

PROPERTY OF UNIVERSITY
OF WASHINGTON LIBRARIES
GRADUATE READING ROOM
NON-CIRCULATING

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82^d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 97—PART 14

JULY 12, 1951, TO SEPTEMBER 17, 1951

(PAGES A4317 TO A5638)



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82^d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Appendix

Time to Talk Tough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1951

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a column by William L. Ryan, Associated Press news analyst entitled "Talk Tough to Russia," which appeared in the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat-Chronicle on July 9, 1951, and an editorial commenting on this column, which appeared in the Democrat-Chronicle the following day.

The burden of these articles is that it is high time to call the Soviet's bluff. In the light of the colossal evidence of bad faith exhibited by the Communists in the Korea cease-fire talks, in staging the talks in an enemy-held city, to the accompaniment of a barrage of enemy propaganda, this advice is both eminently timely and eminently sound. It is one thing for us to be judicious and temperate. It is something else again to submit to deliberate perfidy committed by an enemy who is without the rudiments of either civil or military honor.

Mr. Speaker, the time has certainly come, as these articles well point out, for us to come down off Olympus in our dealings with the Communists, and talk tough.

The articles follow:

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat-Chronicle of July 9, 1951]

TALK TOUGH TO RUSSIA

(By William L. Ryan)

Perhaps the time has come for the United States to assume that the Russians are going to act like Russians. With this in mind—should a cease fire be made to stick in Korea—perhaps this is the time for the United States to begin talking the toughest kind of talk to Moscow.

There are all sorts of reasons for believing the Russians, from Politburo to peasant, are scared. What they do now—and they most surely will have some sort of offensive improvised after Korea—will likely be prompted by that fear.

The Russians, with their vast national inferiority complex, may panic more easily

than we think. Today the bulk of the Russian people dreads war. They know what it is. The Politburo dreads a shooting war because it is aware that it is unready, internally and otherwise. It has made a strategic retreat in Korea—and Korea is beginning to look like a great Soviet blunder. The U. S. S. R.—and the czarist governments before it—always feared a ring of hostility. It is a reality today. Korea, opening the eyes of the Western World to Soviet designs, solidified and strengthened the opposition.

Moscow feared a rearmed West. Korea is making it a reality. Moscow dreaded a remilitarized Germany. But if Western Germany is rearmed, Moscow can blame its adventure in Korea. The Soviet Union now will bring its greatest propaganda barrages to bear against German remilitarization, and in favor of the kind of treaties the Russians want in Germany and Japan.

She may even make menacing gestures. The Western answer can be tough talk—tough talk which can penetrate the iron curtain to the masses of people behind it. They remember that Germany alone, with a heavily armed world on its back, almost brought the great Soviet Union to its knees. Let them now ponder the prospect of a united Western Europe backed by American might.

But it is not only dread of the West's arms which may now keep the Soviet Union in check. Russia itself is a vast complex of fear, the accumulation of decades of rule based on fear.

There is evidence in the Soviet press that the Russian worker is tired—very tired. In the ranks of the proletariat, swollen by the mass importation of country bumpkins with little aptitude or liking for industrial labor there seems to be a slow, despairing resentment. They may have a little more materially than their fathers or grandfathers had, but they are paying a heavy price.

When a worker lately snatched from the farm fouls up an assembly line, his "nitch-evo"—so what?—no longer is a refuge. He is accused of sabotage. He loses pay or he can even be sent away to a labor camp.

When this process is repeated many, many times, factories fail to meet their quotas. The industry fails to achieve goals imposed from above. With true Russian inability to find a middle course, the Politburo orders a shakeup.

Not many months ago a number of ministries underwent these shake-ups. New ones are in the offing now. Pravda has been lashing everything from "serious shortcomings to antistate activities in a number of industries. In particular the lumber, meat and dairy, food and fish industries and the ministry of light industry have been whipped editorially.

Note that all these industries are concerned with consumer welfare. The task

asked of them is impossible. From fear the Soviet Union is throwing everything into the yawning maw of its heavy industry—its war industry. But by succumbing to the great overriding fear the U. S. S. R. is creating new ones daily.

The fears accumulate and multiply themselves. Perhaps in the not too distant future the peak will be reached and the dam will burst. Perhaps the Politburo, more given to blunders than we have been led to suspect, is aware of this danger. Perhaps the time has come to tell Moscow we're sick and tired of their nonsense.

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat-Chronicle of July 10, 1951]

FEAR 'BEHIND THE CURTAIN

On this page yesterday, William L. Ryan offered some encouraging comment for anyone who is inclined to believe that Russia holds all the high cards. Mr. Ryan feels that Russia is beset by fears, that she could not be as tough an antagonist as too many persons believe. And he wondered, at the last, if it wouldn't be worth while for this country to begin talking up to the Soviets. Perhaps because this newspaper has expressed much the same opinion, it finds much to cheer in the Ryan article.

As a people we are too much inclined to take Russia's gabblings at face value. We believe what she says, no matter how absurd or how obscure her boasts and threats. Naturally the Democrat and Chronicle is opposed to any war that is not forced on us, but we do not believe that a courageous stand on our part will lead to war.

Here in Rochester last week was held an important meeting. It was the national convention of the Organization for the Rebirth of the Ukraine. These Americans of Ukrainian stock are not frightened at Russia's bulk. They have a confidence that their old country will yet have the shackles stricken from it, that it will live free, that their relatives will not have to wear the Russian brand. Organizations of this sort feed Russia's fears. She knows perfectly well that under her police state are millions of men and women who would make almost any sacrifice to free themselves.

This country cannot begin to realize the Russians' reason for worry. We are a country of many racial stocks, but we are one people. We are a free and responsible people; the Russians are police-state serfs. We have long coast lines to protect, but not so long as the Russians have. We can send a squad of soldiers to any isolated spot, confident they will hold their ground; Russia cannot trust her soldiers. We have our resources, and an assured manufacturing record. Russia lacks the experience and the ability. If we owned the same liabilities as Russia has, we would be sick with worry.

Cease Fire: Round One**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by Erwin D. Canham, showing the humiliating position in which the United States and the United Nations have been placed in the negotiations at Kaesong.

Our negotiations are under a white flag in an armed stronghold without any news or radio coverage. Once again the Communists are holding and playing all the trumps.

CEASE FIRE: ROUND ONE

(By Erwin D. Canham)

Once more the Communists have completely defeated the rest of us in the use of news as propaganda. They have made public, through the Russia Tass Agency, a detailed statement of what the Communist negotiators proposed at the Kaesong cease-fire conferences and what the United States officers replied. Perhaps they have falsified the record. But at any rate they have sent a precise account around the world.

Meantime the American officers, who ought to understand the operation of news and of a free press—but obviously do not—are tangled in obscurity and confusion. Only a day earlier, General Ridgway held a press conference in which he promised there would be a direct briefing for the correspondents every evening by a member of the delegation staff who had sat in on the conference sessions. He said he would make every effort to get the Allied press to Kaesong, and announced a plan for 16 correspondents and 16 photographers to make the trip. He said a generous amount of description of the atmosphere and color of the meetings would be provided.

Actually, the Allied press received only the scantiest reports of what happened at the first meeting, and then from officers who had not been at Kaesong and had only a little second-hand information. The plan to send correspondents to Kaesong was canceled at the last minute on the ground that it might upset the negotiations.

Meantime, from Moscow, from Peking, and from other Communist centers came a precise and detailed story of what happened at Kaesong. The Tass Agency said that the Communists at Kaesong proposed immediate cessation of hostilities, withdrawal of opposing troops from both sides of the thirty-eighth parallel to a distance of about 7 miles, and evacuation of foreign forces from Korea.

We do not know whether or not this Communist news story, which had exclusive factual possession of the world's news wires, is true or not. We ought to know. We would know if the American officers had given as good a briefing to Allied correspondents as the Communist officers gave to Communist correspondents. But they didn't.

Time and time again, in the propaganda-ridden history of the last few years, this sort of thing has happened. The Communists know the value of the war of words. They fight it shrewdly. We do not understand this war—least of all does the typical military mind understand the importance of news. And so we are beaten before we

start—beaten until we wake up. Sooner or later, somebody who understands these things beats some sense into the officials involved.

Obviously General Ridgway's intentions were all right. His advance set-up was excellent. But somewhere down the line, military red tape and excessive caution got in the way. And the Communists ran away with the major propaganda victory.

Their terms—summarized by themselves and unconfirmed by our people—include these four vital points: Establishment of a 6- to 7-mile wide nonmilitary zone on both sides of the thirty-eighth parallel; maintenance of the artificial boundary between North and South Korea; maintenance of the status quo as of June 25, 1950, the start of the war; and an exchange of prisoners.

Whether or not we can accept all these terms is very doubtful. Certainly we would exchange prisoners. A nonmilitary zone on the boundary between non-Communist and Communist territory sounds all right. But maintenance of the artificial boundary marked by the thirty-eighth parallel is bound to be open to grave dispute. And reversion to the status quo as of June 25, 1950, presumably means no inspection of what may be going on militarily north of the parallel. It means the descent of the iron curtain once more. It presumably means—as was made clear in the Tass story—the withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea.

All these points will require much careful study. Already a violent debate has sprung up in the United States over the acceptability of the thirty-eighth parallel. One group says it is either that or a major war with China—resumption and extension of the present fighting. This group, which appears to include the administration, evidently feels that division at the thirty-eighth parallel would be acceptable if we have rights of inspection to detect military build-ups in the north.

A very vigorous contrary viewpoint has come from Democratic Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, an administration stalwart. Senator DOUGLAS says it would be a calamity if the thirty-eighth parallel is accepted by the United Nations as a basis for cease fire. He says it is pure fantasy to think the Communists will permit international inspection north of that line. His statement is apparently confirmed by the Communist demand at Kaesong for reversion to the status quo.

Senator DOUGLAS urges us to demand settlement at the so-called neck of the Korean peninsula, the narrow waist, nearly 100 miles north of the thirty-eighth parallel. He says that if we settle at the parallel, the Communists will have won a tremendous victory in the eyes of all Asia. "They would proclaim throughout Asia," he says, "that they had driven our forces and those of the U. N. from our positions of last November back to the thirty-eighth parallel and that they had won a crushing victory."

And now it remains to be seen exactly what we can get from these negotiations. The apparent Communist terms are not encouraging. Neither are the circumstances of the conference, surrounded by Communist armed forces.

Instead of meeting in a neutral spot, we are meeting under flag of truce behind the Communist lines. According to all the traditions of warfare, that makes us the ones who are suing for peace. And yet this is not the fact. The Communists, through Russia's Malik, made the decisive overture. We are not suitors. But we are put in that position, and there seems to be nothing we can do about it short of withdrawing from the negotiations.

If the Communist terms are as intractable as they appear to be, this may be the result before long anyway. Or the Commu-

nists may have been engaging in another propaganda spree. Until solid facts come out, we won't know. Stirred by the Communist propaganda victory, the U. N. officials will no doubt speak fast and specifically about the second session of the conference.

Meantime, it is obvious that we are by no means sure of an acceptable cease fire. The road to peace may still be long and hard. But it will be better to fight on for a just and honorable peace than to accept terms which would be defeat now and might mean worse fighting later on. So far, the U. N. forces have valiantly resisted aggression. They should continue to do so until the cause of peace is safe.

An Affirmative Foreign Policy**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, recently I listened with interest to a former Communist who had been converted to the philosophy of a free economy. He described our ideological contest with the totalitarian Soviet system as religious warfare. He described the Communists as religious fanatics burning with crusading zeal for the cause in which they intensely, though mistakenly, believed. He cautioned that the free world could not combat an idea, however erroneous, with a vacuum.

In House Resolution 3798, I sought to contribute to the development of an affirmative foreign policy through demonstrating to the peoples of the world by performance that free enterprise is a superior economic system to totalitarianism.

Very thoughtful comment and constructive criticism is contained in correspondence with Dr. Paul H. Appleby, who is dean of the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University; former Assistant Director, United States Bureau of the Budget; former Undersecretary of Agriculture; former Special Assistant to Lend-Lease Administrator; and member of International Food Missions.

For the benefit of the Congress in its current consideration of the proposed foreign-aid program, I am inserting this correspondence in the RECORD.

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY,

Syracuse, N. Y., May 25, 1951.

DEAR Mr. MEADER: I acknowledge with hearty thanks your letter of May 17 and the enclosed reprint from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In general terms I applaud heartily your purposes and nearly all of your remarks. I think the general point you make is indisputably valid and the dramatization through some such device as your proposed commission would be a thoroughly constructive step. I think you are to be congratulated on your insight and on your freedom from damaging partisan bias.

I have qualms about one part of your enunciation of agenda points. It seems to me that some of your phrases and some of

your paragraphs could be interpreted—without unfairness, even if not correctly—as a certain kind of “imperialistic” drive on behalf of American-type capitalism. At least, your language does not overtly, I think, recognize adequately the many variations in economic structures characteristic of modern societies outside of the iron curtain area, and the insistence of these nations on building in their own terms and not in terms that we find quite satisfactory in the United States. The nationalization of oil or the eviction of foreign ownership of an oil industry, has become a considerable problem internationally just now and illustrates the difficulties I had in mind. Actually, the foreign ownership of important industries in Yugoslavia, in Iran, in Iraq, in Mexico, in India, and in China has been an important aspect of the problem of world order, and if I read your proposal correctly it is predicated rather too sharply on an assumption of great increase in investment of the very kind that has proved offensive in the past. In many parts of the world and in case of certain kinds of investments, it seems to me that a realistic and cooperative approach to the problem of cooperation and world order will of necessity dictate a good deal of help directly to governments and directly through and from our own Government. I don't believe that the issue is wholly an either/or one, but any adequate general approach to the problem you are addressing, it seems to me, ought to include in its terms of reference possibilities for both governmental expenditure and investment and private investment.

With your more fundamental position, I think as already indicated, that there can be no quarrel at all. In one way it may be said that the modern world problem is a problem of raising the standard of living in the rest of the world at a rate commensurate with our own capacity for economic betterment. The United States is in the position of the family of privilege described long ago by Carlyle; that family declined interest in the needs for sanitation and health provision in the city at the foot of the mountain on which the family resided and when the plague came it did not stop at the foot of the mountain. The United States by its very economic preeminence has more at stake than any other society in the business of achieving a kind of world well being which will bulwark our own attainments and values.

With congratulations on your statesmanlike point of view, and with hearty good wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

PAUL H. APFLEBY.

JUNE 1, 1951.

Dr. PAUL H. APFLEBY,
Dean Maxwell Graduate School,
Syracuse University,
Syracuse, N. Y.

DEAR DEAN APFLEBY: Thank you for your thoughtful comments of May 25, 1951, on my proposal to establish a commission on aid to underdeveloped foreign areas.

You have put your finger on the point most likely to be attacked by those unfriendly to the idea. I sought to make clearly, briefly, as did the President in his message—that it is a responsibility of governments to prevent imperialistic exploitation. I envisage as one of the most important and difficult tasks of the commission the development of workable and enforceable means to prevent such abuses of the free-enterprise system. The Sherman and Clayton Acts, other antitrust legislation, and the efforts of the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice leave much to be desired in maintaining equality of economic opportunity within the United

States. Cartels and monopolies abroad are not regarded in the same light as are restrictive trade practices and agreements here. Evolution of an acceptable policy and workable means of enforcing it would not be easy. I don't pretend to know the solution. Perhaps, an able commission, after careful study, would not find it. I attempted to do no more than state an objective in the passages I have underlined in red on the enclosed reprint.

I recognize, also, that the statements in my speech might be interpreted to be an expression of pride in all things American, and an intention to make over all peoples into our images. Actually, I hold no such views. Religions, traditions, social customs and practices, as such, to the extent they do not impair an individual's right to make his livelihood in a free, competitive economy, need not be affected in any way. Any modification required by changed economic conditions would very likely be slow, depending upon education and acceptance of more modern concepts. This is a vast subject, but I would not pretend that religion and customs have no bearing on the economic plight of the underdeveloped areas. Nor do I advocate that they be “Americanized,” except that I think they should have “free”—as contrasted to “totalitarian”—economies if the point 4 objective is to be attained. I sought, at least, to hint at this attitude near the end of the third column on page 3.

I agree that the problem is not either Government grant-in-aid or private investment, but a judicious and balanced combination of both. Your reference to Carlyle's episode is apt—but I would counter that the greatest favor we can do for the underdeveloped peoples is to help them establish for themselves a system where the dynamic forces of individual free man are unleashed in the economic development of the natural resources of the areas they inhabit.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEADER.

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY,
Syracuse, N. Y., June 7, 1951.

Mr. GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. MEADER: It was a real satisfaction to get your letter of June 1. While I had made my comment not on any assumption that your own thinking had missed anything that I might point out, but rather in terms of how others might interpret what you had in mind, the time you took in writing your letter was well spent as far as I am concerned. It reinforces my earlier judgment that you are pursuing with exceptional understanding an undertaking of great potentialities. You have my heartiest best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL H. APFLEBY.

Meet Your Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1951

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following transcription of a speech by Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, dated July 8, 1951:

MEET YOUR CONGRESS

(By Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN)

In the summer of 1950, after the Korean invasion, the President asked Congress to give him authority for the control of credit and power to do certain things considered necessary to the rapid building-up of our Armed Forces and for preparing for all-out war if needs be.

He did not ask for authority to control wages and prices. Not only did he not ask for such authority, but it was clearly understood that he preferred not to have it at that time.

Congress thought otherwise. We believed that should the war grow, it might be necessary to exercise price and wage controls in addition to the means of controlling inflation at its source through the imposition of taxes and restriction of credit.

Therefore, Congress wrote into the Defense Production Act of last September a provision for stand-by controls.

Although new taxes were authorized and stricter credit controls on installment buying were imposed, the President made no move to control wages and prices until January 1951.

In retrospect it appears that the new taxes and credit controls might have prevented any serious price boosts had it not been for one thing.

Between the outbreak in Korea and February 1, 1951, the administration made available nearly \$8,000,000,000 in new credit and purchasing power.

Under the whip-cracking of the White House and the Treasury, the Federal Reserve Board bought several billions in Government bonds.

From this source alone, the lending power of the country's banks increased billions of dollars.

When a bank has idle credit, it lends it if possible. That is what happened in this case.

And 60 percent of the loans from this new credit were made to commodity dealers, speculators, and processors who bid the price of certain commodities way up. Cotton led the way.

Not only did the administration provide speculators with huge amounts of credit, but in late fall and early winter Federal officials made a series of scare pronouncements about coming scarcities and high prices.

This resulted in considerable panic buying by consumers and by January prices had reached a level that the administration said necessitated price controls.

Not a bit of responsibility did the White House assume for its inexcusable and costly blunders. It had to have a whipping boy on which to put the blame.

Whom did it select? Not big business which has its own way these days. Not the transportation companies whose rates have soared until in some cases transportation costs now equal or exceed the cost of the goods. Not the Treasury, which started the inflation spiral in the first place. Not the Government practice of negotiating 40 billion in contracts without regard to any price ceilings at all.

It decided to put the blame on the American farmer—the man who Charlie Brannan told Congress earns the outrageous amount of 69 cents per hour.

So the campaign goes on. Big Government and big business and big-city newspapers against the American farmer—the most outrageous—the most unfair—the most unwarranted propaganda campaign of modern history. The whole pack in pursuit of a quarry which will not run.

I oppose giving further controls to this administration which has not shown its ability to properly use those it already has.

New England Pays More United States Taxes Than It Gets in Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1951

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George H. Arris, from the Providence Journal of July 11, 1951:

NEW ENGLAND PAYS MORE UNITED STATES TAXES THAN IT GETS IN BENEFITS—RHODE ISLAND RECEIVES LARGER PROPORTIONATE SHARE OF WHAT GOVERNMENT SPENDS THAN OTHER STATES IN AREA; COMMITTEE POINTS UP ISSUE

(By George H. Arris)

New England, according to the committee on the New England economy, pays substantially more in Federal taxes than it gets back in Federal expenditures.

In 1948 the region was receiving in the form of Federal Government expenditures, 71 cents for every dollar of taxes sent down to Washington.

Among the New England States, however, Rhode Island, the committee said in its report to the President's Council of Economic Advisers, gets a larger proportionate share of what the Government does spend in New England than any other of the six States.

The comparison is made in all six States in ratios. That is, Government expenditures in a State are taken as a percentage of total expenditures in the country, and the figure so attained is compared with that State's percentage of total United States population and total United States income payments.

RHODE ISLAND RATIO

Set up in this fashion, the committee's tabulation showed that Rhode Island, with 0.51 percent of United States population and 0.57 percent of total income payments in the country, received 0.62 percent of Government expenditures.

In other New England States Federal spending ratios run well below ratios of population and income.

No figures are given in the committee's report on the ratio of Federal taxes paid in Rhode Island to those in the country as a whole, so that it is not possible in absolute terms to get at the amount of actual money drained from the State because of the excess of taxes over Federal expenditures.

Because there is no fine breakdown of State figures in the report, it is impossible also to determine the importance to this State, as compared with other New England States, of husky military installations here and the amount of income generated by them. The most recent estimate of the value of such installations was \$129,198,505 last year. Payroll data shows that the Navy and Army are paying civilian employees in Rhode Island close to \$1,900,000 a month.

ONE BILLION DOLLARS DIFFERENCE

In the study of New England's Federal tax-expenditure relationship, which was a part of a section in the committee's report dealing with capital drain and trade balance, the economists said that the region collected in taxes and sent to other regions of the country close to \$1,000,000,000 more annually than it got back in Federal expenditures.

This deficit was the result of higher per capita incomes in New England, on which taxes were levied, than in many other regions, on the tax side of the equation. And, the result of the farm-support program, various

types of subsidies, and natural resource or other types of public development undertaken by the Federal Government in other parts of the country, in larger amounts than in New England.

The committee said, moreover, that the gap between taxes collected in New England and United States expenditures received had widened substantially in recent years. Whereas spending in New England in 1948 was 71 percent of Federal receipts from the six States, the ratio had been 83 percent in 1929.

NEW ENGLAND'S CHOICE

Discussing this gap, the committee said New England must choose between opposing Government spending unsuccessfully or seeking its fair share of such expenditures—a suggestion which drew fire from several corners of New England.

The committee, however, indicated in its report it would welcome the kind of public discussion it aroused in a region where, it said, "influential people, critical of Federal policies and urging retrenchment, do not want to be bailed out by the Federal Government."

"Here is the great issue," the committee wrote. "New Englanders must decide whether, as Federal operations continue to expand, the region should stand idly by while its income is drained off to benefit other areas and should continue to shun Federal aid of all kinds."

SEEK LARGER SHARE?

"Or, are New Englanders going to seek a larger share of the Federal outlays that increase markets, reduce costs, and bring other regional and national advantages?"

"This is an important issue which should be understood and debated more fully by all groups in the region."

The committee urged new economies in Federal Government as an aid to New England, revision of the tax structure so that the burden falls more on surpluses and less on costs, and "careful consideration by State and local governments of Federal programs which might contribute toward the improvements of the New England economy."

Concerning New England's balance of trade, the committee drew upon a study made in 1939 by Penelope C. Hartland, of Brown University, for much of its information on the excess of imports into the region (in dollar terms) over exports.

RAW MATERIALS

Imports in this instance meant the raw materials and goods which were bought and paid for by New Englanders. Exports were the finished goods and services sold.

In 1939, according to the committee, the excess of imports of commodities over goods exported amounted to \$1,306,600,000, or about 25 percent of the region's income. In part New England paid this balance by earnings on past investments in other parts of the country and by the sale of services—recreation, travel, insurance, education, dividends, rents, and royalties.

Sale of services took care of about 69 percent of the commodity trade deficit, leaving a final unpaid balance of \$404,300,000.

This 69 percent, finally, was made up by importation of capital. That is, outside corporations built plants here, outsiders purchased summer homes, investments trusts channeled new funds into New England enterprises, and foreigners sent capital into this part of the country.

STAKE IN INFLATION CONTROL

Because of the structure of the region's balance of payments, the committee said—that is, because it buys more commodities than it sells—New England has a basic stake in control of inflation.

According to an as yet unpublished analysis by the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, the report said, New England was a net loser

by \$7,000,000 on commercial and financial accounts during 1950 for the first time on record.

This, it said, was primarily the result of what it called the differential impact of inflation upon regions. That is, the bulk of commodities—farm-grown and mined—has risen in price proportionately more than the price of goods made here and shipped to other sections of the country.

TARIFF POLICIES

Concerning trade with foreign countries, the committee pointed to the importance of both export and import business to New England and urged Federal Government consideration of this region in formulation of tariff policies.

It said that tariff reductions in recent years on hard fiber cordage, jute burlap, jute bags, raw wool, softwood lumber, zinc, bauxite, aluminum, copper, manganese, pig iron, steel ingots, unfabricated structural shapes of iron and steel had aided the New England economy as a heavy consumer of these materials.

But it urged Federal authorities to be cautious in making concessions affecting the important old industries in which domestic employment is declining.

"Any concessions on manufactured goods which impair New England's economic position in its large declining industries," it said, "should be offset by reduced barriers on imports of raw materials and goods into New England."

American Bar Association's Proposed Revenue Revision Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. SIDNEY CAMP

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1951

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

SUMMARY EXPLANATION OF AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION'S PROPOSED REVENUE REVISION ACT OF 1951

TITLE I INCOME TAXES

Section 101, taxable years affected: Except as otherwise expressly provided, all amendments made by this title shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950.

Section 102, elimination of the life-insurance factor of pension trusts from taxable income of employees: Under the present law, if a plan provides retirement-income-insurance benefits together with death benefits, the employee receiving such protection is deemed to receive current taxable income measured by the cost of term life insurance in the amount provided during the year. The result is inconsistent with the long-standing rule to the effect that group-insurance benefits are not currently taxable to employees. The amounts are generally small and the administrative difficulties far outweigh the advantage in revenue to the Government. PS-58, promulgated January 30, 1947, and revised March 7, 1947, mitigates this burden somewhat, but does not cure the administrative nuisance, both to the Government and to employers and trustees, of treating the life-insurance factor as taxable income. The bar association proposes to eliminate the insurance factor of pension trusts from taxable income by an amendment to section 22 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Section 103, extension to 75 days of the time within which taxpayer on accrual basis may contribute amounts to pension plan and secure deduction therefor in year of accrual: Under the present law, a taxpayer on an accrual basis cannot take a deduction for the accrued amount of payments to a pension or profit-sharing plan unless actual payment is made within 60 days after the close of the taxable year of accrual. The bar association recommends that section 23 (p) (1) (E) be amended so as to extend this time period to 75 days after the close of the taxable year. The payments under many plans are determinable only when the audited results of the year's operations are known, and often this is difficult to obtain within 60 days.

Section 104, union welfare trusts, deductibility of contributions: The enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act has brought into the limelight so-called union welfare funds, many of which provide pension or annuity benefits. It is understood that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has taken the position that contributions by employers to funds which provide such benefits are not deductible for income tax purposes unless they meet the requirements of section 23 (p) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to conventional pension or annuity plans. The result of this position is to put in jeopardy the deduction of such contributions, since it will be difficult in most cases, if not impossible to meet the requirements of actuarial soundness applicable to deductions under section 23 (p). Accordingly, it is proposed to rectify the situation by making clear the deductibility of contributions to welfare trusts which meet the requirements of section 302 (c) (5) of the Labor Management Relations Act under section 23 (a) of the code relating to ordinary and necessary business expenses. This is believed to be consonant with the intention of Congress, which could hardly have intended that the 1942 amendments to section 23 (p) and 165 of the code should apply to these welfare trusts. This provision is made applicable to all taxable years beginning after December 31, 1941.

Section 105, pension and profit-sharing plans: extension of capital-gains treatment to distributions made within 1 year on account of either the employee's separation from the service or death: Under the present law, if the total distributions payable under a qualified pension or profit-sharing plan are paid to the distributee within one taxable year of the distributee on account of the employee's separation from the service, the amount of such distribution is considered a capital gain to the extent that the amount exceeds the amounts contributed by the employee. This provision is a very desirable one because if, when an employee retires and receives a lump-sum payment, he were taxed at ordinary income rates in 1 year on the total amount of distributions over what he has contributed, a large percentage of the amount he receives might be taken by the tax authorities. Subsection (b) of the bar association proposal would amend section 165 (b) of the code so as to extend capital gains treatment not only to situations where the payment is due to the employee's separation from the service, but also to situations where it is due to the employee's death after his separation from the service.

Subsection (a) is an amendment to section 22 (b) (2) (B), to extend the same capital gains treatment to nontraded plans. There seems no reason why, if the particular pension or profit-sharing plan of a corporation is set up on an annuity basis rather than on a trust basis, this technical distinction should mean a different method of taxation to the recipient of the payments. This section would be applicable to all taxable years since 1941.

Section 106, pension plans for partnerships and individual proprietorships: Un-

der existing law, partners and sole proprietors may not be included as beneficiaries under pension plans for their employees under section 165 of the code, although stockholders employed by their corporation are not so affected. The result is to discourage the establishment of such plans for the employees of business conducted in non-corporate form, and to discriminate against employees of unincorporated business. Section 106 would amend section 165 of the code by providing that the sole proprietor or partner who performs personal services in the business shall be treated as an employee as well as an employer for the purposes of that section; that the part of his income from the business which is attributable to his services shall be deemed compensation; and that where both personal services and capital are material income-producing factors, the apportionment of income to services shall be made under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner.

Section 107, taxation of annuity payments: Under present law, annuity payments are treated as in part a nontaxable return of premiums, and the balance as taxable income. However, the formula used treats as taxable income all of the excess annual receipts over and above 3 percent of the amounts paid for the annuity. The result is that many annuitants are never able to recapture their outlay tax-free, while others, through such recapture, incur a sharp rise in taxable income in the year following that in which the total cost has been recovered under this arbitrary formula.

The proposed amendment substitutes a constant yearly exclusion for the life of the annuitant. If he lives out his exact life expectancy, he will recover tax-free exactly the cost of the annuity. If he lives beyond such expectancy, he will recover tax-free more than his premiums paid; if he dies before the expiration of such expectancy, he will recover less. However, on the average, the results are equitable in that the revenues will not be reduced, and the annuitant's taxable income from this source will be constant.

Section 108, cancellation of indebtedness: Section 22 (b) (9) of the code permits a corporation in certain situations to elect to exclude from gross income the income which would otherwise be taxable to it upon the cancellation of indebtedness, on condition that the basis of its property under section 113 be correspondingly reduced. This provision, in situations to which it applies, relieves hardship by deferring an additional tax burden upon a taxpayer already embarrassed financially. However, the provision is a temporary one, not applicable to cancellations of debt occurring after December 31, 1949; the election to get its benefits must be made at the time the return is filed; it does not apply to noncorporate taxpayers; and it does not apply unless the canceled debt was evidenced by a security as therein defined.

Section 108 would make the provision a permanent part of the code; would extend the period of election until the expiration of the period for filing a claim for refund; would make the provision applicable to all taxpayers; and would eliminate the requirement that the debt be evidenced by a security. The reason for extending the date for election is that there is great uncertainty under the decisions (cf. *Helvering v. American Dental Co.* (318 U. S. 322) and *Commissioner v. Jacobson* (336 U. S. 28)) as to when cancellation of debt results in taxable income to the debtor, and the taxpayer is often unable to determine what action to take at the time the return is filed.

Section 109, last-in-first-out inventory: In cases where, upon retirement of elective inventories involuntarily liquidated, deficiencies or refunds are determined for the year of involuntary liquidation, the present law (sec. 22 (d) (6) of the Internal Revenue

Code) provides that no interest is payable on such deficiencies or refunds. Subsection (a) provides for interest on such deficiencies from January 1, 1948, or from the due date of the tax for the year of replacement, whichever is later; and provides for interest on such refunds from January 1, 1948, or from the date of filing of the claim for refund, whichever is later. In view of the recent addition (by Public Law 819, 81st Cong.) of subparagraph (F) to the code provision in question, a corresponding change is made by subsection 109 (b) of the bill for years to which subparagraph (F) is applicable.

Section 110, alimony paid under separation agreement: Under sections 22 (k) and 171 (a) of the code, amounts paid in accordance with the terms of a separation agreement between husband and wife, where they are not legally divorced or separated under court decree, are not deductible by the husband or taxable to the wife. With the privilege of splitting income introduced by the Revenue Act of 1948, which is open to all married couples not separated under a court decree, it is believed that where separate returns are filed, amount paid under separation agreements should be deductible by the husband and taxable to the wife, even though they are not legally separated under court decree. The proposed amendment is to that effect, although it should be noted that the husband and wife who are thus separated may, at their option, file a joint return, in which event the recommended change would become inapplicable.

Section 111, deduction of worthless stock loss in case of affiliated corporation: This section amends section 23 (g) (4) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code to remove an apparently unintended discrimination.

Section 23 (g) (4) provides that a corporation may deduct as an ordinary loss the loss on worthless stock in an affiliated corporation. In defining what is an affiliate for purposes of that paragraph, section 23 (g) (4) (B) provides that a corporation shall not be deemed to be an affiliate with the taxpayer unless more than 80 percent of the aggregate of its gross income for all years has been from sources other than royalties, rents, dividends, interest annuities, or gains from securities transactions. The limitation was put into the statute in order to exclude holding companies from the benefits of section 23 (g) (4), but as now worded the law inadvertently excludes a number of operating companies, such as banks and investment companies, just because much of their income is derived from rents, interest, or the like. The proposed amendment would extend the benefits of section 23 (g) (4) to losses on the stock of corporations "actively engaged in a trade or business," whatever the source of their income.

Section 112, extension of business-bad-debt deduction: Under existing law a distinction is made between business bad debts and non-business bad debts. The distinction is important because the former are deductible in full and the latter (in the case of a taxpayer other than a corporation) are treated as short-term capital losses which are deductible only against capital gains plus not more than \$1,000 of ordinary income. The nonbusiness bad debt is so defined under existing law as to include true business debts which do not become worthless until after the taxpayer has terminated his business. Since it is manifestly unfair to distinguish in this manner between business debts which become worthless while the business is still in operation and those which become worthless at a later date, section 112 amends the definition of a nonbusiness bad debt so as to exclude a debt arising in the course of the taxpayer's trade or business.

Section 113, change of election with respect to standard deduction: Existing law permits the individual income-tax payer to elect to take a standard deduction instead

of itemizing his deductions. This election must be made on the tax return in a manner prescribed by regulations. An election so made is irrevocable. This provision has worked unjustly for taxpayers who find subsequently that they have acted unwisely or whose correct taxable income is subsequently found to be different from that on the return. Section 113 permits the taxpayer to change an election with respect to the standard deduction for any taxable year, within the period of the statute of limitations. Such change must be made under regulations to be prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

Section 114, wages paid to dependents: Under existing law a taxpayer is permitted to claim a deduction in computing his income tax for wages paid by him to a person who is a dependent and for whom he claims an exemption. Since these wages reduce the extent of the recipient's dependency, it is undesirable to allow the deduction while also allowing the dependency credit. Section 114 disallows the deduction of wages paid to persons who are dependents of the taxpayer.

Section 115, unpaid expenses and interest, related taxpayers: Section 24 (c) of the code was passed at the request of the Treasury to eliminate a great inequity against the Government. Prior to that act, corporate-tax payers would be permitted deductions on the accrual basis for amounts of salaries or interest or the like accrued to related taxpayers; but the related taxpayers (being on the cash basis) might delay for a long time paying or might never pay a tax on the income. Despite the clear purpose of section 24 (c), which was simply to correct the injustice against the Government which was previously possible, the Bureau of Internal Revenue has with success applied that section even to cases where the related taxpayer, although on the cash basis, is actually taxed upon the accrued item upon a theory of constructive receipt. See *Lake v. Commissioner* (148 Fed (2d) 898). Section 115 of the bill would amend section 24 (c) so as to provide that, if the recipient of income is actually taxed on the income, whether or not received by him, the deduction will be allowed to the related taxpayer.

Section 116, credit for dividends received: Under existing law, section 26 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code limits the dividends received credit to 85 percent of the amount received as dividends from domestic corporations which are subject to income taxation. This credit is not extended to resident foreign corporations having substantial income from sources within the United States. Such resident foreign corporations are frequently owned by domestic corporations with the result that, although the foreign corporation is subjected to the regular normal and surtax rates with respect to its earnings from United States sources, dividends to the parent domestic corporation do not furnish a basis for the dividends received credit otherwise afforded similarly owned domestic corporations. The proposed amendment will remedy that situation by extending such credit, with what are believed to be appropriate limitations.

Section 117, installment sales: Section 44 (b) permits use of the installment method, in the case of sales of realty and casual sales of personality, only where the payments during the taxable year in which the sale is made are less than 30 percent of the selling price. Where no payments at all are received in the initial period, the Treasury holds that the conditions are not met and the installment method may not be used. The proposed amendment would avoid this interpretation and would permit application of the installment sales provisions where no part of the selling price is received during the taxable year.

Section 118, installment obligations: This section extends to the estate or beneficiary of a decedent who has elected to report income from installment obligations upon the installment basis a deduction for that portion of the estate tax which was imposed upon the value of such obligations.

Section 119, taxable years of approximately 12 months: This section gives specific legal sanction to the practice of authorizing the use of a 52-week or 53-week year for the purpose of reporting for the income tax.

Section 120, service rendered for a period of 36 months or more: Existing law provides that if at least 80 percent of the total compensation for personal services covering a period of 36 calendar months or more is received or accrued in a single taxable year by an individual or partnership, the tax may be calculated as if the income had been received ratably over the period, prior to such receipt or accrual, in which the services were performed. The relief provided by this averaging device is limited specifically to cases where compensation has been received in a single year for at least 80 percent of a complete task. Relief is denied in situations where an individual is employed continuously for long periods but receives portions of his compensation for the work in lump sums at infrequent intervals. Section 120 extends averaging treatment to cases in which 80 percent of the total compensation for work done to date over a period of 36 months or more is received or accrued in a single taxable year. This provision is made retroactive to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1941.

Section 121, election as to recognition of gain in certain corporate liquidations: Many corporations having no substantial accumulations of earnings and profits nevertheless hold real estate or unlisted corporate securities not readily marketable but considerably appreciated in value. Several times Congress has passed temporary legislation to permit such corporations to be liquidated under certain circumstances without adverse effects upon the stockholders; that is, by taxing to the individual stockholder as ordinary income only that part of the distribution which represents accumulated earnings, the remainder being treated as a capital gain, but excluding from tax the unrealized appreciation in value of assets, that gain being postponed until the stockholder sells such assets. Section 206 of the Revenue Act of 1950, the last such enactment, reactivated section 112 (b) (7) of the Internal Revenue Code, but applies only to those liquidations where the transfer of all the property in liquidation occurs within one calendar month in 1951, pursuant to a plan adopted after December 31, 1950. It is felt that the purpose accomplished generally by this type of legislation is beneficial to the public; and, if this is true, it should not be limited to a single short period. The proposed amendment would make permanent in the Internal Revenue Code the temporary provisions of section 112 (b) (7).

Section 122, gain or loss in connection with certain corporate liquidations: Under existing law, if a corporation is liquidated by distributing its assets to its stockholders, no tax is imposed on the corporation on any appreciation in the value of the assets over the adjusted basis, or cost, to the corporation. As far as the stockholders are concerned, any excess of the value of such assets over the cost or other basis of the stock is taxed as capital gains.

On the other hand, if the corporation sells its assets just prior to liquidation, a tax is imposed on the corporation, and when the proceeds are distributed to the stockholders another tax may be imposed on them. In a great many cases disputes have arisen between the Government and the taxpayer as to whether a sale was made by a corporation

or its shareholders. The problem first went to the Supreme Court in the *Court Holding Co.*, case (324 U. S. 331 (1945)), and again in the *Cumberland Public Service Co.*, case (338 U. S. 451 (1950)), where the Court said: "The oddities in tax consequences that emerge from the tax provisions here controlling appear to be inherent in the present tax pattern. * * * Congress having determined that different tax consequences shall flow from different methods by which the shareholders of a closely held corporation may dispose of corporate property, we accept its mandate."

Section 122 provides that if a corporation sells its assets just prior to liquidation, no gain or loss shall be recognized to the corporation. It contains safeguard provisions against liquidation being used as a device for paying at capital gain rates on sales in the normal course of trade.

Section 123, stock dividends: As the result of recent Treasury Department rulings, the receipt by a taxpayer of preferred stock tax-free as a stock dividend or in a corporate reorganization depends not only upon whether the dividend is in form a tax-free stock dividend or the reorganization is in form a tax-free reorganization, but also upon whether the preferred stock so received is sold by the receiving stockholder or whether it is subject to redemption under sinking fund provisions or by reason of an agreement that the stock may otherwise be redeemed by the corporation in whole or in part. This Treasury attitude makes uncertain the previously well-established law as to tax-free stock dividends and as to the tax-free status of stock received in exchanges under section 112 (b) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code. This uncertainty is hampering many legitimate transactions which should be consummated.

The effect of the proposed amendments is to state explicitly what is deemed to be declaratory of existing law, namely, that the effect of the tax-free character of a corporate distribution of stock should not be lost merely because the stockholder sells or intends to sell his new securities, or that the new securities are subject to a sinking-fund provision of reasonable length fixed with reference to assuring the marketability of the stock, or that the stock is subject to redemption, in whole or in part, at the option of the issuing corporation. The proposed amendments also include a provision that would close any loophole that may exist by reason of a taxpayer entering into a tax-avoidance plan to receive a tax-free distribution of stock, sell the stock, and then have the stock redeemed in the hands of the purchaser.

Section 124, involuntary conversion: Section 112 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code postpones the taxation of profits realized in involuntary conversions where similar properties are acquired to replace those converted. The present statute has been construed to limit the relief to situations where the specific funds received on the involuntary conversion can be traced into similar property. It is often necessary to replace the property before the proceeds of the involuntary conversion are actually in the hands of the taxpayer. Section 124 of the bill amends section 112 (f) so as to provide that it is immaterial whether the money into which such property has been converted is expended directly in the acquisition of other similar property or whether it is used to replace funds already expended by the taxpayer in such acquisition.

Section 125, definition of reorganization: This section provides that section 112 (g) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to recognition of gain or loss in corporate reorganizations) be amended so as to provide that no gain or loss shall be recognized where assets exchanged solely for stock are transferred to a corporation which is a wholly

owned subsidiary of the corporation from which the stock is received. Under the present definition of reorganization in section 112, as construed by the courts, a reorganization which would in all other respects be nontaxable may be made taxable if the assets transferred in exchange for a stock are transferred not to the corporation issuing the stock but to a subsidiary of that corporation. The nature of the interest of the corporation transferring the assets and the nature of the interest of the corporation issuing the stock in return therefor are substantially the same whether the assets are transferred directly to the corporation which issues the stock or to a subsidiary of that corporation.

Section 126, distribution of stock on reorganization: This section of the bill provides for the nonrecognition of gain from the receipt of stock in certain corporate reorganizations known as spin-offs. A typical spin-off occurs where a part of the assets of the corporation is transferred to a new corporation in exchange for all the stock of the new corporation which is thereupon distributed to the stockholders of the original corporation without the surrender by them of any of the stock of the original corporation.

A similar provision was contained in section 112 (g) of the Revenue Act of 1932 and prior acts, but this was omitted in the Revenue Act of 1934 because the decision of the Board of Tax Appeals in *Evelyn F. Gregory* (27 B. T. A. 223 (1932)) indicated that such provisions might be subject to abuse and held to apply to what was regarded as in substance the distribution of a dividend. The reversal of that decision in 69 Fed. (2d) 809 (CCA 2, 1934), affirmed (293 U. S. 465 (1935)), removed the danger of such abuse. Judicial and administrative interpretation of the law since 1934 has established safeguards which now prevent such abuse of the reorganization provisions. It is proposed to restore this provision to the law because it is believed that it is economically unsound to impede reorganizations which divide one corporate enterprise into a greater number of corporate enterprises where such division is undertaken for legitimate business purposes and is not a mere device for the distribution of a dividend. Where stock of a new corporation is distributed without the surrender of stock of the old corporation, the result is identical, in substance, with transactions in which stock of the new corporation is distributed in exchange for the surrender of either all or a portion of the stock of the old corporation—transactions which give rise to no recognized gain under present law. It is not intended to change the existing law as to such transactions but to amend the law so as to permit in the future the same substantial result to be accomplished with the same tax consequences by a spin-off reorganization, both types of reorganization being subject to the general limitations embodied in the *Gregory* case and subsequent decisions based thereon.

Section 127, basis of property included in decedent's estate: Under the present law, if property passes by virtue of a decedent's will or by inheritance from him, the income-tax basis for such property in the hands of his estate, devisee or heir, becomes the value at the date of death (or such other valuation date as is used for estate tax purposes). With two minor qualifications, the foregoing rule does not apply to property transferred inter vivos by a decedent even though such property may be includible in his gross estate for estate tax purposes, as, for example, property transferred in contemplation of death. The proposed amendment would change the law so that if property were transferred either inter vivos, or by reason of the decedent's death, and if such property were includible in his gross estate for estate tax purposes, the income tax basis of such property would become,

after his death, its value on the date of death (or other applicable valuation date).

Section 128, adjustment of basis for depreciation: This section amends section 113 (b) (1) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code and prior revenue laws to mitigate the effect of the Supreme Court's decision in the case of *Virginian Hotel Corporation v. Commissioner* (319 U. S. 523 (1943)). Section 113 requires that the original cost or other basis of property be adjusted to reflect depreciation and depletion sustained since the property was acquired. In 1932 the provision was amended to require the deduction of depreciation "allowed" where it was in excess of the depreciation "allowable." The amendment was made at the request of the Treasury, and the legislative history of the amendment shows very clearly that the sole purpose of the provision was to cover a situation where the excessive depreciation resulted in reducing the taxes collected by the Government in a year which had become barred, so that if the excessive depreciation were restored the taxpayer would in effect be getting a double deduction against the Government. However, the Court in the *Virginian Hotel* case reached an incongruous and inequitable result. That decision prevents a taxpayer from correcting a prior erroneous depreciation figure, even when the Government has not been injured by the error. Section 128, in line with the otherwise universal practice of the Federal income tax statutes from 1913 to date, would permit a taxpayer to compute the taxes for any year on a correct basis, without regard to any error in prior years, so long as the error did not deprive the Government of taxes to which it was entitled.

Section 129, farm expenditures for soil and water conservation: Under existing law, farmers are often required to capitalize costs of soil- and water-conservation improvements to their land. However, it is often impractical for farmers to keep adequate records for the purpose of determining the amount of these costs. For example, a farmer who uses his tractor for plowing in the morning and for large-scale contouring in the afternoon theoretically must capitalize some of the depreciation on the tractor and some of the cost of gas and oil. Moreover, farmers cannot depreciate these improvements because land is a nondepreciable asset. Accordingly, farmers who make these improvements must wait until they sell their farms to obtain a tax benefit for incurring the cost of the improvements. It is not practicable to set up an arbitrary depreciation rate, and instead this section provides that farmers and ranchers be granted an option to capitalize or currently deduct the cost of land improvements. It should be emphasized that this provision will not in any way affect treatment of cost of structures, appliances, and facilities which are subject to the allowance for depreciation. These costs will continue to be capitalized. It might be noted that the State of California adopted a similar law in 1949.

Section 130, retirement of bonds: Section 117 (f) provides capital-gain treatment for the redemption of bonds and similar securities in registered or coupon form, although the gain from payment of other evidences of indebtedness is ordinary income. Under the present law, it is possible to convert ordinary evidence of indebtedness into bonds and similar securities without gain or loss and the gain from the redemption thereof will be treated as a capital gain. The Treasury complained that ordinary income could thus be converted into capital gain merely by changing the type of the evidence of indebtedness and in order to prevent this practice H. R. 6712, the tax revision bill of 1948, contained a provision to the effect that capital gain would result in such cases only where the evidence of indebtedness was originally issued in coupon or registered

form. It is believed that the purpose sought to be accomplished by this proposal was proper but that it was too extreme. Assets of a character which give rise to capital gain need only be held 6 months under section 117, and the proposed amendment provides capital-gain treatment where the conversion occurred 6 months or more prior to the redemption.

Section 181, holding period for capital assets: Under existing law, it has been held (*Commissioner v. Gracey* (159 F. (2d) 324)) that if a noncapital asset is exchanged for a capital asset, the holding period for the former may be tacked on to the holding period for the latter for purposes of deciding whether the capital gain is long term or short term. This construction offers a loophole for tax avoidance, and the proposed section closes this loophole by preventing such a tacking-on.

Section 132, capital gains upon maturity or surrender of insurance policy: Under the present law, amounts received upon the maturity of an endowment policy or the surrender of a life-insurance policy during the lifetime of the insured are treated as ordinary income. In practical effect, the present system amounts to the taxation in a single year of income that was actually accumulated over a period of many years, and the result is that the recipient may be taxed at a considerably higher rate than that at which he would have been taxed if the net gain had been paid out to him over the life of the policy in the form of distributed earnings. Section 132 of the present bill would eliminate this harshness by amending section 117 of the code so as to extend capital-gains treatment to such situations.

Section 133, deduction of contributions under disability benefit plans: Several States have enacted legislation providing for disability benefit programs and requiring contributions by both employers and employees to such funds. In some States provision is also made that, under certain conditions, contributions may be made under approved private disability plans in lieu of contributions to the State fund. In such cases payments by the employer and employee are in no sense voluntary, insofar as they do not exceed the amounts required to be paid to the State fund in the absence of an approved private disability benefit plan. In California, New Jersey, and Rhode Island (and possibly other States) the State courts have held that payments required to be made to the State fund are taxes, and the Bureau has ruled that the full amount of the contributions to such fund by both employers and employees are deductible as taxes. On the other hand, the Bureau has ruled that the full amount of the contributions made by employees to approved private plans in California and New Jersey constitute personal expenses which are not deductible for income-tax purposes. Since there seems to be no valid reason why there should be a discrimination in favor of the State fund in such cases, section 133 removes such discrimination by providing that contributions made under approved private disability plans shall be deductible in the same manner and to the same extent and amount as the payments which would be required to be made to the State fund in the absence of such approved private disability benefit plan.

Section 134, net operating loss deduction: The present law permits a corporation, but not an individual, to include in the computation of a net operating loss carry-back or carry-over losses arising from the sale of property used in a trade or business. The proposed amendment is intended to accord to individuals the same privilege now granted to corporations.

Section 135, refunds based on foreign-tax credit: Section 131 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code permits the Commissioner, without any time limitation, to assert additional

tax for prior years resulting from any claim of foreign-tax credit in excess of the foreign tax which is ultimately paid by the taxpayer. However, if the amount of credit claimed under section 131 for foreign taxes is less than the amount ultimately paid, and if the statute of limitations for filing refund claims has expired under section 322 of the code at the time that the additional foreign taxes are finally determined, the taxpayer is barred by the statute of limitations from securing a refund of United States taxes paid for the earlier year because of his not having claimed a sufficient amount of foreign-tax credit. In other words, the assessment of additional United States taxes is never barred, whereas the refund of United States taxes is barred within the customary periods in section 322.

The proposed revision affords parallel treatment in the two instances referred to, providing equality to taxpayers with respect to the treatment of such foreign-tax credits.

Section 136, accrual of foreign taxes: Under present rulings, credits for foreign taxes are not allowable to accrual-basis taxpayers until the final determination of controversies abroad with reference to such foreign taxes. Delay in such foreign determination often results in the taxpayers' loss of any substantial benefit of the credit, because of reduction or elimination of foreign income in the later year and the resultant credit restriction under section 131 (b) of the code.

The proposed amendment authorizes the computation of such foreign-tax credits under the rule of accrual in the year with respect to which the tax is imposed.

Section 137, taxation of the income of estates and trusts: Under the law as it existed prior to 1942, the income of many trusts was wholly or partly taxable to the trust rather than the beneficiary, although the income was actually distributed to the beneficiary. To prevent this form of tax avoidance, Congress adopted in the Revenue Act of 1942 a very complicated set of rules for the determination of distributable income. Two of these rules, known as the 60-day and 12-month rules, require the computation of trust income for arbitrary periods of time, and have proved unduly burdensome and difficult to apply.

The proposed amendment will eliminate these highly technical rules without reopening the loopholes for tax avoidance which Congress sought to abolish in the 1942 act. This is accomplished by taxing to the beneficiary any distribution from a trust, provided the amount of this distribution does not exceed the amount of net income realized by the trust by the end of its taxable year.

The amendment limits the amounts includible in the income of the beneficiaries to the net income of the estate or trust, thus abrogating the rules of the *Johnston v. Helvering* (141 F. (2d) 208), and *McCullough v. Commissioner* (153 F. (2d) 345). The amendment is intended to provide that income shall retain its character and identity in the hands of the beneficiary, thus making it clear that the estate or trust is a conduit of property passing through it to a beneficiary.

The proposed amendment also clarifies the law relating to the ultimate tax on items such as capital gains which are taxable as gross income under Federal tax law, but are treated as items of principal under State law. Such items under the proposed amendment will remain taxable to the fiduciary unless the will or trust instrument specifically provides for their distribution to a beneficiary.

Section 138, income of discretionary insurance trusts: This section of the bill provides that section 167 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the taxation of income of insurance trusts to the grantor, be amended so as to tax the grantor only

to the extent that trust income is actually used to pay premiums on insurance policies on his life. This would bring the taxation of insurance trusts in line with the present taxation of maintenance trusts as to which, since 1943, it has been provided that the grantor will be taxed only to the extent that trust income is actually used for the support or maintenance of persons he is obligated to support.

Section 139, statute of limitations in case of failure to file return: There is presently no statute of limitations where no return was filed, however innocently. The proposed amendment would provide a 6-year statute of limitations (which is double the normal period) where the failure to file a return was not due to fraudulent intent. In the absence of fraud, the reasons underlying the policy of repose in other fields appear equally applicable to tax liabilities.

If the rulings of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, at the time a return would otherwise be due, are to the effect that no return is necessary, and the failure to file results from such rulings, the normal period of limitations should operate just as though a return had been filed, and the proviso clause of this section so provides.

Section 140, relief of fiduciary from personal liability for decedent's fraud: Under the present law, an executor or trustee who distributes assets of the estate becomes personally liable for taxes which may be due at the time of the distribution. If, unknown to the executor or trustee, the decedent filed a fraudulent income-tax return, no statute of limitation runs which would bar the Commissioner from asserting a deficiency against the executor or trustee for personal liability after he had distributed the assets.

Section 140 allows the executor or trustee to protect himself by asking for a release from this liability prior to making distribution.

Section 141, penalty for failure to file return: Under this section, the provisions of the income tax laws relating to penalties for failure to file returns would be amended by liberalizing the conditions under which no penalty is applicable and by vesting in the Commissioner discretion to reduce or remit penalties in proper circumstances. Under the present law, penalties are not imposed if failure to file is due to reasonable cause, but the courts have defined those words so strictly that in many cases the section works great hardship. This section proposed to eliminate this harshness by an amendment to section 291 of the Internal Revenue Code, and to eliminate a parallel harshness now contained in section 506 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code which denies a deficiency dividend credit to a personal holding company if there is a finding that any part of the deficiency is due to a failure to file the return on time, unless such failure is due to reasonable cause. The principal changes are (a) to provide specifically that if the failure to file results from the belief founded upon a reasonable basis, that no return is required, this shall be deemed reasonable cause, and (b) to give the Commissioner authority to abate, reduce, or refund the penalty, as he deems proper under the circumstances.

Section 142, period of limitations on claims against transferees: Under existing law, the Commissioner is given 3 years in which to assess income taxes against the taxpayer. If the taxpayer has transferred his assets without consideration, the Commissioner is given an additional year to assess against the transferee. Where, however, the Commissioner has done nothing within the 3 years and the taxpayer thereafter transfers his assets, there seems to be no reason to allow the Commissioner to revive his dead claim by assessment against the transferee, and the proposed section would specifically prohibit him from doing so.

Section 143, transferee not bound, in absence of timely notice, by determination against transferor: The law provides generally that if assets of a transferor are transferred to another, the transferee, under the trust fund doctrine, shall be responsible for such taxes as may be held to be owed by the transferor. Under the present law, it frequently happens that after such transfer the Commissioner will issue a deficiency notice to the transferor without notifying the transferee against whom the tax will ultimately be assessed. In such cases (for example, a dissolved corporation) a petition may be filed by former officers who have no real interest in the liability and the decision may be rendered that the tax is due by the transferor. In a number of decisions it has been held that such a decision against the transferor is binding on the transferee regardless of the fact that such transferee has not had any opportunity to defend himself. Thus, the transferee may never have his day in court.

The proposed amendment provides that no decision rendered against the transferor after the transfer of assets shall be binding upon the transferee unless said transferee shall have been given personal notice of liability and a full opportunity to appear and be heard in said previous proceeding.

Section 144, limitations in criminal fraud cases: The general Federal statute relating to tolling the statute of limitations in criminal cases is 18 United States Code 3290, which provides: "No statute of limitations shall extend to any person fleeing from justice." However, for crimes arising under the revenue laws, section 3748 (a) suspends the 6-year statute of limitations for the time during which the defendant "is absent from the district" where the offense is committed. The term "district" as here used means the judicial district wherein the return was filed. *U. S. v. Anthracite Brewing Co.* (11 F. Supp. 1019). Yet many taxpayers are by statute required to file their returns with a collector outside their judicial district. For example, residents of the District of Columbia must file their returns in Baltimore. Also a taxpayer, for legitimate reasons may change his residence to another judicial district after the return is filed. In such cases, there is no effective statute of limitations.

This section, therefore, provides that the statute of limitations in cases involving crimes under the revenue laws be tolled only for the period the taxpayer is actually beyond the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States.

Section 145, limitation period in certain cases before the Tax Court. By reason of uncertainties frequently existing as to the year for determining the deductibility of a bad debt or of a worthless security, the Revenue Act of 1942 provided a special 17-year period of limitations within which to claim refunds or credits attributable to the allowance of deductions for such items. This was accomplished by the insertion of section 322 (b) (5) in the Internal Revenue Code. This section (as amended by sec. 504 of the 1943 act) is applicable to years beginning after December 31, 1937.

Under section 322 (d) of the code, this special 7-year statute of limitations is made applicable to proceedings in the Tax Court but that section in this respect was made applicable only to years beginning after December 31, 1942. It thus happens that in certain proceedings before the Tax Court, the 7-year statute is inapplicable to years ending before December 31, 1942, although the taxpayer, had he not filed a petition with the Tax Court, would be at liberty to file a claim for refund and, if necessary, prosecute the refund in other courts. The proposed amendment would make the 7-year statute applicable in all such proceedings.

Section 146, extension of period for refund in case of waiver by transferee: Under

existing law, both the taxpayer and his transferee may agree in writing with the Commissioner to extend the period of limitation for assessment of the tax. If the taxpayer does so, his time for claiming a refund of overpayment is correspondingly extended. However, (probably due to a legislative oversight), such an extension of transferee liability under existing law does not extend the transferee's period for claiming a refund of an erroneous payment. The proposed amendment would remove this discrimination and give the transferee a similar extension of time.

Section 147, exemption of personal holding company classification of corporation joining in consolidated return: Under the Revenue Act of 1942, a personal holding company not filing a consolidated return was subject to personal holding company tax but not to excess-profits tax. When the 1942 act extended the privilege of filing consolidated returns to affiliated corporations generally, it provided that if an affiliated group wished to file a consolidated return all of the corporations in the group, including any affiliated personal holding company, must join in the return. The bar association believes that it was not the intention of Congress that a holding company in such circumstances should be subject to both the personal holding company tax and the excess-profits tax, and has recommended an amendment to section 501 (b) of the code which would exempt such corporations from the personal holding company classification. Section 131 of the Revenue Act of 1943 changed this rule for the later years of the excess-profits tax (see S. Rept. No. 627, 78th Cong., 1st sess., p. 64), and, of course, the bar association recommendation has no application to years after the elimination of the excess-profits tax. The recommendation applies only to correct inequities done in 1942 and 1943.

Section 148, family partnerships: This section would clarify the tax status of so-called family partnerships. This subject has become greatly confused by judicial decisions which have departed from the otherwise generally recognized principle that the income from donated or purchased property is taxable to the donee or purchaser of that property. The amendment proposed to section 3797 is somewhat longer and more detailed than might be wished, but this detailed treatment seems necessary in order to safeguard the Government's interest and prevent family partnerships from being used as a device to avoid taxes on the income from personal services of one member of the family. Under the proposed amendment, a partner who has contributed capital to the partnership must be recognized as a partner, even though he acquired that capital by gift. On the other hand, if the gift was made by a member of the donee's family, who continues as a partner, the proportion of the donee's interest in the partnership income must bear the same ratio to his capital as that of the donor; if in excess of that ratio, the excess would be taxed to the donor. In such a situation, it is also provided that, if the partnership agreement does not provide for a reasonable allowance for personal services rendered by the donor, a reasonable amount shall be attributed to such services, taxed to the donor and deducted from the taxable share of the donee of the partnership interest.

Section 149, mitigation of statute of limitations: The present section 3801 includes provisions dealing with certain situations in which one taxpayer is taxed on an item of income which has previously been erroneously taxed to another taxpayer, and is designed to avoid the Government's keeping both levies. As it stands now, however, such remedial effect does not apply except where the taxpayer who erroneously reported the

income was, at the time of the erroneous reporting, related to the taxpayer who correctly reported the item of income, as (A) husband and wife, (B) grantor and fiduciary, (C) grantor and beneficiary, (D) fiduciary and beneficiary, legatee, or heir, (E) decedent and decedent's estate, or (F) partner.

The proposed amendment eliminates the requirement of relationship, so that if an item of income is taxed to any taxpayer, any other taxpayer who has already paid income taxes on the item will be entitled to a refund of such income taxes.

This section of the bill also changes existing law in two other respects:

1. It is often difficult to determine the taxable year in which the taxpayer is entitled to take a deduction from gross income. The period of limitation for claiming a refund runs from the date of filing the return or paying the tax. If the taxpayer guesses wrong as to the year to claim an admittedly allowable deduction, and the determination that he has guessed wrong comes when it is too late to claim the deduction for the right year, he does not get the deduction at all. Section 149 (b) (3) of the bill is designed to relieve this inequity. The taxpayer would be given relief where he took a deduction in an incorrect year if, at the time he took the deduction, the statute of limitations had not run for the year in which he should have taken the deduction.

2. Because section 3801 has been designed to give reciprocal relief to taxpayers and to the Commissioner in similar situations, the same section of the bill would protect the Commissioner against the running of the statute of limitations where he asserts a deficiency for failure to include an item of income for a particular year which proves to be the incorrect year, if the assertion is made at a time when he could have made the assertion as to the correct year if he had then known the correct year.

Section 150, net operating loss deductions by transferee corporations: Under existing law, a net operating loss of a corporation which transfers its assets to another corporation in a tax-free reorganization or liquidation cannot be used as a carry-over or carry-back by the successor corporation, except perhaps in the case of a merger involving no termination of the corporate entity under State law. See *New Colonial Ice Co., Inc. v. Helvering* (CAA 2d, 1934, 232 U. S. 435); cf. *Stanton Brewery, Inc. v. Helvering* (CAA 2d, 1949, 176 F. 2d 573). The bill provides for a carry-over, but not a carry-back, in cases of tax-free reorganization or liquidation, provided 50 percent or more of the controlling stock of the transferee is owned after the transfer by persons who owned a substantial interest (10 percent or more) in the transferor in the year in which the loss was incurred. The requirement that control be retained in such persons is deemed advisable in order to prevent abuse through acquisitions of loss corporations by new interests in situations where section 129 may not be sufficient to bar the way. It has been deemed wiser not to attempt to encompass carry-backs within the purview of the present bill, not only because of technical complexities, but because the carry-over provides the most important elements of relief in this area, and particularly because the carry-over is applicable to 5 years while the carry-back may be applied to only 1 year. Consideration will be given, however, to the drafting of an appropriate amendment to cover the carry-back problem.

Section 151, interest on deficiencies offset by overpayments for same year: In cases where there is an overpayment of excess-profits tax and resulting underpayment of income tax, or vice versa, the taxing authorities charge interest on the entire underpayment from the due date of the return, but

credit interest on the entire overpayment, only from the date it was paid, which may be the date of the last installment. Since the underpayment could have been paid in installments if it had been paid on time and since the amount of each installment of the overpaid tax was greater than was legally due, it is only fair to the taxpayer to set off the overpayment against the underpayment and charge or credit interest on the balance. However, present law does not permit this. Section 151 would require it.

Section 152, tax treatment upon death of partner: Partnership agreements often provide for payment of specified amounts of future partnership income to the estate or widow of a deceased partner. Such provisions are designed to produce roughly the equivalent of the decedent's interest in the assets, including his share of income earned by the partnership but not received or accrued at death. The tax status of such payments is uncertain under existing law. In some cases such payments have been taxed as income to the surviving partners and in others to the estate or widow of the deceased partner.

Section 152 excludes amounts so distributed from the distributive share of the surviving partners, except that this rule does not apply to that portion of the distributions which represent payments for decedent's interest in tangible and other assets of the partnership which have an adjusted basis in excess of zero. Amounts so excluded from income of the survivors are treated as income of the estate or widow of the decedent in the year received.

Section 153, gain or loss on sale or exchange of residence: Under existing law a gain realized upon the sale or exchange of a taxpayer's personal residence is taxable, but a loss so realized is not deductible from income. During the current inflation in real estate, many taxpayers who have been forced by circumstances to move their residences have been taxed upon large gains when they disposed of the old residence but have been forced to reinvest the entire proceeds or even more in order to obtain a new home. This has caused widespread complaint at taxation of ephemeral profits, and it is believed that relief is warranted.

The proposed section 153 limits the recognized gain to the cash and other benefits received and not reinvested, with appropriate provisions to cover anticipatory replacement cases and the rather complicated problems of assumed mortgages. It also provides that the cost of the new property shall be reduced by the amount of gain not recognized on sale of the prior residence or increased by the loss on such sale, as the case may be. The effect is that there is a continuing transaction from the purchase of the first residence until sale of the second, with no tax consequences (except for cash received and not reinvested) upon the disposition of the first residence.

Section 154, deduction of industrial and commercial research and development costs: For many years there has existed great confusion, uncertainty, and litigation as to the proper treatment for income-tax purposes of industrial and commercial research and development expenses. It is very difficult to apply orthodox accounting principles to such expenditures and there is no uniform accounting practice in respect of such items. Treasury Department regulations formerly permitted taxpayers to elect either to expense or capitalize such charges, but such regulations were in effect held invalid by decisions of the Board of Tax Appeals, and the present regulations (sec. 29.23 (1) of regulations 111) indicate that such expenditures must generally be capitalized and recovered by depreciation allowances if the taxpayer can show that the intangible business asset has a useful life in the production of business income for a reasonably definite

limited period. However, it is frequently impossible to determine the useful life in the business of an industrial or commercial product, service, or process resulting from research and development expenses.

In order to clarify the existing confusion in respect of the tax treatment of such expenditures, and to prevent tax discrimination between large businesses having continuous programs of research and small or beginning business enterprises, section 154 provides generally that expenditures made in industrial or commercial research and development or improvement of industrial or commercial products, services or processes may, at the election of the taxpayer, be deducted as expenses or capitalized and charged off over a period selected and designated by the taxpayer. Merely providing for deductibility of such expenditures probably would be satisfactory to most large businesses. However, a small business which has unusually large expenditures in connection with a research program, or a new or beginning business enterprise, must be allowed the right to capitalize such costs and recover them by amortization deductions over the estimated useful life, in order to insure equality of treatment with large businesses which can and usually do deduct the full amounts of such expenditures from current income. Since, as a practical matter, it is impossible to estimate with any degree of certainty the useful business life of an intangible industrial or commercial product, service, or process resulting from research, it is provided that the taxpayer may designate the period over which the capitalized costs of a specific research project or undertaking shall be amortized. Any temporary loss of revenue resulting from a taxpayer's selection of an unreasonably short amortization period will ordinarily be recovered in later years when no amortization deduction will be allowable.

Proper safeguards are provided to insure that the taxpayer will keep adequate books and records, and furnish adequate notices (1) of election to capitalize research costs of a specific project or undertaking, and (2) the period over which such capitalized costs are to be amortized. Proper provision is also made to prevent any application of the new provision to costs of constructing buildings or other tangible property, except models, prototype machines, or similar products of research projects.

Section 155, collection of delinquent taxes from Federal employees: There is no statutory authority for the enforcement of collection of delinquent taxes from Federal employees. This section will give Federal taxing authorities the right to enforce collection of these taxes by giving notice to the particular agency employing such employee, and authorizing the agency to withhold 10 percent of the compensation up to an annual rate of \$10,000 and 25 percent of the portion of such compensation in excess of such rate. The proposed legislation places Federal employees and employees in private industry on an equality, and also provides for a continuing levy on both classes of employees.

Section 156, recognition of gain or loss on dissolution of subsidiary corporation by parent. It often happens that a corporation desires to purchase the assets of another corporation, but the latter is unwilling to sell at current value merely because of a low-tax base resulting from depreciation deductions and the inflation in value accruing since acquisition which would result in a substantial tax to the selling corporation and a second tax on its stockholders on distribution of the proceeds. In such a situation, the stockholders of the second corporation are usually willing to sell their stock. However, the purchasing corporation is immediately faced with the possibility that when it liquidates the other, in order to take over the assets, it will be faced with the

claim that it may not use the true cost of the acquisition for future depreciation, but must use the depreciated basis in the hands of the former owner. Where it has appeared that the purpose of buying the stock was to take over the assets, the courts have held favorably to the taxpayer, because the price paid for the stock in reality represents the cost of the assets. The matter has not, however, been sufficiently crystallized and clarified by judicial decision to make this effect certain, and as a result there is continued litigation in this field which discourages such property acquisitions. Section 156 would clarify the statute by providing a practical mechanism, through which, after a purchase of stock, the purchasing corporation may use, as the basis of the assets purchased, the cost so paid for the stock.

TITLE IA. EXCESS-PROFITS TAXES

Section 191, effective date of amendments: Except as otherwise specifically provided, this title becomes effective upon the enactment of the act. The provisions of this title relate to the World War II excess-profits tax law, and do not affect the provisions of the Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950.

Section 192, carry-overs and carry-backs allowable to transferors and transferees in nontaxable reorganizations:

As the law now reads, the excess-profits credit carry-over or carry-back is allowed only to the taxpayer. If a corporation loses its identity in a reorganization, the new corporation cannot carry over the unused credit of the old company or companies; neither can an unused credit of the new company be carried back against the excess-profits net income of the old company. This section would permit the normal application of these credits by respecting the substantial identity of the old and new corporations.

Section 193, source of preferred stock dividends paid in first 60 days of taxable year: In enacting section 718 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code, Congress apparently desired the conclusive presumption there established as to the source of distributions made in the first 60 days of the taxable year to act as a deterrent to the postponement of distributions by corporations into a succeeding year—postponement often carried out in order that there might be, by this manipulation and timing, a minimization of the reduction of equity invested capital for the year. In the case of preferred stock, where periodical payments are provided for under charter or bylaw provisions, there is no such field for manipulation; and there is no need for the application of a conclusive presumption which may be contrary to actual fact. Section 193 amends section 718 (c) (2) of the code to make the conclusive presumption inapplicable in such cases, and leaves the effect of such distribution upon equity invested capital to be tested factually during the first 60 days just as it is tested factually during the remainder of the year.

Section 194, computations of equity invested capital: Prior to the amendment of section 718 of the code by section 219 of the Revenue Act of 1942, in computing the invested capital of a corporation which acquired all of the assets of another corporation solely for the voting stock, only the basis of the assets on hand at the time of the acquisition by the new corporation could be included in invested capital. In other words, the deficit of the old corporation which did not reduce its own invested capital did reduce the invested capital of the new corporation. Section 219 of the Revenue Act of 1942 was designed to overcome that result and to provide that the invested capital of the new company should be the same as the invested capital of the old company and that the deficit of the old company would not be applied to reduce the invested capital of the new company. In interpreting that section in TD 5267 (adding sec. 30.718-7 of regula-

tion 109, approved May 27, 1943), the Treasury has taken the position that section 219 does not apply to a tax-free exchange involving two or more transferors. Section 194 of this bill amends section 718 (c) (5) of the code to provide explicitly that if a corporation acquires all of the assets of one or more corporations under the conditions set forth therein, then the benefits of that section should be derived by the resulting corporation.

Section 195, review of abnormalities by the Tax Court. This section would change existing law in the following respects:

1. Restriction of assessment and collection of deficiency while application for relief pending: Since 1924 it has been provided by law that, except in certain unusual cases, a taxpayer may litigate taxes, other than excise taxes, before being called upon to pay them. However, under the excess-profits-tax provisions, as now interpreted by the Tax Court and administered by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the Commissioner may determine a deficiency in excess-profits taxes and may proceed to assess and collect such deficiency even though the taxpayer has pending a claim for relief, which may or may not eliminate the deficiency in whole or in part. The bill would amend section 732 (a) so as to prohibit the assessment and collection of the proposed deficiency until the claim for relief is finally determined.

2. Tax Court jurisdiction where tax not paid: In *American Coast Line, Inc. v. Commissioner* (6 T. C. 67 (affirmed 159 F. (2d) 665)), the Tax Court held that it had no jurisdiction to review a denial by the Commissioner of a claim for relief under section 722 where all of the statutory excess profits tax had not been paid. A dissenting opinion in that case described the decision as ascribing an "inconsistent and inequitable" purpose to the Congress, since the statute provides that the taxpayer may withhold a part of the tax in dispute until the relief claim is determined. The bill would resolve this apparent inconsistency and make it clear that the Tax Court may pass upon such relief claims before the tax is paid.

Section 196, appellate court review of abnormalities: Sections 732 (c) and 732 (d) of the code provide that decisions of the Tax Court rendered in relief cases shall be reviewed only by a special division of the Tax Court, and that no review shall be had of such decisions by the court of appeals. The special division of the Tax Court permits no hearing on review of the trial judge's decision. This proposed amendment provides for review of such relief decisions by the full Tax Court, and for review of law questions by the courts of appeals in the same manner as other decisions of the Tax Court are reviewable.

TITLE II. ESTATE AND GIFT TAXES

Part I. Estate tax

Section 201, estates to which amendments applicable: Except as expressly otherwise provided, the amendments apply only to estates of decedents dying after the enactment of the act.

Section 202, rates and credits: The present estate tax rate structure is, for historical reasons, complicated and unwieldy and should be simplified. The proposed amendment combines credits and makes possible computation of the tax due by applying a single schedule to the net estate, which itself would be arrived at by subtracting a single specific exemption and then subtracting a single set of credits.

Section 203, proceeds of life insurance: This proposed amendment to section 811 (g) of the Internal Revenue Code would make it clear that insurance is to be treated like any other property, and affected by all provisions governing the inclusion of other property in a decedent's gross estate. When proceeds of policies are receivable by a

beneficiary other than a decedent's estate and all of the incidents of ownership in respect to said policies were irrevocably transferred by the decedent during his lifetime, and not in contemplation of death, the proceeds of such policies should not be included in the gross estate. The present rule seems very unfair, in that life insurance, to the extent that the decedent has paid the premiums thereon, may not be assigned or transferred by complete and outright gift in such manner as to exclude the proceeds from the donor's taxable estate, although such disposition can be made of any other kind of property.

Section 204, exclusion of interest in employees' trusts: Section 165, while it exempts employees' trusts from income tax under certain conditions, subjects the beneficiaries of such trusts to income tax on the benefits received. It seems undesirable and probably not in accord with the intent of Congress to subject these benefits to both income and estate taxes, and it seems more logical that they should be subject to the income tax rather than to the estate tax. Yet there appear to be some indications in the law today that Federal estate and gift taxes might be applied to the value of a deceased employee's interest in a plan, and to a living employee's power to deal with such interest, respectively. Sections 204 and 267 of the bill would clarify this by amending sections 811 and 1003 of the Code so as to provide that employees' interests in trusts qualified under section 165 shall be exempt from Federal estate and gift taxes.

Section 205, optional valuation: Under present law, an executor can elect at the time he files the estate-tax return to value the property of the decedent as of the date of death or as of a date 1 year after death. This election, once made, cannot be changed. It sometimes happens that at the time the return is filed the executor considers the election to be of no importance because the value of the gross estate is less than the specific exemption authorized by the law. If the Commissioner of Internal Revenue later increases the value of the gross estate by adding inter vivos gifts which the executor had considered not a part of the gross estate, the election may become most important.

The proposed amendment would make the election available to the executor of an estate not only at the time the return is filed, but also at the time the election becomes important because of the inclusion by the Commissioner of other assets in the gross estate, or because of the increased valuation of reported assets.

Section 206, deduction of expenses paid from nonprobate assets: Under the existing provisions of section 812 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, permissible deductions from the gross estate for administrative expenses, claims, and the like are only those which are recognized and permitted under the laws of the jurisdiction within which the estate is being administered. As a consequence, where expenses have been incurred in connection with assets includible in the gross estate but not comprising a part of the probate estate, and such expenses have been properly paid out of nonprobate assets, a deduction for Federal estate tax has been denied. For example, in *Estate of Wright* (8 T. C. 531 (1947)), a deduction for attorney's fees paid by the beneficiary to collect life insurance which was included in the insured's taxable estate was disallowed. Section 206 of the bill would amend section 812 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to allow a deduction on account of administration and like expenses which are, in fact, paid out of assets included in the gross estate but not administered as part of the decedent's probate estate, or which are paid by the persons beneficially interested in such assets.

Section 207, time for claiming credit for State death taxes: Under existing law, the credit for State inheritance, estate, legacy, or succession taxes is allowable against the basic Federal estate tax only to the extent that such taxes are paid and the credit claimed within 4 years after the estate-tax return is filed. Usually, the amount of State taxes payable cannot be finally ascertained until the Federal estate-tax liability is settled. Where that settlement is not reached within 4 years after the Federal return is filed, the credit is lost to the extent of any State taxes paid after the expiration of the 4-year period. The proposed amendment will remedy that situation by extending the credit for taxes paid within 4 years after the Federal return is filed, or before the Federal estate tax is paid, whichever is later.

Section 208, credit for gift taxes: At the present time the Internal Revenue Code provides for a credit for gift taxes paid by a decedent during his lifetime. The limitations placed upon this credit, however, are such as to result in a disallowance of a large part of the amount actually paid as a gift tax in those cases where property on which a gift tax has already been paid is for some reason still required to be included in the gross estate. Section 208 of the bill would amend section 813 of the code to make the credit equal to the full amount of gift taxes that resulted from the prior taxation of the property transferred as a gift.

Section 209, deduction for litigation expenses: In Federal estate-tax cases which must be litigated in the Tax Court, the district courts, or the Court of Claims it is not always clear under what circumstances a deduction is allowable from the gross estate for attorneys' fees and other expenses incurred in such litigation. While the Tax Court has promulgated a rule under which such deductions may be allowed, the proposed amendment would make the deduction of these expenses allowable not only in the Tax Court but in the other Federal courts.

Section 210, limitation period for transferees: This section would amend section 90 (b) of the code to provide that the period of limitation for assessment of the estate tax against a transferee or fiduciary shall be the same as the period of limitation for the assessment of such tax against the estate, except where the estate is insolvent. The Commissioner should be allowed the additional year to proceed against transferees only where the additional tax was asserted against the executor within the 3-year period but was uncollectible because the transfer left the estate insolvent. See comments on section 255, below.

Section 211, extension of period of limitation: Under existing law, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has no authority to enter into an agreement with a taxpayer to extend the time within which the estate tax or the gift tax may be assessed. Such authority does exist in the case of income taxes. The proposed amendment would extend such authority to estate taxes, and section 253 would accomplish the same result in the case of gift taxes. Occasions arise in which the absence of this authority means that settlement negotiations must be hurried, or that no real negotiations can be undertaken at all because of the shortness of time within which the commissioner may assess the tax.

Section 212, lien for tax: This would amend section 827 of the code to provide that the lien imposed by the estate tax provisions will be subject to the same limitations as liens for income taxes when applied against purchasers for value and others in like situations, such as bona fide mortgages and pledges and judgment creditors. Under the present law, the estate tax is a lien for 10 years against the gross estate—a lien

which need not be recorded, and which attaches to the property in all but a few instances even though mortgaged, pledged, or sold to a bona fide purchaser for value. It does not attach to property sold to a bona fide purchaser by a transferee, trustee, beneficiary, etc., but does attach to property mortgaged or pledged by such persons and also to property sold by an executor to a bona fide purchaser. It is felt that estate tax liens, like liens for other taxes, should be recorded in order to be valid against mortgagees, pledges and bona fide purchasers for value. Section 212 of the bill, therefore, makes the provisions of sections 3672-3679 of the code, which relate to recording, release and enforcement of liens for other taxes, applicable to the estate tax.

Part II. Gift tax

Section 251, gifts of future interests: At present any gift of a future interest is subject to gift tax irrespective of amount. The proposed amendment to section 1003 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code would allow an exemption from gift tax of any gifts of future interests to the extent of \$3,000 in any year for all such gifts. The purpose is to remove the necessity of many small returns, and since the exemption for each year is nominal in amount, the effect on the revenue would be negligible.

Section 252, lien for tax: See the comments relating to section 212, above. While section 1009 of the code divests property sold to a bona fide purchaser of the lien, there is no protection for bona fide pledges and mortgagees and no specific provision for recording the lien, and this amendment would apply to gift taxes the provisions of sections 3627-3679 of the code, which relate to the recording, release, and enforcement of liens for other taxes.

Section 253, extension of period of limitation: See the explanation of section 211, above.

Section 254, adjustment of values after period of assessment: While the concept of a statute of limitations is firmly grounded in our law, in the tax field one situation has arisen which is technically not covered by any statute of limitations but which in actual practice should be. In certain cases the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has altered the values placed by the taxpayer on property transferred by gift, after the expiration of the statute of limitations with respect to the gift tax return on such property; or the Commissioner has gone back and revised certain exclusions which were allowed or which were not questioned at the time. The Commissioner has contended that, although he cannot assert any additional tax deficiency based on an outlawed gift, there is no statute of limitations to prevent his placing a subsequent gift in a higher tax bracket by revising values reported in returns for earlier barred years. The result is essentially the same as an extension of the statutory period, however long the time elapsed since the transfer. This amendment to section 1016 of the code would prevent an increase in taxes for open years by a revision of gift tax returns for earlier years to which the statute of limitations bars the collection of additional taxes.

Section 255, limitation period for transferees: Section 1016 (a) of the code provides a 3-year period of limitation on the assessment of deficiencies in gift tax. Section 1009 makes the donee personally liable for taxes not paid when due, and section 1025 gives an additional year for assessment against transferees, including donees. As construed (See *Evelyn N. Moore* (1 T. C. 14, affirmed 146 F. (2d) 824)), the Commissioner is allowed 4 years to collect from the donee, even where no attempt was made to collect from the donor within the 3-year

period and where the donor was at all times financially able to pay. For the same reasons stated in connection with section 210, above, it is proposed to amend section 1025 to give the transferee only in cases where timely collection from the donor was prevented by his insolvency.

Section 256, exclusion of interest in employees trusts: This section is explained by the comments on section 204, above.

Title III. Manufacturers' excise taxes

Section 301, sale price: Section 3441 of the Code, prescribing methods for determining the sale price by which various manufacturers' excise taxes should be measured, originated as section 604 of the revenue bill of 1932, which became section 619 of the Revenue Act of 1932. The report of the Ways and Means Committee on that bill (H Rept. No. 708, 72d Cong., 1st sess., pp. 37-38) showed the intent to base the tax on the normal factory price, and that where, by reason of the relationship of the parties, the price charged does not represent a fair value, the tax should be on the same value as in the case of similar sales between the independent parties. However, the courts have held that, where the manufacturer acts as distributor or sells through a controlled sales agency, the tax must be measured by the distributor's sale price, while the manufacturer who does not perform the economic function of distribution is taxed only upon the factory price. (See *C. W. Fitch Co. v. U. S.* (323 U. S. 582); *Compana Corp. v. U. S.* (38 F. (2d) 400); *Ayer & Co. v. U. S.* (38 F. Supp. 284).) These inequities and discriminations would be avoided by the proposed amendment to section 3441, which would exclude from the tax base in such situations costs attributable to selling and distribution, as distinguished from manufacturing.

Section 302, removal of conditions on refunds: This section would repeal section 3443 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code which requires, as a condition to the recovery of overpayment of manufacturers' excise taxes, that the person who paid the tax establish (1) that he has not included the tax in the price of the articles with respect to which it was imposed, or collected the amount of the tax from the vendee or (2) that he has repaid the amount of the tax to the ultimate purchaser of the article or has secured the written consent of the ultimate purchaser to the credit or refund. These limitations on refunds are grossly unfair in at least two respects. They impose an impossible burden of proof as a condition to the recovery of taxes which admittedly were illegally collected. Generally taxes are refundable upon showing simply that they were illegally collected. If any restriction based on equity is to protect the Government against refund, the burden of establishing the existence and the extent of the equity should be on the Government which asserts it; and if the equity cannot be established the legal rights should prevail. Moreover, the provisions unjustifiably discriminate against one who has promptly paid the taxes claimed of him and in favor of those who have withheld payment.

Section 303, appeals to Tax Court: This amendment would give the Tax Court of the United States jurisdiction over disputes involving manufacturers' excise taxes imposed by chapter 29 of the Internal Revenue Code. At the present time the Tax Court does not have such jurisdiction, and, in contrast with the procedure permissible with respect to income, estate and gift taxes, a person has no alternative but to pay manufacturers' excise taxes and litigate their correctness subsequently—an alternative which is unusually burdensome in view of the restrictions on refunds discussed under section 302, above.

Title IV. Miscellaneous

Amendments and Provisions

Section 401, statement of grounds for deficiency: In some cases the Commissioner's notice of deficiency is not complete and the issues are not clarified by his answer to the petition. The Tax Court has held that in such cases it has no power to compel the Commissioner to state the basis for deficiency. Such power should be conferred upon the Tax Court and section 401 provides that this be done by an amendment to section 1111 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Section 402, small claims and settlement branch of the Tax Court: An increasing number of cases have been filed with the Tax Court involving small sums of money, and it is common knowledge that there are many more cases in which revenue agents determine deficiencies of a few hundred dollars, sometimes on more or less arbitrary grounds, and the taxpayer feels impelled to pay the tax because of the expense of appealing to the Tax Court and going to some distant city to have the case heard according to formal court rules. The expense of such a proceeding and such travel may well amount to as much as the tax involved. The persons against whom such small amounts are determined are often people who can ill afford to pay such amounts.

The proposed amendment provides for the establishment of a small-claims branch of the court to be administered by one judge of the court. The judge is authorized to appoint part-time commissioners in all of the collection districts throughout the United States who will hear these small cases in an informal manner similar to that prevailing in the small-claims acts in effect in many States. All cases in which the deficiency or claim is less than \$1,500 would be heard in this manner unless the petitioner expressly moves that his case be heard by the court in the usual manner. Provision is made for appeals from the commissioner to the judge of the court in charge of the small-claims branch, who will then decide the case appealed subject to review by the full court or by the appropriate court of appeals. Provision is also made that service of any person as a commissioner of the court under the proposed provisions shall not bar such person from acting as attorney in other cases against the United States. This last provision is believed important because it is hoped that the commissioners may be drawn from well-qualified lawyers who would serve in such capacity as a matter of public service, thus assuring appointment of the high type of commissioners necessary to make such a plan a success.

A Small-Business Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from the morning paper comes a statement purporting to tell us a part of one of the operations of our President when he was not so small a businessman:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of July 12, 1951]

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

President Harry S. Truman is always using big business for his political whipping boy. During the past few days I've been

telling you about one of the President's flings into big business—a 60,000-share oil stock selling scheme.

The President's attitude today in regard to big corporations is hard to understand. He made money out of his oil stock venture, which, at a minimum, was in the \$200,000 class. Big business is largely manufacturing a product and selling it on a competitive basis.

In the President's oil stock scheme there apparently wasn't much competition, since he sold some shares with a par value of \$1 for \$25. I doubt if many corporations could get away with that today.

In order to find out how it was managed by the Morgan Oil & Refining Co. of Kansas City in 1916, while the President was treasurer of the company, I submitted the incorporation papers to a prominent attorney. He is Bernard T. Hurwitz, of Kansas City.

Mr. Hurwitz was blue sky commissioner in the State of Missouri, from January 1, 1922, to May 1, 1925. He knows a lot about wildcat oil schemes. He spent most of his time examining so-called business trusts operating as business companies, which is exactly what Mr. Truman and Morgan had set up.

Here are some pertinent paragraphs from his legal analysis of the Truman-Morgan oil-stock trust agreement:

"I have examined the amendment agreement and declaration of trust of the Morgan Oil & Refining Co., which said agreement was entered into on March 1, 1917, between D. H. Morgan, Harry S. Truman, Jerry Culbertson, J. J. Hurt, and Earl S. Ridge as trustees, and D. H. Morgan as subscriber. The said instrument having been recorded in the office of the recorder of deeds for Jackson County, Mo., at Kansas City, as instrument No. 1165257, in book 1759, at page 278.

"Without attempting to go into a detailed analysis of the trust agreement of the Morgan Oil & Refining Co., this agreement obviously attempts to give to the trustees and organization all of the benefits of corporate organization, such as freedom from personal liability, without incurring any of the obligations of the corporate entity.

"Declarations of trust were popular during the period from 1915 to approximately 1925, with oil-promotion companies seeking to raise funds by the public sale of stock. Oil promoters in that period were of the opinion that (1) the companies could operate with all the rights of a corporation, without being subjected to any of the obligations of a corporation; and (2) compliance with the blue sky or securities laws of the State were not necessary.

"I found a large part of my time as blue-sky commissioner or securities commissioner taken up investigating such companies and in issuing cease-and-desist orders against them. Business enterprises operating under declarations of trust were designed primarily to escape and evade the inquisitorial powers of the State, both with respect to the matter of original organization and with respect to the promotional sale of stock."

Kansas adopted the first blue-sky law, to nip the enthusiasm of wildcat stock promoters, in 1911. Missouri adopted a similar law in 1913. That was 3 years before the Truman-Morgan company got underway.

Both State laws were imperfect. But I'll let Hurwitz take over from here on that angle:

"These laws were imperfectly drawn, and under some of the earlier decisions, some of the courts held that certificates of interest or certificates of stock in a business trust could be sold without compliance on the part of the promoter with the earlier blue-sky laws.

"The Missouri law was amended in 1923, and from the date of the adoption of the amended laws, the so-called business trusts passed out of the picture. As a matter of fact, one of the principal reasons that most

of the States amended their blue-sky laws was in order to subject these enterprises and their promoters to scrutiny."

That will give you a little background for your listening pleasure next time President Truman starts working over the country's business interests.

The Position of the Consumers League of Michigan on National Economic Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1951

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of the statement of position of the Consumers League of Michigan regarding national economic stabilization, together with a covering letter from the president of this organization, Mr. William G. Diamond, of Detroit, Mich.

The statement includes a comparison of food prices for the years 1939 and 1951.

The article follows:

CONSUMERS LEAGUE OF MICHIGAN,
July 7, 1951.

To Members of Congress and United States Senators from Michigan:

We are enclosing for your information a statement of our organization's position regarding what we feel should be included in a national economic stabilization program. Traditionally our organization has dealt principally with labor standards, grade labels, and similar matters, assuming an active program in the general economic field only during the past war. At our June annual meeting our membership was sufficiently moved by the turn of events during the past year to again take up the matter of general economic controls. The enclosed statement is a summary of feelings expressed at the annual meeting as well as an amount of sampling of members' opinions since then, including formal action taken by our executive officers.

I wish to point out that our organization's membership is what could be easily called a good cross-section—women and men, reasonably large incomes to small incomes, younger persons to some who have qualified for retirement, nonpartisan, etc. The statement of our position was prepared with considerable effort toward taking into account the greatest common agreement of our members.

We respectfully submit our statement in the hope that it will be of some use to you in what must be a very trying time of decision. Regardless of the outcome of the current legislative action we will take the liberty of writing to you from time to time on what we observe and what we feel could be done as we see the situation.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM G. DIAMOND,
President, Consumers League of Michigan.

STATEMENT OF POSITION REGARDING NATIONAL ECONOMIC STABILIZATION

We, as consumers, have felt a very real squeeze between our expenses and incomes during the past year, in some cases having to dip into savings or go further into debt. It is equally true that we feel a consider-

able amount of the squeeze could have been prevented by prompt, intelligent application of reasonable economic controls. The future seems to have in store for us more of the same squeeze which, if met by reasonable legislative action, can be prevented to a large extent. The past year's squeeze has come close on the heels of a touch-and-go spiral since 1946.

It is our assumption that there will be continued extensive defense requirements on personnel, matériel, finances, etc., as well as increasing private and/or public expenditures for overseas economic aid.

From the outset then we feel that an adequate and national stabilization program must be continued to exercise restraints where necessary and that positive aid be granted in some instances to meet the pinch caused by "artificial" national demands on our economy. The current lull evidenced by price reductions and apparently arising out of peace overtures, industrial change-over lags, miscalculated inventories, and credit restrictions are obviously temporary and likely to end within 4 to 5 months. For example, it is extremely difficult for us to believe that the current armistice negotiations will relieve significantly our defense commitments—past experience would dictate that we will have to shift our efforts from one geographical area to another or from one type of effort to another.

The consensus of our members is that a 1-year continuation of a stabilization program would be the very minimum necessary—preferably it should extend 18 to 24 months. (1) A shorter period than 1 year would tend to undermine the attitude with which the public would regard the program; (2) defense requirements are predicted to make abnormal requirements for 12 to 24 months—and now we learn that the program is 20 percent behind schedule; (3) a year would be a minimum time for business, farm, labor, and such organizations to formulate and develop their plans and operations; (4) a continuing study by an appropriate congressional committee during the year's operation of stabilization should reveal the necessity of relieving or increasing controls even before the termination of the period set now.

We further believe that roll-backs should be encouraged and ceilings imposed on those commodity prices which evidence indicates rose chiefly out of speculation on the war. That there should be a thorough examination of the relationship of food prices and food subsidies seems to be imperative, for it is not easy to accept the fact that we furnish tax receipts on the one hand for direct payments to the food industry and on the other hand pay the highest relative food prices in history.

Tax bills are in the mill which will further reduce consumers' purchasing power. These increases plus any approved but unjustified price hikes will have a very serious effect on morale at a time that high morale is a prime requirement. For instance, the most recent Consumers Price Index report shows Detroit's cost of living as having advanced 0.4 from April 15 to May 15. It is elementary to show that this apparently small rise in expense if continued over a year would more than erase the return to be gained from interest on United States Savings bonds—in the past, a very useful anti-inflation device as well as source of income to the Federal Government.

We are of the opinion that there must be a real coordination of the various Federal Government actions which have the direct effect of stabilizing (or failing to stabilize) the economy (i. e. taxes, credit, and issue of money, subsidies, direct price controls, allocation of manpower and materials, etc.). State and local governmental programs would necessarily have to be observed closely, too, and measured to see their results on the national program. Flexibility and balance of program are many times

equal in importance and necessity to the substance of the program; we feel that is the case here.

Our members are convinced that the current emergency—declared or undeclared—is of a sufficiently serious nature and wide enough in scope that the problems and their solutions are above group advantage or partisan politics. We seek enlightened leadership and a sound way or ways out of the difficulties we face.

And, finally, basing the decision on information gained through perhaps a method similar to the "running study" suggested above, we trust that unnecessary restrictions will be removed just as soon as evidence is clear they will not be needed. We dislike controls equally with most other groups, but we are willing to pull our share of the load including restrictions in order to see, first, that our Nation meets its clear-cut responsibilities, and secondly, and equally that we show some progress in spite of the added responsibilities.

Following is the most graphic illustration yet to come to our attention of the ground we consumers have lost with food-dollar in the past 12 years. The list was prepared by Arynness Joy Wickens, Deputy Commissioner of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Foods which \$10 bought in 1939 and now:

TEN DOLLARS, 1939

Ten pounds flour.
Five pounds sugar.
Fifteen pounds potatoes.
Two loaves bread.
Seven quarts milk.
Six pounds rib roast.
Two pounds bacon.
Two pounds butter.
One package rolled oats.
Two dozen oranges.
One pound coffee.
Five pounds cabbage.
Three pounds green beans.
Two pounds veal cutlet and pork chops.
One can salmon.
Three pounds onions.
One pound cheese.
Two dozen eggs.
Three pounds apples.
Two cans tomatoes.
Two bunches carrots.
One can peaches.
Two cans peas.
One head lettuce.
One box dried prunes.

TEN DOLLARS, 1951

Ten pounds flour.
Five pounds sugar.
Fifteen pounds potatoes.
Two loaves bread.
Seven quarts milk.
Six pounds rib roast.
One pound bacon.

Reclamation: For What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I believe anyone who reads this article by Oliver Carlson, which appeared in the Freeman magazine, will agree with his conclusion that the time has come for the people of the United States and the Members of Congress to take a new,

hard look at the Bureau of Reclamation and its grandiose plans.

As this article clearly points out, this country is threatened with bankruptcy because of the wild, fantastic, wholly infeasible, and spendthrift plans advocated by Secretary of the Interior Chapman and Reclamation Commissioner Straus.

The complete article follows:

RECLAMATION: FOR WHAT?

(By Oliver Carlson)

On August 5, 1948, Michael W. Straus, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, submitted to his boss, Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman, a report entitled "Reclamation Program, 1948-54."

The 7-year plan envisaged by Commissioner Straus and his engineers and planners admittedly would cost the American taxpayer a tidy sum. But, declared the report, " * * * the benefits would be substantial, too, and permanent. A huge increase in crop and livestock production would result, as well as an enlargement of electric-power facilities * * * one benefit in itself that indicates the impressiveness of the probable returns is the crop production."

Commissioner Straus and his planners estimated that the program when completed would furnish "a full water supply for some two and one-half to four and one-half million acres." His report indicated that more than 24,000 new family-sized irrigation farms would be created, with a population of from 75,000 to 100,000 persons. The estimated cost for this program, declared Mr. Straus, would total \$3,891,000,000—with expenditures rising steadily from a mere \$204,200,000 in 1948 to \$720,200,000 in 1954.

In other words, cost to the taxpayer would be approximately \$1,000 per acre to turn this arid land of the West into usable croplands. It would represent an investment by the American taxpayer of \$160,000 for each of the 24,000 new farms envisioned by Commissioner Straus. And this cost per farm, remember, would not include farm buildings or equipment—just the raw land.

Is land so precious and the need for new croplands so great that the taxpayers of this country must invest \$160,000 per farm?

If Commissioner Straus and his engineers had consulted with the experts from the Department of Agriculture, they would have learned that our agricultural crisis was due not to a shortage of tillable land or a shortage of crops. Quite to the contrary, they would have discovered that the Government was spending hundreds of millions of dollars to keep crop surpluses off the market. And these surpluses—of cotton, corn, wheat, potatoes, etc., were precisely of the crops which would be raised on the land Commissioner Straus and his engineers propose to reclaim and irrigate.

In the recently issued report by the President's Water Resources Policy Commission, are set forth for all to read the necessary principles to govern the future development of our water resources:

1. A simple procedure for determining whether the money to be invested in a river basin program will be well-spent.
2. The need for a system of repayment designed to treat alike all who enjoy the advantages of Federal investment.
3. That sound management principles be applied to every project.

There is very little in common between these principles and those upon which the Reclamation Bureau has been operating.

The American farmer has learned how to produce more food for more people on less acreage. Forty years ago there were 3.55 acres of cropland for each person in the United States. Today it amounts to 2.55 acres per person. In other words, we need

an average of an acre less per person to feed America and to take care of our large export trade. More than that—the people of this country as a whole are eating more food and better food than ever before. Yet we have less land in crops today than we had 20 years ago when our population was 25,000,000 less than it is now.

But isn't it true that more land will be needed to take care of our increasing population in the years to come? Aren't Commissioner Straus and his planners just showing good foresight in reclaiming arid lands of the West at this time to take care of the increased population 25 years from now? Not at all.

According to the studies of the Water Resources Policy Commission, productive croplands of the United States can be increased by 44,000,000 acres merely by the improvement of existing farm lands now in use. The Commission declares that an additional 10,000,000 acres can be obtained by clearing land of trees, stumps, and brush while another 16,400,000 acres are available through low-cost clearing and drainage.

If the Water Resources Policy Commission experts know what they are talking about, we can add approximately 70,000,000 acres to our productive croplands without the expenditure of billions of dollars of Federal funds. Drainage costs per acre, even at our present inflated prices, would be less than a tenth of the cost of reclamation projects to irrigate land.

The Reclamation Bureau today, with its more than 17,000 permanent employees and its multi-billion-dollar programs, has been turned into a mighty political lever by Secretary of the Interior Chapman. Every project developed or proposed by the Reclamation Bureau in any of the 17 Western States is exploited to the fullest in developing and consolidating political power for the administration.

Oscar Chapman is the chief political strategist and manipulator on behalf of the administration in the far West. He took over this job in the presidential campaign of 1940. His power and influence have grown steadily ever since. President Truman relies upon Chapman completely for political policies and strategy in the Western States.

Many Democratic politicians on the Pacific coast have told me admiringly they regard Chapman as the top figure in the administration. He possesses, they say, more detailed information about the strength and weaknesses of political figures in the West than any other top administration official. When he visits the West to dedicate a new dam or irrigation project, his assistants bring with them complete and up-to-date dossiers on every important figure in the area. Chapman always spends a good deal of time with the key administration supporters planning strategy and letting it be known that, so far as it is within his power, jobs and contracts will go to deserving Democrats. Chapman believes in doing good for the West—but more than that, he believes in doing good for those who will strengthen the Truman political machine.

Reclamation is a sacred word in the arid and semiarid regions of the far West—and has been so for more than half a century. The Mormons under Brigham Young pioneered the irrigation projects of the West. They began bringing water to the dry and thirsty land of the Great Salt Lake Basin early in 1848. Thanks to them, tens of thousands of California-bound gold-hungry immigrants were saved from starvation during the next decade. Nearly all of the arable land in Utah and southeastern Idaho is the work of the Mormons. Men, mules, and horses—without State aid or intervention of any kind—transformed several million acres of semidesert into croplands within a few years.

Spurred by the accomplishments of the Mormon farmers, the whole West from Montana to southern California was soon afire with plans for developing irrigation and reclamation projects. Where but yesterday there had been only sagebrush, tomorrow there would be fields of grain, orchards, and rich pasture lands.

In 1894 Senator Carey, of Wyoming, sponsored an act whereunder the United States Government agreed to donate up to 1,000,000 acres of public land to any State that would agree to reclaim this land. By 1900 there had been organized the National Reclamation Association. Theodore Roosevelt became an ardent enthusiast for reclamation and conservation, and threw the full weight of his personality and his power as President behind the campaign. As a result, the Reclamation Act became a law of the land on June 17, 1902. This act provided for a survey of potential developments and the subsequent construction of needed irrigation projects. To finance the surveys and assist the people of the West in constructing the dams and ditches, Congress set up a Reclamation Revolving Fund, to be derived entirely from the sale of public lands in the 16 Western States (Texas was later added to the list).

The Secretary of the Interior then established the Reclamation Service, which many years later became the Bureau of Reclamation. The Reclamation Act had been designed to help the small farmer, not the speculator. It therefore provided that no individual owner could get water for more than 160 acres of land. Furthermore, these owners had to live near or on the land that was reclaimed. Repayment of the total cost of each reclamation project was apportioned to every landowner getting water, and repayment had to be completed within 10 years. Beyond this all other controls were to be handled at the local level.

In 1914 Congress doubled the repayment period, extending it to 20 years. In 1926 it was further extended to 40 years. At present there is a 50-year repayment policy.

This fivefold extension of repayment time appears on the surface as a wise and justifiable move to ease the burdens of the farmer in the reclamation districts. But in reality such a greatly lengthened repayment plan means governmental control of the project for the entire adult life span of the people involved. Both political and financial control remains in the hands of the Federal Government. In the second place, there is less likely to be a careful scrutiny of construction and overhead costs by the people in the reclamation districts themselves when the repayment period is spread over half a century.

The revolving fund originally established was voted additional funds in 1920 when Congress passed the Mineral-Oil Leasing Act. This provided that 52.5 percent of the oil royalties from all public lands and leases were to be paid into the reclamation fund. In 1939 Congress passed the Hayden-O'Mahoney amendment to the departmental appropriations bill, enlarging the reclamation fund once more. This time it was to receive 52.5 percent of all receipts (including penalties) received by the Treasury Department from land within naval reservations for the period from 1920 to 1939.

The economic feasibility and financial soundness of reclamation efforts during the first three decades of this century have given way to the stupendous but often questionable projects of recent years. The revolving fund principle has been tossed overboard. For the past decade or so the Reclamation Bureau has been submitting an annual budget and getting direct appropriations.

It is important to remember that nearly 15,000,000 acres of western lands have become lush and fruitful by virtue of reclamation.

mation projects privately and locally financed and engineered. An additional 5,000,000 acres has been reclaimed during the past 50 years through the work of the Bureau of Reclamation. Of this 5,000,000 acres, more than 80 percent (4,200,000 acres, to be exact) had already been reclaimed by the end of 1945; that is to say, before Mr. Oscar Chapman became Secretary of the Interior.

Total expenditures by the Bureau of Reclamation during the past 5 years under Chapman total almost \$1,000,000,000 and represent almost as much money as was spent by his predecessors in the 43 years that the Bureau had been functioning. The expenditures under Chapman for 1950, amounting to \$359,703,710, exceed by more than \$50,000,000 all moneys expended by the Reclamation Bureau up to the time Franklin Delano Roosevelt took office in 1933.

Not only have Bureau of Reclamation costs mounted at an astronomical rate during the Chapman-Truman administration, but no serious attempt has been made to make the irrigation activities and multiple dams self-sustaining and self-liquidating. The devices used by the Secretary of the Interior include:

1 Enlisting local or regional support for a project by playing up motives of self-interest. There will be patronage to insure support of local politicians. There will be jobs for the unemployed. There will be lucrative contracts for the business interests. There will be easy pickings for land speculators. There will be cheap water for the farmer and cheap power for the homes and industries.

2 Always submitting very low estimates whenever a new project is proposed for which Congress is to authorize the money. Once the project is under way, estimated costs invariably rise again and again. Chapman and Strauss learned long ago that Congress, grumblingly perhaps, will nevertheless go along in voting the new supplemental appropriations to complete a project rather than leave it unfinished.

In 1937 when the Reclamation boys presented their original estimated cost for the Colorado-Big Thompson project in the State of Colorado, it came to \$44,000,000. By 1947 after the project had been partly completed, this had been revised upward to \$128,000,000—and in 1948 to nearly \$132,000,000.

Then there is the Hungry Horse project in Montana. Originally this was to cost a mere \$6,348,000. By 1947 the estimated cost had multiplied to \$48,000,000; and in the following year, costs of completion were expected to run to \$93,500,000. By the time this project is completed it may have cost us \$150,000,000.

3. The self-sustaining and self-liquidating requirements provided by the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 and other acts of an earlier date, have been largely nullified by a legal opinion handed down by one of Mr. Chapman's solicitors, Fowler Harper, of the Department of the Interior. Harper's opinion, declared Congressman JENSEN, of Iowa, in hearings on the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1949, nullified the basic law of the land and "in my estimation, has been very detrimental to reclamation, hydroelectric power funds, and everything else pertaining to reclamation, irrigation, and hydroelectric power projects."

What the Fowler Harper opinion did in actuality was to give a special subsidy to the water and power users of the project by throwing interest and amortization costs upon the taxpayers of the Nation.

The politicization of the Bureau of Reclamation under present leadership, and its corrupting influence upon the very localities and regions which it proposes to help, demand full-scale investigation and publicity. Up to now the Reclamation Bureau has been a sacred cow which no one dared investigate. But the citizens of West and East alike need to be told the full story.

That the West will need more hydroelectric power and more water as its population and industries grow is beyond question—but from now on every project planned for the West must be concerned with supplying water to cities and industries, not to reclamation of croplands.

The steel mills, aluminum and magnesium plants, copper, zinc, lead, and other metal refineries, foundries and manufacturing plants—without which the new West cannot grow—these and the other thousands of manufacturing plants are the ones that need water and power. It takes 270 tons, or 65,000 gallons, of water to process 1 ton of steel. And though the average person drinks less than 2 quarts of liquid a day, the daily per capita use of water for domestic and industrial purposes is more than a thousand gallons. Without this supply of water Los Angeles, Salt Lake City, Denver, and a host of other western cities would shrivel up and die.

The time has come for the people of the United States and their representatives in Congress to take a new, hard look at the Bureau of Reclamation and its grandiose plans. The question must be asked—and asked soon—"Reclamation, for what?"

Statement of President William Green, American Federation of Labor, on the Need for Strong Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1951

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in inserting the remarks of President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, delivered at an informal meeting of about 200 Members of the House in the Ways and Means Committee room this morning, called by me, in which he directed attention to the dangers that threaten our Nation and our economy unless strong controls are continued under the Defense Production Act.

In his characteristically clear and forceful manner, Mr. Green detailed the dangers that lie ahead unless we effectively apply controls over the economy. His remarks were of such deep interest, I felt they should be made available to each and every Member. The following is a transcript of his statement:

I appreciate very much this opportunity to appear before you and present the views of organized labor on the present crisis confronting the Nation.

The American Federation of Labor and organized labor have consistently supported the Nation's defense effort. Labor unions who have always been the first target of Communist infiltration know the importance of building the defenses of the free world against Soviet imperialism and aggression.

Organized labor also knows that the fight against communism is not merely a fight on the battlefield. Just as important is the fight against inflation at home. By its very nature, the defense program means the danger of inflation. A program to increase production of guns, tanks, aircraft, and other military equipment reduces the amount of goods available to civilians while, at the same time, increasing the money available to buy

this limited supply of goods. The result can only be increased pressure on prices which can easily lead to catastrophe unless we are willing to apply effectively direct controls over the economy.

All of us know that ever since the outbreak of the war in Korea, the threat of inflation has been very real. The dollar has declined seriously in real value. A few facts and figures will prove this point.

Today's dollar is worth only 54 cents as compared with the dollar in 1939. By May 1951, the cost of living, as indicated by the Consumers' Price Index of the Department of Labor, had increased by 88 percent over the 1939 level. For food, which is the most important item in the worker's cost of living, the increase was 139 percent. The dollar today will buy only 42 cents worth of food in 1939 terms.

The above figures give some idea of the tremendous increases since pre-World War II days in the prices which workers have to pay to meet everyday living costs. Moreover, recent short-run increases have markedly decreased the purchasing power of the worker's dollar. From June 1950 to May 1951, the cost of living rose by 9 percent. Again food prices led the way with an increase of 12 percent. By May 1951, the food dollar was worth only 89 cents in pre-Korean terms.

Although there has been a slight slackening in the rise of prices in recent weeks, this should certainly not lull us into any false sense of security. Charles E. Wilson, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, in his second quarterly report to the President, has estimated that the gap between consumer buying power and the amount of goods that will be available for consumers to buy will reach between ten and twenty billion dollars. It is obvious that unless there is authorization to hold down price levels, this gap will create a tremendous inflationary pressure in the economy. Price Stabilizer Michael V. DiSalle has stated that if presently planned price orders are not permitted to go into effect, there may be an increase of 7 percent in the cost of living within the next few months. This is almost as much as the total increase since the beginning of the Korean war.

It is important to emphasize that the rise in prices that has taken place within the past year has seldom been equalled in the history of our country. In fact, except for the inflation of World War I and that of 1946, there has been no comparable price rise since the Civil War. It would be extremely ruinous to our entire economy if the inflationary movement, which has now somewhat abated, were permitted to resume its upward course.

These figures emphasize the importance of the crisis confronting the Nation. To meet this crisis, Congress has been asked to strengthen the Defense Production Act. This act is the basic law of the defense program. It provides the framework for both price control and wage stabilization. Unfortunately, the act in its present form is inadequate to do the job of guiding our Nation's efforts through the months ahead.

The President has made a number of specific recommendations regarding this law. Organized labor felt that the President's recommendations did not go far enough and has submitted a number of other suggestions for strengthening the law. Action on this law has already been taken by the Senate of the United States.

The workers of the country are extremely disappointed by the action which the Senate has taken. The Senate did not merely refuse to strengthen the law; instead it adopted a number of specific amendments which will serve to cripple the operations of our control authorities and help to bring on inflationary increases in prices. Not a single one of the President's recommendations for

strengthening the law were adopted. In my opinion, this is truly shocking. Here is the President who has lived with the law, worked with it, telling the Congress it is inadequate and making specific recommendations for its approval. Instead, the Senate has rejected every single one of his suggestions.

The bill is now before the House of Representatives. The House has already adopted a number of amendments which will seriously weaken the bill.

I want to urge every Member of Congress to think carefully about his votes on these questions. The votes on this bill will affect the entire stabilization program and the whole defense effort of the country.

Because organized labor was so concerned about developing an effective defense program, we have voluntarily joined in the Nation's stabilization program. We have voluntarily submitted to the restrictions of a wage-stabilization program. We have voluntarily agreed that wage increases which workers can obtain from their employers are subject to the regulation and orders of the current Wage Stabilization Board. We have taken this step voluntarily because we have assumed that the other groups in our economy would make similar sacrifices. We have expected businessmen and farmers, as well as workers, to join together in this defense period under a program of equality of sacrifice.

However, unless Congress strengthens the Defense Production Act, the cooperation of workers in the defense program will have to be reconsidered. Without making any threats at all, because I do not want to threaten anyone, I think I can say that the Defense Production Act as passed by the Senate means a program of controls in which strict controls are placed on wages without similar strict controls over prices. How can the workers of this country accept a stabilization program that means strict regulation of the wages they receive, but little or no regulation over the price of things that they have to buy?

For this reason, the future of our whole stabilization program hinges on the action which Congress will take on this Defense Production Act. I want to urge every Member of Congress to study the proposals made by the President and organized labor for strengthening the law. I know that if they do this, they will live up to their responsibilities and will support a law that will meet the crisis now facing the Nation.

Delmarva Chicken Festival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD T. MILLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1951

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, in these days of high meat prices it is important to get the best results from the food on hand. Good cooking is essential for good eating even when one has the good judgment to select a fine Maryland chicken.

Yesterday, at the Delmarva chicken festival in Salisbury, Md., 197 fine cooks from many localities competed in the fourth annual contest to determine the best way to cook a chicken.

The winner was Mrs. Aubrey G. Romshe, of Snow Hill, Md. Her original

prize-winning recipe is inserted here, for the benefit of lovers of good food:

One chicken—three-four pounds, cut in serving pieces.

One onion chopped.

One-half cup water.

One teaspoon salt.

Two tablespoons fat.

Three tablespoons vinegar.

Two tablespoons brown sugar.

One-half tablespoon prepared mustard.

One tablespoon Worcestershire sauce.

One can tomato sauce.

Brown sugar in fat and remove to roaster. Brown onion in fat and add remaining ingredients. Simmer 30 minutes. Pour over chicken. Bake in moderate oven (325-350 degrees F.) 1 hour.

Federal Public Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1951

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, the present Public Housing Act has been with us about 2 years. During that time, at the cost of a great many millions of dollars for administrative overhead, the Government has been able to build approximately 35,000 units. During the same time, private industry has built 2,000,000 units, or more. This, to the intelligent mind, should suggest that passing a bill does not necessarily build houses; that takes carpenters, and plumbers, and other workmen, and it takes lumber and plaster and other materials. It also takes an honest effort to produce results, and it has been my contention that the best results always have been secured, and always will be secured, first, from private industry which has an interest in getting the houses built and ready to sell, and second, from the agencies of government nearest home. These would include the States and the counties and the cities.

The act we passed 2 years ago was curious in itself. It was only the second time we had deliberately bypassed the Congress and told an agency of Government to go direct to the Treasury and stick in its hand and take out money without the customary controls. It obligated the taxpayers for about \$19,000,000. That is a lot of money.

It was an 84-page bill. Do you remember it, Mr. Speaker? I do not recall how many Representatives voted for the bill and how many voted against it. I know that I voted against it. I want housing, for veterans, for nonveterans, not waste and delays and politics. Some of the Members write weekly letters home, or newspaper columns. I was very much interested to reread recently the letter written to his constituents at the time the Act was passed, by the distinguished Representative from the Second District of New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton] and it is so pertinent now that I have asked his permission to include it in

this extension of my own remarks. Mr. Cotton's letter was as follows:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN REPORTS

(By NORRIS COTTON)

JULY 7, 1949.—This is the last week that the House will look upon the familiar scenes of the Chamber it has occupied for nearly 100 years (since 1857). Next year, when it returns from its temporary quarters, the Chamber will be completely remodeled and old landmarks will have disappeared. It is strikingly significant that the last act in the old Chamber may well mark the end of an epoch in our history and the beginning of a new and strange America.

I refer to the passage of the huge Federal housing bill.

Let me tell you why I believe this sweeping statement is justified, why I joined in the long and hopeless fight to strike public housing out of the bill, and why I voted against its final passage.

First, by this act we mortgage our entire future. It permits a Government agency to make contracts for the next 40 years to the amount of twelve to sixteen billion dollars. (Some of this may be paid back but let us not fool ourselves that much of it will.)

These contracts pledge the "faith and credit of the United States." They cannot be broken. The Eighty-second or the Eighty-third Congress or the Ninety-eighth or the One hundredth Congress must appropriate the money. No control is left to the people's representatives come flood or famine, peace or war, hell or high water. No such statute has ever been written before. We vote billions for foreign aid and other purposes but we can watch them, reduce them, or stop them at any time. This, however, is an increase in our national debt and must be paid, just as the interest and principal is paid on that debt.

New Hampshire's share of this obligation is just under \$40,000,000. Do you think our legislature would vote to bond the State for that amount at this time for the slight assistance that two or three of our larger cities might receive? I don't. The share of my own town would be over \$600,000. Do you think our town meeting would vote to issue these bonds? I don't.

How can we talk out of one corner of our mouth about Hoover reorganization and Government economy and then vote this burden on us for 40 years and on our children for many years more?

Second, by this act we create a mighty political machine and a vast army of Federal employees. It is claimed that under it the Federal Government does not build houses but that the local and city governments issue bonds and award the contracts while Washington guarantees the money, pays the interest, and retains enough control to see that it is spent properly. (Incidentally, the Federal Government owns the houses for 40 years.)

This plan has none of the virtues of either Federal or local control and all the sins of both. Can you see the mad scramble of contractors, architects, and sellers of materials to get in on this? Can you imagine the patronage that local bosses and city machines will enjoy? "Where the carcass is, there will the vultures gather." At the same time, Washington, with its finger in the pie, will reach new heights in bureaucracy never before attained in peacetime, and, in the words of the Declaration of Independence, will "send swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance."

No, I could not vote for this monstrosity. I would vote for reasonable Federal aid for slum clearance to be controlled by Congress and scrutinized by its committees on appropriations, and for aid in stimulating private building of low rental units and homes,

but not to issue a blank check for 40 years of Government extravagance and debauchery to the tune of three hundred millions a year.

One hundred and thirty-three years ago a letter went up to New Hampshire on this subject when Thomas Jefferson wrote our Governor Plumer:

"I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of the dangers to be feared. To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy."

How We Got Into This Jam in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the third article in a series I wrote at the request of the Scripps-Howard papers. This is taken from the Birmingham Post-Herald of June 27, 1951:

HOW WE GOT INTO THIS JAM—UNITED STATES, DELUDED BY MYTHS, EMBRACED STALIN, SCUTTLED CHIANG

(By Representative WALTER JUDD)

WASHINGTON, June 26—The United States is involved in a major war in Asia because we have consistently let ourselves be deluded as to the aims and purposes of our enemy.

The No. 1 myth of our age was our believing in World War II that because we were fighting Hitler and Russia was fighting Hitler, it must follow that Russia was a democratic nation very much like ourselves.

The Soviet Union is not a peace-loving democracy. It did not and does not believe in the same kind of society as we do. There was no evidence and there is no evidence that it ever intended to cooperate in building the sort of world of justice, freedom, and peace for which we have fought two world wars.

Our second miscalculation was the myth that the Communists in Asia, or at least in China, were different. They were supposed to be simply agrarian reformers. The belief didn't just happen; it was skillfully organized and put over because it was useful to the Kremlin.

When history is written, it will seem fantastic that the supposedly enlightened and sophisticated Americans could be beguiled into basing their country's foreign policy toward Asia on an assumption which was contradicted by all the evidence.

"AGRARIAN REFORMER" PHRASE

Our State Department policy makers are now ashamed of the "agrarian reformer" phrase. But it played a decisive role in their thinking and it was the chant of most of our opinion-forming agencies.

However potent the agrarian reformer lie was, it alone did not trick us into withdrawing support from the Chinese Nationalists. For that we needed a justification in self-interest. This was supplied when it was alleged that the Chinese Nationalists were not fighting the Japanese as hard as the Chinese Communists were.

Less than 10 percent of the Japanese casualties at the hands of the Chinese were inflicted by the Chinese Reds. As late as 1944 the Chinese Reds allowed the Japanese to pass through their territory to drive 1,100 miles south to kill thousands of loyal Chinese. For 7 years Yen-an, the Red capital, lay within 100 miles of Japanese armies in north China. If the Chinese Reds had been a real threat, the Japanese would have wiped them out. The fact was that Japan appreciated the help of the Chinese Reds against Chiang Kai-shek.

When Japan's surrender made the argument of who was killing the most Japanese irrelevant, another excuse was invented to justify our withdrawing support from Chiang. This was that the Reds were doing more for the common people of China.

ORIGINAL REFORMER

The original social revolution in China was being carried on by Chiang Kai-shek and his associates, mostly American-trained. Eight years of fighting the Japanese and the Chinese Communists with the merest trickle of American aid, halted that revolution.

But we Americans were told that the Chinese Reds had taken it up. It was true that while the Reds were carrying on a policy of withholding food from the cities, the country people ate better. But the apparent rural prosperity lasted only until the starved-out cities fell. The Chinese Reds now take a larger part of the farmer's crop than his old landlord ever did. And the peasants now lack even their former liberty.

While the process of starving out the cities was going on, we were told that the Communists would never take the cities because they knew they couldn't organize them. The fact was that long ago the Chinese Reds had decided that they should take the country first as a means of getting the cities.

When the Communists were gaining North China, we were given another myth by the apologists in our own country for communism. This was that China was too big to be one country. Divide her along the Yangtze River and maybe the Nationalists could handle the problems of the south. This lulled us into doing nothing just long enough for the Reds to seize the whole of China.

STILL ANOTHER MYTH

Now that the Chinese mainland is Communist-occupied except for scattered areas, we are given another myth. This is that if we build up Mao Tze-tung, the Red dictator, he will turn against Russia and come over to our side. But Mao has been saying for 29 years that China must be tied solely and completely to Russia.

Still, we are told that if we give Mao more territory—Formosa, for example—he will desert the winning side in Asia and join us losers. The phrase used is that he will become "another Tito."

Anybody who knows anything about Chinese history knows that there is only one Tito in China. That is Chiang Kai-shek, who deserted the Russians in 1927, became a Christian, and fought for China's independence when we and the British were selling munitions to Japan. He continued to fight for the independence of China after we and the British, at Yalta, deeded control of Manchuria to Russia.

You will hear it said that America need not fear communism in China because the Reds will not be able to convert the people to their way of thinking, will fail to solve China's economic problems, and eventually the Chinese will absorb their conquerors as they absorbed conquerors before.

IGNORANCE OF HISTORY

Such arguments show a complete ignorance of history and of communism. The Reds have never tried to convert a majority of any people. They have never claimed

more than 3 percent of the Russians, 6 percent of the Poles, 8 percent of the Czechs. When they find their ranks getting too large, they hold a purge. All they ever want is a hard, disciplined corps to control all the rest.

Again, since when have the Communists solved anybody's economic problems? They haven't solved Russia's; after 30 years they have no answer for the misery of their own masses except renewed self-sacrifice to a dream of world conquest. Economic problems can be solved only in an atmosphere of freedom, as the history of the United States shows. But every tyranny that comes along uses economics as a weapon.

One more myth remains—that the ancient Chinese will swallow up their conquerors. But this takes time. It took the Chinese 100 years to overcome the Mongols, 267 years to overcome the Manchus. Perhaps in a couple of hundred years they will overcome the Communists, although to say they will is as logical as telling a patient he will get over cancer because he recovered from the measles.

But what will happen to us, our children, and our country in the meantime?

Shall We Limit Federal Taxing and Spending?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1951

SHALL WE LIMIT FEDERAL TAXING AND SPENDING?—IF YOU THINK SO, HELP SECURE THE ADOPTION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 252 FOR A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

STRATOSPHERIC DEBT

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, every newborn American baby opens his eyes to a debt of approximately \$1,700 to the Federal Government. That debt is equivalent to an \$11,000 mortgage on every owner-occupied dwelling in the Nation. That is their part of our national debt which reached the staggering figure of \$257,357,000,000 in the fiscal year 1950.

Now we find that Truman's bloody peace has already cost more than Roosevelt's war. Having the power to do almost anything and to tax without limit, the administration and a majority in Congress are committed to a program of exchanging favors in return for votes. Congress lacks the will or capacity to stop the present trend into more socialism and even more taxes. A government so dishonest and irresponsible at home can exercise no moral authority abroad. Without American moral leadership it seems peace is impossible and continued war inevitable.

So to correct the evils of such a government in our domestic affairs, the people themselves must reduce the amount of government. They must reenact constitutional limitations redefining the kind of government they want. Without that Congress is defenseless against the scramble of interminable organized pressure groups that continue to increase.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

There are a number of tax limitation proposals pending before the House. One provides a limitation of 25 percent

on Federal income tax rates. Twenty-five of the State legislatures have approved such an amendment as the Honorable NOAH M. MASON, of Illinois, shows in his speech in the House of Representatives on Thursday, June 28, 1951.

My resolution, introduced on May 4, 1951, is unlike other proposals. It would amend our Constitution to limit the total Federal tax take for nonmilitary expenditures, including interest payments on the national debt, to 5 percent of the national income in any one year. Less than that percentage met all of our nonmilitary needs from 1789 to 1940, including costs of all wars besides.

What would it mean now in dollars and cents to the Nation and to every individual? In the fiscal year 1950, the national income was at the rate of \$219,200,000,000. All Federal taxes imposed on the people during the same period amounted to \$37,044,733,557. Nonmilitary expenditures approximated \$21,000,000,000 in fiscal 1950, thus exceeding military expenditures which totaled about \$19,000,000,000. In all, Government expenditures exceeded receipts by \$3,122,102,357. These figures show that expenditures of the Federal Government for nonmilitary purposes took 10 percent of the national income.

ITS EFFECT

Effective legislation of the kind proposed would have nearly cut in two these outlays for nonmilitary purposes. Instead of \$21,000,000,000, nonmilitary expenditures would have accounted for \$10,960,000,000. Leaving military expenditures at their actual figure for that year, the total Federal expenditure would have amounted to \$30,000,000,000, approximately. Thus taxes imposed on the people for the year would have been reduced by more than \$7,000,000,000. This would have effectively dried up on the books Socialist legislation, the only way it will ever be repealed.

The amendment envisages the need for additional revenue in time of war. It requires special war taxes to meet war costs. By separating the cost of civilian government from war costs we stop the government raising taxes for war and spending it for other purposes. It also requires special taxes from time to time for the purpose of retiring the national debt. Finally, the amendment restores to the Constitution a limitation which prevailed from 1789 up to 1913, when the Sixteenth Amendment removed it with such evil consequences.

The amendment proposed reimposes on the Federal Government the same character of limitations that have been retained by most of the States and cities from the date of their organization. The result is that most of them are sound and the Federal Government almost bankrupt.

THE NEEDED REMEDY

The National Committee To Limit Federal Taxing Powers supports this amendment. It believes this to be the most feasible remedy yet offered.

Government hand-outs are the sure symptoms of communism. They are contagious. They foster corruption in Government, often under the guise of social

welfare. The end result of this robbing-Peter-to-pay-Paul philosophy is higher taxes.

If we limit the Federal Government's power to impose taxes on the people, as we have done in the States and municipalities, we automatically curtail Government spending. This has stopped even Socialist mayors. If we withhold our money, our officials cannot carry us into socialism or communism. This will enable our elected officials to resist requests from those who clamor for more and bigger hand-outs. It will put method instead of madness in our present Government housekeeping. It will hasten the return of our Nation to a balanced budget. At the same time, it will not reduce our military efficiency nor impair our defense preparedness. Rather it will strengthen us at home and command respect among the other nations.

HOW YOU CAN HELP

If you agree with this proposal, will you organize in your community to support this amendment? Let us stop the spectacle of attempting to make legal the immoral taking by force of one man's house or his cattle or his wages or savings and giving it to another without price.

Talk the matter over with your friends and associates. Write your Congressman and tell him your thoughts on this resolution, and tell him you want to help him, by this resolution, to resist the special pressure groups.

Help yourself—the taxpayer.

House Joint Resolution 252

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to taxes and the national debt

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. All taxes levied and collected for nonmilitary expenditures including interest on the national debt in any one year shall not exceed 5 percent of the national income for the nearest preceding calendar year for which figures are available; nonmilitary expenditures shall include all of those not defined as military expenditures.

"The Congress shall define what constitutes military expenditures, which shall include only such outlays as are used for raising and maintaining personnel for the Armed Forces and for the facilities and materials needed by them to be effective, and for benefits and pensions to veterans.

"The Congress shall also define what constitutes national income.

"SEC. 2. In the event that the United States shall become engaged in war, the Congress shall lay and collect a special war tax which shall be used solely to defray the military costs of that war.

"SEC. 3. The Congress shall from time to time lay and collect a special tax to be used solely to retire the national debt.

"SEC. 4. The power of Congress defined in section 8, article I, of the Constitution to 'borrow money on the credit of the United States' is hereby limited to the power to borrow money when approved by a vote of the people only to meet the needs of a state of war, or to meet a national emergency."

Organized Labor's Demand for Strong Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1951

Mr. SABATH. Mr. James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO, in addressing a conference called by me, of some 200 Members of the House this morning, presented a thorough outline of organized labor's position in the fight to insure effective controls during the present emergency. He pictured the plight of the working people and their families faced with skyrocketing prices, higher rents, and the ever-increasing danger of greater inflation, and the added strain on all Americans as a result of the mounting costs of our defense program.

He advocated strengthened controls and urged that every Member of the Congress stand up and be counted so the American people will know those interested in protecting their welfare and in favor of our defense program.

His statement follows:

I want to express the appreciation of the CIO for you gentlemen taking time off in these hectic days to hear our position on the Defense Production bill you are now considering.

We, of organized labor, feel that the decisions you are making these days on this bill are going to be world-shaking in their effect—that they are either going to help us in our fight against Communist aggression, or they are going to expose us to a devastating inflation that will mean dozens of divisions of armed men added to the Communist forces.

We know that the hour is late, that many Congressmen have made up their minds on how they are going to vote. But we of organized labor feel that it is our duty to make this last-minute appeal, to make it candidly and bluntly, on what we believe will be the consequences of the bill as it is now shaping up.

The working people of America, and I know millions of consumers who are not working people must be deeply puzzled about what is going on in Congress today. They see the spectacle of Representatives of theirs—men who hate inflation as much as they do—voting with the special interests in favor of higher prices, higher rents, more speculation, more profiteering, more inflation. These millions of consumers whether they be wage earners, white-collar workers, families of servicemen, people on pensions—are asking themselves, what can have come over so many of our Congressmen that they are abandoning our most elementary interests and the interests of our national defense?

I know that millions of these people are not writing to their Congressmen, because millions of them are not experienced as are the slick lobbyists. These millions are simple people who don't know the intricacies of legislation or even how to get in touch with their Congressmen. And millions of them are puzzled and baffled by what is going on.

But let this bill pass in its present form, and let the inevitable increase in the cost of living take place. Let the inevitable profiteering continue and grow, and you will see a real awakening on the part of the

American people. But that will be after much of the damage will already have been done. Billions of dollars appropriated for defense equipment will be eaten up in high prices. There will be a race of wages and prices chasing each other more and more frantically. People who have suffered because of this will become embittered and cynical about this defense effort.

And sitting in his perch in the Kremlin, Stalin can have a good chuckle about how easy it was to dupe the American people, about how easy it was to dupe those who profess to be the most ardent anti-Communists in America.

After years of experience in dealing with Communists all over the world, even seeing them in Moscow itself, I am convinced that this proposal of an armistice by the Russians was clearly timed as an attempt to scuttle our national defense and our economic defense. I am convinced by everything I know about Communist tactics that Stalin would rather suffer some temporary loss in Korea if he can only lull the American people to sleep, make us slow up in our defense, let us have a joyride of inflation, turn group against group and class against class.

Then when we are involved in that mad inflation, he can throw his Sunday punch and we will be in for all the horrors that will follow.

That's why I say that in our opinion of Communist strategy the votes you are taking are not only on price and wage controls, but you may be taking the responsibility on whether we are going to win or lose that fight for freedom.

In my humble judgment—and I recognize the honesty of the convictions of many Congressmen who voted against real price controls—I believe that if those people had been on Stalin's payroll they could not have done a better job for the foreign policy of the Soviet Union.

Right now in Milan, for example, the representatives of 50,000,000 organized workers, in the free trade-unions of the world are meeting to determine their course. Many of these groups are powerful in their own national governments. They exert tremendous influence in every continent of the globe. They are the front-line fighters against communism in every factory, shop, ship, dock, mine. Today they are looking to you here to see what America is going to do—whether the actions you take means that America is going to desert the other free peoples or whether we are going to see this thing through and not be sidetracked by Stalin's little tricks.

Let's review for a minute what is happening here in Congress. We had understood that this program of national defense was on a basis of equality of sacrifice. Yet this bill as passed by the Senate, and now shaping up here would penalize people most if they have the lowest incomes. It would penalize the fixed-income groups most, particularly families of our servicemen and hundreds of thousands of disabled veterans.

What this bill is saying to the American people is: "We are going to provide to the manufacturers a guaranty that they can keep their high prices no matter how high their profits are. We are going to guarantee to the big ranchers that their standard is not now parity but 150 percent of parity, we are going to give landlords a 20 percent or more increase in rent over 1947; we are going to allow speculating and profiteering even on our Government's defense program to not only continue but to now get the blessing of Congress."

You will further be saying to the American people: "You who are worst off—you of fixed incomes and low incomes, you who are disabled servicemen or families of service-

men, you who are on pensions or are poorly paid white-collar workers—to you we promise higher and higher prices and rents, no matter how little you are able to bear it."

In other words, you will be saying: "Our policy on national defense is now giving more profits to those who have them and take away from the meager standard of living of those who have too little."

You may accuse us of organized labor of a certain point of view, but you cannot accuse Eric Johnston or Charlie Wilson of having labor's point of view. Yet Johnston and Wilson, big businessmen in their own right, have solemnly said that this bill will cost every American family \$1 a day in increased living costs.

The provision against beef roll-backs and against the use of quotas, means according to the Government authority, Mr. DiSalle, no effective control over meat prices at all. Yet meats make up one-eighth of the average budget of moderate income families.

The worst is yet to come when the big defense spending starts this fall. We will then see that as fast as Congress appropriates money from the people's taxes that money will evaporate like snow on a hot sidewalk to feed the fires of inflation.

There is also before you the so-called Lucas amendment which would take away power of the tripartite Wage Stabilization Board to handle disputes, and allow disputes to fester and break out into ugly disturbances of our defense production. The present system in the WSB is what was recommended by the public, farm, and labor members of the President's Mobilization Board. To pass the Lucas amendment is to say to the Nation that the law of the jungle is to prevail and not the orderly process of mediation and conciliation.

Let me make the position of organized labor, at least the 6,000,000 members of the CIO, perfectly clear in this. You may remember that when the NAM and Chamber of Commerce proposed that both wage and price controls be dropped, we termed that a bribe to organized labor and we indignantly rejected it.

We knew perfectly well as we know now, that in any race with prices, labor that is organized can take care of itself. But we know also that there are 30,000,000 workers for wages and salaries who do not have organized labor's protection of contracts and who will be the chief victims.

We, therefore, insisted that economic stabilization continue even though it meant restrictions on our right to share in the Nation's production and of our employers' profits.

We take that stand because we know that the position of the NAM and Chamber of Commerce will be ruinous to this Nation and to its people. Yet we see here, dozens of perfectly decent Members of Congress running for fright into a position that at least goes two-thirds of the way to the NAM demands.

Let me tell you what you are in for. NAM says that it wants only indirect controls such as increased taxes. But then NAM went to the Senate and proposed a tax program of placing all personal income taxes, some \$22,000,000,000, on the shoulders of the consumers. This would require a 20 percent tax on everything but food and rent. Do you know what that would do, in addition to increased prices?

The man earning \$100,000 a year would pay no income tax. His Federal sales tax would amount to only 3.8 percent of his income. That would be his total Federal tax—3.8 percent of his income. The man earning \$3,000 a year, however, would have to pay 8 percent of his income.

This is the kind of a shameful deal the NAM is leading you into. Do you think the

American people would stand for that very long? I don't.

Let me just show you a few things of what happened in 1946 and is repeating itself today. I want to read from a letter sent by the NAM to its Board of Directors. This letter is dated _____ and is signed by _____

Now here I want to show you the campaign they engaged in. [Shows exhibits.] You know what happened after that. Meat prices went up 56 percent in 5 months and all food prices 28 percent in 5 months. Are we going to be fooled again only 5 years after that shameful episode?

This is a bill to please that oddly assorted group who have some political ends in common. It is a bill to please John L. Lewis, the Communists and the NAM.

If we were to recommend to the working people of this country that we support or even try to live with such a bill they would call us idiots. And they would be right. We would simply be playing into the hands of the John L. Lewis and Communist faction in the labor movement. And that would be of no service to our Nation.

What this bill would do in effect is to allow prices and profits to skyrocket and then try to hold wages down. Gentlemen, as far as organized labor is concerned that cannot be done. You are trifling with disaster.

You cannot have a bill that is two-thirds bad. In our judgment, and we are speaking with deliberation now, we would rather see no bill at all. If the big corporations, the big ranchers, insist on having their way and you are giving them two-thirds of what they want it will be better to give them their way. Then let the situation of 1946 repeat itself, when meat prices rose 56 percent in 5 months.

We cannot and will not support an economic stabilization program that is a fraud on the American people. We are in here today at this eleventh hour because we feel the dangers so deeply that we want to do what we can to avert the disaster.

We ask you to examine this problem again, to talk to your fellow Congressmen, and to show the American people that we have not fallen for Stalin's trickery, that we are determined to see this job through until the dangers of Communist aggression are over, and to that end we are going to put into practice the doctrine of equality of sacrifice.

Organized labor has said repeatedly that we are prepared to pull in our belts in this national emergency and to share fully in the sacrifices that will be required. We did this during 1950 and in the face of tremendous corporation profits. The average factory worker ended the year with just 3 cents more a week, enough for one postage stamp more to spend than at the beginning of the year. This was in spite of working longer hours.

We cannot and will not tell the working people of America that they must cut their standard of living in order to provide additional profits for the big corporations and the big ranchers.

We ask every Member of Congress who feels this problem deeply to fight for a decent bill until the last minute and then insist that everyone stand up and be counted. We know that the record on this action will be made, not only in the votes registered here but in the prices that will be registered in store windows and in the guns and tanks and planes that will not be built because inflation destroyed them first.

Yes, if these gentlemen who support the NAM and the big ranchers believe in their convictions let them, too, stand up and be counted, and let the results of their action be laid out before the American people.

We ask you who believe in protecting the American people and our defense to stand by your guns for a decent bill.

We ask you to do that in the name of America, of our fighting men, of our future. If you do you will have made peace with your conscience and 45,000,000 families will bless you.

Appeasement Roots in Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York World-Telegram and Sun of July 11, 1951:

APPEASEMENT ROOTS IN BRITAIN

Aneurin Bevan and his left-wing supporters in the British Labor Party have issued a new policy statement which ought to win plaudits from the Moscow radio.

It is filled with denunciations of American hoarding of raw materials, the American arms program, and hysterical Americans who are accused of engaging in an anti-Communist witch hunt.

American air bases have been established in Britain to help defend that country and continental Europe from attack by Russia. The Bevanites seem to feel that this gives them the right to make certain demands on us, as they do in five specific proposals which they contend should be the base for future British-American relations.

1. Withdrawal of American recognition from Chiang Kai-shek and a negotiated settlement of outstanding questions with Red China (That follows the Moscow-Peiping line without a quibble.)

2. Abandonment of plans to rearm Western Germany or bring Franco Spain into the Atlantic Pact (That, too, is right down the Kremlin's alley.)

3. Peace proposals to Russia, including an invitation to join in a world-wide mutual aid program (That suggests a bigger Marshall plan, with Uncle Sam putting up the money, as usual. And the Bevanites want the economic assistance whether Russia joins up or not, being willing to take our money even though they don't like us.)

4. Establishment of a "more realistic allocation of raw materials between the United States and its allies." (Our allies have equal access with us to raw materials—if they have the money to buy them. Presumably Mr. Bevan wants us to divide up what we've bought and paid for. Since most of our buying has been from British possessions, this would be a case of Britain selling its cake and then getting it back. And the word "allies" is not used in its military sense, as the next demand of the Bevan left-wing bloc makes clear.)

5. A scale-down of the Western arms program to release labor and resources for "world mutual aid" ("Scale-down" as used there means abandon.)

Of course, if Russia had any sincere desire to join in a world-wide mutual aid program, Western rearmament would be wholly unnecessary. But even Henry Wallace seems to have given up the notion that Russian aggression could be bought off by a show of generosity.

Since the left-wing bloc represents a small minority in the British Parliament, it may seem that its irrational demands can be shrugged off as of little consequence. But this bloc exercises a voice in British policy

far out of proportion to its numerical strength. Without its support the British labor government cannot remain in power.

When our own Government compromises with the viewpoint of that British Government, it is very likely to be yielding in fact to the minority Bevan group, which is more sympathetic to the general Russian position than it is to America's. Our State Department's appeasement policy in Korea undoubtedly had its roots in this situation within the British Labor Party.

H. R. 4552

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my remarks and include a statement submitted to me by John W. Edelman, Washington representative of the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, in opposition to H. R. 4552, the so-called Lucas amendment:

H. R. 4552

I. PURPOSE AND EFFECT OF H. R. 4552

Would abolish the existing Wage Stabilization Board and substitute a new board. The following are the most significant changes in functions and composition provided for the new Board:

1. H. R. 4552 abandons the tripartite principle of equal responsibility for labor, management, and the public, by establishing a board composed of a majority of public members.

2. H. R. 4552 strips the board of its responsibility for the day-to-day administration of wage stabilization controls, by removing its power to promulgate general policies and regulations and by casting doubt on its power to adapt policies and regulations to the equities and needs of particular cases.

3. H. R. 4552 changes the Board's dispute-settlement jurisdiction. Its effect is unclear: it appears to confine this jurisdiction to wage issues in cases referred by any party; but its new effect may be completely to wipe out any dispute powers. At present, the board's dispute-settlement jurisdiction extends to all issues in dispute in cases brought to the Board by mutual voluntary agreement or by Presidential certification.

II. REASONS FOR OPPOSING H. R. 4552

(1) It requires wasteful and inefficient administration of wage-stabilization controls; (2) it prevents solution of the problem of defense-mobilization emergency labor disputes; (3) it destroys the principle of tripartism; (4) it disregards experience, (5) it serves no real need; and (6) it raises serious legal problems:

1. H. R. 4552 is wasteful and inefficient in wage stabilization administration: The bill upsets the present carefully conceived design of economic stabilization controls. At present, the Economic Stabilization Agency is the top planning and coordinating staff for price and wage controls. Its staff is small. It was designed to supervise and direct, but not to operate, the day-to-day administration of price and wage controls. Such administration is delegated to the Office of Price Stabilization and the present Wage Stabilization Board. These agencies are designated and equipped for the realities of economic stabilization regulation. They deal directly with the affected parties;

they are subject to the individual and group pressures and requirements which spell out in concrete terms the desirability of new or amended regulations or policies. In sum, the present set-up provides a top agency for planning, and coordinate price and wage agencies for operations.

H. R. 4552 destroys this sensible arrangement. While leaving the price mechanism untouched, H. R. 4552 wipes out the power of the Wage Stabilization Board to issue regulations. The bill does permit the Board to make recommendations, but it vests sole authority to promulgate general policies and regulations in the Economic Stabilization Agency. This entails the waste of scrapping a presently operating arrangement.

H. R. 4552 divorces responsibility for interpretation, application, and enforcement of regulations from the power to issue regulations. The Board is to interpret, apply and enforce; the Administrator is to promulgate. This apparently invites duplication of staff and effort, and ambiguity of direction.

The incongruity of this organization is emphasized by the act itself. Section 402 (c) of the act, which is not affected by the bill, establishes the basic requirements for wage stabilization regulations and policies. They must be generally fair and equitable; they must prevent hardship and inequity; they must reflect consideration of the base period, of the national effort for maximum production, of whatever factors are deemed generally relevant. These standards demand administrative judgments which cannot be made apart from flesh-and-blood problems posed by real cases. These statutory requirements cannot be satisfied by general regulation alone. No abstract and general pronouncement, especially by an agency not responsible for applying and enforcing the pronouncements, can achieve equity, lessen hardship, or serve the other statutory goals, in every particular case. The bill denies the administrative flexibility which seems required by other provisions of the act.

The bill has the purpose and effect of casting doubt upon the Board's authority to decide cases on their individual merits. Now, the Board is free to promulgate policy in whatever way it sees fit, by decision or regulation. It bases its policy determinations on knowledge of real problems, gained through its cases and experience with the regulations and policies it has promulgated. This method of wage-stabilization administration is more flexible, economic, and sensible than that proposed by H. R. 4552.

2. The bill prevents solution of emergency labor-disputes problem: It is obvious that labor disputes may become a more serious national problem in this period of defense production. This period combines extraordinary need for maximum production with extraordinary economic pressures. A government-as-usual attitude toward labor disputes will hardly meet the national need.

The Wage Stabilization Board is now the only agency established to deal with the special industrial relations problem created by our mobilization effort. The President, in Executive Order 10233, assigned to the Board jurisdiction over labor disputes, wage and nonwage issues included, which were referred to the Board by voluntary agreement or by Presidential certification. This is a limited jurisdiction. As the need might arise, the President was free to satisfy it, presumably by additional delegations of authority to the Board.

H. R. 4552 rolls back most of the dispute-settlement authority granted by Executive Order 10233; it freezes the authority of the President to deal with the national industrial relations problems as they arise. The bill is unclear; the Board may have authority only over wage issues; or it may have no dispute-settlement power whatever. Further, under the bill, cases are to be brought to the Board

at the request of any Government agency, or any party, rather than by Presidential certification or voluntary agreement. Finally, the bill prevents the assumption of any additional labor-dispute jurisdiction by the Board. Whatever may happen, the bill prohibits any use of the Board in the solution of the national industrial relations problem. The bill is therefore too rigid and narrow.

3. The bill destroys the principle of tripartitism: The present Wage Stabilization Board is composed of an equal number of members representative of each of three groups, public, labor, and management. The underlying principle is that each of the three groups brings its own special insights and abilities to the task of formulating, applying, and enforcing all wage-stabilization regulations and policies. The nub of tripartitism is that wage and other industrial relations problems are best solved if the three groups are equally and jointly charged with responsibility.

Tripartitism is given no more than lip service in H. R. 4552. While the bill provides for representation of three groups, it prohibits equality of representation. The number of public members must exceed the number of labor and management members combined.

This is tripartitism in name only. The bill recognizes that tripartitism is desirable, for it avoids establishment of an all-public board. But partial tripartitism is ineffectual, the value of tripartitism lies precisely in equal representation.

4. The bill disregards experience: Although the bill apparently regards the Wage Stabilization Board as a new and untried administrative device, the plain fact is that the record of the War Labor Board offers directly related experience. That Board was a successful Board. In many ways it was accepted as a model by the Congress in enacting the Defense Production Act and by the President in establishing the present Wage Stabilization Board.

The success of the War Labor Board teaches lessons which are disregarded in H. R. 4552. That Board was tripartite in the true sense, and it is generally agreed that its success is due to this factor as much as to any other. The history of the Board demonstrates that the public members were only rarely outvoted by the labor and management members. The War Labor Board was responsible for both dispute settlement, nonwage as well as wage issues, and wage stabilization. In administering wage-stabilization controls, the War Labor Board was free to use, and did use, both general regulations and specific case decision. H. R. 4552, in all its major provisions, disregards the pertinent wartime experience.

5. The bill serves no real need: Nothing in the record of the present War Stabilization Board calls for the restrictions contained in H. R. 4552. It is impossible to know the need which the bill was designed to serve, inasmuch as there is no report accompanying the bill, and the hearings fail to give any clear or definite impression.

On wage stabilization, the present Board has been engaged in its initial establishment of policy. Any impression that basic wage stabilization policy has been established, in the 10 percent formula or otherwise, misreads the requirements of the Defense Production Act. In the face of the statutory command to prevent and correct hardships and inequities, no single formula or ceiling can do the entire wage stabilization job. The need to conform wage regulations to specific cases will remain, whether the Board or the Economic Stabilization Agency administers the controls. No stricter wage stabilization standard can be imposed by the mere administrative shifting of wage stabilization responsibilities.

So far as disputes are concerned, the Board has not exercised its jurisdiction under Executive Order 10233, and so could not have abused these powers. The Executive order prohibits any conflict with existing legislation, including the Labor-Management Relations Act. Thus there is no need for the bill's dispute provisions.

Nor is there reason for abandoning the tripartite composition of the Board. Almost all of the Board's actions have been unanimous. In none have the public members been outvoted by labor and management representatives. And the War Labor Board experience demonstrates that this fear, as well as the others which may have led to H. R. 4552, is fanciful.

6. The bill raises serious legal problems: The bill creates problems of statutory construction. It does not clearly define the functions of the new Board. The Board is empowered to "advise as to the interpretation, or the application to particular circumstances, of policies and regulations . . ." The effect of this advice is uncertain. It is binding upon the parties with the same force as a decision of the present Board? Or is it, like most advice, of only persuasive value, so that it may be disregarded without legal penalty?

The scope of the advice is also vague and uncertain. Under the bill, "stabilization of wages, salaries, and other compensation means prescribing maximum limits thereon." Does this phrase include advising as to the limits in individual cases, or is it intended to be only general in scope? Is it confined to definite mathematical formulae, or can the limits be expressed in general and discretionary terms?

These questions demonstrate that the language of H. R. 4552 is indefinite and ambiguous. Its effect therefore cannot be predicted accurately. It may upset the present proved method of administration without providing any clear alternative.

Finally, the dispute settlement provisions raise serious constitutional issues. In assigning dispute functions to the Board, the President was acting not under his statutory authority but his constitutional powers to enforce the laws and to promote the defense effort. This was the authority relied on by President Roosevelt in establishing the National Defense Mediation Board and the War Labor Board. The authority of these Boards was upheld by the courts. The present Board was given a far more limited jurisdiction in Executive Order 10233, in terms of both number of cases and effect of administrative action. Nevertheless, the bill prohibits not only this Board but any other agency from dealing with labor disputes except as authorized by statute. H. R. 4552 may therefore interfere unconstitutionally with the executive branch.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH THE LUCAS AMENDMENT

The Lucas amendment (H. R. 4552) would abolish the existing Wage Stabilization Board and substitute a new Board with different composition and responsibilities. H. R. 4552 follows exactly the proposals of the National Association of Manufacturers.

The proposed Board would have a majority of public members. The present Board requires equal representation and responsibility for public, labor and industry.

The proposed Board would be stripped of power to issue general policies and general regulations, and perhaps also to decide particular cases. The present Board is exercising these powers.

If H. R. 4552 becomes law the Board would have very little, if any, labor dispute jurisdiction. The present Board has limited dispute jurisdiction and is the only agency which has been created specially to handle

labor problems which could threaten the mobilization program.

1. H. R. 4552 destroys the benefits of tripartitism: By providing that the public members shall outnumber the labor and industry members combined, the Lucas proposal abandons the principle of equal tripartite responsibility in the industrial relations field, as if it were an untried or unsuccessful technique. The fact is that equal responsibility has met the acid test of wartime experience. The War Labor Board had equal numbers of public, labor and industry members; and its success, which no one has challenged, was due in large part to this equal participation by the three groups which have special experience and insight in this field.

The War Labor Board experience demonstrates once and for all that there is no real possibility that labor and industry members would outvote the public members if equal representation were preserved. Under the present Board, according to its Chairman, "There is no evidence that there had been any ganging up in this Board; this Board is developing into a cooperative team."

Equal representation is needed to maintain cooperation. The present Wage Stabilization Board, in a public statement supported by every member, public, labor and industry, urged Congress to preserve the established tripartite system, which it described and defended as follows: "Decisions are made after discussion among equals. They are reached through the exercise of persuasion rather than the exercise of a dominant voting power by any particular segment of the Board. Only through participation by equals can real cooperation be achieved in reaching decisions affecting millions of employees and their employers. Only in this way can those employees and employers be assured that Government is fully aware of their problems, their needs and their desires."

2. The amendment provides a method of wage stabilization administration which is wasteful and unworkable: This amendment provides that the Board may "formulate and recommend" general policies and general regulations to the Economic Stabilization Administrator, who is to promulgate them. It provides also that the Board shall "advise as to the interpretation, or the application to particular circumstances, of policies and regulations promulgated by such Administrator. . . ." The phrase "formulate and recommend", apparently means that the Board is to initiate the general wage regulations and policies; but cannot issue them, even though it may be responsible for their interpretation and application. The Administrator, on the other hand, can veto the recommendations of the Board, but may not be able to get the Board to change its position to conform to his.

Where does this leave the public? When the Board gives advice on the meaning of a regulation, is the advice legally binding and final, or may the Administrator, who issued the regulation, give a higher priority kind of advice? It is impossible to say definitely who is responsible for what, under this amendment. The public, the Board, and the Administrator are bound to be uncertain and confused.

The intention may be to make the Administrator bear the responsibility for day-to-day wage stabilization administration. How practical is this? The Office of the Administrator is now small, and not specialized in industrial relations. It is designed only for top-level supervision of stabilization policy. The practical administration of price and wage controls has been effectively delegated to the Office of Price Stabilization

and the present Wage Stabilization Board. The Lucas amendment retains this sensible arrangement on the price side, but eliminates it on the wage side. The wage control administration it provides is a merry-go-round of confusion and duplication which cannot bear the strain of actual operation.

The incongruity of this organization is emphasized by the act itself. Section 402 (c) of the act, which is not affected by this proposal, establishes the basic requirements for wage stabilization regulations and policies. They must be generally fair and equitable; they must prevent hardship and inequity; they must reflect consideration of the base period, of the national effort for maximum production, of whatever factors are deemed generally relevant. These standards demand administrative judgments which cannot be made apart from flesh-and-blood problems posed by real cases. No abstract and general pronouncements, especially by an agency not responsible for applying and enforcing the pronouncements, can achieve equity, lessen hardship, or serve the other statutory goals, in every particular case. The Lucas amendment denies the administrative flexibility which seems required by other provisions of the act. The system provided by the amendment cannot work successfully.

3. The amendment prevents effective handling of emergency disputes: The present Wage Stabilization Board is the only agency established to deal with the special industrial relations problems created by our mobilization effort. By Executive order, the Board was given jurisdiction over labor disputes, including nonwage as well as wage issues, only when both parties voluntarily agreed to submit the case to the Board or when the President certified that the dispute substantially threatened the progress of national defense. This was a limited jurisdiction, which the President was free to amplify.

The Lucas amendment rolls back this dispute authority. Moreover, it freezes the authority of the President to deal with industrial relations problems as they arise. The exact effect of the amendment is unclear. It implies that some labor dispute jurisdiction may be exercised by the Board in giving advice on the interpretation and application of the Administrator's regulations. But what dispute jurisdiction is conferred by the weak and obscure verb "advise"? And whatever the substance of this jurisdiction, is it to be exercised ultimately by the single Administrator or by the tripartite Board? If the intention is to give the Administrator the responsibility for the day-to-day operation of wage stabilization, the amendment gives no dispute jurisdiction to the Board.

Finally, this amendment prevents the assumption of any additional labor dispute jurisdiction by the Board. Whatever may happen, this tripartite Board, which alone knows the wage stabilization problems, cannot be used to deal with labor disputes in any way. Clearly, this proposal is too rigid and narrow.

In attempting to prevent the President from creating any new agency to advise him as to emergency labor disputes, the proposed amendment raises serious constitutional issues. It is doubtful that Congress has the authority to prevent the President from seeking specialized advice from any source on how best to enforce the laws and to promote the national defense. These are the powers which support the Presidential assignment of dispute functions to the present Board. These powers are granted by the Constitution to the executive branch. By confining the exercise of these powers, the amendment may be an unconstitutional interference with the Executive. There is no

point to straining the Constitution in this way.

SUMMARY

This amendment discards the tried and tested, and substitutes the unsound and unworkable. It destroys the principle of equal tripartism which marked the success of the War Labor Board. It establishes a method of wage-stabilization administration which is impractical and ineffective. And it prevents adequate handling of labor disputes in this period of national mobilization.

Each of these provisions obstructs effective agency operation in wage stabilization and industrial relations. Why enact any of them? No report in explanation or justification accompanies the Lucas amendment. There is no need for the amendment, and no advantage in passing it to compensate for its outstanding defects. It should be defeated.

Will New Declaration of Independence Be Needed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1951

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remark: in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fairmont Daily Sentinel, Fairmont, Minn., issue of Monday, July 9, 1951, entitled "Will New Declaration of Independence Be Needed?"

WILL NEW DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE BE NEEDED?

Less than two centuries ago our forefathers signed a Declaration of Independence, then went out and freely spilled their blood that this Nation might be free.

For a hundred and seventy-five years we who came after them have sung praise to their foresightedness and heroism. We have lauded the statesmanship of the original signers.

For more than a century and a half our Republic prospered and grew and we were independent and free of entangling alliances, outside commitments.

The original signers of the Declaration of Independence had little complaint, compared to the legitimate complaint the people of the United States have had since 1914. They complained of taxation without representation, it is true, but they knew of no such taxes as we have today. They then had as much voice in their own affairs, if not more, than we have today. We have paid infinitely more in lend-lease, in Marshall planning, in do-gooding in a single year to nations whose friendship has been doubtful, than the Colonies paid to England in all of their existence under her rule.

We hold membership in the United Nations. Gradually, little by little, we are losing our sovereignty. One day we shall find it gone. We are becoming a part of a vast world organization in whose iron circle Russia's "nyet" can stymie any objective. We have a coterie of politicians who are selling, giving away, and throwing over the transom the freedom, liberty, and sovereignty bought by the men of '76.

We can say that and more, today, but when the last link in the chain has been forged, what then?

Congress' Tendency To Relax Controls Now Is Frightening

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial, which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of July 11, 1951:

CONGRESS' TENDENCY TO RELAX CONTROLS NOW IS FRIGHTENING

Moscow's motive in authorizing Mr. Malik to propose in the United Nations a ceasefire on the peninsula of Korea is no less an enigma than other decisions formulated by the masters of the Kremlin.

It may be that after a year of failure there is a realization that the struggle is futile. There has undoubtedly been a complete loss of faith in the effectiveness of Chinese and North Korean puppets. Reverses, furthermore, are impairing Soviet prestige throughout the world.

There could be no greater mistake among leaders of the United Nations than to lose sight of the real nature of Communist imperialism, as fashioned and guided by Moscow, and to attribute the Korean overtures to a sincere desire for world peace.

In fact, peace in Korea, if established, will mark the beginning of new danger and new fears and anxieties. It will force to the forefront of all minds throughout the free world the question of where and when the next blow will fall.

Unless realism and wisdom prevail, peace in Korea will be attended by the peril of complacency, the complacency that made it so easy for Hitler in the war's early years virtually to destroy his comfortable, easy-going, business-as-usual neighbors.

One of the possible explanations of Moscow's peace proposal is suggested by Charles E. Wilson, head of the Office of Defense Mobilization. It is intended, Mr. Wilson believes, to lull free countries into a sense of security while the program of world conquest goes forward.

Korea, Moscow realizes, was a mistake. It has not only failed as an enterprise of Communist expansion but it has had the effect of making the free nations conscious of their danger. The last year of war has been marked by the building of formidable military power, also by the development of the readiness and the will to resist. Things have not worked out in accordance with the Kremlin's design.

There is reason for fear and dismay, accordingly, in the increasing signs that the Kremlin's change in tactics may bring about that altered spirit that plays so satisfactorily into the hands of aggressors who crave a moral let-down among their potential victims.

Mr. Wilson is shocked to learn that even before a truce has been arranged in the Korean war there is a movement to wreck the country's entire defense program. This movement is undoubtedly under way and the evidences of its progress will cause rejoicing in Moscow.

Congress considers cutting back the strength of the Armed Forces to 3,000,000 men. There is also a disposition in Congress to surrender abjectly to the forces of inflation through a weak control law which will

give the pressure groups all they desire at the expense of the consumer.

This drift has frightening dangers. It reflects the delusion that Russia has changed, that it has decided to cooperate with other nations in the peaceful solution of world problems. It is far more likely that, for Russia, peace in Korea means nothing more than a battle lost, to be followed at some later date by a new effort to carry out the design of Red imperialism.

Eightieth Congress Looks Better Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Marr McGaffin in the Minneapolis Tribune:

"WORST" CONGRESS OF 1948 LOOKS BETTER NOW

(By Marr McGaffin)

WASHINGTON.—The maligned Eightieth Congress is beginning to look pretty good in comparison with the two that have followed it.

Back in 1948 President Truman called the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress the "worst in history." Later he softened it a bit by calling it the "second worst."

That was just before the 1948 Presidential campaign, and President Truman was out on a barnstorming tour across the country.

He was mad at Congress because it hadn't given him what he had asked. The Republicans had turned down much of his Fair Deal program. They had cut taxes and appropriations.

But mostly he wanted the country to return control of Congress to the Democrats.

Since then President Truman has had two Congresses, both controlled by the Democrats, but here's what happened.

The President submitted 47 proposals to the "second worst Congress in history" and got action on 12 of them.

He asked the Democrat-controlled Eighty-first Congress to act on 50 proposals and got action on only 15.

But the present Eighty-second Congress has paid even less attention to Presidential recommendations than either of the other two.

Out of 47 White House proposals, action has been completed on only 9. Five White House recommendations have been flatly rejected by the Eighty-second Congress compared with one rejection each by the Eighty-first Congress and the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress.

The Republicans, when they were in control, at least gave the President a hearing on most of his recommendations. They pigeonholed six of them but held hearings or took partial action on the others.

The Democrat-controlled Eighty-first Congress, on the other hand, simply ignored 13 of his recommendations. The Eighty-second Congress has upped the ante to 16 blank stares.

Fact of the matter is that Presidential influence with Congress has diminished since members of Mr. Truman's own party have been in control.

Generally, the blame is put on the southern Democrats. Some of them are more conservative than the Republicans. But that isn't the whole story.

The southerners have differed sharply with the President on his fair-employment-prac-

tices legislation and on price controls where they have touched the South's agricultural interests.

But outside those two fields the Democrats, both North and South, have found it hard to go along with him on tax increases, Government spending, and some phases of his foreign policy. They've bucked him on rent control, credit control, and expansion of Federal housing projects.

President Truman rapped the Eightieth Congress hard for the restrictions it put in the Trade Agreements Act. When the Democrats took over the wheel, they kept most of them in the act.

The Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress did its best to get some investigations going and to dig up some dirt in the Democratic record. But it remained for the Democrat-controlled Eighty-first and Eighty-second to root out the influence peddlers that were operating inside the administration.

Even with respect to getting its job done, regardless of political issues, the Eightieth Congress now appears to have stacked up fairly well.

During the first 6 months of the Eightieth Congress, 145 bills were passed. The Eighty-first Congress whipped through 154 bills in its first 6 months.

But the present Eighty-second Congress has enacted only 58 measures during its first 6 months.

Historic Shrines in New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 11, 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting address sent to me by a very distinguished citizen of the State of New Jersey, and a good friend, George Stringfellow. The address is on the subject Historic Shrines in New Jersey, and was delivered by William C. Cope on Flag Day, June 14.

JULY 13, 1951

Mr. President, the other day I offered for insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on historic shrines in New Jersey delivered by Mr. William C. Cope. I did so as a matter of courtesy to the vice president of the Edison Corp., Mr. George Stringfellow. I have been advised by the Public Printer that the cost of printing the address will exceed by one-third of a page the two printed pages allowed under the rule without a statement of cost and will be \$191.34. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Master of Ceremonies, brother Elks, and friends, I have chosen as my topic for this occasion, Historic Shrines in New Jersey.

New Jersey is one of the great States of the Union.

At Ithaca College, on June 2, I delivered the fifty-sixth commencement address and received an honorary degree, doctor of laws. On that occasion, in the interest of good public relations, I felt constrained to place New

York first among the great States of the Union; New Jersey, a close second; and my native State of Ohio was tossed into third place. I did not promise, however, to keep in perpetuity this arrangement. In fact, I suggested to my audience of 2,000 people, when I returned to New Jersey, I might find it necessary to rearrange these three great States.

At this point, I would like to say I spoke at the Ithaca College commencement to the topic, The World Does Get Better. People play a big part in making the world better. I mentioned, in my address, that organizations, such as the Elks, play a substantial part in making the world better. I know of no organization here in New Jersey that does as much for poor little crippled children, whose minds, hearts, and souls are housed in bent and twisted bodies, as does the Elks. The Elks deserve great praise for the wonderful work the respective lodges, here in the State, do for unfortunate crippled children.

I do not know, if and when members of the Elks from the State of New Jersey visit lodges in other States—Florida say—just how they answer when called upon to tell the State they are from. I do know Rotarians, and I have been a Rotarian for a long time, when called upon to tell the State they are from, when visiting a Rotary Club outside of the State, say, rather meekly, "New Jersey." But, when Rotarians from Texas are called upon to tell the State they are from, they shout "Texas." They are proud of their State and say so with enthusiasm.

We have, here in New Jersey, so much to be proud of and so much to be enthusiastic about that we should not hide our lamp under a bushel. New Jersey is one of the leading and foremost States of the Union. Many great men have come from New Jersey. Elias Boudinot lived in Elizabeth. Mr. Boudinot presided at the Continental Congress when the Constitution of the United States was written and approved by the delegates. His old home in Elizabeth, Boxwood Hall, is a historic shrine, kept up by the State.

Grover Cleveland was born in Caldwell, N. J. His birthplace is a historic shrine cared for by the State.

Garret A. Hobart lived at the edge of Paterson. He was Vice President of the United States when William McKinley was President. Mr. Hobart's home is preserved by the Passaic County Park Commission. It stands on the side of Garret Mountain, which overlooks the city of Paterson.

Woodrow Wilson, while born in Virginia, was schooled at Princeton, became a professor at Princeton and later president of this great university. He was elected Governor of the State of New Jersey and President of the United States and remained a citizen of New Jersey until his death.

Woodrow Wilson was the greatest scholar ever to occupy the President's chair. He was a man of magnetic and dynamic personality, an impressive gentleman of considerable poise and bearing, though he never rated himself as a handsome gentleman. He frequently said from the platform:

"As to beauty, I am no star,
There are others more handsome by far;
But my face, I don't mind it,
For I am behind it;
'Tis those in front that I jar."

Our precious American flag, the Stars and Stripes—was unfurled officially for the first time right here in New Jersey.

Philadelphia, Pa., may have been the Cradle of Liberty insofar as our Republic is concerned. The Battle of Lexington and Concord in Massachusetts may have been where the first shots of the Revolution were fired. But, New Jersey was the battleground of the Revolution.

Washington crossed the State of New Jersey with his army four times. Three major battles, that were turning points in the American Revolution, were fought right

here in New Jersey. They were the Battle of Trenton—the Battle of Princeton and the Battle of Monmouth. More than 90 lesser engagements were fought in New Jersey.

The winter of 1777-78, when Washington's Continental Army was encamped at Valley Forge, has received publicity that has made Valley Forge immortal. Nevertheless, Washington's army spent three winters in New Jersey—1777 at Jockey Hollow; 1778-79 at Middlebrook, on route 29 near Bound Brook and Somerville; and 1779-80 again at Jockey Hollow. The winters at Jockey Hollow were possessed of as much privation and suffering as the winter of 1777-78 at Valley Forge. At Jockey Hollow, the winters were severe—snow was from 4 to 6 feet deep. It was extremely difficult to get food to the soldiers; heat was very meager, and shelter was extremely poor. Clothing was quite scanty and much sickness and suffering were prevalent.

I wish to call your attention to a historic shrine here in New Jersey, located in the city of Newark, county of Essex, on the south bank of the Passaic River. This shrine is a monument erected to commemorate the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers, who first settled in what is now the city of Newark. On this shrine is an inscription that says these settlers intended to establish a kingdom of God here on earth, as near as it would be possible to do so. This was the last attempt to establish a theocracy in the Western Hemisphere. A theocracy is pretty much of a dictatorship of religion and government by the clergy.

We do not know the exact day of the month the Pilgrim Fathers landed on the south bank of the Passaic. We do know on the 21st of May 1666, they held their first meeting to organize their church and government. They probably landed 3, 4, or 5 days prior to May 21. Their first formal action was to set up a church that would control orderly government for them.

When their ship cast anchor in the Passaic, they began to unload their belongings and come ashore. Some hostile Indians ordered them to put their things back on the ship because these Indians felt these white settlers had no permission to land where they did. Presently, along came an Indian chieftain with his warriors, who told the settlers they could unload their belongings because arrangements had been made for them to take up a settlement on the Passaic by a committee that had preceded these pioneers. There were 64 of them—12 from Branford, and 53 from Milford, Conn. Their leader was Capt. Robert Treat.

They first called their settlement New Milford, which was named after Milford, Conn. This name was changed years later to Newark because a preacher at the "Old First" church, whose name was Pierson and who was very popular, came from Newark-on-Trent in England.

The settlers landed in a forested area, which was very much of a wilderness. There was a stream that ran from about where the courthouse now stands down past Broad and Market Streets. On the banks of the stream were time-worn paths that the Indians traveled. The virgin forest was full of wild animals—bears and wolves in particular.

On the southeast corner of what is now Broad and Market Streets, there was a large pond and swamp. The stream and the pond have long since disappeared. They are subterranean areas under the city of Newark at this time. The Bamberger store has as its foundation tremendous caissons, driven deep into the earth because of what is termed "an underground river." The Kinney Building, on the four corners, is carried on cofferdams for the same reason.

Our next stop is Ringwood Manor State Park about 30 miles from Newark. It is located at the head of Wanaque Reservoir.

In this famous State park, which is a very beautiful park, there is an old mansion of 78 rooms. The history of Ringwood antedates the American Revolution. In 1730, iron mines were being worked at Ringwood. At least 12 of them have been operated. Millions of tons of good iron ore have been taken from these mines since 1730.

A man by the name of Faesch came over from Europe to search for copper ore, prior to 1730. He traveled through the Ramapo Mountains but instead of finding copper ore, he found iron ore deposits of very good quality. The London Co. was organized in England to operate the Ringwood iron mines. A man named Hasenclever was sent over, after Faesch, authorized to spend £35,000 to develop and exploit the iron mines at Ringwood. Hasenclever was something of an aristocrat and apparently not too much of a businessman. He just about bankrupted the London Co. by spending £55,000. Hasenclever, it is said, had a brass band play for him every night at dinner. He enslaved the Indians and some Negroes. He had his own militia, which he had drilled on the property at Ringwood, and which was used to maintain peace and order.

Upon reorganization, the name of the company was changed to the American Co. and in 1771, a Scotchman by the name of Robert Erskine was sent over to manage the Ringwood iron mines. Robert Erskine was an able geographer and topographer. George Washington drafted Robert Erskine to prepare the maps for the Continental Army. Some historians say if it had not been for Robert Erskine, George Washington could not have won the American Revolution. Robert Erskine planned the roads and the hideouts for Washington and his troops.

Ringwood is about halfway between West Point and Morristown. The road, that went right in front of the manor house at Ringwood, at the time of the American Revolution, was on top of one of the Ramapo Mountains, about 9 miles long, and was called Cannon Ball Road. It is practically inaccessible today. It was the road over which cannon balls, made at Ringwood for use in the Revolution, were transported.

During World War II the Ringwood mines were completely rehabilitated by the United States Government at a cost of four or five million dollars. Modern machinery was installed, large buildings were erected, and the railroad repaired between Ringwood and Haskell to carry the iron ore to the Erie Railroad for shipment to other destinations for smelting and processing. The rehabilitated mines were not operated, however.

At Ringwood, in front of the manor house, you can see several links of what is called the West Point Chain. This chain, it is said by some historians, was placed across the Hudson River during the Revolution to keep British ships from going up the river. Some lengths of the chain are on the grounds at West Point. Part of the chain was undoubtedly made at Ringwood. Each link weighs about 85 pounds. Every other link has an opening so the links could be hooked together.

To the left of the manor house is a stone building that was the blacksmith shop where Washington and his troops had their horses shod. Near to the blacksmith shop is the only water wheel I know of in practical operation here in the State of New Jersey today. This water wheel pumps millions of gallons of water every year into the reservoir on top of the mountain back of the manor house. The water flows by gravity from this reservoir to the mansion and the buildings and all about the picnic grounds in the park.

About 2,000 feet from the mansion, on the old road to Morristown, which is practically abandoned today, is an old pre-Revolutionary cemetery. In this cemetery Robert Erskine is buried. George Washington at-

tended Robert Erskine's funeral, it is said, instead of Major Andre's, who, on the same day, was hanged and buried near Tappan. Robert Erskine's grave is a vault partly above the ground, with a large stone slab on top. Prior to about 40 years ago it is said some bricks fell out of the upper structure, and, according to legend, Robert Erskine's spirit and skeleton in the form of a ghost came out from his grave through the opening made by the fallen bricks and sat upon the stone slab with a blue light, very often at nighttime. According to legend, quite often, Robert Erskine's ghost, with the blue light, would follow travelers at nighttime up and down the valley. Sometimes, it is said, Robert Erskine's skeleton would rattle along behind these going up and down the valley at night. The blue light was always with the ghost, which only appeared under cover of darkness.

About 40 years ago Mrs. Hewitt, who was a widow at that time, decided to have the bricks replaced and end this ghostly apparition. As the story goes, neither ghost nor blue light has ever been seen since the bricks were put back, by order of the Widow Hewitt.

We will now travel over to Morristown. We will make a brief stop at the Ford mansion in Morristown, which is now called Washington's headquarters, and which is under the control of the National Historic Society. George Washington stayed with the Fords at this mansion both winters his army was encamped at Jockey Hollow—the winter of 1777 and the winter of 1779-80. This is one of the most interesting historic museums in the United States with respect to Revolutionary curios, mementos, etc.

When George Washington left the Ford mansion in the spring of 1780 he had Mrs. Ford take inventory of her belongings. She reported to him the only item missing was a silver spoon. When Washington returned to Mount Vernon he sent Mrs. Ford a sterling silver spoon with his initials engraved upon it. This experience is testimony to Washington's character, honesty, and honor.

Back of the YMCA in Morristown, on a rather steep hill, is Fort Nonsense, which Washington had erected, but which was never used. The embankments are still intact and replica gates (heavy wooden gates) still hang to the posts.

Between 3 and 4 miles from Morristown is Jockey Hollow National Historic Park. This is a very interesting place. Many sites are identified with markers where militias, companies, or military units, of one kind or another, from Rhode Island, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Delaware, were encamped.

Under a spreading oak tree, there is a grave with a modest, little, white granite marker, which identifies the spot near which Captain Patton was shot and killed by his own troops when they mutinied under his command. His troops had not been paid for a year or more. They became hostile and difficult to handle. They were determined, in their fury, to march upon the Continental Congress in session in Philadelphia. Captain Patton was just as determined to restore order, and prevent mutiny and desertion. When he stood in their way, he was shot and killed and his troops, out of control, started on their march toward Philadelphia. They got as far as Princeton before they were apprehended and brought back.

In Jockey Hollow National Historic Park you will find the famous Tempe Wickes house. It is pretty much in the same condition and still has the same or similar furniture as was there at the time of the Revolution. Tempe Wickes, you will remember, was a vivacious young woman who had a very beautiful horse that she rode about her father's farm. Some historians say, the British, being very anxious to get her horse, rode after her in an attempt to capture

Tempe and her spirited horse, one day when she was out riding around the countryside. She rode so fast the British lost track of her and she was able to return to her home and hide and shelter her fine horse in her bedroom with the result the British did not capture her horse, and take the animal away from her. I suspect this story is not too true. If anyone tried to seize a horse, it might have been Washington's spirited patriots, and not the British, because there is no authentic evidence that the British were ever in Jockey Hollow.

We shall now drop down to Springfield. In the early summer of 1780, the Battle of Springfield was fought. Lord Cornwallis commanded 5,000 British soldiers on their way to Morristown to burn the stores there. General Greene commanded 1,500 colonial patriots, who were determined to stop the British. The church still stands in the center of Springfield where Preacher Caldwell turned his hymnbooks over to the colonial gunners to be used as cannon wadding. The author of the hymnbooks was a man named Watts. Preacher Caldwell said to the colonial patriots, "Give them Watts." The Battle of Springfield was fought and won by our American patriots. Not long after the Battle of Springfield, Preacher Caldwell's wife, with a small baby in her arms, was shot at nighttime by a British soldier, who fired through the window of her home, killing both Mrs. Caldwell and the baby in her arms. This is one of the awful tragedies of the American Revolution. Some time later, Preacher Caldwell himself was shot and killed by a fanatical, unpatriotic colonial Tory. This devilish Tory was brought to trial in a church in Westfield, convicted and ordered to be executed at once. He was taken out to a hill near to the church and hanged. The hill is still known as Gallows Hill.

We shall now journey on to Middlebrook where Washington's army was encamped during the winter of 1778-79. It was at Middlebrook in 1777, where Washington and his army stopped on their way to Jockey Hollow, that the American flag—the Stars and Stripes—was officially unfurled for the first time in the Colonies.

Our next stop is at Princeton. The Battle of Princeton was fought and won January 3, 1777, and was one of the turning points of the American Revolution. At Princeton is a State park of 55 acres that preserves a part of the Revolutionary battleground and commemorates the Battle of Princeton. In this park, a house still stands in a state of good preservation—the Clark house—where General Mercer, bayoneted and mortally wounded during the battle, died.

On Christmas night 1776, George Washington, with his army of 1,200 men, crossed the Delaware and fought and won the Battle of Trenton, which was another turning point in the American Revolution. George Washington divided his army of 1,200 soldiers after crossing the Delaware under cover of darkness and sent half of his soldiers down the river road to Trenton and the other half out by the way of Bear Tavern in order that he might salvage a part of his army if he suffered defeat.

Washington Crossing State Park, 8 miles out of Trenton, marks the site where Washington and his troops landed the famous night they crossed the Delaware. There is also preserved in Washington Crossing Park a part of the road over which Washington marched his troops Christmas night 1776 by way of Bear Tavern, which is called Continental Lane. It is grown up with brambles but can still be easily identified.

The night Washington crossed the Delaware, a Tory, named Wall, attempted to deliver a message to General Wahl, the commander of the Hessians at Trenton, notifying him that Washington and his army were crossing the Delaware. Some say the Tory,

astride his horse, swam the Delaware River Christmas night to notify General Wahl that Washington was crossing the Delaware in preparation for battle. Tory Wall was unable to contact General Wahl because General Wahl was having a big party, where revelry, drinking liquor, and carousing were supreme. General Wahl was enjoying a banquet and playing cards; consequently he would not see Tory Wall. General Wahl ordered his butler to talk with Tory Wall. Tory Wall handed the butler the note purposed to inform General Wahl that Washington, with his army, was crossing the Delaware. The butler delivered the note to General Wahl, but apparently General Wahl, being liquored up and in a mood for revelry, stuck the note in his vest pocket and forgot all about it and did not read it. The next day the note was taken from General Wahl's clothing on his dead body. Had General Wahl read the note delivered to him by the infamous American Tory, the Battle of Trenton would probably have been very different from what it was, and it might well have been the American Revolution would have been lost.

Our next stop is at the Hancock House at Hancock Bridge near Salem. The Hancock House was built in 1734. The bricks used in building the house came from the other side. The house, at this time, is in a state of fine preservation and is one of New Jersey's sacred shrines. General Simcoe, in charge of the British troops, entrapped some colonial patriots in the attic of this house, where they were apparently billeted. As you enter the attic, you will see a number of stains on the floor. These stains, we are told, are the stains from the blood shed by the American patriots, who were bayoneted, mortally wounded, and bled to death.

We shall next stop at Somers Point near Atlantic City. Here we will find the old Somers Mansion where Capt. Richard Somers 2d was born and raised. At the age of 26 he entered the United States Navy. Under President Thomas Jefferson in 1804 the War with Tripoli was fought and won. Captain Somers, on an American war vessel over in the Mediterranean, volunteered to go with others on a ship loaded with gunpowder to blow up the ships of the pirates anchored in the Bay of Tripoli. The project was a complete success but Captain Somers never returned. He lost his life in this engagement.

And, now, we shall go to Freehold. Near Freehold, the Battle of Monmouth was fought and won, though it came within a hair's breadth of being lost. General Lee was not able to lead his troops to victory. George Washington lost his temper at the battle of Monmouth and became so infuriated at General Lee that he cursed him out right on the battlefield and dressed him down heatedly. General Lee was later court-martialed and dismissed from the Army. Washington rallied the troops that were disorganized and in retreat and led them to victory. The Battle of Monmouth was another turning point in the American Revolution.

Nearby, just across the highway from the Monmouth Battleground, is the Molly Pitcher Well. Molly Pitcher carried water to the American patriots during the Battle of Monmouth in 1780. When her husband, who fired a cannon, fell; she took over the cannon and continued to fire it herself. Molly Pitcher was one of the famous women of the American Revolution.

And lastly, I want to call your attention to Clarksburg, N. J., about 10 miles beyond Freehold, toward Trenton. In 1710, two brothers, Abraham Lincoln and Mordecai Lincoln 2d, came to New Jersey from Massachusetts. They settled in or about Clarksburg. Mordecai 2d was the great great-grandfather of Abraham Lincoln, the rail splitter. Abraham Lincoln was the great

great-uncle of Honest Abe, the great emancipator. Abraham Lincoln operated a forge. Some say the building still stands near Imlaystown, not far from Clarksburg, in which Abraham Lincoln's forge was operated.

Mordecai 2d bought 500 acres of land at Clarksburg. He married, around 1714, Hannah Salter, daughter of one of the early pioneers in New Jersey. Three children of this marriage were born right here in New Jersey. John Lincoln was one of the children. John was the great-grandfather of Abraham Lincoln. He migrated to Pennsylvania and thereafter down the Shenandoah Valley to Lacey Springs, Va. He is known in history as Virginia John.

In a pre-Revolutionary cemetery at Clarksburg, there is buried little Deborah Lincoln, who died May 15, 1720, at the age of 5 years and 3 months. This little girl was the great-aunt of Abraham Lincoln.

On the Hannah Salter branch of Lincoln's ancestral tree his ancestors here in New Jersey can be traced back, with accuracy, three generations. Why historians have bypassed the Lincoln ancestral history in New Jersey is more than I can tell you.

If our New Jersey traditions, our democratic processes, and our precious Constitution, which is the greatest written authority for the administration of good government by free people the world has ever known, are to be preserved, we must place greater emphasis upon patriotism and an appreciation of our democratic way of life than are being placed at this time.

Unfortunately, it appears that communistic Russia does about the best job of selling, to the nations of the world, the worst form of government that the world has ever known. And I am afraid the United States does about the worst job of selling, to the nations of the world, the best system of government that has ever been conceived by man.

I know of no organization better qualified or equipped to help us preserve our precious heritage and our free democratic processes than the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks right here in the United States.

If This Be Peace!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 6, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an article that appeared in a recent issue of *Barrons*. American diplomacy will take another defeat in the Korean talks and as matters stand today the United States and the United Nations are sorry spectacles in the eyes of the world. The sacrifices in life and in property seem to have been in vain because of a lack of a definite foreign policy in the Far East. In view of our present leadership, what justification is there to pour additional billions of dollars in questionable ventures all over the world.

IF THIS BE PEACE—IT WILL TAKE POWER TO MAKE IT STICK

Of the Korean cease-fire affair, still in the balance as this issue of *Barrons* goes to press, one observation may be made at the beginning. It represents one of the strangest and in many ways most distasteful efforts at peace negotiation in which the

United States of America has ever been involved.

Six years ago in Tokyo Bay on the battleship *Missouri* Gen. Douglas MacArthur received the surrender of the Japanese in a ceremony consonant with the long traditions of human warfare and charged with hope for the future. One has only to recall that proud moment to take the measure of what went on last week and is still in progress.

A man called Malik hints in a radio address that Russia might favor a Korean settlement. The free world leaps to attention. Mr. Trygve Lie, on vacation in Europe, hurries home. Mr. Entezam, president of the U. N. Assembly, seeks an interview with Mr. Malik who plays sick. Mr. Truman makes the first Soviet overture the occasion for a highly partisan speech in which he defends Mr. Acheson as the greatest Secretary of State in United States history. Mr. Acheson voices suspicion of the Soviet offer, but sets the wheels in motion for probing it. Out of all this was the Ridgway offer born.

The probable terms of truce, providing for a buffer zone along the present line of fighting and for international inspection behind the lines, are tolerably stiff. Even if they are accepted, the prospect that opens is scarcely exhilarating. After suffering 80,000 casualties the best that can be had is settlement at or near the thirty-eighth parallel with Korea truncated and unification left in the air. After months of fighting, and internal turmoil, the administration is making precisely the kind of cease-fire offer which MacArthur made last March on the eve of his summary dismissal.

It is easy in these circumstances to turn wholly cynical, both toward the possible settlement and even more toward the war which it may bring to a close. We believe that something better than cynicism is required. The fact that General MacArthur, however badly treated, did propose a cease-fire argues powerfully that the present plan is the best settlement that can be had, given all the circumstances. The decision not to bomb beyond the Yalu may have been right or wrong, but the fact is that it was made, and the rest has followed inexorably. The United States has chosen for the first time in its history to fight a limited war. The result can only be a limited and stalemate peace.

The task ahead is to see that the sacrifices already made have not been made in vain. If the cease-fire offer is turned down, then there will be no option but to continue the war on a much wider scale. But if, as assumed here, something comes of it, then, too, an immense and intricate job faces us. If this be peace, then at least these things call for the doing.

The United States must not be cheated of ground so bloodily gained. Much has been made of the fact that in proposing a cease-fire, Russia made no mention of Formosa or admittance of Red China to the United Nations. But these are not necessarily primary Russian objectives. The primary Russian objective, it may be taken for granted, is to get American troops off the Korean peninsula. Yet it is hard to see how such withdrawal can be contemplated for months to come. To do so would be to invite the very conditions which brought on the conflict. The United States entered the war to draw a line against Communist expansion. Until South Korea is strong enough to hold its own, the line will have to be maintained.

The holding of South Korea should go hand-in-hand with the rapid build-up of Japan. The two, indeed, cannot be separated as the Japanese discovered long ago. Korea is the dagger pointing at Japan, and conversely must always be dependent on Japan for its defense. This joint defense will require an increase of American air power in Japan and Okinawa beyond its present strength.

Thanks to insistent political pressure against former views of the State Department, it is now recognized that Formosa as well as Japan is part of the perimeter chain of United States power in the Far East. There must be no let-up in the aid given to Chiang Kai-shek.

The Pacific Pact, including Australia and New Zealand, should be brought rapidly into being along with the pushing through of the Japanese treaty. Both would greatly strengthen the United States hand in dealing with Red China, which next to Russia has been the chief offender in Korea and which seems primed for new adventures. Such adventures can be rendered costly if not impossible provided, but only provided, that the United States in one way or another maintains and strengthens its Pacific position which the Korean war has shown is no less important than the Atlantic. Europe cannot be saved by scuttling in the Pacific. Rather, as General MacArthur argued before Congress, the problems of both are interlocked.

The final condition for preventing a cease-fire in Korea from becoming a step back rather than a step forward is, of course, the maintenance of armament production at home. At the moment administration spokesmen speak ominously of a let-down, but no such let-down, we believe, is likely to occur. Armament orders have now been given in such volume that immense output over the next 12 months could not be stopped even if anyone were so foolish as to want to stop it. What we may be spared if the Korean truce materializes is that plethora of controls so dear to the bureaucratic heart, but which have little if anything to do with the articulation of American economic strength and genius.

That strength and that genius depend on the diffusion, not the concentration, of power—economic and political. Yet in the twentieth century the United States has also discovered that in foreign affairs the exercise of power is essential—that if vacuums are left open, worse forces, not better, will move in. That is the ultimate lesson of Korea. If the lesson has been learned, then it may well be that a mean war, and a mean peace, if it comes, can still turn out to be a permanent victory.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As the personal representative of the President of the United States and 150,000,000 other American citizens I welcome you to this country. It is our sincerest hope that you will be happy here. The people of the United States of America offer freedom and opportunity for you and your fine family. We invite you to enjoy this new-found freedom. Volodymyr Holubiw, and to work with us to maintain it. I am sorry that my colleagues, Mr. Gibson and Mr. O'Connor are not present.

You are here today because many good people were eager to lend a helping hand—the Congress of the United States, the International Refugee Organization, the Displaced Persons Commission, and other United States Government agencies, the 35 State displaced persons committees appointed by governors, Church World Service, an arm of the National Council of the Churches of Christ, and one of the voluntary religious agencies which are part of the program, and a sponsor, a private citizen of Woodruff, Wis.

Your sponsor and these other friends made it possible for you to come to the United States because, as men and women who love freedom for themselves, they seek it also for others. This Nation's displaced persons program and our participation in the great work of the International Refugee Organization give practical and realistic demonstration of our adherence to fundamental human rights—freedom of movement, freedom of residence, and the right of asylum from persecution.

Our displaced persons program stems from our belief in the dignity, equality, and respect of men of good will, whatever their origin and wherever they may pursue their beliefs in freedom and democracy. The DP program reflects our faith in human beings and is a fundamental part of this Nation's arsenal of peace. It is part of our positive answer to the negations of totalitarianism—fear, persecution, and subjugation. We believe democracy offers hope, freedom, and unlimited personal opportunity.

I am proud that my country embarked on this bold humanitarian program to aid you and other stateless and homeless people, and to help relieve an almost impossible situation in already overcrowded areas of the world.

The people of my country are glad to welcome you. We can learn much from you and the thousands of other displaced persons whose lives have been stunted by the perverted use of power in the hands of ruthless men. And in the present crisis, we need your help in the fight which free men everywhere are compelled to wage against those who would enslave us.

You are beginning a new life in a land that is still young. A week ago, the United States celebrated its one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary. And today, as it was in the beginning, we have—and that means you have—the right to worship as we please, the right to think as we please, and the right to voice our opinions. These rights are as precious to us as is the right to live.

Here the individual is important—more important than the state. This does not mean that each individual works only for himself, or that he goes his own selfish way. An individual here is freest when he is seeking freedom for others. This very DP program shows America at its best—private citizens, national and community organizations, local, State and Federal Governments all in a partnership to carry out a fundamental part of our domestic and foreign policy.

You know how precious freedom really is because you lost it. Now that you have found it again, I know that you will work

Welcome to the Two Hundred and Fifty Thousandth Displaced Person

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Wednesday, July 11, there was held in New York City a ceremonial welcome for the two hundred and fifty thousandth displaced person to enter the United States. It was an occasion in which all Americans might well take pride. Mr. Harry N. Rosenfield, a member of the Displaced Persons Commission, represented President Truman at the ceremony. As one of the architects of the displaced persons program, and as an outstanding administrator of it, it was fitting that Mr. Rosenfield should be there in that capacity. He made some brief remarks, which I ask unanimous consent to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

to maintain it for your fellow men. That is the American way, and I know it will be your way.

You are the two hundred and fifty thousandth person to enter the United States under the displaced-persons program, a program which is the fulfillment of the dreams of our forefathers, because it is the present-day application of those great ideals upon which the United States was founded. This program is an expression of faith—faith in humanity—faith in the democratic way of life—faith in God.

And as I welcome you formally to our shores, I have a little gift for you. It is a replica of the Statue of Liberty—a symbol of hope to all the world. Take it with you to your new home in Wisconsin. Cherish it as a reminder of this country's most valuable export—hope for the future. Hope which springs from an opportunity for you and your family to rise to your full stature as dignified human beings and as citizens of a great Nation founded on the inspiring declaration "That all men are created equal."

Price and Wage Controls or More Jobs for Bureaucrats?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from one of our outstanding newspapers, the Toledo Times, of July 3, 1951. The editorial appears under the heading "Price and wage controls or more jobs for bureaucrats."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRICE AND WAGE CONTROLS OR MORE JOBS FOR BUREAUCRATS?

Toledo's pride and joy, the learned politico-economist, Prof. Michael V. DiSalle, came home the other night to bestow some Washington eclat upon a CIO union's dinner party. That, of course, gave him an opportunity to harangue the assembled boosters about the evil-doers who oppose, not only giving Mr. Truman and him greater powers over the Nation's economy, but also the extension, for very long, of the general powers they now have.

Mike made the most of his opportunity by unpacking his mind of more transparent nonsense and pious piffle than he has had occasion to deliver for a long time. But he had a gaudy time bucking himself up by lambasting everyone who disagrees with him and his top boss, the famous inflation-promoter, Mr. Harry S. Truman, President of the Republic. When he shut down at last, he was precisely where he was at the start, to wit, without sensible or sound reason for extending price controls.

As matters stand today, the present controls have been extended for 31 days, so his job has at least another month to run. He finds his range of action limited, however, for Congress adopted two restrictive amendments to its stopgap bill continuing controls. One prevents him from putting ceilings on any manufactured item not now controlled. The other forbids roll-backs of prices.

The month's extension will give Congress time to complete work on the bills it is

considering. No one knows what it will do in the final bill, but it is quite clear by now that it will not give Mr. Truman the 2-year extension he asks. Neither will it give him the enlarged powers he demands as the only means of fighting inflation.

Why the controls should be extended at all is beyond comprehension, except to the eminentissimos of the administration, the planners who crave complete powers over the Nation's economy, and there is no competence in their premise. There was none in Mr. DiSalle's premise Saturday night. That was why he resorted to abuse.

He took credit, to be sure, for the price improvement that has occurred during the past few weeks, claiming that his controls had been more effective than he expected. The slight falling off in the wholesale index in the past few weeks, after holding a steady line for 4 months, was significant enough to alarm the enemies of price controls to a new frenzy of action against them.

It is all right with us, if it pleases Mr. DiSalle, to claim credit for market reactions which were set in train by normal economic factors. After all, a politico is entitled to a bit of self-puffing, but when it comes to arguing for new and greater powers over the economy, he should have more than specious reasoning and empty prattle if he is to convince the public and Congress.

It is true that there is a great apathy among the American people over the matter of price controls. There is an extremely good reason for it, too; namely, the people who know that they never can succeed as anti-inflation measures, since they attack the results, not the cause, of inflation. There is also the fact that prices are not rising, and haven't been for some time. Department stores are loaded up with goods, most of them bought during the panicky weeks following the outbreak of the Korean war, and they are being forced to cut prices. When the Supreme Court nullified the only effective provision of the Fair Trade Acts, so far as price maintenance goes, the boys with the heavy inventories were put in position to speed the turn-over by cutting prices. Since the first of the year retailers in most areas have been resorting to several schemes to wangle customers into their stores, and the process has begun all over again.

Commodity markets broke somewhat sharply a week ago on the heels of Malik's cease-fire proposal. Cotton dropped first. But the drop cannot be ascribed wholly to peace maneuvers. It was overdue, as the Government's reports of prospective cotton production have shown. The crop this year will go over 16,000,000 bales, it is estimated. There is also in prospect another bumper crop of wheat, particularly in the spring-wheat area, which is expected to set a record; not only that but be large enough to offset by a substantial volume the decline in winter-wheat yield.

In short, the situation is such that some good old price competition can take care of high prices much more effectively than any controls Mr. DiSalle can invoke. This is particularly true under conditions which are bringing about a better balance between demand and supply. The Government gave an example of this a few days ago. For a long time the price of rubber at Singapore has been 50 cents a pound, but the United States Government continued to peg it at 65 cents. It refused for weeks to believe that the Singapore price collapse meant anything, but finally it had to yield. It cut the price of rubber by 14 cents, whereupon the rubber industry canceled an average 5-cent increase in the price of tires and tubes.

Now, we are not maintaining that deflation has set in. There has been a set-back to the inflationary forces, but it must be remembered that the full impact of Government spending for mobilization on the economy

will not be felt until late in the fall. When that time comes, the beneficial effects of a Treasury surplus will be wiped out. Indeed, the surplus will be wiped out, and the Government will be engaged in deficit financing again. But if the administration could be forced to adopt sound and sane monetary and credit policies, the inflation could be defeated without price and wage controls.

Electoral College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, 95 percent of the newspapers of America have, at some time or other during the last several years, written editorials pointing out the fundamental need for electoral reform. An excellent editorial has recently appeared in the Texarkana Gazette. I offer it for insertion in the RECORD, and commend its consideration to all Members of Congress:

THE WAY OUT

Looking forward to 1952, a great mass of the people of the United States find themselves in the position of having no confidence in either the Democrat or the Republican Parties as they are now constituted.

Many people who can't stomach the Fair Dealism of the leadership of the Democratic Party similarly have no stomach for the reactionary Republicans who want a few to have everything and the mass of the people nothing.

Surely there is a sound middle ground somewhere and we believe it lies in a coalition of true constitutional Democrats and true constitutional Republicans. A third party, made up of enemies of privilege and champions of State's rights and sound American government, seems to be the only way out inasmuch as demagoguery has become firmly entrenched in the leadership of the two major parties.

Such a third party, however, can be nothing but a glorious dream until individual citizens declare to themselves that they must abandon sectionalism, inheritance, or blind loyalty in their political thinking. It was unfortunate that the forces which broke away from the Democratic Party in the last general election were tagged with the name Dixiecrats. That name made it appear that the South was all alone in standing up for State's rights and constitutional government, whereas such principles are being demanded by people in every State—north, east, south, or west.

The New Orleans States, in a recent editorial, says the great obstacle to a breaking away from the established, unsound custom of voting Democratic or Republican merely because your father or grandfather so voted, is the present electoral unit rule in the presidential election machinery. Under that rule, the entire electoral vote of each State goes to the party winning a bare plurality in the State.

Hung up in a Senate committee is the Lodge-Gossett proposal for a constitutional change which would wipe out the unit rule. Instead, the electoral vote would be made to reflect directly the popular vote. Minority parties in traditional one-party States would then have an incentive to get out a maximum vote.

The first step then in the way out would seem to entail the jarring loose of the Lodge-Gossett proposal. Meanwhile, all American citizens who believe in constitutional government, should begin getting together to make their plans for 1952.

Mr. Pearson and Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, the able and distinguished attorney general of the State of Texas has labored long and well in behalf of tidelands legislation. False propaganda and spurious writings concerning the real issues in this controversy have agitated our attorney general greatly. Mr. Drew Pearson wrote a most unfair and untrue article concerning tidelands in his column on July 9. It was my purpose to ignore Mr. Pearson's propaganda on behalf of Federal ownership of our natural resources and the destruction of States' rights. However, Attorney General Price Daniel elected to write Mr. Pearson a letter, on July 10, concerning the aforesaid column. Such letter is factual, newsworthy, and informative, and should be made a part of the public record. I, therefore, offer it for insertion at this point:

Hon. DREW PEARSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PEARSON: Your column of July 9 on tidelands legislation contains the most misleading and inaccurate information I have seen during my 3 years of acquaintance with this controversy. Your informants on this subject are giving you prejudicial propaganda which, if given the opportunity, I can and will prove to you to be false.

For instance, your column says that the Walter-Gossett bill would restore submerged lands to only 3 States. This is untrue. A mere reading of the bill will reveal that it restores ownership of lands beneath navigable waters within the respective State boundaries to each of the 48 States. Every State in the Union has thousands of acres of submerged lands, the revenues from which are being used for public education and other State functions. These lands and revenues, held and used by the States in good faith for over 100 years, would be taken by the Federal Government under the theory of the tidelands decisions, expressed in your own words as "the theory that . . . the navigable waters of the United States belong to the Federal Government, not the individual States."

For over 100 years the courts held to the contrary and said the lands belonged to the individual States.

Forty-four governors, forty-four attorneys general, and a majority of the Members of Congress from every State want these lands and revenues to be restored to or confirmed in the 48 individual States, and that is exactly what the Walter-Gossett bill would do. It applies to Minnesota and its iron ore and to Maine and its kelp and fish the same as it does to Texas and its oil. Any Congressman who votes against the bill is voting against continued State ownership of submerged lands within his own State. I have yet to find any State official so anxious to get a one-forty-eighth share of Texas' oil as to

surrender title to, and the revenues from, the submerged lands of his own State.

Again, your column would leave the impression that oil companies wrote and are sponsoring the Walter-Gossett bill, and that a vote for it is a vote for the oil companies. This is not true. Together with other State officials, I helped Congressmen Gossett and Walter prepare this bill, and I know that no oil company representative worked on it. In fact, the oil company representatives have stayed neutral ever since Federal officials promised to ratify their State leases in Federal legislation. The Attorney General of the United States told the Supreme Court this would be done as a matter of equity to good-faith purchasers. Every Federal control bill and every State ownership bill introduced in Congress during the past 3 years has provided for ratification of these leases. Therefore, the oil companies will not lose their leases regardless of which Government ends up with the land and the royalties.

That leaves the present issue solely between the Federal Government and the States (and their local subdivisions). I know of no oil company representative who is now working or lobbying for the Walter-Gossett bill. I do not believe you can find one. On the other hand, you will find that the real sponsors of State-ownership legislation are the following organizations, which I list and hope you will publish: The Council of State Governments, the Governors' Conference, National Association of Attorneys General, National Conference of Mayors, American Association of Port Authorities, American Municipal Association (representing 10,150 municipalities in 42 States), the American Bar Association, American Title Association, United States Chamber of Commerce, United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, National Reclamation Association, National Water Conservation Association, National Institute of Municipal Law Officers (representing 1,051 cities).

In all fairness, I do not believe you can call these groups an "oil lobby," and I know you will not find any oil lobbyists directly or indirectly influencing their actions on tidelands legislation.

A vote against State ownership of submerged lands by each of the 48 States is a vote against the views of these organizations, which have the interests of the people and their States at heart as much as anyone who advocates Federal nationalization of this property.

Your column supports Senator LISTER HILL's plan to divide tideland oil royalties among all the 48 States for Federal aid to education. You say those who vote for State ownership are against using the proceeds for education. This is not true. Texas devotes all of the revenues from its submerged lands to its public-school fund. Most of the other States make the same or similar use of the revenues from this type of property. It is to protect our educational system as well as the principles involved in this Federal land grab that we so vigorously support the Walter-Gossett bill.

Texas has collected a total of approximately \$7,000,000 from leases on the tidelands within its boundaries. That has meant a great deal to our school fund, but divided among 48 States it would have been a mere pittance of \$145,833 per State. I doubt that any State has collected less than that amount from its own submerged-land resources, whether they be iron ore, sand, gravel, fish, gas, coal, gold, or oil.

If these Texas leases (350,000 acres) had been leased under the present Federal Mineral Leasing Act, they would have brought only \$175,000 as compared with the \$7,000,000 under State leasing. This is because Texas has averaged \$20 per acre for leases under its sealed-bid system, while the Federal Gov-

ernment receives only 50 cents per acre from the first applicant. The States also receive higher rentals and royalties from their leases.

This brings us to the reason that some oil interests are opposed to State ownership and are now fighting against the Walter-Gossett bill. They are the 1,031 Federal lease applicants who have blanketed the coasts of California, Texas, and Louisiana with Federal applications at 25 cents per acre (the amount payable under Federal law before the 50-cent amendment). These applicants are listed at pages 1286-1294 of the joint hearings before the Committees on the Judiciary, Eightieth Congress, second session (1948), on S. 988 and similar House bills.

On the above list you will find the name of I. A. Smoot, of Salt Lake City, Utah, whom you mentioned in your column of April 18, 1949, as having complained to President Truman about the tidelands oil lobby. You described him as "Salt Lake City's dignified, white-haired postmaster," and said the result of his visit to the President was Mr. Truman's assurance that "as long as I am President I will never permit the submerged oil lands to go back to the States."

Did you know that Mr. Smoot was himself lobbying with the President of the United States in support of his own Federal oil lease application? Whether or not he forgot to tell you and the President about it, I. A. Smoot is an applicant for a Federal lease on 800 acres of land off the coast of Long Beach, Calif., which he hopes to get for \$200 under the 25-cent-per-acre Federal Leasing Act in effect when he filed. It is now worth \$1,000,000 according to the California Land Commission.

Former Senator Burton K. Wheeler and Mr. James A. Murray, son of Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, are registered lobbyists and attorneys for some of the Federal lease applicants. They are doing all within their power against the State ownership bill, but you fail to mention their activities.

Actually, it was former Senator Wheeler, attorney for Federal lease applicants who expect to hit the jackpot if the States lose their fight, who first dug out the plan of dividing up the submerged land royalties for Federal aid to education. It was presented in 1948 through the then attorney general of Montana. It was later espoused by Harold Ickes, a firm friend and witness for the 25-cents-per-acre Federal lease applicants, and is now being advocated by Senator LISTER HILL and the others named in your column.

The plan for Federal aid to education through seizure of submerged lands of the States has been rejected by State officials and congressional committees every time it has been brought up. It will never be approved as long as the majority in Congress opposes dividing up the wealth of the States by placing everything under Federal ownership and control.

No one will deny that the States were believed to own the lands beneath navigable waters within their boundaries for over 100 years. They were in good faith in their ownership, possession, development, and improvement of these lands and in the use of the revenues therefrom for public purposes. It is only fair that this good faith ownership be restored and confirmed by Congress rather than implement Supreme Court decisions which take away these lands without compensation. This is especially true of Texas, which had a solemn contract with the United States by which it retained all its public domain. We get more from the property than the Federal Government would receive under present laws, and we use it all for public education.

If you really want to help the States shoulder their burden of educating their children, help us retain our property and present revenues rather than weakening our

local governments and making us wholly dependent upon the Federal Treasury.

Because of your powerful medium of expression to the people of the Nation, please present our side of the case along with the other side and distinguish honest and sincere State officials from the oil lobby which you write about. If you will give me the opportunity, I will present you the evidence in support of all statements made in this letter.

Sincerely yours,

PRICE DANIEL,
Attorney General of Texas.

Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, Attorney General Price Daniel, of Texas, addressed the Texas State Bar convention on July 5. His speech was devoted largely to a report on the so-called tidelands controversy from the viewpoint of more than 7,000,000 Texans. His excellent address will certainly be of interest to thousands of people who had no chance to hear or read it. I, therefore, offer for the RECORD that part of our attorney general's speech pertaining to tidelands:

Mr. President, distinguished guests, and my fellow members of the Texas State Bar. As attorney general of Texas I appreciate more each year the splendid cooperation and assistance which our office receives from the Texas State Bar, its officers, and members. I thank each of you and hasten to add the sincere hope that you will always continue your interest in this office and your support in the great public issues which confront every State attorney general in this day when the powers of local government, and State and private property rights, are constantly assaulted by those who advocate total power and control in the National Government.

And now for a few remarks concerning *United States v. Texas*. At the time of my report to you in San Antonio last year, the Supreme Court of the United States, by a 4-to-3 opinion, had denied Texas the right to introduce evidence and decided that our property rights in the 2,608,000 acres of tidelands had merged with national political rights when Texas joined the Union. The Court had based its opinion upon a discarded and rejected "equal footing" clause which was never a part of the Annexation Agreement between the United States and the Republic of Texas. Our motion for rehearing was then pending. It was supported by a joint memorandum signed by 11 of the foremost authorities in the world on international law and agreements between nations. As you know, that motion was overruled, but the Court did amend its original opinion so as to remove all references to the Annexation Agreement and thereby ended up with an amended opinion which completely ignores the solemn contract by which the United States agreed that Texas should retain all lands lying within its limits.

The result is that we have an opinion by four members of the Supreme Court which recognizes that the Republic of Texas owned the so-called tideland belt before annexa-

tion and that Texas entered the United States upon an agreement with certain specific terms and conditions (including the retention of all our public domain), but without reason or explanation the Court refuses to apply or interpret that agreement or to hear evidence upon the intention of the contracting parties. Instead, the four members of the Court, through Mr. Justice Douglas, merely repeat the theory of the California tidelands case that "bare legal title" and "mere property ownership" must yield to the political needs of the Federal Government—and that without compensation.

Mr. Justice Black had already indicated in the California case that the old concepts of property law should not prevail when determining the rights of the Federal Government to resources needed in the discharge of its political functions. You may remember that Mr. Justice Black said the following to me during oral argument:

"Well, I don't know that it has been held that oil goes with the soil. Suppose they discovered something about 4 miles under the surface of the earth. Do you mean that the old property concept would have to apply to that even though it was something the Government desperately needed?"

In the California opinion Mr. Justice Black's careless regard for the terms "bare legal title" and "mere property ownership" and his subordination of title to the paramount governmental powers of the national sovereign, caused the State Bar of Texas, the American Bar, and the American Title Association to cry out with alarm that this new theory could destroy the fundamental concepts of all property ownership, both private and State.

The alarm was immeasurably increased by the words of Mr. Justice Douglas in the Texas case, which I quote:

"Property rights must then be so subordinated to political rights as in substance to coalesce and unite in the national sovereign."

As said recently by Dean Roscoe Pound, this is a startling doctrine for a country which has previously maintained careful separation between property rights and political rights.

As said by a distinguished Massachusetts lawyer, Nathan Bidwell, in an article in the Massachusetts Bar Bulletin of October 1950:

"The doctrine laid down in these decisions finds its parallel in the writings of Marx, Lenin and the platforms and principles of the National Socialist Party, in all of which it is provided that * * * property should be taken without compensation on the basis of 'need' for all the people regardless of the law of the land."

As I have insisted since I first addressed the bar on this subject in 1947, principles of government and principles of property law are involved in this conflict which are far more important than the land and the money involved. New and revolutionary principles of law have been written into the tidelands decisions which should never be allowed to stand as the law of this land.

Whether the four Justices of our highest Court intended it or not, these tidelands opinions chart the course for the trend of socialism in our own country. They point the way by which nationalization of oil and other natural resources can be accomplished in the United States, with greater ease than it was accomplished in Mexico, South America, England, Russia, and Iran. At least, in those countries the congress, the parliament, or the politburo adopted a national policy by which minerals under state and private lands were vested in the national government. In our country the Congress has been ignored by the executive officials who conceived this new theory and presented it to the Supreme Court in the name of the United States of America. In fact, Congress has been flouted by the national officials who went to court and

asserted Federal claims to these lands and minerals in spite of the fact that they had twice previously sought authority from Congress to file such suits, and on both occasions Congress had refused to grant the authority. Before the California case was tried and before the Texas case was filed, it was quite apparent from votes of both Houses on quit-claim bills that a substantial majority of the Members of Congress favored continued State ownership and opposed the attempted seizure of such property on behalf of the Federal Government. Because they have ignored Congress and proceeded contrary to the evident will of the majority of the policy-making branch of the Government, these executive officers have now produced the stalemate which has stopped development of additional resources from these lands. Congress has refused to enact the legislation which is necessary before Federal officials can lease or exploit these ill-gotten lands, because the majority of the Congress of the United States is still opposed to socialistic nationalization of property by our Federal Government.

President Truman is opposed to nationalization of oil in Iran but not in the United States. On one day our President protests to the little country of Iran and asks it to hold up on its nationalization of the British oil leases. On the next day our President asks Congress to approve the nationalization of oil and other resources which have belonged to Texas, California, and Louisiana since their entry into the Union.

How can the British, who have nationalized natural resources and basic industries in their own land, and the President of the United States, who led the tidelands nationalization in this country, persuade the people of Iran that it is wrong for them to follow the same pattern in their country? How can our country convince others that they should follow the principles of democracy, free enterprise, and integrity of contracts if our national leaders do not recognize and apply those principles here at home? That which is wrong with nationalization and the breaking of contracts in Iran is also wrong in America.

Actually, as wrong as Iran's nationalization may be, there are many features of the Truman tidelands nationalization which are worse. At least, in Iran, its Congress was consulted and permitted to determine the national policy, while in our country the Congress has been ignored and our national leaders have proceeded contrary to the expressed will of Congress in the tidelands nationalization. Iran proposes to pay compensation for the expropriated property, while our national leaders would take the tidelands without one penny of compensation to those who have held the property in good faith for over 100 years. Iran is expropriating and nationalizing the property of foreigners, while our Federal officials are seizing property from the sovereign States of our own Union.

There were some who lost all hope after the motions for rehearing were overruled in the Texas tidelands case. They sincerely thought it was time to surrender or compromise with those who violated our Annexation Agreement and perpetrated this act of confiscation. As you know, I have always opposed any compromise or surrender that would leave the principles or procedure of that decision as the law of the land. It has been said that a case is never decided until it is decided right. The obligations of our profession transcend even a decision of a court of last resort when a proper remedy lies within the power and justifies the action of the legislative branch of the Government. *United States v. Texas* is a case of that nature. Not only did the Supreme Court apply principles inimical to our system of Government and law and, for the first time

in the history of that Court, refuses to interpret or apply a solemn agreement between the United States and another nation, but the Court also, for the first time in its long history, refused to permit a State to introduce evidence in a contested lawsuit. That case, the largest land suit in the history of this country, was decided upon the pleadings alone. I exhibited to the Court two large boxes of diplomatic correspondence, maps, letters newspapers, and other evidence which would have convinced any court that the Congress of the United States and the Congress of the Republic of Texas by their solemn contract of annexation did not intend for this 2,608,000 acres of submerged land to merge with political powers of the national sovereign, but that they intended the property to remain with the State of Texas exactly as the contract on its face provided. I plead with the Court to hear the evidence or appoint a master in order that we might have a trial on the merits. This was denied by the 4-to-3 opinion of the Court. Under these circumstances, if you were in my place, would you accept the decision as final and call the controversy at an end? I doubt that any member of this bar would feel that his duty had been completed until he had presented that evidence to the Congress and tried in every honorable way to get that body, which admittedly has the final say in this matter, to again separate property from political power and restore this land to Texas. At least, that is what I have been doing and will continue to do as long as I am attorney general of this State.

Texans do not stand alone in their criticism of the principles and procedure followed by the Supreme Court in this case. Some of the Nation's greatest lawyers have used stronger language than anything I have said. For instance, Prof. James William Moore, of Yale, author of Moore's Federal Procedure, and this Nation's leading authority on Federal practice, wrote a leading article in the last *Baylor Law Review* entitled "Expropriation of the Texas Tidelands by Judicial Fiat." He quotes a sentence from the Supreme Court of the United States written in *Windsor v. McVeigh* in 1876, as follows:

"A sentence of court pronounced against a party without hearing him, or giving him an opportunity to be heard, is not a judicial determination of his rights, and is not entitled to respect in any other tribunal."

The president of the Massachusetts Bar Association, Hon. Richard Wait, in an article in the *Massachusetts Law Quarterly* of May 1951, says: "The road by which the Supreme Court arrived at its decision is one which no court should travel and it is important that the bar realize what has been done."

Forty-three articles in law reviews and legal periodicals in 20 States and England have considered the tidelands cases, and 40 of the 43 are critical of the principles and procedures followed by the Court. A typical comment is by Prof. John Hanna, of Columbia University, writing in the *Stanford Law Review*, as follows:

"Four men in the strategic position of members of the Supreme Court thus decided against Texas what may have been the greatest land case in history. Disregarding lawyers directly or indirectly concerned with litigation relating to submerged lands, this quartet of Justices in its opinion stands almost alone among the able lawyers who have studied this controversy."

No writer has yet defended the Court's disposition of the Texas case. Even Harold L. Ickes, the man who started this whole land grab, and Attorney General J. Howard McGrath find it necessary to bolster the Court's opinion by saying that the Texas annexation agreement was broken by our secession from the Union during the Civil War, and that the Court could have sustained its decision on that ground. Mr. McGrath made that argument last month to the House

Judiciary Committee. I replied to the argument by showing it was so unsound that Mr. McGrath and his assistants did not even mention it in their briefs or arguments in the Texas case. The truth is that the Civil War was waged and won to preserve the Union and to render the attempted secessions null and void. President Lincoln kept the stars of the Southern States in the Nation's flag throughout the Civil War, and when it was concluded the rebel States were not "readmitted." Their representation in the Congress was merely restored after their legislatures approved the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution.

I told the committee that it might grieve my grandfathers, who wore the Confederate gray, if they knew that I am now admitting that the acts of secession were void, but I am sure it would please them to know that the successful contentions of the Federal Government in the 1860's are now being used to prevent that Government from stealing the lands reserved by Texas in its annexation agreement.

The Supreme Court of the United States has in seven cases held that the Southern States were never legally out of the Union, and that therefore all legal rights between them and the Federal Government remained the same as before the attempted secessions. One of these, *Texas v. White* (7 Wall. 700), specifically applied to Texas. There the Court said the United States is "an indestructible Union composed of indestructible States," and added: "The ordinance of secession, and all acts of the legislature intended to give effect to that ordinance, were absolutely null. . . . The obligations of the State, as a citizen of the United States, remained perfect and unimpaired."

This Civil War testimony of Mr. McGrath, 90 years late and 100 percent inaccurate, is only another example of the ends to which the Federal officials have gone in their lack of respect and integrity in their dealings with Texas and the other sovereign States of this Union.

The House Judiciary Committee very promptly reported the Walters and Gossett bill restoring State ownership of submerged lands by a vote of 18 to 6. It is conceded that the House will pass this bill by more than a two-thirds vote. Thirty-five Senators are coauthors of a similar bill in the Senate, and a combined report from officials of other States indicates that we are only five or six votes short of a two-thirds majority, which would be necessary to override a threatened Presidential veto, in the Senate. An interim bill providing for State control of this property pending permanent legislation has a better chance in the Senate at the present time.

More work of an educational and informational nature needs to be done in other States. Your three State officials most directly concerned with this problem and all members of our congressional delegation are now united in the determination to fight for proper interim legislation and the ultimate full and complete restoration of this property and reenactment of the principles of law by which it has been possessed and owned by our State. It is in a few of the other States that we must spread the truth and the dangers implicit in the tidelands decisions, so that their congressional delegations will respond as those which already have the facts.

The Statewide Tidelands Committee, composed of representatives of the State bar, the State Teachers Association, the American Legion, VFW, and many other State-wide organizations, is planning a drive for funds to finance an educational program on this subject in other States. Each of you will have a chance to contribute to this program, and I believe most of you will welcome the opportunity. Every State in this Nation has submerged lands and other prop-

erty rights the title to which would be confirmed by the pending quit-claim legislation. All we need is to counteract the expensive Federal propaganda which seeks to limit the issue in the public mind to three oil-rich States and thereby divide and conquer us before proceeding to the subsequent victims. That type of propaganda has completely failed in most States and can be rendered ineffective everywhere by presentation of the true facts.

Lawyers have a greater responsibility in remedying this type of injustice and encroachment upon the rights and powers of the States because we can understand the situation better than the average layman. Our responsibility is greater in stopping the present socialistic trend in our Government, because we are equipped by our training to recognize and resist unwarranted usurpation of power. Most lawyers would agree with the statement of Woodrow Wilson that "the history of liberty is a history of the limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it."

Shakespeare's character, Jack Cade, in *Henry VI*, while planning the totalitarian welfare state over which he would rule, agreed with his coconspirator that to accomplish their purpose they must first "kill all the lawyers." Even then the legal profession was considered an obstacle to the unwarranted grab for power. So may it ever be.

The tidelands confiscation is but one of many indications of the lack of moral integrity which has resulted from a top-heavy concentration of power and politics in Washington. Those patriots who signed the Declaration of Independence 175 years ago yesterday, many of whom were lawyers, warned against the tyranny, confusion, and corruption which could result from a highly centralized and paternalistic Government.

Although late, there are signs that the people at the grass roots of this Nation are beginning to realize what has happened and are ready to do something about it.

Even in our generation the power of Government may be reclaimed by the people, freedom may become more important than security, public office again may become a public trust, faith may replace fear, private enterprise may be encouraged, and property rights may be respected. The outcome of these promising possibilities depends in a great measure upon what we, the lawyers of Texas and the lawyers of America are willing to do about it. Our challenge is great. May we meet it fully by living up to the responsibilities of our profession.

Federal Budget Data

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include the second article appearing in the *Christian Science Monitor* on the budget data supplied by the Truman administration and proving that it is, to say the least, highly unreliable:

FEDERAL BUDGET DATA AROUSING SKEPTICISM
(By Harold Fleming)

NEW YORK.—Some students here of the Federal budget are inclined to view as a new high tide in alarmism Secretary of the Treasury John Snyder's recent statement

that the Treasury will have to borrow several billion dollars in the next 6 months, beginning immediately.

Secretary Snyder was urging the Senate Finance Committee to approve the administration's proposed \$10,000,000,000 tax increase.

How Secretary Snyder figures this is a mystery here for the following reasons:

1. During the past 6 months (January through June) the Treasury ran a book-keeping surplus of around \$3,000,000,000. This was at a rate of surplus never exceeded in Treasury history but once (in the fiscal year 1948). And on a net operating income basis the Treasury must have taken in well over \$4,000,000,000 more than it put into circulation, despite the growth of national defense outlays.

REVENUES STILL EXCEED EXPENDITURES

While national defense expenditures are now running about \$1,000,000,000 a month over a year ago, Federal revenues are up still further. Virtually all categories, including corporate and personal income taxes, payroll taxes, excise, manufacturers' sales, and stamp taxes, are showing sharp increases due to sharp increases in the flow of national income.

2. The working balance of the Treasury's general fund at the end of June was around \$8,000,000,000. Except for a period in March of this year, this puts it at the highest level since the end of World War II. If it were run off to half—which would bring it only slightly below the levels of previous postwar years—it would take care of 40 percent of the Treasury's own estimate of the deficit for the current fiscal year.

Most of that deficit—if there is a deficit—will occur in the second half, not the first. Mr. Snyder is in the position of a man with a wallet full of money, making money hand over fist, arguing that he will, nevertheless, need a lot more income in the next 6 months, beginning immediately.

It is this kind of calculation which makes observers here skeptical of administration estimates of outlays in future years.

ARE DEFENSE OUTLAYS PUT TOO HIGH?

These estimates, as spelled out recently to Congress by Assistant Director Staats, of the Budget Bureau, run as follows (in billions of dollars):

Fiscal year:	Estimated outlays
1952-----	\$68.4
1953-----	80-90
1954-----	78
After that to level off several years, per year-----	75

In general, the skepticism is based on the fact that the administration has not been able to figure at all closely within even 6 months and that its estimates have for some time been too high on outlays and too low on revenues.

Moreover, these estimates assume national defense outlays somewhat approaching those of the all-out effort of World War II. They assume, for instance, defense outlays in 1953 of between fifty-five and sixty-five billion dollars. This compares with maximum annual war expense during World War II of around \$90,000,000,000. Even after discounting for price increases, this comes to half as much outlay during peace as the country spent during an all-out global war. It contrasts with about \$20,000,000,000 this year and \$13,000,000,000 last year.

INCOME RISES AS FAST AS DEFENSE OUTLAYS

Another reason for skepticism about such figures is that it is hard to understand how this much can possibly be spent with wisdom on national defense in peacetime. It is understood that tanks cost two or three times as much and the average airplane, figured across the board from trainers to B-47's, costs five to ten times as much as during World War II. But during peace

there is no attrition. The planes and tanks would merely accumulate.

The United States Navy is already far the world's largest. Atomic-bomb outlays, though multiplying, are still figured in fractions of billions, while the above outlays are in tens of billions. Outlays on guided missiles, jets, radar screens, and so on are limited by available facilities. Research outlays are limited by the available research workers. The total proposed outlays are larger for peacetime than apparently Russia could afford in all-out war.

BUDGET ESTIMATES SEEM UNREALISTIC

Even if, however, these official guesses are taken at face value, some people here doubt that they will have the inevitable inflationary impact argued by the officials who coin them. They are not increasing any faster than the official estimates on gross national product and on national income, as the following figures roughly indicate.

(In billions of dollars)

Year	Defense costs	Gross national product	National income
1946-----	\$49.0	\$211.1	\$180.3
1947-----	16.8	233.3	198.7
1948-----	11.5	259.1	223.5
1949-----	12.2	255.6	216.8
1950—First quarter-----		263.3	216.9
Second quarter-----		271.6	229.1
Third quarter-----		283.9	244.6
Fourth quarter-----		300.3	256.2
Total-----	12.4		
1951 (estimate)-----	22.0	313.9	

These figures do not all jibe statistically. Those for defense costs are for fiscal years, the others for calendar years. But they do in general show that the magnitude of the national economy and the size of its postwar increases, even discounting for dollar devaluation, give ample elbow room for a very large increase in defense outlays. In 5 years the Nation's production and income have increased by from over \$80,000,000,000 to over \$100,000,000,000. And output figures for steel, power, fuel, chemical, and other basic capacities would tell a similar story.

In other words, the officially proposed defense costs for the next few years are as unimpressive compared with either the watt-hours or the voltage of the total national economy as they are overimpressive compared with what a peacetime economy can sensibly spend on armaments that quickly become obsolescent.

Statement to the American People on the MacArthur Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the recent statement to the American people, issued by the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and written by the able chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], is definitely a new landmark in the statement of American ideals in the history of our country, and is fast being recognized as such. I believe this statement represents the firm purposes and the hopes of the people of our Nation in the new era in which

we are living, and therefore represent the brightest hope on the horizon of world affairs today.

A recent editorial from the Detroit Free Press, under date of June 29, 1951, and a column in the same paper by Mr. Malcolm W. Bingay in his column, Good Morning, reflect worthy estimates of this statement of principles, and I ask that these articles be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Detroit Free Press of July 4, 1951]

GOOD MORNING

(By Malcolm W. Bingay)

A REBIRTH OF FAITH

This being the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence and because of the times in which we live, the American people seem to be more acutely aware of the spiritual significance of that document than ever before.

Thomas Jefferson gave to all mankind a great hope.

One hundred and seventy-five years later his vision has been justified by the creation of the greatest, most prosperous and most powerful Nation the world has ever known. It was not a thing of mundane law. The defiance of King George III did not give it its grandeur. It was its spiritual vision which stirred the souls of groping mankind everywhere.

But it is the second Declaration of Independence on which I would like to dwell.

That second declaration of freedom, as I feel sure it will be called in the generations to follow, came from the mind and hand of Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia, chairman of the joint Senate committee investigating the charges and countercharges in the controversy over General MacArthur.

The dust of the ages will cover the 2,000,000 words of that testimony, unread and unsung while what RUSSELL wrote will shine forth in all its glory, comparable to Jefferson's famed "felicity of expression" and equal in historical importance to the Monroe Doctrine.

For exalted vision and exquisite English it is in keeping with the great state papers now preserved in our archives. It caught the spirit of the Jeffersonian declaration, as did Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.

It is as indigenous to our soil and as characteristically American as the yellow flag used by our colonial fathers with a picture of the rattlesnake coiled to strike with the warning: "Don't tread on me."

When Lincoln delivered his Gettysburg Address few people in the audience sensed the grandeur of his concept. Most of the newspapers either ignored it or merely recorded it as something of no consequence. Some of them said "The President made a few remarks." Others denounced it. Only a few sensed its glory.

Time alone brought out the shining luster of his words.

I like to believe that this is the case with the Russell proclamation—to the people of America and to the godless terror that is Russia.

The people were not prepared for it. Out of the long weeks of bitter bickering among mean and petty politicians, of which they had long grown weary, they were not looking for such a soul-stirring message. Nor did the editors. But, as with the Lincoln prayer, I firmly believe it will grow into the hearts and consciences of our people.

I will use the New York Times, that encyclopedia of current history, as an example. When RUSSELL made his declaration the

Times commented editorially upon it almost casually. That was on Thursday. But, by Sunday, there seemed to come a realization that something new had been added to the American tradition.

On Sunday there appeared another editorial, noting that "RUSSELL spoke for the heart of democracy. * * * This affirmation of the Nation's faith ought to be read and re-read by every American." And the Times reprinted it in full, properly typed and boxed to be preserved.

I believe that it will be in the textbooks of our children's children.

It tells the ruthless murderers and tyrants in the Kremlin, in calm, quiet language, not to kid themselves—as Hitler did—that the American people are not sholder to sholder against a common enemy.

"We will be united in our devotion to liberty and justice, be single-minded in our will to preserve our institutions. We hope they may be preserved in peace, but preserve them we shall. We will be together in the defense of our way of life against any alien aggressor."

Here was the old spirit of America undaunted with the sword of God in our hand, glad to live but not afraid to die to preserve the spiritual ideal of our beginnings.

Like the bursting forth of a forgotten sun, it recalled Americans to their old faith against the fogs and fears engendered by the strangely alien doctrine of timidity.

[From the Detroit Free Press of June 29, 1951]

ONE NATION, ONE PEOPLE AGAINST TYRANNY

It is not often that the American people are presented by their political leaders with a great and historic pronouncement of their principles.

From the Declaration of Independence and the Gettysburg Address of Lincoln our mileposts are marked by some inspired pen, a great state paper which explains in unequivocal terms the aspirations and the determinations of a united people; a manifesto behind which they can rally; an affirmation to the world of the hopes and ideals of freemen.

And now we can add to these national pronouncements, the paper addressed to the American people, issued Wednesday by the Senate committee investigating the MacArthur controversy.

For clarity of language, for its unmistakable purpose, this manifesto written by Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia, and subscribed to by all of the members of the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Affairs Committees, should stand as one of our great state papers.

It is a testimonial from the hearts of the American people of their own unshaken faith in the principles upon which this country was established, and a notice to the world that those principles shall remain forever inviolate against aggressive tyranny.

For 7 weeks the United States has been engaged in heated debate, which occasionally rose to heights of bitter partisanship, acrimony and recrimination as a result of the removal from command of General MacArthur and the reexamination of our far-eastern policy.

But the debate, while open to all ears, was our debate.

The Russell paper did not in any way touch upon the controversial matters in the MacArthur hearing, or arrive at any decisions. Those may, or may not, come later.

But what it did do was to clear the air of all remaining elements of doubt that an irreparable cleavage exists in the hearts and minds of Americans.

"Such a hearing," wrote Senator RUSSELL, "involves risks, but it also involves rights, and it is the rights which have made the

risks inevitable. * * * Those who are still privileged to breathe the air of freedom utilize such discussion as a means to temper the steel of national determination and unity."

The free world, pinning its hopes on the continued vitality, integrity, and resolution of the United States to resist aggression, need have no cause for dismay, said RUSSELL with calm assurance. But for those who would think to fatten on our dissension, his warning was clarion clear:

"If those who threaten us take only a tyrant's lesson from differences among freemen and mistake the temper of our people, they can plunge the world into war. But it would be a war they could never win and which would bring them to ultimate destruction."

Many times before tyrants have mistaken our domestic controversies for disunity and weakness. If that is the interpretation Russia puts on the MacArthur hearing, she can learn otherwise to her advantage from history.

Kaiser Wilhelm, observing the apparent state of national confusion in the early administration of Woodrow Wilson, and misjudging our foreign policy from the ignorance and stupidity of its exponent, William Jennings Bryan, made the mistake of thinking we were on the verge of domestic collapse in 1917. A united America quickly taught him otherwise.

Internally torn by the effects of depression and split by the class struggle fomented by the New Dealers and Communists, Hitler thought we were on the verge of civil war.

He, too, learned, as all tyrants must, that America meets all external threats to her liberties in solid phalanx.

Russia is being shown the same thing. The signers of the Russell manifesto represent every shade of political thinking in this country. RUSSELL himself is a Georgia Democrat, but not an administration Democrat. His cosigners included Dixiecrats and Fair Dealers, liberal Republicans, and GOP standpatters.

It is trite, perhaps, to say that in our foreign policy, politics stop at the water's edge.

But it is equally true that in our domestic affairs, our politics do not go beyond our own shores.

The high vision of the Senate committee's address to the people transcends all the issues of Korea and Iran, of Asia and Europe and our own bitter domestic conflicts.

In these times of stress and uncertainty, freemen everywhere may read and take heart from the blazing words of Senator RUSSELL, who has raised the torch of liberty and dispelled the darkness of fear.

"We will be united in our devotion to liberty and justice, be single-minded in our will to preserve our institutions. We hope they may be preserved in peace, but preserve them we shall. We will be together in the defense of our way of life against any alien aggressor."

There stands a statesman in the best American tradition.

Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the Record an address on the subject of controls, delivered by Elizabeth Clark Babbitt over television station WTOP, channel 9.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Fellow citizens, I wish to speak to you about price controls. I was a delegate to the Citizens Conference which met in Washington May 16 through 20. As you know, June 30 is the deadline for controls.

We know that a large group is in Washington now being trained for the carrying out of price control.

Our President, Mr. Truman, has told us there will be many controls. If controls are necessary, they must be well planned and well carried out, and there must be a close correlation between price and wage control, rent and food. There will be little advantage in putting controls on one and not on the other. If it is necessary to put on these controls, it follows that they must be rigidly enforced, not catering to any special group. If there is to be no set up, let's stop talking about it, and try to face things as they are (not as we would like to have them).

If a set-up is forced upon us, it is the business of the administration to see that a plan (so far as it is humanly possible) is set up which shall be fair to both producer and consumer. Unless this can be done, price controls had better be left off.

It is distressing to see people in the low income group come into a grocery store searching from counter to counter for adequate food for their families, at a price which they can afford.

In the old days, there were good American dishes—like corned beef and cabbage, meat or lamb stew with vegetables, baked beans, liver and bacon, not to mention kidneys. Many of you may remember that although father had a note due, mother had been to town on bargain day and bought beyond her budget. However, there was still left enough for food at the old prices. She could still buy sugar, flour, and bacon. She could still buy a gingham dress. This is not the case today. A hamburger steak is beyond her purse, to say nothing of liver and bacon.

Why could not some system be worked out where the basic foods could be sold at a reasonable price?

Group I: Green and yellow vegetables—some raw, some cooked, frozen or canned.

Group II: Oranges, tomatoes, grapefruit, raw cabbage or salad greens.

Group III: Potatoes and other vegetables and fruits—raw, dried, cooked, frozen or canned.

Group IV: Milk and milk products—fluid, evaporated, dried milk, or cheese.

Group V: Meat, poultry, fish or eggs or dried beans, peas, nuts, or peanut butter.

Group VI: Bread flour and cellulose, natural whole grain (first choice dark preferred; second choice enriched or restored).

Group VII: Butter and fortified margarine (with added vitamin A).

Also there should be sold at a reasonable price:

1. Two kinds of meat, different prices (chuck roast and lamb).

2. Two kinds of fish at different prices (cod, found in locality).

3. Two kinds of cheese (sharp and mild).

4. Two kinds of bread (preferably dark).

5. Two kinds of milk (skimmed or whole milk, not so high in butterfat).

This plan would enable a man to go to a store and buy with his earnings sufficient food for his family.

The President says sacrifice. For some this means doing without a little, for others little, but for many, nothing at all. What effect will this have on the health and growth of the American children?

The extra tax should be put on luxuries, not on the necessities of life.

Personally, I have a great faith in the future of America, and faith in our people. I believe that we can still do business based on the principles of fair play, cooperation, respect for the other fellow, based on the golden rule.

"When King and people understand each other past a doubt,
It takes a foe and more than a foe to knock that country out;
For the one will do what the other requires as soon as need is shown
And hand in hand they can make a stand that neither could make alone."

Unity will be achieved only when our country as a whole is convinced that careful, impartial, consistent and unimpetuous judgments are at work.

Defense is everybody's business and wage and price control is everybody's necessity or business, or what George Washington said:

"Let us raise our standards
To which the wise and prudent can repair.
The future rests in the hands of God."

Address by Hon. Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin, Before National Convention of Young Republicans in Boston, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered before the national convention of Young Republicans at the Hotel Statler, Boston, on June 29, 1951, which was broadcast on a Nation-wide hook-up over the facilities of the Mutual Broadcasting System.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, thank you very much for the opportunity to be with you tonight. There are almost an unlimited number of important issues which we might well discuss tonight—issues which should be discussed in every home in America.

We might well, for example, discuss high prices which each day are taking food from the table and clothes from the family of every workingman whose salary has remained the same over the past year in dollars and cents.

In discussing high prices, we could quote the Democrat chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee—the committee that handled the President's controls for him—perhaps quote what he said Monday of this week on page 7033 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—and housewives might well listen to this.

Here is what he said: "The Congress of the United States wrote a wonderful law. If it had been administered properly there never would have been the slightest ill effects from inflation in this country. . . . The administration . . . apparently wished prices to rise so that increased taxes could be collected."

On the other hand, we might well discuss increasing taxes which will cause the pay check of every man in America to shrink.

We might also discuss the question of why we have had three major wars within the lifetime of some of you young people here tonight—the first time in the history of the world that three major wars have been fought by the same country and the same generation. In that connection we might discuss the fact that during this century no wars have been started while the Republicans were in power. The President says, however, "we who were in power when all those wars started are actually the peace party, but the Republicans who were not in control of the machinery of government when this century's wars were started—that party is the war party." Rather tortured reasoning. But maybe the President is right. Maybe the party out of power is the one that starts the war. So perhaps it might be a good idea to take care of that situation in 1952 so the President's party will be out of power and in a position to keep the peace.

Or we might discuss the dishonesty, graft, and corruption approved by the administration. We could talk about the multi-million-dollar fixed loans in the RFC political grab bag. We could talk about the mink coats, the deep freezers, the sale of Government jobs, the dishonest padding of Government payrolls with political hacks, the vote frauds—and all those things that daily become worse as a corrupt machine is kept in power.

Then again we might discuss the twin attempts to destroy this great Nation—one by the slow poison of socialism; the other by the dagger death of communism.

However, with your permission, I shall discuss the planned betrayal of 1951 and the reason why for the first time in the history of this great Nation we have lost a war. Let us together examine the recorded facts and together determine whether we lost because we are so weak or because it was planned that way.

In examining the record, it will be necessary to discuss the actions of certain individuals because history does not just happen. It is made by men—men with names and faces, and the only way that the course of history can be changed is by getting rid of the specific individuals who we find are bad for America.

I shall, therefore, discuss some of the men who have always been found at the time and place where disaster strikes America and success comes to Soviet Russia. Discussing men who are either traitors or dupes is not a pleasant task. But if a man who is picked by the people to man the watchtowers withers away in fear because he may be left a bit bloody—then he should be taken down from the watchtowers.

Korea did not start on the 26th of June. The seeds for today's disaster were sown at Yalta, carefully nurtured at Potsdam, cultivated to the budding stage during the Marshall mission to China, and brought almost to full bloom when the greatest military genius this country has ever known was first handcuffed in battle and finally fired because he refused to follow a strategy of defeat—because he refused to retreat from victory.

Yalta has been mentioned so often that many of us have forgotten exactly what was done at Yalta. Very simply stated, at Yalta we gave Russia control of Manchuria's railroads and her two ports of Dairen and Port Arthur. Control of the railroads and the ports, of course, gave the Communists complete control of Manchuria.

Let us see if this was blindly done. The facts about Yalta are no longer secret. The record is clear now—so clear that we can understand why it was kept secret so long. I have in my hand an intelligence summary prepared by 50 of the Army's top intelligence officers. The date of this is significant—April 21, 1945. It was prepared after the

sell-out of China was agreed upon at Yalta but 3 months before it was confirmed at Potsdam. It was still not too late because Truman could have repudiated at Potsdam what Roosevelt did at Yalta. It was submitted to George Catlett Marshall who was the military adviser at both Yalta and Potsdam. This intelligence report accurately predicted how much America would lose and the Communists gain if we followed the course which was followed at Yalta and endorsed down to the last letter by Truman at Potsdam.

Let me read from this intelligence report which was made part of the committee record by Senator BRIDGES. It was prepared not by 1 man but by 50 of the Army's top intelligence officers. And I ask you, my friends, to attend this well and remember it long.

Let me read from it:

"The entry of Soviet Russia into the Asiatic war would be a political event of world-shaking importance, the ill effect of which would be felt for decades to come. Its military significance at this stage of the war would be relatively unimportant. . . ."

"The entry of Soviet Russia into the Asiatic war would destroy America's position in Asia quite as effectively as our position is now destroyed in Europe east of the Elbe and beyond the Adriatic.

"If Russia enters the Asiatic war, China will certainly lose her independence to become the Poland of Asia; Korea the Asiatic Rumania; Manchuria the Soviet Bulgaria. Whether more than a nominal China will exist after the impact of the Russian armies is felt is very doubtful. Chiang may well have to depart and a Chinese Soviet government may be installed in Nanking which we would have to recognize.

"To take a line of action which would save few lives now, and only a little time—at an unpredictable cost in lives, treasure, and honor in the future—and simultaneously destroy our ally China, would be an act of treachery that would make the Atlantic Charter and our hopes for world peace a tragic farce.

"Under no circumstances should we pay the Soviet Union to destroy China. This would certainly injure the material and moral position of the United States in Asia."

This report was disregarded at Potsdam. When Senator RUSSELL wrote asking Marshall for the Pentagon's copy of this intelligence report, the answer was, "We can't find it. It was probably destroyed."

We next take up the administration's death blow to China—the disastrous Marshall mission. The instructions which he carried with him to China were secret for a long time but finally have become public. These secret directives were directly opposite to the recommendations of General Wedemeyer who had been sent to China to make a survey for the sole purpose of recommending a course of action which would keep China from passing behind the iron curtain. But what happened to Wedemeyer's report? Let me quote Marshall's testimony on page 22 of the Senate Armed Services Committee hearings, September 19, 1950. Marshall said: "I did not join in the suppression of the report. I personally suppressed it."

Without going into all of the details of Marshall's instructions, his task was principally to accomplish two things, which he did accomplish: (1) To cut off all arms and ammunition to our friends in China if they would not agree to take the Chinese Communists into a partnership government; (2) to open up Kalgan Mountain Pass with the end result that the Chinese Communists were put in direct contact with the Russians and then supplied by the Russians from the huge store of captured Japanese military equipment.

In view of the fact that in this document there was brought to full bloom the treason of Yalta and Potsdam; in view of the fact

that in this document there was signed into communistic, atheistic slavery 400,000,000 of our allies; in view of the fact that this document signed the death warrant of every American boy who has died in Korea since the 26th of June—the death warrant of every American boy who will die in the stinking jungles of Indochina tomorrow, on the sands of Iran the next day and on the streets of Berlin and Paris perhaps the day after that—in view of these facts it is most important that we know who drafted this infamous document.

The testimony under oath on this subject differed. Let me read it to you.

General Marshall before the Senate Armed Services Committee, September 19, 1950, said:

"The policy of the United States was being drawn up in the State Department, and that was issued while I was on the ocean going over there (China)."

Testifying before the Russell committee on May 10, 1951 (page 1201), Marshall said—some are saying "that I sat down in the State Department and drew up this policy. I did not."

Here is what Secretary Acheson, under oath, had to say about this same subject before the Russell committee, June 4, 1951:

"At the end of November 1945, Secretary Byrnes and General Marshall met. This was after General Marshall had been asked to go to China.

"Secretary Byrnes read him a memorandum suggesting the outline of instructions for him. General Marshall did not approve of it. General Marshall said he would wish to try his own hand, assisted by some of his associates, in drafting the instructions. This he did, and a draft was prepared by him * * *

And James Byrnes, who was Secretary of State at the time of the Marshall mission, has stated in his book, *Speaking Frankly*: "The President made no changes in those secret instructions except upon the recommendation of General Marshall or with his approval."

You decide who was telling the truth—whether Marshall spoke the truth when he said "I was on the ocean and had nothing to do with its drafting"; or whether Secretaries Byrnes and Acheson spoke the truth when they said Marshall drafted it and no changes were made unless he recommended or approved them.

Marshall came back from China to take over the job of Secretary of State, and the embargo was continued for months after his return. Not an ounce of gunpowder and not a single gun did we send to our friends in China despite the fact that we had full knowledge that the Chinese Communists were being armed and equipped by the Russians out of Manchuria. In fact, Dean Acheson went before the House Committee and asked that we arm Chinese Communist divisions. He did not say who he wanted them to fight—certainly not Communist Russia. Fortunately the House Committee turned him down cold on that one.

Thus was the tide which had been flowing toward victory for the Republic of China turned—thus was it reversed to provide victory for Communist China.

In giving the background of the Korean war it has been necessary for me to mention the name of George Catlett Marshall.

I recently prepared a documented history of Marshall—a documented history of his acts over the past 10 years. Some of my good friends urged that I not do that—and they have urged that I not talk about Marshall tonight—because, they say, it is politically unwise.

It reminds me of the advice I got 16 months ago when we started to bring out the facts on Dean Gooderham Acheson, and

some of the others who have been so bad for this country. Let me remind those well-meaning friends that the reason the world is in such a horrible condition today is because so many two-bit politicians do only those things they think are politically wise—only that which is safe for their own puny futures.

You young people here tonight will be running this country someday. I ask you in the name of western civilization not to follow the disastrous footsteps of those who say don't do anything that is politically unwise. If a task—unpleasant as it may be—must be done, do it. Otherwise, this Nation, this civilization will pass from the face of the earth as surely as did those other great empires of the past which were destroyed because of weak leadership which tolerated corruption, disloyalty, and dishonesty because that was the easier way to follow and perhaps to them the politically expedient course to follow.

I have been through this Nation much in the past year—from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from New Orleans to St. Paul. The American people are desperately searching, hoping, and praying for leadership. They are not looking for men who only do the things that are politically wise or those who measure every act in terms of the votes they can get.

If we of the Republican Party lack the moral courage to do what is right as God gives us to see the right, if we start doing only those things which are politically wise, then the Nation is lost—because while there are some fine Democrats, they have proven that in 20 years as a party they are incapable of doing the housecleaning in Washington that must be done if this Nation is to survive. There are vast numbers of honest loyal Democrats all over this Nation—especially in the South—upon whom I call tonight to join hands with us in the name of America before it is too late.

Let all loyal Democrats and Republicans join hands and call upon Truman tonight to get rid of the Yalta crowd that has brought so much agony and blood and tears to this Nation and which promises nothing but endless, limitless years of dreary war, death, and destruction. Mr. Truman, those men show no sign of reforming. They will not change any more than a leopard will change his spots. The momentum of their past acts carries them onward. Their plight is perhaps best described by Shakespeare in this fashion:

"I am in blood,
Stepped in so far, that should I wade
no more,
Returning were as tedious as go o'er."

Mr. Truman, you can still redeem yourself. Get rid of this entire Yalta crowd that has been so bad for America. Get rid of them lock, stock, and barrel. Get rid of them tomorrow or the next day, but tonight, Mr. Truman, so America can breathe fresh wholesome air and breathe easily.

But let's get back to the planned disaster in Korea. We have mentioned how we presented Manchuria to Russia at Yalta and Potsdam.

Now as you know, Manchuria has been playing a very important part in the Korean war. It is the gateway from China to Korea. The Chinese Communist troops that are killing our boys in Korea must be transported across Manchuria. And here is where the strategy of MacArthur and the Marshall-Acheson strategy came into sharp conflict.

As you know, much of Manchuria is a land of mountains, hills, and valleys. The roads and railroads over which those Communist troops had to be hauled into Korea pass through mountain tunnels and skirt the narrow rims of mountains, pass over bridges spanning deep gorges and wide rivers and through narrow mountain passes.

MacArthur's request was simply to let our planes destroy the railroads where they skirted the rims of the mountains, dump bombs on and close up the tunnels through which the Communists had to move their troops, destroy the bridges over the gorges and the rivers, close up the narrow mountain passes so the Chinese Communists could not go through to Korea—so that they would have to stay in their own country where they belong, and so that the Chinese Communists in Korea would be isolated and the Communist troops there would either starve or be forced to surrender.

Marshall and Acheson opposed this, urging that the Chinese Communists be allowed to roll into Korea. Once the Communists were in Korea, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense announced our troops would not try to win but would indulge in a slaughtering contest until the flow of blood sickened the enemy. They forget or do not care that a killing contest is a two-way street.

While the slaughtering contest goes on in Korea the Seventh Fleet is operating under the most unbelievably fantastic orders that any of you have ever heard of in war or peace. Let's take a quick look at those orders.

At this moment, the Seventh Fleet is patrolling the waters between Formosa (upon which there are located the 600,000 troops of the Republic of China) and the mainland of China held by the Communists. There are two parts to this order. The first part of the order is that the Seventh Fleet prevent the Communists on the mainland from landing on Formosa. But according to the undisputed testimony before the Russell committee, there are no organized Communist army units in the area which would be capable of making any landings—so that that part of the order is meaningless.

Let's take a look at the real meat of the order now. It directs the Seventh Fleet to use whatever force is necessary to prevent our friends on Formosa from making any attacks on the mainland of China. If the Republic of China were to send planes to conduct reconnaissance over the mainland of China, under the Seventh Fleet's orders, it must shoot them down. If Chiang were to send a landing party to the China mainland, under the Seventh Fleet's orders it must sink those boats.

During all this time, the million and a half anti-Communist guerrillas on the mainland have been begging Chiang for some help. But the Seventh Fleet has orders to make sure that he sends not even a single man to the China coast either to give advice to the guerrillas on the mainland or even to pick up intelligence reports from his own people in China. Unbelievable, you say. Yes. Fantastic. Yes. But it is all a matter of cold record that cannot be denied.

And what are the Chinese Communists doing as our Seventh Fleet keeps the legal Government of China from even contacting the millions of loyal subjects still on the mainland? I will tell you what they are doing. They are settling the dust in the public squares of the cities and villages of China as they turn them into charnel houses, systematically rounding up and machine gunning those Chinese who are enemies of communism. You decide why the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State feel that order should be in existence tonight.

The other day when I heard Acheson testify before the House committee and say we had won a great victory if we do as Russia suggested and withdraw to the thirty-eighth parallel and turn over North Korea to the Communists, it made me sick way down deep inside.

Let's see what Acheson considers a great victory. The picture is clear; let's look at it. The war in Korea has resulted in over 150,000 American casualties, and in the words of

MacArthur, it "has almost destroyed that nation of 20,000,000 people." The armies have rolled back and forth across that unfortunate land, destroying every village, every city, and causing the slaughter of millions of women and children. As MacArthur said, "I have seen, I guess, as much blood and disaster as any living man, and it just curdled my stomach, the last time I was there. After I looked at that wreckage and those thousands of women and children and everything, I vomited."

But what have we accomplished by all of this agony and blood and tears? Acheson says, "Oh, we have taught Russia that aggression does not pay." He knows better than that. He knows we have taught Korea and every other nation threatened by communism that resistance does not pay. We have taught them that if you dare to resist Communist aggression, and dare to invite the United Nations to help you, your cities, your villages, your women and children will be wiped from the face of the earth. We say to every other nation, "If you resist, we will fight only in your land. We won't drop a single bomb in the land of the enemy." But Acheson says, "Oh, it is a great victory." And Truman says, "Look what we the peace party have accomplished."

There is nothing new about this strategy of conquest by terror—the strategy of making such a horrible example of anyone who resists that other nations will lose heart and give up without a fight. Genghis Khan was a past master at it. When early in the thirteenth century his Mongolian hordes swept through the mountain passes out onto the eastern plains, their orders were to cut down every living thing that stood above the hub of a wagon wheel in any town that dared to resist. Hitler attempted to annihilate the entire Jewish race because they resisted his madness. He tried to wipe Poland from the face of the earth as a lesson to every nation. But this time, we combine with Russia to do the same thing in Korea.

What more could Russia ask for in Korea? What better example could she set for those nations in Europe that lie in the path of Communist aggression? She has accomplished every purpose in Korea so far. But this is not all.

Acheson in testifying before the Russell committee gave the tip-off of the balance of the sell-out. He said, "Of course, now we oppose turning Formosa over to the Chinese Reds. Now we oppose seating Red China in the United Nations." But, he said, "We will discuss with Communist China what should be done with Formosa." And, says Acheson, "If the other members of the United Nations decide to seat Red China, we won't veto it."

When I listened to Acheson testify that he was a friend of the Republic of China and would, as he said, vigorously oppose turning it over to Red China, it recalled to my mind an article written by his adviser on far-eastern problems—a man who has been named under oath, incidentally, as a member of the Communist Party. Let me read to you what his adviser said:

He said the problem in China was to allow it to fall without it appearing that we pushed her. Then he says: "The thing to do is to let South Korea fall—but not to let it look as though we pushed it. Hence the parting grant of \$150,000,000." That, of course, was before the war in Korea stated. Then it was \$150,000,000 for the price of making it appear we didn't push Korea, now with the war under way, it is 150,000 American casualties and millions of Korean women and children.

When the Red Dean says now we are on Formosa's side, but we will still discuss whether Formosa should remain free, it carries me back to January, when Acheson instructed our delegate to the U. N. to vote to give Red China, Red Russia, England, and the United States the power to settle the fate of Formosa.

You will recall at that time he also said, "We will oppose turning Formosa over to Red China." But said he, "We will decide Formosa's fate by a majority vote of a stacked jury in which the vote will be 3 to 1 for betrayal of Formosa."

This fight to prevent the betrayal of 1951 should not be a fight between America's two political parties. Certainly the millions of people in my radio audience who voted the Democrat ticket love America just as much and fear Communist domination of the world just as much as the average Republican. Certainly any and every intelligent Democrat and Republican knows that if communism continues to roll over the world for the next 5 years at the same pace that it has been enveloping the world for the past 5 years, then there will be neither a Democrat nor a Republican Party. Unfortunately men of little minds have tried to make this a political fight. Unfortunately too many of faint heart, upon arriving in Washington to represent you, mistake the voice of the un-American left-wing Communist camp-following members of the press for the voice of this great land of ours. I can assure them they are wrong.

Republicans alone cannot clean house in Washington. They need the help of all the loyal Democrats of this Nation also. Democrats must at long last wake up and realize that they have no party in Washington. I am mightily encouraged as I meet and mingle with you young people here tonight and find that you, the young men and women of 1951 recognize what an awful mess the older people have made of this Nation and this world. This is your Nation. Yours is the task to bring order out of chaos. If all of the young people like those we have in this audience tonight decide here and now that they are going to work from now until the elections in 1952 to clean out the motley un-American crowd that have been leading us from disaster to disaster, then this Nation will be saved. The hopes of the world are upon your shoulders.

Little-Business Man, What Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Little-Business Man, What Now?" published in the Oregonian of July 7, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITTLE-BUSINESS MAN, WHAT NOW?

If you work in Portland or in Oregon, the chances are better than 99 to 1 that you work for what the Federal Government calls a little business; i. e., one with fewer than 500 employees. And the chances are even greater than you have a legitimate gripe against the operation of the defense program to the detriment of the little-business man, in general, and the Oregon little businessman, in particular.

Item: The General Metalware Co., of Portland, is forced to go to Maryland, Virginia, and Alabama for its steel. But, the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce has discovered, much of the product of the West's

steel mills in California and Utah is allocated to bigger eastern manufacturers.

Item: Government bid invitations, mailed from Washington, D. C., often arrive in Portland days later and too late to submit a bid.

Item: Specifications on some war matériel for use in the Far East have called for delivery of the finished product to an eastern depot. A Portland manufacturer must, therefore, figure a big freight charge into his costs, and the Government, presumably, must then transport the goods across the country again before loading from a west coast port.

These and other complaints were aired Thursday before Representative MIKE MANSFIELD, who spent the day taking testimony for the House Subcommittee on Small Business, which he heads.

Small business also has woes stemming from action of the Supreme Court. Last January the High Court upheld good faith as an absolute defense against charges under the Robinson-Patman Act, the little-business man's bible. And only a few days ago the Court cut a big swath in fair-traded items.

We can shed no tears over the death of widespread price-fixing under fair trade laws, but the Robinson-Patman decision is something else again.

Surprisingly, Portland businessmen who testified Thursday did not mention the earlier Court ruling, which came as the result of a Standard Oil of Indiana challenge of a Federal Trade Commission order forbidding it to sell gasoline to jobber customers in Detroit at a lower price per gallon than to service station retailers in the same area. The Court held that a showing of good faith was a complete defense against any violation of the restrictions in the Robinson-Patman bill, which Congress had drawn to prohibit selective price cuts by a big wholesaler or retailer to undercut small-business competition in a specific area.

The bill does not prohibit price cuts, it merely requires that they be applied uniformly in all outlets of the big operator. But, in the Standard Oil case, the Court ruled that price-cutting need not be uniform if it is in good faith. It will be almost impossible, of course, for any neighborhood store to prove that his big competitor was not acting in good faith in cutting prices in his particular area.

So, unless the little-business man's voice is heard in Washington, D. C., even from so far away as Portland, he—and that means most of us—are in for some big-sized headaches. We hope MIKE MANSFIELD has the key to the aspirin.

Investigation of Loyalty of Employees of the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from me to Mr. Hiram Bingham, Chairman of the Civil Service Loyalty Review Board, Civil Service Commission, dated July 13, 1951, making inquiry as to investigation of the loyalty of employees of the State Department.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 13, 1951.

Mr. HIRAM BINGHAM,
Chairman, Civil Service
Loyalty Review Board,
Civil Service Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR BINGHAM: Yesterday the State Department, in belatedly announcing the June 27 suspension of two of its far-eastern experts, stated that the suspension was "automatic" when the Security Board recommended hearings on charges against them.

I would appreciate knowing whether this is true; and if so, why John Carter Vincent and Philip Jessup, whose cases are pending before the Loyalty Board, have not been suspended.

My records indicate that of all those cases which I gave to the Tydings committee, only 26 have been ordered reopened and are pending before the State Department's Loyalty Board, and that 23 of the 26, even though their cases are pending before the Loyalty Board, still have full access to secret and other classified material in the State Department. This would seem to be an extremely dangerous practice.

In view of the State Department's announcement of yesterday that suspension is automatic when a hearing is ordered, I would greatly appreciate knowing why the other 23 have not been suspended, or at least denied access to secret material.

Sincerely yours,

JOE MCCARTHY.

Resolutions of Nebraska Young Republicans Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a typical cross section of the thinking of young men and women in the Midwest, and particularly in my own State of Nebraska, is contained in the resolutions recently adopted at the annual convention of the Nebraska Young Republicans Club at the Hotel Yancey in Grand Island, Nebr. In accordance with the permission granted me during the course of the Senate proceedings today, I present the resolutions for publication in the RECORD.

The resolutions are as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF THE NEBRASKA YOUNG REPUBLICANS CLUB

I. FOREIGN POLICY

We believe that the United States should oppose international communism wherever found; that all measures short of total war should be used to the extent necessary to accomplish this purpose; that it should be made clear to all countries of the world, both our friends and those who are not our friends, that we do not seek war, but that if necessary to protect the free world, we will not shrink therefrom.

We further believe that the United States has no recognizable foreign policy at the present time; that this lack is directly at-

tributable to the present personnel of the State Department; and that Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, and all of his subordinates engaged in the making of policy, should be immediately replaced.

II AGRICULTURE

We feel that the ultimate objectives of a farm program should be:

1. The gradual and sure elimination of all subsidies and their resultant controls.
2. The greater utilization of farm products in industry, thus minimizing the necessity of price supports.
3. A minimum of regimentation, controls, and subsidies.
4. Unceasing economy in the use of public funds.

Be it resolved, That the ranching and cattle-raising industry be totally excluded from any Government program of regulations, controls, or subsidies, be it further

Resolved, That the administration's policy with respect to the Brannan plan, the socialization of the farming industry, and other related matters be condemned as contrary to the democratic principles of our country, and further that said Secretary of Agriculture Brannan be reprimanded and discharged for his wrongful expenditures of public funds to finance the propagation of his idiotic schemes.

III CIVIL RIGHTS

We believe that the Republican Party should continue to strive for and support better legislation to protect the rights of minorities. We believe that the right for equal opportunity to work to vote, to advance in life, and the right to equal protection under the law should never be limited in any way because of race, religion, color, or country of origin.

IV LABOR

We believe that labor-management disputes can be settled by collective bargaining under present law. Further legislative interference with present methods, which are workable, fair, and sufficient to safeguard the general interest of the public, is unwarranted. We again solicit the support of and extend an invitation to members of both labor and management who are in favor of sound Government based upon the philosophy of a republican form of government.

V. ECONOMY AND TAXES

We feel that the astronomical national debt should be systematically reduced; that any future domestic or defense measures should be scrutinized carefully and reduced to the minimum; that the tax program should produce the revenue necessary to create a pay-as-you-go program.

We further feel that the tax revenue should not be used by governmental agencies to compete with private industry and business; that strict economy must be practiced throughout all phases of governmental activity; and that the purchasing power of the dollar will be increased by the foregoing policies.

Federal taxes

We recommend the elimination of excess-profits tax, because of its inequity, its impracticability, and the complete confusion which has resulted from every past attempt to employ it.

State taxes

We recommend that the legislature of the State of Nebraska provide for a general revaluation of real estate for tax purposes not less often than every 10 years.

Hoover Commission Report

We strongly urge that the Congress of the United States adopt the remainder of the

Hoover Commission recommendations for economy and efficiency of the Federal Government, and that this important action be delayed no longer.

VI. INTERNAL SECURITY

We recommend that the Congress of the United States continue to conduct a thorough investigation into Communist activities in this country, and that those traitors among us who adhere to the vicious tenets of this organization be prosecuted under the laws now in effect or to be placed in effect by Congress.

VII. LEADERSHIP

We believe that if the Republican Party is to continue to function and perform its duty as a political party, it must provide leadership in international, national, and local areas.

The Republican Party today has an opportunity to furnish such leadership, now needed as never before. We therefore recommend that the Republican Party of the State of Nebraska, and of the United States, should immediately formulate a constructive program for the meeting of the challenges and dangers of the international crises with which we are now confronted, and for meeting the challenge of the socialistic state which is gradually encroaching upon our individual liberties, and we call upon all thoughtful Americans to aid in the development and propagation of these principles.

VIII COOPERATION WITH THE SENIOR ORGANIZATION

We commend the present State Republican Party leadership for its wise policy of placing young Republicans on the various committees at the recent preprimary convention. We feel that every element in the party should be represented on every committee so that many viewpoints may be brought into play in deciding matters of party policy.

We reaffirm our willingness to cooperate and assist the senior organization in any possible way in its efforts to achieve party harmony and political victory.

We suggest that it would be to the best interests of the entire organization if the senior organization would carry on with the plan suggested over 2 years ago, to hire a paid organizer for the purpose of strengthening the county organizations.

IX OPEN INVITATION

In conclusion, we, the Young Republicans of Nebraska, reiterate our invitation of 2 years ago to all young men and women of good will and high principles to join our ranks.

We invite the students of our universities who want a solvent nation in the years to come, who want a nation affording abundant and unrestricted opportunity—unaided by a paternalistic form of government.

We invite the young farmer who with his tax dollars supports subsidized market prices. We invite young businessmen who are tired of competing with the Government, hemmed in by unnecessary controls and taxed dry of legitimate profits. We invite all young laboring men who are denied the right to negotiate for work on their own behalf, and who believe that their right to work is as inalienable as their right to strike. We invite the average taxpayer who is paying the highest tax revenue in the history of the Nation, who faces under the present administration a demand for still more, the man who, having carefully balanced his own budget, fails to understand his Government's failure to do so. We invite all intelligent Democrats who are still puzzled by their party leadership, its promises and its failures. To all of you we say—join the party of the future. Join the Republican Party.

Communist Treachery**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter addressed to me by the American Hungarian Federation, and also a letter addressed to the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Acheson, by the American Hungarian Federation.

These letters typify the rule of the Kremlin behind the iron curtain and explain the gangster methods used by the Soviets. All Americans should keep uppermost in their minds the treacherous, unscrupulous actions of these Soviet officials, as to deal with them is like dealing with a confirmed gangster without any morals or conscience.

The Korean cease-fire order for a peaceful settlement of the conflict is to be carefully watched and studied before submitting to any agreements.

AMERICAN HUNGARIAN FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., June 15, 1951

The Honorable JOHN LESINSKI, JR.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LESINSKI: The American Hungarian Federation, the central representative agency of American citizens of Hungarian origin addressed the enclosed letter to the Honorable Dean Acheson, Secretary of State.

This federation also submitted to the Office of Eastern European Affairs of the Department of State, carefully checked evidences substantiating the facts contained in our basic appeal. We requested the expression of our Government's firm objection against the atrocities to which the inhabitants of Hungary are presently subjected by the Soviet-ruled Communist Hungarian Government.

Irrespective of age, religion, family status or any other human consideration, the people of Hungary are condemned to mass internment, execution, kidnaping, and slavery. Names and addresses contained in our proof of evidences cannot be released because of retaliation and retribution directed against the victims of the Communist overlords.

We trust that the knowledge of this purposeful and planned genocide, which affects the lives of thousands of defenseless human beings, will bring about the just indignation of our legislators, church leaders, civic and patriotic representatives. The mass internment, wholesale arrests, execution of innocent human beings, and the transfer of thousands of Hungarians to Russian slave labor camps are outright violations of the Peace Treaty of 1946 concluded between the United States and Hungary. The Hungarian Government agreed in that peace treaty to safeguard the elementary human rights of the inhabitants of Hungary and guaranteed the physical well-being of every Hungarian.

In the name and in behalf of the hundreds of thousands of American citizens, we appeal to you to register openly your objection against the ruthlessness of the Communist dictatorship which created a horrible prison out of victimized Hungary. We, free citizens of these United States, cannot and must not condone any longer conditions under which untold thousands are doomed to everlasting fear and slavery.

The board of directors and the officers of this federation express their gratitude for your favorable action in this matter in advance.

Respectfully yours,

STEPHEN E. BALOGH,
Executive Secretary.

AMERICAN HUNGARIAN FEDERATION,

Washington, D. C., June 14, 1951.

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,

Secretary of State, Department
of State, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The above-named organization represents the overwhelming majority of the loyal American citizens of Hungarian extraction. Churches of the three major faiths; fraternal, civic, patriotic, institutions, and about half a million individual members of various citizen groups located throughout the United States appeal to you in this message through their federation.

The members of this federation join the board of directors in requesting your immediate sympathetic action by protesting against the forced dislocation of thousands of Hungarian citizens from Budapest and other larger Hungarian cities with the ultimate purpose of transporting the able-bodied to Russia for slave labor.

Simultaneously, we are submitting to the Office of Eastern European Affairs of your Department carefully checked evidences substantiating the facts that—

1. The Soviet-ruled Hungarian Government removed by force entire families from Budapest and from other Hungarian cities and interned them in designated rural concentration camps named and identified by authentic letters addressed to friends and relatives living in the United States.

2. Separated minor children from parents. The children to be exchanged for summer-camp training and the parents to serve in labor camps. Similar system during the Greek revolution resulted in mass kidnaping of children to Russia where they vanished forever;

3. Pregnant mothers, pensioned, sick, and aged persons of both sexes are similarly ordered to concentration camps and deprived of proper physical care. In consequence of this forced displacement, thousands of helpless persons become the victim of a planned, cruel genocide.

The substantiated and proven mass torture of the Soviet-ruled Hungarian Government is an outright violation of the peace treaty of 1946 concluded between the United States and Hungary.

It is respectfully urged that the Department of State express its firm objection and disapproval of these inhuman practices and bring these atrocities to the attention of the United Nations Assembly for the purpose of preventing further murderous attempts upon the inhabitants of Russian-enslaved Hungary.

Respectfully yours,

STEPHEN E. BALOGH,
Executive Secretary.

The Dire Need for Effective Controls**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1951

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, realizing the short-sighted policy of the industrialists of the United States in this great emergency, the great president of the General Electric Co., Mr. Charles E. Wilson, having the interest of the country at

heart and being heart and soul in favor of all-out preparedness, thus demonstrating to Russia that we will not tolerate any more of her aggressive actions, resigned his position last December at the call of our President and is now aiding the Nation in every way possible as Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

Mr. Wilson, an American who dearly loves his country, is acutely aware of the great danger involved in the ever-increasing rise in prices and the imminent specter of inflation that now faces us. He strongly advocates effective controls which are necessary to save the Government as well as the American people billions upon billions while at the same time preserving our free enterprise economy.

Upon invitation, Mr. Wilson addressed a meeting of about 200 members of the House Thursday morning which I arranged, in which he reiterated his oft-repeated plea for the continuance and strengthening of controls. He expressed grave fears over the present trend toward weakening and emasculating the control program.

In order to fully acquaint every Member of this House with the hard-hitting facts left with the Members at this meeting by Mr. Wilson, I have requested permission to insert a summary of his remarks in the RECORD. They follow:

MORE EFFECTIVE CONTROLS TO AVOID INFLATION

Mr. WILSON. Ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, needless to say, I am deeply concerned over the trend toward weakening the controls provisions of the Defense Production Act. I appreciate this opportunity of appearing before you to discuss the dangerous situation we are confronted with if adequate controls are not provided.

My good friend, Mr. Carey, and other labor leaders have condemned me from one end of the country to the other as a representative of big business. I plead guilty to the charge, but I assure you, too, that I am proud of the fact that I have been connected with big business. I do not claim to be a politician or a bureaucrat, however. When the President declared the existence of a national emergency last December and called upon me to leave the comparative peace and quiet of private life, I readily responded to his command.

I have always been a firm believer in the doctrine of free enterprise, and that means that I am opposed to a controlled economy. The principles of a free economy were designed for times of peace. In wartime it has always been necessary to resort to governmental control. That is why I am before you today favoring and urging a strong Defense Production Act.

Last year Congress provided a strong Defense Production Act. A Nation-wide organization was set up to stabilize prices and wages. This organization, known as the Economic Stabilization Agency, is functioning effectively. You are now considering the extension of the law which expired June 30 and is now operating under a temporary 30-day extension. Unfortunately Congress has added amendments which will seriously cripple economic stabilization, which could mean substantial price boosts during the coming year. It might add from 12 to 14 billion dollars to the already high cost of living. The stage could readily be set for the disaster of runaway inflation.

Many families in America have already learned the difference between happiness

and misery, with their limited budgets and the constantly growing demands upon them. Surely this is appreciated by the millions who are living on fixed incomes such as pensions and insurance annuities, as well as by those whose wages and salaries have not kept pace with rising costs.

The charge has often been made in the debate on this bill in Congress, that the Government waited too long to use the powers granted under the act passed last year. My answer to these charges is this: That after the act was passed last year, the panic buying tapered off with our victories in Korea. When the Communists of China entered the war in November the scare buying resumed. It was not until then that the real need for controls was fully realized. This was followed by the declaration of an emergency by the President and the following month prices were frozen.

It is absurd to use the argument of delay as an excuse that stronger controls should not be voted now, or that present controls should be weakened. We are now concerned with the future—not with what we did or did not do in the past.

Our bitter experience since the Second World War has shown that we cannot relax in the struggle with Soviet Russia. If we are to "lick" the threat of communism, we must employ every weapon at our command.

Gentlemen, I am more worried than ever before in my life about America's safety—and in that life I have witnessed two world wars with all their tragedies, destruction, frustrations, and failures to provide real peace. I cannot believe that Soviet Russia, in coming out for a truce in Korea, has altered its long-term plans. To me it is but another maneuver in a continuing series of actions designed to weaken the free world. Let us consider these facts when we are inclined to lean back and relax as a result of a possible Korean truce. The battle against communism must be a relentless one, and I want to stress again that we must strengthen ourselves more than ever in history if we are to survive.

The American people are not quitters. I feel certain they understand the grave dangers that confront our country. They won't quit on a program designed to promote our military might, they are willing, as they have demonstrated on occasions in the past, to sacrifice for our security. They will wholeheartedly accept the controls they know are so necessary to insure the safety of the Nation.

I feel confident the Congress will not follow the dangerous course of weakening our efforts on the home front by amending the present bill into ineffectiveness. I strongly urge a more effective system of controls in order to ward off the dangerous trend toward inflation with which we are faced. This is your problem. I trust it will be dealt with wisely and well, and that you will give to our President and the American people legislation which will ensure the fulfillment of our goal to contain and thwart the spread of communism and insure thereby the preservation of the America we all love.

A Welcome Home to Miss Truman, a Fine American Girl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, 6 weeks ago, Miss Margaret Truman, of

Washington, D. C., embarked on a visit to Europe. In her trip abroad, Miss Truman visited Great Britain, France, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxemburg, and Italy. What the peoples of these countries she visited, saw, heard, and spoke with, was an attractive, kindly, gracious and charming American girl—friendly, willing, and interested in the problems of Europe and its people.

Surely, the young women in America today can be proud of the visit of the daughter of our President. Her conduct abroad was that of a young girl who was interested and wanted to see, firsthand, the conditions that existed in Europe.

As the daughter of the President of the United States, Miss Truman's trip was followed with close attention by the American reading public. Her presentation in Europe was that of a warm and friendly person. She was, first, a credit to her mother and father, and displayed those attributes and characteristics that come from a happy, loving, and devoted American family. The United States is proud of Margaret Truman. Her tact, poise, and engaging personality are indeed an excellent reflection on American womanhood.

The Judge and His God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to read the speech delivered by Federal Judge Harold R. Medina at the annual dinner of the Church Club of New York. Judge Medina has set forth in a simple and humble way the larger aspects of Government service. He shows to all of us in all branches of Government, legislative and executive, as well as the judiciary, what great good can come from our service if we seek the aid of our God.

The speech follows:

THE JUDGE AND HIS GOD

(Speech delivered by Federal Judge Medina at the annual dinner of the Church Club of New York, February 5, 1951)

While there is much in the Bible about judges, I do not recall any occasion on which a judge has been called upon to discuss the impact of religion upon the performance of the judicial function. Perhaps this is because this is an intimate matter, thoughts about which one is likely to keep to oneself. In any event, I have chosen as my subject here tonight, *The Judge and His God*. If the subject has not been discussed before, it is high time that someone did so, for I rather suspect that my own experiences, which I am about to relate to you, are typical of those of most American judges, and doubtless of others, too.

As you will see, my address is divided into two parts. The first has to do with the subject of humility, and the second with the subject of prayer.

I suppose I am a more or less typical American. From boyhood I have had an implicit and unquestioning faith, which I

got when I attended the classes in the Episcopal Church at Ossining, N. Y., in preparation for my confirmation when I was a boy at preparatory school. Like most other people I know, I wanted to be a better Christian; but, as I look back over the years, I find that I did comparatively little to put this wishful thinking into effect. As a law student and as a lawyer I fought hard for what I thought was right, and I had a deep and almost passionate interest in the rules of law and the history of their development. They were the tools of my trade, and I worked hard with them.

It was not long after I became a judge that I began to feel a new sense of responsibility. It is something very difficult to explain. It was not simply that I wanted to be right and that I took my duties seriously. There came a feeling that everything I did, even the decision of nice questions of interpretation of mere rules of procedure, was in some way becoming a part of a huge fabric which, on the whole, was part and parcel of the moral law governing mankind and which must of necessity be of divine origin.

As I passed upon the credibility of witnesses, and as I wrote my opinions and formulated my judgments, I gradually came to realize that I was weaving my small part of this huge fabric, and I knew that I would not perform my task aright unless I was constantly mindful of the fact that all these matters, large and small, would be mere futility unless I tried to make each one fit into its proper place in the moral law which governed all.

Right here is the part that is difficult to explain. I was still reasoning as a lawyer. The fundamental principles of law were the same. I was still manipulating the techniques of my profession as before. But there was some subtle force, the impact of which was new to me, which was spiritual in quality. It was as though someone were always watching me and telling me to make very sure that my rulings and my decisions were fundamentally right and just.

You know we judges are the servants of the people, as are all government officials in our particular type of democracy. But I think it will not be difficult for you to see, from the things I have been telling you about, that it didn't take me very long to perceive that we judges are the servants of someone else, too. And I often think of that part of the twenty-second chapter of the Gospel according to St. Luke, which follows immediately after those verses which are so important a part of our Communion service. I refer to the following:

"And there was also a strife among them, which of them should be accounted the greatest."

"And He said unto them, the kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and they that exercise authority upon them are called benefactors."

"But ye shall not be so: but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve."

"For whether is greater, he that sitteth at meat, or he that serveth? is not he that sitteth at meat? but I am among you as he that serveth."

Years ago I often heard Chief Judge Benjamin N. Cardozo, before he became an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States and while he was still chief judge of our New York State Court of Appeals, speak about humility. He was indeed a humble man. One could not fail to observe that. But the full impact of what he had to say about humility was not felt by me until I was myself a judge and found myself struggling with forces too great and too complicated for me to fathom. I saw in a new light the difficulties that beset one in the search for truth and justice.

This was particularly true when I suddenly found myself in the vortex of the trial of

the Communists, in the midst of the play of great forces upon which, for all I know, the destiny of the human race may hang. Later it suddenly dawned upon me that some queer turn in the wheel of fate had singled me out, for the moment, to feel the impact of America's love of justice. And the result was what must be inevitable under the circumstances, that I found myself to be a small, indeed a very small and insignificant, particle in the scheme of things. It has been an extraordinary experience. So much for the first part of what I have to say.

Now as to prayer. Fortunately for me, I was taught to pray from so early a time that I cannot remember going to bed at night without saying my prayers. And only once in all these years have I failed to do so. I remember that occasion very vividly. It was my first night in boarding school, when I was about 14 years old. And in all the excitement of my room at school and my new roommate, and in the general bewilderment, I forgot to say my prayers.

Well, in the course of time I became a judge. I need not tell you that the toughest part of the judge's work is sentencing the people who are convicted or who plead guilty to the various offenses. I had always wondered what I should do if at the time of sentence some prisoner was impudent to me. It seems so clear that in the stress of such an occasion the judge should not mete out a greater punishment from some feeling of personal pique.

One day this happened to me. Most of you probably do not know about it, but the fact is that, with these millions of Government checks that go out through the mail from day to day, many are placed in the mail boxes on the ground floor of walk-up apartment houses and tenements, and they furnish constant temptation to people in distress or people of naturally predatory instincts. Most of the time they get caught, and, as it is a Federal offense, they come before the judges of my court.

On this particular occasion a woman who, it was plainly to be seen, would soon become a mother, came before me, and I struggled away with the probation report and with questions and so on, to see what I should do. She suddenly burst out and gave me a tongue lashing that was a work of art. After reflecting for a moment or two, I made up my mind that it would not be right to sentence her that day, and so, over her resounding protests, I put the matter off for a week.

The following Sunday I was sitting in my pew at St. James Church when the rector, at a certain point in the services, said that he would pause for a moment or two so that every member of the congregation could make a silent prayer in connection with whatever matter was troubling him. I do not remember that having been done before, but I suppose it has. Anyway, I prayed for that woman just as hard and as fervently as I knew how; and a day or two later she was back there in court standing before me. I told her all about what I had been going through. I told her that I had prayed for her in church, just as I have been telling you. I shall not make a long story of it. But the outcome was that I gave her a suspended sentence, and I do not think there is very much chance that she will be in my court or any other court again.

I do not see why a judge should be ashamed to say that he prays for divine guidance and for strength to do his duty. Indeed, there came a time, not so long after the incident I have just described, when I did the most sincere and most fervent praying that I ever did in my life.

As I mentioned in passing, at the beginning of this address, I suddenly found myself in the midst of that trial of the Communists. It took me a long time to realize what they were trying to do to me. But

as I got weaker and weaker, and found the burden difficult to bear, I sought strength from the one source that never fails.

Let me be specific. There came a time when, doubtless due to previous planning, one of the defendants was on the stand and he refused to answer a question, pleading a supposed constitutional privilege which obviously had no application. I gave him time to consult with his counsel about it; I held the matter in abeyance overnight to make sure that I was making no misapplication of the law; and then the next day, Friday, June 3, of the year 1949, I sentenced him to prison for 30 days, unless he should sooner purge himself of contempt by answering the question.

Pandemonium broke loose. The other 10 defendants and their lawyers, and many of the spectators, rose to their feet; there was a great shouting and hullabaloo, and several of the defendants started toward the bench. In all that excitement, I felt just as calm as I do now when I speak to you. I did not raise my voice over the tone which you hear me use now; and I singled out several of those men, identified the language they were using, got it on the record, and sentenced each of them to imprisonment for the balance of the trial.

And I tell you, as I stand here, that my ungilded will alone and such self-control as I possess were unequal to this test. If ever a man felt the presence of someone beside him, strengthening his will and giving him aid and comfort, it was I on that day. And so it was later and toward the end of August, when I finally left the courtroom one day and went to lie down, thinking that perhaps I should never go back. But, after 10 or 15 minutes, I was refreshed and I did go back; and I gained in strength from that moment on to the end.

Perhaps someone will think it wrong for me to tell you these things. But I could not come to this gathering prepared to discuss the ordinary platitudes, or to hold forth on philosophy or international affairs, about which I know nothing. It seemed better, particularly in these trying, difficult times, when each of us is worried, and each of us is troubled over this great country of ours that we love so well, to sound a note of comfort.

After all is said and done, it is not we who pull the strings. We are not the masters, but the servants of our Master's will; and it is well that we should know it to be so.

remedy—a currency redeemable in gold on demand.

The editorial follows:

A RETURN TO GOLD COIN

A correspondent takes this newspaper to task for not having laid greater emphasis on the importance of this country's return to a currency convertible into gold coin. He argues that a restored right of the citizen to own gold coin would enable him, acting individually to protect himself against the worst consequences of a depreciating paper currency and so initiate a popular movement to stop governmental extravagance.

His argument is sound. An inconvertible paper currency is the ideal monetary instrument for a government that promises and attempts to do all things for all men and hang the expense. A people whose government sees a necessity to plunge into an enormously costly rearmament but no need to curtail its nonemergency spending is badly in need of just the curb on its rulers that a gold-convertible currency would provide.

But a return to gold coin in circulation requires congressional action. Now Congress could, if it would, use other means to avert the further depreciation of the dollar, means available to it in its almost routine work of making appropriations. So far, it shows no real will to use these ready-to-hand means of shoring up the exchange value of the dollar, despite the repeated warnings of House and Senate minorities against fiscal recklessness.

It looks very much as though a majority of the lawmakers either favored all-out Government spending or were afraid for political reasons to oppose it. A Congress unwilling to begin to practice fiscal prudence is not likely to put in the hands of the people as sharp a tool for compelling such action as gold-convertible currency. For that matter, the people appear to be unwilling to have that power thrust upon them.

We believe that some day the country will return to gold convertibility as a culmination of the continuing but now quiescent contest for sound money. Before that happen Congress and more particularly the voters at home will have to gain a fuller understanding of what a rotting currency has done and will do to them.

Shortage of Adequate Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the current issue of the weekly publication the New Republic carries a very interesting article on housing. It analyzes the lack of adequate housing which still exists in our country. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HOUSING: A VANISHING VISION

(By Harry Conn)

The 1950 census reveals what has been painfully evident to many an American family—for the second straight decade this country has failed to build sufficient homes to keep pace with the growth of new families.

Meanwhile, in Columbus, Ohio, Builder Walter J. Shapter has announced that he is

The Price-Control Struggle Is a Diversionary Battle: Gold-Redeemable Money Is the Genuine Remedy for Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the sound and fury of the price-control debate is a mockery of the real issue.

We now have a rubber dollar, and no price-control measure can stabilize or preserve buying power for irredeemable money indefinitely.

Congress might equally well pass a statute decreeing that water will henceforth flow uphill so long as our currency is primarily fiat money.

A recent editorial in the Wall Street Journal calls attention to the genuine

cutting his schedule of three new-house starts a week to one and has given up plans for a new 150-home project.

John Hennessy, head of San Francisco's East Bay Builders' Association, has revealed that five San Francisco Bay housing projects, totaling more than 2,000 homes, are being abandoned.

In five counties outside Philadelphia, where 22,000 dwellings went up in 1950, 12,000 are planned this year.

In city after city the story is the same. Construction of new homes for America's families is dropping to a new low. The vision displayed in the inspiring goal held out by the Housing Act of 1949—"A decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family"—seems dismally out of touch with reality today.

"The consensus of those who have studied the housing situation closely," the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency reported in 1949, "is that between 1,250,000 and 1,500,000 sound, acceptable dwellings need to be provided by new constructions, conversions, and rehabilitation each year for at least a decade to meet the current housing shortage and to begin making real progress in raising the housing standards in America."

Last year, with a record 1,400,000 units constructed, hopes rang high that America was on her way toward meeting the housing needs of the one-third of the Nation which the 1950 census clearly showed is still ill-housed.

In 1950, the Census Bureau reports, the United States had 39,400,000 nonfarm homes, including tar-paper shacks, trailers, skyscraper apartments, summer cottages, and even caves. This represented an increase of 9,700,000 units in the last 10 years, a record which the National Association of Real Estate Boards points to with particular pride. But the NAREB fails to mention, and most people are not aware, that between 2,500,000 and 3,000,000 of these added dwellings are reconstructions from larger units. Rent controls and building restrictions encouraged landlords to subdivide more houses during the 1940's than in any other period in our history.

The NAREB concludes that there has been no severe housing shortage because the census reports that there were 2,700,000 vacancies last year. The real estate men fail to add that only 689,000 of these are habitable and are nonseasonable.

For a Nation that prides itself on being one of the best housed in the world, the actual picture presented by the 35,000,000 nonfarm dwellings now occupied is rather sordid. Almost one-third of these units, 11,700,000, are classified by the census as dilapidated, lacking private indoor or flush toilets or baths, and are without hot and cold running water. The actual number of nonfarm homes with plumbing facilities increased by nearly 10,000,000 during the last 10 years, but the improvement came almost entirely in new constructions. The actual number of nonfarm homes lacking these facilities remains about the same as in 1940.

As discouraging as is the general housing picture, the conditions among nonwhites, who live mostly in segregated areas, are even more atrocious. A total of 27 percent of these people live in dilapidated dwellings; 40 percent have no bathing facilities, 50 percent have no hot or cold running water; 18 percent are overcrowded.

In spite of these facts, the NAREB still interprets the census findings as an answer to those who decry the housing shortage. "The 1950 census figures," the association proudly begins a press release, "reveals that Americans presently enjoy more and better housing than they did 10 years ago, with a wide range of vacancies from which to choose. * * *

Last year the real estate interests and builders enjoyed their greatest year of prosperity. The net profits of 15 major building-material companies in 1950 jumped 42 percent above 1949 levels. Between 1945 and

1951, building materials had skyrocketed 93 percent while wholesale commodity prices were going up 73 percent. The mortgage bankers were floating along nicely, getting 4 to 5 percent interest on loans, many of which the Government completely guaranteed. If all this meant homes, good homes at low cost, it would have been worth it. However, \$13,000 homes in the Chicago area jumped to \$15,500 between 1949 and 1950, with similar increases throughout the United States. For the 73 percent of America's families with an annual income of \$4,000 or less, it meant little or no housing.

The quality of many of the homes that were constructed left much to be desired. The dean of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology School of Architecture referred to many of them as "all skimp and omit." The magazine Architectural Forum warned that "FHA housing standards are already substandard," and expressed deep concern over the practice of builder and FHA collaboration to hold plans to the minimum.

High quantity and low quality of home production seems to be giving way to low quantity and low quality in 1951. Official plans call for between 800,000 and 850,000 new houses this year, a drop of some 40 percent. This spring, private builders are averaging less than 90,000 monthly starts compared with 120,000 in 1950. There are two reasons for this alarming decrease: (a) Regulation X and (b) the mortgage bankers' strike.

Regulation X was issued last October by the Federal Reserve Board and Housing Administrator Raymond Foley under authority of the Defense Production Act. It is designed to curb inflation by calling for a down payment on new homes ranging from 10 percent for a house costing \$5,000 or less to 50 percent for a house costing \$25,000 or more. What it has succeeded in doing is eliminating most of the low- and middle-income groups from the purchase of new houses.

The provisions of regulation X are not completely rigid. They can be relaxed in critical defense areas, military or industrial. The startling story, however, is that of more than 300 communities which have applied for a critical defense designation some 200 have withdrawn their applications while only 14 were approved by June 15, 1951. The joker is that Government procurement authorities are under instructions to avoid placing new contracts in these areas, and the regulation covers only specific permits. Therefore, these contracts are becoming choice political plums, and many a Congressman is playing the game all the way.

The second clause of the decrease in home building in 1951 is the mortgage bankers' strike. Just as wars today are often undeclared, so is this strike. But, to any home builder or contractor the strike is just as real as is war in Korea to an infantryman. The issue is money. The mortgage bankers want a higher interest rate on Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration loans. On June 28, 1951, the Wall Street Journal reported the effect of the strike:

"Though the FHA hasn't given out the figures yet, the agency's loan insurance applications this month have dropped one-third from early May—and at a time of year when they're normally on the increase.

"Another Government agency, the Veterans' Administration, guarantees housing loans to veterans at only 4 percent. Its appraisal requests, signifying a builder's intention to build, are running at only about one-fourth of the year-ago pace."

The Journal reports a number of examples of the consequences of the strike. The experience of M. M. Robinson, president of Detroit's General Houses, Inc., is typical. Until March of this year he had planned on putting up about half as many homes as he built last year. Now, with the lack of

mortgage funds, he will have to scale down to one-third of the 1950 total.

In 1948 the mortgage bankers tried a similar strike when they boycotted VA loans but soon gave it up. In 1950, Congress authorized the VA to issue direct loans in any areas where veterans could not obtain loans at VA rates. A total of \$150,000,000 was provided for this purpose, and all but a small proportion used. Recently Congress continued this program, setting it up under a revolving fund. Apparently, many veterans are completely unaware of this benefit, however, and unquestionably many, after being turned down by their bankers, gave up the idea of building a house.

Just how long the mortgage bankers can continue or whether the Government will accede to their demands for a one-half percent increase in interest rates is a subject of considerable speculation. Robert M. Morgan, vice president in charge of real estate for the Boston Five Cents Savings Bank, recently told the Wall Street Journal that he believes the insurance companies, which he considers the backbone of the national mortgage market, will stay out of the market until the end of this year. Other bankers expect mortgage money to be tight the rest of this year.

How much interest rates figure in the total cost of a home is illustrated in an excellent booklet issued by the United Automobile Workers-CIO, entitled "Build Homes by Mass Production." Basing its estimates on distribution prices from 1940 to 1944, the UAW breaks down the costs of an average \$10,000 home as follows:

Materials	\$4, 570
Labor cost on the site	2, 950
Land costs	1, 250
Profits	1, 250
Interest charges (5 percent)	4, 500

The UAW booklet further points out that if the interest rates are four percent, the total interest charges are reduced to \$3,600, still a considerable sum.

Military housing is one of the very blackest sides of our dismal housing picture. The case of Sgt. Richard Price, of Fort Leonard Wood, Mo., is closer to the norm than many Congressmen would care to admit. Sergeant Price tramped the streets for 2 months before he was "fortunate" enough to find a two-room tourist cabin for his wife and two children. Out of his monthly pay of \$225, he pays \$100 for rent.

Former Secretary for Air W. Stuart Symington told a congressional committee in 1949 that poor housing is seriously impairing our military strength. He estimated that among trained technical experts, only 7 percent reenlisted from posts where there was poor housing and about 75 percent signed for another hitch when they had found good accommodations for their families. It cost \$27,000 to train a jet pilot, Symington observed, and poor housing can lose him to the service.

Air Force regulations entitle 18 percent of the top-rated personnel to quarters for their families. In 1949, 69,110 men fell into this classification, but only 17,934 housing units were available for them. Of these, only 6,397 were considered adequate. With the expansion of our Armed Forces the situation has worsened considerably. Throughout the services today, we are at least 250,000 family dwellings short.

The determination to keep Government out of the business of constructing houses, even for the Armed Forces, is largely responsible for this. The Wherry bill, introduced by the Senate minority leader, was passed in 1949 as an answer to this critical problem. It proposed giving builders 100-percent mortgage insurance for homes built around military bases. And Senator Wherry promised that this program would produce 100,000 new units a year. Now, after 2 years, as of March 1951, only 22,659 units have been

processed through FHA. The builders have been reluctant to meet all the requirements of doing business with the Government even with all the lush advantages offered.

Several months ago the mayor of a major defense center wired a congressional committee about the scarcity of defense housing: "Manpower requires houses. No houses—no manpower—no airplanes."

Briefly, concisely, this is the most complete analysis of a major obstacle to American mobilization. In Marietta, Ga., for example, 30,000 additional aircraft workers will be needed in the next 2 years, but on June 28 only three vacant houses were listed. The situation in Marietta could not be much worse. Rent controls were voted out of existence more than a year ago, and some workers are commuting from Atlanta, 40 miles away, and others from as far as 70 miles away. It is a flat impossibility for the aircraft industry to expand under such conditions. The story is the same in Tulsa, Wichita, Fort Worth, Los Angeles, and other aircraft centers.

On April 9, the Senate took the problem into its own hands and passed the defense housing bill. Minnesota's Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY protested that "this is a matter of getting into the Public Treasury, not with a teaspoon but with a scoop shovel. It is an effort on the part of certain persons . . . who have worried about the New Deal and the Fair Deal to give one of the rawest deals to the American taxpayer." The bill provides \$1,500,000,000 to underwrite private construction of rental housing in defense areas and appropriates \$60,000,000 for loans and grants for community facilities and services, but only after private, State, and local government units prove inability to meet the need. If any housing is constructed under this bill, rents are expected to be upward of \$100 a month, beyond the pocketbook of even a defense worker.

No sound, systematic program to meet the critical need for military, defense, and general housing through careful use of available materials and manpower is being seriously entertained by the present Congress. Federal guaranteeing of mortgages issued by private builders seems to be the pattern. And yet, mortgage bankers are demanding high interest rates, and builders want more bonanzas than they are presently receiving.

The best hope for decent, low-cost housing for many Americans is in public housing. What private enterprise either cannot or will not undertake the Government should. Since 1937, with the passage of the United States Housing Act, the Federal Government has been providing for permanent low-rent public housing through projects initiated, owned, and operated by local public agencies established in local communities pursuant to enabling laws enacted by the States.

After World War II the need for more such projects was evident. Even Senator TART, the conservative anchor in the upper Chamber, became convinced that public housing was essential and was a sponsor of the Taft-Elliender-Wagner public housing bill which 4 years later developed into the Housing Act of 1949.

This act was not all the public housing advocates could ask, but it did provide for the construction of 810,000 new homes over a 6-year period. It empowered the President to increase the total to 200,000 in any one year in an emergency. A total of 135,000 units were authorized for each of the first 2 years. A check with the Public Housing Administration reveals as of June 8, 1951, close to 2 years after enactment, only 1,480 of these have been completed and occupied under Public Law 170, and close to 1,100 of them are hold-overs from the 1937 act. Approximately 55,000 more units were approved just before the end of the fiscal year on June 30, but how many of those will actually be constructed is yet to be determined.

To those who look upon public housing as a solid answer to a fundamental need these figures will be a shock. Beneath them lies a story of powerful selfish-interest groups, of public-interest groups that are not effective, and of Government housing agencies that are complacent in the face of the growing power of the real-estate lobby. These stories will be developed in subsequent articles in this series.

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, there have been rumors that Joe Stalin's health is very bad. We heard stories years ago that he was so sick that a double was taking his place in public. Anybody want to bet that he does not live to be 100?

Deplores Increase of United States Traitors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to insert the following letter addressed to the editor of the Cleveland News by my good friend, Mr. J. Webb Saffold, of Cleveland, Ohio:

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEWS:

SR: The most shocking fact about American life in the last decade seems to pass almost unnoticed by our people. During the first 150 years of the life of our Nation you could count the traitors to the United States on the fingers of one hand. But in the last decade there has appeared a new phenomenon in our America, undreamed of by the founding fathers. It is the mass production of traitors, treasonists, and well-trained political saboteurs whose only object is to destroy the initiative of the individual American, which is the motive of our free enterprise system, and make our people economic juveniles wholly dependent upon an all-powerful central government. Thus they would destroy our American way of life and reduce the United States from the great Nation which was the hope of the world to just another Soviet satellite.

These political and economic saboteurs are disguised as "Democrats," "planned economists," and phony "liberals." They never call themselves by their right name, "Socialists," but some of them refuse, under oath, to admit they are Communists for fear of incriminating themselves.

So insidious and seductive has been the everything-for-everybody-for-nothing propaganda of these Socialists that it has lulled the people into that very stupor of indifference, confusion, and frustration which the murderers of our way of life need to complete

the job they are doing on our America. And, now that the conspirators feel sure that they have the whole thing in the bag, they no longer care if the people find them out because these Socialists think it is too late for our people to stop them as these hangmen of our beloved land sit in the seats of power and they intend to stay there. Make no mistake about it, they are running every department of what you imagine is your Federal Government.

The "Snare Deal" administration is applying this Lenin plan strait-jacket to you through false promises, constant propaganda paid for by you, and all too familiar emergency squeezes, as the 12-percent jump in your income tax this year will convince even the most hypnotized stooge supporter of the "Snare Deal" system. You will be high pressured to betray yourself and your country again by voting to keep it in power over you in 1952; in fact, that campaign is already under way. Many thousands of payroll voters are being added to your tax bill weekly to insure victory. This is the "Snare Deal" method of fixing elections.

Over on the other side of the world Stalin drives his underpaid and underfed millions with a phony war scare against the United States, including the 17,000,000 slave laborers who get no wages and even less food. The fear motive is the stock weapon of the Lenin plan and history will record this as the double squeeze play on the American people and their 30-cent-dollar economy.

But if the spirit of Valley Forge is still alive in America, these terribly shrewd and clever Socialists can yet be defeated. They can be, but will they? The answer is up to you.

J. WEBB SAFFOLD.

The Armistice Conference in Kaesong, Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Victors Dictate the Conditions," written by Constantine Brown, published in the Washington Evening Star of July 4, 1951. It deals with the cease-fire conference now being held in Korea.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VICTORS DICTATE THE CONDITIONS—UNITED STATES FOR FIRST TIME IN 175 YEARS GIVES APPEARANCE OF BOWING TO THE WISHES OF AN ENEMY

(By Constantine Brown)

For the first time in 175 years since the Declaration of Independence was signed by the fathers of the Republic, the United States gives the appearance of bowing to the wishes of an enemy.

While our forces in Korea could have won a spectacular victory which would have ended the present conflict, the political leaders have decided to accept terms which the enemy even now is exploiting as an indication of America's defeat.

The United States and the United Nations have ordered the supreme military commander in the Pacific to offer truce negotiations to the enemy at the suggestion of

the Soviet Government. Technically Russia is not an enemy. Factually, it was Moscow which ordered the offensive of its North Korean puppets 53 weeks ago, and it was Moscow also which ordered its Peiping stooges to enter the conflict, when its North Koreans were utterly defeated last November.

Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, following instructions from Washington, offered the Communists a cease-fire. He wanted the discussions to take place at once, and indicated the port of Wonsan as the place for the discussions.

The Communists retorted with counter-proposals. They demanded a 10-day delay, obviously to reinforce their troops, which had suffered severe losses, and also indicated that the delegates should meet, not in North Korea but in a South Korean town, the last foothold they have in that area.

This obviously was intended to bolster their propaganda among hundreds of millions of Asiatics that it is they, the victors, who dictate conditions to the capitalist imperialists. This was to be expected as soon as the name of Gen. Peng Teh-hual appeared as a co-signatory of the message of the Communists in reply to General Ridgway's cable. General Peng, a fanatical Communist, is the same man who negotiated the phony truce when Gen. George C. Marshall ordered Chiang Kai-shek to accept a cease-fire while he was defeating the Communist armies. General Peng is as shrewd as he is unpromising.

If we were to deal with an honorable foe, who shared the ardent desire for peace which the western nations have, little importance would be attached to these preliminary fenceings. Peace is worth many sacrifices, provided it is real and lasting. But we must expect—and even our diplomats agree to that—some very tough conditions from the Moscow-sponsored Communists.

The Peiping radio already is talking about settlement of all Asiatic problems, a settlement in accordance with Moscow's way of thinking. And this would mean the eventual surrender of all Asia to the Kremlin's influence.

Normally, if our Government were free and unfettered in its diplomatic actions, any conditions which are not compatible with our national interests and honor would be bluntly rejected. This is the desire of the Nation as evidenced by the voice of its elected representatives in Congress. Democrats and Republicans alike have served notice to the administration that the desire of the Chinese Communists to enter the United Nations against our will and to take possession of Formosa, in one way or another, would not be approved by our legislators. But they do not have a voice in our diplomatic dealings unless a peace treaty is brought before the Senate.

That body will not have an opportunity to express itself since we are not officially at war with either North Korea or China. Congress has never been asked to declare war on the countries we were fighting, because there was no war in Korea. The administration declared it a "police action" decreed by the United Nations.

The fact that America spent the blood of more than 100,000 of its young men and nearly a billion dollars a week does not apparently give us a greater voice in the forthcoming negotiations than our allies, whose losses have been trivial.

South Korea itself, whose towns and countryside have been utterly devastated and whose population has suffered millions of casualties, probably will have nothing to say whatever.

The political leaders of the administration would, no doubt wish to follow the desires of the Nation. But they feel strongly that we are now one element. Important, it is true, but still only a cog—in the great international machinery.

The executive branch of our Government believes strongly that we must do nothing which may be frowned on by our allies or which will not meet their wholehearted approval. That they want a settlement at any price in Asia is beyond any doubt.

It took some very hard diplomatic work, for instance, to induce Britain to impose official restrictions on the export of strategic materials to China, in spite of the fact that a few of her own sons were fighting and dying in Korea. Although the Chinese Communists in large numbers were fighting United Nations troops, the British Government continued to recognize Mao Tze-tung's Peiping government.

The eagerness with which the United Nations received the phony olive branch from Moscow and the subsequent approval of our cease-fire demand is a clear indication that these same United Nations members who have been so successfully urging us to fight a limited war in Korea, will now insist that we do nothing which might upset the enemy and thus frustrate the political aims of our enemy.

This attitude can be justified, insofar as our allies in Europe are concerned. They do not have, like this country, a common frontier with the Asiatics. In the past the vast expanse of the Pacific provided a degree of safety for us. Today we are uncomfortably close to the Asiatic mainland.

Pay Increases for Government Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include therein a statement made by me today before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with respect to pay increases for Government employees.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN CECIL R. KING BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE WITH RESPECT TO PAY INCREASES FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am pleased to appear before the committee today on behalf of pay increases for postal and other Federal employees.

The testimony before the committee during the past several weeks has established the fact that it would require between a 20 and 25 percent salary increase to bring the Federal employees up to the increased cost of living.

The Federal employees in my district, Los Angeles County, Calif., are consistently feeling the pressure of increased living costs and it is indeed difficult for them to furnish their families with the bare necessities of life. As the members know, it is necessary for many of such employees to seek outside employment in order to properly care for their wives and children.

From the letters I have received from my constituents, I am certain there are numerous hardship cases among our postal employees due to the present inadequate wage scales. Of course, this means that the lower-bracket employees are feeling the pressure the hardest.

There are many bills pending before the committee proposing various increases for

Federal employees, and I hope that the committee in its wisdom will decide on an adequate increase which will enable these employees to meet the necessary obligations and save something for the future. I am anxious to see them treated justly in this respect. I have always supported reasonable and just benefits to the employees of our Federal service.

We all know that the Post Office Department is losing employees to private industry where they secure wages more in line with the increased cost of living. The process of constantly training new employees does not increase the efficiency of the Postal Service.

It is an obligation of this committee and the Congress to approve adequate increases for all Federal employees.

One group of southern California postal employees made a survey recently, and out of 7,195 employees questioned, 804 had left the service. One out of every 4 postal employees have their wives working, and the debts of over 90 percent of the employees are far greater than they were last year. This survey also found that over 1,400 employees separated themselves from the Los Angeles Post Office since July 1, 1950. This is a turnover of approximately 16 percent in the past 10 months.

In spite of the hardships experienced by postal employees I know that they are loyal and place their faith in the Congress which I trust will not let them down.

In my judgment, a substantial pay raise is long overdue for these public employees and I trust the committee will favorably report a pay bill within a week providing increases of at least \$600 annually.

Representative Trimble Discusses Electric Power Problems of the Arkansas Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, on June 26 our greatly respected colleague the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] made a significant speech at Ozark, Ark., in the district which I have the honor to represent. Mr. TRIMBLE was addressing northwest Arkansas leaders in the rural electrification movement. No one could speak with greater authority on the problems of that area, for the gentleman from Arkansas was born in the Ozark country and he knows and loves its people. Among the timely utterances in this important address are those relating to the interrelationship of public power agencies, private utilities, and the rural cooperatives. It is Mr. TRIMBLE's conviction that there is a place in our economy for all, and he clearly defines the basis on which they can serve each other and the public. He refers to the gaps in Federal policy on electric power and he does it with a sympathetic understanding of the point of view of each of the groups. Neither advocates nor opponents of public power will agree fully with what he says but they will recog-

nize in him one who is eminently fair and well-informed. I trust that his suggestions will be carefully weighed by those who are in position to influence decisions on this important question. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, it is good to be with you today in the Arkansas Valley. I come not as a stranger. I come as a neighbor since I live just north of you in Carroll County. My father, when he was a boy, worked in this valley for Jerry Cravens and others. Prairie View, Morrison's Bluff, Coal Hill, Hartman, Ozark, and Clarksville were familiar names to me from his conversations when I was a lad.

I am honored to be your guest. I am proud to be a friend of the REA cooperative movement. If I have contributed in any measure to the program which you represent, I have contributed to the happiness and well-being of the rural people of Arkansas. I favor the rural electrification program. I know about its long struggle for survival in our State.

I have a firm conviction that a strong rural electrification program working with a strong private power program is necessary for our continued growth as a State. However, to permit the private power companies to continue to be the only source of power for our rural electrification co-ops is as contrary to our idea of free, competitive enterprise as it would be to give the REA co-ops a monopoly over the distribution of power. If this reverse situation were true today, you would not find me here speaking in behalf of the co-ops. I would, on the contrary, be lending my voice to help break your monopoly. A monopoly even in your hands would not be good for Arkansas. Only a monopoly of good will serve the State.

The REA co-ops have the right to generate their own power as they need it. They have the right to contract with the private companies. They have the right to contract with Government agencies that have power to sell. They have the right to do these things with the same freedom of choice as the private power companies. These rights must be as complete for the REA co-ops as those granted to any other business.

The Arkansas Valley Cooperative is as American as Plymouth Rock itself; as purely free enterprise as any private power company which does business in this country. The co-op and the private company both operate under the law, they both pay taxes; and they both market electricity.

The private power company is owned by stockholders who invest their money in the organization to make more money. The profit motive is a motive of the finest order. We must protect it and encourage it. If the private power company does not make a reasonable profit, the stockholders who have invested their money in the enterprise lose. As an end result the whole economy suffers by reason of the failure.

The rural-electric cooperative is owned by the people who use the electricity which it furnishes. The organization is built around the service motive. This, too, is a motive of the purest order and must be protected and encouraged. These users of electricity are the sole owners of the co-op. They are in it to receive electric energy furnished by the co-op. The co-op is by the very nature of things locally owned. If the REA co-op cannot get the power to serve its customers at a rate which it can afford, it, too, fails; and the economy of the whole country likewise suffers.

Our forefathers bound themselves together at old Fort Necessity and a hundred other forts in our early history for protection; and, for services to each other in many ways. The rural people of Arkansas have bound themselves together in 18 different organizations in this State for service and protec-

tion in their quest for electricity for their homes and for their farms. This service which they need was denied them for many years by the private-power companies then doing business in Arkansas. The longing of rural people for the conveniences of electricity was denied them because it was not profitable for the private-power companies to serve them. We understand why the private companies hesitated to run their lines through the rural areas of the State. We sympathize with their reasons for not doing so since they are in the business for profit. The congested areas offer far greater opportunity for profit than do the thinly settled areas. There are only two or three users to the mile on present REA lines in many instances. Since our goal is complete area coverage, there may be even less than two or three users to the mile in the rural areas when our goal is reached. One can readily see that this does not lend to success under the profit system of the private-power companies, who are obligated to their stockholders for good stewardship of the money entrusted to them. If the REA co-ops were impelled by the profit motive, they could not exist because of the sparseness of users in the territory which has been assigned them to serve, the expense of reaching them with power lines, and serving them afterward.

The private companies contend they cannot make a profit from selling power to the co-ops at the present rate, for the reason that users of the co-op system are spread over such a wide area with attendant expense of service. The principal private-power company in Arkansas filed a petition with the Arkansas Public Service Commission in October 1948 asking permission to increase the rates to the REA co-ops for the power which it sells the co-ops. The argument was that they could not break even at the prevailing rate. For some reason the petition was not pressed and has not come up for hearing. Could it be that the political weather turned out bad in 1948? I cannot give you the answer. At any rate, this petition hangs over our heads like the sword of Damocles. If this petition is sound in its purpose, then the electric users in the cities and towns of Arkansas who are served by the private-power company are making up the difference in this loss by paying higher rates for the electricity which they use. In other words, the centers of density subsidize the sparse areas. In view of this, it becomes increasingly difficult for us to understand why the private-power companies oppose our right to generate our own electricity; why they fight the building of our steam plant tooth and nail. If we are permitted to generate our own power, more power will be released to the private companies for sale to their customers in the territory which they serve, where there is constant demand for it and where it is more profitable to the companies.

The rural people have a right to organize to secure electric service. They deserve to be protected in that right with the same zeal with which we protect the profit motive of the private-power companies. The one is organized for service; the other is organized for profit. The one serves the rural areas; the other the congested areas. Each brings to the people of Arkansas an essential need without which progress would be impeded as it has been in the past.

One of our problems in Arkansas is to keep our young people on the farms where they belong and where they are needed. To help do this, we must run power lines over the hills, down the valleys, and across the prairies to every farm home in the State. We must furnish these homes with all the power they need at prices which they can afford. This generating plant will help us do that.

One of the most hopeful developments in our rural economy is emerging right here in northwest Arkansas where . . . and I live.

Twenty years ago most of those who tilled our soil were tenants. We lost population because our people moved to other States where opportunities for employment were better. This trend is being reversed. Today most of those who till the soil own their own farms. Others are returning to resume the work which they left a few years ago. I like to think that the REA co-op program has contributed something to this happy condition. I believe it has. Lights, water, radio, refrigeration, washing machines, milking machines, and a hundred other conveniences in house and barn have come to the farm home by reason of the service which we have given to our farmers. They have been encouraged to own land, rear families, and help build a better Arkansas.

We have no quarrel with the private power companies or their right to generate their own power. We do not quarrel with their right to enter into contracts with sister companies or with Government agencies who have power to sell. In fact, we demand these rights for them. We contend, however, that the rural electric co-ops have the same rights. They have the right to generate their own power. They have the same right of contract as the private power companies because each is a free enterprise organization.

Some contend that the REA co-op movement is socialistic. This argument is used by those who do not want to meet the issue on its merits. It is not socialism for people to band themselves together for service and to borrow money with which to operate. Many of our businesses borrow money on which to operate, but that does not make socialists of them. Some say we are socialistic because we borrow money from the Government. Are our railroads, our air lines, our steamship lines, and a lot of other businesses, even some of the private power companies, socialistic when they, too, borrow money from the Government? The charge of socialism has an oppressive weight in these times when so many domestic and international troubles beset us. The opposition knows this and exploits it to the full. The issue is being raised to discourage you in the fight which you are waging for the chance to generate your own power in the Arkansas Valley. If you win this fight, and I hope with all my heart that you do, you will have done more to encourage farm ownership, small industry, and thereby give new life to the coal industry than anything which has happened in this section since the rural electrification program became a reality.

Continuing with this idea of socialism which the opposition to the steam plant and the Southwestern Power Administration like to use, let me quote a very pertinent statement made in an editorial in the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune of March 1, 1947, when the editor said:

"There is no need for public ownership of an enterprise in which rates and prices are regulated by competition. This is socialism; but it is not socialism for a people to control an essential need of which there can be but one source of supply."

A few years ago when social security legislation was pending before the Congress, the same propaganda was hurled as that being used today against you. The country was going socialistic and already was past redemption, so the story went. The insurance companies fought with all their strength to kill the program. They thought they would be ruined for sure by the legislation; they could even see His Satanic Majesty perched on their front steps. When that program was up for extension by the Congress last year after 15 years of operation, the insurance companies supported it wholeheartedly. They had learned that instead of hurting their business, the legislation had made people insurance conscious, and their business as a result was better than before. The same thing occurred in soil conservation and insurance of bank deposits.

There is a great deal of misunderstanding concerning the position of the Southwestern Power Administration and the Department of the Interior in our section. Especially is this true in regard to the steam plant. Section Five of the Flood Control Act of 1944 places the responsibility of marketing all the surplus power from hydroelectric dams which are built by the Department of the Army in hands of the Secretary of the Interior. The Congress has complete control of the program.

For the southwest section of our country, the Secretary of the Interior has delegated this marketing responsibility to the Southwestern Power Administration. The purpose of the Southwestern Power Administration is to carry to the market centers the power generated at all Government hydroelectric projects. The private power companies want to back up to each dam separately and buy all the power produced. One can readily see that this would cut out all competition because reason tells us that no more than one utility company in its right mind is going to the expense of building a power line to each of these hydroelectric projects, even if inclined to do so. The cities which may be near enough do not have the money to build lines out to the dams. The REA co-ops do not have the money to build the lines. This leaves, therefore, the Federal Government the only independent agency which can build the lines and market the power by carrying it to the load centers.

I support the proposition that the dams now producing and those which are to be constructed belong to all the people instead of just a few, and that they should be tied together for economy's sake and for greater bargaining power.

Evidence before our committee in the Congress from the Corps of Engineers indicates that by tying two or more dams together in separate sections of the Southwest, the people benefit by a 15 percent to 21 percent average increase in revenue because of the stabilizing influence which the connections would effect in the power output of the dams. For instance, if one dam happened to be running low because of drought or for any other reason, a dam in another section of the Southwest would be up, thereby balancing out the low level in the other dam to the average extent of 15 to 21 percent. Quite a saving as you can see.

I have supported the tying together of the dams for another reason. If the dams are tied together, there will be a contact for bargaining purposes not with one private utility company only, as they desire, but with 11 separate utility companies who serve in the Southwest. In addition, there will be contacts with countless REA co-ops and municipalities in the area. We will have not only from 15 to 21 percent more electricity to sell, but we will have many more customers bidding in competition for the power generated at the dams. Socialism does not exist and cannot exist where there is competition.

If the Southwestern Power Administration is killed or crippled, there will be only one purchaser of the power generated at each of these dams, and that will be a private power company. The Government is not in the retail power business, and I do not want it in the retail field. I shall oppose that diligently. We do, however, want competition in the wholesale field, especially in marketing the power from the hydroelectric power projects which all of us build with our taxes. The Southwestern Power Administration guarantees us that competition in our section, and it deserves our full support.

It is my considered judgment that the power projects under the Southwestern Power Administration offer great advantages to all the people, including the private power companies and the REA co-ops. I am firmly

convinced that the people of Arkansas want the Federal Government to build these dams and to tie them together with a high voltage line with necessary feeder lines, where those lines do not exist, to take this power to the people at rates that are reasonable and competitive. We believe that such a policy will encourage the private companies and the REA co-ops to continue to grow and prosper. The program of the Federal Government will supplement the power of the private companies and the REA co-ops and aid in the rapid development of our region. We have abundant supplies of cheap fuel in the form of gas, oil, and coal. Private companies and REA co-ops will develop steam generating plants using these cheap fuels. The Government will develop the hydroelectric plants because it is unreasonable to expect the private utility companies or any private agency to build all the dams which will be needed to harness the potential water power in all our rivers. The proper balance and coordination of the hydro and the steam plants will produce the cheapest power and extend its use to every farm home and to the smallest industry.

The Government's program could materially aid private companies and REA co-ops by supplying them capacity for peaking purposes. Private companies and REA co-ops could aid the Government by selling it energy to firm up its capacities in the hydro plants. Teamwork could produce the best results in our region; and teamwork is what we want. Simple justice and fairness to both the private utility companies and the REA co-ops is all that we ask, in order that progress can keep her head high; and ultimately return to the people the money which they have invested in these projects. We must retain them for the use of posterity.

It is said by some that the REA co-ops pay no taxes. Millions of dollars are spent each year by certain organizations working in this country in an effort to convince the public that we are non-tax-paying organizations. Since we are talking about REA co-ops and private power companies today, let us see just what the facts are with reference to these two groups:

First, the REA co-ops and the private power companies pay the same rate of ad valorem taxes. By that, I mean that each is assessed upon the tax books of the counties and each pays the same rate of State, county, municipal, school, and road taxes. In fact, in many of the counties of Arkansas, the REA co-ops are actually the largest taxpayers.

Second, the private power companies are allowed to earn 6 percent profit on their capital investment above expense of operation, depreciation, and taxes; the REA co-ops, however, provide for their operating expenses, which include their tax expenses.

Third, the private power companies, after interest on debts is paid, distribute their 6-percent profit to their stockholders if they desire, the cooperatives, on any surplus which may be created by overpayment by their users of electricity, issue capital credit certificates on the division of the surplus to their users.

Fourth, this distribution of the profit on the part of the private power companies and the surplus on the part of the REA co-ops to their stockholders and users is subject to payment of income tax by both the stockholders of the private companies and the users of the REA co-ops.

In other words, the cooperatives operate under the laws governing partnerships since that is what they are. Private power companies are governed by the laws governing corporations since that is what they are.

To make a long story short, when it comes to the final analysis, there is not a great deal of difference in the pro rata taxes paid by the private companies and the REA co-ops on the profit basis. Each in reality acts as a tax-collecting agency. The taxes paid

by each group are paid by the users of electricity in each system, when all is said and done.

If one-tenth of the effort expended by those who complain that the REA co-ops pay no taxes were devoted to removing the complained-of inequities in their own taxes, if any, they would have my sympathy. Could it be that they are not so much interested in the tax business after all? Could it be that their prime interest is to convey to the general public the impression that REA co-ops pay no taxes in an effort to kill the REA co-ops altogether? Give the people the facts and they will make the right decisions. We are a locally-owned, business-managed, and taxpaying business. We ask no special favors, but we do want to be recognized for what we are—a sound and proud part of the economy of a great State.

Our people in all walks of life are called upon for extra sacrifices at this time because an ally of ours in World War II, who claimed to seek peace, misled us. When the United Nations was organized, we asked for the veto in order to veto war. We thought Russia wanted the veto for the same reason; but to our chagrin and dismay, she has used it many times in the past 5 years to veto peace.

Our basic strength is our spiritual strength. If our reserves of spiritual values are high enough, we will not fail. We must work more, drift less; pray more, talk less; and, as a result, we will love more, hate less. These spiritual reserves must be fortified by our will to win. They must be fortified by economic strength. It behooves us as a people, therefore, to do all we can to maintain these values.

While none of us at home can equal the sacrifice of our lads who fight, there must be equality of sacrifice for industry, labor, and agriculture if it is humanly possible to achieve it. In a complex system such as ours, this is a difficult thing to do. In trying to find what is best for the country, it is necessary that each of us call upon our spiritual reserves and do our utmost to understand all sides of every problem which presses for solution.

As a Member of the Congress, I get constant strength from a quotation from Daniel Webster which is inscribed on a marble plaque above the Speaker's dais in the hall of the House of Representatives where we work. It is a challenge to us all. I commend it to each of you in this troubled hour: I quote:

"Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all of its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

What Price Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, peace or appeasement, that is the question. International law or international anarchy? Korean armistice terms, leaving the basic problem unsolved, make for more rather than less tension in world affairs. Even in Korea, the division of the country into two nations, with the most artificial of boundary lines, means

the perpetuation of this area as a source of future difficulties. The stalemate predicted by Gen. Douglas MacArthur has come true.

An aggressor has pushed the world to the brink of a new world war, and, although his invasion was repelled, his punishment has been limited only to the destruction of war, a risk which he undertook voluntarily. Nothing has been done to punish North Korea. Nothing will be done to punish North Korea. Nothing will be done to punish Red China for her intercession in the conflict contrary to the desires of the United Nations.

They have gotten away with something, and the world is the poorer for their achievement. Other areas of the world are still troubled. Iran, Yugoslavia, Indochina, Burma, Berlin—all these are on the danger list. Meanwhile the Soviet orbit expands. Since the beginning of World War II, the Russian sphere of influence has grown by more than 4,000,000 square miles and some 550,000,000 people.

We have not achieved peace. We have simply contracted for another breather, a new waiting period. Let us not make the mistake of folding our tents or relaxing our vigilance. The enemy is silent. He is not departed.

The Truce Conference in Kaesong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "In Ignorance and Indignity," published in the Wisconsin State Journal on July 11, 1951. It refers to the cease-fire talks now being held in Kaesong, Korea.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

IN IGNORANCE AND INDIGNITY

Americans—and their United Nations allies—don't know what's going on in Kaesong, the city of Korean cease-fire talks, because no American or U. N. correspondent has been permitted anywhere near it.

But the Red world is getting reams of the Communist version * * * and it is a version calculated to put U. N. conferees in the worst possible light, to paint them as the defeated humbling crawling to sue for peace.

Against this version there is no counteraction of truth * * * because the people who could tell it to the world get no chance to see it.

American correspondents have raised a storm of anger at General Ridgway's reneging on his promise to pass a representative group into Kaesong, and their anger is righteous, for it is in the name of the American people who have to pay the bill for what has happened and what may follow.

It is entirely possible that Dean Acheson's State Department has overruled General Ridgway's plan to permit correspondents to observe negotiations to conceal from Ameri-

cans exactly how badly American negotiators have been forced to suffer indignities at the scene—indignities which Communist correspondents, photographers, and newsreel cameramen have been on the scene to record.

Kaesong, picked by the Reds for the conferences, was supposed to have been a neutral city. By mutual agreement, there was to be no display of arms.

Yet when the American officers landed—unarmed, as per agreement—they were surrounded by heavily armed Red Chinese, forced to walk down a lane of armed guards * * * all without a whisper of protest from the Americans.

It makes a nice picture to convince the world that Uncle Sam is beaten, pleading for peace and that everybody had better stick close to Uncle Joe since Uncle Sam can't protect anybody.

The time is too soon, the secrets too dark yet to tell who has won, either the Korean war or the preliminaries, false or real, to its ending.

But it is plain so far that in the propaganda campaign—which Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson keep telling us is an all-important phase of modern warfare—America has been made the sucker.

And it has been made that way through its own fault.

The Communists, of course, set it up that way.

They might certainly have been expected to.

Did Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson realize they would, and yet do nothing about it?

They're doing nothing about it now when they continue to suffer duplicity and let the representatives upon whom the American people depend for information cool their heels in frustration and ignorance miles from the scene of a momentous action.

Congress on Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I insert a part of my remarks in the following editorial entitled "Congress on Trial," which appeared in the New York Times of Saturday, July 7, 1951. The editorial follows:

CONGRESS ON TRIAL

In his second quarterly report to the Nation, Mobilization Chief Charles E. Wilson indicated clearly that he is less concerned about the problem of production than that of run-away prices. "The initial surge of post-Korea inflation," he said, "has been halted—at least temporarily. The crucial question is: How long will the present lull last, and can the line be held when heavy pressures appear?"

Present plans call for a boost in military spending in the next 12 months from the present rate of \$35,000,000,000 a year to approximately \$65,000,000,000. This will mean an enormous increase in spending power. But that spending power will not be offset by a corresponding increase in consumer goods. On the contrary, substantial cut-backs lie ahead for such key items as automobiles and other consumer durable goods. By next summer, according to Mr. Wilson's estimate, the inflation gap will amount to some \$20,000,000,000.

In spite of this ominous picture, reports from Washington indicate that Congress is still thinking in terms of relaxing, rather than strengthening, the present economic controls. It is showing little, if any, evidence that it is prepared to resist the pressure from interested groups for the elimination of the price roll-backs provided for under the original Defense Production Act. Yet, according to Economic Stabilizer Eric Johnston—who presented figures to support his conclusion—this alone could mean a rise of 5 to 7 percent in the cost of living over the next 12 months.

The time has come, it seems to us, to ask when Congress is going to cease merely reflecting the passing emotional moods of the public and begin acting like an adult and intelligent group of legislators. When the Korean war began at the end of June last year this country was in the midst of serious inflation—inflation that had nothing whatsoever to do with the international situation. It stemmed from the Government's overstimulated housing program and from rampant abuse of consumer credit. The administration itself failed, until Korea, to recognize the seriousness of this situation, but what was Congress doing at this juncture? It was busy overhauling the revenue law so as to grant sweeping relief from the prevailing excise taxes, although the Federal Government was even then running a deficit at the rate of \$5,000,000,000 a year.

Once the Korean war was under way the President outlined to Congress his plan for financing a new military effort on a pay-as-you-go basis and asked for certain limited powers in the way of conserving key materials and reducing the threat of further inflation. Now Congress, which had previously been in a deep sleep, suddenly came to life. It came to life, however, only to plunge from slumber into hysteria. Instead of acting on the carefully conceived proposals of the President with the promptness that was so important in the circumstances, it permitted itself to be swept off its feet by the public's mood of the moment, with its emphasis on profiteering and scare buying. For a time it was touch and go as to whether the legislators would succeed in forcing upon the President compulsory controls for which he had not asked, did not want, and, at that time, most certainly did not need. In the end calmer counsel prevailed, and Congress, while still insisting that the administration be vested with powers of over-all direct controls, compromised by placing these on a stand-by basis. But it spent so much time wrangling over the details of this program that it was nearly 2 months before the President obtained the limited powers for which he had asked.

Had the fighting in Korea continued to be a localized war there might never have been any need for invoking the stand-by direct controls. But as we now know, the fighting was not so contained. What completely altered the picture was the entrance of Communist China into the war in late November. That event brought to the United States and to the free nations as a whole a new perception of the dangers in store, not merely in Korea but everywhere, from the leaders of the Kremlin. It introduced new dimensions into our preparedness program, from a military and an economic standpoint, and a new imperative in terms of time.

History will be inclined, we think, to overlook the impetuous behavior of Congress a year ago when it insisted that a police action in Korea warranted the establishment of a sweeping system of direct controls. We doubt that it would regard as lightly the failure by that same body to give the President the powers he regards as imperative for dealing with a problem of the nature and proportions of that we have been facing since last November.

Psalm of the Bureaucrat**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including the following which appeared in the Grace Church Bulletin of Savannah, Ga. It is timely and pertinent:

PSALM OF THE BUREAUCRAT

The Government is my shepherd, I shall not work. It alloweth me to lie down on good jobs; it leadeth me beside still factories. It destroyeth my initiative; it leadeth me in the paths of the parasite for politics' sake. Yea, though I walk through the valley of laziness and deficit spending, I will fear no evil; its doles and vote-getters they will comfort me. It prepareth an economic utopia for me by appropriating the earnings of my grandchildren. It filleth my head with bologna, my inefficiency runneth over. Verily the Government shall care for me all the days of my life and I shall dwell in a fool's paradise forever. Amen.

Hon. Joseph R. McCarthy's Address on General Marshall**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by George Sokolsky, published in the Washington Times-Herald of Sunday, July 1, 1951. It deals with my address on Gen. George C. Marshall.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

Senator JOE MCCARTHY put together a study of Gen. George Marshall from the record made by his friends.

The immediate newspaper reports were based not upon the Senator's 60,000-word speech but on a supposition of what he might have said.

In current journalism, this is called "high lighting" and is generally inaccurate and distorted.

So I waited until I could get a full copy of the speech; read the whole 60,000 words and realized that the Senator had done a decent job of research and analysis.

To make the matter clear, this is a partial bibliography that Senator MCCARTHY used in connection with this speech:

Winston Churchill, *The Hinge of Fate*; Admiral Leahy, *I Was There*; Cordell Hull, *Memoirs of Cordell Hull*, vol. II; Henry L. Stimson, *On Active Service*; James F. Byrnes, *Speaking Frankly*; Sumner Wells, *Seven Decisions That Shaped History*; Edward Stettinius, Jr., *Roosevelt and the Russians*.

Also, Robert Sherwood, *Roosevelt and Hopkins*; Hanson Baldwin, *Great Mistakes of the War*; Gen. H. H. Arnold, *Global Mission*; Gen. Claire Chennault, *Way of a Fighter*;

Gen. Lucius Clay, *Decision in Germany*; Gen. Mark Clark, *Calculated Risk*; Gen. John R. Deane, *Strange Alliance*; Gen. Omar Bradley, *The War America Fought*, Life magazine, April 30, 1951.

Also, Edgar Ansel Mowrer, *The Nightmare of American Foreign Policy*; Jonathan Daniels, *The Man of Independence*; Freda Uteley, *The China Story*; Henry Wallace, *Soviet Asia Mission*; Robert Payne, *Mao Tse-tung—Ruler of Red China*.

This bibliography is important because it shows not a single enemy—personal or political—of General Marshall, unless it be Winston Churchill, with whom Marshall did not see eye-to-eye during phases of the war.

I do not propose here to indicate my own judgment of this speech; I shall do that at another time.

The point of this piece is to suggest that the speech ought to be read; ought to be taken seriously; and should be discussed.

It is apparent throughout that Senator MCCARTHY, while not approving of General Marshall, devotes most of his long speech not to his own views but to quotations from others. He says:

"There are various ways in which to arrive at an estimate of a wartime figure. It is helpful if he will write his own recollections, but that General Marshall has declined to do, giving, as I understand it, the explanation that to do so would injure certain reputations.

"If all public figures accepted that thesis, I may remark in passing, the public would be even less enlightened than it is at present.

"In pursuit of an estimate, one may also gain information from official records. The records of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Anglo-American combined chiefs of staff are not open to my perusal.

"In the end the inquirer will also find in the archives of the enemy, when they become available, evidence regarding the behavior of his own leaders.

"If the archives of the Kremlin are ever open to us, we shall have even deeper insight than we have today concerning the conduct of our current leaders.

"But as matters now stand, I have been forced to rely upon the memoirs and upon some other contemporary sources.

"I repeat that all these are friendly sources, and cannot be charged with attempts to injure General Marshall."

From that point on, Mr. MCCARTHY devotes himself to showing how General Marshall placed himself in posture to run the American participation in World War II, largely by quarreling with Winston Churchill over where the second front was to be and how it was to be managed.

It was Churchill versus Stalin, with Marshall on Stalin's side. Out of this particular decision, which Marshall finally won, Stalin gained mastery of Eastern Europe.

MCCARTHY then goes on to discuss Yalta, raising the issue for the 1952 campaign.

"It was Marshall who stood at Roosevelt's elbow at Yalta, urging the grim necessity of bribing Stalin to get into the war.

"It was Marshall who submitted intelligence reports to support his argument, suppressing more truthful estimates, according to Welles, in Hanson Baldwin's book on page 81, and keeping from the stricken Roosevelt knowledge that the Japanese were even then feeling for peace in acknowledgment of defeat."

It is interesting that some writers insist upon calling all this hindsight.

They forget that men like Herbert Hoover, Hugh Gibson, Arthur Bliss Lane, William C. Bullitt, Joseph P. Kennedy, and many others, including, if I may be so immodest, myself, had lots to say on this subject from 1938 until today.

As one lists such names, it would be most unjust not to include Charles Lindbergh, who was pilloried and destroyed as a public figure because he recognized early the truth of Russian imperialism.

Self-Denial?**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, if brevity is the soul of wit, the Ocean City (N. J.) Sentinel-Ledger has published a witty editorial, which follows:

GLASS-HOUSE DWELLER

President Truman, in a Fourth of July address, called upon the American people to exercise restraint and self-denial.

Huh!

Granting of Bail to Convicted Communists**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I think it was most unfortunate for the American people to read that Judge Learned Hand, of the United States court of appeals, restored the 15 Communists to bail. The reinstated bail was posted by the bail fund of the Civil Rights Congress of New York. This organization was described by Judge Sylvester J. Ryan as unworthy of trust.

I appreciate fully the line of demarcation which divides the executive, legislative, and judicial arms of Government. My work is legislative, and I have listened with great interest to the speeches made on the floor of Congress by my colleagues on the terribly menacing conditions to our Nation and the world, brought about by a scheming, cunning, conspiratorial group of Communists. They hatch their nefarious plans in Moscow, and their dupes in our own country follow out orders.

The information that I receive in Washington comes from the grass roots of our country, from the common people, the people that make up our country. It is the same sentiment which I hear expressed in my own district, from my constituents. I have never believed in witch hunting, but the time has come when American citizens must speak out. That time is now. Judges can do what they please within their own respective jurisdiction, but at the same time, sitting in their study cloisters, I think it would be good for them to know what the public sentiment is, not only in our own city of Baltimore but throughout the Nation. They should know that they must respect public sentiment and must not yield to the false blandishments of these clever Communists, who are determined to overthrow by force our Government and its free institutions.

While I hope there will be a ceasefire, as do all mothers and fathers of the boys who are engaging in the grim but useless struggle in Korea, the attitude of the Communists and their insidious propaganda shows that they are trying,

to make fools of General Ridgway's delegates and those of the United Nations. We must be on guard. Attempts are being made right here in the States by a group of Communists to tear down everything that we hold dear and precious in religion and in those ideals and precious values of a free Government. I certainly hope that our judges will be responsive and understanding. As I have said, I would not invade the judicial province, but I must protest the soft and spongy attitude of Judge Hand. I respect his learning and know that he is a great jurist, but I am afraid that he has been hoodwinked by the Communists, who talk one way and act another.

Discharge of Lt. (jg) William Henry Evans, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD certain references taken from the files regarding the discharge of Lt. (jg) William Henry Evans, Jr., together with a letter from the Secretary of the Navy.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDGEWATER, MD., June 20, 1951.

From: William Henry Evans, Jr., ex-lieutenant (jg) USNR, 513024/1105.
To: The Chief of Naval Operations.

References: (1) Discharge Order to Lt. (jg) W. H. Evans, Jr.; (2) Navy General Order No. 16, (3) OPNAV 37-50; (4) oath signed on May 11, 1949; (5) Constitution of the United States and Bill of Rights.

Subject: Filing this correspondence in officer's jacket and immediate action to expedite money still owed to officer, plus his personal effects, etc., request for.

1. On May 11, 1949, I signed an oath to the effect "that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter: so help me God."

2. I have carried out this oath to defend my country against those domestic enemies of the United States who no longer believe in the Constitution of the United States with its Bill of Rights, who no longer wave the Stars and Stripes as the only flag that Americans should pay allegiance to, who desire to replace the American bald eagle symbol with the United Nations black widow spider symbol, or the Red Russian bear, and who always put the interests of the United Nations and Soviet Russia above those of the United States.

3. Regardless of the clever high-sounding propaganda to the contrary, the present administration is leading the United States to national suicide. The betrayals of Tehran, Yalta and Potsdam (and others less notable, but just as deadly) have put Soviet Russia into a position to make a bid for world

domination. The record of this treason speaks for itself; these traitors already have convicted themselves by their words and deeds.

4. For the unpardonable sin, in the eyes of the present administration, of putting the welfare of my country above the interests of the pro-Red United Nations and Soviet Russia, my commission as a lieutenant (junior grade) in the United States Naval Reserve was revoked, and I was discharged from the naval service under honorable conditions.

5. In spite of the fact that I was officially and repeatedly informed that I was being tried on whether or not I had violated naval general order No. 16 which states that anything authorized for publication must have advance clearance, my discharge order clearly indicates that I was discharged for the text of my letter and not the failure to obtain advance clearance.

6. Moreover, paragraph No. 3 of my attached discharge order also states that "your action was in violation of a directive of the Chief of Naval Operations, requiring advance clearance of statements concerning foreign policy by members of the naval service." This quotation from my discharge order is known as OPNAV 37-50, which was a continental dispatch sent out in December 1950. To clearly illustrate that my discharge was a political matter out of the hands of the Navy, I shall elaborate on the above quotation from my discharge.

(a) I never saw nor heard of OPNAV 37-50 until April 25, 1951, which was 26 days after my letter to Mr. Alfred Kohlberg was published and 40 days after I had written the letter.

(b) On April 25, 1951, upon the arrival of a dispatch to the United States Steamship *Rogers* in the Yellow Sea ordering me to proceed immediately to Tokyo, Japan, I was shown this confidential OPNAV 37-50 for the first time, whereupon I read and signed it as directed (on April 25, 1951).

(c) I informed the Naval Board of Inquiry at Sasebo, Japan; the Naval Disciplinary Hearing in Washington, D. C., and finally the Secretary of the Navy that I could not be held accountable for OPNAV 37-50 under the above circumstances. They all agreed with me on this obvious fact, since I had never seen OPNAV 37-50 until after the letter was written and was published.

(d) In connection with my letter I was continually informed that the text of my letter was not the issue, but the violation of Navy General Order 16. Nevertheless, the contents of the letter were argued with me by persons who had not qualified as competent to pass judgment on the text of the letter, or to discuss such matters objectively.

(e) Even though I could not be held accountable for OPNAV 37-50, Francis P. Matthews accused me of violating this directive and tried me for it, as my discharge order clearly shows. A naval officer is not supposed to keep himself informed of confidential directives (that he has never seen nor heard of) by mental telepathy direct from their sources.

7. A glance at paragraph 3 of my attached discharge order definitely proves that I was tried solely on what I said and not on anything else. I, therefore, demand an explanation as to why my discharge order included a violation of OPNAV 37-50, when no evidence could possibly hold me accountable for that directive, besides being informed that I would not be tried on it.

8. Not only was I convicted for my words against the present administration leaders, I also was tried and convicted for the crime, in the eyes of the pro-Red administration, of daring to expose their idol, Franklin D. Roosevelt, who made the world safe for communism through his betrayals.

It really is a mystery why the author of my discharge order did not convict me for

stating in my letter that Alger Hiss was in a key position at the Yalta betrayal.

In reference to Franklin D. Roosevelt, my discharge order states that my contemptuous words used constitute grave misconduct on the part of an officer of the naval service. Any attempt to inform the American people what really happened at the betrayals of Tehran, Yalta and Potsdam is classified as unsatisfactory performance of duty on the part of an officer whose first loyalty is to the United States of America.

9. The phrases used in paragraph three of my discharge order bear a striking resemblance, in my opinion, to the double talk so skillfully exploited by the Soviet Union.

10. Since the United States Navy was under orders, I was rushed around Japan and forced out of the Navy so fast that I was not able to obtain the following items which are due me:

(a) Personal effects: On May 5, 1951, I was ordered to proceed to Tokyo, Japan, from Sasebo, Japan, in a manner approaching indecent haste, to put it mildly. As my orders at that time still directed me to return to the U. S. S. *Rogers* and to resume my regular duties aboard ship, I naturally left most of my personal belongings aboard my ship. Moreover, as the result of being forced to rush under pressure, I also left some of my personal belongings aboard the U. S. S. *Prairie* (AD-15) which was in Sasebo, Japan, at that time.

Upon arrival in Tokyo on May 5, 1951, I was informed by the pro-American underground that a dispatch had been sent to Tokyo from Washington several days previous requesting Tokyo to originate a recommendation for the revocation of my commission. This was the dispatch which undoubtedly was the reason for my sudden and mysterious change from a defendant to a witness in the Naval Board of Inquiry at Sasebo, Japan.

There is more evidence that I have in this matter, which I shall release shortly, but the main purpose at this time is to show why I became separated from my personal effects.

Upon receiving orders to proceed to Washington, D. C., immediately, I inquired about my personal effects still aboard the ship. In spite of the fact that the ship was due back at Yokosuka on May 17, 1951, I was ordered to leave Japan on May 7, 1951. Now, if this had been a naval matter, the Navy would have let me remain in Japan for another 10 days to gather my personal effects. The orders from Washington stated that they wanted me back there as fast as possible.

(b) The United States Navy still owes me several hundred dollars which I should have received before I was separated from the naval service, plus 8 3/4 days' leave coming to me. For this leave I demand 8 3/4 days' full pay on my pay scale as of May 29, 1951. When I attempted to obtain all the money due me before I was separated, I was informed that I could not be paid one cent because my permanent pay record was not there.

The Navy forced me to become separated from my permanent pay record on May 2, 1951, and never gave me an opportunity to let it catch up to me. Before I left Tokyo, Japan, I pleaded with the officer who signed my orders directing me to Washington to allow me to wait several days in order that I could receive my permanent pay record which was following me up and down Japan. At that time I knew that I would have trouble later in getting paid. Regardless of my pleas, I was ordered to leave Tokyo on May 7, 1951, without my pay record.

In Washington, D. C., a temporary pay record was made out for me at great inconvenience to all concerned. When I requested my money, I was informed that I would not receive a cent until my permanent pay record arrived.

When I left Japan, the officer who signed my orders there promised that my pay record would be rushed to Washington via air mail. It is now June 20, 1951, and I still have not received any money from the United States Navy.

11. It is hereby demanded that the United States Navy expedite my personal effects to me as fast as they rushed me around Japan and forced me out of the Navy without paying me. Moreover, I shall go over to the Officers' Accounts Section in the Main Navy Building in Washington D. C., at 0900 on Tuesday, June 26, 1951, at which time I intend to go over my pay account with the proper authorities and settle this matter to our mutual satisfaction.

12. While holding no bitterness against the naval service, nor against any naval officer, my patience has been stretched considerably in the matter of my personal effects and money due me.

13 The American people realize, as well as I do, that the United States Navy was not responsible for my discharge from the naval service for expressing pro-American views and living up to my oath of allegiance.

WILLIAM HENRY EVANS, Jr.

(Senator John L. McClellan, Senator Ernest W. McFarland, Senator Walter George, Senator Paul Douglas, Senator Everett M. Dirksen, Senator Bourke B. Hickenlooper, Senator James O. Eastland, Senator Harry F. Byrd, Governor Theodore R. McKeldin, Congressman Edward T. Miller, Congressman James Devereux, Congressman Edward A. Garmatz, Congressman George H. Fallon, Congressman Lansdale G. Sasser, Congressman J. Glenn Beall, Congressman Dewey Short, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, Admiral Louis Denfeld, Captain Cronmellin, Mr. Guy George Gabrielson, Mr. Alfred Kohlberg, the Chicago Tribune, the Washington Times-Herald, the Washington Star, the Ashland (Wis.) Daily Press, the Annapolis Evening Capital, the Southern Maryland Times, the American Legion, the Freeman magazine, Common Sense newspaper, Associated Press, International News Service, United Press.)

MAY 28, 1951.

From: Secretary of the Navy.

To: Lt. (jg) William H. Evans, Jr., USNR, Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department.

Via: Chief of Naval Personnel.

Subject: Revocation of Commission and Discharge from the United States Naval Reserve under honorable conditions.

Reference: (a) General Order No. 16; (b) Bu-Pers CL 207-49.

1. When directed by your commanding officer you will regard yourself detached from all duties which may have been assigned you. You will immediately report to the Commanding Officer, Naval Receiving Station, Washington, D. C., for temporary duty in connection with your separation processing in accordance with reference (b).

2. Upon completion of separation processing, and when directed by the commanding officer of the activity at which you are separated, you will regard yourself detached. By direction of the President, the revocation of your commission and discharge from the United States Naval Reserve under honorable conditions are effective at 2400 on the date of detachment.

3. This action is taken by reason of your action, while serving aboard the U. S. S. *Rogers* (DDR-876) on 16 March 1951, in addressing and mailing a letter, containing express permission for republication and to a person and under circumstances providing reasonable cause for belief that republication would be effected, which letter contained highly intemperate criticism of the foreign policy of the United States and impugned the motives and good faith of officials on the highest levels responsible for the formulation and implementation of that policy.

Your action in this respect is considered to have constituted unsatisfactory performance of duty, in that it had a foreseeable tendency to promote disunity and disaffection among other persons in and outside the Armed Forces, rather than singleness of aims and purpose in an hour of national peril. Your action was in violation of a directive of the Chief of Naval Operations, requiring advance clearance of statements concerning foreign policy by members of the Naval Service. Moreover, the contemptuous words used in your letter with reference to the present and a previous incumbent in the Office of President of the United States, and to the present Secretary of State, constitute grave misconduct on the part of an officer of the naval service.

4. Cost of travel is chargeable to subhead 18, MPN, current on date of detachment (1711463 for 1951, 1721463 for 1952), expenditure account 74110, object class 029.

FRANCIS P. MATTHEWS,

Secretary of the Navy.

Government at Halt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted, I include as part of these remarks the lead editorial which appeared in the Oregonian in its issue of Sunday, July 8, 1951, entitled "Government at Halt."

GOVERNMENT AT HALT

The flow of war news and crime news from the Nation's Capital in recent months has been such as to obscure an important fact: The Federal Government is not accomplishing its real job, which is to govern.

This is made all too clear in the current box-score report of the bipartisan Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, a group singularly unimpressed by the headlines about congressional labors on the Kefauver committee and in the MacArthur hearings. The report reveals:

1. Of the 20 Government reorganization proposals placed before the Eighty-second Congress, not one has received favorable approval. In fact, there have been hearings in both Houses on only one minor measure, no action at all on 19 measures in the House of Representatives and no action on 15 of the proposals pending in the Senate.

2. President Truman is still sitting on 51 reorganization plans submitted to him May 8. Not one proposal has been submitted to the Congress.

By contrast, the Eighty-first Congress passed a total of 34 Hoover report proposals constituting roughly half of the entire reorganization program.

And the record of action on the Hoover proposals is just one portion of the evidence of governmental stalemate. The first session of the current Congress, prior to June 20, had enacted only 51 laws, most of them in the category of Public Law 42, which gives each Congressman an increased allowance for telegram and telephone tolls. The busier Eighty-first Congress had passed 114 laws by June 20 of its first session in 1949, and 126 laws by the same date in its second session in 1950.

This poor showing of the Eighty-second Congress may be explained, in part, of course by the unprecedented time taken by the Kefauver and MacArthur hearings. Senators cannot listen to and pass judgment on

2,000,000 words of testimony and still give full time to their other legislative duties.

But there are other reasons for the stalemate, and an important one is the gulf that lies between the President and the Congress in almost all matters of major policy. So inhospitable is Congress to proposals of the administration that even such bipartisan humanitarian proposals as the measure for shipment of food to India meets rough going in the legislative branch.

While such a situation exists, the United States can be said, with some element of truth, to be without a functioning government.

Meanwhile, lying dormant are such Hoover Commission proposals as those for reorganization of the Veterans' Administration, for the reorganization of the post office and elimination of politics from postmaster appointments and for consolidation of Federal public works activities of the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.

Enactment of these and other pending reorganization bills would not only save billions of dollars but would add immeasurably to the efficiency of the Federal Government.

Hon. Joseph R. McCarthy's Address on General Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senator McCarthy, of Wisconsin," published in the Colton (Calif.) Courier, and also an editorial entitled "What Senator McCarthy said About General Marshall," published in the Washington Times-Herald of June 24, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Colton (Calif.) Courier]

SENATOR MCCARTHY, OF WISCONSIN

Senator MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, the stormraiser of the Republican Party, is as necessary on the American political scene as any man in Washington. If it weren't for the McCarthys, who are willing to court unpopularity by calling a spade a spade, the country would be in bad shape indeed.

His latest 60,000 word attack was directed at General Marshall and only incidentally at Dean Acheson.

Even editors who decry the efforts of McCarthy admit that the policies of the two above-mentioned gentlemen have brought the United States to the brink of a terrible war and even now to a war which is costing thousands of American lives.

Their mistakes in Asia have been enormous. Whether their intent was purposeful or not the net result was the same and if it takes a McCarthy, shouting at the top of his voice, to rid public life of these two men, we are for him.

Dean Acheson didn't even know that he had Communists working for him. He defended Alger Hiss to the last. On the other hand McCarthy flayed the Communists in Washington with everything at his disposal and succeeded in routing many from public office and putting many in prison.

Let us not be too hasty in condemning McCarthy. He is the one man in Washing-

ton who seems capable of doing something about a very bad situation.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of June 24, 1951]

WHAT SENATOR MCCARTHY SAID ABOUT GENERAL MARSHALL

Senator JOE MCCARTHY made a 60,000-word speech about General Marshall, on June 14. The kept columnists and newspaper errand boys of the Pendergast mobsters have been screeching the house down, ever since.

They have suggested the Senator is a skunk, traitor, mudslinger, faker of facts, and all-around candidate for horse-whipping. Are they right?

We don't see how anybody can possibly say unless and until after examining the evidence. And right here and now, we will place a small bet, Senator KEFAUVER notwithstanding, that not one of those who have been calling JOE MCCARTHY names since June 14, has actually done the basic homework job of reading the speech, itself. This especially means the editors and writers of the Washington Post.

The writer of this editorial has read MCCARTHY's speech and finds it is a challenge that will have to be met and dealt with, sooner or later.

And what did MCCARTHY say? He said that he had decided to find out what makes Marshall "the greatest living American" and "master of global strategy," as the Truman propaganda has it.

Marshall himself has very carefully avoided giving any direct testimony on the subject.

At the end of World War II, the other principals on the supposedly winning side of the venture who were not still on active duty sat down to give an accounting.

It was their public duty to do so, not to mention a natural act of pride in work supposedly well done.

Secretary of State Cordell Hull, Secretary of War Stimson, Generals Eisenhower and Bradley, Winston Churchill and Admiral William Leahy, Roosevelt's Chief of Staff, are examples of those willing to utter.

Roosevelt, as everybody knows, was carefully saving his papers for his own purposes and since his death whole armies of interpreters have used them.

Secretary of Defense Forrestal was driven to suicide before he could get his own case on the record.

Gen Douglas MacArthur has been on constant foreign service until now and so has not been in a position until this year to begin his own accounting, but he has not hesitated to do so at the opportunity given.

MARSHALL STAYS UNDER COVER

But Marshall? At the end of the war when he retired to Leesburg, Va., Marshall said that he would never tell what he had been doing because he would either have to lie or to wreck reputations with the truth. It was a cryptic and mysterious line that has kept many an inquirer after the facts on the alert ever since.

At any rate, Marshall has kept under cover at all times, both on duty and in retirement, so that any researcher of his career has to look to others for testimony about his behavior.

In preparing his survey of the mysterious general, MCCARTHY said:

"I have drawn on the written record; on the memoirs of the principal actors in the great events of the last 10 years; I have drawn heavily from the books out of which the history of these times will be written for the next 500 years.

"I have drawn from the pens of Admiral Leahy, Winston Churchill, Mark Clark, Robert Sherwood speaking for Harry Hopkins, Henry L. Stimson, James F. Byrnes, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Sumner Welles, Cordell Hull, General Arnold, General Deane, General Chennault, and Jonathan Daniels.

"No one of them alone was trying to or did give anything remotely approaching a complete record of Marshall. The picture emerges, however, as we piece together their recollection of the events in which he figures—oftentimes fragmentary, never directly uncomplimentary, but when fitted together, pointing unerringly to one conclusion.

"It is from these sources, plus the State Department's own files, that the picture becomes generally complete."

And what is the picture? In the war against Germany, Marshall forced on Roosevelt and Churchill the strategy that has resulted in Stalin's grip on Europe. Once, to win his way, he even threatened that he would have Eisenhower resign command of the invasion army.

Read the evidence in the recorded sources above listed, if you doubt that Marshall made the strategy that has made Stalin in Europe.

Was the result a good thing?

The same sources tell how Marshall forced his own judgment in the policy on Asia that has put Stalin in possession of China and now has the United States bloodily involved in a Korean war that has no recognizable end.

Was that a good thing?

Marshall is the publicly proclaimed author of still another policy, the prodigal spending of United States taxpayer's dollars in Europe since the war that has brought us such remarkable gains as the Socialist dictatorship of Britain, the limber-legged French and other continental blackmailers and a soaring cost of living here in the United States.

Marshall's career as "the greatest living American" and master of global strategy has cost this Republic a fearful price. The full amount is not yet known.

God save us from any more of it.

Above and Beyond the Call of Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN A. WHITAKER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. WHITAKER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "Above and Beyond the Call of Duty," appearing in the Sunday Star, Washington, D. C., on Sunday, July 8:

It is right that the Pentagon should guard jealously the high prestige of the Medal of Honor. The highest decoration which the Government awards for bravery against an enemy should not be lightly bestowed. But the concern which some Army officers are reported to have expressed privately over the number of medals awarded so far in the Korean war does not seem to be well founded.

The number of medals awarded within a given period of combat does not necessarily have any bearing on the justification for the awards. The decoration traditionally goes only to those few soldiers who have displayed conspicuous gallantry in action above and beyond the call of duty. The act of heroism must be attested by at least two eyewitnesses and must be confirmed by careful official investigation. Pentagon officials assert that these standards for the award have been rigidly maintained since the outbreak of war in Korea. It follows, then, that the award of the Medal of Honor to 28 valiant fighting men is indicative only of a type of action in Korea that sets the stage for frequent acts of extreme heroism. It

does not mean that our soldiers in Korea are, as individuals, any braver than those of other wars, or that the Armed Forces are any more liberal than in the past in handing out the medals.

The best proof that the Korean medals have been well earned is the tragic fact that only 7 of the 28 Americans who have won the coveted honor have actually received the award. The others are dead or missing.

Statement of the Wage Stabilization Board on Proposal To Change the Tripartite Character of the Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of the Wage Stabilization Board on proposal to change the tripartite character of the Board:

The Congress is now considering a proposal to alter the tripartite character of the Wage Stabilization Board, now composed of equal members representative of labor, management, and the general public. The proposal is for a preponderance of public members whose votes would exceed the combined votes of the members representative of labor and management. This proposal is serious enough, in our opinion, to warrant public concern, even if considered only in relation to the operations of the present Board. It is much more serious, however, when considered in the light of its effect on our system of tripartite action in the long run, where Government is a participant in labor-management relations, and its effect on the democratic values which a tripartite system seeks to preserve. The issues are so important that we would feel remiss in our duty if we were to remain silent. Hence this statement.

Wage stabilization affects millions of employees and their employers. It is only one phase of stabilization of industrial relations in an emergency. Any time groups of employees are involved, their problems must be handled (a) by individual action (b) by collective bargaining or (c) by Government intervention and control. When employees wish to be organized the principles of democracy, confirmed repeatedly by Congress, endorse collective bargaining as a means of solving those problems. One of the great strengths of the American way of life is the proven ability of labor and management to solve their problems with the cooperation, rather than the domination, of Government.

When, as in the present emergency, it is necessary in the public interest to take the power of final decision out of the hands of the parties, the Government must make every effort to preserve for the future the basic values of self-determination, including collective bargaining. During such an emergency, the Government is truly the custodian of the liberties of the parties. It is essential, therefore, that Government act in such a way that those liberties may be returned to the parties at the end of the emergency, with a minimum of damage. This is the objective of the tripartite approach, as it has been practiced traditionally by the Government in emergencies similar to the present. Thus, in the structure of the present Wage Stabilization Board, the members representative of labor, of management, and of the general

public have equal power and equal responsibility, reflected in their equal numbers and their equal voting rights. Decisions are made after discussion among equals. They are reached through the exercise of persuasion rather than the exercise of a dominant voting power by any particular segment of the Board. Only through participation by equals can real cooperation be achieved in reaching decisions affecting millions of employees and their employers. Only in this way can those employees and employers be assured that Government is fully aware of their problems, their needs, and their desires.

The Post Office Is Big Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wayne Township Record of July 6, 1951:

THE POST OFFICE IS BIG BUSINESS

A revealing article on the weird workings of bureaucracy appeared in the June issue of Harper's magazine. Written by C. Lester Walker, it deals with the amazing case of the United States postal service.

The post office is big business, with a capital B. It also enjoys a total monopoly in its field, which is true of no other business, big or little. Its annual revenues run around \$1,670,000,000. It has 500,000 employees, 42,000 branch offices, and 10,000 vehicles. Yet some months ago people in various parts of the country complained of sharp declines in the standards of postal service. All kinds of mail—air, first-class, special delivery, parcel post—was taking longer and longer to reach its destination. In some instances the delays seemed incredible. Mr. Walker writes, "Mail from London, England, was being received in Radio City as soon as mail posted at the same date and hour in the Bronx."

This was the results of cuts in service which were ordered in April 1950. And the reason for the cuts, according to the Postmaster General, was that the Department would have a deficit of about \$530,000,000 for the fiscal year, and something drastic had to be done.

Is it necessary for the post office to lose money—and huge sums of money at that? Mr. Walker does not think so. The British Post Office has made a profit in almost every year since 1711. The Canadian Post Office is also a profit-making enterprise. What, then, is the trouble with the United States postal service?

Mr. Walker quotes a telling sentence from a Hoover Commission report which said the Department has "a creaky, overcentralized organizational structure; outmoded methods and equipment; cumbersome budgeting and accounting systems, a maze of tangled regulations and restrictions." One of these faults, excessive centralization, may be the worst of all. The whole tendency of modern industry has been to decentralize, in the interest of economy, efficiency, and better service to customers. Mr. Walker cites as one example of this a chain-store system with 1,612 stores, each of which has been given almost complete managerial autonomy. In the Post Office Department, by contrast, Washington runs everything. No decision of consequence can be made without per-

mission from headquarters—and this often takes endless, time-bearing correspondence to get.

Mr. Walker finds that the Post Office has been about 100-percent opposed to mechanical handling and sorting methods which are used both in private business and in the postal services of some other countries. It seems to be a case of what was good enough for grandpa is good enough for sonny.

Going on, Mr. Walker believes that the Post Office personnel system is impossible and inefficient. The postmasters themselves are political appointees—they are at the heart of the patronage system. And post-office accounting methods, which are laid down by the all-powerful General Accounting Office, seem to be as archaic as the bow and arrow.

Mr. Walker goes into details in his article, and some of his revelations are staggering. At the end, he summarizes a plan which, in his opinion, would eliminate all or practically all of the Department's huge deficits. In essence, this plan would simply have the Post Office operate along standard business lines—something which, apparently, Government businesses never do. It remains to be seen if they ever will.

The State Department and Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Comments by Crump," which appeared in the Cambridge News, of Madison, Wis., on July 5, 1951. It deals with Communists and the State Department.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENTS BY CRUMP

The State Department's continuous coddling of the Red Communists and the Red North Koreans is enough to drive even the liberals in this country into hysterics. This recent peace move was almost the straw that broke the camel's back as far as some Americans are concerned. There was a time in American history when we could say "Submit to our terms or be defeated" but that era ended with the crowning of Dean Acheson. Is peace so dear that we are willing to sell our souls to those rotten bunch of Commies and kiss the principles, to which 12,000 men died so bravely, good-by? That is exactly what we are intending to do in Korea at the present time.

I would hate to look any of those dead men in the face and say, "Brother you were the biggest sucker who ever died in defense of his country." You who fought to pass the thirty-eighth parallel with the belief that you were doing it as a contribution to the free world and now for the sake of at best a temporary truce, they are giving back everything that you fought and died for. I wonder what Dean Acheson would say if he had to face just one of these men.

Times have changed since World War II when a commander could say, "Unconditional surrender or die." Now we say we want peace any time at any price and it cost us just a few billion and only 160,000

casualties and we are right where we started from with Mr. Acheson still at the helm. How much longer can this stupidity go on? What people forget is that democracy is not an infallible system of government and even the democracy of Athens fell after some incompetent people got into control. Give enough people like Dean Acheson reins in the Government and God help us all.

Will General Eisenhower Be a Candidate?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John O'Donnell in the Washington Daily News of July 12, 1951:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 11.—The big question among the professional politicians in this Capital is whether Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower will or will not be the White House candidate of either the Republican or the Democratic Party in 1952.

As of today, Eisenhower couldn't get the nomination.

One thing is certain in regard to Eisenhower. If he ever gets the nomination the voters can be sure that on the record he will hold a tight censoring hand on the information which is permitted to reach the eyes and ears of the American people.

Eisenhower, from the day he got supreme command in Europe, thanks to his sponsor, then Chief of Staff, Gen. George C. Marshall, and the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, down to the present moment, has consciously or unconsciously, followed the thought that the facts of the Nation's life are much too good for the common people.

On the eve of July 4, he was the top speaker before that hoity-toity starchy assembly gathered in swanky Grosvenor House, Park Lane, London, under the auspices of the English-Speaking Union. The audience, of course, had been talking about the uproar and the sessions of the Senate committee which heard the testimony of our Republic's military leaders on the firing of General MacArthur—no friend of Eisenhower's.

Eisenhower, if words mean anything, tried to put across the idea that his London audience shouldn't be concerned by the MacArthur issue and that he himself deplored it.

Said Eisenhower the American to his audience of Britons:

"This unity of ours is an international fact. Yet it . . . has been obscured in my own country by concern with trifles and small disputes fanned into the flames of senseless antagonisms. Serious differences in convictions . . . scarcely need to be dragged into the public forum in the petty hope of capturing a fleeting local acclaim."

With this smug denunciation of the MacArthur hearings Eisenhower then smilingly observed that he had, during World War II, arguments with some of the British notables present and roundly proclaimed:

"Had these been headlined in the press of our two countries they could have created public bitterness. . . . Decisions were reached because those at odds did not find it necessary to seek justification in a public hue and cry."

FACTS CONCERN EVERY TAXPAYER

In other words, according to Eisenhower today, the facts of direct concern to every American voter and taxpayer, which should have been given through the newspapers and radio so that they could judge the ability of such persons as Eisenhower, Roosevelt, Marshall, and Harry Hopkins, were deliberately withheld and, in his opinion, should continue to be.

Well, all that goes back to that important date of May 6, 1945, when the Germans signed the surrender papers in Reims, ending the shooting in Europe, and Eisenhower held out against allowing the American newspapermen to spread the glad tidings to the American fathers and mothers because of a deal with Stalin.

On May 7, the day after the formal surrender, and 24 hours before Eisenhower wanted to release the news out of respect for the feelings of Stalin, there took place the famous telephone conversation, now released for publication, between Churchill in London and Truman's spokesman, Admiral William D. Leahy, over the secret wire to the highly guarded room in the Pentagon.

Here's how the famous conversation went, according to the official transcript:

"CHURCHILL. It is me, the Prime Minister."

CAN'T ACT WITHOUT UNCLE JOE'S O. K.

"LEAHY. I can convey the following message to you: In view of the agreements already made (by Eisenhower), my Chief (President Truman) asks me to tell you that he cannot act without the approval of Uncle Joe (Stalin). Do you understand me?"

"CHURCHILL. Hello. The German Prime Minister has given out an hour ago, on the radio, an address stating that they have declared unconditional surrender for German troops.

"LEAHY. We know that.

"CHURCHILL. What's the use of me and the President looking to be the only two people in the world who don't know what is going on? The whole of this thing is leaking out in England and America

"LEAHY. My Chief told me that he was unable to agree on an earlier announcement without the approval of Uncle Joe and he asked me to transmit that to you. * * * The rumors will be out in all the papers but the official announcement cannot be made here until we get the approval of the third party.

"CHURCHILL. Of the third party?

"LEAHY. Of Uncle Joe; yes, sir.

"CHURCHILL. The whole world knows it and I don't see why we should put our news off—it's an idiotic position.

"LEAHY. Well, I don't see it, either, being right frank."

An hour later, Churchill called the secret phone in the Pentagon again to report that the victory-flushed crowds in London were getting out of control and demanding the appearance and statements of the King and Churchill.

Leahy replied: "We have communicated with Eisenhower. He says no announcement has been made from his headquarters and that no announcement will be made until after the announcements are made in London, Moscow, and the United States * * * President Truman, in the event of information from Stalin, would make the announcement tomorrow."

"CHURCHILL. Do you really mean that I cannot make the announcement? I cannot do that. You know my difficulties.

"LEAHY. I know. * * * But the President said he would make no announcement until he heard from Stalin."

Ithuriel's Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Barron's of June 11, 1951:

ITHURIEL'S HOUR—SECRETARY ACHESON HIMSELF DISCLOSES WHY HE MUST BE REPLACED

(By Felix Morley)

Ithuriel, legend tells us, was the Archangel whose spear had the magic property of revealing the true nature of everyone whom it touched. And all men at some time experience Ithuriel's hour when, in the words of Kipling's poem:

"* * * the sum of all our past,
Act, habit, thought and passion shall
be cast

In one addition, be it more or less,
And as that reading runs so shall we do."

Last week Ithuriel's hour struck for Secretary of State Acheson, a man who for sheer mental ability is outstanding in public life today. Morning and afternoon, day after day, Mr. Acheson faced a score of Senators, answering innumerable questions on every conceivable aspect of our far eastern policy.

From study of the testimony, and talk with the participants in this great political drama, two over-all impressions emerge. One is the technical competence, up to a point, of Mr. Acheson. He was, of course, well prepared for this ordeal, aided by counsel and fortified by masses of documentation. But these props would have helped the Secretary little except for his alert mind, his adroitness in fencing and his unflinching courtesy toward the inquisitors. By every legal criterion, Mr. Acheson was an ideal witness.

The second general conclusion, forced by the evidence, is the great value of the congressional committee, when conducted on the high plane maintained throughout by these joint meetings of the Senate Foreign Affairs and Military Services Committees. Much of the credit for the quality of the inquiry goes to Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia, whose scrupulously impartial chairmanship stands as a model. But every member also rose to the occasion. Questions were uniformly polite, even when sharply pointed. And thus it was that the witness gradually but revealingly exposed his inner thinking, in response to the probing touch of Ithuriel's spear.

It was on a seemingly minor point that the Secretary first gave himself away. He stumbled badly over the State Department's now famous special guidance paper No. 28, dated December 23, 1949, and circulated to all our diplomatic missions abroad. This was the document written to counter the false impressions that (1) Formosa's retention would save the Chinese Government; (2) The United States has a special interest in * * * Formosa; (3) Its loss would seriously damage the interests of * * * the United States; (4) The United States is * * * committed in any way to act to save Formosa.

Of this confidential document, called by Senator KNOWLAND "a basic revelation of defeatist attitude," 456 copies were distributed. So it is not surprising that the guidance paper was soon picked up by an alert newspaperman and its contents revealed, with

substantial accuracy, early last year. By a committee vote of 15 to 9 the whole has now been published, unquestionably with damage to State Department prestige.

This special guidance paper, Mr. Acheson explained, was designed to discount in advance the anticipated capture of Formosa by the Chinese Communists. It gave the party line to be followed by the Voice of America and other State Department agencies if, as, and when Formosa fell. What got Mr. Acheson into difficulties, in this matter, was his argument that while it was not really State Department policy to be indifferent about Formosa, it was nevertheless smart diplomacy to pretend to be indifferent. This thesis was badly punctured when Senator CAIN wondered whether the State Department habitually orders the Voice of America to broadcast what the Secretary does not himself endorse. At that point Senator BREWSTER cuttingly observed: "Socrates said that the penalty of being a liar was not to be believed when you told the truth."

Ithuriel's spear drew blood a second time when Mr. Acheson refused to admit that the constitutional power of Congress to declare war has reality under present-day conditions. If there had been "a lot of time," he said, it "might possibly have been desirable" to let the representatives of the people vote on the issue of sending our boys to fight in Korea. But the Secretary of State made plain that in his opinion the Executive should decide, and the Congress merely endorse, whether the battleground is Korea, Iran, or any other area that diplomats and generals deem vital to American interests.

Several Senators, not all Republicans, are saying privately that the Acheson hearings were protracted in part because of this casual attitude toward the Constitution. "We decided to show the Secretary," says one, "that if he can usurp the power to make war, we still have the authority to hold him to strict accountability."

The arrogance that underlies Mr. Acheson's quick intelligence, and seems inseparable from it, was further and almost flamboyantly demonstrated when the subject of Yalta arose in the hearings.

It was not even superficially advantageous for the present director of our foreign policy to defend this highly dubious "secret deal with Russia," as Senator ALEXANDER SMITH defines it. When Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin signed the Yalta agreement, on February 11, 1945, Mr. Acheson was only an Assistant Secretary of State. It was kept secret from him, as well as from the Chinese whose territory was then awarded to the Soviet. But the Acheson belief that the Executive is above criticism made him attempt to defend an action that was and is morally indefensible. So the Secretary of State attempted to argue, almost in one breath, that it was wholly proper to give control over Manchuria to Soviet Russia even though "our policy is to keep China from being threatened by the efforts of the Soviet Union."

For the casual newspaper reader the net effect of these revelations of Mr. Acheson's indifference to moral principles has been obscured. The three instances cited, and others such as equivocation on our attitude toward admitting Communist China to U. N., must be patiently unearthed from masses of less significant testimony. But those who closely followed the Acheson evidence last week realize that the policy of the present Secretary of State is fundamentally opportunistic. He has himself made clear that his guiding light is not what is morally imperative, but rather what he can get away with at any particular moment, in any given circumstance.

That, of course, is to imitate the philosophy of the Kremlin and thereby to sacrifice the very basis of principles more valuable

than atom bombs in the struggle against Communist imperialism. And it is because Mr. Acheson does not see the vital importance of principle, and even glories in this blind spot, that he will have to be replaced.

Amid the enormous global responsibilities to which we stand committed, the formulation of foreign policy must be in the hands of one who, in Ithuriel's hour, comes clean on a higher ethical plane than that of Machiavelli.

Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following:

AMERICAN LITHUANIAN
COUNCIL OF BOSTON,
July 11, 1951.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Lithuanian American people throughout the United States, as well as those Lithuanians privileged to reside in the free countries of the world, commemorated the eleventh anniversary of the resubjugation of Lithuania and the decennial of the first horrible deportations from Lithuania to Siberia on June 16, 1951.

In Boston we observed this occasion with appropriate ceremonies, at which a resolution was adopted concerning the plight of our dear motherland, Lithuania. We enclose a copy of this resolution and sincerely hope that you will find time to read it.

We earnestly hope that you will continue to fight the cause of freedom and do all in your power to help Lithuania and other oppressed nations of the world regain their freedom and liberty.

Yours respectfully,

ALEXANDER J. CHAPLIK,
President.

Resolution unanimously adopted at a mass meeting held under the auspices of the American Lithuanian Council, Boston chapter, in protest and commemoration of the following tragedies which have befallen Lithuania and its people: (1) Eleventh anniversary of the resubjugation of Lithuania and (2) decennial of the first horrible deportations from Lithuania, when, during one night, the Bolshevik secret police—NKVD—arrested and carried off to the frigid wastes of Siberia 40,000 innocent Lithuanians:

"Whereas the Soviet Union, relying upon the spurious Ribbentrop-Molotov pact of August 23, 1939, and in disregard of all treaties and agreements with Lithuania, including the peace treaty of 1920, the nonaggression pact of 1926, and the mutual-assistance pact of 1939, did occupy Lithuania by most brutal means and did subject Lithuania to a most cruel oppression; and

"Whereas the Soviet Union, in furtherance of its designs to implant communism in Lithuania and throughout the world, and being unable to bend the resistance of Lithuania to its will, has embarked upon a relentless and unprecedented policy to eradicate the Lithuanian nation, as attested by the fact that it has already deported or annihilated 800,000 Lithuanians, which constitutes over 30 percent of the entire Lithuanian people: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That said resubjugation and genocide being practiced in Lithuania is sorely protested, decried, and deplored; and further be it

"Resolved, That the attention of the United Nations, and of the whole cultured world be directed to the plight of blood-soaked Lithuania, and all effective means be solicited to block the ravisher of Lithuania and to expose him to the nations of the world; and further be it

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to all Congressmen and Senators of the United States, to the representatives in Washington, D. C., of the governments of Great Britain, France, Italy, Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Finland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Spain, Portugal, Belgium, and to the press."

AMERICAN-LITHUANIAN COUNCIL,
BOSTON CHAPTER,

By ALEXANDER J. CHAPLIK, Chairman.
J. JANUSKIS, Secretary.

Year of No Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, our Nation, as part of the United Nations, has now been participating in the tragic Korean conflict for over a year. In the June 30, 1951, issue of Collier's is a most timely editorial entitled "Year of No Decision," which I include as part of these remarks, as follows:

YEAR OF NO DECISION

The undeclared war in Korea, a war the like of which the world has never seen, is now a year old. It began with a courageous and unprecedented action in defense of a noble ideal. For the first time in history, soldiers of 15 nations fought beneath a common flag as representatives of an international organization whose purpose is the preservation of peace. At the end of the year the ideal is still noble. The flag is still there. So are the soldiers. They have fought with an unsurpassed bravery to the point where, at this writing, there are indications that at least an informal cessation of hostilities is possible.

We should like to hope that by the time you read this the United Nations original goal of an independent, united, democratic Korea might be in sight. But the prospects at the moment are bleak. For, in its first year, the Korean conflict has developed certain aspects which, while also unprecedented, are considerably less noble and more confusing than the ideal itself. This situation applies particularly to the United States, which has assumed the United Nations command and provided the great majority of non-Korean troops, and which is the center of the turmoil over strategy and leadership. So let us look back at some of these unprecedented developments from an American point of view.

The Korean war is a war in which our civilian and military leaders can give a clear picture of what defeat would be like, but cannot describe the pattern of victory.

It is a war fought under a new set of rules. It has become a fight in which the U. N. is restricted to counterpunching. It is not the U. N.'s purpose to pursue the enemy and destroy him.

It is a war in which no sizable reinforcements of the U. N. forces are apparently contemplated, whatever the fortunes of battle.

It is a war from which the United States has excluded the trained and accessible sol-

diers of a potential ally (Nationalist China) even though the potential ally is willing to participate and is a member of the world organization under whose banner the other allies are fighting.

It is a war in which some of those other allies have fought the enemy and at the same time traded with him, providing him with the materials which eventually aid him in killing their own soldiers. And the war was almost a year old before the combined goadings of Winston Churchill and the United States Congress prompted those allies to take steps toward ending this practice.

It is a war in which, as the result of a general's dismissal, the country's war councils have become an open forum, with many details of military planning and many bitter differences aired for all the world to hear.

It is a war in which the basic American, and hence United Nations, strategy is built on the shifting foundations of fear and uncertainty, and in which there is no attempt on the part of our leaders to conceal or minimize those emotions. The result of that strategy has led to an ironical situation in which the U. N. is afraid to win the war for fear of making its actual and potential enemies angry.

These unique military aspects have been set down here, of course, without regard for diplomatic and political considerations. Those considerations are highly important. Their ultimate purpose, the prevention of a general war involving Russia, is well known. And it may be that they have inevitably dictated some of the unorthodox strategy in Washington.

But there is one paramount aspect of this unorthodox strategy which is of deep concern to many Americans, including the editors of this magazine. That is the seemingly endless continuation of the slaughter-and-be-slaughtered policy which Mr. Truman and his advisers have decided is the only possible policy in Korea if the third world war is to be avoided. It has already cost some 70,000 American casualties. It has caused suffering, destitution, and a staggering loss of life among Korean civilians. All this, of course, is the inevitable toll of war. But in this case the U. N. forces, unless they are driven into the sea, seem committed to fight indefinitely up and down the Korean peninsula (within certain limits) in a minor-league war—for the enemy's lack of air-and-fire power makes it just that—and try to bleed that numerically superior enemy until he is so weak that he surrenders.

This policy is also of deep concern to General MacArthur, and that concern seems to be one of the things that cost him his command. We have considerable to say about the general on our weekly editorial page in this issue. But it might be pointed out here that one factor in his disagreement with the administration was his desire to fight the war along sound, proven military lines, and fight it to win with the least cost of lives. This concern for the cost of lives brought General MacArthur a rebuke from Secretary of Defense Marshall.

In his testimony before the Senate foreign policy inquiry, Secretary Marshall said, "I am disturbed and I should think you would be disturbed at the effect that will sweep through that force (in Korea) of a situation in which their commander has stated his views which accentuate the casualties that they are suffering and in effect that it is without justified purpose."

It is quite possible that the soldiers in Korea do not need to have their former commander "accentuate" the casualties they are suffering or point out to them the inhibited and frustrating aspects of the campaign in which they are engaged. It is also possible that they might be disturbed by some other testimony by Secretary Marshall,

as well as by General Bradley, before the same Senate committees. For, though they disagreed with General MacArthur on many things, the Defense Secretary and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff did confirm his opinion that the slaughter-and-be-slaughtered policy carries no guaranty of victory.

General MacArthur told Congress that "the position of the command from the military standpoint forbade victory." Secretary Marshall said to the Senators, "I should say that if the Chinese Communist continue in force in North Korea with the potential of additional reinforcements that might be made available, and with our situation where we visualize no considerable reinforcement of the United Nations Army, that they could not be driven out of North Korea." And when a Senator asked General Bradley if the present program in Korea would bring decisive results, he replied, "I am not too sure we will get them under our present methods * * *. I don't believe anyone is going to promise you or the country that we are going to get decisive results under what we are doing."

In spite of this, the President and his advisers see no alternative policy that would not in their opinion bring on general war. Their adherents seem satisfied with that policy and only slightly dismayed by the casualties incurred in the indecisive conflict. One of these adherents, Professor Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., the Harvard historian and a sort of unofficial spokesman for the administration, had this to say. "MacArthur says * * * the American people simply cannot take any longer our 'staggering' and 'progressively mounting' losses." Mr. Schlesinger asked, "What have these losses been?" Then he answered himself thus: "MacArthur himself said that 13,000 Americans had been killed in Korea since last June. This is a terrible and tragic thing. But it seems hardly an intolerable loss for a Nation which killed 31,500 people in 1949 by automobile accidents."

The families of those 13,000 dead, among others, will not share Professor Schlesinger's callous view. They will take his snide quotation marks away from the general's description of the casualties and agree that in a war of vacillating policy, a war whose most hopeful outcome now is the status quo ante bellum, the continuing losses are indeed staggering.

Some of the occurrences that followed General MacArthur's dismissal give reason why the Government's present policy may aptly be called vacillating. (They are discussed more fully on this issue's regular editorial page.) The general proposed certain actions which were stated as contributing causes to his being fired. Now the administration has either adopted them or is contemplating their adoption.

No one outside the iron curtain can accurately say whether General MacArthur's adopted or discarded policies would provoke Russia to open attack. But it is our opinion that some of the people who have disagreed with him most bitterly have made more provocative statements than the former U. N. commander ever did.

President Truman, Secretary Marshall, General Bradley and others high in Government have told Russia and the world that the United States is not ready for war with the Soviets. Mobilization Director Wilson was even more specific. He said the country wouldn't be ready for 2 years. Now, isn't that provoking Russia—or rather, isn't it enticing Russia into war and inviting attack? If Russia is ready for war, would the Kremlin need any more provocation than this open admission of weakness, plus a hot war already going in Korea? Would bombs in Manchuria or a naval blockade of the China coast give the final tip to the scales which

already are so heavily weighted to our disadvantage?

No one, we repeat, can be sure of the answers to those questions. But it does seem that if the men in the Kremlin want war and are prepared for it now, they have ample excuse to get into it. And it also seems that the best guess is still the familiar speculation that Russia has its own timetable, and that if there is to be a general war it will begin when Russia is ready and not before.

So all the arguments and disagreements over Korean policy and strategy boils down to this: the only over-all American policy is the passive policy of waiting to see what Russia is going to do next. Generals may be fired and replaced, but Stalin still calls the turn.

The EDITORS.

Red Double Cross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article:

RED DOUBLE CROSS
(By Ludwell Denny)

The Korean armistice negotiations have run true to form. In almost all Allied-Red conferences, our negotiators have to learn the hard way. They are saved—if ever—only when Stalin overplays his hand.

Gen. Matthew Ridgway and his chief negotiator, Vice Adm. Turner Joy, are the latest—but probably not the last—of a long list of capable and forewarned American representatives who still could not be careful enough in dealing with the double-crossing Reds.

When the Reds substituted Kaesong in noman's land, for the original Ridgway proposal of a Danish hospital ship as a meeting place, we apparently accepted Kaesong on the assumption that it would be neutral unarmed territory and that the two parties would be equal.

Instead, the Reds reoccupied Kaesong with troops and armed guards. Admiral Joy's delegation were photographed along with the guards as Red propaganda fodder to make it appear that they were the defeated, begging cease-fire from the victorious Communists.

The fact that the third-day break came over Red action in turning back a U. N. convoy including newsmen, was merely a belated Ridgway protest against denial of equal status and failure of neutrality observance of which the Reds had been guilty from the beginning.

The net result probably is all to the good, whether these negotiations are to be resumed as the Allied authorities seem to expect, or will be delayed indefinitely until Allied military victory. General Ridgway and his associates hereafter certainly will be sterner in their diplomatic and military dealings with the enemy.

In fairness to General Ridgway and Admiral Joy and their brilliant battle records, it must be remembered that their profession is fighting rather than dickering.

If Stalin repeatedly outsmarted such political aces as Churchill and Roosevelt, if President Truman had to learn that the Red dictator was hardly the good fellow he appeared at conferences, if such canny negotiators as Cordell Hull, James Byrnes, and Ernie Bevin had to learn the hard way, and

such crack military brains as Marshall, Eisenhower, Clark, and Clay were not tough enough in dealing with the Reds at first, it is not surprising that our present negotiators have been jolted a bit.

In most of these cases, whether American or British, Allied negotiators who acted in good faith and were tricked, came out wiser and more effective representatives. In almost every case, however, they did not react sufficiently until Stalin had repeated the double-cross and overplayed his hand.

Perhaps one explanation of Stalin's ability to fool Allied negotiators at first is that the western mind, however hard in actual military warfare, is incapable of being equally ruthless in conference.

To the democratic mind, treachery is not the purpose. It is the Communist purpose in peace as in war, because to Stalin peace is simply a camouflaged form of war to destroy the democratic enemy.

Therefore every Red conference is a trap, and the best agreement is only a temporary ruse to be broken whenever Stalin thinks he can get away with it.

Ethics of the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Must Lift Government From Moral Morass, Senator BYRD Says," an Associated Press article which appeared recently in the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUST LIFT GOVERNMENT FROM MORAL MORASS,
SENATOR BYRD SAYS

The ethics of the Federal Government have sunk so low, says Senator BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, that Congress is considering rewriting the Ten Commandments into a special code for Government officials.

Senator BYRD called it a shameful fact "that the situation in the Federal Government has reached such a point" that it was necessary "to raise the Government from the moral morass."

His remarks about the ethics of Government officials were made in a statement on Government expenditures which Senator BYRD said have been climbing steadily since World War II without any effort by President Truman to check them.

Replying to a statement by Elmer B Staats, Assistant Director of the Federal Budget, that "there is no valid basis for the assertion that vast sums of money can be saved by eliminating waste and duplications in the Federal bureaucracy," Senator BYRD cited the following examples of what he called waste:

Government publicity, \$105,000,000 a year; Armed Forces advertising, \$5,500,000; the Government operates 190,000 nonmilitary motor vehicles more than a billion miles a year; the Air Force is paying civil service salaries plus tuition to send pupils to business schools to learn typing; and Agriculture Department sells surplus butter to Italy at 15 cents a pound while the Army buys oleo at 25½ cents a pound; and the Air Force is planning to buy \$2,500,000 worth of refuse trucks at \$12,109 apiece as compared with \$6,000 trucks used in Washington.

Know Your Adversary and Be Alert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission given in the House of Representatives, I include the speech I delivered at West Branch, Iowa, at the opening of their centennial celebration last night, Thursday evening, July 12.

The West Branch centennial pageant was one of the most interesting and most colorful centennial pageants I have ever seen, as it portrayed the founding and development of President Herbert Hoover's home community and included several important incidents in his family's history and his own childhood as well as the more recent history leading to his election as President. It was indeed an honor and a privilege to attend and to take part in this ceremony.

The program and the pageant were based upon historical and patriotic motifs. My own address follows:

KNOW YOUR ADVERSARY AND BE ALERT

There have been growing up in this world over the past 150 years two great rival nations—Russia and America. Notwithstanding developments in the middle 50 years of this period that obscured their basic rivalry we need to be especially alert today to its existence. This rivalry was recognized by world diplomats, historians, and military leaders soon after the pronouncement of the Monroe Doctrine in 1823. It is worth our while briefly to look back to the writings of the period immediately following the pronouncement of the Monroe Doctrine because it may help us to understand some of the cross currents in world affairs of today.

Alexis de Tocqueville, of France, in 1831, visited the United States to inquire into what was then hailed as the great experiment in constitutional liberty. Coming to North America shortly after the pronouncement of the Monroe Doctrine, de Tocqueville was acquainted with the major currents of national developments in Europe which, in view of subsequent events, be described with remarkable precision.

Writing about 1835 in his *Democracy in America*, he summarized his views with unusual clarity:

"There are, at the present time, two great nations in the world which seem to tend toward the same end, although they started from different points: I allude to the Russians and the Americans. Both of them have grown up unnoticed; and whilst the attention of mankind was directed elsewhere, they have suddenly assumed a most prominent place among the nations; and the world learned their existence and their greatness at almost the same time.

"All other nations seem to have nearly reached their natural limits, and only to be charged with the maintenance of their power; but these are still in the act of growth; all the others are stopped, or continue to advance with extreme difficulty; these are proceeding with ease and with celerity along a path to which the human eye can assign no term. The American struggles against the natural obstacles which oppose him; the adversaries of the Russian are men; the former combats the wilderness and savage life; the latter, civiliza-

tion with all its weapons and its arts; the conquests of the one are, therefore, gained by the plowshare; those of the other by the sword.

"The Anglo-American relies upon personal interest to accomplish his ends, and gives free scope to the unguided exertions and common sense of the citizens, the Russian centers all the authority of society in a single arm; the principal instrument of the former is freedom; of the latter, servitude. Their starting point is different, and their courses are not the same, yet each of them seems to be marked out by the will of heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe."

Just before the outbreak of the Crimean War in 1853 between France and England on the one hand and Russia on the other, Lord Palmerston, British Foreign Minister for many years and Prime Minister for nearly 10 years, spoke of the czarism and its methods as follows.

"The policy and practice of the Russian Government has always been to push forward its encroachments as fast and as far as the apathy or want of firmness of other governments would allow it, but always to stop and retire when it was met with decided resistance. In furtherance of this policy, the Russian Government has always had two strings to its bow, moderate language and disinterested professions at St. Petersburg and London, active aggression by its agents on the scene of operations."

During his famous Asiatic cruise Commodore Perry not only visited the Japanese Empire and other islands of that region but also the mainland of eastern Asia. He was thus able to interpret realistically the movements he discerned.

Commodore Perry presented a paper before the American Geographical and Statistical Society, at a meeting held March 6, 1856, in New York City, from which I quote as follows.

"It requires no sage to predict events so strongly foreshadowed to us all; still westward will the course of empire take its way. But the last act in the drama is yet to be unfolded, and notwithstanding the reasoning of political empires—westward, northward, and southward—to me it seems that the people of America will, in some form or other, extend their dominion and their power until they shall have brought within their mighty embrace multitudes of the islands of the great Pacific, and placed the Saxon race upon the eastern shores of Asia; and I think, too, that eastward and southward will her great rival of future aggrandizement—Russia—stretch forth her power to the coast of China and Siam, and thus the Saxon and the Cossack will meet once more, in strife or in friendship, on another field. Will it be in friendship? I fear not. The antagonistic exponents of freedom and absolutism must thus meet at last, and then will be fought that mighty battle on which the world will look with breathless interest, for on its issue will depend the freedom or the slavery of the world—despotism or rational liberty must be the fate of civilized man. I think I see in the distance the giants that are growing up for that fierce and final encounter; in the progress of events that battle must sooner or later inevitably be fought."

It is my sincere hope that we can avoid this fierce and final encounter between Russia and America that was predicted so definitely by Commodore Perry in 1856. To do so we must know and understand our adversary and we must know our own strength and our own weaknesses. Then we must build a sound economy and develop to the utmost the sinews of our country. In doing this we must rely on the understanding and sound judgment of the American people themselves.

In natural resources Russia and America are the two great "have" nations on this

earth. No small part of our strength lies in our natural supply of strategic and critical materials. Both Russia and America are today vigorously locating, producing, and developing these materials.

Another great factor is industrial production and inventive genius. In that field America has developed overwhelming superiority.

A third great factor is the general development of our economic strength and trained manpower to maintain our agricultural and industrial production.

Another great factor is preparedness. Developments over the past 6 years in Russia give us ample warning of Russia's determination to build her military might to the utmost in preparation for any possible future war. This warning should cause us sufficient concern to build our defenses strong enough to discourage Russia from attacking us and to maintain our position in the family of nations. In doing this we must zealously guard against plunging headlong into militarism and against destroying our own fiscal stability.

Our fiscal strength is the fifth great factor, but here our Federal budget does not give us much ground for optimism unless we quickly reduce wasteful and extravagant Federal spending.

The sixth and greatest factor in building our Nation is our spiritual strength. It is in this field that America shines out in the family of nations in contrast to the godless despotism of Russia.

Russia and America have provided very different roles of government within their lands. The Russian Government promotes despotism and degrades the individual to serfdom. America, on the other hand, places supreme power in the individual.

The strength of our Nation in the family of nations in comparison with Russia will depend on our ability to maintain the six great factors I have briefly discussed. Weakness in any one of these factors can quickly undermine our strength to the point that Russia may decide she can successfully challenge us in that fierce and final encounter predicted by Commodore Perry.

One of the greatest threats to our strength is decay and collapse from within through the loss of interest by the people in maintaining the six great factors on which our strength depends. The infiltration within our own land of Communists and fellow travelers recruited from our own people and directed from Moscow within the past 20 years is a dire warning to us.

At almost the same time President Monroe proclaimed the Monroe Doctrine, Daniel Webster gave us a charge of responsibility that still rings true to this day. In his address at the laying of the cornerstone of the Bunker Hill Monument in 1825, Daniel Webster called out:

"Let the sacred obligations which have devolved on this generation, and on us, sink deep into our hearts. * * * There remains to us a great duty of defense and preservation, and there is opened to us, also, a noble pursuit, to which the spirit of the times strongly invites us. Our proper business is improvement. Let our age be the age of improvement. In a day of peace, let us advance the arts of peace and the works of peace. Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also, in our day and generation, may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

You will be interested to know that Daniel Webster's last sentence in that statement is the only quotation engraved on the walls of the Chamber of the House of Representatives of the Nation's Capitol. I repeat it: "Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see

whether we also, in our day and generation, may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

Our forefathers in their wisdom built for us a great Nation founded on sound principles and they charged us as their successors with the great responsibility of preserving our great Nation. In such service we will perform something worthy to be remembered.

Controls Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of July 10, 1951:

CONTROLS BATTLE

The administration is throwing all its economic guns into a last-ditch fight for retention of inflation curbs. The show has the look of an offensive with its arsenal of argument, propaganda and plea; actually it is a desperate defensive in which the Government seems to have a slim chance of success.

Yet if controls are scrapped, even materially stripped down, the country is headed straight for a new inflation crisis which will probably strike in the fall or next winter.

Nobody likes Federal regulation over prices, credit, wages, supply, rents or profits. We don't like Washington dictation, which obviously has been mushrooming year after year. We are suspicious that national bureaucracy seizes on one factor after another to announce a "crisis", that it manufactures "crises" to keep extending its influence increasingly over our lives.

There has been far too much truth in these apprehensions. But the tendency to expanding Federal domination must not blind us to the hard facts of economics. We are in a period of major defense production, which soon will take some \$4,000,000,000 out of American production for armament. This will mean a tremendous impetus for new inflation.

Economic Stabilizer Eric Johnston declared yesterday that the Nation can look for a much cheapened dollar, worth 30 to 40 cents of its 1939 buying power, if controls are dumped. Mr. Johnston is the Government's chief lieutenant on the firing line to secure passage of controls legislation in Congress. His boss, Mobilization Director Charles E. Wilson, gave similar warnings last night. The President has repeatedly asked extension and strengthening of controls.

Stabilizer Johnston asserted that if Congress voted extension of present controls "we can hold prices for the rest of the year." That is probably an exaggeration. We don't believe that would result. But realistic curbs can brake the pressure of new inflation trends materially—and new inflation stresses are certainly going to strike.

What the administration is seeking to do is not politically popular. Just now there is a leveling off in prices, and the prospect of truce in Korea inclines the public to discard controls. Congress knows and responds to this sentiment.

The Senate after bitter debate refused most of the changes the President asked, and weakened present authority by barring future roll-backs. Now the House is debating its bill, which prohibits roll-backs on farm products and may do so on all prices. The

Senate bill has virtually been rewritten by amendments.

Strong blocs are at work to destroy the curb laws, particularly agriculture groups which want to be kept free from controls, although this is discriminatory and food prices are the major hazard in the inflation picture.

For all the red tape, agency bumbling and hateful restrictions inherent in economic controls, unless we keep and enforce reasonable curbs during the peak of defense production, the Nation is heading into an inflation peril with throttle wide open.

Let's Call Things by Their Real Names

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, it is time that we started calling things by their real names in this country and in this House.

The issues raised in the current debate over price control and other proposed amendments to the Defense Production Act underscore the Nation's desperate need for a new honesty.

I suggest that the Members of the other body who are making a study of ethics—or lack of ethics—in Government might profitably direct some earnest attention to the prevailing sin of political euphemism.

The dictionary defines euphemism as follows:

The substitution of an inoffensive or mild expression for one that may offend or suggest something unpleasant.

Of the sins of omission and commission of which the Truman administration is guilty—and they are many and varied—there is none more prominent, more insidious, or more dangerous than this sin of euphemism.

Under the guise of high-sounding terminology and newfangled, bureaucratic gobbledygook, Mr. Truman is exploiting all of the old-time political medicine-man's bag of tricks on a scale that would have made the old-timer green with envy and dizzy with power. And, Mr. Truman has added a few new tricks of his own.

As a modern political alchemist, Mr. Truman has solved the age-old problem of turning lead into gold—political gold for himself and his henchmen. He does it by the simple process of calling lead gold.

Again I say, Mr. Speaker, it is time that we started calling things by their real names. That is the basic honesty, just as the sin of euphemism is the most basic form of dishonesty.

For example, we have today what is euphemistically termed "Government procurement" and "Government subsidies."

An earlier, more forthright, more accurate generation had another name for such governmental activities.

They called them "pork barrel."

The dictionary defines pork barrel as "appropriations from the Federal Treasury, regarded as appropriated more for local political patronage than for really necessary improvements."

Mr. Truman and his associates have achieved the ultimate in pork-barrel politics. Of course they should not claim full credit for this dubious achievement. They have had unprecedented resources with which to work—voted by the Congress. They have had pork barrel resources beyond the wildest imaginings of old-time politicians—billions for foreign aid, billions for the defense program, billions in subsidies, billions in Federal aid for States and local communities, billions in RFC funds.

The revenues collected by the Federal Government during the Truman administration to date exceed the total revenues collected by all previous administrations combined. What a super-duper pork barrel. How picayunish, by comparison, were the paltry post offices, rivers-and-harbors improvements, and veterans hospitals dispensed by earlier administrations.

And do not think that Mr. Truman, as an old Pendergast politician, does not recognize this pork barrel for what it really is. He and his associates cannot help betraying their enthusiasm for it, even though they have substituted a milder and more polite name for the more honest and offensive one.

Mr. Truman knows the political value of a pork-barrel prosperity. Did he not boast, prior to the 1948 election, that no incumbent administration is turned out in prosperous times?

Did Mr. Truman not say, in a 1950 campaign speech, apropos of the pork-barrel-farm subsidies, that any farmer who did not vote for him and the Fair Dealers "ought to have his head examined"?

Foreign aid, of course, has opened vast new vistas of pork-barrel activity. And the Fair Dealers brag about it. Consider this statement in an ECA booklet prepared at the taxpayers' expense for distribution in one politically strategic State:

Nearly 34,000 Pennsylvania workers can attribute their pay checks to business created by Marshall plan orders. In a typical 4-month period, firms in 97 Pennsylvania cities and towns received nearly \$32,000,000 in direct order for goods furnished under the Marshall plan.

Talk about pork barrels.

The ultimate in Fair Deal government will be achieved when the administration can claim credit for a pork barrel for every American. And these are the same people who like to poke fun at Mr. Hoover's modest proposal of "two chickens in every pot"—to be provided, under Mr. Hoover's quaint, pre-New Deal philosophy, not by Government but by private enterprise.

Of course, the Truman administration which brags of its pork-barrel accomplishments—naturally in more polite terms—does not tell you that the profligate Government spending, the wasteful Defense Department purchases, the Marshall plan pork barreling, and the rest of the "squandermania," are all fuel

for the inflation fires which they profess to be fighting so zealously.

Let us take another familiar euphemism of the Truman bureaucracy—manpower mobilization.

That is an impressive term.

An earlier, more forthright, more accurate generation had another name for it.

They called it the "spoils system."

The dictionary defines the spoils system as follows:

The practice of regarding public offices and their emoluments as plunder to be distributed to members of the victorious party.

Here again, Mr. Truman has had unprecedented resources—almost unlimited plunder in the form of political jobs. And under the refined guise of manpower mobilization for an ever-present emergency—would it not be pleasant to wake up some morning and find that there was no emergency? Mr. Truman has added a few tricks of his own.

Mr. Truman is a great admirer of Andrew Jackson. But he has made a piker out of his hero. Jackson believed that "to the victor belongs the spoils." Mr. Truman believes that spoils are the key to perennial victory.

Manpower mobilization? Yes, indeed. And how they are mobilizing for 1952? There were 315,000 more civilian employees of the Federal payroll in April of this year than in April of a year ago. The number of civilian employees jumped 224,000 in 4 months ending April 30.

Under Mr. Truman's spoils system they do not merely reward the faithful with jobs—they recruit new faithfuls that way.

And in recruiting these thousands of additional spoils men they add to the cost of Government and they transfer needed manpower from productive activities to nonproductive paper-shuffling jobs in Washington. By both acts they add fuel to the fires of the inflation the Fair Dealers profess to be fighting so zealously.

Turn now to another euphemism of Mr. Truman and associates—in some respects the most insidious and dishonest of all.

I refer to the so-called nonpartisan, bipartisan, or unpartisan appeal.

Whenever Mr. Truman wants something he knows he cannot get any other way, or whenever Mr. Truman's sins of omission or commission catch up with him and he needs to wiggle out of a tight spot, he invokes the nonpartisan, bipartisan, unpartisan appeal.

A harder generation shunned such euphemisms.

A harder generation of politicians undertook, with whatever shortcomings and sins, to serve the Nation through the medium of partisan politics—and offered no apologies for doing so.

At least that way the voters had an opportunity to choose. They could take it or turn it down—and out.

At least this system had the virtue of candor, forthrightness, and elemental integrity.

At least this system did not place the dissent in the false light of unpatriotic activity.

At least this system did not use the hypocritical cloak of lofty nonpartisanship, bipartisanship or unpartisanship to conceal its cheap, self-serving partisan activities and objectives.

Mr. Truman's lofty professions on this score do not keep his partisan slip from showing every once in a while.

It is showing in this present alleged fight against inflation.

You remember Mr. Truman's radio address to the Nation on June 15. In that address, Mr. Truman said, speaking of the problem of inflation:

It's up to us, not as Democrats or Republicans, but as Americans concerned with our welfare and our country's welfare. This fight we have to make is not a partisan fight. Inflation is not partisan.

That is the familiar line.

Yet the very next day Mr. Truman's Mr. Boyle, the Democratic national chairman, sent out a letter to Democratic Party leaders and precinct workers throughout the Nation, charging falsely and brazenly that hearings on the Defense Production Act "show that the Republican Party is still the inflation party." That is how nonpartisan, unpartisan, bipartisan the administration's approach to the inflation problem really is.

And because the letter obviously did not rally the support for Mr. Truman's anti-inflation schemes which was hoped for, Mr. Truman's Mr. Boyle last week sent out a second appeal—this time a frantic telegram. It was addressed to all Democratic National Committee members and to all Democratic State chairmen and vice chairmen, instructing them to put the heat on local officials and local civic leaders to put the heat on Members of Congress to get behind Mr. Truman's program. And on what is this latest appeal based? Just this: "President Truman and the Democratic congressional leadership are entitled to full support in this fight."

Of course it is partisan politics. The former Economic Stabilization Director, Dr. Alan Valentine, summed it up in one sentence when he said that the administration has infused the stabilization program with a "ward-heeler, city hall" type of politics. That is how bipartisan, unpartisan, nonpartisan it really is.

The American people want real anti-inflation measures—they want economy in government, they want a halt in soaring taxes, they want an end to the administration's spoils system waste of manpower, they want an end to pork-barrel squandering of the Nation's economic substance, they want an end to devalued, printing-press dollars.

They do not need Mr. Truman's Mr. Boyle to pressure them, through party channels, into support of these real anti-inflationary measures.

That, of course, is most fortunate—because Mr. Boyle has no intention of dispatching frantic telegrams down through the Democratic line of command demanding that the party faithful get behind such measures.

Let it be noted, in this connection that when Congress voted price and wage control powers to Mr. Truman last September it was done without benefit of

telegrams from Mr. Truman's Mr. Boyle to the party hierarchy.

And let it be noted, also, that in the 4 months—the four do-nothing months—which intervened between adoption of those measures last September and the administration's first attempts to use those powers in January—Mr. Truman's Mr. Boyle was not sending any frantic telegrams down the line to put the heat on the people to put the heat on the administration to use the authority it already possessed.

No; Mr. Truman's Mr. Boyle was busy, for at least 2 of those 4 months, with more urgent campaign-year activities.

Make no mistake about this: No anti-inflation measures which merely deal with the symptoms instead of with fundamental causes are going to be effective. Congress cannot possibly write a control bill which will please Truman. More inflation is as certain as the sunset, and Mr. Truman knows it. And Mr. Truman, who is playing partisan politics every minute regardless of his pious professions, is going to blame Congress in general and the Republicans in particular, for the consequences.

It is time to forego our denunciations of partisan politics—played openly, honestly, and frankly.

Let us direct our denunciations, rather, to the kind of cheap politics which cloaks itself in the self-righteous, hypocritical garb of bipartisan, unpartisan, nonpartisan appeals.

I come, finally, Mr. Speaker, to the prize euphemism of them all.

I refer to the concept of economic stabilization as embodied in the administration's Defense Production Act proposals now before this House.

It is nothing new for politicians to make a target of business—and I use the term "business" to embrace the broad field of industry, finance, commerce, and trade.

In bygone days it was customary, in such political sharpshooting, to identify business by the geographical and symbolic designation Wall Street.

As a symbol of big business and vested interests, Wall Street provided the ideal target for political indignation, both justified and demagogic. As a symbol of entrenched evil, Wall Street was useful both in accomplishing needed reforms and in adding color and fervor to campaign oratory.

But it is doubtful whether the most rabid castigators of Wall Street, in those bygone days, ever envisioned, even in their most violent denunciations, the sort of minute regimentation of the most detailed operations of all business, big and small, or the sort of life-and-death powers over all business, big and small, involved in the administration's proposed amendments to the Defense Production Act.

And it may be taken pretty much for granted that these sturdy Americans would have recoiled in horror at such fantastic proposals—because they were equally intolerant of big government, equally fearful of vested political interests, and equally hostile to bureaucratic concentrations of power.

The target of attack has shifted today.

Instead of the big business of Wall Street, the target is Main Street and every merchant on every Main Street in every city in America.

Instead of the big business of Wall Street, the target is Factory Avenue and every industrial concern—big or small—on every Factory Avenue in every city in America.

And the weapon of attack thus directed against every businessman and every merchant—big and small—is not campaign oratory.

It is a real gun—a loaded gun.

The weapon is the full statutory and police power of the mighty Federal Government.

It is power in the hands of a well-heeled, deeply entrenched, authority-drunk bureaucracy, with all of the apparatus and paraphernalia of bureaucracy; the complex, legalistic, constantly revised directives, having the force of law, the endless, time-consuming, labor-wasting forms, schedules, and reports; the overshadowing threat of penalties for violations however unintentional; the complicated computations, in accordance with OPS formulas, which yield as the end-product the price you are permitted to charge your customer, with or without any remaining profit.

And on top of all that, the ceaseless prospect and threat of more powers of Government, including the incredible power to license business, to suspend licenses, and so the power of life-and-death over business.

And, as a crowning insult, as a badge of compulsory acquiescence to bureaucratic regimentation there is the placard which, by law, must be prominently displayed in the place of business:

The prices of merchandise in this store are no higher than the OPS ceiling prices of the articles

Remember, all this is not campaign oratory directed against Wall Street.

This is economic stabilization. This is the law—present and proposed. This is the American businessman of today required by bureaucratic regulation to publicly advertise that he is not a law-breaker, that he is not a criminal.

And all this in the futile attempt to control some 9,000,000 different prices in the Nation's economy. All this in the absurd pretense that 9,000,000 different prices can be set, by bureaucratic directive, in proper relationship to each other. All this in the even more farcical pretense that regulations governing these prices can be changed fast enough and accurately enough to keep abreast of changing economic conditions. All this fantastic invasion of Main Street and Factory Avenue by the Federal Government, when a free market does this immense job automatically. All this when the Federal Government neglects and spurns the obvious and legitimate measures to control and prevent inflation.

An earlier, more forthright, more accurate generation would not have been deceived by the euphemism—"economic stabilization."

It would have recognized all this for what it is—and it would have called it by its real names—regimentation, the anteroom to socialism, tyranny.

We cannot afford, in the name of liberty and in the name of integrity, to do any less with all of these clever euphemisms by which the administration pilfers us of our wealth, ensnares us in red tape, engages in unprecedented practices of pork barreling and spoils, wastes our economic substance, and deceives us with lofty professions.

I close, Mr. Speaker, as I began.

It is time that we started calling things by their real names in this country and in this House.

Carrying Coals to California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1951

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that in the building of certain temporary barracks in southern California in World War II, the heating units specified and installed were found to be coal-burning stoves. The nearest coal is over 1,000 miles away in Colorado. Then in the design of certain post-office structures for construction in California it seems inevitable that we find coal bins built into their basements. Now comes the Defense Transport Administration advising us to lay in our stocks of coal during the summer months.

Mr. Speaker, when will the Washington bureaucrats come to realize that we burn oil and gas in California because we have plenty of both, and no coal.

DEFENSE TRANSPORT ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., July 9, 1951

HON. CARL HINSHAW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HINSHAW: The citizens of this country can do much to relieve the anticipated unprecedented burden upon transportation this coming fall and winter and insure themselves against physical discomfort and inconvenience if they will lay in the winter's supply of fuel now during the summer months.

The suggestion is made in the attached copy of our Information Release, No. 101, issued May 29.

It will be exceedingly helpful if you will pass the suggestion, with your "blessing" on to your constituency through your radio talks and the other media of communication you employ.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES K. KNUDSEN,
Administrator.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 11, 1951.

Mr. JAMES K. KNUDSEN,
Administrator, Defense Transport Administration, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. KNUDSEN: I am in receipt of your letter of July 9 suggesting that I might assist the people in my home district by suggesting that they lay in their supply of winter's fuel during the summer months.

The thoughtfulness of your suggestion is appreciated, but coming from California, as I do, I am sure you realize that my constituents all burn gas or use electricity for heat-

ing purposes, and it would be a bit difficult for them to acquire these items and store them in the summer time against winter's need.

Sincerely yours,
CARL HINSHAW,
Member of Congress.

South Carolina Peach Crop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I very proudly and yet humbly present the attached excerpt from the Spartanburg (S. C.) Herald for Thursday, July 12, 1951. South Carolina is very proud of the fact that she has come to be certainly one of the largest fresh-fruit-producing States in the Nation. Spartanburg County is said to be the leading peach-producing county in the country. Believing that the statistics given by the United States Department of Agriculture in the enclosed clipping will be of interest to you, my colleagues, and to the country generally, under unanimous consent, I enclose same in the Appendix of the RECORD:

USDA ESTIMATES 1951 PEACH CROP AT
6,630,000 BUSHEL

The United States Department of Agriculture Wednesday estimated the South Carolina peach crop at 6,630,000 bushels, which would equal approximately, the record-breaking 1947 crop.

The increase estimate was based on conditions July 1

The 6,630,000 figure is 390,000 higher than the Department's forecast of 6,240,000, issued last month based on conditions June 1. It was only about 1 percent under the May forecast of a record-breaking 6,708,000 bushels.

Shippers of fresh peaches here pointed out that the USDA estimate is a total production estimate—not an estimate of the commercial crop.

The market Wednesday held about steady for the third straight day, with 2-inch-up fruit moving at \$3 a bushel, f. o. b.

R. E. Wintrey, local representative of the Federal-State Market News Service, said inquiry for peaches was good, though shipments were still light.

Some smaller fruit—Burnett Elbertas 1½ to 2 inches, U. S. No. 1, was moving at \$1.75 and \$2 bushel, f. o. b., Mr. Wintrey said.

South Carolina came close to being the Nation's No. 1 peach-shipping State Tuesday

Palmetto peachmen shipped 96 carloads, but were nosed out by Californians who rolled 97 carloads.

Georgia was in third place with 75 carloads. The harvest in that State has subsided recently, but is now moving into regular Elbertas which today furnished encouraging prices for this section's many growers of this variety, topping the deal and scheduled to start moving around July 17.

These are Wednesday's New York basis (not f. o. b.) per bushel prices on Georgia regular Elbertas as reported here by United States Market News Service:

Two inches up, some fair color, \$4-\$4.50; same size, good color, \$4.75-\$5; ordinary fair color, \$3-\$3.75; 1½ inches, \$4-\$4.50, same

size, fine, \$5; 1½ minimum, \$3.50-4; poor color, same size, \$3-\$3.25; wasty, same size, \$2-\$2.50.

The New York wholesale market report was better Wednesday—slightly stronger on best large stock, all good fruit sold out well, dull on others, but with trading generally slow at midmorning.

New York terminal received 40 carloads and 24 truckloads Wednesday morning.

Lightest shippers reported for Tuesday were North Carolina with two carloads and Arkansas, heavily weather-cut, six carloads.

Wednesday's New York basis per bushel prices for South Carolina peaches included:

Hileys, 2 inches up, \$2.25-\$3, mostly \$2 50-\$3; 1½ inches up, \$2.25-\$3; 1½ inches minimum, \$2; 1¼ inches, \$2 50-\$3.

Burnett Elbertas, 2 inches up, \$2.75-\$3; 1½ inches, \$2.25.

Dixigems, 1½ inches up, \$2.75.

Jubilees, winding up, 2 inches up, \$2; 1½ inches, \$1.50.

Golden East, a new variety for this section and largely coming from Greer and Cherokee area orchards, 2 inches up, \$3 62; 1½ inches, \$2.

Stockpile Warning Given 3 Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, a recent report by a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee of the other body discloses that "the United States and the free world stand on the verge of tungsten starvation."

The report charges that, as a result of "bureaucratic blindness" on the part of the Army Department and the Munitions Board, there has been a grave failure in the program of tungsten stockpiling. The subcommittee further states that by the time these two agencies woke up to the situation and began working together, China and other principal sources of tungsten in the Far East had fallen behind the Communist iron curtain. As a result, this Nation's tungsten position is described as "little short of desperate."

In connection with these shocking disclosures, I should like to call attention to warnings regarding even more general lags and breakdowns in the vital defense stockpiling program, which I gave in a speech on the floor of this House on February 24, 1948—nearly 3½ years ago. In this speech I said:

As chairman of a subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee, I am in a position to know that the administration has fallen down on one of the most important bases of a strong and prepared America—stockpiling of strategic materials.

I pointed out at that time that 3 years earlier Congress passed a stockpiling law, and provided ample funds to start this program. I commented on the effrontery of the administration in proposing other national defense measures while failing to see that the stockpiling legislation works.

Summing up the situation as I found it in February 1948, I told the House:

Of something more than 65 strategic materials included in the stockpiling program, only two or three are in full supply in this Nation. On several of the acquisition programs, the stockpile is as big as the program contemplates for this time, in other words, up to schedule. But in more than 60 strategic metals, minerals, and materials we are not up to schedule on our stockpiling.

I asked this question after citing these sorry facts:

What good would it do to have millions of men under arms, or trained to fight, Mr. Speaker, when the minerals and metals and materials needed to supply these men were not available through poor administration of a law passed by Congress?

The question, it is obvious, is even more pertinent and more urgent today than it was then. It is equally obvious that the answer, in terms of administrative performance, still falls desperately short of the critical imperatives of the situation.

The NAM Puts the Finger on Charley and Eric

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, permit me to direct the attention of my colleagues to the following editorial which appeared in the New York Post on Thursday, July 12, 1951:

THE NAM PUTS THE FINGER ON CHARLEY AND ERIC

It looks as though Mobilization Director Charles E. Wilson and Stabilization Administrator Eric Johnston have been expelled from the club. The National Association of Manufacturers has officially announced that they are undermining the American way of life.

That seems to be the substance of the NAM's comment on the valiant efforts of Messrs. Wilson and Johnston to achieve a decent anti-inflation law. They have committed the final heresy, they have stood up and fought for controls over prices and profits as well as wages. This is obviously conduct unbecoming a tycoon and all NAM clients are solemnly admonished to look the other way if they see Charley and Eric walking down the street.

In the latest edition of its news letter the NAM tries to explain what happened to the two fallen idols. Once upon a time both were known as responsible, respectable businessmen. One of them headed General Electric; the other had corporate affiliations too numerous to mention. Yet July 1951 finds them waging a desperate battle for effective home-front controls.

What happened to Charley and Eric? The NAM says the answer is simple. They have become prisoners of their subordinates, the bright slide-rule and figure boys who get up the charts, interpret the statistics and feed them the data on which their thinking is based. Needless to say, these bright boys are New Dealers.

In advancing this explanation of a treason apparently as great as any committed

since Franklin D. Roosevelt deserted Groton, the NAM gazette tries hard to be charitable. It obviously feels that the suggestion that Wilson and Johnston have been duped by their aides is more generous than the allegation that they know what they are doing. Actually we can think of no more abusive remark. We question whether Wilson and Johnston will be relieved to learn that they are stupid rather than sinister.

We rise for the defense. We think the two accused characters have simply managed to achieve larger dimensions than the motley mob of special-privilege lobbyists now swarming triumphantly over Washington. Both men have stated their case eloquently. They have bluntly warned that the future of this country—and of the free world—is menaced by the cynical grab for special privilege now taking place in the capital.

Their stand has inevitably embarrassed all the boodleboys engaged in the great summer offensive against controls. It is palpably difficult for righteous Republicans and Dixiecrat demagogues to picture the President's anti-inflation program as a Socialist plot when Wilson and Johnston are leading the fight for its enactment. So the NAM has felt compelled to tell all. Charley and Eric may be nice guys but they are weak-minded fellows who have fallen into bad company and succumbed to bad counsel; they know not what they do and every upstanding, right-thinking, profit-grabbing patriot is hereby warned to stay away from them.

Seaway Project Endorsed by VFW at State Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a very fine editorial which appeared on June 18, 1951, in one of northern Michigan's leading daily newspapers, the Escanaba Daily Press. This editorial cites the benefits to be derived from the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway:

SEAWAY PROJECT ENDORSED BY VFW AT STATE CONVENTION

The Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Michigan, took a cue from Auditor General Martin here Saturday to adopt a resolution advocating the construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway in the interests of national defense.

Martin brought the matter before the convention with a very convincing argument that a complete relocation of heavy industry, including defense production, would be necessitated in the future unless the seaway was constructed to assure an adequate supply of iron ore for the Midwest smelters.

The seaway has been under steady and constant attack for years but primarily by selfish interests unconcerned with the Nation's welfare. The port cities of the East are particularly active in carrying on a program of vilification of the seaway project.

We are happy that the veterans of Michigan as represented by the VFW, have recognized the importance of the seaway project and have placed the weight of its organization behind the proposal.

The Middle West particularly would be benefited by the St. Lawrence project but the

entire country would share in those benefits, not only because of cheaper transportation but also because of the volume of power that the seaway development would produce.

The time is at hand for action on this project that has been stymied by selfish groups for many, many years.

Interior Department's Disregard of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my attention another instance of the Department of the Interior's utter disregard of the intent of Congress. In this case the Department has used its administrative authority, covering the use of critical materials, to further its unwarranted expansion of transmission facilities, while at the same time placing every possible road-block in the way of essential efforts of private utilities.

In January of this year the Bonneville Power Administration announced an invitation for bids in March for the construction of 45 miles of 230 kilovolt wood-pole, 11-frame structures involving a 230-kilovolt line between Pendleton and La Grange, Oreg. It has also recently announced that bids will be invited this month for a 20,000-kilovolt-amperes substation to be installed at La Grande.

The city of La Grande, as well as all of Union and Baker Counties, was then and is now being adequately served by the California-Pacific Utilities Co. Therefore, there appeared to be no justification for using critical materials in the construction of this wholly unnecessary line, and what is more, no use for the line even if constructed. Furthermore, a news release by the Federal Power Commission on January 9 included a statement to the effect that because of the power shortage in the Northwest, Bonneville would not have sufficient power to satisfy full requirements of the five companies it serves; and that, therefore, "Bonneville will not guarantee deliveries of power at any time."

If Bonneville was not in a position to supply the requirements of its existing customers, there certainly was little justification in extending its transmission facilities into new areas, and particularly areas where private power supply is adequate.

On January 30 a protest was sent to Mr. Clifford B. McManus, the Deputy Administrator of the Defense Power Administration in Washington, by Mr. George M. Gadsby, the regional member of Mr. Chapman's NPA Committee. This letter was not even acknowledged.

Then, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of May 1, 1951, there appeared a statement by Congressman JACKSON, of Washington, as follows:

Early in April of 1950-51, the Idaho Power Co. and the California Pacific Power Co. op-

posed the allotment of materials by the Defense Electric Power Administration to the McNary-La Grande line, on the basis that this will be a wasteful use of such critical materials. On April 16, 1951, after study of the circumstances and justifications for the line, the Defense Electric Power Administration approved the use of materials for this construction, thereby rejecting the power company's objections.

This statement was called to the attention of Mr. McManus by Mr. Gadsby on May 14. In his letter Mr. Gadsby stated that—

The local people familiar with this project and the power situation in the area affected, are convinced that building the line at this time is an unnecessary waste of critical materials, and have urgently requested me to make some further inquiry as to the consideration given it by the Defense Electric Power Administration, and the reason for approval of the line as alleged by Congressman JACKSON.

One month later, on June 15, Mr. Whitaker, Deputy Administrator for DEPA, replied to Mr. Gadsby's January 30 and May 14 letters, with the following statement:

Defense Electric Power Administration, upon receipt of your earlier communication, reviewed the request submitted by the Bonneville Power Administration for the additional materials requested for the construction of this transmission line. Approval of their request was made on the basis that the major part of the material had already been purchased and a considerable amount of Federal funds expended as authorized by Congress. It was our further understanding that this controversial subject was thoroughly considered by the Congress prior to their making appropriations available to the Federal agency.

I am sure my colleagues will agree with me that the basis upon which this request was granted, to wit: "that the major part of the material had already been purchased and assembled," is scarcely tenable, as the materials in question are those most urgently needed for service in areas where the transmission lines are really needed, and transshipment would have involved no loss and little expense.

My colleagues will further agree with me, I think, that it was never the intention of Congress to give the Department of the Interior authority to use critical materials to wipe out private industry by building power lines to areas which are now adequately supplied by private power, and at the same time neglecting territory where public power is the only source, and is short at that.

The St. Lawrence Seaway Is Not a Vital Part of the National Defense Blueprint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the St. Lawrence seaway is not a vital part of our national defense blueprint, ac-

cording to the June 22, 1951, edition of the Lowell (Mass.) Sun.

The following editorial stresses the fact that most of the New England delegation in Congress is opposed to the St. Lawrence seaway.

The editorial follows:

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Opinions have not changed on the St. Lawrence seaway proposition; they are still just as firmly established as they were 3 years ago when this project was in the spotlight on Capitol Hill.

Put once again there is a drive afoot to put through this development, in spite of the objections of most of the New England delegation in Congress. Making the most of the national defense effort, sponsors of the project are talking loudly about the relationship of the seaway to security, declaring that this will permit the largest ships to move to inland waters in the event of trouble on the coastal area of the Atlantic.

What is overlooked by these proponents is the finding made by Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., of Massachusetts, that the waterway would be frozen solid for several months each winter and no shipping could move at all during that period. That in itself is a fact that should suffice to discourage the most enthusiastic supporter since it most thoroughly refutes the argument that the seaway would be a vital part of the national defense blueprint.

An Amendment to the Defense Production Act To Provide for the Automatic Suspension of Price Ceilings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, in order that the membership of the House might have an opportunity to thoroughly familiarize themselves with the amendment which I propose to offer to the Defense Production Act, I am inserting in the RECORD the text of this proposed amendment, and an explanation of its effect. I want this amendment thoroughly considered. I have nothing to conceal in connection with its purpose or its effect. I hope the Members will take advantage of this opportunity to familiarize themselves with the amendment and its objectives before it is presented to the House.

The proposed amendment reads as follows:

SEC 411. If ceiling prices applicable to producers, manufacturers, or processors, or their raw-material suppliers have been or are hereafter established for any material they shall be suspended whenever it is shown to the Director of Price Stabilization that the average price of such material for a period of the preceding 60 days is 2 percent or more below the ceiling price so established for such material and no ceiling shall be re-established or maintained for such material unless or until the Director of Price Stabilization determines that the average price equals or exceeds for a period of the preceding 60 days, or exceeds by more than 5 percent for any one day, the ceiling price previously established, and if and when such

ceiling price is so reestablished it shall be (except in those cases where uniform industry-wide ceiling prices are established in lieu of individual ceiling prices) at not less than the ceiling price previously established: *Provided*, That whenever the ceiling price for any material has been suspended under the authority of this paragraph, the Director of Price Stabilization may require any seller of such material to report any sales made above the ceiling price in effect at the time such ceiling price was suspended.

(Page 23, after line 22, insert the following: "Title IV of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new section reading as above.")

The Defense Production Act provides that when price ceilings are established generally they shall be established across the board. It occurs to me that there has been little effort to establish the coordinated program of across-the-board controls of wages as well as prices which the Congress intended when it passed the present bill. Be that as it may, however. Certainly nobody contends that any ceiling should be maintained where it is not necessary to effectuate the stabilization purposes of the act. We all want as few controls as possible.

We are now concerned with the necessity of devising some formula for the suspension of controls which have ceased to serve any useful purposes. That is what this amendment attempts to supply.

There is a decontrol section in the present act. Section 402 (f) authorizing administrative exemption where ceilings are unnecessary to effectuate the purposes of this title which is to stabilize prices. But we know that controls are never relinquished or abolished willingly. Businessmen know that. The public knows that, and Congress knows it. I think the Congress should expand the present decontrol section of this act by providing a definite procedure for taking commodities out from under control when the ceilings are no longer necessary. Certainly our objective should be to have as few controls as possible.

I think we should establish an orderly system for decontrol which would encourage producers and manufacturers to increase their production and lower their prices and thus answer the inflation problem in the fundamental way. Unless we establish a definite decontrol system and direct the administration to take price ceilings off where they are not needed we may find our economy plagued with unnecessary controls for years. For instance, at the present time although prices in some commodities have dropped way below ceiling levels there has been no movement to decontrol them. Although there are hundreds of commodities which have no conceivable relation to the cost of living, they are under control. The only things that I know that have been decontrolled are dead horses and rattlesnake meat.

The greatest benefit from this amendment should be derived by the consumers in the form of cheaper prices.

The incentive to increase production is provided by allowing producers and manufacturers to get out from under and stay out from under ceilings if they hold their prices below the ceiling level. The OPS controls are so onerous and irksome that I am sure producers and

manufacturers will do everything in their power to hold their prices down if they can escape controls by doing so.

The number of records and reports which are required are not only extremely complicated requiring the time of many lawyers and accountants but they are especially detailed and burdensome. I have heard of numerous cases where relatively small manufacturers have had to employ as many as 100 people just to fill out the forms required by OPS. In one case a manufacturer had filled out over 3,000 forms, then found out OPS had issued a new interpretation which required that they all be done over again. Another manufacturer said he had spent over 1,000 man-hours on making calculations required by unofficial instructions of OPS officials, then an official interpretation was finally issued weeks later which required all the work be done over. OPS changes interpretations continually and will no doubt continue to do so in the future. This time-consuming process of calculating and recalculating and reporting will probably continue as long as an industry is under ceiling.

Even more objectionable than the reports, are the changes that OPS makes in its regulations. As long as an industry is under control that industry continues to live in mortal fear of a change in the OPS regulations which will affect their contracts and their way of doing business as well as their prices. One of the largest industries of this country had had five different orders since the 26th of January. All of them tended to supersede the previous orders and most of them cut across contracts and required new calculations. This fear and uncertainty creates an almost impossible situation for manufacturers and greatly discourages them from increasing production and selling ahead as they normally do. In one major industry I am told forward sales recently have been 65 percent below normal, primarily because of the inability to price their goods under the extremely complicated formula and because of the uncertainty of what subsequent orders would do to contracts made in the interval. Buyers sensing the situation have been out of the market, hoping for a new order and a lower price. Thus a means of getting out from under ceilings by lowering prices should provide tremendous incentive to increase production and lower prices.

In those fields where the seller does not fix his price, as in agricultural products, the rigid ceilings now in effect tend to discourage business. The very existence of the ceiling and the fear of punishment for exceeding the ceiling has the effect of restricting business and forcing prices far below ceiling levels. This is particularly true in agricultural commodities which have quoted markets where prices are fixed on a bid-and-ask basis. Flexibility is absolutely necessary in many commodities which have a very complicated marketing system.

There are a number of commodities like cotton sold on call where the contract provides the premium or discount but where the base price is left open to be fixed at a later time on the buyer's

call in relation to the futures market. In this case the seller has no control over the final price which is determined by the level of the market. Suppose the buyer ordered the price to be fixed on a certain day. If the price happens to be fixed on that day at a time when there has been an upward flurry in the market, the seller may be liable or his contract may become invalid through no fault of his own. The flexibility of this proposed decontrol system would permit normal trade practices to continue.

Let me further illustrate the necessity for flexibility. Poultry, eggs, and dairy products are below parity and under law ceilings are not imposed. There are a lot of others, these are only a few for illustration. These are seasonal commodities on which prices fluctuate, sometimes widely in 30 to 60 days. If in the fluctuation the price reached parity one month, a ceiling could be imposed through all the rest of the year the price was below the ceiling. Because of having touched parity one time, these products would be subject to all the regulations, the record keeping, reports, and uncertainties of controls; and unnecessarily. Under this proposal, if ceilings were established they would be suspended when the prices averaged 2 percent below and would not be reimposed unless and until the preceding 60-day average price equaled or exceeded the authorized ceiling, or unless there was an upward surge which carried the price as much as 5 percent above the old ceiling. Should this occur the public is protected and ceilings could be reimposed.

In most commodities there is a natural fluctuation in prices, especially in seasonal agricultural commodities which producers cannot entirely control. However, these flurries often subside with no damage having been done to the economy. This amendment would permit some flexibility which is absolutely necessary in all commodities the prices of which are fixed on a bid-and-ask basis in established commodity markets.

Let us take a hypothetical example. Say the price ceiling on refrigerators is \$250. If the manufacturer of the refrigerator can hold his price for a period of 60 days to an average of 2 percent below this figure, or \$245, the ceiling would be suspended. I think many manufacturers would make a real effort to increase their production and reduce their cost so they could get out on this basis. Now after the ceiling is suspended it may be reimposed if the price of the refrigerators goes up to a level which averages or exceeds the \$250 ceiling in any preceding 60-day period. If the price of the refrigerator went up 5 percent, or \$12.50, on one single day, the ceiling could be reimposed. Certainly the public would be amply protected against a gouge.

Now, some people have said that the job of policing would be too difficult; that this would be an administrative impossibility to tell when a commodity ceiling should be suspended and when it should be reimposed. It is no more difficult than the present system. At the present time there are very few product ceilings on which each manufacturer has

the same price. In most cases every manufacturer has a different ceiling price at the present time. Every manufacturer calculates his own ceiling on everything he makes. Therefore, the job for OPS would be no more difficult than it is at the present time in checking prices. In fact, it should be a great deal easier, because many commodities have quoted markets where the price level can be easily established.

This amendment carries out the intention of Congress enunciated in the declaration of policy in the Defense Production Act of 1950 which states that the program shall be administered insofar as practicable within the framework of the American system of competitive enterprise.

The procedure would set up an orderly movement back to a free economy under which the Government could gradually reduce controls.

This would provide an incentive to producers and manufacturers to increase their production and reduce their cost in order to avoid the burdensome and irksome features of control and especially in order to be relieved of the constant fear that OPS would change the regulations in such a way as to cancel their contracts and force them to change their way of doing business.

It would also have the further advantage of much needed flexibility in the marketing system and it would escape the damaging and disruptive rigidity of fixed price ceilings.

The amendment is limited to producers, manufacturers, or processors or their raw material suppliers and specifically excludes the ordinary retailers and the other groups that are not directly engaged in production. The amendment is drawn this way because the objective is to provide an incentive to production and also because the problem of price ceilings in the retailing industry is considerably involved—too complicated to handle in this manner.

The history of controls, the world over, indicates that they are never relinquished voluntarily. The "emergency" never ends. There is always some new excuse, and then there are a great many people who unthinkingly embrace the glittering delusion that all that is necessary to change prices and even costs is to pass a law. The planned-economy group has fixed its grasp on all the countries behind the iron curtain. In fact it is this group that designed and built that curtain. The same idea that the governmental planners know better what is good for the people than the people themselves know, strongly influences most of the governments of Europe. We have in the last few years seen it take over in Britain, long looked upon as a bastion of free enterprise. Nowhere has this continuation of controls been able to improve living standards. It has only been able to keep a lot of jobholders on the public payroll, and to give a lot of politicians an issue on which they could stay in power.

This amendment puts the issue squarely before us. Do we want controls only for the purpose of checking prices, or do we want controls for the sake of regl-

menting our economy? The choice is that simple.

The amendment does not in any way weaken the power of the OPS to establish and maintain price ceilings where it feels that they are necessary to protect the public from excessive prices. It only requires the suspension of ceilings when they have ceased to have any effect on prices. Surely there can be no reason for retaining ceiling prices under such circumstances except for the purpose of substituting a regimented economy for our historical free price system.

Nothing Should Be Spared To Render the Strategic Air Arm All-Powerful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, to my mind, there is no scourge or tribulation visited upon the human family comparable to war. I shall never forget the mixed emotions which gripped me when I learned 1 year ago that our country was again going to war with a foreign power—for the third time in my life—not to mention the many, many other times when United States troops have been landed on foreign soil.

Equally well do I recall the emotions which engulfed me when I realized that this was a war that would be fought not alone by our Nation but by a concert of world nations—solely to put an end to bloody warfare.

I remember, too, my exultations as to what I regarded as the superb courage required on the part of President Truman to put United States troops into active battle—to stop aggression—and in that manner stave off, if not altogether prevent, the coming of another world-wide global conflict. I said to myself—if the President's action would, with God's help, bear fruit, the name of President Harry Truman would ring down through the ages.

I am not unmindful of the great measure of criticism that has been leveled at various officials of our Government in these last several years—some of which was well-founded. A portion of this criticism, however, represented—to my way of thinking—the most devilish type hatchet-work that could possibly be done to chop the character and the reputations of splendid public officials virtually to shreds.

Regardless of all that we heard about certain of those in public life, the fact remains that this Nation today is being served by some of the finest American citizens to which our country has ever given birth.

Hundreds of great business executives, leaders of agriculture, labor, industry, commerce, finance, and trade, those engaged in the healing arts, engineers, scientists, lawyers, bankers, and other acknowledged leaders in their crafts or

professions are today, at the request of President Truman, serving this Government at tremendous personal sacrifice. They are doing this solely to insure our continued national existence in a world of peace, tranquillity, and abundance.

On the Meet the Press program telecast by the National Broadcasting Co. on July 8, the guest of the evening was the Honorable Thomas K. Finletter, Secretary of the United States Air Force, and the interviewers on that particular evening were undoubtedly the most representative and interesting cross section of newspapermen that we have ever seen assembled on such a panel.

There was not the least vestige of political complexion evident on the Sunday night program, and I can well imagine that the millions of persons listening sat taut and tense as they heard the questions posed by the newsmen, and listened to the answers made by our great Secretary of the Air Force.

There is probably no man in Government who enjoys the confidence of this body more, or who, in these last 12 months, has grown greater in stature than Thomas K. Finletter.

After his appearance before the Armed Services Committee, in one of the discussions among our members, I heard him described as being one of the most able men in Government today.

I well recall the remarks of my respected colleague, the Honorable LEO E. ALLEN, ranking minority member of the powerful Rules Committee of the House, who, in discussing the value of the USAF B-36 and the atom bomb in containing Russian aggression, spoke as follows:

Mr. Speaker, the name of Thomas K. Finletter is not a new name to the Members of the Congress and others concerned with Government here in Washington. At a great personal sacrifice to himself, Tom Finletter has given unstintingly of his time and largess to the solution of some of the most vexatious problems that have ever confronted our Government and country in the last decade.

We who know him know that America has no finer citizen, or, indeed, one possessed of a more logical and judicial mind than Thomas Knight Finletter, eminent soldier diplomat, barrister, lecturer, teacher, author, a man of tremendous vision, and one, who by his proven executive abilities in the handling of our Air Force, has marked himself preeminent in administration of one of the principal departments of Government.

It is indeed fortunate that we have such as Tom Finletter to head up the forces and the destinies of our great Department of the Air Force at a time when it is being called upon to spend billions of dollars.

Such was the recognition paid to one great American by another.

Discussions relative to a military armistice are now under way in Korea. How quickly political discussions may follow, no man knows. The political discussions will comprehend, among others, recognition of Communist China, the admission of the Russian Chinese to the United Nations Council, the culmination of peace with Japan, the disposition of Formosa, together with questions pertinent to Indochina, the Malayan Peninsula, as well as Thailand.

There are few, if any, men in these United States who have greater knowledge of the political as well as military implication of these problems than does Thomas K. Finletter. He is fully cognizant of the many aspects of all questions dealing with the Far East—and, certainly, his interview of Sunday night, last, showed conclusively that he had no illusions whatever as to what constitutes both the danger and the remedial measures which must be taken to insure enduring peace to our own Nation in all of its relations to the questions of the Far East.

Mr. Speaker, due strictly to the exigencies of these times and to our collective need for a full understanding and the formulation of constructive policies with respect to national affairs, I am asking the consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks and include therein the full transcription of the interview given by Thomas K. Finletter on the televised program, *Meet the Press*, presented on July 8.

Meet the Press—America's well-known press conference of the air—is an unrehearsed press conference. Present were four of America's top reporters: Mr. Marquis Childs, *United Features*; Mr. Lloyd Norman, *Chicago Tribune*; Mr. Fletcher Knebel, *Cowles publications*; and Mr. Lawrence Spivak, *Mercury publications*. It is well to remember that their questions do not necessarily reveal their point of view—the manner in which they are framed is simply their way of getting a story for you.

The program was as follows:

MEET THE PRESS

ANNOUNCER. Our guest of the evening, ladies and gentlemen, will be Mr. Thomas K. Finletter, Secretary of the Air Force, who has recently returned from Japan and Korea.

Miss ROUNTREE. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, members of the press, and Secretary Finletter. Now, Mr. Secretary, if you are all set there I see Mr. Childs has the first question.

Mr. CHILDS. Mr. Secretary, you recently disclosed that the Communists in Manchuria and Korea have built up a new air force of more than a thousand planes. Don't you think that if the advice of General MacArthur had been followed and there had been bombing in Manchuria, that force could never have been built up?

Mr. FINLETTER. No; I doubt that very much, Mr. Childs. It's always possible to build a force in various bases. I don't think anything would have stopped the building up of that force.

Mr. CHILDS. Well, doesn't the fact that that force on those new airfields and that additional build-up of the ground forces give us something of an advantage—disadvantage—now with this truce negotiation going on?

Mr. FINLETTER. I don't know what you mean by disadvantage. Certainly the addition of power on the other side is not to our advantage.

Mr. CHILDS. And you believe that could not have been prevented by any tactics?

Mr. FINLETTER. No; I don't think it could have.

Mr. SPIVAK. Mr. Secretary, on January 16, Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg said from Korea: "The Air Forces are in good shape. American planes have superiority over the best the Reds can put in the air," and on January 29 you said, "Strategic air power is the greatest deterrent to an attack on us and the rest of the world." But recently, Gen-

eral Vandenberg, in his testimony before the MacArthur committee, said, "Our Air Force was a shoe-string air force." Now what are we to believe?

Mr. FINLETTER. Mr. Spivak, I think that that statement about the shoe-string Air Force is taken a little bit out of context in your quotation. As I remember it what General Vandenberg said was that if the Air Force had to do four or five different jobs at once, had to fight say in Korea and other places and be prepared to carry out its basic missions that then it was a "shoe-string air force." But I want to make it entirely clear that we've got a very good Air Force. It is not as good as I hope it's going to be but it's a first-rate force.

Mr. SPIVAK. Well, now along that line in 1948, you asked for a 70-group Air Force, and now I understand you ask for a 95-group air force, and General Spaatz, the former Chief of Staff for Air, said early this year that we need a 250-group Air Force. Now what do we need?

Mr. FINLETTER. This numbers business you know, Mr. Spivak, is a little confusing. Let's see what we do need. What we're working toward, now, is a 95-wing air force and we now have about 87 wings, and we will have 95 wings at the end of the fiscal year 1952, namely on June 30, 1952. On the other hand, that force will not be all equipped with the kind of planes we want it equipped with. It will be well into the end of the year before it is equipped with what we might call the modern type of plane. As for what we need for the future, the Air Staff has under constant study our requirements, and specifically I think that we are going to come up with recommendations for more than the 95 wings.

Let's take the strategic air arm first. The requirements that are on the strategic air arm are increasing daily. We are going to have more bombs to deliver, we are running up against better defenses on the part of possible enemies, and also we are running up against a greater military preparedness on their part. You said something to the effect that, in my opinion the strategic air force was the greatest deterrent to war that there is. I want to subscribe to that. I believe that the strategic air arm is the single most important part of the armed services and I don't think that there should be anything spared which will make that the most powerful force there is. The Air Force will certainly recommend that the strategic air arm be kept up so that it can render the most devastating possible attack that can be made. I could elaborate more on the other branches of the Air Force.

Mr. SPIVAK. Well, Mr. Secretary, on that strategic air arm, you recently said that it was vital for us to get bases, foreign bases, and that seems to be a change in positions, and I wondered whether that change has come about because of what has been happening in Korea.

Mr. FINLETTER. No, there's no change in that, Mr. Spivak. As you know, our strategic air arm is composed of two types of bombers, the inter-continental bomber and the medium bomber. Now, the medium bomber at the present time requires bases outside the continental United States, and that's what I meant by that statement. On the other hand, we are at the minute working on other techniques, such as refueling, which is extending the range of the planes. I want to point out one thing—it is that the move to jet planes to a certain extent restricts the range of our aircraft because the jet range while gradually increasing is not as long as say the B-36 which is essentially a conventional piston prop job.

Mr. SPIVAK. Well, has the success of the MIG's against our 29's had any effect upon your thinking as regards bases, I mean haven't they been knocking out quite a number of our intermediary planes?

Mr. FINLETTER. No; the only thing that the success of the MIG's against the B-29 has done to my thinking is to reaffirm my determination that we're going to have the best kind of planes and the proper numbers of them for this all important strategic air arm.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Finletter, you said something about asking for additional wings. There are rumors around the Pentagon that the Air Force may be planning on a 160 air combat wings with a total force of men of 1,900,000—which is larger than anything the Army plans to have.

Mr. FINLETTER. I can't talk about any specific figure that we're thinking of. Fact is, I think this talking about figures confuses the issue. I think you have to talk in terms of what the three fighting branches of the Air Force are, and you've got to see to it that those three fighting branches are ready to do their job.

We now have something, I understand, in the order of 19,000 planes. The 70-group program contemplated 6,889 first line planes and a reserve of 8,100 planes which gave you 14,000 roughly, or 15,000. If you're going to 160 or 150 you will have an Air Force that nobody ever dreamed of.

Mr. NORMAN. That may be.

Mr. FINLETTER. I'm not saying that that is the figure, you understand, but you're certainly going to need more planes if you have more wings.

Mr. NORMAN. Well, can you explain why we would need those many wings?

Mr. FINLETTER. I can explain to you why, in my opinion, we will need over 95 wings. You've got to look at the three functions that the Air Force will have to carry out. I've given some indications of how seriously I regard the strategic air arm. I believe that it has to have the quality and the quantity of planes that will enable it to do the job and that will have to be more planes than are presently in it. Now the same thing is true, although I don't place the same emphasis on it, of the air defense system. We need more air-defense planes in order that this country may be spared the horrors of bombing to the maximum extent possible. And then, too, as the plans for the North Atlantic Treaty Army and Air Force develop, it may very well be that there will be an additional requirement. Back of all that, you have the transport planes that support all of these things. That's the reason for the need for a very powerful air force.

Mr. NORMAN. Well, at this rate that the Air Force is moving along, and I understand that this plan that you are working toward will cost \$30,000,000,000 a year or—

Mr. FINLETTER. I don't know where you got those figures.

Mr. NORMAN. I read it in the week-end papers.

Mr. FINLETTER. If it was in the papers, it must be accurate. But I don't know anything about that.

Mr. NORMAN. If it is that high, and it seems to me very likely, that 160 groups, if that is the figure and it will cost that much, you're practically eliminating the Army and Navy from any funds.

Mr. FINLETTER. I don't think that's quite accurate, evidently you assume figures, Mr. Norman, which I don't accept. The President's request for fiscal 1952 was for a 60-billion-dollar budget.

Mr. NORMAN. Well, Mr. Secretary, can you build a 150 air group with the 19 billions that they're allotting to you for 1952?

Mr. FINLETTER. No; you cannot.

Mr. NORMAN. Well, how much do you—

Mr. FINLETTER. The figure, by the way, is around 22 billion. The 22 billion will support the 95 wing force.

Mr. KNEBEL. Mr. Secretary, what is the truth about bases in France? You hear all kinds of stories; what do we want in France? There's been some wild story there that we

want to tear up the farmers' fields and put down 50 bases. Is that true?

Mr. FINLETTER. In the first place we have made arrangements for strategic bases in Morocco, I assume you include those. And then it's also quite obvious that as a part of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization it's going to be necessary to have a NATO air force, and it's obvious that a NATO air force is going to require bases, and that is the need for bases. It's really a NATO need, and not a need of the United States of America. You speak, Mr. Knebel, as though the United States were alone concerned with the defense of Western Europe. That isn't true at all. It's a NATO job that is being done. Now, of course, there will have to be wings over there in support of the divisions of the United States which are going over.

Mr. KNEBEL. Well, transfer just a little bit south—how about Spain?

Mr. FINLETTER. What about Spain?

Mr. KNEBEL. Well, do we want bases there, and do we have any assurance from Franco that we will have any?

Mr. FINLETTER. We have no assurance that I am aware of. Of course, we would like bases everywhere we could get them, where they would be useful operationally. Our plan was to have a very wide base structure. I want to make this point if I may. I think it's worth making and that is that the air base structure of the Air Force is not up to where it should be. We are starting in a sense from scratch, not quite from scratch but these new demands on the Air Force are new since the end of the war and it's quite a long build-up job to get your proper bases.

Mr. CHILDS. There's been a lot of talk, and some here this afternoon about the inadequacy of the Air Force. Do you think our Strategic Air Force is sufficiently strong to deliver a retaliatory blow to the Soviet Union if we should be attacked? A paralyzing blow?

Mr. FINLETTER. You said two things there, Mr. Childs. A retaliatory blow and a paralyzing blow. First of all, the Air Force is capable of delivering a very powerful strategic counterattack, a very powerful one. Now when you get into your word "paralyzing," I'll have to digress a moment. No nation has ever been subjected to an atomic attack of the kind of which the United States is now capable and will be capable and of which other nations are also capable and will be capable. Therefore, any prognostication as to the effect of this gets you into a realm of uncertainty. All I can say is that it's a terrible thing. It's the most powerful weapon that man has ever had in his hands and its effect might well be paralyzing, especially in the future, as this power grows on both sides.

Mr. CHILDS. Could you express a ratio, Mr. Secretary, as between the heaviest attacks of World War II and this kind of strategic weapon?

Mr. FINLETTER. It's a totally different sort of thing, Mr. Childs. In the aggregate, the effect of high explosives and incendiary bombing over a long period of time creates terrible damage, but the thing about the kind of attack which is now in the hands of those who have atomic weapons must be measured also by the time factor, because the devastation of this attack can be delivered within a relatively short period of time.

Mr. CHILDS. And as a corollary to this, could the Russians deliver tonight to American cities an atomic attack?

Mr. FINLETTER. They could.

Mr. CHILDS. Or tomorrow?

Mr. FINLETTER. They could.

Mr. CHILDS. When will we be able to say that that is impossible?

Mr. FINLETTER. I doubt if you'll ever be able to say that that's impossible, Mr. Childs, until some new development of science, some miracle comes in. At the present time we only have the orthodox type of air defense

with which you're entirely familiar. We still use the radar that picks up the enemy planes where they are, and reports back, and the interceptors that go up and try to intercept them, and the antiaircraft artillery which tries to knock them down, which is somewhat like the old World War II system. It's more efficient than it was in World War II, but it's nothing like what you're suggesting as a complete guaranty against an attack.

Mr. NORMAN. There are some people, Mr. Finletter, who disagree with your basic thinking on this air strategy. Admiral Gisdle, of the Navy, who is considered a leading naval air strategist, has said that the only way that we can stop an enemy in Europe, besides having foot soldiers on the ground, is to have a large tactical air force, that a strategic bombing force of the kind that you are talking about will not do the job, and he says we are spending too much money. He says that the current funds allocated to strategic air establishments should be turned into tactical air force, that we're spending too much money on strategic bombers, and that strategic air forces, as currently conceived and constituted, do not pull their weight in a specific war situation with which we are faced.

Mr. FINLETTER. Now, Mr. Norman, you'll forgive me, Miss Roundtree, but I want a chance to answer that one. In the first place I completely disagree; let's make that entirely clear. There must be a tactical air force, to be sure, which will work with the ground troops, and please don't think what I'm saying now is that tactical air is not necessary. But any idea that the strategic air force is not predominantly necessary is absolutely wrong. The strategic air arm is the greatest deterrent to attack by an enemy at this time that exists, and it will continue to be such if we put the proper effort in it. I cannot overemphasize the value of the strategic air arm to the defense of this country as well as to that of Europe. I want to repeat and make it entirely clear that nothing should be spared to render that air arm all powerful.

Mr. NORMAN. However, in your report, Survival in the Air Age, which was prepared by the Finletter committee and which you wrote sometime in 1947, you said the commission—that's this air policy commission—does not subscribe to the proposition that armaments are a guaranty of peace. History does not assure us that a strong armament policy by a peacefully inclined nation is certain of fighting off aggressive and totalitarian governments. An aggressor may calculate it can arm better and faster than the nation that it is choosing as its victim, and that if it hits hard enough and with no warning it can conquer.

Indeed a totalitarian government may seek war for war's sake, or to divert attention from its internal troubles even though it may not be certain it will win, so that a strategic air force may not be the deterrent that you say it is.

Mr. FINLETTER. I don't subscribe to the implication of the way you're interpreting that, Mr. Norman.

I stand back of that statement. I believe that today. The point I want to make is that the strategic air arm is the greatest deterrent that there is to war. I didn't say it was an absolute deterrent. Somebody might make a mistake and decide to take it on.

Mr. NORMAN. Are you referring to the Chinese Communists in Korea?

Mr. FINLETTER. Just 1 minute before we get to the Chinese Communists in Korea. To have this strategic air arm available as a deterrent will give us the time; it will be a shield back of which we can work for peace. That is what I was saying—

Mr. NORMAN. You should talk about a quickie war—

Mr. FINLETTER. I didn't talk about a quickie war.

Mr. NORMAN. You say we can devastate in a very short time, paralyze in a very short time.

Mr. FINLETTER. I hope that we can. I thought I prefaced that by saying that one could not be certain about these things. I don't want to repeat what I said before on that.

Mr. KNEBEL. I want to get a little different view, Mr. Secretary. You used the word, I think, in testimony Friday up on the Hill. The money you're asking for now for the bases is an authority program. If I were a Congressman and called you up tomorrow and said I'd like to fly to Venezuela, would you fly me there in a bomber?

Mr. FINLETTER. No; I probably wouldn't. Not unless—

Mr. NORMAN. If I were Chairman VINSON, of the Armed Services Committee?

Mr. FINLETTER. Not unless there was a certificate that it was in the interest of the Air Force.

Mr. NORMAN. Is that the policy.

Mr. FINLETTER. That's the policy.

Mr. NORMAN. Well, how about these foreign relations fellows that just flew to Europe?

Mr. FINLETTER. I don't know about the n. They must have had the proper certificate. I can see high value in having members of the foreign relations committees go to Europe to study things on the spot.

Mr. SPIVAK. Mr. Secretary, are you satisfied that you're getting the fair proportion of the defense budget today?

Mr. FINLETTER. I don't get into proportions, Mr. Spivak. What I am interested in is seeing whether I'm getting enough for the Air Force.

Mr. SPIVAK. Well, now, I can understand that, but you can only get enough if there is so much of the defense budget, you can only get enough if you get a fair slice of it.

Mr. FINLETTER. Not necessarily. We might get more in the budget.

Mr. SPIVAK. Well, now, you said a minute ago, I believe, that the amount in 1952 for 95 wings you expected to get \$22,000,000,000. Now you're aiming for 150 wings. Now that's going to cost you at least \$30,000,000,000.

Mr. FINLETTER. I don't know about those figures, but I do want to point out one thing and that is that in this build-up to 15 wings there is a capitol investment in there. This doesn't mean that if you were going to level off at 95 wings that you would have to keep that rate of spending. You bought some of the capital goods. These figures I'm not familiar with.

Mr. SPIVAK. Well, Mr. Secretary, let me switch a moment. I have before me—

Miss ROUNDTREE. Before we switch, Mr. Childs, did you want to follow up that question? Then go ahead, Mr. Spivak.

Mr. SPIVAK. I have before me a magazine called Air Force which states from official sources that in the Korean war, air power has accounted for 81 percent of all enemy trucks destroyed. This is of March 1950. Seventy-five percent of all enemy tanks destroyed, 72 percent of all enemy artillery destroyed, 47 percent of all enemy troops destroyed. Now, since the Army casualties were over 75,000 and the Air Force casualties under 2,000, doesn't that strongly suggest that we ought to put more of our military budget in air power, rather than in other things.

Mr. FINLETTER. You've got me on a double question here. In the first place, I don't think that those statistics are quite fair to the Army. I personally have been very surprised at the high percentage of casualties that have been produced through the air. But, on the other hand, you would not have held Korea if you hadn't had ground troops in the battle, and American ground troops in the battle.

Mr. SPIVAK. There are some differences of opinion on that, aren't there?

Mr. FINLETTER. I don't know, I am just giving my own view.

Mr. SPIVAK. In regard to O'Donnell who said that he thought he could have taken Korea in 3 months if he had been—

Mr. FINLETTER. I don't know what General O'Donnell said but I rather like these Air Force officers that seem to think they can take anybody single-handed. That is the spirit I like.

Mr. CHILDS. I want to ask you a question, Mr. Secretary. Our Air Force officers have suggested that a preventive strike with an atomic bomb would be important against Russia to prevent a Pearl Harbor here. Do you think that view is widespread in the Air Force and what is your opinion of it?

Mr. FINLETTER. I will give you my opinion of it. I can't tell you how widespread it is in the Air Force, but I will hand you my opinion and it is a very personal one and is one that one makes up in his own individual mind because it is a matter of philosophy and morality.

I think that the United States has to play this the tough way. I think to go the way every other nation in its history for 6,000 years has gone to start a war to stop one is the easier way. I think we have to try to prevent war by this difficult course that we are pursuing, and, I am opposed to a preventive war.

Mr. CHILDS. Your policy on the Air Force is to prevent expressions contrary to that.

Mr. FINLETTER. We don't—the problem does not arise, I don't know who said that in the Air Force.

Mr. CHILDS. General Anderson did for one down at that—

Mr. FINLETTER. He is no longer with the Air Force.

Mr. NORMAN. We were talking a little earlier about the MIG-15 engine and the fact that it was superior to a Saber jet engine, I would like to know first, sir, whether we have captured a MIG-15 so that we could determine that. I notice that the New York Times, this morning, bluntly indicated that General Vandenberg had said that we had captured a MIG-15 either on the ground or otherwise and so determined the superiority of this engine and, secondly, what is the reason for the superiority of these Russian engines over ours?

Mr. FINLETTER. Let me answer the first question. The statements that have been made about the MIG-15 engine are based on sound evidence. They are not just wild guess work, and that is as far as I will go in answering that question. I will not say whether or not we captured the MIG-15. The second part of your question was, Why have they got an engine superior to ours? In the first place, what I think that General Vandenberg said was and what the fact is, that it is believed that that engine is superior to the engines we have in our planes in Korea does not mean it is superior to all of them.

But I think this teaches us a lesson which I would like to emphasize, and that is not to underestimate the engineering and scientific capacity of other nations. We have a tendency to do that too much. This ought to be a lesson.

Mr. SPIVAK. Mr. Secretary, last week on this program, Mr. David Lilienthal, former head of the Atomic Energy Commission, said reliance on the atomic bomb resulted in starving of our Army and Navy and the fact that we had no tactical Air Force and we put all our eggs in one basket—the A-bomb basket. Since the A-bomb and our strategic Air Force are all tied together, I want to ask you, is it true that the other services were starved at the expense of the A-bomb basket?

Mr. FINLETTER. No; it is not true and I want to deny flatly the implication of that

statement. There is nothing gadgety about this A-bomb. When I am talking strategic air force, I am talking about the airplanes that carry the atomic bomb.

Mr. SPIVAK. The H-bomb, too?

Mr. FINLETTER. Yes; and the H-bomb, when it is developed, and I want to make it entirely clear, although I have said it three times, that I consider this very far from a guess and I consider it the basic defense of the United States and of Europe.

Mr. SPIVAK. Can you deliver the H-bombs in the planes you now have or will you need special planes?

Mr. FINLETTER. I don't feel that I should answer that question, Mr. Spivak.

Mr. SPIVAK. I am sorry, sir.

Mr. KNEBEL. Mr. Secretary, why is it, when we had, I think, over 1,000 Air Force bases during the war that you now have to ask for 77 more? Why can't we fix up the old ones?

Mr. FINLETTER. For the reason that we demobilized our base structure. I don't want to give the impression we are building all these bases new. We are, in fact, only building six bases new in the United States. All the rest are being recaptured, and those six are being built new for special reasons. Don't let's get the idea now that we are getting wasteful in our base structure.

Miss ROUNDTREE. I am sorry to interrupt, gentlemen, but our time is now coming to a close. I want to take this opportunity of thanking you, Mr. Childs, Mr. Spivak, Mr. Norman, Mr. Knebel, and you, Secretary Finletter, for being with us on this program of Meet the Press today.

Why Overtax the American People?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the matter of taxes has gotten to be a very important one with all of the taxpayers of the country. The last tax bill passed by the House of Representatives called for a larger amount of taxes than any other bill ever passed by the House of Representatives. That bill raised the personal-income tax to a terrifically high limit, and also the same was true with reference to corporate taxes. That bill also raised excise taxes in many instances and added many additional commodities to the tax list.

The impact of the tax laws on the economy of the Nation has been described very thoroughly in a recent article published by Dr. Julius Hirsch, one of America's great economists.

Dr. Hirsch is a thorough student of finance and economics, and he has written many very instructive articles on these subjects.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting for printing in the RECORD the following article which I think will be found to be interesting and instructive by many of the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHY OVERTAX THE AMERICAN PEOPLE?—CONGRESS COMMITTEE HAS VOTED MORE TAXES THAN NEEDED FOR FISCAL 1952

For 5 years our Government in Washington has consistently underestimated the Federal revenue, and done so to a startling

degree. Now it claims a \$10,000,000,000 boost in taxes is going to be needed to balance the budget in the fiscal year which has just begun.

The administration's present claim for fiscal 1952 ought to be suspect simply on the basis of its record for erroneous forecasts. In addition, analysis of available figures suggests that the cash budget in the new fiscal year will be balanced without any new taxes at all. If Congress yields to the Executive's pressure and passes tax increases, they will simply produce a surplus.

Let us look at a few examples of past underestimates:

THE SINS OF THE PAST

For fiscal 1947—year to June 30, 1947—the President forecast a deficit of \$4,500,000,000. The fiscal year yielded a surplus of \$800,000,000. Miscalculation was \$5,300,000,000. Even though expenditures were greater than forecast by \$6,500,000,000.

For fiscal 1948 the President estimated a balanced budget \$200,000,000 surplus.

I was able to estimate as early as January 1947 a surplus of 7 or 8 billion.

In August of 1947 the President estimated the surplus would be \$4,600,000,000, and we had an actual surplus of \$8,400,000,000 (miscalculation \$8,200,000,000).

For fiscal 1951 President Truman estimated in the budget message of January 1950 a deficit of \$5,133,000,000, and changed this in January 1951, based on new taxes passed in 1950, to a deficit of \$3,100,000,000. We now have a surplus of \$3,500,000,000. Miscalculation, \$6,600,000,000.

Thus, the inflationary pressure which we experienced in the first 9 months of fiscal 1951, was certainly not due to a budget deficit. We will also have, as the figures now stand, no cash deficit in fiscal 1952 even without a penny in new taxes.

NO CASH DEFICIT IN FISCAL 1952 EVEN WITHOUT NEW TAXES

Looking forward, the 1951 surplus amount of \$3,500,000,000 can be carried over into fiscal 1952. This will immediately improve the cash situation—which will be even more favorable since the trust funds (social security, etc.) have also yielded a surplus in 1951, as we had during that fiscal year very small payments, e.g. for unemployment.

NATIONAL INCOME AGAIN UNDERESTIMATED

Furthermore, it has been evident for some time that the national income, on which the budget revenue estimate for 1952 was based, was again forecast at too low a level. Inflation and rising prices boost tax revenues. The enormous expansion of production since Korea—probably about 11 to 12 percent at an annual rate—has increased personal income and taxes.

Total personal income increased by \$25,000,000,000 from July 1950 to April 1951, inclusive, that is from an annual rate of \$220,700,000,000 to \$245,200,000,000. The first budget forecast for 1952, however, was based on a total personal income estimate of \$231,100,000,000 a year which was the figure when the forecast was made in October 1950.

In view of the obvious rise in income, the Treasury itself raised its estimate of tax receipts. As personal income at the beginning of April had reached \$245,200,000,000 on an annual basis, the Treasury forecast that this would also be the average of calendar year 1951, and consequently upped its forecast of revenue by \$3,400,000,000.

Accordingly the administration reduced its claim for \$16,500,000,000 in new taxation to \$10,000,000,000.

Some weeks later, when it was clear that national income had risen again, the Joint Congressional Committee for Internal Revenue upped the Government forecast of total personal income for 1951 to \$255,000,000,000 and arrived at a tax income for fiscal 1952,

on the basis of the present rate, or \$60,-900,000,000.

On June 28, 1951 Secretary of the Treasury Snyder announced that the Government had revised its expenditure figure for fiscal 1952 downward by \$3,200,000,000. Contemplated outlay is now reduced from \$71,600,000,000 to \$68,400,000,000.

Instead of a forecast deficit, he has the second highest surplus in all history for fiscal 1951, namely \$3,520,000,000.

Did Mr. Snyder now at least reduce his claim for \$10,000,000,000 new taxation for fiscal 1952? Did he allow for the better forecast of the Committee of Internal Revenue adding \$2,500,000,000 to tax income; for the fat tax surplus from social-security taxes? Even omitting this last element his deficit would have been reduced to less than \$4,000,000,000.

Far from it.

Sticking to his antiquated income forecast, Mr. Snyder nevertheless still claims that he needs \$10,000,000,000 in new taxes.

I think that it is easy to show that all expenditures for fiscal 1952 can be met without new taxes because—

1. In all probability the national income will be very considerably higher in fiscal 1952 than its rate in April 1951. Forecasts by non-Government experts point to total personal income not of \$245,000,000,000 as last anticipated by Secretary Snyder, not of \$255,000,000,000 as last anticipated by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation in April, but of about 265 to 270 billion dollars as the average for fiscal 1952.

2. The Snyder forecast anticipates that not the slightest cut in the expenditures as proposed by the administration will be made—while Senator BYRD claimed a \$7,000,000,000 cut and Senator DOUGLAS at least a \$3,000,000,000 cut.

3. Even under the assumption that no reduction of expenditures as proposed by the administration would be made, the cash budget for 1952 would look as follows based on present tax rates:

	Snyder proposal	Joint committee proposal	Our estimate
Based on personal income in fiscal 1952 of.....	\$245 billion	\$255 billion	\$265 to \$270 billion
Would yield a tax income of.....	Billions \$58.4	Billions \$60.9	Billions \$62.1-\$63.1
Budget surplus of 1951 carried forward at least.....	3.5	3.5	3.5
Cash surplus of Federal funds.....	3.0	3.0	3.0
Cash supply available for fiscal year 1952.....	64.9	67.4	68.6-69.6

WHY HIGHER INCOME IN FISCAL 1952?

Total personal income is composed of labor income, dividends, and proprietors' income. These were \$165,000,000,000, \$19,700,000,000, and \$48,300,000,000, respectively, when the Snyder forecast was made in April.

Since the April forecast was made, labor income has already increased somewhat. It rose by \$1,900,000,000 from February to March, it rose by \$2,000,000,000 from March to April, and this rise must have continued and will further do so after many hundred wage-raising agreements waiting on the Wage Stabilization Board's desk will be agreed upon, let alone the relaxation in the wage ceilings.

As during the next year the labor force will certainly not decrease but probably increase somewhat; as, moreover, wages are bound to increase some (Senator TAFT thinks more than 10 percent), we consider it to be a modest assumption to put the average wage and salary bill for fiscal 1952 at a rate

of somewhere around \$178,000,000,000. Professor Slichter estimates that it will lie between one hundred and eighty-three and one hundred and ninety billion dollars at the end of the period. As salaries and wages amount to 65 percent of personal income, in the average of a year's period, correspondingly, total personal income should be about two hundred and sixty-nine to two hundred and seventy-five billion dollars, or rather modestly figured between two hundred and sixty-five and two hundred and seventy billion dollars on an average.

Consequently, we would have, with an expenditure of \$68,400,000,000, under the assumption of the Internal Revenue Committee, a cash deficit of \$1,200,000,000, under an assumption of \$270,000,000,000 personal income, no deficit, to a cash surplus of \$1,200,000,000.

But the House of Representatives, as a result of the erroneous assumptions of the administration, has voted no less than \$7,-200,000,000 in new taxes, partly extremely burdensome for an economy experiencing a lull completely unforeseen by official experts.

If the \$7,200,000,000 in new taxes would be enacted, we would have, under the assumption of the internal revenue committee, \$6,000,000,000 surplus; under an assumption of \$270,000,000,000 personal income, seven and four-tenths to eight and one-fourth billion dollars surplus, and this without one penny cut in the administration spending proposals.

To make Congress adopt this huge budget which evidently will yield a near-record surplus, if taxes are increased, the administration announced that in fiscal 1953 expenditures would run to eighty to ninety billion dollars. At the same time, however, it was announced that the military budget for fiscal 1953 might run up to \$55,000,000,000. Based on present standards, this would actually mean that the total budget then might perhaps read \$75,000,000,000—not \$80,000,000,000 and certainly not \$90,000,000,000. Thus, when Snyder testified, he justified his new tax program less by the needs of fiscal 1952 than by the blown-up needs of fiscal 1953.

Hereupon, these questions seem to be justified:

1. Should the end of the bloody fighting in Korea bring no reduction at all in the scheduled expenses?

2. Or should someone within the administration be thinking of using the defense production of our Nation as a political WPA in favor of superemployment during the election campaign of 1952? Or do they just want a big surplus to boast about?

3. If some budget savings were to be brought about by Congress—even if they would not come up fully to the \$7,000,000,000 proposed by Senator BYRD, let alone the \$20,-000,000,000 cut proposed by Senator TAFT, but only the modest \$3,000,000,000 of Senator PAUL DOUGLAS—why does Congress prematurely hand out ten to eleven billion dollars more than needed?

Extension of Federal Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the following resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the

City of New Haven and approved by the Honorable William C. Celentano, mayor, on July 6, 1951, in favor of the extension of Federal rent control for 1 year:

Whereas knowing that rent control is being extended only to July 31: Be it

Resolved, That this Board of Aldermen of the City of New Haven go on record as in favor of extending rent control 1 year, and that this recommendation be sent to all Congressmen and Senators from Connecticut, also to the Honorable BRENT SPENCE, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, and to the Honorable BURNETT R. MAYBANK, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

The Fabulous Fourth District of Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I desire to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Frank R. Wilson, of the Bureau of the Census. It relates to the Fourth Congressional District in Nebraska.

I am sure I will be pardoned for bragging just a little bit. I believe it would be helpful if other Members would give us information about their congressional districts.

The article follows:

THE FABULOUS FOURTH DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

WASHINGTON, D. C.—The Census Bureau, after looking over its 1950 statistics concerning the 38 counties in the Fourth Congressional District of Nebraska, has come up with the opinion that this district is one of the most unique in the Nation.

To illustrate the giant size of nearly everything in this district the Census Bureau says that if every Member of the House of Representatives represented as many acres of farmland as ARTHUR LAWIS MILLER, who represents the Fourth Nebraska District, the United States would have to absorb other nations because, if that were true, nearly 21,000,000,000 acres of farm land would be needed. This would be 20 times the acreage of all farms now in the United States.

Also, the Census Bureau says that if every Member of the lower House represented as many cattle as Dr. MILLER does there would be 844,318,470 cattle in the United States—10 times as many as there are now—and porterhouse steaks would be 10 cents a dozen.

The principal factor that makes the Fourth District unique is the relation between its economic importance as a producer of the Nation's food and its number of people. In the whole 38 counties of this district census enumerators in 1950 found only 315,795. They found very few cities of any size, Grand Island with 22,835 being the largest. The others which exceeded 10,000 population were North Platte, Scottsbluff, and Kearney. All of these cities had high rates of increase in population, but the rural areas showed large decreases. Why? For one thing, the census enumerators found 38,892 tractors on the farms of this area, 20,617 motortrucks, and 83,969 automobiles. Between 1945 and 1950 the tractors increased in number by 11,532 and motortrucks by 7,035. Thus, as the

large farms and ranches are mechanized, there is less demand for manpower and vastly increased production.

Nearly everything in the Fourth District is of giant proportions. The entire 38 counties had only 30,637 farms or ranches—a reduction of 2,000 in the 5 years prior to the census. The farms and ranches of these 38 counties are made up of 47,824,357 acres. Thus, the average size of farm tracts is 1,561 acres. Of the 30,637 farms and ranches, 20,533 are electrified. The average monthly electric bill was \$8.03.

In a single year—1949—these 30,637 farms marketed farm products to the amount of \$266,526,335. Thus, this vast district had a farm income per acre of \$5.57, and these farms attained a total value of nearly 1,000,000,000—to be exact, \$826,490,350. The average value of farms and ranches between 1945 and 1950 increased from \$17,325 and \$35,241.

On the farms and ranches of this district in 1950 the census enumerators found 1,940,962 cattle, 427,124 hogs, and nearly 200,000 sheep.

Most of the farm revenue of this fabulous area was obtained through the marketing of livestock and livestock products. For this the revenue was \$202,393,609, of which \$16,699,226 was dairy products. Crop products sold had a value of \$94,551,941.

The large-scale farm and ranch operations in this district are indicated by the fact that there were 1,788 units that had product sales of more than \$25,000; there were 5,540 which had product sales of between \$10,000 and \$25,000; and 8,138 that had product sales between \$5,000 and \$10,000.

After each census of agriculture, the Census Bureau publishes an interesting booklet called *Ranking Agriculture Counties*. In it are shown the 100 leading counties in the United States in all principal elements of agriculture. Needless to say, many of the 38 counties in this district are entered in these honor lists. Cherry County in this district has for several censuses been the No. 1 cattle county in the country. In 1950 it had 268,456 cattle. All of the 1950 county comparisons have not been made, but in the 1945 census, Elko County, Nev., was second, with 181,608, and Weld County, Colo., third, with 176,751. Cherry County was the first county in the United States in the production of hay; third in the number of horses; and other Fourth District counties which appear frequently in these ranking lists include Custer, Holt, Lincoln, Sheridan, Garden, Dawson, Buffalo, Rock, and Scotts Bluff. In the 1945 census, Scotts Bluff was twelfth in the number of sheep, with more than 260,000, but the 1950 count dropped to a little more than 60,000. The great blizzard, during which flocks were kept alive with hay dropped from airplanes, plus the difficulty of obtaining sheep herders, have combined to greatly reduce the sheep population of the plains area. There were 1,600,000 fewer sheep in Wyoming in 1950 than in 1945.

The Fourth District represents a most interesting evolution from the old grass range toward modern agricultural production. Alfalfa is gaining on the native grass and in 1949 the 453,857 acres of alfalfa produced 917,970 tons, or 2.02 tons to the acre.

The census figures show that the profits of these farms and ranches are being converted to land investments. The ratio of tenancy in this district in 1945 was 39.4 but in 1950 only 29.5, a reduction of 9.9 percent.

The expenditures made by these Fourth District farms and ranches illustrate the growing importance of this area market-wise. For the purchase of livestock and poultry they spent \$48,624,491 in 1949. For purchased feed for livestock and poultry they spent \$28,832,308 and gasoline and petroleum fuel and oil for these highly mechanized units cost \$16,339,720 in a year.

Hired labor earned \$17,550,308 and machine hire cost \$6,793,536.

Grant County had the largest average-sized operations with 10,711 acres with an average value of \$157,692. Arthur County's average value per farm was \$60,023, and Cherry County with an average-sized farm of 4,084 acres had average unit values of \$61,443.

Dr. Roy V. Peel, Director of the Census, says the evolution of the Fourth Nebraska District from its pioneer state of 50 years ago to its present agricultural efficiency provides a significant example of what is going on throughout the West to give the Nation a better balanced economy.

An Amendment to the Defense Production Act To Provide a Ceiling Price Standard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, that there may be every possible opportunity for Members of the House to have the widest advance knowledge concerning my proposed amendment, I am inserting in the RECORD the text of the amendment which I propose to offer at the appropriate time which will provide a standard, or yardstick, against which a ceiling price on commodities processed from agricultural products, can be measured. I believe it is a fair yardstick. I believe it will result in a much greater production of goods than could be hoped for without it. I want everyone to have an opportunity to understand this matter before it reaches the floor. I hope the Members will avail themselves of this opportunity to study this proposed amendment.

The proposed amendment reads as follows.

It shall be unlawful to establish or maintain any ceiling price applicable to manufacturers or processors for any item of material derived in whole or in substantial part from an agricultural commodity if such ceiling price for any such item of material is fixed and maintained at less than the sum of the following:

(1) The current cost of the material used therein computed on a delivered basis (except that the cost of any agricultural commodity used therein shall be computed on the basis of the current cost or the price specified in section 402 (d) (3), of the commodity delivered to the manufacturer or processor, whichever is greater);

(2) All costs currently incurred in the processing or manufacturing operation and distribution of such item, including an allowance for such indirect costs as may reasonably be attributable to such item or material.

(3) A reasonable profit (which for each unit of such item shall be not less than 85 percent of the average profit earned on an equivalent unit of such item during the three most profitable years of the period 1946 to 1949, both inclusive); *Provided*, That if specific dollars and cents ceilings applicable to manufacturers or processors are established for any such item of material and made generally applicable, the costs and

profits referred to in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of this subsection, for each item of such material shall be computed by using a weighted average of such costs and profits of the individual processors or manufacturers of such item.

(P. 18, after line 4, insert the following: "() Sec. 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection reading as above.")

This amendment follows the pattern established by the so-called Bankhead-Brown amendment to the Price Stabilization Act of 1944.

That amendment was sponsored in the Senate by the late Senator Bankhead, of Alabama, one of the best friends the farmers ever had in the Congress, and in this body by the distinguished Representative from Georgia—Hon. PAUL BROWN.

The original Bankhead-Brown amendment applied to cotton and was designed to remedy a situation caused by the failure of OPA administrators to recognize some very obvious facts of economic life.

Under the original Stabilization Act of 1942, ceiling prices placed on items made from agricultural products were supposed to be high enough to enable the processors of these products to pay farmers parity prices. In other words, the ceilings were supposed to reflect parity, but OPA had established ceilings on cotton goods which reflected only the 1942 material and processing costs. It thus became impossible for the price of raw cotton to advance.

Not only was it impossible for the price of cotton to reach the parity figure which the act contemplated, but it soon became impossible for the mills to break even on their low-priced items like duck and denim. When this situation arises in any line, it simply means that the goods will not be produced. Cotton consumption dropped from approximately 45,000 bales of cotton per day in 1942 to around 30,000 bales per day in 1944. It is estimated that the country lost the production of at least 4,000,000,000 yards of cotton goods—the farms lost a market for 4,000,000 bales of cotton—all at a time when the people needed the cotton goods and when farmers needed the market. The cotton was not exported. It was simply purchased by the Government and stored.

In 1944 the cotton industry asked OPA to allow a price increase on those low-priced items for which there was such a strong demand, and on which there was not enough margin to secure their production. OPA replied that the profits of the cotton textile industry, taken as a whole, were as high as in the base period, 1936-39, and that, therefore, no adjustments were necessary.

At last Senator Bankhead and Congressman Brown passed their first amendment which was attacked just as are the amendments which are being offered here at this time. OPA opposed any effort to encourage production by making sure that the producer could earn enough to cover his costs of material, his labor costs, and a profit. Apparently, many of the spokesmen for OPS are now following the same line,

yet neither OPA nor OPS has ever made the slightest effort to show that it is possible to get production any other way.

The effort of OPA to control profits instead of costs, an effort which is apparently to be followed by OPS, stifled production in 1944, and it will always stifle it. If price control is to have any goods on which to apply a price program, it must allow a profit. This amendment tries to set up a fair standard of profit. It gives no protection to the processor who is making more than 85 percent of the average profit for his best 3 years in the 1946 to 1949 base period. This is the period used by the excess-profits tax laws.

I think it is clear that Congress must itself assume the responsibility to lay down plain and fair rules.

Here, in brief, is the effect of the proposed amendment:

First. This amendment tries to make certain that the provisions of the Defense Production Act designed to protect producers of agricultural commodities will not be circumvented and the prices of agricultural commodities depressed below the minimum levels specified in the act indirectly through the squeeze of margins of processors and manufacturers of agricultural commodities to a point where their ceilings do not cover their raw material costs, costs of processing, and a reasonable profit.

Second. This amendment merely requires that any price ceiling applicable to manufacturers and processors established for any item of material derived in whole or substantial part from an agricultural commodity, shall be fixed and maintained so as to cover:

(a) The current delivered cost of the material;

(b) The current processing and distributing costs, including labor;

(c) A reasonable profit.

Stripped of the technical language, this amendment simply requires that the ceiling price applicable to manufacturers and processors of agricultural commodities at least equal the sum of the cost of the raw material plus the cost of processing or manufacturing plus a reasonable profit.

Third. Unless ceiling prices permit a manufacturer or processor of agricultural commodities to recover costs plus a reasonable profit one of two things is bound to result:

(a) The price to the producer of the agricultural commodities used in the processing or manufacturing operation will be reduced to offset the losses; or

(b) Production of the commodity will be curtailed.

Fourth. Congress in enacting the Defense Production Act of 1950 did not intend for agricultural commodities selling below parity to be subjected directly or indirectly to ceiling prices lower than the minima specified in section 402 (d) (3) of the act—parity or the highest price during May 24 to June 24, 1950.

Section 402 (d) (3) provides that no ceiling shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity below the parity price or the highest price received by producers from May 24 to June 24, 1950. It also provides that no ceiling

shall be established or maintained for any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity below a price which will reflect to producers of such agricultural commodity the parity price. In order to help assure this result the act went on and further provided that in establishing ceilings on products manufactured or processed from agricultural commodities that a generally fair and equitable margin should be allowed for such processing.

That language of the act is clear and I am certain it was clear to every Member of this House when it was adopted. In short, it says: (a) That you cannot impose a ceiling on an agricultural commodity below parity, (b) that you cannot impose a ceiling on a processed agricultural commodity that will not return parity to the producer, and (c) that processors and manufacturers of products composed in whole or substantial part of agricultural commodities shall receive a generally fair and equitable return for the function of processing.

Fifth. These provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950 are being circumvented.

Unfortunately these provisions of the Defense Production Act employed some general terms such as "a price which will reflect parity to producers" and "a generally fair and equitable margin shall be allowed for such processing." This gave the Price Administrator an opportunity to place a different interpretation upon the act than was intended by the Congress. An examination of the manner in which this language has been interpreted and the orders which have been issued under it demonstrate clearly the need for this amendment.

SUBSTANCE OF ORDERS AND REGULATIONS ISSUED BY OFFICE OF PRICE STABILIZATION WHICH CIRCUMVENT THE PROVISIONS OF THE ACT

(a) On January 26, 1951, OPS issued the General Ceiling Price Regulation which froze prices at all levels beyond the producer even though the prices of most agricultural commodities were well below parity. A device called a pass-through was invented apparently to give lip service to the provision of the act which prohibited the establishment of price ceilings on commodities processed in whole or substantial part from agricultural commodities which did not reflect parity to producers. The only purpose or effect of this provision was indirectly to subject agricultural commodities to ceilings even though they were selling below parity. Although this action was effectuated through indirection it is as effective as if it were done directly. Under the General Ceiling Price Regulation a manufacturer or processor of agricultural commodities may not pass through in his selling price any increase paid to the agricultural producer until the manufacturer or processor has disposed of all inventory on hand. The manufacturer or processor may not include this increased cost until he has notified the Office of Price Stabilization and submitted a great amount of detailed information. The processor is then permitted to increase his price to reflect the increased raw material cost but he must

make the increase in his price at his own peril because it is provided in section 11 (g) of the general ceiling price regulation that "if in the judgment of the Director of Price Stabilization the increase is deemed unreasonable, excessive, or otherwise improper, he may disapprove the price and restore the old ceiling price or establish a new ceiling price and may apply it retroactively."

(b) Under Manufacturers General Ceiling Price Regulation 22, if the commodity being processed or manufactured is a nonfood product and is made from a product processed from an agricultural commodity which is below parity, no increase in the price of the processed agricultural commodity which occurred after March 15, 1951, may be included in computing the ceiling price.

(c) Under Manufacturers General Ceiling Price Regulation 22 increases in labor costs in processing agricultural commodities occurring after March 15, 1951, are disallowed.

(d) The Office of Price Stabilization has developed what it calls the 85 percent earning standard. This so-called earning standard provides that no increase in ceilings shall be permitted if the average return or net worth before taxes in the industry is below 85 percent of the average for the industry for the three best years during 1946-49. In the fact sheet issued by OPS with respect to this standard it is stated that this standard is a yardstick for determining the extent to which whole industries can be expected and required to absorb future cost increases.

(e) These various regulations referred to above show clearly the various methods and devices that have been employed and which necessarily result in depressing prices to producers of agricultural commodities and preventing the producers from achieving parity. These regulations also stifle production because they prevent processors and manufacturers from recovering all their costs incurred in the processing operation and prevent the earning of a normal profit.

Sixth. The first year's experience under OPS is a repeat performance of the experience under OPA. It became apparent under OPA that language had to be found if producers of agricultural commodities were to be protected and if production was not to be curtailed which would make it impossible for the Price Administrator by indirection to impose ceilings on agricultural commodities selling below parity or to achieve that result by preventing processors of agricultural commodities from recovering their cost plus a reasonable profit for such processing.

Language which would accomplish this objective was finally devised by a very distinguished Member of this House, PAUL BROWN, of Georgia. This language was enacted into law and became known as the Bankhead-Brown amendment. At that time the amendment was limited to cotton and wool. The amendment which I am offering today is the 1951 version of the Bankhead-Brown amendment. The principal difference being that this amendment applies to all agricultural commodities and products

thereof instead of its being limited to wool and cotton.

This amendment is absolutely necessary if we are to protect producers and not stifle production. It does little good to provide that no ceilings be placed on agricultural commodities below parity if a ceiling may be imposed on the processor or manufacturer of agricultural commodities which make it impossible for such processors to pay parity to producers. The Congress found it necessary in 1944-45 and twice in 1946 to enact the Bankhead-Brown amendment with respect to cotton and wool. The amendment worked well then and it is the only thing that has worked. It works because it is fair.

Seventh. The need for appropriate provisions assuring processors and manufacturers of agricultural commodities of ceilings which will cover their cost of operation plus a reasonable profit was recognized very clearly by the chief legal officer of the War Food Administration. Writing for the Michigan Law Review in February 1945, and referring to the various provisions of the Price Control Act relating to the establishment of ceiling prices with respect to agricultural commodities, the chief legal officer said:

All of these major provisions of law relating to the establishment of maximum prices with respect to agricultural commodities would, as a practical matter, have been ineffective without the comparable provisions which the Congress made applicable to maximum prices with respect to commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from agricultural commodities.

Unless this amendment is adopted everything that has been done so far in the Defense Production Act of 1950 to protect prices to producers of agricultural commodities will be ineffective because such provisions can be circumvented through orders and regulations of the type referred to above.

ILLUSTRATIONS

First. Under OPA prior to the enactment of the Bankhead-Brown amendment as a result of the squeeze on the cotton textile mills cotton consumption fell off 33 percent. After the enactment of the Bankhead-Brown amendment production of textiles turned up sharply and continued up during the rest of the emergency period.

Second. Under the existing orders issued by OPS prices of peanuts to the shellers were frozen well below parity on the basis of 1950 crop prices which were at the support level. Large quantities of 1950 crop peanuts are still in the hands of shellers who have incurred storage costs in handling these peanuts. Because of an increase in parity the support price for the 1951 crop of peanuts will be higher than the support price on the 1950 crop. Under existing orders peanut shellers will be unable to increase their prices until their entire inventory is moved. They are also not permitted to increase their prices to reflect storage costs. The effect of these orders will be to preclude the peanut shellers from purchasing peanuts from the 1951 crop until all the inventory has moved. As a consequence the Commodity Credit Corporation will probably be the only mar-

ket available to producers for the 1951 crop. This is a clear illustration of the manner in which ceiling prices at the processor level may be used to depress the price or destroy the market for agricultural producers.

Third. Processors of seasonally produced commodities such as poultry and eggs are not permitted under the general ceiling price regulation to increase their base period ceiling prices to reflect the costs of storage. The provision not permitting the addition of storage costs will discourage processors from placing poultry and eggs in storage during the heavy period of production which in turn will result in a shortage of these commodities during the light-production season.

CONCLUSION

I believe further illustrations are unnecessary. The amendment rests on the basic principle of the profit system. There must be an opportunity to make a profit on every item of production or the unprofitable items simply will not be produced. I believe the American people want and have a right to demand production.

Newton B. Drury, a Great Conservationist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement by myself concerning Newton B. Drury, and comments by others. I wish every nature lover and conservationist in our country could read these remarks, so they would know how fortunate we were in having this great conservationist as our National Park Director for 10 years.

NEWTON B. DRURY, A GREAT CONSERVATIONIST

A few weeks ago, Newton B. Drury, the Director of the National Park Service in the Department of the Interior since August 1940, resigned and returned to his home in California. Gov. Earl Warren promptly appointed Mr. Drury chief of the division of beaches and parks, an important bureau of California's Department of Natural Resources. What was a serious loss to the National Government has been a great gain to my State of California.

Conservationists in all parts of the Nation have been disturbed by Director Drury's withdrawal from the Federal Service, and there has been much discussion of it in many councils, conferences, and association board meetings. Protests have been filed with the President and with the Secretary of the Interior. There has been a general understanding that Director Drury was maneuvered into a situation where he had to resign from the position he had held so long and filled so creditably.

Conservationists were disturbed because if Director Drury did not leave his post voluntarily, pressure of some kind might have been exercised contrary to the intent of the organic act of Congress establishing the National Park Service which provided for appointments of its executive officers under the laws, and under rules, and regulations of

the United States Civil Service Commission which meant that when once qualified and appointed within the classified civil-service officials were to be immune to removal except on preferment of charges and judgment thereon after submission of ample proof of incompetence or inefficiency.

No charges were preferred against Mr. Drury, and apparently none were ever under consideration or even thought of. Apparently, the Secretary of the Interior, Oscar L. Chapman, who as a career man himself had known and worked with Director Drury for over 10 years, held him in high esteem.

It seems that Secretary Chapman indicated his desire, yes, his determination, to appoint Director Drury to a position in his own office with the title of Special Assistant to the Secretary, to engage in certain important liaison activities dealing with interbureau plans and policies where conflicts had appeared, and in other directions to aid the Department head. Director Drury preferred to keep the position he had and which he had held for over 10 years. The Director realized, however, that under a recent statute making effective one of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, the Secretary had the power to move agencies or men at will within his Department, and that he probably had no choice but to accept the new job, which, incidentally, carried compensation lower than that of a bureau chief, or resign.

It seems also that in assigning Mr. Drury to his own office as Special Assistant the Secretary had stated his desire to appoint as Director of the National Park Service Associate Director Arthur E. Demaray in order that he might enjoy the prestige of heading the Bureau until his retirement in the early future, after nearly 50 years of service in the Federal Government. The Secretary also frankly stated he expected to appoint Assistant Director Conrad L. Wirth as Director when Mr. Demaray should retire.

Director Drury concluded that he would submit his resignation rather than take the place offered by the Secretary, which he felt was likely to be temporary and which he did not think presented opportunities for the use of his talents and experience in the field of conservation in which he was especially interested.

The resignation was submitted, and accepted by the Secretary with ample time granted in which the Director could complete work on which he was engaged.

Conservationists in their protests charged that the reasons for proposing to transfer Mr. Drury were not convincing and that there were others having to do perhaps with projects for exploiting national park resources, particularly their waters and reservoir sites; or that other political considerations governed the proposal. They pointed to Secretary Chapman's approval of the dams proposed to be built in the Dinosaur National Monument, Utah, which would, if constructed, flood large areas in the watersheds of both the Green and Yampa Canyons. I have inserted in the RECORD much useful material showing that these dams are not necessary to the conservation of the waters of those streams.

Both the Secretary and Director Drury have had little to say. Director Drury submitted his resignation and Secretary Chapman accepted it with the following felicitous statement:

"During your 10 years as Director, you have been devoted to the cause of the national parks. The National Park Service is a fine organization and I think you can well be proud of its accomplishments. Since you have reached the decision that you should resign from the Department I must, of course, accede to your wishes. In doing so I wish to express my appreciation of our long and pleasant association and to extend to you every good wish for the future."

The Secretary has also explained his offer of a transfer as being in furtherance of a plan he made after he thought he had been told by Director Drury that he (Drury) had an opportunity outside the Federal Government service, and that on this plan he had made commitments regarding appointments of Associate Director Demaray and Assistant Director Wirth.

The Washington Evening Star of April 3, 1951, in reporting the installation of Director Demaray under the following headline:

"Chapman denies Drury ouster as Demaray takes top park post," said this about an interview with Secretary Chapman regarding Mr. Drury's retirement:

"Mr. Chapman explained what he called a misunderstanding in the Drury case.

"Last June, he said, Mr. Drury came to him to say he had received a very good offer of a job and was thinking of resigning.

"That was the first I heard about it," Mr. Chapman added. He said he had urged the park director to stay on."

The Secretary has also pointed out that he has adhered strictly to long-established policy in advancing Messrs. Demaray and Wirth to Director and Associate Director, respectively, and in appointing Dr. Ronald F. Lee as Assistant Director succeeding Mr. Wirth. Furthermore, the Secretary has made no new commitments regarding the Dinosaur Monument dams, and we will continue to hope that he has been convinced that they will not be necessary in the orderly development of the Colorado River watershed. He has been in the Department of the Interior for 18 years as Assistant Secretary, Undersecretary, and Secretary, and in that time has had the National Park Service under his general jurisdiction almost constantly. It seems reasonable to believe that he will not want to take any permanent, irrevocable position that will affect adversely his long record as a protector of national parks and as a faithful supporter of the policies that have been followed for 35 years in compliance with the National Park Service Act of August 25, 1916 which says that "The service thus established shall promote and regulate the use of the Federal areas known as national parks, monuments, and reservations hereinafter specified by such means and measures as conform to the fundamental purpose of the said parks, monuments, and reservations, which purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

So much for Director Drury's withdrawal. His place here has been filled by his chief associate and he has been appointed to head the California State Park and Beach System. The National Park Service is in good hands and so is the California State Park Service.

My object in making this statement to the Congress is to emphasize the fact that Newton B. Drury is a great conservationist and a great public servant, and that his stature is increased by the strength of character and nobility with which he met a strange situation, perhaps just as difficult for his chief, the Secretary, as it was for himself.

I have known Mr. Drury since 1912, when he and I found ourselves fellow graduate students in the Law School of the University of California at Berkeley. In undergraduate days he had been prominent in extracurricular affairs. He had won the Carnot Medal, highest debating award, for which the debaters of Stanford University and the University of California competed. He had been elected president of the Associated Students, highest office within the gift of the student body, and served in this position during his senior year.

On completion of his college course he joined the university faculty as an instructor

in English, later becoming assistant professor of forensics and secretary to the president. In World War I he was a lieutenant in the Air Service of the Army, an observer in the Balloon Corps.

Back in civilian life with his brother he organized and successfully operated a public-relations and advertising business in San Francisco. About this time the Save-the-Redwoods League was organized to conduct campaigns for funds to acquire outstanding groves of the Coast Redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*) which were threatened with destruction. Mr. Drury became the executive secretary of this conservation association and managed its affairs with great success for over 20 years.

As funds became available from private sources the State matched them with appropriations by the legislature. A State park commission was authorized, and it engaged Mr. Drury to direct its purchasing programs, which covered, in addition to redwood groves along the coast, the Calaveras North Grove of giant sequoia trees, beaches, and scenic and historic areas in all parts of California.

When a State park survey was authorized to develop a comprehensive plan for a system of beach, desert, mountain, and historic parks, Mr. Drury was the liaison officer with the famous landscape architect, Frederick Law Olmsted, who was engaged to make the survey and prepare the report.

As a result of the activities of the State park commission and the Save-the-Redwoods League, California has one of the finest park systems in the Nation. Mr. Drury's direction of affairs as the responsible executive throughout the formative period of this development brought him national recognition as an outstanding conservationist and leader in park establishment.

This story, incidentally, of the Save-the-Redwoods League, as well as the whole story of the dramatic development of the National Park Service, is fascinatingly related in a book, *Steve Mather of the National Parks*, by Robert Shankland, published a few months ago by Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 501 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

In July 1933, when Director Horace M. Albright, of the National Park Service, advised Secretary Harold L. Ickes that he wished to resign, the Secretary asked Albright and the Advisory Committee of the Service, headed by the late Dr. H. C. Bumpus, and a few other men prominent in national park affairs, including Frederick A. Delano, Chairman of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Dr. J. C. Merriam, president of the Carnegie Institution, and J. Horace McFarland, long the president of the American Civic Association, to recommend a successor to the retiring director. These men recommended Newton B. Drury, and the appointment was offered to him by Secretary Ickes with President Roosevelt's approval. Drury, however, felt that he could not at that time withdraw from State activities and so declined the invitation to come to Washington. Arno B. Cammerer, the Associate Director, was then recommended and appointed, serving with distinction until his health broke in 1940. Then Secretary Ickes again offered Drury the directorship and this time he accepted it. He took office August 20, 1940. In announcing the appointment Secretary Ickes on August 19 said:

"The Park Service is fortunate in having secured the acceptance of Newton B. Drury for the post of Director. Mr. Drury is outstanding in the field of conservation occupied by the National Park Service and is a nationally recognized authority on park affairs. He has been intimate with the work of the National Park Service and in his post as executive head of the Save-the-Redwoods League of California, has already been of great assistance to the Park Service."

Mr. Drury's years as Director (1940-51) were the years of the war and its aftermath. Exiled to Chicago for 4 years the National

Park Service with other agencies of the Department carried on its activities as best it could with small appropriations and its administrative, protective, and technical staffs badly broken up by men departing to serve in the Armed Forces. There were numerous insistent proposals for utilization of the resources of the national parks by private enterprises on the pretext that these resources—timber, minerals, pasturage, etc.—were required in the war effort. With the unfailing support of Secretary Ickes, Drury resisted these proposals. At the same time, the service and the concessioners in many parks rendered great aid to the Armed Forces by making facilities in the parks available for rest and rehabilitation of soldiers and sailors returned from the battlefronts.

It would be reiterating statements of others if I set forth in detail more of Director Drury's achievements. They may be found in the last chapter, "Mather's Men Garry On," of the book, *Steve Mather of the National Parks*, already mentioned. They are also detailed as part of statements made on Mr. Drury's retirement.

The oldest supporter of the National Park Service, and the organization most influential in securing the establishment of the Service in 1916, is the American Planning and Civic Association, now headed by Maj. Gen. U. S. Grant 3d, ably assisted by the executive secretary, Miss Harlean James. In the April-June 1951 issue of this association's quarterly, *Planning and Civic Comment*, there appears the following comment on Director Drury's service:

"THE SERVICE OF NEWTON B. DRURY TO CONSERVATION"

"When Newton B. Drury graduated from the University of California in 1912 he was already recognized as a young man of promise, for he became successively in the next 6 years, instructor of English, assistant professor of forensics, and secretary to the president. In later years this facility in the persuasive use of the English language was to stand him in good stead.

"After his war service in the Air Force he entered upon his career in conservation. It was in 1919 that he became secretary to the Save-the-Redwoods League, which has been one of the most successful conservation organizations in the history of the United States. In 1940, when he was appointed Director of the National Park Service, his brother Aubrey succeeded him as the Secretary of the Save-the-Redwoods League. The State of California and the Nation at large have reason to be grateful to the Drury brothers for bringing into protected ownership the groves of coast redwoods along the now famous Redwood Highway extending from the Bay Region to the Oregon line—a heritage of priceless value which once lost could never be replaced. If Newton Drury had accomplished nothing more than saving the coast redwoods from destruction his name would go down in history as a revered benefactor of the State and Nation.

"But in 1929, following the pioneer, epoch-making report of Frederick Law Olmsted, which recommended an extensive State park system, it was Newton Drury who was appointed by the Governor of California to take charge of the acquisition program as the executive of the State Park Commission. Thus the redwood groves and the State parks of California are living tributes to the ideals, industry, and devotion of Newton B. Drury.

"There was to be another chapter. In 1940, Newton B. Drury was appointed Director of the National Park Service to follow two other Californians—Stephen T. Mather and Horace M. Albright, and Arno Cammerer who had grown up in the Mather tradition. From 1940 to 1951, under the directorship of Mr. Drury, the National Park Service has a fine record of achievement in the growth of the system, the maintenance of conservation standards, the protection of the parks and

monuments from unrelated encroachments and in the fine working relationships with other Federal agencies.

"And now Newton Drury has returned to California where he is now the director of the State parks and again, with his brother, serving the Save-the-Redwoods League. He has already been honored by the conservation award of the Trustees of Public Reservations in Boston; by the Hutchinson medal of the Garden Club of America, and by two Pugsley medals of the American Scenic and Historic Preservation Society, but the redwood groves and State parks of California will survive as perpetual monuments to Newton B. Drury. And when the record is examined, his constructive leadership in national park policies during his decade in Washington will be clearly demonstrated.

"The American Planning and Civic Association salutes Newton Drury, valued member and effective friend of conservation."

The American Nature Association has always supported the National Park Service. It has a large membership and publishes an excellent monthly journal, *Nature Magazine*. In its April 1951 issue, this magazine contained the following editorial by Richard W. Westward, president and editor:

"CONTENTS NOTED"

"Resignation of Newton B. Drury as Director of the National Park Service has been received with regret and alarm by many conservationists, ourselves included. There is regret at the loss of a fine public servant who for nearly 11 years has been devoted to the integrity of the areas that it has been his responsibility to administer. There is alarm because Mr. Drury's resignation was not voluntary, and because there is increasing evidence that the current policy of the Department of the Interior is weighted on the side of exploitation and development. We are certain, of course, that Arthur E. Demaray, his successor, is devoted to National Park ideals, and that he and his staff will defend these ideals. We offer any aid within our power in the face of a departmental trend that we regard as dangerous and shortsighted, however, politically expedient it may seem on the surface.

"It was in 1924 that we first met Newton Drury. He was then the fighting executive secretary of the Save-the-Redwoods League, working to preserve representative and substantial stands of the incomparable California redwoods from the ax and saw. We roamed the redwoods of Bull Creek Flat and points north with him, and have always treasured that experience. When Horace Albright resigned as Director of the National Park Service to enter private business, the then Secretary of the Interior, Harold L. Ickes, asked the National Parks Advisory Board to recommend the man in its opinion most competent to head the Service. The unanimous choice was Newton B. Drury. He declined because of the challenge then facing him in the redwood problem and the California-parks program. Later, when the office of director again became vacant Mr. Drury was once more urged by Mr. Ickes to accept the appointment. This time Mr. Drury accepted, after being convinced by the persuasive Mr. Ickes that it was a public duty.

"Since August 1940, Newton Drury has served the American people well as chief trustee of incomparable parts of the American outdoors that are the peoples' property. He saw the parks through the war period with wisdom, enjoying Mr. Ickes' cordial collaboration in so doing, and these areas emerged from this trying time virtually unimpaired. He successfully led the fight against subsequent attempts to encroach upon the parks. Most recently he was called upon to present, at a hearing called by Oscar L. Chapman, Secretary of the Interior, the case against the proposed invasion of Dinosaur National Monument by the construction of Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams.

It was a strong case, ably presented, but was opposed by an impressive parade of western Members of the Congress. Later Mr. Chapman decided against the National Park Service and in favor of the Bureau of Reclamation.

"Whether Mr. Chapman expected his decision on the Dinosaur National Monument to settle the matter we do not know. So far as conservationists are concerned, it certainly did not. So far as the National Park Service is concerned, it did. The decision of the Secretary established departmental policy, and we can testify personally that Mr. Drury and his staff were most punctilious in this regard. But conservation organizations were not affected by any such bureaucratic gag rule, and publicity against the Dinosaur dams increased. Whether Mr. Chapman laid this at Mr. Drury's door we do not know, but we would like to make the record clear.

"It is to us significant that the official release announcing Dr. Drury's resignation was innocent of the usual expression of appreciation by his superior for distinguished service. Mr. Chapman is apparently not a hypocrite, but the absence of any such sentiment is ample substantiation—if any were needed—of the involuntary character of the resignation. The Director of the National Park Service had been offered a nebulous and ill-defined position as special assistant to the Secretary, at a lesser salary. Decision was asked immediately, otherwise his resignation would be accepted as of January 15. More often than not these "special assistant" posts are equivalent to moving the official's desk right next to the front door so that he can be eased out quickly when the time comes. We have heard this device described as "Potomac fever," and at least it is an insidious and debilitating malady. Nobody seems to attain an immunity to it, and Mr. Drury did not elect to expose himself to the unfilerable virus that causes the illness.

"While we are keeping the record clear, and in view of national publicity, we must also say that Mr. Drury had no knowledge of the fact that conservationists had carried the case to the President. The Director had gone to California for the Christmas holidays when this initiative was taken, and he was dismayed when he returned to find out what had been done. In taking this step it was realized that it would not alter matters so far as the Secretary of the Interior was concerned. It was, however, felt that Mr. Drury was entitled to conclude his term of office with somewhat more leisure than apparently had been the desire on high. This, at least, appears to have been accomplished. Mr. Drury, of course, has distinct distaste for being placed in the position of a martyr, and we hope that championship of him personally will not be so regarded. Quite likely he will enjoy release from bureaucratic responsibilities, and welcome an opportunity to return to his beloved California. We will miss him, and we wish him well.

"R. W. W."

The most comprehensive review of Director Drury's official career was made by Dr. Waldo G. Leland who for many years was a member, and for 4 years, chairman of the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historical Sites, Buildings, and Monuments of the Department of the Interior. This was printed in the April-June 1951 issue of the *National Parks Magazine*, published by the National Parks Association, of which Dr. Leland is a trustee and Mr. William P. Wharton is president and Fred M. Packard is secretary. The article follows:

"NEWTON BISHOP DRURY"

"(By Waldo Gifford Leland, member, board of trustees, National Parks Association)

"The members of the National Parks Association, and indeed all friends of the national parks, have been surprised to learn

that Newton B. Drury has presented his resignation as Director of the National Park Service. They have been profoundly shocked as they have learned the circumstances which brought about this unanticipated action.

"The termination of Mr. Drury's 10 years of service is not a pleasant story, and nature conservationists throughout the country have every reason to be perplexed and indignant and anxious.

"Without any intimation of dissatisfaction with his administration, but, on the contrary, after repeated expressions of satisfaction and approval, Secretary of Interior Oscar L. Chapman offered to Mr. Drury, early in December, a position of substantially lower grade as special assistant to the Secretary of the Interior, with only advisory functions, the task of which would be to correlate, at an early stage, the plans and projects of the Department's various agencies. This proposal was followed, within hours, by a preemptory ultimatum that Mr. Drury accept the position, or resign as of January 15, 1951. It was only too clear that the proposed assistantship was nothing more than the usual device for disposing of officials whose dismissal is difficult to justify.

"A member of the National Park Service Advisory Board, Charles G. Woodbury, acting on his personal initiative, had long interviews with Assistant Secretary Doty and Secretary Chapman, and elicited the assertion that the only reason for removing Mr. Drury was the desire, which the Secretary acknowledged to be founded on sentiment, to reward Associate Director Arthur E. Demaray, whose long and distinguished services are gratefully recognized by all, by promotion for a short period to the position of Director. The haste to make this promotion was declared to be due to Mr. Demaray's request, of June 26, 1950, to be retired as of November 30, 1950. Assistant Director Conrad L. Wirth would be moved up to fill the position of Associate Director. It was reported elsewhere, and not denied, that upon the retirement of Mr. Demaray the post of director would be filled by Mr. Wirth. The competence of Mr. Demaray and Mr. Wirth are not in question, but these officials have been placed in an uncomfortable position by this procedure.

"On January 10, 1951, Mr. Drury formally declined the position which had been proposed to him and, on offering to state his reasons was told that that was unnecessary. On January 19, he presented his resignation, 'with regret,' to take effect on April 1.

"These are the bald facts of the dismissal of a public servant of the finest type, in the prime of physical and mental vigor, at a time when President Truman complains of the difficulty of inducing first-class men to accept positions of responsibility in the Federal Government, and at a time, furthermore, when an increasing emergency is threatening the national parks with the same dangers which Mr. Drury so successfully overcame in 1941-45.

"In mid-January, as soon as the matter became known, such organizations as the Committee on Regional Development and Conservation of the CIO, the Izaak Walton League, the Wilderness Society, the American Nature Association, and the National Parks Association, addressed letters of protest to the President. It is understood that these letters have been referred to the Secretary of the Interior with instructions to reply to the writers.

"The Advisory Board, whose predecessor, upon being consulted by Secretary Ickes, had recommended Newton B. Drury as the best man in the United States for the post of Director, was not consulted by Secretary Chapman, although the latter met with the Board in November, at which time he had undoubtedly decided upon the course he was about to follow, and talked with apparent

frankness about various problems and especially about the great danger confronting the parks, resulting from pressures by commercial interests. In a matter of such vital importance to the fundamental policies of the National Park Service as a change in the directorship, it would have been appropriate, at least, for the Secretary to consult with the body which had been created by law to advise him. If the present writer, after long association with the members of the Advisory Board, can judge the reactions of the latter, he believes it probable that their collective views will find suitable expression in due time.

"Mr. Drury was appointed Director of the Park Service in 1940.

"In May 1933 Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes convened the Advisory Committee on Education of the National Park Service in his office for special consultation. There were present, as the writer recalls, the chairman, Herman C. Bumpus, former Director of the American Museum of Natural History and former president of Tufts University, long devoted to the development of a program of education and interpretation for the national parks; W. W. Campbell, president emeritus of the University of California; Isaiah Bowman, director of the American Geographical Society, later to become president of the Johns Hopkins University; Wallace W. Atwood, president of Clark University; Clark Wissler of the American Museum of Natural History; Dr. Frank Oastler, of New York, noted nature lover and friend of the national parks, and the writer, who is now the sole survivor of the group. There was also present the late John C. Merriam, then president of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, who had been the first chairman of the Advisory Committee.

"Secretary Ickes, with the then Director of the National Park Service, Horace M. Albright present, informed the committee that, to his great regret, the post of Director of the National Park Service would shortly become vacant because of Mr. Albright's resignation to accept an important and attractive position in private business. Accordingly, he called upon the Advisory Committee to recommend for the post the person best qualified to fill it. The Secretary insisted that the committee make its recommendation without regard to any other consideration than the outstanding qualifications of the candidate.

"The committee withdrew and after a canvass of numerous possibilities, unanimously and with enthusiasm agreed to recommend Newton B. Drury, of California, a recommendation which the Secretary accepted.

"Who was Newton B. Drury? Since 1919, he had been the executive secretary of the Save-the-Redwoods League and, since 1929, he had also served as executive officer of the California State Park Commission. He was born in San Francisco in 1889, the older son of the pioneer editor, Wells Drury, whose book, *An editor on the Comstock Lode*, is a revealing picture of life in Virginia City and other bonanza towns of the seventies and eighties. Newton graduated from the University of California in 1912, and spent the next 6 years, except for war service in the Balloon Corps, at the University, where he was instructor in English, assistant to professor of forensics, and assistant to the president. Later, in 1947, his alma mater was to confer on him the honorary degree of doctor of laws as a 'leader in the preservation and development of valuable recreational areas . . . a conservationist who has applied rational imagination and boundless industry to the public service of his State and Nation.'

"In 1933, Mr. Drury had already achieved a national reputation by his success in preserving thousands of acres of giant redwoods along the California coast, a task which included not only the administration of State

funds, but also the raising of matching funds from private sources for the acquisition of forest lands. He was known as a forceful and eloquent writer and speaker, a man of the highest ideals, combined with sound practical sense, and an executive of solid accomplishments.

"To the disappointment of Secretary Ickes and the Advisory Committee, however, Mr. Drury did not feel at that time that he could ask to be released from his duties in California, and thus, after further consultation with the committee, the Secretary promoted Associate Director Arno B. Cammerer to the post of director.

"This arrangement did not work out as well as had been hoped. There was some incompatibility of personalities, and there was also a serious decline in Cammerer's health, with the result that he was more and more bypassed by the Secretary's office in its relations with the National Park Service. The inevitable consequence of this situation was a lowering of the morale of the service, especially at headquarters, and a growing sense of frustration, because of uncertain leadership and remote control.

"In 1940, Mr. Cammerer requested to be transferred to a position of less responsibility and so, in May of that year, Secretary Ickes again invited Mr. Drury to accept appointment as Director. In his correspondence with the Secretary Mr. Drury discussed the considerations which would influence his decision. Among these he put first the concurrence of the present Director, Mr. Cammerer. He was confident that he could secure release by his present employers, the Save-the-Redwoods League and the State of California, at least for a period long enough for him to make such contribution as he could to the national task. He asked for assurance that he would be left free to concentrate upon the concerns of the National Park Service without being drawn off on departmental tasks only remotely related to the former. He also asked for assurance of freedom to bring to bear upon the problems of the National Park Service the most competent knowledge and the best judgment that could be obtained. Finally he indicated his expectation that the Department would seek and consider, on their merits, the recommendations of the National Park Service on major matters of policy and organization.

"Even with assurance on these points, the decision was not an easy one. Other positions were offered to Mr. Drury, and he had to consider them. One of these was a high administrative post in a great university; another was an important position in a leading institution of scientific research. He felt, however, that his experience and his personal aptitudes should make it possible for him to contribute, at the national level, to the realization of his dearest ideals and purposes. He therefore accepted appointment to directorship of the National Park Service. This he did, not as a job, but as an opportunity for service; and he entered upon his duties on August 20, 1940.

"Between 1933 and 1940, Secretary Ickes had brought about a great enlargement of the scope of the National Park Service, by the transfer of 48 areas from the War Department to the Department of the Interior; by the passage of the Historic Sites Act of 1935; by the passage of the act of 1936, for the study of creational area programs; and by the transfer of all the projects of the Resettlement Administration to the National Park Service, not to mention the passage of the act of 1940, 'to encourage travel in the United States.' Thus Mr. Drury became the head of a multiple-service agency, with duties as its Director which went far beyond those contemplated in the act of 1916, creating the National Park Service.

"Furthermore, the National Park Service was entering upon the most critical period of its history. The Second World War had

already begun to involve the United States, and for the next 5 years, the chief task of the Service was to defend the areas under its jurisdiction and, at the same time, to assure their maximum appropriate contribution to the military and moral strength of the Nation. This task had to be performed under adverse circumstances: the personnel of the Service was rapidly and drastically reduced; the great parks had to be administered on a bare custodial basis; the demands of numerous war agencies, which were frequently supported with insistence by private interests for nonwar purposes, had to be resisted, unless they fulfilled unmistakable war needs not obtainable elsewhere, and which would not cause irreparable damage to the areas. The situation was made the more difficult because of the ill-advised and unnecessary removal of the Service's headquarters staff from Washington to Chicago. This seriously hindered the Service by making administration difficult, and liaison with other branches of Government impossible. Yet, contact with the Army, Navy and Congress became more than ever imperative because of the demands being made upon the Service in connection with the war effort.

"The wartime uses of the various areas were exceedingly diversified. Some of them were essentially military and included the occupation of buildings and land for headquarters, installations and training; but such uses as would have done irreparable damage were, in almost all cases, avoided. Beneficent, or at least less harmful uses were for hospitalization, rest and recreation camps, care of convalescents, and so forth, and were numerous and widely distributed. They enabled hundred of thousands of American soldiers and airmen to visit for the first time the great scenic and historic monuments of their country, and contributed greatly to their morale and welfare.

"Dangerous and persistent were the demands for exploitation of the natural material resources of the parks by logging, mining, grazing, and agriculture. These were resisted with almost complete success by the firm positions taken by Director Drury and his staff, and supported by Secretary Ickes. In the case, for example, of the demands of the War Production Board for the cutting of Sitka spruce in Olympic National Park and its Quetz Corridor and Ocean Strip, the Director formulated the position of the Service in his memorandum of November 18, 1941, addressed to the First Assistant Secretary of the Interior, to the effect that selected cutting might be authorized as a last resort, if immediate public necessity is shown, but that this would be a distinct sacrifice of park values in the interest of national defense and would largely destroy the qualities for which the lands were being acquired. He insisted that any legislation that might be introduced to permit cutting in Olympic National Park itself should be resisted, and he further insisted that all possible supplies of the needed timber elsewhere should be exhausted before using that in the park. He had already started a comprehensive survey by the forestry branch of the National Park Service of all available spruce in the Northwest, and this speedily demonstrated that there were important supplies in Alaska, Oregon, western Washington, and British Columbia. The pressure became such, however, that in December 1942, on the basis of a special report by an assistant in the office of the Secretary, the latter secured the authorization of the President for the sale of spruce in the Quetz Corridor and the Ocean Strip, although Mr. Drury was not convinced that this move was absolutely necessary. The cutting was not of large extent, and although there was further pressure for cutting, the forest in the park itself was saved. By September 1943, estimates of needs were revised, and there were no further requests from the War Production Board for cutting spruce.

"The story of the National Parks in wartime was presented by Mr. Drury in the August 1943 issue of *American Forests*. In the concluding paragraph Mr. Drury expresses his philosophy:

"The wisdom of the Nation in preserving areas of the type represented by the national parks and monuments is clearly evidenced on the American Continent today as increased demands upon our natural resources are invading and forever changing the native landscape. As long as the basic law that created them endures, we are assured of at least these few places in the world where forests continue to evolve normally, where animal life remains in harmonious relationship to its environment, and where the ways of nature and its works may still be studied in the original design."

"The greatest and most persistent danger to which the national parks are subjected results from the plans of other agencies of the Government, such as the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior, for the construction of an infinite number of multiple-purpose dams for the control and utilization of water resources. In view of the relatively small aggregate area of the holdings of the National Park Service, it seems extraordinary that so many of these plans should impinge upon these areas. The projects are too well known to nature conservationists and especially to the readers of the *National Parks* magazine to require enumeration and description in this article. The case of the proposed dams in Dinosaur National Monument is at this moment very much in the minds of all friends of the national parks, and their disappointment and concern at the decision of Secretary Chapman to recommend the construction of the dams, over the opposition of Mr. Drury and the entire staff of the National Park Service, and the protests of nature conservationists is not relieved by the assurance of the Secretary in his Annual Report, 1950 (p. XXI), that 'if the projects are authorized as recommended, extraordinary efforts and diligence will be exercised so that the pristine beauty [sic] of this area will be preserved'."

"The essential thing to be noted in this connection is that Director Drury and his staff and the advisory board have consistently and unceasingly opposed public works which would violate the mandate of the Congress, expressed in its act of 1916, 'to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife—of the parks and monuments—and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations'."

"The Advisory Board, in the course of its meeting of April 1950, communicated its views to the Secretary in these words:

"The Advisory Board believes that the Congress expressed unequivocally and categorically a permanent policy of complete preservation and protection of the areas under consideration, for all time. * * * The advisory board believes that in all cases where departure from this policy is urged in the name of the general welfare it will be found either that the welfare is not in fact general, that it is not national, or that it could be assured through the adoption of some alternate plan. The Advisory Board is convinced that undeviating adherence to this policy as established by the Congress and maintained through the years by the Department of the Interior is the only way to protect the national park system."

"An important aspect of Newton Drury's administration has had to do with recreation. This is a very broad term, ordinarily associated with sports, games, camping and playgrounds. For the National Park Service, however, it means much more, and its chief functions are deemed to be educational and inspirational. In his annual report, 1949 (pp. 307-313), Mr. Drury has expounded his

philosophy under the heading 'The educational function of the National Park Service':

"The essential task * * * of the Service is to see to it that the American people shall have the opportunity to obtain the maximum beneficial use and enjoyment of the kinds which derive from the character of the park area themselves; enjoyment which at the same time involves the minimum of change in the natural or historic scene which the Service is required to conserve."

"To meet that responsibility * * * involves more than satisfaction to the physical senses. * * * It places on the Service the obligation to contribute to a deeper understanding of natural processes and historical events about which any intelligent human being has a natural and legitimate curiosity."

"Within the limits imposed by very inadequate appropriations, the National Park Service has developed recreation of this sort to a remarkable extent. The ideals and devotion of the naturalists, historians, and rangers of the staff have sought realization in their endeavors to make the visits of millions of Americans opportunities for greater understanding and appreciation of their land and of the history of their country."

"However, the act of 1936 greatly enlarged the role of the National Park Service, with respect to recreation, and made it the chief agency of the Government for planning and advising on recreational uses of all kinds of areas, notably on areas created by impounding water, on behalf of other Federal agencies and of the States and their subdivisions. In the opinion of the Advisory Board this responsibility has been well carried."

"The problem as to what extent the Service should exercise this responsibility for areas over which it does not have jurisdiction, and which are used chiefly as regional playgrounds is under consideration. A carefully thought-out report by the Advisory Board has been approved by the Secretary of the Interior and may be supposed to represent the present policy of the Service. It would undoubtedly be the opinion of nature conservationists that this function is secondary as compared with the primary function of protecting and interpreting, at the national level, our unique and most notable places."

"The decade of Mr. Drury's directorship has been one of many other major services. He has reestablished friendly cooperation with the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture with which, in earlier years, there had been a not-too-friendly rivalry. He has, in this last year, with the aid and advice of a special committee, worked out a revision of the policies and practices of the Service with respect to concessions and concessioners, which promises to be beneficial to all concerned, including the millions of visitors who must depend on the concessioners for food and shelter and transportation. He has had to deal with the delicate problem of maintaining the wildlife of the great parks in reasonable ecologic balance, and while experts often disagree with each other as to the methods employed, his approach to the problem has been scientific and he has endeavored to secure the most competent advice."

"Mr. Drury's greatest service has been the complete dedication of himself to his task. He has expressed his ideals in inspiring words in his reports, and in public utterances and writings, and he has justified his faith by his works. He has identified himself with his staff so that together they have seemed to have one voice. He has been a leader among equals, but he has not been their boss. He has inspired the loyalty of the staff to the ideals that they have held in common, but he has never demanded a personal loyalty to himself. He has been eager to obtain the best possible judgment on all problems, and his deci-

sions have been reached after conscientious consultation and mature deliberation. He has not dramatized himself or his position; he has not been spectacular and he has avoided personal publicity. He has had to say "No" far more often than "Yes," and he has said it quietly, but as many times as were necessary to make it stick. He has not pounded the desk or made the rafters ring or broadcast epithets to the front pages of the noneditors."

"This is the sort of public servant that Newton B. Drury has been."

"The dismissal of Newton B. Drury, in the manner described and for the reason alleged, raises many questions which nature conservationists and their organizations are bound to ask. They have had confidence in Mr. Drury, even on the infrequent occasions when not all of them have agreed with him. They have looked upon him as a stalwart defender, within the Government, of the integrity of the national parks. They have recognized his honesty, his singleness of purpose, his reasonableness, and his devotion to the ideals which they themselves hold. They ask whether his successor or successors, whoever he or they may be, will be equally strong to defend and to resist, or will they be more compliant in the face of what may seem to be considerations of expediency? Will they be able to defend the Service from undue interference, already manifesting itself, from "upstairs"? Will they have the vital spark of leadership that will reinforce the devotion of the Service to the great purposes which it has so well served since its creation and that will maintain the morale for which it is justly renowned? Will they be able to command the moral support of the nature conservationists and their organizations across the country, which they will so greatly and sometimes so desperately need? No mistake could be more unfortunate than to underestimate the value of such support or its influence upon public opinion."

"Nature conservationists will realize that now, and in the immediate future, they must be more than ever on the alert. They have not forgotten Hetch-Hetchy; if the destruction of Dinosaur, which has been conclusively shown to be unnecessary, is consummated, and if Mr. Drury is succeeded by directors less determined to defend, without exception, the great heritage of countless generations of Americans, the friends of the national parks will resort to all means in their power to create such defenses in public opinion as cannot be broken down."

Dr. Leland has made this special comment on his article:

"It was my intention, in writing my article on Newton Bishop Drury, for the *National Parks* magazine, to present a factual statement constructive in tone and character, which would, in itself, be the most effective refutation of so-called charges that Mr. Drury had not been aggressive in the defense of the National Parks during the last war, specifically in the matter of cutting Sitka spruce, that he had acquiesced in the construction of dams in Dinosaur National Monument, and that he had opposed the recreational activities of the National Park Service on behalf of areas not included in the National Parks system. These charges have never been made by any responsible official of the Department of the Interior, and nothing that Secretary Chapman has said, to my knowledge, has indicated dissatisfaction with Mr. Drury's administration. Furthermore, my own study of the pertinent documents as well as my personal knowledge of these matters, which were fully and frequently considered by the advisory board in its meetings, demonstrated that the charges were completely contrary to the facts. It did not seem worth while to deal with such charges in any formal way. It was clear that they had not affected confidence in Mr. Drury on the part of conservationists for these were too well acquainted with his

character and integrity, as a man and as a public official, and with his whole career as a defender of our great endowments by nature, to give any credence to them."

Before Director Drury's resignation became effective, representatives of 19 national conservation organizations tendered a cocktail party to the Director and Mrs. Drury at the Cosmos Club here in Washington. At this affair many tributes were paid to the guests of honor. A press release dated March 28, 1951, describes a testimonial presented to the retiring Director and part of it is quoted here:

"You have deserved well of the Republic," declared representatives of 19 national conservation organizations in a testimonial presented to Newton B. Drury, retiring Director of the National Park Service, at a cocktail party in his honor at the Cosmos Club today.

"In signing the testimonial, representatives of these groups recorded their appreciation of Mr. Drury's 'distinguished services' as Park Service Director for more than 18 years, and expressed 'sincere regret that those services should now come to an end.' The statement asserted: 'We feel that our confidence in you, when you entered upon your duties, and our high hopes for your administration have been justified, completely and abundantly.'

"You have been," the testimonial continues, 'the chief custodian of our country's greatest treasures, unique and irreplaceable, the superlative works of nature upon our land and the monuments of the history of our people. You have guarded these treasures with devotion and with courage as a sacred trust on behalf of countless generations to come, and you have known how to draw from them inspiration and enjoyment for the generations of the present. You have held high the ideals of a branch of the public service which has been notable for its ideals and its loyalty to them, and you have maintained and enhanced its great tradition.'

"Signers of the testimonial did so 'on behalf of those millions of our fellow citizens whose lives are enriched and whose love of country is stirred by the experiences which you and your associates of the National Park Service make possible for them.'

"Organizations represented at the gathering and signing the scroll were American Scenic and Historic Preservation Society, American Forestry Association, American Museum of Natural History, American Nature Association, American Planning and Civic Association, Boone and Crockett Club, General Federation of Women's Clubs, Izaak Walton League of America, National Audubon Society, National Parks Association, National Wildlife Federation, Save-the-Redwoods League, Smithsonian Institution, Society of American Foresters, Conservation Foundation, Nature Conservancy, Sierra Club, Wilderness Society, Wildlife Management Institute."

The Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments is now composed of the following men. Mr. Charles G. Sauers (chairman), 536 North Harlem Avenue, River Forest, Ill.; Dr. Theodore C. Blegen (vice chairman), University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.; Dr. Frank M. Setzler (secretary), National Museum, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.; Dr. Harold E. Anthony, American Museum of Natural History, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Herbert E. Bolton, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; Dr. Ralph W. Chaney, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; Mr. Bernard DeVoto, 8 Berkeley Street, Cambridge, Mass.; Dr. Fiske Kimball, Philadelphia Museum of Art, Fairmount, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mr. Tom Wallace, Louisville Times, Louisville, Ky.; Mr. Alfred A. Knopf, 501 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.; Mr. Charles G. Woodbury, 1801 Hogan Place NW, Washington, D. C.

On April 26, 1951, after Director Drury had returned to California the Advisory Board met in Washington, D. C. All members were present except Dr. Bolton and Dr. Kimball. The Board reviewed all the circumstances relating to Dr. Drury's retirement, and adopted a resolution which was at once dispatched to Drury by wire:

"Resolved, That the Advisory Board record its profound regret that the National Park Service should lose the services of its Director, Newton B. Drury, who, for more than 10 years, has directed the activities of the Service and guided its policies with the greatest competence and distinction, maintaining its high standards and defending the Nation's parks and monuments against encroachments and the impairment of their values, and, that the Advisory Board address to former Director Newton B. Drury the expression of its gratitude and appreciation.

CHARLES G. SAUERS,
Chairman, Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments."

The Izaak Walton League is a powerful organization of conservationists, for the most part fishermen, but men who ever keep watchful eyes on the National Park Service. Its executive director, William Voigt, Jr., had this statement to make to Director Drury on hearing of his resignation:

"He told me of your intention to leave the Service—at your chosen time and in your chosen manner, and I will not attempt to dissuade you if you are committed to that course. I will simply express my deep regret that you could not continue until retirement or the close of your active career. My dealings with the Service do not extend back beyond your incumbency and I cannot compare your administration with that of others, nor do I desire to do so. I simply wish to say, from the heart, that I have enjoyed working with you. You have been cooperative and understanding of our views, you have been in sympathy with the majority of the things we have proposed in what we considered the public interest, and I am convinced yours has been a constructive administration, devoted to the ideals and the spirit of the Park Service.

"When you leave we will join lots of others in saying Godspeed. When you go off the Federal staff, you actually may be in a position to be more vigorous and outspoken in defense of the resources of the park system (and similar or related areas) than is now the case. I hope that as you cast about you to choose the vehicles for spare time utilization of your energies, you will think of the league and consult with the league's leadership. We need and want men of your experience and caliber to counsel and advise us, and I hope you will give this expression from me your consideration when the time comes for you to make such decisions."

On the day Mr. Drury's resignation was announced, the only living former Director of the National Park Service, Horace M. Albright, who was at the head of the Bureau from January 1929 to August 1933, was interviewed at Carlsbad, N. Mex., by a reporter of the Carlsbad Current-Argus and made this statement on February 8, 1951:

"I have heard with keenest regret that Newton B. Drury has resigned as Director of the National Park Service. He has served as the head of this important Government bureau since August 1940, and has been an efficient and successful administrator in a very critical period of national park history.

"Mr. Drury is one of the outstanding conservationists of the country. As the executive director of the Save-the-Redwoods League, he deservedly received the major share of the credit for the success of that organization's campaign to purchase and preserve over 50,000 acres of the best stands of California coast redwoods.

"He was also the leader of the group responsible for the establishment of California's State park system, one of the best in the Nation. It was on the basis of this record that Mr. Drury was offered the post of Director of the National Park Service. In wartime it was his duty to oppose all efforts to invade national parks and movements for exploitation of their resources. This he did, yielding only in one of two cases where it was clearly proven that the war effort would have suffered had he not permitted certain limited operations within park reservation boundaries.

"The National Park system was expanded during his administration, Big Bend in Texas and Everglades National Park in Florida being added. Several national parks were enlarged in area and many new national monuments and historic sites were given the protection of his bureau. All in all, Director Drury's many achievements were of great importance and of lasting benefits to the Nation."

As I related in the early part of this statement, Gov. Earl Warren appointed Newton Drury, chief of the division of beaches and parks of California. This appointment was a most popular one, and already Drury is at work on the unfinished business of the State park commission which includes such projects as the preservation of the South Calaveras Grove of Big Trees and adjacent tracts of sugar-pine forests.

Space does not permit quotation of California tributes to Newton Drury but the views of two influential conservation organizations deserve quotation. The Sierra Club which has 7,100 members expresses itself through its board of directors and on February 17 the board unanimously adopted the following resolutions:

"Resolved, That the board of directors of the Sierra Club desires to express to Newton B. Drury its appreciation of the distinguished service he has rendered as Director of the National Park Service during the past 10 years, and that it welcomes his continued participation in the councils of the club in his capacity as honorary vice president.

"Resolved, That the board of directors of the Sierra Club congratulates Arthur E. Demaray upon his appointment to the position of Director of the National Park Service following his many years of devoted service in other capacities in that Service, and pledges to him its cooperation and support."

And in April 1951, the Tamalpais Conservation Club in its magazine said:

"Newton B. Drury is the new chief of the California Division of Parks and Beaches. Mr. Drury recently stepped out as Director of the National Park Service, a post he had held for more than 10 years.

"Newton Drury has a long and distinguished record as conservationist and administrator. Graduate of the University of California in 1912 he was given honorary degree LL. D. in 1947. He was an executive of California State Park Commission 1929-40; secretary, Save the Redwoods League, 1919-40, and has received many honors and awards from various organizations and institutions as a conservationist.

"We congratulate Governor Warren in his prompt appointment of such an able administrator and distinguished conservationist as Newton B. Drury to head our California State park system.

"To Mr. Drury the TCC extends a welcoming hand, with our pledge of cooperation and best wishes for a long and successful career."

So Newton Drury is at home in his native hills and forests and among old friends, but wherever conservationists gather, whether their interests be in parks, forests, historic sites, wildlife soils, or waters, his achievements as Director of the National Park Service will be recalled with appreciation and great respect.

Major Problems and Dangers of Inadequate Manpower Mobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement filed by Francis V. Keesling, Jr., formerly chief liaison and legislative officer, national headquarters, Selective Service System, with Senate House Committee on Armed Services and Senate and House Committees on Expenditures in Executive Departments and House Committee on Education and Labor:

SOME OF THE MAJOR PROBLEMS AND DANGERS OF INADEQUATE MANPOWER MOBILIZATION

From personal experiences at Washington during World War II, I have good reason to be greatly alarmed over the serious consequences which could result from failure to provide a completely adequate manpower program for use during the next major mobilization.

Failure to put into effect a completely adequate manpower program during World War II was one of the major causes of the postwar inflation which since then has been floundering and reflationing.

Such failure also impeded our war effort and jeopardized our national economy and security. Unless preventive measures are taken now, even greater mistakes may be made next time which could cause the entire mobilization structure to collapse, both the military and war production.

Let me tell you how and why manpower mobilization could collapse in whole or in part and cause great and possibly irreparable injury to our war effort and our economy.

First of all, if during full-scale mobilization, the Selective Service System ever became suspected of granting deferments on a political or any other unfair basis, it would not be long before registrants and their families might not abide by its decisions. Also, the morale of those already in the fighting forces would be disrupted. Therefore, it is imperative to avoid even the slightest suspicion of political or other bias. Experience has disclosed that to avoid such suspicion the Selective Service System must be an independent agency at the Washington level and must not be under the domination of any department having either a special interest in inductions or in deferments. Consequently, various proposals during past years to have selective service transferred to the Department of Defense, or to the Department of Labor, or elsewhere, have been turned down as potentially dangerous. Also, every suggestion to place the local selective service boards under the control of any agency such as the United States Employment Service at the local levels, have likewise been properly set aside and defeated. Such proposals must continue to be defeated, as history has proven that there is no better substitute for an independent Selective Service System operating with uncompensated local board members. No substitute can assure the same effectiveness and the same impartiality, or be assured of the same wholehearted acceptance by millions of registrants, their families, and employers.

During World War II it became necessary for me to prevent other agencies from taking over some or all of the selective-service functions. I mention this as an illustration of

how major matters can slide by at Washington unless someone steps in to prevent it. Unless preventive measures are taken, pending legislation (S. 1142, H. R. 3315 and H. R. 3681) proposing to transfer the Selective Service System to the Department of Labor could be enacted by default. I am convinced that the Senators and Congressmen who introduced the bills were not made aware of all of the facts. During the past 3 weeks I have taken the initiative at Washington to see to it that they will be apprized of the true facts. When they have considered them, and when they are asked the same questions I shall now ask you, I feel reasonably sure that the proper answers and solutions will be forthcoming. Do you believe that the Department of Labor which is charged with being the special advocate and guardian angel of labor should control selective-service policies and operations? Do you believe that paid Government employees of local United States Employment Service offices operating under directives from the Department of Labor should supersede the unpaid members of selective-service local boards and make the all-important decisions as to which men go to war and which are deferred? Do you believe that deferred registrants and others on the home front would rather have the selective service local boards administer home front war production manpower controls instead of having such controls administered by local United States Employment Service offices? If you were a registrant, what would be your choice?

During World War II strenuous attempts were made to take occupational deferment determinations away from the Selective Service System and turn them over to the United States Employment Service local offices. Other attempts were also made to take over control of the entire system from top to bottom. These attempts and then partial, but short-lived success, made our regular duties and functions much more difficult.

Also, when consideration was being given to the imposition of controls on war production manpower, the same persons tried to have those controls exercised by the United States Employment Service rather than by Selective Service local boards.

It has always been my position that the uncompensated local board members at the lower levels should make the decisions not only as to which men should go into the Armed Forces and which ones should be deferred, but should also make the decisions with respect to the stabilization and transfer of war workers. Broad manpower policies must, of course, be made by some overall national board of directors, such as the Office of War Mobilization in World War II, the NSRB or DPA. Obviously there is a very important part for the Department of Labor and the local United States Employment Service offices to take along with all the other special interest departments in the over-all manpower mobilization program. They, of course, have expert information and data which should be made available to the Selective Service System by way of advice, both at the national and local levels. There are also other agencies at the national and local levels which must make their expert advice and data available so that Selective Service decisions can be properly formulated and made only after consideration of such expert evidence. That is exactly the way the Selective Service System operated in World War II in connection with its military induction and deferment processes. It continually received and utilized all of the data and advice made available by the various Government departments having particular expert knowledge and data with respect to war manpower matters in their particular fields. However, during World War II certain Government officials working in close conjunction with special interest

groups prevented use of adequate war production manpower controls by the Selective Service System.

During the first years of World War II, President Roosevelt and some of his top officials failed to take a definite position on manpower controls. Those who took a definite position did not do all they could have to get proper action. When the situation became critical because of lack of an adequate program, President Roosevelt belatedly requested the enactment of legislation. Under such legislation, Selective Service would have administered the manpower controls. However, certain persons flagrantly violated the President's official directives (see appendix A) when they pressured to have the United States Employment Service handle it under different legislation from that which the President requested. This action resulted in such confusion that the legislation requested by the President became deadlocked in the Senate after having passed the House of Representatives.

On a previous occasion President Roosevelt, upon receiving a proposed national service bill from Grenville Clark, instructed the WMC to study the subject and recommend a bill for use when and if the President decided manpower controls would be required. After weeks of hard work a WMC special committee completed its draft of the legislation calling for controls to be administered by Selective Service. Can you believe that such legislation, though prepared by representatives of member agencies of the Commission, was arbitrarily pigeon-holed, and that a substitute prepared by the staff of the WMC was submitted to the President in its place? The substitute provided for USES as the operating arm, and followed in substance a bill prepared in the Social Security Agency before Pearl Harbor.

On another occasion a speech I planned to present before the Commonwealth Club of California was ordered canceled the day before the speech in the President's and Justice Byrnes' absence from Washington, although it had been cleared with General Hershey and was on all fours with the legislation requested by the President. I ought to know, because I drafted that legislation, and prepared the speech in explanation and support of its provisions. For those interested in this point, I am including in the Appendix a copy of the "best speech I never made" (See appendix B.)

As a very poor and unworkable substitute for adequate manpower controls during World War II an attempt was made to control war production manpower through the United States Employment Service offices operating under the so-called War Manpower Commission. The record conclusively shows that this failed for two reasons: (1) insufficient teeth to enforce controls, and (2) the fact that local United States Employment Service offices were unable to hold the line against the pressure and requests for permission to transfer, and hence issued "certificates of availability" in large volume. On the other hand, you and I know that the local selective-service boards in a fair and impartial manner could have held that line by making forthright decisions and sticking to them, for they had become experienced in withstanding all of the pressures to which they were subjected in the course of their induction and deferment procedures. In addition, you will realize that during a major mobilization, local boards will already have a close relationship with millions of deferred registrants in the course of classifying them for induction or deferment.

The Boards will have full and complete data as to occupational skills, financial status, dependency, physical and mental condition, and so forth. Having deferred these registrants, the Boards are also in a much better position than any other agency

to deal with them and have them abide by war production manpower directives. Also, why waste money and scarce manpower in creating or expanding many new agencies and offices which under any objective consideration could not possibly do the job as well. In fact, there are many who believe that there is grave danger of complete breakdown if new and untested machinery were utilized in operating the type of legislation proposed by the staff of the War Manpower Commission and the United States Employment Service during World War II. Unfortunately, many took the comparatively smooth operation of the Selective Service system during World War II for granted without realizing the years of planning and preparation that made that possible. Thank God we had that planning and preparation for we thereby avoided the pitfalls of prior mobilizations. Let's not start off from scratch with any untested machinery and plans as substitutes for tried and successful machinery and procedures.

And now let me explain why it is necessary to have adequate war manpower controls during a major mobilization.

Early in World War II and at a time when we had taken only a comparatively small number of men into the Armed Forces, we were already faced with war production manpower problems. Demands for manpower were increasing while supplies were decreasing. Gradually there was a noticeable shift from lower paid, less attractive jobs to higher paid, more attractive jobs. Then there began the ebb and flow—the shifting and re-shifting—even among the higher paid jobs. You will all recall the tremendous manpower turn-over and absentee problems of war industries, and the resultant great losses of man-hours. The multiple and compounding impacts of turn-over, including burdening transportation, housing, community facilities, and the expense and confusion of continual recruiting have been stated by me many times in congressional testimony on my numerous appearances on manpower matters.

As time went on and more and more millions of men were taken into the Armed Forces, the situation became more and more acute. Anyone stopping to think for a moment will realize that we cannot take millions of men out of the labor force without creating manpower shortages and hence greater pressures for increased wages in order to compete for personnel. That is exactly what happened in the absence of selective service being given the authority to require deferred IV-F's and other war workers to stay at their jobs. Management pressured the then War Labor Board for wage increases in order to be able to engage in competitive wage wars solely for the purpose of competing for manpower and without regard to what was fair pay for any particular job. As Uncle Sam was paying the way under cost-plus contracts, prices remained fairly well stabilized, but the seeds of postwar inflation were being sown.

Runaway wages, together with loss of man-hours from continuous job shifting and absenteeism greatly adds to the shortage of manpower and necessarily aggravates the problems of both war effort and non-war effort activities. Then on top of that come all the other impacts of inflation.

During the next major mobilization the situation will be even worse unless adequate war production manpower stabilization and utilization controls are imposed under a fair and impartial program operated by the selective service local boards which have such a close and psychological relationship with the millions of IV-F's and other deferred registrants. Because of this relationship, registrants will more readily comply with the requests of selective service boards than those of any other company.

A glance at the following figures conclusively shows the much greater impact mobilization will have next time.

	1939	1944	1950
Total labor force.....	55,450,000	65,890,000	64,590,000
Civilian.....	55,240,000	54,630,000	63,000,000
Employed.....	45,750,000	53,960,000	59,957,000
Unemployed.....	9,490,000	670,000	3,142,000
Armed Forces.....	220,000	11,260,000	1,500,000

You will note that in 1950 there was no large reserve of unemployed such as existed in 1939. Also you will note that although we had a much smaller number in the Armed Forces in 1950 than in 1944, there were more persons in the labor market in 1950, including those in the Armed Forces, than were in the labor market in 1944 at the height of the war. Consequently, each man inducted or ordered into the Armed Forces at this time causes a greater impact than was caused in 1944 when war production was at full peak and our Armed Forces almost at full strength. Obviously, therefore, any major mobilization in the near future will have a greater impact and will necessarily require adequate war production manpower controls to prevent wage pressures leading to inflation, and to prevent other impacts on our war effort and our economy.

In addition to the ravages caused by war-induced inflation resulting in part from inadequate manpower controls on the home front, the same lack of controls during large-scale mobilization prevents a smooth and proper operation of selective-service induction and deferment processes. That in turn causes dissatisfaction among registrants and inductees, together with their families, as well as causing much unnecessary disruption of war plants. Here is what happens: A selective-service local board in your industrial area works out a deferment schedule with a war plant based on fair estimates of the time it should take for that plant to recruit and train replacements for the vulnerable draft-age workers. But without manpower controls, even though the plant is able to get replacements, it finds that it loses other workers to other jobs in ever-increasing rates of turn-over. It also finds that the loss of manpower from job shifting, coupled with the loss of man-hours from absenteeism, induced in part by higher wages, requires the plant management to ask selective service for extension of the deferments of their draft eligible men, and so on and on, ad infinitum. When such repeated requests for extension of deferments are sought, selective service then has the very difficult choice, which used to be called our "operation dilemma," of either inducting the workers anyway and causing a disruption of war plants, or of deferring those most vulnerable men and inducting other registrants from higher priority categories, such as veterans, fathers, older registrants, etc.

Of course morale questions are raised if Selective Service continues to defer young single men for unreasonably long periods of time while inducting men from higher priority categories. If during a major mobilization Selective Service could require IV-F's and others to remain at war jobs, and to the extent necessary, to shift from nonwar work to war work, then Selective Service could induct the young single men according to reasonable deferment schedules worked out with plant management. Under such a system, the military would get the best qualified manpower for its purposes, industry would receive reasonable deferments under businesslike replacement schedules permitting them to obtain replacements before their essential men were inducted, and

war plants would be able to keep their IV-F's and other higher priority registrants, and to obtain additional war workers from among other deferred registrants with which to carry on essential war production satisfactorily. Under such a program, the pressures for increasing wages as one of the most unworkable and dangerous stopgap methods of obtaining and stabilizing manpower would be nonexistent.

Such a manpower program can be worked out with the full participation and cooperation of labor and management so as to insure a minimum of controls and the maximum protection of the usual processes of labor and management. On the other hand, if management and labor who have everything at stake in preserving our national economy and security, and in the very survival of our country itself, do not acquaint themselves with this subject and see to it that proper plans are made and carried out, there is grave danger that improper programs will be pushed through by certain perhaps well-intentioned but impractical Washington planners or by some organized minority having selfish motives, or by a combination of the two. We must be prepared to defeat any wishy-washy stopgap sort of program containing inadequate controls, while at the same time we must be prepared to defeat any program which contains any unnecessary degree of control or regimentation. And in any event, we must be prepared to defeat any plan proposing to have the controls administered by any agency or machinery that would not assure the same impartiality and effectiveness as the Selective Service System operating through its local boards composed of unpaid civilian neighbors.

Let us not forget that Joe Stalin is vitally interested in having us adopt inadequate and unworkable manpower plans. A manpower mobilization breakdown would be one of his most effective weapons. On the other hand, a proper manpower program is one of our most effective weapons, an inadequate one may prove to be our Achilles heel. We must, therefore, continually be on the alert against the activities of enemy agents who through subtle propaganda and other means may attempt to cause confusion and a breakdown in our manpower mobilization during any major effort. In this regard all interested parties must see to it that Washington officials have all of the facts, and that they face them objectively.

I am very pleased to state that during my many relationships with the Congress and with its committees, they usually came through with flying colors when they had the benefit of all the facts on national defense subjects.

But we must be sure the true facts are presented to expose any untrue propagandized facts and conclusions based thereon. Beware of convincing-sounding statements coming sometimes from persons in high places without first checking the basis for such statements, as sometimes they are statements of conclusion and not of fact. During World War II some persons in high places stated that selective service was not equipped to handle this function or that function, or that manpower controls if handled by the United States Employment Service would be the voluntary method as distinguished from the slave-labor method, and so forth. Actually an examination would have revealed that the so-called USES voluntary way involved much more real danger of slave labor and regimentation than the selective service way which would in fact involve the maximum of voluntary cooperation and the barest minimum of compulsion, and then only on a selective, fair and impartial basis. The situation was so bad that two leading private officials, one representing a large national association of businessmen, and the other an important

union, testified against an essential manpower bill as involving slave labor while at the same time advocating in their testimony a program providing for exactly the same machinery and procedures as was set forth in the bill. It turned out that neither of them had read the bill; the only explanation is that they had been the victims of effective propaganda. As a matter of fact these two men turned out to be the best witnesses for the bill although they technically had vehemently opposed it. (See appendix C.)

When the House committee and the House of Representatives were given all the facts, they voted down all attempts to substitute other machinery for the Selective Service System, by overwhelming votes, and the bill itself finally passed the House on February 1, 1945. In view of my efforts I was given the gavel used in the House that day by Speaker SAM RAYBURN.

Many outstanding Americans such as Bernard M. Baruch, Grenville Clark, the Secretaries of War and Navy, the Chairman of the War Production Board, the Chairman of the War Shipping Administration, Hon. Warren Austin, and many outstanding Members of Congress recognized the need for effective manpower controls and the use of effective machinery, but unfortunately some of the Government officials didn't do all they should have to bring about those controls. As an illustration of the prevalent views in the House committee and in the House debate, I am inserting in the Appendix excerpts from the debate. (See appendix D.) The entire debate will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 1, 1945, and preceding days. The committee hearings will be found in connection with H. R. 1119, Seventy-ninth Congress.

In spite of President Roosevelt's request to have the bill passed without bringing up controversial amendments, such amendments were introduced though definitely known to be controversial, and the record discloses that the sponsors were aided and abetted by staff members of the War Manpower Commission.

That our war effort in World War II was jeopardized by not having adequate manpower controls is conclusively proved by the report of the Sparkman committee made within two weeks of VJ-day. That report shows the serious manpower failure in west coast installations at that time and the failure of liaison to and from the west coast and of proper coordination at Washington. (Copy of the report is in appendix E.)

We must wake up to the realization that enemy agents are not merely there in the direct employ of enemy governments, but that the most effective agents are those "do-gooders" and those nonpractical theorists both in and out of Government who, from lack of practical experience, may vehemently sponsor unworkable and impracticable highly theoretical programs and plans, or who have as their goals socialism or other isms, via social and economic revolutions in the course of the operation or failure of a manpower program. Such persons, though probably for the most part sincere and patriotic Americans, propose their impractical programs and oppose practical programs, either on their own initiative or as a result of unknowingly adopting logical-sounding propaganda skillfully prepared and disseminated by paid enemy agents. Such unpaid and unintentional enemy agents are even more effective than the paid agent, for those who are bona fide Americans can openly and perpetually fight for their unworkable programs while dynamiting feasible proposals. Workable plans were sabotaged in World War II, and so in formulating any future war effort programs, we must guard against any similar sabotage, no matter how well intentioned.

Now, how about universal military training (UMT)? I have said that Congress usually comes up with the proper action on

national defense legislation provided it is given all the facts. In this regard, I am convinced that if Congress is shown the need for having X numbers of competent trained reserves available at all times in addition to those in the standing Armed Forces, it will act wisely and properly. Once the need is explained, simply and clearly, then the method of taking care of that need, in this case providing for the procurement and training of the required numbers of men, can be readily determined and agreed upon. In my opinion any supersales attempt to "sell" Congress the method without first disclosing the facts proving the need, is putting the cart before the horse, and is entirely the wrong approach. In the first place, if the need is there and the project is meritorious, any supersalesmanship does more harm than good. Congress won't swallow any medicine called UMT merely because of an all-out advertising campaign using the slogan, "Congress should use UMT." No; the reason why it must use something is the first step. When it is convinced that there must be X numbers of trained reserves, it is obvious that it must use something to provide them.

In other words the means isn't what justifies the end. And so there can be no mistake concerning my views, I am convinced we must have a certain number of competent reserves available at all times. I am also convinced that whether it is decided to train all or only a portion of each age group, there must always be a Selective Service System to process and procure manpower during any major mobilization. Anyone who says that we can abolish selective service forever if we have UMT or train all of our young men by some other means doesn't know what he or she is talking about (see appendix F), and isn't familiar with the gross mistakes made in the long history of many manpower mobilizations. You all know the problems which have occurred when the armed services attempted to select limited numbers of reservists for active duty during the present emergency. Let's assume that we had trained all of our men before they reached 21 years of age and that 24 years elapsed. Will anyone dare say that the armed services could effectively process on a selective basis more than 30,000,000 men between 21 and 45 years of age, and make the decisions as to which of them should be called to active duty and which should be deferred? The answer is obvious. Consequently, there must always be selective service planning, and in connection therewith the Selective Service System could be used in the procurement of men for any UMT program.

A look at the Washington situation discloses a vital need for private officials and industries to intervene. An objective appraisal of the Washington picture shows too much confusion in the Federal Government. Many avoidable mistakes, serious ones, were made during World War II and continue to be made. Private officials and industries are partly to blame because they have not intervened and participated sufficiently and insisted on the formulation and execution of proper policies.

Among other things, private officials should insist that the Government departments be streamlined. Unnecessary expense and resultant inflation are only a part of it. Great confusion and red tape exist when and if there is an overloading and duplication of personnel both within and among agencies. Also, there is the problem of quality as well as quantity of personnel. Too much unnecessary personnel costs tremendous sums. Too much duplicating and overloading of personnel causes innumerable jurisdictional conflicts within and among agencies resulting in the red tape of countless clearances and buck passings. The expense of having a lot of personnel cluttering up an agency is bad enough. Trying to get important projects cleared through all the titles and by

innumerable officials is even worse. Both businessmen and worth-while Government officials trip over the deadwood and red tape.

Also, when there is too much personnel and red tape within individual agencies, and when you multiply that by too many bureaus, superbureaus, and super-super-bureaus, meritorious and essential projects get lost in the mass of confusion unless almost superhuman, sustained efforts are used.

During World War II there was an unbelievable deficiency in liaison between Washington and the various parts of the country concerning the problems of those engaged in war effort or related activities. Even when facts would get through to Washington, often no proper solutions to the problems were formulated because they got lost in the vast shuffle. (See appendix, last part of D.) Part of the trouble was that very successful deterrent to progress known as the inter-agency meeting. Properly set up and handled, it is excellent, but so often it consisted of getting a large group of Washington planners together who would sit around and dream up what they thought the facts were or should be in the outlying sections of the country, and would then try to formulate policies, directives, memoranda, releases, orders, and so on.

General Hershey quite successfully broke up some of these meetings when he'd inject some realism at the appropriate time by asking, "Now tell me, just how is this going to work in Angola, Ind.?"

I had to do likewise or use other methods to defeat improper proposals or get proper action on vital projects soon enough to be effective.

Situations continue to occur disclosing poor liaison, and the jumping to conclusions and the taking of action without first obtaining and considering the true facts, and then exercising sound judgment and proper public relations with respect to whatever action is taken.

Under the circumstances, I respectfully submit that every patriotic Government official, every citizen and every business has an interest, and should intervene insofar as possible, by insisting that the Government departments be streamlined and properly staffed, and that there be proper liaison to and from Washington and the outlying parts of the country and then proper coordination and operations at the Washington level. Efforts along such lines by commissions and congressional committees should be supported.

With respect to the Nation's fight against inflation, I recommend that it be not confined solely to removing duplication, waste and nonessential expenditures in the non-military departments of the Federal Government, but should extend that effort to include the military as well. The vast bulk of our Federal taxes and expenditures are going into national defense. There is no reason to give the military and other defense agencies blank checks and hold them completely unaccountable. We must subscribe to the slogan "Billions for the essentials of national defense, but not a penny for waste or duplication either in or out of the military." Without adequate safeguards and continued vigilance by Congress and all interested parties, including the top military leaders themselves, duplication and unnecessary waste can occur in the Military Establishment and other defense agencies as well as elsewhere.

In seeking to curtail expenditures both in the nondefense and in the defense programs we must guard against false economy. There must not be a curtailment of the essential activities of the civilian agencies or of any of the essential activities of the defense agencies. We must not blindly urge blanket rule-of-thumb budget cuts, but must see to it that the requests for funds are analyzed in sufficient detail so that unnecessary or

deferable items will be eliminated or deferred while at the same time assuring that projects which must be undertaken or completed without delay are provided funds. In this connection it may be necessary to increase the staff of congressional appropriations and expenditures in executive department committees and other pertinent committees and of the Bureau of the Budget. It may also be necessary to supplement the activities of Congress, congressional committees, and the Bureau of the Budget by creating a permanent budget commission with lifetime members and stringent qualification requirements for membership, together with career-men staffs, in order to assure completely fearless and objective action.

World War II and the period since then have created many problems which are becoming more and more complex. It is imperative that all of us, jointly and severally, recognize that we have a vital interest and responsibility in helping solve those problems. Our survival, literally and figuratively, may depend on how much we do.

An Amendment to the Defense Production Act To Provide for the Coordination of Ceilings on Both Prices and Wages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, that there might be the maximum understanding of the amendment which I propose to offer to the bill now under consideration—the Defense Production Act—I am inserting in the RECORD the text of the proposed amendment, and an explanation of its effect. I have nothing to conceal in regard to the amendment. In fact, I want it to be considered in a "goldfish bowl." I hope the Members will familiarize themselves with this amendment and its objectives.

The proposed amendment reads as follows:

"(5) Whenever an increase in wages is specifically authorized or approved by any regulation or order issued under this title, such regulation or order containing such authorization or approval shall be accompanied by an order or regulation increasing the ceiling price of the applicable material or service to the extent necessary to cover the actual increases in wages unless the President finds and determines that the profit margin for each unit of such material or service will not be reduced below 85 percent of the average profit earned on an equivalent unit of such material or service during the three most profitable years of the period of 1946-1949, both inclusive."

(P. 40, line 22, amend sec. 104, par. (5) of subsec. (b) of sec 402, is amended by striking out par. (5) in its entirety and inserting in lieu thereof a new paragraph reading as above.)

THE NECESSITY FOR LINKING PRICE CONTROL WITH WAGE CONTROL

If our economic situation is sufficiently critical to call for general price controls, controls over wages are also a necessity. We cannot have effective price control without effective wage control. I pointed this out at the time we first considered the Defense Production Act last August.

At that time the House adopted my amendment to accomplish this result.

Let me refresh your memory by quoting from the report of the committee on conference as found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 10, page 14130, as follows:

The House bill authorized the President, in exercising price and wage controls, at the same time both to establish price ceilings and to establish wage ceilings, and, except when deemed necessary to prevent gross inequity or to effectuate the purposes of the act, required the establishment of wage ceilings whenever an increase in wages would require increases in price ceilings or impose an undue burden on a seller operating under a price ceiling. The corresponding provision of the Senate amendment provided that whenever price ceilings were established (and they could be established only with respect to materials and services generally) wages should be established, and contained a similar provision for exceptions necessary to prevent gross inequities or to effectuate the purposes of the act. The House bill also required that wages be stabilized generally whenever price ceilings have been established on materials and services comprising a substantial part of all sales at retail and materially affecting the cost of living. The corresponding provision of the Senate amendment provided for general stabilization of wages whenever price ceilings have been established on materials and services generally. The provisions of the House bill and the Senate amendment were rewritten in conference and are found in section 402 (b) of the conference substitute. It provides that when the President establishes price ceilings, he shall stabilize wages at the same time in accordance with the following principles. Whenever a price ceiling is established for a particular material or service, wages shall be stabilized in the industry or business producing the material or performing the service. In stabilizing wages under this provision the President shall prohibit wage increases which he deems would require an increase in the price ceiling or impose hardships or inequities on sellers operating under the price ceiling. When price ceilings have been established for materials and services comprising a substantial part of all sales at retail and materially affecting the cost of living the President shall impose price ceilings generally and stabilize wages generally.

REQUIREMENTS OF PRESENT LAW

As it now stands, the Defense Production Act requires, in section 402 (b), that—

Whenever a ceiling has been imposed with respect to a particular material, or service, the President shall stabilize wages, salaries, and other compensation in the industry or business producing the material or performing the service.

Clearly, Congress recognized that wages and prices are inexorably linked together. As will be seen in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 9, page 12123, I offered an amendment which was adopted by a vote of 146 to 71, which proposed to use the same wording in regard to both prices and wages. The bill at that time provided, as does the present law, that ceilings should be imposed on prices and that wages should be stabilized. I proposed that the House should say that when ceilings were applied to prices that ceilings should be applied to wages. The RECORD of August 9, 1950, shows that a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, sought to give the House assurance that

there is no difference in the meaning of the wording "establishing a ceiling" and "be stabilized." I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 9, page 12117:

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman just stated that he believes when we have price control we should also have wage control, and I agree with him. Does the gentleman understand that this bill provides for wage controls when we have price controls?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. This bill does provide for it in this way: The second formula is selective control.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. If the President thinks that when he places a ceiling upon selective commodities, the conditions appear to him that wages will have to be raised, then in that instance it is his duty under this bill to put wages under control.

Mr. POAGE. Will the gentleman explain why the difference in the language then? The Spence amendment provides on page 4 that the President may issue regulations and orders "establishing a ceiling or ceilings on the price, rental, commission, margin, rate, fee," and so forth, but when it comes to wages and salaries, on page 5 the amendment states, "Wages, salaries, and other compensation shall be stabilized generally." In other words, it states that prices shall be placed under ceilings but wages shall be stabilized.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. That is the third formula. When he undertakes to put it on over all, if he puts it on a majority of the commodities he then has to stabilize wages by placing a ceiling on wages.

Mr. POAGE. Does the gentleman interpret the word "stabilize" to mean the same thing as to impose ceilings?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Absolutely. You stabilize by putting ceilings on them.

Mr. POAGE. Is it not a fact that in World War II we did place a ceiling upon prices, and that we stabilized wages at 15 percent above the figure that existed at the time we put the ceiling on prices? That was the Little Steel formula, was it not?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The President under authority given him now is not supposed to wait until a 15-percent rise. When a rise is threatened, it is his duty under this amendment to stabilize wages immediately by putting ceilings on wages at that particular time.

I am sure the distinguished gentleman from Georgia believed that the OPS would interpret this language as he suggested to the House. I am sure that it was this belief that induced the gentleman from Georgia, and other gentlemen who represented this House on the committee of the conference, to agree to accept the Senate language. Unfortunately, we have seen an entirely different construction given to the words. I know of no way of getting the regulatory bodies to give the meaning that the House so clearly intended, except to spell out that intent in language that no longer can circumvent.

The Wage Stabilization Board itself seems to recognize the necessity of applying ceilings to both wages and prices at the same time. In a recent appearance before the Labor Committee of this House, Dr. George W. Taylor, Chairman of the Board stated:

Price control is difficult, if not impossible without wage controls. Congress has already abundantly demonstrated its awareness of this interrelationship.

Of course, Congress thought that we had done just what the gentleman from Georgia thought we had done. We

thought we had firmly tied wage and price movements together, but we were to soon discover that we had done no such thing. True, the power had been granted, but it has never been exercised. The term "to stabilize" has been construed just as it was by the OPA, to mean "increase." Thus, we find during the week of May 20 the OPS rolling back the price of beef by 10 percent, and at the same time the Wage Stabilization Board was "stabilizing" the wages of packinghouse workers with a 9-percent increase.

Here we have one of the clearest illustrations of the fact that the price effects of the wage award were not considered. Mr. Eric Johnston, Economic Stabilization Administrator, affirmed this fact in his appearance before the Lucas subcommittee, when he said:

In this meat case, there is an illustration. I appointed a board to investigate the facts in this meat case, and although they made no recommendation to me, nevertheless, written in between every line was a recommendation of approval, and I do not think consideration was necessarily taken by this panel in connection with the price program, and I do not know that they ever asked the price stabilization authority as to whether a wage increase in this field would account for a price increase. I don't think that there was any desire to get in touch with them. I don't think that they felt that that was their business.

This is not critical of them at all, and in fact, I am very praiseworthy of them. I am simply saying that I do not think that they felt any responsibility to inquire as to price effects of their wage action.

While testifying before the Agriculture Committee on May 25, 1951, Mr. Johnston stated about the same thing. Here is the record from page 456 of the committee hearings:

The CHAIRMAN. * * * After this roll-back order on beef prices was issued, a wage increase in the wages of the workers in the packing plants has been approved. And now the answer we want to know is whether this order was issued in contemplation of an increase in wages or will it be necessary to change the order so as to compensate for the increase in wages, or will the packers be forced to absorb the increase in wages?

If the packer is forced to absorb the increase in wages, then it seems to me that you have nullified the effect of the roll-back.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Well, of course, prices and wages are not exactly related in this particular case, any more than parity and escalator clause are related. They are both symbols, but they are not exactly related.

In this particular wage case—and I am delighted that you have asked me the question—management and labor agreed on a wage increase that broke the ceiling formula.

I appointed a fact-finding board in Chicago headed by Dr. Edwin E. Witte, an eminent gentleman in the field of labor-management relations, to make a study of the case and to report the facts to me.

This committee met and studied the situation for some time, and did report to me. And although I did not ask them for a recommendation, I could read in between every line of their report a recommendation that the wage increase be granted. As a matter of fact, the chairman came and personally tried to tell me that it should be granted. I did not grant it, however.

I referred the matter to the reconstituted Wage Stabilization Board. The Wage Stabilization Board heard the matter and reported

by an 8-to-4 decision—a majority decision—in favor of the increase.

They favored it under the law which says that hardship and inequity cases must be taken care of.

That is in the Defense Production Act of 1950.

They approved the increase under that act, thinking that there were inequities in this particular case; in other words, the assumption would be, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that wages were too low in this particular industry.

Now whether that will eventually reflect itself in a price increase, I cannot answer you. I do not know the facts.

A few days earlier Mr. DiSalle had testified before the same committee as follows:

Mr. DiSALLE. * * * I am not a member of that Board (Wage Stabilization Board), nor am I entrusted with the responsibility of its operation (p. 4 of the hearings).

Further on page 332 of the hearings Mr. DiSalle stated:

The CHAIRMAN. It is rather strange that your roll-back is 10 percent and this increase in wages (to workers in the meat industry) is 10 percent. I am wondering if the demand for wages in any degree influenced your decision in the roll-back.

Mr. DiSALLE. No it did not.

The CHAIRMAN. So the roll-back was not made in contemplation of a possible increase in wages?

Mr. DiSALLE. No, it was not.

The CHAIRMAN. It was purely coincidental if it happened I suppose?

Mr. DiSALLE. We gave it no consideration whatsoever.

The CHAIRMAN. Would not this increase in wages have the effect of just nullifying the order rolling back 10 percent of the margins of the processors?

Mr. DiSALLE. I would not know what effect the increase in wages would have.

Mr. ABERNETHY. On that point, Mr. DiSalle, you stated a moment ago that the eventual result of these orders would be to create a fair relationship between the producer and the processor and the packer and the retailer, and so on, and you have just stated that these orders were entered without regard to the increase in wages.

Assuming what you say is true, and in using the word "assuming" I hope you will not misunderstand me, but assuming what you say is correct, that your orders have created a fair relationship, when this new wage ceiling goes into effect, then you must concede that it must be added to the various portions of the dollar that go to the packer, processor, and retailer?

Mr. DiSALLE. We certainly had no way of knowing what the Wage Board was going to do in this particular case.

Mr. ABERNETHY. * * * I am simply trying to find out if they do get the raise, which they are going to get, whether or not it is going to be reflected in the price of the meat.

Mr. DiSALLE. I could not give you that answer because I do not know.

Certainly no further evidence should be needed to convince the most skeptical that as presently operated the right hand of the Defense Production Administration does not know what its left hand does, proposes to do, nor the effect of its actions after they are taken. Yet, it is equally clear that there is a very close relationship between wages and prices. A relationship so close that as Dr. Taylor himself stated, makes it most

difficult if not impossible to control prices without control of wages.

We must recognize, if we are seeking to stabilize the economy, that no price level can be held if the wage level is permitted to continue to rise. Permitting those in charge of wage stabilization to issue wage awards without consideration of their effect on the price level is simply adding fuel to the fires of inflation.

The close relationship of the purchasing power of wages and salaries to inflation can be seen by studying the share of the national income which goes to employees. In 1950, according to United States Department of Commerce statistics, compensation of employees amounted to 64.3 percent of the national income. This was \$152,200,000,000 out of the national income of \$236,600,000,000. Thus it will be seen that any change in the general wage level, however slight, will have an immediate effect on our national income, and, of course, on the amount of purchasing power in the hands of our citizens. This is bound to be inflationary if there is no corresponding increase in productivity.

Wages in the United States in manufacturing industries already bear a very favorable relationship with prices. The data of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics indicates that average hourly earnings in manufacturing have been ahead of consumer prices by a considerable margin ever since 1939, when 1939 is used as the base point. When 1946 is used as the base for wage-price calculations, BLS data shows that average hourly earnings in manufacturing have been ahead of consumer prices ever since February of 1948.

This shows us the recent actions of the Wage Stabilization Board in approving both the cost-of-living escalator type of wage agreement and the annual increment type of agreement, both negotiated before January 25, 1950, as a strong inflationary effect. In many cases, such increases may have to form the basis for price increases. Even if such action is not taken, these additional wage payments will tend to force up the general price level since more money is put into circulation to compete with the same amount or a lesser amount of goods and services. In addition, our wage earners are working increased amounts of overtime. The effect of these additional wage payments upon the statutory requirement of time and a half for overtime will add additional amounts of money into the purchasing stream and thus breed additional unhealthy economic effects.

CONCLUSION

I am convinced that we must take action legislatively to affirm the close relationship of wages and prices during the defense emergency. We tried to take it last August. We have, however, seen that the present law is not all that it should be in this respect, since those in charge of wage stabilization seem to be able to grant wage increases whenever it is expedient to do so, and without regard to the effect on prices. If we are to have any kind of effective price control, we must exercise the same degree of diligence over wages.

The amendment I propose would not prevent wage increases. It would not even require a price increase every time there was an increase in wages in the industry affected. Where there were unreasonable profits, as so many have charged are being made by some industries, the wage increases could be granted with no adjustment of ceiling prices. All that would be required would be a finding that the profit margin would not be reduced below 1946-49 levels. Surely, no one can fairly object to this. As heretofore pointed out, the present law provides that in stabilizing wages the President shall prohibit wage increases which he deems would require an increase in the price ceiling or impose hardships or inequities on sellers operating under the price ceiling. I think this clearly contemplates the same basic treatment required under the amendment.

The vital fact is that the amendment spells out what constitutes a hardship or an inequity, and it requires the President to make a finding or determination which can be challenged if unreasonable. Under the present law the President's judgment cannot be questioned. For practical purposes it is a grant of unlimited discretion to those individuals who serve as Price Administrators and as the Wage Stabilization Board. They are not presently required to coordinate their findings. I think we should provide fair and reasonable guides for their actions. That is all the amendment does. I submit that it is reasonable. That it is fair. That it is necessary.

Labor Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the appended article about a distinguished New Yorker, Harry Uviller, impartial chairman of New York's great dress industry, deserves the study of every Member as a first-rate object lesson in labor-management relations:

[From Nation's Business of July 1951]

HE MAKES STRIKES LOOK FOOLISH

(By Irwin Ross)

Twice within 3 months the girl had an epileptic fit in the plant. Other women promptly fainted, the shop was thrown into an uproar and production was disrupted. When the boss fired the unfortunate worker, her indignant shopmates threatened a strike.

At this point the dispute came for arbitration before Harry Uviller, the impartial chairman of New York's dress industry. Union representatives argued that it was inhuman to victimize a worker because of illness. The boss loudly defended his action. Uviller quieted the disputants, questioned the discharged worker. Yes, she could usually tell any morning whether an attack was impending. But she could hardly afford to stay home.

Uviller nodded sympathetically, and then said, "Suppose you stay out any day when you suspect an attack—and the boss agrees not to dock your pay." The woman was de-

lighted. To the employer, Uviller argued that the good will of the entire shop would justify the additional expense. In 5 minutes he was persuaded and the strike threat was over.

Uviller, who has handled 25,000 such disputes in the past 15 years, generally is ranked as the country's leading labor arbitrator. He has kept peace by dint of great flexibility and imagination, much of his work involving the small, pesky disputes which, if unresolved, grow into major conflicts.

At 54, Uviller is a thin, ashen-skinned, cadaverous man with a solemn face and a body as tense as a coiled spring. Chewing fiercely on long cigars, firing questions at witnesses in a rasping voice, he lacks any trace of judicial demeanor. His impartiality, however, is legendary.

"It would be hard to imagine a more fair-minded man—or one more painstaking," says Isidore Agree of the National Dress Manufacturers Association.

And union leader, Luigi Antonini, adds, "Nothing is harder than to satisfy everybody. * * * Chosen first by unanimous consent, the average umpire winds up being fired also by unanimous consent. But Harry Uviller is an exception to the rule. He really is endowed with exceptional gifts."

With Manhattan's Seventh Avenue as its center, the New York dress industry sprawls from Massachusetts to Pennsylvania. Its 80,000 workers are spread among a vast number of employers—some 2,500. The employers are a highly individualistic, fiercely competitive breed, constantly agitated over the swings of seasonal demand and the vagaries of style.

In the dress business, a fortune can be made one season—and lost the next. So frenetic is the atmosphere that endless disagreements are inevitable. Each year more cases are filed with Uviller's office than all the arbitrations in General Motors, Chrysler, Ford, and United States Steel combined.

"There are no longer crises in Uviller's business," a friend says, "only a series of disagreements." In the 1920's and early 1930's, the crises led to endless strikes, lock-outs, and court litigation. By contrast, there hasn't been a major work stoppage in all the years that Uviller has been in office. This boon costs the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union and the five employer's associations but \$125,000 a year for Uviller's 20-man staff—eight deputies, two chief deputies, and a clerical force. Uviller himself gets \$25,000.

Labor and management have endowed him with vast powers. All strikes and lockouts are illegal during the life of the collective-bargaining agreement; Uviller arbitrates all disputes—including those about wages. In other industries, disagreements arising under wage-reopening clauses have frequently led to strikes. But in 1946, when crippling strikes occurred in other industries, Uviller's dressmakers received their "first-round" wage increase without once leaving their machines.

Peaceably settling such industry-wide disputes is only part of Uviller's problem. The general wage rates have to be translated into specific "piece rates" for each of the 100,000 dress style, annually produced. Determining 100,000 separate rates is a monumental task.

Bargaining starts in the shop, where 90 percent of the rates are settled amicably; disagreements can be appealed up through two tribunals of deputy impartial chairmen until they reach Uviller. He hears the arguments, dissects the dress—and every Friday renders his decisions. It is a back-breaking chore, but it pays off in uninterrupted production.

Many of the arbitrations that Uviller conducts involve more ticklish matters—discharges, discriminatory transfers, illegal stoppages—which come to him directly from

the factory. Hearings, scheduled within 24 hours if necessary, are held in a plain, green-walled conference room. The parties are grouped around a long table, at the head of which Uviller sits, attentively listening under a cloud of cigar smoke. He keeps legal procedure to a minimum. Witnesses often interrupt each other. When the exchanges become acrimonious, Uviller wags a bony finger and warns the disputants to mind their manners.

Some of the cases are fairly clear-cut. A duplicate-maker was discharged for taking a dress pattern with her when she left the shop. The union demanded her reinstatement. The boss testified that she had been warned not to remove dress patterns—a sensitive point in an industry so vulnerable to style piracy.

On the day in question the woman was seen heading for an elevator with an object concealed under her coat. When she was stopped, she threw the pattern—and several epithets—at the boss. The next day he fired her. Her defense was simple: She was not planning to betray trade secrets, but merely to make a dress for herself at home. "No excuse," said Uviller, and she remained fired.

Most cases are more complex. "One of my abiding principles," says Uviller, "is that the human facts in a case are as important as the material facts."

In one case, an operator was fired for tardiness. She told a pathetic story. She lived on the outskirts of town; before leaving for work each morning she had to take care of her paralytic mother and prepare meals for her brood of kids; then, if she missed her bus, she was a half hour late at the shop.

"I sympathize with her," the boss said. "But now everybody in the shop is coming in late, saying, why should Sally get away with murder?" Uviller called in the entire shop during their lunch hour and told them that their shortsightedness was victimizing a fellow worker who already had enough misery. They should be ashamed of themselves. They visibly were, the woman went back to work and group tardiness disappeared.

More than sentimentality is involved in such pacification. Uviller is always guided by what he calls the "over-all interest of the shop." A case came before him where a designer asserted that the firm's sample maker was inefficient; either the sample maker would be fired or the designer would resign—at the height of the season.

Examining the sample maker's work, Uviller felt satisfied that she was not inefficient. It was apparent that the two women hated each other. Simple justice demanded that the decision favor the sample maker, but by that action the firm—and all the workers in it—would suffer a grievous financial blow. Uviller asked the sample maker whether she thought she could get a job elsewhere. Indeed, she knew she could—she merely wanted the satisfaction of besting her adversary.

Uviller explained the situation to her, conferred with the employer, and in the end came up with a solution that satisfied everybody: The sample maker would leave, but with 4 weeks' pay; she also had the privilege of returning to the firm's employ whenever the designer left. Because the turnover among designers is notoriously high, the woman was virtually assured of eventually returning to her old job.

Uviller places equal emphasis on the "public interest of the industry" in determining the merits of a specific controversy. Oftentimes, the parties are unaware of the far-reaching implications of a simple dispute.

A famous instance occurred when a cutter refused to use a new spreading machine—a contraption that unrolls the bolts of cloth before they are cut—At first sight, it was a simple case of insubordination. At

second view, the precedent laid down would affect employment in every cutting department in the industry. The issue was adjusted by an agreement that the new machine could be used when all the cutters in a shop were employed.

Introduced indiscriminately, the machine would have caused unemployment for 10 percent of the cutters in the industry. Introduced gradually, the displacement of workers kept pace with the retirement of old cutters.

Uviller is all for technological innovation, but he insists that the human beings involved be taken care of.

Uviller's sympathy with the worker is no second-hand acquisition. He was born in the poor Brownsville section of Brooklyn, N. Y., in 1897. His parents, who had emigrated from Warsaw a few years before, supported five children by running a grocery store. Harry, a spindly lad who loved to read history books, worked at the store every afternoon.

When he made deliveries he often tarried in the customers' kitchens soaking up the hard-luck stories of the housewives. "Harry was a born confidant," an old friend recalls. "He never had any trouble getting people to unburden themselves. It's been a useful talent ever since."

After attending Boys High School he clerked in a law office for \$5 a week and spent his nights studying law at New York University. After 6 months, however, he had to leave the law firm. Illness had forced his parents to give up their grocery store and Harry was obliged to contribute more generously to their support. He got a job in a coat-and-suit factory at \$13 a week, where he worked simultaneously as book-keeper, assistant foreman, and, at times, shipping clerk. He continued at the law school, being graduated in 1918. But he never got around to practicing his profession, for a better opportunity intervened.

Early in 1919 the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union threatened a strike over the coat-and-suit industry's demand for a weekwork instead of a piecework system. The large manufacturers had an association which could deal with the union but the hundreds of small employers had no spokesman.

At 22, Uviller set out to organize a new trade group. He began in February and by May had 750 members in the American Cloak and Suit Manufacturers Association. After extended negotiations, he came to favorable terms with the union.

A rudimentary grievance procedure was set up under the collective bargaining agreement. Uviller was supposed to meet with his opposite number in the union—one Saul Metz—to thrash out specific disputes.

Uviller had tough sledding, for Metz was a Socialist firebrand who preferred to meet the bosses at the barricades rather than the conference table.

At their first session, six disputes were up for settlement. Metz wouldn't concede a single point. Uviller pointed out that the only alternative, under the contract, was arbitration. Metz intimated that while they were haggling over the selection of an arbitrator he would have all the shops tied up by walk-outs.

Uviller suddenly took another tack: He suggested they put the dispute before Morris Sigman, then vice president of the union. Metz was incredulous at the proposal, but couldn't refuse such a proposition.

Uviller's gamble was well rewarded: Sigman decided more than half the cases in his favor. And Uviller absorbed a lesson: "An unexpected appeal to fair play often pays off."

Six months after his first collision with Metz, he had another run-in with him. Once again they wrangled to no avail over some 10 disputes. Uviller amiably took his de-

parture; 2 days later he invited Metz to lunch. It was a fine spring day. After lunch they strolled in Central Park. Uviller avoided any discussion of business; instead he drew Metz out on the history of the workers' movement, life in the old country, and sundry sentimental tangents.

After 2 hours of uninterrupted conversation, Uviller casually mentioned the matter of their unfortunate dispute. Fifteen minutes later they had reached agreement on all 10 cases. The moral? Uviller says, "Never meet a tough problem head on."

Through the next 15 years Uviller labored to build an equitable working relationship with the union. One of his proudest achievements was the manner in which the pressing machine was introduced into the coat-and-suit industry.

The union stubbornly resisted the machine, for it meant considerable unemployment. Uviller broke the deadlock by proposing that a weekly tax be paid on each pressing machine used by the employer.

The tax—set at \$8 a week—went into a union-administered fund to support unemployed pressers. This program lasted 4 years, by which time the machine had been effortlessly assimilated into the industry.

Although Uviller always was friendly to the union, he had no compunction about fighting strenuously against demands which he considered unreasonable. At one bargaining session, the union representative reproached him sadly. "Harry," he said, "I can't understand your attitude. I always thought you were on the side of the oppressed."

"I still am," Uviller snapped. "My manufacturers are the new oppressed."

At another conference, in 1933, Uviller was hostile to a cherished union proposal relating to the continuance of the pressers' unemployment fund when it was no longer necessary. The argument grew quite heated. At its climax Uviller was denounced by the usually genial ILGWU president, David Dubinsky.

"Uviller," Dubinsky boomed, "you'll regret your position. Your wings will be clipped yet." But 3 years later, when a permanent arbitrator had to be chosen for the dress industry, Dubinsky wanted Uviller. The employers were equally enthusiastic. For Uviller, a man who had spent 16 years as an employers' representative in the coat-and-suit industry, there could have been no greater tribute.

Since that day in 1936 he has labored with fierce dedication at his task. He arrives at his office around 10 a. m., works straight through the lunch hour, and seldom departs before 6 p. m. Along Seventh Avenue Uviller's simplicity has become as legendary as his industry. A Uviller lunch consists of a cup of black coffee, which he brews himself, and some tea biscuits. A guest, however, is favored with a sandwich. Uviller stubbornly resists any persuasion to take a vacation, or air condition his office, or replace the worn maroon rug and nondescript chairs.

He is determinedly functional in his approach to existence. He has sheared off all the nonessentials. He has no hobbies, no preferences in food. He regards clothes as merely a protection against the elements. The only ornamentation he permits himself is two or three match folders attached to his belt like cartridge clips. This saves him the time that might otherwise be consumed rummaging about his person for matches.

Uviller belongs to that select fraternity of executives who seldom answer letters. He infinitely prefers face-to-face contact. "And when you see him, he's a magician," says ILG leader Julius Hochman. "You place a problem in Uviller's hands; he considers it, rolls it around, rubs his palms together, and then, poof, it's disappeared. Solved. A regular Houdini, that Uviller."

We Must Make Democracy Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most potent weapons used by totalitarian propagandists to destroy America's democratic influences throughout the world is the internal disunity in our country over the issue of civil rights. Every incident, no matter how far removed from national importance, is magnified and exploited. Repeated attempts are made to prove that the freedoms, privileges, and protections of individual rights which we consider the practical expression of the ideal American democratic pattern are still being denied to millions of persons in our Nation. Our enemies do this because we are vulnerable. We need not be.

A comprehensive civil-rights program administered by the Federal Government would serve as a positive, cohesive force to bulwark the growing trend toward recognizing the human dignity of all men, regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin. It would help combat our enemies who claim that in the United States the agents of prejudice and race hatred have more influence than those of us who would like to wipe intolerance and discrimination from the face of the earth. In these perilous times the immediate security of our great Nation must take precedence over any considerations of cultural lag and sectional differences. We cannot afford to longer indulge those who do not see the plain handwriting on the wall. We must show by example that democracy works for all of the people all of the time; that it means equality, justice, and freedom for every citizen. The proposed program, supported by the Attorney General's office, has no other objective except to place in the hands of the Federal Government those legal instruments whereby the elimination of undemocratic and discriminatory practices might be accelerated. It would make possible a speedier, more positive implementation of those constitutional rights and guarantees of freedom and equality of opportunity which have been characterized as the heart of the American dream. The picture would then be complete with all agencies of Government—Federal, State, and local—empowered, along with private and voluntary groups, to industriously concern themselves with giving our conception of democracy a glowing vitality. Thus we would not be furthering the interests of a select group at the expense of any other, but we would be upholding the premise upon which our Nation was founded, "to form a more perfect union, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

An effective national civil-rights program would offer to divisive forces either within or without our Nation no quarter to flourish. The gap between theoretic-

cal and practical democracy would then be closed. The issue before us is a challenge to practice what we preach. The American spirit has always inclined us to remove fearlessly any obstacle threatening to deter our cultural or economic advancement. This we must do to keep America strong—and there can be no compromise. We are dealing with an important phase of human liberty—something countless Americans have proved they valued more than life itself. Our ability to lead the freemen of all races and nations in the world struggle against totalitarian oppression may well depend upon our willingness to rise above race prejudice here at home.

Honesty Seen as World-Peace Basis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, this editorial taken from the Los Angeles Herald Express speaks for itself:

HONESTY SEEN AS WORLD-PEACE BASIS

Even as political forces in the United States, Asia, and Europe move toward a cease-fire order in the Korean war and the world prays for what may at best be but a temporary and uneasy peace, an ideological revolution is in the making, right here in Los Angeles, which may well, as its sponsors hope, remake the world.

We should not underestimate in any particular the importance of the MRA Assembly for the Reconstruction of Pacific Relations, which is now under way, an assembly which seeks to remove mistrust and fear and create a real basis of unity.

Moral rearmament has already—

1. Brought industrial peace to the docks of London, Liverpool, and Scotland.
2. Eliminated the threat of civil war on the Malayan Peninsula.
3. United the people of France and Germany in a common cause.
4. Curbed the menace of communism in the Ruhr and stepped up production more than 20 percent.
5. Given the youth of Germany an ideology which is superior and more acceptable to them than communism.
6. Given Japan the spiritual urge to rehabilitate its government as a bulwark of democracy in the Orient.
7. Brought new understanding in management-worker relations throughout the world.
8. Curbed communism in Italy to the point that it is no longer an immediate menace.
9. Dramatized the solution of management-labor problems with the presentation of Jotham Valley, the Forgotten Factor, and The Good Road.

More than 400 delegates from 16 foreign countries are attending the assembly now under way in this city. They have come from Great Britain, France, the Netherlands, Italy, Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Switzerland, New Zealand, India, Malaya, Burma, Japan, the Philippines, Australia, and Korea.

They come with this thought and this plea—as presented by those from Malaya in the House of Representatives in Washington:

"Military aid and material is not enough. Millions of people throughout the East look forward to more than a program of more

houses, food, and work. They want a simple, illuminating, practical way which leads them out of a fear-plagued life drifting into the next world war.

"We must quickly find the way which above all else recreates trust.

"We want to fight with America to bring this ideology to the world. America leads the world materially. If she also gives leadership in this superior uniting ideology, Asia will respond."

Moral rearmament is not a religion—but is rather a new approach to all religion—an approach in which faith in God and complete honesty is the guide to the conduct of individuals, of industry, and of nations.

Remaking the world does not seem impossible to those who have seen what changes this new way of life has done for them as individuals.

False Notes in Truman's July 4 Speech to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Detroit Free Press of July 6, 1951:

A TRUMPET OF UNCERTAIN SOUND—FALSE NOTES IN TRUMAN'S JULY 4 SPEECH TO AMERICA

Recounting the birth of this Republic, dwelling upon the perils which confront it, President Truman's July 4 message to the American people rang like a clarion.

It echoed the majestic notes of the pronouncement penned by Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL a few days after the close of the MacArthur inquiry, in which he warned all hostile powers that this Nation stands with an impregnable solidarity as the defender of freedom.

"We must remember," Mr. Truman told his national audience, "that Korea is only part of the wider conflict. The attack on freedom is world-wide. And it is not simply an attack by fire and sword.

"It is an attack that uses all the weapons that a dictatorship can command. Subversion, threats, violence, torture, imprisonment, and deceit."

It was a summation of the wiles, the immorality of an ideology of totalitarian slavery that in all places and in all ways fights the rights and dignity of man as set forth in the Declaration of Independence.

Indeed, yes, Korea is only part of the conflict. It is not all waged on battlefields. Equally viciously it assaults the individual who stands for truth, for freedom to worship God, for the tenets of justice which safeguard political liberty.

These attacks are as endless as they are inhuman. They are exemplified by such martyrs as Cardinal Mindszenty, Associated Press Correspondent Oatis, Archbishop Groesz, by Vogeler, the American businessman ransomed from the Reds after suffering shattering cruelties.

"The Soviet rulers are trying to destroy the very idea of freedom in every part of the world," Mr. Truman declared.

And on that note, as we have said, he sounded a clarion.

But then, alas, the sound grew tinlike, without the ring of a true trumpet. Mr.

Truman began to address not the American people, but a mirrored likeness of himself alone.

"Moreover," he said, "it is doubly important that we set an example of sober and wise and consistent self-government. We face a long period of world tension, and great international danger. . . . All of these tasks challenge the ability of free people to govern themselves with both reason and resolution."

Who but Harry Truman, in his administration of the Nation's highest office, does not set such an example? Who else is responsible for the General Vaughans, the Bourbon boys of the kitchen cabinet—the fumbling and stumbling and corruption?

Did the people of America try to dismiss traitors in Government with airy references to red herrings? What role can Mr. Truman claim in rooting out the Hisses and Remingtons except as an obstructionist?

Who declined to order Donald Dawson to tell what he knew when Senators sought to flush out the crooks in the RFC, an outworn bureau used to buy political advantage with public money?

Not the people, but Mr. Truman.

Under whose Presidency has honesty in Government fallen to such a low ebb that for the first time in our history a Senate committee has felt it necessary to explore the whole subject of moral ethics in American leadership? The answer is Harry Truman's.

"There are people," the President went on, "who say our democratic form of government cannot do these things (the difficult tasks involved in freedom's preservation). They say we cannot stick to a hard, tough policy of self denial and self-control long enough to win the struggle."

The only defeatist words we have heard come from Mr. Truman. More than once he has resorted to a mustering of fear rather than courage.

It is under his administration that government has run in the opposite direction from self-denial and self-control.

Doesn't the application include public business?

Apparently not.

We have a sprawling, wastrel bureaucracy with more nondefense employees on its payroll than at any time in history.

And in specific economic controls it was Mr. Truman who took no action when they became necessary. It was he who turned his back on advisers such as Bernard Baruch and Dr. Edwin Nourse, of the famed Brookings Institution, who foresaw their necessity. Now Congress dawdles and Mr. Truman demands, but it was he who provided the raw political example.

St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, asks

"For if the trumpet gives an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?"

Mr. Truman, as an Independence Day trumpeter, lapsed into the most uncertain of political sounds. And if insufficient Americans fail to prepare themselves for the battle, it is because of the sour notes which the President's own record makes inescapable.

Mr. Truman charged that there were Americans who proclaimed, as defeatists, that "we can't take it."

That is not true.

They have cried from the housetops that we "can't take it" with a leadership that wastes our resources with socialistic experimentation, with stupid inefficiency, and with gross corruption.

He himself said later in his address that we will lose if we do not correct the domestic evils of inflation and mismanagement brought upon us—but by his own administration.

Yet we believe that even with this terrible handicap of cruel negligence and criminal

waste as well as graft the American people can take it.

This Nation is bigger than any group of politicians who go to make up the Government.

Faith in their way of life is in the very marrow of their bones.

And Mr. Truman is the first President to ever preach the ignoble doctrine of timidity.

Lucas Amendment to Defense Production Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

RAILWAY LABOR EXECUTIVES' ASSOCIATION,
July 13, 1951

Hon. M. G. BURNSIDE,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The railroad unions, along with other organized labor groups, are strongly opposed to adoption of the Lucas amendment to the pending bill to amend the Defense Production Act. The Railway Labor Executives' Association, consisting of 18 national railroad labor organizations representing more than three-quarters of the railroad workers of our country, carefully considered this matter at its regular meeting in Washington this week and it is our considered judgment that adoption of the Lucas amendment would be most unwise.

We agree with the position of the American Federation of Labor on this subject. We are confident that their views have been fully expressed to you and other Members of the House. We think, too, that the presentation made by Mr. Taylor, Chairman of the Wage Stabilization Board, should be given very great weight.

Railroad workers will appreciate it if you and other Members of the House will vote against the Lucas amendment when it comes to the floor.

Respectfully yours,

A. E. LYON,
Executive Secretary.

Extend for 1 Year Deadline for Entrance Into Education Under GI Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution unanimously adopted at the recent Department of New York, Jewish War Veterans convention. I strongly endorse the proposal to extend the July 25, 1951, deadline to July 27, 1952, to enable all veterans who wish to enter school under the GI bill to have a proper and fair opportunity to do so

when all schools are open and available to them. I am confident that my distinguished colleagues on the Veterans' Affairs Committee will do everything in their power to extend this deadline:

RESOLUTION OF DEPARTMENT OF NEW YORK, JEWISH WAR VETERANS

Resolved at the Department of New York, Jewish War Veterans convention, held in South Fallsburgh, May 31 through June 3, 1951, That Congress be strongly urged to extend the deadline for entrance into education under the GI bill (Public Law No. 346) for 1 year until July 27, 1952, to enable those veterans who wish to enter school, to have a proper and fair opportunity to do so when all the schools are open and available to them; and be it further

Resolved, That this extension go into effect at once through proper legislation by Congress.

You Said It, Mr. Halleck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Indianapolis Star of July 12, 1951:

YOU SAID IT, MR. HALLECK

Representative HALLECK went right to the crux of the issue of price control when he said the people and Congress have lost confidence in the administration's competence or willingness to deal honestly with inflation. Control involves a grant of authority to someone to do something. Somebody has to be given the last word. The controller has to be a dictator to get results, if any result is attainable.

No matter how hard Congress might try to legislate a cure or control for inflation. Mr. HALLECK pointed out, it would face the incompetence of those who would be entrusted with administering it. Politics could be expected to figure first with the administration, instead of the public welfare.

There are leading Democrats in Washington who have said as much as Mr. HALLECK about the political miasma that envelops the Nation's Capital.

Big Water Project Nears Completion— Central Valley of California Irrigation Plan Starts August 1—Truman May Attend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to the following news story by Mr. Lawrence E. Davies, which appeared in the New York Times last Sunday. Mr. Davies describes the great Central Valley project of California which will shortly go into opera-

tion. This project represents the kind of comprehensive planning that must be done throughout the United States, if we are to properly conserve, control, and distribute our water supply free from both floods and water shortages. We have been too slow in recognizing our crying need for making local water developments conform to the greater need for over-all planning, and in some areas as a result we have a hodgepodge of individual projects, the purposes of which could have been accomplished more effectively and efficiently by the execution of an over-all plan for the entire watershed in which they are located. The report of the President's Commission on Water Resources has pointed the way to better planning for control, conservation, and distribution of our invaluable water resources.

The Central Valley project was originally planned by the State of California. The legislature authorized a bond issue of \$170,000,000 to finance the construction of the project. A referendum against the act was sponsored by short-sighted groups spearheaded by some privately owned utilities, who thought they saw in the project a potential threat to their own interests. The campaign was hotly contested. The proponents of the project employed a young campaign expert from San Francisco, Mr. Clem Whitaker, who has since become one of the highest—if not the highest—priced public relations counselors in the United States. He is one of the partners in the firm of Whitaker & Baxter, the firm employed by the American Medical Association to fight the President's proposed health-insurance program.

The opponents of the project employed the clever strategy of telling the voters in southern California that the huge bond issue would obligate them for a project of benefit only to northern California. This sort of propaganda, being an appeal to narrow-minded sectionalism and selfishness, is always hard to combat.

Mr. Whitaker was assisted in southern California by the late Ray Davidson, another outstanding public-relations counselor who was able to draw upon his experience in successfully handling several bond-issue campaigns for the Los Angeles municipally owned department of water and power. I had the pleasure of assisting Mr. Davidson as a volunteer worker, enthused over the potentialities of the great project. Volunteers were not numerous in southern California, and the campaign for the project was meagerly financed, although the opponents were well-financed. I remember making as many as 12 speeches a day in various parts of Los Angeles because of our shortage of speakers. We knew that our small group could not hope to carry Los Angeles County for the project, but we felt that if we obtained a large enough vote for it, the overwhelming favorable vote in the area directly affected would give us a State-wide majority. This was the strategy of the campaign worked out by Mr. Whitaker, and, needless to say, his analysis of the situation proved correct. The project was authorized by the voters. Thereafter, on Mr. Whitaker's recommendation, I am

proud to be able to say that I was offered an appointment to the State Water Authority authorized by the act. Although highly appreciative of this kind recognition of my small part in the campaign, I was not in a position to accept the appointment.

Mr. Whitaker, having demonstrated his genius for conducting campaigns, was retained by the largest of the private utilities which fought the project, and under his guidance the public relations of that company have improved to the point that they have, in recent years, been more successful in appealing to the voters than they were in 1934 at the time of the referendum.

Now the great project, envisioned more than half a century ago by farsighted Californians, is about to go into operation. Many of the persons who contributed much toward its success will not be among those of us attending the opening ceremonies, but the spirit of men such as Dr. John R. Haynes, of Los Angeles, lives on in the great public works for which they fought, and in the furtherance of which they gave unstintingly of their time and their fortunes. Yes, it will be a great day, Mr. Speaker, when the Central Valley project goes into operation. The project itself has been so well described by Mr. Davies that I am happy to include it at this point in our RECORD.

[From the New York Times of July 15, 1951]

BIG WATER PROJECT NEARS COMPLETION—CENTRAL VALLEY OF CALIFORNIA IRRIGATION PLAN STARTS AUGUST 1—TRUMAN MAY ATTEND

(By Lawrence E. Davies)

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., July 14.—California's \$600,000,000 Central Valley project, center of many a bitter fight in and out of Congress since construction work began 14 years ago, is about ready for a dramatic public demonstration.

With \$400,000,000 worth of big dams, power plants, pumps, canals, and transmission lines representing the first phase of the project due for completion within 2 weeks, the Federal Bureau of Reclamation has set August 1 as the starting date for integrated operation of the project.

During the following 10 days, by means of a system of rivers, canals, and a pumping station, there is to be carried out what the Bureau describes as "the longest mass movement of water ever attempted by man." Bureau officials here expressed confidence that, despite conflicting reports from Washington, President Truman would be in California to participate at Tracy in one part of the 10-day program on August 4.

The Central Valley project, first envisioned as a State proposition and then taken over and expanded by the Federal Government, is based in its irrigation aspects on the fact of an uneven water distribution in California.

VALLEY 500 MILES LONG

The Sacramento Valley on the north and the San Joaquin on the south make up the Central Valley, 500 miles long. The San Joaquin Valley has two-thirds of the irrigable land, but the San Joaquin watershed offers only one-third of the total water supply. Thus the problem posed to engineers was how to transport the surplus water of the Sacramento hundreds of miles southward to help irrigate the starved San Joaquin area, in which the underground water table has dropped to alarmingly low depths.

The forthcoming celebration is to mark the solving of this problem. The ceremony starts at Shasta, the world's second largest and second highest concrete dam, 10 miles

north of Redding at the northernmost end of the Central Valley. Water being conserved in Shasta Lake, behind the dam, will be spilled over the dam and sent coursing down the Sacramento River.

Not far from where the Sacramento empties into an arm of San Francisco Bay, some of the water is to be diverted from the river through floodgates into a so-called delta cross channel.

This channel carries the water to the Tracy pumping plant, some 50 miles east of San Francisco. There, beginning on August 4, when the Shasta-released waters are due at Tracy, a set of six powerful pumps will lift the waters 200 feet into the Delta-Mendota canal. These pumps, capable of lifting 2,000,000 gallons of water a minute, are second only in size to pumps installed by the Bureau at Grand Coulee Dam in Washington to lift water 280 feet out of Lake Roosevelt to irrigate the Columbia Basin lands in the central part of that State.

The pumping plant at Tracy is operated by electricity brought down from the Shasta Dam generating plant over a Government transmission line. The water hoisted by the plant will flow southward for 117 miles through the Delta-Mendota canal.

At the canal's southern point the water will be dumped into the San Joaquin River to flow back northward and eventually empty into San Francisco Bay. In the meantime, in the San Joaquin Valley water will be released from Millerton Lake, behind Friant Dam, near Fresno, into the Madera and Friant-Kern canals. The latter will carry it southward 153 miles to the vicinity of Bakersfield, 500 miles south of Shasta Dam.

Because of the relatively small water supply in the San Joaquin Basin, it is unfeasible to take this water in quantity from Millerton Lake on the San Joaquin and divert it northward 27 miles through the Madera canal and southward through the Friant-Kern canal without replenishing the San Joaquin River itself somewhere along the way.

This is why the Shasta Lake water is being sent all the way down to Mendota and dumped into the San Joaquin. Thus, in a sense, water from Shasta Lake will be used after early August to irrigate lands as far south as Bakersfield, 500 miles from this lake itself. Actually, some symbolism is involved, since the Shasta Lake waters will start back northward after being poured into the San Joaquin.

Some acreages in the San Joaquin Valley already are under irrigation from Friant Dam, however. As a result, Bureau of Reclamation officials have collected such examples as these:

A 160-acre farm netting \$331 from pasturage 2 years ago with this year's net from an irrigated cotton crop estimated at close to \$20,000, a 400-acre farm netting \$1,500 from barley and pasturage in a dry farming condition with an expected profit this year of more than \$77,400 from cotton.

Completed parts of the Central Valley project have a power generating capacity of 450,000 kilowatts and are designed to help control winter floods, increase summer water flows, combat salinity on farm lands, and improve river navigation.

should be free to editorialize has been a moot question before FCC for many years. Radio stations are now free to use their facilities for editorial comments and the manner in which KFMB, of San Diego, Calif., is using its facilities should prove of interest to all Members of Congress.

Now that most communities have only one newspaper, freedom of editorial comment by radio stations seems most desirable and radio station KFMB's intelligent utilization of that freedom has met with instantaneous approval from the citizens of San Diego.

The comment follows:

ANNOUNCER 1. KFMB's editorial page Transcribed and heard every Friday at this time.

ANNOUNCER 2. An anxious, perhaps an eager world, has been waiting now for 2 weeks to learn whether the United Nations and the Communists can work out a cease-fire agreement in Korea. Has an overt act of Soviet aggression finally been contained? Has the United Nations, through its unique police action, really become a formidable physical force in world affairs? Is peace soon to settle over a peninsula so decimated by war that it is almost literally bankrupt of housing, wealth, able-bodied, healthy citizens, transportation, communications and everything except rice-bearing paddies?

With negotiations beginning tomorrow, we'll soon know the answers to those questions. But there's another gnawing, insistent, disquieting question plaguing all of us. "Will we again lose the peace as we almost did after World War II?"

Tonight, KFMB will tackle that one, certainly as grave a question as ever faced the American public. Here to give you this station's own opinion is Paul W. White, our executive editor.

Mr. WHITE VJ-day was such a short time ago. We all remember what happened. The night we celebrated, and the hangover and hysteria that followed. We'd won the war, hadn't we?

We'd done so well that Mussolini had been killed by his countrymen, Hitler lay dead by his own hand, the Japanese Emperor represented now merely the ghost of proud sovereignty. Two atomic bombs and a series of staggering defeats had made a mortal out of a god.

We were sick of war, utterly sick of it. We hated price and wage controls and rationing. Every single, solitary individual wanted back, in his own hands, the direction of his own destiny. That was the American way.

So what did we do in our mad ecstasy of peace?

Well, we brought the boys home. Any Congressman who suggested that we might still need an alert and expansive Armed Force was howled down by outraged mothers. We wanted an end to controls. Certain people were on hand to assure us slickly that the law of supply-and-demand would work then, that prices would "level out" that there would be plenty of everything for everybody as soon as the production wheels started turning again exclusively on consumer goods.

Surely you can remember what happened to prices—even in the face of ever-increasing, record-breaking production. The 1939 dollar became worth 75 cents, then closer to 60, then down to 49. Maybe today it's worth 40—it all depends upon what index you use to prove a point.

Two other things happened that shouldn't have happened. In 1946, a Congress was elected on the promise that taxes would be reduced. They were, all right, but nothing more phoney was ever handed the average American. People paid lower percentages

KFMB'S Editorial Page

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON D. McKINNON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1951

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Speaker, the question of whether a radio station

of their incomes in taxes, but higher percentages in terms of the value of their money. And no effort whatever was made to write off the monstrous national debt.

The other thing was an economy wave in our defense establishment. We, who were so weak in 1940 and 1941—it seems impossible now that a renewal of the draft bill passed by only a single vote—were weakening again. We, who should have been able to keep that weakness in mind, especially when Soviet Russia made it clear to anyone with eyes and ears that domination by the forces of communism was a world-wide goal. But, no.

We crossed off the list a projected battleship here; we gave up a division of marines there, we quit cold on the airplane and the tank makers, we cut our Army and our Air Corps, we closed down plants making artificial rubber; we ran our affairs as though the Kremlin were issuing the orders. You can't blame the Republicans. You can't blame the Democrats. You can't blame the administration. You can't blame the unholy alliance that keeps conservative Democrats and Republicans in actual control of Congress. You can only blame the people, and they just didn't understand. Maybe they needed guidance and leadership, but about all they heard and read was "economy, economy, economy," as though that word had somehow acquired a spiritual sanctity.

It wasn't enough that Russia kept on expanding. Nobody cared too much about even the loss of stubborn little Czechoslovakia, let alone the sprawling mass of China. After all, we had the atomic bomb, didn't we? Even if the Russians got a clue—it turned out that Americans in the pay of the Communists gave 'em not only the clue but the blueprints—we'd still be so far ahead of any possible enemy that we were safe "Safe."

They showed us a little more than a year ago just how safe we were. KFMB doesn't know—or pretend to know—the Communist timetable, but the Korean Express was probably due to visit next such bastions as Formosa, the Philippines, our hard-won chain of Pacific Islands, and possibly Japan itself. All these in addition to the present adventures in Indochina and Malaya. To say nothing of vast Tibet, where we nor anybody else really tried to stay the forces of communism.

Korea changed things. It got us started again developing our military muscles and our armed might. At first, everyone buckled down to the job, aware that sacrifices would have to be made not only in the spilled blood of our fighting men but on the home front as well.

But, for some reason, the sacrifices weren't called for very soon. The Nation prepared to tighten its belt and then found, suddenly, it was fatter than ever and had actually gained weight.

The grumbling began. Why did we ever get ourselves loused up in Korea anyway? Why did the United States have to supply almost all of the U N fighting strength, with only token forces from 17 allies? What's in it for us?

War production sagged. Civilians weren't even donating enough blood to answer emergency appeals from front-line hospitals in Korea. And the wages, price, and farm subsidy controls' bill passed last year suddenly seemed onerous. Credit restrictions were hurting normal business. Of course they were. Why had they been passed in the first place?

All this before peace in Korea even looked like a remote possibility.

You can imagine what may happen now. If there's a cease-fire, sit down, buy some popcorn, and watch the movie all over again. Already Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, has said we wouldn't need any further controls, and we could cut down on military expenditures. Soon there'll be shouts to bring the boys

home and get 'em out of uniform. The need for a big protectionary Army in Japan and in Western Europe won't be any less, but who's to prove it?

The need for a highly mechanized, mobile Army and Marine Corps, for a fleet to patrol the seven seas, and the need for an Air Force faster and with more fire power than any other, won't be any less, but who's to establish that?

The need to control inflation will be greater, not less. If that isn't done, Korea can be written off the books as a dead loss. The kids who were killed over there in those mountains and in the muck and mire—well, they just got killed; that's all.

Someway, somehow, the public must be saved from the tragedy of making the same mistake twice within 5 years. KFMB dedicates itself to avoiding that mistake. Does any member of our audience have a plan or a program—or even a nebulous idea—that will help? Because right now, with peace so near and so likely, it could easily be the time to dance our way toward disaster.

ANNOUNCER 2 This has been the regular edition of KFMB's Editorial Page, in which the station expresses its own opinion on current events. We shall be glad to hear from others, whether or not they agree with us.

ANNOUNCER 1. The preceding was transcribed. This is KFMB, San Diego—first in news and public service.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, our country launched upon a great program of mobilizing its military and economic strength against the world-wide threat of Russian expansionism last September when the Defense Production Act was passed by the Congress. The act was an integrated program that aimed to facilitate the production of goods required by the military and at the same time to avoid inflation through price and wage stabilization. One without the other could only result in jeopardizing our major objective, which is to preserve the democratic way of life against the machinations of the policies of aggression emanating from the Kremlin.

On April 26, 1951, the President recommended to the Congress a number of amendments that were designed to strengthen the Defense Production Act. Among these were authorization to build and operate defense plants where necessary to produce essential materials and equipment, stronger means for enforcing price-control regulations, regulation of speculative trading on the commodity exchanges, and more effective control over residential and commercial rents. Immediately thereafter, powerful lobbies descended on Washington urging an end to the stabilization program.

The opponents of an effective price-control program are ready to gamble with our national security by failing to give the administration the necessary tools for keeping the price level stable.

This should delight the Russian leaders, who have long nourished the strong belief that inflation is the most effective internal device for destroying the free-enterprise system. Those in our midst who clamor for scrapping price, wage, and rent controls are apparently willing to risk industrial strife and national disunity by giving free reign to the wage-price spiral. So strong is their yearning for business as usual that they are ready to delude themselves and the American people with all sorts of specious arguments. They may be ready to indulge in pleasant illusions, but one fact they cannot ignore, namely, that military expenditures which have been running at the annual rate of \$25,000,000,000 at the end of the first quarter of 1951 will increase to the rate of \$30,000,000,000 by the end of the year. This rate of expenditure will powerfully strengthen inflationary pressures.

Since Korea the rise in the cost of living has taken \$20,000,000,000 out of the pockets of consumers. The people in my district—the Twenty-sixth Congressional District of New York—have had to pay out \$50,000,000 because of the rise in prices since June 1950. They look to their Government to prevent any further deteriorations of their standard of living. They are willing to make sacrifices but they are not willing to see others profit from inflation while they watch their savings shrink and their buying power reduced.

The American people know that half-hearted measures are no way to build up strong defenses against a powerful foe. This is no time for yielding to pressure groups. That is the road to disaster. The emergency calls for self-sacrifice by businessmen, farmers, and laborers. Let us all pull together to achieve our common objective.

No Cease-Fire for Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address by the Honorable Charles Sawyer, Secretary of Commerce, which was broadcast over the Columbia Broadcasting System on July 13, 1951:

I shall talk for a few minutes about controls.

We have imposed controls upon ourselves because we have inflation. We have inflation because we do not have enough production to go around. Unless we keep controls we will not be able to channel this production into defense activities. Unless we keep controls inflation will greatly harm us and perhaps permanently harm us.

It will not do to say that if we fail to retain controls we can reimpose them if inflation gets out of hand. Nothing short of a terrific depression, the results of which, both social and economic, it is impossible to foresee and appalling to contemplate, can have any substantial effect on rising prices once all controls are lifted. This sober thought

should occupy the minds of all those now facing the question, "Shall controls be continued?"

The most vigorous expressions of opinion on controls have come from organizations of business, agriculture, and labor. They are not in agreement, but they are vocal and influential. They are vocal as spokesmen for particular groups, but it is well for them, and for us, to keep in mind that businessmen, farmers, and members of organized labor are also members of other groups. They are first of all Americans—citizens of our great country. They are all taxpayers. They have sons and brothers and husbands and daughters and sisters serving in Korea. They are also consumers and as consumers have a vital and personal interest in the effort to keep inflation from getting out of hand.

There is another group, large in numbers, but not too vocal—those with fixed incomes—disabled veterans, pensioners, white-collar workers, upon whom the pressure of inflation bears with continued and increasing severity and who are not in a position to demand or to secure increases in income which will match inflationary developments. For them, the control of inflation is vital. An abandonment of controls today would have a devastating effect upon them.

Very few people are in favor of controls for the sake of merely controlling somebody—I certainly am not. I would prefer to live in a happy state where I, at least, could do what I pleased—although I would probably have some doubts about the wisdom of this for the other fellow. I know, of course, that this is impossible. We operate daily under all sorts of controls. Many of them few people question. Control exercised by the police, control exercised by local health departments, are examples.

For 3 years I have exercised control over the export of commodities from this country. I will leave it to my listeners to envision the catastrophe which would follow if all controls were immediately removed and shipments from this country were permitted to all parts of the world, without any restriction or restraint whatsoever. If we were to permit materials badly needed here or materials of high strategic value to go to Red China, each of you would regard such an action with horror.

The handling of export controls in the Department of Commerce has been a difficult and at times an irritating task, but it has been done. I hope and believe it has been done to the satisfaction of the Congress, and my belief is supported by the fact that recently our export control authority was extended for 2 years without one dissenting vote in either the House or the Senate.

So-called indirect controls and other suggested remedies will not suffice now. Great increases in taxation and drastic reduction of Government expenses, especially military expenses, where most of the money is now going, would undoubtedly greatly reduce inflationary pressures. There are, however, limits to taxation—the law of diminishing returns will begin to operate; and in the military field there are certainly limits to what we can do in the way of economy.

Controls imposed are not necessarily permanent. To say that they are is nonsense. They were removed after World War II, and in my own Department, about a year and a half ago, when the need for export controls lessened, I reduced substantially the number of commodities under control and released hundreds of employees who were handling them. I will do it again as soon as the opportunity offers.

As early as last July I stated that I thought we should impose immediate price and wage controls, that by this method we

would avoid a spiral of inflation which would become more severe as time went on. Events have proved that I was right. The fact that we did not impose these controls earlier is, however, no reason for releasing them now while they are still needed.

I am, of course, well aware that there are certain commodities which at the moment are in ample supply. Some articles are selling below the price ceiling for that reason. While, for them, at the moment controls are not necessary, neither are these controls hurting anybody. When the supply is reduced and the demand increased, the ceiling will be there to protect the consumer. In my opinion, it will not be long before many commodities now in free supply will be absorbed by a public with ample cash.

There are, of course, today some unemployed in this country; and it is no comfort to a man out of work to be told by statistics that many men are at work. However, our last census report on employment, taken as of the middle of June, shows total civilian employment at 61,800,000. This means that the purchasing power of the people of America is at an all-time high. It is childish to pretend that inflationary pressures are not upon us.

I will leave generalities and talk specifically about commodities with which I am particularly concerned, as Secretary of Commerce. Sulfur, for example. While our country is self-sufficient in sulfur, its exports of this item are vital to the industries of practically all the other nations of the free world. If all controls upon the use and export of sulfur were removed, prices would skyrocket, the supply would go to the highest bidder, regardless of the location or essentiality of its use, and the whole economy—not to speak of the defense machinery—would be thrown out of gear.

I will mention an item more familiar to the average American—structural steel. In the fourth quarter of this year only 1,300,000 tons will be available. Requests already in hand show that 2,400,000 tons could be used by the military, the defense-supporting activities, and the essential civilian economy. In other words, we could use almost twice as much structural steel as we will have. To say that control of this item is unnecessary is to contradict facts which are indisputable.

Of the three materials which are now under the controlled materials plan—steel, copper, and aluminum—the total demand is now at about 35 percent above supply. The controlled materials plan cannot increase the supply, it can see that distribution is made with a proper regard to the various needs of our economy and, in particular, the needs of the small-business man.

The real solution of inflation is increased production. Increased production involves an expansion program. The target for steel is 118,000,000 tons by 1953. The target for aluminum is 1,500,000 tons as soon as we can get it, roughly double the capacity at the time our defense program began. If controls are abandoned it will be impossible to assure the flow of the materials needed for the construction of these facilities or, in the case of aluminum, to assure an adequate supply of power. Only by controls during the immediate future can we get along without controls later.

Immediately following the Communist attack in Korea, we experienced a feeling of unity and a willingness to sacrifice which were most encouraging. People from all walks of life joined in statements that we must discipline ourselves to meet the emergency. I quote from Members of Congress of both parties:

"Controls authorized or imposed now seem a small sacrifice of liberty in terms of what failure to mobilize our economy may ultimately bring."

"Controls are distasteful and contrary to the psychology of our form of government

and our way of life, but the present world-shaking crises make them necessary."

"We are going to give the President of the United States the power to institute controls which may be painful, but controls on the domestic front will maintain a stable situation and give proper backing to the boys overseas."

Every one of these statements was true when made and is true now—with equal, if not greater force, than 1 year ago.

I hope, as we all do, that the war is about to end in Korea. If we permit this possibility to lull us into a false sense of security, if we relax from our determination to prepare for adequate defense, we shall suffer immeasurably from our folly.

If we are asked, "Is there nothing which can be done to remove the pressures of inflation?" my answer is, "Yes, and it will produce a prompt result." We can decide to abandon all operations to defend ourselves, all military aid to our allies; we can agree to a quick truce, or even treaty of peace, in Korea, yielding to the Communists whatever they demand. By these simple procedures we can remove the need for most of the controls we now operate. Such procedures would, of course, have other results, far worse than any controls we have had or will ever have. We would make ourselves the helpless prey of communism. We would let our allies shift for themselves. We would, in short, be entering deliberately upon the road to chaos. This course we will not take. If, however, we intend to defend ourselves, to prepare, if necessary, for an attack against us; if we think the many liberties and blessings we enjoy are worth preserving, we must ignore temporary and unimportant inconveniences, and even sacrifices, and determine to see this thing through.

May I say in closing that not only Congressmen have a great and serious responsibility at this time, but those of us in executive positions should make it clear, and make our promise explicit, that as soon as controls can be abandoned or alleviated, they will be. For whatever part I play in the control operation, I personally make that pledge. I am certain that others handling controls will willingly do the same.

Our enemy in Korea is communism; our enemy in America is inflation. We hear of cease-fire talks in Korea and the war there may stop by agreement. We will never witness cease-fire talks about inflation. The war against inflation will never be stopped by conversation or agreement. It will be stopped by positive and continued action. This enemy will not compromise; he must be conquered. He is momentarily checked. Let us see that he does not get on the rampage again.

History of Labor in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address of Nat Messing at installation of officers of the Waiters and Waitresses Union, Local No. 2, of Brooklyn and Queens, July 5, 1951:

The history of labor in the United States is relatively unknown; numerous misconceptions about unions still exist, and mistakes arising from ignorance create difficult situations. Many union regulations rest

upon long and bitter experiences of industrial hazards. If the fear of unemployment were removed by adequate security, some regulations would become obsolete.

Some union leaders have indeed misused their offices for their own personal advantages and aggrandizement. However, the intelligent person will examine the situation as a whole before forming an adverse opinion. Our political system has not been condemned because some political leaders have been found to be dishonest. Individual bankers have been proven unworthy of the trust placed in them, yet, we do not condemn banking on that account. How can anyone in his right mind condemn the American labor movement as a whole, only because we find an unworthy leader in some insignificant post.

The records will show that labor unions grew up in the United States as a praiseworthy movement in mutual aid and to protect men and women who toil. The labor history shows a valuable contribution to the well-being of our country by way of higher standards of living and increased social security. Labor's unstinted participation in the all-out production effort during World War I and World War II was a distinguished addition to that record. Production was quadrupled because workers sacrificed their normal regulations of the workweek, and thousands of them became casualties as a result of the speed-up system.

The men and women who make up the unions today are typical American citizens who unite for specific economic purposes. They are the soldiers without uniforms, whose sweat, brawn and brain are indispensable both in peace and in war. Contrary to some conceptions, for each unavoidable strike which disturbs production, thousands of strikes are prevented by union negotiations. The great majority of unions cooperate with employers in collective bargaining and loyally abide by their contracts. The closed shop is merely a logical application of majority rule, and is as fair as our system of public taxation, under which we all share the costs of maintaining the services that protect and educate us. The unions justly claim, that all workers who enjoy conditions won by union efforts should assume the responsibility of union membership. Some employers are convinced, and rightfully so, that it is to their advantage to deal with their workers collectively through the union representative and have the worker subject to union discipline, so that the provisions of the agreement can be applied. Union management cooperation has been operating quite successfully and will even be recognized by the die-hards as the only method for peaceful collective bargaining.

Employers used the courts to suppress unions, planted spies within union ranks, hired gangsters to smash picket lines, so as to prevent collective bargaining. Happily those days are largely gone; such activities are now illegal. They should, however, be remembered as a warning against their possible return.

It is our responsibility as citizens of the modern industrial age, to know how and why unions grew up, and to examine their general record. Thus we can eliminate tension and bitterness between labor and management, and approach our contemporary social problems with a better understanding toward solving them.

Unions depend, like other democratic organizations, upon the intelligence of their members, to choose good officers, and to study and adopt wise policies in the light of facts. Now more than ever, citizens organized on the job should be informed about their industry and the general economic situation, to the extent that unions don't have to fight for sheer existence or survival; instead they should participate in endeavors of cooperation between labor and management.

Everyone knows that more and better production is achieved by workers when they are treated properly, and it is our business to see to it that they are treated properly. Dictatorship should have no place in labor, industry, or in politics. If union members are well informed they can correct such dangers. Thank God for the members of the Waiters and Waitresses Union, Local No. 2; they are informed and intelligent people, who are constantly seeking more information for the betterment of their conditions and for the community.

One other problem that the community faces is the fear of labor's power, which exists in the minds of the people who are not informed about the labor movement. The prevalent misconception that the New Deal has given labor a special privileged position, and that it may misuse its power, must be eradicated from the minds of those who think so. They must be enlightened as to the real blessing workers and their unions bring to a community. This fear rests upon ignorance about the purpose and practice of the trade-union movement, and a lack of knowledge of the American citizens who form the trade unions.

Local No. 2, of the Waiters and Waitresses Union, of Brooklyn and Queens, is affiliated with the American Federation of Labor and the A. F. of L. as an organization has always refused to organize a political labor party. It insists that it is nonpolitical and nonpartisan. This does not mean that it is not interested in politics. It has, in fact, a very definite interest, the election of candidates friendly to labor and the defeat of those opposed to labor is very important. It adheres to the doctrine laid down by the immortal Samuel Gompers, "To reward its friends and punish its enemies." This means that it continually endorses and works for particular candidates, no matter what their political label may be. It was the use of injunctions in labor disputes that brought us into the political arena whether we liked it or not.

Again great fear clutches the world. Six years after the defeat of the totalitarian forces in the Second World War, the democratic world is still under threat of totalitarian aggression. The ruthless invasion of the Republic of Korea by an army of Communist puppets, organized, equipped, and directed by the Soviet dictatorship, has made it clear that free nations must at all times be fully prepared to fight in defense of peace and freedom.

Despite the strains and tensions of two world wars in one century, America has continued her forward social and economic progress. Freedom has been snuffed out in half a dozen European countries, and on much of the Asiatic Continent. But freedom continues to thrive in America, because 150,000,000 people of various religious beliefs and racial backgrounds have developed a system of government, and a pattern of human relations based on respect for the rights of their neighbors. Today, we are asked to put our own evaluation on freedom and democracy, in the things we are ready to give up for it, and the sacrifices we are ready to make. Should we price freedom and democracy too low it will be taken away from us, however I have complete confidence in our way of life. I am sure that our democracy will control the conflicting and selfish interests of those who put their personal gains above the over-all welfare. The present situation demands honest to goodness loyalty to our way of life. I am sure that freedom-loving people of the entire world will pass this test with flying colors.

There is no place, in a fight for survival, for dissension and lack of harmony among ourselves. There certainly is no moral or patriotic ground for any American to seek political or personal profit out of this present emergency. I believe that most Americans recognize these facts and live up to

them. We aim to utilize all our personal and organizational influence to reduce the number of exceptions. The one value which we share and revere alike, is the country that provides liberty and equal opportunity. We must put aside the differences that divide us and rally around the uniting cause. Personal bias and pet hates are expendable; the lives and freedoms of Americans are not. People are not born biased, and prejudice is not inherited. It depends entirely upon us to expose and overcome these destructive habits.

We in America, who so frequently take our many blessings for granted, too often take our priceless gift of freedom as a matter of course. We have always lived in liberty and enjoyed freedom and democracy in such large measure, that we sometimes imagine it to be the only normal and natural mode of existence. Some nations are deprived of liberty and their people are forced to endure incalculable indignities and afflictions. We know that wherever liberty is suppressed, truth, dignity, and opportunity for advancement are lost. Let no one say that liberty is a mere abstraction pursued by impractical idealists. History tells us that liberty is as necessary to our existence, as is the air we breathe and the food we eat. In many generations and in many lands, men have foregone food and fortune just to obtain liberty. America has prospered and has become truly a blessed land only because of liberty. It is this regard for human dignity, this respect for our own and our neighbor's rights, this democratic accommodation for the differences of opinions—that made this great country of ours, which we love so dearly, strong and prosperous.

Costly Obstinacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal:

COSTLY OBSTINACY

Kansas and Missouri are experiencing record-breaking floods. Thousands of persons are homeless. Damage already done can be reckoned in the millions of dollars and the end isn't even in sight. Most of the flooding is being done by the Kansas (Kaw) and its tributaries. The Kansas empties into the Missouri and, of course, all of the water eventually reaches this funnel which is the lower Mississippi Valley.

Much of the damage could have been prevented. That's always the saddest part of modern destructive floods. Prevention in this instance would have come in the form of construction of the Tuttle Creek flood-control project on the Big Blue River. It was authorized by Congress in 1938. Because of opposition of some Blue River Valley residents, and especially those from whom rights-of-way would be required construction funds have never been appropriated despite repeated requests by the Corps of Engineers. The drainage area for the proposed Tuttle Creek reservoir and its flood-control dam is 9,556 square miles. Storage capacity at full pool would be 1,245,000 acre-feet.

Had Tuttle Creek Reservoir and Perry Reservoir on the Delaware River been built so that they could be operated during the present floods, crests of flood heights could

have been reduced from 4 to 8 feet, according to Army engineers. As it is, about the only way to get around those fertile valleys today is in a boat. Here again has the adage of penny-wise pound-foolish been proved in relation to flood control. The repetition is sickening.

The Reclamation Department's Cedar Bluff Reservoir and the Kanapolis Reservoir, a Corps of Engineers installation—both on the Smoky Hill River—are in operation and are more than meeting flood-control expectations. Had they not been built, flood heights in the Smoky Hill Valley during the present flooding would be double what they are and cities and communities downstream would have been washed out.

The answer to those who wonder what concern a flood-control dam on a tributary of the Kansas is to the economy of the lower valley is simple—this area's security from floods. If the Ohio happened to be in flood at this time, a man-size flood fight would be in progress from Cairo to New Orleans. There would exist the elements for a major disaster. As it is, the lower river can carry off easily all the water that is causing so much misery in the Kansas-Missouri area, but not until all the authorized projects of the Mississippi's tributaries have been completed has the lower valley a right to regard itself as being completely safe.

Some projects along the tributaries of the lower Mississippi are being delayed or blocked because of the obstinacy or shortsightedness in the matter of providing rights-of-way. The bitter experience of the people in Kansas and Missouri carries a lesson for those responsible. That there is no economy or savings in floods is something some people and areas simply refuse to learn.

President of Ecuador Visits San Francisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLINTON D. McKINNON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1951

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress the following article by David Perlman, of the San Francisco Chronicle, concerning the visit of President Galo Plaza, of Ecuador, to that city, where he signed the United Nations Charter in 1945. A great advocate of world government and an outspoken enemy of communism, President Plaza points up the growing need for a more true and effective world government.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of June 29, 1951]

VISIT FROM A PRESIDENT—UN HAS LIVED UP TO GREAT PROMISE, SAYS ECUADORAN LEADER

(By David Perlman)

Galo Plaza, Ecuador's breezy and personable President, came to San Francisco yesterday to visit the city where he signed the United Nations Charter 6 years ago.

He brought with him an expression of continued faith in the world organization he helped to build, and a hope it would soon grow into "true world government."

He also brought a message from all Latin America. It was this: "As we grow into democracy down there we know our destiny lies with the free world—and our future lies irrevocably with the leadership of the United States."

The husky 45-year-old chief of state, who played football at the University of Cal-

ifornia in 1925, shouldered protocol aside throughout the day.

SECURITY SKIPPED

He greeted the press at the Mark Hopkins Hotel in the morning in loafer shoes and a gabardine sport suit, quipped with University of California faculty members at an International House luncheon in Berkeley, and frustrated State Department security officials who tried to shunt him into elevators while he insisted on stopping to chat with well-wishers.

But he had serious things to say as well, and he underscored them at his press conference and in a speech to the World Affairs Council of Northern California later in the day.

He spoke in a perfect Americanized English which he learned during years in the United States as a student, an apple seller on the streets of New York when his father cut off his allowance, a Grace Line assistant purser, and an Ambassador of his country to Washington.

WORLD GOVERNMENT

"The UN has already lived up to its great promise," he declared, "but eventually we will vest in it sovereign powers that will make it a true world government."

He saw the Soviet proposal for a Korean cease-fire as a "great moral and military victory for the UN" and urged that "we now discuss matters instead of killing people."

Although he urged that "any effort to save lives and bloodshed be considered," he conceded he couldn't quite understand the Russian truce suggestion.

"Nothing the Russians have said so far," he commented wryly, "has been clear to anybody, and we must never forget they have a blueprint for world domination that governs every action they take"

ECONOMIC TEST

Although he hailed America's determination to arm for defense of the free world, he emphasized time and again that only economic progress under democracy could eventually win over communism.

"We have already begun to prove to the people of the world, and especially to the underdeveloped countries, that democracy can provide today what communism promises for tomorrow," he said.

The President pledged that his nation of 3,200,000 people astride the Andes and the Equator would contribute their natural resources and increasing productivity to the fight against communism.

"With technical assistance and protected capital investment from the United States," he said, "we in this hemisphere can create an inner defense line to make us all self-sufficient if the dangerously long lifeline to Asia's resources is cut off."

"Nothing can be so effective in fighting communism as a master plan"—he meant the point 4 program—"of economic development to raise the standard of living in underdeveloped countries"

ECUADOR POLICY

President Plaza proudly termed his own country "a true democracy with complete freedom." Even the Communist Party is permitted to exist there, he said, for "I don't believe in persecuting ideas with police methods."

President Plaza made his trip to Berkeley with his wife, two daughters, his official party of 18 Ecuadoran Government leaders, and State Department officials—all preceded by a motorcycle escort. The Campanile chimes played Ecuador's Himno Nacional as he toured the campus.

Greeted by University Vice Presidents Claude Hutchison and Baldwin M. Woods, Plaza recalled the year he spent as a freshman on the campus and the days he played left end in intramural football. "It was a big disappointment that I could not play on the freshman team," he said, "but I was

playing varsity soccer and the coach wouldn't let me."

DANGEROUS GAME

His father, twice President of Ecuador himself, quereed Plaza's football career for good when he termed it a "dangerous Yankee game" and shipped his son to the University of Maryland after the freshman year. But Plaza confided that standards of danger differ—for he still bears a scar of his chin from a goring by a bull when he was a champion amateur matador in Quito.

At the International House luncheon President Plaza was presented with three inscribed volumes—one on California agriculture and two on the United Nations conference proceedings here in 1945. The UC Alumni Association gave the Plazas a wedgwood platter, a cigarette box that plays Our Sturdy Golden Bear, and a set of paintings of campus scenes.

DINNER WITH WARREN

Last night the President and the men in his party attended a private dinner with Gov. Earl Warren at the family club here, while the ladies saw a performance of Guys and Dolls. They met at midnight at the Mark Hopkins for a party in the Peacock Court given by Brayton Wilbur, president of the World Affairs Council.

The presidential party will spend today shopping and resting and tonight the President will attend a gang dinner at the Press and Union League Club. The President plans to leave for Mexico City, Caracas, and home early tomorrow morning aboard the Air Force plane that brought his party here yesterday from New York.

Amputee Pfc Robert L. Smith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, lying out at Walter Reed Hospital is Pfc Robert L. Smith, a youth of 19, who in a period of a few short months has experienced all of the horrors of the Korean war.

Private Smith is totally and permanently disabled for life—an amputee without legs and without arms—all limbs having been lost as the result of gunshot wound, frostbite in Korea, and imprisonment and mistreatment by the Chinese Reds.

Let me give you a brief statement of the moving events leading up to the amputations of this soldier, Bob Smith. He entered the service April 10, 1950—was shipped overseas August 26, arriving in Japan 3 days later and 3 weeks later in Korea. He was attached to Company B, Thirty-first Infantry Regiment, of the famed Seventh Infantry Division.

On November 29, 1950, at about 10 o'clock at night in the Chosan Reservoir, Private Smith, together with a group of men in his outfit, attempted a breakthrough of a blockade of Chinese Reds who had succeeded in cutting the group off from the rest of their company.

During this attempted break-through, Private Smith was shot in the right arm. His buddies bandaged his wound as best they could, but the crudeness of the bandage was such that Private

Smith continued to lose blood as he lay in the freezing temperature protected only by two blankets and a poncho.

It was in such critical condition that Private Smith was taken prisoner by the Chinese Reds in whose hands he remained for a period of 10 days—a prisoner—without food or water. All the while—during his imprisonment in a mountainous region with temperatures subzero, he was beaten, kicked, and abused by his captors. He was rescued 10 days later by a column of United States Marines. Half frozen, emaciated, Private Smith was sent to an Army hospital at Osaka, Japan, where it was deemed necessary to amputate both legs and arms—three of the limbs being lost as result of frostbite, the other as a result of the gunshot wound which, because of extended neglect, became gangrenous.

As many of you know, Private Smith is now at Walter Reed Hospital where he is being treated and prepared for complete prosthetic fittings.

When the story of Private Smith was disclosed, many generous Americans who wanted to help this soldier in his eventual return to civilian life under one of the most severe of all handicaps, donated to him a total of \$120,000. In order that he may have and enjoy the full benefits of these gifts and donations, I have today introduced a special bill to relieve this veteran—relieve him from payment of a donee's tax under the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. I hope the members of the Ways and Means Committee and the Congress will favor this legislation.

We Are Busily Occupied Destroying Fine Values

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial column by Mr. Robert Ruark, commenting upon the dangerous inroads which our quest for individual security has made in the fundamental American belief and reliance on private initiative and enterprise.

This particular column of Mr. Ruark's is being printed and distributed as a public service by Mr. Ellett Lawrence, of the Lawrence Printing Co., of Greenwood, Miss. I take this means of making the commentary available to all Members of Congress.

RUARK SAYS WE ARE BUSILY OCCUPIED DESTROYING FINE VALUES—BECAUSE MONEY ISN'T WORTH MUCH OUR INCENTIVE BECOMES LESS, TOO

(By Robert C. Ruark)

NEW YORK.—The most damning condemnation of the destruction of our old values that I have run into lately rests in the experience of an advertising executive I know.

This fellow, who works for a major outfit, argued the sum of \$75,000 from his budgeters, said dough to be used to hire three salesmen.

The man wanted top-grade guys, which meant that he went shopping among the opposition. He waved a fat \$25,000 salary under the noses of some first-class fellows he knew. None was making more than \$15,000 a year. And he got no takers.

The answers they gave him were the same; they did not feel that a raise of \$10,000 a year justified risking their established security with a new firm. They were unwilling to gamble, they said, because their new net income after taxes would not be enough more to offset the risk they would face in switching jobs. Here you have the practically unparalleled example of a man with both bold hands full of riches who is unable to find takers.

WILDEST DREAMS OF AVARICE

There was a time when an annual salary of twenty-five grand represented the wildest dreams of ordinary avarice. Twenty-five thousand clams put you in the yacht-and-town-house class. Two bits' worth of thousands averages out to \$500 bucks a week, and for that kind of scratch you could wear mink overalls. Even a few years of that salary would allow a man to store up enough security to keep him comfortable while he lived.

But in the case of the frustrated executive you have several men turning down \$10,000 raises because, as the most common cliché of our time runs, "you can't keep it." This amounts to depriving money of its worth, and the end result is a destructor of initiative, a clipping of ambition. You eventually wind up with lethargy, the translation of which says let George do it. Letting George do it works two ways—either eventual communism or fascism, which means that in any case the control of his personal existence is out of the hands of the individual.

A man just back from the Argentine tells me simply how Peron clinched his control. He merely encouraged collectivism, to such point that when he pulled the drawstrings at the top he had all the trade-unions in the bottom of the sack. He then was able to use them as a blackjack, to where a dictatorship as fine as Mussolini's is now in operation, with Juan and Evita squatting at the top.

WHO WANTS STATIC SECURITY?

Whatever we have in this land was not founded on a desire for static security. The original settlers took a great gamble when they took off from England. A great many rugged men and women wound up porcupined with arrows in order that Hollywood and Vine might become possible.

Many of our mighty moguls of industry today will speak with an accent that is not local to the scene. The vast fortunes that built the know-how that let us win wars were mainly built on gambling, and I don't mean crap shooting. The development of new industries rests on the availability of risk capital. Our national health rests on a man's willingness to take a chance.

I do not understand this sudden apathy, this noncraving for adventure, which seems suddenly to have afflicted us. The young men crave security; they ask about retirement age before they ask about the possibility for advancement. Men offered increases of \$200 a week refuse them because they are not willing to take a chance. I remember I changed three sets of jobs, once, for a cut of two bucks on one and a raise of three bucks on the other, merely because the prospects seemed brighter at the time.

Maybe we are watering down our stock as we water down our currency. But when a man loses interest in making money, you have just deprived him of his power. And that goes for a nation, too.

Call of Reservists to Active Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, congratulations are in order for our colleague, OVERTON BROOKS, for conducting a thorough investigation of the Reserve program. It is too bad so many homes had to be wrecked, so many injustices inflicted before the true facts were brought out into the open.

Just this morning I received letters from reservists stationed on the U. S. S. *Fort Mandan* and the U. S. S. *Ajar*, the two ships I mentioned previously to the House whose officers were supplied napkin rings the reservists were ordered to make. These men are very much disturbed over the waste of the taxpayers' money, and I agree with them that the Armed Forces certainly did not consider their individual welfare or that of the country when they were haphazardly recalled to active duty.

Although it will be difficult to rectify the mistakes of the past, I sincerely hope the release program will be speeded up and that these men will be sent home. Congratulations, Representative Brooks, on a job well done.

How Czechs Have Lost Freedom in Stages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include and call attention to an article from the Washington Post of July 15, 1951. Its author, Mr. A. I. Goldberg, who was there, accounts for the slow strangulation of freedom in that proud and democratic nation.

In it, Mr. Goldberg has this to say:

Freedom is indivisible, a collective thing. Wherever it is attacked, the collective body is wounded.

I am in complete agreement with this truth. I hope that the conviction of William Oatis an honest newsman, who was seeking only the truth but who was found guilty of treason in a predetermined sham trial, will bring this home to all of us. There is no room for truth when evil men seek to kill freedom.

Many in America have yet to see this truth. Many still do not understand the evil of the Kremlin and its use of tricks and subversion which sound the death knell of freedom. Yet none will proclaim that the Czechoslovakia of Benes and Masaryk freely voted itself into slavery and oblivion. Even our Progressive Party split over this, for those who were

truly American gagged when the bald coup broke the hearts of free men everywhere and forced Jan Masaryk to hurl himself to death as a symbol of the freedom which had died in his home country.

The gain, the profit from the supreme sacrifice of the patriots in that battered nation, is that it showed clearly the blood-stained hand of the despots of Russia. Free men saw clearly after 1948 that freedom was indeed collective. They saw and understood that to stand alone was to die alone. Czechoslovakia was stolen, but the steal electrified the bewildered people of Europe and America to join in collective action to preserve freedom. Out of it came the North Atlantic Treaty and the NATO Army—a pooling of strength. Sometime, God willing, this truth, bulwarked by strength, will return freedom again.

OBSERVER TELLS HOW CZECHS HAVE LOST FREEDOM IN STAGES
(By A. I. Goldberg)

(Two years ago yesterday, A. I. Goldberg left Prague after serving as Associated Press bureau chief from August 1947 on through the Communist seizure of control. Goldberg, now on the Associated Press staff at the United Nations, writes of the developments that have crushed freedom in Czechoslovakia.—EDITOR'S NOTE)

Freedom in Czechoslovakia has been killed off by stages for 4 years.

This death by installments began even before the Communists seized power in 1948. The Kremlin issued a no-appeal order to the Czechoslovaks in early 1947: "Stay out of the Marshall plan."

Freedom is indivisible, a collective thing. Wherever it is attacked, the collective body is wounded.

But freedom is also individual.

So long as one man lives with the ideal of freedom in his heart and mind, freedom survives. That is why it takes so long to kill it off, in Czechoslovakia as elsewhere.

CZECHS HAVE LAGGED

That is why the arrest, the mock trial, and the planned conviction of Associated Press Correspondent William Oatis in Prague were but another of a mounting series of attacks on freedom in Czechoslovakia. Almost the first was the regime's throttling of Czechoslovakia's own free press. Another was its attack on organized religion.

Other countries where Soviet push buttons set the pace for Communist executions have had a number of such spectacles. Bulgaria tried several Government officials and a group of Protestant pastors. Hungary put Cardinal Mindszenty and Archbishop Groesz, a foreign minister, and Robert Vogeler, an American businessman, in the dock. Rumania and Poland tried political leaders.

Czechoslovakia has lagged behind. It has been working up slowly to the trial of its former foreign minister, Vlado Clementis, on spy charges. Somehow it hasn't produced him in court yet. It has held trials of minor Roman Catholic clergy.

But since the Communists cowed ailing President Eduard Benes, later forcing him out, and drove Jan Masaryk in despair to hurl himself to death from a fourth-floor window of the Foreign Office Palace, Czechoslovakia has avoided international sensations.

VIRTUAL PRISON CAMP

The Oatis trial brought home to America how far Czechoslovakia has gone from the principles of its founding fathers—principles based on the British, French, and American democracies and written into a declaration at Pittsburgh in 1918 by the Czechoslovak leaders headed by Thomas G. Masaryk.

In Czechoslovakia I saw how those ideals of freedom sought for centuries were arrested by the Communists. I saw push-button executions of freedom begin without even mock trials.

Czechoslovakia has become virtually a prison camp. President Klement Gottwald, an old Communist International officer, and the members of his regime guard it zealously. A very small number of people are trustees, allowed occasionally outside the prison walls for such things as United Nations meetings, or to serve in the diplomatic service.

Many of these are often summoned back. The Czechoslovak diplomatic service, including the one at Washington, has just recently been depleted by such summonses. New trustees are sent out for a short time.

Some have been so contaminated by freedom outside that they refuse to go back. If they go, they are, like Clementis, prisoners. Some are executed. Clementis may yet be one of them.

Push buttons in Moscow control what goes on in the countries under its influence. In Czechoslovakia the push button was working when a Soviet Ambassador made a sudden reappearance in Prague. Revolution followed quickly.

SOVIET INFLUENCE GROWS

A Soviet Politburo member, heavily guarded, made a speech at a Communist Party rally in Czechoslovakia. A purge followed.

The Soviet Foreign Minister nursed his weak heart and his strong bile at a Czechoslovakia spa. Czechoslovakia delegates in the UN began to voice not only the very words of the Kremlin but to speak them in Russian. Before that they used English and French.

A Russian general visited the country. The army got political commissars and Soviet equipment and "reorganization." What I saw, and reported, when freedom was first attacked were police seizing the headquarters of the principal anti-Communist Party. Immediately afterward, troops took over the party's newspaper. Censors were installed in all other newspapers to exercise rigid Communist control so that no word of protest against the regime could get out.

Foreign newspapers and magazines, until then freely sold and widely read, were swept off the news stands. Armed workers paraded and patrolled the streets, to keep down any ideas of a struggle for freedom.

CHURCH ATTACKED

An attack was begun, and continues to this day, against the Roman Catholic Church and its leaders because it was the last big organized obstacle to complete Communist domination.

Nationalism of industry and services was pushed to 95 percent of totality, to crush the shopkeepers, the dangerous middle class.

Work permits and ration cards were issued only if, in effect, a loyalty oath to the Communist regime and to the might and leadership of the Soviet Union were subscribed to.

The Soviet flag, it was proclaimed officially, must fly alongside the Czechoslovak red, white, and blue on holidays. The Sokol, an historic national patriotic society, first was infiltrated and then taken over by the Communists.

Passports of citizens were recalled. No longer could Czechs or Slovaks leave their prison country for vacations in the west or on the Yugoslav coast, favorite recreation spot. Despite this, thousands braved death to escape across the fortified guarded borders.

Parliament rubber-stamped a people's democracy constitution that defended class war.

Workers were forced to attend lectures in Marxist history and teachings. They were incited to denounce the west.

The new Marxist educational program was thrust onto the schools, from 602-year-old Charles University down to the primary schools where photographs of Stalin and Gottwald replaced the crucifix and pictures of the elder Masaryk.

BOOKS SEVERELY CENSORED

The printing of books was severely censored. Listening to western radios was discouraged. Western embassy libraries and cultural centers were shut down.

Workers were sentenced to political re-education labor camps if their ideology was suspected.

The aim was to convert the hearts and minds of men and women—and especially children—from thoughts of freedom.

The campaign to squeeze out western correspondents began with the revolution and came to a climax in the Oatis trial. Before he entered the dock, the campaign was a success. Oatis was in prison, charged with espionage because he tried to do a complete, accurate reporting job as democracies know it—and as the Czechoslovaks knew it not too long ago. All other western correspondents had fled.

Oatis' trial came at the apex of what was almost the first step in Communist freedom-crushing—the assault on press freedom.

But because there are individuals in Czechoslovakia whose hearts and minds still harbor memories and hopes of freedom, it is not entirely dead there.

Appeasement in Korea Will Bring on World War III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, appeasement in Korea will bring on world war III. This is the lesson of Munich which was followed by World War II.

The Korean people, whose sacrifices in the war against communism in that country have been far beyond those of any other, recognize this. Their point of view was eloquently expressed by Dr. Y. C. Yang, their Ambassador to the United States, in a speech on June 23 to the Marine Corps League at Trenton, N. J. In this speech, Dr. Yang said:

This terrible Communist war in my country is approaching its first anniversary. In the dreadful year just past there has been wave after wave of war, up and down, back and forth—all over our Nation.

It is hard for anyone who has not seen it to imagine what this has meant in poverty and suffering.

More than 10,000,000 of my countrymen and countrywomen are homeless. Nearly 3,000,000 of our civilians are dead—from starvation, disease, exposure, bombs, shells, and bullets.

There are thousands and thousands of children who have lost their parents by becoming separated from them in all the confusion and terror of modern warfare. This hasn't happened so much to the tiny tots. Their fathers and mothers carry them as they travel. It is the boys and girls of seven or eight and older—the ones who are big enough to walk and big enough to run when they are frightened. Now they are homeless, with no food and no clothing, and with no way of knowing whether their parents are alive or dead.

I don't know how many of these children have been adopted by the Marines and other U. N. forces. I know you have shared your food with them and covered their nakedness. May God bless you for those acts of mercy.

In the liberated part of my country, many a mountain cave continues to yield its dead—groups of children and grown-ups, too, who have starved to death, or died of privation and cold. Our ruins have yet to give up their quotas of dead.

Now we mourn our dead, both civilian and military, and we mourn the awful destruction of modern war.

But we don't want all of this to have been in vain, and any peace settlement or ceasefire or armistice which leaves Korea divided and the enemy in control of the northern half of our country will never be acceptable to my Government or to the Korean people.

What kind of war would that be, anyway? You lick the enemy and then you beg him to make a peace with you.

I tell you that any half-way settlement in Korea will not bring peace. Instead, it will insure world war III.

We will have given the Communist aggressor a chance to rearm, regroup his forces, and to start all over again. We will have agreed to his timetable of aggression.

But this will not be the case if we deliver the knockout blow in Korea.

Let us respect our honored dead. Let us prove to them that we know they died for liberty and decency and justice—the things brave men are always ready to fight and die for. Let us not commit the unforgivable sin of callously chalking off their sacrifices to appeasement of communism, aggressive communism, the enemy of all mankind.

Yet there are some, I regret to say, who are unmindful of our Korean sacrifices. There are some who seem unmindful of the sacrifices of the noble men who, as members of the forces of the United Nations, have given their lives so this Communist threat will not do to you as it has done to us—the Korean people.

There are some who would forget their dead, their wounded, and their missing. There are some who, even as their fellow citizens die on Korean battlefields, say in effect: "Give us peace. We shall admit that our dead have died in vain."

There are some who think they can make a deal with the Devil and profit by it.

The Korean people, I am proud to say, are not among them. Of all the nations threatened by communism since the end of World War II, we are the only ones who stood up and fought.

Had you not come to our assistance, we would have been overwhelmed because we were fighting with the arms of a constabulary against a Russian-equipped, Russian-directed, and Russian-financed army which had tanks, planes, and heavy guns. We had no tanks, no planes, no heavy artillery. We fought because death was preferable to slavery under communism.

The very fact that we fought has bought time for the free world—time to rearm, to train, and to be prepared.

We have freely given of our life's blood to buy this time. Don't you think that what we ask in return should be given to us?

Our demands are not exorbitant. All we want is a free, independent, and reunited nation. We want to live peacefully, and to rebuild our shattered country. But this will never be possible if the Communists are permitted to remain in control of half of our ancient land. Why, it's as though a murderer and killer entered your home, slaughtered your wife and children, burned down half of the house, and thereafter was permitted to live unmolested in the other half. It's unthinkable. It's insane even to consider such a proposal.

But stark as that example is, there's another word for it in international power politics. That word is appeasement. Are

our memories so short that we have forgotten Munich? There was appeasement for you. Did it preserve peace? It did not. It hastened World War II. I hope and I pray that the statesmen of the free world will see the folly of permitting Korea to be the Munich of the Far East, for the Communist timetable is well known. It's Asia first, Europe second, and America third. There is no if, and, or but about their diabolic plan. It is world conquest and nothing short of it.

Republicans Believed Abandoning Peace Hopes in Effort To Contain Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of the House the following article by Dorothy Thompson, which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News July 9, 1951.

The article follows:

REPUBLICANS BELIEVED ABANDONING PEACE HOPES IN EFFORT TO CONTAIN REDS—GOVERNOR DEWEY'S WORDS, "COLD WAR WILL GO ON," INTERPRETED AS MEANING UNITED STATES AND RUSSIA CAN NEVER LIVE TOGETHER

(By Dorothy Thompson)

NEW YORK, July 9.—The original American policy to contain any further spread of the Soviet empire by armed force is being enlarged, at least by the Republicans. Governor Dewey, when leaving America on another of his international journeys, declared: "The cold war will go on as long as communism leads Russia."

The cold war, with incidental hot spots, now is costing us \$60,000,000,000 a year out of a \$71,000,000,000 budget. We are asked to contemplate the continuance of such a hemorrhage of savings and income, along with inflation, declining purchasing power, hardly veiled military dictatorship over the economy, inability of our youth to plan their lives or even envisage a stable future, as a means—of all things—of checking revolution.

And we are expected to follow through until 800,000,000 people in other states overthrow their governments (presumably with our aid and yet without war) or until these governments decide to come on their knees to Washington.

MEGALOMANIAC PROGRAM

Gentlemen, would you kindly sit down for 10 minutes and think?

What Governor Dewey's words mean, and will be recognized as meaning—in Moscow and Peiping, among all our allies—is that the United States abandons every hope or intention of a settlement based on reason and mutual interest; that we commit ourselves to conspiring for the overthrow of governments not pleasing to Washington; that we reject the possibility of the United States and the Soviet Union coexisting in the same world; that we enter every conference with the prior intention of bringing it to naught; and that we invite war.

If anything is likely to solidify the peoples and governments of the Communist countries and disintegrate the United States coalition, that megalomaniac program is.

PLEDGE TO F. D. R. BROKEN

A legitimate charge against the Soviet Government is its gross interference, via the international Communist Party, in the

internal affairs of countries with which it is at peace; the aid and comfort it gives to subversive elements in all states and the recruiting of their citizens to a higher allegiance to the U. S. S. R., even to the extent, when opportunity affords, of arming those partisans and instigating them to civil war.

What can be charged legitimately is that the Soviet Government has broken its pledge to President Roosevelt to sever itself from control of this party, and cease and desist from such activities.

SAYS WE WILL FAIL

But we cannot so charge or ever hope to reach a detente if we ourselves set out to do the same things, in a world ideological battle.

Furthermore, we will fail. It takes revolutionaries to make revolutions—or even counterrevolutions—not Trumans, Achesons, Deweys.

Since the foundation of this Republic we have watched the expansion and ebb of empires and have interfered only where vital American interests were involved. During the lifetime of this Republic we have had to live in the same world with states whose premises we rejected—with absolute monarchies, dictatorial despotisms, corrupt oligarchies, arrogant aristocracies, devolutionary regimes.

OUTCOME—A SENSELESS WAR

To some such recognition of limitations both we and the Soviet Union must come if the tensions presently driving the whole world to mental and social anarchy, to economic breakdown, and possibly to a senseless war, are ever to relax.

Such would be the counsel of conservatives. But where are they? Where are leaders of common sense—in this epoch the most uncommon quality? They have all become apocalypsts—especially the converted isolationists like Dewey—beating the drums for one world or no world, the millennium or bust.

Sometimes I think it's sunspots.

Judges on the Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Washington Daily News. The editorial follows:

JUDGES ON THE STAND

A Senate committee is investigating ethics, or their lack, in the conduct of Government agencies. And some Members of Congress are talking of enacting a code of morals to be applied to officials of the executive departments.

A bill just put before Congress deals with ethics on another high level—the ethics of Supreme Court Justices.

Introduced by Representative KENNETH KEATING (Republican, New York) and approved unanimously by eight Members of a House Judiciary Subcommittee, it would prohibit Justices of the Supreme Court from testifying as character witnesses in any court.

This bill is a direct result of testimony as character witnesses by Justices Felix Frankfurter and Stanley Reed in the perjury trial of Alger Hiss, who despite their favorable words in his behalf was convicted of lying under oath when he denied giving Government secrets to a Communist agent.

The two justices not only proved themselves poor judges of character. As Mr. KEATING points out, they disqualified themselves from taking part in consideration of the subsequent appeal by Hiss. And they placed other Supreme Court members "in the awkward position of being forced to pass on the guilt or innocence of a person whose character their colleagues had endorsed under oath."

It is unfortunate that Congress should feel it necessary to legislate a common-sense standard of ethical conduct for members of the Nation's highest court. But Justices Reed and Frankfurter are responsible for that necessity. The Keating bill should become a law.

Revenue Revision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the bill which I am introducing today is a revenue revision bill representing the accumulated recommendations of many years of the American Bar Association, acting after exhaustive analysis and study by its tax section, which is composed of several thousand members of the bar of the country who are particularly interested in the field of taxation.

The purpose of this bill, like that of H. R. 7025, introduced by me in March, 1950, is to correct a great many of the inequities, largely of a technical nature, which presently exist in our vast tax system. With the exception of minor typographical corrections in the table of contents, the bill is identical with H. R. 4775, introduced on July 16, 1951, by my distinguished colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. CAMP. Mr. CAMP and I both feel that this legislation is and should remain nonpartisan because it is drawn with a view toward eliminating inequities and promoting a fair and better-administered tax system.

The tax section of the American Bar Association deserves the highest praise for its constructive work in this field. These distinguished lawyers have devoted themselves unselfishly to this task, not in the interest of their clients but in the general public interest of making our tax laws equitable in their application and better in their administration.

Unfortunately, there has been no general tax revision since the Revenue Act of 1942, and as a result there are a great many technical problems which have accumulated during the past 9 years which should be remedied with all possible dispatch. It is unfortunate indeed that these inequities and discrepancies, which are bound to develop in any tax structure as complicated as ours, have had to await correction for so long a period.

The provisions of this legislation do not primarily affect the revenue. The inequities dealt with are not social or economic in their nature, such as, for example, whether one particular group of taxpayers should be taxed more or less than another group, but are tech-

nical in character and are generally recognized as inequities by persons familiar with the practical operation of our tax laws.

A detailed explanation of the individual provisions of the bill prepared by the tax section of the American Bar Association was included in the extension of remarks by my colleague, Mr. CAMP, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 12, 1951, at page A4320 of the Appendix. This clear and excellent statement will be of inestimable value to the Ways and Means Committee and to the Congress, and it reflects the high caliber of work which these gentlemen have done.

It is a distinct pleasure to me to join my distinguished colleague [Mr. CAMP] in introducing this nonpartisan legislation embodying the tax recommendations of the American Bar Association. These highly meritorious recommendations deserve the most careful consideration, and favorable action should be taken by the Congress without delay.

Private Enterprise and Not Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of July 14, Col Robert R. McCormick, editor and publisher of the Chicago Daily Tribune, delivered a most remarkable address over the Mutual Broadcasting Network. This historical and instructive address was undoubtedly heard by many thousands of listeners throughout the Nation. After reading what the colonel said, one cannot help but be impressed by the fact that the development of inventions in the United States has had a marked effect on the growth and progress of our Nation, and in some instances played a prominent part in determining world policies. The inventive genius of our citizens unquestionably made America the most progressive and outstanding Nation on earth. No country today enjoys the comforts and conveniences that Americans do.

I wish that Colonel McCormick's address on inventions were added as a chapter to our school books; that would place in the hands of young Americans something that they need very much. Too many of our youths appear to be under the impression that what we have attained in progress and achievements in practically every field of endeavor, including science, education, and medicine, just came about by chance.

The efforts contributed by and through the inventive genius of Americans in developing the sciences tells a story of the faith and confidence that men had in the future of America. The address of Colonel McCormick especially features the story of what can be accomplished by a free people, unhampered by socialistic and communistic philosophies.

I take pleasure in making this informative and instructive address a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with the hope that those people who were deprived of the benefit of the compact and concise story set forth in Colonel McCormick's address may have the opportunity to read his remarks published in the RECORD, and thereby profit from the story that the address contains.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a radio address of Col Robert R. McCormick as of July 14, 1951, which address is entitled "Inventions; Part I," and is as follows:

INVENTIONS: PART I

(By Col Robert R. McCormick)

In past years I have broadcast on our Constitution and Bill of Rights. Only recently I have lectured on the founding fathers and the liberties they have brought to us that no other people enjoy. Tonight I will speak upon the great scientific developments which have sprung from this freedom.

Before Revolutionary times, there had been little development since Rome. Ships were built of wood and propelled by sails. Land transportation was by horse or human power, mechanics confined almost to the crossbow. Metal was developed for military purposes. Small quantities of metal were used in furniture, which was all hand made. It is interesting to note in Independence Hall, Philadelphia, that the chairs were made to fit each individual Member of Congress.

The first great inventor was Franklin, and he was a revolutionist, not a colonial. He discovered electricity, invented the lightning rod, the Franklin stove, and bifocal spectacles, first perceived heat in the Gulf Stream, and created modern navigation.

The Revolutionary War also produced the submarine and the screw propeller, but not efficient ones, invented by Bushnell. Submarines were later built by Fulton, by the Confederate Hunsley, and were made practicable by Holland with the use of an internal combustion engine and a storage battery.

After it became a nation, America produced most of the inventions. Eli Whitney was the first creator of mass production. He made muskets for the War of 1812 with interchangeable parts, to the admiration and astonishment of Jefferson, himself no mean scientist. Whitney also invented the cotton gin, which opened the way for the gigantic textile industry.

The Baltimore clipper, a great improvement on all sailing ships, led to American dominance in the merchant marine. American frigates in the War of 1812 were faster sailers than their English and French counterparts.

Agricultural machinery came in the thirties. Deere and Oliver were the best known steel plow builders. Hussey and McCormick produced their reapers which have led to immense agricultural improvements.

Also in the thirties came chloroform; ether 11 years later; and the Colt revolver, precursor of the Gatling gun of 1862. The telegraph, also came in the thirties and after it the telephone in 1875.

First Fitch and then Fulton produced the steamboat which was fully developed on the Mississippi River before the Civil War. Steam was first used exclusively as power on the ocean in the *Monitor*, invented by Ericson, who also had perfected the screw propeller, which was necessary for the use of steam as ocean waves broke paddle wheels.

Sails were still found on ocean liners at the turn of the century and delayed the use of steam on ocean ships, and have been in

diminishing use to this day. Steam ships did not come into their own on the ocean until the introduction of the steam turbine which is now being supplemented by Diesel power. Fishing boats and St. Lawrence schooners now operate on internal combustion engines without sails.

Edison, greatest of inventors, is best known for his electric filament light, now becoming obsolete, and the phonograph.

In 1846 the rotary press was invented by Richard Hoe. The multiple unit press, now in universal newspaper use, was invented by me in 1919; rotogravure was made practicable in Germany just before World War I, coloroto by John Yetter here. The linotype was produced by Mergenthaler in 1884. The stereotype machine by Henry A. Wise Wood in 1900.

Modern dentistry originated here. The airplane was invented by the Wright brothers; the helicopter by Sikorsky. Airplane engines were not entirely satisfactory until the coming of Wright (no relation to Orville and Wilbur) and Pratt and Whitney in the twenties. The Rolls Royce engine is built by the automobile factory of that name.

Selden applied for an auto-transmission patent in 1878; Duryea built an automobile that ran in 1892. Rubber was then produced in quantities for tires. A little rubber has been used on bicycles and carriages before that. We now have synthetic rubber made from petroleum and alcohol.

The Kentucky physician, Ephraim McDowell is credited with being the first physician to remove a tumor of the ovary.

Dr. William Beaumont (1787-1853) studied the nature of the gastric juice and early stages of gastritis in a Canadian half-breed, Alexis St. Martin. The Indian had been wounded in the abdomen and was left with an opening in the stomach. Beaumont was thus able to experiment on the effect of gastric juice upon different foods.

It was during 1900 that Dr. Walter Reed proved that yellow fever is transmitted by the *Stegomyia fasciata* mosquito.

Karl Eberth is credited with first distinguishing the typhoid bacteria in 1880. As nearly as I can determine, Dr. William Budd, an English physician, was the first to publish a statement warning that sewage might be looked upon as a means of spreading typhoid.

Streptomycin was discovered by Dr. Selman A. Waksman in 1944; aureomycin by Dr. Benjamin Duggar in 1948. Sulfanilamide was a common chemical used in the German dye industry, but its medicinal value was first discovered by Dr. Domagk. Tyrothricin, a pioneer antibiotic drug, was discovered by Dubos, an American, in 1939. This drug could not be taken internally, but its value intensified the research in penicillin.

The host of household utilities are of American invention. Among other American inventions were:

The water turbine, perfected by Uriah Atherton.

The sewing machine by Elias Howe in 1846.

An ice-making machine by Dr. George Gorle in 1851; electric refrigerators superseded it about 1925. Air conditioning has many forms and many originators.

Oil well (first drilled) by Edwin L. Drake. Oil and its derivations have many uses besides furnishing power and heat. Its first use in lamps is obsolete.

A tractor was built by Jesse Lake in 1867, but successful combustion tractors were not built until after the First World War.

The typewriter by Christopher Latham Sholes in 1867.

Now we have electric typewriters.

The airbrake by George Westinghouse in 1869. The electric transformer, invented by William Stanley in 1885, was produced by the Westinghouse company commercially about 1900.

Barbed wire was produced by Joseph Farwell Glidden in 1873, the steel windmill by Thomas O. Perry in 1882. Barbed wire, the windmill, the steel plow, and the revolver made possible the development of the West. Central heating by Birdsall Holly, but steam heat came with the turn of the century.

Window screens by Edward Thomas Burrows in 1878, but not in general use for another decade.

Machine gun by Hiram Maxim in 1883.

Boats driven by the expansion of naphtha heated by burning the expanded gas came in the eighties; boats were propelled by internal combustion engines in the early nineties, but they could not go as fast as racing rowboats for 10 years more. Gar Wood developed the hydroplane, which made possible hydro-airplanes and the amphibian by Curtiss.

Electric welding, originated by Prof. Elihu Thomson in 1886, was applied to shipbuilding about 1930.

The electric sewing machine was manufactured by Singer in 1889.

Bottle caps by William Painter in 1892.

Electric stoves by William Hadaway in 1896.

The electric vacuum cleaner by John S. Thurman in 1899.

The caterpillar system by Benjamin Holt in 1900. Its use as a tractor is of recent origin.

High explosives by Hudson Maxim and others in 1901.

The repeating rifle in the sixties and the automatic rifle by Winchester in 1903.

The radio tube (from which came television) by Lee De Forest in 1906.

The electric washing machine by Maytag who, he told me, had sympathized with the drudgery of his mother.

Smelting of aluminum was invented by Hall in 1888. Its great use is in airplanes and electric, high-power lines and cooking utensils, but more and more uses are being found for it.

Bronze, brass, and an inferior steel were known to the ancients, but now the combinations of aluminum and of steel with other metals would take a long time to enumerate.

Radar by Dr. Albert H. Taylor and Leo C. Young in 1922.

Nylon yarn by E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. in 1939.

Atomic energy, released and controlled, by Enrico Fermi and other scientists at the University of Chicago in 1942.

The Fourdrinier wire of the paper machine was invented in France, as were the balloon, the camera, an imperfect steamboat, an impractical water turbine, the stethoscope, and cellophane. While water pipes were much older, the first considerable pipeline took water from the river Seine to Versailles for the fountains.

Following horse-drawn railroads and steel rails, England's great contribution was the invention of the steam engine which led to the locomotive and steamboat, power looms, and the steam turbine. Her dominant merchant marine, however, was due to her command of the sea, rather than especially good building.

Aniline dye (coal tar) was invented by Perkin in 1856.

An English doctor, Alexander A. Fleming, rediscovered penicillin, a medicine of the Indians, but its great production has been in this country.

The English also combined an armored car with the caterpillar system and made the tank.

The generator was invented by Michael Faraday in 1831 but its practical application did not come until the nineties. Electric power has now supplanted almost all other forms of power transmission.

Marconi of Italy invented wireless telegraphy.

Cyrus Field invented and constructed the Atlantic cable after cables had been used over shorter distances.

Brazil contributed the blimp, still used, while Germany followed up with the unsatisfactory *Zeppelin*.

The German, Otto, produced the first gas engine; Diesel the Diesel engine, which is supplanting steam on railroads and on the ocean and bids fair to do so in powerhouses. One great advantage of Diesel engines over coal in boats and locomotives is that no fuel is burned when they are stationary.

The thermometer was invented by Fahrenheit in 1714.

Smokeless powder was invented by J. F. E. Schultze in 1863.

The gas burner by Bunsen in 1855.

The jet for airplanes is another form of internal combustion engine, completing Germany's contributions in this line. Strangely enough, the first unsuccessful efforts at steam locomotives were jets. Rockets were used by the English in the War of 1812, successfully at Bladensburg, unsuccessfully at Fort McHenry for recall, "by the rockets red glare" in the Star Spangled Banner. They have been part of our Fourth of July fireworks for a century.

The X-ray by Roentgen, and radium, which led to uranium and the atom bomb, by the Curies.

Germany produced groundwork for paper making but hardly can be given credit for originating the automatic pistol as that is merely a variance of the machine gun.

Sweden's only contributions are dynamite, the safety match, and the cream separator. Scotland's are the bicycle and the threshing machine, produced by Meikle in 1786. The bicycle first came into general use here. It led to one of our first trusts—one which failed.

Colonial status is not favorable to originality or achievement. Canada contributed insulin—no other colony anything.

Austria produced the locomotive torpedo and the malarious bow for ships.

Inventions used in public utilities are found generally over the world, but the use of agricultural machinery is largely limited to the United States, as are household appliances. This is because of our social and political principles that everyone is to be served, while in Europe the lower classes and servants are not considered.

We have produced far more discoveries and inventions than all other countries put together as a result of free institutions. Let us preserve them from foreign adulteration, from socialism, and from communism.

This Is Our Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, our modern world is divided into two segments. What divides the western or free portion so sharply and clearly from the eastern countries behind the iron curtain is not primarily a curtain, no matter how stiff, nor the lack of free interchange of information or communication between the two. It is the value placed upon human life and human dignity. Beyond that dividing line human beings are regarded and treated as mere

pawns in the master plans of ambitious tyrants.

Anyone who is so unfortunate as to stand in the way of those ambitions and plans is summarily done away with. Any persons whose religious or political beliefs are a threat, or whose property is marked for confiscation, or who prospered sufficiently under an older, freer regime to want to return to that way of life—these are the doomed men. Archbishop Groesz and William Oatis are the latest victims among the thousands who have suffered a similar fate.

We in the security of our freedom and strength read of these horrors and are infuriated and frustrated. One natural reaction is to send troops or rain bombs down to annihilate all the perpetrators of these incredible tortures and mock trials. Soberer, second thoughts, of course, reveal the impossibility and futility of such a course. But we can do more than rage or protest our anger in violent language.

Although verbal condemnation may seem weak and puny compared with bombs or other direct military action, we must not neglect to do what we can. Two very thoughtful editorials appeared in the New York Times recently setting forth the avenues of action that are open to us. The victims must not be allowed to feel alone in their time of trial, nor should the instigators of these bestial acts be allowed to forget that their time will come, too. Their actions will not go unpunished. Civilized mills, like those of the ancient gods, may grind slowly, but they, too, will grind exceedingly fine. God willing, the day of retribution is not far distant for the present malefactors.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include these editorials from the New York Times, entitled "The Mark of Cain" and "What Is Our Business?":

THE MARK OF CAIN

The letter which we publish today from Dr. Fabian of the Hungarian National Council is one more reminder that the time has come for our Government to do something about these Communist outrages. To gnash one's teeth, to shout protests and imprecations, to express horror and pity or to throw up one's hands in despair will not help these victims, although it will give them the satisfaction of knowing that they are not suffering in a vacuum. We must do what we can to make certain that they will not suffer in vain.

To begin with they must be made to understand that the United States is interested in their fate and trying to help them. It is not enough for the Voice of America to tell them so. They should have direct word from Secretary Acheson or even from President Truman. When the world learned about the Nazi extermination camps and deportation in 1943 and 1944 President Roosevelt and other Allied leaders issued warnings that such measures must stop and that the criminals responsible for them would be held to account. On March 24, 1944, the President took it upon himself to issue a special statement in which he again proclaimed our determination that none who participate in these acts of savagery should go unpunished. The statement was widely disseminated throughout Europe and circulated through the underground in enemy territory—and by all accounts it was effective.

In this case we are not at war with Hungary, but we did make a peace treaty with

her that contained a human-rights clause, and that clause is now being flagrantly violated. The United States has protested on other occasions to the United Nations against such violations in Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria, and the protests were ignored or rejected. Another protest against the present deportations in Hungary would receive a similar rebuff, although it should be made for the record. But obviously some stronger method is required. The men who conduct these brutal deportations, or who carry out the tortures and mock trials of innocent men like Archbishop Groesz or William Oatis, are criminals by the standards of the civilized world. Why cannot they be branded as such by leaders of western civilization? We should name names, and with the mark of Cain on them these men will at least know that some day, circumstances permitting, they will be held to account, and their victims will know that we do not and will not forget.

WHAT IS OUR BUSINESS?

In the familiar language of Soviet diplomacy the Hungarian Government has advised the United States to "mind its own business." The admonition is in reply to an official protest against the expulsion of three staff members of the American Legation at Budapest, but it is really inspired by the unofficial outburst of indignation in this country at the Communist regime's brutal treatment of its own citizens. Mass deportations of helpless people did not begin in Hungary and are not confined to one country in the grim borderlands under the iron rule of Moscow. But the Hungarian evictions are on a larger and more indiscriminate scale, and we know more about them, chiefly because so many victims are determined at any risk to themselves to let the world know what is happening. The popular reaction to the reports infuriates the authorities in Budapest, accustomed as they are to doing what they please behind the iron curtain.

"Mind your own business," they say. And this immediately raises the question, What is our business? In the first place, it is certainly our business, taken for granted by the entire civilized world until the new cavemen seized the seats of government, to protect American citizens in the pursuit of their lawful duties and to demand proof and satisfaction for nonsensical charges against our diplomatic representatives in foreign capitals.

But above and beyond our business as Americans it is our business as members of the human race to resent, condemn, and stop, if we can, wrongs committed against the human race. Violations of human rights anywhere abridge human rights everywhere. Every crime against humanity—in Hungary, Latvia, China wherever minorities are persecuted, families torn apart, men and women deported, imprisoned, tortured, and killed at the whim of arbitrary power—is a crime against all humanity. We see but dimly, in horrifying glimpses, the cruelties millions of our fellow creatures suffer under the great tyrannies of the twentieth century. But when in the vast, impersonal mirror we do see one instance of this millionfold agony it is impossible not to feel a sense of shame—shame as human beings that we live in a world in which such horrors can be perpetrated, shame as citizens of a free and powerful nation that we can do nothing to prevent or punish them.

But at least we must never become so callous, so blind to our human interests, so defeatist in our fight to overcome evil as to admit that these crimes are none of our business. Let us inform the rulers of Hungary that they are so much our business that we are engaged in a world struggle that is fundamentally a fight for the very rights of humanity that they are violating.

Last Letter Home of an American Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DEMPSEY

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am placing in the RECORD the last letter home of a young American marine who died in Korea for his God and his country.

What Lt. James Callan says in this letter should be important to use who are charged with the grave responsibility of governing this Nation. What he does not say—the unspoken words that lie between the lines—are even more important.

I am including also in the RECORD a letter to me from Jimmy Callan's father, a constituent of mine in New Mexico and an outstanding American. There is little that I can say or add to either letter. The two together speak a better commentary on the price we have paid in the bloody hills of Korea than any story written by a war correspondent.

There has been a great deal of confusion among some of our leaders as to just what our purpose is in Korea, but there was no doubt in Jimmy Callan's mind as to why he fought and died. He gave his life that the America he knew and loved might live. May God give those of us here the strength, the courage, and the wisdom to keep faith with Jimmy Callan and his comrades who have paid so dearly for our freedom.

The letters follow:

CALLAN RANCH,

Red Hill, N. Mex., July 10, 1951.

HON. JOHN J. DEMPSEY,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Mrs. Callan and myself wish to thank you for your kind letter of understanding sympathy, as expressed in your letter of July 2, 1951, concerning the death of our son, First Lt. James Callan 3d, USMCR, killed in action against the enemy in Korea, June 14, 1951.

After being on inactive duty since close of War II, we moved from Texas out to this ranch 4 years ago and he had been operating it, until called to active duty again December 27, 1950. Three months training at Quantico and after a furlough left for Korea, May 12, and after a brief period of getting his command was moved up to the lines—lasting about 2 weeks thereafter. I know he was properly trained and did his best, like the thousands who died before and after him, so my one prayer is that the remainder of our forces be spared; unless we enter a war to win, if it is necessary for our national safety.

I am enclosing his last letter home, since you might find a thought in it as I did. The people referred to were my youngest daughter and my mother, who is ill (in this letter), and my other son.

I cannot help but ask myself a question as I think of our dead and wounded, and I am sure you also have wondered, Does the Star-Spangled Banner yet wave o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave? or is it a Union Jack, a pink one, or a red one? A New Deal, a Fair Deal, or just a raw deal.

Pardon my voicing an opinion, but all with whom I've talked wonder as I do.

As a citizen of New Mexico, I appreciate your letter, and as a father of one of those whose son gave his life to and for our great Nation, I appreciate your sharing with us our great personal loss.

Sincerely,

JAMES CALLAN.

FRIDAY, JUNE 8

DEAR FOLKS War is just as Sherman said. I am now a combat veteran and have acquired a feeling of confidence. This is a good outfit. I just hope to hell the war can be settled one way or another. It's a shame, but I feel that we are doing good, that we can and are helping to prevent world war III, which would be disastrous to the world. Maybe this will wake the world up to the fact that God cannot be denied or ignored.

I hope it has rained and that Biddy's wedding comes out all right. Also that the damned Socialists haven't ruined the beef business.

Damn, but I wish some mail would get in here, then I'd know what kind of questions to ask and what to talk about. Is Sam in the Navy yet? Hope he made that deal he talked about.

Don't you all worry about me. I'm doing my job and can take care of myself with God's help, can do a damn good job.

Write often and send air mail a large pocket knife and whetlock. How is Alma? Hope she is recovered. Tell everyone hello, and I'm fine.

As ever,

JIMMIE.

Postage Rates on Books

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the following article on book rates should interest all Members of Congress.

The cultural growth and intellectual development of America can be measured in terms of the availability of books.

Joseph Henry Jackson is an outstanding newspaperman in California. He knows his subject.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article from the San Francisco Chronicle's magazine section, This World, of July 8, 1951:

BETWEEN THE LINES

(With Joseph Henry Jackson)

It's about time, I believe, that the general public knew more about something that is threatening the distribution of books everywhere, but particularly in the West.

To understand this, I'll have to ask you to be patient through a few brief paragraphs of facts and figures. You can't realize what is facing the far-western bookstore unless you absorb these figures, but I'll try to keep it simple.

First fact of importance:

In 1938 there was established a "book rate" in postage. This rate of 1½ cents a pound was based on the rate paid by the reading-matter portion of magazines. (Magazines pay a higher rate on their proportion of advertising matter, but the reading-matter figure is the one that applies here.)

This rate was established "in the interests of the promotion of cultural growth, education, and development of the American people." It applied equally to the reading matter of magazines and to books.

In 1943, the book rate was doubled and a surcharge was added which had the practical effect of making the book rate 4 cents a pound for the first pound and 3 cents a pound thereafter. Meantime the rate on the reading matter in magazines stayed the same.

In 1949 the book rate was increased again—this time to the present rate of 8 cents a pound for the first pound, and 4 cents a pound thereafter. The magazine rate for its reading matter is still 1½ cents a pound.

Now there is a proposal to raise the book rate again, and very sharply.

The new proposal is to (a) raise the flat unzoned book rate 25 percent, or to 10 cents for the first pound and 5 cents for each additional pound. But the package may not weigh more than 10 pounds in any event, and (b) to substitute a special zoned book rate (to be fixed by the postmaster) for all book packages over 10 pounds and up to 70 pounds.

Thus, at the very least, book postage is to be raised by 25 percent for packages up to 10 pounds, and for packages over 10 pounds still more sharply. In the case of west coast shipments, what has been learned about the Postmaster General's ideas on the subject suggests rises up to 200 or perhaps 300 percent.

One point: There is also a proposal to raise the rate on the reading matter part of magazines, but only from 1½ cents a pound to 2.4 per pound. This still leaves the book rate more than double that of magazine reading matter in packages up to 10 pounds, and between four and five times greater in packages of books heavier than that.

So much for that.

Now for a look at what this does to the far-western bookseller.

First, the profits of the average western bookseller have gone down since 1938, when the 1½-percent book rate applied, from about 5 percent to about 1 percent. Anybody in this audience care to do business in nonrepeat merchandise (books are not like cornflakes; you don't buy the same book over and over again each week or so) on a profit margin as slim as that?

What happens, under the new rate, to western booksellers?

Well, a 10-pound weight limitation would add from 10 percent to 20 percent to the cost of each book handled. These costs of handling would make it unprofitable, moreover, for the publisher to take care of small orders. Even five ordinary books usually weigh over 10 pounds. So, if the new rate goes into effect (it is awaiting action by the House right now), the far-western bookseller is up against it. He will either have to pay an average of some 34 cents each for the transportation cost of books to his store, or pay 10 percent to 25 percent more to the publisher for his books to be sent in smaller quantities at the rate applicable to packages of 10 pounds or less. Either way, the bookseller's costs go up. And in the far West, the bookseller is working now on so small a margin that an increase of this kind will just put him out of business.

How about the public?

In the far West, the public will simply find that the bookstore is disappearing. This means that the resident of the Pacific coast will be limited to the books put out by book clubs and/or the reading matter in magazines—the latter financed in part by advertising, and in part by the low rate (still far below books even if it is raised to the proposed amount of 2.4 cents per pound) that applies on magazine reading matter.

Well, is this what the public wants? The Congress is the representative of the public, it should not be needful to say.

There is reason to think that it is not what the public wants. In fact, on June 6, the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee voted unanimously to freeze the book-postage rate where it now is. Representations were made by various Congressmen to this committee, and it found good cause to take a different view from the Post Office itself and from the ICC which okayed the new rise in rate. Among those very active in following this through and calling attention to the effect of such a new rise in rate upon the western bookseller was California Congressman GEORGE MILLER.

One thing, for example, that Congressman MILLER brought to the attention of the House committee was the fact that according to the Post Office Department itself, only 1½ percent of postal expenditures in 1949 were attributed to the cost of carrying books at the present rate. As to volume, while the poundage of merchandise sent by parcel post just about doubled from 1942 to 1949, the increase in book shipments over the same period was less than 5 percent.

To come down to the point, those interested in books are not arguing for a subsidy. They do ask for equitable treatment vis-à-vis the reading matter in magazines.

And then you note that the rate on this magazine reading matter has stayed where it is for some 20 years while the book-postage rate has increased three times—well you wonder what the basis of this is. And again when you note that the suggested increase in the rate on magazine reading matter brings it only to 2.4 cents per pound, while the proposed new rate on books moves them up to at least four times that much, and in the case of larger, zoned-rate packages, much more than that—well, again you wonder why.

As to what you may do about it—well, a letter to your Congressman or your Senator or both should help show that you are interested.

Any Congressman or Senator is—or should be—in the business of listening carefully to what his constituents say, and, so far as is possible, paying attention to it. Most, as a matter of fact, do exactly that. They are in Congress for that reason.

But the far West is easy to forget; it's 3,000 miles away from Washington. Most of the books are sold in the northeastern part of the United States, where most of the population is, and where the manufacturers are too. Wherefore—well, the far West, that's "way out there."

Yes, but that's not a sound reason for a rate that will result in putting booksellers out of business. One of the reasons for the establishment of the 1½-cent book rate in 1938 was "to disseminate culture equally throughout the land." Now, no one says that costs today should be the same as in 1938, especially when the Post Office loses money regularly. But—well, shouldn't there be some near-parity, at least, between "culture" as interpreted through the reading matter in magazines and "culture" in books? Can you think of two reasons—or even one—why not?

Price, Wage, and Credit Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have read the July 15, 1951, state-

ment of Hon. JESSE P. WOLCOTT, Congressman from Michigan and ranking minority member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, on the subject of controls which I am inserting in the RECORD. I concur wholeheartedly in what he has stated. I have been on record for 2 months now in favor of an extension of the President's powers to impose price, wage, and credit controls. I recently voted to extend those controls for a month longer and I voted against the proposal to limit roll-backs during this month period.

I did so because I believe that the only fair way to impose controls is across the board with no group exempted.

I strongly favored the Wolcott proposal aimed to correct the inflationary fiscal policies of the Federal Government which are the major cause of inflation. I believe with Mr. Wolcott that without correcting these policies, controls will not work, they will merely aggravate the situation and, in the end, produce a real explosion.

The President, by not exercising the power to control which he has had now for 10 months, across the board, has invited the scene we now have in Washington of special groups trying to obtain exemption for themselves. The OPS has been staffed throughout the country with Democratic Party leaders which in itself does not inspire confidence in the manner in which controls have been imposed.

People have asked the Republican Party for an affirmative program and we have responded with the Wolcott amendment. The administration has rejected it. Yet, the majority of the Republicans, I believe, will still vote for the extension and strengthening of controls which the President asks, even though we may feel that this will not stop inflation.

If there is any struggle going on, on extension of controls it is not Democrat against Republican, but, rather, city versus farm. And though I think the farm bloc is wrong, I cannot blame them too much, in view of the fact that the increase in prices beyond that resulting directly from the inflationary fiscal policies of the Federal Government results from cost-of-living increases granted to labor. In fairness, I must state that I have been in favor of labor's cost-of-living increases, because until the rise of cost of living is stopped by across-the-board controls you cannot fairly freeze wages. Increase of wages, though in itself inflationary, is the only safety valve left to prevent a tragic lowering of the standard of living of our wage earners in meeting increased costs.

When controls are imposed across the board, of course, wage control must be included.

To date—July 16, 1951—the majority of the amendments to the Defense Production Act which the Republicans have successfully fought have had nothing to do with price controls. Many of the amendments that are still to come up have nothing to do with the power to impose controls. The power to impose controls is only one segment of the Defense Production Act, and the people should be made aware of this fact.

I conclude by restating that a \$260,000,000 Federal debt and a spend-

thrifty administration that, having started our people on a course of dope addiction, seems intent upon keeping us supplied with dope—unsupported paper money—lie at the root of inflation.

We must change our course. Controls mean nothing unless we do.

Mr. WOLCOTT's statement follows:

WOLCOTT ANNOUNCES HE WILL VOTE FOR CONTROLS BILL

(Statement by Representative JESSE P. WOLCOTT, of Michigan)

The action of the House, and particularly of Republican Members of the House, on pending control legislation, is being badly misrepresented to the country by the bureaucrats and certain irresponsible elements of the press and radio.

If the American people were being correctly informed, they would realize that the Truman administration has endangered the entire controls program by attempting to use the current emergency to grab new powers that would be palatable only to a British Socialist. The program brought before the House by the administration is as dishonest as anything uncovered by the Kefauver committee.

The public should be reminded of some facts.

1. The public should know that the Congress, on its own motion last August, inflated and passed legislation authorizing the imposition of controls on prices, wages, and credit. Mr. Truman did not favor such action, declaring in his press conference on August 10 that the Government was capable of handling the inflation situation with existing machinery. I quote from a story in the Washington Post of August 11, 1950, signed by Edward T. Pollard.

"He (President Truman) still doesn't think the time is in sight for using price and wage controls, which Congress seems ready to give him on a stand-by basis. He thinks the Federal Government, thanks to reorganization and improvements over the last 5 years, has an administrative set-up that can meet any emergency. Replying to a question, he said that the reporter could take that to mean that there would be no revival of OPA."

2. Despite the President's shortsightedness, Congress enacted the Controls Act and it became law on September 8, 1950. Notwithstanding the fact that prices were going up by leaps and bounds, and hoarding was being engaged in by suppliers and distributors, thus sending prices higher, the President blindly refused to act, with the result that between June 27, 1950, and January 26, 1951, the cost of living went up 7 percent and the cost of food 8 percent.

3. On January 26, 1951, the President belatedly decided to impose price, wage, and credit controls. As my colleague, the Republican leader of the House, Joe MARTIN, said at that time, "The administration has only frozen the hole in the consumer's pocket-book."

4. The ineffectual operation of the Office of Price Stabilization can best be evaluated by the fact that between January 26 and June 1, the cost of living and the cost of food went up another 2 percent each. The truth is that in every month since June 1950, without exception, the cost of living has taken a fresh rise.

5. When it recently came time to renew the controls act passed last year, the administration and its coterie of Socialist planners decided that here was the chance to hitchhike a free ride for a number of their pet socialistic schemes. The result was that the bill which was presented to the House contains numerous provisions which are totally unrelated to the consumers' problem of price, wage, and credit controls. For example, the administration is seeking authority to set up Government-

owned plants, to set up Government corporations in competition with private industry, to move existing privately owned plants to other parts of the country by Government edict, to impose marketing quotas, and to sneak in the thoroughly discredited Brannan plan through a system of so-called production subsidies.

Those are pertinent facts.

It is a scandalous picture which is being kept from the American people. It is a national disgrace when the Socialist schemers in this administration trade upon an emergency that is costing American boys their lives in Korea.

There is a deliberate campaign underway to make it appear that Members of the House, including an overwhelming majority of Republicans and not a few patriotic Democrats, are sabotaging price, wage, and credit controls by any change made in the bill.

The truth is that 99 percent of Republicans voting last August 10 on the controls legislation voted in favor of enactment. I voted for the act, as did 140 other of my Republican colleagues.

The truth is that once the socialistic power grabs which this bill contains have been weeded out, and price, wage, and credit controls have been strengthened, the House will pass this bill. I shall vote for it, and countless of my colleagues will do likewise.

It is high time that the campaign of untruth and calumny was stopped and the American people told the truth for a change.

Tax Bill Held Wanting in Fight on Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the last of a series of articles by Harold Fleming, appearing in the Christian Science Monitor.

TAX BILL HELD WANTING IN FIGHT ON INFLATION

(By Harold Fleming)

NEW YORK—Some people here are inclined to view the current administration party line that national defense constitutes in itself a dire inflationary threat as a political form of gainful employment.

This is not to say that the country is going back to the days of the old-fashioned business cycle downswings, nor to say that inflation may not return. It is merely to say that if inflation should return, it will not have been necessitated by the defense program.

TAX BILL SEEN BAD ON SEVERAL COUNTS

One of the chief butts of Wall Street criticism is the tax bill now under consideration in Congress. The objection is not that it would not raise enough money, but that it is ill-devised to curb inflation and in some parts would encourage it.

It is true that few tax bills ever get a good word in Wall Street, whose customers are usually in the direct line of fire of any tax rise and whose top people have probably forgotten more about economics than most of Washington's top people have ever learned. But Wall Street's criticism of the pending bill is more wearisomely negative than of any tax bill in many years.

There is much agreement here with the Roswell Magill Committee on Federal Tax Policy, which recently said that the recent House-passed tax bill is full of "fundamental faults" and is "probably the most badly devised tax measure in recent history." Nor is the local view of wholly pecuniary origin. Wall Street, an aggregate of financial carpenters, has also an "instinct of workmanship" and likes to see things done right.

TAX ON DIVIDENDS HITS OLD FOLKS

The criticisms include the following:

1. The plan to have corporations "withhold" tax on dividends would save the Treasury trouble by causing all stockholders trouble. Hardest hit would be the old folks, who would have to wait for their money, then find out how to get what they saved and invested for, then fill out forms and mail them, then wait for the Treasury to send them their money.

2. The proposal to cut the exempt basis of the excess-profits tax from 85 down to 75 percent is heavily criticized on several counts. First count is that the term "excess-profits tax" has been made a misnomer; any company that makes over 75 percent of what it made in recent years must pay an "excess profits" tax even if its earnings have not increased and have nothing to do with the national defense program.

The excess-profits tax was originally justified as a "blood" tax on those who stayed home from war and made profits from it. The proposed tax is nothing like this. Most people here would rather see the same amount of money raised by straight increases in the regular corporate income tax across the board than raised in this way, which almost seems to reward a corporation for going backward.

EPT SEEN CAUSE OF WASTE

Perhaps the chief criticism of the EPT, however, is that it encourages wasteful financing and soft wage policies. The well-established and successful corporation can figure that over 70 cents of every additional dollar it spends for wages, raw materials, interest, or overhead costs will be paid, in effect, by the Treasury in the form of a smaller tax revenue on a smaller taxable statutory net income. A specific effect is to put the big, successful corporate employers on the side of repeated wage increases (which may explain the support given the new proposals by CIO leaders).

3. The proposed increases in personal income taxes are political. It is argued, but not anti-inflationary. They hit the higher brackets hardest, where the least revenue is to be had and where the most saving is done. The House-passed bill would go even further in this direction than the Treasury's proposals. The Treasury originally proposed an increase of four percentage points in the tax on each income bracket. The House instead voted a 12½-percent increase in everybody's income taxes.

TAX NOT APPLIED WHERE MOST MONEY IS

The difference shows how complex these tax questions have become. The Treasury's proposal would hit hardest the lower brackets, where the money is. For the man paying 20 percent on \$4,000, or \$800, it would raise the tax to 24 percent, or \$960. For the man paying 80 percent on \$500,000, or \$400,000, it would raise the tax to 84 percent, or \$420,000.

The House bill, in raising taxes a straight 12½ percent for everybody, would raise the first man's taxes only from \$800 to \$900, but would raise the second man's taxes from \$400,000 to \$450,000, or from 80 percent to 90 percent.

The Treasury's proposal would cut the first man's take-home by 4 percent, the second man's take-home by 20 percent. The House bill would cut the first man's take-

home pay by only 2½ percent, but the second man's by 50 percent. Yet the Treasury's proposal would raise more money, because there are millions of men in the first bracket but only a handful in the second.

4. Third criticism here of the current congressional tax proposals is that they skip lightly or entirely over excise and sales tax. These are deflationary taxes, in that they discourage expenditure. But this is an old argument of regressive taxation and need not be gone into further here.

DISINGENUOUS ARGUMENT ON INFLATION

The administration gets as much blame as Congress for failing to cope with inflation. Chief charge is favoritism to farmers and labor. On the former count, the administration still stands for parity-based price supports. Thus, for instance, the price of wheat is now down around price-support levels.

The payoff on the administration's attitude toward labor could be heard in the President's June 14 address to the Nation on economic controls. After having taken credit for the price reversal of last spring, and flatly claimed credit for having prevented depressions, the President clearly showed his hand by saying:

"When some of us have to take a cut in profits or pass up wage increases we might otherwise get, let us remember that we are making a contribution to peace in the world."

The idea that some people should contribute by taking less, while others contribute by foregoing more, is seen here as a key to some of the Nation's current complexes on the matter of inflation. A complex in modern idiom is something that you are afraid of but want, but won't admit you want and can't get over thinking about. Thus inflation remains a problem.

Peace Talks in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, the American people do not want another Yalta.

This belief is strengthened by a telegram I have received from the Wyoming Department of the Reserve Officers Association, sent me at the direction of the department's executive committee.

Their telegram reads as follows:

Several recent occurrences, notably the Communists finagling our representatives into their armed camp for peace talks, may indicate that we are again to be jockeyed into an opportunistic compromise for their benefit. Every American is desperately interested in a lasting peace which would be honorable and just but to keep faith with those Americans killed and wounded and the families they have left behind, we must never again be committed by someone who purports to know the answers, before our people are advised of the facts. We hope you, as our elected delegate, will make it your business to know and to tell the people the details of any settlement before it has gone far enough to bind this Nation. Will you please advise us what you can do to inform our citizens on these matters of public concern as and before decisions are made and not after it is too late?

In reply to this telegram, Mr. Speaker, I told the Wyoming Reserve Officers

Association that under present circumstances I seriously doubt if anyone except President Truman, Secretary of State Acheson and the Joint Chiefs of Staff will know the full details of any Korean settlement until such settlement has been concluded.

Unfortunately, this probability may become a reality, a twin to the tragic Yalta experience, when the American public was kept in the dark concerning the secret agreement for more than 2 years. And the public was informed of the terms of the Yalta betrayal only after a congressional committee demanded the details before taking action upon administration requests for foreign-aid funds.

I repeat, the American people do not want another Yalta. They do not want another secret agreement shrouded from the public view to protect the actions of men in whom the American people have lost confidence.

Members of Congress, myself among them, have called for the replacement of Dean Acheson, but without results. We have warned of the loss of faith with our foreign-policy makers which has been expressed by the people we represent. But our warnings have gone unheeded.

Now, Mr. Acheson as Secretary of State will have a major voice in acceptance or rejection of truce terms now being discussed in Korea. The people want to be advised of those terms before—and I emphasize this word—conclusion of the truce conferences. In short, they do not trust Mr. Acheson. He has been paying too much attention to foreign interests and too little attention to the opinions of good American citizens. They feel that he is giving only lip service to Americanism, but is permitting himself to become a tool of foreign masters.

What appears to me to be an indication of the dangerous situation existing in connection with the Korean truce talks is the fact that the Reds are conducting themselves as though they were the victorious hosts extending a condescending hand to a fallen foe. This, of course, is not the case in any degree. The Korean War has not been won by either side. Nothing whatsoever has been accomplished except a vast amount of destruction and human suffering. Both the Reds and the United Nations conferees should be considered on an equal basis, with neither side playing host to the other. This the Reds have not recognized.

The Communist conferees have halted UN truce teams because they were accompanied by newsmen and photographers; yet the Communists have admitted their own newsmen and photographers into the area. I was glad to learn that the UN truce conferees had broken off talks until this situation had been remedied.

Also disquieting is the knowledge that the Chinese Reds are massing troops behind their lines, at the same time that peace conferences are underway. This, of course, lends strength to increasing doubt of the Reds' sincerity in the truce talks.

Many Americans are not too trusting of either side in these negotiations, and

are demanding to be advised of the full facts, as the Reserve Officers Association's telegram states, "before it has gone far enough to bind this Nation." I join with them in this demand.

Texas Cattleman Gives His Side of Beef Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LLOYD M. BENTSEN, JR.

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by a patriotic young American giving his views on the beef problem, which was published in the Columbus Evening Dispatch:

TEXAS CATTLEMAN GIVES HIS SIDE OF BEEF QUESTION

The papers and radio programs have been so full of statements, official and private, relating to the cattle industry that I wonder how there has been time or space for anything else. The terrible thing about all this is that so little of what has been said is actually a representation of the true facts. I wonder if it would not be of interest to the people of your city to learn from a person who was born on a ranch and who has, with only the time spent in the armed service to interfere, spent all of his life on a cattle ranch?

I am 27 years old and I am a veteran of 24 months' service in the Pacific from New Caledonia to Japan with the One Hundred and Twelfth Cavalry Regiment. Just as soon as my Army service was terminated I returned to my home and reentered the ranching business. That was and is the only business I know and it is the business I like. I just naturally like to raise cattle. To me, about the prettiest thing in the world is a Hereford calf. No matter what happens, I believe I will have to stay in this business. I know I will do so just as long as the Government will let me.

From what I have been reading and hearing, I wonder if most people don't believe that this cattle business is just about the easiest and most prosperous occupation in the world. Let me give you some of the facts that ought to correct this impression.

In my own operations I breed cows for the purpose of raising calves to develop into beef animals. This is a year-round operation. We must, of course, depend on nature, especially on rainfall for the answer to the question of whether or not our year will be successful. There has not been a general rain on the land I run my cattle for the past 16 months. Our land is as dry as powder. On a large part of it, you couldn't find a hatful of grass in a day's search.

I do not know of any place to which I could move all my cattle and keep an interest in them. I have been forced to give my cattle a lot of supplemental feed for 9 months. I did ship my steers to better grass but the cows and calves I have had to keep on feeding, and from the looks of things, this feeding has to be kept up for a long time. On these cows this drought forced me to spend an average of \$40 a head more to keep my cattle alive than I would have had to spend if we had been blessed with a good rain. This has been just to keep my cattle alive, not to fatten them.

A range cattleman ordinarily hopes to get about an 80-percent calf crop. Because of this drought I will be lucky if I can get a 50-percent calf crop up to weaning time. And, because of the poor condition of the cows, I cannot hope for anything better than this next year. So instead of getting two calves a year from my cows, as was stated to be a fact by one Member of Congress (a thing prohibited by nature), I will be lucky if I get one calf in 2 years from my cows.

I know that Mr. DiSalle has stated that his figures are derived from studies made by experts. I wonder how many of these experts ever "tailed" a poor cow out of the almost dry bottom of a water tank or hauled feed over a range where the dust would choke a grasshopper. Mr. DiSalle's averages might fit into a book pretty well, but when a fellow has a year like I have had and like this one I am having now, I know that such averages will break anyone.

I like the cattle business. I knew all about the risks to be expected when I came back home from the Army and started out for myself. I'd like to stay in this business. I want to produce cattle, not only because I like to grow cattle but I also like to supply something for other people to enjoy, especially the working class of people who are the ones who ordinarily buy the type of beef I produce.

When Mr. DiSalle can tell me how to make it rain, or how to write a regulation that will hold back a frost or stop a norther, then I'll begin to believe in regulations. But until he can do these things by regulation, I will know that this business of cattle raising just can't be carried on from Washington by a Government agent who never saw a live cow. Let me take my chances with nature, but please save me from the schemes of the do-gooders who sacrifice me and my business in order to develop fine figures and stop beef production.

JOE B. FINLEY, JR.

ENCINAL, TEX.

What About the War Criminals?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD what I regard as a rather pungent thought-provoking editorial which recently appeared in the Albion Journal-Register, of Albion, Ill.

The subject of this editorial raises the question as to whether or not the leaders who started the war in Korea should be hanged or otherwise executed as were the war criminals of Germany and Japan.

Is it to be a soft or a hard peace? I commend the reading of this editorial which expresses the thinking of the editor of a small newspaper from the grass roots of the country. It has something of the ring and spirit, so lacking these days, of those who started the fight for freedom at Lexington and Concord.

WHAT ABOUT THE WAR CRIMINALS?

As this is written Monday morning, it appears that a truce may be effected in Korea. The cease-fire will bring an end to the appalling casualty lists which have brought

grief to families in almost every city, village and hamlet of the United States during the 12 months of the police action.

The end of the actual shooting in that respect is cause for rejoicing. * * * But negotiation of an armistice, when considered on a broader canvass means writing off as wasted the gallant efforts of our Armed Forces during the last year.

It means that those who died, died only to maintain an uneasy status quo. It means those who suffered frostbite and battle wounds endured their agonies in vain. It means that the billions of dollars that the United States has poured into the conflict has been poured down an oriental rat hole.

But a negotiated peace in Korea means that nothing definite has been accomplished, unless one counts the millions of Korean civilian dead, the ruined cities, the wasted fields that have been crossed and crisscrossed by the Four Horsemen.

Our State Department may hail the probable armistice as a satisfactory conclusion to the fiasco. Diffident delegates to the U. N. may rejoice that the oriental sideshow has been abandoned in favor of eventual action under the big top of Europe.

The U. N. will probably hail the armistice as a major accomplishment, blithely ignoring the fact that nothing has been decided in the 12 long and weary months of the limited war.

Worse still an armistice will mean that those responsible for the rape of South Korea and the death of perhaps 25,000 American men, will never face punishment.

Unlike the Nazi high command, that only 5 years ago paid in full on the gallows for their crimes against humanity, those who brought the reign of terror to Korea are to be permitted to sit down at a Munich-like conference table.

An armistice now means a complete repudiation of the blueprint for the brave new world. It means that free nations have turned their backs on the dreams of all of us who believed that somehow a permanent peace might be evolved back in 1946.

It means that the U. N. has tacitly admitted that the Nuremberg convictions and the executions that followed were not the actions of a united world, firmly determined to stamp out aggression and murder. It means that the war-criminal trials less than a half decade ago were not conducted in a solemn responsible court of all nations, but in a manner of a jerkwater JP who shapes the conduct of the trial to meet the predetermined verdict.

If the Korean, Chinese—yes, and even the Russian—leaders responsible for the Korean aggression are not brought before the bars of the same tribunal that sentenced those high in Hitler's oligarchy to the noose—if the same stern punishment is not meted out to the oriental war makers, what is there to deter future aggressors?

Five years ago the world believed that only the threat of swift, sure, and impartial trial and speedy execution of those found guilty would deter would-be aggressors. The nations, prodded by the United States, even went so far as to write new international law—and to, of all things, make such law retroactive—so that the Nazis might climb the 13 steps to the scaffold.

Now, just a few years later, we repudiate that concept—now, because we're afraid of Soviet might—or some other imagined boogie—we agree to sit down and talk things over with the oriental war makers.

Hitler would have talked things over in 1944 or 1943, or at any other time after D-day. A negotiated peace back then would have been no more dishonorable, no more indecisive, and no more repugnant than is an armistice-table capitulation today.

At the end of World War II we solemnly declared that all future infringement on the peace would face stern and sudden justice.

Now, 5 years later, we treat with the perpetrators of the first major aggression to develop since we made that declaration.

No bells should ring when the armistice is announced in mid-July. There should be no rejoicing. The heads of Americans—and those of citizens throughout the entire free world—should be bowed in shame. We should weep—not for our brave men who gave their lives fruitlessly in a phony war, which accomplished nothing—but our tears should be shed for the death of an ideal—for the failure of free men to meet their first test in a struggle to create a world where the "four freedoms" might endure.

More Interior Department Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the propaganda of the Department of the Interior has reached to all corners of the United States. I am submitting another editorial from a Georgia newspaper, the Savannah Morning News, of June 20. It will speak for itself.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT

The propagandists for high Government spending are improving their techniques. The Morning News has received from the regional information officer of the Interior Department's Central Valley project in California a detailed account of ceremonies to be conducted in connection with the inauguration of operation of various phases of the giant Central Valley multi-purpose reclamation project. Water from Shasta Dam used to generate power subsequently flows down the Sacramento river to a pumping station more than 200 miles down stream, where it is pumped up 200 feet into the mountains to flow southward again through a man-made canal eventually as far south as Bakersfield, some 500 miles from the starting point.

The account of the inauguration ceremonies contains glowing descriptions of the way in which mankind will benefit from the vast Federal project through hydroelectric power, swimming, and recreation, fishing, and irrigation from farm lands. There will, no doubt, be many benefits from the project, for no one can deny that fishing, swimming, electric power, and irrigated farmlands are good for the people.

Two questions are prompted by the accounts of the scope of the project, however. First, since the Federal Government, through the Interior Department's Central Valley Authority, will be involved directly or indirectly in virtually every phase of economic life in the entire 500-mile-long Central Valley of California, isn't there a strong possibility that the entire area will be developed into somewhat of a Government-controlled autonomy within itself? This might amount to a small area of total socialization in the midst of an otherwise free and capitalistic area, and if controlled by unscrupulous and ambitious bureaucrats in a strong central Government in Washington, grave political misuses could result.

Secondly, granted that all the various benefits from the project are desirable, can we afford them at a time when the Federal

Government is unable to balance its budget, and at a time when taxes are so high they threaten our ability to maintain our continued high production?

Cooperation of the Veterans' Administration in Treatment of Louisiana Polio Cases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, because of a heavy demand for hospital space caused by a seasonal increase in polio cases which has been much higher than usual, the doctors of Shreveport, La., last week, called upon the Veterans' Administration for permission to use beds in the VA hospital located there. The Administration cooperated splendidly with us, and it was only a matter of hours after the request was made that I was able to telephone my people at home and inform them that our request had been honored.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I offer for inclusion the following editorial upon the Louisiana polio situation which appeared in the Shreveport Times on July 13, 1951:

THE CITY'S SPLENDID WORK IN FACING POLIO

The splendid manner in which public and private agencies of Shreveport are functioning in the present polio situation should arouse confidence, calmness, and admiration among the people as a whole.

In homes where sorrow already has entered, and in homes where naturally there is worry, there also can be complete satisfaction that everything humanly possible to combat the disease has been done and is being continued. The medical knowledge of not only the entire local profession but of national organizations and research groups is in action here in Shreveport.

The question of whether the local polio situation should be called an epidemic is utterly unimportant. "Epidemic" in its general definition simply means widely prevalent locally and spreading somewhat. Technically some would define epidemic as an incident of 1 case in each 1,000 of population. Using the former definition, Caddo's present incidence might be called epidemic; in the latter definition the present 74 cases would have to be more than doubled to justify the term "epidemic." In a nearby town there were 13 cases in 2,000 population. To meet that ratio, Caddo's cases would have to increase to more than 1,100. The National Infantile Paralysis Foundation terms a ratio as small as 1 case in 5,000 population as epidemic. That would mean that almost every polio outbreak in the Nation is an epidemic.

The point in the whole situation is that here in Shreveport the steps that have been taken are the identical steps—and virtually the only steps—that could and would be taken if the present incidence of polio were doubled, tripled, quadrupled, or multiplied to even greater extent.

The announcement of the health board yesterday morning that city swimming pools

are not contributing to the spread of polio is sound, logical, and obvious. Only 2 out of 49 of the present city cases had been swimming in city pools during the polio incubation period. The idea that a properly handled, filtered, and purified swimming pool is a cause of spread of polio is as outmoded as the yarn about warts coming from playing with toads.

Backwoods swimming holes, bayous, lakes, et cetera, may be quite different. But could any area naturally be less susceptible to disease than a modern, new, sunshiny swimming pool with the most modern purification system and the water checked chemically every 2 hours?

The city council is being guided in its steps by the medical profession, through the city health board. The latter acts under decision not only of its own members but of the medical profession, with the city's pediatricians all called on to determine such courses as closing or leaving open places of public gathering.

Back of this is the full strength, research, and knowledge of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, and the physical facilities of it and of the Veterans' Administration.

When the polio incidence began to rise locally, surveys were made quietly throughout the city for space for patients if the number of cases exceeded capacity of normal facilities. The completeness of this job would amaze everyone if there were space for all the details.

When the need for additional bed-space came, it took only 22 hours to call on Washington for space at the local VA hospital and then have that space available for patients. Dr. Fred Bearden and Manager D. A. Hiller at the local VA hospital worked with the medical profession and the health board at this end. Admiral Joel T. Boone of the VA medical force in Washington handled things there. The whole thing went through like greased lightning—because all the steps had been planned in advance.

The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis has made two physio-therapists available for Shreveport. The foundation's area head nurse will teach regular nurses special polio technique at the VA polio ward. The Red Cross will provide extra nursing manpower if needed. The foundation has sent its service director here so that physical facilities for handling polio may become available quickly, if needed. There is no need now. Six respirators have been brought in to Charity Hospital.

These steps not only meet current needs, but they are precautionary as to further increase in polio locally. They inspire confidence and deserve commendation. And the people as a whole deserve their share of praise. A decade or so ago fewer polio cases than at present brought near-hysteria. Today everyone is taking everything in stride—calmly, cautiously, confidently. There's no reason to do otherwise.

Controls: Whose Side Is the Calendar on?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, emotionalism and appeals to class prejudice have figured entirely too prominent-

ly in attempts to influence consideration of the Defense Production Act. One of the more sane editorial approaches to this complex economic problem was that of an article in the Sunday Star, of Washington, D. C., July 15, 1951. Under unanimous consent, I insert this article in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

CONTROLS: WHOSE SIDE IS THE CALENDAR ON?

Like a cat leisurely toying with a crippled mouse, the House of Representatives was taking its own sweet time.

There might be a war still going on in Korea. There might be a bigger war in the offing—to be fought, or prevented by the speedy amassing of enough power to deter the aggressors. There might be, as so many said, a looming threat of disastrous inflation, and it might be that the administration could not cope with it, without the passage of H. R. 3871, a bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes.

There might be desperate pleas for action from Defense Mobilizer Wilson, his gesturing fingers nervously twining and untwining on television screens in every sitting room in the country. There might be a lot of things. But the House was having none of the hysteria. It was going to go easy on this business of economic controls.

And so last week, which had been billed as a period of great decision for America, turned out to be nothing of the kind. The question at issue was a vital one, and a big one. Yet, in effect, the House had only to say whether curbs on prices, wages, rents, consumer credit and materials are necessary at this stage in the battle against world communism and domestic inflation. It has not said anything decisive yet, either way.

Hard as the debate has been to follow, what was going on in the lower Chamber last week was not shadow boxing. Both sides were in grim earnest. There has been no friendly give-and-take in the exchanges. Neither has there been any of the extreme name-calling that, in the past, has gone along with angry outbursts in many a debate on many a less important and controversial issue.

For behind all the politics, there was at issue a question which both sides knew to be debatable, a question on which sincere convictions may clash: Whether a democratic Nation, even in a period of emergency, however doubtful the prospect of genuine peace, should apply to itself the kind of economic tourniquets requested by the President.

TRADING TALK FOR TIME

This week begins with the legislators still trading talk for time. They will continue to pore over scores of proposed amendments, many of them reflecting other purposes from those specifically listed in the bill.

The situation is simply this: Opponents of control authority, a coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats, already have shown enough strength to wallop any of the antinflationary powers sought by the President—including some he got last fall without asking. Several important provisions of the big bill already have been knocked down. Appeals or warnings from outside the congressional ring have had next to no effect. The antiadministration forces have been in a position since Tuesday to pass precisely the control bill they want—or none at all.

And yet they have seemed in no hurry to wind up the fight. They moved slowly in aiming a body blow at the prime target of price roll-backs. They are weaving cautiously in weighing the advantages or disadvantages of the several courses open to those in the driver's seat. Should they knock out the entire law? Or perhaps just soften

up the bill, so that it may still stand above the weakened measure by the Senate 2 weeks ago? Or should they simply come out with a bill battered beyond recognition except for a technically existing title?

Neither side has been in a hurry to take the bull by the horns. Why?

TO HIM WHO WAITS

Speaker RAYBURN, who usually has a pretty fair idea what he is talking about came up with what probably is the shortest and soundest answer to this question. Each side, he said, apparently thinks time is on its side.

In this explanation, Mr. RAYBURN might merely have been proceeding on the assumption that there is some truth to what each side is saying about the other's motives.

The Republicans, that is, say administration Democrats are looking longingly, but in vain, for the postman and the telegraph messenger to haul in huge stacks of demands from outraged constituents demanding that their Congressmen vote for firm authority to hold the price line.

Administration members, on the other hand, say Republicans and southern Democrats bank on a Korean truce that would wipe out whatever demand still exists for strong economic controls.

The Democrats also say the Republicans plan a slow-down that will prevent any sort of Senate-House conference bill from reaching the White House until late this month. The point here is that the Defense Production Act which was to have expired June 30, got a last-minute reprieve until July 31, with prohibitions on price roll-backs during that period.

A take-it-or-leave-it bill presumably would present President Truman with the unpleasant choice of signing a bill of which he disapproves or vetoing it and leaving the country without any controls law or defense production authority.

Basically, the contention of the antiadministration coalition is that Mr. Truman really is after more power, not just some temporary economic controls. The basic contention of the administration is that the people need and want to have their economic life controlled in this period of emergency.

HOW DOES JOHN FEEL?

The House of Representatives, theoretically at least, is the legislative branch where Members are closest to the people. Congressmen run for reelection every 2 years. It may be assumed they are not deliberately unresponsive to what they believe to be the wishes of their constituents. Back of the varied moods, arguments, actions, and inactions of the 435 House Members last week, there were a variety of theories about the reaction of John Q. Public to the problem of economic controls.

Here are some of them:

1. John is apathetic about the whole matter. For all the public clamor, he hasn't really been hurt by inflation so far, and he isn't convinced that the worst necessarily is yet to come. He may talk a lot about how high prices are, and how something ought to be done about it—but he's actually rather relieved when nothing is done about it. He isn't prepared, in other words, to buckle down to business for the long, serious pull.

2. John is hopelessly confused about the whole question of the need for controls. Day after day, from left and right, he is assailed by expert assurances that the country is going to run on the rocks unless controls are instituted—and equally expert assurances that nothing can do it more harm than the establishment or continuance of controls. He is unable to follow the technicalities of the argument. He does not even know whether those controls the administration al-

ready has have been handled effectively so far.

3. John hasn't had a real, across-the-counter chance to see that, despite the still-high prices of many items, the upward price swing of many other items has been checked by present controls.

4. John is fed up with controls. He is constitutionally allergic to them, and as long as his leaders give him any choice in the matter he would rather take his chances on a free-wheeling approach to the Nation's economic problems.

5. John really dreads the day when price ceilings may be removed in an atmosphere of increasing cutbacks in civilian goods as defense production speeds ahead. He assumes—often wrongly—that most Congressmen pay attention to everybody except the "unorganized consumer."

If the House only knew which one of these is a picture of the real John, it presumably would have no difficulty in disposing of the controls bill with dispatch. Meanwhile, however, one thing remains perfectly clear. No one person, event, hope, motive, fear, political consideration, or economic theory is to blame for the legislators' apparent inability, displayed last week, to come to grips with the Nation's economic problems.

A great many factors, rather, all rolled together, have been enough to discourage the House Members from staying up until 4 o'clock some morning, as the Senate did, to whip through a bill. Those factors add up to a feeling of uncertainty on the Hill—a feeling, perhaps, that this is a decision which can look sweet in the making and turn sour overnight. The chances are too great for comfort that today's verdict might be snapped back at the politicians by some sudden turn in the course of human, domestic, or international events.

There could be not the slightest doubt that the House Members, even while they frittered away the hours, knew they were engaged in a debate likely, in its outcome, to influence the course of American history for some time to come. It could not be said they showed signs of not caring about the business in hand.

EVERYBODY'S IN THE ACT

At the beginning of every day's session last week no fewer than 375 and sometimes as many as 395 of the Members answered the opening quorum call. On only one important amendment did the total vote fall below 300. And as for 5-minute speeches, they must have set something of a record.

Administration forces won a limited and short-lived victory in a skirmish last Monday. Representative Wolcott, Republican, of Michigan, urged unsuccessfully that direct controls not be applied unless the Federal Reserve Board and the Secretary of the Treasury used "traditional, orthodox methods" such as raising discount rates, increasing bank reserves, and stopping Government buying to support Government bond markets.

Democrats jumped on the proposal by citing everything from history to horse meat. One Member predicted that if the Wolcott amendment were adopted, this Congress would become known to posterity as "the Congress that put the old gray mare on the family dinner table."

The ease with which Democratic lines turned back the opening-day tide brought premature predictions by some leaders that the principle of direct controls had been saved.

On Tuesday, however, the coalition of Republicans and Democrats at the southern end of the Capitol went into action. King Canute himself, had he been present and duly recorded, could not have stopped the tide. The sight of southern Democrats and farm-State Members streaming up the center aisle to be counted with the Republicans must haunt the week-end dreams of those

inclined to believe that the administration eventually will wind up with the sort of controls authority it wants.

In a fine display of pertinency, the coalition put across an amendment barring until June 30, 1953, foreign imports of fats, oils, butter, cheese and dairy products, and peanuts and rice where such imports would compete unduly with domestic production. It also pushed through an amendment banning restrictions on the quantity of livestock that may be slaughtered.

On Wednesday the coalition was obviously licking its uncontrolled chops, and the blow seemed ready to fall at any moment. But suddenly the debate swung to a sectional issue, arousing another form of coalition. Republicans and northern Democrats beat down a proposal to give the President (who hadn't asked for it) permission to disperse new Government-financed defense plants in nonindustrial areas.

WAITING FOR THE WORST

Administration Democrats, still remembering Tuesday's pounding, hung on for dear life awaiting the worst. A no-compromise decree came from Representative COOLEY, Democratic chairman of the Agriculture Committee and a main promoter of the thumbs-down policy on roll-backs on farm products in particular and other commodities in general.

On Thursday the roof almost fell in again on the administration. The only visible relief was that the price-ceiling amendments had not yet been introduced—and that votes limiting the President's authority were by somewhat narrower margins than the one that had banned livestock-slaughtering quotas. Those amendments would take away the authority of the President to acquire and operate defense plants and to pay subsidies on farm products.

Friday the 13 was as unlucky as ever for administration hopes. Banking Committee Chairman SPENCE, venerable Democratic Kentucky lawyer, who looks like a banker, and Representative MULTER, New York, Democrat, whose round-up effort for beef price roll-backs earned him the nickname "Brooklyn Cowboy," lost again. The House adopted an amendment to deny the President authority to create new Government corporations.

The fog lifted long enough to disclose that the House has almost reached the bill's price stabilization sections. That could open the way for action beginning tomorrow on proposed crucial changes to ban roll-backs on food and farm prices, nullify previous roll-back orders, and prohibit future roll-backs on industrial prices.

Speaker RAYBURN forecast a final vote by late Wednesday. He didn't say positively.

President Truman said he had done all he could to get real a controls bill through; that Congress would have to take the responsibility from here on in. Representative TABER, of New York, a GOP fiscal spokesman, retorted: "Until the President realizes he has responsibilities, there will be no controls bill."

So it went. Meanwhile, with voters watching on the sidelines, both sides clearly are mindful of the risks they are running.

The Republicans and their allies risk scuttling the controls bill and then having the economic situation grow worse. Because of their strength, their risk seems at the moment to be the greater of the two. But the Democratic faithfuls run their own risk—that of pushing for controls against a possibly antagonistic public opinion which, in 1952, might side with a do-nothing Eighty-second Congress, instead of with a whistle-stopping President.

The key man, as always, was the imponderable voter, John Q.—for question mark—himself. What did he want? He might know. But he was not talking loud enough for the men on the Hill to hear.

Injustices in Reserve Call-Ups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Star of July 15, 1951:

HOUSE UNIT CONDEMNS INJUSTICES IN RESERVE CALL-UPS SINCE KOREA—REPORT SAYS GRANDFATHERS WERE TAKEN IN RUSH, ASKS RECTIFICATION OF ERRORS

A special House Armed Services Subcommittee yesterday lambasted the Armed Forces for injustices it found in the call-up of reserves since Korea.

It said even grandfathers were called to arms in a hasty rush that results in broken homes, lost business, resentment, and bitterness.

In a sharply worded report, the subcommittee said partial rectification can be made by releasing as early as possible all reservists now on active duty involuntarily.

This subcommittee, headed by Representative BROOKS, Democrat of Louisiana, has been investigating the entire reserve program preliminary to hearings on a new proposed reserve law.

WANTS ERROR CORRECTED

Mr. BROOKS said a new reserve program must be set up and managed so that what he called the recent errors and injustices will not again be visited on American citizens.

In the rush to build up strength to meet the Communist aggression, the committee said in its report, grandfathers in the inactive reserve were called up while youngsters in the Organized Reserve were left at home.

"Enlisted men with multiple dependents—one with 10 children—were involuntarily ordered to duty while single men remained behind because of their membership in an organized unit.

"Reservists were picked out of college and ordered to report for active duty in a matter of days while their draft-protected non-veteran schoolmates continued to safely lounge on the campus."

SHOULDN'T HAVE BEEN CALLED

Many inactive reservists, employed in essential industries, were called up when they should have been kept in their jobs, the report continued.

The subcommittee said it was understandable that the Armed Forces were in a hurry. There was a pressing need for individual men and officers to fill out regular units.

As a result many inactive reservists were called up before the Organized Reserve organization, such as the National Guard, although there had been a general belief that the Organized Reserve would be called first and the Inactive Reserve only as a last resort.

The report pointed out that as of April 1 there was a total of 650,212 enlisted men. The number of Reserves now on duty represents 24 percent of the total Reserve strength.

MUST DEPEND ON REPLACEMENTS

The subcommittee, while urging rapid release of men called up against their will, said it recognized the discharge must depend on replacements.

Recently all the military services have announced release plans for some reservists and

the subcommittee said it intended to watch the program closely.

"The military services should treat these schedules as contracts and every effort should be made to keep the terms of the proposed release," the report said.

The subcommittee found much fault with the services for not keeping up-to-date records on Reserves to show whether a man, when called, could serve without undue hardship.

More fundamental, it said, was failure of the military leaders to provide a better way to deal with the contingency of a partial mobilization such as that undertaken when the Korean conflict came.

No Federal Ban on Gas Space Heating Is Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the public desire and need for natural gas—the only fuel that has reduced living costs in the American home—is now being threatened by a very broad and Nationwide arbitrary order proposed by the Petroleum Administration for Defense for issuance within the next few days. Provision is made in the proposed order for exemptions, if initiated by utilities, where gas supplies are adequate. However, it seems obvious that in many such areas the utility concerned will not apply for exemption because of practical considerations even though the gas supply in that area is adequate.

Such drastic action would seriously affect an estimated 50,000 dealers and installers of gas space equipment and approximately 300,000 workers for dealers and manufacturers. The financial losses inherent in such an action are estimated conservatively to exceed \$100,000,000, involving not only industrial organizations but banks as well.

The problem is not the supply of gas reserves, but a problem of gas usage and distribution.

Obviously the real answer to the gas-supply problem for certain areas is the availability of additional steel pipe for transmission lines. But just as obviously, this problem cannot be solved by any order of the Interior Department.

The matter of distribution and restriction of gas usage has been a matter handled by State regulatory bodies, coordinating their activities with the Federal Power Commission.

Why should this satisfactory arrangement be changed and the Federal Government be allowed to usurp State powers?

Is the real purpose just regulation as such?

When the Federal Power Commission has authorized gas-distribution lines in the interest of the public, and gas companies have established rates and publicized their program, and when the pub-

lic, including the manufacturers, distributors, and dealers in gas-heating equipment have acted on this condition, it seems inconceivable that a temporary agency such as the PAD should be allowed to overrule experienced and informed permanent organizations dealing with the industry.

Recently Tennessee Valley Authority officials testified before the Federal Power Commission that 90,000,000 cubic feet of natural gas per day would be needed from Tennessee Gas Transmission Corp. for use at a new steam-generating plant at Johnsville, Tenn.

TVA is in the heart of the waterpower and coal areas. Is it in the public interest to consume tremendous quantities of natural gas—one of this country's most valuable natural resources—for such purposes when other fuels can be utilized more efficiently for this purpose than they can be for heating a great number of individual homes where natural gas is the logical fuel?

Why should the basic public-utility concept of serving more people who desire such service at lower cost be sacrificed without any corresponding public benefit?

Why should the relatively small amounts of gas used for actual heat-treating and process work in connection with defense production be used as an excuse for such an order?

It has been publicly announced that the principal reason for the proposed order is that one gas-distribution system is going to be short on gas this winter. No one has yet explained why this condition exists.

If this company's lines were authorized by the Federal Power Commission and the gas was properly distributed by the distributing company, why does this condition exist?

Who is really at fault?

Why should the whole country be made to suffer for one such case?

As recently stated in *Business Week*, "What's eating Interior? There was plenty of speculation this week as to why Interior was playing so rough, but no solid answers. Some thought that the long and bitter jurisdictional disputes between FPC and Interior may be involved."

In view of these facts is a Federal ban on gas space heating by the PAD really necessary?

Relief Chiseling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, since the Senate-House conferees have eliminated the Jenner amendment from the original conferees report on the Labor and Federal Security Administration appropriations bill, it seems their attention should be called to the fact that welfare chiseling is not a problem alone in Indi-

ana. Unfortunately the effects of this relief chiseling are depriving worthy recipients of a fair payment based on today's cost of living. That this abuse does exist elsewhere than Indiana is suggested by the letter from Mr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones, editor of the *Tulsa Tribune*, which under unanimous consent I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the editorial in the *Tulsa Tribune* to which he refers:

THE TULSA TRIBUNE,
Tulsa, Okla., July 11, 1951

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWNSON: I have read with interest an account of your efforts to get a bill that would repeal a Federal restriction on the use or disclosure of information about persons receiving relief benefits. You are indeed right in your stand, and if this battle is not won we will be engulfed with an army of relief racketeers. I am enclosing an editorial that I wrote for our today's issue before I read the story concerning you.

We conducted an exposé of aid to dependent children racketeers in *Tulsa* last winter; and the reporter who did the job, Paul Molloy, has had an article on this subject accepted by the *Saturday Evening Post*. You might ask your staff to keep an eye out for it when it appears within the next 6 weeks, for I think it would give you some valuable ammunition.

Very truly yours,

JENKIN LLOYD JONES,
Editor.

HIDING THE RACKETEERS

Speakers at a convention of social workers in Oklahoma City this week attacked newspapers, like the *Tribune*, that have exposed racketeers among those who receive Federal aid to dependent children.

The *Tribune*, in a survey of conditions in *Tulsa* last spring, brought to light dozens of cases of women, some of them prostitutes, who were making a good thing of bringing illegitimate children into the world to be supported by the taxpayers. Our reporter found repeated cases of children being brought up in squalid, riotous, and immoral surroundings. Case workers were doing nothing about these conditions. And the list of those receiving aid was so well hidden the *Tribune* had to get it from independent sources.

Mrs. Val M. Keating, regional representative of the dependent children aid program, denied that the fund encourages illegitimacy, divorce, desertion, and continued dependency on public funds. Presumably she means that case workers will not permit such conditions to exist. How does she explain what we found in *Tulsa*?

Carl Schmidt, executive secretary of the Illinois Public Aid Commission, attacked the growing move to make public the names of those who are receiving relief funds. He denied it would remove chiselers, but said it would hurt the truly needy most. And Miss Loula Dunn, director of the American Public Welfare Association, said, "Publication could be used for pressure purposes, for political campaigns, and other purposes."

We're getting a little tired of these arguments that tell us we must put our trust in the bureaucrats. We are told we must let them hide the names of those receiving our funds on the theory that the people getting our money have a right to conceal this fact from us, and that if we knew the truth they would be unduly and cruelly embarrassed. What balderdash. Suppose the bureaucrats are inefficient or crooked. Under this system of secrecy who sees to it that families which could care for their own are not dipping into the public till? Other bureaucrats

We can check up on the governor or the mayor, or the fire chief. These people have to tell us what they did with our money. But when it comes to relief funds we are supposed to trust implicitly in the welfare workers. Has there ever been a case where public servants were able to hide the disposition of their funds that a general condition of inefficiency or corruption didn't take over?

And this business about protecting the aid receivers from exploitation by the politicians—that's the biggest laugh. The public officeholders can get at these rolls, although the taxpayers can't. The politicians can make neat little lists of grateful aid-getters. With proper connections they can get friends and supporters on the rolls. The bigger the rolls the more people will be beholden to the politician and the more case workers can be hired to supervise the load. But the taxpayers must never know if the drunken harridan down the street is getting public assistance so her ragged illegitimate children can enjoy their homelife, or if the family with the two television sets, a deepfreeze and a Buick are riding on the gravy train.

Until we can reestablish the principle in this country that no person who is unwilling to be known has a right to put his hand in the public treasury our relief load will grow and abuses will multiply. It is a fundamental principle, and one that must be won over the combined opposition of the politicians, the social workers, and the racketeers.

MacArthur, the People's Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 6, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial that appeared in *Collier's* magazine on June 30, 1951. It relates to General MacArthur and points out very clearly that the general has grown in stature and favor with the American people.

The editorial is as follows:

TAKE A CLEAR LOOK, THEN LISTEN

As a result of Mr. Truman's most controversial decision in his 6 years as President, Gen. Douglas MacArthur has finally emerged before his countrymen as a flesh-and-blood human being. From the start of the war with Japan until his return 2 months ago he had been a shadowy, frequently distorted, and almost legendary figure to most of us. He was a hero, a scapegoat, and a political football. He was quoted, misquoted, and tirelessly analyzed and interpreted by the press.

Perhaps circumstances made all this inevitable. But the general's home-coming, his speech before Congress, and his testimony in the senatorial hearings on foreign policy should have put the whole complicated matter in a better perspective. The extraordinary thing is that they did not. A great many Americans, including influential Government officials and influential writers, seem unwilling or unable to give up their preconceptions. MacArthur the man has been eclipsed by his own shadow.

What the general has said since his return makes it quite impossible for him to be all the things that he is credited with being. He has a policy, whether you agree with it or

not, and he stated it clearly. As a witness before the Senate committees he was composed, lucid, and readily articulate—at least that is the impression given by the bare transcript of the secret proceedings. His 3 days of testimony were a remarkable demonstration of physical and mental vigor in a man of 71. And at the end of those 3 days he had told the world unmistakably where he stood.

He spoke with legitimate authority on matters of which he has intimate knowledge, such as the Korean war and the Far East. But he carefully separated his expert conclusions from his layman's views on conditions in other areas where his knowledge is less direct and precise. He did not present himself as omniscient or omnipotent, as some of his adulators would make him seem. Nor did he do or say anything to justify the New York Post's intemperate editorial description of him as "a desperate, demagogic Republican politician fighting a dirty political war." He gave, it seems to us, as clear-cut and logical a presentation of his side of the vastly complex argument as was possible. Yet the emotion-charged prejudices on both sides were such that the reactions to his testimony resembled nothing so much as the fable of the blind men who, after a limited manual examination of the same elephant, gave their highly divergent descriptions of the beast.

We do not, of course, quarrel with anyone's right to criticize General MacArthur honestly, or honestly to defend him—though we suspect that in the end he will be more hurt by some of his friends than by his enemies. We did not question—nor did General MacArthur—Mr. Truman's right to relieve him of his United Nations command and his administrative post in Japan. We do question his judgment.

Secretary Marshall and General Bradley had built up a detailed and elaborate case for Mr. Truman's judgment in their Senate committee testimony. But Mr. Truman's own later statements indicated that, so far as he was concerned, the main points in the Marshall-Bradley argument were afterthoughts. What first gave him the idea of dismissing General MacArthur, he said, was the general's public statement opposing the sunder of Formosa to the Chinese Reds. (The very same view for which Mr. Truman wanted to dismiss the general is now, of course, administration policy.) And as for the President's methods of dismissal, his summary firing of the commander, in view of General MacArthur's distinguished record, was deplorably rude.

But the general's disagreement with the administration is past history. Obviously the all-important thing now is the underlying difference in policy. For that reason it is necessary for the public and the press to receive the general's views with the same candor that he showed in presenting them, and to make a calm and intelligent attempt to understand his reasons.

This department at least has read the general's statements calmly. It has tried to read them intelligently. And it seems to us that the disagreement boils down to this: The administration believes that the U. N.'s exertion of any greater force in Korea than is being used at present would provoke the Soviet Union into starting a world war; General MacArthur believes that the U. N.'s failure to utilize fully the strength it has at hand is a sign of weakness which plays into Soviet hands and encourages the Reds to further depredations. No one outside the Communist hierarchy knows which is the correct estimate.

We do not say that the general hasn't made mistakes. There may be ambiguities in his position—though fewer, we feel, than in the administration's position. And we also feel that the administration has made

and encouraged charges against the general that are not only unfair but untrue.

General MacArthur has been damned as a warmonger for wanting to use some of Chiang Kai-shek's troops in the Korean war, for wanting to bomb the enemy's bases in Manchuria, and for wanting to blockade China. But now increased aid to Chiang, possible bombing of Manchurian bases, and banning of war-usable exports to Red China are explicit in our Government's policy. Will these actions be any more or less provocative of war because General MacArthur will have no hand in planning them or carrying them out?

This magazine believes that it is more than coincidence that moves suggested by the dismissed general have now been made. It believes that in spite of the hampering atmosphere of emotion, in spite of the powerful effort by the administration and its army of press agents to discredit him, he is having a healthy influence on American foreign policy. Douglas MacArthur has shown himself to be a remarkably honest and intelligent person, and a surprisingly simple and unaffected human being. He has something of value to say to America. It is time that his countrymen forgot MacArthur the legend, took note of MacArthur the man, and listened.

The Challenge We Face

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL M. HARDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the text of an Independence Day address, *The Challenge We Face*, delivered before an Independence Day celebration at Veedersburg, Ind., July 4, 1951:

THE CHALLENGE WE FACE

Friends, we gather here today, here in the heart of the greatest Nation on earth to pay tribute to a hardy band of men who 175 years ago brought into being the American Declaration of Independence.

Today, of course, those men are gone, but the Declaration of Independence still stands, a shining beacon to oppressed peoples throughout the length and breadth of the world.

With you, my friends and neighbors, I should like to briefly discuss this afternoon the manner in which we have lived up to the principles set forth in the declaration which we honor each year at this time. I shall not do so in a partisan manner, for this is not the time for partisan talk.

I shall take as my text excerpts from the writing of Thomas Jefferson, father of the Declaration of Independence, and we shall then be able to judge, perhaps, whether we have lived up as a nation to the mighty principles to which Jefferson and his colleagues affixed their signatures 175 years ago.

Now, a century and three-quarters is no great span of time, as the life of nations is measured. Rome lasted 1,000 years. Athens, the first democracy, survived for five centuries. No; we are still a young Nation, as nations go, and the great American experiment initiated by Jefferson in 1776 is still, relatively speaking, a new experiment in self-government.

Yet, in these 175 years, history has recorded the growth of the physical America

from a community of some 3,000,000 persons to a great world power, the home of more than 150,000,000 people—the goal, we must realize, of hundreds of millions more of the world's peoples in less fortunate circumstances.

History has moved at a faster pace during the past two centuries than in previous times. At no known period has science advanced at such a rapid rate. The hardships of the Jefferson period are practically unknown in modern America, just as the luxuries we view so lightly today could hardly have been foreseen even by a mind so great as that of Thomas Jefferson.

Yet, while it may well have been impossible for Jefferson to have foreseen the marvels which science and technological progress would bring to the America of 1951, he did foresee the pitfalls we might be unable to avoid in our guardianship of the Declaration of Independence. For this what he said as he looked into the future 175 years ago.

"We are able to preserve our self-government if we will but think so."

He might well have added that we will preserve our self-government if we are sufficiently interested in doing so. But are we that interested?

As a Member of Congress, I am of course vitally interested in this question. But, I am likewise interested as an American citizen, just as each and every one of you in this audience is also interested.

The main weapon that you and I have in the ever-present battle to retain the freedoms awarded us by the Declaration of Independence is the right of the ballot box—the right to vote. Indeed, surveys taken by Dr. Elmo Roper indicate that the American people cherish the right to vote above all other freedoms.

Yet it is a shocking commentary on the zealotness with which we guard our independence that only 44 out of every 100 adult American citizens take the trouble to vote in our elections. Fifty-six Americans out of every 100 traditionally do not bother.

And what of our young people? How have we fared as parents and grandparents in imbuing them with the traditions of the Declaration of Independence? Possibly the answer may be found in the fact that of all American men and women between the ages of 21 and 34, only 4 out of every 10 have voted at least once during the past 4 years.

These, my friends, are startling figures, for they show as nothing else can show the dismaying lack of interest among our people in preserving the very freedoms which have made this land of ours the symbol of hope for a suffering world.

The cause in 1776 was freedom—not this or that freedom, not 4 or 50 separate fractions of freedom, but the essential, indivisible thing itself. Freedom, the freedom we gained in 1776, is not a divisible thing. It cannot be broken up into catch-all political phrases. It is a positive thing, this freedom of ours, and it is designed for positive uses.

The goals of 1776, independence and freedom, have become somewhat obscured in recent years. I doubt that Thomas Jefferson would find in the America of today the spirit which was abroad in the land 175 years ago.

Today too many of us are more interested in security than in freedom and the two are not interchangeable words. The true lover of freedom actually scorns security. He does not seek protection, he seeks only opportunity, the freedom to do as he pleases within the moral code which governs all of us.

This, my friends, this freedom seeker, was the American who made our land the greatest in all the world. This was the pioneer who opened up the West. He did not go west in search of security, not at all. Instead, he gave up security which he had at hand in the settled eastern section of

America because, in the true tradition of the Declaration of Independence, he sought more and ever more freedom and he turned to the unexploited western plains for a better area in which to find that freedom.

Jefferson said, and I quote:

"I would rather be exposed to the inconveniences attending too much liberty than to those attending too small a degree of it."

We should pause and study today the lessons in that brief quotation.

The authors of the Declaration of Independence hoped they were establishing here in the new world a community in which freedom would remain uppermost in the public mind for all time. But they realized with Jefferson that constant vigilance would be necessary if the freedoms would be preserved.

Writing in his commonplace book, Jefferson quoted an old Roman epigram: "The more laws, the worse the republic."

The Romans found from bitter experience the truth in that age-old epigram as they vainly endeavored to offset corruption at home by conquest abroad. The Roman Republic fell, my friends, in spite of numberless statutes designed to control prices, provide public employment, supply meal tickets, develop backward areas and, in general, provide both bread and circuses for everyone.

Then, when the Roman senate tried to call a halt by refusing to add more and more laws, it was denounced by power-drunk emperors as a "do nothing" body. Finally, the whole top-heavy imperial structure collapsed under pressure from barbarians who had no laws and no interest whatsoever in social security.

The guilt is not all on a single group of people. All of us have failed to a degree, and the extent of the degree is the measure of our shame.

Less than half our people, as I pointed out a few moments ago, are sufficiently interested in what is happening to American freedom to do anything about it. As a matter of fact, the figure is even less, for reputable analysts maintain only one out of four adult American citizens lists himself as being actively interested in politics, which is the science and art of government.

In 1776 Thomas Jefferson warned that no country can preserve its liberty if its rulers are not warned from time to time that the people preserve the spirit of resistance.

The spirit of resistance, I fear, does not flame very hot in the breasts of the America of today, for how else can we explain the missing 53,000,000 American citizens who failed to participate in the last presidential election.

We have come a long way since 1776. We have multiplied our population 50 times over. But have our problems basically changed? Has our goal changed with our physical growth with the passing of 175 years?

In 1776, the goal was freedom and independence.

Is it any different today? No, it is not. For America once again is engaged in that same struggle. Only the scene and the methods have shifted. The goal remains the same.

During the lifetime of most of us here in this auditorium two great wars have seared the world. Many of you in this audience were very close to those wars and I need not emphasize to you the horror, the suffering, the devastation and, in the end, the seeming futility of those tragic encounters.

Millions were killed, millions wounded. The whole world today still bears those scars, still hears the echoes of destruction.

We thought, you and I, that war had reached its peak in the dark days of 1917 and 1918. And we thought, too, that the First World War was a war to end all wars.

We believed that, you and I, and we prayed that our belief would be borne out. For we were fighting for freedom, just as the revolutionists had fought for freedom a century and three quarters ago.

Then came 1939 and the rumblings of war again were heard across the seas.

1940 and the phony war, and then, in early winter, 1941, we knew at last how wrong we were in believing that the war to end all wars had been concluded in 1918.

We found to our dismay that war, 1940 style, was far more horrible, far more devastating, and then, in the dying days of World War II, a new weapon of unbelievable horror was unleashed. We dropped the first atomic bomb.

Hiroshima, a city the size of Indianapolis, almost ceased to exist. Nagasaki was next and but for the surrender of the enemy there would have been more.

Thus ended the second war to end all wars. We are not well into the first decade of time following the termination of that war.

Are we also, my friends, in the first decade of preparation for the next world conflict?

America is today engaged in the greatest armament race of all time. Our ally of World War II is openly described as our opponent in the world war of the future.

The world has been divided into two parts, one American and free, the other Russian and slave.

The present situation we see described as a cold war. Yet, America has suffered nearly 150,000 casualties on the battlefields of Korea, 8,000 miles distant from this community.

The Korean conflict, so we are told by Mr. Truman, is a United Nations police action.

Yet thousands of American boys are dead, thousands are missing in action, and probably dead. Three hundred thousand more of our sons man the battle lines while the diplomats seek a means of ending this war, which is not a war.

How are we faring in this new challenge to our freedom, this new threat to our independence?

We handed China, with its 400,000,000 inhabitants, to Russian communism. Eastern Europe is in the hands of the Soviet.

Today we discuss peace for Korea, and we discuss that peace on Russian terms. In the Middle East, Iran is on fire.

Communist fifth-columns are at work throughout the world, and their successes outnumber their failures.

Our leaders tell us a war is still 2, 3, 5, 10, perhaps 20 years in the future. The estimates vary but there are few who tell us war is not coming soon.

The only disagreement is to the timing.

So we must be prepared. We must have atom bombs and hydrogen bombs, guided missiles and bacteria, napalm bombs and radar nets, and, of course, planes and ships, tanks and guns, the backbone of military power.

You do not have to go far distant from Veedersburg, Ind., to see what is going on with your own eyes. Witness the smoke belching from the defense plants in Indianapolis. Drive down to Vermillion County where 3,500 laborers are completing a \$50,000,000 plant for the Atomic Energy Commission. No; you need not go far. The signs of war and preparation for war are everywhere.

Is a third world war inevitable? Must it come? Is Korea just the first spark which will set off world holocaust?

I do not think so.

I cannot bring myself to believe that world conflict is inevitable, that it must, of necessity, come in our time or any other time. I think there must be a way out.

I say to you that there has to be a way out, for this tired old world, battered and bruised from the effects of the last two

struggles, cannot stand another and infinitely more horrible disaster.

This is the issue which we face as freedom fighters on Independence Day, 1951. We must prevent world war III.

Not at the cost of our freedom, no, for we value freedom above all else.

But, my friends, I do not see how we could possibly wage a world-wide war—even though we should win it as I believe we would—and preserve our freedom in the winning.

So we must win the battle for peace, for in so doing we can also preserve for ourselves the freedoms handed down to us in the Declaration of Independence 175 years ago.

We have some weapons at hand. The cause of world peace is not a hopeless one.

First, we must bring the conflict in Korea to a close, and on our own terms, not on the terms laid down by Jacob Malik or Joseph Stalin.

This is essential, for we must snuff out the spark of world war III before the fire gets out of control.

Second, we must preserve our national solvency by getting our financial affairs in order, and we cannot accomplish this if we do not cut out the red-ink spending in Washington.

Third, we must retain our free enterprise form of Government and stop the socialistic experimentation. We need watch our step. Freedom lightly held is easily lost.

Remember, we won World Wars I and II because, as a free Nation, we were economically much stronger than the controlled economies of our opponents. The production power of American free enterprise is the greatest single deterrent to Russian plans for conquest. Let us keep it so.

The fourth and final necessity, to me at least, is that we have a spiritual reawakening in this Nation.

We need to reaffirm our christianity. We need to get closer to God. For if the world ever needed God and His teachings, we need them now.

These, then, are the ingredients of a real American program for winning the peace and preserving our freedom.

Please let us pray:

Our Heavenly Father, we humbly beseech Thy guidance on this Independence Day, 1951. Give us the courage and the strength which you bestowed upon our heroic forebears 175 years ago, that we may preserve for our children and all the children of our future the way of life which they established for us. And give us, too, the wisdom we so sorely need to settle our problems without recourse to war and carnage. And above all, give to us renewed appreciation of Thy holy teachings, that we may be better prepared to meet and solve those problems in the days ahead. We ask these things in the Name of our Lord, Christ Jesus. Amen.

Resolution of Jimmie Harris Post, VFW

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, a resolution has been adopted by Jimmie Harris Post, No. 6837, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Boaz, Ala., which post was named for one of the Korean casualties who received many honors in giving his life for his country.

This resolution will be of interest to the Members of Congress, in view of the fine attitude of this organization, and I recommend it for your reading:

Our Nation is facing the greatest crisis in its history. Never before has the future seemed more uncertain; never before have the people been more confused in their plans and proposals to meet the critical problems that confront us. Never before have we experienced such an anomaly in our foreign relations. We have never before been called upon to fight an undeclared war on foreign soil.

While the conditions we face are unprecedented, the issues before us have never been clarified—at least not to the satisfaction of those whose lives and destinies are most affected by them.

It is therefore only natural in such unparalleled circumstances for men to be honestly divided in their opinions. While such a diversity of opinions and such conflicting philosophies may, in normal times, be only the growing pains of healthy progress in a vigorous democracy, they could easily prove to be the means of our undoing in times of great tensions and stress. Violent clashes of political opinion in these disturbing and unprecedented times can only result in lending aid and comfort to the enemies of our free way of life; Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Jimmie Harris Post of the Veterans of Foreign Wars call upon all patriotic Americans to rally to the support of our national administration at this time and lend such sympathy and encouragement to President Truman as is in our power to do, as individuals and as groups; be it further

Resolved, That the national organization of Veterans of Foreign Wars be requested to draft a similar resolution and give it such implementation as its officers deem wise or feasible.

T. G. THOMPSON,
Commander.

Price-Control Power Only Part of Demands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, despite the lengthy, well-publicized, and still continuing debate in Congress and in various public forums over administration proposals for extension and amendment of the Defense Production Act, I question whether there is, even now, a full understanding of the scope and character of the powers being sought by the President.

I suspect that there is still a widely prevailing impression that the proposed legislation is designed primarily to continue the authority to place ceilings on prices and wages. That is part of the program, of course. As I have frequently pointed out, even this phase of the proposals is open to grave criticism, on at least two counts: It represents an attack on the symptoms of inflation, rather than on the causes. Furthermore, it involves the very dubious assumption that Government can set fair prices, in proper relationship to each other, for some

9,000,000 different price items in the Nation's economy, and that a governmental bureau can thereafter make adjustments in those prices as rapidly as overall economic changes occur.

But this is only one part of the program. Actually it represents only a minor part of the powers sought by the President. Let us look at some of the other features of the legislation for which Mr. Truman has asked.

There is the matter of the roll-back authority. A roll-back is a price-control order requiring that existing prices for a given article or product be reduced to a lower price of some past date. It was a power granted very sparingly and used in only a few instances under World War II price controls.

The roll-back which is currently causing the most controversy, of course, is on the price cattle raisers may charge packers. It should be noted, in this connection, that if the prices on cattle had been included in the general price freeze imposed last January, there wouldn't have been any excuse for a roll-back 4 months later. So a roll-back is itself a cover-up for a bureaucratic blunder.

The important point is that a roll-back in effect is an attempt to unscramble scrambled eggs. Serious injustices, to the point of driving a man out of business, are bound to result if you single out one commodity or product for a roll-back and do not, or cannot, also roll back the costs which go to make up the price of that commodity or product.

Thus, in the case of the cattlemen, they must either sell their cattle at a loss as a result of the price roll-back or they must sell them earlier than they normally would, in order to avoid the cumulative cost of continuing to feed the stock. The latter action, of course, cuts the amount of beef available to the consumer.

Added to this is the admission by both Agriculture Secretary Brannan and Economic Stabilizer Johnston that the meat packers, instead of the consuming public, will be the ones to benefit from the roll-back on cattle prices. It is estimated that the roll-back order "will dip into the cattlemen's pockets to the tune of \$75,000,000 to hand over to the packers." That, obviously, amounts to confiscation.

But entirely apart from the price control and roll-back powers sought by the President, the proposed legislation includes the power of the President to grant subsidies—something almost inevitable if there are to be roll-backs. That means a vast "pork barrel" opportunity for the administration. Remember Mr. Truman's 1950 campaign comment that farmers—beneficiaries of Federal subsidies—who did not vote for the administration "ought to have their heads examined"?

The proposed legislation also would give the President power to license every business in the United States—and the power to revoke such licenses. That would mean a complete, life-and-death power over all American business.

The proposed legislation also would give the President authority to construct Government-owned factories for making defense goods and power to acquire any

facility he felt necessary to national defense. That is power to nationalize American industry and business by Presidential order. That is socialism of an even more absolute and virulent type than exists in England.

Let there be no mistake about it. Nothing less than survival of our economic system, and with it our basic political liberties, is at stake in the proposals currently before Congress.

The Public Be Damned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of Sunday, July 15, 1951:

CONGRESS ABANDONS PUBLIC INTEREST BY
ABJECT SURRENDER TO LOBBIES

Congress, through its subservience to powerful pressure groups, is laying the groundwork for severe economic distress and industrial conflict. There seems to be little possibility that the development of these conditions can be avoided.

At every step of the way, President Truman's efforts to establish effective economic controls are being rebuffed. Meat-price roll-backs, which Mr. DiSalle considers as basic to the control of food prices, are accepted now as a dead letter. The farm and the cattle lobbies do not want them.

The apparent helplessness of the President with respect to this issue has been emphasized anew by House denial of the requested authority to build and operate defense plants and to use subsidies to hold down food prices. Congress, in fact, is disposed to give President Truman little or nothing with which to carry on the fight against a rampant inflation.

It is true that there are some Members of Congress who are aware of the dangers of the current trend. They are speaking and voting to bring it under control. But the dominant power is held by the same coalition of forces that is so consistently aligned against legislation designed in the public interest.

In the end, of course, there will be some sort of control law. But it will be a sham, without practical value, drawn with a view to the protection of certain interests. Meanwhile living costs will soar, as also will the costs of the armaments program.

Intimations of the industrial conflict which seems to be a logical consequence of the absence of adequate controls are to be found in the warning of James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO, that unions will not and cannot submit to wage ceilings without effective price controls.

Such an attitude was to be anticipated. Every consumer is aware of the truth of Economic Stabilizer Johnston's statement that the dollar is not worth much more now than half a dollar in terms of its 1939 value. Congress, too, should have knowledge of this decline, also a knowledge of the Marxist theory about the inevitable depression which will smash America.

But Congress, as the record shows, has other fish to fry and proceeds faithfully to serve the farm bloc, the cattle industry, the bankers, and other groups whose profits are at stake. It is still possible that the fight

for effective economic controls can be won. It cannot be won, however, unless the people at home, the masters of the ballot box, speak up in great numbers and in a loud voice.

Dan A. Kimball, an Able Secretary of the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the United States News and World Report concerning Dan A. Kimball, new Secretary of the Navy.

It pleased me to hear the announcement that Dan A. Kimball had been appointed Secretary of the Navy. He served an apprenticeship for the position as Assistant Secretary and Under Secretary. Those tours of duty proved conclusively that he was well qualified for the job of Secretary and on any basis of merit was entitled to it.

I am proud of the fact that Mr. Kimball and I are fellow Californians and fellow aviators of the First World War. But I am more proud of the fact that Mr. Kimball has shown in all his conduct in connection with the Navy that he is a fine executive. In all his conduct with the Navy he has not shown a single tinge of partisanship. He has handled his job with skill and understanding. He understands men and knows how to get along with his associates. That not only brings loyalty but excellent work from his subordinates. The Navy is lucky to have a man of Mr. Kimball's business attainments. He was eminently successful as a businessman and has carried those talents into his work in the Navy Department. He has no favors to dispense and no axes to grind. All he wants to do is to make the Navy the best instrument of defense that the money and men put at his disposition can build. Mr. Kimball does not know I am going to say these things and I hope he will not consider me presumptuous for doing so, as I mean every word I say.

The article follows:

DEFENSE BUYER

Dan A. Kimball has been named head of the revitalized United States Navy. He brings to the post a number of qualifications. He is a businessman of many years' experience. He is an aviator in his own right. He has been a leading figure in the development of rockets and jet engines. And he has been in the Navy Department since February 1949, as assistant secretary and under secretary.

A tremendous mass of detail wells up to the desk of a service secretary—papers to be signed, letters to be written, a multitude of personnel matters. Mr. Kimball, however, plans to devote the greatest part of his time to procurement questions.

Preparations and plans for possible fighting, he says, are the job of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations. But many requests and recommendations, particularly about equipment, come from the

military and must be screened at upper levels. All construction projects must have the Secretary's approval.

A recurrent problem is whether to delay construction of a ship or a plane, while new devices for it are perfected. But a time comes, Mr. Kimball believes, to freeze prototypes and get on with production. This question arose several times in connection with the Navy's new supercarrier which now is about to be built.

The Secretary deplors what he sees as a tendency among military men to buy equipment in quantities and store it away. The answer to preparedness, he says, lies not in building warehouses, but in building industrial capacity and having it ready to turn out military equipment when it is needed.

Mr. Kimball, 55, a comfortable, unexcitable giant of a man, is that occasional paradox, an industrialist who also is a good Democrat, supported Franklin D. Roosevelt throughout and believed all along that President Truman would win the election of 1948.

He was born in St. Louis but spent much of his adult life in California. In World War I, he was an Army Air Corps aviator and trained with the famous James H. Doolittle. They remain close friends. Until he entered the Navy Department, Mr. Kimball piloted his own private plane.

Shortly after World War I, he went to work for the General Tire & Rubber Co., of Akron, Ohio, and rose rapidly. For a long period, Mr. Kimball was in charge of the firm's business in 11 Western States. In 1944, the company made him executive head of its subsidiary, the Aerojet Engineering Corp. It was in this capacity that he learned about guided missiles and jet engines.

Mr. Kimball is companionable, a storyteller with a cigar usually in a corner of his mouth. He makes friends readily and keeps track of them. He has gotten on well with congressional committees, before which he makes frequent appearances.

Mr. Kimball also is on close terms with the other service Secretaries, Frank C. Pace, Jr., of the Army, and Thomas K. Finletter of the Air Force. They have an organization known as the Joint Secretaries which meets once or twice a week.

Like most men connected with the military departments, Mr. Kimball is worried lest a Korean truce be followed by a letdown in American military preparations. He holds to the view that peace is best assured by keeping the country strong. Preparedness costs many dollars, but, Mr. Kimball says, if we can stay out of war, that would be the cheapest investment we could have.

The Kremlin Retools Its Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Edward Crankshaw, the well-known English historian, appeared in yesterday's New York Times magazine. The excellent article is worthy of widespread attention.

THE KREMLIN RETOOLS ITS FOREIGN POLICY—
THE COLD WAR MAY BE RELAXED, BUT THE
SOVIET IS NOT ABANDONING BASIC HOSTILITY
TO THE WEST

(By Edward Crankshaw)

The Kremlin's move for peace in Korea is a sign that one phase of Soviet foreign policy is coming to an end. And this results not

from any change of heart—it has been forced upon the Kremlin by positive action on the part of the west.

We cannot tell precisely what has caused the Kremlin's change of front. All we know is that for a year Stalin has considered, on balance, that the Korean war served Soviet interests, and that he has now decided that it serves them no longer. It may be that China has refused to fight any longer without direct Soviet aid. The Kremlin, knowing that its direct intervention could only precipitate a world war, and having no desire at all to see American troops installed just across the Soviet frontier from Vladivostok, would, in that case, be acting reasonably in trying to establish an armistice along the thirty-eighth parallel. This would have to be seen as a purely tactical move. Or it may well be that the retreat in Korea is only the first move in a larger strategical maneuver.

We do not know which it is, or what caused the step. All we can know is that the Kremlin had two major aims in prolonging the Korean war: the first and obvious one was to drain away the strength of the west in general, and of America in particular, the second, and to my mind equally important aim, was to drain away the strength of Communist China—a strong and unified China standing on Russia's long and vulnerable Asiatic frontier being a standing nightmare of all Russian Governments. If the Kremlin could not even control a Communist Yugoslavia it must know perfectly well that it could not hope to control a Communist China, unified, ambitious, and xenophobic.

But instead of draining away the strength of the west, Korea has multiplied it alarmingly. What it has done to China, we do not know. However, it is a fairly safe bet that the arrangement whereby the Chinese fought while the Russians looked on could not last indefinitely without some friction between their Governments.

And so we in the west, given a moment's breathing space, are once again asking "What next? Is there any real chance of a lasting settlement with the Kremlin? Even if the Kremlin shows itself in an accommodating mood how far is it to be trusted?"

And, beyond these queries is the real question of our time: "Can we live at peace in the same world as Stalin's Russia without paying too high a price?"

The idea of a basic settlement is a contradiction of reality, it implies a static agreement; and the one thing we know about life is that it never stays still. There is only one way of achieving a basic settlement with a major power whose interests and ambitions conflict with our own, that is by conquest or submission, and history has shown that even resounding victories do not last forever, to say the least.

As to whether or not we can trust the Russians to keep any agreement that may be reached, this seems to me to be irrelevant. Trust, alas, is a word which is not found in the vocabulary of modern diplomacy. In dealings with a state which bases itself on an official creed denying morality and seeing the future in terms of predetermined conflict, its use is obviously misplaced. The most that can be expected vis-à-vis the Kremlin is an agreement based on mutual self-interest. The Kremlin would keep any agreement for as long as it thought it to be in its own interest to do so, which might conceivably be a very long time.

In a word, so long as the Soviet Government officially retains what it calls the Marxist-Leninist creed we must regard it as hostilely disposed toward ourselves. There is no escape from this. But it does not mean that we are bound to clash headlong in war. It means only that we have to be very careful. Presumably Stalin and his friends now find it in their interest to reduce the tension. With the end of the Korean war the time is most propitious for

a change of line. This is because there can be no more Koreans. The Kremlin must know very well that it cannot repeat the Korean tactic anywhere in the world without inviting a major war. Whether Stalin would like to fight or not, for some years to come the odds against him will be steadily and rapidly increasing. In other words, if ever there was a danger of Russian attack, which I myself have never believed, that danger has passed its peak.

It cannot recur until either the free economy of the west collapses under its own weight and creates conditions for the spread of native communism, or until the Kremlin has succeeded in reorganizing the whole basis of Soviet economy to support a modern industrialized community at a reasonable level of life and thus put Russia into a position to catch up with the west and ultimately outstrip it.

Since 1947 the Soviet economy has been harnessed to cold war, for which the Russian people have had to pay in their daily lives. The cold war may be seen as a gamble which has not come off. By ruthlessly subordinating civilian to military needs the Kremlin hoped to maintain the commanding position of the Soviet Union, making no concessions, until such time as the natural flaws of the capitalist economy, aggravated and exploited by Soviet threats and maneuvers, should result in the impoverishment of the west and fatal discord between America on the one hand and a divided Europe on the other.

Then through chaos the Kremlin would have been able to extend the Stalinist empire, not by war but through a series of internal revolutions until it was in a position to turn its back on the American Continent and, while building the new Soviet order throughout the greatest land mass in the world, proceed quietly with the task of undermining Britain's overseas empire by encouraging nationalist movements and banditry impartially.

This sort of plan I take to represent the highest flight of the Kremlin's ambitions. In fact, it seems to me far more likely that the chief aim has been limited to sowing discord and depression outside the Iron Curtain wherever possible and by all conceivable means in order to break up the anti-Soviet coalition until such time, as the Soviet bloc had been placed, by a sustained and mighty effort, in a position of invulnerability.

Be that as it may, the gamble has failed. By its actions in the "cold war" the Soviet Government has called into being the most astonishing and overwhelming manifestation of power in the history of the world. And after the failure of Korea she finds herself directly exposed to the most rigorous pressure from this increasing power—pressure which she cannot hope to divert by conducting further wars by proxy. So a new decision is called for.

There are two possible ways in which the Soviet Government might yet hope to achieve its original purpose. The first is by placing such an intolerable burden on the peoples of Europe, forced to spend too great a portion of their substance on armament, that conditions favorable to the spread of communism will again be created. But forcing the enemy to overreach himself in the production of armaments is a dangerous and double-edged game which even the most doctrinaire Stalinists must shrink from.

The other way is suddenly to withdraw the pressure, show nothing but sweet reason, and—fantastic though the idea be—hope that the reaction in America will be so violent that the Government will be forced to call off its armament drive, give the free market its head, and run headlong into a slump which would be the ruin of western Europe. But the Kremlin must know that it will take more than a few easy gestures on its part to gain the confidence of the west.

On the other hand it seems highly improbable that Stalin can keep up his present emergency pressure on the Russian people indefinitely and still get the results he requires if the Soviet economy is to be reorganized to exploit its resources to the full and catch up with America—a task which given the most favorable conditions and on the assumption that America stands still must take at least 20 years.

The Government and party are in danger of working the Russian people to a standstill. I am not saying that the Soviet economy is anywhere near collapse at the present moment; but I am suggesting that there is a limit to the industrial and military power that can be built upon a subsistence level of existence. And the Soviet Union to keep up with American production which is rapidly drawing away from hers is compelled to exceed that limit.

It seems to me that we see a realization of this fact in the emphasis on the giant projects—the hydroelectric and irrigation schemes which have lately superseded the normal 5-year plans. This year since the completion of the first post-war 5-year plan we have heard no more of future plans. Stalin's forecast of what would be accomplished in the next three 5-year plans has been relegated to limbo.

This means that the Kremlin is changing over from the short-term exploitation of the Russian people and their resources in the interests of the cold war to a long-term construction program similar in its aims to the program of the first three 5-year plans which began in 1928 and were designed to provide a suitable base for a greatly expanded economy 10 or 15 years ahead. The drastic revolution in Soviet agricultural practice now being carried out is in keeping with such a long-term view. It is as though the Politburo has seen that on its present basis the Soviet Union cannot possibly hope to compete with the western powers and has decided as it were to retread even if this means a temporary check to the upward curve of production of finished goods.

This whole development, of course, is being presented to the Soviet people and anyone else who will listen as proof of the peaceful intentions of the Soviet Government. But, in fact, the expanded economy made possible by the successful completion of the "projects" can be geared to war production with the greatest of ease. The question asked at the beginning of this article, however, was not "What will the Kremlin be doing in 10 or 15 years' time?" but "What happens next?"

At the present moment, having failed in its object of disrupting the west, the Kremlin, it seems to me, has nothing to lose and a great deal to gain by encouraging a relaxation of international tension and, to improve the lot of its own people and fortify its future strength, trying to inaugurate a period of improved relations with the western powers, with an eye principally to reestablishing trade.

As for our own attitude, it seems to me that we, too, have nothing to lose and much to gain by encouraging a lessening of the tension insofar as this can be done without moral or material damage to the western cause.

Nobody can foretell the future, and for us to share the Communist belief in inevitable conflict is, by implication, to subscribe to their own dogma. If—as may well happen—Stalin decides for whatever reasons that the Soviet Union requires a period of years for consolidation and internal development (as he had done once before in his lifetime) and if this decision offers the prospect of some years of peace without disgrace to ourselves, then to reject it because we believe a future war inevitable is to cast away the substance for the shadow—or to arrogate

to ourselves those powers of infallible foresight which the Marxists claim erroneously for themselves.

But the lesson for us all is crystal clear. If there is to be a general slackening of international tension it will be due to a display of strength and resolution on the part of the west and to nothing else at all. If a change occurs and the Kremlin appears more conciliatory there will be a great temptation to abandon these very policies, above all rearmament and all that this stands for, together with ERP, which themselves have brought about this change. The argument will be that if the Kremlin offers the hand of friendship and we, while appearing to accept it, continue with warlike preparations we ourselves shall be to blame for any future disaster.

This is a false argument. The Soviet Government is the declared enemy of all non-Communist societies everywhere. Until it abandons its declared belief—until, that is to say, there is a complete revolution in outlook of Russia's rulers—we must assume then latent hostility toward us however deeply this may be concealed. Nothing that we can do in the way of conciliation will change this profound hostility. If, as I believe possible (provided we ourselves keep our heads and the Kremlin does not commit some gross miscalculation), we can work through this terrible conflict without a major war it will be because we have opposed strength and resolution with superior strength and resolution (strength is not only a matter of armaments but also of morale) and for no other reason at all.

But to be strong and well armed is not the same as shouting abuse and indulging in belligerent hysteria. It should be seen simply as a form of insurance, and we have to resist with every means in our power the importunities of those who will try to make us abandon this insurance because they will say it is provocative to the Russians and too costly to ourselves.

The Russians are unprovocable. As to the cost to ourselves—rearmament and military service and heavy taxation—even if it means doing without some of the things we want it is surely a small price to pay to avoid a catastrophe. To allow ourselves to become weak and divided and irresolute once an immediate crisis is passed is to invite a dreary repetition of events of the past few years.

The Farm Arm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 6, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following column, written by Thomas L. Stokes, which appeared in the New York World-Telegram and Sun and other papers throughout the country, is deserving of the attention of all of the Members of the House:

THE FARM ARM

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

WASHINGTON, July 13—The farm lobby is perhaps the most powerful lobby operating just now. At least that seems a fair deduction from the way it cracks the whip and cows Congress to curtail controls.

It was not always so. In 1921 a little book appeared entitled, "Uncle Reuben Comes to Washington." It was written by Charles S. Barrett, legislative representative of the then National Farmers Union.

The book was at the same time an announcement that the farmers had come to Washington and a defense of their lobby by pointing out how other interests were represented here. It was, in fact, a catalog expose of lobbyists of that time.

So the farmer came. And, indeed, he did need a friend here then. He had overexpanded during World War I. All through the 1920's we had a depressed situation in agriculture as prices continued to fall. This became a big contributing factor, though little recognized in Washington until too late, in the general depression dramatized by the stock market collapse in October 1929.

Farm organizations, then lacking the power and influence they exert today, battered in vain at the citadels of government. They did get through Congress the McNary-Haugen bill directed at the surplus problem, but it was vetoed by both Presidents Coolidge and Hoover. The latter offered and got enacted an alternative plan of his own for a Federal Farm Board, but it didn't meet the problem.

We are familiar with what happened thereafter in the Roosevelt administration, which recognized the basic role of agriculture in a balanced and healthy economy and put into effect, with the approval of Congress, those well-known measures that brought agricultural recovery and prosperity.

In all of this new dispensation for agriculture, farm organizations had their part. Their lobby grew more and more powerful. It has become so powerful politically it has developed into a sort of hierarchy that often dictates what farmers want rather than following the real and best interests of the farmers.

That is true also of other lobbies, including business and labor. But the farm lobby seems to enjoy one special privilege—its demands are taken virtually at face value in Congress, or a majority of Congress, while demands of the others usually are discounted to some extent. We are suffering now, as a Nation, from this overstimulation of Congress by the farm lobby—and it could be costly.

It is time for Congress to take that into account, to consider the economy as a whole, and to make the necessary discount for the farm lobby that it does for others.

Private Industry and Personal Initiative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following commencement address by President Joe E. Harrell at Worcester Polytechnic Institute, and president of the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co., June 17, 1951, at which he received the honorary degree of doctor of engineering:

PRIVATE INDUSTRY AND PERSONAL INITIATIVE

President Cluverius, distinguished guests, members of the graduating class, ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure and an honor for me to be here today.

It is an important day for you who are graduating and it is important for your families and friends who are sharing the day with you.

I would like to join them in congratulating you on this occasion and spend a little time

with you this afternoon thinking about the years ahead.

Since most of you are planning to enter the field of private business, I would like to make a few comments about that field and the extent to which personal initiative is required to achieve success.

In the first place, may I say that I believe your prospects in private industry are better than those of any preceding generation.

This may seem like wishful thinking to you. In fact, it may seem a little unrealistic because of what you read in the daily papers about war and further threats of Communist aggression.

But may I remind you that beginning with 1775, this country on the average has had a war every 25 years. No generation has been without one. Yet the country has continued to prosper—and some day we shall surely find a way to permanent peace.

And so, in spite of the present unsettled conditions throughout the world, the future holds out many opportunities for the young men who are entering private industry. There never was a time that offered so many chances for success, especially in the fields of engineering and science. Nor has there ever been a time when capable, courageous leadership has been so urgently needed.

For out of the confusion of our times emerges a recognition of what we have here in this country and a realization of what we must do in the future to preserve it. We are learning to appreciate more fully the real significance of those forces that seek to change or destroy our economic system.

Under these circumstances the energy and initiative of young men will be required more than ever to strengthen the system that has brought us where we are today. This is your opportunity.

Looking back over the years, there does not appear to be a single period that could be regarded as normal. Perhaps normal periods are unknown in business. For in business, as in life, change is certain. But the character of the change and the time when it will occur cannot always be predicted.

The trends, however, are unmistakable. From a business point of view, two of these have been of particular significance.

One is the coming of age of private industry in our national life. The other is the importance of the individual in our economic system—a unique development of our American concept of government.

Together these two trends are the basis of our national strength.

Private industry and personal initiative have brought us an unrivaled material wealth. Only a visitor from abroad can really appreciate all that we have here. No other country in the world can equal our industrial production. An almost endless list of products and services is regularly available to the people of America. We take for granted our national wealth and personal opportunity which are the envy of the entire universe.

Important as this industrial production has been to the welfare of the American people, the real skill of private industry has been demonstrated clearly and repeatedly during times of national emergency. The simultaneous defeat of two powerful enemies in different hemispheres during recent years has shown that our national strength lies in our power to produce.

Truly, during a half century marked by two world wars and a world-wide depression, private industry has come of age in this country. For it has learned by experience—often by bitter experience—that its obligations reach far beyond profits and financial success.

It has assumed a major part of the responsibility for our national defense and has met the challenge of warfare with great success.

It has learned its responsibility to individuals, to communities, and to the Nation as a whole.

It has developed a realistic attitude toward working conditions, wages, pensions, vacations, and other benefits.

But in spite of its accomplishments in creating our national wealth and maintaining our national strength, you men doubtless know that for some time private industry has been under attack. In fact, the characteristic mark of foreign dictators has been their hostility toward private industry.

I am sure that you have noticed their eagerness to restrict private business and personal initiative. And business leaders in this country, aware of this fact, are facing up to their tremendous responsibilities with renewed strength and vigor.

Far too many people, even within this country, have accepted the theory that greater regimentation is unavoidable and, in fact, highly desirable. But the advocates of socialism and communism have no intention of going part way. They would eliminate private industry altogether—and with it our national strength. They would stamp out personal initiative. They would destroy completely our free western civilization.

It is my belief that both our material production and our spirit of unselfishness are the fruits of liberty. And I think we have more of both of them here because we have more liberty here.

This greater liberty, however, carries with it greater responsibility. To the degree that Government takes command the individual is relieved of responsibility and is thereby deprived of some liberty—and some opportunity as well.

Government is of course absolutely necessary for the preservation of order, for national defense, and for a great many other things. And if Government fails in its primary functions, there would be little useful freedom in the anarchy and chaos that follow.

But any government which continually extends its power beyond these primary functions continually whittles away at personal freedom. How much personal freedom the Government leaves to its citizens in your generation will be yours to decide.

And so I cannot think of any time in the past when there was more opportunity for a young man in private industry.

I do not limit this to material things. They are important for it is hard to make a good life out of a poor living.

But income is not the only thing. In this country more than anywhere else in the world people get together for good causes.

They give time and money to the support of youth agencies, science, medicine, education—in fact to every conceivable effort to improve the welfare of mankind. The society which you are entering is not only one characterized by great opportunity but one highly charged with good will.

Private business today offers an amazing variety of possibilities for young men.

In the first place you can start in for yourself either immediately or fairly soon. A great many people do.

You can go into a small business owned either by an individual or a few partners. That has been a familiar form of enterprise since the country started.

Or you can go into a so-called publicly owned company—one whose stock is held by many people, whose directors are trustees for the many shareholders and whose professional managers are not themselves large owners of the business.

There is always room for real ability and energy in the big corporation. In general, men rise strictly on merit, for there is little favoritism in the companies run by present day professional management. In these companies most of the present officers began at the bottom and worked their way up by

their own personal initiative, and this process is going on all the time.

Big business owned by the general public should and generally does give its owners pretty complete information about its operations. This is also available to its employees. More than that it is becoming increasingly common to give the employees on their jobs a great deal of information about the company, its policies, practices, and results.

This was not always true and the change is greatly to the advantage of those going to work now.

So it is important for the beginner to make use of this information and turn his vision to the over-all aspect of the business as much as he can.

Furthermore, the first job given to a man—especially if he is an engineer—is likely to involve the doing of some specific thing. This he must do and do well. But never forget that the world is run by people.

If you are going to rise in industry, you must rise by your relations with people. An understanding of people is the key to success in any large organization.

While we can take great pride in the accomplishments of private industry, we cannot overlook the importance of the individual in the success of the system which has made this country great. Learning to deal with people as individuals is our prime responsibility and, in fact, provides the greatest opportunity we have for further improvement in our free economic system.

We must learn to deal not only with physical nature, but with human nature as well.

The engineer, the scientist, the businessman overlooks his greatest opportunity if he fails to bring warmth and understanding to his work—or fails to bring friendly encouragement and tolerance to his associates.

The business leader of today must recognize and share the human emotions of those about him—the pride of the workman in his son's achievements—the grief of the clerk on the loss of her father—the bitterness of the poor and underprivileged—the loneliness of old age—and the justice in the statements of sincere labor leaders.

To you scientists and engineers, I would say that an understanding of the human mind and heart will go a long way in making your technical work more interesting and stimulating. It will speed the day when you can move upward into supervisory and management positions.

For, in this country, the transition from worker to management is a continuous process.

Eliminate the system which provides the urge for exercising personal initiative and you destroy the foundation on which this Nation's progress has been built.

Many of you are going back home. Others are going to strange and new locations. But wherever you may be, do your best to be a good citizen. Do your best to help your company be a good citizen.

I think you will find that your new employer is aware of his responsibility to his own community. For example, right here in Worcester, business leaders have been giving generously of their time and effort and financial support to make this a better city in which to live—a better location for your school and its faculty and its students. This city has earned an outstanding reputation in this respect—and your sense of responsibility to your own community may well be patterned after what is being done here.

In summarizing, I would say that to achieve complete success, you must have initiative and resourcefulness—a determination to excel in the business world which you will soon discover is highly competitive.

You must show a genuine interest in people. You must develop a real sense of re-

sponsibility to your community. You must have courage—with no fear of the future, nor of your own ability to contribute to it.

These are the simple traits required in our continuous search for peace and tolerance in a world which will soon be turned over to you.

May you do your utmost to make it a better world than any other generation has yet seen.

And, above everything else, continue to have an undying faith in Almighty God.

Thank you.

We Await the Answers, Mr. Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following letter from Mr. Earl Bunting, former president of the National Association of Manufacturers, to Defense Mobilization Director Charles E. Wilson, under date of July 11, 1951.

Despite the attempt of President Truman, in his recent radio address on price controls, to smear the NAM and anyone identified with it, it will take more than a smear to answer the questions raised by Mr. Bunting in this letter.

I await with deep interest Mr. Wilson's reply to the following letter from Mr. Bunting:

JULY 11, 1951.

MR. CHARLES E. WILSON,

Director, Office of Defense Mobilization,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILSON: Your radio talk of Monday night troubled me greatly and I have given a lot of thought to it before writing this letter to you. Along with millions of other listeners, it was hard for me to believe that the words I heard came from the lips of a man with your long, practical experience.

We in the National Association of Manufacturers have given you our solid and loyal support in your difficult task to mobilize the strength of America to meet the challenge of world communism. We share your fear of inflation; we agree that inflation plays into Stalin's hands, that we must continue to build our military and economic strength no matter what happens in the cease-fire negotiations.

Therefore it was extremely disappointing to hear you, the acknowledged master of production, completely ignore the role of production in the battle against inflation and to have you put all of your dependence in economic controls, which your experience should tell you will handicap production. By linking the opponents of wage and price controls to the enemies of America, you have aroused the resentment of millions of loyal Americans who are not convinced that by the simple gesture of passing a law, you can hold back the flood of inflation, blueprinted and manufactured in Washington by an administration which refuses to either economize or live within its means.

There are honest men in America—on the farms, the cattle ranges, in the factories, business offices, and small shops of the Nation—and in the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States. These men and women disagree honestly with your

artificial solution to the problem of higher prices. They love America with as great a love as those who cry for a new law to solve every problem, and they are due a better answer than an attack upon their patriotism and love of country.

Because the association for which I speak represents many thousands of these honest men and women who have disagreed with you, I call upon you to provide these answers. And because I remain sure of your inherent courage and willingness to face the truth, I am confident that you will not hesitate to answer these questions which you failed to answer in your message to the people Monday night.

1 Why, as Director of Defense Mobilization—and chief of the Nation's production program—did you fail to mention at any point in your speech that production, and more production, is the backbone of any anti-inflation program?

2 Why did you fail at any point in your address to tell the American people that inflation and higher prices always are created by Government indebtedness, and that an honest, pay-as-we-go tax program, coupled with real economy in Government, is the only known method of stopping inflation before it gets started?

3 If, as you say, you are opposed to controls in time of peace, why are you then advocating controls at this time, when we are faced with a period of defense mobilization which even the Government says may last for 20 years? Do you favor continuing direct controls by Government over this entire period?

4 You say defeat of controls will cost American consumers \$1 a day in the next year. This country tried those same controls during and for a year after World War II, and yet inflation cut the value of every man's dollar in half. Is not the cost of controls vastly greater than the cost of a real anti-inflation program which would save the people this tragic loss of their savings?

5 You have asserted that, if controls are defeated, prices will rise from 5 to 7 percent in the next year. Is it not true that prices during 5 years of the last war period rose more than 35 percent—or an average of 7 percent a year? Does this not indicate that, unless a real anti-inflation program is adopted, prices must rise despite the controls you seek to impose?

6 If farmers accept the fairness of price controls and roll-backs, as you suggested in your speech, why then is every major farm organization opposing the controls you propose?

7 You cite a little story of Charles Dickens, the author, to the effect that indebtedness always brings unhappiness to people. Does not this also apply to the Government of the United States which has gone into debt the last 18 years out of 21? Did not this debt create the very inflation you now are trying to cure by passing a control law?

8 You say that price controls which have been in effect have succeeded in leveling off prices in the past few months. If this were true, would not the demand for clothing, furniture, electrical appliances, television sets and other articles continue at a high rate? Is it not a fact that inventories of stores and manufacturing plants are filled, and there is a weak market for these products? Would you deny that the stable prices on such goods are the result of the high rate of production that has more than met the demand—and not by regulations of your pricing agencies?

9. You referred to the pressure groups—apparently meaning business and agriculture—opposed to wage and price controls. Why did you not mention the efforts of the pressure groups favoring direct controls? (1) Organized labor, which you have

termed the strongest and most effective in the Nation; and (2) the administration, which has unleashed the greatest flood of propaganda in recent years?

It has been difficult for me to address you in these blunt terms, Mr. Wilson. But I firmly believe that in your radio address to the Nation, the full story of inflation—and the proper methods of controlling it—were not given either to me or to my many fellow listeners.

The Nation must be told that the only certain way to check inflation and the high cost of defense, which you described, is for the Government to encourage production; to adopt sound tax policies to pay for the goods it buys and prevent national indebtedness; to reduce all spending not necessary to your defense program and to adopt such other measures as controls over credit and allocations of material. With these courageous steps, the socialist-type controls by which the present administration seeks to delude the American people will not become necessary at all.

Sincerely yours,

EARL BUNTING.

What Price for Better Housing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. M. (DON) WHEELER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House, I am extending my remarks and including an editorial which was written by my good friend, Mr. Albert S. Jenkins, and published in his fine paper, the Baxley News-Banner, published in Baxley, Ga., under date of July 5, 1951.

The position taken by Mr. Jenkins in his fine editorial adequately expresses the position I have taken relative to public housing since I have been a member of this great body. The line of reasoning followed by Mr. Jenkins should persuade many other Members of Congress to his position and mine. I commend this editorial to the attention of the entire membership of the House and the Senate. It follows:

WHAT PRICE FOR BETTER HOUSING?

Some time within the next few days construction will begin on Baxley's 40 public housing units, at a negotiated average cost of slightly less than \$8,000 per unit, we have been advised.

The low bid for the 40 units was originally \$346,400, which would have made the average unit cost \$8,660, but the low bid was reduced to \$312,000 to come more nearly within the appropriation of \$304,000 set up by the Federal Government for the project.

While every town in Georgia, ranging in size from Abbeville to Atlanta, is getting public housing we have felt that Baxley should get its share, especially since we will be called on to help pay for the whole "she-bang." However, we do want to register what we think is a legitimate protest against the program as a whole.

In urban areas like Atlanta, Macon, Savannah, Augusta, and Columbus, low-income families may not remain long enough to acquire homes and the slum removal effects of the program and the high market value of land may justify the low rental housing projects. We do not believe, however, that

either of those three conditions prevail in many towns of less than 25,000.

If the Federal Government really wanted to make a substantial contribution to better housing for low-income groups in the smaller towns and cities of the Nation, we believe the cause would have been more effectively served by making long-time loans at a nominal interest rate to these families to build their own homes.

Those who have had some recent building experience, including the writer, must admit that even at existing building costs in Baxley, a fairly decent small home can still be built for \$8,000 or less. At an interest rate of 1 or 2 percent to cover handling charges, payments could be made within the reach of anyone who can afford to keep up the rent in the public housing units, and we sincerely believe the Government's loss and administrative costs on such a venture would be far less than they can possibly be on a low-rental housing project. And based on observation and statements of landowners and home owners, we can safely conclude that such homes would be far better cared for than any Government-owned units.

The aim and hope of every family is to own a home at some time. Why, oh why, in the name of common sense and decency, must we continue squandering millions and millions, which all add up to billions, on Government-owned and operated projects where a more realistic approach to the problems they are designed to cure would accomplish the results more cheaply and more effectively?

Year of No Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial by the editors of Collier's magazine for June 30, 1951:

YEAR OF NO DECISION

The undeclared war in Korea, a war the like of which the world has never seen, is now a year old. It began with a courageous and unprecedented action in defense of a noble ideal. For the first time in history, soldiers of 15 nations fought beneath a common flag as representatives of an international organization whose purpose is the preservation of peace. At the end of the year the ideal is still noble. The flag is still there. So are the soldiers. They fought with an unsurpassed bravery to the point where, at this writing, there are indications that at least an informal cessation of hostilities is possible.

We should like to hope that by the time you read this, the United Nations' original goal of an independent, united, democratic Korea might be in sight. But the prospects at the moment are bleak. For in its first year, the Korean conflict has developed certain aspects which, while also unprecedented, are considerably less noble and more confusing than the ideal itself. This situation applies particularly to the United States, which has assumed the United Nations command and provided the great majority of non-Korean troops, and which is the center of the turmoil over strategy and leadership. So let us look back at some of these unprecedented developments from an American point of view.

The Korean war is a war in which our civilian and military leaders can give a clear

picture of what defeat would be like, but cannot describe the pattern of victory.

It is a war fought under a new set of rules. It has become a fight in which the U. N. is restricted to counterpunching. It is not the U. N.'s purpose to pursue the enemy and destroy him.

It is a war in which no sizable reinforcements of the U. N. forces are apparently contemplated, whatever the fortunes of battle.

It is a war from which the United States has excluded the trained and accessible soldiers of a potential ally (Nationalist China), even though the potential ally is willing to participate and is a member of the world organization under whose banner the other allies are fighting.

It is a war in which some of those other allies have fought the enemy and at the same time traded with him, providing him with the materials which eventually aid him in killing their own soldiers. And the war was almost a year old before the combined goadings of Winston Churchill and the United States Congress prompted those allies to take steps toward ending this practice.

It is a war in which, as the result of a general's dismissal, the country's war councils have become an open forum, with many details of military planning and many bitter differences aired for all the world to hear.

It is a war in which the basic American, and hence United Nations, strategy is built on the shifting foundations of fear and uncertainty, and in which there is no attempt on the part of our leaders to conceal or minimize those emotions. The result of that strategy has led to an ironical situation in which the U. N. is afraid to win the war for fear of making its actual and potential enemies angry.

These unique military aspects have been set down here, of course, without regard for diplomatic and political considerations. Those considerations are highly important. Their ultimate purpose, the prevention of a general war involving Russia, is well known. And it may be that they have inevitably dictated some of the unorthodox strategy in Washington.

But there is one paramount aspect of this unorthodox strategy which is of deep concern to many Americans, including the editors of this magazine. That is the seemingly endless continuation of the slaughter-and-be-slaughtered policy which Mr. Truman and his advisers have decided is the only possible policy in Korea if the third world war is to be avoided. It has already cost some 70,000 American casualties. It has caused suffering, destitution, and staggering loss of life among Korean civilians. All this, of course, is the inevitable toll of war. But in this case the U. N. forces, unless they are driven into the sea, seem committed to fight indefinitely up and down the Korean peninsula (within certain limits) in a minor-league war—for the enemy's lack of air and fire power makes it just that—and try to bleed that numerically superior enemy until he is so weak that he surrenders.

This policy is also of deep concern to General MacArthur, and that concern seems to be one of the things that cost him his command. We have considerable to say about the general on our weekly editorial page in this issue. But it might be pointed out here that one factor in his disagreement with the administration was his desire to fight the war along sound, proven military lines, and fight it to win with the least cost of lives. This concern for the cost of lives brought General MacArthur a rebuke from Secretary of Defense Marshall.

In his testimony before the Senate foreign policy inquiry, Secretary Marshall said, "I am disturbed and I should think you would be disturbed at the effect that will sweep through that force (in Korea) of a situation in which their commander has stated his

views which accentuate the casualties that they are suffering and in effect that it is without justified purpose."

It is quite possible that the soldiers in Korea do not need to have their former commander "accentuate" the casualties they are suffering or point out to them the inhibited and frustrating aspects of the campaign in which they are engaged. It is also possible that they might be disturbed by some other testimony by Secretary Marshall, as well as by General Bradley, before the same Senate committee. For, though they disagreed with General MacArthur on many things, the Defense Secretary and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff did confirm his opinion that the slaughter-and-be-slaughtered policy carries no guaranty of victory.

General MacArthur told Congress that "the position of the command from the military standpoint forbade victory." Secretary Marshall said to the Senators, "I should say that if the Chinese Communists continue in force in North Korea with the potential of additional reinforcements that might be made available, and with our situation where we visualize no considerable reinforcement of the United Nations army, that they could not be driven out of North Korea." And when a Senator asked General Bradley if the present program in Korea would bring decisive results, he replied, "I am not too sure we will get them under our present methods * * *. I don't believe anyone is going to promise you or the country that we are going to get decisive results under what we are doing."

In spite of this, the President and his advisers see no alternative policy that would not in their opinion bring on general war. Their adherents seem satisfied with that policy and only slightly dismayed by the casualties incurred in the indecisive conflict. One of these adherents, Prof. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., the Harvard historian and a sort of unofficial spokesman for the administration, had this to say: "MacArthur says * * * the American people simply cannot take any longer our 'staggering' and 'progressively mounting' losses." Mr. Schlesinger asked, "What have these losses been?" Then he answered himself thus: "MacArthur himself said that 13,000 Americans had been killed in Korea since last June. This is a terrible and tragic thing. But it seems hardly an intolerable loss for a nation which killed 31,500 people in 1949 by automobile accidents."

The families of those 13,000 dead, among others, will not share Professor Schlesinger's callous view. They will take his snide quotation marks away from the general's description of the casualties and agree that in a war of vacillating policy, a war whose most hopeful outcome now is the status quo ante bellum, the continuing losses are, indeed, staggering.

Some of the occurrences that followed General MacArthur's dismissal give reason why the Government's present policy may aptly be called vacillating. The general proposed certain actions which were stated as contributing causes to his being fired. Now the administration has either adopted them or is contemplating their adoption.

No one outside the Iron curtain can accurately say whether General MacArthur's adopted or discarded policies would provoke Russia to open attack. But it is our opinion that some of the people who have disagreed with him most bitterly have made more provocative statements than the former U. N. commander ever did.

President Truman, Secretary Marshall, General Bradley and others high in Government have told Russia and the world that the United States is not ready for a war with the Soviets. Mobilization Director Wilson was even more specific. He said the country wouldn't be ready for 2 years. Now, isn't that provoking Russia—or rather, isn't it

enticing Russia into war and inviting attack? If Russia is ready for war, would the Kremlin need any more provocation than this open admission of weakness, plus a hot war already going in Korea? Would bombs in Manchuria or a naval blockade of the China coast give the final tip to scales which already are so heavily weighted to our disadvantage?

No one, we repeat, can be sure of the answers to those questions. But it does seem that if the men in the Kremlin want war and are prepared for it now, they have ample excuse to get into it. And it also seems that the best guess is still the familiar speculation that Russia has its own time-table, and that if there is to be a general war it will begin when Russia is ready and not before.

So all the arguments and disagreements over Korean policy and strategy boil down to this: the only over-all American policy is the passive policy of waiting to see what Russia is going to do next. Generals may be fired and replaced, but Stalin still calls the turn.

THE EDITORS.

Federal Pay Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, Congress will shortly be asked to take long-needed action on salary increases for Federal Government employees. The Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has already made its recommendations and the House Committee is meeting in executive session tomorrow morning to give final consideration to the matter.

In view of the urgent need for congressional action to relieve the serious distress which a large proportion of Government workers and their families, particularly in the lower pay brackets, are experiencing, and in view of the imminence of action by Congress, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a statement which I made to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service during the recent public hearings on salary increases for Government employees. The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN F. SHELLEY, OF CALIFORNIA, TO HOUSE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE AT HEARINGS ON THE FEDERAL PAY INCREASE BILLS

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you and the members of your committee for this opportunity to tell you what I think should be done to clear up a very bad situation. I don't have to tell you what a terrific time the families of Federal Government employees have been having trying to make ends meet since prices began to skyrocket after the Korean emergency. I know that your mail has been just as heavy as mine with pleas from fathers and mothers who have to try and feed and clothe a family with food and clothing prices what they are—mothers who have to go out and work, and fathers who have to try and hold two jobs or to borrow money just to keep bread on the table and shoes on their children's feet.

I know that you are just as conscious of the problem as I am, and are just as anxious to find a solution. It is true that there are

a good many complex factors which must be considered. I know that the Federal budget is strained severely by the demands of the defense effort. I know also that the question of just what pattern salary increases for the various classes of employees should take requires grave thought before an equitable formula is worked out. The special adjustments proposed and required for post-office workers present another complicated situation which must be gone into. But the point I want to emphasize is that action should now be taken just as quickly as possible to get final congressional approval of legislation which will help these families keep the wolf from the door.

Wage increases for privately employed workers have been almost universally granted since last June. The Government employee who has so far been denied a raise has been paying for more than his share of the cost of the defense effort. Every time he goes to the corner market and pays \$3 for \$2's worth of groceries he makes another contribution. He has been doing that for over a year now, and in a good many cases, he has just about reached the end of his rope. In a good many other cases the end of the rope was reached some time ago. The turn-over rate among employees in Government agencies, particularly in the lower-paid brackets, has been terrific. Just for example, it has climbed to over 30 percent in the San Francisco Post Office. The Government just cannot afford to go on doing business that way. And there certainly is no justice in forcing faithful employees to a choice of going hungry, or of giving up the benefits they have accumulated during their Government service to go out and take another job.

We all know how much of a scramble Government agencies have had in trying to find people to fill such jobs as clerk-typist and other lower-paid positions. If the Government is to continue operating with any degree of efficiency at all it must be able to meet the competition offered in the labor market by private employers. If we don't do that we will find that the only people we can hire will be those who cannot hold a job in private industry and the operations of Government will suffer accordingly.

First and foremost then, I strongly urge that the just demands of Government employees for salary increases which will permit them to at least maintain the same standard of living which they enjoyed before Korea, be granted. Consideration should be given to two special factors in this connection. Firstly, the extent to which Government salaries may have lagged behind private salaries for comparable jobs before the Korean emergency, and, secondly, the fact that the 10-percent-increase formula established by the Wage Stabilization Board for industry and other private employment in February of this year is now subject to upward revision in the light of most recent cost-of-living indexes which show a continued upward trend.

The matter of equity for employees of the Government, which should be the first thought in the minds of the committee and the Congress as a whole, as it is in mine, is backed up by the practical consideration that unless we do something very soon about the salary situation we just will not be able to keep enough employees on the Federal payrolls to perform the essential services of Government. I know that there are some among my colleagues in both Houses of Congress who will probably say that it would be a good thing if that happened. I want it understood that I am not against economy in Government, and that I certainly believe that waste and inefficiency should be attacked wherever it is found. But when it comes to the point where the Government cannot carry on its essential operations, I will draw the line. Further, when it comes to the point where the Federal employee is

expected to do all the sacrificing while little is done to hold the line any place else, I will go all the way in urging that he be given a little elemental justice.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

When the Bankers Ask for Controls, We Must Need Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 6, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following column by John Elliott is printed in the New York Herald Tribune of July 15, 1951, establishing beyond a doubt that the Defense Production Act is not the brainchild of the state planners, Socialists and Communists:

NEW YORK BANKERS FEAR FOR PAY, PRICE CURBS—SEE PRESSURE GROUPS SABOTAGING CONTROL BILL

(By John Elliott)

The New York banking world is frankly worried about the activities of the pressure groups which in Washington these days are trying to sabotage the price- and wage-control bill.

It sees in the activities of these lobbyists a menace even more dangerous than the subversive labors of the Communist underground. As Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization, expressed it in his radio speech on Monday night, "the only way the Russians can beat us is to encourage us to beat ourselves." These pressure groups, as seen from the New York financial district, are playing, even if unwittingly, the Russian game.

As one prominent New York banker recently pointed out, competent people have been appointed to administer the price control measures, including the roll-backs which are now threatened by congressional action. These officials have been given a job to do and they ought to be left alone without fear of their administration being broken up by pressure groups representing specific interests.

REGULATION W UNDER FIRE

The same holds true for regulation W, which imposes reins on consumer credit buying. The same pressure groups are now trying to bludgeon Congress into depriving the Federal Reserve of its discretionary powers in administering this regulation. While nobody can say dogmatically whether 15 or 18 months is the right length of time for these controls to run, for Congress to come out and proclaim that the period should be 18 months means throwing administrative discretion and wisdom out of the window.

Last summer, when inflationary pressures were just getting under way after the Korean war had started, it was found desirable to go beyond indirect controls, such as raising reserve requirements and making use of open-market operations, and to put into effect direct controls (regulations W and X and wage and price fixing) to halt the rising wage-price spiral.

The experience of the last year has shown conclusively that direct controls do contribute effectively to combating successfully mounting wage and farm prices. And, while it is true that inflationary pressures have been relaxed for the last 2 months and may

continue to lie dormant still for another month or two, they are still potentially dangerous, so that to remove controls now would leave the Nation at the mercy of rising prices, with resultant decline of the dollar in the autumn.

FULL INFLATION SEEN IN FALL

For the grim fact is that it is not until autumn that the Nation is likely to feel the full impact of inflation. Expenditures under the defense program are expected to amount in the next 6 months to as much as they did in all the last 12 months.

Moreover, the Treasury ended the first 6 months of the present calendar year with a cash surplus of \$7,000,000,000. But the cash deficit for the next half year will probably match this huge sum. If it does, this development will represent a swing of \$14,000,000,000 in the Treasury position. The junction of these two factors alone is calculated to produce a strong inflationary pressure in the latter part of 1951.

That is why the New York financial world is so worried about the impact of developments in Korea on Congress. Just at the very moment when the inflation peril may begin to develop in earnest Congress is tending to relax and consider that the crisis is past.

SEEKS TIGHT REIN ON CREDIT

In this critical situation the Federal Reserve System is trying to keep a tight rein on the credit position. It wants to preserve the credit gains of the last 2 or 3 months and will exert no more pressure of its own until the autumn, when it will review the situation in the light of events.

The March 3 accord between the System and the Treasury, which buried their hatchet for the time being, has so far been working extremely well. If there was ever a free market in Government securities, it has been that which has been in operation the last 2 weeks.

It is, of course, possible that the Federal Reserve may in the near future be found to intervene for the sake of preserving an orderly market. If it does enter the market it cannot be too strongly emphasized that the System will do so not from considerations of price or yield of Government bonds, as bond dealers are all to prone to think. Its sole concern is the availability of credit.

If it can be avoided the Federal Reserve does not want again to have to peg the Government bond market and so by increasing bank reserves pave the way for a sixfold expansion of loans, thus transforming the System into what Marriner S. Eccles, former chairman of the board, so aptly called "an engine of inflation."

Tax Squeeze on Our Middle Class

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, in all the concern of our Nation for the public welfare, a new threat to America is in the making with all the sanctions of perfect legality. This menace concerns the great middle class, which economists like to call the backbone of the Nation. In this group are professional men and women, businesses below the level of big business, workers who have accumulated resources sufficient to enable them to

invest in securities or property, shopkeepers, and small merchants.

Under the tax program of the present administration these people are being driven hard. They fear to make any new investments because the risk of loss far outweighs the prospect of net gain after taxes. They are unable to develop substantial savings programs because their living costs have mounted to a point where they can barely maintain their life-insurance policies after paying taxes and ordinary bills.

Colleges, dependent to a large degree upon big givers to support their endowment funds in bygone years, have turned to the middle class more recently. Now they discover that this source is rapidly drying up. If this process continues unchecked, we may run the serious risk of creating an unhealthy gap between the very wealthy and all the rest of us. Nothing is worse for any independent, free people than a situation of this kind.

Self-Interest Groups Fight Effective Price Controls—An Open Letter to a Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me I insert an open letter addressed to a Congressman by Robert P. Vanderpoel, a recognized financial authority, appearing in the July 14, 1951, issue of the Chicago Sun-Times. Mr. Vanderpoel has so addressed his Congressman because it is claimed that consumers have not communicated their views to their Representatives to support a real control bill that will prevent still further inflation and an increase in the high cost of living. I feel that this open letter deserves the earnest and serious consideration of the membership of the House. It follows:

VANDERFOEL WRITES AN OPEN LETTER TO HIS CONGRESSMAN

(By Robert P. Vanderpoel)

AN OPEN LETTER TO CONGRESSMAN TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN, HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Dispatches from Washington state that our Congressmen have not been hearing from home to any great extent on the matter of inflation and controls. They add that in view of this a very much watered-down control bill is likely to be passed because the various self-interest groups, meanwhile, have been bringing terrific pressure to bear.

Under the circumstances, my dear Congressman, I thought I should write to you, I am sure you will not mind this communication coming in the form of an open letter which readers might care to send on to their own Congressmen.

I suppose the majority of those who wrote last winter demanding that Congress take the necessary action to halt inflation, check the rise in prices and protect the integrity of the dollar, feel that one letter should be enough, that they should not have to repeat

themselves every few months or weeks. Maybe they forget that the pressure groups work night and day, month after month, with tireless energy.

You and I know, dear Congressman, there has been a let-up in inflation pressures. Prices have stopped going up. Here and there, in fact, they have declined a bit. You and I also know, however, that this is but a temporary lull in the storm that when the full impact of the defense program is felt late this autumn or early in the winter terrific pressures will arise. The mail from your constituents at that time no doubt will increase, but the inflation surge will already be on and for Congress once more it will be too little and too late.

Controls can be effective

Another thing that you and I know is that controls, while they do not cure the fundamental causes of inflation, can be effective, particularly over limited periods of time and if they are strictly enforced. In order to moderate the results of inflation the public, and apparently Congress, favored the imposition of controls while the more basic factors were being attacked.

Bosses Wilson, Johnston, and DiSalle have used their powers very moderately. The public, in fact, was disappointed that they did not crack down more sharply. In particular, the public wanted price roll-backs. Very few were ordered, the most notable being in livestock where prices had moved ahead so rapidly that meat was disappearing from many tables despite the fact that the packers themselves, at least temporarily, were operating at a loss.

The livestock industry, which successfully fought price controls during World War II, once more girded for the struggle. Feeders had bought high-priced steers confident, as many merchants were in buying excessive stocks of high-priced electrical goods and textiles, that the public would pay any price, and that they could make a fast buck. If prices were rolled back, it would end their opportunity to make a killing. It is not surprising that they howled.

As for the producers themselves, they had done very well but expected to do better. Even at today's high prices they are reluctant to sell their cattle because they believe they can break the back of price control and that the consumers, generally, have so much money that they are willing to pay almost anything for their meat.

The slaughter quota system, Congressman, was a very essential weapon in the hands of the Office of Price Stabilization to keep meat from flowing into black markets. Recognizing that if a sufficient amount of meat were diverted from normal channels into the black markets, the whole price-control effort would fall apart, the pressure groups concentrated their attack on this quota system and as this is written I understand that it is out. This surrender by Congress to the cattle lobby strikes me as a tragic betrayal of the public interest.

Fundamental defenses neglected

Meanwhile, the more fundamental defenses of the dollar have been pretty much neglected. Congress has shown some inclination to cut appropriations but certainly not enough to indicate that it believes that the defense needs and the desirability of preventing a new rise in prices warrants a program of austerity as far as the Government is concerned.

On the other side of the picture, Congress is still fussing around with the tax bill, apparently more afraid of the public's reaction to higher taxes than to the alternate consumers' resentment of still higher prices. In other words, Congress seems still willing to make the widows and orphans, the pensioners, the thrifty, the patriotic holders of Government bonds, the white-collar workers, the civil servants, and unorganized labor pay

for the defense effort through higher prices because it lacks the courage to write a tax law which would bring in the needed revenues.

At the same time Congress, once more acting under the whiplash of the pressure groups, has threatened to force an easing of credit restrictions in the face of admonitions from the Federal Reserve Board that this would be a grievous mistake and despite factual evidence that the combined voluntary and regulatory restrictions have thus far failed to reduce significantly outstanding credit.

I hope, dear Congressman, you will accept this letter in the spirit in which it has been written, as representing the sincere views of one of your constituents who has no axes to grind but is deeply concerned about the domestic outlook.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT P. VANDERPOEL.

We Need a Real Control Law Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article, written by John Stuart, which appeared in the New York Times of July 15, is most appropos:

PRICE DELAYS HIT FOOD PROCESSORS—CONGRESS' INACTION ON CONTROLS HAS CAUGHT MANY "IN MIDDLE," HALTED JUSTIFIED REDUCTIONS—FINANCING IS COMPLICATED—UNCERTAINTY ON FUTURE CEILINGS HOLDS UP LOAN APPLICATIONS TO ACQUIRE NEW HARVEST

(By John Stuart)

Congressional inaction on controls has caught about half of the food processors in the United States between the general price freeze of January and the increased prices permitted on due proof of increased costs, a formula withdrawn when controls were not renewed on July 1.

A survey yesterday showed that the uncertainties of the situation are preventing price reductions that might otherwise be put into effect.

The uncertainty is further complicating the loan applications of food processors who seek to finance the inventories they must acquire during the forthcoming harvest season.

'SAYS CROP CANNOT WAIT

One important figure in the food field yesterday characterized it in this grim fashion:

"Congress can ponder—not to say dawdle. But the crops can't, and neither can we. We've not only got to buy them but process them and finance ourselves on our estimates of costs and future prices. A great industry has never been more critically in the middle."

This man, who refused to be quoted for the obvious reason that he does not want to be called as a congressional witness, pointed out that when the general price freeze was made effective on January 25 processors were caught with inventories both below and above the ceilings then set. Recognizing this, the Office of Price Stabilization ceiling price regulation 22, under which price "roll forwards" as well as roll-backs were to be permitted.

To take advantage of such roll-forwards, however, processors had to file schedules of their costs so complicated and expensive that

in many instances they could not complete them by the announced deadline in May. So the deadline was extended to July 1.

SCHEDULES NOT COMPLETED

By July 1, when, Congress having failed to act, OPS called off all changes, even the biggest food processors had not completed their schedules on some lines. As a result, they are unwilling now to reduce prices on lines due for reduction through softening of the raw-food markets, because they are unable to estimate their losses on other lines where their properly justified increased prices have been suspended.

The maker of one of the most important inventory loans in the food field refused to discuss the situation yesterday. He said he had not only to face the bankers who made the loan but the annual meeting of his corporation's stockholders next week. "And what can I tell them?" he asked.

Like most corporation heads, he does not like controls. But he describes the uncertainties created by congressional delay as worse than "all the hell bureaucracy ever caused industry."

International Labor Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, last month Geneva, Switzerland, was the scene of the thirty-fourth general conference of the International Labor Organization—the ILO. I am extremely proud that in the past, as an official of the labor movement in this country, I have had direct contact with and have contributed something to the work of this great organization.

As most of us know, the United States began official participation in the work of the ILO back in 1934. A total of 60 nations are now members of the organization and work together to accomplish the primary purpose for which it was founded—the promotion of peace by improving social and economic conditions among working people everywhere. The ILO is now one of the specialized agencies of the United Nations. The practical means used to work toward fulfillment of the organization's goal is the study of such questions as working conditions, wages, hours, child labor, social security, industrial safety, employment and industrial training, with emphasis on the preservation and furtherance of the ideal of human dignity. The results of such studies are gone over by representatives of both labor and management in the participating countries, conventions are formulated, ratified at the general conferences, and sent to the several nations for adoption and effectuation.

At the recent general conference Mr. David A. Morse, the Director General of the ILO, prefaced his annual report with a statement underscoring the fundamental beliefs and principles upon which the organization bases its work. Because of the inspirational nature of the simple and yet tremendously impor-

tant credo which Mr. Morse voiced, I include the accompanying excerpts from his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

EXCERPTS FROM REPORT MADE BY DAVID A. MORSE, DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOR OFFICE, TO THE INTERNATIONAL LABOR CONFERENCE, GENEVA, SWITZERLAND, JUNE 6, 1951

Often during the past 3 years delegates have suggested before the Conference and to me personally that the International Labor Organization should pause from time to time to reflect on the simple beliefs which underlie its work. * * * Today, in a time of uncertainty and fear, when the hearts of many may be faltering before the tremendous issues confronting us, when millions in vast areas of the world are awakening to the possibilities within them, I have felt it to be the moment to pause for reflection. I have attempted to restate the beliefs our work is founded upon, to discern the progress in past years as a basis for sober optimism in the future, and to suggest how these beliefs must inspire the developments taking shape in our midst if we are to achieve progress in the years ahead.

The mainspring of our work, as indeed of all true progress, has always been the belief in the essential worth and dignity of the individual. * * * It is from those few who have seen clearly the implications of this belief that has come the inspiration for the advances of the human race: the movements toward liberty of thought and expression, toward political freedom and democracy, and the social achievements of past generations. * * *

We must work toward a society where each individual can live a natural and civilized life, with full scope for the development of his abilities and yet with a sense of responsibility to others and to the community at large, a society which will satisfy the need of the individual to belong, to feel that his life has meaning, and to render service to his fellow men. We must guarantee political and civil liberties so that freedom and social justice may grow together from strength to strength in mutual fulfillment. Only thus can we create a democratic society where man can be truly man. This is the way of progress and of peace.

The obstacles and dangers in our path are a challenge to the best in us. They are, in short, the conditions of poverty, disease, ignorance and injustice stunting the lives of millions today, the enslavement of other millions, the injustices which can result from too rapid industrialization and impersonal bureaucracy, the effects of war, petty nationalism; and, throughout all, the block of fear, freezing action or driving men into dangerous paths. These are among the real threats to peace. These must be the object of attack. * * *

There has been a slow but steady acceptance of the belief that the welfare of all individuals must be the central concern of national policy; that all men and women who are willing and able to work should be able to do so in decent and constantly improving conditions; and that all resources should be developed and utilized to this end. This is no longer mere theory. This conviction is slowly finding expression in achievement.

Wherever this conviction has taken root the working man is no longer a unit in the labor market, or a cipher in national statistics, but is a respected citizen of the community. Independent trade unions have fought their way through opposition, often through bloodshed, to positions of responsibility. There is a growing understanding among employers of their responsibility to the general public interest and of the importance of human relations and good working and living conditions to sound national life. * * *

We have also learned that enterprise and initiative are indispensable if anything positive is to be achieved. The difficulties are so great that the vicious circle of poverty, ignorance, and disease can be broken only if those who have enterprise and initiative are willing and able to use them. Governments, private individuals, and international organizations can contribute in different ways. Together they can take the essential steps of progress.

They must proceed with a full knowledge and understanding of all the facts. They will not achieve progress, and may even cause a backward movement in society, if they attempt more than can be successfully managed at once, or if, by introducing methods alien to the qualities and character of the people, they break down the structure of society and have nothing wherewith to replace it. They must relate their plans to the resources available and to the practical difficulties before them, and work only in ways which can win the understanding and support of the people themselves. * * *

We need an open world. We need a wide understanding between all people, the meeting of man with man, of mind with mind. No barrier should exist to the free movement of people and of ideas. Without an open world we shall never be free from suspicion and fear, we shall never move toward a society of prosperity and peace.

Mr. Speaker, during the later proceedings of the ILO General Conference at Geneva, Mr. George P. Delaney, International Representative of the American Federation of Labor and an official United States delegate to the Conference, addressed the delegates on the very matter which is now causing the Congress of the United States and the people as a whole so much concern—control of inflation during the period of defense rearmament to meet the Communist threat. In his address Mr. Delaney, as he said, was "speaking for both the Congress of Industrial Organizations and the American Federation of Labor, as well as the workers of the United States as a whole." The views on wage policy and economic stabilization which he presented to the Conference are, I am convinced, the views of the American people today. This House would do well to bear them in mind as it votes this week on the various phases of the Defense Production Act. I submit a copy of Mr. Delaney's remarks in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY GEORGE P. DELANEY, WORKERS' DELEGATE, UNITED STATES AND INTERNATIONAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE A. F. OF L., THE THIRTY-FOURTH GENERAL CONFERENCE OF THE ILO, GENEVA, SWITZERLAND, JUNE 1951

I should like, before commenting on the Director-General's report, to announce that I am happy and gratified that, for the first time since 1945, the Congress of Industrial Organization has joined with the American Federation of Labor in participating in the work of the International Labor Organization. I am fortunate in having as my advisers, in addition to the four representatives of the American Federation of Labor, four officials of the Congress of Industrial Organizations. In expressing my views on the question of wage policy and economic stabilization, I am speaking for both the Congress of Industrial Organizations and the American Federation of Labor, as well as the workers of the United States as a whole.

Under the threat of Communist aggression, the free nations have been compelled to rearm in self-defense. With rearmament

has come a new danger of inflation. Inflation, once it appears, tends to spread without regard to national boundaries, until it becomes the common property of all nations.

It is, of course, up to each country to work out its own best answer to the many problems which arise, according to its own particular likes. Nevertheless, these problems are matters of mutual concern to all of us, and it is both timely and appropriate that they should be brought forward for discussion at this meeting.

These matters are complex and involved, but they have very practical consequences, as we have learned only too well over the past decade or two. In particular, the question of wage policy—which means the bread and butter of all workers—is a matter of vital concern to trade unions everywhere.

Speaking for the workers of the United States, we welcome this opportunity to restate here the views which we have sought to advance as a basis for public policy with respect to wages under the conditions now prevailing in the United States.

It is our firm belief that to succeed in its objectives, governmental wage policy during this period of inflation must be based upon a recognition of three basic principles:

First The role of collective bargaining, and the practices and relationships developed under collective bargaining, must continue to be of fundamental importance to the national economy. Steps taken in accordance with public policies in the field of wages may supplement, but they must never supplant, collective bargaining.

Second No policy of restraint with regard to wages can be successful unless preceded by an over-all system of anti-inflation controls, based squarely upon and guided by the doctrine of equality of sacrifice.

Third Wage restraint is not an end in itself. Production is the basic counterforce to inflation. Wage policies which provoke industrial unrest, which interfere with the best use of manpower and resources, or which deprive workers of any real stake in industrial progress, will in the long run defeat their own broader purposes.

If they are to prove successful, wage policies must prove adaptable to industrial realities, and to changing conditions and needs. They must seek to avoid, rather than to emphasize, the use of rigid arbitrary formulas having no better justification than administrative convenience. They must offer workers the assurance that considerations of justice have not fallen victim to considerations of expediency—that their grievances are to receive a fair hearing and prompt adjustment, and that ample scope will be allowed for the alleviation of hardships. They must encourage the correction, rather than the perpetuation, of inequities and disparities in the wage structure.

To stabilize does not mean to make static. Rigid and inflexible wage controls could only prove detrimental to an enlightened concept of stability, particularly in conjunction with a long-range defense effort such as that which confronts us now. They could only have an adverse effect upon labor mobility, morale and efficiency. In the administration of any wage program, flexibility is a basic requisite. It is essential to genuine—as contrasted with superficial—stability.

This means that a high degree of trust and reliance should be placed in the practices and procedures which have evolved under collective bargaining. A workable wage stabilization policy must recognize that collective bargaining is itself a system of equitable stabilization. Negotiated wage agreements—unlike prices which rise from day to day—eliminate uncontrolled fluctuations, and offer guaranties of stability for their duration. They reduce the uncertainties and

speculative influences which are primarily responsible for inflation.

Furthermore, collective bargaining has developed realistic and practical methods for the administration of wage standards, on the basis of the first-hand experience of those most familiar with the facts of a given situation. In view of its stabilizing role, collective bargaining must continue to be the primary means by which those standards are established and administered. National wage policy should be a supplement to, rather than a substitute for, the collective bargaining process.

Increases in the general level of wages, serving to offset increases in living costs, are a consequence rather than a cause of price inflation. Our experience since the Korean outbreak provides ample proof of this. The sharpest price increases have occurred in commodities where wages are a relatively negligible factor in the cost of production, and for which the incomes of workers furnish none of the direct market demand. Commodity market speculation, inventory hoarding and profiteering by dealers and manufacturers have been at the seat of the inflationary disease.

To attempt to combat inflation through a policy of wage restraint, unaccompanied by effective price controls, or to deny workers wage adjustments to compensate for price increases, would be to attempt to cure that disease by attacking one of its symptoms.

To approach the problem of inflation control through the route of wage restraints simply because wages are easier to control than prices would work the gravest injustice upon those who work for wages and salaries, and would impose an undue share of the burden upon those who are least in a position to bear it.

American workers are willing to do their part and to accept their just share of any necessary sacrifices involved in the defense effort. But we say that they must not be required to suffer the economic consequences of legislative or administrative tenderness toward other groups that are actually far better able to bear this burden of sacrifice. They cannot be expected to take kindly to any arrangement whereby they are called upon to subsidize—through reduced living standards—special privileges and immunities accorded to their employers, their landlords, the merchants with whom they deal, or to speculators and profiteers at large.

Not only would such policies violate all standards of equity, in the long run they would be self-defeating. To attempt to offset inflationary forces through a policy of harsh restriction on wages would serve only to hide for a time the basic defects and failures in other vital areas of control, thereby endangering the cause of long-range economic stabilization.

The forces of inflation should be counteracted at their point of origin, and in those areas where controls will involve the smallest possible degree of actual hardship. While wage stabilization policies can have only a negligible effect upon incomes in the higher brackets, it is there that substantial margins of spending can be most readily curtailed without impairing health, welfare, or productive efficiency. Most of the wage earner's income, on the other hand, is spent for food, rent, and the other necessities of life.

Enlightened anti-inflation policies must include an equitable tax program, based upon the principle of ability to pay. This means that taxation should bear heaviest upon individuals with high incomes and corporations with large profits. It should not further impair the living standards of lower- and middle-income families, to the detriment of their health and well being.

Such policies must include an effective and actively enforced program of controls over hoarding and speculation, as well as

price controls. They must include a system of production controls which will assure the flow of materials and resources into the areas of greatest actual civilian and defense needs. Only when measures such as these are in force does it become appropriate to ask the representatives of workers to exercise restraint in their wage negotiations.

In closing, I can perhaps best summarize our position with regard to the major elements of a proper wage policy, in a general system on anti-inflation controls, by quoting from the statement presented to the President of the United States by the United Labor Policy Committee on December 20, 1950:

"The wage stabilization policy must permit the adjustment of wage rates to compensate for increases in the cost of living. Wage stabilization must not become wage freezing. This policy must also provide for the correction of substandard wage and the adjustment of inequities in existing wage rates within or between industries. The now well-recognized principle that wage earners should share in the benefits of industrial progress and increases in productivity which the Nation must and will have from its industrial workers, should be specifically embodied in the wage stabilization policy. Any wage stabilization policy must recognize existing collective bargaining agreements which themselves assure stability."

"Overtime payments for premium work now protected by collective bargaining agreements or existing law must continue to be held inviolate. These provisions do not in any way preclude the working of a work week longer than that now considered to be normal. They merely provide the incentive for productive overtime and holiday work."

The committee further states that: "Our labor force is the Nation's greatest single asset. Steps should be taken to strengthen and enlarge our manpower resources. These steps must recognize the fact that free labor can out-produce slave labor. Free labor will play its role in attaining our objective of maximum production."

No Headlines for These

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I read with interest the following thought-provoking and sensible editorial in the July 12 edition of the Clay County Crescent entitled "No Headlines for These":

Thanks to big headlines and sensation-loving commentators, the people of the United States are thoroughly familiar with the milk-coat episode and the huge profits that a few people have made through the cooperation of the 5-percent boys in Washington.

Not many have heard of the following news stories:

(A) Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan dismissed two officials because they accepted favors from a company doing business with the Government. One of the men, it seems, bought a television set and an automobile at wholesale by using the company's credit.

(b) Raymond M. Foley, Housing and Home Finance Administrator, overheard a chance remark that led to the discovery that every employee in a regional office had received a gift, including television sets, liquor, watches, and hosiery. He forced the return of all gifts and set up a policy to prevent a repetition.

The first class of stories, while interesting to people, does not indicate that most of those who work for the Government are looking for unearned, if not dishonest, dollars. Neither does the second class of stories prove that all governmental officials are watching closely to prevent such incidents.

Does America Back the Ulster Bridgehead?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article by Senator Denis Ireland, published in the Irish magazine *Hibernia*, in the issue of March 1951. Senator Ireland is a well-known journalist in Great Britain and Ireland, who works ceaselessly for the abolition of the partition of Ireland.

The article follows:

DOES AMERICA BACK THE ULSTER BRIDGEHEAD?

(By Senator Denis Ireland)

(So long as the English consider that a "foreign" island on their ocean flank holds direful possibilities in time of emergency, so long will they hold on to our six north-eastern counties. Instead of futile protests and rhetorical slogans can we not evolve an all-Ireland defense plan, an antipartition document that must engage the serious attention of Washington, London, and Belfast?)

During the second act of World War II the pro-British, Anglo-Saxon, and Protestant Episcopal influences in the American State Department worked on the assumption that since Britain is closer to Ireland, it must know more about Irish affairs, and that therefore American policy in Ireland must dovetail with and reinforce British policy in Ireland.

It was a strange assumption in face of 700 years of Anglo-Irish history. But any intelligent Irishman must believe the assumption was made, hence the American Republic's ham-handed handling of Irish affairs under the by-no-means-lamented Mr. David Gray. Hence, too, the reticent official attitude toward Ireland that persists to the present day. Once the American Republic entered World War II, it was, admittedly, bound to act on the basis of the division of Ireland then existing, but a little intelligent analysis then, and a minimum of retrospective analysis now, should have convinced it then, and should convince it today, that as far as Ireland is concerned it has been, and is being, led up the garden path by British imperialism. For the assumption the American State Department took over lock, stock, and barrel, and, apparently, without the slightest examination, from the British was that the division of Ireland positively guaranteed the security of the "British Isles," and that the "Ulster" bridgehead was a gift from God.

Now, the first thing that would strike an intelligent schoolboy about that assumption is that one of the islands included in the British Isles is not British; so little British that in World War II three-quarters of it had succeeded in remaining neutral. And the second thing that would, one imagines, strike a member of a State Department or Foreign Office was that the British Imperial General Staff was laying down the law about an island where the overwhelming majority of the inhabitants declared, and were prepared with arms in their hands to maintain, that they were not within the British Empire. That was not a very promising start for the Imperial or British Isles theory of Irish defense, and American diplomacy might at least have been less ham-handed in Irish affairs during World War II if it had taken the trouble to examine it. It might even today discover just how far British stupidity about Ireland has led it up the garden path, if it was prepared to reflect on Irish affairs after the event. If it were, for example, prepared to reflect on the divided Ireland theory so beloved of the British Imperial General Staff, it might discover what every Irishman who has taken the trouble to study the political anatomy of his own country knows to be the Irish pons asinorum of the years 1939-45—namely, that partition made it impossible for Ireland to produce a clear-cut reaction of any kind. In order to bring home the effect to Americans we have only to inquire whether the United States would ever have entered the war if the sacred union between its North and South had been still unachieved, if their Northeastern States had been occupied by British troops, and if there had been no such provocation as Pearl Harbor?

Having made clear to Washington the basic fact that, insofar as American policy accepted lock, stock, and barrel from Britain the theory that Irish division was somehow a kind of God-sent contribution to British security in the last war, it was itself helping to bring about the very results it deplored, our statesmen, in their exposition of common sense in relation to Ireland and the strategic security of the eastern Atlantic, might then go on to point out the absurdities of the British Isles theory as it affects the use of Irish manpower in wartime. As I pointed out in *Hibernia* last April, the theory that Ireland, far from being a nation, is just a strategic extension into the Atlantic of the island of Britain, leads to an Alice in Wonderland situation in which Irishmen are taken out of Ireland to serve in the armies of foreign nations, and are then replaced in Ireland by foreign troops whose presence in Ireland helps to be-devil the Irish political situation. It is, in effect, very much as if the British and Americans had declared in the last war that the defense of Stalingrad would have been much better carried out by British and American troops, with the Russians standing by as spectators.

ULSTER LOYALISM

In this catalog of muddled thinking one crowning absurdity is still missing—the situation in wartime inside the loyal six counties. Here the Americans must be better informed than they pretend to be, because they were there to see for themselves. They must know that the recruiting figure of the Ulster loyalists, even when swollen by the figures of men from the 26 counties who enlisted in Belfast, do not make impressive reading. They must know the proportion of able-bodied young Protestants who, instead of fighting Germans, were enrolled in semi-Fascist armed police forces to keep watch over the other young Irishmen who were only too anxious to defend their own country, so long as they were allowed to defend it in their own green uniform. The whole thing boils down in retrospect to a mixture of wasted effort, farce,

and an extremely revolting hypocrisy on the part of the more blatant and self-adulatory Ulster loyalists. Here, in fact, was merely another portion of the hell-brew concocted in Ireland by British and American muddled thinking, not to mention vigorous stirring from Ulster, and the main impression that emerges in retrospect is that Irishmen, Englishmen, and Americans should all alike thank a merciful Providence for Hitler's inability to think clearly enough about the job to be done, which was the subjection of Britain and not alarms and excursions in the east.

Here again, as in the matter of the future of industrial Belfast within an Irish economic framework, Irish nationalist propaganda fails because it is not sufficiently realistic. Ulster loyalty may produce results exactly opposite to what a true loyalty to Ireland would imply, since if all Irishmen, including political Ulstermen, were loyal to Ireland in the same fashion and to the same extent that Englishmen are loyal to England, then the safety of Britain would be enhanced by the presence of an island fortress on her ocean flank, whereas the mere existence of the Ulster bridgehead ends, in times of crisis, in the automatic creation of a kind of psychological no man's land almost on Britain's doorstep.

ETHICS AND IMPERIALISM

Such, in the last analysis, are the ethics of the situation. What Dublin has to deal with are, however, not the ethics but the extremely pragmatic politics of imperialism. Imperialism never bothers much about ethics at any time; it does so least of all when interpreted through the inelasticity of the average military mind—as the firing squads following Easter Week 1916 and their consequences in Irish history are there to prove. Now in the year 1951 in the matter of the strategic consequences of Irish division, the military mind crops up again, and what Dublin has to deal with are not the dubious ethics of Ulster loyalty existing by themselves in a vacuum, but the use the British Imperial General Staff is making of Ulster loyalty for imperial purposes of its own—which is a very different matter. The imperialist general staff is thinking in terms, not of political justice but of airfields in Fermanagh and Derry, of flying-boat bases on Lough Foyle and Lough Erne, and of the air coverage that can be provided from them over the North Channel of the Irish Sea and the northwest approaches from the Atlantic. The military and naval minds see only air strips and flying-boat bases neatly marked on a map, what they are not so quick to calculate—what they seem in Ireland completely incapable of calculating—are the political consequences of their calculations. They are not greatly to be blamed for that, since in fact a politician like Churchill, presumably an expert in politics, is quite incapable of calculating them either, and remains blandly insensitive to the political sentiments of the Irish nation; as insensitive as any British Socialist chancellor when, with smooth words about democracy and the liquidation of imperialism, he cocks a mental eye at the dollar-earning capacity of Ulster industry.

THROUGH ENGLISH EYES

Irishmen must grapple with this English form of imperialist thinking that consists in avoiding thought in the kind of terms it understands, that is, in this matter of strategic defense, in terms of the air fields themselves. They must, in other words, come down for a moment from their high plane of political ethics and look at the problem through the eyes of Englishmen. If there is a nexus of Irish political sentiment that seems to an Englishman as frail (and as inexplicable) as a spider's web but is actually, and especially in wartime, stronger than steel, there

is also a ghost at the back of the English mind, a fear that haunts every Englishman every time he looks at a map of what he illogically call the British Isles and notes the nearness on his ocean flank of an island which he knows to be foreign. The first thing a psychiatrist would inquire, of course, is why if he knows the island to be foreign he always acts as if it were part of the British Isles and is naively hurt and surprised when he finds it isn't. But logic like that is lost on an Englishman, and, where Ireland is concerned, the English mind continues to alternate between sentimentality and bitter hostility.

Meanwhile, as any psychiatrist could have prophesied, the ghost remains unaided, the ghost being the fear that some day the foreign island will be the Achilles' heel of Britain. Useless again to point to the imbecility of the fact that it is he himself who is creating the Achilles' heel, not so much by supporting partition (since in fact he is perfectly capable of talking against partition and at the same time making use of it), as of using partition as a stalking horse behind which to conceal his armed forces in Ireland. Useless, too, to underline the fact that at the moment he is supporting a whole series of self-contradictory propositions about Ireland, including a Kiplingesque music-hall tradition of the gallantry of Irish soldiers, coupled with an, at any rate, apparent conviction that the same gallant Irish soldiers could not be trusted to defend Ireland. The English are not interested in logic or dialectics and the only way to crash through their Chinese wall of sentimentality, illogicality, and occasionally downright dishonest thinking where Ireland is concerned would be for an Irish Government to produce a concrete plan for the defense of Ireland, a master plan that should be publicized simultaneously in America, since the moment such a master plan appeared, the English would pretend not to see it, and hardly an inch of space would be allotted to it in their national newspapers.

FIRST PRINCIPLES

This master plan, which should be publicized throughout the world as well as in America, would resume the first principles that have underlain all Irish-Government statements in the matter of the North Atlantic Pact—namely, that Ireland is perfectly willing to sign on the dotted line the moment her reservations under article 4 are met—that is, the moment the threat of the Ulster bridgehead to her territorial integrity is removed. But at this point the new statement should cease scoring juridical and ethical points, and come down to the brass tacks of military strategy; should, in fact, provide an embarrassingly large number of brass tacks for the brass hats of the British Imperial General Staff. Hitherto there has been an air of bleak unreality about Irish demands that Britain should withdraw her forces from Northern Ireland, for the reason that nobody has ever stated, at any rate in public, exactly what is to replace them. And it is exactly at this point that a new analysis can penetrate the unholy alliance between Ulster loyalty and the British Imperial General Staff that constitutes the not-too-solid foundation for the mixed, and in time of crisis potentially chaotic, defenses of the island as a whole.

For at this point the new Irish statement should turn from the court of American, British, and world opinion generally and address itself to the Ulster loyalists. If you insist on being loyal to Britain rather than to Ireland, it would say, then we assume that, even on a basis which we deplore, you want to build the military security of Ireland on a firm and lasting foundation. In that event, with British military resources strained to breaking point to provide garrisons in the Far East and in Germany, not

to mention commitments under western union, we assume you would be prepared to play a part—which in proportion to your numbers within the six-county area must be a leading part—in gradually replacing the British forces at present in the six counties by forces recruited from among the inhabitants of the six counties. If conscription should be necessary, we are prepared to introduce it in the 26 counties at the same moment. The British forces to be finally withdrawn only when the new Northern Irish Air Force is in a position to carry out the tasks and duties at present allotted to the British air arms using six-county airfields and flying-boat bases. The main political assumption underlying these proposals is that the present conception of Ulster unionism must be widened to include the real twentieth-century unionism of the United Nations, western union, and the North Atlantic Pact, to the end that Ireland, at least a military unit, will be able to take her place in the ranks of the western nations.

FINANCIAL ASPECT

Such, in outline, is the substance of a statement that Irish nationalism could make at any moment, *urbi et orbi*, to the world and, more particularly, to the city of Belfast. If its first principles are admitted, but its financial cost to Ulster deplored, the answer is that the financial burden of the new defense forces can be borne by the imperial contribution of which Ulster is always boasting—that the new contribution to the security of both these islands off the coast of Europe would be in men and in the unification of Irish sentiment, rather than in money—always allowing for the fact that, when the complicated financial transactions between Britain and Ulster are finally unraveled, Ulster may not be found to be paying all that she so publicly labels as imperial contribution. The final effect of the new plan would be that the reality of Ulster claims would be finally tested against the reality of world conditions.

QUESTION FOR UNITED STATES

Having asked Ulster the kind of questions that cannot be answered without giving the whole Ulster bridgehead theory away as the dangerously antiquated British imperialist nonsense that it is, having publicized to the Western World the entire statement, plus the absence of any sensible reply from Ulster unionism (and its absence can be safely assumed, since Ulster unionism is in this matter, merely a stooge for the British Imperial General Staff); we shall then be in a position to ask Washington point blank just what it thinks of Irish division as a basis for the security of these extremely important islands off the coast of what might within the course of one short, hectic campaign easily become an all-Red Europe, English Channel ports and all?

It would be an interesting question, the answer to which would involve Washington's opinion of British imperialism in Ireland. For that reason the answer would probably be silence, in which event the rest of the Western World could then decide for itself just how much reality there is in all this talk about the United Nations and the ending of imperialism.

Do Not Slaughter the Slaughter Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is of the utmost importance that every

Member of the House read the following release issued by the counsel to the National Association of Independent Beef Slaughterers, with reference to abandonment of slaughter quotas. It is as follows:

SLAUGHTER QUOTA BAN FAVORS MONOPOLISTS AND BLACK MARKETEERS, SAY INDEPENDENT SLAUGHTERERS

The National Association of Independent Beef Slaughterers warned Congress today that elimination of slaughtering quotas on meat would harm independent small business and turn the meat industry over to monopolists and black marketeers.

The organization, which comprises some of the largest as well as the smaller independent meat firms, said that Congressmen who voted tentatively Tuesday to prohibit OPS from setting quotas on livestock slaughter "apparently were under the mistaken impression that they were helping small business. They were completely wrong."

"In our experience as law-abiding independent slaughterers," the association declared, "we find nothing to support the claims made in Congress that abolition of OPS slaughter controls will either increase the slaughter of meat or help the small and independent slaughterers."

"The ban on slaughter controls will not result in the slaughter of an additional pound of meat, but it will result in the slaughter of many of our independent slaughtering firms. Slaughter controls, in a period like the present, are the only assurance independent slaughterers have of getting their fair share of meat animal for slaughter. Without slaughter controls, the supply of animals is gobbled up by the monopolists and by the black marketeers."

"We speak from experience. Our members have been in business for many years—some have been in continuous business for more than 50 years. The investments of all of us run into the many millions of dollars, and we employ many thousands of people. We have slaughtered cattle and distributed meat through good times and bad, and we want to stay in business."

"We saw what happened to the orderly distribution of meat when slaughter controls were lifted during the last war. Immediately fly-by-night slaughterers sprang up in areas where cattle are produced and drained off the supply of cattle. Legitimate meat supplies dropped sharply in the heavy industrial areas where our members' plants are located and where the bulk of the population works and lives. Not only was the orderly distribution of meat wrecked, but the country lost great amounts of much needed supplies of pharmaceuticals and leather because the fly-by-night slaughterers, who made a killing on meat, didn't bother with the byproducts."

"We don't want this situation to recur, and we appeal to Congress not to turn the meat industry over to the monopolists and black marketeers by abolishing the slaughter control program."

The officers of the association are president: Eugene Meyer, Illinois Packing Co., Chicago, Ill.; vice presidents: Max N. Lampert, Somerville Dressed Meat Co., Somerville, Mass.; Jack T. Ruddy, Peerless Packing Co., Cleveland, Ohio; Carl Rothschild, M. Rothschild & Sons, Inc., Omaha, Neb.; David Resnick, Monarch Meat Packing Co., Milwaukee, Wis.; secretary-treasurer: Sol A. Meringer, Siegel-Weller Packing Co., Chicago, Ill.

The directors of the association include, in addition to the officers listed, Meyer Averch, Capital Packing Co., Denver, Colo.; J. R. Cohn, CeeBee Packing Co., Chicago, Ill.; Harold Dugdale, Dugdale Packing Co., St. Joseph, Mo.; Isadore Gentner, Gentler Packing Co., South Bend, Ind.; Thomas Graver, H. Graver Co., Chicago, Ill.; Fred

Hagenauer, Lincoln Meat Co., Chicago, Ill.; Ira Loewenstein, Superior Packing Co., St. Paul, Minn.; Milton Marshall, Cross Bros. Meat Packer, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.; Floyd A. Segel, Wisconsin Packing Co., Milwaukee, Wis.; Leroy Wimp, Wimp Packing Co., Chicago, Ill.

Horseshoe Bend Battle Recalled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, the Alabama Historical Association, on June 28 dedicated the Horseshoe Bend highway marker, near the historic Horseshoe Bend Battleground in Tallapoosa County, Ala.

Before a large audience in Dadeville, Ala., Judge C. J. Coley delivered a great and memorable dedication address on the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. It not only is a great oration but is a historical document worthy of study. I commend Judge Coley for the outstanding address and the Alabama Historical Association for the recognition given to this national shrine. I am happy to place the following address of Judge Coley in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order that it may be preserved for posterity:

On the north side of the Tallapoosa County Courthouse here in Dadeville, Ala., you will find a bronze plaque on which are these words:

"This tablet is placed by Tallapoosa County in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the battle of Horseshoe Bend fought within its limits on March 27, 1814. There the Creek Indians led by Menawa and other chiefs were defeated by the American and allied Indian forces under General Andrew Jackson. This battle broke the power of the fierce Muscogee, brought peace to the southern frontier and made possible the speedy opening up of a large part of the State of Alabama to civilization."

The wording on this tablet is indicative, to some degree, of the importance of the battle which began on that eventful morning of March 27, 1814; Maj. Gen. Andrew Jackson, commanding 2,000 Tennesseans and friendly Indians, stood poised for mortal conflict. With water on three sides of him, and entrenched behind breastworks, the fierce Muscogee 1,000 strong, nervously awaited the order to sound the war cry. Jackson had placed men on every vantage point around this bend in the Tallapoosa River.

These Muscogees, who were nicknamed Creeks by the British presumably because they built their villages along the banks of creeks and rivers, were worked into a frenzy by varied and many incantations. Then too, the more discerning of the braves were not unmindful that this was to be the epic struggle for their survival as a nation. The medicine men had promised victory to Chief Menawa. They said, "The signs from the Great Spirit were unmistakable."

This particular bend in the Tallapoosa River forms almost a perfect horseshoe and contains approximately 100 acres, then furrowed with gullies and covered by timber. The Red Sticks had thrown huge logs across the peninsula at the narrowest point which made formidable breastworks. The Muscogees were also known as Red Sticks because

of the crimson pole erected in their village which was a symbol of a declaration of war. In the breastworks were two rows of port-holes. This defense was so substantial and built with such skill that one wonders if General Jackson's British adversaries of that time did not aid and abet the Creeks in this plan of battle. At the toe of the horseshoe a fleet of canoes was waiting for the Creeks, should a retreat become necessary.

The ever-faithful Gen. John Coffee was ordered to complete the surrounding of the peninsula with his cavalry and friendly Indians, the type of encircling move for which Jackson became famous. David Crockett was with Coffee on that memorable day. A thousand of Jackson's men were drawn up on the land side with the order "any officer or soldier who flies before the enemy without being compelled to do so by superior force—shall suffer death." Jackson's artillery, consisting of one 3-pounder and one 6-pounder placed on an elevation some 80 yards from the breastworks, began pounding away, but the cannon balls sank harmlessly in the soft pine timbers while Red Stick sharp shooters diverted the cannoners.

Jackson, recognizing the ineffectiveness of his artillery warfare, ordered the infantry to scale the fortifications. The drums of the Regulars beat the long roll. The first man to reach the top of the works fell back dead with a musket ball in his head. He was Virginia-born, courageous Maj. Lemuel Purnell Montgomery, of the Thirty-ninth Regiment. Andrew Jackson wept unashamedly over his body crying "I have lost the flower of my army." Montgomery was 28 years old. His bones lie at rest near Dudleyville in this county.

Young Ensign Sam Houston, who stood 6 feet 6 inches in his sock feet, emerged from the smoke of battle waving a sword and leading his platoon over the ramparts. Houston fell on the inside of the fortifications with an arrow in his thigh but quickly regained his equilibrium and requested a lieutenant fighting nearby to remove it, but the lieutenant suggested he go to a surgeon. Houston became so enraged that he brandished his sword and demanded the lieutenant to pull with all his strength, which the officer did. The removal of the barbed arrow made an ugly gash in Houston's flesh. Immediately, a surgeon was summoned to bind the wound. Jackson, seeing Ensign Houston's plight, ordered him back but as soon as the general had left the scene, young Sam was in the midst of the fray again.

In the meantime, Coffee's Cherokee scouts swam the river, set fire to the village of Tohopeka on the horseshoe and carried away many of the Creek's canoes. This relieved considerably the Indians' resistance to Jackson's frontal attack. Scaling the breastworks was in full swing.

The Red Sticks began retreating and 20 battles raged at once. The plight of the Muscogees seemed hopeless. In the middle of the afternoon Jackson suspended hostilities and sent an interpreter to offer life to all who would surrender.

At that moment, the medicine men were moving among the braves chanting encouragement and falling as the warriors fell. The medicine men said, "The Great Spirit has promised victory, and the sign will be a cloud in the sky." During the lull in the fighting a cloud did appear in the sky as prophesied and the Red Sticks refused Jackson's offer with scorn. This sign of deliverance brought only a light shower.

On the refusal of the Creeks to surrender the wounded Sam Houston seized a musket and led a charge. Five yards from the redoubt Houston received one ball that shattered his right arm and another that smashed his right shoulder. The redoubt was reduced by Jackson with flaming arrows. The carnage was dreadful. The

surgeons removed one of the balls from Houston's body and the other he carried to his grave.

By nightfall the battle was over. Five hundred fifty-seven Indian dead were counted on the ground, and the river was the grave of 200 more. Probably 200 escaped, but not a single Red Stick surrendered. Jackson's losses were 49 killed and 157 wounded.

To chronicle the story of the battle of Horseshoe Bend, or Tohopeka as some are wont to call it, would be incomplete, it seems to me, without taking cognizance of the bravery and the daring, together with the unwavering loyalty, of the Muscogee chieftain, Menawa.

He was a native of the Indian village of Okfuskee, 15 miles south of Horseshoe Bend, and there as a youngster he was known as Hothlepoya, being interpreted "crazy trouble hunter," a name which he earned because of his reckless abandon. His father was a Scotsman. While in his teens he made annual trips to the Cumberland and returned with horses and other booty which he confiscated primarily for the sport of it. In the athletic arena of the giants of the Muscogees he may have met his equal but never his master.

By the time he had obtained his majority, he was known as Menawa, and his reputation for military skill and courage was widespread among his tribesmen. More and more the Red Sticks looked to Menawa for council and leadership.

When Tecumseh, the eloquent and powerful chief of the Shawnees, made a trip south at the request of the British to bestir the red man against the Americans, it was to Menawa he came. Using his golden voice and incantations, he pled with Menawa to mass the Muscogees in any movement that would divert or destroy the Americans. Tecumseh's visit, along with other happenings, was responsible for the Creek stronghold at Tohopeka.

Soon after the battle of Horseshoe Bend got under way, Menawa and the principal spiritual leader or medicine man, disagreed on tactics of warfare. The chief prophet had a tremendous following among the braves, but notwithstanding, Menawa slew him on the spot and as paradoxical as it may seem, the Red Stick warriors rallied to Menawa without a defection.

Menawa was so badly wounded in the late afternoon at Tohopeka that he was passed over for dead. However, the brisk air on that March night revived him and by the force of his unconquerable will he dragged himself to the river's edge, pulled his mutilated body into a canoe and let the current of the water waft the canoe downstream. The Muscogee women and children had been sent, previous to the battle, some fifteen miles to a site where Elkahatchee Creek flows into the Tallapoosa. The next day one of the squaws noticed what appeared to be an unmanned canoe, and set out to retrieve it. Upon investigation, she found it to contain the body of an almost lifeless warrior, which was soon identified as their admired chieftain, Menawa.

In the course of time Menawa regained his health and made his way back to his beloved Okfuskee to find his once flourishing trading business gone, his cattle stolen or destroyed and the village in ashes. Undaunted, he began anew.

An order had been issued in 1836 by the Federal Government to force the Creeks to leave Alabama for a distant land. Menawa had sent his petition to Washington asking that he be allowed to live his remaining years at Okfuskee. The request was granted but due to the lack of dispatch of mail during those times, the affirmative answer from Washington to Menawa reached Alabama after the Red Stick chieftain had been forced to join the "trail of tears" or the "march

of the broken spirited." Menawa died on the trek West and his spirit went to the happy hunting ground before the Creeks reached their new land.

The battle of Horseshoe Bend is important in the annals of American history because it ended the Creek War. And because of the famous Americans who participated. Among them was Major Montgomery, who made the supreme sacrifice and for whom the County of Montgomery, Ala., was subsequently named and some say the capital city of our State. Gen. John Coffee was there. He distinguished himself at Horseshoe Bend and later at the Battle of New Orleans, and was an early settler of what is now Lauderdale County in this State. Coffee, County, Ala., was named in his honor.

And there Davy Crockett, the famous frontiersman, who later died gloriously at the Alamo, was slightly wounded. Sam Houston, who was severely wounded at Horseshoe Bend, was elected to Congress from Tennessee and became governor of the State. Houston became the first president of the Republic of Texas and was later elected Senator from and governor of the State of Texas. Andrew Jackson's conclusive victory over the Indians at Tohopeka added greatly to his fame and he was promoted immediately thereafter. The battle at Horseshoe Bend cleared the way for his campaign at New Orleans. Andrew Jackson is, of course, principally remembered for having been President of the United States for two terms.

The battle at Horseshoe Bend is also significant because it opened up a great part of the southeastern United States for peaceable settlement by the white man.

Surely sometime in the not-too-distant future, in addition to the Government monument there, a fitting park will be built on the land 12 miles to the north of us where a struggle of such enormous consequences took place.

Almost a century ago, a historian wrote this:

"It was not only the power of the Creeks that was broken at the Horseshoe Bend, on the 27th day of March, 1814, but the power of the Red Man in North America. We have had since that day, and shall have for many years to come, occasional encounters with Indians. But never since has there been in arms against the white man any force of Indians large enough to excite anything like general or serious apprehension, or to task the power and resources of the United States, or of any single State, and there never will be. At Tohopeka the scepter was finally snatched from the Red Man's hands; at Tohopeka the long struggle for the possession of the Western World was ended and a continent changed owners."

Knock the Price Down, Spread Distribution: Promotes Industry and Wealth at Home and Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, at this stage of our debate on the Defense Production Act, I think it well to reaffirm our faith in a good, old-fashioned American rule, a rule which in our short history has enabled America to pace the world in promoting industry and wealth, at home and abroad: "Knock the price down, spread distribution."

Prices are going up, the world around. Distribution is shrinking. The pursuit of industry and wealth in the free world is threatened.

The President of the United States calls for action, price action, to spread distribution. He shall have it, at home and abroad, not only from Congress, but from the United Nations.

On Saturday, July 14, 1951, the Washington Evening Star, on page A3, told of a courageous move:

United States ready to ask U. N. to act on crushing world monopolies.

Congratulations, Mr. President. "Knock the price down, spread distribution," and you will keep alive a good, old-fashioned American rule.

Effective Price Controls and the Welfare of Our Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, among the many letters and communications which I received this morning was one from the president of Clifton's Cafeteria, of Los Angeles, Calif., urging support of an effective controls act and criticizing the Congress for delaying its passage. This letter struck me very forcefully and the sound arguments advanced for the enactment of this law is deserving of reading by every Member of Congress, as follows:

JULY 13, 1951.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SABATH: We operate Clifton's Cafeterias in Los Angeles. We enclose for your information a copy of Clifton's Food for Thot (issue of July 5, 1951) that explains (on page 4) to our 20,000 daily customers the difficult situation in which we find ourselves. We are having to pay the highest prices for food in our experience. Yet the crying need of the times is for anti-inflationary prices. It is our obligation to pass along to guests this high-cost food at lowest prices possible. This is becoming extremely hard to do.

We think that our experience illustrates what is happening to many others across the land. We would like to see effective action on a food-wage control law that will help to check the inflationary spiral.

We believe that the alarm expressed by such responsible statesmen and businessmen as Charles Wilson, Eric Johnston, and Bernard Baruch is well grounded and that here is the opportunity and now is the time to let considerations of public welfare and statesmanship override politics and the selfish arguments of special-interest groups for exemption from price and wage controls so necessary as a foundation for our domestic and world policy.

The facts stated in this leaflet constitute a report from the people who have not been heard in your committees.

It is a maxim of statesmanship that those in charge of national policy should always reserve a corner of their minds for the man who has not been heard.

Sincerely yours,

EDMOND J. CLINTON,
President and General Manager.

Mr. Speaker, here are a few comparisons of prices of 1931 and 1951 as shown in a pamphlet which accompanied the Clifton Cafeteria letter which shows what the company paid for its foods:

Item	1931 price	1951 price	Percent of increase
	Cents		
Box of tomatoes.....	25	\$3.00	1,100
1 pound of butter.....	15	.75	400
Top grade rib beef per pound.....	15	.76	400
Canned goods.....			350
Rice and flour.....			500
2 1/2 pint bottle of milk.....	1 1/2	.05 1/2	375

If we fail to pass a real and effective price-control bill, I greatly fear that prices will go still higher and how low-income workers, white-collar workers, and persons with fixed incomes will exist may become a grave problem and bring about unrest throughout our country. Weak controls will bring about inflation. Those in favor of effective controls are interested in the common people and the welfare of our country.

Colorado's Aspinall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REVA BECK BOSONE

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Frontier magazine for July 1951: COLORADO'S ASPINALL—SHORT ON BOMBAST, LONG ON HONEST PUBLIC SERVICE

(By Robert L. Perkin)

DENVER—Colorado's resource-rich western slope is in many ways a land apart. Despite airlines, the Moffat Tunnel, and modern highways, the Continental Divide still pokes its lofty ridgepole down the middle of the State to create a barrier which is both mental and topographical. The western slope is at once a state of mind and an empire to itself.

To represent these wide open spaces "over the hill" in the Halls of Congress, western slope voters twice have chosen by substantial margins a quiet lawyer-teacher-peach grower named WAYNE NOBVILLE ASPINALL.

WAYNE ASPINALL is one of the work horses of the Democratic Party in Colorado. Ever since 1930, in his unspectacular way, he has been ramrodding the party program in lean years and good. Some question about western slope policy. Ask Wayne. Need some votes over there? Wayne would deliver them.

Yet ASPINALL is the veritable antithesis of political hack or party big wheel. Quiet almost to the point of being colorless, school-teacherish in mannerisms, he prefers to serve his district without fireworks, whether as State senator or United States Representative.

His district is a big one—half the State, geographically—and its interests are as diverse as uranium for atom bombs and White River honey for biscuits. There are peach orchards, gold mines, Ute Indians, the "twentieth century's most important oil field" at Rangley, some of America's most awe-inspiring scenery, and the world's larg-

est proven oil shale reserves. The Fourth Congressional District of Colorado also is range country with huge spreads of beef animals, blooded breeding stock and sheep. And there's the rub.

For many years the district was represented in Washington by venerable Ed Taylor, the universally respected Democrat who fathered the Taylor Grazing Act for sensible, controlled use of the public domain. When Taylor died he was succeeded by a Republican who distinguished himself chiefly as spokesman for the big cattlemen in their efforts to grab the Taylor grazing lands and plunder the national forests. He also lined up with the enemies of reclamation even though his own district prospers or hungers in direct ratio to available water.

WAYNE ASPINALL gave special interest serving its comeuppance in 1948, and the western slope once again got decent representation. Early this year the Republican cattlemen tried a sleeper play aimed at riding ASPINALL out of their way. They arranged a memorial suggesting that he be given a post of prestige on the House Ways and Means Committee. Certainly he deserved it. But that would have taken him off the Public Lands Committee, making a vacant chair for Republican J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, from southern Colorado, whose record shows him most friendly to the cattlemen's designs.

ASPINALL spotted the play immediately. In his calm, definite, and forthright way he checkmated the move with this statement: "I want it definitely understood by all the people of Colorado that I do not intend to get off the committee and that I have already refused a place on three of the most important committees in the House in order to keep my membership on the Public Lands Committee."

Round faced, almost cherubic of countenance, ASPINALL is friendly without being hale-fellow. His rare speeches are scholarly, direct, fact-cramped; oratory is for others. His weakness as a political leader is his lack of color and verve, but he makes up for it many times over in the in-fighting.

For it was not by chance that he was tagged twice as majority whip in the State senate, once as speaker of the house, and several times as senate minority leader. He went to the Colorado House of Representatives originally in 1930, served for 8 years, and then was elevated to the senate for another 8.

This rich political education was not lost on the small man who once taught high school in his home town of Palsade. ASPINALL is a sincere, seasoned legislator, short on bombast, long on honest public service in the liberal tradition.

Price and Wage Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two polls and an article, indicating that the voters of this country favor continuing and strengthening price and wage controls, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The first is a poll from my State of Minnesota conducted by the Minneapolis Tribune of June 20, 1951, entitled "Keep Price and Wage Curbs, Public Says." The second is the George Gallup poll entitled "Poll Reveals Voters Favor Tighter Curbs," publisher in the Minne-

apolis Tribune of June 29, 1951. Next is an article in America for June 30, 1951.

There being no objection, the polls and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Tribune of June 20, 1951]

KEEP PRICE, WAGE CURBS, PUBLIC SAYS

A majority of Minnesotans thinks Congress should continue price and wage controls. Two adults in every five, in fact, favor even stronger price regulations.

These Minnesota Poll findings are based on interviews June 6-10 with a State-wide cross-section of men and women 21 years of age and older.

The Government's control program is operated under a law scheduled to expire June 30. Congress is being urged by President Truman to extend the law. The President also has asked for strengthening of the regulations.

Interviewers asked first:

"What do you think Congress should do—make price controls stronger? Keep them as they are? Ease up the controls? Get rid of them altogether?"

The answers:

	Percent
Make them stronger.....	41
Keep them as they are.....	12
Ease up controls.....	8
Get rid of controls.....	25
No opinion.....	14
Total.....	100

Thus, 53 percent favor keeping controls, either in their present or in stronger form; 8 percent would like an easing up of the regulations; 25 percent prefer to see controls ended, and the remaining 14 percent are undecided.

"If you're going to have price controls, the law should be stronger; dealers should be punished if the laws are not obeyed," an Ely farm woman said. A Minneapolis man thinks controls should be as strong as they were in World War II. A Hawley farmer believes that if we take off controls, it will cause inflation.

Persons who favor doing away with controls offer comments like these: "Business will regulate itself if given a chance" (a Pine City man); "Controls just don't work unless there is a real emergency" (a Pine River farmer); "The majority of products don't need control" (a Crookston man).

Among farm people, there are almost as many (34 percent) who think Congress should either extend the present controls or strengthen them.

Fifty-two percent of the college-educated people want to see Congress tighten controls and another 8 percent think the present controls should be continued.

More than two out of three labor union members (69 percent) are in favor of price-control extension, in the same or stronger form.

On political lines, Democratic-Farmer-Laborites, Republicans, and independent voters offer these views:

	DFL	GOP	Independents
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Keep or strengthen controls.....	61	46	47
Ease up controls.....	7	13	8
Get rid of them.....	19	31	28
No opinion.....	13	10	17
Total.....	100	100	100

Interviewers also asked the same State cross-section:

"What about wage controls—do you think Congress should keep wage controls, or do away with them?"

The answers:

	All	Men	Women
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Keep wage controls.....	56	59	54
Do away with them.....	24	26	22
Other answers.....	6	6	6
No opinion.....	14	9	19
Total.....	100	100	100

DFL, Republican and independent voters alike want to see wage controls continued. So do people of all educational levels and of all economic groups. Sixty-four percent of the labor union members interviewed endorse wage control extension.

[From the Minneapolis Tribune of June 29, 1951]

POLL REVEALS VOTERS FAVOR TIGHTER CURBS

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N. J.—Although most voters are far from satisfied with the working of economic controls, there is overwhelming popular support for continuing them.

In fact, the President's repeated pleas for making the price-wage-control program even stronger have struck a responsive chord. A survey just completed by the American Institute of Public Opinion finds that the main weight of sentiment is for making the program more strict and comprehensive.

Interviewing on two questions was concentrated during the week of June 17 to 23, just before Congress began debating the control-extension measure.

The first question was:

"The Federal price and wage control laws end this June 30. Do you think these laws have worked well or not?"

Here is the national vote:

	Percent
Yes, worked well.....	31
No.....	45
No opinion.....	24
Total.....	100

In general, voters who classify themselves as Democrats take a much more favorable attitude than those who consider themselves Republicans.

Among Democrats the vote is evenly divided, whereas among Republicans sentiment is unfavorable by a ratio of 5 to 3.

Here is the vote:

	Democrats	Republicans	Independents
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Yes.....	38	28	28
No.....	39	50	46
No opinion.....	23	22	26
Total.....	100	100	100

In spite of criticism of the laws' effectiveness, fewer than one voter in six thinks Washington should abandon them and have no controls at all.

This is shown in answers to the second question in the survey, as follows:

"Do you think the Federal price and wage control laws should be continued as they are, or strengthened or done away with?"

	Percent
Continued.....	20
Strengthened.....	45
Done away with.....	16
No opinion.....	19
Total.....	100

Sentiment for strengthening the controls was found to be somewhat higher among Democrats than Republicans, as follows:

	Democrats	Republicans	Independents
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Continued.....	22	18	20
Strengthened.....	49	38	46
Done away with.....	9	26	14
No opinion.....	20	18	20
Total.....	100	100	100

[From America of June 30, 1951]

SPEAK UP, M' CITIZEN

When the President faced a battery of microphones and television cameras the night of June 14, Congress was in no mood to write the kind of defense production law the White House asked for way back on April 26. Neither was it disposed, in response to a vigorous request from Charles E. Wilson, mobilization czar, to extend and toughen the Housing and Rent Act of 1947. So far as we can see, Mr. Truman might just as well have spent the evening reading his favorite history books or planning a week-end cruise. Capitol Hill reaction to his deadly serious, down-to-earth speech was very, very chilly.

Whatever doubts existed before, it is painfully clear now that the Eighty-second Congress, dominated on most domestic issues by an informal coalition of Taft-Wherry-Martin Republicans and southern Democrats, will not come honestly to grips with the menace of inflation unless an aroused citizenry makes its influence strongly felt and takes the play away from self-interest pressure groups. Most Senators and Representatives appreciate the timeliness and justice of Bernard Baruch's recent advice to Michigan's freshman Senator, BLAIR MOODY: "You know well enough what to do. Damn the political torpedoes, go ahead." But the run-of-the-mill politician doesn't damn political torpedoes. For the most part, short of an all-out war, he doesn't let them come within a country mile of his craft.

No slouch as a politician himself, Mr. Truman knows this better than most people. That is why he went to the people over the heads of Congress on June 14. He is betting that once the people appreciate the imminence of another wave of inflation, they will accept the necessity for strict controls and light a fire under their dawdling, lobby-conscious Representatives in Washington. He is even convinced that a majority of the rank-and-file members of the farm and business groups opposed to effective wage and price controls are out of sympathy with what their spokesmen have been up to. He is not at all convinced that the National Association of Manufacturers is the authentic voice of business, or that the American Farm Bureau Federation is the authentic voice of agriculture. And he is certain that when John L. Lewis and William Hutcheson oppose controls, they are not speaking for the coal miners and carpenters of the country.

We think the President is right. On the basis of his radio address, we think he is right all along the line. The danger of a big inflationary bulge this fall or early next year is real. Despite the current lull on the price front, the people can be made to see this danger, and once they see it will accept whatever curbs are needed to ward off a catastrophe. Most of them still remember acutely what happened in 1946 when OPA controls, at the insistence of the very groups which are warring on controls now, were prematurely removed. Many of them haven't yet recovered from the resultant price binge. That goes for farmers and businessmen, too, who have discovered that

selling prices do not rise alone. They are accompanied by rises in costs, including the cost of labor, and frequently the most tangible result of an inflationary rat-race between wages and prices is a bad case of ulcers.

Now that the President has gone to the people, it is important for all of us to understand what the issue really is. First of all, it is not a question of all controls or none. Everybody agrees on the need for credit controls, for higher taxes, for a system of priorities and allocations. Despite all the farm and business lobbies in Washington, it is not even a question of either continuing wage and price and rent controls or doing away with them. Even Mr. TART agrees that they must be continued on a temporary basis. The real question is whether or not present controls are going to be tightened up, extended and given a good set of teeth. That's what the fight is over. That's the issue which we, the people, must decide. If you agree that a well-rounded program of controls, including wage, price, and rent controls, is needed to keep inflation in check, let your Senators and Congressman know where you stand. And do it now.

Rider Means Job Freeze

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News of July 16, 1951:

RIDER MEANS JOB FREEZE

(By John Cramer)

If Congress does the expected, and tacks the so-called Jensen rider onto pending non-defense appropriation bills, one of the things you can expect as a result is air-tight freeze on Government employee transfers from agency to agency.

Civil Service Commission has authority to order such a freeze by regulation—and if the Jensen rider becomes law it almost certainly will do so.

Here is why:

Under the rider, agencies could fill only 25 percent of all job vacancies occurring in the new Government year which started July 1—one vacancy out of every four.

The job freeze could be expected to function in two ways:

1. A stiff penalty would be provided for employees who voluntarily resigned from Government, planning to return within a few months. This penalty probably would provide that such an employee must wait at least 6 months to a year before returning to Government. A similar rule was in effect during World War II to discourage unauthorized transfers. Then, employees who resigned with the idea of subsequent transfer, had to wait 90 days before going back to a Government job.

2. Agency-to-agency transfers almost certainly would be prohibited outright in a freeze far tighter than any Government previously has invoked. No agency could be expected to tolerate a situation in which every 12 employees lost by transfer could be replaced by only three employees. Civil Serv-

ice would have no choice except to order a freeze.

This freeze would have its most undesirable effect on defense agencies, who would find themselves prohibited from acquiring new workers by transfer from nondefense agencies—something Congress has been trying to encourage.

That's the dark side of the picture.

On the other side, as pointed out here previously, the Jensen rider would:

1. Accomplish its deep personnel cuts without requiring lay-offs—a tremendous boon to employees who otherwise might find themselves without jobs.

2. Open the way for promotion for scores of thousands of deserving employees. That's because the rider's prohibition against filling vacancies would not apply to vacancies filled by promotions from within. And the many vacancies it would create, inevitably would lead to wholesale promotions.

Incidentally, don't let yourself be confused by headlines (in other papers) which tell of wholesale "job cuts" as a result of the Jensen rider. True enough, it would reduce Federal employment. But the important thing for employees is that it will wipe out any possibility of mass lay-offs in Government during the current Government year.

SPECIAL CASES

Here is how the Senate Civil Service Committee's bill to raise the pay of classified (white collar) Government workers would affect employees drawing so-called seniority pay—and those at rates which do not correspond exactly to the ordinary classification pay steps:

1. Those whose pay falls between regular steps of regular pay grades would be advanced to the next higher step—and assigned the new rate for that step. In other words, they would get slightly higher increases than other employees.

2. Those in regular seniority pay steps would have their salaries increased by the same "average" 84 percent as other employees.

3. Those whose present pay falls below two seniority steps would be advanced to the next higher grade, and given the new rate for that step.

4. Those whose present pay exceeds that of the top seniority step for their grades would have the "average" 84 percent added to their salaries.

CURIOUS DOCUMENT

President Truman's letter Thursday urging 7 percent pay increases for classified and postal workers was a curious document in more ways than one.

On its face, it was a simple appeal for congressional action on raises. But the facts are:

That Mr. Truman's own White House assistants (or at least some of them) took a dim view of raises from the very start.

That these same assistants were mainly responsible for the fact that the administration recommended a parsimonious 7 percent, instead of some larger figure.

That these same assistants argued that the administration should take no position whatever on pay increases—but were talked into a definite stand by Civil Service Commission Chairman Robert (Bob) Ramspeck.

That the real inspiration for the Truman letter was not a White House desire for raises—but, instead, an attempt to head off increases larger than 7 percent. The inside fact is that the letter originated with the Budget Bureau, which was disturbed by Postmaster General Jesse Donaldson's statement to the House Civil Service Committee urging 10 percent for postal employees.

Postscript: If I seem to be belaboring the Administration and the White House, it's only because I like my public officials to be

more forthright in their dealings than administration officials have been on the pay raise question.

Puts Politics in Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram of July 14, 1951:

PUTS POLITICS IN PRICE CONTROL

Just what the Democratic national committee hopes to accomplish by its declared intention to rally "grass roots" support for the kind of inflation control bill the President wants from Congress is difficult to see. Of course, the declaration puts the party on record against high prices. But there is nothing distinctive about that. Everybody is against high prices and wants them lower.

As for rallying "grass roots" support for stiffer controls measures, it is probable that party wheelhorses throughout the 48 States may send telegrams or letters to Washington. But it is doubtful that any great number of rank and file consumers will do so. President Truman in a recent address appealed to the people to urge passage of a strong controls law. The news from Washington never has reported any ground swell of public opinion in the wake of that appeal.

As a matter of fact, the pressure on Congress for and against stronger economic controls is coming almost entirely from self-interest groups. These groups—business, labor and farmer and their various subdivisions—all imply that they are speaking out for the public interest and for the consumer. But actually they are working for the interest of their own particular group. Nobody is working for the consumer which is the largest and most important group of all. And these groups speaking all at the same time talk in a babel of tongues.

The people are confused. They don't know what to think. But they do know that price control has not been especially effective. They heard a lot of talk that meat was going to be cheaper. But the price over the counter is as much, if not more, than it was before all the talk. They know that the President who is now calling for sterner control measures did not want any measure when Congress insisted he have one last July after the war in Korea began. And the people know that he dilly-dallied about price and wage controls during the autumn, delaying any action whatsoever until the November elections had been held. Prices were rising all those months, but the President who seems so concerned about price increases now was not all concerned about price increases a few months ago.

The people, by and large, are disillusioned and somewhat skeptical about the whole subject of inflation control. They have heard a lot of talk out of Washington about inflation control but inflation goes on just the same. They look for sound, inspiring leadership but they do not get it. They look at price control as just about as nonpartisan a matter as anything can be nonpartisan. And the Democratic National Committee makes it a partisan issue. The people know that the party group did not make it a party issue unless the President consented.

United States, Gray Marketeers, and Industry Linked to Steel Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, many of my good friends in the CIO and CIO-UAW have visited me this week urging almost complete control of our American economy by big Government under the provisions of a stringent Defense Production Act. In this connection, it is interesting to me to note that maladministration of existing Government controls is blamed by union leaders and industry alike as one of the main reasons why 100,000 workers are idle in the Detroit area, which includes subcontractors as far away as my district in Indiana. Evidently there can be too much control, especially where the administration of these controls rests in the hands of politically selected field administrators. A happy mean between complete control and absolute laissez-faire seems in the public interest:

[From the Washington Sunday Star of July 15, 1951]

UNITED STATES, GRAY MARKETERS, AND INDUSTRY LINKED TO STEEL SHORTAGE

DETROIT, July 14—Government, industry, and gray marketeers all received a share of the blame today as the Senate dug into reasons for the critical steel shortage and resulting layoffs.

A union man said 100,000 workers were idle in the Detroit area while other parts of the country had a manpower shortage.

A company man said a rocket manufacturer in Dayton, Ohio, had so much steel on hand he had to refuse 5 carloads of it while Michigan manufacturers of the same item were screaming for steel.

The union man was Norman Matthews, national Chrysler director of the CIO United Auto Workers. The company man was William H. Leininger, chairman of the Small Business Committee of the Michigan Economic Development Commission.

PARADE OF WITNESSES

Both were in a parade of witnesses who told Senator Moody's, Democrat, of Michigan, Small Business Subcommittee they didn't know where America's record production of steel was going.

Though not members of the subcommittee, Senators BENTON, Democrat, of Connecticut, and FERGUSON, Republican, of Michigan, joined in the questioning at the opening of the committee's cross-country hearings.

Michigan's Gov. G. Mennen Williams and Blake O'Connor, committee investigator, also took part.

Mr. Matthews attributed the manpower surplus-shortage to the Government's parallel-plant plan for locating defense factories. The Department of Defense adopted this system to reduce loss of military production in the event of an enemy attack.

Mr. Matthews contended that such new plants as those being built by Chrysler Corp. in Newark, Del., and New Orleans were built farther from the biggest sources of manpower supply than necessary for strategic purposes.

BIG LAY-OFFS CITED

"I don't know of a single plant in Detroit where there has been reconversion to de-

fense production," said Mr. Matthews, listing big lay-offs at General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, Hudson, Kaiser-Frazer, Packard, and other auto firms.

Mr. Matthews said he believed Chrysler picked the sites for its new Delaware and Louisiana plants. But when Senator FERGUSON spoke up that the Government would have to approve the location, Mr. Matthews remarked:

"It's six of one and half a dozen of the other."

Mr. Matthews read a letter from Defense Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson saying "a mistake had been made" in the allotment of defense contracts. He said Mr. Wilson promised to have defense agencies review the situation and help the city if possible.

Mr. Leininger said he would give the name of the Dayton rocket manufacturer to the Moody committee in confidence. He said he knew of no Michigan firms stockpiling steel beyond moderate reserves.

NEW WAREHOUSES APPEAR

Mr. Leininger testified that a few new steel warehouse firms had sprung up in recent months to capitalize on the demand for the basic metal. Under present price regulations, he said, some of them can legally charge 200 to 300 percent of the prevailing market price.

"I'd call that a very gray market," Senator Moody commented.

The president of a steel warehouse firm that has been in business 11 years recommended "heavy fines and wide publicity" for "chiselers who take monetary advantage at the expense of the defense effort."

J. Ivan Fiscus, head of the Huron Steel Co., Detroit, made the recommendation. He said the steel mills themselves could help by "keeping closer control on the flow of steel rather than creating a whole new flock of unqualified steel brokers."

How To Control Inflation Without Curbing Incentive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an abridgement of an address by Dr. Neil H. Jacoby, dean of the University of California Business School, before the town hall meeting in Los Angeles on April 30. This compendium was published in the monthly bulletin *Estate and Tax Letter*, published by Clyde R. Welman, of Memphis, Tenn.:

HOW TO CONTROL INFLATION WITHOUT CURBING INCENTIVE

There are four initial features of the tax-reduction bond plan.

First, Congress should increase personal income tax rates by X percentage points in all brackets and label the addition a Defense Tax.

Second, Congress should provide that a taxpayer may deduct from his tax liability, up to the full amount of the new defense tax, the amount of tax-reduction bonds that he elects to purchase.

Third, Congress should direct the Treasury Department to issue a new series of bonds to be known as tax-reduction bonds. These would be nonmarketable, nonnegotiable and available only to persons who take credit for the amount purchased against their de-

fense taxes. Except to meet specified personal emergencies, these bonds would not be redeemable before January 1954; thereafter, redeemable at the option of the holder or of the Treasury. They would bear interest comparable to that on savings bonds.

Fourth, Congress should provide that employers shall withhold the full amount of employee's estimated tax liabilities, including defense tax. At an employee's direction, an employer shall use up to the full amount of his defense tax to purchase tax-reduction bonds in his name.

Why is this tax reduction bond plan superior to alternative methods of curbing price inflation?

Our chief economic problem is to expand production to meet the needs of an enlarged Military Establishment, and to do this in a fully employed economy without generating further price inflation and subsequent economic instability.

The projected increase of 30 to 40 billion dollars in expenditures for military purposes will surely produce a rapid increase in prices under present tax, debt management, and monetary policies. Our economy has yet to feel the full impact of mounting military demands for goods and the withdrawal of young persons from the work force for military service. The inflation problem remains.

The basic solution is to reduce consumer demand, during the next 2 or 3 years by some 15 to 20 billion dollars annually below what it would otherwise be. We cannot rapidly increase production by expanding industrial plant, the work force and workers without either direct controls, which are expensive and partly ineffective, or price inflation, which is unjust and disruptive. Our strategy must be to curb consumer demand, while maintaining incentives for maximum-productive effort.

Consumer demand may be curbed by direct economic controls or by indirect controls. Higher taxes, savings programs, or general restrictions on bank credit are indirect in their effects, they do not apply to particular transactions and decisions. Direct controls, price or wage ceilings, rationing, materials allocations, or manpower restrictions apply to specific transactions and substitute detailed regulations for free-market action. Complex and costly to administer, they often have unexpected and undesirable consequences.

There is a strong case for maximum reliance upon indirect controls. They leave customers wide choice in spending their income and permit larger consumer satisfaction than do price and rationing directives.

They deal with the cause of price inflation. They are inexpensive to administer and they are effective. Direct controls of wages do not prevent substantial increases in take home pay. Price ceilings do not prevent price inflation in the form of curtailment of services by vendors, down-grading of quality, gray or black markets. Direct controls may be justified in maximum mobilization; in the present limited mobilization, indirect controls should be our main reliance.

Certain other elements of the economic situation do not seem to have received sufficient attention.

Fiscal planning should contemplate a "hump" in Federal expenditures. In 2 or 3 years, the Military Establishment will have been expanded to the point where, barring a world war, Federal expenditures may be reduced to the level that will maintain it. We shall probably have passed over the hump of increasing Federal outlays and will enter a period of declining Government expenditure. At that time, the main economic problem may be a deficiency of demand for our enlarged production.

Construction and durable goods production increased rapidly from 1945 to 1950. By mid-1950, the sharp edge of consumer demand for housing and durable goods had been blunted.

What would our economic condition be today had not war in Korea shifted our goals to defense? Potential inflationary pressure, while great, may be overestimated. We may have to face the question of stimulating consumer demand in 1954 or later.

The step-up of annual Federal expenditures from \$40,000,000,000 to \$70,000,000,000 or \$80,000,000,000 may well be a temporary bulge, to be followed by a reduction to a lower long-term level, although probably not as low as \$40,000,000,000. Federal fiscal policy should be designed to meet this probability. The tax reduction bond plan will permit scheduling consumer expenditures in the interest of economic stability.

Reducing consumer expenditure by increasing saving is more important than achieving a budgetary surplus.

The salient economic objective is to prevent further price inflation, not to achieve a balance or surplus during the next 2 or 3 years. There is much confusion over this important distinction.

The prevailing sentiment is that taxes should be increased to cover the prospective budgetary deficit. Pay-as-you-go is the slogan. It is widely believed that inflationary pressure will stop, if only the Federal budget is balanced.

The fact is that a balanced Federal budget provides no guaranty against further inflation. Last year, prices soared despite a Federal budget which generated a large surplus on a consolidated cash basis. Avoidance of deficit financing is desirable in itself and also complementary to a savings program.

Yet the paramount goal is to prevent erosion of purchasing power of the dollar by curbing consumer expenditures. This can be done by inducing consumers to save more, as well as by increasing their tax payments. The need is to transfer spending power from consumers to the Government. Whether consumers get savings bonds or tax receipts is secondary in importance. One may hope for both price stability and budgetary balance; but by all means let us have the former. The tax reduction bond plan will curb consumer expenditures, and therefore price increases.

A steep increase in personal income tax would impair productive effort and widen tax evasion.

Higher corporate incomes taxes would not reduce the gap between personal incomes and the supply of consumer goods. Federal sales and excise taxes would reduce this gap, but by raising prices and thereby increasing pressure for higher wages. If we choose the tax route toward price stability, we should therefore focus on higher personal income taxes.

Personal-income-tax increases large enough to deal with inflation (fifteen to twenty billion dollars per annum) would dampen productive effort. Some already believe that income taxes will take so much of any increase in income that it is foolish to work longer or harder. There is much evidence that further large increases in personal income taxes may seriously curtail productive effort. The public interest requires maximum effort from everyone. The tax-reduction-bond plan deflates expenditure without reducing incentives.

With every rise in the tax rate, also, incentives to evade taxes increase. To the extent that evasion occurs, tax increases fail to reduce consumption or block inflation. The tax-reduction-bond plan would not increase incentives or opportunities to avoid taxes.

The argument is not against any increase in personal income taxes. Increased taxes need to be supplemented by other weapons in the fight against inflation.

Efforts to increase savings-bond purchases are ineffective because of inflationary expectations.

Inducing the public to save more and to invest more in present Government securities would hold promise were it not for growing public expectation that the purchasing power of the dollar will fall further.

These expectations are evidenced by the excess of savings-bond redemptions over purchases and the mediocre success of savings-bond campaigns. The urge to buy tangible things, arising from fear of inflation, itself produces inflation and justifies the expectations upon which it was based. We must break out of this "vicious circle." The tax-reduction-bond plan provides the incentive to defer consumption and purchase bonds. Outright compulsory savings is avoided, yet few taxpayers would fail to reduce their income taxes by buying bonds.

In conclusion, the central idea of the tax-reduction-bond plan is to impose a powerful indirect control over consumer spending by combining a personal-income-tax increase with savings-bond purchases in a way that is economically sound, psychologically appealing, and administratively simple. People will accept curbs on spending, without diminishing productive effort, if provided with an interest-bearing claim on future production, exercisable at a time when spending will serve the public interest.

The plan is not a panacea for price inflation, but merely one element in an economic program for the defense period. Its effects could be offset by failure to achieve necessary governmental economies, by lax credit, taxation, or debt-management policies. Inflation must be fought with a variety of weapons. The use of this weapon does not prevent the use of others.

Finally, the proposal embodies elements of economic philosophy, fiscal policy, and administrative procedure with which the American people are well acquainted. It requires no radical change in our habits of mind. It would put us on the right track in dealing with inflation, but would be a step away from the dubious course of major reliance upon direct price and wage regulation. It would set our feet on the path of responsible fiscal and monetary policy. This is the only route by which the Nation may hope to pass through the years ahead with a minimum damage to a free economy.

Overseas Activities of the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Federal Relations With International Organizations Subcommittee of the Committee of Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I believe it is important that the Members of Congress become fully informed concerning the 73 multilateral international organizations in which the United States participates. As a step toward this objective I have asked the subcommittee to approve a program whereby the staff will prepare a brief and impartial report on United States participation in each of these international organizations. This project has been approved and these reports are now in preparation by the subcommittee staff.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article

from the Sunday Star, July 15, 1951, Washington, D. C., which points out some of the British and French criticism of the shortcomings of UNESCO, which seems to suggest that there is a definite need for the enactment of legislation similar to that introduced by Mrs. CHURCH and Congressman DAWSON, chairman of my committee, H. R. 3406 and H. R. 3697, respectively, which would create a commission to make a study of the administration of overseas activities of the Government with view toward securing maximum efficiency and effectiveness from our expenditures and operations abroad and in our territories:

UNESCO DOINGS CAUSE EUROPEAN GRUMBLING AT CRACKPOT CARNIVAL

(By Marcel Wallenstein)

PARIS, July 14.—Men and women who have the softest jobs in the world at good pay—and tax free—are beginning to worry. A fire has been lit under the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, which has been meeting here in plenary session.

The British who pay one-eighth of UNESCO's expenses and the French, who pay less, are beginning to grumble. The United States taxpayer, who pays twice as much as anybody else for what one European editor has called the crackpot's carnival, seems not to be worried about the drain on his small change.

Next year UNESCO will spend \$8,500,000. Since 1946 it has spent \$34,000,000. What have the nations which have footed the bill obtained for their money? It is doubtful if they have had anything except the information which the UNESCO committee members have sought in many parts of the world.

EMPLOYEES GET GOOD PAY

The chief beneficiaries of this organization, according to critics in Europe, are the employees. They get fat salaries. They are paid traveling expenses to and from all parts of the world and receive a per diem of \$25 a day. They pay taxes to no government. They get whisky, wine, and cigarettes duty free and have other diplomatic privileges.

Investigating the finances of UNESCO recently Viscount Simon, former British Secretary of Foreign Affairs, complained: "They keep books in a haphazard manner."

An investigator in Paris wished to find out what the UNESCO staff does to earn a living. This is what he discovered: The organization seriously put forward a plan to take information criticizing any country out of school-books throughout the world. It supplied cash to numerous strange causes, including a search for mythical Inca treasure. It suggested a new Garden of Eden on the Amazon River, the funds to be supplied by members of the United Nations. It studied the case of an African tribe which extracted the front teeth of children, so they could pronounce words of the native dialect.

EXPLAINING CUSTOMS

He discovered that Miss Myrna Loy, the Hollywood actress, a member of the organization, was concerned with explaining to the world certain national customs—such as why Englishmen carry umbrellas. John Gordon, editor of the London Sunday Express, who is attacking UNESCO as a useless and wasteful group, suggests Miss Loy explain why Americans chew gum.

UNESCO has sent scientists to many parts of the world to study the causes of war. It has published a report on education and agriculture in remote places in Mexico and Africa. It sent a delegation to study newspapers in Brussels and is said to have reported three newspapers were published in a

city that has none. In the same report it praised what it believed was a newspaper when actually the institution concerned in the report was a lunatic asylum.

The critics list many such cases.

HE NOW DRAWS \$1,500 A MONTH

Last year a retired English politician in France found it difficult to bring money from England for his living expenses. He knew officials of the UNESCO and succeeded in having himself nominated to its Paris staff. He draws \$1,500 a month. When he travels he is paid expenses of \$25 a day. He has been repeatedly to New York. Wishing to spend a holiday this summer in North Africa, he applied for and received traveling expenses from UNESCO.

The positions are obtained by nomination by members within the organization. The staff is an international body drawn from most nations which are members of the United Nations. The Director-General is Torres Bodet, a Mexican poet, who draws \$20,000 a year and has a very large expense account and other privileges. Secretaries, messengers, and other minor employees are paid three times the salaries such work normally brings in Europe. All salaries are payable in United States currency.

Stronger Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from Columbia, published and printed monthly by the Knights of Columbus:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN I probably wasn't paying too much attention at the time but I seem to remember you telling me, as a member of the great invisible audience, to let you know if there ever was anything you could do for me. I'm not even sure right now that there is anything you can do for me—according to the papers, you're having plenty of troubles of your own—but there are some matters that have me baffled and even our next-door neighbor, on the left, who is so smart he fixes his own leaky faucets, doesn't know the answers. What got me writing to you is some trouble my neighbors, on the right, had with their 5-year-old daughter, Iris Sandra, a cutie pie who not only does acrobatic dancing but is also a great help to her mother. Well, one day last week, Iris Sandra lugged home \$15 and some cents' worth of meat and groceries from the corner store, which is all of a hundred yards away, and pulled up at the kitchen door breathing hard. Naturally, her mamma and poppa were amazed and distressed and worried about what the neighbors would think about the way they were treating the tot. In fact, they are still telling everyone on the block over and over again: "It was only \$15 worth of meat and groceries we sent her for and we never thought it would strain her strength and anyhow we are feeding her some of those three-star vitamin pills." No one on the block is taking any digs at poppa and mamma because they all know it is something that could happen to anybody at these prices, which brings me around to the problem I would like to bring respectfully to your attention, knowing that you like to have your

finger on the pulse of your constituents as long as they have any pulse. Frankly, you are in danger of becoming known as the representative of the stupidest collection of constituents in the United States of America—or at least that is the impression you'd get if you heard them talking. They open their morning papers on the bus and all you hear is guys muttering, "This is where I came in."

If you look over a fellow's shoulder—which is a cheap trick but you know how it is when your excess earnings are being syphoned off so you won't do anything foolish with the \$3.68—you see a set of headlines that tell about how many miles our boys are on this or that side of the thirty-eighth parallel, and who left how many paragraphs out of some document he was reading to some Senate committee, and how much some big wheel said the price of hamburger should be come December, and what some cattle raisers' mutual protective society told him he should do instead of stand on his head that long and how many shoestrings some Air Force general has squeezed out of a measly little bank roll of a few hundred or a few thousand million—or zillion, or something—dollars, and how some smart operators bought all the bullets left over from the last war and are selling them back or renting them to Uncle Samuel. There are also a couple of stirring messages to the citizens urging them to tighten their belts but it doesn't say around whose neck. Anyhow, these fellows on the bus I am speaking of are so stupid that they think someone is giving them a slight rooking somewhere along the line. They can't figure out for sure who is responsible for the cuffing they get when they start negotiating for a few slices of the cheaper cuts but they know they are getting the old sandbag right behind the ear—and sold. They wouldn't like to think that some of their fellow citizens are ganging up on them but it could be that when they are saying, "That's where I came in," they are thinking of what happened a few years ago when the price controls went off the book on the theory that the result would be lower prices. They seem to think, also, that there is enough of just about everything, including the cheaper cuts, in this country so that there shouldn't be any occasion for a butcher, even as a gag, to put a sign in his window offering a roast of beef for \$1 down and \$1 a week. That ain't funny, McGee. And the front-page pictures of the empty stock pens aren't funny, either. A string of empty coal cars, featured that way, would signify a strike. What are the empty stock pens supposed to mean? Some of your constituents are wondering if some of your colleagues' constituents, out where the deer and the antelope play, are fixing to put the squeeze on them a little tighter. Maybe there isn't much you can do about this, but would you pass the word that the city slickers in your district like to bite on a small steak, at least on festive occasions, without asking the wife's people to go on another note. It isn't that we want anybody to go broke home on the range but would it be all right with them to get rich a little bit gradually, so to speak? Well, Congressman, I will close this letter before it starts to wander all over the lot and I am sorry to have taken so much of your time but I just wanted you to know that things seem to be more than usually mixed up, and I am the same, and I think what is at the bottom of it is that old competitive spirit running a little bit wild and in the wrong direction. Maybe I'm wrong, but I'll bet this joker, Stalin, would blow a lot softer on his bazooka if we were all as set on trimming him as we seem to be on trimming each other.

Yours truly,

J. DOAKES.

Nonsectional St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the first Governors' Conference of Inland America held recently at Omaha, Nebr., and termed "nonsectional," turned out to be a high-pressure attempt to rally Midwest support for the extravagant St. Lawrence seaway.

The rest of the story about this conference is told in the following editorial that appeared in the June 20, 1951, edition of the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer.

The editorial follows:

NONSECTIONAL SEAWAY?

It's strange that the First Governors Conference of Inland America, which has just been held in Omaha, under auspices which its organizers termed "nonsectional," turned out to be a high-pressure attempt to rally Midwest support for the extravagant St. Lawrence seaway, which, if put through, would cause immense damage to eastern seaports, including Philadelphia.

Gov. Val Peterson, of Nebraska, and Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan, sponsors of the meeting, declared any sectional purpose. But it quickly became apparent that one objective was to enlist the Missouri River States in aid of the seaway project, which has been a threat against American taxpayers since 1895 and which repeatedly has been rejected by Congress.

On hand was an array of big shots from Washington, including Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman and Secretary of the Army Frank Pace, Jr., to shout the glories of the often-discredited seaway. Speakers pleaded for the St. Lawrence project as a means to get ore to Midwest steel plants in spite of the fact that it has been argued convincingly that their needs can be taken care of without sea-borne Labrador and Venezuelan ore.

The Truman administration's backing of the seaway as a defense measure lacks merit. The St. Lawrence is frozen up at least 5 months of the year. The truth is that this two-to-four-billion-dollar project is impractical and uneconomic. It should again be tossed out by Congress.

Taxes: 77 Cents an Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, the Millville (N. J.) Republican analyzes our tax problems in an interesting, down-to-earth fashion. Its worth-while editorial follows:

One of the problems in talking about the cost of our Federal Government is the fact that so many of us just cannot comprehend what \$1,000,000,000 means.

Most of us in Millville work for a living. Very many of us started work when we were young. All can recall that in some of our

dream making we may have wished to be a millionaire. To be a millionaire a person would have to have at least \$1,000,000.

So most all of us have grasped the knowledge that a million dollars is a lot of money. We know, for instance, that if we put a million dollars to work for us as an investment at 3 percent, we will have an annual return of \$30,000.

We know very well that we could live handsomely on \$30,000 a year. And to top it off we would get the \$577 a week (that's \$30,000 a year) and if our investment were secure, we would always have the million bucks. We could leave that to the wife and children, or we could bequeath it to charity without any regrets for it had produced quite a comfortable living for us all during our life.

Now we may have some conception of what a million dollars constitutes in money. Even in these times of inflation, that is still a lot of wherewithal. When we talk of a billion dollars, we are dealing with one thousand millions—in other words one thousand times a million dollars is a billion of them.

Our Federal Government proposes that we spend \$72,000,000,000 for fiscal 1952. That is seventy-two thousand millions. Are our figures getting too big?

Another way to look at this seventy-two thousand millions (seventy-two billions) is that spread among the families of the United States it would mean approximately \$1,600 for each and every family.

What does \$1,600 mean to the head of a family? If he works 40 hours a week for 52 weeks at 77 cents an hour he can earn just about that much.

Who is paying this big tax bill? We are. Soak the rich. Tax the corporations. That is always the popular cry of the politician and the office seeker. He figures we dumb voters swallow such balderdash. Some of us do.

But the truth of the matter is that taxes come from the people who work. Who pays the tax of General Motors? The people who buy their cars. Who pays the tax of Swift? The people who buy their meats.

Taxes are part of the cost of doing business. Any business that did not include in its sale price the taxes it pays would soon go broke. So all of us are paying the taxes—whether they are direct or indirect.

Remember it's 77 cents an hour—better than \$30 a week for your family. That isn't hay.

Know Your Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under previous leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix to the Record, I wish to submit an article by the Marine News, of New York, published in the Washington Star of date July 16, 1951, as follows.

KNOW YOUR WATERWAYS—FLOOD CONTROL

Should our rivers flow down to the seas carrying away fertile top soil from countless upland acres and wreckage from flood desolation, rather than a large part of the Nation's commerce? Should their tremendous power run wild, disrupting industry and transportation, destroying wealth rather than creating it? It is estimated that the Mississippi deposits more than 400,000,000

tons of fertile soil (silt) into the Gulf of Mexico every year, and the Columbia more than 100,000,000 tons into the Pacific. This tremendous loss of one of the Nation's most valuable assets, the fertility of its land, is ominous. Certain cities and whole regions containing vital industries are dependent upon flood protection. The great city of New Orleans, and many smaller cities, are wholly protected by levees. Should up-country flood water be dumped on unprotected regions below? Overflows from as widely separated areas as Montana and New York State finally reach the Gulf of Mexico through the Mississippi and its tributaries. Water from the Miami Valley in Ohio finally reaches the Gulf, more than 1,500 miles distant, flowing through flood protection works along the Ohio and Mississippi most of the way. The disaster striking in Kansas and Missouri at this very moment could have been averted through flood-protection works. When unimproved and uncontrolled, rivers are idlers and destroyers; when controlled and improved, they are servants and producers.

MARINE NEWS,

GEORGE H. PALMER,

President and Publisher.

Judge the Record of the Democratic Administration in Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the record of the Democratic administration since 1943 in the matter of foreign policy is clearly set out by Mr. David Lawrence in United States News and World Report of July 20. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including this pertinent editorial. There can be little doubt that our foreign policy has been a failure, as evidenced by the record.

LEST WE FORGET

(By David Lawrence)

December 1943: United States, Great Britain, and China issue declaration at Cairo that Korea would become free and independent upon the termination of the war.

July 1945: Pledge to free Korea reaffirmed at Potsdam, the Soviet Union concurring.

September 1945: Japanese surrender North Korea to Soviet Union, South Korea to United States. The thirty-eighth parallel is military dividing line.

December 1945: Agreement of victors, including Russia, to set up democratic government in Korea.

March 1946: Soviet Union refuses to consult with any except pro-Communist groups in Korea.

May 1946: Joint commission adjourns due to Russians' blocking of progress.

September 1947: Soviet Union rejects proposal for conference to establish Korean provisional government. U. N. takes up problem of Korean independence. Soviet Union attempts to block it.

November 14, 1947: General Assembly of U. N. adopts resolution that elections should be held in both occupation zones and that a U. N. temporary commission should be present during the elections, "with the right to travel, observe, and consult throughout Korea."

January 1948: Soviet Union refuses to allow members of U. N. commission to enter North Korea.

May 7, 1948: Two days before general election ordered by U. N. commission, Communist Party in Korea is told Soviet troops will be withdrawn. Effort to compel American withdrawal.

May 10, 1948: More than 75 percent of 8,000,000 eligible voters in South Korea go to polls and choose national assembly. Dr. Rhee elected chairman.

June 25, 1948: U. N. commission announces election results were "valid expression of the free will of the electorate" in supervised parts of Korea, comprising two-thirds of the population of Korea.

August 1948: United States declares new regime is entitled to be regarded as the Government of Korea. United States military government in Korea terminated.

September 9, 1948: Announcement made that new central government had been established in North Korea, obviously under Soviet auspices.

December 12, 1948: General Assembly of U. N. formally recognizes government at Seoul under Dr. Rhee as lawful over the area where the temporary commission was able to observe and that "this is the only such government in Korea."

August 6, 1949: North Korea Government broadcasts appeals to overthrow Republic of Korea Government.

June 25, 1950: North Korean Army attacks South Korea at dawn south of the thirty-eighth parallel. U. N. commission calls for a "full-scale invasion of South Korea."

June 27, 1950: U. N. calls on members to furnish such assistance to the Republic of Korea as may be necessary to repel the armed attack to restore international peace and security in the area.

October 7, 1950: U. N. resolution reaffirms its objective of establishing a unified, independent, democratic government for all of Korea, and calls on members to give military assistance to that end. This resolution, in effect, also gave approval to the crossing of the thirty-eighth parallel by U. N. forces.

October 17, 1950: President Truman declares "our sole purpose in Korea is to establish peace and independence—our troops will stay there only so long as they are needed by the United Nations for that purpose."

November 28, 1950: General MacArthur reports to U. N. the facts about Chinese Communist intervention.

December 8, 1950: Prime Minister Attlee and President Truman issue statement declaring "there can be no thought of appeasement or of rewarding aggression, whether in the Far East or elsewhere."

December 19, 1950: Chinese Communist delegation at U. N. departs for Peiping, after having refused to meet cease-fire committee and having denounced General Assembly for failing to declare United States an aggressor.

January 2, 1951: U. N. cease-fire group sets forth conditions stipulating that supervision of any cease-fire, "shall be by a U. N. commission," which "shall have free and unlimited access to the whole of Korea."

January 17, 1951: Secretary Acheson discusses cease-fire proposals, stating: "If satisfactory arrangements for an independent and democratic Korea are put into effect, there is no longer any reason for maintaining U. N. forces in Korea."

February 1, 1951: General Assembly of U. N. brands Chinese Communist Government as aggressors, and affirms "determination of the United Nations to continue its action in Korea to meet the aggression."

June 23, 1951: Malik, of Russia, proposes cease-fire agreement based on thirty-eighth parallel.

June 26, 1951: Acheson says halt around thirty-eighth parallel means successful conclusion of war.

July 10, 1951: Cease-fire negotiations begin after United States spokesmen say achievement of peace and security in Korea would be sought as a political objective rather than as a military measure.

Years and years of palaver—and Korea is not yet free. And now how many more years of the same sabotage of the pledged word?

Gold Stars Only for Mothers Whose Sons Died Killing Fascists—Not Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a recent Associated Press release discloses that "only widows and mothers whose sons were killed during world War II may be issued official Gold Star lapel buttons."

In other words, those whose kin died killing the Axis Fascists of Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo can wear the button, while the kin of those who died wiping out Stalin's Red aggressors in Korea are denied the honor.

If this exclusion is not altered, may I suggest, if it is agreeable to those concerned, that the United Nations issue an appropriate remembrance for our Korean war dead?

Hero's Welcome Awaits Medal of Honor Winner at His Mountain Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Gerald Griffin from the Louisville Courier-Journal of May 20, 1951:

HERO'S WELCOME AWAILS MEDAL OF HONOR WINNER AT HIS MOUNTAIN HOME

(By Gerald Griffin)

KENVIR, Ky., May 19—There's more than a hundred frying chickens up at Edd Dodd's house, waiting to be sacrificed on the altar of a hero's homecoming.

The altar, in this case, happens to be mom's kitchen stove. The hero is First Lt. Carl H. Dodd, who was awarded the Armed Forces' highest decoration today in Washington.

This decoration, the Congressional Medal of Honor, places Dodd in a select group of heroes that includes Sgt. Willie Sandlin of Leslie County and Sgt. Samuel Woodfill of Fort Thomas. The two Kentucky sergeants won theirs in World War I.

Dodd won his medal recently in fierce battlefield action in Korea. Like the two Kentucky sergeants of World War I, Dodd earned his decoration when, single-handed, he wiped out an enemy machine-gun nest.

A hero's welcome awaits this Harlan County boy who enlisted in the Army in 1943, won a battlefield commission in recognition of his leadership, and now is coming home on leave. He will return wearing a Silver Star and a Purple Heart, along with his Medal of Honor.

And Carl's parents, Mr and Mrs Edd Dodd, hardly can wait for him to arrive. He is their first-born of a dozen children, 10 of whom still are alive.

The Black Mountain Coal Co., which once employed the hero as a shot-fire, attempted to get him on the telephone today at Washington. They wanted to find out exactly when he is coming home. Company officials and just about everybody else in the coal town of Black Mountain, which has a post office called Kenvir, want to stage a big homecoming for him.

Dodd's parents didn't go to the ceremony in Washington. It takes a good deal of money to do that, and Edd Dodd is a poor man. So they will just wait at the little mountain home where Carl lived when he joined the Army, and they'll give him a mom-made welcome, garnished with fried chicken.

Mr and Mrs Dodd had been notified of the high honor won by their son but hadn't seen anything about it in the papers. They were greatly pleased to receive a copy of this morning's Courier-Journal. They clipped out the story and added it to the clippings they have of his other exploits, including the time he captured a hill in Korea.

Carl was born April 21, 1925, at Evarts, where Edd was a motorman in a mine. The family moved to Black Mountain—Post Office Kenvir—when Carl was 3. There he went through grade school, then high school for 2 years at Evarts.

"Carl's been a good boy all his life," his mother said. "Why, he could put on a clean pair of overalls and a clean shirt on Monday and they would be clean as a pin at the end of a week. He's been so nice and as particular as could be, even as a little bitty boy."

The parents agreed that Carl was always a little peculiar in that he wanted to be alone most of the time. "He was a lone wolf," his father said, "and he always went to school by himself and he came back by himself."

Carl always was well-behaved, they said, and never picked a fight, but he never ran away from one.

"One time when Carl was 16," his father declared, "he and I were in a truck going up Grassy Creek Road when four fellows in an automobile pulled around in front of us and started to make trouble."

"They ganged around the truck and we got out. One of them stood there not doing anything, but he was looking straight at me while the others were jawing at Carl. This man had a gun, I'm certain, but I didn't see it."

"Then the other three jumped on Carl. Before I could get to him, he had stomped two of them and knocked the other one down. Then all of them ran away from there."

Mrs. Dodd broke in to tell about Carl attending church and Sunday school at Kenvir Baptist Church. He always was interested in church plays and he enjoyed church singing.

Carl's 16-year-old brother, Earl, was listening to the conversation in the Dodd living room. He had just finished currying the family horse that serves as a mount as well as a plow horse. He wanted it to be known that Carl once was a Boy Scout, star class, in Kenvir Troop 77. So is Earl.

Carl made good grades at school, his mother said, and he played football at Evarts High School. But when he registered for the draft, he quit school and went to work in the mine. His job there was a bit risky. He fired

the explosive charges that break up the coal seams.

Then he enlisted. After World War II ended, he returned home, discharged as a sergeant. That was in March 1946. The following September, he reenlisted with his former rank and, after a period at Fort Knox, was sent to Korea. Later he was transferred to Hawaii but returned to Korea with the Fifth Infantry Regiment when the present war began.

In November 1947, he married Miss Libby Rose, Anderson, Ind., a native of Williamsburg. They have no children.

Carl's father and mother naturally are mighty proud of their son.

"After he grew up a little," Edd said, "I never tried to act like his daddy. I tried to treat him like a man. And he always helped me a lot on the farm. He was a mighty good worker."

And Edd needed the help. He hasn't been able to do much hard work since he suffered a broken back in a mine slate fall in 1947. He was machine man then. Since his injury, he said, the mine officials have given him light work to do.

But with six growing youngsters at home, it is somewhat of a struggle to support them. Still, nobody goes hungry at the Dodd house. Edd has all the land he can tend. The boys help. He has a work horse and a garden. His wife has her chickens. She won't have quite so many when the hero returns.

The Dodds are not complaining people. They are friendly and, like all mountaineers, proud and hospitable.

Statehood for Alaska and Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the Alaska and Hawaii statehood bills were passed by the House of Representatives in 1950. They failed of action in the Senate that year.

New statehood bills were promptly introduced in the Eighty-second Congress and have been reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. No further action has been taken. The issues have been thoroughly debated in past Congresses. Both major parties have endorsed statehood. The public is for statehood. Public opinion polls demonstrate that preponderant majorities of all the people in the country believe statehood should be granted without delay to these two Territories. If these bills were brought to the floor it would not take more than a few days to pass both of them. This should be done without further delay.

As Mr. Walter Walker, publisher of the Daily Sentinel, Grand Junction, Colo., pointed out in an excellent lead editorial on July 11, there is a real obligation upon both the Democratic and Republican Parties to redeem their platform pledges in respect to statehood. In the editorial this question is asked:

Has either party employed any noticeable energy, during the sessions of the Eighty-second Congress, toward keeping these (and several other) platform pledges?

That question answers itself.

The Sentinel's editorial is printed in complete text here:

OR NO ETHICAL VALUE

Perhaps there will never be such a thing as ethics in politics. But even so, is it illogical for the electorate to demand that political party platforms be more than a compilation of pledges devised solely as voter bait with no serious intent on the part of those devising them to keep the pledges? As we recall, both major party platforms, presented to the electorate during last national election, pledged statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. Both endorsed and either directly or by implication pledged their candidates, if elected, to work for civil rights. Both definitely pledged their successful candidates to submit to Congress a constitutional amendment on equal rights for women.

Has either party employed any noticeable energy, during the sessions of the Eighty-second Congress toward keeping these (and several other) platform pledges? Ask Hawaii and Alaska—or those in our land who still do not enjoy all the civil rights the Constitution guarantees.

We are fast approaching another national election campaign. As far as political platforms are concerned the parties can just present the ones put out in the last campaign, since most of the same old pledges, yet unfulfilled, would be found in any new platform issued. Neither the public nor the parties put very high ethical value on these documents though they are deemed campaign necessities. How seriously they are taken by their authors may be discovered in the peculiar coalitions that have been formed in our Congress in recent years.

Iuka, Miss., the Town of the Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the Record, I am inserting an article that appeared in the July issue of Good Housekeeping relative to the selection of Iuka, Miss., as the town of the month.

No greater tribute could be paid to the enterprising Christian women of any community than this simple story of the accomplishments of these ladies in their concerted efforts to make their home town a better place in which to live.

The article referred to follows:

TOWN OF THE MONTH: IUKA, MISS.

Three Aprils ago, in little Iuka, Miss., 19 women began what became a civic snap-the-whip. These women, all members of Iuka's Twentieth Century Club, were chatting in the living room of Mrs. Kermit Rushing's home when Mrs. Minor Nixon, president of the club, arose to call the meeting to order.

"Instead of following our usual procedure," she said, "I would like you all to listen to a most interesting communication." She read the rules and regulations of a Nation-wide "Build a Better Community" contest, sponsored jointly by the General Federation of Women's Clubs and the Kroger Co. "First prize is \$10,000," she concluded crisply.

For a split second, you could have heard a cotton blossom drop. Then the old conversational dam burst.

"We'll clean up that old garbage dump across from the church," said Mrs. J. E. Thomas.

"We'll build a merry-go-round for Mineral Springs Park," cried Mrs. J. L. Dean.

"Let's plant dogwood trees along our highways," suggested Mrs. Rushing.

"Yes. And clean up Jay Bird Park. It's a disgrace," added Mrs. Berry Lee Pruitt.

"Our schools are old, dilapidated, too small. Let's do something about them," urged Mrs. P. L. Sweeney.

The room vibrated with ideas. Iuka needed a doctor, more schoolteachers, better playgrounds, historical markers, a dial-telephone system. The county's poor children needed free clinic services. Public buildings wanted landscaping. People wanted good music, and a concert series was indicated.

"Well," exclaimed Mrs. Nixon, after an exhausting hour or jotting down suggested improvements for the little town, "I reckon the \$10,000 is ours."

"Yes, indeed," chorused the ladies, and from that moment on they never had a doubt about winning the prize.

Iuka, named for an Indian chief, is a town of 2,000 people, in the rolling purple hills of Tishomingo County, northeastern Mississippi. It is surrounded by cotton fields and pine woods, and flanked on the north by TVA's huge Pickwick Lake. Historically, the town has much to be proud of. Six mineral springs, which are shaded handsomely by century-old oak, sweetgum, beech, and birch trees, had once, in ante bellum days, brought Iuka great fame as a health resort. But the War Between the States brought it a kind of grim fame, too; three major engagements were fought within the city limits and almost annihilated the little spa. Citizens like to point out that only twice in history have the waters of mineral springs failed—once when General Grant's army drank it dry, and again, more recently, when a horde of Yankees descended on the park for a giant barbecue.

Civically, Iuka couldn't hold its head so high. TVA's building of Pickwick Dam and the county's prospering gravel pits gave Iuka a glow of economic health, but not much of this glow was visible to a beauty-seeking eye. A scrubby part separated weather-beaten Front Street from the railroad and highway. Railroad ties lay in untidy piles on one side of the park. Unpaved side streets straggled off to the north, leading occasionally to a handsome ante bellum mansion but more often to unprepossessing cottages. A garbage dump, big as half a city block, rose high in the center of town. No, Iuka could hardly be described as a magnolia-scented, wisteria-shaded, picture-post-card town.

The general citizenry of Iuka first learned of the Twentieth Century Club's build-a-better-community stratagem one dewy morning in May 1949. Nineteen women, dressed in blue jeans, slacks, or overalls and carrying hoes, rakes, and hedge shears, briskly paraded down Front Street toward Jay Bird Park. "We were all shapes, forms, and fashions," one of them reminisces. "The men just gaped."

The men were still gaping when, 5 or 6 hours later, the women walked back toward their respective homes. Jay Bird Park had changed considerably. Weeds had been pulled out of the ground, hedges trimmed, grass mowed, flower beds planted, shrubs tended. The pavilion was sparkling with a coat of fresh paint. For 6 days, the ladies labored on their first project; at the end of that time, the whole town knew what build a better community meant—a lot of hard work and a lot of people to help the 19 women if they were going to win that \$10,000 prize. Jay Bird Park was lovely now, trim and sweet; and the railroad ties were in straight, tidy stacks. But everywhere else, the town still looked shabby.

At this point, the contest ceased being a Twentieth Century Club affair and became

an all-out Iuka concern. "Every man, woman, and child in this town helped us win that prize money," says Mrs. Everett Cutshall.

When the ladies next appeared in their laboring clothes, this time at the garbage dump, the town was there to help them. Talmadge Jourdan, owner of the midtown lot, offered it to the club for a parking area if the women meant what they said about cleaning it up. County road supervisor Bill Gardner volunteered the use of two trucks, a bulldozer, and a grader. Bob Towery, editor of Iuka's weekly newspaper, Viddette, stood in the rain all one day taking photographs, to record for incredulous posterity the knowhow and energies of Iuka womanhood. For a week, the ladies shoveled, graded, graveled, and marked the lot; then they built a gleaming white fence around it. At the end of their labors, 80-year-old Fisherman Brown invited them to the City Cafe for coffee. "You gals got more spunk than anybody in this town," he said mistily.

For nine whirlwind months, these 19 Iuka women waged war against ugliness, dirt, apathy, and skepticism. They wrote 500 letters, one to every registered voter in Tishomingo County, urging voters to visit the county schools and see for themselves the appalling inadequacies there. They recommended a \$50,000 bond issue for school improvements and repairs. On voting day, they drove into the county and taxied scores of voters to the polls. They won a thundering victory: 35 Tishomingoans voted against the bond issue; 465, for it.

Today, Iuka's big new gymnasium in one school serves as a meeting hall, dance pavilion, and general community center for the entire county. A brand-new school gleams perkily atop a hill at the south end of town, its grounds landscaped and its interior painted by the students themselves. Teachers from four States applied for jobs in Iuka's schools.

Dr. Harry Cosby, hearing that Iuka had no doctor, established his practice there and built a new 17-room hospital and clinic. A dial-telephone system was installed in the town. All through hot summer weather, the town was regularly sprayed with DDT, to conquer flies and mosquitoes. Annual play nights for Iuka's children were inaugurated. A handsome historical marker and a gaily painted merry-go-round went up in Mineral Springs Park. More than three hundred dogwood trees were transplanted from Tishomingo County hills to the three and a half miles of highway leading into Iuka. A concert series, with imported artists, sold out to Iukans. The pavilion in Jay Bird Park got additional coats of paint. Stores along Front Street began experimenting with fresh paint, too. "Credit?" says Kermit Rushing, local druggist. "Give it to those 19 dynamos who call themselves the Twentieth Century Club. If they didn't do the work, they saw that it was done."

"Those 19 dynamos" planned, performed, and completed 52 different community projects, including a 175-page report of their doings, illustrated with 250 "before" and "after" snapshots. "We all had to learn to take pictures," Billie Burke Thomas remarks. "How else could we prove to the contest judges way up in New York that we had done all these things?"

In April 1950 Iuka was proclaimed Mississippi's "Build a better community" award winner (prize money, \$300), and club members knew that at any moment national contest judges would steal into town to see what the new Iuka was like. Thus alerted, they goaded the townsfolk into a tidying-up tempest that made earlier clean-up efforts look like finger exercises.

Mrs. Thomas and Mrs. Sweeney met the two Kroger Co. representatives at the airport in Jackson. They drove the men straight to Mrs. Thomas' home and plied

them with coffee until Mayor John Stormont gave them the "all clean" signal. "You can let them out in 15 minutes," he telephoned Mrs. Thomas. "We've got just one alley to go."

As Mrs. Thomas says, "Iuka was without doubt the cleanest spot on the globe that day. Mayor Stormont had street sweepers and sprinklers working most of the night. Housewives all over town had raked their lawns, scrubbed their porches, clipped their hedges, painted their yard furniture. Business people downtown had polished and swept and mopped until Front Street glistened like a Walt Disney toy town. We were lovely."

In May Iuka was named one of the nine regional contest winners (prize money, \$5,000). And one fine morning in June the immaculate little village awoke to find itself the envy of all American small towns—the national winner (total prize money, \$10,300) of the year-long "Build a better community" contest. July 6, 1950, was designated Iuka Day by Gov. Fielding Wright. And when the day came he looked out over the cheering throng gathered there and estimated the crowd at 10,000 people. "If it were a political crowd," he said, "I'd estimate it at 15,000."

Iuka has hardly drawn a relaxed civic breath since then. Half an hour after Kroger President Joseph B. Hall presented Mrs. Minor Nixon with a check for \$10,000 the ladies had it photostated and deposited in the Iuka Guaranty Bank.

"What are we planning to do with it?" asks Mrs. Nixon. "We don't know yet. Perhaps a community house, perhaps a swimming pool. Anyway, something that will be here forever. Right now it's all we can do to live up to our reputation—to consolidate our gains, you might say."

President Hayes Gave Detroit Good Advice on Governmental Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, a newspaper article in the Detroit Free Press of July 14, 1951, announcing that President Truman will attend Detroit's two hundred and fiftieth birthday party, July 28, also stated that Mr. Truman will be the sixth President of the United States to visit Detroit while in office. It named as the other Presidential visitors James Monroe, Andrew Johnson, Woodrow Wilson, Herbert Hoover, and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

As a matter of historical record, and particularly because of the interesting subject matter of an address delivered at the Detroit Fair Grounds, I should like to call attention to the visit of still another Chief Executive to Detroit during his Presidency. I refer to the visit of President Rutherford B. Hayes, September 18 and 19, 1879.

A detailed account of this visit is found in the files of the Battle Creek (Mich.) Journal, whose editor and publisher, the late Hon. George Willard, was a Member of this House for two terms, from 1873 to 1877. Mr. Willard was also a member of the joint committee which devised the

Electoral Commission as the agency for settling the Hayes-Tilden disputed election.

In his Detroit address, President Hayes gave this report on the fiscal condition of the Nation:

Of the debt incurred by the war for the Union, about one-third has been paid, and if the policy of extinguishing the present national debt be adhered to, the paying of \$33,000,000 per year upon the principal, or into a sinking fund for that purpose, will within 33 years leave us free from debt as a Nation.

This favorable outlook, so far as the national debt was concerned, prompted President Hayes to observe that "that which is sound policy for the Nation and State in regard to debt, is wise policy in local and private affairs." And the President proceeded to offer some more detailed advice on the matter of local governmental debts. He cited statistics to show that the local debts of 130 cities increased from \$221,312,000 in 1866 to \$644,378,663 in 1876, or a percentage increase of about 200 percent in 10 years, while the property—valuation—in those cities increased but 75 percent and their population 33 percent during the same period.

Observing that "in many cases the interest paid by cities on their debts is almost equal to their total tax levy for local government," President Hayes said:

Municipal borrowing is the parent of waste, profligacy, and corruption—money that comes easily, goes easily. In this career or reckless extravagance, cities build and buy what they do not need, and pay exorbitant prices in every case.

How shall we deal with these large and increasing local debts? The best answer is. Do not have any. Let it be embodied in the constitution and laws of every State that local authorities shall create no debt, that they must pay as they go, and make suitable provision for the extinguishment of existing debts.

It is interesting to speculate on what President Hayes would have to say on the subject of governmental debt—National, State, and local—if he were to speak at Detroit's two hundred and fiftieth birthday party.

It would be especially interesting to compare his views on governmental debt with the views and record of the President of the United States who is scheduled to speak in Detroit later this month.

Tribute to Katharine Lenroot by the Washington Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the Record a very fine editorial from the Washington Post of July 15 entitled "Children's Friend." This is a well-deserved eulogy of the very

splendid work in behalf of "the welfare of children and child life among all classes of our people" rendered by Katharine Lenroot through a period of 32 years. She has been an outstanding public servant and has earned the gratitude of the people of this country. I share with the Washington Post sincere satisfaction that Miss Lenroot is to be succeeded by Dr. Martha Eliot. As the Post has stated, the Nation's children will continue to be in good hands.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CHILDREN'S FRIEND

The Children's Bureau was in its infancy when Katharine Lenroot joined it as a special investigator 36 years ago. It had been established to report "upon all matters pertaining to the welfare of children and child life among all classes of our people . . ." and had found a sorry picture of needless mortality among mothers and babies. It was estimated from the limited reports available that throughout the country 61 mothers died for every 10,000 live childbirths, and for every 1,000 live births the country lost 100 babies during their first year of life. In 1949, the maternal mortality rate was down to 8, and infant mortality to 29.

Such vital statistics afford but a partial insight into the intertwined careers of the Children's Bureau and of Miss Lenroot who has been its chief for the past 17 years. With the passage of the Social Security Act in 1935, the Bureau assumed administration of title V, providing for grants to the States for development of maternal and child health services, services to crippled children, and child welfare services. In 1938, it undertook responsibility for the child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. From 1933 to 1947, it handled the emergency maternity and infant care program, under which Federal funds were used to pay for medical, hospital, and nursing care during childbearing for over 1,200,000 wives of the men in the Armed Forces, and for the care during illness of more than 200,000 children of servicemen.

Few public careers could have provided richer rewards than Miss Lenroot must have gained from the accomplishments of the Children's Bureau. "The children of this country," President Truman wrote in accepting her resignation, "are better off for your having been in the Government. What greater satisfaction could anyone take into retirement?" What higher accolade could any public servant earn? It is a matter of great good fortune for the country that the President has already selected Dr. Martha Eliot as her successor. Dr. Eliot herself has served the Children's Bureau for a quarter century, directing some of its most important research work in the field of child health and working with Miss Lenroot as associate director. The Nation's children will continue to be in good hands.

Union Pressure for Controlled Economy in the Direction of Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, last week President Green, of the

American Federation of Labor, and Vice President Carey, of the CIO, were invited to the Capitol to put pressure on Members of Congress at a meeting called for that purpose. They have not helped their cause by the tactics used. As part of my remarks, I am including an editorial that appeared in the Washington News and which clearly calls the turn on the strategy employed by these pressure groups:

THEY AREN'T HELPING

Top union leaders display doubtful judgment when they deliver to Congress such ultimatums as some of them did yesterday.

President Green of the AFL, Vice President Carey of the CIO, and other union officers served notice that labor will no longer submit to wage controls unless effective price controls are enacted.

The fact is that labor, as represented by Messrs. Green, Carey, and other members of the United Labor Policy Committee, has not been submitting to wage controls in any real sense.

As Bernard M. Baruch says, it is "bunking" the public to contend that wages can be increased without raising price levels.

Yet members of the United Labor Policy Committee, by threats to withhold support from the mobilization program and by using their influence with President Truman, who puts high value on their political support, have made wage controls little more than a joke.

The practical certainty that they will continue to do just that is one of the big reasons why many Members of Congress sincerely doubt whether any price-control law would long be effective.

Congress should enact price controls and wage controls that can be enforced and that will be effective.

But the tactics of the top union leaders are more likely to handicap than to help those Members of Congress, and those officials responsible for the defense mobilization and economic stabilization program, who are trying to obtain strong and sound legislation.

Help the Czech and the Slovak Underground at the Proper Time To Overthrow the Communist Regime That Enslaves Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Slovak people lost all possibility for their freedom and independence when the Soviet troops marched into Slovakia early in 1945 and when, with the help of the late President Benes, the so-called people's democracy was introduced in that unfortunate country, which later, after the coup of February 1948, became totally Communist.

Since that time Slovakia suffered as much as any other enslaved nation behind the iron curtain. But there is no other country in the Soviet orbit which has a better underground movement than heroic Slovakia resisting communism through its two underground or-

ganizations: The Liberty Legion and the White Legion.

The stirring cry for the freedom of the Slovaks has the sympathy and friendship of the American people who have always been ready to assist the downtrodden and the oppressed. Since the Slovaks stand on self-determination and since they demand free elections or a plebiscite under United Nations supervision, as clearly stated by Dr. V. S. Krajcovic, chairman of the National Committee for Liberation of Slovakia, in the New York Times, February 27, 1951, in order to choose their own form of government and to establish their own state or its association, if any, with other nations, I have set forth these objectives in introducing into the House on July 4, 1951, House Concurrent Resolution 139—a resolution to assist the Slovaks in their struggle for democracy and freedom.

This resolution expresses the friendship of the American people with the Czech and Slovak peoples whom it places in every respect on the same basis of equality enjoyed by any nation of Central or Eastern Europe whether they are Poles, Rumanians, Hungarians, or Lithuanians. Each of them has the basic right for self-determination and the right to set up its own state, or association with others, if any. Such is the meaning of the House Concurrent Resolution 139.

The resolution, therefore, calls upon the President of the United States to direct its United Nations representatives to demand that free elections be held in Slovakia under police supervision of the United Nations so that the Slovaks may freely decide their national future without any outside pressure.

The National Committee for Liberation of Slovakia, the Slovak underground affiliated with it, and the American Slovaks should urge the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to give favorable consideration to this resolution in order to formulate a practical program of assistance to the oppressed people of Slovakia. Since the Slovaks themselves have helped to win our fight for American independence some 175 years ago through the noble efforts of their own champions of freedom who fought with us—Maurice Benovsky serving with General Pulaski and General Kosciusko, at Savannah—we shall not fail the Slovaks in their own struggle for the same freedom and independence.

The text of the House Concurrent Resolution 139, which was referred to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, reads as follows:

Whereas the American people have long accepted the basic principles set forth in the American Declaration of Independence of 1776 in the following words: " * * * that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its

powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.": and

Whereas the American people believe these principles are universal and apply to all men, everywhere, at all times, and under all forms of government; and

Whereas these principles flow from certain essential truths, among which are—

That the Creator is the author of every human being and the source of his rights and that neither the state nor any other human agency has jurisdiction to exploit any human being or violate his rights;

That the state is a servant to mankind and not its master and may not pervert its administrative and police powers so as to make of them a weapon to violate human rights or to terrorize the people;

That there is a brotherhood of men but only under the fatherhood of God; and

Whereas communism wears a humanitarian cloak and poses as the messiah of social justice but in reality has given rise to the most reactionary regime of our time based on barbarism and slavery as a result of its immoral doctrine founded in malice setting man against man, class against class, and all men against God; and

Whereas communism thrusts itself beyond civil government and political philosophy, claiming the whole man, denying all spiritual values, denying his inalienable rights, and seeking to transform all human beings created by God in His image into soulless biological units, fitted into a military and economic machine designed for a world revolution, and

Whereas the Communist regime in the Soviet Union destroyed all possibility for the freedom and independence of the Czech and Slovak peoples following World War II, and plunged Czechoslovakia into communism, by inducing under deceitful pretenses the exile Czechoslovak Government to enter into a treaty with it in December 1943 pledging friendship, reciprocal noninterference into domestic matters, mutual assistance, and postwar cooperation and then by subsequently violating the letter and spirit of the treaty in innumerable instances and in the most flagrant manner, such as forcing the Czechoslovak Government to forfeit Ruthenia to the Soviet Union against the wish of the Ruthenian people; by proscribing and eliminating some traditional political parties, particularly the farmers' Agrarian Party, the largest political party in Czechoslovakia, the National Democratic Party, and the Peoples Party in Slovakia, in order to form a "coalition" government in which the Communists seized the key governmental and administrative positions; by imposing rigid and centralized state control on practically all industry and the entire economy in the interests of the Soviet industrial and military machine in complete disregard of the welfare of Czechoslovakia; following in all this the one aim of seizing absolute control of the political, economic, and moral bases of the Czechoslovak state; and

Whereas the Communists after thus gaining control of the key positions in the government ultimately destroyed all opposition and seized complete power in Czechoslovakia by intimidating and undermining from within the existing political parties opposing the Communists: the Nationalist Socialist Party, the People's Party, and the Social Democratic Party and by helping to create subservient political parties such as the Slovak Democratic Party, and the Slovak Freedom Party, by terrorizing and immobilizing the people with frightening demonstrations of power and force incited and conducted by Communist action committees, and finally in the so-called February coup of 1948, by the use of force and threat of Soviet armed intervention, seized control of all media of information, arrested members of parliament and of the Government, and, forcibly instal-

ling themselves in all governmental and administrative positions, they took over complete control of the state; and

Whereas communism has taken the lives of untold numbers of human beings in Czechoslovakia, and has employed unspeakable brutalities to enslave the population—

By robbing peasants of their farms and transforming them, even where left in nominal ownership of the land, into agricultural robots manipulated by the state, and by forcing them into Communist-controlled cooperatives as a transitory stage to complete collectivization of the land; and by degrading them into mere imitations of the Soviet model;

By chaining workers to their factories and transforming them into industrial robots, by subjecting them to arbitrary and competitive forced standards in work, by regimenting them in state-controlled labor unions perverted from their proper function to instruments of the most ruthless state capitalism the world has ever known;

By depriving intellectuals and all people of freedom of creative work and thought and transforming them into servile slaves of the state;

By suppressing the freedom of the press by means of tyrannical control and censorship of any news or information in any way critical of the Communist regime in power, and by subjecting to persecution those who attempt to report the true facts inside of Czechoslovakia, the latest example of which is the mock trial of the American Associated Press correspondent, William N. Oatis,

By submitting untold numbers to the subhuman conditions of mass imprisonment, and forced labor camps;

By murdering the best of Czechs and Slovaks in order to extinguish the last spark of man's longing for undivided and national freedom, and to destroy the Czech and Slovak traditions and cultures; and

Whereas communism is in the process of destroying the institution of the family in Czechoslovakia in inordinate control of the children and their forced indoctrination in communism, and by setting members of the same family against one another through fear and terror; and

Whereas communism after the brutal torture and mock trial of the three Slovak bishops, Jan Vojtassak, Dr. Michal Buzalka, and Pavol Gojdic, and the persecution and dispossession of Archbishop Josef Beran and other religious leaders, is in the process of destroying religion in Czechoslovakia by fostering schism, by encroaching ruthlessly on the freedom of religious worship and religious expression, by subjecting to political control the discharge by clergymen, priests, and bishops of their duties as preachers of the Word of God and spiritual counselors of man, by imprisoning, intimidating, and terrorizing the duly authorized leaders of the Christian religion which has been the priceless heritage of the Slovak and the Czech people, by seeking to establish schismatic religious associations and to disrupt from within and control from without the freedom and independence of the churches, destroying religious schools and eliminating the religious instruction of the children, by introducing Marx-Leninist doctrine into theological seminaries and by deifying Stalin, the leader of the Red regime; and

Whereas communism is destroying the substance of Czechoslovakia by ravaging the farmlands, by stripping it out of its resources, by transforming the Czechoslovakian Army into a tool of communism and by forging the entire country of Czechoslovakia into an arsenal for further Communist aggression; and

Whereas communism in order to extend still further its tyranny concentrates its efforts on promoting artificial hostile feel-

ings between the friendly and peace-loving Czechs and Slovaks and the people of the United States and of other free nations whose basic aspirations as human beings are identical, and who have no real conflicting interests; and

Whereas agreements made by any one or more of the free nations with the Moscow Communist regime that now enslaves the Czech and Slovak peoples or with the Czechoslovak puppet regime nominally headed by Klement Gottwald, and recognition of this puppet regime as a legitimate government, materially and morally strengthens the tyranny in its power, weakens the resistance of the Slovak and Czech people to Communist tyranny and dims their hopes for liberation; such agreements being used by the Communist regime only to its advantage for the purpose of accumulating greater strength, and to the disadvantage of every other country seeking honorably to compose differences with it, it being one of the prime techniques of communism to disregard truth and honor and the obligation of agreements whenever opportune; and

Whereas in contrast to the treacherous fifth columns that operate in the free countries of the world to enslave them to international communism, there exist in Czechoslovakia potential forces for freedom—especially the underground forces in Slovakia now in action—composed of a great majority of the people who yearn for liberty, which forces, if further activated by the encouragement and positive aid of free peoples of the world, will strengthen them under the Communist tyranny and prepare the way for their eventual liberation and thus help place mankind on the path to peace, and

Whereas past tragic mistakes in the policies of certain of the free nations toward Czechoslovakia, including that of the United States, based on the assumption that collaboration with the Communists was possible, and a failure fully to understand the true nature, extent and enormity of communism's aggressive designs, have substantially contributed toward the strengthening of the Communist regime in Czechoslovakia and toward the placing of the international Communist conspiracy in a position where it is now a clear and present danger to world peace and the free progress of mankind, compelling the United States and other free nations again to undertake a vast program of rearmament, and

Whereas, while we rearm with reluctance and would prefer to devote our energies to peace, we are determined to defend our freedom; and

Whereas rearmament alone coupled with an attempt to compose differences with the Communist regime by treaties and agreements leaving undisturbed said regime and its present enormous conquests of aggression will, over a period of years, place a crushing burden of armaments upon the free world that eventually could well, of itself, destroy freedom, and such agreements and treaties would tend to stabilize said regime in its conquests and give a benediction to a way of life that has declared war on all human nature under its control; and

Whereas the world cannot long continue to exist half slave and half free: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States hereby reaffirm the historic friendship of the American people with Czech and Slovak peoples between whom there are innumerable ties of kinship and concerning whose mutual aspirations for democracy, liberty, and justice there has always been an alliance; that the American motives for the aspirations and this alliance lie deep because the United States of America was founded and was built largely by the oppressed peoples from all countries.

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress of the United States hereby expresses the firm conviction of the American people that the Czech and Slovak peoples have each the right of self-determination to be governed by their own consent based on the free expression of popular will in a free election; and that no nation may deprive them of their territory by force or threat of force and that no nation may keep their territory by force.

(b) It is further expressed to be the firm conviction of the American people that the Czech and Slovak peoples have the right to the basic freedoms for which they have long struggled and for which in World War II they together with other free people, shed their blood, among which freedoms are—

(1) The right of peasants to their own land, to work it as they see fit and to dispose of the fruits of their labor as they see fit;

(2) The right of the workers to select freely the type and place of their employment, and to obtain equitable wages and decent working hours and conditions through the organization of their own truly independent trade unions,

(3) The right of intellectuals to freedom of scientific and artistic creation, to freedom of cultural intercourse with the whole world, and to the establishment of educational, scientific, and cultural institutions independent of state control,

(4) The right of political prisoners of all classes to immediate liberation and aid in rehabilitation;

(5) The freedom of religion, of speech, of thought, and of the press;

(6) The right of the people peaceably to assemble, to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures,

(7) The right of the people to life, liberty, and private ownership of property; the right of an accused to a speedy and public trial in accordance with principles of law and justice

(8) The freedom of movement within the country and of travel abroad and upon the high seas, together with the freedom to engage in commerce and pursuits of private enterprise and in all peaceful activities,

(9) The freedom of families from the Communist way of life and from undue state interference and control, and of parents in the education of their own children,

(10) The freedom of the armed forces to defend the legitimate interests of the Czech and Slovak peoples, the right and obligation of the armed forces to protect the people from the Communist tyranny, and the freedom of the armed forces from being used by the Communist tyranny as an aggressive force both against its own people and against peaceful nations

SEC. 3 To give meaning to their historic friendship for the Czech and Slovak peoples, the Congress of the United States hereby expresses the strong hope of the American people for the early liberation of the Czech and Slovak peoples from their Communist enslavement. To assist in bringing this liberation about at the earliest possible date, the President of the United States is hereby requested—

(1) To formulate a new and stronger foreign policy which among other things, recognizes the essentially evil nature of the international Communist regime, bent on the destruction of the United States and of the free world and distinguishes between this regime and the people enslaved by it and a policy which excludes all further agreements with, commitments to, and recognition of the Communist regime in Czechoslovakia;

(2) To direct our representatives in the United Nations—

(a) To demand that the United Nations charge the Communist regime of Russia with internal aggression in Czechoslovakia

in violating of the basic charter and principles of the United Nations, for robbing Czechoslovakia of its freedom, independence and territorial integrity in violation of treaty obligations, international agreements and of international law and justice;

(b) To demand the withdrawal from Czechoslovakia of Soviet secret police, military and civilian officials and other open or secret agents of Soviet imperialistic domination whose continued presence constitutes a breach of domestic peace and security and a threat to international peace and security;

(c) To demand that free elections be held for the Czech and Slovak peoples under police supervision of the United Nations in order that they may freely decide, without outside pressure, whether to establish a common or separate states, and to organize their own government founded on such principles as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness and to secure to themselves the blessings of liberty.

(3) To explore the methods whereby the American people through their Government, and by private means with government assistance and otherwise may offer aid and moral support to active fighters now struggling for the liberation of the Czech and Slovak peoples and other Communist-dominated countries.

Narcotics Addicts in New York Put at 45,000 to 90,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star of July 16, 1951:

NARCOTICS ADDICTS IN NEW YORK PUT AT 45,000 TO 90,000

NEW YORK, July 16.—The mayor's committee on dope addiction estimated today that between 45,000 and 90,000 persons in New York City are using illicit dope.

Based on the city's population of 7,835,099 (1950 census), that would be 1 out of every 87 or 1 out of 174 persons.

The committee said narcotics addiction, especially among teen-agers, is increasing in the city.

The report called for more severe penalties for dope sellers, and for wholesale revisions of Federal and State penal statutes relating to sale.

The New York State Legislature recently enacted more stringent penalties.

The committee, appointed by Mayor R. Impellitteri last December 11, made the recommendation in a 75-page report on "study on drug addiction among teen-agers."

The committee was under direction of Thomas F. Murphy, former city police commissioner and newly appointed Federal judge.

As one means of combating dope addiction, the report proposed that—"consistent with civil liberty"—all known narcotics addicts be subjected to "compulsory treatment without stigma of criminality, much as is done with insane persons."

The committee estimated there are up to 3,000 dope sellers in the city. This was based on the number of arrests.

Notes From European Capitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. BENDEP. Mr. Speaker, maybe this is what the Soviet Union has been bargaining for. First reactions to the Korean cease-fire talks emanating from London indicate a disposition to cut British defense spending. Minister of Raw Materials Stokes has already said that the big spending may not be so immediately necessary as it had appeared. Shinwell, Minister of Defense, said, "At the slightest sign we should be only too willing to curtail our defense activities." There is talk of trying to wangle a ticket for Red China to the United Nations out of the deal in British circles, and some Labor Party leaders hope that a cease-fire will end American opposition to British trade with Communist China.

In France, too, the multiplicity of domestic problems, together with the large degree of Socialist and Communist influence, makes almost any news of an end to active fighting the signal for a pronounced let-up in defense preparations and spending. France does not relish the prospect of arming Western Germany, and the news out of Korea may dampen her ardor still further.

Throughout Europe, General Eisenhower's task is made all the more difficult. The fact becomes clearer day by day. Europe regards the big show-down as an American responsibility. It will cooperate so far as it is able, but it will not be the all-out, completely determined ally that we should like, until war guns boom over the boundary lines between east and west.

Merited Commendation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include the statement of commendation adopted July 12, 1951, by the board of directors of the Michigan Farm Bureau:

The board of directors of the Michigan Farm Bureau, in session at Lansing, July 12, heartily commends Congressmen Jesse P. Wolcott and Fred L. Crawford for their aggressive and courageous leadership in fighting for sound fiscal policies and indirect controls for stopping inflation. Their strenuous opposition to direct price and wage controls and their fight against excessive Government borrowing is a most timely protection to our free enterprise system.

We highly commend the other Michigan Members of Congress who are stanchly fighting direct controls and wasteful, destructive Government financial policies.

The battle waging in Congress over the re-enactment of price and wage controls is

fundamentally a conflict between the forces of centralized big government and the true representatives of a free people. Prominent Members of both political parties have joined their efforts to stop the further encroachment of bureaucratic power over the lives of American citizens.

The Michigan Farm Bureau considers the unwarranted attempt to inflict direct controls on our productive effort under present conditions as another long step toward socialistic regimentation of the farmer, and the destruction of efficient production of food and fiber.

These deteriorating policies reduce farm production by lowering the standards and output of the efficient farmer to the level of the inefficient producer. They progressively destroy the type of productive farm enterprise upon which our Nation and the people of other lands have to depend for their food. They destroy the initiative and incentive of the farmer and lead straight to Government subsidies and rationing.

The Michigan Farm Bureau is unalterably opposed to subsidies and high support prices for agriculture. Michigan Farm Bureau members want a fair opportunity to derive their income in the market place and not at the hands of Government paternalism.

The objective of the direct-price controllers is evidenced by the fact that some of the officials who are misleading the consumers by pressing for direct economic controls as a remedy for inflation are simultaneously urging the promoting wasteful expenditures and excessive Government borrowing which increase inflationary pressures.

The budget now before Congress must be drastically reduced by the elimination of all unnecessary and defensible projects. The efficient management of both defense and nonmilitary expenditures and operations is imperative. This Board of Directors considers the employment of an army of price-control personnel an illegitimate use of the taxpayers' dollars and a further unwarranted increase of inflationary pressure.

We hereby instruct Executive Secretary C. L. Brody to convey the foregoing statement to all Michigan Members of Congress.

MICHIGAN FARM BUREAU, BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
C. L. BRODY, Executive Secretary.

What's Happened to Charlie?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes:

WHAT'S HAPPENED TO CHARLIE?—CHARLES E. WILSON'S FIGHT FOR EFFECTIVE ECONOMIC CONTROLS MAKES MANY FORMER BUSINESS ASSOCIATES UNHAPPY

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

It used to be said of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt by certain people that he was a traitor to his class.

That was when he pitched in, sleeves figuratively rolled up, to put through the New Deal program of economic and social measures to give a better break to millions of citizens in this country too long neglected. That cost money, which means taxes, and was resented by many of the well-favored and privileged. To them Franklin Roosevelt, himself one of the well-favored and privileged, seemed with all this reform busi-

ness to be stepping out of character as the squire of Hudson Valley.

Charles E. Wilson, Defense Mobilization Director, though certainly no reformer, is getting a taste of this same sort of displeasure from his big-business friends, who can't understand why the former head of General Electric is putting up such a strong fight for controls which they so abhor. It is not yet bitter as was the deep-seated hostility to Mr. Roosevelt, but a sort of bewildered "What's happened to Charlie?" attitude.

Eric Johnston, businessman and four times president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, is in the same sort of situation because of his vigorous support of controls as Stabilization Director. His former business associates are unhappy about him.

What's happened to Charlie and what's happened to Eric is what happens luckily most of the time when outstanding American citizens accept a call in an emergency to leave their private affairs and serve their Government. They recognize immediately that in their new positions they represent all the people and all groups and the interests of the Nation as a whole. Within human bounds, of course, for they still remain human beings. There is no intention here to be Pollyannaish about the two men, but there is the intention to reflect pride that we have a country where that still happens when we get into a fix.

It happens also with our Presidents when they suddenly become charged with the welfare of all of our millions and millions of people. It was so with Franklin D. Roosevelt who did not wreck the Nation as his critics prophesied, as their own flourishing state today shows—though some still are bitter. It was true also with Harry Truman, so unexpectedly catapulted to the anxious seat of authority. This is no better exemplified in his case, incidentally than on one issue which has stirred up so much bitterness toward him—civil rights. On this matter he recognized, when he moved into the White House that he was President of all our people, all races, all colors, all creeds. He recognized, furthermore, that our Nation had assumed leadership in a world of all races, all colors, all creeds, had become a beacon to which all people everywhere of all races, all colors, all creeds had become a hope, and that our own light must be as well-trimmed, as clear and as clean as possible.

Some weeks ago Charles E. Wilson was under bitter attack from labor. Eric Johnston has been through some stormy sessions with labor, too. Now labor is supporting them in their stand for controls to check inflation, and business is restive and complaining. Next week, or next month, the two men may, in the course of their duty, find themselves again the target of labor or some other group with the change of circumstances. That's all in their jobs.

Ordinarily Mr. Wilson is not for such controls on the economy as he advocates now. Nor is Eric Johnston. But these are not ordinary times. They feel that such measures are necessary to meet a crisis in our national life of which both have a grasp and an understanding from their positions on the inside.

There was an incident some weeks ago illustrative of the metamorphosis through which men go when they leave their businesses and become public servants. A delegation representing business organizations, including the United States Chamber of Commerce, went to see Eric Johnston to present their case for restricting the wage disputes and not including also disputes affecting other issues between industry and labor, as labor was urging. John Gall, lawyer and labor expert for the United States Chamber of Commerce, spoke up at the conclusion of the presentation:

"Eric, I am sure you agree with this."

"If I were sitting on your side of the table I would support you entirely," Mr. Johnston replied; "but I am not in business now. I am representing everyone who is interested in this question."

It's too bad Congress doesn't have that attitude.

How To Tell a Communist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article by Richard Armour, from American Legion magazine for July 1951:

HOW TO TELL A COMMUNIST

(By Richard Armour)

A Communist is a person who can read the handwriting on the wall—if it is in Russian. He believes in American free enterprise, which he takes to mean freedom for him to carry out any enterprise that will help to destroy America.

A Communist is enthusiastic about life in Russia, but if you suggest that he go back where he came from, he either admits he has never been there or breaks out in a cold sweat and clutches you by the knees. He draws a fine line between expansion by imperialism and by popular revolution; it is known as the party line.

A Communist believes in streamlining government by reducing political parties to one. He would likewise cut down the complexity of balloting by 50 percent; on all propositions involving a vote of "Yes" or "No," the "No" would be eliminated.

A Communist wants peace in all the countries of the world—a piece of this country and a piece of that one. His great ambition is one world—all Stalin's.

You can tell a Communist, but you can't tell him much.

Oil From Shale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the Record an article from the Christian Science Monitor of Thursday, July 12, 1951, entitled "Oil From Shale." I would like to call attention to the author of the article, Mr. Harlan Trott, that the State of Nevada, too, has many vast rich oil shale deposits. It would be interesting to know if the Union Oil Co. will have to pay royalties on patents under the process to be used. I offer this article for the interest of the Members of the House of Representatives. It follows:

OIL FROM SHALE—PROJECT STEPS NEARER FOR COLORADO

(By Harlan Trott)

WASHINGTON.—Start of the Nation's first large commercial synthetic liquid fuels plant

may be imminent, according to information here.

The Union Oil Co. of California is discussing arrangements with the United States Bureau of Mines for a commercial-sized plant near Rifle, Colo., which would distill oil from shale.

Shale oil is particularly good for making jet aviation fuel.

Bureau of Mines officials hope the Union Oil Co. will go ahead with the first 10,000-barrel-a-day unit. Eventually, it is understood, the Union Oil Co. hopes to have a shale operation producing between 400,000 and 600,000 barrels of crude a day from the vast rich Colorado deposits which yield as high as 50 gallons of shale oil a ton of oil shale.

The first unit would, it is said, produce 10,000 barrels a day.

The shale rock would be distilled in a resort which the Union Oil Co. has developed in a Government pilot plant at Rifle.

DISPOSAL OF SHALE

Union's plant, it is understood, would be located at Grand Junction, Colo. The spent shale could be disposed of there easier than at Rifle. You take down the mountain, melt the oil out of it, and put the mountain back again. Union owns large oil shale deposits in this section of Colorado.

Reports indicate that the company is figuring on taking the mountain to the distillery by rubber-belt conveyor.

The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. has perfected this type of conveyor which is in wide use as a coal carrier in Ohio and West Virginia.

Bureau of Mines officials say they have held discussions with the Union Oil Co. about building a pipeline from Rifle to its refineries at Wilmington.

Such an undertaking, counting mining, haulage, an oil-shale distillery, and corresponding refinery capacity, would cost roughly \$2,000,000,000, it is estimated.

Profits could be enormous for ultimately it would be much cheaper to produce oil-shale gasoline than petroleum gasoline. The supply of oil shale in Colorado would last for centuries.

BENEFIT FOR AIR FORCE

Shale oil is superior to petroleum for many present-day uses.

The jet-powered Air Force would benefit especially by the use of shale oil.

A jet plane uses about five times as much fuel an hour as a propeller-driven plane.

Presumably the important defense factor in the development of shale would enable any commercial oil company to receive Government help in financing the undertaking.

Reports have been prevalent in oil-industry quarters here for some months that some of the large insurance companies are interested in backing expansion of domestic-oil production.

Government officials say the company is planning to refine and market the output of its original distilling unit in the western Colorado area.

Current negotiations between the Bureau of Mines and the Union Oil Co. touched off political overtones.

OTHER SHALE DEPOSITS

For a long time the party in power has said to have been getting votes from western Colorado on its promise to bring about a tremendous industrial development there in the distillation of shale.

Many other States have vast rich oil-shale deposits, notably Ohio and Indiana, and Kentucky. But the synthetic-fuel advisers in the Interior Department concentrate on Colorado.

It is also claimed that they do not mention the controversial possibility of distilling coal instead of oil shale. Coal was an important source of oil during World War II in Japan and Germany, according to official reports published by the Bureau of Mines.

The Interior Department is warning the country of an impending oil shortage that may result in gasoline rationing for American motorists, and the question is raised by the partisans of oil-from-coal and shale development outside Colorado as to whether these should be given more serious consideration.

The Junior Order Always Stands for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, all the fraternal organizations of our great country are patriotic, but the Junior Order of United American Mechanics, commonly called the Junior Order, is especially dedicated to teach and practice and insist on Americanism. This organization has membership in practically every State in the Union. It is always alert to the best interests of America and is quick to condemn all un-American activities. Likewise it is always alert to the activities of Communists and any other groups of Reds or pinks wherever they may be.

The National Council of the Junior Order in its recent session adopted a number of resolutions which express the views of this great organization on many important public questions.

The following are some of the resolutions adopted on June 19 and 20, 1951, at the session held at Old Point Comfort, Va.:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE JUNIOR ORDER UNITED AMERICAN MECHANICS AT ITS BIENNIAL SESSION HELD AT OLD POINT COMFORT, VA., JUNE 19-20, 1951

Resolution No. 3 recited the fact that it had been about 6 years since World War II had stopped, and that universal peace is a thing most earnestly desired and urgently needed to compose the people and allay their fears, and that the national council recorded its desire for full and complete peace treaties to be negotiated and signed at the earliest possible date, and that copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, and to the Senators of the 48 States.

Resolution No. 4 expressed opposition to the employment of any person in either the State or National Government who has ever been a member of the Communist Party, or who has been a supporter of the Communist Party as editor-publisher of any Communist magazine, or who has gone about the country teaching the doctrines of communism, and that strict screening and examination should be made of all applicants for public office, and that those should be weeded out who are now employed by the State or National Government and no mercy to be shown to those who are employed if they have been guilty of membership in the Communist Party or other subversive activities.

Resolution No. 6, World Government: This resolution expressed the sense of the national council to the effect that we cherish the freedoms and our right to self-government as a most precious heritage from our forefathers, and that we want to see the same protected and defended by every pa-

triotic American citizen; and that we stand whole-heartedly for all of our freedoms, including the freedom of individual conscience and freedom of religion and the right of self-determination in government, and that, in our opinion, the entering into any world government program or federation will lead the people of America down the road toward a world-Socialist and pro-Communist government, with losses of basic freedoms which we now possess. It affirmed our stand for the right of democratic liberty both political and religious, and stressed opposition to the ideology of world government and such organizations and federations as sponsor and promote it.

Resolution No. 8 expressed approval of H. R. 4261 which would require the Attorney General of the United States to compile and maintain a list of all subversive organizations in this country.

Resolution No. 10 expressed the approval and support of the national council to the doctrine of separation of church and State.

Resolution No. 11 favored a law being enacted which would forbid the continuous display on school buildings of any flag constituting the emblem of any nation, or group of nations, other than that of the United States.

Resolution No. 14, Membership in the United Nations: Due to the record which Russia has made since the United Nations was established, this resolution expressed the considered opinion that Russia should be disbarred as a member of the United Nations.

Resolution No. 15 contained a solemn warning to State councils, officers and members of councils, and to societies composing the fraternal system and membership in the National Fraternal Congress, and church people generally, to beware of signing Stockholm peace appeal, on the ground that any one who signs this appeal is supporting Russia and her imperialistic designs to promote and extend communism, and in signing it they are doing a great disfavor to America and its institutions.

Resolution No. 16 called for strict and rigid regulations to be adopted and promulgated by the Department of Justice, through the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, warning Chinese and other students who are pursuing courses in American colleges and institutions, that there must be no affiliation whatsoever with any group, cell or activity which is favorable to or promulgates communism, and that those who violate such regulations shall be speedily deported.

Resolution No. 17 demanded that any and all nations which have been guilty of using money supplied to them by the United States to aid their economy, or otherwise to use said funds received from the United States to supply materials for Russia to make up munitions of war to be used against us, that any further aid shall be denied nations that have been guilty of trafficking with Russia with our funds.

Resolution No. 18 expressed opposition to the introduction of subversive literature for school children to read and demanded that literature which is being used in the public schools should be thoroughly examined, and that any and all such literature which is subversive, or carries subversive ideas, be immediately discontinued. The national secretary was directed to send copy of this resolution to the superintendents of education of the 48 States of the Union.

Resolution No. 19 expressed the firm conviction that teachers and others required to take the loyalty oath, should take the simple oath of allegiance of the United States, the same as is provided by the Constitution and is taken by the President and others holding public office. The secretary was directed to send a copy of this resolution to the Attorney General of the United States and to the members of the Senate and House Judiciary Committees of the Congress.

Resolution No. 20, Federal aid to education, expressed opposition of members of the national council to the enactment of any law that would make Federal aid to education available to any other than the free public school system, and also opposed such legislation as grants Federal control of education in the several States, or control of the funds appropriated for education in the States. The secretary was directed to send copies of this resolution to the House and Senate committees of Congress having charge of school legislation, and to forward copies of the same to the State superintendents of public instruction of all the States.

Resolution No. 21 demanded rigid economy in appropriations by Congress for public purposes, in order to relieve oppressive taxation.

Resolution No. 22, on the subject of immigration, expressed opposition to any and all immigration over and above the number provided under the present quota system, and that immigration by special legislation, or by unused quotas, and by Executive orders be discouraged and discontinued.

Resolution No. 30 expressed unanimous and enthusiastic support of the Internal Security Act of 1950, and called upon the Department of Justice to enforce its provisions strictly without fear or favor, and directed the secretary to furnish copies of this resolution to the Department of Justice, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and to the Judiciary Committees of both the House and Senate of the United States.

Harlan Folk Turn Out To Welcome Medal of Honor Winner, Carl Dodd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article by Gerald Griffin, from the Louisville Courier-Journal:

HARLAN FOLK TURN OUT TO WELCOME MEDAL OF HONOR WINNER, CARL DODD—PARADE HONORS FORMER MINER

(By Gerald Griffin)

EVARTS, Ky., May 26.—Even Caesar, making his triumphant return to Rome, never had a warmer welcome than the one given by the home folks to their hero, home from the wars today.

It was homecoming day for an Army man who grew up in the Harlan County coal fields. He was a coal miner before he enlisted. So is his father.

Harlan County, particularly the communities of Evarts and Kenvir, turned out a royal welcome for First Lt. Carl H. Dodd, Medal of Honor winner.

He was decorated last Saturday in Washington by President Truman in the White House. He won't talk about how he won his award but records show Dodd is one of the greatest heroes of the Korean war.

But he didn't mind talking about how glad he was to get home.

"It's wonderful," he said, "to be back home and among people you know."

YEARNS FOR FRIED CHICKEN

The lieutenant, who won a battlefield commission in Korea—he was discharged in 1946 as a sergeant and reenlisted a few months later—flew into Harlan Airport shortly after noon.

His father, Edd Dodd, Kenvir, beaming with pride and sporting a pink rose in his lapel, was waiting there when the plane settled down. Father and son greeted each other casually with a handshake.

Also waiting were four of the lieutenant's younger brothers and his baby sister. But his mother wasn't there. She was at Anderson, Ind., with Carl's wife. Both will be home in a few days and Dodd is glad of that. He said he is getting mighty hungry for some of mom's fried chicken. He will get it, too, for he plans to spend a week at the little mountain home of his parents.

Introducing his father to visiting dignitaries who came to honor him, the lieutenant said, "Don't call him my dad. He's my partner; he's my buddy." Edd just grinned.

From the harbor airport all the way to Kenvir and back to the Everts High School football field, it was a triumphant procession in honor of the one-time mine "shot-firer."

It was a long motorcade, headed by State police. Carl and his father rode in an open convertible despite an occasional shower.

Through Loyall, Brookside, Everts, and Kenvir went the line of automobiles, police cars heralding Dodd's approach.

In the towns the streets were lined with people, most of whom knew him as a boy. Store windows bore welcome signs for him.

"Howdy, Carl. Welcome home," they shouted. He waved back and smiled in response. An occasional soldier along the way saluted.

There were banners over the streets and in every town there was a uniformed high-school band and an American Legion guard of honor. Even the Boy Scouts turned out to welcome Carl, a former scout himself.

A Legion firing squad fired a three-gun salute as Dodd entered Everts, where he went to high school 2 years before enlisting in the Army. Everts even had a float, used yesterday in the mountain laurel festival at Pineville. It bore half a dozen pretty girls dressed as coal miners, who waved and smiled.

HONORED AT BANQUET

The homecoming was climaxed with a formal ceremony here. Dodd gave a brief talk, expressing his appreciation of the welcome. Gov. Lawrence Wetherby gave him a commission as a Kentucky colonel. Senator EARLE C. CLEMENTS praised his exploits. So did Congressmen CARL PERKINS and JAMES GOLDEN. They were introduced by Circuit Judge Astor Hogg, Harlan Mayor J. D. Housley welcomed him back home.

The Reverend Roscoe Douglas, pastor of Black Mountain (Kenvir) Baptist Church, delivered the invocation.

Harold McKnight, American Legion commander at Kenvir, gave Carl a life membership in the Legion. Ray O. Shehan, Harlan attorney, was master of ceremonies.

The unassuming lieutenant was honored further tonight at a banquet in Harlan, at which commonwealth's attorney Daniel Boone Smith was toastmaster. The banquet brought Dodd to a city he doesn't

know well, for, as a member of his family said, "He never did go around much." But the county-seat citizens wanted to join in the celebration for the man who, as Smith said, "has everything that goes to make manhood."

Comparison of Retail Food Prices in Washington, D. C., on June 15, 1950, and July 5, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. REVA BECK BOSONE

OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD at this time a comparison of retail food prices in Washington, D. C., on June 15, 1950, and July 5, 1951. This comparison was prepared by the women's division of the Democratic National Committee and released at a press conference recently by Mrs. India Edwards, vice chairman of the committee. To my mind, the figures speak for themselves:

A comparison of retail food prices in Washington, D. C., June 15, 1950-July 5, 1951*

Commodity	Unit	June 15, 1950		July 5, 1951		Percent change	Commodity	Unit	June 15, 1950		July 5, 1951		Percent change
		Average	Range	Average	Range				Average	Range	Average	Range	
		Cents	Cents	Cents	Cents				Cents	Cents	Cents	Cents	
Cereals and bakery products:							Daily products—						
Cereals:							Continued						
Flour, wheat.....	5 lb....	51.8	39-59	52.0	48-55	Same	Eggs, fresh.....	Doz....	52.0	49-60	77.2	60-89	45 percent up.
Corn flakes.....	11 oz....	17.7	14-23	20.6	20-22	16 percent up.	Fruits and vegetables:						
Corn meal.....	Lb.....	8.1	8-12	10.6	9-16	31 percent up.	Fresh:						
Rice.....	Lb.....	16.7	12-25	18.6	15-22	11 percent up.	Apples.....	Lb.....	16.5	10-21	16.6	13-20	1 percent up.
Rollod oats.....	20 oz....	16.7	14-19	17.8	17-19	10 percent up.	Bananas.....	Lb.....	17.0	14-22	17.3	15-19	2 percent up.
Bakery products:						23 percent up.	Oranges.....	Doz....	46.4	37-60	50.8	33-59	9 percent up.
Bread, white.....	Lb.....	13.0	11.3-14	16.0	16.0		Beans, green.....	Lb.....	15.6	12-21	16.25	13-19	4 percent up.
Meats, poultry, fish:							Cabbage.....	Lb.....	5.6	3-9	4.75	4-6	14 percent down.
Meats:							Carrots.....	Bunch..	10.8	8-15	13.5	13-15	25 percent up.
Beef:							Lettuce.....	Head...	16.1	12-28	15.6	10-25	3 percent down.
Round steak.....	Lb.....	100.9	89-110	111.4	106-117	0 percent up.	Onions.....	Lb.....	8.0	6-10	11.25	9-15	40 percent up.
Rib roast.....	Lb.....	77.8	60-9	82.0	78-89	5 percent up.	Potatoes.....	15 lbs...	79.3	68-125	73.4	59-90	7 percent down.
Chuck roast.....	Lb.....	59.7	55-70	78.1	69-93	31 percent up.	Sweet potatoes..	Lb.....	19.7	5-14	15.0	10-18	40 percent up.
Hamburger.....	Lb.....	55.0	45-83	68.3	65-74	24 percent up.	Tomatoes.....	Lb.....	34.2	24-45	23.0	21-25	33 percent down.
Veal: Cutlets.....	Lb.....	111.6	89-139	133.0	120-139	19 percent up.	Canned:						
Pork:							Peaches.....	No. 2 1/2 can.	27.2	22-39	38.9	31-55	43 percent up.
Chops.....	Lb.....	79.1	60-89	75.0	60-79	5 percent down.	Pineapple.....	No. 2 1/2 can.	35.5	29-45	38.0	31-49	7 percent up.
Bacon, sliced.....	Lb.....	64.7	55-79	67.4	49-83	4 percent up.	Tomatoes.....	No. 2 can.	14.2	10-19	22.0	15-32	55 percent up.
Salt pork.....	Lb.....	32.5	27-49	35.8	25-49	10 percent up.	Peas.....	No. 303 can.	20.8	18-35	20.3	13-31	2 percent down.
Ham, whole.....	Lb.....	63.9	55-73	67.3	61-79	5 percent up.	Dried:						
Lamb: Leg.....	Lb.....	77.6	60-90	84.0	70-89	8 percent up.	Prunes.....	Lb.....	24.2	19-29	23.2	20-31	17 percent up.
Poultry:							Navy beans.....	Lb.....	18.2	13-23	17.5	13-22	15 percent up.
Fryers:							Beverages: Coffee...	Lb.....	74.3	67-85	93.0	77-103	26 percent up.
New York dressed.....	Lb.....	43.8	39-50	48.0	43-49	3 percent up.	Fats and oils:						
Fish: Salmon, pink 16-oz. can.	16-oz. can.	42.5	37-53	65.0	63-69	53 percent up.	Lard.....	Lb.....	17.2	15-21	23.0	21-25	34 percent up.
Dairy products:							Shortening, hydrogenated.	Lb.....	33.7	30-39	40.0	36-41	21 percent up.
Butter.....	Lb.....	75.6	68-89	82.0	78-89	8 percent up.	Margarine.....	Lb.....	33.9	24-39	36.7	35-39	8 percent up.
Cheese.....	Lb.....	53.2	38-72	66.8	59-79	26 percent up.	Sugar.....	5 lbs....	47.9	46-55	50.0	49-51	4 percent up.
Milk:													
Fresh delivered.....	Qt.....	20.4	19.5-20.5	23.0	22.5-23.5	13 percent up.							
Fresh grocery.....	Qt.....	19.4	18-22	21.87	20-23	Do.							
Evaporated.....	14 1/2-oz. can.	12.9	11-17	14.55	14-16	Do.							

* U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Retail Food Prices by Cities, June 15, 1950.
* Spot check of District of Columbia grocery stores, July 5, 1951.

Hon. Alben W. Barkley

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I enclose in the Appendix of the Record the following story by Robert L. Riggs, Washington bureau of the Louisville Courier-Journal, July 8, 1951, about a great American entitled "Don't Figure BARKLEY Too Old To Run in '52; the Vice President Is Ready for Any Job":

DON'T FIGURE BARKLEY TOO OLD TO RUN IN '52; THE VICE PRESIDENT IS READY FOR ANY JOB

(By Robert L. Riggs)

WASHINGTON, July 7.—Please do not count ALBEN W. BARKLEY among those who feel that our Vice President is too old and too ailing to be considered a factor in the presidential election of 1952.

At 73, with his clothes cut back to allow for the 25 or 30 pounds he took off a few months ago, and with his face filled out to remove that emaciated look which goes with quick reducing, BARKLEY obviously feels there is nothing wrong with him that couldn't be remedied if he'd take a month off for an operation to remove cataracts from his eyes.

This is not to intimate that the Kentuckian is doing any angling for next summer's presidential or vice-presidential nomination.

For him to do so would be entirely out of character. His friends couldn't even get him to do anything in his own behalf in 1944 or 1948.

But it is the intention here to hazard a good strong guess that if the Democratic Party, at its convention in Chicago a year hence, again chose him to be Harry S. Truman's running mate, BARKLEY wouldn't feel that his physical condition imposed upon him any obligation to decline.

For that matter, should it work out that the party selected him for the No. 1 spot, the Kentuckian, if he is feeling as fit next July as he is this month, would have no inclination to step aside on the ground that his health was not good enough.

What brings on all the current speculation about BARKLEY's future is the fact that more and more politicians are coming around to the view that Harry Truman is going to run again.

Most of them had accepted that idea some weeks ago. Some, who recognized that you can't keep a President from getting the nomination if he wants it, had been clinging to the forlorn hope that Truman might be persuaded to step aside for Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

But political developments within the last 10 days make it clear that Eisenhower would not be inclined to take a Democratic nomination, that he regards himself as a Republican, and that if he ran for President it would be as the Republican nominee.

Of course, should the Democrats nominate a new face for President, the question of what to do about BARKLEY would not arise. It would follow as a matter of course that another new face would go in the No. 2 position.

But if Truman is to be nominated, there is no simple and logical way to drop BARKLEY if he shows the slightest desire to hold to the Vice Presidency.

Out of this situation, Time magazine, whose journalistic achievements often puzzle many of us engaged in the same business, has discovered a political plot to cut BARKLEY's throat, figuratively speaking.

Time's thesis is that whenever Washington politicians want to undermine an opponent, they leak uncomplimentary facts about him to newsmen.

FOR THE DEFENSE

Such a leak, said Time, caused Columnist Robert S. Allen to write that BARKLEY's cataracts have put him in danger of going blind because he has refused to take time off from his job to have them removed.

Actually, the Allen piece was most friendly to BARKLEY, pointing out his devotion to duty and saying that, with the exception of his eyes, his physical condition is excellent.

But it aroused a BARKLEY defender in a strange place. John Crosson, a city hall reporter for the New York Daily News, part of the McCormick-Patterson empire, came out swinging on behalf of BARKLEY.

New York Democrats, led by James A. Farley, said Crosson, were aroused by the attempt to ditch BARKLEY. If they tried to dump him in favor of a younger man, such as ESTES KEFAUVER, Crosson promised, Farley would do battle upon the convention floor on behalf of the Kentuckian.

Washington reporters haven't been nearly so successful in finding a plot to get rid of BARKLEY as have those who do their writing in New York. Nonetheless, there has been a good deal of finger pointing at the age bracket of the country's top political leadership.

Truman himself is 67. The man who would succeed him if he died today is the 73-year-old BARKLEY. If anything happened to BARKLEY, the next in line would be 69-year-old Speaker RAYBURN, of Texas. Behind RAYBURN would come 82-year-old KENNETH McKELLAR of Tennessee, President pro tempore of the Senate.

It frequently is pointed out that if the Democratic ticket is the same in 1952 as it was in 1948, Truman would be 68 and BARKLEY just a few weeks short of 75 at election day.

As to BARKLEY's eyesight, his vision is as good today as it has been at any time during the last 8 years. In 1943, he underwent an operation for abscess on his eyes. But, at the Democratic convention in 1948, he read his keynote speech without glasses and could repeat the performance again today.

He is reluctant to recognize that he now has cataracts, but he cheerfully accepts the fact that he may have to have an operation to remove them.

DOESN'T THINK HE'S OLD

BARKLEY is well aware of the discussion going on about his age. But it is so foreign to his nature to consider himself old that he has difficulty realizing that he is the 73-year-old Vice President they are talking about.

It likewise is foreign to his nature to consider himself out of public life. Not that he would lack something to do. With Mrs. Barkley's encouragement and clerical assistance, he has embarked upon an ambitious project of writing about his years rich in experience in political affairs.

He could put in a full-time career for several years attending to his literary chores. Hence, there is no need for anyone to concern himself about what BARKLEY would find to do to pass the time.

But there can be little doubt that if you put the decision up to BARKLEY, he'd be more than willing to tackle for another term the job of being Vice President.

There is equally little doubt that he wouldn't hesitate to take on the man-killing job of being President.

**AP Lends Itself to Propaganda Line of
the Administration**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, on July 15 the Honorable JESSE P. WOLCOTT, my colleague from Michigan and ranking minority member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, issued a statement to the press in which he showed that the House action on pending control legislation "is being badly misrepresented to the country by the bureaucrats and certain irresponsible elements of the press and radio." This statement by Mr. WOLCOTT has been inserted in the Appendix of the Record by the Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, and is to be found on page A4410, July 16.

As a former newspaper publisher, editor, and one who has handled thousands of news releases, I considered Mr. WOLCOTT's statement extremely newsworthy, and I took it upon myself, in view of the campaign of misrepresentation which Mr. WOLCOTT so ably described, to examine the treatment of this particular story.

I am pleased to report that the New York Times, which lists itself as an independent Democrat paper, carried a lengthy page 1 account in its issue of Monday morning, July 16, of Mr. WOLCOTT's statement, reporting its essence fairly and objectively.

I am distressed to report that the Associated Press on the same date saw fit to act otherwise. As carried in the Baltimore Sun on page 4 of its issue of Monday morning, July 16, the Associated Press chooses to report that a "lawmaker—who—would not permit use of his name," had said the Truman forces in Congress had fought the good fight and decided they could not win on controls and therefore would "check the verdict to the voters." The story praises "the Truman forces" for "fighting tooth and nail" to get the bill through Congress, but asserts that Congress has "chopped hunks out of the requested powers."

The story goes on in this vein for 12 long paragraphs until finally it devotes a few meager sentences to the statement by my colleague, Mr. WOLCOTT.

In my opinion, the Associated Press story amounts to no more than a Truman party-line propaganda story, and I invite comparison by Members of this House of the New York Times account and the Associated Press story. The comparison will seem to bear out Mr. WOLCOTT's assertion that the House action is being "misrepresented" to the public.

I think the directors of the Associated Press might ask themselves a fundamental question about this particular story. The story plainly states that the

alleged information is based on statements by a lawmaker who would not permit the use of his name. If the lawmaker will not lend his name to such propaganda, why should the great Associated Press lend its name and its prestige to promoting the administration line?

The New York Times account follows:
(By Clayton Knowles)

WASHINGTON, July 15.—The Republican leadership of the House of Representatives sought today to hold party membership in line as the hour neared for the start of record voting on the defense production bill.

Representative JESSE P. WOLCOTT, of Michigan, top Republican spokesman in the House on economic matters, charged the position of the Republicans was being badly misrepresented to the country by the bureaucrats and certain irresponsible elements of the press and radio.

He declared this campaign of untruth and calumny was deliberately planned to make it appear that Members of the House, including an overwhelming majority of Republicans and not a few patriotic Democrats, are sabotaging price, wage, and credit controls.

The real truth, he said, is that his party merely is seeking to weed out socialistic power grabs sought by the administration in asking for 2 years of strengthened economic controls during the peak of the defense mobilization effort.

The Wolcott statement, issued as the House prepared to start voting tomorrow on controversial price-, wage-, and credit-control features of the administration program, was construed as an effort to prevent a possible break in Republican ranks.

Major amendments pending include one that would strike out authority for any further roll-backs in food prices, canceling out in the process the original 10 percent cut-back in beef prices, and another revamping the Wage Stabilization Board and stripping it of authority in labor disputes.

During preliminary stages of the voting on any major bill, the House membership sits as a Committee of the Whole and the votes that shape the bill are not recorded. When the Members return to the House for final action, however, record votes can be demanded.

Thus, it often happens that certain Members will vote one way in the Committee of the Whole, and then will switch in the House where they are subject to roll-call votes.

In the present situation it is possible, albeit improbable, that decisions on the controls bill tentatively won by the Republican-southern Democrat coalition might be reversed on record votes in the House.

BREAK ON MEAT POSSIBLE

Should a break in the voting develop at the roll-call stage, administration forces might be able to restore quotas on livestock slaughtering, held by stabilization chiefs to be necessary for enforcing price controls on meat. They might also be able to prevent curtailment of the authority sought by the administration to deal with the stabilization of prices and wages.

In denouncing bureaucrats, the press, and radio, Mr. Wolcott did not mention names. The two top men in the mobilization picture are Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization and former president of General Electric Corp., and Eric Johnston, Economic Stabilization Administrator, who formerly headed the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Both are Republicans and both support the Administration's program for stronger production incentives and stabilization measures.

Mr. WOLCOTT, taxing the administration once again with delay in imposing price control, said many of the new powers it sought were "totally unrelated to the consumer's problem of price, wage, and credit controls." He said he had voted for the last controls bill and would vote for this one after "pet socialistic schemes" were eliminated.

The House leadership hopes to obtain a final vote on the controls bill by Thursday at the latest, but it will set aside the pending bill briefly tomorrow for several important votes, one of them on a special food-relief appropriation for Kansas and Missouri.

Another vote scheduled is on a bill setting uniform minimum and maximum sentences for violations of narcotics laws.

The Senate, also set to vote tomorrow on food relief, will act this week on a measure to cut annual leave for Government employees, a feature of the economy drive in Congress, and on a proposal to increase Federal grants to the States for public assistance.

With Senate hearings on the new tax bill continuing, Senator EDWARD MARTIN, Republican, of Pennsylvania, said today he felt safe in predicting that the Senate Finance Committee, of which he is a member, would report a bill in which increases "not only fall below the President's \$10,000,000,000 request but will be cut under the \$7,200,000,000 figure in the House bill."

The Associated Press account as carried in the Baltimore Sun, July 16, follows:

WASHINGTON, July 15.—A speed-up of House action on the economic controls bill is in prospect this week. The reason given is that administration backers who have known for days they couldn't really win have decided the record is now clear for the voters to read in 1952.

That summation of the outlook was given by a leading supporter of President Truman's much-mauled plans for tighter curbs to combat inflation and speed defense production. The lawmaker would not permit use of his name.

Up to this point the Truman forces have been fighting tooth and nail as first the Senate, then the House Banking Committee, and for the last week the House itself, chopped hunks out of the requested powers.

MEMBERS PUT ON RECORD

That process consumed time and broke up plans to get final action on the new defense production measure last week. It also put the Members on record, and the Congressman said that is one reason his side kept it going.

Now the schedule calls for passage, perhaps by Thursday, of whatever the administration can get to replace the original law. That act, carrying powers for wage and price control, materials allocation and other such measures, was due to expire June 30 but is kept in force for this month, with some curbs on action under it, by a congressional resolution.

The decision by administration men to take what they can get and check the verdict to the voters is not expected to head off a fight tomorrow over a proposed ban on farm price roll-backs. It is more likely only to cut down the time spent on the issue.

WOULD FORBID FARM ROLL-BACKS

Representative COOLEY, Democrat of North Carolina, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, plans to bring up the proposal, sponsored by his committee, to forbid any future roll-backs on farm products and also to cancel the existing 10-percent cut in ceiling prices for beef on the hoof.

The meat matter, because of its direct effect on everybody's pocketbook, has been adopted on both sides of the controls battle-line as a sort of symbol of the more general

issue. Members whose constituency is dominated by farm interests want a full record on the point as much as the backers of tight controls do.

Administration forces concede privately they have no hope of getting much more than that out of the fight.

WSB PROPOSAL TO COME UP

Another issue likely to be a speech-producer is the proposal by Representative LUCAS, Democrat of Texas, to reform the Wage Stabilization Board so that public members have control and take away the Board's power over disputes. At present the Board, set up by Executive order, is evenly divided among public, labor, and management members. It can recommend settlements in labor disputes referred to it by the parties or certified to it by the President as affecting national defense.

Most House leaders believed the roll-back fight would take too long for that issue to come up tomorrow.

SAYS TRUMAN ENDANGERS CONTROLS

Representative WOLCOTT, Republican, of Michigan, said today the Truman administration "has endangered the entire controls program by attempting to use the current emergency to grab new powers that would be palatable only to a British Socialist."

WOLCOTT predicted in a statement that the House will pass the controls legislation but only after the socialistic power grabs which this bill contains have been weeded out, and price, wage, and credit controls have been strengthened. He added:

"I shall vote for it, and countless of my colleagues will do likewise."

He denied that a Republican-southern Democrat coalition is sabotaging price, wage, and credit controls by voting down administration-backed amendments to the House bill.

Count the Cadence, 1931-51, More Morality in Government Today Than 20 Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago, this September 18, 1931, the Japanese crossed the Yalu River and set the East on fire with the Mukden incident. Herbert Hoover was President. His Secretary of State, Stimson, invoked the Pact of Paris, called upon the nine signatories to put the fire out and send the Japanese back, south of the Yalu. No one answered the call. The Lytton report of the League of Nations bore no action. Ten years later, we were slaughtered at Pearl Harbor. Such was the morality in Government in the early thirties.

Count the cadence. Twenty years later, Red aggressors cross the thirty-eighth parallel. Harry Truman is President. His Secretary of State, Acheson, slaps the Reds down, calls upon the United Nations to put the fire out and send the Reds back across the parallel. The United Nations answered the call. The Reds have sued for peace.

Morality, 1931-51? Count the cadence. Morality in government is on the march.

Voting Down Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, can inflation be prevented under an unsound currency system? Even Holy Writ condemns fraudulent measures and weights:

Thou shalt not have in thy bag divers weights, a great and a small. Thou shalt not have in thy house divers measures, a great and a small. But thou shalt have a perfect and just weight, a perfect and just measure shalt thou have. (Deuteronomy xxv: 13, 14, 15)

Today our currency is diminishing in purchasing power thus defrauding the farmer, the wage earner, the pensioner, the annuitant, and the insurance policy holder. It is destroying endowments and expanding our national debt and increasing our taxes.

Sound Republican doctrine has ever been for a sound currency under which there can be no runaway inflation.

The money of the United States, and every kind or form of it, whether of paper, silver, or gold, must be as good as the best in the world. It must not only be current at its full face value at home, but it must be counted at par in any and every commercial center of the globe. The dollar paid to the farmer, the wage earner, and the pensioner must continue forever in equal purchasing and debt paying power to the dollar paid to any Government creditor.

Controls cannot solve the problem of inflation caused by an unsound currency. Under leave to extend my remarks, heretofore granted, I am inserting an article by William Henry Chamberlin which appeared in the Wall Street Journal July 16, 1951, as follows:

VOTING DOWN INFLATION—YOU CANNOT AVOID THE EFFECTS OF INFLATIONARY POLICIES BY JUST ENACTING A STATUTE TO MAKE THEM ILLEGAL

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

There have been two Nation-wide debates on foreign policy during the current year, and now a debate of equal or greater importance has begun on questions of internal economic policy, with the curbing of inflation as the key subject of argument.

One grave misconception, assiduously propagated by official and unofficial administration spokesmen, should be scotched at the outset, in the interest of fair play and reasonable discussion. This is that there is in legislative action some magic cure for high prices, that it is possible to banish inflation by passing a law against it.

Starting from this assumption, it is easy to brand every Congressman who opposes legislative patent medicine looking to price controls by administrative fiat as a betrayer of consumer interests and a selfish squanderer of the people's savings. But the assumption is false. One would think that in a country with the highest college and high school attendance in the world there would be enough

general familiarity with elementary economics to know why it is false.

LESSON OF EXPERIENCE

There is the plain teaching of experience through the ages, in America and in many other lands. The lesson of experience, tested on innumerable occasions and under very different circumstances, is that no government ever created, even if armed with the arbitrary power of life and death over its subjects, is strong enough to decree effectively the prices at which goods should be bought and sold.

One could only wish that such a complicated phenomenon as inflation would yield to the simple treatment of passing a law forbidding it. Unfortunately there is not the slightest indication that legislation providing a strait-jacket regimentation of prices and wages would produce this effect.

Most of the continental European countries experienced inflation of varying degrees of severity after the war. They cured or alleviated this situation not by piling on more controls, but by relaxing existing controls and applying old-fashioned economic remedies, aiming at balanced budgets, raising interest rates, taking a stand against wage increases that were not matched by increases in productivity.

What may be represented as just a little control upsetting the normal equilibrium of a free market is apt to have the effect of "just a little drink" for a dipsomaniac; it leads logically and almost inevitably to more and more. To control the finished product, whether of farm or factory, and to leave uncontrolled the prices of some of the materials which enter into the making of this product is to invite all sorts of distortions in the price structure.

The logical end of a price-control system is an arrangement under which the Government, through some fantastically powerful bureaucratic organization, would undertake to prescribe what could be charged for every item, large or small, offered for sale and also what every individual should receive for his labor. But such an arrangement would break down from its inherent unwieldiness, leaving a trail of economic havoc and ruin behind it. The Roman Emperor Diocletian introduced such a system, backed by the death penalty, which was rather freely meted out at that time, more than 1,600 years ago. It proved a fiasco and was soon abandoned.

ONE OBVIOUS CAUSE

One of the most obvious causes of inflation is the tremendous increase in the money supply of the country during the last two decades. This currency supply was about \$38,000,000,000 in 1933, about \$180,000,000,000 at the present time. Our national output has substantially increased during this same period, but not by four and a half times. Is it possible to conceive of a law that would pump any considerable part of this \$180,000,000,000 out of our monetary veins?

There are many things that could be done to reduce the inflationary impact of enhanced war preparation. But these are not along the lines of trying by legislative or administrative fiat to establish rigid price and wage controls.

The universal trend to extravagant spending at National, State, and municipal levels could be reversed. Congress could establish a hard-and-fast limit, and at a considerable lower figure than the present, for nonmilitary Government spending. The fetish of cheap money could be thrown overboard. More liberal terms for Government bondholders, especially in the field of tax exemption, could divert a good deal of money from spending to saving.

America's trump card against the worst consequences of inflation is increased production. The results that have already been achieved in this field are impressive, as the following roll call for 1950 shows: 8,000,000 automobiles, 1,350,000 houses started, 14,500,000 wireless sets, 6,000,000 electric refrigerators, 7,500,000 washing machines, over 92,000,000 rubber tires, over 23,000,000 men's suits, etc.

A VALUABLE ASSET

No country in the world has a per capita record comparable with this; and this tremendous outpouring of consumer goods went hand in hand with increased arms spending and substantial aid to foreign countries. It would seem that the free market and personal incentive system which made possible this vast output is a pretty valuable asset, for peace or war.

This thought is worth remembering at a time when we may expect intensive pressure for measures which, however well intentioned, are calculated to injure both. Nothing that paralyzes the impulse to produce can be any help in the fight against inflation.

Do We Need a Realignment of Our Political Parties for 1952?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the text of a debate between the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], on the subject Do We Need a Realignment of Our Political Parties for 1952? broadcast over the radio on the program the American Forum of the Air, on July 15, 1951.

There being no objection, the text of the debate was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DO WE NEED A REALIGNMENT OF OUR POLITICAL PARTIES FOR 1952?

ANNOUNCER. Good evening * * * tonight the American Forum of the Air presents a discussion of the vital topic Do We Need a Realignment of Our Political Parties for 1952? Here with us this evening to discuss this problem are Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, who says, "A coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats controls the legislative program in Congress in many instances. By uniting in a new political party, southern Democrats and Republicans can elect a President of their choosing in 1952."

And Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, who says, "For an election to be meaningful, our political parties must stand for specific issues. Only when each party stands by a clearly defined platform can we be certain of Government by the rule of the majority."

And now, here is your moderator, who 23 years ago, founded the American Forum of the Air, Theodore Granik.

Moderator GRANIK. Both Republican and Democratic Parties have started to prime their heavy artillery for the election of 1952. The target is you and your individual vote. Before every election, efforts are made to

strengthen party unity. But Senator MUNDT, in a forthcoming Collier's article, advocated formation of a new political party, with southern Democrats joining Republicans. Now, how would such a proposal affect our national life? Could a new party elect a President and control Congress?

Tonight the American Forum of the Air discusses this unusual political proposal so that you, the voter, may decide.

Now, Senator MUNDT, would the new party you suggest mean the end of the Republican Party, as such?

Senator MUNDT. Ted, if by the use of the words "as such" you mean the Republican practice of becoming the champion of lost causes in each of the Presidential elections, I would say I hope, "Yes."

If you indicate, on the other hand, it is going to mean the end of the influence of the Republican Party, I would say quite the contrary would be the result.

What I anticipate is to have the Republican Party combine with like-minded Democrats of the South in a Presidential campaign, positions which for a long time now have been upheld in Congress by a nameless but working coalition, of southern Democrats and northern Republicans. It seems to me that the existing Republican and Democratic Party alignments have become pretty confusing and comparatively meaningless to the average voter, because actually today the differences within the two parties are in many instances greater than the differences between the two parties.

What I envision is working out some kind of political formula to form an alliance in 1952, so that people in this country who think alike can vote alike for President regardless of where they live or to which particular party they happen to pay their allegiance.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator HUMPHREY, what do you think of that alliance?

Senator HUMPHREY. Mr. Granik, I say Senator MUNDT's proposal makes some sense in the nature of proposing that we get the political parties cleaned up or cleared up on the basis of issues. Yes, I am for a realignment of political parties, but I am not for a realignment of the political parties on the basis of a section of the country or a regional basis. I am not, for example, saying, "Let's realign the political parties by having the Republicans and southern Democrats get together, because there are all kinds of southern Democrats and there are all kinds of Republicans, as the Senator from South Dakota has pointed out, and very rightfully so."

Differences within the political parties are frequently greater than they are between the parties. I think that is very true particularly in the Republican Party, and I think it was equally true in many instances in the Democratic Party.

So I would just say this: If the Senator from South Dakota is proposing that he take the Dixiecrats of the South, who were able to carry four States in the last election, and put them in the Republican Party, as a Democrat—as a new-deal Democrat, a Roosevelt Democrat—I would welcome that. I would say more power to you, and the sooner that you can do it, the better.

If he is saying that what we ought to have is a strong two-party system in every State in the Union, I would say that is a distinct political contribution and I would say I would support his hand in it. Every State needs a strong two-party system. That means the growth of the Republican Party in areas where the Republican Party is weak, and it means the growth of the Democratic Party where it is very weak.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator MUNDT

Senator MUNDT. I think there is some difference between my definition of a southern

Democrat and that of Senator HUMPHREY when he speaks of an alignment along geographical lines. I simply use the term "southern Democrat" because that is the place in which most of the Democrats who are voting with the Republicans happen to live. We also understand there are some Democrats in the North who think more like Republicans than do some of the Republicans in the North. It is a classification by issues. I do not know what Senator HUMPHREY means by a Dixiecrat. I have a definition of my own of a Dixiecrat. The word "Dixiecrat" is spelled with two i's, and I think that a Dixiecrat is a Democrat who has had his eyes opened, so that he sees more clearly than an ordinary Democrat.

Senator HUMPHREY. I would like to give my definition of a southern Democrat. A southern Democrat is a conservative Republican with a southern accent.

Let us just get down to see whether or not this realignment that the Senator from South Dakota suggests would do what he wants it to do. Let us direct it to particular areas of the country. I happen to believe that some of the most positive liberal leadership in the United States Congress comes from our States in the South. I think that Senator HILL and Senator SPARKMAN, from Alabama, deep in the South, are giving the type of progressive leadership which is a great tribute to the whole political background and culture of the people of the South. That is the kind of Democrat I want in the Democratic Party. That is the kind of Democrat who builds for his section of the country.

What would this coalition that the Senator from South Dakota mentions now offer to the South? I think we ought to just think about that a little bit, because he is recruiting, you see, from the South.

Moderator GRANIK. What do you have to say, Senator MUNDT, about your recruiting?

Senator MUNDT. I will tell you what it would offer in the South. In the first place, the South is in a very unhappy position today since it lost the two-thirds rule in the Democratic National Convention in 1936. The southern Democrat is no longer at home in his own party convention because he has lost his veto power and his influence. So he goes to the convention and has to accept a platform which he does not approve. He has to support a candidate with whom he is not particularly happy. Consequently, when he leaves the convention he feels he has had very little impact upon the trend of national affairs. Then comes November and October, the months of the Presidential campaign, and neither major party sends a candidate for President into the deep South.

The Democratic Party says, "We've got the South for nothing; why should we work for it?" The Republican Party says, "We can't get the South anyhow; why waste our time and talents?" So the people of the South, who are among the best and most patriotic citizens of our country, are practically disfranchised when it comes to an election of the candidates for President. I think the first thing this proposed new alliance would give the South is an impact on the selection of a candidate for President and, more and more, the selection of the correct government for emergency and peace, going in the correct direction.

Moderator GRANIK. Let me quote from an article in the New York Times of June 29, 1951:

"Paul E. Fitzpatrick, Democratic State chairman, speaking in the presence of William M. Boyle, Jr., national chairman, and after a recent conference with the President, attacked the Dixiecrat congressional group as 'infamous reactionaries' partners in an 'unholy alliance' with the Republicans, and foes of the welfare of the people."

Would you care to comment on that, Senator HUMPHREY, or Senator MUNDT?

Senator HUMPHREY. I would make this general comment. It is perfectly true that in this Eighty-second Congress a number of really truly conservative Democrats of the South have joined together with a number of the conservative Republicans of the North, and as such they are the majority within the present Congress. I do not think there is any doubt about that. That is why your price-control program is being scuttled, that is why you are having trouble today with your foreign-aid program. That is why we are having trouble with a number of other projects in the Congress, because on the basis of political philosophy, this group that is referred to in the article from which you quote—a group that agrees with the position of the minority leader in the Senate, Mr. WHERRY—it is a group that agrees with with the basic conservative philosophy of the Republican Party.

I say that the Senator from South Dakota is surely performing a service if he says they should go into the Republican Party, because, frankly, the Democratic Party does not need them and the Democratic Party will be able to gain new strength in other parts of the country, standing as a truly progressive and liberal party.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator MUNDT would you care to comment on this "unholy alliance"?

Senator MUNDT. Yes. That so-called unholy alliance which is a constructive alliance which is making great progress. We will be willing to accept and welcome into our party, any Democrats Mr. Fitzpatrick is trying to read out of his party. If Mr. Boyle and Mr. Fitzpatrick do not want them in their Democratic party, I feel they could form the nucleus of a mighty strong Republican-Democratic alliance to elect a new national administration.

I agree with Senator HUMPHREY from Minnesota, in his respect for Senator HILL and Senator SPARKMAN, of the United States Senate, but I would say that I am confident that the leadership of the South, as exemplified by Senator GEORGE and Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, and Senator BYRD, of Virginia, and a number of others, is the kind of leadership that would appeal to larger multitudes of Americans in the South.

I would like to add to the statement that Senator HUMPHREY made about what this alliance has done about price control. It is also this alliance that stopped the Brannan plan, it has stopped the socialization of medicine, it has stopped the public housing program from taking over all housing in all areas; stopped the socialization of industry as proposed by Senator BENTON the other day during the price control legislation. This alliance has tended to maintain the rights of the people and the rights of the States as against the strong overpowerful central government.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Senator MUNDT made a brilliant and powerful statement there. Let us take a little more critical examination of what great things could come and will come from this coalition that you are talking about. On the basis of the philosophy that is represented, for example, there would have been no TVA for my dear friends south of the Mason and Dixon's line had this coalition been the fact. Shall we say there would have been a growth of monopolies because some of my friends in the South, who are liberal, like Senator LONG, of Louisiana, Senator KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, have led the fight against the basing point bill. I maintain the South has a great deal to gain from the Democratic Party. It gained

an agricultural program which the Republican Party never gave it when it was in control of Congress. The South gained a great deal in housing, and some of the most adamant champions of cooperative housing, low-rent housing, come out of the South to clean up their slums and also from the northern cities, to lead their fight for both low-rent housing and the minimum wage, to better the lives of the working people of the North and South.

I say that both the South and the North have a great deal to gain from a truly progressive, forward-looking Democratic Party, and I welcome the day (I hope the Senator will be able to convince every American by his article in Collier's that those who are of the vintage that believe in monopoly, those who believe in the bill to fix the freight rates, those who have opposed public health facilities, those who have been opposed to the foreign policy of this country, those who have been opposed to minimum wage) let them get into the Republican Party, that is where they belong.

Moderator GRANIK Senator MUNDT.

Senator MUNDT. The first basic concept of political philosophy, which I think would bring the North and South together, is that they concur in the fact that the doctrine of States rights is a mighty important American concept for good government. The difficulty with these New Deal, Fair Deal proposals is that they gradually take away from the people increasing amounts of their money and increasing elements of their power and transfer those to the control of a few politicians here in the Capital City of America. It is that which we propose to eliminate, providing in its stead constructive Federal Government leadership, but having the implementation and the direction and management of these things in the hands of the people and in the hands of the Governors and the legislatures of our respective States.

I would presume that probably this new alignment of political concepts in America would revolve around how large a Federal Government you want, whether the Federal Government should be empowered to do such things as public medicine, for example, or whether it should be done through incentives on the part of the Federal Government, by local individual initiative, or by the support and cooperation of State groups.

Senator HUMPHREY. I believe that the Senator from South Dakota states his point of view with vigor and force, and I am happy he does, because this type of sharp debate on basic political philosophy is exactly what we need in this country. I want to outline again that had the kind of coalition the Senator from South Dakota is talking about been in this country in the past 20 years, the following things would not have happened:

First of all the per capita income of the people in the TVA area would not have doubled; they still would have been down in the depths of economic despair. I also would tell my friends of the deep South that had this coalition existed, they would not have had the flood control, the public works, the canals, the public power, that has made their country today into a thriving, growing, prospering community. It is public power that has helped the South and the far West and the Midwest, and it is this kind of an over-all program of welfare and the assistance of the Federal Government to the States and to the people that has made it possible for all parts of America to grow and expand.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator Mundt.

Senator MUNDT. It seems to me that what is involved is the fact that neither political party under its present name has a consistent and understandable basic political concept. I think we can see in the disagreement between Senator HUMPHREY and myself tonight that there are two points of view shared by a good many Americans. One

feels the central government should be empowered to provide nationalization of power, nationalization of health, nationalization of housing, or education and what not, and my point of view is that such socialistic controls are not the business of the Federal Government. The Federal Government is to umpire, to provide the prods and penalties and induce the State legislatures and individual businesses and corporations to do those things which are right and proper. I think had we had this kind of realignment in charge of the Government the past 20 years, there are some other things we would not have had, either. We would not have a \$260,000,000,000 national debt that we now have, and we would not be passing the large tax bill, the largest in the history of America. We would not have our huge bureaucracy and would not have government of edict and mandate, but government by legislation, which was the concept conceived by our forefathers in Philadelphia 150 years ago.

Senator HUMPHREY. I think we had better look into that. First of all, I do not think that either the southern Democrats or the Republicans could have stopped the debt. There happened to be a fellow around by the name of Hitler and another by the name of Tojo who had something to do with the war. They had brought on \$250,000,000,000 worth of that debt.

Senator MUNDT. That was on the other side of the ocean. FDR and Harry Truman had something to do with that, too.

Senator HUMPHREY. I gave him his time, and I will take my time, too.

The Senator makes these broad statements about whether we would not have had this debt. The debt is a war debt and he knows it as well as the Senator from Minnesota.

He says we have the choice of nationalization of health, and education, and housing. That is not the choice at all. The choice is whether or not the Government of the United States, which belongs to all of the people under the terms of the Constitution, is to help other people to lift their housing levels, to lift their educational levels, to lift their health standards. This is not the choice of nationalization or local health authority; it is a choice of whether or not you are going to have good health in this country, or poor health; a choice of whether or not you are going to lift the standards of education, a choice of whether or not you are going to have housing for human beings or no housing.

Senator MUNDT. May I put a little better definition on this choice? I do not propose that this realignment of political parties would place the northern Republicans and southern Democrats on platforms favoring disease and bad health at all. I do not think that is at all the choice America confronts. I think we both want to help needy people. It is a question of how to help them. Are we going to help them by a strong central government by direct contact to interfere with the lives of the individuals on farms or in homes, or wherever they find them? Or are we going to help them by expanding opportunities to enable them to do the things they would better like to do, by their own power and for themselves?

Take the Missouri Valley, for example, where I live. There we are harnessing the river, providing hydroelectric power, providing soil conservation. But we are doing it by keeping control of it in the hands of the people in the valley. As against that in the TVA, the whole business is controlled by directors appointed by the President. The question is: Where does the ultimate authority rest? With the people in the valley, or in the White House?

Moderator GRANIK. Do you want to answer, Senator HUMPHREY, before we take questions from the audience?

Senator HUMPHREY. The Senator has heard, I am sure, about the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers, the Federal agencies that are handling the Pick-Sloan program and the Missouri Valley development, and he knows the States have nothing to say about it one bit. He knows it is a Federal program. The difference is whether or not you have a coordinated, integrated program like the TVA, or a hodge-podge like you got out there, which the Hoover Commission said was costing double what it ought to cost because of conflict between the agencies. The Senator knows that.

Senator MUNDT. There is one other thing I know. You are talking about construction of projects and I am talking about the administration of the project when it is completed; that I want administered by local direction.

Moderator GRANIK. Gentlemen, in a moment we will take questions from the audience.

Moderator GRANIK. Now we will have the first question from the audience, a young lady, a very charming young lady. Go ahead.

Question I am Bernice Teuteberg. I am a placement officer at the National Production Authority. My question is for Senator MUNDT. Do you consider the general attitude and policy of the southern Democrats to be typical of basic Republican policy?

Senator MUNDT. By and large, I would say "Yes." Of course, I agree with Senator HUMPHREY that you cannot take an area of geography and say that everyone in one area agrees with everybody in that area and disagrees with everybody in some other area. But I would say there is a greater affinity of interest between the southern Democrats and the northern Republicans than there is today an affinity of interest between the average southern Democrat and big-city machines and left-wing fringe groups that have come to control the New Deal Democratic Party of the North.

Moderator GRANIK Senator HUMPHREY.

Senator HUMPHREY. I was just going to pick up that last comment. I am quite interested in that last comment of the Senator from South Dakota.

Moderator GRANIK. About the fringe comment?

Senator HUMPHREY. The fringe comment. I would just say if the Republican Party is going to accept the political philosophy and policy that has been enunciated by the Dixiecrat element of the southern Democrats, then the Republican Party tonight on this program is saying there will be no civil rights, because that is why they walked out of the Democratic Party. The Republican Party tonight is simply saying there will be no more of the Federal assistance in terms of public health; there will be no more assistance in terms of vocational education; no more assistance in terms of public works programs developing in the South and making it into one of the garden spots of America, as they justly deserve.

I want it quite clear that if the Republican Party wants to embrace that kind of philosophy we will be delighted to join the issue in 1952, because on that issue the Democratic Party will be back in power, with a true majority in Congress and a President in the White House.

Moderator GRANIK. Do you want to comment on that, Senator?

Senator MUNDT. Yes, indeed, because Senator HUMPHREY, while he does not seem to want to join this alliance, would like the privilege of helping to write this platform.

Senator HUMPHREY. I helped on the last one.

Senator MUNDT. And some of the Democrats walked out and they may stay out of your party as a consequence this time. But, of course, that is not going to be our program at all. My proposal would give the

American voter an honest choice between two legitimate positions in government. My position is that the rights of individuals and the rights of States are closely allied, and if you build a great big, strong superstate government in Washington which infringes upon the local autonomies of the States and the local rights of individual citizens, you are marching directly down the trail of national socialism. That we want to stop in America before it is too late.

Senator HUMPHREY. I think I ought to make a comment on that because my friend from South Dakota gets these words that just dramatize some sort of theory or legend he had of his "monster government," this "great bureaucracy" that he talks about. Let us face up to it. What has the Federal Government done through its program of grants-in-aid, which is the State, the New Deal program? What has it done? Lifted up the whole educational structure of every State in this land. What else has it done? Helping soil conservation to replenish the soil of this land; made possible electric power to 80 farms out of every 100 in America, making possible reclamation of the land and irrigation of the land. And I tell you there is no freedom lost in that; only the freedom to starve and freedom to be in misery.

Senator MUNDT. I say now that every one of those programs was also supported overwhelmingly by the Republicans in Congress.

Senator HUMPHREY. Of course, that is not true.

Senator MUNDT. Indeed, it is; those were supported and have been supported time after time by Republicans. As a matter of fact, I have sat in the House time after time when by unanimous consent of both Republicans and Democrats, without even a roll-call vote, millions of dollars were appropriated for soil conservation and appropriated for REA and things of that kind.

But I was talking about the Brannan plan, about socialized medicine. I am talking about the things which the Senator from Minnesota is ducking in this debate.

Senator HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota is not ducking a thing. The Senator from Minnesota is saying that when REA came up for vote in 1935, 77 percent of the Republicans in Congress voted against it. Now, of course, they are for it? Why not? It works. When the TVA was up in Congress 66 percent of the Republicans voted against it. Now, of course, they have approved it because it works.

The same thing is true of the George-Barden Act, that has two southern names on it. When it was up before Congress the Republican Party voted against it. And today they get the same new names against the same old names for the same old programs.

Moderator GRANIK. We have about 30 seconds for one more question. Can you give it to us quickly?

Question. My name is M. Victor Rosenbloom. My question is for Senator HUMPHREY. Don't you believe that what we as a country need is not so much a new party realignment against politics but a strong, courageous conviction for basic party principles in the national interest?

Senator HUMPHREY. I believe that is very important because I think, as my friend from South Dakota pointed out very well tonight, that actually a party must stand for something.

Senator MUNDT. The big difficulty is now, as illustrated in 1948, that less than half the people go to the polls. Why? Because most of them felt there was not any great choice between the two platforms and two candidates. The average American feels he is entitled to a choice when he goes to the polls.

Moderator GRANIK. It is time for summary. Will you continue with your summary, please, Senator?

Senator MUNDT. In the 1 minute I have to summarize let me say I think the South

would benefit from this proposed realignment program because it would be given a chance to use its great influence in the nomination and election of candidates for President and in the selection and determination of national policy. I think it would be beneficial to the Republican viewpoint because instead of being a sectional party, as we now are, operating in 36 States, trying to win a horse race with a three-legged horse, we would operate in every State in the Union, the way political parties ought to operate in America.

Primarily, however, the American citizen would benefit because he would get a clear-cut decision in Government, between some form of national socialism, regardless of the fancy name you call it, and our established American concept of self-government. But when you place in the hands of a strong Federal Government control of increasing amounts of the peoples' money that they earn and the authorities that they have, you move in the direction of socialism. If a voter favors that, one party would move him in that direction. If he opposes it, the other party would move him away from it. That is an extreme way of stating the basic dividing line which it seems to me would operate to separate the two parties under the kind of political realignment I envision for America.

Moderator GRANIK. Thank you.

Now, Senator HUMPHREY, your summary.

Senator HUMPHREY. Rather than get into the realm of theory, as my friend from South Dakota takes us, as he stated in his "extreme" way, let me tell what I think would happen by the facts in the record of this kind of realignment. First of all, it would be wholesome because for the first time the American people would really know the Republican Party stood for the following things:

Opposed to American labor, because the Dixiecrat-Republican combination would stand for that; opposed to the extension of social security, because the Republican Congress fought social security, as did the Dixiecrat element of Congress, opposed to soil conservation, because in the Congress of the United States there has been a continuous attack upon that kind of great program; opposed to development of public power, which we had witnessed again just within the last week of Congress, where the Dixiecrat and Republican elements again voted against it.

I say if that is the kind of realignment we are going to have, I welcome it because I would like to have the American people truly know what the political parties stand for.

Moderator GRANIK. Thank you, gentlemen.

You have been listening to a discussion on Do we need a realignment of our political parties for 1952? Our speakers have been Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, and Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota.

Return of the Key to the Bastille

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a broadcast which Mr. Charles Farmer made today from radio station WMBG, Richmond, Va. In this broadcast Mr. Farmer calls for a return of the key to the Bastille as

a gesture of friendship to the people of France.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMER FROM WASHINGTON

(By Charles Farmer)

You've been to Mount Vernon, haven't you? Recall seeing, hanging in a case inside the doorway, the iron key to the Bastille? (The French Government prison) You may remember, from your student days, that exactly 162 years ago last Saturday the French populace stormed the Bastille, releasing political prisoners—who had spoken and fought for liberty for the masses.

Thomas Paine, the American patriot, was in Paris during the uprising. Later, the Marquis de Lafayette entrusted the key of the Bastille to him to give to our George Washington—this Paine did. There, in Washington's home, hangs the key today.

Do you think it would be a gracious gesture of friendship—a century and a half and more old—if we returned that key to France? Just as we of the United States of America love to contain within our borders visible mementoes of our struggles for freedom, surely the French Republic would like to again possess the key to the Bastille—a symbol of the freeing of men's minds in France.

No, not even the gentlest whisper of a suggestion, that this be done, has come from France. The leaders of that nation are too civilized to make such a move, but when President Auriol, of France, was this Nation's guest, a few months past, he was taken on a tour of Mount Vernon. His eyes gleamed, when he beheld the key to the Bastille—but he said nothing. That, of course, would have been a great moment in which to take down the key and present it to the people of France—our friends.

That was an act, on our part, which had been overlooked. Perhaps because we, as a Nation, had forgot the presence of the key—to us a portion of the furnishings, of a great national shrine.

Now we do recall it—as another Bastille Day—France's Fourth of July—passes into history.

It may be well to remember that Mount Vernon is the actual property—more or less under Government supervision—of a private organization—the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association—comprised of patriotic gentlewomen from the 48 States.

A suggestion from some person or group of national renown, to the members of this association, would call to their attention the great power they hold—the power to make a gift to our friends, the people of France, in the name of liberty—a liberty which France, in our most crucial hour, enabled us to achieve.

That hour? Today we think of the Normandy and the astounding Inchon landings as outstanding military achievements, which they are. But there was another conflict when France—by a miracle of land and sea coordination—came to our aid at the moment when victory hung in the balance.

This was at the siege of Yorktown, the decisive moment of the American Revolution, an action which took place within less than an hour's flying time of Mount Vernon, on the Peninsula of Yorktown, where Lord Cornwallis entrenched his forces; here he faced Washington and Lafayette and Rochambeau on land, while De Grasse moved in with his armada by sea; Cornwallis surrendered; the war was over; thanks to the priceless aid, to us, of our French friends.

The surrender of Yorktown took place on the 19th of September 1781, would it not be appropriate to return to the people of France the key to the Bastille on the 19th of September 1951, in token of an undying friendship? asks Farmer from Washington.

The Central Arizona Project**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. CARL HAYDEN**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Ohio and the Arizona Project," published in the Youngstown Vindicator, a great Ohio newspaper, on July 15, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OHIO AND THE ARIZONA PROJECT

Eastern States, which pay most of the United States Government's revenue, say the biggest Federal projects go to Western States which provide a much smaller part of the Treasury's funds. There is truth in the charge, but it is also true that some of the western projects will increase Federal income and thus ease the East's tax burden.

This appears to be true of the long-discussed central Arizona project, to irrigate 725,000 acres. The object is to develop another such region of citrus, produce, and livestock as that in the Phoenix area.

True D. Morse, president of the Doane Agricultural Service, Inc., of St. Louis, reports after a study that in 75 years the project would not only repay 98½ percent of the cost to the Federal Government but would develop Federal income tax ranging from \$4,000,000,000 to \$7,800,000,000 over the pay-out period. Taking the minimum figure, the tax benefit to Ohio is estimated at \$197,000,000.

The study shows the good sense of Congressman MICHAEL J. KIRWAN's broad view of public improvements. He helped his own district (by getting such vital projects as the Berlin and Mosquito Creek reservoirs), but he did not stop there as most Congressmen do. He became interested in conservation on a national scale, realizing that whatever helps one part of the country strengthens the whole Nation.

The central Arizona project has passed the Senate, but faces a bitter fight in the House. The water would come from the Colorado River, and Californians charge that it would take part of their State's rightful share. However, the bill provides that nothing shall be done until the Supreme Court has passed on the rights of the various Southwestern States to the Colorado's water. Indeed, the purpose of the bill is to provide a means of getting the issue before the Court. This seems fair enough. If California is so sure that her rights would be invaded, she should be not only willing but eager to have the Court examine the question.

FEPC Gains in Minneapolis**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "FEPC Records Minneapolis

Gains," published in the American Jewish World of June 22, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEPC RECORDS MINNEAPOLIS GAINS

Before Minneapolis enacted a fair employment practices commission (FEPC) ordinance back in the fall of 1947, there were no Negro sales clerks in the city's department stores. Today—some 3½ years later—every major department store in the city employs Negro sales clerks.

Prior to FEPC in Minneapolis, insurance and other financial institutions in the city employed few, if any, Jewish or Negro clerical workers. Today a number of these concerns are employing Jewish and Negro workers in office and clerical positions.

Widespread discrimination by employment agencies on the basis of religion was the practice in pre-FEPC days. Today questions on religion are absent from application forms and discrimination on that ground has been substantially reduced.

These are among the high lights of the annual report of the city's FEPC commission, of which Amos S. Delnard is chairman.

The report is an impressive recitation of gains in the utilization of workers' highest skills—without discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin—and a striking demonstration of how an FEPC law can be administered, without the fuss and fury that opponents of State FEPC legislation so fearfully apprehend.

In all the many cases that have been called to the attention of the Minneapolis fair employment practices commission, the report says, every one has been settled by the commission without necessity for public hearing or resort to prosecution.

It is of more than passing interest to note that FEPC is a two-way tool; it serves the interests not only of workers but also of employers. In 30 percent of its cases the commission has protected employers or others against unfair charges of discrimination, the report reveals.

Some of Minneapolis' leading citizens—Harry A. Bullis of General Mills, Donald C. Dayton of the Dayton Co., Bradshaw Mintener of Pillsbury Mills, George M. Jensen of the Maico Co. Inc., and others—are on record in the report testifying to the fairness and advantages of FEPC in the city.

The commission is entitled to the highest praise for the exemplary work it is performing. As Mayor Eric Hoyer says, "it is of deep significance that in recent years interest in FEPC work has grown throughout the country because of the valuable and courageous groundwork established by the Minneapolis FEPC."

One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, Mr. George J. Chryssikos, a New York attorney long active in Greek-American affairs, has written an interesting brochure entitled "Fourth of July: the Cosmohistoric Event of 1776," prepared on the occasion of the celebration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary

sary of the Declaration of Independence.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOURTH OF JULY: THE COSMOHISTORIC EVENT OF 1776

(By George J. Chryssikos)

It is the custom in Europe to say that the history of the newer times began in the period of the French Revolution. The truth is that its beginning was the 4th of July 1776. It is usually said that the French Revolution, and its effects, awakened the peoples of Europe to a love of liberty and freedom. However, the fact is often overlooked, that the American Revolution, the mother of the French Revolution, fostered and nurtured this love of freedom in the hearts of the downtrodden and enslaved peoples of the world. The 4th of July 1776 was indeed the beginning of the emancipation of mankind from tyranny and slavery. It was the great and decisive turning point in history, the beginning of an evolution which has been continuing from that time on, having as its ideal the high and undeniably humanitarian sanctity of man throughout the world, as so nobly set forth in the Declaration of Independence.

The outstanding characteristic of that historic document is its philosophical basis. It does not declare, simply, the determination of the American people to fight for freedom and liberty. It justifies this determination with unassailable logic. It bases the right of national independence upon the rights of the individuals who constitute the Nation, and proclaims that political conditions which deny the rights of the individual are unbearable.

This great truth was transplanted from the Declaration of Independence to the Constitution of the United States, which, ever since, has governed the political life of this country. Liberty would have been an insipid fruit, an empty and useless word, if it had been limited to the emancipation of America from England and were a mere substitute for English authority, just another form of government, so to speak, independent externally but federated internally. National independence alone is not the supreme goal. Its indispensable supplements are internal liberty, equality of citizenship, and the security of citizens within the sovereign state. Solidification and protection of the rights of each citizen are the only real liberty, and it is this form of liberty that the founding fathers bequeathed to the American people.

As we all know, this benefit did not exist in every free country in times past. At present, the United Socialist Soviet Republic and all communistic states under her dominant influence have reduced their citizens to mere robots, or spokes of a wheel of the integrated chariot of its leader. The word "liberty" is eliminated from the lexicon of those countries. They are not governments of the people, by the people, and for the people, but rather slaves of a foreign power.

However, we should gather wisdom and inspiration from the lessons of the American Revolution and from the American Constitution, which shelters the political structure of the Government of the United States. The leaders of the people of the early English Colonies of the New World were men of great learning and accumulated wisdom, and not simply men of professional education. They were baptized in the pool of wisdom of past centuries. They were men of eminence and of extraordinary abilities. Through Thomas Jefferson, they bespoke in the Declaration of Independence the experi-

ence and political philosophy of past history. That great American drew abundantly from the spiritual treasures left by ancient Hellenism to be the common property of the world. Their influence on his heart, soul, and mind prompted him to declare the sublime principles of that historic document, in which he justified the Revolution. For those ideas and ideals he continued to struggle ever afterward, as is apparent in all his political, official, and private papers.

Thomas Jefferson was a great representative of the American people in the revolutionary era, and he laid out the road along which Americans have since followed. A profound student of history, he played a very important part in the birth of the United States, a vital nation in a vast country endowed by nature with almost unlimited riches. He envisioned the enormous growth of the newly born democracy of 5,000,000 persons in 13 States. Not only did he anticipate such a gigantic country, but he aspired to make it such, as one is convinced from a reading of his papers in connection with the Louisiana Purchase. He visualized the creation of a nation exceeding the Roman Empire in size, power, and vitality. However, he was deeply attached to the form of the Athenian State. He did not dream of a republic of the Roman type, monopolized by patricians, who held the people in an iron grasp and thereby tortured by constant social and political upheaval and antagonism. He visualized a republic worthy of its name and destined to stretch from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean and from the Canadian border to the Gulf of Mexico and the Rio Grande River. Thus, he aimed to build a democracy of the United States with Athenian material.

It is strange, but nevertheless true, that the Revolution of 1776 owes something to England against whose authority the American people fought. A great epoch in the history of England—and we can say in the history of the civilized world—was the struggle for the support and consolidation of the English Constitution. From the time of Oliver Cromwell, progress had been slow toward real esoteric liberty, toward the security of the rights of the citizen, and toward equal political rights. However, England was the first country to take the lead toward the acquisition of equal political rights, and thus demonstrated a great and important example for all civilized peoples. For Americans of the former Colonies, who had their family roots in England, the struggle of English people for political rights was a racial tradition. It was natural for them to desire that English people should possess the same rights. England wanted the American colonists to be humble and obedient citizens—dumb actors politically, without rights or pretense, although they were taxed without acquiring corresponding benefits. Therefore, the only way by which the Americans could acquire the benefits for which the English people had struggled, and which they had secured, was to become independent and self-governed. The colonists therefore revolted, declaring their independence on July 4, 1776.

When Constantinople fell to the Turks in 1453, it seemed for some time that the flame of civilization would be extinguished forever, except in Byzantium, in the midst of the darkness of the Middle Ages, which covered the Old World.

The flight of the Greek sages to the west brought on the Renaissance by the spreading of Greek culture and sciences. The people of the west could have said to Hellenism, which seemed dead, "Your death gave us life." After the fall of Constantinople, the most important cosmo-historic saga was and still remains the American Revolution.

Without the American Revolution, without America, which has become so vast a

country since 1776, without the spirit which animated this mighty democracy of the United States, without the love of the American people for its freedom and without its readiness to stake everything for its noble ideals, there would not be a free world today. Without the support of this magnanimous, invincible, and glorious country, the anniversary of whose birth we celebrate today, neither in the First World War nor in the Second World War would freedom and liberty of the world have been saved, nor the check of communism and Soviet imperialism have been possible. The world outside the iron curtain would have been deprived even of leadership, not only political and military, but also of moral, so essential in repelling the Slavo-communistic danger which now threatens the world from the east.

Educational Advances Under UNESCO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial from the New York Times of Friday, July 6, headed "UNESCO's pilot plant." I agree that "\$20,000,000, spread over 12 years and six far-flung areas, does not seem like much money in these days." However, this is a most heartening project, and Dr. Torres Bodet, UNESCO Director General, is to be congratulated on it. I well remember his great campaign when he was Minister of Education in Mexico, to which this editorial refers, and which I had a chance to observe when I served as a delegate at the Chapultepec conference in 1945. With his leadership, and with encouraging results in the early years, I would like to hope that this most promising project can be greatly expanded long before the 12 years have gone by. If this project is to be merely a "pilot plant," we in the Congress must be prepared to back its expansion as soon as the world recognizes the potential significance of the great results anticipated by Dr. Torres Bodet and his colleagues.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNESCO'S PILOT PLANT

Twenty million dollars, spread over 12 years and six far-flung areas, doesn't seem like much money in these days. Yet, spent as the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization plans to spend it, this sum can leave its mark on the lives of countless millions of human beings. UNESCO, meeting in Paris, has unanimously endorsed a plan for "a world-wide drive against illiteracy and low living standards." Specifically, it proposes to set up educational centers in Latin America, the Far East, equatorial Africa, the Near East, and southeast Asia, in which teachers will be trained for work in the field. If the pattern already established at the Mexican training center of Patzcuaro is followed, teams including an elementary teacher, a physician, and a vet-

erinarian may be sent into remote villages to help the people.

The present project comes out of the pioneer work of Dr. Jaime Torres Bodet, former Minister of Education in Mexico, now Director General of UNESCO. Dr. Torres Bodet attempted "a simultaneous attack on illiteracy, ill health, and soil erosion"—three of the basic causes of rural poverty. UNESCO is now in a position to extend this attack to all sectors of the earth where its representatives are allowed to operate. Several hundred trained recruits a year, each one capable of training others, will go into this bloodless battle against misery.

The drama in this adventure is not the drama of drums and trumpets. But what if projects like these save multitudes from blindness or death, what if many who have always been hungry learn how to produce enough to eat, what if a little light shines for those who have been living in medieval ignorance. UNESCO's \$20,000,000 and 12 years will not bring these blessings to all who need them, but the new program is at least what Dr. Torres Bodet called his Mexican experiment—a "pilot plant," a landmark on the road toward a happier future.

Arabian-American Oil Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass.:

NEW DAWN IN OIL PARTNERSHIPS BREAKS ACROSS ARABIAN DESERT

(By Grant C. Butler)

The wave of increasingly strong and sometimes violent nationalism making itself felt throughout the Middle East is rapidly forcing the western nations to adopt a new outlook toward that crucial area.

There is a growing realization that if the west is to continue to do business in the Middle East it must take into greater account not only the needs of the individual peoples but their national attitudes as well.

Fortunately, in Saudi Arabia a fairly good start in this direction seems to have been made.

There the United States, and more particularly the Arabian-American Oil Co., seems to have established a working partnership with the local government and population which is proving extremely beneficial to everyone concerned. This policy has combined to bring a prosperous and growing oil industry to one of the world's most ancient countries.

Although both King Ibn-Saud and Aramco are able to point to far-reaching physical achievements in Saudi Arabia, the most important developments are those not visible to the eye. They are measured, rather, in mutual trust, cooperation, and a rising standard of living in an area where poverty has hitherto been chronic.

For it would be hard to overemphasize the importance of affording the Arab visible proof of how Aramco's activities have assisted him—and his country—through the utilization of the vast oil resources. If western ideals are to appeal to the Arab, then he must see beneficial application of them within his own country.

Today the Saudi Arab can see the new construction in his country. He knows that sanitation projects have raised the health standards of his country. He knows that agricultural projects are flourishing in the desert. He sees a new life ahead.

He sees a previously nonexistent middle class of entrepreneurs developing, ice plants, power and utility installations, garages, and furniture plants owned and operated by Saudi Arabs for Saudi Arabs but a few of the new commercial enterprises constantly increasing in number and variety.

A 350-mile railroad is being built from the Persian Gulf into Riyadh, the center geographically of the country and the political capital. Here the King and his numerous progeny reside. On the eastern end of the railroad, at Dammam, a 7-mile pier and wharf is being built into the Persian Gulf. For the first time Saudi Arabia will have adequate deep-water unloading facilities and regular low-cost transportation into the interior.

Public works projects of this type can be seen and their advantages appreciated by all Saudi Arabs. The airports, the water systems, the lighting facilities, and the communications improvements are affecting more and more inhabitants.

But even greater advantages will be gained from the technical and industrial training programs being carried on by Aramco and the other American firms now operating in Saudi Arabia.

These training programs, designed to produce more than 100 different types of skills, are helping to bring industrialization to Saudi Arabia at a faster rate, perhaps, than any other country in the world. Technologically, the country has leaped decades in each of the past few years.

Aramco also has realized the importance of one Arab talking to another in the desert about the company and its operations. Such conversations will be multiplied 10,000 times. It is equal in importance to one American reading his newspaper, multiplied by millions.

Recently a group of Saudi Arabs who had taught their native language to Americans at the Aramco training school in Riverhead, N. Y., went on the air in Jeddah to broadcast views and opinions of life in America.

Americans and Saudi Arabs have both learned valuable lessons at the training school. The Saudi Arabs come to America on a rotating schedule to teach their native language to those Americans heading for Saudi Arabia. They attend night classes in various subjects, and they are taken on escorted tours to great American industrial centers.

Before they return to Saudi Arabia the young instructors have absorbed an amazing amount of Americana. Many learn to play baseball with the students. The majority develop a seemingly insatiable appetite for American movies. Most return home to better jobs as the result of their schooling.

The Americans learn to understand the Arab, his customs, and his culture. They learn to evaluate the great upheaval going on in the Middle East, the slow changing of a culture which goes back several thousand years.

In the years since 1933 when the first Americans arrived in Saudi Arabia, there is evidence that a bond of friendship has developed between the peoples of the two countries. The Arabs seem to like and trust their American friends.

Aramco's public-relations policy has helped to remind Americans continually that they are guests in a country which deserves credit and respect for its basic adherence to the use of world freedom and peace. Americans soon learn that the Arab is unsurpassed in politeness and hospitality.

Perhaps in the future Aramco will devise a method of presenting the cultural and spiritual side of America for the Arabs to evaluate. This need is evident throughout the entire Middle East. It is a gigantic task, but it can be done.

Observations and Recommendations on Our European Defenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, upon returning from Europe recently after conferring with Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, Supreme Commander of European Allied Forces, I prepared and submitted to Hon. CARL VINSON, distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, a report upon our European defenses. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I offer for inclusion a copy of the report which I have submitted:

JULY 3, 1951.

Hon. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In reference to my recent trip to Europe along with other Members of Congress from the Foreign Affairs Committee, Appropriations Committee, and the Armed Services Committee, I desire to submit to you several observations and recommendations. At the outset, I wish to state that the short time which this group of Congress spent in Europe was not such as to permit an exhaustive examination of the subject of European economy or European defenses. Nonetheless, it was long enough to give us some definite ideas along this line within the free countries of Western Europe. I am writing this memorandum with the thought by placing these observations before you, to some extent, our program of joint national defense might be strengthened by timely and proper constructive suggestions and criticisms.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY

In the briefings which I received as well as my own personal observations I was impressed by the remarkable economic recovery being made by the free nations of Western Europe. While the group I visited consisted of England, Norway, Holland, Belgium, France, Italy, and the American and French zones of Germany, the reaction was similar wherever I turned. Nor did I rely entirely upon briefings and upon my own personal observations. Insofar as I did converse with local people, I found almost a completely unanimous sentiment to the effect that the home country had progressed along the road to a wholesome and stable economic recovery. Just how much of this recovery was due to our own efforts and how much to the natural courage and perseverance of free people in Western Europe is difficult to say, but certainly the progress has been such as to justify serious thought and consideration of the program of an immediate reduction in ECA expenditures and the elimination of them at an early date.

As is the case in this country to a much lesser degree, inflation in Europe is a great and grim fear. There is no doubt that this

fact has delayed recovery and it is only after the economy is anchored to a definite level of value that economic progress timidly raises its head and attempts to set the stage for real wholesome recovery. I was shocked to realize, for instance, that the French franc, which in the days of World War I was one of the strong currencies of Europe and worth something like 23 cents per franc in American money, had sunk to a low point where it is roughly exchanged at one-third cent per franc. In the competitive market the franc is worth even less than this figure. In spite of this rank inflation of currencies, where the values remained constant for an extended period of time, business has had the tendency to move toward normalcy, shops to fill with wares for merchandising, and customers seem eager for the bargain counters.

COMMUNISM

With the return of a more stable economic condition, the fight against communism has apparently been pushed ahead. More than any other country visited in Europe, France presented the spectacle of an internal struggle to free itself of communism. Our party was in Paris on the day of the election and the day following. Some of us even visited voting places unofficially to observe the serenity with which the French conducted their elections. Although we left France too early to pass judgment upon the results of the election, subsequent events have clearly indicated that slowly, with a painstaking effort, the great people of this country are repudiating communism and placing their trust in more stable parties, doctrines, and a more patriotic element of their population. It is true that the Communists still produce the greatest popular vote of any party; but the so-called center parties, together with the remarkable strength of the DeGaulist factions, make it obvious that the majority of the French people still stand true to their democratic traditions. I believe with an artful handling of this situation and full cooperation by our people, the Europeans will respond to democratic doctrines in the future as they have in the past.

MILITARY POSTURE

At this juncture, I wish to emphasize that I detected throughout Europe the budding desire of its people to be more adequately armed to defend themselves. It is obvious that this national-defense movement is growing in these countries and is indicated by the building of military organizations and the effort to obtain equipment for defense purposes. England, being located on an island, presents, of course, a different situation. It has maintained its navy and a semblance of an army and air force. On the European Continent, every country visited showed our group by active determination and by military maneuvers and in other ways its desire for immediate national defense; and the physical attitude and moral ability to handle organizations and equipment intended for that purpose. I was impressed by the eagerness of the young men in Norway, Belgium, the French zone, and other places to learn to handle the equipment presently available and to work in cooperation for a larger defense effort.

GENERAL EISENHOWER

Easily the most appealing figure in all Europe is that of Gen. Dwight Eisenhower. He has the enthusiasm of a much younger man, the experience of his great command in World War II, and the prestige of a man who enjoys a unique place throughout the world and especially in Western Europe. With tireless energy, great organizational skill, and a relentless enthusiasm, he is bringing together the leaders of the free people of Europe into a cooperative effort at national

defense. Wherever the name of General Eisenhower is used, the impression upon Europe is apparent.

Illustrative of this fact are the attacks the Communists are making upon him from time to time and his fine work throughout Europe. The satirical cartoons from Communist sources of his landing in France constitute the beginning of a campaign of abuse and misrepresentation and attacks upon him which have continued to this present hour. I was very much impressed by the frank and logical manner in which the general has put together his ideas for a logical program of European military cooperation in defense of democratic Europe.

ENGLAND

The group spent a day visiting the air bases in England. The British bases, of course, were built in World War II but are in excellent shape at the present time. The American bases being built are to be engineered along the familiar lines of bases within the United States and are to be paid for under joint arrangement by the United Kingdom and this country on a 50-50 basis. Without any definite contracts as to the length of tenure, it seems to be agreeable that they be occupied by the troops of this country as long as is necessary to meet the exigencies of this present emergency.

I noted especially in England, and throughout Western Europe generally, the trouble which each base is having with the shortage of spare parts for mechanical equipment. I talked with members of British B-29 crews who told me at different times that this was a great problem. Some of the crew members complained about engine trouble and mechanical disorders of the B-29, and in doing so they exhibited a lack of complete understanding of the mechanism of this great plane. All complained of inability to obtain spare parts, but they also indicated this situation was improving. It was with a matter of pride I learned that not a single B-29 had cracked up during its use by the British aviators.

As to spare parts, it seems to me that in most instances some arrangement could be worked out whereby these parts might be obtained overseas. Arsenal are available in England, Belgium, France, and other places for the making of spare parts and the very fact that these arsenals, machine shops, and foundries are located near at hand, will make the matter of spare-parts production a simpler one and bring about greater efficiency in the proper maintenance of the complicated machines and equipment overseas. This problem should be worked out as soon as possible in the interest of a better European defense.

COMMUNISM

The early returns gave the Communists a popular vote of 5,001,618 with a reported 103 seats definitely captured by them. As against this, the De Gaullists polled 4,039,887 votes with 115 seats. The center parties polled in excess of 7,000,000 votes with a total in excess of 376 seats and 21 seats were left to independents. This gives some idea of the political situation existing in France and gives some idea of the struggle through which this country is going at the present time.

GERMANY

Everybody in Europe realizes that Germany is the key to the European situation. More than ever, today Western Germany is necessary to a proper solution of our problems. We were told the Ruhr problem had largely been solved and that coal mining and steel production are progressing reasonably satisfactorily. The French zone still has some pressing economic problems which are at once apparent to one who talks to the people living in that zone. Until Germany

finds its proper place in the field of affairs among the free people of Western Europe our difficulties in this direction will continue.

It has been proposed that out of Western Germany we attempt to set up a small army of perhaps 250,000 persons, carefully controlled and with special equipment. This army might be called the German constabulary or it may be a part of our Army, or it may be as an independent force. Properly handled and properly controlled such a force might add a great deal to the stability of Central and Western Europe, but great care should be used to avoid a return to anything like the militarism which preceded World War II in Germany. I might state that since Germany has been shorn of a large part of its eastern provinces and has been divided between the Soviet and Western Powers, the European fear of a consolidated militant Germany is greatly reduced, if not eliminated.

AMERICAN TROOPS

My time while in Germany was spent largely with American troops in our occupied zone. I went by train from Wiesbaden, headquarters of the Air Command, to Grafenwohr with Maj. Gen. Paul Dahlquist, then commanding general of the First Division, but now recently made Corps Commander. The Fourth Division was there moving into Germany and one of the great problems which it had encountered was the housing problem.

This is getting to be a most serious problem in numerous places in Europe. The ability to obtain housing is not as fluent now as it was immediately after the end of World War II. People have become settled in their homes and are not easily dispossessed. The influx of some 5,000,000 of people from the Russian occupied zone in the east and from other countries has made the housing problem a difficult one. In advance of the coming of the Fourth Division an effort was made to satisfactorily arrange for housing; but in spite of great efforts made, as additional troops are brought into the occupied zone of Germany our housing troubles mount. It may become necessary that we build considerable housing in our occupied zone of Germany even at this late date.

I spent time inspecting units of the First Division, especially the Sixteenth Infantry. I am glad to report that I found this division cared for with modern mechanized equipment, including tanks, machine guns, rifles, trench mortars, and modern artillery. Moreover, the commanding officer has thought wise to utilize the old German maneuver areas available to their maximum possibilities. Not only do local units of our troops use these maneuver areas constantly, but units from all parts of Germany and from Austria are brought in for training there.

In spite of the present size of the maneuver area, our troops badly need additional acreage for that purpose. As more troops enter the occupied zone for large-scale maneuvers the need becomes more pressing and in time we may really suffer from lack of available training areas.

Both in the field and in the billet morale of our troops seems to be high. The improved methods of procurement and distribution are helpful to the company and battery mess and at the same time a limited amount of food, especially fresh foods, may be purchased locally. Of course additional facilities for recreation are always desirable but the need for it is nothing like as great as it is in places such as in Stevensville, Newfoundland, where the long winters and inaccessibility of the bases make outside entertainment practically impossible.

POSITION OF SPAIN

Wherever we went in Europe the question was asked as to the possible position of Spain in reference to the military recovery of that

continent. In every instance where military men were requested opinions, they almost invariably were to the effect that Spain constituted a tremendous asset which was being overlooked. I think what attracted the military so much were the armies of Spain. Poorly equipped, it is true, but with seasoned manpower available and dependable for emergency purposes.

The view of the United Kingdom, and to like extent that of France, is against the association of Spain into any organized defense of Europe. The fear was manifest in some quarters that the association of Spain into an organization for the defense of Europe would be an element of weakness which might indicate in the minds of many that the Pyrenees rather than the Rhine was the 1951 "Maginot line of defense." There is no doubt but what the view of people such as this should be desired and should receive consideration. At the same time, if the over-all purpose of our being in Europe now is to build up defenses, it is difficult to understand just why a large nation such as Spain, with a comparatively large army available, can be completely ignored.

FRANCE

The French occupied zone presents a startling contrast to that of the American occupied zone. Under ECA expenditures we have primed the factories and workshops of our occupied zone in Germany and as a result progress is seen at every turn. People are busy, in fact bustling. The land is being tilled to the very limit of available acreage and crops seemed to be good when we were in the area. Smokestacks belched smoke and the prevalence of the dinner pail in the hand of the worker gave irrefutable evidence of employment. At the same time no systematic effort is being made to rebuild the bombed out plants and homes. People still live in houses with one or two walls crumpled up into a pile of debris, roofs with openings to the sky in places and floors warped and unstable. Until the German people feel assured that the Russians will not come in and take over, they are withholding reconstruction on a large scale.

In the French zone employment is not at the level of the American zone. The air of industry and of assurance does not prevail. The people dress more shabbily and the lack of large governmental expenditures by the occupying powers is evident.

On the other hand, the maneuvers of the French troops while in this zone presented a spectacle of alert activity. The young men in the unit on maneuvers used tanks with facility and confidence of training and enthusiasm. The marksmanship was excellent.

One of the great problems of the future which must be met is the pay of troops of this country. Of course, the pay of our own soldiers is far higher than anything else in Europe. So low, in fact, is the pay of soldiers from other countries that often this is a source of much friction. A movement is now on to attempt some equalization of pay among the European countries. Such a program cannot and should not affect the pay of the American soldiers.

On the other hand, when the economies of the free countries of Western Europe will permit, some increase in pay might be fully justified. It is not hard to train an unskilled man and produce out of him an excellent mechanic and artisan. With low pay the difficulty comes in trying to keep him in the armed services after he has acquired a technical skill needed in civilian industry. Army careers are broken short by lack of pay and career men are forced to turn to civilian fields for funds needed to maintain their families and meet their responsibilities.

In making these suggestions, however, I know that pay is one of the heavy expenditures in any defense program. If the European nations themselves are to meet this

problem they are going to be required very soon to raise to a much higher level their own expenditures for national defense. I believe it would be unfortunate if our country attempted in the organizing of the defenses of Europe to enter into the pay problem. Our people are the highest paid and Canada comes next, with others in the descending line. This is one problem which is pushing for an early solution.

While presenting this idea, I was interested in the program sponsored by high commanders in our occupied zone for a savings program for American troops. Our staff officers are encouraging not only the enlisted men but the officers to set aside funds for the proverbial rainy day when they may be needed by American soldiers for themselves or their families. I was surprised at the very high percentage of savings in some of the areas in the American zone and I especially commend the commanding officers who have sponsored and carried on such a program with the results obtained. With inflated markets overseas in many instances and the dollar lacking the purchasing power it normally should have, our troops do not make a mistake in setting aside funds for use when they return to their homes in the United States.

Respectfully yours,

OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress.

Security in the Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine address delivered by Hon. Samuel M. Bemiss, of Richmond, Va., before the Virginia Conference of Social Workers, on May 2, 1951, in Roanoke, Va.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECURITY IN THE HOME. WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

If some of us fall from time to time into that elastic and plebeian category embracing the American businessman, it is quite natural that we should possess a curiosity as to the origin of the species, and a personal interest in the place assigned to us in our evolving American society.

The American businessman, as we know the species, came out of the Atlantic Ocean in vessels not much larger than Venus' scallop shell, and landed on a mud flat on Powhatan's River which they named Jamestown after a stupid English King. One hundred and eight of them (adventurers they were called) arrived on three wondrously small ships in the spring of 1607. By fall 45 percent of them were dead.

How the rest survived and what they did to and with the Indians is handed down to us in a fanciful narrative by one John Smith, who was not a businessman and who departed soon for England. He was, however, a man of infinite imagination and apparently was the only one of this first company who had time to keep a diary and write his memoirs. He recorded this observation: "No man is entitled to a place in America. He must make his own." Later John Rolfe, anticipating the constitutional

guaranties of the Bill of Rights by 160 years, wrote that in Virginia every man is enjoying the fruits of his labor, insofar as he has earned them. And here, if we realize it, was sounded the keynote for the first free election on the North American continent. In a marvelously short time these practical people, seeking practical solutions for their problems, laid the economic, political, and social cornerstones for a great nation, and cast the mold for the American businessman which has been modified very little in subsequent years.

I cannot tell you why this paragon or Beelzebub, dependent upon your point of view, has accomplished so much more than his counterpart elsewhere in the world, but I think that the liberty and freedom which he earned and preserved by sweat and blood has contributed to make this Nation the wealthiest on the face of the earth, and his social consciousness has contributed to the greatness of the people.

Of course, this liberty led to great excesses and produced the great opportunists—the Goulds, the Fisks, etc. Piracy seemed for a while to be transferred from the Caribbean to Wall Street. These excesses were counteracted by a great national social consciousness and in an astonishingly orderly manner a great people adjusted themselves to a changing world and a developing society. Ownership of the great services and means of production was transferred from a few proprietors to many, and the direction of industry went to trained businessmen employed by the many owners. A revolution was accomplished and, marvelously, liberties and freedom of action were preserved, and still we enjoy the fruits of our labor. As eloquent evidence of this revolution and the preservation of opportunity you have the careers of Charles Wilson of General Electric, of Walter Gifford of the Telephone Co., of Benjamin Fairless of the United States Steel Corp., and many others.

This development is really quite appalling. One great company owned by a half million people paid in 1950 a billion and a quarter in income taxes, two billion in wages, and seven hundred and forty million in dividends to its owners. With all, it is a free enterprise directed by businessmen, as are the rest of the great and small enterprises in this country. They produce the goods, they pay the wages, and they pay the freight to carry this great Nation, and all more abundantly than any arrangement ever devised by man's ingenuity.

I cannot answer the question posed by the subject assigned to us for discussion. If I attempted to, many of you would disagree. You would also disagree with any definition of security in the home. I suggest that we stand under the shelter of our disciplined society for a moment and watch the straws which are carried along in the hurricane of our amazing development for an indication of its direction and intensity.

The right of the Federal Government to levy income taxes became the law of the land in 1913. The normal tax that year was 1 percent on incomes over \$4,000 and graduated up to 6 percent on incomes over \$500,000. In 1950 the normal tax was 18 percent after allowable deductions and graduated up to a maximum of 91 percent. The Federal budget in 1913 was \$684,755,276.20. Today it is in excess of seventy-one billions. The Federal debt consisted of a small issue of bonds to secure bank circulation. Today the debt is two hundred and sixty billions, and I suppose that the University of California has more students than were enrolled in all the universities of the land in 1913.

We have fought two great wars and the world looks to us to keep it out of the third. In the last few years we have developed a national plan for social security. In addition,

our industry has generally accepted the principle that it is good business for industry to take care of its own and has adopted private plans for augmented old-age pensions, hospitalization, sick benefits, unemployment insurance, paid vacations, the 40-hour week, etc. The cost of these benefits is a part of the cost of the production of goods and services and there is no other source which can provide it. The cost of these so-called fringe benefits amounts on the average to about 17½ percent of our industrial payroll and our scale of wages is the highest ever to exist.

Time and space do not permit even the most superficial survey of the expansion of governmental activities. I just ask you to think of them. Suffice it to say that we have achieved great benefits for the mass of our people without national socialization and without eliminating the right of man to enjoy the fruits of his labor.

It is not for us to say that socialism has failed in England. We don't know what those people want, but we are reliably informed that the sick have trouble in getting medical attention, that labor produces less and gets less, that the people are cold and hungry, and that the Empire is disintegrating. Their effort, however, is valuable, for they are effectively demonstrating to us that prosperity and security cannot be achieved by means of panaceas, inflated currency, and confiscatory taxes, and that security for the family must, like the house it lives in, be built from the ground up and not from the sky down. In our generation we have witnessed currency inflations which have destroyed families and great nations, and it has been ever thus.

And so I come back to the subject of our discussion—to our first American businessmen who believed in elementary arithmetic, who believed that the prosperity of the community depended upon the security of the family and the family security depended in a large measure on family enterprise, and that it is a government's function to protect this security. I reaffirm my belief in the soundness of these precepts, that family security everywhere means prosperity for all, and it is based on security of productive opportunity and a sound national economy.

Importation of Mexican Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Wetback," relating to the Mexican labor importation bill, which appeared in the Washington Post this morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WETBACK

The President's reluctant approval of the Ellender-Poage Mexican labor importation bill puts a mistaken gloss on a piece of sectional and special interest legislation of the very worst kind. As it stands, it is a naked subsidy for a limited number of large-scale Southwestern growers and food processors. It flies in the face of every warning contained in the report of the President's Commission

on Migratory Labor. It contains no adequate safeguards against the illegal entry of a fresh flood of poverty-stricken Mexican farm workers—"wetbacks" as they are commonly called—or against leaving legally admitted Mexican workers stranded here to aggravate the already serious American migratory farm labor problem.

The President made his own misgivings about the measure quite plain. "I could not have given my approval to this act," he said, "had I not been assured by congressional leaders that supplementary legislation and appropriations would receive prompt consideration at this session." We hope that these assurances will be realized. We have our fingers crossed, however, in the light of the act's legislative history. The stalwart efforts of Senators CHAVEZ, DOUGLAS, and HUMPHREY to incorporate rational safeguards were either defeated on the floor or jettisoned in conference. Even Senator DOUGLAS' amendment, providing for a fine and prison sentence for employers of illegal aliens, was stricken by the conference committee. In its place a meaningless substitute was adopted permitting the contracting of Mexican wetbacks who have been in this country for more than 5 years. The measure serves, in short, to legalize the wetbacks already here and to bring in more of these helpless people.

Four supplementary measures are sought by the President: (1) legislation providing penalties for harboring or concealing aliens who have entered this country illegally; (2) authorization for immigration officials to inspect places of employment without a warrant, (3) appropriations to step up the enforcement work of the Immigration and Naturalization Service; (4) funds for the Farm Placement Service of the Labor Department to survey market needs and recruit workers to fill these needs. The last of these is indispensable if any solution of the migratory farm labor problem is to be reached.

Unless the supplementary measures requested by the President are adopted, the Mexican migrants and domestic farm workers will both suffer. Mexican-American relations can only be impaired by a continuance of the ruthless exploitation of Mexican workers which has taken place in the past. And the establishment of decent wages and working conditions necessary to attract American farm workers will be frustrated. In the interest of good neighborliness in the Western Hemisphere as well as in the interest of American agricultural workers—and the long-range interest of agricultural employers—Congress ought to adopt the President's recommendations without delay.

European Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarkable column of July 7 in the New York Times written by Anne O'Hare McCormick. She is quite right in her references to Mr. Paul Hoffman and his efforts along the lines now advocated by General Eisenhower. My own background with the British economy makes me un-

derstand why General Eisenhower's appeal was not more warmly applauded by the English speaking union in London. Yet, he, like Paul Hoffman, who advocates proposals which seem to me essential for the future of Western Europe—proposals for sweeping away the barriers that divide Europe, proposals which were heard for the most part in silence, according to the New York Times London correspondent.

I ask permission to insert this column by Mrs. McCormick not only because of the rare insight which is characteristic of her columns, but because of the high praise which is implicit in her column for General Eisenhower, and for his present leadership, Mrs. McCormick comments that—

Seldom, if ever, has General Eisenhower spoken so forthrightly on a political theme. * * * His address in London was, not one of his spontaneous utterances * * *. It surprised and discomfited his hearers because he was saying, in effect, that unity was the missing ingredient.

Paul Hoffman, in an address of comparable historic significance, called for integration. General Eisenhower now calls for unity, and he points out that European unity would mean early independence of aid from America.

Mr. President, I think that this column by Mrs. McCormick is one of the most important newspaper columns or reports which I have ever called to the attention of the Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MISSING ELEMENT IN EUROPE'S DEFENSE

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

Those who listened to General Eisenhower's appeal for European unity to the English-Speaking Union in London were struck by the fervor with which it was delivered and the coolness with which it was received. The Supreme Commander of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is a very popular figure in Britain. Hailed by Foreign Secretary Herbert Morrison as "the first citizen of the Atlantic," he was tendered the warmest kind of personal ovation at the beginning and end of his address. But his proposals for sweeping away the barriers that divide Europe "were heard for the most part in silence," reports the Times' London correspondent. Prime Minister Attlee limited his comment to remarking that "it was a speech of wide sweep" which needed careful study. The general press reaction reflected Mr. Morrison's cautious view that the Atlantic organization should take precedence over the unity General Eisenhower had in mind.

Even Winston Churchill, whose name the American invoked as the sponsor of the idea of United Europe, responded with unusual reserve. The first step toward the goal, he said, was solidarity between the British Commonwealth and the United States. The unification of Europe was "the second stage," he asserted, and could be founded only upon the first.

BRITISH ISOLATIONISM

It is quite obvious, indeed, that even the immense prestige that General Eisenhower commands in Europe, and especially in Britain, could not arouse enthusiasm in a British audience for the cause he pleaded. Other American advocates of European union, including Paul Hoffman, have run into the same resistance. The Labor government is

opposed on principle to any surrender of sovereignty that might restrict state controls and impinge on its domestic program. And while Conservative leaders support a unified Europe in theory, when it comes down to cases they shy away from the practical steps that would make it possible.

The British attitude toward the Council of Europe and the Schuman plan is based neither on party differences nor concern for the partnership of the Commonwealth, which is strong and close enough to permit Britain to make any other ties her interests dictate. Her reluctance to join Europe springs from a feeling not unlike the old American isolationism, and equally outdated—a feeling that she does not belong to the continent and does not wish to be "federated" into it.

General Eisenhower understands British sentiment as well as anybody. He was fully aware that he was striking an unpopular note when he addressed the representative audience gathered to welcome him and bear witness to Anglo-American friendship on the eve of the Fourth of July. It took courage to take John Bull by the horns, so to speak, and come out boldly for a project that has been smothered, he said, by "procrastination, timid measures, slow steps, and cautious measures."

Seldom, if ever, has General Eisenhower spoken so forthrightly on a political theme. It can be taken for granted that he did not speak without purpose. His address in London was not one of his spontaneous utterances, it was carefully prepared. It surprised and discomfited his hearers, because he was saying in effect that unity was the missing ingredient in the compound he is commissioned to weld together.

He made it very clear that he was not referring to unity in the abstract sense of common purpose and combined action in emergency, but to a workable European federation that would do away with territorial fences, tariffs, the costly encumbrances, and duplicated burdens imposed by a multiplicity of national governments.

AN ACT OF FAITH

But it was as commander of a multinational defense force that his appeal was most significant. General Eisenhower paid tribute to the spirit of cooperation he has encountered in his task. "I have no doubt as to the capacity of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to surmount even the formidable obstacles imposed on us by the political facts of present-day Europe." But in this act of faith he added a warning that reveals why he appealed for British support in achieving European unity. "With the handicaps of enforced division, it is clear that even the minimum essential security effort will seriously strain the resources of Europe."

This is not the American speaking, though he observes that European unity would mean early independence of aid from America. This is the organizer of NATO, expressing a conclusion forced on him by his experience in working to create a unified defense system. He is not urging European union as a political ideal or an economic necessity, like Winston Churchill, Paul Reynaud, Paul-Henri Spaak, Paul Hoffman, and other distinguished advocates of the concept. General Eisenhower argues, with a conviction that impels him to challenge British opinion, that union, real and practical union, is the first necessity of European security. His words must be read, moreover, in connection with the shift in American policy in regard to German rearmament. The idea of a European army is gaining ground, not for the French reason of preventing the formation of an independent German force, but because it is becoming increasingly apparent

that the plan offers the best way of coordinating national units and forming the united defense front General Eisenhower is laboring against enormous national obstacles to put together.

Matchless Forest Saved by a Great Citizen and a Great Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in our RECORD a news story from the New York Times, which describes the beautiful primeval pine forest in California which it now appears will be preserved. I am also asking that we include an article by Florabel Muir, which appeared in the Los Angeles Mirror on July 12, 1951. Florabel Muir is an excellent writer, and her column is a favorite one in Los Angeles.

Although many persons deserve credit for helping to save the majestic pine forest, I believe all will feel that two men are more responsible than others for the success of this worthy endeavor. First and foremost is the great California statesman, Mr. John B. Elliott, whose many outstanding services are too numerous to describe in these brief remarks. Congress can, however, claim some part in shaping his attitude toward public matters, because earlier in his life he represented the Associated Press on the floor of this House. The other person I feel I am justified in singling out for praise is our colleague, the Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD, who has spent many hours during many busy days in arranging for the indispensable Federal participation in the preservation plans. Mr. HOLIFIELD is loved and respected by all Californians. He is noted for his sincere and conscientious service to the people whom he represents. Certainly he has good reason to be proud of his part in saving the great pine forest. California is proud of our Congressman for doing this, and proud of John B. Elliott for being the prime mover in the long and sometimes discouraging fight to prevent destruction of a forest which can be matched no place in the world.

An unusual incident played an important part in the conservation drive. Mr. Gene Wilbur, then a member of Mr. Elliott's staff, was anxious to find a 1927 Federal statute, providing for transfer to the State of California of a corridor area between the North Calaveras Park and the proposed South Calaveras Park. Fortunately, Mr. Wilbur was not a lawyer and went about the matter by actually looking up the word "Calaveras" in the index of the United States Code. He was not surprised, although any lawyer would have been, to find that the word was in the index, and this led to the discovery of a statute passed in 1909, which statute authorized the Secretary of

Agriculture to preserve part of this great Calaveras grove by giving to the private owners of the forest equal stumpage in other areas owned by the Government. This statute has proved vital to the conservation effort—title 16, United States Code, section 494. It became a law during the second administration of Theodore Roosevelt, and at a time when Mr. James Wilson of Iowa was Secretary of Agriculture.

The President of the United States, the Honorable Harry Truman; the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Charles Brannan; and the Governor of California, the Honorable Earl Warren, have all cooperated to carry the conservation plan forward to the present stage which makes complete success probable. Dr. Frederick Law Olmsted, the famous conservationist, has been most helpful. Dr. Willard G. Van Name and Mr. Irving Brant have also made valuable contributions. There are many others whom I would like to mention if time permitted.

The matchless trees will stand as a monument to the fine people who have preserved them as an inspiration to all of us. I should like, Mr. Speaker, to include in my remarks at this point the newspaper story and article which I mentioned a moment ago:

[From the New York Times]

PARK PLAN PRESSED FOR ANCIENT PINES—TREES IN NOTED FOREST EAST OF SAN FRANCISCO MAY BE BOUGHT FOR USE AS PUBLIC RESERVE

LOS ANGELES, July 14.—A 3-year campaign fostered by conservationists from coast to coast, to preserve a unique stand of pine trees, centuries old, in California took on new impetus this week as negotiations went ahead for acquisition by the State of two key tracts of land.

The trees involved are purple-barked sugar pines, some towering as high as 250 feet, with cones as much as two feet long, and dating, quite a few of them from before Columbus' discovery of America.

They are concentrated principally in a 400-acre section of sequoia, pine and fir forest 120 miles east of San Francisco in the Stanislaus River-North Fork Gorge section of the Sierra Nevada Mountains. The site is in the heart of the gold-rush country celebrated by Mark Twain and Bret Harte, and is a scant 25 miles from Angels Camp, the scene of Twain's jumping frog classic.

On the northwest side of the river is Calaveras State Park, comprising a notable grove of sequoia trees. The sugar pines lie southeast of the river, in Beaver Creek Valley, close to another sequoia tract, in an area owned partly by the Government and partly by private interests, principally lumber companies.

The sugar pines, of which there are several thousand large and small, are a type now found only in southern Oregon, California and lower California, the State's peninsular offshoot that belongs to Mexico.

This stand, which qualified naturalists have pronounced the finest known, is on land of the Pickering Lumber Corp. of Kansas City, Mo., major owner in the terrain southeast of the river.

In 1948 it became known that the corporation, in its logging operations in the so-called South Sequoia Grove, was getting closer and closer to the sugar pines.

NINETEEN HUNDRED ACRES IN THE PROJECT

A movement to preserve them as a war memorial park was started by John B. El-

lott, Los Angeles oil operator. The movement has gained the support of scores of leading outdoor and civic organizations and a multitude of citizens in California and elsewhere. The leading eastern campaigner has been Dr. Willard G. Van Name, a retired member of the staff of the American Museum of Natural History, in New York City.

At the same time other groups began promoting State acquisition of the entire south grove, covering about 1,900 acres, as a logical addition to the State park.

The lumber concern indicated its willingness to part with both the sequoia and sugar-pine tracts for suitable compensation.

The intervening 3 years have been occupied with complicated negotiations among the State Department of Parks and Beaches, Gov. Earl Warren, and various Federal agencies.

"CORRIDOR" PARK LIKELY

This week a somewhat complicated program for acquisition of the desired lands began to take shape.

The State department of parks and beaches has allocated about \$1,000,000 for application to the transaction.

Governor Warren has just forwarded to the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture formal application for the transfer of 1,200 acres of federally owned land between the present State park and the south grove, to form, ultimately, a connecting "corridor."

The value of this "corridor" land, it was announced, can be applied toward the required matching of the State's outlay for purchase of the south grove of sequoias from the lumber concern. The prospective size of this transaction has been conjectured to be on the order of \$1,750,000.

Meanwhile, toward ultimate acquisition of the sugar-pine tract, an arrangement has been outlined whereby the lumber interests would give it to the United States Forest Service in return for commercially equivalent Federal timberland close by, whereupon the Forest Service could turn the pine land over to the State.

The San Francisco regional office of the Forest Service announced this week that it had blocked out tentatively an exchange tract, and that the lumber concern was inspecting it preliminary to "firm" negotiations within possibly a fortnight.

[From the Los Angeles Mirror of July 12, 1951]

FLORABEL MUIR REPORTING

"Getting and spending, we lay waste our hours:

Little we see in Nature that is ours"

These lines by William Wordsworth always come to me when I tramp through our California forests and particularly I think of them when I contemplate the destruction of our stand of sugar pine trees.

At the rate they are being cut down for profit we'll have none left in too, too short a time unless friends of these rare and beautiful trees come to their rescue.

We've saved the redwoods, so why not do something for the sugar pines?

About 4 years ago John B. Elliott (you wouldn't think he'd give a darn about a tree, he's such a practical politician) was driving with Representative SAM YORTY through a lush growth of these pines up north and he fell so in love with them he began a campaign to stop the woodman's ax.

Being practical, he didn't just talk about it. He laid out about \$60,000 of his own dough in the campaign. He is still trying, but needs help.

In the July Westways magazine another lover of the sugar pines reveals himself. He is Superior Judge William J. Palmer. He took the time from his busy life to write a long article on these trees for a little boy

named Victor Lanini, 1173 Nevada Avenue, San Jose.

The kid wrote the judge a letter saying: "Our class is studying pine trees. I read in a book that you have information on what we are studying. Would like it very much if you would send us information on sugar pines."

Here is one paragraph Judge Palmer wrote: "If you ever see a sugar pine standing somewhat by itself on a ridge or a mountain crest, so it is silhouetted against a blue sky, with a white cloud here and there, the arms of the tree reaching out as if they were trying to touch the horizon, and from their tips the long cones hanging like Christmas-tree ornaments, you will see a picture of such striking beauty it will never leave your memory."

Victor Lanini isn't likely to be a boy who'll be hanging around street corners smoking marijuana. He'll be seeing much in nature that is his and will grow into a good citizen because of this interest.

Reign of Terror in Hungary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a remarkable dispatch from the chief foreign correspondent of the New York Times, Mr. C. L. Sulzberger. This dispatch gives further information on the terror let loose in Hungary by the mass deportations of pensioners, small merchants, intellectuals, priests, class enemies, and former civil servants following a notice of from 5 to 24 hours. I first called this terror to the attention of the Congress through a letter from Mr. Laszlo Boros, distinguished editor of Ameri-Kai Magyarasag, of Bridgeport, Conn.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUNGARIAN IN A LETTER DEFIES REDS TO HAIL THE FREE WORLD—CITES FRIENDSHIP OF PEOPLE FOR WEST AND POINTS TO DEPORTATIONS FROM BUDAPEST

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PARIS July 5—There are very few chinks in the Iron Curtain, and it is rare that an honest breeze blows through in a westerly direction. For this reason, it is of interest to publish excerpts of a letter received by this correspondent from a Hungarian who had the temerity not only to type out his thoughts but to arrange for their posting to the free world.

He goes by the name of Gustav Magyar, and explains that this is not his real name. His missive, dated Debreczen, June 25, was postmarked from Budapest, June 28, with a patently false return address. It was typed out carefully in Hungarian.

It commences with the following clause, perhaps pompously worded, but nevertheless heartrending, if one considers the risks taken by Mr. Magyar, formulating his thoughts in a country town rigidly ruled by the Communist police:

"Wanting to address a great and free Nation of humanity, the soul feels as if it

had reached halfway between earth and God."

The text itself covers 36 tiny pages of thin paper. It is sent to the people of the United States of America and, in a separate note in English, the author explains that it contains the friendship and good wishes of the Hungarian people to the American people for the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence.

Requesting that the New York Times should publish his views in its July 4 issue, the author expresses "the gratitude of the Hungarian people to your newspaper for the services and helps (sic) being done in these days."

CITES FRIENDSHIP FOR UNITED STATES

What type of message does this anonymous Hungarian friend wish to communicate to the American people? He stresses that the Hungarians, "with the exception of those few who endeavor to plant foreign ideas and foreign hatred in our soul," feel friendship toward all peoples of the world, including those of the United States and "do not wish to be involved in war against any nation, neither American nor Yugoslav." "God witnesses the sincerity of this statement," he adds.

He then draws certain comparisons between the existing state of affairs in Communist Hungary and the democratic United States. For example, he dares to state:

"We believe that it would be excluded in the United States that 100,000 people should be deported from the capital without any legal judgment, simply because they are labeled 'undesirable elements'."

Precisely such a sad forced emigration is now being conducted in Budapest by the police of Matyas Rakosi, Hungarian Communist leader.

As Mr. Magyar contends, "pensioners, small merchants, intellectuals, priests, class enemies and former civil servants have been deported following a notice of from 5 to 24 hours.

"They are only allowed to take a few necessities with them," he writes. "They are stuffed into cattle cars and first deported to distant regions of our country on an initial pretext of population transfers, but there can be no doubt that the ultimate aim is 'liquidation'."

Mr. Magyar asks if this does not indeed violate paragraph C of the second article of the United Nations Convention outlawing genocide, which Communist Hungary signed. Then, after thousands of pathetic words, he adds:

"We are aware that in the United States no forced labor exists. There are no concentration camps. The American economic system doesn't rely on the work of ten to fifteen million forced laborers.

"We wait for the new Lincoln to be born in Asia who will liberate these unhappy people. We wonder if at such a time a new Liberia will be created where those liberated slaves will be permitted to form a new state.

"We are aware that an American citizen doesn't need a police permit and that the American people do not require the right to eat meat, the right to wash with soap, and the right to live in the Capital City; that there are no food-ration tickets.

"We do not believe that the American secret police or political police is approximately as large in size as the Army. We also know that in America there is no need to stage trials against members of the Government, general or church dignitaries such as are taking place in certain other countries.

"Finally we do not believe that problems of education, of art, and of music are resolved in the United States either by the Democratic or the Republican Party. * * *

HAILS FREE ECONOMIC SYSTEM

"We also know that in the United States a free economic system is in force, that the American worker labors only 40 hours weekly and gets for this a sufficient salary and doesn't have to volunteer free hours of work.

"We know that the American miner often earns more than cabinet ministers in certain European lands. We hear that an American workingman can buy a pair of shoes with a day's wages. * * * We have also heard about the strength and independence of the American unions.

"We consider that 30,000,000 automobiles, 85,000,000 radio receivers, 9,000,000 television sets, and 4,000,000 telephones are not the exclusive privilege of the ruling classes. * * *

MENTIONS KOREAN WAR

"We know above all that the American people have lost several thousand heroes who fell in Korea for the defense of peace and for the realization of the principles of the United Nations.

"We know what a tremendous effort and what sacrifices the American people have experienced for victory in World Wars I and II to vanquish dictatorship and assure victory of freedom for the peoples of Europe and Asia."

It is impossible for practical reasons of space to cite more than a fraction of the tragic opinions Mr. Magyar risked his life to send to the west. But his faith is clearly and unswervingly attached to one prediction.

"A few fanatics have the vision of forcing millions and millions to live according to their principles, to keep millions and millions under arms. The vision of this limited group means the deportation, the liquidation of millions and millions.

"But we know that this vision will never come true. It is impossible."

The Christian Answer to Communist Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. HAND. Mr Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am including in the RECORD a sermon recently preached in the Central Baptist Church, of Millville, N. J., by the Reverend Everett Cary Crimmings. This thoughtful approach to the problem of communism has been met with wide acceptance and enthusiasm in southern New Jersey, and I include it for the information of the membership:

THE CHRISTIAN ANSWER TO COMMUNIST AGGRESSION (ISAIAH 59: 19; ZECHARIAH 4: 6, 7 2 CHRONICLES 7: 14)

In the year 1848 Karl Marx and Frederick Engels began their now famous Communist manifesto with the words: "There is a specter now haunting Europe—the specter of communism." Today, a century later, that specter is haunting, not just Europe, but the whole world. Communism is on the march, and it is marching to war. It is marching in Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, France, Italy, Turkey, and Iran. It is marching in China, Korea, Burma, Malaya, the Philippines,

Tibet, Japan, and in many, many other nations of the earth. Everywhere folk hear the tread of its armed feet and everyone wonders what lies ahead.

Our response to the specter of communism has often been that of children running panic-stricken from a haunted house—a response compounded of terror, hysteria, and fear. Such a response is dangerous because frightened people are not capable of making intelligent decisions or of adopting stern and consistent policies to combat the evil.

The first answer to communism, then, is to divest it of its spectral qualities—to see it as it really is and to understand it fully, for communism is not an invisible ghostly power. It is a movement created by man, operated by man, and subject to the same limitations and frailties as all other man-made movements.

Everywhere in the democracies, particularly in America, do we find opposition to communism; but there is an amazing ignorance as to what communism really is, what it believes, how it works, what it proposes to do, and the source of power which has led to its present position in the world. Opposition to it, therefore, is often blind and ill-informed. If a medical doctor is to combat a disease intelligently he must first know the nature and working of it. With that information in mind he can begin to fight it. So it is with communism. Therefore, if we are to approach the Christian answer to Communist aggression we must first inquire what communism really is, what it stands for, and what it proposes to do.

I. WHAT IS COMMUNISM? WHAT DOES IT PROPOSE TO DO?

The word "communism" originally referred to systems of social organization under which goods were held in common. In this sense, some form of it may be said to have been practiced by the early Christians. In Acts 5 we have the tragic story of Ananias and Sapphira. The Church members held all their goods in common. This very definitely was a venture into communism, but it soon faded away.

Communism, as the word is usually used today, has a political, social, and economic meaning. It refers to a society in which the economy is owned by the state and controlled by a "dictatorship of the proletariat," or the common people.

Present day communism is the outgrowth of the industrial revolution of eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. As a result of that revolution, the working man no longer worked in his own shop in his own home, owned his own tools, was his own boss, or had any right to the products of his own labors. He began to feel himself almost as anonymous a factor in the process of production as the machine which he tended. He worked for someone else in a big factory, was huddled into filthy slums and industrial areas, and was paid a starvation wage. The rich were getting richer, and the poor were getting poorer. The result was a deep and searing discontent, always threatening to burst out in open violence.

Such people found ready champions in Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. In 1864 Marx helped found the International Workingman's Association, or the First International. This movement was the predecessor of the Bolshevik Party and the Comintern (the third International) under Lenin. In his pamphlet *State and Revolution* (1917) Lenin stated flatly: "The replacement of the bourgeois (the middle class of people) by the proletarian state (the wage-earning, laboring class) is impossible without a violent revolution." That is still the plan, program, purpose and procedure of the Communist Party. We would do well to bear this in mind as we continue with this discussion.

Communism, the philosophy of world revolution, the revolt against the capitalistic

system, and the determined effort to stamp out religion, has ingrown by leaps and bounds, particularly since the end of World War II. Today it has reached the proportions of a world menace. Today nearly half the world lies in slavery behind the Communist curtain, and the rest of the world is threatened by the awful ghost of it. Communism is the organized effort to overthrow by violence the greatest triumvirate of all history—the economic principle of capitalism, the political principle of democracy, and the spiritual principle of religious freedom.

We must recognize that the Korean situation and the march of communism in East Germany, Iran, Greece, Italy, China, and other countries are not disassociated and isolated events. They are all part of one great world revolution which is being instituted and agitated by Communist Russia. Russia could call upon her satellites in a dozen different countries of Europe and Asia and tomorrow morning the world would see a dozen more Korean situations. Russia doesn't have to start another world war, nor does she have to declare war against the United States; she has only to bide her time and to call upon her satellites to start a rebellion which will involve us and which, by being prolonged, will bleed us white. Then when we are reduced to impotency, which will be in the next decade and a half, or surely before two decades have passed, if we keep on going as we are going now, she can sweep over the world and conquer it without losing a Russian division.

Communism has advanced as a result of promising two things to the proletariat. These things we must know if we are to fight it intelligently.

1. It has promised that it will create a new world, a new social order, in which justice and brotherhood are enshrined. It pledges a society of plenty for everyone, with no unemployment, no insecurity, no exploitation of man by man, no famine, no pestilence, no sword, no racial bitterness, or class hatred.

2. The second promise that communism makes is not so well known. It must be known and fully understood if we are to combat it successfully. It promises to make a new man, a new race of men and women. It promises to liberate man from all the evils, the viciousness, and the weaknesses at present manifested in human personality. The results, it claims, will be a new, finer, nobler, more upright, more unselfish, and more brotherly man than the world has ever known before.

In a word, communism promises to redeem mankind from sin and weakness, and to create a new world in which the redeemed man shall live. Its promises, you will note, are strikingly similar to God's plan for the human race. He has promised through Christ to make a new man and through that new man a new social order. Paul, in writing to the Corinthians (2 Corinthians, 5: 17), says: "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature. Old things have passed away; behold, all things have become new." The Communist would substitute the word "Communist" for Christ in this text and would read it (if he read it at all) like this: "If any man be a Communist, he is a new creature; the old order of things has passed away; behold, all things have become new." Communism is Satan's substitute for God's salvation.

Communism proposes to create the new man and the new social order by world revolution. The existing order of things must be overthrown. Again I refer you to Lenin's statement in *State and Revolution*: "The replacement of the bourgeois by the proletarian state is impossible without a violent revolution."

The first ingredient out of which communism expects to make its new man and new society is atheism. Atheism was the basic axiom of Marxism from its concept to its termination. Lenin, in his pamphlet *Lenin on Religion*, begins with these words: "Atheism is a fundamental portion of Marxism, of the theory and practice of scientific socialism." Lenin also said: "Religion is the opiate of society." One cannot be a Communist and not be an atheist. The first institution to be destroyed by the Communists is the church, and the first persons to be liquidated are the Christians. This we must remember if we are to combat it successfully. The struggle between communism and democracy is the greatest struggle between light and darkness, righteousness and iniquity, God and Satan, that has ever taken place in the history of mankind.

II. WHAT IS THE CHRISTIAN ANSWER TO COMMUNIST AGGRESSION?

I would suggest to you today that there are just four answers to the menace of Communist aggression. I shall not dwell at length upon the first two, but shall emphasize the last two as being the most important. These four Christian answers are: 1. Reason, 2. resistance, 3. repentance, 4. revival. Let us look at them for a few minutes.

1. Reason: We must face the facts about communism. We must use our heads and minds and the intelligence that Almighty God has given us. We must learn that we cannot compromise with it, nor can we appease it. It is a deadly force which will conquer us unless we conquer it. The principles of it have not changed from Karl Marx to Joseph Stalin—they have only developed and brought forth fruit. Do you know that when Mr. Stassen interviewed Mr. Stalin on April 9, 1947, that Stalin said to Stassen: "Lenin is our teacher, and we Soviet people are his disciples?" Stalin said on another occasion: "I am only a disciple of Lenin, and it is my whole ambition to be a faithful disciple."

What did Lenin teach? In addition to teaching that "religion is the opiate of society" and that the "replacement of the bourgeois by the proletarian state is impossible without a violent revolution," he said in his collected works: "As long as capitalism and socialism remain we cannot live in peace. In the end one or the other will triumph—a funeral requiem will be sung either over the Soviet Republic or over world capitalism. * * * There is no alternative. Either the Soviet Government triumphs in every advanced country in the world, or the most reactionary imperialism triumphs * * * There is no middle course." In his last speech, Lenin said: "Gather strength and strike the bourgeois as is necessary. Strike it only in the chest when you are sure of victory." This is the man and this is the teaching that Stalin so devotedly follows. Let us answer this threat of communism first of all by facing the facts about it and by understanding what it is and what its unwavering policies are.

2. Resistance: I shall not dwell but a passing moment here. We of the free nations of the world must resist communism whenever and wherever we find it. This must be done by a thorough understanding of its purposes, by an unwavering faith and trust in God, and by the force of arms. I believe that the United Nations was right in going to the aid of the South Koreans. Unless the free nations of the world fight communism wherever its festering sores break out it will overcome us. If it were true in Lincoln's day that "this Nation cannot long remain half slave and half free," it is equally true today that the world cannot long remain half slave and half free. A decade hence it will be all slave or it will be all free.

3. Repentance. Now we begin to get to the heart of the solution of the problem. It is known that communism flourishes best where corruption is most rampant. Just before World War II broke out in Europe in September 1939, Winston Churchill said in the British Parliament: "The clouds of war are hovering over us again and are about to break upon us. When the war does come, it will be the judgment of God upon us, for we have sinned." If that were true of Britain then, it is even more true of Britain, Germany, France, Italy, and the United States today. I am concerned only about America just now. We have sinned. We have broken God's laws, we have cast Him out, we have prostituted the divine law upon which our culture rests. Let me cite a few figures for you.

The crime reported in our newspapers involving rape, murder, robbery, and violence of all kinds takes \$15,000,000,000 a year from the American income. Criminals have reached an all-time low in age bracket. Teen-agers now comprise the largest number of criminals.

Thirteen billion dollars are whisked away by the gamblers of America each year, and the gambling menace is now permeating the home, the schools, the business world, and politics.

Americans are the most drunken people in the world. Someone estimated awhile ago that 60 percent, or about eighty million, of our people drink either moderately or heavily. We spent \$9,000,000,000 a year on liquor. Think how much good could be done if this amount were spent on home and foreign missions. There are 2,500,000 alcoholics in the United States, and many of them are women, and many are mothers.

Add to this the FBI statement that America's No. 1 problem is juvenile delinquency; that one out of every three marriages today ends upon the rocks of the divorce court, that *Coronet* magazine for September 1950 declared that there are 8,000,000 homosexuals in America; that an estimated 10,000 babies are born illegitimately each year; that the greatest cause of insanity in our country is syphilis; that the estimated cost of insanity due entirely to syphilis is in excess of \$500,000,000 each year; that the latest estimates indicate that 500,000 new cases of this disease appear annually in the United States; and that more than 1,000,000 new cases of gonorrhea are treated by physicians each year. Add to all this the true and terrible revelations of the Kefauver crime investigating committee and we don't have a very pleasant picture to behold.

The Russians don't have to attack us. They have only to wait 10 or 15 years until we have rotted at the core as the result of our own internal moral and spiritual corruption. It is possible that this great Nation of ours will fall. We are no more highly favored in God's sight than was Israel of old. We cannot sin and get away with it any more than she could. Senator TOBEY said at the New York crime investigation hearing "The only thing that can save the United States of America is the second coming of Christ." On March 14, 1951, when two officials of King's County, N. Y., described efforts of gamblers to corrupt the school children of Brooklyn, Senator TOBEY could stand it no longer. With tears streaming down his face, he quoted from Whittier, "Solution there is none, save in the heart of Christ alone." Then he added: "When the hearts of men and women are touched, they take their inspiration from the master of men. Then we will have a righteous and a new America * * * a nation in which dwelleth righteousness. And, before God, it is high time." I agree wholeheartedly with Senator TOBEY. Unless we repent, we as a nation and as a people are going to go the way of Egypt, Babylon, Carthage, Nineveh, Greece, Rome,

and the British Empire. Never was there a greater need for repentance than now.

4. Revival: True repentance always leads to revival. Whenever the Israelites truly repented of their sins God raised up a deliverer and the people were restored. A revival of true, born-again Christianity is absolutely necessary if we are to fight communism and live. Communism is a spiritual force and it must be met by a spiritual force. Communism is a religion and it must be combated by a religion. The thing the Communist hates most is the true religion of Jesus Christ because it is the only thing he fears and the only thing he knows can fight him successfully. The more truly Christian a nation is the less likely it is to be communistic. There are evidences that a revival may come. We are encouraged by the campaigns of Billy Graham and others. God is giving us our last chance. Armageddon is next unless the revival comes. Yes, Armageddon is just around the corner and we don't know how near the corner is.

This revival at home must take the form of a revived and greatly increased missionary effort abroad. It will do little good to have a revival at home if there is no revival abroad. It must be a world-wide revival or it will be incomplete and inadequate.

That nation that has conquered communism more than any other land, Japan, is the nation that has more fully than any other country, including America, employed the only means of combating it successfully. Gen. Douglas MacArthur repeatedly called for millions of Bibles and Testaments. He appealed constantly to all denominations of Christians to send missionaries and evangelists to tell the people of Japan about the Saviour, Jesus Christ. The tragedy of his removal is not so much military and political as it is spiritual. The one man who did more to open up a country to the gospel of Christ than man since Carey, Judson, and Livingstone has been called home, and there is no one to replace him in that spiritual capacity. Only true, born-again, Christianity saved Japan from the fate of China, and only born-again Christianity will save it in the future. "It must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh."

Thus I have tried to outline to you the Christian answer to Communist aggression, which I believe is the only answer to it. If the Christian answer isn't the answer, then there isn't any, and we are doomed. We must answer it by reason. We must know what it is, what its background is, and what its plan for the future is. We must answer it by resistance; a resistance based upon faith and trust in God and upon the use of all the armed might of all the free nations of the world. We must answer it by repentance of our sins. No deliverance ever comes to those who do not repent. And we must answer it by revival—a revival of true born-again Christianity—and a revival of missionary emphasis on a level unprecedented in the annals of Christian history. We must be as zealous in proclaiming the gospel of the saving power and grace of Jesus Christ as the Communist is in proclaiming the gospel of revolution. It is revival or revolution, Christ or chaos, Christianity or communism, evangelism or enslavement, life with Christ or death with communism for the whole world. Ours it is to choose and to choose now. It is much later than we dare to think. "If My people, which are called by My name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek My face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sins, and heal their land." "Not by might, nor by power, but by My spirit, saith the Lord of hosts."

"My good blade carves the casques of men;

My strong lance thrusteth sure.

My strength is as the strength of ten,

Because my heart is pure."

WHAT MAKES A NATION GREAT?

"Not serried ranks, with flags unfurled,
Nor armored ships that gird the world,
Nor hoarded wealth, nor busy mills,
Nor cattle on a thousand hills,
Not sages wise, nor schools, nor laws,
Not boasted deeds in freedom's cause—
All these may be, and yet the state
In the eyes of God be far from great.
That land is great which knows the Lord,
Whose songs are guided by His Word;
Where justice rules 'twixt man and man,
Where love controls in art and plan,
Where, breathing in his native air,
Each soul finds joy in praise and prayer—
Thus may our country, good and great,
Be God's delight—man's best estate."

—Alexander Blackburn.

How Congress and People Can Be Kept in Touch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following editorial which appeared in the *Courier-Post* of July 11, 1951, about our very distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, PETER W. RODINO, JR. If every Member of Congress did as he did, there is not a doubt in the world that this Congress would pass a much stronger controls bill than that urged upon us by our President, instead of cutting to ribbons the one before us.

HOW CONGRESS AND PEOPLE CAN BE KEPT IN TOUCH

That was something more than a publicity stunt pulled the other day by Representative PETER W. RODINO, JR., Congressman from New Jersey's Tenth District, which embraces part of Essex County.

The publicity Rodino received from it will not do him any harm, but we would prefer to believe he did not pull it for that reason, but for the sounder one he professed, which is one other public officials would do well to emulate.

That was to find out the reaction of the public—the average man and woman—by direct personal contact, to a matter of public business and of legislation.

In this case, the matter of business and legislation was prices and inflation, specifically in regard to meat.

The Congressman knew what the cattle growers and the packers and distributors had to say on the subject. He had been kept well informed of their views by their high-powered lobbies.

But the housewife and meat consumer have no comparable lobby to operate on their behalf. (Just as the general public on any item of legislation, has no comparable lobbies to voice its views as against the views of the special interests.)

RODINO wanted to find out what the public thinks about meat prices, about the proposed roll-backs on beef, and so on. He decided the best way to get the real grass-root facts was to put on a butcher's apron and work behind a meat counter for a few hours.

And that, thanks to the cooperation of a supermarket, is what he did.

RODINO found out that housewives unanimously thought prices were too high.

They were in favor of the roll-backs.

They weren't buying expensive steaks except for special occasions which were few and far between, and weren't going to at present prices.

They have learned they can get along quite nicely without them, thank you, much as they would like to have them on the table more often.

One Congressman's findings on the question may not have much effect on the current police control battle in Washington, and might not in any similar legislative controversy.

But if more of them would copy RODINO's direct methods the effect would be strong—and beneficial.

The public would be served, the public that hears so many promises at campaign time but so seldom sees them fulfilled, simply because it is inarticulate and unorganized compared with the highly vocal and well-heeled lobbies for a multitude of private interests.

Of course, it is impractical for every Congressman and every Senator to go out in the field as RODINO did and get public reaction on every piece of legislation that comes along.

There is one way, however, for Congressmen and Senators to get public opinion at all times—and believe us, they will be influenced by it if it is expressed clearly enough, as it can be.

That way is strictly up to you, dear reader.

It means writing your two United States Senators and the Congressman from your district whenever you want them to know your views, and be guided by them, on any subject of national legislation. Write them short letters, or even postcards.

This Nation Under God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Pratt (Kans.) Daily Tribune, issue of Monday, July 2, entitled "This Nation Under God."

We are privileged to live in the greatest and most progressive country on earth, founded upon justice under God, liberty under law, and freedom under democracy.

I believe it is our duty as citizens to protect and preserve this matchless heritage, which came to us through blood and tears and endless sacrifice. It is the most precious thing we have.

Into our Nation and people have been built the prayers and struggles and selfless service of millions of Christian men and women. To them we owe much of our belief in freedom, much of our American dream of equality of opportunity, much of our constitutionalism with its responsibility of the governors to be governed.

If these religious springs of action wither, the days of our national strength are numbered.

I recommend to the Members of the Senate the reading of this editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS NATION UNDER GOD

For years we have been guarding the editorial column for what it is intended—the voice of the ownership and management of that newspaper—but now and then someone comes up with a gem that warrants publication, not just as a quotation, but as the editorial expression of the newspaper as well. We have received from a friend and contemporary, Rolla Clymer, of the El Dorado Times, the résumé of a sermon delivered in the Methodist Church at El Dorado a week ago last Sunday by Rev. Leonard J. Smoot, the pastor. Here is a sermon which we believe should be read from the rocky shores of Maine to the sandy beaches of southern California and from Puget Sound to Biscayne Bay, for here is a sermon that puts on the line in unmistakable and undeniable terms what America needs today to offset and to overcome the total lack of leadership which is dragging America down inch by inch to the level of foreign countries instead of holding high the torch of leadership for others to follow as administrations of the past did for generations up to not too many years ago.

Reverend Smoot likened today's conditions to the days when the immortal Lincoln delivered his memorable Gettysburg Address. He did so in a masterful fashion. Here is the résumé of that sermon:

"Fourscore and seven years ago—November 19, 1863—the President of the United States stood on an improvised platform in the midst of what was only recently a bloody battlefield and dedicated that field as a national cemetery. The opening sentence of his dedicatory address was these words: 'Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the purpose that all men are created equal.' Less than 3 minutes later he concluded his address with these words: 'that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom, that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth.'

"We stand exactly the same distance from Lincoln's Gettysburg Address as Lincoln stood from the Declaration of Independence Address. Is it not time for some stalwart figure to stand and to declare to our Nation that this Nation under God should have a new birth—a new birth of righteousness, of morality, of integrity, and of spiritual values; for without these all of our materialistic and scientific gains mean nothing? The ancient wise man was right when he said, 'Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people.'

"After hearing the Kefauver committee reports, these words of Paul written in the first century come resounding down the corridors of the centuries to us with a strangely familiar sound. They seem strangely pertinent to our day when we have trusted so much in the flesh—man's wisdom and his ability to create and manipulate things for himself—and we have trusted so little in God. The voice of the flesh, materialistic things, etc., has spoken so enticingly that our ears have become more and more tuned to them until it is well-nigh impossible for us to hear the still small voice of God. 'Be not deceived; God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. If to the flesh, he shall of the flesh reap corruption; if to the spirit, he shall of the spirit reap life everlasting.'

"The question of what we can do about it is one which is always uppermost in our minds. What can we do about it? First of all, we must put our own house in order for who am I to point an accusing finger at someone else who is dishonest if I, too, am dishonest, and who are you to accuse

another of a lack of personal integrity if you have sold out yourself? We must put our own house in order—to be still before God until we see ourselves as He sees us and then bring our lives into conformity of what He expects of us.

"Second, we must seek to discover what God is trying to do in this community and join Him in doing it. The great British statesman, Gladstone, once stood before Parliament and said, 'The primary duty of government is to discover what God is trying to do within the next 100 years and use every resource to help Him.' You and I must seek to know what God is trying to do in this world and use our resources in helping Him.

"Third, we can pray. For only through prayer can we put our own house in order, find the strength and the courage and the help we need to put our house in order. Only through prayer can we discover what God is trying to do. Only through prayer can we find the courage and the consecration to use all of our resources in helping Him. This Nation under God must have a new birth of righteousness, of morality, of integrity, and of spiritual values, and these must begin in each one of us."

Republicans and Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of July 18, 1951:

REPUBLICANS AND CONTROLS

The Republican minority leader of the House, Representative MARTIN, and the principal spokesman for the Republicans on economic issues, Representative WOLCOTT, contend that the position of those who are fighting the administration's economic-control program is being egregiously misrepresented to the public.

Representative WOLCOTT is particularly strong in his denunciation of what he calls the campaign of untruth and calumny being conducted by the bureaucrats and certain irresponsible elements of the press and radio. These critics of the antiadministration bloc, says the Michigan Representative, are trying to make it appear that an overwhelming majority of Republicans and a few patriotic Democrats are sabotaging price, wage, and credit controls. This, he declares, is sheer falsification. All that these Representatives are trying to do is to weed the socialistic power grabs out of the new legislation which is to replace the Defense Production Act.

Coming from Mr. WOLCOTT, such a statement seems to us to reflect an almost cynical contempt for the public's intelligence. For it was this same Representative from Michigan who only a week ago proposed an amendment to the pending measure the adoption of which, in the words of Representative SPENCE, of Kentucky, would have scuttled the bill—would have nullified every provision it contains.

Representative SPENCE's charge was neither exaggeration nor misrepresentation; it was literally true. For the proposal of the Michigan legislator was nothing less than the substitution of indirect controls for direct controls. The amendment would have written into the bill the intention of Congress that none of the wage-price controls or con-

sumer or real estate credit control powers should be used unless other indirect means of effecting such controls and stabilization presently provided in other acts for use by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board have been utilized. Even then, the amendment stipulated, direct controls should be used only to the extent needed to supplant the indirect controls.

This was the master amendment offered by the opponents of the pending price-wage control measure. Fortunately, it was defeated. Had it not been, there would have been no necessity for most of the other controversial amendments now under discussion. For it would have knocked out of this anti-inflation legislation, for all practical purposes, the three titles which were the heart of the measure—the titles dealing with price-wage stabilization, settlement of labor disputes, and control over consumer and real-estate credit.

The proposed elimination of the last-named title, incidentally, may be said to represent the ironic high point of the amendment. Representative WOLCOTT, in this amendment, professed to favor "indirect controls," such as a strong credit policy by the Reserve System. Yet it showed that he was not even in favor of Federal Reserve control policy except in a purely theoretical sense. When Federal Reserve policy actually interferes with inflation in such areas as consumer credit or mortgage credit, then, in Mr. Wolcott's lexicon, it becomes a form of "direct control" and must be excoriated.

We think it is pertinent to point out that this is not the first time that Representative Wolcott has sought to chloroform an administration anti-inflation program by offering as a substitute a monetary "solution" which, though it sounded impressive, was really nothing more than a quack remedy. In the inflation debate of 1947 the Michigan Representative suggested that instead of burdening the country with an onerous system of direct controls Congress simply move to curtail credit by raising the gold reserve ratio of the regional Reserve banks from the prevailing 25 percent to 40 percent. The proposal had an alluring sound to those who like controls which are more effective on the blackboard than they are in practical operation. Unfortunately for this particular suggestion, it did not even meet the blackboard test. Someone was unkind enough to take pencil and paper and figure out just what effect the raising of the gold reserve ratio would have in constricting the credit supply. The computation showed that after the change there would still have been sufficient "free gold" left in the banking system for credit expansion to continue without interruption at the alarming rate then in progress for slightly more than 11 years.

An economist has one thing in mind when he distinguishes between direct controls and indirect controls, but the Michigan Representative seems to have quite another. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that when Mr. Wolcott says he is in favor of "indirect controls" he means that he is in favor only of those controls that do not actually interfere directly with the individual's right to the pursuit of business as usual.

No Improvement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lowell (Mass.) Sun of July 13, 1951:

NO IMPROVEMENT

The postal service in the United States is still being operated in an obsolete and inadequate manner despite the revealing comments made by the Hoover Commission which showed that the service had not been modernized to any great extent since the pony express used to carry the mails through to the wild and woolly west.

The result of the Hoover report findings prompted some officials near the top of the postal service to put into effect certain economies which have reduced the amount of service given to the people. That was done so that the Post Office Department might come closer to being a division that could pay its way. But the thought of modernization was pushed to one side; that type of economy which would decrease the cost of operation and provide better service at the same time was not to the liking of these officials.

The employees of the Post Office Department are working in an archaic division which refuses to accept advice on improvement—thus they are not paid adequately because they are working for a backward organization.

Equal Justice Under Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, carved in stone over the entrance to the magnificent marble home of the United States Supreme Court in Washington are the words, "Equal justice under law."

But here in America the New Deal, has in spirit and in practice, destroyed that principle. While, for political purposes, it has campaigned for what it is pleased to term "civil rights" for all, it has at no time made a consistent, sincere effort to establish or enforce that doctrine.

Perhaps the most flagrant violation is shown by its lack of protest of the lawlessness of certain labor leaders and their tools in the union. Some unions have been infiltrated by Communists, a fact well known not only to prominent labor leaders but to those high in authority in the administration ever since the beginning of 1937.

As long ago as 1925 John L. Lewis, after a painstaking and thorough examination through a committee of the United Mine Workers, condemned the attempt of the Communists to infiltrate into American labor unions.

Later, this same John L. Lewis, when organizing the CIO had, and it used many Communists. At the moment, I recall one, Gus Hall, now being sought by United States authorities for incarceration in jail under a sentence recently imposed and which grew out of his Communistic activities, who was then prominent in organizing various unions.

Not so long ago the CIO, because of public sentiment, was forced to expel

certain of its affiliates because they were dominated by Communists. It was only a year or two since President Truman, here in Washington, openly came to the aid of a union whose officers were Communists and who brazenly refused to repudiate their Communistic affiliations.

Over the years it has been customary, not only for the national administration which has had the political support of many a prominent labor leader and organization, but as well as for State and local authorities to completely ignore the principle that justice should be administered without partiality.

Oftentimes, the plea is that the local authorities are not capable of suppressing organized union violence. In some instances that is true. But the local authorities have at their command State and Federal aid, if and when they ask for it, and if and when State and Federal law-enforcing officials are willing to carry out the principles enunciated in the Constitution and give protection to the average law-abiding citizen as he goes about his daily task.

That lawlessness can be easily suppressed and that without undue bloodshed, has been demonstrated many times. Perhaps the two most notable instances are those where Grover Cleveland, a Democrat, enforced the law in connection with the Pullman, Ill., strike; where President Coolidge, as Governor of Massachusetts, told striking policemen that the law would be enforced.

Investigations held by the House Committee on Labor, by the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and by their subcommittees during the sitting of the Eightieth Republican Congress demonstrated that apparently, for political reasons, many a State, and certainly the national administration, by inactivity, had encouraged mob violence when occurring in connection with labor disputes or strikes.

To this procedure there were, no doubt, some local exceptions. One of which I had personal knowledge was that of the law-enforcing authorities in Berrien County in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan.

In that county H. Kubath is, and has been, sheriff for some time; Joseph E. Killian, a native of my home city of Allegan, is the prosecutor. The Honorable E. A. Westin is circuit judge. There, after several instances of violence, local union leaders who had been unduly influenced by organizers from the parent organization were advised by Sheriff Kubath and Prosecutor Killian that the laws which applied to the average citizen and which made it an offense to assault another, except in self-defense, or to maliciously destroy property, would be enforced.

That is to say, that the fact that one who assaulted another or maliciously destroyed property was the member of a union or that the assault or the destruction of property occurred during the course of a labor dispute or strike, or on the picket line would not be any excuse for a violation of the law.

Now, as everyone aware of the facts connected with labor disputes in Berrien

County well knows, the local members of the union are decent, law-abiding citizens, many of them own their own homes. Many of their sons have fought abroad, as have many members of the union. Unfortunately, unduly influenced by such men as John T. Gojack, an "imported" union man, a few of the gullible labor men were led to commit acts which they never would have thought of doing had they followed their own judgment. One of their leaders, Thomas J. Flynn, openly defied Sheriff Kubath. After warning, he incited some of his followers to overturn an automobile which attempted to run a picket line. Now, Flynn knew that the automobile might, and probably would, be damaged. Under the Michigan statute, if the damage to personal property exceeds—I think it is \$100—the offense is a felony and punishable by imprisonment. Disregarding the advice of Sheriff Kubath, Flynn incited some of the pickets to overturn an automobile. The result is briefly and concisely told in a recent issue of the News-Palladium and the Herald Press—the first published at Benton Harbor, the second at St. Joseph in Berrien County. The news story reads as follows:

**FLYNN MUST SERVE TERM—LABOR LEADER
LOSES FIGHT**

Thomas J. Flynn, former Sawyer resident and militant UAW-CIO union leader, has lost a lengthy fight to escape serving a year and a half to four-year prison sentence resulting from a strike at the Nylen Products Co. plant in August 1948.

Flynn was sentenced to prison and fined \$750 by Judge E. A. Westin after his conviction by a jury on a charge of malicious destruction of property. He was sentenced on October 8, 1948.

Flynn appealed unsuccessfully to the Michigan State Supreme Court which upheld the verdict on April 3, 1951.

The State supreme court issued a stay order on April 6, however, pending his appeal to the United States Supreme Court. Failure to complete the procedure for his appeal to the Nation's highest court within a specified time ended his long fight to escape sentence.

The State supreme court in action earlier this week set aside and vacated the stay order.

Prosecutor Joseph E. Killian was to petition the Berrien County circuit court to set aside a like stay order in the case, and will seek a bench warrant for his arrest and commitment to the State prison of southern Michigan at Jackson.

Flynn was arrested by Sheriff H. Kubath on August 18, 1948, while directing picket-line activities during a strike at the Nylen Products Co. plant on the Lake Shore Drive. He was alleged to have ordered pickets to tip over a car driven by Albert Howard, a worker returning to his job in the plant. The car was damaged when it was overturned and Howard was shaken up.

He was brought to trial on September 22, 1948, and was found guilty on September 24 by a jury. He was later sentenced by Judge Westin, but was granted a stay pending his appeal to the State supreme court.

Attorney Nicholas Rothe of Detroit, a top attorney of the UAW-CIO, handled the appellate matters in the case, filing a petition for a writ of certiorari with the United States Supreme Court as his final action.

Flynn is now a resident of Brighton, Mich. He will be taken into custody probably this week end and taken to Jackson Prison.

Mr. Speaker, the lesson to be drawn from this incident is that when local officials perform their duty faithfully, as did Kubath, Killian, the jurors, and the judge, labor disputes will be more quickly settled, law and order maintained, and there will be for all citizens—union and nonunion men, wage earner and employer—equal justice under law.

The jurors who heard these Flynn cases in Berrien County; Sheriff Kubath, who made the arrests and obtained the witnesses; Prosecutor Killian, who filed the complaints and followed through from local justice court to the United States Supreme Court; Judge Westin, who proceeded fairly without fear or favor and who imposed sentence as his judgment dictated, are entitled to the wholehearted commendation of the people, not only of the State but of the Nation. Not because they performed more than their duty but because, under the present national administration, public service in official positions is at an all-time low.

Well Done, Admiral

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following editorial from the Lowell (Mass.) Sun of July 13, 1951:

WELL DONE, ADMIRAL

The soft words of the United Nations have finally been changed. While the Red Chinese and Communist Koreans were throwing their weight around in the past week and while the U. N. command in Korea apparently was taking it like a lamb, the democratic world began to wonder what was going on. Why should the Reds be swaggering around like conquerors and making excessive demands on the subject of how the cease-fire conference should be run?

It was unquestionably the policy of General Ridgway to avoid controversial developments as much as possible so that the discussions leading toward peace might get off to a favorable start. The general knew just how far he could go in this way, and he has gone just about as far as possible, short of following a placating attitude all the way.

The lofty manner in which the North Korean and Chinese officers stopped a convoy of newsmen short of the Kaesong area has proved the straw that broke the camel's back. It has prompted Vice Admiral Turner Joy, senior U. N. negotiator, to send a stern message to the leading Communist negotiator, advising him that such high-handed Red measures are not going to be tolerated. To emphasize his point, he temporarily held up negotiations.

The Reds have named the time and place of the cease-fire talks. They went beyond that by stating that no formal news coverage would be permitted by them. That seemed to have been tacitly accepted by the U. N. negotiators, although no formal consent was issued. The non-Communist world, accustomed to free speech and free press, was stunned by the apparent success of the

Reds in driving home this communistic condition.

But the surprise is past as the facts now come out. Admiral Joy would never have been so forceful and final in his actions if he did not have full consent of his superiors in the United Nations.

Regardless of what the outcome of this may be, there is reason to cheer the fact that one of the basic elements of life outside of the Communist sphere has been cited as an essential part of continued talks which may lead to peace in Korea.

We cannot sacrifice nor minimize such things as free speech and a free press—that is what the democratic world is trying to preserve right at this time. That is why U. N. forces have been fighting in Korea—in what might otherwise have been a local civil war.

**The Reading Crime Probe—Two Evil
Monsters Exposed: The Crime Dragon
and the News Monopoly Dragon**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, in my district there was a crime probe and hearing conducted by the Senate Crime Investigating Committee. The newspaper monopoly there, masking as a champion of clean government, made a strong plea for the probe and hearing.

After the hearing was conducted, I issued a statement but it was suppressed by the news monopoly. I am accustomed to press black-outs but I never expected such a brazen insult to the intelligence of the citizens of Berks County.

People have the right to know what their Congressman is doing in Washington, especially on a matter of such great interest to the citizens of our community.

A policy of news suppression, silence treatments, distorted and colored news and deceptive headlines is dishonest and dangerous because it leads us down the road to totalitarianism and disaster.

Yesterday I made a radio address over Station WHUM on this matter, and I am putting it in the RECORD. It should be of interest to other Members of Congress. What is happening in my district may be a pattern of what is happening in other parts of the Nation.

Today, ladies and gentlemen, I will confine my remarks to the recent crime probe and matters pertaining to the probe. I will also speak out to Mr. Herbert Kohler, editor of the Reading Times.

Many events of great importance are now taking place, about which I would like to speak. But time does not permit me to discuss those matters at this moment. In a previous broadcast I mentioned the losing fight that liberal Democrats are making in the Congress against superior forces of the Republican-Dixiecrat coalition, which are seeking to kill all controls except those restrictions on wage earners and low-paid salaried workers whose pay envelopes are frozen.

If the Republicans, with the aid of the Dixiecrats, succeed in killing controls on rising prices and speculation, it will cause great

suffering among middle- and low-income families, and especially on retired people who must live on small fixed incomes, social security, pensions, and railroad retirement benefits. I am one of the liberal group now fighting the selfish interests trying to kill the controls. I will discuss that issue at some future time. Tonight I will speak on another matter of interest to the people of our community.

Today my discussion will be on the crime probe, and the attitude of the local newspapers. Bear in mind, however, that there is a connection between the crime probe and the attitude of the newspaper monopoly, and the fight of the people to protect their living standards and the fight of the liberal forces against the might and greed of selfish and powerful monopolies.

In the recent Reading crime probe and hearings, I saw a determined effort to gain political advantage by a group which has always opposed liberal legislation and policies which would promote the well-being and happiness of the people. I saw a newspaper monopoly withhold news about the probe. I saw things that were not fair and I protested.

Dishonest editors, armed with poison pens, devoid of principle and armed with the might of a monopolized press unfortunately have a strong influence on public opinion.

A newspaper has the means for readily reaching and influencing the public. It has the power to suppress the voices and opinions of all with whom they disagree or to give all the news and views. It has the power to use the news columns to play up certain groups advocating sales taxes and to black-out other groups and statements favoring liberal measures or it can be fair by treating all groups alike.

The press has the power to build up public officials who serve the selfish interests of the monopoly. It can smear and try to crush those it cannot control. That is a corrupting influence which breeds confusion, suspicion, disunity, and which lowers the ethical and moral standards of a community.

A newspaper, with an honest desire to wipe out organized rackets in a community, could be a more powerful force for good than all the probes and all the law-enforcement agencies combined. But dishonest newspapers have never made an honest attempt in that direction.

Like the gangland chiefs, they too have a desire to control public officials. They, too, have selfish interests to promote, interests which are usually in conflict with the public welfare.

The gangland racketeers want permission for law evasion. The respectable gentlemen of an unfair press are more clever. They want to control the people who make the laws and those who administer them.

We were told in a Reading Eagle editorial that the dragon is not yet dead, meaning the crime dragon. It wants you to support good candidates, meaning their candidates. I say there are two dragons in our midst. If these dragons put on a fake performance of fighting each other, some of us might lose sight of the real stakes involved in this fight, and of the real issues which the smoke screen is expected to hide.

If we are fooled by this show it will be a costly performance for the average citizen, and especially for the most needy among us. Neither of these mighty dragons care about the things that mean a decent livelihood for the people. Neither cares about decent homes for the citizens. Neither of these dragons care about skyrocketing prices which rob our most needy people and the low and middle income families. Neither cares about our cherished freedoms. The

monopolistic dragon wants free speech for itself, and only blows about it for others. It wants the power to bind and gag and club those who dare to challenge the monster's ruthless might and power.

I despise the crime dragon and the underworld characters whose influence has always favored my Republican opponents each time I was a candidate for Congress. That is common talk everywhere in this community and something that Mr. R. P. S. McDonnell, of the Senate investigating committee staff, undoubtedly knows.

Any person of normal intelligence knows that the crime syndicates can operate only because a mayor or a governor will not act, and because newspapers never have shown an honest interest in the matter. Once we kill the crime dragon it will be less difficult to expose the other dragon and actually the most dangerous one.

The crime dragon does not care who is in Congress. But the other dragon does. The crime dragon will do anything to please the local or State law enforcement heads. It will support or oppose any candidate to win the favor of those who control the machinery of law enforcement. And I can assure you that neither the mayor nor the governor wanted to have me elected to the Congress.

The crime dragon seeks a free hand for its racket operations. The other dragon hates liberal legislation and all those who fight for liberal causes. It fights the things I believe in. The monopoly dragon fights the things I voted for in Congress—things like improved social security and railroad retirement benefits, public housing and a fair tax measure which will not pile an unfair burden on those less able to pay. I may be the target, but the people who benefit by liberal laws are the intended victims.

I have spoken out against rackets, illegal and legal ones, which conflict with the public welfare. I have spoken out on the Reading crime probe, not only because I want crime syndicates wiped out but also because I saw the other dragon at work—the monopoly dragon—hoping to benefit by a well-worked-out plan to take over the city and county government while the people were watching the crime show and the so-called attack on the crime dragon. I saw the clever maneuvering of the monopoly dragon to smear and weaken its mortal foes.

And now comes that great champion of the free press, the self-appointed authority on morality and clean government, Mr. Herbert Kohler, of the Reading Times. All the time when I was speaking out on the crime problem, the news monopoly, of which he is a leading part, suppressed my statements. They wanted to silence me and now, in saintly fashion, Mr. Kohler demands that I speak out.

How are Eagle or Times readers expected to know what I have said about this probe so far, Mr. Kohler? You are talking about things I said, but my statements were suppressed in the Eagle and Times.

So where am I to speak out, Mr. Kohler? Is it in your paper or is it over this radio station, which you apparently must frequently tune in to get the news that your paper suppresses?

Who do you think you are fooling, Mr. Kohler? Have you no respect for the readers of your newspapers? I assure you that they are much smarter than you think. Don't you think it is about time you gave an apology to your readers? Tell them, if you dare, why my statement on the crime probe was suppressed by the Eagle and chopped to pieces and buried in the Times. Tell your readers that I offered to appear in a panel radio discussion with civic and religious leaders, and with you, too, Mr. Kohler, and

your friend, the great investigator of the Senate staff, Mr. R. P. S. McDonnell.

I received a courteous reply from all but you and McDonnell. The telegram asking Carroll Winters to join in the discussion was returned to me with a note that he was not home.

I have reasons to believe that those who were courteous enough to reply declined to accept because they have discovered by this time the presence of a second dragon, and they apparently are not going to permit themselves to be used for any selfish advantage.

Again, I want to repeat what I said many times—that the representatives of the clergy was one group which I know were sincere in all they have done. To them I say, again, I am ready to fight the gangland syndicates and their corrupting influence. But I insist that we keep our eyes on both dragons.

And now, Mr. Kohler, you ask me to speak up. You ignore my challenge to debate, you suppress my statements, you black out me—of my activities in Congress, you put a gag in my mouth, you try to silence me—then you pierce me with your poison pen, hit me with your monopolistic club, and demand that I speak out.

I said plenty already, Mr. Kohler, but there is so much more to say. I will speak out some more. But are you going to continue to suppress my statements?

How can I speak out on your news outlet? Fortunately for the good citizens of Berks County, you do not have complete control of all the sources of news and information.

Yes, Mr. Kohler, there are a lot of things I would like to say. I would like to talk about Mr. R. P. S. McDonnell, whom I am told was in frequent touch with you during the probe here. I understand that McDonnell is no longer with the Senate staff. I never took the trouble to call to find out whether he quit or was fired. I don't care, but I do know that he should have been fired for his disgraceful and contemptible conduct here and the totalitarian practices he pursued. Perhaps the great investigator had poor advice and was a victim of some politicians who are far more interested in destroying the social gains of the people than they are about combating organized crime.

It might be well if Mr. Kohler speaks out now and repeats his praise for the great investigator. Tell us, Mr. Kohler, what your real objective is. Try to explain to the people the reason for your policy of news suppression.

Tell your readers, if you dare, why they are not permitted to know what their Congressman is doing in Washington. Tell them why my statement on the crime probe was suppressed by the Eagle-Times. I know the people are eager to know.

You like to talk about red herrings, Mr. Kohler, but you are the champion when it comes to dragging them across the trail.

Speak up, Mr. Kohler, let your readers know if you expect them to believe your editorials and have faith in what your crowd is doing.

And if you dare to let me speak, if you dare to let me use the column you used to attack me on your front page, I will speak and I'll say plenty more that has not yet been told. But I don't want you to tell me what I must say. I want to speak without censorship just as you always do, and I expect the same space as you used to attack me.

Will you let me talk, Mr. Kohler, or do you want to continue with your present act? It is a clever show, but a lot of people are getting wise.

That's all, folks, until tonight when I will discuss another matter of importance to the people of Berks County or until Mr. Kohler lets me speak through his columns.

Cost of Foreign Aid**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with permission granted in the House of Representatives, I am including herewith figures prepared by the Legislative Reference Service to show the full impact of our foreign-aid program on the 12 counties and the 5 largest cities of my congressional district. This distribution has been made in accordance with the per capita average for each man, woman, and child throughout the United States and it brings home to the people of my district the tremendous size of the load of debt the people of my district must bear because of our foreign-aid program for the years July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1952:

Total cost of foreign aid apportioned on a Nation-wide per capita basis as applied to the population of counties and cities of 5,000 or more in the Eighth Congressional District of Iowa:

Area (counties and cities)	Population	Share of all foreign aid proposed and provided, July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1952
Buena Vista County.....	12,113	\$8,438,831.46
City of Storm Lake.....	6,930	4,770,740.60
Cherokee County.....	19,052	13,115,777.81
City of Cherokee.....	7,696	5,298,080.32
Clay County.....	18,103	12,462,467.26
City of Spencer.....	7,421	5,108,764.82
Dickinson County.....	12,753	8,581,185.52
Ida County.....	10,697	7,364,028.74
Lyon County.....	11,097	10,117,708.74
O'Brien County.....	18,970	13,059,327.40
Osceola County.....	10,181	7,008,804.02
Plymouth County.....	23,272	16,007,141.81
City of Le Mars.....	5,846	4,024,503.32
Sac County.....	17,518	12,059,741.56
Sioux County.....	26,381	18,161,208.02
Woodbury County.....	103,917	71,538,541.14
City of Sioux City.....	81,035	57,871,371.70

¹ Apportionment is made on the basis of \$194,476,000,000 total foreign aid proposed and provided by the United States, July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1952. The \$688.42 per person is based on the total population of the United States, the number of troops overseas, and the population of 2 incorporated Territories (Hawaii and Alaska).

Source: County population figures were taken from 1950 Census of Population, Advanced Reports Series PC-8, No. 14-A (final). City population figures were taken from 1950 Census of Population, Preliminary Counts Series PC-2, No. 30, Sept. 1, 1950.

Collecting Money Under False Pretenses**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the National Tax Equality Association, a tax-exempt racketeering lobby, has been collecting vast sums of money from businessmen and corporations by falsely stating to its victims that by taxing cooperative more than \$1,000,000,000

in revenue would result to the Treasury. This false statement so typical of the shady technique resorted to by the National Tax Equality Association to raise money stands exposed in the record of the hearings being held before the Senate Finance Committee on H. R. 4473, the revenue bill.

On June 28, 1951, Secretary Snyder appeared and testified before the Senate Finance Committee. Senator TAFT interrogated Secretary Snyder with reference to the amount of revenue involved in the taxation of cooperatives.

Senator TAFT. How many did you estimate, roughly speaking, or how much did you estimate that that would produce?

Secretary SNYDER. About \$25,000,000.

Senator TAFT. That is not this \$1,000,000,000 they have been telling us about?

Secretary SNYDER. It is not a great increase in dollars.

The editorial from the Swift County Monitor, Benson, Swift County, Minn., Friday, April 27, 1951, indicates the reaction of the press to the false and misleading propaganda of the National Tax Equality Association. I am inserting the editorial as a part of my remarks:

THEY, TOO, PAY TAXES

During the past several weeks this newspaper has published a series of advertisements sponsored by the Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc., wherein cooperative and mutual corporations have been depicted as being nontaxpayers.

We accepted these advertisements for publication because we feel that the columns of a newspaper should be open to free expression of ideas and opinions whether we are in agreement with those ideas and opinions, or not. It is a fundamental policy, inherent to the democratic institutions of our country.

In allowing free dissemination of ideas, a newspaper also has the responsibility of correcting misstatements of fact and to challenge ideas and opinions which, in its opinion, are detrimental to the public welfare.

In the series of advertisements mentioned, we have a good example of what we mean in the foregoing statement of policy. We published them, but we do not agree with the idea they convey. They are misleading. They convey ideas concerning the tax status of cooperative and mutual corporations that are not substantiated by the facts.

Specifically, these are some of the errors of fact we find:

1. "You pay more taxes because Congress continues to allow a favored few big businesses—meaning cooperatives—to pay little or nothing."

One of the biggest cooperatives in this area is Midland Cooperative Wholesale. The little or nothing that Midland paid in income, real estate, and personal property taxes for the years 1947 through 1949 was more than \$800,000. In our own community we have cooperatives that are listed year after year among the highest taxpayers.

2. The cooperatives are called big businesses.

It is true that regional cooperatives, made up of scores or even hundreds, of local associations, have impressive accumulations of assets and do a big volume of business. But, in the sense that Americans think of it, they are not big businesses. If all the cooperatives in the country were combined they would not equal, in assets or business volume, the size of any one of a number of giant American corporations. Furthermore, since when is bigness a crime in the American scheme of things?

3. "Congress lets them escape nearly a billion dollars a year in income taxes by granting them special exemptions."

This statement has been flatly contradicted by an investigating committee of the House of Representatives. The fact is that only one-sixth of the cooperatives in America qualify under the law as being exempt from paying income taxes. These are agricultural cooperatives, and the congressional committee found that, in the case of these relative few that are exempt, the aggregate amount of income retained is relatively small. No appreciable amount of revenue would accrue to the Government if income taxes were levied on these amounts. Five-sixths of the cooperatives pay income taxes on exactly the same basis as other corporations.

4. The ads would have the public believe that cooperatives are expanding on tax-free profits.

Cooperatives expand on the savings and investments of their member owners just as other businesses expand on the invested savings of their owners.

Here in Minnesota we have seen the great advantages that have come to our State and to our communities because our farmers have had the good sense to organize cooperatives. Within the last 15 years we have witnessed electrification of rural homes all over America by farmer cooperatives. By bringing a vitally needed service to rural people, they have enhanced the individual income of farmers, and have provided billions of dollars of business for business people in towns and cities.

The result, income-tax-wise, has been, and will continue to be, a broader base for income-tax levies both for the farmer and the businessman who profits by the farmers' purchases of electrical merchandise and services. Other taxes that any other business pays must, of course, also be paid for all real and personal property the electric cooperative owns. Surely, there is no lessening of tax revenues in a deal like that.

The late J. V. Weber, when editor and publisher of the Murray County Herald at Slayton, saw the issue clearly. He wrote in the Herald of January 31, 1946: "Cooperatives have made great contributions to general prosperity. They have made Minnesota one of the great egg, butter, grain, and livestock States, and through their abiding interest in 4-H Club and similar work, they have made farm life more attractive. They have done a great job, they have saved their patrons money, and they have enlarged the vision of most rural people."

In the cooperative-tax controversy instigated by the National Tax Equality Association and Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc., we want to be shown sounder arguments, backed by solid facts, than have been brought forth to date before we will let a campaign in such as they are now engaged, and in which they infer by innuendo and repugnant pictures that our cooperatives are tax dodging, "tax IV-F," unpatriotic organizations, go unchallenged.

Comments on Drew Pearson by John J.**Cornwell****EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be

printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by John J. Cornwell published in the Hampshire Review for June 6, 1951, relating to comments by Drew Pearson regarding Mr. Cornwell.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KNOCK ABOUT NOTES
(By John J. Cornwell)

ROMNEY, W. VA., June 6, 1951.—Two days in succession last week my name appeared in Drew Pearson's syndicated column, The Washington Merry-Go-Round, the last time in a statement that I resigned the position of general counsel of the Baltimore & Ohio because I did not approve of the adjustment plan the company filed in a Federal court in Baltimore in 1945. The Pearson statement is absolutely false in every particular. I did not retire until March 1, 1946, and not because I disapproved of the adjustment plan but because I was long past the age of retirement and wanted to quit. As a matter of fact, retirement was delayed a year because I wanted to see the end of the court proceeding which was necessary to put the plan into effect. This personal statement is made here in order that any of my friends who read the Pearson articles may know the facts, may know the falsity of his statement and, I may add, that statement has as much truth in it as all of his other statements and insinuations regarding the Baltimore & Ohio's negotiations with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Pearson's publicizing of charges made by one Phillips, a New York publicity-seeking, self-styled financial adviser, casts a reflection not only on the members of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, who passed on the case, but on the Supreme Court also. Phillips had his day in court, many days, even many weeks. He got many thousands of dollars of free advertising in the news columns of the metropolitan papers while attacking, before the court, not only the financial soundness of the plan but the motives of those who proposed it. After exhaustive hearings, covering a period of several months, the court found Phillips' charges, now echoed by Pearson, absolutely groundless. They found the plan to be not only in the interest of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad but in the interest of the public and approved it. Twice Phillips and his coconspirators went to the Supreme Court of the United States, which, after investigating the record, refused to review the case, thus giving their approval to the decision of the lower court.

I am in favor of free speech and a free press. I have exercised those rights and defended them throughout a long lifetime, but one of the penalties we have to pay for that privilege is that it permits radio commentators and columnists who have wide audiences, like Drew Pearson, to cast reflections on honest men and to disseminate charges made by irresponsible people against them. Nobody ever questioned my integrity, not even Drew Pearson, for the implication of his stories are that I was one honest official in the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. As far as I know no responsible person ever questioned my word.

I was a director of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad for more than 25 years and its general counsel for nearly 24 years. I have reached the age where if I were in the habit of prevaricating I would hesitate to do it now, for soon I must stand before the bar where not only men's actions but their motives are given final judgment. And this I want to say—that nowhere did I ever find finer and more decent men than those who were responsible for that company's policies.

Reign of Terror in Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement of protest against the Communist reign of terror now said to exist in Lithuania. This statement was prepared by the American-Lithuanian Community, of Stamford, Conn., comprising Americans of Lithuanian descent. It is a most forceful statement and indeed it is one which could well be used by the Voice of America. I plan to send to Mr. Edward Barrett, the Assistant Secretary of State in charge of the VOA, a copy of this statement for possible use by his program directors.

There is little doubt that the charges set forth in the statement are in large measure true. They are the familiar pattern the Soviet Union follows toward nations and peoples they have conquered. There are many Americans of Lithuanian descent in my State of Connecticut. They are among our most industrious and respected citizens. This statement, today entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, enables me publicly to acknowledge their protest against Communist terror tactics, and also enables me to express my sympathies and concern for Lithuania, not only the nation and its people who now suffer oppression under Russia, but those of its exiles who sorrow for their lost homeland.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PLEA TO ALL FREEDOM-LOVING AMERICANS

JUNE 17, 1951.

HON. WILLIAM BENTON,
Washington, D. C.:

At the June 17, 1951, meeting of the American-Lithuanian Community of Stamford, the following letter was drawn up, as a plea to all freedom-loving Americans, in protest against the tortures and barbaric cruelties inflicted on the Lithuanian nation since 1940 by Soviet Russia and its secret police. It was unanimously agreed to make every effort possible to bring this before the attention of all fellow Americans.

Beginning with June 15, 1940, the very same Stalin-Red hordes of annihilators which are at present murdering our finest American manhood deliberately and callously broke five written peace agreements, devoured Lithuania with a satanic gulp, and systematically began to eradicate every Lithuanian.

From June 14, 1941, on Stalin, the hangman of nations, with the help of the precision-like bayonets of the secret and serpent-like NKVD police, began the most cruel and barbaric torture ever seen, that of forceful deportation of vast masses of Lithuanian people, to the icy graves of Siberia and the horror-filled slave-labor camps of Kazakhstan, and the sadistic murders of thousands of political Lithuanian prisoners.

Up to the present time there have been annihilated and forcibly ousted from their na-

tive land about 900,000 Lithuanians, from a population numbering 3,000,000 people.

Infants, children, women, people of all ages, the sick and the dying, were packed and squeezed into freight boxcars, boarded up with planks and spikes, and transported thousands of miles without water or food. Yes; packed and left for death to devour them—all pitifully and broken-heartedly without hope.

What was their crime? This: A belief in God, love for their native land, a thirst for freedom, and a longing to own their own little home with a tiny piece of farming land.

We firmly, vigorously, and beseechingly protest before all cultured and civilized nations of the world this systematic annihilation of our nation, which is being perpetrated by the Kremlin czars of Soviet Russia.

We plead with all the free people of the world, for the sake of their own preservation and well-being, to listen to the dying pleas of innocent victims of Stalin's hangmen, and to gaze with pity at the bloody tears of women and children dying for a freedom which is such a precious gift of God.

Brother Americans, raise your voices with us against this terrible injustice and inhuman treatment of a peace-loving people.

Free Americans, be prepared so that our American girlhood and womanhood, our children and our parents, would not experience the same horrors and satanic cruelties and indignities that the Lithuanian people suffered from the Soviets for the past 10 years.

In our locality, in our midst, we have witnesses, those who have heard as well as seen the plans and conspiracies against the remaining free nations of the world—a perfect plan of torture and human eradication; and first in line being the annihilation of all Americans who hate communism.

In remembrance of this past terrible and terror-filled decade, we feel that it is our solemn duty and obligation to warn you, now, of impending disaster—you Americans who hold freedom dear to your hearts.

SIMON CHULSKAS,
Mrs. A. BARTWECK,

Committee of the Meeting.

Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the dangers of inflation are a matter of real concern to the people of our country, and the factors which might help to bring about or reduce the threat of inflation are not generally recognized and understood.

A series of articles dealing with this involved but most important phase of our economy has been undertaken by Mr. Rodney Crowther, a well-informed authority, and who is a member of the Washington bureau of the Baltimore Sun, and the articles have been appearing daily in the Sun.

I ask unanimous consent that the first of this series of articles be reprinted in

the Appendix of the RECORD as a contribution toward more widespread understanding of the economic factors now operating.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR MONEY: IT'S IN DANGER OF LOSING MORE BUYING POWER, ECONOMISTS WARN—NATION FACES NEW INFLATION THREAT, WITH DOLLAR SUPPLY OUTSTRIPPING THAT OF GOODS

(By Rodney Crowther)

WASHINGTON, July 8.—The economists agree with the people—there is no general shortage of goods in sight.

Generally, the stores are bulging with goods and the warehouses are packed. The supply of things is the biggest in history.

Nevertheless, warn the economists, the Nation does face a very real inflation threat.

While there is a vast supply of goods, there is a vaster supply of dollars.

And the supply of dollars will grow bigger and bigger as the Nation's defense program expands. The supply of goods will dwindle.

MILLIONS HAVE NO EXCESS

Millions of individual citizens, the economists agree, have no excess of dollars—in fact, they do not have dollars enough to provide actual necessities.

While no individual will admit that he has any excess, the whole economy—business, Government, the people altogether—does have a vast supply of dollars.

What is more, this huge pool of surplus dollars will grow, the economists point out, unless steps are taken to drain off the surplus.

Unless the public awakens, unless Congress acts, unless the people and the Government together attack the problem, say the economists, then another colossal inflation may be piled on top of an already very huge inflation.

HAD BIG INFLATION

Just after the war—in 1947 and 1948—the country had a very big inflation as a result of the accumulated excess of dollars piled up during the war.

Last year, after Korea, the country had another big inflation—more than \$15,000,000,000 of price increases.

Between June 1950 and April 1951 the cost of living jumped 8.5 percent.

The cost-of-living index, computed by the Government, rose from 170.2 in June to 184.6 in April.

That huge increase occurred not because there was any shortage of goods—goods output was constantly expanding in almost every line—but because there was an excess of dollars bidding for goods.

FEARED SHORTAGES

Everybody—businessmen, manufacturers, housewives, speculators—was in a hurry to stock up with goods after Korea. They feared future shortages, or anticipated turning big profits.

But, people ask, where did the excess purchasing power come from?

Out of current incomes and accumulated savings and loans, answer the economists.

Private bank credit in a year expanded over \$13,700,000,000.

Wages and salaries rose steadily during the year after Korea. They are still rising.

In the first quarter of 1950 they were running at an annual rate of \$141,000,000,000. But in the first quarter of 1951 they had risen to a rate of \$162,000,000,000 a year. That put billions of additional dollars into the spending stream.

But people also had billions of dollars of liquid savings—bonds, savings deposits at the

banks, building and loan stock and other savings which they could quickly turn into money.

On top of that, millions of people during the post-Korea buying scare bought on the cuff, that is, on credit. Installment buying rose many billions of dollars. Consumer credit rose over \$3,000,000,000.

Businessmen and manufacturers also bought heavily in order to be sure they would have enough raw materials.

This great spending spree, inventory accumulation and speculative buying sent prices kiting. But it made no noticeable dent in the supply of goods because manufacturers expanded production and shoved goods out to dealers.

PRODUCTION NOT CUT

"Civilian production was not cut back in 1950 as a result of the defense programs," declares the Department of Commerce.

"In fact, civilian production available for civilian use increased steadily in each quarter of the year."

The fact is, the squeeze on the supply of civilian goods has not come yet.

It is in the future. And it is to the future that economists point when they warn about inflation.

Here and there some little shortages are creeping in—as, for example, in brass fittings and copper products generally.

"The first effects of the diversion of materials to defense production are now beginning to be apparent in the consumers durable goods industries," the Department of Commerce recently announced.

HAD RECORD VOLUME

Last year the industry turned out a record volume of passenger cars, refrigerators, electric ranges, television receivers, and other household products.

It is only necessary, the economists say, to look at the inventory charts—one of which appears in an adjoining column—to see that there will be few pressing shortages this year.

"Our studies indicate," said Dr. Ralph Robey, economist for the National Association of Manufacturers, "that there will be a generous supply of consumer goods through the current year—a supply approximating 1948, which was a very good year."

"However, this does not indicate that the total purchasing power will not exceed the supply of goods."

"Probably purchasing power will run well ahead of consumer goods as the defense program grows."

SEES SURPLUS

Dr. Donald H. Wallace, Princeton economics professor, and during the war an adviser to OPA, sees an inflationary surplus of dollars ahead for later this year. He said:

"An inflationary surplus of purchasing power over available consumer goods is probable later this year, unless spending is greatly cut below planned levels."

Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization, in a report to the President last Wednesday, made clear why this is going to be so.

Production of goods by actual volume expanded about 9 percent last year and much of that gain was for civilians.

But this year production for the Government will expand, while output for consumers—mainly of durable goods, such as automobiles, refrigerators, washers, and electrical appliances—will decline heavily.

"Our plans," Wilson told the President, who turned the report over to Congress, "call for an increase for national security defense spending from about \$35,000,000,000 a year to \$65,000,000,000 a year from now."

"The additional defense spending will drive up incomes and the desire to spend without adding to the supply of civilian goods."

"This increase in demand, which outruns available civilian goods, is the crux of the inflation problem facing the American people."

Warning to Silver Producers: Silver Users' Lobby Making Another Concerted Drive to Secure Treasury Silver Below World Market Price and Repeal All Silver Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN T. WOOD

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, in a speech delivered in San Francisco on July 12, 1951, before the Mirror Manufacturers' Association, Rear Adm. Donald J. Ramsey, United States Navy, retired, who now directs the lobbying activities of the Silver Users' Association in Washington, D. C., made a pusillanimous attack on Robert Hardy, president of Sunshine Mining Co., of Kellogg, Idaho; on Congressman WALTER S. BARRING, of Nevada; on that grand old man of the mining industry, Francis H. Brownell, former chairman of the board of the American Smelting & Refining Co.; on the Mexican Government; on American silver producers in general, and urged repeal of the Silver Purchase Act.

My executive secretary, John McBride, author of a distinguished book on money and economics titled "Money Makes the Mare Go" and coauthor of the sound-money bill of 1950—H. R. 2573, Eighty-first Congress—has answered Admiral Ramsey in the following statement:

STATEMENT BY JOHN MCBRIDE

The Silver Purchase Act of 1934 authorized and directed the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase silver for monetary purposes until silver comprised one-fourth of our monetary stocks of gold and silver, but as of this date, silver comprises less than one-tenth of our monetary stocks.

Despite the fact that the Secretary of the Treasury has purchased less than half the amount of silver he was directed to buy, the net profit to the Treasury under the Silver Purchase Act is \$1,500,000,000; and would have exceeded that amount but for the fact that the Treasury lend-leased 400,000,000 ounces to foreign governments for monetary purposes. Even on such a small item as the minting of 5,000,000 Booker T. Washington Memorial half dollars, the Treasury is realizing a net profit of \$1,619,000, representing the difference between the purchase price of the silver and the \$1.38 per ounce the Treasury receives in payment for these coins.

But Admiral Ramsey and the Silver Users Association want the Silver Purchase Act repealed.

Why? Because the silver users and fabricators—the manufacturers of silverware and silver jewelry—want to continue to buy silver below the cost of production. For selfish, sordid, commercial reasons, they are willing to risk the destruction of the Ameri-

can metal-mining industry, depreciate the purchasing power of more than half the people in the world, and wipe out the last remaining vestige of a sound monetary system in the United States by repealing all silver legislation.

Now let us analyze just what their proposal means. Silver is the money of that three-fifths of the world's population residing in the Orient and Middle East; also of Mexico and some other countries. The price of silver regulates their purchasing power. When the price of silver is depreciated, their purchasing power is proportionately reduced.

THE DEPRESSION OF 1929

The depression of 1929 was precipitated when the price of silver was deliberately and artificially forced down from 65 cents per ounce to 26 cents per ounce. That wiped out 60 percent of the value of the money of more than half the people in the world. You simply cannot destroy the purchasing power of over half the people in the world without bringing on a world-wide depression—a depression from which we have never recovered, in fact. It was war—and war only—that brought back full employment and full production; and wars and rumor of wars that have kept our economy going. This deplorable situation will continue until we adopt a sound monetary system and stabilize the prices of gold and silver where they correctly reflect the present depreciated value of the dollar. (Based on the present value of the dollar, gold is worth \$56 per ounce). Gold and silver must be joined, at fixed and proper ratio, to insure adequate monetary reserves to guarantee the redemption of paper currency, at face value, on demand because there is not enough gold in the world to do it alone. Currency that is not redeemable is fiat money; and will eventually become worthless unless redeemability is restored.

Admiral Ramsey suggests that a price of 90 cents per ounce for silver is too high. A silver price of 90 cents per ounce today is equivalent to only 33 cents prior to 1934 when the American people were denied the right of redemption of their currency; so in actual value, or purchasing power, silver is worth little more now than the 26 cents price which precipitated the 1929 depression.

A FRIGHTENING SITUATION

It may startle most Americans to know that of the more than \$26,000,000,000 of United States paper currency in circulation, only silver certificates (less than 10 percent) are redeemable in anything but debts. The law requires that for every dollar of silver certificates in circulation, there must be 77 percent of an ounce of silver back of it to insure its redemption, and while that amount of silver is worth only about 70 cents at present prices, it is certainly a lot better than the debts backing the balance of our paper currency now in circulation; and there is a probability that silver will continue to advance in price. The safest hedge against inflation is some silver certificates in your safety deposit box.

Admiral Ramsey's speech is a warning to the American people that the silver users are getting ready to make another drive to drain silver from the United States Treasury. Just 5 years ago, we experienced a similar drive. At that time, the world price of silver had risen to approximately \$1 per ounce; and they made a desperate effort to enact legislation that would permit them to buy Treasury silver at 71.11 cents per ounce by extending the Green Act. It was currently reported that they had a fund of \$3,000,000 to achieve this objective.

THE OLD PRAIRIE-FIRE TECHNIQUE

Unable to get such legislation through the proper channel—the Senate Banking and Currency Committee—they attempted to accomplish it through the unorthodox method of tacking this legislation on to the Treasury appropriation bill in the Senate. To stampede the Congress into accepting such legislation, they caused quarter-page ads to be placed in many large newspapers in key States absolutely misrepresenting the facts and appealing to the prejudices of the people, denouncing silver producers as seekers for subsidies and even telling servicemen that the mining industry was trying to force the price of silver up so they would be unable to buy silver pieces to add to the silverware they had received as wedding presents, and similar rot. They were very careful not to sign these ads, but ran them in the name of some reputable local jeweler, and each ad carried the names and addresses of Senators and Congressmen, and readers were asked to write, urging extension of the so-called Green Act. As a result, a deluge of letters reached Senators and Representatives in Washington. This is known as the old prairie-fire method of whipping Congress into line through letters from their constituents. Many of these letters were referred by Members of Congress, who received them, to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, and the chairman of that committee inserted a letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 15, 1946, exposing the whole racket.

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE HIFARING

In hearings before the Senate Appropriations Committee it was conclusively proven that the retail price of silverware and silver jewelry ranged all the way from 4 times the value of the silver content of the article to 40 times the value of its silver content, and, therefore, the price of silver had little or nothing to do with the price at which silverware and silver jewelry is sold to the public. As a matter of fact, the silver users would be benefited, rather than hurt, by stabilizing the price of silver at its real value, because it would give more character and stability to their products.

Aside from silverware and silver jewelry, which are luxury or semiluxury products, the industrial uses of silver are largely limited to commodities in which the amount of silver used is relatively small in comparison with the price or value of the commodities, such as mirrors, moving-picture films, electric refrigerators, and automobiles. For example, about 3 cents' worth of silver is used as wiring in small thermostatic controls for electric refrigerators and automobile heaters. Surely no one will contend that it will have any appreciable effect on the price of a \$200 refrigerator or a \$2,000 automobile whether that silver costs 3 cents or 10 cents.

THE PRICE OF SILVER NOT THE ISSUE

But, fundamentally, the price of silver or gold is not an issue. The real issue is a sound monetary system; and that is the only honest approach to the subject. Since the American people were denied the right of redemption of their currency in 1934, the dollar and all fixed-dollar-value securities, including savings, pensions, and life insurance, have lost 63 percent of their value. Prices are high because dollars are cheap; and prices, costs, and taxes will continue to rise so long as the dollar depreciates in value. Surely no one will admit that is a healthy situation; and it is the more tragic because it could be corrected in 90 days without cost to the American taxpayers and without economic disturbances of any kind, merely by making operative legislation that has been on our statute books for 57 years: Section

311, United States Code Annotated (ch. 8, 26 Stat. 4).

SILVER IS THE MAGIC METAL

Silver is the magic metal that can solve most of the world's social and economic problems if we have the brains to use it intelligently. Today, we are importing 25 percent of our copper and 30 percent of our lead and zinc; and paying exorbitant prices for them, despite the fact that these metals can be produced right here at home at a much lower cost.

Ninety percent of all silver produced in the United States is a byproduct of our lead, copper, and zinc mines, and the price of silver is a controlling factor in whether these mines can operate or not. Every year thousands of tons of ore containing lead, copper, and zinc are left in the mines or tossed on to the dumps to be lost forever, because they cannot be profitably mined, milled, and smelted. Most of these ores carry three or more ounces of silver to the ton; and if silver were remonetized and priced at its real value, this great waste could be saved. In addition, there are millions of tons of lead, copper, and zinc ores—actually mountains of ore—which could be profitably mined if silver carried its fair share of the cost of production. This would bring about the employment of thousands of men at good wages and usher in an era of the greatest prosperity America has ever known.

GREATEST CONSERVATION MEASURE EVER ENACTED

Moreover, the remonetization of silver would be the greatest conservation measure ever enacted by the Congress because it would make possible the profitable mining of millions of tons of marginal ores and reduce the cost of production of the all essential metals—lead, copper, and zinc, besides supplying us with many strategic metals for which we are now dependent from foreign countries. It would also increase the wealth of our closest neighbors, Canada and Mexico, both large producers of silver. Just what is wrong about increasing the wealth of Canada and Mexico so they can absorb more of our surplus production? And what is wrong with giving the world a sound monetary system so that so-called backward nations can set up a sound economy of their own? To vote \$8,500,000,000 to help backward nations while we are a party to the continuance of a monetary system that keeps millions in poverty is an unpardonable waste of the American taxpayers' money.

BIMETALLISM MOST PERFECT MONETARY SYSTEM WORLD HAS EVER KNOWN

For more than 2,000 years gold and silver, based on a ratio reflecting the relative production of these two precious metals, were the monetary units and measurements of value throughout the civilized world. When our young Republic set up our monetary system in 1792 we adopted the Spanish milled dollar then current throughout the world as our monetary measure of value. This was the famous "pieces of eight," so called because it was often cut into eight parts called bits to provide smaller coins. We even carried out this idea by minting quarters and half-dollars which appropriately were called two bits and four bits, but we added something entirely original by adopting the decimal system of 10 dimes in a dollar. This dollar contained 371.25 grains of pure silver with a hardening alloy of 10 percent added, so that the dollar weighs 412½ grains. That has never been altered to this day. At that time the ratio between gold and silver, based on their relative production, was 15 grains of silver to 1 grain of gold, so the amount of gold constituting the dollar was one-fifteenth of 371.25 grains or 24.75 grains of

pure gold. In 1836 the ratio between gold and silver was changed to approximately 16 to 1, and the gold content of the dollar reduced to 23.22 grains. Since there are 480 grains in an ounce, simple arithmetic shows that this pegged the price of gold at \$20.67 per ounce and the price of silver at \$1.29 per ounce.

It was with this kind of money we carried our commerce to the seven seas, expanded the original Thirteen Colonies into our present great Nation extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico, adding the Louisiana Purchase, the Oregon Territory, California, Texas, and Alaska; fought a disastrous Civil War; settled our great West; expanded agriculture; developed many of our mines and other natural resources; built most of our railroads; and started the industrial development that has made us the envy of the entire world. Yes, we did pretty well with that kind of money.

ABSOLUTISTS CONSPIRE TO DESTROY US

But the absolutists of the world, then as now, were envious of our progress because our system of government is a threat to all forms of absolutism, whether it masquerades under the name of monarchy, fascism, communism, internationalism, or the welfare state, and sought ways to destroy us then as now.

By 1873, most of the world's gold was concentrated in the banks of England, Holland, and Germany, while silver was scattered among the peoples of the world, so these three countries entered into a conspiracy with the international bankers to bring about the demonetization of silver in what will ever be known as The Crime of 1873. Their objective, of course, was to exploit and pillage the silver-money countries of the Orient and Middle East and the silver-producing countries of North and South America by being able to manipulate the price of silver; and while they temporarily succeeded in their objective, they have created a Frankenstein monster that threatens to destroy them along with the rest of the world.

As a consequence, of the demonetization of silver in 1873, we were dragged through the disastrous panics and depressions of 1873 to 1877; from 1893 to 1896; 1929 to 1938; and through World Wars I and II.

Until we adopt a sound monetary system and restore redeemability to our currency, all the present frenzied efforts to achieve world peace, economic stability, and national security, are just so much sound and fury signifying nothing.

First things must come first; and the first and most important function of government is to maintain and protect the solvency and integrity of the people's money.

Sir Henri Deterding, brilliant financier, economist, and head of Royal Dutch Shell Oil Co. made the statement in 1933 that if silver were remonetized and joined with gold, the purchasing power of the Orient and Middle East would be restored; and the depression ended in a matter of months. But we ignored his advice; and what a mess we got into.

A debauched, manipulated, irredeemable paper currency such as is now current throughout the world is more dangerous and deadly than the atomic bomb, more fruitful of human misery than war, pestilence, and famine; and has brought more injustice than all the bad laws ever enacted. It also supplies the tools with which subversives work and the vehicles on which they are riding to power.

Those who oppose or would delay the adoption of a sound monetary system are playing right into the hands of the Communists and their internationalist racketeering allies who are selling America down the river; and those who are indifferent to this matter and fail to do something about it,

should stop complaining about high prices, high taxes, and the fact that their sons are being drafted to fight more foreign wars, for they have no one to blame but themselves.

Honest money will do more to prevent war, establish justice, insure economic stability, and promote peace and harmony among nations than all the United Nations, Bretton Woods monetary agreements, Marshall plans, Atlantic pacts, and point 4 programs ever devised.

Marshall, Man of Mystery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 13, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials entitled "Marshall, Man of Mystery," published in the Bristol (Pa.) Courier, part 1 on July 5, 1951, part 2 on July 6, 1951, and part 3 on July 7, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of July 5, 1951]

MARSHALL, MAN OF MYSTERY—I

If you will go over the evidence, we believe you will come to agree with us that sometime around the summer of 1938, which is the period when General Marshall was summoned to Washington and put in line for United States Chief of Staff, there were revolutionary changes in the political strategy of the Roosevelt administration.

Prior to that, the tactics had been commonplace. It took no genius to elect the late New Deal President on a bring-back beer platform back in 1932. He went in on the rebound from prohibition and depression. Thereafter for 6 years he followed a pattern of the mingled concepts of starry-eyed idealists and greedy political machine bosses—the sort of pattern you would expect from a committee of advisers in which Harold Ickes and the late Harry Hopkins were key figures.

This strategy reelected President Roosevelt in 1936, but by 1938 it had proved itself a failure. Such political maneuvers as vote-buying with the WPA, the court-packing project, and the reorganization scheme, had backfired badly. More important, though harder to perceive at the time, was the fact that the whole economic approach of the New Deal, which in 1937 appeared to be vindicating itself ("we planned it that way"), by 1938 had demonstrated its incapacity to put the country back on its feet.

Just what part General Marshall played in the evolution of a new and wholly different political approach, in the days when, from the New Deal point of view, the bottom was going out of their hopes (Pennsylvania, for example, was in the process of tossing the Little New Deal out of Harrisburg), is not something which can be inventoried down to the last item.

As subsequently was testified over and over again in the course of the Pearl Harbor hearings, the inner conferences between President Roosevelt and his closest advisers were sacredly guarded secrets. The talkative first brain-trust which came in with the New

Deal had been replaced by men who could and did hold their tongues.

Nevertheless, in a great many of the daring and brilliant pieces of political strategy which have held the New Deal Presidents in command at Washington since those days, even when it has been demonstrated over and again that there is no real majority sentiment supporting them in this Nation—in one after another of those bold and imaginative measures and acts, Marshall's part has been freely acknowledged.

To name some examples, the so-called Marshall plan was one of a series of projects by which General Marshall personally rescued the Truman administration, put it back on its feet in the year 1947 (after the 1946 Republican landslides had captured both Houses of Congress) and enabled it to squeak through to reelection in 1948.

Again, back in 1944, when the Army Board report on Pearl Harbor pilloried the Roosevelt administration (including Marshall himself) for incapacity and lack of vigilance in connection with the defense of Pearl Harbor, most of the Roosevelt spellbinders shivered visibly in their boots waiting for the blasts from Republican nominee Dewey, who was known to have this document in his possession and to be preparing to use it.

But General Marshall was the man who went personally to Dewey, and, depending upon your point of view, either intimidated him or appealed to his patriotism—talked him out of making any reference to this devastating official report.

Going back to 1938, by the latter half of that year it was beginning to become obvious that the New Deal had failed to find a peacetime solution to the depression, and that the one desperate answer remaining was to gear our economy into the world war then developing.

Only those who were politically active in that period, or who had ringside seats, can fully appreciate what an undertaking it was to deliberately set out to swing this country, at that time completely unsympathetic to the militaristic trends abroad, and largely convinced that our entry in the First World War was a colossal and costly mistake, over into a program of war preparation headed directly toward entry into any major conflict which might eventuate.

Innumerable references have been made by New Deal writers to this gigantic feat, in such terms as to indicate the Roosevelt administration undertook the program in cold and deliberate awareness of where it would eventually lead. Indeed, some have been so bold as to hail the accomplishment as a major demonstration of great statesmanship, and to profess themselves unable to comprehend the resentment of those who have asserted that the program was a complete denial of the first principles of self-government.

[From the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of July 6, 1951]

MARSHALL, MAN OF MYSTERY—II

Early in the year 1940, Republican hopes were probably higher than at any other time in the last two decades. The late Glenn Frank had written a complete textbook on how to win the coming campaign. The third-term issue looked like a sure-fire bet, and the Democrats had wound up in a position where, as the Republicans then viewed it, they had nothing in sight save the suicidal course of renominating Roosevelt for his impossible third-term bid.

But only a month or so before the Republican convention, the Republican Party was blitzed by a series of steps revolving around a project which General Marshall had prepared. That was his rearmament program, drawn up by him as Chief of Staff—which position, moreover, it has never been disputed he owned to the personal choice of President Roosevelt.

Obviously, no one can tell us today just what went on in the political conferences which preceded and led up to the bombshell defense address of President Roosevelt. Most of the principals in those discussions now are dead, almost certainly no authentic records were kept, and the testimony of any one participant probably would be challenged by others. None of the survivors, unfortunately, is in a position where his veracity might not be questioned.

Therefore one can only guess whether Marshall's brain (which, after all, is not too distantly related to that of Chief Justice John Marshall, who so profoundly affected the course of the United States Government with his own thought processes a century and a half ago) first visualized the political impact of the defense program being suddenly laid before the American people, coupled with a bid to several outstanding and susceptible Republican leaders to join the Roosevelt Cabinet.

This much is beyond question: Never in the whole previous course of the Roosevelt regime had anything so electrifying, so bold, and, if we are to put the cards on the table, so sinister, cold-blooded and calculating, been tossed into the political arena, as this Bismarck-like proposal that we ungar our Nation from the ways of peace, and step forth into the international arena where one country after another was gliding for inevitable war.

No individual has ever claimed authorship of that project. Granting that it cannot be proven this plan was entirely the brainchild of General Marshall, we will respectfully submit this proposition. That we have noted no other brain except Marshall's at work in either the Roosevelt or Truman administrations which we consider to have the capacity to have worked out that scheme—the same fertile and uninhibited brain which saw almost at a glance the plausibility of the billions of foreign spending under the Marshall plan, and simultaneously, their irresistible political and economic impact at home, giving President Truman his one faint chance for reelection in 1948.

As poets have noted, great brains have not always been put to great purposes, and in our admiration for the capacity of an intellect which can think in such mighty and unfettered terms, we must not lose sight of the fact that the ultimate purposes of whatever General Marshall had had to do in politics seem to us to fall into two small and narrow channels—first, to keep in office those Presidents who had singled him out for their confidence and distinctions; and second, ever since 1941, to keep buried in the background what must be, from the point of view of George Catlett Marshall, the almost unbearable humiliation of realizing that his own part in the Pearl Harbor disaster was censurable and deficient.

Not for all the wealth of Croesus, we imagine, would any proud and able man voluntarily take upon his conscience such an onus of inadequacy, even of failure; and permit himself to be driven to such a point that he had to take refuge in most implausible loss of memory.

Marshall was deep in the conniving which went on as a preliminary to the Pearl Harbor episode. Not only was he author of the rearmament program of 1940 (regardless of whether he blueprinted the political phases of this program), but he also was close in the confidence of President Roosevelt during the ABCD period—the year or more before Pearl Harbor during which, as the testimony amply proves, representatives of America, Britain, China, and the Dutch Republic played checkers with Japan in the Pacific Ocean, trying to force Japan into attacking the United States, and thereby bringing us into the war without the administration having the onus of taking us in.

The "greater good" complex is one which mankind has used to justify the most devious courses of conduct, but even it wears threadbare at times, and we should imagine that part of the unassailable personality of this great behind-the-scenes factor, General Marshall—part of the strange and compelling urge which makes his character such a strange mixture of brilliance and failure—lies in his awareness of the constant threat of titanic collapse of his projects.

Just as the ABCD manipulations produced their desired result, that of Japanese attack, but on a scale and in an unforeseen direction which immobilized our Pacific defenses for months, and protracted the war possibly for years, so the Marshall plan, for example, may eventually turn out to have saddled the American people with unredeemable debts beyond their capacity to carry, the Atlantic pact may boomerang into disaster, and the placid sell-out of the Chinese people to the Reds, over which transaction General Marshall has been presiding for several years, may wind up confronting us with a hostile world of dimensions far beyond our capacity to conquer.

[From the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of July 7, 1951]

MARSHALL, MAN OF MYSTERY—III

The career of General Marshall has many oddities. For example, we know of no convincing explanation ever being given for one of the great puzzles of his life—why it was that he permitted General Eisenhower, at virtually the last minute, to step almost unprepared into supreme command of the invasion, with all its opportunities for acclaim and world prominence—when all indications are that he coveted, and had fully expected for months, to accept the personal direction of that expedition.

There is an interesting point for speculation. If, as seems most plausible, President Roosevelt personally insisted that Marshall remain in Washington, what motive could the President have other than wanting to continue to lean on a trusted and ingenious adviser. That line of reasoning would much strengthen the conjectures made in this article that Marshall eventually came to be the number one confidante and brain-truster both of Roosevelt and Truman. Certainly it is interesting to note that just at the time when Marshall was unable to leave Roosevelt's side, Harry Hopkins, usually considered the principal "brain-truster," was bouncing cheerfully about all over the world—Russia, England, etc., etc.

Quite different is attempting to fathom the motives which led the general to permit his wife to publish an intimate biography of his life during the political crisis of 1946, when his own reputation as a result of the Pearl Harbor matter was in its most shaky stages, and when the Truman administration was dropping to what possibly was the lowest point ever reached by that up-and-down regime.

Offhand, we can think of no other world-prominent figure who was biographed by his wife while he was still alive and still active. The question of taste cannot be avoided. Very few of the world's great men would have cared to face that question, under similar circumstances. Why did Marshall do so? Was there some compelling motive for the book's publication which made it necessary to get an explanation or defense across at that particular moment—perhaps the singularly lame explanation which Mrs. Marshall made for the general's inattentiveness to the American interests on the occasion of Pearl Harbor (she had broken four ribs several weeks earlier, and says he was preoccupied with her condition)?

But dropping questions of taste, and reverting to political considerations, the concept of answering certain embarrassing

questions, and getting certain laudatory propaganda across in a semi-official manner without himself revealing his interest, is a concept entirely in keeping with the mental capacity of the man who dreamed up the multibillion Marshall plan and who "balled out" President Truman after the 1946 Democratic Party disasters.

Mrs. Katherine Tupper Marshall's book, Together, bears no reference to professional assistance in its preparation, yet it is beyond credibility to think that none was given. General Marshall surely would not have trusted his own judgment, nor that of his wife (no matter how able), with a critical national election only months away. It would not have been fair to his "Chief," Mr. Truman, for him to have done so. And the internal evidence is that the book is professional from cover to cover.

A completely modest man would never have permitted the innumerable laudatory passages, no matter how ingeniously phrased, to be printed in such a fashion; and the world is full of outstanding men who would have refused point-blank to allow their wives to write about their lives and careers. Why Marshall chose to do so is one of the major enigmas about him.

Regardless of the date on which General Marshall became a key political figure in the New Deal, there certainly is no question that eventually he did achieve that important, though largely secret, responsibility.

Twice President Truman has drawn him out of semiretirement to rescue the flagging fortunes of the Trumanites. One was the occasion referred to earlier, after the 1946 Republican landslide, when Marshall broke precedence by becoming the first professional soldier to undertake the functions of Secretary of State during times of peace.

Once the Democratic regime was safely past the crossroads of the 1948 Presidential election, General Marshall stepped down again (he then was 78 and, according to his own account, had been eager for years to retire). But the profound reaction against President Truman and Secretary of State Acheson during 1950 resulted in another hurry call for General Marshall. Once again he is in there pitching, and once again President Truman has been lifted out of the hole he seems always hurriedly to dig for himself whenever General Marshall turns his back.

What is cooking on the back of the stove for the up-hill task of keeping the New Dealers in power in Washington next year remains to be seen. Likewise it remains for the future to determine how many of these future lines of defense and strategy will prove eventually to be the handiwork of General Marshall.

One thing is exceedingly clear, no matter who planned what, in the turbulent events of the past 6 months, with surprise following surprise, and the shocks still continuing, not a single key event, not a single vital decision, took place without General Marshall being right at the President's elbow.

In our opinion, for whatever it may be worth, the most outstanding and sensational accomplishments of General Marshall are not to be sought for in the field of military accomplishment, nor of diplomatic achievement either, but in the field of politics.

For years we have believed, and think so more than ever today, that he has been the New Deal Talleyrand, has been the power behind the throne of two successive New Deal Presidents for at least 12 years.

It has taken something akin to magic to keep these two administrations in power. We believe the magic came from the brains of General Marshall.

But we believe that the cost has been frightfully, incredibly great to the American people.

We believe that the financial results of the Marshall plan and the other vast spending schemes in which General Marshall has had a finger have so undermined our national economy that continued inflation is a foregone conclusion, and that we never will be able to return to a condition of gold-standard solidarity and confidence which we once possessed.

We believe that the trick of dragging this Nation into the recent World War through the back door, contrary to wishes of the people, was a destructive force brought to bear upon the will and capacity of our citizens to govern themselves, which may in the long run destroy our Republic and leave us no choice but that of a military dictatorship along welfare-state lines.

We believe that the successive cold-blooded manipulations of world affairs has destroyed any possibility of a successful United Nations, has needlessly and unscrupulously betrayed the faith of almost unaccountable countries which relied upon our good will and our promises—betrayals that date as far back as our failure to stand up boldly on behalf of Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, and Ethiopia even before the World War began, that reached then crescendo at Yalta where Marshall was the closest of Presidential advisers, and still continue with the efforts of our State Department to throw Formosa over to the Chinese Communists.

The seeds of a third world war, in which our survival is no more than a gamble, have been sowed recklessly during the political maneuvers of reelecting New Dealers, along lines, we believe, charted by General Marshall!

Challenging the Right to Interfere With Free Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 2, 1951, there appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune an editorial entitled "A Citizen's Right."

I believe this editorial is particularly effective in that it emphasizes the importance and the sacredness of free speech. The editorial laws stress on the fact that freedom of expression is a precious heritage handed down to us by our forefathers.

Americans today should never lose sight of the fact that our forebears guarded free speech most zealously, and were ready to protect and defend it with their lives. Free speech has always been a boon to liberty-loving people, and on the other hand, a thorn in the side of despots and demagogues. It is wholesome and encouraging to note that Americans today still look upon free speech as a forthright blessing.

The editorial makes it clear that American citizens resent any move or effort made to impinge on the right of free speech. The editorial stresses that any gesture in that direction will immediately meet with a definite challenge. I most highly commend the editor of the Chicago Daily Tribune for taking this

position. Any position that is indicative of back-tracking or surrender relative to the preservation of free speech at this or any other time is an abdication of an important facet of our sacred Bill of Rights. A definite challenge such as this editorial portrays is the only means whereby we can preserve a trust that has been made sacred by our Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the Chicago Daily Tribune editorial entitled "A Citizen's Right." The editorial follows:

A CITIZEN'S RIGHT

The New Deal insistence that all men in uniform think and say only what the administration finds it convenient for them to think and say has produced two more incidents. Unlike MacArthur, the other officers are not professional military men, but citizens in uniform, and their cases raise a basic issue relating to freedom of speech.

Lt. (jg) W. A. Evans, serving aboard a naval ship in the Korean war zone, has been stripped of his commission and relieved of duty for writing a letter critical of the "pro-Soviet" State Department, the "pro-Soviet one-world administration of ours," the United Nations, and Roosevelt's surrenders at Yalta, abetted by Alger Hiss. He said that one hand of the Americans fighting in Korea was tied by Acheson and the other by U. N.

Lieutenant Evans sent his letter to Alfred Kohlberg, chairman of the American China Policy Association, and authorized him to print it. He said he shared Kohlberg's views on the activities of the administration since Yalta and that all officers on his ship "feel the same way I do." The Navy contends that Evans' shipmates disagree with him. This is to be doubted. As Annapolis regulars, they may feel it prudent not to go on public record, whereas Evans, as a civilian reservist, could afford to do so, for he was not obliged to protect his Navy status as permanent career men are.

A second instance of attempted suppression of expression involving a civilian officer was recently brought to light by Brig. Gen. Julius Klein, commanding officer of the One Hundred and Ninth Antiaircraft Artillery of the Illinois National Guard. General Klein was criticized by Maj. Gen. Harry L. Bolen, Governor Stevenson's State guard commander, for statements supporting General MacArthur and for protesting when the honor of firing a gun salute in MacArthur's honor during the general's Chicago visit was taken away from the One Hundred and Ninth Brigade. General Bolen suggested that General Klein either remain silent or resign from the guard.

It should not be debatable that a civilian officer, in a period not governed by any official declaration of a state of war, retains the rights of citizenship accorded him by the Bill of Rights, among them, of course, that of liberty to express himself. Lieutenant Evans and General Klein are not, as the New Dealers try to represent, reduced to stooges of Mr. Truman and his cause simply because they are patriotic enough to volunteer their services to their country.

The attempts of Truman's agents in the National and State Governments to silence officers who have the courage and independence to voice sentiments held by the majority of their countrymen show that the New Dealers are in a panic. Fortunately, most Americans have no intention of yielding their right to hold and voice opinions in opposition to the administration's course, and they will certainly speak most loudly from now on through the ballot box.

Inflation's Ally: The Politician

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT M. COLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, add politics to an already bad situation, and it always gets worse. Add politics to inflation and we will have more inflation. Like war, inflation is the sort of crisis that politicians thrive on. In this third and final article on controlling inflation, I want to show how political price and wage freezes form a glacier behind which inflationary dollars pile up, only to come thundering upon us when the glacier crumbles.

In my first article, Ed, the baker, and Joe, the defense worker, illustrated how this torrent of dollars originates in, first, deficit spending; second, runaway bank credit; and third, shortages of materials. In short, inflation is caused by adding money to the economy without adding equal amounts of goods. The Government paid Joe out of borrowed money. Ed borrowed money from a bank to buy machinery. Borrowed money is created without production of goods. So the new money only serves to bid up prices of the available goods. That is why prices rise when inflation turns out new money.

Now then, suppose Ed and Joe have used their extra money to bid up the price of meat. They do not know exactly why the price of meat has gone up, but they do not like it. So the politician rides up on a white horse and freezes the price of meat. Ed and Joe then pay ceiling prices for meat, and proceed to use their extra money to bid up something else. The politician has to freeze the price of the something else. Eventually the Government has everything frozen. Joe and Ed still have extra money. Remember that price and wage controls do not stop Joe from getting paid at the defense plant, and do not stop Ed from borrowing at his bank. What are they to do with their extra money?

If they use the money to buy things they would not buy otherwise, demand for goods goes up and shortages develop. Suppose they just buy more and more beef at the ceiling prices. They could afford steaks twice a day. But we do not have that much beef available. So the politician rides up on his horse and starts rationing beef. Ed and Joe are glad to have the supply distributed equally, but that leaves them extra money again. So they buy something else, and in no time everything has to be rationed. When controlling starts, it has to go all the way, or someone gets caught in the pinch.

Suppose Ed and Joe put their extra money into savings. Then the Government can never remove price ceilings. If it did, all those piled-up dollars would pour out onto the market and prices would be flooded out. Compare prices now with prices in 1941, remembering that we operated under price controls

during the Second World War. You can see that controls did not stop inflation; they only postponed it, to descend upon us in greater price increases.

The reason is simple enough. The money was backed up behind the price-freeze glacier. Money just does not evaporate. If we use price and wage controls in our long-range mobilization, we will pile up such a flood of inflationary dollars that we will never be able to return to a free economy.

Unfortunately, the voter is not much impressed when the politician rides up to the Federal Reserve Bank and restricts bank credit. In fact, the voter probably would not connect it with inflation control at all. So the politician rides up to the meet counter instead. It comes down to this:

The American people want inflation stopped. Price controls do not stop inflation, but they can be made to look like something effective. Indirect monetary controls can stop inflation, but unless they are carefully explained to the voting public, they do not appear to accomplish anything. The administration chooses to saddle the economy with price and wage controls, forever if necessary, in order to impress the voters with vigorous action.

I outlined in my second article the indirect controls that will stop inflation—not just hide it. They are: First, economy in Government spending; second, pay-as-we-go taxation on a sensible budget; third, control of bank credit through the Federal Reserve System and Treasury Department; and, fourth, high production encouraged by freedom in our economy.

These controls go to the roots of inflation. They are the ones we must have. We will have them if the American people understand them. We can kill inflation, but we need you Americans behind us.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to further extend my remarks on price control placed in the RECORD yesterday.

The people of the United States are tremendously concerned with the specter of inflation. Perhaps we do not always refer to inflation by name. We may speak of high prices, or the high cost of living, or the way the dollar is going down in purchasing power. But however we may refer to it I think most of us know what inflation is. I am sure all of us realize what inflation can do.

Inflation eventually would make our money worthless. Inflation can wipe out our savings, lower our standard of living, impose hardship upon all of us with fixed incomes. We know that in other countries where it has reached

runaway proportions it has wrecked the entire economy.

This question of inflation is not one of mere academic interest. It involves the bread the people eat, the clothes they wear, the houses they live in.

Inasmuch as it is of such importance and inasmuch as we all recognize the dangers of inflation, the only way I can account for the apparent failure of many of our people to come to grips with it is that they do not believe it can happen here.

They have been lulled into a false sense of security by a few soft spots in various markets, and some surplus inventories in specific fields. They watch negotiations for peace in Korea and think we as a nation can go back to business as usual.

We cannot go back to business as usual. I think it is generally agreed that the shadow of a ruthless aggressor is too black and threatening for us to even dream of slackening our rearmament program. And so long as we are irrevocably committed in this rearmament program, we are in peril, in grave peril, of inflation.

The New York Times explained why this was so when it said:

The Government pours new billions into the economy to buy guns, tanks, planes, and other tools of war. The billions, as profits and wages, expand civilian purchasing power. But at the same time, arms production is cutting into the supply of civilian goods. When civilian demand exceeds supply, prices are bid up. When prices rise, the workers demand higher wages, resulting in higher production costs, and still higher prices. The Government has to pay more for its armaments. After a few turns in this cycle the situation rapidly gets out of hand, and the economy is in grave danger.

Unless we take vigorous measures, we face that danger today and tomorrow. We cannot afford to let the situation get out of hand.

We have already experienced some of the effects of inflation. What happened in the 8 months after we went to the rescue of South Korea? According to the consumers' price index of the Department of Labor, prices went up 1 percent a month for the housewife. Individually, of course, many of them went up far more. Look at wool rugs. They went up 33 percent. Hamburger, that staple of food for many people, went up 20 percent; salmon went up 45 percent; lard, almost 50 percent; men's overalls rose almost 23 percent; men's wool suits 11 percent; table model radios, 14 percent.

We all have seen inflation at work in the stores we visit and on the price tags of the things we buy.

By moving promptly and effectively we stopped the trend. Within a month after prices were frozen in January, results could be seen.

The Office of Price Stabilization through its general ceiling price regulation and its subsequent orders has helped curb inflation's destructive force. Whereas retail prices rose 8 percent from June 1950 until February 1951 when price control began to take effect, they rose only nine-tenths of 1 percent from February 15 to May 15. Wholesale prices, which rose 15 percent between Korea and

the general freeze, dropped four-tenths of 1 percent from February to June 19.

Such a condition today, however, must not blind our eyes to the fact that many of the causes of inflation in a defense economy are just now beginning to be felt. During the coming months, they will grow even stronger.

In place of the present expenditure at the rate of \$35,000,000,000 a year for national security, we expect to be spending at a rate of about \$65,000,000,000, a year from now. With that increased expenditure will come some curtailment of civilian goods.

It is impossible to measure accurately just what the gap will be between civilian goods and the available funds to spend on them. According to the Director of Defense Mobilization, it may well be between \$10,000,000,000 and \$20,000,000,000 a year. This huge sum will be pushing relentlessly upon prices. Only strong and effective measures will hold that force.

That price control must be strong, because it must curb a strong force. It should permit roll-backs where roll-backs are necessary, to even out distortions. We must aim at stabilizing the economy now—not at the level we may reach 6 months or a year from now. We must remember that every 1 percent rise in the cost of living takes \$2,000,000,000 out of the pocket of consumers and makes our defense program much more costly.

We must face up to the fact that the classic conditions for inflation will be at hand in the months to come. We must be prepared to stop it.

Hand-Out to Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Local Farmer Gets a Hand-Out," published in the Janesville (Wis.) Gazette of July 7, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOCAL FARMER GETS A HAND-OUT

When a local farmer receives a windfall check from Uncle Sam and doesn't want it, a few taxpayers might start a private investigation. They might find out how many thousands of dollars the local office of the United States Production and Marketing Administration is passing out to farmers for working their own land for their own profit.

Of course there is no Santa Claus in this wasteful squandering. The money comes directly from the pay checks of the taxpayers; but political henchmen are using their hard-earned dollars for political profit to themselves.

A year ago, this farmer was told to cut down his corn acreage, although he had 300 hogs to feed. This year, the agricultural planners told him to extend his crop production, which he has been planning to do for some time.

Last year he spent \$1,100 clearing several acres for crop production which he figured would bring him a good profit. He did so on his own volition as an investment in his own property, to improve his farm and assure a better future.

Now comes a check from the Janesville office of the Production and Marketing Administration for over \$200 to compensate him for clearing land for pasture, for lime and weed control. The farmer did not ask for the payment. He does not figure that he earned it. He does not want it. He spent his own money to clear his land for his own profit. He does not think that the taxpayers of Rock County should be taxed to give him a hand-out for work he was already planning to do.

How many other farmers in Rock County and Walworth County and Jefferson County and Green County, among the richest in the Nation, are receiving such payments from the Production and Marketing Administration, the agricultural conservation program, etc.? What excuse is there for Washington politicians to continue this PMA program, which makes Uncle Sam look like a sap?

Taxpayers are complaining about the deductions from their weekly pay checks. They face much higher taxes, which they know will be squandered, in part at least, by the Production and Marketing Administration, by the Wisconsin State Employment Service, by the Rock County free-lunch school program, and by a hundred other unnecessary services which can be cut—and now.

No one in Government, especially no one in Washington, is going to save the taxpayer a nickel. Next week and the week after and the week after that, part of every pay check will be deducted to pay for an octopus of Government that ought to be hacked and trimmed of the fat, which Members of Congress admit they cannot locate in the bills before them.

The State of Wisconsin is squandering taxpayers' money in an FM radio network that can be heard by fewer than 20 percent of the potential radio-set listeners.

With all this waste, President Truman challenges any American to find a way to save the taxpayers some money. He has done his best, he says.

When will taxpayers rise in wrath? When will they decide to stop working 2 days a week for Washington?

President Truman, et al., declare that we must have controls to stop inflation, but they refuse to cut the inflated dollars out of their own squandering. They are producing inflation, and the taxpayers are paying for it.

It's time for action.

Federal Pay Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a statement I made to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service regarding Federal pay bills:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am very pleased to have the opportunity to present to you my views with respect to the pending legislation, providing additional compensation for postal and other Federal workers.

Many years ago I served as a railway mail clerk, and I know from personal experience in that service, and my close contact in subsequent years with the many postal and other Federal workers in my district, that

they are one of the most loyal groups in our country.

I feel it is an obligation of this Congress to provide adequate compensation for these employees. Certainly it would appear that we are neglecting that duty if we do not provide for Government employees compensation comparable to that which we insist is needed by private employees to live decently. I am sure this committee does not need additional statistics on the greatly increased cost of living which is depriving this group of even an average standard of living. I urge this committee to report on a bill providing adequate compensation for these employees.

I have repeatedly urged that this Congress enact legislation which will begin to do justice by all Federal employees. I again express the earnest hope that Congress will grant them the increases they have earned without further delay.

The Italian Peace Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Heinzen, the editor and publisher of the *Nutley Sun* has had vast experience as a news correspondent. He spent over 25 years on the European scene and knows rather intimately the focal points. More than once he has called the turn.

In his editorial of July 13 he urges for very urgent compelling reasons why immediate action should be taken toward a revision of the Italian Peace Treaty of 1947.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include it herein:

REVISE THE ITALIAN PEACE TREATY

The Italian Government, over the bitter opposition of Italian Communists, has formally authorized the leasing of Leghorn port facilities, on the peninsula's west coast, to the United States with a grant of transit rights across Italy for American military supplies for the central European "cold front."

The Italian Cabinet, in confirming the agreement made by Foreign Minister Carlo Sforza, stressed that the accord fits in the framework of collective defense and mutual assistance as visualized by article 3 of the North Atlantic Pact.

Leghorn thus becomes an American bridgehead, an alternate route into central Germany and Austria to Bremerhaven, the northern German port. The Leghorn route to central Europe is shorter, more easily defensible. Long ago American strategists have realized that the natural gateway to Austria—the port of Trieste—would be lost in the event of war with the Communist axis. Powerfully installed in Albania, the Communists could seal off the Adriatic in the narrow straits of Otranto both by submarines and by planes based in Albania.

The grant of the rights at Leghorn, therefore, gives Eisenhower, as supreme commander of the mutual defense forces in Europe, the alternate route he needs so badly. In weighing the action of the Italian Government, we should remember that Leghorn suffered great damage at the hands of American and British bombers during the war and yet there was no scar to cause even minor hesitation. We should remember, too, that the Italian Government acted in face of violent Communist opposition.

Our own intelligence sources in Washington have reports that the Kremlin has alerted the Italian Communist fifth column to the strategic importance of the Straits of Taranto, the heel on the Italian boot, to counter the Leghorn grant. The Italian Communist Party is making a determined political offensive aimed at getting absolute control of the straits.

In the recent Italian elections, the Communists captured administrative control of the major seaport of Brindisi on the Straits of Taranto, directly across the narrow waters from Albania. According to intelligence reports, the Kremlin blueprint for war contemplates a Russian bridgehead in the Brindisi area where Soviet paratroopers would grab the port and open a pipeline from Albania for men and military supplies.

Revise the Italian Peace Treaty; now more than ever.

Here Is Why Farmer's Share of Loaf of Bread Is Only 2.85 Cents or Even Less

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in a further effort to combat vicious propaganda that farmers allegedly are to blame for high food prices, I am placing in the *Record* an article from the June 1951 issue of the *Co-op Grain Quarterly*, official publication of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, St. Paul, Minn.

The article documents a recent news story that the farmer's share of a loaf of bread is only 2.85 cents by revealing seldom-publicized costs of marketing and distribution—and profits—after wheat leaves the farm. Please notice that the computation is made on the basis of a loaf of bread selling for 15 cents at retail. In many areas, the retail price of a loaf of bread is from 1 to 4 cents higher than 15 cents, in which cases the farmer's share is even less than 2.85 cents.

I call your particular attention to the transportation costs—24½ cents to ship a bushel of wheat from Minot, N. Dak., to Minneapolis, a comparatively short distance; and 51 cents to ship a 100-pound sack of flour from Minneapolis to Cleveland.

The article follows:

CONGRESS TOLD FARMER RECEIVES 2.85 CENTS OF LOAF OF BREAD

The newspaper headline above tells the whole story. The farmer gets only 2.85 cents for the wheat that goes into a loaf of bread today.

The retail price of bread has gone up 19 cents a pound loaf since June 1950. If this increase were due entirely to the rise in the price of wheat, the farmer would be getting \$1.25 a bushel more than he does now.

Actually wheat today has gone up only about 18 cents a bushel above the pre-Korean war price. The national average June 15, 1950, was \$1.93, compared with the May 15, 1951, average of \$2.11.

The table which follows shows the financial transactions involved in wheat and flour. It was prepared by the Minneapolis Grain Exchange. This example is based on current

shipments made in 1950 and represents average figures for a number of companies. The figures were gathered before the two-cent rise in the retail price of bread. Today the wheat farmer's percentage share in a loaf of bread is even less than shown by the table.

Marketing cost of wheat from Minot to Minneapolis

No. 1 dark northern spring wheat 14 percent protein produced in Ward County, N. Dak., delivered by producer to country elevator at Minot, N. Dak. (bushel)-----	\$2 00
Country elevator gross margin for accumulating, storing, loading and shipping to market-----	.06
Railroad transportation costs from Minot to Minneapolis-----	.24½
Commission merchant's charge for selling carlot to terminal elevator, handling, inspection and weighing details-----	.02½
Selling price net terminal elevator f. o. b. boxcar-----	2 33
Terminal elevator charges, unloading, 125 days' storage, turning, conditioning, insurance, and loading out-----	.07
Selling price net to flour miller f. o. b. boxcar-----	2 40
<i>Production and distribution cost of flour</i>	
2.35 bushels or 141 pounds of \$2 40 wheat required to produce 100 pounds of flour, 40 pounds millfeed, 1 pound shrink (cwt.)-----	\$5 64
Depreciation, insurance, interest, taxes, etc-----	.06
Power to operate mill-----	.04
Mill and elevator labor, repairs, supplies, etc-----	.32
Administrative expenses, salaries, etc-----	.11
Main office and branch office selling expense, etc-----	.21
Margin of gross profit miller anticipates-----	.06
Miller's total manufacturing expense (cwt.)-----	.80
Byproduct recovery 40 pounds of millfeed at \$40 per ton bulk Minneapolis, or 2 cents pound (deduct, cwt.)-----	.80
Net cost of 100 pounds straight grade flour bulk, flour f. o. b. mill (cwt.)-----	5 64
Cost of sacks, 100's, paper (cwt.)-----	5 44
Railroad transportation expense to Cleveland, Ohio-----	.51
Delivered cost of 100 pounds straight flour in sack to baker in Cleveland (cwt.)--	6 26
<i>Production and distribution cost of bread</i>	
Cost of 20 pounds added ingredients: fat, milk, yeast, etc., and 60 pounds water-----	\$2 16
Total raw material cost 180 pounds or 2,880 ounces dough (this equals 160 18-ounce loaves)-----	8 42
Raw material cost of baked loaf bread per pound-----	.05¼
Shop labor and overhead-----	.02½
Administrative, selling and delivery expense-----	.03¾
Double wax wrapper-----	.01
Margin of gross profit anticipated--	.00¾
Wholesale selling price per loaf to grocer-----	.13
Retail grocer's margin, including all expenses-----	.02
Retail price per loaf-----	.15

Selling price to consumer, 160 loaves (to produce this bread required 2.35 bushels wheat and 80 pounds of other ingredients—20 pounds plus 60 pounds of water)-----\$24.00

Taxation of Household Appliances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "So This Is Housekeeping," by Shirley Stuart, published by the DA Syndicate, in which is discussed the taxation of household appliances.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SO THIS IS HOUSEKEEPING (By Shirley Stuart)

After tossing a few brickbats in recent months at certain Government groups for treating essential household appliances as luxuries, I want to turn around and offer a bouquet.

It goes to the House Ways and Means Committee, which recently voted to exclude washing machines and sewing machines from the list of products to receive new or added excise, or so-called luxury taxes.

The washing machine and the sewing machine are more than merely labor savers—they are definite money savers, particularly for the middle- and low-income brackets.

Now that we have this concrete example of the realistic approach some men in Washington can apply to the home and its make-up, I certainly wish the House committee could get together with the Federal Reserve Board.

The latter has adopted credit controls which I think need more than a little readjustment.

Without going into any long economic discussion as to the why's and wherefore's of credit controls, I'd like to bring up two things about present controls that throw me completely for a loss.

First—why is it that when Jeff and I decide to trade in our old car on a new one, the Federal Reserve Board says the trade-in value can be applied against the required down payment, but when I want to trade in my old washer, the same principle doesn't apply?

Instead, the Board says, the trade-in value of my washer must be subtracted from the new model's selling price, and then I must pay down 25 percent of the balance remaining.

If it were handled the same way as automobiles, the \$50 I got for my old washer would take care of the down payment required for a \$200 new one. The way it is now, I not only trade in my old machine, but I have to pay an additional \$37.50 in cash before I can get delivery on the new model. This would mean in effect a down payment of \$87.50—or nearly 44 percent.

Second, why does the Federal Reserve Board say that you have to make a 25 percent cash down payment on an installment purchase of a washing machine, or another appliance, while only 15 percent is necessary for a Louis XIV sofa?

I regard my washing machine as more necessary than the living-room davenport, and I'm sure you do, too.

Perhaps members of the Federal Reserve Board have been spending too much time on their own davenports. If they'd get up and visit the homemaker at her washing machine, maybe they'd make their credit controls a credit to their intelligence.

Daniel Calls Pearson on Tideland Oil Blast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, the Austin American, of Austin, Tex., on July 16, 1951, published on its editorial page a reply to Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round of July 9, 1951, on the subject of Tidelands. The reply was written by the distinguished attorney general of Texas, Hon. Price Daniel. This reply emphasizes that Texas devotes all of the income from its submerged land to the public school fund of our State and that Texas when it entered the Union had a solemn contract with the United States by which it retained all its public domain.

The reply as published in the Austin American is as follows:

REPLY TO MERRY-GO-ROUND—DANIEL CALLS PEARSON ON TIDELAND OIL BLAST

HON. DREW PEARSON,
Washington Merry-Go-Round.

DEAR MR. PEARSON: Your column of July 9 on tidelands legislation contains the most misleading and inaccurate information I have seen during my 3 years of acquaintance with this controversy. Your informants on this subject are giving you prejudicial propaganda which, if given the opportunity, I can and will prove to you to be false.

For instance, your column says that the Walter-Gossett bill would restore submerged lands to only three States. This is untrue. A mere reading of the bill will reveal that it restores ownership of lands beneath navigable waters within the respective State boundaries to each of the 48 States. Every State in the Union has thousands of acres of submerged lands, the revenues from which are being used for public education and other State functions. These lands and revenues, held and used by the States in good faith for over 100 years, would be taken by the Federal Government under the theory of the tidelands decisions, expressed in your own words as:

"The theory that . . . the navigable waters of the United States belong to the Federal Government, not the individual States."

For over 100 years the courts held to the contrary and said the lands belonged to the individual States.

Forty-four Governors, 44 Attorneys General, and a majority of the Members of Congress from every State want these lands and revenues to be restored to or confirmed in the 48 individual States and that is exactly what the Walter-Gossett bill would do. It applies to Minnesota and its iron ore and to Maine and its kelp and fish the same as it does to Texas and its oil. Any Congressman who votes against the bill is voting

against continued State ownership of submerged lands within his own State. I have yet to find any State official so anxious to get a one forty-eighth share of Texas' oil as to surrender title to, and revenue from, the submerged lands of his own State.

Again, your column would leave the impression that oil companies wrote and are sponsoring the Walter-Gossett bill, and that a vote for it is a vote for the oil companies. This is not true. Together with other State officials, I helped Congressmen GOSSETT and WALTER prepare this bill, and I know that no oil company representative worked on it. In fact, the oil company representatives have stayed neutral ever since Federal officials promised to ratify their State leases in Federal legislation.

The Attorney General of the United States told the Supreme Court this would be done as a matter of equity to good-faith purchasers. Every Federal control bill and every State ownership bill introduced in Congress during the past 3 years has provided for ratification of these leases. Therefore, the oil companies will not lose their leases regardless of which Government ends up with the land and the royalties.

That leaves the present issue solely between the Federal Government and the States (and their local subdivisions). I know of no oil company representative who is now working or lobbying for the Walter-Gossett bill. I do not believe you can find one. On the other hand, you will find that the real sponsors of State ownership legislation are the following organizations, which I list and hope you will publish:

The Council of State Governments; the Governors' Conference; National Association of Attorneys General; National Conference of Mayors; American Association of Port Authorities; American Municipal Association, (representing 10,510 municipalities in 42 States); the American Bar Association; American Title Association; United States Chamber of Commerce; United States Junior Chamber of Commerce; National Reclamation Association; National Water Conservation Association, and the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, representing 1,051 cities.

In all fairness, I do not believe you can call these groups an "oil lobby," and I know you will not find any oil lobbyists directly or indirectly influencing their actions on tideland legislation.

A vote against State ownership of submerged lands by each of the 48 States is a vote against the views of these organizations, which have the interests of the people and their States at heart as much as anyone who advocates Federal nationalization of this property.

Your column supports Senator LISTER HILL's plan to divide tideland oil royalties among all the 48 States for Federal aid to education. You say those who vote for State ownership are against using the proceeds for education. This is not true. Texas devotes all of the revenues from its submerged lands to its public school fund. Most of the other States make the same or similar use of the revenues from this type of property. It is to protect our educational system as well as the principles involved in this Federal land grab that we so vigorously support the Walter-Gossett bill.

Texas has collected a total of approximately \$7,000,000 from leases on the tidelands within its boundaries. That has meant a great deal to our school fund, but divided among 48 States, it would have been a mere pittance of \$145,833 per State. I doubt that any State has collected less than that amount from its own submerged land resources, whether they be iron ore, sand, gravel, fish, gas, coal, gold, or oil.

If these Texas leases (350,000 acres) had been leased under the present Federal Min-

eral Leasing Act, they would have brought only \$17,000 as compared with the \$7,000,000 under State leasing. This is because Texas has averaged \$20 per acre for leases under its sealed-bid system, while the Federal Government receives only 50 cents per acre from its first applicant. The States also receive higher rentals and royalties from their leases.

This brings us to the reason that some oil interests are opposed to state ownership and are now fighting against the Walter-Gossett bill. They are the 1,031 Federal lease applicants who have blanketed the coasts of California, Texas and Louisiana with Federal applications at 25 cents per acre (the amount payable under Federal law before the 50 cent amendment).

On the list you will find the name of I. A. Smoot, of Salt Lake City, Utah, whom you mentioned in your column of April 18, 1949, as having complained to President Truman about the "tidelands oil lobby." You described him as "Salt Lake City's dignified, white-haired postmaster" and said the result of his visit to the President was Mr. Truman's assurance that "As long as I am President, I will never permit the submerged oil lands to go back to the States."

Did you know that Mr. Smoot was himself lobbying with the President of the United States in support of his own Federal oil lease application? Whether or not he forgot to tell you and the President about it, I. A. Smoot is an applicant for a Federal lease on 800 acres of land off the coast of Long Beach, Calif., which he hopes to get for \$200 under the 25-cent per acre Federal Leasing Act in effect when he filed. It is now worth \$1,000,000, according to the California Land Commission.

Former Senator Burton K. Wheeler and James A. Murray, son of Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, are registered lobbyists and attorneys for some of the Federal lease applicants. They are doing all within their power against the State ownership bill, but you fail to mention their activities.

Actually, it was former Senator Wheeler, attorney for Federal lease applicants, who expect to hit the Jack-pot if the States lose their fight, who first drug out the plan of dividing up the submerged land royalties for Federal aid to education. It was presented in 1948 through the then attorney general of Montana. It was later espoused by Harold Ickes, a firm friend and witness for the 25-cent per acre Federal lease applicants, and it is now being advocated by Senator LISTER HILL and the others named in your column.

The plan for Federal aid to education through seizure of submerged lands of the States has been rejected by State officials and congressional committees every time it has been brought up. It will never be approved as long as the majority in Congress opposes dividing up the wealth of the States by placing everything under Federal ownership and control.

No one will deny that the States were believed to own the lands beneath navigable waters within their boundaries for over 100 years. They were in good faith in their ownership, possession, development, and improvement of these lands and in the use of the revenues therefrom for public purposes. It is only fair that this good faith ownership be restored and confirmed by Congress rather than implement Supreme Court decisions which take away these lands without compensation. This is especially true of Texas, which had a solemn contract with the United States by which it retained all its public domain. We get more from the property than the Federal Government would receive under present laws, and we use it all for public education.

If you really want to help the States shoulder their burden of educating their children, help us retain our property and present revenues rather than weakening our

local governments and making us wholly dependent upon the Federal Treasury.

Because of your powerful medium of expression to the people of the Nation, please present our side of the case along with the other side and distinguish honest and sincere State officials from the oil lobby which you write about. If you will give me the opportunity, I will present you the evidence in support of all statements made in this letter.

PRICE DANIEL.

An Interoceanic Canals Commission, the Best Solution of Panama Canal Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, for several years I have followed closely the interoceanic canals question in collaboration with responsible congressional leaders of both political parties with special reference to its grave implications to the security of the United States and our national resources. In the course of my studies I recognized a definite pattern of propaganda which is obviously a part of an organized drive to secure authorization for the construction of a virtually new canal at Panama of so-called sea-level design to replace the existing waterway.

In an extension of my remarks in the Record of July 13, 1950 entitled, "Panama Canal—Propaganda for Sea-Level Project," attention of the Congress was invited to the nature of this drive.

Since then there have been several apparent attempts to arouse public interest in this project, the most recent example being a news story, in the Chicago Daily Tribune of June 13, 1951, part 2, page 1, by Jules Dubois.

This story, which originated in the Canal Zone and utilizes verbatim quotations from a report by former Gov. J. C. Mahaffey, of the Panama Canal, under Public Law 280, Seventy-ninth Congress, was obviously inspired.

In the opinion of informed Members of Congress, it is a grossly inadequate, if not misleading, treatment of the problems involved, tending to confuse rather than clarify. Moreover, it conforms to the established pattern of propaganda which, since 1945, has consistently emanated from the Canal Zone, stressing the dangers of A-bomb attack as dictating the launching of the vast sea-level project and brushing aside as matters of slight importance the essential and long overdue major operational improvement of the existing Canal.

The report mentioned above was transmitted by President Truman to the Congress on December 1, 1947, and significantly, without comment or recommendation. There is was referred to appropriate committees of the House and Senate which did not direct its publication as is customary in such cases. Fa-

avorable consideration of it by the Congress is not deemed likely.

Hence, the sole dependence of indiscriminating writers upon it as their primary source of information will not beneficially contribute toward the comprehensive public consideration of this subject that is sorely needed. Rather, it may mislead and confuse.

During the past few years, however, a large number of informative articles on various aspects of the canal question have been published. Some have been republished in extensions of remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by distinguished Members of Congress, as listed in a selected bibliography on the Isthmian Canal Policy of the United States, by the gentleman from Texas, Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON, in the RECORD of August 25, 1949.

These, together with other pertinent articles published subsequently to 1949, form an illuminating mass of literature by informed, competent, unbiased, and unselfish experts on the canal situation who possess a high degree of integrity and independence. Their views and utterances on this subject diametrically oppose those set forth in the indicated report under Public Law 280, Seventy-ninth Congress, which were repeated in the news story under discussion.

Special attention is invited to the notable address delivered on April 19, 1948, before the celebrated Cosmos Club of Washington, D. C., by Representative Willis W. Bradley, of California, and published in the RECORD of April 21, 1948, entitled "What of the Panama Canal?"

Representative Bradley is a naval officer of distinction with an extensive background of administrative, ordnance engineering, and navigational experience in various parts of the world, and who has made an intensive study of the problems of the Panama Canal. At the time of his Cosmos Club address he was chairman of the Subcommittee on Ship Construction and Operation of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. As such, he actively participated in the congressional consideration of the ex-Governor's report which was referred to his committee, and was fully informed as to the nature of its contents. His paper, which treats clearly and forcefully with the fundamental issues involved in the modernization of the Panama Canal, is generally considered the best exposition on its subject in records of Congress and merits the closest study.

As pointed out by Representative Bradley, Public Law 280, Seventy-ninth Congress, was drafted in the Canal Zone. Its enactment was sought by those who, when later supervising its execution, subjected the act to an extremely narrow interpretation of the military factors of the law—"security" and "national defense." Thus, by means of extreme interpretation these military factors were made the controlling features of the inquiry under the fallacious assumption, that only a "sea-level" canal would be "secure."

During the course of the investigation, sustained and biased propaganda, often

originating within certain engineering groups in the Canal Zone, seized on the A-bomb as a psychological lever to alarm and influence officials in the executive branch of the Government, the people of the Nation at large, and their elected representatives in the Congress itself, to accept the exaggerated views of the "sea-level" proponents. The fundamental and long-time function of the canal as an agency for transporting ships from one ocean to the other was almost lost sight of in the ensuing general hysteria over the A-bomb.

Instead of encouraging the fullest public discussion of all the main issues, as should be expected under a republican form of government, these advocates consistently attempted to prevent the public expression of views in opposition to their own, thus depriving the Nation, the Congress, and the Executive of full information on a subject to which they were entitled.

Fortunately, the timely publication of many authoritative articles concerning the atomic bomb, subsequent to the submission of the 1947 report, served to counteract the effects of the previous scare propaganda and to remove that terrifically destructive weapon from its position as the dominating influence in public thinking relative to the planning of navigational improvements for the Panama Canal.

In many extensions of my remarks quoting these articles, I emphasized that the time has come to stop deceiving the people with the idea that an impregnable canal can be constructed at Panama or elsewhere. So I now repeat what I have stated many times before that the defense of any type of canal, wherever located, is an over-all governmental responsibility, and that its defense like that of the seaports, airports, railroads, highways, and productive centers of the United States depends upon the combined industrial, military, naval, and air power of this Nation as obtained in both world wars, and not upon passive defense measures, such as may be embodied in inherent characteristics of canal design.

Depending, as the Dubois news story does, upon the ex-governor's report which the Congress refused to consider, the article inevitably reflects a number of fatal flaws embodied in that report.

Basic among these is the emphasis on the potential danger of the A-bomb causing prolonged interruption of transit in the existing canal through demolition of locks and dams with the loss of Gatun Lake followed by lingering radioactivity requiring the abandonment of the present lock sites. In contrast, the article minimizes the interruption to transit in a canal of sea-level design as being of short duration—only a few weeks. Nor does it explore the effects of A-bomb attack on the many miles of earth dams, spillways, diversion channels, and tidal locks in a canal of sea-level design, or the effects of lingering radioactivity on these structures or the contiguous terrain, including the terminal cities.

Competent engineers and atomic warfare authorities who are independent have accordingly challenged the averred military superiority of the sea-level idea as a glaring misstatement of fact. They also challenge the basic assumptions in the ex-governor's report as fallaciously premised, and state that the adoption of its recommendations would be extravagant of national resources.

In view of these facts I must characterize the arguments of the proponents of the sea-level project on this score as fallacies of the first order and, whatever may have been the purpose, have the effect of deception.

The independent experts, to whom I refer, also question the cost estimates given in the report. They state that the estimate for completing the authorized third locks project improved by its modification to include the Terminal Lake plan is greatly exaggerated and that for the sea-level undertaking grossly underestimated.

The news story, moreover, wholly ignores the gravely important problem of a new treaty with the Republic of Panama which undoubtedly would be required for the sea-level project. What such a treaty would cost in over-all indemnity and perpetual annuities no one can predict; but these items would have to be added to the prodigious cost of constructing a canal of such design which, if adopted, might well merit the characterization so often bestowed upon it by experienced and informed engineers as constituting a boondoggling venture of monumental dimensions.

Another serious omission in the story is its failure to deal with the suspended third locks project which was authorized in August 1939 as a defense measure under Public Law 391, Seventy-sixth Congress, and stopped in May 1942, only 6 months after the United States entered World War II.

This project, which was started by the Panama Canal organization, was later shown by maritime authorities of the Government to be navigationally hazardous and operationally unsound. As a result of these disclosures it was subsequently disavowed after some \$75,000,000 of the taxpayers' money had been expended on what, in the light of the operational experience and knowledge, must be accepted as an error in fundamental planning. Fortunately, the excavations accomplished can be utilized in connection with the Terminal Lake plan. But if not so utilized it would appear that the whole third locks venture will prove a total loss.

From the foregoing summary it is clear that the sea-level drive under Public Law 280, Seventy-ninth Congress, served to obscure the third locks fiasco by reviving an irrelevant movement which, when historically viewed, is nothing but a repetition in a modified form of the 1906 controversy as to the type of canal, with a rehashing of most of the old arguments and a total ignoring of economic consequences.

It has long been evident in informed congressional circles that the proper

resolution of the interoceanic canals question cannot be obtained through routine Government agencies, especially those which would benefit from their own recommendations, and that it must be resolved by a wholly independent organization under congressional authorization.

The first step toward this end was the creation on July 1, 1951, under Public Law 841, Eighty-first Congress, of the Canal Zone government and the Panama Canal Company—the latter a business-type organization recommended by the President on January 31, 1950—House Document 460, Eighty-first Congress—to replace the previous predominantly military organization known as the Panama Canal. This action, by emphasizing the Panama Canal as an artery of marine transportation and by forcing the first major organizational improvement in the Canal Zone since 1914, cleared the way administratively for the next move, which is the determination of the form of the future canal, or canals, that sooner or later will be required for increased traffic needs.

As indicated in my extension of remarks of July 13, 1950, the drive for the Panama sea-level project undoubtedly gets much of its force from a combination of manufacturers of heavy earth-moving machinery, dredging and contracting interests, and a limited group of civil engineers, both civilian and military, associated with them. This fact requires that the Congress and the Executive be alert to the unique situation presented.

The interoceanic canal problem is too vast an undertaking and its consequences too far-reaching to be treated in a casual manner. Its determination is too momentous to be dominated by a routine administrative agency or professional group which in the very nature of the case are immune against their own errors, however grievous or costly they may be. The interests of the overburdened taxpayer, and the shipping which uses the canal and has to pay tolls, must be considered.

The best way and, in the opinion of experienced congressional leadership, the only way by which the canal question can be satisfactorily met and solved is by means of an independent, broadly based, predominantly civilian, and strictly nonpartisan Interoceanic Canals Commission, composed of the best qualified men available to make a thorough, objective, and up-to-date study and appraisal of the entire subject of interoceanic canals, and to submit its conclusions and recommendations in the premises.

The solution of this grave question necessarily transcends all considerations of professional or personal character for the grim realities of the situation must be faced regardless of how they may affect individual or group reputations. It is not a matter of condoning error or face-saving but solely of doing what is best for the American people and the world at large.

Let's Be Sensible and Safe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Paterson (N. J.) Evening News:

LET'S BE SENSIBLE AND SAFE

The administration is throwing all its economic guns into a last-ditch fight for retention of inflation curbs. The show has the look of an offensive with its arsenal of argument, propaganda and plea; actually it is a desperate defensive, in which the Government seems to have a slim chance of success.

Yet if controls are scrapped, even materially stripped down, the country is headed straight for a new inflation crisis which will probably strike in the fall or next winter.

Nobody likes Federal regulation over prices, credit, wages, supply, rents or profits. We don't like Washington dictation, which obviously has been mushrooming year after year. We are suspicious that national bureaucracy seizes on one factor after another to announce a "crisis"; that it manufactures "crises" to keep extending its influence increasingly over our lives.

There has been far too much truth in these apprehensions. But the tendency to expanding Federal domination must not blind us to the hard facts of economics. We are in a period of major defense production, which soon will take some \$4,000,000,000 out of American production for armament. This will mean a tremendous impetus for new inflation.

Economic Stabilizer Eric Johnston has declared that the Nation can look for a much cheapened dollar, worth much less than its 1939 buying power, if controls are dumped. Mr. Johnston is the Government's chief lieutenant on the firing line to secure passage of controls legislation in Congress. His boss, Mobilization Director Charles E. Wilson, gave similar warning. The President has repeatedly asked extension and strengthening of controls.

Stabilizer Johnston asserted that if Congress voted extension of present controls "we can hold prices for the rest of the year." That is probably an exaggeration. We don't believe that would result. But realistic curbs can brake the pressure of new inflation trends materially—and new inflation stresses are certainly going to strike.

What the administration is seeking to do is not politically popular. Just now there is a leveling off in prices, and the prospect of truce in Korea inclines the public to discard controls. Congress knows and responds to this sentiment.

The Senate after bitter debate refused most of the changes the President asked, and weakened present authority by barring future roll-backs. Now the House is debating its bill, which prohibits roll-backs on farm products and may do so on all prices. The Senate bill has virtually been rewritten by amendments.

Strong blocs are at work to destroy the curb laws, particularly agriculture groups which want to be kept free from controls, although this is discriminatory and food prices are the major hazard in the inflation picture.

For all the red tape, agency bumbling, and hateful restrictions inherent in eco-

nomics controls, unless we keep and enforce reasonable curbs during the peak of defense production, the Nation is heading into an inflation peril with throttle wide open.

Complements of Navy Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following self-explanatory communication from Admiral Forrest Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF
OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,

Washington, D. C., July 13, 1951.

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON,

The House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: There appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD recently (on page A4164 of the Appendix) an extension of remarks by yourself under the heading "Wasting manpower." Although no comment by the Navy Department on your remarks has been requested, I believe you would be interested in a somewhat fuller explanation of the subject.

I want to state emphatically that the Navy does not feel that it is wasting manpower in its ships—LST, Liberty (cargo), or others. The complements of Navy ships are the result of long experience. To cut those complements would result in serious inefficiency. Every man is on board for a definite purpose.

It is true that the military ship carries a larger crew than a comparable ship in the merchant marine. Any commissioned vessel of the Navy is manned on the premise that it must be largely self-sustaining and capable of operation over long periods of time. In contrast, merchant ships are contracted for point-to-point transportation and with the expectation that up to 30 percent overtime wages may be paid the crew.

More specifically, the naval vessel must have personnel aboard: (1) To accomplish most of the ship's routine maintenance while under way, at home bases, or at isolated anchorages, whereas the civilian ship depends upon shore establishments in port for such work; (2) to do its own stevedoring in out-of-the-way ports and to transfer cargo at sea, a task not required of the civilian ship; (3) to maintain a 24-hour radio watch with facilities for handling coded messages, a watch not required of civilian ships; (4) for medical, supply, added combat equipment, disbursing, military training at sea, extensive damage control, reprovisioning and fueling at sea which are requirements not applicable to civilian ships.

To discharge its responsibilities, the Navy must prepare our ships to be ordered anywhere, for any length of time. Hence, Navy ships must be self-sustaining insofar as we can make them so. That takes more men than for merchant ships. The requirements of a civilian ship could hardly be compared to those of similar Navy ships either in peace or war.

I hope that you will find the foregoing comments helpful.

Cordially yours,

FORREST SHERMAN,
Admiral, United States Navy.

Taking Advantage of Luck To Claim Nonexistent Virtue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following editorial from the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat-Chronicle of July 17, 1951.

Mr. Paul Martin recently pointed out in a dispatch to the Gannett newspapers that in the past 11 years the administration has miscalculated Federal tax collections by \$65,000,000,000. Now Secretary of the Treasury Snyder is claiming credit for a surplus, although the surplus is simply the result of the administration's inability to place defense contracts as fast as the money for them became available. The surplus is sheer illusion, as the administration well knows. With great magnanimity, the editorial writer says that in less exalted circles Secretary Snyder's claims to an illusory surplus would be called demagoguery.

Mr. Speaker, demagoguery is demagoguery in high or low places and a betrayal of the public interest. The editorial follows:

DASH OF DEMAGOGUERY

Paul Martin, of our Washington bureau, has just written an entertaining discussion of the administration's record as a financial prophet. He finds that in 11 years, the administration has miscalculated Federal tax collections by \$65,000,000,000. For the most part, it underestimated the returns, indicating a refusal to believe the productive force of the country is as strong as it really is.

This is more interesting than important, we believe. The estimating of income and outgo is a great business game all over the country and it is a safe guess that there is no business executive who has been able to measure income against outgo without some ludicrous errors. Nothing short of a magic mechanical computer, fed with the exactly correct data, could hope to foresee all the changes, good and bad, which speckle the years.

But the report wins some special attention in Rochester because of a speech made here last week by Secretary of the Treasury John W. Snyder. The Secretary told his audience that the administration is not guilty of practicing deficit financing. He bolstered his argument by citing the current surplus in the national budget, and by going back to the first postwar year when we had another fat surplus of income over expense.

What Mr. Snyder did not say was that the current surplus blesses us because we couldn't sign up defense purchases fast enough, and that the money is as good as spent right now—with some more billions. Nor did he say that the other big surplus resulted from the fact that we did not have to carry through on war purchases for which the budget had provided.

That one should fail to guess the exact line between collections and disbursements is not surprising. That one should take advantage of luck to claim nonexistent virtue is another matter. In less exalted places, the Secretary's claims would be called demagoguery—or worse.

The Treasury Department Nullifies Controls by Its Bond-Buying Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, the power of the administration's propaganda machine is being exercised to persuade the American people that only unlimited wage and price controls can save them from inflationary disaster.

The President makes radio speeches and issues statements from the White House. Cabinet members and important bureaucrats scurry about the country, at the taxpayers' expense, making speeches and holding press conferences. Forty thousand press agents pour out releases to press and radio. The Democratic national chairman misuses a TV interview to issue a call for support by grass-root political workers. The circumstance that this propaganda has no basis in fact is ignored.

After listening to the barrage of administrative propaganda, it seemed to me that the propagandist protested too much. I got an idea.

Now ideas are not much good without facts to support them. Facts are the legs ideas walk on. Neither gets very far without the other. I went after the facts in the hope of getting my idea before the House in terms which would defy contradiction.

I discovered that many of the propaganda statements relating to the orthodox, indirect inflation controls are falsehoods; others are half-truths, even more misleading than the falsehoods.

The situation remains almost exactly what it was in 1945, when it was thought cheaper money was needed to prevent a serious deflation, as predicted by Henry Wallace and other administration advisers.

By act of Congress, on June 12, 1945, in order to increase the volume and velocity of credit, gold reserves behind the Federal Reserve notes were reduced from 40 to 25 percent. There they remain today, broadening the base for the issuance of currency.

By the same act, reserves behind the deposit liability of banks were reduced from 35 to 25 percent. There they remain today, broadening the base of the credit structure.

By the same act of Congress, the policy was made permanent, that banks did not have to put up sound commercial paper to secure the issuance of Federal Reserve notes. Instead, they could put up Government bonds, which are nothing but the outward semblance of Government debt. That provision remains unchanged today. What bank would accept from an individual borrower a statement of his liabilities as the security on which to grant an additional loan?

It is true, on various occasions, under pressure of the world-wide depression,

both Republican and Democratic administrations had found it necessary to permit the use of Government bonds to secure issuance of Federal Reserve notes—but always on a temporary basis.

When Herbert Hoover first used this means of mitigating the effects of a world-wide depression, in 1932, he demanded and obtained of Congress a strict limitation on the period of its use. After Roosevelt came in, the policy was extended continuously until 1945, when it was made permanent.

Thus the value of our currency remains tied to the Federal debt. The higher the debt goes, the cheaper the money, and the higher the prices of everything. Until the administration stops using the public debt to secure the issuance of more and more money and credit, we are going to have more and more inflation.

All of us here know how the national debt has increased since the early thirties. We know it is likely to go on increasing at an augmented rate, because of mobilization to meet the threat of a world conflagration. Who then will say, in the face of these incontrovertible facts, that the indirect controls have been given a fair chance to curb inflation?

The things I have spoken of thus far are well known. They are facts, but they are not all of the facts I have uncovered. Specifically, they are not the facts which serve forcibly to convey the idea I mentioned earlier.

In two respects the Federal Reserve Board appears to have made an honest effort to apply the indirect controls, which can save this Nation from inflationary disaster. It must be admitted, however, that the Reserve Board has not applied those controls with all the vigor the situation seems to warrant.

The Federal Reserve Board has boosted rediscount rates from 1 percent to 1.75 percent. This, in only slight degree, has kept member banks from rediscounting their commercial paper, and using the proceeds each time, after the manner of a revolving fund, to make new loans.

So far as the Government is concerned, creation of so-called credit currency, on the books of the commercial banks, goes on almost entirely unhindered. Money still is cheap at the 2½- and 3-percent rates at which big loans remain profitable to the banks.

Only the patriotic action of the commercial bankers by voluntarily restricting credit expansion, and hence the creation of new money, has been even slightly effective in this area of inflation control.

The Truman administration, of course, contends that orthodox, indirect controls are weak and have little value in curbing inflation. The administration either is uninformed, or seeks to mislead the American people, with respect to the power and potential effectiveness of these controls.

Any banker will tell you that the Federal Reserve Board possesses full authority to raise rediscount rates as high as 7 percent, right under the ceiling at which the usury laws operate. If the Reserve Board should ever do this, it

would put the American economy almost completely on a cash basis. Creation of new money, which under present conditions is the real cause of price inflation, would largely be stopped. A severe deflation undoubtedly would result.

Such is the real power of this particular method of inflation control; and such is the situation that exists today. Consumer goods pipelines are full to overflowing. Excessive expansion of the money supply is the chief cause of our inflationary troubles. Easy money and inflation remain the policy of the Truman administration.

If this were not true, why has the net result of Office of Price Stabilization operations been solely to redistribute profits, and to leave consumers with no relief? Where is the stabilization? Further price roll-backs would only dry up sources of supply. This is a late hour at which to seek price roll-backs. If the Office of Price Stabilization were honestly intended to do what the people are told is intended, there would be no talk of roll-backs. There would, instead, be an effort to stabilize prices.

The effective means of reducing prices, if that is the intention, lies within the province of the indirect controls. Less credit, and a smaller money supply; lower prices. To have OPS sitting on the price safety-valve, while other agencies of Government stoke the inflationary furnace, is an invitation to disaster; an explosion that would blow prices sky-high.

There is another means of curbing the expansion of money and credit, fully as important as those already discussed. This involves the management of the public debt.

All of you sitting in this chamber will recall that early last spring a controversy arose between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board. The Reserve Board announced it would no longer support Federal Government bonds in the open market, through operations of its Open Market Committee. The Treasury violently opposed this policy. Later, what appeared to be an agreement was reached, and it seemed that the Reserve Board, by and large, was to have its way.

This putative agreement eased the minds of many of us. It goes without saying that open-market support of Government public issue bonds at par or above is highly inflationary. It serves directly to encourage monetization of the public debt. Now I have some facts and figures to present to you; facts and figures provided by the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board, which show what actually happened. They are disturbing.

These figures relate to the actions in recent months of the Treasury, with respect to the bond market and the status of the so-called Government trust accounts; and also to the actions of the Federal Reserve Board, with respect to market support of Government bonds.

We know that it has been Treasury policy to substitute so-called special issue, non-negotiable Government bonds for the cash in the trust accounts. Such

trust accounts, theoretically at least, are depositories for social security, unemployment compensation, and similar funds. There are 10 such trust accounts.

There has always been an argument over the investment of these funds. The point is not generally understood. The question is not whether United States bonds represent a good investment for trust funds; it is whether or not the money legally intended for a trust fund can properly be used to pay the operating expenses of Government under a deficit program. I suspect the treasurer of a corporation, under most State laws, would go to jail if he used trust-fund money, which the stockholders thought safely invested, to pay the current deficit of an extravagant operating policy. If the money from social-security taxes were put into special-issue bonds and used to pay off the national debt, it would be very different from the present administration fiscal policy of putting public or private issue bonds in the funds and then putting the money in with operating cash. The debt total today is \$254,727,000,000; the bonds in the social-security fund alone total \$14,000,000,000. These bonds are only promises to pay out of future taxes. The taxpayers must understand they will have to pay social security and similar assessments all over again when money will buy less than now. Economy during this period of investing in the trust-fund bonds or the use of the trust money to reduce the debt, would have prevented this double demand on the taxpayers.

Something happened to policies affecting Treasury management of these trust accounts beginning soon after the first month of the present calendar year. With the onset of the controversy between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board over open-market support of Government bonds, the Treasury began buying public-issue bonds instead of private-issue bonds for the trust funds. This had the same effect as though the Reserve Board's Open Market Committee had done the buying.

While the Open Market Committee was tapering off its purchases in support of the market, the Treasury was stepping in with purchases to offset the action of the Open Market Committee. The Treasury saw to it that certain classes of bonds were supported at par or above. The anti-inflation policy of the Reserve Board was nullified.

During the entire Government fiscal year 1950 Treasury purchases of bonds for the euphemistically titled investment accounts of the trust funds, in round figures, totaled \$401,800,000. In fiscal 1951, up to June 29, Treasury purchases of bonds for these accounts, again in round figures, totaled \$3,500,000,000.

In fiscal 1950 approximately \$2,400,000,000 was paid out in the form of military insurance dividends. Purchases in less than 6 months of fiscal 1951 totaled \$3,500,000,000. There was a difference of approximately \$1,100,000,000 between the two fiscal periods.

Certainly the income of the trust accounts did not increase so greatly in 1951, as compared with 1950, as to explain this difference of more than a bil-

lion dollars on any but one ground. That must have been the retirement of callable special-issue bonds for replacement with marketable, public-issue bonds, bought in the open market.

Should the inference I have just drawn seem hard to believe, listen to these additional figures: In January 1951 Treasury investment-account purchases of bonds for these trust funds totaled \$36,800,000; in February 1951 they totaled \$262,200,000; in March, \$482,700,000; in April, \$8,400,000; in May, \$22,800,000; and in June, the last month of the fiscal year, \$663,800,000.

The Treasury says that nearly \$604,000,000 of the \$663,800,000 worth of securities purchased in June consisted of non-negotiable special-issue bonds. This would leave approximately \$60,000,000 spent to buy other securities. It was said that a substantial portion of the \$60,000,000 went for securities issued by Government corporations—bonds that are neither issued nor guaranteed by the Treasury.

There are no actual figures available to show just where the \$60,000,000 went. We have only the word of Treasury and Federal Reserve Board officials, and evidently they were hazy on the subject. Nobody wanted to be quoted, nor to involve himself in any controversy.

You may be sure that with respect to these figures, as with those of other executive departments and agencies, Congress will be kept in the dark, so far as possible. Customarily the books of such departments and agencies can be looked at only under subpoena by a congressional committee. Even then, the President may be expected to instruct the administration officials involved to ignore the subpoena.

I suggest that possibly here is an instance where it would be well for one or another of the congressional committees interested in the integrity of our financial structure to seek an opportunity to look at the books, to determine just how and to what extent the investment accounts are being used to support the Government bond market.

Some figures quoted at the Federal Reserve Board, which handles the investment accounts under direction of the Treasury, purported to show that during June 1951 the Treasury acquired \$34,600,000 in marketable securities of the Government for the trust funds. An attempt was made to show that approximately \$30,000,000 of the \$34,600,000 went for postal-savings notes. Such notes customarily are short-term securities, running 60 or 90 days. On this basis, it was said that Treasury operations in the open bond market in June were so small as to have no effect on the market.

Somewhere, in the same conversation, it was admitted that a cursory examination of the records showed about \$25,000,000 unaccounted for out of the \$60,000,000 not used for special-issue bond purchases.

If either \$25,000,000 or \$34,600,000 was used to support the Government bond market in June, and I believe one or the other amount was so used, it must have been adequate. Market support mani-

festly consists less of large expenditures than it does of expenditures at strategic moments and under specific conditions.

Let me offer some figures to indicate the status of operations by the Federal Reserve Board's open market committee during the first 6 months of the present calendar year—January through June 1951.

In January, Federal Reserve bank holdings of marketable Government bonds stood at \$20,800,000,000; in February, \$21,500,000,000; March, \$21,900,000,000; April, \$22,900,000,000; May, \$22,500,000,000; and on last June 27, \$22,800,000,000.

These figures, of course, do not represent net transactions, but do represent the combined portfolios of the 12 regional Federal Reserve banks. Bond trading is done by these banks, under instructions from the Open Market Committee. Total net transactions are shown by the differences between holdings at the end of each month.

From these figures the conclusion may be drawn that early in the year—until the end of April—the Open Market Committee, through the 12 Federal Reserve banks, was supporting the bond market. Since the end of April the combined portfolios remained fairly constant. At the end of June the total had been reduced by approximately \$100,000,000 from the April peak.

In April, when Federal Reserve holdings were highest, Treasury purchases of bonds fell away to \$8,400,000. Since that time, as Federal Reserve support of the market was largely withdrawn, Treasury purchases moved upward. From this only one conclusion can be drawn.

As almost everyone has remarked on occasion, from time out of mind, the proof of the pudding has been in the eating. Therefore Government bond quotations, as published in the Wall Street Journal, the New York Times, and other leading newspapers, are pertinent here.

I shall not use up time with a recital of quotations for the entire list. Let me say, instead, that on July 3, the nearest available date to the closing of the fiscal year, long-term bonds generally stood well below par, ranging from 96.28 to 98.4. Shorter term bonds stood substantially above par, ranging in price from 100 to 108.

It is true that bonds tend to rise in price as they approach maturity, but an average of 104 for short-term bonds would indicate strong market support from somewhere.

Commercial banks, it should be remembered, tend to invest in short-term securities, while those securities with remote maturity dates tend to go to the insurance companies. Whatever else is true, there certainly is an explanation here for the continuing activities of commercial banks in monetizing the public debt, slowed only by private agreements among the bankers.

The figures I have given you were taken from the published reports of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board, supplemented by careful questioning of responsible officials. The published re-

ports are complicated, and confusion often is created by the habit of Government bookkeepers of combining the totals of two or more Federal agencies. Segregation of the figures in many instances depends upon the knowledge of some official. The books are not open for inspection.

I believe that such figures as were available, are enough to demonstrate the truth of my thesis. The whole thing adds up, in my own mind at least, to a situation in which the administration tells the public that the orthodox, indirect controls have failed to curb price inflation, while behind the scenes the administration takes steps to see that they do not succeed.

The Federal Reserve Board, which should be independent of the Treasury and of the administration itself, because it is lawfully responsible only to the Congress, is not independent. The Federal Reserve Board would seem to be helpless to make the indirect controls work.

It must be remembered, that not many weeks ago, withdrawal of bond-market support by the Open Market Committee, coupled with the agreement among commercial bankers to hold the line on excessive credit expansion, did bring about a temporary stabilization of prices. Now prices are on their way up once more. I think the Treasury is responsible for the fact.

Several days ago the House defeated the Wolcott amendment which would have compelled the administration to exhaust the orthodox curbs on inflation before proceeding to impose more price and wage controls. I think that was a mistake.

It is my conviction that this action should be reconsidered; that a strong provision should be written into the bill to make sure that indirect controls are applied as vigorously as the occasion warrants.

William Oatis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I enter in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an exchange of telegrams:

Representative JOHN V. BEAMER,
House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.:

Greatly appreciate efforts behalf my husband, William Oatis, imprisoned in Czechoslovakia. Hope for success in expediting his speedy release.

Mrs. WILLIAM OATIS.

St. Paul, Minn.

Mrs. WILLIAM OATIS,
St. Paul, Minn.:

I consider it a privilege and a duty to lend my efforts in behalf of your husband.

JOHN V. BEAMER.

The Spotlight on Drug Addiction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Passaic (N. J.) Herald-News of July 17, 1951:

THE SPOTLIGHT ON DRUG ADDICTION

Drug addiction is one of the terrible curses of mankind, which destroys the user's character before death brings release from misery. Harry J. Anslinger, United States Narcotics Commissioner, describes it as a "communicable disease" more to be feared than smallpox, because one addict is likely to give the habit to as many as four other persons.

Nathaniel L. Goldstein, New York's able attorney general, did a great public service by calling hearings in Manhattan to determine the extent of drug addiction in the metropolis, especially among young people. His probing stimulated police activity. The public was aroused when it read that peddlers were selling deadly, habit-forming drugs to school children. Senate investigators, televising their hearings, put drug addicts on the witness stand to tell their stories to the public.

What Mr. Goldstein did about drug addiction might be compared with Dr. Thomas Parran's attack upon the venereal-disease problem. The former Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service started by dropping the euphemism "social diseases" and by ignoring the taboo against mention of syphilis and gonorrhea. He gave these illnesses their proper names, called for frankness in dealing with them, and showed how they could be stamped out.

The inquiry started by New York's attorney general added nothing to our knowledge of drug addiction but it stimulated public awareness of a social problem, which was healthy and helpful. What good will come of it?

One immediate gain is that the boy or girl who might have been tempted by an addict or a peddler to try a marijuana cigarette, "just for the lift," or a heroin powder, for a greater thrill, knows now that the first step leads invariably to the second, and that soon there is no way back.

Another gain, already noticed, is that judges are dealing more severely with narcotics peddlers. Exemplary punishment will make drug "pushing" less attractive as a means of livelihood for amoral people.

The publicity given the drug traffic also may cause Congress to strengthen Mr. Anslinger's agency. An extra \$16,000 obtained for that bureau by Representative CANFIELD, when he was chairman of a subcommittee of the Eightieth Congress, enabled Mr. Anslinger to send some of his best men to Italy, Turkey, and Iran, where they broke up gangs which were smuggling opiates into this country. It is easier to smash an overseas headquarters, with foreign government cooperation, than to catch smugglers going through our customs.

Passaic has had no drug addiction problem comparable to New York's, despite our nearness to the great city. There are a few unfortunates, "terminal cases," living out miserable lives on legally rationed drugs, the withdrawal of which would bring agonizing death instead of a death that is no less certain, but merciful. There has not been a single reported case of child addiction since the

Passaic Children's Bureau was established in May 1937.

The Passaic Children's Bureau is thoroughly organized to deal with the problem of drug addiction among children should it arise. Passaic, for 14 years, has gone in for prevention, rather than cure, in dealing with juvenile delinquency. School principals and teachers are under instructions to note wayward tendencies in the classroom and the bureau, which Dr Boone supervises, follows up their reports, so that a boy who steals a bicycle does not drift into petty thievery and housebreaking.

Teachers can detect and report symptoms of drug addiction. Attendance officers, checking absences, would run down the "pushers." The bureau is geared for such work.

Fourteen years of preventive effort is paying off.

Night Before Yesterday, Soviet Film Seen in Red Korea, Exposes Kaesong Troop Withdrawal Demand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last November I saw a Soviet hate film in Hamhung, Red Korea, which should alert our U. N. negotiators in Kaesong, relative Communist demands for the withdrawal of foreign troops from Korea.

The Soviet film was named *The Night Before Yesterday*. It had been shown in Red Korea and taught people to hate military uniforms alien to Red regimes. Communist negotiators in Kaesong are on the spot.

Today's headline in the Washington Evening Star says, "One major item blocks truce accord—Issue believed withdrawal of foreign troops." The Kremlin counterpart of Gorbels seems to have embarrassed the Kaesong Reds. But they need not fear.

The U. N. doughboy rose to such an occasion during his stay in Red Korea last year that 3,000,000 Koreans went south with him for the Christmas holidays.

Neckyoke Jones Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include a Neckyoke Jones Says column, published in the Sheridan (Wyo.) Press. The common-sense logic of Neckyoke Jones attracts a wide following in my home area,

and I commend his comments to the attention of my colleagues:

NECKYOKE JONES SAYS

"Looks like the rainmakers has been busy," I orates to Greasewood. "I dunno," he rezounds. "I still got a idee that ol' Maw Nature with the help of a Crow Injun medycine man has somethin' to do with it. However, it seems now that the bureycrats wants to git ahold of it—an' they want Congriss to put up a cupple billyun dollars to help 'em make rain. You know the bureycrats sure never misses a bet. They ain't nothin' makes a bureycrat hot under the crupper like findin' out that they have slipped up on a propysition on which they could spend some taxpayer's money. Now the stockmen who has been tryin' out this here rain-makin' ain't been askin' the goviment for nothin'. They was willin' to take a chance an' gamble on gittin' a few rain drops. If nothin' come outen it—they wouldn't have no holler comin'. You got to give 'em credit for wantin' to pay fer it themselves. But now the politishuns wants to set in the game—an' really go out to spend money in a big way. It's sure a great age in history—wooden legs, free castor oil—and rain. What's next?" Greasewood thinks Injun medycine men is aful smart fellers. Hopin' you are the same, I am.

Yure fren,

NECKYOKE JONES

Representative Meader's Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the *Citizen Patriot* of Jackson, Mich.:

REPRESENTATIVE MEADER'S PLAN

The proposal of Representative GEORGE MEADER, of the Second (Jackson) District, that private industries be given a major role in the development of backward countries throughout the world merits serious consideration.

Representative MEADER would create a bipartisan commission (modeled on the Hoover plan group) to study the whole problem of aid to underdeveloped nations. His plan differs from the so-called point 4 program of President Truman in that the President urges a Government-financed, Government-run set-up. MEADER would have his commission draw up a master plan, then give to American business the job of building factories or developing mineral and farm land where needed.

Native workmen would be trained, native capital would undoubtedly participate and new leadership would be generated that would spearhead self-operated programs in the individual countries.

There are three primary advantages in Mr. MEADER's plan over President Truman's point 4 program in its present form. First, it would eliminate the semisocialistic aspects of point 4. Second, it would build up and reinforce the concept of free enterprise in nations that we must depend on in our ideological struggles against communism. And third, it would be financed largely with private capital instead of tax dollars.

A fourth advantage—one that might ultimately be the key one—is that MEADER would replace the too-often-fuzzy planning of bureaucrats with the hard-headed common sense of practical businessmen, men who would have to make the projects succeed or lose their jobs.

The greatest handicap that MEADER's plan would face, as we see it—aside from the fact that it is offered by a minority party member—is the twofold job of erasing the widespread antipathy in other lands against foreign capital and "exploitation" and eliminating the fear among American businessmen that they would build up a successful enterprise only to have it seized by the government on some pretext or other.

He offers programs to solve these problems; whether they would succeed remains speculative, although there is every reason to hope so.

Although chances of Representative MEADER's plan being adopted by the Democratic majority at this time are slight, that does not mean it should be pigeonholed and forgotten. Development of all countries in the world to a point where the people are prosperous, happy and self-sufficient is one of man's most challenging dreams. Many feel it is the greatest hope for eventual world peace—certainly, if the have-nots are eliminated one major cause for war will have gone by the boards.

The principal opposition to any such suggestion usually comes from those who say the people Representative MEADER and President Truman seek to aid are largely incapable of helping themselves. They assert that any money we spent would just be poured down a rathole.

It's all too easy for us to forget that there was a time when the United States was nothing but undeveloped land. Foreign capital financed the *Mayflower*, the Virginia colony, Pennsylvania, Maryland and all the rest.

Our Nation didn't grow and evolve in a day, in the process it had a full share of help. It's well to note, too, that practically all of this foreign capital came from private investors.

The Meader program is well worth keeping alive and supporting to the fullest extent. Its objectives may be far-distant, but they form a goal that is worth working and waiting for.

Loans on Homes Guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JARMAN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, some time this week the House will vote on the provisions of section 106, subsection (c), set out on pages 44 and 45 of H. R. 3871, a bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950. Said subsection provides:

(c) Section 605 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended (1) by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "And provided further, That no more than 6 percent down payment shall be required in connection with the loan on any home guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration pursuant to the Servicemen's Read-

justment Act of 1944, as amended, and the cost of which home does not exceed \$12,000"; and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following sentences: "Subject to the provision of this section with respect to preserving the relative credit preferences accorded to veterans under existing law, the President may require lenders or borrowers and their successors and assigns to comply with reasonable conditions and requirements, in addition to those provided by other laws, in connection with any loan of a type which has been the subject of action by the President under this section. Such conditions and requirements may vary for classifications of persons or transactions as the President may prescribe, and failure to comply therewith shall constitute a violation of this section."

For the consideration of the Members prior to their vote on this committee amendment, I have asked unanimous consent to have this statement printed in the Appendix of the Record.

A nonpartisan survey has been made by the Agricultural Development Service of the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College entitled "Effects of Regulation X on the Home-Building Industry in Oklahoma City and Oklahoma County, Covering the Period From December 1, 1950, to May 1, 1951." The results of this survey clearly show the need in this section of our country for the amendment under consideration.

Eighty-two percent of all home-loan applications were made by veterans. Only 15 percent of these veterans could qualify under the restrictions of regulation X.

Under regulation X, a veteran buying a \$12,000 house is required to pay \$1,900 down, plus loan closing expense. The great majority of our veterans do not have that kind of down-payment money. They need this amendment.

The text of the survey to which I have referred follows:

EFFECTS OF REGULATION X ON THE HOME-BUILDING INDUSTRY IN OKLAHOMA CITY AND OKLAHOMA COUNTY COVERING THE PERIOD FROM DECEMBER 1, 1950, TO MAY 1, 1951

(Prepared for the Oklahoma Home Builders Association, Oklahoma City, Okla., by the agricultural-industrial development service of the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Stillwater, Okla.)

PURPOSE

On October 12, 1950, the Federal Reserve System imposed a restriction on residential construction credit designated as regulation X. The purpose of the regulation was to tighten credit available for residential construction by increasing the amount of initial down payment and shortening the repayment period. The purpose of the credit regulation at the time of its promulgation was to reduce the volume of new residential dwelling units in the Nation during 1951 to approximately 850,000 units.

It was the feeling of the Oklahoma Home Builders Association that local effects of the regulation might differ greatly from those found at the national level and in other selected areas. Inasmuch as there has been little previous study of local or regional differentials in relation to national development in housing, the Oklahoma Home Builders Association commissioned the agricultural-industrial development service of the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College to make a study inquiring into such

differentials as might exist between the local experience and that at the national level.

Pursuant to that request, the agricultural-industrial development service has completed a study of the effects of regulation X on home building in Oklahoma City and Oklahoma County. The following report includes the pertinent data accumulated over a 5-month period from December 1, 1950, to May 1, 1951, and an analysis of their possible effects on the building industry.

THE DEMAND FOR HOUSING

The preliminary releases from the Bureau of the Census show a decline in 1950 of population for the State of Oklahoma as a whole; however, 90 percent of the urban and metropolitan centers in the State having a population above 5,000 in 1940 show substantial population gains in the 1950 census. Close examination of these facts, supplemented with population data gathered over a period of the past 3 years in connection with survey work being conducted by the agricultural-industrial development service, reveals that a major part of this loss in population has been from the rural areas. Farms in Oklahoma have continued to increase in size, thus causing a rather high rate of farm-home abandonment in the rural areas. Figures gathered by the service reveal that the rate of farm-home abandonment in the State as a whole averages around 35 percent, based on 1940 census figures. Consequently, although the State as a whole shows a loss in population, it is evident that the urban populations have actually increased and the demand for housing in those areas has shown the same increase. We must also add to this situation the fact that families on an average have decreased in size since 1940. The average size of families in 1940 was approximately four. The average size of families in Oklahoma today is approximately three.

The total population in Oklahoma City has increased 32.5 percent over 1940, while the number of dwelling units has increased only 29.8 percent. Taking into consideration the decrease in the size of families since 1940, the increase in the number of families in Oklahoma County has actually been about 43 percent. The housing-demand potential in Oklahoma County based on known population alone is sufficient to warrant the conclusion that housing needs in Oklahoma County have not been satisfied even for the current population.

RECENT DEVELOPMENT IN HOME BUILDING IN OKLAHOMA CITY

Tracing the history of home building and lot development in the Oklahoma City area from January 1, 1947, up to the present date, it is found that a substantially small part of the building development took place in 1947, 1948, and the early part of 1949. A major portion of the building in the area was completed the latter part of 1949 and continued at a high rate through 1950.

A comparison of building development in Oklahoma City with other cities of comparable size in the Nation reveals the fact that the peak of development in Oklahoma City was reached a year and a half later than the peak for other cities. In other words, the boom in building development in the Oklahoma City area got a comparatively late start and was nearing its peak at a time when building development in other cities was already beginning to level off. Consequently, regulation X caught building development in this area short of what would have been a normal fulfillment of the housing-market demand.

The history of development in the past 4 years also reveals the fact that there is normally a time lag of approximately 6

months from the time raw land is bought to the time it is developed for building. Information from the Oklahoma City builders and developers, supplemented by data from the Oklahoma City and County Planning Commission, reveals that since regulation X went into effect there has been an exceptionally small percentage of land development started. In fact, since October of 1950 there has been for the 7 months' period ending May 1, 1951, only 193 lots recorded for development compared with 2,269 lots recorded for development the preceding 7 months' period (table 1 attached). Preliminary figures from the 1950 census releases reveal that the number of housing units in Oklahoma City is barely adequate for the present population. Therefore, any increase in the present size of the Oklahoma City labor force will have the immediate effect of creating a housing shortage. This unfavorable condition coupled with the fact that lot development is definitely lagging could have the effect of creating a critical situation in a very short time.

IMMEDIATE EFFECTS OF REGULATION X ON BUILDING IN OKLAHOMA CITY

According to preliminary estimates by the FHA home building has been reduced in the Oklahoma City area by approximately 50 percent since regulation X went into effect. This percentage is even more significant when it is combined with the fact that a major part of the building since regulation X has been completed on lots bought under the "hardship clause," as interpreted by the Veterans' Administration. The fact that there has been a substantial amount of building carried out even under the "hardship clause" is due to the inertia of the building boom that was in effect at the time of the promulgation of regulation X.

Information based upon approximately 90 percent of the loan applications filed in Oklahoma County obtained from the major loan and finance agencies located in Oklahoma City reveals that only 21 percent of the people who made applications for loans from December 1, 1950, to May 1, 1951, could have qualified under the credit restrictions of regulation X with the indicated cash on hand (table 2 attached).

Breaking the information down by type of loans, i. e., FHA, conventional, and GI, or VA, it is found that 82 percent of all loan applications were GI or VA (table 2 attached). Only 15 percent of those applying for GI loans could qualify under the restrictions of regulation X. Looking at the applications from the point of view of home prices, almost 80 percent of the loan applications were for homes under \$11,000 in price (table 3 attached). More than 60 percent of the prospective purchasers who could not qualify for loans under regulation X were purchasing houses in the price bracket from \$5,000 to \$9,000.

THE EFFECTS OF REGULATION X ON FUTURE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT IN OKLAHOMA CITY AND OKLAHOMA COUNTY

Figures released by the Oklahoma Employment Security Commission show that 12 percent of the total employment in Oklahoma in 1949 and 1950 was in construction and related industry. The drastic reduction in building that is expected, based on preliminary study of the current local trend being brought about by the restrictions of regulation X will have an immediate effect on the State employment picture. In the smaller urban areas of the State where developments were not large enough to come under the "hardship clause" construction is already coming to a rapid halt. With any decrease in other areas of the State in construction employment, the two alternatives for that particular segment of the labor

force are either to seek employment opportunities in Oklahoma City or other potential defense centers in the State or to leave the State entirely to find employment elsewhere. Either of these two alternatives will have serious repercussions upon the State's economy. If employment opportunities are available in Oklahoma City, and the current downward trend in building continues, housing will become an immediate problem. If the labor force moves out of the State, then the potential productive capacity of the State in the present defense economy will be impaired.

The buying power of Oklahoma City families is low on a comparative basis with other cities in the industrialized East and on the west coast. The starting salaries in Oklahoma City's second largest single basic industry employing almost one-third of the total labor force is a little less than \$2,600 per year. The comparatively low buying power of Oklahoma City home buyers places the Oklahoma City area at a definite disadvantage with the other metropolitan centers in coping with the credit restrictions imposed by regulation X.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS¹

By way of summary, it might be well to point out again these facts. First, despite a decrease in total State population in Oklahoma, the population, and consequently the demand for housing has actually increased at a rapid rate in the urban and metropolitan centers. Second, the Oklahoma City area got a comparatively late start in the building boom and is at least 2 years behind other areas in satisfying the demand for housing. Third, the present trend of builder-developers in the area reveals a reluctance to start new developments under the present restrictions. This will have the effect of virtually stopping land development and the creation of building lots when the current inventory is exhausted. At the present rate of construction under hardship cases the lots will be exhausted by July of this year.

Further information from prospective home purchasers reveals the inability of the average income earner in the Oklahoma City area to make home purchases in any substantial volume under the present credit restrictions. The cash savings in the hands of individuals is found to be comparatively low. A major portion of the buying that has been done since regulation X went into effect has not come under the credit restrictions imposed by the regulation.

As stated before the purpose of this survey was to make a detailed analysis of the effects of regulation X on the home building industry in Oklahoma City and Oklahoma County. The results that we have found in Oklahoma County do not by any stretch of the imagination reflect the situation as it may exist in any other city or county in the Nation. It is a well known fact that each individual city has its own particular pattern of influencing economic factors. These factors, including individual incomes, buying power, savings in the hands of individuals, types of basic industry, location, etc., will always bring forth differing results and effects when any blanket regulation covering the Nation as a whole, such as regulation X, is put into practice.

Some of those adverse effects that cannot be readily foreseen are showing up in the

Oklahoma City area in the mortgage market. Due to recent changes in the Government bond market, insurance companies who are heavy bond holders are reluctant to cash them in. Thus the surplus investment capital that would ordinarily be available for purchasing mortgages is tied up. This, coupled with the fact that mortgages are available in the higher income areas of the industrialized East and the west coast at at less than 100 percent has had the effect of halting the sale of mortgages in the Oklahoma City area. The inability of builders to readily dispose of mortgages, the relatively low buying power of Oklahoma city families, and the lack of adequate lot development for future building has brought the Oklahoma City home building industry to the brink of collapse.

We have made no attempt in this study to present possible alternatives or substitute regulations that might alleviate some of the more unfair hardships that regulation X has imposed in some local areas such as Oklahoma City. However, in view of the information contained in this report, it is evident that certain effects of the regulation might be made less severe and serve a more beneficial purpose if limited modifications of the existing regulation were put into effect. These modifications would of necessity need to be made for specific areas based on a thorough knowledge of the existing conditions in those areas.

In the Oklahoma City area the modifications that would likely prove most beneficial from a long-run point of view would be the relaxation of credit restrictions on housing within a selected price range. If homes in Oklahoma County selling for \$11,000 or less were exempt from credit restriction the need for additional housing could be satisfied without seriously affecting the over-all objective of regulation X in the area. However, the most important result of this type of modification would be the lot development activity that would immediately go into effect. Steady and orderly raw land development is an absolute necessity for the continuation of even a restricted housing development program. This is not to say that regulation X will stop home building in the Oklahoma County area, but it is clearly evident that the regulation in its present form will create a time lag in raw land development that could prove detrimental to the area's program of future development.

If it were not considered feasible to make this type of modification, the same effect might be brought about by an allocation system based on a percentage of the homes built in the preceding year, or on the proven need for housing in particular areas. This type of housing program would appear to be the most equitable for two reasons: (1) It would give those cities in the Nation having a maladjustment in their housing demands and needs an opportunity to maintain their building industry on an equal basis with the more fortunate areas where regulation X has not affected the home building industry, and (2) it would enable the building industry to continue substantial operations during a period of time that may mark the difference between the future success or failure of a more severe mobilization economy. There is little doubt that there will be a maladjustment in the distribution of new homes built in the next few years unless some areas are given individual attention.

The national economy is at present being geared for greater defense production. The area of the Southwest and particularly Oklahoma City is available to become an important location for defense production. Restrictions that are placed on the home building industry in this area may in the

very near future have the effect of slowing down, or completely stopping, the defense program of the area. Until such time as we may enter into a full-time war economy, regulation of the building industry should be modified to meet local needs of the present defense economy. Otherwise the efforts that must be put into effect in the event of a full-time war economy may be seriously jeopardized.

TABLE 1.—Oklahoma City plat records¹—
Number of lots recorded and approved for development in Oklahoma City

	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951
January.....				243	
February.....				102	
March.....	29			289	
April.....		34		140	65
May.....				355	
June.....				754	
July.....	24		124	60	
August.....				383	
September.....		24		288	
October.....			21		
November.....	22			8	
December.....				110	

¹ Oklahoma City Planning Commission.

TABLE 2.—The ability of loan applicants to buy homes under regulation X by type of loan¹

[Ability to buy equals cash on hand]

Type of loan applied for	Could qualify under regulation X		Could not qualify under regulation X		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
FHA and conventional.....	103	45	113	55	216	18
GI and VA.....	148	15	803	85	951	82
Total.....	251	21	916	79	1,167	100

¹ Source: Information from loan application forms of major loan agencies in Oklahoma City, Okla., from Dec. 1, 1950, to May 1, 1951.

TABLE 3.—The ability of loan applicants to make down payments on home purchases under regulation X¹

[Ability to pay equals cash on hand]

Sales price of home	Could qualify under regulation X		Could not qualify under regulation X		Total number	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
FHA AND CONVENTIONAL LOANS						
\$2,500 to \$5,000.....	2	1	2	(?)	4	
\$5,000 to \$9,000.....	32	13	35	4	67	
\$9,000 to \$15,000.....	55	22	45	5	100	
\$15,000 to \$20,000.....	11	4	17	2	28	
\$20,000 and over.....	3	2	14	2	17	
GOVERNMENT AID LOANS—GI, VA						
\$0 to \$5,000.....	1	(?)	2	(?)	3	
\$5,000 to \$9,000.....	4	2	20	2	24	
\$9,000 to \$9,000.....	69	27	508	55	577	
\$9,000 to \$12,000.....	63	25	231	25	294	
\$12,000 to \$15,000.....	11	4	40	4	51	
\$15,000 to \$20,000.....	0		1		1	
\$20,000 to \$24,000.....	0		0		0	
\$24,250 and over.....	0		1	(?)	1	
Total.....	251	100	916	100	1,167	

¹ Source: Information from loan application forms of major loan agencies in Oklahoma City, Okla., from Dec. 1, 1950, to May 1, 1951.

² Less than 1/2 of 1 percent.

¹ This survey and analysis was personally supervised by Dr. Randall T. Klemme, Director of the Agricultural-Industrial Development Service and conducted by Mr. William E. Rutler, staff research assistant, and is not a regular project of the service.

TABLE 4.—A comparison of home prices shown on loan applications with indicated cash on hand by all types of loans, Oklahoma City, Okla.¹

Sales price	Indicated cash in dollars										All
	0 to 999	1,000 to 1,999	2,000 to 2,999	3,000 to 3,999	4,000 to 4,999	5,000 to 5,999	6,000 to 6,999	7,000 to 7,999	8,000 to 8,999	9,000 and over	
ALL TYPES OF LOANS	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
\$5,000 to \$9,000.....	88	8	2	1	(²)	—	—	(²)	—	(²)	100
\$9,000 to \$15,000.....	65	20	10	5	5	2	(²)	(²)	—	—	100
\$15,000 to \$20,000.....	13	13	20	7	7	13	—	7	4	16	100
\$20,000 and over.....	7	25	—	12	—	—	—	12	—	44	100
Total.....	72	10	6	4	3	1	(²)	(²)	(²)	2	100

¹ Source: Information from loan application forms of major loan agencies in Oklahoma City, Okla., from Dec. 1, 1950, to May 1, 1951.

² Less than ½ of 1 percent.

TABLE 5.—A comparison of home prices on loan applications with annual income on all types of loans, Oklahoma City, Okla.¹

Sales price	Annual income									All
	\$0 to \$2,000	\$2,000 to \$2,500	\$2,500 to \$3,000	\$3,000 to \$3,500	\$3,500 to \$4,000	\$4,000 to \$5,000	\$5,000 to \$6,000	\$6,000 and over		
ALL TYPES OF LOANS	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
\$5,000 to \$9,000.....	(²)	9	27	23	17	13	5	3	—	100
\$9,000 to \$15,000.....	(²)	1	6	10	19	29	11	25	—	100
\$15,000 to \$20,000.....	—	—	—	—	7	10	14	69	—	100
\$20,000 and over.....	—	—	—	—	—	6	6	88	—	100
Total.....	(²)	6	18	18	17	19	7	15	—	100

¹ Source: Information from loan application forms of major loan agencies in Oklahoma City, Okla., from Dec. 1, 1950, to May 1, 1951.

² Less than ½ of 1 percent.

TABLE 6.—Report of first inspections by mortgage companies in Oklahoma City, Okla., from Dec. 1, 1950, to May 1, 1951

	Number	Percent
Number of starts under regulation X.....	122	13
Number of starts under regulations prior to X.....	796	87
Total starts for period...	918	100

Woman and Inflation: Neglecting Her Power To Prevent, She May Exercise It To Punish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I insert the article entitled "Power of Woman Overestimated," by Mr. Lowell Mellett, as it appeared in the Washington Evening Star on Tuesday, July 17.

While there was a disappointment in Congress in the failure of the women of America to assert themselves in the battle to halt inflation, nevertheless, I feel that there was no necessity for them to do so. After all, they march to the polls on election day and send to Con-

gress their duly elected Representatives to fight for the security of the United States, to protect the best interests of the American home, the family table, and the economy of the Nation. The article by Mr. Lowell Mellett follows:

POWER OF WOMAN OVERESTIMATED—ANGRY AMERICAN HOUSEWIFE HAS FAILED TO DELIVER EXPECTED PUNCH IN BATTLE FOR PRICE CONTROL

(By Lowell Mellett)

They tell you never to underestimate the power of a woman. What they fail to tell you is that it may be possible to overestimate it.

The President, Messrs. Wilson, Johnston, DiSalle, and all the others engaged in the struggle to prevent runaway inflation, have counted heavily on the American housewife. Appalled by the prices she meets in the market place, they have expected her to rise as one woman and demand protection from Congress. There would be a flood of letters and telegrams, they thought, and the telephone wires would sizzle. There might even be a march on Washington by women wielding brooms.

But the great uprising has not occurred. Most every woman you meet seems to be angry at prices and thinks something should be done about them, but the anger isn't being organized and carried to the Congress. Busy lobbyists for special interests, according to House Majority Leader JOHN MCCORMACK, gather in the corridors outside the House to write amendments for House Members to offer. But there is no report of any of them being trampled, or even having an elbow jostled, by delegations of women aroused by the wrong being done them.

Come election time, a year from now, if things have got worse in the meantime, as seems likely to be the case, women may

exert their powers, but it will only be the power to punish, not to prevent.

This seeming or real indifference of the women doubtless is comforting to the Congress Members engaged in overriding the administration. It enables them to agree with Representative WOLCOTT of Michigan, master mind of the Republican-Dixiecrat coalition in this particular fight. Representative WOLCOTT protests "the campaign of untruth and calumny" designed to show that "the overwhelming majority of Republicans and not a few patriotic Democrats were sabotaging price, wage, and credit controls," whereas they are merely seeking to eliminate "socialistic power grabs."

Who is conducting this campaign of calumny, the Michigan man hasn't said. He may have the newspapers in mind. Most of those I see, which is a good many, are generally favorable toward effective economic controls and are not backward in reporting what is happening on the Hill. None is promoting any recognizable "socialistic power grabs."

He could refer to organized labor, the strongest advocate of controls. Able representatives of the big organizations have appeared before committee after committee, during the various stages of the fight, urging consideration of the consumer. They have given Congress the benefit of thorough studies and exhaustive statistics. And they have taken the issue to the workers through their own press, mostly weeklies, now with a total circulation high in the millions, and to the general public through the radio, on which they have established regular daily and weekly programs.

What labor will do if the fight for controls falls isn't being said. But there is no certainty that it will wait until next election to do it. Its acceptance of wage controls always has been predicted on price controls. Without proper price controls, widespread demands for further wage increases are certain to be made. Whether these demands will lead to strikes is anybody's guess. But organized labor, according to this week's CIO News, "will not accept a lopsided bill."

Red Cross Flood Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a telegram from the Washington office of the American National Red Cross by its president, Mr. E. Roland Harriman, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 16, 1951.

HON. CLARENCE CANNON,
House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

Because of the unprecedented nature of the floods sweeping Kansas and Missouri, we have prepared this special report for the information of Members of Congress from these two States. The full resources of the American National Red Cross have been mobilized to help flood victims. Thousands of Red Cross volunteers in cooperation with governmental military and civilian agencies are doing everything possible to relieve suffering during this emergency period.

Ninety Red Cross disaster workers are assisting them. They have established 33 refugee shelters along rivers in Kansas and based on latest reports early today 18 shelters have been set up in Missouri. Our figures indicate that 37,203 families have been affected by floods in Kansas and 4,031 families affected in Missouri. Red Cross is feeding many of these people in shelters and is providing food for some who are staying with friends and relatives on high ground. Reports today indicate that all emergency needs are being met; meanwhile we are rushing preparation for long-term rehabilitation aid to those who will require continuing Red Cross help in repairing or rebuilding and refurbishing their homes. Traditionally, Red Cross provides this type of aid on the basis of need of all disaster victims lacking resources to reestablish themselves. Earlier today I increased the preliminary Red Cross allocation for this emergency from \$250,000 to \$750,000. Further financial assistance as required will be forthcoming from the national organization. Because of unprecedented extent of floods, I have asked Red Cross chapters in Kansas and Missouri to enlist the financial support of all citizens who wish to make special contributions for the relief of their stricken neighbors. Please assure your constituents that the American National Red Cross will go all-out in providing emergency relief and long-term rehabilitation assistance in the weeks and months ahead.

E. ROLAND HARRIMAN,
American National Red Cross.

Statement of Policy on Approval of ILWU Agreements by Wage Stabilization Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD B. VAIL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Speaker, as a cardinal example of unmitigated arrogance and flagrant defiance of the United States Government, I offer the statement of policy directed to Members of Congress by the Communist-controlled International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, headed by the notorious Harry Bridges, which sets forth in no uncertain terms its intention to enforce its aims through stop-work tie-up of water transportation if the Wage Stabilization Board declines to yield to its demands.

In my opinion the situation calls for an investigation by the Department of Justice and such action as may be necessary to establish to the ILWU that their threatened program, if initiated, will bring swift and severe punishment.

The above-mentioned follows:

INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S
AND WAREHOUSEMEN'S UNION,
San Francisco, Calif., July 5, 1951.
Hon. RICHARD B. VAIL,

House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VAIL: The executive board of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, at its meeting of July 26 and 27, 1951, adopted the en-

closed statement of policy on approval of ILWU agreements by the Wage Stabilization Board, which we sincerely request be given every consideration.

We urge that you lend your efforts to secure the immediate approval of the agreements reached by our organization with the longshore employers on the Pacific Coast and in Hawaii.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS GOLDBLATT,
Secretary-Treasurer.

(Enclosure: Statement of policy on approval of ILWU agreements by Wage Stabilization Board.)

STATEMENT OF POLICY ON APPROVAL OF ILWU AGREEMENTS BY WAGE STABILIZATION BOARD

The ILWU, nationally, internationally, and especially in Hawaii and on the Pacific coast in the maritime industry, has recently won notable economic victories at the bargaining table. Unity, determination, and the record of our union has paid off in substantial wage and pension and union security gains.

What was won from some of our toughest employers, however, is now in danger of being snatched away by the Wage Stabilization Board in Washington, created under the National Defense Production Act. This Board, for instance, has approved part of the wage-pension increase negotiated in Hawaii last February, but has refused to rule on the pension plan or on further wage increases for our Hawaii longshoremen, scheduled for January 1, 1952, in case no pension plan has been agreed to by the employers and our union by that time.

Pacific coast longshoremen, clerks, dock workers, car workers, etc., have just negotiated the best pension plan since that won by the United Mine Workers of America. This plan calls for 15 cents per man-hour employer contribution to a trustee pension fund, plus a 5 cents per hour wage increase, plus fringe and welfare improvements. The pension, wage, welfare settlement is subject to WSB approval, but the WSB has not even worked out the policy on pensions and presently is bound by a 10-percent wage-pension ceiling. So our union rank and file is left hanging on the hook. What is rightfully ours is being withheld, and we face the possibility of having our gains handed back to our employers by order of this Government agency.

We are told that the reason for this possibility is that pensions are inflationary and that inflation is a threat to the national economy and national security. One hundred dollars a month to retire a 65-year-old longshoreman or clerk who has spent 25 years or more in the longshore industry is said to be inflationary; but \$50,000,000,000 in profits for the employer is not.

Simultaneously, bribes are being paid in Washington to get war contracts, amortization privileges, and RFC loans, but these are said not to be inflationary. They are said to be the necessary price under our free-enterprise system of persuading business to produce in the interests of the American people.

We resolve as follows:

1. The ILWU demands approval of our Hawaii and Pacific Coast longshore agreements. Disapproval by the Wage Stabilization Board shall be considered by us the signal for simultaneous stop-work meetings up and down the Pacific coast and by longshoremen in the Territory of Hawaii. Such meetings will be held for the purpose of working out a definite program of economic and political action to secure for our rank and file the gains which we have negotiated.

2. If such meetings, or if the result of such meetings, is that it is determined to

tie up the ships, we serve notice now that all ships will be tied up, without any exceptions.

3. The executive board goes on record now to inform President Truman, Democratic Party Chairman William Boyle, Mr. Charles E. Wilson, Mr. Eric Johnston, and various Congressmen and Senators of the sentiments and program of our union, as expressed in this resolution, and our intention to take such action as we deem necessary to secure the results of our negotiations, and to achieve our objectives in this respect.

4. We call upon our locals to likewise support and endorse this program and to likewise notify President Truman, Mr. William Boyle, chairman of the Democratic Party, Mr. Johnston, and their respective Congressmen and Senators and the Chairman of the National Wage Stabilization Board of our program and of our determination to effectuate it.

Public Housing Contra National Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN JARMAN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, later this week the House will vote on the conference committee report on the independent offices appropriations bill, 1952. It is my understanding that said committee report raises from 5,000 to 50,000 the number of public housing units authorized for 1952. For the consideration of the Members prior to their vote on this report, I have asked unanimous consent, to have this statement printed in the Appendix of the Record.

The House has recently passed a \$7,200,000,000 tax bill for the American people to pay in 1952. It is an emergency revenue-raising measure for a recognized emergency preparedness period in our Nation's history. Our recognized objective is to cut nonessential Government spending to the bone and to raise the necessary revenue to prepare our Nation.

Continuance of a public housing construction program would run contra to our national objective. Read again the House debate on May 4, 1951 and remember that in fiscal 1952 we are urged by our leaders, civilian and military, to prepare for tightening our belts and make our greatest effort to prepare our Nation to meet the Soviet threat. Remember that as one major segment of our national economy, the home-building industry produced approximately 1,400,000 units in 1950, but that for 1951, by imposition of credit controls, our Government has cut home-building volume approximately 40 percent, or to 850,000 units. In the light of these developments in our national preparedness program, there is no justification for the initiation of any new public-housing construction.

At a time when Congress is levying billions of dollars in new taxes on the

people of America, read the following newspaper items and decide for yourself whether Congress will be justified in approving a socialized public-housing program for 1952 that underwrites Housing Authority Federal tax-exempt bonds with an unconditional guarantee by the United States Government.

The following item appeared in the Washington Post on July 13, 1951:

BUSINESS OUTLOOK—COMPETITORS FOR HOUSING BONDS MUST BID IN FIVE PLACES AT ONCE

(By J. A. Livingston)

At 3 p. m. on Tuesday, July 17, two powerful financial syndicates will engage in an unprecedented competition. They'll bid in 58 places at once for the privilege of offering American investors \$171,000,000 of a new type of bond.

The securitizers are Housing Authority bonds of cities, towns, and counties. They're unconditionally guaranteed by the United States Government—lo and behold—totally exempt from Federal taxes. Other guaranteed housing bonds have been issued before, but the Federal guarantee applied only if the local housing authority complied with certain specific conditions. No strings are attached in this case. As for the lo-and-beholdness, I'll come to that later.

What makes the competition unprecedented is that the syndicates must submit bids by personal representatives in places as geographically far apart as Moultrie, Ga., St. Paul, Minn., Bethlehem, Pa., Omaha, Nebr., and San Francisco, Calif. While the bids are being opened officially in these various places, the syndicate managers in New York will engage in a game of show down.

One competing group is headed by New York's Chemical Bank & Trust Co. Because it comprises many of the Nation's largest banks, including the Chase National, Guaranty Trust, First National of Chicago, Philadelphia National Bank of America, it's called the "banking group," though many security dealers are in it. The other syndicate, headed by Blyth & Co., Phelps, Fenn & Co., and Lehman Bros., comprises investment dealers, exclusively, and is called the "dealer group."

The syndicate managers will compare their bids—city by city, town by town, and county by county, to determine who is highest, say, on New Orleans' \$17,340,000 block of bonds, or St. Paul's \$9,270,000, or Bethlehem's \$5,150,000, or Tuckahoe's \$1,320,000, or Pittsburgh's (Tex.) \$544,000. But even that won't be final.

A local bank, or a local investment house, or even a group of local investors might make the best bid on the Public Housing Authority's bonds issued by, say, Jesup, Ga., or Nampa, Idaho. So, the winner will be determined not in New York, but on the spot. On this you can bet, the Western Union and American Telephone & Telegraph offices serving Wall Street will have a busy 30 minutes next Tuesday afternoon.

Obviously, the public-housing deal is not like most competitive-bidding deals—winner take all. If the Blyth group bid is much higher than the Chemical's or vice versa, then one group might swallow the entire issue, except for a local winner here and there. But if the two syndicates gage the municipal bond market at about the same level, then the bonds might be split up 70-30, or 60-40, or 51-49 between the groups.

In that event, the Chemical group might offer for sale to investors one lot of Housing Authority bonds and the Blyth group another lot. Or, they might decide, if the split is nearly even—to combine the offerings into a single, big bundle. In any case, a precedent will be established in the bidding,

and—if the bidding's close—in the subsequent public sale of the bonds.

By specific act of Congress—and here we come to "lo and behold"—the bonds are exempt from Federal income taxation, present and future. That's of great significance at a time of rising personal and corporate taxes. For the \$171,000,000 bonds now being issued are only a beginning.

The law authorizes issuance of bonds for 810,000 dwelling units. If costs run to \$8,000 per dwelling, then \$6,480,000,000 bonds could be issued; if \$10,000, then the issue could run to more than \$8,000,000,000. Either amount would be an impressive addition to the \$23,000,000,000 tax-exempt bonds now outstanding. This is ironical, indeed.

For years, Secretaries of the United States Treasury have tried to do away with tax exemption of State and local securities. The Federal Government declines to accord its own obligations this privilege. Yet, Congress has approved an increase of at least 25 percent in the supply of tax exempts. And on a security Congress, itself, guarantees. So, having approved and sponsored housing bonds, Congress cannot in the near future try to legislate against tax exemption.

Thus, the housing bonds are more than an attractive security to the high-income taxpayer. They're a legislative decision of fundamental economic importance.

The following item appeared in the Washington Post on July 18, 1951:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FIRMS AID \$155,449,000 BOND OFFERING

A syndicate headed by Blyth & Co. and Lehman Bros., and including Folger, Nolan, Inc., Robert C. Jones & Co., and Mackall & Coe yesterday were the successful bidders for \$155,449,000 of \$171,319,000 of housing bonds offered by Housing Authorities of 58 communities spread over the Nation.

The bonds are being offered today at prices to yield from 1.05 percent for 1952 maturities to 2.25 percent for those maturing in 1992.

Judging from preliminary inquiries, dealers said yesterday that many of the earlier maturities would be bought by the larger New York banks and insurance firms. Because of the tax-exempt status of the issues it was thought that most of the longer term bonds would be sold to private investors as the 2.25 percent yield is equivalent to a 4.50 percent yield to people whose incomes are high enough to bear a 50 percent United States income tax.

The \$15,870,000 of bonds not awarded to the foregoing syndicate were sold to a banking group headed by the Chemical Bank & Trust Co. and the Chase National Bank both of New York.

Bond dealers reported yesterday that they expected relatively few of the \$9,000,000 of refunding mortgage bonds of the Washington Gas Light Co. awarded to Kuhn, Loeb & Co. would be sold to investors in the District. It was probable that they would be sold principally to out of town institutions, it was said.

The following item also appeared in the Washington Post on July 18, 1951:

PHA TO DECIDE TODAY ON ACCEPTING LOW-RENT HOUSING BIDS

(By Alfred Friendly)

The Public Housing Administration late last night deferred until this morning a decision whether to accept bids from underwriting syndicates on more than \$171,000,000 worth of bonds to finance low-rent housing projects in 58 communities.

PHA Acting Administrator Marshal W. Amis announced the agency's determination would be made at 10 a. m. today.

The sealed offers were opened yesterday afternoon; the interest rates demanded averaged out to about 2.073 percent.

The fact that PHA did not announce its decision at once indicated that the rate demanded was higher than had been expected, but was not so high as to be rejected outright.

PHA had hoped that the bonds could be floated on a yield basis of less than 2 percent. Some months ago, in a less tight credit situation, the expectation was that they could be sold on a 1½ percent annual interest rate.

The bonds are tax-exempt and guaranteed by the Government, thus constituting attractive securities for investors in the high-income-tax brackets. They are offered by the local housing authorities in 58 communities which have developed the low-cost-housing projects to the point where they need temporary financing.

The \$171,000,000 offering is the first under the 1949 amendments to the 1937 Housing Act. Before the year is out, bonds for more than \$200,000,000 more are expected to be offered, and in the first half of 1952 projects needing \$500,000,000 to build are expected to be ready for permanent financing.

Under the new program the Government is authorized to pay out a subsidy of \$1,500,000,000 over a 6-year period to local housing authorities. This was initially expected to permit the building of 810,000 housing units, but with rising costs only 640,000 to 700,000 are likely.

Here is the way the program works: A local housing authority, borrowing enough money from the Government to get a survey going, lays plans for a housing project. If it is approved by the Public Housing Administration it arranges temporary financing, usually from private sources, and then begins the erection of the units. Later—and this is the case with the 58 projects now offering bonds—it either makes arrangements for permanent financing from the Government or—because it is much cheaper—floats its own bonds, federally guaranteed, for public sale.

Private bidders make offers to underwrite the issue, planning to sell the bonds in turn to individual investors. They indicate, as they did yesterday afternoon, what interest rate they demand to take the issues. Offers are made individually on each project.

The housing units are built to rent for about 20 percent below the going rate for decent housing in each community. The Government subsidy is calculated to make up the difference between the operating cost of the project, to be covered by returns from rental payments, and the cost of paying the interest and amortizing the principal of the bonds in 40 years.

Only low-income families are allowed to rent the units. The definition of low incomes varies from a high of \$2,800 a year to a low (in New Orleans) of \$1,500. No family earning more is allowed to occupy the units.

The average rental for a four- or five-room unit—living room, kitchen-dinette, and two or three bedrooms, and bath—is \$23 a month, plus \$7 for utilities. Rents are not fixed for the unit but for the tenant. That is, the tenant pays a monthly rent exactly one-fifth of his monthly income, whatever kind of apartment he occupies.

Under earlier housing acts a total of 191,700 units have been built and rented. Currently, there are over 800 local housing authorities with projects in active stages.

In yesterday's dealings no projects in nearby areas were involved. The nearest was one in Bethlehem, Pa., which is seeking to float \$5,150,000 worth of bonds. Figuring a cost of \$10,000 for land and construction for each housing unit, this would provide for the erection of something more than 500 dwellings.

A Bill To Get Facts on Point 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Detroit Free Press of Tuesday, July 17, 1951:

A BILL TO GET FACTS ON POINT 4

Rising water, bringing fire in its wake, has visited dire disaster on Kansas City. It could have been prevented. With adequate flood control the whole tragic, desolating horror would have been avoided.

Flood control costs billions. So does elimination of erosion and dust bowls, reforestation, slum clearance, adequate hospitals and institutions for the insane, and all the other vast works which must be done before America will be secure against vicissitudes.

Until it is so, any talk of the United States setting out to remake the world—as President Truman does when he speaks of his point 4—is fatuous, puerile nonsense. Before we undertake to provide each Hottentot with a daily quart of pasteurized milk, our own house must be set in order.

That is why his Capitol Hill colleagues should give earnest consideration to a bill introduced by Representative GEORGE MEADER, a new Member of Michigan's Republican delegation in Congress.

WOULD SHOW ADVANTAGE OF AMERICAN WAY

MEADER concurs with the President that large portions of the earth's surface need what Mr. Truman referred to in his inaugural address as "the benefits of our scientific advances and the industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of undeveloped areas."

He agrees also that the President was right when he said that "their poverty is a handicap and a threat both to them and to more prosperous areas."

Where MEADER stops is at the administration demand that billions of dollars in American tax money be used as the magic wand with which it aspires to transform blighted regions into Edens.

Before the necessity for doing that is accepted the Michigan Congressman would find out exactly why the workings of private enterprise rather than exported socialism can't be made to do the job. Very pertinently he said:

"Just as the United States miraculously outstripped state-controlled economies in war production in World War II by calling upon the immense store of energy and initiative residing in a free people, we can demonstrate the superiority of the free enterprise system over state ownership and management in developing the world's natural resources for the benefit of its people."

Nobody has bothered to discover the truth

Admittedly there are hindrances to that. A major one is the political uncertainties which makes private capital hesitant to undertake ventures abroad.

That is exactly where MEADER's bill comes in. It would create a nonpartisan, nonpolitical body modeled on the Hoover Commission to explore existing barriers to the exercise of American initiative in lands where Mr. Truman would activate his hit-the-taxpayers point 4.

It is the obvious beginning point. Until the bars to private initiation of our "scientific advances and industrial progress" in un-

developed areas are precisely known they cannot be removed.

And until we know to what extent they can be done away with neither Mr. Truman nor anyone else can vouch for the validity of his point 4 concept or any part of it. Yet until MEADER introduced his measure no one, Mr. Truman least of all, ever bothered to find out whether there was even partial justification for the point 4 idea.

That is why we say MEADER's colleagues ought to give his bill their serious attention.

Pro and Con on United States Medical Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, the current July issue of the well-known journal, Medical Economics, contains two articles by two of our colleagues in this House, Representative LOUIS B. HELLER, of New York, and Representative A. L. MILLER, of Nebraska. They discuss the question, Do we need a Federal medical academy? The gentleman from New York [Mr. HELLER], who is the author of a bill to establish a United States Medical Academy, takes up the affirmative side; the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] replies in the negative.

Both articles are clearly and ably written, and the views of each are interestingly presented. I am placing the two articles in the RECORD so that all of us in the House may have the opportunity to read them and become acquainted with the views and opinions of our two distinguished colleagues.

The articles follow:

DO WE NEED A FEDERAL MEDICAL ACADEMY?

(Less than a month after Korea, two proposals for a United States Medical Academy were docketed in the House of Representatives. Although neither bill gained much headway during the Eighty-first Congress, the idea is far from dead. Since May, when one of the proposals was reintroduced, doctors have begun to show rising interest in the scheme. To help crystallize thinking, here is the case for and against a West Point of Medicine. Supporting the idea is Representative LOUIS B. HELLER, Democrat, of New York, its chief sponsor in the current Congress. Writing against the proposal is Representative A. L. MILLER, Republican, of Nebraska, one of the M. D. Members of the House.)

"YES," SAYS CONGRESSMAN HELLER

Twice running, our Nation has come up against a grave emergency with doctors in short supply. What's needed seems almost certainly to be a new source of M. D.'s.

Ideally, any fresh source of supply should provide a steady flow of physicians for the armed services, for Government health agencies, and (under extraordinary conditions) for civilian requirements. A federally supported medical academy would, I believe, meet all these needs.

Had a ready reservoir of doctors been available in June 1950, the confused scramble for medical men we have witnessed during the past year might have been averted. We

would have had, instead, a firm nucleus upon which to expand our military medical forces without disrupting the civilian economy.

As things stand, there are huge gaps all along the line—and little hope of respite. Priority I has claimed 10,000 young doctors; by fall, nearly all of them not deferred will be in uniform. This year's graduating class will scarcely make up the deficit.

Clearly, the pinch will not be temporary. By 1954, Dr. Howard Rusk warns, there will be a shortage of 22,000 physicians. For the moment, we must rely on the doctor draft. But what about later on—the next decade, and the one after that?

The answer I believe, may be found in a Federal medical academy. Here are some of the specific proposals contained in H. R. 3931, which I introduced in Congress on May 2.

Students would be appointed in a manner similar to that used by the Military Academies. Age limits: 20 to 25.

Admission requirements would include a college or university degree (or sufficient entrance qualifications to meet the standards of the student's home-State medical school).

Courses would consist of those prescribed by the AMA.

Students, upon graduation, would be commissioned in any branch of the armed services, in the Public Health Service, or in any other Federal service for 5 years.

Not only would such an academy create a reserve pool of military M. D.'s. It would also offer specialized training which, except in rare instances, medical students do not now get.

Specialization is as important today in Federal services as elsewhere. We need more men specifically trained in aviation medicine. We need more men who know the medical factors of life in underseas craft. We need more authorities on the physiological aspects of service in tropical and polar regions.

And consider our woeful lack of specialists in the Public Health Service, both at home and abroad. Existing medical schools simply don't turn out enough public-health men to meet minimum needs. A Federal medical academy would help fill all these gaps.

Furthermore, specialists in military and Government medicine would attain, through such a medical academy, the full professional status they deserve.

Obvious precedents for this idea are the two United States Military Academies, which produce some of the finest Army and Navy officers in the world. Applied to the study of medicine, why shouldn't the same idea produce some of the finest doctors in the world?

Critics of the academy plan say it would dilute the quality of medical education. Military rigidity, it is charged, would hamper professional freedom.

I must emphasize, therefore, that the proposed medical academy would have students, not cadets. Teaching would be in the hands of fully experienced civilian and military professors. The curriculum would include all courses now prescribed in civilian medical colleges.

A Federal medical academy would keep us better prepared for national emergencies and would, at the same time, help to broaden the scope of medicine in this country. Specialists could be trained for many research fields not now fully exploited. Veterans' care and civil defense would be aided. We could have new assurance that no region of our country would be without a sufficient number of doctors at any time for any reason.

The idea of Federal responsibility in these matters is gaining wide acceptance. It falls logically upon the shoulders of Government to train personnel for its own purposes. No

one questions the Government's responsibility to train Army and Navy field and staff officers. So why shouldn't the Government educate and train its medical officers?

"NO," SAYS CONGRESSMAN MILLER

America's medical schools produce the bulk of the world's best doctors. Within our existing frame-work, and without turning to an untried system, we have the means of producing enough well-trained physicians for all our needs.

Why, then, set up a Federal medical academy?

Supporters of such an academy favor it chiefly as a means of relieving the doctor shortage. And this shortage, they claim—because of the country's emergency status—has become essentially a Federal problem.

Actually, when there are not enough physicians for our Armed Forces, there are also not enough doctors for the home front. So the problem is a lot broader than has been admitted.

We are told that the Korean mobilization points up the desperate need for doctors. The facts of the Korean mobilization are these:

In June 1950, the Army called for 2,167 physicians. Just recently another 1,200 were called. Perhaps 2,800 more will be needed as recruitment for the Armed Forces progresses.

Thus, under present circumstances, the military forces will have taken 6,167 physicians by next fall. If the draining off of this comparatively small number of MD's will create a desperate need and will leave us without enough medical care for civilians, then it's passing strange that we were able to spare 60,000 physicians during World War II.

A Federal medical academy. It's claimed, can be operated outside bureaucratic and military influences. But I have yet to be convinced. The late, unlamented red-tape days (circa 1941-46) proved that military science cannot be compared with medical science. For further proof, consider the Government-administered system of military medical education in France.

One Washington doctor, an authority on the system, describes it this way: "The emphasis is placed on degrees and advanced studies, at a sacrifice of practical experience. Doctors attain medical stature and rank almost automatically on completion of a certain type of course. To my mind, there is an excess of theory; sometimes French medical officers spend up to fifteen years taking one course after another."

Which raises a pertinent question: Would a theorist of 15 years' standing help alleviate a doctor shortage?

Obviously, the development of the individual student gets scant attention under such a system. In this country, fortunately, the medical curriculum focuses on individual needs. And that's the way it should be.

Our present medical schools stress the all-importance of the doctor-patient relationship. Would this concept survive the academy system? My guess is that it would be supplanted by emphasis on the relationship between subordinate and superior.

Recently I asked a top-level Government doctor what he thought would happen in a Federal medical academy. His verdict was that "The therapeutic trial-and-error method would suffer; the scientific approach would be displaced by the 'Yes, sir' approach. We've got complete freedom in medical education, and we want to keep it that way."

It is interesting to note, in passing, that the armed services recently turned to civilian consultants for guidance in their residency training programs. Only since this has happened have standards in military hospitals approached those in civilian hospitals.

And how about mechanics of the academy scheme? Signs are that its sponsors are not

entirely familiar with medical education machinery.

For one thing, the type of academy they foresee would be several times the size of our largest existing medical school. Ten years might well be needed to establish its facilities and faculty. Thus the plan would not seem quite so expedient as we have been led to believe.

Then, too, the proposed method of selecting students raises some serious questions. Would a system of selection controlled by Federal officeholders insure choices based on merit alone? Would the Academy, against stiff competition from established schools, really attract the best-qualified applicants?

It is my belief that the best-qualified applicants would not be enticed into an academy where the prospect was 6 or 8 years' regimented training followed by 5 years' captivity. Such an academy would appeal only to men interested primarily in security, a regular routine, and a retirement pension.

The specialized training proposed would have serious limitations also. Too early specialization in aviation medicine, for example, might seriously impair the sound general training every doctor needs. Likewise, the problems of the submarine specialist bear little relation to those of the public health man. How, then, would the academy give students a thorough medical grounding and still prepare them for widely divergent specialties?

Civilian planners have foreseen clearly the need for certain specialists. The Olsen report of the Association of American Medical Colleges, for example, already has recommended an additional 278 hours of instruction in such fields as aviation and civil defense.

If the need for specialists is more immediate than that, why does not the Government now offer inducements that would attract young doctors to the special fields of military and public-health medicine? Basic training in medicine could very well be left up to the existing medical schools and, if the future were attractive enough, many physicians would enter Government medicine on graduation.

Even West Point and Annapolis do not undertake such an ambitious program as that suggested by the medical academy proponents. Their graduates, after a militarized undergraduate course, are sent to other training centers—often civilian universities—for specialized training.

All of which points up the essential fallacy of the medical academy idea. There is no real proof that our existing medical schools are unable to meet the national demand for doctors. And there is no real proof that the academy structure would be suitable for the study of medicine. It would be as logical, in my opinion, to set up academies for statisticians and lawyers.

The Spanish Bishops and the North Atlantic Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include two recently published articles which are significantly connected, one with the other.

The first is an editorial from the magazine *America*, dated July 14, 1951. It

deals with the recent statement of the archbishops of Spain on the economic problems of that country and the approach of the hierarchy in meeting and solving such problems.

The second article is an editorial from the *Washington Star* by Mr. Constantine Brown on the subject of the possible admission of Spain to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

If the positive approach to Spain's economic problems, advocated by the Spanish Metropolitan and which conforms to our own democratic principles, becomes the firmly-adhered-to policy of the Spanish Government, there will be little left to the already weak arguments against the admission of Spain as a full member of the western alliance against Communist imperialism.

SPANISH BISHOPS SPEAK

Social-minded Catholics the world over, not to mention the suffering people of Spain, will be heartened by the plain-spoken statement on economic problems issued by the archbishops of Spain on June 28. In not a few foreign circles, the opinion has been expressed that the church has been too negative in her hostility to communism. The archbishops' statement, entitled "Instructions of the Conference of Spanish Metropolitans on the Duties of Justice and Charity in the Present Circumstances," should do much to allay these suspicions.

It will not allay all of them, however, since unfriendly critics will see in the episcopal action only a belated and necessary recognition of the current unrest in Spain. Actually, the archbishops agreed on their document last December, several months before widespread dissatisfaction in Spain erupted in strikes in Barcelona, Bilbao, and elsewhere. Publication was postponed until the statement could be submitted to Rome for approval. It is possible that the Holy Father had the document in mind when he said last March, in his broadcast to Spanish workers and employers: "Nobody can accuse the church of having been indifferent to the labor question and the social question, or of not having given them their due importance."

Certainly, whatever one may think of the timing, the statement itself allows for no reservations. Though the archbishops do deal abstractly with such subjects as charity and justice, as is entirely proper in a document of this kind, they also descend into the market place and come to grips with the harsh realities of life in Spain today. Read against the background of contemporary Spain, the statement is not a collection of what some people call pious generalities.

For one thing, the churchmen mince no words in spelling out the duties of government. Calling attention to the inflation ravishing the country and to the scarcity and high cost of food, they remind the Spanish Government of its mission to promote the common good, which "includes in the first place the sustenance of the individual." The archbishops themselves have no mission "to descend to technical economic questions," but this, they dryly observe, is not the case with the Government. Hinting rather broadly that the Franco regime has been something less than inspired in dealing with economic problems, the statement says that "it is indeed the obligation of those who govern to be informed by competent technicians."

More pointedly, the pastoral exhorts the Government to crack down on "all monopolies and hoarders that try to impose high prices." The profit motive is legitimate, say the archbishops, but "to exploit the shortage of goods to amass huge profits by

selling well above the just price" is a sin "that cries to the heavens for revenge."

The archbishops also refer to the touchy question of corruption in the Franco government. It is the duty of the state, they teach, "to exact with severity the fidelity of subordinate agents." And they remind the politicians and bureaucrats that they "can sin doubly against justice by damaging the state and by damaging unjustly their fellow citizens" (Those, incidentally, who refuse, in their hostility to Franco, to distinguish between an authoritarian and a totalitarian state should ask themselves whether religious leaders could ever have published such words in Moscow or Bucharest, in Warsaw or Budapest, in Prague or Peiping.)

Finally, the archbishops, alluding to a grave evil in Spanish life, are critical of the luxurious display of plenty in the midst of widespread suffering and want.

"Let us above all not exasperate the poor, the needy, with contrasting luxury and waste. In difficult times, in times of want, austerity is imposed on all, whether they be private persons or organizations, austerity and charity."

In addition to encouraging clerical and lay leaders to work for social reconstruction, the episcopal statement should be a sufficiently clear indication to the Franco government, and to its uncritical supporters abroad, that something more than anticommunism is expected of an avowedly Christian regime.

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 17, 1951]

FRANCO MAY SOON JOIN THE FACT—ADMIRAL SHERMAN'S VISIT TO MADRID IS EVIDENCE OF SERIOUS ATTITUDE TOWARD SPANISH ARMS

(By Constantine Brown)

Evidence is accumulating rapidly now that the western powers are getting serious about the business of bringing Spain into full-fledged partnership with the Atlantic nations' campaign for preparedness against Communist aggression.

Admiral Forrest Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations, is in Europe on a week's visit, which will include a trip to Madrid for conferences with Spanish officials. It will be the first time a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has conferred directly with the Spanish leadership under the Franco regime, and certainly will provide the basis for subsequent negotiations to bring the Spanish forces up to the level of other western forces as a bulwark against the Reds.

It will be recalled that Admiral Sherman was in Lisbon, Portugal, last year and was denied permission to go to Madrid at that time to talk things over with Gen. Francisco Franco's aides. However, some Spanish officials went to Lisbon, where conferences were held. Admiral Sherman was told by the State Department that he could go to Madrid on a private visit in civilian clothes if he wished, but that any official mission there was out of the question.

Admiral Sherman's present trip is to be taken in conjunction with the visit to Madrid last week of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's group which is touring the continent to see how our defense efforts are doing.

Following the Senators' visit to Madrid the story was put out by authoritative sources there that General Franco has arranged to alter drastically the composition of his cabinet, in what was described as an effort to tighten relations with the western powers. In effect, the shake-up may be an effort to meet some of the western powers' objections to practices of the present Spanish government. If so, there is every reason to believe that the major powers of the North Atlantic coalition can get together with the Franco regime's leaders.

Spain is vitally important to the western powers, not only for the 32 divisions of active troops which she now possesses, but also for the vital airfields which she possesses and which would be a most valuable adjunct of those air bases which we are constructing in France and other continental countries.

The Spanish Army is sadly lacking in modern implements of war. It requires heavy equipment—tanks and other motorized vehicles—as well as such things as modern planes, radar, and antiaircraft artillery. These things could be provided her under pending foreign-aid appropriations if barriers now standing in the way of Spain's association with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization can be surmounted.

The selection of Admiral Sherman for this mission of reconciliation with Spain signifies the interest of the American Navy in the acquisition, too, of Spanish naval bases in the Mediterranean for the use of the sea forces now under the command of Admiral Robert Carney. The whole Mediterranean set-up of NATO is up in the air, however, and some agreement with Spain will go far to eliminate difficulties in arranging that part of the defense system.

With the Korean conflict on the way—although not far yet—to some kind of settlement, if only a cease-fire, and with the Iranian situation boiling over as the United States takes a more direct hand in settlement of what could become an extremely dangerous situation, the European members of the NATO who heretofore have stood in Spain's way should be aware that the peril of Soviet aggression is drawing closer to them than ever before.

Admiral Sherman's mission to Madrid and whatever modernization of Spain's policy grows out of it as well as the Senators' visit must be matched by a similar relaxation of Britain's and France's opposition to the participation of the Franco regime in western-defense arrangements.

The United States is more or less in the middle of the whole matter, with a large and vocal part of the American press and Congress pressing for Spain's inclusion and our principal allies in Europe opposing such action. The American Government itself has moved and is moving closer to a formal commitment to Spain, but it has been prevented from moving all the way by the flat opposition of London and Paris.

Coming weeks may see important progress toward the removal of barriers which now stand between Spain and the other western powers.

Commission on Aid to Underdeveloped Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Spruille Braden, of New York City:

NEW YORK, N. Y., July 3, 1951.

The Honorable GEORGE MEADER,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Please accept my thanks for your June 14 letter enclosing your address before the House when introducing your bill to create a Commission on Aid to Underdeveloped Areas.

While I thoroughly agree with your repeated emphasis on the fact that the development of the natural resources of underdeveloped areas must largely be accomplished by private enterprise, I am somewhat fearful that a Commission such as you suggest would find it difficult to make an adequate investigation of this situation, which, in effect, would necessarily have to comprehend a survey of the entire world economy and the economies of each area. In this connection, I respectfully urge your perusal of my testimony given to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House on October 6, 1949.

Incidentally, I doubt that any commission could get very far in convincing the rest of the world to go along the path of individual endeavor such as made this Nation great, when we are, ourselves, departing so rapidly and largely from this sound principle. In other words, the first step must be the setting of a good example by the United States.

With assurances of my high esteem, I am,
Faithfully yours,

Spruille Braden.

Letter From the Secretary of the Air Force Concerning Rotation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 6, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, for many weeks I have been encouraging the Air Force to develop a positive program of rotation and replacement to relieve men in Reserve units such as the Four Hundred and Fifty-second Bomb Wing who have been facing constant enemy fire in Korea.

Last month I addressed a communication to the Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Finletter, again directing this situation to his attention and urging that a rotation and replacement program be developed. In replying to my communication, Mr. Finletter expressed encouraging news that the Air Force is now prepared to work out such a program.

I wish to place in the RECORD at this point, Mr. Finletter's letter to me on this important subject:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,

Washington, July 12, 1951.

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS,

House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HILLINGS: I have your letter of June 30 in which you enclose a letter from a member of the Four Hundred and Fifty-second Light Bomb Wing.

I think there is some misapprehension on the part of your informant. What I said about morale applied generally to the Fifth Air Force. I was not singling out any particular unit. I obviously did not have the time to make any thorough inspection of the morale of the units. As far as the general morale is concerned, I and the various officers who were with me talked to as many people as we could in the short time we were there and were impressed by the morale, which was reflected in the magnificent record which the Fifth Air Force is producing in Korea. The information given me about the Four Hundred and Fifty-second was that its morale also had improved very greatly. I cannot of course know this of my own knowl-

edge, but I cannot help but believe that this must to a large extent be the case in view of the excellent fighting record which the Four Hundred and Fifty-second is making. I cannot believe that any organization with the record that all of these wings of the Fifth Air Force have can be specifically deficient in morale. But perhaps I may be wrong.

The rotation situation is this:

There are two phases of the operation in Korea. In the first phase we had the job of building up our air power. This meant that rotation could not be carried out at the rate that we would like to see it carried out. This is particularly true of the light bomber wings, of which unfortunately there are none too many in the Air Force. The B-26's are our standard light bomber and are playing an especially important role in the Korean operation. It has just unfortunately not been possible to rotate units of the light bombers because we didn't have them. As a result of the light bombers, as well as many of the fighting units of the Fifth Air Force, have had to stay.

Now this situation is improving. We hope by the end of August and the beginning of September to enter into another phase wherein proper rotation will be achieved. The method is as follows:

There are two different sets of standards, one for the combat crews and the other for the ground personnel. In the case of combat crews General Weyland is taking a number of factors (such as time in the combat area, number of missions, and type of equipment) into consideration to establish the so-called optimum standard for rotation. This standard will enable a man to be replaced in accordance with criteria which the Air Force thinks proper and equitable. You will note that this rotation standard was not based on a number of missions alone, although in the case of the Four Hundred and Fifty-second I am informed that they have been told they will be replaced after 75 combat missions.

As far as the ground personnel is concerned, it goes geographically. In the case of Korea the time on an optimum standard is set at 18 months.

Your correspondent also states that other matters are unsatisfactory, although he is not specific about them. I wonder if you would have any objection to my asking the Chief of Staff to send a copy of your letter to General Weyland, as well as a copy of my reply. I shall not do so unless I receive your agreement.

If there is any other information I can give you, please call me.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS K. FINLETTER.

National Affairs Platform of the American Veterans' Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the national affairs platform of the American Veterans' Committee recently adopted at the fifth annual convention in New York City. At this meeting of this World War II veterans' organization our distin-

guished colleague the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] was the guest of honor. While I do not subscribe by any means to every item in the platform, I feel that it admirably demonstrates the long-standing slogan of the members of AVC that they are "Citizens first, veterans second."

There being no objection, the platform was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL AFFAIRS PLATFORM

A. PREAMBLE

National affairs are necessarily conditioned by the prospect of our being a partially mobilized society for many years to come. The policies we here advocate in and of themselves will not preserve and extend democratic values; essential to their ultimate effectiveness is the caliber of the administration and its devotion to the interests of all our people rather than to any single sector of our society.

B. STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

It is appropriate in this preliminary statement of national affairs principles, first to reaffirm our support of the great aims and principles contained in the Charter of the United Nations. The traditional category of national affairs no longer comes vacuum-packed; fiscal and economic policies, labor and manpower programs, the social and economic opportunities that are either opened or denied to individuals—all these have an impact on the effectiveness of American and U. N. efforts to achieve an honorable peace and economic well-being for all.

Since the Communist aggression in Korea, traditional policies of AVC, and of every other civic organization, have been in a state of reappraisal. In making this reappraisal, we reaffirm our whole-hearted support of liberal principles and urge their continual application and, indeed, extension to allow us to surmount the emergency as a free Nation. We cannot afford to place AVC principles in the deep-freeze locker of a fallacious "all guns and no butter" economic mobilization.

The platform proposals contained herein assume an emergency of a long-range character—perhaps a generation or more. In this realistic view, all Americans must learn to live with tension and not to buy the first "quickie" solution offered by an irresponsible individual or group.

Over a long-run period of national mobilization, the greatest internal threat to our way of life is potential development of a garrison-police state. In our natural desire to protect ourselves from external aggression or from the related threat of the small minority of Communists in America, we cannot afford to sabotage the very freedoms we are trying to protect. Of vital importance in the prevention of a garrison-police state is the principle of civilian supremacy. The subversion of this principle would be a first step on the road toward totalitarianism.

Democracy will be effective only if all major segments of our national life are active participants in the formulation and execution of national policies. The exclusion of any major segment—whether it be big or small business, or labor, or the farmer—would severely handicap the national mobilization program. Even more vital is the development of leadership in Government that is tied to the public interest, broadly conceived, and which is capable of rising above the special viewpoint of any interest group—whether that be big or small business, labor, the farmer, the veteran, or the professional military. Our Government must recruit men who are motivated by a

desire to serve all our people and not any particular interest group.

C. ECONOMIC AND FISCAL POLICIES

We recommend that economic policies be directed toward increasing productive capacity, maximizing total production, more rapid fulfillment of military needs, preventing further inflation and rolling back those prices, such as beef, which have far exceeded the general indices, assuring equality of sacrifice, curtailing less essential goods and services prior to cutting down essential activities and keeping always in the forefront those measures necessary for sustained full employment.

We further recommend:

1. That Government expenditures, both military and nonmilitary, be under constant scrutiny with a view to eliminating any unnecessary or wasteful items, but without curtailing essential public, social, and economic services.

2. That corporate taxes, with emphasis on excess-profits taxes, closing of loopholes, progressive personal income and inheritance taxes and excise taxes on luxury goods be utilized in that order to produce new revenue. We are unalterably opposed to general-sales taxes.

3. That appropriate measures be taken to control: (a) bank credit and inventory expansion; (b) prices, including subsidies, dollars-and-cents ceilings, and quality control of consumer goods; (c) wage and salary stabilization consistent with stable prices and a fair sharing of all categories in the distribution of our total income; (d) residential and commercial rents; and (e) Government procurement so as to minimize economic dislocations in the United States and among its allies.

4. That this program be administered on a fair, nonpolitical, and nonpartisan basis and not dominated by any one sector of the economy.

5. We emphasize the need for expanding our national productive capacity to the point that we can produce for both civilian and military needs; during this transitional period all Americans will face some cut in the standard of living and should be prepared for the necessary sacrifices, which sacrifices should be in relation to the ability to sacrifice. The business-as-usual philosophy must also be eliminated as a matter of public policy and the emphasis placed on a production of adequate quantities of bulk-line, popular-priced essential consumer goods.

6. Vital to our democracy is the preservation of small business, and we urge that Government procurement and other controls be administered to preserve and stimulate small business. We condemn the policies which have favored big business and furthered economic concentration.

D. MILITARY MANPOWER

The Federal Government should conscript citizens for military service only in time of war or in periods when it is necessary to do so to prevent war. We believe that in the current crisis the United States is justified in adopting some program of universal military training. Congress should specifically review the program and vote on the question of its continuance at the end of a 5-year period.

E. CIVIL RIGHTS

1. The freedom and dignity of the individual citizen constitute the very foundation of American democracy. AVC has always stood firmly against all practices of segregation and discrimination because of race, creed, or national origin. We hereby reaffirm our faith in the democratic way of life and in the civil liberties and basic human rights upon which it rests and we call

upon our fellow citizens to join us in resisting all assaults upon it.

2. We are opposed to the restrictions being imposed upon the rights of free inquiry and free expression of opinion by governmental bodies and private groups.

3. We oppose those activities of the House Un-American Activities Committee that have fostered its definition of un-American thoughts and have created fear and suspicion.

4. We oppose the misuse of the cloak of congressional immunity for unprincipled attacks upon individuals and groups.

5. Although we recognize the existence of security problems in sensitive areas, we oppose the conduct of the Federal loyalty program insofar as it lacks adequate safeguards for the rights and reputations of Government employees.

6. We oppose the casting of suspicion upon particular groups by the imposition of special oaths.

7. We oppose the suppression of books, movies, works of art, and so forth, at the behest of private groups simply because they are not to their liking.

8. We urge the repeal of the McCarran Act.

9. We urge the establishment by executive order, and/or by legislation, of an FEPC. We urge the establishment of State FEPC's.

10. We urge the passage of antipoll tax, antilynching, and related measures recommended by the President in his Civil Rights messages of 1948.

11. We urge the absolute end of all segregation in the Armed Forces, including the National Guard.

12. We urge that there be included in all Federal legislation making grants to States, cities, or private institutions a provision requiring the benefits of those grants to be administered without discrimination or segregation as to race, color, or creed.

13. We urge the creation of a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice with adequate funds for effective operation.

14. We urge the withdrawal of all tax exemptions from all institutions practicing discrimination except as to sectarian institutions administering or granting preference to a particular sectarian group.

15. We urge that the immigration and naturalization laws be amended to eliminate discriminations, qualifications, and limitations based on race.

F. EDUCATION

1. We recommend that Federal aid to the States should be granted by the Federal Government only to public schools to achieve equality of educational opportunity.

2. We recommend that a Federal program of scholarship aid to individuals should be undertaken to enable outstanding young men and women to secure higher education at accredited institutions of their choice where they are prevented from doing so by economic barriers. Scholarships should be awarded on the basis of ability and financial need without regard to race, color, creed, or national origin.

G. HEALTH AND SOCIAL WELFARE

1. We favor a Federal program of national health insurance and aid to medical education to increase the number of trained doctors and nurses.

2. We support extension of unemployment benefits to persons who are unemployed because of illness or injury not connected with employment. We demand that the principle of administration of all social insurance through a public insurance fund at a pooled risk be maintained.

3. We favor the expansion of social security to cover all employed persons, and a program of family allowances, with adequate benefits to meet the needs of increased cost of living.

4. We urge the creation of a Federal Department of Public Welfare under a secretary with cabinet rank.

H. HOUSING AND CONSTRUCTION

1. Defense housing must be given top priority. Other civilian housing—for low- and middle-income families—should be given a number two priority. Construction of schools, hospitals, and other public service buildings must be given precedence over all nondefense commercial building, luxury housing, and high-cost apartments.

2. We oppose the cut-back in the public-housing program and urge the implementation of the Public Housing Act of 1949.

3. We support the principle of cooperative housing.

I. NATURAL RESOURCES

We urge the establishment of a Federal Department of Natural Resources which would be responsible for over-all development and conservation of natural resources. The Interior Department has the staff and the know-how around which this new department should be organized.

We strongly support the principle: "One river—one plan" which has been tested and proven under the Tennessee Valley Authority. To make most effective the harnessing of water power, irrigation, reclamation, flood control, navigation, and other beneficial uses of our resources, we urge that the Federal functions of natural resources development in each river basin should be administered under one Federal agency. We must use the best organizational and administrative techniques available for the effective development of our natural resources. We therefore urge prompt establishment of a Columbia Valley Authority, a Missouri Valley Authority, a Central Valley Authority, and similar authorities in other major river basins, whose program would be integrated by the Secretary of Natural Resources.

The prompt development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is essential to avert a threatened shortage of iron ore, to provide access between our Great Lakes and the Atlantic, to develop the finest undeveloped hydroelectric site on the North American continent, and to spur the development of Canada's rich natural resources for our common benefit in this national mobilization and for our future expanding economy. We urge that Congress promptly take steps to initiate its development.

Our natural resources development must be geared toward utilization for the benefit of all the people. Toward this objective, we urge that Congress appropriate funds for transmission lines to carry electric power from Federal dams; that access roads be built to bring timber on Federal lands within reach of the small logger; and that Federal cooperative sustained yield timber programs uniformly include provision for reciprocal use of the cooperator's logging roads by other loggers. The management of public lands and forests must aim for both conservation and the development of their fullest uses, including watershed protection, control of stream pollution, grazing, mineral development, flood and erosion control, fish and wildlife habitat protection, recreation, and other uses. Our Federal mining laws must be amended to prevent their abuse and to provide more effective safeguards for the development of both the mineral and non-mineral uses of the land.

The needs of our national security and our expanding national economy require increased development and effective conservation of our lubricants and liquid fuels. We urge the prompt establishment of a commercial synthetic liquid-fuels industry based on our great coal and oil shale reserves, the enactment of legislation for administration by the Federal Government of the oil re-

sources in the submerged lands on the continental shelf and the expansion of hydroelectric power development to conserve our exhaustible supplies of fuels as well as to meet the demands of our industrial expansion.

The increased threat of severe water shortages in many industrial and agricultural areas of our Nation demands prompt development of economical methods of desalting sea water.

In the light of our national security needs, we urge that Congress provide increased funds for the exploration and survey of our mineral and other natural resources, as well as for increased research to develop their most effective utilization. We cannot afford to continue to gorge and waste.

J. CIVIL DEFENSE

We deplore Congress' gross neglect of the civil-defense problem. We recommend a dynamic program of civil defense based upon national leadership and guidance, as well as a national absorption of a preponderance of financing.

We favor a strong State and local effort in terms of personnel, and pledge the full support and participation of our State and chapter organizations.

We favor the policy of "dual purpose" projects wherever possible.

K. CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

1. The Congress must assume new and heavy responsibilities in the present emergency. It must act efficiently and it must be responsive to the national interest rather than representative of regional or private interests. To this end we urge:

(a) That the House of Representatives reinstate the curbs imposed on the House Rules Committee during the Eighty-first Congress.

(b) That the Senate repeal the Wherry cloture rule and adopt a rule for closure of debate by a simple majority. Cloture rules should apply with full force to a motion to take up a bill.

(c) That both Houses take action to improve the quality and safeguard the tenure of the professional staffs of congressional committees.

(d) That there be established a Joint Standing Committee on Lobbying Activities and Campaign Expenditures.

(e) That the Celler bill requiring a fair redistricting of congressional districts be enacted.

2. The investigatory power of Congress is one of the most important means by which it can maintain an effective and needed surveillance over the activities of executive agencies, and over other matters within its legislative competence. At the same time, it is a power which, when entrusted to ruthless and ambitious men, can be used for groundless and expensive harassment of public agencies, and for the vilification of public officials and private citizens. To enable Congress to properly exercise its lawful investigatory authority, but to safeguard the rights and reputations of individuals we urge:

(a) That congressional committees accord full rights of rebuttal and cross-examination to interested persons.

(b) That congressional committees adhere more closely to judicial standards on the admissibility of hearsay evidence.

(c) That Congress itself develop a meaningful code of ethics that would apply to all Members of that body as a means of eliminating irresponsibilities and curbing libelous and slanderous statements.

L. TERRITORIES

We urge that Congress should grant home rule to the District of Columbia.

We urge that Congress immediately act to extend statehood to the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii.

We further urge that Congress enact legislation providing for a Presidential-Congressional Commission to make an intensive investigation of the problems of the remaining United States Territories and to recommend a long-range policy for their administration, a policy which should be directed toward the granting of either statehood or independence.

M. CRIME, CORRUPTION, AND POLITICS

We urge the immediate enactment of legislation that will implement the recommendations of the (KEFAUVER) Crime Committee. Even more important we urge an acceleration of activity on the part of State and local law-enforcement agencies as a vital step in cleansing our national political stables; we pledge the full support of our National, State, and chapter organizations to this program, one phase of which must be the transformation of the AVC "Credo of a Public Servant" into a living reality. The real job of political house cleaning belongs at the grass-roots level. Passing the buck to Washington can bring sensational headlines that are meaningless if State and local officials—and the public—meanwhile sit on their hands.

The Chiefs of the Children's Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mrs SMITH of Maine Mr. President, I have prepared a brief statement about the distinguished women who have served as Chiefs of the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor, and about the present Chief, Dr. Martha Eliot, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Someone has said that an institution is the lengthened shadow of a man. I would add that the Children's Bureau is the lengthened shadow of four great women: its first three Chiefs, Julia Lathrop, Grace Abbott, and Katharine F. Lenroot, and now its fourth Chief, Dr. Martha Eliot. Dr. Eliot does not come lately to her new tasks, for she served on the staff of the Bureau from 1924 to 1949, and for 15 of these 25 years she was, first, Assistant Chief and then Associate Chief.

Devoted and self-denying, all these distinguished women would disclaim such a tribute. Indeed, Katharine Lenroot expressed such a disclaimer most beautifully in a speech she made at the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Bureau when she said:

"The Children's Bureau is not an office or a staff or an appropriation or a body of experience or a method of procedure.

"It is one expression of an appeal and a response—the appeal of the billions of children whose lives have been snuffed out or who have been doomed to suffering, misery, and sorrow from the birth of humanity to the present day; and the response of the sympathetic and understanding spirits of every age—from the ancient Hebrew prophet who cried, 'Shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul'—to the prophets among our own friends and associates. * * * Such is the soul of the Children's Bureau."

Despite such generosity, those of us who have followed the Children's Bureau over the years know what great spirit and sacrifice these women have brought to their public service in behalf of children.

Katharine Lenroot came to the Children's Bureau as a young woman not yet 24 years old. She was a graduate of the University of Wisconsin, having been trained by that great teacher and social leader, Prof. John R. Commons, and had served some 2 years in the Wisconsin Industrial Commission. She won her position with the Children's Bureau through competitive civil-service examination.

Starting as an investigator for the Bureau, she was given increasing responsibilities, as she rose to the position of Assistant to the Chief and later Assistant Chief. In 1934 President Franklin D. Roosevelt made this daughter of a Republican Senator the Chief of the Children's Bureau, a position which she has dignified and enhanced through 17 years.

I emphasize the nonpartisan character of this appointment, because I think it expresses a fundamental principle to which we must always hold. Children must not be made a party issue. The Bureau that serves our children must not be made a party issue. I am proud to testify to the fact that its Chiefs have faithfully adhered to this principle and have never allowed their high office to be used for political advantage. Whatever party each of us may belong to, our ministering to the needs of children must be above party consideration if we are to give all children their fair chance in life and to build a new generation that is truly sound and secure in body, mind, and heart.

With the retirement of one Chief and the appointment of a new Chief, the temptation to look backwards to see how far we have come is great, and I have indulged in it. But we have an even greater obligation to face up to our unfinished business for children and to set our sights even higher than they have been set before. It is one of the distinguishing marks of our people, in which we can take justifiable pride, I think, that each generation of us wants to make life richer, fuller, and more meaningful for the next generation than it has been for us.

I do not need to belabor the point that there is still a great task ahead of all of us and ahead of the Children's Bureau, in particular.

Happily, that Bureau will continue to be lead by an able and dedicated person. Dr. Eliot comes to her new duties after service as a medical social worker and experience in the medical field for many years. She has behind her 25 years on the staff of the Children's Bureau. In her early days with this Bureau, she directed some of its most important research in the field of child health. One of her significant research projects concerned the prevention and control of rickets in children. During this period, she wrote one of the early revisions of Infant Care, since 1914 the Government's best-selling guide on how to raise babies.

Appointed Assistant Chief of the Bureau in 1934 and made associate chief in 1941, Dr. Eliot headed the health and medical services of the Bureau. During World War II, she supervised the operations of the maternity and infant-care program which brought great comfort to the servicemen in our Armed Forces and was used by close to 1,500,000 of their wives and infants.

For the past 2 years, Dr. Eliot has served as an assistant director general in the World Health Organization, with headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland. From this vantage point she helped in the development of WHO's programs concerned with environmental sanitation, malaria, tuberculosis, venereal-disease control, maternal and child health, and nutrition. During her period

with WHO, Dr. Eliot made extended visits to India and to a number of European countries. She now returns to the Children's Bureau enriched by these opportunities to observe the way other nations are tackling their children's needs.

The Tungsten Program of the Defense Minerals Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article dated July 6, 1951, from the Western Mineral Survey, of Salt Lake City, Utah, analyzing the recently announced tungsten program of the Defense Minerals Administration.

This analysis makes it apparent that the present program is going to result in very little new tungsten production. I particularly invite the attention of the Preparedness Subcommittee to this article, since that committee has recently issued a very excellent report on domestic tungsten production.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROMINENT UTAH MINER SCORES TUNGSTEN PROGRAM

Arthur Blake Thomas, well-known mining operator of Salt Lake City, Utah, has done a great service for the miners of tungsten ore with his analysis and comment relating to the recent release by the United States Government that set a price of \$63 per unit for 60-percent tungsten ore.

Mr. Thomas has called the attention of James Boyd, of the United States Bureau of Mines, and Otto G. Klein, regional director of United States General Services Administration, to the fact that their statements contradict one another and that the small miner will find that the \$63 price for ore is an illusion. Mr. Thomas sets forth his analysis of the tungsten market price set-up as it exists at the present time.

"Dr. Boyd has stated that the tungsten purchasers to be made by the Government, will be routed into commercial channels by utilization of presently built mill facilities and that it will be within the ceiling prices of \$65 per unit, the price of Government specification concentrates. In other words the price on crude tungsten ore, f. o. b. Government buying depots will be settled on the amount of Government specification concentrate that can be produced therefrom.

"Mr. Klein, of Denver, has widely spread the news that the Government ore price is to be \$63 per unit for crude ores less penalties involved. To begin with Dr. Boyd and Mr. Klein contradict each other. If the penalties involved are those now in use in the regular commercial channels, who are to handle Government ores, then the price of crude tungsten ore will be under \$20 per 1-percent unit—a price at which the miner cannot produce.

"People in Salt Lake have phoned Mr. Klein and asked him to explain what he means by the term less penalties involved. He has stated that he does not know what

they are. Evidently the tungsten project of the Government is going to be like zinc—a quotation price of 17 cents a pound, but pay to the miner at from 4 to 6 cents per pound. The crime of the matter is that Utah and Nevada, and perhaps Colorado, are full of good-intention small miners now spending their small-venture capital to develop tungsten and under the assumption they will get a price of above \$50 per unit for it.

"I have taken the matter up with various Senators and so forth, to see if the Government won't at once announce its price on crude tungsten ore in a dollar-and-cents statement so that this potential loss might be cut short before too many miners are hurt. I know of your long interest in behalf of mining and hence send you the summary of the situation. I believe it is clear. If there is enough publicity, it might lead to prevention of sacrifice of the miner's interest and to the eastern refinery interests."

As I understand the matter the price of crude ore is to be derived from a price of \$63 per unit of Government specification concentrate that can be produced therefrom. Government specification concentrates are defined as a 60 percent WO₃ concentrate and also devoid of certain contaminations common to most ores. The mine which yields ore from which such a concentrate can be produced is a freak—in the 1,000 to 1 variety. If a given ore is capable of producing only a 20- to 25-percent WO₃ concentrate, through milling at western points, then this material is sent east to chemical refineries where a pure product is achieved. The price paid f. o. b. western points for 20 to 25 percent WO₃ concentrate is far below \$63 per unit of 1 percent and in the vicinity of \$40 per 1 percent unit. Here is an immediate \$23 per ton deduction or penalty that must be imposed on the western miner who has a 1-percent crude ore.

The many fine metallurgical testing laboratories as well as the Bureau of Mines experimental stations will verify the assertion that a recovery of 60 percent of the tungsten content in a 20 to 25 percent concentrate is a realistic average for our domestic tungsten ores, which are very difficult to mill to additional advantage. This brings up the question of "tailings" or mill losses of unrecoverable tungsten in any given ore. Here is another penalty or deduction to be imposed on the miner. What will it be? In actual practice it will probably reach to 40 percent of the gross value of his tungsten or on a 1-percent ore about \$16 per ton. A résumé of what a 1-percent WO₃ is now worth, through established commercial channels is of interest.

For Government specification concentrates impossible to produce from almost all western mines or ores, \$63 per ton.

The going price for 20- to 25-percent concentrate, and this represents the type of concentrate that western mines can produce, \$40 per unit.

Representing mill or tailings loss from the average western mill which can be conveniently erected and operated, \$16 (minus).

The actual worth of 1 percent ore after assessment of penalty for failure to make specified concentrate and mill losses, \$24.

Western mills now processing ore for the miner charge \$7.50 for their service plus \$1.15 independent sampling charges. The figure is entirely in line and just, \$8.65 (minus).

Net value at the mine of a 1-percent tungsten ore, \$15.35.

The above figures are entirely proper. One can safely state that a 1-percent tungsten ore at a western mine now has a value of between \$15 and \$20 per ton. From this figure the miner must pay the costs of mining, which can reach from \$5 to \$8 to \$12 per ton, depending on the amount of exploration carried on to put a new ton of ore

in sight for each ton extracted. Mines are seldom on the railroad and a truck charge of from \$2.50 for 50 miles or \$5 for 100 miles must be met. Railroad freight of from \$2 to \$4 to \$6 per ton is also in order. All this must come from a product worth from \$15 to \$20 per ton at the mine, if a 1-percent ore is to be utilized. If it can't be, only small amounts of tungsten will appear.

At the moment I know of a number of groups of miners who purchase expensive compressors, trucks, and other equipment and move to their 7-percent or 8-percent of 1-percent mines or prospects to produce ore in anticipation of a \$63 per unit price, less \$5 or \$10 or \$15 in penalties they expect to be deducted at the point of delivery. This is the very natural result of recent press releases. Cannot the depot price be announced at once to save eventual loss to a class of people upon whom we all depend for most necessary material.

The refinery is the only point where saving seems possible, if a realistic program is to be put into effect. I understand that only a handful of such establishments are in the East. They assumedly pay \$63 for Government specification concentrates. But such concentrate is never available except from a few sources. The net result is that western concentrates are purchased at around \$40 per unit. These people then produce tungsten powder for industry. The quoted price, as I understand the matter is \$4 25 per pound or \$85 per ton. Government specifications concentrates are apparently not of themselves of any value to industry. The term is simply used as a marketing expression to gauge prices. It is confusing and unnecessary and logs the real issue.

Comments on Atomic War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Caraker Comments on Atomic War," written by George Ernest Caraker, a broadcaster for the North Dakota Broadcasting Co., Inc., of Minot, N. Dak. Mr. Caraker is a bachelor of science and master of arts. He is one of our outstanding citizens, and an authority on atomic energy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARAKER COMMENTS ON ATOMIC WAR

(By George Ernest Caraker)

The defense against an atomic war can not come from the material world. I attended conferences at the United Nations, met and talked with world-famous scientists on both sides of the Atlantic, and did much research. At the end of all this the scientist had one sentence to give the world: there is no defense against an atomic attack.

The only defense in an atomic war is not to have one. The only way not to have the war is to outlaw the destructive uses of the atomic energy. The way to outlaw the destructive uses is to agree to a plan. There are two plans, untouched, unfinished, and almost abandoned. The Gromyko and the

Baruch plan. Unfortunately the dust is beginning to settle on those two plans out there in the United Nations.

The fact that Russia has the atomic bomb, renders useless our claim to the priority of the atomic potential. I mention this atomic question for one reason, to remind, that behind the curtain in the struggle for agreement between the east and the west lies a threat unparalleled in all our history. Make no mistake about it, when you think of Korea and China—think of atomic bombs. When you think of Western Europe and the iron curtain—think of atomic bombs. When Russia moves in the west—expect atomic bombs to fall. And think, how, in this grave hour of crisis man is going to solve the problem with which he is confronted.

Our hope in this crisis, is, that man can repeat history by drawing from some moral or spiritual force to guide him. Somehow in the past, he made it, and now once again is trying to save himself from destruction. This is the world at midcentury, where never before in our history did mankind seek so desperately for the answers to its morals and physical questions. Nations, suddenly aware that they must solve deep problems, began dumping overboard, old ideals, old concepts, old graces, and respects for the humanities.

How can we save ourselves? We can, as in the past, by realizing our own worth, and reinforcing our appeal for those who are unsure of the road to follow. Unlike democracy, Communist ideas laugh at the assertion that individual freedom is essential. But it is essential, because it is freedom which enables man to achieve progress. But these newcomers claim to have found, inside a few years, the answer to all problems which have beset us since the dawn of history. They look upon freedom and individual decency as an outmoded relic. They say, freedom is a barrier to Communist power, and that freedom is something with which the masses may not be trusted.

Yet, despite these fanaticisms—despite the universal aggressiveness—despite all these things, these ideologies reveal fatal weaknesses and misgivings. For it is the lesson of history, that in the long run, freedom is strength and suppression and compulsion is weakness. But such a fact also means that we should be on the alert, for the strength which comes from freedom must be understood and used and not abused or, we will lose that freedom. Such is the challenge of the twentieth century. That we live our daily lives, conduct our community life and our local and Federal Government in such a fashion, that people will see in our way of life the solutions to their severest problems.

The central fact behind socialism and communism is that man cannot think for himself, govern himself, or plan for himself. This means that power goes to a selected group of men, who believe in man's perfection, or the power goes to one man who dictates to millions. The people then find themselves unable to protect themselves through law, justice, politics, and the press. If we use 30 centuries of history, then powerful groups of individuals end up by confusing the issue and by losing touch with the masses. The few leaders fall in their approach to reality and sanity. Then the grand end comes for his country and unfortunately for a large part of the world. This trend today could lead to an atomic war and, because of Russian tactics, threatens to engulf the whole world.

From the central theme of communism has come a vast, mad dogma which has spread far and wide, brutalizing nations, undermining nations, violating treaties, gaining fanatical converts, and controlling 750,000,000 people.

Born during periods of economic distress, we find their leaders largely recruited from the ranks of adventurers and malcontents and social misfits, with the idea of setting up an all-powerful state to control economic activity and eliminate political choice.

While it would be a serious and perhaps fatal mistake for the free world to underestimate the strength and determination of the Communists and Socialists within our midst and in other countries, particularly communism, there is ample evidence that all systems which deny freedom and rely upon compulsion and suppression carry within themselves the seeds of defeat. It would seem that if we are able to solve this threat, then the danger of the atomic bomb might be converted into an instrument for the good of man. If the people of the United States ever decided to abandon their freedom for some new ideology offered them by some powerful dictator, it will not be for the lack of warning—for today America is in the enviable position to study the countries about her—where socialism and communism have taken over.

The free world has two battles to win—the one is a social revolution, a revolution in human relations; the other is the atomic threat—the two battles cannot be separated from each other. It is a world-wide struggle with ethics on one hand and physics on the other, and the decision will have to be reached.

Tribute to the Flag by Mrs. Nora L. Kearns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able article entitled "What Price, Old Glory," by Mrs. Nora L. Kearns, wife of CARROLL D. KEARNS, Representative in the House of Representatives from the Twenty-eighth District of Pennsylvania. It discusses the necessity of taking steps to protect the American flag.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT PRICE, OLD GLORY

(By Nora L. Kearns)

Throughout history, the great nations have had laws to prevent the desecration and mutilation of their flags. The United States, however, has no such Federal law applicable outside the District of Columbia.

The record reveals that efforts to have a Flag Act enacted into law, "To make it an offense against the United States to use the flag . . . for advertising purposes, or to mutilate, defile, or cast contempt upon the flag of the United States," have materialized only to the extent of having such bills consigned to committees of the House and Senate where further action has remained pending—pending since December 18, 1897.

The flag itself was born amid the turbulent days of revolution, June 14, 1777. It was more than 100 years later, however, on June 14, 1899, that a hitherto obscure teacher-principal of a free kindergarten for the poor decided to commemorate that birthday by holding patriotic exercises. The program attracted attention far and wide

and marked the beginning of ceaseless efforts to promote a popular awareness to the historical significance of the flag; to preserve and to perpetuate the aims, ideals, and principles which it symbolizes; and to secure by law, the protection which is its right.

The day itself, June 14, first designated as "Flag Day" by the Colonial Dames of Pennsylvania in 1893, has generally come to be observed as a holiday, though it exists legally as such only in Pennsylvania. The thousands of inspirational public meetings held on Flag Day each year throughout the United States are evidence of American patriotism and the message of the flag, upon that—her greatest day—resounds anew on the Fourth of July and other national holidays.

There does exist a code of flag etiquette, adopted by 68 patriotic organizations, through the auspices of the American Legion. This code can represent the opinion of these organizations only, however, and is not Federal law. The War Department prescribes rules and regulations governing the use of the flag for observance within the Army, but again, it is beyond its province to prescribe them for civilians.

The first national flag bill was introduced in 1897 through the efforts of the Daughters of the American Revolution. They have not relaxed in their Operation Patriotism and in their most recent Continental Congress, April 1951, reaffirmed by resolution.

"Whereas the flag of the United States has no protection by Federal law against desecration and mutilation; and

"Whereas there have been introduced House bill 1333 and Senate bill S 555 for the protection of the United States flag from mutilation, desecration, and mercenary exploitation, with penalties for violation of said laws,

"Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, support House bill 1333 and Senate bill 555."

Their efforts to arouse public sentiment toward the passage of a flag bill have been duplicated by hundreds of similarly minded patriotic societies, veterans organizations, civic groups, lodges and benevolent orders, and individuals. Representatives of foreign governments in the United States have also, understandably, requested a national code of flag etiquette.

Of course, if such a bill were passed, no longer, lawfully, could business establishments use the United States flag for advertising, no longer, lawfully, could one mutilate the flag as an article of wearing apparel, deface it in household decoration, nor consume it in icing, candy, or molds of ice cream.

The flag is worth sacrificing for, suffering for, dying for, living for. When will it be worth legislating for? When will it be granted the protection by law which other nations from time immemorial have given their flags?

What price, Old Glory. How dear, Old Glory.

Why the Livestock Men Oppose Mr. DiSalle's Control Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one of the main reasons why livestock men feel that the administration has not had the right approach to

the meat problem is shown in the following official table:

Cattle—Number on farms, United States, Jan. 1, 1935-51

Year	Kept for milk	Other cattle	Total
	Thousands	Thousands	Thousands
1935	36,357	32,489	68,846
1936	35,452	32,395	67,847
1937	34,853	31,245	66,098
1938	31,774	30,475	62,249
1939	35,626	30,408	66,034
1940	36,432	31,877	68,309
1941	37,383	34,372	71,755
1942	38,837	37,188	76,025
1943	40,210	40,964	81,174
1944	41,257	44,077	85,334
1945	40,849	44,724	85,573
1946	39,093	43,341	82,434
1947	38,468	42,739	81,207
1948	37,175	40,951	78,126
1949	36,528	41,770	78,298
1950	37,265	43,012	80,277
1951 ¹	37,665	46,510	84,175

¹ Estimated

Source: Agricultural Statistics, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

During World War II, while the housewives of the Nation were standing in line in the markets to get a piece of meat, cattle numbers were increased from 68,000,000 to 85,000,000.

Livestock producers would have no reason to receive any special consideration, but they are justified in feeling that when Mr. DiSalle limited the number of cattle to be killed he was following the same program that caused so much inconvenience to the housewives by Henderson-Bowles and company.

Once more I call your attention to the fact that cattle numbers during World War II increased by 17,000,000 head and that following the war large numbers were diverted to Europe, mostly to Britain.

We must also keep in mind that this country has been on an importing basis so far as beef is concerned ever since 1913 when the Underwood Tariff Act was passed during the Wilson administration.

Mexican Wetback Labor in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Is Ike's Icy Glare at Exploitation of Wetbacks an Omen of Politics?" which appeared in the Parkersburg (W. Va.) News of July 8, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS IKE'S ICY GLARE AT EXPLOITATION OF WETBACKS AN OMEN OF POLITICS?

Now that Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, amid all the grave problems engaging his attention in Europe, has found time to deplore the exploitation of illegal Mexican wetback labor in the United States, under conditions little if any better than peonage, we

suppose that sooner or later the bigwig commentators will be compelled to take notice of this renaissance of colonialism in the States not far from the Rio Grande.

Before, in effect, denouncing such inhuman practices as "racketeering," General Eisenhower cited the following item he had noticed in the New York Times.

"The rise in illegal border crossings by Mexican wetbacks to a current rate of more than 1,000,000 cases a year has been accompanied by a curious relaxation in ethical standards extending all the way from the farmer-exploiters of this contraband labor to the highest levels of the Federal Government.

"Although wetbacks are fugitives from justice, southwestern cotton, citrus, and vegetable growers have come to the fixed view that there is nothing wrong in employing them, harboring them, or even in actively recruiting them across the international boundary. Further, they have come to feel they have a vested right in the traffic."

A DRAMATIC GESTURE

If Ike at length had determined to let his name be presented to one of the approaching Presidential conventions, he could not have made a more dramatic political gesture toward the wage-workers of the Nation than to turn his icy glare on the shocking wetback evils, for the exploitation of the illegal wetback labor deprives native American citizens of work at fair wages, and in general serves to lower the living standards of the country. It is a pertinent question to ask, we believe, whether the general's comment does have political significance? Ike is not given to going off half-cocked.

Meanwhile, the Senate of the United States, rather shame-facedly it seems, a few days ago approved a watered-down conference report on a bill purporting to deal with the wetback situation. A record vote was not taken on the conference report. Only a few of the Senators, it seemed, cared to go on record.

SENATOR CHAVEZ SEES SLAVERY

Among these was Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, of New Mexico, who denounced the measure as fostering slave labor in the United States and contrasted our moral condemnation of such colonialism in other parts of the world with our actions at home. Senator CHAVEZ said:

"Mr. President, I shall not take very much of the time of the Senate, but I think a record should be made, and that the American people should know what would be done if this conference report should be adopted.

"First, I invite the attention of the Senate to the record and history of the past 10 years. Our political thinking and our so-called philosophy of government have resulted in hundreds of thousands of white crosses over the graves of American boys. It was hoped that they had not died in vain. It was hoped that they had died in an effort to carry forward an idea. We sermonize all over the world, asserting that we are for free peoples, and we suggest to the Congress the appropriation of funds out of the pockets of the American taxpayers in order to help so-called forgotten people, or those who are not doing very well.

"If it were not for such legislation as the Senate is now called upon to pass, we would not need the four-point program. If we were more opposed to imperialism and colonialism, even in economics, we would not need a point program, or even need to talk about forgotten peoples.

"Mr. President, I congratulate my good friend the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I think he has a fair bill, as a whole, but I, for one, do not believe in slave labor, even if it happens to involve a Mexican. I prefer the philosophy of Jefferson, who said that the Government should be for people instead of for dollars. It seems to be the trend of the moment to forget about humanity and to take advantage

of an opportunity to make a measly dollar. Then we talk about doing something for free people all over the world.

"Does the Senate know why there are backward people in Iran and Saudi-Arabia? It is because of the basic idea in the bill which the Senate is asked to approve this afternoon. Do Senators know why there are starving Mexicans? It is because we are so anxious to make 10 cents or a dollar. Do we mean what we say? There is colonialism in Indochina, in Java, and elsewhere, and there are many backward people there. That situation is fostered by the basic idea and philosophy of the pending legislation, because it is not based upon humanity; it is not based upon freedom about which we love to boast and about which we do so little. It is based upon permitting a few people to take advantage of someone who is hungry. That is what it is, purely and simply.

"I invite the attention of every Senator to the fact that a seat in the United States Senate is not worth that kind of action. I prefer to convey to the American people the idea that I believe in those things which made the Declaration of Independence possible. There are probably those who do not like what I am saying, but I still say it. Fighting for things which I do not feel I should fight for is not worth a seat in the United States Senate.

"Mr. President, only a few years back some of our ancestors left Europe or elsewhere to come to America. For what reason? In order to take advantage of the sacred freedom of this country.

"Without questioning the motives of a single Member of this body, I say that approval of this bill is contrary to common American fair play and decency."

HOW RECONCILE IT?

In connection with the above assertion by Senator CHAVEZ, we can only inquire, How do some Senators of the United States who approved this bill expect to reconcile such callous indifference at home with their professed indignation over conditions in India, Indonesia, China, Africa, and elsewhere in the world? They cannot satisfactorily do so, in our opinion. And there can be no doubt that this lethargy toward the evils of the wetback peonage will be interpreted as but a new sign of the moral decadence of the Government in Washington. For an administration which professes to be the friend of the wage workers to tolerate such wetback immigration, or even supervised wetback immigration at substandard wages along the Rio Grande and in the Imperial Valley while depriving native American labor of jobs, certainly should be listed in the category of not delicate irony.

INJURY TO OUR NATION

But the larger injury to our Nation consists in the racial discrimination, because the so-called Indian peoples, such as those in Mexico, are descendants, according to the leading anthropologists, of Mongoloid races that came originally from China, Manchuria, and Siberia. Thus the United States appears to have aligned its policies against the colonial victims in Indonesia and other parts of the world, with the exception of the Philippines, and this only after long years of tutelage. And sadder even than this, is the fact that some Senators of the United States, together with the southwestern and western exploiters of this immigrant labor cannot see what they are doing to themselves. The Nation is still paying a heavy price today for ruthless exploitation of solicited immigrant labor in the 1880's and 1890's from southeast Europe.

Our country should take pride in being the champion of oppressed peoples everywhere, in accordance with our Declaration of Independence; but if circumstances inhibit us from doing that overseas, then at least we should refrain from giving a bad example at home.

Senator CHAVEZ and those who associated themselves with him—including General Eisenhower—are so right that it is painful to observe the derelictions—the moral blindness, if you will—of those who vehemently denounce communism, yet by their actions add fuel to the flames.

William N. Oatis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the Record the following editorial from the Washington Daily News under date of July 18:

In Red-ruled Czechoslovakia it is a crime to be an American.

That is one reason why William N. Oatis, former Associated Press correspondent at Prague, is in a Communist prison.

The other reason is the supine attitude of our State Department.

The State Department has been dealing with hostile Communist governments for 6 years. But it still has not decided how to protect the rights of an American citizen, abroad on legitimate business, when a Red puppet regime gets nasty.

Mr. Oatis was arrested on charges which the State Department has declared to be false—as they obviously were.

He was sentenced to prison after a trial which the State Department has branded a travesty on justice.

This outrage never would have been perpetrated if the Czech commissars had not been given good reason to believe they could get away with it.

They had seen how the State Department reacted when Moscow's stooges in Hungary threw an American businessman, Robert Vogeler, into jail.

Mr. Vogeler's only crime also was that he was a citizen of the United States. But he stayed in a cell for 17 months while the State Department made futile protests, and he got out only when it finally paid a heavy ransom.

Once yield to blackmail and other blackmailers are encouraged.

Our Government was not always so ineffective.

When Theodore Roosevelt was President, the rights of Americans abroad were treated with respect. He and his Secretary of State made it plain that such rights would be protected—and that the Government of the United States could not be pushed around.

But it is a far cry from John Hay to Dean Acheson.

An official who is soft in dealing with Reds in his own Department cannot be expected to get tough with arrogant Red governments.

Pain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the anonymous lines below are said to have

been discovered scribbled upon the walls of a hospital room next to a bed where a sufferer from an incurable disease had lain. I thought they might be of solace to some in the days ahead:

PAIN

The cry of man's anguish went up to God,
 "Lord, take away pain!
 The shadow that darkens the world Thou
 hast made;
 The close coiling chain
 That strangles the heart; the burden that
 weighs
 On the wings that would soar—
 Lord, take away pain from the world Thou
 hast made
 That it love Thee the more!"

Then answered the Lord to the cry of the
 world,
 "Shall I take away pain,
 And with it the power of the soul to endure,
 Made strong by the strain?
 Shall I take away pity that knits heart to
 heart,
 And sacrifice high?
 Will ye lose all your heroes that lift from the
 fire
 White brows to the sky?
 Shall I take away love that redeems with a
 price,
 And smiles with its loss?
 Can ye spare from your lives that would
 cling unto mine
 The Christ on his cross?"

Refutation of Charges of Magazine of Building Regarding Housing Permits at Savannah River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN J. RILEY

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, I have just noted in the Columbia State, a daily paper in South Carolina, that an unwarranted attack has been made on the Federal Housing Administrator for South Carolina, Hon. H. E. Bailey, by the Magazine of Building which I understand is published by Time, Inc.

To my knowledge numerous commitments for building dwellings and apartments have been issued by the Federal Housing Administration office in Columbia, S. C. Daily, holders of these commitments have been calling and writing my office asking how they can get these commitments financed. As everyone knows, the Federal Housing Administration mortgage market has dried up and until some provision can be made to attract mortgage investors into the Federal Housing Administration market, adequate housing cannot be financed in the critical areas. Numbers of individuals are putting their own savings into construction work in the area of the Savannah River project in an effort to relieve the tremendous demand for housing in that area. I sincerely trust that Congress will soon pass the housing and facilities bill which will be an aid in obtaining the necessary housing in the critical defense areas. I beg to list below a statement by Hon. H. E. Bailey,

Federal Housing Administration Director for South Carolina, in refutation of the charges made by the Magazine of Building, as follows:

FHA SAYS MORTGAGE FUND DEARTH DELAYING AEC BUILDING

The South Carolina director of the Federal Housing Administration yesterday tacked a label of "bosh" to charges that out-of-State builders are unable to get commitments from the FHA office in Columbia for the housing program in the AEC's Savannah River plant, and an attack on AEC area housing by a building magazine.

H. E. Bailey, State director of the FHA, said "shortage of mortgage funds," is the hitch to the building program.

"We have issued in Aiken, Barnwell, and Allendale Counties commitments for 721 living units, approximately \$5,000,000. These mortgages have not been sold, and therefore construction cannot begin," Mr. Bailey said.

The Augusta Chronicle said in its July 4 edition that it had learned "that a number of out-of-State builders" have complained bitterly to the AEC that they have been unable to get commitments from the FHA office in Columbia."

"Shortage of funds is no local matter," Mr. Bailey said. "It is nationwide. In South Carolina today we have between ten and eleven million dollars in outstanding commitments upon which the builders are unable to borrow money," he said.

The Magazine of Building, published by Time, Inc., will say in its July issue, according to the Associated Press, that "some people were less interested in getting housing built for the AEC's \$900,000,000 H-bomb plant than in getting housing construction safely in the hands of good local Democrats."

Mr. Bailey said, in explaining that the tie-up in building is not confined to the AEC plant, "a commitment issued for 500 units at Shaw Field, Sumter, has not been sold and therefore construction cannot begin. A commitment for 85 units at Parris Island has been issued to a New York builder. The mortgage has not been sold and therefore construction cannot begin."

"FHA does not lend any money," Mr. Bailey explained. "The commitments are converted into mortgages and these mortgages after insurance by the FHA are sold to long-term holders or buyers of mortgages, in what is known in the trade as a take-out. Each operative builder employs his own personnel."

"The same housing condition that prevails in the South Carolina H-bomb area prevails in Paducah, Ky., and other areas where there are defense activities," Mr. Bailey said.

"Since December 1, I have talked to between 800 and 1,000 builders. All of them, with the exception of a few local builders, have been waiting on the passage of the defense housing bill, which, as yet, has not passed the Congress."

The St. Lawrence Shindig

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers of the country are still commenting on a junket recently made by a delegation of Congressmen from the House Committee on Public Works in connection with the proposed construc-

tion of the most expensive boondoggling economic monstrosity ever conceived—the St. Lawrence seaway.

Every Member of the House should read the following editorial taken from the June 22, 1951, issue of the Mobile (Ala.) Register:

ST. LAWRENCE SHINDIG

It is common knowledge by now, we presume, that a delegation of Congressmen from the House Committee on Public Works went on a junket recently to make a so-called inspection of the so-called St. Lawrence seaway project route.

The Congressmen in question could not resist junketing about the country at the expense of American taxpayers, even though vast volumes of almost everything imaginable concerning the so-called seaway project were available to them right in Washington, D. C., this great record having resulted from years and years of investigations, studies, surveys and hearings.

On the heels of the junket by Members of the House Public Works Committee, Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, who has been vigorously pointing out the fallacy of the St. Lawrence project, was attracted by a conference arranged at Omaha, Nebr.

This, he noted in remarks on the floor of the House, was the First Governors' Conference of Inland America.

What impressed Congressman VAN ZANDT most, however, was not the conference but the pro-St. Lawrence flavor he saw in it.

"It is interesting to note," he commented, "that no one has been invited to the governors' conference unless he favors the St. Lawrence project."

If anybody wanted to pitch a party in Omaha to whoop it up for the proposed white elephant so-called St. Lawrence seaway, they had a perfect right to do it, so far as we know. But if the purpose was to propagandize for the project, why call it a governors' conference instead of a St. Lawrence propaganda party?

The Case of Dr. Edward U. Condon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I want to call special attention to my letter of July 18, 1951, addressed to our Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Charles Sawyer, in which I have requested that the case of Dr. Edward U. Condon be reconsidered by the Department's loyalty board in view of the recent Presidential directive revising procedures before the board. The letter reads as follows:

HON. CHARLES SAWYER,

Secretary of Commerce, Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SAWYER. I was very pleased to note that a recent directive was issued by the President revising procedures before the Loyalty Review Board and understand now that a check may be made on Federal employees who are not good security risks.

During the past 3 years the Committee on Un-American Activities, of which I am a member, has been making an investigation into the security risk of a number of Government employees, including Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the Bureau of Standards, which is under your Department.

The Honorable RICHARD B. VAIL, who was a member of the Un-American Activities Committee in the Eightieth Congress, carried on some of the investigation of Dr. Condon and on April 23 last, prepared a statement which includes much of the information obtained in the investigation and hearings he conducted. I am enclosing herewith, for your information, a reprint of the statement Mr. VAIL made.

In addition to the material contained in this statement, I am satisfied that other material in the files of the Un-American Activities Committee could be made available to the Department's loyalty board should an investigation by that board be undertaken.

I feel strongly that such a renowned and able scientist as Dr. Condon, who has access to all of our atomic and highly classified military information, should have his alleged associations with known Soviet agents thoroughly explored.

I respectfully request that your Department consider this matter seriously with the view of bringing the information to the attention of your loyalty board.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD H. VELDE,
Member of Congress

Visiting Instruction Corps, District of Columbia Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House the fine service rendered in the District of Columbia by the Visiting Instruction Corps of the Public Schools. This program has a group of teachers who provide education to the home bound and hospitalized children. Children are eligible who are expected to be out of school for two or more months because of some prolonged illness or physical disability. They are taught from the first grade through senior high school. During the 13 years of its existence, the Visiting Instruction Corps has taught over 3,500 children.

Through the skillful and understanding manner of the teachers a renewed purpose in life is each year brought to the victims of poliomyelitis, rheumatic fever, nephritis, serious accidents, as well as those with epilepsy, cerebral palsy and many others. The majority of youngsters are able to return to regular school after being on the program for 1 year. There are some who receive this type of school for 2 or 3 years and eventually enter regular classes. Occasionally there is a child who is not physically able to do this and his only school is the VIC. Each child has the satisfaction and opportunity of progressing in his school work according to his ability and chronological age and does not find himself embarrassed by being a grade misfit upon returning to school.

The period of convalescence has become busy and full of as many normal experiences as the child's physical con-

dition permits. He covers the three R's as well as develops hobbies and projects around his interests. He develops qualities of self-reliance, independence of thought and action which he frequently carries with him long after he leaves the special program.

Regular graduation exercises are held with the Board of Education awarding diplomas to the pupils of the Visiting Instruction Corps who matriculate from junior or senior high school.

The following letter to the editor in the Washington Post of June 16, 1951, shows the grateful reaction of one of the many parents whose children have been enrolled in this excellent program:

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

GRATEFUL PARENT

On June 11 there graduated from junior high school the smallest class of children in the city. Our son was one of the six boys and girls in this group completing a course of study under the supervision of Miss Bertha E. Taylor, Mrs. Bessie W. Cramer, and Mrs. Elizabeth M. Goodman. The teachers working under them comprise the Visiting Instruction Corps. Through the columns of this paper, may I take this opportunity to publicly express our gratitude to the above-named women and to Mrs. Alys McCullough, Mrs. Esther Gillespie and the art teacher, Miss Watts who made yesterday possible.

There has been so much adverse criticism of teachers and educational facilities and curricula that I cannot but pay this tribute to this group who literally have not been stopped by rain or snow in the completion of their work. The sympathy and understanding, the determination to help each of these physically handicapped children develop to the utmost those qualities with which he was born resulted yesterday in a group of children so well poised, so buoyant in spirit, so confident in the future despite their experiences of the past that I'm sure all of us present felt a little ashamed of our own fears.

This is a group of teachers little known to the general public, because, fortunately, few parents need their services. To those of us who know the corps there has come the realization that the very existence of this group is possible only because of our American philosophy of life.

HANNAH STONE BARGTEIL.

WASHINGTON.

Jersey Joe Walcott, Example of a Fine American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, thanks to Arnold Raymond Cream, the highest prize of the boxing world, the heavyweight championship has come to rest in the State of New Jersey. Jersey Joe Walcott, as he is more affectionately and popularly known, is truly a great champion. And the residents of our Garden State can well be proud of him as such. But there is something even more basic for which New Jersey can take pride in Jersey Joe; it is the fine quality and sterling character of the man which

stamps him as truly a fine American. He displayed this last night, when in a dramatic contest and classed as the underdog, he won the championship crown from Ezzard Charles. In this moment of his great triumph, Jersey Joe did not forget to give thanks to Almighty God. In simple, moving, but eloquent language and with a sincere sense of humility he expressed the thought that, no matter how many times you lose, if you have God on your side, you will come out a winner in the end. This lesson in simple faith is one which should be inspiring to the youth of America and all Americans regardless of color, race, or creed.

Jersey Joe believes in translating his words into action. So it was that he also expressed the desire to be able to devote more of his time to teaching youngsters at Sunday-school classes that faith in God is necessary to our way of living.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, faith is necessary in these troublesome times when we are battling the forces of the faithless and the godless who seek to enslave the world. But if all of us remember the simple words of Jersey Joe—that if you have faith in God—no matter how many times you lose, you will come out a winner in the end, then we know that we will ultimately triumph.

I wish to salute a great champion, a fine man, a great American—Jersey Joe Walcott.

Foreign Economic Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of obtaining the advantage of the thinking of persons in various fields of activity on the question of foreign economic aid, which now is being considered by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I have obtained comments from scores of persons on House Resolution 3798, which I introduced to create a Commission on Aid to Underdeveloped Areas.

From time to time I have included the comments of various persons in the RECORD in order that the Congress might have the benefit of their views on this important subject.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I now include several more of these very excellent expressions of viewpoint:

THE AMERICAN POLITICAL
SCIENCE REVIEW,
OFFICE OF THE MANAGING EDITOR,
DUKE UNIVERSITY,
Durham, N. C., June 2, 1951.

HON. GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MEADER: I was pleased to receive a day or two ago, your letter of May 17 and the enclosed extracts of your speech from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have discussed the proposal which you made

with certain of my colleagues and we were favorably impressed with the details of your plan.

If your bill should be passed, I would be most happy to make one or two suggestions regarding membership of technical personnel on it. I particularly feel that the American Political Science Association has some members who would be of great assistance to such a Commission.

Sincerely yours,

TAYLOR COLE.

FRIENDS MEETING OF WASHINGTON.

Washington, D. C., June 5, 1951.

The Honorable GEORGE MEADER,
House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MEADER: Thank you for your letter of May 29, enclosing a reprint of the statement which you made on the floor of the House when you introduced a bill to create a Commission on Aid to Underdeveloped Areas.

I wish to commend you on the bill which you have introduced and on the statement which you made supporting the bill. It seems to me that your plan offers an opportunity for real statesmanship in bipartisan foreign policy at a highly constructive level.

The idea of bipartisanship in the Commission which you propose is a good one, and I should like to see that similar idea extended to insure that aid would be given to underdeveloped areas of the world, without regard to political considerations. I am aware that it may be more difficult to secure approval for such a program, if the aid offered by our Government is free of political attachments, but it will fall in its humanitarian and constructive purpose unless it can be offered freely to all areas where there is need.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT M. HADLEY,

Meeting Secretary.

NASH-KELVINATOR CORP.

Detroit, June 28, 1951.

Hon. GEORGE MEADER,
Congressional Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MEADER: We believe that prior to taking any tangible steps for the implementation of the point 4 program, Congress should pass the Meader bill for the establishment of a bipartisan commission to investigate and report on ways and means to remove barriers to overseas private investments.

By increasing foreign investments on a business basis with appropriate guaranties against expropriation and with assurance of conversion into dollars of annual returns on such investments, the American taxpayers might well be relieved of a heavy financial burden inherent in the government-to-government formula of foreign aid.

We congratulate you for your constructive contribution to the point 4 program as proposed in the Meader bill.

Our best wishes for your success in securing passage of your proposal.

Sincerely yours,

C. W. WEYAND,
Executive Assistant.

THE DETROIT EDISON CO.,

Detroit, Mich., July 10, 1951.

Hon. GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MEADER: I was very happy to receive a copy of your speech on American foreign policy which Mr. Durbin was kind enough to give me. I note with particular interest the positive and concrete approach that you have taken to the problems of overseas development. Particularly outstanding is the effort which you have exerted to place

emphasis on the part of private enterprises in implementing the objectives of our foreign economic policy. The Detroit Board of Commerce has given considerable publicity on the major developments many firms have already made in expanding their overseas manufacturing facilities. However, our ability here in the United States to do the job can best be shown by intelligent and positive action.

Let me compliment you for the wonderful progress that you have made in this direction and in furthering those outstanding objectives of your thinking.

Sincerely,

FRED A. COMPTON.

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS

MACHINES CORP.

New York, N. Y., July 12, 1951.

The Honorable GEORGE MEADER,

The House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MEADER: In Mr. Watson's absence, I am writing to acknowledge and thank you for your letter enclosing a reprint of your statement of April 23 in Congress, introducing a bill to create a Commission on Aid to Underdeveloped Areas.

You have presented a very comprehensive program for eliminating the barriers to the development of the natural resources of the underdeveloped areas of the world. I am sure that this interesting approach to the point 4 program would comprise an effective means for combating the influence of communism by improving the economic and social conditions of the peoples of these areas. You are to be congratulated on your efforts and I wish you continued success in all your endeavors.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE L. RIDGEWAY,

Director of Economic Research.

McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc.

New York, N. Y., May 31, 1951.

Congressman GEORGE MEADER,

Congress of the United States,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MEADER: Thank you for sending me a copy of your speech in the House on April 23, calling for the creation of a Commission on Aid to Underdeveloped Areas.

It seems to me exceedingly important that the point 4 program now getting under way should have focused upon it some intense thinking. Point 4 over the years could become as big and persuasive as the Marshall plan. It makes sense that we know what direction it is taking in its infancy, and we should certainly insist, as you point out, that these overseas programs be keyed to private initiative, not to paternalistic government, operating on a world-wide scale.

Cordially yours,

ELLIOTT V. BELL.

YALE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW,

New Haven, Conn., June 19, 1951

The Honorable GEORGE MEADER,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MEADER: I want to congratulate you on taking the initiative in introducing a bill to create a commission on aid to underdeveloped areas.

I think the time is more than ripe to bring all of our experience to bear on this problem.

By giving aid to underdeveloped areas, I am sure you are right in foreseeing that we can make an effective demonstration of our basic policy objectives, and show in a constructive way what we can offer the world.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD D. LASSWELL.

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE
OF NEW YORK,
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT,
Albany, June 8, 1951.

Hon. GEORGE MEADER,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MEADER: I have had the pleasure of reading your speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 23, 1951. It seems to me that our Government has already been following an affirmative foreign policy through its point 4 program, which is designed to affect favorably the long-range interest of the United States through teaching other people how to help themselves. I grant that the program is to be carried out through Federal funds under the leadership chiefly of the Department of State. Be that as it may, teaching people how to use machinery, how to industrialize their own economies is in itself an excellent program. It will help to raise the standard of living, reduce the effectiveness of subversive groups in the countries concerned and increase the trade of those countries with ourselves.

You see I am entirely in accord with the point 4 program as I understand it.

I am equally in accord with the proposals which make for a dynamic policy which makes it possible for private capital in this country to undertake long-range economic programs in those countries where raising the standard of living will have substantially the same effect as the point 4 program is designed to secure. The advantage of such a program is that it will obviously increase the opportunities for investment and trade abroad, secure the interest in foreign countries in the development of their own economies, I trust, on a private enterprise basis. At any rate, it should have the effect of preventing the development of cartel controls and of Government bargaining, both of which are so restrictive of international trade.

I am frankly in favor of your proposal and trust that a commission on aid to underdeveloped areas may be established and that the findings will be such that they can be put into effect.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT B. COREY

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE,
Ann Arbor

The Honorable GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: I have found the time to look over your address on foreign policy somewhat more carefully and I congratulate you on a very careful presentation, logically and clearly done. I believe you have convinced me that we need a commission similar to the one you propose. While I was reading your speech, I was called from Washington and asked to testify before the Senate Committee on Expenditures which is having hearings on the Hoover Commission proposal to study this question. I think therefore there is considerable interest in the matter and maybe we can get somewhere with a good proposal. I don't have the time now to go over all of the details of your bill in this letter, but on the principal point I am, I believe, now convinced that we need a study independent of the agencies now handling overseas affairs although their participation and testimony would, of course, be essential. I am a little worried that we could not get a commission of high caliber and between ourselves, I was never very enthusiastic about the congressional contingent on the Hoover Commission. With the exception of CLARENCE BROWN, who worked hard and conscientiously, the others were pretty much a total loss. The work on any such commission,

if it is to be done, will be done by public members and any prestige which attaches to their recommendations necessarily arises from the quality of the membership.

Cordially yours,

JAMES K. POLLOCK.

YALE UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL,
New Haven, Conn., June 13, 1951.

Hon. GEORGE MEADER,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MEADER: I have your letter of June 9 and your enclosed speech on the Commission to Aid Underdeveloped Areas. I think that your proposal is a grand one and wish you success on it. I agree that we should be much more aggressively formulating a positive policy along the lines you indicate.

When you formulate another version of the proposed agenda it might win friends to include a number of points on how to ease the impact of such a program on the recipient countries.

With thanks and good wishes,
Sincerely yours,

MYRES S. McDUGAL.

TRUST TERRITORY OF THE
PACIFIC ISLANDS,
OFFICE OF THE HIGH COMMISSIONER,
June 2, 1951.

Hon. GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MEADER: Thank you for sending me a copy of your fine speech.

If a commission could be set up with the problem of thinking through the possibilities of point 4 some great mistakes would be avoided in developing a sentimental and statesmanlike idea into an actuality. Therefore, your commission idea has great merit.

There is some phase of point 4 in practically everything we have to do in the administration of the trustee islands, but there is hardly a place for us under the projected organization should it ever become law. Our people are so few, and so widely scattered, and so limited in economic possibilities, that any thought of a quick return is out of the question. I am going to keep your talk very close to me because it contains much which we may on a very, very small scale translate into action.

Thanks again for writing.

Most sincerely yours,

ELBERT D. THOMAS,
High Commissioner.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
Los Angeles, June 19, 1951.
Congressman GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MEADER: While I have not had time to study and analyze in detail your April 23 speech and the accompanying bill, it seems to me your principle is thoroughly sound. I hope you will press persistently for enactment.

I returned from a study tour of Jordan and Israel last month and I am convinced that, in Jordan, for example, where technical guidance is needed, great strides could be made in large-scale irrigation with the help your Commission could provide. And such development would have a far-reaching effect to stabilize the potentially explosive Near East and Middle East. Many other examples in other parts of the world could be cited.

Very cordially,

JOHN ANSON FORD.

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 12, 1951.
Representative GEORGE MEADER,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MEADER: I was very happy to receive your letter telling about your introduction of a bill in the House of Representatives to create a commission to aid underdeveloped areas. May I congratulate you upon this approach to a positive foreign policy for the United States. I agree with you so heartily that this is a far more effective way of containing communism than all the coercive legislation that could possibly be passed.

It seems to me that we have so much to give in technical ability and creative imagination in this country that it is important we make the world realize what America can do and what it really is and means to her citizens.

I wish you good luck with your suggestion.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. HENRY G. (AGNES) LEACH.

TUNNELL & TUNNELL,
Georgetown, Del., June 11, 1951.
Hon. GEORGE MEADER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: Your letter of June 11 has just been received.

I have gone over, rather carefully, your bill and your speech. I think your ideas are good and hope that it might be possible for you to get this bill through in some form. I think possibly, if I had any suggestion to make, it would be with reference to a report of the Commission either to the President or to the President and to both Houses of Congress. It might be well to consider whether it would be desirable to have a provision that such a report should be made within a specified time.

I knew of your being a Member of Congress and have, at different times, thought of writing you. I don't believe I have done so. We are pretty busy here at this time and perhaps I may be forgiven for being a little lax in my social practices. However, I often think of you and wish you the greatest success in your congressional activities.

Thanking you for your thoughtfulness, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

TUNNELL & TUNNELL,
JAMES M. TUNNELL.

LITTLE, LEISOURD, PALMER & SCOTT,
Seattle, Wash., May 29, 1951.
Hon. GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MEADER: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 21, enclosing reprint of the statement you made on the floor of the House in connection with your bill to create a commission on aid to underdeveloped areas. I have read your remarks and the bill with genuine interest. I think definitely that it is a step in the right direction. To what extent, if any, it overlaps or differs in basic policy from the recent report of the committee headed by Nelson Rockefeller I have not been able to determine from a cursory reading of both your statement and the latter committee's report.

There is no doubt in my mind that something along this line is badly needed, and I certainly am happy to give it my support in principle.

I have recently returned from a round-the-world trip and, over a period of the last 20 years, have traveled extensively in foreign countries. I agree 100 percent that we need a foreign policy which is essentially

positive, rather than negative. Mere containment is not enough.

Please let me know if there is anything I can do to help. I have many friends in both the Senate and the House, and will be glad to do whatever I can.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT S. LITTLE

MAVERICK, PUTMAN & PUTMAN,
San Antonio, Tex., June 26, 1951.
Hon. GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MEADER: As a Democrat and former Member of Congress I am glad to endorse your bill to create a Commission on Aid to Underdeveloped Areas. There isn't the slightest doubt that your belief of a positive foreign policy, "rather than the negative policy" in reference to communism, is the best. Of course, we should have strong preparedness and always be willing to go to war if absolutely essential. The point 4 program and all positive measures should be greatly expanded, and, as you say in your speech, "we must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas."

As Chairman of the Smaller War Plants Corporation I established the technical advisory service for all small businesses, or any business for that matter, and during World War II it was a huge success. I suggested it internationally also, and it met with enthusiastic international response from all nations.

As you intimate, the voluminous literature of the point 4 program has spilled out very much, and, as you say, the American people must be for it and the ablest minds must work for it.

In writing you this I am not criticizing my own party, nor praising the Republican—I am only writing to compliment and congratulate you on your excellent move, and I assure you that if there is anything I can do I will do so.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

MAURY MAVERICK.

(Written in longhand as a postscript:)
Your idea will save millions of lives, will benefit the whole world and help your own district, too

M.

PHILADELPHIA, May 24, 1951.
Hon. GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MEADER: I wish to acknowledge your letter of May 21 together with the copy of your speech on an affirmative American foreign policy as appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Your suggestion of creating a bipartisan Commission on Aid to Underdeveloped Areas under the point 4 program is splendid. You have prepared a fine argument on its behalf and I certainly wish you success in your efforts.

On Monday I am flying to Europe by TWA for a month, otherwise, it would be a pleasure to call on you and discuss your ideas. After my return I may possibly have an opportunity to do this.

With very best wishes, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL FRANCIS DOYLE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., July 5, 1951
Hon. GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have reviewed your bill to create a Commission on Aid to Underdeveloped

Areas and the underlying principle of your bill is much better than the underlying principles of the present law providing aid to underdeveloped areas.

My observation in foreign countries where ECA has been in existence is that the funds have been used in the main to develop Government-owned industries and other semi-socialistic institutions such as cooperatives, etc., and nothing has been done to foster private competitive enterprise in these countries. The net result of the operations to date has been to strengthen cartels and other such institutions which are inimical to the private competitive enterprise system and it has done much to hold back the economic development of Europe.

A program designed to aid the private competitive enterprise system in foreign countries and by the same token aid underdeveloped areas would go a long way toward accomplishing what these funds should accomplish. Your bill is in the right direction.

Very truly yours,

E. S. HARTWICK.

NEW YORK, July 12, 1951

HON. GEORGE MEADER,

Congress of the United States,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MEADER: I have read your April 23 statement which you were kind enough to send me with a request for comment.

My personal reaction is that you are on solid ground. There has been a considerable succession of official reports laying out plans and programs for development of so-called underdeveloped areas abroad. All of these, I believe, have mentioned "obstacles and hazards presently inhibiting the development of the natural resources of underdeveloped areas through the efforts of private citizens and companies and the investment of private capital." Then they go on to use the existence of these obstacles and hazards as a proof that government grants and loans are necessary, and come out with the conclusion that some large sum must be put up by the American taxpayer each year to bring about development. There is a cart before the horse aspect to it, and the unfortunate result is that attention is distracted from the fundamental task of relieving obstacles and hazards, and focused upon getting some more money out of the Congress. I like what you have to say about penetrating below the surface of emotional generalities and getting down to the bedrock of hard facts. If your commission could do this, in a fair and objective manner, it could make a real and lasting contribution to world economic development.

Sincerely yours,

MORRIS O JOHNSON.

Communist Czechoslovakia Continues to Be a Most Favored Nation in the Eyes of the Administration—Why?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the typical abuse of free men by Russian "stooges" in other foreign countries grows worse and worse. Congress has

told the President as plainly as words can be that we should take steps to counteract the uncalled-for persecution of our citizens by withdrawing from all Communist-dominated areas the concessions made in international trade agreements.

The public is entitled to and is beginning to get the attention in the press that will force something to be done.

The following article in the Washington Evening Star of July 19, 1951, gives an accurate picture of how we are pampering these nations:

UNITED STATES TREATS CZECHS AS MOST-FAVORED-NATION DESPITE ABUSE AND JAILING OF OATIS

(By Edwin G. Martin)

Believe it or not, Czechoslovakia, which has just jailed American newsman Bill Oatis on trumped-up spy charges, is one of our most-favored-nations. It says so right in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), negotiated at Geneva, Switzerland, in 1947.

Although the Communists have taken over Czechoslovakia since the Geneva negotiations and are pursuing a straight party line in opposition to our efforts toward peace, we still accord the Czechs all the trade benefits originally granted at Geneva, with a single exception. Among those benefits are savings of from \$4,000,000 to \$5,000,000 a year in United States customs duties.

Czechoslovakian rugs, textiles, glassware, pottery, jewelry, boots and shoes, hops, and many other products continue to be imported at reduced rates of duty, and some of them continue to cause distress to American industries, farmers, and labor producing similar goods.

In the recent Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 Congress has specifically directed the President to take away those benefits from Russia and all other areas dominated by the world Communist movement. In recognition of our treaties and agreements with several of these countries, Congress did not make the change effective immediately but directed the President to take action "as soon as practicable."

AVOIDED VIOLATION

Congress wanted to change our policy of giving trade benefits to Communist areas, but did not want to violate our existing treaties and agreements. This strict observance of international obligations conforms to our long-established policy.

The State Department has notified Russia and several satellites of termination of our most-favored-nation obligations, effective at various dates in accordance with the provisions for denunciation of the various treaties and agreements. However, no action has been taken vis-à-vis Czechoslovakia, presumably because the general agreement (which contains more than two dozen members, including Czechoslovakia) has no explicit provision for expelling a member country.

GATT does contain provisions for voluntary resignation, so that one possible way out of our obligation to the Czechs would be for us to get out of the whole agreement. But the administration would regard that as too strong medicine, because GATT now is the main stem of the foreign trade-agreements program, and the administration is strongly committed to continuation of that program.

Accordingly, the State Department can be depended on to explore other possibilities for carrying out the will of Congress. While we are waiting the Department's decision, a little of the background might be of interest.

Of course, the attractiveness of the United States market for Czech exports is likely to decline somewhat if other friendly nations

join us wholeheartedly in cutting off exports of military potentials to iron-curtain countries. Nevertheless, all the dollars earned by Czech exports will still be welcome to the Kremlin, not only for obtaining civilian goods but also for the more important projects of propaganda and fomenting discord in the free world.

TWO AGREEMENTS NEGOTIATED

The United States has negotiated two trade agreements with Czechoslovakia, the first in 1938 and the second in 1947. Without intending criticism of the State Department, both seem, in retrospect, to have been ill-timed from the point of view of the millions of Americans who have worked, prayed, and hoped for Czech freedom. Each agreement was followed, within a year, by suppression of that freedom by the Nazis in 1939 and by the Communists in 1948.

The writer does not believe that either agreement contributed to the death of the democracy in Czechoslovakia. Nor did either agreement retard the conquest. But the coincidence of events might make it seem that a trade agreement with the United States is a particularly lethal type of poison for a Czech.

The 1938 agreement was bilateral—that is, the only parties to the agreement were Czechoslovakia and the United States. However, under our established policy all the duty reductions made by the United States were extended to the goods of other countries, except Germany and Australia. These are the only two countries that have been blacklisted by the President under the trade-agreements program to date because of discriminations on our trade (Both are now back in our good grace and get all trade-agreement benefits that are applicable to the goods they ship us.)

In the 1938 agreement we reduced our tariffs on most of the goods the Czechs shipped us and agreed not to increase already favorable tariffs on other goods. In return, the Czechs made concessions on our exports, reducing or "binding" tariffs, or promising certain quotas on goods subject to direct controls. In addition, each country promised most-favored-nation treatment to the other—that it would not impose any higher tariffs than on the goods of third countries, and that if quotas were used, the other country would get a fair share of the market.

Among the products on which we made substantial tariff reductions were bottles, other glassware, window glass, hops, knit gloves, various textiles and rugs, beads, handbags, ladies' hat bodies, buttons, buckles, imitation stones, leather gloves, pencils, and certain types of shoes.

IMPORTANT CONCESSION ON SHOES

On the most important type of shoe imported (cemented-sole shoes) the duty was not reduced, but was "bound" against increase above the current rate of 20 percent of the foreign value—i. e., the value in Czechoslovakia. This was one of the most important concessions because it forestalled a possible substantial increase in the duty.

Imports of this type of shoe had been increasing by leaps and bounds at the time of the negotiations and the Tariff Commission was then conducting a cost-of-production investigation to learn whether the duty should be increased. The law provided that if the statutory duty was not enough to offset the excess of domestic over foreign costs, the duty should be increased by as much as 50 percent, and if that was not enough, the statutory duty might be based on the value of domestic shoes rather than the lower values of shoes in Czechoslovakia.

Since the trade agreement was signed before the Tariff Commission completed its

work, the investigation had to be dismissed. Although the Commission did not make any formal findings of cost differences, it was generally believed, both in the United States and abroad, that the agreement actually prevented a considerable increase in the tariff on shoes.

During the life of the agreement, imports of many products increased markedly and domestic industries, particularly glassware and shoes, felt the pinch of severely increased competition and complained bitterly. However, in a very short time, Hitler moved into the picture.

First, the Nazis took over the Sudetenland. American officials scurried to their maps and geographies to check the areas of production of particular articles in Czechoslovakia, to see whether there was a basis for continuing the agreement in force. Meantime, goods produced in the Sudeten area were considered as products of Germany and, as such, were denied the reduced trade-agreement rates. However, the agreement rates were continued in force for other areas and Sudeten goods, by subterfuge, may have actually gotten reduced rates in many cases.

EFFECTIVENESS TERMINATED

Events continued at a fast pace and, by early 1939, the Nazis had taken over practically all of Czechoslovakia. The President terminated the effectiveness of the agreement, but not the agreement itself. In other words, the rates of duty were restored to the statutory levels because the other country was not, de facto, able to live up to its side of the bargain and goods from all of Nazi-dominated Czechoslovakia were treated as German when imported into the United States. But the trade agreement remained as an international document which the President might once more put into operation if the Nazis should be nice enough to go home.

The agreement retained its ambiguous status—out of operation but with the possibility of revival by purely executive action—until 1945. In that year the Congress extended and increased the President's power to reduce tariffs pursuant to trade agreements but forbade reactivation of the 1938 agreement with Czechoslovakia with these well-chosen words: "No proclamation shall be made pursuant to this section for the purpose of carrying out any foreign trade agreement the proclamation with respect to which has been terminated in whole by the President prior to the date this subsection is enacted."

It is understood that the diplomatic coup de grâce was given when, in later correspondence between the United States and Czechoslovakia, the 1938 agreement was referred to as "the former agreement."

From 1939 to 1945, Czechoslovakia was behind the Nazi curtain and most of our imports from that country were goods that had been shipped out before hostilities of World War II. With the end of hostilities, Czechoslovakia was reconstituted as an independent democracy—but one with a strong Communist element hanging over from the Russian occupation.

In 1946, the United States invited 19 other countries, including Russia and Czechoslovakia, to engage in tariff negotiations. Russia spurned the offer, possibly because she had a government monopoly of trade, or because of a dearth of zeal for cooperation, or because her exports to the United States were duty free or subject to very low rates, or maybe for other reasons. Czechoslovakia accepted.

The Czech position was technically different from the Russian. Although some industries were already nationalized and plans for placing trade under government monopolies were progressing, most Czech

exports to the United States were highly competitive and subject to tariffs well above our average levels of import duties. Accordingly, the Czechs had much to gain from substantial cuts in our tariff.

SUBSTANTIAL REDUCTIONS

In the conference at Geneva in 1947, substantial tariff reductions were negotiated with Czechoslovakia on most of her exports to this country. As in the earlier agreement, the rate on cemented-sole shoes was bound at 20 percent. Duty reductions were made on practically everything that had been included in the earlier agreement, frequently on broader classifications and at even lower rates.

In addition, reductions were made on pottery, tableware, zippers, folding rules, bentwood furniture, woodenware, dolls and toys, artificial flowers, and rubber boots. Furthermore, many rates were reduced in negotiations with other countries on products shipped us in large quantities by Czechoslovakia, including burlap and woolen fabrics. All these reductions were applied, of course, to Czechoslovakian products.

By conservative estimate, based on the principal imports in 1950, Czech products pay \$4,000,000 to \$5,000,000 less per year under GATT than they would pay if denied the benefits of trade agreements, as Congress has directed they shall be. Perhaps theoreticians may challenge this estimate on the ground that, if the higher rates were applicable, we wouldn't get the imports. That may be sound, or it may not. Anyhow, this method of computation is probably the best method of illustrating to non-technicians the significance of tariff changes, and is standard practice.

As stated above, GATT was negotiated in 1947. Most of our concessions were made effective by the United States on January 1, 1948. However, some of the concessions negotiated with certain countries, including Czechoslovakia, were withheld at that time because these other countries had not yet signed the agreement.

The Communists usurped control of Czechoslovakia in February 1948. Many persons in the United States thought that because Russia had refused to participate in GATT, they would not permit the Czechs to sign the agreement. This was naive.

MAINTAINS MEMBERSHIP

Czechoslovakia signed GATT in March, shortly after Communists took over. Perhaps the Kremlin preferred to have an agent on the inside, especially since it didn't cost Russia anything and might give them more dollars for propaganda. At any event, Czechoslovakia became a "contracting party" in April 1948, when her concessions were made effective. She has since maintained membership, with full rights of complaint.

At the time of the Czech signing, some wondered if the United States might not refuse to make its concessions effective, since the friction between east and west had already generated considerable heat. However, this country had given its word in the agreement to apply the concessions and it proceeded to honor its obligation literally. With a single exception, all the concessions we initially negotiated with Czechoslovakia are in force today. The exception is ladies' hat bodies on which the concession was withdrawn under the "escape clause" after the Tariff Commission found imports were seriously injuring the domestic industry.

There have been five formal meetings of the contracting parties of GATT since the Geneva negotiations. These meetings are convoked to review the operation of the agreement, consider amendments, admit new members and, in general, to see how the individual members are living up to their obligations.

At these meetings the Czechs have amiable representatives whose conduct is quite correct diplomatically. In at least three important instances they have accused the United States of proceeding illegally.

Along about 1949 the United States, implementing the North Atlantic Treaty policy, began restricting exports of goods having a military potential when destined for iron-curtain countries. The Czechs charged this violated GATT as an unlawful discrimination against them and also as a contravention of the commitment against quantitative restrictions on trade. The United States defended its action as authorized by the security exceptions of GATT. The matter was argued for several weeks. Finally, the Czechs were overruled by the contracting parties.

AGAIN VOTED DOWN

At the Ancey meeting in the summer of 1949 the United States proposed negotiations with the Federal Republic of Germany with a view to its accession of GATT. This time the Czechs charged us with violating the Potsdam Agreement. Again they were voted down.

In both these cases the Czechs were obviously following the Moscow party line.

The third Czech charge of illegality followed our invocation of the escape clause to withdraw the Geneva concession on certain ladies' hat bodies after the Tariff Commission found that imports were causing serious injury to domestic producers. This controversy raged for several months at the Torquay meeting last winter and spring. A special working party of several nations was appointed to review the charges, but its report has not yet been published. However, an analysis of the Tariff Commission's report indicates that the United States action was entirely justified under the escape clause. It is unlikely that any foundation will be found for the Czech contention.

One having access only to published material may be pardoned for wondering if the Czech participation in GATT has been in harmony with the objectives of the agreement.

Analysis of the various courses of action that might be available to carry out the congressional direction that Czechoslovakia be denied all trade-agreement benefits would unduly protract this review. It is a large subject in itself. However, two possibilities, both provided for in GATT, might be mentioned.

Article 23 (entitled "Nullification or Impairment") provides that if the objectives of the agreement are being impeded, one or more of the members might be permitted to suspend some or all of their obligations to the offending member. Article 25 provides for waiver of obligations "in exceptional circumstances not elsewhere provided for in this agreement."

The question confronting the State Department is not especially easy to solve. Our own minimum policy of withdrawing our concessions from Communist areas is clearly settled. But whether we want to go further and try to persuade the other countries to take punitive measures is not easily answered. For one thing, Finland, Denmark, Norway, and others are in exposed positions and would naturally hesitate to offend the Communists unnecessarily.

The important thing, it seems to me, is that our course of action be promptly determined so as to carry out the congressional mandate of withdrawing the concessions "as soon as practicable." Our proposals should be crystallized so that they can be approved by the contracting parties at the meeting scheduled to open at Geneva, Switzerland, on September 18, 1951.

Point 4 Dangers**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. GEORGE MEADER**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Democrat and Chronicle, Rochester, N. Y., for July 8, 1951:

POINT 4 DANGERS

Enthusiasts for the point 4 principle of lavishing American technical and financial assistance in backward countries to help raise their standards of living, have been cooled off a bit by recent evidence of ill will toward America in parts of the world where they had expected to launch their experiments. While this ill will is largely manufactured by propaganda of Communist origin, it is nonetheless a barrier to large-scale aid programs, at least for the present.

Representative GEORGE MEADER, of Michigan, aims to get around this barrier by introducing a bill to set up a commission to survey the point 4 program with a special view to carrying it on through the private enterprise system, and less through the Federal Government. His idea, apparently, is that point 4 would be an irresistible temptation to the Government planners and spenders, unless checked by level-headed businessmen.

The question that occurs to us is whether private enterprise will warm up to the project after seeing what has happened to foreign investments in China, Iran and other places where our capital has ventured. It does not take much to change legitimate investments into the charge of exploitation. American money invested in large-scale foreign projects becomes imperialism when it begins to return a profit. Wise and sympathetic management may evade this danger, as our oil interests have done thus far in the Arabian region, but it seems doubtful that any large-scale foreign program can safely be projected on this basis.

First-hand observers have advised that we extend our help only after requests from foreign governments for definitely specified projects. If, even with the best intentions, we try to force our help, whether of techniques or of money, we are likely to run into difficulties.

**Address at Final Reunion of United
Confederate Veterans****EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. GEORGE M. GRANT**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, last month it was my pleasure to attend the sixty-first and final reunion of the United Confederate Veterans in Norfolk, Va. At the banquet given by the United Sons of Confederate Veterans, Gov. Theodore Roosevelt McKeldin, of Maryland, made a most excellent address. He presented to the three veterans present certificates designating them honorary citizens of the State of Maryland.

XCVII—App.—284

His address follows:

It takes a long, long time to decide who wins a war—or, indeed, to determine whether there is a victor or a loser.

Oh, yes; a general may be forced to surrender his sword to his antagonist, and have the terms of peace dictated to him or to his government. He may see the army of his erstwhile enemy swarm over his land, and see the banner of the opposition fly over the institutions which he sought to defend. Conscienceless speculators, scavenger-like opportunists, and other rascals may follow the conquering troops over the scorched and bloody earth to enrich themselves by loot and exploitation of a suffering people.

But wars, with all their horrors and seeming futility, are based on principles and cannot be decided on points like a football game or on the degree of punishment like a prize fight.

In the final analysis, the historians must decide who fought for what, and then those principles must be assayed in the light of survival and strength.

No one wants war at any time—no one, that is, except the little men who become big agitators, and those few who may stand to profit personally from conflict and who hold that profit above their love for their fellowmen—but, as Lincoln Steffens expressed it "some of us do want the things we can't have without war."

Surely armed conflict was not desired by the rank and file of people in the Southern States in 1861.

Surely there was no wish for war by the masses of the people in the North.

There was little to indicate that those in the Government of the United States, where northerners and southerners deliberated together and fraternized day in and day out over a long period of years, wanted war. There were great debates, but for the most part they were not sectional. There were disagreements, but those men knew how to disagree without becoming disagreeable.

Leaders worked out compromises to settle their differences.

Only the agitators kept the war drums beating through the decades when calmer men worked for peace.

There was little difference in the main planks of the party platforms in 1850—just 11 years before the outbreak of the war. The Democrats placed themselves squarely in favor of preserving the compromises, too, adding only these words: " * * * until time and experience shall determine the necessity of further legislation."

The industrial progress in the decade from 1850 to 1860—the greatest in the history of the Nation up to that time—hardly indicated the approach of war.

The President, at the beginning of the decade, was a southerner, Zachary Taylor, and he had received a majority of votes from the Northern States as well as from the Southern States.

It was Daniel Webster, of Massachusetts, who fought shoulder to shoulder with Henry Clay, Virginia-born Kentuckian, for the compromises of 1850.

Yes; the great men of the South and of the North abhorred the thought of war.

"It is painful enough," said Thomas Jonathan Jackson—the Confederacy's "Stonewall" of a few years ago—"to discover with what unconcern they speak of war and threaten it. They do not know its horrors. I have seen enough to look upon it as the sum of all evils."

But the trees from the seeds of the agitators grew through the troubles of the times and bore their bitter fruits. Secession became the order of the day among the Southern States.

Even then there were efforts to head off the holocaust of war. There were many in

the South who believed secession could be accomplished in peace. There were others who saw a short war. They counted on the apathy among the people of the North.

In the North Horace Greeley advised the Nation to "let the erring sisters go in peace." Abraham Lincoln wrote letters to southern friends urging the maintenance of peace. He demonstrated the humaneness of his nature by the very vacillation and uncertainty of his inaugural address. He declared against the right of secession, but at the same time admitted there was no way to coerce a State that wanted to withdraw from the Union.

Many who loved the Union—North and South—thought of the quick decisions and very certain actions of an earlier President—a great southerner.

"Oh," they cried, "for one hour of Jackson."

Mr. Seward, the Secretary of State, told representatives of the Confederacy that the Federal Fort Sumter in South Carolina would be surrendered to them without a battle. Indeed, the Cabinet was practically agreed on this until President Lincoln intervened.

The fatal shot was fired there on April 12, 1861, and the war was on.

Slavery, of course, had been a great issue in the North—a moral issue.

Tariff long had been an issue in the South—tariff which leading southerners found interfering with the section's trade with Europe.

But slavery was opposed on moral grounds by many in the South as well as by many in the North. There were few in either section who considered it a cause for war in itself. Historians agree rather generally today that human slavery would long since have been abolished without war—and so one wonders if the comparatively few years by which the war advanced the ending of slavery in America justified the bloodshed and suffering that was inflicted by the conflict on both races.

Protective tariffs have come and gone—have been modified, reduced, increased, and debated throughout most of our history. The tariff is a political question of international significance. It is not a satisfactory cause for war.

The Federal Government's real purpose in taking arms against the South, of course, was the preservation of the Union.

The South's real and decisive reason for responding to the challenge was the refusal of the Southern States to accept without a struggle the coercion which it saw forthcoming from the Federal Government. It was not so much to defend an institution which was of little profit to a great majority of southerners and which, indeed, was opposed by many southerners on both moral and economic grounds, as it was to protect the rights of the States to solve their own problems.

There, then, was the issue of the war that may have had the most far-reaching effect on the history of the United States—an issue that lives today as it did then—the issue of State sovereignty.

There it was written in blood on the fields of Bull Run, Chancellorsville, and Gettysburg.

A lost cause? Hardly that.

Who can say to what ends the Federal Government might eventually have gone to dominate the States had it not been challenged by the extremity of war in 1861?

Who can tell what type of dictatorship might have grown from the top-heavy federalism with which the people were threatened in those hectic years had there not been men who were willing to fight and even to die to maintain the rights—yes, and the very identity—of the sovereign States?

There is a principle that survives. There is the fight that goes on—and there in the

vanguard of the continuing battle stand the great States of the South. There among the leaders in the great fight for the preservation of State sovereignty stand the men of the South. I wish I could mention them all—men like North Carolina's Governor Scott, South Carolina's Senator Maybank and Governor Byrnes, and Virginia's own great Governor, John S. Battle, and great educators, like the president of this State's own magnificent university, Colgate W. Darden.

With men like John Battle and Colgate Darden, one wonders why the voters of America ever let Virginia lose her once proud title, the mother of Presidents, or if, perhaps, she will not regain it in the not too distant future.

It well might be—although it is not my place to suggest it—that a greater development of the two-party system within the borders of the State would bring Virginia's outstanding men in both political parties more recognition.

Yes, the sovereignty of the States is under constant challenge by power-hungry men in the Federal Government, and happily there are men and women everywhere—but particularly in the South—who stand constantly ready to meet the challenge. It is important that it be met at every turn if we are to preserve our form of government and maintain the freedoms of the Republic.

And so as we look on this thin gray line of men—the remnant of a once great and proud army in gray—we know that they did not fight in vain.

They, I am sure, join with us in thanking God that the Union of American States—now the bulwark of freedom for a troubled world—was not permanently dissolved. They, I am sure, have no regrets because a large segment of our population has been delivered from the bonds of slavery.

And now it is our turn to join with them in thanking God that the sovereignties of the States have been preserved, for this is the real cause for which they fought and for which their comrades died.

We can be sure that these old soldiers will never die, nor will their glory fade away. They have lived to personify the greatness of our Nation united—the passing of the bitterness of nearly a century ago, and each, I know, can say, as their great leader, Robert E. Lee, once said:

"My experience of men has neither disposed me to think worse of them nor indisposed me to serve them; nor, in spite of failures, which I lament, of errors which I now see and acknowledge, or of the present aspect of affairs, do I despair of the future. The truth is this: The march of providence is so slow, and our desires so impatient, the work of progress is so immense, and our means of aiding it so feeble; the life of humanity is so long, and that of the individual so brief, that we often see only the ebb of the advancing wave, and are thus discouraged."

"It is history that teaches us to hope."

Congress Should Make Thorough Study of Flood Control in Missouri Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 17, 1951:

A VALLEY INVESTIGATION—JOB FOR CONGRESS

The Army engineers have been working on the Missouri River system more than 100 years. They spent \$300,000,000 on deepening it for navigation up to 1945, plus many other millions for flood control.

For the past 23 years they have been operating under a mandate of Congress that flood control is a national responsibility and that theirs is the responsibility for carrying it out. Congress has given them appropriations totaling one and a quarter billion dollars in the last 6 years for work on the Missouri River and its tributaries.

With so much time and so much money, is it unreasonable to expect some progress in the control of floods?

Yet the floods in the Missouri and its tributary, the Kansas, which are now devastating the Kansas City area and eastern Kansas, are the worst in history. The only exception in actual flood height is the flood of 1844, which struck when Kansas City, Mo., was only a village of 700 population.

There is no exception at all in the amount of damage done—it is not only the Missouri Valley's costliest flood, but the Nation's also. Flood stages at Kansas City, Mo., went as high as in the record flood since 1844—that of 1903—though the Army engineers had had 48 years meanwhile to effect some improvement in flood control.

Is this a performance which the people of Missouri and Kansas are willing to accept, and keep on accepting? Or does it represent failure on a monumental scale, failure so complete and so inexcusable that drastic changes are called for?

Should flood control in the Missouri Valley be left in hands which failed to prevent, or even to keep within reasonable bounds, the present debacle?

The Army engineers, as usual, are saying that they are in no wise to blame, Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of Army engineers, says there is really nothing to be surprised at in the fact that the flood overtopped by three feet the \$41,000,000 levees built under his Pick-Sloan plan at Kansas City.

"We have consistently pointed out," Gen. Pick says, "that the Kansas City flood control measures would not be effective in event of a big flood unless supplemented by a system of tributary reservoirs." Congress is to blame, General Pick indicates, for not appropriating more money, and the Army engineers are busily engaged in stirring up a public demand for more appropriations for them.

Some Members of Congress may feel that the appropriations for the Missouri river system have been large enough already to produce better results. But the Army engineers' system of wooing the support of Members of Congress by building large public works in their States and congressional districts does not lend itself to making funds go the longest way—or doing the most good.

If the Army engineers are not responsible for this colossal failure in flood control, who is responsible that the people of Missouri and Kansas can hold accountable?

The answer seems to be, nobody. The buck has been passed. The evasion of responsibility for failure that we are witnessing now is nothing compared with the failures, and the evasions of responsibility for them, that we shall see as long as the Pick-Sloan makeshift is allowed to substitute for a Missouri Valley Authority.

The Army engineers can always say the failure was caused by the Reclamation Bureau, which is building and is to manage some of the dams, and the Reclamation Bureau can always say it was the fault of the Army engineers, which is building and is to manage others.

The floods at Kansas City and in eastern Kansas are not the result of water alone. They are the result of flood control work

done on a basis of political favoritism, done piecemeal, over a period of many years—and the result of divided planning, divided construction, divided management and divided purposes since the Pick-Sloan compromise was made.

The Post-Dispatch believes a serious responsibility rests on Congress to send an investigating committee to the Missouri Valley to see how the country's money has been spent and how the trust it imposed in the Army engineers has been kept.

This should not be one of the committees which are so closely allied with the Army engineers that they are equally responsible for the politics and boondoggling that have hobbled Missouri Valley flood control for a century. It should be a truly independent committee of the Senate and House combined, empowered to examine the results of the Army engineers' stewardship and to compare them with what the MVA method of unified management has to offer.

We propose that the Senators and Representatives from Missouri and Kansas take the lead in a demand for such an examination by Congress, in the determination to have done with half-measures and to give the Missouri Valley the best that modern technical skill can provide.

Pittsburgh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column on Pittsburgh, by Ed Sullivan, the New York newspaper columnist.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THERE'S EVERYTHING IN PITTSBURGH, AND STILL MORE TO COME

(By Ed Sullivan)

PITTSBURGH, June 3.—In all your life you've never seen such building as is going on in this city. For utility and for beauty Pittsburgh is spending about one billion and a half tearing down older buildings which will be replaced by skyscrapers; building parks, and completing the Penn-Lincoln Parkway which will permit autoists from the west to escape the traffic snarls in the narrow streets of the city's west end.

To accomplish this Pittsburgh literally sliced through rocky mountains to carve out a roadbed.

Having already solved its smoke problem, Pittsburgh's staggering building program of new buildings and fine parks will add the final touch of glamour.

Residents of the city are proud as peacocks over what's happening. Hotel men—Joe Duddy, of the Pittsburgher, and Tommy Troy, of the Statler—made decisions that were typical of other locals.

To get the huge building program under way it was necessary for the contractors to work through the night dynamiting and drilling. The hotel managers after consulting their guests and explaining the purpose of the round-the-clock dynamiting told the contractors to go to it.

"The idea," said Troy, "was to get the program off the drawing boards and into actual work. We got it off the drawing boards in a hurry. Now it's so well advanced

that the contractors stop dynamiting at midnight."

Troy, proudest of Pittsburghers, comes from Boston. The veteran Duddy is a Pittsburgher by birth, dates back in hotel history to the days when the father and mother of screen star Adolphe Menjou worked at the old Antlers hotel in this town.

This Pittsburgh is a fabulous city, not easily impressed, because it has seen everything within its own city limits. You can't impress Pittsburgh with wealth, because Andrew Carnegie, Andrew Mellon, the Fricks, and other local families had more multimillions than you could stash in Fort Knox. Even today in Sewickley Heights there are mansions that have over 100 rooms.

It has three big universities, University of Pittsburgh, Carnegie Tech, and Duquesne, and perhaps five other colleges of lesser size. It even has two rivers in its front yard, merging to produce a third.

From its station KDKA came some of the first radio programs. It has fine newspapers, expert newspapermen. In baseball, it boasted immortal Honus Wagner; in the ring the immortal Harry Greb, plus the Zivics and the spectacular Billy Conn. It has produced all-Americans in every field.

It is a city that conveys the impression of enormous strength, an impression heightened, in the day, by the streams of smoke pouring into the sky; accented, at night, by the orange and red glare of steel mill furnaces. There is nothing of the dilettante about Pittsburgh.

In the feudal baron days thousands of immigrants came here, each wearing a tag on his outer clothing that read: "Andrew Carnegie, Pittsburgh." That was sufficient address. Long before bulldozers, these immigrants carved into mountains, built tunnels, dug coke, and cooked steel.

There is a huge Irish and Slavic population here, and sturdy stock of other races. It took tough-fibered men to build Pittsburgh into a colossus, and it took men of fine dreams and great imagination.

As steel goes so goes Pittsburgh, is a local maxim. The national maxim runs to the effect that when smoke is pouring from the Ohio valley, the Nation is prosperous, because the entire country has a stake in steel. Right now, smoke is pouring from the Ohio Valley, as the Nation turns to one of its great arsenals.

Americans should visit Pittsburgh. It is easily one of the most exciting of all star-spangled experiences.

Conditions in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I have read a very clear and informative analysis of certain events in Korea by a distinguished news commentator, Mr. Bill Downs. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A year ago today I was one of the most frightened men in the world. The Korean War was less than 2 weeks old. CBS had just rushed me to the Far East and I was spending my first day at the fighting front near Chochowon.

I've spent a lot of time covering a lot of different kinds of armies, and a reporter learns that fear is as much a part of war as is noise.

But just 365 days ago today, it seemed different. And when I say I was one of the most frightened men in the world, I mean I had a lot of company.

The United States Army in Korea at that time consisted of one regiment. Its only friends, the South Korean troops, had broken. Our GI's at times were outnumbered 100 to 1. And there seemed to be nothing that anyone could do about it.

The American soldiers of that day were "kids" who had joined the Army for the "soft touch." They were soft and badly trained. Someday there will be an investigation as to why they were allowed to sit on occupation duty in Japan and grow all the wrong callouses in the wrong places. Many of them didn't even know the importance of digging in. They knew more about comic books and Japanese women than they did about their own weapons. Many of the early American casualties can be laid directly to neglect of the men by the officers who were supposed to have trained them in Japan.

I had a chance to think these things over under fire, a year ago today, in a Korean ditch nuzzling an odiferous Korean rice paddy. And, as I said, I was extremely frightened and filled with despair. At that time I would not have given a plugged nickel for our chances of staying on the peninsula.

You know the rest of the story. I have gone into this because in weighing the results of the past year's fighting at this time of imminent cease-fire, it is well to remember the deplorable state of readiness in which the United States found itself when the Communists marched in Korea.

In the 12 ensuing months the revival of American power has been miraculous. It is something you have to remind yourself to remember.

And it may be that historians will some day record that Josef Stalin made his greatest strategic mistake when he sent his North Korean puppets across the thirty-eighth parallel and thus aroused the American military and industrial giant to action.

There has been much argument as to whether the Korean campaign has been worth the cost in blood to the United States. I admit that I was one of those who in the early days did not think it was. Korea was of no military value to us; it looked like we were heading for a disastrous defeat; we were forced into battle at the time and place of the enemy's choosing. And no one here at home, including some Congressmen, seemed to care.

Events have changed my mind. Fourteen other United Nations joined us in the fighting. Their contribution was token, but it was there. The Communists have paid a tremendous price for their adventure. The free world has proved that a deliberate breach of the peace can be disastrously costly.

And, most important, the United States is becoming strong. Strong enough to prove that the ideal of freedom, backed by strength, can defend itself against totalitarianism.

You will hear much argument about whether or not the United Nations achieved a military or diplomatic victory in Korea or not.

What we have really won is a measure of future security for the kind of world we stand for. The dangers still exist, but the men who fought and died in Korea have given us this one priceless thing, the time and the ability to defend ourselves.

We will betray the trust of the men who died in Korea only if we waste this time or dissipate this ability through petty, partisan politics at home or a relaxation of our vigilance at other danger areas around the world.

The Armistice in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "U. N. Command Takes Big Risk," written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Star today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U. N. COMMAND TAKES BIG RISK—COMMUNISTS BRING TENS OF THOUSANDS OF TROOPS INTO KOREA WHILE ARMISTICE TALKS ARE STILL PRELIMINARY

(By David Lawrence)

All that has been happening at the conference table in Korea since July 8 is only a preliminary discussion of what the armistice negotiations should discuss. The main parleys haven't begun at all.

Meanwhile the United Nations command, under pressure from politically minded governments, is taking the biggest risk that any army in military history ever assumed.

The Communists are bringing troops into Korea by the tens of thousands. It is estimated that the enemy now has about 720,000 men, while the U. N. has something around half that number.

The U. N. is not likely to bring in reinforcements because of the distance to the various member countries. Yet the Red Chinese can continue to send in reinforcements.

Now the Communists have raised the real issue—the withdrawal of "foreign troops" from Korea. This, of course, means all but North and South Korean troops. This is exactly what happened before, when Russian and American forces were withdrawn. The way was opened to Communist infiltration and control of the North Korean Government.

The Communists have found that the U. N. negotiators in the preliminary conferences will not agree to their demand for withdrawal of "foreign troops." But the Red Chinese and North Korean representatives are not asking at this time for a decision on it. They merely want the item on the agenda of the main conference. The U. N. negotiators can hardly refuse to discuss an item which they themselves have brought up. It cannot be dismissed as out of bounds on the ground that it is political, because the presence or absence of troops in an area where a war has occurred is a vital subject for negotiation. In the end the U. N. will probably consent to seeing the item placed on the agenda of the main armistice discussions and will then urge that it be left to the diplomatic representatives to settle when the political factors come up.

So the procedure appears now to be this:

First, a conference on the preliminaries to decide what the armistice negotiators shall talk about. This is what the present series of talks, begun on July 8, is supposed to resolve. This has already consumed nearly 2 weeks.

Second, a conference of the main representatives to decide on the actual conditions of the armistice—the military terms to assure inspection of both north and south zones, the establishment of a demilitarized zone and similar matters of a military nature. This has not yet begun and may take a month or more to negotiate. Among other things, the conference has to decide when

and where the diplomats will meet to take up the political factors and what countries shall be represented. Then will come the actual cessation of hostilities on an agreed-upon date.

Third, the conference of diplomatic representatives will then ensue and all political factors will be discussed, such as admission of Red China to the U. N., the status of Formosa, withdrawal of foreign troops from Korea and arrangements for the future government of all Korea. These items will surely lead to a deadlock which based on previous experience, may take from 6 to 9 months, and probably will never be settled. This means an indefinite continuation of the armistice.

At any moment that a sign of disagreement arises before the "cease-fire" is actually put into effect, tension will increase and the danger to U. N. forces will be intensified. The presence of the large Chinese armies will be a constant threat and the U. N. will find itself negotiating under the duress of the reinforced Communist armies.

If a "cease-fire" does occur, the chances are that the Communists will then allow the situation to stagnate indefinitely. For there is no pressing reason from their side to make an agreement when they already have achieved what they had a year ago—namely, control of North Korea above the thirty-eighth parallel. If all this sounds like a great victory for the Allies, administration spokesmen and the peace at any price elements which do not like to hear any questions raised about the victory will have to find a new definition of victory to teach in the war colleges where officers of tomorrow are educated in the art of warfare and its objectives.

Katharine Lenroot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, Miss Katharine Lenroot, one of the great public servants of our time, has retired as Chief of the Children's Bureau after more than 30 years of devoted work. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the exchange of letters between Miss Lenroot and President Truman, and several of the scores of tributes to her career which have appeared in the press of the Nation on the occasion of her leaving the Federal service.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISS LENROOT'S LETTER TO PRESIDENT TRUMAN JUNE 22, 1951.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I hereby request retirement from the Federal service as Chief of the Children's Bureau, effective September 1 or as soon thereafter as arrangements can be made for my successor to take office.

It is, indeed, a hard decision to make to leave the Children's Bureau, with which I have been associated throughout almost my entire working life. In the 36 years in which I have been a member of the staff, great advances have been made in maternal and child health, child welfare, and child-labor protection. The Bureau has played a significant part in these changes through research, dissemination of information, coop-

eration with the States in grants-in-aid, establishment of Federal child-labor standards, and development of methods of co-operation with citizens in behalf of children. It has shared with other nations knowledge and experience relating to child life. The Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth served to broaden our understanding both of the importance of going forward in extending and improving services to children, especially in this critical period of world history, and of the need for much more extensive research. I am grateful, especially, for your sponsorship of the conference and the great contribution you made to its success.

In laying down my task, because I have reached the age when I must have more leisure, I am confident that with your understanding and support of its program, the Children's Bureau, with its broad concern for children and youth, will be given still greater opportunity to serve our country and the children who are its future.

Respectfully yours,

KATHARINE F. LENROOT,
Chief.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S LETTER TO MISS LENROOT

JULY 9, 1951.

DEAR MISS LENROOT: With real regret I accept your resignation as Chief of the Children's Bureau of the Federal Security Agency effective at the close of business on August 31 next.

You have been in Government service for 36 years, and for the past 17 years you have headed the Children's Bureau. That is a long tenure of office for any public servant. But it is especially significant because you have been one of that small and select group of women who have risen to high public office through merit and determination. Best of all your service has been as distinguished as it has been long continued.

Toughness is a quality not often attributed to women but the plain fact is that you have been a tough and persistent champion of America's children. You have made them both your vocation and your avocation. The children of this country are better off for your having been in the Government. What greater satisfaction could anyone take into retirement?

Although you will soon retire to a well-earned rest, I hope that from time to time I shall have the chance to look to you for advice and help in matters affecting the children of America. I know that you will never relinquish your interest in their welfare as long as you live.

With warmest good wishes, I am

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

[From the Washington Star of July 10, 1951]

KATHARINE LENROOT AND HER TIMES

(By George Kennedy)

This half of the twentieth century in America has been wonderful for those who have lived it—experienced it.

Few have done better than Katharine F. Lenroot, who announced yesterday that she is retiring as head of the Children's Bureau at the end of August.

It was her good fortune to become aware of what was going on at the turn of the century, at the age of nine in Wisconsin. What was going on was the La Follette revolution.

Her father was in the thick of it. Irvine L. Lenroot, born of immigrant Swedish parents, was one of the young Progressives in the Republican Party in Wisconsin whose responsive surge made Robert M. La Follette Governor and then United States Senator.

She heard the play-by-play account of those events at the family dinner table in Superior, the city that almost shares with

Duluth the position at the head of the Great Lakes.

Miss Lenroot is not all Swedish, although she has shown the marked traits of the Scandinavian in her beauty and strength. Her mother's name was Clough, a Welsh name that came West from New York.

Then Washington, for her father was elected to Congress in the same campaign that put Taft in the White House. He later became a Senator. In those automobileless days she especially remembers the turnout of Mrs. Nelson W. Aldrich, wife of the Senator from Rhode Island, a splendid victoria drawn by a spanking team. She also remembers picking wild flowers in the spring where the Wardman Park Hotel now stands.

Then the University of Wisconsin under John R. Commons. Professor Commons, who wrote the basic literature of the American labor movement, used to send his pupils to watch the legislature in action—one advantage of having the State university in the State capital.

When Katharine Lenroot emerged from the university in 1912 it was an exciting time for a young woman college graduate. It was clear that women were not to be denied much longer. Anna Howard Shaw, Carrie Chapman Catt, and the beautiful Inez Mulholland were leading the fight for woman suffrage.

But Miss Lenroot, like many young women of the day, did not wait for the vote. Wisconsin, sparked by Commons, was about to put a minimum-wage law for women into effect—assuring them \$10 or \$12 a week. Massachusetts already had such a law. Her first job was with the Wisconsin Industrial Commission, working on cost-of-living surveys for the new law. It was at that time that Frances Perkins was directing a survey of New York factories to prevent a repetition of the Triangle Shirtwaist Factory fire.

In 1915 Miss Lenroot took a Federal civil-service examination and was appointed an investigator for the Children's Bureau. She has been there ever since.

Yesterday in her office, surrounded by pictures of Miss Perkins, Jane Addams, Julia Lathrop, the first chief of the bureau; Grace Abbott, the second (Miss Lenroot is the third); Lillian Wald of the Henry Street Settlement and Florence Kelley of the Consumers League, she told some of the history of the office.

The Children's Bureau had its birth when Miss Wald and Mrs. Kelley, both of whom lived at the Henry Street Settlement in New York, sent President Theodore Roosevelt a letter suggesting that the Federal Government should open an office that would give out information to save lives of infants and children much in the same way that the Agriculture Department was advising farmers on how to avoid the loss of calves and pigs.

No idea that sounded good was too radical for Teddy, and he sent them a wire: "Sounds bully, come down and we'll talk it over."

The campaign to get Congress to approve of the idea took 6 years. The Federation of Women's Clubs, church organizations and the National Committee on Child Labor waged a campaign for it.

When the Children's Bureau came into being, women went into Government to work on something they were interested in, ahead of their getting the vote. Julia Lathrop, Miss Addams' assistant at Hull House, Chicago, became the first director.

One of the first tasks of the bureau was to get all the States to report on that most important element of vital statistics, infant mortality. Slowly State after State came into the conference of those reporting.

Some of the reports were shocking. They brought the national average down to one infant death to 10 births.

The change that has come about since is due to medical advances, public-health

measures, and in no small measure to the work of the bureau in getting the facts before the public and getting groups to cooperate in the localities.

Today four deaths in 100 births is high, and as she talked Miss Lenroot pointed to a map showing the black spots. Strangely enough, several of the States that used to lead in unfortunate statistics no longer are in the ten with the highest infant mortality. Today New Mexico, Texas, and Arizona, States where the "wetbacks," the Mexican migratory laborers, flood across the border with their families, lead all the rest.

In 1916 Congress passed a child-labor law which was held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. Two years later a North Carolina father sued for the right to send his boys to work in the cotton mills—*Hammer v. Dagenhart*. For years proponents tried to pass a child labor amendment to the Constitution. Miss Lenroot became head of the bureau in 1934 by appointment of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. The Fair Labor Standards Act or Wage and Hour Law went into effect in 1938 with its provision against child labor, and in affirming its constitutionality in 1940, the Supreme Court reversed the *Hammer v. Dagenhart* ruling.

As chief of the bureau, Miss Lenroot had charge of the enforcement of the child labor provisions. Her experience in that showed her how things had improved.

"We found that children no longer were employed in the cotton mills," she said. "They were going to school. We only found them in fringe industries, cleaning shrimps or pulling turkey feathers. We have come a long way since the child labor fight of the World War I period."

[From the Washington Post of July 15, 1951]

CHILDREN'S FRIEND

The Children's Bureau was in its infancy when Katharine Lenroot joined it as a special investigator 36 years ago. It had been established to report "upon all matters pertaining to the welfare of children and child life among all classes of our people . . ." and had found a sorry picture of needless mortality among mothers and babies. It was estimated from the limited reports available that throughout the country 61 mothers died for every 10,000 live childbirths, and for every 1,000 live births the country lost 100 babies during their first year of life. In 1949, the maternal mortality rate was down to 8, and infant mortality to 29.

Such vital statistics afford but a partial insight into the intertwined careers of the Children's Bureau and of Miss Lenroot who has been its chief for the past 17 years. With the passage of the Social Security Act in 1935, the Bureau assumed administration of title V, providing for grants to the States for development of maternal and child-health services, services to crippled children, and child-welfare services. In 1938, it undertook responsibility for the child-labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. From 1943 to 1947, it handled the Emergency Maternity and Infant Care Program, under which Federal funds were used to pay for medical, hospital, and nursing care during childbearing for over 1,200,000 wives of men in the Armed Forces, and for the care during illness of more than 200,000 children of servicemen.

Few public careers could have provided richer rewards than Miss Lenroot must have gained from the accomplishments of the Children's Bureau. "The children of this country," President Truman wrote in accepting her resignation, "are better off for your having been in the Government. What greater satisfaction could anyone take into retirement?" What higher accolade could any public servant earn? It is a matter of great good fortune for the country that the

President has already selected Dr. Martha Eliot as her successor. Dr. Eliot herself has served the Children's Bureau for a quarter century, directing some of its most important research work in the field of child health and working with Miss Lenroot as associate director. The Nation's children will continue to be in good hands.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of July 18, 1951]

SHE HELPED BROADEN THE HORIZONS OF LIFE

In America today far more children survive their fragile years of infancy than 40 years ago. They live in sturdier health. They live in prospect of freedom from exploitation as they grow older, yet not old enough for grinding labor. They live in brighter prospects of opportunity, in assurance that the institutions which serve them—the courts, the hospitals, the shelters, the centers of recreation—are better and more enlightened in every aspect.

That all this is so is due in a large part to operations of the Children's Bureau, once a part of the Department of Labor, now in the Federal Security Agency. And to refine the record further, much is due to the personal work of Katharine Lenroot, Chief of the Bureau. There is a point in saying this now, as Miss Lenroot retires after 17 years in that post, after 38 years altogether with the Children's Bureau.

The daughter of a former United States Senator, Miss Lenroot is known all over the world as one of its foremost authorities on child welfare. She has given the largest part of her life to that field, with such results of richer, more radiant existence and promise for millions that her departure from public service is a national loss.

[From the New York Times of July 11, 1951]

MISS LENROOT TO RETIRE

Announcement has been made of the impending retirement of Miss Katharine F. Lenroot, Chief of the Children's Bureau of the Federal Security Agency. Miss Lenroot joined the Children's Bureau in 1914, 2 years after its creation, and has served as Chief of the Bureau since 1934. Thanks in large measure to her tireless efforts, these last 30 years have seen many improvements in the field of child and maternal welfare.

The Children's Bureau is, in a sense, the conscience of the American people toward our children. It has been the pilot plant for many of the now well-established social-welfare projects. Through the establishment of health and maternal facilities and the publication of bulletins on prenatal and child care, the Bureau has made available the latest and most scientific information and advice. In all these matters Miss Lenroot has encouraged the closest cooperation between public and private agencies.

Writing in this newspaper in 1947, Miss Lenroot listed the goals before us on behalf of the Nation's children as proper housing, adequate food and medical care for all families, good schools, and able teaching for all children, the expansion and strengthening of both public and private child guidance and social-welfare programs. Though much still remains to be done, American children of today are undoubtedly better off than were those of a generation ago. Miss Lenroot may well take leave of office with the satisfaction of many goals achieved.

The President has nominated Dr. Martha Eliot to succeed Miss Lenroot. As Associate Chief of the Children's Bureau from 1941 to 1949, Dr. Eliot has shown herself to be a courageous champion of America's children. Under her direction we are confident that the Bureau will continue to play a splendid role.

[From the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times of July 11, 1951]

WISCONSIN IS PROUD OF KATHARINE LENROOT

One of Wisconsin's great daughters announced the other day that she is retiring from her long and distinguished career of public service. She is Katharine F. Lenroot, chief of the United States Children's Bureau and the daughter of a shining name in Wisconsin's history, the late Senator Irvine L. Lenroot.

Katharine Lenroot began the career that was to bring her national fame here in the State of Wisconsin, as a member of the State industrial commission. She later went to the Children's Bureau in Washington and rose rapidly to the position from which she has now resigned.

Few people have brought such selfless devotion to so good a cause as Katharine Lenroot brought to her job of defending and protecting the children of this Nation. Her rich experience and her limitless capacity for understanding and work brought lasting benefits to America. In recent years the world has borrowed from her through her contributions to the welfare programs of the United Nations.

The Nation's sentiments were well expressed by the President, who paid tribute to her as "a tough and persistent champion of children's rights."

Wisconsin is grateful to and proud of Katharine Lenroot.

Public Housing Conditions in Los Angeles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram from Mr. Nicola Giuliani, chairman of the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles for 14 years.

This telegram completely contradicts and refutes an article appearing in the July 17, 1951, Wall Street Journal, regarding the rental housing situation in Los Angeles. According to Mr. Giuliani the article presents a biased viewpoint and is not factual.

In the interest of making available information on the actual rental and public housing conditions in the city of Los Angeles, I am placing this telegram in the RECORD:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., July 17, 1951.

CONGRESSMAN CHESTER HOLIFIELD,
House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

My attention has just been directed to an article appearing in the July 17, 1951, issue of the Wall Street Journal concerning this agency's new 10,000 dwelling unit low-rent housing and slum-clearance program. In my 14 years as chairman of the housing authority of the city of Los Angeles, I have never read a more unfair, untrue, and patently biased article in a supposedly responsible newspaper. While the article consists primarily of conclusions of the writer based upon alleged quotations from various individuals, it purports to be a factual summary of our new program in relation to general housing conditions in the city of Los Angeles. At the outset of the article the

writer states "nearly 1 in every 20 Angelinos will be a public housing tenant." The truth is that when our new program is completed there will be a total of 14,852 dwelling units of permanent low-rent public housing in the city of Los Angeles. According to the 1950 Federal census there are a total of 709,100 family dwelling units in the city of Los Angeles, therefore a little simple arithmetic reveals that instead of 1 out of every 20 families, not persons, only 1 out of every 50 families will be living in public housing. A further example of the writer's completely misleading and inaccurate statements is contained in his statement of half truth wherein he says the new program will "add 45,000 more people to the 48,000 already in public housing." The full truth is that of the 48,000 persons presently occupying public housing in the city of Los Angeles approximately 21,000 occupy temporary war housing and temporary veterans' emergency housing which are to be replaced by the new program. In other words, instead of a total of 93,000 persons occupying public housing the correct figure is approximately 72,000. After leading off with these untrue and half true conclusions, calculated to alarm the reader, he proceeds to quote three individuals who represent the local counterpart of the main organizations composing the national real estate lobby, to wit: James M. Udall, a past president of the Los Angeles Realty Board and the Los Angeles Apartment House Owners Association; Fritz B. Burns, a past president of the National Association of Home Builders; and Earl S. Anderson, current secretary of the Los Angeles Real Estate Board. He quotes no one else. He quotes Mr. Udall as saying that "a recent survey shows that there are 2,000 apartments here renting at less than \$40 per month and vacant and that this survey covered only a third of the city's 425,000 rental units." In addition, he also stated "It suggests that there is not only a housing surplus, but it exists for the same low-income group for which the new housing project is designed." What organization made the alleged survey and where in the city these 2,000 apartments are located is not stated. The housing authority at the present time is engaged in relocating approximately 1,707 families from the 11 sites for this new program. The Los Angeles Apartment House Owners Association, of which Mr. Udall is a director, has not referred this agency to one single dwelling unit in its relocation program nor has it done so in the past when this agency has been engaged in removing excess income families from our permanent low-rent projects. In addition, the residential research committee of Los Angeles which is a non-profit private community organization organized for the development and distribution of factual information on conditions affecting housing, mortgage lending, construction, and related aspects of real estate in Los Angeles County, in its last quarterly report dated May 11, 1951, states that vacancies in single dwellings renting for \$40 per month or less had dropped from 14 percent in July 1950 to 0.80 percent in April 1951. It also states that vacancies in unfurnished multiple dwellings stood at 1.90 percent but no rental breakdown is given. Normal vacancy ration in the city of Los Angeles is considered to be 6 percent. In considering Mr. Udall's statement, however, it should also be borne in mind that to the \$40 per month quoted must be added from ten to fifteen dollars per month for utilities making a total cost of fifty to fifty-five dollars per month compared with the \$32.50 per month which is the average rent for a two-bedroom unit in our new program including utilities. Therefore, based upon this agency's own experience as well as the most reliable private research organization in the city of Los Angeles Mr. Udall's statement and conclusion is just not true.

The writer quoted Mr. Burns as being critical of the Housing Authority's "estimated construction cost of \$11,000 per unit," and in commenting said, "We just completed some two-bedroom units at a cost of \$5,000 each. Less than half the cost of these project housing units." The \$11,000 estimated cost quoted by Mr. Burns is the total cost per dwelling unit including the cost of land and slum improvements, clearing of said slums, the cost of new site improvements, including all utilities, sidewalks, streets, etc., and is, therefore, not comparable in any way with the \$5,000 net construction-cost figure cited by Mr. Burns. The estimated net construction cost per dwelling unit for our new program is estimated at \$5,312 for one-bedroom units, \$6,265 for two-bedroom units, and \$7,905 for three-bedroom units. In addition, room sizes will be larger and construction of a more permanent type than anything presently being constructed by speculative builders. Mr. Anderson is quoted as saying, "The national rearmament effort has taken up the unemployment slack and the surplus of housing is evident at hand," and refers the reader to the rental section of the Los Angeles Times on a "certain" Sunday. His point concerning unemployment is completely irrelevant and his statement concerning the surplus of housing has already been factually refuted.

In addition, the article refers to the recent action of the city council in approving sites for our entire new program by a vote of 10 to 5, but again because of obvious bias only contains a statement of Councilman Debs, who voted against two of the projects referred to. The writer failed to quote a single person or organization who supports the program, such as all local veteran organizations, all local labor organizations, the League of Women Voters, and some 75 other organizations. It is a shame and a disgrace that an allegedly responsible newspaper would print such an unfair and biased article, and I am sure thousands of our citizens join me in my views.

I am supplying you with the facts concerning this matter in the hope that you will use them in debating tomorrow when an effort is scheduled to be made in the House to limit the national program to 5,000 dwelling units for the next fiscal year. Please do everything you can toward sustaining the conference committee report of 50,000 units.

Kindest personal regards,

NICOLA GIULII,
Chairman.

Prayer for a Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the American people are horrified by the disastrous floods now sweeping through Kansas and Missouri, drowning people, demolishing homes, schools, and business houses, destroying crops, and washing away the land.

This could all have been prevented by the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority, such as we have on the Tennessee River. As I said the other day, the Tennessee Valley Authority has wrought the greatest development of ancient or modern times.

I have been introducing bills for a Missouri Valley Authority in every Congress for many years.

If my bill had been passed years ago, this, and similar disasters, could have been averted. The people throughout those States drained by the Missouri River and its tributaries could have been enjoying reduced electric-power rates. By holding back the floods on those streams and preventing them from synchronizing with the floods on the upper Mississippi and the Ohio Rivers, we could have protected the lower Mississippi, as well as the Missouri Basin, and saved enough money to have paid for the entire development.

If Congress wants to prevent these disasters in the years to come, save that vast volume of hydroelectric power that is now going to waste every year on the Missouri and its tributaries, protect the lower Mississippi from the disasters with which it has been visited, conserve the soil of the area, and save untold hundreds of millions of dollars in flood-control expenditures on the lower stretches of the father of waters, then you should follow the example set by the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority and pass the bill which I have introduced for a similar authority for the Missouri River and its tributaries.

At this point I am inserting a verse which seems to me to be appropriate at this time.

It reads as follows:

When dust storms sweep from every field
And fill our eyes and ears and throat,
When all our steamboats are aground,
Or all our houses are afloat,
When transportation has become
As obsolete as Noah's Ark,
When all our land is washed away
And all our people in the dark,
Then hear our prayers, God, speed the day,
When Congress gives us MVA.

Sales Tax Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Benjamin L. Masse, which appeared in the July 21, 1951, issue of the magazine America:

SALES TAX PROPOSALS

Before a skeptical Senate Finance Committee on July 5, the National Association of Manufacturers dusted off its old proposal for a general consumption tax. As outlined by Charles R. Sligh, Jr., chairman of the NAM tax committee, the consumption tax would be imposed at the manufacturing level and apply to everything except food, liquor, and tobacco. (Liquor and tobacco would continue to be subject to heavy excise taxes.) Mr. Sligh estimated that at a 19-percent rate the consumption tax would raise \$18,000,000,000 a year.

The Finance Committee also heard a proposal for a general sales tax at the retail level from the American Retail Federation

and other retail groups. Formerly opposed to such a tax, the influential National Retail Dry Goods Association told the committee that it was preferable both to an increase in personal and corporation income taxes and to the NAM's tax at the manufacturer level. The committee was also cool to this proposal.

The standard objection to sales taxes, of whatever kind, of course, is that they are necessarily regressive. In taxing the purchases of rich and poor at the same rate they fall more heavily on the poor. As our tax system has developed, the dominating principle has become "ability to pay," and this is reflected in the progressive tax on personal and to a lesser extent, on corporation incomes. From this source we are currently deriving about 85 percent of our revenue. Sales taxes, in the form of excise taxes, also have a place in the Federal tax picture, but a relatively minor one. If the country wishes to maintain the equitable tax principle of "ability to pay," the present emphasis on income taxes must be maintained, although in times of emergency there is a legitimate excuse for expanding somewhat the scope of excise taxes. Senator TOM CONNALLY, Democrat, Texas, had this tax philosophy in mind when he accused proponents of a general sales tax of attempting to shift the tax burden from their shoulders to the shoulders of consumers.

The conservative chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, Senator WALTER GEORGE, Democrat, Georgia, pointed out another difficulty, which rendered the proposal for a general sales tax "impractical." Were the Federal Government to expand its operations into the sales-tax field, it would gravely interfere with State and municipal efforts to raise revenues. At the present time 29 States have a sales tax. They would resent and fight any attempt of the United States Treasury to poach on their preserves.

Proponents argue (1) that only a sales tax will reach \$130,000,000,000 of personal income not now under levy, and (2) that high income-tax rates destroy personal initiative and imperil corporate finances. The first argument forgets that the "untouched" \$130,000,000,000 is actually taxed, indirectly, in all kinds of ways. The second argument, a strong one in peacetime, loses much of its cogency in time of war and national emergency.

Economy Where It Hurts and Rule by Lobby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following two items which appeared in the Washington Post of July 19, 1951, I understand are being reprinted in newspapers throughout the country as a public service by the International Latex Corp.

Both items have an important bearing upon the Defense Production Act now before the House. I recommend that every Member read them:

[From the Washington Post of July 19, 1951]

ECONOMY WHERE IT HURTS

(An editorial in the New York Times)

Both Houses of Congress have, as usual, spent a good deal of time this spring and summer worrying about the annual appro-

priation bills to pay for the manifold activities of the Federal Government for the year 1951-52. The House has been cutting down the President's budgetary requests and in some cases the Senate has been going the House one better.

Though some of the specific cuts they make may not be wise, it is an excellent thing for our legislators seriously to concern themselves with economy in Government. But while economy-minded Congressmen have been wrangling over a slash of 525 automobiles in one bill and elimination of 46 chauffeurs in another we wonder why so many have been insistently turning their backs on a really fertile field for the economizers, where savings could be measured in terms not of millions but of billions.

General Marshall reported not long ago that of the \$35,000,000,000 voted for rearmament last year a full 20 percent had gone up in smoke. He didn't use the word smoke, however. He used the word inflation. Charles E. Wilson reminded us the other day that a heavy antiaircraft gun that cost \$180,000 before Korea is now \$250,000; a pair of combat boots has gone from \$5.22 to \$11.63; wool shirts from \$7.84 to \$17.35, and so on. No citizen needs to be reminded of what has happened to the price of food or clothing for him. The Government, no less than the average citizen, can be bled white by inflation, and the process is already well under way. This is something for the economy bloc in Congress to have the courage to face up to. It is all right to economize on smaller things; but inflation is the biggest thing to have hit this country's pocketbook yet.

[From the Washington Post of July 19, 1951]

RULE BY LOBBY

(Sylvia F. Porter, in the Atlanta Journal)

What we are being forced to witness is nothing short of and nothing more than pressure-group government in America.

That's one of the most evil and disastrous things that can happen in a democracy.

Yet, that is what we have seen in Congress' frantic fumbling over the Defense Production Act these last several days.

The exhibition has been downright shameful.

The farm bloc? The farmers want floors under but no ceilings above farm prices.

The business lobbies? They're all for stabilizing wages but they don't want an official finger touching prices or profits.

The unions? They want stiff price controls but weak wage controls or if it can be managed, no wage controls at all.

The auto and appliance dealers? They don't care what happens to controls generally but they sure don't want any tough curbs on installment buying of autos or television sets.

The meat interests won't stand for meat controls.

The banking interests won't even listen to an argument for additional loan controls.

The real estate lobbies are livid at the idea of continuing or tighter rent and housing controls.

And so it goes up and down the line. Each is acting as a group unto itself—and the devil take the country as a whole.

Each wants the "benefits" of inflation (I use the word "benefits" sarcastically) and each wants some other group to pay the bill.

And what's so shocking, so shameful about it is that our Congress is bowing meekly before the lobbies, is giving in to the most arrogant demands and not even blushing about it.

Only the patriot hasn't been heard; only the consumer hasn't been consulted; only the national defense hasn't been mentioned.

As for the reaction of the special interests, one auto dealer said it all as far as I am

concerned: "I never believed we could swing it, that we could get what we asked. Wow."

We still have a little time left to regain our balance. Let us cut through the name-calling, try to reach the fundamentals.

Let us assume we will continue our remobilization; let us assume we will not be so insane that we will give up our defense program now, fall back into another pre-Korean unpreparedness.

What then?

Defense Mobilization Director Wilson says we will be over the remobilization hump by 1953. Between now and the end of 1952, though, the schedule calls for rapidly mounting defense spending. In a few months, spending is slated to rise to \$1,000,000,000 a week.

Even though the entire emphasis right now is on deflation, therefore—and there is more talk of bust than boom—there still will be a big pinch on materials, manpower, and equipment next year.

To face even that possibility without plenty of ammunition in the locker is downright stupid. To risk another inflation is to make sure that we will have another deflation.

And the signposts on that road are written in the pages of history in the blackest of letters—inflation to deflation to bankruptcy to dictatorship.

That is why we must keep our powder dry, in the economic as well as the military sense.

If we use our heads and pull together these next several months, we can attain and we can maintain economic stability.

Pressure-group government is sick government. We cannot afford this sickness; we must not permit this sickness.

The Tungsten Scandal Reported by the Senate Committee on Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 6, 1951

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, recently a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, known as the Johnson Subcommittee on Preparedness, issued a statement on the tungsten program. Tungsten is an absolute essential in our war effort. The statement by the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services fully confirms everything which has been stated by the House Subcommittee on Mines and Mining with reference to this important subject. I have prepared some excerpts from this Senate report, which I think will be of interest to the House and the country at large, and, under unanimous consent, I include them at this point in the Record:

SIGNIFICANT STATEMENTS CONTAINED IN THE REPORT OF THE PREPAREDNESS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES ON TUNGSTEN

BLIND MAN'S BLUFF

Here were two agencies—the Munitions Board and the Department of the Army. Each was the child of a parent organization—the Nation's Defense Establishment. Each had an important defense responsibility involving a vital metal—tungsten. Each had the clear obligation to work together for the national security. * * *

The Army had an important program—the development of armor-piercing shells—which required large amounts of tungsten. The Munitions Board had the responsibility of stockpiling the metal lest America's supplies be suddenly cut off.

It would be difficult to picture a situation crying more loudly for the closest cooperation. The armor-piercing shell development—the so-called core program—was a foundation stone of the Nation's military plans. The stockpiling was absolutely essential since the major sources of tungsten were overseas—particularly in China—and could readily be cut off.

The two agencies had merely to get together, decide how much was needed and ask the Congress for the appropriations.

And yet, for nearly 3 years no one—absolutely no one—informed the Munitions Board of the amount of tungsten required for the Army's core program and the Board made no effort to find out about it. The two agencies seem to have been playing blind-man's bluff.

Meanwhile nobody was storing up tungsten.

When they finally got together it was too late. China, the principal source, was just about ready to fall into the hands of the Communists.

Even then, they acted as though time were something not for action. The program for stockpiling tungsten merely stepped up from a crawl to a shuffle. For nearly 2 years, the agencies planned to make plans but rarely took any action.

TUNGSTEN STARVATION

Today, the United States and the free world stand on the verge of tungsten starvation. Production can be increased; more efficient methods can be found; nonessential uses can be slashed ruthlessly. But the fact remains that no foreseeable eventuality will provide all that is needed by the European democracies and the Americas to meet their essential civilian and military requirements.

SHORT-SIGHTEDNESS AND BUNGLING

A detailed study of the actions of the Munitions Board in connection with the stockpiling of tungsten reveals a startling degree of short-sightedness and bungling which has hampered our preparedness program and impaired our security. While all of the facts upon which this conclusion is based cannot be made public without direct aid and comfort to our enemies, enough are set forth below to be indicative of the remainder.

The main reason for the low state of our tungsten stockpile, in our opinion, is the inadequacy of the stockpile objectives from July 23, 1946, the date of the enactment of the Stockpiling Act, to July 20, 1950, after the beginning of the Korean war. * * *

The initial objective was increased on December 31, 1948, but even this new objective was inadequate in that it failed to recognize the need to discount the probability that some imports would be cut off during a war. It is obvious that such an inadequate objective would not protect this country from a "dangerous and costly dependence * * * upon foreign nations * * * in times of national emergency," as contemplated in the stockpiling statute. This second inadequate objective was maintained for over a year and a half because of a disagreement between the Department of the Interior and the Munitions Board over strategic assumptions which are the basis for discounting imports. * * *

Of course, inadequate objectives resulted in inadequate procurement of tungsten for the stockpile. * * *

NO SINGLE AGENCY

This committee is of the opinion that so long as the responsibility for imports of tungsten and other strategic materials is not centralized in a single Government agency, there can be no certainty that imported

supplies available to the United States will be adequate. Reliance on market fluctuations, subject as they are to speculative manipulation to assure needed imports, is a weak reed for our preparedness program. More use should be made of our Government's international bargaining power, e. g., one of our strongest assets, the power to make loans abroad has remained unused. * * *

CUT OFF FROM MAJOR SUPPLIES

Almost overnight, we have been cut off from our major sources of this metal which is so essential in peace and so vital in war. Those sources are the rich reserves of the Far East which we have lost through the Communist conquest of China, the bloody conflict in Korea, and the ceaseless guerrilla fighting in southeast Asia.

At the same time, our tungsten coffers, which should have been filled to the high-water mark against just such a contingency, are down to the danger point. We face the lean years without the comforting fat we should have accumulated in the days of plenty.

THE PRICE WE PAY

The price we will pay for our sins of omission will be high—very high.

We can increase our production; we can dip into our stockpiles; we can buy from what is left of the free world. But the harsh, inescapable fact is that we can foresee nothing short of a miracle that will produce enough tungsten for the combined essential needs of ourselves and our allies. * * *

Taking into consideration all the circumstances, reasonable men would expect the United States Government to have a policy for stimulating both domestic and foreign production. However, reasonable men are frequently disappointed in their expectations. There is very little in the line of a well-rounded domestic program and less than that—in fact, nothing—in the line of a foreign program.

Tidelands Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing House Joint Resolution 296, to provide that royalties received under certain mineral leases covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf shall be set aside in the Treasury for use as grants-in-aid of education, and for other purposes.

The Supreme Court has ruled in *U. S. v. California* (332 U. S. 19), June 23, 1947. The Supreme Court stated without equivocation that "California is not the owner of the 3-mile marginal belt along the coast." And in *U. S. v. Texas* (339 U. S. 704), October 16, 1950, the Court settled for all time this controversial argument between the United States and the several States by holding that the ownership and proprietary rights to this marginal sea, as well as the governmental powers of regulation and control, was in the United States of America as a whole.

Thus, the Supreme Court has declared without question that permanent rights and dominions in this area have been vested in the Government of the

United States and not in the respective States themselves.

It is the purpose of this bill, which is in large part a companion measure to similar bills introduced in the Senate by Senators HILL, DOUGLAS, MORSE, BENTON, TOBEY, NEELY, SPARKMAN, KEFAUVER, CHAVEZ, HUMPHREY, and HENNING, to provide on a long-range basis for the education of the children of the United States and to place the funds derived from the oil deposits in the marginal sea areas in a special account in the United States Treasury for that purpose. It is also the intent of this resolution that during the time of the present national emergency, all funds derived from the so-called tidelands oil shall be used for only such urgent development essential to the national defense and the national security as the Congress may determine. After the termination of the present national emergency, the moneys in this special account shall be used exclusively as grant-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education.

Under section 3 of the resolution a National Advisory Council on Grants-in-Aid of Education will be established. This Council will be composed of 12 persons having experience in the fields of education and public administration. Four will be appointed by the President of the Senate; four will be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and four will be appointed by the President of the United States. Not more than two from each group of four appointees shall be members of the same political party. It shall be the function of the National Advisory Council to formulate and transmit to the President of the United States for submission to Congress, not later than February 1, 1953, a plan for the equitable allocation of the moneys available for use as grants-in-aid to American schools.

The moneys to be derived under this resolution would not be intended as a substitute for but rather an additional supplement to any program for Federal aid to education to be paid for out of tax revenues.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution offers a reasonable solution to the present tidelands situation which will not, in my opinion, be settled definitely until legislation is adopted either to permit the normal private exploration of the offshore fields to go forward under the control of Federal Government, which I think would be the proper action for Congress to take or to turn the properties over to the States as the legislation, recently reported out by the Judiciary Committee, would do. This quitclaim measure has the full endorsement of the coastal States involved in the tidelands controversy.

It is estimated by the United States Geological Survey that there may be \$40,000,000,000 worth of oil in the offshore deposits. This money, if used properly, should go far toward strengthening the foundation of the American public-school system which, at the present time, is finding it exceedingly difficult to survive. I might say at this point that it is not unusual for the United

States Government to devote a portion of its natural resources to the advancement of education because the country's system of land-grant colleges was created through grants of public lands under the Morrill Act of 1862. This has been a wise use of a great resource in creating a national asset.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution, which I have just introduced, will receive the support of this body and while I recognize that the details concerning its administration, may be difficult to work out, I feel that the matter is of such import to all the people of the United States, that a satisfactory management of the problem could be achieved. These oil lands are not the properties of the individual States but they belong to all the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert at this point in my remarks a copy of House Joint Resolution 296 which I have today introduced:

Joint resolution to provide that royalties received under certain mineral leases covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf shall be set aside in the Treasury for use as grants in aid of education, and for other purposes

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States on June 23, 1947, rendered an opinion in the case of *United States v. California* and on June 5, 1950, rendered opinions in the cases of *United States v. Louisiana* and *United States v. Texas*, holding that the United States has paramount rights in, and full dominion and power over, the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf adjacent to the shores of California, Louisiana, and Texas, and that the respective States do not own the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf within their boundaries; and

Whereas the American system of primary, secondary, and higher education faces a financial crisis of severe magnitude because of the unusually large growth in the school-age population, because of the inadequate supply of teachers, and because of the deteriorating and infirm physical plan of the American educational system; and

Whereas the children of the United States are this Nation's most precious natural resource and their education has from the beginnings of this Republic been traditionally held most dear by all Americans: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, under such regulations and subject to such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, is authorized to issue mineral leases covering the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf. The Secretary shall require the payment under each such lease of a royalty of not less than 12½ percent of the amount or value of the production saved, removed, or sold under such lease.

SEC. 2. All moneys received by the Secretary of the Interior from leases issued pursuant to this resolution shall be held in a special account in the Treasury during the present national emergency, and until the Congress shall otherwise provide the moneys in such special account shall be used only for such urgent developments essential to the national defense and the national security as the Congress may determine. After the termination of such national emergency the moneys in such special account shall be used exclusively as grants in aid of primary, secondary, and higher education.

SEC. 3. There is hereby created a National Advisory Council on Grants in Aid of Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Council"), to be composed of 12 persons having experience in the fields of education and public administration, 4 to be appointed by

the President of the Senate, 4 by the Speaker of the House, and 4 by the President of the United States. No more than two from each group of four appointees shall be members of the same political party. It shall be the function of the Council to formulate and transmit to the President of the United States, for submission to the Congress not later than February 1, 1953, a plan for the equitable allocation of the moneys available under section 2 for use as grants in aid of primary, secondary, and higher education.

SEC. 4. It shall be the duty of every State or political subdivision or grantee thereof having issued any mineral lease or grant covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf to file with the Attorney General of the United States on or before December 31, 1951, a statement of the moneys or other things of value received by such State or political subdivision or grantee from or on account of each such lease or grant since January 1, 1940, and the Attorney General shall submit the statements so received to the Congress not later than February 1, 1952.

Congressional Medal Winner Lauds Captain Bailey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following statement made recently by Master Sgt. Stanley T. Adams when he received the Medal of Honor. Sergeant Adams has given high praise to Capt. Charles R. Bailey, of Jackson County, Ala., and I am pleased to bring his fine statement to the attention of the Members. The following article appeared in the *Progressive Age*, July 12, 1951:

CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL WINNER LAUDS CAPTAIN BAILEY

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 3.—President Truman today pinned the Medal of Honor on Master Sgt. Stanley T. Adams for heroism "above and beyond the call of duty" in the Korean War.

In this exclusive article Sergeant Adams writes that even if the war in Korea ends, the Communists will "start to fight the same kind of dirty, stinking fight all over again, maybe in India, maybe in Iran."

The Olathe, Kans., sergeant who let enemy grenades bounce off his body when he led a 13-man unit against 250 troops, bluntly asserts that the Reds won't stop in Korea.

Sergeant Adams said:

"I'm not much different than anybody else who has been to Korea. Maybe I'm lucky I got back. There're plenty of good sergeants, good soldiers, the best buddies a man ever had still over there. They will never come back. Maybe I'm lucky."

"Sometimes I'm not too sure. Everybody back here thinks that we're going to have an armistice and everything will be O. K. again. They are the same people who think the war is for somebody else to fight, while they sit home nice and comfortable and read about it, if they can spare the time.

"I think about all the good men we lost over there and I just want to tell the American people what it means to live and fight in filth, with insects and heat or maybe

freezing cold, and maybe to die that way on some crawling, dirty Korean hill, or next to a road, or all by yourself where nobody even knows about it.

"The American people have to know what war means and what aggression means. They have to know that to the Reds human life means nothing. Aggression means everything. They won't stop in Korea.

"I hope all the lives we lost over there aren't wasted. They will be wasted if the people back home forget what has happened, or don't know about it.

"We have to realize that even if the fighting should stop in Korea, it just means the aggressors will start to fight the same kind of dirty, stinking fight all over again, maybe in India, maybe in Iran, maybe somewhere else.

"They say all men are created equal. But who is equal? Are the people who sit back home and worry about business profits equal to the man who is dying on the thirty-eighth parallel?

"We are all equal—equal in our responsibilities and duties to America and to the kind of life I want my kids and your kids to have.

"I just want to say another word about something that has bothered me. We heard a lot of talk over there about people back home worrying about the rough treatment their boys get in training.

"Let me tell you this, the training they get in the Army just can't be rough enough. You can't realize this until you've seen the kind of war the Communists fight. When you are in it, it means the difference between living and dying, just how tough you are—and how much you know.

"I'd like to say something else.

"I'm receiving a big honor today, but all the honor and everything else reverts back to one wonderful man. He's Capt. Charles T. Bailey, of Scottsboro, Ala. Whatever I live to be, will be due to him."

Joe Walcott's Great Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, truer words were never spoken than the comment of a sports writer last night following the winning of the heavyweight championship by Jersey Joe Walcott, of Camden, N. J. In speaking of Jersey Joe, he said: "A good clean life pays off."

No one who knows Jersey Joe Walcott, whose real name is Arnold Raymond Cream, will ever question the fact that his life is a living example of the truth of that statement.

I have known Jersey Joe Walcott for many years. He and his family, consisting of a wife and six children, lived until recently in Merchantville, N. J., which is my home town. The last few years he and his family have lived in Camden, N. J., a few miles distant from his former home. Thus, I have had the opportunity to know him personally. I can testify today to the fine, upright, and moral life that he has lived. This fact was recognized and expression given to it by the leading citizens of Merchantville in a testimonial dinner given to him

a few years ago, after what most people believed was his victory over Joe Louis.

On the occasion of the testimonial dinner he was also spoken of as the uncrowned champion and confidence was expressed in his ability sooner or later to establish himself as the heavyweight champion of the world. He has now made good. He has accomplished what was predicted at that time.

The course that Jersey Joe has traveled to reach his pinnacle of fame has been no easy one. He has had many setbacks, but, with his eye continually on the ultimate goal, he has persevered until success was finally gained. Through all these years of struggle, from the time of the depression when he worked as a WPA laborer to support himself and his growing family, through years of ups and downs in the boxing game, through disappointments without number, he has battled on constantly with the thought that some day he would be champion. His courage, perseverance and willingness to sacrifice for the gaining of his goal has carried him forward when less courageous souls would have faltered and given up the struggle.

I wonder if we can fully estimate the good that will come throughout the years as a result of the thoughts and desires he has expressed. His brief speech reached 60,000,000 people by radio and television immediately after his victory. He spoke as one to whom faith in God was a deep religious conviction. He spoke of his desire to help the boys of America to live right. He hoped that he would have the opportunity of addressing Sunday schools to accomplish this purpose. This was no cheap publicity stunt. He spoke what was uppermost in his heart. His life is a guaranty of his sincerity of purpose. On Sunday mornings it is a fine sight to see Joe Walcott, his wife, and six children attending church service. To him participation in the sport of boxing is no different than participation in any other manly sport, track, basketball, baseball, and all the other sports.

The fact that Joe Walcott at 37 years of age could gain the championship is something that has never been accomplished before in the history of boxing. His ability to do so leaves no doubt that throughout the years he has lived a clean life. Night clubs and bright spots have never had an attraction for him. His home, with a faithful and splendidly educated wife and six bright, promising children, has been his joy and satisfaction. Too much credit cannot be given to his wife and the children as a helpful influence. It is for them that he has worked and striven, and they honor and respect him as a true and faithful father.

In conclusion, I can safely say that no victory in any major sport has brought forth such genuine and wholehearted expressions of good will, satisfaction, and congratulations to the victor as has come to Joe Walcott since his victory last night. He has the best wishes of all that he will have many years of health, happiness, and success and, that his life will continue to be a living example of the truth that a good, clean life pays off.

Jack Daniel's Whisky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 13, 1951

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as everybody who knows me is aware, I have been a temperate man all my life. I have voted that way, and I have acted that way. However, the State of Tennessee, after trying out prohibition, provided for local option in the State and also permitted the manufacture of liquors.

One of the most celebrated liquors in our State, and indeed one of the most celebrated liquors in the country, is manufactured at Lynchburg, Moore County, Tenn. It is called Jack Daniel. The distillery was started by a gentleman by the name of Jack Daniel nearly 100 years ago. Mr. Daniel was a splendid man, and he began the manufacture of a liquor which I am told is peculiarly enticing and attractive to anyone who tastes it.

He had no children, and in 1907 he deeded the distillery over to his nephews, Lem Motlow and Dick Daniel. Later Mr. Lem Motlow became the sole owner. He was a man of the highest character and standing, and I knew him very well. Although I had favored prohibition, and it was a very live question at that time, he supported me in 1915 for the Senate. Of course, if he had been considering only his business, his every interest would have been the other way. I knew him, esteemed him, and respected him most highly.

I first met Mr. Motlow when I visited Lynchburg in 1915. I was told that he had been very much against me because I favored prohibition. In my talks with him he very frankly told me that the first time I ever met him he decided he was going to vote for me because he believed that I was an honest man. It was a very high compliment to me, and I have told the story with great pride and affection ever since. I esteemed Mr. Motlow most highly. We were good friends from the first time I met him until he passed away.

He died in 1947, leaving his distillery to his four sons, who have run it ever since, and its products still enjoy the high favor which it enjoyed under Jack Daniel, the founder, and Lem Motlow, his successor.

It is now owned by Mr. Motlow's four sons, but I am advised that the chief manufacture is in the hands of his eldest son, Reagar Motlow. The sons, like their father, have always been my friends, and their friendship I esteem and respect in the highest degree.

Recently, in the July number of *Fortune*, is a description of the distillery. Everyone in Tennessee is proud of the successful operation of this plant. Tennesseans are proud of the memory of Jack Daniel; they are proud of the memory of Lem Motlow; they are proud of the splendid character and citizenship of Mr. Motlow's four sons.

I ask unanimous consent that the article in *Fortune* describing this plant be printed in the Appendix of the *Record*.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the article will make $2\frac{1}{3}$ pages of the *Record*, at a cost of \$191.34.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

RARE JACK DANIEL'S

If you have never heard of Jack Daniel's whisky, so much the better. Its relative obscurity is part of its charm. For this backwoods brand of spirits, which is scarcely advertised at all and amounts to the merest ripple in the oceans of whisky produced and consumed in the United States, has become the beneficiary of a wonderful whispering campaign. Little knots of Jack Daniel fanatics are to be encountered in all parts of the country and in all walks of life. They pluck at one's sleeve and whisper, "Try some of this. It's made in a li'l ol' still way off somewhere in the hills of Tennessee. The same family has been making it by the same secret process for nearly a hundred years. It's expensive, and hard to get, but no other whisky in the world tastes quite like it."

The enchanting thing about this legend is that it's largely true. Jack Daniel's indubitably has a distinctive taste, though it is made, as most good whiskies are made, of no other blessed thing but grain and water. Though not quite the oldest in years, the Jack Daniel Distillery is the oldest registered distillery in the United States, being the first under the wire when the registration law was enacted shortly after the Civil War. It is owned and managed by the four brothers Motlow, grandnephews of founder Jack Daniel, who died childless in 1911. They make the whisky by the exact formula followed by their late father, Lem Motlow, and Uncle Jack before him, and they even employ some of the original primitive equipment.

They make as much of this whisky as they can without impairing its quality, imperiling their financial security, or plumb tiring themselves out. Each year they make more—sometimes 50 percent more—whisky than the year before, but just can't seem to catch up with the demand. It is a situation over which the brothers Motlow neither exult nor despair. They like people to like their whisky, and they enjoy living well as a result. But they have no ambition to become big rich, and especially not at the expense of family pride in the product.

Though the Motlow boys, all University of Vanderbilt graduates, are by no means guileless, there is no hint of trumpery, no evidence of calculation even, in the remarkable word-of-mouth build-up that Jack Daniel's enjoys. In a field where endorsements are bought at fancy prices, the roster of Jack Daniel's rooters is something to make a professional whisky publicist tear his hand-painted tie to shreds. John N. Garner, when he was Vice President of the United States and used to invite friends into his chambers to "strike a blow for liberty," invariably struck the blow with Jack Daniel's. One of the few things reported publicly about the private life of shy William Faulkner, Nobel prize novelist, is that he prefers to drink Jack Daniel's "on the rocks." A typical votary is a rich and retired industrialist who entertains lavishly on his Long Island estate and tells guests, "There are three kinds of whisky—cookin' whisky, drinkin' whisky, and sippin' whisky. This here (proudly patting a bottle of Jack Daniel's) is sippin' whisky."

HEAVENLY HOLLOW

Jack Daniel's whisky is made in a sylvan setting of such cool beauty and graceful conformation of rock mountain, fell, and stream, that the visitor, caught up in reverie, finds it difficult to rid himself of the

illusion that he is reliving something out of a long-forgotten novel by John Fox, Jr. The little court-square town of Lynchburg, Tenn., lies in the foothills of the Cumberland Mountains some 70 miles southeast of Nashville. A mile beyond the town, off the old turnpike to Chattanooga, the traveler comes suddenly upon "the hollow," the name given a rugged ravine that runs several hundred yards back into the hills until it meets a sheer limestone cliff. At the base of the cliff is a cave, and from its great mouth there gushes, summer and winter, a stream of cool, sparkling water. Anyone with an ounce of sentiment should be willing to believe that this heavenly water, springing from somewhere deep in the limestone formation, is a major tributary to the clarity and flavor of Jack Daniel's whisky. There is some scientific support for the belief, too. The water flows at an invariable year-round temperature of 56 degrees and it tests completely free of iron (which is murderous to whisky).

Along the bank of the stream a road cuts through the center of the ravine. On either side, the modest buildings are grouped. At the stream's edge are the brick stillhouse, the leaching shed, a picturesque remnant from the original still, and United States warehouses No. 1 and No. 2. Across the road is the wooden one-room office building (which catches the constant cool draft emanating from the cave), and below it are a new administration building, the powerhouse, two additional warehouses, and finally the white-pillared mansion, facing the turnpike, where Lem Motlow's widow lives.

Fanning out from the centerpiece of the cliff are two lesser undulating hills. On the left slope, 400 head of beef cattle are pastured, and into their pens is piped the nurturing "slop" or stillage from the distillery—the finest cattle feed in the world. On the right-hand swell stand the sawmill and the ricks of sugar maple slowly burning to char. It is through this char that Jack Daniel's whisky, by an ancient but now unique process, is leached after distillation. The only argument about the whisky countenanced around Lynchburg is whether it is the spring water or the leaching that makes Jack Daniel's the finest whisky in the world.

Whisky has been made in the Hollow, legally or otherwise, since revolutionary times. Jack Daniels was born not 5 miles distant from the spot in "about" 1848. At age 12 he went to work for Dan Call, who ran a distillery a few miles up the pike at a place called Louse Creek, and became a full partner at 15. Shortly after the Civil War, Call, a pious Lutheran, was ordered by the elders either to quit the church or to quit whisky making. Jack Daniel, who was a Primitive, or "foot-washin'," Baptist, suffered from no such compunctions or pressures, so he bought Call out. He then purchased the Hollow and the 500 acres surrounding it, and began making sour-mash whisky under his own label.

LITTLE JACK'S MASH

It was a straight whisky made from a sour mash that was dominantly corn, a small percentage of rye and, of course, an addition of barley malt to convert the starch into sugar. By "sour mash" is meant merely that when the fresh yeast is added to the mash to cause fermentation it is inoculated with a portion of the ripe yeast, or spent beer, from the previous day's run. This is called yeasting back, or in Tennessee hill terms, "sloppin' back." Compared with the sweet-mash or fresh-yeast process, a sour mash usually requires 24 hours longer to ferment. It thereby forms a higher amount of lactic acid, hence the term "sour," though no one but a professional whisky taster could detect sour from sweet. It is claimed, however, that the yeasting-back process helps to ensure uniformity.

Several fine bourbons today are made from a sour mash—there is nothing exclusive about it. But the leaching process, which Jack Daniel learned from old fellows in and around the Hollow, is something else again. It was peculiar to Tennessee, and the Motlows are the only ones to have carried it down, in just that fashion, to present-day distilling.

BIG, LITTLE MAN

From the time he acquired the Hollow little Jack Daniel (he stood 5 feet, 5 inches high), garbed himself in a knee-length frock coat of black broadcloth, affected a high-rolled planter's hat, fawn-colored vest, and broad bow tie, and was never thereafter seen, day or night, in any but such formal attire.

As 76-year-old Uncle Jess Motlow, the family whisky taster and raconteur, recalls him, "He was a tidy little man, vain, exactin', but generous." He was fond of his own liquor, and of the ladies, but remained to the end of his life a preening bachelor. Some years before he passed on he had a life-sized statue of himself sculpted. It stands today on a little patch of greensward at the entrance to the cave.

Though Jack Daniel prospered and grew to preeminence over all other Tennessee distillers, he never worked more than "a hundred bushel a day," and his market and reputation were mostly regional. He didn't try to buck Kentucky, for instance, or any States north of it, but sales of Jack Daniel did spill over into Alabama, Georgia, and to Texas, which has always had a strong affinity for Tennessee. However, in 1904 a friend induced him to ship a case along to the St. Louis Exposition, and to the chagrin of the big distillers, unheralded Jack Daniel's won the highest gold medal. Thereafter Jack Daniel's picked up gold medals at Liège in 1905, Ghent in 1913, and at the Anglo-American Exposition in London in 1914. Apart from their listing on the back label, no particular capital was made out of these rather extraordinary honors. But they show that Jack Daniel's always had something about it that intrigued the connoisseur.

In his shanty of an office, hard by the cave, little Jack had a safe that was as stubborn and unpredictable as he was. One morning in 1905, in the usual tempest of opening the safe, Uncle Jack gave it an unusually hard kick and incurred such a severe clot in the arteries of his leg that eventually it had to be amputated. Thereafter he left most of the management of the plant to his nephew, Lem Motlow, who had come to work for him at 17, in 1887. Finally, in 1907, Uncle Jack deeded over the business to Lem and Dick Daniel, another nephew. Two years later Lem bought out Dick's share.

LEM MOTLOW, PROPRIETOR

Lem Motlow was as much a character, in his own right, as was Uncle Jack. He was, by contrast, big and burly, but he, too, had his idiosyncrasies of dress. He always wore an expensive black broadcloth suit, a wide-brimmed black hat with its crown uncreased, immaculate white shirt buttoned at the collar, and no tie. Even when he sat, proud and erect, in the State legislature he disdained a tie. His operations were decidedly more expansive than Uncle Jack's. He bought vast tracts of land, engaged in large-scale farming, and bred championship Tennessee walking horses. Like Uncle Jack, he was quick tempered, and once wounded an antagonist fatally in a quarrel. But his generosity was legendary, like the time he bought two carloads of model T Fords and passed them out to relatives and friends.

It was Lem Motlow's fate, however, to be driven, for many long years, from the hollow. In 1909 Tennessee went dry, and 2 years after that (the year of Uncle Jack's death) even the manufacture of whisky for shipment outside the State was banned. Lem Motlow set up shop in St. Louis, was

burned out, then opened a distillery in Birmingham, Ala., and Alabama went dry. He started up again in St. Louis, but in 1920, of course, he was forced out of the business completely.

When national prohibition was repealed in 1933, Tennessee still clung to the dry side. Farmer Lem Motlow won a seat in the State legislature and began to battle for manufacturing privileges and a county-option liquor law. By 1938 he had muled it through. Though he was now an old man (67), short of cash money and plagued with ill health and other troubles, he was determined to reopen the hollow and put Jack Daniel's, without change, back on the map.

Lem had four sons, Reagar, Evans, Conner, and Robert, all living on fine farms that he had deeded to them in the early twenties. Even with the mortgage money thus supplied, the precious spring, the Jack Daniel name, and the know-how, they had to go outside the family for additional capital. The problem was to find investors who'd understand that their share would give them no call to tamper with the principles and practices of making Jack Daniel's whisky. They found them among a few friends in Nashville, who took a 50-percent interest and a respectful attitude toward Lem Motlow's ideas on how the business was to be run. They have never regretted it.

It was, however, a long hard pull to get back into production. After 30 years of disuse, the hollow had little usable equipment. Without benefit of architect or engineer, the Motlows and their hired hands put up a new brick distillery and mash room, and began processing, in November 1938, 50 bushels of grain (about 200 gallons of whisky) a day. Soon Lem Motlow's illness developed into semiparalysis, but disdaining a wheelchair he had a big Negro carry him about the premises as he tested and tasted every step of the operation.

Then, when their first batch of whisky had barely matured, the war came along, and except for a few brief holidays whisky production was banned by the United States Government. Many straight-whisky makers stretched out their inventories by resorting to blends with neutral or cane spirits. The big distillery combines combed the country offering fabulous prices for whisky stocks, and indeed bought dozens of small distilleries outright. Jack Daniel, however, refused either to sell to or buy from other distilleries a single gallon of whisky. It bottled a few hundred cases of straight whisky a month, and nothing more. But its most dramatic gesture of fidelity came in 1946, just a year before Lem Motlow's death. The Government had lifted the ban, but still imposed restrictions on the type of grain allowable for whisky. The old man would have none of it. "Jack Daniel's," he said, "has been made from No. 1 grain—the finest white corn money can buy—for 75 years, and so long as I live we're not going to use anything else." So they continued to make industrial alcohol, on a break-even basis, for the Government.

As a result of these factors the postwar boom caught the Jack Daniel Distillery in a poor quantitative position. Not only was it in short supply over-all, with less than 18,000 barrels in the warehouse in 1948, but it had practically no fully aged whisky for sale. But if this was the penalty management had to pay for its pride, there were certain compensations. What little whisky it had made and sold was awfully good whisky, and the word began to get around. Those who liked the 3-year-old green label began to yearn for the 4- and 6-year-old black label that "money can't buy." And so it snowballed. The Motlows are as much in the dark as anybody as to why Jack Daniel's, though always a good draw in the South began to pull so suddenly in the big cities in the East and on the West coast. They do know that "Jack,"

as it is called in Tennessee, made a good many friends among the 500,000 or more troops that were trained at nearby Camp Forrest during the war.

To be sure, the rise of Jack Daniel's is doubtless a sociological phenomenon to some extent. In drinks (the Gibson cocktail, for example), as in the arts, coteries, and cults spring up, and as mysteriously vanish when the novelty rubs off. To the drinking elite there is a certain cachet to the rare, the quaint, the romantic Jack Daniel's. Elegant Lucius Beebe, for instance, who can collect money on his testimonials for food, drink, and shaving lotions, delights in touting Jack Daniel's for free. The Motlow brothers, who wear shoes, too, are aware of this. But with all due modesty they think the majority of drinkers who cheer Jack Daniel's do so because of its superior quality and taste.

THE PERSONAL TOUCH

Reagor Motlow, 52, Lem's chunky, chatty, sharp-minded eldest son, who now heads the enterprise, has vastly more technical learning than his predecessors, but far from turning his head it seems rather to have reinforced his allegiance to the old ways in whisky making. "With good straight whisky," he says, "and not those fruit-salad concoctions, you can't substitute formulas and instruments for instinct and experience. There's no escape from the 'four unknowns' all whisky has to go through—mashing, fermenting, distilling, and barreling. Each time, despite controls, any one of these reactions is liable to turn out differently. You have to be alert enough to spot something wrong about a batch, and then have the guts to do it over again until it's right. Why, Uncle Jess here never read a chemistry text in his life, but after 54 years of stillin' whisky you can't fool his eye, his nose, or his tongue."

Uncle Jess gives with a faint, leathery blush. "Why, Lord a' mercy," he says, "I don't know nothin' about diastase and such things as Reagor talks about. All we was taught was how to take a bushel o' grain and get some whisky out of it."

"There's another thing we hold to," Reagor continues, "and that is that it's not age that's important in whisky; it's what is done to it before it gets in the barrel. We think that 4 years in the wood is quite sufficient for Jack Daniel's because it matures faster than other whiskies, but if custom has led people to insist on 6-year-old whisky we'll have to give it to them again, I suppose."

In the Jack Daniel Distillery's leisurely, choosy way with a batch of whisky, the sour mash usually bubbles away for the full 96-hour cycle before old-time stiller Lem Tolley, with an approving nod from Uncle Jess, declares her ready to run. When she does run, it is a source of pride to the Motlows that she runs less than 4½ gallons to the bushel compared with the 5 gallons of liquor the average United States distiller extracts from a bushel of grain. The whisky comes out of the still, white and clear, at about 120 proof (it is barreled at around 105 proof and bottled at exactly 90 proof). But before it goes into the barrel Jack Daniel's gets that extra blessing.

The leaching process is no lick-and-promise ceremony. Though once upon a time sugar maple abounded on the distillery property, much of it now has to be imported from Alabama and other States at an average cost of \$18 a cord. The distillery hands split the logs in the sawmill, pile them in open ricks, and burn them to a carefully calculated char. The charcoal is then ground fine and tamped down 10 feet deep into the leaching cisterns. Three thicknesses of specially loomed blankets cover the false bottoms of the leachers. The raw, white whisky is poured into this filter in a lively stream, and emerges in an agonizing trickle. If it runs any faster, they examine the leacher for gaps

or trenches, retamp it, and run the whisky through again. On the average, it takes approximately as long again to leach as it does to mash, ferment, and distill the liquor in the first place.

What does this do for Jack Daniel whisky? The jest is that it removes the "hangover," and it could well be the true word so spoken. The Motlows say only that it apparently removes some objectionable impurities and heightens esters and other congeners, which give a desirable character and flavor to the whisky. Some judges believe that 4 days in the leacher is worth 2 years in the barrel, and they cite the dark, rich color of 1- and 2-year-old Jack Daniel as substantiation. At any rate, visiting amateurs who take what Reagor Motlow kiddingly calls the "organalptical test" (be sure to spit, and now swallow) have no trouble in distinguishing between the leached and unleached liquors.

After the leaching, the whisky, under the eye of Government inspectors, is poured into new, charred, white oak barrels. Here again the Jack Daniel people get in a final, custom-tailored touch. They insist that their coopers expose the staves to 12 months of rain, frost, and sun. "The weathering takes out some of the harmful tannoids," Reagor explains. "You get green cooepage, and you're liable to get a persimmony taste in your whisky—God forbid."

PRICES AND PROFITS

From these attitudes and exactitudes it can perhaps be appreciated why Jack Daniel's, though not a bourbon according to label, not bottled in bond, and not often available even in the 4-year-old state, is nevertheless a premium whisky (the green-label, 3-year-old sells at \$6.05 a fifth in New York, the black-label, 4-year-old at \$6.67). It's not a bourbon merely because Lem Motlow, who wanted to distinguish it from Kentucky whisky, convinced Government experts that though his whisky was made from a bourbon mash, the leaching gave it special characteristics, and he was entitled to label it plain "whisky." It is not bottled in bond because of its traditional 90-proof (B. in B. must be 100 proof). But it is a costly whisky to make, not only because of the special processes, but because of its production of a mere 2,400 gallons a day.

To be sure, the Motlows are taking a nice profit, and in the last few years the small group of investors has been enjoying a return of from 15 to 20 percent on the Jack Daniel shares. But it is still something this side of a gold mine. Out of the gross sales of some \$4,500,000 last year, the Jack Daniel distillery paid out around \$3,000,000 in gallanage taxes alone. The underwriting or banking aspect of the whisky business is a considerable burden for an outfit in Jack Daniel's circumstances. After all, Jack Daniel has had only five full years of production since it reopened. The whisky it is producing now, at a cost of around \$60,000 a month, won't be available for shipment and sale until 3 years and more have passed. To raise ready cash the distillery has reluctantly marketed, in the past couple of years, a 1-year-old whisky called Lem Motlow's Tennessee Sour Mash Whisky. That it is a popular and potable whisky at this tender age is a remarkable tribute to the process, but as soon as matured stocks will allow, this brand will be dropped.

Thus, while the amazing word-of-mouth campaign buzzes on, the Motlows, juggling their small stocks (40,000 barrels now) back in Lynchburg, can capitalize on it only fractionally. There won't be any fresh stocks of black label, for instance, until 1952, and the amount then available will depend upon how much green label the distillery bottles in the meantime. And always over their heads hangs the threat of local prohibition and of Government restrictions on grain. Sometimes, on a dark day, the siren song

of the syndicates is a real temptation to Reagor and his brothers.

The circumstances, naturally, pressure the Motlows either to expand or to sell, and neither alternative particularly appeals to them. Right now they are following the former course, insofar as it can be financed out of earnings, but with the definite determination to keep the business within bounds of the hand-tooled, intimate, ever-loving operation it has always been. They feel that around 30,000 cases a month, or, roughly, triple the current output, is as much whisky as they can make in the way, and in the place—meaning the Hollow, of course—that they want to make it.

Even so, it won't be easy. Some seventy-odd employees already crowd the Hollow a bit, and this month Reagor Motlow somewhat ruefully removes his wonderful collection of junk and memorabilia from the little low-roofed office that Jack Daniel built 60 years ago, and takes up quarters in a new air-conditioned brick building down the road a piece. He may even be forced to hire himself a female secretary. This means he will henceforth have to run the business without benefit of the kinfolk, neighbors, and superannuated employees who gather every afternoon on the porch of the old office to gossip, whittle, sip from the spring, and smile slyly at little Jack Daniel's marble image. It may be a pathetic fallacy, but one can't help thinking that this, too, has contributed to the fragrance and balm of Jack Daniel's Old Time Tennessee Sour Mash Whisky.

U. S. S. "Walke" and the Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I think the House of Representatives should know about the remarkable record made in the Korean War by a great American warship, the destroyer *Walke*; and also I want to pay tribute to the fine example of leadership exhibited by its captain, Marshall F. Thompson, and other officers of the ship.

I know quite a bit about the *Walke* and its crew because one of my close friends, Alfred D. Garvin, a Chicago boy, is executive officer of the destroyer which has been in the thick of the fight to subdue the expansion of communism in Korea.

The *Walke* has covered more distance, fired more rounds of ammunition, and in turn been under more fire from the enemy than any other naval unit in the area. This destroyer, which came out of the "moth-ball fleet" inflicted terrific punishment on the Reds, especially at Wonsan.

Throughout its operation in Korean waters Captain Thompson has demonstrated wonderful leadership, has inspired his men, and has maintained morale in the highest traditions of our Navy.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include in the RECORD a Memorandum to All Hands which Captain Thompson distributed to the *Walke* crew. This memorandum, a unique document, explains the records and accomplishments

of the destroyer. It is an outstanding example of how an officer can keep up the spirit of his men, make them all a part of a splendid fighting team, and put over to them in clear, understandable language the part they are playing in the Korean war. The memorandum follows:

A MEMORANDUM TO ALL HANDS—U. S. S. "WALKE" AND THE KOREAN WAR

1. It has been almost 7 months since the *Walke* joined the active fleet, of which the past 15 weeks have been in the western Pacific. While most of us understand the importance of the struggle in Korea as a part of the efforts of the free nations to repel communism, I think it is time we reviewed the situation, with emphasis on the part of the *Walke* has played and is still playing.

2. To cover the subject with some program let's consider: first—what has the Navy accomplished; second—what has the *Walke* done; and finally, has it been worth while, that is, are the Koreans worth fighting for?

WHAT HAS THE NAVY ACCOMPLISHED?

The Korean war, like every war so far in history, will be won ultimately by the soldier, the GI who carries the gun and lives in the mud and dirt of war. In Korea the U. N. Navy has been helping the foot soldier in two ways. First, by cutting off the flow of supplies from Communist China and the U. S. S. R. by a tight blockade of the entire peninsula. Second, by providing close air support from our carriers for the front-line troops, and by blasting rail and road routes by ship's fire and air bombardment.

When the Soviet-created illegal government of North Korea invaded the U. N.-sponsored Republic of Korea, the North Koreans were supplied by three sea routes and two land routes from China and Manchuria. You can see these routes on the attached map. In the first surge of victory, the enemy made an amphibious landing at Samchok, on the east coast. Supplies flowed in heavy stream along the five routes until the U. N. acted and authorized the use of force in the defense of Korea.

Within a few days the United States Navy had completely severed the three sea routes, and Communist shipping disappeared from the Japan Sea and the Yellow Sea. At the same time our carrier-based planes, with the Air Force, tried in vain to stop the Communist advance. All of you know the story of the retreat to the Pusan beachhead. There, with their lines of supply under constant attack, the Communist forces were held and finally driven back, out of South Korea, past the thirty-eighth parallel, and up to the Yalu River, the border with Manchuria. There, in December, with the North Korean invaders in complete defeat, it seemed that the war would end. However, without warning, and in defiance of the United States, the Chinese Communists hurled an army of hundreds of thousands of men against the U. N. forces.

During the long and painful retreat that followed, the Navy evacuated the trapped marines and infantry at the Hungnam beachhead. Naval guns and naval aircraft pounded every line of supply. The blockade was made so complete that not a single enemy junk or sampan could operate. The Chinese Communists were finally slowed, stopped, and then pushed back. At the present time the front lines are north of the thirty-eighth parallel, and our forces are braced for a new Chinese assault.

As a part of the Navy plan to support the troops by cutting off enemy supplies, it was decided to cut the east coast highway and rail net at Wonsan and Sonjin. At Wonsan the longest naval siege in history continues. Surrounded on all sides by hostile shores, U. N. warships anchor and keep the transportation system under con-

tinuous fire. At Sonjin, where the siege is also continuous, destroyers keep the roads and rails under daily bombardment. Traffic on the east coast system has been reduced to zero by day, and to furtive and unreliable movement by night.

The enemy works hard to keep his bridges and tunnels in repair, by working all night. The next day his work is demolished by the Navy. Supplies get through by occasional truck, by oxcart, and by being carried on the backs of men. It is not sufficient to supply an army.

The only enemy route not cut by the surface ships of the Navy is the west-coast rail and highway route, which has become the main source of supplies for the enemy. There the Air Force and Navy planes scour the area by day, forcing the Communist to travel only at night. During darkness radar-equipped planes find their trucks and trains, bombing and strafing them. It must be tough to be a part of the Communist supply system.

WHAT HAS THE "WALKE" DONE?

Of course, we can start off by saying that of the 8 ships in our squadron that came out of the mothball fleet the *Walke* has steamed more, fired more, spent more time in Wonsan, and been fired at more than any of the others. During the 4 weeks we had with the blockade and bombardment force the *Walke* fired over 4,000 rounds of 5-inch ammunition at the enemy. In Wonsan we knocked out a gun position, burned up a radio station, troops barracks, and a large gasoline dump. Shells from the *Walke*, on three occasions, forced out of action the enemy batteries on Kalma Gak which fired on the ships in Wonsan. At Sonjin, as well as at Wonsan, the *Walke* delivered that steady bombardment which is needed to keep the enemy off their roads and bridges. Far to the north, in the Chonjin area, *Walke* has closed in to within 2 miles of the beach to bombard the transportation net. We have made antijunk sweeps to within 40 miles of the U. S. S. R.

It is not hard to feel we are helping the war when we anchor in Wonsan, shooting all night. But it is a little more obscure when all we do—apparently—is to chase the carriers around. When escorting the carriers our job is to protect the big ships and their planes from air and submarine attack, so that the planes can carry out their missions. If and when the Commies launch their air force against us, our training and weeks of fruitless screening will have been worth while. In the meantime we know that the presence of our destroyer screen has kept the Communist Air Force away from our carriers.

The important thing to remember is that when the firing key is pressed in plot, it is not just a gun crew that is firing. Every man on the ship has played his part in getting that shell on the target. The engineers who get us there, the supply personnel who order the ammo, the cooks that feed us, the electronics technicians, the fire-control men, and the repair personnel who keep the ship operating, all have played their part. Every shell fired must be brought aboard by hand, by some man on the ship. The orders received by radio and visually play a part, along with the men who receive them. The officers who conn the ship, control the battery, and manage all the departments play their role.

On a destroyer every man is essential for the ship to steam, fight, communicate, and live. When the firing key is pressed, there are 300 fingers on it. Every shell that hits the target plays a part, not only in the Korean war, but in the world-wide struggle for liberty in which free nations are engaged.

The most important question remains:

HAS IT BEEN WORTH WHILE?

In other words, has the sacrifice made by both the Regulars and the Reserves been

worth while? Are the Koreans really worth fighting with and for?

Let's take a look at the Koreans. For almost 50 years they were a plundered colony of Japan. During that period the spirit of freedom was kept alive by a sort of government in exile and by an underground at home. When World War II ended, the Koreans became a free people, sponsored by the U. N., but with no history or tradition of freedom and independence as a background. In spite of this, and in spite of the illegal refusal of the Soviet Union to allow North Korea to become a part of the republic, the new state overcame its difficulties, and was on the way to becoming stable and self-governing.

When the Communist invasion began, the small Korean Army was driven back rapidly. Seoul, the capital was taken, the country overrun, and only the small Pusan beachhead remained. Under these conditions the South Koreans fought on, aided by the United Nations. They are still fighting and still suffering the heaviest casualties of all U. N. troops. Their nation is devastated, cities ruined, industries destroyed. Compare their fighting belief in their country with, say France in 1940. When the Germans took Paris, all France surrendered. They deemed their cities more important than their liberty. Compare Korea with all the European nations that have fallen to the U. S. S. R. since the war. Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Hungary, and many others fell without a fight. Only Greece and Korea have fought for their freedom, even at the expense of their cities, their industry, their lives.

If all our allies in the struggle against international communism were as steadfast as Korea, we would have little to fear indeed.

To sum up then, I believe we are fighting in a good cause, I believe the Navy is playing an important part in this fight, and I believe that what the *Walke* has already done has made it worth while to put her back into service.

MARSHALL F. THOMPSON,
Commanding Officer.

Gill Robb Wilson Declares, "The Skies Hold Key to Peace," While at the Same Time Secretary Finletter Declares, "The Strategic Air Arm Is the Single Most Important Part of the Armed Services"; Nothing Should Be Spared To Make It the Most Powerful Military Service on Earth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, for the last 2 years I have repeatedly stated that our possession of the atom bomb, our strategic Air Force, and the B-36's are the only things which have contained the Russians and prevented the outbreak of a full-scale global world war III.

There are many in this House who disagreed with me. They thundered here on the floor and in committee in the B-36 investigation that the Air Force, in building a strong strategic Air Force, was putting "all of its eggs in one basket." Today we find these same critics bemoaning the fact that the Air Force

has not built enough B-36's, although I am sure they know not of what they speak.

Mr. Speaker, the people of these United States not alone believe in, but they have implicit faith in, their Air Force and rightfully regard it as the greatest military force on the face of this earth.

Oh, yes; I know about the money we voted the Air Force that was withheld from them, and which they weren't permitted to spend for planes, but I also know of the great work they did with the money which they did receive and did spend for planes—planes of all makes, of every type, of the latest designs; planes with the greatest speeds; planes that afforded the greatest safety; planes that achieved the highest altitudes, possessed the greatest gun platforms; and planes which justifiably make the American people feel proud of its Air Force.

The pride and the faith of this Congress in the Air Force could not have been greater expressed had it been shouted by the Speaker from the top of the dome of the Nation's Capitol than was expressed by the approval of the Air Force program by the Armed Services Committee of the House a short 72 hours ago.

Mr. Speaker, on Sunday last I came upon the first of a series of three articles written by Mr. Gill Robb Wilson summarizing his conclusions on the hope of world peace after 3 months of observation and study in Europe and the Middle East.

There are few men in America today who are more qualified to speak on such a subject than is Gill Robb Wilson, and I do certainly commend the reading of this article to every Member of the Congress. World conditions as they exist today make the article entitled "Skies Hold Key to Peace" one of tremendous interest to every Member on both sides of the aisle.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is still another item to which I wish to direct your attention. It was written by our good friend John G. Norris, reporter for the Washington Post. Mr. Norris' article treats briefly of a proposal to establish an Air Force academy. This proposal is covered by a bill placed in the hopper by the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Hon. CARL VINSON, of Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I bespeak the opinion of the vast majority of the Members of this House when I say that we are all fully conscious of the benefits that will come to this Nation from the establishment of an Air Force Academy of equal stature to the institutions we maintain at West Point and Annapolis.

Moreover, I feel that the present need for such an establishment is so pressing that funds should be made available, not a year from now, but at once. This would enable the Air Force to associate the faculty and establish all criteria and curriculum to such a degree as to permit them to operate the school in some temporary quarters while the permanent plant facilities are being located and es-

tablished. With the further increase in Air Force strength provided for by this Congress, there is now a greater need than ever for competent military airmen—men highly trained in all branches of aeronautics to take over and administer and even enhance our great Air Force along the lines of economy and efficiency under which it is now functioning. The need for that high type of Air Force personnel follows the appropriation which we made to that service just as surely as a tail follows a dog.

Mr. Speaker, realizing the deep interest of the Members of this body in Gill Robb Wilson's findings on the recent investigations in respect to European air power as well as in the bill which the Hon. CARL VINSON introduced to establish a separate Air Force Academy, as covered by the article written by John G. Norris, I am asking unanimous consent to place these two articles in the RECORD of this day's proceedings.

The articles are as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of June 24, 1951]

SKIES HOLD KEY TO PEACE

(By Gill Robb Wilson)

(This is the first of three articles by Mr. Wilson summarizing his conclusions on the hope of world peace after 3 months of observations in Europe and the Middle East.)

Air power's first major prophet, Billy Mitchell, was wont to tell us youngsters in the air service that the 2,200-mile Mediterranean, "the Big Ditch," would be as significant to the air age as it had been to a thousand years of sea power.

Mitchell would point out that the narrow sea had cradled ship handling and navigation and so had projected western rather than eastern standards around the globe. It had enabled the maritime fringe lands of Europe to exercise restraint upon the hordes of Eurasia.

Mitchell forecast that in future time a combination of land-based and sea-borne air power in the Mediterranean would succeed to the main responsibility of preventing Russian imperialism from gobbling up the globe.

So often did Mitchell dwell on the threat of potential Russian imperialism in discussions with the writer that when he died in 1936 I wrote some verses reflecting the rise of the Red star titled "Epitaph to Mitchell." Now, 15 years later, with General Eisenhower's right flank in the Mediterranean just in process of organization, a few lines of the humble epitaph might be recalled:

"Look up, Uncle Sam, through the haze
o'er the hills

To see what swings over the head:

Arcturus and Mars and Polaris have formed
A fresh constellation in Red!

Your surveys and maps are decadent with
age

Be they either of land or of sea;

Look up, Uncle Sam, and take bearings
again

To see what your heading should be!"

Since World War II the free nations have been so distracted by Soviet pressures and bluff that the cold fact of Communist failure in the Mediterranean Basin has escaped general notice. The Mediterranean remains today with all its possibilities for containment of Soviet imperialism practically unimpaired.

Target distances from the Mediterranean and its border lands to Russian industrial centers are still the shortest. Western control of the Mediterranean still interposes between Eurasia and the vast resources of

Africa which would give the Soviet world domination.

The Mediterranean contains many peoples who are willing to face up to their problem—Turks, Greeks, Yugoslavs, Italians, Spaniards—mountaineers.

If determination to prevent war is the main theme of American policy, the political vacuum which exists in the Mediterranean must be filled immediately. Spain must be accepted into the United Nations and become a member of the North Atlantic Pact. Greece and Turkey must be brought into full western partnership. The bargains of the west with the oil-producing Arabian states must be modified to create a better standard of living for the Arab peoples. The Moslem nation of Pakistan must be guaranteed as inviolate from Indian ambitions.

A clear-cut line of coordinated responsibility in the Mediterranean and Middle East must be established as between the United States and Great Britain. An integrated Mediterranean command embracing elements of border lands supplemented by American air and sea power is now possible under the recent appointment of Admiral Robert B. Carney as General Eisenhower's commander in chief of Atlantic Pact forces in Southern Europe.

If these matters are accomplished, the historic significance of the Mediterranean can be kept inviolate and its influence serve to deny traditional Russian imperialism its voracious ambitions.

[From the Washington Post of June 23, 1951]

BILL ASKED TO SET UP AIR ACADEMY

(By John G. Norris)

The Pentagon asked Congress yesterday to establish an Air Force Academy of equal stature to West Point and Annapolis.

With White House approval, the Department of Defense proposed spending \$20,000,000 to get the project started. Somewhat similar legislation was sidetracked last year because of the Korean war.

Chairman CARL VINSON, Democrat of Georgia, of the House Armed Services Committee, introduced the bill. He said he hopes to get it passed this session.

TEMPORARY LOCATION FIRST

Under the administration proposal, \$10,000,000 would be authorized to set up an Air Academy at a temporary location. This would permit the faculty to be organized and operating while a permanent school is established.

Another \$10,000,000 would be authorized for purchase of land and preparation of plans for a permanent academy.

A Pentagon board has narrowed prospective permanent sites to Camp Beale, Marysville, Calif.; Colorado Springs, Colo.; Madison, Ind.; Charlotte, N. C.; Grapevine, Tex.; Grayson County, Tex.; and Randolph Air Force Base, Tex.

PROPORTION OF GRADUATES

A recent survey showed that 47 percent of Regular Air Force officers are college graduates, compared to 71 percent of Army officers, and 87 percent of Navy officers.

The Air Force now takes 25 percent of each West Point and Annapolis graduating class, but the Department said the Army and Navy need all their officers today and that it is not practical to expand those schools. Under the bill, the Air Force would take half its Regular officers from the new academy and half from ROTC and similar programs.

When Louis Johnson was Secretary of Defense, legislation was sought for a third service academy. He favored abolishing the separate service character of West Point and Annapolis and simply training officers for the Armed Forces. This plan was opposed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and an advisory board of college presidents.

Political Hot Potato—The China Lobby**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1951

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a part of the RECORD a column by Joseph C. Harsch, chief, Washington news bureau of the Christian Science Monitor, which appeared in the Sacramento Bee of July 7, 1951, entitled "Political Hot Potato—The China Lobby." I have introduced a resolution to create a select committee to investigate this political hot potato. I hope it will be given the serious and favorable attention of the House. The article is as follows:

POLITICAL HOT POTATO—THE CHINA LOBBY
(By Joseph C. Harsch)

When Republican Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, gave notice during the Acheson questioning in the MacArthur hearing that he intended to raise the question of the so-called China lobby a low whistle could be heard through the political fabric of this city on the Potomac.

When Democratic Senator BRIEN McMAHON, of Connecticut, twice brought forth by question and answer two specific incidents alleged to be related to the activities of this alleged lobby the professional politicians of both parties began looking to the fittings on their storm cellars.

It remains to be seen whether the preliminary moves made by these two daring Senators from opposite sides of the political aisle really result in a serious effort to discover how much substance may lie behind one of the most talked about subjects in the fabric of American politics.

There has been talk before, many times, of an investigation into the China lobby. Always before it has ended in just talk.

The reason why it has ended in just talk is entirely speculative. There is a wealth of gossip and rumor on the subject, but almost no publicly documented fact.

The rumor and gossip are to the effect that if Congress ever seriously starts working on the subject the chips will fly in all directions and may hit names which will prove highly embarrassing, both to the Democratic and to the Republican Parties.

What Senator McMAHON has brought out in his two preliminary excursions is equivalent to the previews at a movie house. They avoid giving away the plot but, at least in theory, whet the interest of the audience for a ticket to next week's show.

In this case Senator McMAHON established that the United States sent \$200,000,000 in gold bullion to China and that according to Treasury views, this became the basis of inflation which is said to have been manipulated deliberately for some more personal purposes than the defense of China against the Japanese armies.

Then, 6 years later, a group of Chinese, unidentified, attempted to corner the United States market in soybeans.

Is there a connection between speculative manipulation of United States gold in China in 1943 and an effort to rig the soybean market in 1949?

One can only state the question. If anyone in Washington knows the answer, he has not put it into the public record. The implication is that if the full facts ever are brought to light they may show that private Chinese fortunes coined out of China's wartime misery moved to the United States and have since been used to make more money for their owners.

The belief behind the initiative of Senators MORSE and McMAHON is that part of this process of making more money for the owners was heavy investment in influencing Congress to vote more money for the Chinese Nationalist Government.

What Senators MORSE and McMAHON propose is that some agency of Government, whether congressional or executive is not yet clear, find out how much Chinese money came to the United States and what happened to it.

Did it finance an actual China lobby working for purposes more personal and less altruistic than the rescue of China from communism?

Did some influential Americans take chunks of that money innocently or otherwise? Is there any connection between such possible taking of the money and various votes in Congress?

These are questions arising from the streams of gossip and rumors which have flowed around the political citadels of this city for years. Will they be answered? That is a question causing the politicians some anxiety.

How Far Shall We Go in Controlling Prices?**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. WALTER M. MUMMA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, as with other Members of the House, a good many letters have come in to my office during the past month asking me to vote for or against the controls demanded by the Truman administration in connection with extension of the Defense Production Act of 1950.

The views expressed in a letter of June 11, 1951, from Mr. Harold Fritchman, of my home city of Harrisburg, Pa., are typical of the group that would go all-out on these controls.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include copy of Mr. Fritchman's letter and my reply of June 13, which explains my general attitude on this important subject. These communications are as follows:

HARRISBURG, PA., June 11, 1951.

Congressman WALTER MUMMA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MUMMA: I am writing this letter in the hope that it may have some influence in persuading you to join with other Members of the House of Representatives in passing a strengthened Defense Production Act.

Despite all assurances by big business interests in 1946 that abolishing controls at that time would bring about a leveling off of prices, we found the contrary to be true, as prices spurted after these controls were abolished. We are now faced with a renewal of this propaganda by the same interests with no reason to believe that the result will be any different.

Instead of permitting profiteers to run rampant and siphon off so-called excess money which abolishing price controls will permit, the low- and middle-income groups should be encouraged to put this money into savings to bolster our postwar economy. Higher prices will not only prevent this wise action but will further increase already

profit-swollen Government defense and war expenditures making a continued long period of high taxation necessary on the general public whose buying power is the lifeblood necessary to the preservation of our free-enterprise system.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD FRITCHMAN.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 13, 1951.

Mr. HAROLD FRITCHMAN,
Harrisburg, Pa.

DEAR MR. FRITCHMAN: Thanks for your letter. I am deeply interested in the present economic plight of our country and its millions of citizens. Our present national debt is \$254,789,979,267.58, which is really something to think about.

I appreciate advice and truly seek a solution of current problems that will afford relief to all our people—especially those who must live on fixed incomes based on the old purchasing power of the American dollar.

We are now being asked by our President for a stronger Defense Production Act with roll-backs and stiffer controls on commodities and prices, etc. From my observation, it is locking the barn door after the horse is stolen. A sincere effort was made immediately after the Korean incident to get right down to business and set up wage and price controls. Mr. Bernard Baruch, whose opinion is generally accepted, advocated such action and predicted quite accurately what would happen otherwise. We finally wound up with the present legislation which allows the President to put into effect when he sees fit such controls as he deems necessary. This was much too late, as you know.

The Korean police action was continually being minimized until the mounting casualty lists and military reverses brought us to the point where the American people realized—despite official denial—that world war III was upon us. All along the way, scare buying on the part of merchants and consumers created temporary shortages, and up went prices. Merrily the vicious circle of one round after another of wage and price increases continued. The question now seems to be which increase should, would, or can be stopped first or last. The Macy-Gimbel case may, better than any law Congress could enact, be a step toward correcting the situation. Let's hope so. The test will be their ability to replace the material from the manufacturer at a reasonable price—and, too, the manufacturer's ability to secure labor and material costs on a replacement sale price basis.

This has been the story since 1946, when the first decision of which you speak was made to drop controls. This continued until the time the President was driven into action to stop the floodwaters of inflation.

Personally, I have wondered if the Government does not desire to have prices as high as they can go without rampant inflation so that people will be lulled into a feeling of contentment with their present rate of wages as compared to 1945, when controls were removed. However, as the wheel turns, they find themselves back where they started in actual purchasing power.

For instance, each month I have the opportunity of cashing in a war bond. The \$50 I receive from a \$37.50 bond does not give me the return in actual cash it was supposed to. First of all, out of the so-called profit of \$12.50 come the new high income, State, and county taxes. Then you will find, for example, a \$50 suit is now priced at \$75 or \$80, and that everything else you buy is in proportion. This can be stopped, a more natural value established, and further price rises prevented by cutting governmental expenditures, resisting pressure groups—local, national, and international—who know economies are necessary but want them at the other fellow's expense. That this situation

obtains is brought out in the debate on every appropriation bill. I think our military expenses can be cut down materially and still have as good, if not a more alert, defense organization. If you look around at our local military and defense set-ups, you see much waste of material—and manpower, especially. If there were a slight undermanning there would possibly be more alertness, rather than the feeling that John will do it. Note the Senate vote on June 12 cutting down the forces of Government agencies 10 percent.

Not trying to argue against your thought of profiteering, I know from my own knowledge of Government purchasing that your Uncle Sam isn't doing so bad. There are no doubt cases of excessive prices or profits in certain supplies, but here Uncle Sam comes in again, with his normal income tax, his excess-profits tax, and last but not least, renegotiation. In World War II, General Motors' actual profit was around 1½ percent on figures I have seen.

Free trading on the basis of supply and demand, to my mind, is the best insurance against profiteering. There are tremendous stocks at all levels of some items, particularly television, appliances, etc., and I have read quite recently of new automobiles being offered in Texas at a percentage off list. Today we hear of the impending relaxation of credit buying, which is surely the result of pressure from the above causes.

Pardon the length of this letter. I am interested in the same things as you are. By carefully studying legislative problems, endeavoring to get the facts, and voting accordingly, I hope to do a good job as your Congressman.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WALTER M. MUMMA,

Member of Congress.

"The Fifty-six Men Who Signed the Declaration of Independence Declared Their Beliefs to All the World: That All Men Are Created Equal, That All Men Are Endowed by Their Creator With Certain Unalienable Rights, and That Governments Derive Their Just Powers From the Consent of the Governed"—Dr. John R. Steelman, Battle Report—Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, again Battle Report, Washington, under the guidance of the Assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman, has brought to untold millions in their homes a direct report from high Government officials concerned with some particular phase of public administration vital to the Nation's welfare.

Additionally thereto, in this the forty-fourth Battle Report, and accompanying the reports of these public officials, is a film story of the latest development in modern warfare now being operated under the military title of "vertical development."

On the occasion of this teledocumentary, Dr. Steelman brings to the television audience Rear Adm. Allan E. Smith, United States Navy, commander of Task Force 95 in Korea; the United States High Commissioner to Austria, Ambassador Walter J. Donnelly; and, last but not least, a man well known on Capitol Hill, the great friend of every Member of this House from our newest page to the Speaker himself, Col. John C. (Johnny) Meyer, United States Air Force, and America's greatest living fighting ace, home from his victorious tour of duty in the Korean war.

Mr. Speaker, it seems like but a few months ago that "Johnny" Meyer, who, previous to his Korean service, served in the Congressional Liaison Division of the USAF, called at my office to say good-bye on his way to Korea to take up the splendid work of affording tactical support to the ground troops fighting in that far-off country.

Then one day came another report. Col. "Johnny" Meyer, who had accounted for 37½ enemy planes in World War II, and now in command of a jet fighter group in Korea, had brought down his first Russian MIG-15.

Another pause. Another day, and still another headline. This told us that "Johnny" Meyer, flying a Sabre jet, had brought down a second Russian MIG airplane. While Colonel Meyer dissents, the Russian MIG-15 has been acknowledged by eminent authorities to be the greatest fighter jet aircraft in the world.

Colonel Meyer's statement on this Battle Report certainly thrilled the American audience as he modestly recited the victories gained by the Sabre jets of the USAF Fourth Fighter Group in that narrow corridor south of the Korean border. This is where the real dogfights take place high in the heavens, thus keeping the Communists off the backs of our tactical planes, giving front-line close support to our ground troops.

Mr. Speaker, Battle Report, Washington, in its every aspect, more and more each week commends itself to the reading of every Member of this House. In order that all of the many friends of Colonel Meyers here in this House may become more conversant with the achievements of our Air Force in Korea, as well as with other aspects of our economic, politic, and military exploitations at home and abroad, I am extending my remarks and inserting the same in the RECORD.

The producer-director of this NBC program is Ted Ayers; the technical director, L. A. McClelland; the commentary, Robert McCormick. The script writer is Lou Hazam; the film editor, Bill Brooks; the floor manager, John Johnson; production assistant, Jean Montgomery; art by Joseph Ferrier; music adviser, Fritz Balzer; and sound by Bob Haines.

BATTLE REPORT, WASHINGTON—JUNE 29, 1951

ROBERT MCCORMICK, Washington, standing by, like the rest of the Nation, awaiting further developments on the cease-fire in Korea, and the world, whose hopes for peace stir once again, even as the battle continues in the Far East. Against this exciting new de-

velopment in Korea, NBC television brings you forty-fourth Battle Report.

Vertical envelopment, a new development in modern warfare spelled out by troop-laden helicopters taking off in mass formation. The idea, airborne mobility, that experts say will make the tactics of World War II look dated.

The helicopters are preceded by planes which move in upon the enemy to strafe and bomb, preparing the way for whole divisions to be moved wherever they are needed.

Divisions that will be sent into action so fast they can overcome the enemy's advantage in size.

To screen off the landing zone from the enemy's beach defenses, Corsairs race in to put down a cloud of smoke.

And now the giant twin-motored "egg beaters" come in for a protected landing. They disgorge their armored human cargo and drop heavy equipment which they will use to fight. In this way does this new mobility seek to give meaning to General Collins' remark: "Where the enemy mounts a wall of flesh, we must mount a wall of fire."

Marines go into action, blasting at the enemy with guns and artillery which only a few moments ago were not even there.

The flame throwers, too, go to work with their deadly man-made lightning, burning their way forward while their buddies blast.

Here come the Air Force fighters and bombers to join in their arrival, carefully timed so that they will do the most good. Object: to soften up the beach.

The invading force now amounts to a sizable army, packing a mean wallop. They are joined by tanks that add their weight to the attack. As wounded fall, versatile helicopters drop down to pick up the wounded and fly them away for speedy medical attention. Thus has the term "vertical envelopment" come to spell for many a new weapon, a weapon that may, in the opinion of one of our leading tacticians, make war in Europe tactically tough for the Russians.

Before we post the roster on Battle Report today, in person and via camera, drawn from the forefront of the battle against Soviet communism, a film story on a new development in modern warfare, plus the latest developments on the Korean cease fire, we will first hear from the Assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

Dr. JOHN R. STEELMAN. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Next Wednesday is July 4—the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the signing of our Declaration of Independence. The President has proclaimed it as a national day of rededication to the principles which are stated so dramatically in that immortal document. Under the direction of a commission headed by Mr. Chief Justice Vinson, celebrations will be held in cities, towns and villages all over the Nation. But, regardless of whether we attend one of these celebrations or not—regardless of what we are doing or where we are on July 4—every one of us should give a thought to the event which has made this holiday.

In 1776, the 56 men who signed the Declaration of Independence declared their beliefs to all the world: that all men are created equal, that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, and that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

This courageous act became a milestone in human history. Their beliefs became the foundation upon which this Nation was built—the very fabric of the American way of life. Those principles are our most precious heritage.

Wherever you are next Wednesday, won't you take the time to remember all the good things you have obtained—all the happiness you have found because of the freedom and opportunities which are ours? We owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to the men who pledged their lives, their fortunes, and

their sacred honor so we could live as free men. Let us remember them and rededicate ourselves to their ideas—which are our ideals.

My friends, today, by way of the cameras, drawn from the forefront of the battle against Soviet communism, is a film story on a new development in modern warfare. Additionally thereto, we shall hear from Rear Adm. Allen E. Smith, United States Navy, commander of Task Force 95 in Korea, as well as from United States High Commissioner Walter J. Donnelly, back from critical Austria to make report to the President. Also we are going to hear from Col. John C. Meyer, United States Air Force, and America's greatest living fighter ace, home from victorious service against Russian MIG's in Korean skies.

Mr. MCCORMICK. You are at sea now, off the shore of Korea again, as the battleship *New Jersey* lays down its initial bombardment upon Communist supply ports. This 45,000-ton superdreadnaught—which recently replaced the "Big Mo" in action there, has made its weight felt blocking the enemy's main supply routes from Asia and North Korea. And here a Navy rocket ship goes into action inside Wonsan Harbor against Red shore establishments, troop concentrations, and supply dumps—a spectacular night display of fire power. And finally, home from the war, aboard four destroyers come Navy warriors, after nine long months of fighting in Korea. As they are greeted by mothers, wives, and sweethearts, let us turn to another recently home from his assignment as commander of Task Force 95. For some pertinent words on the U. N. forces maintaining control of the seas in Korea, here is Rear Adm. Allan E. Smith.

Rear Adm. ALLEN E. SMITH. By July 4, 1950, the blockade of Korea and Formosa was established and has been effective ever since. Because our Navy has retained complete control of the sea lanes, thousands of tons of supplies and equipment have flowed by ship from our American industrial centers to our Army, Navy, and Air Force in the Far East. During the first 6 months of the Korean action Navy ships transported 239,554 military personnel and 5,000,000 tons of supplies and ammunition from the United States to the Far East. Over 10,000,000 barrels of aviation gasoline and petroleum products for planes, tanks, and trucks arrived by ship for the Armed Forces during this period.

However, logistic support of our Armed Forces is but one byproduct of our maintaining the control of the seas. Because of our effective naval blockade, the enemy was forced to resort to the last two remaining supply lines available to him, the western land road and rail system which passes from the Yalu through Pyongyang to Seoul and the east coast highway and rail lines from the Manchurian and Siberian borders to Wonsan, and thence also to Seoul. The surface ships of Task Force 95, our own carrier-based planes, and the United States Air Force are putting a noose around these last remaining supply lines. For the past several months the Air Force has been hitting the western land route hard as have the Carline Corsairs and the British Sea Furies. The eastern land route has been battered into a state of collapse by Navy Corsairs and Sky Raiders of Task Force 77 and the constant bombardment by the Navy gunfire-support ships of Task Force 95. The sea blockade and interdiction program illustrate the old saying that "an Army fights on its stomach." Over 10,000 Red soldiers surrendered recently because they were out of food and ammunition.

To help understand what some of the various types of ships do to help maintain control of the seas and damage the enemy, let us look for a moment at the destroyer mine sweepers and the smaller sweepers. They contribute to everything the bigger ships do, and have a number of specific accomplishments of their own. They're the

Navy's "me first" boys. The mine sweepers are the ships of the Navy whose job it is to clear enemy harbors in advance of an amphibious landing and to clear coastal waters of mines so that the larger ships can fire on targets ashore. They sweep newly captured ports so Navy supply ships can enter near the front lines with logistic support for the ground and air forces.

Some newsmen have referred to mines and mine warfare as the dirty-trick department. However, defensive mines in a large part are a perfect weapon for a nation with inferior sea power or a nation with no navy at all. In a fashion, using mines may restrict control of the sea or slow the movement of ships of a superior naval power. At some ports in Korea, this is precisely what happened to us. Complete control of the sea was regained after only a few days' delay, but under other circumstances such delays might have been disastrous. The Korean waters are noted for their extreme tidal currents. These currents in some cases cause the mines to "walk," and it obviously becomes dangerous if a mine "walks" into a previously swept channel. To insure full safety for the ships and men, these sea lanes are constantly being swept to clear all mines. Mine personnel are trappers and trap snappers rather than hunters. They seldom get a huntsman's personal satisfaction, and they collect no hazardous-duty pay. But the men of the mine sweepers have a pride in performance even exceeding that of the marines and the carrier-based pilots.

The cruisers, destroyers, and frigates do the blockading and naval gunfire interdiction choke off the flow of supplies to the Communists. They've also inflicted thousands of casualties in reserve areas and on the battle line while shelling enemy troops. Whenever our ground forces plan to advance, the Navy provides gunfire support along the east and west coasts of Korea. The mobile seagoing artillery protected the Eighth Army's flanks on both ends of the battle line when the Reds launched their recent spring offensives. Speaking of our 130 days successive bombardment in the Wonsan area, the commanding general of a U. N. Eighth Army Division expressed his appreciation for the naval bombardment and termed the accuracy of the gunfire outstanding. I have a copy of a dispatch here with me that was received just before I left the Far East. I would like to read it to you, and particularly to the parents of our naval gunners who may be viewing this show—I would like the parents of these boys to know that the job their sons are doing aboard our naval vessels has received a grateful "well done" from a ground general of a U. N. Eighth Army Division, and here is the message.

ANNOUNCER. Your shells exploded on enemy troops as close as 150 yards ahead of my men and dispersed the enemy troops before they could deploy against my division. The prisoners we have taken are more afraid of naval gunfire than they are of any other attack, because it is unseen and it is accurate.

Mr. MCCORMICK. And now, from Korea across Asia and the Middle East to Austria, where America, represented by these GI's in training, still sits across the council table from Soviet Russia. Here, in a city once a tourist wonderland and now a combat training center for our occupation troops, cable cars lift trainees thousands of feet above the valley. Then comes the hardening process on one of the toughest infiltration courses in all Europe. Just back from Europe to confer with the President on the tinderbox that is Austria comes our next guest. He brings you a report not only on the temper of the Austrian people but some interesting side lights on our fellow administrators there, the Russians. We focus now on the United States High Commissioner for Austria, Ambassador Walter J. Donnelly.

Ambassador WALTER J. DONNELLY. I have just returned from Austria to report to the President, the Department of State, the Congress, and to you on our mission there, which is unique in the world. Austria is the outpost of western civilizations in Europe. It is the only place where the four powers—the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union—work together and where the Soviets do not have the veto power. We hold frequent meetings, and every 2 weeks I sit in the allied council with the representatives of France, Great Britain, and Soviet Russia, the latter being a lieutenant general in the Soviet Army. While common agreement is rare, the four-power machinery should continue until the state treaty is made effective and all of the occupation troops leave Austrian soil.

Austria has been occupied for 13 years—from 1938 until 1945 by Nazi Germany and since 1945 by the four powers. The United States and the two other western powers have long taken the position that a state treaty reestablishing Austria's independence and full sovereignty should be concluded. The Soviets have frustrated our efforts.

The situation in Austria is unique in another respect, too. It is the only place where we have a four-power occupation and nevertheless the Austria non-Communist government exercises complete jurisdiction over the country, including the Soviet zone. Free elections have been held at several occasions all over Austria with a minimum of interference with the rights of the people. The Communists have never succeeded in obtaining more than 5 percent of the vote and received less votes proportionally in the Soviet zone. This is due to the fact that the people there know them only too well.

Recently we asked the Soviet repatriation mission to leave the American zone since they had completed their mission there. The Soviets did not want to leave; we had to insist and finally to escort them to the Soviet zone.

We are all very proud of the way and manner in which the Austrian Government and the Austrian people have stood up against Soviet encroachment on their rights. The Austrian people are thoroughly prowestern and genuinely grateful to the United States, and all we have done since the end of the war to put Austria back on its feet and to overcome the disaster of the Second World War. Notably, the Marshall plan has put Austria and its people in a position to resume their economic life.

We are proud of Austria's friendship, and Austria is proud of ours.

Mr. MCCORMICK. High in the sky behind the enemy lines before the peace overtures began, an American plane finds its target, a Russian-built MIG, and lets the jet have it. As it falls to crash, the enemy pilot bails out and our side scores another kill. Two such kills as this were won in Korea by our next guest, whose total credits are but one-half plane short of the all-time wartime record.

In World War II air combat, such as you see here, he destroyed over 22½ enemy planes in air-to-air battle, plus 13 on the ground. Such a record helped win for him command of the Fourth Fighter Interceptor Group, which he took to Korea and led against the enemy in its first combat mission. He pauses to report on Battle Report before leaving for his new assignment as deputy commander of the One Hundred and First Fighter Interceptor Wing based in New Hampshire. America's greatest fighting ace today—Col. John C. Meyer.

Col. JOHN C. MEYER. The Sabre jets of the Fourth Fighter Group were primarily engaged in holding Communist jets at bay in "MIG Alley," a narrow corridor running 30 to 40 miles south along the Korean border in order to keep them off the backs of our tactical fighters operating along the battle front

in close support to our ground forces. During this period we had about 1,000 individual encounters with the Russian built 15's. Like our own F-86 Sabre, it is a high-speed swept-wing jet fighter.

From these dogfights 9 miles high over "MIG Alley" we learned some important technical and tactical facts about modern aerial warfare. These lessons are:

1. All air-to-air combat is taking place near or at the speed of sound.
2. The Russian-built MIG-15 is at least as good, performance-wise, as our own F-86 Sabre jet.
3. The jet airplane is a tough airplane to shoot down.

To go back—the combat maneuvers of aircraft at and close to the speed of sound places challenging requirements on the aviation industry and the Air Force to engineer—develop, and produce aircraft of continually improving aerodynamic design.

That the Russians already recognize this fact is brought out by the performance of their MIG-15 in combat against our F-86. These Russian-built aircraft were tough. They were tough to fight, tough to lick, and tough to destroy. Someone may ask why, if these, the enemy airplanes were so good, were we able, during the period of our encounters, to destroy 31 Russian MIG's while losing only 1 F-86? This is explained by an understanding of what I call the fighter aircraft complex; that is, the airplane itself and its performance, the armament and firing control system, which is the mechanical feature of the shooting performance in which the MIG holds its own with the F-86. In comparing the whole weapon—that is, the MIG and its guns and the pilot—against the F-86 and its guns and its pilot. The whole American weapon whipped the whole Communist weapon. Most significantly the pilots of the Fourth Fighter Group are the most experienced air fighters in the world.

The toughness of the MIG is not purely an attribute of that airplane, but rather a general characteristic of all jets. This is being borne out by the fact that our conventional fighters in the tactical support phase of the Korean war alone are suffering losses considerably higher than that of our jets so engaged. If we should become engaged in a global conflict where enemy air power would be encountered in large force, it is my opinion that other than jet fighters used for close support of our ground forces would not survive.

I believe that the most important single lesson to all Americans from this action of ours in Korea is that the Russian world power can produce an airplane equal in performance to America's best. Any nation which can do this has the potential for a first-rate air power qualitatively as well as quantitatively. Therefore, we must, in all fields of research and development—in fact, in our total national effort—continuously work toward insuring our security against any again rising international gangster.

Mr. McCORMICK. This is the battle that may soon be settled. This is where and this is how for exactly a year plus 4 days free men armed with guns, ships, tanks, and planes rose in might and indignation over the unprovoked invasion of South Korea and said to those who would deprive humanity of its freedoms, "This evil shall not be done." Joined as never before in their history and giving true meaning to what was formerly spelled only in words in a charter and in a name—United Nations—the democratic world put its forces shoulder to shoulder and challenged those who would make it slave. Here in the sweat born of the hot summer sun, here in the cold of the winds of winter, youthful Americans from Kokomo and Silver Spring, mustached Turks from Ankara, kilted Scots from Glasgow, laconic Britons from London show the stuff of which they are made.

And each day as the smoke of battle cleared and as night fell they stole out to find their wounded and bury their dead—The price of their heroism. We counted our own losses heavy—12,202 Americans killed, 10,512 missing, 158 captured. Should peace come, America, don't forget this, and permit not the silence that will follow the abruptly stilled sound to lull you into a sense of false security, for, if the past few months' history have taught us anything, they have taught us the need to be prepared.

Remember, the Communist bear still stalks half of Europe and most of Asia, and by his words and actions he shows that no lasting peace will be ours without strength. The climate in which each of us seeks to live out his life and raise his children will not come with ideals alone but with the might to match them. And freedom—freedom will always belong only to those who are willing to fight for it.

One hundred and seventy-five years ago the founding fathers of our Nation signed with their pens and backed with their blood this hallowed document—a declaration of all we live by still. That this occasion may not pass unnoticed in this crisis point in our saga, we call upon William Flaherty, who portrays Thomas Jefferson nightly here in Washington in Paul Green's historical drama *Faith of Our Fathers*. For some sentiments truly pertinent to our times, then, these words of Thomas Jefferson:

"The flames kindled on the Fourth of July 1776 have spread over too much of the globe to be extinguished by the feeble engines of despotisms; on the contrary, they will consume these engines and all who work them.

"All eyes are opened, or opening, to the rights of man. Let the annual return of this day forever refresh our recollections of these rights and an undiminished devotion to them. May it [the Declaration of Independence] be to the world the signal of arousing men to assume the blessings and security of free government.

"My God. How little do my countrymen know what precious blessings they are in possession of, and of which no other people on earth enjoy."

So, until we turn our cameras upon the Nation's Capital again next Friday to report on the battle of democracy against world communism, this is Robert McCormick putting a period on your forty-fourth Battle Report, Washington.

Airfields in French Morocco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I offer for inclusion an editorial from the New Orleans Times-Picayune of July 16, 1951:

COOPERATION FOR DEFENSE

Announcement by the United States Air Force that arrangements have been completed for its use of seven airfields in French Morocco, with command headquarters in the capital of this African colony, should be welcomed as a good step forward in implementing western defense. We understand this is the first occasion on which the French have granted such bases for the use of another nation. The French are notably reluctant to agree to such limitations of their sovereignty, and congratulations for the

Government's move in the case of Morocco are all the more deserved.

While Britain has without hesitancy extended rights to air bases to the United States Air Force at several areas around Britain, the French until now have resisted such cooperation. But if adequate defenses are to be established against the undiminished threats of Communist aggression, the old notions of sovereignty probably will have to be replaced by a broader concept of international cooperation.

We prefer to think of the right to use air bases in the common defense as a matter of cooperation rather than as a giving up of sovereign rights. Presumably French logic has arrived at this same view in the case of Morocco. If that is the case, we hope it will be only a short time before French logic sweeps still further and agrees to grant bases for the United States Air Force in Algeria, Tunisia, and other areas in Africa, and even within continental France, if the security of the Atlantic defense requires it.

Aging Widows and Mr. Ewing's Foot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an editorial which appeared in the July 2 issue of the Richmond News Leader.

This editorial points up well the tirelessness of those who would make of our Federal Government a vast, suffocating, socialistic mass.

It is needless for me to recall at this time the many steps in the dangerous march toward complete state socialism which have been taken in the United States in recent years. It is important that we be vigilant, however, against the insidious efforts of such socialistically minded jumping jacks as Mr. Ewing. The Congress has put them back in their boxes repeatedly, but it is apparent that their springs have not been broken.

AGING WIDOWS AND MR. EWING'S FOOT

There is this to be said for Oscar Ewing, the Federal Security Administrator: He never gives up.

Four times in the past 4 years, Mr. Ewing has peddled his scheme for socialized medicine, and four times Congress has looked at the label and thrown his product away. Mr. Ewing has tried soft words and hot speeches; he has conducted a propaganda campaign in the teeth of a mandate not to spend money on propaganda; he has worked every source of political influence from Senator LEHMAN in New York to Senator MORSE in Oregon, and he has had Harry Truman himself to beat the drums at every whistle stop. And still Congress hasn't bought what Mr. Ewing has to sell.

So last week Mr. Ewing offered something new. He called in reporters and gave them the pitch: A plan to provide hospital insurance, at Government expense, for persons 65 and older and dependents of deceased persons insured under the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System.

His sales talk was impressive. There are only 7,000,000 persons, he pointed out, in this group. They need hospitalization insurance. It would be very valuable to them. It would protect them against having to ask emer-

gency aid from their families, or from private or public agencies; it would reduce Federal, State, and local expenditures for public assistance. The cost of these benefits—up to 60 days of hospitalization per year for each beneficiary—could be paid out of social-security funds now on hand. No new taxes would be required. The program would be administered through State health departments. There would be a specific provision against any supervision or control over the details of administration or operation of any hospital. Widows with infant children would benefit; and all hands would receive (dramatic pause for effect) paid-up hospitalization insurance which would be valid not for weeks, not for months, but for life.

As we say, it was a good spiel. But we're not having any. We want no foot in the door, and that's what Mr. Ewing is putting forward here. In our view, the ills that afflict the body politic can be cured in sounder fashion than by employing old Dr. Oscar's patent tonic, body restorer, and mange cure. The stuff, we fear, is habit-forming. Once the sample had been swallowed—at a mere \$200,000,000 for the first year—the pressure to buy the family-size bottle would be far more difficult to resist. A law providing free hospitalization for 7,000,000 persons aged 65 and over, together with their dependents and minor children, would be merely extended or just broadened in its coverage to take in 143,000,000 more. And little by little, the very controls that Mr. Ewing now disclaims so piously would have to be applied. They could not be avoided. A controlled economy may operate without economy, but it cannot operate without controls.

We hope Congress will put this legislative elixir on the nearest handy shelf, just where it put the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bills. But while the lawmakers are about it, they might well look into Mr. Ewing's statement that the added expense of \$200,000,000 in new hospitalization services is "well within the means of the present insurance system." The social-security set-up is so fabulously unsound, from an actuarial standpoint, that one despairs of ever seeing the light of reason in its calculations. This Nation, though it doesn't know it yet, already stands committed to staggering burdens to meet the social-security payments of 20 or 30 years from now. But if Mr. Ewing has \$200,000,000 on hand that he doesn't need and can afford to spend on a new hospitalization program, then something is curiously wrong. The unneeded \$200,000,000 would help a little bit—not much, but a little bit—on the country's quarter-trillion-dollar debt.

When Congress conducts its hearings on Mr. Ewing's foot in the door, it might be an idea to inquire into that available \$200,000,000, put it to good use, and then put the bill in moth balls.

Draft Appeals Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I offer the following news item from the Washington Daily News of July 17, 1951. The amendment referred to in the item is one that I sponsored in order to reduce the difficulty in draft appeals. Under this amendment the number of

draft-appeal boards will be increased from one in each State to one for each Federal judicial district.

This change increases the number of boards from 48 to 96 and removes many hardships that formerly existed in the presentation of the appeals. Under the old system a man often had to travel hundreds of miles at heavy expense to reach the appeals board, then to find that the board usually had no members from his own area who were familiar with economic, business, and personal problems of his home city and county. In Texas, for instance, selectees have had to travel hundreds of miles to present their cases to the one appeals board in that State. In Louisiana it has been necessary for appellants from the northwestern part of the State to travel 350 miles to the appeals board.

This increased efficiency will not increase the costs of operation of the boards. Clerical help can be borrowed for appeals cases from local selective service boards in many instances. In large cities the same clerk may be used by a number of appeals boards. For the appellant, it reduces his travel costs, cuts down the amount of time he must be away from his work to perfect his appeal and produces a more satisfactory and speedy decision.

DRAFT APPEALS EASIER UNDER NEW REGULATION

Draft Director Lewis B. Hershey has amended selective-service regulations to make it easier for draft registrants who live away from home to appeal for occupational deferments. It was announced today.

Under the new rules, registrants who appeal for occupational deferments can have their cases shifted to the appeals board having jurisdiction over the area in which they now live. Formerly, they had to handle appeals through the appeal panels having control over their local boards.

Selective Service officials said the change was made because the old rules worked a hardship on registrants who had moved away from home and also on their employers who have the right to appeal for deferment of employees.

Report of Home Loan Bank Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a release of the Home Loan Bank Board, which is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 14.—The last of the Government's investment in the capital of the 11 district Federal home loan banks has been paid back. William K. Divers, Chairman of the Home Loan Bank Board, reported today.

His statement followed the receipt by the Treasury Department of \$10,000,000 from the home loan banks of Little Rock and San Francisco, each of which paid off a balance of \$5,000,000.

The report emphasized that the regional banks of the System are now owned 100

percent by their 3,968 member institutions, chiefly savings and loan associations, which have financed more of the Nation's small homes than any other type of lenders. The members now hold capital stock in their district banks to the amount of \$262,315,975, which with earned surplus of over \$31,000,000 makes up a total capital of about \$293,500,000.

The Government's investment of \$125,000,000 in the capital of the Federal home loan banks was made during several years beginning in 1932, following an act of Congress in that year which authorized the creation of the Federal Home Loan Bank System as a reserve-credit network for home-financing institutions.

The first repayments of the United States Treasury funds were made in 1945. Since January 1, 1950, \$106,000,000 of the capital owned by the Treasury has been repaid, most of it substantially ahead of the schedule set down by law. On its investment in these banks the Government received dividends amounting to about \$26,175,000.

"The Federal Home Loan Bank System was established by Congress for two general purposes" said Mr. Divers. "First was to meet the seasonal and emergency credit requirements of the home-finance institutions which should join it as members. Secondly, the System was designed to make possible the shifting of home-mortgage funds from areas of surplus to areas of scarcity. Both of these functions have been carried out through long- and short-term loans to members, largely secured by home mortgages.

"Since they were established, the district banks have advanced to their members a total of \$3,819,000,000. Of this amount \$3,003,000,000 had been repaid as of last June 30, leaving \$816,000,000 outstanding at that date. No losses have been sustained. In turn, the member savings and loan associations of the System have made loans for the construction, purchase, repair, and refinancing of homes to an aggregate of about \$29,000,000,000 over that same period.

"While this total of lending to home owners is not a direct result of the support supplied by the Federal home loan banks, it does reflect the flexibility of the System and the part played by its member institutions in the American economy. Of course, those institutions have obtained the great bulk of their loan funds from their local savers and investors. At no time have advances from Federal home loan banks exceeded 5 percent of the combined resources of all members, which now are estimated at \$17,000,000,000."

Supplementing their capital, the district banks of the System have gained wide acceptance for their securities in the open market. Mr. Divers said. Since 1937 they have sold their consolidated obligations to a total of \$3,035,000,000. Securities amounting to \$547,500,000 are now outstanding.

Another source of funds expanded widely in recent years is the deposits of surplus cash of member institutions in their respective district Federal home loan banks, he added.

Have We the Strength of Character To Follow Road Leading to Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing to receive from the country a

frank expression of views from a thinker and a writer who is not so close to the picture as we Members of Congress are.

I have the honor to represent the Eighth Congressional District of Michigan, which is inhabited by American men and women who might be classified as the average. They go about their daily work in the pursuits associated with agriculture, manufacturing, transportation, communications, the services, merchandising, and the professions. They think as the average American thinks, and all of them have substantially grown up under our ideals and institutions.

There appeared in the Sunday, July 15, 1951, issue of the Saginaw News an editorial which raises a basic question. This is an editorial which should be read by the Members of the House and Senate, and I am pleased to submit it for the RECORD so that those who are interested may read what the editor of the Saginaw News, Mr. Otto C. Pressprich, had to say.

The editorial follows:

HAVE WE THE STRENGTH OF CHARACTER TO FOLLOW ROAD LEADING TO PEACE?

Pessimism overshadows the thoughts of many competent observers as the world watches the drama of truce negotiations unfold at far-off Kaesong in Northern Korea.

British fears have prevailed again, they say. The United States and the other United Nations have acknowledged defeat. The Communist aggressors will not be punished and Korea will not be unified after all. Red prestige will grow rapidly throughout the Orient and in other lands. Red propaganda will spread the word that the vaunted power of the United States and other free nations was challenged and fought to a standstill by Red China. Appeasement is the order of the day and it will lead to the same tragic results that came out of Munich.

Obviously much of this is true. British concern for her trade empire has been a large factor. Perhaps even greater in influence has been the Truman administration's dogged determination to go before the people of America in the 1952 elections as the architects of peace.

America's allies, looking to this Nation for rescue if the deal turns sour, are willing to pay a high price for peace. As a minimum, says United States News and World Report magazine, the price which the Red negotiators will demand is United Nations membership for Communist China, an end to economic sanctions against China, and perhaps assurances that the island of Formosa eventually will go to Communist China.

Can the United States afford to let so great a price be paid? This newspaper believes it cannot.

It may be that Formosa can be surrendered without incurring too much danger. The problem is largely military. We do not know whether retention of the island is vital to American security. But General MacArthur believes it is, and we have faith in his views.

It may be that western efforts to blockade the Chinese coast can be safely suspended. This again is a matter of military logistics which the layman is not able to analyze fully.

But it is the conviction of this newspaper that admission of Red China as a member of the United Nations would be an act of abysmal treachery to the millions of men and women who in two world wars have given their lives to the cause of making this world a decent place in which to live.

The United Nations is the world's chief instrumentality of establishing peace on a just basis. As presently constituted, it consists of a General Assembly in which all

member nations are represented and a Security Council made up of the delegates of 11 of the member nations. Five nations have permanent membership on the Security Council. They are the United States, Russia, Britain, France, and China.

The Security Council is in temporary eclipse because of the veto power granted to each of the Big Five on Russia's demand when the U. N. was founded. Use of the veto power by the Soviets has tied the Security Council's hands and it was only the fact that Russia was boycotting the Security Council in June 1950, that prevented Russia from vetoing Security Council sanction to halt the aggression when North Koreans crossed the thirty-eighth parallel a little more than a year ago.

But let us make no mistake about it. Russia will strive to give the Security Council full control of U. N. military forces if she ever manages to win a dominating voice in the Council. Stalin has only one Council vote now. If Nationalist China is thrown out and Red China seated, he will have two. Then will come the big Red drive to put a Soviet puppet in France's seat and thereby give Stalin and his politburo a long start toward full control. It is well to remember that communism already is so strongly entrenched in France that many of her army officers up to the rank of colonel make no bones about admitting that they are Communists.

If the Kremlin ever gains control of the Security Council, the world will see an international army enrolled under a Red U. N. banner and made so powerful that no nation or group of dissenting nations can hope to oppose it. That will be the day when a world-wide Communist empire goes into operation.

That day's coming can be prevented if the United States and her allies will stand firm and act courageously.

It is not enough—perhaps not even possible—for the free world to block Red aggression wherever it appears. We cannot hope to win if we let Moscow choose the time and the place for every test of strength. Our only chance lies in taking the initiative ourselves.

The initiative need not and should not be along military lines, though it will need the backing of a strong military establishment. It must give the people of the have-not nations, including the unhappy Red satellite lands, something to which to tie their hopes and aspirations.

The weapon with which we can strike effectively at Moscow's schemes is at hand. It has been forged for us by the Kremlin itself. It is the Kremlin's demand that Red China be seated in the United Nations.

What would be simpler and more potent than for the free world to take up the challenge and determine that seats in the United Nations shall be occupied only by representatives who have been chosen freely by the nations they are to represent?

Let the Red regime which now holds China in its armed fist have China's U. N. seat if the Chinese people themselves so determine in an honest election conducted by U. N. representatives. The Chinese people have lived under Red terror long enough to know whether they want to continue under it. The bloody purges of landowners and other enemies of the state which have been in progress nearly 3 years have caused the Chinese people to understand that their Red conquerors are not mere agrarian reformers.

The answer, of course, is that neither Chinese Dictator Mao Tse-tung, nor Joseph Stalin himself if Mao were willing, would dream of letting non-Communists conduct an election in China.

But a crusade for self-determination of all peoples would not only keep Red China out of the U. N. It could and should be used as the basis for an appeal to all people

in Red-slave states to rise against their masters.

It would have to be a sincere crusade. It would have to be made to apply to all peoples, including those in the British, French, and other colonial empires.

But it would be a spiritual crusade which would carry to all peoples the hope of regaining freedom, dignity of the individual and the other rights bestowed upon them by their Creator. It could be a crusade enlisting all people who recognize their duty to establish on earth not mere physical security but the Kingdom of God. Unless America and the other free lands develop some such crusade, we are likely to find ourselves fighting always a defensive action against Red aggressors and not winning any converts to strengthen our cause.

The time is ripe for this Nation to tell Moscow that we will use our veto power to keep Red China out of the U. N. until a Chinese plebiscite which we can recognize as honest has been held, and then to broadcast our stand to all peoples by every communication method that can be devised.

This is the road which leads to peace. Some of our allies may not have the courage, the strength of character that is needed to follow it. Have we?

The Japanese Peace Treaty—Activities of Senator Magnuson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, on June 26 the Washington Evening Star carried an article written by Columnist Doris Fleenor, which referred in a complimentary fashion to a distinguished Member of this body, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. The author pointed out the close and harmonious working relationship which exists between Ambassador Dulles and the Senator from Washington, and their joint efforts to bring the Japanese people back into the family of nations on a just and equitable basis.

It is only natural that the senior Senator from Washington, coming as he does from the west coast, should be actively interested in far-eastern affairs. For decades his State has been the gateway for trade with the Orient. During his 15 years of service in the Congress of the United States he has been prominently identified with legislation and problems relating to our merchant marine and fisheries industry.

Constantly he has sought to promote the welfare of these two basic segments of our economy. At the same time, he recognizes that the Japanese people must be given an opportunity to become self-sustaining, self-respecting, and useful members of international society.

To date the American people have extended to the Japanese people assistance totaling over one and three-quarters billion dollars. This represents a load which we cannot permanently saddle on the backs of the American people, nor do the Japanese want it so. It is encouraging to see one of our leading col-

umnists recognize the good work the senior Senator from Washington is doing.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DEPARTURE FROM CONFUSION—DULLES AND MAGNUSON NOW HAVE IN HAND MAIN OUTLINES OF JAPANESE PEACE TREATY FULFILLING TWO VITAL AIMS

(By Doris Fleson)

The careful and cooperative planning of a Republican diplomat from the canyons of Wall Street and a Democratic Senator from the Northwest is presenting Washington with a welcome departure from the current confusion and rivalry between the executive and legislative branches.

Between them, Ambassador John Foster Dulles and Senator WARREN MAGNUSON, of Washington, have in hand the main outlines of a Japanese peace treaty which will fulfill two vital aims:

1. It will bring Japan into the United Nations as an independent nation, freed of occupying forces and rearmed to do its part in the fight against Communist aggression.

2. It will replace the threat of another prewar Japan, the cut-throat economic competitor that the West learned to fear and hate, with a nation allowed trading room but required to obey the West's rules of conservation and fair trade.

The international political goals of the first part of this tall order are the special province of Mr. Dulles, and he has proved brilliantly successful with them in a hard recent week in London. When the British succumbed to Mr. Dulles' argument that Japan presented the only potential source of military strength now available to the Allies in the Far East, he was over the hump.

It was Mr. Dulles' inspiration to separate consideration of the economic problems posed by Japan from the general treaty. These economic aspects are covered by a blanket provision in which Japan obligates herself to negotiate settlements with the Allies in the fields of trade agreements, merchant marine, and fisheries.

Thus, the Senate will be free to act swiftly on the general question of mobilizing the political, social, and military force of Japan for the anti-Communist world. This will be a popular aim, and Senators are predicting that once allied accord is reached action can be had with reasonable promptitude.

From a domestic point of view, the Senate will be more skeptical with respect to the economic aspects. And this is where Senator MAGNUSON, whose special province is merchant marine and fisheries—he is head of that subcommittee of Interstate and Foreign Commerce—comes in.

As for the trade agreements, Japan, the Senate will be assured, can be fitted into the existing trade agreement structure. The State Department now possesses a vast experience in reciprocal trade agreements and is ready to promise the Japanese its prompt cooperation.

Senator MAGNUSON is starting his work on the problem of Japan as a trading and fishing nation entitled to an adequate merchant marine and fishing fleet with the premise that the West will not try to fence off the Pacific Ocean. He is aware that extremists here and in Great Britain would prefer to have it that way but he believes he can convince the majority to the contrary.

The Senator from Washington initiated his present studies with a trip to Tokyo and the Far East where he talked directly to Japanese officials. When their negotiators arrive, which will be soon, he expects to sit down with them and United States shippers and fishers and talk things over.

The Cease-Fire Discussion at Kaesong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the important and interesting analysis entitled "After Kaesong," which appeared in this morning's Washington Post. This is written by the Alsop brothers, Joseph and Stewart, Connecticut's most renowned journalists. This week on Hartford's powerful radio station, WTIC, in a broadcast on which Representative A. A. RIBICOFF, and I participated, Representative RIBICOFF said that our constituents, the Alsop brothers, were America's top newspaper commentators on our foreign policy. It was this comment by my brilliant colleague, Representative RIBICOFF, a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and a keen student of foreign policy, which caused me to read this column with such care this morning, and to call it to the attention of the Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

AFTER KAESONG

There is a fairly simple explanation of the strange ritual at Kaesong—the talks about a cease-fire, as a prelude to an armistice, as a prelude to peace negotiations, which are carried on while the Korean fighting also continues. The cease fire and armistice are in fact expected to be the last serious acts of the Korean drama.

No doubt, when and if the generals and admirals successfully complete their labors at Kaesong, the diplomats and statesmen will go to work in their turn under somewhat less primitive conditions. No doubt there will be peace negotiations, with all the familiar trappings of agendas, proposals, and counterproposals, and loud haggings about the meaning of such terms as "free elections." But almost no one hopes that these negotiations will accomplish anything.

Gen. Nam II and Gen. Tung Hua clearly hold this view. Hence the North Korean and Chinese representatives are trying to crowd into the Kaesong agreement clauses that belong in a final settlement, such as provision for withdrawal of all foreign troops from Korea. Equally, the same view is held by the leading personalities in Washington and Tokyo. And that is why Vice Admiral Joy and his delegation are proceeding with such meticulous deliberation, even although this means that the somewhat desultory fighting is thereby prolonged.

The reasons for this view are also plain enough. After a cease fire and armistice, each side will hold roughly half of Korea. Each will demand a final settlement on its own terms—the United Nations calling for a settlement responsive to the wishes of the Korean people; the Communists demanding a "democratic" settlement which will insure Communist control of the country. This sort of negotiation is doomed to deadlock before it begins.

What then will be the consequences, if the bitter, bloody war in Korea simply tails out into a cease fire and armistice, without the

formal peace agreement that customarily concludes wars? Where will it leave us? Not too badly off appears to be the answer.

It is possible, in the first place, that defense of the postarmistice status quo can eventually be left to a greatly strengthened South Korean army, provided the Chinese also wish to recall their "volunteers" on reasonable terms and at a reasonable time. If not, some United Nations troops will have to be retained in Korea, as a safeguard against renewed aggression. But even if the American forces are thus prevented from saying a final farewell to a country they do not love, there will be substantial consolations, both positive and negative.

First, since Japan is so near, the Korean garrison can be relatively small. Most of the American divisions can be pulled back to Japan or brought home.

Second, even a small UN garrison will be a better guaranty against renewal of Korean hostilities than any peace treaty. No doubt its retention will be denounced by the same Senators who have attacked the administration for being overly hasty in recalling American troops from Korea 3 years ago. Yet General MacArthur himself planned to leave UN forces in Korea for several years, at the time when he expected to conquer the whole country.

Third, on the larger question of peace treaty versus no peace treaty, there is one advantage in having no peace treaty that almost no one seems to have thought of. In brief, the announced American policy is to neutralize Formosa for the duration of the Korean war; and this has been somewhat grudgingly accepted by the world at large. But if the Korean war is formally terminated, and we still seek to continue the neutralization of Formosa, we shall run into the worst trouble with our allies and in the United Nations that we have seen yet. In blunt language, we will not have a leg to stand on, and the resulting ruckus will risk splitting the Western alliance from nave to chops.

On the other hand, if the Korean fighting just tails out into a cease-fire, armistice, and deadlocked peace negotiation, the whole status quo will be perpetuated, including the neutralization of Formosa. It can and will be continued, under these conditions, without too much difficulty. And so we shall be borrowing a useful leaf from the book of the other side.

The plain truth is that this wind-up of the Korean fighting is a rather special test of American political sophistication. Shall we, because there is no formal peace, feel cheated? Shall we, because there is no more war, relax our whole defense effort? In that case, we shall be proven fools. Or shall we soberly take the result in Korea for what it is—a handsome though not decisive victory—and go on with our defense effort, because we realize that no local victory will remove the danger hanging over us? In that case, we shall be proven wise indeed.

Military Housing Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials from the Washington Daily News, one in the edition of today and one in that of yesterday, and an

editorial from the Washington Star, dealing with military housing conditions.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News]

FOR SHAME

Disgusting conditions of substandard housing and rent-gouging in the vicinities of three of the Nation's large military bases are charged in a report by the Senate's preparedness subcommittee.

Senator JOHNSON of Texas, chairman of the subcommittee, says:

"We believe this report uncovers a serious situation which is having an adverse effect upon the morale of those Americans who have been called into military service."

That is putting it mildly if what follows in the report, prepared after on-the-spot investigations, is typical.

Bases investigated were Camp Breckinridge, Ky., 24 miles from Evansville, Ind.; Camp Bucker, 75 miles southeast of Montgomery, Ala., and Fort Leonard Wood, near Rolla, Mo.

Judging by pictures and details presented, nicknames given some habitations by GI's are more than apt. Near Camp Breckinridge, for example, are such places as the coalshed, the barn, the chicken coop, the tarpaper shack, the toolshed, the firetrap and the rat house.

Also near Breckinridge, the report asserts, a minister of the Gospel has cut up a former CCC barracks into three tiny apartments which he rents to soldiers' families for a total of \$148 a month. He pays \$25 for the whole building.

A private and his bride pay \$40 a month for two cramped rooms in a converted coalshed—no running water, no inside toilet, one room's ceiling so low a man 5 feet 8 inches tall cannot stand erect in it.

There is much more to back up the subcommittee's statement that servicemen are being shamelessly victimized at the hands of civilians whose property and lives the men in uniform are dedicated to defend.

Such conditions are revolting to every sense of decency. They are devastating to military morale. They reflect gravely on military commands which tolerate them.

Outraged public opinion should demand their prompt correction by action of Congress and of responsible military authorities.

[From the Washington Daily News]

UNCLD SAM'S DISGRACE

Anger is justly stirred because GI's and their families are being cruelly gouged by extortionate rents for miserable housing in the vicinities of military bases.

But it ought to be directed at the right culprits.

Towns near the Army camps named in the Senate preparedness subcommittee's stinging report are small and not well supplied with good houses for rent. That fact, and the natural desire of many soldiers to have their families with them while they can, make opportunity for gougers to demand and get outrageous rates for sheds, barns, and other makeshift shelters.

But it would be unjust to condemn whole communities for the gouging. A large majority of the residents of towns near Army camps are honest, patriotic Americans, who want to treat GI's and their families kindly and fairly. They doubtless deplore the scandalous housing conditions reported as deeply as does Senator JOHNSON's subcommittee.

Publication of the report has brought from Secretary of the Army Pace the promise of a positive program to correct those conditions. Congress should be vigilant to see that the promise is kept.

For surely a Government which can fritter away literally billions on doubtful and debatable projects—a Government which talks constantly of human needs—can afford, and is obligated, to make it possible for its fighting men and their families to live like human beings.

[From the Washington Star]

APPALLING, BUT HARDLY SURPRISING

The military housing conditions described in a report by the Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee are certainly bad enough to warrant all the denunciatory adjectives used by Chairman LYNDON JOHNSON. It is, indeed, appalling and disgraceful that families of servicemen should be living in such shacks and other makeshift quarters as are depicted in the report. But, considering the mobilization rush which followed the outbreak of war in Korea, it is hardly surprising that such conditions have arisen.

There is no condoning, of course, the rent gouging which the subcommittee found to exist in a number of instances. The investigators reported that increases of 100 percent in rents were commonplace in towns adjoining the rapidly expanded camps and that several cases involving 500 percent increases were discovered. There is no excuse for profiteering at the expense of men suddenly called to the defense of the Nation. Noting that some of the rentals charged servicemen or their families did not appear unreasonable, the subcommittee nevertheless criticized the living conditions which were forced upon servicemen's families.

However, it is not fair to blame the communities adjoining the reactivated camps for the lack of housing that developed after Korea. The shortage was inevitable under the circumstances which prevailed as we began our hasty remobilization last year. Nor is it right to imply, as the report seems to do, that local communities forced servicemen and their families to live in substandard quarters. The implication was contained in the report's comment that "the primary question was not one of rentals but of living conditions which were forced upon servicemen's families. . . . Those who offer unfit quarters to servicemen do not acquire dignity for their exploitation merely by reducing the margin of their profiteering."

It is evident from other statements in the report that no forcing was necessary to induce the men and their families to rent converted garages, coal sheds, chicken coops, barns, and the like. It was either live there or send their families back home, which military authorities advised the enlisted men to do in vain. To understand the conditions, one must remember that at the time of the Communist invasion of South Korea the three camps investigated by the subcommittee were abandoned World War II posts. Camp Breckinridge, near the town of Morganfield, Ky. (population, 4,300), has mushroomed from a ghost camp to a busy training center with 25,567 troops and 1,175 civilians. Camp Rucker, at Daleville, Ala. (population, 1,000), has grown into a 30,000-man center. Camp Leonard Wood, near Waynesville, Mo. (population, 2,000), has 32,000 men. All three camps were reactivated last summer to train the new divisions being raised for service in the emergency.

Many of the trainees insisted on bringing their families with them, despite warnings of Army officers of inadequate housing facilities. Perhaps the Army should have ordered the men to leave their families home, instead of merely advising them to. But there is a morale factor that must be considered in unnecessarily separating men from their families and sometimes this factor outweighs other considerations. So the camps soon filled to overflowing with military personnel and the little towns nearby were swamped

with servicemen and their families. Small wonder that barns and sheds were pressed into service for the overflow.

The Army Department has not been unconcerned about this situation. Trailer camps have been set up in some places and more are planned. Secretary Pace says that local authorities have been urged to provide more and better housing—a difficult task for communities which saw the camps evacuated after World War II and which have no assurance that another evacuation will not follow easing of the present emergency. An investment in housing now could become a total waste tomorrow. But more trailer communities should be feasible. And local authorities can help to relieve conditions by enforcing sanitary regulations, exposing profiteering, and applying rent controls wherever possible. The problem, in short, is one which requires a fine degree of cooperation between camp officials and the residents of adjacent towns. Apparently there was not sufficient coordination of efforts in the first rush of the remobilization program.

Korean Policy After the Cease-Fire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the editorial page of the Washington Post of July 19 carried a very interesting letter by Mr. Yongjeung Kim, president of the Korean Affairs Institute, who is one of the leading spirits among Koreans in this country. Mr. Kim suggests a program for Korea. While I am not ready to pass judgment on the several points made in Mr. Kim's program, I think it is an extremely interesting one and worthy of attention and consideration. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KOREAN POLICY AFTER THE CEASE-FIRE

The World's spotlight is focused on the truce meeting at the thirty-eighth parallel. The talks must succeed if the war-ravaged Korean people are to survive.

A cease-fire arrangement is the first step toward peace. The fact that it will end the bloodshed and destruction will make it acceptable to most Koreans, regardless of other considerations. Differences as to the future of Korea must not therefore be allowed to interfere with a prompt conclusion of a cease-fire agreement.

Koreans do not want to continue to be pawns in a struggle between the great powers. They want peace and the opportunity to determine their own fate. "All occupations are failures"—as General MacArthur said at Wake Island—regardless of the fine principles and motives behind them. Ignoring this truth will be a grave mistake.

As soon as an armistice is arranged, therefore, the statesmen should allow the Korean people to reunite their country and put their own house in order. How can this be done? Most Koreans—as well as others truly concerned with the future of the Far East—feel that the solution requires the following steps:

1. Creation of a peace committee, composed of near eastern and Asian representatives

and/or others to expedite the unification of Korea and the restoration of her independence. This body should be empowered to act as an interim national authority until a unified Korean government is established through national elections.

2. Organization of an advisory body, to consult and assist the peace committee, composed of one Korean from each province who is of good reputation, who at no time served under either of the present regimes, and who is not considered a former collaborator in the Japanese rule.

3. Dissolution of the two existing governments, since neither enjoys popular confidence, to provide the people with an unhampered opportunity to shape their own future (If the leaders of both sides would resign voluntarily, they would render a great service to the nation.)

4. Immediate establishment of local governments, through popular elections observed by the peace committee, to assume local civil and police functions from the present regimes.

5. Withdrawal of all foreign forces and simultaneous demobilization of all Korean troops under the supervision of the peace committee, to create a peaceful atmosphere before a general election.

6. Establishment of a national government through a general election observed by the peace committee soon after the local administrations are set up.

7. Neutralization of Korea through a guaranty by the members of the United Nations and China to respect Korean independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity and to seek no special political or economic privileges.

8. An immediate start on reconstruction and rehabilitation of Korea by all nations, under the leadership of the United Nations, with a schedule that envisions substantial completion in 3 years, as a symbol of human conscience and a fitting monument to world peace.

The Korean problem can never be solved unless the Korean people are entrusted with their own destiny. Nor can it be settled as long as two rival Korean regimes are supported and condoned by foreign powers. Any attempt to save or merge the present governments will only perpetuate the long-standing evil. The Korean people must be free from the two extremist rules which they distrust and fear. It is the people—not these groups—who deserve support from the great powers in their struggle for survival and independence. It is these Koreans—not their power-grasping leaders—who have the great stake in the truce talks.

YONGJUNG KIM,
President, Korean Affairs Institute.
WASHINGTON.

Control of Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on July 18, 1951, under the combined headline "Justice Department and FTC take separate lines on prices."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT AND FTC TAKE SEPARATE LINES ON PRICES

CAMPAIGN OPENED AGAINST COERCION OF RATE SLASHERS

The Government today announced a prompt and vigorous campaign against anyone who attempts to force cut-rate merchants to raise their prices.

Launching the campaign as an anti-inflationary measure, Attorney General McGrath warned all levels of the business world that he will move to prosecute those who seek to coerce cut-rate outlets into putting price-tags up to agreed minimum levels.

Seriously concerned

In a formal statement, he said the Justice Department is seriously concerned over reports that such attempts already have been made.

The statement indicated grand-jury action may be in the offing in some areas against this type of activity, which the Department said is in violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act. The Department declined to comment on any specific actions.

At the same time, Assistant Attorney General H. G. Morrison, Chief of the Antitrust Division, said anyone who has knowledge of such practices "owes it to himself and to his country to bring such information to the attention of the Department of Justice."

Especially important now

He said conspiracies to maintain prices at levels higher than those set by active competition gain new importance in times of high prices and inflationary pressures.

The Department's new move stems directly from the Supreme Court decision of May 21 which cut the ground from under a main provision of the so-called fair-trade laws which exist in 45 States. They do not apply in the District.

That provision said a manufacturer may set the resale price for his product and require all retail outlets to abide by it. The Supreme Court ruled that such pricing agreements are legal only where the retailer voluntarily enters such an agreement with the manufacturer. Even though he is in a State where the law applies, the retailer who does not participate is not bound by the agreements.

It was this High Court ruling which set off the recent spree of price cutting in New York department stores.

NEW YORK STORES' RECENT WAR IS UNDER INVESTIGATION

NEW YORK, July 18.—Pricing policies and advertising claims of New York City's major department stores are under investigation by the Federal Trade Commission.

The action resulted from a complaint by the Better Business Bureau of New York City, which mentioned specifically the advertising claims of R. H. Macy & Co. and Gimble Bros.

Macy's was singled out for its claim that "we endeavor to save our customers at least 6 percent for cash, except on price-fixed goods," and Gimble's for its slogan, "For cash or for credit, nobody undersells Gimble's."

Charge misleading claims

The complaint charged that such claims tend to mislead and deceive the public and constitute unfair business competition of a most serious nature.

John C. Wood, chairman of the board of the bureau, said today that the bureau sent its complaint to Washington July 9. Yesterday, he said, the bureau received an acknowledgment from James M. Mead, Commission Chairman and former Senator from New York.

Mr. Mead's letter said the complaint had been referred to the Commission's investi-

gation bureau of antideceptive practices for expeditious action to determine whether such advertising warrants corrective action by the Commission.

Could issue cease order

Where it finds an unfair practice exists, the FTC can order the offender to cease, and may bring contempt action if the practice is continued.

Mr. Wood said the bureau had taken the matter up with the Trade Commission only after it had tried unsuccessfully to get merchants to discontinue voluntarily the advertising claims it held to be unfair.

The complaint brought to a head a controversy that has been building up for many years among retail merchants over advertisements about underselling. This long-standing friction flared into an open price war among several of the large department stores after a Supreme Court decision 2 months ago that manufacturers could not enforce fixed resale prices on retailers who refused to sign agreements with them.

MACY'S OUT OF BUREAU

The Better Business Bureau is financed by most of the large business and industrial concerns in the city and by many small businesses. Macy's has been out of the bureau for many years. Gimbel's is a member.

Jack I. Straus, president of Macy's, said the store had received a copy of the complaint. "It should be pointed out that the membership of the board of directors of the Better Business Bureau of New York includes several of Macy's competitors."

He said similar action in the past had resulted in dismissal of the action by the FTC.

Bernard F. Gimbel, president of Gimbel's, said any store making general underselling claims should be willing to have its books and records open to inspection by the proper authorities.

The Commission's investigation is expected to take months.

Friendly Relations Between the United States and the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the New York Times this morning carries a most timely editorial captioned "Slow mail to Moscow." The editorial deals in part with the McMahon joint resolution of friendship which, as we know, was passed by the Senate and the House of Representatives, expressing the friendship of the American people for the people of Russia. The editorial also deals with the letter of friendship written by President Truman to President Shvernik. I do not know just why President Truman's letter was addressed to President Shvernik; I never heard very much about him, although I suppose he still holds the job of President. Certainly the editorial emphasizes the fact that we should make every effort we can to let the rank and file of the people of Russia know of our friendship, as expressed in the McMahon resolution.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

editorial from the Washington Star, dealing with military housing conditions.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News]
FOR SHAME

Disgusting conditions of substandard housing and rent-gouging in the vicinities of three of the Nation's large military bases are charged in a report by the Senate's preparedness subcommittee.

Senator JOHNSON of Texas, chairman of the subcommittee, says:

"We believe this report uncovers a serious situation which is having an adverse effect upon the morale of those Americans who have been called into military service."

That is putting it mildly if what follows in the report, prepared after on-the-spot investigations, is typical.

Bases investigated were Camp Breckinridge, Ky., 24 miles from Evansville, Ind.; Camp Bucker, 75 miles southeast of Montgomery, Ala., and Fort Leonard Wood, near Rolla, Mo.

Judging by pictures and details presented, nicknames given some habitations by GI's are more than apt. Near Camp Breckinridge, for example, are such places as the coalshed, the barn, the chicken coop, the tarpaper shack, the toolshed, the firetrap and the rat house.

Also near Breckinridge, the report asserts, a minister of the Gospel has cut up a former CCC barracks into three tiny apartments which he rents to soldiers' families for a total of \$148 a month. He pays \$25 for the whole building.

A private and his bride pay \$40 a month for two cramped rooms in a converted coalshed—no running water, no inside toilet, one room's ceiling so low a man 5 feet 8 inches tall cannot stand erect in it.

There is much more to back up the subcommittee's statement that servicemen are being shamelessly victimized at the hands of civilians whose property and lives the men in uniform are dedicated to defend.

Such conditions are revolting to every sense of decency. They are devastating to military morale. They reflect gravely on military commands which tolerate them.

Outraged public opinion should demand their prompt correction by action of Congress and of responsible military authorities.

[From the Washington Daily News]
UNCL SAM'S DISGRACE

Anger is justly stirred because GI's and their families are being cruelly gouged by extortionate rents for miserable housing in the vicinities of military bases.

But it ought to be directed at the right culprits.

Towns near the Army camps named in the Senate preparedness subcommittee's stinging report are small and not well supplied with good houses for rent. That fact, and the natural desire of many soldiers to have their families with them while they can, make opportunity for gougers to demand and get outrageous rates for sheds, barns, and other makeshift shelters.

But it would be unjust to condemn whole communities for the gouging. A large majority of the residents of towns near Army camps are honest, patriotic Americans, who want to treat GI's and their families kindly and fairly. They doubtless deplore the scandalous housing conditions reported as deeply as does Senator JOHNSON's subcommittee.

Publication of the report has brought from Secretary of the Army Pace the promise of a positive program to correct those conditions. Congress should be vigilant to see that the promise is kept.

For surely a Government which can fritter away literally billions on doubtful and debatable projects—a Government which talks constantly of human needs—can afford, and is obligated, to make it possible for its fighting men and their families to live like human beings.

[From the Washington Star]

APPALLING, BUT HARDLY SURPRISING

The military housing conditions described in a report by the Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee are certainly bad enough to warrant all the denunciatory adjectives used by Chairman LYNDON JOHNSON. It is, indeed, appalling and disgraceful that families of servicemen should be living in such shacks and other makeshift quarters as are depicted in the report. But, considering the mobilization rush which followed the outbreak of war in Korea, it is hardly surprising that such conditions have arisen.

There is no condoning, of course, the rent gouging which the subcommittee found to exist in a number of instances. The investigators reported that increases of 100 percent in rents were commonplace in towns adjoining the rapidly expanded camps and that several cases involving 500 percent increases were discovered. There is no excuse for profiteering at the expense of men suddenly called to the defense of the Nation. Noting that some of the rentals charged servicemen or their families did not appear unreasonable, the subcommittee nevertheless criticized the living conditions which were forced upon servicemen's families.

However, it is not fair to blame the communities adjoining the reactivated camps for the lack of housing that developed after Korea. The shortage was inevitable under the circumstances which prevailed as we began our hasty remobilization last year. Nor is it right to imply, as the report seems to do, that local communities forced servicemen and their families to live in substandard quarters. The implication was contained in the report's comment that "the primary question was not one of rentals but of living conditions which were forced upon servicemen's families. . . . Those who offer unfit quarters to servicemen do not acquire dignity for their exploitation merely by reducing the margin of their profiteering."

It is evident from other statements in the report that no forcing was necessary to induce the men and their families to rent converted garages, coal sheds, chicken coops, barns, and the like. It was either live there or send their families back home, which military authorities advised the enlisted men to do in vain. To understand the conditions, one must remember that at the time of the Communist invasion of South Korea the three camps investigated by the subcommittee were abandoned World War II posts. Camp Breckinridge, near the town of Morganfield, Ky. (population, 4,300), has mushroomed from a ghost camp to a busy training center with 25,567 troops and 1,175 civilians. Camp Rucker, at Daleville, Ala. (population, 1,000), has grown into a 30,000-man center. Camp Leonard Wood, near Waynesville, Mo. (population, 2,000), has 32,000 men. All three camps were reactivated last summer to train the new divisions being raised for service in the emergency.

Many of the trainees insisted on bringing their families with them, despite warnings of Army officers of inadequate housing facilities. Perhaps the Army should have ordered the men to leave their families home, instead of merely advising them to. But there is a morale factor that must be considered in unnecessarily separating men from their families and sometimes this factor outweighs other considerations. So the camps soon filled to overflowing with military personnel and the little towns nearby were swamped

with servicemen and their families. Small wonder that barns and sheds were pressed into service for the overflow.

The Army Department has not been unconcerned about this situation. Trailer camps have been set up in some places and more are planned. Secretary Pace says that local authorities have been urged to provide more and better housing—a difficult task for communities which saw the camps evacuated after World War II and which have no assurance that another evacuation will not follow easing of the present emergency. An investment in housing now could become a total waste tomorrow. But more trailer communities should be feasible. And local authorities can help to relieve conditions by enforcing sanitary regulations, exposing profiteering, and applying rent controls wherever possible. The problem, in short, is one which requires a fine degree of cooperation between camp officials and the residents of adjacent towns. Apparently there was not sufficient coordination of efforts in the first rush of the remobilization program.

Korean Policy After the Cease-Fire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the editorial page of the Washington Post of July 19 carried a very interesting letter by Mr. Yongjeung Kim, president of the Korean Affairs Institute, who is one of the leading spirits among Koreans in this country. Mr. Kim suggests a program for Korea. While I am not ready to pass judgment on the several points made in Mr. Kim's program, I think it is an extremely interesting one and worthy of attention and consideration. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KOREAN POLICY AFTER THE CEASE-FIRE

The World's spotlight is focused on the truce meeting at the thirty-eighth parallel. The talks must succeed if the war-ravaged Korean people are to survive.

A cease-fire arrangement is the first step toward peace. The fact that it will end the bloodshed and destruction will make it acceptable to most Koreans, regardless of other considerations. Differences as to the future of Korea must not therefore be allowed to interfere with a prompt conclusion of a cease-fire agreement.

Koreans do not want to continue to be pawns in a struggle between the great powers. They want peace and the opportunity to determine their own fate. "All occupations are failures"—as General MacArthur said at Wake Island—regardless of the fine principles and motives behind them. Ignoring this truth will be a grave mistake.

As soon as an armistice is arranged, therefore, the statesmen should allow the Korean people to reunite their country and put their own house in order. How can this be done? Most Koreans—as well as others truly concerned with the future of the Far East—feel that the solution requires the following steps:

1. Creation of a peace committee, composed of near eastern and Asian representatives

and/or others to expedite the unification of Korea and the restoration of her independence. This body should be empowered to act as an interim national authority until a unified Korean government is established through national elections.

2 Organization of an advisory body, to consult and assist the peace committee, composed of one Korean from each province who is of good reputation, who at no time served under either of the present regimes, and who is not considered a former collaborator in the Japanese rule.

3 Dissolution of the two existing governments, since neither enjoys popular confidence, to provide the people with an unhampered opportunity to shape their own future (If the leaders of both sides would resign voluntarily, they would render a great service to the nation.)

4 Immediate establishment of local governments, through popular elections observed by the peace committee, to assume local civil and police functions from the present regimes.

5 Withdrawal of all foreign forces and simultaneous demobilization of all Korean troops under the supervision of the peace committee, to create a peaceful atmosphere before a general election.

6 Establishment of a national government through a general election observed by the peace committee soon after the local administrations are set up.

7 Neutralization of Korea through a guaranty by the members of the United Nations and China to respect Korean independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity and to seek no special political or economic privileges.

8 An immediate start on reconstruction and rehabilitation of Korea by all nations, under the leadership of the United Nations, with a schedule that envisions substantial completion in 3 years, as a symbol of human conscience and a fitting monument to world peace.

The Korean problem can never be solved unless the Korean people are entrusted with their own destiny. Nor can it be settled as long as two rival Korean regimes are supported and condoned by foreign powers. Any attempt to save or merge the present governments will only perpetuate the long-standing evil. The Korean people must be free from the two extremist rules which they distrust and fear. It is the people—not these groups—who deserve support from the great powers in their struggle for survival and independence. It is these Koreans—not their power-grasping leaders—who have the great stake in the truce talks.

YONGJEUNG KIM,
President, Korean Affairs Institute.
WASHINGTON.

Control of Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on July 18, 1951, under the combined headline "Justice Department and FTC take separate lines on prices."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT AND FTC TAKE SEPARATE LINES ON PRICES

CAMPAIGN OPENED AGAINST COERCION OF RATE SLASHERS

The Government today announced a prompt and vigorous campaign against anyone who attempts to force cut-rate merchants to raise their prices.

Launching the campaign as an anti-inflationary measure, Attorney General McGrath warned all levels of the business world that he will move to prosecute those who seek to coerce cut-rate outlets into putting price-tags up to agreed minimum levels.

Seriously concerned

In a formal statement, he said the Justice Department is seriously concerned over reports that such attempts already have been made.

The statement indicated grand-jury action may be in the offing in some areas against this type of activity, which the Department said is in violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act. The Department declined to comment on any specific actions.

At the same time, Assistant Attorney General H. G. Morison, Chief of the Antitrust Division, said anyone who has knowledge of such practices "owes it to himself and to his country to bring such information to the attention of the Department of Justice."

Especially important now

He said conspiracies to maintain prices at levels higher than those set by active competition gain new importance in times of high prices and inflationary pressures.

The Department's new move stems directly from the Supreme Court decision of May 21 which cut the ground from under a main provision of the so-called fair-trade laws which exist in 45 States. They do not apply in the District.

That provision said a manufacturer may set the resale price for his product and require all retail outlets to abide by it. The Supreme Court ruled that such pricing agreements are legal only where the retailer voluntarily enters such an agreement with the manufacturer. Even though he is in a State where the law applies, the retailer who does not participate is not bound by the agreements.

It was this High Court ruling which set off the recent spree of price cutting in New York department stores.

NEW YORK STORES' RECENT WAR IS UNDER INVESTIGATION

NEW YORK, July 18.—Pricing policies and advertising claims of New York City's major department stores are under investigation by the Federal Trade Commission.

The action resulted from a complaint by the Better Business Bureau of New York City, which mentioned specifically the advertising claims of R. H. Macy & Co. and Gimble Bros.

Macy's was singled out for its claim that "we endeavor to save our customers at least 6 percent for cash, except on price-fixed goods," and Gimble's for its slogan, "For cash or for credit, nobody undersells Gimble's."

Charge misleading claims

The complaint charged that such claims tend to mislead and deceive the public and constitute unfair business competition of a most serious nature.

John C. Wood, chairman of the board of the bureau, said today that the bureau sent its complaint to Washington July 9. Yesterday, he said, the bureau received an acknowledgment from James M. Mead, Commission Chairman and former Senator from New York.

Mr. Mead's letter said the complaint had been referred to the Commission's investi-

gation bureau of antideceptive practices for expeditious action to determine whether such advertising warrants corrective action by the Commission.

Could issue cease order

Where it finds an unfair practice exists, the FTC can order the offender to cease, and may bring contempt action if the practice is continued.

Mr. Wood said the bureau had taken the matter up with the Trade Commission only after it had tried unsuccessfully to get merchants to discontinue voluntarily the advertising claims it held to be unfair.

The complaint brought to a head a controversy that has been building up for many years among retail merchants over advertisements about underselling. This long-standing friction flared into an open price war among several of the large department stores after a Supreme Court decision 2 months ago that manufacturers could not enforce fixed resale prices on retailers who refused to sign agreements with them.

MACY'S OUT OF BUREAU

The Better Business Bureau is financed by most of the large business and industrial concerns in the city and by many small businesses. Macy's has been out of the bureau for many years. Gimbel's is a member.

Jack I. Straus, president of Macy's, said the store had received a copy of the complaint. "It should be pointed out that the membership of the board of directors of the Better Business Bureau of New York includes several of Macy's competitors."

He said similar action in the past had resulted in dismissal of the action by the FTC.

Bernard F. Gimbel, president of Gimbel's, said any store making general underselling claims should be willing to have its books and records open to inspection by the proper authorities.

The Commission's investigation is expected to take months.

Friendly Relations Between the United States and the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the New York Times this morning carries a most timely editorial captioned "Slow mail to Moscow." The editorial deals in part with the McMahon joint resolution of friendship which, as we know, was passed by the Senate and the House of Representatives, expressing the friendship of the American people for the people of Russia. The editorial also deals with the letter of friendship written by President Truman to President Shvernik. I do not know just why President Truman's letter was addressed to President Shvernik; I never heard very much about him, although I suppose he still holds the job of President. Certainly the editorial emphasizes the fact that we should make every effort we can to let the rank and file of the people of Russia know of our friendship, as expressed in the McMahon resolution.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SLOW MAIL to Moscow

Our correspondent in Moscow reports the republication in *Izvestia* of the rather sensational article in the new Soviet English-language magazine *News* in which Eugene Tarle, the Soviet historian, argues for friendly relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. Anything published in Russia is "official," but the Tarle article becomes doubly so when it is reprinted in the government organ for the edification of the Russian people. In the same dispatch our reporter notes that no mention has appeared in the Soviet press of the McMahon resolution or President Truman's letter to President Shvernik. Both documents emphasize friendship for the Russian people and the American desire for peace, but neither has yet been made public in Russia.

Here in one lightning flash we get a simultaneous glimpse of the scene on both sides of the iron curtain. On one hand, the President and Congress of the United States, constituting together the most powerful voice on earth, cannot get a public message through to the people to whom it is addressed. The President's letter and the congressional resolution express the official policy of this country, but the only version of American policy the Soviet peoples are permitted to know is what their Government chooses to tell them.

On the other hand, for weeks and months the Soviet press has been harping day after day on the points of conflict between America and the Soviet Union. It has combed history for examples to prove that we have always had aggressive designs on Russia and insisted that we are now bent on preparing for a war to exterminate the Russian people. Then suddenly, for some reason, the Kremlin line veers, and Professor Tarle, long in disfavor, is summoned to present the opposite side of the case. He discovers that there is no basis either in history or in present conditions for the existing strain in Soviet-American relations.

A turn of the same spigot, and Moscow can switch on hot water or cold—change its policy from "hate" to "friendship." As far as the Russian people are concerned, the sleight-of-hand artists can change our policy, too, to suit their convenience. For the people can never learn what we are really thinking and saying, can never know what to believe as the knob twists from one tune to another, until, as the President said in his undelivered letter, "communication is permitted to flow, free and open, across international boundaries."

An Earlier Congress Passed a Price-Control Law; Are We Too Smart To Learn From Their Experience?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, price control by act of Congress is not a new idea. The First Continental Congress tried it in 1777. Then, as now, the scheme had wide popular support.

Then, as now, prices rose in spite of price-control laws.

Then, as now, the Government was using irredeemable paper money. That

paper money ended up worth less than 1 percent of its original value.

Will the New Deal printing-press money end the same way?

It is too early to tell—but this much can be forecast with accuracy—unless sound money is restored, which means a currency redeemable in gold, the American dollar will some day meet the fate of all previous irredeemable currencies.

Price control by statute ignores all natural law and the teachings of history.

If persisted in, one does not need to be a prophet to foresee its ultimate consequences.

The revolutionary experience and consequences of price control are vividly described in the following paragraphs:

In the beginning of 1777, Congress, with the warm approval of the great body of the people, determined to enter into a course which the more sagacious men in America knew to be little better than insane. It imagined that it could regulate all prices by law, and maintain them at a level greatly below that which the normal operation of the law of supply and demand had determined. Laws with this object were speedily made in all the States.

The prices of labor, of food, of every kind of manufacture, of all domestic articles, were strictly regulated, and committees employed to see that these prices were not exceeded.

The measure, of course, aggravated the very evil it was intended to diminish. Goods that were already very rare and greatly needed were carefully concealed and withdrawn from sale lest they should be purchased at prices below their real value.

In most cases the law was disregarded, and sellers continued to sell, sometimes secretly, sometimes openly, at prices higher than the law permitted, charging an additional sum to compensate them for the risk they incurred.

Mob violence directed against the "engrossers, monopolizers, and forestallers," combinations of the more patriotic merchants binding themselves to sell only at the authorized prices, newspaper denunciations, and occasional legal punishments, were all insufficient and impotent; and in September 1777, John Adams wrote that in his sincere opinion the act for limiting prices, if not repealed, would "ruin the State, and introduce a civil war."

At last, in October 1778, Congress voted that "all limitations of prices of gold and silver be taken off," but the States continued for some time longer to endeavor to regulate prices by legislation.

Still more terrible in their consequences than the attempted limitation of prices were the laws which were passed by the different States at the invitation of Congress, making paper money legal tender, compelling all persons to receive it in full payment of debts or obligations contracted before the Revolution, and pronouncing those who refused to do so enemies of the liberty of America.

Few laws have spread a greater amount of distress, dishonesty, and injustice through a great community.

All those who subsisted on life incomes or fixed rents or interest of money found their incomes rapidly reduced to a small fraction of their previous value; while, on the other hand, vast wealth was suddenly created, as the whole debtor class were enabled to free themselves from their obligations.

Debts incurred in gold were paid off in depreciated paper which was only worth a twentieth, a thirtieth, a fortieth, or fiftieth part of its real value.

They were legally extinguished by a payment which was in reality not 1 shilling or sixpence or even threepence on the pound sterling. In a country where debtors were

extremely numerous, and where the whole social and economic system rested on the relation of debtor and creditor, this law opened the door to the most enormous and far-reaching fraud, but it acted differently on different classes, and this difference had an important influence upon the fortunes of the Revolution.

To the laborer who lived upon his daily wages, the depreciation was of little moment, especially if he had been too improvident to lay by any store for the future. Earning and spending in the same currency, the change was no disadvantage to him, and he was even benefited by the unnatural stimulus which the immense quantities of paper money thrown suddenly upon the market had given to all kinds of labor.

On the other hand, the wealthy and the saving and the helpless classes were in general utterly ruined.

Debts of merchants which had been contracted when goods were cheapest and had often been for years on the books were now discharged in paper not a twentieth part of the real value.

Widows and orphans in great numbers, who had been left fortunes in money, were paid off by guardians, trustees, or executors in depreciated paper.

Old men who had lent out the savings of industrious lives, and had been living comfortably upon the interest, were fortunate if they did not receive back their principal shrunk to perhaps a fiftieth part of its original value.

Everyone who had been sufficiently saving to lend was impoverished.

Everyone who had been reckless and improvident in borrowing was enriched, and "truth, honor, and justice," in the emphatic words of a contemporary American historian, "were swept away by the overflowing deluge of legal iniquity."

Among the enterprising men who had thrown themselves into the first movement of the revolution were many of broken fortunes and doubtful antecedents, many ardent speculators, many clever and unscrupulous adventurers. Such men found in the violent depreciation, the local variations, and the sudden fluctuations of the currency a ready path to fortune, and they soon acquired a new and sinister interest in the continuance of the struggle.

Among others, the gentleman who called himself Earl of Stirling, and who had attained the position of brigadier general in the American service, had entered it overwhelmed with debt, but by availing himself of the condition of the currency, he is stated to have paid off debts amounting to nearly 80,000 pounds with 1,000 pounds of gold and silver. Very seldom in the history of the world had the race for wealth been so keen, or the passion for speculation so universal, or the standard of public honesty so low.

"The first visible effect," wrote a contemporary American economist, "of an augmentation of the medium and the consequent fluctuation of value was a host of jockeys, who followed a species of itinerant commerce, and subsisted upon the ignorance and honesty of the country people; or, in other words, upon the difference in the value of the currency in different places."

"Perhaps we may safely estimate that not less than 20,000 men in America left honest callings and applied themselves to this knavish traffic." "The manners of the continent," wrote the Committee of Foreign Affairs in March 1778, "are too much affected by the depreciation of our currency."

"Scarce an officer but feels something of a desire to be concerned in mercantile speculation, from finding that his salary is inadequate to the harpy demands which are made upon him for the necessities of life and from observing that but little skill is necessary to constitute one of the merchants of these days."

"Speculation," wrote Washington, "peculation, engrossing, forestalling, with all their

concomitants, afford too many melancholy proofs of the decay of public virtue."

The vast gains rapidly acquired by privateering, the enormous rate of insurance, the enormous prices given for such European goods as arrived safely in America, had already produced a spirit of fierce and general gambling which the depreciation and fluctuation of the currency immeasurably increased.

Immense fortunes were suddenly accumulated; and, in the gloomiest period of the struggle, Philadelphia was a scene of the wildest and maddest luxury.

Many years after the peace with England had been signed the older Americans could clearly trace in the prevailing spirit of recklessness and dishonest speculation the demoralizing effects on the national character of the years of the depreciated currency. (History of England, by William E. H. Lecky, vol. IV, pp. 36-40.)

Mexican Farm Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Wetback Curbs Sought by Truman," which appeared in the New York Times of July 14, be printed in the Appendix of the Record. This article explains the comprehensive program to improve the lot of migratory farm workers which the President requested when he signed the bill authorizing the recruitment of Mexican farm workers.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WETBACK CURBS SOUGHT BY TRUMAN—PRESIDENT ASKS BROAD PROGRAM TO CONTROL MEXICAN LABOR AND IMPROVE FARM CONDITIONS

(By Louis Stark)

WASHINGTON, July 13.—President Truman proposed today that Congress provide a comprehensive program to improve the lot of migratory farm workers.

Mr. Truman signed yesterday the bill authorizing the recruitment of Mexican farm workers after congressional leaders had assured him that further legislation and appropriations would follow. Mr. Truman urged this program in a special message today:

1. A law to punish those who may harbor or conceal wetbacks (Mexican farm laborers who wade or swim the Rio Grande).

2. A law to permit the Immigration and Naturalization Service to inspect without a warrant places of employment where they have reason to believe illegal immigrants are working or quartered.

Soon after the President's message had been read, Representative EMANUEL Celler, Democrat, of New York, announced that he would offer a bill to implement the President's proposals.

It will seek a fine of \$1,000 or a year in jail or both for transporting aliens into the United States illegally, for concealing or harboring them or knowingly offering them employment.

The bill also would authorize immigration officers to enter any private property, other than a dwelling, where the officer has reason to believe an alien illegally in this country may be found.

The President also suggested a supplemental appropriation enabling the Immigration and Naturalization Service to expand its enforcement personnel as well as immediate congressional action to vote more funds for the Farm Placement Bureau of the Department of Labor.

H. L. Mitchell, president of the National Farm Labor Union, AFL, said today that unless the President sees to it that the Labor Department carries out its responsibilities regarding the farm-labor program better than in the past, increased appropriations for the Farm Placement Service will mean little to the American farmer.

"The present Farm Placement Service is grower-dominated and spends 98 percent of its efforts in working out plans to import cheap foreign labor for exploitation by industrialized farm enterprises," he declared.

These proposals, the President told Congress, would not take care of all problems affecting migratory farm labor. He pointed out that the President's Commission on Migratory Labor recently had submitted a very useful and constructive document that called for many additional changes in handling migratory labor.

Indicating his desire to see other recommendations by his Commission adopted, the President promised to submit additional suggestions to Congress for improvement in the working conditions and living standards of migrant workers.

The new law scarcely touches the problem of the wetback, he said. Last year, 500,000 of these illegal immigrants were returned to Mexico, he declared, and 300,000 the year before.

The presence of these illegal workers, according to the message, had depressed seriously wages and working conditions in the Southwest. Use of these illegal employees has affected legal contract workers from Mexico, as well as American farm workers, the President pointed out.

Safeguards provided in the law have little meaning, the President noted, if illegal immigration continued and if these employees were used by American employers to take the place of other workers.

Therefore, he declared, illegal immigration must be stopped and the use of our domestic labor force must be improved.

In advocating the punishment of anyone harboring or concealing aliens, the President pointed out that there was such a law on the statute books, but that it was not enforceable because penalties were not provided. To discourage the smuggling of aliens, he proposed that existing laws be strengthened.

The President was not satisfied merely with stopping illegal immigration, but also insisted that we must improve the utilization of our own citizens in the farm labor force.

As a first step toward this end, he asked that the Labor Department's machinery for ascertaining labor-market needs be surveyed to find how many contract workers to bring across the borders.

Jailing of Oatis Proves Disregard for Freedom of Press Under Soviet Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to

place in the Record two newspaper articles which compare the conditions under which agents of the Soviet Union gather news in the United States and representatives of our free press attempt to gather news behind the Iron curtain. These articles appeared in the Washington Daily News for Friday, July 20, 1951.

The summary action of the Communist rulers of Czechoslovakia in jailing the American newspaperman, Mr. Oatis, is further proof that under the Communist regime there is no freedom of the press:

SOVIET'S FEDOROV ROAMS CAPITOL AND WHITE HOUSE

(By Andrew Tully)

Mikhail Fedorov is a chubby little man with wavy brown hair and baggy trousers who lives in fashionable Quebec Place here and is seen often at the White House and State Department.

So what, you say?

So this: Mikhail Fedorov is a Russian who bosses the official Soviet news agency, Tass. And while AP Correspondent Bill Oatis languishes in a Czech jail as a "spy," Mikhail Fedorov moves freely about official Washington, enjoying the same special privileges granted American reporters.

ACCOMPANIES TRUMAN

Mike Fedorov attends all President Truman's press conferences. Like the other reporters, he can accompany the President on trips so long as Tass pays his expenses.

Mike Fedorov is one of five reporters in Washington representing Tass or the Communist Daily Worker, of New York. The others are all Americans—or, rather they are citizens of the United States.

In New York, headquarters for the United Nations and thus Moscow's principal propaganda outlet in the west, the roster of Soviet-employed newsmen is even larger. Tass has 15, including 9 American citizens; and the Moscow newspaper, Pravda, and something called the All-Union Radio Committee each has 1, both Russians.

Second in command to Mike Fedorov in the Tass bureau here is Larry Todd, a slim, pink-complexioned man. Mr. Todd was head of the bureau for many years until his bosses in Moscow suddenly sent Mr. Fedorov over here a few years ago to supplant him.

DESK AT STATE DEPARTMENT

The other two Tass bureau members are Jean Montgomery and Euphemia K. Virden. Completing the Washington roll is the Daily Worker's correspondent, Rob F. Hall, a bulky, amiable, pipe-smoking man.

Mr. Todd is Tass' State Department reporter, and has a special cubicle in the department's spacious press room, complete with desk, typewriter, and telephone service. Miss Montgomery is assigned to Capitol Hill and Miss Virden handles assorted assignments. Mr. Hall covers a little bit of everything for the Daily Worker, in addition to writing a daily Washington column.

There is no ban on where these people may go in search of news. They are not even excluded from the Pentagon's daily military briefings on the situation in Korea, although to date no Tass or Daily Worker correspondent has appeared at one of them.

IKE APPROVED BAN

Miss Montgomery did attend Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower's press conference just before he left on his first look-see tour of Europe. When she asked to be allowed to be present, Defense Department press officials checked to see if it was O. K. The military was opposed, but the White House, State Department, and General Ike himself all insisted she be permitted to attend.

Miss Montgomery also attended the briefing held by Lt. Gen. Elwood P. Quesada on the atomic bomb tests at Eniwetok and the press conference held by Defense Secretary George C. Marshall upon his return from Korea.

Tass, of course, also bought the full transcript of the Senate hearings on the discharge of Gen. Douglas MacArthur during which many military secrets came out.

OFFICIALS AT DISADVANTAGE

There's no doubt, though, that the presence of these representatives of international communism put United States officials at a disadvantage. This was emphasized a couple of years ago when Senator BRIEN McMAHON, Democrat of Connecticut, chairman of the joint congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, was having a press conference.

Suddenly Mr. McMAHON broke off the press conference. He explained, "I can't say anything more with that representative of the Kremlin present." He was referring to Jean Montgomery, sitting unobtrusively in a corner.

MINOR INCONVENIENCES

At the White House, Press Secretary Joseph H. Short, Jr., also has to be cautious. Whenever he wants to let the press know that the President is making a trip, but doesn't want it announced immediately for security reasons, he has to call the White House corps in one by one; if he called a press conference Moscow would get all the dope within an hour.

But these are minor inconveniences for these agents of Communist Russia. True, they resent them because it is their job to obtain as much information as possible. But Bill Oatis, from his Czech cell, would tell them they were pretty lucky.

AMERICA'S OATIS SITS LOCKED IN A PRAGUE PRISON

(By Kermit McFarland)

Paid news reporters from Communist countries in Europe may roam Washington, New York and other United States points at will.

But there are no American reporters roaming Communist Czechoslovakia.

There is only one American reporter in Czechoslovakia—he's in prison.

The rest either have been kicked out or beat it in time to escape the fate of William N. Oatis, the slight, shy Associated Press reporter who got 10 years after a rigged-up trial in which he was charged with spying.

ORDERED FROM PRAGUE

In Czechoslovakia B. C. (before Communism) there normally were 25 to 30 western newspaper men—American, French, or English.

Four American reporters were ordered out of Prague last year. Two others escaped just in time, one after Mr. Oatis was arrested last April. And still another, who quit Prague on a routine transfer 2 years ago, since has been accused of spying by Communist propaganda.

American and other outside newspapermen had been unwelcome in Czechoslovakia since the Communists took over in 1948. Their situation became more and more unpleasant as the Reds tightened their grip on the once-democratic republic.

But it was not until last year that the Communists really cracked down on the intruders.

In January 1950, they ordered two American newsmen out of the country. They were Richard Kaschke of the Associated Press, now in Germany, and Rob Roy Buckingham of the United Press.

OUSTED TWO MORE

Three months later they ousted two more—Nathan Polowetzky of the AP, now in Korea, and John Higgins of the UP. Mr. Polowetzky's name was used freely in the Oatis trial. The prosecution referred to him as "the spy, Polowetzky."

Dana Adams Schmidt of the New York Times left Prague in May, last year, just before Mr. Oatis went there. He had been tipped off he was about to be arrested and his name had been hooked up to so-called espionage activities in trials inflicted on some unfortunate Czechs.

After Mr. Oatis' arrest last April, the United Press ordered its Prague correspondent, Russell Jones, to Frankfurt, Germany. Mr. Jones thought he was coming out for a day's conference, but his employers told him to stay out.

FORCED EMBASSY CUT

A. I. Goldberg, chief of the Associated Press bureau in Prague when the Communists took over, left there 2 years ago on a routine transfer. But in the Oatis trial, he was pictured as head of an espionage ring.

The Communists didn't stop at ejecting newsmen.

They forced the American Embassy in Prague to cut its staff, first by two-thirds, later to 12 persons. And they closed United States free libraries in Prague and Bratislava, arresting and convicting four of the Czech employees for espionage.

ALL RELEASES CENSORED

He said all he did was follow his routine duties in supplying information and news about America. Actually, all the releases distributed by Mr. Kolarek had been censored by Czech officials.

The newsmen who were lucky enough merely to be expelled were accused of unobjective reporting. The facts are the Czech Communists imposed such severe restrictions on imperialist newsmen that it was practically impossible to learn anything—or use it if they did.

SELDOM AT CONFERENCES

Joseph C. Kolarek, the information officer at the American Embassy, was given 3 days to get out of Czechoslovakia. He got.

Mr. Kolarek, now in a State Department office here, was accused of a slanderous campaign against Czechoslovakia.

They seldom were permitted at official press conferences and ultimately their only sources of information were the official news agency and the Communist radio.

Since Mr. Jones, of the UP, left Prague, there are only six American newsmen left anywhere behind the iron curtain—covering an area of 70,000,000 persons. And one of them represents the Communist Daily Worker in New York.

All of them are in Moscow—and you know how much real news they can gather there.

Inflation in the Building Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Surplus Heads," published in the Wall Street Journal of July 18, 1951, dealing with the activities of the Federal Government in the attempt to take inflation out of the building industry.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SURPLUS HEADS

The Federal Government lately has been going through quite a few gyrations to take the inflation out of the building industry.

It has used tighter mortgage regulations, allocation of building materials, and what are in effect licensing arrangements to restrict certain types of building—all for the announced purpose of reducing the demand, and hence the price pressure, on building materials and skilled labor.

But surprisingly—well, perhaps not so surprisingly at that—the Government hasn't done anything to check the most fertile source of inflation in the building industry, Government building. On the contrary, the construction programs of the Government which are under Government sponsorship seem to be booming along at an increased pace.

The situation in Los Angeles, as reported by our Mr. Rees, is an extreme case, but not a unique one. There a \$111,000,000 public housing project is under way which with older projects will provide a Government home for nearly 1 in every 20 Los Angelenos. You might think from this that housing was short in Los Angeles. It isn't. Vacancies in private dwellings there are the highest since the thirties. A recent survey showed, among other things, 2,000 apartments renting for less than \$40 a month—and vacant.

Across the country, private housing construction declined 7 percent between May and June. But did total housing construction decline so as to relieve the pressure on building materials? Not at all. More than 42,000 public housing units were launched in Government-sponsored projects. This means that total housing construction increased—from 97,000 units in May to 144,300 units in June.

So we have the Government's regulation X to curtail the credit to private homebuilders. And we have Government-sponsored projects, like the Los Angeles one, creating millions in new credit by issuing bonds guaranteed by the United States Treasury.

We have a tight materials-allocation program to insure that needed materials go into defense work at the expense of the homebuilder and the private apartment builder. And we have the Government, all over the country, competing vigorously for the scarce materials to build Government apartments. To build them, incidentally, where there is already surplus housing.

One local realtor remarked, "We need public housing in Los Angeles like we need a hole in the head." Well, looking at the Government's criss-crossed anti-inflation program in the building industry, it strikes us that there's a surplus of heads of that model.

Propaganda Trial of Archbishop Stepinac Was Embarrassing Mistake for Tito

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Embarrassing Mistake," which appeared in the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal of July 16, 1951:

EMBARRASSING MISTAKE

In his swing away from the Stalinist pattern of communism toward a government a little more compatible with the democratic West, where his best hope of survival now rests, Marshal Tito has been trying to undo some of the political mistakes of recent years.

One of these mistakes was the propaganda trial of Archbishop Joseph Stepinac. The

Catholic prelate was sentenced in 1946 to 16 years in prison for alleged collaboration with the enemy, and subversive activities. It was one of the early efforts to undermine organized religion among the satellite nations and followed a familiar Soviet pattern.

That the archbishop is now an embarrassing prisoner has been made apparent by the attempts of the Yugoslav Government to free him without repudiating the evidence it once manufactured.

He was offered his freedom if he would leave the country immediately. The archbishop replied that leaving the country was a matter to be decided by his ecclesiastical superior, Pope Pius XIII.

So the Yugoslavs next made their offer to the Vatican. And the Vatican has replied that while it would very much like to see the archbishop freed, Archbishop Stepinac wishes to remain near his faithful, and so the Vatican will respect his wishes in the matter.

And so the archbishop remains in prison, an increasingly strong symbol of faith in God and mankind. It must indeed be difficult for Marshal Tito to retrace the path he once embarked on. If his regeneration is to be sincere, it will have to be complete.

Power Payoff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oregon Daily Journal of July 17, 1951:

POWER PAYOFF

As usual the United States Senate is showing a more thorough understanding of the need for western power and reclamation than is the House of Representatives.

The House Appropriations Committee threatened to wreck the Pacific Northwest's power development program by slashing \$60,100,000 from 1952 budget requests.

It voted to cut the appropriation for McNary Dam (key to the current Columbia Basin program) by \$6,900,000. It disallowed the \$10,000,000 sought for continuing the Albeni Falls project. It cut Detroit Dam \$2,000,000 and Hungry Horse Dam \$1,000,000. It threw out completely appropriations sought to start The Dalles Dam on the Columbia, Ice Harbor on the lower Snake and Hells Canyon on the upper Snake.

The House committee also slashed deeply into the Bonneville Power Administration's request for funds for transmission lines and substations, maintenance and operation. It cut \$7,000,000 from the construction budget and recommended a 10-percent, across-the-board reduction in personnel.

The Senate Appropriations Committee subsequently restored \$5,000,000 to the BPA construction budget and voted to limit the personnel cut to administrative personnel. And the Senate itself voted 57 to 19 against cutting \$16,000,000 from going reclamation projects.

All power interests of the Pacific Northwest, public and private, have united in requesting the Senate Appropriation Committee to restore House cuts for McNary, Albeni Falls, Ice Harbor, The Dalles, and the Dexter re-regulating dam at Lookout Point.

The Columbia basin interagency committee, composed of Pacific Northwest repre-

sentatives of Federal agencies and State governments, has requested the defense mobilization board to intercede with the Senate committee in behalf of the same projects.

Five of the Pacific Northwest's six Senators, Senator Cordon being the only exception, voted in favor of starting new projects in eight States.

As pointed out by the Pacific Northwest Public Power bulletin, cuts proposed by the House committee would have the same effect as would the bombing of Bonneville dam. They would reduce aluminum production by 100,000 tons a year and they would continue the Pacific Northwest's power shortage indefinitely.

Only excuse given by the House committee for its devastating cuts was an unwillingness to appropriate any funds for new projects and the opposition of the fish interests.

We submit that this is false economy and faulty reasoning.

The Pacific Northwest is dangerously short of power.

This places severe restrictions on industrial development and war connected industries such as the light metal and heavy chemical, shipbuilding, and aviation industries.

And increasingly heavy and imperative power demands are being made by the Hanford plutonium plant.

The power projects at issue are self liquidating. The region's Federal power system has already returned more than \$224,000,000 to the United States Treasury, making possible a net profit of \$68,000,000.

In short, Uncle Sam's investment in Columbia basin power development has proved sound.

It should be continued on a systematic, business-like basis.

Hold the Line—Real Estate Man Pleads in Support of Defense Production Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a letter I received from a real-estate broker in my district who expresses his feelings on the Defense Production Act. I feel that every citizen interested in the welfare of the country should read the fine thoughts of my constituent. The letter follows:

Congressman MELVIN PRICE,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MEL: I am much concerned by the tremendous effort being made by many business, industrial, and farm groups to block continuation of an effective control bill to prevent further inflation. Although the present control legislation hurts "business as usual," I am convinced that positive controls are necessary and that voluntary plans are no good whatsoever. I know that the general public in this area is in accord with the thinking of Charles E. Wilson and Eric Johnston on this matter of controls and inflation.

Being in the real-estate business in a heavy industrial area, I know that many industrial workers in need of homes are suffering considerable hardship under regulation X. Of course, this situation has ad-

versely affected our business and the construction of necessary housing, but regardless of the personal sacrifice, we should hold the price line and do the job needed for defense preparedness. It is folly to underestimate the constantly worsening international situation.

I hope that my 46 months' active duty during World War II and subsequent 66 months' Organized Reserve status proves not to have been in vain. It's time for statesmanlike action in Congress; let's hold the line and stay prepared. If we need more taxes to pay as we go, let's raise more taxes. With best personal regards, I am

Respectfully yours,

Ethical Standards in the Government Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent and stimulating statement on ethical standards in the Government service, presented before the special subcommittee of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, considering this subject, by Mr. Benjamin V. Cohen, former counselor of the State Department, and member of the United States delegation to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF MR. BENJAMIN V. COHEN ON ETHICAL STANDARDS IN THE GOVERNMENT SERVICE, BEFORE THE SENATE LABOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 21, JULY 3, 1951

I am glad to appear before the committee on its invitation to say a few words on the maintenance of ethical standards in the Government service. While not now in the Government service, I have served in Government in various capacities for more than 15 years.

Whatever differences there may be as to the proper activities of a modern state, I believe that there should be general agreement that a highly trained, competent, and trustworthy Government service is a well-nigh indispensable adjunct of effective, democratic government in our time.

Moral standards in Government inevitably reflect the moral standards of the community. But as Government service in the higher and more important echelons involves the exercise of a public trust, it is important that the moral standards in such echelons should reflect the highest and not the lowest standards of the community.

I think on the whole moral standards in Government service do compare quite favorably, as they should for the reasons I have stated, with moral standards outside of Government.

But nonetheless the maintenance of high ethical standards in Government is too important to be taken for granted. We should constantly be on guard against the erosion of standards in Government by reason of public neglect, complaisance, indifference and at times hostility.

While the public should be alert to guard against and to condemn departures from the high standards which the public has a right to expect in its Government, loyal, faithful, and competent public servants are entitled to the respect and appreciation of the public that they serve. It is a little unfortunate that disinterested devotion and enterprise in the public service are not always recognized and that it is sometimes thought that promotion and confirmation may more readily be secured by those who do not put their necks out.

Departures from high standards on the part of a few Government servants are no excuse for the indiscriminate maligning and abuse of Government servants.

Obsolete and cantankerous notions of what the Government service really is, still color too much of our public thinking about the Government service. The old notion still survives to some extent that Government jobs are easy jobs obtained through political favoritism by those who cannot make the grade outside Government. The notion still survives to some extent that Government servants are bureaucrats delighting in the proliferation of red tape and obstructing and not facilitating the operations of Government.

And to these old notions that Government officials are proverbially lazy, stupidly wooden, and painfully inefficient has been added the equally perverse notion that Government officials who are neither lazy, stupid, nor inefficient are prone to be worse; they are reputed to be overzealous or punitive in their ideas of law administration and enforcement.

While of course there are great differences among our Government servants as there are among any large group of our people, nonetheless as a whole they are honest, hard-working, and intelligent and among them are found many men and women of exceptionally high character, ability, and devotion. I recall only recently speaking with a large industrialist who was indulging in some of the stereotyped complaints against Government bureaucrats. I took some satisfaction in being able to point out to him that two of his top and trusted advisers only a few years ago had been vilified as arch Government bureaucrats.

But much more serious in its possible effect on the public service is the notion that has recently been exploited that disloyalty and immorality are rampant in the Government service. I am deeply convinced that the detection and rooting out of the black sheep is made more difficult and not less difficult by smearing the whole flock.

It is one thing to review the qualifications of officials holding security-sensitive positions to make certain that they clearly measure up to the high standards which should be required of those in such positions, and to make promptly such changes as may be in the public interest. But it is quite another thing to expose all public servants to the peril of being denounced by secret informers, and of being adjudged suspect of disloyalty and being declared ineligible for any public position on undisclosed evidence.

Indiscriminate attacks against the integrity of the Government service are themselves a threat to the integrity of the Government service. In this connection I should like to draw your attention to an article by Mr. James Reston, in the New York Times of June 19, 1951, in which he points out that Foreign Service officers are becoming increasingly reticent in their reporting for fear that their reports may become a source of internal political controversy and for similar reasons are increasingly reluctant to accept assignments in politically sensitive areas.

When public servants become afraid of being publicly pilloried for the forthright performance of their public duties, the integrity

of the public service and the safety of the Republic are threatened. Where abuses exist in the public service they must be eliminated, but the elimination of abuses must and can be accomplished without destroying the morale and vitality of the public service.

I shall now attempt to offer a few suggestions to assist in maintaining and improving the standards of Government service.

(a) A Public Service Council: I would propose the creation of a Public Service Council to guard the integrity of the public service from threats from within or without the service.

I think such a council should be composed of retired public servants with long and distinguished records in the executive, judicial, or legislative branch of Government. It should be composed of men like Judge Learned Hand, Admiral Nimitz, Ambassador Grew, former Congressman James Wadsworth, and former Secretary Harold Ickes.

I would not burden or involve the Council in individual disciplinary proceedings. I would authorize the Council to look into situations which affect the maintenance of standards within the Government service and have the Council issue from time to time reports upon how such situations should be dealt with. I should think that such reports dealing with live situations would be more helpful than a single code of rules of conduct which gives rise to questions as to the applicability of the rules to particular situations.

I should hope that one of the situations which the Council would reveal and report on would be the operations of the loyalty and security programs and their effects on the Government service.

I should think the Council should have a small but highly competent staff. Inasmuch as experience indicates that most commissions lose some of their vigor with the lapse of time I should like to see as an experiment the whole membership of the Council and its staff changed every year or two.

In order that the Council's work should not be considered as directed solely at the elimination of abuses in a negative way, I should like to see the Council authorized to issue a limited number of degrees or citations for long-sustained and truly outstanding contributions to the public service beyond the call of duty.

(b) The establishment of permanent under secretariats for career public servants: I would also suggest that there should be established in the various departments and agencies a permanent under secretariat to be held by a career public servant. Such position should carry great standing and prestige and be suitably remunerated.

I do not think it is a good practice for a permanent public servant to look forward to the holding of a political office in his department or agency as the crowning event of his career. But the highest permanent position in a department or agency should be regarded as a position not inferior in prestige and remuneration to a Cabinet position. While I would avoid making any hard and fast rule, I do not think as a general proposition non-political career men should hold political offices or be responsible for political decisions.

It is, I think, unfortunate that we do not follow more closely the practice of other democracies in holding political officers politically responsible for the administration of their departments, instead of trying to reach back of them and make civil servants defend themselves politically. It should be the job of the political head of a department to see that his department is properly run, and if it is not, he should bear the blame, not the career men who are supposed to be subject to his directions. A high-ranking permanent career official should be able to help the career officials of lesser rank to avoid accepting responsibility for political decisions. If

a career official is constantly worried about defending politically the advice he gives his superior, his objective and nonpolitical judgment is likely to be seriously impaired. To translate expert advice into political action and into terms which will be understood by the Congress and the public, the political offices in government should as a rule be held by men with political experience and understanding.

(c) Publicity of sources of income of public officers: I would further suggest that public servants should file with the head of their department or agency a statement of their income and the sources thereof. I should also suggest that not only former public servants but all those who receive fees or other compensation for representing private clients before a department or agency should file a statement disclosing such fees and compensation with such department or agency. Such requirements might not wholly eliminate subtle trafficking in influence, but they would help to determine to what extent people are paid for their work and to what extent they are paid for their influence.

While it may be helpful to try to set up standards to govern the conduct of public servants after they withdraw from the public service as well as while they are in the public service, it is extremely difficult to legislate morals and attempts to do so may be ill-advised.

Public service should be made attractive as a permanent career and also as a temporary career. But you do not make public service attractive as a permanent or temporary career if you make it too difficult for a public servant to withdraw from the service. Able men and women want to retain some freedom of choice. If a lawyer gives 10 or 15 years to specializing in the work of the Federal Communications Commission or the Securities and Exchange Commission he would be gravely handicapped in reentering private practice if he could take no cases in the field to which he had given the best years of his life.

Private practitioners before a Government agency no less than public servants within the agency acquire special knowledge and experience from their work. But knowledge and experience may be used properly or improperly. Of course a lawyer should not take a particular case for a private client if he had worked on the other side of the same case for a private or a Government client. But a lawyer who has long and honestly served a Government agency may sometimes have more respect for the work of the agency than a lawyer who has always dealt with the agency at arm's length.

(d) The elimination of money as an influence in elections: Senator BENTON has directed the attention of the committee to the lavish use of private funds in primaries and elections. In that connection I should like to offer a concrete proposal which if accepted should, I think, make it possible for the Congress to reduce to a minimum if not eliminate altogether the need of private funds to finance political campaigns.

My proposal is that a reasonable and equal amount of free time on radio and television should be made available to all candidates in Federal, State, and local elections and primaries.

The air waves belong to the public and are not privately owned. Licenses to use the air waves should be conditioned on the licensee's undertaking to permit the free use of his facilities for reasonable periods at election time by political candidates or their chosen spokesmen. I do not believe that the exaction of such a condition would result in the surrender of any valuable wave lengths by existing licensees. The exaction of such a condition from those seeking to obtain or renew licenses to use the public's air waves seems to me to be reasonable, just, and proper.

With free radio and television time available to enable candidates to reach and present their views to the electorate, it should be feasible to limit rigidly campaign contributions and campaign expenditures.

I have long been of the opinion that it would be better and cheaper for the taxpayer in the long run for the Government to pay the necessary costs of election campaigns than to have those costs privately financed. But until the rise of the radio and television as a principal medium of campaigning there were many practical difficulties in working out a feasible scheme to eliminate the private financing of campaigns. But the availability of the radio and the television has greatly reduced these difficulties.

It would undoubtedly be a mistake to assume that all campaign contributions are improperly motivated. But when large sums of money are used to finance elections and the better-financed candidates have an advantage over their rivals, the time has come when the influence of money on elections should be eliminated.

I remember a story which may be apocryphal which used to be told in the old days when it was thought that some of the utility companies had been active in raising campaign funds. The story was to the effect that a gubernatorial candidate had to decide whether he would let the utilities or the gamblers finance his campaign and he took the gamblers' money because he thought fewer strings were attached to their money. Perhaps if the candidate had had the benefit of the work of the crime committee he would have had more difficulty in making his choice.

Be that as it may, I think that in the end in some way or other the public does pay and pays heavily for the private money that goes into campaigns. The elimination of private money as an influence on elections should help to maintain and improve the ethical standards on government and in public life.

McCarthyism Versus Trumanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very pertinent article which appeared in the Baltimore Sun this morning.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOP GOVERNOR RAIPS CRITICS—TRUMANISM NOT MCCARTHYISM IS REAL PERIL, KOHLER SAYS

MADISON, Wis., July 19.—Wisconsin's Republican Governor today invited four Democrats who had asked him to take a stand on "McCarthyism" to "join with us in an effort to throw out Trumanism."

Gov. Walter J. Kohler told the Democrats in a letter that "Senator MCCARTHY's activities please neither the Communists nor certain Democratic leaders."

"I am of course aware that you are primarily interested in getting newspaper publicity," Governor Kohler wrote. "I can assure you, however, that if you will denounce the condonation of Alger Hiss by Dean Acheson (Secretary of State); if you will excoriate the Missouri ballot frauds, the mink coat,

deep-freeze and RFC scandals, the Kansas City killings of Democrat leaders in Democrat headquarters and the general incompetence of the Democrat Party in the Nation you will get far more newspaper space than by asking my opinion of communism in government.

THROW OUT TRUMANISM

"And you will be performing a useful public service as well. I invite you to join with us in an effort to throw Trumanism and all it stands for out of our national life next year."

Kohler addressed the letter to State Senator Gaylor A. Nelson, Assemblyman William Proxmire, James E. Doyle, and Henry S. Reuss. They had asked the Governor to declare where he stood on "McCarthyism."

They referred to charges made by Senator MCCARTHY, Republican, Wisconsin, that there are Communists in the State Department and to subsequent investigations last year by the congressional committee headed by Senator Tydings, Democrat, Maryland.

The Governor said MCCARTHY's charges "have been given neither a full nor a fair hearing by the Tydings committee."

ADMINISTRATION PROTECTED

He added:

"The way in which the Tydings committee handled this investigation has left the American people with a feeling that it was only interested in protecting the Democratic administration and not in discovering whether Communist sympathizers had been able to infiltrate into this administration.

"Like Senator MCCARTHY and like all loyal American citizens, I am emphatically opposed to the infiltration of Communists into our Government, as I am unequivocally opposed to communism anywhere."

Losing Our Freedom: Through Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Losing Our Freedom: Through Treaty," written by James Ratliff and published in the Cincinnati Enquirer of July 15, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOSING OUR FREEDOM: THROUGH TREATY

(By James Ratliff)

Americans have found a new way to hand over their freedom—without firing a shot and with the United States Constitution nodding approval, says a sober Cincinnati businessman back from his third international conference.

Surprised Cincinnati audiences who have heard talks by William McGrath, president of the Williamson Heater Co., generally agree that Uncle Sam has indeed found a new way of cutting his own throat.

Mr. McGrath says we can—and do—legislate ourselves into collectivism by international treaty. For treaties, once confined to wars and things like international fishing grounds, are now being cooked up to control our everyday lives and make a joke of the Declaration of Independence.

We are "giving America away," thunders a past president of the American Bar Asso-

ciation in agreement with Mr. McGrath, a Democrat. "It's more dangerous than communism because fewer people are aware of it," chimes in a Cincinnati attorney, another Democrat.

"I have been concerned about the situation for some time," says "Mr. Republican" Senator ROBERT A. TAFT.

How is it that something that so concerns men of both political faiths has not reached the public?

"The press has been ignoring the problem of law by treaty," believes Mr. McGrath, although he is aware that legal journals have debated the subject for 2 years. And he knows the American Bar Association has considered everything from an amendment to the Constitution to special treaty clauses that they're not sure will protect America.

There are three major reasons why America is having treaty trouble:

1. America is the only country in the world which unreservedly makes any treaty supreme to any law in the land. Acts of Congress or even municipal ordinances which conflict with our international treaties are superseded. Article VI of the Constitution guarding our liberties provides this.

2. Treaties are now being dreamed up by international dreamers which would regiment us if we sign them. And if we sign them they're our supreme law. And we're close to signing several. And only half of our Government—the Senate—votes on a treaty.

3. Any time America sits down in international conferences of the 60 U. N. nations our negotiators are a free enterprise island in a sea of socialistic planning. Even well meaning treaties come out of such sessions in a form likely to upset our constitutional liberties.

Mr. McGrath has just returned from his third year as a delegate at the International Labor Organization in Geneva, Switzerland. Now a United Nations organization, the ILO is the sole surviving appendage of the old League of Nations. We got into it in 1934 under the urging of Mrs. Frances Perkins, then Secretary of Labor. The U. N. took it over after World War II.

The purpose of the ILO is laudable—endeavoring to raise labor standards all over the world, Mr. McGrath reports. This means better working conditions, higher living standards and fuller recognition of the rights of employees. Obviously, these embrace tremendous goals in other countries, he notes.

To accomplish these aims, the ILO operates like a congress and passes resolutions, recommendations, and conventions. The first two are nice friendly suggestions that every country ought to turn into law. Conventions are actual drafts of laws, and each country is supposed to submit the convention for ratification to its own lawmakers. For the United States such ratification, by the Senate alone, automatically creates supreme law.

Some of the proposals being pushed at ILO include ideas like nation-wide collective bargaining (which could mean actual communism, with a small "c"), abolishment of all private employment agencies, and legalization of the closed shop. In the latter case, a treaty to this effect could, theoretically, slip through the Senate alone and create law that Congress as a whole has rejected.

Mr. McGrath points out that much more far-reaching treaties are emerging elsewhere in the U. N., too.

The covenant of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is a virtual world constitution. If it passes the United States Senate and is signed by the President we may find that we have traded away some of our precious Bill of Rights.

Instead of the rights charted for us by men like Thomas Jefferson, we would find ourselves part to an ambiguous document originally authored by 3 Russians, 14 assorted

U. N. members, and 1 lone American. The lone American was Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

The U. N. Covenant on Human Rights is an honest attempt to bring decency and liberty to the world by setting down on paper a virtual world constitution that the U. N. hopes some day all nations will adhere to. But many Americans find it far inferior to the Constitution it could conceivably supplant in America.

No great reform in the world today more strikingly illustrates our dilemma than the genocide (race murder) treaty now in a Senate committee. Who could frown on a law designed to punish horrible crimes like the deliberate Nazi attempt to wipe out whole races in murder camps?

Yet the way the law is worded many lawyers insist it could possibly drag Americans before international tribunals for minor racial arguments in any American village. That's not the kind of law our forefathers came over here to establish.

Is it just a theory that treaties take precedence over American laws? After all, for 162 years of our Constitution we've never had much complaint.

"We've never had treaties like we have today," says Mr. McGrath, pointing to a famous case in California. Out there an alien Japanese just tossed California's land law into the Pacific Ocean. How? He based his case on the U. N. Charter and the appellate court upheld him with 12 ominous words:

"The United Nations Charter has become the supreme law of the land."

Another Japanese beat a Seattle municipal ordinance to get a pawnbroker's license; a sailor hurt in Naples sued the United States Government, both under international treaty. Some foreign attorneys couldn't even wait until we ratified the Declaration of Human Rights.

They demanded freedom of the 11 convicted United States Commies under it in a complaint filed with the U. N. If the Senate had already ratified the treaty, then American citizens convicted in an American court for violating an American law might have been freed.

Maybe all these things are only symptoms, but Mr. McGrath believes the doctor should be called before the disease becomes incurable.

They Told Us Then

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the President and others have placed so much emphasis on what has been said by the spokesmen for organized industry, and recently the President was so bitterly critical of these spokesmen, that I feel the Record should carry at least some observations on this subject contrary to that view.

June 14 President Truman made a radio appeal to the people of this country urging them to line up behind his recommendations for a stronger price control law, a longer price control law, and altogether he led millions of people to believe that all we needed to do to save our economic life was just to pass another law.

Mr. Henry Hazlitt, in Newsweek of July 2, 1951, made some pertinent observations, and under the unanimous

consent granted to me to revise and extend my remarks, including certain material, I now submit these observations as a part of the debate:

THEY TOLD US THEN

(By Henry Hazlitt)

Mr. Truman's radio appeal of June 14 exposed more than ever the logical and factual weaknesses of the administration's case for price control.

"These people who say we should throw out price controls and rent controls," the President said, "are all wrong. They are just as wrong now as they were back in 1946. They told us then that if we would just put an end to price controls, everything would be rosy and prices would stay right in line."

Though prominent labor leaders and farm groups have been opposing the continuance of price-and-wage controls, Mr. Truman picked the National Association of Manufacturers to symbolize the whole opposition. "The NAM," he said, "put full-page advertisements in the papers all over the country [in 1946] saying if we would just take off price controls, there would be plenty of things to buy at reasonable prices."

The NAM did make the mistake of implying that if price controls were removed, the competition and increased production resulting would in themselves bring down prices. But what Mr. Truman has forgotten is that this mistake was not confined to the NAM. It was President Truman himself who, on February 14, 1946, declared: "Production is our salvation. . . . Production will do away with the necessity for Government controls." And Chester Bowles, his price administrator, said 4 days later: "Production is the only answer to inflation."

I recall these statements because I quoted and took issue with them in an article in the New York Times of February 25, 1946. I pointed out then that such statements represented "at most only a half-truth. . . . For prices are determined not only from the side of supply, but from the side of demand. Demand is now far greater than it was before the war because money incomes are far greater. And money incomes are greater principally because the supply of money and bank credit has been almost tripled since the outbreak of the war. . . . the solution to the problem of high prices, in brief, is not production alone. It is the production of more goods combined with the cessation of production of more money and bank credit."

Returning to the subject in the Times of May 6, 1946, I wrote: "Unless there is a radical change in our monetary and credit policy, the upward pressure on prices today seems likely to continue for at least several years. . . . The cure for the present inflation is a change in Federal fiscal and money policy, not constant renewals of price control."

Prices in fact continued to go up, not because price control was taken off, but because the administration continued to increase the supply of money and credit. At the end of April of this year, the total demand and time bank deposits and currency outside of banks was \$15,000,000,000 more than at the end of June 1946.

Mr. Truman, in his recent radio address, of course utterly ignored the fact that the upward pressure on prices today comes from his own administration's monetary and fiscal policies. And he went on to imply that those who, like himself, favored the price control, were inspired only by the loftiest patriotism, while those who opposed price control were merely lobbyists, who placed private interests above the national interest.

After the representatives of the administration testified in favor of a good, strong law, he explained, the congressional committees heard from 124 witnesses, represent-

ing all sorts of private organizations. And do you know how many of them came out for the bill? Twenty, just twenty. Instead of concluding that this might indicate some possible weaknesses in the bill, or some real dangers to producers and production, Mr. Truman implied that the 104 opposing witnesses were all placing their private interests above the national interest.

Mr. Truman's strange idea is that the only way to be a real friend of the consumer is to make things tough for the producer. But it is a little hard to see just how the consumer gains by measures that discourage production.

Huge Lobby Fund of National Tax Equality Association Should Be Investigated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, a notorious political propaganda organization, masquerading under the pious sounding name of "National Tax Equality Association," is now trying to raise colossal lobby funds totaling more than \$31,000,000 for use in attempting to high-pressure and intimidate the United States Senate in connection with the pending tax legislation. The activities of this organization are nothing less than wholesale racketeering, principally for the benefit of an unscrupulous bunch of professional lobbyists and agitators. In its campaign of misrepresentation and intimidation, this organization professes to be seeking only so-called tax equality, but its real aim is to cripple, and if possible to destroy, thousands of useful non-profit organizations such as the farmers' cooperatives, building and loan companies, mutual savings banks, and mutual insurance companies. If this propaganda organization should succeed in its reprehensible campaign, it would leave the farmer, the small-business man, and the wage earner at the mercy of the huge high-profit organizations, who are its principal contributors.

While this organization loudly complains of tax exemption, at the same time it claims complete tax exemption for itself and for the huge propaganda lobby funds it collects from its deluded supporters. In the recent tax hearings before our Ways and Means Committee, the racketeering character of this group was thoroughly exposed and its claims were completely discredited. Nevertheless, it is actively continuing its callous campaign of deceit and distortion, in which it is attempting to "soft soap" Congressmen who agree with it and at the same time vilify and misrepresent those who disagree.

I have in my possession photostatic copies of letters recently sent out, by the thousands all over America, by this National Tax Exaggeration Association seeking to raise lobby funds of nearly \$2,000,000 from stock insurance companies and stock insurance agents alone.

Since the alleged insurance tax inequalities amount to only 6 percent of the total alleged tax loopholes of which this organization complains, a simple mathematical calculation shows that the total lobby funds it is now seeking to raise aggregate more than \$31,000,000. In fact, its money-begging letter to insurance agents states that the lobby fund of nearly \$2,000,000 sought from stock insurance interests is based upon a formula which has been cut down considerably in comparison with other business groups that are supporting this effort.

These letters ask the stock insurance companies to contribute on the basis of "\$25 for each million dollars of premium income" while they ask the insurance agents to contribute on the basis of \$400 per million dollars of premium income.

Ironically enough, this so-called tax-equality association evidently does not really believe in equality because the amount it asks from the insurance agents, most of whom are comparatively small-business men, is 16 times greater, in proportion, than the contributions it seeks to collect from the stock insurance companies themselves, most of which are large and prosperous.

These money-begging letters further state that this organization's "job in the next few months is a big one and it takes money to carry it out with the effectiveness that will spell success." These letters to the stock insurance agents also say "This is a big fight in which you have a big stake. If we are to be successful, adequate finances are absolutely necessary."

Of course these money-begging letters do not explain just how this racketeering organization proposes to use these huge lobby funds in its attempts to bamboozle and intimidate the Senate Finance Committee and the Senate.

This is a very serious matter and it ought to shock not only the Senate Finance Committee but also the rest of Congress and the American public in general.

Perhaps the Senate committee now engaged in public hearings on legislative ethics may be interested in exploring this scandalous mess. However, since I understand that committee is not requiring witnesses to testify under oath it would probably be better for a thorough investigation of this matter to be made by the congressional Committee on Lobbying or by the congressional Committee on Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce.

At the conclusion of my remarks I am inserting two letters sent out by the National Tax Equality Association, now masquerading under the name of "Insurance Men's Committee for Tax Equality."

INSURANCE MEN'S COMMITTEE
FOR TAX EQUALITY,
Chicago, May 24, 1951

Mr. CHARLES E. HODGES,
President, American Policyholders'
Insurance Co., Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. HODGES: Did you know that the favorable tax position enjoyed by your mutual insurance company competitors permits them to escape Federal income taxes which amount to about one-third of their dividend payments to policyholders? That's a sizable advantage when it comes to selling

capital stock insurance and an advantage that will become even greater when stock insurance company taxes go even higher, which appears to be inevitable. With an excess-profits tax of 77 percent or more, the total tax advantage will amount to nearly two-thirds of the present payments of policyholder dividends.

Here are the facts: Even though mutual insurance companies are presently subject to Federal income tax, they do not pay on the same basis as their stock competitors. They are taxed on gross income after deducting dividends paid to policyholders, while their stock competitors are taxed at regular corporate rates on their entire net income.

Reliable research shows that mutual casualty insurance companies pay only about one-fourth the tax that a stock company would pay on similar net earnings. For instance, stock casualty companies (at the old tax rates) pay about 22 percent of their underwriting and investment income in Federal taxes while mutuals pay less than 6 percent. For the year 1949 this meant a saving of approximately \$26,000,000 or 28 percent of policyholder dividends totaling \$92,000,000.

A similar situation exists in the fire field. Mutual fire companies would pay approximately \$14,000,000 more if they were taxed on the same basis as their stock competitors. This amounts to 37 percent of policyholder dividends totaling \$38,000,000 in 1949.

These organizations have ample ability to pay full income taxes on their underwriting and investment income just like their stock competitors. If they were required to do so, the policyholder dividend would be largely neutralized as a competitive factor.

Experience under excess-profits tax during the years 1941-45 showed that mutual insurance companies could escape this tax almost entirely through the policy holder dividend device. This will happen again unless the mutual-insurance companies are placed on the same tax basis as capital stock insurance companies.

For the past several years every member of this committee has shared with many other thousands of businessmen the conviction that the tax subsidy afforded all mutual and cooperative competitors of tax-paying business by existing Federal income tax laws must be done away with. To this end, we support to the hilt the objectives of the National Tax Equality Association.

We believe you will agree with us that, with Federal taxes and deficits mounting ever higher, the most propitious time in recent history has now arrived for all of us in the capital stock insurance business to take a more prominent part in the Nation-wide effort to resolve this problem, which the National Tax Equality Association has carefully planned and is ably conducting.

Remember, Federal Government will cost not less than \$70,000,000,000 in the next fiscal year. Is it not then high time for Government to stop equivocating about seeing that all businesses shoulder their just share of this burden? If there ever was a time, now is the time to press home the demand for justice with all possible force. Surely we cannot fail to get the necessary remedial action if we will see that this is done.

NTEA's job in the next few months is a big one and it takes money to carry it out with the effectiveness that will spell success. It is the hope of our committee that the stock insurance companies will help put this program over by underwriting \$50,000 of its cost.

For your guidance in considering a subscription, we suggest a formula of \$25 for each million dollars or fraction thereof, of premiums written by your company for the year 1949. We believe you will agree that this is the most equitable way of apportioning the total among the various companies concerned.

We profoundly hope that your company can be counted upon to align itself with us and the other stock insurance companies in supporting this effort 100 percent.

Sincerely yours,
EDWARD J. BACHMAN,
Chairman.

INSURANCE MEN'S COMMITTEE
FOR TAX EQUALITY,
Chicago, June 1, 1951.

DEAR FELLOW AGENT: Our insurance men's committee for tax equality takes pleasure in enclosing another educational folder in connection with the very important matter of Federal income-tax differential between stock and mutual-insurance carriers. We are sending you this information because we think that you will want to be informed on this subject, as it has been the personal experience of those of us who are well acquainted with the facts that such information is of great help in the production of business for our own offices.

We were very hopeful that the capital-stock companies would see fit to underwrite the entire cost of this educational and legislative program. However, we have not been notably successful in securing their financial help up to this time. In spite of this disappointing development our committee has, with the financial help extended to the National Tax Equality Association by other trade groups, been able to carry out a rather limited part of the program to get tax equality in the insurance business.

We are sure that you will feel as we do that this very important program cannot be allowed to bog down for want of financial support from our own people. If we are going to secure a revision in the tax law which will eliminate the tax differential that now makes over half of the mutual insurance dividend possible, we had better see that this matter is taken care of in the next tax bill, otherwise, it is likely to be years before the subject can again be reopened before the Congress.

This is a big fight in which you have a big stake. Victory can be had if we all get behind this effort immediately. If we are to be successful, adequate finances are absolutely necessary.

Time is short, and we do need your help now. We, therefore, urge your consideration of making a subscription and suggest as a basis for determining the amount a formula of \$10 per \$25,000 of your agency's premium income. This formula is similar to those used by other trade groups that are supporting the fight for tax equality. We are well aware, however, that premium volume does not always reflect an agent's ability to contribute to a campaign of this kind. With that in mind, our formula has been cut down considerably in comparison with other business groups that are supporting this effort.

Will you help make the fight successful? Please make your check payable to National Tax Equality Association and mail it today in the enclosed return envelope.

Sincerely yours,
EDWARD J. BACHMAN,
Chairman

Spend for Dredging Instead of Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include

the following letter and an article from Boston Business for June 1951:

PROPELLER CLUB OF
THE UNITED STATES,
Boston, Mass., July 19, 1951.
HON. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We concur with the views expressed by Colonel Gallagher in the attached article and desire to bring these to your attention as you deliberate on the present rivers and harbors bill. We sincerely believe this most important harbor of Boston has been greatly neglected and believe it is of vital importance to this community and the Nation, both in times of peace and national emergency.

Sincerely,

HERBERT S. EVANS,
President.

SPEND FOR DREDGING INSTEAD OF SEAWAY
(By Col. Leonard B. Gallagher, manager, Maritime Association, Boston Chamber of Commerce)

The great hue and cry of the proponents of the St. Lawrence Waterway project that it is vital to our national security, caused by the hearings held before the House Committee on Public Works in Washington, has temporarily subsided. The opponents have opened their attack on the project.

The whole argument causes many people seriously concerned in strengthening our national defense to ask themselves a lot of questions. This applies particularly to the great number of persons who are directly or indirectly interested in the development and the readiness of the port of Boston for an emergency.

The St. Lawrence advocates would have the Federal Government spend more than a billion tax dollars under the guise of national defense. It would take 7 years to build the waterway, and it would only operate 7 months a year. Only 10 percent of American-flag shipping could use it.

MORE ESSENTIAL PROJECTS

The thought occurs to a lot of us that there are many other projects already in existence that are essential to our national security. By this is meant that our navigable rivers and channels essential for the conduct of the commercial shipping business are in many cases badly in need of maintenance dredging to insure their efficient operation. It seems that we should fix up these existing navigational facilities essential to our national defense, including a number in Greater Boston and New England before we take on any new navigation projects of doubtful value.

It has been difficult to get adequate appropriations locally for this maintenance work, for it has been hard to arouse sufficient interest to get our congressional delegation behind this matter. There are no members of the New England congressional delegation on either the House or Senate Public Works Committees. This lack of representation probably works against us in securing funds for needed Boston and New England projects.

This year the total amount advocated for the maintenance of river and harbor work is approximately \$41,000,000 for the entire United States. The Chief of Engineers is understood to have submitted a much larger figure, but it was cut down in the Bureau of the Budget, probably as a nondefense item, in their opinion. Needless to say, when a project is constructed it is known that there will be a certain amount of maintenance work necessary, from year to year, after its completion. It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to see that these funds are provided.

A HIGH-TIDE PORT

At the present time the Port of Boston is what might be termed a high-tide port because, while the main channel leading into our harbor from the sea is 40 feet in depth, the channels leading off it to the various piers and terminals are in most cases of a much lesser depth. Modern freighters and tankers require at least a 35-foot channel in which to operate safely and economically day and night at all stages of the tide.

In Boston we have an average high tide, above mean low water, of 9.5 feet. The extreme low tide is approximately 2 feet below mean low water. Thus it is readily seen that at times a 35-foot channel, at mean low water, may only be 33 feet deep. With the effect of adverse winds taken into account it will be even less than 33 feet, and in addition, 2 feet of water under a vessel is normally considered essential to insure control.

In Boston Harbor we have projects that are essential to the efficient operation of the port that are in great need of maintenance dredging. As an example, we have the Reserve Channel, which services the Army Base (nine berths), Castle Island (seven berths), White Fuel Co., Boston Edison, and others. This channel is supposed to be 30 feet in depth. However, it has shoaled up, and at the present time, has a controlling depth of 26 feet. This means that ships must await high water to reach their berths, thereby, in many cases suffering delays with increased costs of operation (\$100 plus per hour).

ONE OF BUSIEST CHANNELS

This channel is one of the busiest in Boston Harbor and, in addition, it would certainly seem that, since the Armed Forces may see fit to take over and operate their property at the Army base at any time, it would certainly be necessary in the national defense to have this channel maintained to its project depth of 30 feet. The cost involved is approximately \$400,000. The Congress recently has directed that a survey be made to consider deepening this channel to 35 feet.

The Mystic River has a controlling depth of 27.5 feet. The project calls for 30 feet and recently Congress has authorized 35 feet, but no funds have been allocated. Super-tankers operate to the berths of the Esso Co. under high-tide conditions. Needless to say, this important waterway should be dredged to 35 feet without delay.

Chelsea River, along which is stored 50 percent of the oil of this community, has a project depth of 30 feet. Congress authorized the Corps of Engineers to make a report as to the advisability of increasing its depth to 35 feet. This report is now long overdue. On the Chelsea River, it is necessary to operate the tankers at high-tide slack-water periods. If we had 35 feet of water, it would be possible to operate at both high and low stages of tide. This would increase the time available for transiting the narrow bridge openings and would spread out the bridge openings in such a way that there would be less interference with highway traffic. Money should be allocated to deepen this channel at once.

MORE SHALLOW PLACES

There are many other places where shoaling has occurred. There are 24-foot shoals in the Narrows of Georges Island, 22-foot shoals inside Hull Gut in the center of the channel, a 23-foot shoal in the entrance to Weymouth Fore River off Sheep Island in the center of the channel, and a 23-foot shoal in West Gut off Prince Head in the center of the channel.

The Cape Cod Canal, of tremendous importance in an emergency as well as ordinary use in time of peace, has an authorized depth of 32 feet, but has a controlling depth of 28 feet in the approaches.

The American Sugar Refinery Co. has great difficulty in getting ships to their plant in the Fort Port Channel due to shoaled conditions.

All of the above shoals should be dredged without delay to at least the authorized depth.

It seems that before we start any projects, such as the controversial St. Lawrence waterway, adequate funds should be appropriated so that the existing channels necessary for the commerce of the country and absolutely vital for national defense should be put in first-class condition. Every time someone tries to get money for maintenance dredging or for rivers and harbors projects, the encounter the cry of "pork barrel." This is an unfortunate situation because adequate channels are essential to our commerce and national defense.

MANY OTHER PROJECTS

Besides the maintenance dredging, there are many new projects in New England that have been authorized by Congress for which no funds have been appropriated to complete. Many of these projects are 4 and 5 years old. Many of them are rather small and require very little money. We find the towns and States have their money ready to contribute but the Federal Government lags behind and will not appropriate their part so they drag on from year to year. At the same time we can appropriate billions to the Marshall plan, point 4 plan, and do most anything except to properly maintain the channels necessary for the conduct of our commerce and essential for our national defense. The June 26, 1950, Life magazine presents the story of the enormous French hydroelectric project, La Grotte, now being built with Marshall plan money.

In Boston we also are awaiting funds to complete several authorized new projects, such as the deepening of Mystic River to 35 feet, the completion of the extension of the President Roads anchorage, and the Weymouth Fore River project. All of these are economically justified and urgently needed.

Have we gone crazy in this country that we can construct new work for foreigners all over the world and we can't provide funds to fix up our own house? Can we spend a billion on the controversial St. Lawrence and not afford to spend \$400,000 to fix up the Reserve Channel? Many think that the St. Lawrence project will benefit almost solely the Canadians and foreign-flag operators with the Americans paying the big end of the check. Let's stop it and insist that our congressional delegation secure more adequate funds for the maintenance of our channels and also to initiate new and economically justified work in this area without further delay.

National Service Life Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a letter from Hon. Carl R. Gray, Jr., Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and my reply thereto. Both are letters relative to an opinion rendered by the Solicitor of the Veterans' Administration, to which I made reference in an extension of remarks on July 5, 1951.

The letters referred to follow:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., July 14, 1951.

Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RANKIN: This will respond to your letter of July 3, 1951, concerning the interpretation of Public Law 23, Eighty-second Congress.

Enclosed is a copy of an opinion by the Solicitor, prepared after reexamination of the question as to whether the disability insurance authorized by section 602 (v), National Service Life Insurance Act, is available to the holders of life-insurance policies authorized by section 10 of Public Law 23. The conclusion stated in the Solicitor's opinion appears inescapable and I have approved the opinion.

The conclusion reached with reference to this matter has the merit of not committing Congress to a possibly unintended course of action; it does not in any way usurp legislative authority, since any other legislative intention, previously existing or subsequently formed, may be embodied in express legislation.

Sincerely yours,

CARL R. GRAY, Jr.,
Administrator.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D. C., July 17, 1951.

Gen. CARL R. GRAY, Jr.,
Administrator of Veterans' Affairs,
Veterans' Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL GRAY: This will acknowledge your letter of July 14 in response to my letter of July 3, concerning the interpretation of the disability-income provision available to holders of National Service Life Insurance term policies issued pursuant to section 10 of Public Law 23.

Of course, I had read the Solicitor's opinion when I wrote you asking you as to "where in the legislative history of this act there is any authority for the opinion which the Solicitor has rendered." Since your have failed to make reply to my question, I assume, therefore, that you are unable to find any authority in the legislative history for the opinion which the Solicitor has given to you and which you have approved, and which will, therefore, be binding in the administration of this act.

Fortunately, this is a question which can be, and I am sure will be, tested in the courts. The net result, however, will be to place an added expense upon some individual veteran or one of the veterans' organizations—an expense which could have been avoided if careful consideration had been given the legislative history of the act, as I requested. I have no doubt that any court will sustain my view of this matter and will overrule the opinion which you have approved.

Sincerely yours,

J. E. RANKIN,
Chairman.

Controls and Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Rec-

XCVII—App—286

ORD, I include the following editorial from the Oregonian for July 13, 1951:

CONTROLS AND SPENDING

The Truman administration has got itself into a strange and strained situation on price and wage controls. But so has Congress. And it is the obvious intention of the administration to make political capital of the congressional revolt against controls which the administration refused to invoke in the first place and which Congress forced upon it.

The wisdom both of the administration and of Congress certainly can be questioned. We get the definite feeling that the conflict between the two has become more important to the participants than the national welfare, however sincere they may believe themselves to be.

Representative HARRIS ELLSWORTH, Republican, of Oregon's Fourth District, has been calling for an end to price controls. Recently, he wrote:

"Only the portions of the law authorizing price and wage controls were to expire (on June 30). The remainder carries on through until 1952. When the act was under consideration by Congress last summer, the President had requested production controls, but did not want authority to control prices and wages.

"Under the pressure of a new war in Korea and threat of total war, Congress insisted on writing the price control sections. Perhaps that was the reason for setting the expiration date this year. Strangely enough, the President is now placing the greatest emphasis on price-control authority. Meanwhile the Korean venture seems likely to end, at least for a while, and our economy has absorbed the impact of defense production thus far and does not seem to be too much worried about the so-called major impact of defense buying which is supposed to come this fall."

Many economists agree that price and wage controls are necessary evils, either for their real or psychological effect, though only stop-gap barriers to inflation. But it is obvious from past experience that controls are virtually useless unless they are imposed early in the inflation emergency and applied rigidly—as harmful as this may be to production and employment in some lines. This, the Truman administration refused to admit.

Congress, on the other hand, is inclined to slap on controls for short periods, then knock them off about the time that some benefit to the consumer may be in sight. Congress is, we think, thoroughly inconsistent.

In the present situation, assuming an end to the war in Korea, the key to the Nation's welfare lies in the effects of scheduled and anticipated Federal spending for rearmament and other purposes in the next 2 years. Mr. Ellsworth and some other Members of Congress appear to discount this impact, but Congress as a whole appears disinclined to take the long chance and slow down the defense program—to space it out over a period of years, instead of jamming the main effort into the next 2 years.

If Congress intends to cut the muscles out of the controls program, just when these heretofore atrophied organs are beginning to develop, it would be better advised to throw out price and wage controls entirely and rely on the stimulus to production to take up the inflation slack. This, of course, would give the Truman administration campaign material for 1952—whether truly or falsely based—but someone has to demonstrate a little political courage if the Nation is to stay strong.

We cannot see any probability of averting further, more serious inflation—with or without price and wage controls, as we have known them—if a 10-year armaments and world-aid program is to be stuffed into a 2-

year package. We think it is incumbent upon the administration and Congress to get together and decide whether a spending rate, largely for defense, of around \$70,000,000,000 in fiscal 1952 and \$90,000,000,000 in fiscal 1953, is truly necessary to meet the menace of communism.

Katharine Lenroot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several of the many tributes from the press of the Nation to Miss Katharine Lenroot on the occasion of her retirement as Chief of the Children's Bureau.

There being no objection, the tributes were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of July 11, 1951]

A NOTABLE CAREER OF SERVICE—KATHARINE LENROOT RECALLS THE LONG BATTLE HERE IN THE TWENTIES FOR THE WELFARE OF THE NATION'S WOMEN AND CHILDREN

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

Like Gen. Omar N. Bradley, who got into West Point from an alternate's position and went on to a distinguished military career, Katharine Lenroot, a young woman from Wisconsin, entered as sort of an alternate back in 1915 into the Children's Bureau, then a scraggly orphan of the newly created Labor Department. Thus began a notable career of public service to our Nation's women and children.

Retiring after 17 years as Chief of that Bureau, now in the Federal Security Agency, she recalled the circumstances. The Bureau, then operating with a handful of people on an annual budget of \$25,640, suddenly got an increase of \$168,000 under the awakening social impulse of the Woodrow Wilson New Freedom and had openings for 26 women. She took the civil-service examination and qualified. But she was twenty-seventh on the list. Then someone resigned—and she got a job.

But there was nothing accidental about her career, as was the case, by his own account, of Omar Bradley, who apparently had not the least thought of being a soldier but was induced to try for West Point by an older man in his Missouri community who pointed out it was the way the get the education the young man coveted. Katharine Lenroot knew what she wanted. She grew up in the atmosphere of the La Follette reform era in Wisconsin, which her father, Irvine L. Lenroot, later United States Senator helped to promote and make a reality as the speaker of the Wisconsin House of Representatives. She had studied at the university under Prof. John R. Commons and was inspired by that great teacher to an interest in labor problems. After graduation she worked for 2 years in the State's industrial commission before beginning her great adventure in Washington.

What still is most vivid to Miss Lenroot, looking back on it all, was the fight here during the 1920's for recognition of the Federal Government's responsibility for welfare, which, in her chosen field, meant the welfare of the Nation's women and children. The

spark of the "new freedom" had flickered out meanwhile, and laissez faire lethargy again was the order in Government. The fight revolved about the Sheppard-Towner bill for Federal grants-in-aid to the States for a cooperative program of maternal and child welfare for which an appropriation of \$1,200,000 was proposed.

She smiled over the memories.

"They said we were just a bunch of spinsters and flat-chested old maids. Why, such an appropriation would wreck the Republic."

Cautiously the act was limited to 5 years. Thereafter it was renewed for two. Then, presto, Congress cut off the aid and relegated the Children's Bureau to a research and reporting agency—and that was so recently as 1929, the tag end of the "Coolidge prosperity" which nearly everybody thought then was going to last forever. That remained the Bureau's function until its reinvigoration in 1935 in the Roosevelt New Deal.

It is still a bit astounding to Miss Lenroot how negligent and apathetic we were about our human resources in the twenties. Significant, perhaps, was the fact that in the La Follette-Costigan unemployment relief bill of 1932 it first was proposed to turn over relief administration to the Children's Bureau, as that was then about the only Federal agency acquainted with the special problems involved in the depression. However, other agencies were created for that purpose.

It is a bit astounding to Miss Lenroot, too, how quickly the climate changed around Washington when the depression woke us up, and also a matter of pride, for she was in the midst of all of it and the long-overdue adjustments for which she had worked—abolition of child labor eventually through the Wages and Hours Act after the Supreme Court had nullified an anti-child-labor act of Congress and a constitutional amendment had failed; extension of aid to the aged, as well as expansion of maternal and child care, and all the other things. In all of these she had pioneered.

She is proud of her Bureau and its devotion, its personnel's readiness to give 12 hours a day and Saturdays and Sundays often. Proud, too, of her predecessors who inspired and trained her—Julia Lathrop and Grace Abbott, the two previous chiefs—and very happy that the work is to be carried on by Martha M. Elliott, formerly her associate director, who for the last 2 years has been with the World Health Organization.

As the job of the comparatively recent past was to establish a pattern of Federal responsibility for welfare, with use of the taxing power for the benefit of all the people under national leadership, so Miss Lenroot feels that the emphasis for the next decade must be on getting the people, under this now accepted pattern, to recognize and accept responsibility as individual citizens for what happens in their communities. We cannot let responsibility become too remote, off here in Washington, if our democracy is to remain a living institution.

[From the Washington Star of July 12, 1951]

TOUGH BUREAUCRAT TAKES A REST—MISS KATHARINE LENROOT PLANS TO TRY A BIT OF LEISURE AFTER LONG YEARS OF NOTABLE PUBLIC SERVICE

(By Lowell Mellett)

A great bureaucrat is departing from the Washington scene and millions of people in this and other lands have cause to note her departure with gratitude as well as regret. The cause for regret is obvious. It is the loss of the selfless service of a public servant supreme in her field. The gratitude is felt by those who have seen and appreciated the weight of the burden she has carried during a great part of her 60 years. They are grateful now that she is able to pass this burden

on to a competent successor and obtain for herself a little of the leisure that has long been due her; grateful also that she can leave knowing she enjoys the world's approval of the work she has done.

The bureaucrat is Miss Katharine Lenroot, successor to two other great women, Julia Lathrop and Grace Abbott, as Chief of the Children's Bureau. It is significant perhaps of the stature of the Children's Bureau that it is known just as that, although it is only a segment of the Federal Security Agency, as it was formerly of the Labor Department.

What does it take to be a bureaucrat whom everybody applauds and nobody belittles? President Truman in granting Miss Lenroot's request to be relieved wrote: "Toughness is a quality not often attributed to women, but the plain fact is that you have been a tough and persistent champion of America's children." (He could have said children everywhere, considering the effort expended by Miss Lenroot in the international field during recent years.)

It is difficult to think of Miss Lenroot as tough. Good looking, gracious, charming, and, above all, gentle, but surely not tough. However, the President knew what he was talking about. He knew that when the Chief of the Children's Bureau had committed him to a course of action he could expect her, in her own gracious, charming, and gentle manner, to hold him to it.

They came to know the tough side of the lady bureaucrat in Congress, too, as witness her success in defending necessary appropriations against querulous committee members, sometimes wearied with well-doing. It may be thought that a children's bureau, by its very nature, would be immune to attack. And it is true that the Senate laughed the other day when Senator **MARBANK** solemnly remarked, "I am in favor of children." But there was a time, and not so long ago, when the Federal Government considered children, like the weather, as something it couldn't do much about.

Probably in her memory Miss Lenroot will take greatest satisfaction in the part she played in obtaining acceptance of Federal responsibility for the welfare of the Nation's children. That came first in 1922 with the passage of the Sheppard-Towner Act, providing financial assistance to poverty-stricken States. This beginning came to an end in 1929, but the principle was again accepted by the New Deal and nobody now doubts its validity. So we have an anti-child labor law, provisions for maternal care and other evidences that an American child is regarded as an American child, regardless of the State in which it lives.

Miss Lenroot has also had the physical toughness required of a good bureaucrat. Not tough enough perhaps to run the gamut of the Washington cocktail circuit, but tough enough to take her work home with her and devote many night hours to it; and to include Sunday in her workweek.

Few have earned so well the leisure she now seeks, but one wonders whether she will really get it.

[From the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times]

MISS LENROOT LEAVES UNITED STATES POST—CHILDREN'S FOSTER MOTHER APPROVES PRESENT GENERATION

WASHINGTON—A white-haired spinster who has devoted her life to the betterment of children said Tuesday that this is "a wonderful generation" but that much remains to be done to bring out the best in American youth.

Miss Katharine Lenroot, known as the foster mother of America's children, is an authority on the subject.

She has spent 36 of her 60 years with the United States Children's Bureau—the past 17 as chief of the Bureau. Now she is retiring and making plans to live out her span

in a little house in Westchester County near White Plains, N. Y.

The daughter of the late Senator Irvine L. Lenroot, Republican, of Wisconsin, she was born at Superior, Wis., March 8, 1891. She was graduated from the University of Wisconsin in 1912.

A few hours after the White House announced her resignation, Miss Lenroot—blue-eyed and demure—sat reflectively in her office and talked about her favorite subject, children.

She has no illusions, she said, about the world which children must cope with—"It is a world of rapid change and much uncertainty."

"Some children may suffer. But, by and large, our young people have developed the sense of responsibility, readiness, and initiative to deal with this world."

But the plumpish lady, whose energy belies her years, is by no means satisfied by all that has been accomplished in public services to children in recent years.

"We hear so much talk of the release of atomic energy," she said. "There are amazing possibilities in the release of human energy."

The amount of money spent for children Miss Lenroot called infinitesimal compared with the billions spent on atomic research.

"Children," she said "must be given first-class opportunities."

She deplored the tremendous waste of human resources—juvenile delinquency, wasted talents of handicapped children, teen-age narcotic addicts, and the stunted personality and character of the children of some working mothers.

"Much of this can be remedied," Miss Lenroot said, "by intensive research and the kind of environment necessary to bring out the best in children." "Here," she said, "is where the emphasis must be in the coming decade."

Miss Lenroot said child-rearing techniques now have quite properly swung back to the middle ground—between overemphasis on regimen and controls, and overemphasis on permissiveness.

"But most of all we have to rely on common sense," she added. "And that is a pretty good thing to rely on. That is the way the human race has developed so far."

Much has been accomplished in child welfare since Miss Lenroot joined the Children's Bureau in 1915. "Then," she recalled, "one-tenth of our babies died in their first year. * * * Many States had no child-labor laws. * * * Orphaned children were institutionalized and forgotten. * * * There was no Federal aid to States."

But much remains to be done, she said.

In her letter of resignation to President Truman, Miss Lenroot urged continued and unceasing concern by this country for the children who are its future.

During her years as foster mother to the Nation's children, she was tempted many times to adopt a child. But, she said, she always abandoned the idea because she could not do justice to her Government job, too.

"Now," she said, "I do not think it would be wise to adopt a child at my age."

[From the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser]

UNITED STATES CHILDREN'S BUREAU BOSS RESIGNS AFTER 36-YEAR CAREER

WASHINGTON, July 9.—Katharine F. Lenroot is stepping down as Chief of the United States Children's Bureau. In her place President Truman has named one of her chief aides, Dr. Martha M. Eliot.

Mr. Truman accepted Miss Lenroot's resignation Monday, effective August 31, "with real regret."

Between the two women, and the small Bureau staff, the country has seen a spectacular drop in infants' deaths in recent decades, abolition of child labor, the growth

of public aid for impoverished mothers—and beyond American shores, a growing world concern for child welfare.

Wisconsin-born, golden-haired Miss Lenroot was the daughter of the late United States Senator Irvin L. Lenroot. But she ignored possible paternal aid on her first job hunt. She took a civil-service exam in 1915 and landed the post she wanted; a small job with the Children's Bureau.

Her first assignment was in slums where she saw children of 6 working 12 hours a day. Since then her drive has been to force public aid for neglected children, orphans, those in trouble with the law.

Miss Lenroot is now white-haired. Twelve-hour working days were common on her calendar. She was seldom seen at Washington parties. In her letter of resignation she says, "I have reached the age when I must have more leisure." She will retire to her home near Hartsdale, Westchester County, N. Y.

President Truman's letter accepting the resignation told Miss Lenroot, "toughness is a quality not often attributed to women but the plain fact is that you have been a tough and persistent champion of America's children."

Dr. Eliot will carry the same degree of "toughness" into the post. News of the appointment reached her at her Quebec summer home. She has just finished 2 years as assistant director of the United Nations World Health Organization.

She took her M. D. degree at Johns Hopkins in 1918. In 1923 she became an instructor of pediatrics at Yale University, where she remained until 1934. There she plunged into her first big research job on child health, a community study of rickets, and the effect of sunlight and cod liver oil on the disease. Later she repeated the study in Puerto Rico.

During her last 10 years at Yale she held a second job, Director of Child and Maternal Health for the Children's Bureau. In 1935 she became Assistant Chief of the Bureau and moved to Washington.

Her pungent testimony was one of the forces that wrote a section on child and maternal health into the social-security law. She became administrator of the Federal grants-in-aid to the States for developing health services for children and mothers.

In 1942 she successfully campaigned for a fund of \$125,000,000, which was spent through State boards to help pregnant wives of United States servicemen in the four lowest income brackets.

In 1947 she was the first woman elected president of the American Public Health Association.

[From the Washington Post of July 15, 1951]
CHAMPION OF CHILDREN—SHE CAME FOR 1
YEAR AND STAYED 36
(By Nicha Searle)

"Well, I might stay a year," the young girl from Wisconsin thought as she arrived in Washington with a job as special investigator in the Social Service Division of the Children's Bureau at \$1,200 a year.

Today, nearly 37 years later, Katharine F. Lenroot, retiring Chief of the Children's Bureau, is looking forward to another type of future. In this one there is time to read and think, time for a "real vacation," and a chance to enjoy the responsibilities and benefits of a citizen in a community where there is a vote.

In her letter of resignation, Miss Lenroot said, "I have reached the age when I must have more leisure." The "Grand Old Lady" of women Government workers will make her home in Hartsdale, Westchester County, N. Y.

But it's a cinch she won't get too far away from her main interest in life—the welfare of children. Although her last day as chief

of the bureau she has headed for 17 years will be August 31, she will be right back at her favorite work between September 21 and 26. Miss Lenroot will act as cochairman of the Inter-Agency Conference on Personality Development in Children being held at Princeton, N. J.

Quite a few changes have taken place since that day almost four decades ago when Miss Lenroot arrived in Washington. She remembers one of her assignments as special investigator in 1915 which took her to the poorer neighborhoods of the city.

There she saw 7- and 8-year-old children working as many as 12 and 14 hours a day stringing beads or making artificial flowers. She remembers seeing one young mother who returned to work the day after her child was born since that was the only way to bypass starvation.

One prevailing opinion in the early days of the Bureau, Miss Lenroot found, was that it dealt with "luxury services." Children, Miss Lenroot states firmly, are an emergency. And it is this practice of treating every case individually and as quickly as possible which has earned her the name of "foster mother to millions."

She remembers with a smile the passage of the Social Security Act in 1935 (one of the high spots of her career) and her worries about the budget.

"We'll need at least \$100,000 for the Bureau," she earnestly told the then Assistant Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Altmeyer. "You'll get more than that," the Assistant Secretary predicted.

"I've been in the Bureau longer than you and I know Government appropriations," Miss Lenroot insisted.

To her complete surprise, the Bureau was given the fabulous sum of a million and a half dollars. With it came the welcomed responsibilities, under title V of the act, which provided for grants to States for their development of maternal and child health services, services to crippled children and child welfare services.

The White House Children's Conference in 1950 is another milestone in the life of children, Miss Lenroot believes. It was there that men and women of all professions gathered to find out how they could interpret to the parents of the world the scientific information and resources they possessed. The conference also stood out, says Miss Lenroot, because of its citizen participation—almost 100,000 individuals were engaged in its work.

President Truman, in a letter paying tribute to Miss Lenroot's tenure of office as a public servant, said:

"Toughness is a quality not often attributable to women, but the plain fact is that you have been a tough and persistent champion of America's children. You have made them both your vocation and avocation. The children of this country are better off for your having been in the Government."

As the President said, "What greater satisfaction could anyone take into retirement?"

The Present World Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a stenographic transcript of remarks by Hon.

Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, made off the record and from notes, to a group of magazine and book publishers, on June 29, 1951, which was made public at the request of several of those who were present.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure to be with you this afternoon. It is particularly pleasant since it gives me the opportunity to thank all of you who gave so generously of your time and efforts, both working here at home and through the special panel which went abroad, to help us on our overseas information service. You did a tremendous job for us, and we are very deeply grateful.

This afternoon I am going to try something of an experiment. I am asked to speak with you on what is called the present world situation. Now that is something of a problem, because I have also asked my associates who are dealing with the various geographical portions of our work to come and tell you in some detail about it, and I do not want to anticipate what they are going to say. Therefore, I thought we might spend a little time on trying to discover what the present situation is; and, if we can get that in our minds, then perhaps some of the things that my associates say to you may have a little more meaning.

There are several preliminary observations I would like to make about the present situation. One of them is that it is not a situation clouded in obscurity. There is a blinding light thrown upon it—in fact, so much light that the question arises whether the light is not too strong and too multi-colored for reading purposes. I have had a few figures collected for me on some of the contributions to knowledge on this subject which are being put out by Government and by you, who are sitting here. My own Department, the State Department, puts out each year 1,200 press releases dealing with the present international situation. Every day we put out 320,000 words over all channels of the Voice of America. Every day we put out 40,000 words through the five wireless bulletins which we send to all parts of the world. Each year we put out 20 publications in the field of documentation of diplomacy, each one of these volumes containing from 100 to 1,500 pages. We put out 70 volumes a year in the field of current information, running from 100 to 500 pages. We put out 200 volumes a year, each running from 20 to 500 pages, on treaties and international actions.

The ECA, the Treasury, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal Reserve Board probably put out together some three times as much as we do on the international situation.

The Congress has made this one of its main subjects of interest, and you have with you this afternoon the two leading contributors to a congressional work of 2,000,000 words on far-eastern policy. I think I led with 418,000 words and General Bradley came a poor second with 278,000.

Outside of the governmental field, there are 500 books a year printed on international affairs and the present international situation, and there are 3,000 magazine articles a year which are sufficiently important for bibliographical listings. Of course I cannot even begin to estimate the number of words put out in the news columns and the editorials.

So you see there is plenty of light being thrown on the present international situation. As I say, the light may be too strong and it may be too varied for reading, but the situation certainly is not developing in gloom.

There are three things that I would like to talk with you about for a moment in the light of all these volumes of words I have talked about. I have had some 20 or 30 important monographs in the Library of Congress examined from three points of view. One was to find out when the writers of these monographs thought the present situation began. When is "present," in other words? The second thing was, what do these authors, these writers of these important monographs, believe to be the common characteristic, or what is the outstanding characteristic of the present, as distinct from the past or the future? The third was, what are the essential steps recommended for dealing with the present?

You will be interested to know some of the results of this inquiry. Let's take first of all when the present situation began. When is "present"? One writer says the present situation began in 1905 with Japanese victory over the Russians in the Russo-Japanese War. Another writer says it began with the conference at Yalta. Another says it began with General Marshall's mission to China in 1945-46. Another says it began with the invention of the airplane. Another says it began with the great upsurge of population which took place when modern medicine checked the death rate of the last century. Another one, who is not quite so modern, says it began with the Protestant Reformation. Another says it began with the collective action taken against aggression in Korea. Another, a medievalist, says it began with the Portuguese exploring the Senegal River 500 years ago. Another says the "present" began with the dropping of the atom bomb.

The main point in common that we can find in all these writings is that the present is upon us now. All we can say is what the little boy said to the little girl when he was looking over the fence and she was on the sidewalk. She asked, "Are you going to Mary Brown's party?" and he answered, "I am to it." All we know is that we are in the present, but when it began we cannot tell. We can say that there is no one moment when it began. We can say that there will probably be no one moment when it will end. But it is with us. Human experience is not like a book, it is not written in chapters.

The next thing that I had examined was, what is the fundamental quality of the present? How do you tell the present? How do you know something is present and is not characteristic of the past? Going through these monographs, we come upon these theories. One is that the fundamental quality of the present situation is that it is a contention between great powers over the control of territory and that in this contention between great powers ideological differences not only are secondary but really obscure the real meaning of the present time. Another writer says that the fundamental characteristic of the present is that it is a conflict between ideologies and that the old conflicts of states about territory have nothing to do with the present. Another says that it is fundamentally a struggle between the rule of law, imposed in the classic conception of the state, and a conspiracy, on the other hand, which is the revolt of men against the state. Another says that it is the struggle between the awakened peoples of Asia and the decadent peoples of the West. Another says that the fundamental quality of the present situation is that nations have tended to renounce the healthy interest in national self-interest and have run off after the will-o'-the-wisp of collective security. Another one says that the quality of the present is that nations have not renounced their interests in national security and have failed to set up collective security in a world commonwealth.

All that we get out of these analyses of the quality of the present is that struggle is at the heart of the times in which we live, that the times in which we live are onerous, but that there is hope for mankind if we will keep our minds on the heart of the problem.

When we come to look for the heart of the problem, we find it somewhat confusing. It reminds me of some words in the introduction of Henry Nevins's book, *Changes and Chances*—you remember that is the first of three volumes in his autobiography. He was a wonderful man, whom many of you I am sure knew while he was alive. He was a great war correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*. In his book he discussed one of the prayers in the Book of Common Prayer. The words I refer to are:

"That so, among the sundry and manifold changes of the world, our hearts may surely there be fixed where true joys are to be found."

Nevins said that he always thought the writer of that prayer was slightly naive, because, if one only knew what the true joys were, it would be no difficulty to keep one's heart fully fixed upon them. If we only knew what the heart of the problem was at the present time, it would not be difficult to keep our minds on it.

Now we come to the third thing that I asked to have looked up in these monographs—what is the line of action necessary to deal with the present situation? One writer says that we must recognize that what we are involved in is the struggle for the minds of men and that we must spend vastly more money on that and not waste our funds on economic or military expenditures. Another one says that the minds of men are trivial things at best, and that the minds of men follow their stomachs and, therefore, the thing to do is to concentrate on economic activities, and intellectual and ideological results will follow. Another writer says military power is the only thing that counts in our time—forget all this nonsense about propaganda and economics and concentrate on the military problem. Another one says that the real heart of the matter is a struggle for power as based upon position and therefore what we must do to settle the contention of our times is to come to agreement dividing the world into power areas. Another one says that the heart of the matter is to get away from the outmoded ideas of national sovereignty and go in for world government so that all differences between nations will be mere partisan friction, and war, if there ever is any war, will become merely small civil disturbances.

Summing up all of this, what you get out of the people who are writing most seriously about our time is that there is no sovereign remedy, that there is no one course to pursue, that there are many courses, many attitudes, which we must take. I think this is a rather long-winded way of coming to a conclusion which all of you recognize is inherently sensible, that there is not any one characteristic of our time, there is not any one answer to it. It has many characteristics and there must be many answers to it. I venture to put down here some of the attitudes which seem to me essential for us to have in mind as we struggle with the times in which we live.

The first attitude which seems to me essential is the recognition that, whenever the present began and whenever the present will end, it will be with us for a very long time. If we will get that firmly in mind, we will begin to get over the impatience which leads people to try to find magic solutions. If we will recognize that we have before us a long period of work, then we have the beginning of wisdom. Once we understand that we have a long period of work before us then we can see that the object of our efforts is not

to remove these problems. They are not removable. The object of our work is to reduce these problems to manageable proportions.

If we can reduce them to manageable proportions, and if we will then accept continuity of responsibility in managing those problems, we begin to see some daylight ahead. But we cannot for a moment believe, if we are really sensible in facing the present, that the problems can be escaped. We must believe over and over again, and understand over and over again—as though we heard them for the first time—Lincoln's great words in his message to Congress of December 1862: "We cannot escape history." We cannot escape the problem of the present. We can only escape it by death or defeat. If we are going to deal with those problems, we must be willing to deal with them for a long time. We must be willing to reduce them from almost impossible problems to manageable problems, and we must have a sense of continuing responsibility in dealing with them.

The second very important attitude for us to take in dealing with the problems of the present is to avoid over-dramatizing any particular problem or over-emphasizing it. That is always our danger, not peculiar to the United States but common to everybody. The particular problem with which we are dealing seems to us to be the overwhelming problem of all time. Take Korea, for instance, which God knows is important enough. There is a phrase which has been applied to it which is typical of this attitude which I am urging you to avoid. The activities of the U. N. in Korea have been described as "the reluctant crusade." That phrase seems to connote that Korea is the place where the show-down between the east and west is going to occur. The reluctant crusade—reluctantly the East and West get into the show-down. Now if anything is important, if anything is true about the situation in Korea, it is the overwhelming importance of not forcing a show-down on our side in Korea and not permitting our opponents to force a show-down.

That has been the whole heart and essence of the policy which the administration has been following and which General Marshall and General Bradley so brilliantly described in the hearings before the joint committee. Korea's significance is not the final crusade. It is not finally making valid the idea of collective security. It is important perhaps for the inverse reason that in Korea we prevented the invalidation of collective security.

Collective security is not something which is established once and for all by some dramatic gesture. Collective security is like a bank account. It is kept alive by the resources which are put into it. In Korea the Russians presented a check which was drawn on the bank account of collective security. The Russians thought the check would bounce. They thought it was a bad check. But to their great surprise, the teller paid it. The important thing was that the check was paid. The importance will be nothing if the next check is not paid and if the bank account is not kept strong and sufficient to cover all checks which are drawn upon it.

The third attitude which I think is important for us to have in mind is a proper sense of proportion about the problems and difficulties which come before us. In getting the proper sense of proportion about our difficulties the first thing that we must do is to understand that the present situation is a great deal more serious than the United States as a whole has yet come to realize. We must understand that the Soviet Union is a much tougher adversary than the United States has yet realized. We must not only understand that but we must understand something else, and that is that the Soviet

Union is not the only difficulty that we have. Behind and beyond the Soviet Union, and our problems with the Soviet Union, lie other difficulties, perhaps even greater. The important thing about our actions in the present is that we must so act in dealing with the immediate difficulty that we manage also the more long-range ones.

What do I mean by those general words? Twice in our lifetime we have dealt with problems before us as though the solution of those problems was the solution of all problems. We dealt with the Kaiser as though the defeat of the Kaiser was the defeat of all such menaces to the world. And yet there immediately grew up after that Hitler and Tojo. Then we dealt with Hitler and Tojo, and then we found looming behind them Stalin and the menace of communism and the Soviet Union.

Now what lies behind the Soviet Union? I see two problems. I am not saying these are caused by the Soviet Union, but I am saying that here are problems which we must reduce to manageable proportions in our dealing with the present. One is the awakening of the vast populations of Asia, populations which are beginning to feel that they should have and should exercise in the world an influence which is proportionate to their numbers and worthy of their cultures. That force is a force which can be turned to good, or it can be a force which can rend to pieces a world which has imprudently managed its immediate problem and which finds itself weakened, perhaps shattered in facing these upsurging forces of Asia. Therefore in thinking about the Soviet Union we must think about this shadow on the rock behind it. We must manage our difficulties so prudently that we have strength and initiative and power left to help shape and guide these emerging forces so that they will not turn out to be forces which rend and destroy.

In addition to the emergence of these peoples of Asia with the ambitions and possible power—which has to be thought about in relation not only to the existing power but also to the power which might be left after some imprudently inaugurated struggle had torn the Western World apart—there are the great problems of the world's growing hunger, of its growing numbers, of its deficient knowledge of the very elemental methods of staying alive.

These are the problems, these are the shadows on the rock behind the Soviet Union, of which we must never lose sight. All of this has to do with getting the proper perspective on the difficulties before us.

Another attitude which we must always keep in mind is the need to match our strength with the interests which we must defend. We hear it said—and it is wisely said—that there must be a balancing of commitments and capabilities. Too often people say that when they mean that we should reduce our commitments to meet whatever our capabilities may be at any time. Nothing could be more erroneous than that. What we must do is to be conscious of our national interests. A commitment is a national vital interest of which we have become conscious and for which we have made provision, but we may have national interests, which are just as valid, of which we have not become conscious, and for which we have not made provision—about which we should immediately become conscious and about which we should immediately make provision.

Another attitude which we must have in mind is that there is no unitary approach. I suggested this a moment ago when I talked about cures which have been put forward for our modern evils. To think that there is a unitary approach is a fallacy. We must use all means at our hand, whatever they are, and not say that one is the answer, or one or two are the answers. If you take, for instance, the views of those who urge that

propaganda is the sole necessary weapon to survive and win in the modern world, you easily find yourself in the ridiculous position where you may have all the people of a nation on your side, but those people are politically organized as an effective opposition to you. To a very large extent—not completely, but to a very large extent—that is the situation which exists in China. I believe that the vast masses of the people in China are sympathetic to the United States, and yet those masses of people in China are organized effectively against us so that they are a very strong opponent. So propaganda is not the sole answer. It is an important weapon, and we must use it—we must use it fully but it is not the sole answer.

Neither is dealing with governments alone the sole answer. The idea that we can make arrangements with this, that, or the other government, without regard to popular support founded on free consent would all too probably involve us in excessively brittle alliances. We have a very good illustration of that sort of brittleness in the arrangements which were made between Hitler and Mussolini; they seemed very fine but they were very brittle, and when the pressure was put upon them they broke down. As it turned out, not the nations but only their passing masters proved to be the parties to the alliance.

We must be aware of both the fallacy of recovery without defensive strength and the fallacy of military strength upon a shaky economic foundation. These two things are of vital importance. They go together and they are at the heart of our efforts at the present time in the North Atlantic Treaty countries. There you have a community, an important community, a virile one, one which has come through grave and deep economic troubles and has been fighting its way up for some time.

Economic well-being is not enough by itself. The countries which we have aided along the upward road now see that the situation demands a tremendous effort to build up, along with us, military strength as well as economic strength. Defensive strength is as integral to recovery as a fence is to a cornfield. Yet in seeking to replenish military strength it is necessary to avoid putting too great a load on our allies or on ourselves, for that matter.

There must be a very carefully worked out balance between the firm economic foundation and the strong military defense so that the military defense does not bring down the economic structure in ruins and so that the economic structure is built up for the purpose of defending itself with its military components.

We must also recognize that there is no substitute for strength at the center. Alliances are important. It is of vital importance to us that our allies in the North Atlantic Treaty and in the Rio Treaty be strong and that the bonds between them and us be strong. But it is equally important, if not more important, that there be strength at the center of these groups—the strength of the United States, its economic strength, its military strength, which will, in itself, breed strength at the periphery of our associations. The same applies in the United Nations. In that union of nations there is no substitute for the strength of the United States at the heart of the great group of powers which share our determination to uphold the principles of the charter.

In building that strength it is very important that we should not underestimate ourselves. We have to meet and face limitations and difficulties. But if every time a difficulty comes along somebody says, "Oh, to do that will wreck the economy of the United States," that is underestimating ourselves. I have no doubt that there is a point beyond which the United States cannot go, but I am equally sure that we are

not anywhere near that point. Therefore the thing to do is not to be timid about ourselves but to realize that our great strength is there to be used, and to use it wisely and economically and sensibly to create the defenses which we need.

May I say right here in connection with this business of creating strength at the center, we must not for one second allow any development which may occur in Korea to lull us into a belief that now we have turned the corner, and now things are going to get better, and therefore we do not need to make the effort which we have been making. I think we need to make it even more than we made it before. If it is possible to bring about an end of the fighting in Korea, it will be because of the efforts which we have already made and the sacrifices of the men in Korea. The success of our policy will mean only one thing, and that is that we have held off this conspiracy against us and that we have some time now which, if used wisely, will give us the power and give us the union with powerful allies which can deter world war III. If we do not do that, if we allow ourselves to be lulled by Korea, I can assure you that, just as certainly as you are sitting here, we will be hit within the next 6 months to a year with a much tougher blow somewhere else. If we do not make the efforts now, we will be unprepared for that blow. We may completely deter it if we now all bend together every effort we can to going forward with the program.

Another point is that we must believe that time is on our side. I concede to you that in saying this there is an element of faith. There is an element of faith, because I believe that we are people who act. Time is not on our side if we merely sit in the shade and fan ourselves. Time is on our side if we go to work. We can do much in time. We can strengthen ourselves; we can strengthen our allies. We have a vast productive power which is now not harnessed, much greater than those opposed to us. We can harness it. There is much we can do and, if we will do it, time is on our side. If we don't do it, it is not.

Therefore, we come to the matter of will. We have a strong geographical position. We have people who are skilled in industry, who have courage, who make fine soldiers and producers. We have natural resources. We have the productive plant. All of those things are no good at all unless they are cemented together and thrown into action by will. I believe that the American people have that will and that they can put that will strongly behind everything of a material nature that they have so that they, along with their allies, will secure for the future the things they value.

Another attitude of the utmost importance is that we must keep constantly before us the goal toward which we are working. What we are working toward is a situation in which the normal course of settling disputes will be negotiation. We are enthusiastic people, and occasionally we get so enthusiastic about what we are doing that we believe that is the end instead of the means. We must never get ourselves into the state of mind where we say that we are building this strength in order to use it. We are building this strength in order that we may never have to use it, in order that we may get to the point where the normal way to settle things is to sit down, to argue about them, to negotiate about them, and to find a solution with which all parties concerned can live, even though it is not ideal for any of us.

That is not really a hopeless ambition. It seems a long way off—and it is a long way off when you are dealing with the Soviet Union under the present imbalance of power—but we have reached a situation in the Western Hemisphere where negotiation is the normal way of settling disputes. The normal way for the American republics to

settle all their differences—and there are very grave and serious difficulties—is by negotiation and reasonable settlement. That has taken nearly 60 years to work out. It has taken all of that time to build up the trust of the American republics among themselves and between them and us. For years we were called the "Colossus of the North," and we took actions from time to time which made the other American republics apprehensive of us, but I think that no longer exists. I do not believe there ever took place in the world a more harmonious or constructive meeting than the recent meeting between the foreign ministers of the American Republics, in which all sorts of questions, vitally affecting all our countries, were taken up and discussed. Sometimes points of view were very far apart. On one very tough economic question it took staying up all night for 3 nights to get people to realize that there was a good deal in common between them. But we solved that question and we will solve other differences in this hemisphere in that way.

There is one last attitude which I should like to stress, and that is that we must always keep in mind that we must deal with these problems within a pattern of responsibility. I should like to talk a little bit about what I mean by a pattern of responsibility. I mean that we must act with the consciousness that our responsibility is to interests which are broader than our own immediate American interests. Great empires have risen in this world and have collapsed because they took too narrow a view. There is no divine command which spares the United States from the seeds of destruction which have operated in other great states. There is no instruction to that one of the fates who holds the shears that she shall withhold them from the thread of life of the United States. We must operate in a pattern of responsibility which is greater than our own interests. We cannot yield to the temptation, because we are virile and enthusiastic, of thinking that, because we believe a thing, it just must be right. We must not confuse our own opinions with the will of God.

That is essential for leadership. It is not merely a moral dissertation which I am making. It is essential to leadership among the free nations if we are going to maintain the sort of coalition which we have. We cannot take the attitude that we will coerce nations, that we are so right that if they do not do exactly what we want them to do we will withhold economic aid, or we will withhold military aid, we will do this, we will do that. If we take that attitude, then we are creating a relationship indistinguishable from that which exists between the Soviet Union and countries associated with it. That must never be our attitude. We are the leader. We are accepted as the leader. But we will continue to be accepted as the leader only if the other countries believe that the pattern of responsibility within which we operate is a responsibility to interests which are broader than our own—that we know today what Thomas Jefferson was talking about when he spoke of the need of paying a decent respect to the opinions of mankind.

How can we institutionalize that sense of responsibility? The means are at hand, have been used, and must continue to be used. The means lies in the United Nations. There is much talk these days that the United Nations has proved itself ineffective—it does not do this, it does not do that, we must scrap it in favor of some other kind of coercive machinery. I do not agree with any of those views.

I don't think anyone is more conscious than I am, unless it be General Bradley, of the difficulties of working within a coalition as large as the group in the United Nations who are associated together in Korea. There are a thousand problems in working with so many nations, considering their

points of view and modifying your own so that you may maintain a true friend. But I assure you that it is worth it a million times. Whatever loss there is in efficiency of operation is gained a million times by the strength which comes from the group's believing that the leader is paying attention to other people's points of view. We should be forever grateful to the United Nations for furnishing a forum where the United States of America, to maintain its leadership, must enter and must explain itself to the rest of the world, and do so in terms which are so persuasive that countries will be convinced, do so under circumstances where the United States and its representatives listen to the representative of the smallest country in the world who has a point of view which he wishes to express, do so under circumstances where we make every effort to harmonize the views, adjust views, and may not force views down other people's throats. If we do that, then I believe the United States will avoid that narrow view which has led to the destruction of great powers and great empires in the past. The United States will lead into a new course in which the free nations will continue to be free nations, freely associated, freely, willingly, and eagerly accepting leadership which they believe considers their interests as deeply as it does its own.

The St. Lawrence Seaway and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under previous authority to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to submit a digest of an address on the St. Lawrence seaway by Hon. Lionel Chevrier, Canadian Minister of Transport, as follows:

THE SEAWAY AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

The following is a digest of an address on the St. Lawrence seaway by the Honorable Lionel Chevrier, Canadian Minister of Transport.

From the point of view of national defense, the development of the St. Lawrence deep waterway is of the greatest importance. In February of this year the permanent Joint Board of Defense made a joint recommendation concerning the military value of the project. The Board recommended its early construction—stressing the need for the additional supplies of hydroelectric power vital to the expansion of the military strength of the two nations and the value of the seaway as an inland waterway relatively safe from enemy action. This will enable the two countries to move war materials at less cost in money and resources than by any other means. It will permit greatly increased shipbuilding and ship repairs in the relatively well protected Great Lakes shipyards.

The addition which this project would make to the military potential of the United States and Canada will far outweigh the initial expenditure in manpower, money, and critical materials. It must be realized that much of these materials will be required in any event, because if this project is not now proceeded with, alternative sources of power will have to be provided. Without the construction of the seaway the large deposits of high-grade iron ore in Labrador

cannot be moved economically and expeditiously to the Great Lakes steel centers.

Look at the map of North America and you will find that the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway lies almost in the center of the five physiographic regions of the North American Continent. The upper end of the seaway links the Canadian west to the Atlantic seaboard and the American West to the Port of New York. It joins the wheat fields of western Canada to the United Kingdom market.

When one realizes that more yearly tonnage passes through one of the bottlenecks in the upper lakes region, namely, the locks at Sault Ste. Marie, than through the Panama, Suez, Manchester, and Kiel Canals put together, this gives some idea of the tonnage that is likely to come through when the development is completed. The building of the Panama Canal through the Isthmus of Panama, the construction of the Suez Canal, linking the Mediterranean with the Red Sea, were logical projects. They were the inevitable and the right thing to do, no matter at what cost. On the proposal to construct the deep waterway in the St. Lawrence River to link the Great Lakes to the Atlantic Ocean, the verdict will be the same.

The friendly relations existing between Canada and the United States for well over a century have been greatly enhanced by two world wars. These wars, and particularly the last one, have brought us together more than ever before. They have shown that on many problems not only do we think alike but frequently we act together. Such was the case of Ogdensburg, on the Joint Permanent Defense Board, at Hyde Park, on the Alaska Highway, in the Northwest Passage, and perhaps more particularly in the air by means of our transborder services. Our Governments think alike on the development of the St. Lawrence waterway.

I believe the vast majority of our people think alike, but we must translate this thinking into action. We must act together upon it so that, to use the words of a great British statesman, in the days to come the Canadian and American peoples will, for their own safety and the good of all, walk together in majesty, in justice, and in peace.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, this mother has registered a legitimate complaint. Once we adopt universal military training this treatment of our boys will be mild, indeed:

JULY 17, 1951.

HON. DANIEL A. REED,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing this letter because I want to call to your attention several conditions at Fort Dix which I feel should be investigated.

Our eldest son has nearly completed basic training at that camp and I feel I can speak freely now without showing partiality.

He had been there about 2 weeks when he wrote home requesting civilian underwear. As we understood it, the serviceman is permitted to wear that type if he so desires and we complied with this request.

Our second request from him was for a gun-cleaning kit as there were only four

such kits available to a group of 64 men in his barracks. Such a shortage meant that the last man to whom the kit was available would have to wait several hours in order to clean his gun. There are plenty of these kits available to the civilian, as we found out when we complied with his request.

Our third request was for fatigue pants which were purchased locally and sent to him.

Our fourth request was for a fatigue shirt as one of the two he had been issued had been stolen from the laundry line. He asked his supply sergeant for a replacement and was told that it would necessitate a long wrangle from the quartermaster and he may as well get along without it.

There is a generous supply of these shirts at the PX village in the center of the camp. The boys may purchase these shirts but they are unable to get any replacements. It's the first time that either I or any of my friends have heard of a soldier having to buy his own clothes. If there are plenty of clothes why are they not given to the soldier instead of him having to buy them. This does nothing for their morale or for that of the parents. It seems to me that something is definitely wrong here. Up to this point in our son's career as a hired soldier, we have sent him approximately forty dollars worth of equipment and clothing.

In his eighth or ninth week of basic, they were ordered to go on a supposedly 10-mile hike. This turned out to be 20 miles, with full pack. They were given a 20-minute rest and then immediately ordered to do a 4.4-mile speed march in 52 minutes. This is another sample of the Army's common sense. Is it any wonder the fellows were collapsing all along the line of march? Very recently they marched 6 miles out to a machine gun range, fired all morning, then marched 6 miles back for noon chow. They were allowed one biscuit with gravy for their main dish. As they were the last group to eat and there were plenty of biscuits, they asked for more and were refused. That same afternoon an Army truck drove away from the mess hall with the back of the truck half full of biscuits which were dumped. Seems senseless, doesn't it?

We are also led to believe that our sons will be given tests and placed in the branch of the service for which their aptitudes show them to be of the most value. Such was not my son's case. He was tested and should have been placed in an office working with tabulating machines or with personnel. But because of his build, they were compelled to place him with a combat infantry unit. He became thoroughly disgusted and volunteered for paratrooper training.

Also, we parents wonder why so many athletes are deferred. If a young man is physically able to play such rigorous games as football, baseball, and basketball, to mention a few of the most common ones, is he not able to do something of more value to help out in this national emergency? A good many parents do not like this show of partiality and I trust many of our servicemen are much disturbed over it.

Also, the officers training our sons were to use good language in addressing the trainees, so we were also led to believe. I have never heard such name calling as our son has told his dad about. Only in the service does any man have to take such remarks and not be able to talk back. I realize that this is an individual habit that no organization can cope with but cannot the right sort of officers be put in charge of the trainees?

All in all, I would say that there is much to be done to make better feelings in the service and boost morale at home.

As a mother of two servicemen, the one of whom I have written and the younger son who is a member of the active Naval Reserves and expects to be called to duty

soon, I feel that I have the right to ask that you do all in your power to correct or at least better these conditions.

Very sincerely yours,
A CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY MOTHER.

As America Observes One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary of Declaration of Independence Slovaks Recall Lost Independence of Native Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I have always felt that our greatest weapon against Communist terror is the truth. We must find the truth through work and understand the enslaved behind the iron curtain. Those behind the iron curtain risk their lives daily and now they await us, who live in freedom to act to help them.

We worry too much about the strength of the enemy without attempting to fathom the weakness. Believe me, there is uneasiness, hidden tension, uncertainty behind the enemy's mask of invincibility.

The Communist empire's ultimate and determining weakness is the hatred and hope of the peoples and nations whom her empire enslaves—the non-Russian peoples—the Slovaks, Poles, Latvians, Estonians, Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Macedonians, and other ethnical groups.

To the peoples of Eastern—Central—Europe and of the entire Soviet empire, America must once more proclaim her allegiance to the liberation program of freedom and self-determination. We must announce, not in diplomatic whisper but so that the entire world will hear, that we stand with the peoples longing for freedom and against the tyrants who enslave them. We must declare that these peoples—the Slovaks prominent and proud among them—are our friends and our allies whom we are ready to aid—their underground partisans—as the Slovak Biela Legia, white legion, the underground forces in the mountains of Slovakia; whose outside contacts are the Slovak Liberation Committee; and the National Committee for the Liberation of Slovakia—who today are harassing the Communist octopus but tomorrow, with their ranks increasing a millionfold, will be gnawing at the very nerve center of this monster.

America's true allies are not the dissident products of the Kremlin, but the victims of Communist oppression.

The world witnesses our opportunity and America's opportunity to take or forsake these peoples, the kinsmen of our naturalized citizens.

We must speak to each group behind the iron curtain in terms it can understand.

The best way to speak to the peoples of Slovakia, is to let them know what their kinsmen in America have accom-

plished and in that manner to enlist the fire, the spirit, and the optimism of all Slovakian speaking underground partisans, to increase their struggle against the Communists, for it will be a renewed courage and hope secure in the knowledge that America, as the true friend of liberty, is supporting a common cause.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include herewith two articles from the oldest Slovak newspaper in America, *Slovak v Amerike*, written in honor of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of our Declaration of Independence.

[From the *Slovak v Amerike*, New York City, of July 3, 1951]

AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE IS 175 YEARS OLD—THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF SLOVAKS TO THE PROGRESS OF AMERICA

[Written in honor of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence Day by John C. Selranka, editor of *Slovak v Amerike*]

When we as Americans are celebrating the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the first Thirteen Colonies of the United States, it is fitting and proper that we look at the past and see what the Slovaks have contributed to the progress of this country, which gave them freedom, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.

The first prominent Slovak to come to the United States was Count Maurice Benovsky, King of the Island of Madagascar in 1785. He had letters of introduction from Benjamin Franklin, noted American statesman. However, it is stated that some Slovaks fought with the armies of Polish General Pulaski and Kosciusko and that on one occasion even Benovsky visited these generals during the Revolutionary War.

We have historical records that various missionaries came to the new country even before the Revolutionary War. One of them named Henry Loskiel baptized Indians in the Passaic region of New Jersey 100 years before the Declaration of Independence.

Slovaks took part in the Civil War and had their own battalion under the leadership of Col. Geza Mihalotzy, who received sanction of the great emancipator President Abraham Lincoln for those ventures. Colonel Mihalotzy fought gallantly and died near Chattanooga, Tenn., where he is buried in the National Cemetery. Thousands of other Slovaks fought and died with him on President Lincoln's side.

Let us continue and examine the records of the Spanish-American War. We still have Slovaks living who fought in that war.

In narrative we come to the World War I, in which thousands of Slovaks fought and died. Among those especially the heroism of Sgt. Matej Kocak a valiant soldier is outstanding. Kocak received the Congressional Medal of Honor from both Army and Navy. He died on the battlefield of France, where he is now buried.

During World War I those Slovaks who were not naturalized joined the Czechoslovak legions under the leadership of Gen. Milan R. Stefanik, Slovak scientist who rose from an ordinary private to the rank of general in the French Army during World War I, within a period of 2 years. General Stefanik, was on the military staff of General Pershing and Marshall Foch. This is a great chapter in American history by itself.

Let us continue with World War II in which some 85,000 Americans of Slovak birth and descent fought. Slovaks bought \$65,000,000 worth of war bonds under the leadership of able Father John J. Lach, of Whiting, Ind., and launched Liberty ships named for Gen. Milan R. Stefanik, Rev. Joseph Murgas, well-known inventor of radio, and Rev.

Stephen Furdek, known as the father of American Slovaks. Bombers and various planes, ambulances, etc., were donated to the fighting American forces. Some 5,000 American Slovaks made the supreme sacrifice on various battlefields. One of them was a Catholic Slovak chaplain, Father Seccina, of Indianapolis, Ind.

Now the Korean war found the American Slovaks again in the front lines and many of them paid supreme sacrifices. Lt. Stephen Matejob, of New York City, graduate of West Point Military Academy, is one of the many American Slovak soldiers who were decorated for their gallantry.

This is only the contribution of American Slovaks in brief from the military side.

ONE HUNDRED YEARS OF CULTURAL AND ECONOMIC CONTRIBUTION

Slovaks began to settle in this country right after the revolution of 1848. In fact the revolution in 1848 was inspired by the American Declaration of Independence.

During these hundred years the Slovak people in America built over 500 churches of various denominations, some 300 schools, 100 halls, and 12 strong national organizations, with total paid membership of half a million and assets of \$50,000,000. These same organizations paid in death benefits and charity some \$40,000,000 to their members and their widows and orphans.

These same American Slovaks educated some 1,500 priests and ministers, vast number of teachers and college professors, doctors of medicine, scientists, newspapermen, professional sportsmen like Johnny Risko; Pete Latso; Andy Padko, J. Oracko, of Notre Dame; Karcis, of Pitt; Bednar, of Bethlehem; etc.

They have earned great reputation in steel mills, mines, numerous factories, as managers, superintendents, and labor leaders. From the rank and file of the Slovak union workers in America the Hon. John T. Kmetz, born in Slovakia, was appointed Assistant Secretary of Labor by President Truman.

Americans of Slovakian birth became members of State legislatures; namely, George A. Hricko, Senator John Haluska, Michael Gervenak, John J. Pekar-Baker, John Yourishin, John Mikula, etc., in Pennsylvania; and Senator John Smolka, Stephen Zona, Frank W. Sotak, George Fedor, etc., in Ohio; Michael Matta, counselor for registration commission of Philadelphia and Joseph A. Franek as first mayor of Farrell, Pa.; Joseph Mittuch, born in Slovakia, as mayor of Carteret, N. J.; Assemblyman John J. Vavrence and Dr. Stephen A. Lesko, both of New Jersey; Stephen A. Toth, assistant attorney general of New Jersey, the late Peter P. Yurchak, deputy attorney general of Pennsylvania; and the present Deputy Attorney General Paul Selecky and Mayor Koss, of Wallington, N. J.; Mayor Andrew Kovack, of Whiting, Ind.; Senator Joseph Virostek, of East Douglas, Mass.

Julius Badzik, assistant prosecutor of Cleveland, Ohio, Judge Michael Tremko, of Chicago; the late Judge George Teney and Councilman Mary Sotak, of Cleveland; Assistant Prosecutor John Ruslnack, of Detroit; Prosecutor Francis Doctor, of Washington County, Pa.; Police Chief George Matowitz, of Cleveland, known as gangbuster, Prosecutor Matthew Melko, of Middlesex County in New Jersey; Prosecutor Joseph Molitoris, of Warren, Ohio; City Attorney John D. Dluhy, of Clifton, N. J.; Michael Kosik recently appointed Secretary of Anthracite Reconciliation Commission of Scranton, Pa.; well-known boxer, Steve Hamas, and singer, M. Halama Yurkanin; Kozak, Tkach, and Slovak bankers, namely, M. Bosak, Joseph J. Chilla, J. Wills, and others too numerous to mention have proven themselves to be capable public servants,

although only first and second generations of American Slovaks.

During the 100 years of Slovaks in America some 120 publications and newspapers were founded to acquaint the new immigrants with the American ideals. These newspapers published in the Slovak language were the greatest torch bearers of American liberty and culture. They reached every mining town and far away hamlets, bringing Americanism to the new inhabitants and the future Americans, who raised their children and educated them in the gospel of Americanism as advocated by Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, etc.

From these Slovak newspapers the new immigrants learned just as much and sometimes even more than an average American knew about their institutions and after 100 years of Slovak life in America, this newspaper is very happy to report that although it was founded 62 years ago, there is great interest among the Americans of Slovak origin and descent for its continuance.

In other fields Slovaks have shown remarkable progress in this great land of opportunity. For instance, in the films the daughter of a Slovakian miner from Scranton, Pa., Miss Elizabeth Scott, is today a leading cinema star in Hollywood. Miss Marienka Michna is a leading pianist, Maestro Rudolf Petrak is a leading member of the New York City Opera Company and has made tremendous success on the radio and television. Alois Havrilla was awarded many prizes for his excellent English diction as radio announcer and commentator.

The sons of Slovak immigrants today occupy positions in leading American universities as for instance the late Dr. Stephen Yeshko, noted scientist, was professor of Georgetown University; Ivan I. Kramoris, professor of Marquette University; George Washkovich, professor of Hunter College; George Kondie, professor at St. John's University, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Dr. Mary Wargo, scientist at the Mellon Institute of Pitt University, etc.

Former West Point Military Academy graduates, namely, Col. Benjamin Chapla is with the United States Army in Germany and Stephen Faris with the American Embassy in Rome. Others are on duty in various parts of the world.

Sons and daughters of American Slovaks are missionaries in various foreign countries reaching as far as Dark Africa, where they are spreading the culture of Christianity.

Others born in Slovakia, namely, the late Joseph Pulitzer, revolutionized American journalism. Dr. Edward Steiner, of Grinnell College, Iowa, is credited with giving men like Harry Hopkins a start in life. Dr. Steiner proudly claims to be of Slovakian origin.

Distinguished Americans are proud to have Slovaks as their intimate friends. The late Edward L. Vaczy, former tenement house commissioner under Mayors John Hylan, James J. Walker, Joseph V. McKee, and John P. O'Brien, although born in Kosice, Slovakia, was an intimate friend of the late President Woodrow Wilson and the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt as well as famous Gov. Alfred E. Smith.

American cardinals, namely, Gibbons, Hayes, Mundelein, Dougherty, Spellman, Stritch, and Mooney and many bishops and archbishops often paid tribute to the Slovaks for their contributions to the progress of America. Leading American orator the newly consecrated Most Rev. Fulton J. Sheen, auxiliary bishop of the archdiocese of New York, often praised the Slovaks in his remarkable addresses.

The late Col. Stephen Bonsal, confidential adviser of President Wilson wrote and spoke about the Slovaks with great zeal and enthusiasm. This can be said also about thousands of other Americans, who have often praised the Slovaks for their contri-

bution to the gigantic progress of America even in the United States Congress on numerous occasions.

Slovaks are Americans by choice. Their children are intermarrying with other nationalities and thus adding to the melting pot for richer, better, and greater America than their fathers and forefathers found over a century ago and decades that followed.

Today, when we pause to pay tribute to the fathers of our great country, the United States of America, we pray that the Almighty will continue to bless it and that with America's help we may be able to free the oppressed people of Slovakia and their neighboring countries, who are suffering under Communistic rule.

God bless America.

[From the Slovak v Amerike, New York City, of July 5, 1951]

WHAT WAS SLOVAKIA LIKE 175 YEARS AGO?—"LONG MAY OUR LAND BE BRIGHT WITH FREEDOM'S HOLY LIGHT"

(Written in honor of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence day, by John C. Sciranka, editor of Slovak v Amerike.)

When an American reads about the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the birth of our American Nation, he no doubt will present a question. What was Slovakia like 175 years ago?

Let us look at the record and see for ourselves.

One hundred and seventy-five years ago, when our American fathers signed and proclaimed the Declaration of Independence, Slovakia was living through the period of its renaissance.

Slovakia was the first independent and democratic state of central Europe. It had its first King Samo in the seventh century.

Just to better illustrate the Slovakian history take for instance the year of 1492 when Columbus discovered America. In that same year on February 9, 1492, King Vladislav II opened the Hungarian Diet with a proclamation in the Slovakian language, which was translated into Magyar (Hungarian) by Valentine, Bishop of Varadin.

This we mention to prove that the Slovak culture is ancient. Prior to the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus, King Matej Korvin (Matthias Corvinus) often called the just, founded in 1443 the first university at Bratislava, called University of Istropolitana. This university was opened 10 years before the University of Budapest in Hungary.

This should suffice for an introduction.

Let us continue. When the Liberty bell tolled in Philadelphia and the Declaration of Independence was heralded to the world, great leaders were mapping the future of the Slovak nation. Foremost among these was Jan Holly (1759-1849), known as the Slovak Homer. Holly as a student for a Catholic priesthood devoted much of his time to reading and translating classical literature, including Virgil, Homer, Horace, and Theocritus. (See the book, Slovaks, written by the late Peter P. Yurchak and sold by Rev. John Lach, of Whiting, Ind.) This period also belongs to Anton Bernolak, to whom the Slovaks owe their literary language. In 1746 even foremost Hungarian Scholar Bel admitted about the Slovak language: "It is no whit inferior in gravity and grandeur to the Spanish, nor in sublimity and strength to the English, nor in richness of thought and expression to the German, nor in softness and euphony to the Italian, nor in imperiousness to the Magyar (Hungarian)."

Anton Bernolak, a Catholic priest compiled and published a monumental six-volume-polyglot dictionary. Bernolak founded in

1783 a Slovak educational guild. In 1787 he published his *Philologico-Critical Dissertation on the Slovak language*, which proves that 175 years ago, when our American independence was born, the Slovaks were a highly developed cultured people.

During this period there were other great Slovak intellectuals. Let us mention but a few of them, namely Jozef Ignac Bajza (1755-1836) who wrote in every field and stood in the vanguard of the Slovakian renaissance.

History tells us that Juraj Fandly (1754-1811) was then perhaps the best stylist of this period. He was a devoted follower of Bernolák and devoted his life to the practical enlightenment of his people. He wrote many popular books on agriculture and animal husbandry.

Canon of Ostrihom

In this period the Slovaks had Juraj Palokovic (1763-1835) as Canon of the famous cathedral in Ostrihom. He was a passionate supporter of the Slovak language and the Slovak national cause. Ostrihom is even now the famous city, in which is the see of Hungarian cardinals.

Canon Palokovic published the dictionary of Bernolák and also all the translations of poet Jan Holly at his own expense. Holly translated Aeneid and Palokovic gladly paid the publishing expense which was a great help for the Slovak literature. (This is a good example for some of the rich American Slovaks who fail to support Slovak literature.)

Slovak Cardinal Rudnay.

Just imagine 175 years ago, when the Declaration of Independence was proclaimed in America, Slovaks had their cardinal. Now after 175 years, in America we haven't even an American bishop of Slovak birth or descent although there are over 1,000,000 Slovak Catholics in this country.

His Eminence Alexander Cardinal Rudnay became primate of Hungary—just like Cardinal Mindszenty—Cardinal Rudnay gave generously for the support of a Slovak cause and especially toward the publications of Slovak books. It was Cardinal Rudnay who bluntly said "I am a Slovak; and though I should sit in the chair of Peter I shall remain a Slovak."

Yea, Slovaks had great men. Later on the persecution of the Slovak nation came and feudal system as well as Magyarization did much harm to the Slovak culture. Nevertheless the nation, strengthened by the past sacrifices of such leaders as mentioned here, fought valiantly for its existence. The Slovaks won over the Hungarians and the Czechs. Now, they are fighting the battle of their lives with the Communists. There are few real Slovak Communists. And even those few leaders who came to prominence like Vlado Clementis, deposed foreign minister of Czechoslovakia now awaiting sentence; Laco Novomesky, Gustav Husak, etc.; took communism as an adventure, thinking that they could outsmart Stalin and Moscow. They found out too late that they played a very hazardous game.

Now that we Americans of Slovakian origin or descent have a proof that when the Declaration of Independence was proclaimed 175 years ago the people of Slovakia were on the top with high ranking dignitaries; this should make us all feel proud of our Slovak ancestry. This should also make us guard our American heritage against the evil forces. After the period of renaissance, Slovakia deteriorated by its gentry and by the laxity in work and spirit for those great ideals for which the above mentioned have so nobly sacrificed. The punishment came as a result of this negligence.

The Slovak people after the death of Bishop Karol Kuzmany, first president of the Slovak Academy of Arts and Sciences, whose delegation visited the United States of America in 1935 and 1936, lost their

bishops, and it was only after the establishment of the first Czechoslovakian Republic in 1918, with the help of American Slovaks, that the first three Slovak bishops were appointed by the Vatican, namely Most Rev. Marian Blaha, Most Rev. Jan Vojtassak and Most Rev. Karol Kmetko. Bishop Blaha and Vojtassak visited the United States in 1926. Bishop Blaha died. Bishop Vojtassak, 74, is now in prison, sentenced to 20 years by the Reds with two other bishops, Most Rev. Michael Buzalka and Greek Catholic Ordinary, Most Rev. Pavel Góddic. Bishop Kmetko was elevated to the rank of Archbishop and he died several years ago after persecution by the Communists.

American Slovaks have a great obligation toward the homeland of their ancestors, historic country of Slovakia which they should restore to its free and independent status.

Let us pledge on this the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Declaration of our American Independence that we will do everything in our power to liberate the land of Saints Cyril and Methodius, Svato-pluk, Ratislav, Mojmir, Holly, Bernolák, Rudnay, Stefanik, Hlinka, and Tiso.

God bless America and Slovakia.

In Washington It's Waste as Usual

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. K. ARMSTRONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, in the July 1951 issue of the Reader's Digest there appeared a most important article by Mr. Stanley High entitled "In Washington It's Waste as Usual." This article makes a most valuable contribution to the discussion of the need for economy in the Federal Government and ways to attain reduction of nonessential spending. I commend the article to the attention of my colleagues in the House.

IN WASHINGTON IT'S WASTE AS USUAL.

(By Stanley High)

In the defense sacrifices required of the people of the United States, is the Government of the United States leading the way and setting the example?

The answer is: No.

We are told business as usual is out. For the families of several million young Americans, life as usual is out. But in Washington, bureaucracy as usual, waste as usual, pork barrel as usual seem to go on.

Instead of conserving manpower needed in defense, the Government hoards and wastes it.

Instead of reducing nonessential spending, many bureaucrats are using the defense effort to justify more spending.

"Strict economy in nondefense spending is required," said President Truman in his \$71,500,000,000 budget message. But when Members of Congress began to look for ways to put this strict economy into actual practice, the President issued a warning that, for any savings made, Congress would have to take the risk.

The President asks for \$1,333,333,333 for public-assistance programs—three times the average amount for 1943 to 1947. "Why should this hugely augmented sum be needed for public assistance," asks the New York Herald Tribune, "when we are already in a period of unprecedented full employment, with severe labor scarcity in the immediate offing?"

Recently General Marshall, Secretary of Defense, declared: "We must husband our military and industrial manpower with the utmost care. We must avoid waste of the productive energies that have helped make our Nation powerful."

Let us see how our Federal Government is avoiding such waste of manpower:

Prior to the outbreak of war in Korea, civilian employment in the Federal Government had leveled off at about two million—nearly two times the number employed at the outbreak of World War II. From June 30, 1950, to January 1, 1951, civilian employees were added to Government payrolls at the rate of 1,000 a day. During January the hiring rate went up to 2,000 a day. The present budget will probably add 500,000 more. Then the army of United States Government civilian employees will be nearly as big as the combined total of all the men in the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines as of last spring.

"The build-up is already nearing runaway velocity," says the Washington Star. "The whole outlook is a dismaying one."

While some increases in the Government's civilian employment are now undoubtedly necessary, the average American is bound to be dismayed by the way in which Government manpower, already employed, is wasted.

Recently Senator PAUL DOUGLAS of Illinois inquired into the number of hours worked per year by Government employees. He found that, with vacation, sick leave and holidays, most of them get 10 weeks off every year, at full pay. The average Government employee works 1,650 hours a year. In private industry, says Senator DOUGLAS, 1,900 working hours per year "is considered a very liberal standard." Thus the Government employee gets 6 weeks more time off annually than the non-Government worker.

It has been estimated that, if Government employees put in the same number of hours per year as the employees of private industry, the taxpayers would be saved at least \$200,000,000 annually and the country's vital manpower pool would probably be increased by 100,000 workers.

In January a committee of the House, headed by JOHN BELL WILLIAMS of Mississippi, reported on its investigation of employee utilization in the executive departments. In numerous sample agencies, among the hundreds of employees whose only job was to make out purchase orders, it was found that the average workload was two orders per worker per day. A large percentage of the purchases were for less than \$20 each. The cost of putting through each purchase order averaged, in the Treasury Department, \$7.06, in the Bureau of the Mint, the cost was \$13.98, and in the United States Coast Guard, \$23.94. In the Interior Department the average cost was \$9.95 per order. Records of the National Park Service showed that one copy of a 50-cent magazine, with procurement charges added, had cost the taxpayers \$13.89. To the purchase price of \$2.45 worth of drinking cups for the Bureau of Reclamation, the administrative cost added \$17.35. In one large quantity of purchases for the Office of Education, investigators found that overhead added 33 percent to the cost of each item purchased.

The committee found that, in order to give the appearance that they had work to do, employees were forced to falsify records by signing erroneous work-progress reports. Employees were threatened with punitive action when they refused.

An employee testified "There was not enough work to keep more than a third of us busy at any time. Supervisors sat and talked all day. I was told to write personal letters, etc., just to appear busy in case some of the officials came through the room."

The committee brought to light the vicious circle of waste and inefficiency by which, to increase the salary status of the

officials involved, small offices are made into big offices and ridiculously divided into endless divisions, branches, sections, units, etc.

Many thousands of loyal, hard-working Government employees resent these conditions. "I can see no difference in a padding of payrolls and padding a budget," one worker told the committee, "and as a taxpayer I object to both." But employee objections make little headway.

Last July the President requested the heads of 14 Federal agencies to cut down their spending programs, in the interests of national defense. Many expenditures were suddenly regarded as essential for defense. In the October 1950 issue of Commerce, Jack Robbins points out that "at the Agriculture Department officials conveniently reasoned that the Department's connection with food production insured against any economizing there." A Labor Department official said: "In view of the duties assigned to the Department under the President's executive order of September 9, there may even have to be some expansion here." The Secretary of the Interior found little chance to curtail the activities of his Department because, in his words, "they are essential to the national security."

The Committee on Federal Tax Policy estimates that the present budget can be cut by \$10,000,000,000 without any injury whatever to national defense. Senator BYRD, calling for a reduction of \$9,000,000,000 and for increased efficiency, declared that the alternatives are "financial disaster" and "military impotence."

But when proposals for specific reductions are made in Congress they are likely to have hard going. In a newsletter, a Senator recently assured his constituents that the President's budget should be cut before any new taxes are voted. But a little later, he wrote to his constituents that when a proposal was made to close down a Federal project in his State he at once "jumped into the fight," saved the project and indicated that it would have bigger appropriations next year.

A Member of the House recently declared that "in voting for appropriations I intend to use this yardstick: If it will help the defense effort, I am for it. If it will not, I am for postponing it."

But to this commendable standard, the Congressman made an exception for a flood-control project for his own district. Although outside the strict military, he favored it as badly needed.

In one of the most dramatic and carefully considered economy efforts in United States Senate history, Senator DOUGLAS last year made an item-by-item fight on the Senate floor to reduce pork-barrel spending in the notorious rivers and harbors bill. In all he made proposals for 84 specific cuts in the current measure and 50 proposals for future reductions, to save more than \$2,000,000,000. But, with special interests backing each of these 134 items, every proposed saving was defeated.

Only insistent, aggressive pressure from the American people—whose money is being wasted and whose security is imperiled—can bring this run-away situation under control. There are some indications that such pressure is beginning. Lately there has been a notable increase in mail from constituents—making sharp demands for economy on the part of Congress. These demands have already strengthened the efforts of Congressmen who believe with Senator BYRD that our strength and preparedness in all respects depend upon reduction in nonessential spending.

But there will be no adequate reductions unless pressure from the people is greatly increased. To add to that pressure without delay is, I believe, an obligation upon every patriotic American.

Résumé of Findings of the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining in Connection With Recent Hearings on the Defense Minerals Production Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1951

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the House has conducted hearings over a period of months on the administration of the Defense Production Act of 1950 as it relates to the production of critical and strategic minerals and metals. The abysmal failure of this program has appeared as clearly to us as it has to the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, which recently reported on the failure of our defense agencies to prepare us with sufficient supplies of tungsten. I wish to make available to the Members of the House at this time, and to the public generally, a résumé of the findings of the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining in connection with these hearings on the defense minerals production program. The résumé is as follows:

RÉSUMÉ OF FINDINGS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING IN CONNECTION WITH RECENT HEARINGS ON THE DEFENSE MINERALS PRODUCTION PROGRAM

Following the enactment of the Defense Production Act of 1950 the Department of the Interior, through its Defense Minerals Administration, issued several statements and press releases pledging cooperation and assistance to the domestic mining industry for the purpose of "keeping mines, smelters, and mills at maximum efficient operation and in expanding production of those mineral commodities in short supply."

METHODS AVAILABLE

The principal methods which were announced as having been worked out and available to provide Government assistance to expand domestic minerals production under the Defense Production Act included (1) Government guaranty of private loans, (2) direct Government loans, and (3) procurement contracts. A program providing for Government participation in approved projects to be conducted by private enterprise for the exploration of known deposits of certain minerals and metals also was announced.

NOTHING DONE

The Defense Production Act was signed by the President on September 8, 1950. By the end of March, 6½ months later, evidence gathered showed that little or nothing had been or was being accomplished under the act to encourage and expand the exploration, development, and mining of strategic and critical minerals and metals in the United States and pointed to the need for an investigation of the situation.

The Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, at my request, held a 9-day series of hearings on the subject from April 4 to June 18. The subcommittee held the hearings for the purpose of determining: (1) The authority and responsibilities of each administrative unit of the Government having any jurisdiction over various phases of the defense minerals production program;

(2) the policies formulated and decisions rendered by each unit of the Government in reference to such programs; (3) what had been accomplished and was being done or proposed under the Defense Production Act of 1950 to encourage the exploration, development, and mining of strategic and critical minerals and metals from domestic sources; and (4) the reasons for the delays in executing the necessary programs.

ONLY ONE CONTRACT

Eight months after the enactment of the Defense Production Act of 1950 the subcommittee found that only one procurement contract had been made under the act to stimulate and encourage the expansion of the domestic production of strategic and critical minerals and metals; no assistance had been granted for exploration; and no loans had been granted to mine operators for the purpose.

Although the subcommittee hearings brought several of the agencies concerned with the defense production of minerals and metals into closer contact with each other, impressed upon these agencies the urgency of developing the domestic mining industry, and brought the existing mechanism into closer balance and operation, little has been accomplished under the Defense Production Act to alleviate the current shortages of minerals and metals and the much greater shortages expected in the future.

As of July 1, 1951, almost 10 months since the President signed the Defense Production Act, only two procurement contracts had been made under the act for the domestic production of minerals and metals, and only one direct RFC loan and one guaranteed bank loan had been made for the purpose. On July 1 the Defense Minerals Administration had received 761 applications for Government participation in domestic exploration projects but had entered into only 50 contracts for the purpose. The Government's share or participation commitments in these exploration contracts totaled \$2,219,534 or 57 percent of the total cost—a drop in the bucket in relation to the amount of exploration work that needs to be done throughout the United States, or when compared with the \$1,000,000,000 project the Secretary of the Interior felt to be necessary and was planning 3 years ago for the purpose of attempting to survey and determine the mineral resources of the United States.

NO TUNGSTEN

Although the military and essential civilian requirements for tungsten are reported by Government officials to be nearly astronomical and the anticipated future supply from both domestic and foreign sources to be far below the amount required, it was not until May 10 that the agencies announced a support price to encourage the domestic production of tungsten.

Limited manganese and chromite programs are still in the works. The "consideration" stage is about as far as copper, lead, zinc, and mica expansion programs have gone.

Several factors appear to be directly responsible for the failure of the agencies to take prompt and adequate measures to alleviate current and anticipated shortages of minerals and metals through a necessary expansion of the domestic mining industry. We find that—

COMMITTEE FINDINGS

The Office of Defense Mobilization laid down a set of policies which provided that direct Government loans be reduced to a minimum and that extreme care be used to avoid expansion of marginal producers which may require continuing subsidies.

The defense agencies charged with the responsibility of expanding mineral and metal production facilities have been proceeding

too cautiously and apparently with little or no regard to the urgency of the times—callous to the minerals and metals shortages closing small-business enterprises throughout the Nation, contributing to inflationary pressures, and endangering the economy and security of our Nation.

The quantities of minerals and metals hoped for and anticipated from overseas sources of supply during the next 5 years or during a total world war under the guise or label of "strategic assumptions" and "calculated risks" also restrict the effort being made to expand the production of minerals and metals from domestic sources of supply. In some items, such as manganese and copper, emphasis has been given to projects from which little or no production would be obtained until 5 or 6 years hence; projects or programs which would result in more immediate production appear to have received much less consideration.

THEORISTS IN GOVERNMENT

The lack of funds with which to make contracts and commitments has been a serious bottleneck. As a result of an administrative interpretation of the Defense Production Act, funds must be set aside to cover the gross commitment of a contract or program. The agencies are not permitted to proceed on the prudent-reserve theory. For example, although the defense agencies firmly believe that the tungsten price-support program will not cost the Government one red cent, it is required that the total gross commitment of \$180,000,000 be earmarked and set aside. The same is true of the aluminum-expansion program to the tune of approximately \$600,000,000. During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951, the defense agencies obtained \$1,600,000,000 in borrowing authority. Practically all of this already has been earmarked and set aside against gross commitments for all types of materials. About half the amount, or close to \$800,000,000, has been earmarked for aluminum and tungsten alone, whereas \$100,000,000, or less, probably would be sufficient on a prudent reserve basis. We have been informed that a support-price program to encourage the expansion of copper, lead, and zinc production would require \$1,500,000,000 a year to be earmarked under the present method of doing business under the Defense Production Act. I explained this problem to the House Committee on Banking and Currency during recent hearings. I am pleased to find that the Committee on Banking and Currency proposes to amend section 303 (c) of the act so that an amount not to exceed the probable ultimate net cost to the United States of any contingent liability need be earmarked from the total funds authorized to be borrowed under the act.

UNBELIEVABLE CONFUSION

The hearings held by the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining also revealed that an unbelievable state of confusion and uncertainty exists among the agencies concerned with the expansion of the domestic mining industry. They seem to have learned little from the experiences of the World War II agencies. So many agencies and sub-agencies are concerned with various phases of the minerals and metals problem that the formulation and execution of an effective national minerals policy is practically impossible today. At the request of the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining, the Defense Production Administration submitted a list of various Government agencies, committees, and groups that have a significant interest in strategic and critical minerals and metals. The size of the list is startling to say the least. This list contains the names of 50 departments, agencies, and sub-agencies of the Government, including the President and the Executive Office of the President, 5 major United States Government

interdepartmental committees; 14 congressional committees and subcommittees; and 9 major international groups. The confusion and acute lack of organization and coordination that exist today as a result of close to 70 agencies, committees, and groups significantly concerned with minerals and metals points to the urgent need for a single Federal agency to coordinate and execute minerals and metals policies at the same high level as now exists in the case of agricultural products.

MOBILIZATION PLAN NEEDED

The domestic minerals industry is in great need of positive and detailed mobilization plans that will guarantee not only maintenance of current rates of production but also the increased production demanded in the interest of our national economy and security. To the extent the Congress does not direct such accomplishment by law, I trust the committees of the Congress will induce action by other means.

Correspondence Between the President and Mrs. Guyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I want to call to the attention of every Member of Congress some correspondence between the President of the United States and Mrs. C. Irvin Guyer, of Springfield, Mass. Mrs. Guyer's letter gives a clear and forthright picture of the plight of millions of Americans who are living under the threat of inflationary prices.

The Chief Executive's reply to Mrs. Guyer is as clear and forthright as the housewife's letter to the President.

I cannot help but wonder how many Members of Congress are answering their mail from consumers as honestly and as boldly as the President replied to Mrs. Guyer.

The correspondence follows:

To the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES:

SIR: I understand that right now Washington is crowded with lobbyists, lobbyists representing the cattle interests, the real-estate interest, the farm interests, etc., all fighting to weaken price-control legislation or to eliminate it entirely. Nowhere have I heard of any lobbying being done for a very large and pretty important group of Americans who will certainly be seriously affected by any further inflation—the housewives.

Since I cannot afford a trip to Washington to lobby for the housewives personally, I am writing to ask you, Mr. President, to speak for us.

Will you tell Congress, Mr. President, that we feel it is absolutely imperative to roll back prices wherever unfair profits are being made, since the budget of the average housewife simply will not stand the \$360 a year increase in the cost of living which would otherwise result? Will you tell the cattlemen that we feel a profit of 150 percent of parity is too high, and that the proposed roll-backs on the price of beef were certainly justified? Tell them, please, that steak disappeared long ago from the tables of most average American families and that a further increase in the

cost of living would mean the disappearance of hamburger—that the housewife would have to turn to fish and other substitutes. Thus the cattlemen would be destroying their own markets. Or do they feel that the profiteers will buy enough steaks to make up for the absence of any beef whatsoever on the table of the average American family? No doubt \$360 is a very trifling sum to the cattlemen now lobbying in Washington—just a very small fraction of the cost of one of the many lavish parties they are putting on in their efforts to influence some of our Congressmen, but to the average American family it looms pretty large.

Take my own case for example, as I believe I am fairly representative middle-class housewife. I have five children, the oldest of whom has just completed her first year at the State University, and the youngest will enter kindergarten in September. My husband is a successful "small-business man" who works every day and several evenings a week trying to earn enough to support us. He is also the organist of our church. No 5-day—40-hour week for him. My oldest daughter is working for the summer months to earn money to help defray her expenses at college for the coming year. My 16-year-old daughter is also working during the summer to earn money for her schooling.

My 14-year-old boy earns what he can by mowing lawns, caddying, etc., and even the two smallest boys help with the household chores, as I cannot afford the extra help needed to run a household of this size. Thus far we have been fortunate. We have been able to "keep our heads above the rising tide of inflation," but another increase in living costs would just about submerge us.

But, Mr. President, will you tell Congress that even greater than the effect a ban on roll-backs would have on the family budget would be the moral effect on the American family. We know that with the outbreak of war in Korea and before the price freeze could be imposed, many unpatriotic Americans took advantage of the situation and raised their prices, while the more scrupulous voluntarily held their prices down. Are our children going to be led to believe that in our American democracy the greedy are rewarded and the honest penalized? What else can they believe if those producers who are making unfair profits are not compelled to roll their prices back?

Mr. President, we have never made it a practice in our family to blame the Government and the politicians for all the evils that beset the world. We believe that you are doing everything in your power to hold down the inflationary forces that are threatening to wreck our economy, and that many Members of Congress are fighting with you. However, it is apparent that an alarmingly large number of them are succumbing to the pressure of the lobbyists, perhaps believing that the American public is indifferent to the situation.

Will you tell them, Mr. President, that we are not indifferent about continuing price controls and roll-backs where indicated? We realize that either some prices will have to go down or others go up in order to correct present inequities. We know that a further increase in prices will mean a further deflated dollar which could lead us into national bankruptcy and the depression so eagerly awaited by Communists all over the world. Surely they must understand, Mr. President, how cleverly the Communists have maneuvered us into the present situation. What a diabolically clever piece of strategy to call for peace talks just at the time the Defense Production Act must be renewed, believing that with the hope of peace in Korea the American people will be stupid enough to relax controls. How they must be chuckling as they sit back and watch the combined forces of greed and

partisan politics preparing to tear down the barriers that have been erected against runaway inflation.

Mr. President, we can't let this happen. Will you once again remind the Members of Congress that a terribly grave responsibility rests on their shoulders? Will you urge them to forget the pleas of the pressure groups and think only of the danger that is threatening our country and the entire free world? Inflation must be stopped before it wrecks our entire economy and sets the stage for communism to take over. The only way to prevent this is by passage of a strong price-control bill with no weakening amendments. Congress alone has the power to do this.

Tell them, Mr. President, we are counting on them not to let us down.

Respectfully yours,

ALICE L. GUYER

Mrs. C. Irving Guyer.

DEAR MRS. GUYER: Thank you for your thoughtful letter about the need for price controls. It means a great deal to me to get letters like yours. And I have been getting many of them—letters from places like Houston, Tex.; and Oakland, Calif.; and Cincinnati, Ohio; good, heartening letters from big cities and small towns and R. F. D.'s all across America.

These letters prove what I believe so strongly, that millions and millions of Americans—housewives like yourself, and workers, and businessmen, and farmers—know the facts about inflation and understand them very well. They know the lobbyists are working hard here in Washington to get the Congress to pass weak control laws, which will keep us from putting up a successful fight against inflation. And they know how badly off we'll be if the lobbyists win.

I don't think you can fool most Americans once they have the facts. And I'm convinced that more and more Americans are learning the facts about inflation. And the more of our fellow citizens who do know the facts, the easier it will become to ward off the lobbyists' attacks and get the kind of legislation that the people of this country need and are entitled to.

You asked me in your letter to speak for you and all the other housewives, who aren't represented here in Washington by any lobby organization. Of course I will do that. It's what I have been doing. It's what I'm here to do. I have been speaking for you and working for you as hard as I can to make clear what the issues are in this fight against inflation and to convince the Congress that we must get a strong new control law on the books.

Let me say this to you. If we can't beat off the lobbies this time, we will just make a new start and try again. I want you to remember always, that though the special interests may have a triumph now and then, the people's interest is sure to carry in the end. Once the people know the facts and understand where their interests really lie, they are an irresistible force. Nothing can stop them.

That is our whole history as Americans.

I would like to ask you to remember one thing more. In Springfield, Mass., the cattle ranchers of the west may seem very far away. It must be hard, sometimes, not to identify them all with their self-styled "spokesmen" in Washington. It is just as hard, sometimes, for people out west not to identify all eastern businessmen—even small-business men like your husband—with the "spokesmen" of the "big interests" in New York, or the paid propagandists of the National Association of Manufacturers.

But these are both mistakes—mistakes none of us can afford. Most of the cattle-men and most of the businessmen are good

patriotic Americans, who want to safeguard their own interests, like anybody else, but not at the country's expense.

I am sure you know this. I am sure you realize how little the big paid lobbyists in Washington may really represent the members of their own organizations, much less anybody else. But these "spokesmen" have been filling the air with so many violent accusations against whole groups of Americans, that I fear sometimes lest many of us may forget how much we have in common—how much our welfare as individuals is bound up with our common welfare as American citizens, working together.

If we all remember that and keep it constantly in mind—in spite of all the shouting by the "spokesmen" and the "special pleaders," we can win the battle for price controls and the bigger battle that lies behind it—the battle for peace and security in the world.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Amendment to Price-Control Bill Detrimental to Efficient Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the price-control bill now before the House was reported to the House by the Banking and Currency Committee with approximately 57 amendments. In addition to this large number, there were upward of 75, maybe a hundred, more, offered from the floor of the House. Unfortunately many of these amendments were not subject to roll-call votes. Some of the amendments were meritorious, others were not.

My voting upon each of the amendments was based upon the theory that under present conditions we need an adequate price-control bill, but one that will not handicap either producer, businessman, or consumer to a greater extent than necessary.

In order that there may be some understanding of the reasons of my vote with respect to some of the outstanding amendments, I herewith submit the following by way of explanation of my vote against the adoption of amendments I hereafter mention.

First, The Poage-Cole amendment provides cost-plus pricing on every product at every stage of production and distribution. The costs which must be included are direct costs as well as indirect costs, many of which cannot accurately be measured on individual products. In the case of agricultural commodities, the processors' costs must even include parity prices—which processors do not pay when farm commodities are below parity. Most of them are. Processors of wheat, corn, peanuts, tobacco, potatoes, barley, oats, grapefruit, lemons, oranges, chickens, eggs, and apples, to name outstanding examples, would have to be allowed prices which represented a so-called reasonable profit

not just on their actual costs but on raw-material prices substantially higher than they actually paid. Grapefruit is selling at 53 cents a box—26 percent of parity—but the grapefruit processor could set his price based on raw material cost of \$2.02 a box. Potatoes are \$1.08 a bushel, 59 percent of parity. The potato-chip manufacturer, however, could pretend, in setting his price, that he had paid \$1.82, the parity price, for potatoes. There are innumerable such examples. But this does not end the plus features of the amendment. Every processor or manufacturer must be allowed for each item he makes a profit equal to 85 percent of his average profit for that item during the three most profitable years of the 4-year 1946-49 period. This cost-plus system would cost consumers, industry, and Government billions of dollars. Even worse, it would paralyze both price control and American business, because 85 percent of American corporations simply do not have the kind of cost-and-profit data required by this amendment.

It can be readily seen that the adoption of this proposed amendment could be highly detrimental to the consumers' best interest. Thus, my vote against it.

Second, The Davis amendment would freeze for a period of 4 months all wages and all prices except farm commodities selling below parity. It would not freeze rents. Since only five major farm items are selling above parity, this amounts to a freeze of everybody except the farmer and the landlord. Food and rents could rise while wages remained frozen. Costs to business could rise as farm commodities or imported raw materials rose in price, but business could not get essential price relief for 4 months, not even those companies operating in the red. Many might have to close their doors, throwing thousands out of work. The inflexibility in pricing would create chaos in defense production. As an example, an increase in the prices of machine tools was ordered last week to break a bottleneck in defense production. Since this order came after the July 7 deadline for price increases provided for in the Davis amendment, the machine-tool-price increase would be canceled, and this bottleneck in vital defense production would continue to the detriment of our rearmament program.

While there may be some advantages to be gained by the adoption of this amendment, yet it seems to me on the over-all application it could be detrimental to the workers and the consumer; hence, my vote against it.

Third, The Hope amendment to ban slaughter quotas removes the only effective device for distributing fairly and equitably among established slaughterers all of the available livestock sent to market. The National Association of Independent Beef Slaughterers declares the amendment would "result in the slaughter of many of our independent slaughtering firms." Without quotas only the big packers and the black-market operators would obtain supplies of livestock if marketings are reduced or if military purchases rise substantially.

Small slaughterers outside the major marketing areas would be squeezed out and meat famines would occur in many regions. The quota system assures a fair supply of meat to all.

My first inclination was to support this amendment, but, as I gave the matter further study, I came to the conclusion that it could, under certain circumstances, and, on the basis of past experience, prove highly detrimental to the consumer; hence, my vote against its adoption.

The Cole amendment requiring a profit on every species of meat for every segment of the processing industry would inaugurate an entirely new pricing system in the packing industry and enable it to capitalize on current high demand for its product. The present law already guarantees "a generally fair and equitable margin" for all processors of agricultural commodities, including livestock. This amendment would guarantee profits to individual meat processors on lines which are not normally profitable to those firms. These higher prices are not necessary to assure fair over-all profits to the industry. They would merely increase the packers' total profits at the expense of the consumer. Prices would be higher particularly on the cheaper cuts of meat purchased by low-income families.

This amendment has, in my opinion, no justification for its adoption. It would change the bases on which this industry has operated in the past and undoubtedly increased prices to the consumer. Hence, my vote against its adoption.

The Fugate amendment, prohibiting the scheduled two additional roll-backs on beef cattle, knocks out reductions to consumers which would average 10 cents a pound on retail cuts of beef. Thus, the consumer would have to continue to pay present retail-beef prices. The original 10-percent roll-back on cattle prices gave only negative relief to the consumer by preventing an increase in retail prices. The two additional roll-backs would give the consumer positive relief in lower prices on all cuts. Even after all three roll-backs scheduled for cattle prices, beef cattle would remain at 122 percent of parity, or 22 percent higher than the relative fair price determined under the parity formula. Since most agricultural commodities are selling below the parity level, the farmer would still derive greater relative purchasing power from the raising and sale of cattle than from the production of almost any other farm commodity, thus providing adequate incentive for increased production of beef cattle.

My opposition to this amendment was more fully set forth in my speech appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on a previous day. I do not favor this amendment because it would greatly handicap the Administrator in making possible lower prices to the consumer. I am strongly in favor of giving all the necessary help that is possible to accomplish the purpose of price-control legislation.

How We Lost One War and Got Into Another

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the fourth in a series of articles I wrote for the Scripps-Howard newspapers:

WASHINGTON, June 1951.—One reason we Americans don't have a successful policy in Asia is that too many of our officials have a vested interest in failure.

We are not talking about those who were in our Government—and some of whom may still be in our Government—who knowingly made decisions that were calculated to deliver to communism the fruits of Allied victories in World War II.

We are talking about the good men, patriotic men, who felt that the difficulties in Asia were so great that we were licked before we started. Viewing Asia through the gray glasses of pessimism and despair, they not unsurprisingly failed.

And having failed, they seem determined that nobody shall replace them who with greater courage and confidence in the ability of America to inspire and uplift the oppressed masses of Asia, might succeed.

There is nobody so tenacious of position as the man who has said that a task is impossible and fears that somebody will come after him and prove that he was wrong.

There were three American generals who failed in China.

One was the late Lt. Gen. Joseph L. Stilwell. Stilwell had the job of consolidating the anti-Japanese forces in China with virtually no outside aid, because we were devoting 98 percent of our effort to defeat Hitler.

The job required somebody with the tact of an Eisenhower. Stilwell was a cantankerous man of great personal courage, who was cast in the wrong job. We now know that he was being flattered and used by a group in our State Department.

As I write this I have in my hand a copy of a secret report that was sent October 10, 1944, by John Stewart Service, State Department political liaison man with the Communists at Yenan. It is addressed to General Stilwell. In it Mr. Service, who, incidentally, is still in the State Department, repeats the transparent lie that the Chinese Reds are democratic eight different times.

He urges Stilwell to disregard "any ties of gratitude" to Chiang Kai-shek for his long resistance to Japan and to force a union of the Nationalist and Red armies under American command. "There is only one man qualified by experience for the job," Service states, leaving Stilwell to conclude that it is Stilwell.

At Service's prodding, Stilwell reached for complete authority in China, which would have meant supplying American arms to the conspiracy which was dedicated to achieving absolute domination of the country. Chiang balked, and Stilwell had to be recalled.

Gen. George C. Marshall, Stilwell's close friend and unwavering supporter, followed Stilwell to China with a directive from the White House and State Department to force the unity Stilwell had sought by threatening the free Chinese with loss of American support if they refused.

Since the Communists never want unity, but control, they were able by their obstruc-

tionary tactics to thwart Marshall's mission. He came home a bitter and disillusioned man, who damned both sides in China indiscriminately. With the orders he took out, his failure was inevitable and not necessarily his own fault.

General Marshall clings to his opinion that China is a hopeless mess. The man who performed so brilliantly as Army Chief of Staff in World War II cannot concede that even indirectly he could ever have been wrong.

Gen. David G. Barr was sent to China in 1948 when the fate of the Nationalist government had already been determined by the negative United States policy pursued in the crucial years of 1946 and 1947. He naturally was discouraged.

Against these three generals who failed, we have any number of American military men with equal or superior knowledge of Asia who have succeeded there—to the limit permitted by our State Department and President.

General MacArthur was one. He's no armchair strategist. He has shown in Japan that it is possible to reverse the tide of prejudice against westerners, to substitute trust for hate. But MacArthur was bypassed by the State Department on every political decision outside his command in Japan.

Until the Senate hearings, General MacArthur had never once received an official invitation to give his views on what we could and should do in China.

Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer is another general who has a habit of success. Wedemeyer went to China between Stilwell and Marshall's visits. He succeeded admirably with the Chinese but his report to Washington outlining what would—and did—happen in China and in Korea, if certain American steps were not taken, was suppressed.

Maj. Gen. Claire L. Chennault, the leader of the Flying Tigers, is another American military man intimately acquainted with China who has a record of achieving the impossible.

Along with these three from the Army, we have the Navy. Seven admirals in succession have said that the job of keeping Asia free can and must be done—Admiral Harry E. Yarnall (retired) and Admiral Thomas C. Hart (retired), before World War II.

Rear Adm. Daniel E. Barbey, the first Navy commander who went in after the war, was removed because he spoke out against the reckless policy of turning China over to the Soviet Union after his men had fought clear across the Pacific to keep Japan from getting China's manpower and resources and turning them against the United States.

He was succeeded by Admiral Thomas C. Kinkaid (retired), whose eyes just flash when he talks about the mess our Government's policy of negativism and defeat has made out there. You wouldn't call Admiral Kinkaid a know-nothing or "just emotional about Chiang Kai-shek."

Admiral Kinkaid was followed by Admiral Charles M. Cooke (retired). He is pretty good, too—so good that he planned most of the brilliant strategy of our Pacific campaigns. He is so concerned about helping Chinese stop Chinese Communist expansion, so we won't have to, that he is out in Formosa now working as a private citizen to help save what he knows is so important to this country.

And Cooke was followed by Vice Adm. Oscar S. Badger and Admiral Arthur C. Radford, who both disagreed with our policy of doing just enough to be held responsible for what happened in China, but not enough to succeed—the worst of all policies.

On the one hand are three men who failed in China. They say it can't be done.

But on the other hand are 10 equally able men who succeeded. They say it can be done. Whose judgment are you going to take?

If I am sick, I don't want a doctor who can explain to me, no matter how eloquently, why he can't get me well. I want one who is determined to find a way to cure me.

President Truman alone under our system has the power of calling in a new panel of physicians.

Long Beach, Calif., Shipyard Can Handle Any Navy Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I herewith call the attention of every Member of Congress to a newspaper comment appearing in the Long Beach (Calif.) Press Telegram recently with reference to the Long Beach navy shipyard. I was very sure that the content thereof would be valuable and informative as to the present status of the world-famous Moreell Dry Dock which can handle any ship afloat.

If I had the privilege of showing you and my other colleagues pictures of this great and famous Moreell Dry Dock at the Long Beach navy shipyard, you would see five great ships of the Navy undergoing work at the same time. The drydock is 1,105 feet long and 155 feet wide, and has a 17 feet 7½-inch concrete and steel floor. The concrete in the structure would pave a two-lane highway for a distance of 115 miles.

This necessary and history-making Navy shipyard on the shores of my beautiful home city of Long Beach, Calif., is situated within what is commonly known as the Long Beach-Los Angeles Harbor. This harbor, Mr. Speaker, has the prominent protection of a great Federal breakwater which extends from Point Fermin on the southwest to a point approximating Newport on the northeast. It is said that thus results one of the best protected and most adequate and available harbors in any port in the world.

I, myself, have had the inspiration of seeing the fleets of the United States Navy peacefully at anchor within that harbor on a day when I stood in review with the then Secretary of the United States Navy, the Honorable Curtis D. Wilbur.

The newspaper comment follows:

LONG BEACH YARD AGAIN CAN HANDLE ANY NAVY JOB

With the huge Moreell drydock now in operation for the first time in many months since subsidence forced its closing, the Long Beach naval shipyard today stands ready for any job that may be required.

Between 50 and 60 major ships can be repaired at one time with the facilities now in operation, the Navy reports.

Employment in the yards is well over 6,000 and by late summer to total number of workers will reach 7,000, a Navy spokesman said.

The yards were reactivated February 1, after being closed several months, and already 125 ships sent here for repairs or

overhaul have been completed and returned to action.

To handle the fighting ships there are three drydocks in operation. The Moreell dock is 1,105 feet long and 155 feet wide. Today it had five ships in it being worked upon at once. The two other docks are 693 feet long and 104 feet long. There also is a floating drydock in the yards.

The Moreell dock contains 50,590,000 gallons of water and can be pumped dry in 2 hours when no ship is in it. The floor of the huge structure is 17 feet 7½ inches thick, of concrete and steel and the dock, plus the dike constructed around it as part of the subsidence remedial work, contains enough concrete to construct a two-lane highway 115 miles long, the Navy reports.

The Moreell dock is one of the largest in the world and can handle any ship afloat.

The yards now are receiving more than \$2,000,000 worth of stores a week to stock the fighting ships. Purchases locally are averaging \$879,000 a month, the Navy report shows.

The civilian payroll is over \$2,000,000 a month.

Communist China Uses Clever Plays To Push Its Hate Drive Against United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edward Hunter:

COMMUNIST CHINA USES CLEVER PLAYS TO PUSH ITS HATE DRIVE AGAINST UNITED STATES

(By Edward Hunter)

HONG KONG, July 14.—New plays being produced in Communist China are pointing up the thoroughness and the long-range character of the Red regime's hate campaign against the United States.

They show that there is nothing temporary about Red China's hate drive. Instead, it has been made a part of all the normal spheres of life, education, the theater, journalism, religion, and commerce.

No Chinese, no matter what his age or work can escape participation, although the accusations are often crudely drawn, the technique with which they are taught is centrally directed and skillful. Take a book of plays, for instance, just put out by Red China, entitled "Pictures of Violent Deeds by Imperialist Americans." There are five one-act plays in the book, in the course of which Americans are shown perpetrating almost every crime known to man.

WRITTEN IN SHANGHAI

The plays were written by the Shanghai Drama Academy, which operates directly as part of the government propaganda machine. Leading playwrights of China are members, and do the writing under Communist Party guidance.

These plays are sent to schools, factories, and every sort of social and political organization throughout the country, for production by amateur and professional play troupes. Failure to perform them voluntarily makes the members liable to self-criticism as backward elements, a charge frequently followed by purges. Untold tens or hundreds of thousands of Chinese have

seen the plays. Many have had so much fun helping in the production that they willingly absorb much of the anti-American propaganda.

INCLUDE KNOWN NAMES

The plays have been made even more convincing by including characters known by name throughout the nation. They are written as documentaries in play form, and supposedly tell the true, inside story of great events. The first play in this book is entitled "The Warmonger," and has Gen. George C. Marshall as its principal character. Others include Mrs. Marshall and Ambassador Leighton Stuart.

How can an ordinary Chinese know that the scenes shown to him in such a matter-of-fact manner, and the words put into the mouths of these people, are lies? With no opportunity to learn different, the people accept what they hear and see as truth. These teachings are part of a permanent policy uninterrupted by such incidents as a lull or a truce in Korea, a fact of the utmost significance to America's future.

MARSHALL SLANDERED

The plot of this first play is a simple one. General Marshall is portrayed as posing as an advocate of a coalition government for China while actually masterminding military operations against the Communists.

He is portrayed as arranging petty bribes and instructing Ambassador Stuart that our first task is to hook in all the intellectuals. Stuart is shown as a craven, confused intriguer.

Delegates of the middle-of-the-road parties are shown comparing notes on how much money they have been paid by Marshall, and a scene sure to amuse the audience is the one in which one delegate complains that he has received less than another. This slapstick comedy is made to appear as if it were true by the use of actual names and party designations.

MRS. MARSHALL, TOO

Mrs. Marshall is portrayed as a comic character, who constantly refers to her love for China, but always to a ridiculous China of the dead past, saying, for instance,

"I love this peaceful nation, built upon rites and the virtue of complacency. Long pigtailed, bound feet, ceremonial greetings, bowing and the kowtow—you couldn't find another country like it in this world. So very cute, really."

Any modern young Chinese, hearing such words, will bristle at them. Put into the mouth of the wife of the American envoy by Chinese Communist propagandists, the effect cannot be minimized.

MISSIONARIES ALSO TARGETS

A harder nut for the Communist propaganda ministry to crack was the problem of disparaging American missionaries, most of whom have spent their lives teaching tolerance and human betterment. But the problem was tackled frontally—the play, The Hypocrite, badly accuses the missionaries of virtually every vice known to man.

The plot puts an elderly missionary in the role of a conniving sadist who first impoverishes neighboring farmers, then takes over their land for himself. One scene shows a Chinese mother on her knees, begging for the return of her land. As she kneels, an American Embassy official steps up to snap her picture. Then the Americans are shown having a good laugh over the trick—the photo will be used in America to prove how the Chinese are being converted.

Even the American's traditional generosity in foreign countries is undermined. In the play, Such Is Their Discipline, a little boy is run over by an American Army truck when he goes out to get some American candy, relief packages are shown to contain nothing but spoiled food, and Chinese have

women are raped by American soldiers after accepting their gifts.

The purpose of these plays is frankly stated in the preface—to oppose the United States in accordance with China's historic and righteous cause.

New York Young Republicans' Recommendations for a Positive Foreign Policy in the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended are resolutions adopted by the board of governors of the New York Young Republicans Club on July 10, 1951:

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A POSITIVE FOREIGN POLICY IN THE FAR EAST

I

Whereas the military operations in Korea were occasioned by Communist aggression growing out of the artificial division of that country without the sanction of the Korean people, and

Whereas the purpose of the UN military opposition to Communist aggression in Korea was and is to show that the free peoples of the world can and will stop aggression, and to establish freedom and government for Korea by Koreans; Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the only basis for a permanent settlement of the Communist aggression in Korea be the evacuation of the country by Chinese military forces and the unification of Korea, in accordance with United Nations directive, under a democratic government with national elections to be held under U. N. supervision at the earliest opportunity, and the maintenance of security by a U. N. police force until Korea can defend itself; and be it further

Resolved, That preparations be instituted through U. N. channels for the full reconstruction of Korea on a sound economic basis.

II

Whereas the Communist regime in China is judged by the U. N. to be guilty of unwarranted aggression, and has ignored or disobeyed various U. N. directives; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the United States oppose the admission of Communist China to membership in the U. N. so long as the Communist regime in China defies the authority of the U. N. and does not demonstrate its willingness to comply with the U. N. Charter, and, if necessary and possible, use its veto power for that purpose.

III

Whereas the Communist Chinese regime has been the main obstacle to peace in Korea; Therefore be it

Resolved, That, in the event of continuation of hostilities, the United States ask the United Nations to impose a naval blockade of Communist China, and such other measures of a military or economic nature as may be necessary to bring the war to a speedy and successful termination.

IV

Whereas the Government of the Republic of China was one of the founders of the United Nations and has remained loyal to it; and

Whereas the Chinese Government was forced to withdraw from the mainland and

remains on Formosa as the only spokesman for Chinese freedom from Communist tyranny; and

Whereas a tradition of deep friendship between the United States and the people of China has been a fundamental characteristic of American policy; Therefore be it

Resolved, That—

(a) The Assistant Secretary of State be commended for proposing a new positive policy regarding the Government of the Republic of China, reaffirming this country's cognition of it as the only legitimate government of the Chinese people;

(b) The United States give the Chinese Government, presently located on Formosa, fullest assistance;

(c) Formosa itself not be surrendered to Communist control for any reason whatsoever.

V

Whereas events in Asia have a direct bearing upon world peace and American security; and

Whereas the people of Asia are deeply concerned with the establishment of their independence and with the peace and security they need for developing their countries; and

Whereas communism seeks to exploit weakness and poverty; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the United States initiate action toward the formation of a Pacific Pact for the defense of the free countries of East Asia, to include the non-Communist nations of Asia as well as the other non-Communist nations directly concerned with the maintenance of peace in that area, and that the United States urge the United Nations to undertake such programs of economic advice and assistance as shall be necessary to place the national economies of the Asian nations on a sound, progressive basis.

Military Agreement With Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit these observations.

I certainly hope that our bungling State Department will not tie the hands of our able Admiral Sherman in his current negotiations with Spain, because of the influence of the British Socialist Government.

The other day, the British Bevan Party manifesto took a position against British rearmament and to deny overseas bases to America.

We would indeed be suckers if we permitted the British to influence our position in this matter.

It is elementary that Gibraltar must be kept open in order that the Mediterranean arm of the Atlantic be free. Militarily, this is of the utmost importance, because—

First, it is an avenue on which air-sea power could be brought to bear against the Soviet Union and her European satellites.

Second, it is the sea lane of logistic support for southern France, Italy, Yugoslavia, Greece, and Turkey.

Third, it is an efficient sea lane to the Middle East and the largest petroleum lands in the world.

Finally, it would be a formidable water barrier against a European continent held by the Red army, if that should come to pass.

Since Russia recognizes nothing but force, a military alliance with Spain would be a strong deterrent to the Com-mies and might prevent world war III. If war should come, we would be badly crippled without it.

This agreement with Spain is dictated by our own national self-interest. It is hoped that nothing will be permitted to stand in the way of its consummation.

Price Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues will be interested in reading the following letter from leaders of the Liberal Party in New York City, which I am convinced reflects the thoughts of an overwhelming majority of our citizens on some of the actions which this Congress is taking:

LIBERAL PARTY OF NEW YORK STATE,

New York, N. Y., July 16, 1951.

HON. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, JR.,

House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROOSEVELT: It seems almost inconceivable that Congress should permit a few powerful special-interest lobbies to shear it of its sense of responsibility to the people of the Nation in the fight against inflation. It is equally strange that, at the moment when watered control bills threaten further mulcting of both the Government and the consumer, Congress is considering shifting the major tax burden from the wealthy to the lower-income groups.

There is something fantastic in this whole attitude. Congress does not know whether there will actually be a truce in the Korean War. Congress does not know whether the Communist truce move is another Kremlin tactic to hoodwink Congress and the Nation into relaxing our defense efforts. Congress must know that, even if a truce does materialize, our country and the free world will still remain in mortal danger from Soviet imperialist expansionism. Surely Congress must realize that the defense-production program must continue unabated—must, in fact, be accelerated. Under these circumstances, how can Congress even consider opening gaping holes in the dikes against inflation?

We must have a Defense Production Act tailored to the needs of the Nation, not to the greeds of a few. We need strong, effective price controls, including roll-back powers. We need strong rent controls, not blanket rent increases. We need heavier taxation to pay for defense, but it must be imposed strictly in accordance with ability to pay. This principle rules out sales taxes or other regressive taxes on any level from which they may be transmitted to the consumer, including such camouflaged sales levies as the so-called consumption tax.

We urge you to do everything you can to stem the inflation build-up in Congress. We urge you to lend every effort toward passage of strong control legislation on all fronts, including prices and rents, and toward enactment of equitable tax measures. We

urge you to help undo the serious potential harm to the Nation that lurks in the DPA bill passed by the Senate.

We want to take this occasion to express our gratitude to all those Members of Congress who have been carrying forward the fight for effective anti-inflation controls. We have consistently followed and appreciated such efforts. We are sure that constituents have, too.

Sincerely yours,

MARK LEWIS,
Chairman, National Legislative Committee.
BEN DAVIDSON,
Executive Director.

TVA Provides Flood Control—The Missouri Valley Should Have Flood Control Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of the House, I believe, know well, the Tennessee Valley Authority has been an excellent example of how, through foresight and planning, floods can be prevented and controlled, and lives and property can be saved.

In the prevailing conditions of disaster in the great States of Missouri and Kansas the people there might well take a lesson from the Tennessee Valley in the matter of flood control, conservation, and the saving of lives and property under conditions of unusual rainfall and other factors causing high waters. One such disastrous flood as has been so recently experienced can and has caused loss far in excess of what would have been the actual cost of constructing proper dams and other flood control installations. The people of the Missouri Valley area can profit from the experience of the TVA and the Corps of Engineer flood-control projects in the Tennessee Valley area.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I desire to have included in the RECORD with my remarks an editorial from the July 15, 1951, issue of the Nashville Tennessean entitled "Flood Control Is Possible." The editorial is as follows:

FLOOD CONTROL IS POSSIBLE

For the simple reason that it has worked so well, the flood control program of the Tennessee Valley Authority is often all but overlooked when TVA's benefits to this region are assessed.

The benefits of this aspect of the TVA operation are brought home forcibly, however, by the millions of dollars worth of damage being wreaked by rampaging waters in Kansas and Missouri. Though it offers little comfort now to the thousands of residents of that area who have lost so much, the fact remains that a Missouri Valley Authority could have averted much of the destruction being heaped on numerous cities and acres of rich agricultural land.

According to the last annual TVA report, the Authority's flood control program has saved the Tennessee Valley some \$45,000,000 since 1933. When compared to estimates of

the Midwest flood damage—which go as high as \$1,000,000,000—this may seem to be a relatively small sum.

It is a significant figure, however, because it shows that a comprehensive flood control program incorporated into a valley development plan does provide reasonable safety from disasters like that now seen in Kansas and Missouri.

In its report issued earlier this year, the President's Water Resources Policy Commission said the development of possible multiple-purpose projects on the Missouri River and its tributaries "would protect the major points now subject to flood damage and would provide the maximum feasible amount of reliable flood protection and control."

Yet, this protection has been denied to the people now suffering because of both local and national opposition to an MVA. Even limited projects have been long blocked. In 1938, for example, Congress approved two reservoirs on Missouri tributaries that would have made the current situation much less serious. But those reservoirs were never built, largely because of the hostile reaction of residents whose land would have been inundated.

In the wake of this present catastrophe, it is possible that the people of Missouri and Kansas will reexamine their attitudes about flood control and that the outsiders who have opposed a Missouri Valley Authority because of its cost will recognize their false economy.

If, in taking a new look at the problem, they want any proof as to the effectiveness of valley-wide flood control, it can be found in abundance right here in Tennessee.

Great Britain Offers Assistance in Flood Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the following note was presented to Secretary of State Dean Acheson:

BRITISH EMBASSY,

Washington, D. C., July 19, 1951.

His Majesty's Ambassador for the United Kingdom presents his compliments to the Secretary of State and has the honor to inform him that he has been instructed by His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to inquire whether there is any aid which His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom and the British people can give to those who have been afflicted by the disastrous fires and floods which have recently occurred in the States of Kansas and Missouri. Sir Oliver Franks would be grateful if Mr. Acheson would let him know what suggestions the United States administration wish him to transmit to His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom.

Mr. Speaker, this offer of aid to our own people who are victims of the recent floods and fire in Kansas and Missouri is sincerely appreciated. Adversity and disaster strike at unexpected times and places without selective distinction. It may come to any human being anywhere throughout the world. In adversity, friendship, expressed through voluntary help, is man's greatest gift. The

American people are deeply touched by this warm friendship displayed by our British friends and hope that arrangements may be made which will permit our friends to give and our own disaster victims to receive the assistance of those who desire to help us.

Drew Pearson Falsifies George Washington's Views on Price Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post of July 20, 1951, the Drew Pearson column carries some excerpts from a letter written to James Warren on March 31, 1779, by George Washington.

A part of what Mr. Pearson lifted from Washington's letter is inaccurate. The entire excerpt deliberately misrepresents George Washington's views on price controls, as expressed in that letter.

Actually, Washington pronounced price control to be wrong, and did so in this very letter, but Mr. Pearson chose to omit that passage of the letter to James Warren.

The following is the section of the Pearson column which misrepresents Washington's views:

GEORGE WASHINGTON ON ECONOMY

Here is what George Washington wrote about inflation and price control on March 31, 1779, in a letter to James Warren:

"Is the paltry consideration of a little dirt pelf to individuals to be placed in competition with the essential rights and liberties of the present generation and of millions yet unborn?"

"Shall a few designing men for their own aggrandizement, and to gratify their own avarice, overset the goodly fabric we have been rearing at the expense of so much time, blood, and treasure, and shall we at last become the victims of our own abominable lust for gain?"

"Our cause is noble, it is the cause of mankind; and the danger to it is to be found within ourselves."

Now here is what George Washington actually said in that letter about price control:

"Let vigorous measures be adopted; not to limit the prices of articles, for this I believe is inconsistent with the very nature of things, and impractical in itself, but to punish speculators, forstallers, and extortioners, and above all to sink the money by heavy taxes. To promote public and private economy; encourage manufactures, etc."

Following is the complete excerpt from Washington's letter that deals with inflation and price control, as it appears in the Writings of Washington, volume 14, pages 312-313:

TO JAMES WARREN

MIDDLEBROOK, March 31, 1779.

Nothing I am convinced but the depreciation of our currency proceeding in a great measure from the foregoing causes, aided by stock jobbing, and party dissensions has fed

the hopes of the enemy and kept the British arms in America to this day.

They do not scruple to declare this themselves, and add, that we shall be our own conquerors. Cannot our common country America possess virtue enough to disappoint them? Is the paltry consideration of a little dirty pelf to individuals to be placed in competition with the essential rights and liberties of the present generation, and of millions yet unborn? Shall a few designing men for their own aggrandizement, and to gratify their own avarice, overset the goodly fabric we have been rearing at the expense of so much time, blood, and treasure? And shall we at last become the victims of our own abominable lust of gain? Forbid it heaven; forbid it all and every State in the Union; by enacting and enforcing efficacious laws for checking the growth of these monstrous evils, and restoring matters, in some degree to the pristine state they were in at the commencement of the war. Our cause is noble, it is the cause of mankind; and the danger to it, is to be apprehended from ourselves. Shall we slumber and sleep then while we should be punishing those miscreants who have brought these troubles upon us and who are aiming to continue us in them, while we should be striving to fill our battalions, and devising ways and means to appreciate the currency; on the credit of which everything depends? I hope not. Let vigorous measures be adopted; not to limit the prices of articles, for this I believe is inconsistent with the very nature of things, and impracticable in itself, but to punish speculators, forestallers, and extortioners, and, above all, to sink the money by heavy taxes. To promote public and private economy; encourage manufacturers, etc.

Measures of this sort gone heartily into by the several States would strike at once at the root of all our evils and give the coup de grâce to British hope of subjugating this continent, either by their arms or their arts.

The first, as I have before observed, they acknowledge is unequal to the task; the latter, I am sure, will be so if we are not lost to everything that is good and virtuous.

Korea, Gibraltar in the East, Strong and Free, Can Prevent China, Russia, and Japan From Again Cutting Each Other's Throats and the UN's Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on the map, Korea resembles Florida. Shaped like a rough-hewn springboard, it has been used for more aggressive moves in the last 57 years than any other country in the world.

The United Nations must make Korea strong and free, a Gibraltar in the East, to prevent China, Russia, and Japan from ever again cutting each other's throat and that of the UN too.

The slaughter of American boys at Pearl Harbor would never have occurred had the ports and airfields of Korea been available to the United States. The war with Japan would have been avoided.

When Japan crossed the Yalu in 1931, the League of Nations threw its birthright away because it failed to punish

the aggressor. The United Nations saved its birthright when it poured firepower into Red aggressors for their dastardly June 25, 1950, attack on the people of Korea.

The United Nations must, indeed, make Korea strong and free, a Gibraltar in the East, to prevent China, Russia, and Japan, as they have in the past, from ever again cutting each other's throat, and that of the United Nations too.

Practical System of Organizing Reserve Components

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I submit the following editorial from the Washington Post, issue of July 17, 1951:

REASSURING RESERVISTS

As a counterpart of the universal military service and training law, the Defense Department has at last come up with a more practical system of organizing reserve components. The improvement, as embodied in the Brooks bill, is overdue. To many reservists and to the House Armed Services Subcommittee, which has just issued a plain-speaking report on the subject, the system by which men have been called to active duty during the limited emergency has seemed to operate without rhyme or reason. It has kept many men on tenterhooks, and it has seemed to discriminate against the enlisted men and junior officers, whereas the better-paid field-grade officers have not been called. To be sure, there has been reason back of the system in most cases, it has operated on the basis of need. However, the reserve program has this against it—that many officers and enlisted men, when they signed up, did not anticipate a limited emergency and did not know what they were getting into.

That confusion should soon be remedied. Under the new proposals an Assistant Secretary in each of the services would be given responsibility for Reserve affairs, thus assuring top-level continuity and interest. The Reserves would be divided into three components—the Ready Reserve, the Standby Reserve, and the Retired Reserve. The Ready Reserve would be what its name implies—it would be composed of individuals ready for mobilization at any time the need arose. They would be required to take annual active-duty training. The second category, the Standby Reserve, would consist of men who would be available only upon declaration of war or proclamation of national emergency by Congress. Within the Standby Reserve would be another subdivision, the Inactive Status List, whose members would receive fewer perquisites and would be subject to call only when qualified officers of the other Reserve components had been exhausted. The Retired Reserve could be employed on the same basis as the Standby Reserve.

This seems to us a sensible plan with which to implement the Reserve obligations of universal service. All persons governed by the UMS law who had served less than 8 years on active duty would be required to participate in the Reserves. Those with less than 4 years of active duty or 3 years

of accredited training would be placed in the Ready Reserve; the others would be in the Standby Reserve. In time of emergency a priority system by which individuals and units of the Ready Reserve would be called would be publicized.

Particularly important is the proposed establishment of a promotion system in the Reserves approximating that of the Regular services. This would eliminate one of the chief complaints, particularly with respect to the Army, where Reserve promotions have been few and far between. The proposals, of course, are aimed at the future; undoubtedly, even if necessary legislation is adopted, some difficulty will be experienced in satisfying the desires of present reservists as they are fitted into the new scheme. But in any event the proposals are a positive step forward at a time when it is imperative to get a definite program to sustain reservist morale.

A Free Economy, the Only Source of Ample Food and Shelter—4,000 Years of Failure of Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I want very briefly to give you a little sketch of 4,000 years of uninterrupted failure of price controls as applied in the experience of nations from the beginning of civilization. We have heard from time to time that our experience with price controls dates from Leon Henderson, or from 1942.

That American passion for economic freedom has deep roots in our history becomes clear when one reads the words of the president of Princeton, John Witherspoon, in a letter to George Washington:

Fixing the prices of commodities has been attempted by law in several States among us, and it has increased the evil it was meant to remedy, as the same practice has done since the beginning of the world.

Is that really true? What does the historical experience of mankind teach about this fundamental issue, which touches the life of every man, woman, and child?

CONTROLS TRIED 4,000 YEARS AGO

The temptation for people in power to tamper with prices and production seems to be a very ancient human game. Thus, in the Laws of Hammurabi, King of Babylon—2285–42 B. C.—we find wage controls for boatmen, reapers, threshers, shepherds, laborers, artisans, bricklayers, tillers, stone cutters, milkmen, and carpenters. Regulated also were builders' fees and warehousing, as well as rental of cows in milk, calves, oxen, wagons, and freight and passenger boats. On the basis of historical evidence, we know that ancient history, throughout the changing centuries, is characterized by a never-ending succession of popular upheavals against tyrannical rules and regulations imposed upon the people from above. This continued

strife reveals one of the fundamental themes of human history—a struggle between regimentation and freedom.

We find later laws in ancient history, like, for example, the Hittite Code—1350 B. C.—which was discovered in Baghaz Kot in Asia Minor, that attempted to establish provision for wages and prices. The very fact that such laws had to be abolished or drastically revised under popular pressure indicates that even in ancient times rulers met with deep-seated resentment against their attempts to block the activities and trade of their citizens.

ROME HAD FREEDOM

History tells us that the Roman Republic, under a constitution guaranteeing freedom, became the envy of the "barbarians" of other countries. Its soldiers were increasingly victorious in their conflicts with the half-hearted mercenaries of neighboring nations that enjoyed little freedom. The glory that was Rome extended throughout what is now Western Europe and northern Africa because Rome was the center of freedom. There were no planned economies. As Gibbon tells us, freedom, honor, and justice were universally recognized virtues. And the freedom of Rome extended to its colonies.

The recurrent famines of earlier days were experienced with less and less frequency. Rome gave the civilized world the highest standard of living then known to mankind. But what happened? The leaders reached out for power. The republic became an empire. At first the emperors were cautious. They talked freedom as they planned a police state. Gibbon says, "Augustus was sensible that mankind is governed by names; nor was he deceived in his expectation, that the senate and the people would submit to slavery, provided they were respectfully assured that they still enjoyed their ancient freedom. A feeble senate and enervated people cheerfully acquiesced in the pleasing illusion." And so the people were fooled by bread and circuses. They looked to the government to supply more and more of their needs. Production declined everywhere. Prices skyrocketed.

ROMAN CONTROLS FAILED MISERABLY

Emperor Diocletian decided to maintain his popularity with promises to fix prices and reduce the cost of living. So in A. D. 301, he issued an imperial edict fixing the prices of commodities for the whole Roman Empire. His grandiose scheme was ushered in with a fanfare of benevolent propaganda. In fact, in the preface to the edict, the Roman Emperor shows an insight into the laws of psychological propaganda technique which is as startling as it is up to date. He assures his people that the coming economical control system is built on the highest motives of making the whole nation participate "in the blessings of that peace for which we have laboriously striven." He continues that in order to make this price-fixing system work, it is necessary for the rulers like "watchful parents of the whole human race" to help the people with remedies from above, and that such measures have become necessary,

since humanity cannot achieve such good results by its own free action.

The edict goes on to explain how the people have become greedy; how exorbitant profits were being made; how monopoly was running wild, and the people, therefore, needed protection from foes within as well as foes without. The only cure was a complete over-all control of food, clothing, wages, and so forth. Reading the list of commodities which the emperor asked his Mike DiSalle of that day, Maximianus, to take control of, reads astonishingly like our own modern OPS lists: Farm products, dyes, needles, feathers, filling for upholstery, seeds, wine, oil, meat, poultry, fats, sea food, building timber, wooden posts, finished wagons, agricultural implements, and so on ad infinitum.

In order to enforce his imperial law, Diocletian built up a huge bureaucracy to administer his universal price-control system. A contemporary observed has characterized the situation in the following words: "The number of ministers, of magistrates, of officers, and of servants who filled different departments of the state, multiplied beyond the example of former times."

The price-control police forces of Diocletian had as their legal weapon, severe penalties against any breach of the law. Death was the punishment for those who dared sell above maximum prices. Death also for the buyer who aided and abetted him. Death, too, for those who bought and sold illegal stocks. However, human nature being what it is, these penalties did not affect the general picture, and no bureaucratic machinery or legal apparatus could prevent a complete breakdown of the law of supply and demand with all the economic and social evils resulting from it.

Economic historians of the Roman Empire find that a situation developed which was as tragic as it was prophetic. Because the scarcity of production was heightened by the interference from price-control laws, prices on consumers' goods in the actual market rose to catastrophic heights. The control system which was put into operation to combat inflation, in this manner actually created inflationary trends which broke the backbone of the economic life of a great empire. Everywhere the results soon became visible: Building and construction stopped entirely. The arts and sciences fell into decay to such an extent that modern historians can recognize immediately the crudity and purility of the craftsmanship of this period. Artistic creativeness and inventive skill did no longer thrive in this new atmosphere of economic tyranny.

History goes on to point out that while the economic waste was incredible the trades sank to ever lower levels. Poverty was created among the broad masses, while the merchants and small entrepreneurs were impoverished into bankruptcy. Landowners and manufacturers, who were the hardest hit, lost interest in a system of economic slave control that took away the private inventiveness and enterprise of the human genius.

In the realm of agriculture the situation became so bad that the Emperor found it necessary to order the farmers and the farm laborers controlled by serfdom under state supervision. That this measure could only lead to a worsening of the agricultural situation is perfectly explainable by the well-known historical law, that soil tilled by slave labor never yields abundant fruits such as land cultivated by free farmers.

To meet this general extremity of national economics the Emperor, therefore, naturally turned to the device which is as common as it is artificial, namely, of exorbitant taxation. Taxes and surtaxes multiplied in a hopeless effort to fill an ever-empty treasury.

Thus ends the only total price-control system which the history of the Roman Empire records. Diocletian alone, of all the Roman emperors, was foolish enough to attempt it. If he had listened to the history of his Empire, he might have observed how earlier attempts of partial price fixing under emperors like Tiberius, Commodus, and Alexander Severus all had broken down. However, like many panic-stricken tyrants in the history of mankind, Diocletian apparently fancied that, if the price-control system only could be made totalitarian and foolproof, it would work where partial attempts have broken down. He lived to see the tragic mistake of his economic tyranny over a whole nation's life, since his experiment ended with such a complete failure that the edict had to be repealed as useless and unenforceable. Soon after the poverty-stricken and indignant people forced his abdication on May 1 A. D. 305.

The more serious lesson of this Roman price-control experiment is grasped, however, only if one realizes that its long-range effect on the Roman Empire was directly connected with the economic destruction of the greatest empire of ancient history. As the historian, Jules Toutain, has pointed out, the economic breakdown of the Roman Empire made it fall an easy prey to the attack of the barbarians who, a few generations later, poured in over the borders of the Empire south of the Danube and west of the Rhine. What had once been a proud and great nation had deteriorated into a mass of people which had lost both the productive initiative and the national self-esteem which make a people strong and healthy. One of the fundamental laws of national defense is that only a nation in which freedom has been preserved under law is able and willing to take up arms in defense of human rights and human dignity.

Upon the grave of the Roman Empire the well-known historian, Samuel Dill, of Oxford, has written the following epitaph, which we may do well to remember:

The system of bureaucratic despotism, elaborated finally by Diocletian and Constantine, produced a tragedy in the truest sense, such as history has seldom exhibited: In which, by an inexorable fate the claims of fancied omnipotence ended in humiliating paralysis of administration; in which determined effort to remedy social evils only aggravated them until they became unen-

durable; in which the best intentions of the central power were, generation after generation, mocked and defeated alike by irresistible laws of human nature and by hopeless perfidy and corruption in the servants of government.

It is not surprising that kings, who were notorious for their excessive egotism, should be found in the list of rulers bent upon price control. There is Philip IV, of France, who, in 1306, antedated Hitler's Jewish pogroms by six centuries, and who created a dire scarcity of wheat, bread, and clothing throughout his nation by his price-control system.

There are English kings, like Henry III and George II, who tampered with prices of grain and bread until Parliament rose up in indignation and repealed these royal price-control attempts.

There was Edward II, who, on an island like England, hit upon the ridiculous scheme of safeguarding production level on sea food by a control system which was inaugurated as a benefit for the people, but actually turned out to be such an impossible flop that all fish disappeared from the markets in the British Isles.

FRENCH CONTROLS FAILED

A complete survey of ancient, medieval, and modern price-control systems proves that they created scarcity instead of production and ill will instead of cooperation. One of the most illustrious and meaningful examples of this historical law we find as we turn to the history of the French Revolution.

When the leftists of that day—the Jacobins—decided to destroy French culture and French enterprise, they made use of the old tyrannical medium of a violent price control. Being experts in revolutionary technique, they chose to place iron control upon 39 necessities of life under the agency called committee of public safety.

The picture of what happened to the French revolutionary price-control system runs true to pattern.

As one historian, Andrew Dickson White, wrote in 1876:

The first result of the maximum was that every means was taken to evade the fixed price imposed, and the farmers brought in as little produce as they possibly could. This increased the scarcity, and the people of the large cities were put on an allowance. Tickets were issued authorizing the bearer to obtain at the official prices a certain amount of bread or sugar or soap or wood or coal to cover immediate necessities.

As another historian reports this era:

Prices were fixed. Any attempt to profiteer on necessities was made punishable by death. To break all opposition, the terror was established. The tribunal revolutionaire began sending scores of innocent people to the guillotine every day. Between March of 1793 and July of 1794 nearly 3,000 people were executed in Paris and about 15,000 in the provinces. At Nantes three or four thousand prisoners were thrust into old boats that were sunk in the middle of the river; at Lyon they were shot down in groups of as many as 200 at a time.

The Civil War of the Vendee began in 1793. Insurrection against the revolutionary government spread into Poitou, Anjou, and Brittany. Threat of famine compelled the rationing of food. There was much discontent on that account. The Hebert group

attempted to incite the famished people to an attack on the convention. Robespierre acted swiftly. Hebert and his chief lieutenants went to the guillotine. That was in March 1794.

Robespierre, then 35, became the uncontested master of the situation. From April to July 1794, his authority was unchallenged. He moved rapidly toward his goal of complete social equality. It was ordered that the confiscated properties of enemies of the Republic should be given to deserving patriots. Saint-Just was charged with this distribution, and was authorized to revise the code of social institutions in the interest of pure democracy * * * trial by jury was denied to those suspected of conspiracy and the tribunal was authorized to make condemnations without the hearing of witnesses. Heads began to fall faster than ever. It was the great terror. In 45 days there were 1,285 executions.

The great terror was an expression of Robespierre's impatience to realize his ideal state. He wished to destroy all opposition to the establishment of social and economic equality. But he had overreached himself. The razor of the Republic began to lose its popularity. The pitiless apostle of liberty, fraternity, and equality began to lose prestige. The word "tyrant" was murmured. * * * On July 28, 1794, Robespierre and his brother, Saint-Just, and 19 others were executed. That ended the terror, and it all but ended the Republic. Democracy followed autocracy to the guillotine. The death of Robespierre ended the dream of pure democracy and equality. No man dared to espouse the perilous cause that had brought death to its devotees. The Robespierre legislation in the interest of equality was either suppressed or ignored and, to the delight of the merchants, price control was abandoned.

All price fixers do not meet so violent an end as that of Robespierre but the wrath of the hungry and disillusioned people always descends upon them.

A sigh of relief and a new spirit of self-governed activities swept through France. The farmers plowed and planted, and during the month of July 1795 they could once again harvest their crops as free men after the disastrous and negative years of revolutionary price control. Liberty had conquered once more.

EARLY AMERICAN OPA'S

Coming now to the United States, we find the resistance to Government tampering with the laws of supply and demand greatest of all. A limited price control was attempted during the American Revolutionary War, but the alert and freedom-loving citizens, taught by experience, soon totally rejected this Government interference with the economic life of the States.

Led by Connecticut and Massachusetts, the New England States went in for regulating prices early in the Revolutionary War. This emergency measure was motivated quite as much by the fact that the continental currency lost its monetary value as by the self-evident fact that British blockade created a severe shortage of consumers' goods. The inevitable result was that the 1774 price level soon broke down, and as early as the spring of 1777 Connecticut, Rhode Island, and New Hampshire were forced to raise the level for maximum prices. In Rhode Island, however, the town of Providence objected strenuously. It di-

rected its representatives in the legislature to fight such measures, as they created scarcity and produced animosity.

In Connecticut, Governor Trumbull warned in a public statement:

If we affix a low price to provisions and articles of importation we shall find that the farmer will cease to till the ground for more than is necessary for his own subsistence, and the merchant will not risk his fortune on a small and precarious prospect of gain.

The good Governor was really advocating what later generations prefer to call controlled inflation, even though he must be excused for not knowing the modern devices of economic deception called farm subsidies and cost-plus contracts.

Soon the States, including New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, began to labor under keen misgivings, however, that the price control as such was a deceptive technique. This discovery led to an interstate convention being called in New Haven in January 1778. The war was still raging and the longed-for victory for independence still did seem far away. In a stampede of economic panic, the delegates voted, therefore, to adopt a price advance of 75 percent above the 1774 price level.

What was meant to be a radical cure threatened to become a disaster, since a run-away inflation soon began to encompass the national economic life. The Continental Congress very quickly realized that it had to reverse its policy in order to avert sure economic doom. In its meeting of April 8, 1778, it declared, therefore, to the sorely tried war-torn Nation:

It hath been found by experience that limitation on the prices of commodities is not only ineffective for the purpose proposed, but likewise productive of very evil consequences to the great detriment of the public service and grievous oppression of individuals.

The courageous and wise pronouncement by the Continental Congress had a reassuring effect upon the States. In fact, so much so that price fixing was permitted to lapse for about a year. During this period, the American people discovered that price fixing could not serve as a safeguard against the heavy inflation which their just War of Independence gave them to carry as an additional price for freedom. They recognized this as an economic fact which proved that, measured in money values, they all were becoming poorer as together they were winning their freedom.

In 1779 the last brief attempt was made at price fixing as a remedy to control a deeply wounded war economy. On May 25, 1779, the town of Boston adopted a price schedule for 15 articles on a month-to-month basis. And in July of the same year, a State convention at Concord adopted a general price level, stipulating that violators were to have their names published in the newspapers as enemies of the country. The background for this threat against violators was, of course, the fact that the very outcome of the whole war hung in the balance.

Yet, even so, history records that penalties were rarely imposed. Indeed, the

laws were, for the most part, not enforced. They remained, as Prof. Allan Nevins has pointed out, on the statute books.

And as soon as the fortunes of war turned, the States rid themselves of the fruitless and scarcity-producing price-control system, which they had grasped in a moment of panic. It is to the undying glory of the men and women of the Revolutionary period that a whole year before Cornwallis surrendered at Yorktown, all the States had already repealed their price-control laws.

Such was the depth of their belief in freedom as a producer of goods and services. Price control in America was over—not again to be revived for 160 years.

They fought not merely for independence. They fought for freedom and learned right in the middle of war itself that freedom produces more food and clothing and shelter than controls can produce. They emancipated freedom from Europe and European controls.

During the postwar period, under the Articles of Confederation, our colonial ancestors lived in an era of high prices. The unsecured revolutionary currency was issued in such quantities that "not worth a continental" became a popular phrase. The monetary situation interfered seriously with trade and tended to foment discord, distrust, and disunity.

It was in this atmosphere that the Constitutional Convention met in 1787. It is worthy of note that no delegate to this convention seriously proposed that our Government should have the power to fix prices. Their generation had learned that Government price fixing would not work and so this power was not listed among those delegated powers which the people gave their Federal Government.

To exercise such power now is sheer usurpation. It was the adoption of our Constitution with its limitation on control that brought the new era of food and shelter. We need to remind ourselves that this era started right here in America. Our example spread around the world until the world rejected freedom for many forms of collectivism. With that has come again the ghastly prospects of starvation and famine. That has been the rule of life throughout history except where for brief periods of time freedom of the people has been maintained.

This has always existed whenever land has been used in common and regulated by some central authority. The planned economies of lords, kings, and dictators have always resulted in famine and want.

Freedom, which is synonymous with ample food and shelter, is the first great achievement of modern times. Under the Constitution, Americans were free to own their lands, work out their own plans, and enjoy the fruits of their labor without regulations by authority or oppressive taxation. With this freedom has come agricultural science and invention of machinery, increased supplies of food, intellectual advance, improved means of communication, steam, electricity, and all the wonders that only the imaginative and creative minds and

spirits of free men and women may comprehend for the future blessings of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, this debate has clarified one fundamental thing; namely, the fact that we are today witnessing the old, old fight between two contradictory political systems of government. On the one hand we have the advocates of government control over national life and national production. They willingly abandon freedom. To adopt price controls in peacetime would be clear proof that the European idea of government control and government domination and compulsion has moved permanently into the political philosophy and political life of this great Republic.

Those who do not believe that freedom will solve our economic problems should stop fooling themselves. They continue to talk about freedom, but they do not really believe in it. They give lip service to liberty, but the moment the test comes they call for continued and increased power for public officials.

Mr. Speaker, the test is here. Are we going to give our people, and the rest of the world true statesmanship, built on first principles.

I am reminded of the words of a free American from the debate on price regulations of February 14, 1777, in the Continental Congress, where Mr. Benjamin Rush stated:

The salvation of this continent depends upon the authority of this Congress being held as sacred as the cause of liberty itself. It becomes us, therefore, to be careful of the remains of our authority and character.

We know that what this Nation and other nations expect from the United States at this crucial moment in history is production and more production of vital foods and clothing and shelter for consumption at home and especially food for people abroad. Half of the starving are dependent upon us. The managed, controlled, and forced spirit of man will neither produce nor work nor fight nor make sacrifices necessary to rebuild a world civilization which was wrecked by an evil domination system which was built on absolute government control.

It is deplorable that 15 years of false indoctrination has dulled our sense of liberty, our passion for its products. Having won a complete victory over government-controlled systems in Germany and Japan, we too are in danger of continuing to follow the false philosophy of good coming from government interference, the Hegelian doctrine of the omnipotent state. It is Hegel who said:

A state is the divine idea as it exists on earth and we must therefore worship the state as a manifestation of the divine on earth. The state is the sole condition for the attainment of the particular end and good. The state must, in its constitution, permeate all situations.

The Members of this House are the representatives of a free people against these prophets of doom and gloom and their fundamental philosophy of life and Government so completely out of line with truth and fact. I agree that what is at stake is our entire economic future, only I believe that our future, as our glorious past, should be dedicated to free-

dom and faith and not to price control and fear.

We have corruption and we have black markets because we have man-made control instead of adherence to that fundamental law called the law of supply and demand. A natural law which is as inevitable and basic as the law of gravity cannot be set aside by any law even of Congress. Freemen meeting in a free market doing their free selling and buying proves to be far more honest in the long run than people who have Government officials looking over their shoulders every time they turn or every time they finish a product. Freedom is more honest than Government and so much more productive.

Everything that is happening now points to the fact that if we now continue to substitute expediency for faith in freedom we are on the road to weakening more and more the central idea upon which the Republic was founded. We are on the way to corruption and disintegration. To guarantee that this catastrophe shall not happen to the last bastion of free enterprise or free economy in the whole world we must keep free from price controls and hold fast to our free economy.

If we cannot read history so well or act so courageously as our forefathers in dealing with price controls, we can imitate them. Let us take a leap of faith in freedom if we would have food, clothing, shelter, and the good life.

Reserve Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans States, issue of July 17, 1951:

Representative OVERTON BROOKS' subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee reports the sort of confusion, injustice, waste, and stupidity in the reinduction of reservists that is old stuff to all who read the newspapers or are in conversational contact with men in the service.

The origins of this unhappy mess are to be found, we think, in the legislation enacted by Congress. The draft law itself lays down some of the broad requirements for military service and stipulates who shall be liable to induction. Then the President of the United States supplements the law with some directives specifying who may be inducted and who may be excused for one reason or another. Finally, the National Director of the Draft, General Hershey, adds some directives and regulations, which leaves the local draft boards with bundles of confusing instructions.

The draft boards are required to meet their quotas, and in numerous instances they are subject to the influences of politicians and kin and employers, so they excuse some from serving and induct some who have legitimate reason to be excused.

All of these enormities grow out of the fact that Congress never had the courage to

write a universal training and service statute that would exempt no one, not even the IV-F qualified for limited service. The injustices of which Representative Brooks speaks will all be eliminated when universal military training is adopted, and in all probability not before.

MacArthur a Candidate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following editorial from the Mountaineer, Ripley, W. Va., of June 29, 1951:

OUR GUESS WAS, AND IS YET, MACARTHUR IS A CANDIDATE

Have you lost the weebegone look in your eyes when you learned that General MacArthur had been relieved of his command in Korea? Are you one of those that let out those woeful moans and felt like all things had come to an end? Were you one of those who thought all was lost in Korea because MacArthur had been dismissed?

How has the war progressed since in your estimation the only man that had brains enough to run it, General MacArthur, was relieved of his command and a subordinate officer, General Ridgway, took command? Are you aware of the fact that victory has crowned almost every day's fighting since MacArthur lost command and General Ridgway took command? The foregoing was not written to take any glory from MacArthur, it was written to show you how wrong you were. Possibly if MacArthur had stayed in command he may have done as well, but it is most certain he would not have done better. At least, he had not up to this time done near as well.

Do you remember we told you in the first issue of the Mountaineer after MacArthur's dismissal that he would be a candidate for President, and all the hullabaloo raised about his dismissal was for political purposes. You may have thought we were wrong, we could have been wrong, and could even yet be wrong when we tell you that MacArthur is a candidate for President. If we are wrong, the four speeches he made in Texas were misdirected. General MacArthur hardly mentioned the war in Korea and he attacked domestic matters all together. All four speeches were purely political.

Do you remember another thing that we told you, that the Republican leaders in making a campaign issue of MacArthur would be riding a dead horse. We also told you that the MacArthur shows were all out of proportion and that they would dwindle and dwindle fast. His invasion of Texas was the best proof that his popularity could not last. In the four speeches he made in Texas he never had more than a fourth to a third of a crowd expected and advertised for.

Yes, MacArthur is a great man, truly a great man. He wanted to carry the war into China and the Joint Chiefs of Staff did not think it was best to invade China at that time. Finally this difference went so far that the President had to dismiss General MacArthur. The General's dismissal was not to take anything from him, it was done to carry on the Korean war the way the Joint Chiefs of Staff thought best.

Whether the war should have been carried into China (Manchuria) at that time no one knows. It may never be known whose judgment was best. To have carried the war into China may have brought Russia into the war at once. That is another thing no one knows. The Chiefs of Staff said no, we will not attack Russia at this time, and MacArthur said his hands were tied if he was not allowed to carry the war into China (Manchuria). MacArthur said he didn't think Russia would attack us. Who knows?

You who think MacArthur was right, don't complain that we are having to fight in Korea, for if we carried the war into China it would be a far, far greater job. It would take every soldier boy we have on that eastern front. You most certainly know that the East isn't the only place we have to have boys, ships, planes, and guns.

President Truman was put on the spot. He had to dismiss MacArthur or carry the war into China. The President's Chief of Staff advised that to carry the war into China was at that time an unnecessary risk. The President had to act.

There is no doubt but what MacArthur was sincere, and we will never know whether he or the Chief of Staff was right.

The sad part for MacArthur wasn't his dismissal. His dismissal made a great hero of him. The sad part of it was the Republican Members of the Senate and party leaders about Washington attempted to capitalize on his dismissal, and, as we told you in the first issue of the Mountaineer following his dismissal, MacArthur would end up the goat. Isn't it evident to you now, you, who abused the President for what he did, that MacArthur would have been much better off if the Republicans had not attempted to use him for campaign bait.

Regardless of how the war ends in Korea the MacArthur affair should never have been made a campaign issue. It is very evident now, to most any kind of observer, that the Hoovers and Tafts erred seriously when they backed MacArthur solely for political reasons.

The Korean war was the Republicans' No. 1 vote getter for 1952. But when the party backed MacArthur and advocated making war on China at the very great risk of starting world war III, they lost their No. 1 campaign complaint. Mr. TAFT, the chairman of the fault-finding committee, sure has erred in this one.

The investigation of President Truman's dismissing of MacArthur has flopped. This investigation was demanded by Senator TAFT and his colleagues. Why did they want the investigation? Was it that they were in sympathy with MacArthur? Not at all. General MacArthur and TAFT are not personal friends. It was for discredit to the President. Now, you realize that nothing has come from the investigation except to strengthen the President's position by 100 percent.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call attention to articles in the May and June issues of the Hoosier Farmer. They are thoughtful articles concerning the St. Lawrence seaway. One is written by Hassil E. Schenck, president of the Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc.

The articles follow:

[From the Hoosier Farmer for May 1951]

FARM BUREAU FAVORS ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY NOW

(By Hassil E. Schenck, president, Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc.)

For many years the American Farm Bureau Federation has been on record by resolution favoring the St. Lawrence seaway project. This project is designed to provide water transportation for most seagoing vessels into all the Great Lakes area. While being on record favoring this over a long period of years, up to now it has been given only passive support.

In the January meeting of the American Farm Bureau Board it was decided that in the light of recent developments, that considerable attention should now be given to the promotion of this project.

The Mesabi mines have furnished a great portion of the ore which has made possible the great iron and steel cities of the Great Lakes area. This supply is rapidly being exhausted. The new source of supply (and it is a source which will last for many, many decades) is the Labrador area. The most logical and lowest-cost method of getting this ore to our great iron and steel centers is by way of the proposed St. Lawrence project.

I doubt if this will very greatly affect the railroads of the country, because if we should allow our iron and steel centers to depreciate, many railroads now serving them would of necessity depreciate along with them. It is true, it would adversely affect some of our eastern seaboard, such as Boston, New York, and Baltimore, but a seaboard should be the means to an end in rendering service to the people and the economy of a country, not the end itself.

ELECTRICITY IS SHORT

A considerable shortage of electric power is reported in the Northeast which makes absolutely necessary the erection of a plant to supply additional low-cost energy and this needs to be taken into consideration. I am not advocating Government-owned power plants, but would advocate that private corporations be given first options on such power plants, if, and when established.

If there are other more economical methods than the hydroelectric process, then, of course, the most economical method should be used.

Another factor in which the farmers of the great Middle West are vitally interested, is that of getting their exportable farm produced commodities to the ocean and also in getting imported commodities needed in the Midwest here at the lowest possible cost. The farmers of Indiana and other States in the great Midwest (the breakbasket of the world) would stand to benefit very materially by lower costs on incoming and outgoing traffic.

Canada is vitally interested in this project and according to authentic reports, is not only ready and willing to join in the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway project, but if we are not ready to cooperate, their interest is so great that they are contemplating the project alone. Should this happen, it would put United States shipping in a position where it would have to pay toll on all incoming and outgoing traffic, with all revenues going to the Canadian Government.

A GRAVE MISTAKE

It would seem a grave mistake, when the United States would have far greater use, because of her greater population and production, than would Canada, that the United States Government should not have her proportionate share of these tolls.

The arguments being used against the St. Lawrence project are little different from those advanced against the Erie Canal and the Panama Canal, both of which are wholly

United States owned. One of the big objections is that the expenditure would not be economically justifiable. Both the aforementioned projects have not only proved economically sound, but are commonly acknowledged as very essential to our present-day transportation procedures. As we look to the future, it might well prove a great asset in our mobilization plans and at the same time greatly strengthen our national defense.

FARMERS ARE INTERESTED

Farm Bureau is not acting blindly on this, but only after the most careful studies and consideration. The farmers in Indiana may well take their time and effort to contact their Congressmen and Senators, informing them of their interest in the St. Lawrence seaway project.

[From the Hoosier Farmer of June 1951]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY WILL SAVE UNITED STATES MONEY

"It is likely that Government spending will be increased rather than reduced if the St. Lawrence project is not constructed," declared the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association in a study entitled "The St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project and National Security," issued recently.

The report, prepared under the direction of Dr. N. R. Daniellian, executive vice president of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, formerly a member of the economics faculty of Harvard University, states that the seaway will provide a submarine-free route for the transportation of much-needed Labrador ore to Great Lakes steel centers.

WILL SAVE MONEY

Pointing out that United States taxpayers will pay higher prices for steel, bread grains, and ships if the St. Lawrence seaway is not built, the report declared, "We cannot afford not to construct it."

St. Lawrence resolutions are in committees in both House and Senate. The seaway has been urged for national security by Defense Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and chairman of the Munitions Board, John D. Small.

Without the seaway, the Daniellian report states, steel costs will rise because of higher transportation expense for bringing iron ore to steel mills. Also, lacking the cheap seaway water route, the Government will pay from 5 to 10 cents more on every bushel of agricultural produce transported from the Midwest to overseas destinations.

The report points to the experience of the last war, when shipbuilding costs were unnecessarily high because there was no direct access from the Great Lakes to the ocean. Obstructions in the St. Lawrence River, to be removed by pending legislation, made it necessary to float ships on pontoons from the Great Lakes down the Mississippi River to tidewater.

Mobilization goal for steel production, 130,000,000 tons of annual capacity by 1960, will require 158 million tons of iron ore. The necessity of importing 40 to 50 million tons of this ore has put the spotlight on the Labrador reserves, now being developed.

"If the St. Lawrence proper is not constructed, alternative power and transportation facilities will have to be provided to meet increased power and transportation shortages," the report states. "Much more steel and manpower will be required to provide the alternate facilities—ore boats, loading and unloading facilities, additional rail facilities, and steam electric plants—than will be needed to construct the St. Lawrence seaway and power project."

The report concedes that all defense spending is inflationary, whether under-

taken as private or public projects, but points out that the effect of the St. Lawrence project will be less inflationary than other means of solving current shortages. The cost to the United States, \$566,000,000, of which \$192,000,000 is for power to be paid by New York State, and \$374,000,000 is for navigation—is expected to be repaid in 50 years by income from navigation tolls and power revenues.

Price and Wage Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, in presenting the following statement by the American Association of Independent Industries, I want to commend their sound and statesmanlike contribution to public thinking at the time that we are attempting to legislate effectively on the important problems of price and wage controls and taxation.

The association's views on these subjects are in refreshing contrast to the narrow self interest views of many other business and farm groups who are presently attempting to have controls abolished or weakened to a point where they may become a mockery.

Truly workable and effective controls are essential to preserve our economy, and the enactment of a Federal sales tax would be a serious blow to the working man and to business in general.

STATEMENT BY ED STEVENS, DAWSON, GA., PRESIDENT OF AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF INDEPENDENT INDUSTRIES, ON CONTROLS AND TAXES

The American Association of Independent Industries is one business group which recognizes that you can't control inflation without controls. Large business and banking interests in this country cry "havoc" about inflation and then pressure Congress to avoid passing anti-inflationary legislation.

The association I head believes such shenanigans are dangerous for the American people and equally dangerous for American business.

You simply can't lick inflation by encouraging runaway prices. Runaway prices are bound to occur without controls where needed commodities are in scarce supply.

By controls I mean commodity and wage controls. You can't have one without the other. With around fifty-eight billions to be spent on defense the coming fiscal year, inflation will strike like 100 A-bombs unless we prepare an adequate defense against it.

The American Association of Independent Industries, comprising several hundred small manufacturers and businessmen from approximately 20 States also wishes to go on record against a sales tax in any form. Such a tax is cruel because it hits those least able to pay. Big business and financial groups trying to put over a vicious sales tax will reap the whirlwind of contempt from the American public if such a tax is foisted upon the people. Like Samson in Biblical times American business may bring the Temple down on its head. American business cannot afford to sow the seeds of ill will

which a sales tax in any form would certainly provoke.

The businessmen in my association are neither short-sighted nor greedy. The vast majority of American businessmen are just like our Members. But some of their spokesmen are men who never learn. These alleged business leaders are the best friends communism has in our country. But they are so feather-brained, they don't realize it.

Crime in America: Its Effect on Foreign Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Crime in America: Its Effect on Foreign Relations, which I delivered at Columbia University on July 10, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The title of my talk tonight, "Crime in America: Its Effect on Foreign Relations," may seem a bit far-fetched to some, but it is not.

History has placed the United States in a position of world leadership. We did not seek this place, but we cannot foreswear it.

In the nineteenth century Britain occupied such a place in history and imposed upon the world the Pax Britannica, largely through her mastery of the seas. In the late pagan and early Christian world Rome occupied a similar place and imposed a Pax Romana, principally due to her power at arms.

Today we seek peace, but we know that it will not be a Pax Americana, in the sense that there was a Pax Britannica or a Pax Romana, because no one nation today possesses the strength at sea or at arms to enforce peace on the rest of the world.

The Pax Americana, if there is to be one, and God knows there must be if life as we know it is to survive, must come principally from a moral and ethical leadership of the community of nations. The United States, as the richest and most powerful nation in the world today, must supply that leadership. The free world looks to us to do so. There is no other to take our place.

Viewed in this light, it is easy to see that almost everything we say, almost everything we do—indeed, almost everything we think—has its reflection on the delicate scales of international affairs. Take so obscure a thing as the Naval Observatory in Washington, for example. The clocks of the Nation are set by this federally operated observatory. When World War II dramatized the awful necessity for global thinking, we learned that problems as local as commuter-train timetables had to be considered with a view to keeping tracks clear for supplies destined for battlefields around the world. And the commuter-engineer's watch, adjusted to observatory time, took on an international significance. Even congressional enactments affecting the size of or the price to be paid for our agricultural production assumes importance to people overseas.

Thus it is with domestic crime in the United States. It, too, is tossed upon the scales.

As the leading nation in the community of nations, it seems to me that we have two major problems to solve. One of these concerns the working out of our own foreign relations. The other concerns the necessity of keeping ourselves vital and clean within—an example for other nations to follow. Let us tonight consider the second of these major problems, first, because the successful solution of our foreign affairs depends first upon a healthy vigorous nation at home. History has shown us that nations as great in their time as we in ours, have fallen in the hour of their greatest prosperity from corruption within. Rome was one of these. And, in more modern times, France discovered that corruption at home was more dangerous than the Germans on the other side of the Maginot line.

In my opinion we cannot overemphasize the necessity for healthy public morals at the basic unit of government, and of politics, in the United States—the locality. Our Federal Government is a collection of the morals and the politics of the thousands of localities throughout the Nation. The ordinary course of a man up the political ladder in the United States is by successive steps from the locality. Ordinarily, he takes an interest in his county or ward or city election, perhaps seeks office there, and then may or may not proceed to the State or national level of office and politics.

In the locality, however, the moral tone of his later service—as Governor, Senator, Ambassador, or President—has usually been set.

If the community is one in which the racketeer is the man to see when it comes time to elect an alderman, judge, or mayor, then we are fortunate if in later service this man arises above the moral tone of his beginning. There really is no great distinction between the traffic ticket fixer and the fixer on any level of government, domestic or international.

Similarly, it is the sum total of the economic well-being of our communities that make for a United States with a healthy economy. The racketeer and the gambler are parasites on the community and the Nation. They perform no useful service; they produce nothing. We found, during the course of our investigation, that these parasites drain from our people billions of dollars a year, which otherwise might be diverted into useful enterprises—which, instead of producing cases for the relief rolls, would produce substantial citizens, working each day as part of a great team, to keep this a substantial country.

Then, too, some criminal gangsters and unethical people had wormed their way into government at all levels. This was and still is sapping some of the vitality and strength from our democratic processes. It has caused some loss of confidence and even in some places disrespect of a few public officials.

Another point that I want to make as to the effect of crime on our foreign relations is one which concerns world opinion. Not everyone in the world knows us as well as we know ourselves. Actually we are a people of great good will. The national predilection for the under dog hasn't changed. The parasites are few—the Nation as a whole is a nation of hard workers—a heritage which we acquired from our forefathers who had to work hard in order to carve a nation out of a wilderness. We are gregarious—known as a nation of joiners.

In other words, all in all, we're not hard people to know. The great majority of the

people of the United States, of the Members of Congress, and of the executive branch of the Government, fit into this picture. Our investigation showed that to be true. For every crooked politician there were 100 public servants, working quietly and efficiently at their job for the benefit of their people.

But the smudge on the picture comes from this 1 out of 100—from this small minority who are the criminal element, who get into politics, who hand-pick public officials, who manipulate deals, who run gambling establishments, who kidnap and murder.

Those stories go over the wires from America—and our enemies abroad are quick to pick them up and magnify them. This, they may say, is the typical America—this is the gangster ridden, Wall Street dominated, war-mongering America.

Nothing, of course, but be a greater lie. In fact, the disclosure of our crime committee should serve to ennoble America in the eyes of the democracies of the world, and also in the eyes of the peoples behind the iron curtain if they can get the story of what we did.

For our crime committee is showing just how vital America is by doing this job. It was an example of a branch of the Government in a democracy responding to the people's will in seeking out and exposing conditions in politics, in Government, and in the communities which should have been sought out and exposed. I say that we responded to the people's will in doing so because before we undertook this investigation many fine and fearless public officials, editors, and citizens' groups had undertaken similar investigations on their own in their own communities. They were led to the conclusion that there were interstate aspects to this situation that they couldn't tackle on a local level and that is when we stepped in. I have evidence in the form of thousands of letters and hundreds of scribbled notes from telephone conversations that in doing so we were following the will of the people.

Our job is to bring home the facts and bolster them by exposing the present and potential dangers in organized crime. Woodrow Wilson was right in stating that the American people can successfully cope with any evil if they know the facts. It was necessary to give accurate accounts of these facts by every means at our disposal: Senate reports, press reports, radio, and television. And, hoping that it may be of some assistance, I have written a book setting forth the story as it unfolded before my eyes.

The people are now vigorously and with continuing determination following through with further exposures, revised laws, increased interest in law enforcement and in Government generally. America is becoming a cleaner country and is thereby increasing its economic and spiritual strength. This is indeed a demonstration of the intelligence and courage of a free people.

The recent MacArthur hearings by the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees strengthened our unity here at home and those abroad, who think, must know that it was a great lesson in the value of self-government. Consider this paragraph of the unanimous report of the two committees:

"To these critics of our form of government who contend that public discussion of such matters creates dissent and breeds confusion, we have a simple answer. Those who are still privileged to breathe the air of freedom utilize such discussion as a means to temper the steel of national determination and unity."

The work of the Senate Crime Committee of State and local commissions followed up by necessary legislative and law enforcement reforms is democracy at its vital best—democracy that periodically cleanses and purifies and rebuilds itself—as does the great Mississippi River which flows by a section of my home State.

This part of the story of crime in America deserves to be on the positive side of these delicate scales of international affairs, which, as I said earlier, everything we do in the United States affects one way or the other.

As the leading nation in the world today, it is not enough for us to control the domestic criminal at home, which we hope to do especially now that his existence has been high lighted, but we must take the leadership in controlling the international gangster who is abroad in the world.

The international gangster is not too different from his domestic counterpart. There is a parallel between the code of the domestic criminal and the social philosophy of the totalitarian state. Both are predatory. Both have the same insolent disregard for man's freedom and independence.

I am convinced that to survive effectively, domestic crime and corruption must grow in power and greed. Either the civilized elements of society collapse under their drain of plunder, or these same civilized elements refuse to be plundered and rid themselves of their parasites.

Totalitarian nations must also expand to keep pace with internal pressures. An ever-increasing police force is necessary in such nations to keep the home front productive and in subjection. We see these states bursting their borders out of sheer necessity to gobble up provisions for their unproductive watchdogs. But they never have enough. The annexed nations also soon have need of expensive watchdogs to keep them producing. And so it goes.

The preparatory type of nation has caused us a great deal of trouble in the twentieth century, but at no time has it been successful in the final analysis. We have seen several predatory nations fall. Unfortunately, it took the arms and the blood of ourselves and our allies to accomplish their fall. Our foreign policy now should be directed at keeping such nations within their own borders—where, I believe, if such a policy is successful, they eventually will fall of their own weight, or their leaders will be forced to make changes in the social structure in keeping with the ideals of more enlightened society to prevent their falling. Our answer must be in a positive foreign policy that is based firmly upon the American heritage of good will, of respect for the underdog, and for the individual liberty and dignity of man.

When we consider wheat for a hungry India, we must not allow ourselves to be heckled into attaching strings that smack of a political deal with a starving man. That's a little too much like the gutter type of ward politics I discussed at the beginning of the evening—when we give a hungry man a bowl of soup in return for his vote. It gives some basis to our enemies' claims.

We must not allow our own prejudices—and we do have some—to extend to political feuding with our allies. I am thinking particularly of our great and good friend Britain. It seems to me that many of us in the United States have been rather petty and mean in our criticism of Britain. This has extended beyond the international field into criticism of internal affairs in the British Isles. Britain today is a Socialist State—but it is a state that completely recognizes the freedom of man—and it seems to me

that is where our legitimate interest in British internal affairs ends. We are not socialist—we do not intend to be—but as long as Britain respects the freedom of man, and I think that shall be as long as there is a Britain, then I think it is not for us to say "Tsk, tsk—how horrible are the British with their socialized medicine and their socialized economy." That's none of our business.

We are prone to forget that among our allies today are proud nations—and justly so. We are inclined to lay down a policy and say: "This is it." Then we act like an abused rich uncle if every one of them doesn't step right up and agree. They shouldn't be expected to agree immediately. A conference table isn't built that way. If we give in a point, our critics at home are inclined to scream that "America is always giving in to Britain or France." "It's time," they say, "to stand up for America." Thus they again insult our allies. But you rarely hear them say, as in the case of Japan, that Britain and France have given way to the American viewpoint.

Negotiation on the Japanese peace treaties has done a great deal to strengthen the ties between the United States, Britain and France, but at one stage of the proceedings it was feared that this issue might lead to a serious breach.

The French were at first opposed to making any peace treaty with Japan for fear it would antagonize Russia. The French were told that no precedent for the treaty with Germany would be set by the treaty with Japan. If France didn't wish to go along on the Japanese treaty, the United States would break with France on this issue. France decided to come along.

Then the British, fearing Japanese trade rivalry, wanted Japan kept economically weak. It was pointed out to the British that Japan was the great Far Eastern bulwark of democracy and that the United States had poured \$2,000,000,000 into Japan to keep the country from going Communist. It was pointed out that Japan, an island not unlike Britain, had to build up strong trade in order to live. And the British were convinced that cooperation rather than rivalry would be better in insuring future peace in the Far East.

This Japanese peace treaty should now be given No. 1 priority by the United States. It should be a fair and liberty treaty. In Japan we have the most westernized nation in the Far East, one that has developed the techniques of industrialization of the west, one that has quick potential for joining the free nations of the west as a bulwark of democracy.

My own criticism of our foreign policy to date has been that it was in many cases too negative. For a long time now, it has seemed to me, we have based our foreign policy to much on what Russia might or might not do. Just as we in the United States do not gage our domestic policies on the whims of the racketeers, so we should not gage our foreign policy on the whims of a Stalin.

We have become the leader of the world—not through choice but through history. President Truman and the State Department, with the backing of both parties in Congress, are pressing in the right direction and have made very substantial headway.

In America the decent people do band together, not only to make war on the criminal but to set the policies which prevent the criminal from becoming sufficiently obnoxious to require that war be made on him.

The analogy applies to the international field. Law and order, justly administered and backed by an enlightened public interest can defeat the domestic criminal on the home front. A body of international law,

vigorously and intelligently enforced by all freedom-loving nations, might well prove the downfall of totalitarian ambitions for all times. Within the family of nations there now exists enough free societies to outweigh the aggressors if they would but use their power of justice and intelligence. And if we trust our own mature weapons of justice and intelligence, and use them as forcefully as the aggressors use their primitive weapons of armed might.

What should such a body of law encompass? And how should it be enforced? The answers to both these are already astir in the hearts of millions who will not settle for less than their faith in that ideal society. This vision has already expressed itself in noble experiments here and there.

Enough such experiments towards a body of civilized international law have been tested to give us vision and conviction to proceed.

We have in the U. N. seen representatives of the family of nations sit down at conference tables and thrash out their problems. We have seen the power of world opinion force would-be aggressors to sit down and submit themselves to these conferences.

We have seen authoritarian states submit to the majority will of nations. When the General Assembly voted down the veto of the Soviet Union, and thwarted Russia remained within the United Nations, it was an historic day in the progress of mankind. Twenty years ago Germany and Japan walked out of the League of Nations when thwarted. Today the power of world opinion has become so strong that even the toughest aggressor thinks twice before flouting it. And before this world opinion we, the free and progressive nations, have everything to gain. The strong-arm men of jungle force have everything to lose.

We have seen the beginnings of a World Court of Justice. We have seen individual aggressors tried, convicted, and executed for their crimes against the family of nations. The simple clauses of international law behind the Nuremberg trials can be the beginnings of a body of law which will one day be most helpful in freeing us from the threat of renegade aggressors.

Recently we have seen one man successfully crusade for an international treaty against brute aggression. Dr. Lemkin, of the law school of Yale University, has persisted against terrific odds to get his genocide treaty ratified by the United Nations. Briefly, genocide—race murder—means killing or inflicting bodily harm or hardship to weaken the physical strength of any group. And the treaty provides punishment for such crimes against humanity. Broadly interpreted, this treaty outlaws the brutal stock in trade of every aggressor group or nation. The humanitarian power of world opinion was so skillfully used that even Soviet Russia dared not oppose the treaty, and voted with the rest of us for its ratification.

This treaty is so well constructed that it passed all arguments before the New York Bar Association. It was recommended in a resolution by that body for ratification by the United States Congress.

It is up to us to see that this convention is ratified by our Congress. For by our example others may be encouraged to give this humanitarian treaty reality.

We have made much headway through the U. N., the Atlantic Pact, and the proposed Pacific treaty offers great hope. Little by little, the nations whose people believe in freedom, but who are strong enough to repel aggression if necessary, are getting together, becoming more closely united. Let's hope that unity by law for our mutual pro-

tection can come faster. Good neighbors, when menaced by gangsters, meet, agree on laws for protecting themselves from the lawless elements. It's time we took further steps to do this in the free international neighborhood. To lead and show the way in this direction is America's greatest challenge.

Death of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial on the death of Admiral Sherman published in today's Evening Star.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADMIRAL FORREST P. SHERMAN

When Admiral Sherman was asked the inevitable question about the state of the Navy, during his testimony in the MacArthur hearings, he replied that the Navy was stronger in ships and men and morale than at any time since the peak of its power in World War II.

He said it then with confident pride of a good Navy man. But he could also have said it with justified pride in a personal accomplishment. More than any other one man he could have claimed credit for a remarkable transformation within the Navy under his command as Chief of Naval Operations.

Admiral Sherman was brought back to Washington from his command of the naval forces in the Mediterranean, late in 1949, to become the youngest Chief of Naval Operations in the history of the Navy. No man could have been summoned to take a tougher job. Navy morale was pretty well shot. The popular Admiral Louis Denfeld, regarded within the service as the Navy's champion in its losing fight under unification and economy, had just been relieved. There was incipient revolt in the Navy's high command, out of tune with the administration, out of tune with the Secretary of the Navy, and feuding with the other services.

Although he had risen in the Navy by his own superior abilities and a gallant war record, Admiral Sherman was not well known to the public. His part in drawing up the finally approved plan for unification of the services had not made him particularly popular with his brother Navy officers. But from the beginning of his services as Chief of Naval Operations, the Navy began to regain its lost ground. He brought an extraordinary high type of leadership to the top. His sagacity—recognized by his classmates at Annapolis in 1917 in the The Lucky Bag observation that "He is our most convincing argument that 'brains is king'"—and a pleasing personality, coupled with conscientious devotion to duty, won the respect of colleagues in the other services and his political superiors. He was the most frequently mentioned successor to General Bradley as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs. There are few men in Washington who have risen, in the short space of less than 2 years, to the high position he had come to occupy as one of the Nation's chief military-policy makers.

Admiral Sherman had started on the delicate mission which took him to Europe within 10 days of his return from another visit to Korea. When he left Washington he was tired. He had sought, by rigid self-discipline, to save his strength to meet the demands of exacting and never-ending responsibility. His death at 54 comes as another warning of the price we pay these days for loading good men down with heavier tasks than the strongest of them can carry. His death is a grievous loss to the Navy and to the country he served with such distinguished dedication of his fine ability.

Rewriting the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Rewriting the Constitution," published in the Bismarck (N. D.) Tribune of July 13, 1951. I invite particular attention to the fact that Representative USHER L. BURDICK, of North Dakota, who is quoted in the editorial, has an outstanding record as a Member of the Legislature of North Dakota, as speaker of the house, and as lieutenant governor. He is one of the outstanding citizens of the State, and a man peculiarly versed in legal and State matters.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REWRITING THE CONSTITUTION

Congressman USHER L. BURDICK, of North Dakota, is much concerned, and properly so, over the apparent authority which the Charter of the United Nations holds over even the Constitution of the United States.

The Congressman is not alone in his concern. Through the country there is a growing demand that safeguards be established to protect the Constitution from being superseded or rewritten by United Nations documents.

The concern stems in part from a decision handed down about a year ago by the California court of appeals, and containing what have been termed the "12 most ominous words of legal meaning" uttered in our time.

CHARTER IS NOW SUPREME

In holding that the California alien land law is nullified because it is in conflict with an international treaty, the court said unanimously:

"The United Nations Charter has become the supreme law of the land."

To students of government, this was tantamount to saying that the Constitution already has been superseded by the United Nations Charter.

The reason why this is true is simple. The Constitution itself states that treaties made by the President, and approved by the Senate, shall be the supreme law of the land. The United States subscribed in a constitutional manner to the United Nations Charter, as a treaty. Therefore, the Charter now is the supreme law of the land.

Moreover, any of the covenants or conventions sponsored by the United Nations

have the standing of treaties and become the supreme law of the land once ratified by a two-thirds vote of the United States Senate.

Thus it has happened that a law passed by Congress and held unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court has later been upheld by the Supreme Court after a treaty covering the subject had been ratified by the Senate.

Persons who feel deeply about the importance of preserving the Constitution point to this as proof of a dangerous anomaly: The Constitution can be used to negate itself and to, in a measure, deprive the people of the United States of the very guarantees of individual liberty that the Constitution was intended to preserve.

There are several examples of how this can work

One is in the international covenant of human rights, which some scholars feel would supersede our own Bill of Rights. Our own Bill of Rights states that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of people peaceably to assemble." Thus the Bill of Rights makes these three freedoms untouchable.

But the international covenant says: "Freedom to manifest one's religion or beliefs shall be subject only to such limitations as are pursuant to law and are reasonable and necessary. * * *

If the covenant were ratified, on the ground that the purpose was to implement a treaty, the Supreme Court might say that Congress could pass laws about religion, free speech, and free assembly.

CAN IT BE USED TO RESTRICT?

Another example is in the North Atlantic Treaty, ratified in 1949. The Constitution says that only Congress can declare war. The treaty says that we must regard an attack upon any one of the other signatory nations as an attack upon ourselves. This means that the moment one of those other nations is attacked, we are at war whether we want to be or not and without a declaration of war by Congress.

Still another example is in the genocide convention, which has gone into effect without the adherence of the United States. The convention outlaws mass murder, which is a purpose with which all persons will agree. It also defines genocide as "causing serious * * * mental harm to members of" a "national, ethnical, racial, or religious group." BURDICK interprets this as a prohibition against "hurting the feelings of anyone belonging to any sect, nationality, or religion." He feels that it can be used to destroy free speech and free press in the United States.

The North Dakota Congressman has proposed a constitutional amendment which provides that a two-thirds vote of the entire Congress, instead of just the Senate, must be had to ratify a treaty.

It also has been proposed that the Constitution be amended to eliminate the provision that a treaty is a "supreme law of the land." The effect of this would be to make treaties effective only insofar as they do not conflict with the Constitution.

Americans were among the most idealistic supporters of the United Nations and have been among the most idealistic advocates of United Nations covenants and conventions intended to implement the Charter. They want to give this attempt to create greater harmony and justice among the family of nations every chance to work.

At the same time they treasure their Constitution as the final guardian of their individual liberties. They would not knowingly

stand still while the Constitution and the safeguards it contains were whittled away by a series of international agreements about which they know little and have scant opportunity to debate.

Certainly the framers of the Constitution did not intend, when they wrote the phrase that makes treaties the supreme law of the land, that such treaties were to take priority over the Constitution itself.

The question is a difficult one, but one which deserves consideration by all thinking citizens and certainly by Congress. There is no more sacred human document in this land than our Constitution. Any question, however slight, as to its preservation, should not be lightly dismissed.

Gross Rent in Relation to Income for Non-Farm-Dwelling Units

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS,

Washington, July 20, 1951.

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. YATES: In accordance with your request of July 10, 1951, I am enclosing data on gross rent in relation to income for non-farm-dwelling units in the United States. Separate figures are shown for one-person households, for dwelling units constructed after 1945, and for those constructed before 1945.

The data are based on a preliminary sample of dwelling units enumerated in the 1950 census of housing. Because they are based on a sample, they are subject to sampling variability and may differ from the results which would be obtained from a complete tabulation.

Tables 1 and 5 contain summary distributions of the renter-occupied dwelling units to permit an evaluation of the units for which the percentage of gross rent to income was computed. No computations were made for families and individuals occupying their quarters rent-free, those having incomes of less than \$100 during 1949, those with incomes of \$10,000 or more, and those for whom income or rent was not reported. If the income was over \$10,000, the specific amount was not reported in the enumeration. Tables 2, 3, 6, and 7 are based on those units which reported a rental amount of \$1 or more and an income of \$100 to \$9,999.

The median of 56 percent shown in table 3 for total families and individuals with incomes from \$100 to \$999 is slightly smaller than the corresponding median of 59 percent provided to Senator SPARKMAN several weeks ago. The 56-percent figure is based on a more detailed tabulation which enabled us to calculate a more refined median.

The enclosed data have not been published by the Bureau of the Census. If you make them public, it would be appreciated if you would cite the Bureau of the Census as the

source and state that the figures are based on a preliminary sample from the 1950 census of housing.

A technical note explaining some terms and a statement of sampling variability is enclosed.

Sincerely yours,

ROY V. PEEL,
Director, Bureau of the Census.

TABLE 1.—Primary families and individuals in nonfarm renter-occupied dwelling units, for the United States: 1950

Primary families and primary individuals	Percent distribution of nonfarm renter-occupied dwelling units	
	Total	1-person households
Total: Number (thousands).....	17,080	2,160
Percent.....	100	100
Rent free.....	7	10
Paying rent:		
With income of \$10,000 or more.....	1	10
With income of less than \$10,000.....	4	10
With income of \$100 to \$9,999.....	78	67
Not reporting rent or income.....	19	12

TABLE 2.—Gross rent as percent of income for primary families and individuals in nonfarm renter-occupied dwelling units, for the United States: 1950

Gross rent as percent of income	Percent distribution of nonfarm renter-occupied dwelling units	
	Total	1-person households
Primary families and individuals paying rent and with income of \$100 to \$9,999 (total).....	Percent 100	Percent 100
Under 10.0 percent.....	14	9
10.0 to 14.9 percent.....	24	14
15.0 to 19.9 percent.....	21	15
20.0 to 24.9 percent.....	14	12
25.0 to 29.9 percent.....	7	8
30.0 to 49.9 percent.....	12	22
50.0 percent or more.....	8	20

Source: Preliminary sample data from the 1950 Census of Housing.

TABLE 3.—Median of "gross rent as percent of income" for primary families and individuals in nonfarm renter-occupied dwelling units, by income level, for the United States: 1950

[Median not shown when base is less than 100 sample cases]

1949 income	Median of "gross rent as percent of income" for nonfarm renter-occupied dwelling units	
	Total	1-person households
Primary families and individuals paying rent and with income of \$100 to \$9,999 (total).....	Percent 18	Percent 25
\$100 to \$999.....	56	51
\$1,000 to \$1,999.....	26	29
\$2,000 to \$2,999.....	19	18
\$3,000 to \$3,999.....	16	16
\$4,000 to \$4,999.....	18	
\$5,000 or more.....	10	

TABLE 4.—Gross monthly rent of primary families and individuals in nonfarm renter-occupied dwelling units, for the United States: 1950

Gross monthly rent	Nonfarm renter-occupied dwelling units			
	Total		1-person households	
	Percent of total	Percent of number reporting	Percent of total	Percent of number reporting
Total: Number (in thousands).....	17,080		2,160	
Percent.....	100	100	100	100
Number reporting—				
Under \$10.....	1	2	3	3
\$10 to \$19.....	7	8	14	18
\$20 to \$29.....	13	15	18	22
\$30 to \$39.....	18	20	17	21
\$40 to \$49.....	18	20	13	16
\$50 to \$59.....	13	15	8	10
\$60 to \$74.....	10	11	4	5
\$75 to \$99.....	5	6	3	3
\$100 or more.....	2	3	1	1
Rent free and not reported.....	13		18	

Source: Preliminary sample data from the 1950 Census of Housing.

TABLE 5.—Primary families and individuals in nonfarm renter-occupied dwelling units, by year built, for the United States: 1950

Primary families and primary individuals	Percent distribution of nonfarm renter-occupied dwelling units by year built			
	Total	1945 or later	1944 or earlier	Not reporting year built
Total: Number (thousands).....	17,080	1,550	14,840	700
Percent.....	100	100	100	100
Rent free.....	7	9	6	4
Paying rent:				
With income of \$10,000 or more.....	1	3	1	1
With income of less than \$10,000.....	4	3	4	6
With income of \$100 to \$9,999.....	78	75	80	45
Not reporting rent or income.....	10	10	9	44

TABLE 6.—Gross rent as percent of income for primary families and individuals in nonfarm renter-occupied dwelling units, by year built, for the United States: 1950

Gross rent as percent of income	Percent distribution of nonfarm renter-occupied dwelling units by year built	
	1945 or later	1944 or earlier
Primary families and individuals paying rent and with income of \$100 to \$9,999 (total).....	Percent 100	Percent 100
Under 10.0 percent.....	7	13
10.0 percent to 14.9 percent.....	18	25
15.0 percent to 19.9 percent.....	22	21
20.0 percent to 24.9 percent.....	14	14
25.0 percent to 29.9 percent.....	11	6
30.0 percent to 49.9 percent.....	18	11
50.0 percent or more.....	10	10

Source: Preliminary sample data from the 1950 Census of Housing.

TABLE 7.—Median of "gross rent as percent of income" for primary families and individuals in nonfarm renter-occupied dwelling units, by income level and year built, for the United States: 1950

[Median not shown where base is less than 100 sample cases]

1949 income	Median of "gross rent as percent of income" for nonfarm renter-occupied dwelling units by year built	
	1945 or later	1944 or earlier
Primary families and individuals paying rent and with income of \$100 to \$9,999 (total).....	Percent 21	Percent 18
\$100 to \$999.....		56
\$1,000 to \$1,999.....		26
\$2,000 to \$2,999.....		19
\$3,000 to \$3,999.....		16
\$4,000 to \$4,999.....		13
\$5,000 or more.....		10

TABLE 8.—Gross monthly rent of primary families and individuals in nonfarm renter-occupied dwelling units, by year built, for the United States: 1950

Gross monthly rent	Nonfarm renter-occupied dwelling units by year built			
	1945 or later		1944 or earlier	
	Percent of total	Percent of number reporting	Percent of total	Percent of number reporting
Total: Number (in thousands).....	1,550		14,840	
Percent.....	100	100	100	100
Number reporting—				
Under \$10.....	1	1	1	1
\$10 to \$19.....	3	3	7	8
\$20 to \$29.....	7	8	14	16
\$30 to \$39.....	10	11	20	23
\$40 to \$49.....	11	13	17	19
\$50 to \$59.....	9	10	15	17
\$60 to \$74.....	17	20	8	9
\$75 to \$99.....	19	23	4	5
\$100 or more.....	7	9	2	2
Rent free and not reported.....	16		11	

Source: Preliminary sample data from the 1950 Census of Housing.

TECHNICAL NOTE

Gross rent: The gross rent is the contract monthly rent plus the reported average monthly cost paid by the renter for water, electricity, gas, and other fuel. (Contract monthly rent is the rent contracted for by renters of non-farm-dwelling units at the time of enumeration; the rent is the amount contracted for regardless of whether it includes furniture, utilities, or personal services.) If furniture is included in the contract rent, the reported estimated rent of a dwelling unit without furniture is used in the computation instead of contract rent.

Income: Income is the total amount of money income received in 1949 by all members of a primary family, or by a primary individual, from the following sources: money wages or salaries; net income (gross receipts minus expenses) from the operation of a farm, business, or profession; net income (or loss) from rents; interest and dividends; pensions; veterans' payments or assistance; receipts from roomers or boarders; royalties;

and other income such as alimony, contributions for support from persons who are not members of the household, periodic income from estates and trust funds, and periodic receipts from insurance policies or annuities.

Gross rent as percent of income: The "gross rent as percent of income" is the percent of the income which is paid for gross rent. The yearly gross rent is expressed as a percentage of the combined 1949 money income of all persons in the primary family, or the income of a primary individual. The percentages were computed for each primary family and individual; the medians were based on the separate computations and not on aggregate amounts of rent and income for a particular group.

Primary family, primary individual, and one-person households: A primary family consists of a head and all persons related to him by blood, marriage, or adoption and residing with him. If no persons related to the head are living with him, the head is considered a primary individual; there may or may not be nonrelatives living with him. A one-person household consists of a primary individual living alone.

Year built: The "year built" for a dwelling unit refers to the calendar year in which construction was completed. Dwelling units are classified by the date of original construction of the structure in which they are located, not by the year of any remodeling, additions, reconstruction or improvements that have taken place.

Nonfarm renter-occupied dwelling units: A unit is renter-occupied if any money rent is paid or if it is occupied rent free. Units occupied rent free are those which are not occupied by the owner and for which no money rent is paid. Nonfarm units consist of urban and rural-nonfarm dwelling units.

Source and reliability of the data: The figures in tables 1 to 4 are based on a preliminary sample of a total of 38,000 dwelling units, of which 17,000 were nonfarm renter-occupied, selected from those enumerated in the 1950 census of housing. These dwelling units are located in about 14,000 census enumeration districts systematically selected from all enumeration districts throughout the Nation. The figures for tables 5 to 8 are based on a sample one-fifth as large as the sample for tables 1 to 4.

Because the figures are based on sample data, they are subject to sampling variability. The chances are about 19 out of 20 that the differences due to sampling variability between the figures in the enclosed tables and those which would be obtained from a complete tabulation of the 1950 census data are less than the variability indicated below.

Estimated percent	Sampling variability (in percentage points)					
	Total renter-occupied dwelling units in table—			1-person households in table—		
	1	2	4	1	2	4
2 or 98.....	1	1	1	1	1	1
5 or 95.....	1	1	1	2	2	2
10 or 90.....	1	1	1	2	3	2
25 or 75.....	1	1	1	3	4	3
50.....	1	1	1	4	4	4

For example, 14 percent of the primary families and individuals reported rental amounts which were less than 10 percent of their income (table 2). The chances are about 19 out of 20 that a complete tabulation of the 1950 census would show that the proportion paying less than 10 percent of

their income for rent would be between 13 percent and 15 percent.

Estimated percent	Sampling variability (In percentage points)						
	Total renter-occupied units in table 5	Renter-occupied units built in 1945 or later in table—			Renter-occupied units built in 1941 or earlier in table—		
		5	6	8	5	6	8
2 or 98.....	1	2	2	2	1	1	1
5 or 95.....	1	3	3	3	1	1	1
10 or 90.....	1	5	6	5	1	1	1
25 or 75.....	1	7	8	7	2	2	2
50.....	1	8	9	8	2	2	2

The following table gives the sampling variability for medians shown in table 3 and table 7:

Median of "gross rent as percent of income": Total column in table 3:	The chances are about 19 out of 20 that the median which would be obtained from a complete tabulation would be between—	
	18 percent.....	17 and 19 percent
56 percent.....	52	and 60 percent
28 percent.....	22	and 30 percent
19 percent.....	16	and 22 percent
16 percent.....	13	and 19 percent
13 percent.....	9	and 17 percent
10 percent.....	6	and 14 percent

Table 7.	
21 percent.....	18 and 25 percent
18 percent.....	17 and 19 percent
56 percent.....	49 and 67 percent
26 percent.....	23 and 29 percent
19 percent.....	18 and 20 percent
16 percent.....	15 and 17 percent
13 percent.....	12 and 14 percent
10 percent.....	8 and 12 percent

Although the figures are based on data obtained from the 1950 census, there may be differences between the data in the enclosed tables and the data to be published in the final 1950 census reports, apart from differences caused by the sampling variability. The main reason for such differences is that the preliminary estimates do not include all of the refinements that result from the careful examination of the schedules and tables to which the census data will be subject prior to the publication of the final report.

In addition to sampling variability and limitations of the types mentioned above, the estimates are subject to biases due to errors of response and to nonreporting. The possible effect of such biases is not included in the measures of variability, data obtained from a complete count of all dwelling units are also subject to these biases.

Some Facts About the Livestock Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, while the livestock farmer does not take the position that he should have any special consideration that is

not extended to all other groups of agriculture, it appears that the public should be advised of some of the facts in regard to the livestock industry.

Most of the discussion seems to be leveled at the beef producer, so we should get the picture of the extent of this industry. A rather small percentage of the beef of the Nation is marketed as choice corn-fed beef. This probably does not represent more than 6 or 7 percent of the beef and many markets have very few of this class of animals.

Of course there has been a great demand for beef as the result of rather full employment but there are many factors involved. Ever since 1913 when the Underwood Tariff Act was passed, we have been on a beef-importing basis and part of the difficulty in controlling beef prices is due to the world price situation. The sheep industry is one apparent example—we have less sheep in the United States today than we had 50 years ago and domestic production has not been encouraged. The world price of wool has gone to \$1.01 which is some 200 percent of parity. In other words, it is evident that it is difficult to control prices on any commodities when the world price is so much higher than our own domestic prices. Our imports of beef percentage-wise, of course, are a much smaller part of the national beef production than are wool imports a part of the national production and consumption, but the influence is there just the same.

IMPORTANCE OF DAIRY CATTLE TO THE BEEF SUPPLY

On January 1, 1940, before World War II, we had in the United States a total of 68,309,000 cattle. Of this number over 50 percent, or 36,432,000, were classed as milk cattle.

It appears that few people realize that a large percentage of the beef supply of the Nation comes from the dairy industry.

There are two factors which should be very evident. First, beef from beef cattle is naturally an expensive product when one realizes the investment involved in keeping a cow a whole year only for the calf she may have. Second, beef produced as a side line to the dairy industry is important so far as the supply and price are concerned.

A large proportion of the processed meat and soft meat is derived from the dairy industry. This, of course, applies to a large percentage of veal as well. A high percentage of the cattle numbers in the United States are in the Corn Belt with Chicago as the livestock capital of this country and the world. The principal beef-producing States in numbers marketed are Texas, Iowa, Illinois, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. Since January 1, 1943, the numbers of milk cattle in the United States have been less than the number of nonmilk cattle. On January 1, 1951, we had an estimated total of 84,000,000 head of cattle, 37,500,000 of which were milk cattle and the balance, or 46,500,000 were nonmilk cattle.

WHY THE LIVESTOCK MEN OPPOSE THE ADMINISTRATION'S BEEF PROGRAM

As previously pointed out we had a total of over 68,000,000 head of cattle on January 1, 1940. Then came the heyday of the Henderson-Bowles regime and while the housewife was having difficulty in getting a piece of meat at the market for her family, the livestock producers increased their cattle numbers from 68,000,000 on January 1, 1940 to 85,000,000 on January 1, 1945. This was an increase in numbers of 17,000,000 head of cattle or a 25-percent increase at the very time the consumer was denied the opportunity of buying any meat. Immediately following World War II, large numbers of cattle were slaughtered and shipped out of the country, mostly to England.

One of the main objections that the livestock men have to the present program of Mr. DiSalle, is due to the fact that he started off on the same road that was proven to be so ridiculous under the Henderson-Bowles approach. Mr. DiSalle, started out by putting in a program to license the number of people who could slaughter cattle and thus discourage slaughtering; and although he had no control over imports, the result was that imported cattle sold for from 5 to 10 cents per pound more than domestic cattle. This just does not make sense. So long as Johnston and DiSalle talk about quotas we can expect continued confusion.

THE OLEO LEGISLATION INCREASED BEEF PRICES

The United States has less dairy cows now than it had 15 or 20 years ago and the milk production per capita is going down each year. If we had maintained the number of dairy cattle in proportion to the population of the country and had not subsidized the production of vegetable oils, our supply of beef would have been considerably greater than it is at the present time. In other words, if we had the additional 5,000,000 dairy cattle that have been eliminated as the result of subsidizing oleo, we would have a more ample supply of beef now. In fact a bill was recently passed to bring in several thousand Mexican laborers to help harvest the cotton crop at Government expense, all of which adds to the vegetable oil subsidy.

There are some indications that more consideration will be given to the livestock industry legislatively, but at the present time a large part of the criticism accorded to the livestock producers is the result of either unwise or unfair legislative advantages given to the vegetable-oil producers and nonlivestock producers in the Nation.

THE HOG SITUATION

Whereas the Department of Agriculture was anticipating a huge Government stockpile of pork in 1948, the hog producers saw the handwriting on the wall and marketed their animals in such a way that the Government was not called upon to advance any Federal funds for disposing of surplus pork. This hog situation is easier to keep under control because a large percentage of commercial hogs are raised in a comparatively

small area. The States of Iowa and Illinois alone produce a large percentage of the commercial hogs of the Nation, with parts of Indiana, Kansas, Nebraska, Missouri, Minnesota, and Wisconsin also producing large numbers.

While there has been considerable complaint about the price of meat it should be kept in mind that the price of pork in 1948 was one-third less than it has been during the past year in the Corn Belt. The pork production can be increased rapidly as was shown during World War II, whereas the increase in beef is a much slower process.

LACK OF LIVESTOCK LEADERSHIP

It is apparent that the entire livestock supply could have been handled with much less heat and more common sense if we had had a more thoughtful approach to the problem. Livestock leadership was offered by the Farm Bureau, National Grange, and other farm organizations in its advocacy of an increase in production but it was not cheerfully accepted or appreciated.

The quickest way of getting an increased meat supply is through chickens. Within a few weeks' time millions more chickens can be made available and there has been considerable increase in this field but there is no doubt but what if as much time and effort had been extended to increase meat production as has been spent in trying to confuse and harm the program, the result would be that we would have a more acceptable situation than we are facing at the present time.

Over the years the price of cattle at the market, including commercial veal, has been slightly higher than pork. There is a relationship between the prices of these two meat products and an increased supply of one will have an influence on the other. This also applies to the relationship between other protein foods, such as chickens, eggs, and cheese. It was only a few months ago that there was considerable public criticism of the support program for eggs providing the Midwest producers 25 cents per dozen. However, the day they took the support price off eggs it was evident the results might not be as satisfactory as some people anticipated. The support on eggs was a stabilizing influence. The removal of this support is most assuredly going to result in less production and higher prices.

It appears to me that the time has come when we had better stop trying to level the guns against the small percentage of our people as the farmers are becoming a small percentage of the population. The fact that farm labor is difficult to obtain and the fact that a few hundred of these people harvest the crops while our own farm boys go to the cities or into the Army, is evidence to most everyone that the farming business is not so attractive or rosy in comparison with other industries. In other words, there is plenty of land and great opportunities for more people to produce if they desire to do so. The difference between what the producer receives for his product and what the consumer pays for it is rapidly becoming

greater. The producer is being criticized for the price that he is not receiving but is being held accountable for. If one realizes the cost of production, including the transportation costs, taxes, and all that goes with it, it should be evident that it is unfair to hold the producer responsible for the increased cost of food. It should be kept in mind that the producer of food puts in many more hours of work every day than the average worker.

This is not altogether a problem here in our own country, it is a world problem. It is ridiculous to listen to the voices that compare 1939 prices with present prices. In August 1939, although it was the seventh year of the more abundant life of the New Deal, you will find according to the official report of the United States Department of Agriculture, that cotton was bringing 8 cents plus to the farmer, hogs 5 cents plus per pound, and wheat less than \$1 per bushel. Milk was selling for less than \$1 per hundred pounds in Wisconsin. The Federal land bank foreclosed more farms in Wisconsin than in any year in its history.

After all we hear a lot about what the agricultural programs have done, the facts are that no real attempt was made to help the farmer until the Steagall amendment to the Price Control Act was adopted. The war and talk of war has been a factor in maintaining prices since that time and of course we have had an increase in the public debt of about \$200,000,000,000 which is also in the picture.

The philosophy of the support program as initiated by the Steagall amendment has been weakened by unwise agricultural leadership but this situation can be improved as the problems arise. We have at least adopted a policy that the labor involved in agriculture is worthy of a minimum wage somewhere near the support given other groups of our society. This is not a political matter. It is fundamentally an economic question and in the future I believe we are going to find more consideration and equality extended to the livestock industry than we have up to this time.

Instead of further wrecking the livestock industry like the sheep industry by lack of support, and the dairy industry by subsidizing the vegetable oil substitutes, it appears we can look forward to more general support and consideration of American agriculture. This will be more apparent when we realize that we have weakened our system of conserving soil fertility by giving preference to soil depleting crops.

AGRICULTURAL POSSIBILITIES AND THE FUTURE OF THE LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY

Anyone familiar with the agricultural possibilities of our great country should realize that we can increase its agricultural production more and more materially when there is an incentive to do so. Few people realize that ever since 1925 we have been on an agricultural import basis in pounds, bushels, and tons. While propaganda might be that we have shipped large quantities of certain agricultural products, in total pounds,

bushels, and tons, we have been on an agricultural import basis ever since 1925. During the depression and the low-price years of the New Deal we had the largest agricultural imports we ever had in the history of this country, and since 1940, our so-called exports have been subsidized and given away, have been pretty well taken care of by imports for which cash was paid. Of course, we have given away half a billion dollars worth of tobacco under the Marshall plan to feed the starving people of Europe. While such procedures may not be a good public policy in the future it is hoped that a constructive approach can be made to this problem.

We have many undeveloped acres of land in this country and the State of Wisconsin alone has 4,000,000 acres of marshland that could be drained and converted into good productive land, to say nothing of the thousands of acres of cut-over land that could be used for raising farm products and developing livestock production, and additional millions of acres adaptable to trees and forestry.

Fundamentally, so long as we have opportunities for expansion and food production we should be able to meet the situations as they present themselves because any country that has the potential possibilities of adequate food supplies can, with the right attitude, meet the economic problems that arise.

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, whatever happened to Governor Dewey? Did he forget to take along some "information specialists" on his trip?

The Bonus Riot of 1932

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Bonus Riot of 1932 Back in News," written by Richard Morris, and published in the Washington Post of July 22, 1951; also an article entitled "Secret Testimony of Commie on Bonus March Made Public," published in the Washington Times-Herald of July 14, 1951.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of July 22, 1951]

BONUS RIOT OF 1932 BACK IN NEWS

(By Richard Morris)

A representative of the Comintern likened it to "an alarm clock waking somebody up out of a dead sleep."

General MacArthur called it "a bad-looking mob animated by the spirit of revolution."

A newspaper reporter compared it to "ancient Carthage," with thousands of men "encamped just as, in ancient times, were the mercenaries of Hasdrubal."

Anyone who saw it recalls a scene of distress that led to degradation and death, and finally to despair.

The 2-month siege of the Nation's Capital by hungry, ragged, determined veterans of World War I reached its climax in rioting and bloodshed 19 years ago Saturday.

What brought this snowballing army of men—on foot, by automobile, by freight train—to Washington from Portland and Lansing and Memphis and Jersey City?

The story of the bonus expeditionary force, with emphasis on the role of communism in its march and battle, was told again July 13 on Capitol Hill.

The principal narrator, John T. Pace, 54, of Centerville, Tenn., told a subcommittee of the House Un-American Activities Committee how he almost succeeded in his mission to gain control of the army for communism.

Pace, who led a Michigan delegation to Washington in the 1932 bonus march but renounced the Communist Party in 1935, showed a remarkable faculty for recalling dates and events of the depression crusade.

"The party instruction was to support the demands of veterans in all of their struggles and specifically where their actions were self-initiated in defiance of the law," Pace testified at a closed session of the subcommittee 2 years ago. He was called to amplify this testimony 9 days ago, when it was first released.

It was Pace's "candid opinion" that, had the agitation been continued another week, "the Communists would have gained the leadership of the bonus expeditionary forces, thereby resulting in forcing the Government to take the action that they did take, at a time when the results would have been much more disastrous."

There is evidence that Pace may have exaggerated the party's capabilities at this point, for many adherents of the bonus army had begun to vacate the Capital—since Congress had adjourned without enacting the \$2,000,000,000 cash bonus—before the ill-fated riot of July 28.

Perhaps the dispersal of the legions under Commander Walter W. Waters provided an opportunity for the Red minority to seize the control it had so long sought, only to be frustrated at every turn by the police and the veterans themselves.

Joseph Zack Kornfeder, a member of the party's central committee in 1932 but now an anti-Communist, told the subcommittee:

"The spontaneous outburst of the bonus march created a crisis in the central committee of the Communist Party, because the party, although working for the creation of such a movement, had, as it were, missed the boat in getting it started; so it started by itself and the problem then arose as to what could be done to get hold of this runaway movement and catch up with it."

The size of the bonus army, which began descending on Washington late in May 1932, was variously estimated at a maximum of from 10,000 to 20,000 men. Pace testified

that no more than 100 Communist Party members participated.

"The active party group, party faction that we knew were reliable party members, would number no more than 25," he said.

At the outset, the advent of Red agents was anticipated. On May 28, the Washington Post reported that a group of former servicemen, now members of the Workers Ex-Servicemen's League, affiliated with the Communist Party, will be segregated from the main army so as to avoid any untoward incidents.

On May 30, the invaders began arriving in force. They were greeted by Patrolman James E. Bennett of the Traffic Bureau, whose first published comment was:

"Fellows, you're welcome here. But the minute you start mixing with Reds and Socialists, out you go." The morning paper said the men cheered him.

Waters, who had become recognized as the leader of the main force, then voiced an oft-repeated slogan:

"You won't have to eject them. If we find any Red agitators in the group, we'll take care of them and take them to the District line. We came here under the same flag for which we fought."

An optimistic system of discipline was inaugurated. It was said to be stricter than the Army, with company organization, reveille, field kitchens, schedules, and policing details.

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, author of the bonus bill then bottled up in the Ways and Means Committee, said he had ascertained that "all the men are orderly, sober, and sincere."

He also said that Police Commissioner Pelham D. Glassford "deserves commendation for the great consideration" shown the men.

Glassford, a retired brigadier general who made his motorcycle his headquarters, soon became a storm center because of his methods of handling the situation. Pace, the Communist leader, told how his contingent of 700 or 800 defied police orders and camped at Thirteenth and B Streets SW. They were visited by Glassford.

"He immediately became very fraternal with us. We were busy building furnaces to cook on, cleaned out the apartment, took shower baths, and he furnished us with the necessary straw ticks, straw, and cooking utensils, and food for the first real supper we had had since we left * * *."

"We were quite disturbed by the fact that the men began to think quite a bit of General Glassford, which didn't do our cause any too much good."

On May 31, the BEF's system of ferreting out Reds was tested. Two men who were distributing Communist literature in billboards at Twelfth and D Streets SW., were given a hearing by a "kangaroo court" and sentenced to 10 lashes on the back with a strap. The sentence was executed and they were thrown out of the camp.

A group of men from 10 States, quartered at the Belber-Kaufmann vacant store near Eighth and I Streets SE., established a blacklist of men expelled for violations of regulations. A news account said "most of those expelled were convicted of agitation."

Living conditions, sanitary facilities, and food became increasing problems early in June as the ranks swelled to several thousand, many of whom established camps at Anacostia.

The first big parade and demonstration was staged June 8, after an alleged Red plot "to cause bloodshed by rioting" was aborted by police reinforcements and the main body of the BEF.

District officials spent hours trying to devise ways of getting rid of the uninvited

visitors. An offer of free truck rides out of the city was greeted with laughter and scorn.

By June 14 enough signatures on a discharge petition had been obtained to force a House vote on the bonus bill. "A parade of monster proportion and lavish color," said the Washington Post, lobbied for the measure along Pennsylvania Avenue.

The House passed the bill by a 211-to-176 vote on June 15. Two days later the Senate registered an emphatic "no" by a 62-to-18 vote.

The BEF still vowed it would stay until the bonus was paid. Waters promised the defeat of President Hoover, who said he would veto the measure if it passed. And the Communists renewed their sporadic agitation.

Even the left wing, however, was split factionally. One element, said to number about 700 and led by Roy W. Robertson, refused to be identified with Pace's contingent.

And in the main BEF, Waters and Harold B. Foulkrod, of Philadelphia, chairman of the legislative committee and director of the lobbying campaign, competed for power early in July. Foulkrod quit the BEF July 9 and urged others to return home.

Many followed his example, for Congress had voted a \$100,000 loan for transportation to get the unwieldy force out of the city.

On July 16, Congress adjourned. That same day, the greatest massing of policemen seen in Washington since the race riots . . . entirely isolated the area between the Treasury and War Department Buildings and H Street and Pennsylvania Avenue Northwest, after an attempt by a straggling band of about 50 veterans to picket the White House had been broken up with a brief struggle, according to the Washington Post of July 17.

Picketing the White House became the new tack of Pace's forces. On July 20, Pace, Beckworth E. Johnson, and Walter F. Eicher were jailed on charges of parading without a permit and disorderly conduct.

They were convicted and sentenced to pay \$40 or serve 40 days. When Judge Isaac R. Hitt offered to release them if they would swear not to repeat the offense, both contended that they had committed no offense. The offer was withdrawn, and Defense Counsel Charles E. Ford announced he would appeal.

It was a stroke of fate that Pace should be in jail when the BEF occupation was turned into a rout by Federal troops under General MacArthur, then Chief of Staff, on July 28.

The crisis apparently had been passed. The Washington Post that morning had printed little more than a column about the BEF. For weeks, the story had been running for several columns daily, starting on page 1.

The inconspicuous one-column headline of July 28 blossomed into a two-line, eight-column banner July 29:

"One Slain, 60 Hurt, as Troops Rout BEF With Gas Bombs and Flames."

With dramatic suddenness, the evacuation of buildings on Pennsylvania Avenue NW, near Third and Fourth Streets, exploded into a riot between veterans and police. One veteran was shot and killed and another was fatally wounded. Six policemen were injured, two seriously, by veterans hurling brickbats and wielding axes.

Seven hours later, at 4:22 p. m., President Hoover announced he had ordered out troops to put an end to "rioting and defiance of civil authority."

Mounted cavalymen and infantrymen with fixed bayonets moved down the avenue behind tanks. Flames swept the crude huts and lean-tos where the bedraggled army had camped over a wide area of the Capital.

Most of Pace's men had moved out before the troops reached their camp. He was to be

released from jail several days later, after charges against him were dropped.

The terrified veterans fled in all directions, many with their wives and children. Some 50 suspected Communists were rounded up, only to be released after order was restored.

General MacArthur, the ranking officer of the Army, had accomplished his mission as commander of a force of 800 troops.

Most of the veterans went to Johnstown, Pa., to lick their wounds and reorganize for a future day. But their plan was never realized.

Such was the scene in Washington in the hot, humid, hungry days of July 1932, when the big news elsewhere was prohibition and renomination of Hoover and nomination of Roosevelt, and the Lindbergh kidnapping and the rise of Hitler.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of July 14, 1951]

SECRET TESTIMONY OF COMMIE ON BONUS MARCH MADE PUBLIC—HOUSE INVESTIGATORS REVEAL FACTS SUPPRESSED 21 MONTHS BY DEMOCRATS

The secret testimony in 1949 of a former Communist leader, exposing the Red leadership of the 1932 soldiers' bonus march on Washington, was made public yesterday by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The testimony had been suppressed for 21 months when it was published last June 1 by the Times-Herald and Chicago Tribune. Representative VELDE, Republican, of Illinois, a member of the committee, said the testimony had apparently not been published by the Democratic majority of the committee because it contradicted an old smear attack on General MacArthur who cleared the bonus marchers out of the Capital.

LEGION WAS DUPED

The committee recalled John T. Pace, 53, of Centerville, Tenn., former high Communist Party official, as a witness in open session yesterday and then made his suppressed testimony a part of the record.

Commenting on VELDE's charge, Chairman Wood, Democrat, of Georgia, said one committee member (revealed by the Times-Herald as Missouri Democrat MOULDER) had voted against publication of the testimony in 1949 because it disclosed the American Legion as dupes of the Communists in 1932. Legion officials said they, on the contrary, had urged publication of the testimony to instruct veterans' organizations in tricks of the Communist Party.

Pace repeated his testimony that Communist agitators, including himself, fomented the bonus march and would have provoked bloodshed and riots in Washington if MacArthur had not restored order without injury to a single veteran.

ELEANOR HELPED SMEAR

Malicious bonus-march stories have been circulated against MacArthur for nearly 20 years. Left-wingers, including Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, helped spread reports that gunfire was ordered by MacArthur. The facts, as outlined by Patrick J. Hurley, then Secretary of War, were that not a shot was fired and not a single veteran was injured in the evacuation.

Asked if the Communist Party should be outlawed, Pace said the time for such action was long past due.

"There is nothing to the argument that such action would drive the party underground," he said. "The real backbone of the leadership of the party has always been underground and always will be until the revolution. Those who operate openly are only fronts for the real leaders."

BALTIMORE WITNESSES DEFY COMMIE QUIZ

Five witnesses from Baltimore refused yesterday to give the House Un-American Activi-

ties Committee any information about Communist activity in the defense area of the city.

All declined to answer questions about communism on the grounds that to do so might incriminate them.

They were Thelma Gerande, a former business-office manager for Marine Shipbuilding Workers Union; William W. Hill, former president of the Baltimore local of the United Electrical and Machine Workers Union; Herbert J. Nichol, a field organizer for U. E.; Milton Self, a shipyard worker; and Irving Winkler, a mechanic.

Self, Winkler, and Nichol were identified as members of the Communist Party in recent testimony by Mrs. Mary Stalcup Markward, one-time undercover agent for the FBI. Each refused to affirm or deny her allegation.

Miss Gerande refused to reply when asked if she were a member of the Communist Party. But she criticized the committee for what she said was its failure to investigate anti-Semitic organizations "indicating you are sympathetic with them."

Representative JACKSON (Republican), of California, told her "anyone who says that lies."

Criticism of Pick-Sloan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Writer Explains Why Pick-Sloan Plan Won't Work," written by Richard Baumhoff, of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and published in the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Leader of July 19, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WRITER EXPLAINS WHY PICK-SLOAN PLAN WON'T WORK

(By Richard Baumhoff)

Three big new dams are being built in the Missouri River in the Dakotas and the water-resource program in the Missouri Basin has been underway for 6 years with expenditures running to about a billion and a quarter dollars—but right now the lower river and some of its main tributaries are suffering from a severe flood.

People are asking why such destructive floods have not been stopped. The fact is that only a limited amount of construction has been accomplished on projects designed to control floods in the lower or eastern end of the basin, reaching to St. Louis. Main projects have been stymied for various reasons, as will be related here.

AGENCY PRINCIPALLY CONCERNED

This discussion deals essentially with the existing interagency program for the Missouri Valley—the expanded Pick-Sloan Plan written into law by Congress late in 1944. The agency principally concerned therein, under the coordinating efforts of the Missouri Interagency Committee, is the Army's Corps of Engineers, which has flood control as a prime civil function.

Advocates of a Missouri Valley Authority have raised the argument that an MVA might do a better job, but as yet there is no MVA nor any physical plan of work an MVA might do, and the perennial bill for an MVA

has not even been introduced in the current session of Congress.

Fort Peck Dam, a huge structure on the Missouri River in Montana, built before World War II, and the three dams now being erected in the Dakotas can exert a certain effect on flood control downstream. But the Army engineers can make no claim that these dams would do more than reduce the flood crest above St. Louis and Kansas City by more than a few feet.

(At the present time downstream areas in Kansas and Missouri are experiencing one of the most disastrous floods in history.)

In North Dakota criticism of the Pick-Sloan plan is directed at the huge cost of the Garrison Dam—which is expected to cost twice as much as originally estimated by the Army engineers. Critics point out that the cost to taxpayers hardly justifies the good-will effect—either in flood control, electric power production, navigation purposes or for irrigation. The Pick-Sloan plan for irrigating large areas in northwestern North Dakota has been proven to be completely unsound, because NDAC scientists point out that soil analysis of the area indicate the land is not the type that can stand irrigation.

United States total—Public housing program under Housing Act of 1949, by State¹

[Dwelling units as of May 1, 1951]

State	Placed under construction	Under final contract		Under preliminary loan contract	Under reservation	Total	Number of localities
		Sites purchased	Sites not purchased				
Alabama.....	1,838	1,127	1,133	7,220	268	11,586	65
Arizona.....		484	113	1,186		1,813	7
Arkansas.....	1,290	206	80	451		1,937	8
California.....	1,189	13,078	6,389	1,186	86	21,928	71
Colorado.....	800	200		1,500		2,500	1
Connecticut.....	1,384	200	962	1,054		3,604	14
Delaware.....				380		380	1
Florida.....	1,309	100	788	3,218	166	5,611	19
Georgia.....	2,059	2,731	1,248	7,206	793	14,037	107
Idaho.....	75			200		275	2
Illinois.....	865	3,442	3,049	20,300	367	28,023	56
Indiana.....	24	350	318	3,125	170	4,017	9
Kentucky.....	1,680	2,373		1,545		5,598	16
Louisiana.....	1,640	845	1,142	3,249	354	7,220	20
Maine.....				50		50	1
Maryland.....	60	1,252	341	4,223		5,879	5
Massachusetts.....	1,108	1,519	2,858	3,023	350	9,758	19
Michigan.....	830	2,554	330	11,525	630	15,869	19
Minnesota.....	832	338	602	2,208	175	4,245	10
Mississippi.....	271	200		1,025	111	1,676	15
Missouri.....	704	1,984	454	5,824	900	9,866	3
Montana.....		110		40		150	3
Nebraska.....	400			300		700	1
Nevada.....		100				100	1
New Hampshire.....			200	200		400	1
New Jersey.....	4,426	3,611	247	5,346		13,630	32
New Mexico.....		78				78	1
New York.....	5,358	9,962	4,810	10,135		30,265	13
North Carolina.....	2,533	902		3,556	75	7,066	22
Ohio.....				2,850	16,870	19,720	15
Oregon.....		106	8	91		205	8
Pennsylvania.....	1,038	5,202	370	16,116	1,130	23,856	43
Rhode Island.....	397	1,242		806		2,445	3
South Carolina.....	1,056	216	85	1,537	752	3,646	30
Tennessee.....	1,916	2,343	125	4,605	253	9,242	24
Texas.....	1,936	4,161	6,668	4,642	301	17,708	88
Virginia.....	866	1,640	3,005	2,525		8,036	9
Washington.....	150	155	158	375		838	10
West Virginia.....			20	590	670	1,190	4
Wisconsin.....	726	60		2,234		3,020	4
District of Columbia.....			364	4,000		4,364	1
Total.....	38,670	62,930	35,930	140,580	24,421	302,531	781

¹ Excludes data for Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Government Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article dealing with the problem of controls and

All in all the Garrison dam project appears to be nothing but a huge "pork barrel" dam that looks impressive but in reality has little real value.

Public Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a statistical report showing the status of the low-rent public-housing program as of May 1, 1951. From this report it can readily be seen how ill-considered was the action of the House of Representatives on May 4 in reducing the construction during fiscal year 1952 from 50,000 units to 5,000 units:

courage to go all the way and kill the whole OPS political monstrosity built up by Mike DiSalle.

If there were ever any need for the retail mumbo-jumbo of confusion set up by this agency—and even that is open to doubt—it has been completely dispelled by the cooling off of the Korean War, the rise of vast inventories of consumer goods, the tendency toward falling prices, and the report of near-record crops.

There is no emergency today. Certainly, the rearmament program should be kept going at a high rate, and there should be Government authority to channel scarce materials into war goods. But the rate at which the war goods are exhausted is now being cut back by the slowdown of shooting (and possible complete stop) in Korea. We are not on a full-scale war footing, either for men or materials.

NONEXISTENT MENACE

Yet the OPS office is paying thousands of employees for doing nothing effective or of consequence. Nothing could be more absurd than to maintain a large force of Government employees pretending to cope with a menace which has ceased to exist. With most prices below ceiling and every indication that they will continue to slide off, with merchants getting the jitters and having sales, and definite signs of a buyers' strike, why keep all these birds going through the motions?

Even the most ardent advocates of controls admit now that inflation has calmed down. But they contend that it will inevitably start up again, when the war materials plan gets into fuller production.

That has all the earmarks of a plain guess, and a bum one. Sure, there will be more military hardware produced as the contracts, slow up to now, are filled, but if the stores are loaded with consumer goods and people are not buying and not likely to buy unless prices fall, why should there inevitably be an inflation? The war factories are not paying wartime overtime, the consumer goods industries are already cutting back and installment credit is and should remain tighter.

WILL GO ON AND ON

Well, even if inflation doesn't take hold in the fall, it surely will by next spring, they say. That's another guess. Meanwhile, unless something drastic is done to rid the taxpayers of these new salary-drawers, complete with offices, secretaries, Government-paid phones and cars, it will go on and on, just like all bureaucracies. No Federal jobholder ever recommended the abolition of his job. The sensible course is to abolish the whole useless set-up and let next spring take care of itself.

When the wartime OPA was abolished stocks of goods were small and the pipe lines were not full. People had more money than they knew how to spend. It was natural that they bid up prices before production caught up. But the situation is reversed today. There is plenty of stuff to buy. (The purchasing agents will tell you sadly there is too much.) And people are much more reluctant to part with a buck than they were in 1946. They're overcommitted on installments, they are feeling the high cost of living, they have become more tax conscious. And having got sucked into two war scares of buying—last July and last January—they are much more wary now.

Washington reports say Mr. Truman, the control bosses, and the union spokesmen are surprised and discouraged because there has been practically no public response to their hysterical screams for controls. Why should there be? The majority of the public is getting wise to them. It can see through the sham and recognize the program for what it is—just a stacking of new job holders, without any noticeable effect on prices.

OPS written by Philip W. Porter, a well-known writer of keen insight and of great ability, and published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of July 14, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTER ON CONTROLS—ASKS FOR DEATH OF OPS—PREDICTS PRICE DROP—MORE INFLATION NOT NECESSARILY SO

(By Philip W. Porter)

It looks now as if the House in Washington is going to cut the heart out of the controls extension bill, but it ought to have the

The union bosses are particularly upset, but why they should expect favorable response to their propaganda is also a mystery. The public took their measure last fall and elected a majority of Congressmen who opposed them personally, opposed socialistic "controls" and spoils politics. Why be surprised when these Congressmen vote the way their constituents want? The unions still haven't realized that the voters don't want a union-controlled, socialistic, job-stacking administration. There is even doubt that the Democrats themselves today have a majority within their own party for it. The southern Democrats and the northern Jeffersonians don't want it—that's for sure.

Better Government Forecasts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in the current issue of Newsweek, Mr. Henry Hazlitt, an eminent economist, points out that for the fiscal year 1951, the administration made a series of very bad guesses. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an interesting article with tables set forth and I commend it to the attention of the Members:

GOVERNMENT PLAN THYSELF

(By Henry Hazlitt)

In its budget estimates for the fiscal year 1951 the administration made a series of bad guesses. The President originally figured that the Government would spend \$42,400,000,000, take in \$37,300,000,000, and end up with a deficit of \$5,100,000,000.

This estimate was made in January 1950. Had Mr. Truman foreseen the outbreak of war in Korea that June his deficit guess would probably have been even larger. Last January, after 6 months of actual fighting and mobilization, he turned in a revised estimate reducing the expected Federal deficit to \$2,700,000,000. Less than 3 months later this was changed to an expected surplus of \$2,900,000,000. When the fiscal year had actually closed on June 30 last, actual Government expenditures had come to \$44,700,000,000, receipts to \$48,000,000,000, and the surplus to \$3,300,000,000.

So, in spite of an unexpected year of war, an estimated deficit of \$5,100,000,000 became an actual surplus of \$3,300,000,000. This was an error of \$8,400,000,000—an amount greater than the total average annual expenditures for all purposes in the Roosevelt administrations prior to the Second World War. This huge error merely comes on top of a record of chronic bad guesses. The table below compares for each year since 1934 the President's estimates (in millions of dollars) of expenditures, receipts, and deficits for the following fiscal year with the realities of that year.

Even if we disregard the five war years, 1942 to 1946, inclusive, and the wartime year 1951, we find that in the remaining 11 peacetime years there was an average error of 20 percent in estimating expenditures, an average error of 13 percent in estimating revenues, and appalling errors and reversals in estimating surpluses and deficits. In short, a government that presumes to plan and forecast for everybody cannot even estimate with reasonable accuracy what its own expenditures, revenues, and surplus or

deficit are going to be. It cannot predict even its own action, and makes errors of a dimension that would bankrupt a private business in no time.

EXPENDITURES

Fiscal year	Budget estimate	Reality	Percent difference
1935.....	\$5,901	\$6,802	+14
1936.....	7,884	8,477	+8
1937.....	6,173	8,001	+30
1938.....	5,756	7,626	+32
1939.....	6,809	8,707	+27
1940.....	8,905	8,998	-----
1941.....	8,424	12,710	+51
1942.....	17,486	32,397	+85
1943.....	58,928	78,178	+32
1944.....	104,128	93,743	-10
1945.....	97,954	100,405	+2
1946.....	82,530	63,714	-23
1947.....	35,125	42,505	+21
1948.....	37,528	33,791	-10
1949.....	39,699	40,057	+1
1950.....	41,858	40,156	-4
1951.....	42,439	44,700	+5

RECEIPTS

Fiscal year	Budget estimate	Reality	Percent difference
1935.....	\$3,975	\$3,800	-4
1936.....	3,992	4,116	+3
1937.....	5,654	5,194	-8
1938.....	7,294	6,242	-14
1939.....	5,919	5,165	-13
1940.....	5,669	5,367	-5
1941.....	6,248	7,607	+22
1942.....	8,275	12,709	+55
1943.....	16,487	22,281	+35
1944.....	33,081	44,148	+33
1945.....	40,769	46,457	+14
1946.....	41,255	43,038	+4
1947.....	31,513	43,259	+37
1948.....	37,730	42,211	+12
1949.....	44,177	38,246	-14
1950.....	40,985	37,045	-10
1951.....	37,306	48,000	+29

NET DEFICIT

Fiscal year	Budget estimate	Reality	Percent difference
1935.....	\$1,986	\$3,002	+51
1936.....	3,892	4,161	+12
1937.....	519	2,707	+422
1938.....	1,538	1,044	-----
1939.....	950	3,542	+273
1940.....	2,326	3,611	+9
1941.....	2,176	5,103	+135
1942.....	9,211	19,598	+113
1943.....	42,441	55,897	+32
1944.....	71,047	49,595	-30
1945.....	57,185	54,948	-6
1946.....	41,530	20,676	-50
1947.....	23,612	1,754	-----
1948.....	1,202	18,419	+1,608
1949.....	14,808	2,141	-----
1950.....	873	3,111	+256
1951.....	5,133	13,300	-----

1 Surplus.

2 Deficit.

The Chippewa National Forest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Forestry's Challenge to America," published in the Grand Rapids Herald-Review of July 19, 1951. It refers to the Chippewa National Forest and its management, recently the recipient of an award for most distinguished accomplishment.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FORESTRY'S CHALLENGE TO AMERICA

The Chippewa National Forest and its management were recently given an award for most distinguished accomplishment. To those who know the forest and its sincere personnel, the honor is known to be well merited.

In recent years there has been a great change in the forest problem. There has been much discussion of the needs of forestry and how they might be met. There has been a period of agitation, debate, controversy, indecision, uncertainty, and some accomplishment. Today there is no doubt, in the mind of any impartial observer, that forests can be protected, conserved, and developed through an effective cooperation of man with nature.

It has been demonstrated that fires can be controlled if the State and the Nation decree it and make possible the necessary facilities. New chemicals and methods can go far in checking disease and pests. Brush can be cut back. The problem in forestry is largely that of dividing up the soil and the sun. That means thinning of some stands and replanting of others, both expensive processes. Forests should be properly harvested and their products used to the best advantage. All of these things can be done if the means to do them are provided.

The problem of forestry is now one, not only of trees or science, but of money—hard, cold cash. If the people of the State and the Nation wish the proper conservation and development of their forests, all that they need to do is to reach into their own pockets. Foresters are ready. Nature is willing. The forests are waiting. Anything that Americans wish to do for their forests they can accomplish by providing an adequate support for forestry.

Nature has been so lavish that Americans have long thought that they could get all that they wished from the forests for all time. Up to a generation ago the Nation did nothing to forests except cut them. There has been realization in late years that forest conservation and development is not only possible but necessary. At that the States and the Federal Government are now spending an amount for all forest programs which is less than 70 cents a year for each man, woman, and child in the Nation.

To double expenditures for forestry, State and Federal, would require another 70 cents per capita, or an aggregate of about a hundred million dollars. In these days of many dollars, this is a small amount of money. Translated into more understandable terms it may be computed that America's expenditures for forestry may be doubled for the price of an hour's work a year by each wage earner in the Nation. To double forestry expenditures would be the equivalent of but a dollar or two for each thousand feet of lumber or ton of paper produced annually in the United States. A hundred million dollars is one twenty-fifth of 1 percent of the present annual national income.

Though appropriated by legislatures and Congress and collected from the taxpayers, forestry expenditures are not taxation in the ordinary sense. They are, in truth, capital expenditures which, in varying periods of time, will return in some form to the American people.

The friends of forests must not be timid. The cause which they represent is great and the influences which will aid are extensive and strong. The forests have built nearly every home in America since the days of Plymouth Rock. They have built the barns and fenced the farms of the Nation. The forests have furnished the poles which now carry scores of millions of miles of talk-

ing wires. Cedar and pine support the wires for power and light. The steel rails of the Nation rest upon trees from the forests. Forests protect lakes and waters, game and fish, and they provide pleasure and inspiration for every person in the land. Forests help to make the paper for newspapers, magazines, and books, and the publisher and the forester are partners in one of the greatest undertakings in democracy.

With moral, industrial, and spiritual obligations to forests that are beyond measurement, the practical help that forests now so sorely need should come forth readily.

Covenant on Human Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Covenant on Human Rights," published in the *Palladium-Item* and *Sun-Telegram*, of Richmond, Ind., on July 20, 1951. It deals with the problem which I discussed on the floor of the Senate during the past week.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

COVENANT ON HUMAN RIGHTS

The United Nations covenant on human rights carries a high-sounding name. But the name belies the vicious purpose of this pact.

Senator BRICKER said it should be called the United Nations covenant on human slavery. Why?

Because it jeopardizes certain basic freedoms of the people.

If accepted by the United Nations General Assembly next November and ratified by our Senate, it virtually would repeal the religious and press freedom guarantees of our Constitution.

Senator BRICKER has introduced a resolution which would disapprove the Covenant on Human Rights and would direct our representatives at the United Nations to drop negotiations on it.

The covenant was prepared under the "immediate direction of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt," who was Chairman for 5 years of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. She resigned as Chairman last April.

The State Department, according to Senator BRICKER, is backing this scheme which would enable it "to stifle all criticism of the so-called Fair Deal."

Senator BRICKER charged that Secretary of State Acheson, who is a constitutional lawyer, "cannot help but know that to ratify the covenant would radically change the meaning of the Constitution. To date Mr. Acheson has been strangely silent in regard to this covenant."

The threat to religious freedom is in article 15 which provides that freedom to manifest one's religion or beliefs shall be subject to such limitations "as are pursuant to law and are reasonably necessary to protect public safety, order, health, or morals, or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others."

Our Constitution guarantees absolute religious liberty. Under the covenant on human rights, a dictator can outlaw a religion by merely ruling that it is inimical to the public safety or the freedoms of others.

In the same way, the Government can control the press in "case of a state of emergency." Senator BRICKER rightly pointed out that President Roosevelt could have applied this control and restriction in any of the emergencies experienced in the days of the New Deal.

The covenant is a smoothly worded instrument by which the press, for instance, could be shut down for criticizing President Truman's Fair Deal and his foreign policies.

Any administration having a majority vote in the Congress could provide such restrictions of freedom of speech or of the press as it deemed needed for the national security or public order.

By declaring an emergency, as set out in the covenant, the President could close all newspapers in the country.

By resorting to the plea of emergency, Peron closed *La Prensa* because he believed it necessary for "the protection of national security."

That is the practice which the covenant would authorize and legalize for the head of any government.

Senator BRICKER performed a public service in citing the dictatorial restrictions in the so-called covenant of human rights.

The Congress should adopt his resolution to disapprove this global pact that will abridge our religious and press freedoms.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a distinguished foreign publication, the *London Economist*, which has long and realistically reported America's rise to world leadership, has come forth with its view on how the St. Lawrence seaway project ties in with the full mobilization of America's strength.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the *RECORD* excerpts from an article of April 21, 1951, carried in the *Economist*, entitled "New Hope for the Seaway." I believe it will benefit all of us to read this. It will remove us for a while from the confusion surrounding the discussion of the St. Lawrence question in this country, and expose us to the objectivity and mature judgment of trained and experienced students of world affairs.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the article were ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

For almost half a century Americans, like Canadians, have dreamed of a seaway 2,300 miles long that would join the land-locked Middle West with the salt-water highways of the world via the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence. Interest has been quickened by the prospect of harnessing, for electricity production, the tremendous water power of the International Rapids section of the river.

The seaway would put directly into world commerce at low cargo rates the immense

agricultural, mineral, and industrial riches of the Midwest. Great inland cities like Chicago, Detroit, and Cleveland would become ocean ports, yet in wartime the ship-line would be secure from prowling submarines. And the American half of the 13,000,000,000 kilowatts of hydroelectricity to be made available each year would help to relieve the serious power shortages in upper New York State and New England.

Although this project fires any disinterested imagination, and is a nonpartisan issue, it is a chronic source of intense conflict for special and sectional interests—between rail and water transport companies, between private coal and electricity concerns and those who want public water power, between ports on the Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico and those on the Great Lakes, between businesses in the East and in the Middle West, and so on. All the national farm organizations want the seaway as a cheap avenue for grain exports, but industrial interests are sharply divided and the trade unions tend to go along with the industries they serve. Thus, the railroad brotherhoods line up behind the rail carriers, while the longshoremen back the seaports, coal companies, which still oppose the venture have the miners' redoubtable Mr. John L. Lewis in their corner.

The loudest voices in the present controversy, however, are not those of eastern opponents but of midwestern proponents, who have recently recognized that the supply of high-grade iron ore (which comes from the Mesabi Range in the Lake Superior district of Minnesota), is diminishing at an alarming rate, and may be exhausted within a decade. The Secretary of Commerce says the United States will have to import 40,000,000 tons of iron ore by 1960. Here is a long-term threat to the prosperity of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Michigan—perhaps the greatest manufacturing center in the world and one which produces 70 percent of America's steel. The threat is scarcely lessened by new discoveries of limited deposits in Ontario or by plans for utilizing low-grade taconite—still a slow and expensive process. The only real promise of relief is in the discoveries of Labrador and Quebec, north of the Gulf of St. Lawrence port of Seven Islands. This area, which probably contains as much high-grade ore as the Mesabi district, is now being developed by several midwestern steel companies.

For a generation businessmen and industrialists in the Middle West felt that they could ignore the dispute. But they have been taking anxious second looks since they realized the cost handicap their region would suffer if iron ore had to be brought in by way of the Atlantic and expensive rail transit from the coast. * * * As a result, midwestern farm organizations and trade unions which have long pleaded the seaway cause are being reinforced by worried editors, chambers of commerce, steel makers and steel users. Huge concerns like the General Motors Corp. and the Ford Co. are now actively interested. The important Ohio Valley Improvement Association has changed over from opponent to advocate.

In his budget message Mr. Truman asked Congress for \$20,000,000 to launch the seaway and power project, and this time his plea is sharpened by intimations from Ottawa that, if the United States continues to mark time, Canada will next year begin to construct both seaway and power plant on its side of the border. The opposition is still strong and vocal, but there is a growing feeling, in and out of Congress, that an enterprise which makes obvious economic and engineering sense and one which Mr. Herbert Hoover once called the greatest internal improvement yet undertaken on the North American continent will eventually be carried out.

Lesson Available in Yalta Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an article by the Alsops, entitled "Lesson Available in Yalta Pact," and appearing in the Chicago Sun-Times of July 22.

Their article clearly brings forth the fact that the attacks on the Yalta agreement have been unwarranted, unjustified, and unfair. It leaves no room for doubt about the attitude at the time of the agreement of one of the administration's most bitter critics, Maj. Gen. Patrick Hurley. Moreover, after reading the article, which is based on facts, one cannot help but conclude that the anti-administration forces presently beating their breasts and tearing their hair over the Yalta agreement are responsible for the present state of the world—not the agreement itself. The article is well worth the time to read carefully and completely:

LESSON AVAILABLE IN YALTA PACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

WASHINGTON—This is a pretty good time to think about the Yalta agreement—but not in the idiotically misleading manner that lately has become fashionable. The real point about Yalta is that it was a pretty good deal, if the other parties to the bargain had only kept it. And the bargain might have been kept, too, if it had not been for our own folly.

Speaking particularly of the far-eastern aspect of the Yalta agreement, there are three facts that every one forgets. First, Roosevelt offered Stalin concessions in Manchuria because his chief military advisers wished to buy Russian aid in the conquest of the Japanese Islands, which then officially was estimated likely to cost 2 years and half a million American lives. Second, this offer was made with the practical thought clearly in mind that the Soviet armies in Siberia could and would seize these Manchurian positions in any case.

Third—and this is what is most important—a promise to enter the Japanese war was not Stalin's only part in the bargain. Stalin also recognized the government of Chiang Kai-shek as predominant in China; and he promised to "support" the Chiang regime by every means in his power. Furthermore, he embodied this recognition of Chiang's predominance and his promise of support in his treaty with Chungking, negotiated after Yalta by Dr. T. V. Soong and approved by Chiang himself.

There is no doubt that on its face this was a good deal, as Maj. Gen. Patrick Hurley, among others, frankly stated at the time. The power of the Chinese Nationalists already was declining. The power of the Chinese Communists already was growing. And if Stalin, the master of the Chinese Communists, would help to establish Chiang as the ruler of China, it was the cheapest way out of a messy business.

What is interesting and new is the further fact that Stalin actually did try, for a while, to keep the promises he gave Roosevelt at Yalta and T. V. Soong in Moscow. It is to be hoped that the essential documents to support this addition to history soon will be published in Belgrade.

Meanwhile, it can only be said that one of these correspondents, when in Yugoslavia recently, was given what appeared to be indisputable proof. This came from leading Yugoslavs who had been in touch with members of the politburo of the Chinese Communist Party in the postwar period, when Chinese and Yugoslavs still were linked, of course, by the same faith.

In brief, Stalin ordered Mao Tze-tung and his fellow Chinese Communists to enter a coalition government in China on the terms already laid down by Hurley as President Roosevelt's representative at Chungking. These coalition terms were calculated, or so Hurley then believed, to insure that the Communist members of the proposed coalition would be controlled by Chiang and the Nationalists.

It would seem the Hurley view was justified. At any rate, Mao Tse-tung shared it fully. He flatly refused to obey Stalin's command, declaring that his Communists would win all China in the end and refusing to sacrifice this future victory to a subordinate place in any coalition.

The episode followed exactly the same pattern as that other strange, unrecorded bit of history—Stalin's order to Marshal Tito to bring back King Peter, and to carry out the Stalin-Churchill bargain making Yugoslavia a joint Anglo-Soviet "sphere of influence" on a 50-50 basis.

In both cases, it is now clear, Stalin was acting on a false estimate of the toughness and resolution of the western nations. When Tito defied him, Stalin warned that the British and Americans would land in Yugoslavia to make the 50-50 bargain stick; but Tito knew better. When Mao defied him, Stalin continued to exert pressure for compliance with his order until he was confronted with the spectacle of America's postwar demobilization.

Then, and only then—when Stalin knew that the howls of the same politicians who are now denouncing Yalta had caused America to cast away all her wartime power—did Stalin throw the rather hopeful Yalta bargain out the window. Then, and only then, did the Soviet Union begin to give the Chinese Communists the active support they needed to win their civil war.

There is a lesson in this fragment of the past. At Kaesong, Stalin's representatives are preparing to turn off the Korean war as though it were a leaky water tap which had been keeping people awake. The Moscow chorus already is beginning to sing its extensive repertory of slumber lullabies for silly statesmen.

The known aim is to make the Western Powers halt their rearmament and go to sleep again. For the west to do so will be suicide. But, if the west now learns the lesson of strength that was forgotten after Yalta, there are good reasons to be hopeful about the future.

The Faith of an American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief statement entitled "The Faith of an American," by Mr. Edgar Rogle Clark, a Mississippi musician and teacher.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FAITH OF AN AMERICAN

(By Edgar Rogle Clark)

I was born an American, and by my color, am considered a Negro. I am Caucasian, Mongolian, and Negroid. My ancestry arrived on the *Mayflower* and the *Blackbird*, but even earlier, they had explored the New World with Columbus. My ancestors were pioneers, some immigrants, and others indigenous to American soil. It is difficult to assign me to any caste or race. Even though the bodies of some of my ancestors were chained, their spirits were never enslaved. My status as an American has been made possible by blood, toll, faith, and the underground railroad, all of which led to Lincoln's proclamation giving official recognition to an already accomplished fact.

Fortunately, there are no typical Negro names to add to the already heavy burden of the color stigma. Some minorities have been able to change their names to ease the complication of discrimination, prejudice, and segregation. But among my people names like Cohen, O'Shay, Silvera, Jones, and Zuzuki are often encountered. Even with such names most of my breed comes plainly labeled and we can do little to change our color. The less color, the less discrimination. Yet, I refuse to wrap a towel around my head to pass myself off as a native of some country of the Far East. It seems then that bias is based solely upon color. Is being born with a dark skin a sin against society, and is color alone an enemy? Yet, I am not alarmed at these implications of my race or my color, for surely my shoulders are broad enough to bear up under the considerable avalanche of slander and caricature. I wear my color not as a mourning badge, but as a mark of triumph.

My education has been entirely secular, my name is English, and my cultural heritage compares favorably with that of any white American. The American culture which I enjoy sprang from 2,000 years of Christianity. I am one of the older of America's children, and into my hands is given her priceless heritage. Mine is the whole embittered past, and mine is the shining future. Life is continually weighing me in very sensitive scales, and at other times, repressive machinery seems to be encircling me closer and closer. Basically, I like the democratic structure, and the conceptions of equality and the rights and dignity of man. And I realize that there are many problems that are so ponderous that even the heavy rollers of democracy cannot flatten them down altogether overnight. I believe that this Government though not actually perfect, is the best in the world.

Today, 1951 A. D., the Negro courage has won the most heroic struggle of an enslaved people in the history of mankind. As one American white man put it: "It is astonishing to see how soon the American Negro became civilized." To many of my complexion, this statement might have been offensive. On hearing this testimony my mind ran back to brutal lynchings in this country and the relapse of many good Americans into barbarism.

If we may judge from the Zimbabwe ruins, some African tribes were at one time more civilized than the Europeans. Certainly we know that civilization has nothing to do with geographical boundaries or with the pigmentation of skins. Savages have been misunderstood and have had all sorts of dreadful traits and customs unjustly attributed to them. The man who lived some distance away and minded his own business became—like the "heathen" who originally was only a dweller on the heath—the feared one, an object of terror. And if he had a different colored skin he was per se a "savage." It is

only now that the American Negro is becoming an integral part of the social, economic, and political life in America. But he is also a crusader for freedom, striving to take his place as a first-rate citizen. This country's pattern of segregation, our mob violence, our unequal educational facilities, our physical and moral barriers, the disfranchisement of great groups of native-born citizens all contribute grist to the European mills of anti-Americanism. These evils certainly draw attention to what is weak in our democracy.

The American way of life—the principles of equality and of the dignity of the individual mean much to me. But I resent undemocratic practices which prevent us from achieving these ideals. The Negro today sees two Americas. First, there is democratic America, the ideal of the Constitution of the United States. But there is also the America in reality which falls short of these democratic ideals, the one the Negro must face every day. Some believe that education, not legislation, will solve our problems of racial difference. But education is slow. We have only one life to live. After 87 years of freedom we would like to enjoy some of the rights of a first-class citizen in our time.

To us this land is a promise and an expectation, the real testing ground for the democracy about which we preach so much. Our past, present, and future lie here. Our seeds are planted, our feet have taken root, our ships are burned, and there is no returning. Our joys and sorrows, our sweat and blood have fertilized this land. Together, white and black, we have conquered land, water, disease, and disaster. We built the cabin and the skyscraper. Together we must live.

I am not a "pleader for my people." I am just one of the 12,000,000 voices in 1951 waiting to take his rightful place in a democracy. There are many who will work with me until real democracy is achieved, the democracy that the confused world needs at this very hour. It is only when we have set our own house in order that we can conquer communism. Correction of our own weakness would refute the strongest argument of the Communists about United States racial hypocrisy. Then all Americans can join against the common enemy.

Flood-Control Problems of Ventura County, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ERNEST K. BRAMBLETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Robert L. Ryan, engineer-manager, Ventura County Flood-Control District, California, to the Senate Civil Functions Subcommittee:

JULY 1951.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the following information is offered to your subcommittee in order to familiarize you with the flood-control problems of Ventura County and to ask for appropriations as you see fit to start the approved Federal projects.

Ventura County is a coastal county lying adjacent and northerly of Los Angeles County. The terrain is both mountainous and alluvial, combining flood-control problems peculiar to both types of terrain. The valley and plain areas are highly developed, agriculturally with citrus and walnut

ranches—field crops, and a tremendous oil development.

The main stream, the Santa Clara River, runs generally westerly, southwesterly through the county to the Pacific Ocean, thus dividing the county in two. On the south side lies the two great Naval Installations, United States Naval Station, Port Hueneme, where most of the supplies and construction equipment are shipped to the Pacific, as well as a training and embarkation point for construction battalions; the guided missile test center, Point Mugu, which is being enlarged continuously into one of the largest installations of its kind in the United States.

United States Highways No. 101 and No. 101 alternate, join south of the Santa Clara River and continue as one highway across the river, and north to San Francisco. The State route No. 118 from Los Angeles also must cross the Santa Clara River so the protection of the bridges and maintenance of a channel on the lower end of the river is most important for maintaining traffic for military as well as civilian use between both sides of said river.

1. Santa Clara River project, as recommended, consists of two parts; one, a levee on the left bank of the lower section of the river and a channel for the lower end of Santa Paula Creek, a tributary.

The Santa Clara River is a typical California coastal stream, subject to high intensity of rainfall and runoff and with a watershed containing mountains in the upper areas and a flat alluvial plain in the lower reaches.

A few miles above the Pacific Ocean the river emerges from an area fairly well confined by mountains and hills, into a plain where the river has poorly defined banks of sand and gravel. The river is progressively eroding to the southwest in the direction of the prevailing downgrade, although the maintained channel is generally westerly. Floods in recent years have caused considerable damage to highways and property and it is not improbable that a new channel might be formed as a result of a major flood.

United States Highway No. 101 and route No. 118, as well as the main coastline of the Southern Pacific, cross the Santa Clara River in the area of the alluvial plain. These highways serve all traffic between Los Angeles and the north coastal area and between the San Joaquin Valley and the coast in this area. They also serve the two large naval installations, the United States Naval Station at Port Hueneme and the Guided Missile Test Center at Point Mugu.

The loss or damage to bridges and approaches would be disastrous to the operation of the vital naval installations which feature so large in our national defense program. In addition the disruption of traffic on these two highways both from a local as well as an area angle would be very serious.

The construction of 5 miles of levee on the left bank of the river would prevent further possibility of the Santa Clara River eroding a new or enlarged channel south of the present one with consequent damage to industrial and agricultural lands, as well as assuring an uninterrupted flow of highway and rail traffic both to the naval installations in the north and south coastal areas. The proposed levee is the most important part of the entire Santa Clara River project.

Santa Paula Creek is a high-velocity stream, the lower portion of which travels on a debris cone higher than the city of Santa Paula which lies adjacent and westerly of the creek. This creek is crossed in the lower section by the branch of the Southern Pacific Railroad which connects the San Joaquin Valley route with the coast route. It is also crossed by Highway No. 126 which connects United States Highway No. 101 at Ventura with United States Highway No. 99, which latter highway runs from Los Angeles to the San Joaquin Valley.

The improvement of this channel would thus protect the city of Santa Paula and the adjoining agricultural lands from floods as well as providing continuous highway and rail traffic on the branch line of the Southern Pacific and the State highway.

2. Stewart Canyon Debris Basin and Channel is the second project in flood-control work in the Ventura River Basin. The first project, a levee on lower Ventura River, has been constructed with Federal funds and is being maintained by the district.

Stewart Canyon is a steep canyon with a watershed which has a top elevation of about 6,000 feet and drops down to 650 feet in a relatively short distance. It then enters into a fairly flat area and the channel now runs directly to the city of Ojai. It is subject to extremely heavy rainfall of short duration, with consequently high intensity of runoff including large debris flows. The situation was aggravated by a severe fire in 1948 which almost completely denuded the watershed of protective growth. The Corps of Engineers expended emergency funds to construct a debris sump after the fire for the protection of life and property. The district acquired the property on which the work was done, as well as sufficient property for the permanent installation. This project is for the protection of life and property, as well as highways, streets, and the railroad, and is worthy of serious consideration.

This brief report is offered for your consideration, and it is hoped that sufficient funds can be appropriated to at least commence these projects. In any case it is hoped that planning funds can at least be appropriated so that the projects can be constructed in the near future.

I wish to thank you for the opportunity of being able to present these matters to your subcommittee in person.

Respectfully,

ROBERT L. RYAN,

Engineer, Ventura County, Calif.,
Flood Control District.

TABULATION PROPOSED FEDERAL FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS

Santa Clara River—Santa Paula Creek project: estimated present cost, \$5,725,000

State water resources board recommendation for a first appropriation \$500,000.

Stewart Canyon project: estimated present cost \$1,312,000.

State water resources board recommendation for first appropriation, \$500,000.

Mission of the Voice of America: Promote Truth, Dissolve Tyranny, Fuse a Meeting of Minds on the Road to Freedom and Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, people of the world thirst each day for truth to learn whether the trend is toward freedom or war. America travels the road to freedom, promoting truth, dissolving tyranny, fusing a meeting of minds against man's eternal enemy, tyranny.

Tyranny is despised because it is selfish and cruel, exploits the worker and depresses man. It travels the road to war.

The tyranny of Red regimes, the TNT governments which take and torture, pervert and twist the brain of man, must be dissolved.

We hear the cry, "Arms and the man." In combat, they can destroy the "take and torture" of tyranny, even contain it in peace.

But truth reaches beyond the range of combat, enters the home of friend and foe; quenches their thirst; fuses their minds with a will to travel the road to freedom and strength, dissolving tyranny.

To this mission is the Voice of America dedicated. God grant it success.

Legislative Log Jam Must Not Be Allowed to Pigeonhole Progress on Hoover Commission Recommendations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of every Member of Congress the warning issued today to President Truman and the Congress by some 30 outstanding citizens. These national leaders have joined in a statement to warn that the current legislative log jam must not be allowed to pigeonhole the Report of the Bipartisan Hoover Commission on Federal Reorganization, Efficiency, and Economy. They are right and their plea should not go unheeded.

Signers of the statement, led by Dr. Robert L. Johnson, national chairman of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, point out that 50 percent of the Hoover Commission's recommendations were enacted by the Eighty-first Congress "with many substantial improvements and economies."

The signers, all prominent members of the citizens committee, observe with dismay that the first 6 months of the Eighty-second Congress have been characterized by a singular lack of legislative activity.

With equal dismay we note that President Truman has submitted only one reorganization plan to the Congress during this session.

The statement said—

This is an unhappy contrast with 1949 and 1950. . . . The Hoover report is above and beyond politics . . . one of the most hopeful signs of our times. It would be bad enough to see this report defeated openly by the forces of bureaucratic indifference and group selfishness. To see it go down through sheer neglect would be a national tragedy.

Besides Dr. Johnson, who is president of Temple University, Philadelphia, the signers include: T. Coleman Andrews, of Richmond, Va.; Rear Adm. Frederick J. Bell, retired, of Baltimore, Md.; former Senator Prentiss M. Brown, of Detroit, Mich.; Francis J. Chesterman, of Phila-

delphia, Pa.; Donald Comer, of Birmingham, Ala.; William E. Cotter, of New York City; Dr. Donald J. Cowling, of Minneapolis, Minn.; John W. Davis, of New York City; Thomas J. Dodd, of Hartford, Conn.; Gen. William J. Donovan, of New York City; Ferdinand Eberstadt, of New York City; former Governor Charles Edison, of West Orange, N. J.; Clarence Francis, of New York City; John M. Hancock, of New York City; Milton E. Kahn, of Portland, Oreg.; Oveta Culp Hobby, of Houston, Tex.; Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, of New York City; Donald V. Lowe, of Ridgefield, N. J.; former Governor Leslie A. Miller, of Cheyenne, Wyo.; Col. Alvin Owsley, of Dallas, Tex.; Fred D. Patterson, of Tuskegee, Ala.; former Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson, of New York City; Neil Petree, of Los Angeles, Calif.; Captain Edward V. Rickenbacker, of New York City; Lessing J. Rosenwald, of Philadelphia, Pa.; Morris Sayre, of New York City; Miss Anna Lord Strauss, of Stepney, Conn.; John Stuart, of Chicago, Ill.; and A. L. M. Wiggins, of Hartsville, S. C.

Under permission granted me by the House, I am including in the RECORD the text of the statement, as follows:

JOINT STATEMENT BY DR. ROBERT L. JOHNSON AND PROMINENT MEMBERS OF THE CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR THE HOOVER REPORT

Just over 2 years ago the bipartisan Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (Hoover Commission) completed its historic report to the Congress which created it. Some 50 percent of the Commission's recommendations were adopted by the Eighty-first Congress in the form of 20 public laws and 26 Presidential reorganization plans. As a result, many substantial improvements and economies have been instituted in important areas of government. This shows what can be done when legislators and officials work together toward goals that transcend politics.

We now note with dismay, however, that the first 6 months of the Eighty-second Congress have been characterized by a singular lack of legislative activity. We recognize that exceptional circumstances prevail. Yet we feel justified in pointing out that a serious legislative log jam is developing.

If the reasons for action on the Hoover report were compelling in 1949-50, they are doubly so today. The unenacted 50 percent of the Hoover Commission's recommendations have profound bearing on all the current problems of government. The need for reorganization of the Department of Agriculture, the Post Office, and the Veterans' Administration is clearly indicated by the Commission's findings which show that these agencies are handicapped by obsolete organization and wasteful practices in their efforts to meet overwhelming workloads. The Commission also sounded a clear call for consolidation of Federal medical services, modernization of Federal personnel procedures, and an end to the wasteful competition for public funds between rival agencies engaged in public works projects.

These and other important recommendations are embodied in a series of 20 bills based on the Hoover report, which have been introduced in the Congress under splendid bipartisan sponsorship. There is thus available to the Congress a program for increasing Federal efficiency and reducing waste which can help mightily to avert further inflation.

To date, however, little action has been taken. The legislative log jam threatens a delay which, if prolonged, might prove fatal

to full adoption of the Hoover Commission report.

This would be a serious loss to the Nation. It would also be a deep disappointment to the many thousands of good citizens of both parties who are working unselfishly in support of the reorganization program through 300 State and local citizens committees from coast to coast.

In fairness to the Congress, it should be pointed out that the administration shares responsibility for adoption of the Hoover report. Under the Reorganization Act of 1949, which the Hoover Commission recommended, the President is authorized to submit reorganization plans for the realignment of agencies in the executive branch. Unless either House rejects such plans within 60 days, they automatically become law. The Reorganization Act of 1949 is by far the strongest instrument of its kind ever authorized by Congress.

With equal dismay, therefore, we note that President Truman has submitted only one reorganization plan to the Congress during this session. This is an unhappy contrast with 1949 and 1950. By June 30, 1949, seven Presidential reorganization plans were before the Congress. At the same time last year, 27 such plans had been presented, and 20 had already received final congressional action.

Fully recognizing the huge new burdens which have fallen upon the administration since the Korean invasion, we feel bound to point out that the Hoover Commission's report is clearly and fundamentally linked to the successful prosecution of the national defense effort. We, therefore, urge the President and the Bureau of the Budget, to which it has assigned the major portion of reorganization responsibility, to act affirmatively in the near future by submitting plans based squarely on the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

We understand, of course, that many of these measures are controversial. We recognize that every citizen who entertains reservations with respect to some aspect of the report can, and should, express his viewpoint.

But we do insist that anything so valuable as the Hoover report should be made the subject of prompt, frank, open public and congressional discussion, debate—and action, pro or con. The Hoover report is above and beyond politics. It has done much to reawaken the long-dormant interest of the free citizen in the management of his government. It is one of the most hopeful signs of our times.

It would be bad enough to see this report defeated openly by the forces of bureaucratic indifference and group selfishness after due hearing and debate. To see it go down through sheer neglect would be nothing short of a national tragedy.

The Hoover Commission's report must not be pigeonholed. We strongly urge Congress and the administration to move swiftly and vigorously in behalf of Federal reorganization, efficiency, and economy.

Congressmen and Military Secrets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, Congress has vehemently demanded that our classified information be protected by removal from office of persons considered

to be security risks. The security program is based upon recognition of the fact that inestimable damage can result from unauthorized divulgence of the contents of classified documents, particularly those which contain military or diplomatic secrets. Breaches of security can mean war, death, and destruction. Only highly trained personnel can safely be entrusted with the important task of deciding when and under what circumstances classified information may be made public.

A breach of security is just as serious and just as damaging when committed by a Congressman as when committed by anyone else. In fact, it is more serious because it tends to destroy the mutual trust so essential to a satisfactory working relationship between Congress and those executive agencies which handle delicate international matters, the conduct of war, and plans for defense. To legislate intelligently, Congress needs to be fully informed, but to be fully informed Congress must be as trustworthy as the agencies of Government from which it demands full and complete disclosures of secret data.

A member of the Armed Forces who disclosed military secrets would be quickly punished pursuant to laws passed or regulations approved by Congress.

The breach of security discussed in the editorial from the Washington Post, which I should like to insert at the close of my remarks, is unfortunately not the only instance of congressional carelessness in the matter of security, but it is a particularly flagrant one, and unless we take action to prevent a repetition, we will have aided the cause of those who seek to destroy faith in our democratic institutions. The editorial from the Post follows:

SECRETS

A few weeks ago there was hope that with the end of the MacArthur hearings we might have at least a breathing spell in the all-out effort to publish the Nation's secrets. There now comes a report from Capitol Hill that dashes these hopes and testifies to the most wanton irresponsibility on the part of Congress. A pair of Representatives opposed to the Air Force's strategic bombing program forced an Air Force officer testifying before the House Armed Services Committee to reveal secret information on the number of B-36's currently in operation. Despite the fact that the figures were explicitly given on a confidential basis, the Congressmen went out and released the figures.

It so happens—and it is one more index of stupidity—that the information released is almost wholly irrelevant to the case the Congressmen are trying to prove. It also happens, however, that the figures are of inestimable value to the Soviet Union. They represent top secret order of battle information which, except for congressional volubility, would have been almost impossible to secure. On the basis of this information the Soviets can gage production figures and thereby calculate future United States strength at any given moment. Only the reading of codes or the placing of agents in the highest staff conferences—only, that is, the successful accomplishment of the most difficult intelligence activities—could have produced results so satisfactory to the Soviet Union. The time has come when action by censure should be undertaken by Congress against such irresponsible Members.

Massachusetts, Take Stock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I shall deliver over WMEX, Boston, Mass., Monday, July 23, 1951, 7:45 to 8 p. m.:

Ladies and gentleman of the radio audience, the Committee on the New England Economy, after much painstaking study, has just submitted a revealing report to the President.

It deals with the problem of defense mobilization in the six Northeastern States and with the requirements for long-range regional economic stability and growth.

What it has to say affects every person who works or lives in this area.

The report is so thorough that I shall only attempt to pick out certain highlights about Massachusetts, which is the heart of New England.

It would be well for all of us to realize that change is the law of life. No city or State can be content with what it has, because it would lose ground to its up-and-coming neighbors. Marking time is no way to make progress in a competitive world.

Judged in terms of per capita income and standard of living, Massachusetts is one of the more prosperous States of the Union. It has many assets, including a population with a high level of education and skill. It is a place where many people like to live because of its proximity to the shore, because of its climate, and because of its general social and cultural environment.

On the other hand, it is deficient in many raw materials of modern history. Its transportation costs, power costs, and taxes are higher than those same costs in other States. Much of its plant and equipment is old and needs modernization. These, plus other high-cost factors, are the result of the failure of Massachusetts people to make the most of their assets. This can be traced in part to the inaction, or unwise action by various Government authorities, both local and Federal.

Massachusetts is being forced to adapt its economy to changing conditions resulting from the opening of new frontiers of knowledge, and also the new industrial frontiers of the West and the South. Without turning its back on the past, Massachusetts needs to attain a better balance between the old and the new in the development of enterprise. Upon the skill shown by its leaders in keeping pace with progress will depend the prosperity of the larger population in the next generation.

Suppose we start with the year 1921.

Since then, the Bay State has lost the advantage it held in two of its major industries—textiles and shoes—which were responsible for nearly 40 percent of manufacturing employment. Some of these industries migrated away from the Northwest, while others shifted their operations to Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont. Furthermore, the factories that remain here, are able to produce goods with fewer employees because of labor-saving machinery.

Between 1919 and 1947, while manufacturing employment in the United States as a whole increased 44 percent, it declined in Massachusetts by 8 percent.

It is probable that losses of employment in the soft goods industries will continue. In

view of the technological revolution going on in textiles. It is the responsibility of business, labor, educational and political leaders in Massachusetts to seek substitute employments.

It should be noted on the hopeful side that the Nation appears to be in the midst of a substantial shift in raw materials sources, particularly in the fields of metals. Since 1945, the imports of aluminum from Canada have been large, and the projected expansion of Canadian production suggests that this source may be very important in the future. The discovery of vast iron-ore deposits in Quebec Province opens up a new opportunity because Massachusetts is located near this supply and could use it to expand its metal-using industries.

The relations of Massachusetts with the Federal Government is another part of the problem. In recent years, the National Government has collected and spent from 20 to 25 percent of the total income produced in the United States. It is in a position to reshape the economy by the manner in which it distributes this revenue. For example, it improves the competitive position of the South and West with public power developments, or through the building of defense plants and their sale to private industry at bargain prices. Likewise, the agricultural price-support program has the effect of increasing the income of farmers in other regions and might result in turning the terms of trade against Massachusetts by increasing the price of foods purchased from these other regions.

In this readjustment, Massachusetts has been compelled to give more than it has received. I do not suggest that we should oppose Federal programs that contribute to the well-being of the country at large merely because they are a drain upon us. In fact, we get some indirect benefits from the development of other regions. The point I want to make is this: As Federal operations continue to expand, we cannot afford to stand on the sidelines and shun Federal aid of all kinds. We ought to get our fair share.

Because Massachusetts has a number of one-industry communities, it is necessary for business leaders, labor leaders, and political leaders on the local level, to get together and work for a program of diversification.

As an older industrial section, Massachusetts has become too conservative as to methods and customs. Its future depends upon a modernization of its older industries and a development of new industries. In too many cases it has become over cautious. Time and again, the Committee on the New England Economy was told of great difficulty in getting new ideas accepted. This inflexibility in thinking and resistance to change have applied to management and labor alike. These attitudes have been particularly serious in certain of the communities committed to the older declining industries such as textiles and shoes, according to the committee's report. In some of these cities and towns, management, labor, and government—each looking at its own problems without due concern for the common interest—have too often been working at cross purposes. The result has been a fragmentation of the community, splitting the unity that is needed to solve the common problem.

The responsibility of Massachusetts is to make its resources and effort available to further the national defense program. Its opportunity is to do so in ways which will further the long-range adjustments that are necessary if we are to go forward with the times.

The committee offers these, among other recommendations, to improve business, employment, and income in Massachusetts.

Since manufacturing is the key everything should be done to encourage a climate that

will foster up-to-date manufactures. This means an overhaul of tax and regulatory laws, community organizations to promote growth, and similar activities.

A census of industries in terms of potentials of the area would reveal what could be manufactured here. It would show us what industries are most likely to develop, and would give us clear goals to shoot for.

The United States Department of Commerce is urged to expand the uses of funds for industrial research and development. This would help to provide technical and managerial services to smaller businessmen who are not financially able to get this modern know-how.

New industries needed to provide adequate and stable employment should be encouraged both in prosperity and in depression.

In communities where one-third or more of industrial employment is dependent upon the shoe or textile industry, local groups should take steps immediately to broaden their industrial bases by encouragement of diversification among other equally suitable products.

To meet potential recessions in industrial employment, each community should itself develop a stockpile of public-works projects. Such stockpiles should be based on estimates of vulnerability to unemployment, availability of facilities and labor, and lack of attractiveness to venture capital.

The committee strongly recommends that, wherever possible, the Federal Government should adopt minimum standards of working conditions and social services. In this way, the States would not be competing with each other, trying to lure away industries by offering lower wage rates, lower unemployment compensation, and lower workmen's compensation benefits. With higher Federal standards, applying to all States, this cheap raiding would be eliminated.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Congress should review the problem of asset depreciation for the purpose of making tax revisions that would encourage the modernization of plant and machinery by older concerns. This would help them to prosper and employ more people.

There should be a reexamination of transportation facilities with respect to Canadian sources. All the New England States should consider the long-run future of the natural resources in Canada and Labrador, and the desirability of improving transportation access to these sources.

The committee recommends further study of power costs, and the possibility of reducing them in connection with such community problems as navigation, flood control, river pollution, and reforestation.

In education, it is urged that the leaders in that field give more attention to the development of regional and community institutions of learning which directly serve the community and the region as well as the Nation.

Business, labor, the State and Federal Governments, should make every effort, in regard to tariff policies, to avoid action which would cause job dislocations before new job opportunities are at hand.

Massachusetts has been challenged by other problems before.

By knuckling down to business, it managed to overcome every threat to its progress. It will do so again.

Our task is no longer one of shifting from agriculture, fisheries, and forestry to manufacturing. Rather, it is one of changing over and streamlining our present industrial set-up. We need to make new products and build a greater variety of business and job opportunities.

A high level of income, education, skill, and responsible leadership, together with

unrealized opportunities for further growth, underlines the fact that the means for the solution of our general problem are at hand.

Massachusetts should look forward to an expanding economy that will provide more employment side by side with rising standards of living. Such a future will not come without effort. It will require the effective cooperation of many individuals and groups, both public and private.

This cooperation is part of our tradition.

But the initiative must come from each individual helping to rekindle enterprise in his home town first, for the State is only the sum total of its communities.

Massachusetts is getting its second wind for the new tomorrow that is its goal.

Share-the-Wealth Plan for Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FRANK WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remark, in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Forth Worth Star-Telegram:

SHARE-THE-WEALTH PLAN FOR TIDELANDS

The proposal of 11 Members of the United States Senate to divide all future tidelands oil revenues among the 48 States for support of education is bound to have a powerful allure. It is calculated to appeal strongly to those States which, without examining the proposition closely, see themselves as falling heir to an unexpected legacy of oil riches. That is probably the main purpose of the plan—to weaken support of the various States for pending legislation to restore title to offshore lands to the coastal States which held their undisputed possession for many years until the Supreme Court ruled otherwise.

In a reply to an article by Washington columnist Drew Pearson supporting this share-the-wealth program, Texas Attorney General Price Daniel goes beneath the surface of this plan and shows how deceptive is its appeal. He points out how the other States would stand to lose far more than they would gain if this enticing plan is adopted in preference to restoration of the tidelands areas to the States they adjoin.

Every State in the Union, as Mr. Daniel points out, has thousands of acres of submerged lands, the revenues from which are used for public education and other State functions. These valuable, revenue-yielding lands are subject to seizure by the Federal Government under the same theory that the tidelands have been taken—the theory, as expressed by Mr. Pearson, that the navigable water of the United States belong to the Federal Government, not to individual States.

And what would the States get in return for relinquishing these valuable holdings? In the case of Texas, one of the only three States which so far has derived any revenues from leases, royalties or oil production in its tidelands, the total collected from tidelands leases to date has been approximately \$7,000,000. Divided among the States, this would mean only \$148,833 per State, undoubtedly a great deal less than the States have derived from the submerged lands within their borders.

On the 350,000 acres of submerged lands it has leased, Texas has had an average return

of \$20 an acre under its leasing system. The Federal Government receives far less—50 cents an acre from the first applicant. Had the Texas tidelands been under control and management of the Federal Government in the past—the revenues would have amounted to only \$175,000. A similar amount collected in the future, and the lesser rentals and royalties received under Federal management of oil lands, would mean not nearly so rich a windfall for division among the States as might be expected.

There are some among the uninformed or unthinking who might be willing to accept this proposed largess collected by the Federal Government from a few of the States and distributed to all. But their eagerness might be dampened if they understood that such a gift would carry with it the danger, if not the inevitability, of the Federal seizure of all lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries, the increased encroachment of the Federal Government upon the traditional rights of the States, and the Federal control which inescapably would come with Federal financial support of education.

The governors and attorneys general of 44 States do understand this. That is why they consistently have resisted this educational share-the-wealth scheme—which is not new but first was broached in 1948—and have insisted that title to the offshore lands and lands underlying navigable water within the States be confirmed to the States by clear-cut congressional action.

Noted Editor Discusses Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, permit me to call the attention of the House to an editorial written by Mr. Manchester Boddy, noted editor and publisher of the Los Angeles Daily News:

CURTAIN LIFTED ON STALIN ANTI-UNITED STATES AIM

For the last 2 years or so anyone who wanted to show that he was up on his current reading about world affairs could do so by saying that the United States had no foreign policy; didn't know the score, didn't know what to do and was just playing—and very badly—by ear.

From there he would go on to tell how smart the Russians had been. They knew just what they wanted and how they were going to get it. The United States just was no match for the crafty Stalin and his Communist conspirators. We couldn't beat something with nothing, the Russians had something—a plan—whereas we had nothing.

Well, it is now revealed that one night in July 1947, Josef Stalin met in the Kremlin with an official delegation from Czechoslovakia and calmly outlined at considerable length his plans for confining American power to the Western Hemisphere and extending Soviet power throughout Europe and Asia.

And now, for the first time and in Stalin's own words, the current—July 14—issue of the Saturday Evening Post reports what the Russian ruler said.

STALIN'S OWN WORDS RECORDED

Arnhorst Heldrich, who attended the meeting as secretary general of the Czech Foreign Office, recorded Stalin's talk. His story is told by Stewart Alsop, veteran newspaperman and Post writer.

And what a story. Because the Czechs were in his power, the Russian ruler had no idea his words would ever be repeated, the article states. But Heldrich escaped, has visited the United States, and we now have his exact record.

Josef Stalin, according to the record, based his international strategy on three basic assumptions:

1. That the United States would suffer an economic catastrophe;
2. That this catastrophe "would permit American power to be confined to the Western Hemisphere, leaving Britain and France too weak to resist the pressure"; and
3. That American outer defenses or "positions of power," as Stalin called them—in Europe, the far Pacific, Near and Middle East—could be torn down rather easily and Russia wouldn't need to engage in any action that would serve as a Pearl Harbor and unite the American people.

Those were the basic assumptions upon which Stalin built Russia's foreign policy.

Anyone reading Stewart Alsop's article—and it should be read in its entirety—will be impressed to see how closely Stalin's basic assumptions fit into the pattern of events—initiated by Russia—that have occurred since the cold war began.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN-POLICY CRITICS WRONG

This newspaper has felt for some time that critics of our State Department have been inexcusably wrong in insisting that our foreign policy has failed to take the initiative from the power-mad Communist dictatorship in Moscow, that Russia has had free-wheeling in carrying out her program of aggression.

As the current Post revelation makes clear, Russia actually has been dramatically and, for her, tragically wrong on all three points of her basic assumption. As it says.

1. There has been no American depression.
2. American power has been increasingly committed outside the Western Hemisphere, in direct opposition to action by the Soviet Union.

3. These very—Russian—actions, culminating in the aggression in Korea, have had a cumulative effect on American public opinion very like Pearl Harbor.

In short, each of Stalin's basic assumptions has proved dead wrong.

It is about time, we think, for our State Department critics to admit that our definite foreign policy has been to accomplish just that—and we have done a pretty good job of it at least to date.

There is, however, a grave note of warning in the Post revelation.

ONLY WAR CAN ACHIEVE RED AIMS

"It must now be clear to Stalin," it says, "and to the other men in the Kremlin that their aims cannot be achieved without world war. . . . Heldrich believes that when the Soviet atomic stockpile reaches a decisive size war will probably come."

These sound like logical conclusions, but they may not be as sound as they seem. There exists, for example, the possibility that Russia's dramatically presented peace act on the world stage of the United Nations has been launched to confound, confuse, and defeat the American foreign and domestic policies that have, in fact, been so successful in defeating Russia.

One of the first reactions in Congress to the Korean peace move has been a drive for severe cuts in our economic aid to Europe program. While Congress is working at this,

the Communists in Iran are doing their level best to cut off Western Europe's supply of oil. If Congress and Iran's Reds are successful, at least one of Stalin's main assumptions—to leave "Britain and France too weak to resist the pressure" might yet be realized.

CONGRESS ACTION MAY HELP STALIN AIM

Another direct result of Russia's peace antics has been to encourage Congress to prepare the United States, for a possible economic catastrophe by destroying the whole system of economic controls with which our economy has been harnessed in a united effort to meet the Red challenge in Europe and Asia. If this antiadministration movement is as successful as the coalition opponents are trying to make it, Stalin's second assumption may be saved.

Finally, there is growing evidence that the up-coming political campaign will produce a strong effort to convince the American public that Korea and other Red aggressions in Europe and Asia should not have been allowed to serve as another "Pearl Harbor" in arousing the American will to meet the Red challenge wherever it appears in Europe and Asia. If this sort of political campaigning succeeds, Stalin may yet prove the soundness of all three points in his basic assumption—MANCHESTER BODDY.

JULY 18, 1951

Prayers for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Tablet, a Brooklyn, N. Y., newspaper, on Saturday, July 21, 1951:

PRAYERS FOR PEACE

Herve J L'Heureux, a wounded veteran of World War I, one of the founders of the American Legion, a veteran American Foreign Service officer, and presently Chief of the Visa Division of the Department of State, is the originator of a Prayers for Peace Movement which merits widespread endorsement, encouragement, and support. Mr. L'Heureux's message is simple. He asks a minimum of 1 minute of prayer daily, at noon, by every man, woman, and child in the United States, each in his own way, and each according to his own faith, to seek divine guidance and assistance in securing world peace.

It is not Mr L'Heureux's intention to form an organization, but rather to build up a custom among the American people to pause for 1 minute in the midst of their daily tasks, at 12 noon each day, to raise their minds and hearts to Almighty God in sincere and earnest prayer, to ask Him to help us adjust our international differences and to enable the nations of the world to secure an equitable and abiding peace. Certainly such a custom would be not only praiseworthy and meritorious, but it would do far more toward achieving the goal of universal peace than hours spent by diplomats in futile discussions at the council table.

Mr. L'Heureux's experience in the foreign service has convinced him that there is abroad a general lack of appreciation of the true character and ideals of the American people. Americans are thought to be es-

entially capitalistic, materialistic, and addicted to luxurious, secularistic living. He believes that a movement such as his will convince the world that Americans are truly a "God-loving, God-fearing, and peace-minded people."

Two thousand four hundred groups and organizations have already endorsed the L'Heureux peace resolution and are carrying out his plan. Mr. L'Heureux suggests that business organizations, labor unions, social, civic, and fraternal as well as religious organizations adopt a resolution calling upon their members to adopt the custom of pausing for 1 minute each day at 12 noon to pray for peace.

Catholics who have been urged again and again by the Holy Father, by their bishops and priests to pray without ceasing for world peace, should certainly give every possible support and encouragement to the establishment of this custom throughout the United States. If it be true that "the family that prays together, stays together," it should be more abundantly true that the Nation that prays together will stand solidly and firmly in the face of all threats of destruction.

The American people need to pray. Insofar as Mr L'Heureux's movement helps in that direction it is most worthy of commendation and encouragement.

U. N. and Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "U. N. and Press," written by George E. Sokolsky, and published in the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune of July 16, 1951. The article deals with the problem which I discussed on the floor of the Senate during the past week.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U. N. AND PRESS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The United Nations gradually, through its various committees, is moving into world government. The country that it uses as its testing ground is the United States. Few Americans are conscious of the activity of the United Nations. Many of those who know what is being done by the various U. N. committees refuse to believe that any of it can have any permanent effect on American institutions.

Yet under the Charter of the United Nations, which in the American political system is a treaty signed by the President and ratified by the Senate, decisions of the United Nations have already been applied to cases in our courts with the full weight of the law.

One of the committees of the United Nations which has concerned itself with questions tremendously important to the United States is the special committee on the draft convention on freedom of information. As the work of this committee is studied it is clear that its interest is not in freedom of information but in the right of governments to limit and suppress information and for the harassment of reporters. This is done under the Aesopian word "responsibility."

Carroll Binder, of the Minneapolis Tribune, the American representative on this committee, has been waging a losing fight trying to educate some of the Europeans about freedom of the press, as practiced in the United States, where the imperfections of man are recognized and often assumed to be natural and therefore unpunishable.

In those other countries the theory is that the great mind alone can determine what the people ought to know and that competent reporters who check their data are spies or irresponsible. Carroll Binder describes their attitude:

"These governments are engaged in a terrifying experiment to condition the minds of hundreds of millions of persons in an attempt to make them respond automatically to the commands of their rulers. In their hands information has been transformed from a means of enlightenment and understanding into a political weapon taking any form or shape required by the situation. It has become a knife to assassinate reputations, a drug to dull the senses, or a poison to instill suspicion and fear.

"Of course, when they have sought support for their view in the United Nations they have been careful to present it in the most disarming disguise. They have maintained that to promote friendly international relations it is first necessary to define what information is and then to suppress the dissemination of anything which does not conform to the definition."

What these countries seek to do in the United States is to make the newspapers and the journalists responsible. They do not recognize that the laws of libel are sufficient, they demand that, by administrative procedure, a government shall be enabled to take action against a newspaper or a reporter who is not responsible. By responsibility, they mean that no reporter should write nor should a newspaper print anything that annoys the politicians of any country. Binder says

"This convention was never, as I understand it, intended to deal primarily or even directly with the work of journalists. I have understood its intent to be the promotion and protection of everyone's right to freedom of information. To distort it into a punitive measure directed at journalists would certainly be a mockery of everything the United Nations has attempted to do in this field. We must realize that undesirable checks placed on journalists would apply equally to artists and teachers, to lawyers and politicians, and in the last analysis to people like ourselves drawn from every walk of life. Even if the grievances against some journalists and newspapers are assumed to be real this is certainly too high a price to pay to settle a few scores."

The State Department has put up a good fight against the Europeans who seek to suppress freedom of the press throughout the world by means of the United Nations. The American position is: "We are convinced that the fundamental principles of freedom of information cannot be the subject of compromise."

The United Nations is, however, a complex and enormous organization in which compromises must be found among 60 nations. Things happen there and the public finds itself faced by a condition from which there is no immediate withdrawal.

It is therefore essential that the American position be strengthened to say not that "freedom of information cannot be the subject of compromise but to say that the 'freedom of the American people are not subject to discussion."

Poem by a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Arthur Glassbrook, of Berkeley, Calif., has sent me the following poem.

I urge you, my colleagues, to read it and catching its rhythm catch the pertinent thought behind it:

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR—

I'm glad it's you I'm writing to,
Because what is right to do, you'll do;
I don't hanker for high-priced cars,
Trips to the moon and drinks and cigars;
But I'd like three meals that part-way square,

A peg for my hat I can keep right there;
A chance to have my thinking clear
Without the dread undertone of fear—
Fear for the lack of the wherewithal
That settles down like a cheerless pall.
Working each day for my daily bread
Is something I'm proud to do, instead,
It has turned to a grind on a treadmill track,

Oh, please, please, please, roll the prices back

Please, please, please let's have control
So I can feel that I own my soul

I love the sunsets and fields and sky,
And the mighty trees with their stature high;

I love the creatures of woodland trails,
And the feathered things, and the flow'r-decked vales;

I love the hills with their grassy slopes,
But why must people behave like dopes?
It's a good old earth, can't we keep it so,
Without driving good folks where bad must go?

There's a place somewhere, if not in the sun,
At least in the shade, for ev'ryone.
What the Joneses do, I never care,
For my life's not patterned by their T-square,

But it matters a mighty lot to me
When a price "ain't what it oughter be"
I'll still see the sky though I'm "in the hole,"
If we have a wise, firm price control.

George Washington on Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, in the July 20, 1951, Appendix, I reported a deliberate misrepresentation in Drew Pearson's column on George Washington's views on price control.

A mistake in the typesetting of this extension left a confusing picture regarding this falsification of Washington's views.

Accordingly, I am constrained to restate the facts distorted by Mr. Pearson

in his July 20 column in the Washington Post.

The column in question carries some excerpts from a letter written to James Warren on March 31, 1779, by George Washington.

A part of what Mr. Pearson quoted from Washington's letter is worded inaccurately. More important, his entire excerpt deliberately misrepresents George Washington's views on price controls, as expressed in that letter.

Actually, Washington pronounced price control to be wrong and impossible, and did so in this very letter, but Mr. Pearson chose to omit that passage of the letter to James Warren.

The following is the section of the Pearson column which misrepresents Washington's views:

GEORGE WASHINGTON ON ECONOMY

Here is what George Washington wrote about inflation and price control on March 31, 1779, in a letter to James Warren:

"Is the paltry consideration of a little dirty pelf to individuals to be placed in competition with the essential rights and liberties of the present generation and of millions yet unborn?"

"Shall a few designing men for their own aggrandizement, and to gratify their own avarice, overset the goodly fabric we have been rearing at the expense of so much time, blood, and treasure, and shall we at last become the victims of our own abominable lust for gain?"

"Our cause is noble, it is the cause of mankind, and the danger to it is to be found within ourselves."

Mr. Speaker, now here is what George Washington actually said about price control in that letter to James Warren:

Let vigorous measures be adopted, not to limit the prices of articles, for this I believe is inconsistent with the very nature of things, and impractical in itself, but to punish speculators, forestallers, and extortioners, and above all to sink the money by heavy taxes. To promote public and private economy, encourage manufactures, etc.

The Crozet Superhighway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article on the proposed Crozet Superhighway, entitled "Highway Would Honor Claudius Crozet," by James Euchner, which was published in the Sunday magazine of the Richmond Times-Dispatch of July 15, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HIGHWAY WOULD HONOR CLAUDIUS CROZET (By James Euchner)

A soldier of Napoleon, who emigrated to the United States when his leader was exiled from France, may have a coast-to-coast highway named in his honor.

Currently awaiting action in the Public Works Committees of both the Senate and House of Representatives is a joint resolution proposing that a transcontinental route from Boston to San Diego be designated as the Crozet Superhighway, in memory of Claudius Crozet, a Frenchman by birth but a Virginian by adoption.

Nothing could be more fitting tribute to the man who, as chief engineer of Virginia during the early nineteenth century, frequently planned in his mind a system of roads extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific. To a certain extent he carried out these plans—eastern sections of United States Routes 40, 50, and 60, which can be followed from the east to the west coast, were originally built under Crozet's supervision. Appropriately, the proposed superhighway would follow portions of all these routes.

A man of exceptional ability, versatility, and vision, Crozet is remembered primarily as a great engineer, but also as an outstanding educator. He was appointed to the first board of visitors of Virginia Military Institute in 1837 and as president of the board was instrumental in setting up a sound program of training. The cadet mess hall at VMI is named in his honor.

Were it not for the political demise of Napoleon Bonaparte, Claudius Crozet probably would have pursued a successful military career in France, instead of coming to this country. A graduate of the Ecole Polytechnique, Paris, he fought as an artillery officer under Napoleon in Germany, Holland, and Russia and was captured by the Russians during the retreat from Moscow. He was later awarded the Cross of the Legion of Honor. In 1816, after Napoleon's fall, Crozet and his wife sailed for America, where his first job was as professor of civil engineering at the United States Military Academy.

Finding himself without textbooks, he translated a three-volume French engineering text and also wrote a book on mathematics. He is also credited with having introduced the use of the blackboard to this country while teaching at West Point.

In 1823, he left the academy to become State engineer of Virginia, which then, of course, included the present State of West Virginia. Among his early projects were surveys of turnpikes from Winchester to Romney, from Staunton to Lewisburg, and from Staunton to Parkersburg. The latter, which crossed nine mountain ridges, is still considered one of his greatest feats.

LEFT VIRGINIA IN 1831

Crozet left Virginia in 1831, largely because of disagreements with bureau of public works officials, who would not go along with his insistence that the State should concern itself more with railroads and less with canals.

After a year as the first State engineer of Louisiana, and three as president of Jefferson College, near Convent, La., he made plans for retiring and returning to France. Instead, he came back to Virginia for another term as State engineer. From 1844 to 1849 he was principal of Richmond Academy and from 1849 to 1857 chief engineer of the Blue Ridge Railroad, now part of the Chesapeake & Ohio. It was during this period that he built the Blue Ridge or Rockfish Gap tunnel, near the present town of Crozet, Albemarle County, named in his honor by the C. & O. Later he helped supervise construction of the Washington aqueduct.

In 1860, at 71, Crozet returned to West Point as a member of a board appointed to revise the Military Academy's program of instruction. He died in 1864 at the Midlothian home of his son-in-law, Dr. C. S.

Mills. His body was originally buried in Shockoe Hill Cemetery, Richmond, but in 1942 was removed for reburial at VMI.

For the most part, the Crozet Superhighway would be new in name only. Most of the the proposed route consists of highways now in existence or under construction. Special new construction has been proposed for the West Virginia section, which would run the entire length of the State, and for the short Virginia segment, which would consist of a few miles crossing the northern tip in the vicinity of Winchester.

Actually, various combinations of new and already existing roads could be used for this section of the superhighway. The West Virginia Legislature has authorized the expenditure of funds for surveys and preliminary engineering work to determine the advisability of building new roads for the Crozet route. Virginia, as yet, has taken no action.

The highway is the idea of a group of West Virginians. The Crozet Superhighway Commission, a volunteer organization with headquarters at Elkins, W. Va., has been contacting highway commissioners, legislators, and civic groups in States through which the route would pass, seeking backing for the project. Thus far, according to D. D. Brown, chairman of the commission, no serious objection has been raised, and Delaware and Maryland have already officially approved the group's plan.

According to the plan, the superhighway would originate at Boston, follow State Route 9, United States Route 20, and State Route 15 through Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New York, and enter New York City on the Merritt Parkway. It would cross the Hudson River on the George Washington Bridge and connect with the New Jersey Turnpike, now under construction. The Delaware Memorial Bridge, also now being built, will connect the southern end of the turnpike with United States Route 40 south of Wilmington, Del. Route 40 would be followed to Baltimore.

Two routes have been proposed to bring the highway from Baltimore to Gore, Va., 14 miles northwest of Winchester. One would follow the present United States Route 1, or a parallel highway now under construction, to Washington, thence up United States Route 50 to Gore. The other would follow Route 40 to Frederick, Md., and improved United States Route 340 to Harper's Ferry, just across the State line in West Virginia. From Harper's Ferry, a new road would be built to Gore, a distance of roughly 40 miles, over a relatively straight line passing just north of Charles Town, W. Va.

From Gore, a new route might be built through West Virginia via Baker, Moorefield, Elkins, Norton, Ellamore, Adrian, Frenchton, Ireland, Charleston, and Huntington. Or the highway could follow existing roads—United States Route 50 from Gore to Junction, W. Va., State Route 4 to Charleston, and United States Route 60 to Huntington.

The superhighway would continue west via Route 60 through Louisville and Paducah, Ky., to Poplar Bluff, Mo., United States Route 67 through Little Rock, Ark., and Texarkana to Dallas, Tex.; United States Route 80 through Fort Worth, Abilene, and El Paso, Tex., Lordsburg, N. Mex., and Phoenix, Ariz., to San Diego.

The resolution proposing approval of the name and route was introduced in Congress by Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE and Representative HARLEY O. STAGGERS, both of West Virginia. Early action on the measure is not expected, but eventual approval seems quite likely. A man like Claudius Crozet has more than mere sectional appeal, although his name may be little known in States other than those in which he worked.

Baccalaureate Address of A. Whitney Griswold, President of Yale University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, baccalaureate addresses, filled with advice to the youth of America, are familiar to all of us, and I know from experience that it is difficult to include in such an effort some new thought that will be helpful and encouraging to the young men and women who face the days ahead. This is especially true now when the perplexities are tremendous, the confusion enormous, and there is present the awful threat to our liberty.

However, A. Whitney Griswold, president of Yale University, in his first baccalaureate address after taking office, sounded a call for the reappraisal of the dignity and worth of the individual, and in a brief but impressive way, with thrusts of logic from his penetrating mind, completely devastated the mythical claims of communism. He urged men and women to do their own thinking and reasoning, and condemned the suppression of the individual. He, along with Thomas Jefferson, proclaimed that "morality, compassion, and generosity are innate elements of the human constitution, capable of cultivation in individuals, and capable of transmission to society through individuals." President Griswold expressed in words the thoughts of many of us, and exposed communism for what it is. He brings hope and courage, and he renews our faith in the principles on which our Republic is founded.

I hope that my colleagues will read this truly remarkable and wholly American address to the youth of America. It is full of sound reasoning and good common sense. It follows.

"Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt have lost his savour, wherewith shall it be salted?" (Matthew 5:13).

If I divine the mood of you who are leaving Yale this spring, it is one of cheerful resignation. To your cheerfulness in all winds and weathers, in clear skies and at ceiling zero, we who have lived and worked among you are admiring witnesses. We take courage from your courage. But I observe also that you share the prevailing mood of the hour, which in your case consists of 9.0 bargains privately struck with fate—on fate's terms. I observe that you are resigned to a world in which people become numbers on Selective Service and social-security cards; in which lotteries are illegal except when they deal with human life, and in which the individual, sacred to both Christianity and democracy, sometimes seems to exercise about as much control over his own fortunes and those of his fellow men as a baseball in the World Series.

I will say this much for your mood: at least it is healthier than the one which attended my own commencement. We were graduated into the greatest economic depression in history and the origins of the greatest war in history with assurances that

poverty was about to be banished from the earth and that war had been outlawed among the nations. No such disillusionment lies in store for you are awaited us in 1929: come what may you are better prepared for it. But that is all I will say for your mood. As a philosophy of life it is as false in its fatalism as our mood was in its romanticism.

We have not resigned from the human race. Neither science nor technology nor all the deterministic doctrine inspired by them, nor the despotisms that have tried to force that doctrine upon mankind, have succeeded in producing a world that can function without our individual powers of reason, imagination, and conscience. We are not mere sponges or plankton afloat on a tide of causation over which we have no control. We are rational beings, capable of charting the tide, and navigating it, and even diverting and directing it. The salt—to return to the Bible's metaphor—has not lost its savor; and there would be no way of salting the earth if it had. There is no dialectical or technological substitute for the creative individual.

Whence come our doubts and hallucinations to the contrary? Partly from fear, partly from laziness. We are afraid that where, as in Soviet Russia, there is mystery there is also magic; that the Russians have possessed themselves of some supernatural means of enslaving the will of men; that they will blow us all to bits by methods unknown to western science. We have beguiled ourselves with gadgets, with machines that work for us, and think for us, and entertain us, and (as we believe in our folly) educate us, until our God-given individual powers have become atrophied through disuse. In this hypnotic state we have fallen prey to some of the very teachings we profess to abhor, the teachings of those who proclaim the world machine blueprinted in the Kremlin and the atomizing of the human race without the assistance of the bomb.

The last world war and the terrible weapons now in existence give us abundant reason to fear the next; and the ruthless and aggressive tactics of the Kremlin around the world give us every reason to think that the Russians are willing to gamble on it. But there is no reason in the unreasoning dread that exalts them into supermen and credits their doctrine with wonder-working properties, and as for the television sets that take us from our books, the business machines that clatter away under wall mottos reading "Think," the electrical examination-corrector that dispenses with writing, the inner-spring mattresses that end up in bed boards, and the prefabricated knowledge that ends in remedial reading—for all this childish fascination with gadgetry we have only childishness as an excuse. Shall we then offer fear and childishness as proof that the individual has played out his role; that the salt has lost its savor?

No, you will say; but what about science and the industrial revolution now projecting itself into the atomic age? And I will answer you with the fact that whereas the first social interpreters of these phenomena were responsible for the idea of the submergence of the individual, modern scientists are the leaders in repudiating it.

I do not know what it is that makes each generation so sure that its own set of circumstances is unique and yet forms a basis for universal preachments and predictions. The Bible says it is the essential vanity of man. I should say it is his innocence of history—of the cumulative experience of his fellow men. We are forever calculating our prospects on the strength of a mere peep through a knothole at this experience. So early economists who observed the first sensational progress of the industrial revolution deduced their concept of economic man, which the scientific Socialists appropriated and developed into the full-blown doctrine

of economic determination. The whole dialectical process is barely a hundred years old, and the leading figure in it was Karl Marx.

Let us concede that Marx chose an exceptional knothole—the British Museum—that he brought to it an exceptional intellectual apparatus, and that he kept his eye to it (day after day for nearly 35 years) with exceptional perseverance. His range of vision was still exceptionally limited. Man made his debut on the planet in the Pleistocene epoch of the Cenozoic era, about a million years ago. From the time he took up farming in the Neolithic Age, about 7000 B. C., his experiences having been relevant to modern economic society. There is every reason to extend this perspective to 7000 A. D., if not to 1,000,000 A. D. Marx's focal depth included little more than a bookish version of the industrial revolution in England between the years 1820 and 1860, with the preponderance of his evidence drawn from the earlier rather than the later part of that period. That is to say, Marx took as the verification of his hypothesis a static view of conditions in one country, already undergoing change while he wrote, and offered it to the world as both timeless and universal. Nor was his view entirely objective. Marx was a bitter, vindictive, unhappy man, suffering the plagues of Job without Job's faith, tortured by poverty and disease, living in squalor, so proud and thin-skinned, as one of his brilliant biographers tells us, that he made excessive demands on the world and when these were not satisfied (as they nearly always were not) turned in upon himself "in paroxysms of hatred and of rage." Yet it is this static, myopic, misanthropic view of human experience that is offered as the principal foundation for the belief that the machine is all and the individual is nothing, and for the Communist dictatorship that exploits that belief to suit its purposes. It has all the eerie aspects of those prehistoric Siberian mammoths frozen into the ice with hair and flesh intact, with everything, that is, except life and sense.

One would think that the very nature of Marx's vision would make it suspect; that the influence of his own baleful personality contradicted his own thesis; that the direct, personal influence of Lenin on the outcome of the Russian revolution (suppose the German high command had never let him cross Germany in that sealed-up boxcar) contradicted it even more emphatically; and that the fact that the thesis has to be maintained by tyranny and enforced by secret police contradicted it finally and flatly. Still there remains our awe of science and the technology of our own time. What do our own observations tell us?

If we carry them far enough to include the opinions of modern scientists, they will tell us of steadily broadening horizons for the creative individual and of the urgent need for him to press on toward those horizons. "Man has risen, not fallen," writes George Gaylord Simpson in *The Meaning of Evolution*. "He can choose to develop his capacities as the highest animal and try to rise still further, or he can choose otherwise. The choice is his responsibility, and his alone. There is no automatism that will carry him upward without choice or effort and there is no trend solely in the right direction. Evolution has no purpose; man must supply this for himself." To do so, to make the wise choice for himself and his fellow men is the ethical responsibility of man which he must discharge as an individual if he is ever going to realize its benefits as a species.

But, we say, can we not entrust this responsibility to others, to the elaborate teams of specialists that are constantly producing new techniques, new tools and, may we not assume, new visions of wisdom and justice? What do the scientists say to this? I suppose there is no more impressive example of team

work in human history than that which produced the atomic bomb.

Listen to the opinion of one of the world's outstanding scholars in that field, Percy Bridgman, whose researches in nuclear physics won him the Nobel Prize in 1946. So elaborate has the organization, equipment, and administrative detail become, writes Professor Bridgman, that each team of physicists "has to be driven by someone at the head who has the ideas. There is danger here that all the rest of the team will pick the brains of one man, with an ultimate decrease in the number of physicists in the community capable of independent and critical thought." And he goes on to say:

"The participation of the individual is necessary in every process of intelligence, not merely in the processes of science. Intelligence can be given a meaning only in terms of the individual. It seems to me that this has a far-reaching significance not usually appreciated, for I believe that here is to be found perhaps the most compelling justification for democracy. Intelligence is based on the individual. An authoritarian society in which the individual is suppressed cannot, by the nature of intelligence, be characterized by general intelligence."

Gentlemen of the graduating class, this is a truth Christ perceived and most surely intended to communicate to his disciples when he told them they were the salt of the earth for which there was no substitute; and that they were the light of the world, but they must not hide that light under a bushel. This is also the truth that the founders of this Republic perceived and Jefferson proclaimed when he said that morality, compassion, and generosity were innate elements of the human constitution, capable of cultivation in individuals, and capable of transmission to society through individuals. It is for life in this free, Christian society that we have prepared you at Yale. It remains for you, each according to his talents and each as an individual, to embody the degree of wisdom and integrity we may expect for that society.

The Baited Hook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on last Monday, July 16, I called the attention of the House to the actual and alarming effect of OPS General Overriding Regulation 15 upon the machine tool industry and our defense effort as a whole.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the *Wall Street Journal* of July 18. This editorial describes in simple, though graphic, language, the serious consequences which will result from this pattern for Government control of profits which is intended to set the pace for further control of all American industry's profits. Mr. Speaker, this represents a serious threat to our entire system of free enterprise.

In addition, I am including letters from Mr. Frederick C. Blackall, Jr., first vice president of the National Machine Tool Builders' Association, and from J. A. Bradner, president of the Lees Bradner Co., of Cleveland.

The above-mentioned follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal of July 18, 1951]

THE BAITED HOOK

The other day the Office of Price Stabilization announced a raise in the ceiling prices for machine tools. It did it with a formula that contains a hidden hook.

Ostensibly the increase was allowed to give relief to machine-tool manufacturers and to spur production as a part of the defense program. But it seems likely that the net effect will be to establish Government profit control over the industry, to set a precedent for profit control over business generally.

The hook is that the OPS has tied its price increase to a company's assets; that is, each company will be permitted to raise its prices enough to give it a fixed, maximum return expressed as a percentage of its assets.

The formula apparently works like this: The machine-tool builder goes back to this 1938-49 earnings experience and arrives at a gross percentage of earnings relative to his assets during those years. Say it comes out that the company has earned 20 percent on its assets. It is now, under the OPS rule, entitled to earn 80 percent of this amount; in other words, it can set its prices to make a return of 16 percent on its assets as of the present time.

The bait in this is that it will help companies with good earning records during the base period; many companies will now have a higher ceiling price for their tools than they would under the general freeze.

It is not so good, of course, for companies that did not do so well during the years 1938-48 but are now "up and coming." More importantly, however, it freezes the earnings of all companies. It puts price control on a profit basis.

For instance, suppose that a given company is entitled by the formula to an overall profit of \$200,000. The company may double its current output by putting on extra shifts, or it may improve production techniques—but it can still make no more than \$200,000 profit unless it has increased its capital investment. At the end of each 12 months it must compute its profits and rebate any excess to its customers.

On the other hand, a company could get lax on efficiency, slack off on production, and yet conceivably raise the price on each machine so that it could make exactly the same dollar profit it made before with less production. This is hardly an incentive for efficiency.

Attempts by the Government to get profit control, to get the power to control not only the prices a company may charge, but also to fix the total profit allowable regardless of volume or efficiency—these are not new. The only difference in this latest attempt, it seems to us, is that it comes with the lure of a well-baited hook.

NATIONAL MACHINE TOOL
BUILDERS' ASSOCIATION,
Cleveland, Ohio, July 20, 1951.

HON. FRANCIS P. BOLTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN BOLTON: Last week OPS issued "General Overriding Regulation 15" entitled "Adjustment of Ceiling Prices of Machine Tools," to take effect on Monday of this week. In view of your present concern over the whole problem of extension of controls, we think that the peculiar and alarming nature of this regulation will be of interest to you.

The regulation was issued following a directive from Mr. Wilson, who insisted that clarification of the machine tool price situation was imperative in order that machine tool builders might devote their entire ener-

gies to production, and be provided with genuine incentives.

But when issued, the regulation proved to be one not of price control but one of outright profit control.

Under the regulation, a machine tool company computes its average rate of return on total assets from 1938 to 1948 inclusive and is then permitted to realize 80 percent of this rate when applied to its total assets today. Working backwards from the allowable percent of profit, the manufacturer may fix his prices for 12 months ahead at levels which he estimates will yield the profit allowed. If, however, the profit turns out to be over 5 percent in excess of the rate allowed, the excess must be refunded to customers.

My main purpose in writing you today is to make very clear that the Nation's machine tool builders are not in favor of this so-called price control, which is not price control at all but is a blatantly transparent mechanism for the control of profit. They did not, and do not now approve of the issuance of any such dangerous excursion into socialistic philosophy. Our objections are as follows:

1. The underlying principle behind this regulation is wholly un-American and contrary to the intent of the Congress. The objective of the price control bill was literally to control prices; not to fix arbitrarily, by Federal decree, a stipulated rate of profit. General Overriding Regulation 15 is a clear-cut step in the direction of profit control in this country. It is a new concept wholly foreign to our traditions and institutions.

2. The refund provision is equivalent, in effect, to a 100-percent excess-profits tax administered by OPS.

3. The regulation puts a floor under the earnings of the inefficient and high-cost manufacturer. If his costs increase, he can simply raise his prices, as long as he does not exceed the permissible gross earnings. This procedure might better be termed price setting on a formula of inefficiency-plus. It is an open invitation to the misuse of taxpayers' money.

4. The regulation does not carry out the directive of the Office of Defense Mobilization. It neither stimulates production nor provides incentive.

5. The regulation would tend to limit, rather than to expand the productive efforts of the efficient manufacturer, for it would offer him no incentive to increase operations and output beyond his own convenience. When the dollar profit permitted is geared to total assets instead of to volume of sales, why should a company take on more business than the amount required to yield the maximum rate of profit allowed?

6. There is a sinister implication in the regulation. It could well serve as a pattern to be applied to other industries. Indeed, with this as an entering wedge such a development would be almost inevitable. Is the administration, under the guise of price control, seeking to establish the socialistic principle of profit control in the hope that it may remain in effect after the emergency is over?

The machine-tool industry seeks no subsidies nor guarantees of profit. The OPS knows full well the nature of price controls appropriate to the machine-tool industry. This has been developed through weeks and months of discussion of the subject between OPS officials and the Industry's Advisory Committee. The industry had sought controls based upon prices quoted during the freeze period, plus such allowances for increased costs as OPS considered proper. Controls of such a nature would not put a premium upon inefficiency; they would provide a stimulus to production, and would enable the industry to do what Mr. Wilson considers so imperative—namely, to devote

its entire energies to the speeding up of machine-tool output for the defense program.

Speaking both as an individual machine-tool builder and as vice president of the National Machine Tool Builders' Association, I can assure you that our industry earnestly urges you to give this matter your careful consideration and to institute steps to withdraw this highly dangerous regulation.

Very faithfully yours,

FREDERICK S. BLAKALL, JR.,
First Vice President, National Machine
Tool Builders' Association and Presi-
dent and Treasurer, the Taft Petree
Manufacturing Co.

JULY 19, 1951.

HON. FRANCIS P. BOLTON,
The House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. BOLTON: We certainly want to commend you for spotting the Office of Price Stabilization's endeavoring to use its controls authority, not to control prices, but to impose profit controls.

Need, as you know, for an enormous outpouring of machine tools is recognized. Mr. C. E. Wilson on July 9 directed:

"Metalworking tool production must be increased. The necessary measures are. (A) The Office of Price Stabilization shall modify price controls on new metalworking tools to give metalworking tool builders the stimulus to expand their production for essential needs."

The Office of Price Stabilization chose to wrench the effect of this ODM directive into something quite else. In the OPS statement of considerations issued to appear to effect compliance with an explicit order, to the OPS, it is stated that:

"This general overriding regulation permits adjustments in manufacturers' ceiling prices for machine tools and machine tool attachments. These ceiling prices may be adjusted either on an over-all basis or for a particular machine tool or machine tool attachment. On an over-all basis, the manufacturer may secure an adjustment which will enable him to realize 80 percent of his average rate of return during the years 1938 through 1948. For a particular machine tool or machine tool attachment, the manufacturer may secure an adjustment which will enable him to realize his total unit costs, plus a profit of 5½ percent."

Does this, "... give metalworking tool builders the stimulus to expand their production?" Is a miserable 5½ percent profit before taxes either stimulus or price control? This is profit control, certainly not the desire of the legislators when the enabling legislation creating the Office of Price Stabilization was enacted, nor the intent of ODM in issuing the directive in question. Profits and their review are a function of tax and profit legislation, not price laws. Prices, and prices alone, are the function of OPS.

We, machine tool builders, simply cannot produce if we are to be forced to live under strictures such as those envisioned by the Office of Price Stabilization.

A specific illustration of the effect of these regulations if chosen might be interesting to you. About 11 years ago at the request of the Army Ordnance Department, we financed, designed, developed and made available the model 40. The first of these machines was shipped in the early spring of 1940 and in the ensuing 5 defense and war years we built about 1,000 of these tools. In the years that elapsed between 1945 and late 1950, we built six more, for hordes of these tools were readily available, used. No market existed then for new machines. By the way, used 40's now, if available, would today sell for \$5,000 or \$6,000 a piece in usable condition.

Last September, we on our own sensed a coming market for our 40. Now, our capacity to produce is limited. Therefore, we instituted a search, we unearthed subcontractors superlatively well equipped to then undertake building machine tools and after checking prices from various people interested in building the 40, we personally ordered 150 40's, months before any need for the machine became otherwise apparent. Our subcontractor has done a superlatively good job, the first machine is done and 40's are and will be available.

Our Lees Bradner model 40 Thread Miller, as in the case with any machine tool, is expensive and difficult to build, for this is one of the problems indigenous to the production of machine tools. Defense program users—Incidentally the sole users—of the model 40 machine were and are avid to buy the model 40 at prices established competitively months ago. Orders for the model 40 machine have started to materialize, roughly half our original commitment for 150 machines have been spoken for, we have been commended by Ordnance that our 40's are in—for us—big production, and we are assured that at least the remaining half, and probably even more of these machines, are going to be spoken for shortly.

Then came price roll-backs, not price control.

If roll-backs stand, it is going to be necessary for us to deliver 40's at a price of \$6,100.20 net to us per machine.

Our cost is \$7,055 per machine. Can this possibly be what the legislators had in mind when there were enacted the laws that created the OPS?

Yours respectfully,

J. A. BRADNER,
President, The Lees Bradner Co.

3. The farmers received an average of 2 and 3 cents per pound here. How much did the public pay per pound for tomatoes in the North?

4. Why was a 5-percent immaturity law imposed on the east Texas farmers and not on the valley farmers?

5. Why were canneries allowed to pay \$50 to \$65 per ton for ripe tomatoes in the valley and not here?

6. Why during the war were roses and that type of crop declared unessential and a luxury item by the Government, the sweetpotatoes were considered a war crop? Yet in 1950 the rose farmers received Federal aid but we sweetpotato growers did not. Was it because we overplanted? If so, what was our reason? Was it because the Government controlled the cotton acreage to where some of us couldn't raise cotton? Isn't this country seriously short of cotton now?

7. Why are we farmers paying inflation prices for seeds, fertilizer, and equipment and received depression prices for all products produced this year?

Isn't the Government of the people, for the people, and by the people? Or is it for an individual few?

A free-born American.

N. E. DUDLEY.

TROUP, TEX.

[From the Houston Chronicle of
July 16, 1951]

WE DON'T KNOW

Charges by Representative LINDLEY BECKWORTH, of Gladewater, that the Department of Agriculture is urging sweeping policies upon Congress "without having any infor-

mation on which to base those policies" are backed by the Texan with a sheaf of letters from Department officials.

These letters, asking how many farmers are benefiting from such programs as price support, export subsidies and school lunch commodity purchases, are invariably answered with the report that the Department does not know how many growers are receiving specific benefits from the programs.

BECKWORTH asked about a wide variety of agricultural products, including cotton, corn, wheat, soybeans, eggs, dairy products, pears, walnuts, filberts, almonds, apples, oranges, rice, tung nuts, wool mohair, hogs, and blackeyed peas.

To all of these queries the refrain was the same: The Department of Agriculture "feels" that "all growers" are benefiting from the Government's operations, but it can't supply any figures. Secretary Brannan in one instance offered to "make an effort to get" the information covering a few counties.

It seems strange that if the Department can tell every farmer how many acres of cotton he can grow, it can't tell how many farmers are cooperating with or benefiting from the Government's farm policies.

One would have supposed that Washington's army of Federal employees would have all such important information neatly compiled and ready to be tapped for Congress' scrutiny at a moment's notice.

"How in the world can they come up here and ask for big-money programs when they don't know themselves what the result is to the individual farmer?" BECKWORTH asks. He adds that if the Department's reply that it "feels" all growers are benefited satisfies Congress, "then we are pretty easily satisfied—too easily."

Cotton production in the United States by cotton State, by cotton county—for the State of Florida, 1950

State and county	Number of cotton allotments	Total cotton acreage allotted	Number of cotton bales ginned	Total value of cotton	Average acreage per allotment	Average number of bales per allotment	Average value per allotment
FLORIDA							
Alachua.....	3	16.0	15	\$2,700	5.33	5.00	\$900.00
Escambia.....	342	1,913.9	1,136	204,480	5.60	3.32	597.89
Hamilton.....	329	1,624.5	255	45,900	4.94	.78	139.51
Holmes.....	1,212	6,369.7	2,618	471,240	5.26	2.16	388.81
Jackson.....	2,255	9,509.3	3,019	543,420	4.22	1.34	240.98
Jefferson.....	458	2,618.0	524	94,320	5.72	1.14	205.94
Lafayette.....	100	306.7	80	14,400	3.07	.80	144.00
Leon.....	341	1,955.0	184	33,120	5.73	.54	97.13
Madison.....	910	4,164.3	1,170	210,600	4.58	1.29	231.43
Okaloosa.....	413	2,461.9	829	149,220	5.96	2.01	361.31
Santa Rosa.....	802	5,498.0	2,249	404,820	6.86	2.74	504.76
Seminole.....							
Suwannee.....	389	959.3	137	24,600	2.47	.35	63.39
Walton.....	639	3,136.4	893	160,740	4.91	1.40	251.55
Washington.....	479	1,464.8	722	129,960	3.06	1.51	271.32
Total.....	8,672	41,997.8	13,831	2,489,580	4.84	1.74	314.14

NOTE.—Counties were used for each State in the cases where complete information was available.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS,
Washington, July 16, 1951.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In accordance with your telephone request to Mr. Ray Hurley, Chief of the Agriculture Division of this Bureau, the following table gives the production of cotton in Florida for the year 1950:

Production of cotton in Florida, by counties, crop of 1950

County:	Bales produced
Alachua.....	15
Escambia.....	1,136
Hamilton.....	255
Holmes.....	2,618
Jackson.....	3,019
Jefferson.....	524

Production of cotton in Florida, by counties, crop of 1950—Continued

County—Continued	Bales produced
Lafayette.....	80
Lake.....	31
Leon.....	184
Madison.....	1,170
Okaloosa.....	829
Santa Rosa.....	2,249
Seminole.....	110
Suwannee.....	137
Walton.....	893
Washington.....	722
All other.....	7

Total..... 13,979

If we can be of further service to you, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

ROY V. PEEL,
Director, Bureau of the Census.

Cotton Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter which was printed in the Tyler Courier-Times, Tyler, Tex. Also I include an editorial that appeared in the Houston Chronicle July 16 on July 10, I included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD certain cotton statistics, I now include some statistics about Florida.

The matter follows:

[From the Tyler (Tex.) Courier-Times]
LETTERS FROM OUR READERS

To the Editor:

I have a few questions I would like answered by the public and especially the East Texas Agricultural Council.

1. Why after we were urged by our county agent and others to take special care of our tomatoes. The valley was 18,000 acres short due to the freeze. Yoakum was damaged by hail. The local crop was damaged by weather conditions. Therefore the outlook was bright for the remainder. Then we were told by an article in the Tyler Morning Telegraph that there would be no aid from the Federal Government because we overplanted.

2. Is it possible to check any 3 years in succession up to 1945 and find out how many carloads of tomatoes were shipped to the Northern markets? How many were shipped this year?

New Atlantic Agreement Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an excellent address entitled "New Atlantic Agreement Needed," which was delivered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] at the Atlantic Union Strategy Conference in Washington, D. C., on May 18, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NEW ATLANTIC AGREEMENT NEEDED

(By Senator GUY M. GILLETTE, member, Senate Foreign Relations Committee)

IN FACE OF DEEPENING WORLD CRISIS, TRADITIONAL DIPLOMACY NO LONGER ADEQUATE FOR SOLIDARITY OF ATLANTIC COMMUNITY

Almost a year ago, I remarked that the Atlantic Union idea was one of the few bright hopes in an otherwise bleak and dreary landscape of cold war.

Today it is no longer a hope; it is a necessity.

It is a necessity because, in spite of the progress toward effective Atlantic unity made in the past year, the world crisis has deepened and broadened so swiftly that traditional diplomacy, traditional government-to-government methods, can no longer cope with it.

Even though General Eisenhower has been appointed commander of the Atlantic defense army; even though a functioning Atlantic defense headquarters, with subordinate production and finance boards, has been established; even though the United States Senate, after long and often confused debate, has approved sending four more American divisions to the European continent; and even though the other Atlantic allies are demonstrating new determination to augment their military strength, there is still a great gap in the picture.

It becomes more painfully evident every day that what we lack most is an adequate democratic institution through which the peoples allied under the Atlantic Pact can exercise civilian political control over this vast international military undertaking.

I can report to you, however, that many of the outstanding leaders of our Atlantic community are aware of this gap and are thinking of how best to remedy this unhappy defect.

They are beginning to realize that efforts to establish an Atlantic military force before setting up an effective and responsible civil authority to direct it, are both a denial of basic democratic processes and an obstacle even to successful military organization.

They are beginning to see that the commander of the military organization has no government from which he can seek political directives vital to his task.

They are beginning to recognize the underlying dilemma: Democracies cannot permit military decisions to be taken without civilian approval and civilian direction, but civilian direction and approval can be obtained under the present 12-headed Atlantic Council only after interminable delay, tireless negotiation for unanimity, and tedious consultation with the ministries of a dozen sovereign states.

They are keenly aware of how the effects of every military decision spill over into

civilian life—raising the specter of inflation, reducing civilian production and standards of living, causing available supplies of raw materials to dwindle and disappear, and, in general, damaging national economies of countries that have just barely emerged from the wreckage left by World War II.

REALITIES FORCE NEW SOLUTION

On a purely practical basis, then, and in response to purely immediate needs, it is now becoming apparent to political and military leaders in all the Atlantic Pact countries that we are going to need some sort of new Atlantic agreement. We are being forced by the realities to seek the creation of some political authority—some executive, legislative, and judicial institutions—for the Atlantic countries that will be responsible to the peoples who are providing the soldiers, paying the taxes, and making the sacrifices to defend the whole community.

What all this means is that the Atlantic community has outgrown the forms suitable to the government of a single nation and adapted to relations between sovereign states. These forms no longer provide means by which the collective will of the great body of citizens in the Atlantic Pact countries can find a channel for regular, effective, and democratic expression. The old forms furnish no workable machinery for harmonizing and satisfying the common needs of the peoples of the Atlantic or for instilling in their leadership a sense of mutual responsibility toward the citizens of all the nations constituting the Atlantic community.

As the Roman republic, after spreading its power around the shores of the Mediterranean, once faced the problem of organizing an empire based on conquest without sacrificing the liberty of its own citizens, so the Atlantic democracies face the problem of organizing a community based on equality without sacrificing the liberty of the citizens of any of the constituent nations. Rome failed in her attempt, chiefly for lack of adequate instruments and concepts of government. We will not have this excuse; the necessary concepts and instruments—federal union—are staring us in the face, waiting to be put to use.

Since last January, I have been in correspondence with the heads of all the political parties (except the Communists) in the countries which originally sponsored the Atlantic Pact. I have found the reactions among leaders in the Atlantic parliaments almost unanimously favorable to our proposal for an Atlantic federal convention. I do not mean by this that they have all necessarily endorsed any particular plan or formula or structure. But they have expressed eagerness to work out some better way of strengthening the North Atlantic community.

Our Atlantic allies are showing themselves more and more anxious to find a basis for closer union with us. The unanimous passage of a resolution by the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe at Strasbourg recently, inviting observers from the American Congress to the fall sessions of the Assembly and asking for public discussion on problems of common interest between delegations of the two Houses of Congress and of the European Assembly, is the most recent and most striking evidence of how urgently our friends abroad desire a closer union between Western Europe and North America. They are only waiting for America to make the first concrete move.

In that connection, let me quote a paragraph from the letter I received from the distinguished Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Louis St. Laurent:

"Since the success of the proposal contained in your resolution would clearly depend on the initiative being taken by the United States Government, it would, I feel, be premature for our administration to take

any initiative until a decision had been reached in principle in Washington."

The view of Mr. St. Laurent, I believe, reflects that of the other countries concerned. If we are to move forward, the American people are going to have to shoulder the larger share of the responsibility for creating this union. Once the United States makes up its mind to proceed in this direction, there is little doubt that our allies will meet us on the same road.

This being so, the work of the members of the Atlantic Union Committee now becomes even more vital than before. In taking part in this effort, they are making the crucial contribution. Not even the first steps toward the goal will be taken unless the American people believe in it, want it, and demand it of Congress. Whatever my colleagues and I may do to heighten interest and stimulate support abroad for Atlantic union will amount to nothing if the people of this country are not behind us, pressing the Congress as a whole to take action.

In recent years—and this is worth remarking—we have grown accustomed to using the term "Atlantic community." We use the term to mean more than a geographic region. We use it in the sense of a society of nations or peoples with certain common characteristics, common aims, and common needs. Does the phrase "Atlantic community" describe something real? Or is it a convenient fiction or a propaganda slogan? Is it a vision for the future, or does it now exist? In a word, what is it?

Here, around this great oceanic lake, live several hundred million people who, over the centuries, have constructed a civilization based on a common heritage. They are people who share the political inheritance of the civilized west, the glorious hopes and ideals with which Greece and Rome enriched the world. They are people who have created a society centered on the rights and dignity of individual human beings, a society designed for individuals to live in as brothers.

The differences that separate those who live in the Atlantic world are fewer, and the similarities they share with each other are more numerous than the differences and similarities between them and peoples living anywhere else. This is a human and historical fact. Let us not deny this fact. Let us welcome it and build upon it.

We who live around the Atlantic ocean already know each other better than we know any other peoples. We are the sons of the same ancestors.

In spite of distance, in spite of barriers set up by governments, in spite of the natural tendency of people to cultivate their own gardens, we of the Atlantic world maintain an infinite number of personal relationships with each other.

To take a homely example, I have been struck by the fact that last year the American people sent to people they knew in Western Europe three times as much mail—personal and business letters, periodicals, newspapers, parcel post packages—as they sent to people in Latin America, and six times as much as to the Pacific. The figures are revealing: In 1950, we mailed more than 147,000,000 pounds—not pieces but pounds—of mail to Western Europe, compared with some 52,000,000 pounds to Latin America and only some 24,000,000 pounds to the Pacific. This is one simple index of the interrelation among the peoples who are joined by the Atlantic waterway and the air above it.

All of us in this Atlantic community share a common set of interests and needs. We do not all have identical ways of living or identical social systems. We do have ways of living that are outgrowths—in different directions and at varying stages of development—of the same Greek and Roman society that lies at the root of western civilization.

Even in certain European countries where development seems almost to have stopped since feudal days, we can see the image of the past out of which the rest of the Atlantic countries have grown. Try as we will, we cannot find this image of our own past in other parts of the world.

We are a community in the sense of sharing a similar political tradition of representative government whatever the differing forms or constitutions may be. All of us set the law above any man. All of us seek to protect by law the individual liberty of every man.

We are a community in the sense of sharing common defense needs. Our independence, our institutions, our ways of living are all threatened by an aggressive, imperialistic dictatorship from which we must defend ourselves. Our recognition of this has led to the North Atlantic Treaty, to the military assistance programs, and to the present efforts to create an unprecedented international army for Atlantic defense.

We are a community in the sense of having common economic needs. Not only for protection but for prosperity, the economies of Western Europe and North America are interdependent. Together they form the greatest market on earth. Among themselves the Atlantic countries carry on the largest exchange of goods and services of any international trade in the world. We can only speculate how much greater this exchange would be if the barriers now erected by governments were gradually dismantled.

The union could put an end to the currency problem, the dollar gap, the balance of payments issue that plagues the countries of the Atlantic. By providing one big market twice or three times as large as the United States market, the benefits of mass production for mass distribution could be immensely expanded. Lower living costs and higher purchasing power would extend to all the people in the union.

Certainly one of the most fabulous eras of prosperity ever known would open before us when the people of this community could trade and migrate freely among each other without unnecessary restrictions, quotas, customs, and tariffs.

Since the end of World War II, the Atlantic community has taken some long strides toward integration. The Marshall plan is the longest economic step toward integration, the Atlantic Pact the longest military step.

Yet we have taken no comparable political steps. In spite of all our efforts to realize economic and military integration, the Atlantic community is without a government. It is as if the American Colonies after the Revolutionary War had remained friendly and cooperative allies but had retained their sovereignties as individual countries and had never moved even so far as adopting the Articles of Confederation, let alone ratifying the Constitution.

Address of Drew Pearson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on July 1, 1951, Mr. Drew Pearson, the eminent columnist and radio commentator, was invited to deliver his weekly broadcast from historic Independence Hall in Philadelphia.

Mr. Pearson made a masterful statement that should be read by all who failed to hear him.

It is included here so that all may read it:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, this is Drew Pearson. I have been invited by Governor Fine, of Pennsylvania, to broadcast today from the most hallowed and historic spot in America, the east room of Independence Hall. I have the great honor to be seated in the historic chair of George Washington, at the desk where was signed that great Declaration which gave birth to a new nation. In this room there also met the Provincial Assembly, the Superior Court. Later the Second Continental Congress. Here also George Washington delivered his Farewell Address, and Abraham Lincoln lay in state following his death. With me in this room today are Mayor Bernard Samuel, of Philadelphia, who has done so much for the Friendship Train, the Mercier Train, and the Tide of Toys; Judge Edwin Lewis; Arthur Greenfield, President Conone, of the homecoming committee; George Jessel; and other distinguished visitors, celebrating the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration which set forth what was then a bold and revolutionary doctrine that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, and that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

For 175 years, free men throughout the world have been marching into battle to champion the ideas scratched on a piece of parchment in this room at this table. Now before giving you the news of the day, I would like to compare some of the problems faced by the founding fathers with those we face today. When Thomas Jefferson rented a room in the home of a German bricklayer just across the street and for 18 days worked on drafting this famed Declaration, democracy was considered as deplorable as slavery and a lot more dangerous. Men at that time were by no means equal, and the right to vote was held only by the property-owning few. The signers of the Declaration, therefore, were considered radicals, and they sometimes received angry glances in the streets of Philadelphia when they passed. Furthermore, there was no rejoicing when the Declaration was signed, no mobs stormed the doors of this room clamoring for a decision. The Liberty Bell did not ring out until July 8, 4 days later. It was a grim, grave decision to take, this American Revolution. And every man, as he stepped up to sign, knew that he would be hanged by his neck until dead if the British ever caught him. Yet despite uncertainty and opposition and the fact that equality of man was then unheard of, the 56 founding fathers after 3 days of continuous debate, did sign this great human document the most far-reaching since the days of Christ. The men who signed this parchment were young. Their average age was 44. Some of our foremost leaders today are about 70. Like us today, these young men also had to cope with the problem of inflation. But they were tougher about it than we. America's first price ceiling was not issued by Mike DiSalle but by the Continental Congress in 1776, and carried this stern warning:

"Assorted vultures who are preying on the vitals of their country in time of common distress by selling above prices set by this price chart shall be exposed by name to public view."

Today, we call them price gougers, but the founding fathers had a better name—vultures. Today Attorney General McGrath is sitting on 1,100 price violations sent him for prosecution. However, he has done nothing except to keep the names secret. The found-

ing fathers on the other hand, exposed vultures by name to public view. The founding fathers also had their problem of rivalry between the planters and farmers, many of whom favored England and the merchants and city population, which did not. The fathers would be disappointed, however, at our own congressional debate of last week which showed that we had made even less progress than they in getting the cattlemen and cotton growers of the South and West and the city consumers of the North and East to realize that this is one country, and every section is interdependent upon the other. They would have been shocked at the greed, the selfishness, the bitterness of debate, and would have felt that we were a long way from taking Benjamin Franklin's advice: "Gentlemen, we must all hang together, or assuredly we shall hang separately."

The founding fathers also would have been sick at heart at the hatemongers that today are abusing the freedom they fought and died for. The Gerald L. K. Smiths, the Merwin K. Harts, the Joe Kamps, and the Joe McCarthys. On the other hand, here are some things the signers would be happy about, if they looked down on their country today.

1. We have kept alive their championship of the equality of man, and have gone to the rescue of a weak and distant country across the Pacific, and have rallied other nations in a common drive to prevent aggression. For we have found as they did, that freedom does not come easily. It has to be fought for.

2. We have retained civilian control of government, including the removal of a popular military figure when he challenged civilian rule. For the founding fathers feared military power more than they feared death, and George Washington was quick to turn his powers back to Congress.

They would have been glad also that we have retained the Revolutionary spirit, and are still striving for social welfare, better education. And they would regret that we had not gone further to improve life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. For the Declaration of Independence is not something that we can let lie dormant, it's something that we have to reaffirm again and again. And so from this setting, here is some up-to-the-minute news in the battle of the free world against communism.

Small Mine Operators Classed as Speculators, Advised They Are Out of Defense Picture, and Told They Might Just as Well Play Roulette or Bet on the Races as Try To Produce Strategic Minerals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN T. WOOD

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, last year the small-mine operators were enthusiastic about the part they would play in the production of strategic minerals for the defense effort.

Enthusiastically they went into the hills, opening old mines, seeking new ones—lead, copper, zinc, antimony, tungsten, manganese, uranium, and other strategic minerals—and then

waited anxiously for the help and co-operation they had been led to believe would be forthcoming from the Defense Minerals Administration. But in most instances it never came. Instead of assisting our small domestic miners, we are importing 25 percent of our copper, 30 percent of our lead and zinc, and other strategic metals at prices above those paid to domestic producers.

Last week, according to the appended article from the Salt Lake Tribune of Salt Lake City, Utah, they were told by a representative of the DMA that "the small miners are speculators, are out of the picture—they might just as well go to Las Vegas—play roulette or bet on the races."

That is what has happened to our once great mining industry which contributed so much to the building of the West. Small wonder that 80 percent of our metal mines are closed, while we finance foreign mines employing slave labor and buy their production at prices higher than are paid to domestic producers.

If the American metal mining industry is to be revived, it must stop begging for crumbs from the king's table, organize and demand sound monetary and fiscal policies, the remonetization of silver, a return to bimetallism, and the restoration of the protective tariff; and call a halt to global boondoggling.

The article from the Salt Lake Tribune and a letter from the vice president of the Idaho Small Mine Operators Association follow:

DMA AID RECOMMENDS ROULETTE TO SMALL MINERS

(By Observer)

The transcript records of some defense meetings sometimes reveal astonishing statements made by representatives of Government agencies.

Last Tuesday's tungsten conference in Denver was a striking example.

Although the tungsten situation has been discussed to great length in the press, the Denver development justifies additional light on the official attitude toward the small miners of the West.

CONFERENCE INVITATIONAL

Invitational in nature, the Denver conference apparently was intended for processors rather than producers of tungsten. A few producers, quite a few processors, Defense Minerals Administration officials, and representatives of the Office of Price Stabilization, the General Supply Administration, and the Bureau of the Budget attended the meeting.

Witnesses for the producers were unanimous in their testimony to the effect that the present Government program which requires a 60-percent tungsten concentrate renders a great majority of independent and small producers helpless to contribute to desperately needed ore tonnages.

ECONOMICS DISCUSSED

In addition, so well known an organization as the Vanadium Corp. of America notified the DMA that it could not furnish the milling facilities for the formerly productive Boulder County area of Colorado because of the economics of the Government program. On top of this, the HMS tungsten mill of Salt Lake City informed the DMA that it was withdrawing its plant from participation in the program because the program has not and cannot provide even break-even prices for the many small tungsten miners in the West.

The record of the meeting reveals some heated discussion, a discouraging and astonishing attitude on the part of one DMA official, an interesting description of the current tungsten program, and a word of hope for tungsten miners expressed by a representative of the Bureau of the Budget.

INDEPENDENT REPORTS

An independent tungsten miner declared, in estimating the tungsten program, "You cannot help agriculture by promoting the production of fruit cake." That, of course, referred to the 60-percent tungsten concentrate requirement.

Representatives of the General Supply Administration indicated scant interest in how tungsten is produced and centered their interest in the purchase thereof after it is produced.

But it remained for G. B. Holderer, Washington, D. C., representative of the tungsten division of DMA to astonish the meeting and create speculation as to whether his remarks were or would be authorized by the top DMA officials. The stenographic record of the meeting contains his answer to the exposition of the plight of the small producer, his spendings to date and the problem of future spending. He said.

GAMBLING SUGGESTED

"The small miners are speculators, are out of the picture—they might just as well go to Las Vegas—play roulette or bet on the races."

The one word of hope for a revising of the tungsten program was expressed by M. T. Bunger, of the Bureau of the Budget. This official frankly admitted that the small miners were justified in their stand and expressed some hope that all the facts might bring about a change to ore stockpiling as originally intended.

IDAHO SMALL MINE

OPERATORS ASSOCIATION,

Mackay, Idaho, July 18, 1951.

Hon JOHN T WOOD,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WOOD I have been watching and waiting for the DMA in Washington to get down to business and act in some manner that will show that they know what they are doing.

They have been put on the carpet for not having tungsten on hand, but don't seem to know there is plenty of it, if they will put out a little effort to get it.

I know of two good prospects close to the railroad, and during the end of the last war shipped a test lot of 4 tons or so that assayed at 3.38 WO, and got paid \$71 per ton net for it by the Government agent in Salt Lake City, Utah. Tungsten was \$24 a unit then.

I had built a road to the deposit, put in an ore bin, and made ready to produce as was requested by the Government. But—just as I had gotten things ready, I was notified that the Salt Lake mill was closing down and that they were not buying any more ore. The war was over. I was left holding an empty sack and out considerable money.

In 1915, I went all-out to mine tungsten in Nederland, Colo. Tungsten was quoted at as high as \$105 per unit (20 pounds 60 percent WO, contained), but there was a shipload received from South America and the price dropped to \$9 per unit. I had to walk out of town, and in debt.

Now, Congress has passed a bill that says \$63 for 5 years or until so much tungsten is received by the Government. Who is going to put up \$100,000 to build a mill under such uncertainties?

So, under the conditions that are laid down by the Government and DMA, maybe Mr. G. B. Holderer, DMA aide, is right in saying at the tungsten conference in Denver,

Colo., the other day that the small miners are speculators, are out of the picture, and that they might as well go to Las Vegas, play roulette, or bet on the races. I am thinking he is right because I believe I would have as much chance getting my money back on a horse race as I would trying to guess what to depend on what will happen next through the actions of the DMA.

I cannot understand what Mr. Holderer thinks he or his organization can gain or how he or they expect to get the cooperation of the people or the miners with whom they must deal to make a success of their organization.

I have authority from the DMA to mine, mill, process, or whatever I can to produce 60 percent tungsten concentrates for 5 years at \$63 per unit WO, provided they don't get a certain amount before the 5 years expire.

They sent me instructions, and the places where it might be possible to get my ore milled. I tried them all within Idaho State and Utah.

Under certain circumstances these places do not have to take custom ore for processing, that is, if they were working at full capacity, which they were.

The DMA doesn't seem to know that each deposit of tungsten probably will be different in character, relative to impurities, and takes a different treatment and that a mill for custom work must be built accordingly.

The \$63 offered by the Government for processed tungsten is just the reason why the DMA hasn't been able to get any stock for stock piling. Why sell for \$63, when you can get more after it is processed and you have to process it anyway in order to market it?

The Government is going to have to pay more money to get tungsten, so why not pay more by processing the ore? Two or three hundred thousand dollars will install a plant centrally located. I am sure every miner would be willing to pay two or three dollars a ton extra, until the Government gets their money back. I would gladly pay \$5 continuously provided the Government will show me where I can depend on selling my ore for a few years without any if's, or so many provisions attached to their contracts.

This is one chance where the Government can help without going into direct competition with big companies, because the larger companies are refusing to accept custom ores owing to the economics of the Government program.

Of course, the whole thing depends on whether the Government needs tungsten. If they are willing to put out some taxpayers' money where it is needed, or whether we small miners shall have to join up with Costello and play the races and other gambling devices where we will have at least one chance out of a hundred.

Very truly yours,

F. D. SHERRY, Sr.,
Vice President, Idaho Small
Mine Operators Association.

**Secretary of the Treasury Snyder Says
the Dollar Has Not Shrunk**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to say I missed the newspaper report of the speech made by Secretary Snyder, evidently a 4th of July verbal skyrocket, in which he proclaimed that

there is no inflation and that the dollar has increased in value. It was called to my attention by an editorial in the Santa Ana Register, a daily newspaper published in Orange County, in my district. Evidently other editors and economists failed to understand the economics on which this remarkable statement was based, and asked for an explanation. I now rise to ask the Secretary of the Treasury if he will be kind enough to explain the explanation. The editorial, which contains excerpts from the original speech and from the first explanation, follows:

TREASURY HEAD SAYS DOLLAR HASN'T SHRUNK

Everybody can quit worrying about inflation. We make this announcement on the authority of no less a financial expert than Secretary of the Treasury Snyder. According to Mr. Snyder, there is no inflation—except in regard to food, that is. In a Fourth of July sputter the Secretary said the American dollar not only hasn't depreciated but has increased in value. The AP quoted him as explaining:

"I don't feel sorry for the American dollar. The dollar is worth 40 percent more today, per capita, than it was in 1939, taking into consideration the adjustments in taxes and wages."

He added that, with the exception of groceries, Americans get more for their money now than in 1939, and they get more value for the money they spend.

We thought we had heard everything in the way of financial gibberish from New Deal mouthpieces, but we hadn't. It remained for Mr. Snyder to outshine all the other bureaucratic spouters of nonsense and outright falsehoods concerning money matters under the New Deal regime.

RANK MISSTATEMENT

Such a rank misstatement didn't go unchallenged. Editors and some politicians promptly wanted to know what the head of the Treasury Department was getting at by telling the people that today's pewee dollar is worth 40 percent more per capita, than it was in 1939.

For instance, a standard make suit of men's clothing purchased today for \$75 could be bought in 1939 for \$37.50. The price of a home today is anywhere from two to three times the price in 1939, etc.

Mr. Snyder, unable to back up his statements about the value of today's dollar, said he had not been properly understood. So he came out with this explanation:

"The per capita purchasing power of the American people has improved by about 40 percent since 1939 after making full allowance for the increases and price changes."

There you have a working example of the new-deal method of meeting a challenge. This method is to put out completely false propaganda and then to explain it by resorting to gibberish that nobody can make head or tail of.

The nearest approach to meaning we can get out of Mr. Snyder's explanation of his original phony statements is that after paying your staggering Federal income tax, old-age security tax, the hundreds of hidden taxes, your increased State and local taxes, the dollars you have left will buy 40 percent more commodities at current inflated prices than the dollars you had for spending in 1939.

FUNNY EXPLANATION

Since Mr. Snyder exempted groceries in his original words of wisdom and didn't change the exemption in his funny explanation, it's to be presumed that this 40 percent

greater buying power he says you now have doesn't apply to the food you buy.

Why is that?

Is this weird commentator on financial matters implying that the Nation's food producers, processors, and retailers have an inside track in the race for riches? If we're able, as Mr. Snyder maintains, to buy 40 percent more in the way of clothing, housing, automobiles, gadgets, entertainment, and those mysterious articles called sundries, why aren't we able to buy 40 percent more food?

We want the Secretary of the Treasury to explain this food business since he seems to have an explanation handy for the rest of the financial mess into which the bureaucrats have flung us.

But what's the use? There's far too much worthless talk coming out of Washington now. Mr. Snyder would probably tell us that the answer to the food situation is to get out of Michael DiSalle's road.

Unjust Indictment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Dothan Eagle, Dothan, Ala., for July 20, 1951. Recently the wiregrass section of Alabama was the subject of severe criticism regarding inadequate housing facilities for military personnel stationed at Camp Rucker. Early during World War II the Public Housing Administration erected 100 dwelling units of brick and brick-tile with concrete floors. These housing units were constructed at Daleville, Ala., a small town within 2 or 3 miles of Camp Rucker. At the close of World War II Camp Rucker was placed on a stand-by basis by the military authorities. Soon after the close of the war the housing units were sold for practically nothing—although Camp Rucker remained on a stand-by basis. I begged and pleaded with the housing authorities to leave the housing units intact until the military made a final disposition of Camp Rucker. My efforts were futile and the housing units were torn down. The following editorial points out that it was the Government—not the people of the Wiregrass—that tore down a 100-unit apartment house in the very front gate of Camp Rucker within 1 year after World War II ended. I, too, would like to voice my objection for placing the blame on the people of that section for a situation over which they had absolutely no control.

The editorial follows:

UNJUST INDICTMENT

Seldom has a region been so unjustly maligned and tarred with distortions as the Wiregrass, which was accorded such treatment in a Senate subcommittee's report painting this section as a land where families of military personnel at Camp Rucker are

victimized wholesale by landlords and compelled to live in miserable quarters.

The people of the Wiregrass, to put it mildly, are stunned and shocked that such a picture of them would be presented to the Nation by a committee that should be responsible for its actions. Their resentment is not born of sensitivity to outside criticism, nor does it stem from inherent pride of their community.

Rather, it derives from the obvious fact that the committee's investigators—whoever they are—seized on a few isolated cases and represented them as a general picture of the entire region, thus indicating a whole section and its people as profiteers cashing in on an emergency.

They also are resentful that the committee's report took no cognizance of what the people of this section have done, on their own, to accommodate military persons who are temporary residents of the area.

Of course, there is a housing shortage in the Wiregrass. There always is when a military camp is established temporarily and, so long as the camp remains temporary, the shortage will continue to exist. And we doubt not that there have been cases of excessive rentals, human nature being what it is.

It is puzzling, though, that even with an acute shortage apartments in Dothan are advertised for rent every day. It is also puzzling, in view of this, that the Dothan housing authority has apartments vacant in the Henry Green apartments, as well as in the new Negro development, and will rent them to military personnel eligible by reason of income and dependency.

Instances of military personnel living in "hovels" are so rare that for a committee to portray them as an average and regional condition is nothing short of fantastic. In fact, there is considerable difference of opinion on what constitutes a "hovel." As for high rents, admittedly some are high.

But, over-all, there is much reasonableness in rental charges. The 90 percent (estimated by Mayor Douglas Brown of Ozark) who are maintaining reasonable rents are uncredited with fairness and are being blamed for the unreasonableness of the 10 percent who are greedy, an affliction not exclusive to any region.

Let it be emphasized here that we hold no brief for rent gougers who are taking advantage of the emergency. They cannot be criticized too bitterly. But we do hold a brief for the Wiregrass and are aware that the majority of the people of this section want and strive to treat the military personnel fairly.

We resent the committee's painting of the entire Wiregrass with such a black brush, not only because a false picture is being presented to the Nation but because the committee's findings are distorted, exaggerated, and misapplied. Whether deliberately intended or not, the results are the same.

The Wiregrass should not be blamed for a shortage in housing.

But so far as the lack of accommodations for Rucker personnel is concerned, the Government itself cannot escape responsibility.

It was the Government—not the Wiregrass—that tore down a 100-unit apartment house at the very front gate of Camp Rucker within a year after World War II ended. This building, containing 1, 2 and 3-bedroom apartments, was built for servicemen and it was razed so that the Government could sell the plumbing.

That was done by the Government even though Rucker was continued as a stand-by camp.

If there was any future need for Rucker envisioned, why wasn't the need for housing envisioned? Instead, the Government lev-

eled to the bare ground 100 apartments that were hardly 3 years old and requiring absolutely no maintenance because they were of masonry and concrete construction.

This was not mentioned in the subcommittee's report.

Nor did the report mention how many families in the Wiregrass, responding to civic pleas, converted homes into apartments and built extra rooms. They spent considerable money in the process and, while not expecting to accumulate fortunes, are entitled to a reasonable compensation for their occupancy. Why was this ignored?

Maj. Gen. Walter D. Luplow, commanding officer at the post, believes the committee's report generalized on isolated cases and questioned that the "conditions are as black" as painted. He had sympathy for this section's problem in providing temporary housing and commendation for assistance from the Wiregrass communities.

Maj. Gen. Norman E. Hedrickson, commanding officer of the Forty-seventh Division, pointed out that the servicemen make their own arrangements for housing and of their own free will, and added that the men of his division were advised of the shortage of accommodations before they came to Rucker.

It is significant that these two officers have not spoken out in the tone of the committee. Since they look after their men you may be sure they would have voiced complaints if they had felt them justified.

The Wiregrass has been taken for an unjust ride, indicted as a region and a people for a handful of unpleasant instances and for the byproducts of an emergency over which it has no control. It is the same emergency that has called its own sons into service.

William Oatis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous leave I include a letter that is typical of the many being received since I introduced House Resolution 332 in behalf of William Oatis, now imprisoned in Czechoslovakia:

DELCO-REMY DIVISION,
GENERAL MOTORS CORP.,
Anderson, Ind., July 18, 1951.
Representative JOHN BEAMER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: Just in case you haven't yet received a copy of today's Indianapolis Times I am enclosing a tear sheet. I thought you would be particularly interested because the Oatis case seems to monopolize almost the entire front page, and your resolution in the House is prominently mentioned.

I also want to say that I hope you give them both barrels on this. I have talked to a number of people, and I know they are thoroughly in accord with your resolution. Certainly the Oatis case to date is one of the blackest marks on the pages of our diplomatic history as far as American nationals are concerned. Having worked a few years on newspapers myself, it makes my blood boil to know that the foreign Com-mies government can get away with something like this.

If there is anything at all that I can do down this way that would be of help to you, please advise me, for I would certainly welcome the opportunity to aid in marshaling public opinion behind your efforts in Oatis' behalf.

Best regards to Mrs. Beamer, and again let me know if we can be of any help.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. HARDY.

Canada Willing To Build St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, during these trying days when the American taxpayer is bowed down with the heavy tax burden, the Dominion of Canada indicates that it is ready to finance, furnish material and manpower, and start construction of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway.

As a relief to the American taxpayer and to the strain the St. Lawrence seaway would make on our national economy Canada should be encouraged to proceed with its plan to build the international ditch. If Canada finances and builds the St. Lawrence seaway, it will collect, no doubt, toll charges from all ships using the seaway, as a means of recovering its investment. Thus the American people will not have to stand the burden of increased taxes to provide an international waterway with no guaranty of recovering the cost due to our well-known attitude of being against toll charges.

If Canada finances and builds the St. Lawrence project, it will be the first major project financed without financial aid from the United States.

The following editorial appearing in the July 22, 1951, New York Times tells of Canada's willingness to build the St. Lawrence seaway without any help on our part.

The editorial follows:

CANADA CONSIDERS NEW SEAWAY PLAN—
DOMINION MAY PUSH SHIP ROUTE ALONE,
AND LEAVE POWER TO LATER JOINT APPROVAL
(By P. J. Phillip)

OTTAWA, July 21.—If the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives finally rejects all proposals for joint construction of the St. Lawrence seaway, it is considered certain here that Canada will make a new approach to the problem and seek international approval for the power project, but build the seaway canal on the Dominion's side of the river and operate it nationally.

The need for power is so urgent, both in Ontario and upper New York State, that it is believed, or at least hoped, that Washington will put its stamp of approval on the power scheme as a separate project in view of the attitude of Congress toward the seaway.

In such an event it would be possible for Canada to go ahead alone on construction

of the seaway without affecting the water levels in any way.

BUILDING NEEDS EVALUATED

Studies have already been made of the availability of labor and materials for the construction of the enhanced navigation route and the feeling is that what is necessary can be obtained.

Parliamentary approval for the scheme also is believed to be assured on the ground that enlarged navigational facilities between the ocean lanes and the Great Lakes is essential for national defense as well as for the economic expansion of the Dominion.

Behind the new determination to go ahead with the seaway lies a strong belief that the immense iron-ore discoveries in Quebec and Labrador, and the development of the oil fields in Alberta and contiguous regions promise a tremendous new era of development for Canada if only low-cost transport can be assured. Not only the Dominion but the whole of North America stands to benefit from this development, it is argued. It is not in any selfish spirit that the Canadians are working to assure, independently, what the House of Representatives seems to wish to reject.

CHAPMAN'S VIEWS NOTED

Attention has been accorded here to the statement by Oscar Chapman, Secretary of the Interior, calling for the joint development of the Far North regions by the United States and Canada, but to most observers in the Dominion it seems that it would be more reasonable to begin by the development of the more habitable parts of the country before efforts are made to push the frontier closer to the frozen regions where, whatever the natural wealth, living conditions are so harsh that it always would be difficult to get people to settle and make permanent homes.

On the score of continental defense it is maintained that the easy haul of iron ore from Ungava, by water, to central continental steel plants and the adequate supply of hydroelectric power to Ontario and New York State are much more important and urgent than hypothetical plans for the protection of distant places. These remote wastes, such military expeditions as Musk Ox and Sweetbriar already have shown, are adequately protected by nature.

State Department Trading With Communist Areas a Public Scandal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the American people are carrying the fight for decent treatment of our citizens by Communist countries while our so-called diplomats turn their backs and pretend not to notice. The Oatis case has become highly important, not only because of the outrageous treatment of one American citizen, but because it has become a symbol of what we are to expect continually unless some lily-livered Rhodes schoolboys are booted out of strategic posts in our State Department.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article which appeared in the Sunday Star on July 22, 1951. This article capably points out that the

invoking of trade sanctions against Communist Czechoslovakia would be a simple matter and that it would vitally affect that country. It shows that the recent act directing the President to withdraw most-favored nation treatment from Communist areas is being ignored—once again the striped-pants boys are thumbing their elevated noses at Congress and the American people.

How long will the citizens of this country tolerate them?

The article follows:

END OF CZECH TRADE BENEFITS URGED IN RETALIATION ON OATIS

(By Edwin G. Martin)

As public resentment mounts against Czechoslovakia's false imprisonment of William Oatis, more and more people are wondering why the United States does not promptly impose trade sanctions. The Congress directed last month that this be done as soon as practicable but, as yet, the administration has not acted.

Although no reason has been given for the lack of action, it is a fair assumption that legal problems are involved. Just what are these problems and how can they be met?

First, it should be clearly understood that under our domestic law the President has ample authority to act at any time. The original Trade Agreements Act of 1934 provides that the President may at any time terminate any such proclamation (of reduced tariffs) in whole or in part. Accordingly, the only possible legal problems are international.

These legal problems arise from the general agreement on tariffs and trade negotiated by the United States with a free Czechoslovakia and a number of other countries in 1947. The various countries exchanged tariff concessions—reductions or bindings of tariff rates

CONCESSIONS STILL IN FORCE

The rates agreed on by the United States were about 50 percent below our statutory levels. These concessions are still in force and are a great benefit to Czechoslovakia's exports to this country. Possibly Czechoslovakia's tariff concessions are still nominally in force, but they have lost all their significance because, under Communist rule, all foreign trade is conducted by Government monopolies whose transactions are based on political, rather than commercial, factors.

Accordingly, the principal consideration for our concessions to the Czechs has failed. Yet the State Department apparently feels we now have a legal obligation to keep our concessions in force.

The writer believes the legal difficulties are not too hard to surmount and that our Government could do this in about 2 months if it takes a firm stand promptly and presses for action vigorously. Furthermore, the United States would not need to withdraw wholly from the general agreement which is the sole cause of the legal difficulties.

It should be borne in mind that we are not here considering termination of the reduced rates for all countries. We are considering withdrawing them only from the Communists. Increasing the rates on Czech products would be of real significance. It would make it much more difficult for the Czechs to sell in our markets. It would reduce the profits of their exports. It would reduce their favorable balance of trade with the United States.

Under the existing regime of general agreement, Czechoslovakia seems to have a legal right to the reduced rates and also a right to the same rates as those we assess on British, French or other goods. The only way speci-

fied for taking away these rights requires a vote of the contracting parties to the agreement as a group.

NO PROVISION FOR OUSTERS

GATT does not contain any explicit provision for expelling a defaulting party from the agreement, but it might well be argued that the contracting parties as a group necessarily have implied powers of expulsion. In this connection, a parallel might be drawn from our own history. The United States Constitution empowers the President to appoint Government officers but says nothing about their removal except by impeachment. The Supreme Court has held that the power to appoint necessarily included the power to remove. Why should not the power of the contracting parties to admit countries as the general agreement also embraces power to expel them?

Since becoming a member of the agreement in 1948, Czechoslovakia has not acted to carry out the spirit of the agreement. She has, without cause, accused the United States of illegal actions on several occasions. She has suppressed individual freedom and enterprise on which the expansion of international trade was supposed to be based. She has blacked out the sources of information on which one could judge her performance. It is a safe bet that she has ignored and violated the principles established in the agreement for the conduct of state-trading enterprises.

The United States would be entirely justified in moving for the expulsion of Czechoslovakia from the agreement. Such action could be taken at the next regular session of the contracting parties at Geneva on September 18, or a special meeting could be called prior to that date. The important thing is to decide promptly what we want to do and then do it. The majority of the other contracting parties will support any reasonable proposal we make.

OTHER PROVISIONS AVAILABLE

But if it should be decided not to move for prompt expulsion, there are two provisions of the agreement which would permit prompt implementation of Congress' direction to withdraw existing benefits. These are articles 23 and 25.

Article 23 deals with the subject of Nullification or Impairment. It provides that the contracting parties (as a group) may authorize one or more individual parties to withdraw concessions from an offending country. A country is an offender if its actions result in nullifying or impairing any benefit of the agreement or in impeding any objective of the agreement. Decisions in such cases are taken by a simple majority of the votes cast, each party being entitled to one vote.

Article 25 provides that "In exceptional circumstances not elsewhere provided for in this agreement" the contracting parties (as a group) may waive any obligation of a country under the agreement. Such waivers may be granted only by two-thirds majority vote.

By proceeding under either article 23 or 25 the United States might be relieved of its legal obligations to Czechoslovakia. This means it could increase its tariffs on all Czech goods without any suspicion of violation of an international agreement.

Ample grounds (pointed out above) exist for our invocation of the nullification clause, even if we limit our approach to matters dealing strictly with trade.

NEGOTIATIONS SEEN USELESS

However, there is no need of so limiting our approach. The whole course of conduct of Czechoslovakia in the last 3 years has been such as to convince many people that it is useless to try to deal with them. Their per-

verted concept of moral standards is simply beyond the pale.

How can we expect honest dealing from the country that perpetrated the Oatis case in the face of its own constitutional guaranty of freedom of the press?

Broadly speaking, the situation in Czechoslovakia today is basically the same as in 1939. The fact that the Communists permit a nominal Czech Government to carry on, while the Nazis simply absorbed the country, makes little difference. The country is just as much under foreign control and is not de facto carrying out the trade agreement as it was intended at the time of negotiation.

When the Nazis took over Czechoslovakia in 1939 the President acted promptly, terminating the existing tariff reductions because Czechoslovakia could not carry out its side of the bargain. The President still has the same power. Although we have taken insult and injury from the Czech Communists these last 3 years, let us hope that effective retaliation may be taken by our side in the not-too-distant future.

Installment Credit

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve Board put into operation an order known as regulation W. The intention of this order was to curb consumer credit by increasing the amount of down payment required to be made in the purchase of automobiles, appliances, and durable goods. The regulation also provided that the article purchased should be paid for in a shorter length of time. As a result of regulation W, many salaried people and others of small means were deprived the privilege of purchasing merchandise that was so greatly needed by them. The wealthy and well-to-do were not affected by the Federal Reserve Board order. They could purchase any piece of merchandise desired. To buy an automobile, the purchaser had to pay one-third down and agree to pay the remaining balance within 15 months. Previously, he could buy a car by paying 25 percent down and liquidate the balance in 21 months. The poor people find it difficult to make the down payment on an automobile and prohibitive to meet the large installments that would be required to be made in order that the remaining indebtedness be paid in full within the period of 15 months.

It was the intention of the directive to curb inflationary pressures on the economy. The Board felt that this regulation was needed in view of the expanded production required in the preparedness program. Regulation W falls flat as a means of controlling inflation. Inflation is caused by an abundance of money competing in the channels of trade for scarce commodities. If the situation existed in this country where the great masses of the population had billions of dollars in buying power with which

to purchase goods that were in short supply, the regulation W would occupy a needed role. The purchase of scarce commodities would then be minimized and stabilized. The situation today is quite different. The people have little cash with which to buy such articles and the warehouses are swollen with every conceivable type of automotive vehicle, furniture, fixtures, and household appliances. Because of these excess stocks, the consumer is benefited by reason of lower prices. The manufacturer is worried because he does not know where he will get a market for the product of his manufacture. The retailer is alarmed because he cannot move the inventories he has in stock. The consumer is in the position of needing a refrigerator, a stove, a washing machine, or a car, but he is unable to buy because of regulation W and its stringent requirements.

I have just left the floor of the House where amendments to the Defense Production Act have been adopted which greatly relaxed the provisions of regulation W. I supported the amendments which would make it easier for the American people to purchase this merchandise. The bill presented to the House had provided for an 18-month maximum period in the payment of automobile notes. I supported an amendment which extended this 18-month period to 21 months. An amendment was agreed to which would reduce the amount of down payment required in making time payment purchases. Should the emergency become more severe and a much larger percent of the productive effort of the country go into strict defense production, tighter controls could and should be put into effect. Under present conditions regulation W is not needed.

Panic a Bomb Hazard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Jonesboro (Ark.) Evening Sun of July 16, 1951:

PANIC A BOMB HAZARD

Civilian defense now being emphasized for the Nation has as its principal purpose safety of the populace in case of an attack by bombs. Ever since Hiroshima there has been fear that the principal cities of this country might suffer similar attacks by bombs more devastating than those dropped on the Japanese. The military has been frank in saying some enemy bombers would get through the best aerial defense.

For that reason civilian-defense measures have been aimed at advising citizens what to do in such cases, together with organizing for fire and other results which would follow.

Great secrecy has surrounded atomic experimentation in recent months. There has been a general conclusion, however, that panic would cause more casualties than the

explosions themselves. The incredible congestion of traffic which would follow a bomb attack in any large city is the factor which is causing the greatest concern to those entrusted with organizing for civilian defense.

The people have been oversold on the dangers of bomb attacks, and the hazards will subside when the facts become known. But the panic which would result because the people have been made hysterical by constant fear of bomb attacks can hardly be prevented without long and persistent education.

Godfrey Should Be Wiser as Well as Sadder Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, when a professional radio and television entertainer steps out of character and assumes the role of political lobbyist, both he and his sponsors can expect a vigorous public protest. No one knows that better today than Mr. Arthur Godfrey, who is a sadder and should be a wiser man, since his excursion into politics bootlegged under the radio and TV billing of entertainment.

If Mr. Godfrey is not yet convinced of the wisdom of the old adage about the shoemaker sticking to his last, the Federal Communications Commission should add to his enlightenment and that of his sponsors. Equal time should be afforded by the sponsors and the networks for presentation of views in rebuttal of those advanced by Lobbyist Godfrey.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include two editorials from the Washington Times-Herald of July 18 and 19, 1951:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of July 18, 1951]

"STATESMAN" GODFREY

Arthur Godfrey returned to television Monday night after a visit with General Eisenhower in Paris. But it was not as Godfrey the entertainer; it was Godfrey the "statesman."

Godfrey demanded that his audience campaign for all-out shipment of American troops and supplies to Europe.

One biographer has estimated that Godfrey, a graduate Washington disc jockey, earns \$1,000,000 a year. He makes this princely sum because the public listens to and watches his radio and television programs.

Yet Godfrey has no qualms about using his public. Eisenhower crooks a finger and Godfrey, accompanied by Bernard Baruch, rushes off to Europe. Now he returns to try and sell the American public a bill of goods prepared by Eisenhower.

If Godfrey is so interested in advancing the cause of European nations that are too corrupt to join in their own defense, let him send abroad some of his own tremendous earnings. The American people have had enough of this wasting of blood, bullets and bullion on decaying European battlegrounds.

Godfrey's performance demonstrates once more the method by which the American public is chased up and down the street by the politicians in power. Why stand for it?

[From the Washington Times-Herald of July 19, 1951]

TENDERIZED HAM

Yesterday morning, Mr. Arthur Godfrey's sensitive artistic temperament suffered a shock. Godfrey has just returned from Europe. There, he was elegantly entertained, coached, and trained in the art of political salesmanship by none other than Gen. Ike Eisenhower.

It was clever of Eisenhower to pick Godfrey for this honor. Godfrey has made millions beguiling vast radio and television audiences in the virtues of merchandise and he is a pleasure to hear when he is doing that.

But it is no pleasure to a responsible-minded citizen concerned for grown-up political thinking in America to hear Godfrey prattling to his innocent audience about international affairs. It is nauseous.

OBNOXIOUS DECEPTION

That's not what the crowd gathered around to hear. Godfrey is doing himself and everybody else wrong when he switches his pitch to politics.

And so it was that yesterday the Times-Herald called his hand and Godfrey, who is so used to being petted, praised, and paid for his efforts, suffered the said shock.

He fouled up the air at considerable length, yesterday, to let his listeners in on his anguished alibi.

Too bad, Arthur. You asked for it. When you put down your ukulele and try to pose as a statesman, you are out of character. Furthermore, you are entering an arena of controversy in which those who try to dish it out have to be man enough to take it.

Quit blubbering. If you think you can become a politician without consequences, you have some interesting experiences ahead.

Know Your Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under previous leave to insert my remarks in the Appendix to the RECORD, I wish to submit copy of an article by the Marine News, of New York, published in the Washington Post of even date, as follows:

KNOW YOUR WATERWAYS—REASON FOR ACTION

It seems incredible that Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma could suffer an estimated loss of \$750,000,000 in flood damage in so short a time; a tragic demonstration of what rivers running wild can do. Costly disruption of industry and transportation will continue for months. Years will be required to restore a large part of the tremendous loss. Fertile land and crops have been heavily damaged. Farmers have suffered. Until preventive measures are taken such disaster looms constantly, not only in Kansas and Missouri but in many other areas throughout the Nation.

The Sandy Hook Pilots Association is directing attention to the inadequacy and danger of the New York and New Jersey channels, serving the Nation's largest port; too shallow, too narrow, too tortuous, the Association stresses. Other important channels are equally inadequate. But when civic organizations initiate flood protection works or needed harbor and channel improvements in their regions, and when Congress, after extended surveys and examinations have

been made, and public hearings held, authorizes certain such improvements, the cry immediately goes up that these important measures of safety and aids to commerce are pork-barrel projects. While multibillions are being spent around the world for various purposes and there is much talk about the billions that can be saved through some reorganization of the Federal Government, the spending of a relatively small amount annually for the betterment of our own country is derided by some as extravagance and waste, or pork-barreling and logrolling.

All thoughtful Americans are for economy, we are sure, but not for the kind that neglects desperately needed flood-protection works and important waterway improvements so helpful to defense, commerce, and industry. The building of America is not yet complete; America is still growing and developing. A large part of this growth, development, and added strength depends upon the continued building of flood-protection works and the further improvement and construction of harbors and channels.

MARINE NEWS,
GEORGE H. PALMER,
President and Publisher.

The Yellowstone News—Montana's Newest Newspaper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD two statements by my old friend, Fred J. Martin, publisher of Montana's newest newspaper, the Yellowstone News. They are titled "So You May Know" and "Why the Yellowstone News?"

Fred Martin has had a long and distinguished career in the newspaper field in Montana. To him and his associates in his latest venture I wish the greatest possible success in the years ahead, and to Billings and its surrounding territory, I extend my congratulations on this new addition in its progressive growth.

The statements follow:

So You May Know

Why the Yellowstone News? Who is the new publisher? What will be the policy of the new paper?

You readers are entitled to answers to the above questions. Because this will be a personal-opinion page it seems fitting that you should have the complete background of the editor and publisher. Next week, as indicated in another column, we will tell you about the individuals who comprise our editorial staff.

The reason for a personal autobiography is that family background, experience, and education constitute the basic roots of a personal philosopher. The latter, in the case of your editor, forms the foundation of an editorial policy of the newspaper.

My mother was born in Sweden. She came to Minneapolis when she was 14. My father, who died in 1948, was born in Michigan. He was a member of the Butte fire department for 50 years, 32 years as fire chief. I was born in Butte. An older sister (who incidentally is the mother of eight children) lives in New York and a younger brother (a fireman in Missoula) who a year ago was

recalled from civilian life to serve as a pharmacist's mate in the United States Navy.

My first job was when I was 10. It was as errand boy and janitor in a drug store. The hours during the summer were from 8 a. m. to 10 p. m. and the pay \$25 a month. After that came jobs as a newspaper carrier. During World War I, there was a summer on an extra gang. While attending the University of Montana I was employed as a cub reporter on the Missoulian and the Sentinel at Missoula, as well as the usual run of jobs college students get. However, my parents scraped up plenty for me. During my junior year at the university I was elected president of my class. I was a member of Phi Sigma Kappa, social fraternity; Sigma Delta Chi, honorary journalism fraternity, and Silent Sentinel, senior honorary society.

After receiving by bachelor of arts in journalism in 1925 I was a cub reporter on the Butte Post (where I had worked the summer previously). During another summer vacation while in college I was employed by the Old Yellowstone Trail Association as its representative to dispense travel information. After 3 years in Butte, the lure of a big city took me to San Francisco, where I had hoped to get into an advertising agency. That door seemed blocked because of a lack of selling experience so I decided to turn salesman. The job was selling radios direct and subsequently my job was manager of a crew of 50 or more salesmen. However, along about October 1929, radios started coming in the back door at a speed greatly in excess of those sold via the front, so the business folded its tent.

GLAD TO COME BACK

Montana seemed like a good spot to come back to, even though jobs were scarce. Finally, there came a chance to work during the vacation period in 1930 on the Great Falls Tribune. That paved the way for a chance to serve as publicity man and campaign secretary for the late Senator T. J. Walsh. This was a great experience. For 60 days I was his constant companion on a tour which took him to every county seat in the State at a time when the State's agricultural economy was at a very low ebb. Montana began to mean something more than Butte, Billings, Great Falls, and Missoula. Without question, the character, personality, and philosophy of Senator Walsh made a definite impression on my thinking. What would have happened had he lived to serve as attorney general of the United States during the first term of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt?

In November, 1930, my wife (a graduate nurse) and I were married, despite the fact that there was only a promise of a job as secretary of the Montana State fair at Helena. We did get the job though. The fair, financed jointly by the State and Lewis and Clark county, was noted mainly for horse racing. Thanks to the late Dr. W. J. Butler, State veterinarian, and Dick Richards, then livestock specialist of the Montana Extension service, I had a part in an important 4-H development. The fair paid the freight, as well as premiums, for 4-H calves and we induced the late Walter Hanson of the Hanson Packing Co., of Butte, to pay \$5 a pound for the champion (which paid off the mortgage on the farm of the boy's dad); \$3 a pound for the reserve and \$2 a pound for the third ranking steer. Dr. Butler and Richards were of the opinion that such a program would do more to emphasize the importance of quality, the value of feeding to the economy and give an impetus to the 4-H program. In that year the fair spent as much on the 4-H program as it did for horse race prizes. The fair died for want of an appropriation in 1933.

\$19.86 A WEEK

However, we had our belongings packed to go back to Washington in March of 1933

when, instead, we read in the newspapers Senator Walsh, for whom we intended to work, had died. After a couple of months came a chance for a temporary job on a Helena newspaper at \$19.86 a week. The world got brighter with another permanent job as a reporter in Helena. About a year later came the chance to go to work in Great Falls where we lived from 1934 to 1943.

Joseph Kinsey Howard (author of Montana, High Wide and Handsome) and I organized a unit of the American Newspaper Guild in Great Falls. Subsequently, I was named to the executive board of the Cascade Trades and Labor Assembly. This was during the time the Workers Alliance, an organization which was infiltrated with Communists, was a potent force and had considerable success in organizing the unemployed and those on relief. Relief agencies were considered at that time as places for political patronage. The bungling administration provided ammunition for the Communist-inspired disturbances, which political demagogues approved from the public platform. Convinced that the great majority of unemployed were not to blame, lots of folks did everything possible to help them. Once, while on a trip to protest political bungling of the State welfare administration, I was named vice chairman of the first merit examining committee of the Montana Department of Public Welfare, a group designed to assist in the selection of employees on the basis of merit, rather than patronage. In 1937, I was named vice chairman of the Great Falls Housing Authority. The latter was organized as a means of trying to find a solution to the problem of finding jobs for building craftsmen in Great Falls. When several hundred Great Falls smeltermen were laid off because of a power shortage, a move was initiated to provide for power development at Fort Peck. I was sent to Washington and authorized to speak for the Montana State Public Service Commission, the city of Great Falls, as well as Great Falls civic, farm, and labor groups.

When a controversy developed between the Great Falls city administration and the Cascade County commissioners as to who to appoint as the fifth member of the city-county airport commission, I was named and participated in the program of development of facilities which was the foundation of the air-base development.

LABOR TROUBLES

I lost favor with the Communists when I refused to join the party and with the labor politicians when I endeavored to get the labor assembly to adopt a resolution that no one could be elected to an assembly office who held a political job. At the time the president was WPA administrator; the vice president was manager of the State liquor store; the secretary was a WPA foreman, and the treasurer was an employee of the State employment service.

About that time I was given the job as associate editor of the Montana Farmer and in that capacity had the opportunity to study the agricultural and livestock economy of the State. In July of 1941, I was drafted by William H. Bartley, then collector of customs for Montana and executive director of the Montana Defense Savings program, to be his assistant in the job of organizing the defense (war bond) organization in the State. We did set up committees in every county in Montana, conducted a bond-selling anti-inflation program in November of 1941, and Montana set the pace for the Nation in December 1941 after Pearl Harbor. That record was maintained during World War II. With the exception of about a year and a half spent in the United States Marine Corps as a first lieutenant assigned most of the time as liaison officer with the State selective board, I remained on the war-bond job until March of 1946.

TO LIVINGSTON IN 1946

With a college pal, Dr. Stanley T. Dohrman, Great Falls orthodontist, I purchased the Park County News and Hammond Printing Co. at Livingston on March 17, 1946. By that time, it didn't seem to me that there was any point in continuing on the United States Treasury Department payroll. The people of Park County were unusually helpful and within a relatively short time the number of subscriptions practically doubled. It was hard but enjoyable work. I have served as a member of the executive board of the National Trout Derby, held annually on the second Sunday in August, and as president of the Livingston Chamber of Commerce. During one of the hectic periods of the State highway administration a State-wide group named me as chairman of a so-called citizens committee. For a time, I served as a member of the board of directors of the Montana Chamber of Commerce.

In Great Falls and at Livingston I was named to the vestry of the Episcopal churches in those cities. I am president of the Livingston Shrine Club and vice president of the Livingston Rotary Club.

Our son, Fred, Jr., just completed his freshman year at Denver University, although he worked throughout the school term in the promotion and editorial departments of the Denver Post. He is working there this summer. Our daughter, Pat, will be a junior in high school this fall.

As indicated last week, my coming to Billings was by invitation, not through personal solicitation. The present arrangement was with the approval of the two former publishers, L. M. Prill of the Midland Review and Chester K. Shore of the Herald.

Here's what I told the Park County News readers last week in my editorial about the new newspaper in Billings:

"Just as a father has to be close at hand when a new member of the family arrives, so we want to be in Billings at the time of publication of a new newspaper's first edition. But, we do not intend to neglect our eldest child. We might temporarily give the youngest more attention, but that isn't a true sign of our feelings.

"Had it not been for you folks in Park County, there never would have been the opportunity in Billings. We know your loyalty will not falter."

But, even though we intend to divide our time to some extent, we do intend to live in Billings. We have a place to live.

F. J. M.

WHY THE YELLOWSTONE NEWS?

The Yellowstone News definitely wants to be a spoke in the wheel of progress rumbling on for a greater Billings, a greater Yellowstone County, a greater Montana, and a greater America. There are no false illusions that such a position can be achieved by magic.

Foundation stones are honesty, integrity, cooperation, and understanding. Then comes teamwork between capital, which provides the facilities, and labor, which makes them produce an acceptable product to the public, which has to pay the bill.

The end product of a newspaper is news. The Yellowstone News does not intend to deal in sensationalism or to dispense propaganda. Definitely, it does not have the facilities to print all the news, but its staff will endeavor to high light the significance to you, the readers, of news developments as they effect you. To accomplish this, the News has recruited a news staff which we confidently believe will develop into a team which will have few equals in Montana. Next week we'll tell you more about them.

Our plan is to develop a new style for a weekly paper. Of course, it is the same basis as that adopted by any paper, but we have

copied some ideas from the weekly news magazines. Each week there will be significant articles on business and industry, agriculture, government, church, home, school, leisure, people, medicine, society, and editorial opinion. Those will be planned with the definite purpose of providing something of interest for everyone. The material will be gathered from authoritative sources, here or elsewhere.

The Yellowstone News does not start from scratch. It has the advantage of a firm foundation of the readers of the Midland Review and the Herald. In the years to come we hope by teamwork and effort to retain the old and make many, many more friends.

However, we would be derelict if we neglected to express our sincere thanks for the many, many new subscribers, the support of old and new advertisers, and the understanding of all, including the editorial, advertising, and mechanical staff, during this hectic reorganization period. But we are on our way. Thanks everyone.

F. J. M.

Address by Hon. Frank Carlson, of Kansas, July 23, at Chautauqua Institution, Chautauqua, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of the Forty-fifth Congressional District, which I have been privileged and proud to represent, have been honored by the appearance of Senator FRANK CARLSON, of the State of Kansas, on the program of the Chautauqua Institution at Chautauqua, N. Y., on July 23, 1951. The Senator delivered a notable address entitled "Current Problems and How They Affect Our Daily Lives."

The true spirit of Americanism runs through the warp and woof of this great address, so characteristic of the spiritual and patriotic fervor of Senator CARLSON in his private and public life. He has served his great State with marked distinction in the House of Representatives; then as Governor of the State of Kansas, and now as United States Senator from his State.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting excerpts from the address of Senator CARLSON delivered July 23 at Chautauqua, N. Y.:

When we consider how fortunate we are to live in the ways of democracy—instead of the ways of dictatorship, we can see that this is indeed a time to count our blessings, to assess our heritage, and to chart our course for the future. Thomas Jefferson might have written today the letter he wrote to James Monroe from Paris in 1785. His trip to Europe made him—as it has so many people since—acutely aware of the beauties of his own country, "its soul, its climate, its equality, liberty, laws, people, and manners. My God, how little do my countrymen know what precious blessings they are in possession of, and which no other people on earth enjoy."

Our heritage comes from many sources. Through the centuries men have fought for the basic philosophy embodied in great documents: in the Magna Carta, the Bill of

Rights, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution of the United States.

Running through these documents is insistence upon the idea that men can defend themselves against arbitrary power and tyranny if they have a government of laws and not of men.

It seems to me that too few people stop to count their blessings and ask why they should be favored over other people with the most comforts and the highest standard of living in the world.

Let me again remind you, the American people with less than one-fifteenth of the world's population and residing on about 6 percent of the world's land area produce 50 percent of the wealth, consume 50 percent of the goods, and own 50 percent of the gold.

When we look closely at the ingredients of American greatness, we might ask ourselves whether it came as the result of the abundant resources placed by God within our boundaries; but then again we are reminded that Russia has even more resources than we, and it hasn't made them a great nation.

We might credit our greatness with our land and our climate, our private enterprise system, our system of general education, or our great inventions, but other nations have these.

All of these things help to make America a great nation and give us a high standard of living, but it took one more ingredient which is more or less peculiar to America—that is a willingness to work. Our national philosophy, which has glorified production, plus the willingness to work, plus a system that lets the individual apply his best talents and energies to the resources at hand and reap the rewards of his ingenuity have made America.

Totalitarian governments are opposed to our idea of life. They not only ridicule but seek to obliterate the basic truths of religion. And yet, today the whole world needs a total mobilization of all its moral forces. Moral rearmament would go much further to save the world than military might, much as the latter seems needed now as a police force to keep the peace.

Certain it is that if we are to preserve and save our sacred freedoms we must have a strong, courageous, and God-fearing people.

More than vast resources, rich mines, fertile fields, and immense industries—more than these are needed to make a great nation. The real worth and wealth of a nation rests in its people, and in the loyalty, patriotism, and righteousness of the people. The greatest resource of our Nation is an educated people who can play an intelligent part in giving their consent to be governed. They need to know what is going on in the world today so that they can do something about it. Time and again we have found that the broad base of education in a democracy is the real reservoir upon which we can draw our leadership.

The most distinguishing feature of our problems is that when they are discussed in general terms they seem to sound like so many words unless they are specifically spelled out in their concrete effects upon the individual. Most of our problems—be they national or international—are occurring in the context of the conflict between democracy and communism. It is often the case that discussions of this subject are philosophical and to the man on the street the language probably sounds "high falutin." He is far away from the places where decisions are made, and it is some time before these decisions begin to be felt in terms of his daily living.

We must have a clear conception of the nature of democracy, of the nature of communism, and of the issues involved in their conflict. If we have a pretty clear picture

of the total situation and of the underlying philosophy and probable consequences of certain actions it will be possible for us to use better judgment in making our decisions. Instead of dealing with each event as if it were isolated, and instead of dealing with each one in a piecemeal fashion—so that the right hand does not know what the left hand is doing—we shall be able to place each problem as it arises in a setting which will permit us to hue to a straight line toward our goal.

Now this is a case where you as an individual are going to be affected whether you do something about Soviet expansion or you sit still and do nothing. If you do nothing, ultimately you will lose your freedoms which have been won during centuries of struggle. If you just sit still and take no action, the day will come when you cannot speak, cannot read, cannot write, and cannot print what you believe in. You will be watched by spies, your social life will be regimented, and you will not be able to work where you want at the job you want—you will not even be able to move freely around the country. You will either fit into a regimented pattern dictated by the state, or you will be liquidated.

This alternative has been decisively rejected by the free men of the western world. Reluctantly at first, because we tried—and are still trying—to cooperate for world peace through the United Nations, but finally with firm conviction, we took up arms against a sea of troubles. We decided that the only way to meet Soviet pressure was by vigorous counterpressure.

The greatest mistake the Kremlin made was in 1945 when a small group of the Communist Party refused to take the hand the United Nations held out in friendship. It would have been to their advantage ultimately to adopt a philosophy of coexistence in the world instead of stubbornly adhering to an ideology which does not solve the problems of mankind but only reduces men to slaves of the state. For democracy can never die. The desire for freedom is too innate a characteristic of man to be obliterated from his make-up. The idea that every man's soul counts is a Christian concept upon which religion is based; and the idea that every man's vote counts in having his say as to how he shall be governed is a democratic concept. We may have to fight again for these ideas, and it may be dismaying that we have to do this instead of spending all of our time and energy upon constructive activities; but we need never fear that the ultimate victory will be on our side.

We are faced with the problem of properly dividing our efforts between production for defense and for our normal civilian needs. Our defense program, now taking 10 percent of our total production, is expected to consume 20 percent. Orders for defense production have been placed for \$42,000,000,000, but only \$10,000,000,000 have been delivered thus far. By June 1952, it is estimated that the rate of delivered orders will be about \$4,000,000,000 a month.

Prices rose, and suddenly we were faced with the problems of inflation and of controls. People are concerned about the rising prices for food and they wonder how they are going to pay their grocery bills. One thing is certain—we cannot blame the farmer for this situation. Instead of being overpaid, as some people contend, farmers are actually earning less for labor, investment, and their management ability than other groups in our Nation. If you work an hour in a factory, you may not be able to buy as much of certain items as you did in the past, but you can buy more food. I suppose the reason we notice the increased prices more than ever is because we are eating more and better food than ever before. It is interesting to note, however, that you

pay as much to get the food marketed and distributed as you do to the farmer who produces it.

There is so much discussion on the high cost of living and it seems as though the farmer is being made the scapegoat for all the ills that beset the consumer.

Let's look at the record taken from the Bureau of Labor Statistics and see what is happening to the farmer's income.

In 1947 the farmers of this Nation received \$17,800,000,000 out of a total national income of \$198,700,000,000. In 1948 they received \$16,500,000,000 out of a total national income of \$223,500,000,000. In 1949 they received \$14,100,000,000 out of a total national income of \$216,800,000,000, and in 1950 they received \$13,000,000,000 out of a total national income of \$235,600,000,000.

In other words, the income of the farmers in this Nation has not kept pace with the continuing rise and increase in national income, but is decreasing year by year.

The income of farm people, based on an hourly wage dropped from 94 cents an hour in 1947 to 69 cents in 1950. This despite the fact that we have a fixed minimum wage of 75 cents per hour in the Nation.

During that same period retail trade workers averaged \$1.17 an hour, manufacturing workers \$1.46, and building construction workers \$2.03.

The farmers of this Nation receive an average return of 5 percent on investments in plant and equipment, which is less than one-third of the return that corporations realized on their capital in 1950.

Farmers are engaged in war production when they turn out food and fiber for our troops and our allies, just as surely as any business that has a defense contract with the Government. And it costs more to get above normal production from a businessman or wage earner.

Will a truce in Korea mean that we can sit back and forget the problems of inflation and taxation that are before us? Can we assume that communism has been contained and that we can go our separate paths in peace? I do not think so. The events in Korea are not the first with which we have had to deal; neither will they be the last. Aid to Greece, the Berlin airlift, and the Marshall plan were steps taken prior to the Korean aggression. To meet what might happen hereafter, we must have strength and stability so that the men in the Kremlin will understand—and correctly estimate—our determination to defend the entire periphery of the free world.

When the Communists criticize, it is for the purpose of tearing down. When we criticize conditions which have developed and created problems, it is for the purpose of improving our Government.

If we investigate crime, racketeering, and dope, it is not because we want to tear down our governmental structure—it is because we wish to see the problem clearly, and determine what part of the Congress can play by passing laws which will solve or mitigate the problem.

We are always working to improve and strengthen our democracy.

When we investigate crime and its connection with government, it is not with the idea of tearing down the basic structure of our society. Our motive in holding hearings on the possibility of establishing a Commission on Ethics in the Federal Government is to define conditions which will result in an improvement of personnel. The newspapers often tend to overemphasize the sensational or bad aspects of the news they are reporting, and this, too, may have an effect upon your psychology—upon your confidence in the Government.

It is, therefore, necessary for us as individuals to keep in mind that just as a farmer has to spray for certain insect pests and watch his crop carefully in order

to bring in a good harvest—so in every other sphere of human activities, we have to prevent locusts, boll weevils, borers, and blight from affecting our human resources.

Many people become mentally ill because they have fears. And our world is now so geared that we seem to have more and more things for people to be afraid of. The fear of atomic bombs, and now the fear of the even deadlier hydrogen bomb has set people all over the country to building bomb-proof shelters.

Insofar as possible, by preventive steps, people must be kept from living their lives in fear. The answer to our problems is not to escape or to get scared. People must have a faith and a determination which will make them strong to meet any situation which arises.

It is not enough to go to school while you are young and then to stop learning about what is going on in the world. Your opinion will not mean much unless it is based upon knowledge and unless you use that knowledge to bring about desirable results. As citizens it is your responsibility to give your consent to be governed by voting wisely, and by keeping in touch with the lawmakers who are formulating policies to guide our future actions. You should be informed as to what our policies are after they are decided upon. You must strengthen democracy by vigorous participation in all its functions. You have to play an active part in extending democracy and perfecting it both at home and abroad.

In these days when we are being tested, we must keep faith with our Christian heritage which gives us belief in the human personality and the possibility of developing a society based upon the brotherhood of man, equal justice under law, and peace under God.

Natural Gas Decision

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the recent decision of the Federal Power Commission rejecting and disclaiming jurisdiction in rates for natural gas at the source. In the recent Phillips Petroleum Co., of Bartlesville, Okla., decision, the Commission may well be setting a precedent whereby the Commission would claim lack of jurisdiction over many producers and gatherers of natural gas. The effect such a precedent may have on the cost of natural gas to the consumers demands our immediate attention.

For 3 weeks this august body was deliberating on ways and means to curb inflation and the steady rise of the cost of living. Could it be that this body will turn its back on a flagrant omission of effort by the Federal Power Commission to do its just share in controlling wellhead rates? Are we going to allow special interests, during these critical times of defense and economic strife to enter into inequitable profits through the back door, opened wide by a body of five men directly answerable to this Congress.

In the Eighty-first Congress the natural-gas profiteers by Presidential veto were denied the special legislation which would make possible an unjust share at the expense of the natural gas consuming public. What the President of the United States and Congress would not allow to be railroaded into law against the public interest, the Commission has accomplished by its recent decision.

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal very pointedly and effectively reviews the natural gas issue and the shocking gas decision, which I recommend to my colleagues:

A SHOCKING GAS DECISION

The Federal Power Commission has now declared the so-called independent natural gas producers the winners in a fight that those same producers had already lost in the White House, in Congress, in the courts, and in the minds of the FPC's own staff.

The losers are the Nation's 40,000,000 natural gas consumers—including those in Milwaukee and Wisconsin.

In ruling that it has no jurisdiction over the wellhead rates charged by the Phillips Petroleum Co. to the Michigan-Wisconsin Pipeline Co., the FPC has made a shambles of gas-rate controls.

Rates to the consumer are now controlled by State public service commissions. Rates from pipeline firms to distribution companies are controlled by the FPC. Refusal by the FPC to control wellhead rates to pipelines makes the pipeline and consumer rate controls meaningless. As we pointed out previously, it makes the FPC and the State public service commissions responsible for a horse that has already started to run away.

The FPC apparently voted 4 to 1 not to take jurisdiction in the Phillips case. Commissioner Thomas C. Buchanan, who has fought for protection of natural-gas consumers, dissented. Mon C. Wallgren, chairman, led in the scuttling of controls. In effect, he violated the policy of President Truman, his friend and the man who appointed him to office.

A year ago Congress passed the Kerr bill which would have removed independent producers, who control 85 percent of the Nation's natural-gas reserves, from FPC control. President Truman vetoed the bill and Congress failed to override the veto. In his veto message President Truman warned that FPC control must be maintained over wellhead rates "to prevent unreasonable and excessive prices which would give large windfall profits to the gas producers at the expense of the consumers."

Wallgren and his three fellow commissioners have agreed to give the producers those windfall profits.

The shocking FPC decision was forecast by the attitudes of Wallgren and his fellow commissioners when Wisconsin and Milwaukee officials were arguing the Phillips case before them. Repeatedly Wallgren bitterly attacked the Wisconsin public service commission. He criticized the FPC's own staff members when they argued against the Phillips company and for consumers.

A year ago both Wallgren and Commissioner Claude Draper seemed opposed to the Kerr bill and its surrender to the gas interests. What has happened to change their minds? Why have they lost interest in protecting the consumers of natural gas?

Incidentally, Wallgren's vote is particularly interesting in view of a statement he made in a letter to Governor Kohler of Wisconsin. In that he cited a supreme court decision which, he said, indicated that the FPC did have power to control wellhead rates. He voted against that decision.

Wisconsin and Milwaukee must, of course, appeal the FPC decision to the courts. To fail to do so would be to throw in the sponge in a fight that is important to every natural gas user in the country. To fail to appeal would be to hand the gas producers their greatest victory and open the way for them to raise gas prices—and their already fabulous profits—as much as the traffic will bear.

Another Chance To Rescue Our Failing German Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of July 11, 1951:

ANOTHER CHANCE TO RESCUE OUR FAILING GERMAN POLICY

Our Government has taken the only sensible course in proposing an end to the state of war with Germany. We need not expect, however, that the action will greatly improve our relations with the German people or make it much easier to enlist their support in a united defense against Soviet power. We are merely making the best of a pretty poor situation.

The Soviets long since adopted the technique which Hitler found so successful in dealing with German opinion. They have made a strong emotional appeal to the instincts of the race, with no regard for honesty or consistency. Thus Stalin, whose policies have resulted in splitting Germany in half, has constantly posed as the champion of German unity—on his own terms. Those terms would make it impossible for Germany to operate as a democratic nation. But millions of Germans, used to long years of totalitarian rule, feel little reluctance about buying unity at the price of liberty.

The western nations, on the other hand, have fallen into all sorts of awkward positions in trying to pursue an honest course. The dominant occupying power has naturally been the United States. It is also the power with the least experience in dealing with the subtle problems of an occupation. We started out with a stern rule against fraternization. Then we veered all the way over to a policy of trusting friendship, before the German people had had a chance to work their way back to our respect.

Our greatest successes in Germany have been based on shows of strength. Biggest of all was the airlift. Citizens of Berlin have just dedicated a memorial arch to Allied airmen who lost their lives in this awesome demonstration of power, determination, and technical skill.

Our worst failures have developed in those areas in which we have followed democratic practices that the Germans neither understand nor appreciate. They have felt only contempt for the slow, tortuous process of American justice, which has kept Nazi war criminals alive through an endless series of appeals. Every German knows that American planes destroyed whole districts of Berlin, Hamburg, and Frankfurt. Hardly a German realizes that the American taxpayer has spent over \$4,000,000,000 since the war to restore his country.

We have handled most ineptly the question of rearmament, letting the Germans

feel that we must have their help and will sell our allies down the river to obtain it. Millions of Germans are genuinely burned out and disillusioned by the experiences of World War II. It is natural for them to take an attitude of deep cynicism toward any move to integrate Germany with the west, the mood of "ohne mich" (don't count on me). Many other Germans of the old Nazi turn of mind are deliberately using this national spirit of defeatism as a means of extracting the maximum price from America for rearmament. Their final objective is to get German units, under German command, equipped at American expense. Hitler's victims in western Europe are passionately opposed to this little game of blackmail.

It is still not too late to gain something from revising our policies in Germany. Our objective there is not to win fulsome friendship from people who so lately were slaughtering our troops. Our objective is to win the respect of the Germans by a policy of coolness, intelligence, fairness, and dignity. Only such qualities can achieve any useful cooperation from a people who so recently suffered from the corrupting disease of nazism.

The Lesson Sergeant Ingman Has Taught Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech:

THE LESSON SERGEANT INGMAN HAS TAUGHT US—SPEECH MADE BEFORE CELEBRATION HONORING KOREAN HERO, SGT. EINAR INGMAN, WINNER OF CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR, HELD AT PRIDE ATHLETIC PARK, JULY 15, 1951, AT TOMAHAWK, WIS.

(By D. C. Everest)

Mr. John F. O'Mella, Sgt. Einar Ingman, Col. Joe Foss, Pvt. Clayton Slack, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, as one who has been a student of American history from early boyhood, I have developed what might be called a hero-worship complex. Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, or any of the others who I thought contributed to the greatness of this country were among my heroes, and I didn't overlook Horatio Alger. Hero worship ties in closely with love of country.

This country would not be in the mess it is today if more people had developed a similar complex. I have always looked up to men of action; people who have the know-how, the guts to carry on, and the willingness to accept responsibility. I never thought I would have the honor and opportunity to pay homage to a young man from my neighborhood, and two others from other localities who today are members of the most exclusive club in this country. Living members of the Congressional Medal of Honor Club are mighty few among 153,000,000 people.

What they have done to win this most-coveted honor has been through their own efforts. No pull, no political preferment, no shenanigan of any kind, nothing but their commanding officers' factual report of what they did by their own effort in defense of their country or in the aid of those in their military unit has won them the highest honor awarded anyone for any service.

To Sgt. Einar Ingman I would say, "I salute you and extend the felicitations and congratulations not only of industry, but of every red-blooded American on the recognition of your service through congressional action and the presentation of the Congressional Medal of Honor by the President of the United States. Few have that distinction, and few have lived to personally receive the greatest award in the gift of the Congress of the United States.

"You must get a great thrill in returning to your home community with such a magnificent record and just recognition of your efforts. It must also impress you with the fact we are living in a rapidly changing world.

"Three years ago when you entered the military forces you were Einar Ingman's boy; today Einar Ingman, Sr., is just the father of Sgt. Einar Ingman, winner of the Congressional Medal of Honor. My guess is he loves it. I know I would under similar circumstances."

The old saying, "The boy is father of the man," is again exemplified in this instance. But how did the boy accomplish it? He grabbed opportunity by the tail, he used his head, he assumed responsibility, with his reorganized outfit he fought off a horde of the most despicable enemy we have ever encountered, he accomplished his mission, and through the recommendation of his commanding officer has now received the highest award in the gift of the Nation.

We cannot all do that, but we can use the same basis of thinking regardless of what we are doing. Speaking for industry, which is the backbone of the country both in peace and war, I say now that industry and every other peaceful pursuit, including agriculture, needs men of the caliber and resourcefulness of Sgt. Einar Ingman, Col. Joe Foss, and Private Slack.

People who are willing to do things above and beyond the call of duty, people who recognize opportunity and have the fortitude to accept responsibility and thus continue to build up a productive nation which, by its own stature, may not be forced to continuously engage in military operations. Concurrent with that, our Government should never again allow the criminal procedure of reducing the military forces, as was done in 1945-46, to a mere skeleton. While there is nothing we desire more than peace, we must still deal with an international situation and no one can guarantee the mental or moral stability of those who control all the countries on earth. We must be able to protect ourselves against any aggression.

Again, Sergeant Ingman, I extend my sincere congratulations. When you have finally been discharged from service and you have a desire to become associated with industry, if you do not find what you want in your home town, come and see me.

Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent request to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to say that I have the privilege to represent one of the largest cotton-producing sections of Louisiana; as a matter of fact, my home parish—county—is sometimes first in

the production of cotton in Louisiana; therefore I am sure that you realize my interest in and obligation to the cotton farmers of my district.

Mr. Speaker, on yesterday one of the largest cotton farmers in my parish telephoned me to say that in about 2 weeks the cotton crop would begin to come to the market and that the farmers were not satisfied with the present price and the prospects of obtaining a fair price commensurate with the cost of production.

I was told that seed, fertilizer, insecticides, wages, farm machinery, and everything in connection with the cost of producing cotton has cost the cotton farmers more than ever before in the history of the industry.

This farmer told me that he was speaking for the majority of the producers in the area and that, while they have responded patriotically to the call of the Government in increasing the planting to the maximum of their land, utilizing every worker available to help meet the Government goal, they feel that they will not receive the proper protection in the marketing of the crop and that it will be the same old story—the price will be low, even to the point of being below the cost of production, when the cotton is marketed and that, after the cotton has been taken from the producer, the price will then skyrocket and instead of the farmer obtaining a price commensurate with the value and world market price the speculator and middleman will be the one to reap the rewards of their labor.

Mr. Speaker, I have discussed the situation with my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], who is chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, and while he is fully aware of the support and loan programs of the Government naturally he stated that while he is sympathetic to the problem that there was nothing further that could be done under the law except for the farmers to hold their cotton until they were able to receive a price which they thought they should receive.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, this is probably all that could be said about the situation; however, it must be remembered that the majority of the farmers have to borrow money to make the crop and that just as soon as the crop is ready for the market they have to sell the cotton in order to immediately pay back the money they have borrowed to make the crop.

Mr. Speaker, I thought I would call the attention of the Congress to this situation, as I think that the cotton producer should have all the consideration that all of the other industries have.

In connection with the subject, Mr. Speaker, I include in this statement a copy of a release from the Louisiana Agricultural Extension Service in regard to the 1951 cotton crop, as follows:

[From the Opelousas Daily World of July 19, 1951]

IN 1951—A GREAT COTTON PRODUCTION

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is another in the series of editorials prepared by the editorial staff of the Louisiana Agricultural Extension Service for publication in the State

press on farming in its relation to national issues.)

The latest USDA crop forecast indicates that cotton growers have responded generously to the Government's request for greater production this year. Plantings this spring are estimated at 29,510,000 acres, which, allowing for the normal abandonment of acreage, would mean a crop of about 29,000,000 acres as compared to only 18,600,000 acres in 1950.

If weather and insect conditions are normal, growers may harvest 18,000,000 bales as compared to only 10,000,000 bales last year and a 1951 goal of 16,000,000.

Indications are that the growers, in turn, will be rewarded for their effort in planting a bumper crop. Demand probably will be good, whether the war in Korea is settled or not. The trade recently has been bidding about 35 cents a pound for the new crop and it is expected that Government price supports will be between 32 cents and 35 cents. If the harvest totals as much as 18,000,000 bales the crop may be worth \$3,000,000,000, an all-time record, compared to \$2,000,000,000 last year.

In this emergency, as in many others, the farmer has come through. Barring catastrophic weather and insect conditions, the cotton growers will produce enough to assure the free world that there will be no shortage of its most important fiber.

And there is no indication so far that the production of food and other vital crops will suffer because of the big increase in cotton. It represents an added effort on the part of cotton growers.

Food and fiber are as important to the national defense as bullets. The ability of American farmers to meet record needs with record production is one of the greatest sources of American strength.

Is the Gamble With Spain Worth the Risk to Us?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of July 19, 1951:

IS THE GAMBLE WITH SPAIN WORTH THE RISK TO US?

What do we hope to get out of Franco that will offset the hostility of all our North Atlantic partners to any open alliance with dictator-ridden Spain? The answers to this question cover a wide range. There are those who believe that to be anti-Communist is enough, and that Franco's record on this score alone entitles him to our warm friendship and to billions for armaments, food, and reconstruction. This has never been the view of Europeans who have seen fascism in action more plainly than we have, and it is a view which finds no sympathy outside the few hidebound rightists in all countries.

The prevailing excuse for an American deal with Franco, however, lacks even the distorted idealism of the fanatic anti-Communists. It admits that Franco is a tyrant, that Spain is an oppressed and near-bankrupt nation. But we need his army, his bases, and ports, and the natural bastion of the Pyrenees on our side even if it costs us some sniping from our friends and a lot of

money that will need to be diverted from free Europe. This is the military man's viewpoint and it is fairly obvious that the last few months have made it—however reluctantly—the view of the State Department as well. Thus official sanction is given the visit of Admiral Sherman to Madrid, and both Britain and France are moved to express their open disapproval of the possible bilateral deal in the making.

Opportunism must certainly be the keynote of any United States-Spanish agreement and it is an opportunism that every Communist agitator in Europe can use against us. It is difficult to justify politically, moreover, since even the nations which have most to lose in another world war openly regret an alliance with Franco at the risk of antagonizing us.

Morally the agreement we seem to be approaching is indefensible. How about its military value, our principal talking point? In the opinion of all reliable observers we should be required to spend billions on the crumbling ports, the scattered and inadequate airfields, the ill-equipped and corrupt armies of Spain. Since even our resources are not inexhaustible, will these billions come from sums that might equip our real allies? And suppose the world is wise and fortunate beyond its deserts, and war can be avoided for that decade that George F. Kennan thinks so all-important: What will Spain do with its equipment, its revitalized army, its planes and tanks? Every accession of strength or importance by Franco in the past 10 years has brought an outburst of bluster and threats and an increase of terror at home. It is only reasonable to suppose that any strength we give or lend to Franco will be used first of all to repress the Spanish people and to strengthen the hold of dictatorship, and secondly to meddle and threaten in every delicate situation where jackal tactics might strengthen Spanish power or make possible a Spanish threat.

There is no natural friendship between the American and the Spanish Governments. There is only a possibility of a temporary tolerance for mutual gain. We would gamble on our possible gain; Franco would be strengthened and enriched. We would gamble on weakening alliances based on real mutual interest, with no certainty of winning thereby even one convinced friend. And in the long run we would betray the wretched Spanish people for the sake of a corrupt regime which now holds them down by force and which would use our aid to strengthen that force. When all the considerations are weighed, what can we gain from Spain that can compare with what we risk losing?

After Having Achieved Innumerable Victories and Honors for the 347 Missions and 1,500 Combat Hours He Flew in World War II, Col. "Pop" Polifka, United States Air Force Aerial Expert and One of America's Most Beloved and Popular Airmen, Has Made the Supreme Sacrifice in the Skies Over Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it distressed me greatly to learn

that Col. Karl C. "Pop" Polifka, one of the most courageous and distinguished Air Force pilots ever to fly the heavens, made the supreme sacrifice last week in Korea.

Karl Polifka died as Karl Polifka would want to die—in aerial battle and in defense of the flag and country he loved so well. Not alone will the people of Watsonville and elsewhere in my district mourn his passing—but Americans everywhere who knew him will pay tribute to his untimely passing.

As an airman, he was unsurpassed. Probably the greatest reconnaissance flier in the history of military aviation, there are few whose achievements in the air equal those of this great aerial expert who, in World War II, flew 347 missions in the Pacific alone.

It was Colonel Polifka who sought out and spotted the Japanese fleet at Rabaul, and it was information furnished by this intrepid United States Air Force flier which enabled the Navy to mass its fleet in order to engage the Japanese in the Battle of the Coral Seas.

Karl Polifka was equally at home in all parts of the world. Born at Raton, N. Mex., he spent considerable of his life in Colorado, then moved to California, and for 4 years attended the university of that State.

Upon graduation from flying school on June 16, 1938, he was appointed second lieutenant in the Air Reserve, and on October 1, 1938, was appointed second lieutenant in the Regular Army Air Corps. He was graduated from the Air Command and Staff School in 1947, and from the Air War College in 1950.

As commanding officer of the Mediterranean Allied Photographic Reconnaissance Command and the Ninetieth Reconnaissance Wing, he pioneered new techniques of bomb-strike and bomb-damage-assessment photography. This was accomplished with a forward-facing oblique camera, and his method thereafter established the operational accuracy of fighter-bomber units engaged in bombing attacks as well as furnishing immediate targets for planning further attack.

Additionally thereto, extensive low-altitude enemy line communications as well as visual and photographic reconnaissance was performed in penetrating the Rhone Valley to a depth of 200 miles, and furnishing information vital to the landing-force commander.

Colonel Polifka received many honors, including the following military decorations: Distinguished Service Cross; Silver Star; Legion of Merit, Distinguished Flying Cross; Air Medal with one oak-leaf cluster; Army Commendation Ribbon; Papuan Campaign Ribbons, with citation for Nineteenth Bomb Group; Distinguished Unit Citation, Eighth Photo Squadron; Croix de Guerre with gold star and palm.

Karl Polifka was a true American. He was warm-hearted, friendly, congenial, helpful, a gentleman respected alike by his brother officers and enlisted men.

All who knew him, loved him. Any-one hearing the name "Pop" in the Air Force, immediately thought of Polifka.

"He was a grand fellow." He was "friendly," he was "a nice guy," and "the greatest photo reconnaissance man in the Air Force"—"far from a military martinet, but he really knew his trade." There are but a few of the things that were spoken of him.

Mr. Speaker, Karl Polifka hated war and he hated destruction. I know that he freely sacrificed his life for the principles which he cherished and that, in fighting in Korea under the flag of his native America and the United Nations, he felt in his heart that he was fighting a war to end war.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the membership of this House to extend my remarks, and include therein the Associated Press dispatch, date-lined Tokyo, July 8, telling of the passing of this brave son of America:

COLONEL POLIFKA KILLED IN KOREA; AERIAL EXPERT—RECONNAISSANCE PIONEER FLEW 347 MISSIONS IN PACIFIC IN WORLD WAR II

Tokyo, July 8—Col. Karl C. Polifka, of Watsonville, Calif., a pioneer and key figure in military aerial reconnaissance, has been killed in action in Korea, the United States Far East Air Forces announced Sunday.

Colonel Polifka's plane was hit by enemy small-arms fire from the ground and crashed in hostile territory. His body was recovered by an Air Force helicopter under heavy enemy fire.

An airman who witnessed the incident from another plane said Colonel Polifka maneuvered his craft back to within a few miles of friendly lines after it was hit. He bailed out, the witness said, but his parachute caught on the tail of his plane.

Colonel Polifka commanded the Sixty-seventh Tactical Reconnaissance Wing. In World War II he commanded the First Photo Reconnaissance Unit in the Southwest Pacific. He flew 347 combat missions in that war and won many decorations.

IN FIRST PLANE OVER TRUK

Colonel Polifka was in the first American aircraft to fly over the Japanese stronghold of Truk in May 1942. He earlier had spotted the Japanese fleet at Rabaul, enabling the United States Navy to mass for the Battle of the Coral Sea.

Assigned to the Mediterranean theater, he led his reconnaissance unit in photographing Cassino, the Anzio landing and ferreting out the enemy's secrets from the Balkans and France all the way to Poland.

The last Lightnings and Mosquitoes used in reconnaissance could photograph a 7-by-400-mile strip of territory, and in 1 month alone in 1944 the unit turned out 1,250,000 prints. In 8 months, the unit flew thousands of sorties to map 163,000 square miles.

At one time, Army officers estimated that the unit was operating the biggest photographing, processing and printing plant in the world, one which in civilian life would represent a \$100,000,000 business in terms of personnel and equipment.

Ogden Press Reverses Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of these remarks, I append an editorial from the Times-West Virginian,

of Fairmont, W. Va., from its issue dated July 22, 1951. This editorial quotes at length from the News, of Parkersburg, W. Va. Both of these newspapers are members of the Ogden chain. It is noteworthy that the Ogden chain at long last sees the value of the St. Lawrence seaway, and its favorable influence on the economy of our State, particularly the northern section of our State. It is noteworthy that this chain at long last sees how this and related projects will expedite the marketing of our West Virginia coal, the best in the world, for use in the production of steel.

In April 1933, in my maiden speech on the floor of the House of Representatives, I announced myself as in favor of this project on the major premise that it would help materially the entire economy of West Virginia. In subsequent elections the Ogden press spearheaded the opposition against me, and one of the grounds was my support of this project. I am especially pleased, therefore, to see that this newspaper chain has at long last seen the light.

The editorial follows:

THE SEAWAY

Opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway, which has been powerful for more than three decades, may now find new forces working to bring about conclusion of this great project which would bring oceangoing vessels from the Atlantic to the Great Lakes.

According to the Washington Star, the M. A. Hanna Co., of Cleveland, has enlisted five "little steel" companies to assist in its development of iron ore in Labrador. The steel industry must turn to new sources of ore, for the vast deposits of the famed Mesabi Range are no longer vast. If similar demands were made on the Mesabi Range as were made during World War II, this source of supply would not be sufficient to keep the blast furnaces going.

Editor Herman Everett Gleske, of the Parkersburg News, refers to this new interest in the St. Lawrence seaway because of Labrador iron ore, and says:

"How the picture has changed relative to steel mills in the Ohio Valley does not seem to be generally realized, in connection with the long-projected St. Lawrence seaway. Could the seaway be built in time, the Lake Erie ore unloading facilities could still be used, without economic necessity forcing steel mills to make an exodus from the valley in order to get nearer the Atlantic or Gulf seaboard."

The Parkersburg editor then quotes the Washington newspaper and finally concludes:

"If in addition to the seaway, a Lake-to-the-Ohio-River canal could be built, our position vis-à-vis the steel industry in our valley would be superb. There would be an all-water haul from Labrador to Wheeling, Parkersburg, Marietta, New Martinsville, Weirton, Moundsville, St. Marys, Sistersville, Ravenswood, Pomeroy, and Point Pleasant. Furthermore, this route would be highly defensible in time of war, whereas the ocean routes from both Venezuela and Labrador would be highly vulnerable."

"It seems strange that anyone, considering the dangers which now beset our country, would want to go against this project. Our four upper valley Senators, Taft, BRICKER, KILGORE, and NEELY ought to be urged to take a lead in favoring the seaway, and our Members of the House, as well. Our relations with Canada should be considered, too."

Think what this might mean to Fairmont if the Ohio to the Lakes canal could be achieved in addition to the St. Lawrence

seaway. Fairmont now is the head of navigation on the Monongahela River and the future will bring improvement of the locks to permit larger vessels to come all the way to Fairmont. With an Ohio to the Lakes canal and the seaway, Fairmont coal could be shipped by boat all the way to the sea and to Atlantic ports anywhere.

The prospect of being able to travel by water from Fairmont to any great port in the world has fascinating overtones.

Catastrophe Lies in Wake of Uncontrolled Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Humboldt Standard, published at Eureka, Calif., under the date of July 11, 1951. This editorial, entitled "Inflation—Problem of the Day," is very timely, and I desire to call it to the attention of the conference committee which is now considering the price-control bills passed by the House and Senate.

There are provisions in both bills which need modifying and need to be considered in the light of our American free-enterprise system. The context of this editorial, I believe, is in line with the thinking of our people who are well-informed and vitally concerned with the problems and dangers that accompany the inflationary trend.

This well-thought-out editorial, Inflation—Problem of the Day is as follows:

INFLATION—PROBLEM OF THE DAY

Principal issue before Congress at the moment, and before the public for that matter, is the question of what to do about controlling inflation or if, indeed, anything can be done toward keeping prices under control. And even as the public watches, the weekly and monthly reports from agencies that keep tab on price trends continue to show the climb in the cost-of-living that has hampered the purchasing power of the dollar to the lowest point in our history.

Can controls do the job? The administration thinks so, and they are joined in that belief by a great many other persons, in both public and private life.

But controls, of any kind, are foreign to our American way of doing things, and they are at best a palliative, not a permanent cure. Ranged against the opinion of the administration are a good many economists, producers and, likewise, private citizens.

One thing we do know—that during the World War II period, controls did serve to keep prices on most commodities at reasonable levels; it was not until after the war that the real rise in prices began. And we may recall, also, that producers, at the time controls were removed, promised the public that the lifting of the ceilings actually would tend to lower rather than to boost prices. But this promise has not materialized to date.

But another we also know—that controls tend to drive commodities out of the open market and bring about the situation we know as the black market, with the evil

of under-the-counter dealing whereby anyone can buy anything if he has the cash to meet the price.

Somewhere between these two opinions, perhaps, lies the solution. The problem is to find it and to apply it before inflation destroys the economy of both the average person and the Nation at large.

Where and when did inflation begin? There again, answer to the question is somewhat elusive. But there is slight question that it actually had its inception in the financial policies that have been pursued by the Federal Government during the last two decades. The reckless spending of the Government, which began in 1933 as a means of alleviating the depression of that era, started off the entire cycle by giving people generally a false conception of money and credit. Through the years this policy has continued to run counter to sound economic principles through public hand-outs of tax money, padding of the public pay rolls, a "cheap money" practice which has made higher prices and depreciated currency inevitable, through subsidies that guarantee the producer a profit even when the producer is a marginal operator with no business in the field in the first place.

At the source of the evil is the vast maze of Federal lending agencies which together make the Federal Government the greatest source of so-called private credit, coupled with loan policies that also stimulate inflation. Another contributor is the diversion of American products, particularly foodstuffs, to other parts of the world. The Government itself, through its practice of subsidies and purchases of surpluses, has sought to curb the working of the natural laws of supply and demand by attempting to insure high prices to producers and restrict production that in itself creates a supply that will be reflected in lowered costs and prices. Somewhere along the line the private citizen, the so-called little man, has been forgotten.

Admitting that we have inflation with us at the present time, we must also know that we have not yet experienced the full catastrophe that full inflation brings in its wake. We trust that we never shall. But, by the same token, if the inflationary trend should reach its peak, then the Communists will have won the cold war without a shot, for we shall be a wrecked nation.

One thing is clear, controls or no, we must head off this prospect. Similarly, if we do not have controls, then let us have an end to subsidies, the diversions, the innumerable other artificial curbs and governmental extravagance that defeat the principles and the action of natural economic laws.

Confusing the Real Issue Behind Tidelands Oil Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Enterprise-Record, published at Chico, Calif., under the date of July 9, 1951, in connection with H. R. 4484, which would confirm and establish the titles of States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters.

The editorial criticizes an attempt by Columnist Drew Pearson in his column published in this newspaper on July 9, 1951, to cloud the real issue at stake in this controversy. Mr. Pearson would make it appear that the oil companies and three States in particular—California, Texas, and Louisiana—are striving to selfishly retain their titles to submerged oil lands along their borders, to the detriment of the educational institutions of the United States. He would make it appear that scheming and wealthy oil companies and States with selfish interests are attempting to fatten their own larders at the expense of innocent children who must do without the benefits of a free and adequate education.

This is not a fight between oil companies and the Federal Government, it is a righteous attempt on the part of the States to retain what is theirs. The royalties collected by the State of California from the operating oil companies are much greater than royalties collected by the United States Government from similar fields. Our royalties are used for the purchase and maintenance of parks and beaches, and benefit a large segment of our population—as well as the thousands of visitors to our State.

Congress should take action to clear up this controversy by reversing the unfair ruling of the Court and release the impounded fees to the States.

The editorial referred to above, entitled "Oil and Politics," is as follows:

OIL AND POLITICS

Once again Drew Pearson beclouds an issue in search of a villain for his column in today's issue of the Enterprise-Record.

Pearson makes it appear that the tidelands oil controversy is between the Federal Government and the oil companies. However, according to our understanding, the quarrel is a matter of States' rights.

Historically the States have collected royalties from the oil companies for all oil produced from tidelands on their boundaries. The oil companies must pay the royalties either to the States or the Federal Government, depending on who has title to the tidelands.

In recent years the Truman administration preempted title to the States' tidelands and the administration-controlled Supreme Court backed them up. Congress has been trying to prevent this power grab and return control of the tidelands to the States, where they belong. There does not seem to be any earthly reason why California should not control and receive the benefits from her tidelands as she has for the last 100 years.

Pearson would make it appear that anyone who opposes this administration grab is an enemy of education. No one denies that more money is needed to support our educational institutions. However, the worthiness of the cause does not justify the stealing from a few States to support educational institutions in all of the States. Robin Hood reportedly stole from the rich to give to the poor, which made him some kind of a legendary hero, but such practices are frowned upon by modern jurisprudence.

California and the oil companies are doing their share in support of our educational system. When you buy an oil product, taxes represent a far larger proportion of the selling price than is generally realized.

The oil industry is one of the most heavily taxed of all enterprises—as a whole it represents 3 percent of the national income and pays 7 percent of the Federal, State, and local taxes.

Oil actually pays about 200 different kind of taxes, including severance taxes, pipeline taxes, privilege taxes, pump taxes, and so on, which are levied by 180,000 separate taxing jurisdictions throughout the Nation. In 1950, it is estimated, the industry's total tax payments came to \$3,500,000,000.

In that same year, the value of domestic crude oil production at the well was \$5,000,000,000 and the wholesale value of all refined petroleum products was about \$8,000,000,000. Consequently, oil's 1950 tax bill was equivalent to 70 percent of the original value of the basic product, crude, and to 44 percent of the wholesale value of the products resulting from the crude.

This is something to keep in mind when someone tries to make rogues out of our basic industries which have contributed greatly toward making California the great State which it is today.

Taxpayers Pay for Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks a pertinent editorial from the Janesville Gazette, Janesville, Wis., entitled "Social Security From No Rich Uncle." This is an interesting editorial, and the writer certainly points out very clearly that there is no rich uncle except the taxpayers of the United States:

SOCIAL SECURITY FROM NO RICH UNCLE

Duping the public into believing that Uncle Sam is a "rich uncle" whose gold-lined pockets are bottomless has become common practice since 1932. The New Deal and Fair Deal have done their best to persuade citizens to "let Uncle Sam take care of you."

The inference is that Uncle Sam can and will do anything for you that free enterprise can't or won't. The idea is you are to get all you can from Uncle Sam instead of earning your own security. It follows that the social-security checks, conservation checks, unemployment checks, and all the other payments which millions of Americans are getting every month are gifts from Uncle Sam and that the citizen has a right to them, whether or not he does anything for them.

This fraud has gone so far that some unscrupulous businessmen are doing the same thing—telling prospective customers that Uncle Sam has saved up a hoard of gold at Fort Knox or elsewhere which is theirs.

One of these, a Madison insurance company, writes to a Janesville prospect thus:

"Did you ever wish you had a rich uncle who would leave you a fortune? Well, you have—your Uncle Sam. He is the richest uncle in the world, and he has accumulated for you and your family a small fortune—\$12,000, \$18,000, or more—in your social security benefits, if you get full benefit from this act."

The letter then suggests that the company will "make suggestions on guaranteeing that you receive it."

What are the facts?

First, there is no rich Uncle Sam. Any accumulation comes out of the pockets of the worker and his employer, in taxes. No one gives any one anything. The worker and his boss pay hard cash, for years.

Second, the small fortune, it is true, is available if the worker works 40 years, earns

maximum pay 40 years, lives a long life and if his wife, too, lives a long life.

No one, regardless who he is, should be allowed to create the impression that a rich uncle has a fortune to dump into our laps or that they can guarantee it. Such sales talk is pure poppycock, nay unto fraud.

Government has nothing and gives nothing. What it has it takes from the citizens and what it passes out is only what it has taken away. Let's not be fooled.

Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. K. ARMSTRONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, more than 70 years ago Booker T. Washington, America's greatest Negro leader, worked out plans by which the masses of Negroes, with the cooperation of their fellow Americans, could earn for themselves a respected place in the life of the Nation. These plans included such everyday virtues as honesty, efficiency, thrift, cleanliness, truthfulness, racial harmony, and industrial training.

Booker T. Washington lived long enough to prove the soundness of his ideals and teachings which earned for him a place in the Hall of Fame. He did not, however, live long enough to get his teachings sufficiently widespread among his people to achieve the ends he hoped to achieve, that is to have them earn sufficient economic security to stand on their own feet and bear their share of local, State, and national responsibilities to the end that they might merit the Nation's respect.

Six years ago the plantation on which Booker T. Washington was born, a 216-acre tract in Franklin County, Va., was put up for sale. It was purchased by a group of people who believed that the ideals and teachings of Booker T. Washington can help to solve many of today's problems, both for the Negro and the Nation, if put into widespread use. The group secured a charter from the Commonwealth of Virginia under the name of the "Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial." The expressed objective of the organization is "to perpetuate the ideals and teachings of Booker T. Washington." The group is headed by S. J. Phillips, a graduate of the school which Booker T. Washington founded. Associated with him are outstanding men and women of both races. Just how well the memorial has advanced can be judged by the amount of service it renders today to thousands of Negroes of low-educational status.

Following are some of the projects and aims of the organization, which I heartily commend to my colleagues in the House, and to American citizens of good will everywhere:

AIMS AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE BOOKER T. WASHINGTON BIRTHPLACE MEMORIAL

The plantation on which Booker T. Washington was born has been converted into a

center of unselfish service where conscientious Negro men and women work night and day to help in the development of activities and plans designed to help the Negro to stand on his own feet. From this center has been developed a field service which is carrying help and guidance to thousands of Negroes who stand gravely in need of this help. The birthplace of Booker T. Washington has been dedicated as a national shrine by the Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia. The Virginia General Assembly appropriated the first \$15,000 toward its establishment. The memorial is located on Highway 122 in Franklin County. It may be reached by leaving United States Highway No. 220 at Rocky Mount and traveling 16 miles on State Highway 122, or by leaving United States Highway 460 at Bedford, Va., and traveling 24 miles on State Highway 122. National headquarters includes the following:

1. A replica of the slave cabin in which Booker T. Washington was born. This building was constructed by funds appropriated by the Virginia General Assembly and is built on the exact spot where the original cabin stood. It is visited by thousands of people annually.

2. Walter L. Hopkins Hall: A permanent 40 by 60 two-story structure named in honor of the late Attorney Walter L. Hopkins, a member of the Virginia General Assembly, who was the first white man to accept membership on the memorial's board of trustees. This building houses "opportunity students" and makes possible recreational and assembly rooms.

3. Thomas G. Burch Memorial Building: A two-story building, 30 by 60, named in honor of the late Senator Thomas G. Burch who introduced the bill which made possible the coinage of the Booker T. Washington memorial half dollar. This building (under construction) is to replace the administration building and post office which was destroyed by fire during December of 1950.

4. Booker Washington birthplace, Virginia: To have a community named for the noted educator is a great tribute. The center of this community is a second-class United States post office through which millions of pieces of mail pass annually. With each piece carrying the postmark, the public is reminded of a memorial to a great American.

5. Virginia cottage: A modern two and one-half story building which is used for quarters of the president and several workers. This was once a two-room frame building but now it contains twelve rooms with all modern conveniences and a central heating plant.

6. Tuck Hall: Named in honor of Ex-Gov. William M. Tuck, who gave splendid cooperation to the memorial's program. This is a renovated barn which has been preserved in its original exterior form for historical reasons. This houses teachers and workers and provides dining room space.

7. Poultry and farm equipment: Poultry houses, a farm set-up, including modern machinery, thoroughbred animals, and a 30-acre orchard. This serves as a guidance center for thousands of Negro farmers and farm families through the number of meetings, classes, and other activities that are conducted at the birthplace.

8. The memorial driveway: Constructed a two-lane driveway a quarter of a mile long leading into the memorial.

9. Additional land acquired: Acquired 350 acres of land adjoining the birthplace of Booker T. Washington, making a total of 566 acres.

10. Renovations and constructions: Renovated three farm dwellings and barns and constructed fences around the 566 acres of land.

11. Improvements: Installed electric lights and made provisions for sewage-disposal system for all buildings.

12. The Old Burroughs Home: This was the "big house" of plantation days. It was a story and a half frame building which had been renovated to serve as administration building for the memorial. It housed the post office and thousands of dollars' worth of equipment. This building was destroyed by fire in December of 1950. The memorial sustained a loss of \$150,000. The contents of the building were only partially covered by insurance.

EXTENSION SERVICES OF THE BOOKER T. WASHINGTON BIRTHPLACE MEMORIAL

1. The Booker T. Washington Memorial Trade School: Located in Roanoke, Va., 22 miles from Booker Washington Birthplace, Va., the Roanoke branch of the Booker T. Washington Memorial Trade School is one of the Memorial's largest field units. It was established in September of 1948 to offer trade and industrial training opportunities to adult Negroes who did not have such opportunities in their earlier years. It offers courses in auto mechanics, bricklaying, carpentry, beauty culture, radio repair, shorthand, typing, office practice and bookkeeping. Courses for domestic and hotel workers, shoe repair and sewing were also included in its plans. These three latter courses, because of the few registrants, have been temporarily suspended.

The school has graduated more than 200 skilled workers who are at present earning decent livings for themselves and their families. It has a present enrollment of 400 students. The Booker T. Washington Memorial Trade School is the only private school ever to be approved by the State approval agency for the training of veterans according to a statement made by the agency. It is classed as one of the best trade schools in the State.

2. The Booker T. Washington good will hour: America is nothing more or less than the joys and sorrows, the hopes and dreams, the loves and hates, the progress, peace and contentment of its people. Thinking men have established tools through which the thoughts of these people can be guided, influenced for good, and channeled along lines that strengthen the invincibility of the Nation. Chief among these tools is the radio. In keeping with Booker T. Washington's ideals of "letting no man drag him so low as to make him hate his fellowman," the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial, early in its history, thought in terms of building better relationship among Americans of different races and creeds.

To this end the memorial labeled one of the main phases of its four-point program, Inter-Racial Goodwill. Throughout every activity that it sponsors it constantly attempts to get men to work together for their mutual welfare; to understand and look for the best in each other; and to practice goodwill and Christian tolerance toward all men. One of the main tools that it uses to give widespread publicity to this phase of its work is the radio. In 1948 a radio commission was established. It included a number of prominent people. For the past 5 years the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial has maintained year-round good will building radio broadcasts. These are presented each Sunday morning at 9:30 under the caption, "The Booker T. Washington Goodwill Hour." Each broadcast usually includes heart-warming Negro spirituals sung by talented, and in some instances, famous Negro groups from various areas. Well prepared scripts attempt to sell the idea that good will is necessary to the invincibility of our Nation and that the Golden Rule, to be effective, must be practiced toward all mankind, regardless of race or creed.

In addition to the Booker T. Washington Goodwill Hour, which is broadcast regularly as a public service over Station WROV in Roanoke, Va., and WSFA in Montgomery, Ala., the memorial, from time to time, has presented its program over hundreds of broadcasting stations and over the networks.

3. The Booker T. Washington community service clubs: The world is in a process of change. Groups of people everywhere are trying to better their conditions, to make larger contributions to human welfare, to measure up to higher standards, to help themselves to grow in keeping with the times in which they live.

The Negro, like all other racial groups, must think in terms of what he can do to help himself. He needs to look about him in his own community to see what he can do to improve his own condition; to make his contribution to community welfare. The Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial knows that no better tool can be found to help the Negro to help himself than the sane, fundamental teachings of Booker T. Washington applied to daily living.

The Booker T. Washington community service club is designed to carry these teachings to Negroes in areas where they show signs of being needed most. They are self-help clubs, through which members work to improve conditions in their own communities. Each is a link in what is hoped will be a Nation-wide movement through national respect, which will in turn result in a higher type of citizenship.

"There is no defense or security for any of us except in the highest intelligence and development of all." (Booker T. Washington)

4. The Booker T. Washington birthplace demonstration farm and the Macon County farm project: Agriculture furnishes the bulk of employment engaged in by the majority of the 10,000,000 Negroes who live in the South. These are for the most part small farmers whose knowledge of modern farm practices is very limited. Macon County, Ala., and Franklin County, Va., were selected as typical southern rural communities that needed help and guidance in soil building and conservation; plant and seed selection; crop rotation, marketing, and general farm management. In keeping with Booker T. Washington's ideals and ideas of taking help to the worker on the job, the memorial, through a well laid out cropping system, for more than 3 years has sought to show the farmers of these areas how they could make their efforts pay.

The president of the memorial is himself an experienced agriculturist, having served as farm demonstration agent for the States of Alabama and Arkansas and manager of Tuskegee Institute's 2,000-acre farm as well as junior soil conservationist for the Federal Government, gives personal guidance to the manager of this particular project. Just how well these farms are producing may be estimated by a few figures taken from its production sheet during the past 3 years: 6,000,000 plants of certified sweetpotatoes, 1,000,000 pounds of cabbage, 40,000 pounds of poultry products, 10,000 pounds of farm cured meat, 3,000 bushels of sweetpotatoes, 200 tons of hay, 3,000 bushels of wheat, 115 bales of cotton, 3,000 bushels of corn, 2,500 bushels of oats.

This project is equipped with tractors and other modern farm machinery. It is staffed by an efficient farm manager and a force of farm workers who have caught the vision of what the memorial is trying to do to help the farmers of the South. They work with a will to help make a success of the undertaking. Booker T. Washington's admonition to "Cast down your bucket where you are" is being stressed for the benefit of the

farmers who live in Macon County, Ala., and in Franklin County, Va. This particular project is representative of the type of work being carried on through the memorial's agricultural program.

5. The Negro Agricultural Service Center of Georgia: According to recent statistics 10,000 Negro farmers live in the State of Georgia. Like most southern farmers, these farm families need help and guidance if they are to succeed sufficiently to make the standards of American home life and to provide education for their children. As a means of securing such aid for this large group the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial secured the cooperation of the Georgia State Board of Education and a number of outstanding citizens of both races to work together to establish a Negro Agricultural Service Center for the State of Georgia. It is hoped that a center will be established that will be a credit to the spirit of interracial good will that motivated the undertaking, a source of help to the Negro farmers of the area, and an economic asset to the entire area.

6. The George Washington Carver National Monument Foundation: Possibly one of the finest examples of the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial's operations as a "Center of Unselfish Service" is evidenced in the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument Foundation at the birthplace of George Washington Carver in Diamond, Mo. The program of the new organization is as follows:

(1) To help underprivileged Negro youth through opportunity scholarships

(2) To conduct demonstration and research in the field of agriculture and to make surveys on rural life.

(3) To establish George Washington Carver community service clubs.

(4) To promote a program of racial understanding and greater good will, based on the philosophy of Dr. Carver and Booker T. Washington, and to assist other nonprofit Negro educational institutions.

7. Better worker institutes: By way of encouraging right work attitudes and pride in work well done, the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial, during the courses of the year, holds several "Better Worker's Institutes." These are short inspirational courses that consist of demonstrations; informative discussions and helpful addresses that point out the value of efficiency, punctuality, regularity, and dependability; round-table discussions and forums. Certificates of merit are awarded to workers and leaders who stand out because of the contributions they have made to job efficiency or to community welfare.

8. The Burning Bush: The Cavalcade of America, a radio feature of the du Pont Co. last year broadcast a story on the life of Booker T. Washington under the caption "The Burning Bush." By way of cooperation with the program of the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial, the du Pont Co. had transcriptions made of this broadcast and turned them over to the memorial. A well-equipped sound truck has carried this story to thousands of Negro school children in southern areas.

9. The life of Booker T. Washington in motion pictures and drama. The memorial has presented From Slave Cabin to Hall of Fame in dramatic form in several areas. These presentations dealt with the life of Booker T. Washington. They received city-wide acclaim and had the support of such outstanding individuals and organizations as mayors of cities, city boards of education, etc. The memorial has also aroused a national interest in the presentation of a full-length movie on the life of Booker T. Washington. Schools, churches, women's clubs, and representatives of the general public have en-

thusiastically endorsed the idea of such a movie.

10. Helpfulness toward others: The motivating theme of Booker T. Washington's life was helpfulness toward others. In keeping with this theme, the memorial has sought to render unselfish service in the following ways:

(a) It has shared the premiums on the sale of the Booker T. Washington commemorative half dollar with churches, schools, and organizations to help further their programs.

(b) It has cooperated by making its facilities available in various community programs such as making surveys on tuberculosis, blood-bank donations, Red Cross, and community fund projects, etc.

ADDITIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS THAT WILL BE MADE POSSIBLE THROUGH FUNDS REALIZED FROM THE SALE OF THE BOOKER T. WASHINGTON COMMEMORATIVE HALF DOLLAR WHICH WILL BE MINTED UNDER HOUSE AMENDMENT 3176 AND SENATE AMENDMENT 1047

1. The fight against communism: The vast majority of Negroes always have been, and it is our honest opinion, always will be loyal Americans. Because, however, Negroes have been and are targets of constant relentless Communist propaganda as brought out in hearings before the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-first Congress—the board of trustees of the Booker T. Washington birthplace memorial included a fight against the spread of communism in its 1951 program. The main objectives of the fight being to educate Negroes on the evils of communism, to explain its insidious methods of approach; to put them on their guard against Communist agents and propaganda which comes in the disguise of friends to help their cause.

2. A reaffirmation of faith in the ideals and principles of democracy. Concerted, continuous efforts to teach the masses of Negroes the concept upon which our Nation was founded, to hold up the opportunities and advantages which the laws of our land make possible, to the end that there shall be developed among them an unswerving faith in the principles and ideals of our Government as set forth in the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, and the Constitution of the United States.

Wisconsin Call to Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a copy of the Wisconsin Call to Action, as well as several editorials which appeared in Wisconsin newspapers supporting this movement.

The Call to Action is a bipartisan movement, originated early this year in my State with the intent of impressing the people of Wisconsin and, indirectly, the people of the entire Nation, with the desirability and practical necessity of strengthening the United Nations organization. Dr. J. Martin Klotzsche, president of the Milwaukee State Teachers College; Mr. Francis A. Henson, educational director, International Union UAW-A. F. of L.; Mrs. Norbert Klein, in-

ternational relations chairman, Federated Women's Clubs; Mr. Roy Matson, editor, Wisconsin State Journal; Mr. S. F. Shattuck, former member of the board of directors, Kimberly-Clark; and Dr. Merrill Abbey, pastor, First University Methodist Church, Madison, were the members of the original sponsoring committee.

I am fully in agreement with the basic intentions and principles of the Wisconsin Call to Action, for I sincerely believe that the United Nations organization offers the best hope for future peace in the world. I realize that there are certain imperfections in the U. N. Charter and that at present there is a need for stronger unity among its members. Nevertheless, the achievements of the United Nations in the years of its infancy have been notable, and the improvements in its organization have been encouraging. The Acheson plan exemplifies the progressive developments which have occurred in the United Nations.

It is my belief that our strong support of the United Nations and of the North Atlantic Treaty, set up under its Charter, will give added strength to this organization and, with continued progressive revision of the Charter, will lead to the development of the UNO into a workable organization capable of coping with international problems and difficulties.

The Wisconsin Call to Action, I may mention, received wide and enthusiastic support throughout our State. It was embodied in these words:

WISCONSIN CALL TO ACTION

Our country and the entire world stand on the knife edge of disaster.

The U. N., because of Charter limitations, has been unable to prevent aggression or to unite the world in the face of aggression. We are now called upon to choose whether to discard the U. N. because of its limitations or to keep the U. N. and remove its limitations. To discard the U. N. is to resign ourselves to war as the final arbiter of world disputes. It is surely the better part of wisdom to keep the U. N. and endow it with the power it must have to halt aggression and preserve the peace.

Therefore, we, the undersigned citizens of Wisconsin, urge President Truman, in cooperation with the leaders of Congress, to press for immediate adoption within the U. N. of the following proposals:

1. Establishment of a U. N. armed services committee under the jurisdiction of the General Assembly. A civilian leader of worldwide stature should head the committee and act as commander in chief of the U. N. armed forces. To insure full and proportionate sharing by each nation in the burdens of defense, the committee must be empowered to integrate and direct the armed forces of the participating nations. The military powers of the various U. N. members would then be united to meet aggression anywhere in the world as the armed forces of the Atlantic nations are now being united to meet any aggression in Europe.

2. Revision of the U. N. Charter to include these carefully limited powers necessary to compel settlement of international disputes by means other than war: (a) The right to make enforceable laws to control armaments; (b) the right to apply those laws through U. N. courts to individual offenders rather than entire nations, thus stopping aggression

at its source; (c) the right to maintain effective, tyrannyproof armed forces to meet aggression; (d) the right to raise dependable revenue.

The necessary revisions might well be drafted by a Charter review commission appointed under article 22 of the Charter. The revision must include a more adequate method of U. N. representation than the present system of one nation one vote.

The U. N. should be established on the basis of the revised, veto-free Charter as soon as a majority of the nations ratify, even though the Soviet Union or others may refuse. A strong U. N. government, preserving to the nations full jurisdiction over domestic affairs, is the only sure protection against recurring wars.

The cataclysm of war may still be prevented should our Nation follow this policy immediately and vigorously. If full-scale war does again overtake us, this course of action will unite the free world and conclude the conflict with the enduring peace which alone can redeem the terrible cost of victory.

Mr. Speaker, this document was signed by an unusually broad cross section of leaders of public opinion in the State of Wisconsin. In addition, by signing the enclosed Editors' Affirmation of Wisconsin call to action, the editors of numerous newspapers lent their support and greatly contributed to the success of this movement:

EDITORS' AFFIRMATION OF WISCONSIN CALL TO ACTION

We, the undersigned editors of Wisconsin, reaffirm the principles set forth in the Wisconsin call to action. Our news tickers, which rest on the pulse of the world and bring to us events even as they are happening in the most remote places, tell us by that very fact that—

(a) Man can no longer live unto himself in a world knit together as ours is by science and technology.

(b) Neither can man live within the world society without committing suicide unless basic armaments of modern warfare are under the jurisdiction of a common authority, which in turn is controlled by its members.

(c) Such an authority must be so limited in its powers as to reserve to each nation its full domestic sovereignty, else peace would not long exist.

In our opinion, the Wisconsin call to action fully recognizes the above conditions. It sets forth a greatly needed plan for developing the United Nations into an institution that can give man freedom from the tyranny of war and from the despotism of the conqueror.

There is one additional point with respect to the call to action which, in my estimation, should be borne in mind by the membership of this august body. That is that the call to action originated in the State of Wisconsin, which State, in the minds of many persons throughout this Nation, is frequently, although often undeservedly, associated with the idea of very strong political isolationism. The Wisconsin call to action should serve to rectify that erroneous impression.

In conclusion, I wish to commend the sponsoring committee, the editors, and the other prominent citizens of the State of Wisconsin who originated and supported the call to action. I believe that the call merits immediate and earnest consideration of the President of the United States, of Congress, and of all of

the citizens of our great Nation, for it is, in the words of the editors of the Milwaukee Journal "an earnest and courageous expression from thinking people who realize that 'our country and the entire world stand on the knife edge of disaster'."

I wish to commend the following editorial comments on the Wisconsin call to action, which appeared in our State newspapers, to the careful attention of the membership of this body:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of May 31, 1951]

THE CALL TO ACTION

The most heartening thing about the Wisconsin call to action is that it comes out of Wisconsin.

The name of Wisconsin is synonymous with that of blind political isolationism in many parts of the country. The reputation is undeserved, but we are stuck with it nevertheless.

The call to action is a serious, well thought out plea to President Truman and to Congress to put this country back of a program for a stronger United Nations. It is signed by 72 of Wisconsin's prominent citizens from almost every section of the State and representative of most fields of endeavor.

These citizens urge American leadership toward revision of the U. N. Charter so that the world organization can maintain effective armed forces, make enforceable laws to control armaments, raise dependable revenue, and move effectively to compel settlement of international disputes by means other than war. They declare that a strong U. N. government, preserving to member nations full jurisdiction over domestic affairs, is the only sure protection against recurring wars.

One does not have to agree with every detail or underwrite every comma of the Wisconsin call to action in welcoming it as a commendable contribution to the great American debate that is in progress today. It deserves the attention of the President and Congress, and of the U. N. It is an earnest and courageous expression from thinking people of this great Midwestern State, people who realize, as their call says, that "our country and the entire world stand on the knife-edge of disaster."

[From the Appleton Post-Crescent of May 30, 1951]

WISCONSIN CALL TO ACTION

A representative group of Wisconsin citizens has sponsored a petition to the President to press for immediate adoption within the United Nations of certain amendatory proposals to the Charter.

This group has been actuated by the conviction that our country and the entire world stand on the knife-edge of disaster. They then set forth that the United Nations because of charter limitations has failed of its great purpose to halt aggression as well as to unite the world against aggression. Either we must resign ourselves to war, say these gentlemen, or we must keep the United Nations and improve it. In short, clipped sentences, the shortcomings of the United Nations are indicated together with the proposals to cure existing weaknesses. It is suggested that the United Nations might be created into a potent weapon for peace by the establishment of an Armed Services Committee under the jurisdiction of the General Assembly and headed by a civilian leader who would act as the commander in chief of the United Nations Armed Forces. The necessity of a full and proportionate sharing by each nation of the burdens of defense is recognized and, it is said, "the committee must be empowered to

integrate and direct the armed forces of the participating nations."

It is acknowledged, of course, that the United Nations Charter would have to be revised if settlement of international disputes by means other than war is obtainable. Such a revision would include the following powers, carefully hedged about and limited against abuse:

(a) The right to make enforceable laws to control armaments.

(b) The right to apply those laws through United Nations courts to individual offenders rather than entire nations, thus stopping aggression at its source.

(c) The right to maintain effective, tyrannyproof, armed forces to meet aggression.

(d) The right to raise dependable revenue.

Manifestly no one but a lunatic wants war. Manifestly, then, the free world stretches out its arms for a messiah, someone capable of making the beautiful words used by the sponsors stand up and walk. But there is only one thing worse than being a confirmed pessimist in relation to this question and that is to be an optimist without steering lights or rudder.

It demands a great deal of courage to try to set up in confidence a practical and workable system that will insure full and proportionate sharing by each nation in the burdens of defense, in the face of the present war in Korea in which 40 nations belonging to the United Nations have spurned their duty, and done so dishonorably.

Consider what would happen if the United Nations were to try "to raise dependable revenue." Reflect, also, upon what would happen in this world were the United Nations "to make enforceable laws to control armaments," and then really tried to enforce them. Would we not find ourselves immediately upon the battlefield? Do we not know in advance that every honest and genuine effort at peace would be denounced by the despotic governments as a treacherous plot to trap and destroy communism?

The call to action declares that the United Nations should be reestablished on the basis of the proposed "veto-free charter when a majority of the nations ratify and even though the Communist countries do not." In this respect we think we see a practical feature in the proposal that may make it worth its weight in gold. We would then have the rest of the world united but of course the tyrants would be united against us, even as they are now.

We must not forget that with us belong such men as Peron and such countries as Bolivia and Paraguay and quite a number of other men and countries that will never do their share unless they are first beaten to their knees. Also in our group we will find many of the most bitter and cursed prejudices and envies. Several free nations do not want to see the people of Japan or Germany get to their feet. Others carry prejudices against Spain and Portugal. Envy of this kind seldom wear their real purposes on their sleeves.

The idea is titanic but it should be tried. There is nothing to lose in the effort. There is a possible gain in the more tightly cementing together the free nations, some of which are weak and vacillating.

In 1917 we went to war to make a peaceful world. That was absurd. In 1941 we repeated the blunder. That was doubly absurd. There is a possibility that we may accomplish something practical by trying to preserve peace before all peace is lost.

[From the Kiel Tri-County Record of May 31, 1951]

WISCONSIN CALL TO ACTION

"Our country and the entire world stand on the knife edge of disaster."

"The U. N., because of Charter limitations, has been unable to prevent aggression or to unite the world in the face of aggression. We are now called upon to choose whether to discard the U. N. because of its limitations, or to keep the U. N. and remove its limitations. To discard the U. N. is to resign ourselves to war as the final arbiter of world disputes. It is surely the better part of wisdom to keep the U. N. and endow it with the power it must have to halt aggression and preserve the peace.

"Therefore, we, the undersigned citizens of Wisconsin, urge President Truman, in cooperation with the leaders of Congress, to press for immediate adoption within the U. N. of the following proposals:

"1 Establishment of a U. N. Armed Services Committee under the jurisdiction of the General Assembly. A civilian leader of world-wide stature should head the committee and act as commander in chief of the U. N. armed forces. To insure full and proportionate sharing by each nation in the burdens of defense, the committee must be empowered to integrate and direct the armed forces of the participating nations. The military powers of the various U. N. members would then be united to meet aggression anywhere in the world as the armed forces of the Atlantic nations are now being united to meet any aggression in Europe.

"2. Revision of the U. N. Charter to include these carefully limited powers necessary to compel settlement of international disputes by means other than war.

"(a) The right to make enforceable laws to control armaments, (b) The right to apply those laws through U. N. courts to individual offenders rather than entire nations, thus stopping aggression at its source; (c) The right to remain effective, tyrannyproof, armed forces to meet aggression; (d) The right to raise dependable revenue.

"The necessary revisions might well be drafted by a Charter Review Commission appointed under article 22 of the Charter. The revision must include a more adequate method of U. N. representation than the present system of one nation—one vote.

"The U. N. should be established on the basis of the revised, veto-free Charter as soon as a majority of the nations ratify, even though the Soviet Union or others may refuse. A strong U. N. government, preserving to the nations full jurisdiction over domestic affairs, is the only sure protection against recurring wars.

"The cataclysm of war may still be prevented, should our Nation follow this policy immediately and vigorously. If full-scale war does again overtake us, this course of action will unite the free world and conclude the conflict with the enduring peace which alone can redeem the terrible cost of victory."

The above statement was originally prepared by a group of interested citizens of the State, headed by Dr. J. Martin Klotsche, president of Milwaukee State Teachers College.

Editors of the State are now backing the program in a strong manner, and the Record editor, along with many others in the State, has signed the following affirmation.

"We, the undersigned editors of Wisconsin, reaffirm the principles set forth in the Wisconsin Call to Action. Our news tickers, which rest on the pulse of the world and bring to us events even as they are happening in the most remote places, tell us by that very fact that (a) man can no longer live unto himself in a world knit together as ours is by science and technology; (b) neither can man live within the world society without committing suicide unless basic armaments of modern warfare are under the jurisdiction of a common authority, which in turn is controlled by its members; (c) such an authority must be so limited in its powers as to reserve to each nation its full domestic sovereignty, else peace would not long exist."

In our opinion, the Wisconsin Call to Action fully recognizes the above conditions. It sets forth a greatly needed plan for developing the United Nations into an institution that can give man freedom from the tyranny of war and from the despotism of the conqueror.

[From the Waukesha Freeman of June 13, 1951]

SENTIMENT IN FAVOR OF STRENGTHENING U. N. GROWS

Thirty-five Wisconsin editors to date have given their support to the call for a strong United Nations, made recently by a number of Wisconsin citizens, led by Dr. Martin Klotsche, of the Milwaukee State Teachers College. This has special significance only because these men, whose task is to make day-to-day and year-to-year appraisals of community, State, National, and international problems, have shown interest in improving the effectiveness of this world organization. The call to action sets forth an urgently needed plan for developing the U. N. into an institution that can give man "freedom from the tyranny of war and from the despotism of the conqueror." The call urges American leadership to work toward a revision of the U. N. Charter so that it can make enforceable laws to control armaments, apply those laws to individual offenders rather than nations, raise dependable revenue, and maintain effective armed forces. This, it is claimed, would enable the U. N. to "compel settlements of international disputes by means other than war," and stop aggression at its source.

There is a growing realization that if the U. N. is to survive as an effective world agency for peace, it will have to be strengthened to meet the challenge. This can be done in various ways. Wisconsin's recommendations, which are now underwritten by many responsible citizens, suggest the following means:

1. Establishment of a U. N. Armed Services Committee under the jurisdiction of the general assembly. A civilian leader of world-wide stature should head the Committee and act as commander-in-chief of the U. N. armed forces. To insure full and proportionate sharing by each nation in the burdens of defense, the Committee must be empowered to integrate and direct the armed forces of the participating nations. The military powers of the various U. N. members would then be united to meet aggression anywhere in the world as the armed forces of the Atlantic nations are now being united to meet any aggression in Europe.

2 Revision of the U. N. charter to include these carefully limited powers necessary to compel settlement of international disputes by means other than war:

(a) The right to make enforceable laws to control armaments.

(b) The right to apply those laws through U. N. courts to individual offenders rather than entire nations, thus stopping aggression at its source.

(c) The right to maintain effective, tyrannyproof, armed forces to meet aggression.

(d) The right to raise dependable revenue. It is hoped these proposals will be given the earnest attention of congressional leaders and the President and that together they will press for their immediate adoption by United Nations signatories. Experience in meeting the threat of aggression, gained since the U. N. Charter was originally drawn and adopted, dictates the need for these revisions.

[From the Green Bay Press Gazette of May 30, 1951]

WISCONSIN CALL TO ACTION

A representative group of Wisconsin citizens has sponsored a petition to the Presi-

dent to press for immediate adoption within the United Nations of certain amendatory proposals.

This group has been actuated by the conviction that our country and the entire world stand on the knife edge of disaster. They then set forth that the United Nations because of Charter limitations has failed of its great purpose to halt aggression as well as to unite the world against aggression. Either we must resign ourselves to war, say these gentlemen, or we must keep the United Nations and improve it. In short clipped sentences the shortcomings of the United Nations are indicated together with the proposals to cure existing weaknesses. It is suggested that the United Nations might be created into a potent weapon for peace by the establishment of an Armed Services Committee under the jurisdiction of the General Assembly and headed by a civilian leader who would act as the Commander in Chief of the United Nations Armed Forces. The necessity of a full and proportionate sharing by each nation of the burdens of defense is recognized and, it is said, the committee must be empowered to integrate and direct the armed forces of the participating nations.

It is acknowledged, of course, that the United Nations Charter would have to be revised if settlement of international disputes by means other than war is obtainable. Such a revision would include the following powers, carefully hedged about and limited against abuse:

(a) The right to make enforceable laws to control armaments.

(b) The right to apply those laws through United Nations courts to individual offenders rather than entire nations, thus stopping aggression at its source.

(c) The right to maintain effective, tyrannyproof, armed forces to meet aggression.

(d) The right to raise dependable revenue.

Manifestly no one but a lunatic wants war. Manifestly, then, the free world stretches out its arms for a messiah, someone capable of making the beautiful words used by the sponsors stand up and walk. But there is only one thing worse than being a confirmed pessimist in relation to this question and that is to be an optimist without steering lights or rudder.

It demands a great deal of courage to try to set up in confidence a practical and workable system that will "insure full and proportionate sharing by each nation in the burdens of defense," in the face of the present war in Korea in which 40 nations belonging to the United Nations have spurned their duty, and done so dishonorably.

Consider what would happen if the United Nations were to try "to raise dependable revenue." Reflect, also, upon what would happen in this world were the United Nations "to make enforceable laws to control armaments," and then really tried to enforce them. Would we not find ourselves immediately upon the battlefield? Do we not know in advance that every honest and genuine effort at peace would be denounced by the despotic governments as a treacherous plot to trap and destroy communism?

The call to action declares that the United Nations should be reestablished on the basis of the proposed "veto-free charter when a majority of the nations ratify and even though the Communist countries do not." In this respect we think we see a practical feature in the proposal that may make it worth its weight in gold. We would then have the rest of the world united but of course the tyrants would be united against us, even as they are now.

We must not forget that with us belong such men as Peron and such countries as Bolivia and Paraguay and quite a number of other men and countries that will never do their share unless they are first beaten to their knees. Also in our group we will find

many of the most bitter and cursed prejudices and envies. Several free nations do not want to see the people of Japan or Germany get to their feet. Others carry prejudices against Spain and Portugal. Envy of this kind seldom wear their real purposes on their sleeves.

The idea is titanic but it should be tried. There is nothing to lose in the effort. There is a possible gain in more tightly cementing together the free nations, some of which are weak and vacillating.

In 1917 we went to war to make a peaceful world. That was absurd. In 1941 we repeated the blunder. That was doubly absurd. There is a possibility that we may accomplish something practical by trying to preserve peace before all peace is lost.

[From the Sheboygan Press of June 6, 1951]

WISCONSIN'S CALL TO ACTION

A few weeks ago 72 Wisconsin residents, including 7 from Sheboygan, issued a call to action in which they urged President Truman and Congress to press for immediate adoption of changes in the United Nations Charter.

The Wisconsin call to action asserts that because of Charter limitation, the UN has not been able to prevent aggression or to unite the world in the face of aggression. A choice has to be made, either to discard the U. N. because of its limitations, or to keep the U. N. and remove its limitations. The signers of the call contend that to discard the U. N. is to resign ourselves to war as the final arbiter of world disputes. These signers believe it is the better part of wisdom to keep the U. N. and endow it with the power it must have to halt aggression and preserve the peace.

Here are the proposals contained in the Wisconsin call to action:

1. Establishment of a U. N. armed services committee under the jurisdiction of the General Assembly. A civilian leader of world-wide stature should head the committee and act as commander in chief of the U. N. armed forces. To insure full and proportionate sharing by each nation in the burdens of defense, the committee must be empowered to integrate and direct the armed forces of the participating nations. The military powers of the various U. N. members would then be united to meet aggression anywhere in the world as the armed forces of the Atlantic nations are now being united to meet any aggression Europe.

2. Revision of the U. N. charter to include these carefully limited powers necessary to compel settlement of international disputes by means other than war:

- (a) The right to make enforceable laws to control armaments.

- (b) The right to apply those laws through U. N. courts to individual offenders rather than entire nations, thus stopping aggression at its source.

- (c) The right to maintain effective, tyranny-proof, armed forces to meet aggression.

- (d) The right to raise dependable revenue.

These proposals are drastic, but we must recognize that the times call for drastic action. It takes courage to break with tradition, but following tradition means one war after another. Who among us can recall when there was no fighting going on in the world or when no countries were setting the stage for a new conflict?

We are not too far today from a U. N. armed force as proposed by the Wisconsin group. Troops of a number of nations are fighting the aggressor in Korea and they are under a single command. The problem is to set up a program under which each nation would provide its proportionate share to the burdens of defense so that an integrated U. N. force would be prepared to act at any time.

Once such a force is established, the control of armaments would become a comparatively minor problem.

Granting the right to U. N. courts to seize individual offenders is vital to world peace. When that is done, there will be no new Hitler. The offender would be seized and brought to trial before he could start a war. If such a course had been possible 12 or 15 years ago, there would not have been a Second World War. Hitler would have been stopped in his tracks. You may object to giving such powers to an international authority, but isn't that preferable to sending your sons to war? It's one or the other.

Granting the right to raise dependable revenue should not bother any of us. We contribute to support of the United Nations now. Once the U. N. has the power to maintain peace, it will not need large sums for armaments and will not need a large military force. A fraction of the amount we now spend each year for defense purposes would take care of our share of U. N. requirements.

Since the call to action was issued, a number of newspapers have commented favorably. There should be much more comment, both in the press and by organizations and individuals so that the Members of Congress will come to the realization that the people want action. The people of Wisconsin have the opportunity of taking a leading position in a practical and comprehensive movement for world peace. There is no easy way to maintain peace. We must work for it constantly.

Low Pay of Postal Workers Destroys Morale and Lowers Standard of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat of July 19, 1951, entitled "Postal Wage Raise":

POSTAL WAGE RAISE

The pay scale for post office workers is much too low. This situation is destroying morale of employees throughout the system, causing a startling personnel turn-over, and as a consequence, steadily lowering standards of service. Postal employees have asked Congress for a 17-percent increase in wages.

It is true that postal workers were granted a pay rise of \$120 a year in November 1949. But even if they get the 17 percent now asked they would not be receiving enough to compensate for increased costs of living, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Carriers and clerks start now at \$2,670 a year and get \$100 more each year until they reach a maximum of \$3,670 annually. This is not enough to attract and keep competent employees. Three out of five postal jobholders have to supplement their wages by doing outside work or having wives or children work. They are quitting in droves for better-pay jobs. In St. Louis the system lost 600 last year.

These employees are replaced with temporaries, who take no examination, often have no interest in the service, and use their jobs only as a stopgap until better opportunity is found. Capable, experienced men in the service are discouraged and going into debt.

The House Post Office and Civil Service Committee this week is holding hearings on the postal wage bill. A Senate committee has recommended an amended measure, with an 8.8 percent increase. Pay of postal employees is among the lowest in Federal service. A 17 percent wage boost is justified. These Federal employees are worthy of their hire, contrary to thousands whose services could be dispensed with at no Government loss.

The Pennsylvania Department, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Demand Unconditional Release of William N. Oatis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the voice of over a quarter of a million veterans and their wives in Pennsylvania join the chorus of countless millions of American citizens who are outraged over the imprisonment of William N. Oatis by the Government of Czechoslovakia.

In a letter addressed to Secretary of State Dean Acheson, James J. Davis, department commander of Pennsylvania's VFW, calls upon the State Department to launch a "get-tough" policy to bring about the immediate and unconditional release of Associated Press correspondent, William N. Oatis, now in prison on false charges of espionage in Czechoslovakia.

Commander Davis' letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF PENNSYLVANIA,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
Harrisburg, Pa., July 20 1951.

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State of the United States,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: The arrest, the solitary confinement, conviction, sentencing, and finally false imprisonment of William Oatis, chief of the Prague bureau of the Associated Press, by the Czechoslovak Communist regime because of his objective reporting outraged war veterans.

What representations have been made so far, beginning with Mr. Oatis' arrest, do not seem to parallel our time-honored policy of protecting Americans in foreign countries. The measures have been wholly inadequate. We demand Mr. Oatis' immediate, unconditional release.

Mr. Oatis' arrest was preceded by that of Consul General Angus Ward in Mukden and by Mr. Vogeler's in Hungary, to mention only recent outstanding instances elsewhere, have become too recurring to be allowed to continue and simultaneously expect the United States to maintain its international self-respect or for Americans abroad to retain the dignity that was theirs by virtue of their citizenship.

We firmly believe it is time for our Government, through your Department to make unmistakably clear to the Communist and Communist-dominated countries that false arrest of an American national will no longer be tolerated without punitive action; that we are as through bribing as we were with the Barbary pirates in 1804. In world-wide piracy, present-day Communists are comparable to the Barbary exploiters in ran-

som and in every conceivable crime against civilized mankind, including genocide.

If objective reporting by American correspondents abroad is to be the basis of allegations eventually twisted into charges of espionage, then it should follow as a retaliatory measure and to end propaganda originating openly in our country, that we appropriately punish correspondents of Communist newspapers for twisting out of all semblance of truth the ideals, the aims, the purposes and the general cross-section of American public opinion, in addition to distorting the policies of our Government.

An instant case in point is that of the Tass correspondent of Moscow's Pravda, dated New York, July 18, as reported July 19 by Eddy Gilmore of the Associated Press from Moscow, who quoted a piece of Pravda, in Pravda:

"It is impossible not to notice the growing horror among the imperialist bosses of the United States of America at the thought of peace."

Certainly our Government has the means at its disposal to prevent the continuance of this sort of unobjective, from our viewpoint, reporting especially when we are spending millions of tax dollars monthly on the Voice and other projects, that are completely nullified by the "accurate, objective" reporting of the Tass correspondent. American correspondents in Poland were expelled for infinitely less.

Most seriously, this correspondent of Pravda should be immediately expelled from our country and never again permitted to return. The same treatment should be meted out to any other correspondent who in the past, or in the future, deliberately falsifies the truth about our country.

We cannot conceive that our freedom of the press, which must remain inviolate, should be extended to those whose objective is to destroy us. To knowingly permit them to carry on their wicked, iniquitous work under our noses is sheer national stupidity and a source of unrestrained joy to our enemies.

We have been sufficiently humiliated as a nation at the United Nations by unpreventable Communist denunciations. We have retaliated there.

We were originally excluded, for reasons unknown to us, but Communists correspondents were included, at the Kaesong so-called truce parley. We are making progress there.

It is time now, as we finally did with the sentencing of Internal Communists, for us to do something equally as effective about those in our midst who foment and maintain unrest by their reports to foreign newspapers, if only through the cancellation of their passports and immediate expulsion.

Such action should be a part of the "get tough" policy every thinking American approves and anxiously looks forward to implementation. Through it Americans could find renewed confidence that their Government will protect them and their interests, both here and abroad, in the tradition to which we were accustomed.

Pussyfooting with Communists has gotten us nowhere except deeper involvement.

We ask, in the name of our freedom and international self-respect, and fervently hope you will initiate now, strong positive steps demanding the immediate unconditional release of Mr. Oatis, so as to reassure puzzled, despairing Americans everywhere who believe our national dignity has suffered abroad through failure to follow the positive attitude we have traditionally asserted worldwide during the 175 years of our independence.

Very truly yours,

JAMES J. DAVIS,
Department Commander.

XCVII—App.—290

College of the Pacific Enters Second Century of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article printed in the Stockton Record concerning the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the College of the Pacific. On July 11, 1951, it started on its second century of service.

This college has had a very interesting development. In 1924 the college was moved to Stockton from San Jose, Calif. Before that time it found itself cramped for space and the area from which it received most of its students already contained several richly endowed private college and public institutions of higher learning. Consequently, it was determined that if COP was to grow it had to find another location.

Mr. J. C. Smith, of Stockton, donated the initial 40 acres for a campus and later gave another 10 acres. The campus was called the Harriet M. Smith Memorial Campus in honor of the donor's mother. Later, Mr. and Mrs. Amos Alonzo Stagg donated 21 acres to the college so the campus now contains 71 acres.

The people of Stockton and the surrounding area raised \$1,600,000 to relocate COP at Stockton. The \$1,600,000 was used to erect buildings on the Harriet M. Smith Memorial Campus. I can think of no more worthwhile investment by a group of people than the investment of this money in the College of the Pacific. When the college was relocated at Stockton it then had within a short distance of its campus a larger high school population than was found around any other college in the entire country. In other words, the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley, in the center of which is Stockton and COP, contained a larger high school population than any similar-sized area in the United States that was unserved by a 4-year college.

The college brought many interesting and talented people to our city. Dr. Tully C. Knoles was the president of the college at the time it came to Stockton. I doubt if any man in California, and perhaps in the entire country, has had a more profound influence on students than has Tully Knoles. For 48 years he has been a teacher and lecturer. The influence he has exerted on the students who attended his classes at the University of Southern California and at COP is almost fantastic. I have met them in all walks of life and in all parts of the country and have yet to find one who did not tell me what a profound influence Dr. Knoles had on the particular individual. Several years ago Dr. Knoles retired as president of COP and the trustees of the college appointed him chancellor.

Another remarkable personality of the faculty of COP, known to every sports

writer in the country, is Amos Alonzo Stagg, who became the college's football coach in 1933 and was its coach until 1947. Mr. Stagg has told me and I am sure he must have told others that the reason he came to Stockton in place of some other city where he might have had a position with a larger school at a much larger salary was because the program COP was developing appealed to him and he was much impressed with Dr. Tully Knoles, its president. Mr. Stagg's influence on the youth of America is impossible to measure. As a coach he is a genius. I believe he started more innovations in football than any other coach. I doubt if there is any coach in the country who has had a greater moral influence on his athletes than has Mr. Stagg. I have met men who served under him as athletes, either in football, baseball, or track, in all parts of the country. Never have I met one who did not practically worship Mr. Stagg and whose influence was indelibly impressed upon the particular individual.

There have been many other interesting personalities and remarkable individuals on the staff of the college of the Pacific but the two I have mentioned here are the ones who have outstanding national reputations.

COP has made a fine record in athletics since locating in Stockton. Its most spectacular football team was the team of 1949, sparked by that great little quarterback, Eddie LeBaron, now serving in the trenches of Korea with the United States Marines. It seems incredible but the football team of this small college was selected in 1949 by a poll of Associated Press sports writers as the tenth best team in the entire Nation. It is my opinion that the 1949 COP football team could have scored on any team in the country and I bar none. They may not have had enough power in depth to win but I believe they had a punch that would have scored on any team pitted against them. In 1943 when the Marines and Navy were training men at the college Mr. Stagg was the coach and had one of the best teams in the Nation. In that year he was voted "coach of the year."

Following the retirement of Dr. Tully Knoles as president, the trustees appointed Robert E. Burns to that position. He is typical of the new type of college and university president. Mr. Burns is an excellent administrator and, while not a scholar in the technical sense, has a fine scholastic record as a student and teacher. He has the knack of making friends and getting along with people and making contacts beneficial to the college. He has a broad view of the contribution which COP should make in the field of higher learning. This means not only training students for skills in special fields of endeavor but also the broadening and advancing the field of knowledge. I believe Mr. Burns shows great promise and will measure up to the challenge that the presidency of his college presents to him. If he is a symbol of what we may expect of COP in its second century I believe we have every reason to think the second century of the college's progress will be as fruitful

and constructive as the accomplishments of the first. The alumni, the faculty, and the students of COP can be proud of the record made in its first century and look forward with confidence to an even better record in the second century. The college has carried out a wonderful program of education and has enhanced the moral tone and the cultural atmosphere of the city of Stockton and the surrounding area. In its first century the college has made a remarkable record and a distinct contribution in the educational and cultural fields and its board of trustees is now laying plans to make the college an even greater force in the coming century.

I am very proud of the fact that my wife has a degree from the College of the Pacific, which she obtained in 1935—18 years after she began her college work at the University of California. She was busy taking care of our home and our children between the time I married her in her junior year at the university and the time when she enrolled at the College of the Pacific in the early 1930's. But in 1935 she got her degree from COP, of which she and I are very proud.

Following is the article from the Stockton Record:

ONE HUNDRED YEARS AGO TODAY THE COP RECEIVED FIRST CALIFORNIA CHARTER—CONVOCA-TION CEREMONIES COMMEMORATE THE COLLEGE THAT ALMOST WAS FOLDED

One hundred years ago today, July 10, 1851, the first Supreme Court of California, during the first year of statehood, issued the first charter for a college in the Golden State.

The institution thus founded is today the College of the Pacific in Stockton.

Tonight at 8 o'clock in Pacific Auditorium the California educational landmark will be observed with appropriate convocation ceremonies. Among those participating will be Gov. Earl Warren, Chief Justice Phil S. Gibson and five other members of the State supreme court, and Dr. Willard E. Givens, executive secretary of the National Education Association.

FOUNDING FATHERS

The principal founding fathers of the pioneer school were vigorous young Methodist leaders who came to California in 1849 and 1850 along with the gold hunters. Isaac Owen, William Taylor, and Edward Bannister reached California, respectively, in a covered wagon via the Overland Trail, in a clipper ship around Cape Horn, and on a steamship after a crossing of the Isthmus of Panama.

Owen was the promoter and financial agent, a presiding elder of the church who rode up and down hundreds of miles of primitive and bridgeless California trails, and everywhere plugged for the idea of a college in California.

Taylor was the vivid San Francisco waterfront street preacher of the early fifties who is credited later with sending from Australia the seeds which fostered the original eucalyptus plantings in California.

Bannister, who became the first president of the college, sailed into San Francisco Bay on the historic steamer *Oregon* on October 18, 1850. The ship was flying a pennant with the words "California is admitted," thus bringing to the State the first news that President Millard Fillmore had signed the bill making it the thirty-first State in the Union.

BOARD ORGANIZED

Before the new State was a year old these far-seeing lovers of education had organized a board of trustees, raised \$27,500 for endow-

ment, held a series of conferences in San Jose and San Francisco which determined upon founding an institution of the grade of university, selected a site in Santa Clara, and moved to apply for a charter.

California legislative machinery, to provide for much action, was incomplete. Hence, the supreme court was authorized, ad interim, to act in the matter, and thus it was that it was the court and not the State legislature which in legal fact founded Pacific with State approval and sanction—a process said to be unique in legal annals.

The first charter was drawn in the name of California Wesleyan College, in imitation of several earlier Methodist related colleges in America. The name was never popular and within a year it was legally changed to University of the Pacific. In 1911 it was made officially College of the Pacific.

Pacific's first 30 years were in Santa Clara. Here the school had two divisions, the male department and the female institute. But even with this careful segregation of the sexes, Pacific was a pioneer of coeducation for those times. The first degrees were conferred in 1858 to five men and five women—at separate commencement exercises.

STAY IN SAN JOSE

In 1871 Pacific occupied the College Park campus at San Jose where it stayed until 1924, and where it enjoyed the golden era of its nineteenth century history. The move there was seemingly prophetic of Pacific's present destiny, for the San Jose campus was on a tract of land recorded as the Stockton Rancho.

Pacific pioneered many areas of study in the West. It established the first medical school in California, opening this branch in San Francisco in 1859. The first catalog of the school asserts that the bay city is an ideal location for medical studies because the high incidence of deaths from poisoning and violence makes material for dissection abundant and cheap. The medical department eventually became the Cooper Medical School and later the medical school of Stanford University.

Pacific had troubles and struggles as well as triumphs, and after the turn of the century found itself outdistanced by richly endowed private schools and big tax supported institutions which grew up around it. It was a period and a trend which accounted for the demise of no less than eight other private colleges in northern California.

But Pacific, the first, persisted, and there was never a spring when a group of students had not completed their work and received their degrees.

TULLY KNOLES ERA

After World War I, Tully Knoles came from the chairmanship of the department of history at University of Southern California to the presidency of Pacific in 1919. It was a trouble shooting assignment, expected to result in the best plan to liquidate the assets of the old school, but instead it was the beginning of the greatest era in the history of the college.

After careful study of the California picture it was Dr. Knoles who led Pacific into a significant new era of service in the San Joaquin Valley, which in 1920 was shown to have the greatest population in America of high school students not served by a college in their own area. Other cities were interested, but Stockton came through with the biggest welcome for the venerable college and Pacific occupied the new campus here in 1924.

A quick index to the expansion of the school here is seen in the fact that by 1936, Dr. Knoles had conferred more degrees on Pacific graduates than had all the presidents who preceded him since 1851. Now Pacific has granted a total of more than 5,000 degrees.

WIDE CURRICULA

Pacific begins its second century on a 72-acre campus, with buildings and equipment valued at more than \$4,000,000. Academically it offers the widest area of studies and major curricula among the private institutions in California, excepting only Stanford and USC.

Under the presidency of Robert E. Burns since 1946, Pacific has continued to pioneer new fields, even as it did in its nineteenth century years.

Illegal Sale of Narcotics in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the sale of narcotics to people of this country—especially to the youth of the country—has broken out in most alarming reports. These facts seem well established:

First. That the illegal sale of narcotics in the United States is increasing.

Second. That the principal victims are usually young people.

Third. The drug addicts are here in numbers which call for action.

What is the matter with our enforcement of laws against the smuggling and sale of narcotics? Is the law inadequate, or is the fault to be entirely lodged with the criminal division of the enforcement of the narcotics drug laws of this country? These questions the people are asking from one end of the country to the other.

My considered opinion is that we have every law required. If not, such laws as are needed could be obtained from Congress by unanimous consent. The trouble lies, then, with the enforcement of the laws we have. It isn't a question of our officials not wanting to enforce the law, or of any interest that they may have in not enforcing the law, but I think our enforcement officials have given more time to the antics of the United Nations attempt to build a world enforcement organization than they have in attending to our own laws and enforcing them. Why do we have to connive with other nations in order to enforce the law here? Why do we have to confer jurisdiction on the United Nations to handle a matter which we are abundantly capable of handling ourselves? Apparently many of our enforcement officials are more concerned with making our law subservient to the conventions and protocols of the United Nations, thus destroying our own sovereign power, than they are in retaining our own sovereignty and standing on our own feet and handling our own problems as a sovereign nation should.

This United Nations seems to be feverishly working overtime on every conceivable phase of human life to confer upon a world organization the com-

plete jurisdiction of the laws, morals, and aspirations of freedom-loving countries. Is this United Nations, heralded as an instrument to spread freedom, actually an institution designed to destroy freedom? It is an organization ostensibly designed to bring peace and prevent wars, but operates as an actual instrument to foment wars.

I think the people of this country should watch the machinations of this organization. They should be alerted to what is going on in this body, and be prepared to prevent it from taking over this country completely, and making of this great Republic merely a member of a superior world government.

I think our failure to enforce the narcotics law of the United States is due to the secret protocols that are outstanding and which will finally be written into conventions and presented to the Senate of the United States for approval. We have already seen how the approval of the Charter of the United Nations has set aside the laws of one State and annulled them because they conflicted with a convention—or law—of the United Nations.

If all these protocols on narcotics—which are merely agreements among nations as a basis for obtaining a convention from the United Nations, some of which have been unconstitutionally signed by representatives of this Government—are finally drafted into one general law and passed by the United Nations, it does not take a wizard to understand that exceptions here and exceptions there to appease one nation, or several nations, will result in an instrument which, if approved by the Senate, will present conflicts with our own laws. In such case the convention will become another supreme law of the land, and our own laws of enforcement of the narcotics law will be annulled. I am sure the people of the United States do not want this situation to develop. Shall we have to admit to the world that this great powerful Nation is incapable of enforcing its own criminal laws?

Vast Difference in Way United States Treats Reporters From the Iron Curtain Countries and the Way They Treat Our Newsmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, shortly after the trial of the Associated Press reporter, William N. Oatis, in Prague, Czechoslovakia, I made a statement which the Voice of America beamed to the iron curtain countries. I invite my colleagues' attention to my statement which follows herewith:

The arrest and imprisonment of William Oatis, the Associated Press news correspond-

ent in Prague, Czechoslovakia, points out the basic difference between a free nation and a nation dominated by a dictatorship. It points out the difference between the freedoms enjoyed in a true democracy and the restrictions experienced in countries under Communist domination.

William Oatis was a newspaperman. It was his duty to report to the people of the world the news as he found it in the country where he was assigned. In a free nation this sort of newspaper work is not only permitted but is welcome—it is expected.

Here in America, newspapermen from all the nations of the world are permitted freedom of action; freedom to report news as they find it, whether it reflects favorably or unfavorably upon our own country. There is no censorship, because here we have no fear of the truth.

In the Communist-dominated nations of the world freedom of the press does not exist, and until there is such freedom there can be no freedom for the individual.

Freedom of the press is important. Freedom of the radio is important. Freedom of speech is important. Freedom of religion is important.

The individual must be free if a nation is to be free.

No Time for Strict Controls Under the National Production Act of 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including my personal observations on the subject of the price controls act which we are now debating. The theory of controls as advocated in the pending measure will actually result in a permanent regimentation of our economy.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the purpose of price controls is to protect the consuming public against high prices when there is a scarcity of consumers commodities. I do not quite understand the necessity for the present controls program in view of the large inventories that exist. There may be an exception in the case of steel and several industrial items but the decision does not pertain directly to those essential items for the consuming public. Mr. J. A. Livingston, a business analyst, points out that business firms have heavy inventories on hand and to such an extent that there has been a noticeable slowdown in retail sales. At the end of May, retail stocks of 96 large department stores throughout the United States approached \$1,200,000,000, the year before that they were \$300,000,000 less. Mr. Livingston points out that this 33-percent increase in inventories more than offsets the 12-percent rise in prices. The important thing is that dollar sales are not up. In spite of the big inventories in May and June, sales were 3 percent above 1950. A 3-percent rise in sales does not square with a 33-percent rise in inventories.

This authority also points out that department stores had inventories on

hand and commodities equal to a 4.4 months' supply of goods; before Korea they had only 3.5 months'. In the meantime many department stores and retailers generally have stepped up advertising and have organized to cut prices in an effort to reduce stocks. In spite of all this activity to sell goods, the merchants are not getting the results they anticipate. The public is obviously not responding.

Labor organizations such as the A. F. of L. and the CIO are backing Truman and DiSalle, asserting that if prices are not kept under control, wage stabilization will collapse, but farmers oppose ceilings on agricultural prices and this presents a cleavage between the farmers and the workers and of course in many instances this embarrasses some Congressmen. No doubt Members of Congress are confronted with a delicate problem and the question is, "Will inflationary forces regain ascendancy in the fall as the administration contends?" At the moment the tendency is the other way. Since March, wholesale prices have declined about 2 percent. This drop does not fully reflect the important sharper drop in raw materials prices. The Bureau of Labor Statistics Index of 28 essential commodities is off 14 percent from the high of the year in February. The decrease in the drop of some commodities has been fairly spectacular. Rubber, tin, and wool are off 4 percent from their high earlier in the year. Print cloth is off 28 percent. Cotton has dropped sharply on announcement that almost 30,000,000 acres that were planted will yield 60 percent more than last year. This would mean a crop of 16,000,000 bales, whereas domestic consumption is around 10,000,000 bales.

Mr. Livingston concludes his analysis by stating:

The pace of rearmament will determine the trend of prices and business. After a cease-fire in Korea, if realized, a diplomatic settlement must still be reached. Meanwhile suspense and indecision in the administration, in Congress, among businessmen, and in America's many markets, stocks, commodities, wholesale, and retail prevails.

In view of this situation it would seem that this is not time to be imposing stricter controls upon the American people.

Radar Equipped for Finding and Attacking Enemy Bombers, Regardless of Fog or Darkness, Air Force F-94's Will Play an Important Part When 210,000 Volunteers Report for a 2-Day Rehearsal and Defense Test Next Saturday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wonder just how many of my fellow Americans realize how completely the highly

coordinated Administration of Civilian Defense and the United States Air Force are working together and what they have already accomplished in anticipation of a sudden attack by way of the air—against our country.

It is really uncanny to think that an Air Force fighter pilot can now fly in one of our modern jet high-speed planes and, regardless of fog, clouds, or Stygian darkness, discover, take after, and shoot down enemy aircraft that are approaching our shores. Moreover, he can do this stretched out in a cockpit of an all-weather aircraft traveling at a speed of 750 miles an hour, more or less.

Mr. Speaker, I have just come upon a news article from the New York Herald Tribune, June 18, written by Ansel E. Talbert, reporting on the proposed rehearsal of the civilian-defense exercise scheduled to be held next week end.

This article by Mr. Talbert, feature writer of the Tribune, is so replete with material that is of such great interest to my colleagues that I am asking unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include the same in the records of today's proceedings.

Mr. Talbert's article reads as follows:

JETS AT JERSEY BASE REHEARSE FOR 2-DAY CIVIL DEFENSE TEST
(By Ansel E. Talbert)

WRIGHTSTOWN, N. J., June 17.—Air Force F-94 jet fighters with rocket-like afterburners for creating terrific bursts of speed streaked for the upper atmosphere from the runways of McGuire Field here today during a rehearsal for the Nation's civilian defense exercise next week end.

The F-94's, which are radar-equipped for finding and attacking enemy bombers in darkness or any kind of overcast weather, operate from bases on both coasts and in Alaska. McGuire Field, their home in this area, adjoins Fort Dix and is about 70 miles south of New York City.

The fast planes are the first jet all-weather interceptors assigned to operational duty with America's air defense squadrons and are in readiness for action 24 hours a day.

TWO-DAY DRILL PLANNED

When the Air Defense Command of the Air Force calls to duty next Saturday more than 210,000 civilian volunteer members of the United States ground observer corps in the northeast, Great Lakes, and west coast regions for a 2-day aircraft detection test, the F-94's will play an important role.

For the first time in 2 years civilian ground observers will be on duty night and day for the entire period of the exercise. Their aircraft-flash reports, after being filtered and passed to the Air Force ground control intercept units, will be one of the chief sources on which the take-off orders to see-in-the-dark F-94 fighters will be based.

In an effort to gain a first-hand impression of the most important links in the Nation's defense chain, this correspondent visited the headquarters of the Fifty-second Fighter All-Weather Wing commanded by Col. Ernest H. Veverly, a veteran pilot holding the Distinguished Flying Cross, and flew in the radar operator's cockpit of one of the new two-place F-94 jets.

The all-weather aircraft was piloted by Maj. John L. Elser, who occupied the forward seat in the cockpit. The take-off did not differ greatly from those in scores of different plane types in which I have flown—aside from the lack of vibration of the type created by all piston-engine types—until Major Elser cut in the afterburner. This is a tubular attachment behind the plane's

jet engine of 5,400 pounds power thrust, into which a spray of fuel can be shot.

BLAST MULTIPLIES THRUST

The fuel mixes with the stream of hot air that is being forced out of the tail-pipe of the jet engine and causes a resulting blast which gives the plane several times the ordinary power thrust for short periods.

The rapid acceleration from afterburner use is extremely noticeable. It causes sensations akin to those experienced during high-speed catapult take-offs from aircraft carriers and creates a mental impression of riding a skyrocket.

Through employment of its afterburner the F-94 can climb to 40,000 feet much faster than comparable jet planes designed to intercept enemy bombers at high altitude have hitherto been able to do. The plane's speed can be increased to nearly 700 miles an hour when it is pursuing enemy bombers.

After climbing high over New Jersey, Major Elser leveled off his fast climb and, upon shutting off the plane's afterburner, headed for the New York area on a course which would have intercepted enemy bombers coming down from the north.

Changes of direction were given to Major Elser from the ground in accord with information obtained by the ground control intercept station by radar and other means. In actual combat a pilot would be directed to the general area of his target and then his own radar operator would take over and guide him directly to a position from which he could open fire.

SUITS INFLATED

Suits worn by F-94 and other jet pilots in combat inflate automatically during tight turns and other aerial maneuvers over vital spots on the body. This automatic action prevents the blood from flowing to the lower extremities with resulting black-outs.

The return to base was made in a manner so as to conserve as much fuel as possible by eliminating all superfluous actions and the actual landing from a position over McGuire Field was somewhat suggestive of a dive-bomber attack. All of the final approach was monitored by radar, however, and the pilot kept informed of how well he was doing.

How We Lost One War and Got Into Another

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the fifth and last of a series of articles written by me for the Scripps-Howard newspapers.

WASHINGTON, June 1951.—No American policy toward Asia has a chance of achieving peace or security for this country unless it looks forward to the liberation of China from the Communist yoke.

The liberators of China should be the Chinese themselves, because an east-west racial war is precisely what we must avoid.

But the Chinese, and other Asians, should be assured that whenever they wish to take arms up against their conquerors, we stand ready and willing to aid them.

This must be so, not because of our historic friendship for the Chinese people, but for the sake of our own security.

Twice in the past 10 years we have been involved in wars originating in Asia. We did not get into World War II until Japan attacked us. We are now involved in what is probably world war III because of an attack against our ward—South Korea.

We Americans have dangerously neglected our Asian geography.

Hitler knew, and said, that his plan to conquer the world would never succeed until he had gained the raw materials and manpower of the undeveloped areas. Those resources are mostly in Asia. That was why he first made an alliance with Stalin and then attacked his partner.

With our aid Stalin defeated his former comrade, Hitler, and then seized for himself the choicest prize of Asia—China.

All of the wars of the past 25 years have been essentially wars for the conquest of China. That was the goal of Japan in her 1931 invasion of Manchuria and in her 1937 strike for the rest of China. The war in Korea is an attempt to consolidate and extend the victory in China. Communism is dedicated to just one aim: the complete conquest of Asia. With all of Asia Communist, the Kremlin knows that Europe will have to fall because there will be no materials for the factories.

On December 2, 1945, William Z. Foster, head of the Communist conspiracy in this country, wrote in the Daily Worker: "The war in China is the key of all problems on the international front." For that reason, he added, "The key task is to stop American intervention in China." By American intervention, Foster, and his master Stalin, meant "effective American assistance to the Government of Free China."

America is a two-ocean country. Neither ocean is more or less important than the other. On our west, American security has always lain in having a free and independent China. China has a fifth of the world's population and a third more is around her borders. The Asian populations now hold the balance of world power.

We have been dangerously asleep to the risk to our own security in permitting the Asian part of the world to come under the Kremlin.

When a relatively minor effort in China would have established the free Nationalist Government, which had resisted the naval imperialism of powers like Britain and could have stopped the land assault from Russia, we found excuses for not acting.

Our idea was that we were protecting the lives of American boys. Now American boys are dying anyway in Asia. British colonialism, which was always hostile to Chinese independence, preferring a disunited China which she could penetrate with her commerce, is attempting to obscure our vital security interests in Asia.

But if and when the Communist influence is extended to Indochina, Malaya, and Hong Kong, Britain necessarily will be on our side and whether we or they like it or not, American and British troops in large numbers will be committed to land warfare in Asia.

It's inevitable; the workshop of Europe is useless without the raw materials of Asia.

I have always held that we should try to forestall that eventually.

We still may be able to forestall it if we will build a backfire against communism in Asia.

When I was a boy, we had two big fires in our part of the prairie. Each was stopped by plowing a single furrow and starting a backfire. A single furrow would not in itself halt a prairie fire. But it is a line from which you can start a backfire that will halt the big fire.

It is much cheaper and easier to start that backfire, even now in China, than to wait and try to fight all the little fires that will break out along China's borders if we accept the Communist conquest of China as an

accomplished fact, as an irreversible trend of history.

Trends of history are invented by the rapacious to intimidate their opposition, and by the timid to justify their failure to be firm.

Courage and foresight for our leaders at this moment in history would consist in offering materials and advice to the Free Chinese on Formosa for whatever liberating activities they feel able to undertake against the Communist armies on the mainland.

A half million Chinese on Formosa are willing to fight for the freedom of their country. Our aid does not have to be confined to them. We should find ways of getting arms to the guerrillas on the mainland of China and offer help to potential defectors among the Communists themselves.

Such a policy would be an economy for the United States. It would be taking a page from the book of the Kremlin, fighting communism with one of communism's most effective techniques. And beginning the policy in China, would take the pressure off all the areas around China.

If you will look at a map, you will see that China is the palm of Asia and that Korea, Japan, Indonesia, and southeast Asia are the fingers. Without the palm the fingers are useless. That is why Russia chose to take China first.

Russia now counts on her control of China to wipe out American influence in Japan. She knows we cannot continue the occupation indefinitely, that sometime the United States will get weary of supporting Japan as a compensation for Japan's loss of her China trade. When that happens, Japan will go under.

And when Japan goes under, or long before that, the United States will be in a full-scale war with communism. We fought World War II in the Pacific to prevent a union of Japan and China under fascism; we cannot tolerate such a union under fascism's twin, communism.

Make no mistake. It will be the worst war in our history. At Pearl Harbor, Japan, an Asian nation, administered to the United States the most humiliating defeat in our 175 years as a Republic. If we continue to drift as we are now doing, within our lifetime there will be an outbreak of Soviet Pearl Harbors all the way from the Philippines and Alaska to Hawaii and perhaps on our own west coast.

There are some who say that Europe is more important to us than Asia. In a battle no part of the line is more important than any other point. A weakness at one point is an invitation to disaster at all points.

There are some who reply: But if we are firm in Asia, we may lose the support of our allies in Europe.

Such a conclusion is not in accord with human nature. Anybody who says this is being blinded by Communist propaganda. In this world nothing is so admired as strength—moral and physical. Among nations who have a common interest, as we and our allies have, strength in one will inspire strength in the others.

The task of our statesmen is to inspire strength.

St. Lawrence Seaway

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Ap-

pendix to the RECORD, I wish to submit an article by Mr. Richard B. Frost, published in the *Detroit Board of Commerce* on July 2, 1951, as follows:

CANADIAN VISION MAY SOLVE UNITED STATES PROBLEM

(By Richard B. Frost)

On page 4 in this issue of the *Detroit* is a digest of an address by the Canadian Minister of Transport, the Honorable Lionel Chevrier. He points to the vital need for early construction of the St. Lawrence waterway.

Canadians have threatened to construct this vital waterway themselves if our Congress won't grant approval for United States participation this year. Canadians are impatient, as are all those interested in the progress and security of our two great nations.

For a few generations our friends in Canada have patiently waited for our United States to join them as partners in this project, vital to the economic and military welfare of our two countries. They have waited while short-sighted interests have blocked the various bills presented over past decades to Congress for approval. These bills have been stymied with old and tattered arguments, used in opposing the Panama and Suez Canals, the establishment of a trucking industry, airways, and other manifestations of progress that have always, when secured, benefited manifold those that represented the most bitter opposition.

We in the United States owe a debt of gratitude to Canada for her forbearance. Nowhere else in the world could this happen. Waterways of Europe and Asia have always been objects of envy. They have been subjects of numerous wars, both hot and cold. For centuries nations have sought to exploit and control vital communication routes for their own advantage.

We, as a nation, have taken an active part in these European and Asian battles. Today we are rendering aid, both diplomatically and economically, in order to secure such waterways as the Bosphorus and the Suez Canal.

Canada, on the other hand, has sacrificed her own progress and great need for power in the interest of her friendship with the United States. Who can blame our friends to the north if their patience has reached the limit of endurance.

How long will unpatriotic groups prohibit our United States from partaking in the development and control of an economic advantage that is rightfully ours?

The Rains Descended, and the Flood Came

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under authority to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article from the *Sunday Washington Star*, entitled "The Rains Descended, and the Flood Came," as follows:

THE RAINS DESCENDED, AND THE FLOOD CAME

It began with April showers—nothing more sinister than that. The winter and early spring had been fairly dry. All Kansas was glad to see the rains come drifting across the land.

Soon the broad valleys, lifting westward into the foothills of the Rockies, were green with corn, grass, and winter wheat—maturing rapidly in the low-lying eastern part of the State, more slowly on the high prairie 400 miles to the west. There were the usual thunderstorms, concentrated largely in the humid eastern section. Rapid changes in temperature, occasional hailstorms and minor tornadoes—all this was to be expected. The flatlands and undulating plains drank up the water.

By the end of May, they were not so thirsty. In the east-central part of the State, the wide valleys of the Kansas River—known locally as the Kaw—received at least twice their normal precipitation for the month. Along the Arkansas River, further to the west and south, it was the same story. Rainfall for the whole State ran 60 percent above average.

At first, the western prairies remained relatively dry. Late in May, however, these were hit by pouring rains around the Colorado border, where they reach an altitude of some 4,000 feet. From the high wheatlands, down through the Arkansas and the mountain-born tributaries of the Kansas, there rolled a tidal freshet, modest harbinger of things to come.

SOAKING THE LAND

By early June, rain and wet soil was hampering farm work in eastern Kansas. Water seeped over the saturated lowland fields. Weeds began to sprout. And that month proved the wettest June in 65 years. There were 12 to 18 days of heavy rains over much of the State.

By the Fourth of July the situation was serious. Corn and wheat fields were choking with weeds, which even invaded the pasture lands. Still, the rains came. The Kansas River was overflowing its banks near Topeka. Upstream—but too far upstream—on the Kansas' Smoky Hill tributary, dams at Kanapolis and Cedar Bluff were holding the swirling upland waters in check. So was the Harlem County Dam, on the Republican River, near the Nebraska border. The trouble was that the storms had given the country its heaviest drenching below the dams.

At Kanapolis, where the \$12,000,000 dam is backed by a reservoir covering 3,550 acres, officials ordered the emergency flooding of a supplementary area of 13,900 acres which, in normal seasons, is leased to farmers. Still the water rose downstream. At Topeka, on the morning of July 10, it was approaching 30 feet above low-water level.

On that crucial morning, when the heavens opened up and unleashed disaster, the soil of Kansas—from the prairie sod of the west to the garden farmland of the east—was one vast sodden sponge. It could absorb no more. Shallow lagoons lay over the fields. Every ditch, creek, and stream bed was full to overflowing.

Thus was the stage set for the most destructive flood in the Nation's history.

THE DELUGE

It is 600 miles from eastern Kansas to the Gulf of Mexico. It is more than 3,600 miles from eastern Kansas to the Gulf of Alaska. Yet in these two distant areas, at the beginning of July, there was set in motion a giant conspiracy of the elements which was to touch off the climax of the natural drama building up along the Kaw.

In the Northwest Pacific, off the southern coast of Alaska, the formation of an unusually strong high-pressure area was reported by many sources. The news came in from ships on weather stations or commercial runs, from shore stations in the Aleutians, Alaska, and the Canadian Northwest, from airplanes on the northern route to the Far East and from Air Force Superforts on polar patrol out of Fairbanks. To them it was strictly routine.

But this mass of cold, dense air piled up to a height of nearly 8 miles. Moving clockwise around it, winds began to pour the chill toward the southeast. It spread itself like a blob of molasses over the Canadian coast, into our Central Plains. Its vanguard headed straight for Kansas.

From the Gulf of Mexico, meanwhile, another air mass was rolling north. This one was hot and moist. It crossed Louisiana and Texas, Arkansas and Oklahoma. Near the eastern end of the borders of Oklahoma and Kansas, the two opposing forces met.

The air from the Arctic hugged the ground with bulldog obstinacy, the tapered edge of its forward wall pushing several miles under the northbound mass before coming to a halt. The hot air, being lighter, was lifted in the collision, riding up over the dense layer beneath. The effect is a familiar one to meteorologists. They call it a cold front.

The hot air, laden with the waters of the Gulf, cooled rapidly as it climbed. The higher it rose, the closer was the condensation point approached. Somewhere in the atmosphere over Kansas, the moment came when the air from the south could hold its moisture no longer. At that moment, on July 10, nature let go and the deluge began.

It was the same kind of torrential rain which frequently develops in Asia, Africa, and the Philippines, when hot air masses are forced up over mountain ranges. It is this sort of a situation which waters the Nile, pouring a steady stream through the rainless desert without benefit of tributaries. But the Kansas River, which had to carry this burden, is not the Nile, and the country around it had been anything but rainless. And so the flood came.

STATIONARY COLD FRONT

Cold fronts, customarily, move either forward or back, depending on the relative push of the two air masses involved. For four long days, however, this one stood still.

In the first 24 hours several points in the Kansas River basin were drowned under 8 inches of rain—about twice the average Washington rainfall for the entire month of July. It was not that bad everywhere, and by July 14 the worst had passed. By then, however, an average of 8 inches had fallen over the entire river basin. The downpour was concentrated principally in eastern Kansas, although Missouri and adjoining sections of Nebraska and Oklahoma also were hit.

The Kaw and its tributaries rose up as one unit under this final, overwhelming blow. The normal river flow was multiplied, overnight, some 50 to 75 times. The usual flood crests, neatly plotted on the scientists' charts, were lost in the general inundation. All rivers in the area were affected—the Arkansas, Neosho, and other lesser streams flooded to record stages, causing damage and driving people from their homes in scores of cities and towns. But the water that really mattered was the water boiling down the Kansas basin, past Topeka, to a meeting with the Missouri at Kansas City.

THE FLOOD

The Kaw behaved as no white man ever saw it behave before. The Indians, however, had shown early settlers in the region high-water marks of one flood or even greater proportions.

This occurred, they said, in 1844—the year of the great waters. That was 2 years after Col. John C. Fremont blazed a trail westward to Oregon and California, while Kansas was still Indian territory. Early engineers checked the Indians' points of reference with official markers on the river. There seemed little doubt that the flood stage in June 1844 had reached 38 feet above low-water level—2 feet above the peak recorded this time.

That, however, was too far back to worry about. The twin Kansas Citys had based

their flood defenses on remembered experience in the intermediate record-high year of 1903. The yardstick proved inadequate. This time the water smashed over 22-foot dikes protecting the famed industrial sections. It buried railway yards, packing plants and stockyards under 14 feet of current. It spread its relentless blanket over over 1,384 blocks in the two cities which, for all it knew or cared, might as well not have been there.

As barrier after barrier went down before the advancing tide, men even tried to plug the gaps with their bodies until sandbags could be brought up. Thirst, ironically, became a part of the plague with flooding of the pumping station which supplies Kansas City, Mo., with two-thirds of its piped water. The water which coursed through the streets was unfit for consumption, without boiling and chemical treatment. And then, with the water, came fire. Runaway oil and gasoline storage tanks, ignited by high-tension wires, exploded and burned for days. Seven city blocks were razed by the flames.

Through it all, on high ground beyond reach of the water, 90 percent of the cities' residential area remained relatively unaffected. But from the edge of the downtown section at the foot of the bluffs on the Missouri side, clear across to the central business section of Kansas City, Kans., there stretched one watery wilderness of wreckage. Pyres of black smoke rose from the ruins.

DOWN THE MISSOURI

The long crest, disgorged by the Kaw, rolled into the Missouri. In midweek, around Kansas City, the water began to recede. The picture improved—but not much. The water left tons of mud behind it—heavy, slimy, 6 inches deep on any level surface the flood had reached. Weary victims turned to the job of digging themselves out.

City dwellers were not the only victims. By Monday, the experts figured, at least 850,000 acres of farmland had been flooded in Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma.

The skies were clear over Kansas by then, and so were they downstream along the Missouri to St. Louis. All along the line people prayed for them to stay that way. For, barring more rain, the effect of the flood would become less and less severe as more and more unaffected streams diluted it with the volume of their normal flow. The bigger the stream bed became, the more capable it became of absorbing the excess tonnage of water—just as the branches of a tree become stronger as they join together in approaching the trunk.

The Missouri, the first branch to lend its strength to supporting the runoff from Kansas, mercifully was some 10 feet lower than normal for the time of year at Kansas City. But Big Muddy, big as it is, could not handle the weight of water which hit it there. All along the river flood warnings were flashed. On Tuesday, at 30 miles a day, the crest pushed through Waverly and Lexington, Mo., eclipsing a century of records. On Wednesday night it battered its way into Jefferson City, inundating more than a score of blocks. The great surge poured by at 600,000 cubic feet a second, as compared with the normal July flow of 75,000 cubic feet. Its power was unimaginable—too much for the dikes. Between Kansas City and St. Charles, an estimated 1,500,000 acres of cropland were under water. The river in places was 5 miles wide.

The next great target was St. Louis, which waited fairly confidently, relying on its long experience in handling floods, and on the fact that the mighty Mississippi would add its weight there to the side of natural law and order. The city knew the flood would probably set a record, but expected little damage. Most of its area is on high ground.

And so the Kansas waters moved back toward the Gulf of Mexico from which they

had come. The prospect is that when the crest passes the mouth of the Ohio this week it will no longer be dangerous. It will leave behind it, however, the first billion-dollar flood in the Nation's history.

THE LESSON

Could it have been prevented? The question was on everybody's lips. Can this sort of thing be avoided in the future?

The debate is many-sided, but one point, to begin with, seems fairly clear: This was one flood disaster for which man himself could hardly be blamed—insofar, at least, as his sins of commission were concerned. Man did not cause this flood by plowing the land and cutting down trees. No soil-conservation program, alone, could have prevented it.

The plains of Kansas have never been really forested. And 107 years ago, when the area experienced the only flood known to have surpassed this one, no plow had touched the land.

This does not mean that soil conservation is unimportant. Erosion of the land contributes to floods just as, in the vicious cycle, floods contribute to the erosion of the land. But the fact remains that this particular flood would have hit, and hit hard, even if the land had been nurtured with as much pains as it has been abused.

The question, then, is whether soil conservation, in combination with other flood-control measures, could have prevented what happened in the Missouri Valley during the past week, and could prevent it happening again.

Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of Army engineers, had a positive answer: "If all the upstream reservoirs now either authorized by Congress or planned were in operation, we could have passed all this with no damages to the Kansas Citys."

The Kanapolis and Cedar Bluff Dams, mentioned above, are part of a long-range plan for the whole Missouri Basin, approved by Congress in 1944. Congress has yet to appropriate funds for the bulk of the projects, planned jointly by the Army engineers and the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation.

PICK-SLOAN PLAN

General Pick is one of the formulators of this Missouri Valley flood-control plan, and he gave it a half of its name. The other half came from W. G. Sloan, a former Regional Director of the Reclamation Bureau. The Pick-Sloan plan is a sort of informal compromise between the views of two schools. The Army originally thought the flood-control problem should be attacked by building big dams and levees along main streams. The Bureau, on the other hand, stressed the importance of controlling the water flow in upper tributaries, not only by storage dams, but also by replenishing the soil.

For the Kansas River Basin alone, under the plan, some 13 new projects involving the storage and channeling of the waters have been recommended. General Pick has estimated that completing this local program would cost, at 1951 prices, about \$300,000,000—far less, he points out, than the direct cost of the flood, not to mention intangibles like soil erosion and loss of time.

The over-all plan, however, embraces projects in 10 States—Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, Colorado, Montana, Iowa, Minnesota, Wyoming, and the Dakotas. The original idea was that this work probably would cost in the neighborhood of \$1,500,000,000 to \$2,000,000,000. In the light of present costs, these figures obviously are far out of date.

The general principles embodied in such plans as that of Messrs. Pick and Sloan have won rather wide acceptance. Yet there are those who doubt that they prove effective in the long run. There is an intensely practical school of thought which holds that reservoirs designed to relieve the pressure of flood-

waters eventually will become choked with the masses of silt carried by the floods—the same stuff now coating Kansas City.

There is another school—more theoretical, perhaps, but no less earnest—which contends that the present approach to the whole problem of flood control, particularly in the Missouri Valley, is administratively unsound and therefore can lead only to failure. These critics do not object to presently contemplated projects; they object to their piecemeal direction. The problem cannot be solved, they contend, until it is attacked from every quarter, under unified direction.

The model, of course, is the Tennessee Valley Authority, which succeeded in harnessing and controlling the Tennessee River to the great benefit of that entire, once-depressed area. The leading champion of a Missouri Valley Authority is Senator MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana. Similar authorities have been proposed for other river basins, notably the Columbia Basin.

All of the proposed new river valley authorities face stiff opposition—on the ground that they are socializing influences which violate States' rights over local waters, and which are subsidized by Federal taxes unfairly imposed on other, uninterested areas.

BIGGER THAN KANSAS

In surveying the waterlogged wreckage of the great flood of 1951, then, and looking ahead to the chances of making good on an oath of never again, the Nation is finding itself up against a situation which might be summarized in this way.

Yes, the Kansas River almost certainly can be made safe against a recurrence of this year's flood. The cost is great, and floods like this one are once-in-a-lifetime affairs. Yet all floods are expensive. In the Kansas River were made proof against them, mankind would have scored an indisputable economic and social gain.

But the Kansas River is only one of many rivers, and the cost of making them all safe would be very great indeed. For after all, who knows where, next time, the rains may decide to descend, and the floods to come?

Meet Acheson Issue Head-on

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, any proposal to hit back at Secretary of State Acheson by the devious device of striking the funds for his salary from the State Department appropriation ought to be abandoned.

I want to see Mr. Acheson out. But there is serious question as to the constitutionality of any move to refuse to appropriate his salary.

Furthermore, in my opinion such a move would not force his resignation. Certainly a man of his financial position, particularly one who has been associated with a law firm which has a record of huge retainers for services to foreign government clients doing business with the State Department, would not be persuaded to relinquish his office and its prestige and power by loss of his salary. I am sure he would be willing to remain in office as a dollar-a-year man.

Mr. Acheson's complete unfitness for the office of Secretary of State, particularly as reflected in the official foreign policy of prevarication regarding Formosa, which he has admitted, calls for meeting the issue head-on, not by ineffectual and devious back-door attack.

The Silver Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Rear Adm. Donald J. Ramsey, United States Navy, retired, treasurer, Silver Users Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY REAR ADM. DONALD J. RAMSEY, BEFORE THE MIRROR MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION, MARK HOPKINS HOTEL, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., JULY 12, 1951

It is my privilege to again address you on the silver situation. When I last appeared before you in late October 1950, the price of silver was 80 cents per ounce. At that time I explained to you how the producing interests control and manipulate the silver market.

My remarks along this line reached the director of the Bank of Mexico, who stated that Mexico does not take into account the criticisms the foreigner makes for having forced, indirectly, the rise in the price of silver in the international markets; and then went on to explain Mexico's silver policy. He stated that Mexico is actively interested in the silver price as there are great mining resources where exploitation would have to cease if that metal does not have an adequate price. On the other hand, he states they are interested that the silver market remain stable and they would make efforts to equalize its quotations, because an excessive price would encourage the countries and particular individuals who have hoarded this metal in great quantities, and would create dangerous fluctuations in the internal market. In other words the price must not be too high, nor too low—for Mexico. He stated that the declaration of the consumers of silver in the United States has caused great surprise in Mexico, inasmuch as they have accused his country of being the cause of the recent price rise of silver. He also stated that my remarks could only be attributed to the lack of adequate information. Perhaps it is too much information.

Now, let us return to the silver market. In October 1950, the price of silver advanced from 72¾ cents per ounce to 80 cents per ounce. The explanation given in New York for this rise, was that the Bank of Mexico had withdrawn as a seller of silver in the United States, although from Mexico City we received the explanation that the rise in the price of silver was due to an increased demand rather than a withholding of Mexican sales. A Mexican newspaper, however, reported that local silver sales were suspended while a new export tax was studied. They couldn't get together on their explanations, which I am sure caused some

embarrassment to the gentleman in Mexico. The results of the rumors that the Bank of Mexico was withdrawing as a seller last October were twofold: First, it induced some "scare" buying by consumers, and second, it gave the producing interests in this country an excuse to raise the price, and thus we had the price established at 80 cents per ounce. The interesting part about this whole business is that there was plenty of silver available at the time of the price rise. And so we went along for a few weeks until on Friday, December 29, 1950. On that date there appeared a small article, tucked away in the New York Times, to the effect that the Bank of Mexico had retired all silver available to the world market, and that the move was expected to raise the price of silver. The same old familiar pattern. This little tip-off was either planted deliberately or it leaked out—possibly to the embarrassment of the Mexicans. In any event, on January 5, 1 week later, the producing interests withdrew from the New York silver market. Three days later they came back but the price of silver was now 90 16 cents per ounce. Was this price rise as a result of supply and demand? Oh, no. There was plenty of silver both before and after the price rise. The producing interests simply decided to get another 10 cents per ounce for silver.

Perhaps you will wonder why they picked the price of 90 16 cents per ounce. To the quoted price should be added 0.25 cent handling charge, which makes it 90.41 cents per ounce. This, however, is for silver which is 0.999 pure, so that the price for pure silver would be 90½ cents per ounce, which is the price the Treasury must pay for domestic silver when it is offered by the producers.

In other words, the New York market price and the Treasury price for domestic silver are one and the same. This fact prompted the president of the Sunshine Mining Co., one of the few remaining companies producing silver primarily in any quantity to make a statement to his stockholders as follows:

"Domestic supplies of silver have dwindled and imports of foreign silver have increased, so that the silver price in the domestic market has risen until it is now equal to that offered by the Treasury for newly mined domestic silver. This situation emphasizes the pointlessness of the perennial attacks upon the Silver Purchase Act and it is to be hoped that the public will be given a rest from the campaign of misleading propaganda that has been waged against the producers of this highly important metal."

The president of the Sunshine Mining Co. talks of misleading propaganda yet he does not hesitate to mislead his stockholders in making the statement that the Treasury offers any price for domestic silver. It does no such thing—the law requires the Treasury to receive such silver when offered by the producers. It might also be of interest to his stockholders to know that the Treasury Department, when asked by the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee in the Senate to comment on a bill to repeal the silver purchase laws, made the following comment:

"The Treasury Department would not be disposed to object to the enactment of such legislation."

The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System made the following comment:

"The Board believes that enactment of S 2829 (which provides for the repeal of silver purchase laws) would be in the public interest."

At this point I would like to comment on another bit of misleading propaganda which frequently comes from the silver-producing interests—the latest coming from Representative BERING, of Nevada, in which he states:

"Every ounce the silver miner sells to the Treasury at ninety-odd cents becomes worth \$1.29 when coined into dollars, thus making the general public a profit of 39 cents at the expense of the miner," and that "The silver miners will not be satisfied until they get the full monetary price of \$1.29 an ounce to which they are entitled."

He further stated:

"In the case of silver, we have a curious and perhaps unparalleled situation where the silver miner is subsidizing the Treasury (hence the average citizen) rather than getting subsidies from the Government."

An editorial in the Morning Register, Des Moines, Iowa, answered these statements, probably more effectively than I can, when it said, "Phony silver claim if we've heard one," and then ended up by saying, "Let's not be ridiculous, Congressman BARKING."

It is true that the Treasury makes a profit on domestic silver turned into the Treasury, but here is how it is done. The domestic producer gets 90½ cents for each ounce he turns into the Treasury. Sixty-three cents' worth of this silver is set aside to back the paper printed by the Treasury to pay for this ounce. The other 27 cents' worth is considered profit. Then, by law, which requires the Treasury to value the monetized silver at the rate of \$1.29 per ounce, the 63 cents' worth of silver miraculously becomes worth 90½ cents, and is so carried on the books of the Treasury. The joker in this transaction is that no one in the world will give you 90½ cents for 63 cents' worth of silver. In other words, the 27-cent profit is made as a result of a fictitious valuation of the silver set aside to back our paper money. It is the most insidious of all subsidies. No money is taken from the taxpayer to pay for the subsidy. * * * It is paid for through the reduction in the amount of backing for every dollar in your pocket. So you can understand why the Des Moines paper calls this a phony claim. Wouldn't it be wonderful if the mirror manufacturers could get a law passed to permit them to handle their accounts in this fashion, and yet you are just as much entitled to it as the silver producers.

Last September, Mr. Francis R. Brownell, former chairman of the American Smelting & Refining Co., distributed a little pamphlet entitled "The Problem Posed by the Silver Users Association in 1950," in which he attempts to defend the position of the producers. Mr. Brownell makes no mention of the effect of our present silver legislation on the monetary system of our country, nor how it permits the producing interests to manipulate and control the silver market. I can assure Mr. Brownell, Congressman BARKING, and the president of the Sunshine Mining Co., that the silver users will pose a problem to them as long as the present silver situation exists and that there will be no cessation of the perennial attacks upon the Silver Purchase Act.

There was a little by-play in the silver picture last month which is interesting to note. On the 7th of June the price of foreign silver in the New York market dropped from 90 16 cents per ounce to 87¾ cents per ounce. The decline was attributed to the falling-off of demand and the accumulation of foreign silver. This drop in price was rather interesting because it appears that the Mexicans were not aware of the fact that the price was to be dropped. Those of us who watch the silver market were interested to know why the Mexicans did not step in and buy up the so-called surplus in order to stabilize the market. The price remained at 87¾ cents for about 3 weeks during which time the demand was light. Everyone who follows the silver market knows that some of the silver consumers shut down during July, and that there would be very little demand during this period for silver, even

at a reduced price. It is curious to note, however, that what little demand there was was probably in excess of the offered supply. On June 28 the old familiar pattern again appeared. Mexico announced that they were withdrawing from the silver market—this time for the rest of the year. It was further reported that the Mexican Government was buying all of her current production of the country. Following this announcement the price of silver went back to 90.16 cents per ounce. You will remember when I spoke to you last I made reference to the fact that the price of silver remained steady for nearly 6 months, regardless of supply and demand. It would be interesting to know whether or not this drop in price for 3 weeks was perhaps not planned in order to give the impression that the market does sometimes react to supply and demand. The circumstances would tend to indicate that such was the case.

Now, let us take a look at the silver-supply picture. According to reports, the Mexicans intend to absorb their own production for the rest of the year. In other words, Mexico's new production will not be exported to the New York market. If this be true, the supply picture is still not too serious. According to the Bureau of the Census, silver imports for 1950 amounted to 140,000,000 ounces. Consumption estimates were 120,000,000 for the same period. This means that we started the year with a 20,000,000-ounce surplus. Imports for 1951 through June 13 amounted to approximately 72,000,000 ounces. This gives us a total available for 1951 of approximately 92,000,000 ounces. Even if Mexico does not export any silver during the rest of 1951, there will be silver coming in from other countries. If we assume consumption to be as high as it was last year, we will need to import but 28,000,000 ounces during the rest of the year to give us 120,000,000 ounces. There has, in the past, always been more silver available than figures would indicate. In discussing the supply so far, no mention has been made of domestic silver which would become available at a slightly higher price of, say, 96½ cents per ounce; also, at about this figure, the "free" silver in the Treasury would become available to industry. Thus, it would appear that the silver supplies will be adequate to meet demands for some time to come. This does not mean, however, that the users of silver need have no fears for the future. We must be eternally vigilant to insure that supplies remain available.

The reason given for Mexico's absorption of its own production is that they have coinage commitments requiring considerable amounts of silver. It is reported that they have a coinage order for Saudi Arabia involving some 17,000,000 ounces of silver. It is also reported that they are negotiating with Pakistan for an order involving 10,000,000 ounces. In addition, they are reported to have entered into a barter arrangement with Western Germany for approximately 7,000,000 ounces. This makes a total of approximately 34,000,000 ounces. It is not known over what period of time these orders extend and the Pakistan order does not appear to be firm as yet.

The necessity for obtaining our own domestic production in a free and open market is more than ever apparent. Last year some 42,000,000 ounces of silver went into the Treasury, which does not need it. We must continue our efforts to acquaint the people of this country with the true silver picture. We must work to carry out our objectives of a free flow of silver in commerce, both foreign and domestic, at prices governed by competition operating under the ordinary laws of supply and demand. This can only be accomplished through the repeal of our silver-purchase laws.

Farm Prices Not Cause of High Food Cost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the price received by farmers for their produce from 1948, the peak year, to the present, conclusively shows that the prices of these products have not caused the rise in the cost of living. The table which is herewith inserted tells the whole story:

Specified commodities; average price received by farmers, North Dakota, designated dates

Commodity and unit	Highest price postwar		Jan. 15, 1951
	Date	Price	
Wheat, bushel.....	January 1948.....	\$2.03	\$2.11
Rye, bushel.....	March 1947.....	2.88	1.44
Corn, bushel.....	January 1948.....	2.40	1.38
Oats, bushel.....	January 1948.....	1.20	.73
Barley, bushel.....	January 1948.....	2.23	1.31
Flaxseed, bushel.....	March 1947.....	8.20	4.20
Potatoes, bushel.....	April 1946.....	1.90	.85
Hogs, hundred-weight.....	January 1948.....	25.90	19.20
Feef cattle, hundredweight.....	April 1951.....	28.50	21.40
Veal calves, hundredweight.....	April and June 1951.....	32.00	29.00
Sheep, hundred-weight.....	February and March 1951.....	18.00	14.20
Lambs, hundred-weight.....	March 1951.....	35.00	30.00
Butterfat, pound.....	December 1946 and January 1948.....	.88	.72
Milk, wholesale, hundredweight.....	January 1948.....	4.50	4.00
Chickens, live, pound.....	August 1948.....	.260	.183
Turkeys, live, pound.....	December 1948.....	.480	.34
Eggs, dozen.....	November and December 1948.....	.460	.283

Statistics, Bureau of Agriculture

Examine each and every item. Wheat, for example, has dropped 82 cents per bushel while bread has risen from 10 cents per loaf to 17 cents. Rye dropped \$1.44 per bushel, but rye products increased 75 percent. Hogs dropped from \$25.90 per hundred to \$19.20, but in the markets porks went right on up. Beef sold for \$28.50 per hundred, live weight, dropping \$4.10 per hundred, but beef products went up so high to the consumer that many millions of people could not buy at all.

Milk, chickens, turkeys, eggs, and butterfat declined, some of these items drastically, but prices to consumers went up.

While the farmers' income has been declining gradually since 1948, pay to labor in industries went up from \$1.30 per hour to \$1.58 per hour. Corporate profits rose from \$32,500,000,000 in 1948 to \$51,000,000,000 in 1951.

The consumers of the East seem determined that the farmers are the villains in the high cost of living, and representatives of the large eastern centers like New York lost no time in sniping away at the farmers. I told them on the floor of Congress that what they

needed as much as a 5-cent cigar was another real depression like we had in 1932. Farmers were broke and were being driven off their farms—their buying power was gone—manufacturers could not sell their products, factories closed, and labor roamed the streets until 15,000,000 men and women registered in the army of the unemployed.

The same thing can happen again. The farmers' income is dwindling. And soon the farm belt will have no buying power. Factories will close again and labor will walk the streets.

In other words, if this trend keeps up we will not be bothered with inflation, but a period of deflation will grip the country. Unless this buying power of the farmers is maintained, there will be a period of deflation and unemployment just as surely as we stand here today.

Is it not about time the East woke up and considered the farmers as a part of our national economy?

America's Public Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. REVA BECK BOSONE

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to make a statement about America's public employees—the few we hear about and the many we do not, and about ourselves whose zeal in forgetting the loyal and honest thousand is equaled only by our zest in remembering the disloyal and dishonest one.

It was with mixed emotions that I read an item in the paper the other day detailing how an employee of the Department of Commerce had been rewarded for honesty. Why, I asked myself, was it necessary to publicize the honesty of an employee of the Department of Commerce or the honesty of the employee of any other governmental unit, in or out of Washington? Surely not because cases of honesty are so rare in our Government that when an upright employee is found her name should be emblazoned on the pages of a big daily newspaper. Surely not because honesty in Government has reached the "man bites dog" stage in the eyes of the hard-boiled journalist, when honesty becomes a matter of news.

No, that was not the reason. No thinking person will say that all the employees of the Government are dishonest, just because an infinitesimal percentage have been found dishonest. No one will deny that hundreds of thousands of our people, your friends and mine, and the friends of John Jones and Jim Smith, work for the Government day after day,

year after year, sometimes for a whole adult lifetime, and not in any minute of that long service have they done anything dishonest or been a party to any effort to defraud the Government.

But since honesty in Government is not an oddity, why is honesty given space in the daily press? Why did the news men take time away from their more sensational stories and give the lady a pat on the back for turning down an offer of a bribe from a New York export firm and getting enough evidence to prosecute the firm? Again I turn to the man-bites-dog idea. Was it printed because it is so rare that a man not in Government attempts a crime? Was the fact that a non-Government individual had been caught red-handed the element of news? Surely not, for I know from my many years on the bench that a great many people not in Government commit crimes. In fact, I cannot recall more than a handful of public employees who stood before the bar of justice in my court, but I can certainly say that there were many thousand non-public employees there—and many of them were guilty as charged.

Why then the story? Frankly, I do not know, but I am glad it was there. I was glad it was there because I am sick of hearing some of the Washington character assassins accuse Government employees in such broad and harsh terms that they make it appear the whole Government is interlaced with graft.

I think it is one of the sad commentaries of our times that so many speeches have been made and so many columns written over such a relatively small percentage of acts which could be called illegal or, in some instances, unethical.

I know that every Member of this House of Representatives deeply deplores the fact that any employee or official of the Federal Government has proven himself venal or dishonest in any way. I am sure there is wholehearted agreement that such a person has no right in Government service, but I think every fair-minded legislator will agree that it takes more than a repetition of unsupported charges to make a person guilty and that all are not black who are painted black.

If the newspapers of this Nation were to play up the acts of honesty performed by the public servants, there would not be enough paper in the country to print the editions. If every honest person got a hike in pay for his honesty some of the loudest critics of this administration would break blood vessels when the appropriation bills came up to pay for the increases.

Now, ladies and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, Mrs. Helen Mathieson is not the exception; she is the rule. The story does not typify the unusual but the usual. Her story is not appreciated because her act was unique, but because it was just an opportunity to point up what we all know, but which many have been hoodwinked into forgetting—that the American public servant is honest, sincere, and a credit to this great Nation.

Defense of the Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

DEFENSE OF THE DOLLAR

JULY 7, 1951.

1. Defense of the dollar is the paramount problem. The critical front is on the Potomac, not the Yalu or the Elbe. Stalin is as keenly aware of this fact as is the President, and the latter goes the limit when he says: "If inflation got away from us and wrecked our savings and ruined our economy, that would be the easiest victory the Kremlin could ask for. Communist Russia could win the whole world to totalitarianism without firing a shot."

2. What does he mean? Not merely that the vested capital of the country will be wiped out, including the worth of pensions, of life insurance policies and of mortgages. He means the destruction of the American system, in terms of politics as well as economics. He means just what he says, namely, that the alternative to a sound dollar is the acceptance of Stalinism.

3. History cannot be mocked. The traditional recourse of the dictator in his quest of power is seizure of the public purse. All other authority follows that. On this account the founding fathers gave the control of money to the Congress and kept it from the executive. Solvency for years past, prior to 1933, has been anchored to a natural standard—gold—a rock against which the waves of extravagance could make no headway.

4. That control has been lost. It is no longer a barrier to the whims of the executive and Congress. Nothing other than a temporary agreement among a few officials restrains the Government from printing money in whatever amount it wishes. It need not go to the public for funds, for it can pour its promises to pay into the banking system whenever these officials, or others to follow them, decide again to have the Federal Reserve System support the bond market.

5. Such dollars have a backing so long as they are receivable for taxes, but they are fiat money just the same. They produce the inflationary gap. They are the life-blood of extravagance.

6. They are "flat" for this reason. Just as they are created by decree of the Government, just so their value can be utterly destroyed by another decree. It is only common sense to realize that a single election can, directly or indirectly, repudiate the public debt in its entirety. It can do by electing a Congress pledged to appropriate no funds for interest payments. It can do so by boosting expenditures higher and higher to the point where paper money will be of value only to museums. After that, the concentration camps.

7. The States are in imminent danger. They cannot print money. They must use whatever currency the Federal Government foists upon them. Already their tax sources have been invaded. Malignant inflation can deprive them entirely of usable funds. More and more they look now to Washington for what is called, with the illusion of language, "Federal aid." They get but a part of what has been taken from them. They cannot, even now, sustain their normal and historic

functions without begging from the Federal capital the means to keep alive. Inflation hastens attenuation of the idea of federation. Tomorrow there may be provinces instead of States, ruled by satraps dispatched from Washington. Constitutions cannot prevail against the power of the purse.

8. All of the foregoing the present Government, directly and by implication, admits. So, it cries: "Inflation must be stopped." But who creates inflation and at what paps does it nurse? They who cry "wolf" are the wolves. The theory seems to be that it takes a thief to catch a thief. And what cure is offered? Give us more money. The taxes, already confiscatory, are not enough. The ideal position, says the Government, in effect, is when virtually all profits flow into its coffers, when the people cannot pay high prices because they have not the means to buy more than a modicum even of essentials.

9. Nationalization of profits is the worst form of socialism. When a government nationalizes industries it must at least manage them and be concerned with profits or losses. When it seizes the profits of private industry it absolves itself of risk. Call it cowardice or identify it as a subtle method of accomplishing by indirection what Stalin at least has the nerve to do openly and violently.

10. "How long," asks a Senator, "can American business go on paying from 60 percent to 70 percent of its income in taxes, and survive?" The answer of an official is that, barring a general war, reductions may be permissible after 1955. But taxes then will inevitably be higher, not lower. If inflation has not been stopped in its tracks. And how much longer can the middle classes, the salaried people and the annuitants, survive under present and proposed taxation? The kulaks need not be liquidated, as was the Russian method, by cutting off their heads. "You take my life when you do take the means whereby I live."

11. Confiscatory taxation is inflation. To put \$17,000,000,000 of additional taxes on the economy is to add even more billions to the cost of doing business. Taxes, like wages, are a cost figure. Somewhere, somehow, the high rates that are prescribed to stop inflation actually bring it about. Listen to the President on that point. He says (not with entire correctness) that the entire \$4,000,000,000 of new taxes levied last fall paid for not a single gun because the inflation meantime had raised the cost of defense purchases by \$7,000,000,000. Consider that—\$4,000,000,000 added to the tax load at a net loss of \$3,000,000,000 to the Treasury. Stalin laughs; we cry.

12. In the shadows of that picture, it is maintained that there is only one answer, namely, to give the Government more power. It wants to put ceilings on prices and to license business. To fortify its demand, officials with one accord, from the President down, keep telling the country that an even more devastating inflation is just ahead. It is an invitation to everybody to rush into the marts and buy, at any price. It is a repetition of the warning from the White House itself, last summer, to use dollars quickly because they were certain to depreciate.

13. "We propose," say officials, in effect, "so to expand the facilities of the country that, within a year or two, production will be in such huge volume as to assure competition in the marketplace; we can and will have butter and guns." There is considerable merit in that argument. The American economy, in all truth, is an economy of surpluses. That was true before Korea, and the potentiality grows with the days.

14. But political error can be the snake even in such a promised Paradise. Will the

private economy expand under the burden of confiscatory taxation, combined with price and allocation controls? Already, there are signs that management is becoming cautious. Who is going to buy a production so vast that it would swamp domestic markets? It may not be practicable to subsidize exports interminably. It may be that point 4, whatever its merits, will not be a powerful force in the world economy until decades hence.

15. An expanding economy is a desirable economy, but not if the expansion is at an explosive rate. Not if the assets of the generations to come are sequestered in advance, not moderately but extravagantly. Ours is a mansion already filled with good things. We have, as Charles Kettering has noted, with 6 percent of the world's land area and 7 percent of its population, 58 percent of the telephones, 76 percent of its automobiles, and 34 percent of its radio and television sets. That is an establishment worth looting, and the doors are left unlocked for any demagog to enter when Federal expenditure is unlimited.

16. This enormous accomplishment has been achieved under our American system of free enterprise, which is quite a different thing from the feudal Capitalism which in other places is under attack and we are called on to protect. The Nation can live a long time on its fat unless that fat be squandered.

17. The authorities, with support from both political parties, offer only one solution—higher taxes and more controls. Every proposal from the White House is for heavier expenditure. There must be, its propaganda insists, no slowdown of its welfare projects. It wants to increase them and it uses the necessity of defense as justification for projects that would be of debatable propriety even in normal times. But the more revenue Washington gets the more it is certain to spend. It refuses to recognize that the barrel has a bottom.

18. There has been built up an opinion that it is reasonable to question the practicability of a White House program. Experts in public relations are summoned to Washington to advise the Office of Defense Mobilization how to coordinate the activities of all the multiple public relations officers of the Government to carry a single message to the public, and sell the idea that not only is the policy of the Government perfect and unassailable, but also that its methods of mobilization are beyond criticism.

19. How close are we even now to the one-party system in our Government? It is wise to have partisanship end at the border and to present a united front abroad. But that is quite a different thing from outlawing debate in the formulation of the policy, whatever it may be. Therein lies the fallacy of a bipartisan foreign policy. It is sheer madness to foreclose on discussion. A country under parliamentary forms is in a sorry status if it lacks a loyal opposition. Diplomacy ought not to be deceptive of our own people.

20. The peril is far too great to permit major decisions to be made in secret chambers, even though members of both political parties participate. It is known now that the present danger is largely the consequence of fatal errors made at Yalta and at Potsdam. In the first case, a Chief Executive sick unto death, with his principal consultant in a similar condition, made concessions that poured strength into Stalin's veins. He did this as Commander in Chief, without consultation with Congress and without reference to the people. That was embezzlement of power. Who can assure that it would not happen again, or that another victory in another war might not be bartered away by a well-meaning but incompetent authority?

It is the abuse of our own institutions that makes necessary a defense of the dollar.

21. The people are confused because the danger to the country has not been explained to them with vivid clearness. They have been bombarded with a series of generalities, some of which would tax the credulity of infants. "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself," said Roosevelt, but the Washington bureaucracy, including the generals, has again and again, in public testimony, indicated a dread lest a gesture here or an action there annoy the Politburo.

22. It might be supposed that Russia was the giant and this country the pigmy. It may be doubted if the Politburo is more cunning than America in its programming. It is altogether unlikely that its production equals America's in volume or parallels it in quality, over all.

23. Extravagance in Government can be moderated, and without impairment of defense. The so-called Marshall shield calls for mobilization of our collective production facilities and an arrangement whereby they may move into maximum output by pressing a button. Most of this capacity already exists. After the last war the Government retained 440 of its War II plants as a reserve of industrial capacity. More than half of these—278—are now producing defense items, and another 66 are being reactivated. Defense has already arranged for \$6,000,000,000 additional in plant expansion and tooling, mostly for the production of aircraft. Private capacities have enormously expanded since War II. Atomic warheads, artillery shells and guided missiles are well advanced, as is the use of atomic power for submarines. Together there exists already with rapidly increasing potentiality, a Marshall shield.

24. Defense is the one great area in which economy can be practiced. Let us confine its actual production to usable hardware. Let there be no such overproduction, say, of tanks, as to overwhelm our storage facilities. This would serve a double purpose, since it would also tend to minimize obsolescence.

25. Let it be observed, too, that possibly the very hugeness of the appropriations is intended to frighten Stalin, with no present idea of actual use of the amounts in full. Yet defense will always be tempted to spend whatever is authorized. The Watchdog Committee of the Senate can be of incalculable service to the Nation by keeping its tender fingers in touch with this situation.

26. Inflation has already gone so far that possibly some form of price control is essential, but to be used only if necessary and with great caution. Let there be denial of appropriations for projects that safely can be postponed. Let the Congress wait, at least until fall, before imposing any new taxes whatever. Let aided foreign nations also show restraint in spending their and our money on welfare or postponable projects. Let a spirit of devotion to the public weal be substituted for the extravagant atmosphere that prevails in Washington. In a word, let the bureaucracy become patriotic.

27. The thing that is inflated is the Government. Big Government costs big money. Inflation is conceived and born in Washington. Only the Federal Government can spend in unlimited amounts. It alone determines the value of money and the extent of credit because it alone is legally empowered so to do. The administration already has controls adequate to stop the inflation dead in its tracks. It can stabilize the whole economy by utilizing its present powers. It can do so by putting ceilings on expenditures. It can barricade the American system against disaster by itself practicing that economy which it so belligerently calls on the mass public to endure. Congress should insist that it do so.

Could the Recent Flood on the Missouri River Have Been Prevented?—Collingwood Says "Yes"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I am inserting a broadcast delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System last Sunday by Mr. Charles Collingwood, one of the Nation's outstanding news commentators. While I do not happen to live in the Missouri River Basin, I think the observations made by Mr. Collingwood apply to any of our river basins and natural drainage systems. This broadcast in a few words covers pretty much the whole problem of flood control in the Missouri River Basin and in my humble opinion it is worthy of the special consideration of the Members of Congress coming from that area as well as the consideration of the Congress as a whole having the welfare of our country at heart.

One day last week this reporter witnessed one of the great modern disasters. Like most disasters it need never have happened.

I was with a group of reporters who flew with President Truman over the flooded areas of Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma. Hour after hour we cruised along over the muddy, swollen rivers, looking down on the roofs of houses sticking out of the water, the flooded factories, the broken bridges, the rows of freight cars floated out of line like so many toy boats in a bathtub. We flew over close to a thousand miles of rivers in flood—up to the Mississippi from St. Louis to Kansas City, along the Kansas River to Fort Riley, over the Big Blue, the Republican, the Smoky Hill, down the Neosho, past Emporia into Oklahoma. Looking down, you could trace the river beds by the line of trees and the bridges—not very big rivers, most of them you could throw a rock across when they're in their courses, today they spread over the farm lands and towns 3, 4, 5 miles wide. We saw close to a thousand miles of rivers out of their banks, and we didn't see it all. Two million acres of land were flooded. Gen. Lewis Pick, of the Army engineers, calls it the billion dollar flood, and that's as good an estimate of the damage as any.

It was a shocking spectacle but the most tragic part of the whole thing is that it needn't have happened at all. We didn't have to have this flood. We know how to control rivers. In particular we know how to control the Missouri River. Experts have been making studies of it since the 1830's and all the elements of a plan that would not only prevent floods but would transform the Missouri Basin into a stable and fruitful area are at hand. The story of why we had this flood is a story of private selfishness, bureaucratic rivalry, false economy, and politics. Some of its outlines are worth considering as the great flood of 1951 rolls on toward the sea, leaving a billion dollars worth of damage in its wake.

The principal character in the story is the Missouri itself—the Big Muddy—big, muddy, and unpredictable. It is the longest river

in the United States. It runs for 2,500 miles from its source on the Continental Divide in Yellowstone Park to St. Louis. The Missouri Basin includes all or part of 10 States, from Wyoming, Montana, and the Dakotas in the North to Kansas, Missouri, and Iowa. Now, this is important, because everyone agrees that if you're going to do anything about a river, you've got to consider the whole river and its whole watershed.

We're concerned with floods on the Missouri River now, but flooding is only one of the problems in the Missouri Basin. In the Missouri Basin, it would seem, it's either a feast or a famine. If it isn't flood, it's drought. All of us remember the dust storms and droughts of the 1930's. That was in the Missouri Basin. Streams ran dry, springs failed, the crops withered, and when the winds came the dust obscured the sun. In 1938 nearly 9,000,000 acres were blowing. Thousands of people went bankrupt. In the 1930's 300,000 people moved out of the Missouri Valley. Those were the dry years. And then in the 40's the rains came again (there's a definite rainfall cycle in the Missouri basin), and when the rains came the waters raced down the slopes that had been overplowed, overgrazed, poorly cared for, carrying the mud of the plains into the creeks, into the streams, down the tributaries into the Missouri. And there were floods. There were record flood stages on the Missouri in 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945, 1947, and now 1951. All the signs point to a recurrence of the dry cycle soon, and then the coin will be reversed and the problems of the Missouri Basin will come from not enough water instead of too much.

Obviously, the Missouri basin is in trouble—bad trouble—of which the present floods are only a symptom.

When there is trouble, people want to do something about it. The Missouri basin is no exception. The difficulty is that everyone wants to do something different. The various plans for the Missouri basin have provided one of the great running controversies within the Government in recent years. To begin with there are the Army engineers. They love to build dams, and they worked out an ambitious program of dams and reservoirs on the main stream and the main tributaries. The engineers General Pick says that if these dams had been built there would be no flood disaster now. The Army engineers are principally interested in flood control and navigation. But the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation loves to build dams too, so it worked out another, equally ambitious program. But the Reclamation Bureau is especially interested in things like power and irrigation, and their program called for different kinds of dams in different places. Many epic battles were waged between the two, until they finally reached a compromise called the Pick-Sloan plan which includes most of the projects of both. Congress authorized this in spite of widespread criticism that many of the projects were self-defeating—but the Pick-Sloan plan has never really got going partly because of economy-minded Congresses, partly because of local opposition. If you build a dam, the water backs up, and some areas are flooded. Nobody likes to be flooded, so everywhere a dam was to be built, the people rose up and said, "Build it somewhere else." The result was that when the present flood hit there weren't enough dams to impound the water. The Army engineers say bitterly that \$300,000,000 worth of dams which they had asked for would have saved Manhattan, Kansas, Kansas City, and other ravaged areas.

But the Pick-Sloan plan is not the only one in the field. The Department of Agriculture has a plan, too. Its experts say that all the dams and levees in the world aren't

enough unless you get at the source of the problem. The source, says the Department of Agriculture, is in the watershed—the area which drains into the river. You've got to manage that watershed, see to it that the water stays on the ground instead of pouring into the streams. To do this, they have devised a huge program of land management, involving crop planting, grazing methods, and forest management. The critics of this plan say it's all very well, but it's not enough—there were floods on the Missouri before the first farmer came into the basin, so even if you restored the land to its virgin state, you still wouldn't stop the floods.

So the arguments go, while floods and droughts continue to plague the Missouri Valley, and the whole economic and social life of the area is rendered precarious. It's quite obvious that each plan has merit. It's equally obvious that no one of them alone is adequate to solve the manifold problems of the Missouri basin. What is needed is a unified approach, beginning far back in the watershed, extending to big projects on the lower reaches of the river—an approach which will take into account, not only flood control, but irrigation, navigation, power, recreation, land management, all the rest. We have the tools to do such a job. We know how to do each part, but we haven't put them all together. And what is true of the Missouri is just as true of the Ohio, the Connecticut, the Potomac, and others of the great rivers of our country. If the floods on the Missouri can drive this lesson home, untold benefits for the Nation may grow out of this terrible tragedy.

Is the Army Wasting Reserve Manpower?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a very interesting letter from a man whom I have known for over 25 years and in whose judgment I have great confidence. This gentleman served in both the First and Second World Wars. Between these wars he was in the Army Reserves. Knowing him as I do, I have not the slightest doubt that his information about Reserves called to active duty is correct. The cases he cites may be isolated ones, but I wonder if they are not typical of the use of reserves recalled by the Army.

I do not wish to indulge in any unfair criticism of the Army. However, I hear so many similar things from individual Reserves regarding their own experiences and assignments that it makes me apprehensive. Men who have served in one war should not, if it can be avoided, be required to serve in an active duty status unless it is absolutely essential to our national security.

This outlines my reason for obtaining unanimous consent to include the following letter as part of my remarks:

July 18, 1951.

HON. LEROY JOHNSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ROY: Thanks a lot for your letter of June 25, 1951. I must say that the Colonel's

letter to you contains about as much information as most reports.

The future well-being of the Reserve Corps of the United States will be seriously affected by the current attitudes adopted by the armed services. It is going to be difficult indeed to induce young businessmen, the natural leaders of younger people, to remain in the Reserve Corps if the Armed Forces are going to take the attitude that they can call them to active duty without their consent and then give them piddling jobs which require only 5 or 10 hours a week. I think that all young Americans, particularly those who are in the Reserve Corps, are willing to make any sacrifice necessary for their country, but it must be difficult for young people whose lives are disrupted for the second time (having served their country in World War II and now being called back on what is supposed to be another emergency) to understand why the Government summarily directs them, without their consent, to leave their business where they are just commencing to get a foothold after the last war and rushes them back into uniform only to assign them to duties which take only 5 or 10 hours a week. It doesn't make any sense and the result is bound to be that young men who are leaders will hesitate to remain in the Reserve Corps, not because they are unmindful of the importance of being available for service if they are needed, but because they are fearful that the leaders of the country will be so wanton in their disregard of the importance of a civilian individual's time as to order them back into the Armed Forces whether they are needed or not.

I know of no single factor that would do more damage to the preparedness of this country or its morale than to continue to put men on active duty without their consent under circumstances which even a child would recognize as a wanton waste of the ablest manpower of our younger generation.

Now I've blown off steam and I feel better, and it must be difficult for you fellows in Congress to get this type of letter but in this case I feel justified because there is something that really needs to be done about it.

A good example came to my attention just a few days ago where a young doctor has 6 months more in residence at the Los Angeles County Hospital to qualify as an ophthalmologist. He served as an ensign in World War II in the Navy and was offered a Reserve commission which, on his father's recommendation, he declined. His draft board placed him in 1-A. The local medical board refused to delay his induction to permit him to complete the 6 months' training that would make him a specialist. The armed services, under their rules, could not commission him and delay his call to active duty so that he could complete his residence and qualify for his specialty. All of this adds up to a loss to the United States. The young man for the second time will be required to enter the armed services and, maybe when he gets out next time, will be unable to resume or to secure the opportunity to resume and complete the 6 months residence needed to make him a specialist.

Another case that has come to my attention is a young law student with 6 months to go to complete his legal education. He could not secure a delay to permit him to do so. He was inducted and placed in a camp within 50 miles of the law school. During most of the time that he would have been engaged in completing his legal education, he was assigned to kitchen police.

These are just a few samples of the waste of our young manpower that are taking place in this country today. While everyone does and should appreciate the importance of having young men serve under emergency conditions, the building up of our Armed Forces should be accomplished with due regard for the necessity of those who are not professional soldiers carrying forward their

lives after they have completed their service and in instances where young men have already served in World War II, every opportunity should be given to them to complete their education or their qualification for their life work and they should not be again returned to the Armed Forces without their consent except in extreme emergency, and those who have been returned should be given an early release.

Well, this second blow-off of steam ought to really wind me up for the day. Anyway, Roy, I thought you might find these comments interesting and maybe helpful in the effort I know you are making to assist our armed services in arriving at the right decisions in these difficult times.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

Wisconsin Educator Retires After 35 Years of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if there is any one group of people who can take just pride in their contributions to the American way of life, it is the teaching profession. From the little red schoolhouse to the great colleges and universities spread across this country, men and women have been going forth to teach the young people of this country so that they might be fitted to meet conditions later in life. Especially proud should be those men and women who have engaged in teaching youngsters in our rural schools and those educators who have in turn prepared those teachers for this important work. Today we know that the rural school youngster is receiving a basic education comparable to that of a city youngster.

Mr. Speaker, in Racine County, Wis., an outstanding educator has just retired from 50 years of teaching. His name is A. J. Smith and for 35 years he served as principal of the Racine-Kenosha Rural Normal School at Union Grove, Wis.

Mr. Smith was recently honored by the Normal School Alumni Association, and this was a fitting climax to his many years of service to Racine and Kenosha Counties. I am including as part of my remarks an article that appeared in the public press in my district relative to the work of this outstanding educator. The people of Racine and Kenosha Counties, Wis., will miss the valued leadership of Mr. Smith and the good wishes of these communities go with him in the days ahead.

The article follows:

NORMAL SCHOOL LEADER TO RETIRE

Arthur J. Smith, principal of the Kenosha-Racine Rural Normal School at Union Grove, this week announced his retirement effective July 31. Smith has been principal of the school since its organization in 1916, prior to which he was principal of Wilmet High School for 3 years.

Smith began his teaching career in Door County in 1901 at the age of 17. After com-

pleting a course at the State normal school in Oshkosh, he became principal of the Reedsville school in Manitowoc County and later served as Door County superintendent of schools for 4 years.

Smith's first activities as principal of the normal school included the canvassing of Kenosha and Racine Counties to obtain the required number of students.

The educator has since seen the normal school progress from temporary rooms in the Union Grove high and graded schools to the present structure which was built in 1919. Storms Hall, the women's dormitory, was added in 1922. Enrollment has climbed to 80.

Conditions at Bodega Bay Should Be Recognized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "Is Bodega Bay Simply a Recreational Harbor With Local Benefits?" from the Press-Democrat, published at Santa Rosa, Calif., under the date of July 16, 1951.

Bodega Bay is far from being a recreational harbor, with benefits purely of a local nature. It is one of the vital harbors in northern California, a link in the extensive fishing industry of California, which alone exceeds in volume the fish production of all New England States combined. In addition to a locally owned fishing fleet valued at \$290,000, Bodega Bay shelters between 400 and 600 outside vessels during the peak of the fishing season. Last year, despite a disappointing salmon run, the six commercial fisheries located at Bodega Bay handled over 2,000,000 pounds of fish—valued at \$352,000.

A resolution, adopted by the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors, requesting Federal funds in dredging this vital harbor which is silting in at a rapid rate, gained little headway here in Washington, D. C., because it is evidently regarded as a recreational harbor with a small volume of general commerce. Yet, fishermen operating out of Bodega Bay contribute largely toward meeting the food requirements of the civilian population of the Nation, as well as that of the Armed Forces.

Along the two-hundred-odd miles of coast line from San Francisco north to Humboldt Harbor, only Bodega Bay and Noyo Harbor can be used safely for fishing-boat moorings—and Noyo Harbor's entrance is virtually unprotected from the heavy seas. Furthermore, this coast line is considered by the Federal meteorological studies to include North America's stormiest stretch of coast.

The editorial in reference above is as follows:

IS BODEGA BAY SIMPLY A RECREATIONAL HARBOR WITH LOCAL BENEFITS?

If anything could be more indicative of the lack of understanding in Washington,

D. C., about the importance of north coast harbor projects, it is the letter which the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors received Friday from the Corps of Engineers' deputy chief of civil works for rivers and harbors.

The corps recognizes the need for some maintenance of Bodega Bay against silting. Col. W. D. Milne wrote in response to a resolution urging that the bay be dredged.

But, he added, "maintenance of navigation facilities for recreational craft, where the benefits are of a local nature or for small volumes of general commerce, under present conditions must be deferred."

"Recreational craft."

"Small volumes of general commerce."

Is this a fitting description of a key harbor for the west coast fishing industry, which in California alone exceeds in volume the fish production of all New England States combined?

Is it a fitting description of a harbor which shelters between 400 and 600 outside fishing vessels during the peak of the fishing season, in addition to a locally owned fishing fleet valued at \$290,000?

Is it a fitting description of a harbor whose six commercial fisheries dealers last year handled 2,153,000 pounds of salmon, albacore, crabs, bottom fish and shark liver valued at \$352,000, despite a disappointing salmon run?

"Benefits of a local nature"

Does this describe the fishing industry, which harvests and processes food for millions of American civilians and fighting men overseas?

We suppose a resident of the east coast—even a Corps of Engineers colonel—might comment that after all, if silt closes Bodega Bay, the fishing boats can go elsewhere.

And, except for the \$250,000 fisheries investment and the food production which thereby be lost, this comment is understandable, coming from someone thinking exclusively in terms of the east coast.

Geologically, the east coast is sinking. Valleys which ran down to the ocean ages ago are now submerged and form protected harbors which can be kept open with a minimum of dredging. A map of the east coast is like a piece of paper torn across the grain. Countless inlets and harbors offer protection for small craft and good locations for fish-processing firms.

If the colonel would then look at the map of the west coast he would find long straight stretches, interspersed only infrequently by inlets and harbors, characteristic of a geologically rising coast line.

A drive along Highway 1 from San Francisco to the Oregon border would convince him of the map's accuracy.

Along two-hundred-odd miles of coastline between San Francisco and Humboldt Harbor, only Bodega Bay and Noyo Harbor can be used safely for fishing boat moorings, and Noyo Harbor's unprotected entrance is frequently pounded by heavy waves.

Furthermore, according to Federal meteorological studies, this coastline includes North America's stormiest stretch of coast.

The total wreck of the drag boat *Del Monte* as it attempted the Noyo Harbor jetty mouth last November, and the half dozen other fishing vessels which have been lost along the coast in the past few years are evidence of the perilous fishing conditions.

Harbors like Bodega Bay and Noyo are vitally important not only as havens for fishing craft; they also extend the field of fishing operations, just as tankers and supply ships extend the range of a Navy task force.

A fishing boat obviously operates from either a permanent or temporary base. It goes out to sea, catches a load of fish, sometimes in a matter of hours, and returns to its base to unload. The major portion of a heavy salmon run off Bodega Bay would be

lost if the 400 to 600 boats were based in San Francisco Bay or Noyo Harbor.

Let Bodega Bay, Noyo Harbor, or both, silt in, and the Nation loses a source of essential food just as surely as if farmers plowed under thousands of acres of ripening wheat.

Although a few recreational boats are moored in Bodega Bay among the preponderance fishing vessels, it is not by any odds a recreational harbor. Nor is it an unimportant harbor, with small volumes of general commerce and benefits of a local nature.

No one acquainted with this area could term it such.

State Department Replies to Statement What Should Our Message Be?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have felt that a positive statement of the ideological goals of democracy was essential for our own people, for our friends and potential friends abroad, and for effective psychological warfare against Soviet propaganda.

Recently there was called to my attention an unpublished statement entitled "What Should Our Message Be?" that was written by several leading social scientists engaged in research into human behavior.

I inserted this statement into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 2, 1951, hoping that it would satisfy a real need for those interested in our information programs. It was, and still is, my hope that the statement will also refute some of the outspoken critics of our Voice of America who claim that it is useless to invest money in ideological warfare.

Knowing the importance that this statement *What Should Our Message Be?* can have to our policymakers, I have sent the statement to a number of Government officials, including the President and the Secretary of State. Both the President and the Secretary have written to me to tell me how highly they approve of this important document.

I also sent this statement to Assistant Secretary of State Edward Barrett, who is the man directly in charge of our information programs. Today I received a letter from Mr. Barrett outlining just what the State Department has done and is doing to improve our present program. I hope that every Member of Congress will read Mr. Barrett's letter as well as the statement *What Should Our Message Be?* copies of which can be procured from my office.

Mr. Barrett's letter follows:

JULY 24, 1951.

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HOWELL: I was very glad to receive your letter dated July 16, 1951, and I want to thank you for sending me a reprint of the extremely thoughtful article *What Should Our Message Be?* which you inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 2, 1951.

You are quite right about the article having been called to our attention previously.

In fact, some of those responsible for the article have been working closely with us. We agree that the paper contains an excellent statement of the necessity for a program such as ours, the problems we face in insuring its proper operation as well as many concrete suggestions for strengthening the program. The credo at the end of the paper is particularly impressive, and it is one of the best summaries to date of the message we are carrying to people throughout the world.

You have asked for my reaction to pages 5 and 6, or that portion of the paper under the heading, "What we ought to remember." I would like to assure you of my agreement on the points which the authors have made in this section, and in doing so I would like to restate what I consider to be six very specific objectives of our program. They are:

1. To expose the vicious nature of Soviet communism.
2. To place psychological obstacles in the path of Soviet Communist aggression.
3. To instill in people of free nations the desire to cooperate with America.
4. To build a spirit of unity, determination and confidence in all nations of the free world.
5. To promote a better understanding of the United States among the peoples of the world.
6. To strengthen cooperative international relations.

There are our objectives, and our plan for achieving them is to reach the people of the world by every means at our disposal. We are in daily communication with millions of people in many countries throughout the world by means of radio broadcasts, motion pictures, and press material. Our exchange of persons program and the maintenance of United States information centers abroad provide still further means for Americans to meet and talk to people of other lands and for persons in other countries to visit the United States and to see American democracy in action.

I would like to turn now to the specific points raised under the heading "What we ought to remember." The first statement says, "We must make it clear that we do not want to impose; we do not want to destroy." I agree wholeheartedly with this statement and assure you that we believe we have no more right to impose our way of life on people in other countries than the Soviet Union has to impose communism on the rest of the world. In this connection, please refer back to two of the six objectives I have outlined above, namely, that we want to expose the vicious nature of Soviet communism and we want to instill in people of free nations the desire to cooperate with America. This is certainly not to say that we want to actively impose on other nations a new way of political or economic life, or that we are trying to save any particular form of society at the expense of mankind in any part of the world. We recognize that evolution and change are inherent rules of nature, but we also recognize that evolution and change should be the result of peaceful means rather than force. We intend, therefore, that our message shall be one of freedom designed to insure a condition whereby human dignity will be maintained, and the individual will be able to enjoy the freedoms to which the authors of this article have referred in their credo—I, e., freedom from want, freedom from fear, freedom to choose, and freedom to help shape his own destiny.

We do not want to make the mistake of regarding democracy as an end in itself. Instead, we believe democracy as we know it in the United States is a means to an end whereby the maximum benefits of life are experienced because of the freedom we enjoy under our democratic way of life. This ties in with the fifth objective I have

listed, namely, that we want to promote a better understanding of the United States among the peoples of the world. With a better understanding of our way of life, we believe they will want to emulate in their own countries the conditions which have made America the free and abundant country that it is today.

The authors of the article are quite right in stating that only failure would result if we were to offer to the people of Europe liberalism and democracy wrapped in an optimistic package. We are fully aware of the historical disappointments experienced by certain European countries and can well understand the skepticism of many European people. We do not try to exploit these conditions by offering false promises of a better world. It would avail us nothing to counter the false promises of the Soviets with more false promises of our own, and so we confine ourselves to a hard-hitting campaign of truth which encourages individuals to exercise their basic right and freedom to choose the system under which they will live.

In reaching people in Asia by our point 4 program, our aim is to help them to help themselves. We realize that an attitude of superiority will not win us friends, and that consequently, the aid we send them and the manner in which that aid will be used, must be decided with the full participation and initiative of the recipient. Our task is not to recreate the world in our own image. We are engaged, instead, in an effort to strengthen our ties with other countries as a means of further securing the integrity and well-being of the free world. Economic strength, in which point 4 plays a vital role, is one of the fundamental conditions we desire to establish. In the information program every effort is made to interpret point 4 aid and to relate it to a situation in which people are making a determined attempt to create a better life for themselves by using their natural and human resources more fully and effectively. Our treatment of the point 4 programs stresses the idea of co-operation and joint action toward mutually desirable goals. We also stress the fact that the United States is not engaged in drafting master blueprints to govern the economic development of all countries. We are, however, prepared to consult with and to assist friendly countries in working out their plans for economic stability and development.

You have inquired how the article entitled "What Shall Our Message Be?" has been, or will be, put to productive use in the Department, and in answering this question I would like to refer to the seven suggestions the authors have made under the final heading of "Strategy notes." First, they have suggested that we concentrate on the people of the world whose minds are not already in "iron molds." The very extensiveness of our program will show that we have been doing this since its inception. I am listing below the countries throughout the world in which various phases of our programs were in operation during fiscal year 1951, since I believe such a list will dispell all doubt that we are directing our programs toward any one limited area:

Aden, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Ceylon, Chile, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Egypt, Elre, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Free China, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indochina, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Luxemburg, Malaya, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Norway, North Korea, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Russia, Saudi Arabia, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Thailand, The Netherlands, Trieste, Tunisia, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

In addition to the work we have been doing in these countries, you will be interested in knowing that by the end of fiscal year 1951, the Voice of America programs were being broadcast in 45 languages.

Secondly, the authors have pointed out the need for a clear message, one which is unambiguous, simple, pointed, plausible, and not easily distorted. We believe that our programs, which are dedicated to relaying the message of human freedom to people throughout the world, carry such a message.

The third suggestion is that by means of pretests on small samples of a population we determine in advance what the particular context of our information and educational exchange programs will be, thereby insuring plausibility and effectiveness. In this connection we have used scientific research organizations where available and we have received this type of guidance from our own officers in the field who are in daily communication with the people in countries to which they are assigned, and are, consequently, in a position to keep us informed of the information requirements of the people and to evaluate the effect of our programs. This suggestion goes on to say we should benefit by information to be obtained from defectors, and I must assure you this has been done from the beginning. From numerous interviews of this type, our officers in the field have obtained information regarding the number of people who are reached by our programs and the effect of our programs on these people. They have also obtained many extremely worthwhile suggestions regarding program content.

I would also like to refer to the fourth and fifth suggestions regarding the technique of irony and the use of slogans. Many of our broadcasts have used in the past, and continue to use, irony, satire, and ridicule in getting their point across, and our press and publications program has made wide use of cartoons, posters, and slogans during the last year.

The sixth suggestion is that we avoid words spoiled by the Soviets. I would like to assure you that we are constantly on the offensive with our programs and it is only in the belief that it is our duty not to let Russian lies about America go unanswered that we have occasion to use any of the Soviet terms at all. Even then our reference to their terms is confined to refuting the big lies, ridiculing the lesser ones, and ignoring the rest of them.

Suggestion No. 7 is concerned with "... a Voice for America at home." The people in the United States have shown considerable interest in our broadcasts and in the other phases of our programs. We, in turn, have been glad to receive their questions, criticisms, and suggestions and have answered them in every instance. It may be that we will be permitted to adopt a suggestion for having a 15- to 20-minute weekly report to the people about our program. We would welcome an opportunity to tell the people of America not only about our Voice of America broadcasts, but also about the other phases of our work.

I regret that it is not possible to go into all of the interesting points in the article at this time, but there is something I would like to discuss here, and that is the authors' statement on page 4 that "We must constantly emphasize our interest in the Russian people and the people of the satellite countries, clearly and constantly distinguishing between the Soviet regime and the dictatorships in satellite countries on the one hand, and the people who live in those areas and their national symbols on the other hand." This is a theme which has received a great deal of consideration and has been used in our broadcasts since 1947 when we initiated the Voice of America programs to the Soviet Union. It has been further

developed and reemphasized since that time, and one of the most recent expressions thereof is found in our radio and press coverage of the McMahon-Ribicoff resolution regarding the abiding friendship of the American people for all other peoples, including the peoples of the Soviet Union.

In conducting the International Information and Educational Exchange programs, we give full cognizance to the different political, economic, and social conditions in the many countries where the programs are in operation. Full consideration is being given, and has been given in the past, to the various points which the authors have indicated we should remember about Europe and Asia.

We appreciate the fact that, in planning our broadcasts, or our press and motion-picture output, the problem of judging the recipient's reaction to our programs is a very basic one if we are to avoid losing sight of our listeners' desires and interests, by thinking of our listeners in American terms rather than in their own terms. The USIE staff, both domestic and overseas, consists of many trained radio, press, and film specialists as well as experienced people working on the exchange of persons programs and the maintenance of USIE overseas missions and libraries and reading rooms. We believe that by having this staff work together with area specialists in the Department and Foreign Service, we are able to take advantage of skills possessed by people in many lines of endeavor. We also believe it is the interweaving of the experience and skill of the USIE staff and the area specialists, which gives us an unbeatable combination for insuring the effectiveness of our programs.

I am sure you know how much I appreciate the continued interest you have shown in our programs, and the support which you have given us. Thank you again for forwarding the article. I am very glad to have this opportunity of discussing it with you.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD W. BARRETT,
Assistant Secretary.

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the tragic results of the floods in the very heart of our country bring dramatically to our attention the carelessness with which we have despoiled our forests and laid bare our fields.

Naturally there is a hue and cry for dams and reservoirs, for man-made methods of flood control costing millions if not billions of dollars. Little is being said of the need to replace the trees by which nature holds floods in control and spreads her rains more widely and so more safely across her lands.

Much of this can be done by one-family farmers and landholders, as well as by mine owners and others who cut over great tracts of forest lands, leaving them bare instead of replanting them with trees which in due course would, of themselves, give fair return in dollars, even while they held the soil and served nature in her need for rain control.

The States would do well to emulate my great State of Ohio, which passed a law in the twenties, introduced by my husband, Chester C. Bolton, who, before his service in this House, introduced a bill into the Ohio Legislature to exempt from taxation such land as shall have been planted with trees.

This was in great contrast to the action of one of the more Northern States which put a tax on such planting, so discouraging the mine owners who had cut over the land to get out the ore and who wanted to replace the needed trees. The tax could well have been placed upon the lumber that would have been available for cutting several decades later.

The Missouri floods have destroyed vast acres of farm land. Topsoil will fill the reservoirs built to control the raging waters and much will be carried down to form more deltas in the Gulf of Mexico. So it was in Egypt many centuries ago. Let us learn our lesson; let us plant unlimited numbers of trees; let us learn contour plowing; let us work with nature, not against her; and let us hope it is not too late to stem the tide of waste and destruction that we are responsible for.

Mr. Speaker, I am including in my remarks an editorial from the Washington Post of July 18, 1951—although I do not agree with it in detail—because it points up many matters that are vital to the future of this country:

AFTER THE FLOOD

As the dirty work of mopping up begins in Kansas and Missouri after the disastrous flood, some serious long-range thought needs to be given to the lesson of the calamity. In the judgment of the Chief of Engineers, Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, that lesson seemingly is a call to build more dams and storage reservoirs. But the real lesson, it seems to us, is a great deal more fundamental. It points to the compelling need for river valley conservation and development, not on the present hit-or-miss basis, but according to an integrated plan.

This newspaper observed the other day that "although field terracing, grasslands, and proper forest management will not of themselves prevent all floods, they are essential ingredients of flood control." The trouble is that many of these ingredients are being neglected in the concentration on one or two aspects of flood control. No one could deny that dams and reservoirs are necessary to deal with present conditions after years of abuse of the land. But the most effective of all dams is the earth itself with its natural cover.

It is this factor which has received insufficient attention, for example, in the grandiose program for the Missouri River embodied in the Pick-Sloan plan. This plan has been described as an arrangement of convenience between the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation to let each proceed its separate way. There are some good things in it, along with what in our opinion is an expensive boondoggle in the plan to extend navigation up the Missouri. But it makes little allowance for the work on individual farms, the reforestation of denuded hillsides, the restoration of the water table, and the attempt to regain a natural balance—all parts of a rounded program. Indeed, there are many who believe that the vast dams and reservoirs flooding thousands of acres will become useless because of silting without comparable work where the water falls.

It is possible that too much emphasis has been placed upon the controversial electric-power aspects of valley development, whereas the conservation benefits have not been stressed enough. Integrated treatment of natural resources can be accomplished in two ways—by integrating the agencies concerned with conservation and development into a Department of Natural Resources with a single unified program, an end which seems as far away as ever—or by a separate valley development authority. The latter seems to us the more attainable. It does not matter what the authority is called or whether it is patterned on the Tennessee Valley Authority or upon some different scheme with more popular participation. The important thing is to obtain more understanding of the sobering fact that none of the advertised depletion of minerals or other resources poses as serious a threat to the country as the continued washing away of its topsoil.

Mystery of the Missing Beef

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks two editorials which are pertinent to the present controversy over the high prices of meat and call special attention to the editorial entitled "Mystery," which indicates that 30 percent of available beef is not reaching local meat markets, because of OPS regulations. I am including both editorials which appeared in the Chicago Daily Drovers Journal on July 18, 1951:

MYSTERY?

Last week the country's 12 leading livestock markets received 39 percent more cattle than the preceding week, and within 3 percent as many as the same week last year. But during the week, the 95 leading beef-producing plants were able to buy under OPS compliance ceiling prices only about 70 percent of cattle they bought during the same week last year.

"For the sixth straight week," says the American Meat Institute, "these 95 plants have been forced to work at reduced production rates, ranging between 30 to 47 percent down from corresponding weeks of a year earlier, because of their inability to buy sufficient cattle without running the risk of breaking OPS regulations carrying penalties of heavy fines and jail sentences for violations. A serious and disturbing situation is developing, too, because of the fact that these leading plants are those upon which pharmaceutical manufacturers rely for vital byproducts, such as glands, from which to prepare many medicines important to the medical profession for saving life, relieving pain, and the treatment of serious diseases and physical ailments. Many of the plants surveyed have been unable to supply normal quantities of beef to their retailer customers for availability to the public. In some areas, especially those distant from points to production, retail stores have been sold out of certain popular cuts, when they had them at all, early in the day. This has been especially true of such cuts as round steak and sirloin."

Where did the cattle go that the 95 leading beef-producing plants were unable to

buy? They are no longer standing around the 12 leading livestock markets.

THOSE CHEAPER CUTS

Folks who think their meat bills are too high might try using some of the cheaper cuts for a change. Home economics and nutrition specialists toss out that thought. Using moist heat at low temperatures, cuts like chuck, brisket and plate of beef, hock and butt of pork, and rolled shoulder and shoulder chops of lamb can, in the hands of a good cook, produce delectable dishes at considerable less cost than the steaks and roasts which most housewives seem to prefer. But there is the rub. Housewives not only prefer beef over pork, and the more expensive cuts over the cheaper ones, but most of them seem to have the funds to buy what they want. Correcting that situation would appear to be beyond the power of Government.

Loss of Admiral Sherman Great Blow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, from the Boston Traveler of July 23, 1951:

TODAY IN WASHINGTON

(By David Lawrence)

LOSS OF ADMIRAL SHERMAN GREAT BLOW

WASHINGTON, July 23.—Loss of Admiral Sherman is a tragedy for the United States at a critical time in its history, for he was the "brains" of our global strategy and one of the most brilliant military leaders this country has produced.

It was not only that Admiral Sherman, as chief of staff to Admiral Nimitz, planned the strategy and worked out the over-all operations in the sweep of American forces across the Pacific in World War II, but he became, in the postwar years, a great asset to top planning through his intimate experience as commander of our fleet in the Mediterranean. He was the only high official on active duty here who had participated in command of Army, Navy, and Air forces in the last war.

Admiral Sherman's entry into the Joint Chiefs of Staff as Chief of Naval Operations when Admiral Denfeld was removed helped slowly, but surely, to solve a very difficult situation as between the armed services. He recognized that morale had been sagging in the Navy, due to interservice friction. He knew, also, the importance of reconciling differences in discussions with the heads of other services.

When the legislation designed to bring about integration of the armed services in 1947, Admiral Sherman, at the suggestion of the late Secretary of Defense, James Forrestal, took over the task of harmonizing differences. When he was called to become Chief of Naval Operations in November 1949, there were some Navy men who thought he would become a "political stooge" of the administration and would not stand for the traditional policies of the Navy. He soon dispelled that idea, and only last week, this correspondent heard high Navy officers who had been critical of Sherman in the early stages, singing his praises as having done the best job that anyone could have done for the Navy.

Forrest Sherman will be remembered for his thoroughness and fidelity of his assignments. He will be remembered for his efficient manner of presenting the needs of the Navy to other officials in the executive branch of the Government and to the committees of Congress. He will be remembered by Navy men for his independence and his steadfastness. For at a time when Secretary of the Navy Matthews attempted to punish Arleigh Burke, a Pacific war hero, and prevent him from being promoted to the rank of admiral, the simple, straightforward presentation of the case which Admiral Sherman made personally to the President won Mr. Truman's approval, and Burke got the promotion.

Time and again as Admiral Sherman in recent months discussed with this writer the events in Korea and the MacArthur hearings and various matters of vital concern in world strategy, there was always the clear-cut devotion to the best interests of the United States and an unwillingness to let political considerations in a domestic sense ever affect his judgment of what ought to be done in a military sense. The Nation may well mourn the death of Admiral Sherman. He was a great American.

It will be a hard job for the President to designate someone now to succeed Admiral Sherman who will have the same confidence that the entire Navy had in their deceased Chief. It will not be easy to find a naval officer who matches his knowledge of strategy and his statesmanship.

What is particularly tragic is that Admiral Sherman, who had been entrusted with the delicate mission of bringing Spain into military alliance with the United States, did not have time to report to the Joint Chiefs. He alone carried in his head all the background of the conferences with General Franco and other officials—and now that task probably will have to be done over again. Who can do it? Maybe Admiral Robert Carney, now our commander in the Mediterranean and a former Deputy Chief of Naval Operations. As for a successor here in the post of Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral A. W. Radford, commander in chief of the fleet in the Pacific, is by all odds the logical choice from the standpoint of ability and experience.

The William Oatis Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I enclose a news letter by the Honorable WILLIAM BRAY, of the Indiana Seventh District, in which he so ably expresses the hope that prompt and positive action be taken in the William Oatis case:

A CONGRESSMAN REPORTS, No. 24

International kidnapping is nothing new. Precedents have been established as to the best method for dealing with foreign thugs who kidnap American citizens, but they are not being followed today.

In 1904, an American merchant named Perdicaris was kidnaped and held for ransom by a Moroccan bandit called Raisuli. President Theodore Roosevelt, who had a knack for making the importance of the United States known abroad, did not wait to act. He told his Secretary of State John Hay to cable the United States consul this blunt statement. "Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead."

His verbal arrow hit the target. Perdicaris was released unharmed, and the incident was over.

Times have certainly changed since the days of Teddy Roosevelt. When an American businessman, Robert Voegler, was imprisoned in Hungary on trumped-up charges, the President took no action. Voegler wasted away in jail for 17 months while the State Department made a deal for his release. We had to bargain with hoodlums.

Now the State Department policy of "wait until the dust settles" is being applied to the imprisonment of a Hoosier newspaperman.

William Oatis, an Associated Press correspondent from Marion, Ind., has been sent to jail by the Communist Government of Czechoslovakia. He is charged with being a United States spy, but his only "crime" was his attempt to report fairly and honestly the news from behind the iron curtain.

Representative JOHN V. BEAMER, Republican, of Indiana, has introduced a resolution calling for a halt to all trade with Czechoslovakia. (Our imports from that country totaled more than \$7,000,000 during the first 3 months of this year. In addition to helping the Communists, we are hurting American labor.)

BEAMER also favors a complete break in diplomatic relations if the Czechs do not free Oatis.

I support his resolution 100 percent.

Other Congressmen have suggested that we deport all Soviet reporters now in this country. It was also recommended that if the State Department cannot guarantee the safety of our citizens behind the iron curtain they should all be brought home. We should not have to bargain with "hooligans."

Certainly some drastic action is necessary to stop this shameful treatment of our countrymen. When foreign governments perpetrate such outrages on our citizens, it is evidence of the failure of our State Department to maintain the prestige abroad which the United States had enjoyed since the War of 1812.

Conviction of William N. Oatis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an editorial from the Clarksdale Press-Register, of Clarksdale, Miss., July 19, 1951. Affirmative action by our Government in the case of William Oatis is necessary in this Communist war against the free press:

THE IRON CURTAIN—NO FREE PRESS

The iron curtain countries have totally destroyed anything even remotely resembling a free press within their own borders. Now they are trying to make certain that no news concerning them, save for official government hand-outs, reaches the rest of the world.

That is about the only logical deduction that can be drawn from Czechoslovakia's conviction of William N. Oatis, an American and an Associated Press correspondent, on charges of spying out state secrets and reporting slanders and lies, and his sentencing to 10 years in prison.

So far as can be ascertained, Mr. Oatis' crime consisted of trying to do his job properly. He did what every good reporter in every free country does every day—that is, he sought and reported the news. As is customary with every press service, his super-

riors in the AP organization gave him assignments and he did his best to carry them out. These assignments were in no way unusual, and none of them could be considered "spying" as that word is understood in the Western World. But in the Communist world spying means anything which displeases the heads of state. The laws are so drawn that anyone, citizen or foreigner, can be severely punished for saying and writing things which wouldn't cause an eyebrow to be lifted elsewhere.

Mr. Oatis' ordeal followed the usual pattern. He was held incommunicado for 70 days. He was not allowed to contact his friends or American officials. The State Department has formally charged that his so-called confession was prepared by the Czech secret police, and that he rehearsed it under police direction. This confession, the State Department added, was only the admission of an American reporter that in the high traditions of his profession he was attempting under the most unfavorable conditions to report a true picture of conditions and events in Czechoslovakia as he saw them. It said further that Oatis' conviction shows that the present regime in Czechoslovakia fears truth, hates liberty, and knows no justice.

The Western World has learned something about how confessions of this character are obtained. The victim is subjected to merciless questioning. He is given little food. He is kept awake for days and nights on end. He is alternately threatened and cajoled. He is beaten. The whole idea is to break down the will—to bring the man to a point of mental and physical exhaustion and despair where nothing matters except that he sign and agree to anything. This happened to Robert Vogeler and others. It undoubtedly happened to Oatis.

What can the Government do to protect our newsmen in the Communist nations? Alexander Jones, President of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, has suggested that, in reprisal for the treatment of Oatis, the trade privileges now given Czechoslovakia in the American zone of Germany be withdrawn. Others think we should go much further. As an example, the Portland Oregonian said editorially, "If the United States does not get its back up soon, these kidnappings, pseudo trials, extorted confessions, and imprisonment of Americans will become chronic. Our Government should give immediate study, with a view of action, of the possible effects of making the iron curtain a two-way barrier; that is, the withdrawal from outlaw nations of all American nationals and the complete severance of diplomatic relations, plus an airtight ban on all commercial transactions between these countries and the United States." This may seem to be an extreme policy. But, in dealing with communism, it may prove to be the only feasible one.

Foreign Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "No War—No Peace," which I made before a luncheon plenary session of the Colgate University conference on American foreign policy, on Sunday, July 22, at Hamilton, N. Y.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great pleasure to appear on this program today. Ever since your first annual conference on American foreign policy, I have desired to be present at one of your sessions. This is the first time I have been able to do so.

Furthermore, the theme of this particular session is not a new one to me. Last April in New York City I spoke on the same subject. Although I shall not repeat that speech on this occasion, I would bring to your attention a number of points which I emphasized at that time. They are as pertinent and as true today as they were then, and public reaction to them has increased their relative importance.

Let us not be deluded by the so-called truce or agenda connected with it or by any cease-fire resulting from it, which may occur in Korea. Let us remember that this action will have taken place as a result of the suggestion of a spokesman of Soviet Russia. Let us remember, also, that the negotiations between our forces and the Chinese Reds and North Koreans were initially carried on according to their terms, at their stipulated time, at their picked location, and in their prescribed fashion.

Indeed, let us not forget that, ever since the close of World War II, the very idea of peace in the world has been in a major sense illusory. To the extent that Soviet Russia has not yet made a direct attack upon us or our allies, to the extent that a state of war has not actually been declared by us, by any of our allies, or by Soviet Russia, we have been at peace but all of us know that in reality a condition of war has existed ever since June 25, 1950, when the Soviet-inspired attack by the North Koreans violated the thirty-eighth parallel.

In the European theater, to be sure, Soviet strategy thus far has not called for a hot war, but the difference between a cold war and a hot war is merely a difference of degree and severity. The motive, the intent, the purpose, and the objective in both types of war are identical.

The very fact that, during the period since the close of World War II, Soviet Russia has been devoting her chief effort to the production of armament and the raising of armies, while the free world has been disarming and struggling to rehabilitate its peoples and to restore its economies as preliminary steps to the restoration of peace and freedom everywhere, is indicative of the sinister purpose of the Soviets. The very fact that, during this same period, through intrigue and subterfuge and infiltration, Soviet Russia has been pursuing a course of aggression and conquest among her neighbors, provides further conclusive evidence of her diabolical intent. The very fact that, by obstructive tactics, Soviet Russia has conspired with her satellites to make the United Nations virtually impotent and to frustrate its every effort to preserve peace and to establish security against aggression and attack for every nation on earth, offers undeniable proof of Soviet Russia's intent to conquer the world and to destroy all freedom and to this end to employ every effective device at her command.

Alarmed by these facts, the free nations of the world have taken collective action for the sake of self-preservation. Progress in these efforts toward collective security has been marked especially by the Rio Treaty, the Greek-Turkish aid program, the Marshall plan, the North Atlantic Treaty, and the mutual defense program. And now, under the terms of that treaty and as a part of the defense program, the United States is in the process of sending additional Armed Forces to Europe.

It is unfortunate, indeed, if there are those in our Government who seek to gain par-

tisan advantage by playing politics with the question of national security. Although neither one of them should be thus accused of base motive, some weeks ago the London Times made the amusing suggestion that a debate between former President Hoover and General MacArthur would be very instructive. According to the Times, "General MacArthur wants much more war than does the administration and Mr. Hoover wants much less, while the right wing of the Republican Party agrees 100 percent with both of them."

To the everlasting credit of General MacArthur, his appearance before the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees, as well as the ensuing hearings held by these committees, have done much to clear an atmosphere which had become murky with individual ambitions and charged with politics. Most significantly all of our top military commanders have been in agreement that the menace of Soviet imperialism is global and that the conflict against communism calls for global strategy.

It is most distressing to observe, however, that so many Americans do not yet seem to be aware of the deadly peril now confronting our country. At the same time, it is even more distressing to observe that so many other Americans, apparently aware of this peril, seem to be indifferent to it.

I sometimes wonder if these phenomena are indicative of decadence to which, it has been alleged, our American society is succumbing. At any rate, such a condition would seem to be in line with ideas concerning us which have been and are being broadcast by the Soviets.

As long as there remains in the world an aggressor as powerful and ruthless as is Soviet Russia, there can be no peace. Periods of comparative calm, when there is little or no fighting, must not delude us and our allies into thinking that peace has come. Indeed, such a delusion can be our greatest danger as we proceed with preparations for defense. This delusion can be the Achilles' heel of the Western World. More than anything else, it can cause our ultimate downfall and destruction.

As pertinent to these observations, I noted with much interest General Bradley's recent comment to the effect that a cease-fire in Korea might increase, rather than diminish, the danger of Soviet attack elsewhere. In fact, it seems to be generally recognized that Russia has not been happy about the Korean situation, that United Nations' resistance there was unexpected and caught her off balance, and that she would prefer to call it a day and open up on some other front—or perhaps try to lull us to sleep by playing possum.

So it is that this year and the years immediately ahead may be for America among the most trying years in our whole history. Our approximately 80,000 war casualties in Korea, including almost 25,000 dead and missing in action, have made an impression upon many Americans, which can be erased only by the final defeat of Communist aggression as a menace to our free society. The question naturally arises: Have the American people the courage, the fortitude, indeed the character, to meet and overcome the Communist challenge?

Pious pronouncements and congressional compromises will never suffice for this purpose. They can only befuddle issues and confuse the public.

If we are to meet the challenge head-on, we must not only undertake, but complete, an adequate preparedness program. This undertaking is truly global in scope.

It means American manpower in the Armed Forces and on the production line. If it is to be effective, it will cause scarcities in some important and essential consumer goods; it will stimulate anew the inflation spiral; it will require at least the amount of

controls over prices, wages, credit, critical materials, and distribution generally, which were put in effect under the Defense Production Act of 1950 and have received so much criticism as presently to threaten their continuation.

It means American-aid programs in those countries which have not yet had sufficient economic recovery to assure their ability to exist independently. It means the contribution of American assistance and know-how to those areas of the world which, unless rescued by the blessings of freedom and independence, are likely to become victims of Soviet scheming and treachery. It means that, as expounders of freedom and equality, we Americans are called upon to exercise the courage of our convictions right here at home.

It is tragic that so many of our fellow countrymen are unconvinced of the truth in what I state. And yet, their suspicions are not without some justification.

The fact of the matter is that a substantial number of the American people do not wish to entrust Mr. Truman with the powers which are essential to the Presidency if our preparedness program is to be completed properly and on time. It is most disturbing that so many Americans appear to be more interested in disparaging and discrediting Mr. Truman than in licking communism and in dealing appropriately with the dangerous problems which beset us. The reasons for this extraordinary attitude are, nevertheless, apparent.

Lack of a definite foreign policy—in fact, a most dubious foreign policy, if any at all until very recently—in the Far East and unsavory disclosures concerning State Department personnel and activities have occasioned a public distrust which borders on outright hostility toward many of those responsible for our foreign affairs. (At this point, I would mention one of the brighter aspects of a generally grime setting and pay tribute to my former colleague in the United States Senate and our distinguished Ambassador at Large, John Foster Dulles, for his extraordinary contribution to peace in so successfully directing the formulation of the pending Treaty of Peace with Japan.) The confusion, incompetence, and questionable practices, which so patently exists in certain administrative agencies, have reduced public confidence in the administration and in Government generally. The utter lack of leadership on the part of the President himself and his personal shortcomings, including his unfortunate displays of temper, have still further aggravated the situation. Perhaps, most of all, the abominable manner in which he removed General MacArthur from his Far East commands has contributed substantially to the ever-increasing public indignation toward Mr. Truman.

Recognizing as I do and critical as I am of the faults and weaknesses of the President and his administration, I would be blindly bigoted if I were to condone the prejudiced criticism and fault-finding of those who condemn everything which Mr. Truman does, solely because he is the chief apostle of the New or Fair Deal. I admit that it is difficult to obtain national unity when so large a proportion of the American people are without confidence in their Chief Executive. But the fact remains that Mr. Truman is our Chief Executive and, if the Lord permits, he will remain our Chief Executive for no less than another year and a half; the American people decided this question in 1948. The further fact remains that partisanship and animosity toward Mr. Truman can never justify the divided Nation which they are producing or the aid and comfort to the Kremlin which they are providing.

It is regrettable that the President has so defied the Congress and been so contemptuous of its legitimate prerogatives that considerable ill-feeling toward him has arisen

among its Members. This condition, however, can never excuse the Congress for failing to do its share in its relationship toward him. Angry as many of us may be because of overt acts by the President, we cannot afford to lose our perspective. Only through reason and common sense and rationality can the Nation, in the present circumstances, prepare to meet whatever the future may hold for us.

Call present conditions what we will—peace or war—we must prepare for the worst. And we must have the courage and faith and conviction to continue in this preparation and defense as long as we and the free world are threatened by powerful forces of aggression. Upon our capacity, temporarily at least, to endure genuine privation and sacrifice depends our ultimate survival as a free people.

Never has American character been put to greater test. Never have Americans more needed the help of Almighty God to do the job that must be done.

Duty of Eligible Citizens To Vote in National and Off-Year Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have in my hand an address on the subject of the duty of eligible citizens to cast their votes in national and off-year elections, delivered by Harry L. Brumond, chairman of the Citizens National Affairs Committee, at the meeting of the executive committee, held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, on July 23, 1951. It is one of the very finest speeches I have heard on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that I may have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As chairman of the Citizens National Affairs Committee, I wish to outline to you the purposes of the committee and its program for the millions of white-collar and medium-income citizens of this Nation.

First, of prime importance, is to get the average citizen to fulfill his obligations to his Nation, his community, his family, and himself: To exercise his right to vote. Good citizenship means good government. The citizen of today must accept his responsibility to help elect to public office men and women of proven ability, courage, and integrity.

Only 40 to 50 percent of the eligible citizens cast their votes in national and off-year elections. We must stimulate political interest and activity among these millions and make them vote-conscious. People must be stirred to understand they will lose their very freedom if they do not exercise their right to vote.

Good government, economic stability, social security, and well being are made possible only when we, the voters, take time out to do our duty and vote for men and women who are willing to serve as true public servants for the public interest.

The days of the horse car and stagecoach, together with boss-controlled politics, have seen their day. Political racketeer-controlled organizations are on their way to oblivion. Because of the findings of the Senate Crime

Investigating Committee, proving a definite tie between racketeers and politicians, public sentiment throughout the Nation has been aroused—and rightfully so.

What shall the voter do to assist in the election to public office of capable, honest, and efficient public servants?

We, the voters, who are interested in a clean, efficient, progressive Government administration must sacrifice a few minutes of leisure time to study the experience and integrity of candidates seeking public office.

We of the Citizens National Affairs Committee are interested in candidates, regardless of party label, and officials in public office, who pledge themselves to support legislation for a people's program that will benefit the white-collar and medium-income groups, their community, and the Nation as a whole.

This program will include legislation in the public interest for the development of the national defense, food and rent controls, social-security and housing programs, veterans' needs, economic reconstruction and development, foreign policy, appropriate national budget and taxes.

Our most important responsibility is to select candidates who will best carry out our program.

Republicans are not the only ones who can build schools. Democrats are not the only ones who can build hospitals, and Independent-Progressives are not the only ones who can build housing. Any Republican, Democrat, or Independent-Progressive can build all three well only because of his proven qualifications and not because of his party label.

Being willing to accept and support candidates for public office regardless of party label affords a somewhat wider range of selection, but even this, under our present party system, in most parts of the country, limits our selection, because county and State committees of all major parties still select most of the candidates. The best we can hope for at the present time is to select the candidate designated who comes nearest to our expectations regarding fitness, integrity, and courage of conviction to serve all the people for the public good.

The Citizens National Affairs Committee is against the old, antiquated, boss-dominated party designation of candidates because it does not represent the will of the people as to who is a competent and qualified candidate.

In most cases under the present system, a candidate to be eligible for designation must have been a loyal party member and worker and known to his political organization leader as one, not too smart to become independent of party support, and not too illiterate as not to appreciate the choice of the party organization by accepting its dictates regarding patronage and special favors.

Unfortunately this is the type of individual who is willing, anxious, and greedy for public office, to serve you and me, the taxpayer.

In most cases these very individuals are the only ones who will accept the moderate pay, with the hope of being a part of graft and corruption by which they can raise their regular income several times over.

Why do you suppose a candidate running for public office that pays \$5,000 a year will spend \$20,000 to get it? Why do you suppose this candidate will accept campaign contributions ranging from \$500 to \$5,000 from bosses and racketeers, all of whom have some good ideas as to what the cash benefits will be.

It is this very system that keeps qualified, business and professional men and women from entering politics. It is this very thing that keeps politics in the racket class. Under the present system the politician goes to the racketeer for big money to carry on his campaign. If elected, the candidate is subser-

vient to the racketeers and does their bidding at every back and call.

Through the report of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee we know of existing tie-ins with sinister forces all over the Nation. The big question is What are we going to do to correct this system?

It will not be an easy task. But a step forward in the right direction is the following:

Let us adopt the preferential primary system of choosing qualified candidates—a system whereby every American citizen as qualified by law is eligible to seek public office without party selection. The voter alone, on election day, selects the candidate of his choice. This will put an end to the party primary system.

The preferential primary system if adopted by Nation-wide legislation would be a severe blow to all organized, racketeer-controlled politics.

Every man and woman of high moral character, with honesty of purpose and strong courage of conviction could feel free to enter politics with the view of rendering real public service, without being under the domination of organized or corrupt party leadership.

For the voters to hope for this kind of change from a time-worn system means some concentrated effort on the part of each and every one of us—we must give some time and interest to local, State, and National politics, if we are sincere with ourselves that we seek a change.

We must, and this is all-important, select and enthusiastically support those candidates that we feel are interested in our demands for change—we must know how to differentiate between a sincere candidate seeking public office who is in sympathy with our program and principles and who pledges his fearless and honest support, and a boss-controlled organization politician who, like a parrot, quotes the founding fathers and the fundamental principles of our democracy at election time, but after election cynically tears up his campaign speeches and promptly forgets all promises.

There can be no reform until all of us stand firm behind nonpartisan representatives of citizen's interests.

If we desire honest and efficient government we must vote for men and women of high principles, regardless of party label.

Our plan of action is a simple one. It is 100 percent American and it is 100 percent right.

The Citizens National Affairs Committee will recommend for support qualified candidates with high concept of service to the public, responsible to all people, not to any special interest. It will support honest men and women, with minds and hearts rooted in a deep sense of loyalty to the fundamental principles of our democratic society.

The first safeguard of our liberty is the individual American who cares enough about his or her community to give time, thought and energy to being a good citizen. The first duty of a good citizen is to vote.

The Citizens National Affairs Committee pledges, with the enthusiastic support of its many members, to carry on a national campaign to get the American citizen to accept his most important civic responsibility: to exercise his right to vote.

The greatest power in the Nation to make possible good, honest, fearless administration in Government is your vote.

The democratic right to vote is yours, and yours alone—to benefit you and your family.

Vote on election day—vote for the candidate of your choice.

The candidate that may serve you and your country best may be a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent-Progressive, but first, last, and always he will be an honest, capable, and fearless American.

Suspension of Certain Individuals in Loyalty Cases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter dated July 16, 1951, from Hiram Bingham, Chairman of the Loyalty Review Board.

I may say that the purpose of inserting this letter in the RECORD at this time is that I wrote the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission some time ago, at the time two State Department employees had been suspended. At that time the Secretary of State said that those two employees were suspended because it was mandatory under the law. I wrote to Chairman Bingham and asked him, if that were true, why there had not been suspensions in other cases in which charges had been filed—specifically in the cases of John Carter Vincent and some 29 others.

In the Chairman's reply he points out that the Secretary of State was mistaken when he said that under the law he—Bingham—was bound to suspend the two men referred to. The Chairman of the Loyalty Review Board rightly points out that the Chairman has no power whatsoever to suspend these individuals, and that only the Secretary of State can do so. It is entirely within his discretion.

For fear that the insertion of my letter to Mr. Bingham may raise a question as to whether or not Mr. Bingham is empowered to take such action, I think his reply should be inserted in the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., July 16, 1951.
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY,

United States Senate

DEAR SENATOR McCARTHY: I have your letter of July 13, 1951, wherein you inquire regarding the suspension of individuals who have loyalty cases pending before the State Department's Loyalty Board.

With regard to your specific question inquiring of the Loyalty Review Board why certain individuals whose cases are pending before the Loyalty Security Board of the Department of State have not been suspended, I would like to call your attention to part II, section 4, of Executive Order No. 9835, wherein it states "the head of the employing department or agency may suspend any officer or employee at any time pending a determination with respect to loyalty," and to the provisions of Public Law 733 which state "the Secretary of State . . . may, in his absolute discretion and when deemed necessary in the interest of national security, suspend, without pay, any civilian officer or employee of the Department of State (including the Foreign Service of the United States)" In connection with the provisions of Public Law 733, I wish to call

your attention to part VI, section 3, of Executive Order No. 9835, wherein it is stated "The provisions of this order (Executive Order No. 9835) shall not be applicable to persons summarily removed under the provisions of . . . any . . . statute conferring the power of summary removal."

Article II, section 2, of the Constitution of the United States provides "the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments." Congress has from time to time vested the power of appointment of inferior officers in the heads of departments and agencies. The courts have construed that the power to discharge, which necessarily includes the right to suspend, is inherent in the right of appointment.

Growing out of this constitutional provision, it has always been held, traditionally, that the head of the department is the only person who may suspend or remove a permanent employee from the Federal service. Undoubtedly, the President, by the use of the language set forth in Executive Order No. 9835 as quoted above, and Congress, in giving the agency head authority to suspend under Public Law 733, in his absolute discretion, recognized this traditional principle, which stems from the Constitution.

The regulations and directives of the Loyalty Review Board must recognize that the agency head has exclusive power to suspend an employee. Therefore, the Board has not reserved unto itself the authority to direct the agency head to suspend employees, but has left the matter to his discretion.

Since the Constitution of the United States, Public Law 733, Executive Order No. 9835 and the regulations and directives of the Loyalty Review Board all point to a noninterference with the right of the agency head to suspend in his absolute discretion the Loyalty Review Board cannot answer your specific questions as to why certain persons have not been suspended even though their cases are pending before the Loyalty Security Board of the Department of State.

A copy of Public Law 733 and a copy of Executive Order No. 9835, are attached hereto for your ready reference.

Cordially yours,

HIRAM BINGHAM,
Chairman, Loyalty Review Board

Containment Is Far From Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an unusually interesting article entitled "Containment Is Far From Enough," by Barbara Ward, formerly associate editor of the *London Economist*. By common consent Miss Ward has long been recognized as one of the most thoughtful and objective writers on current economic and political subjects. This latest article merits careful heading and thought by Members of the Senate and the public generally.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTAINMENT IS FAR FROM ENOUGH—CONSTANT TALK OF DEFENSE CAN DEFEAT EVEN OUR MOST LIMITED OBJECTIVES IN THE EAST-WEST STRUGGLE

(By Barbara Ward)

Of one thing can the Western World be perfectly sure. With or without settlement in Korea the hostility of the Soviet world will continue, and will need to be countered and contained. Local settlement, however satisfactory, does not alter the fact of general hostility. A western victory in Greece did not decrease Soviet pressure on Tito. The triumph of the Berlin airlift did not end the machinations of the Communist Party in Western Germany. The sweeping successes of the Marshall plan have not disarmed a single Soviet soldier. Just as British armies in the nineteenth century defended India's northwest frontier through a succession of minor wars and incidents, so the new frontiers of the free world have to be defended through all the major and minor provocations of Soviet power.

It is the essence of containment to recognize—stubbornly and patiently—this extremely unpalatable fact. Yet the supply of patience available to free, outspoken, volatile societies tends to run short—particularly before elections. It is clear that the basic principles of containment are likely to receive some very rough treatment in the months to come. Already leaders in the United States fear a let-down in popular opinion and a revolt against the austerities of a strong defense program. Already in Britain mischievous men of the left are pretending that Britain should draw apart from America lest containment should lead to war. It is difficult to imagine a time when it could be more important to reaffirm unity and staying power in carrying on the policy of containment of Soviet Russia.

The difficulty is that containment has very little to commend it directly. The two chief human instincts today are undoubtedly the hunger for peace and the hope of a better material life. Communist propaganda harps incessantly on both themes. It makes no difference that in Soviet Russia and its satellites, millions of men are under arms and that the whole industrial system is weighted toward the heavy industry needed for armaments and away from consumer goods. Behind the iron curtain the blanket of propaganda covers such facts, and at home and abroad every ruse of diplomacy is used by the Communists to fasten the blame for rearmaments on the imperialist leaders of the west.

"Believe us," say the Communists, "trust us, accept our little Picasso peace dove and you can have peace and rising living standards."

Reason in the western democracies rejects the bait. Reason, remembering the lesson of Munich, accepts the fact that appeasement and capitulation lead not to peace but to war at the worst possible moment.

But the electors are not all reason. They fear war passionately, with its intimations of ever more ghastly weapons. They dislike high prices and shorter supplies. They resent the drafting of young men and the growth of national armies. This is a powerful accumulation of emotional and instinctive distaste. Fears of inflation, a generation under arms, the overhanging threat of destruction—are these the real implications of containment? If so, is reason strong enough to silence the protest of feeling and instinct not only today and tomorrow but for the years during which—if war is to be avoided—the Western World must continue to make containment work?

Here the difficulty is that statesmen today are practically compelled to speak more of defense and armaments than of any other purpose simply because it is in the field of armaments that the Soviet Union has contrived—by the simple expedient of not disarming after 1945—to leave other nations behind. With the single vital exception of atomic warfare the Soviets still hold the initiative in arms. Until the disparity is made good, rearmament must dominate western policy.

Need it, however, so dominate the presentation of western policy? Through long debates in the United States Congress, first on the dispatch of troops to Europe and then over the dismissal of MacArthur, strategy seemed to crowd out everything else. The peaceful purposes of containment and the really new and revolutionary changes in world cooperation which it is bringing about fell into the background.

What the ordinary man and woman today need to feel—in Naples or London, in New York or Hamburg—is that an effective system of defense can be made not much more hampering to the general expansion of western society than the existence of a trained and efficient police force in civilian life, and that the real aims of western society far transcend the negative duty of self-defense. In physical terms, such an affirmation rests on an all-out effort in the next years to expand the whole economic basis of the Western World—to multiply the Nation's capacity to produce, to extend their industrial equipment, to develop their sources of supply, and increase on every side the flood of production.

Such a process of expansion would in itself go some way to meet the claims of less developed areas to have a share in the west's growing economic resources. The physical demands of armed strength cannot be met wholly from existing supplies and sources. The opening up of new materials and new markets in South America for instance, or southeast Asia would draw up under privileged nations in the wake of western advance. Indeed this process is already coming about.

But so much is only the physical foundation. The greater task is to interpret western purposes in political and moral terms by which the mass of people can be captured and inspired. A vast expansion of production cannot be secured without the intimate cooperation of management and labor. Still less can it be achieved without unified strategy between the free nations for the use and development of raw materials, and the use of productive capacity. Thus in two areas of past conflict, western policy is fundamentally committed to unity, cooperation, and mutual respect.

That this is more than words, has already been proved by the fantastic success of the Marshall plan, by the entirely new spirit created in such organizations as the Anglo-American Productivity Council, and by the welcome given by the world to America's point 4 programs or the British Commonwealth's Colombo plan. It is proved all over again each day by every act which substitutes understanding and joint effort between governments for old-style imperialism and exploitation—now virtually to be found only in the Soviet camp.

Yet, this wider vision has slipped out of statesmen's speeches. The man in the street hears every day of the 15 percent of his effort which represents arms. The vision of the other 85 percent that is creating, unnoticed and inarticulate, new relations between men and nations has been allowed to vanish from his mind.

It is true that not everyone in the west is prepared to accept this wider vision of western society. There are, for instance, those who either by impatience or by some funda-

mental lack of confidence in western staying power, deny the possibility of defeating communism peacefully first by ending the disequilibrium in armament and then by building a western society of infinitely greater wealth, scope, and vision than Russia can ever emulate. They argue instead that Russia must be crushed and communism violently destroyed if the west is to survive.

They are few, however. Not many raise their voices for preventive war. Most people are restrained by the prospect of atomic destruction and the doubt whether an atom-devastated world could be the framework of a free and ordered society. The more serious and dangerous critics, therefore, are those who believe that the creation of a great and dynamic international society under American leadership, strong enough to discourage attack and attractive enough to undermine Communist pretensions, is simply beyond the power of the United States and its allies to achieve.

Basically, such men—whether in the United States or in Europe or in India—advocate retreat and withdrawal. In America, it is called isolationism, in Europe, defeatism, in Asia, neutrality.

It is at this point that western weakness in face of Communist ambition seems most naked and pitiful. Whoever heard the men in the Kremlin doubt their capacity to recreate the face of the earth? When did a Communist leader petulantly declare: "This task is beyond our capacity." What local satellite has hinted that he would like to expand or intervene or lead or manage but unhappily his resources do not run to it?

Yet, resources are as nothing compared with the will to use them. In 1939, the west's resources infinitely outmatched Hitler's, but the dictator had his own crazy view of a Nazi world order, and in spite of all the west's potential power, came within an ace of achieving it. To believe a task is impossible, is the first step toward making it so. The isolationists, the neutralists, and the defeatists are all, in fact, saying: "Stalin can do the job but we cannot." This surely is the ultimate betrayal.

It is one of the ironies of history that this attitude of incapacity should have appeared at all in the United States, a nation which is above all geared to the achievement of the impossible. It is not a wild-eyed idealist but a man of sober judgment and a great industrialist, Defense Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson, who recently told the American people that within a short space of time production of steel and aluminum could be expanded so that the supplies available for the civilian economy would be as great as in 1950, a year of peak production. His judgment is simply based on experience—the experience of America's miracle of production when, between 1940 and 1944, it doubled the size of its economy, and again, between 1947 and 1950, when it increased Western Europe's war-devastated economy to a level 148 percent higher than it was in 1938.

These are not dreams, but facts. The trouble in the free world today is that its facts and its resources tend to be greater than its vision and its dream. It would be a most extraordinary paradox in this crisis of western history if vision were, in fact, to fall short of capacity. If one thing is more true than anything else of the men who created and built up the Atlantic community it is that hitherto their vision has always determined the use they have made of their resources—often very narrow resources.

The handful of men who crossed the Atlantic to New England, the settlers who conquered a continent in their covered wagons, the men who fought and died in two great wars to prevent the extinction of freedom, the statesmen who evolved and the men and women who supported such tremendous

ventures as the Marshall plan—for all these generations, faith has grown with responsibility and then the resources have been found for the work.

Today, the challenge is beyond the continental scale. It is world-wide and it covers every aspect of man's relations with his fellow men. By the mercy of providence, it comes at a time when the grasp of the Western Powers under American leadership, of technical procedures, productive processes and scientific advance have developed so tremendously that a world-wide responsibility is not beyond their physical capacity. The only doubt is whether they have the necessary political and moral stature.

This is the real issue before western statesmanship today. If the task of the Western World is pitched too low, if the talk is all of defense and not of production, of containment and not of creation, of armies and not of a peaceful dynamic world, the limited task of containment itself cannot succeed. But if passivity, neutralism and retreatism are left behind, and the aims of expansion, production, unity and brotherhood are affirmed in their place, western resources will, as they always have, suffice. Today's crisis is not at heart a crisis of physical strength. Fundamentally, it is a crisis of vision and of faith.

Anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union," by Victor Lasky, published in the National Jewish Monthly for June 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE SOVIET UNION—STALIN USES JEWS AS SCAPEGOATS TO DIVERT WEALTH FROM HIS REGIME

(By Victor Lasky)

Suppose for the sake of argument, that Congress suddenly passed legislation forbidding American Jews to write to relatives in other lands. Suppose, also, that the FBI began arresting Zionist leaders and hurling them, without trial, into dungeons. Suppose that the State Department refused permission to American Jews to visit Israel. And suppose that American newspapers were all controlled by the Government and suddenly began denouncing Bernard Baruch, Irving Berlin, David Dubinsky, Louis B. Mayer, Rudolph Halley, Irving H. Kaufman, David Lawrence, Walter Winchell, and George Sokolsky as "homeless cosmopolitans, people without kith and kin, tribeless bastards, rabbits, passportless wanderers."

Would—or could—there be any honest doubts that official anti-Semitism had come to America?

Yet these suppositions are brutal realities for the estimated 2,000,000 Jews in Soviet Russia. Arrests of Jewish leaders on such fantastic charges as "cosmopolitanism"; disappearances of numerous Jewish artists, writers, and intellectuals; the destruction of Jewish organizations; the abolition of the sole remaining Yiddish-language newspaper—all these can lead to but one tragic

conclusion: that the Kremlin is conducting an all-out campaign to wipe out Jewish culture.

But apologists for the Red Utopia (most of whom stomach even the Soviet-Nazi pact) insist that this is not really anti-Semitism. Unfortunately, too many otherwise knowledgeable liberals maintain that, even if there's much that's deplorable about the U. S. S. R., anti-Semitism is impossible there. Why? Because it's forbidden by the Constitution. By the same logic the U. S. S. R. is the world's greatest democracy. That, too, is written in the Soviet Constitution. By this juridical cretinism the Soviet myth-makers have been able to fool some people into believing that national and racial prejudices have been wiped away by the Bolsheviks. Only recently, for example, a book reviewer in a great metropolitan daily could state, as casually as if it was a fixed law in physics, that "racial prejudice has no place in the Soviet Union." Ironically, the twisted mentalities making up the Fascist crackpot movements also insist there's no anti-Semitism in Russia. Otherwise, how can the Gerald L. K. Smiths and the Upton Closes continue their refrain that "all Jews are communists" and "Russia is being enslaved by the Jews."

But, if we are to judge from past reactions to Soviet events, it will take considerable time before the outside world believes there is really anti-Semitism in Russia. Mass awareness has always come too late. When man-made famine stalked Russia in the early thirties, few people believed the reports that millions of Russian peasants had perished. Such reports, the liberals thought, were inspired by the reactionaries to discredit the young Socialist state. By the time the non-Communist world learned the bitter truths about Stalin's monumental boner in attempting forcibly to collectivize the farms, there was no way to aid the victims. The same thing occurred with the purges which went on consistently in the twenties and thirties.

JEWIS ARE ISOLATED

This time the victims are Jews. And the deadly time lag between the event and the realization is dooming the Russian Jewish community to isolated suffering. Instead of world-wide indignation, the Jewish victims of the new Soviet terror can count only on apathy, for the most part. Perhaps when the present victims of Soviet tyranny are beyond our reach, there will be considerable indignation and protest—but then it will be entirely too late.

For anti-Semitism in Russia is now in the stage of violence. For the first time in Soviet history, Jews are being menaced physically. And the shocker is that Stalin is not doing anything to prevent violence against them. Outbreaks against Jews are regular occurrences in many parts of Russia, particularly the Ukraine. According to reliable reports reaching the West, summarized recently by J. L. Teller in the *Christian Science Monitor*, "even more disturbing . . . have been assaults on individual Jews in such large cities as Moscow, with its 300,000 Jews, and Odessa, with its 100,000 Jews. Soviet officials are reported reliably to have shown indifference to the complaints of the Jewish victims and to have taken no steps to curb the mounting frequency of these incidents, notwithstanding the formal ban on anti-Semitism in the Soviet Constitution."

The tragedy is that there is still speculation as to whether anti-Semitism exists in the Soviet paradise. As early as 1947, *Newsweek*, in what was far from the first report, had already informed the American public that "an unpublicized but nevertheless effective anti-Jewish policy which was first adopted by the Soviet Government at the time of the Soviet-Nazi pact . . . has now been revived as a corollary to the Soviet antiwestern campaign."

V. M. Molotov had already stated, in announcing the Soviet-Nazi pact, that fascism was "a matter of taste." Nevertheless, the *Newsweek* story was startling. Not that the Jews in the Soviet Union ever led a better existence than other sections of the population. They suffered equally with the others. But here was something new. The Jews were being singled out for special repressions. Not a crack down on Jews because they were bourgeois or Kulaks, but a crack down on Jews as Jews—the classic name for which is anti-Semitism.

The bare bones of the *Newsweek* story have since been given documentary flesh. Before me, as I write, is a small mountain of tragic material—material which makes a newspaperman lose his customary professional restraint, particularly if the newspaperman happens to be Jewish. There are newspaper reports by Drew Middleton, Cyrus Sulzberger, Edmund Stevens, and other well-known correspondents, as well as scholarly studies on different aspects of the plight of Soviet Jewry by such noted scholars as Solomon Schwarz, Jacob Lestchinsky, and Harry Schwarz. There are studies by the American Jewish Committee and the recent documentation of the Jewish Labor Committee, which urged the United Nations to undertake a thorough investigation into the practices of the Soviet Union in the treatment of minorities and especially the pogrom that is being executed against the Jewish people. Note the use of the dread word "pogrom."

To deal properly with this testimony would take an entire issue of this magazine. Let us content ourselves with a few incontrovertible reports.

Pulitzer prize-winning correspondent Edmund Stevens, of the *Christian Science Monitor*, who left Moscow in the fall of 1949, has reported: "Even more drastic was the systematic campaign to eliminate Jews from posts of responsibility and especially from positions involving contact with the outside world. In a matter of weeks (in the winter of 1948-49) all Jews serving with the Soviet occupation administrations in Germany and Austria were recalled. No more Jews were included on foreign missions and delegations. Today Jews are not even admitted to the special school that trains personnel for the Soviet foreign service. The same restrictions apply to the Ministry of Foreign Trade."

EXPOSED SELVES IN 1949

In 1949 the masters of the Kremlin revealed their anti-Semitism to the world. They opened fire on Russian Jews under the obscene battle cry of "war against the homeless cosmopolitans"—words right out of the Nazi lexicon. Then they took another lesson out of Dr. Goebbels' master study of how to torment Jews. The Soviet press began to print, in parentheses, the original Jewish names of the cosmopolitans, along with the Russian pseudonyms under which they were known to the public.

That this is a brand-new practice aimed solely at the Jews was denied by a writer for the left-wing *Daily Compass*, of New York, who declared: "It is regular Soviet practice to print both the pen name and the family name of authors when they are mentioned in connection with any official or state matter." But, the *Daily Compass* notwithstanding, the Soviet press has yet to print the real names of Stalin or Molotov (Djugashvili and Scriabin) or of any other non-Jew. Still aping the foul Nazi press, the Soviet publications went the whole hog—publishing cartoons of the cosmopolitans which, according to Edmund Stevens, "depicted them with Faginlike profiles and the public got the point."

EHRENBURG: AN EXCEPTION

Only one Jewish writer of prominence managed to come through this period of anti-Semitic upheaval with his hide and

huge income intact. But Ilya Ehrenberg was a Jew in name only and one of the most slavish adherents of the Stalinist regime. Ehrenberg apparently won his way back to favor by publicly insulting Mrs. Golda Myerson, the first Israeli minister to the U. S. S. R. at a diplomatic reception. Within hearing of such foreign dignitaries as Lt. Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, then the United States Ambassador in Moscow, Ehrenberg said loudly: "I can't bear to hear English, especially when spoken by a Russian-born Jewess."

According to General Smith, in his book, *My 3 Years in Moscow*, a few Jews like Ehrenberg who hold high positions in the Soviet hierarchy "are always pointed to by the Kremlin to refute any implication of anti-Semitism. But during the past decade it seems that Jews have systematically been removed from influential positions in the Soviet Government and the diplomatic and armed services." He added this significant detail: "From the foreign office alone, while I was in Moscow (1946-49), Litvinov, Lozovsky, Maisky and less important but almost equally able Jewish officials were relieved or relegated to retirement or to positions of less importance."

It might be well to ask any Communist: Can you name any Jewish official in any Soviet mission abroad? Or ask the comrade to cite a single—only one—Yiddish publication in the vast Stalinist empire. Ironically, not even the *Freiheit*, the Yiddish Red daily published in New York, is permitted to circulate in Russia. Yet publications in languages of other Soviet nationalities are allowed to flourish.

Even the Soviet satellites are picking up the refrain. The Hungarian radio, in a broadcast which sounded very much like the unlamented Goebbels, recently attacked the international Jewish bourgeoisie and the international Jewish speculators who cooperate with the West German Government. And the Communists of the world are now bitterly assailing the new Israeli Government. Moscow radio accused Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion of cooperating with the Nazi clique of Western Germany in order to prepare a new slaughter of the Jews.

But why go on? At this late date the problem is not to "prove" that anti-Semitism in Russia is government policy. Only those who refuse to see will deny the facts. The question, as it was with Hitler, is: What can we do to save our Jewish brothers?

In order to do this we must try to understand the whys of Soviet anti-Semitism. It must be understood that the Soviet regime is completely amoral—capable of anything which would preserve the iron-tight Stalinist dictatorship. That is why the past three decades have been the graveyard of all hopes anyone had ever entertained about the U. S. S. R. (a monumental work on this subject is Julien Steinberg's *Verdict of Three Decades*).

The new Soviet anti-Semitism is an invocation of the scapegoat technique, which served Hitler so well. The Jews have always been useful villains. On their shoulders can be placed all the faults of the dictatorial regime. Even before World War II, anti-Semitism had been widespread in the Soviet Union. The tragic extent was disclosed by the Nazi invasion, when the conquerors were greeted as liberators by millions of Russians. And, according to Solomon Schwarz, of all the ideological nonsense brought into the occupied Russian areas by the Nazis, only Jew hatred met with staggering success.

"When the war ended," the noted former Moscow correspondent, Eugene Lyons, wrote in the *Freeman*, "the Kremlin apparently decided to accept and exploit the malicious force it had been unable to curb or control."

Having failed to achieve unity with the people on the higher levels of loyalty to the regime or Communist ideology, it now sought identification with the masses on the lowest level of their primitive prejudices. In a perverted fashion Stalin chose to come closer to his subjects by pandering to one of their worst moods. * * * It could be turned into a convenient lightning rod to draw at least part of the mass discontent away from the Soviet masters * * *"

Another factor making for the new anti-Semitism is the rise of Israel. The birth of the new Jewish State was greeted with joy by the Jews of Russia, as by their brethren everywhere. But Zionism—even the teaching of the Hebrew language—has long been forbidden by the Soviet regime. And in the U. S. S. R., enthusiasm for any other nation leads to grim repercussions. The un-Soviet behavior of the Russian Jews (who flocked to the new Israel Embassy in Moscow to seek visas to the Promised Land, but were forbidden to leave) whipped the Politburo to Nazi-like intensity in carrying out its already established anti-Semitic program.

Twice in our time the Jews have been the victims of mighty dictatorships. We had no trouble in understanding the tragedy in the first instance. How long before the world understands the second?

Revision of the Italian Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Italian Treaty Revision," published in the Evening Bulletin, of Providence, R. I., on July 23, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ITALIAN TREATY REVISION

It is patently unjust and, under present world circumstances, unrealistic to hold Italy to a peace treaty made 5 years ago when Japan is to be treated benevolently and Western Germany will receive tender handling.

Italy certainly has worked her way back into the comity of free states. She became a cobelligent of the Alien Powers in 1943 with the fall of fascism. She has disavowed the monarchy and set up a republican form of government. She is a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. She has resisted the internal pressure of Italian communism to take over political control.

The United States, at the time of negotiations, did not want to impose onerous burdens or restrictions upon Italy. We went along under two assumptions: (1) That with the Italian treaty finished the Austrian and German treaties would follow speedily; (2) that Italy would be admitted to the United Nations and, through a clause in the peace treaty, rectifications of the treaty would be possible.

These assumptions have been proved invalid. Russia has refused to conclude the Austrian treaty, whose principal terms have been settled, and has balked every attempt to draw a German treaty. Four times Russia has vetoed Italy's application for membership in the United Nations.

With Italy's fine record and the radical change in circumstances since the signing of the Italian treaty, the time has come to forget legalistic arguments and approach revision on the facts in the case.

It is a contradiction for the United States to supply Italy with arms and military material for the strengthening of western defense and yet hold her standing army to the peace-treaty limitations of under 300,000 men. It is economic nonsense to expect Italy to pay reparations to Russia and war claims to others when the United States is pouring in millions to keep Italy a going concern. It is the reduction to the absurd for Italy to turn over war vessels to Russia and then have the United States give Italy war vessels.

While the three western powers continue to hold Italy to the letter of the treaty lest the Soviet Union use revision for propaganda and diplomatic exploitation, Russia has reduced the treaties with Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania, which the western nations signed, to scraps of paper by rearming the satellites.

The movement in the United States Congress to bring the Italian treaty in relation to the realities reflects the sentiment of the American people. But it would not be sound policy and it would be unwise for the United States to act unilaterally. President Truman wrote to Secretary of State Marshall on May 6, 1947, when opposition developed in the Senate to ratifying the Italian treaty: "It would be a heavy blow to our country's leadership in world affairs should we unilaterally withhold approval of the treaty." That same unilateral argument is good today when revision is the issue.

We should adopt the same procedure toward Italian treaty revision that we did with the Japanese treaty—that is, secure consent from Britain and France through diplomatic channels and put revision on a multilateral basis. Russia will howl, of course, but the demands of simple justice to Italy cry more loudly.

Open Mind on McCarthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Open Mind on McCarthy," by Bill Cunningham, published in the Boston Herald of July 17, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPEN MIND ON MCCARTHY—RIGHT OR WRONG, SENATOR IS A TWO-FISTED FIGHTER

(By Bill Cunningham)

I expect to go to Washington later in the week, more on pleasure than business, and it's entirely possible that at the place I'm going I shall meet the famous—or notorious, depending on who's talking—Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin. That happened the last time I was there and I was somewhat amazed to discover he didn't wear horns, slug his fellow guests with a blackjack, nor monopolize the conversation with abuse of Dean Acheson.

I'm reminded of this because practically the only unfinished business in this steamfitter office here at midsummer, with the dog

days apanting, are letters to the number of a score or so trying to get me on record for or against the controversial gentleman from Wisconsin. I refuse to get—one way or the other. The truth is I just don't know.

I can't go along with anybody who makes charges without proving them. Yet, what is proof and what's the time limit on it? Proof or vice versa, of his main contention is locked in the State Department files and protected by the Presidential order not to deliver. Still, what of this new development, with two key figures suspended by the loyalty board and some 26 others apparently likewise fingered for reexamination? Is that heading toward proof?

IMMUNITY BUSINESS NOT RELISHED

I don't like this "immunity" business—direct character attack from the privileged sanctuary of the Senatorial floor, where nothing said can be held legally against the say-er. That seems too much like hitting a man when his hands are tied, and still I'm wondering if I wouldn't do the same thing in a kill-devil fight, especially if I were a fighter of the type of Senator MCCARTHY.

That last possibly can stand a little explaining. I think MCCARTHY, right or wrong, is an all-ways fighter. Temperamentally, he's of the type of the last of the old Southwest I saw as a kid. When you jump him, or he jumps you, it's a fight to the death and there are no rules. He'll fight you fair. He'll fight you foul. Or he'll fight you fair and foul. The main idea is that only one man is going to be able to walk away when it is over.

As I understand the MCCARTHY story, he was a freshman Senator, a bachelor, and with time on his hands when the Republican senatorial veterans asked in routine fashion who of the general brotherhood would be available to make Lincoln Day speeches over the country where these annual affairs would be held. Considering it a call to duty, he sent in his name.

Since his name didn't mean much, they gave him a couple of second-class dates, one out in his own district, the other somewhere in West Virginia. The big shots, naturally, knocked off the big ones for themselves—New York, Chicago, Boston, and so forth, where they'd get their names in the big city papers. Almost like the celebrated Carl Moore song, "Nobody knew what happened to McCarthy," rather what was happening with McCarthy.

ADVICE OF WARM FRIENDS SOUGHT

MCCARTHY, however, taking his assignment seriously, went to some of the members of the faculty of one of the colleges in Washington—warm friends of his, as I understand it, from his days in the service. He discussed the assignment with them and asked their advice on a subject. They told him they didn't see how he could do better than to attack communism.

That corresponded with his own ideas, so he instructed his secretary to procure sufficient source material for an address on the evils of that great conspiracy. The story goes that the secretary then went to several Washington writers of various categories who specialized in the subject. These were delighted to hand over their files.

Those who consider this all to have been a terrible thing maintain the trouble was that these files contained a conglomeration of material, some of it authentic, some hearsay, some nothing but rumor. They charge MCCARTHY was either too naive or too headline-hungry to differentiate.

In any event, he let go first in Wisconsin. He had no particular coverage of the national sort. The big shots had hogged that, but by the time he got around to repeating his suddenly sensational charges against the State Department in West Virginia, the delayed-action report had boomed out of Wisconsin and every ear was tuned to that little

West Virginia radio station that aired the repeat.

Suddenly, the Republicans had won themselves something. They didn't know what, nor just what to do with it. Action was swift and sensational. A congressional hearing was ordered (the Tydings committee). The young man was going to need money to set up his side of the case. I know the Senator who started calling the somewhat startled faithful. He managed to get \$3,000, which he turned over to McCARTHY for investigators, extra secretarial help and so on, and he told McCARTHY he was afraid that was all he could get.

COMING ELECTION TO TELL STORY

It was to develop, however, that the young man wouldn't need any more. Contributions, with no strings attached, started pouring in on him voluntarily, and although certain of his colleagues began to decry and denounce him, they dried up fast when it swiftly developed that a great ground swell from the grass roots was pro-McCARTHY and wanted to hear more.

That's how it began. The rest of the saga is well enough known. McCARTHY may be riding to a terrific fall. That fall may come with failure to be reelected next year. Every effort will be made to beat him, and if he is defeated, that may be the end of him. If he wins . . . ?

Right or wrong, don't make the mistake of discounting his courage. These new efforts to discredit his war record are strictly the bunk. He had the war record, all right, as a captain of Marines. He did not quit at the height of the war, as charged. He was invalidated home with a broken and burned foot and leg, and before he was well the war was over. That red-card business is more of the same. Every Senator and Representative who's a Reserve officer has exactly the same card in his file, following a Defense Department ruling that as of now, they're of more value in Washington than they would be with troops.

My mind is open on Senator McCARTHY. It does look as if he's been guilty of some terrible things, but were any of them as guilty as Yalta? Let's wait and see what the harvest is. Somebody or something—maybe McCARTHY—deserves to be reaped before very much longer.

Proposed United Nations Covenant on Human Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Bricker's Warning," published in the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer of July 21, 1951. I discussed this subject on the floor of the Senate last week.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRICKER'S WARNING

The Senate should favorably consider the resolution of Senator JOHN W. BRICKER expressing disapproval of the proposed United Nations Covenant on Human Rights, which he has denounced as a "blueprint for tyranny" aimed at stifling criticism of the Fair Deal through Government control of the press.

He said the covenant had been drafted under the immediate direction of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and he called upon Secretary Acheson to instruct her, as the United States delegate on the U. N. Commission on Human Rights, to renounce this blueprint for tyranny or accept the consequences for sponsoring it.

Although he predicted the covenant never would be ratified, he said adoption of his resolution would minimize the undeniable embarrassment of treaty rejection.

Senator BRICKER did well to warn that the proposed covenant would make the press subject to certain penalties, as he said Secretary Acheson must realize, and that this would radically change the meaning of the Constitution by abrogating its guarantee of the freedom of the press and allow the Government to crack down on newspaper critics.

The Ohio Senator is not a newspaperman but a lawyer. It is therefore the more significant that he charged that the international-do-gooders and the State Department are pushing this Covenant on Human Rights toward ratification because it is an ingenious mechanism designed to stifle all criticism of the Fair Deal.

"In this country," he said, "the State Department is moving to destroy the freedom of the newspapers by using the United Nations as a shield for its activities."

Senator BRICKER has rendered a valuable public service by sharply warning against the proposed United Nations Covenant on Human Rights.

Hon. Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ZALES N. ECTON

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD various editorials commending the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. They are taken from the Chilton (Wis.) Times-Journal, of July 12, 1951; the Wisconsin State Journal, of July 20, 1951; the Doylestown (Pa.) Daily Intelligencer; the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times; the Marshfield (Wis.) News-Herald; and the Parkersburg (W. Va.) News.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chilton (Wis.) Times-Journal of July 12, 1951]

CONVENTION WHOOPS IT UP FOR McCARTHYISM

It is to the everlasting credit of the delegates to the State convention of the Republican voluntary committee at Wisconsin Rapids last Saturday that they went on record in overwhelming numbers in support of a resolution lauding Senator McCARTHY's fight against Communists in Government.

There is a small but highly vocal group of politicians in the State who are eagerly intent on disparaging McCARTHY. They want to make him out to be an irresponsible man whose conduct and actions transgress reason and principles. They are afraid of him, actually. They accuse him of smearing reputations and then use the tactic they exorcise to smear him. They don't attempt to answer his charges. They just stuff them

off by calling what he does and says "McCarthyism," and by insinuating that the term has the meaning of aathema.

Recently Senator McCARTHY prepared a highly documented survey of United States foreign policy in the Far East since Yalta. In the development of his thesis he quotes liberally from books and speeches by such people as Winston Churchill, Admiral William Leahy, Henry L. Stimson, James F. Byrnes, Sumner Welles, Robert Sherwood, Hanson Baldwin, Gen. H. H. Arnold, Gen. Claire Chennault, and many others. He quotes also at considerable length from the white paper prepared by Secretary Acheson and his State Department to paint a black picture of Chiang Kai-shek and his followers in China.

The documented record tells in detail the part Secretary Acheson and Gen. George C. Marshall played in the events that led up to the loss of China to the Communists. The record is very far from a flattering account of the statesmanship of the two men who were most responsible for what has occurred. We haven't seen any effort on the part of McCARTHY critics to question the accuracy of the data he presents. They resent any impugnement of the record of the great Gen. George C. Marshall but don't point out in what detail McCARTHY is wrong in attributing to him a major share of the blame for the loss of China to the Reds. They charge "McCarthyism" and hope that the people will just take it to be the irresponsible mouthing of an irresponsible Senator. The delegates to the Wisconsin Rapids meeting didn't fall for that kind of smear.

A favorite contention of the critics of McCARTHY is that he has made charges but has not proved them. The American people who read the newspapers know how hard it is to prove charges against a member of the Government whom the Government is bent on protecting. Facts implicating Alger Hiss as aiding the Russians were given to an assistant to the President early in World War II. They were laughed off as is McCarthyism now. Hiss was kept on to play an important role in the establishment of the United Nations, to advise the President at Yalta after that occurred. The charges against him were called a red herring by President Truman and it was not until about 10 years later that Hiss was convicted. The story is much the same in the case of William W. Remington, a \$10,000-a-year Commerce Department employee. He was investigated and let out of his job and taken back. Years passed before he finally was convicted of lying when he denied that he ever had been a Communist. It isn't easy to convict a traitor when he has powerful friends in Government to protect him.

Clear evidence that our State Department leaned to the Communist side is to be found in the fact that such thoroughly informed and thoroughly American men as General MacArthur and General Wedemeyer were never consulted about the formulation of far-eastern policy. That fact alone renders our policy makers suspect.

Then we have the spectacle of a Secretary of State who won't turn his back on a convicted traitor who played an important part in concocting the mess our country now is in.

And the final and most convincing evidence of all that there has been something rotten in our Government is the fact that China—a nation of 450,000,000 people, bound to the United States by 100 years of friendly relations, a fighting ally in World War II—became in the space of a few years a ruthless shooting enemy. That is the payoff of the work of our far-eastern policy makers. By their fruits you shall know them.

Senator McCARTHY is accused of being indiscreet, of evidencing more zeal than discretion. There may be justification for the charge. The same may be said of every

American hero who has been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for deeds of valor in the Korean war. Every man of them showed more zeal for achieving an objective than discretion to save his own life. Of the 27 men so far awarded the medal, only 7 survived the heroic actions for which the awards were made.

The American people know there have been Communists in our Government from the records of convictions and confessions. They know there are in it "liberals" who do the work of Communists. They admire McCarthy for braving the criticism and scorn to do a job that he—and they—believe should be done.

[From the Madison (Wis.) State Journal of July 20, 1951]

QUESTIONS FOR QUESTIONERS

Some Democrats in these parts wanted to know what Gov. Walter Kohler thought of "McCarthyism." The governor told them, and at the same time asked some questions of his Democratic inquisitors.

We are sure all citizens of Wisconsin would like to hear Badger defenders of the Fair Deal discuss these points:

Do Democrats contend there never have been and are not now Communists, fellow-travelers, or sex perverts and other poor security risks on the Federal payroll, in strategic places?

Do Democrats believe the Communists-in-Government charges brought by Senator McCarthy were given a full and fair hearing by the Tydings committee?

Do Democrats care to defend Secretary of State Acheson, who has refused to turn his back on Alger Hiss, a convicted traitor?

Do Democrats care to defend "Trumanism," with its mink coats, deep freezes, RFC scandals, Missouri vote frauds, and "Government by crony?"

The governor admits he is flatly opposed to the infiltration of Communists into our Government. How stand his Democratic questioners, on this and other issues mentioned by Walter Kohler?

[From the Doylestown (Pa.) Daily Intelligencer]

THE SMEAR TECHNIQUE

No single episode more clearly reveals the extent to which the American people have mislaid the power of self-government than does the current discussion over the indictment of General Marshall by Senator Joe McCarthy.

The whole business is like a bad dream. Only in a world gone completely cockeyed could anything of the sort take place.

Here is a member of the younger generation, one of the men who fought it out, risking their lives a thousand times during the recent war, trying to save the American people and their Government from the dictators of the earth.

He came home. He campaigned against the La Follette dynasty in Wisconsin and defeated the gaudiest of that family in a stirring campaign. When he went to Washington he discovered that this Nation is in far more danger from its enemies within than from those outside our borders—found that it has nursed vipers in its bosom.

Joe McCarthy took on the biggest of the big shots in the group that has been busily selling us down the river for years, giving away our assets and betraying our friends in order that the evil red star of Russian communism might rise in the sky.

Senator McCarthy dealt in facts. He followed his conclusions where the facts led him. Gradually he came to discover that the kingpin in the machine which had stripped us of all the advantages we should have gained from the costly victory in the Second World War was Gen. George Catlett Marshall.

As we said, Joe McCarthy dealt primarily in facts. They were unanswerable facts. No one has yet demolished them. His critics, the defenders of the Truman administration and of the gilded reputation of General Marshall, have never seriously tried to reply to these facts.

Instead, the marine hero sent to Washington to represent the supposed owners of our National Government, the American people, has been given the most gigantic and best organized course in personal abuse ever known in American history.

This is the smear technique. It is the device of dictators and demagogues. It is the enemy of truth.

On the few occasions when anyone ventured to enter open debate with McCarthy they got hopelessly the worst of it. That is what happened to former Senator Tydings of Maryland.

Now a new chapter has unfolded.

Senator McCarthy recently finished a gigantic new job of factual research. Having been accused of bias in reference to Marshall, having been accused of carelessness in giving credence to unreliable witnesses, he undertook to tell the story of Marshall's record out of the writings of unimpeachable figures—most of them personal friends and admirers of Marshall.

He analyzed the works of Winston Churchill, Cordell Hull, Henry L. Stimson, James F. Byrnes, Sumner Welles, Edward Stettinius, Robert Sherwood ("Roosevelt and Hopkins") and a host of others of similar standing, and went through reams of official documents and sworn testimony.

The fruits of this research he presented to the United States Senate in the form of an address entitled "America's Retreat from Victory—The Story of George Catlett Marshall."

The transcript covers 48 large pages. In it, very little is in the words of Senator McCarthy, virtually all is quoted from others—as noted, many of them—Marshall's friends.

To anyone who reads it seriously and with an open mind, its impact is devastating. It is unanswerable. McCarthy's strictures are irrefutable. He is right as rain, on down to the solemn warning near the end:

"The Congress of the United States is the people's last hope, a free and open forum of the people's representatives . . ."

But who will read it?

The tragic truth is that very few will ever see copies of the manuscript—far fewer will ever read it through. How the American people have slipped and slid. Back in the early days, when our Constitution was being ratified, it was studied and discussed throughout the Nation. The "Federalist Papers" analyzing it were eagerly passed from hand to hand. Nearly every American had an opinion of some sort, founded upon factual knowledge and information.

Now we're too busy to be bothered in a matter even more urgent.

And the reply; It is nothing more than a renewed smear. Hardly any of Senator McCarthy's opponents have bothered to read what he says. Many of them brazenly accuse him of saying things not contained in the address. The whole reliance is on personal abuse.

There is the picture—a factual serious analysis, based almost entirely on quotations from men of the highest standing, being torn to pieces by those who have not read it and are not replying to what it contains—and the jury in the case, who will also be the victims in the threatening tragedy, too much entertained with trivial interests to go to the bottom of the matter.

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times of July 16, 1951]

WHITEWASH WEARS OFF

The whitewash the Tydings committee applied to the State Department loyalty in-

vestigation last summer is beginning to peel. It has been confirmed that an undisclosed number of State Department officials have been suspended pending a check on their security status.

Only two of the suspended group were identified, their names having leaked already. Both are specialists and influential in China policy. Another far eastern expert in the Department, John Carter Vincent, recently was demoted from a ministerial post to a consulate in north Africa. Loss of China to the Communists has been called by General MacArthur the greatest diplomatic blunder in United States history.

The security screening has been slow to start. An explanation might be the disclosures of the MacArthur hearings, or it might be, as Senator McCarthy says, that the State Department is afraid of the newly created Internal Security Subcommittee headed by the outspoken Senator McCarran. The latter was instrumental in obtaining passage of a tightened security law last year, under which Federal employees may be dismissed if there is reasonable doubt of their loyalty.

The Security Subcommittee currently is investigating charges that Communist sympathizers have been slanting Voice of America broadcasts, but is preparing to delve into pre-Korea Far East policy.

Probably the most effective influence, however, has been that of Senator McCarthy, himself. He invited Department attention to several of those suspended more than a year ago. Developments since have emphasized the absurdity of calling his charges a hoax, as did former Senator Tydings and his committee colleagues, Senators Green, of Rhode Island, and McMahon, of Connecticut.

Senator McCarthy declared he had to overstate his case initially in order to arouse public opinion. Certainly nothing less than shock treatment could move the State Department from its naive insistence that all was well. Developments come slowly but they attest the service Senator McCarthy performed for the American people.

[From the Marshfield (Wis.) News-Herald of July 20, 1951]

BACK OF IT ALL

The failure of the Tydings committee last year to provide for a full and open investigation into the charges of Communist influences within the State Department and the committee's obvious desire to smother the whole situation, continues to plague the Democratic Party.

And the plague is just as aggravating to party leaders and followers today as it was when the charges first were made. Senator McCarthy has become a half-shirt to the Democrats. He has a mean, brusque manner to needling the party, from President Truman down. He continues to employ the needle with telling effect. Democrats have coined the word, McCarthyism, in an effort to bottle him up and all who go along with the Senator. But it just isn't effective. Joe still goes on.

And well he might. His accusations have never been disproved. On the contrary, evidence continues to build up supporting his claims that the State Department is infiltrated with Communists or Red sympathizers. Just last week a half dozen or more high placed employees in the Department were suspended by Secretary Acheson who said nothing about his official act until the news was smoked out by newsmen.

This newspaper has, on numerous occasions, voiced its disapproval of Senator McCarthy's methods, but we have had to confess that until some one in or out of the State Department comes forth with all the facts and proves beyond the shadow of a doubt that McCarthy is wrong, and that his charges are unfounded, we must go along

with the junior Senator. Why did the Tydings committee smother the investigation into those charges? Why, if they are unfounded, does not Dean Acheson come forth with the proof? A simple statement, backed up by adequate proof, would serve to silence Joe McCarthy for the rest of his life.

Wisconsin people have watched their junior Senator pretty carefully. Voters of this State like a fighter and consequently they admire McCarthy. But they would drop him like a hot potato if proof were furnished that he is making false accusations. He would be a dead duck politically.

It is amusing to note the efforts of Democrats in the State to kill McCarthy off politically. He has had a tough time with the opposition since starting his campaign against the State Department. He has been smeared and belittled. Even in his own party, many leaders have remained aloof, fearing to be injured politically if his charges were proved unfounded. The word "McCarthyism" was invented as a smear word.

Recently, efforts have been made by Wisconsin Democrats to force Governor Kohler to disown McCarthy, politically. How he ever permitted himself to be pushed into a corner, we do not know; the governor is pretty naive politically, and much too trusting for a man in politics. He agreed to meet four enterprising young Democratic politicians to explain his position with reference to McCarthy.

The ranking member of the four young legislators broke the appointment and the governor then refused to make another appointment. Instead, he invited the Democrats and the whole Democratic Party from Truman down to clean up their own back yard, including the situation in the State Department. The young Democrats issued a statement saying the governor refused to meet them and had made an unwarranted attack on the Democratic Party on unrelated matters.

The waste in Washington, mink coats, deep freezes, Reds in the State Department, theft of atom-bomb secrets by Reds, Kansas City ballot-box theft, and the whole gamut of graft and corruption in and out of Washington are all matters related to the Democratic Party and Wisconsin Democrats are in big business trying to hide the party's sins behind a trumped-up situation involving Governor Kohler, admittedly one of the most successful chief executives this State ever had.

We don't think the ruse has worked. McCarthyism isn't sticking as a smear word. It has a different connotation than its inventors intended. It points right at the Truman administration, the State Department, and one of the saddest predicaments in which this Nation ever found itself politically.

Back of it all is the hope that some Republican will knock McCarthy off in the primary next year so no Democrat will have to tangle with him in the general election. Again we say, Acheson can kill off McCarthy if the Secretary and his Department are clean. But that's about the only way McCarthy can be beaten in 1952, in either primary or general election.

If Acheson resigns before the end of the year, as is rumored, and without clearing his Department or himself, then the Democrat who tangles with McCarthy in the general election in 1952 is in for a rough time. This, we surmise, is what the four young Democrats have in mind in their political maneuver involving Governor Kohler.

[From the Parkersburg (W. Va.) News of July 20, 1951]

SENATOR JOSEPH MCCARTHY DESERVES GRATITUDE OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Once again Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, has demonstrated that he de-

serves the gratitude and acclaim of the entire American Nation for his fearless factual exposé of the political incompetence of Gen. George Catlett Marshall, who, despite terrible errors of the past, is still a chief counselor and mentor of both the Pentagon and the White House, though on the score of a faulty memory alone he long since, in our opinion, should have been relegated to retirement.

We here do not impugn in any manner the high patriotism of General Marshall; nor do we question his acknowledged military genius. It is in the field of world politics that we offer our criticism of a succession of errors on his part that have cost us the once tight alliance with China and catapulted that nation's 450,000,000 of people into the maw of imperialistic communism.

PURSUIT OF FATA MORGANA

Nor are we here speaking with the benefit of hindsight, for at the time—back in 1947 and subsequent years—we made vigorous protests against the utter folly of General Marshall's pursuit of the Fata Morgana of compulsory coalescence of the Chinese Communists and Chinese Nationalists while he was in China as the special emissary of the United States President.

Senator McCarthy since then, however, has thoroughly documented General Marshall's career, not from memoranda of his political enemies, but from the memoirs of his friends.

As in the case of Senator McCarthy's battle against Secretary of State Dean Acheson—now all but won, for the handwriting is on the wall and Acheson's days are numbered—once again the administration's \$100,000,000 propaganda machine has been turned against the Wisconsin statesman with all of its formidable capacity.

AN ICONOCLASTIC BLAST

Possibly ex-Captain of Marines JOE MCCARTHY was too blunt in his arraignment of the failings of General Marshall, for the public obviously was unprepared to swallow so bitter a pill in connection with the Senator's iconoclastic blasts against the glittering figure of a national hero. But it is a pill that, in our opinion, someday will have to be swallowed, and, indeed, may loom large in the history of our times.

But who will be the people's champion, if not someone who has the courage to go against the political Goliaths of the present regime—the biggest of the "big brass"? Of the ultimate vindication of Senator McCarthy by the harsh facts of history, we have no doubt whatever. And it would richly reward the American people, in our view, if they listened intently to him now, rather than later.

THE KEY TO EVENTS

See the cartoon elsewhere on this page today, and you will get the key to much that has happened and is happening. It shows someone resembling Mr. Truman joyfully boarding a gorgeous bandwagon and preparing to move his party into 1952 under the flaunting banner: "Peace and Prosperity."

What a monstrous irony.

For Korea is a "peace" of abject appeasement.

And the prosperity is a fake prosperity—the fool's gold of war and rearmament.

But the picture explains much. It is the attempted rejoinder to the well-nigh unanswerable "Three Democratic Presidents and three wars in one generation." Here they are: Wilson, 1917-18; Roosevelt, 1941-45; and Truman, 1950-51.

This is the dread political incubus which the administration so desperately is striving to escape, and it has now culminated in the blatant, ludicrous assertion that the present administration which got us into the foolhardy war in Korea—at a cost of 80,000 dead, wounded, and missing—is the "peace party."

ECHOES OF MUNICH

Nor can it be forgotten that it was Acheson, the United States Secretary of State, who sued for peace; and not Malik, the Soviet envoy, as some would make it appear. Malik in his cease-fire proposal merely echoed what Acheson had proffered in his testimony before the Senate investigators in June.

And how feebly that contrasts with the unconditional surrender demand made on Hitler, even though the fruits of that surrender were frittered away at Yalta.

Give the impeccable Mr. Acheson a monocle and an umbrella and he would appear to many to be the living image, in his Korean peace tenders, of Neville Chamberlain at Munich.

The world well remembers Winston Churchill's dour comment on Munich, when he said:

"Gentlemen you have chosen between war and dishonor. You have chosen . . . dishonor. You shall have war."

Mr. Churchill's comment scarcely was heeded then; just as Senator McCarthy's comment on our far-eastern fiasco has not been widely enough heeded now.

Indeed, the American people are already beginning to feel that our Korean misadventure was either a Quixotic bit of idealism unsuited to the realities of the present world, or the rashness of a small group of inflated egotists, who disdainfully overrode Congress, in a badly calculated risk, that now brings the dread denouement of an ignominious armistice—something hitherto unheard of in all the annals of America—a truce that has cost us face throughout Asia.

ONWARD RODE THE 600

And all this at the cost of the blood of brave American men who knew not for what they fought, but who, in the tradition of "Onward Rode the 600!" at Balacava, died heroically doing their duty to the memory of a great past, but under the flabby banner of a flimsy, superogative government that knew not the reverence for Old Glory which still animates our Nation.

As the heroic 600 died in the Crimea nearly 100 years ago, so our boys died in Korea for a not dissimilar error in the Crimea in 1945. And the enemy was the same—Imperial Russia.

The present painful events in the Kaesong armistice camp, more than ever indicate that Acheson and Marshall must be dispensed with, if there is to be an end of the blood-letting. All the flamboyant bandwagons and flaunting political banners on earth will not overmatch this inescapable conclusion. We therefore say, without reservations:

"More power to Senator McCarthy."

Problems in Rain Making

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the disastrous floods in Kansas and Missouri have brought national attention on the over-all problem of the control of rainfall through artificial methods.

It is obvious that the Congress should authorize a study of this entire problem before harmful precedents are set, and before vested interests develop. I have

introduced a resolution calling for such a study by the House of Representatives.

There is a very enlightening article in the July issue of the magazine *Public Works*, by T. H. Evans, dean of engineering, Colorado Agricultural and Mechanical College. I include it as a supplement to my remarks:

PROBLEMS IN RAIN MAKING

(By T. H. Evans)

In the far-western States during the past 2 years there has developed almost a tidal wave of large-scale operations to force nature either to give up or to withhold moisture in the atmosphere to suit the will of man. This work comes under the general heading of artificial nucleation, a scientific development that is only an infant but which gives promise of unbelievable results. It is claimed by one operator in the field that it is possible in many arid regions of the country to double the average annual precipitation or run-off. This means doubling either the average annual rainfall, or snow-fall, or a combination of these, depending on the region. It is further claimed that hail can be prevented, and that undesirable rain can be prevented at will. It is even believed by some that fog can be dissipated where desired. These are merely some of the claims. Perhaps they will all be substantiated. Most of us who live in the arid and semiarid West hope they can be.

It is easy to imagine the terrific impact of such an achievement on agricultural practices, engineering, law, economic level, transportation, domestic water supplies, hydroelectric power, and almost every human activity. If the claims prove correct this will be the biggest thing since the atomic bomb. The impact, of course, will not be limited to the drier sections of the country but will be felt nationally. The large-scale experiments that are going on in the West were tried in the New York City watersheds to improve the critical situation that developed there in 1950.

WHAT COULD HAPPEN

The impact would radically alter certain agricultural practices because it would not be necessary to hope for rain in dry farming—it would be there about when wanted. Susceptible areas that now rely entirely on a little rain and elaborate irrigation systems could forget their worries about water shortages in the system, or about priorities under appropriation law. In fact priorities might even become unnecessary if there were always assurance of an abundant water supply. Towns that are now limited because of inadequate water supply might continue to expand. Regions that are short on industry because of inadequate water could begin to attract industries. Areas that have had their economic level held down because of all too frequent crop failures could begin to raise that level. Grazing lands would be lush with rich grasses. The threat of dust bowls would disappear. Streams would have new and higher averages that would be free of the extreme variations that exist now. Hydroelectric plants could operate on a larger firm power load. If fog could be dissipated at will, the transportation systems—particularly ship and air—could maintain better and safer schedules.

This all sounds too good to be true, and that may be just the case. So far there is no conclusive proof, on a sound scientific basis, that all this can be done. In the first place there has not been sufficient time for adequate proof and, secondly, even outstanding meteorologists, who are most closely allied to this scientific field, are in disagreement as to its possibilities. We, in the West, where additional water is needed badly in most areas, want the experimenters and operators to have every reasonable opportunity

to prove their claims. We feel that these large operations on a county- or basin-wide scale must be continued for enough years to acquire reliable scientific data for reevaluation.

HOW RAIN MAKING STARTED

All of this really got started just a few years ago. Although many laboratory research men, here and abroad, had delved into the science of meteorology and cloud physics for decades, it was probably not until Schaeffer's experiments at General Electric in 1946 that the real possibilities of causing artificial precipitation from certain types of clouds was fully realized. Dr. Irving Langmuir made some large scale experiments in New Mexico in 1949 that received considerable publicity and seemed to start a chain reaction of other experimentation. There are now many commercial concerns operating in this field under various kinds of contracts with farmers, ranchers, municipalities, and so forth. At present, practically anyone can try to milk clouds or knock off thunder-heads, but the fly-by-night operator with no experience, unsuitable equipment, and poorly trained personnel will probably only last a short time.

The principal method used today is that which involves spraying vaporized silver iodide into the atmosphere from the ground in such a way as to disperse it by winds to the so-called target area. By the time the particles have traveled some distance downwind from the generator they have dispersed into a very large volume of air—both vertically and horizontally. The optimum conditions within the area must be such that precipitation is incipient and lacks only the necessary nuclei to trigger it off. It is possible also to "over-seed" and dissipate a potential rain, or even the entire cloud. Nuclei are quite often there naturally. If not, however, and all other required conditions exist, then the artificial nuclei will start things going. Another advantage of the artificial nuclei is that even though some natural rain would fall, the amount can be increased because such nuclei are effective at much lower altitudes in a cloud than are the natural nuclei. This article will not attempt to explain the theories involved in this complicated set of phenomena. The explanation has been given in several outstanding scientific papers by authorities in the field such as Langmuir, Schaeffer, Vonnegut, Krick, and so forth. A very good popular explanation is that by Roscoe Fleming in *Public Power* for October 1950.

Another still common but apparently less efficient method, that was actually in use before silver iodide, involves using dry ice dispersed from an airplane. It has the big disadvantage of requiring expensive airborne equipment, and gives dispersal on vertical surfaces rather than over a large volume. It further requires operation under the most unfavorable flying conditions. Although silver iodide can be dispersed from a plane, the usual practice is to employ ground generators.

The need for additional, reliable water supplies in most of the far West is quite obvious to those who live in its vast arid and semiarid sections. The need is probably also evident to those who live in the more humid regions of our country but have traveled through the West, have seen pictures of it, or have read of the antagonisms that develop between some Western States over a relatively small quantity of water. This crying need is the reason there have been so many large-scale operations carried on in California, eastern Oregon, Arizona, New Mexico, and Colorado during the past 2 years. It is understood an operation on the vast King Ranch in Texas is contemplated for this year. It appears that the operations will snowball into such a multitude that the State of Colorado, as an example, may be almost completely covered by contracts from

the Continental Divide to the Kansas and Nebraska line on the east. About the eastern one-third of Colorado is practically all dry-land farming. It was part of the Dust Bowl of the early thirties. Large parts of the remainder up to the eastern edge of the Rockies are irrigated. There are even extensive mesas within the Rockies that are largely irrigated. Colorado is second only to California in the acreage irrigated in the United States.

TYPES OF RAIN-MAKING CONTRACTS

There seem to be several types of contracts available to those who hire the operators. One is a flat fee for a service covering a definite time interval in months or perhaps a year. In this case the contractor does not necessarily guarantee any specific results. Another type might be called a minimum-maximum contract. A minimum fee is paid no matter what happens, but if a stated increase (perhaps doubling an annual average) is proven then the maximum is due. A third type could be called a double-or-nothing contract, since that is just about the way payments would be made. If the goal is to increase an annual average, a certain sum would be due if accomplished. If not, then nothing is due. Of course, if the operator came through on this latter type his total fee would be larger than in the other two types. Any kind of a contract might be negotiated, but most possibilities would be some of the examples given, or a combination of them. As a numerical example of cost it was proposed in one case that for doubling the average annual runoff from an increased snow pack the third type of contract would cost \$100,000 or nothing. The quantity of extra water under consideration was about 350,000 acre-feet. In most regions this is very cheap water provided the farmers wouldn't get it naturally.

THE NEED FOR WATER

It is easy to see why the desire to try these methods of getting additional moisture is spreading and has reached pandemic proportions. Many regions of our West suffer almost continual drought for many years in succession. Other areas have mined their water tables to supplement surface supplies to such extents that critical situations are developing. In other areas there just isn't enough surface water to irrigate properly all irrigable land or to supply cities and towns with enough domestic water. The new artificial precipitation science looks like manna from heaven if all the advertising, as well as statements from some outstanding scientists, prove correct.

Because there is disagreement, however, between top-notch scientists regarding the possibilities and long-range worth of weather control through artificial nucleation, it is evident that proper scientific evaluation must be made over a reasonable period of years. How much of the increases claimed in precipitation is natural and how much is purely artificial? It is relatively easy to measure total precipitation and runoff but we don't know how much is natural and how much artificial in these operations. It is a satisfactory yardstick to measure these components of the total that we need. No one seems to have devised that yardstick yet that is acceptable to all scientists. Methods are available, which over a span of perhaps 3 to 5 years, may prove something, although longer periods would provide better results. In the case of rainfall, however, the accuracy of results would depend for one thing on the adequacy of coverage in the target and adjacent areas by gages of long and reliable past records. Really good coverage does not exist in most regions that might be affected. At any rate some evaluation is better than none, and unless the present large-scale operations are properly evaluated by qualified neutral agencies, then a marvelous

opportunity will be lost and we may never have an unbiased answer. People are skeptical for the most part of evaluations carried out by operators who are in the business to make a profit, no matter how honest and sincere they may be.

NEEDED LEGISLATION

Because of the need for evaluation, so the public will be properly informed in the near future, there is need for legislation. As a bare minimum the legislation should require registering or licensing operators in order to keep track of them and their areas of operation. It should require also, a central agency to receive regular reports from operators as to when and where they operate in order to have proper data on which to evaluate the results. If there isn't such an agency set up in a State, then the public will never be able to go to a source for an answer it will rely on unless the Federal Government takes over the job.

At the present time the State of Colorado has a committee working on a proposal to regulate artificial weather modification. This was submitted to the legislature in the form of a bill and was passed by both houses in March. The spirit of the bill is to encourage experimentation and development in every reasonable way. A very minimum of regulation is spelled out but a commission is proposed which will be able, as the need arises, to adopt the necessary regulations to protect the public interest. The commission recommended would be composed of one representative, appointed by the Governor, from each of the four congressional districts in the State, and the State engineer. The commission, among other things, is empowered to hire an individual or organization to evaluate scientifically operations carried out in Colorado. The commissioner of agriculture actually handles the administration of the act on recommendations of the commission. The commission will recommend licenses and hear cases involving license revocation or charges against an operator. It will also have power to require an operator to cease activities in any area where it could be shown excess moisture would be against the public interest at a particular time.

The committee that worked out the proposal consisted of varied interests within the State. It invited in other parties who might offer criticisms or recommendations to make a better bill. The principal opposition appeared to be from groups already contracting for extra rain or snow and who resented governmental interference in the way they spend their money. They did not seem to realize that the entire public is concerned deeply in these activities and that the intent of such a bill is not to hamper experimentation and development but to provide reasonable safeguards of the public interest. If the opponents are paying for something they would have gotten anyway, they will probably be glad to learn about it one of these days. The bill cannot conceivably keep any group from getting a legitimate rain-increasing job done and spending as much for it as they see fit.

A bill has been introduced in the Federal Senate, known as the Weather Control Act of 1951, by Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, that gives the Federal Government pretty complete control over anything done along this line. It also sets up a commission under the Secretary of Commerce with very great powers for rigid control of the conduct of experiments and operations. It further would protect any contractor (operator) from damage suits growing out of his activities. The Government would stand these if proven.

This commission would be empowered to carry out, or have carried out, research in all aspects of weather control, including processes, devices, and materials, as well as the utilization of weather control in agri-

culture, industry, commerce, and military operations. It would also have the power to issue and revoke licenses. Not the least of the contemplated powers of such a commission would be to fix fees, rates, or charges in weather-modification contracts. It could issue injunctions in any case where it felt the general welfare would thus be served. It could also require reports of all activities and methods of operators, and inspect the activities at any time. In other words, this proposed commission would have practically absolute authority in the control of any weather-modification or weather-research activities carried on in the United States.

It is understood that several States in addition to Colorado are considering legislation at this time to regulate in one way or another the operations of those engaged in artificial nucleation. Arizona, California, and Wyoming are three known to have under consideration such bills. At a meeting of the Western Interstate Committee on Agriculture held in Santa Fe, N. Mex., last October, the following resolution was passed regarding artificial nucleation:

"Since the business of artificial nucleation of clouds to create rainfall has relatively recent beginning and has not progressed to a status where regulation is indicated, although some preliminary supervision by a proper State agency would appear desirable, your committee recommends that (a) research and development work in artificial rainmaking be encouraged; (b) legislation be adopted, if necessary, to provide for the registration with a proper State agency of (a) persons or organizations engaged in the business of operating artificial nucleation equipment with provision for information on areas of operation, and (b) of persons or organizations selling equipment and supplies for artificial nucleation or possessing equipment and supplies used in connection therewith."

It is believed by many people that the first statement in the resolution is not strong enough. Apparently some Congressmen feel that strong regulation is indicated, and a number of others in positions to know, feel definitely that a reasonable minimum of regulation is needed. While unduly restrictive legislation would undoubtedly hamper and discourage free experiment and development, that being proposed in Colorado would not. It is so flexible that it will enable rules and regulations to be developed as the need arises. It does give the reasonable minimum protection, however, to which the general public is entitled at this time.

This Matter of Ethics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, morality, ethics, propriety, and integrity in government and business is suffering under the prevalent attitude of "for you, my dear Mr. Gaston," so effectively illustrated in the following recent editorial from the Milwaukee Journal:

A disturbing thing about the growing national concern with ethics and integrity is that in most cases it deals with ethics and integrity for somebody else.

Business groups, for instance, think we need a higher level of ethics in government—but say nothing about some business groups that corrupt government.

The best illustration of all, perhaps, lies in Congress.

A Senate committee is busy holding hearings on ethics. Half a dozen codes of ethics for government employees have been introduced. Congressmen and Senators have peraded before the committee calling for higher standards for Government service.

This is all fine—but Congress shows little concern about its own ethics. The Senate refuses to do anything about the filibuster, for instance, which enables one or a handful of men to block majority action on important measures. Neither House does anything about log rolling and "pork barrel" legislation in which Congressmen vote gravy for colleagues and get gravy in return.

The House ignores the fact that one of its Members, Representative **WALTER BREHM**, Representative of Ohio, has been convicted of forcing his employees to pay "kickbacks." He is still a representative in—as far as the House is concerned—good standing. The Senate has ignored the fact that Senator **JOHN BUTLER**, representative of Maryland, had a campaign manager who pleaded guilty to violating Maryland's corrupt practices act in the election in which BUTLER won his Senate seat.

Quoting Doris Fleeson, Washington columnist, Congress seems to think "it's fine to be against sin as long as it does not involve unkindness toward a Member of the club."

If Congress is sincere about ethics, one of the first places it ought to start house cleaning is right in its own "clubhouse."

St. Lawrence Seaway Will Not Cost United States More Than Other Projects Authorized, Constructed, and Under Construction, Comparable Costs Favorable to Others—California Central Valley Project Just Completed at Cost of \$600,000,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to point out that the cost of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway will not cost the United States more than other projects already constructed, under construction and authorized.

The hearings by the House Public Works Committee disclose, beginning at page 1341, part 2, of the hearings, a few of the projects which will cost the Government as much or more than the United States portion of the seaway, \$818,063,000.

While it is true that the St. Lawrence seaway will cost the joint sponsors—Canada and the United States—\$818,063,000, this cost is divided jointly between Canada and the United States; however, since Canada has already constructed a part of the project, and since Canada will have to build tunnels and bridges not included in the project itself, even taking this into consideration, the actual cost to the United States, including the power portion of the project,

our total contribution will be only \$566,794,000.

If the Congress should vote to turn the power project to the State of New York, the State of New York would contribute \$192,493,000, which would reduce the amount to be paid by the United States to \$374,301,000.

Therefore, this is not a billion-dollar project to the United States as some have tried to represent.

In addition, the hearings will further disclose that the project for the United States portion will be self-liquidating, and I have proposed an amendment to amortize the revenues by a bond issue over a period of 50 years, and if this amendment is adopted, there will be no money required from the Treasury of the United States, but on the contrary, the revenues will take care of the bonds and interest.

Below is a partial list of a few flood-control projects which have and will cost the United States Government a comparable amount with the St. Lawrence seaway, to wit:

Los Angeles County drainage area—exclusive of Whittier Narrows Reservoir—\$301,605,000.

Garrison Reservoir, N. Dak., \$268,000,000.

Fort Randall Reservoir, S. Dak., \$189,200,000.

Oahe Reservoir, South and North Dakota, \$245,900,000.

Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma, \$686,370,000.

Oregon, McNary Dam, Oregon and Washington, \$270,000,000.

Washington: Chief Joseph Dam, \$266,000,000.

The above are only a few of the flood-control projects. The amount expended and authorized on the Missouri River Valley and the Mississippi River Valley is more than the cost of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Projects of the Bureau of Reclamation cost millions of dollars. For instance, the Grand Coulee Dam will cost the United States \$253,600,000, Hoover Dam will cost \$173,900,000, and Bonneville Dam will cost nearly \$100,000,000.

Of interest in this connection is the story on the completion of the Central Valley project of California, constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation at a cost of \$600,000,000, and which will be dedicated by President Truman on August 1 of this year, which I will read into the RECORD, as follows:

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., July 14.—California's \$600,000,000 Central Valley project, center of many a bitter fight in and out of Congress since construction work began 14 years ago, is about ready for a dramatic public demonstration.

With \$400,000,000 worth of big dams, power plants, pumps, canals, and transmission lines representing the first phase of the project due for completion within 2 weeks the Federal Bureau of Reclamation has set August 1 as the starting date for integrated operation of the project.

During the following 10 days, by means of a system of rivers, canals, and a pumping station, there is to be carried out what the bureau describes as the longest mass movement of water ever attempted by man. Bureau officials here expressed confidence that, despite conflicting reports from Wash-

ington, President Truman would be in California to participate at Tracy in one part of the 10-day program on August 4.

The Central Valley project, first envisioned as a State proposition and then taken over and expanded by the Federal Government, is based in its irrigation aspects on the fact of an uneven water distribution in California.

VALLEY 500 MILES LONG

The Sacramento Valley on the north and the San Joaquin on the south make up the Central Valley, 500 miles long. The San Joaquin Valley has two-thirds of the irrigable land but the San Joaquin watershed offers only one-third of the total water supply. Thus the problem posed to engineers was how to transport the surplus water of the Sacramento hundreds of miles southward to help irrigate the semiarid San Joaquin area, in which the underground water table has dropped to alarmingly low depths.

The forthcoming celebration is to mark the solving of this problem. The ceremony starts at Shasta, the world's second largest and second highest concrete dam, 10 miles north of Redding at the northernmost end of the Central Valley. Water being conserved in Shasta Lake, behind the dam, will be spilled over the dam and sent coursing down the Sacramento River.

Not far from where the Sacramento empties into an arm of San Francisco Bay, some of the water is to be diverted from the river through floodgates into a so-called delta cross channel.

This channel carries the water to the Tracy pumping plant, some 50 miles east of San Francisco. There, beginning on August 4, when the Shasta-released waters are due at Tracy, a set of six powerful pumps will lift the water 200 feet into the Delta-Mendota Canal. These pumps, capable of lifting 2,000,000 gallons of water a minute, are second only in size to pumps installed by the Bureau at Grand Coulee Dam in Washington to lift water 280 feet out of Lake Roosevelt to irrigate the Columbia basin lands in the central part of that State.

The pumping plant at Tracy is operated by electricity brought down from the Shasta Dam generating plant over a Government transmission line. The water hoisted by the plant will flow southward for 117 miles through the Delta-Mendota Canal.

At the canal's southern point the water will be dumped into the San Joaquin River, to flow back northward and eventually empty into San Francisco Bay. In the meantime, in the San Joaquin Valley water will be released from Millerton Lake, behind Friant Dam, near Fresno, into the Madera and Friant-Kern Canals. The latter will carry it southward 153 miles to the vicinity of Bakersfield, 500 miles south of Shasta Dam.

Because of the relatively small water supply in the San Joaquin Basin, it is unfeasible to take this water in quantity from Millerton Lake on the San Joaquin and divert it northward 37 miles through the Madera Canal and southward through the Friant-Kern Canal without replenishing the San Joaquin River itself somewhere along the way.

This is why the Shasta Lake water is being sent all the way down to Mendota and dumped into the San Joaquin. Thus, in a sense, water from Shasta Lake will be used after early August to irrigate lands as far south as Bakersfield, 500 miles from the lake itself. Actually, some symbolism is involved, since the Shasta Lake waters will start back northward after being poured into the San Joaquin.

Some acreages in the San Joaquin Valley already are under irrigation from Friant Dam, however. As a result, Bureau of Reclamation officials have collected such examples as these:

A 160-acre farm netting \$331 from pasture 2 years ago with this year's net from

an irrigated cotton crop estimated at close to \$20,000; a 400-acre farm netting \$1,500 from barley and pasture in a dry farming condition with an expected profit this year of more than \$77,400 from cotton.

Completed parts of the Central Valley project have a power generating capacity of 450,000 kilowatts and are designed to help control winter floods, increase summer water flows, combat salinity on farm lands and improve river navigation.

Imprisonment of William N. Oatis a Challenge to America and Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, the shocking conviction and imprisonment of William N. Oatis on trumped up spy charges by Communist-ruled Czechoslovakia ought to jolt every American into full realization of the true nature of the enemy we face in a divided world.

Mr. Oatis was an Associated Press correspondent in Prague. He is a mild-mannered, conscientious, patriotic midwesterner who went from the newspapers of Marion, Ind., up the ladder to a position as head of the American wire service bureau in a foreign capital. His only crime was his devotion to his duty, as we see it in this country, to get the truth rather than the propaganda of the Communist government in power in Czechoslovakia.

Mr. Oatis is in a Communist jail today because Red-dominated nations around the world are determined to discredit American prestige, and because they know that a supine State Department in Washington will confine itself to diplomatic protests rather than militant action.

The Oatis case is not unlike that of Robert Vogeler, American businessman in Hungary, who stayed in a cell for 17 months while the State Department made futile protests. He got out only after heavy ransom was paid and then due primarily to the determination and resourcefulness of his wife, rather than from any help of the American Government.

The present situation is a sad contrast with the days still within the memory of many when America "spoke with a soft voice but carried a big stick." There was a time when the rights of Americans abroad were treated with respect—and the world knew the Government of the United States could not be pushed around. But it is a far cry from Theodore Roosevelt to Dean Acheson. An official who is soft in dealing with Reds in his own country cannot be expected to get tough—or be effective—with arrogant Red governments.

Mr. Oatis already has been confined since April. How long he remains confined will depend on just one thing—the degree of indignation of the American people. That indignation can be

given official recognition through Congress. It can be given effective power in two channels—trade and diplomatic relations. Commercial relations with this country, vital to Czechoslovakia, could be and should be terminated. Diplomatic relations could be severed if other means failed.

It is revealing to note that during the first quarter of the present year, Czechoslovakia was allowed to sell over \$7,000,000 worth of goods in this country. At that rate, nearly \$30,000,000 worth of her goods will come into the United States this year. At the same time, the United States permits the sale of machinery, vehicles, chemicals, textiles, and animal products to Czechoslovakia. Both the trade and the materials are vital to the Red-dominated country. Immediate and firm action to halt such trade until the release of Mr. Oatis would be something the Reds could understand. The threat of severed diplomatic relations would be equally understood.

Such a course already has been proposed in the Congress by my distinguished colleague, the Honorable JOHN V. BEAMER, of Indiana. The determination of the American people can turn that course into action. The time has come—in fact it is long overdue—to impress deeply on Communist minds everywhere that the United States can and will retaliate effectively when Americans are abused by other governments.

It is time for the voice of America to be heard, backed up by the big stick of determination.

Mission to Madrid, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting this article by George H. Todt, which appeared in the Highland Park News-Herald, one of the progressive newspapers in my district in Los Angeles. I wish to state that I concur in Mr. Todt's analysis.

MISSION TO MADRID, 1951

(By George H. Todt)

At long last, and none too soon to suit me, we have dispatched Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, to Spain to attempt to bring that nation into some sort of unilateral military working agreement with this country.

Perhaps I am too naive to understand the politicians, but it has seemed to me in the past that it was our announced intention to gird ourselves to deter possible aggression from—pardon me for being blunt—Russia.

Now, if this were indeed the case, it would seem to me that we have not gone directly to the heart of the problem. If we had, then it would be bound to follow that we might have proceeded differently than we have.

For instance, it seems rather silly to give the English and French untold billions of

economic and military assistance when all we receive from them in return are their pitiful bleats instead of combat divisions for General Eisenhower and his European Army.

After 2 years of trying, as they claim, they have now managed to present the supreme commander with less than 10 of these highly prized units.

And the Red Army has 200 facing the 10 of the west.

Less than 20,000,000 Spaniards have 23 combat divisions on the line today. With some American equipment and a little beefing up here and there, these people could be added to General Eisenhower's numerically weak forces.

Frankly, he needs more men than our niggardly allies are willing to provide for him. Therefore, I think we should cast about for some new allies.

Keep the old ones—yes. But with new allies in Europe, some of the prima donnas might come to realize that American money can be allocated to others than themselves if they are not willing to do their decent share. And it should be, too.

It is no priceless privilege for us to be taxed through the nose to try to help nations that don't have enough backbone any longer to even try to save themselves from the evil forces which Josef Stalin is presently assembling for their early conquest.

These apathetic dullards are letting us down—and particularly General Eisenhower. The greatest general in the world cannot fight well against 10 or 20 times his numbers.

Now, in the event anyone considers me unjust to think of the French, British, and Italians as something of phonies at this time, let me tell you why this is the case.

These people have 150,000,000 of population. We have aided them on every hand with many billions of ECA aid. They are unable to produce more than 10 or 15 divisions among them.

On the other hand, let us consider the little nations of Europe for a moment. Spain, Switzerland, Sweden, Yugoslavia, Greece, and Turkey have only a total of 70,000,000 people all told. They have not received much financial assistance, if at all, from us.

Yet they have a total of 138 combat divisions between them.

So who is kidding who this time?

You see, it can be done where the spirit is willing.

But it cannot be done in the cases of nations who are unwilling to do their fair share and instead drag their feet.

It is my suggestion that we all write our Congressmen and request them to do one important thing.

Let them allocate the American foreign aid and armaments in the future in direct proportion to the contributions of the various nations concerned to General Eisenhower.

If the French only care to offer 5 divisions, give them only 5 units of aid. If the Spaniards give 23 divisions, give them 23 units' worth of armaments and assistance.

If anyone else will lay it on the line for us, why, then give them a generous full measure of whatever we have.

But I, for one, am tired of this one-way traffic between us. I am willing to help them as long as they do their share. But heaven help them if they do not. And good riddance, too.

So that none will misunderstand me here, let me make my position clear. I am very fond of the Europeans themselves and have always been friendly to them in the past.

Since I have lived among them for many years, I am not entirely blind to some of their faults. One which is inescapable to those who know them is simply this:

They are moochers—at least wherever the rich Americans are concerned.

They will be delighted to let us make their beds for them and sweep up after them—as long as we are suckers enough to do it.

Now I am not requesting any end to assistance which we have commenced for our allies. I am not trying to rock the boat. But I am asking for a more realistic approach to this entire matter.

This is how realistic I intend to be about this.

From now on I am a friend of any European nation in direct proportion to the amount of tangible assistance it provides now for Dwight Eisenhower. I do not want him participating in some European Bataan of the future.

But he will unless our allies come through with their share of men.

Now before the apologists for the Europeans take me to task for what I have written here, let them answer this question for me first:

If little Switzerland and Sweden have 15,000,000 people and 45 combat divisions, how many should 150,000,000 French, English, and Italians be able to provide?

I will be very grateful for your answer.

Government Economy and Public Pressure for Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FRANK WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Dallas Times-Herald of June 20, 1951:

GOVERNMENT ECONOMY AND PUBLIC PRESSURE FOR SPENDING

Advocates of high Federal taxation as a relatively painless device for preventing inflation almost always qualify their argument by adding the phrase "with strict economy in nondefense items of the Federal budget."

Unfortunately, while it is easy to increase taxes, it seems virtually impossible to reduce expenses. Because of this, the money collected through high taxes is spent by the Government. Purchasing power is, therefore, only shifted from some pockets to others.

Currently, the champions of economy in the Senate and the House of Representatives in Washington are being heard from. It is reported that they are likely to cut huge gaps in the budget of the National Government, that is, in the parts of the budget that have no connection with the rearmament program.

For instance, one committee has momentarily voted to cut down drastically the number of automobiles with full-time chauffeurs used by staff members of the numerous departments in Washington. However, when the smoke clears, it probably will be revealed that very few chauffeurs have been released.

Of course, the Government is so big that if all the chauffeurs on the Federal payroll were discharged the saving would be hardly visible to the naked eye. This particular gesture toward economy is significant mainly as an indication that some Members of Congress are aware that there is in the Government too strong a tendency toward luxury, and that extravagance in some places is soaking up revenue that is badly needed in other places.

The truth is that the Government is so big that expenditures cannot be closely checked. Congress appropriates huge sums of money to various spending agencies and simply cannot exercise the degree of vigilance that is necessary to prevent waste. When it is ultimately discovered that money has not been spent wisely and frugally, Congress orders a probe, and although the blame may be fixed, the money has already been spent.

At this time, while the taxpayers are being gouged to finance a colossal armament program, it is obvious that nondefense items should be cut to the quick. But when Congress or the budget officers of the executive department begin to wield the pruning knife, loud complaints are heard. Officials of the agencies that are threatened express these complaints but they have supporting them powerful lobbies representing sections of the public.

While the public at large deplores the rising cost of Government, politicians have learned by sad experience that economy, when it becomes specific is not popular. Every item of Government spending benefits some element, large or small, of the public. Everybody favors governmental economy in principle, but at the same time, everybody expects the other fellow's item to be cut. As long as this situation exists the champions of economy will be overruled, and the Federal Government will grow bigger and bigger and more and more luxurious.

More Reclamation Bureau Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, not long ago, this House sought to lighten the tax load on our citizens by cutting down on what we thought were unessential activities of Government Departments.

Our colleagues in the Senate discovered some expenses we overlooked, and voted to make further cuts, for which all of the taxpayers should be grateful.

One of the most money-saving motions ever made in Congress was to put some curbs on the production of propaganda—not on necessary information, but on uninvited, self-glorifying, seldom-used press releases from Federal agencies—by reducing the appropriations for Government ballyhoo artists.

Before this Congress finishes with the long-delayed appropriations for the fiscal year that started 3 weeks ago and before we let too much revenue go to waste because little items are overlooked, I hope the conferees on the Interior appropriations bill will give a little study to some of the mimeographed propaganda that comes out of the Reclamation Bureau.

On previous occasions, I have pointed out that this agency acts as if the Federal Treasury was a monetary spring that never dries up. The Reclamation Bureau seems callously indifferent to the pain felt by our people when they discover how much of their income has been withheld by their employers to satisfy Uncle Sam.

A sample of the way a Government agency can abuse and misuse appropri-

ations that we vote, is given by a press release issued by the Interior Department last week.

This hand-out is captioned "National benefits from California's Central Valley project." It goes on to say that "every State in the Union contributed materials that went into California's new Central Valley reclamation project."

Who doubts that every State, and perhaps some foreign countries, supply raw materials used in building this project, which, incidentally, Californians will pay for, unlike the people in some other States who want to make Uncle Sam into a streamlined Sam-ta Claus.

I hope my colleagues will look closely at this product of the Interior Department's press section and ask why it is necessary to spend taxpayers' money preparing, mimeographing, and distributing such statements. None of my newspaper acquaintances feel that this press release includes any startling information and most of them agree that anybody interested in these facts could get them by telephoning or going over to the Interior Department.

This release shows that Congress should be more alert in seeing that information staffs of Federal Departments supply information that is wanted and needed and demonstrates, I submit, that we can cut down the size of press relations outfits which exist to beat bass drums attracting attention to their bureaus and bosses.

There is much interesting information in the press release I am criticizing. I am pleased to know how many States shared in the generous outlays of public funds. However, I wonder if enterprising newspaper, magazine, and radio reporters could not have dug out these facts without a mimeographed statement that gives the impression the Reclamation Bureau is a generous sugar daddy.

When we get around to voting on the next tax bill, I hope my colleagues will remember this statement that was financed by every one of our constituents. Following is the heading of the statement: "National benefits from California's Central Valley project"

Experiment in International Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, my home city of Greenwood, Miss., is in the second year of its participation in the Community Ambassador project sponsored by the Experiment in International Living. In 1950 one of the young businessmen of our city spent several months in France as a representative of our community, and this year a young lady from Belfort, France, will visit Greenwood as a further extension of the project.

It is this mutual exchange of knowledge and understanding at the practical grass-roots level which can be of inestimable benefit to international amity. I am proud of the role which Greenwood has played in this project.

Mlle. Gabriel Macaire is the French Community Ambassador who will visit our country. She arrived at Quebec last week, and her tour of this country before going on to Greenwood will include a visit to Washington arranged by Miss Mary Elizabeth McBee, of Washington and Greenwood.

As an extension of my remarks, I include an article which originally was published in the Greenwood Commonwealth:

COMMUNITY-AMBASSADOR PROJECT TO BRING FRENCH GIRL TO GREENWOOD

Under the sponsorship of the Greenwood Community ambassador project, Mademoiselle Gabriel Macaire, of Belfort, France, will be brought to Greenwood from her native country for an extensive visit during August and September. Mlle. Macaire will arrive in this city on the night of July 29.

Last summer Minter Aldridge of this city visited for several weeks in the Macaire home at Belfort. He was sponsored by the same organization as Mlle. Macaire and traveled through the channels of the Experiment in International Living. Mlle. Macaire will follow the same procedure.

The Experiment in International Living is a nonprofit, nonsectarian educational organization, working to build up in various countries a group of people interested in promoting mutual understanding and respect between their own and other lands. Founded by Mr. Donald B. Watt in 1932, the experiment for 18 years without interruption has been sending college and secondary-school-age groups to live as members of families abroad, and to work, camp, and travel in close association with their contemporaries in Europe and Latin America.

Mlle. Macaire's visit has been made possible through the cooperation of the various civic clubs and the governments of Leflore County and the city of Greenwood. Representatives of these groups, as a result of the successful tour of Minter Aldridge last year, have recognized the import that a project of this type carries in good will among nations. While in Mississippi Mlle. Macaire will spend a good deal of her time traveling to various points of interest in the State. A trip to New Orleans has also been planned. Her headquarters will be in a private home in Greenwood.

Her ship will dock at Quebec, Canada, on July 20. From Quebec she will travel to New York and thence to Washington, where she will be met by a Mississippi delegation, which will conduct her on a 5-day tour of the Nation's Capital. From Washington she will fly to Memphis, where a Greenwood delegation will meet her and drive her to Greenwood.

The Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I want to call to the attention of all Members of Congress the following article entitled "Voice of America Future

Hinges on Senate Views," which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of July 22, 1951.

In view of the debate that is currently going on in the House, this article which was written by Creston Mullins is of particular timeliness. The article follows:

VOICE OF AMERICA FUTURE HINGES ON SENATE'S VIEW—STATE DEPARTMENT IN HARD FIGHT FOR FUNDS WITH WHICH TO STEP UP TRUTH CAMPAIGN

(By Creston B. Mullins)

The State Department is keeping its fingers crossed these days as it awaits Congress' verdict on its request for more funds with which to carry on its world-wide truth campaign.

It has been an uphill fight all the way. The Department, already slapped down in the House, is pinning its remaining hopes on the Senate. Here is the situation at the moment.

The bill, which has been reported out by the House Appropriations Committee lops \$30,000,000 off the \$115,000,000 sum which the Department thinks it needs to operate its international information and education program for a year. This bill, due for consideration on the House floor any day now, covers operating expenses only.

Earlier this spring the House took an even tougher view of legislation covering State's ideas on capital outlay for expansion of its Voice of America radio network. The Department had asked for \$97,000,000 to build additional transmitters. The House bill granted it less than a tenth of the figure asked—\$9,500,000 to be exact.

When the Senate took up these bills, it decided to consider them together. It has held hearings on the whole information program. A report will be issued shortly. The Department has made for the Senators—and still is making—an all-out effort to try to salvage as much as it can toward a step-up of America's campaign in the world war of ideas. Its plans have the backing not only of the President, but also of the National Security Council and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, for they are considered to play an important part in our prosecution of the cold war.

TEST OF FIRMNESS

Special interest attaches to the issue at this time, moreover, for how Congress acts on the information program appropriation is regarded as a test of congressional resistance to the temptation to relax in the wake of Korean truce negotiations.

The arguments which the State Department is putting forward in urging the need for expansion of its education program runs like this:

Our war of ideas against the Soviet Union and its bloc of satellites not only may have a great bearing on whether there will be a shooting war but also certainly will influence the psychological conditions under which any future war will be fought.

The Voice of America is engaged, in conjunction with the British Broadcasting Corp., in a verbal bombardment of Russia which is making real inroads in the U. S. S. R. From 38 transmitters in this country and 12 abroad, radio programs go throughout the world in 48 languages. Six of these are in the languages of the Soviet Union itself. Five more are in the language of the European satellites, and four are in Chinese dialects. The rest are the languages of the free world, all of which must be regarded as potential, if not actual, allies of this country if world war III breaks out.

What of the results? How are we doing?

There is no such thing as a Hooper rating for Voice reception behind the iron curtain. Traditional methods of sampling listener selection and reaction are totally useless in judging the effectiveness of Voice broadcasts in the Red bloc.

JUDGE BY REACTION

That does not mean, however, that there is no criterion by which Voice effectiveness can be judged. As a matter of fact, there are some very good, if unorthodox, means of determining how the Voice is worrying the Communists. Perhaps the most reliable indication of effectiveness is the "ouch!" method. Step on Stalin's corns and he lets out a yell. Stalin recently has been yelling ouch more frequently and loudly than ever before.

The jamming of American broadcasts has grown to the point where approximately 1,000 ground wave and 200 sky wave distortion transmitters are being employed to block out Voice programs. Yet more than 25 percent of the American broadcasts are estimated to be getting through to the interior of Russia. This operation of obstruction is estimated to be costing Russia as much or more each year as the whole Voice program for the 1951 fiscal year—\$15,000,000.

That Russians continue to hear the Voice is known from independent reports of defectors, those who have deserted to the west from the U. S. S. R., as well as friends of the west who remain in the Soviet.

GIVE THEM THE FACTS

But there is even more pertinent evidence of Voice effectiveness. The Soviet official propaganda for home consumption frequently presents rebuttals to statements which the Russians could have heard only on the Voice. These rebuttals thus give further currency to the very statements they are intended to counteract.

The effectiveness of American broadcasts to Russia lies in their dispensing of the scarcest intellectual commodity in the Soviet and its whole bloc—news, real, hard, factual news. Voice broadcasts are heavily laden—and will be increasingly so—with that kind of simple, straightforward, truthful report of facts and happenings which people listen for eagerly, and which passes from mouth to ear in unsuppressible defiance of laws which carry the death penalty. More than 60 percent of the broadcasts beamed to Russia are strictly news programs.

Although the Red-held territory and that one-third of the human race which is under Red bondage is the battleground on which the Voice fights its principal battle, its attention is devoted also to stimulating the peoples of the free world, not only counteracting the Red propaganda spread in non-Communist countries but also presenting a picture of the best there is in American culture and American life.

Audience reaction is followed closely by Voice officials, particularly in non-Communist countries, where it is possible to gauge listeners' selection of programs and their response to what they hear. Each point of presentation—clarity of reception, pronunciation of the language by announcers and commentators, the speed at which they talk, and the inflection of their voices—is checked constantly and carefully. In some countries it is possible to maintain panels of observers, who judge the programs constantly.

WRITTEN WORD, TOO

The other major phase of International Information and Education—press and publications—is producing results which can be totaled up in millions of column inches of reading matter published each year in the newspapers, magazines, and specialized periodicals of all the free countries.

International information falls into three main categories, which are far more distinct in the printed word and picture than in the spoken word of the radio. These are:

1. Straight news and feature stories, which carry to the rest of the world the real picture of America, to destroy the false picture presented by communism.

2. The propaganda of freedom—that is, factual commentaries explaining world events in terms of liberty and western civilization, and

3. Point 4 material—that is, scientific, technical, and other specialized articles, reprinted for the people of other countries to help them develop their industries and agriculture, thus raising their standards of living and their resistance to Communist blandishments.

HUNGARY COULDN'T TAKE IT

Again, proof that this highly developed and expertly directed campaign is beginning to hurt the Communists is found in the official reaction against it in Communist nations where it is still operating. The latest and most dramatic demonstration of the pain it is inflicting was the recent expulsion from Hungary of two American Legation officials. Only thus could Hungary's Red government rid itself of a most troublesome thorn in the side.

The United States agreed to eliminate its information and cultural activities in Hungary, but followed up with the expulsion of two Hungarian diplomats from this country.

Russia has strictly limited the number of copies of the magazine *Amerika*—done in the best American style for distribution in Moscow. Throughout the Communist world, American news and propaganda has hurt so badly as to provoke drastic measures against it.

But, while the publication part of the program has been severely throttled behind the iron curtain, it goes forward unchecked, and with even greater effectiveness, among the peoples on this side of the curtain, not only countering the immediate blows of Communist propaganda in free countries, but also laying that foundation of truth on which, alone, democracy can be built.

There can be no vacuum in the minds of men, the State Department believes. If we don't fill it the Communists will.

Are We Financing Both Sides of the Korean Conflict?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an article by Hon. William C. Bullitt, a former American Ambassador, on the subject of Hong Kong, which I trust every Member of Congress and everyone else who has the opportunity to do so, will take time to read.

Some of its revelations are astounding. The matter referred to follows:

HONG KONG: BEAUTIFUL PROBLEM CHILD

(By William C. Bullitt)

Of all delightful islands that stud the southern seas, Hong Kong is one of the most beautiful. Only a mile from the Chinese mainland, its mountains spring abruptly from the blue waters of the South China Sea, embracing sunny bays and beaches and one superb harbor. In latitude and climate it approximates Hawaii. On its peaks and heights in summer a cool evening breeze wipes away the heat of noon and renders even the hot season a tranquil felicity. On those peaks and heights live the British—fewer than 10,000. Below, on both sides of the port, live 2,000,000 Chinese.

The island has delivered a fabulous stream of wealth to the British since first they seized

it in 1839 as a base from which to smuggle opium into China. Last year they made more money than ever before by selling Communist China the goods and materials she needed to make war in Korea. Nevertheless, there is a cloud on this happy British business horizon. The Chinese Communists, like all other Chinese, are determined to take back Hong Kong from the British. The roots of this determination run deep. For to all Chinese, Hong Kong symbolizes the sufferings and humiliations they have endured ever since 1839 when their great old civilization began to be battered to bits by British guns in the First Opium War.

From its birth as a British Colony, Hong Kong has been a problem child. In the eighteenth century, under Emperors Kang Hsi and Chien Lung, China stood at an extraordinary height of culture and prestige. Europe and Great Britain had an excessive admiration for all things Chinese. There was a fad for Chinese painting, furniture, porcelain, wallpaper, silk, and tea.

England emerged from the Napoleonic Wars mistress of the seas; leader of the industrial revolution; with goods to sell and with a burgeoning impulse to increase her wealth and dominion. China remained aloof. She refused to exchange ambassadors with any nation, and her desire for foreign goods was so slight that she refused to permit foreign merchants to land in any port except Canton, where they were confined to an inconveniently small area on the waterfront and obliged to do business through a group of merchants selected by the Chinese Government.

The Chinese demand for British goods was small, and in order to balance their annual account with China the British had to pay out large amounts of silver. Silver began to be drained away from India, then ruled by the British through the agency of the East India Company. The East India Company had a monopoly of all the opium produced in India; it was also the principal British agency trading with China through Canton. How to balance the trade and reverse the flow of silver? The British found an easy answer: Sell vast quantities of Indian opium in China.

The Dutch had introduced opium into Formosa about 1650, and thence the vice had spread to the mainland. In 1800 the Chinese Emperor issued an edict prohibiting the cultivation of the opium poppy in China and the importation of opium from abroad. The East India Company stopped sending opium to China in its own ships, but it continued to produce ever-larger quantities of opium and to sell it to merchants who smuggled it into China.

By 1821 the smuggling was thoroughly systematized. In the center of Canton Bay rises a harborless mountain island called Lintin. The British anchored three large floating warehouses close to Lintin, and opium clippers, fast ships carrying about 20 guns, transferred their chests of opium to the floating warehouses, where it was packed in small bags and smuggled ashore in boats manned by Chinese. Officials were bribed to wink at the trade.

Smuggled opium rose from about 2,000 chests in 1800 to about 26,000 in 1836. Approximately one-sixth of the entire revenue of the British Government of India was coming from the sale of opium to be smuggled into China. The tide of silver turned and so much of it flowed out of China that a silver scarcity began to upset the price level. The Emperor was warned that the bodies and morals of his subjects were being corrupted more profoundly each year, and that the country would face a vast economic depression unless opium smuggling should be stopped. Thereupon the Emperor ordered an incorruptible official,

Lin Tse-hsu, to go to Canton as Imperial Commissioner to suppress the traffic.

In March 1839 Commissioner Lin ordered the British merchants in Canton to deliver to him all their opium within 3 days. He announced that he would prohibit all British trade with Canton—including the lucrative tea and silk trade—unless the opium was surrendered. Captain Elliot of the British Navy ordered all British merchant vessels to assemble in the safe anchorage of Hong Kong down the bay below Lintin. The only British ship of war then in Chinese waters was ordered to protect the smuggling fleet.

Commissioner Lin countered with a blockade of the river. On March 27 Captain Elliot gave in. More than 20,000 chests of opium were turned over to Lin, who destroyed it.

Lin got rid of the 1838-39 opium crop, but he knew that a fresh crop would be coming from India. He wrote to Queen Victoria, appealing to her to stop the growing of opium in India: "We have heard that in your honorable barbarian country the people are not permitted to inhale the drug. If it is admittedly so deleterious, how can to seek profit by exposing others to its maleficent power be reconciled with the decrees of Heaven?"

"We have reflected that this noxious article is the clandestine manufacture of artful schemers under the dominion of your honorable nation. Doubtless, you, the Honorable Chieftainess, have not commanded the growing and selling thereof."

But Parliament had officially approved the opium traffic by adopting a resolution: "It does not seem advisable to abandon so important a source of revenue as the East India Company's opium monopoly in Bengal."

Palmerston was the Queen's Foreign Secretary. Elliot wrote him urging "powerful intervention." The destruction of 20,000 chests of opium had so raised the price that British smugglers were arming their clippers more heavily and organizing gangs of thugs to get the new opium crop ashore. Elliot admitted that the opium traffic was "discreditable to the character of the Christian nations under whose flag it is carried." Yet he urged that Great Britain use force if necessary to compel the Chinese to back down.

On August 21 Elliot gathered all the British from the Canton Bay area on ships in the harbor of Hong Kong, where they could be protected from any possible violence. Commissioner Lin countered by forbidding the Chinese to sell food or to give water to the British on the ships. Three Chinese war junks lay on the Kowloon side of the harbor. When food and water were refused in Kowloon, Elliot, on September 5, 1839, opened fire on the junks. Thus started the First Opium War.

Secretly Palmerston wrote to the Government of India, ordering 16 warships and 4 armed steamers to carry 4,000 troops to blockade Canton and also the mouths of the Yangtze and the Yellow rivers. When rumors of this expedition got back to England, Palmerston could no longer avoid a debate in Parliament. Many Englishmen were horrified at the idea that Great Britain should go to war to compel the Chinese to smoke opium.

William E. Gladstone, later Prime Minister, said in that debate: "I will ask the noble Lord a question. Does he know that the opium smuggled into China comes exclusively from British ports, that is, from Bengal and through Bombay? If that is a fact—and I defy the right honorable gentleman to gainsay it—then we require no preventive service to put down this illegal traffic. We have only to stop the sailing of the smugglers' vessels. . . . The great principles of justice are involved in this matter. You will be called upon, even if you escape from condemnation on this motion, to show cause for your present intention of making war upon the Chinese. They

gave us notice to abandon the contraband trade. When they found that we did not, they had the right to drive us from their coasts on account of our obstinacy in persisting in this infamous and atrocious traffic. I am not competent to judge how long this war may last, but this I can say, that a war more unjust in its origin, a war more calculated in its progress to cover this country with permanent disgrace, I do not know, and I have not read of." Nevertheless, the House of Commons voted in favor of the Opium War by a majority of nine.

The Chinese were everywhere defeated. On August 29, 1842, a treaty of peace was signed. It provided for the absolute cession of Hong Kong to Great Britain. The Chinese were also compelled to open the ports of Canton, Amoy, Foochow, Ningpo, and Shanghai to British trade and to pay for the opium that Commissioner Lin had destroyed. Otherwise, opium was not mentioned.

It did not need to be, for with Hong Kong a safe base for the smugglers and open ports on the coast, the British could smuggle into China as much opium as India could produce. The number of chests smuggled rose from 26,000 in 1836 to 52,000 in 1850. Hong Kong prospered, and the drug gnawed deeper and deeper into the vitals of China.

But the peace which ended the First Opium War was no more than an uneasy armistice. The British wanted to get the opium traffic legalized. In addition, they wanted access to more cities, and a diplomatic representative in Peking.

The humiliation of the Chinese was so profound that an enormous wave of feeling rose against the Manchu Dynasty. This was one of the roots of the Taiping rebellion, which began in 1848 and did not end until 1865. That civil war cost 20,000,000 Chinese lives and the destruction of Nanking and the richest parts of the Yangtze Valley. When the Chinese Government was weakened by the rebellion, the British again made war in 1856—the Second Opium War, which ended in 1858 with China's complete defeat.

By the treaties of Tientsin in 1858 and of Peking in 1860 the opium traffic was legalized, and part of the Kowloon Peninsula was ceded to the British. In 1898 the British obtained a 99-year lease on a large strip of the mainland adjoining Kowloon, so that today greater Hong Kong comprises both the island and a substantial bit of the mainland.

Hong Kong grew into a vast port for legitimate trade and has now abandoned completely the smuggling of opium. But scarcely a day has passed in more than a century without smuggling of one sort or another being done through its harbor. In 1948 and 1949 China's Nationalist Government tried to prevent the smuggling of gold and valuables out of China to Hong Kong and the smuggling of luxury articles into China from Hong Kong, but bankers and merchants of that port smuggled, both ways, everything on which they could make a profit.

In those years, as the Communists advanced toward Hong Kong, the British began to fear that Mao Tse-tung might seize the colony. He could bring overwhelming force against its long land frontier and perhaps capture Kowloon. Then the port and the beautiful island would be at his mercy. Moreover, if the Communists could gain control of the trade unions in Hong Kong, they could paralyze the port with strikes and riots; and if Mao chose to prohibit trade between Hong Kong and the rest of China, he could ruin the colony.

Bankers and merchants, faced by these possible threats, decided that if they made themselves sufficiently useful to the Chinese Communists Mao would not seize Hong Kong. As commercial agents for a Communist Government of China they would prosper

mightily. Some Hong Kong businessmen pointed out that this was short-sighted policy: the Chinese Communists would become so powerful and so hostile to Great Britain and the United States that the vital interests of those two Nations would oblige them to force Hong Kong to stop serving the Communists. Therefore, they contended, it would be in the long-run interest of Hong Kong to support the Chinese Nationalists. But most of the bankers and businessmen chose to believe that Hong Kong would be able to continue indefinitely to do an enormous business with Communist China. They persuaded the British Government to take this view.

Great Britain recognized the Communist Government of China. Hong Kong began to supply the Communists with everything, including war materials, for which they were able to pay. In 1950, after the outbreak of the war in Korea, Hong Kong made more money than in any similar period in its history.

Now the British Government is in a predicament. It has 12,000 soldiers fighting the Chinese Communists in Korea. Its Crown Colony of Hong Kong is supplying materials to those Communists who in turn are killing British and American soldiers. But if Hong Kong were to cease to make itself vitally useful to Mao Tse-tung, he might take the colony. This is one reason why the British continue to favor appeasement of the Chinese Communists, although their aggression in Korea and the declarations of their leaders have made it clear that they are an integral part of the world-wide Communist war machine.

The supplies shipped via Hong Kong to our mutual Chinese Communist enemy have helped to produce more than 50,000 American casualties. Yet the United States Government hesitates to interfere with this British harvesting of quick war profits by imposing severe restrictions on trade with Hong Kong.

It is contrary to the interests of the democratic world for Hong Kong to be supplying the Chinese Communists. It would be contrary to the interests of the democratic world to have the Chinese Communists take Hong Kong. The British do not quite know how to get themselves out of the moral morass they have muddled into. Yet if the question of Hong Kong is tackled courageously it should not be beyond the intelligence of the British Commonwealth, the United States, and the United Nations to devise a solution. But the initiative must come from the United States Government—and quickly.

What Does Organized Labor Think of Our Foreign Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, in an article entitled "The Road Ahead to a Free World" appears this significant expression of convictions of a large segment of our American people.

The article says, in part:

Traditionally our country has upheld the principles which are basic to all human progress: Respect for the supreme worth of each person because he has a divine soul, and for his right under God to work out his destiny.

In political life this means self-government and self-determination of nations; in economic life, free enterprise and free unions.

The article then goes on to talk about the threat to the free world. It says:

Our country has thus far met this challenge with only a piecemeal and halting strategy of defense. * * * Our defense wall in the Far East was not clear in 1949 and early 1950. We had given Stalin every reason to think that in Korea we would not offer military resistance to invasion. * * *

While stopping the Communist advance in Europe we gave away China to Stalin (1947-49), thus opening ourselves and our allies to a two-front attack—in Asia and Europe. A consistent policy, with adequate help to the anti-Communist Chinese, could have prevented the present huge loss of lives for Americans and our allies in Korea. * * * They—referring to the Truman administration—were at one time ready to consider admitting Red China to the United Nations and yielding Formosa to her.

Let me say at this point that, while the paragraphs I have just quoted were lifted from the context, nevertheless not one word in the article changed or weakened in any respect the statements of opinion just quoted.

This is a serious condemnation of the New Deal and Fair Deal administrations' foreign policy.

This criticism has been voiced by Republican leaders. But this article is news. No doubt you have come to the conclusion that this article appeared in the United States Chamber of Commerce bulletin or in a publication of the National Association of Manufacturers. In this you would be mistaken.

This article clearly states some of the paramount issues of the foreign and domestic policy of the administration. It was published in Labor's Monthly Survey, issued at the highest policy-making level of the American Federation of Labor. To be exact, it was printed in the April-May 1951 issue, volume 12, Nos. 4 and 5.

It seems to me, beyond any possible doubt, that this article in a leading labor publication demonstrates several things that are too often ignored or overlooked.

One is that the rank and file of American labor are good and patriotic Americans. That goes without saying, but this article is proof of any doubts which some people may entertain.

In this article, too, is demonstrated the complete understanding of labor that the Truman administration foreign policies, mistaken if not worse, have cost the American people the friendship of the greatest and most populous nation in Asia, and that those policies alone have thrown the Chinese people to the Communist wolves.

Still further, this article plainly indicates the understanding of labor that the end result of the Truman foreign policies, up to this moment, has been the tragic loss of nearly 80,000 American boys, dead, wounded, and taken prisoner, to say nothing of \$10,000,000,000 in expenditures which must be borne by the taxpayers of our country. And if I am not mistaken, the end is not yet.

These things, in themselves, I believe, should challenge our attention when the

Fair Deal administration boasts that it possesses the blind support of organized labor, regardless of administration sins against the American people.

Another thing demonstrated by this article in Labor's Monthly Survey, it seems to me, is the fact that the American heritage of plain common sense enables the unionists to understand that, without free enterprise, unions cannot exist.

This, I believe, comprises an important part of the justification for the attitude of this Congress and some others before it, in refusing to go along with the socialistic program of the Truman administration.

Organized labor knows, in this country as they are coming to know in some others, that under any socialistic form of government unions are destroyed. When everybody works for the Government, and the word of government is law, where is the place for free and independent bargaining, and what becomes of the right to strike?

Organized labor in this country has looked at the plight of the British people under socialism. As evidenced by this article in Labor's Monthly Survey, labor understands that socialism destroys, not only the unions, but also the basic freedoms which have made the American people the happiest, most prosperous, and the strongest, at peace and at war, of any in all the world.

Let me say in conclusion that this authoritative article in Labor's Monthly Survey makes me happy to realize how closely my own thinking on these matters agrees with the rank and file of organized labor in America.

Research in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1951

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 26, the twelfth annual Cotton Research Congress will convene in College Station, Tex., the home of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas. It is fitting that the Cotton Research Congress has selected this site on which to meet, as this year this great college is celebrating its seventy-fifth anniversary. The agricultural department of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas has contributed greatly to the work of cotton research, and rightfully so, cotton being Texas' largest agricultural product.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the keynote address which will be delivered by Mr. Burris C. Jackson, of Hillsboro, Tex., chairman of the State-Wide Cotton Committee of Texas, upon the official opening of the twelfth annual Cotton Research Congress:

We would indeed be remiss in opening this twelfth annual cotton research congress if

we neglected to recognize at the outset the great achievements in many fields including cotton research which in three-quarters of a century have emanated from the institution which is host to this meeting—the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas.

As this seventy-fifth anniversary of Texas A. and M. is celebrated we can trace its amazing growth from a humble beginning in 1876 to the huge and efficient plant we see here today. Undeniable visual proof of this progress is evidenced in a comparison of Foster Hall on the military walk with this modern air-conditioned building in which we are meeting.

We can talk about buildings and laboratories—about men who have traveled the road from these halls to high places in our Nation and in the councils of the world. But as we pause in our reflection it requires only slight concentration to realize that among the greatest achievements of this institution are those which have not made the headlines—that no medals hang from the breasts of the men who accomplished them—yet, as a result of their service, our land and the lives of its people will be enriched for generations to come. It would take far too long to recount here the good deeds of the men of Texas A. and M. in nearly every field of human endeavor.

Today, let us think of cotton, not especially because of this congress, but because in this greatest of all cotton producing States, cotton is the very lifeblood of our economy, and millions of Americans are dependent upon cotton.

The factors which influence cotton and its future, influence the very way of life of our people. For when cotton prospers, they prosper. When cotton moves forward, so do the people. That is why the contributions of Texas A. & M. College to cotton, and the deeds of many of you people who are with us today are as enduring as our land itself.

It would be unfair, indeed, to single out the names of individuals in connection with some of these achievements and it is not possible to enumerate all the research work for cotton. We would not attempt to cite any one phase of research or to evaluate its importance in comparison with others. We can only briefly illustrate by calling to mind, at random, a very few of these accomplishments, take a quick look at some research in action, the theme of this Congress.

We can recall the demonstrations in Texas in the early part of the century which led to the establishment of the agricultural extension services throughout the country. We can review the progress in cotton breeding which produced a cotton adapted to the dry lands and winds of a section of this State—a variety of cotton which today is planted on 3,500,000 Texas acres and has made the high plains of Texas one of the largest producers of cotton in the world.

We can point to the advances in mechanization which have allowed us to produce cotton economically, which have slashed to an amazing low the hours required in all operations from land preparation through harvesting. We can remind you of the amazing trend toward mechanical harvesting—of the 5,000 cotton strippers that are being manufactured this year to reduce to a minimum the back-breaking labor required to harvest cotton.

Our mind's eye, too, turns, to the early experiments in cotton irrigation which have made possible the production of cotton on acres that once were barren waste, opening up new lands to provide this Nation and the world with the fiber it demands in ever-increasing quantities.

We recognize further the basic work in cotton genetics and cytogenetics now going on, the remarkable progress that has been made in the control of cotton diseases and insects,

and in the development of equipment, both ground and airborne, for applying insecticides and other materials. Research, too, has made possible better ginning, processing, marketing, and manufacturing of cotton. The research in cottonseed is far reaching in its scope and in result.

Yes; cotton research is in action, not only in Texas but throughout the cotton belt and elsewhere. It will open up new markets for fiber and seed and bring greater prosperity and comfort to our people. That will be discussed at this Congress.

I recall a recent demonstration in which a scientist held up two apparently identical samples of cotton fabric, then wadded them up in his fist. One wrinkled but the other resumed its original shape. Making cotton wrinkle-resistant enables it to compete in markets for a million additional bales annually—and that's only one example of one phase of cotton research, and the vast possibilities offered.

In another instance two ironing-board covers were displayed. Both were cotton. One was unserviceable after 28 hours' use. The second, which was partially acetylated, was still in service after 114 hours. Laundry press covers use more than 100,000 bales or \$20,000,000 worth of cotton annually. The new acetylated cotton cloth will outlast nylon, will cost less money and will turn out high quality work.

Cotton now can be dyed with wool dyes, making it possible to achieve a brilliance in fabric which once was not thought possible. With more research cotton will be made stronger, more resistant to weather, to wear, to wrinkling and to soiling. It will be crisp or soft, sheer or opaque, absorbent or water repellent.

We mentioned a moment ago the work of our cotton breeders with new and improved strains of cotton. These hold promise of high luster, low nap count, greater strength, longer staple, and many other desirable characteristics.

Other researchers in their basic studies of cotton fiber are examining its structure, how moisture and heat affect it, and the result of heat, acids, aging, and other influences on it. They are seeking to stabilize cotton against these destructive influences and to improve its quality in other respects, through chemical modification.

In research on cotton processing they are working to develop cotton yarns which can be knit at higher speeds. They are finding out more about the spinning qualities of the fiber and are working to develop better machinery for opening and cleaning cotton at the bolls.

All these things mean that there will be a greater use for cotton, this product which is our greatest agricultural commodity and which means so much to our Nation and the world.

I would like to continue to paint you an optimistic future for cotton, but I feel, that in all fairness, we cannot afford to be anything other than realistic about the magnitude of the task that lies before us in cotton research.

This job is enormous but it is one that is so important that the whole future of cotton depends on how well it is accomplished. Our future depends on it because cotton's future lies in its markets and the key to markets is research and promotion.

Cottons' markets today are faced with the greatest challenge they have ever confronted. Our competitors, through research and promotion, have so strengthened themselves that they are threatening to take from us an income which we once felt was secure. Yet cotton remains the greatest of all fibers, the most useful, the most versatile, and the cotton industry stands as a bulwark of the Nation's economic system.

It is pointless to detail just who are these competitors and where they are hurting us. Those facts are widely known. What cotton must do is broaden and intensify its own research program. A main purpose of this Congress is to aid in pointing the way. Cotton must mobilize its forces stronger than ever, and the American public, who has a big stake in cotton's progress, must be able to realize it. For the people's sake, cotton must move forward in its opportunities to serve mankind.

Cotton and cottonseed products are also essential in war, so vital in these troublesome times. Cotton is the one fiber that can expand its production in a single season without building costly new plants at Government expense. It is a commodity second only to steel in military importance and is used in more than 11,000 items for our Armed Forces.

These simple facts, without further elaboration, not only emphasize the sheer folly of curtailing the cotton-research program but prove the need for expansion.

And as we dedicate ourselves to this task of expanding and strengthening research for cotton, safeguarding it from any short-sighted assault, we are working for the best interests of our country. We are working in the interest of freedom itself. With that assurance, and in this atmosphere of a great institution, I am pleased to open the twelfth annual Cotton Research Congress.

Kentucky Is Still Noted for Its Beautiful Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES S. GOLDEN

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, during the 200 years of the existence of Kentucky, since its early discovery in 1750 by Dr. Thomas Walker, of Charlottesville, Va., Kentucky has been noted for its courageous, virtuous, and beautiful women.

That tradition has been handed down from generation to generation and for the past several years in Bell County, Ky., near Pineville, the county seat, the Kentucky laurel festival in beautiful Laurel Cove, a beauty contest has been held each year when the mountain laurel is in bloom where the most beautiful young lady of this State is crowned beauty queen.

Each of the colleges and universities of the State and adjoining States select their most beautiful girl and in the last week of May, when all of the beautiful mountain flowers and shrubs are in bloom, the Governor of the Commonwealth crowns the young lady who is selected as the most beautiful.

The seat of this Kentucky mountain laurel beauty contest is just a few miles from the national park at Cumberland Gap through which most all of the pioneers and early settlers passed during the early history of America as they marched westward and northwestward to conquer the wilderness. This section of Kentucky is replete with many historic shrines and beautiful recreational grounds for tourists to visit. It is only

about 30 miles from the site of the first house built by white man west of the Allegheny Mountains known as the Dr. Thomas Walker State Park. It is also close to the beautiful Cumberland Falls which is now a State park and within less than a half day's drive of one of the greatest inland lakes in America, known as Cumberland Lake where a huge dam across Cumberland River in Russell County has impounded a lake approximately 110 miles long and from 2 to 10 miles wide.

This lake furnishes excellent fishing and boating for tourists and all of this section of Kentucky, which is near to one of the Seven Wonders of the World, namely Mammoth Cave, is fast developing into a great tourist center where millions of American people can come and enjoy the beautiful scenery, the historic shrines, and the hospitality of the Kentucky people.

This year's mountain laurel festival was written up and described in the Courier-Journal by one of Kentucky's foremost newspaper columnists, Mr. Gerald Griffin, and I am attaching hereto and incorporating as a part of my remarks his account of this beautiful and festive occasion:

1951 LAUREL FESTIVAL WAS BEST YET

(By Gerald Griffin)

PINEVILLE, June 2.—The 1951 Kentucky mountain laurel festival was the biggest and best of them all.

Festival officials, committee members and spectators who have seen all the pageants since the first one in 1931 agree on this point. This year's, held last week end in Laurel Cove, a few miles out of Pineville in Pine Mountain Park, was an event that will long remain in the memories of the thousands who saw it.

The reigning queen, Miss Betty Lyen, of Harrodsburg, was crowned by Gov. Lawrence Wetherby climaxing an elaborate pageant and ceremony at the cove on the afternoon of May 25.

A striking brunette, she is a member of this year's graduating class at Transylvania College, where she is a member of Delta Delta Delta sorority. She is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Homer T. Lyen.

WAS POPULAR CHOICE

Miss Lyen, as festival queen, took over the mantle and diadem of laurel blossoms from another lovely brunette, Mrs. Clyde Bennett, of Evans. Representing Union College at Barbourville, Mrs. Bennett was Miss Patricia Parsons. She was a freshman when Senator EARLE C. CLEMENTS, then governor of the Commonwealth, placed the crown on her head.

And the Senator was on hand at the festival this year to watch his successor place the crown on the head of the new queen.

The choice of Miss Lyen as queen was a popular one with the thousands of spectators who crowded the natural amphitheater to see the pageant and hear the music. It was her second appearance as a candidate for the queenship. She represented Transylvania 2 years ago.

The festival continued the greater part of 3 days, beginning Thursday night with a dinner and reception for the 16 girls representing Kentucky colleges. It was held at the home of Dr. S. H. Flowers and Mrs. Flowers in Middlesboro. Then the queen candidates and their escorts were guests at a dance in the Lincoln Memorial University gymnasium at Harrogate, Tenn.

After the coronation, the new queen and her attendants were guests of honor at a

grand ball in the Pineville High School gymnasium where Queen Betty and the Governor led the grand march. There was an intermission floor show by girls from the Lillas Courtney School of the Dance, Louisville. These girls also presented a ballet at the conclusion of the coronation ceremony.

HIGH-SCHOOL GIRLS TAKE OVER

But, whereas the college girls were the center of attraction the first two festival days, the high-school girls came in for their share on Saturday night. That was at the Princesses' Ball, also held in the gymnasium here, and a new princess was crowned. There were 17 candidates for this honor, from high schools in southeastern Kentucky.

The new festival princess is Miss Barbara Vermillion, Corbin. She succeeded Miss Marty Blair, Barbourville. A big chief of the Mohawk Tribe of Red Men's Lodge crowned her with a feathered Indian headdress.

The festival provided a gala time for Pineville, with many luncheons, receptions, and parties during the 3 days.

On the day of the queen's coronation, Mr. and Mrs. Herndon Evans entertained with a luncheon for out-of-town guests including Senator Clements, Mrs. Clements, Governor Wetherby and Mrs. Wetherby. That afternoon, just after the pageant, Mr. and Mrs. Richard Barker entertained the group at a cocktail party at their home, next door to the Evanses.

Among other guests at both parties were Mr. and Mrs. Fred B. Wachs, Lexington, and Mr. and Mrs. Harry Carr, Louisville. Mr. Wachs is retiring president of the Mountain Laurel Festival Association, Mr. Carr, who formerly lived in Pineville, is the new president. Last year he was master of ceremonies at the pageant.

Mr. Speaker, Kentucky wishes to invite all Members of Congress and American citizens to visit our beautiful State, and we hope that it may be possible for you to come during the laurel festival so that you can see the growing of Kentucky's beauty queen and mix and mingle with the Kentucky people and participate in her hospitality.

We Should Send the Report on Housing Back to Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 20 years this country has been kept in an almost continuous state of national emergency.

The idea of declaring an emergency, whenever it might serve to scare Congress into yielding before White House demands, began with the first administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Most of these national emergencies have been artificial. They have been used to further socialistic schemes by which the executive branch of Government increased its own powers at the expense of the legislative branch.

We are presented once more, on a lesser scale, with one of those phony emergencies.

This time no national emergency has been declared, but the scare aspects of the emergency technique are present in full force.

We are being shocked by heart-rending stories of appalling slum conditions under which married personnel of the Armed Forces are compelled to live in the areas around military and naval installations.

We are shocked by stories of rent-gouging on the part of supposedly patriotic Americans; rent gouging on a scale never seen before, unless it was in England at the dawn of the industrial revolution.

Photographs have been shown us to prove that Army and Navy families are living in doll houses originally built for children; in shacks made of tin cans and beer bottles, and even in chicken coops.

Statistics have been read in this House, designed to show that landlords in the neighborhood of military and naval posts have boosted rents for armed services personnel anywhere from 100 to 500 percent.

All this is very shocking. It is no doubt true, so far as it goes. These examples of slum conditions for armed services personnel and of the lowest kind of rent gouging, represent the exception rather than the rule. Truth has been perverted into a lie.

Which of us will testify that this sordid picture represents the real situation in our home districts? Who will say that even a small percentage of landlords, who rent to Army and Navy families, are so lost to patriotism and to common decency as to prey on the defenders of our Nation?

In every community there are a few landlords of the kind depicted in the photographs and the statistics laid before us. In every instance where such a condition exists, it must be eliminated immediately. No man in his right mind would think otherwise.

This bogey of slum housing and excessive rents for armed services personnel has not been raised in good faith. It has been raised to scare Congress into doing something that has no relation to housing for Army and Navy married personnel.

In H. R. 3880, making appropriations for the independent offices and agencies, the House voted to restrict public housing starts by the Public Housing Administration to 5,000 during the 1952 fiscal year. The Senate amended the bill to increase the number to 50,000, where it stood when reported back to the House by the committee of conference.

Therefore it should be obvious that these horror tales concerning the plight of armed services personnel were calculated to stampede the Congress into accepting the highest possible figure for the authorization of public housing starts this year.

The propagandists ignored the fact that relief for such Army and Navy families as are being victimized should properly be granted in other appropriation bills. That can and should be done.

It should be apparent that the administration has applied pressure, by relating two separate propositions, in an effort to use Federal public housing again as a step toward socializing the American economy. The Truman administration pushes for more and more Federal public housing, in spite of the fact it has failed to carry out the authorizations Congress granted in the 2 years since enactment of the Housing Act of 1949.

Government wastefulness in construction of public housing, the high rentals charged for housing units in Government projects, far beyond the reach of low-income families, and the demonstrated fact that local governmental units can do a better housing job than the Federal Government can do—all have been discussed ad nauseum.

There are other considerations against a continuance of large-scale housing construction by Federal agencies which have received little attention.

One of these is the political aspect of public housing. Political organizations, devoted to perpetuating Federal public housing and interested in the patronage jobs connected with such projects, have grown to large proportions. These organizations, by their very nature, are being used for political purposes far removed from public housing.

The Boston Herald, dated Tuesday, May 1, 1951, published an article headed "City asks probe of pay-offs for project homes."

The Herald story goes on to say:

The Boston City Council yesterday asked Federal housing authorities and the attorney general to investigate persistent reports that in order to obtain an apartment in a Boston public housing project one must slip a person of influence \$300 to \$500.

"In the two new Brighton housing projects a prospective tenant must have a 'sponsor' in addition to the under-the-table payment," complained the councilman from the district. "People are going to be surprised at the names of the sponsors," he added.

The council's action followed a warning by Mayor Hynes that no gratuities should be paid for apartments. He urged applicants to report any such irregularities to the housing authority.

That would make it look as if the Boston municipal authorities were asking the Federal housing authorities to investigate themselves. What kind of a sponsor would it be necessary for an apartment-seeker to have?

Here is an example of what is going on in Kern County, Calif. I quote from a bulletin from by Fred E. Widmer, executive director, Housing Authority of the County of Kern, to all employees of that housing authority, as follows:

At a meeting of the League of California Housing Authorities, held in San Francisco August 4 and 5, 1950, it was resolved that proposition No. 10, which will be voted upon at the general State election to be held November 7, 1950, is a measure to kill all public housing in the State of California. It is a vicious move, promoted by a small, selfish, well-financed minority.

To survive we must put up a successful fight to bring out a "No" vote on proposition No. 10. To do this we have hired one of

the best professional agencies to conduct the program—and this costs money.

It was recommended that each employee of both Federal and local authorities contribute a certain percentage of their salaries for the next seven pay days.

Salaries up to \$275 per month, 3 percent; up to \$450 per month, 4 percent; over \$450 per month, 5 percent.

We, our families, and our friends must get out a "No" vote on proposition No. 10. It is going to be a hard fight, but we can and will win.

Almost anyone can imagine what would happen to those who failed to kick in with the political contribution.

Here is still another example, this time in Miami, Fla. I quote from a special bulletin, dated June 26, 1950, and addressed by V. M. Kimbrew, housing manager, to all tenants of Edison Courts, a Federal project located at 325 Northwest Sixty-second Street, in Miami. Says the bulletin:

Tomorrow, June 27, is voting day. Tomorrow we either win or lose more public housing in Miami. If you appreciate what public housing did for you (and is still doing) when you needed housing so badly, then go to the polls tomorrow, Tuesday, the 27th, and vote "yes."

Every tenant in this project will be expected to vote "yes" tomorrow. The polls are open from 7 a. m. to 7 p. m., located in Edison High School Auditorium, Northwest Second Avenue and Sixty-first Street. If you need transportation, contact our office.

A distinguished Member of this House told me, some time ago, of the statement of the manager of the Federal housing project in his home city. He was told not to worry about the vote from the Federal housing tenants, it would be delivered by the manager. I add that the Congressman assured the manager he did not want that kind of help.

The investigation of the Federal housing projects in the County of San Diego showed similar political influence exerted on the tenants. This report, if I recall correctly, came from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, during the Eightieth Congress.

My interest has been primarily in waste, and the failure to produce the number of houses required, when the matter was placed with some Federal agency, as compared with the results under local agencies, or in the hands of private builders. A recent clipping, which I seem to have mislaid at the moment, is a straw in the wind. It referred to a Federal housing project, with about 500 units. The manager has been getting \$8,000 for supervising this project; the clipping announced the increase of his salary to \$9,100. There is no way in which ordinary business criteria can be impressed on Government agencies.

A motion to recommit the conference report will be made when it comes to the floor. One of the items in disagreement will be this problem of Federal housing, as compared with local projects, or privately built homes. I hope we will say that the wording in the bill as it left the House should be retained. This said that the housing agencies should not send planners and promoters

all over the Nation, giving the impression the Congress was committed to more projects than had yet been authorized or financed. We could at the same time keep the number of starts to any minimum number.

If we are to have public housing, let us have public housing sponsored, supervised, and financed by the States, the counties, or the cities. We will save money and we will get houses. Even before that, we should check the greater likelihood of getting more houses, and cheaper houses, and getting them more quickly, if we give every possible encouragement to private builders. Everybody in America will be better off, especially the families who need shelter, and the already overloaded taxpayers.

A Birthday Party de Luxe: Detroit, 1701-1951, 250 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I rejoice in the privilege to tell of the gala ceremonies on the two hundred and fiftieth birthday of dynamic Detroit.

The giant city that took on new rules in World War II, that stilled its production line for its automobiles and turned her thoughts to the defense of the Nation, and became known throughout the world as Detroit, the Hub of the Arsenal of Democracy, today pauses and makes merry to celebrate her two hundred and fiftieth birthday. No wonder she celebrates with the world's largest birthday cake, stationed in Grand Circus Park in the heart of the city, lighted with 250 candles. There will be the big parade at the festival's peak on July 28, at which the President of the United States, Governors from various States of the Union, foreign diplomats, and officials from various walks of life, will take part. There will be the anniversary medallion modeled in beautiful bronze depicting in bas-relief the landing of Cadillac in 1701 and Old Fort Pontchartrain contrasted against the Detroit of today and tomorrow as a lasting souvenir of this great birthday celebration. The University of Detroit, my alma mater, staged Detroit's official birthday show, the City of Freedom, at the stadium grounds on the university campus. All groups have entered into the spirit of the birthday festival of Detroit, the City Beautiful, and everything from the new Veterans' Administration Building to the animals at the zoo have polished and slicked-up in conformity with the opinion expressed by Mr. Selden B. Daume, president and general chairman of Detroit's two hundred and fiftieth birthday festival.

But why should I go on? Let the able pen of Mr. John C. Manning tell the story

of the miracle in Michigan as it appeared in Town and Country magazine in its publication of February last. The article follows:

MIRACLE IN MICHIGAN

(By John C. Manning)

Detroit is preparing for a birthday party, come summer. Except for the sudden shadow of war it would doubtless have been the most robust shindig ever witnessed by man or beast in this part of the country. The city will be 250 years old in June and the municipal officials want to tell the world about it, loudly and with flourish. But, aside from the city fathers and those loyal groups who always rally in matters of communal enterprise, not one Detroitier in a thousand is wasting a minute's thought about it. This may seem difficult to understand, but it is quite in character. Detroiters rarely wear their civic pride on their sleeves.

Detroit was founded 50 years ahead of Pittsburgh and a century ahead of Cleveland and Buffalo and is the oldest American city of consequence west of the Atlantic seaboard. It was founded 17 years before New Orleans, 28 years before Baltimore, and it is more than a hundred years older than Chicago. It is only 75 years younger than New York, 70 younger than Boston, and a mere 21 behind Philadelphia. Yet the average educated Detroitier generally knows more about the history of Boston, New York, and Philadelphia than of his own town. This is not because he is a dullard, he simply takes Detroit for granted. It suits him, and he doesn't bother about the whys and wherefores. He feels it is his prerogative to traduce his town venomously, which he does at the slightest opportunity, but he does not welcome criticism from outsiders however well meant it is.

Detroit actually was created in defiance of the judgment of the keenest statesmen of seventeenth-century France. It was chartered toward the end of that Imperial era as the future leading fur post of the western world. It never fulfilled the forecast even for a decade or a year. It lay inconveniently north of the great, natural transcontinental trade routes. It had no advantage as a port because it lacked good harbors. Therefore, men said, it would stagnate and die as civilization rolled westward, to the south of it. But it refused to wither, paradoxically, it took root and grew. It grew in spite of itself, slowly, indifferently you might say, through the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. And then overnight, with the birth of the present century, it fairly exploded into growth and action.

Detroit was born under the white-and-gold flag of France while France and England warred for possession of North America. The English eventually won the city and the children of the first French settlers helped their British conquerors fight off American colonists during the Revolution. This defense was carried out so shrewdly that Detroit did not come under the American flag until 20 years after the Colonies had won their independence.

Most historians agree that this reluctance of Detroiters to revolt against British rule cost the settlement favor from our infant Federal Government and retarded Detroit's development for nearly a generation. The same stubborn refusal to kowtow to Washington, only a few years ago, deprived the city of those lavish New Deal grants that stimulated vast public works in so many American communities, and nobody in Detroit regrets it.

For the first 200 years of its life, Detroit was sedate if not downright somnolent. For the last 50, it has been a strident and swag-

gering world metropolis. Fifty years ago it was unpretentious among American cities and enjoyed no fame abroad. Today, with the exception of London, New York, Paris, and Berlin, it probably is the most widely known city in the world. Everybody in the world would like an automobile and everybody knows that Detroit is the automobile capital of the world.

Seventy-five years ago, nearly all Detroiters knew each other. Today, nobody knows his next-door neighbor. Better than 60 percent of the residents are automobile workers or their kin. If they think about their city at all, they look upon it as a big factory, and their civic pride is measured by the size and regularity of their pay envelopes.

But you would be wrong to conclude from this that Detroiters have no pride in their city. It prevails to a lusty degree. Those who cherish it, however, have learned patience the hard way. Detroit is so highly industrialized that it feels the quirks of economic variety more quickly and drastically than such cities as St. Louis, where commerce is conservative and financial ups and downs less mercurial.

People who consider Detroit their real home and who love every sprawling, nolsy mile of it, realize that today's dream of community betterment may be sidetracked temporarily by tomorrow's recession. They cling to their dreams, serene in a faith that, if not tomorrow, then the day after or the day after that, Detroit will boast a water front to rival Rio's and a revived symphony orchestra to rival Philadelphia's, and an express highway system to rival New York's.

The tomorrows of the faithful sometimes lengthen into years, but the dreams do come true one day. Detroit is that kind of community. It is the optimistic type of community where the very nondescripts and migrant workers, who give it a shoddy surface appearance now, will, by some alchemy of association, be the most fervent boosters for civic improvement 10 years hence.

A retrospective glance reveals the skein of paradox that began with the first page of its history and continued unbroken to this moment.

Sieur Antoine de la Mothe Cadillac founded Detroit. He came out of Gascony to the New World, a protégé of Pontchartrain, Finance Minister to Louis XIV. He was among the most intrepid of those reckless adventurers who explored the northern stretches of this continent for Louis at Versailles. In addition to his courage, he possessed the practical French conviction that a man should feather his own nest in life. Because he arrived late on the American scene, the slender Gascon noble found precious little feathering. Frontenac, Governor of Canada, tried to help him, but by then the pickings were slim. As commandant at Michilimackinac, the island fortress on top of Lake Huron, Cadillac learned to his chagrin that, without grafting, he couldn't amass any formidable bundle of money. He respected money almost as much as he respected adventure, but he was not a grafter.

Cadillac knew of the narrows now called the Detroit River. Whether he had actually visited the region is uncertain. There is no uncertainty, however, about his being a man of vision. He figured that a settlement on those lower straits not only would have sound military value, by commanding the approaches from the lower to the upper lakes, but that it could be developed into the center and clearinghouse for the fur trade of the entire Northwest country.

He went to Paris and sold his idea to the court. Armed with the royal blessing, he returned to Montreal and, on June 2, 1701, led a canoe flotilla from there through the Nipissing and down through Lake Huron and Lake St. Clair to "d'Etoir," which means

the narrows. Past beautiful Belle Isle they floated, the long canoes containing 50 soldiers and 50 settlers, and a mile or two beyond where the river swings westward they headed in and landed on the north shore.

On the north shore, mind you. That landing provided the first and most fantastic of Detroit's many paradoxes. Eighty-odd years later, the peace treaty, following the American Revolution, set the border between Canada and the United States on a center line through the Great Lakes and their connecting rivers.

Consequently, Detroit, Mich., is north of Windsor, Ontario. Travelers, especially from the middle States, include a trip to Windsor as a must on their first visit to Detroit. Unless they be geographers, it confounds them to go south across the river from Detroit to Canada. They insist it just cannot be. Every schoolboy knows Canada is north of the United States and no one can tell him differently.

The beginning of the city in its present form and outline dates from 1805 when it was swept by a fire which destroyed every building except one. It was rebuilt on a pattern similar to that employed by L'Enfant in the laying out of Washington. Woodward Avenue runs north from the river and divides the city east and west. Grand River Avenue runs diagonally northwest into the center of the State, and Gratiot Avenue northeast to Port Huron and the Thumb district beyond. Michigan Avenue, heading northwest on a lesser bias, is the old post road than once ran from Detroit to Chicago.

This fanlike arrangement of principal thoroughfares, considered ideal 150 years ago in that it permitted potential spacious park areas between the spokes of the fan, has resulted in a constantly increasing traffic snarl within a 2-mile perimeter of the downtown business section. As a matter of fact, if an inquiring reporter were to poll Detroiters on the worst feature of their city, the consensus would be that it is the traffic congestion in the main sections.

In 1805 the population was between 6,000 and 7,000, a third of whom were English, Scotch, or Irish, and two-thirds descendants of the original French settlers. The French influence still remains in Detroit. More than a few families trace their ancestry back to the voyageurs or soldiers who scrambled ashore behind Cadillac. In this connection, it is pertinent to recall that modern Detroit reflects the stamp and the blending of three distinct cultures. First, the French, a handful of whom were aristocrats and the remainder level-headed, frugal peasants. They were a sociable folk but home loving. Next came the English. They were better mixers and leaned more to public entertainment and gatherings. The final definitive culture to infiltrate was that of the New England and other eastern colonists.

These three social strains followed one upon the other. Over the years they blended happily into a lasting cultural pattern which never has been appreciably disturbed. An immigration poured West in the 1800's, Irish and Germans and Slavs and Latins settled here as they did in other industrial centers. And after a generation or so, they were absorbed in the existing cultural background.

Through the nineteenth century Detroit experienced several phases of expansion. Considerable shipbuilding was done in yards along the long water front. Then, about 1830, the town became a rather bustling center of general wholesale and retail trade. Hundreds and thousands of land-hungry easterners began emigrating to central Michigan and upper Ohio were farm acreage was cheap and good. They stopped over at Detroit to buy their farm equipment and maybe pick up a horse or two and

a farm wagon. Manufacture of farm vehicles led to the eventual establishment of shops for the building of more elaborate buggies and carriages. And this little industry grew into the automotive empire that not even the most visionary Detroiters dreamed of in those placid times.

By 1880 Detroit was a solidly established, second-class American city of the older kind, as we measure age in American history. Its streets were, for the most part, wide and tree-lined. Its homes, in the better residential sections, were stanchly built and commodious. A surprising proportion of them (considering the architectural morbidity of the Victorian period) were gracefully attractive in a quaint way. Along such fashionable avenues as Woodward, Jefferson, Cass, West Fort, and Lafayette Boulevard, the predominant building materials for homes were brownstone, granite, and sturdy red brick. Frame houses were the rule in the more modest sections. Slums at that time were only a vague threat. Even in the poorer sections, most of the wooden cottages were neat, with front and back yards.

Detroit, circa 1880, became noted for its pharmaceutical products. It led in the manufacture of stoves and furnaces, and such heavy things as wheels and parts for railroad trains. Its people were conservative in business, conservative in social intercourse, conservative in their general outlook, conservative in the utilization of their wealth. The rich families were cultivated and urbane enough, but hardly smart in the frivolous sense. They traveled moderately. They sent their sons to Yale, Harvard, Princeton, or to the University of Michigan, which had been founded jointly by a great Catholic priest, Gabriel Richard, and his friend—a great Presbyterian minister, the Reverend John Monteith. They sent their daughters to finishing schools in the East, or to exclusive local seminaries. They were, in a word, smug.

When the new century arrived, Detroit's population was about 285,000. Then came the automobile and a metamorphosis as bewildering as anything in the Arabian Nights. Henry Ford, Henry Leland, Durant, the Dodge brothers, Chalmers, and the rest of the automotive pioneers created a jumbled kaleidoscope of bursting growth and community prosperity that shuttled the quiet city of 285,000 into today's glamorous place of 2,000,000 inhabitants.

The story of Detroit and the automobile has been told so often, so voluminously, that repetition here would be tiresome. And the story of Detroit's wartime production is familiar to all literate people in the world. It is worth touching on only because, at the dawn of the Second World War, considerable doubt existed that the city's industry could meet the demand for guns and tanks and planes and munitions. You may remember, for example, how newspaper columnists and radio commentators used to allude to the Willow Run bomber plant as "Ford's Folly" and how Detroit automobile manufacturers were scolded by far-left liberals as selfish moneygrubbers who were not interested in changing over to war production and who knew only how to make automobiles.

You may remember, too, how those sneers were throttled and the scolding transformed into applause as the B-29's rolled out of Willow Run, and the GM planes, and Chrysler tanks and the Hudson and Packard armament surged into being as Detroit rapidly became the Arsenal of Democracy. If you are a statistician, you may recall that, between 1940 and 1946, Detroit factories shipped \$25,000,000,000 in war matériel; that Detroit manufactured 11 percent of all the war equipment employed by the Allied armies and navies.

So, in this year of grace, 1951, Detroit sprawls along the north shore of her river, thinking little, if anything, about her past and readying calmly but competently for whatever the future may decree. If it be another war, she will build for it more quickly even than she did for the last one. Her laboratories and research plants have gained by experience. She is big in area as well as in population. Besides the city proper, she completely surrounds two good-sized cities—Highland Park and Hamtramck. The latter, in a recent census, was said to contain more Poles than any city except Warsaw.

Detroit is untidy and restless and noisy. Her residents are of every race under the sun and every color. They get along fairly well together. In fact, from the population viewpoint, the city is as cosmopolitan as Marseilles or Port Said. But in another way, it is almost as parochial as a Vermont village.

Two million inhabitants, for instance, and only two legitimate theaters; few restaurants to capture the interest of an epicure, less than a dozen first-rate urban clubs, no present big-scale symphony (it died unnoticed because those who could have saved it were too busy making munitions in the last war); no tenderloin district, but a slather of tawdry saloons and taverns scattered all over town and a slather of neighborhood movie houses that did a land-office business until television invaded the beer gardens; no single, sharply defined smart shopping district, but several widely separated and fragmentary districts that drip exclusiveness.

You might think from the above paragraph that the average well-to-do Detroiters has no recourse at night but to stay home and go to bed. On the contrary, he is as gregariously inclined as his fellows in any other city. He is an avid country-clubber. Detroit boasts more than its share of good golf and suburban clubs. In the gracious precincts of such places as the Country Club, the Little Club in Grosse Pointe, the Detroit Golf Club, Oakland Hills, Bloomfield Hills, Meadowbrook, Red Run, Knollwood, Plum Hollow, the Grosse Pointe Hunt Club, and Bloomfield Open Hunt, Detroiters entertain and take their ease. And because Detroit is a waterside city much of its life revolves around its several distinguished yacht clubs—the Detroit Boat Club, the Detroit and Bayview Yacht Clubs, and the magnificent Grosse Pointe Yacht Club.

Because its industries grew faster than it could digest them, the present residential sections have been shoved farther and farther outward. Save for those conservative families who ignore change, most of the better residential sections are on the outskirts of the city or beyond. Palmer Woods to the north, and Sherwood Forest and Huntington Woods are typical. Grosse Pointe to the east along the shore of Lake St. Clair is one of the most widely acclaimed gold coasts on the continent. Birmingham and Bloomfield Hills, a dozen miles north of the city proper, and several villages to the west house many prosperous Detroiters.

Wherever they live, Detroit is their city. They grumble at it and pretend they hate to work in it day after day. But they are liars. They love it. They love everything about it—good and bad. Many of them, particularly in the financial and manufacturing fields, almost might be said to commute between Detroit and New York on the crack Wolverine or Detroiters of the Michigan Central Railroad. They are always glad to get home.

They remind you of Kipling's flea-bitten old sailor who, speaking of the world in general, said:

"It never does no good for me
But I couldn't leave it if I tried."

Fortification of Dorchester Heights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a copy of a letter written by Morgan Connor on March 9, 1776, to Samuel Potts, Esq., of Philadelphia, Pa.

Due to the fact that Dorchester Heights, which was recently recognized as a national shrine, is located in my congressional district, this copy was sent to me by Conrad L. Wirth, Associate Director of the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior, with the information that—

Superintendent Ronalds, of Morristown Historical Park, Morristown, N. J., came across this letter in going through Mr. Lloyd M. Smith's vast collection of revolutionary manuscripts.

In relation to the identification of Morgan Connor, and the part he played at Dorchester Heights, where under the leadership of Gen. George Washington, the Continental troops compelled the British to evacuate Boston, as well as an outline of his service during the Revolutionary War, Mr. Wirth further said:

In this connection [Superintendent Ronalds said] Morgan Connor had come to Boston in the summer of 1775 a first lieutenant in a Pennsylvania rifle regiment. When he wrote the letter he was a captain in the First Continental Infantry. Eventually he became lieutenant colonel of the Seventh Pennsylvania, and was granted 6 months' leave on December 2, 1779. He was lost at sea in January 1780.

This historic and most interesting letter brings us back to the trying and early days of the Revolutionary War.

It is also a letter that brings to light one of the unknown heroes of that vital and important period in the life and history of our country, in those days when our very independence as a Nation and our freedom as a people was at stake.

The letter follows:

CAMP ON PROSPECT HILL, March 9, 1776.
TO SAMUEL POTTS, ESQ.,
To the care of W. D. Potts, Merchant,
Water Street, Philadelphia, Pottsgrove.

SIR: Last Saturday night we began to bombard the town of Boston, which was warmly returned on the side of the King's troops. This fire was continued till Tuesday morning and was intended to draw their attention this way and cover a design that was formed of fortifying two hills on the south side of Boston. This had the desired effect, for our people to the amount of 3,000 went on Monday night, and by means of the heavy fire kept up were not discovered till next morning, when, to the great surprise of the King's troops, two towering fortifications appeared on the heights of Dorchester. This seemed to throw them into great confusion, as those hills command the harbor. We learn that it was agreed in a council of war to give us battle, but while they were making the necessary dispositions a heavy gale of wind sprang up which for that time put a stop to

their further progress. I believe they have since thought better of it, for we discover no movement of theirs that would indicate such a design. Some deserters who came out yesterday say they are preparing to abandon the town, but what degree of credit is due to this report I am not able to determine. Certain it is that they are shipping as fast as possible a great many effects, large quantities of artillery and ordnance stores, but I rather think they mean to risk a battle and are prudently taking every necessary step to have everything in readiness to push off in case of a defeat. If they attacked our lines at Dorchester we had 4,000 men ready with boats to make an attack upon the town at this side so that we would have had a warm day of it, and I verily believe we would have given them a drubbing. On Monday night we fired 300 cannon and mortars, which were answered by 4 times that number, so that from 7 in the evening till 6 in the morning there was nothing to be heard but a constant explosion of cannon and bursting of shells. We had two men killed, but what execution our fire did we don't learn. We very unluckily burst five mortars among which was a fine 13-inch brass mortar taken in the store ship. There were bombs thrown from Boston almost to Cambridge; this is full 2 miles. I've no time to say more, as I am this moment ordered out on duty. Please to make my compliments to Mr. and Mrs. Tut-ter, to whom I would wish to have this letter addressed with you. I would wish my best compliments made acceptable to Mrs. Potts and all other friends.

I am, sir, with great esteem, your assured humble servant.

MORGAN CONNOR.

P. S.—This moment the selectmen of Boston came to the lines with a flag of truce to let General Washington know that General Howe said if he (Washington) would desist firing that he (Howe) would evacuate the town in 3 days without plundering or destroying it, but if we continued to harass his troops he would burn the town. What answer the general will give is not known. To-night we shall make some nearer approaches by fortifying an eminence within half a mile of the town. Adieu, sir, once more.

M. C.

Profane Priest Makes Mockery of American Immigration Laws; Costs Taxpayers One-fourth Million Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, Constantinos George Georgiades entered this country illegally more than 15 years ago. Although his illegal status was immediately discovered, and although immediate steps were taken to deport him, he is still here. Not only did this alleged priest enter this country fraudulently and illegally, but his conduct during these last 15 years has been insulting to the church of which he professes to be a member, and harmful to the many American communities in which he has lived.

For the record, let me give you a chronological statement concerning this illegal alien's record.

On February 25, 1936, Constantinos George Georgiades, a priest in the com-

munity of Clygada, district of Athens, Greece, appealed to Bishop Arsenious, of Brooklyn and New Jersey, for a position as priest under the bishop's jurisdiction. But before receiving a reply he left for Buenos Aires, Argentina, leaving behind his wife and children, for which no reason has ever been given, and finally became installed in a paying position in a Greek church at Buenos Aires. Something happened in Buenos Aires having to do with the conduct of Georgiades and apparently kept secret by the church authorities. But in the month of August 1937, Georgiades appealed again to the bishop, this time for a parish in the United States. He arrived here on September 30, 1937, at the port of New York, with a special passport under section 3 (1) of the Immigration Act of 1924, upon the representation that he was to be assigned for duty at the chapel of the Greek Embassy, Washington, D. C. Incidentally, there was no such chapel, which Georgiades well knew, and no attempt was made to assign Georgiades to the Greek Embassy in Washington, but instead he was sent as a priest to the Greek community of a small town in Massachusetts, Clinton. His service there was a short one, because the whole parish was up in arms shortly after his arrival and the officials of the Greek community were thoroughly disgusted with his conduct. From then on Georgiades was assigned first at one church and then another, because time after time complaints became too violent to keep him where he happened to be; and at Biddeford, Maine, for instance, his conduct became so unseemly that a movement was started to have him sent out of the parish because of his profane and obscene language, and, in addition to which, according to the record, he was guilty of most immoral conduct. The record shows that he made improper advances to women both within and without the Greek community and that he patronized a colored house of ill fame in the city of Portland, Maine.

This gives you but a brief indication of the pattern of Georgiades' conduct throughout the 14 years he has been in the United States, during which time the Immigration Service has continuously, but with gentle hands, endeavored to have him deported. I desire at this point to submit for the record a copy of facts relied upon for the deportation of Constantinos George Georgiades, the original of which can be found in the files of the Immigration Service, as it gives in brief but pointed language a number of the facts concerning this so-called priest.

Now let me point out to you, fellow Members of Congress, a few facts relative to the 14 years of effort by the Immigration Service to rid the Nation of this alien. I feel sure that you will agree with me, that now that we are preparing to defend ourselves against a world menace, it is about time that the extravagance of the Government in coddling aliens at the expense of the taxpayer should stop. You can at least begin to comprehend the cost of this unnecessary expense when I tell you that the outline of the proceedings in the case of Constantinos Georgiades, Case No.

1256369, submitted from the files of the Immigration Service, shows that from September 30, 1937, to November 21, 1950, there were 109 actions, not to speak of endless correspondence, interviews, notices, hearings and the like.

This outline of proceedings shows that there have been 5 decisions of the Board of Immigration Appeals adverse to Georgiades, 2 petitions for writs of habeas corpus filed, 6 private bills introduced in the House and Senate for the benefit of this alien, not any of which have been approved but which for months stayed the proceedings of the Immigration Service; that he has been taken into custody for deportation three times, and that the date of deportation has been extended by various officials, 6 months twice, 60 days once, and 30 days several times. Time after time he has requested and the Department has granted him the privilege of voluntary departure, but he is still with us, and the case is still pending, and the taxpayers are still bearing the unconscionable expense of this farce.

On January 27, 1949, The Central Immigration Office found this alien deportable on charges, denied his application for voluntary departure and reexamination, and ordered the alien deported to Greece. A warrant of deportation issued. This was approved by the Board of Immigration Appeals, making the fifth decision to that effect.

Public Law 863, July 1, 1948, Eightieth Congress, second session, expanded classes of aliens who may be eligible for suspension of deportation and on August 20, 1948, the Central Immigration Office ordered hearings reopened to afford Georgiades an opportunity to apply for benefits of Public Law 863, but he declined and refused to avail himself of this opportunity to prove himself worthy of special consideration under this law.

On February 20, 1950, the United States Supreme Court rendered an opinion in the case of *Wong Yang Sung v. McGrath* (339 U. S. 33) to the effect that hearing provisions of the Administration Procedure Act was applicable to deportation proceedings and as a result of this it became necessary to rehear hundreds, possibly thousands, of cases pending in the Immigration Service, and therefore it became necessary for the Central Immigration Office to direct its field office to grant Georgiades a hearing de novo as required by the Sung decision. As a result of this proceeding the hearing examiner concluded that Georgiades is deportable and that he has established statutory eligibility for suspension of deportation. The case is again pending before the Board of Immigration Appeals.

Mr. Speaker, I further submit for the record the following memorandum prepared for use of the subcommittee of the House handling immigration matters:

1

On February 25, 1936, Constantine Georgiades, a priest in the Community of Clygada, District of Athens, Greece, applied to Bishop Arsenious of Brooklyn and New Jersey for a position as priest under the Bishop's jurisdiction.

II

Before receiving a reply from Bishop Arsenious, respondent left Greece for Buenos Aires, Argentina. He left a wife and family in Greece. His reason for so doing has never been given.

III

He was installed in a paying position in the Greek Church at Buenos Aires, under the jurisdiction of Archbishop Athenogoras.

IV

Shortly after undertaking his duties as a priest in Buenos Aires something happened which has been kept sub rosa, apparently by church authorities. However, information is that the Greek Counsel at Boston, Mr. A. L. Liatis, has a certain document which concerns the conduct of Constantine Georgiades during his brief stay in South America.

V

In August 1937 Georgiades appeared again to Bishop Arsenious for a parish in the United States. Bishop Arsenious accepted the application of Georgiades and received a request from him for documents allowing him entry into the United States. He pledged "absolute secrecy."

VI

On August 23, 1937, Georgiades, knowing that some irregular method was being pursued to secure his entrance into this country, wrote Bishop Arsenious saying, "If I do receive any documents, do I risk the danger from the American Embassy or the Greek Embassy?"

VII

Simultaneously with Georgiades' application to Bishop Arsenious, he set about procuring a separate passport through Archbishop Athenogoras.

VIII

On August 23, 1937, Georgiades wrote Bishop Arsenious: "I am trying to prepare the ground in order that my resignation will not seem sudden." For some reason he was exceedingly anxious to leave Buenos Aires as soon as possible.

IX

On September 30, 1937, Georgiades arrived at the port of New York on steamship *North-ern Prince* with a special passport and was admitted under section 3 (1) of the Immigration Act of 1924 upon the representation that he was to be assigned for duty at the Chapel of the Greek Embassy, Washington, D. C. (There was no such chapel, and Georgiades knew it.)

X

No attempt was made to assign Georgiades to the Greek Embassy in Washington, but immediately after his arrival in New York he was sent as a priest to the Greek community of a small town in Massachusetts (Clinton).

XI

Georgiades' term of service at Clinton was a short one. The whole parish was up in arms shortly after his arrival, and the officials of the Greek community were thoroughly disgusted with his conduct.

XII

Georgiades was dismissed as the priest at Clinton, Mass., on September 8, 1940, on certification of the officials of this Greek community that the conduct of Georgiades "was far below the standard set for a man who has the honor of wearing a Roman collar."

XIII

Straightway Georgiades was assigned as priest for the Greek community at Biddeford, Maine, and straightway his conduct became so unseemly that a movement was started to have him sent out of the parish. He used profane and obscene language, and, according to the record, was guilty of most

immoral conduct. The record shows that he made improper advances to women both within and without the Greek community, and that he patronized a colored house of ill fame in the city of Portland, Maine.

XIV

The record also shows the sworn evidence of persons who knew nothing of Georgiades or his church affiliations that he brought different women to an auto camp and spent the night on various occasions with these women.

XV

On November 11, 1941, Georgiades was arrested and brought before court at Worcester, Mass., on November 12, 1941. He had been caught by the owner of an auto camp in Clinton peeking through auger holes which had been bored into the side of an auto camp where he was staying overnight. His attorney urged the owner of the camp not to press the complaint; that it would ruin Georgiades and his church. Whereupon the case was settled out of court on the ground of wanton destruction of property.

XVI

Throughout these episodes at the tourist camp in Clinton, Georgiades disguised himself as a layman by concealing his priest's collar.

XVII

A few days before Georgiades was caught peeking through the auger holes at the tourist camp in Clinton the record shows that one Eranouel Haramis, of Saco, Maine, was in the room where Georgiades lived in Biddeford and saw a carpenter's auger. When questioned why he had it, Georgiades said he wanted it to bore a hole into his trunk because he had lost the key.

It should be noted here that the owner of the tourist camp in Clinton discovered new auger holes the day after Georgiades stopped at his camp. He finally became suspicious of Georgiades for this reason and for the fact that he registered women as his wife.

The discovery of the auger in the priest's home and his apprehension in the act of peeking through the holes in the cabins are highly circumstantial evidence to prove that the man is abnormally immoral.

XVIII

Nobody denies that Constantine Georgiades is in this country illegally. On August 27, 1942, a letter from Commissioner Earl C. Harrison, of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Philadelphia, states, "• • • You are advised that the file of this office shows that Constantine Georgiades was found deportable from the United States, but in view of the circumstances in his case he was given permission to depart voluntarily."

XIX

On May 9, 1942, a letter from Howard K. Travers, Chief of the Visa Department, Department of State, wrote concerning the deportation of Georgiades in part as follows:

"This case has been carefully considered by an interdepartmental committee, by an interdepartmental visa review committee, and by the Board of Appeals. Notwithstanding such consideration, the conclusion has been reached that a favorable recommendation for the issuance of a visa is not warranted at this time."

Since I do not have access to the complete file, I do not know how many times this case has gone the rounds of procedure both in the Department of Immigration and the Department of State. I am informed that the full interdepartmental procedure has been employed at three different times and each time the decision was that this man was an

undesirable person, that he was here illegally and should be deported.

XX

At the conclusion of each round of procedure, another preexamination has been given allowing Georgiades to depart voluntarily.

XXI

This preexamination procedure as practiced makes vicious inroads upon any attempt at enforcement of our immigration laws. The deportee utilizes Congressmen and Senators to bring pressure upon consulates along the border for a promise of visa in advance of voluntary departure.

XXII

General Information Concerning United States Immigration Laws from the United States Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Philadelphia file No. 55878/558, was recently received in response to inquiries regarding this case. Among other rules and regulations contained in the above-mentioned pamphlet is the following:

"Besides having the right documents, an alien must meet other requirements. The immigration laws intend that only those aliens who are mentally sound, morally clean, and physically fit shall enter the United States."

XXIII

Constantine Georgiades is in this country illegally. The special passport on which he gained entrance at the port of New York contained a gross misrepresentation of fact. This misrepresentation deceived our immigration officials. The Immigration Department has decided that Georgiades is here illegally. The record shows that he has not only deserted his own wife and children in Greece, but that he is a man of gross immorality.

XXIV

We are well aware that many times aliens who are here illegally are permitted to remain because they are found to be worthy people and the facts in their particular cases are persuasive that they will conduct themselves as decent, moral people. The instant case presents exactly the contrary situation. It is difficult to understand why anybody who is such a menace should be permitted to remain in this country, cover himself with the cloth of the church, and demean all concepts of decency and of religion.

XXV

The attorney of Constantine Georgiades has argued that his client is a good man but that there is a war between two factions in the Greek church and he has been caught between the upper and nether millstones. He has also argued that there is some wealthy man in Maine who from personal pique is trying to persecute Georgiades. Those are not the facts. Regardless of which faction of the church Georgiades serves, he is still here illegally. True, he deceived one bishop, and for the time being pays homage to another, but this has nothing to do with the deportation case, except as it goes to show that Georgiades is a dishonest and an insincere person.

XXVI

There are many Greeks in Maine and Massachusetts who earnestly desire the deportation of Constantine Georgiades, not only as one who is in this country illegally, but as one who is an unworthy priest who practices profanity and immorality. They ask his immediate deportation in accordance with law for the honor of Greek people in this country and for the well-being of all communities contaminated by his presence and conduct.

Mr. Speaker, I requested the Immigration Service to give me a brief notation of the various docket entries in the Georgiades case. From the following recitation of these entries, it is obvious that Georgiades has cost the American taxpayers at least a quarter of a million dollars:

OUTLINE OF PROCEEDINGS IN CASE OF CONSTANTINOS GEORGIADES

September 30, 1937. Alien arrived at New York in possession of section 3 (1) nonimmigration visa and was admitted.

March 23, 1938: Investigation conducted as to legality of alien's immigration status. Alien examined under oath by immigrant inspector.

April 14, 1938: Application for warrant of arrest submitted to central office.

June 14, 1938: Central office requests additional information from Secretary of State.

February 2, 1939: Secretary of State supplies additional information.

February 10, 1939: Warrant of arrest under immigration laws issued by Assistant to Secretary of Labor, charging that alien remained longer than permitted by law.

February 23, 1939: Additional information received from Secretary of State.

March 17, 1939: Alien taken into custody under warrant of arrest. Hearing thereunder started and adjourned to permit alien to obtain counsel. Alien released on own recognizance.

March 22, 1939: Hearing held. Additional charge lodged that at time of entry alien was immigrant not in possession of immigration visa. Hearing is concluded. Presiding inspector concludes alien is deportable on lodged charge and recommends voluntary departure.

April 18, 1939: H. R. 5852, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, private bill introduced in alien's behalf.

May 1, 1939: Central office directs deportation proceedings held in abeyance pending outcome of private bill.

May 22, 1939: Record forwarded to central office for review.

January 3, 1940: Board of Review finds warrant charge not sustained, recommends that Department of State be requested to advise whether alien's Greek passport was fraudulently and illegally obtained.

January 17, 1940: H. R. 7995, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, private bill introduced in alien's behalf.

June 20, 1940: Request addressed to Department of State.

July 1, 1940: Act of July 1, 1940 (54 Stat. 711), amends section 15 of Immigration Act of 1924 by setting limits to period of admission of section 3 (1) nonimmigrants; also provides for approval of Secretary of State before they can be required to depart.

August 19, 1940: Secretary of State submits report indicating alien's passport was obtained in good faith.

October 15, 1940: Board of Immigration Appeals concludes that act of July 1, 1940, is retrospectively applicable and that warrant charge is therefore tenable; orders that Secretary of State be requested to advise whether he approves contemplated action that alien be required to depart.

November 1, 1940: Request addressed to Secretary of State.

November 18, 1940: Secretary of State approves contemplated action requiring alien's departure.

January 27, 1941: Board of Immigration Appeals finds alien deportable on warrant charge and directs that order of deportation be not entered but that alien be required to depart within 90 days after notification of decision.

February 5, 1941: Central office transmits Board's decision to field office. Central office notifies sponsor of H. R. 5852.

February 6, 1941: H. R. 3136, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, private bill introduced in alien's behalf.

February 8, 1941: Field office notifies alien's attorney of Board's decision and directs that alien depart by May 8, 1941.

February 13, 1941: Central office directs field to hold further action looking to alien's enforced departure in abeyance, pending outcome of private bill.

May 26, 1941: Alien files motion for reopening in order that he may apply for preexamination.

June 16, 1941: Board of Immigration Appeals grants motion and orders proceedings reopened.

August 22, 1941: Alien's attorney files application for preexamination.

October 16, 1941: Reopened hearing held. Presiding inspector recommends voluntary departure and preexamination.

December 22, 1941: Record of reopened hearing submitted to central office for review.

May 8, 1942: Alien and witnesses interviewed in connection with H. R. 3136. Sworn statements taken.

June 2, 1942: Field report of investigation on H. R. 3136 submitted to central office.

July 2, 1942: Central office submits report on H. R. 3136 to Attorney General.

July 8, 1942: Attorney General submits report on H. R. 3136 to chairman, House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Thereafter, on various dates, private citizens submitted protests against alien.

July 26, 1943: Attorney for private citizens asks Board of Immigration Appeals for opportunity to appear before Board and argue against grant of discretionary relief to alien.

September 24, 1943: Argument before Board of Immigration Appeals. Alien's attorney and attorney for opposing private citizens heard.

November 24, 1943: Board of Immigration Appeals orders case reopened for further investigation, limited solely to issue of alien's good moral character.

March 27, 1944: Reopened hearing held and completed.

April 8, 1944: Presiding inspector's opinion concludes alien has established good moral character.

April 25, 1944: Record of reopened hearing submitted to central office.

September 7, 1944: Board of Immigration Appeals extends time within which alien may depart voluntarily for 6 months and authorizes preexamination.

April 28, 1945: Alien's attorney submits motion to Board for extension of 6 months within which to depart voluntarily.

June 4, 1945: Board of Immigration Appeals grants 6 months' extension.

October 18, 1945: Alien preexamined and found admissible to United States when in possession of a quota immigration visa.

Instead of departing for Canada to make formal application for the visa, the alien thereafter corresponded with the American consul in an effort to obtain a section 4 (d) nonquota immigration visa as a clergyman. On December 19, 1945, the consul advised the alien that no further consideration would be given to his visa application until he abandoned his illegal residence in the United States. The alien's attorney thereupon requested the central office to legalize his status without having him leave the country or in the alternative that a 6 months' extension be granted.

February 21, 1946: Central office extends departure time for 60 days and orders alien

placed on notice that if he fails to depart within said period preexamination will be rescinded and an order of deportation entered.

June 1946: Central office orders alien deported to Greece on charge stated in warrant of arrest.

July 16, 1946: Board of Immigration Appeals affirms.

July 16, 1946: Warrant of deportation issues.

August 2, 1946: Alien's attorney files exceptions and asks reconsideration.

August 19, 1946: Central office orders stay of deportation for 30 days, pending decision of motion for reconsideration.

September 13, 1946: Alien's attorney files motion to reopen.

September 25, 1946: Board of Immigration Appeals orders that outstanding order and warrant of deportation remain in full force and effect.

September 29, 1946: Alien's attorney applies for 30-day stay of deportation.

September 30, 1946: Central office denies application for stay.

October 1, 1946: Alien taken into custody for deportation.

October 1, 1946: Alien applies to United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania at Pittsburgh for writ of habeas corpus. Writ issued, returnable October 4, 1946, and date for hearing set for October 31, 1946. Court orders alien released on \$500 bond.

October 2, 1946: Board of Immigration Appeals affirms central office order of September 30, 1946, denying application for stay.

October 3, 1946: Court extends time for filing return to writ to October 15, 1946.

October 14, 1946: Return to writ filed.

October 23, 1946: Hearing date on writ adjourned to November 22, 1946, on court's motion.

October 28, 1946: Hearing date on writ indefinitely postponed on court's motion.

January 6, 1947: Hearing date on writ set for January 14, 1947.

January 8, 1947: H. R. 698, Eightieth Congress, first session, private bill introduced in alien's behalf.

January 14, 1947: Alien's attorney moves for continuance of hearing on writ in view of pendency of H. R. 698. Court grants continuance to April 3, 1947.

March 28, 1947: Court grants alien's attorney's ex parte motion for indefinite continuance of hearing on writ.

May 2, 1947: House Judiciary Committee votes down H. R. 698.

May 14, 1947: Hearing on writ set for June 16, 1947.

June 16, 1947: Writ of habeas corpus dismissed on motion of alien's attorney. Alien remanded to custody of Immigration and Naturalization Service.

June 20, 1947: Alien released on \$500 bond.

July 2, 1947: Central office recommends termination of proceedings on ground warrant of arrest was invalid at inception.

July 8, 1947: Board of Immigration Appeals affirms.

July 18, 1947: S. 1660, Eightieth Congress, first session, private bill introduced in subject's behalf.

August 11, 1947: Secretary of State requested to advise of any objection to reinstitution of deportation proceedings.

October 28, 1947: Secretary of State advises there is no objection.

November 25, 1947: New warrant of arrest issued, charging alien remained in United States after failing to maintain exempt status under which admitted.

December 10, 1947: Central office submits report to Attorney General on S. 1660.

January 12, 1948: Warrant of arrest served on alien. Alien released on \$500 bond.

January 20, 1948: Attorney General submits report to chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee, on S. 1680.

January 28, 1948: Hearing held and completed under warrant of arrest. Alien applies for voluntary departure and preexamination.

February 12, 1948: Presiding inspector concludes alien is deportable and recommends voluntary departure and preexamination.

April 1, 1948: Record of hearing forwarded to Central Office for review.

July 1, 1948: Public Law 863, Eightieth Congress, second session, expands classes of aliens who may be eligible for suspension of deportation.

August 20, 1948: Central Office orders hearing reopened to afford alien opportunity to apply for benefits of Public Law 863.

September 23, 1948: Alien's attorney advises that alien does not wish to apply for suspension of deportation but wishes matter disposed of on present record.

January 27, 1949: Central office finds alien deportable on warrant charge, denies application for voluntary departure and preexamination, and orders alien deported to Greece. Warrant of deportation issues.

February 7, 1949: Alien's attorney files notice of appeal to Board of Immigration Appeals.

March 22, 1949: Oral argument heard before Board of Immigration Appeals.

July 15, 1949: Board of Immigration Appeals (one member dissenting) affirms central office decision.

September 21, 1949: Alien submits letter to Board of Immigration Appeals requesting reopening in order that he may apply for suspension of deportation.

September 28, 1949: Board of Immigration Appeals denies reopening.

October 13, 1949: S. 2684, Eighty-first Congress, first session, private bill introduced in alien's behalf.

October 18, 1949: Alien taken into custody for deportation.

October 18, 1949: Alien applies for writ of habeas corpus in United States District Court, Western District of Pennsylvania, at Pittsburgh. Writ issues, returnable in 16 days, and court orders alien released on \$500 bond. Hearing on writ set for November 7, 1949.

October 26, 1949: Central office instructs field office to stay further proceedings during pendency of private bill.

October 31, 1949: Court permits alien's attorney to withdraw writ of habeas corpus.

November 18, 1949: Formal order entered by court, permitting withdrawal of petition for writ of habeas corpus and remanding alien to custody of Service.

November 29, 1949: Alien released on \$500 bond.

February 20, 1950: Opinion of United States Supreme Court in *Wong Yang Sung v. McGrath* (339 U. S. 33), holds hearing provisions of Administrative Procedure Act applicable to deportation proceedings.

April 4, 1950: Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization indefinitely postpones action on S. 2684.

April 6, 1950: Central office directs field to grant alien a hearing de novo as required by Sung decision.

April 14, 1950: Alien's new attorney requests permission to review record.

June 2, 1950: Relevant portions of record loaned to alien's attorney.

July 5, 1950: Alien advised that hearing is scheduled for July 13, 1950.

July 6, 1950: Hearing rescheduled for August 14, 1950, at request of alien's attorney.

July 12, 1950: Hearing rescheduled for August 17, 1950, at request of alien's attorney.

August 17, 1950: Hearing under warrant of arrest conducted and concluded. Alien applies for suspension of deportation.

November 2, 1950: Hearing examiner concludes that alien is deportable and that he has established statutory eligibility for suspension of deportation.

November 16, 1950: Alien's attorney files exceptions.

November 21, 1950: Record of hearing forwarded to central office for review and decision.

Mr. Speaker, for the last 10 years, to my personal knowledge, numerous Members of Congress have appealed to Immigration officials for the speedy deportation of Constantine Georgiades. His case makes this Government look ridiculous. His case causes the good citizen to ask himself, "Can an alien criminal spend his life in America and thumb his nose at law and decency?" Apparently, the answer to this question is "Yes."

Resolutions From the Military Order of the Purple Heart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to your attention the two resolutions hereinafter set forth from the Military Order of the Purple Heart of my native State of California. They come to my attention from the distinguished department adjutant, Mr. Adrian H. Mayer, who is a resident of my home city of Long Beach, Calif.

I know that the subject matter of each of these fine resolutions is close to the heart and purposes of the Members of Congress in their dedication to the proposition that those who have served our beloved country in uniform shall not lack in every reasonable and proper protection and worthy benefit.

The above-mentioned follows:

MILITARY ORDER OF THE PURPLE HEART,
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA, INC.,
Long Beach, Calif.

HON. CLYDE DOYLE,
Congressman From California,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed are two resolutions adopted unanimously by the eighteenth annual convention of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, Department of California.

It is our belief that the material contained in these resolutions is of vital concern to the veterans of all wars and conflicts, and we will appreciate any effort on your part in behalf of these resolutions.

Patriotically yours,

By the commander,

REX W. FRANKLIN,
Junior Past Department Commander.

Whereas the widows of World War I veterans who became the wife of a veteran after December 14, 1944, are not eligible for a widow's pension: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this eighteenth annual convention of the Department of California, Military Order of the Purple Heart, go on record as favoring the extension of eligibility time limit for widow's pension from December 14, 1944, to December 31, 1950; be it further

Resolved, That the California representatives in both Houses of Congress be requested to introduce a bill in Congress, and support it, to extend this pension eligibility; and be it further

Resolved, That the national department, Military Order of the Purple Heart, be requested to act on this matter, memorializing and mandating same at the next annual national convention, to be held in Phoenix, Ariz., August 14-18, 1951.

Whereas Public Law 346, commonly known as the GI bill, is to expire July 25, 1951; and

Whereas due to the aid received by many veterans under this law, this country has been benefitting in that better and more satisfying citizens are taking their proper place in life, many of these veterans have greatly improved their opportunities, and their standing in their respective communities, and

Whereas if this law is permitted to expire, many veterans who have not had an opportunity to take advantage of this law, and the rights extended to them under it, will lose out in the privileges intended to be extended to them: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Motion Picture Chapter No. 1898, of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, Department of California (in meeting duly assembled this 26th day of June 1951), That the Congress of the United States be petitioned to extend Public Law No. 346 for a period of 2 years from July 25, 1951.

Iron Ore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix to the Record, I wish to include an article by George Kennedy, columnist, published in the Washington Star on Sunday, July 15, 1951, as follows:

A little ceremony was held on a Baltimore dock last month to mark the arrival of the Liberty ship *Simeon G. Reed* with the first load of iron ore from Liberia.

The Liberian Ambassador, C. D. B. King, made a speech, as did representatives of the State Department, the Import-Export Bank, the port of Baltimore, and the Republic Steel Corp., which has developed the Liberian mines. Unfortunately, the ship was detained at quarantine by the public health authorities. It was not in sight during the speech-making. And the ceremony was dampened by a heavy shower.

But, before the week was over, the *Simeon G. Reed* was made fast alongside the Baltimore & Ohio's new \$5,000,000 ore dock. Big grab buckets were plummeting through the hatches and being hoisted back with 5-ton bites. The lumpy ore was screened onto the longest, single-loop, rubber-belt conveyor in the world and carried to a hopper which dumped it into railway gondolas. And soon Diesel locomotives were huffing and puffing to get the precious stuff over the humps of the Appalachians on its way to Republic's furnaces in Ohio.

It was history's first movement of ore from an Atlantic port across the mountains, and the management of the B. & O. could take great satisfaction in it. Like all midwestern railroads, the B. & O.'s big revenue has always come from the movement of coal to

seaboard. Now there was every prospect that the railroad would have a profitable two-way haul over the mountains, east-bound coal and westbound ore. The Pennsylvania Railroad would share in this movement, but the B. & O. got ahead of its larger competitor with the construction of the new ore dock.

And the Nation could well take satisfaction in it. For it meant that the postwar ore rush, which had prospectors drilling iron deposits in every continent, was paying off.

BETTER THAN TACONITES

The ore rush was caused by the possibility that the day may come when the big power shovels in the Lake Superior district will take their last bite of high grade, open-pit ore. The steel industry already has spent millions experimenting on taconites. Taconites are pellets of ore obtained from rock. The process calls for grinding the rock finer than face powder, picking out the iron with a magnet, and then cooking the iron powder to make it back into pellets.

If the steel industry had to be fed on taconites there would be a change in our economy that would make the current controversy on the price of beef seem frivolous. Our recent progress in the iron age has been based on steel made from low-cost, open-pit ores. That is what made possible the \$500 model T, the \$2 keg of nails, multistoried buildings, the 10-cent can of soup, throw-away razor blades, and bobby pins.

The present danger is not that the Lake Superior district, with its great Mesabi Range in Minnesota, actually will run dry. It lies, rather, in the fact that this region's ore-producing capacity has been expanded about as far as it can go.

The United States now is making steel in the same amount as at the World War II production peak—100,000,000 tons a year. The rearmament program may boost that figure by 15,000,000 tons next year. The National Security Resources Board estimates that our steel production will go to 130,000,000 tons by 1960.

It takes a ton of ore to make a ton of steel—a ton of scrap is added. So if we are going to be making 30,000,000 extra tons of steel in 8 or 9 years, and if Mesabi's expansion days are over, it can readily be seen that 30,000,000 tons is going to have to come from somewhere else.

That has been the reason for the big ore search. The results so far give every reason to hope that the 30,000,000-ton gap can be closed by 1960.

LIBERIA A SMALL SHOW

The iron range of hills in Liberia, into which Republic Steel is digging, is small compared with some of the other finds. Republic plans to import about a million tons a year from Liberia. Bethlehem plans to get 3,000,000 tons a year out of its Venezuelan operation. The first shipment arrived in Baltimore Harbor in April. The United States Steel Corp. has discovered an iron mountain in Venezuela, the Cerro Bolivar, which is bigger than its Hull-Rust-Mahoning mine in the Mesabi, heretofore the biggest iron mine in the world.

Even the Venezuelan supply may be small compared with Labrador, where drillers have already proved about as much iron as there is in sight on the Mesabi. What is going on in Labrador is one of the great industrial adventures of our time.

In a few days drillers will hole through a tunnel almost a half mile long, to push a railway through the Laurentian Mountains to get the ore. This railroad, which will run north from the port of Seven Islands, just within the great breakwater provided by Anticosti Island in the St. Lawrence Estuary will be double-tracked and 365 miles long. It is probably the biggest railroad construction undertaken on this continent since the transcontinental Canadian lines were built.

There are 1,600 men working up there now. All those in the mine area, and all their equipment and supplies, had to be flown in. Weather stations and flying fields have been established. And all this is being done at a time when private capital—so it is said—no longer takes risks.

Labrador ore is being developed by the M. A. Hanna Co. of Cleveland, which is the second largest shipper of ore from Minnesota. Hanna made the explorations and obtained the mining concessions together with the Hollinger Co., which mines gold and silver in Canada. Hanna then created the Iron Ore Co. of Canada, an American company, and through it brought five steel companies into partnership in the enterprise. In all, the group has about \$225,000,000 to fool around with.

The work has been running ahead of schedule. Current plans call for the shipping of 5,000,000 tons of ore during the 1955 season and 10,000,000 tons in 1956 or 1957.

This Labrador ore is not piled up in mountains. It comes out of one of the dreariest wastes in the world. The region looks from the air as if an ocean had dried up leaving a lot of big puddles. There is hardly any game except small fur-bearing animals. The trappers used to go in in the winters and avoid the area like the plague in the summers, because it teems with mosquitoes.

Iron ore was discovered there years ago by a missionary priest of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate.

WHY THE DELAY?

Here is how George M. Humphrey, president of the Hanna Co., told Congressmen about it in the St. Lawrence seaway hearings earlier this year:

"Now the reason that nothing was ever done about it before," Mr. Humphrey said, "is this: That part of Labrador is a very sparsely settled country. Practically all of the people in Labrador live within 5 miles of the coast, because there are no roads. There are no railroads. There is absolutely no means of communication of any kind except by water.

"Human beings were limited to this: You took a canoe and a pack and went up there, taking only what you could carry on your back. It took 6 weeks or more to get in, and 6 weeks or more to get out and you only had a couple of months to be up there. Then all you could discover was what you could look at, or what you would dig by yourself with what you could carry.

"So that until flying became available, there was no means of determining how much ore was there. When flying came in and developed, you were confronted with this problem. To get planes big enough to carry substantial equipment and set yourself up in a substantial way, meant that somebody had to be prepared to gamble and lose two or three or four or five million dollars. There are not a lot of people who are willing to do that.

"We got ourselves financed so that we were willing to do that. It was known that it was going to take an enormous investment to get the ore out of there. That meant there had to be a great big tonnage up there."

The Hanna Co. found the tonnage. The drills which were taken down, packed in flying boxcars, flown to Labrador's interior and reassembled, have already proved 400,000,000 tons of high-grade open-pit ore. Mr. Humphrey was not sure what portion of the known ore-bearing territory had been proved, but he was sure that it was less than 10 percent.

Mr. Humphrey was testifying in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway, the navigation and power project that would enable ocean steamers, with 26-foot draft, to go up and down the river between Montreal and Lake Ontario. The present locks are only big

enough for small steamers with 14-draft. He said that with the seaway, his company would ship about 10,000,000 tons of ore to the steel plants on the Great Lakes. Without the seaway, the limit would be about 6,000,000 tons.

POLITICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Although Labrador will only be able to ship ore about 7 months of the year, because in winter the ore freezes in the railroad cars, Labrador has one great advantage over other parts of the world—as an ore producer. That advantage is political.

Undoubtedly the political stability of Canada was an element in the willingness of insurance companies to take a \$100,000,000 mortgage on the U.S. deposits.

In Venezuela, things are a little different. Foreign capital has been encouraged, and the great oil companies have experienced a bonanza there. Still, there is something about a country where a military junta can replace an elected government overnight that must be hard on the ulcers of an American industrialist investing \$100,000,000 of his corporation's funds there.

The United States Steel Corp.'s mountain of iron was found in 1947 by F. H. Kihlstedt, a Swede who was an unhappy neutral under Japanese rule in the Philippine Islands until VJ-day.

The modern iron ore prospector is a far cry from the gold prospector of song and story. In the first place, he is a corporation employee, his discoveries belong to his employer. Mr. Kihlstedt's find has been estimated to be worth a total of \$10,000,000,000, presumably when the mountain has been moved to the stockpiles of blast furnaces in the United States.

Mr. Kihlstedt's reward for his efforts has not been revealed, but he is reported to be a well-satisfied man. The adventure had one similarity to gold prospecting. The party of prospectors tried to move about unobserved in the vast savannas of the Orinoco. They knew if they were seen taking an interest in any locality, Venezuelans of the neighborhood might beat them to filing claims. As it was, one of the prospecting party made the mistake of talking about the mountain of iron in a night club. It cost the steel company \$450,000 to buy off the resulting claims.

Mack C. Lake, an old-time M. A. Hanna Co. geologist borrowed by the steel corporation for exploration work, is credited with giving Mr. Kihlstedt the tip that led to his discovery. Mr. Lake, who had ordered an aerial photography survey of an 80-mile strip of territory along the Orinoco, was consulting with the Swedish prospector at his base camp. The geologist looked off into the distance and pointed out the mountain on the horizon.

"That's an interesting looking hill," he said. "Better have a look at it."

Kihlstedt first took several looks at the mountain from an airplane. Then one morning long before dawn, his party set out in a convoy of jeeps. He found the mountain was covered with a high grade of iron ore. Drilling has since proved it to contain 500,000,000 tons of the ore.

The steel corporation still is negotiating with the Venezuelan Government over royalties.

Also in Venezuela's Orinoco Valley are ore deposits from which Bethlehem is already feeding its furnaces at Sparrows Point in Baltimore Harbor. The spot is known as El Pao, and was discovered in 1926 by a native prospector. Bethlehem acquired the concessions in 1933. A railroad was built from the mine to the river, where barges are loaded. The barges are towed to Puerto de Hierro, Bethlehem's "port of iron," 230 miles downstream, which can be reached by ocean-going vessels.

Construction was started in February 1941, but Pearl Harbor put an end to it until after the war. The iron port was not completed until a year ago.

El Pao is an open-pit operation with the most modern machinery, producing a maximum of ore with a minimum of man-hours. The ore is scooped up by electric shovels and loaded into 30-ton Diesel trailer trucks. The trucks take the ore about a mile downhill to a crushing plant, where it is broken into small pieces and dropped into 70-ton railway cars.

At the end of the railroad, which is 35 miles long, the barges are loaded with the most modern type of rubber-belt conveyors. The same type of conveyors at the dock at Puerto de Hierro load it into the ships. Bethlehem plans to bring 3,000,000 tons a year from El Pao to take care of its current increase of 2,800,000 tons in steel production.

All of this ore will come to Baltimore, most of it for the Sparrows Point plant, although some may be shipped to Bethlehem, Pa. Even if the St. Lawrence Seaway is completed, it is not expected that Venezuelan ore will be carried the additional 1,300 miles and more to get it to the Bethlehem and United States Steel plants on the Great Lakes. Bethlehem will continue to import ore from its Chilean mines, and this also will be unloaded at Baltimore.

Photographs of the Republic Steel Corp. s mining in Liberia show that comparatively elementary techniques still are being used there. The ore deposit is in the form of a cliff almost a mile long, and from 30 to 100 feet high. The face of the cliff has weathered and broken off through the centuries, leaving a huge continuous pile of ore at its foot. The pieces range in size from a marble to a box car.

GRAVITY SYSTEM

Liberian laborers, with pneumatic drills, break off pieces of ore, which fall down hill—where other laborers pick them up by hand and put them in trucks.

To get the ore to Monrovia, the capital and seaport of Liberia, a 43-mile railroad was built, the first in the country. At the dock in Monrovia grab buckets lift the ore from the railway cars and drop it through the hatches of the ship.

Republic has ordered a fleet of 23,000-ton ore carriers built at Clydebank, Scotland. The first will be delivered in September. The new ore discoveries are going to be a boom to the shipbuilding industry. The M. A. Hanna Co. intends to build a fleet of ships for its Labrador ore, and United States Steel will need more ships when it starts to get ore out of Venezuela.

While the discovery and development of such vast deposits in Labrador, South America and Africa have prevented a forced change in our economy, from low-priced to very high-priced steel, this shift in the source of supply is bound to make changes in the location of the industry.

The United States Steel Corp. is going ahead with the construction of its plant at Morristown, Pa., opposite Trenton—a plant which will be supplied by Venezuelan ore. A survey is underway for a steel plant location on the banks of the James River, near Newport News, Va., and the New England Council is trying to get a steel plant built near New London, Conn.

Whether this development will turn out to be simply an addition in the East to the Nation's steel-producing capacity, or the start of an actual shift in production from the Great Lakes area to the East, depends on whether the St. Lawrence Seaway is built. About 75 percent of steel production is west of the line between Pittsburgh and Buffalo, an area that cannot get its proportionate share of the new discoveries without opening the St. Lawrence.

Faith of Our Fathers: Congressman Doyle Urges Colleagues To Attend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, recently Mrs. Doyle and I and a group at my invitation attended the magnificent and historically accurate, timely pageant, Faith of Our Fathers. It was a real inspiration.

This pageant of history, produced midst the beauty of God's out-of-doors in the heart of Rock Creek Park, is not only informative; it is a rich contribution to our further appreciation of the life and times of George Washington. It perceptibly increases the knowledge of the life of the Father of Our Country and his distinguished associates.

This dramatic pageant with a cast of over 1,000 active participants is produced at 8:40 each night except Sunday up to and including September 3, 1951. The general admission is only 75 cents, while the reserved seats are only \$1.50. It is produced by the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission at the Carter Barron Memorial Amphitheater at Rock Creek Park.

I have no hesitancy to urge you and each of you to attend this symphonic drama by Paul Green. For instance, one of the scenes is the laying of the cornerstone of the United States Capitol in the District of Columbia, September 18, 1793.

Senator Byrd's Jefferson-Jackson Day Address in Atlanta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial appearing in the Chattanooga Times of June 30, 1951, which discusses the attitude of the southern voters toward the opinion expressed in the address by the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner at Atlanta. It is my feeling that the Chattanooga Times editorial expresses the viewpoint of the southern people.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT IN TUNE WITH THE PEOPLE

Senator HARRY BYRD, addressing a Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner in Atlanta "to raise funds for the Democratic Party," threatened a southern revolt if a civil-rights plank is included in the Democratic platform and if "socialistic schemes" are not stopped.

Senator BYRD said: "No Democratic President can be elected without the votes of the Southern States." It may be that no Democratic President can be elected next year even with a full solid South vote, but in four of the last five national elections the Democratic candidate could have given the votes of the 11 Southern States to his opponent and still would have been elected. And in the last election Georgia and Florida could have been added to the four Dixiecrat States and Mr. Truman would still have been elected. The Democratic Party can't win without the North and the West.

Senator BYRD's appeal for governmental economy has more support now than ever before. But in his Atlanta speech he placed most emphasis on an attack on Government aid of various sorts—including public housing—and he called this socialism.

"Socialism and free enterprise cannot live under the same roof," said Senator BYRD. But some of the governmental assistance projects he calls socialism "live under the same roof" with free enterprise in every democratic country and will continue to do so.

The fact is, southern politicians do not interpret the mind of the southern people. The civil rights issue and, in another day, prohibition and religious bigotry combined are effective political arguments in the South. We say that with regret. But the average southerner has no sympathy with any alliance of Democratic Congressmen with Republican Congressmen to take the lid off of prices, to give support to the lobbies which seek to undermine public power as socialism, to give support to McCarthyism or to throw monkey wrenches into the effort of this country to prepare itself against world war III.

They have no sympathy with any view so narrow that it calls any form of governmental assistance which helps the common people socialism.

Southern politicians may permit themselves to be used as tools in these endeavors, but they are out of touch with the southern people. There will come a time, we suspect, when the South will resent the efforts of its political figures to make it appear that southern citizens do not think for themselves but can be delivered in any way the politicians choose.

The civil-rights issue was strong in 1948 just as bigotry was strong in 1928, but neither was strong enough to deliver the South. Certainly, issues which involve the mere use of labels as does this application of socialism to everything the expensive lobbies oppose cannot be used by Senator BYRD or anyone else to any effect in the South.

United States Policy Regarding Trade With Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the story in the New York Times of Sunday by the Times' distinguished correspondent in Geneva, Switzerland, Mr. Michael L. Hoffman. Mr. Hoffman's cabled dispatches, in my judgment, consistently show the best understanding of economic problems within Europe, and in the economic relationships between Eu-

rope and the United States, of any such dispatches appearing in the American press.

Here, in a very short story, only 10 paragraphs long, Mr. Hoffman gives a remarkable summary of how United States trade policy confuses Europe. In particular he shows the unsoundness of the so-called Kem amendment, or any other such legislative efforts to regulate trade policy in detail through congressional action.

I have not previously seen Mr. Hoffman's phrase "the balance of advantage," but it is an excellent phrase to describe the objectives we should establish in our trade policies with Russia and its satellites, and in the trade policies of Western Europe as well. The western countries should seek to develop policies which will give us the balance of advantage. As Mr. Hoffman points out, it is folly for us in Congress to try to decide by legislation whether it is good or bad, for example, for the west to ship 10 tractors to Poland in exchange for 5,000 tons of coal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES TRADE POLICY CONFUSES EUROPE—ATTEMPTS BY CONGRESS TO FIX EAST-WEST COMMERCE RULES IRK EXPERTS ON CONTINENT

(By Michael L. Hoffman)

GENEVA, July 21.—European governments are confused as well as irritated by the United States handling of various issues connected with trade between the Communist and non-Communist world. The irritation is attributable to the attempt of Congress to make acceptance of Congress' theory on what is right and what is wrong in trade policy a condition for receiving United States aid.

European trade experts doubt very much whether Congress, with all its other tasks, can form a very sound judgment on whether it is good or bad, for example, for the west to ship 10 tractors to Poland in exchange for 5,000 tons of coal.

But taking all things together, it is probable that the confusion about United States policy is doing more damage than the irritation. What is the United States trying to accomplish, European governments want to know. United States representatives throughout Western Europe have been trying unsuccessfully to answer this question for the last 3 years.

VIEWED AS ECONOMIC WEAPON

It seems from the latest manifestations, such as the Kem amendment (which would ban all United States aid to countries sending forbidden materials to Communist countries) that the United States is coming close to regarding east-west trade as an element in economic warfare. No United States spokesman ever has told any Europeans this but this is how they interpret recent United States actions.

Now Britain and the United States, and one or two other countries, have had lots of experience in economic warfare. During World War II control of trade with neutrals, for example, was managed on the basis of agreed principles enforced by a blockade. Nobody ever suggested even at the height of the war that trade with Sweden or Switzerland be suspended on the ground that Sweden and Switzerland were manufacturing valuable armaments and other things for the enemy.

The reason that trade with the neutrals was not cut off was that such trade was a two-way proposition. In fact, it has several dimensions, including a financial and a transport dimension. The best Allied experts

figured out where the balance of advantage lay and released goods to the neutrals accordingly.

EUROPEANS FOR WARTIME POLICY

What Europe cannot understand is why the United States does not follow the balance-of-advantage principle now if economic warfare of some kind is the objective instead of trying to write a blanket formula into the law.

Every Western European country has some kind of trade agreement with one or more Communist countries. There is almost always some kind of trade negotiation going on between the East and the West. But every western country at present has to consult Washington bilaterally on what the United States considers contraband. There is not any mutually agreed policy applied by the West as a whole.

From the European viewpoint, Washington's apparent preoccupation with what goes from the west to the east and neglect of what comes from the east to the west also seems short-sighted.

Europe is hoping that after Congress finishes writing a law on the subject enough flexibility will be left so that the United States Government can overhaul its whole policy on east-west trade and put an end to what Europeans characterize as the bungling that has marked the situation up to the present.

Under So-Called Progressive Education the Child Exists for the State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the Saturday Evening Post of July 14 carries an article by Frank Chodorov that should not escape the attention of the people of this country. A progressive-minded educator was employed in Pasadena, Calif., and upon assuming control of the school started in on certain reforms said to be embraced in progressive education. The whole central idea of education, as he viewed it, was to adjust the child to a group and not to train him as an individual. Molding of the child to social order is the principal business of modern schooling, according to this leader.

To add further to this scheme of education, the parents were not to interfere with this wonderful new discovery in education. Says the professor, in substance: "Parents have no competence in the field of education, and individual relationships between parent and child terminate when the child enters school."

This is surely an innovation in our system of education. If this is what they call progressive education, I, for one, do not want any of it. I have always supposed that the state existed for the individual, but according to new doctrine in education the child exists for the state.

Many prominent educators have endorsed the new progressive education system of alienating the child from family ties and directing his education to have him fit into social groups instead of equipping him with the means, as an

individual, to lead an independent and dignified life. Pasadena, where this system was tried, disapproved it and the educator of this new scheme was fired.

This new progressive education idea sounds exactly like the Nazis of Hitler Germany, the Fascists of Italy, and the Communists of Russia. There seems to be a well-organized group in the United States bent on destroying all systems we have known and even the Government itself.

Since those who advocate the overthrow of our laws by means of conventions of the United Nations, and those who advocate making the child a cog-wheel in the state are, many of them, citizens of the United States, their activities are more to be feared than any nation on the globe today. If we remain true to our purpose in preserving a democracy which has lasted since 1789, there need be no fear from without, but we can be easily destroyed from within. The people of this country must remain alert to all the multitudes of changes in our lives advocated by impracticable men who happen to be serving in our educational institutions. Men who have been educated and reeducated until they have no common sense left are dangerous to this democracy.

Increasing Encroachment of the Federal Government in Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following resolution adopted by the American Legion Post No. 300, Department of Indiana, on May 6, 1951:

INDIANAPOLIS POWER & LIGHT POST,

AMERICAN LEGION, No. 300,

Indianapolis, Ind., May 16, 1951.

The following resolution was presented and unanimously approved at a regularly constituted meeting of the post on May 11, 1951, held in Ipalco Hall:

"A resolution opposing the increasing encroachment of the Federal Government in private enterprise

"Whereas we, of the American Legion, have associated ourselves together to uphold the Constitution of the United States of America, to foster and perpetuate a 100-percent Americanism, to inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, State, and Nation, and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy; and

"Whereas certain groups and individuals, having influence both within the Government and without, are known to be conspiring for the purpose of socializing our American economy; and

"Whereas according to the Hoover report on reorganization of Federal business enterprises, there are about 100 important undertakings which the Federal Government owns or in which it is financially interested, these concerns engaging directly or indirectly in lending money; guaranteeing loans

and deposits; writing life insurance; producing, distributing and selling electric power and fertilizers; operating railways and ships; purchasing and selling of farm products; and the smelting and sale of metals; and

"Whereas the socialistic influences have, in many instances, successfully disguised their objectives by the use of benign terminology such as "welfare," "security," "public ownership," etc.; and

"Whereas an attempt has been made to exploit the field of socialized medicine and a movement is now under way to exploit and promote other socialized programs under the guise of the national emergency, the first and foremost point of attack being in the field of electric power, which has been definitely declared by the proponents of socialism as the key to greater general nationalization of the country's industrial resources; and

"Whereas the ambitious program to establish a duplicating giant power network and steam-generating facilities under Government ownership already constitutes a serious burden on the American taxpayer, because this encroachment on privately owned business is destroying one of the Nation's principal sources of tax revenue, namely, the business-managed, taxpaying public utilities; and

"Whereas the defense of America, including the battle against inflation and the Communist drive to ruin our economy, depends very largely on eliminating nonessential expenditures from the Federal budget: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That this Post 300, American Legion, Department of Indiana, pledges to oppose, by all lawful means, the continuing encroachment of the Federal Government upon business-managed industry in general, and this body of voters opposes, in particular, the unnecessary construction of Government-owned generating plants and duplicate transmission lines which compete with and will ultimately exterminate business-managed, taxpaying electric utilities; and be it further

"Resolved, That this resolution be forwarded to the Indiana Department of the American Legion for its endorsement and transmittal to the national organization for incorporation in its national program, with action requested at the next national American Legion convention; and copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Indiana in the United States Congress "

WINFRIED F. PULSIFER,
Commander, Post 300.
BERTRAM C. BEHMANN,
Adjutant, Post 300.

Alaska-Hawaii Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct attention to an excellent article by Mr. Marquis Childs, which points out some of the disadvantages the whole Nation suffers as a result of our failure to grant statehood to Alaska and Hawaii, both of which Territories are integral parts of the United States and should be recognized as such by admission into the Union as sovereign States.

We have delayed too long in taking the necessary action to grant statehood to these Territories. There has been a feeling that the House should await Senate action, and, although this might be

desirable, it has proved impracticable, and I intend, therefore, to ask our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to schedule hearings on the statehood bills without further delay.

The Childs' article points up the problems which have arisen due to our inability to arrange for a dependable supply of newsprint sufficient to take care of the needs of our publishing industry. So much depends upon the ability of the press to obtain newsprint that we should allow nothing to deter us from moving forward in every possible way to enlarge our newsprint supply. This is one of many reasons why the statehood bills should be enacted. The following Childs' article appeared in this morning's Washington Post:

ALASKAN NEWSPRINT: SHORTAGE AMIDST PLENTY

(By Marquis Childs)

High on the list of failures of both the preceding and the current Congress is the refusal to grant statehood to Hawaii and Alaska. The two Territories will always remain in semicolonial status until they are incorporated in the Union.

This is particularly true of Alaska, which will never get adequate military defenses until it becomes something more than an outpost. That is why some of the strongest pressure for statehood came from responsible defense officials when a year ago it seemed that final action was possible.

Now Secretary of Interior Oscar Chapman has shown in a special report what great new potentialities for industrial development exist in the Northwest. If Canada would go along in a joint development plan for both Alaska and British Columbia, a new industrial empire is possible which would provide homes and jobs for at least 6,000,000 people. With our rapidly expanding population it is important to look to the future.

Alaska is a source of wealth for one of the commodities in shortest supply in the world today—newsprint. This shortage, which has inflated the price of newsprint to an extraordinary level and which keeps papers in Europe and elsewhere pathetically small, bears directly on the issue of freedom of information and the competition of free ideas. The newsprint squeeze, along with the rapid rise in other fixed costs, constantly narrows the range both of information and opinion.

According to Secretary Chapman, timber in Alaska is sufficient to produce 1,000,000 tons of newsprint annually in perpetuity. The Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture is now trying to interest manufacturers and groups of newspaper publishers in starting plants in southeast Alaska.

There the Tongass National Forest, which covers most of the area, can support indefinitely on a basis of sustained timber yield at least five large pulp and paper mills, plus some lumber, plywood and so forth. The estimated sustained yield is a billion board feet, which at present prices would be worth more than \$150,000,000. The present yearly output, virtually all of it in lumber, is 70,000,000 board feet.

In the face of this extraordinary wealth, with newsprint growing scarcer and dearer month by month, not a single pulp mill has been built in Alaska. A contract for a rayon pulp development has been negotiated, calling for an estimated 1,500,000,000 cubic feet of timber from the Ketchikan area of the Tongass forest and several groups are said to be interested in newsprint manufacture in the area around Juneau which is capable of producing 1,000 tons daily in perpetuity.

One reason this development has been so delayed is that powerful interests in this country would like to cut Alaskan timber and ship it to mills in British Columbia and the United States. But the Department of

Agriculture, supported by the Interior Department, has fixed a policy prohibiting the export of logs unless they have received at least primary manufacture in the Territory.

The reason for such a policy is obvious. If Alaska's wealth were to be shipped out merely as raw material for industries to the south, there would be no development in the Territory itself. Stripped of its wealth, it would remain like the cut-over country in northern Wisconsin and Minnesota more or less empty and unproductive. The chance for building a stable population with a real stake in Alaska—the only basis for adequate military defenses—would be gone.

That has unfortunately been the attitude of some of the interests that lobbied so powerfully behind the scene to stop Senate action for statehood for Alaska and Hawaii after the legislative process had gone nearly to completion. They have concentrated on getting out quick returns regardless of what happens to the land or the people. These interests seem to have special influence with Senator HUGH BUTLER, of Nebraska, who more than any single individual was responsible for blocking the statehood bills.

The issue of public versus private power enters in here, too. Whether private utilities could develop the great water power sites in Alaska or whether they could be properly utilized only through a comprehensive TVA approach by Government is a question that is bound to be sharply debated.

But with the great potential wealth to the north, present scarcities will not long be tolerated. As was suggested by the able summary prepared by a special newsprint subcommittee of the Committee on Small Business headed by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, unless action is taken by the Federal Government, it probably will be many years before the Alaskan development occurs. Here is a wide open opportunity for private enterprise to forestall Government and show that it can do the job.

Pitchmen on the Payroll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, as this body considers bills which appropriate the taxpayers' money to support the various Federal agencies for the next fiscal year, I think we should keep in mind the fact that huge sums are being expended to maintain various publicity men and press agents on the payrolls.

An editorial published in the Baldwin Park (Calif.) Bulletin on Thursday, July 12, enumerates some interesting examples of Government publicity activities. This article states that the Bureau of Reclamation has been one of the principal offenders in carrying out propaganda activities.

The editorial follows:

PITCHMEN ON THE PAYROLL

The recent Saturday Evening Post article How Government Pressure Boys Squander Your Money, should be required reading for Californians. For one of the outstanding examples cited in this startling exposé of how "Government agencies beat the drum to glorify and perpetuate themselves with expensive books, cocktail parties and thousands of paid press agents," concerns the

arrogant propaganda activities of the Bureau of Reclamation here in California.

All Government agencies have legal—and presumably useful—functions to perform under laws enacted by Congress. Those proper functions, by no stretch of the imagination, include lobbying at the public's expense. Yet, the Post article discloses that all 1,600 of the Bureau's Central Valley project employees were officially instructed as follows:

"You are information people, every one of you. You have got to get out and meet the folks, even joining the luncheon clubs and the chamber of commerce and the churches. Congress is very sensitive and susceptible to what goes on at home, and the more friends we make here the more easily it will be back in Congress to get our appropriations."

Last month a high spot in the Bureau's propaganda activities was reached with the mailing from Sacramento of a 2-foot long, heavy cardboard mailing tube containing a cartoon map of CVP, a 1,500-word long press and radio release, a three-page list of fillers, describing CVP, and a sheet listing dates and places for various water festival celebrations during the summer. This mailing was sent not just to California newspapers but to papers all across the country. The Columbus (Ga.) Ledger ran an editorial condemning the mailing as a shocking waste of public funds and printed the map under the caption: "Note to Reds—Here are your targets."

The Bureau of Reclamation isn't the only offender in this regard. Though the expenditure of official time or Federal funds to influence legislation is punishable by fine and imprisonment, it is apparently established procedure in a great many Federal agencies. The pitchmen on our public payroll, creating artificial desires for more and more Government services, cynically egging on each and every pressure "gimme" group, blithely spend our money to convince us that they need still more.

Lovely Lobbyist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, were there more lobbyists of the kind represented by the lovely wife of my esteemed colleague the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, GORDON CANFIELD, I am confident that we would have passed a more effective control bill last week.

Unfortunately, however, lobbyists are not always as unselfish and as interested in the welfare of our Nation—they are more interested in serving purely a special interest.

I was very pleased to hear the remarks of my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] when he alluded to Mrs. Canfield as the "very charming, very gracious, very lovely" lobbyist who was working in the interest of price control. She, like many other housewives, was confronted with the problem of high prices and immediately called it to the attention of her husband. Though I am certain that the gentleman from New Jersey, who has always been able to feel the pulse of the people, and who represents them well,

also understood the problem, I am nonetheless certain that Mrs. Canfield's lobbying had a very strong effect.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article which appeared in the Newark Evening News, of July 23, 1951, entitled "Lovely Lobbyist":

LOVELY LOBBYIST

Mrs. Gordon Canfield, of Paterson, has one advantage over most housewives in New Jersey; she does not have to go out of her own home to make her views known to her Congressman. That she does make her views known, and effectively, was testified to the other day on the floor of the House of Representatives by her husband.

This "very charming, very gracious, very lovely" lobbyist, as Representative CANFIELD described her, is at her wit's end trying to find in the stores of her community how she can properly get food to feed five hungry mouths. In this respect, she is no different from other housewives. It is a problem common to most Jersey homes.

Mrs. Canfield does have special access to her Congressman. But every housewife can have ready access to her's if she will but take advantage of the mails. There is no question that the Congressman will give heed if enough housewives make their views known.

Need Firm Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. WHITAKER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. WHITAKER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "Need Firm Hand," appearing in the Park City Daily News, Bowling Green, Ky., July 1951:

The Russian peace proposal offers hope to the millions of people who would like to see an end to the fighting and something approximating real peace established in this war-weary world.

Or does it? Is it an honest attempt to negotiate at least a dispute that has already claimed thousands of lives and cost billions of dollars in war expense and destruction of property? Or is it another crafty Kremlin trick to lull the United States and its U. N. allies into a feeling of false optimism? Is it a trick to split the Allies by causing dissension among them over the actual peace terms?

Those questions have to be asked by any sensible person because of Russia's long record of diplomatic duplicity, double-crossing and shameless dishonesty in her international dealings. They have to be asked despite U. N. Secretary-General Trygve Lie's assurance that the Soviet's motives are sincere and their off-hand peace bid should be taken seriously. They have to be asked because a wise man always reaches for a grain of salt when listening to pious utterances from a known liar.

So while Mr. Malik's gambit offers hope to some, it also confronts President Truman, the State Department, and their opposite numbers among our U. N. allies with a keen challenge. It is a challenge to their judgment and their ability to come through when the chips are down in an international poker game in which one player has no compunction about using a marked deck and hiding a few aces up his sleeve.

By their handling of the situation the President and his advisers have a chance to redeem themselves with many citizens throughout the country who feel that Truman-Acheson and company have demonstrated something less than dynamic leadership in their handling of the whole problem of communistic expansion in Asia.

Because of previous sad experience of those naive enough to take Russian promises at face value, it is only the part of wisdom to retain a healthy skepticism until the Reds' sincerity is proved beyond doubt. But that does not mean that we should lead the U. N. along the path of timidity. The burden of proof of sincerity is on Russia. By taking a firm stand with her and refusing to be stampeded by wishful thinking, we can call her hand and make her put her cards on the table. Then perhaps our diplomats will learn that Russia doesn't hold all the trumps they had credited her with. Or that she is just trying to cheat again.

Mutual Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement by Mrs. Allan C. G. Mitchell, a director of the League of Women Voters of the United States. This statement is a reflection of the thinking of the women of the Nation. I agree with the thinking expressed in this timely statement and urge the House membership to give thoughtful attention to the statement:

STATEMENT OF MRS. ALLAN C. G. MITCHELL, BLOOMINGTON, IND., A DIRECTOR OF THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, ON THE MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

The League of Women Voters is a non-partisan organization devoted to developing informed and active citizens. We now have over 100,000 members organized in 764 communities in 43 States. The league is supporting a program of economic and military assistance to other countries because we believe such a program to be basic to the present and future security of the United States. In particular, the league has given sustained attention to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the European recovery program, and assistance to underdeveloped countries by the United States and the U. N. We would like to see these three programs included in the bill which this committee will write. I should like to speak briefly about NATO and ERP and then at more length about aid to underdeveloped countries which our members believe should be emphasized.

1. The League of Women Voters support of the North Atlantic Treaty is based on our conviction that collective security offers the best chance for a lasting peace. We have supported this treaty since 1949 when it became evident that efforts in the United Nations to create an effective security system were being blocked. We regard the treaty as a necessary expedient and supplementary to the United Nations but by no means as a substitute. In April, at our national council, the delegates again discussed collective security problems. We favor the strengthening of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization

and supplying it with the necessary materials to enable the member countries to build and coordinate their defense efforts.

2. The league endorses the European recovery program in 1948 after prolonged discussion of the risks and costs involved. The evidence shows that the hopes of the program were realized beyond most expectations. Exclusive of the accomplishments in the realm of industrial and agricultural production and increase in trade there are other favorable outcomes. The European recovery program has inspired the member nations to take bold steps toward the integration of their economies and toward closer political cooperation. The organization of European economic cooperation, the Strasbourg Assembly, the Schuman plan, the European Payments Union, and proposals for a European army represent significant advances toward a Europe capable of supporting and defending itself.

All western European nations, however, have not progressed in their recovery at the same rate. In some nations production still lags and the balance-of-payments problem is acute. Also, the living standard is still so low that many of the people remain discontented and are susceptible to totalitarian doctrines which seem to promise relief. The existence of such problems warrants continued United States participation in European recovery. These nations now have the added burden of rearming to defend themselves against possible aggression. Without continued United States help, European nations would seriously jeopardize the economic strength brought about by their labor in the last few years. The League of Women Voters, therefore, urges Congress to continue adequate appropriations for economic aid to western European nations.

3. In the past 2 years the league has given much attention to the acute problems of underdeveloped countries, particularly their effect on the immediate security of the United States as well as our longer-range plans for peace. At our last convention in 1950, one of the three national issues chosen for concentrated attention was "the expansion of world trade and international economic development with maximum use of United Nations agencies." More recently at this year's council meeting the delegates were outspoken in reporting widespread support among the league membership for technical assistance to underdeveloped countries.

The support among our membership for this program of assistance to the underdeveloped nations is so great that I am including a few quotations from local leagues:

From Peterboro, N. H.: The Peterboro league heartily endorses the point 4 program. It does not want to see the longer-range objectives lost sight of in the defense crises. It felt that the psychological value was as great as the strategic-materials value if they must be balanced against each other. The league believes that in spite of difficulties and complications due to the defense effort the program should be carried out for the benefit of the peoples in the underdeveloped areas and in the hope that it will further the peace effort.

From Lancaster, Pa.: "We feel strongly that a really bold and imaginative point 4 program is the most important challenge facing us. . . . By far the strongest feeling [that came out of the debate] was that the military-aid program should not be allowed to disrupt economic recovery in Europe and that a strong point 4 program is the best 'containment' policy for Asia."

From Yellow Springs, Ohio: "We believe that conditions in 'backward' areas are an ever-increasing danger to world peace and would be so even if Russian imperialism should somehow disappear. Therefore, we feel that point 4 cannot wait until the

emergency is over, but must be pushed immediately and vigorously. . . . Yellow Springs members are strongly in favor of our promoting the point 4 program largely by appropriating funds to be administered through the U. N. We support wholeheartedly maximum use of United Nations agencies."

From Pasadena, Calif.: "At a time when military measures are receiving primary consideration, we believe it is the league's function to emphasize the importance of international economic development as a means of promoting world stability and lasting peace."

From St. Louis, Mo.: "At a members' meeting, March 16, 1951, our league voted to ask National to be on the watch for point 4 legislation, and to support it in every way possible."

From Stillwater, Okla.: "We believe that the need for aid to the underdeveloped countries of the world cannot be seriously questioned. We feel that the extremely low standard of living of two-thirds of the world's population constitutes a real and continuing threat to world peace and stability. We are supported in this view by the present threats to world peace which we find in China, Iran, Indonesia, the Philippines, and Korea, all of which lie in that area designated 'underdeveloped.' We further feel that the defeat of communism, without a subsequent rise in the living standards of the people, would bring only temporary relief. Poverty, not communism, is the basic threat to world stability."

This program makes sense to our members, and we believe it has also caught the imagination of the American people. We agree strongly with the view expressed in the Rockefeller report, *Partners in Progress*, that the United States can no longer assure its own security with means found here at home. We need the underdeveloped countries, both economically and politically, and the peoples of those countries are anxious for a chance to help themselves. We believe the United States should seize this opportunity for a mutually beneficial program. Such a program offers hope to the people of the United States and the free world that we can in due course cope with our world-wide economic problems before we are overcome by internal or external attack or by the strain of arming against attack.

Communism has spread by exploiting the very real conditions of want which exist for the vast majority of people in the underdeveloped countries and for the sizable group of underprivileged in certain developed countries such as France and Italy. The sound way to combat the Communist advance is for the free world to meet it squarely with a positive program to cut the ground from under its feet.

Fortunately, the free world has already made a successful start on such a positive program through the activities of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, the United States point 4 program and the Colombo program of the commonwealth. We have learned through experience with the European recovery program and in Latin America how to apply the techniques of mutual aid and self-help so that the contribution we make in personnel and dollars can result in lasting benefits. The technical-assistance program is one that allows those who have skills and who have profited from the atmosphere of a free society to share those skills with others who have not had these opportunities.

The league is concerned that the technical-assistance program go forward as much as possible through the U. N. We realize some of the limitations of such a program progressing on a multilateral scale, but the league believes that the advantages outweigh the disadvantages. Maximum use of

the United Nations is efficient use of American money as it means sharing with other countries the burden of providing funds, equipment, technicians, and training facilities. Maximum use of United Nations also has the advantage of counteracting the deep fear of recipient countries of exploitation by the economically developed countries. The Congress and those who administer technical-aid programs should look with foresight to the increased use of the U. N. in carrying out these programs. It is gratifying that the rehabilitation programs for Korea and the Arab refugees are to be carried out through the United Nations. I emphasize the United Nations here because the league believes that the foundation of United States foreign policy lies in supporting and strengthening the United Nations whenever we can. Without such an international body there is little possibility of maintaining international order.

Our success in maintaining the rearmament effort over the necessary period of years will depend directly on the success of the economic effort of the free world. Furthermore, not only the rearmament effort but the present and future prosperity of the industrialized regions depends on the markets and raw materials of the underdeveloped regions, which are in turn dependent on us. We see the interrelationship of these programs to the extent that one cannot succeed without the fulfillment of the other two.

One of the most difficult questions which the Congress must face in connection with this mutual-security legislation is what is a sound division of funds and materials between the arms program and economic program. We fear there may be a tendency to sacrifice economic aid to the more obvious needs for military aid. We believe this would be short-sighted and in the long run perhaps disastrous. The importance of economic aid has been expressed by our members again and again, and I want to emphasize this to the committee.

The league is well aware of the strains which the rearmament effort is putting on the American economy with the consequent danger of inflation. In the modern world the price level is not merely a domestic concern. Inflation here produces repercussions throughout the free world. Our members have been active in urging the Executive and the Congress to support a firm program to control inflation, particularly stressing the need for a pay-as-we-go tax program, credit controls and reductions in nonessential Government expenditures. At the same time we are convinced that the United States must continue to fulfill its collective security obligations under the United Nations Charter and such regional arrangements as the North Atlantic Treaty. In the long run a collective system of defense will be less costly to the United States as well as offering the world its best chance of deterring aggression.

In summary, the League of Women Voters is supporting military aid to implement the North Atlantic Treaty, continuance of the European recovery program and assistance to underdeveloped countries. We are emphasizing the importance of the economic-assistance programs and full use of U. N. agencies wherever possible.

We believe that the goal of world peace is to be won only through cooperative effort. We are convinced that United States leadership is imperative if this cooperative effort is to succeed. Finally, we know that United States leadership is the responsibility of every American citizen. The League of Women Voters, a citizens' organization concerned with Government's role in national and international affairs, assures the Congress of its active and concerted support for these three programs of United States foreign policy. We ask that the bill which your committee reports make adequate authorization for their support.

Protection Needed at Noyo Harbor, Calif.**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article from the Press-Democrat, published at Santa Rosa, Calif., under the date of July 15, 1951, entitled "Fort Bragg Fishermen Stand To Lose \$750,000 This Year."

Next month the tuna and albacore season begins, and due to hazardous conditions at Noyo Harbor, located near the city of Fort Bragg, the fishing industry there expects to lose an estimated \$750,000 worth of business. This revenue is derived from the larger fishing boats that ply the waters off northern California during the tuna and albacore season, and in the past have accounted for 75 percent of the business in this type of fish conducted at Noyo. This revenue will be lost because the skippers of these boats have served notice they will not enter Noyo Harbor this year.

The skippers still remember what happened last year when considerable damage was inflicted upon their craft by the heavy seas buffeting across the unprotected harbor.

The hazardous conditions at Noyo Harbor have accounted for a great deal of damage to expensive equipment, bodily injury—and even loss of life. The risk is so great that marine insurance companies refuse to insure equipment operating from this harbor, or set the rate so high that it is prohibitive.

There is a permanent investment of \$2,751,500 represented in fishing vessels, riverside production and distribution facilities at Noyo Harbor. During 1950 value of the fish harvest to meet civilian consumer demands and requirements of the military was set at \$8,500,000. This harbor is the only haven for fishing boats and smaller craft along a 200-mile stretch of rugged, stormy coast line.

A project to construct a breakwater to protect Noyo Harbor was recommended by the Corps of Engineers many years ago. Congress authorized the project 8 years ago, but no funds have been allocated. I have been informed by the Corps of Engineers that the cost of constructing a model breakwater and subjecting it to the necessary tests would amount to some \$25,000.

I have called the necessity for this project to the attention of the Senate Subcommittee on Army Civilian Functions, requesting the desired allocation if additional funds are recommended for new projects. If favorable action develops, the dangerous threats to the economic welfare of a multimillion dollar fishing industry will be greatly diminished.

The article citing the loss which the fishing industry at Fort Bragg faces due

to existent conditions at their harbor is as follows:

**FORT BRAGG FISHERMEN STAND TO LOSE
\$750,000 THIS YEAR**

(By Edwin F. Davis)

The tuna and albacore season begins next month, and the Fort Bragg fishing industry expects to lose \$750,000 worth of business due to silting of Noyo Harbor.

Already skippers of large tuna boats, which range almost the length of the west coast and account for 75 percent of Noyo's tuna and albacore business, have given notice they can't risk entering the harbor this year.

Still fresh in their minds is the densely packed harbor of a year ago, when white-crested waves broke across the unprotected harbor entrance and buffeted the fishing boats, causing thousands of dollars in damage.

Heavy rains have carried silt down the Noyo River, depositing it near the harbor entrance. Stormy seas, in turn, have beaten the silt back into the channel entrance and alongside the fishing-plant docks on the north bank of the river.

Louis Cavallini, manager of one of the six fisheries and chairman of the Noyo Harbor District Board of Commissioners, comments:

"We tie boats alongside the dock and keep the propellers whirling to churn out a channel which fishing boats can use to come alongside without keeling over."

"It has got so bad they can't berth at low water, but have to come in at high tide."

Noyo Harbor is one of several in the redwood empire which is gradually silting in due to the lack of periodic dredging by the Corps of Engineers.

The corps' deputy chief of civil works for rivers and harbors explained in a letter to the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors, referring to Bodega Bay and its \$550,000 of annual fish production: "Maintenance of navigation facilities for recreational craft, where the benefits are of a local nature, or for small volume of general commerce, under present conditions must be deferred."

The west-coast fishing industry, which in California alone exceeds New England's, would dispute the word "recreational" as an accurate description of Bodega Bay, which handles upward of 600 fishing vessels during salmon season, of the Petaluma River, with its multimillion-dollar industry depending on large traffic, or of Noyo Harbor, with its \$2,751,500 permanent investment in permanent fishing vessels and river-side production and distribution facilities; and its \$8,550,000 of fish harvested in 1950 for civilian and Armed Forces use.

There are two other projects, in addition to the crucially needed dredging, which Noyo Harbor fishermen and fish processors believe highly important to future operations of the industry.

1. The harbor district seeks a Government loan to dredge a mooring basin upstream from the present channel, which ends 0.6 of a mile above the harbor entrance. The loan would be repaid in 10 years, from mooring rental receipts. Mr. Cavallini points out that the law forbids impeding a navigable channel, but now fishermen have no alternative, despite the danger of fire or storm damage in a heavily crowded and unprotected harbor.

2. A federally constructed breakwater, anchored to a rocky cliff extending seaward on the south side of the harbor entrance. This project was recommended by the Corps of Engineers a decade ago and Congress authorized it 8 years ago, but has not allocated funds.

Ray Welch, secretary of the Fort Bragg fishermen's Union, cites a half dozen wrecks which have occurred within the past several years due to the absence of a breakwater. Only last November the \$65,000 fishing vessel *Del Monte* crashed against rocks south

of the harbor entrance, a total loss, as it attempted to navigate the jetty mouth in heavy seas.

The Corps of Engineers estimated the cost of the breakwater project at \$600,000 in 1940. Since then, the cost has roughly doubled, but the value of boats has trebled and the cost of repairing them is four times what it was 11 years ago.

Members of the Noyo fishing industry consider their projects not only important to them and to the community's prosperity, but also to the Nation as a whole.

Is not plentiful food necessary in peace or war? they ask. They add that Noyo Harbor, the only haven for fishing boats and other small craft along a 200-mile stretch of coast between Humboldt and Bodega Bays, was also headquarters for a Navy sea-rescue unit during World War II.

Let's Stay Strong**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. JOHN A. WHITAKER**

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. WHITAKER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "Let's Stay Strong," appearing in the Park City Daily News, Bowling Green, Ky., on July 2, 1951:

It took a long, long time, but at last we are on the road to achieving universal military training. Although some 18½-year-olds (and some parents) may disagree, that's the most important news, in the new manpower draft bill just signed by President Truman.

To be sure, a lot has to happen before UMT becomes an actuality.

First off, a five-member National Security Training Committee will have to get to work and spell out the details of operation. The committee has to make its report to Congress sometime within the next 4 months, and it has to have the endorsement of the Secretary of Defense.

After that, the Armed Services Committees of each House will have 45 more days to mull over the details. Then comes the debate on the floor. As has happened before, of course, the argument could go on forever without getting anywhere. But Senator RUSSELL, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, promises action will be speedy once the supporting legislation needed for UMT is ready.

There is one other hitch. Even after the law is passed, UMT will not go into operation until the President or Congress decides it is no longer necessary to draft men under 19 to keep our authorized armed strength. The experts in Washington seem to think this means UMT will take a back seat until the Korean war is over, an observation which could mean anything, since nobody knows what the next move in Korea will be.

Nevertheless, it's an historic step. Now that nearly everybody seems to agree we ought to have UMT, it makes sound sense that we build the foundations for it carefully.

The administration began urging it back in 1946. The American Legion says it's been urging UMT ever since the end of World War I. And Secretary of Defense Marshall goes back much further. "The objective of a universally shared obligation for the defense of our country," he points out, "is now within our grasp for the first time since George

Washington began the pursuit of this goal a century and a half ago."

Whether it took 5 years, 32 or 150, another 5 months or so does not really matter. UMT seems destined to be part of American life for quite a while.

The important thing now is to put UMT together in such fashion, to quote General Marshall again, that "it will permit us thereafter to continue strong militarily in keeping with our great purpose of promoting peace in the world."

Mutual Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I enclose herewith a statement by the Reverend Thomas B. Keehn, legislative representative, Council for Social Action, Congregational Christian Churches. Reverend Keehn particularly directs attention to the importance of the point 4 program. I agree with the idea that point 4 should be kept clearly defined. This article is worthy of careful consideration:

STATEMENT OF REV. THOMAS B. KEEHN, LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE, COUNCIL FOR SOCIAL ACTION, CONGREGATIONAL CHRISTIAN CHURCHES, BEFORE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JULY 23, 1951

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Thomas B. Keehn, and my address is 1751 N Street NW, Washington, D. C. I am appearing before your committee today to testify on behalf of the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches with respect to the mutual-security program. My position with the Council for Social Action is legislative secretary. The council is composed of a board of 18 persons elected by the general council of the Congregational Christian Churches, which is the representative body of our 8,000 churches and 1,100,000 members. The Council for Social Action has been given the responsibility by the general council of helping the individual churches make the Christian gospel more effective in society in the areas of international relations, race relations, and economic affairs. I should like to make clear, at this point, that according to our policy each individual church and each national board speaks only for itself. In my capacity as a witness today I am, therefore, speaking only for the Council for Social Action.

I am also authorized to state that another body of the Congregational Christian denomination, the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, has recently expressed its approval of the point 4 program as an essential part of America's foreign economic policy. The American board has carried on a program of education, social welfare, industrial and vocational development, and medical care for more than 140 years. This program, which involved expenditures of more than \$1,800,000 during the last fiscal year, has always been centered primarily in the so-called underdeveloped areas of the world.

In a letter dated July 19, 1951, addressed to me, Dr. Ronald Bridges, president of the American board, stated:

"I am interested and gratified to learn that you are to appear before the House Foreign Affairs Committee in its hearings on the mutual security program.

"You know of the great concern that is being evidenced by the various foreign boards of our churches, especially in connection with the point 4 program, and I want to be sure that you have the action recently taken by the prudential committee of the American board on this matter. Enclosed you will find a copy which you may use as you see fit in the presentation of your testimony."

The resolution referred to by Dr. Bridges reads as follows in sections particularly relevant to this testimony:

"That approval in substance be given to the findings of a special consultation on the churches' relations to peoples in underdeveloped areas of the world held at Buck Hill Falls, April 24-26, 1951, as a guide to the staff in dealing with the immediate proposals before them and as a basis for the formulation of a long-range policy for the American board.

"That officers and missionaries of the American board be asked to interpret to individuals and churches the fundamental humanitarian principle of sharing which is at the heart of the point 4 program, to the end that, progressively, popular support and congressional support of the point 4 program may be forthcoming."

This convergence of interest of the American board and the Council for Social Action is, we believe, a happy and significant development. It indicates a widespread interest within the churches in the kind of program to aid in the economic and social development of the underdeveloped areas which is symbolized by point 4. Growing out of generations of practical experience of the American board in the foreign-mission field, and the interest of the Council for Social Action in foreign policy, this program—point 4—represents something which we believe should be in the forefront of American foreign policy.

One personal word may be appropriate here. At the request of the Division of Foreign Missions of the National Council of Churches, I was released from my present responsibility for the 8-month period, October 1950 to June 1951, to make a special study of the relationship of missions to the point 4 program. The Division of Foreign Missions represents the major Protestant missions boards. As has been stated on many occasions by both churchmen and political leaders, foreign missions pioneered in developing the point 4 idea. Particularly in the fields of health, education, and agriculture these religious agencies have been concerned with basic human and social needs of people in the underdeveloped areas, as well as in their moral and spiritual welfare. One of the activities carried on during this period of service for the Division of Foreign Missions of the National Council of Churches was to assist in the planning and carrying out of a 3-day consultation on the churches' relation to peoples in underdeveloped areas. This meeting was attended by 125 leaders of Protestant missions and social-action agencies. I am sending to each member of the committee a copy of the report of this consultation entitled "The American Churches and Overseas Development Programs." This document represents a realistic appraisal of the needs and obstacles to economic and social development in the underdeveloped area and the motivations and principles which must guide a program of this kind if it is to be successful.

As is apparent from this background, we are particularly interested in the provisions of the proposal before this committee relating to the economic aid of the more than 1,000,000,000 people who live in the under-

developed areas of the world. This part of the foreign-aid program represents expenditures of approximately \$500,000,000. We are not at all opposed to the larger items requested for economic aid to Europe and military aid to the free world. In fact the Council for Social Action has on several occasions supported both of these programs. We do not feel qualified to speak about the details or amounts requested for either of these activities. It might be appropriate to express the hope that in the European economic-aid program, the original purpose of the Marshall plan will not be lost because of the new conditions occasioned by the rearmament program. Certainly some adjustment will be called for, but no military program in Europe can be achieved or even made palatable to the people unless there is a sound and continuing improvement in the program of economic development in the European nations.

About the program of economic and social development in the underdeveloped areas, we do have several specific comments.

First we would like to emphasize the strategic and long-term importance of this program of economic and social development in the underdeveloped areas. Here we agree with the thesis developed by the report of the International Development Advisory Board and by Mr. Nelson Rockefeller in his testimony before this committee. The report of the Churches and Overseas Development stated:

"In the past man has lacked the physical capacity either to destroy his kind by the tens of millions or to lessen measurably the misery and squalor which too often were an accepted condition of their daily existence. That is no longer true.

"Today man has developed scientific instruments which are easily capable of crippling civilization as we knew it. But he has also developed knowledge and techniques which for the first time make systematic social and economic progress a possibility not only for the citizens of a few nations but for most of mankind.

"The poverty and social disorder which afflict so much of the world are ancient and persistent evils. Their eradication will not be a matter of years, or even of decades. The problem is vast and complex, the misery pervasive, the causes intertangled. But a road toward a better lot for the people of these areas has become increasingly visible in the private, governmental, and inter-governmental development programs which have been launched or proposed since the end of the Second World War. The philosophy behind these programs has become familiar to Americans as the point 4 concept.

"If the point 4 concept is not vigorously applied, a series of degenerative wars appears to be almost inevitable. But if the concept is given full support, the result can be a more wholesome and secure world for our children than their parents have ever known."

Thus we want a point 4 program that is clearly identified, that is in the spotlight, that is a central and permanent part of American foreign policy. That is, from our point of view, a weakness of the proposal before you. Point 4 functions are scattered throughout the four titles of the document. It takes some arithmetic and a skillful detective to locate the pieces which, when put together, spell point 4. We believe that point 4 should be, at the very least, a separate title in an over-all foreign-aid bill. At present it is lost amidst military and temporary economic programs. This is a major weakness, a weakness which will be misunderstood particularly by the more than 1,000,000,000 people who live in the underdeveloped areas. Because military and economic aid are so mixed, it may be believed in some countries that they must take the military aid in order to qualify for the eco-

nomie. And this will produce tension, perhaps resentment, in the underdeveloped areas where the spirit of political independence is as potent as the economic and social needs of the people are widespread.

Secondly, we are concerned with the magnitude and administration of the program. Point 4 has become a generic term. It is a symbol. It has a long history in government as well as among private agencies. At the present time there are at least two major point 4 programs carried on by the United States Government—one under the aegis of the Technical Cooperation Administration of the Department of State and the other under ECA, particularly its Special Economic Missions in Southeast Asia and its program in the Dependent Overseas Territories of Africa. According to the report of the Rockefeller International Development Advisory Board, all of these activities taken together accounted for the expenditure of nearly \$300,000,000 in fiscal 1951. ECA programs in the underdeveloped areas differ somewhat from TCA activities in that the former supplies some grants and materials as well as technicians. But they are all point 4 in the broadest sense. Presumably the \$500,000,000 listed as economic aid to the underdeveloped areas in the draft now before you represents a continuation and enlargement of this program although we have not seen a country by country break-down. At any rate we strongly believe that the amount of \$500,000,000 for technical assistance and economic and social development in the underdeveloped areas is a reasonable amount for the next fiscal year. It should be approved. This is the amount recommended by both the Gray and Rockefeller reports.

To administer such a program effectively, the operations now carried on by TCA and the ECA underdeveloped areas functions, should be combined into a single administrative unit. Probably this should be a division of ECA with clearly defined responsibilities and authority. This division could then become the nucleus of a single independent overseas economic administration as recommended in many private and public studies of the problem. The functions of this agency could be clarified as experience dictated. But at least here we would have the beginning of the kind of permanent, independent overseas economic agency which appears to be so desperately needed.

Incidentally, reports from certain parts of the world indicate that in each country there should be much more effective coordination of the various United States programs—economic, information, and military—than now exists.

Thirdly, we believe that there should be the maximum use of voluntary agencies in the point 4 program. This was the intent of Congress as expressed in the Act for International Development, adopted last year. At the planning stage in advisory relationships, both here and in the field, and in the actual administration of certain projects, we believe that the aims and purposes of point 4 can best be fulfilled by use of voluntary agencies of all kinds.

A fourth and final concern which we would like to stress is related to the direction in which the program should move. For example, church agencies generally feel that increasing use should be made of the United Nations and the specialized agencies in technical assistance and economic-development programs. Especially as long-term, large-scale development projects are undertaken, financial and investment programs under U. N. aegis will help avoid possible charges of imperialism and thereby serve America's real interests. For this reason we support the proposals in the Rockefeller report for an International Development Authority and an International Finance Corporation, both related to the International Bank for Reconstruction which is a U. N. agency. Congress

would serve the United States and the U. N. well by initiating steps to get these new programs started. At best, several years will be required, and now is not too soon to begin. In the meantime, we have made an investigation of technical-assistance programs now carried on by the U. N. and the specialized agencies. We believe they fulfill an important function and could be expanded. United States contributions of approximately 10 percent of current appropriations for technical assistance and economic development in the underdeveloped areas could be usefully employed by the U. N.

Church agencies and members appear to be committed to the point 4 idea carried on by the United States and U. N. with greater enthusiasm than anything else in the last decade with the possible exception of the establishment of the U. N. itself. With their world-wide organization, they are prepared to carry on programs of education and assistance in the grass roots of America and the rice roots of Asia. They believe that this is a program which must be supported by citizens and by the Government for the long pull—for at least the next 50 years. Point 4 must go on when—in fact especially when—the military-aid programs decrease. Point 4 can become a kind of twentieth-century emancipation for the billion and more people, largely colored, who are enslaved by poverty, ignorance, disease, misgovernment, and disintegrating social orders in the underdeveloped areas of the world. It can become a road to peace along which mankind may walk forward into the sunrise of a better tomorrow.

No Need for Oil Price Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, the following article was clipped from a recent issue of the Independent Petroleum Association of America.

The price of oil has advanced less than 1 percent, according to this article, since the Korean war began. In contrast with other items, this is practically no advance at all. Under these circumstances, there certainly is no rhyme or reason, no excuse whatever, for arbitrary regulations and directives attempting to regulate the prices of crude oil and its products.

Following is the article, which shows that there is no need for oil price controls:

ON PRICE CONTROL

Government statistics show that oil prices are being frozen in the face of steady increases in other prices and costs. The United States Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that wholesale prices of all commodities have increased 17 percent since the beginning of the Korean war. Farm-products prices are up 22 percent; foods, 16 percent; textiles, 35 percent; metals, 10 percent; building materials, 13 percent; chemicals, 26 percent. In contrast, the price of crude petroleum, as a result of minor adjustments, has increased less than 1 percent.

The facts show that price-control authorities are following a course that threatens to repeat the discriminatory and unsound actions as to oil prices taken during World War II. These actions during the last war

greatly depressed oil prices in relation to the other prices and the rising costs of finding, developing, and producing crude oil. As a result of OPA policies, our reserve producing capacity was dissipated and the American consumers suffered the hardships of temporary oil shortages in 1947 and 1948. The Nation cannot afford to repeat these mistakes by following unrealistic price policies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Federal agencies concerned with petroleum be urged to recognize the disparity between oil prices and the price of other commodities and avoid discriminatory and inequitable price actions that would threaten the future of supplies upon which this Nation's security depends.

The Other Cheek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. MCGUIRE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the Record a thoughtful editorial from the Meriden (Conn.) Morning Record of July 20:

THE OTHER CHEEK

The imprisonment of William Oatis in Prague diminishes again the number of western newsmen behind the iron curtain. At present there are less than a score trying valiantly to cover events in the vast area of Communist Europe. Six of these are in Moscow. Prague is now without any coverage at all, except what is phoned out for the UP by a Czech national, who, incidentally, must be a very bad insurance risk at the moment, and the daily dispatches of two United States embassy representatives.

In this country, on the other hand, Communist newspapermen are going about their business without let or hindrance. Tass reported, undoubtedly in glowing terms, a peace rally in Chicago at which a number of notorious Communists kicked the Red gong around. Newsmen for Russian publications as well as for the Daily Worker and indigenous pink-tinted sheets have equal chance with reputable democratic papers for Government press meetings and releases, and can still prowling about the Pentagon waiting for the breeze to blow loose sheets of paper their way.

There has been no official protest, nor is there likely to be, about the peculiar yardstick which governs the orientation of Red-reported news stories. Ordinary newsmen report the facts of their stories as conscientiously as they are able and, given a chance to editorialize, disagree violently about the conclusions. Communist newsmen live in happy harmony. If something benefits Uncle Joe it is a good thing. If it militates against his interests it is a bad thing. When a Communist newsmen digs out a story closer to espionage than anything William Oatis ever approached, which has happened more than once, we berate ourselves for our stupidity in letting him get the information, not the reporter for his spying.

Anyone who doubts that western democracy is founded on Christian principles should take a sharp look at this policy of turning the other cheek. Our policy has always been, and should always be, to keep the avenues of information as open as possible, even though they are temporarily one-way streets and though Red reporters give wrong reports of their turnings.

Like most of the Christian precepts, it is good common sense as well as good religion. For the people who read the Communist newspapers, knowing how western reporters have fared in their own countries, must be struck by the freedom which permits our news to reach them. More important still, the people of free countries and countries aspiring to freedom see and judge the two news policies. It is an example of democracy in action that no amount of propaganda can distort.

Income-Tax Exemptions for Certain Military Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, Congress has delayed in many instances in adopting legislative measures of benefit to the Armed Forces performing so valiantly in Korea. A dramatic incident concerning a Veterans' Administration hospital refusing treatment to a wounded Korean veteran was needed to accomplish the passage of a medical-benefits bill for veterans of Korea. To date, no action has been taken by Congress to increase the monthly pay of service personnel in combat zones. It is shameful that no impetus has been supplied by the leadership to attain this worthy objective.

I hope that no such delay will affect the provisions of the bill I introduced today to continue tax exemptions for servicemen and women in combat zones. The present authority for such exemption expires on December 31 and should be reenacted as soon as possible. I have tried to correct one inequity in the present law and trust that the Committee on Ways and Means will favorably consider its adoption.

Under the authority granted by Congress, income-tax exemptions for members of the Armed Forces covers the entire compensation of enlisted personnel and \$200 monthly compensation for officers. The exemption applies only to compensation paid during the months served in the combat zone as designated by the President under Executive Order No. 10195.

The present exemption fails to provide for members of the Armed Forces who are hospitalized elsewhere as a result of wounds or sickness incurred in the combat zone. It is this contingency that I wish to have included in the law. The meager compensation now granted should be tax-exempt while the member of the armed services is confined to a hospital, whether it be in the United States or Japan. Certainly the period during which a wounded or sick soldier is hospitalized should be considered as one of active service. My bill provides that the exemption shall apply only to hospitalization necessitated through service in the combat zone.

Let us keep the faith with those who have kept faith with us. This would be little enough to compensate the fighting men in Korea for their defense of freedom. It is essential that Congress not allow this very small benefit to lapse through inaction.

Radio Speech in Regard to Legislation Introduced by Hon. Frank L. Chelf, of Kentucky, With Respect to Indecent Molestation or Sexual Abuse of a Minor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK L. CHELF

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over WHAS, Louisville, Ky., on July 22, 1951, and WGN, Chicago, Ill., on July 24, 1951:

Ladies and gentlemen, first, I want to thank Mr. Quaal, of WHAS, for inviting my old friend and former House colleague, the Honorable EVERETT DIRKSEN, that great United States Senator from Illinois, and myself to discuss with you tonight the all-important subject of the urgent need for Federal legislation to protect our children from the sex criminal and the peddler of narcotics. Senator DIRKSEN and I have each introduced bills in the Senate and the House, respectively, which would provide penalties of life imprisonment or death to those furnishing narcotics to a minor.

Inasmuch as I have also introduced a bill in the House to provide severe penalties for those who would ravish our children, I will, therefore, confine my remarks to that particular phase of this discussion, leaving the question of the sale of narcotics to my able and good friend, Senator DIRKSEN.

My friends, the tenth amendment to the Constitution prevents a Nation-wide, uniform Federal law pertaining to sex criminals. The tenth amendment reserves to the individual State legislatures all general police power. In other words, if we are to have adequate laws for the protection of our people, they must be enacted by the States. This is known as States' rights.

There are only two courses of action to be followed in seeking a Federal law to prevent sex crimes against children. One is to attempt to amend the Federal Constitution. However, during the past 162 years there have been 4,468 attempts to amend the Constitution, and, as you know, only 22 have been successful, since we have today just 22 existing amendments. This course, then, appeared impractical.

The second possibility to be explored is to amend the United States Code to include penalties for a flight across a State line to avoid prosecution on a charge of sexual abuse of children. I am trying to do this with my bill.

In the present Lindbergh law the Federal Government has jurisdiction only in cases where the kidnaper flees across a State line. This law has almost stopped kidnapping. My bill regarding the sex criminal is patterned after this law.

I have been informed that recent figures of aggravated assault and rape throughout the country reached the shocking total of over 93,000—during a 12-month period.

Broken down, this means 250 criminal assaults per day—or approximately 10 such violations against our citizens every single hour. These facts alone graphically point up the desperate need for both State and Federal legislation for the protection of our children against the sex pervert.

During the past 20 years that I have practiced law, I have had first-hand knowledge in the prosecution and defense of almost every known crime on the statute books. Ten of my twenty years were spent as prosecuting attorney. As a result, it has been my experience that 75 percent of all criminals commit crimes willfully and maliciously. It is my contention, therefore, that the greatest deterrent to a potential violator of the law, is the definite knowledge that a stiff penalty awaits him.

I cannot agree with some that practically all sex offenders are mentally deficient, and as a result, not responsible for their acts, no more than I can agree that every person charged with murder is insane. Dr. Val B. Satterfield, assistant professor of psychiatry at Washington University School of Medicine at St. Louis, stated that the sex criminal is basically no different from a thief in that he takes what he wants without the consideration of the rights of others.

My friends, I am willing to concede that approximately 25 percent of sex crimes are committed by those who are mentally deficient, but this should not excuse them for their acts of violence against our children. What is needed, and I shall do my utmost to help provide it—is the enactment of legislation for the construction of a new modern Federal psychiatric hospital staffed with the best psychiatrists, in order to treat and cure these sex deviates. But in the name of heaven, we must keep them incarcerated during their treatment so that they cannot stalk our highways, streets, and alleys looking for new victims amongst our youth.

Folks, I do not profess to have all of the answers to this grave problem but this, I think all can agree, action is needed now to (1) provide laws that sting to the quick the 75 percent of these criminals who willfully seek out our children to perform their depraved acts, and (2) provide adequate Government hospitals to cure that 25 percent of those mentally deficient criminals. I am supported in this assertion by none other than the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, of the FBI, who recently said: "If existing State statutes do not provide for * * * psychiatric treatment [of sex deviates] * * * then it is time to pass such a law."

Ladies and gentlemen, a recent news story stated that a sex criminal charged with raping a little 9-year-old girl was so severely beaten by the other inmates in the jail that he had to be placed in a separate cell. Yes; his act was so despicable that other hardened criminals could not "stomach" what he had done.

The Cleveland Plain Dealer had this to say, editorially, about my proposed legislation: "No crime deserves punishment more swiftly and surely than a sex crime against a child. Violation of the body of a child is so ghastly, it sickens us as citizens. Congressman CHELF may have the answer. * * * CHELF's idea, though drastic, makes sense because the situation is drastic."

Ladies and gentlemen, I notice that my time is about up. Therefore, in conclusion, let me summarize by saying that I am trying to protect our children from sex perverts, and where there is now no Federal law upon the subject, my bill would make it a penalty of from 10 to 20 years for the first offense and for the second offense—life imprisonment or possible death.

Thank God, Senator DIRKSEN, there's no politics where our children are concerned. You pass your narcotic bill in the Senate and I hereby promise to support it vigorously when it comes to the House.

Our Town: A Modern Sodom**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, it may stand us in hand to take stock at home, to determine whether our town, our home city, or place of residence is a modern Sodom. There may be more corruption and maladministration at home than we realize. Not all of the corruption is in Washington, D. C., the National Capital, bad as that may be. By and large, the Government at Washington, in my humble opinion, largely reflects the conditions of our local government at home. Is our town a modern Sodom? If it is, a heavy responsibility rests upon each of us to do something about it. Each of us may be a contributing cause to this bad situation, and each of us owes a responsibility to ourselves our generation, and to future generations, to attempt to see that our town is no longer a modern Sodom.

The following article is a sermon by Ira W. Langston, minister of the Park Avenue Christian Church in New York City, delivered a few months ago, and which I copy from the Christian-Evangelist of April 4, 1951:

OUR TOWN: A MODERN SODOM

Some of our boys will die today on the sides of mountains and in the marshlands of Korea. Most of them will die in a pursuit that they had no desire to follow and be buried in a land that they had no desire to see. Why is this thing happening to the sons of our flesh?

It is true that most of the men in our Armed Forces had no desire to grow up and be soldiers and sailors and marines. The military has never been a glamorous profession in our country. It is true that most of them had no desire to see Korea. Korea is a small country in the Far East that has never been dramatized to the public in our country. Why then, are these sons of ours dying on the battlefields of Korea?

Our boys are dying in Korea today because we have come to a period in world history when most of us believe that the nations of the free world will stand or fall together. We want to have our part in maintaining the free world. There is an element of nobility in the stand that our boys are making in Korea today.

But most of our boys have been told that it is necessary for them to fight in Korea today in order that our way of life be maintained here in this country. Our boys are dying on the battlefields of Korea in order to maintain our way of life.

I hope to God that those from our city have not been able to get and read the local newspapers during these recent weeks. Are you aware of the story that the front pages of papers have been telling recently about our way of life?

We have been told that hoodlums and racketeers have been buying and paying members of our police force for protection while they gorged their greedy souls on the filthy money that they have illegally bilked from the people of our community.

We have been told on the front pages of our papers that some of the public servants in whose care we have intrusted the safe-

keeping of our homes against the ravages of fire, have been guilty of graft and the misappropriation of funds.

We have been told that dope peddlers, than whom there surely must be no lower form of human life, have been exploiting the children in our schools and on the streets of our city.

We have been told that even the exterminating contracts of our public schools have been turned over to a pack of vermin who care more for unearned money than they do for the health and welfare of our children.

We have been told that some of the basketball heroes of our local colleges have been approached and appropriated by gamblers who care nothing for the prospects for the future of our bright young men, who scorn the noble traditions of our distinguished educational institutions, who if you please, make a laughing stock of our boys in Korea who are dying for our way of life.

We have been told on the front pages of our newspapers in these recent days, that Ambassador William O'Dwyer knew how to stop the hoodlums and gangsters from interfering with the war effort when he was a general in the Army, but they did not tell us why he did not know how to stop these same unscrupulous characters from sabotaging the peacetime democracy of our city while he was mayor of our town.

Indeed we have been told so much about the symptoms of rottenness that have been exposing themselves in our city during these recent days, that it is not too much to presume that this community which you and I call home, is fundamentally rotten to the core.

It is because of this that the basketball scandal suggested the parallel to me between our town and the ancient Sodom, which God looked upon with such outrage because of its immorality that he rained fire and brimstone from Heaven upon her. Sodom was destroyed because there were not 10 righteous men in the city. How much lower must we go before God must deal with us in this same cauterizing fashion?

Let us face it, my friends. The moral temperature of a city must reach a low estate before general corruption becomes a matter of public knowledge. In a city where the moral temperature of the citizenry is high, there is not likely to be a scandal in the police department, the fire department, the educational system, and the college institutions, all at the same time. This is not just a matter of a few individuals who have lost their sense of moral and ethical judgment. These are symptoms of fundamental rottenness. This is possible only when the moral temper of the whole community is sufficiently low that it can tolerate such things. And for us, you and me, for us to allow the moral temperature of our community to get so low at the very time that we are asking our boys to fight and die for our way of life is a matter that is shocking indeed.

We have shrugged our shoulders too long at things that we have known about our city that brought us shame. But the very attitude that we can shrug these things off is one of the very causes that make it possible for them to exist. You cannot build a good community out of bad people, and bad people can never take over and run a good community. They can't do so for long. Either the good people will turn in righteous indignation and spew the vermin out or they will adjust to their presence and partake of their violence and vulgarity.

Now, New York is different. It is a big city. It is difficult to know and accept the responsibilities of citizenship in New York. It is much easier to move into a house behind the isolation of doormen and accept the protection of the altitude and the elevator men. But this will not spare our children from dope while they are at school or on the

street. It will not make safe a city that allows graft and pollution in its departments of protection and safety.

Some time ago I was talking to a young woman student who was here in this country from Tibet. She and I met on a college campus in central Ohio. She was homesick for New York. I could not understand why. "I like New York better than any other place in the United States," she said, "because everyone in New York is a displaced person." Do you see what she means? She is telling us that we all hide from our proper responsibilities as citizens here. We just dwell here for the time being but our real home is 'way down South or way out West.

That is one of the major reasons why the lowest elements of our community can set the moral tone of our society. You can't have a good society run by bad men. Either the good people will spew out the bad or they will compromise with and partake of the immorality that abounds. In our aloofness we have chosen the latter.

Many of us have partaken of the immorality of this city in a semilawfulness of the fact that we were doing so. Let me refer again to Sodom. When the time came for Lot and Abraham to divide their flocks and separate into their own ways, Lot looked down upon the rich plains about Sodom and Gomorrah. Lot knew that Sodom and Gomorrah were wicked cities. He knew also that they were rich. Now Lot was not a bad man. Lot was a righteous man. But he saw that Sodom and Gomorrah and the plains around about were rich. So Lot chose the way of Sodom and Gomorrah. He did not choose the wicked ways. Indeed he did not even go into Sodom at first. He did not because he wanted to partake of the riches without partaking of the evil. But Lot did partake of both. And everyone who comes to New York does the same thing. New York is a rich city. It is rich with money. It is rich with opportunity. And countless of our best people from all over this Nation of ours, come annually to New York to partake of the riches in money and opportunity. But when they do so without assuming responsibility for the moral tone of our community by actively joining hands with the forces which are dedicated to maintaining a healthy moral climate, they are throwing their weight in with the scum that is leading our city and our way of life down the road to destruction. And by this very act they are calling down the perils of evil and wickedness upon all of us.

Nor is this a minor matter. The best records that I have indicate that less than 2,000,000 of our people are known and recorded as members of the Roman Catholic Church of our city. Less than 700,000 Jews are known and counted by the synagogues of our city, and less than 600,000 Protestants are known and recorded by the Protestant churches of our city. Less than 3,500,000 of our 8,000,000 people are even known by the religious institutions of our city. I wonder what the ratio was in Sodom before God rained fire down upon her houses and streets.

Now the best guess that I would be able to make about the number of people who are actively concerned for the religious institutions of our city would be about one-half of those whose names are recorded as members. If this is true, then out of 8,000,000 souls, we have less than 2,000,000 who are doing anything recognizable to maintain and extend a safe moral standard of living in New York City through her religious institutions.

This is not to apologize for the churches and synagogues either. Even 2,000,000 people who were genuinely dedicated to the idea that our community would be a fit place to live would have made a better record than we have seen written. But these 2,000,000 are too often concerned about their differences of opinion about what happened in the first century and have no time or energy to

act in concert on what is happening in New York today.

This is not an apology for the religious institutions of our town. If they had been fulfilling their function they would have observed and challenged the community before this cesspool of iniquity had erupted to spill all over their beautiful temples.

We are all in this thing together. We must all face the ghost like passage of the spirits of our boys as they depart this life, having given the last full measure of their lives for "our way of life." I do not believe that they are dying to make New York safe for dope peddlers. I do not believe that they are dying to make New York a haven for the gambling rings and the racket kings.

I do not believe that they are dying so that you and I can live in safety close enough to this "Sodom" to gain the fame and riches that are here to be garnered.

I do not believe that you and I can face God and the memories of these and others who have died for the defense of this land if we acquiesce in the perpetuation of the unholiness of this establishment which is our city.

Well, what can we do?

In the first place, I would like to shout into the ear of every self-respecting citizen of this city, who is not in the place of worship of his choice and say, "Go down to our jails this afternoon and say a word of greeting to your partners who have been accepting bribes for throwing basketball games." They are your partners for you are helping sustain a city where that kind of thing has been winked at and jested about for years.

After that, go down to Bellevue Hospital and ask to see some of the young dope fiends that you have helped to create. You did help because you have felt that it is enough for you to live in a city and refuse to use dope yourself. That is not enough. A democratic city is the responsibility of all her citizens, and when dope is peddled freely among the youngsters of that city, it is peddled because the good people allow it. Good people cannot live in isolation and insulated against the realities of community life.

Then I would say, get on down to the temple of your choice and ask God's forgiveness for your negligence as one of His favored children. And while you are there, pledge your continued and constant support to the institutions in the community which represent and proclaim the highest moral standards that we know.

Then I would say to the churches of this city, you Roman Catholic church members, let your cardinal know that this immorality and violence outrages you. Ask him to call upon the people in power on your behalf to see that this city is cleaned up. I am embarrassed that the faculty of Bradley College in Peoria, Ill., is afraid for their boys to come to our town to play basketball. I believe that you are embarrassed, too.

I would say to the Jewish congregations of the city. Let the representatives of Judaism know that you want this city cleaned up.

To the Protestant congregations of this city I would say, call, write, or wire Mr. Pettit of the Protestant Council of the City of New York. Tell him how many citizens you represent and ask him to call upon the authorities of this city to clean it up.

To the active members of this congregation I would say, bow your heads with me as we pray God's forgiveness for the part that we have had in allowing our town to become a symbol of moral degradation and shame. Join with me also in the petition that God will lead us in the days to come to assume more fully our proper responsibilities as Christian citizens of this our chosen city.

For God has promised: "If my people who are called by my name will humble them-

selves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways, then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land."

Effects of the Manufacturers' Roll-backs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a statement I have prepared with reference to the roll-back prohibition, section 2, which was adopted by the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS, OF ILLINOIS

There has, I believe, been a great deal of misunderstanding about the actual effects of the roll-back prohibition, section 2, which was adopted by the Senate. I believe that it is now generally understood that section 2 not only cancels the two beef-cattle roll-backs proposed for August and October; it also cancels the general manufacturers' order, which was originally to take effect on May 28, was then extended until July 2, and is now being held in abeyance pending final congressional action on the question of roll-backs.

What may not be so well understood is the fact that the manufacturers' regulation not only involves price roll-backs; it also involves price roll-forwards for those manufacturers whose cost increases advanced faster than their prices by the time the general price freeze of January 25 caught them. Such manufacturers are depending on the various manufacturers' regulations to bring them relief, but the relief will not come unless the House-Senate conference allows these manufacturers' regulations to go into effect.

Because of the long lead-time in the machinery industry, in which contracts are often made a long time before actual delivery takes place, there were a great many cases in which costs had advanced faster than contract changes could be made. The machine-manufacturers' regulation provides, therefore, for many price roll-forwards.

In order to show how many of these firms are depending upon the manufacturers' regulations for relief, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the text of a telegram I have received from a machine manufacturer in Rockford, Ill., whose name I will withhold for reasons of privacy:

"Manufacturers who restrained their price increases as a part of voluntary price controls have been assured by OPS that they would be allowed to catch up with costs through such regulations as CPR 30. Now OPS has petulantly suspended that regulation because they have been forbidden to roll back the prices of those manufacturers who raised prices indiscriminately. This is grossly unfair to those who attempted to cooperate and can only undermine such value as there may be in price controls. Your expression of your thoughts of this to OPS will be appreciated."

OPS has not suspended CPR 30, which covers machine manufacturers, out of any petulance. Far from it, they have suspended the regulation by direction of Congress, since the stopgap extension we passed until July 31 prevents their putting CPR 30 into effect,

as will the Senate roll-back prohibition. That is why I am passing my thoughts on to my colleagues in the Congress.

There have been those who have made light of the efforts of many patriotic businessmen who responded to the Government's request for voluntary price restraint last December, and who tried to hold their prices despite some rising costs. These businessmen deserve the relief contained in such regulations as CPR 30. And while Congress has not prevented OPS from granting upward adjustments, unless it allows OPS to bring down the prices of those concerns whose prices have far outstripped their cost increases, the adjustments required will be much greater, since every price will have to be brought into line with the highest prices. It seems clear to me that this can only mean the beginning of an uncontrolled wage-price spiral.

Obligation for the Education of Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial taken from the Saturday Evening Post of July 14, 1951, entitled "Educators Should Be Warned by the Pasadena Revolt."

I recommend that all parents take an interest so as to ascertain the method of teaching their children. It is possible for children to be inculcated with ideas that are hostile to our American institutions.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATORS SHOULD BE WARNED BY THE PASADENA REVOLT
(By Frank Chodorov)

Are parents, as parents, relieved of all obligation for the education of their school-age children? Do parents, as taxpayers, have any right to express an opinion on the curriculum or teaching methods in the public schools?

These are the questions that have emerged from the now-famous Pasadena case. They are, of course, fundamental, and transcend the particular issues involved in the controversy, and the attendant passions. To see how they have come to the surface calls for a brief summary of the main events in this highly publicized controversy.

A superintendent of schools—one with a national reputation—was hired by this education-conscious California city. Immediately he began introducing changes in subject matter and teaching technique, toward the end that Pasadena might have the "best" and "most modern." Taken as a whole, the reforms followed the lines of what is called progressive education, which emphasizes the adjustment of the child to the group, rather than his development as an individual. The acquisition of knowledge, this philosophy of education holds, is of little or no importance, while the molding of the child to the social order is the principal business of modern schooling.

These ideas did not set too well with many Pasadena parents; they held to the notion that schools were for the teaching of the three R's and some other subjects which their children might find helpful. Their

dissatisfaction with the innovations came to the boiling point when the superintendent asked for a considerable boost in school taxes to meet the higher cost of progressivism. The election campaign let loose all their pent-up dissidence. The charges of socialism and communism were freely hurled at the new system, and the superintendent was excoriated for being a traitor to American tradition. The passions aroused did not subside with the overwhelming defeat of the tax proposal, but found expression in a popular demand for the removal of the superintendent.

With the resignation of the superintendent, the case should have been closed. The fact is, it seems to have started with that event, for the advocates of progressive education have taken the dismissal as a challenge to their ideas. A book-length story of the incident, in which the author gives the superintendent's side the better of it, has received laudatory reviews from highly placed educators and pamphleteers have taken up the cudgels for the superintendent and his philosophy, and against the people who deposed him. Perhaps all this agitation is due to the fear that the ousting of the superintendent, who stands high in the progressive movement, portends further set-backs in other cities where an aroused citizenry are on the march.

Putting aside the arguments for and against progressivism, the implications of the general position taken by these protagonists are: (a) parents have no competence in the field of education and therefore ought not to interfere with the experts, (b) as taxpayers they have no more right to express an opinion on how their children should be educated than a patient has a right to dictate the doctor's prescription.

Whether or not progressive education is a tool of socialism, as charged, there is no question about the socialistic character of that position. It very definitely holds that the individualistic relationship between parent and child terminates when the latter enters the public school. At that moment, it says, the child becomes a ward of the community, as far as its education is concerned, and the community, operating through its experts, must not be interfered with in the exercise of its guardianship. This is not far removed from the Spartan doctrine that the child belongs to the state and should be trained exclusively for its service.

Thus the Pasadena case has blossomed out into a fundamental moral and social question. Even if progressivism were to go back to teaching the three R's, and were to revert to the idea that the purpose of education is to prepare the child for a happy and fruitful individual life, rather than to turn out a cog for the social machine, even if there were no quarrel with what or how the teachers taught, could we, should we, accept the idea of alienation from home ties? Is it consistent with the nature of things for the mother to rid herself of all concern in the intellectual development of her offspring? Finally, is it consonant with democracy to say that the taxpayer has no voice in how his money shall be spent?

Hoover Commission Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALLAN OAKLEY HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Rec-

ORD, I include the following resolution relative to the Hoover Commission report:

HOOVER COMMISSION REPORT — RESOLUTION SPONSORED BY REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., REPUBLICAN LEADER OF THE HOUSE, AND ADOPTED BY THE REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE OF THE HOUSE, JULY 25, 1951

In time of crisis like the present, when our country is threatened by inflation from within and military conquest from without, it is of urgent importance that the Federal Government be operated with maximum efficiency. A clear course toward that end was charted by the Hoover Commission on Government Reorganization, which recommended reforms that would save an estimated \$5,400,000,000 a year.

The Hoover Commission was established by the Republican Eightieth Congress, and enactment of the Hoover report has been a steadfast goal of Republican Members. However, the present Democrat-controlled Congress has accomplished almost nothing toward putting the remaining half of the Hoover Commission recommendations into effect. Of 20 legislative proposals submitted by the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, not a single measure has been enacted. In the House of Representatives hearings have been held on only one measure. President Truman's record is even worse, of 51 reorganization plans suggested to him by the Citizens Committee, only one has been forwarded to Congress.

It is the sense of Republican Members of the House that national solvency and security demand prompt consideration of the pending Hoover report recommendations. Republican Members urge President Truman and the Democrat leadership to join them in such a united effort.

A Few Things We People Are Thinking About

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received a very interesting letter from a constituent of mine. This man lives in one of the most prosperous smaller cities of my congressional district in northeastern Oklahoma. He has been in the retail business in his city for perhaps more than a quarter of a century. He is one of the outstanding Christian gentlemen of his community and enjoys the respect, esteem, and unquestioned confidence of his fellow citizens.

This constituent wrote me voluntarily. He is a lifelong Democrat. He has at least one close relative on the Federal payroll. He is a student of human nature, economics, business relations, and government, and is capable of an intelligent exposition of any subject to which he addresses himself.

It is most heartening and encouraging to find those who will voluntarily write their Representatives in Congress, giving them the benefit of the thinking of not only the authors of such letters, but of the people themselves with whom they

come in daily contact. This well-informed gentleman says:

In this letter I will try to give you some of the ideas that are expressed by the ordinary, representative people.

Those are the best ideas on earth. Such ideas are of incalculable assistance to any Representative who conscientiously is endeavoring to represent the wishes and the best interests of the people of his district. It certainly enables him to know their thinking and how he can best protect their interests at all times. In concluding the letter, my worthy constituent says:

"I can mention in one letter only a few of the things that we people are thinking about."

The letter to which I have referred, which I prize as one expressing true American sentiments, follows:

Like many other persons I have refrained from writing to you about different matters but I notice that numerous organized minorities seem to make themselves felt and heard with the Members of Congress so you may be interested in hearing from one of the common people. Many times the customers of my store, who are farmers and small-town people, express themselves about public matters and most of them are very well informed. In this letter I will try to give you some of the ideas that are expressed by ordinary, representative people.

Most people do not mind paying taxes but they do not like to have taxes increased by the Federal Government when they feel that the Government itself is not using much sense and little economy in its own affairs.

According to the papers there are many instances of waste and extravagance on which savings could be made and, except for defense, probably most of the departments could operate on a large percentage less money than they now use. I notice that some effort has been made to cut the vacations of civil-service employees from 6 weeks to 5 weeks, which would save about \$200,000,000. No doubt you know that the average vacation in business is not more than 2 weeks and I see no reason why the Government should spend millions of dollars for additional vacations for its employees when taxes are so high.

The papers indicate there are thousands of public relations men and chauffeurs for the big men of our Government and we might be able to struggle along without them.

These things may be small ones but at \$200,000,000 a crack they would soon add up to a billion. We certainly can get along with a lot less government from Washington than we now have. No one, of course, wants to see a war but most people do not want to be taxed to death for years and years and let Russia sit back and push us around whenever convenient. People do not want further appeasement and many of them think we should quietly rearm to the hilt and then push Russia back or go to the mat with her for good.

All of us are afraid of inflation and many people believe the Government has caused more inflation than anything else that affects the question. It just seems a matter of common sense that if the Government permits and encourages the granting of increased wages to large pressure groups that prices in turn must be increased and we have a daily upward spiral.

Many people think that those in authority are looking for votes rather than trying to protect this country. The Government is setting up a tremendous organization, on

one hand trying to keep prices down when for years they have kept increasing wages and the Government agencies have been lending money and, in fact, almost forcing people to borrow money from them.

Few people desire to have this country socialized but the program which is being followed by the Government is driving us toward socialism. The Government is getting into too many businesses and competing with private business too much. There are too many people that are exempt from taxes and I refer particularly to the big co-operatives.

The labor unions are creating national monopolies and must be trimmed down and broken up into State groups so that they cannot exert national pressure to a degree which endangers our national interest.

This letter is now too long and I can mention in one letter only a few of the things that we people are thinking about. People are seriously concerned with our National Government and many think we have too much government and that the quality is rather poor.

Condition of Farmers Under Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Agrarian Reform," published in the Winnipeg Free Press of June 14, 1951. It deals with the conditions of farmers under communism.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AGRARIAN REFORM

In their efforts to win the sympathy of Canadian farmers, the Communists argue that their various conquests of power represent not the triumph of a new imperialism but the attainment of simple justice by poor peasants long subject to a degrading feudalism. Simple-minded fellow travelers once contended—and may still do—that the new rulers of satellite states are not really Communists at all but agrarian reformers thrown up by mass discontent.

It would be difficult to conceive a more fantastic deception.

The nature of the Communist agricultural revolution and counterrevolution is admirably illustrated by the case of Estonia. With the exception of Hungary, where the end result is the same, all the European Cominform states accord with this pattern.

FACTS SUMMARIZED

The facts regarding Estonia are admirably summarized in the World Today, a publication of the Royal Institute of International Affairs. Prior to 1914 there were in Estonia 51,000 independent farmers. There were also 52,000 tenants farming large estates. About 58 percent of the land was held by great proprietors whose possessions averaged 5,200 acres.

After the First World War, independent Estonia carried out a large-scale land reform. The big estates were parceled into small holdings of not more than 124 acres. New farms to the number of 37,000 were created. By 1939 there were 140,000 farms in the country, averaging 56 acres each. Farms exceeding 250 acres comprised only 3.3 per-

cent of the land. Under this type of feudalism the area of arable land was increased by nearly 20 percent, production of food grain by 52 percent, of cattle by 88 percent, with comparable improvements for horses, pigs, the yield of milk, of eggs, butter, and bacon. There were no less than 3,972 co-operative societies. Mechanization was proceeding apace.

The Russians seized Estonia in June 1940, promising that there would be neither nationalization of land nor collectivization of agriculture. Within a month the land had been nationalized. Farms exceeding 74 acres were then broken up for the benefit of new settlers and persecution of the kulaks or wealthier farmers followed in the spirit of class war.

In 1947 there began the drive for collectivization. The first weapon employed was discriminatory taxation. Specifically the farmer possessing a cow, a pig, 10 sheep, and 15 chickens was taxed 5.4 times as much as his neighbor who had joined a collective and maintained the same number of stock on the acre formally left for his own use. Between March 1948 and March 1949 the number of collectives rose from 59 to 530. As only 15 percent of the farmers had then joined, the Communists decided that the pace was too slow.

They fell back on their second weapon—deportation. Some tens of thousands of farmers were deported to remote areas of the U. S. S. R. By June 1949 Moscow was able to boast that there were 2,950 collectives comprising 78 percent of the former Estonian farmsteads.

SECOND PHASE

The collectivization drive then passed into its second phase. It was argued, as in Russia, that the collectives were too small. They are therefore being lumped together in larger units surrounding agrogorods or agricultural towns.

The nature of a kolkhoz or collective farm is not well understood in this country. Like the serf of ancient times, the kolkhoznik is bound to the soil. He cannot even leave the collective farm on a visit without a permit from the authorities. This is liberation.

Rewards of labor are based on the piece-work system. Each day a farmer must accomplish a fixed "norm," which is set high. If he works faster and accomplishes more he gets higher wages but there are no higher rates for overtime. He can devote his leisure to his own plot but there are ways and means of circumscribing such activities. One is "socialist competition," a system whereby the Communist bosses of one collective challenge another in the fulfillment of labor tasks.

SLOW PROGRESS

Agricultural production is still far below prewar standards. Communist authorities have shown concern over livestock figures which are only half those of 1939. Slow progress here seems directly related to collectivization which does not favor animal husbandry since it removes the freeholder with a direct incentive to care for his stock. Yields of field crops generally have been lower largely due to a shortage of farm manure.

These declines are reflected in standards of living. In terms of meat the 10 rubles received by a farm worker for a normday is worth only one third of what the industrial worker received in 1939 and even this is subject to a discount of 10 to 15 percent, for taxes. But the prices of most consumer goods have in the interval mounted six to 10 times. While the Soviets are most reluctant to provide comparative figures, it appears that the "liberated" collective farmer is having a thin time.

In the face of what has actually happened the propaganda about "agrarian reform" looms as a monumental Communist lie.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record program Nos. 42 and 44 in my broadcasts to the people of Pennsylvania in the series, Happenings in Washington. These programs were broadcast on June 4 and July 2, 1951.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 42)

This is Ed MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another discussion of Happenings in Washington.

Within a few weeks we will have reached the first anniversary of that fateful day last June when President Truman ordered the Armed Forces of the United States into action to repel armed aggression against the free Republic of South Korea.

At the same time he ordered American naval forces to prevent military action between the Island of Formosa, held by Chinese Nationalist forces, and the mainland of China, controlled by the Communists.

This decision, you will recall, was a complete and sudden reversal of the Truman-Acheson policy in the Far East.

At the beginning of 1950 Secretary of State Acheson, dealing at the same time with political and military aspects of the situation, wrote off Korea and Formosa as having no strategic value to the United States.

Carrying out this Truman-Acheson policy, the President on January 5, 1950 announced "that the United States Government will not provide aid or advice to Chinese forces on Formosa."

Secretary Acheson announced a line of defense in the Pacific which left Formosa and Korea to the tender mercies of the Communists.

That, I maintain, was an invitation to the Communists to embark on a free ride into Korea. That invitation they accepted, expecting to meet only the weak opposition of the poorly organized South Korean defense force.

Now, almost a year after the shooting started, testimony before the Senate Investigating Committees reveals who was responsible for the decision to abandon Korea and Formosa.

It is clear from the testimony that this Truman-Acheson policy was adopted by the President and the Secretary of State against the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

It was a political decision, contrary to the definite opinion and advice of the top military experts of our Nation.

The testimony reveals just as clearly that President Truman and Secretary Acheson reversed their policy and plunged us into war without giving the military any opportunity to make plans for successful operations in Korea.

Our soldiers, inadequately trained and poorly equipped, were thrown into battle against a superior force, although the President and the State Department had no definite plan or objective.

Now, after nearly a year of death and destruction, does the President, the State Department, or the Joint Chiefs of Staff have

any definite policy in Korea and the Far East?

Let me say that to me, after examining the official record, the most shocking thing is the admission that our floundering Government at this late date has not yet agreed on the political or military objectives of this tragic war.

It was brought out in the testimony that on February 13 of this year, when the Joint Chiefs of Staff met with the State Department, and again on March 15, at another meeting, the military had been unable to get the State Department heads to define our political objectives in Korea.

The State Department asserted it wanted to wait until the military outlook was clarified. At the same time the military leaders wanted a political decision upon which to base a course of military action.

Out of all this buck passing between the State Department and the Joint Chiefs of Staff there was evolved a synthetic, make-believe policy, described by Gen. Omar Bradley in his testimony as a "wait and see" proposition.

I repeat that—wait and see.

But the bullets, the shells, and the bombs of the enemy didn't know about that.

The fire from the Chinese Reds did not wait and see.

Each week the casualty lists given out at the Pentagon grew bigger and bigger.

And today, at this very moment, the same policy persists—wait and see.

And the casualty lists continue to grow bigger and bigger.

When General Bradley testified before the Senate committees on May 24 the American people learned for the first time the truth about the casualties in Korea.

In his testimony General Bradley admitted that the American forces fighting in Korea had suffered casualties totaling nearly 142,000.

We have been led to believe that our total casualties were about 69,000. But General Bradley revealed that noncombat deaths and injuries had not been included in the figures given to the public.

Let me remind you that when President Truman went on the air to justify his dismissal of General MacArthur, he said, and I quote:

"I have * * * considered it essential to relieve General MacArthur so that there would be no doubt or confusion as to the real purpose and aim of our policy."

But he did not say that the weak, timid, vacillating, wait-and-see policy, enunciated by Secretary Acheson, was responsible for all the doubt and confusion.

General MacArthur had constantly called for new political decisions essential to a solution of the situation in Korea.

He did not get the political decisions he requested just as the Joint Chiefs of Staff were unable to get definite decisions on political objectives from the State Department.

He recommended to the Joint Chiefs of Staff a program which he felt was required by military necessity in the conduct of the war.

1. The intensification of our economic blockade against China.

2. The imposition of a naval blockade against the China coast.

3. Removal of restrictions on air reconnaissance of China's coastal areas and of Manchuria.

4. Removal of restrictions on the forces of the Republic of China on Formosa, with logistical support to their effective operations against a common enemy.

One of the most important things brought out in the investigation is the fact that this program, as outlined by General MacArthur, is the same plan recommended

by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to President Truman, through Secretary of Defense Marshall, in a report dated January 12.

A copy of this report was sent to General MacArthur.

Again the military recommendations were overruled and rejected by the political policy makers.

General MacArthur also had asked authority to engage in what the Air Force calls hot pursuit of enemy planes, even if they crossed the Yalu River. Again the Joint Chiefs of Staff approved, but again the political policy makers—Truman and Acheson—rejected the proposal.

In my analysis of the testimony I find that the only difference between General MacArthur and the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the basis of military strategy, was the question of bombing supply bases and troop concentrations in the Communist sanctuary north of the Yalu River.

With the exception of this one point, our country is now demanding from the United Nations or has received approval of every recommendation made by General MacArthur.

So that the MacArthur policies, which the President declared did not agree with those of the Truman-Acheson administration are now being adopted as the official program for the conduct of the war in Korea.

In many speeches, on the Senate floor and elsewhere, I have insisted that the American people have a right to know what commitments we have entered into all over the world.

I have argued that one of the great dangers to world peace rises out of secret agreements reached without the approval of Congress. It has never occurred to me that diplomatic commitments would ever be made by the President and the Secretary of State beyond our military capacity to carry them out.

But General Bradley, appearing before the Senate committee a week ago last Thursday, made the astounding statement that the United States may have more diplomatic commitments than we can carry out militarily at the present time.

I believe the policy of open covenants, openly arrived at, advocated by Woodrow Wilson would do more to restore and preserve peace than any diplomatic deals made in secrecy and withheld from the people who must pay the price of their fulfillment.

At this time I want to discuss one phase of the Korean struggle which is too little understood by our people. Let me try to clear away some of the confusion so that we can have a clear understanding of the great need for clear thinking and clear decisions from our Government.

It has developed in these hearings that we have surrendered the right of independent action in international affairs to the United Nations.

Testimony has been given disclosing that decisions agreed upon by the heads of our Military Establishment and the State Department, and approved by the President, have been vetoed by our allies in the United Nations.

Those countries, with mere token contributions to the fight against aggression in Korea, have been responsible for scuttling most of the proposals of General MacArthur and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

When you ask the reason, Secretary Acheson will tell you: "We cannot go it alone. We cannot stand without allies. We must not offend them or we shall be left alone and friendless in a hostile world."

But I would like to ask:

"If they walk away from us, where will they go? How will they stand without us? Who will provide the funds for their rearmament? Who will supply the ships and planes

and food and military supplies they need so urgently?"

They know that without our help they haven't a chance to escape enslavement under the tyranny of Red Russia.

Now I want to call your attention to one of the most alarming developments in the Truman-Acheson attitude toward Communist China.

You must remember that when the conflict in the Far East comes to an end the terms of peace will be negotiated by the United Nations, and the United States.

Recently Secretary Acheson made it known that if a cease-fire agreement was reached he would be willing to discuss the admission of Red China to the United Nations and the surrender of Formosa to the Chinese Communists.

And he further stated that while we are opposed to the admission of Red China to the United Nations and are opposed to turning Formosa over to the Communists, we would not exercise the veto power if a majority in the United Nations voted against us.

That proposition, my fellow Pennsylvanians, is appeasement in its worst form.

It would be a dishonorable betrayal of every American boy who is fighting in Korea in the cause of freedom and justice to help the brutal march of armed aggression.

It would be shameful abandonment of the cause for which heroic American boys paid with their lives on foreign soil, far from their homes and loved ones.

My fellow Pennsylvanians, it must be clear that the military policies and the strategy of this war are not being decided by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who are best qualified to do so.

Those decisions are being made by the same leaders who sold China into the hands of the Communists and by our allies in the United Nations who value trade with the enemy above hope for peace and freedom.

That calls for the immediate dismissal of Dean Acheson as Secretary of State and a thorough housecleaning in the State Department.

This is Ed MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capitol. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON, PROGRAM NO. 44
(By United States Senator EDWARD MARTIN, of Pennsylvania)

This is Ed MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another discussion of happenings in Washington.

First let me tell you how much I appreciate the many messages of cheer and encouragement I received during my illness.

Also I want to extend my thanks to my friends and colleagues, Congressman VAN ZANDT and Congressman GAVIN, for the interesting and informative talk they gave 2 weeks ago when they substituted for me on this program. I am sincerely grateful for their valuable assistance.

In recent weeks Congress has been engaged in battling with an enemy whose destructive force can wreck the whole economic structure of the United States.

That enemy is inflation. It is the rising spiral of price increases which robs the American dollar of its purchasing power and brings cruel hardship to a large percentage of our population.

It brings the worst harm to the great majority of our people who live on fixed incomes, the white-collar worker, the aged and retired who depend upon the return from their invested savings, and those who receive pensions or annuities.

Every housewife who has struggled to make ends meet knows how rising prices at the

store make it impossible for her to buy the things her family needs and should have.

I don't mean fancy goods or luxuries. Many families have been deprived of actual necessities because inflation has stolen a substantial portion of the workers' wages.

In considering this serious problem we must realize, of course, that there is no magic formula by which we can have low prices, high wages, and big profits all at the same time.

There is no magic by which Congress can stop the rise in prices overnight merely by passing a law.

There are no miracle men in any of the agencies of Government created to deal with prices and wages.

For many years we got along pretty well with a sound, natural law that maintained a balanced economy without Government help.

It was not passed by Congress. It was not written in the law books.

It was the ancient law of supply and demand.

That law regulated the price we had to pay for things without controls and without an army of administrators, investigators, enforcement officers, and others on the public payroll.

It operated as an integral part of the free-enterprise system of the United States.

It was supported by open competition in the market place.

It gave incentive for the production of more and better goods at a lower price.

It was the strongest factor in the development of the giant productive capacity of American industry.

It created our ability to out-produce any other nation in the world.

When we were plunged into the Korean conflict a year ago, production for civilian needs was at a high peak. It became necessary to expand military production as rapidly as possible in preparation for any eventuality, including the possibility of all-out war on a global scale.

Materials needed for the manufacture of guns, tanks, planes, ships, and other weapons of war cut sharply into the supply of civilian goods.

Some businessmen, expecting to reap a harvest of big profits, rushed out to buy. Consumers increased their purchases because they expected there would be shortages.

In the meantime, Government spending added billions to the money supply, increasing the inflationary pressure and started a new upsurge of prices.

Congress recognized the danger and in September we enacted the Defense Production Act of 1950. This act gave the President greatly increased power to impose ceilings on prices and wages, to restrict consumer credit, and to establish priorities and allocations for critical materials.

It also gave the President power to seize or requisition materials and facilities, including real estate, necessary for national defense.

It authorized the President to make loans to private business for the expansion of production and to guarantee financial institutions against losses incurred in financing defense contracts.

The President, in a message to Congress, had asked for some of these powers. But he did not ask for authority to fix prices and wages. He took the position that such action was not necessary.

But time and costly experience have proven that the President was wrong.

The dangers of inflation have increased tremendously and the problem of combating

it has been made much more difficult because the President failed to impose price and wage controls when they could have been used most effectively to check rising prices.

When the Defense Production Act of 1950 was passed I urged the President to freeze prices and wages immediately clear across the board, and even to roll them back to June 25, but Mr. Truman refused. He told a news conference that Senator MARTIN was mistaken about the need for such controls.

In a State-wide broadcast to the people of Pennsylvania, I said I had great fears of inflation unless effective controls were imposed at once to protect the consumers of our Nation.

In that broadcast I said:

"I hope the President will use the powers granted in this bill immediately.

"Everyone knows that prices are constantly moving upward. With increased Government spending for defense they will rush even higher. Labor is already demanding wage increases to meet the rising cost of living. Artificial shortages have been created by some unscrupulous businessmen to extort higher profits from the public.

"Unless controls are put into effect at once, clear across the board, we will have a race between prices and wages that will mean a dangerous inflation.

"Let me say that we cannot have wage control without price control. Neither can we have effective price control without wage control. They must go together."

On September 1, in a discussion of the defense production bill on the Senate floor, I repeated that statement and I added:

"If we are to halt runaway spiraling of the cost of living, controls must be placed simultaneously on both prices and wages, clear across the board. In my opinion that is the only system of controls which has any chance of working."

It is difficult to estimate how much the President's failure to take prompt action cost the American people.

Eric Johnston, Economic Stabilization Administrator, stated recently that inflation has added \$21,000,000,000 to consumers' living costs since January 1950. That period, of course, includes 6 months of rising prices prior to the Korean war.

Another frightening figure was given by the Secretary of Defense, General Marshall, when he testified before a House Banking and Currency Committee hearing a month ago. He said that the enormous increase in prices has already reduced the value of defense appropriations for 1951 by \$7,000,000,000.

In other words, the defense loss from inflation is very close to the total amount of additional revenue that the Government will collect under the new tax bill now being written.

But the worst feature of the situation grows out of the stubborn refusal of the Truman administration to attack the fundamental causes of inflation—uncontrolled and extravagant spending by Government, excessive public debt, and unsound fiscal policies.

Somewhere along the road we will have to put on the brakes or else face the danger of wrecking the whole economy of the United States. That would mean national bankruptcy.

In his recent radio talk to the Nation, President Truman made this significant statement, and I quote:

"If inflation gets away from us and wrecks our savings and ruins our economy, it would be the easiest victory the Kremlin would hope for. Communist Russia would win the

whole world to totalitarianism without firing a shot."

Then he said, and again I quote:

"This fight we have to make is not a partisan fight. It strikes all the people in all parties. This is a fight for everyone to join—a fight for the very life of the Nation."

Yes, my fellow Pennsylvanians, it is a fight to preserve our Republic as a land of liberty and freedom of the individual.

It is a fight which can end in crushing defeat unless we build our economic defense as well as our military strength.

And more important than controls and restrictions—more important than concentrating unlimited power in the Truman bureaucracy—is to curtail all Government spending not connected with national defense.

The first step in that direction should be the scrapping of all the socialistic schemes that pretend to give the people something for nothing.

Next we should return to a sound currency and restore fiscal policies that will prevent watering our money with printing-press dollars.

Next we should adopt a tax program that will pay the cost of our defense preparations on a pay-as-we-go basis.

But Mr. Truman in his broadcast made no mention of these things. He proposed only greater power to control, not only prices, but all business and industry.

When the Truman administration submitted its draft of the new defense production bill it contained a provision to license every business dealing in material or services under price regulation. It was argued that such a license system could be used to put out of business any person or firm that violated controls.

I am happy to report that this dictatorial proposal was overwhelmingly rejected by both the Senate and the House committees.

Of course, none of us has any sympathy for law violators but such a drastic program could open the way for its misuse for political purposes. Also it could impose unwarranted punishment upon innocent victims. Some of the control regulations are so complex that even a Philadelphia lawyer can't understand them.

The American people do not like controls. Under normal peacetime conditions they will resist every attempt by the Government to place restrictions upon the freedom of the individual.

But in times of emergency, when the safety and security of our Nation is threatened, they are willing to give up a portion of their freedom in order to strengthen the defense of our liberty and independence.

However, in making this and every other sacrifice that may be needed, they have the right to demand that all restrictions be removed at the earliest possible date, consistent with national security.

Next Wednesday we will celebrate the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of American independence.

We mark this Fourth of July at a time when freedom in the United States and in the world is facing its supreme test.

As part of the Nation's observance it is planned to hold a token session of Congress in Independence Hall where liberty was proclaimed throughout the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof.

This should serve to recall our debt to the founding fathers and to impress upon every American the sacred obligation to protect and preserve the great freedoms we enjoy as Americans.

This is Ed MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

Three Million Children in United States Attend Shockingly Bad Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, the distressing shortcomings of the Nation's educational plant outlined by Mr. Stacy Jones in the current Parents' magazine article should be called to the attention of Congress and of the people. And, under unanimous consent, I insert the article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

We cannot afford an educational plant which fails to prepare the youth of the Nation for the future. Full utilization of defense and civilian production potentials will demand a constantly more skillful citizenry.

It is time we had an accurate accounting of the cost to the Nation of bad or missing school facilities. I am sure the cost would stagger the imagination and make appear small in contrast the funds now asked for school building.

The effectiveness of any defense program depends upon the ability of the people who carry the gun or operate the machine. The effectiveness is definitely affected by the schooling of the individual.

The article follows:

CHILDREN AMERICA FORGOT—THREE MILLION CHILDREN RIGHT HERE IN THESE UNITED STATES HAVE SHOCKINGLY BAD SCHOOLS, IF ANY

(By Stacy Jones)

If you were living today with your serviceman husband near the Tinker Air Force Base, in Midwest City, Okla., you might be hopelessly anticipating the prospect of sending your child to class in an abandoned coal bin, come to the beginning of this school year. If husband Fred were stationed at the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, near Dayton, Ohio, Fred Jr., would be learning his multiplication tables in a once-abandoned building, constructed when Ulysses S. Grant was President of the United States. In winter, in this building, heat comes courtesy of a pot-bellied stove. In any season of the year, there is no plumbing at all. Whether it's June or January, each time a child wants to go to the toilet he has to cross a busy highway to get there.

If you were married to an engineer, about to go to work in the H-bomb plant of the Atomic Energy Commission, to be set on 200,000 acres along the Savannah River in South Carolina, your child would not fare any better. He might find no classroom in the countryside near the project. Although the H-bomb plant is expected to bring in at least 25,000 children of new families within the next 3 years, all the available classroom space on the development is already choked to capacity. If you and your husband found a home across the river in Richmond County, your child wouldn't be any better off as to schools. Because Richmond County, already pressed by Federal personnel from Camp Gordon, from two Veterans' Administration hospitals, from an arsenal, from Clark Hill Dam, has 6,000 children without classrooms now. They are meeting in churches, on the stages of auditoriums, in private houses, and in empty storerooms.

As an atomic scientist, your husband might be ordered to Paducah, Ky., where the Atomic Energy Commission is presently constructing a \$350,000,000 gaseous diffusion plant to manufacture uranium 235. But in the area around sleepy little Paducah, the school population has been shrinking steadily for the past 10 years. Old buildings have been abandoned in favor of consolidated schools. The schools' ex-personnel has been looking for, and finding, other work. Today, with the new AEC plant in the process of being built, it is true that Paducah has been shocked wide awake. In all good faith, the town is frantically attempting to re-expand its educational facilities to meet the inevitable influx of new hordes of school-age children. But Paducah is running up against the hard wall of a complicated economic problem. The high wages of the Atomic Energy Commission itself have lured school janitors and school bus drivers and school teachers away from their old board of education jobs into new and much more lucrative Federal positions. (The AEC pays \$12 a day to ex-janitors whose wages, previously, had been about \$4 a day.) So next fall, Paducah, Ky.—home of this country's newest uranium 235 plant—may have inadequate school staffs and have to use temporary schoolhouses.

In many defense-affected areas the classrooms which do exist are already miserably overburdened. Many of the schools operate on half time, with two shifts of students using the same desks every day.

Luckily, this critical state of affairs is not Nation-wide. Although there are children without proper schools elsewhere, it is endemic primarily to America's defense-affected vicinities—small towns where new defense plants or military posts are being reactivated or expanded. The arrival of thousands upon thousands of defense workers and/or military personnel with families has completely flooded the schools in these communities.

But the appalling statistics of this children's crisis are a measure of its national importance. Right this minute, at least 810,000 sons and daughters in these United States are without schools. They are being packed in with the 2,200,000 other pupils who, as of now, comprise the total student population of all the defense-affected areas in the country. This means that, as a direct result of Federal activity, more than 3,000,000 American children don't have proper schools. They are children America forgot in its rush to build defense plants and Army installations. Nobody knows how many more millions will be drastically affected as the Nation's defense activities continue their mushroom growth.

Who is responsible for the shameful failure of the most scientifically and culturally advanced country in the world to provide adequately for its own children's education—and so, for its own future. Last year, Congress officially accepted the responsibility. It admitted that it wasn't fair to expect communities, in which huge new defense plants were being built and communities where Army camps are being expanded, to finance the construction and maintenance of additional schools needed to take care of the new, sudden influx of children. Besides gorging the schools in defense areas with more children than they can handle, the Federal Government further handicaps the very same schools in another way. When it moves into a locality with an Army camp or a defense project, it removes the suddenly Government-owned land from the district's tax rolls. A congressional committee has calculated that land which the United States owns now inside America's school districts would—if the Government could be assessed for it—bring into these money-strapped communities about \$186,200,000 annually in school

taxes. In its last session, Congress passed an act which provided that the Federal Government should pay its fair share in the erection of the new schools needed in the defense-affected areas throughout the country. But when appropriations time came around, Congress voted less than a tenth of the sum to which the act's formula would have entitled the country's defense-affected school districts. Even if the funds are doubled by a supplemental appropriation, almost nothing in the way of school construction can be accomplished by the beginning of the next school year.

Briefly, this is the legislative case history of the defense-affected schools' scandal. Public Law 815, the act which provides Federal aid for school construction in defense-affected areas, accepts the Government's responsibility to pay for such new schools in proportion to the number of children it forces on any given district. The appropriation of \$46,500,000 voted for this year proved to be shockingly inadequate. Under the law's formula \$350,000,000 would have been needed.

So the United States Office of Education got an assignment in arithmetic. Seven hundred and forty-eight defense-affected districts had filed applications for aid on more than 1,000 school-building projects. In all, these districts asked for about \$200,000,000—or about \$150,000,000 less than the \$350,000,000 to which the law would entitle them. Although most of these crowded districts have already borrowed and taxed themselves to the limit, they proposed to spend, anyhow, about \$100,000,000 of their own money.

From these figures, you can calculate the pay-off. The Office of Education is over \$100,000,000 short of funds which have been requested by the distressed school districts, this Department is required to allot whatever money is at its disposal in order of "urgency of need." In practice, it works out so that the very worst cases get some financial aid from the Government, but the others get none at all. One harassed education official said, "I feel like a father who has 10 barefoot children, and only enough money for 2 pairs of shoes."

Actually, here is how those precious, woefully inadequate \$46,500,000 are being spent. Funds were set aside to meet the most pressing demands for new schools at military bases and \$2,500,000 went for temporary school buildings, chiefly at the Savannah River and Paducah AEC developments. This left only \$31,500,000 to fill \$200,000,000 worth of requests from 748 districts. Out of this, tentative allotments were made to 75 cases.

The President has recommended a supplemental appropriation of \$50,000,000. But even with this, the United States Office of Education would still be short \$103,000,000 of what the schools asked. At this writing, the fate of the President's recommendation is unknown.

Fortunately, the schools fare somewhat better under Public Law 874, which is aimed not at school construction, but at school maintenance and operation in defense-affected areas. Congress appropriated \$28,500,000 for these matters, to be divided pro rata. More than 1,000 eligible districts will get about three-quarters of the money to which the law's formula entitles them. But this doesn't solve the problem of how to operate and maintain a school for whose existence Congress failed to provide.

Around the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, where school children must cross a heavily trafficked Ohio State highway to go to the privies, the Government not only removed taxable property from the rolls, but it also left a school bond issue standing against the remaining non-Federal property.

On top of this, tax-exempt Federal housing was constructed in town, and federally owned plants were leased to private companies which were also exempted from taxation.

There is yet another legal loophole which fuels up the country's attempts to provide decent education for its defense-affected children. The law requires that a school district's application for funds be based on average daily attendance for the current year. Obviously then, a town like Paducah, which will house the AEC's new uranium 235 plant, can only helplessly anticipate the arrival of thousands of new school children in time for next term. It cannot request funds for children who will be, but are not yet, in attendance at its schools.

As the mother of a school-age boy or girl and the wife of a defense worker or a military man, you would face educational set-ups just as shameful as the ones in Paducah and the Wright-Patterson Air Base at many, many smaller camps throughout the country. The Chanute Air Force Base, for instance, is the sole business of Rantoul, Ill. Next year, school attendance will probably be eight times as large as it was in 1940. The town has long ago outgrown its schools.

Let's say your husband is an instructor in the weather school on the base. You, your husband, and your two sons rent an apartment with two bedrooms in a converted private garage in town. You have no yard and no front porch to call your own, so your boys play after school in vacant lots.

Rantoul's elementary school is, naturally, full up. So your sons travel by bus to temporary classrooms on the base. These classrooms were hastily created by putting up flimsy partitions in the hospital wards. Each room might hold 20 children in reasonable comfort. But there are 35 kids in Jimmy's room and 45 in Frank's. The partitions aren't soundproof, so the children are inevitably distracted by what goes on next door. There is practically no blackboard space. It is unbearably hot on sunny fall days.

All the children must go without outdoor recess and play because their shouts might disturb the convalescent men in the hospital buildings. There is no gymnasium or auditorium, and therefore, no physical education or visual-aids program. Because the kids have no cafeteria either, your boys travel home again for lunch. But since they are in different classes, they come and go at different times. So you prepare breakfast and lunch for them separately, as a daily routine.

Moreover, you have been informed that the hospital ward classrooms are only loans from the base. In case of an epidemic, they will have to be reconverted for the use of patients within 24 hours. But epidemic or not, the school board has been on notice that it will have to return the rooms to the base by this fall.

Rantoul and 21 other Illinois school districts which are similarly affected asked for Federal aid for schools. Rantoul was lucky. The town received more than \$1,000,000 for a new school. But Rantoul turned out to be one of only four to get construction funds.

On the Pacific coast, with its heavy concentration of naval and air force bases, school conditions in defense-affected communities are as bad, if not worse. A distracted mother in Atomic City, Idaho, a hamlet near another AEC project, wrote recently to President Truman. She told him that the mothers in Atomic City had to drive their children 26 miles to a high school, 28 miles to a grade school, and 32 to a junior high. She begged him, in the name of the town, for a local school. In Roswell, N. Mex., the dilapidated school building outside Walker Air Force Base has coal stoves and outdoor toilets.

Detroit is another good—or more accurately a bad—example of a metropolitan area which has never recovered from its tremendous growth during World War II. Within 10 miles of Detroit's city hall, schools exist where wells and outside privies are used in lieu of toilet facilities.

It is inevitable that these intolerable school conditions will permanently scar the children who are suffering from them now. Earl James McGrath, United States Commissioner of Education, puts it like this: "When a child becomes 6 years old and finds no school to go to, there is no way we can repair the damage 3 or 4 years later. America's children cannot be put into educational cold storage for the duration of the emergency and then later be moved into an academic hothouse for forced growth."

Well, why doesn't Congress appropriate enough money to meet its own formula for Federal aid to schools in defense-affected areas, you may well ask? What happened to that other \$150,000,000 which Congress might have voted for school construction this year, but did not? The answer is obvious, ironical, and it could be fatal to the future of this country—unless every outraged American citizen brings the tragic case of this country's forgotten children to the attention of his home-district Congressman at once.

In the vast, hurried build-up of military installations, atom-bomb projects and industrial plants all over the country, Congress has short-changed the children in defense communities.

Congress has apparently not yet recognized that the most powerful Nation in the history of the world will be only as effective in securing the peace as the minds of men can make it. The 3,000,000 children, caught now in the cultural and intellectual trap of defective schools, are the men and women of America's tomorrow. If we continue to sacrifice their schooling—the making of their minds—to expediency, we may well be sacrificing the future of this country.

Write or wire to your Congressman urging him to vote the appropriations necessary to meet the school needs of these forgotten children.

Neosho Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MYRON V. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the disastrous flood that has just taken place in Kansas, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following editorial taken from the Parsons Sun, one of the leading daily newspapers in southeast Kansas:

NEOSHO FLOOD CONTROL

The greatest flood in Neosho River history has raised an inevitable question: What can be done to prevent a repetition of such a disaster?

The United States engineers have a plan for flood control on the Cottonwood and Neosho Rivers. It involves four dams on the Cottonwood and the upper Neosho at a cost of some \$36,000,000.

The series of dams would absolutely control floods on the upper branches of the river; it would reduce the peak overflows in the lower valley. An engineers' estimate is that 6 to 7 feet of water would have been

taken off last week's crest in this area had the dams been in operation.

That means, in event all four dams are constructed, southern Neosho County and all of Labette County would be spared from the most devastating floods. Six to seven feet off of last week's high mark would put the peak at about the 1948 record, which was bad but much less so than the recent catastrophe.

The Neosho River has a history of frequent floods. Its record in that respect may be equaled only by the Marais des Cygnes in Kansas. Floods ranging from mild overflows to the all-time high of last week occur on the Neosho as often as two or three times a year.

The Army engineers have a plan for controlling those floods. Even the most ardent flood-control boosters on the river admit it isn't a complete and foolproof program, but still it is a big step in the right direction.

The Sun has viewed the over-all national flood-control program of the engineers with mixed emotions. It never has questioned the wisdom of flood control on the Neosho River; the only question has been the most effective methods to be followed.

After the recent disaster, there isn't much room left for debate. The water must be impounded at or near its source if calamity is to be averted. That means, for better or for worse, big dams. They wouldn't have stopped all of last week's overflow; they would have saved much of the valley from the devastation which has come upon it.

Estimates are that damage in the Cottonwood and Neosho watersheds from the flood will reach \$50,000,000. That may be high—or it could be low. If it is high, it won't be very high. The engineers' contemplated \$36,000,000 expenditure for the four dams thus will be no more than the damage last week, and probably a lot less.

The engineers have a plan; this area can do no less than give it all-out support. There should be no repeat performance of the 1951 disaster, if human efforts can prevent it.

The dams can't be built overnight. The first step is to secure \$250,000 planning money from Congress this year for Strawn dam. If that is included in the new Federal budget, the next step will come a year hence when appropriations for the dam itself must be secured.

Residents of this area can inform their United States Senators, SCHOEPPEL and CARLSON, of the urgency of providing the planning money this year. They can give moral and financial support to the Neosho-Cottonwood Flood Control Association which is spearheading the fight for the dams on the two rivers.

Action will be necessarily slow, but no time can be lost if effective measures are to be taken at the first possible moment. The engineers may not have the complete answer, but it is the only one immediately available and should be accepted by the Neosho Valley as the chief hope of preventing the river from approaching this year's destructive stage again.

The Effect of Price Control on the Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I represent one of the greatest textile manufacturing

districts in the world. Many thousands of my people labor daily in these great plants.

These people have been loyal Americans for generations. They always do more than their part in times of national emergency. During World War II not 1 day was lost by any of these mills in the Third South Carolina District. They operated night and day weaving cloth for the Armed Forces.

Management and labor enjoy a beautiful relationship in South Carolina. They are united in wishing to see the textile industry grow and prosper.

My people view with alarm and apprehension the increasing power of the Federal Government, reaching its bureaucratic tentacles into every phase of American life. Government meddling and red tape has created confusion in the textile industry. Bureaucrats who have little knowledge of this industry are administering the present price-control program. The textile people have not even been represented in the high policy councils of the OPA dictatorship. When our mills are forced to curtail because of foolish Government policy, the working people suffer.

The following letter was written to me by people who actually work and sweat in a large cotton mill in my district. These people ought to be heard and their opinions considered. They are the ones who are forced to pay high taxes. They, as public-spirited American citizens, hate to see their money wasted by this orgy of Federal spending. They want freedom from fear and freedom from too much government.

EASLEY, S. C., July 23, 1951

Hon. WILLIAM J. BRYAN DORN,
Member of Congress, House Office
Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DORN. As cotton-textile operatives, we want to write you our ideas about controls. We had a very small cotton crop last year and the farmers this year have planted 58 percent more acreage at the request of the Government and expect an increase in production of 60 to 70 percent, which will relieve the raw-cotton shortage.

Soon after the Korean war began the textile industry did its part by increasing production to take care of civilian and military needs, reaching peak production in January, February, and March. However, in January 1951, our Government, by issuing price-fixing and control orders, demoralized the industry. On account of this Government interference the textile operatives are very unhappy as extended vacations and curtailed schedules are beginning to be felt throughout the industry.

We would like very much to see the abolishment of the OPS, for with its numerous orders and counterorders the industry is in so much confusion that we can see no hope for normal operations for a long time, and, unless we should have an all-out war, we see no excuse for controls of any kind. However, should war come, we stand ready, to the best of our ability, to do our part in seeing that production will supply the needs of both civilian and military requirements.

Yours very truly,

S. G. Allen, J. R. McNeely, D. M. Underwood, L. A. Ross, J. L. Hayes, Fred A. Hamilton, H. S. Hughey, Sam Thomas, Cal D. McGohe, E. H. Atkins, Lowell Southerland, Weldon Carmas, J. S. Barwell, James Adkins, Claude Peace, B. S. Halder.

Tribute to Miss Katharine Lenroot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last evening the Senate confirmed the nomination of Dr. Martha M. Eliot to be Director of the United States Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor.

I should like to say just a few words with regard to her distinguished predecessor, Miss Katharine F. Lenroot, of Superior, Wis., who resigned recently.

Miss Lenroot had announced her retirement at a time when I was in Europe with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and so this has been the first possible occasion for me to say a few words in tribute to this splendid American woman leader—daughter of one of the great Senators of the United States and of the Badger State, Hon. Irvine Lenroot, and in her own right the long-time Chief of the United States Children's Bureau.

I cannot imagine a single field more satisfying, more productive of good, more important in terms of the Nation's future, than that of service to America's children. In this field Katharine Lenroot has for so long excelled that her name, like that of Dr. Eliot, has become synonymous with the modern concept of developing the potentialities of children and giving them every possible break that a wise and sound nation can.

She has not, however, confined her activities solely to the children of this land, but during 36 years of Government work has contributed of her great talents to the children of the U. N. and of the world.

We of America's Dairyland are proud of Katharine Lenroot, and proud of the tradition of service of which she and her late distinguished father have been such shining examples. We wish her all of the very best. We know that one so active as she cannot close the curtain completely down on so splendid a career, but that we can count on her for continued service for good causes.

Let me add a brief biographical note. Katharine Lenroot was named head of the United States Children's Bureau in 1934 by President Roosevelt. She became the third woman to hold that job. Previously she had served as Acting Chief of the Bureau.

She was born at Superior, Wis., on March 8, 1891, and was graduated from the University of Wisconsin in 1912. The following year she was appointed a deputy of the Wisconsin State Industrial Commission, a post which she resigned to join the staff of the Children's Bureau in January 1915. Her salary at that time was \$1,200 a year. She became Assistant Chief of the Bureau in 1922.

In 1935 she served as president of the National Conference of Social Work; later she also served as executive secre-

tary of the White House Conference on Children in Democracy, as an adviser to United States delegates to the International Labor Organization Conference at Paris in 1945, as secretary of the U. N. temporary Social Commission, and as United States member of the executive committee of the International Children's Emergency Fund.

I was happy indeed to note that in the July 17 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] had printed an editorial from the Washington Post in praise of Miss Lenroot.

At this time I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two additional splendid editorials, the first from the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times, of July 11, 1951, and the second from the Superior (Wis.) Evening Telegram of July 14, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times of July 11, 1951]

WISCONSIN IS PROUD OF KATHARINE LENROOT

One of Wisconsin's great daughters announced the other day that she is retiring from her long and distinguished career of public service. She is Katharine F. Lenroot, Chief of the United States Children's Bureau and the daughter of a shining name in Wisconsin's history, the late Senator Irvine L. Lenroot.

Katharine Lenroot began the career that was to bring her national fame here in the State of Wisconsin, as a member of the State Industrial Commission. She later went to the Children's Bureau in Washington and rose rapidly to the position from which she has now resigned.

Few people have brought such selfless devotion to so good a cause as Katharine Lenroot brought to her job of defending and protecting the children of this Nation. Her rich experience and her limitless capacity for understanding and work brought lasting benefits to America. In recent years the world has borrowed from her through her contributions to the welfare programs of the United Nations.

The Nation's sentiments were well expressed by the President who paid tribute to her as "a tough and persistent champion of children's rights."

Wisconsin is grateful to and proud of Katharine Lenroot.

[From the Superior (Wis.) Evening Telegram of July 14, 1951]

MISS LENROOT'S NOTABLE ACHIEVEMENT

Her Superior neighbors justly take pride in the career of Katharine F. Lenroot, one phase of which has by her own decision been closed this week at the Nation's Capital.

As chief of the United States Children's Bureau, Miss Lenroot rose to a position of eminence not only in her own country, but throughout the world wherever people have come to recognize the nurture of children as a highly important responsibility that confronts government. She went to Washington eager to have a part in this line of activity which was just emerging as a force containing possibilities for great accomplishment. Encouraged by President Wilson and inspired largely at first by Grace Abbott, its competent director, the Bureau had got only well started when the change in administration found its loyal and far-visioned staff battling to maintain the ground that had been won.

Only a comparatively small staff made up the department when in 1921 Miss Lenroot, upon Miss Abbott's recommendation, was appointed to succeed her as chief. Less than 10 years out of school at the University of Wisconsin, she was called upon to take over the leadership in a fight for the very existence of the organization to which she and her associates were so devoted and in the future of which they had such unbounded confidence.

But Miss Lenroot was well qualified for the task. At the University of Wisconsin her studies under such professors as Commons and Ross had grounded her well and the few years immediately following graduation she had spent in the industrial commission of her home State. Furthermore, from early childhood she had grown up in surroundings that were conducive to the development of the spirit of public service to which she early decided to dedicate her life. In Wisconsin she had witnessed many stirring political scenes of which her father, the late Irvine L. Lenroot, was an integral part. It was no surprise to her to learn that even such a vital work as the Children's Bureau should be subjected to a fight for its life in political Washington.

In the decade that followed Miss Lenroot's first term as Bureau chief its importance became more fully recognized both by the administrative and the legislative departments of Government. Appropriations followed that placed it on a plane with other fully recognized activities. Its influence soon was being felt throughout the Nation and the goals it set became the aspiration of thoughtful leadership in all quarters. Under her wise guidance, this influence spread to other nations and other continents and Miss Lenroot was sought from many directions for advice and inspiration.

Such a career naturally led to international recognition when the United Nations organization was brought into being and Miss Lenroot was summoned to take part in beginning for the world the type of work that had built up one of her own country's most cherished possessions. She is still associated in that work.

Miss Lenroot's plans for the future have not been announced but her Superior neighbors well know that these plans will include the use of her great talents and experience for the further benefit of all peoples that will ever be seeking to build a better generation to replace the one that went before. Superior is well justified in its pride for having had part in the building of the career of such a daughter.

Koreans Lose the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MYRON V. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to submit an editorial from the Topeka Daily Capital on the Korean war and the difficult situation in which the Korean people now find themselves. This editorial is taken from the paper published by former Senator Arthur Capper, and I think pretty well explains the terrible tragedy that has taken place in Korea:

KOREANS LOSE THE WAR

Korea is a long way off and those of us here at home perhaps cannot have any conception of what conditions are like, but reports from that tragic country indicate that the original purpose of the war probably has lost all meaning by now.

No matter how the peace negotiations result, no matter whether the war is halted or whether it continues, the real losers are the Korean people both north and south of the parallel.

While our U. N. delegations haggle over disputed points, while soldiers fight on the field of battle, and while peace groups argue over terms, the Koreans keep right on wandering over their devastated land.

With thousands of our own people displaced temporarily by floods, we Kansans have a broader understanding of what it means to be homeless than we could have had a few weeks ago. But, bad as the floods are, they are in no sense comparable to the suffering in Korea.

It is estimated that one person in six, perhaps one in four, is dead, hurt, or homeless in Korea's war which is now a year old.

About 3,500,000 persons including women and children are war refugees. Entire towns have been wiped off the face of the earth. In the city of Seoul alone, the tide of war swept through five times in separate battles. This meant destruction, looting, and an almost complete elimination of daily necessities of life.

During this year of tragedy, Koreans by the thousands upon thousands have marched on foot through bitter cold as well as blistering heat, not stopping to count or bury the dead falling along the way. While mass starvation was prevented by food brought from the United States, starvation and disease nevertheless have taken a ghastly toll.

And the worst of it is that the Koreans face the future without hope.

Some of our people like to believe that our forces are fighting for the freedom of mankind in Korea, but our diplomatic and military blunders to date make it doubtful that this will ever be achieved as far as the Koreans themselves are concerned.

Even if the war should halt tomorrow and never be resumed, the Koreans have lost. They would have been far better off if it had never started.

During World War II it was necessary for Allied forces, in order to liberate France and some of the other European countries from the Germans, to bomb the cities of friendly nations. While many friendly to the Allied side were killed, the people as a whole welcomed this phase of the war because they knew it meant future liberty for those who survived. Not so in Korea. There is no guarantee of any kind, and scarcely even a hope, that the Korean people will not eventually become Communist-dominated.

This is the horrible futility of the Korean war as it stands today.

The effect upon our own country has been noted for months. The United States never engaged in a war so unpopular or so little understood.

No one has been able to explain satisfactorily why we entered the war, what we hoped to gain, or why the war has been conducted in a manner to make a military victory an impossibility. The peace negotiations, while arousing some hope that our troops can be returned home, have been bungled badly.

As a result, the program of European defense has taken heavy set-backs. With Korean experiences fresh in mind, many Americans are questioning whether we have any business getting into what could be a great world war. If we cannot settle a comparatively small problem in Korea, how can we solve the big one shaping up in Europe?

Secretary of the Treasury Snyder Carries Propaganda of Falsehoods on Incomes to the Chicago Bond Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following statement from Free Enterprise News Bulletin for June 15, 1951:

SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY SNYDER CARRIES PROPAGANDA OF FALSEHOODS ON INCOMES TO THE CHICAGO BOND CLUB

The Associated Press reports that Secretary of the Treasury John M. Snyder, speaking before the Chicago Bond Club, on June 13, said:

"The average per capita income in the United States today after taxes, will buy almost 40 percent more in actual goods and services than the average per capita income in 1939."

Mr. Snyder is also quoted as having said: "Give us full confidence that the one roadblock to peaceful progress—the threat of Communist aggression—will eventually be removed, and that our Nation can then look forward to a new era of world peace and prosperity. This is our goal."

Mr. Snyder's fine statements are belied by the facts, as revealed by the Government's own economic advisers and statisticians.

Taxes, per se, of necessity include the levies by Federal, State, and local governments. In comparing what the per capita income will buy for any specified years, the taxes are a fixed obligation, and the remaining income, after the tax liability at all levels, is the measure of purchasing power, which coupled with the value of the dollar in the market place, gives a true indicator of the economic situation.

Tying per capita income, before taxes, to wage gains since 1939, we offer for the record the following table showing the real wages in the manufacturing industries since 1939:

[1939 dollar = \$1]

Year	Average hours worked	Average hourly wage	Weekly average wage	Purchasing power of \$1	Wage in 1939 dollars
1939.....	37.7	\$0.633	\$23.86	\$1.00	\$23.86
1940.....	38.1	.661	25.20	.992	25.00
1941.....	40.6	.729	29.58	.945	27.96
1942.....	42.9	.853	36.65	.853	31.27
1943.....	44.9	.961	43.14	.804	34.71
1944.....	45.2	1.019	46.08	.791	36.48
1945.....	43.4	1.023	44.41	.774	34.37
1946.....	40.4	1.084	43.74	.718	31.39
1947.....	40.3	1.221	49.25	.631	31.07
1948.....	40.0	1.327	53.15	.583	30.99
1949.....	40.0	1.401	54.92	.587	32.28
1950.....	40.0	1.466	59.33	.581	34.31
1951 (February).....	40.0	1.420	56.80	.542	33.37

The table presented on page 1 of this bulletin was compiled from various tables presented in the Monthly Labor Review, issued by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor. The purchasing power of the dollar was computed on the basis of the cost-of-living index using the average for the years 1935-39 equals 100.

It should be remembered that in 1939, the average workingman paid little if any Federal income tax, since the personal exemption for a married man with no dependents

(other than the wife) was \$2,500 plus \$400 for each dependent. Today the tax rate allows a personal exemption of but \$1,200 for a married couple, plus an extra \$600 for those over 65 years of age, plus \$600 for each additional dependent. Thus a workingman earning \$23.86 per week in 1939, or a total of \$1,240.72 for the year would have been exempt from Federal income taxes. Today, a workingman with a wife only, earning \$56.80 a week or a total of \$2,953.60 for the year will be obliged to pay \$255 in Federal income taxes by the computation on the short form for persons with incomes under \$5,000.

By deducting the income tax from the total earnings, the remainder for the working man in February 1951 is \$2,698 which multiplied by the purchasing power of the dollar (54.2 cents) shows a comparable 1939 income in purchasing power of \$1,462.32. The difference between 1951 and 1939 is \$221.60, which represents an increase of approximately 18 percent over the 12-year period. This is a far cry from Mr. Snyder's 40 percent more in actual goods and services.

THE SITUATION WITH RESPECT TO COMMODITY MARKETS

Based upon reports of the Bureau of Labor Statistics on the Daily Index Numbers and Spot Primary Market Prices for 28 commodities at wholesale, as of June 1, 1951, based upon the August 1939 equals 100, we find the following situation:

Index, August 1939, equals 100; June 1, 1951, equals 359.6 cents.

Purchasing power of \$1 equals \$1; June 1, 1951, equals 27.8 cents.

Per capita income:

Average, 1939-----	\$554.20
Tax liability-----	136.95
Disposable income-----	417.25
Average, 1951-----	1,659.50
Tax liability, 1951-----	437.21
Disposable income-----	1,222.29
Purchasing power of \$1 (multiply)-----	.278
Real disposable income in 1939 dollars-----	339.80

Tax liability consists of Federal, State, and local taxes averaged against the total population. National income reduced to per capita basis by dividing the reported total by the population.

Incidentally, the per capita national debt rose from \$309.03 in 1939 to \$1,696.10 in 1951.

The New Deal-Fair Deal administration continues its well-trying and thoroughly organized system for control; viz: Patronage, propaganda, promises, and deficit spending.
PAUL O. PETERS.

Twelve Million Prisoners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, from the very instant of the infamous arrest of Associated Press correspondent William Oatis—through his mockery of a trial, and now, in his unjust imprisonment—there has been an unceasing demand

from the American people, and from this Congress which represents the American people, for the liberation of this innocent man.

This Congress cries out for the release of William Oatis because he is a fellow American.

This Congress cries out for the release of William Oatis because he has become the universal symbol of the freedom of the press, guaranteed in the Constitution of this Republic.

Let us be swift to point the finger of accusation at the real persecutors of William Oatis.

But let us be slow to accuse an entire nation for the bestial acts of a few.

William Oatis is not the only prisoner in Czechoslovakia.

There are 12,000,000 prisoners in Czechoslovakia.

According to a 1949 United Nations estimate, the entire population of Czechoslovakia was 12,463,000.

Of this number, it is safe to say, 12,000,000 are unwilling prisoners of the Kremlin.

The Czechoslovaks, prisoners though they are today, are a sturdy and an independent people by nature.

They are farmers, artisans, artists, mechanics, miners, and educators.

Their wisdom and their courage contributed as much to the progress of their geographical area as did the great natural resources of their land.

There are large numbers of Americans of Czechoslovak origin. My own Nebraska is proud of its citizens of Czechoslovak ancestry. Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin, and other States have a like pride in the sturdy contributors to their progress whose forefathers came from this land.

I know. I have made it a point to know. I was born in Czechoslovakia.

It is common practice today to think of the linking of the people of Bohemia-Moravia and Slovakia as a new thing—an event that came about in this Republic in 1918.

But they were joined together a thousand years ago—as the great Moravian Empire—in the ninth century. They speak different languages but they understand the language which the other group speaks.

They have been temporary prisoners many times in their long history. The Magyars held them for a time. They regained their freedom. The empire of Austria-Hungary held them for a time. They regained their freedom.

The 12,000,000 prisoners of Czechoslovakia will again fight their way through to liberty because they want to be free.

I decry the imprisonment of William Oatis by the Communists who are now in control of Czechoslovakia. I condemn the Red masters in Prague for this vile atrocity.

I decry the imprisonment of 12,000,000 free citizens of Czechoslovakia. I condemn the Red masters in Prague for this atrocity.

The United States is a great, free Republic. Our people understand and give their prayers for one man, William

Oatis, and for 12,000,000 men, women, and children.

He will be free.

They will be free.

Pagan Rome fell before the prayers of the Christian martyrs.

The invading Huns of Attila reeled back from praying Western Europe.

Let William Oatis rejoice.

Let the people of Czechoslovakia rejoice.

Let Stalin tremble.

The American people are making their plea to God.

And no evil force that was, is, or ever will be on this broad earth has the strength to resist the limitless power of a free people in prayer.

Food Costs Double Since April 27, 1942, As Dollar Value Declines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from Free Enterprise of July 24, 1951:

FOOD COSTS DOUBLE SINCE APRIL 27, 1942, AS DOLLAR VALUE DECLINES

The American people who so gullibly swallow the New Deal-Fair Deal economic nostrums apparently have extra short memories when they write to their Representatives in Congress demanding economic controls.

Back in April 27, 1942, at a time when our economy was under war-time controls, including OPA and all the rest of the New Deal emergency agencies, the Safeway stores of the Washington metropolitan area printed an advertisement in the local newspapers quoting food prices and also an insert urging the people to "Keep 'em Flying" by buying war savings stamps at your neighborhood Safeway in 10- and 25-cent denominations.

We have one of these advertisements before us, and have computed the items of food which could be purchased at retail for \$18.75, the cost of a \$25 savings bond which matures in April 1952.

We also have before us several of the pious declaration by the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, who in a speech at Brooklyn, N. Y., on November 4, 1932, said:

"The Democratic platform specifically declares, 'We advocate a sound currency to be preserved at all hazards.' That . . . is plain English."

In a radio address on October 22, 1933, Mr. Roosevelt said:

"When we have restored the price level, we shall seek to establish and maintain a dollar that will not change its purchasing and debt paying power during the succeeding generation."

Just how badly fooled the American people were is hard to estimate. However, those who bought savings bonds and held them up to now, instead of investing the money on things of tangible value, such as homes, or personal property, can find little of comfort in the facts revealed by our survey of current food prices in the same Safeway stores as of July 24, 1951.

Comparative cost of food items in Safeway Stores of Washington, D. C., Apr. 27, 1942, and July 24, 1951

[This survey shows what \$18.75 would buy in April 1942, and what the same items cost as of July 24, 1951.]

	Apr. 27, 1942	July 24, 1951
MEATS		
Ground beef, 4 pounds at 17½ cents.....	\$0. 70	\$2. 60
Boneless stew beef, 4 pounds at 25 cents.....	1. 00	3. 56
Veal cutlets, 2 pounds at 47 cents.....	. 94	2. 58
Beef tongue, 3 pounds at 19 cents.....	. 57	1. 79
Plate boiling beef, 3 pounds at 13 cents.....	. 39	1. 17
Subtotal.....	4. 34	13. 48
DAIRY PRODUCTS		
Milk, 6 quarts, 2 for 23 cents.....	. 60	1. 38
Cottage cheese, 2 cartons, 16 ounces.....	. 20	. 50
Butter, 92-score, 2 pounds at 42 cents.....	. 84	1. 62
American cheese, natural, 1 pound at 34 cents.....	. 34	. 69
Evaporated milk, Pet. 3 cans.....	. 25	. 43
Subtotal.....	2. 32	4. 62
DRIED FRUITS AND JELLIES		
Prunes, 2 pounds.....	. 23	. 53
Raisins, seedless, 2 15-ounce packages.....	. 22	. 58
Apricots, 2 packages, 11-ounce.....	. 44	. 84
Peaches, 2 packages, 11-ounce.....	. 40	. 80
Grape jelly, Schimmel's, 2 pounds.....	. 25	. 50
Apple jelly, Musselman's, 2 pounds (2 jars, 4 pounds).....	. 38	. 80
Subtotal.....	1. 92	4. 05
COFFEE, CONDIMENTS, ETC.		
Coffee, 2 pounds, Airway.....	. 43	1. 51
Salad dressing, 1 quart.....	. 35	. 64
Mayonnaise, 1 quart.....	. 45	. 78
Salad oil, Wesson's, pint.....	. 27	. 37
Jello, 6 packages.....	. 38	. 51
Subtotal.....	1. 88	3. 81
FLOUR, BREAD, CEREALS		
Flour, 12-pound sack, Gold Medal.....	0. 58	1. 20
Quaker oats, 20-ounce package.....	. 10	. 17
Cream O'Wheat, 28 ounces.....	. 24	. 30
Wheaties, 2 packages.....	. 19	. 30
Jumbo bread, 1 pound, 5 loaves.....	. 35	. 80
Subtotal.....	1. 46	2. 77
FRESH VEGETABLES		
Celery, 2 pounds.....	. 20	. 24
Lettuce, 2 pounds.....	. 18	. 46
Rhubarb, 2 pounds.....	. 10	(1)
Kale, 2 pounds.....	. 10	. 17
Spinach, 5 pounds.....	. 25	. 60
Subtotal.....	. 83	1. 47
MISCELLANEOUS		
Condensed milk, Challenge, 14-ounce can.....	. 14	. 25
Evaporated milk, Land o' Lakes, 6 cans.....	. 47	. 86
Succotash, 2¼ can.....	. 10	. 16
Subtotal.....	. 71	1. 27
BABY FOODS, SIRUPS, ETC.		
Karo sirup, blue label, 2 cans 1½ pounds each.....	. 26	. 48
Strained prunes, 11 ounces, 2 jars.....	. 27	. 30
Chopped foods, Heinz, 6 cans.....	. 50	. 90
Gerbers foods, 6 cans.....	. 38	. 58
Grapefruit juice, 2 cans.....	. 15	. 16
Fruit cocktail, No. 1 cans, 2 each.....	. 27	. 48
Applesauce, Mott's fancy, 3 cans.....	. 25	. 45
Subtotal.....	2. 08	3. 35
CANNED FRUITS AND VEGETABLES		
Del Monte pears, 2½ size, sirup, 2 cans.....	. 46	. 90
Del Monte apricots, 2 cans.....	. 38	. 66
Peas, Emerald brand, 4 cans at 12½ cents.....	. 50	. 68
Corn, Gardonside, 4 cans.....	. 36	. 64
Tomatoes, standard, 4 cans.....	. 38	. 64
Carrots, diced, 4 cans.....	. 38	. 64
Beets, Fame cut, 4 cans, 2½ size.....	. 46	. 48
Cherries, sour, pitted, 2 cans.....	. 29	. 40
Subtotal.....	3. 21	5. 04
Grand total, all listed items.....	18. 75	39. 86

¹ Out of season.

Secretary of the Treasury Snyder has been speaking at various places throughout the Nation and has frequently been quoted as having said:

"The average per capita income in the United States today, after taxes, will buy almost 40 percent more in actual goods and services than the average per capita income in 1939."

He also is reported to have said:

"The per capita purchasing power of the American people has improved by about 40 percent since 1939 after making full allowance for tax increases and price changes."

This technique of the big lie, stands exposed by a careful investigation of all facts about income, taxes, and the cost of living.

The per capita income in 1939 was \$536. However, the dollar had a purchasing power of \$1.30 in the market place. Thus, the actual per capita income amounted to \$696.80.

The per capita income for 1950, reported by the President's Council of Economic Advisers, was \$1,336. The purchasing power of the dollar in the market place averaged about 50 cents. Thus the \$1,336 reported per capita income represented only \$668 compared with \$696.80 in 1939.

The real Democrats and Republicans in Congress could render distinguished service to the American people by exposing the technique of the big lie which the New Deal-Fair Deal depends upon to pull the wool over the eyes of the American people while they squander our tax dollars in all kinds of international enterprises throughout the whole civilized world excepting Russia and the iron-curtain countries.

PAUL O. PETERS.

Present Danger From Air Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES J. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Staten Island Advance of July 23, 1951, on air pollution.

The effects of air pollution have become so serious a national industrial health problem as to have proven fatal in extreme cases, such as that of Donora, Pa.

If poisonous air can become fatal in concentrated quantities, how can there be much doubt that the slow, day-by-day inhalation of lesser amounts could prove fatal eventually through accumulation of poison in the system, resulting in a foreshortened life span.

The industrial hygiene experts of the United States Public Health Service have expressed the opinion that industrial air pollution is a serious menace to health, more serious than they believe they are able to determine within the limited means available to them.

As I have a serious air-pollution problem in my district, comprising Staten Island and lower west Manhattan, I requested permission of the State health authorities of New York and New Jersey to permit the United States Public

Health Service experts to examine conditions in the area. This they did 2 years ago, but explained that they did not possess the funds to make a thorough research into the problem of air pollution which, they said, involves unexplored factors.

The Federal health authorities explained that scientific research could not be made without a special authorization of appropriations for the purpose. This research, they said, must be done on a national scale over a period of years so as to provide the widest scientific experimentation in order that any particular area affected would derive the fullest benefit.

In cooperation with the United States Public Health officials, I introduced House Joint Resolution 416 in the last Congress, to provide for an extended survey of the air-pollution problem in order to benefit the Nation, as well as my district. I familiarized every Member of Congress with the legislation but the Korean outbreak necessarily diverted attention to national defense. House Joint Resolution 416, therefore, died with the Eighty-first Congress.

But it is my contention that national health is a bulwark of national defense, that even with all things being equal the healthier nation will survive and excel. I, therefore, introduced House Joint Resolution 38 on the first day of this Congress. This measure was identical with House Joint Resolution 416 of the Eighty-first Congress.

However, pursuant to an agreement made between the Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior, and the United States Public Health Service, Federal Security Agency, to combine efforts toward the elimination of air pollution, I introduced House Joint Resolution 218 in order to fully cooperate with the Government agencies upon whom the solution of the problem would depend.

House Joint Resolution 218 superseded House Joint Resolution 38 and broadens its scope by providing for the combined efforts of the Bureau of Mines and the United States Public Health Service in an extensive research and survey to determine the causes, the effects on the health of man, and the means of preventing air contamination. The resolution provides for authorization of such sums as may be necessary each fiscal year for the next 5 years. Each year, no later than January 1, after funds are made available, reports shall be made to Congress by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, through the Federal Security Administrator and the Secretary of the Interior, respectively.

It has been my earnest endeavor to obtain a hearing before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which this legislation has been referred, so that expert testimony can be heard from the Bureau of Mines, Public Health Service, Health Commissioners of various States and cities, and the taxpayers of intensely affected areas, who should be given an opportunity to explain the conditions to which they are subjected.

As an indication of representative sentiment in my district in favor of House Joint Resolution 218, I submit

the following editorial from the Staten Island Advance of July 23, 1951:

Too Vital To Die

Congressman MURPHY's antismog measure could be stamped DIC—died in committee.

And 'Islanders could reconcile themselves to breathing foul air, farmers to viewing ruined crops because of New Jersey smog for several more years at least.

Congressman ROBERT CROSSER, Ohio Democrat, has put the cards on the table.

Chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which has Mr. MURPHY's measure, Mr. CROSSER said that his group has 300 bills waiting in line and "I can't get some of the members to take much action."

Blocked is House Joint Resolution 218 which would have authorized a survey of the causes of smog by the United States Public Health Service and the Bureau of Mines.

Its life was short * * * and not at all sweet. Introduced just before the Easter recess, it was shunted to Mr. CROSSER's committee—and there, apparently, it may stay for the remainder of the current congressional session.

Pigeonholed without a fair chance.

Pigeonholed, although medical records will show that islanders may trace ailments, and their aggravation, to the poisonous smog that blows over from New Jersey industry.

Pigeonholed, although island farmers can present evidence of thousands of dollars lost through crops ruined by smog.

We don't know how many of those other 300 bills are just as important, or how many will receive action, but we do know this is a terrific blow to the hopes of the island for cleaner air.

The island should fight to revive the measure.

Perhaps we were expecting too much in anticipating congressional action on a matter so vital to public health and welfare.

But the island has little alternative.

Health authorities of New York and New Jersey have stated repeatedly that they needed that study—its factual evidence and suggested remedial methods—before State legislatures could move to establish an agency to combat air pollution.

Both States now deny that they have the funds, the manpower, or the equipment to make the survey.

Do the members of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee know these facts?

Do they know that if they don't revive House Joint Resolution 218 cleaner air in the island-Jersey region is years away?

And, mind you, this is only one part of the Nation affected.

The resolution proposes no survey for the island alone, but for all sections in the country suffering from poisoned air.

Thousands upon thousands of persons must continue to breathe air dangerous enough to kill plants in a few hours.

An examination of the backgrounds of the members of the committee shows there's no lobby within it to push the measure through.

Too few of the members come from sections where smog is prevalent. Too many make their homes in small towns and cities in agricultural areas.

Mr. CROSSER, the ranking Democrat on the committee, makes his home in Cleveland, but Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH, the ranking Republican, makes his home on Route 2, Gladewater, Tex.

In all there are 29 Members on the committee—15 Democrats and 14 Republicans.

Somewhere within this group Staten Island must be able to find the spark for action. If Congressmen are prodded hard enough, they move.

Staten Island isn't asking much. All it wants is a fair hearing so that the measure

may be sent to the House floor for a vote. And if there's anything amiss with the resolution as it is now written, we'd like to know about it now so that it can be changed to avoid future delays.

We have asked islanders before to write to the committee. We feel another try should be made.

So that you may know whom to write, where the Congressman is from, and his party affiliation, we list the committee membership. Write to any, or all if you will, at Washington. In addition to Congressmen CROSSER and BECKWORTH the committee members are:

JOHN V. BEAMER, Republican, Indiana; JOHN B. BENNETT, Republican, Michigan; F. ESTEL CARLYLE, Democrat, North Carolina; J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, Republican, Colorado; JAMES I. DOLLIVER, Republican, Iowa; WILSON D. GILLETTE, Republican, Pennsylvania; WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, Democrat, Pennsylvania; ROBERT HALE, Republican, Maine; LEONARD W. HALL, Republican, New York; OREN HARRIS, Democrat, Arkansas.

LOUIS B. HELLER, Democrat, New York; JOHN W. HESELTON, Republican, Massachusetts; CARL HINSHAW, Republican, California; RICHARD W. HOFFMAN, Republican, Illinois; ARTHUR G. KLEIN, Democrat, New York; JOHN A. MCGUIRE, Democrat, Connecticut; PETER F. MACK, Jr., Democrat, Illinois; JOSEPH P. O'HARA, Republican, Minnesota.

J. PERCY PRIEST, Democrat, Tennessee; KENNETH A. ROBERTS, Democrat, Alabama; DWIGHT L. ROGERS, Democrat, Florida; HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr., Republican, Pennsylvania; THOMAS B. STANLEY, Democrat, Virginia; HOMER THORNBERRY, Democrat, Texas; THOMAS R. UNDERWOOD, Democrat, Kentucky; JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, Democrat, Mississippi; and CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, Republican, New Jersey.

It's worth writing—for your health and welfare.

New Hampshire's Impression of Iowa Farm Boys and Girls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include part of a newspaper article written by Leon W. Anderson, which appeared in the Concord Daily Monitor and New Hampshire Patriot of July 20, 1951. I am pleased to know that the writer of this article was so favorably impressed with our Iowa people when they visited his great State:

THE STATE IS MY BEAT

(By Leon W. Anderson)

A big flock of Iowans poured through the statehouse yesterday morning and gave us a thrill.

We got so flustered for a time that we didn't quite know whether we were afoot or horseback, there were so many of them. But we finally swung into action, learned where they came from and where they were going, and came up with a healthy respect for Iowa.

It was probably one of the biggest delegations of nonresidents to invade our statehouse in many years. There were 74 of them, believe it or not.

We sensed from the start that they were not New Hampshire folks. There was a

freshness of purpose and looks about them which gave that impression. "Extroverts" is a good word to describe what we are trying to say.

We started trailing them as they poured through the legislative chambers and headed for Governor Adams' office.

We learned that they were members of Iowa's annual Rural Youth Tour, and belonged to the Junior Farm Bureau Federation of that Midwest State. We thought they were rather unusual boys and girls and learned that we were right. They ranged in ages from 18 to 25. Some of them are school teachers and others are getting set for duty in the Armed Forces.

That rural youth business sort of had us puzzled. They didn't look like "hayshakers" and we saw no corn husks sticking from their ears.

But steady questioning brought out they really were farm folks. It was just that they were different kinds of farm youngsters from those who have to do with our rocky soil and small, hilly fields.

We asked one of them how in heck they got so far from home and where they got the cash to do it with. This youngster appeared surprised. He explained each one financed his or her own expenses.

Gosh, we commented, that sounded like a lot of money. The young man smilingly said it was not much, being only \$150 for transportation and another \$75 for meals and the fun of picking up souvenirs for the folks back home.

So we gave up. It was the darndest bunch of farm kids we have ever seen in action. It was refreshing to meet them.

They were in charge of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Heman. He is State director of young peoples activities of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation, and lives in Des Moines. We had a hard time, in fact, picking them out from the rest of the flock, because the Hemans looked as chipper, young, and full of eager freshness, as any of their charges.

Heman explained they were on an 11-day jaunt. They arrived in Boston by train yesterday, after a New York City stop. Then they piled into busses and came to Concord to be shown around by Director Alfred J. French, of the New Hampshire Farm Bureau, and Agricultural Commissioner Perley I. Fitts. They visited William Jordan's Kadokeadee farm on the Long Pond Road, and then set off for an overnight stop at St. Johnsbury, Vt.

Tonight they are scheduled to stay at Quebec's swanky Hotel Frontenac, no less, and then they will go to Montreal. At Buffalo, N. Y., they will entrain again and go home.

Nothing To Be Proud of

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, here is a hard-hitting editorial that exposes the sell-out of American consumers to those who would fatten themselves at the expense of our national security.

It strips away the artifices by which special interests try to hide their "great betrayal" from the people.

It shows how they are planning to rob the American public by paying them wages in cheapened dollars.

"Stand up and be counted," it says.

Either we have real controls against inflation, or we gamble with the American economy, which is just duck soup for Stalin.

A control bill that fails to control is a bill that will encourage inflation.

No man can be for controls and against controls at the same time.

Those who engage in this deceptive juggling may profit from it. The Boston Traveler, in its lead editorial of Monday, July 23, 1951, attacks this dangerous duplicity head on.

In so doing, it is meeting the highest standards of courageous and responsible journalism. Under unanimous consent, I insert the editorial in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as a public service:

NOTHING TO BE PROUD OF

Perhaps the best description of the House action on controls is provided by the simple fact that many Representatives did not want their names linked to amendments they had anonymously supported.

When they had to confront a roll call many solons abandoned crippling amendments they had supported in the obscurity of voice votes shouted cravenly in the House sitting as a Committee of the Whole.

The measure has finally been passed, and now goes to Senate-House conference. It has weakened the National Defense Production Act at the very time when it should be strengthened. With the consumers' dollar already reduced to 92 cents since the Korean War started and with the real inflation threat still ahead, the House deliberately blunted the weapons with which inflation can be fought.

All that apparently saved America from the almost complete rout of controls was the reluctance of the Representatives to stand up and be counted. Their shame, their fear, or possibly their better second thoughts, at least killed amendments they would have suspended price and wage controls completely for 120 days; that would have wiped out the 10-percent beef price roll-back already instituted, and that would have guaranteed profit margins on every article of trade.

But the law actually passed is bad enough. It reflects primarily a surrender to short-sighted pressures on farm and business blocs. The reluctance of Congress to extend Government control over our free enterprise system is understandable. In normal times such reluctance should be overwhelming. In the present emergency, however, the tides of run-away inflation can cripple our free enterprise system far more than emergency controls to hold inflation in check.

The alarming fact is that the House has taken sandbags off the inflation dykes when they should have piled on more. There can be no serious criticism of Congress for withholding power from the President to license industries and to finance Government plants for production. Those are extreme measures that should not be resorted to now.

The House acted stupidly and recklessly, however, in eliminating meat slaughtering quotas, the one device that gave promise of defeating the black market. Without this safeguard the House has paved the way for the collapse of food controls. Just as bad was the House's action in prohibiting imports of oil and fats, in outlawing future roll-backs and in forbidding curbs on commodity speculation. Its relaxation of some credit controls furnishes a device for accelerating the pace at which consumer goods are exhausted. It will be interesting to see if the prediction of some business interests that production can meet such heavier demand will work out as defense cuts deeper and deeper into supply.

In the final summing up the House buckled under political pressures. The broad national interest has been sacrificed to special groups. Primarily the farm lobby has been in the saddle, although for obvious political reasons Mr. Truman preferred to single out the National Association of Manufacturers for condemnation.

Nor can the administration heap all blame upon the Republicans. Such Democratic stalwarts as Senators DOUGLAS, SPARKMAN, and FULBRIGHT ducked vigorous leadership when a weakened price-control measure went through the Senate.

Congress has fallen far short of statesmanship and Mr. Truman of leadership. Events may well force a special session of Congress. It has taken the worst flood in American history to show Congress how wrong it was in yielding to the farmers in their opposition to effective flood-control measures. Another flood—inflation is now poised over our heads and Congress has weakened the levees, as it responded to the same bad counsel.

The Story of the Defense Production Act of 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. M. (DON) WHEELER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am inserting a statement I had ready to make last week while we were considering the Defense Production Act. Not being a member of the committee on Banking and Currency, I was unable to get sufficient time last week to make the statement. The statement is as follows:

THE STORY OF THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

(By WILLIAM McDONALD WHEELER)

In September of last year, when the Congress was considering the Defense Production Act of 1950, I felt that the Congress should recognize the emergency that existed by spelling out in the law the manner in which wages and prices should be controlled. If these controls were needed sufficiently to pass any law on the subject then, they were needed badly enough to have frozen both wages and prices at that time. If this had been done there would have been no necessity for the much-talked-about roll-backs that are now being considered.

Instead of facing up to its responsibility by spelling out in the law that which would be controlled and the manner in which the controls would apply, Congress passed a law, my objections and vote against it to the contrary notwithstanding, which delegated to the executive department of the Government the authority to impose controls.

In spite of the fact that he had been given authority to do so, the President failed to do anything in the way of imposing any controls. He did make some show of intent to control certain things at a later date by causing to be placed on the Federal payroll thousands of employees in a confusing mess of new alphabetical agencies. The mere existence of all these new agencies constituted sufficient threat as to lead thousands of producers, processors, and retailers to abruptly increase the prices of the goods and services in which they dealt. This was a natural reaction to the impending threat,

for it was reasonable to assume that whatever ceilings that were to be eventually imposed would be based, in large degree, on prices prevailing at the time ceilings were to be imposed.

The President's failure to take action other than that of creating a threat in the form of new agencies and his failure to do anything about the abrupt spiraling of wages last winter accounts, in large part, for the unreasonable rise in prices that the country experienced the latter part of last year and the early part of the current year.

After having waited until prices and wages had reached dangerous inflationary levels the stabilization authorities came forth with a device called the roll-back, which is clearly remuneration under due process of law, property from American citizens without fair remuneration under due process of law. This can be shown by assuming that a farmer bought some feeder cattle last December and paid 28 cents per pound for them, only to find 2 months later, and after having paid increased feeding cost both in the form of the actual feed and the labor involved in getting the cattle ready for market, that the Government orders him to sell the cattle at a lower figure than he had actually paid for them. It can readily be seen that the only way this farmer can be kept from actually losing money on the transaction would be for the Government to subsidize him by paying to him the amount lost in the transaction. This roll-back scheme is nothing more than a forerunner of the much-publicized Brannan farm plan, which calls for the taking of money from the taxpayers to pay producers the difference between that which the Government says he can sell for and that which the ultimate consumer pays. I for one want no part of such a socialistic plan, and I do not believe the American people want it.

Since the OPS and the dozens of other alphabetical agencies have been in actual operation the ceilings that have been imposed have actually become price goals instead of price ceilings. This fact alone proves that the OPS has actually contributed to the inflationary process instead of curbing it. In spite, however, of the fact that sellers have, in thousands of instances, actually increased prices in order to reach the ceiling placed by OPS, this agency has continued to issue a growing volume of orders, rules, regulations, and amendments. Most of these provide for new price ceilings, and most of the new ceilings are above current market prices.

All of the confusing and ineffective orders that are being issued are still being issued in the name of inflation and public protection. As long ago as April 8, however, Price Administrator DiSalle stated publicly, "the inflationary rises since Korea have been largely psychological." The Wall Street Journal quotes him as further stating, "Price controls would not halt or even control price rises but that they were politically necessary; for psychological reasons the Government had to convince the citizens that it was doing something about inflation." On the basis of his own statement, DiSalle sees it as his job not to control prices but to control public opinion about inflation that, as he sees it, is not an inflation at all but merely a psychological demonstration.

In view of the foregoing quoted expressions of the Price Administrator's opinion of the function he is supposed to perform, it is small wonder that a control law that was enacted last year has been poorly administered in such a way as to make it worse than ineffective. The bright so-called intellectuals, with whom the Administrator has surrounded himself, have proceeded to issue ream after ream of regulations, rules and amendments to same. As if the actual volume of printed matter were not enough to completely confuse the public to whom it

is directed, the content is so composed as to cause serious disagreement between leading lawyers of the country. It is easily seen that regulations, which defy practical definition by those who engage in the profession of law, cannot do other than enrage and confuse laymen who are subject to penal servitude and fine if compliance is violated.

Although there are many fine, conscientious, and patriotic people employed by the various new alphabetical agencies that have been set up under the Defense Production Act, experience strongly indicates that the large majority of these employees have been placed on the payroll on the basis of political consideration rather than on ability to administer in a common-sense manner the law authorizing their existence and ability to issue clear-cut, simple regulations that the average American citizen can understand.

After nearly a full year of befuddled experimentation with an effort to control the economy of this country; nearly a year of operation that has increased instead of lowering the spiral of inflation; nearly a year of ignoring the real causes of inflation, and nearly a year of half-hearted attempts to control inflation by controlling prices while totally ignoring wages that contribute so much to the cost of finished products, the administration now is urging Congress to pass an extension of the law and further urging that more powers be given the administration than are granted under existing law.

If only one reason were needed as ground for opposing the passage of the new Defense Production Act, it is the fact that no mention whatsoever is made in the pending bill of wage control. This is more than positive proof that the administration has no intention of even attempting to control wages. It is true, as night follows day, that prices cannot be equitably controlled unless wages are controlled at the same time. Of course, the reason for this disregard of the obvious necessity of controlling both prices and wages simultaneously is that control of wages is considered politically inexpedient by the administration. They continue to urge Congress to pass authority to control prices with none to control wages in the firm belief that they can continue to fool the people into thinking that a real effort is being made to control inflation.

The President is attempting, through his top-flight bureaucratic propagandists, to get the American people to write to Members of Congress urging the passage of the new control law. They are desperately attempting to sell Americans on the idea that the people can have their cake and eat it, too. They do not bother to tell the people that the only way a producer can sell his products for a high price and at the same time allow the consumer to buy the product for a low price is for the Government to pay the difference to the producer. They glibly ignore the fact that whether the difference is paid at the time of purchase or at the time the tax collector comes around it still must be paid.

In an obvious attempt to get the Brannan farm plan's foot in the door, the pending bill provides for the payment of subsidies to producers. As pressing as the current emergency is, the American people do not want the administration to reach into the tax-till for money with which to pay producers the difference between the low price they would get for their products and the high cost of producing these commodities. Without going into various reasons as to why the Brannan subsidy plan should not be authorized, since it has been well discussed in the press of the country, suffice it to say that this dishonest and ineffective approach to the problem of inflation should not be pursued.

If there can be any justification for economic control by Government edict in this

free-enterprise system of ours, it can only be found during periods of extreme emergency when we are faced with serious shortages of the goods that constitute our standard of living. In order to ascertain whether we are actually faced with shortages of a sufficiently serious nature as to justify living under strict economic controls, exercised by a power-mad administration, we should look to the record of that which we have on hand and that which we have good reason to expect will be produced for our storehouses during the current production season.

We are producing at a near record rate this year in nearly all fields. Steel production is up 10 percent above last year. We expect to produce at least 70 percent more cotton than we did last year, and with a 2,000,000-bale carry-over we should have roughly 20,000,000 bales on hand. Wheat production is expected to top last year's crop by 48,000,000 bushels and last year's crop was so large that we have millions of bushels stored as surplus. Corn production is expected to be up 164,000,000 bushels from last year, and here again we have surplus corn stored, like wheat, in facilities on which the taxpayers are paying enormous amounts in rent. These are just a few examples of the fact that we have a surplus supply of almost all food and fiber items.

Surpluses cannot condone control by Government order if we are to adequately regard the basic tenets of the free-enterprise faith on which this country was founded and grew to greatness. Experience gained during World War II should convince beyond any reasonable doubt that the only answer to inflation in the fields where shortages are found is increased production. When production is encouraged the law of supply and demand will take care of high prices. If production is hampered by confusing and inequitable controls, inflationary pressures will continue in any field. This, it appears to me, is no more than a statement of rudimentary economic fact.

Before leaving discussion of surpluses, it is worth noting that the administration is currently asking for additional billions of dollars to be spent on the ECA program. When administration spokesmen are questioned as to the wisdom of sending all these dollars, goods, and services to foreign lands, they answer by saying that our economy will not be damaged since we have so many surpluses in this country. This answer is obviously contradictory in view of their current insistence on expanded control authority based on the premise that we are suffering from shortages in almost every field. It is more than passing strange that they are able to talk so glibly from both sides of their mouths in their attempt to justify opposite conclusions on the same premise.

Most of this discussion thus far has related, in large part, to the effect of controls on agricultural products; however, the arguments made in this regard apply as strongly to many items in the so-called hard-goods field. It is very significant that Mr. Charles Wilson, head controller for the administration—and one who has spoken loudly and long in an effort to sell his control program to the people—can find that his own company, General Electric, currently has approximately 18,000 electric refrigerators stored in its Washington warehouse figuratively crying for customers to purchase them. If the number stored in the Washington warehouse is indicative, there must be thousands more stored by this one company all over the country and, if the indication holds throughout the industry, the many other manufacturers of this item must have additional thousands in storage for lack of customers. That which is true of refrigerators is true of literally hundreds of other items that have inventories swollen all over the country. A further significant fact in this regard is that

there is a reasonably weak market in many of these items that compose the swollen inventories. This weak market is reflected in the relatively low cost of such of these items as clothing, furniture, electrical appliances, and television sets. There is no denying that the stable prices on such goods are the result of a high rate of production that has more than met the demand—and not by regulations issued by the stabilization authorities.

A lot has been said by the Government propagandists, the press and the radio commentators about certain so-called pressure groups impressing their will upon Congress during the pendency of the legislation now under consideration. They would have the public believe that any Congressman who opposes passage of the pending bill has sold out or unethically yielded to pressure exerted by the NAM, the Farm Bureau, or some other group seeking selfish advantage. They religiously avoid any disparaging mention of the pressure groups that are favoring the passage of the bill such as the organized labor groups and the group of tax-paid Government propagandists of which they are members. The practice of branding all those who oppose their socialistic schemes as being selfish, unpatriotic devils is not a new device to the fair dealers who now demand more and more power to be used for the socialization of this country. Contrary to the practice of certain columnists and radio commentators, I do not propose to speak for anyone but myself, but the fact of the matter is that I had publicly expressed my opposition to the farcical control bill long before I learned of the position taken by either the Farm Bureau or the National Association of Manufacturers. And, in spite of the concerted effort on the part of many propagandists to discredit the Congress of the United States, I have faith in the integrity of my colleagues in the House to believe that they are not being unduly influenced by selfish pressure groups.

Much has been said here of late concerning the fact that the dollar is now worth only 54 cents. No argument can be raised to deny this fact; however, it is significant that very little was said on this score until time came for the administration to seek additional control power. The truth of the matter is that due largely to the fiscal policies of the administration the dollar has been worth very little more than 54 cents at any time during the last 5 years. Reference is made to the unwise and inflationary fiscal policies of the administration simply because the greatest single contributing factor to inflation has been this policy.

If it is agreed that production is the ultimate answer to inflation, then it must follow that every time the Government adds additional thousands to the payroll, thereby taking these thousands from the production line, inflationary pressure is increased. Without disparaging a single one of these employees, it must be admitted that they are providing service of one kind or another and are not producing food, fiber, or anything else except, in many cases, confusion. No single facet of the entire picture has more definitely contributed to inflation than has the hiring of thousands of Government employees.

A policy of unbridled taxation, Government spending, and the inexcusable waste attendant to this spending is another very large contributing factor to inflation. As long as the Government continues to spend billions of dollars in every field imaginable, both necessary and otherwise, and wastes billions in the process, inflation will be with us regardless of the kind of control act that is passed. As long as money is made more readily available than goods inflationary pressures will increase. All this is to say that the very administration that is pleading

so fervently for controls of all kinds and descriptions is responsible, in convincing degree, for the inflation it would have you believe controls will cure.

Administration spokesmen agree that they are opposed to controls in time of peace. They admit that these controls in time of peace would wreck our system of government and cause it to be replaced by one of socialistic pattern. While making this admission, they insist that the present control justifying emergency will, in all probability, last for as long as 20 years. By their own admission food for serious thought can be found in the question as to whether our free-enterprise economy can survive the controls they advocate for 20 years. In this regard it is worthy of note that the employees of the various stabilization agencies have been promised certain awards that can be earned after 10 years of service and certain other awards after 20 years of service. This indicates to me that the powers that be in the stabilization program envision having a job of administering this control legislation for a long time to come.

In planning to set up elaborate control machinery with which to control all prices, the planners studiously ignore the fact that prospects for crop production July 1 are as good as the best in recent years. Conditions continue to improve with aggregate crop acreage the largest since 1933. Aggregate production is now expected to top all other years except 1948. These are estimates made by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

The planners who advocate strong controls over every phase of American life will tell you that the bright outlook insofar as food supplies is concerned can be discounted since the Military Establishment will require foodstuffs in ever-increasing amounts. If the personnel making up the armed services were being recruited from foreign lands, this argument would stand. However, the fact of the matter is that American soldiers will consume very little more food and fiber in uniform than they would if left in civilian life. Since the military will consume very little more food and fiber, and a large part of the larger amount consumed being attributed to gross waste that could be remedied, the total food supply will not be affected greatly whether 3,000,000 or 6,000,000 men are under arms. They all must be fed, clothed, and sheltered whether in or out of the uniform.

Some of us Members of Congress are really trying to attack the problem of inflation at its source by taking action to cut all the unnecessary items from the President's budget. Many of these items can be cut drastically without endangering the security of this Nation. One large item that can stand considerable paring, if not total abolition, is the gigantic foreign-aid program for which the President is now asking \$8.5 billion. If the recipients of these global handouts are not ready to travel on their own after us having financed them since World War II, there is good ground to wonder whether there is any hope for them. Certainly no one in his right mind is still so gullible as to believe that we can buy the friendship of these people. If these recipients of our bounty have those things that we need we should buy those items in a straightforward business deal and quit this quixotic foolishness of giving everything we have away with no hope of receiving anything in return.

Certainly we should not be dishonest enough to tell the American people that we must control every phase of their lives because we are suffering from shortages and then come right along and tell them that a handout program to the rest of the world is justified as a means of getting rid of enormous surpluses we have on hand. The fact of the matter is that we could take the millions of dollars which administration of the control program will require and the

billions of dollars being requested to finance the foreign-aid program and use this money to buy from foreign countries those things of which we are short in this country. In addition to this, we could release thousands of Americans from their control jobs so that they could go to work on the production lines. By doing these three things we could acquire an adequate supply of those items of which we are short and, in view of the fact that we are short in comparatively few fields, we could rearm without completely disrupting our entire economy.

It will be found that there are more controls of people embodied in the Control Act than there are controls of prices. This is in keeping with the obvious purpose of the administration since they want to completely run this country. They have used every device and trick of deception known to the field of propaganda in their effort to set class against class in this country. They have tried to draw definite lines between consumers and producers when the truth of the matter is that producers are also consumers and those things that are good for one group are good for the others. They have succeeded in causing millions of Americans to believe that Congress is completely dominated by certain evil pressure groups composed of selfish profiteers who have no regard for the welfare of the country. This is positively not true and the administration spokesmen know it. Their willingness to bear false witness in this manner, while attempting to pressure Congress themselves, is sufficient evidence to indict their fitness to hold positions of public trust.

The administration, through its spokesmen, has been telling the American people that if they would write to their Congressmen and get them to vote for the controls; if sufficient power could be placed in the administration, it would guarantee the people security in the form of low prices. They have not suggested to the people that with this power to control prices must also go power to control people and take their liberties from them. No, the requests for power have been sugar-coated by promises of something for nothing in the full knowledge that, once the sugar-coating is melted away, it will be too late for the people to regain their freedom.

I would vote for restricted power to allocate certain strategic materials, but I will not be beguiled into voting away the freedom of American people in exchange for the empty promise of steak that be bought a little cheaper. I know that a law passed here in Congress saying that steaks could not be sold for more than 10 cents per pound would not work in such a way as to increase the supply of steak. If this could be done, then a law could be passed making everyone a millionaire. The law of supply and demand cannot be superseded by any law we pass here, but the liberties of the people can be forfeited if we choose the way of least resistance by simply giving the President dictatorial powers and telling him to solve all our economic problems for us by putting his armies of bureaucrats to work on them.

The American people can solve the problem of inflation if they are willing to pay the price of abstaining from buying those things that are priced beyond reason. We do not require steak six or seven times every week. There are a lot of things we can do without for a while. Spoiled and pampered as we are, it will require some self-restraint and self-denial, but the inescapable fact is that those who have died to purchase our freedom paid far more dearly than we are called on to pay. We can do it the way that seemeth hard or we can solve our problems by simply delegating power to the President. The way that seemeth hard will preserve for

us our hard-won freedom. The way that seemeth easy, since it is the way of least resistance, is the way weak people tread on their downward march to slavery.

Someone has aptly said, and I quote, "I had rather die on my feet than live on my knees." This quotation could very well be taken as the motto of every American today, for our liberty is just as much in jeopardy here at home as it is from external foes. As long as we are free we can eventually vanquish the outward foe, but when freedom is gone not enough difference is left between our lot and those enemies from without as to make fighting seem worth the effort and danger.

If it is old-fashioned and reactionary to believe in the American people and their ability to solve their problems without forfeiting their freedom; if it is crime to hold freedom in higher regard than all the security slavery's chains can give me; if it is wrong to believe that the economic system of free enterprise and the profit system is the best economic system ever devised by the mind of man, having given to Americans the highest standard of living ever known to man, if it be treason to prefer liberty under God to all the Utopian promises of security that the chains of slavery can hold, then I stand convicted before the bar of human justice and throw myself upon the mercy of the court.

In closing I would quote John Stuart Mill, who said: "A people may prefer a free government but if, from indolence, carelessness, or cowardice, or want of public spirit, they are unequal to the exertions necessary for preserving it; if they will not fight for it when it is directly attacked; if they can be deluded by the artifices used to cheat them out of it; if by momentary discouragement, or temporary panic, or a fit of enthusiasm for an individual, they can be induced to lay their liberties at the feet even of a great man, or trust him with powers which enable him to subvert their institutions; in all these cases they are more or less unfit for liberty; and though it may be for their good to have had it even for a short time, they are unlikely long to enjoy it." Where can a more scathing indictment be found of Americans who would now place their hope for continued freedom in the hands of those who are obsessed with desire for more and more power. God forbid that we have reached the dark day in this land when life is held so dear and indolence so sweet as to allow us to surrender our all into the hands of other humans whoever or whatever they may be.

Free the Women, by Dr. Florence A. Armstrong

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. EDWARD T. MILLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our thoughts and energies are focused on the international scene, let us not forget that this very condition makes it more necessary than ever before to get our own house in order. It would indeed be desirable if action could be taken with respect to the equal-rights amendment, which a number of us have sponsored, and other needed reforms at home.

Under leave, I am including herewith an article by Dr. Florence A. Armstrong, which appeared in the July issue of the Kiplinger magazine, *Changing Times*:

FREE THE WOMEN

(By Dr. Florence A. Armstrong)

In this time of national emergency, the country's resources would be greater and its morale higher if justice were done to all citizens, regardless of sex. A nation that degrades, with humiliating discriminations and hampering disabilities, half of its entire population—the women—will ever be at a distinct disadvantage among nations that give equal participation, equal rights, equal justice, and equal human dignity to all their citizens, both men and women.

For every good reason, it seems to me, the United States should grant to its women their full citizenship, now, without further harmful delay.

As with the extension of suffrage, some individuals and groups would at any time object strenuously to granting full citizenship to women, on the basis of some prejudice or because of some vested interest in the subjection of women. Organized labor and groups controlled by labor do so. Such objections, which oppose the world trend and the evolutionary trend, should no longer be permitted to deny fundamental rights to half our population.

The only practicable way to eradicate legal discrimination against women is to adopt another amendment to the Constitution.

The National Woman's Party in 1923 introduced such an amendment, popularly known as the equal rights amendment. It reads, in 1951, as follows:

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

"The Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

"This amendment shall take effect 1 year after the date of ratification."

The amendment is supported by about two score national groups and by innumerable individuals, both men and women. Support in Congress has increased at every session.

WHAT DISCRIMINATION?

I am frequently asked what discriminations would be removed by the equal-rights amendment. I, myself, have seen eight types of legal discriminations which seem to me most harmful to women. No doubt each person would make a somewhat different list. My own list includes the following:

1. Restrictions on hours of work. Laws covering working hours of employed women, where different from the laws applicable to men, have proved extremely troublesome to women. When introduced in New York, such laws caused thousands of women to lose their jobs overnight, according to reminiscences of a worker as told to me.

Usually this legislation limits the number of hours women may work and specifies which hours they may not work, such as after 10 p. m., and it places women at a cruel disadvantage in competition with men on the same jobs who are not so restricted. The reports, inspections, and allocation of penalties involved provide jobs for many in government—another group with a vested interest in thwarting equal rights for women.

2. Discrimination in pay. To remedy this, 12 States have passed laws requiring "equal pay for equal work," but these laws are very complicated.

3. Restrictions on property ownership. These old, unjust laws cause untold hardships and agony to women, most of whom know nothing about property laws before they marry. Most published articles on the

subject make light of these laws, using gross caricatures for illustrations, and high lighting such silly points as "Who owns the wedding ring?" The intent of such material seems to be to prevent discussion by making all discussion of equal rights for men and women ridiculous; persons in a weak position are ever especially sensitive to ridicule. Such laws, however, can easily be studied by anyone.

The Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor, Washington 25, D. C., publishes a pamphlet, *The Legal Status of Women in the United States (1948)*, on the laws of each State. One has only to ask for the pamphlet on one's own State. No woman should be without such data.

4. Restrictions on guardianship of minor children. The worst laws give all rights to the husband, even to the disposal, without the consent of the mother, of children unborn. The newspapers are full of conflicts over this point, in and out of the courts.

5. Occupational restrictions. Any job discrimination based on sex and not on competence is particularly harmful and cruel nowadays, when more and more millions of women—married and unmarried—are employed.

6. Restrictions on the right to sue. These laws result in very bad situations, as in cases where a husband can sue his wife if she assaults him, but the wife cannot sue the husband if he assaults her. Several States still have these restrictions. The press reports cases of juveniles who have got into trouble with the law trying to help their mothers during violent abuse by fathers. Juvenile delinquency and criminal careers frequently begin thus.

7. Restrictions on control of earnings. Under a few statutes, a woman cannot own or control her own earnings after marriage. Some States, like Iowa, have in this respect modified the old English common law (which treats women as chattels) and provide for her the right to her separate earnings.

8. Various laws now completely outmoded. Such laws, originally discriminatory, have become worse with time, even ludicrous. As an example of such is an old Iowa law: In seizure of property for debt, the husband may keep the tools of his trade, but the woman may keep only one sewing machine and \$50 worth of poultry.

PROGRESS, BUT NOT ENOUGH

Over the years some States have removed their most flagrant discriminations, in response to the efforts of organized women. Some have even put equal rights for men and women into their State constitutions. I have been told that the National Woman's Party and the National League of Women Voters were each able to get about 150 discriminatory laws removed from the statute books soon after the suffrage amendment was passed.

The Wisconsin Legislature in 1921 wisely passed a law giving to women "the same rights and privileges under the laws as men in the exercise of suffrage, freedom of contract, choice of residence for voting purposes, jury service, holding office, holding and conveying property, care and custody of children, and in all other respects."

If the same thing had happened on a national scale, the country would have benefited immeasurably in the succeeding generations.

Besides Wisconsin, three other States have equal constitutional rights for men and women: Missouri, New Jersey and Wyoming. Since some opponents of the equality principle almost shriek their warnings of the havoc it would cause, they should notice how these States move along smoothly enough!

New Jersey, for example, took care of the minimum wage law (that bugaboo of labor

and welfare workers) by simply amending it. They substituted the term "any person" for the words "a woman or minor," and thus extended coverage to all workers. Could not any of the so-called "protective laws" be so handled after the Equal Rights Amendment passes? If existing laws of that type are considered undesirable, they could just be dropped.

In one area—jury service—much progress has been made in the States. After extensive effort on the part of organized women, 40 States now provide that women may serve on juries. The latest addition to the list is Tennessee (1951). Still missing from the list are Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, New Mexico, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Texas and West Virginia.

By way of summary, it may be said that year by year a little progress has been made. But hundreds of old, discriminatory laws still remain on the books and new ones are being added, unfortunately, not only by some States but by the Federal Government as well.

The only practical way to get rid of all these unjust and uneconomical restrictions on women is to adopt the Equal Rights amendment to the Constitution. The sooner it is done, the better.

Lawrence, Mass., Recruiters Tops in New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, It is time we paid tribute to the clean-cut and conscientious young men who are recruiting the cream of American manpower for service in the Armed Forces.

Especially when the number of men—and women—they have enlisted heads the New England "parade."

Lawrence, Mass., is proud to have five leaders in this field and wants the world to know the outstanding job they are doing. The Army, Navy, and Air Force are to be commended for selecting men of such high caliber in the first place for this responsible assignment. Of greater importance is the fact that these recruiters are justifying, beyond expectation, the faith of their superior officers. All of them possess distinguished World War II records. But I believe that it is their neat appearance, their exemplary conduct, and their excellent public-relations work that is attracting so many young men to volunteer for careers in our defense team.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a recent story from the Lawrence Tribune that pays deserved tribute to their recruiting accomplishments:

LAWRENCE RECRUITERS TOPS IN NEW ENGLAND

Hundreds of Greater Lawrence men who are serving in the Armed Forces today have enlisted through the local recruiting stations in this city and for the past 2 years these same subrecruiting offices have broken enlistment records in the New England area.

In January and February the Army and Air Force was tops filling more than their

quota and topping such stations as Malden and others in the Greater Boston area. The Navy office in Lawrence has been the No. 1 recruiting substation in the Boston and New England section for the past 2 years and in June enlisted the most men in the history of that office. The Marines are not to be outdone. In February and March more men enlisted through the little office in the post office building than in any other month in the history of that substation.

The men in charge of these offices have received many letters of commendation for their fine work from higher headquarters. All of the stations do not take in the Lawrence area alone. Some of the men have to canvas as far as Newburyport to seek recruits and others cover the Lowell, Haverhill, Reading, and Wakefield districts. However, it is for the number of volunteers that they have enlisted in Lawrence that they have received praise. In every other town and city in the State enlistments have fallen off due to the lag in the war in Korea. This is not so in Lawrence. The Navy, which recruited well over 70 last month, has reached the 50 mark this month. The Army and Air Force always manage to fill their quota, and the Marines, as they say, "have the situation well in hand."

If you ever decide you want to make any one of the services a career and walk into one of the recruiting offices in this city you will meet the following men, what you might call the unsung heroes of the defense effort:

Chief William E. Davis, M. M. C., and Arthur W. Jones, R. D. 1, of the United States Navy; Tech. Sgt. Samuel Griffiths of the United States Marines; Sgt. (1c) Joseph A. Boardman, station commander at the local Army and Air Force recruiting station, and Tech. Sgt. Leonard J. Cutter of the United States Air Force. All are veterans of World War II, which was needless to say in the first place, but the ribbons they carry on the left side of their uniforms tell quite a story and if the men that they have enlisted shape up in any way like the persons who recruited them then they will have reason to be proud when they wear one of Uncle Sam's uniforms.

Newspapermen Back Truman Recall of MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to the following news story by Mr. Richard L. Strout. It appeared in the *Christian Science Monitor* on July 16, 1951:

NEWSPAPERMEN BACK TRUMAN RECALL OF MACARTHUR

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON—In one of the most comprehensive surveys of the press ever undertaken the Saturday Review of Literature has received answers from 332 working newspapermen in Washington, Tokyo, and the United Nations as to what they think of the MacArthur controversy.

The weekly declares that since the end of World War II it is doubtful whether any event has been more prominently headlined and treated in the press than the dismissal of General MacArthur. It queried correspondents in Tokyo, Korea, Washington, and

the United Nations on their opinions, and the results were tabulated and analyzed by the Elmo Roper associates.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur is credited with a job well done in the occupation of Japan. On the other hand, by what editors call an overwhelming majority the reporters approve President Truman's recall of General MacArthur. Many correspondents expressed criticism of the way the recall was made while considerable controversy arose over the issue of bombing Communist air bases beyond the Yalu River in Manchuria.

TRUMAN SUPPORTED

Asked whether they believed President Truman was right in recalling General MacArthur, 85 percent of the correspondents answered they thought the President right, 13 percent thought him wrong, and only 2 percent had no opinion.

Second question was the effect of the recall on the Far East—would it help, or harm, United States influence? Here 37 percent thought it helped, another 31 percent thought it had no effect (largely because of confidence imposed in Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway) while 22 percent thought it had harmed.

The Washington press corps was asked whether it thought the episode helped or harmed America's influence in world affairs. Those who felt United States prestige was enhanced came to 58 percent, while 15 percent thought it had been damaged. A fairly large group, 27 percent thought United States influence was not affected.

Next question was, what about the reaction at home? "There was surprising unanimity over where the people will finally stand," Mr. Roper reports. "By well over a 4-to-1 count the correspondents believe the people finally will approve President Truman's action."

EFFECT ON KOREA

What about the effect of the removal on the fighting in Korea? Correspondents actually in Korea were asked this question. A majority of 52 percent said they thought morale had not changed as a result. Thirty percent thought morale had been boosted, and only 3 percent thought morale had been lowered.

In analyzing these replies, Mr. Roper explains that "at least half of those who say morale is 'unchanged' believe that the decisive change for the better in morale among the troops took place not in April when General MacArthur was removed, but in December and January when General Ridgway took over the Eighth Army." Mr. Roper added, "The war correspondents emphasized time and again the differences—from the troops' standpoint—between MacArthur and Ridgway."

On the big issue of bombing bases in Manchuria, a key point raised by General MacArthur, the working press "gives the general a divided verdict," the report states. A majority of 63 percent says the policy of bombing bases in Manchuria is right, but mostly only in terms of the Korean fighting. Of these 63 only 12 percent believe bombings would be right under any conditions. Another 32 percent are flatly opposed to the idea, and 5 percent have no opinion. Mr. Roper says this question "provoked a good deal of emotion."

JAPAN RULE PRAISED

General MacArthur gets his highest praise in connection with the occupation of Japan. The working press in Tokyo voted 91 percent in calling the occupation generally successful. A high 76 percent said that his administration went as far toward democratization of Japan as was possible for an occupying power to go.

Last big question put to correspondents was whether they felt coverage of the issue

has been fair and impartial. The Roper report says that 65 percent answered that they thought press coverage was satisfactorily handled, "while only 14 percent say a poor job was done. Another 22 percent had mixed opinions."

A variation was whether there had been "undue bias or partisanship." Some 52 percent thought the handling of news stories "fair and objective." 22 percent charged most of the press with bias, and 26 percent more picked out specific papers for charges of partisanship. Regarding the latter, "a definite pattern emerged. There was widespread feeling that the pro-MacArthur press had been most guilty of bias in reporting."

Even among correspondents who "thought most coverage was unduly partisan," Mr. Roper reports, there were several newspapers which were praised. "Chief among these," he records, "was the New York Times, but close behind in praise came the New York Herald Tribune and the Christian Science Monitor."

The wire services also were praised for impartiality, particularly the Associated Press and the United Press.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial relating to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project which appeared in the July 16 edition of the St. Paul Pioneer Press. This editorial reflects the widespread desire of the people of the Midwest-Great Lakes area for the St. Lawrence project, and their hopes that Congress will do its duty to the country by enacting pending seaway legislation into law.

NEXT SEAWAY HOPE

The House Public Works Committee held a secret session last Thursday on the Great Lakes seaway and power project at which action on a motion to kill the bill was blocked, evidently by Chairman BUCKLEY. If the fate of this great improvement hangs on the slender thread of parliamentary maneuvers, the outlook for the triumph of reason and national interest over the selfishness of some powerful industries seems dark indeed.

If this is in fact the case, the hopes of the interior States and provinces of this country and Canada will necessarily turn next to Ottawa rather than Washington.

The possibility that Canada will go forward with this improvement by itself has not been taken seriously by the opponents of the project, but there have been repeated suggestions there that this be done. One of these was made by Canada's minister of transport, Lionel Chevrier, who said last year, "If it is impossible to obtain the joint development referred to in the 1941 agreement, then consideration must be given—as indeed it already has—to an all-Canadian route."

Such a route is feasible from an engineering viewpoint. The cost would be heavy for Canada to stand alone, but on the economic side, it would be no less practical on that basis than if constructed by the two countries.

Canada has been interested in the project as an all-water outlet for its wheat and other export products, and would expect to finance it out of tolls on Canadian and American ships. Canada has large deposits of nickel, cobalt, tungsten, lead, zinc, and titanium, extensive oil formations, and great timber resources. Full development of this natural wealth has been held back by lack of an economic means of transportation.

Canada would not only gain by such stimulus to its development but the access of ocean shipping to Canadian ports, perhaps at preferential rates, would encourage industry of other types to migrate or spring up there. Canada's gain might be the United States loss, but anything that builds up the economic strength of the continental interior would be bound to work out for the benefit of the entire region regardless of imaginary boundary lines. Even at heavy tolls, American shipping would certainly use the seaway and much, if not all, of the benefit anticipated from a joint venture would accrue to the Lake States from a purely Canadian route.

The opposition to this natural and logical improvement is being shortsighted as well as selfish. The few miles of rapids that block the Great Lakes to ocean shipping will inevitably be flooded out one day, if not by this country in partnership with Canada, then by Canada alone. It would be far better were this to be an American and Canadian project rather than just Canadian, but if it can be had on no other terms then let it be all Canadian.

Our neighbors to the north can be sure that if they are obliged to move alone, they will have the cheers of the people of these States to the south of them, and also whatever material aid and encouragement it is open for them to give.

The Wool Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very interesting letter that I have received from Mr. Harold A. Bishop, president, Boston Wool Trade Association, Boston, Mass.:

BOSTON WOOL TRADE ASSOCIATION,
Boston, Mass., July 20, 1951.

HON. THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The wool situation is receiving top-level consideration at the international materials conference presently convening in Washington, and the wool trade has put forth the view that intervention through controls or allocation programs will not provide a better result to the United States military or civilian than can be provided by private industry.

Against a QMC invitation to supply one and one-half million yards of 16-ounce shirting the QMC received total offerings of 7,000,000 yards from 30 mills. The 1,500,000 yards can be obtained at prices ranging between \$3.2184 and \$3.70. When the same fabric was last purchased in March the price range was \$5.50 to \$6 per yard.

QMC invitation to supply 6,300,000 yards 16-ounce Army serge brought bids from

61 mills with total offerings of about 18,000,000 yards. This fabric cannot be compared identically with previous bids as the orders placed in March called for 18-ounce fabrics. However, market sources consider the present prices are approximately \$2.25 per yard down from the March purchases.

An interesting observation is that the largest unit in the industry, the American Woolen Co., offered to supply the entire quantity of both fabrics but their prices will not enable them to get an award. One might well conclude from this that the machinery and inventory required to fill substantial contracts are still available.

Reports from Australia indicate that the Australians are beginning to yield to the pressure from United States Government officials (acting without the support of wool growers, mills, or merchants) to arrange to make wool available to the United States on some special preemptive basis instead of by private sale as heretofore.

The facts pointed out above indicate clearly that any wool needs of this country can be fully met by private industry, and that no need exists for the intervention of the Government to procure by extraordinary means the wool supplies for this country.

Furthermore, the price of wool has now declined to a point not over 10 or 15 percent above pre-Korea levels, which removes the threat of any inflationary effect on the consumers' pocketbook.

Your cooperation in referring the above matter to the attention of the United States delegates at the international materials conference will be most appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD A. BISHOP,
President

The Present Situation on Immigration Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested to insert in the RECORD the following address delivered by Irving M. Engel before the conference of Jewish social welfare held in Atlantic City on May 23, 1951, and which has been described as an erudite dissertation on the principles involved in our immigration law together with a description of pending legislation.

It is advisable that on such a matter as this the record be complete, for which reason I have asked permission to insert the address. It is as follows:

THE PRESENT SITUATION ON IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION

(By Irving M. Engel)

INTRODUCTION

Immigration to the United States has been a matter of concern to all social agencies from their inception. As our concept of social welfare has broadened from the initial palliative of food for the hungry and medicine for the sick, so it has grown to recognize the immigrant as a potential source of strength for the Nation. His need for aid in immigration and in adjustment is a legitimate social need. Properly planned aid, we know, pays quick dividends for the commu-

nity, for the general public and for our total economy.

In the early days—when the great American tradition of haven for the oppressed was nurtured—the immigrant's strong arms and stout heart were a welcome contribution to the rapid settlement and building of the country. Until 1875, there were no Federal immigration laws as such, although there had been passed laws dealing with naturalization of aliens. A few States had attempted legislation to regulate settlement of immigrants within their respective jurisdictions, but in 1876 the United States Supreme Court declared all such State laws unconstitutional.

BACKGROUND

An awakening public concern with health and welfare standards was reflected in the first bill of "exclusion" passed by Congress in 1875. This bill excluded known prostitutes and criminals from the country. Legislation over the ensuing 40 years kept pace with medical and social advances by adding certain contagious and "loathsome" diseases and antisocial acts to the list for exclusion.

The important fact about our immigration laws, until after the First World War, is that legal exclusion was based almost entirely on the merits of the individual case. Our laws were exclusive, but they were not restrictive. The major exception was the racist Chinese Exclusion Act, passed in 1878.

In 1917 the many immigration regulations were codified in a single statute which has since served as the basic immigration law. In addition to setting forth the many bases for exclusion of individuals, the law also clarified the status and rights of aliens by establishing reasons and procedures for deportation. In general, while the burden of proof that he is not deportable was on the alien, the courts, in one ruling after another, have in the past shown deep concern for protection of the alien's rights. I do not wish to dwell on this particular aspect of the immigration process beyond underscoring the obvious responsibility of our national and community agencies during the period prior to citizenship.

QUOTA SYSTEM AND NATIONAL ORIGINS LAW, 1924

The whole basis of our immigration laws was radically shifted, from 1921 on, in a period of vast world unrest following on the heels of the First World War. The Immigration Act of 1924, which still governs our immigration policy, was adopted at a time when the Ku Klux Klan was at the height of its power, and it represents Klan thinking, pure and simple. This act not only limited the total number of immigrants to 154,000 a year, but set up a system of preselection and restriction on a racial basis, only thinly veiled by being called a quota system. Under this law, the total of 154,000 is allocated among the countries of the world by a formula which favors the countries of northern and western Europe at the expense of the others. The system is rigid and invariable. If a given country does not use up its entire quota in a certain year, the unused portion cannot be carried over to another year or transferred to another country. As a result, total immigration has actually been only 38 percent of the number that was theoretically admissible.

All of us here will remember well the heartaches and horrors of the 1930's as we labored to rescue fellow Jews from the gathering storm in Europe and so often found ourselves blocked by restrictive quotas. It is fruitless to dwell on the many who might have been saved; on the skills and devoted talents forever lost to America by its own restrictive laws. But in these troubled times we should, at least, determine to ameliorate these undemocratic laws which have barred so many from our shores.

It is important to note that within the restrictive scope of the immigration laws, there have been from time to time amendments which served to lessen individual and family hardships. At the same time, the amendments, over the years, also bred innumerable inconsistencies. From the legal point of view, one amendment occasionally had the result of almost nullifying another, unintentionally. The law, for instance, differs from one section to another, in setting the legal age for qualification as an adult. In one place, it's 18; in others, 21.

PUBLIC INTEREST IN IMMIGRATION LAWS

Up to, and through, the last war, the general public was not particularly concerned with our immigration laws, or the concurrent provisions relating to aliens' rights and status. The laws themselves were so complicated that the average citizen could not possibly understand them. But there was a growing concern on the part of social agencies, and certainly on the part of the Jewish social agencies, that the immigration laws seem to have been frozen on an anti-social and antidemocratic level against the long-range interests and the general social standards of our country.

Perhaps the first public awakening to the whole question of immigration and alien control came in 1940 with the widespread publicity given to the Alien Registration Act. This act, incidentally, was fairly well administered, and probably helped to allay public suspicion of aliens later when the United States actually was at war. Certainly it is a fact that the neighborhood persecutions of aliens so common in the First World War were not repeated in the last war. Hopefully, some credit for this can also go to a generally deeper social understanding among Americans.

REFUGEE PROBLEM AFTER WAR

The end of the European holocaust brought home the problem of refugees, and fostered some understanding in the general public of the need for offering asylum on the mass basis actually denied by the laws. Many Americans began to learn, at first hand, what our immigration laws actually were. America, the traditional home of the oppressed, both economically and politically, they learned, had in legal effect closed its doors on most of the refugees.

TRUMAN DIRECTIVE

President Truman courageously cut some red tape with his December 1945 "Directive" which accelerated the rate of immigration, and favored DP's without actually changing the basic law. The "Directive" set up facilitative services abroad to speed visa issuance. More important, it provided for the so-called Corporate Affidavit, which, in essence, recognized and legalized the interest and responsibility of voluntary social agencies vis-à-vis government and immigrant. The social agency was no longer merely a tie between the prospective immigrant and an individual American, but a controlling factor in the immigration of the alien irrespective of individual sponsorship, responsibility, etc. For the first time in our country's history, it became possible for social agencies, with Government sanction to accept responsibility for immigration and resettlement of newcomers, and plan accordingly with local communities.

The Truman directive, and the effective work of the social agencies, created a background against which it was possible to conduct a campaign of public education leading first to the passage of the Displaced Persons Act in 1948 and then to the elimination of most of its discriminatory and restrictive provisions by amendment in 1950.

DISPLACED PERSONS ACT

It is an interesting commentary on the development of social consciousness in the

general public that, once awakened to the problem, there has been only sporadic opposition to the mass immigration resulting from the Displaced Persons Act.

And the DP's amply repaid America for her hospitality. Thousands of them risked their lives on the battlefields and many of them made the supreme sacrifice to help bring victory to the land of their adoption.

That we were the first to have the atomic bomb is due to our generosity in opening our doors to displaced persons. It was a DP—Dr. Einstein—who first suggested to President Roosevelt that we initiate a project for development of the bomb. Many other refugee scientists who had been driven out of Europe by Hitler and Mussolini worked on the project and helped to make it a success.

In many other ways, these newcomers contributed to our war effort.

Thousands of American airmen and sailors, who were forced to take to the rafts on the Pacific, escaped a horrible death from thirst by the use of the "belly" still which distills drinkable water from the sea. That still was invented by a refugee scientist.

One of the great bottlenecks in the early days of the war was the need for antennas for tanks and walkie-talkies. At that time, these antennas were being cut from cold steel. A Viennese metallurgist developed a plan for use of powdered metal and in a few weeks, from a small plant in Yonkers, he was supplying our entire Armed Forces.

On the battlefield, in the laboratory, and in the shop the men and women who, after incredible sufferings abroad, had been given haven in this country, demonstrated their gratitude and loyalty by helping America win the war.

The mass immigration of the DP's has served to awaken the public and our legislators to the necessity of codifying and liberalizing basic immigration law.

At the same time, the ramified technicalities of immigration law and procedure have made it difficult for most persons to follow what is going on and to understand the long-term implications of some suggested revisions. No one would disagree with the necessity for making our immigration laws compatible with the needs of national security, yet it is imperative that our anxiety on this score should not be permitted to result in the continuation of the negative aspects of the present laws and, in some provisions, a worsening of the legislation.

At least one step ahead of public interest in immigration—and probably a determining factor in favorable reaction to the newcomers—has gone the organized planning of our social agencies to make each immigrant an integrated part of his community as quickly as possible. Unquestionably, the favorable reaction of the American people to DP immigration has been heightened by the personal experience of seeing the new American arrive in his community and being speedily aided in adjusting to the American scene and mores long before the end of the 5-year period when he could actually become a citizen.

The Displaced Persons Act of 1948 attempted to follow the pattern of our basic selective immigration laws by also setting a selective basis for the displaced persons. It set quotas on farmers and also on countries of origin. The fallacies of this kind of preselection were quickly obvious on a mass immigration basis. In brief, it simply didn't work. The amendment of June 1950 recognized that the method was impractical by eliminating these preselective conditions.

JOB AND HOUSING ASSURANCE

In passing, and incidentally, there has been criticism of the act for its requirement that each displaced person must be guaranteed housing and a job in the United States before he is granted a visa. However,

it is important to recognize that this particular provision, whatever its intent might have been, is actually a practical liberalization of former immigration requirements. Previously it was necessary for some individual to prove that he was financially able to support the prospective immigrant for the 5-year period preceding citizenship. On a mass basis, such a requirement was obviously impossible, particularly for those many DP's who had neither relatives nor friends in this country, and who constituted the bulk of the refugees desiring to settle here. The guaranty of job and housing—which is quite broadly interpreted for accredited agencies such as United Service for New Americans—is in effect a legislative recognition of the social responsibility of our community agencies. It legally accepts their promise to aid immigrant X as against the previous requirement that John Doe prove he had enough money to support Richard Roe, in case Richard couldn't support himself once he got here.

FIRST HEARINGS ON REVISIONS OF BASIC LAWS

Two years ago the Congress of the United States decided that our immigration laws needed a thorough airing and going over. In the face of developing social trends, changed world conditions, the growth of America as a world power, and international concern for the movements of peoples, the basic immigration laws of the twenties presented some archaic and confused concepts. Hearings were held at the time, and then the matter was put in the deep freezer for seemingly more pressing problems. They have been taken out of the freezer by the Eighty-second Congress, but the world moves so fast today that the liberalizing concept of 2 years ago has again undergone a metamorphosis.

DEMOCRATIC AND SOCIAL CONCEPTS DESIRABLE

Before I discuss specifically the legislation before us today, which is the McCarran-Walters omnibus immigration bill, I would like to point up a few major positive points on which I think we can agree, as Americans, as socially conscious individuals, and, incidentally, as Jews. I say "incidentally", because since the establishment of Israel and its absorption of so many DP's, this is no longer a Jewish problem. We, as many other troubled persons in America today, are conscious of a gulf between precepts and practices; between what we say and what we do. The Voice of America calls for refugees behind the iron curtain to flee to the haven of the democracies; then our laws negate the promise offered. We, as social workers, have a particular responsibility to take leadership in bridging the gulf.

In a practicing democracy, which we aspire to be, these should be the bases of immigration legislation:

1. Nondiscrimination on grounds of race, religion, or ancestry. (This, of course, is basic.)

2. Recognition that we are big enough to absorb the immigrant and that his strength adds to our strength.

3. Recognition that the immigrant is not a commodity to be traded in on the labor market, but a human being whose skills and talents, and those of his children cannot be prejudged.

4. Consciousness of the existing threat to our national security, but a realistic awareness that it would be a tragic error to yield our democratic concepts and basic civil liberties in exchange for a nonexistent shield such as the magical thorn-hedge which protected the sleeping beauty or the wall of fire which protected the sleeping Brunhilde.

The present controversy over immigration policy is not new in our Nation's history. If we examine the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, we note that on one occasion a Congressman from Massachusetts stood on the floor of the

House and stated that a liberal immigration policy was suitable when the country was young and unsettled, but now that it was mature and fully developed, immigration should be restricted. That Congressman was Harrison Otis, and the year was 1797.

We must face the fact that there are two basic, but conflicting tendencies today, legislatively, publicly, and often within ourselves as individuals. The worsening of tension between the western democracies and the Soviet Union has created a sentiment for controls, both internally and in terms of immigration, while at the same time, we are concerned with the imperative necessity of selling the democratic way of life abroad.

These tendencies helped to stir the sentiment for liberalized legislation. At the same time, they stirred other legislators to propose increased stringency of the laws—again internally and in terms of immigration.

Another striking inconsistency appears when we consider the case of the so-called Mexican wetbacks. These are aliens who enter the country illegally from Mexico, primarily to seek employment on the ranches and farms of the Southwest. Due to the demand for cheap labor in that area, the influx of thousands of these wetbacks every year is generally winked at, and those very Congressmen and Senators who are most vociferous in condemning the immigrant who comes in from Europe are highly indignant when an attempt is made to cut off the flow of illegal immigration from Mexico into their constituencies.

OMNIBUS BILL INTRODUCED

In the spring of 1950 an omnibus immigration and naturalization bill, S. 3455, was introduced which presumed to reflect the views and considerations that were brought out at the hearings during the preceding 2 years. No action was taken on this bill at last year's session of Congress, so that when the Eighty-second Congress opened, the bill was reintroduced under a new number, S. 716, with a number of changes, some of a more liberal nature. Meanwhile, however, during the summer of 1950, some portions of S. 3455 had been incorporated into the controversial Internal Security Act of 1950 and have thus already become part of the law of the land. Parallel with the introduction of S. 716 in the Senate, an almost identical bill, H. R. 2379, though with several more liberal features, was introduced by Representative WALTER in the House. Finally, a third omnibus bill sponsored by Representative CELLER (H. R. 2816), and more liberal in many respects than H. R. 2379, was also introduced in the House.

JOINT CONGRESS HEARINGS

In March 1951, joint congressional public hearings were held on the bills. Again, at these hearings, numerous private organizations of all kinds presented testimony, pointing out the faults and dangers of the proposed measures.

But we would be indulging in self-deception if we did not point out, at the same time, that some of the testimony itself dealt only with some single and specific provision without comment on the total bills. Some of the agencies and individuals testifying were primarily concerned with one piece of the proposed legislation that happened to affect them directly. In a few cases, they were willing to accept every other negative aspect, given the one section they cared about; in many cases, the seeming lack of concern for the total bill was actually the result of total ignorance for the immigration problem as a whole. Testimony on the bills, thus far, points up the necessity of an informed opinion and of an aroused concern for every aspect of the pending legislation. This information and this concern must be manifest now inasmuch as whatever stand-

ards are adopted as a result of these bills, will likely remain on our American statute books for many years, perhaps even for decades. The Immigration Act of 1924 has remained on our statutes for a full quarter century, and has thereby affected, directly and indirectly, in countless crucial ways, the lives of millions of human beings.

INTERNAL SECURITY ACT—EFFECT ON IMMIGRATION

Here is one of the provisions of that portion of the Internal Security Act of 1950 which dealt with immigration.

It excluded those who at any time had been members of the Communist or other totalitarian party. This blanket prohibition was quickly shown to be unworkable in its application. The letter of the law, as applied to the immigrants by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, created complete confusion and a practical reversal of the desire of Congress to eliminate mainly actual totalitarians of the left. Not only was the right also excluded, but all those who had either erred in early days or had been compelled by certain circumstances to become members of the proscribed groups, and had since recanted in entire good faith. The principle of "permanent guilt" established by this provision of the act was so obviously inequitable and unworkable that the Congress, in March 1951, was compelled to amend the law to permit the admission of former "nominal" members of all totalitarian groups.

These bills (S. 716 and H. R. 2379) would tighten our immigration, deportation, naturalization, and expatriation laws, while showing little regard for civil rights or constitutional principles of protection for the individual. The Walter bill—H. R. 2379—is somewhat more liberal than the Senate bill, although both contain many of the same basically restrictive provisions. For the purpose of this discussion I shall primarily examine the Senate bill (S. 716) since it would take hours to analyze the individual distinctions between the provisions of these two bills.

Senate bill 716 would set up a system of priorities within each quota, whereby 50 percent would be assigned to aliens or specialized skills and training, 30 percent parents of American citizens, and 20 percent to spouses and children of alien residents. Only the remaining 10 percent could be devoted to general immigration, all unused portion of the 90 percent set aside for preferred groups would be lost. In effect, this would mean that many otherwise worthy and desirable immigrants would either be forever excluded or would have to wait endless, weary years for entry visas.

As a matter of fact, the "selective" method of former immigration laws never went as far as this. Some of the most conspicuous contributions to our Nation have been made by immigrants who could not prove such specialized skills and training as S. 716 would now demand. Nor does the bill recognize that a belief in the equal worth and dignity of the individual is one of the foundation stones of American democracy. About 60 years ago Irving Berlin, at the age of 5, was brought here with his family from Eastern Europe. I am sure that no immigration inspector had the capacity to look at that group, with their strange language, queer garb, and foreign mannerisms, and forecast that among them was a child who would write the songs that America would sing in war and in peace over a period of nearly 40 years.

There are certain major provisions in the bill which I propose to detail for you. But first I want to mention a few minor provisions—minor in that actually few persons may specifically be affected by them—but important in that they highlight a general retrogression from present legislation.

SOME MINOR PROVISIONS OF S. 716

1. The bill provides that the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization and the Administrator of the Bureau of Passports, Visas, Security, and Consular Affairs shall be native-born citizens of the United States. No such provision exists in our country for any other office excepting that of the President of the United States. As I am sure you are all aware, the latter provision was a matter of historical expedience. It is against American tradition and experience thus to imply second-class citizenship for Government office.

2. The proposed bill would wipe out all exceptions to the literary requirement for immigration. As of now such requirements can be waived for persons who are victims of religious and racial persecution and also for close relatives of American citizens where application of the requirement would forever prevent reunion of a family group.

3. The bill would wipe out a section of the 1924 law which permitted the entry of ministers and professors outside of the quota of their country of origin. The 1924 measure recognized the value to the United States of immigrants in these professions. Under the proposed bill, ministers and professors would merely be given priority on a quota list as members of skilled professions.

4. Discretion of the Attorney General to readmit a resident alien following a temporary absence abroad is severely limited and proscribed by the new bill, which provides readmission only for an alien with "seven consecutive years of a lawful, unrelinquished domicile," who is not deemed otherwise inadmissible for political reasons. The present latitude given the Attorney General to exercise discretion based on individual cases is wiped out.

I might cite numerous other sections of the bill, where the omission, or the occasional addition, of one word serves primarily to tighten the law and restrict any authorized official from using discretionary judgment. For instance, section 101 (e) provides that "the giving, loaning, or promising of support or of money or any other thing of value for any purpose to any organization shall be conclusively presumed to constitute affiliation therewith." The inclusion here of the single word "conclusively" has the legal effect of denying an individual alien the opportunity to show what the alleged facts might be and to prove that he is innocent of any intent to affiliate with a proscribed organization. In other words, no matter how innocent, or through what error and misunderstanding the money or other thing of value was given, the word "conclusively" here prevent explanation and the exercise of discretion by United States officials.

MAJOR PROVISIONS OF BILL

There are three major categories under which the laws relating to newcomers can be divided. And I would like to give you some major points of the proposed McCarran bill under these categories, namely: (1) Immigration, (2) resident alien status, (2) deportation.

1. Immigration: It is proper to point, first, to one important advance of the new proposals over present immigration law, although the new proposal is by no means all it should be. Nonetheless, it does go a long way to wipe off our books some of the flagrantly racist sections of the present law.

RACIST CONCEPT PARTIALLY ELIMINATED

The new bill actually eliminates reference to certain racial groups as ineligible for naturalization and hence, admission. Quotas for all the Asian countries, although small, are incorporated in the bill, thus recognizing their eligibility for immigration. However—and this holds true only for Asians—the country of birth is not the determining factor for any person with 50 percent or more

Asian blood. In other words, the concept of judging by ancestry—or race—is maintained. Hence, a British citizen, born in London, of a British father and Japanese mother would be allocated to the Japanese quota, and if the small quota of 100 such persons per year were exhausted, he could not enter the United States at all as a legal immigrant.

Similarly, a limit of 100 per year is set on the number of persons born in any one colony or other dependent area which is chargeable to the quota of the governing country. The practical effect of this provision is to limit immigration from Jamaica, Trinidad, and other West Indian colonies without actually putting a basically racist concept into so many words.

NEW RESTRICTIONS WITHIN QUOTAS

The new quota restrictions provided in S. 716 can actually reduce immigration drastically. The majority of witnesses and organizations testifying on the subject before the Senate subcommittee hearings urged that the prevailing national quotas be made more flexible, and that recognition be given to national need and humanitarian considerations by allocating unused quotas to all such immigrants.

S. 716 does exactly the opposite by superimposing a new quota system on the old to establish iron-clad preference categories as we have seen. Thus, 50 percent or more of immigrants within existing quotas would have to be certified by the Attorney General as urgently needed in the United States because of high education, technical training, specialized experience, exceptional ability, and so forth.

Thirty percent of each quota would go to parents of adult United States citizens. It would seem unlikely, on the face of it, that 48,200—or 30 percent of the total 154,000 immigrants allowed annually—would have adult children who are citizens of the United States.

Twenty percent of each quota would go to spouses or children of aliens who are permanent residents of the United States—again, the round figure of 30,000 seems an unlikely estimate.

The remaining 10 percent of quota is all that would be left for immigrants not falling in the three major preferred classes. And this 10 percent is a fixed limit regardless of whether the other 90 percent has been utilized.

It is obvious that such a provision would serve, as it was undoubtedly intended, to reduce immigration to a trickle. Here again the result is being achieved by indirection. The parties who would seek to cut down on the intake of immigrants appear unwilling to present their proposal directly and have it debated in the open.

ADDED GROUNDS FOR EXCLUSION

Fourteen new grounds for exclusion of immigrants set up in S. 716, some of which I have already discussed. A variety of physical and mental conditions are specified as rendering the newcomer inadmissible or deportable. There is, in addition, considerable doubt about the meaning of such phrases as "moral turpitude" as used in the bill. One provision would bar aliens convicted of alleged felonies in their own countries, even though those countries are totalitarian and the so-called felonies would not be considered crimes under American law. For example, a Jew convicted by some Nazi court, theoretically not a political matter, and thereby incurring criminal penalties, would be forever excluded. This, in effect, is abdicating to foreign courts the power to determine who shall have the priceless privilege of entering America.

RESIDENT ALIEN STATUS AND DEPORTATION

Social agencies have a special responsibility, and play a significant role, in the newcomer's life during the 5-year period prior

to citizenship. If we fail to understand the present law and its application, all of the aid which we strive to give to the newcomer and the community in speeding his adjustment through social and cultural integration can be wasted and our work will be less effective and far less productive from every humanitarian and social standpoint.

STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS ABOLISHED

Let me point out two important general provisions of the Senate bill which govern all the other specific provisions. The statute of limitations—a principle very basic to American liberty and jurisprudence—would be abolished in relation to aliens. At any time during the life of a naturalized citizen, a decision made earlier in his favor could be upset and reversed. Further, he could be subjected to deportation on grounds newly established by the bill (and presumably succeeding bills) which were not a part of immigration legislation at the time of his entry. He would never be free from fear and never secure in his proudly acquired citizenship.

COURT REVIEW LIMITED

To compound the wrong, he could also be deprived of court protection in deportation proceedings. The Senate bill in effect removes immigration and nationality cases from the jurisdiction of the courts except through a writ of habeas corpus, and then only with respect to questions of law, not of fact. The courts may not in any form review determinations of fact or the exercise of discretionary authority by administrative officers. It is clear that tremendous power is here placed in a few hands without the right to protest against administrative error or abuse.

If the applicant is excluded, he has no recourse. If he is admitted, the Government can reopen the case regardless of the number of years which have elapsed or of his conduct during that period. There is no machinery to bring about uniformity in applying the law throughout the world nor is there any check against incompetence or dishonesty on the part of immigration officials.

ADDED GROUNDS FOR DEPORTATION

There are a good many specific additions to immigration legislation which broaden the grounds for deportation and narrow the rights of the alien and naturalized citizen. But Mr. Greenleigh is going to interpret these for you, since they most specifically affect the work of the community social agencies concerned with the welfare of newcomers.

OMNIBUS BILL SHOULD BE OPPOSED AS NOW DRAFTED

Its passage would have the practical effect of barring the door to many deserving immigrants; it would serve notice on the rest of the world that we do not actually mean what we say; it would turn into stone the bread of compassion which we offer the oppressed throughout the world.

What should be done in this critical junction?

First, of course, we must oppose the passage of the pending bill, as now proposed, and do everything in our power to alert the people to the viciousness of some of its provisions.

But this approach alone is a negative one. We must go further and seek positive remedies to revamp our immigration system so that it becomes just and fair, and in consonance with our traditions of hospitality and democracy.

OBJECTIVES FOR NEW LEGISLATION

An immediate objective should be an amendment to the law which would permit the pooling of unused quotas. Under such a provision, if any nation in a given year fails to use its entire quota, the unused portion would not be lost, but would be placed

in a pool and made available for those countries whose visas are oversubscribed. Reasonable administration of such provisions would permit the annual entry into this country of the full quota of 154,000 immigrants whose admission is theoretically provided for but who in fact never come.

But that is for the near term. Our ultimate objective must be the complete elimination of any provision in our immigration statutes by which preference is given or barriers raised on account of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Of course, the present standards of health and character would be maintained and provisions for screening against criminal and subversive tendencies would be continued.

At a time when manpower is of such vital importance and when our own birth rate is falling, we are foolish to exclude so many worthy men and women who, morally and physically, would add to our strength as a Nation.

INFORMED PUBLIC AND COMMUNITY LEADERS NECESSARY

I would like to impress on all of you the necessity of going back to your communities with an understanding of what is now before Congress and the kind of legislation we earnestly desire and must seek for our own strength as a Nation and as democratically-minded individuals. The influential citizens who make up the boards of directors of our many social agencies need to have the kind of information I hope we are giving you in this session. They need to understand the basic concepts of immigration which make it possible to recognize quickly the desirable as against the restrictive.

Through our various national agencies, geared to the task of evaluating immigration legislation and transmitting these evaluations to you quickly, you—and your community—will be kept in close touch with what is going on. It is up to you to let your community leaders know the whole story, so that when responsive action is called for, it will be forthcoming quickly, and from informed community sources which can command the respect and prompt response of our legislators.

This involves more the matter of justice and decent treatment for the immigrant. It involves more than the manpower, the skills and the talents which our country so badly needs. We are concerned here with the very soul of America. For we are endeavoring to eliminate the conflict between the great principles for which Americans have fought and died and the vicious, undemocratic concepts upon which our immigration system is based.

Let us resolve that we shall not relax our efforts until no man is barred or given preference as an immigrant because of his race, his creed or his national origin. Only when we have removed all such gaps between our professed principles and our actual practices can we hope to win the minds and hearts of men to our support in the struggle for freedom and equality throughout the world.

It Can Happen Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by Harold Cross in the

Hammond (Ind.) Times reminds us that the Russian problem may eventually solve itself from within its own boundaries:

TOP COMMUNISTS' FUTURE

"All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." This assurance from the Gospel of St. Matthew would serve as a summary of the rise and fall of the tyrannies of Hitler and Mussolini. It could happen to the present Russian despots also. There appears to be enough jealousy and intrigue in the inner circle now to make it likely that even the topmost officials will meet violent ends. In the 1920's Kamenev, Zinoviev, Rykov, Bukharin, and Leon Trotsky, cofounder with Lenin of the Bolshevik state, were the most influential figures in communism. All were killed by their colleagues. The process presumably still continues, though less well advertised. All that is known is that a prominent figure sometimes disappears, to be seen no more; when the period of silence is long enough, his fate can be guessed.

This could happen to Molotov, Vishinsky, Gromyko, Malik, and Stalin himself. Not one of these can be certain that violent death will not be his portion at any time. It happened to the leaders of the French Revolution; why not to the Russian group? This ever-present possibility may well help to explain Russian edginess and violence of speech.

To Those Who Seek Proof of Rebellion as a Result of the Voice of America Broadcasts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, 300,000 Polish civilians were killed in 1944 in Warsaw because they rebelled against Nazi tyrants on a false promise of armed assistance by the Soviets.

Is the Voice of America ready to promise and carry out its promise of outside armed assistance to people who rebel against tyranny?

The bulk of United States Information and Education output to Soviet and satellite peoples is designed to foster popular dissatisfaction with Communist regimes. This is done by reminding them constantly of the conditions under which they are forced to live—denial of all personal liberty, sacrifice of their welfare to the selfish interests of their masters, police-state persecution, and so forth, as compared with conditions under which peoples of the free world live.

The purpose of this is to keep alive a realization that there is a better way of life, and that the time will come when the peoples behind the iron curtain can throw off their shackles and join other peoples in the establishment of a free society.

The "time will come" phrase is important. We do not now encourage open rebellion against Communist regimes. Peoples behind the iron curtain are potentially our strongest allies. To encourage them to premature resist-

ance—before there is a good chance of success—would be a disservice to them and to us.

It would make us guilty of murder, the same kind of cold-blooded murder for which Molotov and Stalin are now judged guilty when they incited the Warsaw slaughter of Polish civilians in August, 1944.

Is that what those who seek proof of rebellion, as a result of Voice of America broadcasts would have us charged with? Murder? I think not.

Mr. Speaker, I list below capsules to show the effectiveness of our information and education efforts:

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Speech made by President Klement Gottwald to the Czechoslovak Communist Party on February 22, 1951:

The Voice of America broadcasts . . . distorted facts, spread untruths, intentionally harmed the economic relations of my country with others and assisted deserters and common criminals.

HUNGARY

From a Hungarian radio program, March 13, 1951:

The Hungarian peace movement must overcome often recurring sectarian shortcomings and combat enemies who attempt to weaken the movement by causing damage, sabotaging production, listening to the American radio, and by spreading rumors.

REFUGEE

A defector stated that his final decision to seek refuge from the U. S. S. R. resulted from learning via the Voice of America broadcasts that the United States did not return Soviet refugees to the Soviet authorities. The Kasenkina case played a large part in encouraging him in this belief.

POLAND

Quoted from the speech made by Bierut, President of Poland, to the Polish Communist Party on February 21, 1951:

We must not, however, blind ourselves to the fact that a few diversionists and foreign agents, hailing chiefly from the remnants of the landowner and speculator class, can do much by diversionary and whispered rumors. This is the more true in view of the fact that the radio propaganda of the imperialist, though noisy and mendacious to the point of idiocy, does reach the most backward cells of our organism. This criminal diversion must be stamped out.

UKRAINE

Excerpt from a Ukrainian displaced persons newspaper in Germany dated March 18, 1951, which says that it was announced over the Kuybishev radio that a trial against "sabotage of the Socialist construction" had just ended. The Stalingrad district court sentenced three persons to death and eight persons to 2 to 18 years' imprisonment. These persons were found guilty of sabotage of the last years distribution plan, of systematic listening to false broadcasts of the Voice of America and of spreading those broadcasts with bad intention.

HUNGARY

A quote from a Budapest radio broadcast made in April 1950. The broadcast over the Budapest Hungarian said:

The summary tribunal of the court of the Hungarian peoples republic in Gyer has pronounced the sentence of death on Agoston

Rahring, Jr., a Kulah accused of hiding arms. The accused was a regular listener to the United States imperialist radio which incites to war, and he speculated on war.

RUMANIA

Speech of the Rumanian Vice Premier Luca delivered on January 26, 1950, which attacked the Voice of America "for spreading false rumors about impending currency changes."

POLAND

A newspaper story in the Washington Evening Star of April 28, 1951:

SEVENTEEN ANTI-RED POLES ESCAPE IRON CURTAIN IN IRON HORSES

BRUSSELS, BELGIUM, April 28.—Broadcasts by the Voice of America and the British Broadcasting Corp. inspired 12 Polish rail workers to flee their Communist homeland in two stolen locomotives and seek refuge in Western Europe, it was learned last night.

With the help of a forged collective passport, the freedom loving 12 broke through the iron curtain and made a 17-day journey across Germany to Courtrai, Belgium. Not even the Russian border guards in East Germany questioned their credentials.

Five of the escapees have been given asylum in Belgium. The other seven continued on to France.

One of the railroaders, Stanislaw Oles, told newsmen this version of the escape:

Two Belgium-made locomotives broke down and Polish officials ordered them sent to Belgium for repairs. Six good Communists were supposed to take the engines, but the 12 nonconformists steamed off in them instead. And with the help of their forged passport and the connivance of a minor railroad official they made their escape without being questioned.

Oles said he and his friends, several of whom had been threatened with arrest for their opposition to the Red regime, had heard about the free labor organizations of the Western World through Voice of America and BBC broadcasts.

Oles said some 2,500 Polish railroaders are under arrest for antigovernment activity. He added:

"You can imagine how many more are taking part in the anti-Communist underground fight in Poland."

"Go to it, Voice of America. Remember, if you weren't hitting 'em where they aint, and spilling 'em on their tails, their Commie catcalls would be kisses of death. Sempre Avanti! Avancez!" Naprzod. Vorward! You are 'chop-chop' for oriental minds. Good luck."

Hold Your Hat, Here Comes Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, in 1933, the Roosevelt administration deliberately adopted inflation as a governmental policy. The American people have been the victims ever since. They will continue to be, for inflation is being deliberately accelerated.

Seemingly, no scruples deter those who are engineering inflation. They are taking us galloping down the Communist road of currency destruction—and price controls are used as a tactic

of deceit to postpone public understanding of that mad purpose. The people must be kept fooled—at least the majority of them.

As we are steadily pushed toward economic chaos, the ordinary citizen can take some measures to preserve his individual economic strength. That is his patriotic duty, as well as his responsibility to his family.

For his struggle against this governmental betrayal of his freedom, the advice recently carried in the *Farm Journal* is highly constructive. The *Journal* article, by MacDonald Brown, is as follows:

HOLD YOUR HAT, HERE COMES INFLATION
(By MacDonald Brown)

Every farmer who sells anything or buys anything is affected, for better or worse, by the present and coming inflation. What ought he to do about it, if anything?

First let's be sure what we are talking about. There are other meanings of "inflation," but what we mean here is a general rise in the price average of all goods and services; or, to put it the other way around, a general fall in the value and purchasing power of the paper dollar. That is what we have been having since about 1933, and more severely since about 1939. And we are nowhere near the end of it.

WHAT CAUSES INFLATION?

What is the cause? Why do shoes, for example, cost \$9, \$12, \$16, \$25, when the standard price in 1910 was \$3.50—the best shoes only \$6. Why must you now pay a dollar or more for the same hair-cut that cost 25 cents in 1910? Why are most other things in proportion?

These things don't just happen—there is a reason: what is it? Let me state right here the general principle:

The size of the public debt is the thing that determines the price average.

The higher the public debt, the higher will be the prices of goods, of labor, and of everything else, in any country where the citizens are reasonably free to run their own affairs.

I will come back to this a little later, and explain why it works this way. But meanwhile, keep in mind the general basic fact: the larger the public debt, and the heavier the tax burden necessary to carry it, the higher will be prices and wages, and the lower the real value of the dollar.

If this is so, it is easy to see what is ahead of us. The debt of the United States Government was around \$2,000,000,000 in 1903. World War I pushed it up to about \$26,000,000,000 in 1920, from which it gradually fell to about \$16,000,000,000 in 1929. With the depression, the debt grew to around \$44,000,000,000, and after we got into World War II, the debt of course went up like a rocket. Today it is a little under \$260,000,000,000, and is going up. Now we are in a fresh burst of spending and borrowing, resulting from our anti-Communist defense program.

The necessary result of public debt is taxes. History shows that in a free country, in peacetime, the population will not pay out much more than 15 percent of their incomes for taxes. If taxes go higher, the people either vote the Government out of office, or set about increasing their own incomes. This would not be easy for any one taxpayer. But when every taxpayer and every wage earner is pushing in the same direction—up—it becomes easy.

MORE DEBT, MORE TAXES

The total public debt—national, State, and local—is now around \$300,000,000,000, and going higher. Total taxes, national,

State, and local, must be now around \$60,000,000,000 a year—and going higher. That means that the total individual incomes of all of us ought to be about \$400,000,000,000 a year, to carry the tax burden comfortably at 15 percent.

But the whole national income is now supposed to be running at the rate of only \$230,000,000,000 a year. If so, taxes are taking nearly 30 percent of it. Can that last long? It never has. No free country has ever paid that much very long. The answer must be to get incomes up, and that means higher prices on nearly everything.

In other words, more inflation is inevitable; the end is not even in sight.

THE EFFECT ON FARMERS

Assuming now that more inflation is still to come, that prices will go much higher, that the dollar will buy less and less, what will this do to farmers?

The answer is clear. Inflation will hurt badly every farmer who is not prepared for it; but the farmer is in a better position than most people to defend himself.

This is because the farmer's income is very flexible, not fixed; it can be pushed up by one means or another almost as fast as the dollar goes sour.

Prices of many farm products are now tied to parity, which means that if wages and prices of merchandise advance, farm-support prices go up, too.

You may or may not like the parity-price system. Many people think that the whole set-up is unsound. But whether it is or not, there it is. Farm prices, and consequently farm incomes, cannot under present conditions be beaten down much by the pressure of city buyers.

Every farmer, whether covered by support prices or not, must be vigilant to protect his selling prices and income to see that the consuming public, pinched by inflation, does not succeed in rolling back their losses on him.

The farmer is lucky, too, in that his capital is already invested mostly in things—land, buildings, and equipment, not dollars—and the value of things goes up during inflation.

Farm land is one of the very best of inflation defenses, and so are farm improvements. While land prices in normal times follow the course of farm incomes (and they always do, to some extent) over a long stretch land will advance as the value of the dollar falls. A productive farm, run by a good farmer, is probably the most nearly inflation-proof property there is.

But farmers must still pay inflated prices for everything they buy, and there are other pitfalls.

WHAT TO DO ABOUT IT

In particular, the farmer, like everybody else, should not have his savings in the form of dollars. No more than he can help, at least. His balance in bank, the money he has lent on a mortgage or a note, the bonds he owns, even his life insurance, all are payable to him in dollars; and he can be pretty certain that what the dollars will buy when he gets them back will be less than now.

From the standpoint of strict logic, therefore, the farmer, like everybody else in a period of inflation, ought to be a debtor, not a creditor. If he can make profitable use of borrowed money, and if he does not get in so deep that a crop failure or other bad luck could wipe him out, and if being in debt doesn't cost him too much peace of mind, he will be better off to borrow dollars worth say 50 cents in purchasing power, and pay off this debt later with dollars worth 30 cents.

Millions of people have done just that since 1939. Millions of others right now are carrying debts along, watching them get easier and easier to pay off as prices go higher and dollars get cheaper.

OWN THINGS, NOT DOLLARS

However, debt is always dangerous. And each individual farmer should study his own circumstances, and decide how much risk, if any, he can afford to take. But whatever he decides, he can at least get out of the creditor class—he can stop lending money. He should get organized as fast as possible so that he owns things, not dollars or claims on dollars.

A very good spot for savings is a part ownership in some of the great American corporations—in other words, ownership of common stocks. These are nearly inflation-proof. Beware of putting money in any one company, in any speculative business, and particularly in any new, small, or local enterprise. But savings divided among 10 of the great corporations are reasonably safe, and divided among 50 big corporations are as safe as anything can be in this dangerous age.

WHY TAXES FORCE INFLATION

Let us go back briefly to the subject of taxes and prices. How do heavy taxes force inflation?

The way it works is this (and you will see what an inevitable cause-and-effect situation we are up against): the United States Government, the State governments, the cities, counties, townships, and boroughs all borrow money. On this money they must pay interest, and usually must pay something into a sinking fund. To pay the interest and pay back the loan, they must collect taxes; the larger the debt, the higher the taxes.

Now taxes do not come out of nothing. They must be paid by individuals, by corporations, by landowners, by everybody. And these taxes quickly become a cost in the production of everything.

A corporation, for example, hardly ever really pays taxes. It must, and does, add them into the price of whatever it makes and sells. Taxes, therefore, do not come out of the company or its stockholders—they come out of the customer, and that's you. A corporation is a tax collector, not a tax payer.

Now when a corporation's tax rates are jacked up it is only a short time before its selling prices go up, too. That's how the tax is passed along to you. It can easily do this, because all other corporations are feeling the same pinch. So prices edge up a little.

PRICES UP, WAGES UP

Then consumers, workmen, and farmers and their families, finding costs of living advancing, begin to demand higher wages and higher prices. City workmen, particularly those organized in unions, always are able to get more wages. That adds a little more to the cost of goods. Then prices of goods have to be raised a little more. Then more wage demands, enforced by strikes.

And here, almost before we know it, we are in the old familiar see-saw race upward—the "inflation spiral"—wages up, prices up, wages up, and so indefinitely.

Where will it end? Who knows? Do you see any end to public borrowing, to more taxes, to higher wages, to higher costs, to higher prices? If so, where?

Will the dollar ultimately go all the way, and be worth nothing, as the German mark did in 1922 and 1923? No, that is not likely. But let's not forget France, whose paper franc was worth 20 cents in 1914, about 5 cents in 1924, and is a little more than one-quarter of a cent now. It has lost more than 98 percent of its purchasing power since 1914.

About all anybody can do is to understand clearly where we are headed, to protect himself as well as he can, and hope for the best.

Now a few words of warning. I have been speaking right along of the price average. It is the average of all prices that has gone up and will go much further.

That does not mean that the individual price of every individual product—potatoes, broilers, oranges, pork, or steel—will necessarily act the same. The law of supply and demand still holds. If there's a shortage of a given product at a particular moment at a particular place, the price will go up faster. If there is a big surplus over demand, the price of that one product will collapse, often below the cost of production.

In the long run, though, all prices will move together. Whenever supply and demand are pretty well balanced, then the price of that product will be the cost of production plus a profit.

THERE WILL BE SET-BACKS

The other warning point is this: While the end of the inflation will be somewhere away up, it is pretty certain that the upward spiral will be interrupted from time to time by set-backs and depressions. Prices may fall a little. Workmen may even accept a piddling 5-percent cut in wages, as they did in the 1930's.

If that happens, don't jump to the conclusion that inflation is licked—it is only interrupted. Keep your eye fixed on the public debt, on public spending, on taxes, and you will know what to look for when any temporary depression is over.

Finally, some brief remarks on certain incorrect ideas and false theories:

You will hear heavy taxation recommended to soak up purchasing power and so check inflation. There is absolutely nothing in that—not as a permanent thing. An individual does lose some of his purchasing power temporarily when he pays his taxes, but that only makes him struggle all the harder to push up his income for the next year. Heavy taxes guarantee inflation.

You will hear that a surplus of money in circulation, or in bank credit, causes inflation. That is partly true—they both help push up prices. Artificially low-interest rates do, too. So does the fact that we have been "off gold" since 1934. But none of these is the true cause; actually, a surplus of money is more a result of inflation than a cause.

CONTROLS DON'T CONTROL

There is much talk of Government controls of prices and wages, and this can only be called ridiculous. Even in the dark days of World War II the price controls did not control effectively. Real prices, which is to say open-market prices, which is to say black-market prices, rose in spite of laws and armies of administrators and police. In peacetime controls would be even more of a farce.

So there we are. Unless the public debt is repudiated, unless the politicians stop spending, borrowing, and taxing, unless people stop acting like human beings—in other words, unless a few miracles occur—we are in for much more inflation.

Hold your hats, folks—here we go.

Terror in Hungary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of my colleagues to the following letter, written by Dr. Bela Fabian on July 8, 1951, which appeared in the New York Times of July 10, 1951, together with an editorial which appeared in that paper the same day:

TEROR IN HUNGARY CHARGED—DEPORTATIONS TO SLAVE-LABOR AREAS COMPARED TO NAZI METHODS

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The New York Times in its issue of July 6 publishes C. L. Sulzberger's report from Paris, the gist of which is a letter from Lunganary. Similar letters are being received by the thousands by American citizens of Hungarian origin since the month of May.

The Hungarian National Council (339 East Fifty-second Street, New York City) and the American Hungarian Federation (1624 I Street, Washington, D. C.) are collecting these letters, which reveal all the sad and horrible phases of eviction and deportation now taking place in Hungary. We learn from these letters that members of the middle class, newspapermen and other intellectuals, shopkeepers and handicrafts men have and are being evicted from Budapest and other Hungarian cities under the pretext that they are socially dangerous elements.

Moreover, we learn that age is no obstacle for eviction. The mother of the former mayor of Budapest, Eugene Sipöcz, aged 102; the helpless inhabitants of homes for the blind, the crippled, the aged, as well as incurable patients living in charitable institutions, have not been spared. The bodies of persons who cannot stand the strain and die on their way are simply hauled out of the train at intermediate stations. Endre Morvay, former deputy mayor of Budapest, was among those who died on a deportation train.

People who as a protest pinned the yellow star on their clothes as a reminder of Nazi times were severely beaten. The deportation trains are now leaving Budapest three times a week from a suburban station.

EVICTON OF LEADERS

It was from these letters that we learned, further, that Charles Rassay, Rudolf Rupert, and Gabriel Ugron, former leaders of Hungary's Democratic Party, which had always represented the ideals of freedom in the past, were evicted with their families. For the time being they are living in tiny villages in the eastern part of Hungary, along with the other thousands of evicted persons. These villages, however, can be considered only as transitory places on the line toward Kollma, Karaganda, Tashkent, and Alma-Ata.

There is no difference whatever between Auschwitz and Karaganda. The freezing cold of the Arctic regions, the unendurable labor in the primeval forests, in the gold mines of Kolyma, the coal mines of Karaganda, or in the cotton fields in the tropical heat of Tashkent and Alma-Ata are as murderous as the gas chambers of Auschwitz.

It took a long time for the world to learn the names of Auschwitz and Buchenwald. It may be feared that it will be too late when the opinion of the world will learn the meaning of Kolyma, Karaganda, Tashkent, and Alma-Ata.

FIGHTERS FOR DEMOCRACY

It is a tragic fact that the world is still suffering from a lack of horror in the face of horror. The Democratic Party leaders of Hungary fought for the same ideals in Hungary which were and are the ideals of President Roosevelt and President Truman, of Vice President Barkley, and of Senators Lehman and McMahon.

The Hungarian Communist newspapers say that these Democratic leaders, as well as the thousands of evicted persons, represent a fifth column in the service of the United States attempting to destroy the people's democracy.

I do not know if everyone in the United States is aware of the true meaning of communism. I do not know if everyone is aware in America that communism is a merciless enemy with whom no compromise is possible. I would like to tell those suffering from delusions that it is not only the leaders who are being deported from Hungary. The same

is happening to fellow-travelers, the quarter-masters of communism.

BELA FABIAN.

Member of the Executive Committee of the Hungarian National Council.

NEW YORK, July 8, 1951.

THE MARK OF CAIN

The letter which we publish today from Dr. Fabian, of the Hungarian National Council, is one more reminder that the time has come for our Government to do something about these Communist outrages. To gnash one's teeth, to shout protests and imprecations, to express horror and pity, or to throw up one's hands in despair will not help these victims, although it will give them the satisfaction of knowing that they are not suffering in a vacuum. We must do what we can to make certain that they will not suffer in vain.

To begin with, they must be made to understand that the United States is interested in their fate and trying to help them. It is not enough for the Voice of America to tell them so. They should have direct word from Secretary Acheson or even from President Truman. When the world learned about the Nazi extermination camps and deportations in 1943 and 1944 President Roosevelt and other Allied leaders issued warnings that such measures must stop and that the criminals responsible for them would be held to account. On March 24, 1944, the President took it upon himself to issue a special statement in which he again proclaimed "our determination that none who participate in these acts of savagery shall go unpunished." The statement was widely disseminated throughout Europe and circulated through the underground in enemy territory—and by all accounts it was effective.

In this case we are not at war with Hungary, but we did make a peace treaty with her that contained a human-rights clause, and that clause is now being flagrantly violated. The United States has protested on other occasions to the United Nations against such violations in Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria, and the protests were ignored or rejected. Another protest against the present deportations in Hungary would receive a similar rebuff, although it should be made for the record. But obviously some stronger method is required. The men who conduct these brutal deportations, or who carry out the tortures and mock trials of innocent men like Archbishop Groesz or William Oatis, are criminals by the standards of the civilized world. Why cannot they be branded as such by leaders of western civilization? We should name names, and with the mark of Cain on them these men will at least know that some day, circumstances permitting, they will be held to account, and their victims will know that we do not and will not forget.

Statesmanship in Our Relations With Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, ever since the Battle of Breed's Hill, British governments have been ready targets for American irritation. One of the surest ways

to bring a cheer in many areas is to mention "perfidious Albion." This is sheer historical emotionalism, and it has no place in sound American statesmanship.

Today the British are on the eve of exploding their first British-made atomic bomb. This is no mean accomplishment in a land trying earnestly to raise itself by the bootstraps from two savage, power-consuming wars in half a century. England is not prepared to disappear from the list of world powers. More important to us, however, is the realization that much as Britain needs Uncle Sam's dollars and trade, we too need the use of the "permanent, fixed airplane carrier" which the British Isles represent on the European scene. We have only a small number of bombers which could fly from our shores anywhere near a potential enemy. We must have British and French bases. Without them, our atomic power is immobilized.

This is the cardinal fact in our dealings with Britain. Let us not forget it.

Creation of Missouri Valley Authority the Only Way To Prevent Repetition of the Present Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting my bill, H. R. 4881, to establish and develop a Missouri Valley Authority.

This would prevent for all time to come the recurrence of the horrible disaster from which the people of that area are now suffering. It would bring a new life to that entire section of the Middle West.

It would provide navigation that would be of untold value in wiping out the one-way freight rate with which the people of those Western States are now punished.

It would generate twenty or twenty-five billion kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power every year that is now going to waste, and distribute it throughout the 10 States in the Missouri Valley area—Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Missouri, Colorado, Minnesota, and Iowa—double the supply of electricity they are now using and reduce the overcharges they are now paying by \$230,000,000 a year—which in a few years would add up to more than this entire development would cost.

It would hold back the floods on the Missouri River, keep them from synchronizing with the floods on the Ohio and the upper Mississippi, and reduce the flood crest on the lower Mississippi to such an extent that it would save enough money on flood control on that

stream in a few years to pay for this entire development.

It would enable the people in that area to conserve the soil that is now being washed away, and at the same time, prevent the destruction of their homes, crops, roads, bridges, schoolhouses, and business establishments, and in that way save billions of dollars for the now unprotected people of that area in the years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I am not speaking as an inexperienced amateur in this field. I was coauthor with Senator Norris, of Nebraska, of the bill creating the Tennessee Valley Authority, and have fought its battles from that day to this. It has wrought the greatest development of ancient or modern times. It is generating every year something like 18,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power, which is being distributed at the yardstick rates and saving the people of the TVA area hundreds of millions of dollars every year on their light and power bills alone. It has also supplied a yardstick to show the rest of the country what electricity should cost them, besides originating our present program of rural electrification—the greatest thing that has ever been done for the farmers of this country.

It has provided navigation on the Tennessee River all the way from Paducah, Ky., to Knoxville, Tenn., controlled the floods on the Tennessee and its tributaries, and enabled those people to conserve their soil and protect their area from such disasters as that now being experienced by the people along the raging Missouri.

This is the only way you will ever provide adequate protection for the people in that area, develop that great wealth of hydroelectric power that is now going to waste, improve the navigation all the way up to the headwaters of the Missouri River, and provide a program of soil conservation that will save the rich lands of those States in the years to come.

This project, together with the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway, will provide what will amount to a slack-water route from the Gulf of Mexico to Fort Benning, Mont., the head of navigation of the Missouri River, as well as to all points on the Tennessee, the Ohio, the upper Mississippi, the Illinois, and the Great Lakes, and at the same time, save the swift current of the Mississippi for the downstream traffic.

The Tennessee-Tombigbee project is already authorized, and we expect to get funds to speed up its construction right away. In fact, this route is already developed more than half the distance between the Gulf and the Tennessee River, or will be when the Demopolis Dam, which is now under construction, is completed. These two projects will be worth untold billions of dollars to the people of that great midwestern section, from Pittsburgh, Pa., all the way across, including the States of West Virginia, Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, and the rest of that great western country, as well as that of

Tennessee, western Virginia, western North Carolina, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and the other States touched by this great inland waterway system.

These two projects will not only supply the missing link in our internal waterway system, but will supply the missing link in our national defense and enable us to defend our country against any possible attack.

I sincerely hope that the Committee on Public Works, to which this bill has been referred, will report it at an early date and that Congress will pass it without delay.

We cannot afford to wait.

At this point, I am inserting the bill, H. R. 4881, to establish a Missouri Valley Authority.

The matter referred to follows:

H. R. 4881

A bill to establish a Missouri Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Missouri River, its tributaries and watershed, to prevent floods, reclaim and irrigate lands, encourage agriculture, stimulate industrial expansion, develop low-cost hydroelectric power, promote navigation, increase recreational possibilities, protect wildlife, strengthen the national defense, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That this act, divided into sections according to the following Table of Contents, may be cited as the "Missouri Valley Authority Act."

Table of Contents

Part A—Objectives of Missouri Valley Authority

- Sec. 2. Declaration of purposes.
- Sec. 2a. Definition of Missouri Valley region.
- Sec. 2b. Headquarters of agency to be in valley.
- Sec. 2c. Recognition of interests of the States.
- Sec. 2d. Recognition of water rights.

Part B—Organization of the Missouri Valley Authority

- Sec. 3a. Missouri Valley Authority.
- Sec. 3b. Location of principal office.
- Sec. 4a. Composition of Board of Directors.
- Sec. 4b. Terms of office of Directors.
- Sec. 4c. Vacancies on Board.
- Sec. 4d. Quorum of Board.
- Sec. 4e. Salary of Directors.
- Sec. 4f. Restrictions on public-utility affiliation.
- Sec. 5a. Duties of the advisory committee.
- Sec. 5b. Composition of advisory committee.
- Sec. 5c. Vacancies on advisory committee.
- Sec. 6a. Applicability of Budget and Planning Act of 1921.
- Sec. 6b. Disposition of net proceeds of Corporation revenues.
- Sec. 6c. Required accounting records.
- Sec. 6d. Applicability of Government Corporation Control Act.
- Sec. 6e. Financial discretion of the Corporation.
- Sec. 6f. Administrative accounts and forms.

Part C—Formulation of the plan for Missouri Valley development

- Sec. 7a. Specifications of the Corporation plan.
- Sec. 7b. Purposes to be considered in making the plan.
- Sec. 7c. Specified detail of the plan.
- Sec. 7d. Cooperation with other Government agencies in planning.
- Sec. 7e. Submission of the plan to the Congress.
- Sec. 8. Limitation of public-land law.

*Part D—The powers and duties of the Corporation**Corporate Powers*

Sec. 9. To act as a corporate entity.

Acquisition of Property

Sec. 10a. To acquire property.

Sec. 10b. To purchase materials.

Eminent Domain

Sec. 11a. To exercise the right of eminent domain.

Sec. 11b. Condemnation procedure.

Sec. 11c. Valuation procedure.

Sec. 11d. Appeal of Commissioners' award.

Sec. 11e. Appeal to circuit court of appeals.

Sec. 11f. Passage of title to the United States.

Sec. 11g. Procedure if property is owned by legal incompetents.

General Powers and Duties of the Corporation

Sec. 12a. Construction of projects.

Sec. 12b. Transfer of existing projects to Corporation.

Sec. 12c. Make agreements with non-Missouri Valley States.

Sec. 12d. Make agreements with local governments.

Sec. 12e. Readjustment of displaced populations.

Sec. 12f. Operation through other Government agencies.

Sec. 12g. Operation of Fort Peck Dam.

Sec. 12h. General limitations on Corporation activities.

Disposition of Water and Federal Land

Sec. 13a. Authority to sell water.

Sec. 13b. Authority to subdivide Federal lands.

Sec. 13c. Appraisal of affected lands.

Sec. 13d. Procedure for sale of irrigated lands.

Sec. 13e. Allocation of costs to irrigation.

Sec. 13f. Water repayment contracts.

Sec. 13g. Irrigation of leased Federal land.

Sec. 13h. One-hundred-and-sixty-acre limitation on water delivery.

Sec. 13i. Irrigation of excess lands.

Sec. 13j. Transfer of excess lands.

Disposition of Electric Power

Sec. 14a. Authority to sell surplus power.

Sec. 14b. Authority to construct and operate transmission facilities.

Sec. 14c. Priorities in disposal of power.

Sec. 14d. Sale to individuals.

Sec. 14e. Conditions of power sales.

Sec. 14f. Authority to acquire existing facilities.

Sec. 14g. Authority to determine power rates.

Sec. 14h. Definition of terms: States, counties, and municipalities.

Sec. 15. Improvement of private lands.

Extension of Credit to Local Governments

Sec. 16a. Credit for water facilities.

Sec. 16b. Credit for power facilities.

Allocation of Costs Among Multipurpose Projects

Sec. 17a. Procedure for allocation of costs.

Sec. 17b. Reporting on allocations to the Congress.

Sec. 17c. Power cost records.

Safeguarding the Missouri River

Sec. 18a. Preventing contamination or obstruction.

Sec. 18b. Enforcement of Corporation rules.

Continuing Powers and Duties of the Corporation

Sec. 19. Authorization for continuing activities of Corporation.

Sec. 19a. Conservation of resources of Missouri Valley.

Sec. 19b. Promotion of research.

Sec. 19c. Consultation with other Federal agencies.

Sec. 19d. Consultation with the States.

Sec. 20a. Access to Patent Office of the United States.

Sec. 20b. Employee inventions.

**Take Tax Assistance Payments*

Sec. 21a. Assistance payments in lieu of taxes.

Sec. 21b. Report to the Congress on payments.

Sec. 21c. Tax exemption of Corporation.

Part E—Miscellaneous

Sec. 22a. Employment policy.

Sec. 22b. Nonpartisan employment.

Sec. 22c. Compensation of injured employees.

Sec. 22d. Prevailing wages on construction work.

Sec. 22e. Use of other agency personnel.

Sec. 23a. Applicability of penal statutes.

Sec. 23b. Punishment for fraud.

Sec. 23c. Punishment for conspiracy.

Sec. 24. Separability provision.

PART A—OBJECTIVES OF THE MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

SEC. 2. In order to provide for the control and prevention of flood in the Missouri Valley region, the generation, sale, and distribution of electricity, the reclamation of public lands, and for the application and use of the waters of the Missouri River and its tributaries on the public and private lands of the area for irrigation and other useful purposes, to safeguard the navigable waters, to promote navigation, to encourage a sound agriculture, to encourage industrial development, to preserve and develop the recreational advantages, and to foster the fuller utilization of the resources of the region, all for the purpose of fostering and protecting commerce among the several States, strengthening the national defense, conserving the water, soil, and forest resources of the Nation, and promoting the general welfare of the United States, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States—

(a) that the Federal Government shall establish and maintain a broad program of unified water control and resource development for the Missouri Valley region, consisting of the entire Missouri River, its tributaries and watershed, as located within the following States: Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Missouri, Colorado, Minnesota, and Iowa;

(b) that the administration of such a multipurpose program shall be entrusted to a Federal regional agency having its principal headquarters in the region, which shall be directly responsible to the President and Congress, with full authority and responsibility for carrying out the program herein authorized;

(c) that the interests and rights of the States in determining the development of the watersheds within their borders and likewise their interests and rights in water utilization and control, as well as the preservation and protection of established and potential uses for all purposes, of the waters of the region's rivers, shall be recognized by such a regional agency to the fullest possible extent, and that accordingly such a regional agency shall utilize to the fullest possible extent the advice, assistance, and cooperation of the people of the region and their public and private organizations, local and State, as well as the advice, assistance, and cooperation of the existing operating agencies of the Federal Government;

(d) that nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting or intended to affect or in any way to interfere with any vested right acquired under the laws of any State or Territory relating to the control, appropriation, use or distribution of water used in irrigation, and nothing herein shall in any way affect any right of any State or of the Federal Government or of any landowner, appropriator, or user of water, in, to, or

from any interstate stream, or the waters thereof: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall limit the authority of the regional agency to acquire by purchase, lease, condemnation, or donation, real or personal property, or any interest therein, which falls within the scope of the plans formulated by the Authority, transmitted to the President and approved by the Congress, as provided in section 7 of this act.

PART B—ORGANIZATION OF THE MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

SEC. 3. (a) To carry out the purposes and policy of this act, there is hereby created a body corporate which shall be known as the "Missouri Valley Authority" (hereinafter referred to as the "Corporation") and which shall be an instrumentality of the United States.

(b) The Corporation shall maintain its principal office at a convenient place in the territory in which its activities are conducted. Upon selecting the location of its principal office, and in the event it later makes a change in such location, the Corporation shall file notice of such selection or change for publication in the Federal Register.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF CORPORATION

SEC. 4. (a) The Corporation shall be directed and controlled by a board of five directors, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Any member of the Board may be removed by the President. In appointing the members of the Board, the President shall designate the Chairman. The members of the Board of Directors shall be citizens of the United States, and at least three members of the Board shall have had a legal residence within the Missouri Valley region for a period of not less than 5 years prior to appointment. All other officials, agents, and employees shall be designated and selected by the Corporation. Each member of the Board, and each of its officers, before entering upon the duties of his office, shall subscribe to an oath (or affirmation) to support the Constitution of the United States and to perform faithfully and impartially the duties imposed upon him by this act.

(b) The terms of office of the members first taking office after the approval of this act shall expire as designated by the President at the time of nomination, one at the end of the third year, two at the end of the sixth year, and two at the end of the ninth year after the date of approval of this act. A successor to a member of the Board shall be appointed in the same manner as the original members and shall have a term of office expiring 9 years from the date of the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed.

(c) Any member appointed to fill a vacancy in the Board occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

(d) Vacancies in the Board, so long as there shall be three members in office, shall not impair the powers of the Board to execute the functions of the Corporation, and three of the members in office shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of the business of the Board.

(e) Each of the members of the Board shall receive a salary at the rate of \$20,000 a year, to be paid by the Corporation as current expenses. Members of the Board shall be reimbursed by the Corporation for actual expenses (including traveling and subsistence expenses) incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Board by this act. No member of said Board shall, during his continuance in office, be engaged in any other business, but each member shall devote himself to the work of the Corporation.

(f) No Director shall, during his continuance in office, have a financial interest in any public-utility company engaged in the business of generating, transmitting, distributing, or selling power to the public; nor in any holding company or subsidiary company of a holding company as those terms are defined in the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935.

THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 5. (a) The Board shall be assisted in the discharge of its duties by an advisory committee which shall act in an advisory capacity upon such matters of broad policy and on specific matters as hereafter designated, as may be referred to it by the Board.

(b) The advisory committee shall consist of the Governor or his designee from each of the States within the Missouri Valley region as set forth in section 2 (a) of this act, and of the principal officer or his designee of the following Federal Government agencies: Departments of Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, Justice, War, Labor, Federal Power Commission, and Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; and twelve persons, residents of the area of the Authority, three of whom shall be selected by the President to represent the interests of agriculture, three to represent the interests of industry and commerce, three to represent the interests of labor, and three to represent wildlife and aquatic life, conservation, and recreation, in the area covered by the Authority and activities of the Corporation. The advisory committee shall organize and choose its own officers. It shall meet in the area not less than twice each year to receive reports of progress and in one of such meetings shall receive a copy of the annual report of the Corporation. The committee may make such comments to the Corporation and to the President on the annual reports as it sees fit to make. Extraordinary meetings of the advisory committee may be called upon petition of a majority of its members, or upon written notice of the Chairman of the Board.

The advisory committee shall advise concerning the initial plan for unified development of the Missouri Valley region before it is reported to the President and Congress, as provided in section 7 (a). The Governors of the States within the Missouri Valley region shall constitute a special panel of the advisory committee to advise concerning Federal-State relationships on all matters coming under the purview of the advisory committee.

Each member of the committee, before entering upon the duties of his office, shall subscribe to an oath (or affirmation) to support the Constitution of the United States and to perform faithfully and impartially the duties imposed upon him by this act. Members of the advisory committee shall be reimbursed for actual expenses incurred in the performance of their duties. The term of office of committee members from Government agencies shall be coextensive with their terms of office in their respective agencies. The terms of office of non-Government members shall be fixed in such manner as to provide that the term of one each of the three representing agriculture, industry and commerce, labor, and wildlife and aquatic life, conservation, and recreation, shall expire as designated by the President at the time of nomination, one at the end of the third year, one at the end of the sixth year, and one at the end of the ninth year after the date of approval of this act. A successor shall be appointed in the same manner as the original member and shall have a term of office expiring 9 years from the date of the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed.

(c) Any member appointed to fill a vacancy in the committee occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

SEC. 6. (a) All funds required by the Corporation in addition to those derived and expended pursuant to subsection (b) hereof shall be provided by appropriations in accordance with the procedures of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 20), except as otherwise provided herein. All appropriations necessary to carry out this act are hereby authorized.

(b) The net proceeds for each fiscal year derived by the Board from the sale of power and water by the Corporation, and from any other activities of the Corporation, including the disposition of any real or personal property, after deducting the cost of operation and maintenance, and an amount deemed by the Board as necessary to withhold as operating capital or devoted by the Board to new construction, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States at the end of each calendar year. Any funds retained by the Corporation shall be devoted only to construction work of a character directly incidental to the projects authorized by the Congress except as appropriated by the Congress for specific purposes.

(c) The Corporation shall at all times maintain complete and accurate books of account. The system of accounts and books and records kept for that purpose shall be subject to the approval of the Comptroller General of the United States, as to their adequacy for the accounting purposes of the Corporation. The Corporation shall maintain its power accounting system in conformity with the Federal Power Commission's uniform system of accounts. In December of each year the Board shall file with the President and the Congress a financial statement and a complete report as to the business of the Corporation covering the preceding governmental fiscal year.

(d) The Corporation shall determine and prescribe the manner in which its obligations and expenses shall be incurred, allowed, and paid: *Provided*, That the Corporation shall be a wholly owned Government corporation within the meaning of the Government Corporation Control Act, approved December 6, 1945, and its transactions and operations shall be subject to control in the manner provided in that act except as specifically set forth in section 6 (b) above.

(e) Nothing in this act shall be construed to relieve the treasurer or other accountable officers or employees of the Corporation from compliance with the provisions of existing law requiring the rendition of accounts for adjustment and settlement pursuant to section 236, Revised Statutes, as amended by section 305 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 24), and accounts for all receipts and disbursements by or for the Corporation shall be rendered accordingly: *Provided*, That subject only to the provisions of the Missouri Valley Authority Act, the Corporation is authorized to make such expenditures and to enter into such contracts, agreements, and arrangements, upon such terms and conditions, and in such manner as it may deem necessary, including the final settlement of all claims and litigation by or against the Corporation, and, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law governing the expenditure of public funds, the General Accounting Office, in the settlement of the accounts of the treasurer or other accountable officer or employee of the Corporation, shall not disallow credit for, nor withhold funds because of, any expenditure, not tainted with fraud, which the Board shall determine to have been necessary to carry out the provisions of said act.

(f) The Corporation shall determine its own system of administrative accounts and the forms and contents of its contracts and other business documents except as otherwise provided in this act.

PART C—FORMULATION OF THE PLAN FOR MISSOURI VALLEY DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 7. (a) The Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to formulate and report to the President and Congress with the utmost expedition its recommendations for the unified development of the Missouri Valley region in accordance with the purposes and policy of this act: *Provided*, That a progress report shall be made quarterly to the President and to the Congress.

Such recommendations shall include a complete plan for the unified control and utilization of the waters of the Missouri River system, which will reconcile and harmonize the requirements for flood control, navigation, reclamation, agricultural purposes, power, recreational, the recovery of archeological, paleontological, and historical remains, and other needs in such a way as to secure the maximum public benefit for the region and the Nation: *Provided, however*, That works and programs already approved by the Congress falling within the scope of river basin development as defined in this act, for which appropriations have already been made, shall be included in the plan insofar as may be practicable and continued to completion, without regard to the time which elapses between the enactment of this act and the approval of the unified plan as set forth in this section: *Provided further*, That the use for navigation of waters arising in the States lying wholly or partly east of the ninety-eighth meridian shall be only such use as does not conflict with any beneficial, consumptive use, present or future, in States lying wholly or partly west of the ninety-eighth meridian of such waters for domestic, municipal, stock, water, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes. In formulating such a unified plan and recommendations, the Corporation shall give particular consideration to the general plans set forth in House Document No. 475 and Senate Document No. 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, as revised by Senate Document No. 247, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, subject to such modifications as the board determines to be necessary to best serve the purposes of this act, and shall conduct such additional surveys and investigations as it deems necessary or proper, and shall enlist the advice and assistance of appropriate local, State, and Federal governmental agencies, educational institutions, and private organizations: *Provided further*, That in formulating a unified plan and making recommendations the Corporation shall incorporate the programs and insure such proper participation of existing governmental agencies as it deems consistent with the purposes of obtaining the maximum river basin resources development under the unified system of planning and management contemplated by this act. Particular consideration in such a plan and recommendations shall be given to projects and activities which shall serve the following purposes:

(1) The control and prevention of floods which impair and disrupt navigation, the facilities of interstate commerce, the properties and functions of the United States, and agricultural and industrial properties and production, by, among other means, the storage, control, and disposition of flood and surplus waters, and the control and retardation of water run-off and the restoration and improvement of the absorption and infiltration capacity of the soil. Projects for such purposes shall include, but not by way of limitation, dams, reservoirs, levees, spillways, and floodways; improved methods and conditions of soil conservation, utilization, fertilization, and cultivation; and the conservation of forests and afforestation and reforestation of lands.

(2) The promotion of navigation by, among other means, the improvement of the channels of navigable rivers and their tributaries;

the prevention of siltation of such waters; the regulation of stream flow; and the development and coordination of navigation facilities.

(3) The proper utilization and reclamation of arid, semiarid, or swampy public lands by, among other means, the irrigation, drainage, development, and improvement of such lands.

(4) The safeguarding of navigable waters and their use by, among other means, the prevention and abatement of pollution of navigable streams and their tributaries.

(b) So far as may be consistent with or necessary or appropriate for the control and prevention of floods, the promotion of navigation, the safeguarding of navigable waters, and the reclamation of the public lands, as provided in subsection (a), the plan and recommendations shall incorporate the existing and partially completed structures developed pursuant to the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, and subsequent appropriation Acts for these purposes, and shall give due regard to the following, among other considerations:

(1) the present and future development and conservation of water for power, irrigation, and other beneficial uses;

(2) the prudent husbandry of soil, mineral, and forest resources and their conservation for recreation, the protection of wild game, aquatic life, the recovery of archeological, paleontological, and historical resources, and other beneficial uses;

(3) the restoration of the declining subsurface water table, taking account of the influence of subsoil insects, soil bacteria, and other contributing factors,

(4) the preventing of irreparable waste of the Nation's resources from droughts, winds, dust storms, and soil erosion

(5) the utilization and disposition of war and defense plants, in such manner as to encourage desirable industrial and business expansion;

(6) the establishment of a permanently prosperous and well-balanced agriculture within the region, pursuant to the policy of this act, and including a comprehensive program for provision of low-cost fertilizer to farmers;

(7) the integration and interconnection of projects and activities, the development of their multiple purposes, and the equitable distribution of the benefits thereof;

(8) equitable contributions to cost by States and subdivisions and agencies thereof benefited by the projects and activities; and

(9) such economic, social, and cultural values as may be affected or furthered by the projects and activities

(c) The plan and recommendations authorized in subsection (a) hereof shall be in sufficient detail to provide the President, the Congress, and the people and institutions of the region with reasonably specific information as to—

(1) the water control and utilization policy and program which should be established and maintained;

(2) the nature, scope, and general location of the projects and activities recommended, including present recreational advantages or development, and the estimated cost and benefits thereof;

(3) the order of preference and priority which should be followed in the construction and carrying out of such projects and activities in the light of the conditions existing and anticipated at the time of the report.

(d) In formulating such plan and recommendations, the Corporation shall give due consideration to existing surveys and plans relating to water control and resource development for various purposes, shall conduct such additional surveys and investigations as it deems necessary or proper, and shall enlist the advice and assistance of appropriate local, State, and Federal gov-

ernmental agencies, educational institutions, and private organizations.

(e) The plan and recommendations formulated by the Corporation and submitted to the President and Congress as provided in subsection (a) hereof shall be submitted to both Houses on the same day and to each House while it is in session, and shall remain available for the consideration of the Congress during the session in which it is introduced but in no case for less than a period of 90 calendar days. If not affirmatively disapproved by the Congress by concurrent resolution, or if no action is taken by the Congress to extend the time of consideration, said plans and recommendations shall be deemed to be effective upon the adjournment sine die of the Congress. If the Congress adjourns sine die before the expiration of the 90-day period, a new 90-day period shall begin on the opening day of the next succeeding regular or special session. A similar rule shall be applicable in case of all subsequent adjournments sine die before the expiration of 90 days. Additions to and modifications of the plan and recommendations may be submitted to the President and Congress in the same manner and shall be subject to approval on the same conditions as the original plan and recommendations.

Sec 8. This act recognizes the existence of an important body of law affecting the public lands, irrigation, reclamation, grazing, geological survey, national parks and monuments, historical and archeological resources, mines and mineral holdings of the United States Government, and forest land.

The Authority is hereby directed to take such law into account in formulating its plan for the unified development of the Missouri River Basin. It is further authorized and directed to make such contracts with the appropriate agencies of the Government administering these laws as will preserve effective participation of these agencies in the unified development of the Missouri River Basin and other proper administration of the laws in question to the fullest extent deemed practicable by the Corporation.

PART D—THE POWERS OF THE CORPORATION CORPORATE POWERS

Sec 9 Subject to the provisions of this act, the Corporation—

(1) shall have succession in its corporate name;

(2) may adopt and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed,

(3) shall have power to enter into such contracts and agreements, and to exercise such powers and do such things, as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the powers now or hereafter conferred upon it by law,

(4) may sue and be sued in its corporate name and may settle and adjust claims held by it against other parties or persons and by other parties and persons against it, except claims cognizable under the Federal Tort Claims Act;

(5) shall be held to be an inhabitant and resident, within the meaning of the laws of the United States relating to the venue of civil suits, of any judicial district lying wholly or in part within the Missouri Valley region as defined in section 2 (a). The district courts of the United States shall have original jurisdiction of all proceedings against the Corporation or against any Director, officer, employee, or agent thereof by reason of his being such Director, officer, employee, or agent; and the Corporation or any such Director, officer, employee, or agent thereof who is a defendant in any such suit may, at any time before the trial thereof, remove such suit from a State court into the district court of the United States for the proper district by following the procedure for the removal of causes otherwise provided by law.

ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY

SEC. 10. The Corporation is hereby authorized—

(a) to acquire, by purchase, lease, condemnation, or donation, or by transfer under section 12 (g) hereof, such real and personal property and any interest therein, and may sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of any real and personal property and any interest therein, as in its judgment may be necessary in carrying out the purposes of the Corporation under this act. Title to all real property or interest therein, whether acquired by condemnation or otherwise, shall be taken in the name of the United States of America, and thereupon such real property shall, for the purposes of this act, be entrusted to the Corporation as agent of the United States. The Corporation shall not dispose of any real property on which is located a permanent dam, hydraulic power plant, or munitions plant heretofore or hereafter constructed by or on behalf of the United States or the Corporation. In accomplishing the purposes of this section, every effort shall be made to preserve existing recreational values. The provisions of section 355, Revised Statutes (40 U. S. C. 255), as amended, shall be inapplicable as respects acquisitions by the Corporation. All condemnation proceedings shall be had pursuant to the provisions and requirements hereinafter specified: *Provided*, That nothing contained herein or elsewhere in this act shall be construed to deprive the Corporation of the rights conferred by the act of February 26, 1931 (46 Stat. 1421),

(b) to purchase and acquire such materials and other personal property as may be required to carry out the purposes and policy of this act. All purchases and contracts for supplies or services, except for personal services, made by the Corporation shall be made after advertising, in such manner and at such times sufficiently in advance of opening bids, as the Board shall determine to be adequate to insure notice and opportunity for competition: *Provided, however*, That advertisement shall not be required when (1) the Board determines that an emergency requires immediate delivery of the supplies or performance of the services; or (2) repair parts, accessories, supplemental equipment, or services are required for supplies or services previously furnished or contracted for; or (3) the aggregate amount involved in any purchase of supplies or procurement of services does not exceed \$500; in which cases such purchases of supplies or procurement of services may be made in the open market in the manner common among businessmen: *Provided further*, That in comparing bids and in making awards the Board may consider such factors as relative quality and adaptability of supplies or services, the bidder's financial responsibility, skill, experience, record of integrity in dealing, and ability to furnish repairs and maintenance services, and the time of delivery or performance offered.

EMINENT DOMAIN

SEC. 11. (a) The Corporation shall have power in the name of the United States of America to exercise the right of eminent domain, and in the purchase of any real estate or the acquisition of real estate by condemnation proceedings, the title to such real estate shall be taken in the name of the United States of America, and thereupon all such real estate shall be entrusted to the Corporation as the agent of the United States to accomplish the purposes of this act. Any proceedings under this section shall be instituted in the United States district court for the district in which the property with reference to which the power of eminent domain is being exercised, is located.

(b) Upon the filing of a petition for condemnation and for the purpose of ascertaining the value of the property to be acquired,

and assessing the compensation to be paid, the court shall appoint three commissioners who shall be disinterested persons and who shall take and subscribe an oath that they do not own any lands, or interest or easement in any lands, which it may be desirable for the United States to acquire in the furtherance of said project, and such commissioners shall not be selected from the locality wherein the land sought to be condemned lies. Such commissioners shall receive a per diem of not to exceed \$25 for their services, together with an additional amount of \$10 per day for subsistence for time actually spent in performing their duties as commissioners.

(c) It shall be the duty of such commissioners to examine into the value of the lands sought to be condemned, to conduct hearings and receive evidence, and generally to take such appropriate steps as may be proper for the determination of the value of the said lands sought to be condemned, and for such purpose the commissioners are authorized to administer oaths and subpoena witnesses, which said witnesses shall receive the same fees as are provided for witnesses in the Federal courts. The said commissioners shall thereupon file a report setting forth their conclusions as to the value of the said property sought to be condemned, making a separate award and valuation in the premises with respect to each separate parcel involved. Upon the filing of such award in court, the clerk of said court shall give notice of the filing of such award to the parties to said proceeding, in manner and form as directed by the judge of said court.

(d) Either or both parties may file exceptions to the award of said commissioners within 20 days from the date of the filing of said award in court. Exceptions filed to such award shall be heard before three Federal district judges unless the parties, in writing, in person, or by their attorneys, stipulate that the exceptions may be heard before a lesser number of judges. On such hearings such judges shall pass de novo upon the proceedings had before the commissioners, may view the property, and may take additional evidence. Upon such hearings the said judges shall file their own award, fixing therein the value of the property sought to be condemned, regardless of the award previously made by the said commissioners.

(e) At any time within 30 days from the filing of the decision of the district judges upon the hearing on exceptions to the award made by the commissioners, either party may appeal from such decision of the said judges to the circuit court of appeals, and the said circuit court of appeals shall upon the hearing on said appeal dispose of the same upon the record, without regard to the awards or findings theretofore made by the commissioners or the district judges, and such circuit court of appeals shall thereupon fix the value of the said property sought to be condemned.

(f) Upon acceptance of an award by the owner of any property herein provided to be appropriated, and the payment of the money awarded or upon the failure of either party to file exceptions to the award of the commissioners within the time specified, or upon the award of the commissioners and the payment of the money by the United States pursuant thereto, or the payment of the money awarded into the registry of the court by the Corporation, the title to said property and the right to the possession thereof shall pass to the United States, and the United States shall be entitled to a writ in the same proceeding to dispossess the former owner of said property, and all lessees, agents, and attorneys of such former owner, and put the United States, by its corporate creature and agent, the Corporation, into possession of said property.

(g) In the event of any property owned in whole or in part by minors, or insane persons, or incompetent persons, or estates

of deceased persons, then the legal representatives of such minors, insane persons, incompetent persons, or estates shall have power, by and with the consent and approval of the trial judge in whose court said matter is for determination, to consent to or reject the awards of the commissioners herein provided for, and in the event that there be no legal representatives, or that the legal representatives for such minors, insane persons, or incompetent persons shall fail or decline to act, then such trial judge may, upon motion, appoint a guardian ad litem to act for such minors, insane persons, or incompetent persons, and such guardian ad litem shall act to the full extent and to the same purpose and effect as his ward could act, if competent, and such guardian ad litem shall be deemed to have full power and authority to respond, and to conduct or maintain any proceeding herein provided for affecting his said ward.

GENERAL POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE CORPORATION

SEC. 12. (a) The Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to construct, acquire, operate, and carry out such projects and activities in the Missouri Valley region described in section 2 (a) as will serve to control and prevent floods, to reclaim the public lands, to promote navigation, and safeguard the navigable waters, and so far as may be consistent with such purposes to generate and distribute the maximum amount of electric power, having due regard to the preservation of natural recreational advantages and values: *Provided, however,* That nothing contained in this act shall be interpreted as authorizing the Corporation to exercise the powers herein granted in any public park or monument without express consent of Congress or the State by which said park or monument was established. The Corporation shall have such powers as may be necessary or appropriate to effectuate the purposes, policy, and program authorized in this section, including, but not by way of limitation, the power—

(1) to acquire, construct, operate, maintain, and improve dams, locks, reservoirs, levees, spillways, floodways, fishways, conduits, powerhouses, steam-generating plants, transmission lines, rural electric lines, and substations, canals, roads, roadways, docks, wharves, terminals, and recreation facilities, and structures, equipment, and facilities incidental thereto;

(2) to acquire, construct, operate, maintain, and improve such machinery, equipment, structures, and facilities, for the storage and transportation of water or for the generation and transmission of electric energy as the Corporation deems necessary or appropriate to supply existing and potential users or markets;

(3) to develop and provide such methods and conditions of water and land utilization as the Corporation deems necessary or appropriate to prevent and abate floods and droughts.

In order further to effectuate such primary purposes in the construction and operation of dams for projects entrusted to it, the Corporation insofar as practicable, shall make provision, in the construction of any dam, for such foundations, sluices, pen stocks, and other works as may be necessary or appropriate to prevent the waste of water power at such dam and to make possible the economical future development of water power at such dam.

(b) The President is authorized, whenever in his judgment the purposes of this act and the interests of economy and efficiency will be served thereby, to transfer to the Corporation the use, possession, control, and operation of any dam or water-control project, together with appurtenant works and transmission facilities, constructed, under construction, or hereafter constructed by or in behalf of the United States or its instrumen-

talities in the Missouri Valley region, and of such other real or personal property of the United States, or any agency thereof, as he may from time to time deem necessary or proper to carry out the purposes and policy of this act. In connection with any such transfer, the President shall make such provision as he deems necessary or appropriate for the transfer to the Corporation of unexpended balances of appropriations available for use in respect of such dam and other water-control projects, appurtenant works, transmission facilities, and of such other property, together with personnel equipment, and any powers, duties, and obligations pertaining thereto. Nothing in this section shall constitute an order of transfer to the Authority of any moneys in the reclamation fund.

(c) The Corporation is hereby authorized to negotiate agreements with States or their instrumentalities adjacent to the Missouri Basin States as enumerated in section 2 (a) to effect mutually satisfactory transmountain diversions of water. Such agreements shall be reported to the President and to the Congress.

(d) The Corporation is authorized to negotiate, execute, and carry out contracts with States, counties, municipalities, and all State agencies and with railroads, railroad corporations, common carriers, and all public-utility commissions and any other person, firm, or corporation, for the relocation of railroad tracks, highways, highway bridges, mills, ferries, electric-light plants, and any and all other properties, enterprises, and projects, whose removal may be necessary in order to carry out the provisions of this act. The Corporation is further authorized to exercise the power of eminent domain to carry out the purposes of this subsection.

(e) The Corporation is authorized to advise and cooperate in the readjustment of the population displaced by the construction of dams, the acquisitions of rights-of-way, and other necessary acquisitions of land, in order to effectuate the purposes of this act; and may cooperate with Federal, State, and local agencies to that end.

(f) The Corporation is authorized, if in its judgment the interests of economy and efficiency will be served thereby, to construct or operate any project or conduct any activity entrusted to it through, or in conjunction with, other departments and agencies of the United States, or in conjunction with States or subdivisions or agencies thereof, including local levee and drainage districts, or other public or cooperative agencies. The departments and agencies of the United States are hereby authorized to participate in the construction or operation of such projects or the conduct of such activities on terms mutually agreeable to such department or agency and the Corporation.

(g) The exclusive use, possession, control, and operation of the Fort Peck Dam across the Missouri River in the State of Montana, together with its appurtenant works, powerhouse, transmission lines, and all equipment, lands, and buildings, in connection therewith, are hereby transferred and entrusted to the Corporation for the purposes of this act.

(h) All the projects and activities authorized pursuant to this section shall be constructed, operated, and carried out in accordance with the purposes and policy of this act and from the effective date of the plan and recommendations provided for in section 7 hereof, in accordance with the more precise terms thereof.

DISPOSITION OF WATER AND FEDERAL LAND

SEC. 13. (a) The Corporation is authorized to contract for the delivery of water for any purpose with individual water users, organizations of water users, irrigation districts, conservancy districts, associations, corporations, or other public or private agencies. The contract shall be in conformity with

the provisions and policies of this act and may include such terms, conditions, rules, and regulations as in the judgment of the Board may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act. In case of noncompliance with the terms, conditions, rules, or regulations included in any contract for the delivery of water the contract may provide that it shall be voidable at the election of the Board and it may also provide for discontinuing the delivery of water thereunder.

(b) Whenever any lands in Federal ownership are to be benefited by the application of water under the authority of this act, the Corporation shall survey, plat, and analyze the land and divide it into farm units. Wherever necessary to the orderly development of the whole area to be benefited, the area may be divided into irrigation blocks consisting of groups of units or areas defined by natural boundaries to which the waters shall be applied at substantially the same time and by means of the same general distribution system, each unit shall be offered for occupancy or sale as hereinafter provided. No units shall include more than 160 acres of irrigable land or the adjusted acreage above the 160-acre limitation hereinafter set forth. Nothing in this section shall limit the right of ownership of any quantity of nonirrigable land, or land to which water could be made available under the provisions of the Corporation but is not delivered.

(c) All public-domain lands to be benefited by waters developed by the project shall be impartially appraised by the Corporation without reference to or increment on account of the construction of the project. Such lands as shall have been purchased by the Corporation, or by other agencies of the Federal Government and thereafter transferred to the Corporation, shall likewise be appraised without reference to or increment on account of the construction of the project and without reference to the price for which said lands were purchased by the Corporation or by other agencies of the Federal Government. Such appraisals shall take into consideration the value of any land improvements and/or structures or other improvements erected on the property and such appraisal shall constitute the sales price of the units created from said lands.

(d) When lands in Federal ownership are ready for occupancy and water is available for delivery thereto, the Corporation shall publish a plat of said farm units and a notice of its intention to sell such farms upon application, giving the general conditions of sale, including credit terms and qualification of applicants. Said notice shall be published once each week for three successive weeks in a newspaper of general circulation in the county or counties in which the units or any portions thereof are located and copies of said notice shall be sent for posting or other publication to such persons, organizations, or agencies of the States or Federal Government as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall direct. In the disposition of any land which the Corporation may have available for sale, preference shall be given to applications by veterans otherwise qualified under tests prescribed by the Corporation, who are found eligible on account of service for any of the benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended.

(e) In addition to determining under section 17 (a) the portion of the total costs of any project to be allocated to the various purposes for which the project has been constructed or to which it may be devoted, the Corporation shall also determine the reimbursable portions of the construction costs to be allocated to irrigation. Such reimbursable construction costs allocated to irrigation shall then be equitably apportioned to the lands to be benefited on a per unit basis according to the measure of benefits, char-

acter of the soil, topography, and all other pertinent factors. Immediately upon filing notice thereof in the office of the county recorder of deeds or other appropriate county official, the portion of the construction charge allocated to each unit shall become a lien against said unit until repaid. The reimbursable portion of the total construction costs allocated to irrigation purposes shall be determined by the Corporation after careful consideration of the prospective normal earning capacity of the lands and the ability of farm families of average size, ability, and industry to pay the purchase prices of said farms, maintain a satisfactory standard of living, and pay the operation and maintenance charges for the water and the proportion of the construction charges to be allocated to said farm units.

(f) The reimbursable construction costs allocated to irrigation purposes, as determined in subsection (e) above, together with the annual costs of operation and maintenance of the project and distribution system shall be recovered, whenever practicable, from the water users under repayment contracts. Such contracts may be entered into by the Corporation with individual water users, or, wherever practicable, with organizations of water users, irrigation districts, conservancy districts, associations, corporations, or other public or private agencies having sufficient power to enforce the collection of charges against its members or the lands within its boundaries.

Said repayment contract shall provide (1) for the repayment of the reimbursable construction costs apportioned to said unit, with or without interest, over such period of time and in installments of such amounts payable on such dates as the Corporation may deem advisable; (2) for the establishment of a lien against the land to secure the repayment of said construction costs and such operation and maintenance charges as shall be assessed from time to time and for the enforcement of such liens in accordance with the laws of the State within which the property is situated. The contracts may also include such other terms, conditions, rules, and regulations as in the judgment of the board may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act. In case of noncompliance with the terms, conditions, rules, or regulations included in any contract for the delivery of water, the contract may provide that it shall be voidable at the election of the Corporation and also for discontinuing the delivery of water.

(g) No water made available by any project constructed under the authority of this act may be delivered to any of the lands to be benefited, or to any of the lands within an irrigation block where such irrigation blocks have been established, until a repayment contract or contracts shall have been executed as hereinabove provided, except that water may be applied to lands owned by the United States under lease arrangements providing for a fair rental and an amount sufficient to pay the reimbursable construction costs which would be required to be paid during the period of the lease under a contract of repayment.

(h) Except as provided in subsections (1) and (j), water shall not be delivered from, through, or by means of the project works to or for use upon lands in the ownership of any one landowner holding in excess of 160 acres of irrigable land until a public hearing has been held before the Corporation in which the landowner affected has been given an opportunity to testify concerning his need of the land in question as an indispensable part of the unit within his ownership. The Corporation may find in favor of the applicant, permitting him to own and operate irrigable land in excess of the 160 acres, but in no case shall this exceed a minor fraction of a second 160 acres. The landowner must have been in possession of

the land subject to this provision of the act for a period of not less than 3 years prior to application for a hearing on the enforcement of this provision. All irrigable lands in the ownership of one landowner in excess of 160 acres or the adjusted acreage above the 160-acre limitation shall be considered excess land.

(i) A landowner holding excess lands as hereinabove defined may secure the delivery of water to a designated unit within his ownership, upon entering into an agreement with the Corporation, or any water-distributing agency approved by it, to dispose of said excess lands within a reasonable period of time and for the appraised value of said lands without reference to or increment on account of the construction of the project. The appraised value of said lands shall be determined as the Corporation may provide. In case of disagreement between the landowner and the Corporation with respect to the appraised value of "excess land" provision shall be made for the selection of an impartial arbitrator to determine said appraised value. A reasonable period of time may be allowed the landowner to dispose of said excess lands, not more than 5 years, during which period of time water made available by the construction of the project may be delivered to the owner's 160 acres, or less, of irrigable land, or the adjusted acreage above the 160-acre limitation as allowed by the Corporation under the terms of an applicable repayment contract. Should any unusual economic condition drastically depress farm-land values, or other circumstances develop to prevent the disposal of existing land within the 5-year period, the Corporation, upon showing of diligence on the part of the holder of excess land in complying with this section, may extend the 5-year period after a formal hearing. As used in this act the term "landowner" denotes any person, corporation, joint-stock association, or family, and the term "family" denotes a group living together and consisting of either or both, husband and wife, together with their children under 18 years of age, or all of such children if both parents are dead. The term "their children" includes the issue and lawfully adopted children of either or both husband and wife. Lands shall be deemed to be held by a family if held as separate property of husband or wife, or if constituting a part or all of their community property or the property of any or all of their children under 18 years of age.

(j) In the event that excess lands shall be acquired by a landowner, subsequent to the execution of a repayment contract, through foreclosure or other process of law, by conveyance in satisfaction of mortgage-secured indebtedness, by inheritance or by devise, the Corporation may continue the delivery of water to the lands of the said landowner upon his entering into an agreement with the Corporation to dispose of said excess lands within a reasonable period of time, not to exceed 3 years, and for the appraised value of said excess lands determined in the same manner as under subsection (1) hereof. Should any unusual economic conditions drastically depress farm land values, or other circumstances develop to prevent the disposal of existing land within the 3-year period, the Corporation, upon showing of diligence on the part of the holder of excess land in complying with this section, may extend the 3-year period after a formal hearing.

DISPOSITION OF ELECTRIC POWER

SEC. 14. (a) The Board is hereby authorized to sell surplus power generated by it, to States, counties, municipalities, corporations, partnerships, and individuals, according to the policies hereinafter set forth.

(b) To encourage the widest possible use of available electric energy, to provide adequate markets and outlets therefor, and to

prevent the monopolization thereof by limited groups or localities, the Corporation shall acquire, construct, operate, maintain, and improve such electric-transmission lines, rural-electric lines, substations, and other structures and facilities as it deems necessary or appropriate to bring electric energy available for sale, from its projects to existing and potential markets, and to interconnect such projects with other public or private projects for the disposition or interchange of electric energy. To provide for emergencies, break-down relief, and increased safety and economy in operations, the Corporation may enter into contracts upon suitable terms with public and private power systems for mutual interchange of electric energy and reciprocal use of transmission facilities.

(c) To insure the disposition of the electric energy developed at a project for the benefit of the general public, and particularly of domestic and rural consumers, the Corporation shall, in disposing of electric energy, give preference and priority to States, districts, counties, and municipalities, including agencies or instrumentalities thereof or of two or more States (in this Act called public agencies), and to cooperative and other organizations not organized or administered for profit but primarily for the purpose of supplying electric energy to their members as nearly as possible at cost (in this Act called cooperative agencies). In the event of competing applications by public or cooperative agencies (whether or not formally organized) on the one hand, and other persons or agencies on the other hand, the Corporation, in order to preserve and protect the preferential rights and priorities of such public and cooperative agencies, shall allow to people and communities, when within such distance from such project as to render practicable the transmission of power therefrom, reasonable opportunity and time to acquire, purchase, or construct the necessary facilities for the use or distribution of such electric energy, including reasonable opportunity and time to create and finance such public or cooperative agencies under the laws of the several States.

(d) Subject to the provisions of this act, the Corporation may enter into contracts for the sale at wholesale of electric energy whether for resale or direct consumption, to public and cooperative agencies and to private agencies and persons; and may sell electric energy directly to farms and in rural communities which the Corporation finds are not adequately serviced with electric energy at reasonable rates. The Corporation shall make every endeavor to sell its electric energy to cooperatives operating under Rural Electrification Administration contracts. Failure to make such satisfactory arrangements shall not prevent the Corporation from the selling of electric energy directly to farms and rural communities, but before doing so the Corporation shall set forth the record in the case before the advisory committee for its advice. Contracts entered into under this subsection shall be binding in accordance with the terms thereof and shall be effective for such period or periods, including renewals or extensions, as may be provided therein, not exceeding in the aggregate twenty years from the respective dates of the making of such contracts. Such contracts shall contain appropriate provisions, to be agreed upon between the Corporation and the purchaser, for the equitable adjustment of rates at appropriate intervals. In the case of contracts with private agencies or persons who resell the bulk of the electric energy purchased, the contracts shall contain appropriate provisions authorizing the Corporation to cancel the contract, in whole or in part upon 5 years' notice in writing whenever in its judgment there is reasonable likelihood that part of the electric energy purchased under such contract will be

needed to satisfy the preferential rights and priorities of public or cooperative agencies under this Act.

(e) Any contract for the sale of power may include such terms and conditions, including reasonable, nondiscriminatory resale rates, and provide for such rules and regulations as in the judgment of the Board may be necessary or desirable for carrying out the purposes of this Act. In case of dispute over proposed power contracts respecting terms, contracts, and rate schedules, prospective purchasers may ask for an advisory committee opinion as to whether the proposed contract is in keeping with the purposes of this Act; and in any such case the contract shall not become effective until the opinion of the advisory committee has been obtained. In case the purchaser shall fail to comply with any terms and conditions agreed upon, or violate any rules and regulations, said contract may provide that it shall be voidable at the election of the Board.

(f) In order to supply farms and small villages with electric power directly as contemplated by this section, the Board in its discretion shall have power to acquire existing electric facilities used in serving such farms and small villages.

(g) Rate schedules for the sale of electric energy by the Corporation shall be prepared from time to time by the Corporation. Subject to the provisions of section 17, the Corporation shall fix such rate schedules as it finds necessary or appropriate to provide adequate markets and outlets for electric energy and to encourage the widest possible use of electric energy, having regard (upon the basis of the application of such rate schedules to the capacity of the contemplated electric facilities of the Corporation or of a project of the Corporation) to the recovery of the cost of generating and transmitting such electric energy, including appropriate reserves for maintenance and upkeep and the amortization of the capital investment over a reasonable period of years. In order to distribute the benefits of an integrated transmission system and to promote the equitable distribution of electric energy, rate schedules shall provide for uniform rates, or rates uniform throughout prescribed transmission areas.

(h) The term "States," "counties," and "municipalities" as used in this act shall be construed to include the public agencies of any of them unless the context requires a different construction.

IMPROVEMENT OF PRIVATE LANDS

SEC. 15. The Corporation is also authorized to enter upon privately owned lands to be benefited by the application of water from projects developed under the authority of this act pursuant to contracts with the owners thereof for the purpose of improving and developing said lands by land leveling and other soil improvement and conservancy devices, for the construction of farmstead buildings and improvements, and for the development of ground waters for domestic purposes. The cost of said work shall be reimbursable in full, with or without interest, within such period of years and upon such schedule of repayments as the Corporation may deem reasonable and proper.

EXTENSION OF CREDIT TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

SEC. 16. (a) In order to facilitate the distribution of water in accordance with the provisions of this act, the Corporation is also authorized to advise and cooperate with States, counties, municipalities, and nonprofit organizations within distance permitting practicable utilization of water stored and available at any work or facility of the Corporation and to extend credit to such agencies and organizations and to assist them in acquiring, improving, and operating existing canals, conduits, laterals, pipelines, ditches, and incidental works and

facilities, or in acquiring any interests therein.

(b) In order (1) to facilitate the disposition of the surplus power of the Corporation according to the policies set forth in this act; (2) to give effect to the priority herein accorded to States, counties, municipalities, and nonprofit organizations in the purchase of such power by enabling them to acquire facilities for the distribution of such power; and (3) at the same time to preserve existing distribution facilities as going concerns and avoid duplication of such facilities, the Corporation is authorized to advise and cooperate with States, counties, municipalities, and nonprofit organizations situated within transmission distance from any dam where such power is generated by the Corporation and to extend credit to such agencies and organizations and to assist them in acquiring, improving, and operating existing distribution facilities and incidental works, including generating plants and interconnecting transmission lines, or in acquiring any interest in such facilities, incidental works, and lines.

ALLOCATION OF COSTS AMONG MULTIPURPOSE PROJECTS

SEC. 17. (a) The Corporation shall make a thorough investigation of the cost or value of each dam, steam plant, or other similar improvement hereafter constructed by or turned over to the Corporation for its management and control for the purpose of allocating such cost or value among the various purposes served by the improvement, such as navigation, flood control, irrigation, power development, or other types of development, as the case may be. Costs of facilities having a value only for one purpose shall be allocated to that purpose; costs of facilities having a joint value for more than one purpose shall be equitably allocated among such purposes in such manner as the board deems necessary or appropriate to encourage the widest possible economic use of water for irrigation and of electric energy for domestic, rural, and industrial needs, and to avoid the imposition upon any one purpose of a greater share of joint costs than such purpose should fairly bear. The Corporation shall also determine the appropriate periods and rates of amortization to be applied to the capital investment allocated to a revenue-producing purpose. The Corporation shall make this allocation of costs and periods and rates of amortization only after formal public hearings held at some designated point within the area affected by the decision. It shall make its findings and decisions known to the advisory committee. The committee shall in turn record the committee's views in the manner with the board and with the President of the United States. The allocation of costs and the periods and rates of amortization so determined by the Corporation, if not disapproved by the President of the United States, shall be final and shall be used thereafter in keeping the books of the Corporation.

(b) The Corporation shall, within 3 years from the date of enactment of this act, file with Congress a statement of its allocation of the value of all such properties constructed or turned over to said Corporation and which have been completed prior to the end of the preceding fiscal year, and shall thereafter in its annual report to Congress file a statement of its allocation of the value of such properties as have been completed during the preceding fiscal year.

(c) For the purpose of accumulating data useful to the Congress in the formulation of legislative policy in matters relating to the generation, transmission, and distribution of electric energy, and to the Federal Power Commission and other Federal and State agencies, and to the public, the Board

shall keep complete accounts of its costs of generation, transmission, and distribution of electric energy and shall keep a complete account of the total cost of generating and transmission facilities constructed or otherwise acquired by the Corporation, and a description of the major components of such costs according to such uniform system of accounting for public utilities as prescribed by the Federal Power Commission, with such modifications as may be deemed by the Corporation and the Federal Power Commission to be necessary or desirable by reason of the nature and character of the Corporation and its operations, together with records of such other physical data and operating statistics of the Corporation as may be helpful in determining the actual cost and value of services, and the practices, methods, facilities, equipment, appliances, and standards, and sizes, types, location, and geographical and economic integration of plants and systems best suited to promote the public interest, efficiency, and the wider and more economical use of electric energy. Such data shall be reported to the Congress by the Corporation from time to time with appropriate analyses and recommendations, and, so far as practicable, shall be made available to the Federal Power Commission and other Federal and State agencies which may be concerned with the administration of legislation relating to the generation, transmission, or distribution of electric energy. It is hereby declared to be the policy of this act that, to make the Corporation's power projects self-supporting and self-liquidating, as soon as practicable the surplus power shall be sold at rates which, in the opinion of the Corporation, will produce gross revenues in excess of the cost of production of said power; and the Corporation shall file with each annual report a statement of the total cost of all power generated by it at all power stations during each year, the average cost of such power per kilowatt-hour, the rates at which such power is sold and to whom, and copies of all contracts for the sale of power.

SAFEGUARDING THE MISSOURI RIVER

SEC. 18. (a) To insure the integrated and coordinated promotion of navigation, control and prevention of floods, safeguarding of navigable waters, reclamation of the public lands and protection of property of the United States, no dam, appurtenant works, sewer, dock, pier, wharf, bridge, trestle, landing pipe, building, float, or other or different obstruction or polluter affecting navigation, the use of navigable waters, flood control and prevention, the public lands or property of the United States shall be constructed and thereafter operated or maintained over, across, along, in, or into the Missouri River or any tributary stream of said river or any tributary of such stream, except in accordance with plans for such construction, operation, and maintenance approved by the local office of the Corporation. The Corporation shall draw up and make public rules and regulations under which incidental, temporary, or minor construction, in the categories referred to in this paragraph, may be made by private citizens, corporate or public bodies without prior approval of the Corporation. Such structures of a semi-permanent or permanent character shall be listed with the Corporation. The requirements of this section shall be in addition to the requirements of all other applicable laws of the United States or of any State; and any approval, license, permit, or other sanction required by any provision of any such law or laws for the construction, operation, or maintenance of any such obstruction or polluter of any part thereof (except such as may be constructed, operated, or maintained under this act or other law of the United States by the Corporation) shall be required as in such law provided.

(b) The Corporation may bring appropriate proceedings in a district court of the United States to enjoin any violation of this section within the territorial jurisdiction of such district court, or to require the removal of any obstruction or polluter constructed, operated, or maintained within such jurisdiction in violation of this section; and upon a proper showing a temporary or permanent injunction or decree shall be granted without bond.

CONTINUING POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE CORPORATION

SEC. 19. In addition to formulating the plan and recommendations required by section 7 of this act, the Corporation is hereby authorized to engage in the continuing activities, more particularly defined below:

(a) To aid the proper use, conservation, and development of the natural resources of the Missouri Valley region, and with a view to the coordination and integration of programs, projects, and activities of agencies having an interest in developing the resources, including wildlife and aquatic life, archeological, paleontological, and historical remains of the region for the purpose of increasing efficiency and eliminating waste and duplication of effort, and to provide for the general welfare of the citizens of said region, the Corporation is hereby authorized, by such means or methods as it may deem proper, to make such surveys, investigations, studies, and plans for the Missouri Valley region as may be useful to the President, the Congress, and the several States in guiding and controlling the extent, sequence, and nature of development that may be equitably and economically advanced through the expenditure of public funds, or through the guidance or control of public authority, all for the purpose of fostering an orderly and proper physical, economic, and social development of said region.

(b) The Corporation is further authorized to undertake such engineering and economic research and demonstrational work as it deems necessary or appropriate (1) to develop its studies and plans; (2) to test or demonstrate the feasibility of such plans; (3) to promote the wider and improved use of electric power and water for irrigation purposes, agricultural and domestic use, and for small or locally owned industries; and (4) more efficiently to develop or carry out any project or activity authorized under this act or entrusted to the Corporation under any other act or administrative order. In order to carry out such activities, the Corporation is authorized to acquire, construct, operate, maintain, and improve such laboratories and experiment stations as it deems necessary or appropriate.

(c) In carrying out the activities authorized in subsections (a) and (b) hereof, the Corporation shall have the power to study the plans, projects, and activities of the several Federal departments and agencies having an interest in resource development in the Missouri Valley region. The Corporation, insofar as practicable, shall consult and cooperate with the field offices and services for any information or data relevant to such plans, projects, and activities, and it shall be the duty of such departments and agencies to have their field offices and services take such action as may be necessary or appropriate to cooperate with the Corporation in carrying out the provisions of this paragraph.

(d) The Corporation, insofar as practicable, shall consult and cooperate with the States and with public and cooperative agencies in the making of studies, the collecting of information and data, the development of plans, and the research, demonstrational, and educational work authorized for carrying out the purposes of this act. The Corporation may make available to the departments and agencies of the United States and

to the States and the people thereof, and to public and cooperative agencies, such information, studies, and recommendations as it deems necessary or appropriate, and such other information and studies and such recommendations for State legislation as the Corporation deems advisable to aid in carrying out the purposes of this act. The Corporation shall, from time to time, as the work provided for in the preceding subsections progresses, recommend to the President and Congress such legislation as it deems proper to carry out the general purposes stated in subsection (a) hereof.

USE OF PATENTS

SEC. 20. (a) The Corporation, as an instrumentality of the Government of the United States, shall have access to the Patent Office of the United States for the purpose of studying, ascertaining, and copying all methods, formulas, and scientific information (not including access to pending applications for patents) necessary to enable the Corporation to use and employ the most efficacious and economical processes in the course of its operations. Except as provided in subsection (b), any owner of a patent whose patent rights may have been thus in any way copied, used, infringed, or employed by the exercise of this authority by the Corporation shall have as the exclusive remedy a cause of action against the Corporation, to be instituted and prosecuted in the appropriate district court of the United States for the recovery of reasonable compensation for such infringement. The Commissioner of Patents shall furnish to the Corporation at its request and without payment of fees, copies of documents on file in his office.

(b) Any invention or discovery made by virtue of and incidental to service to the Corporation by an employee of the Government of the United States pursuant to section 22 (e) of this act or otherwise, or by any employee of the Corporation, together with any patents which may be granted thereon, shall be the sole and exclusive property of the Corporation, which is hereby authorized to grant such licenses thereunder as shall be authorized by the Board: *Provided further*, That the Board may pay to such inventor such sum from the income from the sale of licenses as it may deem proper.

MAKE TAX ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS

SEC. 21. (a) In order to render financial assistance to those States in which the Corporation carries on its operations and acquires properties previously subject to State and local taxation, the Corporation is authorized and directed to pay to said States during each fiscal year a sum in total not less than the revenue lost to the State and political subdivision affected by the Corporation's removal of property from the tax rolls formerly subject to State and local taxation. The first payment to be made by the Corporation to the States and political subdivisions affected shall be based on the then prevailing tax rate. Subsequent annual payments shall be made according to the property tax rates effective for the major portion of the year for which payment is due. The determination of the Corporation of the amounts due hereunder to the respective States shall be final.

(b) The Corporation shall, not later than 5 years after the enactment of this act, submit to the Congress a report on the operation of the provisions of this section, including a statement of the distribution to the various States hereunder; the effect of the operation of the provisions of this section on State and local finances; an appraisal of the benefits of the program of the Corporation to the States receiving payments hereunder, and the effect of such benefits in increasing taxable values within such States; and such other data, information, and recommendations as may be pertinent to future legislation.

(c) The payments authorized under this section are in lieu of taxation, and the Corporation, its property, franchises, and income are hereby expressly exempted from taxation in any manner or form by any State, county, municipality, or any subdivision or district thereof.

**PART E—MISCELLANEOUS
EMPLOYEES OF THE CORPORATION**

SEC. 22. (a) The Board shall without regard to the provisions of civil-service laws applicable to officers and employees of the United States, employ a general manager and such other managers, assistant managers, officers, employees, attorneys, agents, and consultants as are necessary for the transaction of its business, fix their compensation, define their duties, require bonds of such of them as the Board may designate, and provide a system of organization to fix responsibility and promote efficiency. Any employee of the Corporation may be removed in the discretion of the Board. Officers and employees of the Corporation shall be classified and remunerated in conformity with the Classification Act and pay scale of the United States civil service, except as specifically exempted by this act. By a majority recorded vote of the Board, particular contract, short-term, or expert employees of the Corporation may be exempted from the Classification Act and pay scale of the United States civil service. Subject to the provisions of this act and of other laws of the United States, the Corporation may deal collectively with its employees through representatives of their own choosing and is authorized to enter into written contracts with such employee representatives.

(b) In the employment, selection, classification, and promotion of officers and employees of the Corporation, no political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration, but all such employments and promotions shall be given and made only on the basis of merit and efficiency. Any employee of the Board who is found by the Board to be guilty of a violation of this subsection shall be removed from office by the Board. It shall be unlawful for a member of the Board to make or assist in the making or cause to be made any employment, selection, classification, or promotion of any officer or employee of the Corporation on the basis of or because of any political qualification or test, and any member of the Board who violates this provision shall be guilty of an offense against the United States and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year or both.

(c) The benefits of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, shall extend to persons given employment under the provisions of this act, subject to the provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act.

(d) All contracts to which the Corporation is a party and which require the employment of laborers and mechanics in the construction, alteration, maintenance, or repair of buildings, dams, locks, or other structures or facilities shall contain a provision that not less than the prevailing rate of wages for work of a similar nature in the vicinity shall be paid to such laborers or mechanics. In the event any dispute arises as to what are the prevailing rates of wages, the question shall be referred to the Secretary of Labor for determination, and his decision shall be final. In the determination of such prevailing rate or rates, due regard shall be given to those rates which have been secured through collective agreement by representatives of employers and employees. Where such work as is described in this subsection is done directly by the Corporation,

the prevailing rate of wages shall be paid in the same manner as though such work had been let by contract.

(e) The Corporation is authorized to request the assistance and advice of any officer, agent, or employee of any executive department or any independent office or agency of the United States, to enable the Corporation the better to carry out its powers successfully, and as far as practicable shall utilize the services of such officers, agents, and employees, and the President shall, if in his opinion the public interest, service, or economy so require, direct that such assistance, advice, and service be rendered to the Corporation, and any individual that may be by the President directed to render such assistance, advice, and service shall be thereafter subject to the orders, rules, and regulations of the Board, and the Corporation shall reimburse such department, office, or agency for the compensation of such individuals while serving pursuant to such direction.

MISAPPROPRIATION OF FUNDS

SEC. 23. (a) All general penal statutes relating to the larceny, embezzlement, conversion, or to the improper handling, retention, use, or disposal of public moneys or property of the United States shall apply to the moneys and property of the Corporation and to moneys and properties of the United States entrusted to the Corporation.

(b) Any person who, with intent to defraud the Corporation, or to deceive any director, officer, or employee of the Corporation or any officer or employee of the United States, (1) makes any false entry in any book of the Corporation, or (2) makes any false report or statement for the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

(c) Any person who shall receive any compensation, rebate, or reward, or shall enter into any conspiracy, collusion, or agreement, express or implied, with intent to defraud the Corporation or wrongfully and unlawfully to defeat its purposes, shall, on conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

SEPARABILITY PROVISIONS

SEC. 24. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

Michelangelo of the United States Capitol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, today more than at any other time the great works of the "Michelangelo of the United States Capitol," Constantino Brumidi, have finally come to be evaluated on the simple basis of the actual greatness of his works. There is not the slightest doubt that his decoration of the Capitol is one of the masterpieces of world art. I give thanks to the American people for affording this distinguished gentleman the privilege of performing this work. I wish to thank Dr. Myrtle Cheney Murdock who so zeal-

ously spearheaded the recognition of this masterful artist. In a small measure of tribute I include the article from the *Evening Star* of July 26, 1951:

**MICHELANGELO OF THE UNITED STATES
CAPITOL**

(By Jack Jonas)

It took the Nation 70 years to recognize Constantino Brumidi, dogged by criticism, but a never-defeated artist who labored a quarter of a century to decorate the Capitol with his murals and other paintings.

Although countless visitors have viewed the results of his efforts, until recently his name remained obscure, relegated to brief references in Washington histories and to his seldom-seen signature, "C. Brumidi, artist, citizen of the United States."

Today, beneath the fresco the Italian-born artist painted on the Capitol dome, ceremonies honor his memory on the one hundred and forty-sixth anniversary of his birth.

The fact that he is even now gaining notice is due to the persistence of Dr. Myrtle Cheney Murdock, wife of Representative MURDOCK, Democrat, of Arizona. It was through her efforts that Congress authorized last year a bronze marker for Brumidi's grave in Glenwood Cemetery. The marker is to be placed later. Dr. Murdock also has written a biography of Brumidi.

Brumidi was born in Italy, but his early history is as vague as were previous mentions of him.

He came to this country in 1852, and soon after his arrival was busy with his painting. He painted the Crucifixion for St. Stephen's Church in New York and The Holy Trinity in the cathedral at Mexico City.

Then he was hired by Capt. Montgomery C. Meigs to decorate the room of the Committee on Agriculture at the Capitol, and his career as the "Michelangelo of the United States Capitol" began.

After he had been commissioned, in 1855, to decorate the Capitol, he remarked:

"I no longer have any desire for fame or fortune. My one ambition and my daily prayer is that I may live long enough to make beautiful the Capitol of the one country on earth in which there is liberty."

His brush was busy in succeeding years. He painted symbolic figures of history, geography, mechanics, commerce, the arts and the sciences, and war, portraits of Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, Alexander Hamilton, John Fitch, Robert Fulton, Samuel F. B. Morse, and many others.

His pay at first was \$8 a day. Later the figure was raised to \$10 a day. When he did his 3 years' work on the canopy and frieze of the Capitol rotunda, he was paid a lump sum of \$30,000.

His life was far from serene.

His appointment to paint the Capitol pictures had been bitterly opposed by American artists. Congressional leaders, goaded by the resentful American artists, continued to plague him through the 25 years that he worked.

Three years after he was hired, a group of artists called for a House committee to pass "intelligent and unbiased adjudication on embellishments in all national buildings."

The committee was set up, and issued its report, and without naming Brumidi, severely criticized his work.

"A plain coat or two of whitewash is better, in the opinion of this committee, than the tawdry and exuberant ornaments with which many of the rooms and passages are being crowded," the report stated.

And again, after he had been at work 4 years, the committee reported:

"Far greater sobriety should be given to these halls in their general effect, so as to render them less distracting to the eye."

His private life was unhappy, too. He battled against ill health and the unhappiness caused by estrangement from his lovely wife, Lola Germon, nearly 40 years his junior.

She had served as the model for the women in his fresco.

Brumidi was 60 when he finished the painting in the Capitol dome. When he was past 72, he began work on the encircling frieze in the rotunda.

While at work on the frieze, he suffered the injuries that led to his death 4 months later. He slipped and fell on the platform high above the Capitol floor.

In the ensuing 4 months, he continued to work at home, busy with sketches for completion of the frieze. On his death bed, he turned the sketches over to Filippo Costaggini and designated him to complete the work. Costaggini worked until the sketches ran out, but the frieze was never finished. The sketches were not complete. Brumidi died February 19, 1880.

At his death, Congress changed its tune and paid him lavish tribute. But his name gradually slipped into obscurity, to remain there until Mrs. Murdock accidentally discovered his unmarked grave in Glenwood Cemetery and began her campaign for his recognition.

Last year, Congress approved a bill appropriating \$500 to place a bronze marker on Brumidi's grave. The marker now is being executed. Mrs. Murdock said, and will be placed on the fence-enclosed grave at a later date.

Brumidi's prophetic realization that fame and fortune had passed him by is pointed up by the fact that when he died he was so poor that Congress had to appropriate money to pay for his burial.

One Hundred and Forty-sixth Anniversary of the Birth of Constantino Brumidi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address of Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, on July 26, 1951, at the exercises commemorating the birth of Constantino Brumidi:

Briefly, the purpose of these exercises, authorized by the Congress, is to commemorate the one hundred and forty-sixth anniversary of the birth of Constantino Brumidi, the artist who spent many years decorating the Capitol Building of the United States, and died as the result of a fall while working on the frieze above us.

In welcoming you to these ceremonies, I do so with the knowledge that no more appropriate setting could be found to honor this great artist, whose love of these, our United States of America, is reflected in his artistry that is found not only in this rotunda but throughout the Capitol Building.

This was his sanctuary, his haven of peace, far away from inequity and intolerance, for here Constantino Brumidi toiled in a work of love for this, his adopted country.

It is not my intention to outline in detail the life of Constantino Brumidi; other speakers will do that. But I would like to reflect on Brumidi's thoughts as he drew from the fire of his artistic mind and hands.

At the age of 47, when most men have established themselves in their community, Constantino Brumidi was banished from his native Italy—a political exile. He sought asylum in America.

Here, indeed, he found a lively experiment in full liberty. Here liberty was to him a living thing.

Brumidi was thrilled with this liberty and with freedom of opportunity, for here he found that the Pilgrims, the Puritans, the French, the Dutch, the Germans, the Irish, the Italians, and many, many others, had brought their measure of culture. All these were poured into the melody of the American scene—the sterling qualities of each people in this melting pot of America.

This was in 1852. Constantino Brumidi was in love with his adopted country. Citizenship became his primary objective. Freedom of opportunity that this new land offered came to him when he was engaged to adorn the walls of this very building with his glorious artistry.

The Capitol became his island of peace. His paintings and figures were to flower as a memorial to our debt of the past and our destiny for the future. From history, religion, and legend, he worked in decorating this shrine of continuing history. Constantino Brumidi felt that this was the citadel of the country's ancient history—ancient only in the terms of the newness of this New World.

On and on Constantino Brumidi worked in telling the tale of this shrine that is the enduring triumph of America.

Brumidi's work flourished for more than 25 years until his tragic fall from the frieze just above us. His enthusiasm and his work grew with the years, but his greatest triumph came in 1857 as he finished a mural in the Chamber of the House of Representatives. Only his signature remained to be done.

With typical Brumidi style, he wrote the epitaph of a true American: "C. Brumidi, artist, citizen of the United States."

Federal Employees Answer Criticism—American Federation of Labor Lodge No. 1286, Ashland, Ky., Sends Letter to Ashland (Ky.) Independent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, one of our most maligned groups of citizens are our Federal employees. By and large they are loyal, efficient, and hard-working, yet they are constantly made targets of criticism. Members of Lodge No. 1286 of the American Federation of Government Employees sent the following letter to the Ashland (Ky.) Independent, setting forth their views on the leave situation.

ASHLAND, KY., JULY 10, 1951.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE ASHLAND (KY.) INDEPENDENT AND PUBLIC

As Federal Government employees, most of whom entered the Civil Service with the distinct printed agreement that 26 days annual leave was part of the "hiring bargain," the members of this union—Ashland Lodge No. 1286, American Federation of Govern-

ment Employees, A. F. L. affiliated—feel justified in the following comment on the "26 to 20" editorial that appeared in the July 4 issue of the Independent.

Among other remarks that editorial expressed jubilation over the United States Senate's "Rob Peter to pay Paul" action in voting to cut us to 20 days leave so that they could bring the postal workers up to the same amount and still make some saving to the Government. It also made the doubtful statement that most Americans get no more than 2 weeks' vacation a year.

In answer to this we could advance the following refutation:

1. We could state that the Independent's editorial writer must have been thinking of the near sweatshop pay and working conditions of some of Ashland's stores and small businesses when he stated that most Americans get no more than 2 weeks' vacation. The overall national vacation picture shows up a little differently.

2. We could state that a few years ago the postal worker had the choice between a pay raise and a leave raise. They chose the pay raise. Now their sponsor, Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, wants to give them the leave raise also—at our expense. Our quarrel here is with their sponsor, not with our sister union, the Postal Workers. The Independent seemed to neglect this point.

3. We could point out that industrial employees have received from two to four pay raises since we have received any. This, and the defense effort have raised living costs so high that many Government employees are now living "mighty low on the hog." Some so low that they are using their leave on odd jobs about town to try to keep ahead of the sheriff. For them there is no real vacation.

4. We could tell the story of the many Government wives who have felt it necessary to go back to work to help with the family budget.

5. We could state that we Americans boast that our Government has never repudiated an obligation. We are happy to agree that in large and international matters that is true. Unfortunately, in smaller matters involving Government employees, particularly Immigration and Bureau of Prisons employees, this present possible leave repudiation will be only one of more than one discrimination. One case actually involves an infraction of the 8-hour law by the Government itself.

6. We could remind the public that Government workers are also taxpayers—just as interested in real Government economy as any other taxpayer. This is a point that editorial writers everywhere in taking their many "cracks" at all public servants seem to want the public to forget. They talk to the public in a tone that implies that public servants are some sort of a parasitic, non-taxpaying second group unrelated to the taxpaying public. For instance, the chief phraser of this letter, together with his working wife and daughter made \$7,500 last year. Out of that was paid well over \$1,000 in direct taxes alone, to say nothing of several hundred dollars in hidden taxes. Why shouldn't he be interested in real Government economy?

7. We could state that our national union headquarters has many hardship cases on file indicating that we in the field are probably better off than many Government employees in Washington. Crowded, expensive Washington forces many low-bracket girl clerks to commute as high as 20 miles to and from work, and, to save money, club-up two and three in a hot, stinking room for which with rent controls riddled, they often pay enough to have rented an entire house a few years back. These, too, often use their leave to make extra money.

8. In making their criticisms of public servants editorial writers are fond of reminding them of their patriotic duty in the defense effort. In fact, in Washington right now there is much talk that in the national interest we should agree to a reduction to 15 days leave for the duration. Probably we do need reminding. We've been so lax in patriotism in the past. In 1918 and 1943-44, while many editorial writers we know were patriotically using their 2 weeks' vacation—that somehow lasted from November to April—on the dangerous end of a fishing pole in Florida waters and elsewhere, the very great majority of the members of this union local were "enjoying" 26-days-plus vacations in such highly exciting vacation spots as the Argonne, Chateau Thierry, Tarawa, Guadalcanal, and Iwo Jima.

As we said above, we could, as Government employees, claim the above points; but we will not. We waive them—ask the public to set them down as figments of our imaginations, and as brother taxpayers go along with us in commending Colonel Forgey's editorial writer for his valiant stand on Government economy. Government employees should be cut in every way possible.

How else are we ever going to get economy started? We must start somewhere, and it always has been good, safe, statesmanship to start the ax in the lower brackets—among people with the least resources to whack back. It makes for fewer expensive court of claims suits, fewer expensive lawyers hunting loopholes, and other irritating high-bracket boomerangs.

And, unless we whack this possible \$200,000,000 off the Government employees, how are we ever going to reduce taxes? With a possible national budget of \$60,000,000,000—300 times \$200,000,000—that just possibly might reduce our taxes the sizable one-third of a cent on the dollar, unless, of course, some enterprising editorial writer induces his community to put the heat on Congress for some \$200 pork-barrel project for their local community, or some foreign nation, which is dally cutting our national throat in the United Nations, wants another \$200,000,000 gift.

In conclusion, permit us to state that Government workers never have been the pampered set some would have you believe. Our fight is, and always has been, not to get ahead of the high cost of existence, but to try to keep up with it. We've heard criticism of the shiny new cars a fortunate few of us drive to work. Don't let that fool you. Those are mostly the fortunate few who have had sizable promotions or have other sources of income besides their Government pay check—working wives, inheritances, etc. The great majority of Government workers cannot afford the garage rent on a good car, let alone buy one.

To those who do not believe our statements we extend the invitation to take the civil-service tests, join us, and find out for themselves. But do not stay in the service more than 10 years or you will find yourselves so stuck with high, nonreturnable investments in such things as retirement that, in fairness to your families, you can't get out. And, in any case, don't stay in past the age of 40. If you do, you will find that you must spend the rest of your life varying degrees behind the cost of living. And, most certainly, while you are frantically chasing that cost of living, you can expect to have conservative publishers, editorial writers, Senator BYRDS, Senator DOUGLASSES, and Westbrook Peglers nipping at your heels.

JOHN D. WINSETT,
President, Acting.
ROBERT L. GROOMS,
Secretary.
M. C. SHEPHERD,
Treasurer.

Death of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared in tribute to Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, who died suddenly in Naples, Italy, a few days ago, and an editorial from the Manchester Union Leader of July 25, 1951.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BRIDGES

The sense of shock I feel in the realization that Admiral Forrest P. Sherman has met an untimely death is heightened, I suppose, because of the close personal bond which has always existed between us.

Forrest Sherman was born in Merrimack, N. H., on October 30, 1896. He distinguished himself as a student at Massachusetts Institute of Technology and later at the Naval Academy, where he graduated in 1917.

His career as a fighting sailor in World War II is well known. But his greatest service to his Nation probably took place during the period from January 21, 1950, up until the day of his death. He became Chief of Naval Operations during one of the great periods of crisis in the history of this Nation.

By his zeal, his enormous capacity, his penetrating knowledge, and his ability to lead men he performed near miracles in fostering the morale and fighting qualities of the United States Navy during the last 18 months. His whole life was devoted to defending America by means of sea power. When our Nation was called on to fight in Korea in June of 1950 we found the Navy was ready for the war. It went into action in accordance with the highest traditions of our naval history and no small part of the morale of our Seventh Fleet. I can testify as a member of the Armed Services Committee, was due to the unremitting efforts of Admiral Sherman.

Admiral Sherman was a great naval commander. He was a man who shunned the spotlight, but always allowed his actions to bespeak the job he was doing.

Just last week in Spain, Admiral Sherman proved the enormous capacity of his ability and character. He undertook one of the most delicate diplomatic efforts of our postwar history and, as always, he accomplished his objective.

America can ill afford to lose a man of the attainments and the ability of Admiral Sherman. He was one of New Hampshire's greatest contributions to the America which he loved so well. I have lost a warm personal friend. The United States Navy has lost a courageous and competent chief. The United States has lost one of its most trustworthy leaders.

[From the Manchester (N. H.) Union Leader of July 25, 1951]

ADMIRAL SHERMAN'S LOSS

The sudden death of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman in the midst of critical deliberations is a source of deep regret.

Catapulted into the job of Chief of Naval Operations after the firing of Admiral Denfeld in November 1949 in the unification squabble, Admiral Sherman won the confi-

dence of the men of the Navy by his quiet fairness, and a place in the Nation's counsels by his diplomatic skill.

Born in New Hampshire of an old New England family, Admiral Sherman shared the New England tradition of seamanship. From the beginning his naval record was one of unbroken proficiency. He was not satisfied to simply follow naval tradition, which has had a paralyzing effect on the record of so many seamen. He sought to keep abreast of the times by familiarizing himself with the weapons and strategy of modern combat. When naval aviation became an integral part of naval operations, he mastered flying and became known as the flying admiral.

He played an important role in World War II in the Pacific, and was in command of the aircraft carrier *Wasp* when she was sunk in the Solomons. It is not unlikely that his sudden death from heart failure at the early age of 54 may be traced to some of the strenuous circumstances of incidents like this. For after maneuvering his shattered ship into a position where the escape of his crew became possible, Captain Sherman was the last man to leave the ship, and spent 2 hours in the water before he was picked up.

As Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Sherman was largely responsible for working out a compromise in the controversy over unification. Large sections of the Navy had been bitterly opposed to unification, charging that domination of the Joint Chiefs by the Army and Air Force was whittling away the Navy's combat strength. Not only has this opposition died down today, but by his quiet influence Admiral Sherman reversed the trend of the Louis Johnson economy program, and the Army Air Force domination, so that the Navy today is coming into its own.

Admiral Sherman seems to have been largely responsible for the last mission on which he was engaged at the time of his death. He had long stressed the necessity of bases in Spain against the arguments of the State Department and the other Joint Chiefs. His position was that military necessity must supersede all political objections.

This position undoubtedly is sound, and it was logical when the State Department and the other chiefs were won over to it, that Admiral Sherman should be sent as an emissary to General Franco. His inability now to report on his talks with Franco will probably cause some delay and make additional talks necessary. But it is hoped that the effects of his mission will in no way be nullified, and that the delay occasioned may not be too great. The problem of integrating Spain into the western defense is urgent and important.

Attorneys General Ask Lands Return

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FRANK WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Dallas Morning News of July 24, 1951:

ATTORNEYS GENERAL ASK LANDS RETURN

The National Association of Attorneys General is urging support for the Walter-Gossett bill (giving the States quitclaim

title to what has always been assumed to be their own offshore lands until the remarkably unreasoning opinion of four United States Supreme Court Justices, acting as a temporary minority, held otherwise). It is an even-tempered and reasoned document in which the committee representing the attorneys general present their case against legalized theft. It is difficult for anybody else to preserve his temper in discussing it and, off committee status, few attorneys general can. The rape of the tidelands would be a legal absurdity were it not a legal travesty on the common sense and justice of the law.

Every contention that the committee places before Congress this week has been presented to the unreasoning court. Not one has been refuted in any language the Court has used to express its opinion. The theft of the tidelands rests solely upon an entirely new conception of Federal power, created by the current Court and contrary both to the original thinking in the Constitution and the holding of this Court's predecessors for almost a century and a half.

This is the reason why justice is obtainable only at the hands of Congress, whose act can set the Court's arrogant self back on its heels. This is the reason why States' attorneys general must patiently explain to the representatives of all the people that the extraordinary expropriative theory set up by the Court can operate to seize any State land. Paramount rights has nothing to do with oil or tidelands or offshore areas per se. It sets up a contention that affects all. Nor can any assurance by the President that he has no intention to apply the paramount right to seizure to anything else have any value. His predecessors did not seize the tidelands. Truman did. The next Truman, or the present one in what seems to him emergency, would seize again.

The attorneys general are to be commended also for restressing the fact that the blatantly repeated assertions that this is an oil-lobby law and an oil-lobby fight are a flat lie. The men who so state know that what they say is not true. They use the statements to lull into security a public that needs in its own interest to be alarmed. If the public is so lulled, Congress will not act. If the public is alarmed, Congress will act.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD program No. 45 in my broadcasts to the people of Pennsylvania in the series I call Happenings in Washington. This program was broadcast on July 16, 1951.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON—PROGRAM No. 45

This is Ed MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another discussion of Happenings in Washington.

When the Federal Government closed its books on June 30 for the fiscal year 1951, its financial affairs were in a confused and muddled state.

We entered the new fiscal year without any determination as to how much the Government will spend and without any decision as to how the money is to be raised.

In other words, no appropriation bills had been enacted into law by the June 30 deadline and the new tax bill was still far from completion.

Under these circumstances it became necessary for Congress to resort to stop-gap legislation so that the various Federal departments and agencies could continue to function. In a last-minute rush both Houses of Congress voted for an emergency measure authorizing the Federal agencies to continue expenditures through the month of July. It provided that the rate of spending during July must not exceed the average monthly rate for April, May, and June, the last 3 months of the fiscal year 1951.

This action, according to Congressman JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Republican leader of the House, will cost the American taxpayers an extra \$100,000,000 in July alone.

It will be impossible to complete congressional action on all the appropriation bills in the remaining 2 weeks of July. Therefore, another emergency extension will be needed and more millions will go down the drain.

I agree with Representative MARTIN's statement in which he called this situation an "incredible financial mess." He declared that the "whole pattern of Government spending is in a state of chaos, unprecedented in the history of the country."

In my opinion, the blame must be placed on the stubborn refusal of the administration leaders to cooperate with those of us in Congress, of both parties, who are fighting for economy.

The people who work for a living are paying a high price for government and they are not getting their money's worth.

The Truman administration has brought its full force and power into a determined effort to put a higher price tag on government—to spend more and more—and to reach deeper into the pockets of the taxpayers.

Since June 28, when the Senate Finance Committee began hearings on the new tax bill, the big guns of the Truman administration have been aimed in that direction.

Let us look at the tax-and-spend picture as it now appears.

You will recall that when President Truman sent his budget message to Congress last January he asked for \$71,500,000,000 to run the Government during the next fiscal year, beginning July 1, 1951. He asked Congress to increase the tax bill of the American people by an additional \$10,000,000,000, and said he would later ask for another increase to raise \$6,500,000,000 more.

Subsequently he abandoned his recommendation for the additional \$6,500,000,000. The President predicted that on June 30, when the fiscal year 1951 closed, there would be a deficit of \$2,700,000,000.

But the President was wrong. He was mistaken by \$6,000,000,000. Instead of a deficit the fiscal year ended with a \$3,500,000,000 surplus.

It would appear, therefore, that with all its reckless extravagance, its waste and inefficiency, its lavish handouts of subsidies and loans, Mr. Truman and his spendthrift crew were unable to get rid of all the money they had taken from the taxpayers.

But, I regret to say, there is no reason for rejoicing in that surplus. It will disappear very quickly. Secretary of the Treasury Snyder made that very plain when he announced the surplus. Increased spending by the Department of Defense, now running at the rate of nearly \$3,000,000,000 a month, would not only wipe out the surplus, he said, but would create a deficit of \$3,500,000,000 by September 1.

When President Truman's request for \$10,000,000,000 in additional taxes was submitted to the House it was given very careful study by the Ways and Means Committee. With the Democratic Party in control of Congress, that committee, of course, has a Democratic majority. But despite all the pressure from administration sources, they refused to accept the President's figures. The new tax bill, as approved by the committee and passed by the House, reduced the \$10,000,000,000 tax increase proposed by the President to approximately \$7,200,000,000.

As passed by the House the bill is the largest single tax measure in the history of the country. It would boost the total of tax increases voted by Congress since June 1950, just a year ago, to \$17,000,000,000.

This figure seems almost unbelievable when we look back only 20 years and find that the total cost of operating the Federal Government, including the Army and the Navy in 1930, was less than \$3,500,000,000.

The bill passed by the House has been widely criticized. Much of the criticism appears to be justified. I am sure the Senate Finance Committee, of which I am a member, will make many changes.

It may even become necessary to take a fresh start and rewrite the whole bill.

But I can assure you that certain objectives will be placed foremost. We will make every effort to spread the next tax load so that the burden will not impose unwarranted hardships upon any class of taxpayers.

We will keep in mind the continuing need for expanded defense preparations, even though hostilities in Korea are halted.

We will demand that no additional taxes be levied for nondefense purposes that can be curtailed or eliminated.

We will give careful consideration to the destructive inflationary pressure generated by unrestricted spending, whether by the public or by the Government.

I think I can safely predict that when the Senate Finance Committee is ready to report the bill the tax increase will not only fall below the President's \$10,000,000,000 request, but will be cut under the \$7,200,000,000 figure in the House bill.

In any discussion of taxes it is important to remember that every dollar collected and spent by Federal, State, or local government, is taken from the earnings of the people.

Every tax dollar, no matter whether paid by individuals, corporations, or in the form of excise payments, comes out of the pockets of the American people. And the heaviest burden falls upon the great middle class—the working men and women—and all others who live on wages, salaries, and other fixed incomes.

It is this great class of citizens, the solid backbone of our Republic, with whom I am principally concerned. Look at what has happened to the salary of the teacher, the office worker, the clerk, the salesman, the man who delivers your milk and bread, the little fellow who fills your gas tank, and all others who work for a fixed salary.

What has happened to the thousands of retired workers living on a pension earned after many years of service in the schools, in the church, on a railroad, with the police or fire department, or in industry?

What has happened to the worker who has invested his life savings in real estate, insurance, Government bonds, or an annuity, in order to provide a fixed income in his later years?

What has happened to the disabled veteran who must live on benefit payments from the Government and the dependents of those who died in the service of their country?

Let me tell you what has happened to this great body of Americans.

In plain language, they have been robbed.

They have been robbed through excessive taxation and unsound Government policies which have destroyed the purchasing power of every dollar they receive.

Yes, they have been robbed—and the effect is just the same as though they had been held up at the point of a gun.

More than half of their earnings have been taken away—partly by excessive taxation and partly by inflation resulting from unsound Government policies.

In view of this dangerous situation we must proceed with extreme caution in framing a new tax bill. We must avoid adding to the heavy burden under which these Americans are now struggling.

One administration spokesman who testified before the Senate Finance Committee argued in favor of the Truman \$10,000,000-000 tax increase because, as he said, "It takes more from the lower groups."

He contended that any tax increase must reach into the low brackets because much of the national income available for spending is with that group. This argument was presented as a means by which inflation could be checked.

Now I ask you, what difference does it make, as far as the inflationary effect is concerned, whether the taxpayer spends his own money, and perhaps saves a part of it, or whether the Government takes away a substantial part and spends it, leaving the taxpayer no opportunity to save?

You may be sure the Government will spend every dollar it gets its hands on.

In some quarters it is regarded as good politics to advocate what is called soaking the corporations. But don't be fooled by that kind of deception. That method hits the little fellow just as hard, because taxes paid by corporations are added to the price of goods they produce and in the end the consumer—that is the American people—pay the whole bill.

No matter what kind of tax program is adopted, the money comes out of the same pocket—the pocket of the buying public.

Inflation cannot be cured by Government spending. It can be cured by saving—by the Government as well as by the individual citizen.

In order to keep taxes at the lowest possible level, consistent with the needs of national defense, we must have every possible economy. And the Government must set the example.

Every expenditure not related to preservation of American freedom must be cut to the bone. Every nondefense project must be thoroughly examined in order to decide whether it can be curtailed, postponed, or eliminated.

The American people would have greater confidence in the tax program if they saw some evidence of willingness by the Truman administration to economize wherever possible.

I can assure you that the Senate Finance Committee is working toward an objective, and that is to write a tax bill that will be fair and equitable and will maintain our national economy at its greatest strength.

We are guided by the warning of that great Chief Justice, John Marshall, who laid down the principle that the power to tax is the power to destroy.

Our purpose is not to destroy but to build for greater progress and a more productive and more dynamic America.

In closing let me give a word of warning. Out of our desire to keep taxes at the lowest possible level we must not curtail or neglect our preparations for defense against Communist aggression.

Truce in Korea will give no assurance of a peaceful future.

Until the Communists abandon their ambition for world conquest, we must constantly increase our national strength—militarily, financially, and spiritually.

This is Ed MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

Superiority in the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BLAIR MOODY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Let's Face It—We're in a Jam," by our colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], published in this week's issue of the Saturday Evening Post. In my judgment the Senator from Massachusetts has presented in eloquent and forceful style a situation which neither the Congress nor the American people can afford to ignore.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S FACE IT—WE'RE IN A JAM

(By United States Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.)

It is seldom that the fate of so great and complex a Nation as the United States hinges on one great decision being correctly made. But, in sober truth, the decision which we Americans make in the next few months on whether we will or will not create air superiority will have fateful consequences for us and can spell life or death for the people of Western Europe.

The reason for this can be simply stated: since the end of World War II and the utter disintegration of our Armed Forces at that time, the greatest single deterrent to Soviet aggression has been the strategic air force with its capacity to deliver bombs on the vital centers of the Soviet Union. In a matter of a few years—how few no one knows—that advantage will disappear. We can at that time hope to defeat an onslaught of the Red army only if the armies of the free world are properly supported by aviation, if our own air defense at home is strong enough to protect our vital centers from Soviet air attack, and if our strategic air force can retaliate with deadly effect on the Soviet's vital points—even though it has lost its former monopoly in long-range bombing.

Yet the truth is that on balance we have not got air superiority over the Soviet Union today. This comes as a shock to those of us who have assumed throughout these tense years that while the United States could not match the mass armies of Red Russia and her satellites man for man and gun for gun, we not only could be but were superior in the mechanized branches of warfare—notably the Air Force. Except for our waning advantage in strategic air power, we find ourselves outclassed not only by the Soviet's ground armies but also by Soviet tactical aviation and air defense.

Military air power has three principal functions, the first of which is air defense, which is a Nation's ability to defend its homeland—its industrial power—against enemy air attack. The biggest potential source of military power on earth today is the United States industrial plant, and the United States is now, and for some time to come will be, unable to defend it adequately, even against the enemy's presently limited ability

to strike with atomic attack. Of course, our most effective defense against this danger in the long view is a counteroffensive aimed at the centers of Soviet power.

The second principal function of military air power is the strategic air attack aimed at the war-making installations of the enemy. The most encouraging aspect of the relative position of United States air power versus the Soviet is our ability to wage an atomic air offensive. Clearly the essential reason why the Soviets have not dared to gamble on world war III rests with our power to drop atomic bombs on their homeland. Yet, even our strategic air offensive is not so formidable as it should be, and each day our relative superiority over the Soviets in this one element of strategic air power diminishes. We face an urgent responsibility for greatly increasing the weight of our strategic air power—first, in order to retain the capacity for overcoming the steadily improving enemy defenses and, second, to be able to destroy both the enemy's industrial capacity and his long-range bombing force. Even the B-36, invaluable though it is, cannot retain indefinitely its present position as the world's only bomber of truly intercontinental range. The seesaw contest between the defense and the offense moves for supremacy so rapidly, and the advantage of the one over the other changes so frequently, that no nation can afford to rest its military power on a single article of military equipment. As the Red Queen said, "Now here, you see, it takes all the running you can do, to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that."

The third function of military air power is tactical air power, by which a nation protects its own field forces and harasses the field forces of the enemy. As Secretary Pinletter said, "In war our tactical air units have the job of destroying the enemy's air force and attacking the enemy's ground army. Both of these operations give support to our own ground forces. In building our tactical air forces we must be sure that we have the tactical air strength necessary to defeat the enemy's air force, because loss in the air could lead to disaster on the ground." It has been clear for some time that while tactical air cannot alone defeat an enemy on the ground, no ground force can win against hostile tactical air superiority unless it is prepared to mass tremendous weight of numbers and accept fantastic casualties. Our forces in Korea are massively outnumbered by the Chinese Reds. Yet so far they have been able not only to hold but also inflict staggering casualties on the Chinese, about 50 percent of which, as of January 1, 1951, are directly attributable to our great local air superiority. All this would change overnight if the Soviet Union threw in its great weight of tactical air power, as the commanders of our forces in Korea have clearly warned.

The Senate recently overwhelmingly voted approval for sending four additional divisions overseas, provided always, of course, that the Joint Chiefs of Staff certify that sending these divisions is an essential step in strengthening the security of the United States and that the nations of Europe are making their own full and realistic effort. But the whole idea of the North Atlantic Treaty defense is based on the assumption that the troops on the ground will have really adequate tactical air support, so that a smaller number of ground soldiers at decisive locations in Europe can canalize a Soviet attack, forcing it to concentrate and thus making it a target for a massive tactical aviation. A glance at the map of Central Europe reveals many broad rivers, estuaries, mountains, swamps, and densely wooded areas. Trained troops constantly on station at these points could undoubtedly compel an aggressor to attempt his advance

through a few "gaps" and along a few open roads where he would be subject to bombardment. On this assumption a North Atlantic force of 60 divisions could stand off whatever the Soviets would be able to launch in attack. Whoever is interested in the welfare of these troops must be equally interested in seeing to it that an adequate tactical air force is in existence to protect them. Unless there is massive tactical aviation, the strategy for defending America and Europe in Europe will fail.

The strongest recent statement on the question of the importance of air power in the ground battle was made by General Bradley in the Saturday Evening Post, October 15, 1949, when he said:

"Let's forget the axioms and take a fresh look. Europe abounds in natural barriers and powerful defensive positions, as every American who fought through there can testify. It is true that the Germans swept swiftly westward across this land at the beginning of the war, and that our Allied forces rolled eastward at the end. But—a big but—in each case the advancing forces had superiority in weapons and mobility and tremendous superiority in weapons and mobility, and tremendous superiority in the air. Reverse this situation. Give the defensive forces superiority in fire power, in mobility, and in the air—an advantage well within the industrial ability of the Western World—and the entire picture changes. The defenders will then be able to turn back invaders far superior in numbers."

This is also the opinion of leading French and German military chiefs.

In order to decide how large the tactical air force in Europe ought to be, we must first have an estimate of how big the Soviet tactical air force is. Published figures which are quite generally accepted estimate the Soviet tactical air force at 16,000 to 20,000 planes. Of this total, some are needed in other parts of the world, and it is probably not too wide of the mark to say that 9,000 Soviet tactical planes are available for attack on the west.

It is widely acknowledged by military authorities that the ground forces of the North Atlantic Treaty nations cannot hope to cope with the Soviet mass armies, unless the air forces of the North Atlantic Treaty nations are strong enough to win the air battle against the Red air force. Winning this air battle will require that the air forces of the North Atlantic Treaty nations have at least a 2-to-1 air superiority over the Red air force in Europe. If we assume that the North Atlantic Treaty nations should have at least a 2-to-1 air superiority to meet the Soviet mass armies—which is not lavish if truly massive tactical aviation is our objective—it follows that the tactical air force of the North Atlantic Treaty powers should consist of at least 18,000 planes. This total should not include whatever British or French planes are used in air defense for the protection of places such as London and Paris against bomber attack.

If we assume that the United States would contribute 20 percent of the North Atlantic Treaty tactical air force, that would mean 3,600 planes, or about 50 tactical air groups, leaving 14,400 planes to be flown and operated by the other North Atlantic Treaty nations. Bear in mind, of course, that the United States will in all probability supply a substantial number of the planes to be manned and operated by the North Atlantic countries, assuming always that these nations make their own full and realistic effort in the air as on the ground. If they do make their full effort, it appears that a figure of 6,000 planes to be supplied to these countries by the United States is a reasonable estimate, considering the state of the plane-manufacturing industry in Europe. To the total of 3,600 planes manned by United States personnel must, therefore, be added 6,000 planes for operational use by the North

Atlantic countries, or a rough total of 10,000 planes. This total does not include the extra planes which are required due to wartime attrition. Nor does it include whatever American tactical planes may be needed in other parts of the world.

The appropriation bill for the coming fiscal year should, therefore, appropriate enough dollars to provide 50 tactical air groups of 3,600 manned planes and 6,000 planes for operation by the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty.

This is a tremendous figure. It must be at the least about three times as large as the tactical air force which is said to be contained in the administration's present 95-group program. But the fact that we may soon have six of our own divisions in Europe leaves us no choice whatever. If we are to have six United States divisions in Europe by the beginning of 1952, then we must have an adequate amount of tactical aviation which can give them a real protective umbrella. To send troops overseas without adequate tactical aviation is just exactly the same as sending them into battle without rifles, tanks, or artillery. Remember that in April 1945, General Eisenhower had under his command a ground force of 86 combat divisions and air forces containing 11,500 combat aircraft and 1,150 transport aircraft. Long before, the German air force had been defeated. Ever at the beginning of the invasion in June 1944, the German air force contained only 5,000 to 5,500 planes for all fronts. Against General Bradley's Twelfth Army Group of 48 divisions and General Vandenberg's Ninth Air Force of 31 combat groups containing about 2,000 combat planes the Germans could muster only about 500 combat-operational planes. Of the 16,000 to 20,000 planes which the Soviets are believed to have, 9,000 would be for Western Europe alone.

In addition to the immediate responsibility of voting funds for an Air Force of 50 tactical groups, as a minimum protection to our soldiers in Europe, Congress should vote funds for 38 groups for air defense, consisting of fighters and interceptors to defend vital installations here and our bases abroad, and for 62 strategic groups consisting of long-range and medium bombers and fighter escorts.

Remember that there is enormous interchangeability among these various categories. In fact, heavy bombers have actually often been used to provide tactical support just as, in the early days of the tank, long-range artillery designed for indirect fire was often used to fire point-blank at armored vehicles. Remember, too, that each of these fighting groups must have its medical, its base and its maintenance and supply units, and that training and transport facilities will also have to be provided in proportion. Remember, finally, that the Air Force must have latitude to change these proportions as the situation changes. In this article only rough proportions can be set down.

The present over-all objective of 95 groups by the end of 1952—of which 15 would be air transport—actually envisages an Air Force half equipped with obsolescent planes, and means that in terms of modern planes, which are the only ones which can successfully match Russia in the air, we would be building only the equivalent of a 50-group Air Force for all purposes—tactical, air defense and strategic, or a third of what is really required. Under present conditions of partial mobilization, even this inadequate objective cannot be achieved in less than a year and a half. That gives some idea of the "jam," as a Nation, we are in.

It all boils down to the fact that our objective is not big enough, that our proposed rate of attainment is not fast enough, and that unless we increase our objective and step up our rate of national achievement, we court national disaster. To be bru-

tally frank—and we must not be anything less—the requirements of our own national security cannot be met with "guns-and-butter" appropriations. It takes money. At recent Senate hearings I asked General Spaatz, who commanded our wartime air forces in Europe with such great success, how many combat air groups would be necessary to carry out our national commitment to help defend America in Western Europe in case of an attack by the Soviet Union. He said the number which we had in World War II, which is 240 groups. Surely General Spaatz qualifies as an authority, since we are talking about the theater of potential air combat which he commanded in history's greatest war so far. Of course, General Spaatz had in mind the Air Force we would need to fight a war to a successful conclusion, and the force required to be in being on the first day of such a war would be smaller than the ultimate force. What I am recommending is a readiness force of sufficient strength to support our position overseas and protect against air attack the mobilization potential of the United States. And I am suggesting that this force must contain at least 150 groups.

Let us come now to the question of dollars. It is estimated that the Air Force which I have here outlined will cost \$32,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952. Of this amount, \$22,000,000,000 has already been requested for the administration build-up to 95 groups. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, the cost is set at \$27,000,000,000 and for June 30, 1954, at \$37,000,000,000. In manpower this force will require 1,800,000 officers and men as compared with 1,061,000 for the 95-group force and the 727,000 officers and men who are in the Air Force at the present time. There are two bottlenecks which inevitably retard the building of this force. One is due to the large number of men who must be in fighting units here and in various parts of the world, and consequently cannot be used as teachers. This inevitably slows up the number of young men who can be taken into the Air Force. Another bottleneck is the lack of installations—"housekeeping" facilities, and so on—to handle this increased activity.

These dollar figures represent the best opinion of professionals in the executive branch. It is impossible for a layman to know whether the figure is high or low. Certainly it is a figure of such magnitude that if it were adopted it would drastically change all the fiscal arrangements of the Government. It, therefore, deserves not only the careful scrutiny of the Appropriations Committees in both Houses of Congress; it justifies also the creation of a body, similar in general character and intent to the Hoover Commission, to make sure that in an expenditure of this colossal size, affecting as it does every segment of our economy, there is absolutely no waste. When people ask, as they do with increasing and justifiable frequency: "What happens to the billions of dollars that we appropriate for our Armed Forces?" there must be absolutely definite and satisfactory answers. To exercise constant vigilance over such gigantic expenditures demands time and special training which Congress has not got. A committee of experts created and paid by Congress and independent of the executive would create public confidence and would be clearly within the spirit of the Constitution.

The adoption of such a program requires an end to the guns-and-butter attitude of mind. This means not only economy and efficiency in the operation of the Government but the ruthless elimination of nonessential activities. In this field of general government a congressionally sponsored commission could effectuate large savings.

Many other things are also vital. There must be sea power so that the supply lanes

for this Air Force—and for the Army overseas—will always be kept open; and testimony of Admiral Sherman gives us the assurance that this sea power is equal to the task.

There must be land power. We look to the Army to force the aggressor into certain channels where the air can hit him—or, depending on one's point of view, we look to the Army to hold the overseas air bases from which the enemy is pounded. Clearly, the Army is one activity in which allies are a particularly vital necessity. We cannot provide the overwhelming proportion of men for the air and sea efforts and provide an overwhelming number of the troops on the ground as well. It will be disappointing if ultimately we supply much more than 10 percent of the troops for the defense of the free world in Europe. If we take full and imaginative advantage of the potentialities of countries both in and out of the Atlantic Pact and utilize to the full the services of all the stateless anti-Communist young men from behind the iron curtain who will be willing to fight as volunteers for freedom, the American percentage might even be below 10 percent. The United States Army, therefore, appears today as the spark plug for the ground forces of the free world, and we have the assurance of General Collins that it is currently big enough for that purpose. Undoubtedly every professional Army man will agree that a tactical air force is vital to an army's survival. It is therefore no belittlement of either the Army or the Navy to say that at the moment air power is the point of the spear.

Ever since the end of World War II we have been plagued by lack of foresight and tragic miscalculations. We lacked foresight when, in 1945, we started to demobilize our Armed Forces and scattered our supplies and equipment to the four winds. We miscalculated tragically at Yalta. We erred grievously in June 1949 when we evacuated Korea and announced to the world that it was no longer essential to our defense. In order to understand our present dangerous situation as regards air power, we should allow our minds to go way back—back, first, to 1945, when the present occupant of the White House took office. At that time we had a power for peace which was unequalled in history and for which we had suffered almost 1,000,000 casualties. Today, after 6 years, we seem to have thrown away the power for peace for which these thousands were killed, wounded, and captured.

We are now in an arms race and, therefore, the question of whether we are ahead or behind depends upon what the other fellow is doing. If he puts on more speed, we must match him. One thing we know: We now have the second most powerful air force in the world—apart from the strategic air arm, in which the Soviet Union is catching up. And the second most powerful air force is not good enough. We must establish leadership and then keep it. This means constancy of purpose. We must outlast the Soviets, regardless of our politics and regardless of our changing moods.

There are those who will say—and with many good reasons—that this program will strike a heavy blow at our economy. They will point out—and with much justification—that it consequently strikes a blow at our political system, which is so closely meshed with our competitive economy. They will, therefore, say that such a large expenditure as this endangers that democratic way of life which it purports to defend and that by making such expenditures we so drastically change our own country that we actually play the Soviet game.

This argument has the ring of sincerity. It would have the ring of truth if one did not contemplate the alternative to the policy which I propose. That alternative is to muddle along for another 10, 15, or 20 years, as we are now doing, with the second most

powerful air force in the world. We thereby carry most of the drawbacks of a heavy military program with none of the advantages of decisive action and regained initiative for durable peace which a really strong military force can provide. We may well wonder how the intensity of our American national temperament and the free institutions of this country will weather 15 years of indecisive and hugely expensive muddling.

On the other hand, we have always been able in our history to rise to the occasion, make a major effort and meet the issue, no matter how difficult the issue was. It is better, therefore, to build strength quickly, thereby regaining the initiative quickly and thereby being able quickly to put enough diplomatic pressure on the Kremlin to do the following things: call off the aggression in Korea; agree to real disarmament accompanied by international control and inspection; and adopt a generally cooperative and civilized behavior in the United Nations.

The program here proposed is the opposite of a program for preventive war. It is a program to build strength so that we can end the war we are in and prevent world war III from overwhelming us. It is a program to keep faith with a small group of young Americans in Korea who are sacrificing their all while we muddle along in an atmosphere of politics as usual and of every man for himself. It is a program to give us more than the "shoestring Air Force" which, General Vandenberg testified, was inadequate to enable us both to support our troops in Korea and to deter the Soviets from direct aggression on America.

Churchill said "For good or ill, air mastery is the supreme expression of military power." This leads squarely to the conclusion that to continue with a one-shift air force for 1 second more than is absolutely unavoidable can lead only to our destruction and defeat.

Peace Propaganda From the Kremlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a timely and challenging article entitled "Danger of Red Peace Propaganda Offensive Pointed Out—Could Slow Defense Effort," written by Raymond P. Brandt, chief Washington correspondent of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and published in that newspaper on July 22, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANGER OF RED PEACE PROPAGANDA OFFENSIVE POINTED OUT—COULD SLOW DEFENSE EFFORT—REAL PEACE CAN BE ASSURED ONLY WITH STRENGTH, UNITED STATES LEADERS DECLARE—WARN AGAINST RELAXING NOW—SOME CONGRESSMEN INDUCED TO WEAKEN ANTI-INFLATION MEASURES AS A RESULT OF KOREAN CEASE-FIRE TALKS

(By Raymond P. Brandt)

WASHINGTON, July 21.—The Kremlin has started a third peace propaganda offensive which State Secretary Acheson this week warningly described as just another note in a Russian lullaby to induce the United States and its allies to relax on their defense programs.

The latest Politburo maneuver is the publication of a fortnightly 32-page magazine in English called "News" that purports to seek Russian friendship with the Anglo-Saxon nations. The propaganda is obvious but American officials are fearful that the unformed—even a majority of Congress—may be caught off guard by a hidden ball play that will fit into the Kremlin's broad strategy for world domination.

The new magazine appears to be a follow-up on Jacob A. Malik's speech that started the negotiations for a Korean armistice. It may be a part of a bigger propaganda effort and diplomats are wondering what is coming next.

The White House, the State Department, and the Pentagon are looking at the Russian offerings but are not buying anything yet. The new Red zig-zag fits in too neatly with Russian plans to be accepted at face value and Acheson told reporters that he could not imagine a more stupid or dangerous thing for the United States to do than to be lulled by such moves.

A sizable group in Congress, however, has been influenced already by the Korean armistice talks. This was foreseen by the White House and a concerted countereffort was immediately started by President Truman and his highest officials to warn the country and the Congress of the danger of falling for soothing Russian words instead of going ahead with the administration program until the Kremlin had demonstrated its good faith by positive deeds. Others in addition to Truman and Acheson who have urged that we go ahead with the defense program until Russian offers something solid include Defense Secretary Marshall, Defense Mobilization Administrator Charles E. Wilson, Economic Stabilization Administrator Eric Johnston, Price Administrator Michael D. Salle, and several administration Senators and Representatives.

Nevertheless, a conservative Republican conservative Democratic combination in the House has let the Korean armistice negotiations weaken the pending anti-inflation control legislation. If this attitude prevails on other important legislation, such as military and foreign aid appropriations and on increased taxes, it may turn out that the Reds won a great victory in the Korean war.

Acheson foresaw the present congressional danger as early as June 29, when he made an off-the-record speech to a group of magazine and book publishers that was later released for publication.

In that talk, he urged that present problems be viewed in the light of history. His theme was that "there is no substitute for strength," both in the United States and the United Nations, and he noted that the Korean negotiations were possible because we had proved ourselves strong.

He continued, "May I say right here in connection with this business of creating strength at the center, we must not for one second allow any development which may occur in Korea to lull us into a belief that now we have turned the corner, and now things are going to get better, and therefore we do not need to make the effort which we have been making."

"If we allow ourselves to be lulled by Korea, I can assure you that, just as certainly as you are sitting here, we will be hit within the next 6 months to a year with a much tougher blow somewhere else. If we do not make the effort now, we will be unprepared for that blow. We may completely deter it if we now all bend together every effort we can to going forward with the program."

"Another point is that we must believe that time is on our side. I concede to you that in saying this there is an element of faith. There is an element of faith because I believe that we are people who act. Time is not on our side if we merely sit in the

shade and fan ourselves. Time is on our side if we go to work. We can do much in time. We can strengthen ourselves, we can strengthen our allies. We have a vast productive power which is now not harnessed, much greater than those opposed to us. We can harness it. There is much we can do and, if we will do it, time is on our side. If we don't do it, it is not."

The current Russian propaganda effort is a rightward zig from the leftward zags of the two previous offensives, the first of which was the so-called Stockholm appeal for outlawing the American atomic bomb and the second the so-called World Peace Council effort for a pact of peace to be written by the five great powers, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, the Soviet Union, and the Chinese Communist Government. At the same time the Kremlin was engineering these two crusades, the Soviet Government was using the United Nations organizations and the Conference of Deputy Foreign Ministers at Paris as forums to shout warmonger at the United States.

There were slight hints this spring that the Politburo and the Cominform might change their tune—their diplomats became a little more affable and four-power peace talks were resumed in Berlin on contraband shipments between East and West Germany.

American officials who have dealt with the Russians over the years do not think the switch in the propaganda line means a switch in the Kremlin's over-all objective of world domination. As our experts see the present situation, the change resulted from the failure of the Stockholm and the World Peace Council appeals, the military situation in Korea, the growing economic and military strength of our allies and friends in Europe and—perhaps—growing discontent in the Soviet Union and its satellites.

The immediate Russian objectives, as seen from here, are:

1. To create dissension in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and block the rearmament of Western Europe, particularly of Western Germany
2. To slow down European economic recovery, which is making the rearmament possible and is causing defections from the Communist Party in many nations.
3. To snarl up the almost completed negotiations for a Japanese peace pact.
4. To gain time to catch up with the American A-bomb stockpile and to increase the military forces of Russia and its satellites.
5. To weaken the American defense effort by trying to show that the United States and Great Britain have nothing to fear from the Soviet Union.

On the last-named point, it is interesting to note that some political observers think the new Moscow magazine is designed to appeal to the conservative isolationists in this country and to the labor radical Bevanites in Great Britain. From London press dispatches, the British Government was no more favorably impressed by the News than was Washington.

Many elaborate speculations are advanced by our experts for the timing of the Kremlin change from a warlike to a peace-like role. They concede this is crystal-ball gazing and it is likely that the true answer is a combination of factors.

The two other propaganda offensives, although ostensibly labeled peace movements were essentially antagonistic to the United States. The Stockholm petition began with a meeting of intellectuals in Paris in 1948 and when it ended in November last year, its sponsors claimed they had collected 450,000,000 signatures, of which 385,000,000 were in Russia and the satellite countries.

It is revealing that just before the Reds launched their military attack against South

Korea in June 1950, more than half the North Korean population was reported to have signed this document.

While the petitions were being circulated, the Cominform established the World Peace Council. The announced objective was to get signatures to a resolution designed to create a movement of public opinion powerful enough to force discussion and formal conclusion of a five-power peace pact. This proposal ignored the United Nations. No Allied government took it seriously.

Its true nature was exposed by the fact that of the 262 Peace Council members, 85 percent were Communists and fellow travelers. All but 2 of the 27 members of the executive committee, according to Assistant Secretary Hickerson, were either Communists or fellow travelers. The chairman was Joliot-Curie, who was fired from the French Atomic Energy Commission because of the doubt about his primary loyalty to France. Paul Robeson, the Negro singer, was the American member of the executive committee.

The last step in the leftward zag was the meeting of the Foreign Ministers deputies in Paris from March 5 to June 22 which the Russian Gromyko used for a sounding board for Communist propaganda against "American warmongering."

The Kremlin had asked in November for a Big Four foreign ministers' conference and the deputies tried to work out an agenda for such a conference. They held 74 sessions and ended without final agreement. At these sessions, Gromyko revealed that the Kremlin had two immediate objectives. To stop the rearmament of Western Germany and to create dissension in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The other deputies were impressed by one odd fact. Some of Gromyko's speeches were printed in full in French Communist press and not in the Russian papers; others were printed in full in Moscow and not in Paris. From this they deduced that the Kremlin had been forced to do some unusual propagandizing in its own territory.

Now American diplomats are impressed that the English articles in the "News" are being translated into Russian for publication in Moscow newspapers. This apparently means that there is to be some sort of a propaganda switch in the Soviet Union itself.

Another fact that impressed the State Department was that Alexander M. Troyanovsky, Russian ambassador to this country in the 1930's, had been brought out to dress up the magazine with his recollections of American efficiency, creative energy, and democratic spirit.

Troyanovsky, who began his political career as a Social Democrat and not as a Communist, was highly regarded in Washington for forthrightness and—for a Soviet diplomat—courage. The Russian Government has kept him in obscurity for more than a decade. Now that he can serve its purposes, he is put on display.

The popular former Ambassador is the personification of the changes in Soviet foreign policy. If he can be brought out of obscurity, he can be put back in obscurity.

That is not to say that the White House, the State Department, and the Pentagon are not hopeful that a workable agreement can be reached with the Kremlin. Much will depend on what settlement can be made on the Korean situation, militarily and politically. If the Reds give evidence of good faith in deeds in Korea, the next phase will be the Japanese peace treaty. If agreement is reached on that, other steps toward peace may be possible.

Even then, however, the administration will try to keep up the long term defense program, on the belief that in dealing with the Kremlin "there is no substitute for strength."

The School System of Pasadena

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the insertion in the Appendix of the Record of a statement by Catherine C. Hallberg and Louise H. Padelford on the Pasadena Story.

The preservation of this statement in the Record seems to me worth while because of the fundamental issues that are presented, and the obvious sincerity of these earnest and patriotic Americans, who are profoundly disturbed over certain existing tendencies in education.

My interest was attracted not only since I myself am a product of the American school system of a somewhat earlier date, and a public school teacher for a short period, but as a result of my acquaintance with Mrs. Louise H. Padelford, the worthy daughter of a distinguished sire, our former beloved colleague, Senator Albert W. Hawkes, of New Jersey.

Mrs. Padelford has long shown her deep sense of civic duty in her leadership of Pro America, a group of women devoted to the public welfare with no thought of self.

At this distance I would not presume to express an opinion on the merits of this highly publicized controversy that has attracted national interest and concern, but it seems to me most desirable that the point of view and the considerations which moved some of those concerned in this dramatic struggle might well be available for interested Americans.

In the general loosening of standards that is so tragically evident in the world today, it may be well for Americans to pause and consider whether we have not moved too far from the woodshed in the development of our youth.

I have been informed by the Public Printer that the cost of printing this statement will be \$225.50.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE PASADENA STORY

(By Catherine C. Hallberg and Louise H. Padelford)

"The enemy in Pasadena" Those words have headlined three separate articles in national publications recently. The authors mean us. It has been charged that we are "against the public schools." It's almost a Believe It or Not by Ripley sort of thing. Dr. Harold Benjamin, at the National Education Association convention last summer warned: "The enemy is trying our lines with a number of local, probing raids, attempting to find out where we are weak or strong, testing his methods of attack, recruiting and training his forces, building up his stockpiles." And to this statement a very left-wing lawyer added: "The issue shaping up in Pasadena was likely to be the test engagement." That sounds positively formidable, or perhaps funny, when we know our

interest arose solely from our having small children in the local schools

If you parents should make the faux pas we did in accepting seriously the invitation of the educators to take an active interest in your schools, you too may be branded as Public Enemy No. 1. We're expected to concern ourselves about government, and if need be, to criticize our administration; that is not only our right but also our duty as good citizens. But when we exercise the same right and duty in concern about our schools, supported by our taxes for our children, educators and many well-intentioned lay persons will rise with fanatical, almost religious zeal, to defend the schools against all questioning. We certainly are not against public education—we know of no one who is.

People today are concerned only about the philosophy and methods currently employed in the schools under the name, "modern education." Or perhaps it is called more descriptively "modern pragmatic education" since the term "pragmatic" indicates emphasis on what is practical or useful at the moment; truth is that which works. Thus we are concerned about this materialistic philosophy stemming from the John Dewey belief that there are no basic principles and no lasting truths. And we are concerned, too, about methods used to promote such a philosophy.

Before we attempt to describe the events that led to our Pasadena situation we should like to identify our beliefs by referring to the excellent report, General Education in a Free Society, made by the Harvard committee. Some of you interested in education may know it. It recognizes the educational task in America today is "to preserve the ancient ideal of liberal education and to extend it as far as possible to all members of the community." In this age of specialism, which we all recognize, the basic problem, the Harvard committee believes, as do we, is "how to save liberal education and its values within a system where specialism is necessary." And in pleading for the opportunity of a liberal education for every American child we'd like it to be thoroughly understood that we recognize the usefulness of modern teaching techniques such as audio-visual aids, some educational trips, etc. There is no thought nor need for sacrificing them, nor is there any desire, as is often foolishly charged, to return to the little red schoolhouse.

As we progressed through a sometimes distasteful situation we learned that the problem was far more than local. In Eugene, Minneapolis, Denver, Los Angeles, Bethesda, parents, even though belatedly, were daring to examine and appraise what was happening to their children in the public schools under modern pragmatic education. This wide complaint isn't surprising, for most of the teacher-training centers in the iron-bound system producing accredited teachers today have been greatly influenced by Teachers College of Columbia, the "vatican of the cult," as Albert Lynd so aptly described it. To this mecca of education teachers from every part of the United States have made pilgrimages and carried back to their schools methods and philosophies dominant there. These have in turn produced the results protested far and wide.

This is what we saw happen in Pasadena:

In 1948, after 20 years of service, our Pasadena superintendent retired, and Willard E. Goslin was brought here from Minneapolis to replace him. Many parents hoped that this move would mean a change from the so-called progressive education we had in our schools. We discovered, however, that under the new name of "modern education" much the same process was not only continued but accelerated. How we came to that unhappy conclusion we shall attempt to show by relating chronologically significant events, digressing only long enough to explain what we didn't like and why.

In 1949 a man who is known as one of the great teachers of modern times, a leader of "modern pragmatic education," Dr. William H. Kilpatrick, was brought to Pasadena from Columbia Teachers College for a series of conferences with certain of our teachers. A report of his lectures was published in booklet form under the title "We Learn What We Live" and distributed to all teachers and interested members of the public. From this we parents learned much about the modern in modern education.

We learned that the purpose of modern education is the good life, as determined by group action, with the good varying pragmatically from place to place, from time to time. "Good life" is a nebulous phrase, something everyone believes in, from Plato's concept to Christ's. The purpose of "modern pragmatic education," moreover, is to train into all the students the kinds of personalities and character traits which can make it possible for everyone to live the pragmatic educator's concept of the good life. That, certainly, wasn't what we believed the purpose of education to be; rather, we believe its purpose is to develop those traits of mind and character necessary for a full and responsible life in our society, namely, "to think effectively, to communicate thought, to make relevant judgments, to discriminate among values." Those actual words, expressing our thoughts more ably than we, are from the Harvard committee's report.

Expressed another way, the liberal educator believes that to have a good life one must be free—be able to judge and plan for himself in order truly to govern himself—and to achieve these ends one must have the mind development mentioned above. This wisdom, acquired through a liberal education, is quite different from the training of the pragmatic educator which looks to skill as its outcome.

Our first opposition to Dr. Kilpatrick, therefore, was fundamental—getting right down to the purpose of an education. Then, as we read further in Dr. Kilpatrick's conference report, we were startled by many new proposals, as well as by many terms heretofore unknown to us. Listen yourself to some of the vocabulary in your schools and inquire into its meaning and ramifications—experience curriculum (an outgrowth of the project method), core program (subjects mixed together and not taught separately), mass promotion, reading-readiness, personal evaluation, subjective rating, etc.

Dr. Kilpatrick proposed that our children "learn what they live" by means of an experience curriculum. To our astonishment he stated that there is to be no subject matter as such, and no set program of instruction. There would be no periods of the day devoted to the teaching of subjects. In fact, reading, writing, spelling, grammar, arithmetic, history, etc., aren't to be taught separately at all. Instead, the children are to select what they like as projects upon which to work. With this new approach to teaching go the proposals of avoiding any system of marks or report cards. There would be no examinations. There would be no promotion as such. It was suggested that children remain with a given teacher for a few years, working on classroom projects which grow from the pupil's own interests. This would give rise to incidental learning rather than imposing upon the child any systematic learning of basic skills and fundamental information.

It wasn't hard for us to imagine that a really superior teacher might conceivably inject into certain projects the basic information that traditionally has been offered to children as specific subjects taught in regular class periods. But with equal ease we realized how average teachers might fail to achieve even a fraction of the basic training needed. We thought of one sample project, which has been carried on in a seventh grade classroom.

"Making the most of myself: How can we have a happier home life? How can we make better friends? How can we improve our health? How can we get rid of superstitions and funny ideas? How can we have a happier school life?" Again, we imagined a superman could inject into these topics some basic English, history, and arithmetic, but the whole idea is alien to the purpose of education in which we believe.

This sort of an "experience curriculum" was proposed as a full program for the elementary level, declining to 50 percent of the senior high school program. This and Dr. Kilpatrick's other plans for "remaking education" would not have concerned us Pasadenaans so much had not the following signed statement by our superintendent appeared in the foreword: "In company with other leaders, Dr. Kilpatrick has had opposition to some of his views. However, parents, teachers, and other citizens who have taken the time to study and understand his proposals have very generally supported them." We saw this endorsement as an indication that pragmatic education was being greatly accelerated in Pasadena.

Appropos of the experience curriculum and its emphasis on the present, the Harvard committee writes: "There is a variety of aim and method in education. The solution that recognizes a spirit of change centers on contemporary life", and eliminating subjects taught as such, "tries to organize knowledge around actual problems and questions which young people may be expected to meet in mature life—health, vocation, family, social issues, private standards and the like. The difficulty here is a somewhat naive dismissal of the fact that a great many people have contributed over a very long time to human knowledge which calls for respect. Moreover, since conditions change, what assurance is there that the problems which students study will resemble those that they will meet?"

About the time we were delving into the intricacies of the experience curriculum, a series of training courses for our teachers was announced by the administration. Learning about them through our PTA activities, some of us parents undertook to attend in order to learn more about "modern education."

The experience curriculum, grade evaluation, the camping program, and several other subjects were covered by separate groups of teachers using the "group dynamics" technique. Dr. Kilpatrick's theories and proposals were discussed with apparent approval by many of the participating teachers. And with a statement by the administration encouraging the teachers to adopt such methods so soon as they were willing, it seemed obvious that "modern pragmatic education" was being energetically furthered in Pasadena.

The central theme of one teacher training group was the frequently expressed aim of modern educators, namely, the education of the "whole" child, physically, mentally, and emotionally. It is true that physical and mental health are important qualities in addition to intellectual ability. "Our point is that in a proper scheme of liberal education", reads the Harvard report, "the man will acquire the capacity to meet various problems in matters of health, human relationships, and the like. In this view the education of the mind leads to a maturing of the whole person. On any other view, the obvious danger is that schools will set for themselves so inclusive an objective" that they will fall far short of their man-goal. "The schools cannot do everything. When they attempt too many tasks they sometimes fail to do any of them well."

There are other well-qualified institutions, such as the churches, Scouts, and similar character-building groups, not to mention the family, which are vitally concerned with helping to develop the complete man.

In still another training course, the grade evaluation group, the teachers were asked to consider Dr. Kilpatrick's idea of having no grade or report cards. Some teachers reported that grades had already been abolished in their schools. Where grades were still the practice, the teachers favored subjective grading, or measuring the pupil's work only in relation to his own ability (if that be possible to determine). The parents in the group, however, felt it was better to measure a child's achievement against a standard; not only for the purpose of giving the parent knowledge about the child but more important, of providing an incentive for the child himself. Many of the teachers were more concerned about frustrating the few incapable pupils than with providing the great majority of average students with the incentive for betterment, and providing the superior students with the reward for good work. "One of the most damaging of all modern theories is the belief that children should be kept out of every situation that might give them a sense of inferiority—for example, that children should not be given definite marks for their school work, because a poor mark will make its recipient feel inferior. This delays the child in his discovery of the realities of life." That comment is from an article in the March Reader's Digest, written by Psychologist Henry C. Link.

Dr. Henry M. Wriston, president of the Association of American Universities, disapproves of abolishing grades for the following important reason: "Learning by hard work and by foresight to escape failure is one of life's greatest lessons, and to short-circuit that lesson by abolishing failure by edict is to give a false definition of success and to lend an illusion of achievement where none exists."

And as the well-known and highly regarded superintendent of schools in Topeka states, "Personally, I am not one to label everyone as a Communist simply because he does not think as I do. However, when one calls for the abolishment of all competition in the classroom, and doing away of rewards for superior effort, etc., he is merely advocating for the childhood level the same things that the Communists are demanding in our society for the adult level. If this policy is carried to the extreme in the childhood years, it seems obvious that it prepares children to fit better into a communistic regimentation than it does into a society championing democracy and free enterprise."

As the reader no doubt has noted, we have mentioned our beliefs about the philosophy of education only in contrast to the philosophy of modern pragmatic education, which we have in our schools. It is possible that this article would be more constructive if we were to explain more thoroughly our beliefs about the purpose of education and our concepts of method, but this has been done more ably than we could do it in writings by Mortimer Smith, Gustav Mueller, Jacques Maritain, Bernard Iddings Bell, Albert Lynd, Dr. William Bagley (and many issues of School and Society), Dr. Robert Hutchins, Dorothy Thompson, and by the Harvard committee's report. In the sincere hope that we may aid in clarifying a most confused and grave problem throughout our Nation, we intend merely to list the course of events that led to our Pasadena situation and to explain our objections to some of the methods and philosophy.

One deep objection is to the contention of many educators that some students are incapable of and should not be offered a liberal education. In this regard all parents would do well to consider Dr. Robert Hutchins' argument that "either we should abandon universal suffrage or we should give every citizen the education that is appropriate to freemen. We cannot say that we

are for democracy and at the same time protest the impossibility of preparing all the citizens to take their part in a democracy. In a democracy the people rule and are ruled in turn for the good life of the whole community. If democracy is to work, every citizen must have the education that rulers ought to have. If we do not know how to give every citizen this kind of education, we shall have to find out. Liberal education is the education appropriate to freemen. Since it originated at a time when the few were rulers, it was originally an aristocratic education. [The educators] most undemocratically assume that the mass of the people are incapable of achieving a liberal education, but they have no evidence for this, because the mass of the people have never had an opportunity to achieve it. It is true, that as large numbers have come into the American educational system, education has deteriorated and liberal education has almost vanished. But this is the result of the indolence and inattention of educators rather than the ignorance and incapacity of students. To teach a boy who does not care about being educated how to read, write, figure, and understand the ideas that have animated mankind, is hard, it is far easier to forget that he is going to be a citizen and set him to learning or to think he is learning, a trade."

Of course, the modern educator often states that his program is the education and training necessary for the future citizens of our democracy. It becomes important, therefore, to learn what they mean by "democracy." As it is defined by various key figures of the American Education Fellowship, it differs rather amazingly from the concept agreed upon by the founders of this Republic. Here we might remind you that the American Education Fellowship is the name adopted in 1944 by the former Progressive Education Association founded in 1919. At the later date it became politic to discard the term "progressive education" which had fallen into disrepute. As the reader has noted, "modern education" now is the preferred term.

The American Education Fellowship puts out a monthly magazine entitled "Progressive Education." On the back of most issues in 1950 was listed the twofold purpose of the organization as follows: (1) "to channel the energy of the educators toward the reconstruction of the economic system," and (2) "the establishment of a genuine world order, an order in which national sovereignty is subordinate to world authority, an order in which world citizenship assumes at least equal status with national citizenship."

These statements of policy may explain some of the reasons and purposes behind current changes in curriculum and teaching methods. We were particularly sensitive to this philosophy in Pasadena for two reasons: (1) We had Dr. Kilpatrick expounding his views in person, heartily endorsed by our local superintendent, and (2) our assistant superintendent in charge of curriculum was a director of the American Education Fellowship, which, as we said, recommends reconstruction of our economic system and the establishment of world government.

We could quote many, to us alarming, statements by American Education Fellowship leaders. In holding the belief that schools are the rightful agencies for political change, these leaders differ with Dewey who says that educators should not act politically. For example, we were amazed at John L. Childs' declaration that frank commitment to the "welfare state" is essential; at George S. Counts' statement that the day of individualism in the production and distribution of goods is gone, and that teachers should deliberately reach for power and then make the most of their conquest; and at many other proposals discouraging individ-

ualism and individual initiative, including the convictions of the well-known textbook writer, Harold O. Rugg.

Because we knew something of the policies of this organization and of many of its most influential members, we were not happy to have one of the directors of the American education fellowship in charge of curriculum for our school system. Also, in February 1950 its representative to the parent international organization, one Dr. Theodore Brameld, was brought to our town. We had read his belief that "teachers and parents holding restated democratic purposes must join with other forces in the community who conceive of public schools as rightful agencies of social change as well as mere stability." We know too of his book, *Design for America*, a report of his experiment in Floodwood, Minn., to indoctrinate junior high school students with collectivism. For these reasons we questioned his being hired to speak in Pasadena to our teachers and parents. He, however, was stoutly defended by our superintendent as well as by the president of our PTA council because of his experience in the field of interracial relations. Neither they nor any member of our school board gave evidence of concern about his advocacy of collectivism.

Since the interest in schools appeared to be growing and hence newsworthy, early in 1950 one of our local newspapers began printing its subscriber's letter on the subject of schools. The comments, of course, embodied an accumulated reaction to the progressive education which Pasadena schools had taught since it was introduced in the early 1930's. There were hundreds of letters by parents complaining that their children couldn't read or spell or do simple arithmetic adequately. Employers complained of these same basic weaknesses in new employees. One father decried the lack of geographical knowledge, stating that his child could describe the present composition of the United Nations but had no concept of where the participating nations' countries lay.

Another serious worry expressed in parents' letters was the evidence of statism in the social studies textbooks used by their children.

Now again parents were complaining that textbooks in the social studies classes were tending to be so current in nature that essential history was being neglected in lieu of fair deal policies. For example, one textbook in use is *Living in the People's World*, by Roth, Hobbs, and Greenleaf. This book deals with an unbelievable list: nationalism, internationalism, geography, meteorology, production of food and minerals, transportation, communication, the American economic system, government, the traits of individuals, how to get a job, and a host of other matters; all in 767 pages. In stressing the proposition that today's world is new, ever changing, and swiftly shrinking, the hint is strong that such fluidity must and should lead to political internationalism. In dealing with world citizenship, the authors, like the American Education Fellowship, proceed from the basic assumption that world citizenship is our goal. They leave no room for consideration of the wisdom of such a policy.

Looking through this junior high-school social-sciences text, *Living in the People's World*, which appears to be a study of current affairs, we could not forget the warning in the Harvard report that "it is educationally dangerous to require students to form judgments without evidence. It follows that they must be given experience in gathering and weighing historical evidence." To talk about and pass judgment on isolated current events without studying the historic background may serve to teach only the imperfections of our society. Since current problems are almost invariably the

product of "tradition and inherited ideas," the present should be studied and interpreted through knowledge of the past. How well we know that current problems and issues which are absorbing today may seem trivial or quite forgotten a few years hence.

At a recent American Historical Association meeting charges were made which throw some light on some of the modern social-sciences textbooks that cover "current history." Several prominent historians charged that the "court historians" subsidized by the administration in recent years have simply prevented any rewriting of history in the light of hindsight. Such rewriting, even when archives and records can be obtained, is largely excluded from publication. In short, as was charged by Dr. Harry E. Barnes, well-known author and former professor of history at Columbia, Smith, and Amherst, history as a science is threatened by a black-out.

When leading members of the American Historical Association object to the pro-administration slant of recent history books, obviously, no one will be surprised to find works praising the welfare state in our schools. We believe our education should emphasize the study of American history and its philosophy of freedom and leave current affairs largely alone until they are shaken down and judged in the light of time. Our children then would receive the background of knowledge necessary for intelligent judgment of whatever problems they will face as "current" in their time. As the well-respected columnist William Henry Chamberlin recently wrote concerning Alger Hiss' generation, "The Russian Revolution won converts because the American Revolution was not adequately understood."

This lack of history and perspective was only one of the complaints in the hundreds of letters. Then parents all over Pasadena began comparing notes and questioning what to do next. There had been an organization set up in the spring of 1949 for the purpose of backing certain candidates for election to the school board. After the election the organization, called the school development council, had continued in existence in a somewhat desultory fashion. It proved a ready-made vehicle for hundreds of protesting parents to submit their complaints and proposals in a constructive, organized, and orderly fashion. Thus in March 1950, a reorganization meeting was held, a new steering committee appointed, and in April at a large meeting, members were still questioning how their criticisms might best be met by the schools, when an election was announced, to be held within a matter of a relatively few weeks. The school board was asking voters approval to increase the allowable elementary school tax by 50 percent. This placed the council in a quandary. They already didn't like what they were buying and now, before they could do much about it, they were being asked to buy more of the same. In fact, members of the school development council objected to acquiring more of Dr. Kilpatrick's theories in the form of modern education workshops and a proposed camp program. Therefore, instead of being able to operate constructively to correct the weaknesses, they were forced immediately to wage an opposition fight to the tax levy increase. They did so on the grounds of the increase not being necessary for the kind of basic, liberal education which they considered more desirable for our community than the modern extras being suggested. But for many people the prime reason for opposing the tax increase was that it seemed the only way of halting and correcting the school practices and programs under criticism. After a brief but bitter battle, with excessive statements hurled from both sides, the tax levy was defeated

by 2 to 1, with an exceptionally large vote of 32,000 for our town.

During the course of the election battle, the school development council had made the mistake of ordering and distributing at one meeting copies of a pamphlet which one of its members had discovered. Because the contents of that particular pamphlet stated many of the parents' contentions about the unprofitable results of progressive education, it seemed convenient to have it in print. In the speed and furor, the amateurish council had not checked on the background of the writer of the article. This was an unfortunate oversight. It seems that despite the outstanding national citizens listed as directors of the organization publishing the pamphlet, there had been unpleasant claims made against the author and these were skillfully transferred to the school-development council in an attempt to discount the effectiveness of that group. Avoiding an answer to any statement in the pamphlet, the opposition made completely untrue allegations that the council was a part of a sinister national organization's plan to destroy the schools. One of our leading ministers preached a sermon about the author who was unknown to the council but about whom the minister mysteriously had acquired information. This was later reproduced in a full-page advertisement in both of our newspapers, despite the fact that no answer nor reference was ever made to any argument in the bitterly criticized pamphlet. This is the well-known smear technique of "guilt by association."

Soon after the tax levy increase was defeated by the 2 to 1 vote, a statistical research firm conducted a public-opinion survey for a teachers group, the Pasadena Education Association. Although the survey was hailed widely as proof in their favor by the administration supporters, the sampling was not well done. The survey reported that of the actual voters interviewed, about the same proportion voted for the tax measure that voted against it (34.7 percent pro—37.8 percent against). That, of course, means the results were weighted, because if the sampling had been accurate the survey would have reported interviewing persons in the 2-to-1 ratio of the actual vote instead of that 50-50 showing. Yet, despite the fact that the survey covered more "yes" voters, relatively, than it should have to be fair (probably due to the inclusion of a large number of teachers), it was most interesting to note that of the interviewees asked opinions as to whether enough time is spent on teaching the fundamentals 50 percent thought not, about 35 percent thought "yes," and about 15 percent didn't know.

Another interesting fact about teaching the fundamentals was revealed. In a breakdown in age-group answers, the largest opposition to current results and methods was reported in the 30- to 39-age group, the group which is apt to have immediate contact with schools through their children. Often critics of modern education are dismissed lightly as being very old persons whose judgment is distorted by failing memory or tightening of purse strings.

Needless to say, the tax fight brought forth many derisive and uncomplimentary charges about persons unfairly labeled as opposed to public education. Oddly enough, we noted that many backers and defenders of our school administration were left-wingers. This was first evident during a rezoning move by the school administration earlier in the spring. The official reasons for the rezoning were the usual technical ones, with which there could be little reasonable objection. On the other hand, during the hearing before the school board there was a packed-meeting demonstration that was altogether objectionable. There were many fervent and impassioned speeches pleading

for the rezoning on the basis of democracy, for the abolition of Jim Crowism. Some of the persons who were key figures in this demonstration were recognized as local Wallace workers, that is, Independent Progressive Party members. Oddly enough, before the actual day of one meeting, the Peoples World, Communist newspaper of Los Angeles, reported with accuracy who was to speak at the school-board meeting, even mentioning the arguments to be used.

One wonders why the left-wing crowd are backing up strong supporters of modern pragmatic education. They add loud and aggressive voices in denunciation of those of us who believe education has been taken off the track, and who would like to see it become the type of education that performs one of the true purposes of the word—to supply the intellectual power the community requires.

Our reporting cannot be complete without mention also of our superintendent's resignation last November at the request of the school board. He had previously offered to resign if the board so desired. Thus, in the hope of avoiding an awkward situation which threatened the superintendent upon his return from an eastern trip and in the further hope of offering him the opportunity while away of making other arrangements quietly, the board sent a confidential telegram asking to take advantage of his earlier offer to resign. The superintendent's decision to make the telegram immediately public resulted in arousing sympathy for him because of what seemed on the surface to be unfair treatment. Promptly a citizens' group formed protesting the action of the school board. As this and other groups interested in the schools evolved, we noticed how many of the same radical interests were represented—with the usual window dressing of solid citizens.

This, in brief, is our "Pasadena Story." We have tried to be factually explanatory. Where it has been necessary to allude to our philosophical beliefs, we have used quotations from professional persons in the educational field. It is encouraging to learn how many great minds in our country have spoken out in favor of a liberal education for all our citizens, combining where necessary with the specialism important to our age. Such comment is directly opposed to modern pragmatic education.

As we tried to bring out, in a somewhat chronological form, we learned that our school system sponsored one of the leaders of modern pragmatic education. We studied the record of Dr. Kilpatrick's conference in Pasadena. We attended teacher-training courses that carried on his philosophy. We saw hundreds of parents protesting the results of modern education as evidenced in their children, and we heard parents protesting the content of some of the current courses and the textbooks used.

In the course of events we made another significant discovery. Political left-wingers in our town are the strongest backers of modern pragmatic education and the most vociferous denouncers of persons who dare to question some of its practices. As we went into the philosophy and backgrounds of some of the key functionaries of modern pragmatic education, we became increasingly concerned.

The latest link in the left-wing portion of the Pasadena story has been an article written in the Christian Century, a national publication directed toward the ministers of our churches. That article, denouncing "the enemy in Pasadena," was written by one Carey McWilliams, a lawyer who has been listed as a member of many Communist-front organizations.

Because another national publication which recently denounced us roundly, is a school "trade publication" which has our

ex-superintendent as an editorial consultant, perhaps part of its ire could be considered loyalty to one of its own.

We strongly believe that the public school system should have everyone's fullest support. Because the physical plants of many schools in the country badly need improvement and because in many sections teachers are grossly underpaid, local citizens' or parents' groups are working throughout the Nation to correct these inadequacies through public tax support. The National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools is one of these organizations, urging that we "arouse in the community the intelligence and will to improve our public schools." While we endorse such action heartily, we suggest that even more important is the consideration of what methods and philosophy are taught within the school buildings. We believe that the obligation to examine what is taught, and by what methods, goes hand-in-hand with the good citizen's financial support. It is important to listen when a growing number of intelligent men make remarks like those recently made by Dr. Wallace Sterling, president of Stanford University. He said that our schools have become little more than vocational centers to educate all at a low level at the expense of the intelligent. "American education pays too much attention to preparing students for earning a living, too little to problems of teaching them to think, hence to function as intelligent citizens."

We have tried to show how important it is, again in the words of the National Citizens Commission, to make the best in education available to every American child on completely equal terms. Education, as we have indicated, should have as its purpose mind training and judgment formation, and not the pragmatic purpose of training for skill and adjusting only to current environment. The ability to think logically, combined with a knowledge of the heritage of the past, will provide a mature mind able to cope with any and all current problems, and able not only to adjust to his environment but what is equally important, to improve his environment.

Furthermore, our public schools are charged with the responsibility of teaching the principles and traditions of our great country and its constitutional form of government. Those who know only the present and not much of the past, who learn (only) what they live, may have to experience many of the tragedies of the past. Happily we not only learn what we live, as the pragmatists say, but we can live a great deal of what we learn from history in all fields. And although science and psychology are offering many aids and helpful viewpoints, to teachers, they should not change the goal of offering all children a liberal education as opposed to modern pragmatic education. We contend this liberal education is due every American child on completely equal terms if the strength and spirit of our Nation are to be maintained.

Government Employees—The American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the

XCVII—App.—296

RECORD a letter to the editor, published in the Washington Evening Star of July 24, 1951, under the headline "The American way." It refers to Government employees.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN WAY

By congressional action, Government employees are set up by grades from bottom to top, according to qualifications, with provision for promotions and advancement to higher levels from time to time—the American way of life. This permits them to live on gradually higher levels—i.e., have better homes, better apartments, better furnishings, better education and a chance for some savings, with the necessary accompanying higher costs, higher expenses, higher rents, increased taxes, employment of additional help, obtaining more services, and larger contributions to the Community Chest, Red Cross and other charities. Each advancement permits a little higher standard of living. Each employee lives within his respective income with the aim to advance and live a little better.

Consequently, when living costs rise skyward, such change strikes all these grades of employees alike. It reduces their respective standard of living substantially in proportion to their incomes or salaries. If it is desired to maintain these respective standards of living in the American way of life, the salaries should be increased somewhat in proportion to the respective salaries which they already receive as set up by congressional procedure.

If, however, as the costs of living soar, Congress wishes to reverse its long-established procedure and refuses to grant proportionate percentage pay raises except for the first few grades, it will force the better-paid employees and those who have earned promotions to seek cheaper apartments, sell their homes and go back to less expensive quarters, wipe out their savings, withdraw their children from college and pay institutions, diminish their means of aiding charitable causes and distressed neighbors, reduce such employees to the lower standard of living and the abandonment of the American way of life.

Inasmuch as the President, the Civil Service Commission and the Senate, as well as a substantial number of the House Members, favor the salary increases on a percentage basis for the various grades, I concur in this principle and urge the enactment of a substantial pay raise on a percentage basis, and strongly oppose any flat raise in dollars for the Government employees across the scale of grades.

GEORGE A. RAUSCH,
American Federation of Government
Employees.

World-wide Cartel in Tin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "United States Sees Victory Over Cartel in Tin," by William S. White, which appeared in the New York Times yesterday.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SEES VICTORY OVER CARTEL IN TIN—SYMINGTON SAYS PRICE GOUGING IS ENDED—NATION NEARLY SELF-SUFFICIENT IN RUBBER

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON, July 24.—The United States has struck a hard blow at what it considers to be a world-wide cartel, or pool, in tin and now feels strong enough to end forever all price gouging in that strategic material.

Moreover, with its legislative and executive branches working in close concert on the whole problem of the prices of foreign-produced commodities indispensable to war, the Government now is approaching self-sufficiency in rubber.

This was brought out today before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, which months ago started efforts in this field, by W. Stuart Symington and Jess L. Larson, the two administration officials responsible for carrying out the campaign.

They warned foreign producers and combines that the actions that had beaten down exorbitant prices in tin and rubber could be used in other raw materials. Already they said, the United States had enough of both commodities to be certain that it could never lose a war for want of either.

AGREEMENT WITH BOLIVIA

Mr. Symington, the one-man directorate of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, disclosed also that the United States now had reached an agreement in principle with Bolivia, one of the great tin sources, to buy at \$1.12 a pound metal that cost about \$2 a pound a few months ago.

Last March the subcommittee which is headed by Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, asserted that this country was being gouged by some of its allies in its efforts to assemble stockpiles necessary to defend the Western World.

It recommended that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation become the sole importer of tin, for whatever purpose, and that it stop all purchases until a better price was found from a world cartel declared to be controlled by British, Dutch, Belgian, and Bolivian interests.

Reporting on this experiment, which he called a test case to decide whether this country can acquire needed critical materials at fair prices, Mr. Symington told the subcommittee that it had been a success.

The United States, he declared, has no intention of paying a penny more in future that it now has agreed to pay Bolivia. A few months ago, because of the war in Korea, speculators were acquiring tin to be sold at \$4 a pound.

The Bolivian arrangement, Mr. Symington said, is regarded as a fair contract that need not disturb the economy of that country, in whose welfare the United States recognizes a strategic interest.

He said it still was true that cartel pressures were keeping the best grades of tin from the United States, although this country consumed about half of the world's production.

The RFC head declared that there was no longer any possibility of holding up the United States. He said this country now had enough reserves to be able, if necessary, to control the world tin market simply by halting purchases again, breaching, if not destroying, the cartel.

Mr. Larson, head of the General Services Administration, the housekeeping agency of the Government, testified that foreign rubber interests already had "priced themselves out of business for all time to come" in normal circumstances.

The United States, he declared, was now buying natural rubber on the world market

at 45½ cents a pound, as against 85 cents a few months ago, and had so developed synthetics that in a few years it was "going to be completely independent of natural rubber."

As to tin, he said, experimental work in cheap aluminum has given promise that foreign producers may soon lose the great bulk of their tin market in this country unless they maintain reasonable prices.

He said that United States soldiers soon might be eating field rations out of aluminum, rather than tin, containers.

"I should like to say to the tin areas of the world," he observed, "that this procedure of rigging the price of vital materials is cutting off their nose to spite their face."

"What has happened is an indication of what this Government can do to a rigged economy. This country is not going to stand and take this sort of thing."

Republican members of the subcommittee congratulated Mr. Symington and Mr. Larson for introducing what Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, called "a little Yankee trader touch" to their enterprises.

It was understood that Mr. Symington's agreement with the Bolivians, whose economy depends on tin, had been approved by the State Department, which was eager to avoid any instability in that country. The accord is scheduled to be initialed soon by the Bolivian Ambassador.

The steps taken by the subcommittee and the administration on tin, Mr. Symington said, already have saved this country half a billion dollars.

Minnesota Wants St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article appearing in the July 22 edition of the Minneapolis Tribune relative to the results of a State-wide public poll on the St. Lawrence seaway. This poll shows that 84 percent of all Minnesotans favor the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

Most Minnesotans who know about the proposed St. Lawrence seaway are personally in favor of the Great Lakes-to-Atlantic waterway project. But less than half of them expect the seaway to be built within the next 10 years.

These are Minnesota poll findings in a State-wide survey in which a representative cross section of the adult population was interviewed.

Though the St. Lawrence seaway has been discussed for years, many of the State's residents do not know about the project, the poll finds.

Interviewers asked everyone questioned in the survey:

"Do you know what is meant by the St. Lawrence seaway project? What is it?"

Forty-six percent gave correct explanations; 5 percent gave vague or wrong answers; and 49 percent said they didn't know.

Further questions were asked only of those who gave correct answers.

One question was:

"Do you favor or oppose the St. Lawrence seaway project?"

The replies:	Percent
Favor it	84
Oppose it	4
Qualified or undecided	12
	100

Interviewers also asked:
"Do you think the seaway will be built some time in the next 10 years, or will not?"
The answers:

	Percent
Will be built in next 10 years	41
Will not	30
Qualified	7
No opinion	22
	100

Most people giving qualified answers said that would depend on the world situation and if we stay out of war.

College-educated men and women are best informed about the seaway project (more than three-fourths of them know what the plan involves) and are most strongly in favor of it (88 percent approve).

The project, cost of which has been estimated at more than \$800,000,000, to be paid jointly by the United States and Canada, envisions a series of channels and locks through which oceangoing vessels could journey from the Atlantic through the St. Lawrence River to Great Lakes ports. Hydroelectric power would be developed through a number of dams along the seaway.

"It would put more men to work and make freight costs cheaper," a Minneapolis man said. "On the whole, it will improve the whole Midwest," an Ely man said. "It would provide a better outlet for farm crops from the Midwest," a Crookston farmer said.

Six Months of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1951

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House, I present for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Daily Times, published at Mamaronck, N. Y., entitled "Six Months of Congress":

SIX MONTHS OF CONGRESS

If the number of laws passed indicates activity, it might be worthy of note that the Eighty-second Congress in its first 6 months of existence passed 70 laws. The Eightieth Congress, which President Truman classified as "do-nothing," passed 145 new laws during its first 6 months. There is as yet no public record as to what Mr. Truman thinks of the Eighty-second Congress.

But if our present Congress didn't do much legislating, it did a tremendous amount of investigating. To date major congressional committees have disclosed to the public the situation on our military weaknesses, the background of General MacArthur's dismissal, the policy—or lack of it—in our foreign relations, crime conditions in our larger cities, questionable procedures in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the low standards of morality by appointed and elective Federal officials.

But for important legislation there have been lengthy delays. Such postponed bills include those on the military budget, the foreign-aid program, tax legislation, and anti-inflation controls for more than a tem-

porary period. As for the first half year ended, not one of the regular appropriation measures had been sent to President Truman.

If the next 6 months don't produce a better legislative record, we tremble to think what the President might call this Congress.

Bipartisanship in Foreign Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we hear so much talk these days of interparty and intraparty strife that I feel that it is incumbent upon us to point out as often as the situation justifies that there are many issues on which men of good will of both political parties can rise above petty differences and see eye to eye. Certainly, in the face of the common peril of world communism, this is no time for petty party politics as usual.

For that reason I was particularly delighted that the New York Herald Tribune editorial page chose to comment recently on an exchange of friendly correspondence which I had had with Secretary of State Dean Acheson. While I have not always agreed with the Secretary of State, for that matter, have had quite a number of differences with him, I did feel that his cooperative activity and that of his subordinates genuinely merited praise on my part. The particular occasion for my letter to the Secretary was a splendid discussion which we of the Foreign Relations Committee had held with our United States ambassador to Manila, Hon. Myron Cowen, an able representative of our Government, who, incidentally, is now working night and day with leaders of the Philippine Government in connection with problems which have arisen over the Japanese Peace Treaty.

We are fortunate to have able public servants at home and abroad, and I for one feel that when they have been doing and are doing praiseworthy work, in whole or in part, commendation should be appropriately rendered to them.

I might incidentally mention, Mr. President, that on my return from my recent trip to Europe one of the very first things I was happy to do was to praise the splendid job which State Department officials at home and in Europe had performed in facilitating the two-week review which our committee members made of the problems of Western Europe.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Herald Tribune editorial of Wednesday, July 11, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOTNOTE TO BIPARTISANSHIP

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has been described as a repository of secret and hidden things; and certainly there will have been

few who unearthed from its voluminous pages the surprising exchange of compilations in recent correspondence between Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, and Secretary of State Acheson. Senator WILEY is not usually among those who have kind words for Mr. Acheson. But on this occasion the Senator from Wisconsin had been exploring some interesting channels for increasing communication between the top officers of the State Department and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; he had been conducting a small but significant experiment in bipartisanship. The success of his efforts is recorded for the historian in the exchange of letters now embodied in the RECORD.

It had been Senator WILEY's idea that regular procedures for bringing returning ambassadors and other high officials into contact with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee would be advantageous. The first essays along this line worked well, it seems, with the controversial Kem amendments being viewed under a fresh and instructive light, and leaders of both parties coming close to friendly accord. Senator WILEY was so pleased with the response of the State Department to his initiative that he wrote of his pleasure to Mr. Acheson, who replied a while later in terms of equal cordiality. A fruitful experiment has thus gotten under way. As for the letters, they stand like a touch of calm and sweet reason amid the turbulence, the passion, and the stormy emotions which cloud so many pages of the volume of our political history.

Lack of Reserve Planning Serious

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the entire program of call-up of reserves in the Armed Forces since the beginning of the Korean war has been characterized by haste, lack of planning, and injustices to the individuals involved. A recent editorial in the July 17 issue of the Rochester Times-Union deals very ably with this subject. The conclusion drawn that a national plan is urgently needed to cope with either partial or total mobilization is, in my opinion, inescapable. The world has been living on the brink of disaster too long for anything else to be justifiable by the Department of Defense planners.

The editorial from the Rochester Times-Union follows:

LACK OF RESERVE PLANNING SERIOUS

Lambasting of the armed services by a House subcommittee for the injustices it found in their call-up of reserves since Korea is probably deserved. But the problem is much broader than that and one that should have immediate national attention.

The committee found that many men were called to arms at a cost of closing up their businesses and breaking up their homes while young, unmarried men in organized Reserve units were left to pursue their ordinary civilian way of life.

College men in unorganized reserves had to quit school at once and join the colors while their classmates with no service record

were protected from callups by draft exemptions for education.

Enlisted men with multiple dependents—in one case, a man with 10 children—were ordered to duty while single men remained behind because of their membership in an organized reserve unit.

Other inactive reservists in essential employment were called up when they should not have been.

The committee partly excuses the armed service for the pell-mell race to fill ranks. Their pressing need was for individual men and officers to fill regular units or as replacements. As a result, inactive reservists were called first, while organized reserve units were ordered to duty only as a last resort.

However, it seems to us that the fundamental failure here—apart from the great personal injustice in thousands of individual cases—was a lack of a national plan both for partial and for total mobilization.

This Nation should have both. The years since the war have been long enough to provide both. Yet when the decision was made last July against total mobilization, the services were left to a helter-skelter scramble for men to fill the gaps in skeleton organizations, without regard to or a record of the personal situations of the men called and the minor tragedies that ensued.

Men join the reserves because they have a greater regard than average for national defense. That regard is the most precious commodity a republic can have. It should be husbanded and strengthened by the knowledge that as reservists they will be fairly and equitably treated by their Government.

Defense Production Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that this bill, in its final form, is going to be pitifully weak and inadequate. A good strong bill that will do the job is needed and it will be a tragedy for this country if such a bill is not enacted. For that reason, I strongly believe that the present bill should be re-committed so the committee can report a good bill in about 2 weeks.

If re-committed, a new bill can be reported out in less than 2 weeks' time. During the period of 2 weeks, the newspapers, radios, and other media of information, will be able to fully inform the public about the amendments that have been offered and about the entire bill. At the present time, the general public does not have the faintest idea of what has been happening during this debate. It does not realize that some of the amendments practically guarantee inflation and high prices.

If the public is given time to study those amendments, I am sure that the people of the Nation will let their Congressmen know in no uncertain terms just how they feel about such amendments. In order to give the people time to get such information and then to express their opinion to the Congressmen,

it is of the utmost importance that a final vote on this important bill be delayed for at least 2 weeks. The only way that can be done is by recommitting the bill.

I am going to vote for recommitment in the hope that, in that way, a good strong bill will come before us 2 weeks from now. In that way, many of the parts of this bill and many of the amendments which are so harmful to the public and particularly to that section of the public which cannot afford to pay more will be eliminated.

In other words, I believe we should vote to recommit as an expression of our opinion that—

First. The present bill is not nearly as good or as strong a bill as it should be.

Second. We want a bill that will give better and fairer treatment to the great majority of people who have been harmed so much by the increased cost of living.

Third. We can get a good bill in less than 2 weeks if we recommit the present bill.

If the vote to recommit does not carry, of course we must all vote for the present bill, even though it is weak and inadequate. It is at least better than nothing and, in addition to that, there is always the hope that when this bill gets to conference, the conference committee may improve it somewhat.

I have been assured that there will be a motion to recommit and, if that fails, a vote on the final passage. I intend to vote for the motion to recommit and, if the bill is not recommitted, I shall then be compelled to vote for final passage. I strongly hope, however, that the motion to recommit will carry so that we will be able to vote for a good strong and adequate control bill 2 weeks from now. I believe it is far better to delay this matter for 2 weeks in order to have a good bill than to be compelled to take a poor bill at this time.

Price-Control Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I will support this amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

It is designed to check a proposed order by the Petroleum Administration for Defense freezing all installations of gas appliances anywhere in the United States according to its own choice and dictation.

The proposed order is based on two major claims: First, that there is a definite shortage of natural gas; second, that there is a critical shortage of steel and possibly other materials used in natural-gas pipes and space appliances.

I would not dispute categorically either of these claims. Shortages exist and make urgently necessary Government

regulation and control to insure expeditious conduct of the defense effort.

But the fact is that companies engaged in building natural-gas facilities and manufacturers and distributors of heating appliances are already presently in possession of large quantities of steel and large numbers of these appliances.

This amendment will not limit control over allocations and priorities in any way. It will permit those business units which have steel and appliances on hand to use the steel and install the appliances provided regulatory bodies of their several States permit it.

The amendment would retain control over public utilities in the several States in accordance with present law and practice.

If PAD proceeds with its proposed order, many sections of the Nation now working on expansion of gas facilities will be severally affected.

In my own State, for example, pipeline construction which would bring natural gas to Massachusetts consumers might be stopped or curtailed. Installation of gas heaters and appliances for consumers would be prohibited. Householders and business would thus be deprived of essential services. Industry would be seriously curtailed and unemployment would ensue.

Because I deem the effects of the proposed order violative of our constitutional system regarding regulation of public utilities, harmful to the interests of consumers, business and workers in my district and State, as well as the national economy, I will vote for this amendment and urge Members of the House to do likewise.

The No. 1 Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on appropriations for the State Department on Tuesday, July 24, some questions were raised about the trip to the Far East sponsored by the State Department of Mr. Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review of Literature. I have known Mr. Cousins for some time and consider him one of the ablest editors of our day. I think it is particularly noteworthy that he recognizes clearly that arts and letters cannot be divorced from what goes on in the world. Mr. Cousins has written a number of brilliant pieces, which include "Modern Man Is Obsolete," published in August 1945, immediately after the dropping of the first atom bomb. The current issue of the magazine dated July 28 contains an editorial by Mr. Cousins relating an experience in Pakistan on his recent trip there. Its title is "The No. 1 Question."

I hope that every Member of the House of Representatives—especially those whose doubts have been raised in the recent debate—will take the trouble to read this very fine analysis of one of the most perplexing problems that face America today. Under unanimous consent, I include this editorial in the Appendix of the Record.

THE NO. 1 QUESTION

At a junior college in Lahore, the university city of Pakistan, I ran into trouble. In the question period following my talk a student of perhaps 19 or 20 demanded the floor, then leveled a long and accusing finger at me.

"You have come to the wrong place if you expect us to believe your propaganda about America," he said in a tense and angry voice. "We know the truth about America, and we students protest your use of the platform of this college to try to pass off dishonest and untruthful stories about the United States. Since you have already spoken, it is too late to do anything about it. We can, however, enter a protest with the principal of the school for having invited you to speak. And we can demand that a representative or a supporter of the Soviet Union be permitted to come here and talk to us about conditions in that country."

As the student spoke the head of the college, seated at my right, was visibly disturbed. He got up and walked to the front of the platform, interrupted the student, then began to apologize to me publicly for what he described as an "unfortunate outburst."

"I ask that the speaker ignore this demonstration of bad manners," the principal said. "Here in Pakistan we give honor and not insults to our guests. I am sure I speak for the large majority of the students here in admonishing our ill-tempered and ill-mannered member."

It appeared from the general applause at this point that most of the students agreed with the principal. I regretted, however, that he had disciplined the student openly. Actually, the student was not to blame. I had set the stage for his protest by expressing the hope that everyone would feel completely free to take issue with anything I said during my talk. My purpose in coming to Pakistan was to have the fullest possible exchange of views. Accordingly, I assured the principal that I didn't feel that what the student said reflected in any way upon the hospitality of the college, and that I was anxious to have the student enlarge on his remarks. What, in particular, did he object to in my talk as being propaganda?

The student seemed reluctant to get to his feet, and I asked the principal to assure him that it was entirely in order for him to continue to speak as openly as he did a moment ago. The principal seemed a little dubious at first about my request, then instructed the student to comply with the wishes of the speaker.

"I am sorry if what I said was regarded as an insult," the student began, "and I am sorry if I seemed angry. But you can understand how disturbing it is to hear things that we believe to be false and how unfair it is not to be able to hear at first hand about the Soviet Union if we are officially assembled to hear about the United States."

"You have asked me what it is in particular I disliked about your talk. Much of what you said about the United States was very general. You tried to give us confidence in America's intentions in the world. Frankly, I believe you to be an apologist for the American people at a time when America is committing great crimes in the world. If you really wanted to be honest with us"—

and here his voice took on the same tenseness and harshness it had when he had spoken the first time—"you would have admitted all the ugly things you do to people in America who do not happen to have a fair white skin."

At this point there were staccato shouts of approval and a short burst of applause. This emboldened the student, and he raised his voice.

"In America there are 20,000,000 people who are called citizens but who are not citizens at all. They have been condemned as inferior beings and they are not allowed to participate in what you call your democracy. They do not enjoy the same protection under the laws you give to white people. If a colored person commits a crime, however minor that crime may be, he is apt to be seized by crowds. Your lynchings are the purest form of mob justice in the world."

"If a colored person becomes ill does he have available to him the same hospital and medical facilities as does the white? If he wants to travel somewhere is it not true that he is compelled to sit in a specially designated section, so that he will not contaminate the pure white travelers? Can the colored person sit down at the same school desk, at the same dining table, or register at the same hotel? Why do you insult the intelligence of the world by calling yourself a democracy when 20,000,000 of your people are forced because of the accident of skin coloration to live in slums and eat inferior food and go to inferior schools and work at inferior jobs? Is this what you mean when you say that in a democracy the individual must be given every opportunity to develop himself and to fulfill his highest potential? Those are just words. Stupid, dishonest words, and you do no credit to yourself when you say them."

The principal stood up and once again started to reprimand the student when I asked that he be allowed to complete his statement.

"I am grateful to you for your courtesy," the student said, "but I want you to know how I feel. Everyone of us sitting here feels the same way about your wicked and cruel race prejudice in the United States [loud applause from the audience] and every time we read about a lynching or about that very distinguished American, Ralph Bunche, not accepting a high position in the American State Department because he would have to live in Washington, where he would have to stay out of the best hotels and restaurants and accept the status of an inferior person in the very capital of the country he was called upon to serve—when we read about this, we shake our heads, sadly, then we shake our fists, because what you do is not only an insult to a great human being like Mr. Bunche, but a direct insult to all people in the world who do not happen to have white skins like yourself."

"Often we read about members of our Government and their families who have gone to the United States on official business and how they are openly insulted in the streets by ignorant and evil Americans and how they are turned away from hotels or deprived of seats in public transportation carriers or made to feel inferior. The chairman speaks of hospitality. You are entitled to it. But no country in the world offends the others with its lack of hospitality as does America. We are fully aware of the embarrassment felt by our people when they visit your so-called great democracy."

"Well, we will tell you one thing. We are not inferior. There is the entire Moslem world that is involved in this. And there are the peoples of India and China and Indonesia and Japan and South America. One day you are going to discover that you and

your stupid prejudices are alone in the world and that the overwhelming majority of the world's peoples have decided that they have put up long enough with your fancy talk of superiority and your fancy airs and your evil discriminations."

The atmosphere in the small auditorium seemed supercharged. Under the whiplash of the student's emotional outburst the audience was being transformed into an angry entity. He had touched off something powerful and harsh in the group, producing a mass countenance of vengeful bitterness. The principal saw it and moved quickly to head it off.

"A question period is for questions," he said strongly. "If you have a question, ask it, but no speeches."

"I intended what I said to be a question," the student said. "Does the speaker deny that race discrimination and prejudice exist in the United States, and if so, how does he reconcile it with his general statements about democracy in America?"

The student sat down and smiled triumphantly in response to the murmuring approval of his fellows. Though the majority of the students may not have agreed with the tone and temper of his remarks, they seemed to be generally sympathetic to his basic argument. This did not surprise me. By the time I came to Lahore I had spoken perhaps 50 times at various public meetings in the Far East. And each time I had spoken, without exception, the issue of race prejudice in the United States came up. Out of the countless hundreds of questions that were asked me everywhere this was by all odds the one asked most frequently. Indeed, you could almost count on it to lead off any general question period, no matter what the particular subject matter of the talk happened to be. If I spoke about education in the United States or about journalism or about books or about American foreign policy, the first question was apt to be about lynchings or segregation. Nor did the auspices under which I spoke make much difference. Whether it was a gathering of conservative businessmen at a Rotary session in Bombay, or a small meeting of Government officials in New Delhi, or a conference of editors, writers, and publishers in Calcutta, or a teachers' college for women, or a convention of theologians, the question unfailingly came up. Generally, of course, it would be asked with far more tact and moderation than had just been shown by the young Lahore student, but it was just as deep and insistent.

Before leaving the United States I had been warned that this was something I could expect to encounter almost everywhere I went, but not until I had to contend with it day after day was I able to comprehend how strong and basic it is in the thinking of the eastern people. I had thought from what I had read that our identification with the British in Asia or our own far-eastern foreign policy would be the chief targets of criticism. These were of concern, certainly, but they were small matters compared to the criticism against us on color grounds. You were conscious of it in almost everything that happened. Day after day the local newspapers would play it up prominently on the front pages. Frequently the news would be distorted or exaggerated, and sometimes news items ostensibly having nothing to do with the problem of the Negro in America would carry some strained reference to it. The question would come up in polite and sometimes not-so-polite conversation. People seemed to have all the details about the exclusion of a colored applicant from a southern university the day before, or the complete account of what happened when

Indian or Pakistan individuals appearing in American public thoroughfares in their own national dress were insulted or accosted as freaks or dangerous foreigners. Not infrequently these critics claimed a great deal more information about the color problem than actually existed. I was astounded at the weird misconceptions of the nature and extent of the color problem in America. It was not unusual to find well-educated persons thinking in terms of the problem as it existed perhaps 50 years ago, making generalizations about the whole of the United States that were only true regionally.

It should be obvious, of course, that color is the biggest telling point in Communist propaganda against America. The revolution in Asia today takes different forms in different places, compounded generally of the struggle for freedom from outside domination, of the longing for basic justice and opportunity, of the so-far losing fight against disease and enfeeblement. But through it all runs something constant and powerful. It is the quest for self-respect, a revolution of pride. It is the deep determination to end the age of indignity. This is a mighty and growing natural force which the Communists are putting to their own use. Forget everything else the Communists are doing or saying about us in their propaganda. Forget for the moment about the charges of atomic diplomacy, warmongering, aggression, and all the other stereotyped nonsense. All this is easily enough answered. The one argument we have yet to meet effectively is the one that touches Asian peoples where they are most sensitive and where they have a personal sense of involvement—color.

I should have been very much surprised, for example, if there was no direct connection between the patent pro-Soviet feeling of the Lahore student and his mountainous resentment against America on color grounds. One might suppose that the natural antagonism between communism and the deeply felt religion of the Moslems would act as a bar to Communist propaganda activity. Yet in Pakistan I found a surprising disposition in some quarters to accept at face value many of the rosy interpretations of life and politics in the Soviet Union, with a corresponding tendency to believe the worst about America. Behind these attitudes was usually the conviction that the Soviet was the champion of equality while the United States was the global headquarters of race prejudice.

What do we say when we are confronted with these attitudes and arguments? In my own case, during the early part of my trip I think I made a serious mistake in attempting an answer, I think I was overly circumspect, overly cautious and diplomatic, overly concerned about stepping on sensitive toes. After a while, however, I realized I would have to be completely direct and blunt, almost to the point of seeming militant. By the time I got to Lahore I was pretty well tuned up for the challenge.

I began in my reply by saying that, certainly, race prejudice exists in the United States and is a serious problem here. Having said that, it was important to make a distinction between the problem as it actually existed and the problem as presented by Soviet propaganda and as generally reported in the press, not excluding the influential Times of Pakistan. The condition of the American Negro was bad enough, but it did not even remotely resemble the deliberate exaggerations and distortions that were concocted for propaganda purposes and that were, unfortunately, so widely accepted.

Yes, race prejudice existed, I said, but did the students suppose that nothing was being

done about it? Did they suppose that the overwhelming majority of the American people were not aware of the problem and were doing nothing about it? Did they know anything about the work of such organizations as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People under Walter White, a Negro himself and one of the most respected and influential American citizens? Were they familiar with the reports of the NAACP, which made it clear that greater progress had been made in the past 15 years than in the previous 50? Were they aware of inspiring advances which indicated that America was well on its way toward eliminating the evil of segregation? A slow but steady integration was taking place—without widespread violence. Educational opportunities were increasingly in evidence. Many States had prescribed penalties against job discrimination on racial grounds. The hideous denial of the ballot box to colored American citizens was being abolished. In town after town throughout the South Negroes were being elected and appointed to public office. Old taboos against Negroes in professional sports were practically extinct. The Nation's finest prize-fighters were Negroes. In baseball the man who was probably the most popular player in the game today was a Negro. In literature, science, philosophy, religion, music, the dance, Negroes were making outstanding contributions and enjoyed the esteem of their fellow Americans.

Now this progress wasn't fast enough or deep enough—admittedly—and it could never be fast enough to suit many millions of Americans who were aware of the challenge and who had been working for many years to meet it and who would not be content until it was completely solved. But the important thing was that they were at work on it, that historic progress was being made. The important thing, too, was that the Government itself was not a party to the crime or the party behind the crime, as happened in Germany with respect to race and religious prejudice under nazism. Indeed, the executive branch of the American Government had been in the role of prod to get action by Congress and the States in removing racial barriers.

But the problem of prejudice, I went on, was not a uniquely American problem. It was a human problem. It existed inside people. It was the problem of inferiority and superiority. It was that corrupting and corroding experience that took place inside a person when he arrogated to himself certain privileges which he denied to others on the basis of what he liked to think were nature's own laws. I was deeply disheartened, for example, by the prejudice and discrimination I had seen on the Indian subcontinent. In the leading hotels of Bombay, owned and operated by Indians, was posted the sign, "South Africans Not Admitted." Among Indians themselves, I frequently found discrimination according to color and caste as severe as any I had observed in the United States. National laws had been passed against the inequities of Untouchability, yet many of the evils persisted. What was worse, many of the Untouchables were willing parties to the social contract of prejudice. In Pakistan, and I hoped that those present would correct me if I was wrong, I had found evidence of religious intolerance and prejudice. This was nothing official, so far as either state or theology was concerned, but it was there just the same. There was an unfortunate attitude of superiority of religion that inevitably made for prejudice. So far as minorities were concerned, there was a distinct prejudice against Sikhs.

I brought this up not by way of admonition, nor even by way of using the glass-house theory to obtain immunity from criticism. I brought this up only by way of indicating that the problem of prejudice knew no national boundaries. To a large extent it was a common problem. Perhaps all peoples working together inside the United Nations might be able to contribute to the self-understanding that would have to go into the making of any basic attack on the problem of prejudice—racial, social, religious, economic, political. Perhaps such a common effort might be more constructive than the destructive and often ill-informed criticism that served only to enlarge misunderstanding and therefore prejudice.

This was my attempt at an answer which would be neither apologetic nor self-righteous. I was gratified by the response of the students, especially when it led to a friendly post-lecture discussion with the student who had asked the question in the first place. He said he was satisfied with the answers but felt that we were at fault for not making our story known all over the world. There was certainly no argument about that.

Defense Production Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1951

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate having these few minutes to submit my protests to the National Production Authority controls bill recently passed by the House of Representatives. It is an unjust piece of legislation, designed and executed solely for the benefit of the processors, the packers, and the big-business men of this Nation. It is not a measure to protect and assist the greatest consumer in this country, the average American family. This controls bill assures the big fellows of their profits, but it denies the workingman's family a well-balanced diet at a fair price, or needed improvements for his home or farm.

When farmers, glassworkers, miners, school teachers, and the harried housewives of my district ask me to do something about high prices, I am indeed put to shame when this controls bill is discussed. I must admit to them that Congress is too wrapped up in special interests to heed the cries of the consumers.

I am of the working people, and for them I have endeavored to see that right prevails. Having once been a farmer, I know of the problems he faces. He may get good and fair prices for some of his produce, but his overhead is so stupendous that profits are soon gone. At no time in our history have the prices of farm machinery, feed for stock, and farm labor been so high. The American farmer provides the world's breadbasket, and this is no time to jeopardize the horn of plenty. The farmer must be protected and helped. His profits must

be maintained at a level that will permit full operation and production of his land. Today, as it was in Biblical times, the welfare of a nation is gaged by its farmers. Where there are prosperous farmers, there is a strong nation.

Before it is too late, I urge you, my colleagues, to reconsider and strengthen this legislation so that all Americans, especially the farmer, will be helped. Prices to consumers must be controlled. The defense of our Nation must come before everything else.

The Struggle for Control of China— Excerpts From the Statement of Secretary of State Acheson, June 4, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, on June 27, 1951, I introduced, as an extension of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, excerpts which I had selected from Secretary Acheson's extended review of American relations with China. That review, as you may recall, was presented—extemporaneously as I understand it—to the joint Senate committee then conducting hearings on the dismissal of General MacArthur.

The initial group of excerpts had been selected from the Secretary's description of events in China through the period ending with VJ-day. I have now completed a selection of excerpts describing the period from VJ-day to the collapse of Nationalist military resistance on the China mainland.

I feel compelled, however, to stress again, as I did on the earlier occasion, the difficulty I have encountered in attempting to abbreviate Secretary Acheson's splendid statement. For those who would criticize my selection of statements from the larger whole, I can only repeat the earnest suggestion that everyone read Secretary Acheson's testimony in its entirety.

It is only when we are armed fully with facts that we may understand and debate reasonably and without bias or passion issues which are of great moment to our democracy. The 2,000,000-word record taken by the joint Senate committee provides a factual basis from which reasonable and intelligent discussion may proceed. For those who desire to base their judgment on reason and fact, and who wish to avoid opinions which float on emotion and prejudice, the facts are available.

And to that body of fact, Secretary Acheson made a monumental contribution in his clear and detailed testimony. He, and the other great witnesses who appeared before the Senate committee, have provided us full assurance that the men responsible for maintaining the security of this country are of the high-

est caliber of leadership, ability, and loyalty. His statement follows:

THE STRUGGLE FOR CONTROL OF CHINA—EXCERPTS FROM THE STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF STATE ACHESON, JUNE 4, 1951

PART II. DECLINE OF NATIONALIST POWER

Choices in 1945: Stay, pull out, or fight

Shortly after VJ-day, the United States Government had three choices open to it.

One choice was to pull out of China. That was an impossible choice to make because of the presence of 1,235,000 armed Japanese troops in China, exclusive of Manchuria, and of another 1,700,000 Japanese civilians. There was a Japanese force and a Japanese influence so great in China that, by throwing its weight to either side in this civil war, it could have taken over the administration of the country, and Japan in defeat would have found itself in actual control of China—a result which we could not, of course, help to bring about.

The second choice was that the United States Government might have put into China unlimited resources and all the necessary military power to try and defeat the Communists, remove the Japanese, and remove the Russians from Manchuria. That was a task so great and so repugnant to the American people that the Government could not undertake it, and it was one which was not in accord with American interests.

The third choice—and the one which was chosen—was to give important assistance of all sorts to the Chinese Government and to assist in every way to preservation of peace in China and the working out of the agreements which were so necessary to enable the Chinese Government to reestablish itself in those parts of China where it had been before and to get, for the first time, into areas of China where it never had been.

General Marshall's objective: To avert civil war

After the agreements between the Chinese Nationalists and the Chinese Communists that I have spoken of in 1945, October 11, 1945, armed clashes broke out again between the two parties. Both the Chinese and American Government authorities were gravely disturbed that civil war would break out.

If there was civil war going on in China between the Government forces and the Communist forces, all possibility of removing the Japanese either disappeared or was gravely diminished. The possibility of occupying North China became much dimmer. The possibility of moving into Manchuria became nonexistent. And the possibility of really getting any reforms in South China or any other part of China would be greatly diminished.

So the peace became a major objective of both the Chinese Government and the United States Government in its efforts to help the Chinese Government.

It was in that situation that General Marshall was asked by the President to go to China at the end of 1945.

The Marshall mission: The early days were hopeful

General Marshall arrived in China at the very end of December 1945. By February 1946, three major agreements had been reached between the Chinese Government and the Communists. These grew out of the earlier agreements of October 11, 1945, which discussed the general principles.

The agreements of January and February 1946 carried into considerable detail how this should be done.

The first agreement provided that all fighting should cease, and provided for the setting up of an executive headquarters in which there would be American chairman-

ship and National and Communist representation. Tripartite teams were set up which went to every area where there was any clashing between the troops, and together they brought that fighting to an end.

This worked very well until the two parties fell apart—then nothing worked.

The second agreement was for government reorganization and for a constitutional government. It provided that there was to be an interim state council that was to function as the supreme organ of the state. The Kuomintang Party was given 20 of the 40 seats in this National Council. The other 20 seats were distributed among the Communists and the other parties and to some nonparty people. It was provided that Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek as President of China, should select all members of the council—from his own party and those from all the other parties, including the Communists. It would also leave him with a veto over any action of this council.

The temporary government was to continue until the constitution was to be agreed upon on May 4, 1946, and it was hoped that at an early date, sometime in 1946 or 1947, I believe it was, there could be an election, and they would then set up a regular constitutional government.

The third agreement was for a military reorganization and the integration of the Communist forces into those of the Nationalist Government. It was provided that there should be a great reduction in forces on both sides, because China could not support the tremendous military establishment which existed on the Nationalist side and on the Communist side together. The army was to consist of 60 divisions—50 National Government divisions and 10 Communist divisions. The divisions were to be stationed in certain numerical strengths in various parts of China.

The important thing here about the agreement, as we look back on it, was that so far as Manchuria was concerned there should be 15 divisions—14 National Government divisions, and 1 Communist division. If that could have been carried out, the whole situation might have been very different.

By the end of 1946 we had removed 3,000,000 Japanese, just a few thousand under 3,000,000, from China to Japan—one of the great mass movements of people. To do that, we landed 50,000 marines in China. The marines had to go in there, hold coal, which was the heart of the industrial life of China, hold the seaports so that they would not be captured by Communists, and then receive the Japanese and put them on ships and take them back to Japan.

At the same time, our Armed Forces airlifted whole Chinese Nationalist armies from South China into the areas which were being evacuated by the Japanese. Now that was a tremendous undertaking, most skillfully carried out, which permitted the Chinese Government to get back into areas of China which it would have had the utmost difficulty in even getting into without that colossal effort.

Failure of the 1946 agreements

In 1946, the situation of comparative peace which had been brought as a result of the agreements in the early part of the year began to deteriorate. Fighting broke out in many places.

When this fighting broke out, General Marshall was acting as mediator. He called on both sides to stop the fighting. Both professed to want to do it, but did not do it. One side or the other would believe that it could gain an advantage by capturing this or that city or area, and believed it could strengthen itself in the negotiations, and would start an attack.

Therefore, General Marshall asked for and obtained from this Government an embargo

on the shipment of combat matériel into China. That embargo lasted from the time it was imposed in August 1946 until May 1947. During this time, the Nationalists were winning the battles, but they immobilized themselves.

General Marshall left China in January 1947 to return to Washington. The effort to mediate came to an end with his departure. From then on we go into the military period of the struggle between the two governments.

Civil war: Overextension and collapse

The Nationalist Government reached a peak of its military holdings toward the end of 1948. In the middle of 1948 it had approximately 3,000,000 men under arms, opposed by something over 1,000,000 Communist troops, of whom about 400,000 were guerrilla troops.

Until the end of 1946 and the early part of 1947 the military gains made by the Nationalist Government appeared to be impressive, but in fact they were not. General Marshall repeatedly pointed out to the Government that what it was doing was overextending itself militarily and politically, since it neither had sufficient troops to garrison this whole area, nor did it have sufficient administrators to administer the areas that it was taking over. It was not giving the people of the occupied areas what they had been led to expect when the National Government came in, so politically it was doing itself harm, and militarily it was doing itself harm.

Nationalist lines got pushed way forward; finally the troops at the end take up defensive positions behind some kind of walls, a long line of communication has to be guarded, which is eventually cut, and over and over again the troops at the end of the line either go over to the side of the enemy without firing a shot, or sufficient of them do so that those who want to fight can't fight.

That was the story of the war from 1946 on. At first it looked very successful—lots of areas occupied, important cities taken—but the armies all go to garrison, they become immobilized, and maneuver and initiative are left with the Communists.

American aid after the Marshall mission

After General Marshall returned, in the summer of 1947, the President sent General Wedemeyer to China on a fact-finding mission. General Wedemeyer went to China and returned. He recommended assistance of economic and military equipment for a 5-year period, which would require congressional authorization.

The Secretary of State, General Marshall, then had prepared, and with the approval of the President sent to Congress a recommendation for aid to China, \$570,000,000 in economic assistance over a 15-month period. It was not recommended that we should take measures of military aid which would lead to United States military intervention in China or direct involvement in the civil war.

This recommendation was considered by the Eightieth Congress in 1948. The Senate bill reduced the period of time from 15 months to 12 months, and split the appropriations and recommended \$338,000,000 for economic aid and \$125,000,000 as a special grant to be used at the discretion of the Chinese Government. However, when it came to the appropriation process Congress only appropriated \$275,000,000 for economic aid and \$125,000,000 for military aid. So a total was actually made available by the Congress of \$400,000,000 as against \$570,000,000 requested.

There was already a United States Military Advisory Group in China, established in 1946, and in 1947 the commanding officer of this group had been authorized to give ad-

vice on a confidential basis to the generalissimo, advice of a strategic nature, but the United States was not willing to assume responsibility for the strategic direction of the war.

General Marshall, in a message to General Barr, pointed out one reason why. He said: "I know from my own experience that advice is always listened to very politely but not infrequently ignored when deemed unpalatable."

Therefore, we did not take responsibility for the strategic direction of the war, nor did we recommend that American officers should be with troops in combat areas.

Internal weakness of the Nationalist Government

We have talked from time to time here about the great necessity for reform in China. General Marshall, during his mission, stressed that over and over again with the Generalissimo, pointing out that the whole possibility of any kind of armed action against the Communists must at last rest upon a belief in the country and their own belief that they had something which was worth fighting for, and was progressive and good, and that if we did not have reform in China, we were never going to get this spirit which was necessary to fight and defeat the Communists.

General Wedemeyer stressed over and over again that there must be political, economic, and social reforms in order that the Chinese Government might put itself at the head of this great demand for improvement, which was existing in China, and not allow the Communists or anybody else to take that advantage away from them.

The real collapse of the Nationalist Government in a military way began in the latter part of 1948. The first large-scale defection and collapse occurred in September 1948 with the fall of Tsinan, where government forces without any effort at all went over to the other side and surrendered with all their matériel.

In mid-November 1948 General Barr, who was the head of the military mission to China, reported:

"I am convinced the military situation has deteriorated to the point where only the active participation of the United States troops could effect a remedy. No battle has been lost since my arrival due to lack of ammunition or equipment. Their military debacles, in my opinion, can be attributed to the world's worst leadership and many other morale-destroying factors that led to a complete loss of the will to fight."

By the end of 1948 the struggle in North China had virtually ended with the complete collapse of the Nationalist armies. Eighty percent of all the matériel we had furnished, both during the war and after, to the Nationalist Government, was lost; and 75 percent of that is estimated to have been captured by the Communists.

IN SUMMARY

Now, at the very end of my remarks here, I briefly sum up some of the things, material and otherwise, which the United States did in aid of its policy in China.

Speaking, first, of things on which it is impossible to put a dollar value, first is the aid rendered by the United States forces in China in planning and in carrying out the movement of the Chinese Government forces into areas occupied by the Japanese.

Second is the evacuation of the Japanese troops from those areas.

Third is the aid rendered by the United States Marines in North China; in occupying key areas and maintaining control for the Government of essential railway lines until the Government was able to take over.

Fourth, the aid provided by the United States military advisory group.

Apart from this, the United States Government, in the period from VJ-day until early 1949, authorized grants and credits to China totaling approximately \$2,000,000,000, of which approximately \$1,600,000,000 were grants; and \$400,000,000 were on credit terms.

This total is divided almost equally between military and economic aid. The amounts do not include United States surplus property, except where the sales were on credit terms.

Surplus property, with a total estimated procurement cost of over a billion dollars, has been sold to China for the agreed realization to the United States of \$230,000,000, of which \$95,000,000 were on credit terms.

By the spring of 1949, the military position of the Chinese Government collapsed to the point where the Chinese Communists controlled the major centers of population, and railways from Manchuria south to the Yangtze. The military collapse of the Chinese Government had, for the most part, been the consequence of inept political and military leadership, and a lack of the will to fight on the part of its armies, rather than inadequate military supplies.

It was at that time the considered judgment of responsible United States Government observers in China that only the extension of unlimited American economic and military aid involving the use of our own troops and operations which might require the extensive control of Chinese Government operations would enable the Nationalist Government to maintain a foothold in South China.

It was believed that United States involvement in Chinese civil war under the existing conditions would be clearly contrary to American interests.

One further observation I think is important, and that is that American aid cannot in itself insure the survival of a recalcitrant government or the survival of a people that this government is trying to help against aggression.

What our aid must do and can do is to supplement the efforts of that recipient government and of that people itself. It cannot be a substitute for those efforts. It can only be an aid and a supplement to them.

The United States Government, in aiding another government, does not have power of decision with that country or within that government. That power of decision remains with the government, the people in it.

Those are thoughts I think we should have in mind.

Time To Send Him Back?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Paul Martin, Washington bureau chief, Gannett News Service, has made a brief but pungent suggestion which appeared in a recent editorial in the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union. It might be classified as a footnote to history.

The editorial follows:

TIME TO SEND HIM BACK?

President Roosevelt sent General Marshall to China in 1946-47 to get Chiang Kai-shek to accept the Communists into a coalition government.

When Chiang refused to play ball, the State Department cut off United States aid

to the Nationalists, and China subsequently fell to the Communists.

Maybe it's time now to send General Marshall back to insist that the Communists accept the Nationalists into a coalition government.

The MacArthur Affair: Bomb or Boomerang?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, when General MacArthur was suddenly and dramatically relieved of his command it evoked national comment that frequently produced more heat than light. Only now are we getting the well-measured words that come with time.

At this late date Writer John E. Sawyer gives us an exceedingly accurate and fair appraisal of the situation in the July 24 issue of the Reporter. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this article in the RECORD of today:

THE MACARTHUR AFFAIR: BOMB OR BOOMERANG?

(By John E. Sawyer)

For 3 months now the main cry of the neo-isolationists and bigger-war groups in the Republican Party has been that the Truman-Marshall-Acheson policy could only mean an endless and indecisive war in Korea. Today the limited-war policy seems about to produce a cease-fire under conditions offering reasonable hope that the United States has led the United Nations in a collective military action that has halted and reversed Communist aggression. As this same wing of the party now rushes in with a new line—denouncing as a defeat the very termination of hostilities that they earlier had either demanded or proclaimed impossible except on MacArthur's terms—they might well pause to assess the wisdom of their behavior during the phase just passed.

For even before the prospective termination of hostilities the conclusion of the hearings before Senator RICHARD RUSSELL's joint committee posed the question. "How did the political 'pros' of right-wing republicanism who seized upon a MacArthur affair with shrieks of impeachment and roars of victory make out? Did they in fact launch a bomb or a boomerang?"

The fact that the main tent was set up in the Senate gave senatorial Republicans the ringside seats and the chance to play most of the leading roles. But it's now time to throw the spotlight back on to the minority leader of the House, the chunky little man from North Attleboro, Mass., JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

JOE MARTIN deserves this belated attention twice over. He was, after all, the first to get into the act in a big-time way—a fact that the subsequent crowding upstage should not be allowed to obscure. Whatever the role that his now-celebrated letters actually played in precipitating the affair, it will be a long time before he'll have to abandon all claim to having been the man who actually got the show on the road with his maneuverings-by-mail.

More important, JOE MARTIN is a symbol of a group within his party that has repeatedly thrown over the traditions of responsible Republicanism reaching from Alexander Hamilton to Henry L. Stimson

and Arthur H. Vandenberg, and has determinedly sought to make partisan capital out of our foreign problems. While many men in many parts of the world contributed to the build-up of this crisis, there is considerable evidence that General MacArthur quite consciously forced a showdown, and that behind his increasing provocative actions and communications lay more contact with extremist Republicans than has yet been disclosed. Of this wing of the party MARTIN is a far more powerful representative than many men who took the stage as the show went on.

General MacArthur clearly has meant many different things to many people. The man and the symbol have either attracted citizens or repelled them for reasons ranging from the great issues of American foreign policy down to the basic emotions aroused by any such display of masculine power, decision, drama, action, and arrogance.

On the Congressional stage, motives have been equally mixed. Many political leaders in both parties have been trying to establish policies that can best serve the national interest. Even those who disagree most with the Formosa-First Republicans should recognize that some among them act on sincere conviction about the national interest rather than simply on calculations of partisan advantage.

There is little in JOE MARTIN's record, however, to suggest that such concerns have weighed heavily upon him. Few figures in public life have burned with a more purely political flame throughout a long career. Few have so rarely allowed considerations of national welfare to interfere with party politics, so resolutely resisted the temptation to think in terms other than those of the grab for power.

Whatever the MacArthur affair may have meant to others, it seems safe to assume that to MARTIN and his crowd it meant one thing above all else: a political weapon that at worst would enable the neo-isolationists to regain control of the Republican Party, and perhaps of United States foreign policy as well, and that at best might hit the administration where, supposedly, it was weakest, and blow it out of office in 1952.

GAIN OR LOSS?

Viewed in these terms how did the affair come out? Final results, of course, will not be in until a year from November, but there is quite a lot of evidence that must already be worrying the political "pros" who started it. The problem can perhaps best be sharpened by setting up some of the results that seem to be emerging against the goals and expectations of the first roaring days. Ten points, while by no means covering the whole impact of the case, should give MARTIN and his friends something to think about.

1. The attempt to raise a colorful military hero into the role of policy-maker over the heads of the properly constituted authorities has been repudiated by military and civilian opinion alike. The constitutional limits of the field commander's function have been clarified. At no time since the Second World War has the subordination of military to civilian authority been so clearly understood all around.

2. The attempt to set up the Joint Chiefs of Staff—the men, their office, and their judgments—in opposition to President Truman and Secretary Acheson, has produced instead an extraordinary show of unity. While voicing individual differences of opinion, the military and political advisers have shown broad agreement, not only about relieving MacArthur, but about the basic foreign policies of the Republic as well.

3. The subsequent attempt to discredit the Joint Chiefs as stooges of the President or as

distant desk officers has instead led to renewed support of these officers and their functions. Even critics of their policies, such as General Wedemeyer, and, on occasion, General MacArthur himself, have stated that United States global military policy must rest in their hands and have urged the Congress to follow their counsel. In exchanges that pitted a General Bradley against Senators like WILEY, CAIN, and KNOWLAND, it was not Bradley who came off second best in the eyes of the public.

Further, the military competence of the Joint Chiefs and their chosen field commanders has done much to undo the "authority" of MacArthur's criticisms. Somewhat reluctantly, the military witnesses revealed that the Joint Chiefs had warned MacArthur of the perilous gap on the left flank of X Corps through which the Chinese later poured; the quiet effectiveness of the Ridgway campaign has told the world its own impressive story.

4. The attempt to brand the Korean intervention—our first action to halt overt aggression—a monstrous folly was first spiked by the hero himself. General MacArthur, though "not consulted," upheld the President's decision, declaring that this action not only "[restored] at one stroke the enormous prestige of the United States. It confirmed the people of the Far East that we were not going to let them slide into slavery." He further agreed that the "psychological effect of withdrawing from Korea [now] would collapse the confidence, not only of the Far East, in our strength to carry out an obligation which we have announced, but throughout the world." These statements and policies, repeated by the various Presidential advisers as well, cannot have been without effect on millions of Americans who had been in honest doubt about the need and purpose of this action.

5. The alternative attempt to plunge America into an ever-increasing commitment of resources to the Asian theater forced General Marshall, and those who followed, to present to the American people the most explicit and comprehensive brief for our present policy to date. To some extent the Senators from Formosa themselves have made the Asia-first policy ridiculous. (People began asking themselves whether Formosa was really a fourteenth state that the founding fathers had in mind.) To a still greater extent their policy went under before the massive evidence about "the wrong war at the wrong place, at the wrong time, and with the wrong enemy", and before the massive arguments for recognizing the priority of industrial Europe, and for using time to build up our strength here and abroad.

6. The attempt to make Truman (and the internationalists of both parties) bear the political costs of the hateful waste and casualties of war seems to have failed. The war-with-China and the war-with-Russia-now Republicans let Mr. Truman off this hook. By a prodigious effort they jockeyed themselves and their party into the position of wearing the war-party label for the next election, while Mr. Truman will be widely identified with a policy of resisting aggression with the least possible losses. The termination of hostilities might really make the new label stick.

7. The attempt by the neoisolationist wing of the party to take control of Republican foreign policy, to defeat Vandenberg bipartisanship, seems to have backfired. Its irresponsible tactics, its talk of impeachments and contempt, as well as the contradiction of wanting a bigger war with a smaller defense budget, have served to discredit it. TAYLOR's inconsistencies got far less attention than usual, and on the critical vote half of WILEY's fellow Republicans opposed him.

MacArthur himself significantly struck out at the isolationist position, protesting against

"strait-jacket formulas" on the disposition of troops and specifically stating that "we should make every possible effort to assist Western Europe in her defense," with ground forces as well as air and naval forces. The discomfiture of the fumbling Formosa firsters as compared with MOORE's effective showing may aid the reemergence of Republican voices that, without a courageous leader, had lately retired into the back-ground.

8. The attempt to disrupt the United Nations front and to separate America from its allies has led to repeated assertions from many sides of the value and importance of preserving that front. Even General Wedemeyer's testimony reiterated this theme. The demonstration that we are willing to try to operate within commonly agreed-on policies and that United States arms are subject to responsible civilian control has reassured European allies fearful of headlong generalship. It has helped deprive our critics abroad of their main argument against assuming further burdens in the effort to halt Soviet aggression; it has increased our bargaining power in asking for wider commitments; it has increased our influence in the U. N. and among wavering people on the margins of Soviet power.

9. The attempt to fix upon the administration, and upon Acheson in particular, the historical responsibility for the spread of communism in Asia has given the defendants a unique opportunity to go back over a cloudy, complicated history and explain their case. In an exceptionally able presentation, Acheson has set Yalta in its pre-atomic perspective and analyzed more persuasively than ever before the reasons why Chiang Kai-shek failed. The spotlight was also thrown for a minute on the China lobby and its activities, which are of a kind Americans do not like. Finally, General Wedemeyer, introduced as a major witness for the prosecution, asserted that the Communists could have been stopped at the Yangtze "with broomsticks" if the Nationalist regime had had the will to do it. He also revealed that at a time when he felt seven American divisions might have halted the Communist tide and saved even Manchuria he was refused these divisions by none other than General MacArthur—an other decision presumably understandable in the conditions under which it was made.

10. The attempt to split the Democratic Party over foreign as well as domestic policy has, instead, produced Democratic solidarity rare in recent years. A southern Senator, no particular friend of Mr. Truman's, has conducted the inquiry in a way that has commanded general respect, and as the issues have unfolded the Democratic membership in and out of Congress has come to understand and support the administration's foreign policy to an extent not recently known. The Democrats also show signs of headiness over the slow discovery that the Republicans are committing themselves to a campaign in the area where Truman is actually strongest—his foreign-policy record—rather than in such areas of Democratic political weakness as mink coats and mediocrity.

THE BALANCE SHEET

These 10 points are obviously not the whole story. Large numbers of people will remain convinced that a great soldier has not only been wronged but can say or do no wrong. Large numbers will forever bitterly oppose anything Mr. Truman does. Larger numbers still will remain ignorant or confused about the issues and choices before us.

But these 10 points should be enough to worry JOE MARTIN. Of those not irrevocably committed in any event, we would hazard two guesses: That the number of people who will now support MARTIN and company are not only notably fewer than this group earlier hoped but fewer than before the af-

fair; and, second, that the policy of a sober assumption of our responsibilities in the twentieth-century world is now more widely supported than before, not only in the country at large but in the parties that must act upon that policy. Another question remains: How long are Republicans going to let the Martin-Taft-McCarthy wing dominate the party's public stand on foreign policy?

Czech Puppets Dance to Moscow's Tune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, the once proud Republic of Czechoslovakia, founded by the late great Thomas Masaryk and nurtured to full democratic development by that able European statesman Eduard Benes, has come upon sad and tragic days. Under the yoke of communism, everything remotely resembling freedom and true democracy in Czechoslovakia has been totally destroyed. Freedom of the press is one of the latest victims, for Communist Czechoslovakia no longer desires to have the world know what is going on in that unhappy land and it no longer wishes to have its people maintain any contact with the free world.

How else can one explain the arrest, the trumped-up charges, the phony trial, and the conviction of the American news correspondent William N. Oatis by the Czech Communist authorities? Mr. Oatis was merely trying to do his job fairly and accurately as an honest newspaperman, but to the Communists this only means reporting slanders and lies, carrying on espionage and activities hostile to the Czech state. The transcript of the trial, as released recently by the State Department and published in the United States press, does not bear out these charges. Oatis merely carried on the normal activities of any newspaperman in the course of his news gathering functions. The Communists found this to be a "crime" and sentenced him to 10 years in prison.

The Oatis case differs from other cases involving trials of foreigners in iron-curtain countries in one major respect—the defendant was found guilty of doing well the job to which he had been assigned and for which Czechoslovakia permitted him to come into the country. Other than that, we have the usual pattern of false charges, the confession, and the travesty of justice so characteristic by now in Communist-dominated countries.

Several suggestions have been made for American reprisal for the treatment given to Oatis by Czechoslovakia. Among these suggestions are the following: To sever diplomatic relations with Czechoslovakia; to bar reporters for the Communist press in Eastern Europe from gathering news in this country; to break off trade relations with Czechoslovakia; to withdraw the trade

privileges which we have extended to Czechoslovakia in the American zone of Germany; to bring the matter to the attention of the United Nations, and other proposals.

Whichever of these steps is finally taken, it should be done in a manner to make it unmistakably clear to Communist Czechoslovakia, to the other Communist-dominated countries, and to their Communist overlords in the Kremlin, that persecution of American nationals for the sole reason that they are Americans will not be tolerated, that false arrests and phony trials of peaceful and loyal American citizens must cease, and that unless these iniquitous acts are stopped immediately and men like Oatis are released to return to their homeland in freedom, we shall be compelled to retaliate in kind.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow the name of America to be shamefully degraded and humiliated by Communist satraps and satellites acting as puppets for Moscow.

An interesting editorial on the subject appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle, July 23. It reads as follows:

UNITED STATES SHOULD END ALL TRADE WITH CZECHS TO FORCE FREEING OF OATIS

The unjust imprisonment of William N. Oatis, Associated Press correspondent at Prague, has again brought home to the American people the outrageous mistreatment of our citizens in the Russian satellite states.

Responsible for this were the Red rulers of Czechoslovakia who dance obediently when the Kremlin calls the tune. We have seen the Hungarian puppets handle a similar case in an equally high-handed manner when they threw an American businessman, Robert Vogeler, into jail on trumped-up charges and kept him there for 17 months. He is now free only because our Government virtually paid blackmail to get him out of the clutches of the Commies.

This is no way to handle such incidents. It is high time that our Government took a tough position when its citizens are subjected to this kind of mistreatment by these upstart Commies who in this case disgrace the name of Czechoslovakia, once one of the best governed and most prosperous of democracies.

There is no question that Oatis has been jailed on trumped-up charges of "spying." The whole proceeding in Prague has been a travesty on justice as we know it.

Our Government should break off all relations with the puppet regime in Prague, both diplomatic and commercial. This would be a serious blow to Red Czechoslovakia. America could get along without the Czech trade, whereas the goods we send there are vital to the economy of that nation.

Since the State Department seems to be unwilling to take the drastic steps needed, Congress should act. There are already resolutions in both Houses to suspend trade with Czechoslovakia until Oatis is freed. The authors are Senator HERBERT R. O'CONOR, Democrat of Maryland, and Representative JOHN V. BEAMER, Republican of Indiana. Those resolutions, or something similar to them, should be passed promptly.

The Czechs are bluffing. Their leaders think we do not have the nerve to defend our own citizens. If we acted with the strength at our command, we believe they would back down at once.

And we should let the world know that this would be our general policy on all incidents of this sort.

Postal Salaries Must Be Adjusted Upward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, it is urgent that salaries be adjusted upward to provide adequate incomes for postal employees. The postal service is the blood stream of our economic system, but this stream is no longer flowing freely. Low pay for mail carriers and the resulting poor morale and high turn-over in personnel are the reasons for the erratic mail deliveries we are experiencing today.

Although food costs have increased 15 percent in the past year, and the general cost of living has increased 10 percent, postal workers have received no increases in more than 2 years. Consequently, Federal salaries are falling behind the level of private industry and the Government is finding it impossible to retain the services of its most competent persons. The annual turn-over among postal employees is as high as 40 percent in some areas. The general average of turn-over is 25 percent. This means, from the standpoint of comparable personnel policy in private industry, that the postal service is being managed poorly by the Government. The results are reflected in inferior services, and also in higher costs of operation. It has been stated that it costs the Government twice as much to train new employees as it would to grant cost-of-living increases.

Not only have postal employees lost income because of the increasing cost of living but they have lost still more through increased taxes, Federal, State, and local. In addition, further increases in Federal income taxes are imminent.

Many faithful postal workers are no longer able to buy necessities of life for themselves and their families on their postal salaries. To cope with the situation, many employees have taken outside jobs. Wives of the postal workers have in many cases been forced to find work. In spite of this, the postal employees must finance their own pensions by paying 6 percent of their salaries to a retirement fund. They must provide their own bonds. They must pay for their own badges and maintain their uniforms. Their grossly inadequate salaries are reflected in the increased number of loans granted by the postal employees' credit unions.

Postmaster Donaldson has recognized this unjust situation and has recommended that salaries be adjusted to remedy it. Specifically, the Postmaster General recommended that the four lower postal grades be eliminated entirely so that the entrance salary would be sufficient to permit the Post Office Department to obtain the help which is now being hired by private industry. Mr. Donaldson pointed out that entrance pay for postal employees is \$1.32 per hour, while that for most industries is

\$1.50 per hour. Mr. Donaldson also recommended that postal salaries be reclassified so that supervisory personnel be given the monetary recognition they deserve. In addition, the Postmaster General recommended a general increase in accordance with the present-day cost of living.

It is essential that postal employees be given increased salaries so that they can meet normal living expenses. It is equally essential to maintain and to increase the efficiency of the service. This fact has been recognized by the Wage Stabilization Board which has ruled the postal workers can have a pay raise.

I will wholeheartedly support legislation which would grant an increase to postal workers.

Address at Two Hundredth Anniversary Banquet at New Braintree, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article:

Speaking at the two hundredth anniversary banquet at New Braintree last night Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton, lauded the dauntless spirit of the American founders which made possible the realization of free government and free enterprise in the Nation.

"It was in communities like this," said PHILBIN, "that liberty was carefully nurtured, individual responsibility developed and free institutions made a living reality."

"For more than 175 years our great Republic has endured by virtue of the sacrifices of succeeding generations of Americans and their determination vigilantly to guard the precious values which underlie the philosophy and practice of democracy. This town bears mute but eloquent testimony to that fact."

"Each generation has met the challenge to its freedom just as our citizens must meet it today. Armed strength and material power of themselves are not enough to safeguard our liberty. We must exemplify and practice the basic spiritual values of integrity, freedom, and justice which form the foundation stone of our democratic system. Just as we enjoy the rights and privileges of free men and women, so must we live up to the responsibilities which go with that freedom."

"The Nation is merely the collective whole of which we all are a part. Each community must meet its responsibility to the Nation and each individual must be prepared to meet his or her responsibility to the Nation if democracy is to survive in this world of ruthless violence, conspiracy and deceit, and grave threat to our security."

"If thoughtless indifference to what is happening in the world, in the Nation, in the community, in the public service is substituted for positive individual responsibility to guard liberty and free enterprise, we shall ground on the shoals of socialism and become the slavish subjects of the rigid superstate our potential enemies seek to fasten upon us."

"The national security must ever be our greatest concern in these days of threat and

danger. We must boldly face the critical problems of defense and war and try our best to solve them by peaceful means.

"But we cannot be craven or weak before the forces of godless hate. We must stand firm and steadfast by our American principles and for our American interests never fearing or retreating before diabolical enemies of our freedom at home or abroad.

"This crisis will require sacrifice and hardship. But if our governmental affairs are handled with courage and prudence it should not require the abandonment of additional democratic patterns. With intelligent public action and patriotic popular support, there is no reason whatever why we should not be able to protect the Nation during this period against further inflation, decreased dollar values, and excessive costs of the necessities of life. We cannot and should not tolerate from any government fiscal extravagance and bounding prices of commodities that would in short time, indeed, destroy the American standard of living.

"The people rule this Government. They will get in time the kind of government they want. We all must realize the dangerous trends in which we live. Let us strive for security, for balance, for order, and for peace and prosperity under free institutions through strength, restraint, and willingness to pay the price which our freedom demands.

"Let us keep it vividly in mind at all times that democracy and prosperity can be destroyed more surely by unwise and unsound economics right here in our own country than they can be by foreign aggression.

"This vital decision must be made by the people themselves who have it in their own power, depending on what policies they pursue, to preserve or to destroy the greatest sanctuary of human liberty in the world.

"May God grant us wisdom to see the light which illumines the paths to peace, security, prosperity, and national well-being."

The Late Philip Hicky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, Philip Hicky's passing on July 9, 1951, is a great loss to his city, his State, and the whole Midsouth region. He was an outstanding business and civic leader in his home city of Forrest City, Ark., where he had lived for more than 30 years.

Due to ill health Mr. Hicky retired in 1949 and spent his remaining days at his country estate near Forrest City that he loved so well. At the time of his retirement he was general manager of Armour & Co.'s cotton-oil mills at Forrest City, Memphis, Pine Bluff, and Jackson, Tenn.

Fred McCallum, publisher of the *Forrest City Daily Times-Herald*, wrote a splendid tribute to Philip Hicky. I include the full text, as follows:

[From the *Forrest City (Ark.) Daily Times-Herald* of July 10, 1951]

As We See It

(By the editor)

The tragic and sudden death of Philip Hicky at his beautiful home near the city yesterday afternoon removed one of those who have done more than their part to make Forrest City the desirable city it now is.

Until his retirement a few years ago and the failure of his health, he was a worker who accomplished what he started.

His able management of the huge industries entrusted to his care show his ability. The beauty of his home grounds, the well-kept orchards and vineyards about his home, the beautiful lake which played an unwilling and unwitting part in his death, and the substantial lines of the home itself show that he had the touch of an artist, as well.

The closely knit ties of the home he established testify that he was a good father and husband. Many of the city's most enjoyed and substantial improvements came into being partly through his guidance and leadership.

Men of his ability and character have left their imprint on the communities in which they lived from the Stone Age on up to the present time; and it is due to their efforts that civilization has slowly but surely been able to continue to advance upward.

Philip Hicky led an active and useful life. He lived to almost the allotted time of three score years and ten. His accomplishments were sufficient. Idleness, inactivity, or helplessness would have galled his proud spirit. We think since his strength was used up, he would have preferred to go as he did—quickly, and we hope, without pain, in the setting of the parkway by the lakeside he loved so well, his spent frame cradled by the waters he caused to be there to receive him as he expired.

To those grieving members of the family he left so suddenly we can but repeat the immortal lines of Kipling:

"When earth's last picture is painted and the tubes are twisted and dried,
When the oldest colors have faded, and the youngest critic has died,
We shall rest, and, faith, we shall need it—lie down for an aeon or two,
Till the Master of All Good Workmen shall put us to work anew."

Remembering the parable of the Good Steward, we know he will be most joyously welcomed in his new home.

And may his faithful helpmate, who has called us often in the past to compliment us on articles appearing in this column, find the message we thought so fluently but wrote so feebly today, and may it strengthen her, the better to enable her to bear her grief and sorrow at his passing.

The Quaker Technique

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the *Record* an article entitled "The Quaker Way Wins New Adherents," from the *New York Times* magazine for Sunday, June 17, 1951, written by the distinguished engineer and chairman of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission, Mr. Morris Llewellyn Cooke.

Mr. Cooke's temperate review of the values and growing use of the "sense of the meeting" method for making group decisions takes on added significance in the light of his own varied experience in public life and in the face of the clear

need for developing greater tolerance, understanding, and teamwork in the execution of the Nation's business.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

THE QUAKER WAY WINS NEW ADHERENTS—THIS OLD TECHNIQUE FOR WORKING OUT DIFFERENCES IS INCREASINGLY USED IN AFFAIRS OF HIGH POLICY

(By Morris Llewellyn Cooke)

To persons who are not initiated in politics, a decision reached by the processes of debate and majority vote acquires an aspect of sanctity as the ultimate expression of democracy. But those in Washington who deal with the complex problems of statecraft inevitably come to see grave shortcomings in the honored old way of settling issues. Increasingly these men and women are resorting to a subtle and effective method long used by the Quakers to arrive at essential unanimity in their business sessions—the process known as taking "the sense of the meeting."

The technique is being adopted by numerous directors of public and private organizations in various parts of the country. It has in recent years helped to settle policy on several national issues of great consequence. Already one can detect the small but significant beginnings of this approach in some actions of the United Nations. Doubtless quite a few of those who are starting to employ the technique are not even aware of its Quaker origin, but they are all too familiar with unfortunate results developing from the great reliance on the reaching of decisions by majority rule.

The faults of the conventional parliamentary procedure arise from its basic assumption—that there exists a divergence of interests rather than a common purpose. The introduction of a resolution for a yeas-and-nays vote is conceived as a kind of contest between opposing forces, each going into battle armed with fully formed conclusions which it then attempts to put over on the other side. If a group cannot force acceptance of the whole program, then it proceeds, by a process of barter, to swap point for point—often without regard to the right or wrong of the individual points.

The outcome of the vote, then, is a victory for one side and a defeat for the other, which leads to grudges. It is likely to represent no group decision based on the intrinsic merits of the case but a sort of ledger sheet showing the result of bargaining negotiations. And it imposes on the minority a course of action in which they do not concur and which they may positively resent. At its most extreme the tenor of this method may be described in the words of a prominent businessman in the 1920's, who told a stockholders' meeting, "We will vote first and discuss later."

The Quaker practice of "taking the sense of the meeting," on the other hand, is a combination of free discussion and quiet thinking. "The Quaker form of church government," says Howard H. Brinton, director of Pendle Hill, Friends' Graduate School at Wallingford, Pa., "is the most complete democracy ever devised. Not only do the Quakers refuse to admit the imposed authority of any individual. They do not even admit the authority of a majority. All decisions must be made on the basis of unanimity, reached by a process that considers the opinion of every person, both expert and inexpert. Therefore, a Quaker committee sometimes appears to be amateurish and time consuming."

It is well worth this time, in the Quaker view, to develop in a group the willingness to accept unanimously what appears to be the balanced judgment of the majority or the best informed.

First, according to this procedure, a subject is introduced not by presenting a resolution but by "reading a query." This is usually done by the chairman—or "clerk of the meeting," as he is known in Quaker groups. Such a departure from parliamentary order is by no means a petty one, for by this simple device, the issue seems to come from the group as a whole instead of being sponsored by one faction within it.

Various points of view on the subject are expressed by individual members—whoever wishes to contribute. But strong words, provocative language, and repetitive discourse are taboo; members are encouraged to speak just once on a given point, and only after careful thought. And, most significant of all, the individual speaks not simply as a man expressing his own conscience but as the voice of the group addressing itself to the issue at hand. If a contrary viewpoint is raised, it is considered as if it were one's own for the purpose of treating it objectively. "Getting under the weight" of the other man's doubts is the term the Quakers sometimes use to describe this attitude of respect for a minority viewpoint.

If conflict at any point becomes so heated as to make an agreement doubtful, the clerk may halt discussion and ask the members to consider the subject for awhile in thoughtful silence. The value of such a deliberative period was shown during World War II, when a group meeting in a midcity Philadelphia office attempted to settle a troublesome strike. All interests were represented. The president of the concern was high in the councils of the Episcopal Church. The discussion having become bitterly deadlocked, he said: "My partner is a Quaker from Delaware County and I propose that after the manner of friends we settle down to a period of silence and see if we cannot get some light on these troublesome differences."

After 5 minutes of a profound silence the meeting was called to order and the discussion resumed in a different atmosphere. In a very short time an agreement satisfactory to all was reached.

There is never any voting. When a positive program of action appears to have been indicated by the evidence brought to bear on the subject, the clerk sums it up by "presenting a minute," expressing what he takes to be the sense of the meeting—the consensus, the course of action which would take into account the most significant pieces of evidence contributed by all the members. At that certain point "you can almost hear the meeting click," as one experienced clerk describes this phase of the proceedings, "and that's the clue for the clerk to present his minute."

The sense of the meeting stands as the group's decision unless some challenge is made by an unsatisfied individual. In this case the clerk may suspend the subject for the time being—true unanimity obviously being out of the question—to permit more careful consideration and perhaps to gather more facts. A committee may be appointed for research and to prepare a report for the next meeting, when a new attempt is made to attain unity.

Much of the success of this technique depends on the skill and the character of the clerk. He must not only be acute, intelligent, sensitive to the meanings expressed by the members, but he must take care to refrain from being domineering; in fact, must frequently suppress his own attitudes. From the membership as a whole the system requires thorough frankness, sincerity, and a cooperative spirit.

Beyond these there are two principal elements in the practice. There must be a belief on the part of all or most of the participants in the meeting that agreement is desirable. Secondly, the belief must be enter-

tained that in any decisions taken the way should be left open for the unconvinced, or for the skeptics, eventually to join in the view reached by the main body of the group.

If these two convictions are held by a substantial number of those present in the meeting, the Quaker practice has been known to surmount very great initial differences of opinion.

How successful is this temperate method when serious differences exist? The best answer lies in a recital of some important cases where agreement is, or has been, attained by the Quaker principles of unanimity.

1. The President's Water Resources Policy Commission, recently published under its report under the title "A Water Policy for the American People." The findings were concurred in unanimously by the seven Commissioners. The Commission, of which I was Chairman, never took a vote and no record was kept of its proceedings. The report itself is its record. Even though its assignment from President Truman involved reaching decisions on many highly controversial questions affecting water and land, everything was talked out in conference until a meeting of minds was arrived at.

2. The Acheson-Lillenthal atomic energy report was drafted by a group which tried to operate after the Quaker fashion. A helpful factor in creating the necessary deliberative quiet was that meetings were held in a storage warehouse on the outskirts of Washington, and no one but the participants knew of the project until the work was completed.

3. The Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress in 1948-49, commonly known as the La Follette-Monroney committee, drafted—without taking a vote—the voluminous report on the basis of which Congress was fundamentally reorganized.

4. The present Senate Republican conference, of which Senator MILLIKIN is chairman and to which all Republican Members belong, takes no votes and such conclusions as are reached are stated by the chairman to be his interpretation of the committee's joint thought.

5. The International Monetary Fund operates in accordance with this bylaw: "The chairman will ordinarily ascertain the sense of the meeting in lieu of a formal vote" unless a vote is specifically called for. Frank Coe, the secretary of the fund, tells me that during the 4 or 5 years since it was organized decisions have been reached on over 1,000 issues and that on only 12 or 13 of them have votes been taken.

6. The Committee on Economic Development, one of the major organizations studying public finance, carries on its discussions and frames its findings Quaker-fashion. At the conclusion members of its committees are recorded as voting for or against, with the opportunity accorded for explanatory footnotes.

7. Finally, because it is frequently said that the Quaker method can be used only where relatively small groups are concerned, it is worth while to note that the First National Conference on Aging held in Washington during August 1950, under the auspices of the Federal Security Agency, with an attendance of 816, used the group process of discussion and decision. Clark Tibbetts, who acted as chairman of one of the principal committees, thinks that the success of the several sections was "almost in direct proportion to the use made of the group method."

For all these striking examples, it would be false optimism to conclude that the "sense of the meeting" technique could be applied successfully to the deliberations of major political bodies, such as a Congress in full session. Here the limitations of the method must be acknowledged. For by its very definition it requires not only utter frankness, sincerity and mutual trust but also a sup-

pression of any personal, factional, partisan or sectional interests.

There is no room in the Quaker practice for unreasoned obstinacy in the face of sound evidence, nor for resistance to unity on a particular issue based merely on traditional antagonism. Some Friends themselves go as far as to say that the practice cannot be applied with much hope of success in any group composed of elected representatives who must report back directly to a constituency, for often the constituency holds some minute but unshakable special interests that are contrary to the interests of the group as a whole.

This also raises the question whether anything can be gained from the Quaker method in the way of peaceful and effective deliberations among the United Nations. It must be recognized that the necessary frankness and trust between eastern and western nations are unfortunately lacking at present. We could not feel sure, for example, that evidence presented by the Soviet Union and her satellites would be anything more than a disguise for her real purposes or a calculated move undertaken for propaganda value.

Still there is a direct relationship between the Quaker practice and methods of securing agreements on disputes before the U. N. Assembly, once these disputes have been handed over to conciliation commissions or to mediators. Because it is possible for these commissions to operate in private, without the glare of press and radio publicity and without the necessity for individual members of the commissions to record their points of view, the way seems open for utilization of the Quaker practice.

In the case of the U. N.'s subsidiary agencies, those smaller nonpolitical organs in which a group of nations represents the total membership, there is also good opportunity for using the sense of the meeting, for in these cases the members are not expected to reflect only their own national interests. The Economic and Social Council the Trusteeship Council, and their subcommissions are examples in point. There have been occasions in each of these bodies when the chairman has been able, because of the thorough discussion that has taken place, to make voting a perfunctory step.

Do these instances of successful use of the Quaker method, and examples of public bodies which might try it, indicate a wider usefulness for the sense-of-the-meeting technique in the future? That they do. If the executives of organizations dealing with public affairs, from the municipal level up through the councils of the United Nations, will test this technique they will find that important decisions can be arrived at with less partisanship, more harmony, and with greater faith in the results achieved. That much, in these irascible times would be a great deal.

Constantino Brumidi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at services commemorating the one hundred and forty-sixth anniversary of the birth of Constantino Brumidi, the Capitol artist,

held Thursday morning, July 26, in the rotunda of the Capitol:

Today, after a silence of more than 70 years, we commemorate—we remember—a humble immigrant who came to our shores 99 years ago—Constantino Brumidi. He brought with him the genius of a Michelangelo. Here, as we stand in this historic rotunda of the Nation's Capitol, he speaks to us through his matchless art—a gift from God himself.

The unnumbered millions who have visited this shrine of all Americans, and walked its spacious halls and historic rooms, have been thrilled by the beauty he left behind on its painted walls. Death stayed his skilled and unerring hand in 1890.

Here he labored with the eye and hand of a master for a quarter of a century. Only an inspired soul could leave such a priceless gift to a mighty nation and unborn generations who may visit here.

Constantino Brumidi came to America from Italy in 1852. My own father succeeded him, by the brief space of 2 years, in 1854. Freedom beckoned them, and the countless thousands who followed after, to this, our beloved land of opportunity and privilege, where "the air is full of sunlight and the flag is full of stars."

When Brumidi landed in America, he at once sought citizenship within the provisions of our laws. The law required him to remain 5 years before he could accomplish the longing of his grateful heart. Within 3 days after the allotted years had passed, he became a citizen of the United States.

Among the first of many masterpieces he produced thereafter was the painting of a mural in the Chamber of the House of Representatives, showing Cornwallis at Yorktown. So proud was he to become a citizen of the land of his adoption that he signed his name, on the lower right-hand corner of that mural "C Brumidi, artist; citizen of the United States."

We do well to remember this genius of paint and brush, belated as it is and forgotten as he was. Recently he was rescued from oblivion by the patriotism and untiring efforts of a great and noble woman, Mrs. Myrtle Cheney Murdock.

We honor ourselves today by honoring the man who has moved multitudes. They have come here and gazed in awe and rapture at the creations of his faultless skill. America gave him opportunity. He gave to America richly, in return, that rare talent and ability with which he was endowed. Thus he expressed his gratitude for citizenship.

This month we celebrated the one hundred and seventy-fifth birthday of our Republic, the signing of the Declaration of Independence. Our thoughts turned and our hearts warmed with sentiment and patriotism, to the 55 men who pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor when they affixed their signatures to that famous document. Had their cause failed, death would have been their portion.

Such was the danger and travail that attended the hazardous beginning of that freedom, opportunity, and privilege which invited Brumidi to our shores, and which we enjoy today as citizens of the finest country in the world.

Do we appreciate America? Are we as proud and conscious of our citizenship as was this humble immigrant, Constantino Brumidi, whose name and fame we commemorate today in the very presence of his lovely and exquisite achievement?

With a world on fire, and liberty in danger everywhere, may we take home with us today a greater appreciation of his incomparable legacy to America and, from the lesson he taught, a deeper reverence and love for the land we call home.

Constantino Brumidi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, this morning in the rotunda of the Capitol we celebrated the anniversary of the birth of Constantino Brumidi, the artist who spent many years decorating the Capitol Building of the United States and who died as a result of a fall while working on the rotunda frieze, his last assignment in the Capitol.

Many notables attended this ceremony as well as the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives. It was a dignified and deserving tribute to the man who by his artistry and genius fused with his great love and devotion to the land of his adoption, depicted with the skill of Michelangelo, America as the land of democracy and freedom.

This ceremony under the historical and allegorical scenes so deftly depicted in print and plaster by that great artist was enriched by the angelic voice of Miss Lois Hunt, beautiful soprano of the Metropolitan Opera Co., who sang the Star-Spangled Banner as it had never been heard here in the Capitol. Miss Hunt also left her audience spellbound, not only by her voice, but by her masterful manner of delivery as she sang an aria, *Un Bel Di*, from Puccini's *Madame Butterfly*.

Another great artist who thrilled the capacity audience was Pvt. Vic Damone, popular cinema and radio star. His rendition of *Sorrento* and *God Bless America* as he proudly wore the uniform of the United States Army, won the genuine plaudits of the multitude present.

And now last but not least, I wish to place on the RECORD the entire speech of Dr. Myrtle Cheney Murdock, wife of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. MURDOCK), whose inspiration it was to pay this fitting tribute to the Michelangelo of America, Constantino Brumidi.

Before doing so I should like to pay proper respects to the joint committee of the Senate and House: Hon. John O. Pastore, chairman, Senator from Rhode Island; Hon. Theodore F. Green, Senator from Rhode Island; Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, Senator from New Mexico; Hon. Margaret Chase Smith, Senator from Maine; Hon. James H. Duff, Senator from Pennsylvania; Hon. George A. Dondero, secretary, Representative from Michigan; Hon. Foster Furcolo, Representative from Massachusetts; Hon. Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Representative from New Jersey; Hon. Victor L. Anfuso, Representative from New York; Hon. Albert P. Morano, Representative from Connecticut; David Lynn, adviser, Architect of the Capitol.

The speech follows:

CONSTANTINO BRUMIDI

One hundred and forty-six years ago today a babe was born in Italy, a babe whose des-

tiny was to be linked with yours and mine. From his father came the name, Brumidi, but it must have been his Italian mother who first called him Constantino. She might have remembered the old Roman Emperor, Constantine, but I would rather believe that she laid store by the word, Constantino—meaning—constant, steadfast, faithful.

We know next to nothing about the life of this child in Italy, as a child or as a man. But we do know that as a man he landed on the shore of America, an Italian refugee, hunting liberty at the age of 47.

I hold in my hand an old Bible of great worth. It fixes the date of this Italian's birth and the date of his American landing. On a page reserved for family record we have among other precious data in Brumidi's own handwriting these words, "Constantino Brumidi, born in Rome, July 26, 1805." And on the inside front cover is this record, "Constantino Brumidi, from Rome, Italy. Arrived in New York, America, on the 18th of September, 1852. Presented to me by the American Bible Society."

And now will you imagine yourself in this Capitol Building of the United States in 1852. Your Senate was at home just north of this rotunda in what is now a vacant shrine and show place. The Chamber of the House of Representatives was then what is now Statuary Hall, just south of the rotunda. Remember, the Senate and House extensions as they are today were barely begun by 1852. This rotunda must have been in its unadorned state, much the same as it would be today in its unadorned state, with this exception, that above us was a low, uninteresting wooden dome, the present cast-iron dome having been built between the years 1856 and 1865.

Brumidi stood, we think, in this rotunda soon after taking out his preliminary naturalization papers, even before the close of 1852. His brilliant, active mind dreamed of a frescoed frieze in imitation bas relief, encircling these rotunda walls that would picture for all posterity the stirring story of this young Republic. But, midst the confusion of building and preparations for a change of Presidents, the Italian artist came and went without incident. However, he took with him the dream for a rotunda frieze.

We find him next in Mexico City making beautiful a cathedral for the Mexican people. And during those years in Mexico he remembered the rotunda frieze in the United States that he wanted some day to paint, so he sketched many of the scenes in Mexico.

How do we know? We have in our possession the original working sketches for this frieze—a scroll more than 30 feet long and 13 inches wide, in sepia water color done on Manila wrapping paper frequently spliced, signed and dated by Brumidi. Influenced by this sojourn in Mexico, by evidences of ancient Aztec culture found there, the artist made use of the Aztec Calendar Stone in the second group on the North wall of the frieze—Cortez and Montezuma at the Mexican Temple.

With the preliminary sketches drawn so early we can but wonder how it happened that the frieze was actually Brumidi's last work in this Capitol.

Brumidi's first work in the Capitol Building of the United States, his sample, if you please, was in the old House Agricultural Committee Room, finished in 1855. There he demonstrated his ability to do real fresco on ceilings, and his artistry on side walls with oil paints on dry plaster at a wage of \$8 a day, and at first, I believe, he purchased his own supplies. Remember, though, from the beginning Brumidi worked for more than money.

When asked that first year what his wage demand would be, he is recorded to have said, "I am no longer interested in fame or fortune. My own ambition and my daily prayer

is that I may live long enough to make beautiful the Capitol of the one country in the world in which there is liberty." And Brumidi's American-born son said of his father 60 years later, "All labor was given freely out of pride in the Capitol Building of the United States and love for the land of his adoption."

Since we know all this we should not even be amazed at the tremendous amount of decorative beauty this Italian artist left on the walls and ceilings of this Capitol. Twenty-five years he painted here. He came during the administration of Millard Fillmore and he stayed on during the administration of six other Presidents: Franklin Pierce, James Buchanan, Abraham Lincoln, Andrew Johnson, U. S. Grant, and Rutherford B. Hayes.

Exquisite decorations adorn six committee rooms in this Capitol—five in the Senate extension and the one we have already mentioned in the House extension. Today two of these Brumidi rooms are reserved for the District of Columbia Committee of the Senate, and two for the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, and one for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Brumidi is responsible for the complete design and execution of the President's Room in the Senate Annex—having labored with love for 6 years on that room—the Senate Reception Room—beautiful and restful, where the Senators still receive their constituents, and the large mural, Washington and Cornwallis, that was a part of the House of Representatives Chamber for 93 years—finished in 1857 and signed, "C. Brumidi, artist Citizen of the U. S."

At the age of 60 this steadfast friend of American liberty, finished the almost unbelievable task of painting the huge fresco in the top of this dome above us—to be exact, 4,664 square feet of concave fresco, figures that had to be 15 feet in height up there in order to look life-size to you and me down here, 180 feet below. Well, at this point you should have Brumidi's own definition of fresco:

"Fresco derives its name from fresh mortar, and is the immediate and rapid application of mineral colors diluted in water to the fresh mortar just put upon the wall, thereby the colors are absorbed by the mortar during its freshness and repeating this process day by day until the entire picture will be completed."

According to letters saved by the Department of the Interior and preserved in the National Archives, negotiations with Brumidi for painting this dome canopy began in 1862. On December 3, 1864, Architect Walter reported that the canopy for the picture over the eye of the dome was ready for the artist, and that Mr. Brumidi was "about to commence work." On November 1, 1865, Architect Clark reported that the picture over the eye of the dome was all painted in but that Mr. Brumidi was unwilling to have the scaffolding removed until he could "cover the connections of the pieces of plaster put up in sections day by day," and until the plastering was thoroughly dry and the colors would have no more "change-ment."

The truth is that Brumidi was finally persuaded that the scaffolding should be removed at that particular time for public exhibit, but with the understanding that later the scaffolding would be rebuilt and the artist would be allowed to smooth over the connections of the pieces of plaster. That smoothing-over process was never ordered, but today we are glad that it happened so, because those connections between the pieces of plaster which you can easily see from the floor of this rotunda make up the surface proof that the canopy above us is real fresco.

Brumidi signed a contract with the Department of the Interior which promised

the artist \$40,000 upon the completion of the dome canopy. If you were to tabulate today the old vouchers signed by Brumidi that are preserved in Architect Lynn's office in this Capitol you would find that the vouchers for the dome canopy total \$39,500. It was Senator Voorhees, of Indiana, on the floor of the Senate a few days after the death of Brumidi who explained the missing \$500. Senator Voorhees introduced an amendment to an appropriation bill that day asking for \$700 for Brumidi. He explained that when the scaffolding had been removed from beneath the canopy of the dome in 1865 before Brumidi was given time to smooth over the connections of the pieces of plaster, the Government could not pay the full price for an uncompleted picture, so \$500 was retained. "And," said Senator Voorhees, "we saved \$200 by not rebuilding the scaffolding, so I consider that that \$200 also belongs to Brumidi." Not a Senator voted against this \$700 appropriation.

I am sure some of you Congressmen and Senators are wondering how that \$700 was spent after the death of Brumidi. It was the Department of the Interior again that saved the record. In an old Department expenditure book now in the Archives is an itemized statement of the checks written on the \$700 appropriation. Two hundred and fifty dollars went to Elena Brumidi, the artist's Italian-born daughter, in Rome. Two hundred and fifty dollars went to Laurence Brumidi, the artist's American-born son in Washington, and the extra \$200 paid Brumidi's funeral expenses.

But I believe the fact that I want most that you should remember about the dome canopy is this: Brumidi painted that 4,664 square feet of fresco over the eye of the dome, a painting with a concavity of 21 feet, in exactly 1 year's time, and he was 60 years old at the time. Almost incredible.

And still America's steadfast friend, the faithful lover of liberty, never forgot that early dream of 1852. Remember? That frescoed belt around this rotunda? For some reason no appropriation was ever made by Congress for the rotunda frieze while Brumidi was here. He finished the dome canopy in 1865. He finished some oil portraits on the walls of the ground-floor corridors in the Senate Annex in 1870. In 1875 and 1876 he was at work on a frescoed ceiling in the old Sergeant at Arms Office in the Senate Annex. In 1877 Brumidi took the initiative. He said to Capitol leaders, "All right; I will do the rotunda frieze for the daily wage."

So at the age of 72 our Italian artist began his last fresco, and he began just above this platform with the Landing of Columbus. He worked almost with desperation in his determined effort to leave a completed procession of American historical scenes around this rotunda, but time gave the artist no help. At the midpoint over there where the light floods the fresco of William Penn and the Indians the old artist collapsed on the scaffolding. The chair on the platform tipped beneath him, throwing him over. He held by his bare hands to the round of the ladder with a part of his body on the platform until a Mr. Lammond came from the top of the dome down to him, and some other workmen came from the rotunda floor up to him and rescued him. His work in the Capitol Building of the United States was done. He died 5 months later—February 19, 1880.

At Glenwood Cemetery here in Washington the grave of Constantino Brumidi has been unknown and unmarked by the Government of the United States, but Congress has recently voted a bronze tablet for the resting place of our Capitol artist which will be sealed to a low granite headstone with appropriate ceremony at a later date.

Back in 1880, 4 days after Brumidi's death, two Members of the United States Senate paid tribute to the Capitol artist. Senator Morrill, of Vermont, as he closed his eulogy to his friend from Italy, said: "Brumidi's great desire was that he might live to complete his last great work. So long had he devoted his heart and strength to this Capitol that his love and reverence for it was not surpassed by even that of Michelangelo for St. Peter's."

Senator Voorhees, of Indiana, on that same day back in 1880, after he had suggested the \$700 amendment, said this: "Mr. Brumidi was engaged at the time of his death on what he regarded as the greatest work of his life. He was unfolding with the magic of genius in the rotunda of the Capitol the scroll of American history, from the landing of Columbus to the present day. He earnestly desired to live long enough to complete this vast conception. But he has left an empty chair and his great design unfinished, as others have done and will continue to do in other places."

"At no distant day some memorial will be erected in some appropriate place in this Capitol to his memory. He who beautifies the pathway of life, who creates images of loveliness for the human eye to rest upon, is a benefactor of the human race. He will be crowned by the gratitude of his own and of succeeding generations. In the older countries of Europe, where the profession of art has a higher rank than here, Brumidi would have had a public funeral and his remains would have been deposited in ground set apart for persons of distinction. In England he would have had a place and a tablet in Westminster Abbey."

"It matters little, however, whether we or those who come after us do anything to perpetuate his memory. The walls of this Capitol will hold his fame fresh and ever increasing as long as they themselves shall stand."

Today, 71 years after the artist's death, another tribute in words has been paid Brumidi, this time by Mr. C. F. W. McCready, of Pennsylvania, not a Member of Congress, not an Italian-American, but simply one of the rest of us. He pays so just a tribute to Brumidi as to make it almost a dedication. I shall read his tribute as your tribute and my tribute to the Michelangelo of the United States Capitol. Shall we not stand?

"We are assembled here to honor the memory of a great man, an Italian refugee in whose heart burned the eternal spark of freedom; in whose mind was the purpose to serve his adopted country, in whose hand was the skill of a Michelangelo; in whose soul was the love of the beautiful—Constantino Brumidi, artist, citizen of the United States."

"As we stand in the rotunda of this Capitol, and as we gaze in wonderment at the historical and allegorical scenes so deftly depicted here in paint and plaster, we pause in our admiration to say, 'Truly a great man worked here.' As long as the frescoes shall live Brumidi is not dead. His soul speaks to us from the very walls and ceiling of this rotunda. A spell of magic enchantment pervades this spot. The past merges with the present. Time is of no account."

"Here is a spot to which politicians and statesmen and all the rest of us may come to draw inspiration, to cleanse our souls of pettiness, and to get a vision of our high calling from the loftiness of the dome above."

"Here may inspiration take wing and be translated into new horizons of achievement."

"His work alone is a sufficient memorial to the fame of this great artist. But that succeeding generations may know his name, we pay official tribute on this occasion to Constantino Brumidi, artist, citizen of the United States."

America's Socialists**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the *Record* an editorial from the Chicago Sunday Tribune dated July 22, 1951, entitled "America's Socialists."

AMERICA'S SOCIALISTS

The Communist Party in the United States has taken to cover. Eleven of its leaders have been convicted, seven of them are in jail, and four are in hiding. Seventeen others have been indicted. The missing ones are believed to be directing the movement from underground while the heat is on.

Meanwhile, it is full steam ahead in the United States with the other branch of Marxian radicals, the Socialists. In Britain, trade unionists were the hard core of the Socialist movement which adopted the name Labor Party, sought to elect a body of their members to Parliament, and eventually took over the government.

The Labor Party here is the CIO. Unlike the British Labor Party, this Socialist organization in the United States is not content to bide its time by electing a few candidates to constitute an element in a congressional minority. The CIO moved in on the Democratic Party, and upon the death of Franklin Roosevelt took over the White House. Harry S. Truman became President only because he was approved as Vice President in 1944 by Sidney Hillman of the CIO hierarchy.

The CIO's man in the White House, although nominally a Democrat, has proved to be more of a Socialist than Ramsay MacDonald, Britain's first Socialist Prime Minister. MacDonald actually turned out to be a moderate, with the result that a large part of the Labor Party turned against him and he was maintained in office by the support of the Conservative Party. Truman on the other hand, though retaining the Democratic label, has never failed to do the bidding of the Socialists who placed him in a position to succeed to the Presidency.

Clement Attlee, the British Prime Minister, in his book "The Labor Party in Perspective," says that although socialism is a universal movement, "an examination of the Socialist movements throughout the world will show their form is conditioned by their circumstances." In promoting socialism in this country with the backing of President Truman, the CIO has departed in only one important particular from the program of the British Socialists. They have not yet sought Government ownership of the means of production.

This is probably only a matter of timing, and springs from a conviction that by concentrating upon other parts of their program they can so burden private enterprise that it will fall of its own weight. Similarly, the Labor Party was in office in 1924 and again in 1929, but nationalization did not begin until it came into power for the third time in 1945.

The CIO hopes to make this a Socialist country by destroying the roots of capitalism. The first step consists in increasing Government expenditures for so-called social-welfare purposes. To the schemes already in effect, the CIO, with full backing of the man in the White House, adds a call for medical care for everyone available at public expense; vast new public housing projects; Federal grants to education and expendi-

tures for recreation. As if these items were not enough to overload a budget, the CIO enthusiastically indorses any scheme for spending money to raise standards of living all around the world. It also backs huge military expenditures both at home and abroad.

As expenditures on such a scale create a bull market for labor and drive up prices, the CIO wants its man in the White House to have the authority to pay subsidies to farmers so that the Treasury will pay part of everybody's grocery bill. It wants the President to have the power to control prices without simultaneously controlling wages, confident that their man will let their pay go up while prices are kept down. It demands that the revenue to pay for the vast budget be obtained by raising taxes on corporations and persons in the higher-income brackets, in spite of the fact that such taxes have been raised again and again and are higher than ever before.

The CIO Socialists are not unaware of the consequences of the measures which they urge. They know that an expanding economy, such as we have known, requires an endless stream of new capital, that this can come only from retained profits they seek to prevent corporations from earning, or from new investment funds of individuals they mean to prevent from saving. The Socialists know that by cutting off new capital from private enterprise they can bring about the stagnation which, as in England, will make the nationalization of the instruments of production acceptable or perhaps inevitable.

The CIO is the expression in the United States of an economic system which has ruined England. Of the three branches of our Government, the American Socialist movement dominates the executive branch and substantial segments of the legislative and judicial branches. The free Members of Congress should reflect upon the full significance of the Socialist economic controls and of the Socialist tax proposals that are urged upon them by the CIO and the Socialist in the White House.

When Will Dean Acheson Resign?**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the *Record*, I include the following editorial from the *Peoria Star* of July 24, 1951:

WHEN WILL DEAN ACHESON RESIGN?

It is not easy now to remember how long rumors have predicted the resigning of Secretary of State Dean Acheson. Certainly they have persisted since the conviction of Alger Hiss when Acheson shocked the Nation with his statement that he would not turn his back on Hiss.

To speak of Acheson resigning is, of course, to compromise the truth to some degree. It is commonly understood that the decision will rest with President Truman. If and when the day comes, during the Truman administration, that Mr. Acheson leaves the office of Secretary of State, the timing and the manner of his departure will be determined by the President.

Since, up to this time, Mr. Truman has been adamant in his refusal to remove Mr. Acheson, in spite of appeals from prominent members of his own party, it is difficult to

imagine a change of the President's attitude that does not reflect the exigencies of the 1952 campaign. For the last month or two, it is reported that many worried Democrats high in party councils have been going to the President to beg for Dean Acheson's removal. Senator CONNALLY of Texas is one of those who have stiff reelection battles ahead and anticipate that Mr. Acheson will be a serious handicap. Mr. Truman is too much of a party man to brush such appeals lightly aside.

Mr. Acheson has been the most controversial figure in the office of Secretary of State in twentieth-century American history. For 2 years he has been the chief political target of Republicans in Washington. Many Americans blame him for the dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. His Far East policy is condemned by many as the principal cause of the loss of China to the Communists. His vacillation on such major issues as Formosa and Chinese representation in the United Nations has cost him the confidence of many of his own party. Some Democrats, while believing that he is a competent public official, feel that no person who has become the center of so much bitter controversy should remain in the Cabinet.

Recently there seem to be more rumors that the President will allow Mr. Acheson to resign in time to get away from the center of public attention before the 1952 campaign. It may be a cynical comment on American politics, but if Mr. Acheson should be replaced by the end of this year, he might be pretty well forgotten by the time of the November 1952 election.

Petaluma River—An Important Waterway**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the *Record*, I include an editorial from the *Argus-Courier*, published at Petaluma, Calif., dated July 19, 1951, and entitled "River Dredging."

One of the main commercial waterways in northern California is the Petaluma River, which provides a water route from the highly productive inland areas of central California. The grain crops of the Sacramento Valley must be shipped into Sonoma County to support the large poultry and dairy industries, so essential to the economic welfare of our entire economy. Barges and tankers haul in excess of 200,000 tons of freight over this river annually, comprising agricultural products, construction materials, petroleum, wool, and many others.

According to the California State Senate fact-finding committee, the Petaluma River carries the largest tonnage of any Federal waterway in the immediate North Bay section.

However, due to silting in of the river bed and dangerous shoaling conditions that develop, barges and other shallow-draft vessels can ply the river safely only at high tide. As a result, the maximum of this navigable stream has not been attained because of the inability to maintain regular schedules,

and has developed a hardship to the industry in not having the advantage of the low rates of water transportation.

The chamber of commerce of the city of Petaluma, as well as the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors, have adopted resolutions urging allocation of Federal funds to maintain this waterway at project depth. The shoaling of sections of the canal create the present conditions which interfere with the regular movement of freight shipments.

Until recently the river was dredged every 4 years, but we are now informed that funds are not available for continuation of this operation. The last dredging was conducted in 1947, at a cost of around \$50,000. The river is silting in very rapidly, and there is a definite need for dredging to maintain the minimum channel depth of 4 feet.

Increased food production and stepped up manufacturing demand convenient and low-cost transportation to meet the needs of our growing population, as well as requirements of the military. The North Bay counties are recognized as being among the leading agricultural producers in California. Industrial development has shown a rapid increase since the end of World War II, and the percentage of population growth is among the highest in the State.

Proper maintenance of the Petaluma River will facilitate movement of goods and produce, and increase the tonnage of freight shipments and stimulate the economy in general. I call upon the Army engineers to allocate enough money to maintain such projects until the funds are available to make improvements commensurate with the growing demands.

The editorial in reference above lends emphasis to the need and is as follows:

RIVER DREDGING

If the Petaluma River is to be maintained as one of our main transportation arteries, dredging will have to be done to remove dangerous shoaling conditions and to make the river safe for transportation. Tonnage passing up the river in the past few years has been reduced, but recently there has been renewed activity and interest in the waterway. New developments in handling bulk feed shipments have made the feed companies interested again in using the river.

At the present time the river has more tonnage passing over it than any other Federal waterway in the immediate North Bay section. The potential tonnage, if the river is dredged and again made safe for transportation, is much greater.

Members of the Petaluma group meeting last week in San Francisco with the Army Corps of Engineers received little encouragement or help from the Federal Government in dredging the river. They were told that Federal funds were being directed to defense and other vital needs, and that it would be difficult to show a definite need for river dredging on a defense basis.

The chamber of commerce, quite naturally, is not content with this report. The directors have passed a resolution, which will be forwarded to the Army Corps of Engineers, as well as to our Representatives in Washington, urging that the necessary funds be appropriated to carry out the needed dredging work as soon as possible.

There are a number of good arguments which favor resumption of dredging on the river. Agriculture is strongly tied in with the defense effort. Armies as well as defense workers have to eat. Poultry and dairy products are an essential part of our diet.

Petaluma is a large and productive poultry and dairy center. If the river can bring us feed for our chickens and cows at a cheaper rate, then it is to the advantage of the defense effort that the river be dredged so that it can be used with safety.

Moreover there are other potentials along the river for the defense effort. There are a number of firms which may receive defense contracts, and if they do the river might prove to be a cheap transportation artery for them, too.

We have not yet reached our peak in the defense effort. As production steps up, and we reach that top, every mode of transportation is going to be taxed to provide the swift flow of goods to the necessary centers. No way of transportation can afford to be overlooked, be it railway, highway, or waterway.

Missouri's Intellectual Cousins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement by George S. Reuter, Jr., of Henry County, Mo., concerning the great contributions in educational careers of Dr. C. A. Phillips and Dr. H. A. Phillips:

MISSOURI'S INTELLECTUAL COUSINS

(By George S. Reuter, Jr., former superintendent of schools, R-VIII, Henry County, Mo.)

Few citizens become outstanding in life. Rarely are these noted people related, or are their contributions during the same era, or in the same State, or in the same profession. Missouri has such an exception in Dr. Claude A. Phillips and Dr. Harry A. Phillips, the intellectual cousins, who are actually cousins.

Dr. C. A. Phillips, who was born at Chapel Hill, Mo., in 1871, was graduated with a master of arts degree from the University of Chicago in 1910 and doctor of philosophy degree from George Peabody College for Teachers in 1919. Dr. H. A. Phillips, who was born in Lafayette County in 1875, received his master and doctorate degrees from Cornell University in 1919 and 1920.

Both have held prominent places in Missouri education. Dr. C. A. Phillips was a member of the faculty of Central Missouri State College from 1906 to 1924, and he also served as dean from 1913 to 1924 there. Since 1924 he has been professor of education at the University of Missouri, and he has been director of training there. Dr. H. A. Phillips was a member of the faculty of Central Missouri State College from 1908 until he recently retired.

While both are educators, Dr. C. A. Phillips has been particularly interested in elementary education, while Dr. H. A. Phillips is a professional geographer and authority in agriculture. Both have written books in their fields that have become noted.

Both have found time to be leaders in the Presbyterian Church. Dr. C. A. Phillips was president of the Missouri State Teachers Association in 1914. He was president of the board of education when the present Warrensburg high school building was erected in 1923. Dr. H. A. Phillips has been president of the Johnson County Historical Society, a citrus-farm owner in Texas, and a long-time member of the board of directors of the Citizens Bank of Warrensburg.

Those of us who have had the honor to sit in the classes of these intellectual cousins are certain that Missouri and America owe them a vote of thanks for their many contributions to mankind.

Planned Economy—A Case History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, a prominent midwestern banker and distinguished economist has written a case history of a striking example of the planned economy that is menacing this country today.

He is Towner Phelan, vice president of the St. Louis Union Trust Co., of St. Louis, Mo. The example he uses is the proposed multi-million-dollar Central Arizona project—S. 75 and H. R. 1500—which the Bureau of Reclamation has fully supported both in the Congress and with widespread publicity.

In the St. Louis Union Trust Co. letter for July 1951, Mr. Phelan documents the fantastic structure of this project and presents facts which show that it is a serious threat to basic economy of the entire United States.

I feel certain that the Members of Congress will not only wish to read this case history but will wish to preserve this factual information, so they may be fully informed of how speculators and selfish interests are seeking to undermine our economy only for their own gain.

Mr. Phelan's report, which is entitled "Planned Economy—A Case History," follows:

PLANNED ECONOMY—A CASE HISTORY

(By Towner Phelan, vice president, St. Louis Union Trust Co.)

The basic idea underlying a planned economy is faith in the superman. It is a conviction that the individual is incapable of managing his own affairs and that supermen in Washington, London, or Moscow are qualified to plan and direct the lives and activities of all the people. Let us examine the myth that, when an individual in Washington or Moscow is clothed with a little temporary authority, he becomes infallible and endowed with wisdom which ordinary mortals do not possess.

The best way to show how economic planning works is to examine a specific case history like the central Arizona irrigation project. This project has been recommended by the Reclamation Bureau and the Department of the Interior, and a bill (S. 75) authorizing it has been approved by the United States Senate. It is a project to divert water from the Colorado River to provide irrigation for farm land in central Arizona. To do this, water must first be raised to a height of nearly 1,000 feet by pumping and then transported some 300 miles to central Arizona by canals and pipelines. Demand for this project arises because more land is being irrigated in central Arizona than the present water supply can support. As a result, underground water supplies are being depleted by excessive pumping, and the Bureau of Reclamation estimates that 152,500 acres of

land now being farmed will revert to desert wasteland unless more water is provided.

The central Arizona project is a rescue project to prevent this land from going back to desert. It also will provide sufficient water to irrigate 73,500 additional acres. Thus its whole purpose is to provide water for 226,000 acres of land of which only 162,500 are now being farmed.¹

From the standpoint of costs in relation to expected benefits, possibly nothing more fantastic than the central Arizona project has ever been proposed. It is combined with the Bridge Canyon Power project because the proposed dam on the Colorado River will be used both for irrigation and for the generation of power.

Based upon Senate bill S 75, the estimated construction cost of the entire project is \$708,000,000. Of this amount, \$415,000,000 is allocated to the irrigation project; and the balance to power, municipal water supply, flood control, and wild life conservation.²

What the final cost will be no one can tell, but past history indicates it will far exceed current estimates. The \$708,000,000 estimate of construction costs for the entire project was based on July 1, 1947, prices. Meantime, costs have risen greatly. Quite aside from the rise in construction costs, history shows that in most cases the initial cost estimate of a Government project is very low, later estimates much higher, and the final cost higher still. The Hoover Commission gives many such examples, among them the Hungry Horse project in Montana which was originally estimated to cost \$6,300,000 but actually cost \$93,500,000.³

"BAMBOOZLING CONGRESS" BY FALSE ESTIMATES

Leslie A. Miller, chairman of the National Resources Committee, Hoover Commission, and former governor of Wyoming, says of the cost estimates of both the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Corps of Engineers:

"In their indecent zeal to extend their empire, both agencies are guilty of underestimating—apparently deliberately—the cost of the projects they propose to build. This underestimating has the effect of bamboozling Congress."⁴

Even if we assume that the final construction cost of the Central Arizona project will be no more than the estimate of \$708,000,000, the total cost to the taxpayer will be nearly three times that figure. On May 12, 1950, the House Committee on Public Lands passed a resolution asking for certain information on this project from Interior Secretary Chapman and the Bureau of the Budget. Among the questions asked was: "How much interest on the national debt occasioned by the project will be borne by the Nation's taxpayers, assuming a 75-year repayment period and a reasonable construction period?" Secretary Chapman and the Budget Bureau replied that the net interest to be borne by the Nation's taxpayers because of the proposed Arizona project would amount to a total of \$2,075,729,000.⁵ This estimate is based upon S. 75 (the Senate bill which has authorized the project), an estimated construction cost of \$708,780,000, an interest rate of 2.5 percent on Federal obligations, an 8-year construction period, and a 75-year financing period. In other words, the true cost to the taxpayer will not be merely the construction costs, but a figure 2.9 times as great.

¹ Central Arizona Project, 81st Cong., H. Doc. No. 136, March 22, 1949, p. 70 f.

² Reply of the Department of the Interior and Bureau of Budget Regarding Central Arizona Project, June 28, 1950, p. 2.

³ Hoover Commission Report, p. 266.

⁴ The Battle That Squanders Billions, May 14, 1949, p. 4.

⁵ Reply of Department of the Interior and Bureau of the Budget, op. cit., p. 9.

As previously noted, \$415,000,000 of the estimated construction costs is allocated to irrigation. But if we assume that the estimate of Secretary Chapman and the Budget Bureau is correct, the total interest cost to the taxpayer of the irrigation portion of the project will amount to \$1,203,000,000. This is more than four times the total value of all farm land and buildings in the State of Arizona which were listed by the United States Agricultural Census for 1945 at a total value of \$288,000,000.⁶

What are we getting for this huge sum? The acreage now under irrigation which the project will prevent from reverting to desert wasteland amounts to 152,500 acres. But the project will also permit irrigation of 73,500 additional acres of land, making a total of 226,000 acres to be benefited. If we divide the \$415,000,000 construction cost and the \$1,203,000,000 interest cost by 226,000, the construction cost for each acre benefited amounts to \$1,836 per acre and the interest cost to the taxpayer amounts to \$5,323 per acre.

Who would get the benefit? We quote from the official report and findings on the central Arizona project:

"The project area contains an estimated 6,000 farms. . . . An estimated 7 percent of the farms are 500 acres or larger in total acreage and contain an estimated 55 percent of the irrigated land."⁷

SUBSIDY \$1,575,000 FOR EACH OF 420 FARMERS

Seven percent of 6,000 is 420. Thus, 55 percent of costs allocated to irrigation will be spent for the benefit of 420 farmers. This is an average expenditure of \$543,000 per farm for construction costs. But the total interest cost to the taxpayer will amount to \$1,575,000 for each of these 420 large landowners.

What if the cost of the project turns out to be double or triple its estimated cost, as the past performance of the Bureau of Reclamation in grossly underestimating costs strongly suggests that it will be? Then the cost of the project to the taxpayer could amount to 8 to 12 times the value of all farm land and buildings in Arizona. This would cost the Nation's taxpayers from three to nearly five million dollars for each of the 420 farmers who will reap the major share of the benefits. In this connection, we repeat the words of Leslie A. Miller, chairman of the National Resources Committee of the Hoover Commission, who said, "Both agencies [the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Corps of Engineers] are guilty of underestimating—apparently deliberately—the cost of the projects they propose to build. This underestimating has the effect of bamboozling Congress."

According to Barron's weekly, the Bureau of Reclamation had five power projects under construction in 1935-39, the estimated costs of which were approximately \$300,000,000. By 1950, the estimated costs of these projects had multiplied five times and amounted to \$1,546,000,000. Eight additional projects started in 1940-44 were originally estimated to cost \$184,000,000, and this figure has now jumped to \$468,000,000.⁸ In view of this record, the final cost of the central Arizona project is likely to be at least two to three times present estimates. This would double or triple interest cost to the Nation's taxpayer, now estimated to be \$5,323 for each of the 226,000 acres benefited and \$1,575,000 each for 420 large farms. Nonetheless, the Interior Department's report on the central Arizona project has the brazen effrontery to assert that "the benefits exceed the cost by 50 to 60 percent."⁹ The report of

the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is equally unrealistic and calls the project "urgently necessary."¹⁰

Perhaps the only reason that this fantastic project has not already been authorized by Congress is the opposition of California and Nevada who fear that diversion of water from the Colorado River for irrigation purposes will deprive them of water they need. For this reason, President Truman and the Budget Bureau originally opposed the project but have since modified their position. We quote Budget Director Pace:

"In spite of the announced position of opposition contained in my letter of February 4, the President would reconsider his position if the Congress, by affirmative action, should settle the water-rights controversy."¹¹

The central Arizona project is too strong for the stomach of even such an ardent left-wing advocate of welfare-statism as Secretary of Agriculture Brannan. Secretary Brannan criticized the phony estimates by which the Bureau of Reclamation sought to prove that the central Arizona irrigation project is economically justified. He also pointed out the danger that there may be a repetition of the overexpansion of acreage under irrigation that caused this problem to arise. Secretary Brannan said:

"So far as we can determine, once the new water supply became available there could be a repetition of the unfortunate overexpansion that gave rise to the present problems of the central Arizona area."¹²

The minority report of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs quotes the Department of Agriculture as stating:

"The contemplated reservoirs will be rendered useless by sediment within a comparatively few years if nothing is done to reduce erosion. It seems clear from the foregoing that the proposed central Arizona project must be supported by projects and activities not contemplated in the report; in particular, by upper basin reservoirs and a program of land treatment."¹³

Why did the report not include the upper basin reservoirs, and so forth, without which the project "will be rendered useless by sediment within a comparatively few years"? Was it to minimize the estimated cost and thereby "bamboozle" Congress and defraud the taxpayer with phony figures and false estimates? The minority report also states:

"All departmental reports except that of Interior are highly critical of economic and engineering features of the project. . . . Furthermore, there is no assurance that there will exist the extremely important element of a substantial quantity of Colorado River water available for diversion to central Arizona for irrigation and other purposes."¹⁴

Although the project would impose an interest burden of at least \$2,000,000,000 on the taxpayer—mainly for the benefit of 420 farmers—"there is no assurance" there is water sufficient to give Arizona farmers the relief promised. The minority report of the Senate committee says:

"The central Arizona project can only have a water supply for the new use which is proposed by taking it from some other project."¹⁵

Thus it is proposed to saddle the American taxpayer with an interest burden of at least \$2,000,000,000 for a project that may not even be feasible. Two billion dollars is almost half the total expenditures of the Federal Government in the last fiscal year before Roosevelt. If the actual cost of the project proves to be several times the estimated cost,

¹⁰ Bridge Canyon Project, 81st Cong., S. Rept. No. 832, August 3, 1949, p. 3.

¹¹ Central Arizona Project, op. cit., p. 7.

¹² Ibid., p. 103 f.

¹³ Bridge Canyon Project, op. cit., p. 31.

¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 19, 32.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 27.

as appears probable from past underestimates of the Bureau of Reclamation, then the interest cost to the American taxpayer could exceed the total expenditures of the Federal Government in any single peacetime year prior to Mr. Roosevelt.

The central Arizona project sets a dangerous precedent. Government power projects heretofore have been set up on the assumption that the interest cost will be recovered in the sales price of power. In irrigation projects, the interest costs are borne by the taxpayer. In the central Arizona project, however, the interest recovered in the sales price of power will be used to subsidize the irrigation feature of the project. Thus the taxpayer must bear the interest burden not only on the irrigation part of the project but also on the power part of the project. If this principle is applied to other Government power projects, it will enormously increase their cost. The tax foundation says that if the Columbia River Basin program is treated in the same manner, interest cost to the taxpayer would amount to \$4,500,000,000.¹⁴

How serious this interest component may ultimately be, may be realized if one assumes that the Arizona project treatment of interest will be applied to other Government projects. Lt. Gen. Raymond A. Wheeler, recently retired Chief of Engineers, has made an analysis of what various Federal agencies (Engineers, Reclamation, Department of Agriculture, and Federal Power Commission) had spent and were planning to spend on water-resources development.¹⁵ The figures are:

Works already completed.....	\$4, 779, 700, 000
Projects under construction..	4, 593, 000, 000
Projects definitely planned..	18, 983, 900, 000
Projects planned for the long-range future.....	29, 152, 600, 000
Total.....	57, 506, 200, 000

These figures are for construction costs alone. If the central Arizona project is taken as a criterion, the interest cost to the taxpayer would triple these cost figures. Then if the estimates prove to be much lower than actual costs there will be a further huge expansion in costs. Therefore, (1) if these projects are carried out, (2) if the taxpayer must bear the interest costs, and (3) if the actual construction costs exceed estimates to the extent that past history suggests, then these projects could cost the Nation's taxpayer as much as \$500,000,000,000. Such is the stratospheric financial vista that opens up as we contemplate merely one segment of planned economy and its corollary of welfare-state spending.

Planned economy as an abstract idea has an irresistible appeal to the academic mind. It enables the planner to ignore completely hard realities and human nature in order to prepare a dream-world blueprint for Utopia. But these Utopian blueprints can never work in practice because they never come to grips with actualities. They are a form of daydreaming which permits the planner to live in the unreal world of his imagination. Planned economy likewise has an irresistible appeal to the bureaucrat—but for a different reason. To bureaucrats, planning is an excuse "to expand their empires," to increase their spending, and thus to become bigger and more important bureaucrats. The most effective way to appraise economic planning is to show how it actually works in practice.

The central Arizona project is merely one of many examples of how economic planning really works. It illustrates many of the basic weaknesses that make a planned economy unworkable. Perhaps the greatest of these weaknesses is that governmental planning

always is political planning. If the State does the planning, it necessarily is guided primarily by political considerations—not economic ones. Arizona has a population of only 749,587 (less than half the population of the St. Louis metropolitan area) but has two United States Senators.

THE TEST OF THE MARKET

The second basic weakness of a planned economy is that it does not have to meet the test of the market. In a market economy, manpower and resources are used to produce those things that the people want most as determined by their buying or nonbuying. A planned economy diverts manpower and resources from producing what consumers will buy to producing things they would never buy. Does anyone believe that the 420 farmers, who will get 55 percent of the benefits from the Central Arizona Project, would pay \$1,575,000 each for irrigation? Does anyone believe that the crops produced by these 420 farmers would sell in the market for a price that would provide \$1,575,000 per farm for irrigation? The Central Arizona Project represents a gigantic waste of manpower and resources that would be impossible under a market economy. It can and does occur in the Government-planned segment of our economy because Government planning does not have to meet the test of consumer acceptance in the market.

The third great weakness of a planned economy is that planners cannot plan. The free market can determine far better than some bureau in Washington, for example, how many pairs of shoes should be manufactured in 1951 and how they should be divided as to sizes, styles, qualities, etc. The evidence that planners cannot plan is overwhelming. For example, after V-J Day, OPA economists predicted that unemployment might reach ten million by June of 1946. The War Mobilization and Reconversion Office predicted 8,000,000 unemployed by the spring of 1946. These false predictions were responsible for Mr. Truman's 1945 program of increasing wages while holding the line on prices—a blunder which was largely responsible for our postwar spiral of inflation.

The fourth great weakness in economic planning is that it undermines individual initiative and responsibility. It tries to substitute centralized bureaucratic planning for the planning of millions of individual businessmen, farmers, etc., which makes our enterprise system the most productive in the world.

What the economic planners said in the 1930's seems utterly ridiculous today. Professors Alvin H. Hansen of Harvard, Glenn E. McLaughlin and Ralph J. Watkins of Pittsburgh University, and other economists testified before the Temporary National Economic Committee in 1939 to the effect that the United States had become a mature economy, that its period of growth was over, and that we had an enormous overcapacity in industry which we could never use. The TNEC said that our steel industry was overbuilt and advised scrapping plants. It is ironical that today's planners bitterly condemn the steel industry for not having expanded enough and advocate that the Government enter the steel business. The gloomy prophecies of our economic planners in the thirties are reminiscent of the following statement made by Carroll D. Wright, Commissioner of Labor, in his 1886 annual report:

"The nations of the world have overstocked themselves with machinery and manufacturing plants far in excess of the wants of production. . . . The day of large profits is probably past."

Examples of the failure of economic planning are almost endless. They include farm price supports and acreage limitations; price controls; Mrs. Roosevelt's Arthurdale, W.

Va., housing-job plan for miners which cost \$5,000,000 and was later abandoned and sold for \$50,000;¹⁶ the Lustron prefabrication housing fiasco; and the malodorous RFC deals.

FREE DENTURES BUT ALMOST NO MEAT

In Great Britain, economic planning has provided free dentures but almost no meat for them to chew. It caused the disastrous 1947 shutdown of industry due to a coal shortage. It is responsible for many fantastic schemes on which the taxpayers' money was wasted. For example, according to a Reuters news dispatch, the British Government has given up a scheme to provide England with eggs from a state-run chicken ranch in Africa. The news dispatch says:

"It has so far cost British taxpayers \$2,300,000 and has produced almost no eggs. . . . The collapse of the scheme—one of the biggest colonial development schemes launched by the Government—follows 4 months after the east African peanuts scheme was abandoned last January. That failure led to \$100,000,000 being written off."¹⁷

Planned economy never works because its basic assumption is that a few experts can sit in an "ivory tower" and measure and weigh all the multiple forces that affect our economy and make wise decisions for its over-all control. Even if this ridiculous assumption were true, planned economy still would not work because it would be impossible to plan on a basis of objective facts and without regard to political pressures. The late Mr. Justice Holmes believed that law is arbitrary force expressing the will of the stronger part of society. Whatever the merits of this view as applied to the law, it is certain that economic planning is no more than arbitrary force expressing the will of the stronger part of society as represented by political pressure groups. In actual practice, economic planning is the worst kind of power politics. The London Economist has long been an advocate of economic planning but it has had ruefully to admit that: "Planning as practiced by the present Government is now clearly bankrupt."¹⁸

It is folly to believe that men in Washington, London, or Moscow, vested with a little temporary authority, suddenly become supermen endowed with superhuman intelligence and the ability to control the lives of all the people better than can the people themselves.

Progress Report on Camp Adair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted, I include as part of these remarks the lead editorial which appeared in the Oregon Daily Journal Saturday, July 21, 1951, entitled "Adair Progress Report." The editorial follows:

ADAIR PROGRESS REPORT

Adair Village hasn't been saved from the wreckers.

Not yet.

¹⁶ St. Louis Post-Dispatch, March 21, 1951, p. 8B.

¹⁷ St. Louis Globe-Democrat, May 10, 1951, p. 1A.

¹⁸ Economist (London), August 16, 1947, p. 266.

¹⁴ Washington Report, March 20, 1951.

¹⁵ The Battle That Squanders Billions, p. 9.

But, at the Journal's request, demolition of this \$3,000,000 facility—the former camp hospital remodeled into dormitories for GI students of Oregon State College—has been halted until the proper authorities can determine whether it is usable for other purposes.

The State Board of Higher Education has ordered Oregon State College to withhold sale of the buildings for 30 days.

Secretary of Defense Marshall has referred the matter to Secretary of the Army Pace for his consideration. It was General Marshall, remember, who took the decisive action that determined the location of Camp Adair in the first place.

Governor McKay and the State board of control have canvassed the situation to determine whether the State can acquire and use the Adair facilities. The Governor, who served at Camp Adair during the war and is fully acquainted with its facilities, says he can find no way for the State to utilize the former Army hospital.

The Salem, Corvallis, and Albany Chambers of Commerce have actively sought to find industries that could profitably use Camp Adair facilities. But so far they have been unsuccessful.

Corvallis and Albany editors have taken an active interest in the problem. J. H. Gallagher, Corvallis engineer, who is sometimes called the father of Camp Adair, has prepared engineering studies of facilities remaining at both Camp Adair and Camp White and is trying to interest both the Army and Veterans' Administration in making beneficial use of the \$10,000,000 worth of buildings and services still remaining at Camp Adair.

All the angles are being explored.

But there isn't too much time.

Edgar W. Smith, president of the board of higher education, who issued the order postponing sale of Adair Village, points out that it is costing OSC \$4,000 a month to maintain, guard, and protect the Village properties. That cannot go on indefinitely.

Here is a suggestion:

Let the Army, Veterans' Administration, and Selective Service name a joint survey team to resurvey the Camp Adair situation.

If, after they look over the property and confer with the Governor and board of higher education, they determine that no beneficial use can be found for the former Army hospital, we'll shut up and let nature and the wreckers take their course.

Meanwhile, we insist it's worth trying.

Three-million-dollar Government facilities don't grow on trees. Ask any taxpayer.

Tax Exemption for Permanently Disabled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, while the need for workers in almost every line of endeavor increases daily, yet, operation of our present Federal income tax laws, paradoxically, is driving many of our citizens away from employment.

The reason for this is, there are many physically handicapped people who are so severely disabled that they are obliged to use individual taxes, in going to and from their places of work. These peo-

ple are in wheelchairs, or on crutches, and cannot avail themselves to use of trains, busses, or streetcars.

These handicapped cannot afford to pay the additional increases in taxi fares which have been imposed, across the country, and many of them state that they will stop work entirely, and, instead, be obliged to go upon relief, because they cannot meet their present expenses.

Also, there are many persons who are supporting handicapped who are so severely disabled that they cannot care for themselves, and the Federal Government, although thus relieved of expense of caring for such handicapped, on public assistance, yet denies the persons who support these disabled an equitable exemption in income tax to meet their additional expense.

To meet this situation I have introduced H. R. 4748, a bill to grant additional income-tax exemptions and deductions to taxpayers who are permanently disabled, and to allow additional income-tax exemptions to taxpayers supporting dependents who are permanently disabled.

I urge every Member of Congress to join me in getting H. R. 4748 passed with further delay.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include a copy of the bill itself and a statement of Paul A. Strachan, President, American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, explanatory of the bill:

[H. R. 4748, 82d Cong., 1st sess.]

A bill to grant additional income tax exemptions and deductions to taxpayers who are permanently disabled, and to allow additional income tax exemptions to taxpayers supporting dependents who are permanently disabled

Be it enacted, etc., That section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deductions from gross income) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(cc) Transportation of disabled individuals to and from work: In the case of a disabled individual, expenses paid during the taxable year for transportation to and from work to the extent that such expenses do not exceed \$600. For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'disabled individual' means an individual who is blind (as defined in section 25 (b) (1) (C) (iv) or who has lost the use of a leg, of both legs, or of both arms, to such an extent that he is unable during the entire taxable year to use, without undue hardship or danger, a streetcar, bus, subway, train, or similar form of public transportation, as a means of traveling to and from work."

Sec. 2. (a) Section 25 (b) (1) (C) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to additional exemption for the taxpayer if he or his spouse is blind) is hereby amended by inserting at the end of clause (ii) the word "and", by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (iv), and by inserting after clause (ii) the following:

"(iii) an additional exemption of \$600 for each dependent who is blind, if the taxpayer is entitled to an exemption under subparagraph (D) with respect to such dependent. For the purposes of this clause the determination of whether a dependent is blind shall be made as of the close of the taxable year of the taxpayer, unless the dependent dies during such taxable year in

which case such determination shall be made as of the time of such death;"

(b) Section 25 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to exemptions of a taxpayer) is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (D) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraphs:

"(E) (i) An additional exemption of \$600 for the taxpayer if he is a disabled individual at the close of his taxable year; and

"(ii) An additional exemption of \$600 for the spouse of the taxpayer if the spouse is a disabled individual and if the taxpayer is entitled to an exemption, under subparagraph (A) for such spouse; and

"(iii) An additional exemption of \$600 for each dependent who is a disabled individual if the taxpayer is entitled to an exemption under subparagraph (D) with respect to such dependent;

"(iv) For the purposes of this subparagraph the term 'disabled individual' means an individual who is permanently incapacitated in connection with normal remunerative employment or work by reason of a medically demonstrable chronic sickness or a physical defect or infirmity (whether congenital or acquired by accident or illness) except that such term shall not include an individual who is blind as defined in subparagraph (C) (iv). The determination of whether the spouse or a dependent of the taxpayer is a disabled individual shall be made as of the close of the taxable year of the taxpayer, unless the spouse or dependent dies during such taxable year, in which case such determination as to the decedent shall be made as of the beginning of such taxable year."

Sec. 3. (a) Section 1622 (h) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to withholding exemptions) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraphs:

"(F) One additional exemption for himself, if on the basis of facts existing at the beginning of such day, there may reasonably be expected to be allowable under section 25 (b) (1) (E) (i) (relating to disability) for the taxable year under chapter 1 in respect of which amounts deducted and withheld under this subchapter in the calendar year in which such day falls are allowed as credit.

"(G) If the employee is entitled to an exemption under subparagraph (E) with respect to any dependent of the employee, the employee shall be entitled to any exemption to which such dependent is entitled (or would be entitled if such dependent were an employee receiving wages) under subparagraph (C) or (F), but only if such dependent does not have in effect a withholding certificate claiming such exemption."

(b) Section 1622 (h) (1) (D) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to withholding exemptions in respect of the spouse of the employee) is hereby amended by striking out "(B), or (C)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(B), (C), or (F)."

Sec. 4. The amendments made by sections 1 and 2 of this act shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950, and the amendments made by section 3 of this act shall be applicable with respect to wages paid on or after the first day of the first month which begins more than 20 days after the enactment of this act.

STATEMENT BY PAUL A. STRACHAN, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

1. We respectfully point out, if such deductions as would be permitted under this bill are not allowed, many handicapped, now employed—for the most part on small salaries

or wages, and because of their severe disabilities, obliged to travel by individual taxi, instead of regular bus, street car, or train, faced with the rapidly increasing cost of living and transportation—will be obliged to give up work, entirely, go upon relief, and thus cause the Government loss in two different ways; one, Government income from present taxes paid by these handicapped; the other, Government additional loss, by virtue of requiring increased relief appropriations to meet such situations.

2. There are many persons in moderate circumstances, financially, who are compelled to remain in nursing homes, hospitals, etc., for continuous and continual treatment and care. They are not, under present laws, allowed a fair deduction in taxes, and this bill is an effort to abate, somewhat, the heavy drain upon such persons' financial resources.

I mention, particularly, those who are confined because of strokes of paralysis, cerebral hemorrhages, arthritis, poliomyelitis, multiple sclerosis, muscular dystrophy, cardiac troubles, and other severely crippling ailments, injuries, or congenital defect or deformity.

3. One of the saddest situations today is, that of parents, relatives, or others who are compelled to support children who are totally, or at least, severely handicapped. A case in point, known to me, is that of a young woman in her early thirties, whose husband is a disabled veteran of World War II, and the total income of the family is \$3,800 per year. The couple have two small children, a girl, 3½ years old, and a boy, about a year and a half older.

The girl is victim of cerebral palsy and epilepsy. Her medical care in an institution, and which care is absolutely essential, costs not less than \$250 per month, and the young and distracted parents, having no means other than the husband's earnings and his small disability allowance, are forced to follow the course of putting the girl into this institution; letting her stay in a couple of months; then, taking her out until they can save up enough money to reenter her, and so on, ad infinitum. There are many such instances to my knowledge, and certainly, the Federal Government does not wish to impose undue stress and tribulation upon these otherwise willing and hard-working, patriotic American citizens.

4. There are cases where, a single man or woman takes upon himself, or herself, the support of a totally or severely disabled person—generally relatives. This single man or woman is not given tax allowance sufficient to meet the amounts expended for such assistance to these handicapped people. Since support, which, necessarily, today, would be quite expensive, is in itself, an aid to Government, as such people, thus are not on relief, or dole, it is unfair that the person affording such support is not allowed a sufficient tax offset to cover this additional expense.

In conclusion, H. R. 4748 is an effort to deal more equitably with handicapped who, today, in the face of rising costs of living, cannot meet expenses, and since the American people have declared that it is essential that all citizens who can do any kind of work, in this grave emergency, be afforded opportunity for suitable employment, that, of course, includes the physically handicapped. But, when they cannot, because of need of using wheel chairs, or crutches, use streetcars, busses, or other ordinary means of transportation, and are forced to use the more costly taxes, under present laws, the Federal Government denies these handicapped tax exemption for such expense. This bill will go a long way toward rectifying that inequity.

Also, the supporters of those who are so severely handicapped that they cannot care for themselves, should be afforded sufficient

Federal tax exemption to afford them tax relief.

Congress should immediately approve of this bill, not only as a means of furthering employment of handicapped, and affording some relief to parents and others who support helpless handicapped people, but as an economic and humanitarian move to benefit the whole Nation, as well.

The Fight Is Ours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to your attention the city of Lawrence, in Massachusetts, as an example of a community that has courage and enterprise. It does not "cry-baby" and depend on Federal hand-outs to take care of its own responsibilities.

Lawrence has the largest woolen-worsted mill in the world. This is an industry troubled by the lack of nearby raw materials and in the throes of a technological revolution. A variety of new industries will have to take up the slack caused by the decline or migration of an old industry. To a city that was originally built around textile mills and geared to the manufacture of one major product this represents a serious test.

Other communities, faced by a similar challenge, have thrown themselves upon the charity of the Federal Government in bootlicking dependence or have given up the struggle to become ghosts of their former selves.

This cannot be said of Lawrence. Hit hardest by the recession of 1949, it bounced back, fighting the problem with the skill and determination of a city that has spirit. A labor-industry committee is battling to get new business for Lawrence. It will not be easy. But a community that refuses to be licked will not be licked.

Its get up and go wins the admiration of all those who believe in the American way. Even the New York Times has singled out Lawrence to give it an A for conspicuous effort.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Evening Tribune of Lawrence, under date of July 20, 1951, showing how Lawrence believes in itself by proclaiming that "The fight is ours":

THE FIGHT IS OURS

Lawrence is flattered to note that the good gray pages of the New York Times have spoken appreciatively, and even a little flatteringly, of Lawrence's efforts to make manifold its claims upon industrial prosperity. Citing Lawrence as a typical one-industry city, the article, written by Mr. John H. Fenton, depicts Lawrence as aggressively seeking in every way possible to keep what it has while, at the same time, casting about for ways to expand employment opportunity within the city. It is not necessary to go into the details of it, which are familiar to most Lawrencians, but the fact that Lawrence has been represented as a community which is determinedly fighting its limita-

tions is, we feel, excellent publicity for Lawrence.

It does not harm to have it get around that there is in Lawrence a resolute confidence that Lawrence is not going to fall by the wayside—if human effort, human courage, and human intelligence can do anything to prevent it. This is, of course, the sort of atmosphere that is highly regarded by all people of energetic disposition, because such people thrive best in an atmosphere where the emphasis is on positive values, rather than on negative values. In other words, if it is Lawrence's purpose to interest new industry in Lawrence, a prospective settler would find small encouragement to identify his future with ours if he encountered the sort of bleak defeatism which refuses to admit that the sun exists because it has been temporarily obscured.

It isn't necessary to strain after analogies. Of two men of equal merit, both down on their luck, which one would you prefer to give a berth on your team—the shortsighted one with the long face or the one with the fire in his eye? It's pretty much of a rhetorical question, of course, because, obviously, there isn't much of a market for gloom. So we feel that the Times has done us a good little favor by calling attention to the fact that, while Lawrence has had its share of ups and downs, its buoyancy is undiminished.

Because its name has long been identified with textiles, Lawrence has had assessed on it a larger share of the New England regional problem than other manufacturing communities. This imposes upon Lawrence a greater obligation to face the problem squarely and unflinchingly. Men can alter circumstances to suit their hopes and ambitions by applying themselves diligently to the task at hand and not leaving it to remote agencies whose interest in a local problem must of necessity be related to many other interests and considerations. In this instance anxiety is in inverse ratio to distance, if official Washington knows Lawrence as a dot on a map about which it can be very objective, Lawrence knows Lawrence as home. It therefore follows that the people who are best qualified to argue the virtues of Lawrence are the people who have the most to lose if Lawrence sustains an economic loss. And that means everyone in Lawrence. If the enemy were at the gate everyone in Lawrence would subordinate every other concern to the more clamorous issue.

The enemy may not be at the gate at this very moment, but he is not so far away that we can delude ourselves that we are invulnerable. Our vulnerability is dramatically attested by the fact that our total prosperity could be struck a grievous blow by one decision. This is something which we must face. This is something which will not wait. We should now, this instant, alert our every faculty and focus their combined vigor on the issue. Our local government and our legislators, our businessmen and our professional men, our labor leaders, the people who work in the mills, and the people who work in the stores and factories should manifest by their concern that they have a full and deep awareness of the gravity of the situation. The pressure thus generated will at least call attention to the fact that Lawrence has a substantial equity in the country's industrial economy—an equity which it does not want to relinquish without a fight.

If Lawrence is now regarded as an aggressive community, and if this attitude of mind has won us favorable opinion outside of Lawrence, does it not follow that a greater aggressiveness, deriving its authority from a greater zeal, would inspire an even greater regard from what Lawrence has to offer? It is now nothing short of mandatory upon all of us to boost Lawrence in every way

possible. It is not something which we can afford to give a mere perfunctory attention. We have had our warning. When people see smoke in the distance they take note of it. If the smoke comes from the burning enthusiasm of Lawrenceans for the good city of Lawrence it would mean that here, at least, was a city where civic cohesiveness prevailed over independent concerns, where unity of purpose was embarked upon a creative attempt to safeguard its economic integrity. It could not fail to be impressive and it could not fail to have good results.

Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted to extend my remarks in the Appendix to the RECORD, I wish to submit a statement by the gentleman from California [Mr. YORTY] in regard to the tidelands question, as follows:

SANTA MARGARITA WATERSHED, CALIFORNIA

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to take this moment just to ask the Members of the House to interest themselves in a lawsuit pending in California that has national implications.

In our State the attorneys for the Lands Division of the Department of Justice are in the process of serving complaints on every person who owns land in the whole Santa Margarita watershed, asserting that the rights of the Government are paramount to the rights of every other user of water in that area, and asking that the title of the Government be quieted to the water which it asserts it owns by virtue of the national defense establishment at Camp Pendleton and by virtue of having acquired a ranch there called the Santa Margarita ranch.

Those people who have scoffed at the implications of the so-called tidelands decisions and failed to see the ultimate end of the theory of those cases; those who have felt that the theory would not be extended to other types of property; those people who have thought heretofore that the tidelands fight was merely some kind of a dispute between the Federal Government and the big oil companies; those who have failed to understand that a fundamental question of the sovereignty of our States is involved as well as the constitutional prohibition against taking private property without paying for it—those people had better wake up and examine this water suit in California.

Mr. Speaker, I also include in these remarks an article by Mr. Kimmis Hendrick, chief of the Pacific news bureau of the Christian Science Monitor, published in that paper on Saturday, June 16, 1951, as follows:

ARMS BASE STIRS WATER-RIGHT FIGHT IN WEST—FARMERS SEE FEDERAL INTERVENTION

(By Kimmis Hendrick)

FALL BROOK, CALIF.—Is the United States, under the guise of military necessity, attempting to usurp water rights which California farmers long have claimed?

Is the United States, indeed, attempting to confiscate what amounts to private property here, as one important western newspaper editorially contends?

These are burning questions in California at the moment. They are inspired by a water-rights suit filed in the United States

District Court at San Diego by the Office of the Attorney General of the United States, naming Fall Brook and other water users as defendants.

If the answer to either question is yes, it could mean that the United States is attempting to establish, in this obscure back country village, a revolutionary precedent. For many decades water rights have been regarded as under State, not Federal, sovereignty.

GROWERS WARY

Specifically and repeatedly, the United States is saying that it has no such intention. But the fear that it has persists in these parts, and California interests strongly opposed to Federal intervention in State affairs are echoing the fear far and wide.

The Government's complaint says it seeks to determine the water rights of its great marine base, Camp Joseph H. Pendleton, as riparian to the Santa Margarita River. In Fall Brook this is being taken as tantamount to an assertion of right to all the water in the river, to the annulment of rights locally claimed.

At the moment, because the case has yet to be tried, the only thing that can be done objectively is to report what both sides say and describe the background.

Fall Brook is a tiny place, friendly and beautiful. Tucked at the foot of coastal mountains, it is some 50 miles north of San Diego and inland about 20 from Oceanside. The village and its surrounding valley have perhaps 10,000 residents.

VITAL MINORITY

It may sound callous to say so, but nobody can call Fall Brook anything but a very small pebble in the pool of world affairs—especially when compared with Camp Pendleton in these days of defense urgency. Nobody, that is, except one who remembers, as the men of Fall Brook do decidedly, that in the American system small pebbles often rightly make big precedents.

Throughout the semiarid parts of the West, of course, any question of water rights can easily become a major issue. Here is land where water has to be husbanded drop by drop. When it is, deserts turn to rose gardens and dry valleys yield fabulous crops.

In little Fall Brook, enterprising men have turned one such valley to real riches. It is superb for avocados and lemons. A new avocado grove in this area may pay its taxes the third year. One 25-acre grove, perhaps better cared for than most, is netting \$2,000 an acre annually. The average comes closer to \$1,000. Lemons are almost equally profitable.

CLAIMS BIG SHARE

Can the Government develop Camp Pendleton as it wants to currently without taking away the water these growers, most of them small operators, require? The Government claims 35,000 acre-feet of water from the Santa Margarita, one of the growers' three sources of supply. This is more, actually, than the river's actual annual flow, which makes the suit, a civil action, look extraordinarily menacing to people hereabouts.

It appears that the defendants, including water users far up the river, run to from 12,000 to 16,000 in number. The chief defendant is the Fall Brook public utility district. Although it is reported that the Government may wish to excuse many of the defendants, it is generally understood that they must all respond, or they lose their water rights, however the case turns out.

COSTLY LEGAL TEST

It costs from \$50 to \$100 in legal fees for the individual to respond, Fall Brook people say, and whichever sum is multiplied by 12,000 or 16,000 defendants, the case promises to be an expensive proposition.

The suit has been represented as an attempted grab by the Government.

The influential Los Angeles Times, which thinks it is, quotes the opinion that it may become "California's biggest lawsuit." The Times sees the Government's claim—the complaint asserts "a paramount right"—as "an assertion of authority so sweeping that the upholding of it would result in the destruction of the private rights and negation of the fifth amendment."

SEE FIXED MENACE

Although some might find it difficult to read any such menace into the complaint, the fear has a certain plausibility in current western thought.

California is exceedingly disturbed by the Federal Government's assumption of tidelands sovereignty. Important interests also are disturbed by evidence that, in many places, the Federal Government is trying to establish a new concept of water rights which would put them under Federal instead of State jurisdiction.

In the West, the position always has been that who held the water controlled the land, and State water law, through long precedent and interpretation, has established such a pattern of ownership and control.

That is why many people regard the Fall Brook case as crucial. They also are concerned about it for a further reason. For years, in California, the military has been careful to put civilian needs foremost, and this looks like a reversal of that policy.

HUGE INVESTMENT

Camp Pendleton, its United States naval hospital, and the United States naval ammunition depot here occupy sites acquired by the Government during 1941-43, including the old Rancho Santa Margarita. They cover approximately 135,000 acres. They represent Federal investment in land and facilities exceeding \$100,000,000.

The property was selected, the Government says, because there was no other site on the entire west coast so suited to the need. It had land enough on which to house and train men, ocean beach enough for practice in amphibious warfare, and—or so it adds—water.

Fall Brook would find Pendleton a very congenial neighbor were it not for the problem involved in factor three. It is the Fall Brook position that the Government ought to go elsewhere for the water.

President Roosevelt said as much on November 29, 1944—that "an emergency exists in the water supply of Camp Pendleton" and "the Colorado River offers the only available source."

In 1949, marine officers and Fall Brook citizens sat down to confer on the whole matter and reached what lawyers call a memorandum of understanding.

NAVY PLAN UPSET

It provided for certain mutually satisfactory exchanges of water between the marine base and local water users. It assumed that extra water for the military would come from an addition to the aqueduct now bringing Colorado River water to San Diego.

Some time after the 1949 conference, the Department of Justice objected to the exchanges. It said the Navy could not give away water rights it had acquired by purchase of Rancho Santa Margarita.

Hence the current suit. More fundamentally, the Government says the reason for the suit is that it is not certain what its rights to the Santa Margarita are, and wants them determined.

Should the Fall Brook assumption prove correct that the Government wants more than this, it still remains a significant fact that the decision rests with the findings of a court of law.

It is not pleasant, naturally, for Fall Brook people to have to go to court, especially against their Government. Their widely known attorney in the case, Phil D. Swing, accurately refers to the plaintiff as "the most powerful antagonist in the world."

WANTS AIM CLARIFIED

In legal language, what is the problem from the Fall Brook view? On May 9 in San Diego, when Jacob Weinberger, presiding judge of the district court, heard and denied certain motions by the defendants, another defense attorney, Jesse R. O'Malley, put it like this:

"These landowners have to know whether they are faced with a claim that will wipe out their holdings or a claim for correlative rights. * * * (In other words, is the Government asking for all the water, or just its share?)

Speaking for the Government, which has sole jurisdiction over Camp Pendleton land under both California and Federal law, William H. Veeder, special assistant to the United States Attorney General, made these statements of record:

"We claim that the measure of our rights is the rights which we purchased from the Rancho Santa Margarita and the measure of our rights will fix our interests as they relate to all others on the stream. That is why we are here. * * *

"We readily admit that one of the most trying questions that will occur in this case is whether the United States, having bought a riparian right from the Santa Margarita River, may now use it for military purposes. We submit that we can. We say that Congress and Congress alone has the power in regard to those waters and that the laws of the State of California do not pertain to them."

GRAB DENIED

Then Mr. Veeder declared: "All that the United States is seeking here is to have its rights adjudicated as they pertain to other rights, and we are not seeking to take any rights from anyone."

This seems plain. Local reaction to it implies a fear that it does not mean what it says—else that the court could find that no one but the Government has rights, or that some long-claimed local rights are not valid.

This anxiety is measurably offset by the knowledge people around here have that Judge Weinberger knows the region—and is a jurist of marked humanitarianism. He found no reason to grant the defendants' motions to the Government's case, but he made this promise: "This is not to say, however, that the Government will be excused from making full disclosures and I am sure it has no desire to be excused."

That is to say, if the United States has a subtle purpose in this case, the judge will get it out in court. Which promise, certainly, should reassure the Fall Brook farmers.

CITE SAFEGUARDS

The Fall Brook farmers make it plain, by the way, that they are not wanting to keep their water rights just so they can be extravagant. They are in the forefront of San Diego County's fight to use every drop of water carefully during these drought years.

"We impound every drop of rain we can and put it down to replenish our wells," says George Yackey, chief engineer and general manager of the Fall Brook Public Utility District. He points to the small earth dams reared across little ravines and gulleys for that purpose.

The Fall Brook men cherish freedom as they cherish their valley. One recent Thursday noon when a typical group of them met for a Rotary Club luncheon, with the water problem much to the fore, they showed this heartily as they sang the first verse of America before they sat down. The familiar words were no mere sentiment; under the circumstances they sounded like the battle cry of justice:

"From every mountain side
Let freedom ring."

Inflation and Deflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, inflation has about run its course in this country. It was due to the following causes:

Following World War II, when we should have started the process of paying the cost of that war and getting our own house in order, our leaders, through the so-called bipartisan policy of reviving the world, instead of this country, started on the most extravagant foreign policy any country has ever known. Our tax money was scattered to the four winds of the earth in rehabilitating foreign countries and building the United Nations Organization and the Atlantic Pact to protect the world against what these leaders called the enslavement of the world by the forces of the Russian dictators. The power of communism was enlarged upon, and with it went a genuinely planned war scare, implying to the people of this country that we could not hope to prevent communism from overrunning this Nation unless we had the help of other countries. We were told how weak we were, and that as a last clear chance we must unite with other countries if we hoped to survive. This scared the people more, which was the planned intention.

We scattered billions around the world; we were strong enough for that, but too weak to defend ourselves, so we were told. This money—this gift money—was used in this country by foreign governments in the purchase of goods and munitions of war, and the price to those countries meant nothing, as it was gift money. Prices of everything ran up. For example, the British outbid us \$30 per thousand on our surplus war lumber, and our own dollars were used by foreign countries right here, which had the effect of boosting prices. There was no limit to our spending and furnishing money for foreign governments to spend. It meant nothing to them, as they were using our money, and not theirs. Dollars began to shrink in value, and the more the dollar shrank the more dollars we furnished.

As I see the situation, we have reached the peak of the inflation, no matter what controls are voted by Congress. What will naturally follow this busted spiral of prices? Deflation—not inflation—will be our worry from now on.

For several months now merchants in the large centers have put over installment buying to the limit, and as a result the working people are mortgaged up for months ahead. They bought on time and that kept business going. Listening to the radio, we can hear daily right now, "Come in and buy—make your own terms. A dollar down and as

much time as you want to pay the balance." Stores are loaded up with goods, but one of these days there will be no buyers and the buying power of the people is gradually drying up.

Taxes are the highest ever known in this country, and it was announced by the administration leaders that high taxes would stop inflation. This defies all economic laws. High taxes will cause deflation, but high taxes never stopped inflation.

If this bubble of skyrocketing prices is about to burst and we start on the decline, high taxes sap the buying power of the people. What they scrape up and hand over to the Government to squander on its wild-goose chase to convert the world to our ideas of democracy leaves just that much less for the people to use in buying what they need.

Installment buying will keep up a front for a time, but it will make the collapse that much more severe when real deflation hits.

Already the farmers of the United States have lost billions in buying power. In North Dakota alone the average wheat crop today will bring one hundred and forty millions less than it did when we started this system of tailing up every country from Dan to Beersheba. All other crops have lost buying power in proportion. The first symptoms of the deflation period will be discovered when manufacturing plants cannot sell—and when these plants cannot sell, they will close. When they close, men and women will lose their jobs. This process has already started and if it were not for war-plant business we would be up against it right now. I lived through just such a period in Congress following World War I. I have seen the time when 15,000,000 people were out of work in this country. They had no buying power, and worse than that, they could not obtain food and sufficient clothing and housing. I have seen mothers with hungry children trailing through the congressional offices asking for food.

Every sign points to a repetition of this sad experience. Nothing but a reversal of our foreign policy and the giving of some attention to conditions in this country will prevent a financial disaster. When this depression hits and people are not in debt they can stand quite a shock, but if they are in debt those debts cannot be paid and foreclosures and dispossessions will come thick and fast.

There is no country on earth—and some of them have received billions from us for nothing—that will come to our rescue—for two reasons: First, they will not be able to help us, and, second, we have been advertised throughout the world as a Santa Claus and no country will think we need help. We will be right up against it, as we are in Korea. The United Nations is a great organization, with 58 or 59 countries supposed to be linked up. In Korea, where the action is supposed to be supported by this great organization, 52 of those other countries have not supplied one man or one dollar. We have lost 20 men to 1 man lost by the entire number of other

nations engaged in that war, excepting South Korea.

The sooner we discover that we are living on this earth and not in the clouds, the sooner we quit this policy of going wool-gathering to every corner of the world to establish for others the famous "four freedoms," the sooner we quit spending our blood and resources in such an asinine adventure, the better we shall be able to protect this country from an enemy, or all the enemies this country has. We have many enemies. Human nature runs in nations as it does in individuals. If you want to lose a friend loan him money.

Suppose we had put 25 percent of the money we have spent on foreign countries into the building of our own defenses, does anyone with common sense feel that we need fear any country? Suppose we had put half of that staggering some eight hundred billions into the defenses of the United States in the air, on the sea, and on our land, would we now say that we cannot defend ourselves without the assistance of a fictitious United Nations?

So far as I am able to do it, I propose to advise the people of this country what we are up against now, and what we will be up against when the sharp talons of a depression hit us. Would it not be advisable to keep a few dollars on hand for our own defense?

Many millions of our people have been frugal enough to put money into savings bonds to aid them later in life. Do you not think we are getting close to the bottom of the tax barrel when we demand in a tax bill 20 percent of the interest on those savings bonds? The tax bill as written demanded interest on savings accounts, no matter how small—but the administration was shamed out of that, and the demand was given up.

According to the college advisers of the administration, a tax on savings bonds and accounts would stop inflation. I have been charged with many things, but I have never been charged with being a professor of economics. I do know absolutely, however, that to take interest on savings bonds away from the people will destroy their buying power, and loss of buying power brings on deflation.

Need for Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the *Norborne* (Mo.) Democrat-Leader of July 13, 1951:

DAM THE RIVER AND DAM IT NOW

It is impossible to estimate the damage to this community by the recent floods but it will run into thousands and thousands of dollars. Multiply this situation by the many communities of the Mississippi and Missouri

Valley and you arrive at a figure that even Washington would respect.

Many plans have been offered to control the rivers of the valley but none can be agreed upon. The most feasible plan is the one offered by the Army engineers to build a series of dams and reservoirs along the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers to hold and store this surplus water. Whether politics, big business, or both, are mixed up in this no decision affair should be ascertained.

We can, and are, sending billions of dollars to Europe under the Marshall plan in the hope it will make friends and influence people and prevent them from going Communist.

There is no danger of the Middle West going Communist but the people out here are getting tired of toting sandbags in an effort to hold a weak levee only to see their crops and homes go floating down the river.

The time has come to find out the views of your Representatives in Congress. We suggest you make inquiry of Senator JAMES P. KEM, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.; Senator THOMAS C. HENNING, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.; Representative MORGAN M. MOULDER, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.; Representative PHIL J. WELCH, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C. Tell them dam the river and dam it now.

General MacArthur's Address Before the Massachusetts Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Gen. Douglas MacArthur before the Massachusetts Legislature:

In this historic forum I recall vividly and reverently the memory of those great architects and defenders of liberty who immortalized the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. To this section of the country men point as the cradle of our freedom.

For here was established more than three centuries ago a declaration of rights from which ultimately came the constitutional mandate guaranteeing our civil liberties. Here men arose militantly in protest against the tyranny of oppressive rule of burdensome taxation. Here men engaged in formal combat to sever the distasteful bonds of colonial rule.

Here men etched the patriot's pattern which all races who harbored in their hearts a love for freedom have since sought to emulate. Here men, by their courage, vision, and faith, forged a new concept of modern civilization.

Before the descendants of these early American patriots I am honored, indeed, to address this legislative assembly in response to its thoughtful and kind invitation. I do so with neither partisan affiliation nor political purpose.

But I have been warned by many that an outspoken course, even if it be solely of truth, will bring down upon my head ruthless retaliation—that efforts will be made to destroy public faith in the integrity of my views—not by force of just argument but by the application of the false methods of propaganda. I am told in effect I must follow blindly the leader—keep silent, or take the bitter consequences.

I had thought Abraham Lincoln had pinned down for all time this ugly code when he declared: "To sin by silence when they should protest makes cowards of men."

I shall raise my voice as loud and as often as I believe it to be in the interest of the American people. I shall dedicate all of my energies to restoring to American life those immutable principles and ideals which your forebears and mine handed down to us in sacred trust. I shall assist in the regaining of that moral base for both public and private life which will restore the people's faith in the integrity of public institutions and the private faith of every man in the integrity of his neighbor.

I shall set my course to the end that no man need fear to speak the truth. I could not do less, for the opportunities for service my country has given me and the honors it has conferred upon me have imposed an obligation which is not discharged by the termination of public service.

MATERIAL SUPERIORITY CITED

Much that I have seen since my return to my native land after an absence of many years has filled me with immeasurable satisfaction and pride. Our material progress has been little short of phenomenal.

It has established an eminence in material strength so far in advance of any other nation or combination of nations that talk of imminent threat to our national security through the application of external force is pure nonsense.

It is not of any external threat that I concern myself but rather of insidious forces working from within which have already so drastically altered the character of our free institutions—those institutions which formerly we hailed at something beyond question or challenge—those institutions we proudly called the American way of life.

Foremost of these forces is that directly, or even more frequently indirectly, allied with the scourge of imperialistic communism. It has infiltrated into positions of public trust and responsibility—into journalism, the press, the radio, and the schools.

It seeks through covert manipulation of the civil power and the media of public information and education to pervert the truth, impair respect for moral values, suppress human freedom and representative government and, in the end, destroy our faith in our religious teachings.

This evil force, with neither spiritual base nor moral standard, rallies the abnormal and subnormal elements among our citizenry and applies internal pressure against all things we hold decent and all things that we hold right—the type of pressure which has caused many Christian nations abroad to fall and their own cherished freedoms to languish in the shackles of complete suppression.

As it has happened there it can happen here. Our need for patriotic fervor and religious devotion was never more impelling. There can be no compromise with atheistic communism—no half-way in the preservation of freedom and religion. It must be all or nothing.

We must unite in the high purpose that the liberties etched upon the design of our life by our forefathers be unimpaired and that we maintain the moral courage and spiritual leadership to preserve inviolate that mighty bulwark of all freedom, our Christian faith.

LIKENED TO TEA-PARTY ERA

It was the adventurous spirit of Americans which despite risks and hazards carved a great nation from an almost impenetrable wilderness; which established the pattern for modern industrialization and scientific development; which built our own almost unbelievable material progress and favorably influenced that of all others; which through the scientific advance of means of communication closed the international geographic gap to permit rapid and effective trade and

commerce among the peoples of the world; which raised the living standard of the American people beyond that ever before known; and which elevated the laborer, the farmer and the tradesman to their rightful station of dignity and relative prosperity.

This adventurous spirit is now threatened as it was in the days of the Boston Tea Party by an unconscionable burden of taxation. This is sapping the initiative and energies of the people and leaves little incentive for the assumption of those risks which are inherent and unescapable in the forging of progress under the system of free enterprise.

Worst of all, it is throwing its tentacles around the low income bracket sector of our society, from whom is now exacted the major share of the cost of government. This renders its paper income largely illusory.

The so-called forgotten man of the early thirties now is indeed no longer forgotten as the Government levies upon his income as the main remaining source to defray reckless spendthrift policies.

More and more we work not for ourselves but for the state. In time, if permitted to continue, this trend cannot fail to be destructive. For no nation may survive in freedom once its people become the servants of the state, a condition to which we are now pointed with dreadful certainty. Labor, as always, will be the first to feel its frightful consequences.

It is quite true that some levy upon the people's earnings to pay the cost of government is unavoidable. But the costs of government, even discounting extraordinary military requirements, have risen at an accelerated, alarming, and reckless rate.

Nothing is heard from those in supreme executive authority concerning the possibility of a reduction or even limitation upon these mounting costs. No suggestion deals with the restoration of some semblance of a healthy balance. No plan is advanced for easing the crushing burden already resting upon the people.

To the contrary, all that we hear are the plans by which such costs progressively may be increased. New means are constantly being devised for greater call upon the taxable potential as though the resources available were inexhaustible. We compound irresponsibility by seeking to share what liquid wealth we have with others.

In so doing we recklessly speak of the billions we would set aside for the purpose, as though they were inconsequential. There can be no quarrel with altruism. Such has ever been a predominant quality making up the nobility of the American character. We should do all in our power to alleviate the suffering and hardship of other peoples, and to support their own maximum effort to preserve their freedom from the assaults of Communist imperialism.

But when this effort is carried beyond the ability to pay, or to the point that the attendant burden upon our own people becomes insufferable, or places our own way of life and freedom in jeopardy, then it ceases to be altruism and becomes reckless imprudence. I have yet to see evidence that such vast outlays were preceded by the slightest concern for the ultimate effect it will have upon our own liberties and standards of life.

NO WAY OF REPLENISHMENT

This Nation's material wealth is built upon the vision and courage, the sweat and toil, hope and faith of our people. There has been no magic involved upon which we might again call to replenish our denuded coffers.

We can either advance upon the security of sound principles or we can plunge on to the precipice of disaster toward which we are now headed in the dangerous illusion that our wealth is inexhaustible—and can therefore be limitlessly shared with others.

It is argued that we must give boundlessly if we are to be insured allies in an emergency.

I reject this reasoning as an unwarranted calumny against well-tested friends of long standing. The survival of the free world is infinitely more dependent upon the maintenance of a strong, vigorous, healthy, and independent America as a leavening influence than upon any financial aid which we might provide under our own existing stringencies.

The free world's one great hope for survival now rests upon the maintaining and preserving of our own strength. Continue to dissipate it and that one hope is dead. If the American people would pass on the standard of life and the heritage of opportunity they themselves have enjoyed to their children and their children's children they should ask their representatives in Government:

"What is the plan for the easing of the tax burden upon us? What is the plan for bringing to a halt this inflationary movement which is progressively and inexorably decreasing the purchasing power of our currency, nullifying the protection of our insurance provisions, and reducing those of fixed income to hardship and even despair?"

I fear these questions, if asked, would be met by stony silence. For just as in Korea there has been no plan. We have long drifted aimlessly with the sole safeguard against the ineptitude of our leaders resting upon American enterprise, American skill and American courage. But once the incentive for the maximizing of these great attributes is lost the bulwark to support our failures is gone and the American way of life as we have known it will be gravely threatened.

LET-DOWN IN HIGH PLACES

Indivisible from this trend and probably contributory to it is a growing tendency to overlook certain forms of laxity in high quarters. Petty corruption in the public administration is a disease unfortunately common to all nations but I refer to an even more alarming situation.

Men of significant stature in national affairs appear to cower before the threat of reprisal if the truth be expressed in criticism of those in higher public authority.

For example, I find in existence a new and heretofore unknown and dangerous concept that the members of our Armed Forces owe primary allegiance and loyalty to those who temporarily exercise the authority of the executive branch of Government, rather than to the country and its Constitution which they are sworn to defend.

No proposition could be more dangerous. None could cast greater doubt upon the integrity of the armed services.

For its application would at once convert them from their traditional and constitutional role as the instrument for the defense of the Republic into something partaking of the nature of a pretorian guard, owing sole allegiance to the political master of the hour.

While for the purpose of administration and command the armed services are within the executive branch of the Government, they are accountable as well to the Congress, charged with the policy-making responsibility, and to the people, ultimate repository of all national power.

Yet so inordinate has been the application of the Executive power that members of the armed services have been subjected to the most arbitrary and ruthless treatment for daring to speak the truth in accordance with conviction and conscience.

DISMISSAL IS DISCERNED

I hesitate to refer to my own relief from the Far Eastern Commands as I have never questioned the legal authority underlying such action. But the three sole reasons publicly stated by the highest authority clearly demonstrate the arbitrary nature of the decision.

The first reason given was that, contrary to existing policy, I warned of the strategic

relationship of Formosa to American security and the dangers inherent in this area's falling under Communist control. Yet this viewpoint has since been declared by the Secretary of State, under oath before congressional committees, to have been and to be the invincible and long-standing policy of the United States.

The second reason given was that I communicated my readiness to meet the enemy commander at any time to discuss acceptable terms of a cease-fire arrangement. Yet, for this proposal, I was relieved of my command by the same authorities who since have received so enthusiastically the identical proposal when made by the Soviet Government.

The third and final reason advanced was my replying to a Congressman's request for information on a public subject then under open consideration by the Congress. Yet both Houses of Congress promptly passed a law confirming my action, which indeed had been entirely in accordance with a long-existing and well-recognized though unwritten policy.

This law states that no member of the Armed Forces shall be restricted or prevented from communicating directly or indirectly with any Member or Members of Congress concerning any subject unless such communication is in violation of law or the security and safety of the United States. And this formal enactment of basic public policy was approved without the slightest dissent by the President.

Is there wonder that men who seek an objective understanding of American policy thinking become completely frustrated and bewildered? Is there wonder that Soviet propaganda so completely dominates American foreign policy? And, indeed, what is our foreign policy?

We hear impassioned appeals that it be bipartisan—violent charges that sinister efforts are being made to obstruct and defeat it—but I defy you or any other man to tell me what it is. It has become a mass of confused misunderstandings and vacillations. It has meant one thing today—another tomorrow. It has almost blown with every wind, changed with every tide.

The sorry truth is we have no policy. Expediencies as variable and shifting as the exigencies of the moment seem to be the only guide. Yesterday, we disarmed, today we arm and what of tomorrow? We have been told of the war in Korea that it is the wrong war, with the wrong enemy, at the wrong time and in the wrong place. Does this mean that they intend and indeed plan what they would call a right war, with a right enemy, at a right time and in a right place?

If successful in mounting the North Atlantic Pact in 1953 or 1954 or at one of the ever changing dates fixed for its consummation, what comes then? Do we mean to throw down a gage of battle? Do we mean to continue the fantastic fiscal burden indefinitely to our inevitable exhaustion?

NEITHER VICTORY NOR DEFEAT

Is our only plan to spend and spend and spend? Do we intend to resist by force Red aggression in southeast Asia if it develops? Do we intend to take over commitments in the explosive Middle East? Do we intend to enter into a series of military alliances abroad? Do we intend to actually implement by force of arms the so-called Truman plan? These are questions that disturb us because there is no answer forthcoming. We do want and need unity and bipartisanship in our foreign policy—but when there is no policy we can but dangerously drift.

In Korea, despite the magnificent performance of our fighting forces, the result has been indecisive. The high moral purposes which so animated and inspired the world a year ago yielded to the timidity and fear

of our leaders as after defeating our original enemy a new one entered the field which they dared not fight to a decision. Appeasement thereafter became the policy of war on the battlefield.

In the actual fighting with this new enemy we did not lose but neither did we win. Yet, it can be accepted as a basic principle proven and reproven since the beginning of time that a great nation which enters upon war and fails to see it through to victory must accept the full moral consequences of defeat.

Now that the fighting has temporarily abated the outstanding impression which emerges from the scene is the utter uselessness of the enormous sacrifice in life and limb which has resulted. A million soldiers on both sides and unquestionably at least a like number of civilians are maimed or dead. A nation has been gutted and we stand today just where we stood before it all started.

The threat of aggression upon the weak by those callously inclined among the strong has not diminished. Indeed, nothing has been settled. No issue has been decided.

This experience again emphasizes the utter futility of modern war—its complete failure as an arbiter of international dissensions. Its threat must be abolished if the world is to go on—and if it does not go on it will go under.

We must finally come to realize that war is outmoded as an instrument of political policy, that it provides no solution for international suicide. We must understand that in final analysis the mounting cost of preparation for war is in many ways as materially destructive as war itself. We must find the means to avoid this great sapping of human energy and resource.

This requires leadership of the highest order—a spiritual and moral leadership—a leadership which our country alone is capable of providing. While we must be prepared to meet the trial of war if war comes, we should gear our foreign and domestic policies toward the ultimate goal—the abolition of war from the face of the earth.

This is what practically all mankind—all the great masses which populate the world—long and pray for. Therein lies the road, the only road, to universal peace and prosperity. We must lead the world down that road however long and tortuous and illusory it may now appear.

Such is the role as I see it for which this great Nation of ours is now cast. In this we follow the cross. If we meet the challenge we cannot fail. But no end may be achieved without first making a start—no success without a trial.

ABOLISH, NOT CONTROL, WAR

On this problem of greatest universal concern, unless we address ourselves to the fundamentals we shall get no farther than the preceding generations which have tried and failed. Convention after convention has been entered into designed to humanize war and bring it under the control of rules dictated by the highest human ideals. Yet each war becomes increasingly savage as the means for mass killing are further developed.

You cannot control war; you can only abolish it. Those who shrug this off as idealistic are the real enemies of peace—the real warmongers. Those who lack the enterprise, vision, and courage to try a new approach when none others have succeeded fail completely the most simple test of leadership.

As I have traveled through the country since my return, I find a great transformation in America, thought to be taking place. Our apathy is disappearing. American public opinion is bargaining to exert its immense power. The American people are expressing themselves with dynamic force on foreign policy. This is exerting a profound influence upon the Soviet course of action.

Few events in the life of our Republic have been of more significant importance nor

more heartening than this rallying of the collective will of the American people. They are putting pressure upon their own leaders and upon the leaders of those with whom we are directly or indirectly engaged. And just as it has cast its influence upon policy and events abroad it can be brought to bear with no less telling effect upon policy and events at home.

Therein lies our best hope in the battle to save America—the full weight of an aroused, informed and militant public opinion. I stated in Texas:

"If it be that my relief was the spark which ignited this great power of American public expression; which caused our people to rise above the level of narrow partisanship to unite in a common crusade to effect a spiritual rebirth in American life; which restored to the American people the full glory and dignity of self-rule under those same high principles and ideals which animated our fathers; which restored a lost faith in ourselves and our free institutions; which provided the symbol for rallying the mighty forces for good throughout the land—then I would be thankful, indeed, to a farseeing and merciful providence and could not ask for more."

We stand today at a critical moment in history—at a vital crossroad. In one direction is the path of courageous patriots seeking in humility but the opportunity to serve their country, the other that of those selfishly seeking to entrench autocratic power.

The one group stands for implacable resistance against communism; the other for compromising with communism. The one stands for our traditional system of government and freedom; the other for a socialist state and slavery.

The one boldly speaks the truth; the other spreads propaganda, fear, and deception. The one denounces excessive taxation, bureaucratic government and corruption; the other seeks more taxes, more bureaucratic power, and shields corruption.

The people, as the ultimate rulers, must choose the course our Nation shall follow. On their decision rests the future of our free civilization and the survival of our Christian faith. Not for a moment do I doubt that decision or that it will guide the Nation to a new and fuller greatness. Good night

Reserve Officers Association of the United States Express Profound Sorrow Over the Death of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the president of the Reserve Officers Association on July 23, 1951, expressed the deep regret and sorrow of the reservists of the country to Mrs. Forrest P. Sherman, the wife of the former Chief of Naval Operations who died yesterday in Europe.

Col. John P. Coleman, of Dayton, Ohio, the national president of the group of 70,000 Reserve officers, said:

Admiral Sherman had the affection and confidence of all reservists. His firm hand at the tiller of the Navy will be missed sorely. He was a good friend to the civilian sailors of the Naval Reserve and was respected sincerely by reservists of the other services.

Colonel Coleman also announced that the ROA's distinguished service citation of outstanding service to the country will be awarded Admiral Sherman posthumously.

We had intended to present the admiral with the citation when he finished his term as Chief of Naval Operations—

Coleman said.

It is fitting and proper that his family at least be aware of the association's high regard for him.

The distinguished service citation, which has been awarded only three times before, is the highest honor the Reserve Association makes to military leaders.

The Soil Conservation Service—What It Does and How

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Soil Conservation Service has no one engaged in demonstration work. That type of work was eliminated from Service activities when the agency completed the first stage of its operation in 1944.

No one in the Service is employed in teaching, except that some of the more experienced technicians spend short periods occasionally in familiarizing SCS technical employees with the in-Service techniques of soil conservation.

Eighty-five percent of the funds of the Service are spent for employees' salaries, not for demonstration or teaching; but for actually going with farmers through their fields and pastures and over their idle lands, and up and down their gullies and eroded areas to prepare cooperatively with the farmer a blueprint, acre by acre, for the entire farm. If the farmer is satisfied with the blueprint and reaches the stage of wanting a plan applied to his land, then again the technicians of the Soil Conservation Service go out on the farm and help the actual application of the conservation job to the land.

This kind of work has to be done through the instrumentality of human beings. It is an action program of lay-out work and technical guidance. The best estimates we have indicate that we are still losing today around 500,000 acres of land every year—that much ruined or made unfit for further immediate practical cultivation as the result of excessive erosion, which we now know how to prevent. I think it should be pointed out in this connection that the Bureau of Agricultural Economics is said to have estimated that about 2½ acres of reasonably good land are required to produce a minimum, adequate, nutritional diet per capita. Others have pointed out that ½ acre additional is required per capita for the production of various raw materials of industry, such as cotton and flax. At this time,

with the population estimated at 154,000,000 (and increasing annually at the rate of 2,000,000), we have, according to estimates with respect to our present area of good cropland, only about 3.2 acres per capita. So we have not just a limited area of good cropland, but, in effect, a decreasing limited area. We must continue the soil conservation program at full speed or we will be a deficit Nation with respect to our supply of productive land. Getting to work on this basic job was delayed too long in the first place. Very little was done to halt the inroads of erosion until the program of the Soil Conservation Service got under way in the early thirties. Our delay cost us in the neighborhood of 100,000,000 acres of cropland.

If our population should continue to increase by 2,000,000 a year for so much as 10 years, and if we dilly-dally with our going and highly effective program of soil conservation, we will become a deficit Nation, while now we are supposed to be the leader of the world.

Last year alone some 6,500,000 acres of land was treated with conservation practices.

It is not unusual for good corn land in the Corn Belt to lose 60 tons of soil per acre annually by erosion under ordinary farming practices. The production of this land, on the average, is now about 60 bushels of corn per acre. In other words, a ton of soil is lost by erosion to each bushel of corn produced, or 36 pounds of soil required for the production of each pound of grain. Assuming that all the stalks and cobs are returned to the land, it takes approximately 2 pounds of ordinary Corn Belt soil to furnish the mineral nutrients required to produce 1 pound of grain. Consequently, 18 times as much soil is lost by erosion as it takes to supply necessary nutrients for corn without soil-conservation practices.

A relatively small percent of the total conservation job has been completed to date. The total conservation job of the Nation includes all kinds of farm and range land, not just a part of the land.

Contributions are being made by many States and State agencies, particularly by the State agricultural experiment stations and the State conservation departments. It must be remembered that the farmers themselves are contributing, as well as can be determined, about three-fourths of the cost of the job.

Soil-conservation work is going too slowly, we all agree, especially when we think of the annual loss of 500,000 acres each year, with additional damage to even more land. If we could, it would be most fortunate to finish the job within the next 10 years; but it probably cannot be finished that quickly. When I say finished, I mean the application of the needed basic conservation measures to the land, up to the stage of maintenance. The work is going much faster in some parts of the country than in others. It seems to go slower where the average productivity of the land is very much above the average of the United States. Probably this is because the farmer in these better areas feels that

his annual losses from erosion, while considerable, may not be serious enough to jeopardize his farm any time soon.

In some parts of the country, the soil-conservation program is going much more rapidly because the hazards have been of a much more threatening nature. In some sections it was not difficult for the farmers to see that in 3 or 4 or 5 years they would have to go out of the farming business if the erosion could not be reduced with practical measures. There are some counties in some parts of the country where conservation has progressed so rapidly that the farmers are beginning to talk about proper methods of celebrating the completion of the job—up to the state of maintenance. Actually, in a number of counties the job of applying the basic conservation measures have been completed to the extent of 80 to 90 percent.

I am proud to say that the farmers of the Seventh Iowa District are in the forefront in effectively conserving their priceless soil.

Why Shouldn't They Be Americans?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Blake Clark, appearing in the August number of Reader's Digest condensed from the Freeman. How much longer will the Congress delay action to remove the last remnants of the worst blot on America's record—discrimination against people of Asian ancestry just because of their race? How much longer will we jeopardize the lives of Americans by failing to remove the insult which denies us the full trust and good will of a billion people?

WHY SHOULDN'T THEY BE AMERICANS?

(By Blake Clark)

Mrs. Nawa Munemori is the mother of an American World War II hero. A grateful nation bestowed the Congressional Medal of Honor on her son, Sadao, for wiping out two machine-gun nests and throwing himself on an exploding hand grenade to save his fellow soldiers. The United States Army transport, *Pvt. Sadao Munemori*, which brought his regiment home from Europe, bears his name today. Yet Mrs. Munemori, his widowed mother, is denied citizenship by the country for which her son sacrificed his life.

Mrs. Munemori symbolizes the plight of victims of our outmoded immigration and naturalization laws, which discriminate against worthy people purely on the basis of their race. These antiquated statutes give the Communists in the Far East a powerful anti-American propaganda weapon and damage our relations with the people of Asia.

The situation of some 85,000 aliens in this country demonstrates the unfairness of the position we have taken. About 80,000 are Japanese; 5,000 are Koreans and Polynesians, with a sprinkling of other nationalities.

These residents legally entered this country before 1924. The Immigration Act of that year permitted them to remain here but continued to deny them the rights of naturalization that were granted to European immigrants. The sole consideration affecting our treatment of these long-time settlers is their race.

Sir Peter Buck, for example, a former professor of anthropology at Yale University, is one of the world's outstanding scientists in his field. England was proud to knight him, but he is refused the privilege of United States citizenship. Sir Peter is the son of an Irish father and a Maori mother. The fact that he is half-Maori—and that alone—bars Sir Peter from citizenship in his beloved adopted country.

Before his recent appointment as Korean Ambassador to the United States, Dr. Y. C. Yang was a prominent Honolulu physician and had practiced in this American community for half a lifetime. He was educated in the United States, is married to an American, and is the father of an American daughter. Dr. Yang would have welcomed American citizenship long ago had it been possible.

When Pearl Harbor was attacked, Dr. Yang responded immediately to an emergency appeal for medical volunteers to treat the wounded. He worked indefatigably to save the lives of many American seamen. He then volunteered in the Hawaii National Guard. After being commissioned a captain and serving 2 weeks, he was notified that his services could no longer be accepted. As a Korean, he was classified as an enemy alien. He could not serve his chosen country because of his race.

The Japanese—the largest group affected—have probably contributed more to America than any other Asiatics. Their sons formed the famous Four Hundred and Forty-second Regimental Combat Team, which probably received more decorations and suffered more casualties than any unit of similar size in the entire United States Army, yet these parents cannot become citizens.

The abuses against those of Japanese origin are compounded in California where many of them live. There State law forbids an alien ineligible for citizenship from owning a farm. Men who have turned acres of desert waste into green, producing fields can cultivate the land only as hired hands.

The California law makes it a crime for a Japanese alien to "enjoy, use, occupy, be, or remain on the land, or have a beneficial interest in the land, its crops, or proceeds." Temporarily in abeyance pending court decision on a case, this prejudiced law has been so strictly enforced in some counties that families cannot live together. California filed a suit to seize the property of Mrs. Roy K. Hirata, born an American citizen and mother of three citizen children, because her alien husband had helped her cultivate her farm and lived on it. Hirata had to leave home and watch hired strangers gather the crops he had planted.

Akira Iwamura was eager to get home after 2 years with Army Intelligence in the Pacific. His father had bought 60 acres of good Fresno grape land in his citizen son's name in 1938, and had been taking care of it for him. California welcomed Akira home from war service with a demand that he forfeit his land—because his alien parent had a beneficial interest in it. Akira's lawyer advised him to settle out of court. In exchange for the State's "quieting the title," Akira had to pay half the assessed value of the land to buy back his own acres.

California is not alone in making the racially ineligible alien run a stiff obstacle course for his livelihood. Nowhere from the Pacific to the Atlantic can he be a lawyer or certified public accountant. Despite shortages in important professions, 26 States prohibit his making a living as a dentist, 25 as

a physician, 18 as a teacher. Some 500 laws passed by various States bar him from such work as a real estate or insurance agent, pharmacist, or civil servant. In some States he cannot even accept an old-age pension, although money toward it may have been withheld from his wages.

The Immigration Act of 1924 was passed to prevent a horde of foreigners from flooding our shores and depressing our wage scales. Legislators worked out an equitable system, as far as the nations of the Old World were concerned. It was agreed that America could readily assimilate 150,000 immigrants a year, about one-sixth of 1 percent of our population as reported in the 1920 census. A quota was assigned to each nation, based on the number of residents each had contributed to our population.

But, with the exception of Persia and parts of Afghanistan and Russia, oriental nations received no quota at all. Instead, they were described as constituting the "Asiatic barred zone," and were told to keep out. According to Joseph C. Grew, former ambassador to Japan, it was perhaps the worst mistake we ever made in our relations with the Orient. This gross insult placed a potent weapon in the hands of the Japanese militarists. They used it to promote "Asia for the Asiatics" throughout the Far East.

During the war the folly of asking aid from the Chinese while barring them as racially inferior became so obvious that in 1943 we exempted them from the excluded groups. Later the bans against India and the Philippines were lifted. It is time to wipe our record clean of the remaining blot which mar our relations with potential friends and allies.

On a recent trip around the world I heard repercussions of this short-sighted race prejudice at every stop. In Bangkok a newspaperman said that Communist editors in the Far East constantly told their readers that we consider orientals racially inferior and despise them. An American official in Rangoon declared that the Burmese ask constantly if the status of our "outcast law" has been changed.

"The Communists," said a Korean, "accuse America of fighting a colonial war here. If you extend us a quota, it will help show you mean it when you say we deserve equal democratic rights." In Japan the chief news over Radio Tokyo for days dealt with the hearings in the House of Representatives on a bill to abolish this racial clause.

Correcting these abuses would not result in a large flow of foreigners into the United States. Japan's annual quota would be a mere 185, most of the other Asiatic areas would have 100 each. If every excluded group used a full quota each year, their total would not equal 1 percent of our 150,000 yearly immigrants. In actual practice, the number of arrivals would be even fewer. Qualifications such as literacy, health, and ability to earn a living would keep the number of immigrants from some countries low. In all we could expect each year less than a thousand newcomers, a comparatively infinitesimal number.

Public-opinion polls show that the great majority of Americans, including Californians, do not want any person denied citizenship because of his race. A bill to this effect, supported by church and civic groups and by our Departments of Justice and State, has three times passed the House by unanimous vote, only to be stopped in Senate committee. Representative WALTER JUDN, well-known authority on the Far East, and one of the bill's sponsors, is convinced that if it could be brought to the floor for a vote the majority of Senators would agree with the majority of other Americans.

Before the end of World War II the United States and Nazi Germany were the only two major nations that used race as a test for

naturalization. Now we alone maintain this discrimination. In Asia we face a well-organized minority attempting to unite the east against us. We can show the people of the Orient we stand back of our national pledge of "liberty and justice for all" by welcoming worthy persons and providing them equality under our naturalization and immigration laws. From a purely selfish standpoint, wiping discrimination off the books as well as out of our hearts would be worth more to us in the Orient than a dozen Army divisions.

Address of Secretary Acheson at the Opening of the Two Hundred and Fiftieth Birthday Celebration of the City of Detroit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I place in the *Record* the address of the Honorable Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, at the opening of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the city of Detroit, Veterans Memorial Building, Detroit, Mich., on Tuesday, July 24, 1951:

LOOKING AHEAD

Mr. Chairman, I am honored to be here today to take part in Detroit's two hundred and fiftieth birthday party.

This is an occasion of importance—to our country and to the world, as is evidenced by the presence here of the distinguished Ambassadors of Great Britain, of France, and of our next-door neighbor, Canada. Their presence reminds us of the many contributions their countries have made to the fabulous growth of this community.

We are also honored tonight by the presence of Dr. Ralph Bunche, citizen not only of Detroit, but of the world.

Two hundred and fifty years ago, this 24th of July, Cadillac brought ashore his 100 men to build a fort where Detroit now stands. In the language of our reports from the front this might be called establishing an outpost in platoon strength. But this would wholly miss its significance, and his own idea of what he was doing.

In the narrow strait commanding the passage between the two great lakes of Erie and Huron, Cadillac saw a secure position, a commanding position, an economic position for trade and commerce. And he saw all of this with the eyes and mind of a pioneer—shrewd, aware of dangers, aware of opportunities, but dominated always by the driving power of an idea—the idea of discovery, of building, of creating, of enlarging, of leaving behind him something new and challenging and alive—something which would change the whole life of man on this globe.

To the pioneer, security came first. He knew the dangers beyond every bend in the river, behind every tree. He had seen hundreds of charred or smoking ruins and the horrors around them. He kept his equipment operational and his powder dry. He understood propaganda, although he didn't know the word. Whatever the word was, it didn't fool him. Most of his people made bullets, sharpened their cutting weapons, built forts and mounted guard while the others cleared the fields, cultivated them, and traded. If the military program failed everyone got killed.

Cadillac was building for a future greater than he could have known. How little could he have foreseen the majestic and powerful community which Detroit has become, a symbol to all the world of the New World's industrial might.

We, too, are pioneers. We, too, are making beginnings that arch into the future beyond the limits of our vision—the beginnings of a world secure, free and infinitely productive. Like the founder of Detroit, we draw upon our faith in the future to meet the dangers of the present.

Here in the heart of this Nation's great productive power is a fitting place from which to look ahead to the job that faces us in the world. For the factories of Detroit, built by American labor, commerce, and industry, symbolize the power of American production which may tip the balance of history in our times.

For us, as for all pioneers, security comes first.

We are in great danger, greater perhaps than many Americans now appreciate. This danger is not less than it was a month ago, although some of us seem to think so.

You may recall Aesop's old fable about an argument between the North Wind and the Sun. They were trying to see which one could take off the coat of a man who happened to be passing by.

The Wind tried first. It blew and blew, and the icy blasts made the poor man shiver with cold. But the more the Wind blew the more the man clutched his coat about him, and finally the Wind gave up.

Then came the Sun. Out from behind a cloud it came, and shone gently and warmly.

And the man, of his own accord, removed his coat.

This fable illustrates our present danger. The icy blast of Korea made many people realize the need for building our strength. But, as soon as the slightest break in the clouds appeared, some of our fellow citizens were ready to relax into the nearest rocking chair.

In Korea, General Ridgway and his command are alert against a trap.

But are we alert against falling into a bigger trap here at home? Will the warm sunshine of a false propaganda "peace" campaign lead us to think that our problems are solved and that we can safely let down our defense effort? That would be a dangerous and costly mistake.

Whether or not an armistice results from the talks in Korea, the fundamental job ahead of us will not change.

The attack on Korea brought home to many of us the readiness of the Communists to risk war. And it gave an impetus to our arms-building program. But it was not Korea alone that was the reason for our defense effort.

Whether or not there is peace in Korea, whether our adversaries are cooing like doves or growling like bears, our job remains the same. The threat we face remains the same.

The world has never known a more ruthless or more powerful challenge to the independence of nations and the freedom of men.

The tactics of the Kremlin are flexible, and may change from season to season. But so long as its power is of threatening proportions, and so long as it does not show a willingness to work for a stable and peaceful world, the danger to us remains.

We must move ahead steadily and firmly to build our strength, regardless of what tune the Soviet Union happens to be playing at the moment. In that strength lies our only security. We must not be distracted from it by the switching-on of a Russian lullaby.

Neither war nor weakness is the way to meet the Soviet challenge. We will counter force with force, if necessary, but war does not solve problems—it multiplies them. Weakness, on the other hand, would lead to defeat, with or without war. Between these

two extremes lies a middle course, which seeks to block Soviet expansionism without war, by building an effective system of collective security, and by making it strong. This is the course we are following.

The job before us—the great rearmament effort of the free nations—has an urgent priority, if we are to reduce the risk of war and pass safely through the dangers of these next few years.

The danger of war and of disintegration will continue until the free nations have fully repaired their military weakness. It must be understood that weakness not only invites attack; what is even more menacing, it paralyzes the will to resist and makes for political disintegration.

The massive effort which is just now gaining momentum in our country and among our allies to build up our armaments is not an endless job, nor one without limits. It has specific goals, both as to amounts and as to time.

What we are building is an adequate deterrent force against military attack. We already have the means to guarantee that a general military attack against us would be costly to the aggressors. We must now achieve a force of sufficient size to make it plain that such an attack could not succeed.

How big does this force need to be? Our best military experts, working together with those of our allies, have developed strategic plans which estimate the numbers of men, planes, tanks, guns, and so forth, which we and our allies need to insure that a Soviet attack upon us could not succeed.

We do not have to match the Soviet armies man for man, or gun for gun, since our mission is to deter, not to attack, but we have a long way to go before we reach a safe deterrent level.

Communist armed forces at present total some 9,000,000 men. The Soviet Union has more than 4,000,000 men under arms. Chinese Communist forces exceed 3,500,000 men. The European satellite regimes have nearly 1,000,000 men.

The Soviet Union has more than 260 divisions, fully mobilized. In addition, the Soviet Union has a trained reserve of massive proportions. The Soviet air force is the world's largest in peacetime, with more than 20,000 first-line aircraft, a large proportion of which are jets of excellent quality.

What these figures mean for us is that we have a long way to go before we can breathe more easily.

Let's look at what we are doing to reduce as quickly as we can this risk of war.

First of all, we are building strength at the center. We are mobilizing the great strength of the United States so that we will have readily available forces, and a production base that will enable us to expand rapidly if necessary.

Within the past year, we have advanced the timetable of this effort, but it is still short of what we must do. If we are to meet our minimum goals, we will have to do more than we are now doing. And it may be necessary to raise our sights to higher goals.

This is a job which needs to be done co-operatively with our allies. We cannot do it alone, or without an effective organization of the total allied effort. Side by side with our defense program at home, therefore, we are helping to build a force in being in Europe.

Under General Eisenhower, the integrated force of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has been moving rapidly from a paper organization to the beginning of a real defense system. The command structure is functioning; actual divisions are under his command; new divisions are being formed and trained; the nucleus of his tactical air force is conducting maneuvers. A program for expanding the network of allied tactical air bases in Europe has been launched.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization has come to grips with the problem of developing the military production potential of Western Europe. We are working together to lick the financial problems, the raw material problems, and the many other problems which must be overcome in the process of building strength together.

We are greatly encouraged by the progress our European partners are making in strengthening their unity of operation. Many of us do not realize what progress has been made toward European unity in just the past 2 or 3 years.

The North Atlantic Treaty idea of pooling military strength is a revolutionary peacetime accomplishment. At Paris, several of the European nations are now in conference seeking to carry this principle further forward by establishing a single European defense force. We are deeply concerned with the success of this conference, and we are doing all that friendly cooperation can do to help it succeed.

This effort is of a piece with the bold vision and promise of the Schuman plan—which will pool the coal and steel industries of Western Europe.

The vast free market of the United States, which allows raw materials and human skills to be used efficiently, has shown us the value of breaking down local trade barriers. We do not have one automobile industry in Texas and another in North Dakota and another in Florida. We build steel mills and parts factories and assembly plants wherever they can efficiently serve the entire country, without regard to State lines. The Schuman plan is a step in this direction in Europe.

By such steps as this and the proposed European defense force, we believe that our European partners can continue to move toward greater unity and greater strength.

Although our joint progress toward an effective defense force in Europe has been considerable, it is not enough, when measured against the goals that are necessary to insure our common safety. No one can be satisfied with the progress so far made. A greater effort is required, from us and from our allies. This effort must be measured according to our economic capacities since economic health is an important foundation for defensive strength.

Along with our effort at home and in Europe, we are also seeking to build other situations of strength in Asia, the Middle East, and other parts of the world, as a bulwark against further advances of Communist imperialism.

The treaty of peace with Japan will be taking concrete form in a little more than a month, and it will be followed by security treaties with Japan, and with Australia and New Zealand. These are in addition to our long-standing commitments to the Philippines, whose security is as much our concern as the defense of our own land.

What we are now doing, in this total effort at home and in various parts of the world, is building up the capital equipment of a defense system. We started with very little, and several years of very hard effort are before us—even harder than we have yet put forth.

But the greater our effort now, the more rapidly will we pass through the present period of maximum danger.

When we have achieved our goals, when we have acquired the capital equipment of an adequate defense, we must not again be foolish enough to destroy it, to relax our guard. Once the capital cost has been met, military expenditures and military aid programs will be substantially less. Once a level of defense has been achieved which should deter any power from plunging the world into war, the task will shift from creating defenses to maintaining them. But they must be maintained, and fully maintained.

Until we reach that point, it would be as dangerous to relax our effort as it is to fall asleep in a blizzard. This is something we must all of us understand thoroughly, so that no one will be able to lull us or divide us, or in any way keep us from building the strength and unity which spell safety for us.

When we have a stout shield of defense, our problems will change, and become more manageable. So long as the Soviet regime remains what it is—committed to the aim of world communism directed from Moscow, dedicated to a fundamental hostility against states that are not subservient to its will—we cannot ever afford to become less vigilant of our freedom.

The danger of war may be reduced, but the struggle will continue. The Soviet threat is much more than a military one, and we can expect that the effort to subvert free peoples, to lure them into captivity with empty promises of a better life, will go right on.

Therefore, we must continue to offer real leadership toward the kind of life that people want. Behind the protection of our military shield, we can increase our cooperative efforts toward higher living standards and toward economic development.

We would also be able to give much more help in other problems beside those created by the Soviet Union—in such problems as arise from the awakening of the vast populations of Asia and the Middle East, and their desire for national self-expression and for the improvement of their conditions of living.

Our practical help to the people of the Middle East, of Asia, and of Latin America can be both to their interest and to ours. For it is crucial to the future peace of the world that these turbulent and dynamic forces emerge in forms that will be constructive and truly progressive.

We are the natural allies of these peoples. We have with them a common interest in peace, in progress, and in freedom. We can enter with them into a partnership of peace.

As we carry forward these activities, and as we maintain our military shield, the temptation for the other side to use force will be reduced. Instead, they will be more willing to begin the peaceful adjustment of some of the issues. It will be to their, and to our, self-interest to do so.

We are of course prepared to undertake such adjustments at any time. We would welcome any genuine opportunity to reduce the level of tension in the world—but we must always be alert against the baited hooks of phony propaganda.

The ultimate purpose of all these efforts—whether military, economic or political—is to bring a realization in the Soviet Union that no one power is going to dominate this world, and that it would be foolhardy for any power to try to do so.

When this realization sinks home in Moscow, we can begin to hope for those changes in the Soviet regime which will make for a more peaceful world.

What sort of changes do we need to look for?

It is not that we want to compel other countries to adopt our form of government or our economic system. What we are concerned about is whether their system is one which inevitably attempts to dominate other people.

If the Soviet Union is to become a friendly member of the world community—within the meaning of the Charter of the United Nations—there must be real evidence that the Soviet rulers have renounced their hope of world domination, their dedication to the forcible overthrow of other governments, and the isolation of their people from the outside world.

No one can now predict how or when such change may come about. We must be prepared for the possibility that it may take many years.

We know that many strains and tensions exist within the Soviet world. We know that such things as the perpetual mobilization of the people, the suppression of national freedom in the satellite countries, the inevitable frictions of police-state rule, all must have, over a period of time, a significant effect. Ultimately, these factors, when added to the realization of the Kremlin that intimidation, falsehood, and the sowing of confusion can be neither successful nor profitable, may bring about a change in the Soviet system, which, in turn, will reduce the fear of war in the world.

The Soviet rulers are aware that we shall have to overcome difficulties of our own in the meantime. The maintenance of even a limited mobilization level also puts strains on us. The Communists are counting on these strains to make us tire of our burdens, to break our nerve, to bring about our collapse, to break down our economic system, and to weaken our political institutions. They stand ready to profit by any weakness which we might show.

But we confidently believe that time is on the side of freedom so long as we make good use of it. We can meet the test of time better than they can. We have faith that free societies can outlast, outproduce, and outbuild a police state, and can better stand the tensions of partial mobilization. We of the free world have geography, resources, manpower, and moral values on our side. So long as we also have a firm and resolute will, we shall come out on top.

This is the picture of what we face. The prospect may be hard and long. It may mean many more sacrifices for us, more shortages, higher taxes. But there is no easier way through the dangers of the present. If we shirk it, the alternatives are war or surrender.

You all remember the poster which said: "Uncle Sam needs you." And the finger of Uncle Sam pointed at each of us, and followed us. This, too, is a job for all of us. There is no man or woman in America so important, or so unimportant, that he can shrug his shoulders and say: "Let somebody else do it." Whether you work with a wrench, a gun, a hoe, or a pencil, you are an important part of this job.

Today as in the time of Cadillac, the real strength of our free society in an emergency is that the individual free men and women pitch in and deliver the goods.

Make no mistake about it—this is an emergency, an emergency as great as any our country has ever faced.

We shall need a new birth of patriotism, above our personal interests and our party loyalties—a patriotism which is strong enough and mature enough to inspire us for the long haul.

We shall need the kind of faith that gave courage and strength to the pioneers of America.

We need a faith that can look ahead and see a job that may take years, which surely will take patience, moderation, restraint, steady nerves, and lots of effort—a faith that will say: "We can do it."

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, if our United Nations allies are ready to accept Red China into membership, what does Secretary of State Acheson do?

Price-Control Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent and leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from B. W. Harwood, owner and operator of the Harwood Hotel, Camdenton, Mo., I first state that I favor and have supported and voted for the bill to extend the Defense Production Act, and all other proposed acts of Congress to provide for the prevention of exorbitant and inflationary prices. However, regardless of our acts and passage of such laws, the bureaucratic administrators formulate and promulgate such ridiculous, impractical, and complicated orders, rules, and regulations thereunder, which irritates and agitates the people and destroys the effective purpose of the price-control laws passed by Congress. The following letter from Mr. Harwood is an example:

HARWOOD HOTEL,
Camdenton, Mo., July 16, 1951.

HON. MORGAN MOULDER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MOULDER: As you know, I have owned and operated the Harwood Hotel Restaurant here in the Missouri Ozarks for the past 20 years. We have quite a business here and folks drive here from miles around to enjoy our good country food.

It now looks like all the folks are going to be powerful disappointed when they get here if all these regulations I have been getting from Washington mean anything.

Here is what people like me are up against. I would like to have your ideas as to what I should do. I hate to close the place up but I can't operate under the present rules and regulations.

For example, I quote a miscellaneous amendment from Ceiling Price Regulation 25, amendment 1. This seems to deal with the deckle on a piece of corned beef. It says, "The hard fat along the sternum edge (the area on the bone side of the brisket which is adjacent to and directly under the sternum bone) of the boneless brisket shall be trimmed level with the boned surface of the brisket and to within $\frac{1}{2}$ inch of the lean lying between this hard fat and the border of the skin surface fat." This amendment also states, "The web muscle (full lip) shall be left attached with the thin narrow edge, trimmed to expose the narrow portion of lean meat."

Now, Mr. MOULDER, after reading that one, I am sure in a fog. I showed it to my cook and right then and there she threatened to walk out on me, and good country cooks are hard to get these days. She said she had no idea where the sternum bone on a piece of corned beef is located and neither do I. She also said that if the web muscle had to be left attached to the lip it sure would not look like much on the blue-plate special.

You will also note on this regulation 25, amendment 1, a great deal of reading about udders and tails. We have never done a big udder or tail business, but maybe we could try. I wonder how a big juicy udderburger would appeal to the customers. I can just hear the children saying, "Mudder, can I have an udder udder?"

It looks like the days of the good old country ham and red-eye gravy will just be

a pleasant memory. The customers will have to be satisfied with a good portion of baked tail.

I notice there are still some things we can serve, however. You will note in regulation 14, amendment 3, dated May 18, 1951, it says—I quote under item 36—"Excluded are truffles, capers, canned snails, sugar, Easter-egg dye, and rattlesnake meat."

So when you next come in to see me, better brace yourself. Looks like you are due for a big dish of canned snails, truffles, and rattlesnake meat. There is nothing better, I guess, than a big, rare rattlesnake steak.

Now you know me pretty well. Please write to me and tell me, Am I going crazy? Or maybe someone else is wrong.

Yours very truly,

B. W. HARWOOD.

C. J. Ryan, Secretary to Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, this morning as I came into my office, my secretary handed me an excerpt from last night's Star. A glance at the heading provided the shocking news that a friend of many years would visit me no more. I first became acquainted with Charles Ryan when I came to Georgetown as a student in the fall of 1926 and I made the first visit to my Congressman. At the office of Congressman Richard Freeman, I met his secretary, Mr. Ryan, and during the course of my studies which coincided with his secretaryship, Charley, as we all knew him, accommodated me many times with books, documents, pamphlets, and data which were most helpful to me. This friendship grew closer when I came to Washington as a secretary and Mr. Ryan visited me since he was a constituent of my boss. As fellow secretaries we had worked closely together and when I became a Member of Congress Charley Ryan was among my frequent callers and one who always brought helpful suggestions. The article to which I referred at the outset gives a résumé which I desire to have included with these remarks as it will tell to many of Charley's friends on the Hill about his untimely demise and relates his association with the various Members of the House whom he had served during these years. I noted at the funeral this morning a delegation of secretaries and our former colleague, Harve Tibbott, with whom Charley had sealed a bond of loyalty and friendship.

C. J. RYAN, SECRETARY TO CONGRESSMEN

Charles J. Ryan, 54, secretary to several Members of Congress during the last 28 years, died Monday after a 6-month illness at his residence, 3726 Seventeenth Street NE.

A native of Connecticut, Mr. Ryan first came to Washington as a secretary to the late Representative Richard P. Freeman, of that State. Born and reared in Stonington, he was in the real-estate and insurance business before coming here.

Mr. Ryan was with Mr. Freeman for 10 years. He later served as secretary to Representatives Dr. William L. Higgins, of

Connecticut (1933-37), Harve Tibbott, of Pennsylvania (1939-49), and Robert W. Kean, of New Jersey (1949-50).

While secretary to Representative SHEEHAN, Republican, of Illinois, this year Mr. Ryan was forced to retire because of ill health.

Mr. Ryan attended the National University Law School and Georgetown University. He received his law degree from Georgetown in 1930.

He is survived by his widow, Mrs. Esther O'Connor Ryan, of the home address.

Prayers will be said at 9:30 a. m. tomorrow at the residence. Requiem mass will be at 10 a. m. at St. Francis De Sales Catholic Church. Burial will be in Fort Lincoln Cemetery.

Hitler's Heritage Stalin's Undoing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Hitler rattled his saber, drew it, fell on it, and died. Stalin holds Hitler's saber. It will prove his undoing.

The diplomacy of the United States has placed the Communists in a tough spot in the Far East. I should like to quote an editorial in the Bayonne Times dated Tuesday, July 24, 1951:

THE REDS' DILEMMA

The diplomacy of the United States, about which it is eternally fashionable for Americans to be shy and deprecatory, has placed the Communists in a pretty tough spot in the Far East. When they return tonight to give their answer on whether negotiations or war will proceed they have a choice between (1) breaking off the negotiations on what is obviously a trumped-up issue, and (2) knuckling under on still another point.

The no-foreign-troops question is a trumped-up issue because it has been a Communist demand from the first day that Malik returned to the Security Council last August. At that time he got the United Nations answer, that the UN cannot pull its troops out of Korea until Korea's neighbors, China and the Soviet Union, prove they can be trusted. The answer is still the same, and the Communists know it. If on June 23 Malik made his proposal on the cease-fire at the thirty-eighth parallel with such a condition as this in mind, then the Communists have plainly been trying to attain by trickery what they have been able to get by neither war nor diplomacy. If the war is resumed because of a breakdown on this point, it is hard to believe that even the most loyal Communists will miss the fact that here, again, we have had a case of Communist double-dealing.

But suppose the Communist negotiators troop back to Kaesong tonight to yield on this point. Then their situation is different, but still bad. The Communists thought they were being smart when they led the people of the Soviet Union, China, and the captive countries to think that the United States and the UN were suing for peace. But if they now yield on the troops issue, as they yielded before on making Kaesong a neutral city and on the admission of UN reporters, what becomes of all their big talk?

Maybe it's time for us to be a little less defensive about our foreign policy. Perhaps we can even afford to bring a little.

The Port of New York-New Jersey Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Port of New York Authority should be renamed the Port of New York-New Jersey Authority because so many of its operations take place on the land and coast of New Jersey. The time has arrived for this not-so-benevolent sharecropper, the Port of New York Authority, to consider the economic welfare of the people of New Jersey and especially those of Hudson County.

I refer to an article on the port of New York in the June 1951 issue of Fortune magazine. It renders high praise to the efficiency of the personnel on the Port Authority, but it scolds the city of New York for falling asleep at the switch of progress and letting its port facilities go to pot. Baltimore and Philadelphia are outpunching New York for new shipping business. The people on the Jersey shore line are victims of New York's port going to seed.

If the name of the Port of New York Authority were changed to include New Jersey, I am certain the port of New York would straighten up and fly right.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to develop this topic from time to time.

Know Your Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix to the RECORD, I wish to submit an article by the Marine News, of New York, published in the Washington Post, of even date, as follows:

KNOW YOUR WATERWAYS—A LOOK AT THE RECORD

Sites were chosen along the Delaware River recently for two great new steel plants. Already one of the busiest inland waterways of the Nation, the Delaware is becoming a greater national asset with each passing year. The proposed deepening to Trenton will add tremendously to its usefulness.

Tows of more than 6,000,000 gallons of petroleum products from along the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway are reaching industry and private consumers along the entire Mississippi-Illinois waterway system as far north as the Chicago, and St. Paul-Minneapolis areas. The improved Monongahela River is tremendously important to the Pittsburgh steel-making area. The Great Lakes waterway system, with its locks, harbors, and connecting channels, is the greatest waterway asset in America. The improved St. Marys, St. Clair, and Detroit

Rivers are the busiest waterways in all the world. With a season of only 7 to 8 months they each handle more than twice the combined tonnage of the Suez and Panama Canals. Every American ship and navy yard is on a Federal waterway.

The Gulf Intracoastal Waterway grows in importance year after year. Of 36 United States ports handling more than 3,000,000 tons of cargo annually, 10 are along the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway. Houston, with its 55-mile deep-water channel to the Gulf, is the third largest port in the Nation.

These are but a few examples of some important present-day waterways, parts of which at one time or another were dubbed by some as pork-barrel projects. Provision for their construction and maintenance was included in a bill which is derided year after year as the "pork barrel" river and harbor bill. (Marine News, New York, N. Y. George H. Palmer, president and publisher.)

Information Specialist, What's That?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, you remember the period when undertakers became morticians and painters became interior decorators. About the same time, newspapermen became information specialists.

In the Federal Government, publicity men decided that this was a good title to mask propaganda. Today, no Federal agency is complete without a goodly number of information specialists who pound away at typewriters, whir the mimeograph machines, and pour out "dope" by the newsprint ton to an eagerly waiting world. Nine-tenths of their effusions get into the nearest wastebasket.

A joint conference committee on appropriations has recommended a 25-percent reduction in budget estimates for salaries paid to Government press agents and information specialists. In one department alone, the Pentagon Defense Department and armed services offices have an annual payroll of \$1,484,853 for these specialists. This is an increase of more than \$1,000,000 in the last year. Five hundred and twenty-five people are on the payroll in this department of public relations, 200 more than last year. Besides this the Army and Air Force in the last year have dished out \$5,868,000 to private business for advertising and promotion purposes. This includes the distribution of handouts to newspapers, magazines, radio and TV stations. One drive costing \$66,000 in a single contract was directed at influencing the ladies to join the services.

Isn't it about time we stopped wasting money for purposes like these? The Army, Navy, and Air Force don't need propagandists. They have written their record in American history. There is no sense in creating nice, soft jobs for some people at our expense.

The Southwestern Power Administration: A Case History in Plunder by Bureaucrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Economic Trend Line Studies:

THE SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION: A CASE HISTORY IN PLUNDER BY BUREAUCRATS

To those who follow closely congressional appropriation hearings, it has been evident for many years that bureaucratic officials, in a great many instances, are much more interested in expanding their personal power than in performing a public service. Congressmen, even though they desire to protect the public interest, do not have the time or the facilities to carefully consider the hundreds of requests for funds. This situation permits unscrupulous public officials to request unreasonable appropriations, thus aggravating the serious problem of governmental waste. A good case history of this plunder is provided in the development of the Southwestern Power Administration and its entourage of lawyers, engineers, and bureaucrats who seek ever greater domination over the electric power industry in Missouri, Arkansas, and Oklahoma.

In order to appreciate the background of the current situation, it is necessary to go back to the Rural Electrification Act of 1936. This was a very sound piece of legislation and had the approval of farmers, farm associations, and several private utility companies. The act provided for loans to co-operative associations organized to furnish electric energy to those rural areas not receiving central station service. The provisions carefully excluded any Federal agency or bureau from using funds to enter into competition with local borrowers or private industry. No generating plants or transmission lines could be built without the approval of the proper State regulatory body. It was clearly the intent of Congress in this law to confine rural electrification to home rule and protect existing private electric industry.

The Flood Control Act of 1944 was another law pertaining to the generation of power. This legislation was enacted to enable the War Department to dispose of incidental electric energy generated at multiple-purpose dams where the primary function was flood control, irrigation, or navigation. Again, Congress set up in the law adequate safeguards for private utility firms. Rates charged for power were to be high enough to provide for all operating expenses, amortization, and interest on the projects. All funds collected were to be turned over to the United States Treasury in a trust fund in order to assure that taxpayers in Maine, Florida, and California would not have to subsidize cheap electricity in the Midwest. The Department of the Interior, which was authorized to dispose of the power, was specifically prohibited from building or acquiring transmission lines except where such lines were necessary to make power available to appropriate agencies.

Despite the specific limitations on bureaucratic action and the protection afforded to private electric facilities in these two laws, a concerted move has been under way for 10 years to cripple private companies and satisfy the greed of public power fanatics. In

1941 the Rural Electrification Administration and the Federal Works Agency, together with certain elements in the White House, literally stole Pensacola Dam from its rightful owner, the State of Oklahoma (over the protests of the State's governor) and proceeded to build 193 miles of transmission lines to serve an area already served at Lake Catherine, Ark. Mr. Douglas G. Wright, present Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration was placed in charge of Pensacola Dam.

In 1943, when dams at Norfolk in the northern part of Arkansas and Denison Dam on the Red River between Oklahoma and Texas were completed, the Southwestern Power Administration by presidential edict, was established with Mr. Douglas G. Wright as Administrator. Also, in 1943, prior to the passage of the Flood Control Act of 1944, with its provisions for depositing all funds derived from the sale of power in the Treasury of the United States, the bureaucrats succeeded in getting a very innocent sounding amendment passed to Public Law 216, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session. This amendment provided for a continuing fund of \$100,000 to be made available to the Southwestern Power Administration "to defray expenses in connection with emergencies and to provide for continuous service." During the period from 1943 to 1950, it was not necessary to spend 1 penny out of this "continuing fund" as all expenses of the Southwestern Power Administration were provided by annual appropriations by Congress.

By 1946 the bureaucrats and their political cohorts evidently felt that the time was ripe to smash completely the legal restraints placed on them by Congress and destroy the business managed electric companies. In that year, the Department of Interior brazenly came before Congress with its request for its so-called comprehensive plan covering the area of Arkansas, Oklahoma, and parts of Missouri. The plan called for an expenditure of \$223,000,000 in Federal funds for the construction of 18,000 miles of transmission lines and some 850,000 kilowatts of steam generating capacity.

Fighting for their right to continue in business, the electric utility companies appeared before Congress in opposition to the plan, pointing out that it would duplicate every foot of transmission line of the twelve companies supplying the area and place the Government directly in the power business. Congress refused to enact the plan, but permission was granted to build one transmission line connecting the Norfolk and Denison Dams. The project cost \$7,500,000 compared with the request of \$223,000,000.

Undaunted, the Department of Interior came back to Congress in 1947 and requested \$30,000,000 for transmission lines. The Department officials confessed they had overstepped their authority in asking for the original grant. They were so sorry for their request Congress again refused to grant funds. However, in 1949 the appropriation was pushed through Congress with the aid of Fair Deal legislative support. Also, in the same appropriation bill, an amendment was introduced to raise the continuing fund of the Southwestern Power Administration from \$100,000 to \$300,000. There was absolutely no need for this action. A continuing fund is promptly replenished as soon as expenditures are made, and when such a fund becomes a part of an appropriation bill, payments may amount to billions of dollars per year. In essence, it is a blank check to its beneficiary.

Now the Department of Interior and the Rural Electrification Administration were prepared for a battle of extermination against private power companies. Through the efforts of the National Rural Electric Co-operative Association supercooperatives were

formed in Missouri, Arkansas, and Oklahoma. Various loans in the order of \$10,000,000 and \$20,000,000 were requested by each of these cooperatives from the Rural Electrification Administration. Some loans were made to construct generating capacity of three to eight times the requirements of members. Also, thousands of miles of transmission lines were projected. Contracts were entered into between these supercooperatives and the Department of Interior, providing for the sale of the entire output to the Department of Interior (Southwestern Power Administration). To all intents and purposes, both the generating plants and the transmission lines upon completion become the property of the Southwestern Power Administration. This scheme was contrived despite the specific disapproval of Congress under the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 and the Flood Control Act of 1944. In passing, it should be noted that the contracts between the cooperatives and the Southwestern Power Administration provide for rates about 5 percent higher than existing rates of private utility companies to these same cooperatives.

The only block to date in this nefarious alliance to plunder the Federal Treasury and ruin private industry is the certificate of convenience and necessity which must be issued by the Arkansas Public Service Commission. Final action, as of this writing, has not yet been taken on the application.

This story constitutes one of the boldest plans ever placed in operation by greedy bureaucrats to use Federal funds to expand their own power and influence. The proposals and actions have been arbitrary and against the clear intent of the law. Millions of dollars have been spent and appropriated without consideration of economy or justification for service.

Mr. H. Stephen Raushenbush, a distinguished Socialist and former head of the Power Planning Division of the Department of the Interior, made this pronouncement:

"While the long-time aim of the liberal and radical groups is the abolition of the profit system for private use, our present strategy should be to take every opportunity to prove that there is something better than the profit system. Within the next 10 years we are going to have a chance such as we have not had in the last 40."

Then, after the completion of the socialization of the electric utility industry:

"We must force our experts on agriculture, trusts, coal, power, subways, housing, milk, etc., to tell us correctly which the next steps are and identify ourselves with their success."

Undoubtedly, Mr. Raushenbush's statements are still shared by some members of the Department of the Interior. They are also shared in Moscow.

The story of the Southwestern Power Administration is a story of socialism in action. It is also a chapter in greed and power hunger of bureaucrats and their self-seeking lawyers and engineers, the public servants paid by American taxpayers.

Earl Warren's Record Makes Him Popular

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, a Gallup poll recently conducted "from Maine to California" showed that, if Governor Warren, of California, and President

Truman were running for President, Warren would get 52 percent of the votes, and Truman would get 29 percent, the remaining voters being undecided.

Among independent voters, where a candidate must get his votes to win, Warren would get 53 percent; Truman would get 18 percent; the remaining votes being undecided.

Why this fine showing? It is because of Governor Warren's magnificent record as a public official; attorney general and Governor. He has handled the problems of California with consummate skill during 10 trying years when California's population was increased by 4,500,000. His appointments were good; he got along with the legislature; he balanced the budget; he set aside a sizable sum of money for a "rainy day"; in short, he did such a good job that the people returned him to the governorship three times by overwhelming majorities. He attracts a tremendous vote because he is an outstanding executive and he has the human touch as well. The overwhelming majorities which Warren has received indicate the confidence the people of California, of all shades of political opinion, have in his record as Governor.

Executive Requests for Appropriations— Proposed Amendment of Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1951

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Baltimore Sun of July 26, 1951, carried an editorial commenting most favorably upon the bill introduced recently by the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act with the purpose of holding Government expenditures to a minimum. Both the bill and the editorial deserve the attention of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PLAN TO CONSERVE THE TAXPAYER AND HIS DOLLAR

The latest congressional effort to get on top of the legislative budget problem is S. 913 which Senators McCLELLAN and MOODY are pushing. Technically the new bill would be an amendment to the legislative budget section of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Its purpose is not as ambitious as the full-dress balancing of expenditures with revenue contemplated in the Reorganization Act. What Messrs. McCLELLAN and MOODY are trying to establish is merely a joint committee to exercise a sharper selectivity in the Congressional judgment of appropriation requests from the executive branch.

The problem at which the Senators are shooting is inherent in the nature of our

Government. The executive agencies tend to be manned with more or less permanent personnel. The hot shots at the top of these agencies and the specialists in the lower echelons have years of experience in their field. The best of them are always under temptation in the defense of pet projects to try to hoodwink the less seasoned Congress people who come and go with the fortunes of elections.

The result is that Congress, under always heavier pressure to economize, sometimes doesn't know where the really soft spots in proposed spending schemes are to be found. Across-the-board cuts of 5 percent or 10 percent are often necessary and might well continue to be necessary under the new McClellan-Moody plan. But the Messrs. McCLELLAN and MOODY hope that by a more selective examination of executive requests they might be more able to spot waste and so protect the really useful spending plans.

So the McClellan-Moody joint committee would be drawn from the Senate and House Appropriation Committees, and armed with a permanent staff of budgeting experts. These specialists would have the seasoning and the experience to stand on equal terms with the permanent experts from the agencies. They would have sweeping powers of inspection of agency records and estimates. The hope is that they would in time meet the executive-branch experts on their own ground and signal their Congressional principals when to use the ax on the phony spending proposals.

All such schemes are an effort to tighten the historic legislative control of the purse strings. In a time of \$60,000,000,000 budgets with \$90,000,000,000 budgets looming, the public will demand the most careful study of all these plans for conservation of the taxpayer and his dollar.

Assistance to Foreign Countries and the Kem Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "They're Lions at Home," published in the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald of July 20, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY'RE LIONS AT HOME

Some weeks ago Congress passed the so-called Kem amendment which forbids the administration to extend American economic aid to countries which carry on trade behind the iron curtain.

The purpose of this amendment was clear. Congress wanted to serve notice on the beneficiaries of American hand-outs that henceforth they will not be allowed to work both sides of the street. They will not be permitted to accept free merchandise from the United States and then pass it along, in the channels of trade, to countries which are avowed enemies of the United States.

The administration fought this amendment bitterly. It contended that such a law would cramp the style of the advanced thinkers who dole out America's billions overseas, and would make it impossible for them to act in accordance with their unparalleled wisdom.

So Congress made a concession. It provided that the ban could be set aside in any specific instance certified by the National Security Council.

Shortly after the Kem amendment was passed the NSC took advantage of this provision in an astonishing way. It set aside the entire amendment for 90 days. And at the same time it announced that two countries—Austria and Norway—had been granted permanent exemptions.

This week the NSC certified another permanent exemption—for India.

The reasons offered in this instance were truly remarkable.

The NSC set forth that the recent food loan to India had made that country more friendly to the United States, and that cutting of aid now would "reverse the trend." And it added, completely dead-pan, that:

"It is not likely in any case that India would adapt its trade policies to obvious American pressure."

Here is another revelation of Washington's appeasement mentality. As has been the case in Korea since that war began, America's spokesmen are afraid to stand stoutly and proudly for the interests of this Republic—for fear they may hurt the feelings of some other nation.

And in each instance the men responsible are the same. The Messrs. Truman, Acheson, and Marshall are the authors of the soothing-syrup policies toward Red China, and they are also the dominant members of the board which now is quaking at the thought that India may be displeased by what the Congress in Washington has done.

Congress, representing the people, took the view that nations which trade with the enemy are doing great harm to the United States and to its soldiers at the front—and that certainly the United States should not subsidize this trade by way of its foreign-aid program.

That was and is a reasonable view. We think beyond question a majority of the people would subscribe to it, and would want to see the Kem amendment firmly enforced.

But these men in Washington, who are so excessively timid in the face of the enemy, become brave as lions when confronted with congressional opposition.

In this case they are taking advantage of a safety-valve clause in a law passed by Congress, in order to brush aside the plain will and intent of Congress. In effect they are taking the law-making power into their own hands on the grounds that they know best.

Administrative arrogance of this sort is nothing new in Washington. And this, we surmise, will not be the last instance of it unless Congress cracks down hard.

Sales of Narcotic Drugs to Teen-Age Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Wednesday, July 25, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Crime Committee [Mr. O'CONNOR] introduced on behalf of himself and the other members of the committee, including myself, a bill (S. 1900) to provide an increased penalty for the sale of narcotic drugs to persons under 17 years of age. This bill was referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee. Our colleague's comments on

this subject may be found on page 8807 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I can think of few subjects on which the American people are undoubtedly more unanimous in their convictions than that of eliminating the human vampires who feed on the blood of teenage youngsters by selling them habit-forming drugs. If ever there was a vicious breed of individual whom society should punish it is these adults who lead youngsters down the horrible path of dope addiction.

Editorials all over the Nation have commented on this subject and on the Senate Crime Committee's exposé of dope traffic as it affects our children. I have in my hand two such editorials from Wisconsin papers. The first is an editorial from the Racine, Wis., Journal-Times of Tuesday, July 10, entitled "Get the Narcotics Sellers." The second is an editorial from the Thursday, July 19, issue of the Manitowoc Herald-Times entitled "Kill That Rattlesnake." This editorial comments in particular on a campaign which is being waged by the Wisconsin Aerie of the Fraternal Order of Eagles against the narcotics traffic.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of these two editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Racine (Wis.) Journal-Times of July 10, 1951]

GET THE NARCOTIC SELLERS

For the teen-age victims, it began as a lark—an excursion into the unknown, like the first ride on a roller coaster. Or it started as a challenge—the proof of daring so they could keep up with the crowd and not be called a "square."

Then the roller coaster became something they couldn't get off. In place of "squares" they became "junkies," "mainliners," and other names in a strange doped-up jargon that is finally beginning to shock America. Instead of a lark, it was a down-hill ride with little chance of anything at the end but tragedy.

These were the youngsters the Nation suddenly became aware of after their stories were aired in New York and later before the Senate Crime Investigating Committee in Washington—stories of kids who but for the grace of God could be ours. These were the kids enmeshed in the growing drug peril, addicts whose lives are pretty sure to be ruined no matter what we do for them now.

How did it happen? Some blame it on a general break-down in family life. Others say it starts in the slums and breeds on delinquency, or that the new American credo has put too much emphasis on "being accepted by the gang."

All of these ideas, added together, are only part of the answer. The big factor is that the stuff that makes dope addicts is available—as available, in many cities, as ice cream and candy.

How can we stop it? By going to work on the real dope fiends. The fiends aren't the ones who use marijuana, heroin, and cocaine; they're too smart. They sell it, and the customers have to keep coming back for more and more, until they will do almost anything—as the customers themselves have testified—to get the "stuff."

The fiends are the pushers, who like to get their customers young, because teen-agers are susceptible, and once they get started, will get other teen-agers to go along with them. United States Narcotics Commission-

er Harry J. Anslinger figures there are 10,000 youthful addicts now, triple the number since 1950. The fiends—the pushers—are willing to give away samples, the evidence shows, to get another steady customer.

For the peddlers it's big business. And the overhead is low; overhead in this case being the price the peddlers have to pay when they're nabbed. Anslinger points out that the average sentence, up to now, has been 18 months. What with pardons, paroles, and commuted sentences, a peddler regards punishment like that as a vacation.

What would happen if we go tough? The same thing that happens when the rats find there's poison around the corn crib. In St. Louis, Anslinger point out, an 18-year sentence for a convicted peddler started the rest of them running out of town.

Other things would help, too. Although Anslinger doesn't agree, many experts put up a sound argument for education—a carefully planned program to drive home to our youngsters the horrible facts of dope. And it's only merciful that we take steps to provide hospitals where those who have already been victimized can be treated, even if the treatment is only a dim hope for escape from the nether world of addiction.

There's a chance for the rest of our children. There are laws pending in Congress and in many States that would require minimum sentences of 2, 5, and 10 years for first, second, and third convictions of drug peddlers. There's even a proposed Federal law with a death penalty for peddlers who sell to minors.

We hope Congress was listening when the teen-agers spilled out their stories of the lark that turned out to be a roller coaster on the road to horror.

[From the Manitowoc (Wis.) Herald-Times of Thursday, July 19, 1951]

KILL THAT RATTLESNAKE

A committee of Wisconsin Eagles, headed by Judge Albert H. Schmidt, of Manitowoc, has embarked on an ambitious job—stamping out the illicit trade in and use of narcotics and dope. This is a program that should send every Wisconsin citizen, regardless of whether or not he is affiliated with the Eagles, flocking in wholehearted support.

And Manitowoc can well feel proud of its former county municipal judge for 28 years, Albert Schmidt, who was the leading figure in the drafting of the proposals to kill this rattlesnake. Judge Schmidt, always a leader in programs of community welfare, has taken on a real battle this time, and every man and woman in the Nation should consider it their civic duty to join in the crusade against this terrifying monster—illicit narcotics.

The recent newspaper stories concerning the alarming increase in the use of dope, particularly by high-school youngsters in the overcrowded major cities of the United States, have been nauseating.

We have read of despicable characters who reap a rich harvest plying their illegal dope trade among boys and girls ranging as low as 13 and 14 years of age. Think for a moment what you would like to have done to any moronic ghoul who started your teen-aged boy or girl off down the path of physical and mental destruction on the needle.

Now read closely the proposals for punishment of convicted narcotics criminals as suggested by Judge Schmidt's Eagles committee. They provide life imprisonment and death—and without probation or suspension of sentences by our courts.

The Eagles program also provides room for every thoughtful man and woman—interested in maintaining a strong America—to join in the crusade against dope right in his and her home community.

It should be, and must be, the duty of all to fall in line with Wisconsin Eagles in this tremendous job of public welfare. And it

must be done at once. Sometime in the future may be too late. The dope menace is that serious.

Necessity of Flood-Control Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made today before the Subcommittee on Army Civil Functions of the Senate Committee on Appropriations by the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], regarding the necessity for appropriations for the construction of flood-control projects.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. KERR of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, the destruction caused by floods at Kansas City and in nearby areas of Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma in the past few weeks is fresh in the minds of the members of this committee.

You have heard this disaster described as the work of a flood that comes once in a hundred years, but I want to say to this committee that some place in that area is hit by just such devastation almost every year. It is not uncommon for a large part of our total annual rainfall to hit the earth in a few hours on the heels of months of drought. Sometimes these rains fall upon the northern part of the Arkansas-Missouri Basin in Kansas and drain into the Missouri River. Sometimes they fall on the southern part of Kansas and drain into the Arkansas Valley, flooding the fertile lands of northern and eastern Oklahoma as they go.

One of the tributaries of the Arkansas River which carried the great Kansas rains into Oklahoma this year was the Neosho which damaged a dozen Kansas cities before it reached Miami, Okla., where 3,000 people were forced to leave their homes. The damage in Miami and Ottawa County alone is estimated at \$6,000,000.

Another Kansas-Oklahoma tributary of the Arkansas is the Verdigris, which had already this month destroyed thousands of acres of promising crops in Kansas and Oklahoma, and flooded several cities before the rains came which brought devastation to Kansas City and the areas along the Missouri as well.

A third is the Chikaskia. This year we have had floods on all three, on the Arkansas, in western Oklahoma, and at Waurika in southern Oklahoma, too.

Out in Oklahoma people ask me why our Government cannot do something to protect them if it has so many billions to spend for the protection of people across the seas. I believe that the members of this committee feel about this just as I do, and the big question in your minds is: How can we go forward with a program of flood-control work at the same time that we are faced with an international situation which threatens to engulf the entire world?

My answer to that question is this:

First, there are flood-control projects on which the Congress has taken three steps—authorization, planning, initial construction—but which have been halted because of the international situation.

Second, there are projects on which the Congress has taken two steps—authorization and planning.

Third, there are projects on which the Congress has taken the first step—authorization.

I believe that Congress must continue to advance these projects.

In the first group, the people of Oklahoma and Arkansas are interested in a vital project on the Verdigris River—Oologah. The Army engineers tell us that had Oologah been built it would have this year saved crops worth \$2,700,000 in its own valley. This is nearly 10 percent of what it will cost to build—and there have been five floods on the Verdigris in Oklahoma in the last 10 years, each of which has been as great or greater than the biggest flood on the river this year.

The floods on the Verdigris are so common that only the highest of the bottom lands are farmed. Oologah would protect 84,000 acres of the richest land in the world from most floods, and when it is built the annual value of the crops in that valley which it will protect will be not \$2,700,000, but, at least, \$10,000,000. We are advised that construction of Oologah can go forward in an orderly manner for 18 months before any steel is needed. The expansion of the steel industry which is now in progress will be completed by the fall of 1952, and the present pinch relieved.

In the second group of projects, those authorized and planned but not started, we Oklahomans have a keen interest in the Toronto Dam on the main stem of the Verdigris in southern Kansas. Toronto should be started, and as much work done as is possible without entering the competition for steel at this time.

Over in the Kansas River Valley, I am informed, the proposed Tuttle Creek Dam is in the same class with the Toronto Dam on the Verdigris.

I believe General Pick has advised this committee that any flood-control program for Kansas should include them both. Altogether there are at this time three reservoir projects in the recent flooded section completely planned and ready for construction money: Oologah, Toronto, and Tuttle Creek.

In the third group—authorized but not yet planned—are six comparatively small Kansas dams which mean much to us in Oklahoma. Four of these—Strawn, Council Grove, Marion, Cedar Point—are on the Neosho. Two—Neodesha and Elk City—are on the Verdigris.

We in Oklahoma believe that Strawn should come first because, had it been built, we would not now be faced with the terrific job of rehabilitation at Miami, Okla.

Mr. Chairman, there is another and important reason why work should go forward as rapidly as possible on Oologah and Toronto. The people who live on the reservoir sites are entitled to be paid for their land so that they may move to their new homes. They have been put on notice as to the Government's intentions. Neither public agencies nor private citizens can afford to make additional investments which they know will be flooded when the dams are built. Few private buyers want land which they know is soon to be condemned by the Government. These people are caught in a blighted area, and common decency calls for us to treat them justly.

Recently, we who represent the States of Arkansas and Oklahoma directed attention of this committee to the critical situation at Braden's Bend on the Arkansas River at the Oklahoma-Arkansas line. Here is a place of potential tragedy because caving banks are about to divert the larger flow of the Arkansas into the channel of the Poteau, a smaller tributary. When this occurs—and it

will soon do so unless prevented—floodwaters will take with them not only thousands of acres of fertile land, but also rail and road bridges and parts of the industrial area of Fort Smith.

We cry for flood control on the upper reaches of these streams, but we would not have you forget the need of immediate action down stream where these floodwaters must be contained.

Bank stabilization at Braden's Bend and other critical points in Arkansas where railroad bridges and gas and oil pipelines are threatened, will take no critical materials, nor is it a costly work if taken in time.

Measured by the benefits, all of these proposed projects are profitable public investments—not pork barrel or give away. In the potent words of the Kansas City Star "The Time To Take Action Is Now."

Gentlemen, the elements do not wait for us. The people of our section need flood protection now. We have seen the two greatest floods in the history of eastern Oklahoma hit Fort Smith, Ark., on the Oklahoma border within the span of a few days. Members of the Senate who flew over St. Charles, Mo., when the Missouri was at its peak this week, carrying 600,000 cubic feet a second past that point, saw a great flood. Yet not once but twice in 1943, in a matter of days, the Arkansas carried more than 800,000 cubic feet a second from Oklahoma into Arkansas and took with it 23 human lives and did hundreds of millions of dollars damage to private and public property. No matter how many problems we may have, I do not see for the life of me how we can ever with a clear conscience fail to do what is required to achieve adequate flood control. The greater our needs for production, the more important it is we be prepared to meet them.

We can go forward with construction that does not take steel now. We can complete the planning job. For Oologah we can save at least 1 year. For Tuttle Creek, and Toronto, we can save two. For Strawn and other authorized dams in Kansas, we can save three.

There is a tendency in talking about flood-control projects to confine ourselves to the cold, economic aspects of the problem. But I was struck by a remark made by our new Governor of Oklahoma, Johnston Murray, in talking to members of the Public Works Committee when they were in Oklahoma.

You know Governor Murray has had about the same experience in the first few months of his administration that I had as Governor 8 years ago. Then as now, soon after the legislature adjourned the State was hit by a tremendous flood. I went into the flooded areas and saw the human misery which goes along with economic desolation. Governor Murray has done likewise and his remark about what he saw is very important. He told us he had observed it is the little people who suffer most when their homes and their crops are taken by the floods. No one can see such misery and ever forget it, Mr. Chairman. We must see to it that this does not happen again.

Election in Finland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, all Americans were highly gratified to read in the press the recent articles about the

election in Finland, in which the outstanding anti-Communist public official in Finland was elected to the Parliament.

In that connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record two newspaper editorials in regard to the contribution which Finland is making in the direction of freedom.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FINLAND STANDS FIRM

The Finnish election results are in and they indicate little change in the country's political complexion. The Social Democrats have edged out the Agrarians as the leading party, but no one party is strong enough to form a government by itself. Finland's Communists did not increase their vote and are no nearer power than they were before the election.

All this may seem prosaic and unexciting at first glance, but closer scrutiny reveals a good deal more. Basically the election represents a defeat for the Soviet Union and for the "progressive" forces in Finland it has so ardently supported. The Soviet propaganda barrage against Finland's non-Communists these past few months has been intense indeed, implicitly carrying threats of what may await that tiny country if it does not elect leaders more to Soviet liking. Within Finland the Communists have been handsomely financed and have been able to stage an election campaign far out of proportion to their previously demonstrated numerical strength in the population. They have been aided by discontent over rising inflation. Yet despite all this their position after the election is essentially unchanged. They represent a secondary political power, significant more because of their servitude to and relationship with the U. S. S. R. than because of their internal strength.

The Finnish people have stood firm where a nation with weaker nerves and less courage might have surrendered. Their example should not be lost upon the nations of Western Europe, most of them much larger than Finland and in less perilous geographic position vis-à-vis the Kremlin's armed forces.

FINLAND AND NEIGHBOR

One of the mysteries of Soviet foreign policy has been the Kremlin's dealings with its northwestern neighbor, Finland. Finland has a common border with the Soviet Union stretching from the Gulf of Finland 800 miles north to the Arctic Ocean. Twice in the past 12 years Finland and Russia have been at war—in 1939-40, when Russia attacked the Finns, and again from 1941 to 1944, when Finland served as a base for the Nazi attack on Russia. At the war's end the feeling in the west was that from now on the Kremlin would keep a tight grip on Finland.

Oddly enough, this has not been entirely the case. True, the Russians have dictated Finnish foreign policy—Moscow kept Helsinki from joining the Marshall plan, and the two countries have a treaty of "friendship and mutual assistance." But in domestic matters Finland is no satellite. Democracy flourishes and anticommunism is pronounced. The Government is a centrist coalition led by the Agrarian Party. Most Finns sense that the Soviet is a threat to their independence, but it is a danger they have grown accustomed to and do not worry about very much.

ELECTIONS WERE FREE

Last Monday and Tuesday Finland held its triennial national election for the 200-member Eduskunta (Parliament). Although the Russians contributed to the Communist Par-

ty campaign, Moscow did not interfere with the voting. The election was free, the ballot secret. Following Finnish custom, the chairmen of each election district first turned the ballot boxes upside down to show they were empty. Half a dozen parties competed. The main issues were domestic—taxes, state subsidies, Government spending, and, probably most important, high prices.

The Government parties and the Conservatives lost seven seats to the Communists, chiefly, it was believed, because of discontent over the rising cost of living. But the CP is still in third place; it was unable to regain the strength it won 6 years ago. Moreover, the Finnish voters showed their independence of the Kremlin by electing to the Eduskunta Russia's *bête noire*, Väinö Tanner, former leader of the Social Democrats, who was imprisoned at the behest of the Soviet on charges of drawing Finland into World War II against Russia.

Finland's present Government will now resign and a new administration will be elected—presumably from among the centrist parties. The Communists are already demanding key Cabinet posts, but most observers predict they will not get them. On the other hand, the new Government, whatever its composition, is expected to continue Finland's policy of guarded friendship toward Russia.

Cost Upon Russia Heavy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following editorial entitled "Cost Upon Russia Heavy," which appeared in the Daily News Democrat of Festus, Mo., on July 23, 1951:

COST UPON RUSSIA HEAVY

It is too early yet to predict with any degree of certainty whether a truce can be agreed upon at Kaesong. It can be said, however, there is some indication that the Chinese are taking a hand, and may overrule the Soviet on their troop-withdrawal proposal. This presumption falls into various unsubstantial reports there is much unrest in some of the satellite countries.

There is wide speculation to the effect that the Soviet Government has lost the "cold war." Russian leaders, it is pointed out, have seen numerous failures in their strategy during the past 5 years. These failures culminated in the rearming of the west. Noting some of the Communist failures. They failed to dominate Greece. They failed to block the Atlantic Pact, and they failed in the siege of Berlin. Now it appears they may fail in the aggression of Korea.

The victories against communism have been costly, and the United States has carried the heavy end of the burden, both in blood and in money. Russia has not been compelled to send her soldiers into the conflict, but she has lost heavily otherwise.

Through her rearmament program, Russia has placed a heavy strain upon the people of that country, and the standard of living has gradually depreciated. It has put a heavy burden upon the Communist satellites, draining off much of their industrial production and food stuffs into the channels of war. It is generally believed that the economy of all free countries today is far stronger than

that of the countries dominated by the Soviet nation.

There is a feeling abroad and considerable information to support it, that Russia may resort to new tactics. Opening of peace offensives ostensibly for the purpose of lulling the western powers to sleep, is expected in the very near future.

After a bad beginning at Kaesong, where our representatives went under a flag of truce, the mistake has been rectified and we meet the enemy upon equal terms. The Communists had sought to prove to their world the U. N. was coming to them. The tough policy of General Ridgway put the Communist delegation in its place, and if the truce can be won, the Soviet will have lost another of her undertakings against the free world.

H. R. 4387—Income Limitations for Non-Service-Connected Pension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter I have received from Mr. Russell E. Sullivan, who is the national executive committeeman of the Disabled American Veterans from the second district, which comprises Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey.

In this letter, Mr. Sullivan calls my attention to a provision in H. R. 4387, passed by the House of Representatives on June 20, 1951. This is what is commonly known as the income limitation bill, that increases the annual income limitations governing the payment of pension to veterans and their dependents.

The provision to which Mr. Sullivan objects is the one that provides that income from all sources be included in the computation of annual income. I was a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs that held hearings upon the measure. The chairman was the able A. Leonard Allen, of Louisiana, who has always been so fair and so considerate of our veterans and their problems during his 15 years of service in this House.

During all of the testimony concerning the bill and in the discussions later in executive session it never entered the minds of the subcommittee members that the pension for which an applicant was trying to qualify would be included in the computation of annual income.

When I received this letter I talked with an official in the office of the assistant administrator for legislation at the Veterans' Administration, and I asked him for an opinion as to what interpretation the department would place upon such a question. This he could not give me, and I expressed my surprise that in preparing the report upon the measure his office did not foresee the likelihood of such a question being raised. I can only reiterate that it was not the

intent of our committee that a pension be included in computing income.

If the matter is not clarified in the Senate, where the bill is now being considered, I hope there will be an opportunity to do so here. Mr. Sullivan's letter follows:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,

Washington, D. C., July 20, 1951.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: Mention is made of H. R. 4387, sponsored by your committee, which passed the House on June 19 and is presently pending in the Senate.

A review of the bill discloses that income from all sources shall be included in computing gross income to ascertain if a widow without dependents earns more than \$1,800 per year, or \$3,000 per year in the case of a widow with dependents. Of course if she did she would be ineligible for the pension provided for the widows of war veterans.

The inclusion of the provision pertaining to all income, which would include insurance that the veteran paid for in his lifetime, seems unjust.

Within the last few days Warren Petersen, of Wallingford, Conn., a World War II veteran who lost his leg in combat in Europe in 1944, had an automobile accident. His remaining leg had to be amputated in order to get him out of the car, and some 3 days later he died of the injuries. He left a widow and three children, all under 5, and one of whom was born 2 hours before his fatal accident.

As a non-service-connected death case his widow will get a pension of \$42 a month plus \$12 for the first child and \$6 a month for each of the other two children, making a total of \$66 a month for food, clothing, shelter, medical expenses, and education when the children get older.

You can readily appreciate that the amount is not nearly enough to maintain a decent American standard of living and when one considers that the accident that cost Warren Petersen his life might never have occurred had he the use of the leg he lost in combat in World War II, the situation seems even more tragic.

Then, if he had insurance that paid off in monthly installments over the year, the widow and orphans might find out that the income from it prevented the pension being paid because of the provision in the law mentioned above.

Can you possibly do anything to have the law amended before final passage so as to eliminate income from insurance and also possibly raise the amount paid for each dependent child? The above case shows why such action should be attempted.

Sincerely yours in comradeship,

RUSSELL E. SULLIVAN,

National Executive Committeeman,

Second District (Connecticut,

New York, and New Jersey).

Address of Hon. James P. S. Devereux, of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1951

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to have my remarks inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following address made by

my colleague, Congressman JAMES P. S. DEVEREUX, at the picnic of the Federation of Republican Women of Montgomery County on Saturday, July 14:

I have been in receipt of many letters, some urging stronger controls, some advocating abolition of all controls. The great majority of the people, who take a stand one way or the other, do not specifically state what controls should be lifted or what controls should be made stronger. Some of these requests, undoubtedly are prompted by self-interest and others believe that their stand is the proper solution to higher prices.

When we speak of higher prices, we must first understand the cause for higher prices. Basically the reason for higher prices is inflation and to impose direct price controls would not, in itself, cure inflation. Inflation is the evil we must combat and that is the fundamental issue at stake.

I think a homely example would be to liken our entire economic problem to a pot of boiling water. We might temporarily be able to keep the pot from boiling over by placing a heavy lid on the pot, but eventually if enough steam were generated even an extremely heavy lid would eventually be blown off. This would be the operation of direct controls.

However, if we attack the problem at its source, that is, the fire under the boiling pot, and reduce that fire, we will keep the pot from boiling so violently and thus prevent it from boiling over.

The other day on the floor of the House an amendment was offered to the administration's defense production bill, which deals with controls, providing that the administration exercise all of the indirect controls as well as such other controls as the ultimate bill would provide. Unfortunately, this measure was defeated and it was said in the press that the proponents of the bill had been attempting to scuttle the Defense Production Act, whereas, in fact, they were simply directing the administration and the Federal Reserve Board to use such powers as they now have by existing law.

In a war economy, such as we have today, there is no question in my mind that we must have allocation of certain materials which, in itself, is a control, and it may be, in cases where things are in extremely short supply, that some direct price controls will have to be imposed. But to get to the root of the evil, that is inflation, I feel that we must attack the problem by reducing buying power which is now competing for the goods and services that are available or increasing production. In this connection we must understand that inflation is caused by having more money bidding for various commodities than we have commodities available for sale. When such a situation exists, when there is an oversupply of money as compared to the amount of goods available, prices will rise according to the natural laws of supply and demand.

Specifically I believe credit restrictions must be imposed. Possibly in some cases the present restrictions are too harsh, but we must remember that the use of credit restrictions is one way that the purchasing power of the public is reduced and therefore there is not as much money available to make purchases or compete for the available commodities. When that condition exists, the law of supply and demand will automatically reduce prices.

There are two basic ways for the Government to obtain money; one is through taxes and the other is by borrowing (that is, selling bonds).

To digress a moment, I think we should understand one of the basic structures in our financial system. The vast majority of bonds sold by the Federal Treasury are sold to the member banks of our Federal Reserve System. When these bonds are sold to a member bank, each is paid into the Treasury,

which is used in the conduct of our governmental affairs.

But here is a point that I do not believe the majority of the people of our country understand. After these bonds are obtained through purchase by a member bank from the Federal Reserve System, that bond, in turn, may be pledged as security within the Federal Reserve System in order to have more money issued to the member bank, thus creating more and more money as this transaction is repeated.

At one time in the history of our banking system should a member bank of the Federal Reserve System wish to have money issued to it, it was obligated to put up sound commercial paper (which represented an equity in real property) or gold reserves. They are still obligated to do this but in a greatly lessened proportion than they were years ago.

From this it can be readily seen that the Government, in itself, in not keeping up to sound standards is, in itself, depreciating our currency and is not acting in good faith. The Federal Reserve Board has the power now to require better securities upon which to insure currency and thus increase the dollars value.

The question that now confronts us is if we need money in order to meet our governmental obligations, what do we do. One thing, of course, is to raise our taxes higher and higher, but if taxes continue higher and higher so as to destroy all incentive, there is no doubt in my mind that production will decrease and we will then have a scarcity of materials which, in turn, will invite inflation.

There is still another approach to the situation. Supposing we arrange our affairs in the Federal Government so that it is not necessary to require the billions and billions of dollars for the operation of its affairs, then it will not be necessary to sell additional bonds which, as I pointed out, are inflationary, or to increase taxes, which are not only stifling to production but work an extreme hardship on fixed-income groups.

I have been in Washington for a comparatively short time as your Representative, but I am thoroughly convinced that economies can be exercised in the Federal Government as have been attempted from time to time from sincere Members of the Congress regardless of party affiliations.

In conclusion I would like to point out that there is no one simple answer to this very complex problem, and that with so many factors to contend with, we must use all available means in order to beat inflation.

The Pledge to the Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, most of us have time and again said:

I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands: one Nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Presumably, as we uttered those words, we believed them. Yet today some of us who follow through and translate into action the thought expressed in that pledge, are bitterly denounced by others who apparently are doubtful of the soundness of the principles enunciated in the Constitution; so

lacking in faith in the ability, the courage, and the endurance of our people that they fear our ability to defend ourselves; have reached the conclusion that we must purchase the friendship of other nations, rely upon them for our own national security.

Because I have vigorously and unceasingly opposed any surrender of our sovereignty, our entry into any international agreement which would make us subject to the orders of a superworld government, I have been bitterly criticized by editorial writers, radio commentators, and columnists who follow the international line.

More recently an editor in my district, because I cannot support the internationalists' candidate, General Eisenhower, as the Republican nominee for President, referring to my opposition to membership in an international organization, wrote that Eisenhower's views "may not accord with the narrow insularism of Mr. HOFFMAN or Colonel McCormick," and that it did no "constructive good for Mr. HOFFMAN to smear him as a candidate of Wall Street and the internationalists."

I made no attempt to smear General Eisenhower. He is an outstanding, patriotic American. Wall Street and the internationalists are supporting him. That is well known.

I just do not agree with General Eisenhower's views as expressed earlier this week, that American youth should be conscripted to fight in an international army, in an international uniform, under an international flag, an international commander and in an international war.

Another editor expressed the opinion that I had outlived my usefulness in Washington. His opinion seems to grow out of the fact that I have vigorously and consistently opposed the New Deal and recurring wars abroad.

I plead guilty to consistent opposition to the New Deal, for I have from the very beginning been opposed to its policies, which have given us national bankruptcy, inflation and two wars.

Those who criticize my "agin" attitude should remember that the Ten Commandments all admonish us against certain sins.

The editor to whom I just referred writes:

Certainly somewhere between Colonel McCormick and the President there must be a middle ground—a middle ground that provides for protection of our interests in the world-wide maneuvering and at the same time gives some protection to the American taxpayer.

The fact that each of these editors refers to Colonel McCormick leads me to wonder whether they are really dissatisfied with my services here as their representative, or whether they are peeved because of the editorials in Colonel McCormick's Chicago Tribune which advocate the adherence to constitutional procedure and avoidance of undue involvement in the affairs of other nations.

My views do not grow out of the editorials printed in the Chicago Tribune, although I am happy indeed to find that they are in accord with the Tribune's

editorial policy, which to me seems to be one of unwavering support of the principles enunciated in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

In my humble opinion, the Chicago Tribune is not only an outstanding newspaper from the news standpoint, but it speaks and reflects the views of Midwest people who have faith in our form of government, still adhere to the advice of Washington and Jefferson that we avoid entanglement in the affairs of other countries.

What the internationalists are doing to this country is set forth, in part at least, in an editorial from yesterday's—July 26—Tribune, which reads as follows:

DENATIONALIZING AMERICA

Preliminary agreement has been reached among France, Italy, West Germany, Belgium, and Luxemburg to merge their land, sea, and air power in a 2,000,000-man internationalized force to operate under General Eisenhower as commander of the European army. These nations would confirm the arrangement in 50-year treaties and would leave the way open for other nations to enter the compact.

The joint force would have its own uniform, would employ standardized arms, and would be under an international parliament, identical with the governing agency to be created under the Schuman plan for pooling Europe's coal and steel. Defense matters will be in charge either of a European defense minister or of a committee composed of representatives of the participating nations.

If this arrangement is to be limited to Western European nations and is to be regarded as a device by which they may avail themselves of the military strength of West Germany, a state which is now not a member of the North Atlantic military pact, it is welcome. Anything that can develop cohesion among these states and bring them to make a greater contribution to their own defense will relieve the United States of some part of its present very heavy burdens.

But approval of the arrangement depends upon whether United States forces assigned to the Eisenhower army are to stand aside from the European military and political compact and are to exist as an organization independent of, but associated with, the European organization. Unless there are safeguards of this kind, the United States can find itself hopelessly enmeshed with Europe and on the way to losing its national sovereignty.

Senator OWEN BREWSTER, of Maine, back from a trip to Europe, had brought a disquieting report that Eisenhower contemplated a non-national army to represent all 12 Atlantic Pact nations, among them, of course, the United States. The Senator said that the general's conception was that this force would function under a single flag, would have a common uniform, and would be directed by a single command. If this organization were to comprehend the United States, the perils need only to be enumerated to become manifest.

With the flag, of course, there would have to come into being a new superstate represented by the flag, and in turn representing the 12 member nations. This state would have at its disposal an army, navy, and air force, which are already in existence, at least in a rudimentary way. Possessing these attributes of super-sovereignty, it could hardly stop short or possessing itself of the other powers which characterize states or supranational authorities of the kind conceived.

It would be bound to have a common discipline for the common forces, which requires a common code of law and a common

judicial system. If the soldiers, sailors, and airmen were to swear allegiance to a new flag, they would all expect equality under it. Pay scales of a dozen national forces would have to be brought into line. That suggests the creation of a common currency.

A common currency, of course, could only rest upon a common economic and fiscal structure, suggesting that each member state would pool its production, waive control over its trade, and give up the national practice of budgeting, taxing, and spending as an individual country. All of these functions of national government would have to be transferred to the superstate, with its flag of General Eisenhower's invention.

A common military establishment, naturally, could only carry out a common foreign policy, so each of the member states would have to place the conduct of its diplomacy in the hands of the supranational authority. Each nation would further be obliged to yield the power to declare war or maintain neutrality.

All of these powers having been lost, there would be little left to national legislatures. The American Congress would be reduced almost to a nullity. The American citizen would find himself under a new flag, alien to him, and would discover that his concerns were now administered at some distant place by a foreign authority. The President of the United States might retain his title, but his station would be honorary and his duties nil.

Americans would awaken to the fact that their country had been pulled out from under them, and that it had none but a fictitious existence and sovereignty. They would find that they were now sharing equality in the lot of the British Socialists, the Icelanders, and the Portuguese, who only a few days ago held a totalitarian presidential election in which there was but one candidate. Americans would find themselves in the reluctant embrace of a France 25 percent Communist. They would be under a common flag with these and the people of seven other foreign countries.

At a stroke Eisenhower would realize all of the ambitions of the proponents of the Atlantic Union movement and suchlike one-worlders. That this is his ambition is attested by his own pronouncements. When he took over command of the Atlantic Army, he said that henceforward he could be only one-twelfth American. When he spoke in London the day before the anniversary of American Independence, it was to urge the European nations of the Atlantic Pact to unite politically. His reception at the hands of Britons was cool. Apparently now he would reassure them by putting the United States at their permanent disposal.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps, when some of those who criticize the Tribune and your humble servant's views have had experience under law as administered here in America by an international organization, they will realize then, if they now cannot, just what local government by internationalists means.

Submerged-Lands Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1951

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 4, 1951.

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN,

The White House,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As you know, the matter of quitclaim legislation which, at the expense of the other 45 States, would make an outright gift to California, Texas, and Louisiana of the Federal oil lands lying off their coasts, is again being proposed and strongly agitated by certain groups of Senators and Congressmen.

That the selfish and regional interests who are sponsoring this legislation can claim any support whatever from representatives of the 45 States who will be despoiled of their rightful share in this immensely valuable Federal property, indicates the measure of success with which they have carried on their extensive campaign of misleading propaganda, and have descended upon Washington with one of the wealthiest and most powerful lobbying groups in history. They have influenced the Congress with such adroitness and success that a great many Congressmen and Senators whose support they have enlisted, and whom both you and I know to be entirely honest and intelligent men, are apparently unable to comprehend the obvious fact that in voting for such a measure they will be betraying the interests of their own constituents and the overwhelming majority of the American people. The issue reduces itself to the simple question of whether all the people of all the 48 States are to enjoy the benefits of the national wealth lying off their coasts, or whether the Congress is to be misled by the propaganda and lobbying of the three coastal States and a few big oil companies, into betraying the vast majority of the American people by supporting away their property to the selfish enrichment of the interests which have misled them.

Most surprising to me is the information that quitclaim legislation is being advocated by a number of Congressmen and Senators from the reclamation States. California and Texas are two of these States, and I can of course understand why the representatives of those States might desire the Federal property along their coasts to be given away. But it is my information that quitclaim legislation is being advocated by some of the representatives of the other 15 reclamation States, namely, Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

If the Mineral Leasing Act is applicable to these oil lands in the marginal sea, then all the reclamation States stand to realize tremendous financial benefits from the Federal ownership and administration of this area, inasmuch as 52½ percent of all Federal royalties collected under that act (by 30 U. S. C. A. sec. 191) passes into the reclamation fund. The application of the Mineral Leasing Act is now pending in two cases in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. It is expected by everyone, including the Justice Department, that this question of the application of the Mineral Leasing Act will be decided in one of these cases this fall.

Now if the court decides that the Mineral Leasing Act applies, it will mean, as I have already pointed out, that 52½ percent of all Federal royalties from the lands now sought to be quitclaimed away will go into the reclamation fund, from which the people of these 17 semiarid reclamation States will benefit enormously by reason of the irrigation and power projects which will be undertaken in their States. But at the present time we have before us the amazing spectacle of representatives of some of those States agitating in the Congress for the enactment of legislation which would give away the oil lands from whose royalties the reclamation projects are to be financed, and which would thereby cut off irretrievably the

principal source of the finances through which those projects in their own States would be carried out and paid for. And I have just learned, even more to my astonishment, that inasmuch as the budget for the next fiscal year now contains no funds for reclamation construction, a number of Senators from the reclamation States of Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Utah, Wyoming, and Washington, will concentrate their efforts upon the inclusion of \$17,516,000 in the Bureau of Reclamation budget, in order to start one new project in each of those States during the fiscal year beginning July 1. This situation appears especially ridiculous in light of the fact that over \$33,000,000 is now being held in escrow pursuant to agreement between the Federal Government and California, by way of royalties from oil taken off the shores of California alone. This is only a small part of the total sum that would inure to the United States, the total being estimated by some to amount to many billions of dollars.

The public apathy toward this situation, especially in the reclamation States whose interests are most vitally concerned, is hard to understand. For the most part, these people have been deluged with false propaganda, just as their Senators and Congressmen have been. But even harder for me to understand is the gullibility of those representatives of the reclamation States in Congress who are advocating this legislation directly in betrayal of the vital interests of their own people.

You know that I have always said that the best antidote for false propaganda lies in education and in placing the true facts before the people. But up to now the facts have been largely withheld from the people and misrepresented to the Congress. Certainly if the facts are given to the people they will be able to understand where their interests lie. These facts, simple as they are, apparently are not understood by some Representatives in Congress. It would appear to me, if I may so state, that you could render an inestimable service to these people of the reclamation States, as well as to the Nation as a whole, if you would explain this situation to them.

Sincerely yours,

BURTON K. WHEELER.

A Farmer Looks at Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RUTH THOMPSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1951

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the Michigan Potato Growers News:

A FARMER LOOKS AT TAXES

(By Fred H. Sexauer, former president of Dairymen's League)

Politicians and some economists deal in so much double talk about taxes that we of the soil sometimes become a bit confused. Items of five, ten, twenty, fifty, and seventy billion dollars roll off the tongues of the bureaucrats like water out of the end of a hose. Talk of billions is so common today that the words million and billion are often confused with each other. Probably this is because neither a million or a billion can be understood by most of us. Anything less than a billion dollars becomes confused with

fractions or the sum to the right of the decimal point.

To some of us taxes mean hours and days of work. How much is a billion dollars? As I figure it, \$14 per working person for each of the 70,000,000 working people in these United States is just \$1,000,000,000. Working 8 hours a day at \$1.75 per hour a man earns just \$14. So \$1,000,000,000 of taxes is the total production of every working man and woman in these United States for one 8-hour day. Sixteen billion dollars added to the tax bill of this country is the total work of each and all of us for 16 days, about 2½ weeks.

A total estimated tax of \$71,000,000,000 a year means 71 days of our labor—not only my labor, not only your neighbor's labor, but the labor for 71 days, that is 14 weeks, a quarter of a year, of every man and woman working for gain in the United States of America. And if you happen to get less than \$1.75 per hour it may even mean more days and weeks.

When the President makes a tax request of Congress he is actually asking for hours, days, and weeks of your life and mine. When Congress appropriates that money they appropriate so many hours of our labor.

No one will deny that taxes are the products of yours and my hours of labor and are necessary to run the Government, but we are interested in whether or not those hours of labor which we have put in are wasted. I do not want them wasted in the support of useless officeholders or the maintenance of nonessential regulators or the wastefulness of the military. When the President asks for, and Congress appropriates, a week of my time and deprives me of the products that that week of mine would earn for me, I want to know that that week is going to be used as faithfully for my country as I would use it for myself.

When an army sells useful material as surplus they are selling my time. When the RFC makes a bad loan to or through some palace favorite they are loaning hours of my labor. When some regulator lives on Government salary and does not produce he is living on the products of my labor.

Taxes are the productivity of men's hands and brains, and the use of men's hours of labor. The dollars are only the tokens by which labor, brains, or savings are taken from the individual and transferred to the state.

The next time an appropriation of a billion dollars is mentioned just say to yourself, "There goes another day of my earnings; another day's production of this Nation which I never will be able to buy."

Don't figure taxes in money. Figure them by your hours of labor—of hand and mind—and your savings from past hours of labor. (Michigan Milk Messenger.)

Resolutions of New Haven Chapter, No. 31, Disabled American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN A. MCGUIRE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1951

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, in today's mail I received a letter from Russell E. Sullivan, of New Haven, Conn., national executive committeeman, Disabled American Veterans, for the States of Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey, in which he enclosed copies of resolutions presented to the annual convention of

the Department of Connecticut of the Disabled American Veterans which was held in New Haven on June 16 and 17, and which I had the honor to attend, by New Haven Chapter, No. 31, which is located in the largest city in my district. The resolutions were all adopted by the Connecticut DAV convention and are to be presented to the National Convention of the Disabled American Veterans which is to be held in Milwaukee, Wis., commencing August 13. They appear to be worth while, and I am taking this opportunity of calling them to the attention of the Congress.

Resolution 1

Be it resolved by New Haven Chapter, No. 31, Disabled American Veterans, in regular meeting assembled here in New Haven, Conn., this 12th day of June 1951. That we go on record as favoring enactment of legislation by the Congress of the United States that would grant to war veterans hospitalized in the facilities of the United States Veterans' Administration the privilege of sending letters through the United States mails without the payment of postage; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be presented to the annual State convention of the Department of Connecticut, and if adopted there shall be presented at the national convention of the Disabled American Veterans to be held in Milwaukee, Wis., commencing on August 13, 1951.

Resolution 2

Whereas there is an urgent need for stenographic service to supplement the work performed by the national service officers of the Disabled American Veterans, and

Whereas, following completion of the in-service training program of the Disabled American Veterans under public laws enacted by Congress, the secretarial service formerly furnished by the Veterans' Administration was withdrawn: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by New Haven Chapter, No. 31, Disabled American Veterans, in regular meeting assembled, That they go on record as favoring enactment of legislation by the Congress of the United States which would provide for and authorize the Veterans' Administration to furnish stenographic service to the full time accredited representatives of organizations incorporated by an act of Congress.

Resolution 3

Whereas there are over 1,000 veterans from Connecticut presently hospitalized outside of the State, and

Whereas there are over 300,000 veterans in the State of Connecticut and there exists only one hospital bed for each 993 such veterans, and

Whereas when the West Haven Veterans' Administration hospital opens there will be only one hospital bed for every 241 veterans; and

Whereas this figure of veterans per bed will rise because of the casualties occurring in the Korean conflict; and

Whereas there are over 500 Connecticut veterans hospitalized in the neuropsychiatric hospital of the United States Veterans' Administration at Northampton, Mass.: Therefore be it

Resolved by New Haven Chapter, No. 31, Disabled American Veterans, in regular meeting assembled, That they do go on record as favoring conversion of the United States Veterans' Hospital at Newington, Conn., from its present status of general medical to that of a neuropsychiatric hospital upon the opening of the new West Haven Veterans' Administration Hospital so that the many Connecticut veterans presently hospitalized outside the State may re-

ceive treatment closer to their homes and loved ones.

Resolution 4

Whereas disabled veterans, as a group, have a shorter life expectancy than the average person; and

Whereas existing Federal civil-service laws provide that all persons employed by the Federal Government must take a reduction in pension of 3 percent for every year of age they are under 60 at time of retirement; Therefore be it

Resolved, That New Haven Chapter, No. 31, Disabled American Veterans, in regular meeting assembled, does go on record as favoring enactment of legislation by Congress which would provide for optional retirement, without reduction in annuity, for persons employed by the United States Government upon attaining the age of 55 with 39 years of service.

Resolution 5

Whereas the United States Veterans' Employment Service has performed an excellent job in the placement of seriously handicapped veterans; and

Whereas there are constantly being released from the Armed Forces veterans, who because of service-connected injuries or wounds are in need of guidance, counseling, and placement service; and

Whereas the appropriation for the aforesaid service has been reduced below the standard which will permit it to continue its important and necessary function; and

Whereas the income tax paid by veterans placed by the aforesaid service by far exceeds the amount appropriated and also the amount recommended for appropriation. Therefore be it

Resolved by New Haven Chapter, No. 31, Disabled American Veterans, in regular meeting assembled, That they go on record as asking Congress to appropriate sufficient funds to maintain the staff and administrative force of the United States Veterans' Employment Service in the manner in which it was last year when their service proved so efficient and worth while.

Resolution 6

Be it resolved by New Haven Chapter, No. 31, Disabled American Veterans, in regular meeting assembled here in New Haven, Conn., this 12th day of June 1951, That they do go on record as favoring enactment of legislation by Congress which would grant to the widows and dependent children of veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict the same pension rights presently enjoyed by veterans of World War I.

Resolution 7

Be it resolved by New Haven Chapter, No. 31, Disabled American Veterans, in regular meeting assembled here in New Haven, Conn., this 12th day of June, That they do go on record as favoring enactment of legislation by the Congress of the United States which would grant widows of veterans and their dependent children more liberal earning rights before suffering the loss of their pension, i. e. that the widow without children be permitted to earn \$2,000 per annum in lieu of the \$1,000 limitation presently imposed and the widow with children be permitted to earn \$5,000 in lieu of the \$2,500 limit presently imposed, before losing their pension, and further that income from insurance shall not be counted in ascertaining gross income.

Resolution 8

Whereas there is presently pending before Congress legislation, which if enacted into a law, would reduce the sick and annual leave presently granted to Federal employees; and

Whereas such a reduction in leave, if enacted into law, would work considerable hardship on the large number of disabled veterans now in Federal service who need

such leave for pension and compensation examinations, out-patient treatment, and hospital treatment of their service-connected disabilities: Therefore be it

Resolved by New Haven Chapter, No. 31, Disabled American Veterans, in regular meeting assembled, That they do go on record as favoring enactment on no legislation which would reduce the amount of sick leave or annual leave presently granted to Federal employees.

Resolution 9

Be it resolved by New Haven Chapter, No. 31, Disabled American Veterans, in regular meeting assembled here in New Haven, Conn., this 12th day of June 1951, That they do go on record as favoring enactment of legislation by the Congress of the United States that would provide that one of the dependent children of veterans who lost their lives in the service of the country, or who subsequently died of service-connected causes shall be entitled to the educational benefits which would have accrued to the father under the Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944, had he lived, in those instances where the father never took advantage of the law because of death or other reasons.

Resolution 10

Whereas the Veterans' Administration has closed hospitals in various parts of the country, despite the protest of veterans' organizations and Members of Congress from effected areas, and

Whereas it is felt that such action should have the approval of Congress before being taken: Therefore be it

Resolved by New Haven Chapter, No. 31, Disabled American Veterans, in regular meeting assembled, That they do go on record as favoring enactment of legislation by Congress that would provide that no Veterans' Administration Hospital would be closed without the prior approval of the Congress of the United States.

Resolution 11

Whereas there has been introduced from time to time in Congress legislation which, if enacted into law, would materially weaken the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944; and

Whereas there exists, under presently existing legislation, ample opportunities for Federal agencies concerned to take care of nonveterans who might be reached in a reduction in force: Therefore be it

Resolved by New Haven Chapter, No. 31, Disabled American Veterans, in regular meeting assembled, That they do go on record as opposing enactment of any legislation which would grant nonveterans with certain specified years of service exemption from the provisions of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944

Resolution 12

Whereas the Hoover Commission has made recommendations which, if enacted into law and placed in effect, would result in the abolishment of the Veterans' Administration and the splitting up of its functions among the other Government entities, and

Whereas such an act would result in inferior and less centralized service to the veteran, especially the disabled veteran; and

Whereas such an act would place the presently existing Veterans' Administration hospital program under another Government agency that would not deal with veterans as a group: Therefore be it

Resolved by New Haven Chapter No. 31, Disabled American Veterans, in regular meeting assembled, That they do go on record as being opposed to the enactment of any legislation which would change the presently existing Veterans' Administration set-up.

Resolution 13

Be it resolved by New Haven Chapter, No. 31, Disabled American Veterans, in regular meeting assembled, That they do go on rec-

ord as favoring enactment of legislation by Congress which would provide that the dependent children of veterans who lost their lives in the service of their country in time of war, or who subsequently died of service-connected causes shall be entitled to hospitalization at United States Veterans' Administration facilities in those instances where the widow executes an affidavit of financial hardship.

Resolution 14

Be it resolved by New Haven Chapter, No. 31, Disabled American Veterans, in regular meeting assembled here in New Haven, Conn., this 12th day of June 1951, That they go on record as instructing their commander, Rudolph Raffone, and the other elected delegates to the Department of Connecticut convention, which is to be held in New Haven, Conn., on the weekend of June 16, to present these resolutions for appropriate action by that body, and further, that if adopted that action shall be taken to present them to the national convention of the Disabled American Veterans which is to be held in Milwaukee, Wis., for 1 week, commencing on August 12, 1951.

The Late Admiral Forrest P. Sherman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under the direction of Hon. Thomas L. Thistle, mayor, arrangements are under way for memorial services for the late Admiral Forrest P. Sherman in Melrose, where the admiral grew up and in whose public schools he received his early education. The plan has the spontaneous approval of all the people of Melrose in the desire to honor to the full the memory of their most distinguished citizen. In the meantime, the following resolutions have been passed by the city government:

RESOLUTIONS ON THE DEATH OF ADMIRAL FORREST P. SHERMAN, CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, UNITED STATES NAVY

CITY OF MELROSE,
IN BOARD OF ALDERMEN,

July 23, 1951.

Whereas the untimely passing of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations of the Defense Department of the United States, has, in a very special way, laid a burden of deep sorrow on the hearts of the people of this city of Melrose where he lived as a youth and grew to manhood, and which he always regarded as his home; and

Whereas it is now remembered that the career of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, from its earliest beginnings, was marked by a constant tenacity of purpose in the attainment of the high goals he set for himself, surpassing brilliance and intrepidity in assisting in the defense of his country in time of war and, during the period of his services as Chief of Naval Operations, a knowledge and understanding of the responsibilities given to him and an appreciation of their relation to the welfare of his country and the security of its citizens which gained for him the complete confidence of his superiors and, indeed, of all the people of the United States, to a degree which warranted entrusting to him missions of the most vital importance to its continued existence as a free

democracy and the maintenance of its prestige among the nations of the world; and

Whereas it is further remembered that the achievements of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman have not only brought richly deserved credit to himself and distinction to the country which he so faithfully served, but peculiar honor to the community of which it could truly be said that he was its most illustrious citizen: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the mayor and members of the board of aldermen of the city of Melrose, in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, acting in behalf of the citizens of said city, do hereby give solemn expression to our sincere regret and sense of irreparable loss in the death of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman; and be it further

Resolved, That these resolutions be spread upon the records of the board of aldermen and that a copy thereof be prepared and sent to the family of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman as a token of sympathy to them in this tragic hour.

RONALD H. WINDE,
President of the Board of Aldermen.
THOMAS L. THISTLE,
Mayor.

Western Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that we get the layman's view of conditions in Western Europe and I want to include, in his own words, the interesting observation of Mr. R. P. Johnson, of Fremont, Ohio, in the *Fremont*, covering his recent trip to Western Europe:

JOHNSON'S MESSAGE

Since my return from Europe, I have been asked by some of the employees to give my impressions of these various countries in comparison to ours. This could be simply stated by saying in a few brief words that every minute of the day all America should inwardly utter a prayer of thanks that they are Americans, that they live in America, and that they should keep America free.

The trouble today is that we have too many crackpots and too many "isms" favorable to a change in our way of life. And to try, by copying the European manner of doing things, we will eventually destroy all the good things we enjoy in our country.

For a long time the best things in America have been done by Americans, have been thought out by them and certainly were not copied by foreign influence. It is gradually becoming more so every day that a state of condition the like of which exists in some of these foreign countries will occur here unless we put on the brakes and slow down some of our political leaders in Washington.

It is hard to give a mental picture of what transpired during my trip, but I will do the best I can, and, of course, anyone else who would make the same trip would probably come back with entirely different views, depending on the motive of their trip.

In the first place, England struck me as being beyond the standpoint of trying to recover any of her past glories. Up until the last war, England more or less dominated the civilized world and controlled the destiny of millions of people in her Empire, whose influence was spread over all countries with the

exception of ours. Since the war you may have noticed the disintegration of this great Empire, reminding us all of the crack-ups in history of other great empires, such as the Roman dynasty, the Napoleonic era, etc. I don't feel that there is a chance of her ever regaining the place she once enjoyed for the simple reason that she has lost a great portion of her colonial possessions and is living entirely in the past, just like people do in their old age. They think in the past and can't see the future.

The English Parliament, like our Congress, is the ruling body in England today, although the English people look to their King as the symbolic head of their Empire. This is purely tradition and is something that they would not want to dispose of, even though the role of the King is meaningless as a governmental force, and all Britain is ruled by a present-day socialistic form of government.

The English people are rationed to the standpoint of bare necessities, far worse than the austerity you read about in the papers. The American visitors, on the other hand, are unrationed and feel guilty of getting all the things they want to eat in the hotels, because they know that the great majority of the people are struggling along on practically nothing. In fact, one meal that I could have ordered would have been a week's ration from a standpoint of meat and dairy products for a whole family for a week. There is no country that can properly get along when they produce only 35 percent of the things for their existence. England, on this hand, imports 65 percent of things they eat, or else they would not survive. Therefore, instead of trying to improve agriculture by better utilizing their vast estates and putting in farm and other supplies, they are continuing to go along their old way of doing things. From a machine and industry standpoint, I got the impression that they are at least 25 years behind us and do not believe that they want to get used to mass production or volume production and do not care to learn anything about it. They apparently are not technically inclined and their scale of living is very low in comparison to the standard of living our average employee enjoys. In other words, it is impossible for the average workingman in England to ever own a car, and the best he might be able to get would be a bicycle.

Culturally, they undoubtedly surpass us. From a standpoint of cleanliness their streets are spotless. No one throws paper or cigarettes or waste material on the sidewalks or streets, and their homes, likewise, are spotless. Generally, my impression of English methods and philosophy is that we could not learn anything from them that would improve our lot here in America.

This was true in Belgium, France, and Italy as well. In these four nations enormous amounts of American money on the Marshall plan and ECA programs has been spent which bolstered their economies to at least a favorable condition which their own governments could not have achieved without this aid. It has kept their economy going and has helped restore their industry and agriculture economically to a great extent. I don't believe that any of these countries are appreciative of this fact but rather that they feel we owe it to them because they have the opinion that they saved the United States from devastation by stemming the German military ambitions. They do not seem to realize that America was forced into that war. Furthermore, I got the impression that they expect and believe we should pull them out of the fire at all times in the future, such as in wars that might be contemplated by aggressor nations like Russia. They do not want to make the supreme effort of trying to help themselves.

At one time I was against the spending of Marshall plan money and hand-outs, and, for that matter, I still am against it. But as long as we are doing it I believe we should put it out with a string on it to make these people self-sufficient. I cannot help but feel that this mistake is going to cost us dearly in the future. Certainly they should not be given any money unless they show a willingness to help themselves and there should be some method of paying this money back, even if it took 500 years.

Another distressing thing about these four countries is the fact that, excluding socialistic England, they are all leaning toward communism. It is going to be a long tedious time (if ever) for them to work themselves out of this frame of mind because their habits have been brought about over a period of centuries and most of them are of peasant origin and do not have the education or desire to get ahead. My biggest observation in these countries, again excluding England and taking Belgium, France and Italy into consideration, is that education is at a premium and for the preferred few. Consequently, where you have illiteracy and ignorance you breed communism and all the things that communism stands for. This was one thing that struck me forcefully. Their papers in the metropolitan cities such as London, Paris, etc., are only two to four sheets, containing no news worth mentioning, have no funnies and consequently could be eliminated as far as enlightening the public in the standpoint of what is going on.

All the time we were in Europe you would never think that there was a war going on in Korea, as most of the papers carried it in one small paragraph. With the lack of information and current events they certainly will not take an interest in the Korean war that has been wished upon us. They have no magazines like we have here. They also lack comics and humor and no country can get along without some of this. I was very much impressed with Germany. Germany has had no benefit of any ECA or Marshall plan money up to now and still they are forging ahead by doing things the hard way. I have always found that the best people are the ones who are just a little hungry, which seems to cause a stimulation of ambition to bring about some sort of a change. This stimulation is apparent in Germany and I believe, for that reason alone, Germany will eventually come out of this with more scientific developments and in better shape than the other nations in Europe.

In Holland and Germany, I found there was no illiteracy, everybody must have an education. At least it shows that they are trying for the better things in life such as we have. There is a lot of room for improvement, such as having a better form of government. I would not want to find any better people though than the German people we met and I would definitely say that the great majority of them were not in sympathy with the Hitler movement when Hitler was in power. They have had the unhappy experience of always getting a poor leader and then being good followers. If they could get out of the habit of this they would become a great nation. This could be applied to Holland as well. This goes without saying that Switzerland should be the best country of all because it is free of wars and they take advantage of things that come to them, being very proud of their money and not like all the rest of them, anxious to get American dollars.

The situation of labor in all of these countries outside of Switzerland is about the same. The American labor union leaders should make a trip as I did and spent some time in these factories and compare it to

the American standard of conditions that exist here. Undoubtedly our labor leaders have been over there, but I believe they haven't informed the rank and file as to how much greater our standards of living and working conditions are.

There is no 40-hour week in any of these countries. They work 10- and 12-hour days, 6 days a week with no overtime, and their scale of wages gives them a bare existence. The rate of pay is from 15 to 30 cents an hour. And in our money, of course, would be extremely low because they cannot buy the luxuries and can buy only the necessities of life.

You do not find the safety regulations or any of the factory conditions that you do here. And, the only thing that I can find extremely different was probably the amount of men that were doing a given job. To me this means inefficiency. Unlike our American plants that are well staffed and equipped, our men given assigned duties, the European plants, while utilizing many men on a single operation, are not flexible. In our plants one new piece of equipment would release many men who could be utilized in the research and development of new and additional products. Over there, generally speaking, one new machine would just cause 5 to 100 men being laid off. This explains the multitude of products we have here which has, in turn, raised our standards of living to where they are. In Europe they manufacture just one of this and one of that. While over here we have many models of say refrigerators, cars, etc. We manufacture so many of these, then so many of that, and so on. Over there they are too standardized, and when they have made this they are through.

Burdensome taxes in these countries stifle incentives and ambitions of these individuals to the extent that industrial enterprise is suffering due to a lack of improvement and development. Germany before the war had been a leader in the industrial and chemical and machine industries. Naturally, the war has broken up a lot of this leadership. But I was impressed by some of the rubber and plastics machinery German engineers are developing.

I can foresee just such a thing happening to all of us here if we do not stop some of the fantastic things that are happening in Washington. When you destroy a good middle class of people, such as we have in America, you destroy the whole population morally and otherwise. You can't make 90 percent of our population poor through taxation without economy and still have a good country.

This may be dull reading to some of you, but these are my impressions of my recent trip to Europe in quest of advancements in Machinery which might be adaptable to our own plan. I still feel that America is a leader and controls the destinies of the world.

We need statesmen, diplomats, and smart people in our Government in the future if we are to survive.

Voice Challenges Reds To Let Oatis Speak on the Radio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1951

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News of today:

VOICE CHALLENGES REDS TO LET OATIS SPEAK ON THE RADIO

The Voice of America today challenged Czechoslovakia "in the name of decency" to let William N. Oatis broadcast daily from Prague so that the American people will know that the Associated Press correspondent is still alive.

The Voice broadcast its appeal to Czech President Clement Gottwald.

"One hundred and fifty million men and women of America and hundreds of millions elsewhere in the free world, want to know whether one man held in jeopardy in your country is all right," said a Voice commentator. "Let's see you be big, Mr. Gottwald, let's see you do one decent thing in a lifetime of indecent acts. Bring William Oatis to the Prague radio every night."

"Bring him drugged, if you must. Bring him mouthing anti-American propaganda if you must. But bring him."

The Voice commentator conceded his request was unusual but added that he was trying to speak man to man to Gottwald.

"This request would not have been necessary, Mr. Gottwald, if you had even allowed Ellis Briggs, the American Ambassador, to see William Oatis," the Voice said. "But you have allowed no one to see him, no one but your own, and the reports of such sycophants as you can muster are not acceptable to the American people."

"* * * We do not want to hear one of these days that William Oatis is ill, and that despite everything the six doctors you have sent to attend him he has passed away quietly in the night."

"Nor do we want to hear that somehow by some strange writ of Communist law that William Oatis is no longer held in a Prague jail, but has been removed to more distant places."

"I request that every night for as long as you illegally hold William Oatis, you bring him to the microphone or Radio Prague to report to the American people on his health, his well being, and his treatment in the past 24 hours. The American people, for whom I speak now, request that William Oatis speak to them over Radio Prague for 5 minutes every day so that they can hear with their own ears that their compatriot still lives."

Veterans' On-the-Job Training Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM T. BYRNE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1951

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

PATROON BROADCASTING CO., INC.
Albany, N. Y., July 25, 1951.
WILLIAM T. BYRNE,
Representative, New York District 32,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Today I am finishing a 2-year on-the-job training course as a radio news reporter. Without the help of the Veterans' Administration, I do not think I would have been able to learn the reporting business as I have.

The VA on-the-job training program has enabled me to learn this profession—and has made it possible for me to overcome a

disability and enabled me to earn a good living.

I have already thanked the VA, and I want you, as my Representative in Congress, to know I really appreciate the assistance the Federal Government has given me, not only from an educational standpoint; but also from a medical standpoint.

Sincerely yours,

ED GRAHAM,
News Reporter, WPTR.

Flood Control in the Missouri River Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1951

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, some comment has been heard within the past few days concerning the need for a Missouri Valley Authority to prevent a recurrence of the recent tragic and disastrous floods suffered by residents of the lower Missouri River basin.

Mr. RANKIN, of Mississippi, said on July 16 before this House:

That disaster could have been prevented, if Congress had passed my bill to create a Missouri Valley Authority.

Senator MURRAY, of Montana, told the Senate on July 23 when he presented his bill, S. 1883, which establishes a Missouri Valley Authority with unlimited powers:

The old methods and programs to control these floods in the Missouri Valley which have been followed through the years have completely failed.

Senator KEFAUVER, Tennessee, told the Senate on July 24:

For many years now we have been appropriating millions of dollars annually for flood-control work. We have built levees along the great rivers—built them higher and higher and higher. Then when the floods come, we pile sandbags on top of the levees, as we are now doing south of St. Louis.

I believe it is time to ask ourselves just how wasteful is it to build these local, or levee, flood-control works without also controlling the water in the headstreams.

Fortunately, in the Tennessee Valley Authority, we have visible and concrete evidence of what proper flood-control methods at the source of the water can do in preventing disastrous floods.

Mr. Speaker, we have a coordinated plan of development which envisions the control of the headwaters of the Missouri River, as well as the construction of main stream structures to regulate the river flow, irrigate 5,000,000 acres of land, and produce hydroelectric power. That plan is commonly known as the Pick-Sloan plan; technically it is known as the Missouri Basin project, authorized by Congress in the 1944 Flood Control Act—Public Law 534, Seventy-eighth Congress.

The critics of the Pick-Sloan plan and advocates of the valley authority scheme say our plan has failed. Mr. Speaker, let us look at the facts. Construction was initiated on the Pick-Sloan-plan

structures in the fall of 1946. In the 5 years of construction the Republican River, which joins the Smoky Hill and Solomon Rivers at Junction City, Kans., to form the Kansas River, is completely controlled. Dams at Enders, Bonny, and Medicine Creek along the Republican River tributaries in Nebraska are completed. An on-stream dam at Trenton, Nebr., is 50 percent complete and another on-stream dam at Republican City, Nebr., known as Harlan County Dam, was closed last week. The residents of the Republican River watershed suffered a flood in 1935 which caused untold millions of dollars in damage and took the lives of 110 persons. A flood again in 1947 took the lives of 12 persons around Cambridge, Nebr. Despite heavy rains in that watershed this year, the Republican River remained in its banks. Too, due to these completed structures mentioned herein, the flow of the Republican River was cut to a minimum during the high crest of the Kansas River downstream.

Two dams have been completed in the Smoky Hill River Basin in Kansas, an important tributary of the rampaging Kansas River—Cedar Bluff Dam, near Ellis, Kans., and Kanopolis Dam, upstream from Salina, Kans. The residents of the Smoky Hill River Basin suffered no damage during this recent heavy moisture period in Kansas. Too, the regulation of the flow of the Smoky Hill River prevented that stream from contributing to the high crest of the Kansas River. Each of these structures are multiple purpose and provide storage for irrigation purposes, as well as flood-control and river-regulation purposes.

On the main stream of the Missouri River, we have under construction, today, Garrison Dam in North Dakota, which is 42 percent complete; Oahe dam and Fort Randall Dam in South Dakota, which are 4 percent and 46 percent complete, respectively. These structures will serve flood control, river regulation, irrigation storage, and hydroelectric power generation purposes.

In addition to the structures, others are well along in planning which will fit into the operation of this integrated plan of development designed for the maximum use of the water resources in the Missouri River basin.

Therefore, it would appear, Mr. Speaker, that we have made great progress in the 5 years the Pick-Sloan plan has been under construction.

In order to correct the recent floods, the construction of Tuttle Creek Dam, north of Manhattan, Kans., where the Blue River joins the Kansas; Glen Elder on the Solomon River; Kirwin on the North Solomon; Webster on the South Solomon and Wilson Dam on the Saline River, all in Kansas, must be completed. These projects are all authorized as a part of the Pick-Sloan plan. They were scheduled for construction in an orderly manner for completion of the plan, which is estimated to take 40 years. In view of the recent floods, the responsible agencies and Congress should reconsider present construction schedules.

The valley authority advocates say our plan has failed. It is interesting to note that Senator MURRAY's bill, S. 1883, directs the authority board of directors in

formulating such a unified plan and recommendation, to give particular consideration to the general plans set forth in House Document No. 475 and Senate Document No. 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, as revised by Senate Document No. 247, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session—section 7 (a), page 16, S. 1883.

Mr. Speaker, those documents set forth the details of the Pick-Sloan plan. Is it possible that those who say our present plan has failed would adapt the same plan to their purposes?

The valley authority advocates paint in glowing terms the accomplishments of the authority system in the Tennessee-River system. Total Federal expenditures in the Tennessee Valley since its inception have exceeded \$1,000,000,000. Mr. Speaker, the Tennessee Valley has 41,000 square miles of drainage; the Missouri Valley has 530,000 square miles of drainage. The TVA has been in operation for 18 years; we have been in construction in the Missouri basin 5 years. We can accomplish similar wonders with a smaller proportionate amount of money and in less time under our present Republican form of Government.

In flood time or drouth the proposed MVA is a socialistic monster. It is uneconomical and unsound. It is phony. We do not need it now or ever. Its primary purpose is not to control floods, but rather to set up a new political order in the Missouri basin.

Minnesota, an Ideal Family Vacation Spot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, for all but Members of Congress, summer is a time for vacation, a time when families go away together for rest and enjoyment, a time for getting better acquainted, for building new strength. I would like to remind the people of the land that one of the finest vacation spots in the world for families to get real enjoyment is my own great State of Minnesota.

For fear that I may be accused of boasting, I would like to call your attention to what is said about Minnesota as a vacation spot by Mr. Frank Cipriani, travel editor of the Chicago Sunday Tribune. Read Mr. Cipriani's articles and then come up to Minnesota for the finest vacation available. I think it might do the Congress and the Nation some good if we took a recess in our labors here and all the Members visited Minnesota. I will guarantee you will be better for it when you return to your duties here.

The article follows:

MINNESOTA, AN IDEAL FAMILY VACATION SPOT—
STATE OFFERS ALL OUTDOOR SPORTS
(By Frank Cipriani)

Minnesota calls itself the land of 10,000 lakes, but actually it has more than 11,000,

and most of them provide the kind of a summer vacation that the entire family can enjoy.

The season is now open, of course, and already early summer vacationers are out in the woods, on the lakes, in areas of rustic surroundings—fishing, boating, hiking, and relaxing. The volume of vacationers will swell when the schools close, releasing scores of thousands of youngsters to travel with their families.

You can get to Minnesota by train, plane, bus, or private car, and you can take your vacation relatively near—in the St. Paul-Minneapolis area which is well geared for visitors—or go up into the far north country, which is still, in many sections, quite rugged and wild.

What will a Minnesota vacation cost this year? Probably a little more than last, but not much more in most cases, and no more in others. The State has 4,000 resorts, ranging from a few rooms to many, and most operators are trying to keep price levels down against rising expenses.

Rates vary, but fall into ranges of \$25 to \$75 a week for housekeeping cottages, \$2 and up a day per person for sleeping cabins, and \$6.50 to \$15 a day per person for accommodations on the American plan (with meals). It is important that if you intend to vacation in Minnesota this summer that you make reservations now.

Minnesota is a big State, rich with all the natural endowments for outdoor recreation and pleasure—lakes, forests, absorbing scenery, invigorating summer climate, and considerable wildlife. It has Indians, too. It has more than 40 State parks and waysides, many of them with picnicking and camping grounds, and at least one, like Itasca State Park, north of Park Rapids, with housekeeping cabins, and a hotel overlooking Lake Itasca.

Minnesota has so many outstanding resort areas that it is difficult to single out any special areas, but you can't overlook, among the many, the Arrowhead region covering 10 counties in the northeastern part of the State; Detroit Lakes, west and north of Brainerd, center of more than 400 lakes, Miles Lacs Lake, 425 miles from Chicago, or Lake Minnetonka.

Actually you can go anywhere north of the Twin Cities and at random find yourself a select spot tailored to your personal liking and finances.

Far northwest is the remote Lake of the Woods region, cutting into both Minnesota and neighboring Canada. This is a wildly spectacular area, abundant with wildlife and fishing. Here, incidentally, is the northernmost point in the United States. In short, for those who like their holidays both outdoors and rugged, Lake of the Woods is the answer.

Northeast is International Falls, gateway to an unbelievably spacious wilderness, with all the fishing, hunting, and canoeing to satiate the most enthusiastic outdoors enthusiast.

Then there's Hibbing, in the midst of the exciting Arrowhead resort country with thousands of lakes; Ely, in the heart of the vast Superior National Forest, and also Virginia and Grand Marais, likewise gateways to this widespread wilderness.

This forest is truly a forest. It covers some 3,500,000 acres. Here one may find a little interlude of solitude from the busy streets, jangling phones, speeding cars, and squawking radios of the big city and here, also, one may find a good, healthful outing in addition.

Another big woodland is Chippewa National Forest, which embraces many lakes, including the sizable Cass, Winnibigoshish and Leech Lakes. Cass Lake, the town, is a main gateway. Nearby are half a dozen reservations containing 15,000 Chippewa Indians. Early this month they hold their annual pow-wow.

The fabulous Paul Bunyan country is centered in Bemidji, just west of Chippewa Forest. This is excellent summer vacation country. Fish are as plentiful as the tall tales they tell about Paul Bunyan. This legendary gentleman could, they'll tell you, blow the roof off the bunkhouse every time he sneezed. His voice was so loud people nearby had to wear ear muffs, and once he blew so hard he bowled over 12 acres of trees. Well, maybe so. Anyway, the fish up this way are real.

Just at random, here are a few other fine vacation spots in Minnesota: Eden Valley, Nisswa, Alexandria, Aitkin, Duluth, Gross Lake, Lake Vermilion, Pelican Rapids, Crane Lake, Lake Kabetogama, Big Fork, Blackduck Lake, Baudette, and beautiful Hiawatha Valley, touching Winona, Wabasha, Lake City, Red Wing and Hastings.

A number of special events are scheduled in Minnesota during the summer, principal ones among them the Aquatennial at Minneapolis July 20-29, and the canoe derby at Bemidji July 13-20, this tying up with the aquatennial.

For a happy summer vacation, try Minnesota this summer.

Mr. Speaker, other newspaper articles containing information concerning how to reach resort areas in Minnesota were published in the Chicago Tribune for June 3, 1951. This information will be of interest to Members of Congress, I am sure, so I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as follows:

HOW TO REACH RESORT AREAS IN MINNESOTA

If you are among those who will be vacation bound to Minnesota this summer, here are some suggested routes to that area.

To reach resorts or vacation spots in the northeastern part of the State—Mille Lacs, International Falls, Bemidji, and so forth—probably the best way to go is U S 14 to U S 61 to St. Paul for the first leg of the trip. St. Paul is approximately 430 miles from Chicago.

There is just one qualification on this suggestion of U S 14: To find smoother roads, the Chicago Motor Club advises taking Ill. 72 from Chicago northwest to Ill. 31, jog north to Huntley Road, then Ill. 47 and north to 14.

The roads recommended in Minnesota are reported in good condition for driving at the present time.

A stretch of 70 miles on U S 61 south of St. Paul closely parallels the Mississippi river and is widely known for its scenic beauty.

Mille Lacs is a well known resort area about 75 miles above St. Paul. To reach it from St. Paul, take U S 10 and 169. This vacation spot, a great expanse of teeming water and virgin woods, is often referred to as the "sportsman's paradise" because of its excellent hunting and fishing.

Northwest on U S 169, on the way to International Falls, is the town of Hibbing in the heart of the Minnesota Arrowhead country. A great scenic attraction here is the world's largest open-pit iron mine.

International Falls is at the Canadian border on the shores of Rainy Lake. To get there from Hibbing take Minnesota 73 to US 53. Motorists are warned not to pick up hitchhikers in this area because of border jumps.

The town of Bemidji, a place of fame in Minnesota because of its claim to being the home of Paul Bunyan, can be reached by returning from International Falls on U S 71. Huge statues of the legendary figure, Paul Bunyan, and his blue ox, Babe, stand near the lake.

From Bemidji take U S 371 to U S 10 to U S 52 into Minneapolis.

To return to Chicago from Minneapolis, take U S 65 to U S 52 down to Dubuque, Iowa; cross the Mississippi here on U S 20

and turn south on Illinois 80 to U S 52 Illinois 64 (North Avenue).

A wider circle of resort areas of Minnesota can be made by taking U S 61 from St. Paul through Duluth and along the wilder shores of Lake Superior up to Grand Marais (the scenic Gunflint trail is just north of here); turn back to U S 61 to Little Marais and turn right on Minnesota 1 to the city of Ely, in the heart of the Superior National Forest and the gateway to the famous "roadless area" resort and canoe country.

From Ely, cross over to Hibbing, Grand Rapids and Bemidji on Minnesota 1 to U S 169, and 169 to U S 2; then by coming down U S 171 to U S 10, you could go left through the Mille Lacs region and down U S 169 to Minneapolis.

Another way to reach the northeastern corner of Minnesota above Duluth, is up through Milwaukee, Green Bay, and the north woods of Wisconsin. This gets you into the glistening lake and tall-woods region faster than via Madison.

Take Illinois 42 (Sheridan Road) to Illinois 173; cross over to U S 41 just beyond its reconstruction point and up to Milwaukee; Wisconsin 27 to Green Bay, Wisconsin 29 to Wisconsin 47 to U S 45; then 45 to U S 8, left to Wisconsin 47 through the resort area around Rhinelander and Eagle River up to U S 51; then take 51 to U S 2 and left into Duluth.

The return from Duluth could be made on U S 53 to Eau Claire, Wis., and U S 12 to Madison, from Madison take U S 14 to Chicago.

Look to the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1951

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of small talk regarding the loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Henry J. Kaiser enterprises.

Presently the gossips hit at the loan to the Kaiser-Fraser Co.

The Richmond Independent, of Richmond, Calif., answers some of these fatuitous statements in an editorial entitled "Look to the Record," which I include in these remarks.

It might be well to remember that Kaiser steel paid back all of its loan ahead of schedule and more important it paid dollar for dollar the amount the Government had invested in the Fontana steel plant though it was a war baby. Another steel company paid about 20 cents on the dollar for a steel plant built under comparable conditions.

The Richmond Independent is qualified to speak. It is published in Richmond, Calif., where Kaiser set records for shipbuilding in World War II.

The editorial follows:

LOOK TO THE RECORD

Last week a United States Senate subcommittee made a public declaration in which it said that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans to the Kaiser-Fraser Automobile Co were not in the public interest and should not have been made.

It seems to us that the subcommittee did not delve very far into Henry J. Kaiser's

record of financial transactions with the Federal Government, or it would not have come to such a conclusion.

In the first place, Henry J. Kaiser and his various enterprises have been very good customers of Uncle Sam, as far as paying back principal on loans, interest on loans, rentals, and Federal taxes. In fact we can almost go as far as saying that he has been the best customer the RFC or any of the other money-lending bureaus have ever had.

Let's look at the record. It shows that Kaiser and his various firms, Kaiser-Fraser, Kaiser Steel, Kaiser Aluminum, and Kaiser Metals have paid to the Government in principal, interest, and rentals, \$253,956,397. And in addition the Kaiser firm has paid Federal taxes, on these properties involved in the loans, to the tune of \$139,146,911. The grand total is almost \$400,000,000.

Now, at the present time Kaiser-Fraser owes the RFC something like \$62,000,000, peanuts when you consider the amounts of the other loans, all of which have been repaid. This debt to the Federal Government is current, the interest is being paid, the principal is being paid, and they are not behind in their payments.

Henry J. Kaiser has been subjected to all kinds of congressional committee investigations. Each time he has come out as clean as the proverbial whistle—clean because he has never resorted to outside influence, under-the-table practices, or fraud in his dealings with the Government.

The subcommittee said, in part:

"It does not believe that the interest of the general public was such as to justify the use of public funds to continue the operation of Kaiser-Fraser as an automobile company."

To which we say "Tommyrot!"

The Kaiser-Fraser loan was one of the best the RFC ever made. At least they have the Kaiser family holdings as security, something they did not have in cases too numerous to mention, but one in particular which could bear a little more scrutiny—namely the Luston company which nicked the Government for untold millions. And the RFC was left holding the bag to the tune of those millions.

Apparently the Senate Banking Subcommittee cannot see the forest for the trees, or is it bad for the Government to make money by lending money?

Kaiser has borrowed many millions from the Federal Government. He has paid back all but \$62,000,000—with interest—and it is a lead-bottom cinch that the \$62,000,000 will be repaid when it is due.

Yes, the RFC could do worse, much worse, than lend money to Henry J. Kaiser and his companies. The Banking Subcommittee is way off base on this report.

Northwest Airlines Celebrates Twenty-fifth Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, in this day, when we read of rocket planes that travel more than 1,500 miles an hour, it is hard to realize that aviation is a very young industry. As we watch the hundreds of planes landing and taking off daily at the National Airport, adhering to regular schedules and transporting thousands of passengers to every part of

the Nation and the world, it is almost impossible to believe that only 25 years ago, commercial airlines were just beginning their first flights.

This year Northwest Airlines, with its main office in Minnesota, celebrates its twenty-fifth birthday. The history of Northwest Airlines is a modern adventure story, an adventure story of American business with all its courage, its skill and its far-sightedness. In these times, when we have so many fears concerning the system of free enterprise, I commend the following to your attention, the story of Northwest Airlines' 25 years, which appeared in the Minnesota Historical Society publication of St. Paul, Minn., entitled "News for Members" for July 1951:

AVIATION HISTORY

Northwest Airlines, the only major airline with home offices in Minnesota, is observing its twenty-fifth anniversary this year. The illustrations on these pages will give you some notion of the progress made during those years in the field of aviation. Above are two of the first planes used by Northwest. On the opposite page is a 75-passenger, double-decked stratocruiser, last word in aviation luxury.

Obviously things have changed since Northwest Airlines began operations on October 1, 1926. On that crisp fall day, an open cockpit Curtiss Oriole biplane took off from the St. Paul airport and pointed its nose toward Chicago. The cockpit carried a mailsack instead of a passenger, and the plane flew an irregular course over numerous check points like a railroad bridge, one farmer's barn, and another farmer's silo. In that year, a one-man mechanical force, four pilots, and two planes comprised the operating division of Northwest.

Today the original 400-mile route has grown to more than 20,000 miles and the staff well into the thousands. The fleet of 2 tiny planes has grown to 10 Boeing stratocruisers, 21 Martin 2-0-2's, and 17 Douglas DC-4's. The silos used as navigation aids have been replaced by radio beams, paths of lighted beacon towers, and dozens of other modern devices.

The four pilots who flew the first flights are gone, but shortly after the line was founded they were joined by others who are still in the harness with Northwest. They are the ones who remember many of the personal, humorous incidents that occurred during those 25 years of serious growth.

For example, the oldtimers recall how airlines grew from open mail planes to cabin planes for passengers, competing with railroads by offering complimentary meals aloft. That sounded fancy, but early passengers recall how they flew serenely along in a Hamilton plane built for one pilot and four passengers. Complimentary meals aloft was quite a ceremony then. The pilot would place the stick securely between his knees to keep the plane on an even keel. Then he gingerly handed back to one passenger and another cardboard lunch boxes containing cold fried chicken and French fried potatoes.

In July 1927 Northwest started its passenger service, and the next year they began flying mail by night. By the winter of 1933, the company was flying from Chicago to Spokane, Wash. Since that time New York City, Alaska, and the Orient have been added to its ports of call.

The history of aviation in Minnesota is still to be written. But the MHS is beginning now to collect information on all phases of this subject before it is lost forever. The growth of the Civil Aeronautics Department is a chapter in itself. Perhaps you know some of the pioneers in this field who should

be interviewed or encouraged to write their reminiscences, or who have letters, diaries, and other manuscripts bearing on the early days of aviation in the State. If so, please tell us about them. Aviation is a vital chapter in the story of Minnesota, a chapter we must begin to preserve now before it is too late.

Admiral Sherman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1951

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, today at 3 p. m. the Nation will honor Admiral Forrest P. Sherman by interring his body at Arlington National Cemetery.

The great qualities that went into the make-up of the man and naval officer are intimately revealed in the following article by John S. Knight, editor and publisher of the Chicago Daily News, on Wednesday, July 24:

THE EDITOR'S NOTEBOOK

WARTIME MEETING REVEALED SHERMAN'S GREAT QUALITIES

I first met Admiral Forrest P. Sherman on a sweltering August afternoon in the bombed-out city of Manila.

It was in 1945 and 16 Japanese envoys headed by Lt. Gen. Takishiro Kawabe had just stepped from an American C-54 transport plane at Nichols Field to sue for peace.

These representatives of Emperor Hirohito were flown to the Philippine capital to talk with General MacArthur's staff concerning the terms of the official surrender.

Like all other correspondents in Manila, I was worried later that day over the "scuttlebutt" that only a limited number of reporters would be invited to witness the wind-up of the Pacific war aboard the battleship *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay.

Admiral Sherman apparently sensed my feelings and said quietly, "What are your plans?"

I replied that I hoped to get into Japan on one of General MacArthur's planes.

With a twinkle in his eye, the admiral remarked that perhaps I had seen too much of the Army and the Air Force and not enough of the Navy. He added: "Why not fly back to Guam with me tonight? If you do, I think I can find room for you on the *Missouri*."

That was good enough for me and I accepted the invitation at once.

During the flight to Guam, I had ample opportunity to become well acquainted with the man who was later appointed Chief of Naval Operations.

Admiral Sherman impressed me from the start as having distinguishing qualities that set him apart from the usual run of Navy brass.

Although Sherman was a first-rate fighting man, having been awarded the Navy Cross for extraordinary heroism when the aircraft carrier *Wasp* was sunk by a Japanese submarine, I was attracted most by his scholarly mind and his keen perception of political and economic problems.

The following day, Admiral Sherman sent me by Navy plane to Iwo Jima and from there by destroyer to join the U. S. S. *Iowa* in Sagami Bay.

A seat upon a 16-inch gun turret overlooking the captain's promenade deck of the *Missouri* was my reward on that memorable

"surrender Sunday" for being tossed about on a tiny destroyer for more hours than I care to remember.

On Monday following the surrender, Gen. Julius Ochs Adler (New York Times) and I flew back to Guam with Adm. Chester Nimitz and Adm. Forrest Sherman.

Here again, we were delighted with the fine quality of Sherman's mind and I wrote at the time: "We shall be hearing more about Sherman as time goes on."

Admiral Sherman died in Italy last Sunday after concluding a series of major defense conferences in Western Europe.

At this critical stage in world affairs, he will be hard to replace. More than any other one man of the Navy, Admiral Sherman made the most valuable contribution to unification of the Armed Forces.

When Admiral Denfeld was fired as CNO for making a last-ditch fight against a single Department of National Defense, Sherman was given Denfeld's job.

At first, Sherman was resented by Navy partisans who thought he was "too friendly" to the other services. This feeling was based upon Sherman's staff work with officers of the Army and Air Force when unification was still in the planning stage.

Later, the critics' panning turned to praise. For Sherman, in his quiet, efficient, tactful way, did more for the Navy in his relatively short tour of duty as CNO than all of the shouting admirals put together.

Like MacArthur, Admiral Sherman was well versed in fields other than those pertaining to the military. He knew history and politics and had the intuition of a trained diplomat.

For this reason, Admiral Sherman represented his country abroad with dignity, firmness, and understanding.

It is tragic indeed that his career has been ended at the very moment when the country is in the greatest need of his services.

Alaska Grows Up, Should Be Admitted as State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable interest in Alaska these days for several reasons. I believe the membership of the House will read with interest a fine article, published in the *Eagles'* magazine for July-August 1951 entitled "Alaska Grows Up."

The article is written by Richard L. Neuberger, and it points out the fact that Alaska is no longer a primitive frontier, but a huge northern Territory, making giant strides toward statehood and industrial development. The article follows:

Alaska is coming of age.

Ten years ago Alaska was still predominantly a wilderness. It could be reached from the United States only by boat or plane. Its population was a mere 72,000. Statehood seemed far off. Industrial development was even more distant.

Today Alaska is a land of thriving, cosmopolitan communities. A broad graveled road with magnificent bridges ties it to the rest of the North American continent. Its population is 127,000, a prodigious gain of more than 75 percent since 1940. Statehood al-

ready has been approved by one branch of Congress. It is possible that Alaska soon may become a world center for the production of aluminum and pulp and paper.

Last year an event occurred which symbolizes Alaska's new status. For the first time in history more people traveled to Alaska by automobile than by steamer. The number of visitors arriving by sea in 1950 was 17,430. But 22,507 persons rolled into the Territory over the 1,522-mile Alaska Highway, constructed in World War II.

Even more significant, 5,984 of the people arriving by car did not leave Alaska. The population of the Territory is still growing—in spite of the fact that in the decade between 1940 and 1950 Alaska had the greatest proportionate increase of any area under the American flag, even including California.

Alaska's six Eagle aeries, scattered all the way from the British Columbia line nearly to the Arctic Circle, are located strategically to be part of the Territory's biggest boom.

Aerie No. 162, in Ketchikan, which packs more canned salmon than any other community in the world. Five miles outside Ketchikan, ground has been broken for the first pulp mill ever to be erected in the north. It will tap the continent's largest remaining stand of spruce and hemlock timber. These trees grow in the vast Tongass National Forest.

Douglas Aerie is situated in a suburb of Juneau, the Alaskan capital. Douglas lies directly across a narrow salt-water inlet from Juneau. Many men associated with territorial agencies are brothers in Douglas Aerie. They are helping to direct the expansion now taking place in Alaskan industry, agriculture, and transportation.

Aerie No. 25 serves Skagway, where Jack London and other cheechakos sloshed ashore half a century ago to hunt gold in the Klondike. Skagway is the site of the proposed Taiya hydroelectric project, which would exceed even Grand Coulee Dam in the production of kilowatts.

Most of the brothers of Aerie No. 25 work for the narrow-gauge White Pass & Yukon Railway, which ascends the mountains to Whitehorse, principal military base along the Alaska Highway.

Anchorage is by far Alaska's biggest city. More than 31,000 people inhabit the Anchorage area. This is an amazing increase of 567 percent over 1940. Where a decade ago bears roamed and lordly moose foraged there now are supermarkets, housing projects, and busy bus lines. Aerie No. 2509 engages in many community enterprises in this city, which is also the headquarters of the Alaska department of the United States Army.

Fairbanks has a bustling Aerie. It also has Ladd Field, most strategic air base in the Far North, where extensive cold-weather experiments are conducted. No artificial ice ever is required. In temperatures as low as 66 degrees below zero Superforts take off casually from Fairbanks for routine flights over the pole. Fairbanks is also the terminus of the Alaska Railroad, supply line of the Territory, and the source of good jobs for many members of Aerie No. 1037.

Valdez is on a wooded harbor along the coast. It is the point at which the famous Richardson Highway touches tidewater. This was the first road ever built in Alaska. Cargoes are put ashore at Valdez and trucked over windswept passes to the Alaska Highway.

Brothers of Aerie No. 1971 are among the men who perform this rugged task at the steering wheel. Frequently they move critical military loads in temperatures so low that antifreeze solution has been known to harden in radiators.

The Alaska of 1951 challenges many long-held notions of what life is like along this rooftop of North America.

It distinctly is not primarily a realm of grizzled prospectors, man-eating brown

bears, Eskimo igloos, and gun-totin' adventurers. These picturesque things are there, of course. But they are the exception and not the rule.

Alaska is growing up. It is becoming increasingly civilized with each passing day. It is not so unlike the Pacific Northwest States of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho—familiar to thousands of Eagles.

Juneau's Baranof Hotel is as luxurious as many hotels in the distant "States." Members of Aerie No. 1037 who work on the Alaska Railroad operate a streamlined train which would do credit to numerous transcontinental systems. This train is the Aurora, rolling between Anchorage and Fairbanks. At a banquet in Ketchikan or a ball in Juneau, one is sure to see the latest in women's fashions.

Nor is Alaska exclusively a land of snow and ice, winters are severe in the interior but the cities along the sea have milder weather than St. Louis or Boston. Visit a beach near Ketchikan or Sitka. You will find children romping in the sand, bathing beauties posing beside the waves, and cottages ringed with wild flowers.

Alaska is just coming into its own. For example, Skagway now has a population of 600. Yet the Alaska Development Board points out that a project is possible at Skagway which would boost the population to 40,000.

In the mountains high above Skagway, the Yukon River rises and flows 2,000 miles to the Bering Sea. But Skagway, on the shores of the Pacific, is a mere 19 miles away. What if some of the Yukon's headwaters were diverted backward to Skagway? This would accomplish in 19 miles a drop in elevation which now is distributed gently along 2,000 miles.

Water thundering through tunnels and canyons to Skagway could generate 12,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity annually. This would be the greatest power project in the world.

Because power is the principal ingredient in aluminum, the Aluminum Co. of America has taken a 50-year lease on 350 acres in the Skagway area. The largest light-metal plant ever constructed could be the eventual result.

Stroll down the main thoroughfare of a thriving Alaskan city, such as Juneau or Anchorage. You will not find it greatly different from any Eagle community of comparable population in the far-off United States of America.

Men do not wear mackinaws and parkas. They wear business suits and overcoats—perhaps with rubbers in the rain or galoshes in the snow. There are supermarkets and movies and doctors' clinics. Busses look just like busses in the States. Daily papers are published, such as the Anchorage Times and the Fairbanks News-Miner.

Of course, you will discover some contrasts with the United States. Prices are higher in Alaska than in any other place over which our flag flies. It is not uncommon to pay \$1.50 a dozen for eggs, \$1.35 for a lettuce and tomato salad 50 cents for a dish of ice cream and \$2 for a haircut. Wages, too, are higher. A master carpenter on a construction project may earn \$700 during a month.

The number of white men in Alaska outnumber white women at least 2 to 1. This means there are comparatively few families. It is frequently a big event in a remote hamlet when a new schoolteacher or nurse arrives to assume her duties. Often she does not remain single for long.

I remember talking to a pretty brunette nurse in Ketchikan. "When I decided to go to Alaska," she said, "I thought I was going to live on a frontier. I took along all sorts of rugged equipment. But in my first letter home I sent for my best evening gown. I never saw so many formal parties before in all my life. A few months later I sent for

my bathing suit. I believe my folks in Omaha thought I had been shipped off to Miami or Honolulu by mistake."

Alaskan people are public spirited. Juneau's citizens, aided by Eagles in nearby Douglas, recently raised \$71,000 in a few months to help finance a public library. Furthermore, the capital city recently became the first Alaskan community to pave all its principal streets.

Anchorage, the fastest growing municipality anywhere on this continent, has accomplished miracles in a few years. It has established a new water and sewer system, modernized its telephone exchange, built many additional schools, and developed parks and other recreational facilities.

Gov. Ernest Gruening, of Alaska, cites these feats as evidence that Alaska has come of age, that it is ready for full membership in the Union. Although it is hard for us to realize, Alaska is more populous than at least 15 States were when they were accorded stars in the flag. President Truman has advocated statehood, and the United States House of Representatives has acted favorably on a statehood bill.

In spite of the advances made by Alaska toward civilization, don't forget to bring your fishing equipment and shotguns if you head north. There are still countless lakes where only a few white men have fished. The 28-inch trout will snap at a bent pin. Ducks and geese abound in the marshes. And if you have an adventurous spirit, you can trudge up the Stikine River or into the solitude of Kodiak Island in quest of the world's biggest meat eater, the Alaskan brown bear. But be sure to take along an experienced guide and a rifle which never jams.

Alaska today is on the march to statehood and industrial development. But enough of the frontier remains to make any pulse beat faster.

Central Valley Recreation Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1951

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, in California, between August 1 and 10, extensive celebration of the initial operation of the great Central Valley reclamation project will be held beginning in the north near Shasta Dam at Redding and continuing day after day southward to the end of the Friant-Kern canal at Bakersfield. These spontaneous observances will follow the course of the water as it moves southward in man's most ingenious engineering work. Local communities and people who have waited and prayed for the water to flow in the ditches for many years have formed committees and are planning the events, the greatest of which is scheduled for Tracy where the great pumps that reverse the flow of the San Joaquin River will go into operation on August 4. Prominent friends of the Central Valley project from all over the country will join in these celebrations. The President may attend. Secretary of the Interior Chapman will be there. Many members of the committees of the Congress that have considered this project through the years will attend and

speak on the invitation of the organizing committees. Governor Earl Warren of California and many other State and local dignitaries will be present and will participate.

Since my district is in part in the Central Valley and the Contra Costa canal, an important part of the project, serves my constituents, I join all the people at home in inviting everyone to look toward California between August 1 and August 10 and to see what it means in the West to put a great reclamation project into operation.

It has proved annoying that some have attempted to detract from these celebrations and to throw cold water on the spontaneity of the occasion. For the information of my colleagues, I include an editorial published on July 12, 1951, in the Tracy Press and a news item which appeared on July 11 in the Stockton Record. I also attach an editorial by Paul C. Bodenhamer that appeared in the July 9 issue of the Redding Record-Searchlight. They follow:

[From the Stockton (Calif.) Record of July 11, 1951]

CVP 3-DAY FESTIVAL TRACY'S OWN IDEA, PROMOTED BY CITY—PETE COCHAIRMAN ANSWERS SOLON CHARGE; RECLAMATION BUREAU IS NOT TRACY HOST

TRACY, July 11.—"Tracy's Central Valley project pumping plant celebration to be held August 3-5 is Tracy's project—good, bad or indifferent—and not the Federal Bureau of Reclamation's," said Bruce Hotchkiss, celebration cochairman, today.

Hotchkiss' statement came in answer to accusations by Los Angeles Representative NORRIS POULSON (Republican) who said the Reclamation Bureau is spending hundreds of thousands of dollars illegally on self-praising propaganda in connection with the opening of the CVP.

Poulson declared California farmers have a right to celebrate the arrival of water for their fields, but Reclamation Bureau officials should be servants, not hosts at the party.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AIDING

Commenting on this Hotchkiss said, "The Tracy Pumping Plant celebration was a product of mine and Tracy District Chamber of Commerce secretary, Bob Monagan's, imagination. It stemmed from a desire to obtain publicity for Tracy. It is thoroughly independent of Bureau of Reclamation efforts—they have had no members in it nor directional efforts.

"As a matter of fact," Hotchkiss added, "the Bureau has even bucked us on several ideas for the fete."

Hotchkiss explained the conception and workings of the Tracy group by stating an independent corporation was formed in February of this year. It was named the Tracy Pumping Plant Celebration, Inc. The organization was formed to plan and promote a celebration. The board of directors was formed of Tracy citizens who hired Art Craner, for 14 years director of the Los Banos May Day celebration, as director to promote the fete.

INVITE PRESIDENT

"Through Craner's efforts and the possibility President Truman might attend the dedication of the plant Tracy and the celebration has gained widespread publicity," declared Hotchkiss.

The celebration group before actual formation, invited the President to attend the dedication ceremonies. Following formation, the corporation has successfully promoted a queen contest in which a \$7,500 profit was made. "Through our own efforts," Hotch-

kiss said, "we have been able to finance our group."

This has been done, he went on, by selling carnival rights, campaigning for funds from contractors and by selling concession rights and program rights.

"We even held a dinner and auction in March from which we raised \$500 on which to operate. We auctioned prizes donated free of charge by local merchants."

[From the Tracy Press of July 12, 1951]

FEDERAL BUREAU PROPAGANDA

A recent article in a national weekly magazine titled "How Government Pressure Boys Squander Your Money," and a blast from Congressman NORRIS POULSON the past week have centered attention on the propaganda activities of Government bureaus, especially the Bureau of Reclamation, in connection with the celebrations incident to the dedication of the Central Valley project this summer.

According to the magazine article this Bureau has spent untold sums of the taxpayers' money in lobbying and glorifying itself through expensive cocktail parties, air junks, and by publication of books and other promotional material, which has been mailed to newspapers throughout the entire United States. Every Bureau employee, this article explains, is a press agent who is expected, by official suggestion, to get out and meet the folks, even joining luncheon clubs and chambers of commerce and churches, because Congress is very sensitive and susceptible to what goes on at home, and the more friends we make here the more easy it will be back in Congress to get our appropriations.

There are a lot of mighty fine people working for the Bureau of Reclamation in the Tracy district who should not be blamed for such activities, for we are sure most of them do not believe in such tactics. Working for the Bureau of Reclamation is a job, a way to make a living, and all of the Bureau people we know here are earning their money. Few if any of them have the time to spread propaganda, and it is probably the last thing they would think of doing anyway.

The Bureau of Reclamation is not the only offender in this regard, either. Though the expenditure of official time or Federal funds to influence legislation is punishable by fine and imprisonment, it is apparently becoming established procedure in a great many Government agencies. The thousands of pitchmen on the public payroll, creating artificial desires for more and more Government services, cynically egging on each and every pressure "gimme" group, are spending huge sums to convince us that they need still more tax funds, money that should be going to more worthy purposes.

Just for the record, the celebration Tracy is going to state here on August 3 to 5 is not financed in any way by the Bureau of Reclamation, and indirectly by the taxpayers. All the necessary cash is being raised in one way or another by the local corporation handling the event.

[From the Redding Record-Searchlight of July 9, 1951]

NONE OF THE BUREAU'S BUSINESS?

NORRIS POULSON, a Congressman from Los Angeles, has sent us an eight-page mimeographed release from his office in Washington, D. C., blasting at the Bureau of Reclamation for what he calls an "orgy of illegal spending to praise its own officials." The only thing it proves conclusively is that Representative POULSON's hatred for the Bureau affects his judgment. His statements are so extreme and intemperate, they so frequently exaggerate and distort the facts that it is hard to give any real consideration to whatever just complaint POULSON may have.

"The Bureau of Reclamation," the Congressman says, apparently in all seriousness, "never did anything unselfishly or for the good of anyone but itself. The Bureau is a political cell, and its sole purpose is to destroy individual rights and become the absolute master of the western half of this country." What has set him off is the Central Valley water festival, August 1 to 10, in which Redding and other towns are participating enthusiastically. Poulson declares:

"The festival should be none of the Bureau's business, and Bureau henchmen should be excluded along with smallpox. The Bureau built the Central Valley project only through suzerainty and the tolerance of a hopeful and trusting people, and the Bureau should be the servants of those people, not their hosts. The party should not be given either by or for the Bureau, but by the Bureau's rightful employers, the Central Valley farmers, who must pay the project bill." And again:

"For several months every city, town, and crossroads hamlet in the United States has been inundated by a flood of organized hypocrisy, both oral and written, from the bureau propaganda mill, the greatest fountain of misrepresentation in the Government. No lobby in the Nation could afford to issue a small part of the material, mostly blather in this case, with which the Bureau has littered editors' desks and harangued civic gatherings from Canada to Mexico. And even more.

"Up and down the length of California a regiment of selected Bureau missionaries have been traveling for months, spreading the gospel of their greatness on every village and farm. * * * The Bureau's plans comprise a display of wanton spending at a time when any GI in Korea would give a month's pay for one smell of a Central Valley alfalfa field instead of the constant stench of rotting corpses. * * *

"The Bureau has one goal; to secure a stranglehold on all sources of water, all projects, all rights to the use of water. That done, there is nothing the people can do, except pay the bills and genuflect before the leering faces of their masters, the mercenaries of Strous, et al. * * * These are the people, the Bureau and its menials, who are demanding that the citizens of California pay them homage for 10 days at the same time they are striving to wreck the State's economy."

Come, come, Congressman. Sensible, constructive criticism—which the bureau needs and deserves—might improve the bureau. But folks around here, who have had lots of first-hand experience with the bureau and the Central Valley project, know that it simply isn't so that the Bureau never did anything for the good of anyone but itself or that its sole purpose is to destroy individual rights or that a regiment of Bureau missionaries has been calling on every village and farm. Folks here may even wonder why you, living outside the project area, show such great concern and why you—or somebody—should go to the expense of mailing out your mimeographed blast.

The fact is that 12 or 13 years of work are being climaxed in August when the project commences fully integrated operations. The Bureau built it and has a right to be proud of it. The Bureau cooked up the celebration and is working with the various communities, such as Redding, but the local communities are running their own shows. Redding chamber of commerce, for instance, is working on an observance here and regards the celebration as a good thing which will bring Nation-wide publicity to the State and to our own city.

This paper has had some pictures and maps and factual material (much of it at the paper's own request) from the bureau, but it hasn't been inundated with material, hypocritical, or nonhypocritical. And while

the editor's desk is littered, it is not with bureau material.

There are interests that hope to gain their own selfish ends by destroying public confidence in the Bureau of Reclamation. Congressman Poulson is playing their game, and not very subtly.

Why We Are Short of Metals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, a resolution will soon come to the floor of the House to permit lead to enter at a reduced duty or free because the metal is in short supply. The fact is that procurement authorization for lead under ECA to May 31, 1951, amounts to \$57,300,000. How long are the flames of inflation to be fanned into a destructive flame by giving away our vital metals? It only creates a greater domestic shortage which of course forces up the price. Not only this, these gifts are paid for by our taxpayers. Does destructive taxes mean nothing to the spendthrifts operating the ECA?

Under leave to extend, I am inserting the following:

MARSHALL PLAN PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION
TOTAL \$12,500,000,000

To July 16, 1951, the Economic Cooperation Administration reports procurement authorizations as follows:

Cumulative total for Europe (including MDAP and GARIOA).....	\$12,046,254,000
Cumulative total for Yugo- slavia-MDAP.....	27,900,000
Cumulative total for Far East area.....	495,854,000

Total authorizations... 12,570,008,000

By dishing out American tax dollars to try and rehabilitate the economies of European countries in many instances the Federal Treasury has supplied funds for the procurement of strategic and critical materials which were in short supply in the domestic markets, thus creating an inflationary cycle which the Government now proposes to check or halt by heaping new tax burdens onto the American business economy.

A program reaching such economic asininity deserves more than passing consideration by the American people who must shoulder the burdens of the ultimate costs. Here are some facts to think about.

To May 31, 1951, the procurement authorizations for nonferrous metals were as follows:

Copper.....	\$352,800,000
Aluminum.....	123,000,000
Zinc.....	79,600,000
Lead.....	57,300,000
Brass and bronze.....	9,300,000
Nickel.....	6,200,000
Tin.....	2,000,000
Others, including precious.....	19,700,000

Total authorized..... 649,900,000

The inflationary effect of the procurement authorizations under ECA are shown by the wholesale prices reported by the

Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, which were:

	April 1946	May 1951
Copper, per pound.....	\$0 2120	\$0 2420
Aluminum, per pound (scrap).....	.0741	.1725
Zinc, per pound.....	.1200	.1750
Lead, pig, per pound.....	.1721	.1700
Brass sheets, per pound.....	.302	.3770
Tin, wholesale, per pound.....	.9400	1 3986

As we have so frequently warned, it is time to close Uncle Sam's international gift shop instead of authorizing new expenditures which will burden the American productive economy and contribute to inflation.

United States Advisory Commission on Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1951

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE,

Washington, July 27, 1951.

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY,

House of Representatives

DEAR MR. ROONEY: One of the misstatements that was made in the so-called Voice of America appropriations debate in the House on Thursday, July 26, is so unjust that I believe you will want to correct it in the RECORD. In that debate Congressman TABER said, with reference to the United States Advisory Commission on Information: "I talked with a member of the Advisory Commission a little while ago, who said he had not been called to a meeting in a year. The editor of the Saturday Evening Post, who was on that Commission, has never been called to a meeting, and he wrote just a little while ago just what he thought about the situation and the way it was not being carried on for the good of the American people to get across the message of where America stood."

In the absence of Mr. Erwin Canham, the Chairman of the Commission, who is even now abroad where he is looking into some of our operations, I think I should state the facts. There have been six meetings of the Commission within the last year. Every member has been invited to attend each of these meetings, and each of the members has attended at least some of the meetings, in addition to looking into the operations individually. I attach a full list of the meetings and the attendance at each.

Also, as I believe you know, the individual members of the Commission have spent a great deal of time looking into the operations of this program abroad.

In addition, I attach a letter from Mr. Ben Hibbs, the editor of the Saturday Evening Post, indicating that he has attended every meeting called since he was appointed to the Commission and reflecting his true views about the program.

I am sure you will want to see that the record is set straight on this.

Sincerely,

EDWARD W. BARRETT.

DEAR MR. BARRETT: I understand that it was said on the floor on Congress one day this week that I have never attended a meeting of the United States Advisory Commis-

sion on Information since my recent appointment as a member of the Commission. This is untrue. There have been two regular meetings of the Commission since my appointment, and I have attended both of them. In addition, I spent a full day in New York recently inspecting and investigating the radio, film, and publication operations of the State Department's information program. Furthermore, I have access to much written material dealing with the program, and I spend a great deal of time between meetings reading this material and informing myself about its various phases.

Since my appointment, the Commission has made one report to Congress. I did not sign this report for two reasons. At the time the report was written, my appointment had not yet been confirmed by the Senate, and I felt I had no legal right to sign. Secondly, at that time, I had just been appointed and had not had time to inform myself about the information program or the work of the Commission. Since then, I have informed myself, and if I had the opportunity today to sign the report, I should do so without hesitation.

I understand that it was also said on the floor of Congress that I recently "wrote something" expressing critical views of the Voice of America. This is not true. I have written nothing about the Voice of America since I have been on the Commission. We did publish a few months ago, in the Saturday Evening Post, a guest editorial written and signed by an outside writer, and in this editorial the writer was in some degree critical of the Voice.

My position is that there is room for improvement in the whole State Department's information program, as there always is in any activity, governmental or private. But I do not believe this program has been a failure, and I do believe that it is being steadily improved. Moreover, I believe most urgently that the program is of such enormous importance that we simply can't throttle it by denying funds for its continuance. Sincerely,

BEN HIBBS,

Editor, Saturday Evening Post.

U S Advisory Commission on Information— Advisory Commission meetings

Date	Location	Member attending
June 27, 1951...	Washington, D. C.	Erwin Canham (chairman), Philip Reed, Mark May, Ben Hibbs
Mar 30, 1951 ¹	do.....	Erwin Canham (chairman), Mark May, Ben Hibbs, Justin Miller
Dec. 13, 1951 ²	do.....	Mark Ethridge (chairman), Erwin Canham, Justin Miller, Mark May, Philip Reed
Aug. 30-31, 1950.....	do.....	Mark Ethridge (chairman), Erwin Canham, Mark May, Justin Miller
June 28, 1950.....	do.....	Mark Ethridge (chairman), Erwin Canham, Justin Miller
Apr. 2-3, 1950.....	New York City	Mark Ethridge (chairman), Erwin Canham, Justin Miller, Philip Reed, Mark May (Apr. 2 session)
Feb. 20-21, 1950.....	Washington, D. C.	Mark Ethridge (chairman), Justin Miller, Mark May, Erwin Canham
Nov. 23, 1949.....	do.....	Mark Ethridge (chairman), Philip Reed, Erwin Canham
Aug. 3-4, 1949.....	do.....	Mark Ethridge (chairman), Philip Reed, Erwin Canham, Justin Miller, Mark May

¹Part of morning session joint with OEX Commission. Afternoon session joint with OEX Commission.

**U. S. Advisory Commission on Information—
Advisory Commission meetings—Con.**

Date	Location	Members attending
June 8-9, 1949...	Washington, D. C.	Erwin Canham (chairman), Justin Miller, Mark May, Philip Reed (June 8 only).
Mar. 12, 1949...do.....	Erwin Canham (chairman), Mark May, Justin Miller.
Feb. 21, 1949...do.....	Erwin Canham (chairman), Mark May, Philip Reed, Justin Miller.
Jan. 24, 1949...do.....	Mark Ethridge (chairman), Justin Miller, Philip Reed, Erwin Canham, Mark May.
Dec. 6, 1948...	New York City.	Mark Ethridge (chairman), Erwin Canham, Philip Reed, Mark May.
Nov. 22, 1948...	Washington, D. C.	Mark Ethridge (chairman), Erwin Canham, Justin Miller, Mark May, Philip Reed.
Oct. 7-8, 1948...do.....	Mark Ethridge (chairman), Erwin Canham, Justin Miller, Mark May, Philip Reed (Oct. 7 only).

NOTE.—In addition, Erwin Canham and Ben Hibbs spent the day of May 23, 1951, in New York studying radio, film, and publication operations of the information program.

**Title of the States to Submerged Lands
Within Their Borders**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1951

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint resolution, adopted by the House and Senate of the State of Maryland:

House Joint Resolution 8

Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to enact a bill confirming the title of the several States of the Union to submerged lands within their borders and requesting the Senate Committee on Armed Services to hold hearings to obtain information and to recommend to the Senate appropriate legislation defining the delimiting territorial waters of the United States

Whereas the State of Maryland is the owner of approximately 1,600,000 acres of submerged lands covered by the tidal waters of the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries, as well as some 61,000 acres of submerged lands of the Atlantic coastal shelf within 3 miles from the shore, subject only to Federal powers of navigation, commerce, and national defense; and

Whereas in 1775 the State of Maryland succeeded to all rights of Lord Baltimore, and, as a sovereign, the State also became entitled to the recognized public-law rights of a sovereign to land within its borders under navigable waters; and

Whereas by virtue of the Federal Constitution ratified by Maryland on April 28, 1788, the State of Maryland's rights to these submerged lands under navigable waters were recognized and forever formalized, subject only to delegated Federal powers of navigation, commerce, and national defense; and

Whereas for more than 170 years the United States Government, Congress, and

the Supreme Court have uniformly, unanimously, and consistently recognized that title and the rights which accompany it; and

Whereas in 1937, for the first time and as an original proposition, the Federal Government began to assert, through the agency of Secretary Ickes, claim to the marginal seas by reason of the fact that oil was being extracted in those areas by the States; and

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States in 1947 in a suit instituted by the Department of Justice entitled "*U. S. v. California*" (332 U. S. 19), overthrew more than a hundred years of established precedents in a night-makes-right decision and held that the United States had paramount rights over the submerged lands adjacent to the shores of California while not deciding the question of ownership; and

Whereas in a subsequent decision, entitled *Toomer v. Witsell* (334 U. S. 385), decided in 1948, the Supreme Court held that the power of South Carolina to regulate fishing in the marginal sea area within its boundaries may be exercised only "in the absence of a conflicting Federal claim," citing *U. S. v. California*; and

Whereas the President of the United States has heretofore issued an Executive order authorizing the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Interior to recommend establishment of zones for Federal regulation and control of "fishery resources" and "fishing activities" in "those areas of the high seas contiguous to the coast of the United States," and the Department of State in December 1948 notified coastal State officials that it will begin to put this program into effect, and

Whereas said Federal executive agencies have introduced in Congress and will attempt to speed the passage of a bill bestowing Federal ownership and control of the marginal seas of all the coastal States, and

Whereas the Department of Justice in the proceeding above referred to entitled "*U. S. v. California*" is attempting to persuade the Supreme Court to declare that the San Pedro Bay off the coast of California is a marginal sea and so a Federal area except as to points within headlands which are within 6 miles of each other, and

Whereas the headlands of the entrance of the Chesapeake Bay are more than 6 miles apart; and

Whereas the Department of Justice has publicly expressed the belief that the Chesapeake Bay, like Delaware Bay, is a "historic exception" to the 6-mile headland rule, and

Whereas, while the Department of Justice and the Executive branch of the Federal Government have stated that the marginal sea rule did not apply to navigable waters within the boundaries of the State and that its extension would not be sought, there are many in office in the Federal Government who believe and strive to the contrary, and

Whereas if the Department of Justice and the executive branch of the Federal Government could persuade the Supreme Court to overthrow more than a hundred years of established precedent and to rewrite the Constitution of the United States in the case of the marginal sea, there is no reason to believe that they cannot in the near future similarly persuade that Court to extend that doctrine to the Chesapeake Bay and the inland waters of Maryland and all other States, and from there to all public lands and natural resources, and so destroy our present system of dual sovereignty and constitutional government; and

Whereas the claims of those who would extend the Federal power are sought to be plausibly and immediately masked under the needs for defense of natural resources, including oil, and the necessity of Federal power over marginal seas for national defense; and

Whereas actually the establishment of the open seas at a point within 3 miles of the

shore line may, in many cases, if not all, materially weaken the position of the United States in international law and thus hinder national defense, and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has heretofore passed a bill (which was vetoed by the President of the United States) to retain in the States their formerly undisputed sovereignty and rights with the saving provision as follows: "*Provided, however, That nothing in this act shall affect the use development, improvement, and control by or under the authority of the United States of said lands and waters for the purposes of navigation or flood control, or the production or distribution of power, or be construed as the release or relinquishment of any rights of the United States arising under the authority of Congress to regulate or improve navigation or to provide for flood control or the production or distribution of power*", and

Whereas a majority of both Democrats and Republicans in the Congress, since the decision of *U. S. v. California*, have always favored the passage of such a bill, and

Whereas similar bills are now pending in the Congress of the United States. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, (1) That the State of Maryland is emphatically in favor of continued State ownership and control, subject only to constitutionally delegated Federal powers, of lands and resources within and beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States and requests Congress to pass suitable legislation to that end;

That the Senators and Members of the House in Congress from Maryland are hereby requested to give active opposition to all pending and proposed measures which would create Federal ownership or control of lands, fish, or other resources beneath navigable waters within State boundaries, except such rights as are delegated to the Federal Government by the Constitution of the United States and that our Senators and Members of the House in Congress are hereby requested to give their active support to legislation which would recognize and confirm State ownership of such property, and

(2) That the Senate Committee on the Armed Services be requested to hold hearings at the earliest practicable date for the purpose of obtaining such information as may be necessary to enable that committee to recommend to the Senate appropriate legislation defining and delimiting the territorial waters of the United States consistently with the sovereignty of the several States of the Union, the international rights and obligations of the United States, and with due regard to the national defense, to commerce, and to the conservation, development, and utilization of the resources of the marginal seas and the constitutional relationship with national economy and national defense, and

(3) That a copy of these resolutions be mailed to each Senator and to each Member of the House in Congress from Maryland and that Senator Millard E. Tydings, as chairman of the Senate Committee on the Armed Services, be and he is hereby respectfully requested to introduce a resolution in the Senate substantially similar to resolution (2) hereof and to expedite the hearings referred to in that resolution.

Joint Resolution 2

(1) That the State of Maryland is emphatically in favor of continued State ownership and control subject only to constitutionally delegated Federal powers of lands and resources within and beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States and requests Congress to pass suitable legislation to that end;

That the Senators and Members of the House in Congress from Maryland are hereby

requested to give opposition to all pending and proposed measures which would create Federal ownership or control of lands, fish, or other resources beneath navigable waters within State boundaries, except such rights as are delegated to the Federal Government by the Constitution of the United States, and that our Senators and Members of the House in Congress are hereby requested to give their active support to legislation which would recognize and confirm State ownership of such property

Congressman Brooks' Report on European Trip

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF
HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1951

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report submitted to me by the Honorable OVERTON BROOKS, of Louisiana, relating his observations and conclusions as a result of his recent trip to Europe. I think Mr. BROOKS' views are so ably presented, and his report contains material of such importance to legislation now pending before the Congress, that it should be incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all Members of the House may benefit from it.

The report follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 3, 1951.

HON. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN In reference to my recent trip to Europe, along with other Members of Congress from the Foreign Affairs Committee, Appropriations Committee, and the Armed Services Committee, I desire to submit to you several observations and recommendations. At the outset, I wish to state that the short time which this group of Congress spent in Europe was not such as to permit an exhaustive examination of the subject of European economy or European defenses. Nonetheless, it was long enough to give us some definite ideas along this line within the free countries of Western Europe. I am writing this memorandum with the thought by placing these observations before you, to some extent, our program of joint national defense might be strengthened by timely and proper constructive suggestions and criticisms.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY

In the briefings which I received as well as my own personal observations I was impressed by the remarkable economic recovery being made by the free nations of Western Europe. While the group I visited consisted of England, Norway, Holland, Belgium, France Italy, and the American and French zones of Germany, the reaction was similar wherever I turned. Nor did I rely entirely upon briefings and upon my own personal observations. Insofar as I did converse with local people, I found almost a completely unanimous sentiment to the effect that the home country had progressed along the road to a wholesome and stable economic recovery. Just how much of this recovery was due to our own efforts and how much to the nat-

ural courage and perseverance of free people in Western Europe is difficult to say; but certainly the progress has been such as to justify serious thought and consideration of the program of an immediate reduction in ECA expenditures and the elimination of them at a reasonably early date.

As is the case in this country to a much lesser degree, inflation in Europe is a great and grim fear. There is no doubt that this fact has delayed recovery, and it is only the economy is anchored to a definite level of value that economic progress timidly raises its head and attempts to set the stage for real wholesome recovery. I was shocked to realize, for instance, that the French franc, which in the days of World War I was one of the strong currencies of Europe, and worth something like 23 cents per franc in American money, had sunk to a low point where it is roughly exchanged at one-third cent per franc. In the competitive market the franc is worth even less than this figure. In spite of this rank inflation of currencies, where the values remained constant for an extended period of time, business has had the tendency to move toward normalcy, shops to fill with wares for merchandising and customers seem eager for the bargain counters.

COMMUNISM

With the return of a more stable economic condition, the fight against communism has apparently been pushed ahead. More than any other country visited in Europe, France presented the spectacle of an internal struggle to free itself of communism. Our party was in Paris on the day of the election and the day following. Some of us even visited voting places unofficially to observe the serenity with which the French conducted their elections. Although we left France too early to pass judgment upon the results of the election, subsequent events have clearly indicated that slowly, with a painstaking effort, the great people of this country are repudiating communism and placing their trust in more stable parties, doctrines, and a more patriotic element of their population. It is true that the Communists still produce the greatest popular vote of any party, but the so-called center parties, together with the remarkable strength of the de Gaullists' factions, make it obvious that the majority of the French people still stand true to their democratic traditions. I believe with an artful handling of this situation and full cooperation by our people, the Europeans will respond to democratic doctrines in the future as they have in the past.

MILITARY POSTURE

At this juncture, I wish to emphasize that I detected throughout Europe the budding desire of its people to be more adequately armed to defend themselves. It is obvious that this national defense movement is growing in these countries and is indicated by the building of military organizations and the effort to obtain equipment for defense purposes. England, being located on an island, presents, of course, a different situation. It has maintained its navy and a semblance of an army and air force. On the European Continent, every country visited showed our group by active determination and by military maneuvers and in other ways its desire for immediate national defense, and the physical attitude and moral ability to handle organizations and equipment intended for that purpose. I was impressed by the eagerness of the young men in Norway, Belgium, the French zone, and other places to learn to handle the equipment presently available and to work in cooperation for a larger defense effort.

GENERAL EISENHOWER

Easily the most appealing figure in all Europe is that of Gen. Dwight Eisenhower. He has the enthusiasm of a much younger

man, the experience of his great command in World War II, and the prestige of a man who enjoys a unique place throughout the world and especially in Western Europe. With tireless energy, great organizational skill, and a relentless enthusiasm, he is bringing together the leaders of the free people of Europe into a cooperative effort at national defense. Wherever the name of General Eisenhower is used, the impression upon Europe is apparent.

Illustrative of this fact are the attacks the Communists are making upon him from time to time and his fine work throughout Europe. The satirical cartoons from Communist sources of his landing in France constitute the beginning of a campaign of abuse and misrepresentation and attacks upon him which have continued to this present hour. I was very much impressed by the frank and logical manner in which the general has put together his ideas for a logical program of European military cooperation in defense of Democratic Europe.

ENGLAND

The group spent a day visiting the air bases in England. The British bases, of course, were built in World War II but are in excellent shape at the present time. The American bases being built are to be engineered along the familiar lines of bases within the United States and are to be paid for under joint arrangement by the United Kingdom and this country on a 50-50 basis. Without any definite contracts as to the length of tenure, it seems to be agreeable that they be occupied by the troops of this country as long as is necessary to meet the exigencies of this present emergency.

I noted especially in England, and throughout Western Europe generally, the trouble which each base is having with the shortage of spare parts for mechanical equipment. I talked with members of British B-29 crews who told me at different times that this was a great problem. Some of the crew members complained about engine trouble and mechanical disorders of the B-29, and in doing so they exhibited a lack of complete understanding of the mechanism of this great plane. All complained of inability to obtain spare parts, but they also indicated this situation was improving. It was with a matter of pride I learned that not a single B-29 had cracked up during its use by the British aviators.

As to spare parts, it seems to me that in most instances some arrangement could be worked out whereby these parts might be obtained overseas. Arsenal are available in England, Belgium, France and other places for the making of spare parts and the very fact that these arsenals, machine shops and foundries are located near at hand, will make the matter of spare parts production a simpler one and bring about greater efficiency in the proper maintenance of the complicated machines and equipment overseas. This problem should be worked out as soon as possible in the interest of a better European defense.

COMMUNISM

The early returns gave the Communists a popular vote of 5,001,618 with a reported 103 seats definitely captured by them. As against this, the de Gaullists polled 4,039,887 votes with 115 seats. The center parties polled in excess of 7,000,000 votes with a total in excess of 376 seats and 21 seats were left to independents. This gives some idea of the political situation existing in France and gives some idea of the struggle through which this country is going at the present time.

GERMANY

Everybody in Europe realizes that Germany is the key to the European situation. More than ever, today Western Germany is necessary to a proper solution of our problems. We were told the Ruhr problem had

largely been solved and that coal mining and steel production are progressing reasonably satisfactorily. The French zone still has some pressing economic problems which are at once apparent to one who talks to the people living in that zone. Until Germany finds its proper place in the field of affairs among the free people of Western Europe our difficulties in this direction will continue.

It has been proposed that out of Western Germany we attempt to set up a small army of perhaps 250,000 persons, carefully controlled and with special equipment. This army might be called the German constabulary or it may be a part of our Army, or it may be as an independent force. Properly handled and properly controlled such a force might add a great deal to the stability of Central and Western Europe, but great care should be used to avoid a return to anything like the militarism which preceded World War II in Germany. I might state that since Germany has been shorn of a large part of its eastern provinces and has been divided between the Soviet and Western Powers, the European fear of a consolidated militant Germany is greatly reduced, if not eliminated.

AMERICAN TROOPS

My time while in Germany was spent largely with American troops in our occupied zone. I went by train from Wiesbaden, headquarters of the air command, to Grafenwohr with Maj. Gen. Paul Dahlquist, then commanding general of the First Division, but now recently made corps commander. The Fourth Division was there moving into Germany and one of the great problems which it had encountered was the housing problem.

This is getting to be a most serious problem in numerous places in Europe. The ability to obtain housing is not as fluent now as it was immediately after the end of World War II. People have become settled in their homes and are not easily dispossessed. The influx of some 5,000,000 people from the Russian occupied zone in the east and from other countries has made the housing problem a difficult one. In advance of the coming of the Fourth Division an effort was made to satisfactorily arrange for housing; but in spite of great efforts made, as additional troops are brought into the occupied zone of Germany our housing troubles mount. It may become necessary that we build considerable housing in our occupied zone of Germany even at this late date.

I spent time inspecting units of the First Division, especially the Sixteenth Infantry. I am glad to report that I found this division cared for with modern mechanized equipment, including tanks, machine guns, rifles, trench mortars and modern artillery. Moreover, the commanding officer has thought wise to utilize the old German maneuver areas available to their maximum possibilities. Not only do local units of our troops use these maneuver areas constantly, but units from all parts of Germany and from Austria are brought in for training there.

In spite of the present size of the maneuver area, our troops badly need additional acreage for that purpose. As more troops enter the occupied zone for large-scale maneuvers the need becomes more pressing and in time we may really suffer from lack of available training areas.

Both in the field and in the billet morale of our troops seems to be high. The improved methods of procurement and distribution are helpful to the company and battery mess and at the same time a limited amount of food, especially fresh foods, may be purchased locally. Of course additional facilities for recreation are always desirable but the need for it is nothing like as great as it is in places such as in Stevensville, Newfoundland, where the long winters and in-

accessibility of the bases make outside entertainment practically impossible.

POSITION OF SPAIN

Wherever we went in Europe the question was asked as to the possible position of Spain in reference to the military recovery of that continent. In every instance where military men were requested opinions, they almost invariably were to the effect that Spain constituted a tremendous asset which was being overlooked. I think what attracted the military so much were the armies of Spain. Poorly equipped, it is true, but with seasoned manpower available and dependable for emergency purposes.

The view of the United Kingdom, and to like extent that of France, is against the association of Spain into any organized defense of Europe. The fear was manifest in some quarters that the association of Spain into an organization for the defense of Europe would be an element of weakness which might indicate in the minds of many that the Pyrenees rather than the Rhine was the 1951 Maginot Line of defense. There is no doubt but what the view of people such as this should be desired and should receive consideration. At the same time, if the over-all purpose of our being in Europe now is to build up defenses, it is difficult to understand just why a large nation such as Spain, with a comparatively large army available, can be completely ignored.

FRANCE

The French-occupied zone presents a startling contrast to that of the American-occupied zone. Under ECA expenditures we have primed the factories and workshops of our occupied zone in Germany and as a result progress is seen at every turn. People are busy, in fact bustling. The land is being tilled to the very limit of available acreage and crops seemed to be good when we were in the area. Smokestacks belched smoke and the prevalence of the dinner pail in the hand of the worker gave irrefutable evidence of employment. At the same time no systematic effort is being made to rebuild the bombed-out plants and homes. People still live in houses with one or two walls crumpled up into a pile of debris, roofs with openings to the sky in places and floors warped and unstable. Until the German people feel assured that the Russians will not come in and take over, they are withholding reconstruction on a large scale.

In the French zone employment is not at the level of the American zone. The air of industry and of assurance does not prevail. The people dress more shabbily and the lack of large governmental expenditures by the occupying powers is evident.

On the other hand, the maneuvers of the French troops while in this zone presented a spectacle of alert activity. The young men in the unit on maneuvers used tanks with facility and confidence of training and enthusiasm. The marksmanship was excellent.

One of the great problems of the future which must be met is the pay of troops of this country. Of course, the pay of our own soldiers is far higher than anything else in Europe. So low, in fact, is the pay of soldiers from other countries that often this is a source of much friction. A movement is now on to attempt some equalization of pay among the European countries. Such a program cannot and should not affect the pay of the American soldiers.

On the other hand, when the economies of the free countries of Western Europe will permit some increase in pay might be fully justified. It is not hard to train an unskilled man and produce out of him an excellent mechanic and artisan. With low pay the difficulty comes in trying to keep him in the armed services after he has acquired a technical skill needed in civilian

industry. Army careers are broken short by lack of pay and career men are forced to turn to civilian fields for funds needed to maintain their families and meet their responsibilities.

In making these suggestions, however, I know that pay is one of the heavy expenditures in any defense program. If the European nations themselves are to meet this problem they are going to be required very soon to raise to a much higher level their own expenditures for national defense. I believe it would be unfortunate if our country attempted in the organizing of the defenses of Europe to enter into the pay problem. Our people are the highest paid and Canada comes next, with others in the descending line. This is one problem which is pushing for an early solution.

While presenting this idea, I was interested in the program sponsored by high commanders in our occupied zone for a savings program for American troops. Our staff officers are encouraging not only the enlisted men but the officers to set aside funds for the proverbial rainy day when they may be needed by American soldiers for themselves or their families. I was surprised at the very high percentage of savings in some of the areas in the American zone, and I especially commend the commanding officers who have sponsored and carried on such a program with the results obtained. With inflated markets overseas in many instances and the dollar lacking the purchasing power it normally should have, our troops do not make a mistake in setting aside funds for use when they return to their homes in the United States.

Respectfully yours,

OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress.

In Memoriam, Forrest P. Sherman,
Admiral, United States Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1951

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following order of services at the funeral of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman at Arlington Cemetery this afternoon:

ORDER OF SERVICE

Hymn, Christ, The Lord is Risen Today—Band.

OPENING SERVICES

(All standing)

"I am the resurrection and the life," saith the Lord: "he that believeth in Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in Me, shall never die."

I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that He shall stand at the latter day upon the earth; and though this body be destroyed, yet shall I see God: whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not as a stranger.

We brought nothing into this world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out. The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord.

PSALM XXVII

(Read responsively, all standing)

The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom then shall I fear? The Lord is the

strength of my life; of whom then shall I be afraid.

One thing have I desired of the Lord, which I will require; even that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life, to behold the fair beauty of the Lord, and to visit His temple.

For in the time of trouble He shall hide me in His tabernacle; yea, in the secret place of His dwelling shall He hide me, and set me up upon a rock of stone.

Therefore will I offer in His dwelling an oblation, with great gladness. I will sing and speak praises unto the Lord.

Harken unto my voice, O Lord, when I cry unto Thee; have mercy upon me, and hear me.

My heart hath talked of Thee, seek ye my face. Thy face, Lord, will I seek.

O hide not Thou Thy face from me, nor cast thy servant away in displeasure.

Thou hast been my succor; leave me not, neither forsake me O God of my salvation. I should utterly have fainted, but that I believe verily to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living.

O tarry thou the Lord's leisure; be strong, and He shall comfort thine heart, and put thou thy trust in the Lord.

PSALM CXXI

I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills, from whence cometh my help?

My help cometh even from the Lord, who hath made heaven and earth.

He will not suffer thy foot to be moved; and He that keepeth thee will not sleep.

Behold He that keepeth Israel shall neither slumber nor sleep.

The Lord himself is thy keeper, the Lord is thy defense upon thy right hand.

So that the sun shall not burn thee by day, neither the moon by night.

The Lord shall preserve thee from all evil; yea, it is even He that shall keep thy soul.

The Lord shall preserve thy going out, and thy coming in, from this time forth for evermore.

GLORIA PATRI

Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost;

As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen.

THE LESSON

(All seated)

ST. JOHN XIV 1

Jesus said, Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in Me. In My Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto Myself; that where I am, there ye may be also. And whither I go ye know, and the way ye know. Thomas saith unto Him, Lord, we know not whither Thou goest; and how can we know the way? Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by Me.

THE CREED

(All standing)

I believe in God the Father almighty, maker of heaven and earth:

And in Jesus Christ His only Son our Lord; who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary; suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried. He descended into hell. The third day He rose again from the dead. He ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father almighty: from thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

I believe in the Holy Ghost, the holy Catholic church, the Communion of Saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting. Amen.

THE PRAYERS

(Seated, with head bowed)

The Lord be with you.

And with thy spirit.

Let us pray.

Our Father, who art in Heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever. Amen.

Remember Thy servant Forrest, O Lord, according to the favor which Thou bearest unto Thy people, and grant that, increasing in knowledge and love of Thee, he may go from strength to strength, in the life of perfect service, in Thy heavenly kingdom, through Jesus Christ our Lord, who liveth and reigneth with Thee and the Holy Ghost ever, one God, world without end. Amen.

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, in whose hands are the living and the dead; we give Thee thanks for all those Thy servants who have laid down their lives in the service of our country. Grant to them Thy mercy and the light of Thy presence, that the good work which Thou hast begun in them may be perfected; through Jesus Christ Thy Son of our Lord. Amen.

Almighty God, who hast created man in thine own image; grant us grace fearlessly to contend against evil, and to make no peace with oppression; and, that we may reverently use our freedom, help us to employ it in the maintenance of justice among men and nations, to the glory of Thy Holy Name; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Almighty God, Father of mercies and giver of all comfort, deal graciously, we pray Thee, with all those who mourn, that, casting every care on Thee, they may know the consolation of Thy love, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE BLESSING

Unto God's gracious mercy and protection we commit Forrest. The Lord bless him and keep him. The Lord make His face to shine upon him, and be gracious unto him. The Lord lift up His countenance upon him, and give him peace, both now and evermore. Amen.

THE GOD OF PEACE

The God of peace, who brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ, the great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant; make you perfect in ever good work to do His will, working in you that which is well pleasing in His sight, through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.

Hymn, Eternal Father, Strong To Save—Band

(Guests will remain in their seats until the funeral cortege clears the amphitheater.)

All that the Father giveth me shall come to me, and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out.

He that raised up Jesus from the dead will also quicken our mortal bodies by His spirit that dwelleth in us.

Wherefore my heart is glad, and my glory rejoiceth: my flesh also shall rest in hope.

Thou shalt show me the path of life; in Thy presence is the fulness of joy, and at Thy right hand there is pleasure for evermore.

THE COMMITTAL

Unto Almighty God we commend the soul of our shipmate departed, and we commit his body to the ground—earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust—in sure and certain hope of the resurrection unto eternal life, through our Lord Jesus Christ; at whose coming in glorious majesty to judge the world, the earth and the sea shall give up

their dead, and the corruptible bodies of those who sleep in him shall be changed, and made like unto His own glorious body; according to the mighty working whereby He is able to subdue all things unto Himself.

I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write: From henceforth blessed are the dead who die in the Lord: even so saith the spirit, for they rest from their labors.

THE PRAYERS

The Lord be with you,
And with thy spirit.

Let us pray.

Lord, have mercy upon us
Christ, have mercy upon us.
Lord, have mercy upon us.

Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed by Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation. But deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom, the power, and glory forever and ever. Amen.

O God whose mercies cannot be numbered, accept our prayers on behalf of the soul of Thy servant departed, and grant him an entrance into the land of light and joy, in the fellowship of Thy saints. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Almighty God, we entrust all who are dear to us to Thy never-failing care and love, for this life and the life to come; knowing that Thou art doing for them better things than we can desire or pray for; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

O Lord, support us all the day long, until the shadows lengthen and the evening comes, and the busy work is hushed, and the fever of life is over, and our work is done. Then in Thy mercy grant us a safe lodging, and a holy rest, and peace at the last. Amen.

BENEDICTION

The Peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keep your hearts and minds in the knowledge and love of God, and of His Son Jesus Christ our Lord: And the blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, be amongst you, and remain with you always. Amen.

May the souls of all the faithful departed through the mercies of God rest in peace, may light perpetual shine upon them. Amen.

Aid to the Palestine Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a statement by Msgr. Thomas J. McMahon, president, Pontifical Mission for Palestine, and national secretary, Catholic Near East Welfare Association:

STATEMENT FOR THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

I am particularly interested in section 204 of title II of the proposed draft of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as presented in the background pamphlet, Mutual Security for Fiscal Year 1952, and in the relevant prefatory pages, especially page 26 entitled "Aid to the Palestine Refugees."

Thus, my competence in answering the gracious invitation of the House committee lies in the fact that, for several years, I have been actively engaged in relief and humanitarian work among the people of the Middle East and that for the past 3 years I have been personally and physically present there to direct the activities of the Catholic Church in behalf of the Palestinian refugees. Accordingly I am more than deeply interested in the prolongation of every aid possible, on the part of our Government and of every agency, whether public or voluntary, to the Near and Middle East and more precisely to the Arab refugees of Palestine.

That it is absolutely necessary to continue such aid everyone even remotely acquainted with the problem must admit without qualification. We who have worked so long among these destitute Palestinians would view with very genuine horror any other point of view. The Palestinian Arabs are the innocent victims of the warfare that engulfed them and forced them out of their homes, and as the fourth successive year of this tragedy now begins, it finds them in the same continuing need, while their state of mind must be described as one of despair. The United States cannot afford to forsake these exiles, and the radical motive for such aid goes far beyond a mutual-security program. It is basic justice on our part to keep on helping these hundreds of thousands of innocent victims, of homeless people.

We go well beyond politics when we point out to the designated representatives of the noble and generous American people that there can be no security in the Middle East until the problem of the Palestinian refugees is solved. The very existence of the problem has caused not only complete privation among the victims themselves, it has also brought about an economic and moral crisis in the Middle East, embittering every honorable citizen of the nations involved.

Now, in all honesty, let it be said that the magnanimous aid of the American Nation will not be the only factor in solving what I consider the most aggravating problem in the pattern of a hoped-for world peace. By all means, and out of strict justice, let the United States vote as much monetary aid as possible to the United Nations' program for the relief of the Palestinians, but in a greater degree we beg our legislators to see clearly what is involved.

In the very excellent explanations of the Mutual Security Act, you write of the continuance of direct relief, though on a diminishing scale, and of the reintegration of the refugees in the economic life of the Middle East. What have you done for a just settlement of the Palestine question? What have you done to compensate the homeless people who did not give up their homes voluntarily? You will never achieve peace in the Middle East until you have given these hundreds of thousands of people the rights that are most certainly theirs. You have been voting to the UNRWA and its antecedent agencies a respectable aid each year since the problem began, but it is another thing to solve the problem at its roots.

We must not think of the Palestinian refugee as unkempt, almost unworthy objects of charity. Among these good people the number is legion of those who are wonderfully trained, well cultured, genuinely moral, men and women who could take their places with you and with us all in any walk of life. Why then should we speak of a dole for such as these? In the name of God, let the representatives of the American people examine the roots of the Palestine question and seek to make some reparation for man's inhumanity to man.

Let us by all means vote the aid that has been determined for the refugees of Palestine. Since it is all too little with which to solve the problem, it is our bounden duty

to go much further and try to end the restlessness, the misery, the homelessness of these poor people. There is no doubt that men of good will in this country will thereby make the Middle East as much a part of the free world as we are.

Peril on Your Food Shelf

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, recent years have seen marvelous advances in the scientific processing and packaging of food. Our tables are set with wholesome delicacies more tempting and easier to prepare than most of us dreamed possible. Yet, with all this progress, a new and pressing danger appears.

There does not appear to be any regulation in the Food and Drug Administration requiring a firm to receive the approval of that Administration prior to marketing any substance. In addition thereto, the Food and Drug Administration accepts the statement of the marketing firm on face value that the safety of the preparation has been established.

The following article appeared in the July 1951 issue of the American Magazine. The author, Congressman JAMES J. DELANEY, is chairman of the Nonpartisan House Select Committee To Investigate the Use of Chemicals in Food Products. This body has been holding hearings for nearly a year to determine the effect of such chemicals on the Nation's health. These hearings have revealed evidence that hundreds of untested and unproved chemicals, in the hands of irresponsible food manufacturers, are threatening the health, and even the lives, of our families.

PERIL ON YOUR FOOD SHELF

(By JAMES J. DELANEY, Representative from New York)

Not long ago a frozen-food packer was told that this new shipment of peaches would stay bright and fresh looking if he added a touch of thiourea. He tried it. The chemical worked a miracle of freshness and coloring. The shipment went out.

Another frozen-peach firm did the same thing. Before shipping out its product, however, it invited the local Food and Drug Administration inspectors to test the food. Samples were fed to experimental rats. Within a few hours they all died.

By nearest chance the inspectors then learned of the first packer's shipment. From that moment on, there took place as exciting and dramatic a chase as ever thrilled a Hollywood film audience. And this time the stakes were more than the price of an admission. They were the lives of thousands of men, women, and children.

Fortunately, the episode had a happy ending. All of the peaches, still bright and still deadly, were intercepted before they could be eaten by unsuspecting American families.

Other episodes have not ended so happily.

Several years ago a salt substitute was put on the market for use by people on a low-salt diet. It contained lithium chloride, a chemical whose effect had been only super-

ficially tested. Three persons died before the salt could be withdrawn from the market.

These instances point up a blunt fact: Our food supply is being doctored by hundreds of new chemicals whose safety has not yet been established.

Many of these chemicals were developed during and after the war. Most of them may prove harmless, but enough have been proved dangerous and even deadly to make us wonder if our health is threatened.

In the year that the House committee has been investigating this problem, scores of noted scientists have testified that the rapid rate at which substances, heretofore foreign to the body, are being introduced directly or indirectly into our food is alarming and may have a serious effect on the health of all of us, especially our children.

Nothing is more important to the American family. It is axiomatic to say that the survival of the country, as well as its democracy, depends on the health of its citizens. The shocking number of our young men who cannot meet the relatively modest physical requirements of our armed services must make each of us ask the reasons for this reservoir of ill health in the midst of such a varied and abundant food supply.

The growing number of mental diseases makes one wonder if there is not some connection between that problem and the many new chemicals used in our foods. In New York State alone, mental hospitals now care for 117,000 patients—almost 1 patient to be supported by every 100 citizens.

Why then, one asks, are new chemicals added at all?

The answer is easy. They are relatively cheap, easy, and work wonders as preservers, blenders, softeners, bleachers, emulsifiers, insect and fungus killers, and crop stimulants.

In one product, for example—bread, testimony has revealed that many bakers have been able to reduce the amount of shortening in the last several years by about 50 percent. This they have done by chemical emulsifiers first put on the market in 1947.

Here is the over-all scoreboard at the present time: The Food and Drug Administration has listed 704 chemicals which are being used in our regular food supply, of which only 428 are known to be safe. In other words, 276 chemicals are unknown and untested quantities, and some of them may be slowly poisoning us.

This potentially lethal situation is due to a curious loophole in our present laws—a tragic legal joker that permits us to become a nation of 150,000,000 guinea pigs guilelessly testing out chemicals that should have been tested adequately before they reached our kitchen shelves.

Doctors testifying before the House committee have stated that there may be some connection between these new chemicals and the increase of such diseases as cancer, polio, and the mysterious virus X.

It must be said emphatically that no reputable food manufacturer would knowingly use any substance known to be harmful. Indeed, most of the big processors of nationally advertised products—companies like Swift, General Foods, Quaker Oats—maintain elaborate laboratories where tests are constantly being made to safeguard the public. An organization like the A. & P. has several thousand people continually engaged in laboratory and field inspection of its products. They, as consumers themselves and as honest businessmen, are as anxious as anybody to ensure a pure and wholesome food supply.

But here is the rub: There is absolutely no law to prevent a small, unscrupulous manufacturer from turning a quick dollar by using a substitute which is untested or, at best, inadequately tested.

And most important of all, there is also no law to compel testing new chemicals to determine what the cumulative effect would

be over a period of time. On the whole, scientists are not so much concerned with the acutely toxic chemicals whose deadliness can be readily detected. They are more concerned with the small and insidious effects of substances which do harm only after being fed to people for months or years.

Under the present set-up, the Food and Drug Administration can act legally only after the food product has been put on the market.

It is important to contrast this situation in regard to food with the situation in regard to drugs. In the latter, no such peril exists. The public is adequately protected. An amendment to the Food and Drug Act, passed in 1938, requires that a manufacturer submit evidence to show that a new chemical is noninjurious before he introduces it—even if the tests take 10 years to complete.

Since no similar safeguard exists with food, many chemicals are used with no real knowledge of what they will do to the human system. Certain ones which cannot be bought in a drugstore without a prescription, for example, can be bought indiscriminately in a feed store to be fed to livestock or sprayed on crops, often ending up on our table.

A decade or so ago this situation was relatively innocuous. But since the war, during which new agents were discovered almost daily, the use of chemicals in foodstuffs has blossomed and spread like the proverbial green bay tree.

In Massachusetts, to cite a case, a big brewery not long ago got the idea of using hydrofluoric acid in its beer. It made unnecessary the sterilization of the beer, a tedious process. The acid, however, is a serious poison. Before the Government was able to step in and stop the practice, the beer had been sold all over the country.

In Indiana, a manufacturer took to using a mineral oil in his popcorn instead of butter or other fats. He treated the oil with butter color, labeled it "edible fat," and sold it all over the United States. Mineral oil will not only wash out the fat-soluble vitamins in the food it is used in, but, by lining the stomach, will prevent the absorption of necessary vitamins from other foods eaten, leading to a dangerous vitamin deficiency. The fact that the popcorn was sold largely to children made the case more tragic.

There are hundreds of other cases—perhaps not so dramatic but potentially just as serious.

There is nothing wrong with chemicals in themselves. Some, like common salt, have been used a long time in food products to enhance both taste and nutritive value. The introduction of vitamin D, another chemical, into milk has undoubtedly proved beneficial, and reflects a desire on the part of manufacturers to give consumers better and richer products. The enrichment of hominy grits with a component of the vitamin B complex has worked wonders in wiping out the disease of pellagra in certain poorer sections of the South, where that food is a staple.

In general, nutritionists agree that no new chemical should be added, however, unless it is definitely proved safe, serves a useful purpose, and is not a substitution in whole or in part for a natural food element.

Such is not the case at present. Here are a few foods in which chemicals are playing a questionable role:

Poultry: Chicken producers, especially in the East, have found that by inserting a synthetic hormone called stilbestrol in the necks of male chickens they can add weight quickly and increase the market value of their products. The chemical pellet causes the fowl to assume female characteristics. He becomes tender, develops greater deposits of fat, and grows faster.

Recently, it has been alleged that the residue of these chickens, sold to mink

farms, caused the minks to become sterile and stop reproducing. As a matter of fact, there is a bill in the House of Representatives now to compensate the mink growers, who say they followed the advice of Department of Agriculture bulletins in feeding these chickens to their minks and thereby made the animals incapable of reproducing.

Canadian authorities have outlawed the use of stilbestrol, fearing it might cause sterility among people.

The product is still widely used in this country. It is spreading to sheep, pigs, and cattle. There is no legal way to prevent the amount used per animal being stepped up at any time to hasten the fattening process.

There is no evidence that the chemical is injurious to human beings. The point is, we don't know. Meanwhile, it continues to be used.

Bread Because of the demand of the housewife for ever softer, ever whiter bread, chemical ingenuity has flourished in this field.

For at least 25 years, Agene (nitrogen trichloride) was widely used to give an artificial, quick-aging effect to flour. Three years ago an English chemist found that bread made from this flour caused epileptic fits in dogs. Although there was no evidence that it had a deleterious effect on humans, millers and bakers voluntarily agreed to abandon its use. The point is that no adequate tests had ever been made on Agene.

Bread softeners are now almost universally used. Some companies urge the consumer to "feel how soft the bread is" on the package. They do not explain that this extra softness is arranged chemically. Polyoxyethylene-monostearate-type softeners were first introduced in 1947, when the price of shortening was high. Testimony has shown that many bakers have reduced their shortening about 50 percent since they started to use this surface-active agent.

In 1949, two companies alone sold 30,000 bakers 10,000,000 pounds of chemicals. These chemicals are used as substitutes for fluid milk, butter, eggs, essential oils, and organic materials.

Although again there is no conclusive evidence that these new chemicals are harmful, there is plenty of evidence that they have reduced the nutritive content.

Dr. Anton J. Carlson, Chicago University's eminent physiologist and one of the world's greatest nutritionists, testified before the House committee that the insistence on white bread is a snob factor that comes down to us from the days of the Roman Empire 2,000 years ago, when the wealthy classes had white bread and the slaves dark bread.

Testimony concerning bread has also revealed that it costs a bakery only one-half cent more to produce a loaf of the highest quality than it does to produce one of the lowest quality. There would be little or no surplus of milk or wheat in this country if all bread products contained milk and flour in quantities found desirable by nutritionists. Such a policy would be a boon not only to the consumer but to the farmer as well.

Soft drinks: The phosphoric acid used to blend soft drinks should not be used, experts have testified, without more testing. Experiments at the Naval Medical Research Institute showed that a human tooth put in soft drink's containing this chemical lost its enamel and became soft in 24 hours.

On rats it was shown that their molar teeth dissolved down to the gum line if the rats were well fed for a period of 6 months but were given nothing to drink but this beverage. Dr. Clive McCay, Cornell University nutritionist, has stated that the acid may account for this deleterious effect, not the sugar.

"Since soft drinks are playing an increasingly important part in the American diet

and tend to displace such good foods as milk, they deserve very careful consideration," he says.

Meat: Some of the new chemicals reach our food indirectly through the use of insecticides and fungicides. The use of DDT, for example, has been widespread in dusting crops. It has been widely hailed as a wonder chemical in keeping the insect army under control.

Although, several years ago, it was shown that there was no immediately discernible toxic effect when it got into the human system in small quantities, it was not realized until recently that DDT will store itself in the body fat and can, eventually, have a cumulative and serious effect on the liver. It is also interesting to note that people suffering this last winter from virus X exhibited the same set of symptoms as people suffering from DDT poisoning.

The Texas Research Foundation, an independent, nonprofit organization financed entirely by private business interests, recently analyzed ordinary meat products bought at random in local meat stores and found that the degree of DDT contamination in fat meat ran as high as 69 parts per 1,000,000. The Food and Drug Administration has set 5 parts per 1,000,000 as a safe maximum. Toxicity tests have shown that even as little as 5 parts per 1,000,000 DDT will produce slight but definite liver injuries in rats.

Fruits and vegetables: Chlordane, first introduced commercially in 1947, has been used as an insecticide on a large variety of fruit and vegetable crops. In the first 9 months more than 1,000,000 pounds were sold. Since then its use has become even more widespread. The director of the Food and Drug Administration's pharmacology division, Dr. A. J. Lehman, recently testified that chlordane is four or five times more poisonous than DDT and that he would hesitate to eat any food that had any chlordane residue on it at all.

As a result of testimony developed by Vincent A. Kleinfeld, chief counsel of the House committee, Dr. Charles S. Cameron, medical and scientific director of the American Cancer Society, revealed that we are by no means sure whether the residue of arsenic sprays on foodstuffs does not cause cancer, and that such a possibility could be determined only by further studies. The use of 80,000,000 pounds of arsenicals yearly in the United States, he asserted, definitely justified such studies, and for this reason the American Cancer Society was vigorously backing additional legislation.

Another dangerous new insecticide is selenium. Animal experimentation has shown that 3 parts per 1,000,000 in the diet will produce cirrhosis of the liver and that animals may eventually develop cancer of the liver.

Many other pesticides have been used or proposed for use. Their safety has in no way been established. So far as is known no immediate deaths have resulted from their use. But there likewise is no evidence of what they will eventually do.

The above are only a few examples of groups of food in which new chemicals, introduced by irresponsible manufacturers, are playing an unknown role.

The public must be given the same sort of protection in its food that it gets in its drugs. Actually, foods are more important. Drugs are used only when someone is sick, and then generally only under a physician's direction. Foods are eaten promiscuously.

Just what legislation will be recommended to Congress as a result of the hearings now being held before the House committee is as yet undecided. And just what Congress will do about such recommended legislation is equally uncertain.

The committee feels, however, that just as no honest person worries about the penalties for burglary, no honest food processor need

worry about any changes in the food and drug laws.

All of the testimony given before the committee, of course, leads to one obvious question: What can the average housewife do to protect herself against a growing use of chemicals which eminent nutritionists have called "alarming"?

In the opinion of most, the solution is not for the housewife to become an amateur chemist but to insist that Congress give the Food and Drug Administration adequate legislation to handle the problem before the product gets on the market.

Women played a prominent part in pushing through the legislation which guaranteed the pre-testing of drugs. The General Federation of Women's Clubs was solidly behind the amendment and exerted enormous pressure. It is not too much to expect that the same thing will happen with food. Individuals, of course, can write their Congressmen, but organized groups of individuals are much more effective.

Housewives can also help by not asking for extra-soft, extra-white, extra-smooth food products. There is a temptation on the part of some manufacturers to supply them by using cheap and easy chemical additives rather than expensive shortenings and blenders. In general, housewives should demand as many enriched foods but as few preservatives as possible. They should also learn to read labels carefully, especially when buying a new product. They should demand not only complete and exact labeling, but the proportions of each ingredient. At the moment there is a proposal to fix the minimum amount of natural ingredients in various products; for example, the minimum amount of milk solids to be used in bread products. At present the average quantity is only 1½ percent.

The last time the food and drug law was amended it took 5 years to get it through. Open opposition to such legislation is rare. It's like coming out in favor of sin. But the danger is that undercover opposition might persuade Congress to let the legislation die, or at least emasculate it.

The pre-testing-of-drugs amendment was pushed through only at the last moment, when 100 people died as a result of drinking an elixir of sulfanilamide into which a solvent, previously used only in car radiators as an antifreeze, had been introduced. The drug had been thrown on the market without adequate testing.

There is no legal way—at this moment—to prevent this happening again in food.

Far from a groundless scare, this has a terrifying basis of reality. It almost happened when thiourea was put in those frozen peaches.

For the safety of all Americans, it is vital that adequate legislation be passed. Especially before we have another tragedy to pinpoint the need.

Commencement Address by Robert Ramspeck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1951

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, in the long and proud history of this Congress the annals of its activities are replete with examples of devotion to duty. We have seen in our time and have read in our records of our outstanding col-

leagues who served with us and with our forebears. No one in that illustrious list of contemporary and predecessor alike has made a greater contribution to his time and his generation than has our former beloved colleague, Bob Ramspeck.

Mr. Ramspeck retired from Congress to devote his talents to the ever-growing and amazing industry of aviation. Much of the progress aviation now enjoys is because of the judgment and vision possessed by this great American. Mr. Ramspeck was happy and aviation was happy with his tenure of office. He made many friends for aviation—in every walk of life. It was with great reluctance that Mr. Ramspeck was compelled to temporarily sever his relations with this indispensable industry. However, at a tremendous financial sacrifice to himself, when called upon by his Commander in Chief to take over the Civil Service Commission, Bob Ramspeck heeded the call and today serves as Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, rendering a tremendous and magnificent service to his Nation.

Mr. Speaker, all Americans respect and admire Bob Ramspeck. There is little wonder, therefore, that on Monday, June 11, 1951, Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio, conferred upon Mr. Ramspeck an honorary degree of doctor of laws. On the occasion above mentioned this outstanding American delivered a thought-provoking address to the graduating class of that fine institution. I want this Congress and this Nation to read the remarks then and there delivered by my friend. I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, hereby insert this splendid address that more may read, that more may learn, that more may take heed to his advice.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS TO THE GRADUATING CLASS AT OHIO WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY, DELAWARE, OHIO, MONDAY, JUNE 11, 1951, BY ROBERT RAMSPECK, CHAIRMAN OF THE UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Today marks the end of a period for those of the graduating class—but it is also the beginning of a new era in life.

The days you have spent at this great institution, one with a history of almost a 100 years, will always have a cherished spot in your memories. I have no doubt you will carry through life the imprint of the associations that you have had here. Your future life will reflect the things you have learned and the contacts you have made.

When I think of memories, I like to refer to the passage in "The Dude Wrangler," where its author, Struthers Burt, said:

"The remembrance of beauty, the beauty of a thing, or of personal relationships, or of a country, has always seemed to me the chief end of life. The present cannot be held; it slips through our grasping fingers, becomes immediately the past. The future may be neither beautiful nor worth remembering; certainly its beauty will be accompanied by ugliness and tragedy. But what has happened is ours and cannot be taken away from us; and the mind, like the gauze screen through which gold is run, transmutes in retrospect almost everything into loveliness. Remembrance is the one sure immortality we know."

Thus the memories you take from Ohio Wesleyan will in the years to come be transmuted into a heritage no one can take from you—the memories of fellow students, of the faculty and of a thousand incidents you will like to recall.

But others are better fitted to talk of these things. I want to discuss the new era which begins for you today. You will go forth to become a part of a troubled world—a world that seeks peace, but prepares for war.

What will you do with opportunity in this world? Will you be content to let others concern themselves with the fate of the world while you engage in the game of seeking material things only? I hope not.

Your country needs men and women willing to serve the cause of humanity. It needs Christian men and women who pull their fair share of the load. It needs people who feel a sense of personal responsibility—who have the courage and the willingness to serve in the public interest.

There are many opportunities for service and it is my hope that you will here and now determine to spend some part of your future in such service.

If you are a man, I do not mean belonging to a luncheon club composed of fellow businessmen, or to the chamber of commerce, or to the fraternal order of your choice. If you are a woman, I do not mean the local women's club, or a garden club, or a bridge club, or a civic association. All of those things are good and serve a fine purpose, but I mean a more personal responsibility.

This is a political world in which we live. It functions through governments. Some of these are representative of the people, others are not. We believe in a representative government. However, it can be no better than the will of the people make it. When many of our people take no part in the selection of the representatives, it is likely to suffer. Will you do your part, or will you, like so many others, take no interest in this right you have as a voter?

Will you set an example of doing things the right and legal way—because it is right? Or will you exceed the speed limit on the highway because no policeman is in sight?

Too many people in this age, it seems to me, assume that so long as they do not get caught anything is all right. Businessmen seek special privileges from officials when they must know it is wrong—they excuse themselves because their competitors do it. Public officials take favors to which they are not entitled, because they think others are doing it.

Right and wrong are personal things. No law can be enforced unless public sentiment stands behind it—unless at least two-thirds of the people voluntarily observe it. The example of those who do right, because it is right, is what we need.

We need public officials who look upon public office as a trust, who do right because that is the proper thing to do. We need businessmen who seek no special privilege and accept none because that is the proper thing to do. We need citizens who set the example of doing right and of taking an active part in the selection of competent men and women to represent us in our city, county and State governments and in our Federal Government. And above all, we need less selfishness and a greater willingness to see the public interest made paramount.

Today we are struggling with inflation. It can destroy our civilization. It can bring victory to the ruthless purposes of the men in the Kremlin, men who have no God and to whom human life has no value. Yes, it can bring them a victory—but I do not believe they can achieve it if we stay strong, both militarily and economically.

Yet we see groups having a selfish and special interest who oppose plans for the safety of our country. They seem to have forgotten their personal responsibility as citizens. They are not acting on the principle of what is right—but solely for their own selfish interest.

This is the great challenge of the day—the challenge of doing right—because it is right. It is, as I have said, a personal responsibility. If we all feel and practice personal

responsibility we can make our way safely through the present troubles. We can become so strong that no nation will dare attack us.

It was my privilege recently to attend a dinner in Washington given by members of the American Law Institute. The honor guest was that distinguished jurist, Judge Learned Hand, who is about to retire. In responding to the things said of his great work on the bench, he said, in part:

"My friends, our future is precarious. I do not know if you remember the time 11 years ago—in 1940—when we were here, just on the eve of those dreadful days when it seemed not unlikely that the whole of all that which made life precious might be overwhelmed. Today we stand in as much danger as we did then; and, although it is not from us that the heaviest sacrifices are demanded, yet we have much to answer for. I like to hope—although I agree that we can have no certainty, still I like to hope—that we have a good chance, a splendid fighting chance, and much assurance of victory, but on one condition: That we do not go to pieces internally. It is there, I think, that you and I may be able to help. Because, my friends, will you not agree that any society which begins to be doubtful of itself, in which one man looks at another, and says, 'He may be a traitor,' in which that spirit has disappeared which says: 'I will not accept that, I will not believe that—I will demand proof.' I will not say of my brother that he may be a traitor, but I will say, 'Produce what you have. I will judge it fairly, and if he is, he shall pay the penalty; but I will not take it on rumor, I will not take it on hearsay. I will remember that what has brought us up from savagery is a loyalty to truth, and truth cannot emerge unless it is subjected to the utmost scrutiny'—will you not agree that a society which has lost sight of that cannot survive?"

"And so I say to you that today we stand as we did 11 years ago, perhaps in even greater peril; and I say, too, that you and I have this which we can contribute and which may be the most important of all. On our people has fallen a responsibility greater than that of any other people; you and I, loyal custodians of our precious heritage, have our part to perform."

This inspiring message from the great jurist was directed to his fellow members of the legal profession, but it should apply to all of us. We have our responsibility to prevent internal collapse—to prevent rumor and hearsay from motivating our thinking. We should demand proof. No ugly charge should control our opinions unless the evidence is presented.

If we lose faith in our fellow citizens because of charges recklessly made and not supported with the evidence, we tend to become like those behind the iron curtain. There every man suspects his fellow and no one trusts anyone. Judge Hand, it seems to me, was warning us of this danger.

One of the foundation stones of our civilization is the right of being deemed innocent until proven guilty.

Our Government is founded upon the consent of the governed. If we lose faith in it, there will be no consent and no effective government. It is our personal responsibility to see that such a thing does not occur.

In my present position I am concerned each day with the personnel policies of the Federal Government. The Civil Service Commission is the central agency having responsibility for personnel practices in the Federal Government. We seek to bring into the Government young men and women of real ability and of strong character—men and women who will serve the public interest.

The dynamic Theodore Roosevelt, as a young man, served 6 years as a member of the Civil Service Commission. In May 1906, when he was our President, he said:

"I am now naturally brought into relationship with a great number of important offices

in different branches of the Government throughout this country and I continually have to consider the question of the efficiency with which they are handled. Practically without exception, I find that an office in which there is laxness in the administration of the civil-service law, where there is an effort to circumvent the law, where there is an effort to get around it, is an office in which poor service is rendered; the chance for fraud, for speculation, for dishonesty, is always greater in such an office than in the office where the law is well and faithfully observed.

"If the appointing officer administers the civil-service law in a spirit of hostility to it, it has been my experience that in the great majority of cases, inefficiency and corruption are sure to obtain. And while, of course, it is true that the mere observance of the civil-service law can never result in a thoroughly efficient administration of any office, yet I am inclined more and more to feel that the observance in the letter and spirit of the civil-service law is the first requisite in obtaining clean, decent, efficient Government service in any branch of the Government."

The distinguished president of this great university was for many years a member of the Commission. During World War II he was a tower of strength to the Nation in that capacity. Those of us interested in the matter regretted his leaving, but our loss was your gain. Today he is again rendering a fine service to his country in its time of need.

It is my hope that you will consider devoting some of your life to the service of your country. There are many satisfactions in such service. No doubt you can make more money in the field of business or finance or in manufacturing, but your country needs men and women of high character and of ability.

The Federal Government today is large and carries great responsibilities. It vitally affects the lives, the happiness, and the safety of all of our people. It is the recognized leader of the free people of the entire world. It has been forced by circumstances to take this position of world leadership. It seeks, in cooperation with other free nations, a world of law and order, of peace and opportunity for freemen everywhere.

We cannot attain these objectives unless the Government can command the services of young men and women like yourselves—men and women with trained minds, with good character, with a sense of personal responsibility.

We cannot lead the world to peace unless we remain strong at home—strong in military power, and, more important, strong in those things which have made the United States the greatest Nation on earth.

It seems to me that the things that made our country great are the things I have discussed here today. It is the strength that comes from a citizenship composed of men and women who do right—because it is right—who willingly assume their responsibilities in a Nation in which all power comes from the people.

As you go forth to join in the life of our country, so much depends upon you—and others like you. Are we to continue to be a great people? We will—if you and others who graduate today from similar institutions have the character and the zeal to keep us great. There is great power for better things in the young men and women of the Nation. Our Nation was founded by men of comparative youth. They knew what they wanted. They placed the power of government in the people, having faith that such action was wise. So far they have been proven right. Our heritage lies in your hands.

That heritage will not be preserved by men and women who shirk responsibility—who seek only selfish goals—who are motivated by rumor or hearsay. *

It will be preserved by men and women who do right—who serve the public interest first—who are unselfish—who assume a fair share of the responsibility for its preservation.

If young people like yourselves go forth and lend their talents, their education, their character, and their efforts to the job of preserving and strengthening our country, they will make it possible for the United States to discharge its responsibility for world leadership, and our Nation can then lead the world to a state of peace and tranquility, based upon law, with the rights of all people made safe.

As you walk forth today, won't you join in the crusade for better government, for more personal responsibility, for law and order—for things that are honest, decent, and based upon truth?

With a militant force of young men and women dedicated to such ideals, we can securely face the threat of the Kremlin to subjugate all peoples to its lust for power. We can preserve our heritage of freedom and can extend its blessings to the other nations of the world.

The fate of the future depends in large measure upon the course that you take—the course that all our people take in the coming years. May God guide us and give each of us the wisdom and the courage to do right in all things at all times.

Central Valley Water Festival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, the Governor of California has proclaimed August 1 to August 10 as Central Valley Water Festival Days. These water festival days will mark the first operation of the huge pumping plant at Tracy, Calif., and the first full operation of the several features of California's Central Valley project, which has been constructed with Federal funds under the direction of the United States Bureau of Reclamation. The Congress first appropriated funds to begin work on the project in August of 1935.

Full project operation will bring about the greatest man-made transfer of water in the world. By exchange, water supplies will be readjusted the 500-mile length of the Central Valley of California, from Shasta Dam near the city of Redding in the north, to the city of Bakersfield in the south.

I have been appointed chairman of a special congressional subcommittee to participate in the community celebrations, which begin when water will be released at Shasta Dam on August 1, and end with an observance in my native town of Bakersfield on August 10.

Only 20 years ago, the proponents of the Central Valley project, including then State Engineer Edward Hyatt and other leaders in the water field, were criticized as impractical dreamers, and it was predicted the project would never be a reality. Today their vision and their efforts are applauded by hundreds of thousands of Californians who are becoming increasingly conscious of their vital but limited water supplies.

Because this event is of national significance, and because the project has attracted worldwide interest, I am pleased to include for the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Water Dream Materializes," from the Sacramento Bee of July 9, 1951.

WATER DREAM MATERIALIZES

Gov. Earl Warren has proclaimed the period from August 1 to 10 as Central Valley Water Festival Days.

It will mark the passage of Sacramento River water through the West Side canal into the San Joaquin Valley, the first time this dream of many years' standing will be realized.

During the 10-day festival, cities and towns plan celebrations along the route the water will travel.

And they certainly have good cause.

Governor Warren aptly summed up the situation when he said in his proclamation:

"It (the project) involves the longest mass movement of water ever achieved by man

"The project is one of the greatest advances that has been made in the history of our State.

"It gives us new hope as we enter our second century of statehood, a century in which we know our continued growth will require the conservation of every drop of water that falls in our State for every useful purpose water can serve."

And he went on to say California is completely dependent upon water development. No one will question that statement.

Without water development, this State would be the barren wilderness which her discoverers found more than 100 years ago.

And her maximum growth cannot be achieved until man has made wise use of every drop of water within California's borders.

That is what the Central Valley project is seeking to accomplish.

And it is well that this milestone in the progress toward that goal should be celebrated.

The Public Library: Rampart for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Saturday Review of Literature of July 7, 1951, contains an excellent article by Dr. Luther H. Evans, Librarian of Congress, entitled "The Public Library: Rampart for Freedom." This article contains a fine statement of the role of libraries and of the present crisis which confronts our Nation. I ask unanimous consent to have the article in full printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PUBLIC LIBRARY: RAMPART FOR FREEDOM (By Luther H. Evans)

Freedom of speech and freedom of the press we justly prize as among the inalienable rights of the individual. But it is upon the correlatives of these—freedom to hear and freedom to read—that all our other freedoms rest. For these are not only among the basic rights of society; they are among the necessary conditions of the existence of a free social order. The perpetuation of a

free society requires not only that men have the legal right to hear and read the truth, to seek information from varied sources, to explore divergent views, to be exposed to new or heretical ideas, but that they have the actual opportunity to do so. And the perpetuation of our cultural health similarly requires that men have not only the right but the means to encounter a wide variety of intellectual expression and to share with contemporary creators in the arts their fresh and emerging perceptions of the human experience. Free participation in the State exists only where there is free participation in information; the commonwealth of the human spirit is shared only so widely as the works in which it is embodied are shared.

The actual freedom to hear and read was never so important as it is today. A century ago, even in some degree a generation ago, a man could accumulate during his formal education an intellectual capital that would remain valid for the rest of his life and would provide the solid basis of knowledge against which his political and social judgments could be formed. But so rapidly does knowledge expand today and so swiftly do practical affairs conform themselves to new ideas that a man's college education is in good part obsolete before he attends his first class reunion.

The generation of men now reaching the peak of their effective participation in public life completed their formal education 25 or 30 years ago. How inadequate is the intellectual equipment of that day to meet the problems of this. The concept of relativity, though well known to physicists, had not penetrated general metaphysics; indeed, the possibility of any alternative to Aristotelian metaphysics was as yet unthought of in the general classroom. The college student of that day, unless a specialist, was graduated innocent of knowledge of nuclear physics and of the whole concept of matter or of cosmology itself as it exists today. His ideas of the state were formal and legalistic; totalitarianism had hardly penetrated his awareness. References to Asia in his academic education had probably stopped with elementary-school geography. His economics was shallow and inadequate to the comprehension of the actualities of limited competition or the potentialities of dynamic state intervention in the economic process. The biology he had learned in undergraduate courses was still largely taxonomic, the psychology still mechanically behavioristic. Unless he has reequipped himself intellectually since he left college, the graduate of the class of 1921 simply does not possess the conceptual tools to deal with the major problems that press on his generation.

At the same time that formal education has become so inadequate for the provision of an informed citizenry, the citizenry itself has been projected as never before into the detailed workings of government. Perhaps because the specific acts of government touch him more closely than before and because the newspaper and popular magazine, the radio and television now flood him with the detailed superficialities of government action the individual citizen holds more decided views on more particular issues and presses them more effectively upon his political leaders than did his father. And the issues themselves are more complex, more grave, more perilous than any that taxed his father's politics. The democratic revolution has carried far beyond the dreams of Jefferson and undertaken burdens unknown in his day; the necessity of a variously enlightened citizenry which he foresaw has become our compelling imperative.

The instruments of public information to accomplish that enlightenment are certainly abundant. No people ever spent so many hours of every week reading newspapers and popular magazines, listening to radio comment, observing television programs, and

sitting through movies. At times there seems to exist for us not merely the freedom but the compulsion to read and hear. But all these media through which we are so unremittingly approached have one disturbing characteristic; they are instruments through which one or a controllable number of views can simultaneously reach large masses of men. This characteristic lends itself to ideological monopoly. Even where totalitarian usages are not involved, we have seen in our own country the ominous aptitude of the mass media for creating and disseminating one accepted view or a single cultural pattern.

This tendency is indeed difficult to escape. The economics of the mass media are such as to require a mass market for their support. An urban newspaper, a popular magazine, a movie, network radio or television programs can sustain themselves only if regularly heard or read or seen by hundreds of thousands or even millions of people. Such media must be capable of interesting and must avoid offending the great mass of the population. Their producers can rarely afford to utilize them for the dissemination of specialized or advanced information, the presentation of divergent views, the advocacy of unpopular causes, or the introduction of novel cultural expression.

This is not to say that the mass media are inherently or usually or even often harmful. On the contrary, they are indispensably useful in purveying the great mass of information and entertainment that is of interest to most people. If the opportunities for recreation given by them were cut off this would be a drear place; and without the flow of news achieved by the mass media the functioning of our society would be impossible. However, the mass media cannot fill one of our great contemporary social needs, and it is highly important that there be other readily available sources of information and means of cultural expression as a corrective to their inherent tendency toward uniformity.

Books are almost the only medium that can fill this need. Though the always rickety economics of the book trade has tended to show a disturbingly increased reliance on mass methods of distribution, which fall into the very pattern of uniformity we need to counteract, it still permits the dissemination of a far wider range of knowledge, ideas, and cultural experiment than does the economics of any other medium. Where a movie must be seen by hundreds of thousands to break even and a national radio network may depend on an even larger number of regular listeners for its solvency, a book can be profitable on a few hundred sales a week and can sustain itself on a much smaller distribution. Even the smallest organization can still afford to publish a book or a pamphlet. Both the specialized learned institution and the small committee with a "cause" find in the book their means of expression.

Moreover, books are the only general medium of communication under the control of the recipient. A man who wants to experience "Hamlet" may have to wait months or even years before he has a chance to see it on the screen or stage or television or hear it over the radio; but he can read it when he chooses. Though the educational potentialities of the other media are enormous, it is only by rare coincidence that a man impelled to find out something about nuclear fission or cancer control will be able to tune in on a program that will answer his questions; but if he has access to a good collection of books he can get immediately what he wants. A man in the average small city has a choice on a given evening of two to six radio programs, perhaps half a dozen movies, two or three television programs, or at least a couple of newspapers. In his public library he may have his choice of tens of thousands of books.

The economics and what may be called the technology of the book hence directly contrast it to the other major media of communication. Instead of the characteristic pattern of one idea conveyed simultaneously to hundreds of thousands of minds with the selection of the idea in the hands of the sender rather than the recipient, we have the one recipient free to choose among the products of the tens of thousands of authors. The mass media have always the menace of becoming the instrument by which the user is controlled, but the book is always and inherently his servant.

Because books and those serious magazines that share their characteristics are the principal instruments by which man can extend his knowledge, correct his prejudices, enlarge and freshen his views, and broaden the range and depth of his cultural perceptions, because books are the principal means of keeping alive the sacred leaven of heresy, of opposing accepted error with unpopular truth, of giving a voice to the ignored and a forum to the oppressed; because they can intrude freshness and savor into the gelatinous uniformity of our cultural life—the means by which books are made realistically available to people are of the most profound social importance.

An indispensable means is the public library. Though individuals can assemble books that are the working tools of their profession and buy books from time to time that attract them, only the very rich can afford to create private libraries capable of placing at command any considerable portion of available intellectual resources. Even had one the means to buy, only a few bookstores in the largest cities can afford to maintain stocks from which to choose that are at all comparable to those of a reasonably good public library. It is of the essence of the book's utility that it gives the user the choice not only among ephemerally appearing products but among the organized accumulation of knowledge and recorded expression, and this only the library can do.

For an institution of such superlative social importance the public library in the United States has faltered alarmingly in support and in accomplishment. Librarians and public alike are liable to complacency about the state of the library in the United States. We are likely to cite comparative statistics which place us in a flattering position in relation to other countries, without recognizing either the greater responsibility of the library in the United States or its incomparably greater sources of potential support. We are also likely to quote figures on the proportion of the population that receives library service, without admitting that they mean little more than literacy figures.

The blunt fact is that almost no Americans living outside rather large cities—and this means most of us—have access to a library capable of giving really good service, as pointed out in Robert D. Leigh's *The Public Library in the United States*. And even those living in large cities rarely use their libraries to the extent that is socially desirable or even essential. Libraries are an underexploited resource even where they are best developed. Most Americans who have access to a library at all have access only to a small, ill-selected, and inadequately maintained collection consisting principally of popular fiction and manned by a part-time staff without professional training. The library which serves the average citizen is likely to be open only for limited hours and to be inconvenient enough of access and use so that the citizen is likely to prefer buying a paper-backed edition for a quarter and throwing it away. If he is truly an average citizen he does not use the library at all.

What is wrong? In the first place, one of the glories of the American free public library—its decentralized local support and management—has become a major weakness. With rare exceptions, good libraries now

exist only in large cities. There is no reason why a small school cannot be as good as a large one. Its teachers can be as well paid, its plant qualitatively as good, its per student budget as high. But a small library cannot be as good as a big one. The very essence of the social function of the library as contrasted with other media of communication is that it can respond to whatever need of the user. And a big collection of books can do this better than a little one. Moreover, only in a sizable library is the specialization of staff possible that is usually necessary for effective professional service. Only relatively large cities of about 100,000 and upward now support libraries of an adequate size to give good service.

But there is no reason why small-town and rural areas of comparable population and wealth cannot unite their library services to provide a central collection of books of adequate size with an effective extension service. And there is no reason why each State cannot provide a comprehensive central reservoir of books to supplement local resources and a central professional staff able to give guidance and work on major bibliographical problems or why a State cannot provide funds to assist in the equalization of service between the richer urban areas and the poorer rural areas, as in the case of schools. There is no reason, that is, except inertia and complacency, for the cost above the present unorganized services would be negligible, the return on each tax dollar would be much greater, and with thoughtful planning the full vigor of local initiative and management could be preserved.

As in the case of education generally, there is need also for Federal financial stimulus to library development (though less need for continuing Federal subsidy because of the inherently inexpensive character of library service). This need would be met by the library services bill, which barely failed of passage in the last Congress, is presently before the Congress again, and deserves the vigorous support of everyone to whom books have meaning.

In the second place, we need more and better librarians. The last decade has seen a remarkable increase in the standards and a long overdue and inadequate increase in the salaries of professional librarians. I know of no profession whose members surpass public librarians of this country in a sense of dedication to their duties. But the profession does not yet attract an adequate number of competent people. Many library schools could handle sizable increases in enrollment, and vacancies in professional library positions exist all over the country. Especially will a marked increase in the number of persons taking library training be essential if library services are to be expanded at a rate at all commensurate with the national need. To achieve this we need marked increases in salary, the increase in prestige that comes from the community's recognition of the importance of the library's task, and a permanent extirpation of the myth that librarianship is an effeminate profession for men and an old-maidish one for women, in which adventurous minds cannot find a satisfying career.

In the third place, libraries need to extend their services to include those media which, like books, are capable of inexpensive accumulation into reservoirs. Particularly I have in mind the educational film, recordings, and prints. These materials enable the library to offer a greatly enriched opportunity for intellectual and cultural enrichment especially in smaller communities affording otherwise only restricted access to serious music and art. This development is now rapidly extending itself in the major urban libraries but is as yet rarely found in those areas in which it is most needed.

In the fourth place, we need to make it much easier to use the library. An analysis of the patterns of public-library use shows

clearly, as might have been expected, that the busiest people are the least frequent users. The high-school student on summer vacation is a heavy user; the suburban husband and father rarely enters a library. This means that the library is failing to reach precisely the groups whose activity and responsibility in the community create the greatest need for ready access to information and for the stimulus of contact with a wide range of ideas. In large part this failure is due to the simple lack of time to read and is beyond the reach of the library. But I suspect that the major difficulty is not so much lack of reading time as a lack of convenient opportunity to visit the library; the wait while books are called for and charged and the nuisance of returning them are also difficulties. Libraries need to experiment imaginatively with solutions to this difficulty. What, for one example, about loans by mail of books called for by telephone—a procedure some extension services and commercial lending libraries already use?

And to make possible the carrying out of all these foregoing measures we need to spend a great deal more on libraries than we do. A great deal more in relative terms, that is, for the total amount we now spend on public libraries in the United States could be doubled with no perceptible effect on the economy. Total present expenditures for public library support are on the order of \$100,000,000 annually. This is about 65 cents a person, less than one-sixth of 1 percent of public expenditures, about one twenty-fifth of 1 percent of the national income, about one-fiftieth of our expenditures on public schools, less than one-half the subsidy given newspapers and magazines through the second-class postal rate. Viewed nationally it is a negligible figure. Even if it were doubled, which is probably about what a good library service would cost, it would still be negligible as a burden on the national income. The cost of a movie apiece would do it.

It is obviously not because the cost would be burdensome that we support libraries so inadequately. It is because we have never realistically faced the problem as we have been forced to do in the case of schools. Library appropriations slide on from year to year, an uncontroverted element in municipal budgets, arousing little opposition, and commanding little vigorous support. In this municipality or that an energetic librarian or an active board of trustees will get a sizable increase in support, especially when a new building is needed. In a few States here and there more effective State aid may be won. But little occurs from year to year to lift the national average of library support to a degree that would permit the new level of library service required by the times.

From many points of view library support is retrogressing. Though there has been a substantial dollarwise increase in library budgets since World War II, it has probably not kept pace with the dropping purchasing power of the dollar and certainly not with the combined effects of inflation and population increase. As a percentage of the national income, library support has dropped sharply. Nor is there any comfortable basis of assurance that the situation will improve. No present trend points to the rapid increase in library support that is essential for effective service. Nor can librarians themselves initiate such a trend. They are too few and their political influence is too limited. If effective library support is achieved over the next decade it will be because library trustees and citizens at large who are devoted to intellectual freedom and growth undertake a deliberate and concerted campaign of national scope to break out of present limitations and establish a new level of library service as the accepted norm in this country. We must do for libraries what we have done for education in general.

And, finally, in achieving the necessary enlargement of library support and service

we need always to preserve the finest traditions of the free American library. The whole special significance of the library in our social structure, its particular role as a medium of communication, depends upon those traditions of freedom. I do not believe there is any need to worry about the public librarians themselves. So single is their devotion to the ideal of free service to all that any restrictive concept of the library would be simply unintelligible to them. And I think it is not too much to say that, though most librarians are persons of limited means, wholly dependent on their salaries, and without personal political strength, no group in America has more steadily, quietly, and successfully resisted all pressures of obsecraturism, bigotry, and censorship.

But the tide of such pressures is rising and the strength of every free institution will be tested by their attack. As the public library grows in importance as a principal weapon against intellectual monopoly their force will be increasingly directed against it. In maintaining their freedom against it, each community will need the understanding support of every liberal element. Support can be no better given, for their freedom is an essential in the freedom of us all.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at Annual Convention, Department of Pennsylvania, Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me at the annual convention, Department of Pennsylvania, Veterans of Foreign Wars, at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa., on July 12, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is most appropriate for a great organization of patriotic Americans to hold its convention this year in this great city of patriotic inspiration.

Here in the city of Philadelphia, 175 years ago, American independence was proclaimed, bringing into the world a new concept of human freedom.

Here in the summer of 1776, was formulated the sacred principle that Almighty God has endowed all mankind with the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

For the first time in the history of the world there was established a government based upon social, political, and economic freedom of the individual.

It recognized the people as the masters of the Government and not the servants of any king or ruler.

To support and preserve that priceless ideal, free Americans, imbued with the spirit of patriotic devotion, have fought and died in every generation.

Whenever the Nation has called upon them, the youth of our land has gone forth to protect and safeguard American freedom in all its greatness and glory.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars have a place of distinguished honor in the glorious procession of those who have defended America when threatened by foreign foes.

I am proud to salute you and praise your loyalty, in peace and war, to the principles that are the firm foundation of our liberty and independence.

We meet at a time when the world awaits the outcome of true negotiations in Korea.

A year has passed since I had the privilege of addressing your 1950 convention at Harrisburg. It has been a tragic year of conflict and sacrifice.

On the other side of the world, 7,000 miles from their homes and their loved ones, nearly 12,000 hero dead have been added to the honor roll of those who gave their lives in battle against tyranny and enslavement.

It is fitting at this time to recall the immortal words of Abraham Lincoln "that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain."

Just as in Lincoln's time there remains before us today a great unfinished task to which we must dedicate ourselves with increased devotion.

The highest hope in the heart of every American is for peace in the world; peace with honor, freedom, and justice.

No group in all our land is more ardently devoted to peace than those who have experienced the horrors and the terrible hardships of war.

The desire for peace is uppermost in the heart and mind of every American soldier who served in the trenches and the fox holes of Europe or who crawled on his belly in the mud and the swamps of the Pacific Islands.

Yes, we veterans who know what war is, want peace—but we want nothing less than an honorable and just peace.

The founding fathers, in their defiance of the might and power of the British Empire, pledged not only their lives and their fortunes but also their sacred honor in the cause of liberty.

Today as the battlefield commanders in Korea meet to plan a truce, the honor of every American is in the balance, pledged to uphold the historic mission of the United States—to maintain the right of freemen to live in peace and dignity, secure in life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

But this tragic fact remains—truce in Korea gives no assurance of a peaceful future. The ultimate aim of communism is still world domination. Their sole objective is to conquer and destroy freedom in every nation where human rights are respected.

With the end of the shooting in Korea the Soviet tyrants will not abandon their efforts to weaken the United States in the hope that we will become an easy prey for their evil designs.

The cease-fire arrangements will save American lives. That is good.

The terrible loss of life sustained by the Chinese Reds may be unimportant from the Communist standpoint. To us the life of every American boy is precious.

One of the most unfortunate circumstances in the present situation is that General MacArthur made the same cease fire proposal last March. At that time he announced he was ready to confer in the field with the Communist commander in chief. But the State Department cracked down on General MacArthur, repudiating his proposal.

Three months later we accepted the same proposal for cease-fire negotiations offered by the spokesman for Soviet Russia. In the meantime thousands of American boys were added to the casualty lists. What a tragic waste of precious time and precious lives.

But the fundamental conflict between the American free way of life and godless communism continues. It will not be settled merely by ending hostilities in Korea.

First and foremost we must keep in mind always that the only real threat to permanent peace in the world comes from Communist Russia. The real enemy is not Red China, nor any of the satellite nations that have been imprisoned behind the iron curtain.

There has never been any doubt that the evil influence which menaces civilization originates in Moscow—from which we heard the offer to cease hostilities in Korea.

Doesn't that warn that we must proceed with extreme caution in our negotiations?

It seems to me we should ask ourselves these questions:

"What are their real motives?"

"Do they really want peace?"

"Do they believe that in our desire for peace we will again fall into the trap of appeasement?"

"Do they hope we will again abandon principle as we did at Yalta and make concessions that will further strengthen Communist power in the world?"

These things must not happen.

A peace not based on honor and principle can only result in further aggression and ultimate war. Yalta is the best proof of that statement.

In his testimony before the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees of the Senate, Secretary of State Acheson revealed certain principles as part of our new policy in the Far East. He assured the committees that the State Department would not accept the Communist regime as the recognized government of China and that we would not consent to the admission of Red China to the United Nations.

He added that we would neither permit the Communists to take Formosa nor give Red China a place at the conference table to arrange a peace treaty with Japan.

The American people were cheered by this evidence of a firm policy in opposition to the Communist demands. Previously Secretary Acheson's position was that we would not use the veto power if the United Nations voted to admit Red China to membership.

In the negotiations now under way we must not be influenced by any fear of offending Russia.

We must not be influenced by fear of offending any other nation which sought to profit by shipping munitions and supplies into Red China.

Instead, it is time to adopt a policy which will make them fearful of offending the United States.

We must stop pussyfooting. We must stand up for American principles.

We must make known to the world that we will not agree to any settlement which will again betray the Nationalist Government of China by allowing the Communists to take its place in the United Nations.

We must make known to the world that we will not permit Formosa to fall into the hands of Communist China.

We must make known to Russia and every other nation that we will not permit any aggressor to shoot his way into the United Nations over the bodies of American boys.

To fail to make this position crystal clear would be a cowardly betrayal of every American youth who fought so gallantly in Korea and of all who made the supreme sacrifice.

The United States would be false to its trust, false to its ideals, and false to its great heritage if it accepted Red China into the United Nations.

Let us make that clear not only to our foes, but just as clear to our friends and allies. Our Government should notify the British, the French, and all others that we do not regard United Nations membership as a prize to be awarded for criminal aggression.

And if, despite all this, the United Nations still wants to accept Communist China in its membership, then I say there is one thing and only one thing for us to do—get out.

The United States must be firm about this. We've had enough of pussyfooting and weaseling. Our State Department has scrapped the noble eagle as our national emblem and has substituted the umbrella of appeasement.

My fellow Americans, there was a time when American citizenship was a protective shield the world over. It was an insurance policy against mistreatment in foreign countries. All the nations of the globe respected an American and the American passport. That respect was earned by a firm, straightforward, honest foreign policy, supported by a courageous State Department.

What now? Well, you all know the answer.

Weakness, vacillation and appeasement in our foreign dealings have made Americans abroad victims of injustice. In recent months, we've seen American missionaries mistreated, arrested and expelled in China.

We've seen an American businessman imprisoned, tortured, and forced to make a false confession of espionage—by an insolent, arrogant satellite of Communist Russia.

Most recently we've seen representatives of the American press also arrested and tortured into making false confessions that they were spies.

Americans are being treated thus because America has forgotten the admonition of Teddy Roosevelt to walk softly and carry a big stick. Instead, we've let a pink-tinged State Department make our foreign policy, selling out our friends to those who would kill our youth and destroy our liberties.

To you, my comrades of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, let me state my position.

I have just laid down for you certain principles which I believe are fundamental for both the honor and security of our Republic.

I pledge you that, with all the energy and strength at my command, I shall resist any attempt by the State Department or national administration to deviate from these fundamentals.

I shall speak out and vote in the Senate in defense of these principles.

Away from the halls of Congress I shall continue to speak and fight for them. I shall appeal to my comrades in arms to arouse the American people for the fight to defend Americanism against communism.

We have a long way to go before we can hope for permanent peace. While we work for that objective let us keep our guard high. Let us build American strength to its highest peak.

Strength, courage, patriotism and a clear, firm, honest policy in our dealings with the world, is the best insurance against war.

Proposed Increase in Natural-Gas Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have commented on numerous previous occasions against the negligent attitude displayed by the Federal Power Commission in its failure to protect the consumers of Wisconsin and of the Nation from being gouged by tremendous natural-gas increases.

It is incredible to me how such rate increases can be tolerated when the Nation, under administration guidance, presumably is engaged in a hard fight to control inflation wherever it raises its ugly head.

The most recent action of the FPC—its 4-to-1 decision against assertion of Federal jurisdiction over prices charged at the wellhead for natural gas—was

one of the severest blows administered by a Federal agency against the public interest in recent years. The consequences of that decision are so vast that we at present can only dimly perceive them. The inevitable train of more rate increases, price increases, cost increases all along the line, cannot help causing the inflation spiral to rise still higher.

When the Chief Executive of our Nation vetoed a bill which would have surrendered control over natural-gas rates, most of the Nation, I believe, applauded his action. I, for one, vigorously praised the President for that veto, as did the people of my State practically unanimously.

We were very much surprised, therefore, to read that the President stated that the FPC's most recent decision had "no connection" with his own previous veto of the gas-rate exemption bill. Not only did the FPC decision have a very harmful effect, but it was as directly contradictory to the President's own veto message as could possibly be conceived. This fact is borne out by a Washington Post editorial of Wednesday, July 25, which I have in my hand.

I submit this editorial, not by way of a personal criticism of the President, because actually I think that insofar as protection of the consumer is concerned, his previous position well merited the Nation's backing. But his current statement involves an inconsistency which should not, I believe, be allowed to stand uncorrected.

I have written to Chairman Wallgren, of the Federal Power Commission, asking him whether he, for one, can square the President's veto action with the President's most recent statement.

At this time I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the Record:

First. The text of my letter of July 25 to the Chairman of the FPC.

Second. The Washington Post editorial.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
July 25, 1951.

Re request for rehearing on Phillips Petroleum Co. case.

Hon. MON C. WALLGREN,
Chairman, Federal Power
Commission, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you to respectfully urge a rehearing by the Federal Power Commission of the Phillips Petroleum Co. case.

It seems to me that unless there is such a rehearing and a reversal of the Federal Power Commission's 4-to-1 vote against assertion of Federal jurisdiction over rates charged for natural gas by Phillips, millions of America's natural gas consumers, including those of my State, will have been dealt one of the most devastating inflationary blows which has been administered to them.

I well recognize that, even if the Federal Power Commission should reject this request for a rehearing, that the FPC decision can and undoubtedly will be appealed to the highest courts of the land. However, it seems to me that in view of the long period of time that would be consumed by such appeal and in view of the fact that the FPC is presumably supposed to protect the public interest

in the first place, the obligation still rests on you and your associates to review the facts and possibly change your minds in this respect.

As I have indicated to you on previous occasions I well recognize the fact that the members of independent administrative tribunals, like the FPC, are entitled to come to their decisions on the basis of their individual consciences and analysis of the facts. I do not, of course, quarrel with your sincerity, but I do seriously question the wisdom of your mutual legal judgment.

The Commission's 4-to-1 decision is apparently based on the premise that everybody is out of step but the majority of the Federal Power Commission. The Congress is presumably out of step because it wisely refused to override the President's veto of the Kerr bill which would have exempted independent producers from regulation. The President of the United States is presumably out of step because he held to the idea that the American people were entitled to protection from being gouged by independent gas producers. The Supreme Court is presumably out of step because it clearly indicated that the Federal Government did have the power to regulate natural gas producers. The legal counsel of your own Federal Power Commission is out of step because he indicated that the Commission does have jurisdiction. Commissioner Thomas Buchanan, your able associate, is presumably out of step because he, too, refused to abandon the concept that the Commission very definitely does have the necessary authority.

And so the four-man majority on the Commission stands in isolation not only from the best legal judgment which is available, in my opinion, but it stands in isolation from the American people as a whole. Surely, the Commission is aware that the net effect of its opinion will be terrifically inflationary. Obviously, it is impossible to efficiently regulate gas rates charged by pipeline companies if those rates cannot be controlled at the original wellhead.

I cannot help but feel that those sections of the American press which have already commented in protest against the FPC's decision, are completely right in their pointing out that the FPC has in effect accomplished what all the supporters of the independent producer's exemption bill could not accomplish.

If your Commission's decision is allowed to stand, it will constitute one of the most unfortunate blows to the public welfare which has been administered in recent years by an administrative tribunal of the United States Government. I want to be completely fair to yourself and to your associates who happen to hold a different opinion from mine, but I cannot help but feel that your decision violates, as I have indicated, not only sound, legal opinion but the judgment of the Chief Executive of the United States and some of the best legal minds in America.

I know that you have a very high regard for the Chief Executive of our Nation, just as he has a high personal regard for you. One of the most bewildering aspects of the situation, insofar as the American public is concerned, is that when President Truman was recently asked to comment on the Commission's decision, he stated that it did not contradict his veto message of a year ago. The two cases, the President said, had no connection.

This is one of the most astounding observations that I have ever heard the Chief Executive make; because, as I have pointed out, what your decision does is accomplish precisely what the Kerr bill set out to do, namely, to exempt the so-called independent natural-gas producers (who control 85 percent of gas reserves) from Federal Power Commission control. Not only, therefore, does the FPC's decision have a connection

with President Truman's veto message, but it is 100 percent contrary to the letter and spirit of that veto message.

Now, I recognize that you are not responsible for the President's statements in his press conference, but it seems to me that in view of the fact that the President long ago set the policy of the executive branch of government toward the objective of protecting the consumers of natural gas, it is completely inconsistent and contradictory for the FPC to now reverse that policy. I believe that the people of this Nation, regardless of political faith, stand by the President's original view, based upon his splendid decision in vetoing the Kerr bill. However, they are astonished, as I am, by the President's latest comments.

I know that you, in particular, who have served in our National Legislature, can realize the problems faced by a legislator who is trying to represent faithfully the views of his constituents. I know, therefore, that you will recognize that I submit these views not by way of personal criticism—protection of the public—but rather on behalf of a principle from which it seems to me the FPC under your chairmanship has now sadly strayed. At any rate, the basic issue in this whole question is a matter of law and legal interpretation, and it is my earnest hope that the FPC will make a better study of the law than it apparently has thus far.

I should very much appreciate hearing from you on this matter and in particular, getting your interpretation of the relation between the FPC's decision and the letter and the spirit of the President's veto message on the Kerr bill.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

[From the Washington Post of July 25, 1951]
NATURAL GAS

In one of the ablest veto messages he has ever sent to Congress, President Truman pointed out a little more than a year ago that the Kerr bill would have opened the door to consumer price gouging by the so-called independent producers of natural gas. The effect of the bill was to remove these producers from the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission—at a time when the demand for natural gas was growing rapidly. But now, ironically, the FPC has decided of its own accord that it has no jurisdiction over activities of producers and gatherers of natural gas, even though they sell the gas in interstate commerce. The door is therefore left quite as wide open to price gouging as if the Kerr bill had been enacted into law. The Presidential veto has been overridden not by Congress but by the presidentially appointed FPC itself.

The chief architect of this reconstruction is the President's good friend, Mon C Wallgren, berthed at last in the chairmanship of the FPC after Mr. Truman had vainly tried to persuade the Senate to confirm his nomination to other more honorific posts. The President makes no complaint about the reversal; he said the other day that the FPC acted or the evidence—which comes close to saying that he was mistaken when he vetoed the Kerr bill. Of course, the FPC is bound, as a quasi-judicial commission, to follow its independent judgment as to the requirements of the law rather than the wishes of the White House. But many informed persons believe that it was not necessary for the FPC thus to restrict its own jurisdiction. The experts who advised the President to veto the Kerr bill certainly held to the broader concept of the Commission's powers. Otherwise the veto would have been much ado about nothing. From the point of view of the consumer it appears that Mr. Truman was right about the Kerr bill and that the Senate was right about Mr. Wallgren.

Veterans' Administration Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have set forth in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal of July 17.

Dealing, as it does, with the medical care program for our veterans and with the investigation of that program recently carried on under the able direction of Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, I know it will prove of interest to the Congress.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VA MEDICAL CARE WANTING

When Carl R. Gray, Jr., took over the office of Veterans' Administrator from Gen. Omar Bradley, the medical and hospital care being given veterans by the VA had earned the reputation of being the best available anywhere in the world.

The credit for this was freely given to General Bradley, his chief medical officer, Dr. Paul R. Hawley, and Dr. Hawley's deputy, Dr. Paul B. Magnuson, to whom General Bradley gave a free hand and complete support. After General Bradley and Dr. Hawley left the VA, Dr. Magnuson tried to carry on in the same way and maintain the same relationships and standards.

Friction developed, however, and Dr. Magnuson resigned rather than tolerate what he considered hampering interference by Director Gray and nonmedical officials in the VA. This and the growing rumors of deterioration and lack of confidence in the Administration of the VA medical care setup—especially criticism from medical circles—led to a quiet and thorough investigation of the whole situation by a Senate subcommittee, of which Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota, was chairman.

The committee's report, issued a few days ago, vindicated Dr. Magnuson. It was sharply critical of the administrative nightmare that has hampered the medical-care program since Director Gray has been in office, and said that this was putting the world's finest medical service in serious jeopardy. The committee called for changes in administrative orders of the VA and three changes in the law to correct the situation.

The reaction of Director Gray to the criticism and recommendations has been anything but reassuring. His press spokesman has brushed the report off as a lot of hokum and Director Gray himself claims now that the report was inspired by the testimony of ill advised and ignorant people. He has indicated, in about so many words, that he doesn't intend to follow the recommendations of the committee but will handle matters in his own way, which the committee so sharply criticized.

The Humphrey committee gave every indication of leaning over backward to be fair in its investigation. The committee did not jump at conclusions or try to make headlines. It called a long list of highly competent and thoroughly informed witnesses. Some of the more vehement critics of the recent trends in the VA medical set-up even called the committee report almost a whitewash.

It comes right down to the question of whether Director Gray is going to do what is necessary to restore complete confidence in the VA medical care program, and the high quality of its service to more than 100,000 patients daily at a cost of \$650,000,000 annually, or whether he isn't. If he isn't, then something more effective than a committee slap on the wrist and suggestions for remedies is plainly necessary.

Constantino Brumidi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, yesterday in the Washington Star there appeared a beautiful and eloquent tribute to the great Italian artist, Constantino Brumidi, the evidences of whose artistic skill are to be seen throughout the Capitol Building, especially in the rotunda. The tribute was written by the Chaplain of the Senate, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, and was published in his column in the Washington Sunday Star entitled "Spires of the Spirit." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT

(By Frederick Brown Harris)

AN IMMIGRANT'S IOU

Republics are notoriously ungrateful. It seems to be an unfortunate trait of a democracy to be unkind to its chief benefactors. Its most shining servants and saints often are those who are cannonaded while alive and canonized only long after death has removed them beyond the reach of praise or blame. History has witnessed countless repetition of the bitter mundane experience of one of the few, the immortal names that were not born to die, as it records—

"Seven cities vie for Homer dead

Through which the living Homer begged
for bread."

When three score and 11 years ago an Italian refugee, an outstanding artist, died, he had been denied fame and recognition by the nation which his devotion and skill immeasurably had enriched. Yet, in spite of the disdain and derision of his contemporaries, through the patient toll of a quarter of a century, by his genius he transformed the expanding Capitol of the United States into an embellished cathedral of patriotic symbolism. His tolling hands began their tryst with beauty before Lincoln entered the White House to face the heart-breaking task of saving the Union. When a tragic accident snatched him from his unfinished task, Hayes had succeeded Grant as President of the Republic. It is no exaggeration to say that this adopted son of America is worthy to be acclaimed as the Michelangelo of the monumental edifice which is the shrine of each patriot's devotion. For Constantino Brumidi breathed on bare walls the haunting beauty that burned in his poetic soul.

And so, back of the artistry of our chambers of democracy, is the tale of an exile

from the storied land of art and poetry and music, who here immortalized the epic scenes and towering personalities of this new world of freedom. His loving signature is written in heroic depictions, in human portraits, and, for good measure, in romantic landscaped etchings as well as in birds and flowers and fruit. Out of his cornucopia came varied forms and figures, clinging to the walls and ceilings in gorgeous colors and rich designs.

Perhaps the climax of all his Capitol treasures is what is known as the President's room on the Senate side. More than 6 years he toiled terribly on that jeweled ceiling, but the bequest he left there has given it the distinction of being called the most exquisitely decorated room in America.

Brumidi was no novice in the realm of art when, at almost 50, a political outcast, he left his native Rome. To him, freedom beckoned from this blessed land of room enough. For years he had steeped himself in the mural glories of the Vatican and had helped to restore the faded Raphael frescoes. Once in America, his gifted brush and soaring imagination were dedicated to sacred subjects, as he painted altar pieces of the crucifixion in New York and Philadelphia churches. During a visit south of the border, he beautified a cathedral in Mexico, while working on sketches for the proposed scenes in the Washington Capitol.

At 72, this neglected and unapplauded master of paint and fresco closed his weary and saddened eyes and was buried in an unmarked grave in the city he adored. Few there were, among his contemporaries, who sensed that there had passed from the earth a workman that needed not to be ashamed, whom remote generations belatedly would laud less than a week after death had vetoed his ardent desire to complete the vast rotunda design, where he was unfolding the scroll of American history, this prophecy was uttered on the floor of the United States Senate, "One day Brumidi will be crowned by the gratitude of succeeding generations." But alas, the long years passed and a pre-occupied Government allowed his memory to gather dust on the high shelf of oblivion.

Then at long last, her great heart shamed by such flagrant ingratitude, a determined woman, Dr. Myrtle Cheney Murdock, the cultured wife of a congressional legislator, by persistent research and the gathering of historic facts, burnished anew the annals of inspiring achievement. In her volume, which is a lovely example of the bookmaker's art, were reproduced, in glorious colors, the immortal frescoes for all to see and admire.

So it has come to pass that a woman has written Constantino Brumidi's name and fame as high as the stupendous dome he decorated with the magic of his inspired art. She and those who have shared her passion saw what Sir Edward Burne-Jones saw in the frescoes of Brumidi's native Rome, "there's a lump of greasy pigment at the end of Michelangelo's bristle brush and by the time it has been laid on the stucco, there is something there all men with eyes recognize as divine."

At the call of both Houses of Congress, on July 26, 1951, the stately Capitol of our Nation was the scene of a significant birth-day celebration. In the setting of the rotunda, crowded with Americans whose hearts were strangely moved, the official event belongs under the Spires of the Spirit, for with Brumidi the Capitol truly became an artist's sanctuary. On that July day, in a moving gesture, with his deathless contributions to the splendor of the vast dome looking down upon the throng, there was dramatically lifted up the artist's worn copy of the Holy Bible. In it, the hand that adorned the Capitol had entered the date of his arrival on the shores of this sweet land of liberty as he fled from the thralldom of the old. In the sacred book he had inscribed, "Presented

to me by the American Bible Society." It was in the inspiration of that book of books that he put upon the very walls of the Capitol his offering to the God of Liberty and of Beauty, from whom his genius was a golden gift.

The beautiful is essentially the spiritual, making itself known through the senses. When God would lead to the beauty of holiness, often he makes a stairway to it by the holiness of beauty. And now, as we give Brumidi his rightful niche in the Westminster Abbey of our faith, come darkened days when the liberty this patriot artist mirrored in grandeur is imperiled as never before, it is well to read with grateful eyes the IOU of this Italian refugee as he declares, "My daily prayer is that I may live long enough to make beautiful the Capitol of the one country in the world in which there is liberty." He still lives in that beauty. How impressive in its simple eloquence under the white dome on a mammoth mural is the opulent designation, "C. Brumidi, artist, citizen of the United States."

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a broadcast made by me on July 30, 1951, which is program No. 46 in the series entitled "Happenings in Washington."

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON— PROGRAM NO. 46

(By United States Senator EDWARD MARTIN,
of Pennsylvania)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital and bringing you another discussion of Happenings in Washington.

Many thoughtful Americans have been deeply disturbed by the Truman administration's high-pressure demand for controls that would give the bureaucrats a stranglehold on the national economy.

I don't mean controls on prices, wages, or critical materials needed for defense. I don't mean controls that would protect the American people from the ruinous effects of runaway inflation.

We must have those so long as the present emergency continues. Everyone who has been feeling the pinch of high prices wants a fair and equitable system of controls. They want a price level that will keep essential commodities within the reach of people who live on fixed incomes, the wage earner, the salaried man, and all others of limited means.

But they see grave peril in the attempt by the administration to grab unlimited powers and to impose upon the Nation a program that is completely socialistic.

It is a program that would place in the hands of politically appointed and politically minded Federal officials the power of life and death over any business or industry that incurred their displeasure.

It would cut down to the vanishing point the fundamental principle of our Nation's greatness—freedom of the individual.

The tremendous propaganda machine at Washington is operating at full speed. It has the services of hundreds of press agents

on the public payroll. They are doing everything possible to convince the American people that those who oppose the socialistic schemes of the administration are sabotaging price and wage control.

Don't let them fool you.

Ever since the House and Senate began to turn down portions of the scheme, the administration propaganda machine has been mudslinging at Congress.

You know, the administration has its own definition of a "good" Congress and a "bad" Congress. A "good" Congress is one which gives the administration everything it demands. A "bad" Congress is one which thinks for itself and is not afraid to say "no" in the public interest.

In this talk I want to present the plain, hard facts about the administration's scheme to grab unlimited, centralized power. I want to tell you what it really is, what it could do and why Congress, for the most part, has rejected it.

I hope you will follow me carefully. Your basic freedoms are involved here.

First of all, let me make this clear. Congress is not opposed to a fair program of controls to check inflation. Even when President Truman saw no need for controls, Congress urged such a program and actually passed a bill giving the President full power to control prices and wages.

You will recall that in June 1950, at the outbreak of the Korean War, there was a rush of buying and hoarding. Prices shot sky high. At that time I recommended a mandatory price and wage control program, clear across the board. I warned that unless the President took immediate action, inflation would get worse and the balance between wages and prices would be lost.

Many other Members of Congress also urged action.

Prices were rising all the time and labor was becoming more and more restless—but President Truman turned thumbs down on our suggestions. He rejected them again in July and August. He insisted no compulsory price and wage controls were necessary.

Finally, last September, with the cost of food, clothing and other commodities climbing out of sight, Congress refused to wait any longer. It passed the Defense Production Act of 1950. This gave the President absolute power to control prices and wages. But he refused to use this authority. It was not until the end of January 1951, 4½ months after we passed the Defense Production Act of 1950, that the general price freeze order was issued.

I think the record plainly shows that Congress did try to protect the American people from inflation and that the administration was asleep at the switch.

Now, let's turn to President Truman's bill of this year to extend and expand the Defense Production Act of 1950.

This bill goes far beyond the grant of powers in the 1950 law. It goes far beyond the powers which President Roosevelt and President Truman had during World War II.

It goes far beyond any powers Woodrow Wilson had in World War I, that Abraham Lincoln had during the Civil War, or any other American President has ever had in wartime or peacetime.

That is the kind of extreme power President Truman is demanding—but Congress, I am proud to say, has refused to surrender to him.

I think it is most fortunate that we have men of both parties in the House and in the Senate who believe in restricting the power of the Government to control the lives of the people.

Let me enumerate a few of the things Mr. Truman demanded in his bill.

Under the guise of national defense, he asked the right to license every business in the United States and the power to revoke such licenses.

Do you realize what that means? If some petty bureaucrat decided your factory in Allentown, your steel plant in Pittsburgh, or even your corner grocery store in Altoona was out of line, he would just yank your license. You'd be out of business. Because Congress refused to grant this power, we are smeared as obstructionists.

Mr. Truman asked authority to seize private property, when deemed necessary to national defense, merely by filing a notice in court. He could take anything—a farm, a factory, an office building, a store, an automobile, and so on. The owner of such property would have no safeguards such as are provided under existing law.

Again, in the name of national defense, Mr. Truman asked the power to condemn, acquire, or operate any kind of plant, factory, or facility, and to build Government owned plants. Do you realize the implications of such boundless authority? Mr. Truman could take over an entire industry and nationalize it, the way the British Socialist Government took over the English railroads and coal mines. Mr. Truman could take over and socialize our steel mills, all our railroads, automobile plants, or any other industry, large or small.

That is pure, unadulterated socialism. Yet Mr. Truman's propaganda machine smears Congress for refusing to give the President these powers.

The President asked authority to pay subsidies at its own discretion to any producers. He could subsidize some farmers and refuse others. He could subsidize some manufacturers and refuse others. What a tremendous power that is for an administration to have with an election coming up. Even a Democratic-controlled Congress couldn't stomach that.

The President asked power to establish new Federal corporations by Executive order. He could start another Reconstruction Finance Corporation, another Commodity Credit Corporation, or anything else. And he could determine their powers without any check by Congress. He also wanted a free hand for all defense expenditures. Now, stop and think about that a moment.

Under this proposed power, Mr. Truman could absolutely prevent Congress from imposing any economy upon any civilian agency by taking the position that it was contributing to national defense.

One of the broadest and most dangerous powers asked by the administration was the right to deny Government loans, tax-amortization benefits and other Federal aids, to industrial expansion projects in areas which have not been approved by the President.

That proposal would have made possible the dispersal of defense plants from Pennsylvania and other industrial sections of the East into the South and West.

In other words, it would take industry away from the areas where it has been long established and where the skills and know-how have been developed and transplant it into newly created industrial centers at great expense to the taxpayers.

My fellow Pennsylvanians, never before in our history, no matter how grave the times, has any President sought such drastic and terrible powers.

Taken all together they add up to socialism and dictatorship.

They are a threat to our freedom and our form of government.

These powers, if granted, would mean the end of our system of free enterprise.

They would add immensely to the size, complexity, and cost of our Government.

They would require a new and heavier burden of taxation.

They would increase the pressure of inflation upon every citizen.

They would destroy initiative and all the incentives that have produced the strength of American industry and our high standard of living.

Despite the barrage of administration propaganda, despite all the smearing tactics directed against those who oppose the socialistic proposals, Congress will give the Truman administration all the authority necessary to cope with the problem of price and wage control.

Congress will give the administration all the power it needs to combat the rise of inflation and to stabilize the national economy.

The one element needed is cooperation by the administration in cutting down to the lowest possible level all spending not related to national defense.

Spending by the Government adds to the inflationary pressure just as much as spending by private citizens.

I do not subscribe to the idea that higher taxes, draining off the earnings of the people, are a cure for inflation.

The more effective remedy, in my opinion, is the strictest economy at all levels of government, sound fiscal policies, a sound currency and balanced budgets.

To make progress in that direction it might be well for Congress to consider controls on the Government rather than by the Government.

During his term of office President Truman has advocated many proposals which Congress has rejected as socialistic. If they had all been adopted, even without his latest demands, the United States today would be bankrupt, under a form of government patterned after European socialism. All political and economic control would be concentrated in an all-powerful Federal bureaucracy.

The United States has survived internal strife, two world wars, and financial depressions.

If we all work together to preserve the kind of government under which our Republic attained world leadership we can survive the dangers of national bankruptcy and socialism.

We can build a greater, stronger America without surrendering to Government the great freedoms which, under the American system, are the sacred heritage of all the people.

This is Ed MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

**Address by Hon. Robert A. Taft, of Ohio,
to the Plymouth County Republican
Club**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the address I delivered to the Plymouth County Republican Club in Plymouth, Mass., on July 28, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Plymouth County Republican Club, fellow Americans,

it is inspiring indeed to come to this historic spot and speak to the citizens of Massachusetts, including the very descendants of the men and women who led the way in the settlement of what is now the United States. It is an honor to be associated in this ceremony with the leaders of the Republicans of Massachusetts, and with Joe Martin, former Speaker of the House, with former Governor Bradford, with your Senator, Lev Saltonstall and Cabot Lodge, who have made such an enviable record in the Senate of the United States.

We have come here to celebrate the record of the Pilgrim Fathers, and to rededicate ourselves to the ideals which inspired one of the great adventures of all time. They came to this continent 331 years ago primarily to secure religious liberty, and they did it with a courage and a sustained determination which triumphed over obstacles that we Americans of today can scarcely conceive. To these pioneers there was no concern about security, which dominates the thought of so many today. There was no complaint of the standard of living far below anything our poorest workmen would now accept. They were guided by the most rigid religious and moral principles which sustained them in adversity and inspired them to determined effort. They believed in God from the bottom of their souls. As said by Baylies, "They, in pursuit of religious freedom, established civil liberty; meaning only to found a church, gave birth to a nation; in settling a town, commenced an empire."

Two of the basic principles of the Pilgrim Fathers are badly needed in the United States today, and they are in danger of disappearance from the scene. The first is honesty and integrity. The second is a determination to acquire, protect and maintain liberty, of the individual and of the Nation. To those two principles the Republican Party does, and should, devote itself. No political party can survive unless it is based on certain principles which unite its members and lead them to a united effort in any election and in deciding policy. Its members may differ as to the application of those principles, but the essence of a two party system is that they will compromise their differences on lesser programs in order to support the basic principles. And so today we are unified even if we differ in detail or in degree. We believe in honesty and integrity in government. We believe in protecting and maintaining the liberty of our people at home and abroad, the liberty which the Pilgrim Fathers came so far to establish.

In 1951 we are nationally an opposition party, although the majority of the States are governed by Republican governors and Republican legislatures. Our proper function today is one of critical analysis, all the more important because of the disaster and dangers brought about by the policies of the present Administration. In 1952 when we appeal to the people to entrust us with the control of the Federal Government, we must then present an affirmative program, but I have little doubt that we can agree on such a program to carry out the principles of our party, for the differences that exist are minor compared to the principles on which we agree.

It is hopeless to expect honesty and integrity in the Washington Government without a complete housecleaning and the election and selection of officials with much the same uncompromising honesty as the Pilgrims brought to Massachusetts. We offer a return to honesty and integrity in government and a straightforward facing of the issues before us, Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Hamilton, and Madison said what they meant and no one questioned their unwavering integrity. There was no concealment in their make-up. Integrity to them was not merely financial honesty, but a clear

presentation of the real nature of their proposals to the people. Today the Government has reached a low point not only in direct corruption, but also in the studied practice of concealing the actual meaning of policies which may be adopted. No one can review without shame the revelations made by direct congressional investigation of the influences used in Washington to obtain favors—favors in the importation of perfume, favors in the pardoning of criminals, favors in the handling of income tax cases, favors in gambling, and favors in every other field regulated by the Government. The Look article of May 22, "The Scandalous Years", reviews many of those revelations showing that the influence of gamblers and criminals extended into the Washington offices and even besmirched the portals to the White House. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, because of its vast funds available for loans, became a target of those who were willing to use the influence which is so effective in drawing money from the Treasury. The Department of Justice itself was influenced to drag its feet in investigations and prosecutions which might have led to inconvenient exposure. In a large organization many things may happen without the fault of those at the head of the Government, but the discouraging thing today is that no one has even been rebuked or dismissed from the Government because of these revelations. The immoral if not illegal practices are condoned by the highest authorities. Only a Republican administration can restore principles of common honesty to Washington.

So, also, in the field of issues a deliberate policy of concealing the facts, and misrepresenting the necessary effect of policies urged, has become almost universal in every field of public activity. Apparently, a Government department feels that the people are too dumb to reach a correct conclusion. So, before adopting a policy, it enlists all modern publicity techniques to sell it to the people. It fails to present many of the fundamental facts without which a reasonable conclusion cannot be reached. It engages in pure unprincipled propaganda without any suggestion that there is, or may be, an opposing view. The Government is able, and does, exercise a strong and improper influence over many channels of public opinion. When a policy is once decided upon, the air the very next morning is heavily burdened with those commentators who try to boost the party line. The Government promises high prices to the farmer and low prices to the consumer at the same time, without revealing the fact that vast subsidies are involved which would have to be paid by the taxpayer, and, after all, these same producers and consumers are the taxpayers. The socialization of medical care and many other welfare services is concealed by the euphonious name of social insurance. It is certainly not insurance, but socialism. Boiled down it is merely another tax on some of the people to furnish free services to millions of others, most of them fully able to pay.

The Republican Party offers a return to honesty and frankness in administration on the problems of the day. The time has come for a moral revival which will restore to our people the confidence in the integrity of Government and in the sincerity of the principles of their leaders.

Together with honesty we offer that other philosophy which lay at the basis of the whole Pilgrim adventure. We are united in the determination to maintain the liberty of this country, the liberty of the American people both at home and abroad. Never except perhaps in the earliest days of the Republic has this liberty been so threatened as it is today. It is threatened by the mil-

itary strength of the Russian Soviet Government from abroad. It is threatened by the advocates of totalitarian control and socialism at home.

We find an administration in power today in this country whose domestic policies would bring the United States very close to the socialism of Great Britain, and establish in this country an arbitrary control by the Federal Government of commerce, industry, labor, agriculture and all welfare services. Their whole socialist program was set back by the elections of 1950, but many of its features are now proposed on a supposedly temporary basis in connection with the mobilization program. The Government is proposing a vast expenditure for Armed Forces: foreign aid, \$70,000,000,000, \$90,000,000,000, perhaps a \$100,000,000,000 a year and such spending may be necessary. But it means that the Government would be conducting nearly a third of the total activity of the country. It means deficits and inflation and controls. With the spending also goes the power which inevitably builds up the Government to dictatorship.

What is that liberty which the Pilgrims established and which, during these more than 300 years, has gradually built this country up to be the greatest and the happiest and the most powerful country in the world today? It is not just what we hear called free enterprise. It is the liberty of the individual to think his own thoughts and to live his own life, liberty of the teacher to teach those theories which he thinks are sound, liberty of the family to choose what it will spend its money for and what it will eat for supper, liberty of the local community to determine how its children shall be educated and its various local services administered, the liberty of local self-government without which in a country the size of the United States there can be no liberty at all, liberty of men to choose their own occupation and liberty of men to establish their own businesses and run them as they think they ought to be run so long as they do not interfere with the rights of other people to do the same. And finally, the liberty to worship God which the Pilgrims sought as their first end. It is these liberties which have given dignity to the individual in this country, which have provided a vast flood of ideas competing with each other until the most effective theories and methods and principles are found, which have increased the production of the United States and the productivity of its workmen and, of course, the standard of living of its people. The more we produce per person, the more there is to consume per person.

Now we see many people in the administration and throughout our Government who believe that this whole system ought to be abandoned, that we ought to turn to a planned economy, that the Government ought to fix prices and wages and control the detailed operations of every business, that the Government ought to go into business itself if it does not like the way the industry is being operated, that the Federal Government should take over most of the functions now performed by localities and establish a vast welfare system under the euphonious name of social insurance, that the Government should control agriculture in detail and tell every farmer how to run his farm.

The Republican Party has opposed this program. It has advocated progress in education and research and a standard of living by Government advice and assistance without Government dictation, and maintaining affirmatively the greatest liberty possible under the complications of the modern world.

In the welfare field the Republican Party has advocated many measures designed to achieve the constant improvement of the condition of the people without a surrender

of their liberty. Those measures will be clearly presented in the next election when we have the responsibility of outlining a definite program.

Today, as the opposition, we have the job of analyzing critically every feature of the program now claimed to be essential to the carrying out of mobilization. We have the job of seeing that the surrenders of liberty which may be necessary in that program are only temporary and that they do not go beyond the absolute necessity of the case. That is not always a popular job. Congress has just passed an extension of the price- and wage-control law. It is said that it is watered down. Yes, it is watered down from the outrageous demands of the President. We rejected the attempt to license every business, the power of life and death over industry. We rejected the demand for the power of Government operation in any industry if the bureaucrats didn't like the way it was run by private operators. We rejected the demand for subsidies and the kind of roll-backs which would require subsidies. The bill gives ample power, perhaps too arbitrary, to fix prices and wages. Remember the administration wanted all these powers in time of peace, and we have the job of seeing that they do not use the mobilization as an excuse to put over a Socialist program which the people have rejected. The opposition to the administration bill was not politics. It was conscientious protection of the liberty of our American system. Probably the best politics would have been to give the President every power he asked, and let him enjoy the full effect of failure and resentment.

What is the real purpose of American foreign policy? It must be to protect the liberty of the American people and after that the peace of the American people. War can only be justified if it is absolutely essential to preserve our liberty, because war today defeats its own purposes and does almost as much damage to the victor as to the vanquished, and it may destroy the very liberty which it is designed to protect. Any policy which gives away billions of America's assets can only be justified if necessary to preserve our liberty. It has not seemed to me that our recent administrations have been ruled by those purposes, nor that they have been inspired with any determination to preserve the peace as long as possible. War has been treated by them as an instrument of national policy. But today, I think it is fair to say that there is a unity in this country in one great purpose—to protect our liberty against the threat of Soviet imperialism and communism.

There is no doubt that the liberty of this country is threatened at the present time, probably more seriously than at any time since the early days of the Republic. Soviet Russia is a threat because of the great extension of all air power, because of its vast army and vast manpower, because of its possession of the atom bomb and because of the aggressive fanatical spirit of communism able to weaken the opposition of its opponent. We have the problem of dealing with that threat. So far as the general strategy of our foreign policy at the moment, therefore, is concerned, there is substantial unity between the administration and the Republican Party and within the Republican Party. We agree that the threat has not really been reduced by the Korean armistice, and that this armistice gives no excuse for the relaxing of our efforts. We agree that we must check the growth of the power of communism by every possible means within our power and capacity. There is no doubt that we must tremendously increase the Armed Forces of the United States. There is no doubt that if other nations will use assistance from us in checking communism, and if such assistance can be effective, we should give it freely.

There are substantial differences on the question of the particular projects to be used to accomplish our purposes—that is, on the tactics of our cold war. And these become important because one of the limitations on our action is that it be “within our power and capacity,” and we must choose between these tactical projects. There are definite limitations on what the United States can do. We cannot undertake to engage in land warfare with Russia throughout the entire world, or meet every advance the Communists may make. No doubt the military people could recommend projects costing at least \$150,000,000,000 a year, all of which would be helpful in containing Russia. Military operation today has grown tremendously in expense. But we cannot spend that amount of money without a huge increase of debt and without an inflation which might destroy the very system of production to which we look for the backlog of success in any war that may occur. The administration itself admits that probably we cannot raise more than \$75,000,000,000 a year in taxes, and therefore any spending beyond that point means a straining of our whole economic system which must only be undertaken if it is absolutely essential. The present program is dangerous because it proposes to spend \$90,000,000,000 in fiscal 1953 and again in 1954 or perhaps even \$100,000,000,000. Already the administration seems to contemplate a total deficit spending of \$50,000,000,000 during the 2 years at the peak of our rearming. There can be no doubt that any such program must be subjected to a real critical analysis by Congress and by the Republican Party. Even then there must be a selection between many different projects which might be adopted to check Communist aggression.

I believe that control of the sea and air throughout the world is within our capacity, and that we should therefore, undertake to secure that control in cooperation with the British Empire. If we have such control, this country will be safe, and we can be of maximum assistance to those who undertake to check communism throughout the entire world. I believe that the preparation in time of peace for immediate land warfare by ourselves against Russia on any large scale on the continent of Europe or the continent of Asia is beyond our capacity. We can assist those who are defending themselves, but we cannot undertake the job ourselves, or do anything unless the bulk of the defense is furnished by the nations who are directly concerned.

This does not mean that we should not help these other nations. There has been substantial agreement on the program of giving economic assistance to those who can use it to check the growth of communism from within. Second: we have given arms to suppress Communist guerrillas and to enable nations to protect themselves against invasion. Third: we have adopted a kind of Monroe Doctrine for Europe giving warning to the Russians that if they attack certain other countries, they will find themselves at war with the United States. We have agreed to go to the defense of all of these countries if attacked, and we have the Navy and the Air Forces available for that purpose. Finally, we have undertaken to defend certain places with American soldiers such as Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines. We have sent six divisions of American troops to Europe, and we have become involved in the Korean war.

But land warfare in Europe or Asia is the most dangerous and the most expensive. The stationing of American soldiers in foreign lands to defend them against attack is the most likely to involve us in war, and therefore should never be undertaken without congressional approval. Even under the present tremendous program we are only providing 24 Army divisions, and certainly we can-

not undertake with them to meet Russia's two hundred divisions on the Continent. Certainly, it seems clear that we should not commit any troops to any European army unless the Europeans themselves furnish the bulk of that army, and that I understand to be the position of General Eisenhower and every member of the administration. I question the wisdom of sending troops to defend one country against another country, unless the country to be defended initiates the request and is earnestly and enthusiastically determined to defend itself.

In applying this policy, I see no reason why we should favor either Asia or Europe. All that I have asked for is a consistent policy applying to both. My only quarrel is with those who demand that we go all out beyond our capacity in Europe, and at the same time refuse to apply our general program and strategy to the Far East. The defense of Formosa, for instance, was always a simple and easy action involving about one percent of the effort which we undertook in Europe. Yet, in spite of Mr. Acheson's recent testimony, the administration proposed to abandon Formosa to the Chinese Communists. In Greece we have spent several billions of dollars to support a government which has strong reactionary tendencies. In China, on the other hand, the State Department hampered the Nationalist Government and consistently favored the Chinese Communists. By arming Greece and Turkey, by encouraging the formation of a German Army, by arming nations all around Russia from Norway to Iran, we certainly take the risk of inciting the Russians to begin a third world war. But in China and Korea we refuse to employ the only means that could possibly win the Korean War—those proposed by General MacArthur because there is a remote possibility that Russia might become sufficiently concerned to send troops across Manchuria into Korea.

I believe today that Republicans can generally agree that the most important element in the building up of our defense against Russia is complete control of the air. The exact extent to which we use our Armed Forces on land can certainly be determined from time to time by the strength which we develop and the encouragement given to us by those who are directly in the path of Russian aggression.

We are constantly met by the statement that no one should question the recommendations of the military, and no one should question the foreign-policy decisions of the State Department. Anyone who ventures to do so is immediately smeared by the administration press and accused of torpedoing a bipartisan foreign policy which has certainly never existed since 1948. I suggest that the appeals for unity of this kind are an attempt to cover up the past faults and failures of the administration and to enable it to maintain the secrecy which has largely enveloped our foreign policy before and since the Second World War. There seem to be a number of individuals and editors and columnists and commentators who accept any policy proposed by the State Department or the Defense Department, even if it is the exact opposite of what that Department proposed 6 months before. Certainly, when policies have been determined, unity and execution are highly desirable. I don't think any well-informed Russian today can feel that there is any dissension among our people as to the basic policy of opposing Russian aggression at every point. But it is a fallacy, and a very dangerous fallacy threatening the very existence of the Nation, to discredit those who demand a critical examination of the details of foreign and military policy, or to smear those who criticize the results of past policy and draw from those results a conclusion as to what should now be avoided.

It certainly should be pointed out that the great power of Soviet Russia today was

built up by the policies of the Roosevelt administration at Tehran and Yalta, and of the Truman administration at Potsdam, the acceptance of the theory that communism was a form of democracy, and that Soviet Russia itself was a peace-loving and liberty-loving democracy. No such fatal delusion has ever possessed the leaders of the American Republic. Under that delusion we established the Russians in Berlin and Prague and Vienna where they dominate central Europe when American troops could certainly have occupied the first two of those strategic points. Our leaders accepted Stalin's promises when he had never kept a promise, and there was no means of enforcing them. We turned over control of Manchuria to Russia contrary to the principle of the open door in China which had dominated our far-eastern policy since the days of John Hay. We sent General Marshall to China to demand that Chiang Kai-shek put the Communists into his cabinet, and when he refused we cut off military aid which was essential for the defense of China against Communist attacks. Surely, a criticism of that policy based on the results which it has achieved—the loss of China and the threat to our whole position in the Far East—is the duty of anyone who discusses foreign policy.

We are about to enter into an armistice at the thirty-eighth parallel. We thus return to exactly the same position which we occupied some 3 years ago before we withdrew our troops from Korea. But in the meantime there have been 80,000 American boys killed or wounded, we have destroyed the very nation to whose assistance we went and it is said that there have been a million civilian casualties. Certainly a stalemate peace at the thirty-eighth parallel is better than a stalemate war at the thirty-eighth parallel. But why any war at all? If we had remained in South Korea, there would have been no war. Even if we had armed the South Koreans as General Wedemeyer in 1947 warned us that we should do before moving out there might have been no war. In January 1950, Secretary Acheson in his eagerness to make it clear that we would under no circumstances go to the assistance of the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa made it also clear to the Russians that our policy was absolutely opposed to sending any troops to Korea. Naturally the Russians saw a soft spot, and they took the Secretary of State at his word.

Could there have been a more inconsistent, a more wavering, a more disastrous policy than that which took us into the war that is now being concluded? Admitting that there was some justification for sending troops to defend South Korea to show the world that aggression would be punished, then certainly we have utterly failed in the purpose of our venture, for the Chinese have succeeded in an aggression far more dangerous than that of the North Koreans. They have marched their troops into another country and attacked the very United Nations' forces which were engaged in punishing aggression. They have pushed those forces back from the Yalu River to the thirty-eighth parallel, and now they are to receive the rewards for that aggression in a stalemate peace. As far as military aggression is concerned, the Korean War has only proved that small aggressors will be punished, but that nothing will be done to big aggressors. How can the administration escape the responsibility for the death and wounding of 80,000 American boys, and why should such criticism not be made?

The last two administrations have assumed complete authority to make in secret the most vital decisions and commit this country in secret to the most important and dangerous obligations. It has always been a part of our American system that basic elements of foreign policy shall be openly debated. It is said that such debate and the

differences that may occur give aid and comfort to our possible enemies, but the only thing that really gives aid and comfort to our enemies is the adoption of policies which play into their hands and give them victory and bring disaster to our country, as has our policy at Yalta and in Korea. Such aid and comfort to the enemy can only be prevented by frank criticism before such a policy is adopted. Unity carried to unreasonable extremes can destroy a country. Hitler achieved unity in Germany at the cost of the destruction of his country. Mussolini had achieved unity in Italy. The leaders of Japan, through a method of so-called thought control, achieved unity in Japan and disaster for the people.

Today it is just as easy for America to adopt a false policy leading to the destruction of its country as for any other nation to do so. The one danger is that we undertake to do more than we have the capacity to do. The best safeguard against fatal error lies in continuous criticism and discussion to bring out the truth and develop the best program. It is not only the right, but the duty of those in the minority to reexamine constantly and constantly discuss the foreign policy of the United States.

So, also, in the military field it is right and proper that the proposals of our military advisers be subjected to critical analysis. Our military effort must be limited by our economic capacity and the extent to which it must be limited is a question to be determined by civilian officials. Nor are the military always consistent. It was only in March 1950 that General Bradley testified that \$15,000,000,000 was ample for the defense of America, and I think General Eisenhower thought that perhaps we should spend \$500,000,000 more. General Bradley expressly said that the Chiefs of Staff had never approved the large figure of \$20,000,000,000, and that if he suggested \$30,000,000,000 he ought to be removed as Chief of Staff. Now they want \$65,000,000,000 in a single year. Last September they wanted 2,100,000 men in the Armed Forces; in December 2,700,000; by January they had boosted their sights to 3,500,000. Now the President refers to this as merely an interim goal, and suggests that we may be spending \$100,000,000,000 by the Federal Government alone in 1953, which means a total tax burden of well over 40 percent of the national income. In England a 40 percent burden has killed initiative and progress and reduced the country to complete dependence on an all-powerful government. We cannot raise the taxes for any such program, and we must recognize that it means further inflation, a great increase in the national debt, hardship and turmoil and impairment of the very production which is the backbone of our strength. Certainly it is the duty of those of us in Congress to require that the program be subject to a detailed study and examination. It is idle to say that these are military questions. Military advice is most important, but the final determination of vital questions of national policy requires a civilian decision. That decision cannot be left to the secret conclave of Truman and Acheson and Marshall. In that decision the Congress and the opposition must play a vital role.

I believe, therefore, that the policy upon which all Republicans can unite is one of all-out opposition to the spread of communism recognizing that there is a limit beyond which we cannot go without threatening our own liberty, our own welfare, and the very strength upon which we must rely to win a war if such a calamity should ever occur. We can agree that the proposals of the administration for military expenditures and for foreign aid should be subjected to critical examination; that they should only be adopted if it is determined that they

are absolutely necessary to protect the liberty of the United States; that they should not be used as a means of extending the Government controls and dictatorship which the Democratic administration sought in time of peace.

There is no reason for pessimism about the present situation. There is no reason for fear or trembling. We are by far the greatest nation in the world, and the fastest growing nation. It is only our leadership which has led us temporarily into an emergency problem. We have the means at our command. We have a people united as to our main purpose. We need only a Government inspired by the principles of the Pilgrim Fathers—a Government which is honest to the core and furnishes a moral and religious leadership to the people, a Government inspired by the dominating purpose that it will maintain at all costs the liberty of its people from foreign and domestic threat.

The Flood in Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I am sure that all Members of the Senate and, for that matter, of the entire Congress, are aware in a general way of the havoc and ruin that have been caused in the States of Kansas and in the States of Missouri and Oklahoma, by reason of the recent disastrous floods.

I am certain that every practical consideration will be given in furthering the programs of development of projects that will prevent a recurrence of these disasters.

Recently at the flood-control meeting in Kansas City, Leo McNalley, a resident of Minneapolis, Kans., made a statement pointing out the devastation and ruin in the Solomon River Valley. His statement further points up the need for serious consideration, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, so that all interested might get a better picture of what is confronting the people of the communities involved.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF L. A. McNALLEY, ATTORNEY AT LAW, OF MINNEAPOLIS, KANS., ON JULY 25, 1951, IN KANSAS CITY AT THE FLOOD-CONTROL MEETING

It is my pleasure to speak to you on behalf of residents of the Solomon Valley and as a representative of the Solomon Valley Flood Control Association. This association had its inception July 6 after the June 24, 1951, flood and before the holocaust of Friday, July 13.

For geography on this matter, the Solomon River begins in Sherman County, Kans., and drains an area of 17 counties, or major part thereof. It empties into the Smoky Hill River approximately 285 miles east of its origin near Solomon, Kans., or some 40 miles below the Kanopolis Reservoir on the

Smoky Hill River. About 7,000 square miles are included in this basin. One hundred and seventy-six thousand people reside in these 17 counties.

This association has an executive committee comprised of one person from each of 24 towns and cities located below the proposed dams. The dams proposed for the Solomon River are the Kirwin, Webster, and Glen Elder. The Kirwin is high on the agenda for construction and we are informed that contracts could be let in approximately 60 days after appropriations are made for its construction. The Webster would be under construction in 1 year, and the Glen Elder in less than 2 years.

These dams will impound a total of 382,000 acre-feet of water; thus, they would have lifted 15 feet off the June flood. From June 26 to July 4 of this year, the Solomon was continuously at flood stage. This water traveled at a rate of speed so that its head would have reached Lawrence about July 10, 11, 12. These three reservoirs if they had been constructed would have diminished the damage suffered not only in the Solomon Valley, but every valley below it.

At Minneapolis, Kans. since 1941, the Solomon River has reached flood stage 18 times. We are sick of it, definitely sick, and something must be done. Seven of these floods were within one-half foot of the high 1903 mark. Three were above it. In only 3 years out of the last 11 has the Solomon failed to flood. In 1950, it flooded six times. So far in 1951 it has flooded four times. We have our fingers crossed for the rest of 1951. The old mythical Indian that predicts floods on the Solomon is now saying, "You ain't seen nothin' yet." Every time a black cloud appears in the Northwest, it chills the hopes of the people on the Solomon.

There has not been a train over the Beloit Branch since June 20. The July flood of this year maintained a mark above that of 1903 continuously for 6 days, and this water came from Beloit, Kans., at a rate of approximately five times its normal speed.

The reservoirs proposed on the Solomon will control these floods. We have seen ample proof of this in the Kanopolis and Cedar Bluffs Reservoirs. To impound the water now in the Kanopolis Reservoir in farm ponds, it would take 37,500 ponds of 10 acres each, 3 feet deep, or 3,750 ponds of 40 acres, the same depth. These farm ponds would cover 150,000 acres of land. The Kanopolis Reservoir covers 13,000 acres.

You can walk a few short blocks from here and see the utter destruction heaped upon this city from water from the Solomon and other tributaries of the Kansas basin. Dikes and dams built here without the reservoirs are not the answer, and vice versa. The people in our valley have lost valuable, fertile land, gutted with new valleys, covered with silt, covered with gravel and sand, and the topsoil gone. The silt presents a complicated problem. Can it be tilled? And if it is tilled, what will the winds do to it in the late summer when they come? Homes, machinery, livestock, furniture, and all kinds of worldly possessions and precious treasures are destroyed and gone. The financial losses will never be known in anywhere near the exact terms. Returning to the slimy ruins, in the stench, with near 100 degree weather, has brought forth a loss far greater than any ever measured in dollars—it is the loss of human initiative. Now having faced 10 floods in less than 2 years' time, the pluck, grimness and determination of the people of the Solomon Valley is diminishing fast. Their endurance is exhausted. Many are moving out. Faith can be restored in these people if we act now.

We earnestly solicit your help in solving this problem, and we earnestly pledge our help to each and every flooded area to solve this problem and solve it now.

The St. Lawrence Seaway**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, we are missing an opportunity to make a profit for American taxpayers and build up our defenses at the same time. This fact has been recognized by Blair Fraser, a well-known Canadian writer, in a recent article entitled "Why Uncle Sam Has Blocked the Seaway," carried in the May 15 issue of MacLean's magazine, published in Toronto. I ask that excerpts from the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

If the United States Congress is ever going to ratify the 1941 St. Lawrence seaway agreement it will do so this year. If not, and chances look none too good, Canada might as well start the job alone.

It's worth doing. It will bring 2,300,000 horsepower of cheap electricity to Ontario and Quebec—the last major source of power still undeveloped in central Canada. By letting all Great Lakes shipping out and some ocean shipping in, it will cut \$48,000,000 a year off transport costs. It will add \$70,000,000 or more a year to Canada's national income, by doubling the market for Quebec-Labrador iron.

Those are the measurable advantages. More important are those that can't be measured.

With the seaway Canada and the United States could build their antisubmarine fleet in the safety of inland shipyards. With the seaway the great inland steel mills of North America would have a safe and ample supply of ore when the Mesabi Range is exhausted, as it will be before many years are gone; otherwise, ore must be imported over a long sea route, vulnerable all the way to submarines.

With the seaway a war emergency can be met without overstraining the railways as they were overstrained last time. With the seaway and its power development, heavy industry in the North American heartland could be expanded very fast to meet the demands of war or peace.

All these imponderables and some of the straight cash benefits too are worth as much to the United States as to Canada. That's why every President since Woodrow Wilson, every governor of New York since Al Smith, has been willing and anxious to make it a joint project with the United States paying most of the costs. . . .

Charles E. Wilson, Coordinator of Defense Production, testified with the zeal of a convert. Two years ago, as president of General Electric, he'd been against the seaway. Today, as the man in charge of defense production, he is for it—converted, he said, by a closer examination of the facts. He now feels, as a businessman, that he'd be glad to undertake the seaway and power development as a private venture.

By contrast, the opposing witnesses looked like a parade of nonentities. The opening witness for the opposition, who spent several days on the witness stand, was the assistant general counsel for the Association of American Railroads, chief supporter of the anti-seaway lobby. Succeeding witnesses, in the main, have been equally obscure citizens.

Why, then, isn't the seaway bill sure to go through?

It's still possible, of course, that it may go through; informal polls seem to indicate a majority of the House committee favors it. But the Senate Foreign Relations Committee must also approve and its hearings haven't even begun; the chairman, Tom CONNALLY, of Texas, has been an anti-seaway man for years. In either House the Rules Committee can bury it, keep it off the floor and away from a vote.

They can, but why should they? What explains this determined suppression, year after year, of something favored by every administration from Harding's to Truman's?

What would we have to pay per year to earn the benefits offered by the seaway?

An astonishingly small amount, really. The St. Lawrence seaway is a capital asset which will not depreciate; except for a few bits of machinery, it will always be as valuable as it is now. There's no special reason, therefore, for trying to recover the capital—we could afford to pay interest on the whole amount indefinitely. On this basis the carrying charges of all the navigation works amount to only \$15,300,000 a year. Those for the St. Lawrence canals alone would be \$12,300,000.

Even with a very moderate schedule of tolls the St. Lawrence canal would earn this much money. It would require a charge of only 20 cents a ton on raw materials and 65 cents a ton for manufactured goods to bring in \$12,300,000 a year.

There's one last point in favor of it, this year, which may not make much difference to the ordinary taxpayer but has some attraction for the Canadian Government. This year the seaway project might be rated as something less than a net out-of-pocket expenditure. This year it could be counted, in part at least, as a defense outlay.

North Atlantic Treaty nations are under no compulsion to spend any particular sum, or mobilize any particular number, in the joint effort of common defense. However, there is a good deal of pressure on each country to pull its weight.

Canada doesn't mind spending money; it does mind mobilizing forces larger than can be got by volunteer methods. Any excuse for increasing our financial contribution and decreasing our share of armed force is welcome. The seaway would be one such.

It would occupy 10,000 men for 5 or 6 years, and cost more than a quarter of a billion dollars. This outlay of men and money would be for an objective which the American Government's own spokesmen have called, repeatedly, an urgent defense requirement. Why isn't it equally so if Canada does it alone?

Looking at it this way, you might say Canada could pay for the seaway by deducting it from her income tax.

Proposed Withholding Tax on Dividends**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, since there is some proposed legislation in the 1951 Revenue Act that requires credit unions to withhold 20 percent of any dividends paid to members, I thought it would be rather enlightening to place in the RECORD a letter which I have just received from the Sinco Credit

Union, of Independence, Kans., which speaks for itself.

I am sure this experience could be multiplied hundreds and thousands of times throughout the United States, and I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDEPENDENCE, KANS., July 17, 1951.

Hon. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPPEL,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Sinco Credit Union, whose membership is restricted to personnel employed in Sinclair Building in Independence, Kans., making possible potential membership of 400, was chartered in June 1950.

Its 2.40 percent dividend in 1950, totaling \$32.57, was distributed to 117 members holding fully paid share interests. The largest dividend was \$3.60 and the smallest 1 cent, distributed as follows:

Over \$3.....	1
\$2 to \$2.99.....	3
\$1 to \$1.99.....	7
50 cents to 99 cents.....	2
Under 50 cents.....	104

We have been informed the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives is proposing the 1951 Revenue Act include a requirement that credit unions withhold 20 percent of any interest or dividends paid to members, just as employers now withhold a percentage of salaries paid to employees.

Such a regulation imposed on credit unions comparable to ours, whose operating personnel serve without pay, will cause them to question whether or not they can continue to function.

If such a regulation appears in proposed 1951 Revenue Act, we urge you to oppose it in the belief the cost of accounting for and remitting such withholding will equal or exceed the revenue to be remitted.

Yours truly,

SINCO CREDIT UNION,
By A. J. NICHOLSON, President.
By B. E. EVANS, Secretary.**The Displaced-Persons Program****EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial which appeared in the July 14, 1951, issue of the Minneapolis Morning Tribune on the displaced-persons program be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DP PROGRAM ENTERS ITS FINAL PHASES

"Thank you, America. This is the greatest day of our lives and I am happy to speak not only for myself and my family but for all displaced persons who have been given new hope and a new home in this country. So many of us after the war thought we would never have a happy life again. . . . I am sorry that my English is not good enough to say what is in our hearts, but all of us know we have been given the greatest

gift of our lives, the chance to become citizens of America."—Volodymyr Holubiw, a Polish-Ukrainian, the two hundred and fifty thousandth displaced person to enter the United States.

Multiply these sentiments by about 800,000 and you have a rough idea of what this country will have gained in the way of appreciative, loyal citizenship when the displaced persons resettlement program is completed.

Thanks to timely action by Congress, it now seems likely that every one of the 341,000 DP's allowed under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 will be able to reach these shores before legal barriers clank down again.

Deadline for entry under the amended law had been June 30 of this year, but a last-minute extension was rushed through both Houses of Congress setting December 31 as the new "last day" for granting of visas. Transportation difficulties may delay the arrival of the last DP's but all but the ethnic Germans, who may enter until June 30, 1952, should be able to enter by April of next year.

Congress extended the time limit in response to compelling evidence that the resettlement program, as it has worked out thus far, has been highly satisfactory and that cutting off the program June 30 would have dashed the hopes of thousands of refugees in the resettlement "pipeline." In addition, the Displaced Persons Commission had 150,000 unfilled applications from American citizens who wanted to sponsor DP's.

In Minneapolis this week Dr. C. E. Krumboltz, of the National Lutheran Welfare Council, which has taken care of more than 23,000 DP's, said he is well pleased with the over-all aspects of the resettlement program. He estimated that from 85 to 95 percent of the refugees already admitted have made satisfactory adjustments. "When you remember that these people are all individuals with individual strengths and weaknesses, the number who have failed to adjust is surprisingly small." Close to 75 percent of transportation and expense loans to Lutheran DP's have already been repaid, he added.

Similar experience has been reported by the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Church World Service, and other sponsoring agencies which help these modern pilgrims find jobs and homes in the new world.

Not all of the DP's have done well, of course. Some take longer to fit in than others. There have been misunderstandings with employers. Jobs have disappeared while the DP's were struggling with red tape in an effort to reach them. Illness and legal restrictions, too, have dimmed the once bright hopes of many refugees.

On balance, however, this country can be proud of its role in what has been called the largest peacetime-resettlement program in the world's history. In finding room for the newcomers we are acting in the best of American traditions and at the same time receiving a rich transfusion of talents, hopes, and dreams from the Old World.

able article entitled "Old-Age Security for Our Economic Areas." This was written by Prof. Seymour E. Harris, of Harvard University, and appeared in the New York Times magazine section on July 29. Professor Harris is one of the seven distinguished members of the Committee on the New England Economy of the Council of Economic Advisers. This committee recently completed an excellent report on the New England Economy, and this article is a natural a follow-up on that report and, I assume, a partial preview to his forthcoming book on the economics of older areas. Professor Harris poses an old and difficult question. How can the older economic regions of the United States, such as New England, best maintain a balanced economic position in the expanding over-all economic pattern of the United States? This is a question of interest not only to us in New England, but to the South, as Professor Harris points out, and indeed at varying times and in varying degrees to all sections of our country.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OLD-AGE SECURITY FOR OUR ECONOMIC AREAS—AN INDICATED THERAPY IS STRENUOUS COMPETITION WITH THE IDEAS AND ENERGY OF NEWER REGIONS

(By Seymour E. Harris)

Regions, like people, age; and in the aging process an economic arteriosclerosis tends to develop. This social disease develops as inhabitants of new industrial regions, seeking a place in industry, confront the older regions with intense competition, profiting from the freedom to manufacture, relatively unfettered by past practices and customs. Although the newer regions offer competition, they also provide new markets for the older areas. A crucial issue for the latter is: Do they gain more from the rising income associated with the opening of new economic frontiers than they lose from competition?

The economic problems of New England are typical consequences of the aging process, but all older regions face similar problems. And even the relative new industrialized areas—for example, the Southeast—are on the way to their own industrial ailments. In fact, the Southeast will encounter problems more serious than those of New England because of greater dependence on one industry. Just as the industrialization of Asia weakened the British economy in the interwar period, the continued industrialization of Latin America and Asia will threaten the South's ascendancy in textiles and, therefore, her industrial status. In short, all regions have to face up to the problems of economic geriatrics, but their adaptive capacities seem to vary.

Why do the older regions lose? Many of their relative losses are inevitable. But in part the results are of their own doing. People who have arrived are likely to become smug. Similarly with regions. Management, when in the hands of the fourth and fifth generation of one family, often has lost the fire and creativeness of the original builders. There are, of course, exceptions: Dennison's, a major producer of paper products and office supplies, is operated by a fifth-generation management and is still a highly successful firm.

But it is not merely a question of nepotism. Even in the industries largely controlled by newcomers, the older areas are remiss in management. For example, the Middle West captured the market for infant

and juvenile shoes, the growth of which anyone with imagination could have forecast from the increase of births during the war.

This lack of venturesomeness is evident in the reluctance of bankers to lend. In hearings last summer on RFC loans, for instance, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, said in discussing a refusal of the Boston banks to lend to Raytheon:

"I would like to know just what has happened to the business judgment of the Boston bankers, that they will refuse a loan so that the business has to come running down here to Washington to get Government money. The people up in New England are shouting all the time; at least, the leading financiers of New England are shouting all the time, about the horrors of governmental investment; and yet here is a business which is earning \$1,500,000 a year on the average for the last 6 years and whose present orders on hand aggregate \$40,000,000, when an investment of \$1,000,000 will free it from a rental charge of \$324,000 and still the Boston banks will not lend."

Nor is it merely management that is to blame. Workers in older areas also become fixed in their working habits. They resist adapting themselves to new working conditions, to new labor-saving devices with corresponding adjustment in work loads. A textile engineering firm testified before the 1950 Massachusetts commission on textiles that a completely new 450-loom mill, producing combed broadcloth, would require under current labor-management agreements, 158 operatives in the North, but only 118, or 25 percent fewer, in the South.

New England's head start is in some ways a handicap. For example, the great New England industrial machine developed in the second half of the nineteenth century was tailored to a market perhaps one-fifth or less of the current market. The resulting industrial structure is not nearly so well adapted to a \$300,000,000,000 economy as that of newer areas. The latter can build on the assumption of a vast economy; and they can much more easily adapt their plants and equipment to the size of markets, and the advances of technology than older areas for they start fresh.

In some respects, the failure is only comparative—as against positive action by the newer regions and by the older (e. g., Southeast) regions that are seeking industry. The newer industrial regions inherit certain advantages.

First, they profit from almost inexhaustible supplies of labor from the farms. These recruits from the farm crowd the city labor markets, depress wages and, unhampered by old working habits and attracted by what seems to be remarkably high pay, ask no questions about workloads, and display an eagerness to learn and cooperate. The workers are younger and in general more enthusiastic.

Second—a factor related to the first—wage rates are likely to be lower in many of these regions. The South's emergence as a great textile center stems primarily from the availability of rich labor supplies and low wages. At the turn of the century the wage rates of the South were about 40 percent below New England; now, under the pressure of industrialization in the South and increased demand for labor, the difference is of the order of 10 percent.

Third, the newer industrial areas have the advantage of proximity to rich markets and raw materials. Obviously, New England tends to become less and less central.

Fourth, the attitude of the newer industrial areas toward Government is different from that of the older areas. Whereas New England businessmen are extremely hostile toward government, and especially toward Federal Government, and New York mildly receptive but unenthusiastic, the South and

Old-Age Security for Our Economic Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a remark-

West are more inclined to seek Government aid.

Fifth, the citizens of the newer industrial area bestir their communities and State and local governments in a manner which puts their industries at an advantage. This is evident in their tax structure, which spares business as much as possible and even discriminates in favor of factories attracted from other areas; in the manner in which all sections of the community contribute funds toward providing sites, building and subsidies for other purposes to attract new industries.

Related to the attitude toward Government is the problem of working conditions, social legislation, and the like. New York and Massachusetts have been in the vanguard of social legislation. This legislation, which limits hours of work, fixes minimum pay, provides high standards of social security, and gives collective bargaining a fair chance, is costly to a region which has to compete with other regions having much lower standards along these lines.

Testimony before the Tobey committee of the Senate in 1948 on the closing of the Nashua, N. H., mills of the Textron Corp. can serve as a concrete guide to the problems raised by newer industrial areas. It showed from the experience of the Textron Co.:

1. Take-home pay of northern workers was 10 percent more than in the South. Yet Carolina employees produced from 25 to 100 percent more yards and pounds per hour than many of the northern workers.

2. The illegality of the three-shift system in New England (at least in parts of it) raises costs there because overhead costs per unit of output are much higher where only one or two shifts are employed.

3. Power costs averaged 7.1 cents per kilowatt-hour in four mills in South and North Carolina against 12.4 cents in Nashua, N. H., and 17 cents in Manville, R. I.

4. Freight differential for raw cotton favors the South against Nashua by 62 cents per hundred pounds.

5. Property taxes on inventories, plant, buildings, and machinery average 48 cents a spindle in five Carolina plants and \$2.53 a spindle in Nashua.

It is quite obvious what happens to many industries when they see better prospects in newer areas. Capital and management move into the area where other resources are plentiful and cheap.

This migration is unfortunate only in the sense that it brings severe problems of readjustment for the areas losing plants. Our theory of international or interregional trade tells us that the losing areas will soon concentrate on other industries where high labor costs are not a serious deterrent; that is, where high wages are more than offset by high productivity.

But unfortunately the adjustment is slow. Workers out of jobs refuse to leave their home towns and abandon their acquired skills. An interim period of unemployment then depresses wages, as has happened in New England in the last generation.

There is still another important adjustment that takes place. Workers, as well as capital and labor, tend to migrate. But the migration is not from North to South; but rather from South to North and Northeast to West. The explanation of these movements is that incomes are still low in the South. As capital moves to the South and labor moves out, the net effect is for wages in the South to rise toward those of the North.

The diagnosis of relative economic decline in older areas is relatively simple. What of the therapy? Economic geriatrics, like regional economics, is an unplowed field.

Obviously the simplest maxim is that the older regions must meet the competition of

ambitious, vigorous, aggressive youth, full of new ideas and unencumbered by orthodoxy.

In adjusting wage rates and workloads, in accelerating management, in scrapping old plants and equipment, in sparing industry excessive taxloads and wasteful public spending, in seeking cheap power, in adapting factories and products to the vagaries of the markets, in demanding a fair share of Federal bounties which reduce costs and expand markets—in all of these, the older regions need to advance.

The argument is not that the older areas will thus be able to hold on to all their established industries. Far from it. New England, for example, will continue to lose in textiles; and the apparel industry, which is strong in New York, will continue to grow in other regions, and in part at the expense of New York. All that we suggest here is that protectionist devices—tariffs, subsidies, preferred buying by the public agencies—be enlisted only to lighten the transition for the towns or regions largely dependent on the declining industries.

Of greatest importance is the preparation of a census of industries for the older regions. What is needed is a priority list of industries based on the special advantage of the regions inherent in their wage rates and cost structure—and suggested by the availability of labor, by proximity to markets and raw materials, and by the changing spending pattern of the average consumer.

We can relate this analysis to the report recently released of the Committee on the New England Economy appointed by the President's Council of Economic Advisers, of which the writer was a member.

What are the economic difficulties of New England? An unfortunate dependence on industries which tend to decline in the Nation's economy and which easily migrate—e. g., shoes and textiles; serious lacks in raw materials which deprive the area of access to important new industries; inflexibility and often obtuseness on the part of large segments of labor and management; resulting high costs of labor and capital; the market disadvantage of being perched up on a corner of the Nation; decent standards of working conditions and social security not matched by the South—these are the major causes of maladjustment. The minor ones are high power costs, a less than perfect tax structure, lack of community action, hostility to Federal Government.

Yet with all of that, New England's record over the years has been remarkable. The miracle is that southern New England, with an area of 12,000 square miles and a population of 7.5 millions, with virtually no natural resources, is one of the leading manufacturing "nations" in the world, with a total output for the whole region of \$7,000,000,000 in manufactured goods and \$14,000,000,000 in all.

In summary, older regions tend to decline absolutely in periods of depression and even at times in prosperous periods; but in a growing dynamic economy the decline is likely to be relative.

These areas can soften the blow; they can accelerate movements of population from the depressed areas and industries into these areas, they can stimulate industries for which their experience and advantages fit them, particularly with a view to establishing diversified industries; but above all, they must compete with the newer areas on a cost basis. That means minimum tax rates, given social objectives, cheap power, a fair share of Federal aid, wage rates adjusted to productivity, modern capital and management, effective use of research facilities and skillful uses of subsidies to attract industries as an offset to their use by newer areas.

Inventions—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I heard the radio address delivered by Col. Robert R. McCormick, editor and publisher of the Chicago Tribune, a few nights ago over the Mutual network. His address was entitled "Inventions, Part II." On a previous occasion I inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by the same speaker entitled "Inventions, Part I." The remarks that I made at that time as disclosed by the RECORD were prompted by the impressions that this important address made upon me especially with reference to its factual and historical value.

The second address is as fully enlightening and interesting as the first one delivered by Colonel McCormick. Part II on Inventions discloses a painstaking and careful study and research of the records of progress made by the people of the United States within a period of less than two centuries. No other nation on earth has ever come near or been remotely equal to what America's free thought and enterprise have accomplished in that short span of time. I congratulate Colonel McCormick on his forthright and sound position that he has taken in regard to making known to the people of America the facts about what made American great and at the same time alert the conscience of the American people to the necessity of keeping America free and unfettered by socialism and similar philosophies in order that this march of progress may continue.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an address delivered by Col. Robert R. McCormick entitled "Inventions, Part II." The radio address follows.

INVENTIONS—PART II

(By Col. Robert R. McCormick)

Last week I named a great many inventions that have been made since the Revolutionary War. Tonight let us see how they were made available to the public.

Franklin did not manufacture his inventions. His bifocal spectacles were available to opticians and his lightning rods to wire makers. The former never did get into mass production; the latter, not until many years afterward.

Before Whitney, muskets and rifles and fowling pieces were largely made by individuals, just as Paul Revere made the spikes for the Constitution in his own shop. Whitney built cotton gins and afterward had a musket factory. He never became a great capitalist.

One is surprised, I think, to learn that the capitalist bankers of 100 years ago all began as clothing merchants; then, on second thought, one is not surprised, because the clothing industry had existed indefinitely before the post-Revolutionary inventions; the cotton gin and the power loom were among the first of them, and the money, of course, was there. Clothing is still a great industry,

including weaving, clothes making, wholesale and retail merchandising. Many of the great names of finance were and are merchandisers, among them Field, Macy, Gimbel, Wood, and Wanamaker.

The first great American capitalist was George Peabody, originally a merchant. He took into partnership with him Junius Morgan. They were extremely successful in getting money from London, the financial center of the world, and investing it in the United States, the growing country of the world. John Pierpont Morgan, the son of Junius Morgan, moved to New York, made a partnership with Anthony J. Drexel, and became the chief financier of the world.

Oliver, Deere, and the McCormicks had factories to manufacture their inventions. Deering acquired the Marsh factory at Plano, Ill., and moved it to Chicago and became a prime competitor, until 1902, when through the services of J. P. Morgan & Co., the International Harvester Co. was formed of the two big companies and a number of other manufacturers, some of them foreign.

The western migration called for many wagons, of which the Conestoga was the first. Immigrants reached Chicago by boat or by rail and bought wagons here made by the Weber Wagon Works, Studebaker Bros., the Schuttler Wagon Works, C. P. Kimball & Co., and others. Buggies were made by B.ewster. Broughams and landaus were largely imported from France. The Weber Wagon Works was sold to the International Harvester Co. Brewster tried to compete in the manufacture of automobile bodies but was unable to do so. The Studebaker factory turned to the manufacture of automobiles, but not under the ownership of the Studebakers.

Morse's inventions were the telegraph and the Morse code, which has been succeeded by the printer. Morse licensed different people to make the transmitters and receivers, which led first to a number of telegraph companies which, through combinations and failures, have been reduced to Western Union in this country, whose service is atrocious. There are still 3 major cable and 14 principal wireless companies, including Press Wireless, owned by six American newspapers.

Alexander Graham Bell invented the telephone. At first there were many telephone companies in the United States. They have been combined into the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., whose service is beyond praise. English and French telephones—government-operated—are wretched, but the French originated the cradle phone of today.

Marconi's invention led to the Marconi Co., with which Lloyd George was scandalously connected and was, in turn, taken over by the British post office. In this country it was operated by the Radio Corp. of America.

Lee De Forest invented radio. Radio stations sprang up all over the world. Instead of his awarding licenses, socialist influences put the awarding of wave lengths under a Government commission. Wave lengths have been allotted largely by seniority but with some political corruption. The administration shakes them down for free time at will. Radio stations have been combined in the radio networks, as have television stations. A form of radio known as FM, although giving a slightly better tone, has never become competitive in the field.

The early settlers went down the Ohio River and its tributaries in flat boats propelled by the current. Some transportation was carried in bateaux, which went down with the current and were poled and pulled up. Lincoln, as a young man, worked in one of these boats. Steamboats began on the Hudson and then were built for the Mississippi, generally at Pittsburgh.

It is to be noted that the Annapolis Convention, which led to our Constitution, originally met to build a canal up the Potomac River. The rivers and canals were public

ways; the only capital needed was for the boats themselves. They could freely pass each other in the same or opposite directions. For that reason no great steamboat companies were organized, boats being owned by individuals, by individual companies, and in small fleets. We hear of the names of individual heroes like Jim Bludso, or individual boats like the *Movastar*, the *Prairie Belle*, and the *Robert E. Lee* * * * and the same was generally true of the Great Lakes, both of sailing vessels and steamships, such as the *Walk-on-the-Water*. The big fleets of ships now in use are not common carriers but the property of manufacturing companies, such as the steel companies.

The development of iron and steel, of course, is mostly associated with Andrew Carnegie, who knew little of steel but used the knowledge of others, but his holdings were taken over by J. P. Morgan when he formed the United States Steel Co.

Among other members of the combine was the American Steel & Wire Co., of which John W. Gates was president. Morgan had been given a power of attorney to name the first board of directors. Gates read the list in the newspaper and finding his name was missing, called on Morgan in a great rage.

"Oh, Mr. Gates," said Morgan coldly, "the men who are organizing this corporation have decided to offer you and your friends a price for your interest in the American Steel & Wire Co. You may accept it or reject it, as you see fit. It will be impossible for you to enter the directorate of this corporation or to take active part in the management of the company. You have made your own reputation, Mr. Gates. We are not responsible for it."

"My reputation is as good as yours," Gates replied hotly. "I do nothing worse than you do, only you do it behind closed doors."

"That, Mr. Gates," said Morgan, "is what doors are for."

Other great steel companies, as of our day, are the Inland Steel Co., Bethlehem Steel Co., M. A. Hanna & Co., the Colorado Steel & Iron Co., and the Tennessee Coal, Iron, & Railroad Co.

The first railroad in this country was the Baltimore & Ohio. Charles Carroll of Carrollton, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, was its leading organizer.

The characteristic of railroads, the private right-of-way, created complexities in trains passing each other, which prevented more than one agency operating on the railroad. In all cases, the locomotives belong to the railroad, but some of the cars have belonged to other owners. As all our railroads soon became of standard gage, cars of one railroad could be used over others, a great convenience with the change of seasons.

The great names of railroad builders were: Vanderbilt, who started as a ferry operator, then a steamship owner, one of his descendants produced the Pacific type locomotive, A. J. Cassett, of the Pennsylvania system; James J. Hill, of Great Northern. The greatest accomplishment, of course, was building the Union Pacific to the coast. In connection with this was the Credit Mobilier scandal, which seems to have been a perfectly proper transaction, misunderstood and misrepresented at the time.

Minor magnates were Jay Gould of evil reputation, Collis P. Huntington, and Russell Sage. The last bore the reputation of a miser and became the butt of a popular song:

"Now I am the pet, you bet, of the bankers and brokers and all that set,

The idol of the little boys that sit up in the gallery,

When, in my diamonds I appear, I look like a beautiful chandelier,

And Russell Sage would fall dead if he had to pay my salary."

It is an extraordinary thing about these railroad financiers that, with one or two

exceptions, they knew little about railroads, using equipment invented and built by others and employing engineers mostly from West Point.

E. H. Harriman, father of the present-day politician, became interested in the Illinois Central with Stuyvesant Fish. There are different published accounts over the reasons for their quarrel, but the one gossiped about at the time was that Mrs. Fish, a society leader in New York, snubbed Mrs. Harriman.

Many railroads were not properly laid out. Some of them were unduly lengthened to get more Government grants. Harriman was the only one of the financiers who became a railroad expert. He shortened lines under his control, notably the Union Pacific, which he built across Salt Lake to avoid going around it.

At the time he was stricken with his fatal illness, he had announced his ambition to increase the gage of railroads from the present 4 feet 8½ inches, which was stupidly borrowed from the old stage coach, to 6 feet. After his time, partly due to the negative action of the Interstate Commerce Commission, partly due to lack of great leadership, railroads have not been able to finance such a herculean venture.

At one time, the Vanderbilt lines operated Wagner sleeping cars, but George M. Pullman designed much the best sleeping car and, operating his own cars, finally secured a monopoly in this field. Recently and foolishly, as I think, the courts have compelled the separation of manufacturing from operating. The cars are now operated by a company owned by the railroads.

During the age of steam locomotives, the Baldwin Locomotive works of Philadelphia was the dominant manufacturer.

Now that Diesel engines are driving them out, the General Motors Co. has become the leader in that field. General Motors, composed of 15 companies put together under the leadership of William Durant, is the largest manufacturer of automobiles and automobile trucks. The other truck manufacturers are Ford, Dodge, International Harvester, and Studebaker. The other great automobile manufacturers are the Ford Co., Chrysler (which absorbed Dodge), Studebaker, Packard, Nash, and Hudson. Automobile and truck manufacturing has become the greatest industry in the country, surpassing the railroads.

We learned trucking in France during World War I, where they had roads suitable for trucks. As our own network spread across the country, trucking has become a great industry here. In dollars of passengers and material carried, the railroads rank first as of 1950, with \$9,473,210,788; the trucks second, with \$4,244,274,069; the air lines third, with \$405,658,735.

At the turn of the century, windmills were very important, especially the Aermotor Co., makers of steel windmills. Electric power companies and internal combustion engines have pretty well driven them out of the field. Electric motors have taken the place of stationary internal combustion engines. The great inventor became the head of the Edison Manufacturing Co., producing all kinds of electrical equipment. Then it became the General Electric Co. It formed subsidiaries in Canada, England, and Sweden. At one time, we bought large, high-voltage motors for the Ontario Paper Co. from the Swedish General Electric Co. because no other manufacturer would attempt them. They are still running continuously after 40 years. The Westinghouse Co. is the second largest manufacturer of electric machinery, but there are a great many more companies engaged in this business.

The figure that loomed largest in the public mind, as a multimillionaire and a malefactor of great wealth, was John D. Rockefeller. He was not the pioneer in producing

oil, but he became the greatest distiller and shipper, partly by the use of railroad rebates. It is strange to think that he became a multimillionaire when the only use for oil was for lubricants and illumination. He put his accumulations into banking, steel, and shipping on the Great Lakes. The Standard Oil Co. was dissolved by court action. Rockefeller began retiring in his fifties, but lived to be 98. In his old age, he made a practice of giving dimes to almost everyone he met. But it is the face of another unscrupulous money maker that is on the modern dime.

Whereas Rockefeller once controlled all of the production of petroleum products, with the great increase in consumption for motive power, we now have 14 big oil companies in the world and over 150 fair sized oil companies in the United States.

It is interesting that the present day Rockefeller and Harriman are New Dealers. A son of Thomas Lamont, last head of J. P. Morgan & Co., and Frederick Vanderbilt Field are extreme radicals.

After the invention of the airplane, it was developed as a military weapon by the French, English, and Germans. The Americans lagged far behind. The Dutch company, Fokker, during and right after the war led the way.

Ford's efforts at airplane building were unsuccessful, but a young man, Donald Douglas, starting on a small loan indorsed by a few businessmen in Los Angeles, produced the Douglas airplane, although the Lockheed and the Boeing, after they had overcome structural defects, pointed the way to the larger ship. The DC-1 was followed by the DC-2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 6B, while the Boeing developed into the Stratocruiser and the Lockheed into the Constellation.

Our manufacturers now make the most and best planes, military and commercial.

All these tremendous advances have come from our revolution and our Constitution. Next week, or the week following, I will tell how our future is jeopardized.

Wanted: Sponsors for Tanks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial under the heading "Wanted: Sponsors for tanks," which appeared in the July 26 edition of the Mount Sterling Advocate, published at Mount Sterling, Ky.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WANTED: SPONSORS FOR TANKS

The following editorial was taken from the American Press and meets with our wholehearted approval. We are reproducing it in full and sending a copy of same to Senators UNDERWOOD and CLEMENTS in the hope that this injustice against the press of the Nation may be corrected.

"We wonder what the head of an automobile manufacturing concern would say if he received a letter from the Government reading:

"The United States Government would like your help in making tanks, but no funds

have been authorized for this purpose. We are enclosing specifications, and hope you will be able to produce them as a public service, or will find patriotic citizens who will sponsor their production."

"Such a request would seem ridiculous, but we wonder if there is any more logic to it than to the Government's requests for free 'emergency' advertising in newspapers.

"It costs money to print advertising, just as it does to make tanks. It requires labor. It requires materials. And the printing of free advertising cuts down on space which could otherwise be used for paid advertising.

"But for some reason, the Government departments have singled out newspaper publishers as a group which can be called upon for special contributions.

"We think it is high time that this attitude changed. During the last two wars publishers have done much more than their part to help their country. They will continue to do so in their news and editorial columns any time our Nation faces an emergency.

"But we think it is time that the expenses of war advertising, like any other war costs, be shared by all citizens.

"Publishers, the same as all Americans, are paying increased taxes to support our military expansion. But it hardly seems fair that publishers should be taxed to pay war costs of others and at the same time be asked to produce the war product they manufacture for free.

"Until something is done about this we know that publishers will go right ahead publishing necessary Government messages without grumbling. But as the need for wartime advertising increases, we hope Federal legislators will recognize the unfairness of this situation and do something to remedy it."

Interest on Defense Bonds Should Not Be Taxed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, for the past year we have been hearing reports that the American people have been redeeming more Government war and defense bonds than they are purchasing such bonds. In fact, according to Treasury Department reports, the amount of series E bonds cashed during the 12-month period ended June 30, 1951, exceeded the sales of new bonds by \$1,022,000,000. This is the first year, since these bonds were originally placed on sale to the public exactly 10 years ago, that more bonds were cashed in than sold during the year. This is a situation that should be corrected.

I do not pretend to know the exact cause for this. It could be due to the steadily rising cost of living during the past year or to the post-Korea panic buying which resulted in greater redemption than sales of defense bonds. The following figures, depicting the trend in sales and redemptions of series E bonds since January 1950, were

checked and verified with the Treasury Department:

Series E bonds
[In millions of dollars]

	Sales	Redemptions
1950		
January.....	402	320
February.....	361	224
March.....	364	300
April.....	305	275
May.....	307	313
June.....	297	334
July.....	318	368
August.....	270	304
September.....	244	348
October.....	271	360
November.....	246	318
December.....	284	350
Total.....	3,669	3,913
1951		
January.....	343	418
February.....	272	362
March.....	280	344
April.....	254	324
May.....	247	339
June.....	244	311
Total.....	1,640	2,157

Mr. Speaker, I specifically want to call attention to the figures for the first 6 months of 1950, which is the period before the outbreak of the conflict in Korea. During that period, sales amounted to \$2,036,000,000 and redemptions \$1,775,000,000, or \$261,000,000 worth of bonds more sold than redeemed.

Now, if you will examine the figures for the 6 months after Korea, you will find that the trend is in the other direction. During this period only \$1,633,000,000 of bonds were sold, while redemptions jumped to \$2,138,000,000, or \$505,000,000 worth of bonds more redeemed than sold. The same trend also has continued in the first 6 months of this year when \$1,640,000,000 were sold, as compared with \$2,157,000,000 cashed in, or a net outlay of \$517,000,000.

There is, however, an encouraging feature in this situation. In the month of May the first series E bonds, sold in 1941, reached maturity. These amounted to \$110,000,000, which the holders of these bonds could collect at face value. You will recall that the public had been urged to hold these bonds for an additional 10 years at the interest rate of 2.9 percent. The effect of this offer to the public was therefore watched with some anxiety on the part of Treasury officials.

The results were better than expected. Only \$13,600,000 worth of bonds out of the \$110,000,000 that matured in May were cashed in. In the month of June, \$89,000,000 worth of bonds matured, of which \$23,700,000 were cashed; and out of \$135,000,000 maturing in July, only \$25,200,000 had been cashed through July 26. The aggregate for the first 3 months, since maturity is in effect, is as follows: \$334,000,000 worth of bonds matured in these 3 months, but only \$62,500,000 worth were cashed—which is less than 19 percent of the total. In the months and years ahead many more millions of dollars worth of bonds sold during the war years will mature requiring huge

outlays by the Treasury to finance their redemption, unless we can find a way to persuade the public to continue to hold on to them and to purchase new bonds as an investment and as a patriotic duty in support of our national-defense program.

Besides these two reasons for holding on to defense bonds—investment and patriotic duty—there is a third and no less important reason: Its value in helping to curb inflation. Retention and the continued purchase of bonds helps to draw off excess consumer purchasing power, thereby limiting the impact of inflation on our national economy.

For these reasons, I am introducing a bill to exempt from income taxation all interest received by individuals from United States savings bonds. I believe that some inducement should be given to those who are desirous of holding on to their bonds. I believe also that we should offer a good incentive to our people to continue to buy more bonds. I think it is unfair, under the circumstances, for a tax to be paid by patriotic citizens who voluntarily supported the war effort in the past, and who are now similarly aiding the defense effort and are helping to curb inflation. Passage of this bill would unquestionably help to reverse the current trend and result in new and unprecedented sales of defense bonds.

Report of Subversive Activities by Legion of Illinois Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, under unanimous consent heretofore granted, I submit for the information of every Member of this Congress a report of subversive activities made by the Americanism Commission of the American Legion, Department of Illinois.

Having been a member of the Select Lobby Committee of the Eighty-first Congress and a member of the Un-American Activities Committee of this Eighty-second Congress has perhaps made me more aware of some of the intolerances, prejudices, and rank injustices perpetrated against people on account of their race, creed, color, or religious beliefs.

Mr. Speaker, throughout the history of the American Legion, its membership has vigorously fought against the precepts of totalitarianism by the Communists, Fascists, or any other totalitarians.

In its national convention in Miami in 1948, the American Legion there adopted two resolutions known as Resolutions 264 and 621. Before you note the report of subversive activities by the Department of Illinois, American Legion,

1950, I wish to have you note the Resolution 621 by the national convention of the Legion at Miami in 1948. It said:

Resolution 621

Whereas it has been the policy of the American Legion, as part of its Americanism program, to condemn and oppose all forms of subversive activities, whether they be manifested by an appeal to racial hatreds and prejudices or by attempts to divide this Nation into industrial strife by agitating and fomenting trouble between capital and labor and economic group against economic group; and

Whereas communism is an ideology, a state of mind, a bundle of emotion, which has skillfully organized and developed, with many secret and conspiratorial aspects, to serve where required as a fifth column for the Government of Soviet Russia; and

Whereas many Communists, Communist sympathizers, and their fellow travelers are reliably reported to have secured employment in confidential and key positions in public office, political and labor organizations, and particularly in the teaching profession in our schools and colleges; and

Whereas subversive organizations and individuals are continuing their vicious campaigns of propaganda to disunite and divide the American people, setting class against class, race against race, and creed against creed; and

Whereas these un-American forces are disrupting national unity in these critical post-war years, when victory on the home front and peace in the world are as important as was victory on the battle front; and

Whereas some form of legitimate democratic action is necessary as a defense against Communist betrayal of our form of government and to insure the safety and security of our Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion in national convention assembled, That we call upon the people of our Nation to oppose this threat to American unity and urge our fellow citizens of all races, colors, and creeds to demonstrate that same spirit of cooperation that was evidenced by our Armed Forces on the battle fronts in our fight against aggression, bigotry, and intolerance, and fight every attempt of these un-American forces to destroy the fundamental principles of life, liberty, justice, and freedom guaranteed by our Constitution.

Having read said Resolution 621, I call your attention to the fact that my membership on the Un-American Activities Committee in this Congress challenges not only me but every member of that committee to perform official duties under Public Law 601 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the text of which follows:

The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States; (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution; and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

Because subdivision 2, hereinabove stated, charged the committee with investigating "subversive and un-American propaganda," I was naturally interested to find out how Mr. Webster defined

the word "subvert." I quote his definition:

To overturn; overthrow; ruin utterly. To undermine the morals, allegiance, or faith of; corrupt.

You will see, therefore, that the challenge of the Un-American Activities Committee enters into the field of the very foundation of this generation, past generations, and future generations.

Recently a witness before our committee, who had been an agent of the FBI for several years, during which time he was definitely assigned to become a member of the Communist Party of America as an "undercover agent," testified before us that a Communist in America with whom he was personally familiar in the cell meeting openly discussed the matter of how and where they could obtain firearms which they would bear against the United States in time of anticipated revolt against our constitutional form of government. If this is not subversive misconduct, what is it? If this is not preparing and planning to overthrow the American Government by force of arms, then what is it?

At the Thirty-second Annual National Convention of the American Legion at Los Angeles, Calif., October 9, 10, 11, 12, 1950, Resolution No. 404, entitled "Program To Alert Our Citizens To Need for Tolerance and Unity," was adopted. Therefore, the following report of subversive activities by the Department of Illinois, American Legion, becomes very timely and appropriate. It follows:

REPORT ON SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES, AMERICANISM COMMISSION, DEPARTMENT OF ILLINOIS, AMERICAN LEGION, 1949-1950

In the course of the past 30 years, the Department of Illinois and the American Legion nationally have sought without surcease through their many programs, and in particular the Americanism program, to call attention to the threat and danger of communism. We have successfully alerted the American people to this peril. Also in our midst are those hatemongers who wittingly or unwittingly nullify by their preachment and actions the moral, mental and physical development of our Nation. We, as an organization, have been quick to oppose subversive forces whether coming from the extreme right or from the extreme left. During the last few years, in our National Legion monthly publication, "Trends and Developments," the Legion has undertaken vigorous efforts to counteract Communist activities in the United States, and at times has pointed out the dangers of activities of those of the extreme right. The report submitted here calls attention again specifically, to a number of the individuals and organizations which continue to create unrest in our community by using totalitarian propagandic techniques against segments of our population. We, of the Legion are very well aware that even today there are too many among us, fanatics, professional hate peddlers, and last but not least, misguided folk who make it their prime object in life to pit race against race, creed against creed, and class against class. The boys now dying in Korea have no tag mark of race, creed or class. The Protestant, Catholic, Jew or Colored are dying—are fighting, side by side. Hence, if our mandates on this subject are to be given the force and effect which we seek to create by their adoption, it becomes necessary

to wage a relentless and continuing fight against such inequities and dangers to our Nation's welfare, coming as they do from within our borders as well as from without. The 3,500,000 Legionnaires must meet in the open this growing danger which comes from those purveyors of bigotry and hate.

Hence, the purpose of this report is to keep before the Illinois membership the long-time stand against intolerance adopted first in 1939, national convention, Resolution No. 395 (Americanism report), and at the national convention in Boston, Mass., in 1940, followed subsequently in 1941 at the national convention in Milwaukee, Wis., and thereafter reaffirmed in every convention, including the national convention at Philadelphia, Pa., 1949.

Resolution No. 395, condemnation of subversive propaganda, 1939 National Convention:

"Whereas, at the present time subversive propaganda of racial, religious and class hatred, emanating from alien sources, is being circulated within the United States for the purpose of fomenting internal strife and dissension, destroying the unity and morale of our citizenry, and thereby sapping the very foundations of our Nation and with an effort to upset peacetime security and wartime national defense: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the American Legion, in its Twenty-first National Convention, does hereby condemn all propaganda disseminated by any person, publication or organization, for the purpose of fomenting hatred against any group of American citizens on account of race, class, or creed, and proclaims the same as destructive to the foundation of our Nation, as inimical to the welfare and defense of this Nation; and be it further

"Resolved, That every member of the American Legion shall endeavor, by all means within his power, in the several localities from whence they come, to foster and promote every sound measure designed to strengthen understanding, tolerance and co-operation among our citizens of various religious, racial and nationality backgrounds."

Resolution No. 559, Thirty-first National Convention of the American Legion at Philadelphia, Pa., August and September 1949:

"Whereas the fundamental law of our country guarantees to all peoples equal rights and equal opportunities and the right to worship their God as they see fit; and

"Whereas it is provided that our laws shall be made and enforced by representatives of our people chosen under the law to do so; and

"Whereas, membership of the American Legion is made up of those who served our country in time of great national stress, without distinction as to race, color, creed or class: Be it

"Resolved, that the American Legion assembled in national convention in Philadelphia, Pa., August 29, 30, 31 and September 1, 1949, consider any individual group or individuals or organizations which create or foster racial, religious, or class strife among our people, or which take into their own hands the enforcement of law, determination of guilt or infliction of punishment to be un-American, a menace to our liberties and destructive to our fundamental law; and be it further

"Resolved, That we consider such action by any individual groups or organizations to be inconsistent with the ideals and purposes of the American Legion."

If we act upon these resolutions as we must, then the problem of intolerance will be substantially cleared up and resolved.

In setting forth this report we are asking every legionnaire in Illinois to recognize the

need of doing something individually and collectively to stamp out this scourge of prejudice and intolerance.

The Department of Illinois invites you to study this report carefully and well, believing firmly that this subject is of the utmost importance to the unity and well-being of every American who believes in maintaining America American.

GERALD L. K. SMITH, ST. LOUIS, MO., CHRISTIAN NATIONALIST CRUSADE, PATRIOTIC TRACT SOCIETY

In each of our previous reports, considerable attention has been given to publishing and setting forth the un-American activities of Gerald L. K. Smith. For many years, Smith has been successful in securing substantial sums of money from gullible Americans. We again wish to alert all of our members and their families to the continued threat to American unity that Smith and his followers present. Continuing his 1950 campaign, both in his literature and public appearances, he has reached a degree of hostility unparalleled in the past. Space does not permit quotations to support our position. Nevertheless, we state without fear of contradiction that all for which Gerald L. K. Smith stands is contrary to the spirit of the preamble of the American Legion.

GEORGE W. ARMSTRONG, FORT WORTH, TEX., THE JUDGE ARMSTRONG FOUNDATION

These are the words of George W. Armstrong, published on January 30, 1950:

"I am superior by blood and inheritance to any and every man of African and Asiatic ancestry. The Anglo-Saxon race is superior to every other race. We are God's chosen people. We have created this Christian civilization which we enjoy and have created this Christian government without the help of Jews or Negroes. If that is bigotry, then I am a bigot, but I regard it as pride of blood and ancestry."

Criticized by the Legion in 1949, Armstrong gave added proof of his hate-mongering record when in October of 1949 he offered a huge grant of \$50,000,000 to Jefferson Military College in Mississippi on condition that it would teach the doctrine of white supremacy. When the American press revealed Armstrong's long and repulsive record of anti-Negro and anti-Semitic activities, Jefferson Military College refused his un-American offer.

THE KU KLUX KLAN

Many of our Southern States continue to suffer the outrageous activities of different Klan groups. Whether it be the Association of Georgia Klans, the Association of Carolina Klans, the Northern and Southern Knights of the Ku Klux Klan in Florida, or any other fancy title, these proponents of bigotry and prejudice, with their "grand dragons," "Imperial wizards," and "emperors," must be exposed and opposed by all right-thinking Americans. An alleged campaign to promote Americanism and combat communism proves to be a fraud when evil men don robes and masks, assume the duties of police officers and judges, create terror by unlawful demonstrations and cross burnings, flog and lynch innocent victims, and attempt to divide American groups with a campaign of racial and religious antagonisms.

It is a source of encouragement to note that a growing number of southern communities have attempted to cope with this problem through the passage of legislation seeking to unmask the hooded order and prohibit cross burnings. Other communities should be encouraged to take similar steps.

For years national commanders of the Legion have cried out against this organization, and numerous convention mandates have been adopted strongly opposed to the

nefarious workings of the Klan. Our Legion posts will join with other civic-minded organizations in alerting our people to the un-American character of these hooded Klan groups.

JOSEPH BEAUHARNAIS, CHICAGO, ILL., WHITE CIRCLE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.

A Pied Piper has struck up a tune in Chicago. The banner he wears carries the slogan, "White Supremacy." That's what the Chicago Daily News had to say about the White Circle League of America, Inc., which boldly sprang up in Chicago in 1949. Promoted by one Joseph Beauharnais, this outfit began to circulate inflammatory and highly prejudicial literature seeking to "wake the white population of Chicago." Denounced by a municipal court judge as "a racket for financial gain," this group in Chicago sought members at a dollar a head. Although plainly a racket, a number of people have contributed to the race-baiting program of this hate organization. Brought into court in May of 1950, Beauharnais was fined \$200 for circulating defamatory literature.

Thereafter, the attorney general of Illinois filed a proceeding to dissolve this group as an Illinois corporation. On June 29, the Circuit Court of Cook County ruled that the corporate charter be revoked. Quick to act, legionnaires in Chicago and in Illinois contributed to the exposing of this organization.

MERWIN K. HART, NEW YORK CITY, NATIONAL ECONOMIC COUNCIL

Last year in our report, we presented Merwin K. Hart, of the National Economic Council, as a hate propagandist. Hart's group had been denounced earlier by "America," nationally known periodical, in the following fashion:

"Those who reason in the manner of the National Economic Council are, whether they know it or not, selling out to the Communist Party."

In February 1950, Plain Talk, well-known for its vigorous opposition to communism, saw fit to publish the following about Hart:

"The role played by Mr. Hart, founder and president of the National Economic Council, Inc., may be justly described as that of a Trojan horse . . . Mr. Hart brings to the noble cause of freedom the disease-carrying elements of hate and civil strife. He unwittingly serves the common enemy and furthers the divisive and wrecking operations of Stalin's fifth column."

Hart injects anti-Semitism into his newsletters which speak for themselves on this point by hammering against a so-called Zionist menace and a plot to destroy the Christian religion. Discussing this issue in his Economic Council Letter, of December 15, 1949, Hart states:

"For these Zionists, descendants—some of them—of David's compatriots, having enjoyed the fat of the fairest land on earth, are today conspiring to take everything into their own hands. They are pursuing a policy, nationally and internationally, that threatens the traditional religion and the way of life of all America."

"And as Americans awaken to what is happening, they will arise and say to the Zionist, 'Thou are the man.' For because of their overbearing greed and their recent and present willingness to involve this country in every kind of evil, they are the No. 1 enemy of American liberty and the Christian church. They are the outstanding cause of the dire troubles facing Americans today."

As this report is being prepared, Hart is being questioned by the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities of the United States House of Representatives as to his lobbying techniques and methods of raising funds.

JOSEPH P. KAMP, NEW YORK CITY, CONSTITUTIONAL EDUCATIONAL LEAGUE

In our report last year we expressed our views relative to Mr. Kamp and his organization. On June 15, 1950, the chairman of the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities of the House of Representatives, Representative FRANK BUCHANAN, of Pennsylvania, referred to Joseph P. Kamp, of the Constitutional Educational League, as one of the leaders of a very vicious hate lobby, and described Kamp as the author of rather scurrilous literature.

On June 16, 1950, Kamp started to serve a sentence of 4 months in jail for having refused to reveal the names of his contributors to a House committee investigating campaign expenditures in 1944.

Since 1937 Kamp has been the executive vice chairman of the Constitutional Educational League, whose main activity is pamphleteering. In his accusations of Communist infiltration, Kamp has been making irresponsible charges against responsible and respected groups and individuals.

He, too, like Merwin K. Hart, is under questioning before the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities of the House of Representatives.

GERALD B. WINROD, WICHITA, KANS.

Nazism represents life, happiness, and prosperity. The Roman Catholic Church is the scarlet woman of Babylon. Mussolini is an intellectual giant. International Jewry has always furnished the financial motivation for communism.

These have been the amazing views of Gerald B. Winrod, bigoted preacher of Wichita, Kans. In operation for many years, Winrod's propaganda venture consists of a unique dissemination of religion injected with plenty of prejudice. Winrod publishes the Defender magazine, which has a claimed circulation of 77,000 copies. This is supplemented by leaflets and pamphlets, many written by Winrod, others by figures active in the hate movement.

HARVEY H. SPRINGER, ENGLEWOOD, COLO., PROTESTANT INFORMATION BUREAU

Known as Denver's cowboy preacher, Harvey Springer is one of a small number of dissident preachers who distort Christianity, spreading a campaign of hate against the Catholics and responsible groups in the Protestant Church. Pastor of the Englewood, Colo., Baptist Tabernacle, Springer has gained a substantial following in the Colorado area enabling him to engage in widespread literature distribution, radio sermons, and periodic junkets to various parts of the country. During the past year he has concentrated his propaganda efforts in a so-called campaign to Tell the Truth About the Catholics. His publication, the Western Voice, and literature and tracts distributed by his Protestant Information Bureau have charged the Catholics with every imaginable sin, supported by unfounded facts and complete distortions of religious writings. A tract, entitled "Why I Am a Protestant," charges that:

"The greatest threat in America and the loss of our liberties will not come with the red horse (communism), but it will come through Catholicism."

An examination of some of his other anti-Catholic writings, such as The Judgment of the Great Whore and The Harlot Woman on the Scarlet Beast, illustrates the extent to which this man has violated Christian ethics and principles.

WILLIAM L. BLESSING, DENVER, COLO., HOUSE OF PRAYER FOR ALL PEOPLE

Far less successful than Harvey Springer, William L. Blessing is another example of the small band of preachers in America who

attempt to build up a following and prestige by a continuous and vitriolic attack against the Catholic Church, the Jewish people, and liberal leaders and organizations in our country. Blessing, who takes pride in his one-time membership in the Ku Klux Klan, minces no words in his sermons and writings, in lashing out indiscriminately against all the groups he opposes. In his November 18, 1949, issue of Showers of Blessing, he warned his readers to:

"Keep on the alert and guard our Republic of the United States of America against papal fascism, Jewish communism, and every other foreign ideology."

WESLEY SWIFT, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., GREAT PYRAMID CLUB, ANGLO-SAXON CHRISTIAN CONGREGATION

According to Wesley Swift, the Catholic Church does not represent "white Christian people." On June 2, 1950, Swift exclaimed before a Los Angeles gathering:

"I am going to recommend some candidates who should be elected, for they are with us 100 percent. You may say, how come a preacher is in politics. I am not in politics, but the Catholic Church and the Jew synagogue can tell you whom to vote for, so why not me, who represents the white Christian people?"

Our legionnaires will want to know just who this Wesley Swift is. Wesley Swift modestly describes himself as "reverend" and "doctor." He is not affiliated with any of the major churches. Although at one time he claimed the connection, he never was nor is he now connected with the Methodist Church.

In California in 1945, Swift prided himself in the questionable honor of being Gerald L. K. Smith's chief bodyguard. Thereafter, Swift became an organizer for the Ku Klux Klan, an organization which the American Legion has opposed for many years. Not satisfied with the financial return in these efforts, Swift formed his own enterprises, including the Great Pyramid Club and the Anglo-Saxon Christian Congregation. Unfortunately, many well-motivated people have been duped into contributing substantial financial aid to these ventures.

ROBERT H. WILLIAMS, SANTA ANA, CALIF.

We reported last year on Mr. Williams. This year at a time when harmony in our Armed Forces is so desperately needed, Robert H. Williams goes so far as to extend his professional hate activities to a former key figure in Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower's European Command, Gen. Mark Clark. In his Williams Intelligence Summary, of September 1949, for example, an attempt is made to smear General Clark in the following manner.

"The world Jewish community had cause to be proud last week when one of its members, Gen. Mark Clark, was promoted from command of the Sixth Army to command of the entire Army Field Forces of this gentile republic."

Thereafter, in March of 1950, Williams contended:

"In case of war, America will suffer an absolute dictatorship. Armies are traditionally pro-gentile, but there is a tense power struggle going on for complete control of the United States military forces. It has not yet succeeded. If Jewish extremists get complete control, the worst will happen here, as it did in Russia. Millions of the more capable gentiles will be destroyed (as fascists, capitalists, anti-Semites, enemies of mankind.)"

FOREST C. SAMMONS, HUNTINGTON, W. VA., WEST VIRGINIA ANTI-SOVIET LEAGUE

A comparative newcomer in the field of hate mongering, Forest C. Sammons is a

follower of Gerald L. K. Smith and State director of Smith's Christian Nationalist Crusade, in West Virginia. Sammons delivered an un-American speech at the Christian Nationalist Crusade convention in St. Louis, in September 1949. Shortly afterward, he formed his own organization, the West Virginia Anti-Soviet League. Its primary function to date has been the dissemination of hate pamphlets which have been mailed to State governors, Congressmen, and a selected list of West Virginia professional men. One pamphlet is an Open Letter to Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson on the Cause and Cure of Communism and Anti-Semitism. Typical of its contents is the following false statement:

"Jewish political Zionists and the leaders of organized world Jewry are the Godfathers of Communism and Sovietism."

OTHER HATE PUBLICATIONS

In addition to a number of publications already mentioned, in order that our Legion posts throughout Illinois may be alerted to the names of the many publications and periodicals which promote prejudice and divide the American people, we now list in this report an additional number of others representing similar views. Although a few in this list are presently inactive, we feel that our Legionnaires should be fully advised of these facts.

America Speaks, Beacon Light Herald, William Kulgren, Atascadero, Calif.

The Broom, C. Leon deAryan, San Diego, Calif.

X-Ray, Court Asher, Muncie, Ind.

American Digest, Dewey Taft, Wichita, Kans.

Destiny, Howard B. Rand, Haverhill, Mass.

The Eleventh Hour, Lawrence Reilly, Detroit, Mich.

Bible News Flashes, William D. Hirstrom, Faribault, Minn.

Sunshine News, Luke Rader, Minneapolis, Minn.

Truth and Liberty, C. O. Stadskev, Minneapolis, Minn.

Common Sense, Conde McGinley, Union, N. J.

Dayton Independent, A. G. Silvey, Dayton, Ohio.

Ohio Pioneer, H. W. Binegar, Dayton, Ohio.

The Free Press, Syd Pierce, Redmond, Oreg.

American Commentator, Stephen Nenoff, Cedar City, Utah.

The Individualist, Guy C. Stephens, Danville, Va.

CONCLUSIONS

1. A proper evaluation of the subversive activities described in this report discloses the grave threats to the concept of the American Government and the American way of life. There are no greater dangers to American unity and welfare than the perversions of communism and fascism as manifested in open daylight in our country today. We must realize more than ever that vigilance only is the price of liberty. These sinister un-American forces, designed to divide and to disrupt America, must be met energetically everywhere, lest we pay the grim penalties of disunity and the loss of freedom.

2. The membership of the American Legion must stand strong and united against all un-American activities, communism, fascism, socialism, hate-mongering, discrimination, and traitorous propaganda.

3. Every Legionnaire charged to carry out Americanism activities finally should make it his duty to make the findings of the Legion's hate-mongering and un-American reports available to every member of the post for study and action.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Too many appointments at random of post and district Americanism chairmen are

made without consideration of the importance of this work. Our Americanism program is a live one and constantly in operation. It needs chairmen who are interested and will work.

2. Know the Americanism programs of the American Legion, National, State, and local. Our program is the source and knowledge of Americanism.

3. Do not remain silent but challenge those who attack the American system by instructing them in its principles. This means knowledge of our history, the Constitution of the United States, and Illinois, a study of present-day problems, and intelligent suggestions for their solution based on American principles and standards.

4. Keep an interest in the schools and pay them frequent visits. Service them by providing speakers, medal awards, and supporting the principal and teachers in their school activities, as well as suggesting tactfully helpful hints on their improvement.

5. Study reports on hate-mongering groups and individuals who create religious and racial issues. They create disunity and chaos in our social, political, and industrial fabric. Most of those, you will find, are individuals interested in private gain who prostitute themselves and their small abilities upon an altar of greed and avarice. Under the pretext of fighting communism or other subversive activities, they attack certain groups of our citizenry in order to give vent to their hate and their spleen, at the same time picking up a few paltry dollars, oftentimes from those whom, though they can ill afford the money, are whipped up to a state of fanaticism which blinds their reason and thinking.

The Illinois department through its Americanism Commission has made a study of these groups and individuals and has attacked their alien philosophies which they express under the guise of Americanism, but which are in truth and in fact encouraging chaos and disunity among us. They feed their hate upon the particular groups and individuals whom they dislike and seek to destroy. They are a distinct threat to the preservation of our governmental establishment and to our Republic.

Almost everyone who joins the American Legion seeks to be a good Legionnaire. There are those who carry their share of the work. However, there are those who shirk from responsibility. This number is large. Therefore, we must extend a special invitation to these comrades to take up the fight and battle for America and Americanism in relation to its fight against un-Americanisms. To those who may not know it, the American Legion has reached the pinnacles of its efforts in alerting the American people to the dangers of communism. This has taken many years, and no longer is there apathy and lethargic thinking among the American people on the dangers of communism. There were those even in our ranks who faltered, but we carried on the fight, and today, we find the Nation standing strong in its determination to rid the country of those unpatriotic and alien-minded American citizens and foreign agents who lurk in the back shadows of unrest, chaos, and treason.

Divine providence continued to be good to America by providing it with His heaping bounty. He has nurtured and guided America through its dark days. And it is He who has inspired the American Legion to carry on its Americanism work in order that an enduring peace may be obtained and that America may march forward to meet its ultimate destiny provided by His omnipotence.

ELLIODOR M. LIBONATI,

Chairman, Americanism Commission, Department of Illinois, the American Legion.

Sherman Helped Bring About Major Changes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include a very fine article by John G. Norris in the Washington Post of July 29, 1951:

SHERMAN HELPED BRING ABOUT MAJOR CHANGES

(By John G. Norris)

Admiral Forrest P. Sherman was Chief of Naval Operations less than 21 months, but his influence on American military and foreign policy and our security was far-reaching.

Sherman's accomplishment in rebuilding the Navy from the low it had reached in the fall of 1949 is fairly well known. He won approval for the big, flushdeck aircraft carrier that had been canceled during his predecessor's regime and had the satisfaction of placing the contract for this symbol of continuing American naval power just before his death.

The veteran naval officer also could point to the fact that the Navy had reached a greater state of readiness than ever before in peacetime. Even before Korea he had managed to restore a large part of the operating forces cut out during the economy program of the year before. These two achievements were doubly important, for the loss of the super carrier and cutbacks in ships, planes, and marine combat forces had been at the root of the dissatisfaction which broke down naval morale and brought on the so-called admiral's revolt in October 1949.

HELPED RESTORE NAVY STRENGTH

Sherman boosted Navy morale in a number of ways. Taking office at a time when many naval men felt they had little future, he built up esprit de corps to a new high. It was not easy, for at the beginning Sherman was a bit suspect.

Had not the new CNO been one of the architects of unification, which too many naval officers felt was the cause of all their troubles? Couldn't he be expected to be a stooge for Pentagon chiefs, going along with further slashes in naval power?

It didn't happen that way. Moving quietly, he began winning approval bit by bit for restoration of Navy strength. Aiding him was the fact that the cards started running his way. The House Armed Services Committee submitted a report partly aiding with the Navy rebels in the October 1949 revolt, and some of those on the other side in the Pentagon privately admitted there might have been some provocation which helped bring on the mutiny. Sherman's success was due largely to his persuasive articulateness, brilliant mind, and broad background in the over-all field of military—not just naval—affairs.

SERVICE GAINED NEW CONFIDENCE

Two other things contributed to the new confidence created in the Navy: Sherman made certain that there was no retaliation against the ranking officers who were called before the House committee and cut loose with sharp criticism of Pentagon military strategy; and he led the way to a more balanced Navy.

When an attempt was made to block the promotion to rear admiral of Arleigh Burke, one of those in the "revolt," Sherman con-

vinced President Truman and Navy Secretary Francis Matthews that this would be unwise and unfair. He left Admiral Arthur W. Radford, leader of the protesting group, as Pacific Fleet commander; and made a point of consulting him frequently. Only in the case of Capt. John G. Crommelin was action taken, and everyone admitted that he had put Sherman in a spot where he had to invoke discipline.

The new CNO moved decisively to create a more balanced Navy. Many surface officers had felt there had been too much emphasis on the "big punch" of the fleet—attack carrier aviation. Under Airman Sherman, the big carriers continued important but the other two major naval missions—antisubmarine warfare and amphibious operations—received more stress.

He also drove steadily to make the Navy more mobile, cutting down the shore establishment and expanding the fleet.

INFLUENCED FOREIGN POLICY

These contributions to American military power are better known than Sherman's influence on United States foreign policy. The latter was considerable. His extensive and detailed knowledge and understanding of grand strategy, and unusual intellect affected not only leaders in the Pentagon. It extended to the State Department and White House.

More than any other man, Sherman was responsible for the reversal of American policy toward Spain. He constantly stressed the strategic importance of the Iberian peninsula, pointing out that it controlled the entrance to the Mediterranean, sat in the middle of the NATO powers and offered excellent sites for air bases.

The Pentagon view on Formosa—that we should help the Chinese Nationalists arm to assure that the island did not fall into hostile hands—likewise has prevailed during the past year. Sherman contributed to this shift in policy.

Similarly, his knowledge of geopolitics and presence in the high military command had its effect on what the United States did in Greece and Turkey, the Middle East and Western Pacific. He was a firm believer in the importance of the Mediterranean and the Western Pacific in particular—and the whole globe in general—to the future well-being of the United States. A book, "United States Life Lines," prepared under his direction in 1947, explored and outlined adequately for perhaps the first time, America's economic and military dependence on strategic materials and shipborne overseas trade.

Sherman, more than any other top military leader in recent years, introduced politico-military considerations into Pentagon high planning. It may be that it was this recognition of the problems of the diplomat which helped win Governmental approval of many Department of Defense proposals.

Yes, the ruddy-faced Navy chief will be missed at the council table.

The Soldiers' Housing Evil—Soldiers in Stinking Hovels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following editorials entitled "The Soldiers' Housing Evil" and "Soldiers in Stinkinghovels," published, respectively, in the New York Herald Tribune and the Washington Post, and reprinted as a public service by the International Latex Corp., of Dover, Del., in the New York Times on July 26, 1951.

Both editorials acknowledge that the public has long been aware of the shocking housing conditions in the vicinity of a large number of our military establishments, that investigations have been held and efforts made to change our laws to remedy the situation. However, as both editorials further point out, we have not done nearly enough to provide decent, livable homes for military personnel and their dependents at such military establishments.

In reprinting these editorials, the International Latex Corporation has called public attention to the very serious need for further broad legislation if we are to provide enough good housing construction at all military posts to assure military personnel of a decent place in which to live.

I strongly recommend that the Congress respond promptly to the public demand that those Americans who are devoting their full time to the defense of our country be given a fair chance to enjoy the same decent housing conditions that so many others enjoy at no sacrifice.

The editorials follow:

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

THE SOLDIERS' HOUSING EVIL

The squalid housing of military personnel who live on post has been fully exposed by the press both in news stories and supporting photographs, and it also has been well investigated by a committee of Congress. It is time now to do something about it. The causes of the evil condition are fairly obvious. The general housing shortage that has existed since the last war is one. The new building up of the military forces is another. The greed of a certain element of property owners in the vicinity of military establishments is still another. And loopholes in the Federal housing laws complete the background.

Under the Wherry Act, the Department of Defense is not permitted to build new housing at camps that are militarily designated as temporary. But the legal rat hole most responsible for the soldier rent-gouge racket is that which permits a property owner who converts (after February 1947) a nonhousing structure to a housing building to charge whatever rental the traffic will bear. It is by taking advantage of this defect in the law that an unscrupulous property owner can put a door on a chicken coop, call it a house, and extract an outrageous rental from a desperate serviceman who can't find a real home for his family.

The House Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee has completed an investigation of the housing conditions around several military establishments in widely separated parts of the country, and it has come up with some sensible suggestions. First, it would have the Federal laws strengthened wherever they are weak, because offending landlords usually are able to operate within the letter of the law.

It proposes also the Department of Defense give greater consideration to off-post housing before selecting new sites for military establishments. Finally, it asks the Department of Defense to do everything possible

to alleviate the existing situation. This is a generalized recommendation, but it still has point. The Department is pushing some housing construction outside a few posts, and perhaps more can be undertaken. In the meantime, Secretary of the Army Frank Pace, Jr., announces that he has a program for meeting the situation, and he intends to submit it to the Department of Defense for action. Certainly some plan must be translated into deeds—into actual, livable homes—immediately. The present situation is intolerable.

[From the Washington Post]

SOLDIERS IN STINKING HOVELS

Senator JOHNSON's preparedness subcommittee has used some sharp language to condemn the indecent housing and rent gouging to which many servicemen and their families are being subjected. But the detailed descriptions and pictures of the ancient farmhouses, chicken coops, garages, shanties, "rat houses," barns, tool sheds, and firetraps that are being used for living quarters seem to justify the harsh words. The committee is right in saying that "structures with no water available, heating facilities so bad that bottled drinks will freeze in the same room with a large stove, no sanitary toilet facilities, primitive food storage, no sinks, cardboard windowpanes and paper walls, cannot in 1951 be regarded as 'housing'."

To permit local profiteers to charge exorbitant rents for shelter of this sort is to heap injury upon injury. "Some landlords," the subcommittee reports, "have succumbed to avarice and increased rents by 100 to 500 percent in camp areas since the influx of troops and their dependents." Many tenants living under such conditions have been afraid to protest because of threats of eviction. We are glad to note that the Army is moving rapidly to alleviate these conditions and to inform military personnel in housing shortage areas of their rights and of rent-control regulations.

But the most far-reaching solution, as the subcommittee pointed out and as Secretary Pace acknowledges, is more housing of a decent sort. Some relief can doubtless be given by setting up new trailer camps. But additional houses in the vicinity of many camps are also needed. The housing defense bill now before Congress would permit the FHA to resume the insurance of mortgages on houses built on leased land at military reservations and enable the Government itself to provide essential housing where private industry fails to do so. More important, it would authorize Federal spending for streets, sewers, and other community facilities the lack of which is holding up urgent housing projects. The bill is still in the House Banking Committee awaiting a green light. Unless it is soon taken off the shelf a large share of the blame for the inadequate housing of servicemen as well as of defense workers will have to be laid at the door of Congress.

How They Teach Americanism in All Things at Buffalo's Public School 51

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, it was with joy and enthusiasm that I read a very complimentary article to a very patriotic citizen of my community. This article is a fair and fitting tribute, not

only to Mr. Paul Wamsley but also to the community he loves. There are no doubt many Paul Wamsleys in America. In many instances, their work may go unnoticed. America has great need of many more such individuals. This appeared in the August issue of the American Legion magazine and I include it herewith:

HOW THEY TEACH AMERICANISM IN ALL THINGS AT BUFFALO'S PUBLIC SCHOOL 51

(By Joseph C. Keeley)

A few years ago a group of Communists opened a Young Pioneers Club in an industrial section of Buffalo. By all rights it should have been a perfect location to recruit children and through them their parents. The neighborhood was made up of working people, a majority of whom were foreign born, and recreation centers such as this were not plentiful.

But somehow the club didn't catch on. Children ambled in and attended some of the gatherings, but they never returned. The Reds kept their clubhouse going for a few weeks, then they too left and didn't return.

The reason for the failure of the Communies was a significant one since it provides an answer to those who will "What have we got to counter the appeal of communism?"

The answer in this case was a school, a school that is doing a job—specifically Public School 51, at the corner of Hertel Avenue and Gurnsey Street, not far from Buffalo's busy water front.

To look at it you wouldn't think there was anything remarkable about this particular school. It's like thousands of other, elementary schools scattered around the country. The main building was put up back in the nineties, and its red brick construction is a familiar sight to all Americans. An annex built in the twenties is gradually melting into the older structure, and the two buildings together accommodate about 650 children.

What is so unusual about it? The answer can be found by visiting a few of the classrooms and talking to the principal, Paul Wamsley.

You'll soon learn that this is no ultraprogressive school where teaching methods change as often as women's clothing and have about as much substance. Public School 51 is, indeed, quite the opposite. It's a school where an amazing job has been done in restoring to elementary education a number of sound, old-fashioned principles, successfully blending them with modern teaching techniques.

You can describe it by saying that Public School 51 teaches Americanism.

There will be those who will sneeringly retort, "Flag waving." Well, the fact of the matter is that there is a good deal of flag waving at Public School 51. But the kids are flag wavers for an excellent reason. Here is one school where the teachers instill a pride in the United States, its history, its traditions, and its ideals. The result is, the children wave the flag because they've learned to love it.

It isn't just a matter of flag salutes, pledges of allegiance, and patriotic pictures—important though they be. It's a way of teaching that was suggested to Paul Wamsley by an incident that happened about 20 years ago. A kindergarten teacher came to him and told with amazement that a child in her class had stood up, raised her hand in a clenched-fist salute and in a childish treble started singing the Internationale. On investigating, the principal found that the little girl's father was out of a job and broke. In his bitterness he had turned to communism. Eventually, a job was found for the man and he broke his ties with the Communists.

The incident, however, made Paul Wamsley think. "I realized that if they could sell that stuff to a kindergarten child, we could and should sell Americanism. Now we're doing just that, from kindergarten through the eighth grade. And we teach it in every subject."

In most elementary schools history is often the only subject in which the child learns much about this country. Public school 51 does more. In addition it uses other subjects as a vehicle to give the child a broad understanding of the greatness of the United States.

Go into a music class and in any group of songs there will be at least one of a frankly patriotic nature, and you may be sure that the others will make singers and listeners better appreciate some aspect of American life. In English classes, whether reading, writing or speech, stress is laid on subjects that, while giving the child exercises in English, also teach him something about America. Even in art classes no opportunity is overlooked, and I will hazard a guess that the school uses more red, white, and blue paint and crayon than any other combination of colors.

Now all this might become tiresome to the children if it were not for the manner in which the teachers of 51 do their job. Many educators hold that education prepares for life, but Paul Wamsley has sold his staff on a different concept. "Education," he maintains, "is life." Applying this, the teaching staff draws on everything at hand to teach the boys and girls.

The policeman on traffic duty at the corner is an example of this. He does more than see that the children get safely across the street. He is brought into the teaching orbit, to train the boys selected for the safety patrol. All the children know him, and with this as a starting point the children are taught that the law, as personified by the policeman, exists to protect the individual.

Another kind of lesson is taught by means of the school banking system. Not just that thrift is a good thing, though that of course is emphasized. But rather that it is good to be industrious and earn one's way, that being the American way, as opposed to the notion that the world owes me a living. This same thought is reiterated in the school's shop class. The boys there learn of the dignity of labor as they make their bookends, towel racks, and lamp bases.

There's another lesson in Americanism that the boys and girls of public school 51 absorb from all their activities—that healthy competition makes champions. Further on you will read how these children outdistanced many others in the things they did to help win World War II, such as selling more than a million dollars' worth of War Bonds, a national record. More recently they have been showing the same aggressive spirit in other undertakings. Last year, for instance, the school won a National Valley Forge Freedoms Foundation Americanism Award. This year the school made the best record of all the Buffalo schools in the American Legion's tide of toys collection. Even the school's magazine which reports these honors, *The Broadcaster*, is imbued with the same will to win, having placed first in its class 19 times in the national competitions conducted by the Columbia University Scholastic Press Association.

These many honors have given the children an esprit de corps that is like that of the student body of a university with a winning football team. One of the major problems of the teachers is to keep the kids from coming to school when they are sick and ought to be in bed.

But probably even more important than their lessons in competition and enterprise is the way the children are taught to work together. From the stress that is laid on this, it is obvious that Paul Wamsley gives

teamwork top priority in his own thinking on the subject of Americanism.

I saw an excellent example of the way the school teaches the American way of working in harmony to accomplish something. Several grades staged a pageant in the auditorium to mark Lincoln's and Washington's birthdays. Every boy and girl in the classes represented took part. Some of the children spoke only a few lines, but for a brief moment each child was on stage and in the spotlight, and the responsibility was on that child. If he muffed his lines there was no prompting. He was strictly on his own, and he knew his companions were counting on his contribution. I might add that the quality of the performance would have done credit to children of high-school age. My personal feeling is that this can be credited to the way each child accepted the personal responsibility.

This excellent system is used in other ways. For instance, everyone in the school takes an active part in making the *Broadcaster* the prize-winning magazine it is. Following is an excerpt from an issue published in December 1945. This particular piece has been selected since it serves a dual purpose. It will give you some idea of what these very young Americans did to back up the fighting men of World War II, and it will show how an entire class works together:

"SCHOOL 51 IN WORLD WAR II

"All of us at School 51 tried to help win the war—(Helen Mack).

"We did many different things for our country—(Donald McRobb).

"There was a scrap drive in which our school gathered a great pile of metal—(Doris Hoedt).

"We had more tons of scrap than any other elementary school in Buffalo—(Donald McDonnell).

"You should have seen the great pile that was in our playground. There was a great big boiler brought from Grand Island in the heap—(Joan Kramer).

"Our school won a banner called the Minute Man for selling so many bonds and war stamps—(Dorothy Cramer).

"School 51 led all the schools of Buffalo in the sales of war stamps and bonds—(Norma Walton).

"In 1943 we had a special drive to raise money by stamp and bond sales to buy three Airacobras—(Carol Stenman).

"A contest was held to choose a name for the planes—(Donald Lester).

"Kathleen McRobb of the fifth grade gave the winning name. It was *Buffalo Belle*. Her brother, Donald is in our room—(Earl Dworak).

"Boys and girls in many rooms wrote letters to the boys in service. We wanted to help cheer them—(Elaine Braley).

"We also sent many pretty valentines to the boys—(Richard Filer).

"The first Christmas that we were at war our school sent boxes to the boys and girls who were former pupils of School 51—(Milton Erdel).

"The children brought things to help fill these boxes—(Frank Barr).

"Many children brought old paint brushes so their bristles could be used to make good brushes—(Joan Biggie).

"Old victrola records were brought in so that they could be used to obtain shellac from them—(Robert MacFee).

"We were asked to bring old silk stockings. Our school had many bundles collected—(Dorothy Kish).

"We helped other countries also during the war. Some clothing was sent to people in Europe—(Elizabeth Karpie).

"Many fine boxes were packed with useful things which the children brought. These were sent to the Russians—(Joseph Levesque).

"All of us remember bringing bars of soap which were sent to people in Europe who

had not had any soap for a long time—(Mildred Shisler).

"We have had many paper drives. We are still bringing in paper which is much needed—(Catherine Matesich).

"We have been telling some of the ways our school has been helping during the war—(Joan Mann)."

The foregoing is an eloquent testimonial to the Americanism taught at Public School 51, but there's more to it than that. The boys and girls of this school don't get themselves on any juvenile delinquency records. Even petty pilferage, "light-fingeredness," is no problem since the children are indoctrinated with the idea that they must respect the property of others. Among the alumni, the record shows how the lessons taught at 51 pay off in citizenship. By careful checking, Paul Wamsley has found that his alumni (a) have excellent voting records, (b) rarely if ever ask for jury deferment, and (c) rarely request draft deferments.

The last is evident from the record. This one school had 647 of its alumni in World War II, and there are 20 gold stars on its service flag. Already it has lost three graduates in the Korea fighting.

It is relatively easy for Paul Wamsley to find out about such things as the doings of his alumni because the great majority settle down near the school and close ties are maintained. If there is a death, a marriage, a birth, or a baptism in the neighborhood, the principal is usually invited. And he makes it a point to be present. Nor does the school neglect the amenities. Twenty-five years after graduation, an alumnus gets a certificate appropriately printed on silver paper, reaffirming the privileges of graduation. On the fiftieth anniversary a gold certificate is tendered.

"Because of such things this school is truly the center of the community," says Mr. Wamsley. "Certainly it is working constantly for the community since we have even more adults attending night classes than our enrollment of children in the regular day classes. However, it is made obvious to us in many ways that the people of this section appreciate the work of this school, and give us every possible support."

The American Legion has more than an academic interest in Public School 51 if only because Paul Wamsley has long been active in the organization. In 1943 this valued member of Tuxedo Post 175, Buffalo, was awarded the \$1,000 Lewis S. Rosentiel prize for being the Legionnaire performing the most outstanding community services during that year. This award was made at the national convention at Omaha by James F. O'Neill, then national Americanism chairman.

To win this award, which Legionnaire Wamsley characteristically turned over to local, State, and national humanitarian projects, the school principal had contributed an estimated 3,000 hours to various community service activities. Much of this time was spent in various Legion activities and in addition he made an impressive record in civil-defense work.

A Legionnaire as well as an educator, Paul Wamsley has some definite ideas as to how members of the Legion can work in greater harmony with those who teach our children.

"Whatever infiltration of our schools has been accomplished by subversive elements can be countered effectively by Legionnaires working with educators," he declared. "But there is a wrong as well as a right way to do this. Legionnaires should not look upon educators as unapproachable and sometimes antagonistic people who live in a different world, but as their neighbors whose job is to teach children. They should understand that the educator's aims are likely to be identical with their aims, and his problems are likely to be the same as theirs. By being tactful and trying to understand the schoolman's viewpoint, Legionnaires can do much

to create an atmosphere favorable to the teaching of true Americanism."

One of the educator's problems, he pointed out, is the scarcity of really fine material for teaching Americanism in the grades. This, he explained, made it necessary for his teaching staff to improvise much of the material they were using.

"Why," he asked, "aren't there a lot more motion pictures about the heroes of American history portraying our great admirals, generals, and statesmen? Hollywood persists in presenting American history in terms of cowboys doing their fighting in frontier saloons, and I dare say that more film footage has been wasted on Jesse James than on all our Presidents. When it comes to modern subjects, Hollywood gives the impression that the outstanding Americans of recent years have been certain Tin Pan Alley song writers and various people in show business. In addition there has been undue emphasis on thugs such as Dillinger. Is it any wonder that our children often grow up with a warped outlook on life?"

However, even such influences as those are no match for what boys and girls learn at Public School 51. Following is a sample, a composition from the Broadcaster, which might well be studied by all Americans, grown-ups, as well as children:

"The principles of Americanism are simple and unlike other 'isms' are fair to the individual. Every person in the United States, rich or poor, colored or white, is an important individual who has the right to speak up for himself. He has the right to live the type of life he wishes; he has the right to choose the leaders he thinks deserve office in the Government. All Americans are equal before the law. All have equal rights, privileges, and responsibilities.

"Americans have the right to assemble and discuss freely any social or political problems without intrusion by the police. Americans can attend any church they choose. They have protection against illegal search and seizure, or loss of their lives, their liberty, or their property.

"No person in America is compelled to work for any person or company against his will. Everyone has the right to petition the Government for grievances. The people run the Government; the Government does not run the people. At election time every adult citizen has the duty of voting for the candidates of his choice.

"These are the basic principles of Americanism that are the priceless heritage of every American citizen."

Little wonder that the Buffalo Courier Express, commenting editorially on Public School 51 last year, came to this conclusion:

"Principal Wamsley and the faculty of school 51 are to be commended for bringing honor to their school and to their city."

The Salem Invalid Home in the Little Town of Elk Horn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, in the little town of Elk Horn, Iowa, a genuine Christian spirit reigns supreme in the hearts of the people. For a half century or more, Elk Horn has maintained the Salem Old Peoples Home, where hundreds upon hundreds of old folks have spent their declining years among

old friends in cleanliness and contentment, under the sponsorship and management of the Lutheran Church.

In addition to the old folks who applied for admission to the home in years past, many, many invalids had made application to be taken into the home, but that was impossible due to the lack of accommodations. It was a heart-breaking task for the minister and the board members to turn down such requests. So, several years ago they did what their Christian hearts dictated.

A building fund contribution campaign was inaugurated, the funds to be used in building the Salem Invalid Home, costing in the neighborhood of \$100,000 for the building, furniture, and hospital equipment. Fund raising committees were also appointed in many of the surrounding towns, and mind you no Federal contribution was requested. Hence, the good people over a wide area contributed liberally. Plans were drawn, the contract let to a responsible contractor, and about 2 years ago the building was completed and ready for occupancy. God's works had again been exemplified in the acts of His children for suffering humanity.

There is a great need for expansion of the Salem Invalid Home, and for many such homes for unfortunate invalids in our blessed land, as stated in "The Salem Messenger," herewith quoted:

NEWS ITEMS FROM THE HOMES

We have been fortunate in securing a matron for the first floor at the old people's home. Mrs. Jens Jacobson, who was our matron 8 years ago, has come back to help us out. Needless to say we are glad to have her back. She is 8 years older than when she was here last, but she is still able to get around like she used to. We still have full house at the old people's home as well as the invalid home. We have received two new guests since we last wrote: Carl Nielsen from Missouri Valley and Mrs. Katie Christiansen from Spencer, Iowa. Our cook at the old people's home, Marie Nielson, had to submit to an operation from gall bladder. She is now back on her duties again. Mrs. Hans Juelsgaard of Elk Horn substituted during her absence.

At the invalid home there have been but few changes. There has been only one death the last 3 months. Mrs. Anna Thornberg from Underwood, Iowa, died July 7 and was buried in Underwood 2 days later. Mrs. Thornberg had been at the home the last 12 years. She was the lady that made dolls and gave most of them away. The children always liked to visit her—sometimes she had the room full of children. She had not been able to walk as long as she was with us.

We are still pressed for room in both homes, but the demand seems to be most urgent at the invalid home. As long as a person is able to take care of himself he can always find a place to stay, but if dependent upon others for care it is a different story. Those who apply at the invalid home are usually people who need care at once. We have had to turn so many down and tell them we have no room. When you see the disappointment in their faces it makes you feel sad that you have a home for invalids but are not able to do anything for them. There are so few homes that take care of such patients and still a home that is needed perhaps more than any other. We have homes for old folks who are able to take care of themselves; we have hospitals for those who are sick, but practically no homes for those in between. They are not hospital

patients nor able to care for themselves in old people's homes.

I believe this is a field that has been grossly neglected. We must do something to provide a home for those people who need this type of care. It is the aim and desire of this home to do all we possibly can to provide more space. For a long time we have been so crowded we have had to have one patient in the reception room and one in the hall. When money becomes available we propose to add another wing to the home. This would provide room for 15 or 20 more people. We have no definite plans as yet as to how to raise the money. If someone with ample means could be interested in such a project, we would start to build right away.

What a wonderful thing for someone to use his money for such a project. Such a memorial would do a lot more good than money usually does. It would do good to hundreds of people, not only in this generation, but for many generations to come. I cannot conceive of money doing more good than being used in the Master's work whether it be in the one mission or the other. God says: "Whatsoever you have done for one of these little ones of Mine you have done it unto Me." When God gives us means He also wants us to be good stewards. If someone would be interested in helping us with a substantial sum, we would like to talk it over with you.

At our last board meeting it was decided to make two rooms out of the sunporch. The porch is not being used very much by the patients; it will do more good this way.

We have now had the sale we mentioned in our last paper. The old folks had made a lot of articles and many of their relatives and friends of the home had sent in things. A large crowd came to bid—much larger than we had dared to expect. The best part of it was that they were very enthusiastic bidders. The sale and lunch brought a little over \$400.00. We had not even expected half of this amount. It was a great encouragement. Many of the old folks had been wondering if anybody would come and buy their things. When their things were brought up for sale and sold well, you could just see their faces beam. It was not only a success as far as money goes, but the psychological effect upon the old folks was worth even more than money. They are talking about trying it again some other time. Nothing like keeping busy, and that also goes for old folks. Thanks to all the bidders and all who brought articles and all who helped in other ways.

We have taken a number of movie films of the homes and surroundings as well as other interesting "shots." If organizations would like to see them, we shall be glad to receive invitations to come and show them.

For a Real Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News for today:

FOR A REAL CHALLENGE

The State Department's Voice of America has challenged the Communist Czech Government to let William Oatis, imprisoned Associated Press correspondent, broadcast to the United States.

We don't think it is much of a challenge, and we wouldn't be altogether surprised if the Czech Reds went through some such hokum.

But what assurance would there be that Mr. Oatis was broadcasting with any degree of freedom? What could he say, if a couple of Communist guards stood before him with guns at his head? The broadcast wouldn't show that. Or what assurance that he was not drugged—as he may well have been at his farcical trial.

For those who could positively recognize the unfortunate man's voice, it would only prove that he was still alive. But it would give little hint as to the horrible ordeal he must be undergoing. His words would mean nothing, as the trial proved.

No, the only challenge we'd like to see from this country, and one that is consistent with United States dignity and self-respect, is that Czechoslovakia release Mr. Oatis and deliver him safely into American hands—at once. Or suffer such wrathful consequences as an outraged American public now feels. Congress is the one to do the challenging in this matter—not our wrist-slapping State Department.

Trailer-Coach Industry Aids Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government, the States and municipalities should take concerted action to put a stop to the deplorable housing conditions for servicemen revealed by the Johnson Preparedness Subcommittee.

The recommendations in the report should be studied closely and carried out to the greatest possible extent. In addition, other practicable steps should be taken as quickly as possible. States, counties, and municipalities in the areas where decent housing for servicemen is lacking should enact, as quickly as possible, laws and ordinances which fix minimum sanitary and other modern standards for trailer parks.

The modern trailer coach, if satisfactory trailer parks are available, is an answer to the housing problem for many servicemen and their families. The modern trailer is a mobile house and needs only water, sewerage, and electrical facilities for comfortable modern living.

An example of what can be done in this field is the enactment by the State of South Carolina of a statute setting satisfactory standards for trailer parks. This statute, enacted with the Aiken atomic-energy development in mind, resulted from cooperation between the trailer-coach industry and State authorities, and is helping to solve the housing problem in the Aiken area.

If State and local authorities will not see to it that good trailer parks are available in the areas where servicemen are being gouged and imposed upon, the Government itself can see to it that facilities for trailer coaches are provided on Government property.

I would much prefer to see the facilities provided by private capital, but I want a stop put to the conditions described in the committee report.

I fully agree that the Defense Department, in selecting military installations for reactivation or expansion, should consider as a major criterion the availability of satisfactory dependents' housing. Steps to see that modern trailer parks are available in these areas—and areas already reactivated—is one way to provide such housing.

Midwest Flood Also Burst a Political Dike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I wish to include an article by Mr. John W. Ball, published in the Washington Post of Sunday, July 29, to wit:

MIDWEST FLOOD ALSO BURST A POLITICAL DIKE
(By John W. Ball)

Weather, which affects nearly everything, from personal dispositions to next Christmas' dinner, this year has stirred up one of the hottest political rows of recent memory.

Torrential rains this spring and summer in the old Dust Bowl area of the great plains—the Kansas and Nebraska prairies—not only brought about the worst floods in midwestern history, but caused a violent eruption of the long-simmering controversy over the future of the vast Missouri River basin.

Scores of plans of varying proportions have been proposed for the Missouri River, most of them in the last 20 years. They have been so numerous, and the support of them so noisy, that the general public, especially those people outside the valley, is too confused to decide properly who and what are right.

There are three stand-out plans:

1. The Pick-Sloan plan, named for its creators, Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of Army Engineers, and Glenn Sloan, now retired, but formerly regional engineer of the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation.

2. A Missouri Valley Authority, patterned after the Tennessee Valley Authority, which would superimpose upon the 12 States in the Missouri Basin an independent agency to carry out a nonpolitical, comprehensive, integrated program of valley development.

A bill establishing such an agency was introduced in the Senate last Monday by Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana, and 13 other members, half of them from Basin States. They are Senators DENNIS CHAVEZ, Democrat, of New Mexico, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, Democrat, of Rhode Island, LISTER HILL, Democrat, of Alabama, WILLIAM LANGER, Republican, of North Dakota, ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, GUY M. GILLETTE, Democrat, of Iowa, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, MILTON R. YOUNG, Republican, of North Dakota, HERBERT H. LEHMAN, Democrat, of New York, OLIN D. JOHNSTON, Democrat, of South Carolina, JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, and WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington. Of the six sponsors not

from the Missouri Valley, three, significantly, are from the Tennessee Valley. Only two, both from North Dakota, are Republicans.

3. The Agriculture Department plan, proposed as a complement to the Pick-Sloan plan, which contemplates a 30-year program of soil conservation, including thousands of upstream dams and millions of acres of other moisture-saving farm practices.

There are two outstanding problems in the Missouri Basin. They appear contradictory, but so does everything else in that vast area. They are (1) the problem of too much water, and (2) the problem, at other times, of too little water.

In spite of the floods that with seasonal regularity roar down the Big Muddy, one potent argument against the Pick-Sloan and Agriculture Department plans is that there is not enough water for all they promise. If the program of irrigationists is carried out, there won't be enough water for power and navigation. A 9-foot channel from Sioux City to St. Louis would require so much water at all times that it is doubtful if the power and irrigation demands could be met. In other words, the whole problem is one of such great size and complexity that critics insist that only a single, over-all planning agency, such as a valley authority, could do the job.

ONE IS WELL ALONG

Of the three, the Pick-Sloan plan is the furthest advanced. The others are barely out of the idea stage. Pick-Sloan won congressional approval in a sudden wartime maneuver in 1944. Work is progressing rapidly. Its immensity, totally unrealized by most of us, staggers the imagination. Some idea of what is involved may be gained from the following statistics:

1. The Missouri River Basin includes one-sixth of the surface area of the United States and one-fourth of all its farm land.

2. The Garrison Dam in central North Dakota, now under construction, will form a lake longer than either Lake Ontario or Lake Huron. Its shoreline of 1,600 miles will be greater than Lake Erie's. There are five more dams almost as important.

3. Pick-Sloan would build 150 multiple-purpose dams, and, its authors say, protect 5,000,000 acres of farm land from floods, irrigate 5,000,000 acres, and provide supplemental irrigation for 2,000,000 more.

4. Lakes created by the dams would force 5,000 farm families to evacuate their homes. The water would inundate towns and villages and change the way of life of up to 60,000 families, including the residents of one Indian reservation.

FIFTEEN TO TWENTY BILLION COST

The total cost? Your guess is as good as any. When Pick and Sloan first presented their plan in 1944, it carried an estimate of \$1,500,000,000. Nearly that much has already been spent. Today the cost of the 150 dams has ballooned to five and one-half billion. The Hoover Commission estimated that the river bed development alone would cost six and one-half billion. Generally, estimates are that if the scheme is completed, the cost may be anywhere from fifteen to twenty billion dollars.

The Agriculture Department plan, when presented 2 years ago, was estimated to cost \$8,500,000,000. It proposed that the Federal Government pay three billion, the States half a billion, and the farmers themselves five billion.

The Agriculture plan was tossed in after the Pick-Sloan plan was presented to a surprised country, revealing that its authors had almost completely ignored the argument that moisture conservation at the rainfall site would alleviate many flood conditions. There is a powerful school of thought that believes such a program more valuable than Pick's scheme of huge reservoirs and dikes. To such arguments, Pick retorts: "Soil conservation is all right and neces-

sary to protect the land. But it has no place in flood-control planning."

The Agriculture program is built upon the theory—a pet of moisture conservationists—of "storing the water in the soil." That means retaining the water by means of small farm ponds, forested areas, contours, terraces, etc., as near as possible to where it falls. Augmenting this would be small dams in the small headwaters—the little creeks and branches that grow into the big and raging rivers. There are striking examples of its successful application, notably in the Tennessee Valley.

A SODDEN SPONGE

General Pick disputes this theory. He likens the soil at times of floods, such as the recent Kansas and Missouri disaster, to a sponge that is filled with water and cannot hold any more. All the water-saving methods of soil conservationists, he insists, would not have been of any effect in Kansas early this month.

He proposes impounding the water in huge reservoirs behind big dams, that at normal times are kept at a low enough level to absorb all the water that nature may send along. He would supplement these with miles of levees and other flood protection installations at cities and low farming areas.

Each side claims that the recent Kansas-Missouri tragedy has proved its points.—Pick, that the great soil-conservation programs of Kansas and Nebraska had little effect; and his opponents, that all the millions so far spent by the Army engineers have been poured down a rathole.

Senator MURRAY's bill for MVA has attracted the support of an important group of engineers and others, including Morris L. Cooke, chairman of President Truman's Water Resources Board, Dewey Anderson of the Public Affairs Institute, Author Louis Bromfield, who owns the well-publicized Malabar Farm in Ohio, a showplace of soil conservation; James G. Patton, president of the Farmers Union, and many members of the Hoover Commission. Its chief editorial sponsor has been the powerful St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

In reply to the Post-Dispatch, Pick says that every other newspaper "of importance" in the Missouri Valley supports his plan, including the also potent Kansas City Star and Times and the Omaha World-Herald.

The MVA has had considerable backing among west coast, eastern and southern newspapers.

WERE BITTER FOES

Many opponents call the Pick-Sloan plan a "shotgun wedding" of the earlier plans of the Interior Department's Reclamation Bureau and the Corps of Engineers. The story of its inception fits into such a description. Until Pick returned from Burma, where he won wide fame as the builder of the famed Ledo Road into China, the two groups had bitterly opposed each other. Reclamation had time only for plans that emphasized irrigation and the opening of new land. The engineers were limited in their vision to programs of river navigation and flood control—the building of levees and channel deepening.

Reclamation had its Sloan plan. The engineers had their plan. The two conflicted at many points. In fact, the bitterest criticisms the Pick-Sloan projects meet today are repetitions of things the two agencies said about each other prior to 1944.

The two were suddenly driven into each other's arms when, in 1944, President Roosevelt asked for a Missouri Valley Authority, similar to TVA. In what is known as the new Missouri Compromise, they merged their schemes in a short 2 days, agreed never to say another nasty word about each other's projects, and launched the new program. In a remarkable job of selling, they put it over with Congress in a few months.

Proponents of a Missouri Valley Authority are at great disadvantages, compared with the Pick-Sloan boosters, because—

1. Congress already has authorized work to start on 40 percent of the Pick-Sloan plan.

2. Pick and Sloan have toured the basin from one end to the other, talking before chambers of commerce and pointing out the great future the plan holds for each community.

3. The 12 States in the basin are overwhelmingly Republican and sharply opposed to basin authorities as creations of the New and Fair Deals. Each year, a Governors' council from these States elects five of its number to a 10-man Missouri basin inter-agency committee. The other members are five Federal officials. These Governors have no vote or other authority, and the States have no power to halt the projects. The Federal agencies doing that work are supposed to clear all projects with the committee. As a general rule, apparently, the committee's chief worth is as a publicity medium for the bureaucrats running the program.

3 The Pick-Sloan group has a plan, detailed and under way. The Valley Authority group merely argues that an independent authority can do the job better, and would make the Missouri a garden spot like the Tennessee Valley. To the hard-headed Missouri Valley farmer, that seems like "buying a pig in a poke."

The Pick-Sloan program has had powerful support from the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, a creature of the Engineer Corps officered by Members of Congress whose constituencies have particular interest in the activities of the Engineers.

Lately, it has become apparent that Pick has won the support of President Truman, to whom he outlined the part of the plan that has to do with the Kansas River and its numerous branches—the Missouri tributary that was responsible for the Kansas City-Topeka-Manhattan flood.

This was evident from Pick's confidence upon his return from Kansas City recently. He threw down the gauntlet to his soil conservation opponents, and openly challenged them with the declaration that they "didn't know what they were talking about." He called upon all who "honestly wish" to control the Missouri in flood to "stand up and be counted."

A year ago, two editors of the reliable Farm Journal made a trip up the 1,000 miles of the proposed Pick-Sloan development to attempt to visualize what changes it would effect. They foresaw that "ducks navigating the Missouri Valley will have to learn their geography over again" with six multimillion dollar dams "creating another Great Lakes in the center of the United States."

PICK-SLOAN PLAN

(Forty percent authorized by Congress, with contracts already let for more than half.)

One hundred and fifty multipurpose dams, designed to (1) stop floods and (2) protect 2,000,000 acres of cities, towns, and farms.

Irrigate 5,000,000 acres, including 19,000 existing dry-land farms which would be subdivided into at least twice that number of irrigated farms. Total irrigated land estimated at 67,000 farms of 80 acres each, which, sponsors say, will support 268,000 more inhabitants in the now sparsely settled country.

Supplemental irrigation for 2,000,000 acres more.

Increase the basin's crop output 10 percent.

Generate 13,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity annually.

Deepen 750 miles of the Missouri below St. Louis City for navigation.

Build 1,500 miles of levees.

Increase city water supplies and area's recreational facilities with sites for fishing, swimming, boating, etc.

Total cost. \$5,500,000,000 to \$6,500,000,000, at present prices. Outlays to date total about \$1,250,000,000. Plans for the Kansas River and its tributaries alone would cost more than \$300,000,000.

AGRICULTURE PLAN

(A proposed plan to tie in with Pick-Sloan. To be built within the next 30 years. No action yet by Congress, and none apparently contemplated.)

Build 14,000 to 16,000 small upstream dams and 408,000 farm ponds.

Reseed 38,000,000 acres of range and cropland.

Reseed 400,000 acres of forest range.

Dig 78,200 new wells.

Contour 36,000,000 acres; strip crop 20,000,000 acres, build 2,000,000 miles of terrace and 431,000 miles of grassed waterways, fence 76,000 miles of forest for grazing; build 3,300 miles of livestock trails.

Spend \$250,000,000 on tree shelter belts and 750,000 acres in additional windbreaks around farmsteads, rural schools and churches.

Encourage improved grassland management on 117,000,000 acres. Improve irrigation and drainage plans.

Control rodents, insects, brush and weeds.

Total cost \$8,500,000,000, divided as follows: Federal Government, \$3,000,000,000; 12 States involved, \$500,000,000; farmers, \$5,000,000,000.

RESERVOIRS AND DAM SITES IN COORDINATED PLAN OF BUREAU OF RECLAMATION AND ARMY ENGINEERS CORPS

MONTANA

1. Tiber.
2. Wilson.
3. Nilan.
4. Wells.
5. Canyon Ferry.
6. Terry.
7. Whitetail.
8. Apex.
9. Kelly.
10. Brenner.
11. Clark Canyon.
12. Landon.
13. Taylor.
14. Bridger.
15. Mission.
16. Antelope.
17. Sweetgrass.
18. Newland.
19. Hobson.
20. Stanford.
21. Ross Fork.
22. Snowy.
23. Yellowtail.
24. Little Horn.
25. Moorhead.
26. Medicine Lake.

NORTH DAKOTA

27. Crosby.
28. Garrison.
29. Broncho.
30. Dickinson.
31. Heart Butte.
32. Cannonball.
33. Thunder Hawk.
34. Sheyenne.
35. Jamestown.
36. Des Lacs.
37. Bald Hill.

SOUTH DAKOTA

38. Shadell.
39. Blue Horse.
40. Bixby.
41. Green Grass.
42. Brennan.
43. Angostura.

- 44. Rocky Ford.
- 45. Philip.
- 46. Oahe.
- 47. Big Bend.
- 48. Fort Randall.
- 49. Gavins Point.

WYOMING

- 50. Hunter Mount.
- 51. Thief Creek.
- 52. Sunlight
- 53. Oregon Basin.
- 54. Kane.
- 55. South Fork.
- 56. Red Gulch.
- 57. Lake Solitude.
- 58. Willow Park.
- 59. Lake de Smet.
- 60. Triangle Park.
- 61. Smith.
- 62. Bull Creek.
- 63. Alzada.
- 64. Keyhole.
- 65. Du Noir.
- 66. Raft Lake.
- 67. Soral Creek.
- 68. Onion Flat.
- 69. Anchor.
- 70. Boysen.
- 71. Badwater.
- 72. Middle Fork.
- 73. Edgemont.
- 74. Kortes.
- 75. Glendo.

COLORADO

- 76. Cherry Creek.
- 77. Narrows.
- 78. Wray.
- 79. Bonny.

NEBRASKA

- 80. Dismal.
- 81. Loretta.
- 82. Erickson.
- 83. Davis.
- 84. Boelus.
- 85. Plum Creek.
- 86. Enders.
- 87. Red Willow.
- 88. Medicine Creek.
- 89. Culbertson.
- 90. Harlan County.

KANSAS

- 91. Pioneer.
- 92. Norton.
- 93. Kirwin.
- 94. Webster.
- 95. Glen Elder.
- 96. Cedar Bluff.
- 97. Wilson.
- 98. Kanopolis.
- 99. Tuttle Creek.

MISSOURI

- 100. Chillicothe.
- 101. South Grand.
- 102. Osceola.
- 103. Pomme le Terre.
- 104. Richland.
- 105. Arlington.

Confidence in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an excellent and concise statement from the Nashville Banner, of Nashville, Tenn.:

The presidency of the United States was never intended to afford a screen between the American people and stupidity in judgment, error in policy, mediocrity in administration, incompetence in personnel or unwarranted usurpation of authority.

Loyalty requires no blind allegiance to such, even in time of war. The welfare of the American Republic is paramount.

Confidence in Government is founded upon and sustained by a full knowledge of the truth. Without it, neither this free Government, nor any other, can long endure.

Residents of Pennsylvania Are Thankful
for the Defeat of the St. Lawrence Sea-
wayEXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the people of Pennsylvania are gratified over the action taken by the House Public Works Committee when it defeated the proposed St. Lawrence seaway which has been before Congress for over half a century.

The following article by the Associated Press, taken from the Washington Evening Star of July 26, 1951, tells the story of what happened when the House Public Works Committee met in executive session on that date and sounded the death knell over the proposed international ditch:

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY KILLED BY 15-TO-12 VOTE
OF HOUSE UNIT

Legislation to authorize the St. Lawrence seaway and power project was killed today by the House Public Works Committee.

The action was taken by a 15 to 12 roll-call vote of the 27-member committee on a motion by Representative PICKETT, Democrat of Texas, to table the bill.

Those voting with Mr. PICKETT to table the bill:

Representative FALLON, Democrat, of Maryland; QUINN, Democrat, of New York; DEMPSEY, Democrat, of New Mexico; WATTS, Democrat, of Kentucky; ANGELL, Republican, of Oregon; MCGREGOR, Republican, of Ohio; AUCHINCLOSS, Republican, of New Jersey; BEALL, Republican, of Maryland; VURSELL, Republican, of Illinois; SCUNNED, Republican, of California; GEORGE, Republican, of Kansas; BRAY, Republican, of Indiana; BAKER, Republican, of Tennessee; and WOOD, Republican, of Idaho.

TEN REPUBLICANS OPPOSED

Ten Republicans voted with five Democrats in turning down the bill. Those voting against tabling it were:

Representatives BUCKLEY, Democrat, of New York, chairman of the committee; LARCADE, Democrat, of Louisiana; DAVIS, Democrat, of Tennessee; TRIMBLE, Democrat, of Arkansas; BLATNIK, Democrat, of Minnesota; JONES, Democrat, of Alabama; KLUCZYNSKI, Democrat, of Illinois; MACHROWICZ, Democrat, of Michigan; SMITH, Democrat, of Mississippi; MAGEE, Democrat, of Missouri; DONDERO, Republican, of Michigan; and MACK, Republican, of Washington.

Members of the committee explained today's vote means the measure cannot again be brought before the committee unless two-

thirds of the membership so votes or unless unanimous consent is obtained.

Thus, for all practical purposes, the long-debated seaway proposal, grimly opposed by powerful industrial and power interests, again was buried by Congress, another setback for forces which have been seeking its authorization for nearly 20 years.

The project authorization, in the form of a treaty, was first beaten in the Senate in 1934. Again, in 1944, the project legislation was attached to a rivers and harbors bill in the form of a rider and lost, 56 to 25.

The next defeat came in February 1948, when the Senate, by a 57 to 30 vote, returned the measure to its Foreign Relations Committee for further study.

Today's defeat marked the first time the legislation had been voted down by a congressional committee.

Representative BLATNIK, a leading supporter of the project, said he was not dismayed by today's action.

"This," he said, "is the first battle in the whole fight. I view it as a moral victory."

Get Oatis Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Kingsport (Tenn.) News of July 23, 1951:

GET OATIS OUT

It looks as if the American public is getting fed up with the State Department's casual attitude toward Bill Oatis, the Associated Press correspondent who was jailed by the Czechs after a "confession" of spying.

Resolutions have been introduced in Congress which would—

1. Sever diplomatic relations with Czechoslovakia.

2. Ban trade with that country.

3. Evacuate all Americans from the country.

4. Bar all foreign Red newspapermen—including Russia's from the United States.

But to date, the State Department's sole reaction has been to "protest" in a Voice of America broadcast. You can just see some of those fancy Department boys stamping their feet and saying, "Goodness, what a nasty thing to do."

When Robert Vogeler was jailed by the Hungarians on a similar trumped-up charge, his loyal wife met opposition when she tried to get the State Department to do something. In fact, Department officials advised her to keep quiet.

Fortunately for her husband, she ignored this advice and raised considerable Cain until she got some action.

It is high time we all started to raise Cain and get Bill Oatis freed.

Time was in this country, when the Nation was run by men with guts, when the Constitution followed our citizens no matter where they went. When the United States was but a mere babe in the world family of nations our leaders sent Marines to avenge insults to United States citizens—and got by with it.

But what have we got today when the United States is the most powerful free nation on the globe? We've got a lily-livered Secretary of State who coddles Reds in his own Department and is afraid to offend Reds

abroad. And we've got a President who gets "tough" only with Wall Street and a few honest, outspoken Republicans and Democrats.

God forbid that the United States should sink so low.

America Betrayed at Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including an article that appeared in the current issue of the *National Republic*, a magazine of fundamental Americanism:

AMERICA BETRAYED AT YALTA

(By Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH, Representative from Wisconsin)

The tragic Yalta Conference of February 1945 stands in historical perspective as the blackest page in American diplomatic history. In the secret agreements concluded at Yalta between Roosevelt and Stalin are found the very roots of all the world's bloody postwar history—the betrayal of Poland, Yugoslavia, Albania; the delivery of China, Manchuria, and Tibet to communism; the partition of Germany; indeed, the fateful collapse of the whole structure of world peace for a generation.

Because Yalta repudiates every tradition of American diplomacy, the secret agreements entered into there should be renounced, abrogated, and set at naught by formal congressional action. Similar action renouncing the Truman ratification agreements reached at the Potsdam Conference in July 1945 would follow logically; for Potsdam was little more than Stalin's formal blinding of the new President, Truman, to the Roosevelt commitments made at Yalta. There is much evidence in the public record to indicate that at the time of the Potsdam Conference President Truman did not have full knowledge of the secret deals concluded 5 months earlier at Yalta.

House Concurrent Resolution 102, introduced by me on May 14, 1951, would accomplish this formal renunciation of the secret agreements at both Yalta and Potsdam by simple majorities of the House and Senate. That resolution is now pending before the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

One authoritative and reputable contemporary comment fairly characterizes the Yalta agreements. Arthur Bliss Lane, the United States Ambassador to Poland, recalls his first examination of the Yalta text in the State Department at Washington:

"As I glanced over it I could not believe my eyes. To me every line speaks a complete surrender to Stalin."

In China at about the same time Ambassador Patrick J. Hurley was present when the Yalta terms were made known to Chiang Kai-shek. Of that incident Hurley wrote:

"Our diplomats surrendered the territorial integrity and the political independence of China in a secret agreement at Yalta. The Yalta secret agreement is the blueprint for the Communist conquest of China. Every step in the Communist conquest of China has been engineered by our own diplomats, in cooperation with the Chinese Communists and Russia."

In the same vein, General MacArthur told the recent Senate inquiry:

"It is my personal opinion that the greatest political mistake we made in a hundred years

in the Pacific was in allowing the Communists to grow in power in China. * * * I believe it was fundamental, and I believe we will pay for it for a century."

Two decisive legal debilities of transcendent historical significance invalidate these Yalta agreements. James A. Farley, one-time Postmaster General under Roosevelt, has stated publicly that at the time of the departure for Yalta President Roosevelt was a dying man. Two months after his return from Yalta the President died at his Warm Springs retreat. Unfortunately, Mr. Farley's frank revelation concerning the true state of Mr. Roosevelt's health during late 1944 and early 1945 was not published until March 8, 1951. But, in the meantime, Winston Churchill had observed knowingly that Mr. Roosevelt was far from buoyant health at Yalta; and Vice Adm. Ross T. McIntire, the White House physician, since has acknowledged "that by inauguration time (January 20, 1945) fatigue was again becoming a real problem. * * * He left immediately for the Yalta Conference."

Of course, no nation can be bound morally to trades and deals made in secret by a diplomatic representative admittedly in moribund health, particularly when those trades and deals transfer whole nations and entire populations to an unacknowledged and unwelcome sovereignty.

Secondly, President Roosevelt's closest adviser at Yalta was Alger Hiss, since convicted in the courts for perjury in concealing his Communist activities and connections as part of the Kremlin spy ring in wartime Washington.

Alger Hiss was at one time a ranking officer in the Far Eastern Division of the State Department, the office in which the present Korean disaster was hatched. Later he was executive secretary to the Dumbarton Oaks Conference in Washington, which set up the framework of the United Nations, the instrumentality which gave the Russian Communist barbarians their first seat at the council table of humanity. Next he was the intimate personal adviser, confidant, and drafting clerk to an ailing President at Yalta. Finally he was General Secretary of the San Francisco Conference, in April-June 1945, which drafted and approved the United Nations Charter. Hiss was apparently the real architect of the Yalta treachery.

Former Secretary of State Byrnes in his book, *Speaking Frankly*, refers several times to the poor state of Roosevelt's health at Yalta. He also illuminates the great part played at Yalta by Communist Agent Alger Hiss.

But Farley's summation on Yalta is perhaps the most penetrating:

"In our evaluation of President Roosevelt, Cordell [Hull] and I agreed that he was a sick man at Yalta, and should not have been called upon to make decisions affecting his country and the world. Physical illness, we knew, taxed the mind and left him in no shape to bargain with such hard bargainers as the Russians and such astute diplomats as the British."

"On every side I heard expressions of regret that he was not himself in the most critical days of world history. Had he not been physically and mentally tired at Tehran and Yalta, and at home, and had America had a more vigorous voice in international affairs, statesmen of the world agreed almost without exception, that many of the troubles vexing the world today would not have arisen."

This one statement fully justifies a formal renunciation of the whole Yalta operation. It is well supported by Ambassador Lane, who wrote: "Mr. Roosevelt returned to Washington from the Crimea Conference mortally fatigued."

In a word, Yalta was a conference dominated by a dying President, whose closest

and most intimate adviser, as we now know, was a Kremlin agent and spy.

I recall vividly President Roosevelt's personal report to Congress on the Yalta meeting made on March 1, 1945, before a joint session of the House and Senate. The President spoke from his wheelchair. He assured Congress and the world repeatedly that there had been no secret agreements reached. His report was broadcast to the largest radio audience of record to that date. Several years were to pass before the true picture of Yalta would be pieced together.

Since that historic occasion I have placed in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* from time to time 19 different vignettes of Yalta segments. As each vignette of treachery, betrayal, surrender, moral retreat, or appeasement came to light that segment of the disaster was documented in the public record.

The first of this systematic historical series was offered in the House on March 2, 1945, the day after President Roosevelt's report to Congress, under the title "Yalta, Moral Retreat, Poland and Small Nations Crucified." The most recent item in the series appeared on June 8, 1951. Taken together, these 19 articles now form a rounded, but still developing picture of one of the most appalling tragedies in human history. The world will never forget that at the time of Yalta the Russian dominion embraced only 200,000,000 population, while 6 years later the Kremlin sphere comprised over 800,000,000 people. The black night of tyranny and godless materialism spread like a plague from Yalta, to engulf one-third of the globe. Over large areas of the earth, peace ceased to be even an honorable aspiration for enslaved and imprisoned mankind.

The background for Yalta, of course, was the Cairo conference, in November 1943. There Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek was given a solemn promise by Roosevelt that all territories taken from China by Japanese conquest would be restored to China. This pledge included complete restoration of Manchuria, Formosa, the Pescadores, plus establishment of a free, independent, and united Korea.

The year 1944 brought the American military forces back to the Philippines in the Pacific, and to the Rhine in Europe. Both Germany and Japan were punch-drunk, ready for the knock-out blow. The atomic bomb was in actual production. Such was the triumphant military situation at the moment of the disastrous Yalta meeting in February, 1945. China, a strong and faithful ally in the war, had not even been invited to Yalta. Poland, stretched on the diplomatic rack for partition, was not even informed that her future was on the Yalta agenda.

The final plenary sessions of the Yalta Conference on February 11 brought a joint public statement of an agreement for the occupation of Germany; the partition of Poland; and the opening of the United Nations Charter Conference at San Francisco on April 25. President Roosevelt, in his own press conference, hailed Yalta as the beginning of a new era of peace in the history of the world.

About 2 years were to pass before the world learned of all the secret agreements concluded at Yalta with Stalin. The first of these secret agreements to be revealed was that covering the veto in the U. N. Stalin had demanded the veto in the Security Council. Roosevelt and Hiss had readily conceded. Russia since has used the veto 48 times to frustrate effective U. N. action against Communist aggression.

Next it leaked out that Russia had been given three votes in the U. N. No other nation had more than one.

Third, it was established that the Yalta agreement had hit upon the sum of \$20,000,000,000 to be collected in reparations from Germany—half of it to go to Russia,

the remainder to be divided among all the other allies.

But not until July, 1945—2 months after President Roosevelt's death—did the world get the first inkling of the secret agreement between Roosevelt and Stalin under which Russia was given Outer Mongolia, Port Arthur, Dairen, Manchuria, the Sakhalins, and the Kuriles. China, which had fought for 8 terrible years to regain Manchuria from Japan—always with strong United States support—was not even consulted on this deal. Indeed, it was President Roosevelt who undertook, personally, to win Chiang Kai-shek over to this gross barter of Chinese areas to Stalin—in return for Russia's participation for 6 days in the war against Japan. One significant paragraph of this secret agreement from Yalta reads:

"It is understood that the agreement concerning Outer Mongolia and the ports and railroads referred to above will require concurrence of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. The President (Roosevelt) will take measures in order to obtain this concurrence, on advice from Marshal Stalin. The heads of the three great powers have agreed that these claims of the Soviet Union shall be unquestionably fulfilled after Japan has been defeated."

The terrible significance of this secret betrayal is that the above terms were not made public by the State Department until March 24, 1947—more than 2 years after the agreement and almost 2 years after Roosevelt's death on April 11, 1945.

But long before these more shocking aspects on the Yalta agreements had been exposed to public view, President Truman had taken decisive steps to force Chiang Kai-shek to accept Communists in his own government. On December 15, 1945, Truman sent word to Chiang that United States assistance would be stopped summarily unless the Communists were admitted to the government at Nanking. The Communists in China then were called by our State Department "simple agrarian reformers." Chiang demurred. Then Gen. George C. Marshall was sent to Chiang as Truman's special ambassador to force the alliance with communism. Chiang had been waging a no-quarter war with communism in China since 1928.

How completely the Truman policy enforced the alliance with communism in China is related by General Chennault in his book, *The Way of a Fighter*. At one point north of Hankow some 200,000 Nationalist troops had about 70,000 Communists trapped. The Reds were being exterminated. The United States truce team sent up by Marshall ordered a cease-fire. The trapped Communists escaped, to return a year later as part of a gigantic Communist offensive. On another occasion near Canton, Chiang's soldiers had trapped 100,000 Communists. The Marshall truce team permitted the Communists to march unmolested to the bay, whence they sailed for Shantung. Chennault continues:

"The worst fiasco was at Kalgan Pass, a historic gateway between China and Manchuria. At the end of the war there were no organized Communists in Manchuria. Early in 1946 a Government offensive captured Kalgan and sealed off the pass, trapping nearly 1,000,000 Chinese Communists in northwest China, who were moving toward Manchuria. Marshall made strenuous efforts to open the Kalgan Pass for these Communists. Eventually the Government withdrew, and the Communist horde poured into Manchuria. The Communists then broke the truce by fortifying Kalgan Pass. It was these troops who marched under a safe conduct of the American-sponsored truce through Kalgan Pass and returned with Japanese arms, supplied by Russia, that won the decisive battles in Manchuria in 1947."

That is how China was delivered to communism, pursuant to Roosevelt's Yalta pledge to win Chinese support for the bald barter of Chinese territory to Stalin.

While the United States truce teams prolonged the cease fire, the Russian Red Army was systematically looting the industrial arsenal in Manchuria. Guns, tanks, and planes were seized, entire war plants and whole industries were stripped and dismantled. The Red army took 90 percent of the machinery in the Manchuria coal industry, 80 percent of the metal-working industry, 75 percent of the textile industry, and 50 percent or more of the chemical, cement, power, railroad, and steel industries.

The Reverend William R. Johnson, of Polo, Ill., for 36 years a Methodist missionary in south China, returned to America in 1944 from a Jap prisoner-of-war camp. He has since devoted himself to documenting the delivery of China to Stalin by our own State Department. His conclusion, published in April 1950, is worthy of note today:

"Were Secretary Acheson performing his duties as a member of the Communist sabotage group under Kremlin direction, it is difficult to discover how he could have done more, or left more undone than he has, to serve the Kremlin's purposes."

The free world is paying a staggering price for the private deals concluded at Yalta. The betrayal of China was matched on the other side of the world by the betrayal of Poland. Never in modern history were two noble principles of humanity so grossly betrayed and abandoned.

Closing of Veterans' Administration District Office at Boston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the people of Massachusetts and New England protest very strongly the closing of the Veterans' Administration district office in Boston and the moving of the office to Philadelphia. Under permission, I include in my remarks news items from the Lowell Sun and the Boston Herald.

Taking the district office from Boston will be a great economic loss to that area, and give poorer service to the veterans and their families and will cause many to lose their jobs. Taking the district office to Philadelphia, the Veterans' Administration will take over the building now occupied by the United States Census Bureau. The Veterans' Administration was created to serve the veterans. This will hurt that service.

For several years Congress has been considering the advisability of decentralizing Government departments from the Washington metropolitan area. Mr. Jess Larson, Administrator of the General Services Administration, last Tuesday before the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, testified in favor of Senate bill 1623 to decentralize Government departments to other parts of the United States away from Washington. The House Committee on Expenditures in Executive

Departments has been considering H. R. 4728 for the purpose of decentralizing in the next 2 years 50,000 Government employees to other parts of the United States because of the congestion in Washington and for security reasons.

The district office of the Veterans' Administration at Boston should not be moved at this time to Philadelphia which is close to Washington.

[From the Lowell Sun]

CLOSING OF HUB VA OFFICE HIT

Boston, July 27.—State veterans' organizations joined today in a loud protest over the proposed closing of the Veterans' Administration district office in Boston.

The State departments of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars termed the move "false economy" and the Massachusetts chapter of the Disabled Veterans said that action would be taken at its annual State convention today.

Veterans Administrator Carl R. Gray, Jr., announced that the Boston office, employing 831 persons, and the offices in New York and Richmond, Va., would be consolidated at the Philadelphia office.

The move was expected to save about \$517,000 a year in Boston alone, but Commander George W. Grader of the State American Legion said that was a "mere drop in the bucket" in Federal spending and that the regional office was necessary.

[From the Boston Herald of July 28, 1951]
VETS TO PROTEST OFFICE CLOSING—DAV HEARS
HYNES PROMISE TO HELP

A rising protest from veterans in all sections of New England against the proposed closing of the Boston District Office of the Veterans' Administration is expected to be crystallized into action by delegates attending the thirtieth annual convention of the Massachusetts department, Disabled American Veterans, now in session at the Copley Plaza.

In a welcoming address to more than 700 delegates attending the opening session yesterday afternoon, Mayor Hynes promised he would formally protest the move.

READYING PROTEST

Even as the mayor spoke, officers of the DAV were readying a resolution of protest against the closing, which will be presented to the convention.

Plans for closing the Boston district office, which handles insurance and death claims for veterans throughout New England, were announced by the Veterans' Administration on Thursday. All activities of the Boston office will be merged in an enlarged district office to be located in Philadelphia.

High lighting the opening day's convention activities were the registration of delegates, a business session, and a band concert at night in Copley Square. There will be another concert in the square tonight.

Presiding at the opening session was State Commander Walter F. Morgan, of Somerville, whose term is now expiring.

NEW COMMANDER

Senior Vice Commander Timothy J. O'Neill, of Boston, is expected to be unopposed for election as the new commander.

Boston City Councilman Robert J. Ramsey is the convention chairman.

Today will be veterans' day at the convention, with hospitalized veterans of the Spanish-American War, World Wars I and II, and the present Korean action being guests of the DAV for the day. The men, from veterans' hospitals in all sections of the State, will be guests at a luncheon at the hotel and then attend the Red Sox-Detroit game at Fenway Park, as well as the convention banquet tonight in the ballroom of the hotel.

Included among the speakers at the 3-day convention will be National Commander Boniface Rallie, of Detroit, and Vice Commander Edward Fuller, of Vermont, and officials of the Veterans' Administration.

In Washington, Representative McCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, on behalf of himself and other Democratic members of the Massachusetts delegation, wrote Veterans' Administrator Carl Gray, asking that the move to close the Boston district office be suspended.

Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, Republican, of Massachusetts, ranking Republican on the House Veterans' Committee, protested the action in a House speech and demanded an immediate investigation.

"It will not save a penny and actually will cost more," she told her colleagues, and asked, "Why should these three States be discriminated against?"

On Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks the following editorial of July 24 that appeared in the Burlington Free Press of Burlington, Wis., relative to its position on foreign aid spending programs:

Elsewhere in the paper today you will find a news item from Congressman L. H. SMITH in which he points out that the foreign aid bill of \$8,500,000,000, which is presently being battled in Congress, would cost each taxpayer \$56.20.

It has always been SMITH's policy in regard to foreign aid to carefully scrutinize not only the amount requested but also the manner in which it was to be administered and expended. He has long been a foe of the administration's policy of literally throwing the money away. He has fought to have the expenditures controlled; to prevent the leak of the aid to Communist-dominated countries and Russia itself.

Knowing full well that much of the appropriation money either in the form of manufactured goods or some other commodity has found its way to such an end, SMITH has voted against much of the proposed aid. Because of this stand he has been misbranded an isolationist, a person who refuses help, and many other cruel names. In spite of the name calling, he has courageously led the fight to save the taxpayer's money and certainly his presence not only on the congressional floor but on the Foreign Affairs Committee has prevented even greater squandering of your tax money.

We read in the daily papers of the foreign-aid countries and how well they are recovering, but two columns over there is a story about a shipment of some vital war material being made from one of these countries to Russia or one of its dominated countries.

Judging from this sort of thing, it's apparent Congressman SMITH is doing the kind of job we want done, and it's unfortunate more of his cohorts in Washington do not agree with him.

Now the administration has asked for \$8,500,000,000 for more foreign aid—more than \$6,000,000 to come from Racine County of which the people in the city of Burlington will supply \$268,000, each resident contributing \$56.20.

Cut our share of \$56 in half and properly manage its expenditure in the foreign aid countries and we'll go along once more. But don't we need that money for our own defense? Our military leaders still cry unpreparedness.

Let's stop sacrificing our own country to build those countries whose desire for freedom and a democratic way of life is questionable.

The Iranian Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from Life magazine, which points out that, despite the bungling of the State Department in the Iranian oil-fields dispute and its tragic results, our State Department might have learned a lesson which will be valuable in handling similar situations in the future. The editorial commends the efforts of Max Thornburg, whose excellent efforts at settling the tense situation were rewarded with dismissal from Iran by the State Department.

[From Life magazine of July 30, 1951]

REMEMBER IRAN—IF ITS LESSONS ARE HEEDDED, WE WILL DO BETTER ELSEWHERE

Things continue to go from bad to worse in Iran. At this writing the prospects of saving Iran from itself and of saving Iran's oil for western use are as black as the oil in question. President Truman's roving fixer, Averill Harriman, has persuaded Iranian officials to say they will talk matters over again with the British. But the Iranians have come to hate Britain so thoroughly that they would rather leave their oil in the earth and let their country go to ruin than restore British control of the Iranian oil industry. The British refuse to produce and process the oil unless they are free to run the industry which they founded, built up, and owned until the Iranians nationalized the whole business last March.

There the issue stands, deadlocked between two positions which are equally right in principle and wrong in practice. And there, too, in massive confidence on the borders of Iran, stands the Soviet Union, ready to move in and pick up the pieces when the disaster is complete.

What can the United States Government do about it now? Not much, at this stage, beyond the mediation Mr. Harriman has been trying to accomplish. But the American people can do something—not, unfortunately, to repair the damage already done in Iran, but to guard against the same sort of damage being done elsewhere. The American people can fix clearly in their minds, and never forget, the shocking failure of their Government to move and act in Iran when there were many chances to do a great deal. If there is a certainty in this era of uncertainties, it is that in 1949 and 1950 the United States Government could have prevented disaster in Iran and achieved a great triumph of enlightened leadership.

First of all, the United States Government could have made a serious effort to arouse the British Government to a fresh sense of its responsibilities in Iran. Instead the State Department succumbed to the insane

pretense that the British Government was not responsible for British oil policy in Iran—it was just a business matter between the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. and the Iranian Government. The simple fact was and is, of course, that the British Government is the principal owner of the oil company. To hold, as the State Department did hold, that anyhow the United States Government could not be telling the sovereign British Government how to act was to make nonsense of all that Secretary Acheson is so fond of saying on other occasions about the mutual rights and responsibilities of allies.

The United States Government also had the opportunity to do some concrete and useful things on its own. The young Shah, a firm friend of the United States, was eager to cooperate. So, in the very last months when something might have been done, was America's most active friend in Iran, Premier Ali Razmara. Now the Shah is helpless and Razmara is gone, assassinated by an Iranian nationalist.

If ever there was a place for a modest, well-thought-out program of economic and technical help, it was in Iran. Ambassador John C. Wiley, who went to Tehran in 1948, and Ambassador Henry Grady, who succeeded him in June of 1950, were in turn led to believe that just such a program was coming up, and they rightly led the Iranians to expect help. About all they and the Iranians got from Washington was neglect. A small military-aid program was started and various loans and grants were discussed. But the State Department simply did not bother to push them or to work them into a sensible whole. At the eleventh hour, in late 1950, Ambassador Grady dashed home in a despairing effort to press through at least one item—a \$25,000,000 loan which had been allowed to stall on technicalities. It finally went through, so late that the Iranians no longer wanted it.

Nevertheless a brilliant plan for the salvation of Iran had been worked out—by Overseas Consultants, Inc., a private outfit of American specialists in the employ of the Iranian Government. Given a modicum of British cooperation and United States support, the plan might have been Iran's economic Magna Carta and a model of western effort in other backward countries. It got no support from either the British or United States Governments, and to the lasting shame of both it is a dead dream today. Last March the chief architect of this great plan, Oilman Max Thornburg, was actually encouraged—meaning asked—to leave Iran by his own State Department, acting at the behest of the British Government. The disgraceful ground for this disgraceful finale was the assertion that Max Thornburg was a disturbing influence in Iran. If the several lackwits who dozed in Washington while Iran went down the drain had done one-tenth of what this disturber of official peace tried to get done, the United States would not be despised as it is in Iran today. And the Soviet Communists would not be waiting in quiet triumph for the prize that has so nearly been given to them by default.

Secretary of State Acheson and his fellows in failure are welcome to take what comfort they can from the thought that the United States problem in Iran is very complex and very difficult. Of course it is complex and difficult—in Iran, in the rest of the erupting Middle East, in great areas of Asia and Africa where the fevers of human want and national aspiration are rising. With the best will, the most intelligent policy, and the strongest action possible, there can be no absolute certainty of success in any of these places. But there is one absolute certainty: it is certain that communism is going to win and freedom is going to lose in these places if the United States does no better from now on than it has done in Iran.

Thinking of it this way, any American in his senses is bound to perceive that the United States should have done better in Iran and must do better elsewhere. If enough Americans determine to make their country's best good enough for the problems and necessities that confront the United States and its allies in so much of the world, there need be no more Iranians.

A Project That Must Be Completed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD excerpts from an article which has appeared in the American Engineer, official publication of the National Society of Professional Engineers. The article points up the feasibility, from an engineering standpoint, of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway. Nature and man have completed 95 percent of the channel. It is necessary to make improvements in only a short stretch of the river to open a magnificent water highway, 2,347 miles long, to supplement the economic growth and the defensive strength of the United States and Canada.

[From the American Engineer of April 1951]

To the layman and even to many professionals, the thought of making a ship channel 2,650 miles long—the length of the proposed seaway from Duluth to the Atlantic Ocean—borders on the impossible. Actually such a channel exists for about 95 percent of that distance, and it is the completion of the job started by man and nature that has been a favorite debate topic for many years. Outside of simple dredging, the bulk of the work to be done is on the 120 miles of the St. Lawrence River running between Ogdensburg, N. Y., and Montreal. Along this route will be built a large dam, powerhouse, three locks in the international section of the St. Lawrence River, four locks in the Canadian section, and dredging in the various reaches. This will cost, according to Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of Engineers, United States Army, around a billion dollars with the United States paying six million and the Canadians about four. Inasmuch as Canada has already spent one hundred and thirty-two million and the United States thirty-two million on existing works comprising integral parts of the project, the cost to complete the project is estimated at eight hundred million, of which this country would pay out five hundred and seventy-three million and the Canadians two hundred and thirty million.

Opponents also stress the fact that upward to 81 percent of our merchant marine could not use the 27-foot channel depth. In his statement, General Pick claims that the present Great Lakes fleet could operate over the 27-foot seaway without restriction. As for seagoing ships, certain practical considerations involved in operating seagoing vessels, the general says, tend to increase appreciably the number of vessels that could transit the seaway if a 27-foot controlling depth were provided.

The Maritime Commission has stated that under such practical operating conditions practically every type of vessel in the Ameri-

can merchant fleet with the exception of very large transoceanic ore carriers and supertankers could transit the 27-foot seaway.

What of electric power? Plans call for a 2,200,000 horsepower hydroelectric station in the international rapids section. Not only is there a huge volume of water running downhill here but the year around evenness of the flow is almost as important. This means that at no time, even during dry months, will large amounts of generating capacity stand idle. It is figured that the United States will spend about \$188,000,000 for its half of the power project and that 5,800,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity will be available each year at a cost of 2.92 mills per kilowatt hour.

It's a fact that power is so high in the northeastern United States that industries consider moving out, and new firms refuse to move in. Electric customers in New York State pay 26 percent more for electricity than the national average and use 20 percent less. This in no small way accounts for the fact that every New York Governor since Al Smith has been for the power project in spite of the fact that the port of New York is opposed to it.

The St. Lawrence seaway still has much strong and well organized opposition and, although such new arguments as national security and tolls to pay the way have been introduced, those fighting for the project still see a long hard road ahead. But, in moments of strength, they point out that the TVA and even such old developments as the Panama Canal, met with scorching opposition only to win out in the end. The opposition, on the other hand, feels it can fight a long and very effective delaying action, and anyone must admit that they have a lot of experience upon which to base their optimism.

If the go-ahead is forthcoming, very little time would be lost. The Corps of Engineers says that general plans and specifications have been prepared on the entire dual-purpose project. For all initial construction features including access facilities, transmission lines for power, and so forth, as well as initial work on the main dam, powerhouse, and navigation structures, contract plans and specifications are on hand. For the long Sault Dam for example, the general plans, specifications, and design analysis have been completed. The plans and specifications, says the Corps, are sufficiently complete to permit advertising for bids for the construction of the dam and its flanking earth dikes.

Will Congress say "Yes"?

Dam the Floods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as only a few days have passed since the headline news was the terrific floods in Kansas, I am sure Members of the House realize the urgency of immediate action along those rivers to prevent a repetition of such devastation.

The losses of farms and factories, of homes, schools, churches, business houses, industrial plants will exceed one billion dollars.

If this Nation can rehabilitate citizens of other countries, torn by war, certainly

it can spend some of the tax money it collects to protect our own citizens from the devastation of floodwaters.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill calling for the authorization of flood-control projects on the Republican and Delaware Rivers, tributaries of the Kansas, on the Marais des Cygnes and its tributaries, and on the Marmaton. I trust the Public Works Committee will give this bill the immediate attention it deserves and needs.

How the Miami Valley Abolished Floods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD BREEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. BREEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to the following article which appeared in the Dayton (Ohio) Daily News of Sunday, July 22, 1951:

HOW THE MIAMI VALLEY ABOLISHED FLOODS

The people of the regions devastated by the Kansas-Oklahoma-Missouri floods, if they are smart, will start reading up on the history of the Dayton flood.

Dayton and the Miami Valley turned its flood of March 1913—the greatest disaster from water up to its time—into the last flood. The people of the Missouri-Mississippi watershed can, if they have the imagination and the grit, turn their billion-dollar flood in to the last flood.

An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure; but it is far harder to obtain. Failure to organize effectively to prevent war has caused two international calamities in this century. Only now, with the United Nations and its stand in Korea—products of a belatedly learned lesson—do we have a fighting chance to forge the protection that will make unnecessary the cure.

In Dayton and the Miami Valley the ounce of prevention was not brought without great struggle and cost. After the work of burying the dead, rescuing the marooned, feeding the stranded, removing debris, and rebuilding a large part of a city was completed, there remained the danger that the community would fail to rise to the challenge to avert future floods.

But the community was aroused and it was blessed with tough, aggressive, imaginative leadership. The first impetus was provided by a specially created Ohio Flood Commission. But soon Dayton citizens were meeting to raise money for a detailed survey. At this meeting, the late Adam Schantz struck the spark that ignited the conservancy project. Pointing out that property damage from this single flood ran to \$140,000,000, he proposed a subscription for the survey of \$2,000,000. He offered himself to put up \$100,000. The citizens' meeting at once lifted its sights and the trail that led to the conservancy program was broken.

The survey was organized and headed by Col. E. A. Deeds. J. A. McMahon, one of the ablest and finest men Ohio has ever sent to the House of Representatives, was engaged to draft a bill to create the Miami Conservancy District. A brilliant young engineer, who had been supervising engineer of Federal drainage investigations a few years earlier, and who also had been in charge of the design of reclamation works in the Southern States, was selected by a

committee composed of Walter S. Kidder and Gaylord Cummins. The engineer was Arthur Morgan. Many years later, largely on the basis of his brilliant design of the conservancy, Morgan was called by President Roosevelt to head the Tennessee Valley Authority.

With the personnel assembled and the grand design drawn, the battle, of course, was only beginning. There was the customary public inertia to be overcome, and there was the usual violent obstruction by persons who thought their own interests would be harmed by the project.

A fateful battle to get the legislature to pass the conservancy bill by the two-thirds majority required was won by the narrowest of margins and partly by grace of a stroke of parliamentary alertness.

The story of how the five conservancy dams were built at a cost of \$39,000,000 (about 30 percent of the cost of the flood) is familiar to all Daytonians. So is the story of how the last of the bonds was paid off, slightly before the maturity date in 1949. Equally familiar is the fact that there have been no destructive floods in the Miami Valley since 1913; the fact that the fears of the upstream counties that water would be backed up to flood their farm lands was long since proved unfounded; the fact that generous compensation was paid farmers whose lands lay on the proposed reservoir floors; the fact that the conservancy has been universally popular in its own region and that it has stood as a model before the world.

Not least among the lessons taught by the conservancy was the feasibility of creating special authorities to work across county lines. In recent years even States lines have been obliterated in the successful search for a solution to regional drainage, harbor, and other problems.

Now the peoples of the Missouri-Mississippi watershed know the cost of failing to unite to prevent disaster. As they dig out from the flood they can use the example of the Miami Valley conservancy. They can use the example of the larger Tennessee Valley Authority. Their problem is larger and more complicated than was that of either of these but at least it is not new; they have guideposts to follow. Indeed they have the minimum blueprint of the Pick-Sloan plan and the maximum blueprint of the proposed Missouri Valley Authority.

Perhaps now they will be ready to wage the kind of fight against inertia and vested interest which was fought and won, nearly 40 years ago, in Dayton.

1952 Presidential campaign, even if, as he says, he will not be a candidate himself.

But a cold analysis of the speech reveals that it is pretty well filled up with platitudes and inconsistencies. In what might be termed the preamble to his speech, he said he was speaking "with neither partisan affiliation nor political purpose," and then he went on for three-quarters of an hour with an outright political speech aimed directly at the Truman administration. Even though still a member of the Armed Forces, and therefore still subject to the authority of his Commander in Chief and fired for flouting that authority, he said, "I shall raise my voice as loud and as often as I believe it to be in the interest of the American people." For this sentiment he must be commended, but he might bear in mind that he is permitted to talk as General MacArthur only through the sufferance of his Commander in Chief.

The general speaks of corruption in high quarters and then says it is a disease "unfortunately common to all nations." He might well have also said it was common to all parties, as we learned in the early 1920's when the Tea Pot Dome scandal broke out in the Harding administration.

He would abolish war as utterly futile and always a complete failure as an arbiter of international dissensions. But in the next breath he says we must be prepared to meet the trial if war comes and then "gear our foreign and domestic policies toward the ultimate goal—the abolition of war." This we understand is the whole purpose of our defense program and the North Atlantic Pact—to build up a military power so strong that no enemy nation will dare go to war with us—"peace through strength."

He declared that the Korean war was futile, and that after millions of casualties had been suffered, nothing was settled and no issue decided. But even while he was speaking the U. N. and Red conferees on the other side of the world were reported in agreement on the subjects for discussion to bring about the cease-fire order. We may well wonder would we have been that far along now, if General MacArthur had his way in carrying the war over into Manchuria. We wonder.

While we cannot agree with all that General MacArthur says and proposes, we hail him as a great soldier, a great orator and, for his able work in Japan, a great statesman. But we believe he will continue to serve his country better if he abandons his present partisan role of political critic.

Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial that appeared in the Boston Sunday Post of July 29, 1951:

SUMMING UP THE MACARTHUR VISIT

Now that General MacArthur has "faded away" from the New England scene, a few last impressions would seem to be in order before his whirlwind visit is permanently assigned to the archives. That the event was a memorable one in Boston history goes without saying. The general left a strong imprint of his personality on all he met here, even those with whom he had the most fleeting contacts, and he climaxed his tour with

a hard-hitting address to the legislature that in many respects was the most forceful since his dismissal as Far East commander.

The enthusiasm engendered was remarkable for one who has been out of the limelight for some months and over whose recall the first flush of indignation had passed. It must rank high in the realm of welcomes to visiting dignitaries. If it lacked the hysteria of the greeting to Charles A. Lindbergh, who preceded him here by exactly 24 years—less 2 days—it was because the circumstances were different and the present age is a more sober one. Its closest parallel, perhaps, was the visit of Gen. Dwight Eisenhower on November 12, 1945, for these two Army heroes have much in common in the high regard in which they are held here as elsewhere.

MacArthur's coming served to dispel at least two false notions that are commonly held. It showed that Dame Boston is not too sedate to kick up her heels when the occasion warrants, for this reception was definitely on the exuberant side. It also showed that the general is not always the austere, grim-visaged individual he is pictured to be. He gave us another facet of his character entirely—affability, geniality and a general aura of good fellowship. It added a pleasant note, indeed, to the proceedings.

And, of course, Boston took to its heart the gracious, attractive Mrs. MacArthur. Her quiet charm endeared her to all. She seemed almost fragile until one recalled the tenacity with which she stayed at her husband's side during the difficult war years which included a precarious existence in a bomb-shaken cottage with her son on Corregidor and a perilous escape by PT boat and plane.

Her married life certainly has been an eventful and difficult one, being lived entirely on foreign soil in contrast to her earlier years. Yet there was no touch of gray in her hair. She did not in the least show her 52 years nor, for that matter, did her husband his 71. They were a truly devoted couple. The general revealed in a thousand gestures his deep solicitude for her at every stage of the journey—the anxious way he looked back toward her car when they were separated; the promptness with which he would step up to hold her arm when she showed the slightest sign of faltering before the flashbulb barrage. And she, for her part, was the typical, proud, unselfish wife, desirous only of remaining in the background so that the full spotlight could play on her husband whom she so obviously adored.

It would have been nice if this appealing family portrait could have been rounded out by the appearance of their son, but unfortunately this was not to be as he was elsewhere engaged. But we know that he is the unassuming, upstanding young boy to be expected of two such fine parents, and that he will be a credit to them and his illustrious name.

Regarding the MacArthur speech, main point of his visit, the general was at his best when he sketched the ineptitude and bewilderment of our Far East policies, and his most telling point was the vindication of his own views regarding the importance of Formosa, cease-fire procedure and the like—views, the expression of which at the time, cost him his job. But there were political overtones and inconsistencies in his remarks on the ill effects of loyalty, the importance of which he as an Army man must realize, the evils of taxation and the stress on reprisals, which he said, entirely without reason we believe, that he must endure if he talks out of turn. Some of the things he desires, like abolishing all wars and at the same time wiping out communism, while striking a popular chord, are more easily stated than achieved.

At the outset he was careful to explain that his speech had neither partisan affiliation nor political purpose. But while he was

MacArthur's Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of July 27, 1951:

MACARTHUR'S SPEECH

No doubt millions of people who heard and saw General MacArthur deliver his speech at the State House were captivated by his magnetic personality and his masterful oratory. If the general retains his present extraordinary physical vigor for another year, he may well be a forceful factor in the

not an avowed candidate for office, he spoke like one. His words need to be heard, and his counsel on the Far East, on which he is an acknowledged expert, should be heeded, but he has yet to demonstrate Presidential caliber.

MacArthur Talks Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Traveler of July 27, 1951:

MACARTHUR TALKS POLITICS

The people of Boston and of several other parts of Massachusetts have had their long-awaited chance to see and applaud one of this country's great military figures, General MacArthur. In his visit among us the general and his charming wife lived up to any reasonable expectation of what their appearance and behavior should have been. We doubt that many were disappointed.

The general's speech before the assembled general court is something else again. In his inimitable style of rhetoric, MacArthur lashed out at virtually every policy of the Government, domestic and foreign. He did it with a bitterness that the deposed Far East commander had not before equaled and in a tone that was strongly political.

No one would deny MacArthur his absolute right to express his views on the political course this country is taking. Loosed from the restraints of active military command, it may even, as he said, be his duty to avoid sinning by silence on the political and military developments that disturb him. But the MacArthur of the statehouse on Wednesday night was talking as a political man and he can be answered as such without withdrawing from him one bit of the respect due him for his enormous military accomplishments.

What would MacArthur substitute for the Government policies for which he expressed such biting contempt? We can assume that in domestic policy his generalities would, if translated into action, place him in the extreme right wing of the Republican Party. We can only guess how much of a roll-back of the so-called welfare state the general's views would require, but it would be considerable. The outline of his social views, then, is quite clear.

We cannot say as much for his foreign policy opinions. In this vital area of national decision MacArthur seemed to hold views that are in contradiction of each other. He was at the same time belligerent and pacific. He favored a bigger war in Asia, yet he seemed to be for fighting it, even now, with a smaller budget. He attempted to justify his own self-defeatingly belligerent offer of a cease-fire to the Chinese and at the same time attacked the U. N.'s agreement to at least talk about a truce when the offer came from the other side. He went out of his way to brand the present talks with the hate word "appeasement."

MacArthur has never been in sympathy with, nor understood, the sort of limited war we have been fighting in Korea. His hostility to it justified his retirement from command long before Mr. Truman acquired the nerve to do it.

He has failed to recognize that the free world was not prepared to fight anything but a limited war in Asia. He sees no advantage for us in the limited peace that must follow a limited war, even if it buys us immeasurably valuable time. He admits no aspect of victory in the halt put to Communist aggression and in the new strength and will with which this successful collective action has endowed America and its allies.

With the general's judgment of the worth of the sacrifice in Korea we believe the majority of Americans disagree. And his political adherents would do well to remember that the present administration is identified with the policy of stopping aggression and the spread of war at the lowest cost in men and treasure.

MacArthur made one statement which, if it remains in people's minds as the message of his speech, could do great harm to our mobilization program. He said we were so strong "that talk of imminent threat to our national security through the application of external force is pure nonsense."

We cannot believe that the general was seriously arguing for the let-down in preparedness his words appear to condone. It all depends what he meant by "imminent." We think most Americans will feel that the threat is "immediate" and "ominous" and will act accordingly, General MacArthur to the contrary notwithstanding.

James J. Hogan Junior High School: An Appropriate Tribute to a Wonderful Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I am including in my remarks a very fine editorial from the Times-Herald, of Vallejo, Calif., concerning Dr. James Joseph Hogan.

In December 1929 I was in Washington, representing the city of Stockton in connection with the development of the Stockton deep-water channel project. At that time I had the good fortune to meet Speaker Longworth and to have a long conversation with him in the Speaker's office. Due to the fact that I had served in the same branch of the Army as his brother-in-law, Quentin Roosevelt, Mr. Longworth was unusually cordial.

Among other things, he asked me who represented my district in the House of Representatives. When I said Charles F. Curry, he said, "You are lucky because you really have two Congressmen. Mr. Curry is a very respected and able Member of the House, and Dr. Hogan really represents you also, and has a tremendous influence on the Members of the House."

Later, when I became a Member of the House of Representatives, I learned that this statement was literally true. The Member who told me more about Dr. Hogan than any other Member was Earl C. Michener, of Michigan. In those days the House of Representatives did not have a doctor, as it does now. Dr. Hogan would frequently be called on by

Members for medical advice. According to Mr. Michener not only did Dr. Hogan help Members with their health problems but he had a magnetic personality that soon won the confidence of the Members of the House of Representatives. Also he had a charming and talented wife who was very popular with the congressional wives. As a couple they developed tremendous good will among the Members of Congress.

Evidences frequently crop up, in my conversations with some of the older Members of the House, of the remarkable hold that Dr. Hogan had on the confidence and the friendship of the Congressmen who knew him. Hon. CARL VINSON, of Georgia, chairman of the committee on which I have the honor to serve, has told me several times, with much pride, how he "helped Charley Curry and Dr. Hogan prevent the removal of Mare Island Navy Yard to Alameda." Others have testified to the esteem in which the Hogans were held.

What appeals to me most, however, is that this fine man came to Washington to represent his adopted city of Vallejo, not for pay, but because he loved the city of his choice, because it and its people had been so good to Dr. Hogan. His was a labor of love and that plus his great personality is what made him so successful in representing Vallejo in the Nation's capital.

I never realized till I read this splendid editorial what a great success Dr. Hogan was in his chosen profession. He was really a statesman without public office and an ambassador without portfolio. Many people are happier and Vallejo is a better city because of the work of Dr. Hogan. I hope that the children who attend the high school named in his honor will learn about him and his accomplishments. It will inspire every one of them and plant in them the desire to live a useful and fruitful life.

The editorial follows:

Vallejo's third junior high school is to be named in the memory of Dr. James Joseph Hogan, who died July 15, 1942, in Cincinnati, Ohio, as the result of a chronic heart ailment. Dr. Hogan was 70 years old at the time of his death.

After 9 years, the community to which Dr. Hogan contributed so very much is belatedly giving to him, in at least some small measure, the honor he deserved throughout almost all of his lifetime.

Dr. Hogan was a Vallejoan. But actually, few Vallejoans ever realized, even many of his good friends, that his mind and his heart belonged to the world itself. Few knew, and "Dr. Jim" was not the type to tell them, that his research in the field of vaccine and blood plasma saved many thousands of lives.

For doctors the world over, Dr. Martin H. Fischer, professor of physiology at the University of Cincinnati when Dr. Hogan died, gave his friend a one-sentence eulogy of which any doctor could be incomparably proud.

Dr. Fischer at that time declared:

"He was the man responsible for the definition of what constitutes a proper infusion to overcome surgical shock."

Dr. Fischer used "definition" as a medical term. He might have used the word "discovery." Of all the thousands of researchers who preceded him, through more than a

century, Dr. Hogan was the first to make that discovery. It was a milestone in the history of medicine.

He was a graduate of Cooper Medical College in San Francisco, a member of the Royal College of Surgeons in England, and licentiate of the Royal College of Physicians. It was in England that he did his postgraduate work.

His "definition" discovery, as it related to surgical shock, was made when he was a young man.

As far back as 1915, he went to Europe at the invitation of the German Government at that time, to introduce his perfected treatment for the intravenous use of gelatin solutions in place of transfusion for shock after wounds.

In England, he conferred with medical authorities there. And in Paris, he demonstrated the treatment in the American Hospital, and the hospital at Jully, on a corner of the historic Marne battlefield.

On his return to the United States, he recalled:

"I saw plenty of the wounded, where they were brought back for secondary treatment. Berlin is full of them; London is full of them; Paris is full of them. They are everywhere."

It must have been a source of tremendous satisfaction to Dr. Hogan to realize that thousands of the wounded, in all three of those great cities, and on the battlefields of that First World War, were saved because of his discovery.

Yet somehow, through the many years that followed, in his own home town, it was not so much for his greatness in the medical world, but for his championing of Mare Island Navy Yard and Vallejo that he was best known to the general public.

Vallejo was not the sprawling metropolis then that it is today, and Mare Island more than once had to fight for its very existence.

Dr. Hogan, of course, was Vallejo's representative in Washington, D. C. He led the fight, through the years. Always, he was successful.

He had, among many other qualities, a keen sense of history.

He realized, in 1928, what America's post-war leadership never did realize, and what most Americans prior to the outbreak of World War II, and even after World War II, did not realize.

Once, in an address at Richmond, he declared that the Washington Disarmament Conference was one of the biggest farces ever fostered upon the American people.

Our national prosperity, he declared, depended upon adequate sea power. American ships had to keep open sea lanes for America's merchant marine. And yet, during those terrible months in the Atlantic in the earlier days of World War II, U-boats almost succeeded in closing those sea lanes, because our naval power had been stripped during the years of peace that followed the First World War.

Perhaps it was his training as a doctor and a researcher that enabled him to probe for and find the truth in all things.

He surely was a realist, and yet, somewhat paradoxically, he was a great humanitarian. Or maybe it was that he went further than most, and realized that the two rightfully, and always in a Christian sense, must go together.

To those thousands whom the Greater Vallejo area has welcomed from every State in the Union, and who now are employed at Mare Island, it will be difficult to realize that a job at that vital installation sometimes depended on the success of Dr. Hogan in the Nation's capital, striving to save Mare Island from its unthinking enemies.

There were few bigger news stories that could break here, back in those days, than

the stories which revealed, always in bold headlines, that there would be another submarine for Mare Island to build, or another cruiser, and more allocations for their construction, and the improvement of the yard's facilities.

The climax probably was the Battle of the Mudflats, in which Alameda sought to become the new Mare Island.

For many days—indeed, for many months—it was touch and go.

Here in Vallejo, hundreds of families—fathers and mothers and their children—waited for the news.

Finally, those who fought for Mare Island could report triumph.

"And there were many who helped us," Dr. Hogan would want it said.

He surely would not have considered his career somewhat fabulous. And yet it was.

There was his research in medicine in his youth.

There was a time, too, when he practiced medicine here. Vallejo was not so small that it could be said that Dr. Hogan was, after that great and beloved tradition we have in America, a "country doctor"—although many a call he made in the middle of the night, across muddy roads, to help those who needed medical attention.

And then there was his activity in the Nation's Capital, in behalf of Mare Island and Vallejo—in whose destiny he believed with fervor.

And again, his research in medicine. That first, great love, he cherished until the day he died.

Indeed, it was while visiting with Dr. Fischer, with the two of them planning yet more research in their field, that Dr. Hogan died.

He had, of course, friends all over Washington. A Navy man himself, he had many friends in the Navy. One was an officer named Nimitz—who was to be known to the world as Pacific Fleet Admiral Chester Nimitz. There were many others.

Dr. Hogan, as a matter of fact, had countless friends in virtually every walk of life. He was a very democratic person, who liked people very much.

Faith, honesty, courage—all the virtues were his.

In the nine seemingly brief years since Dr. Hogan died, much has happened in the world and in the Mare Island-Vallejo area for which he struggled so selflessly and so earnestly and so successfully through the years.

Such is the irony of passing time, there are thousands now living here, and working on Mare Island, who might ask: "Dr. Hogan? Who was Dr. Hogan?"

But these are the relative newcomers, themselves helping to build our community, now Vallejoans themselves.

The important thing, despite the fleeting years, is the very real fact that Dr. James Joseph Hogan, a great American in every sense, did live here, and did contribute so very much to the betterment of the community that was his home town—even though, in a sense, the whole world at times was his "home."

And what is important, too, is the fact that students who will attend the new James J. Hogan Junior High School can be proud, as youth has a right to be proud, of their school's name.

In every sense, Dr. Hogan was a great man—a modest discoverer, a wonderful humanitarian, a man of science, a courageous fighter, a savior of life on a tremendous scale, a civic-minded citizen in the very best American tradition, a human being who struggled for the rights of other human beings.

For such a man, Vallejo's newest junior high school will be named.

Acheson Speech Baffling in Ambiguity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article:

ACHESON SPEECH BAFFLING IN AMBIGUITY

(By David Lawrence)

When the Secretary of State makes an address, a good deal of deliberate planning lies behind his words. From his staff of policy makers come memoranda that lay down the points that must be emphasized to fit changing situations.

But the speech which Secretary Acheson made at Detroit is baffling in its ambiguity. The words at times are those of a MacArthur but the acts which are contemporaneously recorded in the news dispatches are those of a Chamberlain.

What Dean Acheson says is important because, for all practical purposes, he is President of the United States. He is virtually commander in chief of the Army, Navy and Air Force. He defines their scope of action. For Mr. Truman does what Mr. Acheson tells him to do. No man in the office of Secretary of State heretofore has had the opportunity to wield such power, first, because no President ever delegated as much authority to him and, second, because no comparable issues fell to a Secretary of State to decide. Mr. Acheson told a Senate committee recently that a cease-fire in Korea around the thirty-eighth parallel would be a "victorious" conclusion of the war there, and he emphasized that this would mean that aggression had been repelled.

Yet now, in his Detroit speech, the Secretary says the aggressor hasn't been tamed at all. He adds:

"We are in great danger, greater perhaps than many Americans now appreciate. This danger is not less than it was a month ago, although some of us seem to think so. * * * Whether or not an armistice results from the talks in Korea, the fundamental job ahead of us will not change. * * * Whether or not there is peace in Korea, whether our adversaries are cooling like doves or growling like bears, our job remains the same. The threat we face remains the same."

This would seem to imply that the sacrifices made by the U. N. forces, including casualties of 80,000 Americans, have not swerved the aggressor from his course. Then comes this curious paragraph:

"Neither war nor weakness is the way to meet the Soviet challenge. We will counter force with force, if necessary, but war does not solve problems—it multiplies them. Weakness, on the other hand, would lead to defeat, with or without war."

The foregoing—countering force with maximum force—was the main theme of General MacArthur's frequent messages to his superiors in Washington and of his Boston speech, too. It was because of his exposition of this very doctrine in his message to the enemy commander that he was summarily removed from all his commands.

But, while it is sound doctrine, whether Mr. Acheson or General MacArthur expresses it, the Secretary of State qualifies it almost immediately when he says:

"Between these two extremes lies a middle course, which seeks to block Soviet expansionism without war, by building an effective system of collective security and

by making it strong. This is the course we are following."

Then came the explanation of what that middle course is:

"We do not have to match the Soviet armies man for man, or gun for gun, since our mission is to deter, not to attack, but we have a long way to go before we reach a safe deterrent level."

What kind of gobbledygook is this for our military chiefs to digest? Is a military force built solely to be strong on the defensive? Is there no thought given to offensive strength sufficient to win a war when the enemy has begun it? Mr. Acheson amplifies his thinking thus:

"What we are building is an adequate deterrent force against military attack. We already have the means to guarantee that a general military attack against us would be costly to the aggressors. We must now achieve a force of sufficient size to make it plain that such an attack could not succeed."

Does this mean that America has adopted a policy of being willing to accept stalemates in future wars? Has victory been deleted from the vocabulary as well as the planning of our military forces? Is the enemy to be given to understand that, if an attack is made and he fails to penetrate our lines, we will agree to cease-fires and compromises of the thirty-eighth-parallel sort of stalemate? Is Korea to be a pattern for future military policy?

Plainly the Detroit speech by Secretary Acheson is a revelation of the new concept of American military policy—not to fight to win but just to keep the enemy from winning. If that is all our Army, Navy, and Air Force are to be permitted to do in the next war, then the Soviets may some day accept as a realistic though unwitting description of the morale of U. N. countries what Mr. Acheson says:

"It must be understood that weakness not only invites attack; what is even more menacing, it paralyzes the will to resist and makes for political disintegration."

Doorway to Slavery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the Record an article published by the Long Island Daily Press June 11, that tells a story of teen-age drug addiction.

The Scriptures mention the unforgivable sin and I wonder if it might not be the scandalizing of children and their enslavement to this pernicious vice. The passer of dope is like a venomous snake to be crushed under foot and must be killed. Such peddlers are beyond the pale of humanities. They are the most dangerous persons alive. They kill not only the bodies and minds but the souls of the young as well.

The above-mentioned article follows:

HOW I BECAME A DOPE ADDICT BEFORE I WAS 18—A JOY SMOKE LED LUCY TO SLAVERY; A KICK?—ONLY FEAR RULED HER HEART

(By Geraldine Scott)

It was a casual "joy smoke" in a boy friend's automobile that changed the course

of Lucy's life. Lucy told about it as she sat in the pleasant white-curtained living-room of her parents' suburban house. Her mother kept glancing at Lucy with a mixture of fondness and anxiety. Later, she was to say:

"If only I had questioned Lucy more closely at the beginning. I kept noticing that her eyes had a glassy stare when she came home from dates. But she kept insisting I was wrong. I just didn't know what a glassy expression can mean."

(If your son or daughter has a glassy expression and the pupils of the eyes are distended and do not contract, even when a bright light is flashed into them, the chances are 100 to 1 the youngster's been smoking marijuana cigarettes.)

"I first heard about marijuana cigarettes in high school," Lucy recalled. "Some girl friends and I were dating an older crowd of boys and I heard rumors that most of them smoked reefers. It seemed to be an unwritten law that girls shouldn't."

After she graduated high school, Lucy tried her hand at a few office jobs, but found that she couldn't get interested in an office routine. She wasn't interested in going to college or in studying for anything special. She just wanted to go out and have fun. And her parents, proud that they didn't need to have their daughter work, encouraged her.

"She had no real purpose in life," said Lucy's mother softly. "And we were too stupid to realize that."

"I kept seeing that same fast crowd," Lucy continued. "I guess I was particularly popular with the fellows because most of the other girls were rather dowdy looking. Oh, my skin was really perfect once." She ran her hands over her face, where the skin was still splotchy from her habit of the past. "Maybe it will be again—some day."

Soon Lucy found herself seeing a lot of Hank, who was particularly desirable because he had his own car and was a "free spender" on dates. She never did find out where he got the money.

"We would go out and dance and maybe drink a little and then park somewhere and smooch," Lucy said, blushing a little in the presence of her mother. "I was having fun, but I wanted to have more fun."

One spring night Lucy and Hank went for a drive on a secluded lane in the country. After a while Hank stopped the car and pulled out a cigarette case.

"Go ahead, baby, you might as well get high," he said to Lucy. "Everybody else does."

Lucy took her first smoke of marijuana. She recalls that, en route home, everything seemed to be happening twice as fast as usual.

"Even my mind. It seemed to me I was being terribly witty and that Hank and I were having a brilliant and sharp conversation. That's the way marijuana affects you—at first."

When Lucy got home that night, her mother asked if anything was the matter and commented that her eyes looked glassy.

"I took a look in the mirror, and they didn't seem glassy to me. But they must have been. That's how you can tell if anyone's been smoking marijuana. That's how the police tell. They flash a light into your eyes, and if your pupils don't contract, he knows you're riding on cloud 7."

Lucy's first cigarette wasn't her last.

"I kept coming home glassy-eyed and my mother kept asking me what was the matter, but never dreamed I was smoking marijuana. She didn't even know I had ever smoked any kind of cigarette. But finally my father grew suspicious. Somebody told him about marijuana. He hunted through my pockets and purse, but of course he didn't find them."

"I always hid the reefers in a package under my brassiere."

Where did she get the cigarettes?

"At the beginning I didn't have to pay for any of the dope I took. Otherwise, despite the fact that my parents gave me an ample allowance, I might have gotten discouraged. I don't know the situation now, but a couple of years ago it would cost me about \$10 a day to keep myself supplied."

(Narcotics agents here say the cost of heroin or cocaine for the average addict in this area is now between \$5 and \$15 a day.)

"Hank would just give me all the reefers I needed. Then I needed more and more. I grew depressed when the spell wore off. I would chew my nails and fret until I got another cigarette."

Then her eyes clouded as she began to tell me about Ralph. It was Ralph who made her abandon marijuana for heroin and then abandon her parents for his vicious kind of life.

"I kept seeing Hank, and he kept giving me reefers. But outside of a little petting, there was nothing between us. As a matter of fact, it was Hank who introduced me to Ralph."

By that time Lucy, encouraged by her parents to remain jobless, had decided she would try something "intellectual" like writing or music.

"I decided that," she laughed softly, "every time I smoked a reefer."

She asked Hank to take her to a jazz concert in New York one night. There she met Ralph. Afterward a whole gang, including Ralph and his date for the evening, Dotty, went to an upper West Side apartment "to smoke a little pot."

"Ralph and I got to talking, and before I knew it, I was hearing the story of his life. A life, incidentally, that he was very bitter about. He had come East from Los Angeles, where he used to live with his mother. He got into some girl trouble and came to New York to live with his father. His parents had separated when he was very young. He had only contempt for his mother and hatred for his father."

He was a handsome youth of 19, when she met him, Lucy recalled, aside from a certain glassy expression.

"But then he'd been using marijuana since he was 16 and had been hooked on heroin for several months."

Lucy remembered that Ralph had fluctuated between his own date, Dotty, and herself that first evening.

"I really think he was trying to decide right there which of us he liked best. All I know is, he took me home and I fell head over heels in love with him. But now that I think back, I'm sure he figured out he could make more use of me than he could of Dotty. And that's why I was the 'icky' one."

"Ralph had learned, I discovered later, to use women to get what he wanted. In the past, older women had fallen for him and had given him money."

Lucy, who was now being badgered by her parents as her eyes grew glassier and her skin spottier from the secretly smoked reefers, decided to take Ralph home with her one evening and have her folks meet him. The first time, he came to dinner. Lucy's mother didn't like him at once because he pecked at his food, instead of gobbling it up in normal youthful fashion.

"He was the strangest boy I ever met," Lucy's mother said. "I would watch him toying with his meat and was sure he was ill. Of course, he was ill, but I didn't know why then. He was always ready to eat candy, though, or any sort of sweets. He'd go after candy as if he were starving."

(A craving for sweets goes along with dope addiction. That's one reason many dope users develop bad complexions.)

Mrs. D. said she asked Lucy not to see Ralph again after he dropped a pawn ticket

out of his coat pocket one evening and she saw it was for a gun.

"I asked him what in the world he was doing with a gun and he gave me a long story about driving a car west for some people and needing it for protection. I grew afraid for my daughter."

Lucy promised not to see Ralph. But a few weeks later she left home, and it was nearly a year before her family saw her again.

"I had no idea where she was," said Mrs. D. "I reported her to the police as a missing person, of course, but I never heard anything from her until the night she called me after she was arrested. I aged 20 years, I think, while Lucy was away."

Lucy's eyes filled with tears and she jumped up from the sofa.

"I wish I could talk to every kid who's tempted to do the things I did. I wish I could warn them what they're getting into. You don't get kicks. All you get is fear all the time. Fear of the police. Fear of getting an air bubble in an artery that would kill you. Fear of a rusty needle. Fear of running out of money and not being able to get any more stuff. Fear of getting bad stuff or of taking an overdose. Nothing but fear."

Lucy recalls she thought she could try heroin, at Ralph's insistence, without "getting hooked."

"But I found out you can't chippy around with heroin. (Chipping is what the narcotic users call those who just take a shot now and then and manage not to get hooked.) You may play in luck with it for quite a while if you keep yourself down to the minimum shot, which is about a quarter of a capsule, but sooner or later you get hooked. Don't let anybody tell you you won't. I know."

Lucy tried heroin. Within a few weeks she was using \$10 worth a day.

"How did I get the money?" Lucy settled back in the couch. "I'll tell you. It isn't a pretty story."

Air Training Command Is Heart of Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on July 7 last, a significant ceremony took place at Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Ill., celebrating the eighth birthday of the Air Training Command, aptly described by Lt. Gen. Robert W. Harper, Commanding General ATRC, as the "heart of the Air Force."

High light of the day's observance was the dedication of "Yount Hall," ATRC's headquarters building at Scott, which has been named in honor of Lt. Gen. Barton K. Yount, one of the real pioneers of the Air Force and first commander of the training command. General Yount was commanding general from the beginning of the command in 1943 until his retirement from the service in December 1945. He died in 1949.

The present commanding general, Lieutenant General Harper, has been associated with military education throughout his career. He is ideally equipped to meet the responsibility for direction of the tremendous expansion in the Air Force training program.

General Harper paid high tribute to General Yount's advanced philosophy of training for the Air Force in the following address delivered at the dedication of Yount Hall. General Harper's address follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, we are here for a purpose which I am sure profoundly impresses you as it does me. We have gathered today to pay tribute to the memory of a great American and his accomplishments.

General Yount, as much as any man I can recall, regarded the military service as a public service. Throughout his life, which was a life of selflessness, he regarded every military assignment in the light of a trust. And as additional offices and responsibilities were assigned to him, the more keenly he followed a highly personalized program of acting for the best interests of our country.

As the first commanding general of the Air Training Command, General Yount was faced with a gigantic task of organization and administration. In those early days he demonstrated qualities of leadership which make it such an abiding honor for us all to participate in this ceremony.

It is particularly fitting that we should have this observance today. For on the day that the Air Training Command was founded 8 years ago, General Yount foresaw and properly gaged the importance of training for the Air Force of today and the Air Force of tomorrow.

I knew General Yount well and admired him greatly. Although this is personal to me, I cannot help but quote a few passages of letters he sent to me revealing his great breadth of vision, his friendliness, and his greatness.

When General Yount assumed direction of this command 8 years ago today, at Fort Worth, Tex., he fully understood the vast scope of the training responsibility. He voiced this thought to me, and I quote.

"The peace and safety of our country, and in fact of the world, may depend upon the training of our Air Force—our first line of defense."

He was a kindly, sincere man, with many warm and close friends. Recalling them, he once wrote me a memorable paragraph about our people:

"Recollections of my association with the personnel of the Air Training Command are the most treasured of my memories of the national service. I enjoyed the spirited co-operation of a group of people I shall admire always—the officers, airmen, and civilian personnel who established and maintained the proud record of the Air Force training program."

Ladies and gentlemen, as a succeeding commanding general who has been privileged to head up the Air Training Command, I am sure that General Yount voiced my deepest sentiments about our people.

And the founder of our command issued a ringing challenge to those of us who are charged with carrying on his training program. He said, in part:

"The Air Training Command is not spectacular. It does not engage in combat, but had it not been for our command there would have been no efficient combat. The training command is the very heart of the Air Force, and I hope in the years to come it will be so acknowledged."

Today, and rightly so, our combat-crew training-school program has become a reality. I believe that General Yount foresaw that some day this would be an additional responsibility in order to relieve the combat commands of this training mission so that they might concentrate on their primary mission—combat.

I am pleased to report to this audience that the cold war and the Korean situation did not find the Air Training Command unpre-

pared. The people of our command have responded nobly to the current emergency and are prepared for even greater effort according to the finest traditions of General Yount's advanced philosophy of training for the Air Force.

It is a philosophy which is the basis of our training today. We make no compromise with the quality of our product—producing the best possible officers and airmen according to the desires and needs of the using agency. These are unchanging and unchanged principles in our Air Force training program.

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force and to the memory of Lt. Gen. Barton K. Yount, a great civic and military leader, I dedicate this building and direct that it shall hereafter be known as Yount Hall.

Retrospect on India Food Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the long consideration of India's request for aid in meeting its food crisis, which ended in passage of the India Emergency Food Aid Act, left a certain amount of misunderstanding as to the motives of Congress and the attitude of the American people toward India. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article on this subject which appeared in the *Hindustan Times*, an influential newspaper published in New Delhi, and written by Sidney Hertzberg, its special correspondent in the United States. Mr. Hertzberg analyzes the entire picture and puts its various elements in perspective. The conclusions he suggests are perhaps as valuable for Americans as for Indians. If both Indians and Americans will keep them in mind, relations between the two countries can be increasingly fruitful.

[From the *Hindustan Times*, New Delhi, of June 29 and 30, 1951]

INDIA FOOD AID BILL

(By Sidney Hertzberg)

WASHINGTON—The India Emergency Food Aid Act passed by Congress constitutes the first important piece of official bilateral business between the U. S. A. and India. It is hard to imagine how it could have come at a worse time. In the months during which India's request was under consideration, India's moral influence in the U. S. A., once greater than any other country's, virtually disappeared. When the request was first made, the Communists were on an offensive that carried them deeper into South Korea than they had been since the start of their aggression, and Americans were being faced with growing casualty lists. India, despite Peking's refusal to accept U. N. cease-fire proposals, would not join in the U. N. finding that the Chinese Communists were aggressors. The feeling here grew that India was no longer the disinterested peacemaker but the apologist for aggressors. Increasingly, too, Americans drew a sharp contrast between what they felt was Mr. Nehru's willingness to appease the Chinese Communists and what they regarded as his intransigence in his "cold war" against Pakistan over Kashmir.

All this was complicated by the MacArthur upheaval.

In this atmosphere, a test case in Indo-American relations—more specifically in the American attitude toward India—was bound to be a trial of fire. From the beginning, some observers were ready to assume that the U. S. A. could not pass the test. As early as January 26, one Indian correspondent here reported a "Senate decision" to "shelve" India's request and, after bemoaning this "decision" at length, expressed regret "that America should attempt to use food as a political weapon." At the time this dolorous dispatch was written, President Truman had not yet transmitted India's request to Congress, the necessary bills had not even been introduced and public discussion of the matter had barely begun. What the dispatch illustrated was the predisposition to assume that America would act as its sharpest critics predicted.

FUNCTIONING DEMOCRACY

It could be of the utmost importance for Indo-American relations if India had a rounded picture of how America responded to her first official request for aid. And in drawing this picture, the tendency must be avoided to accept the worst—or the best—in America as representative of America as a whole. The United States of America is a functioning democracy and, though Congress sometimes seems behind the people and sometimes ahead of them, it is fair to assume that how the United States Congress votes is the best test of what America wants. The fact is that Congress met India's request. No record votes were taken in the Senate, but the opposition there was negligible. In the House of Representatives, the final vote was 225 in favor and 82 against, a division of nearly 3 to 1. For purposes of comparison, the final vote in the House adopting the Marshall plan in 1948 was 329 to 74.

Furthermore, looking back on the whole experience now, there was never any serious reason to doubt that the request would be met. There was throughout the question whether it would be a gift or a loan. There was also a question as to whether payment in specified strategic materials would be mandatory. These were the questions on which discussion mainly revolved, and not whether or not India's request—which was for grain "on special and easy terms"—should or should not be met. The questions were resolved in favor of a loan and a provision for repayment in unspecified strategic materials "so far as practicable and possible."

As small evidences that the matter was not to be regarded entirely as a hardheaded business deal, Congress voted to pay ocean freight on relief packages to India and set aside the first \$5,000,000 of interest for educational purposes.

NO POLITICAL CONDITIONS

At no point did any one propose "political conditions" in the sense of trying to force India to change her attitude on international issues. This does not by any means mean there was a lack of outspoken denunciation of Indian attitudes, particularly on China. Nor does it mean a small minority in Congress would have been above extracting political concessions if there were some way of doing it. But they remained a small minority and they had sense enough to know that political concessions were out of the question. They contented themselves with obstruction and in the end simply with voting against the bill.

Again, it should not be assumed that all or most of the 82 Representatives who voted against the bill wanted political concessions or harbored any particular animus toward India. As I have pointed out, there were 74 votes against the Marshall plan. There is a hard core of isolationist Congressmen, hap-

pily a minority, who oppose foreign aid of any kind. Foreign aid, they feel, means high taxes and a threat to the American standard of living. They scorn wide-eyed internationalism and global thinking. Some of them just do not like foreigners, even as some Indians do not. On the other hand, a few Congressmen announced that, though they had opposed the Marshall plan because it was an impractical scheme to save the world, they would support the India bill because it was a practical measure to prevent starvation.

Nor do I think there were any devious motives behind enactment of the bill. I do not think that the primary factor was the hope of buying India's friendship. The United States of America has given away billions of dollars during the last few years and there has been barely a word of thanks from anyone. Americans have pretty much accepted the old adage that it is impossible to be both wealthy and loved. Yet, they know they cannot escape the responsibilities of wealth. Certainly the hope was expressed during the debates that Indians would think better of Americans—or at least would not think of Americans as monsters. And, of course, it was pointed out repeatedly that failure to meet the request would have a disastrous effect on the Indian's opinion of the American.

But throughout the discussion there was also an undertone that failure to meet the request would have an even more disastrous effect on the American's opinion of himself, and here lies the key to the American attitude on this matter. I believe the most important single motive behind American support of India's request was simply the feeling that those who have plenty must share it with those in need. This is not a feeling peculiar to Americans; it is a feeling shared by all civilized people. It is one of the hallmarks of a civilized people.

SPONTANEOUS RESPONSE

It is a feeling that exists in the hearts of people and its existence in the hearts of millions of Americans is what made it a foregone conclusion that India would be helped, despite Korea and Peiping and provocative remarks by Indian spokesmen and the excesses of American extremists. It is a feeling that cannot be created by propaganda and for which no one can take the credit. When India's emergency need was first made known here, spontaneous pressure for congressional action came from all parts of the country and continued until the bill was passed. In the hearings before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, the only public hearings held, all witnesses favored a gift of grain. Indeed, not a single important American organization opposed it, though none of them support India's policy on Korea.

In addition to the spontaneous reaction, some notable special efforts were made. The State Department presented an extraordinarily effective case for India. Consistent support was voiced by America's most respected newspapers. The New York Times, that paragon of American capitalism and of sedate journalism, printed 17 vigorously worded leaders favoring a gift without conditions of any kind. Religious and labor groups were specially active in directing pressure on Congress and their work was coordinated through the American Emergency Food Committee for India. Within Congress, a small group of Senators and Representatives pushed the bill tirelessly and their work to some extent reflected the years of cultivation of Congressmen by the India League of America. The specific arguments advanced by these groups were telling but essentially irrelevant. Their activity could only help to evoke the basic feeling among Americans that hungry people must be fed. Without this feeling, no arguments would have helped.

REASON FOR DELAY

There remains the question why Congress was so long in reaching a final decision. While the delay caused anxiety all around, fortunately it has not been tragic since Indian ports apparently have been operating at capacity during the past few months handling purchase grain from the United States of America and elsewhere and the loan grain will still be in time to meet shortages in the fall. But it was excruciating to watch a handful of obstructionists in the House thwart the obvious will of the American people.

Proponents of the bill were aware of the fact that the delays would be interpreted in India as unwillingness to help. Friends of India half regretted the fact that the President did not have the power to act with totalitarian speed. However, it is undoubtedly a greater compliment to both India and the United States of America that the matter was subjected to the fullest and frankest public debate, despite the atmosphere of high emotionalism, and that it met the acid test.

Consideration of India's request spanned a full 6 months. Mrs. Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit made the first representations on December 16 last year and, with the President's signature, the bill became law. India sent a formal note to the Secretary of State on February 8. President Truman sent his special message to Congress urging a grant of grain on February 12 and bills were introduced 3 days later. The House Foreign Affairs Committee held hearings from February 20 to 23 and on March 1 voted favorably on a bill providing for a grant of 2,000,000 tons. Then followed a long deadlock which was not broken until April 24 when the House Foreign Affairs Committee, after reconsidering its action, reported out a bill providing for a loan rather than a grant.

Meanwhile on April 20, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations reported out a bill which would make the grain available on a half-loan half-grant basis. By the end of May, both Chambers had adopted loan bills and there remained only the reconciliation of differences and the President's signature.

CUMBERSOME PROCESS

Of course it can be said that democracy is a cumbersome process, and so it is. However, it does not have to be as cumbersome as all that. The delay cannot be excused on that basis. It is also true that this Congress has been a particularly dilatory one. It is shot through with frustration and political maneuvering. The India food bill is one of the few important pieces of legislation it has passed though it has been in session for almost 6 months. This was a factor of some importance.

Having watched closely the tortuous course of the India food bill, I should give two main reasons for the delay. The first is the blind obstructionism of a small group of violently antiadministration bitter-end isolationists, both Democrat and Republican. The second is the controversy over a loan versus a grant. How these two factors operated may be seen by looking back at the timetable of action and inaction.

The first period ending in the President's message to Congress was devoted to canvassing public and congressional reaction to the request, determining how it should be met, preparing the case and briefing officials. This preliminary period proved to be time well spent because after the bills were introduced things moved quickly. The House Foreign Affairs Committee acted favorably in 2 weeks with only 4 out of 27 members opposed though opposition was expected to be stronger in the House than in the Senate. The bill had powerful bipartisan support and no effective opposition was in sight. At this point most observers felt, with good reason, that the rest was formality.

Then came the long period of almost 2 months during which the delaying factors flourished. As is done with all House bills, the India food bill was sent to the powerful House Rules Committee which controls the channeling of all legislation to the floor of the House. No bill can be considered unless granted a rule by the Rules Committee. But the membership of this committee which is only 12, includes some isolationists who oppose foreign aid. It also included a few men who preferred a loan over a grant. As a result, the House bill, which provided for a grant, simply languished in the Rules Committee.

Meantime, advocates of a loan gathered strength. Their principal argument was that India herself had not asked for a grant. They also argued, sincerely and with some cogency, that the granting of gifts was an unhealthy thing between nations. A loan, they maintained, implied a relationship of equals rather than one of giver and receiver. On the other hand, the administration, in deciding to ask Congress for a grant had argued with great cogency, that credits for foodstuffs were economically unsound because they provided no basis for the creation of income and that the piling up of such credits would weaken India's capacity to service the debts it must incur for its long-range development program which will create income. Administration supporters were loath to recede from this position.

There thus arose something like a war of attrition between defenders of a grant and advocates of a loan, a war in which the non-participating hungry of India were due to be the chief sufferers. The grant approach still seemed to command the support of most Congressmen. Sincere advocates of a loan without strings seemed to be a minority. They were abetted by a group that wanted a loan as a way of extracting war materials from India in payment. But their commanding position was due to the presence of two or three intransigents on the Rules Committee who were against both loan and grant and who were able to prevent the grant bill from reaching the floor of the House. Finally, rather than delay any further in a dispute over method, administration forces gave in. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, hoping for a compromise, reported its 50-50 bill. The House Foreign Affairs Committee, to placate the autocrats of the Rules Committee, reversed their bill from all-grant to all-loan. This switch provided oratorical ammunition for the obstructionists who, when the loan bill was finally debated, taunted those who were supporting a loan as second best with their own arguments against a loan. However, after the grant and loan advocates joined forces behind a loan no real trouble was encountered except for the flurry of demagoguery about monasite sands.

UNHELPFUL STATEMENTS

I believe that the original bill which provided for grains to India on a grant basis would have been passed had it not been for the House Rules Committee.

This delay gave those who advocated food aid to India on a loan basis an opportunity to gather strength. It also gave the isolationists time to fish for whatever opposition they could arouse by belaboring Mr. Nehru. In spite of this delay, the grant of a 50-50 bill might have passed if it could have been out of the the Rules Committee and if Mr. Nehru had not expressed a preference for a loan. Even after Mr. Nehru's expressed preference for a loan, 32 votes, about one-third, were cast in the Senate against changing the half-loan half-grant provision to all loan.

Mr. Nehru's announcement of his preference for a loan on May 10 was a perplexing development. The grant bill would not only have relieved the current shortage, but also through the use of counterpart funds for basic agricultural improvement, would have

made a substantial contribution to India's program for self-sufficiency in food. For this reason, for the economic reasons advanced by the State Department and for the quite simple reason that the United States of America could afford it, friends of India warmly supported the grant. However, no one here would dispute Mr. Nehru's preference. What was puzzling was the fact that he waited until May 10 to express it. The alternatives must have been known to New Delhi long before then, indeed from the beginning. Had Mr. Nehru expressed his preference earlier, the grant-loan dispute would have been resolved forthwith and the bill would no doubt have passed earlier. Also the administration and the friends of India who were stoically holding the line for a grant would have been saved much unnecessary effort.

Half a dozen times while the bill was under consideration, Indian spokesmen made remarks that complicated the task of its supporters. These remarks were of the kind that added nothing to the clarification of India's position in world affairs, but did give this position special anti-American overtones. It was felt here that they could have been left unsaid without compromising in the least India's integrity.

However, while these remarks encouraged the isolationists in their thesis that India was a Soviet satellite they had no real effect on the situation. Some Congressmen said that, while they disagreed with Mr. Nehru, they admired him for standing by his beliefs. For others, India's repeated warnings to Americans that she is an independent nation are becoming somewhat tiresome, especially in view of the settled conviction here that nobody has any designs on India's sovereignty except the Soviet imperialists.

More worrisome were some of the statements dealing specifically with the food crisis. Until he cleared it up Mr. Nehru's mention of conditions that would barter away India's self-respect was a cause of concern. Mr. Nehru's radio address of May 1 caused the most trouble. It was read in full during the House debate and referred to repeatedly to support the claim that India's food crisis was not as serious as the bill's supporters had made out.

The most startling development, however, was the report from London on June 4 which attributed to Mr. Krishna Menon the happy news that "India will be able to solve her critical food problem whether or not the United States of America sends aid." It was recognized here that Mr. Nehru, in a speech directed to Indians, might have good reason for quieting fears about the food crisis. But Congressmen who know little about internal Indian politics could not understand why Mr. Menon, in London, should take the trouble to announce that the crisis was over. This report came while the bill was in conference committee. It was mentioned when the bill was up for final passage, but luckily by this time the opposition had lost its spirit. Had the report come a week earlier, its effect might have been serious. It would have been extremely embarrassing to have had to examine the political sentiments cherished by India's High Commissioner to the United Kingdom, which made him so anxious to prevent the United States of America from getting any credit for helping India.

UNITED STATES ATTITUDE

The full record of the congressional debates on the food bill, particularly in the House of Representatives, amounts to a handbook of American attitudes toward India. It reveals the broadest possible range, from Gandhi worship to the belief that Indians are a special breed of Communists who believe that the emancipation of cows and monkeys are more important than the welfare of human beings.

Mr. Nehru and his position on the Korean crisis were constantly attacked. Some sound explanations of Mr. Nehru's position were made, but not a single Congressman tried to defend it. Almost every Congressman who spoke for the bill specified that he supported it despite Mr. Nehru. However, this particular attitude by no means implies a settled hostility to India and the Indian people as a whole. The most important generalization that can be made on the basis of these debates is that the United States Congress earnestly, almost pathetically, wants to sustain friendly relations with India.

Of course, "friendly relations" is a phrase that can be utterly meaningless or it can be a euphemism meaning that Mr. B. N. Rau must always vote with Mr. Warren Austin in the U. N. I am sure Americans would not object to such a development after they recovered from the initial shock. But I also suspect they would be a little disappointed in India. What the basis of friendly relations would be was probably best expressed by Representative WALTER H. JUMP, a Republican, whose views on foreign affairs are widely respected. Dr. JUMP was decrying the notion that the United States of America could "buy friendship" through its aid to other countries. He said he was sure India would appreciate whatever the United States of America could do. But that he felt, was not too important. "The real return and recompense to the United States of America is not that the Indians come to us and say 'Thank you, thank you.' The real return to us is that they stay independent. Our American objective is not to secure a quid pro quo in the sense of making India in the least subservient to our country. We are not trying to make satellites as the Kremlin does."

Some of what was said during the House debates will surprise and amuse Indians. Some opponents of the bill roundly denounced the administration for appeasing Mao and declared that Mr. Truman was now trying to appease Mr. Nehru. General MacArthur's speech before Congress, which included an excellent exposition of the rise of an Asian nationalism, was quoted by several Congressmen in support of the bill. The message to Congress from a group of Indian Parliament members was mentioned in support.

MR. COX'S OPPOSITION

The most active participant in the debate was Representative E. E. Cox, of Georgia, an anti-Acheson southern Democrat, of the Rules Committee, who probably bore the major share of responsibility for delaying passage of the bill. Mr. Cox was on his feet constantly, peppering other speakers with questions. Someone had persuaded him that Mr. Nehru was a Communist, and during the first day of the debate Mr. Cox challenged almost every speaker to deny this.

LOAN REPAYMENT

One of the recurring points made throughout the debate was that, on the basis of America's past experience with loans, there was small ground for hope that the loan to India would be repaid. This argument was used mainly by Congressmen who were also opposed to a gift. Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN of New York, former director-general of UNRRA, made a stirring reply to these fears. He recalled that India had contributed \$30,000,000 to UNRRA though no UNRRA relief was ever sent to India despite her great need. "I conclude by again saying that I know of no people who have a higher regard for their commitments, who are more honorable, who are more sincere, who have a deeper sense of pride and of conscience, than the people of India," Senator LEHMAN said.

Another theme that was repeated throughout the debates was India's need for self-sufficiency in food. It was often mentioned

in a context that implied congressional willingness to give substantial help to a program designed to achieve this end. In the report of the House conferees on the final version of the bill, the following statement appears: "The committee of conference was aware of the needs of India for a program in the field of agriculture that would prevent a recurrence of famines. It also considered India's development programs. Further consideration of India's long- and short-term programs will be studied later this year under the technical assistance program. Similarly a well-balanced mutual aid program for this region will be the subject of intensive congressional interest."

Certainly there is no commitment here, but it establishes Congress' continuing concern with the problem. During the past 6 months of public discussion of the food bill, many Americans have learned a great deal about India's food problems, including the knowledge that the long-term food problem should and can be solved. Now may be the time to get American help to achieve that one basic objective.

Control of Our Rivers a Complex United States Problem—Two Agencies Are Already at Work on It, but the Progress Is Slow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under authority to extend my remarks in the Appendix to the RECORD, I am including an article by Mr. Luther Huston, published in the New York Times, of Sunday, July 29, 1951, as follows:

CONTROL OF OUR RIVERS A COMPLEX UNITED STATES PROBLEM—TWO AGENCIES ARE ALREADY AT WORK ON IT, BUT THE PROGRESS IS SLOW

(By Luther Huston)

WASHINGTON, July 28.—When rampaging rivers pour over cities, towns, and farm lands, Congress is inundated promptly by new demands for comprehensive programs and fat appropriations to prevent destructive floods.

The high waters that swept through the Missouri River Basin are ebbing as this week ends, but pressures for a stepped-up flood-control program are mounting in Washington.

The problem of flood control is a complex one, linked with many other phases of the national economy. It is controversial because it touches so intimately the interests of so many regions and so many people.

A COMPLICATED PROBLEM

In all programs of river development there are four basic elements that must be woven into an integrated project. They are navigation, flood control, irrigation, and hydroelectric power. Corollary elements that enter almost every program include such things as atomic-energy installations, stream pollution, drainage, recreation, conservation of water for municipal and industrial uses, preservation of fish and wildlife, reforestation and conservation of timber resources, protection and preservation of industrial

sites and food producing resources and many others.

Flood control and navigation are the responsibility of the Army Corps of Engineers. The river and harbor improvement program dates to 1824 and since then it has been carried on by the Army engineers. In 1936 Congress added flood control to the activities for which the Federal Government assumed responsibility and gave charge of it to the corps.

The Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation is entrusted with the development and execution of irrigation and hydroelectric programs.

The opportunities for friction and jealousies, for overlapping of projects and for waste in planning and construction where two powerful agencies operate in fields that must be integrated to be effective, are obvious. There is no doubt that such conditions have existed, and situations that appeared to the layman to be unsound, if not ridiculous, have developed. Officials of the engineers and the Reclamation Bureau maintain, however, that considering the scope of the operations the agencies must share, friction and waste are at a minimum.

Congress has authorized about 1,000 flood-control programs and has appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the Army engineers, something like \$2,500,000,000. According to the latest statistics, 275 projects have been completed, some 225 are under construction, and more than 500 of those authorized have not been started.

The Engineer Corps estimates that existing projects are preventing annual damage averaging \$343,000,000 against an average annual loss of \$466,000,000 that still is occurring.

The Reclamation Bureau has completed vast projects in the West and is engaged in building and planning others. These are intended primarily for power and irrigation but virtually all also provide for flood control. The cost of the flood-control installations comes out of the Army engineers' appropriations.

TVA, NO MORE

Congress has set the programs under which the engineers and the Reclamation Bureau carry on their work. It has steadfastly refused, however, to sanction the expanded program of "valley authorities" that is a cherished policy of the Truman administration. Years ago Congress authorized the Tennessee Valley Authority, which has now virtually completed and is operating the most broad-scale project for integrated development of an entire river basin attempted in this country.

President Truman would apply the TVA formula to the Missouri River Valley, the Columbia River Valley and other great river basins, but Congress has refused to go along with him.

The Missouri Valley, scene of the latest flood disasters, turned from the President's valley-authority scheme to the Missouri River Basin Project, known as the Pick-Sloan plan, and developments now under way and contemplated in that area conform to that plan.

THE PICK-SLOAN PLAN

The Pick-Sloan plan consists of a series of proposed engineering works in the ten States of the Missouri Basin designed to curb the destructiveness of the river and develop its productive capacities. The Army and Reclamation Bureau are carrying on the work in cooperation with the Departments of Agriculture and Commerce, the Federal Power Commission and the governments of the ten basin States. These activities are correlated through the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee.

The opposition to the valley-authority program uses various arguments, not the

least of which is that such a system gives the Federal Government vast powers that should belong to states and communities. Valley authorities are administered by Federal appointees and some opponents contend that this constitutes a distasteful relinquishment of State sovereignty.

There is no opposition to flood control and river developments as such and it is generally recognized that such works are properly the function of the Federal Government. Broad-scale flood control would not be possible by any private means and even State governments would find their resources inadequate to carry out the works that would be required. Anyway, Congress has laid down the policy that flood control and related activities pertaining to the Nation's rivers are the function of the Federal Government.

Admittedly some of the projects smack of the grandiose, but in all cases the Reclamation Bureau counters with claims that the benefits far outweigh the costs and points out that all its projects are self-liquidating. The Army will not recommend a project unless its costs can be liquidated in 50 years.

Despite what has been done, Federal officials say the work hardly has started and that new projects and proposals will be forthcoming for years, if not for generations.

The pace of the program will depend upon how generously Congress appropriates funds for the agencies involved.

State Department Propaganda and Publicity Program Shock American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an article by Fulton Lewis, Jr., which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald. It points out just what has been going on in the State Department in this matter of publicity and propaganda. When the State Department appropriation bill was before the House last week, I offered an amendment which would have cut the amount allowed for publicity purposes 25 percent. It was a small enough cut, and on a tie vote my amendment was rejected. It is quite likely that the Senate committee considering that appropriation bill will insert the sense of my amendment for the funds used for publicity purposes should be drastically curtailed.

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

It may come as a surprise to you, but as taxpayers you have been investing millions of dollars in an organization that breaks laws, violates all the basic principles of good business operation and is bossed by individuals with no previous experience in handling large numbers of people or huge sums of money.

Edward W. Barrett, assistant secretary of state, and his aide, C. M. Hulten, appeared before the House appropriations committee recently and presented a picture of ineptness, mismanagement and disregard of con-

gressional instructions. They run the Voice of America, successor to Elmer Davis' wartime information.

Barrett and Hulten are angling for something like \$115,000,000 so they can convince the rest of the world that the United States is kindly toward it.

In private business both would be cashed in six months if they wasted stockholders' money the way they toss our tax dollars around.

For instance, despite explicit orders from Congress, they hired 116 additional employees for the management branch of the Voice at a time when an efficiency report labeled the office overstaffed. They wasted \$70,000.

In August the Voice started production on a film, a two-reeler called "U. N. Aids the Republic of Korea." Seven months later the film was still incomplete, despite the expenditure of thousands of dollars and the use of hundreds of people who apparently just shuffled the film from department to department. By the time the so-called propaganda "experts," Barrett and Hulten got through with the war in Korea and moved so fast the two-reeler was obsolete.

The Voice is supposed to "sell" the United States to Russian and iron-curtain country citizens. There is no positive evidence that the Voice ever actually reaches any of these individuals, although there are schemes afoot to put radio propaganda transmitters aboard merchant ships and on remote mountain peaks. The main trouble seems to be that the Russian peasants not only lack radios, but also lack electricity to run them if they were made available.

Actually, broadcasts to iron-curtain citizens are secondary to the Voice. Most of the talking has been to Americans. This baffled House Members, and they quizzed Barrett and Hulten in detail.

They found out that from July 1, 1949, to January 30, 1951, a total of 364 speeches were made in 29 States, including Washington, D. C., by Voice people.

This led Representative JOHN J. ROONEY, New York Democrat, to remark to Barrett: "So far as your problem is concerned, I had no idea that you were in the speech-making business to Americans at a time when there should be a lot of speeches and broadcasting directed to those outside the country and behind the iron curtain."

In all, 114 people took part in propagandizing the United States about the Voice, some speaking more than once. Of course, those on the Federal payroll got paid for their gabbling and most, although Barrett was vague about it, got travel pay while touring the United States to convince citizens that peace is impossible unless we fill the foreign airwaves with gabble.

Besides diverting funds to pay unauthorized help, the Voice managers diverted cash for building projects. Such activities are violations of authorized Government procedures, to say nothing of being contrary to sensible business practices.

Both Barrett and Hulten are full of imaginative plans for the Voice. Yet neither one, according to their own admissions, has any idea what is going on in their agency. They set up regulations and issue orders calling for progress reports on multimillion-dollar construction projects, but field managers simply ignore them. This failed to trouble either Barrett or Hulten.

On the basis of their own testimony, a conservative estimate is that in private business practice Barrett and Hulten would shove a normal corporation into bankruptcy in 6 months. If we really want to fix the Russians, we ought to lend Barrett and Hulten to them. In 6 months the Kremlin propaganda machine would be off the air, and we'd all enjoy the silence.

MacArthur Firing Has Killed Japan's Belief in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arnold Burnett, managing editor of the Peoria Journal, appearing in the Journal on Wednesday, July 18, 1951, entitled "MacArthur Firing Has Killed Japan's Belief in America":

MACARTHUR FIRING HAS KILLED JAPAN'S
BELIEF IN AMERICA
(By Arnold Burnett)

TOKYO—The Japanese have different standards, different reactions, from those we occidentals have. They judge things differently.

Douglas MacArthur came very close to being a god to the Japanese. Certainly from their viewpoint he was a man of god-like character and actions.

Because of their tremendous admiration—near-worship—of General MacArthur, American prestige in Japan took a crushing blow when he was summarily removed from his job as supreme commander here by President Truman.

This may seem an out-of-date story, about an event that happened so many months ago that it has nearly faded from people's minds, and certainly has faded from the news picture.

CRUSHING MEMORY

But it has not faded from the minds of the Japanese. It is still the No. 1 topic of conversation here in Japan. It is the absolute evidence, to them, of the tremendous gulf between the West and the East, and of the different standards and ways of life. It is proof of the old Kipling quotation: "East is East, and West is West; and never the twain shall meet."

Americans who lived in Japan before the war, and who returned as soon as the war ended, tell of the tremendous impression the MacArthur discharge had upon the Japanese. And Japanese to whom I have talked ask me how such an unbelievable thing could happen.

Japan—particularly Tokyo—was badly smashed after the war. American pin-point bombing had kept intact the buildings we planned to take over for the occupation, and such places as the Imperial Palace. But the rest of the city was rubble.

IN THE RUINS

There were no street lights. No water. No homes. The Japanese people were starving. They were living in ruins. Disease was rampant. This was a badly beaten nation.

Douglas MacArthur sat in the Dai Ichi Building, aloof, austere. He seldom smiled; he never stopped. He strode grimly along the sidewalk from his car to his office; to his home. He worked day and night. He saw no one except those who could help Japan rebuild itself.

Gradually life returned to the city, and to the nation. The Japanese themselves, under the MacArthur plan, built their new homes; their stores. They produced goods, started factories, tilled the soil. Street lights returned. Streetcars and busses moved along the streets. Automobiles made an appear-

ance. Slowly Japan overcame her terrible problems, and today Tokyo is a modern metropolis, busy, bustling, prosperous.

OF THEMSELVES

The Japanese ran the country. There were military police, of course, but the Japanese police controlled the Japanese people. The Japanese Diet made the laws that governed the Japanese people. The Japanese businesses and factories were owned and operated by Japanese people, with Japanese capital.

And the man under whose wise guidance all this came about, still sat in the Dai Ichi building, as if in an impenetrable fortress; unreachable. The Japanese crowded around the Dai Ichi each day hoping to see him as he strode rapidly from his car to his office, without glancing to right or left.

It wasn't long before the stern, aloof supreme commander took on the aspects of a stern, aloof god in the minds of the Japanese. The kind of god they understand; a god of wisdom and might; a god who helps humans, and punishes humans, but is above human emotions himself.

WALL OF SORROW

I am told that when the Japanese heard that General MacArthur was discharged they were stunned. They gathered around Dai Ichi in a solid wall, and they were very quiet when he left the building and drove away.

In the pre-dawn darkness of the day MacArthur left Japan, there were several million Japanese lining the miles from his home to Haneda airport. There were thousands on the field itself. And when the MacArthurs drove along the streets to the airport, there were tears streaming from the eyes of the people; tears from men as well as women; sobs of sorrow from youngsters.

And when MacArthur turned at the plane door and waved a last goodbye, the Japanese people cried aloud in the grief and fear.

NEVER THE TWAIN

And never again will there be a perfect understanding between the West and East. Never again will the Japanese people let themselves have great faith in a man from the Western World. Never again will they set up a western god, for never again do they want to see a god cast down.

We westerners cannot possibly understand how deeply we have been damaged with the Japanese by the summary dismissal of MacArthur—the unbelievable firing of him like the firing of an insolent clerk—but we can be sure of one thing:

The Japanese are never going to wholly trust us again.

General MacArthur's Boston Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the editorial comment by the Christian Science Monitor on the recent address delivered before the Massachusetts Legislature by General of the Army Douglas MacArthur:

AN AMERICAN SYMBOL

New Englanders have had their opportunity to pay tribute to General MacArthur, and

they understand better than ever why he constitutes a stimulating even revivifying, symbol to great numbers of Americans.

The dignity of his appearance before the Massachusetts Legislature, the restraint of his voice yet the deep earnestness of his utterance—these, combined with his appeals to integrity, individualism, and self-reliance, all struck notes which find a particular echo in New England and have also evoked response from the country at large.

It is as if millions of Americans have missed from public life a quality they instinctively seek in public figures. Here it is epitomized in a man who has worn with singular distinction and achievement the uniform of his country for more than half a century, who exalts the concept of devotion to duty as he sees it, and who extols virtues long associated with American military tradition.

Mayor Hynes could well congratulate the general on "the strong moral and spiritual tone" of his speech. Undoubtedly General MacArthur would agree that citizens individually must form their own judgments as to the wisest, most effective application of their country's resources to the Christian and patriotic purposes he described.

Leaving strictly military themes, his address was a broad exposition of his own political philosophy, a viewpoint which has for some time awaited so eloquent a spokesman. However, they may analyze the content of the address, those who have seen and heard General MacArthur during his visit to Boston sense the feeling of having entertained a great American.

Abelman Hails DA's Crusade To Curb Paid Charity Solicitors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article from the Brooklyn Eagle of July 15, 1951, entitled "Abelman Hails DA's Crusade To Curb Paid Charity Solicitors":

ABELMAN HAILS DA'S CRUSADE TO CURB PAID CHARITY SOLICITORS

District Attorney Miles F. McDonald's recent recommendation that the city investigate the activities of paid charity solicitors was applauded yesterday by Max Abelman, one-time head of the Brooklyn Federation of Jewish Charities.

Abelman pointed to a magazine article, written by him 25 years ago, in which he urged creation of Board of Charity Control.

In the American Hebrew, dated July 30, 1926, Abelman condemned "the evil of new and unnecessary charitable societies," and urged formation of a board, "the duty of which would be to approve the charity and inform the State board of charities and public whether or not the organization is worthy."

"The sooner legislation is adopted to create such a body, the sooner the public will be safeguarded from unscrupulous solicitations," he wrote.

"We cannot be criticized for having too much charity, but we can be and are criticized for having too many self-duplicating charitable organizations."

"Today, even more than in 1926," Abelman, director of public relations at Jewish Hospital, said yesterday, "there is a crying need for a central body."

"McDonald should be firmly upheld in his attempt to combat the nuisance of unnecessary and fraudulent solicitation. The public is to blame in great measure for its failure to donate intelligently. Nation-wide legislation should be passed to meet a situation that is by no means confined to New York City."

Jane Lawrence Makes Bow at Salzburg Fete

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to call to the attention of the House of Representatives a news story by Howard Taubman in the New York Times of Sunday, July 29, 1951.

In his story, Mr. Taubman brings out the fact that Miss Jane Lawrence, of Bozeman, Mont., made her operatic debut on the opening night of Salzburg's annual and world-famous festival. It is with a sense of personal pleasure that I note that this great event in the life of Miss Lawrence has taken place. It is my hope that from the springboard of the Salzburg festival, Miss Lawrence will continue up the ladder of fame and success and that eventually her abilities will be made use of by the Metropolitan Opera Co. We of Montana are extremely proud of the great success which Miss Lawrence has achieved.

The above-mentioned follows:

AMERICAN IN BOW AT SALZBURG FETE—JANE LAWRENCE, OF BOZEMAN, MONT., MAKES OPERA DEBUT AT FAMOUS MUSIC FESTIVAL

(By Howard Taubman)

SALZBURG, AUSTRIA, July 28—A girl from Bozeman, Mont., made her operatic debut last night in no less glamorous a forum than the opening night of Salzburg's annual and world-famous festival. She was Jane Lawrence, whose previous experience has been in the American musical theater, including Broadway appearances in Oklahoma, Inside U. S. A., and Where's Charley?

Miss Lawrence got the chance to sing at Salzburg when an American friend introduced her to Georg Solti, conductor of Mozart's Idomeneo, which was chosen to open this year's festival here.

Mr. Solti listened to the young woman and took her on despite her inexperience in opera. He was rewarded tonight by promising singing, which, once Miss Lawrence learns poise and repose in this new field, should develop into the work of an artist.

Miss Lawrence had in her favor her stage know-how. She is attractive and knows how to move on the stage. Her good looks would decorate any stage. Her voice has good natural quality. Her trouble tonight was that she was forcing because of tension, and in the difficult arias Mozart allotted to Electra, her role, she tended to be a bit short of breath in crucial moments. If this using up of her resources ahead of time can be corrected, she will amply justify Mr. Solti's and Salzburg's faith in her.

The opening, which took place in the riding school, where Max Reinhardt used to put on his sweeping productions of Goethe's Faust in prewar festivals, assumed gala proportions of the days of a decade and a half ago when Salzburg was the dominant festival

in the world. In spite of topcoat weather, many women in the audience wore summer finery. There were diplomatic and military figures of importance, including many Americans, in the international audience.

It took this city, Mozart's birthplace, a long time to get around to Idomeneo. In fact, it has taken a long time for this opera to get any attention, but this season it also ushered in the Glyndebourne Mozart Festival.

Salzburg's production was on a tremendous scale. Using three levels and the vast breadth of the riding school stage, it employed a huge chorus, ballet, and many extras, and it spread over tremendous areas. No human eye could follow all that was happening on the stage at times, and there were moments when one felt that Josef Gielen, stage director, had been too lavish for the good of the production.

However, Idomeneo needs a lot of help to hold interest on the stage, even though it contains music of singular breadth and nobility. If Salzburg's production erred on the side of being too pretentious, at least it never gave the eye much rest. Musically the performance was first rate. In the role of Itha, there was Hilde Gueden, a soprano, who sings with purity, security, and elegant style. It is said that she has been engaged for next season at the Metropolitan Opera and she should make a big impression on America, for she adds a handsome appearance to her vocal gifts.

The title role was taken by Rudolph Schock, a tenor, who sings with the understanding and feeling of a musician. Richard Foltz, as Idamantes, was the conventional operatic tenor. Kurt Boehme, reported to be a new basso of importance, seemed to be troubled by a cold.

Mr. Solti, an immensely talented young conductor from Hungary, distinguished himself in the pit and it was a joy to hear the Vienna Philharmonic once again.

Caspar Neher designed an impressive set, but his costumes seemed to get out of hand and for ballet in this subject of ancient Greece he provided in one scene silver wigs and long white gloves, making it appear as if the court of Louis XIV had somehow wandered into antique Crete.

Mississippi River Has Many Mysteries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit an article from the Scientific American which was published in the New Orleans Item on July 26, 1951, as follows:

RIVER HAS MANY MYSTERIES

Ol' Man River, the Mississippi, is renowned as our biggest and best-known river. Actually it is our most misunderstood river.

No stream in the United States has been the subject of so many persistent misconceptions. Schoolbooks and encyclopedias alike contain a strange mixture of conflicting information about the Mississippi.

It is said to be very muddy. The great load of sediments it carries is supposed to be building up its bed and banks and so require the raising of levees to ever-greater heights.

There is a firmly rooted belief that the Mississippi is steadily building its delta mouths farther and farther out into the

Gulf. Not one of these beliefs, however, is correct.

The colossal proportions of the Mississippi—its 1,244,000 square miles of watershed, equal to 41 percent of the whole United States area; its enormous floods which discharge as much as 2,000,000 cubic feet of water per second and make the river a mile wide and up to 200 feet deep—have ever furnished food for the imagination and for theorizing.

The prime mystery has always been that the Mississippi, an alluvial (soil-washing) river, does not behave at all like other alluvial streams, such as the Yellow River, the Nile, the Euphrates. The sediments carried by those rivers have built their beds and valley lands to ever-higher elevations.

RIVER TOTES A LOAD

Now the Mississippi carries a huge load of sediments. Each year it transports 400,000,000 tons of silt and gravel downstream, about 90 percent of it in the form of fine particles suspended in the water, the rest heavier material that is rolled along the bottom.

Yet, despite that immense wash of soil, the Mississippi has shown no appreciable build-up of its bed or valley lands for thousands of years. Why?

Part of the answer is that the Mississippi's volume of water is so huge that its sediment load is actually relatively light—about one-tenth the amount in the Missouri and the lower Colorado (before the building of the Hoover Dam).

The Yellow River in China carries a vastly heavier load, the weight of the solids suspended in it often exceeds the weight of the water itself.

Thus the Mississippi is a comparatively clear stream. In late September 1936 during a low stage, it flowed water as blue as that of the Danube (which also is blue only during low-water periods).

SOFT, CLEAR WATER

The normal turbidity of the Mississippi is due not to mud, but to minute fragments of mineral matter, mostly sparkling silica grains. A glass of water dipped from the river clears itself quickly. The water is soft and pleasant to drink.

It is popularly supposed that the mouths of the Mississippi are continuously building a delta as other great alluvial rivers do. But the Mississippi is not building out its delta at all. Jetties constructed at its mouths in 1875 have not had to be extended, and the Gulf of Mexico has not become more shallow.

What, then, has become of the billions of tons of sand and silt the river has dumped into the Gulf?

Borings in the Gulf revealed that the earth's crust there has sunk under the weight of the accumulated sediment. The subsidence of the crust began 30,000 to 40,000 years ago when the last glacier started its retreat.

The rivers then flowing into the Gulf unloaded enormous quantities of coarse gravel. Under the weight of this gravel the earth crust in the Gulf has been pressed down and its subsidence accompanied by an uplifting of adjacent coastal lands in the State of Mississippi.

Anyone seeing the Mississippi soon after a flood has subsided cannot fail to notice the new layer of sand that the overflowing river has deposited on the tops of its banks.

The net effect of the deposits has been to create a ridge 12 to 15 feet high along the river on each bank. These natural levees help to account for the fact that the Mississippi's valley lands have experienced no appreciable build-up through the long course of time.

IT IS DEEP, NOT SHALLOW

The presence of the natural levees has misled many people to believe that the river flows on a ridge built up from its own deposits. Actually the Mississippi is a very

deep river. In many places its bottom is below sea level, even as far upstream as 470 miles, where the land is 100 feet above sea level.

Throughout the entire 850 miles between Cairo and Baton Rouge the river's low-water level is all of 30 feet below the adjacent land surface. Consequently, the river must rise at least 30 feet before its water level equals the elevation of the land, not taking into account the additional height of the natural levee.

The fact that flood levels in the Mississippi have risen with time is due solely to the high levees that man has built to keep the river confined during flood. In the course of a century the high-water mark mounted 6 feet at New Orleans, 13 feet at Memphis.

Since 1932 the flood stages have been lowered by artificial cut-offs that have eliminated some of the worst bends and shortened the river about 170 miles. This operation has reduced flood stages three feet at Natchez, 10 feet at Vicksburg, 15 feet at Arkansas City.

Common conception pictures the crest of a great flood as rushing with raging speed down the river. It is true that during a great flood the surface water attains a velocity of nine to 13 feet per second—from three to five times the speed of normal currents. But the crest of the flood as a whole actually moves only half as fast as a small rise in water level during the low-water season.

The explanation is that during the rising stages of a major flood a large volume of water is continually being subtracted from the advance floodwave to fill that part of the channel ahead of it where the water surface still is low.

That's just another way of saying that the Mississippi is a ponderous giant of a river—almost as full of paradoxes as it is of water.

Admiral Behrens, A-Bomb Medical Expert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Brooklyn Eagle recently published a most interesting article on Rear Adm. Charles F. Behrens, who is a resident of my district. Admiral Behrens is a radiological expert. Before assuming his present post with the Eastern Sea Frontier, he was director of the Atomic Defense Division of the Navy's Bureau of Medicine and Surgery. He has also edited and contributed to two books on atomic medicine, a field which is of great significance at this time. I commend to the attention of my colleagues this highly interesting article, which reads:

BROOKLYN'S MAN OF THE WEEK—ADMIRAL BEHRENS AN EXPERT ON A-BOMB MEDICAL EFFECTS

(By Leslie Hanscom)

Rear Adm. Charles F. Behrens' quiet estimate of the recent atom bomb tests at Eniwetok contrasts rather pallidly with the frenzied rhetoric of the press reports on the big blast. To the gray-haired medical officer the bomb show was simply "quite impressive."

Observing the spectacle as the Navy's radiological expert, Admiral Behrens was less bowled over than the Congressman who felt himself "at the gates of Hell looking into eternity," thanks to the fact that he knew what was going on. He is as familiar with

the hectic behavior of electrons and neutrons as he is with the gripes of ailing sailors.

An incorrigible researcher, the admiral, who could fill the tweeds of a university professor with the same dignity he now gives to a two-starred naval uniform, learned in the laboratory long before the bomb was invented that atomic energy and radioactivity are exciting stuff to handle.

He still remembers the kick to his imagination delivered by a teacher in Philadelphia's Central High School back in 1910 or 1911 when the teacher suggested that the sun's light and heat might be a result of some kind of radioactivity. Later he was further intrigued by reading another authority's visionary conjecture that "in every breath we draw there is enough energy to run the workshops of the world."

EXPERT ON ATOMIC MEDICINE

Decades of study since then have taught the admiral not to sell the powers of radioactivity short. Today, however, as a recognized expert on atomic medicine, he has some soothing words for those who have taken too seriously the nightmare reports on the lingeringly lethal effects of an atomic explosion.

"The idea that every citizen should go around with a Geiger counter to check on radiation after a bomb burst is something to get away from," he says. "Since radiation was the new and strange element in the bomb's effect, much of the emphasis has been placed there. At times it has been highly overrated."

"The truth about radiation is that you should neither exaggerate it nor forget about it. The chances are that fatalities from radiation would probably add up to only about 15 percent of the total deaths if a bomb should fall on New York City. On the other hand, this would, of course, in a city of this size mean quite a large number of people."

NO PERIL TO RESCUE WORKERS

"The important thing to remember is that there would be virtually no radiological perils for rescue workers. In a fairly high level bomb burst, which is the kind most likely to occur, the really dangerous radioactive effects come at the time of explosion."

"After the burst takes place and the fire ball has formed, a swelling cloud carries the radioactivity some forty or fifty thousand feet upward. The only kind of explosion which can leave behind any important residual effects is the underwater burst such as the one with which the Navy experimented at Bikini. Needless to say, this type of explosion would be extremely difficult for an enemy to duplicate."

The admiral, who lives with his wife, Emma, at 420 Clinton Avenue, was sworn in to his present rank by Vice Adm. Oscar C. Badger, commander of the Eastern Sea Frontier, when he was assigned to duty with this command early in the month. It was a climax to 31 years of service with the Navy.

Admiral Behrens joined the service in 1920 as a medical officer. A fourth-year specialist in radiology at the Medical School of the University of Pennsylvania, the admiral carried his specialty into the service with him. Radiologist in those days, however, meant X-ray man. And, even at that, the young officer discovered that the Navy's demands upon its doctors converted any specialty to a virtual sideline.

JOINED IN MEDICAL RESEARCH

Serving aboard the U. S. S. *Henderson* and the U. S. S. *Relief* and doctoring Uncle Sam's marines on foreign-shore duty in Haiti made life interesting but left little time for the research toward which his scholarly instincts inclined him. Scientific investigation was placed on "a pretty desultory and personal basis."

"Like Westinghouse and du Pont, however," the admiral says, "the Navy has learned that research pays off." From dealing out aspirin to ailing leathernecks the medical officer progressed to the command of the Naval Medical Research Institute. Before he reported here to take up his duties in an office at 90 Church Street he was director of the Atomic Defense Division of the Navy's Bureau of Medicine and Surgery.

He points out that in his particular field of radiology the Army and Navy did much of the pioneer spade-work. As confirmation he displays a book dating from near the turn of the century which treats of the United States Army's use of the X-ray during the Spanish-American War.

TWO BOOKS BY THE ADMIRAL

Two books of the admiral's own for which he has acted as both editor and contributor are *Atomic Medicine and After the A-Bomb*. The works deal, as the titles indicate, with the care of victims injured by radioactive rays and also with the treatment of casualties whose ordinary injuries are complicated by radiation.

His present duty with the Eastern Sea Frontier is the admiral's fourth assignment to the New York area. In 1938 and 1939 he served at the Brooklyn Navy Yard hospital and from 1945 to 1947 he was executive officer at St. Albans Naval Hospital.

Tidelands Oil Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, last Friday when I called up the rule for the consideration of the so-called "tidelands oil bill," which is a misnomer, I expressed my views upon the bill, calling attention to the fact that it was against the best interest of our national defense and the future of our Nation, and that on three different occasions the Supreme Court has ruled against the claims of individual States as to their rights to these under-the-ocean resources, namely in the cases involving the States of Louisiana, California, and Texas.

I also called attention in my remarks to extracts from the very able presentation on this subject by our former colleague, the Honorable Sam Hobbs, of Alabama, in the Seventy-ninth and Eighty-first Congresses, who was probably more thoroughly posted on this subject than any Member of this House.

In view of the importance of this legislation and my earnest desire to bring home the grave importance of the entire matter, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a further statement just prepared by our former colleague, Mr. Hobbs, after extremely careful thought and study, and upon his personal request to have it brought to the attention of the membership. The statement follows:

THE FALSE LABEL: "TIDELANDS"

An old crooked lawyer, well versed in what he called "tricks of the trade," was asked by a neophyte what secret had enabled him

to win so many of his cases? The older replied:

"If you have a good case, you don't need a secret; but if you have no case, stay as far away from it as you can, make up a good lie and ride it hard."

We may laugh at the old crook, but is not a great deal of legislation put over by following his rule?

The Communists have certainly been most successful in using his technique by majoring and emphasizing the word "peace" as the bait in every booby trap they have set for the unwary among us.

And many competent legislators who would know better if they stopped to think, have been sucked in by the oft repeated falsehood that the fight that has been raging, at least since 1936, over subocean oil, involves "tidelands."

Tidelands are, of course, those lands laved by the tides as they ebb and flow. They are sometimes under water, sometimes not. The bed of the ocean begins where tidelands end. Mesne low-water mark has fixed the extreme outer edge of anything that could properly be called tidelands.

The Solicitor General of the United States testifying before the House Judiciary Committee on August 29, 1949, made this statement, fully approved by the Attorney General:

"The widespread dissemination of that false assumption has been facilitated by the use of the word 'tidelands.' That term is a verbal trap. Strictly speaking, tidelands constitute the area that is alternately covered and uncovered by the tides—the lands between the high-water mark and the low-water mark. The Supreme Court has often indicated that the individual States own the beds of their inland navigable waters as well as the tidelands. The United States has never challenged that finding. The decision of the Supreme Court in the California case does not cast any doubt upon it. The facts and the law have been misrepresented and grossly misrepresented.

The important thing to bear in mind is that the lands in controversy are not tidelands. They are the submerged coastal lands seaward of the tidelands. They begin at the low-water mark where the tidelands end, and there has never been any decision of the Supreme Court dealing with such submerged coastal lands that held that they belong to the adjacent State.

The States contended otherwise and cited numerous decisions in support of their position. But in the California case it was found, upon examination, that no one of them so held. That was one of the issues before the Supreme Court.

Six times the Supreme Court of our Nation has held that paramount rights in everything relating to national defense, maintenance of armies and navies, navigation, and the general external sovereignty as defined in the *Curtiss-Wright Case* (299 U. S. 304, 315, 317) are vested in the National Government, and that the rights of the constituent States are subject to those rights that the constituent States granted their National Government, both before and in the Constitution of the United States.

Those six cases are: (1) *Pollard's Lessee v. Hagan* (3 Howard 212, 230 (1845)); (2) *The Mariana Flora Case* (11 Wheat. 1, 41); (3) *United States v. California* (332 U. S. 18, 37 (1947)); (4) *Toomer v. Witsell* (334 U. S. 385, 402); (5) *U. S. v. Louisiana* (339 U. S. 699); (6) *U. S. v. Texas* (339 U. S. 707)

JUDGE COMBS' SPEECH

Yet, in spite of all this, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS] took the floor of the House on June 26, 1950, and made the speech of the year from the standpoint of Texas.

The subject under which his speech appears in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*, volume

96, part 7, page 9209, is the Tidelands decision of the Supreme Court in the Texas case.

He stuck to his subject. More than a dozen times he uses the word "tidelands" to indicate what he claimed to be talking about, and the cases from which he read deal with "tidelands," "beds of all tidewaters," or "soils under tidewaters."

He mentions "land" and "title" just as though he thought the bed of an ocean, sea or gulf was "land," and that there could be no recognized legal right in the absence of "title."

But one of his standing as lawyer and jurist must certainly know that the decision which was his subject, had nothing to do with tidelands, that in the Texas case there was no dispute as to tidelands, and that while no one has title to the air he breathes, nor a grant of the right to use any of it, yet so fixed and well recognized is that right that when one deprives another of that right the law calls it murder!

However, in that speech Judge COMBS has raised other embarrassing questions that clamor for his answer.

In that speech of June 26, 1950, why did Judge COMBS read to his colleagues of the House what he said was a brief excerpt from *Mumford v. Wardwell* in which a comma had been changed to a period, and the closing phrase of the sentence had been entirely left out? Of course, Judge COMBS didn't do it, or know it had been done. Who was his ghost writer?

Who made those vital changes? Why do they still appear in the final bound volume of the *RECORD* a year later, just as he read that alleged quotation to us on June 26, 1950?

Judge COMBS, in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*, volume 96, part 7, page 9210, is quoted as having said:

"I will read brief excerpts from three decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States to illustrate the uniform holding

"In one early case, *Mumford v. Wardwell* (6 Wall. 423, 436), handed down in 1867, it was held: 'The settled rule of law in this Court is that the shores of navigable waters and the soils under the same in the Original States were not granted by the Constitution to the United States, but were reserved to the several States, and that the new States since admitted have the same rights sovereignty, and jurisdiction in that behalf as the Original States possess within their respective borders. When the Revolution took place the people of each State became themselves sovereign, and in that character hold the absolute right to all their navigable waters and the soils under them.'"

That purports to be a verbatim quotation. But the period there shown is not in the decision, nor in the reports thereof, which quote it correctly; but in the speech of the gentleman from Texas, before the middle of the line had been reached, that awful period appears: Where the unanimous decision had a comma, followed by the phrase the Judges wrote to finish their sentence before they put a period at the end of the finished sentence, the Judges' comma and concluding phrase has been completely deleted, and that awful, tell-tale period substituted. And what was the concluding phrase that someone was so anxious to get rid of that misrepresentation was committed for the nefarious purpose? It was just this: "Subject only to the rights since surrendered by the Constitution."

So we see, the forgery converted the usual and undisputed statement of sound law into the kind of bunk needed to give color of support to an utterly unsound and untenable contention.

Who was the ghost writer?

Who misled Judge COMBS by concealing from him the misrepresentation?

Can he mislead you?

Look! No Brakes on Price Control**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of July 30, 1951:

LOOK! NO BRAKES ON PRICE CONTROL

The new 1951 model price-control bill is on display in Washington, D. C.

It neither shines nor gleams. For a new model, it is a shabby affair indeed. But it has passed the Senate, is scheduled to glide through the House of Representatives today. With the present control law expiring Tuesday midnight, President Truman is expected to sign the measure, since he is left no other real choice.

So, this price-control bill is it. As turned out by the Senate-House conference committee, it is a slightly better measure than either of the separate bills produced by the two branches of Congress, which the conference committee had to reconcile. Senator SPARKMAN says it can be lived with.

In our opinion, however, this bill will not even hold the line on prices, let alone roll any prices back. By its very terms it means higher prices on many things, and that can only mean more inflation.

As it stands, the new measure bans all roll-backs on beef (two more were planned); it kills the administration plan for livestock slaughter quotas; it relaxes credit restrictions on many items; it permits another increase in rents, to 20 percent over the figure of June 30, 1947, which means at least another 5-percent rise across the board. Worst of all, it provides a loophole for boosting nonfarm prices which Economic Stabilizer Eric Johnston calls a piece of built-in inflation.

Thus this 1951-model price control bill might be compared to a 1951-model automobile which was equipped with obsolete and faulty brakes.

A day of reckoning is coming. The consumers of America are going to render their verdict on this legislation.

First test will be coming up on Labor Day. That is the day when the Treasury opens up its new campaigns to sell defense bonds. That campaign will run for several months, and before it is over the effects of this new price-control legislation will be felt by the general public.

That will be the day of reckoning.

Today most defense bonds are being bought by the small savers, people with modest incomes. An estimated 85,000,000 Americans hold E-bonds. The Wall Street Journal reports that "Treasury officials say big money men are putting their money into things like real estate and stocks, which are supposed to go up in value as inflation gnaws away at the dollar."

A lot of the "little money men"—the consumers who will be hardest hit if this new price-control bill doesn't work—are going to raise a lot of questions.

The cartoon on this page today tells the story of the decline in the purchasing power of the dollar.

That decline is felt in the pocketbook of every housewife in America. It is measured by the fact that food which cost \$5 in 1939 today costs nearly \$12. It is measured in the hardship visited upon the many Americans with fixed incomes.

So, if the new price-control bill kicks prices still higher, leaves people with less income than ever, so that they buy fewer defense bonds than before—Congress will have to shoulder the blame.

As the American people have proved over and over, they will buy defense bonds, both for investment and for patriotism. They will buy plenty more—if this price-control bill doesn't wipe out their money for savings.

In drafting this bill, from start to finish, Congress remembered the special interests, and forgot the consumers. The consumers are not going to forget Congress.

**Termination of the State of War With
Germany****EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. SIDNEY A. FINE**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1951

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, the joint resolution before us today seeking to terminate the state of war between the United States and the Government of Germany does not disturb the supreme authority of the allied governments in Germany. We are assured that our action today in no way affects our status in Germany or any of the rights of the United States and its citizens. Our vote is thus limited to a termination of the legal state of war with Germany.

With my affirmative vote goes my prayer that this may be the end of an era of wanton destruction of human beings. Nazism, in my opinion, is just as great a menace to world peace and to our democratic institutions as communism. I abhor them both. In waging our campaign against communism we must not fail to stamp out once and for all every shred of both nazism and fascism wherever it rears its ugly head, whether it be in Germany or any other nation we are now befriending.

The atrocities of Buchenwald, Belsen, Dauchau, and other murder camps must always be a reminder of the danger still lurking unless the proper steps are taken to keep those really guilty from the control of the German Government. I am in full accord with High Commissioner McCloy's statement of the United States policy in this regard published last April:

It is the policy of the United States to support the development of a democratic Germany and to aid all democratic elements in Germany to safeguard against the revival of nazism or the imposition of communism. * * *

Equally sinister is the threat from other totalitarian groups composed in large part of former Nazi activists. In certain areas of Germany, small groups are again trying to spread the evil doctrines, the old slogans and tactics, which brought Germany to ruin and will do so again if they should ever prevail. The German people, through their democratic governments, must be aware of these developments and be prepared to deal effectively with them. The German people cannot ever again permit such forces to gain control in their country, nor will the democratic world permit it.

Mr. Speaker, but for the fact that Russia's expansion policies have become a major threat to our civilization we might have dealt differently with the German problem. However, with its full realization we must take the risk of reestablishing Germany, while at the same time maintaining the necessary safeguards against the resurgence of nazism. With this in mind, I am going to support the resolution.

Hon. Ed Gossett, of Texas**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow our colleague, the Honorable Ed Gossett, of the Thirteenth District of Texas, will depart from our midst, having resigned as a Member.

Mr. Gossett and I entered Congress on the same day, January 3, 1939, and our courses have run parallel almost since that date.

As a member of the Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary having to do with much of the legislation on immigration and naturalization, Mr. Gossett and I have sat side by side at the hearing tables and during those years I have come to value his worth not only to the people of his district but to the country at large.

Few men, in my judgment, have gained a wider knowledge of the immigration laws and problems attendant thereto, than has Mr. Gossett. On a number of occasions he has gone abroad and studied, at first hand, the conditions that there exist and at other times he has visited the ports of entry at almost all the large cities in the United States, and from all these visits and study he has been able to give to the committee the full fruition of his wisdom and experience.

Truthfully, he will be sorely missed and his place will be exceedingly hard to fill. He has frankly stated that he has been compelled to leave the Congress in order that he might acquire sufficient financial means to educate his family. In this we wish him every success.

In conclusion, may I say that as one of the opposite political faith, and coming from a widely separated area, I know of no man in my experience who has given a greater and a more unselfish and devoted service to his country than Ed Gossett. He is a genuine American, ever alert to uphold and sustain the principles of our Government and fearless and outspoken in the defense of America and its institutions.

In departing from public life, this Congress and this Nation have lost a valued, true, and experienced public servant. I am sure that the good wishes of every Member of the Congress goes with him as he enters upon his new duties.

NATO Needs a Supreme Political Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Anne O'Hare McCormick in the New York Times:

NATO NEEDS A SUPREME POLITICAL AUTHORITY
(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

The five-nation agreement on plans for a European army is rightly regarded as a political event of the highest importance. Militarily, the proposed international force is only framework; all the vital details have to be filled in. So many other decisions have to be made to turn this revolutionary concept into reality—on the sharply controversial question of the size of the basic units, for instance—that it looks at this point rather like "the airy fabric of a dream." As Hanson Baldwin observed in this newspaper yesterday, the attempt to organize such an army in the present period of emergency might interpose another echelon of command in the already complicated apparatus of NATO and thus delay and even obstruct the development of military strength in Western Europe.

The arguments in favor of the enterprise are predominantly political. The European army is the military counterpart of the Schuman plan, and the obstacles to be overcome in merging national contingents into a single permanent army under a European defense commissioner are even more staggering than the difficulties of pooling iron and steel under a supranational authority.

Nevertheless the French and the Germans have doggedly persevered in both efforts. That they have succeeded in reaching accord in principle on the military as well as the economic plan proves that they are moved less by a dream than by very practical compulsions. If the day's news were not so crowded with excursions and alarms, we should recognize the signs of Europe's obstinate push toward unity as the extraordinary phenomenon that it is.

PROGRESS DESPITE THE SNAGS

It is extraordinary because it keeps on in spite of snags at every turn. The facts of life and the nature of nations would seem to make either a Schuman plan or a European army impossible of achievement. A Franco-German partnership in the crucial fields covered by these projects appears especially fantastic. Perhaps it is impossible; no one can be sure that these bold schemes will ever be worked out. Yet to the French, judging by the current political crisis, getting the Germans into a European system is apparently more important than getting their own party leaders to form a national government. And West Germany, at least under the present leadership, is driven by the same forces to go along with the French.

The United States, not long ago pressing for a German army, has switched to the French idea of a European army in which German troops are incorporated. This is one reason why the Germans switched in turn from indifference to interest and participation in the French plan. But it does not wholly account for General Eisenhower's approval of the project. He must be more aware than anybody else of the complications likely to arise if another organization

were formed within the wider frame of NATO. As outlined, the European army would be part of NATO and under his over-all command; but it is clear, as Mr. Baldwin suggested, that organizing a defense force on a new basis at this time might further slow up the pace of rearmament, already dangerously retarded by a confusion of councils and squabbles over the allocation of authority.

However, it is just because General Eisenhower has learned by experience the difficulties on the other side that he came out so strongly for European unification in his Fourth of July speech in London. Dealing separately with 12 different nations is harassing enough to lend attractiveness to the idea of negotiating with one authority even for five nations. If such an authority could be set up, it would save rather than waste time.

THE POWER OF DECISION

The need for a unified political authority over the military high command is not filled by the Atlantic Council, which can do no more than recommend—and unanimously at that—to each of the 12 governments it represents. In the Second World War Roosevelt and Churchill had the supreme power of decision which no one exercises now and which must somehow be recreated if all political as well as military responsibility is not to devolve on the military commander. Eisenhower's plea was for political unification. He favors the Schuman plan, the European army, the OEEG, and every other scheme for integration because they lead toward political unity.

The Defense Minister of the Netherlands, Cornelius Staf, in an interview this week, went so far as to say that NATO was dying for lack of a governmental body that would meet at frequent intervals with the supreme commander to coordinate plans, exchange information, and agree on common policies. The reason the Dutch are unwilling to join the five nations which have agreed on a European army is that it does not include Britain. Foreign Minister Dirk Stikker, who is also president of the Council of Europe, declared in a recent speech that a European union without Britain is not viable. It is becoming increasingly doubtful, when it comes to that, if the Atlantic defense system can be as effective as it must be unless there is closer coordination of policy not only within Europe and between Britain and the continent, but between Europe and the United States. The mutual security program is not enough unless it is directed by and to common purposes, clearly understood and supported by the participants. If Europe is forced toward unity almost against its will, so is the whole free world.

Seaway Opposition Takes Narrow View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I wish to include in the RECORD the following editorial from the Escanaba Press, Escanaba, Mich., which appeared July 19 during the debate on the St. Lawrence seaway bill in executive sessions of the House Public Works Committee. The committee's action on Thursday, July 26, in tabling this bill makes this editorial most timely.

OPPOSITION TO SEAWAY STILL POWERFUL, TEST VOTE REVEALS

Indicative of the opposition still prevailing in Congress to the St. Lawrence seaway project is the result of a vote by the House Public Works Committee Tuesday on a motion to table the power and navigation project bill. The committee voted 14 to 13 against tabling the bill.

The proponents of the seaway concede that powerful opposition is coming from areas not directly served by the proposed project. These forces have effectively bottled up the St. Lawrence seaway project year after year and it appears now that they may be successful again, despite the urgent pleas of straight-thinking Americans who recognize the importance of this project.

The bill was kept alive in the initial vote in committee by the narrowest margin. Congressmen from areas not directly served by the seaway project have consistently taken a narrow and selfish view, without realizing the value of this project from a standpoint of national defense.

Middle western Congressmen, unfortunately, may have to adopt new tactics to force a change in the voting habits of many of their colleagues from other areas on the seaway issue. They may have to refuse support for any local projects and governmental programs in areas now opposing the seaway. It may take some pressures of this kind to break the congressional jam that perennially balks action on the St. Lawrence water development project.

Neglected Pilot Knob Battle Site Suggested as National Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article taken from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on July 23, which is entitled "Neglected Pilot Knob Battle Site Suggested as National Monument".

NEGLECTED PILOT KNOB BATTLE SITE SUGGESTED AS NATIONAL MONUMENT—NOW UNDER FOREST SERVICE WHICH HAS NO FUNDS FOR MAINTENANCE—HISTORICAL IMPORTANCE OF AREA

(By J. Loyd Huett)

IRONTON, Mo.—Fifteen hundred unknown Civil War heroes lie buried in one weed-choked field at Old Fort Davidson, near here.

They were killed within a few hours in the battle of Pilot Knob September 27, 1864, were dumped without ceremony into the rifle pits surrounding the fort, and covered with the dirt from the embankments behind which many of them fought and died.

Though these men fought under different flags, and wore different uniforms, they were all true Americans fighting in the defense of their personal ideals of democratic government of a free people. In death those men were united in a common grave, as the Nation was more firmly united by the Civil War in which they fought.

Yet, despite the importance of the battle of Pilot Knob to the course of the Civil War in Missouri, not even a simple gravestone marks their burial place in the weed-choked field just outside the earthen fortification of the old fort.

It has been proposed that Fort Davidson be named a national monument and transferred to the National Park Service for proper care.

BATTLE OF PILOT KNOB

In the battle of Pilot Knob, Brig. Gen. Thomas Ewing, Jr., commanded about 1,500 Union soldiers, based in Fort Davidson.

Maj. Gen. Sterling Price, of the Confederate Army, with a force of approximately 12,000 men, succeeded in cutting off all reinforcements from the fort and launched an attack on the Union forces.

The Confederates attacked from Shepherd Mountain, just across the valley to the south, intent on overrunning and capturing Fort Davidson and the Union forces within it by sheer weight of superior numbers.

The Confederates were stopped, however, at the deep moat or ditch which completely surrounded the earthen embankments of the fort. They had light ladders to be thrown across the moat as bridges. But the ladders were found to be too short, and under the rifle fire from the fort the Confederates were forced to retire, leaving almost half of their attacking force dead or wounded.

General Ewing later estimated that approximately one-fourth of his Union force were casualties in the battle.

The Confederates, confident of being able to take the fort the following day, rested and reorganized during the night. General Ewing, who realized that his small force could not possibly repel another heavy charge by the Confederates, decided to abandon the fort during the night.

The Union forces muffled the hooves of their horses and the wheels of their vehicles by wrapping them with burlap sacks and blankets. They piled all equipment which they were unable to take with them on and around the powder magazine within the fort. Then, lighting a long fuse to the magazine, timed to explode the ammunition several hours after their retreat, they abandoned the fort and escaped over the road leading to Potosi.

On the following morning when General Price's Confederates approached the fort, nothing remained for them to do except bury the hundreds of Union and Confederate dead.

The fate of Missouri in the Civil War was probably determined in this battle. Though the Union forces lost the battle, the Confederates were never able to regain the initiative and were soon forced to retire, except for scattered bands of guerrillas.

Yet those brave men who fought so savagely on both sides at Fort Davidson lie in wholly unmarked common graves, unhonored and almost forgotten.

The exact location of the mass graves is not now known, though the locations of the rifle pit graves could probably be determined from Government maps of the Fort Davidson establishment of that time.

The fields around Fort Davidson, where the rifle pit graves are believed to be, were for many years under cultivation. They are now so overgrown with weeds and coarse grass that walking through them is difficult.

The earthen embankments of the fort proper have undergone surprisingly little change since their final abandonment as a military post following the Civil War. The entire area is overgrown with brush and weeds, and a grove of trees has sprung up within the fort and along the embankments and the moat surrounding it.

Yet erosion has brought little damage to the earthen embankments and the moats just outside. Even the crater caused by the explosion of the powder magazine is still plainly visible.

On a recent week-day visit to Fort Davidson, during which I spent about an hour at the fort, a total of five automobiles stopped and their occupants walked over the site, taking pictures and discussing the battle of Pilot Knob.

Nearby residents said hundreds of automobiles visit Fort Davidson each week, despite its neglected state.

This historic site is now the property of the United States Forest Service, and a part of Clark National Forest.

It is not set apart by law as a historic shrine, but is simply a part of the forest cropland.

As a matter of administrative policy, however, largely on responsibility of the forest supervisor who administers the Clark National Forest, a two-strand barbed wire fence encloses the earthworks and the adjoining fields.

Cooperating with the Forest Service, the Missouri State Highway Department has erected a board sign at the entrance to the fort near Highway 21, giving brief comment on the battle.

The Missouri Conservation Commission has quite recently planted a multiflora rose hedge to succeed the barbed-wire fence. The hedge is still quite small and will not become an effective fence for several years. The Missouri Highway Department also soded the eroding parts of the embankments with grass several years ago.

Forest Supervisor Byron Groesbeck, who is in charge of the Clark National Forest, says there is no appropriation for maintenance and improvement of such sites as Fort Davidson.

Groesbeck stated that as a part of the national forest, this historic site cannot be given the care and attention it deserves.

The tract of land on which Fort Davidson is situated in the early part of this century fell into the hands of Col. Thomas Ewing, son of General Ewing. In 1938 Colonel Ewing gave the 40 acres to the Forest Service with stipulations that the tract should never pass from Government ownership and reserving the right to erect a monument at the site.

Transfer to the National Park Service would apparently fall within these stipulations. Some Missouri conservation leaders have expressed doubts as to the Park Service being willing to accept the responsibility. However, there is a general consensus among those interested that transfer to the Park Service would be the best solution.

One of these persons, August P. Bellmann, manager of the arboretum at Gray Summit, writes:

"I am heartily in agreement with [the] proposal to make Fort Davidson a national monument."

Terminating the State of War Between the United States and the Government of Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1951

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to support this resolution which ends the state of war declared in December 1941 against all of Germany, not a part of it. This resolution passed at this particular time, you will note, embodies all of Germany which will be helpful to the West German Government and the other free nations who pursue the hope that Russia can eventually be pushed out of East Germany uniting the German Government.

Russia, in fact, signed the Potsdam agreement which provided for the unification of Germany through a peace treaty later to be agreed upon. From that date to the present time, Russia has made it plain that she has had no intention of living up to such a treaty agreement and that she intends to keep the vast German territory she now occupies as a western extension of Russian power.

This move on the part of Congress in its declaration that we are no longer technically at war with the German Government will strengthen German ties with the western Atlantic states, will give her greater freedom of trade with the other nations of the world, greater responsibility in Western Europe, and should increase her industrial and economic rehabilitation and development.

Mr. Speaker, this move will aid the economic and military recovery of all Europe, because Germany with its vast deposits of coal and iron, and because of the inventive genius, the skill and craftsmanship of its people is the hub of the industrial development and recovery of all of Western Europe. Western Germany is absolutely necessary to the defense of Western Europe.

This resolution will seek to undo the great mistake made by President Roosevelt and Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau when they decided on the unconditional surrender of Germany. Decided that Germany should not be allowed in the future to develop her industries, but be transformed into an agricultural state.

This decision meant the absolute destruction of nearly all of the industries of Germany before we would consider making peace with that nation. You will recall Morgenthau sold the idea to President Truman that in the future Germany should be confined to an agricultural state, his determination for its industrial destruction was so great. Had it not been for that policy, we could have made peace with Germany months earlier and would not have destroyed her country to the point where it has cost the American taxpayers many billions of dollars necessary to furnish food to prevent her people from starving, and billions to rebuild her industrial plants.

We now find Russia so threatens Western Europe that we need a strong Germany today, and a Germany that is willing to join with the Atlantic Pact nations and the United States in fighting against any attack on Western Europe in the future.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad commentary, but I think it should be noted that due largely to the Russian propaganda during the war when she was supposed to be our ally at the treaties of Yalta and Potsdam our representatives went as far as they possibly could for the ultimate and continued destruction of Germany and on the other hand through appeasement helped to build Russia up in Eastern Europe and in Asia, making it possible for her today to threaten Western Europe, make war on Korea, engulf China, and threaten the world.

It is to be hoped that as the German people become more powerful, as they

will, that they will align their economic and military strength with the people of Western Europe and the United States, and that ultimately the Russian power will be driven out of East Germany unifying finally the German Nation.

Mr. Speaker, for several years past, many of us in the Congress have urged this administration and the United Nations to admit Spain into the western defense orbit. The Communists and left wingers in this country, England, France, and Italy have steadfastly opposed it. It is encouraging to note that the officials of our Government have recently been taking steps toward seeking the cooperation of Spain in the plan now being developed for the defense of Western Europe. Such action should have been taken years ago, for both Spain and Germany can make a great contribution to the defense of Western Europe.

This resolution ending the state of war with Germany should, in my opinion, receive the unanimous vote of the Members of the House. Let us give the German people a chance to help themselves, Western Europe, and the world in its fight against communism.

Road to Recovery Rugged for Kansas City Flood Victims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, an article published in the Sunday Washington Star of July 29, 1951, was of special interest to me, and the description given by the author, Mr. W. H. Shippen, of the great destruction and suffering and agony of rehabilitation after a major flood reminds me of the great catastrophes that recur in Louisiana from time to time.

Mr. Speaker, thinking this article would be of interest to Members of the Congress I am, under unanimous consent, including it in the Appendix of the RECORD. The article follows:

ROAD TO RECOVERY IS RUGGED FOR (KANSAS CITY) FLOOD VICTIMS
(By W. H. Shippen)

KANSAS CITY, KANS., July 28.—The people of the flood-stricken lowlands have tackled the long road back, but the grade is too steep for many to make without prompt and effective assistance.

The overwhelming nature of the tragedy becomes more apparent daily as farmers and river-bank dwellers straggle back to their former homes through debris and the all-pervading muck now turning to dust.

A breath of this dust is difficult to forget. It carries a suggestion of pestilence. But thousands here today were breathing the tainted air and drinking water from questionable sources while they toil under a blazing sun to salvage what they can.

Federal officials at the recent emergency conference in Kansas City, Mo., gave assurances that no epidemic will develop. Those working in the flooded sections, however, are

far less optimistic. Efforts to get clean drinking water to thousands of people scattered through the mud-blighted regions are only partly effective.

HOG SLAIN IN STREET

The destitute are loath inclined to be fussy about sanitation facilities. Only one man looked up from his work today as a huge, muddy hog staggered across the street in front of our police car and fell into the gutter. The thirst-crazed animal began to choke down the slime.

A young Negro ran over and poured some water from his canteen on the pig's nose. Then he found an ax and put the animal out of its misery. The pig was one of thousands of animals which had escaped from the stock yards or drowned there.

The colossal destruction of food is everywhere apparent along the Kansas River in the factory towns of Armourdale and Argentine.

Grain and meat ruined in storage is matched by fields now deep in mud or sand. Stands of corn, sorghum and wheat are turning yellow in areas better drained than those which took the brunt of the wild currents.

Another problem with grave implications to the national economy is that faced by the railroads. The Kansas City's are served by a dozen rail lines, several with transcontinental connections.

RAIL LINES SLOWED

Washed-out bridges, inundated roadbeds and damage to more than 87,000 pieces of rolling stock have stalled some lines and slowed others to a fraction of normal capacities.

The billion-dollar flood is just too big for the average man. You can see it in his face. The flooded areas of the cities' housed laborers and others in the low-income brackets.

The residents have big families and debts bigger still.

Red Cross workers estimate the average head of a household can raise about \$150 in a pinch. There is virtually no insurance for flood damage in the valleys.

During early stages of the flood, even those who were losing everything shared the excitement and a sense of mutual helpfulness with their neighbors. Those whose homes were spared opened their doors to the less fortunate.

It was not unusual to see 25 or 30 children under one small roof, mothered by volunteers who bathed and fed them and told them bedtime stories. But as the days slipped by these tasks became too heavy for persons with other responsibilities.

The result has been that the Red Cross today is receiving as many new requests for help as it did in the first days of the flood.

The Red Cross moved in immediately with grocery orders, emergency shelter, and medical aid.

Assistance is coming much slower from the various Federal departments concerned with the area. They have to make detailed surveys, reports, and follow procedures which seem incredibly slow to those who are hungry and destitute.

People here are usually stubbornly reluctant to ask for help from any source. Rescue workers find them digging away at the mud and climbing through their wrecked homes and places of business despite the red "condemned" placards.

Many structures are still collapsing because of undermined foundations, broken walls and the heavy deposits of silt reaching up to third stories in the lowest sections. The fact that the water system is still out of commission along the rivers hampers rehabilitation.

SICKENING ODOR OF DECAY

One focal point of damage lies in Armourdale, where the rampaging Kansas sent 26 to 30 feet of water down the length of Kan-

sas Avenue. Crushed buildings and tangled debris in the wake of the torrent appear to have been swept by a hurricane.

A nauseating odor of decay clings to the river valley. World War II veterans find it harder to take than the sweetish scent which permeated bombed-out cities like Berlin, Tokyo, or Manila.

Yet the work goes on around the clock. Bulldozers nudge through the muck, manned by operators who breathe through moist handkerchiefs.

Rescue workers here deplore the fact that no road blocks were established in the early stages. Trucks and automobiles, many driven by sightseers, jammed the streets to such an extent that ambulances and emergency vehicles were held up for hours.

Aid came first from the Red Cross, which mobilized a small army of volunteers under direction of trained disaster relief personnel drawn from many cities.

Typical of the leadership was that supplied by chairman John Ziegelmeyer of the Wyandotte County chapter of the Red Cross. The 33-year-old attorney worked for the first 4 days with only a few hours of sleep snatched in automobiles and motor boats.

When the main channel of the Kansas topped the levees and raced through Armourdale, Mr. Ziegelmeyer and a fellow volunteer, Ed Haren, a florist, embarked in a motor boat and cut trolley wires which were damming the debris along the street.

The volunteers remained on the alert beside radios to get news of impending levee breaks and spread an alarm ahead of the advancing waters. The police department supplied Mr. Ziegelmeyer with a radio-patrol car and an emergency badge.

Neither man had any way of knowing, until they cut the first wire, if the current was still on. They chopped through the roof of a three-story building and hoisted a cripple to safety with the aid of ropes.

He and his fellow workers are known by their first names to thousands of flood sufferers in the area. Traffic officers make a special effort to speed the emergency vehicles through streets still clogged with debris or partly blocked by oil-storage tanks unseated by the flood.

In the untouched uplands of Kansas City, Kans., many public schools have been turned over to the Red Cross.

The morale problem is building up. Thousands of displaced persons have returned to their former homes only in recent days. The full extent of the disaster has been impressed upon them.

OTHER FOLKS HARD HIT

Many elderly persons obviously are overwhelmed. They lack the money, energy, and inclination to make a fresh start under the threat of the rivers. Many farmers in the outlying districts are talking about pulling out for good.

The long-range plans of a score of Federal agencies are slow in getting under way. In the distressed sections people have answered so many questions and filled out so many reports they are beginning to say that they can't eat a Federal survey, or find shelter beneath one.

One of the first aims of the Government is to get the transportation system back in operation, through the extension of credit and the release of scarce materials. Measures also are being taken, through inoculations and the distribution of fresh water, to head off the possibility of an epidemic.

There are relatively few mosquitoes in the area. Too, the water supply on the high ground remains uncontaminated, and the residents of these sections are in a good position to help less fortunate neighbors.

SIXTY DAYS NEEDED FOR YARDS

Federal experts said the stockyards probably can be put back in operation in the next 60 days. It probably will take much

longer however, to restore normal rail service through the key cities here.

The over-all task of controlling the rebellious Missouri throughout its 530,000,000 square miles of watershed is now one-fourth complete. The major responsibility rests with the Army Corps of Engineers, who are building reservoirs, levees and flood walls, while the Reclamation Bureau of the Interior Department constructs small dams primarily for irrigation purposes.

Sentiment in the 10 States lying partly or wholly in the Missouri Valley favors the plan worked out by the Engineers and the Interior Department.

STORAGE RESERVOIRS EFFECTIVE

The storage reservoirs already built performed according to plan. All of them held back flood waters, but the difficulty was that the heaviest rains fell below the dams.

In some quarters, including CIO unions and small farm groups, there is the belief that the joint plan is wasteful because authority is divided. They continue to insist on some independent Federal agency like the Tennessee Valley Authority.

It seemed likely, however, that the Nation's costliest flood will override conflicting opinions and speed measures for the conservation of a river valley embracing one-sixth of the land area of the United States.

People hardest hit were unanimous in this opinion.

"We've got to do something—even if it's wrong."

Italian Peace Treaty of 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, there is growing realization of the need for reconsideration or abrogation of the whole unwise Italian Peace Treaty of 1947, which violated every principle of the Atlantic Charter and is a contradiction of the North Atlantic Treaty and the organization which has been brought into existence for the defense of Western Europe. I introduced earlier in this session House Joint Resolution 224, which calls for the necessary action to relieve Italy of her liabilities of 1947 and thereby allow her to take an effective part in the defense of the liberties of Western Europe and of the other democratic nations of the world. I am pleased that the Board of Commissioners of Newark in the following stirring resolution has endorsed this movement, and I trust the House Foreign Affairs Committee will recognize the strong public sentiment in favor thereof by scheduling House Joint Resolution 224 and similar measures for early hearings. The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the Italian Peace Treaty is not consistent with the international position assumed by Italy and with the readiness with which the people of Italy have embraced the cause of liberty and democracy; and

Whereas the moral significance of the said treaty places the Republic of Italy in a position of inferiority to other free democracies and peoples of Europe; and

Whereas the clauses of the treaty impede Italy in the full performance of the defensive

and economical potentialities of which it is capable under the North Atlantic Pact, to which Italy eagerly, freely and sincerely subscribed, without seeking privileged conditions for itself: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newark, N. J., That they hereby request the Congress of the United States to revise the aforesaid treaty of peace with Italy to the end that said clauses be eliminated; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Senate, to the Speaker of the Congress and to Members of Congress whose districts embrace this city, and the Senators from New Jersey.

The Truth and Nothing But the Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, an inspiring address delivered over the air on July 28, 1951, by Col. Robert R. McCormick, entitled "More About the United Nations," puts us in possession of facts that have long been denied to the people or deliberately hidden from them by those who control the propaganda mills of our Government. In Colonel McCormick's address you are not beguiled with half-truths and misleading statements. On the contrary, his address is an overall exposé of the diplomatic jockeying and intrigue to which the people of the United States for some time last past have been subjected. The address is also revealing in that it points out where the United States is giving its substance to an organization that presently is bent on building up a group who would subordinate the Constitution of the United States to that of a one-world charter. Colonel McCormick's address contains material that should cause all reasonable minds to pause and hesitate about doing anything that may extend added power to the United Nations Organization.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include herein the address referred to in my remarks and entitled "More About the United Nations," which address was delivered by Col. Robert R. McCormick over the Mutual network on July 28, 1951. The address follows:

When President Truman denounced the conviction of Associated Press correspondent Oatis by Czechoslovakia, he omitted to say that Czechoslovakia is an original member of the United Nations. A great deal has been said of the conviction of the Catholic prelates in Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, secured by torture-induced confessions, and the oppression of religion in Poland, and again the fact that these countries were members in good standing in the United Nations has been avoided.

The prevailing habit of misstatement, half truth, and no statement has pretty well persuaded the ignorant that the United Nations is an enlightened, beneficial, even holy organization. The worst the well informed thought of it was that its highfaluting lan-

guage was a fraud to cover the sinister acts that got us into the Korean war.

When the organization was formed under the leadership of Alger Hiss, his treason was undreamed of; nor was the decision of the Appellate Court of California that it is the supreme law of the land contemplated, which partly but not entirely excuses the Senators who, under pressure of propaganda and political coercion, voted for its ratification.

The 60 countries which compose the United Nations are not similar in history, race, religion, language, and law, as were the 13 original States, and as are the 48 present States. They can be divided into classifications: primitive, dictatorial, iron curtain, countries with ineffective or no constitutions, subject states, aggressor states, states with religious political parties, polygamous states, and Socialist states.

Among the primitive states, I find Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Israel, Lebanon, Thailand, India, and Pakistan, all of them polygamous.

The dictator states. Argentina, Dominica, Paraguay.

Iron curtain states: Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Poland, Russian Soviet, Byelorussian Soviet, and Red China, which the State Department is conspiring to recognize.

States with undesirable or no constitutions: Egypt and New Zealand; Canada has no constitution, but proximity, history, and close intercourse have implanted our principles on all but the professional hatchet men and Rhodes scholars.

Aggressor states: England, which not only oppresses Egypt and Burma, but also Scotland and Wales; France, which oppresses north Africa and Indochina; the Netherlands, which oppresses Indonesia, Australia, which oppresses Borneo, and New Zealand, which oppresses several peoples in the Pacific.

The avowed purpose of the United Nations was mutual assistance against aggression by anyone. It is to be noted that no effort has been made to stop the aggression of Britain in Egypt and Malaya; of Holland in Indonesia; of France in Morocco and Indochina, of Belgium and the Union of South Africa in Africa.

Within the last few weeks, Britain, France, and India have stated that they would join the United Nations in protecting their own possessions, but would consider whether to aid any other countries that are attacked when such a situation should arise. Of the 60 members, only 16 have sent forces to Korea, and these only token forces, except for the United States.

States with religious parties, thus violating our principle of the separation of church and state: Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Italy, and France.

Socialist states: England, Denmark, and Sweden.

States with constitutional governments are Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Luxembourg, Mexico, Norway, Panama, Peru, the Philippines, and Sweden. Some of these constitutions are obviously shaky.

The three solid republics in the world are the United States, Turkey, and Uruguay. As I have said before, a large majority of useful inventions have been made in the United States. Of the other United Nations, only Britain, France, and Italy have made any at all.

I am not considering the countries of central and south Africa, which I have not visited.

France and Great Britain, so long the dominant nations of the world, have fallen on hard times. Britain, for lack of a constitution, has become a socialized state, tyrannized over by the party in power in the House of Commons and far nearer in theory and practice to Russia than to us.

The peripatetic gyrations of France in the last 12 years are too well known to need comment. Its strongest party is the Communist Party. Both England and France have treaties of alliance with Soviet Russia.

The Appellate Court of California has held that the United Nations Charter, as the supreme law of the land, repealed the California law forbidding Japanese to own real estate in California, on the ground that the charter was promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

By the same theory, it would hold that the laws forbidding polygamy in this country discriminated against people practicing that custom. Ladies supporting the United Nations, bear this in mind.

The United Nations is proposing a declaration of human rights and a companion piece, a convention on freedom of information, which would replace the first amendment to our Constitution, providing for freedom of speech and of the press, with a very dangerous code to suppress freedom of religion, speech, and the press.

The genocide convention adopted by the United Nations and sent to the Senate by President Truman would render illegal a great deal of standard literature, including the New Testament.

Between the dictator states, iron curtain states, Socialist states, and primitive states, we might get a statute providing for communism and socialism in this country. That may well be the administration's object.

As well put by the Columbus (Ga.) Ledger: "The Supreme Court has never expressly declared any treaty ratified by the Senate invalid.

"This Supreme Court has upheld a law enacted to place teeth in a treaty after it had declared the same law unconstitutional before a treaty was ratified.

"This instance of the Supreme Court ruling that the treaty-making power could be used successfully where the Constitution forbade the Congress to act is pointed to by Frank E. Holman, of Seattle, a former president of the American Bar Association, in an article in the September issue of the ABA Journal, entitled, 'Treaty Law-Making: A Blank Check for Writing a New Constitution.'

"Here's how it came about: In 1913, Congress enacted a Federal migratory bird act. After its approval by the President, its constitutionality was questioned on the grounds that it invaded the reserved powers of the States, and the statute was declared unconstitutional in 1914 by the Supreme Court in *United States v. Shauver*. The Court held:

"That the National Constitution is an enabling instrument and, therefore, Congress possesses only such powers as are expressly by necessary implication granted by that instrument is not questioned. Unless, therefore, there is some provision in the National Constitution granting to Congress either expressly or by necessary implication the power to legislate on this subject, the act cannot be sustained."

"Supporters of the regulations governing the taking of migratory birds then sought the treaty route. The President concluded a treaty with Great Britain, and the Senate ratified it.

"A second migratory bird act was then enacted. It was practically identical with the first, and it was attacked as unconstitutional also.

"This time, the Supreme Court, in *Missouri v. Holland*, upheld the law as valid, since it was implementation of a valid treaty.

"This decision," Mr. Holman writes, "in effect, and really for the first time, opened the way for amending the Constitution of the United States by and through a treaty, because it proclaims that an otherwise un-

constitutional law may become constitutional when, as, and if the President negotiates a treaty on the subject and obtains approval of the Senate."

"This is nothing more nor less than government by treaty.

"We can lose such right as freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom of peaceful assembly if our Senate by 34 of its 96 votes ratified as a treaty the covenant on human rights."

It is plain that 40 of the 60 United Nations countries do not subscribe to our ideas of constitutional government, and many more are uncertain, and that any agreements that they can reach will be utterly destructive of our way of life.

It is equally plain that all informed people who support the United Nations plan just that.

International Treaties and United Nations Charter Threaten United States Domestic Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including a news article that appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on Sunday, July 29, written by Mr. Chesly Manly of the Chicago Tribune Press Service, in which he refers to an article by Oscar Schachter, Deputy Director of the United Nations Legal Department, which declares in effect that United States domestic laws are subject to treaties entered into by the United States with foreign governments.

Mr. Speaker, this is a dangerous move on the part of those who believe in world government for it deprives the citizens of this country of protection under our basic laws. I commend this article to all who are interested in this highly controversial question.

UNITED STATES LAWS MUST YIELD TO CHARTER, SAYS UN AIDE

(By Chesly Manly)

NEW YORK, July 26.—The revolutionary theory that American courts are obliged to give effect to the human rights provisions of the United Nations Charter as the supreme law of the land, notwithstanding any conflicting domestic laws is upheld by Oscar Schachter, deputy director of the U. N. legal department.

Schachter's views are expressed in an article in the Vanderbilt Law Review in which he defends a California appellate court decision declaring the State's alien land ownership law invalid because it discriminated against Japanese and violated the U. N. Charter.

The U. N. lawyer, an American, emphasizes that the views expressed in the Law Review article are his own and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the U. N.

SOCIALISTIC STATE FEARED

Although Schachter does not share the fears of American Bar Association leaders regarding the dangers of law making by treaty, he fully agrees with their contention that this can and is being done in the name of the external obligations already assumed by

the United States or now under consideration in the U. N.

Frank E. Holman, of Seattle, former president of the ABA, maintains that the proposed U. N. covenant of human rights would transform the United States into a socialistic state. Carl B. Fix, of Milwaukee, another former president of the ABA and more recently chairman of its committee on peace and law through the U. N., declares in a discussion of the proposed covenant that, the road to Federal absolutism is being made very, very easy.

Article 33 of the U. N. Charter declares that the organization shall promote "universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion." Article 56 declares that all U. N. members "pledged themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the organization for the achievement of the purposes set forth in article 55."

Many authorities have maintained that these provisions impose no legal obligations upon U. N. members. These authorities have characterized the human-rights provision as guiding principles or general purposes to be observed by U. N. members. The General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, which are the U. N. organs principally concerned with human rights, have no compulsory powers; they make recommendations which have no obligatory effect. Moreover, article 2 (7) of the Charter expressly forbids the U. N. to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any member.

Schachter makes short shrift of these arguments. He maintains that the pledge made by U. N. members in article 56 was intended to constitute a legal commitment on their part.

"It is after all a commonplace in international law that states assume duties of a legal character which are not enforceable by international organs," he writes. Having satisfied himself that article 56 imposes a legal duty upon member states in regard to human rights, Schachter considers the question whether that obligation, under the American Constitution, is a direct source of law for American courts. He concludes that it is.

SUPREMACY CLAUSE CITED

The supremacy clauses of the Constitution is "not rendered nugatory because the treaty provision does not specify the type of action which the courts may take in carrying out the obligation," he asserts.

The supremacy clause is contained in article VI (2) of the Constitution, which provides that "all treaties made, or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

Schachter cites the California appellate court decision as an illustration of practical judicial action to give effect to the charter provisions. Under the supremacy clause, he declares, the statute denying persons the right to own land because of race would have to yield to the treaty and hence be declared invalid.

COVENANT RULING CITED

"Another compelling example would be presented where a court is requested to enforce a private agreement which it clearly considers contrary to recognized rights and freedoms; in that case the charter provision would reasonably include the duty to withhold the judicial action requested," Schachter writes. In a footnote he recalls that the United States Supreme court, in *Shelley against Kraemer*, decided in 1948, denied enforcement of restrictive real estate cove-

nants based on racial discrimination as being contrary to constitutional guaranties. Schachter writes that it would be "most difficult to conclude that the charter provisions on human rights cannot legitimately be given effects by the courts in appropriate cases."

"As United States Air Force Planes Continue To Fly 10 Miles and More Above the Surface of Our Earth, at Randolph Air Force Base a Small Group of Aero-Medical Scientists at the School of Aviation Medicine Are Striving To Match Medical Developments With Mechanical Genius"—Robert McCormick, Battle Report, Washington

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, again Dr. John R. Steelman, the Assistant to the President, has brought to the American people, through Battle Report, Washington, several guest speakers to make personal report with respect to their work in national affairs.

More and more each week Battle Report, Washington, is becoming the National Broadcasting Co.'s most popular teledocumentary emanating from the Nation's Capital. By this means, more than 40,000,000 Americans are personally advised by high officials of their Government concerning matters of current interest.

First on Dr. Steelman's list of this week's guests was Mr. Bennett Wolfe, of the Associated Press, a close and intimate friend of Mr. William N. Oatis, recently sentenced to 10 years' imprisonment by a Czechoslovakian court on a trumped-up charge of espionage. In his talk with Dr. Steelman, Mr. Wolfe told of how he personally hired young Bill Oatis back in Indianapolis, Ind., 14 years ago.

Today—

Mr. Wolfe says—

Bill Oatis languishes in a foreign prison simply because he tried to be a good reporter. He tried to report and interpret events behind the iron curtain just as he once had done in Indiana. Even the Czechoslovakian prosecutor in his kangaroo trial paid Oatis a high compliment in this connection when he said, "Oatis was an especially dangerous agent because of his discretion and his insistence on obtaining only accurate, verified information."

In the course of his interview, Mr. Wolfe told of what the managing editor of the Lincoln (Nebr.) Journal, Raymond A. McConnell, Jr., wrote in a news editorial in which he said, in part:

Mr. Oatis' only crime is against a tyranny that enslaves man by trying to hide from the world the ugly truth about itself.

Mr. Wolfe also went on to say that, in a telegram to the Voice of America, Mr. McConnell "confessed"—that is the

word he used—"to being one of Mr. Oatis' thousands of accomplices on free newspapers," and concluded his interview by stating:

I am sure that all newsmen throughout the free world will be proud to join Mr. McConnell in his "confession."

Of deepest interest to the people in general and to the Members of Congress in particular was the report by Mr. C. Stribling Snodgrass, Assistant Deputy Petroleum Administrator in charge of foreign operations. His report on the Iranian oil situation warrants the deepest study by all concerned with happenings in the Middle East.

The narration of Robert McCormick, commenting on the pictures of the happenings in Yugoslavia, was equaled by the brilliant paper read by one of the chief Air Force surgeons, Brig. Gen. Edward J. Kendrick. General Kendrick told the millions of his audience of the tremendous task that confronts the Surgeon General with respect to the altogether new science of aerial medicine—the problem of making it possible for the men of our Air Force to perform even more daring feats with some measurable degree of ease, comfort, and safety to their physical bodies, with retention of mental capacity.

The next guest presented was Col. J. L. Throckmorton, who landed in Korea but a few days after the outbreak of war and was placed in command of the Fifth Infantry Regimental Combat Team. Mr. Speaker, the report of the commander of our foot soldiers on hand through all the campaigns fighting up to the Yalu River and his stories of the hardship of wading through bitterly cold mountain streams and of men who spent sleepless, freezing nights in lonely fox holes searching for enemy movement in fighting for their lives, merit reading by every Member of this Congress.

It is because of these and other reasons that, under unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks, I include therein as part of the extension, the forty-fifth Battle Report, Washington, as it was telecast over the National Broadcasting Co.'s network and coaxials.

The producer-director of this program is Ted Ayers; the technical director, L. A. McClelland; commentary, Robert McCormick. Script by Lou Hazam; the film editor is Bill Brooks; floor manager, John Johnson; Art by Joseph Ferrier; music adviser, Fritz Balzer; sound by Bob Haines; and the production assistant is Jean Montgomery.

Battle Report, Washington, follows:

Mr. McCormick. The greatest threat to world peace; the tremendous armed power of the Soviet Union, will still remain, even if the Korean fighting stops.

Giving voice again to the President's Independence Day warning on the eve of the cease-fire negotiations in Korea, NBC television news calls its cameras into play for its forty-fifth battle report.

Washington—where Defense Mobilizer Charles Wilson, in his quarterly report, urged the Nation to keep its guard up, whatever happens in Korea, and Korea, where action such as you see here, is slowly grinding to a halt in anticipation of Sunday's peace talks.

Tonight on Battle Report a rare look at the Yugoslav Army; and from the Washing-

ton bureau of the Associated Press, the man who hired William N. Oatis, the American correspondent the Czechs jailed on fake charges of spying; a report on the Iranian oil crisis from a top Government-petroleum official; a regimental commander's eye view of the Korean battlefield; and the first time on television the film story of the Air Force's unique School of Aviation Medicine.

But first, the Assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

Dr. STEELMAN. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This week, free men all over the world have been hoping and praying that the present negotiations with the Communists will restore peace to the long-suffering Koreans. Each report that has reached us seemed like a ray of sunshine piercing through the fog.

In addition to Mr. Bennett Wolfe, of the Associated Press, we shall have with us tonight Mr. C. Stribling Snodgrass, Assistant Deputy Petroleum Administrator, who will bring to you by way of Battle Report, Washington, some first-hand information with respect to the problems that are facing the free world in Iran, Brig. Gen. Edward J. Kendrick, of the United States Air Force who will inform you with respect to but a few of the problems that are presented to your Air Force in caring for its flyers who fly frequently to heights 9 miles and even more above the earth's surface; Col. J. L. Throckmorton, former commander of the Fifth Regimental Combat Team, who is here to tell you of the wonderful spirit exhibited by the American soldiers and the splendid feats they are performing in carrying on that battle now raging under Korean skies.

On the other side of the world from Korea, an American newspaperman, Mr. William N. Oatis, has been sentenced to 10 years' imprisonment by a Czechoslovakian court. He was accused of espionage. Tonight we have a man in the studio who knows him well, a fellow newspaperman, Mr. Bennett Wolfe, a close and intimate friend of Mr. Bill Oatis.

Mr. Wolfe, won't you tell us something about Mr. Oatis—what kind of a fellow he is—and what do you know about these accusations?

Mr. WOLFE. Back in 1937, and when chief of the bureau of the Associated Press at Indianapolis, I received at letter from a young man at Marion, Ind. He said he would like to go to work for the AP. He was working on the Marion Leader-Tribune at the time and hadn't been long out of DePauw University.

That young man was Bill Oatis, now under a 10-year prison sentence in Czechoslovakia on trumped-up charges of being a spy.

I was impressed with the letter. Oatis had some excellent ideas about news writing and he said he thought that the average reporter wasn't thorough enough, that the average reporter didn't dig deeply enough for facts.

That was the kind of a man I wanted, so Bill Oatis got the next job I had to offer.

Oatis, a gangling young man with a studious look, was only 22 or 23 at the time. He progressed rapidly, then came the war and off to the Army he went in 1943.

After the war, he returned to the AP and was transferred to the cable desk in New York. From there he went to London and from London on his ill-fated assignment to Czechoslovakia.

Today Bill Oatis languishes in a foreign prison simply because he tried to be a good reporter. He tried to report and interpret events behind the iron curtain just as he once had done in Indiana.

Even the prosecutor in his kangaroo trial paid Oatis a high compliment in this connection. He said, and I quote, that Oatis was "an especially dangerous agent because of his discretion and his insistence on obtaining only accurate, verified information."

"What was Oatis' crime?" you ask. Raymond A. McConnell, Jr., managing editor of

the Lincoln (Nebr.) Journal, puts it this way:

"Mr. Oatis' only crime is against a tyranny that enslaves man by trying to hide from the world the ugly truth about itself.

"In a telegram to the Voice of America Mr. McConnell 'confessed'—that's his word—to being one of Mr. Oatis' thousands of accomplices on free newspapers."

I am sure that all newsmen throughout the free world will be proud to join Mr. McConnell in his confession.

Dr. STEELMAN. Thank you, Mr. Wolfe. I believe all of us now feel we really know Mr. Oatis. We also must realize that there is no such thing as a free press under the hammer and sickle. It is one of the great tragedies of our time. The entire Communist dictatorship is based upon the premise that a small self-appointed group is qualified to do the thinking for an entire nation. Without freedom of the press there cannot be freedom of thought. And without the freedom to think, men are mere robots. Now, back to Robert McCormick and our guests.

Mr. McCORMICK. Iran—where crowds demonstrate as the great British oil refinery at Abadan, the largest in the world, is nationalized by the Government. With Britain's largest overseas investment threatened, the anxious free world hurries to add up its oil reserves; a world that has had brought home to it again the fact that the center of gravity of the world's oil supply has been shifting slowly eastward from the Western Hemisphere to the Persian Gulf. Stopping from a plane only a few hours ago, returning him from a trip designed to bring our Government and the oil industry together in the face of this emergency, comes our next guest. Familiar with the Middle East, where he served as a petroleum expert during the last war, he is back at work for Uncle Sam as the Nation's Assistant Deputy Petroleum Administrator in charge of foreign operations. For a report on the world-wide problem raised by the Iranian crisis, here is C. S. Snodgrass.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Petroleum is as important to the defense effort of the United States and the other free nations of the world as gunpowder or any of the other vital weapons of war.

Within the last few days, the flow of oil from Iran to dozens of countries throughout the world has been halted.

Several scores of empty tankers which had been on the way to Iran to load oil are now riding at anchor in the Persian Gulf or are tied up at docks in ports from London to Calcutta, awaiting sailing orders.

The world's largest refinery—at Abadan, in Iran, on the Persian Gulf—is gradually shutting down because its storage tanks are nearly full and there is no way of transporting gasoline, fuel oil, and other refined products to consuming countries all over the world.

The refinery at Abadan is twice the size of the largest refinery in the United States. It employs some 40,000 people. Of the free world's total supply of refined products, more than 5 percent are normally produced at this single source.

Iran's total output—including both crude oil and refined products—amounts to about 750,000 barrels a day. This is almost as much as the total oil production of the countries behind the iron curtain.

The closing down of operations in the oil fields—Masjid-Sulaiman, Haft Kel, Ahwaz, and others, and even more serious, of operations at the Abadan refinery—creates a gap in the world's oil supply. It will require the most energetic efforts to fill this gap.

This is not only because of the amount of oil involved but because of its strategic location. Iran is the ancient bridge between eastern and western civilizations.

A complete interruption of supplies from this source would create distress and hardship in the Eastern Hemisphere. The replacement of these supplies from other sources will involve American companies operating abroad.

While a British company, the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., is directly involved, the oil itself has been supplied to and would be missed by many countries, for example, India, Pakistan, Malaya, southeast Africa, the Antipodes, as well as to the fueling of Europe's reconstruction and rearmament program. At this time, by virtue of the shortage of petroleum products the problem is not only a British or an Anglo-American Oil Co. problem, but also it becomes an international problem.

Because of the possible loss of Iranian oil to the free world, the Government is taking steps, in cooperation with the petroleum industry, to make up as far as possible for these losses.

Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman, the Petroleum Administrator for Defense, recommended to Charles E. Wilson, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, and other agencies of Government concur, that American companies doing business abroad should be brought together to advise our Government on steps that can be taken to assure a continued full supply of oil to the free world.

Secretary Chapman early this week appointed 19 companies to membership on a foreign petroleum supply committee, which held its first meeting in New York City yesterday.

I have just returned from New York where a subcommittee has been working all day today devising a plan of action to alleviate shortages. We expect the Committee to recommend to the Government a plan of action which will call for such steps as exchanges of products between areas, stepped-up crude oil production in certain countries, adjustments in refinery operations, and joint use of tankers and storage facilities overseas, without regard to ownership.

By these means, and all others that ingenuity can devise we hope to lessen the impact of the loss of Iranian oil.

Mr. McCORMACK. Only a few days ago, here in Washington, Yugoslav Ambassador Vladimir Popovic formally submitted to our Secretary of State an urgent request that we rush arms to Yugoslavia as soon as possible. The pressing reason, according to the Ambassador, there has been "no let up of pressure" on anti-Soviet Yugoslavia, although Communist, by Russia and her satellites, and the war of nerves is getting hotter every minute in the Balkans. We've already sent some equipment to Yugoslavia, America, and to show you what they can do with it, we bring you not a rare view of the Yugoslav Army on maneuvers.

The Marshal provided with binoculars, the signal is given and all hell breaks loose.

The order to charge, and out into no man's land pour the pride of the Yugoslav Army, seemingly, tough as nails. This army you can see is the outgrowth of what was Tito's guerrilla army during the war. It is made up largely of men who distinguished themselves as individuals in dangerous hit-and-run action—action that called for hard resourceful troops. When the war ended, and Tito became the head of the government, these self-made soldiers became Tito's formal armed force. Tough as they are, however, they have not yet been tested as a unified army in large-scale warfare. One thing they do prove—even in Yugoslavia, an army travels on its stomach.

Now the tanks join the fray. We're informed that main problem of the Yugoslav Army is not morale, but equipment like this.

They've virtually received no heavy equipment since they broke off from the Russians. Their main equipment is what they captured from Germany and Italy during World War II.

Suddenly the skies fill with Yugoslav planes which roar in to add their 2 cents' worth. It is a limited air force composed of what they captured and what they got since the war from the Russians. Yugoslavia itself has no aircraft industry.

Camouflaged artillery—such as these the Yugoslav Ambassador would like to see more of—chatter a greeting at the planes. The planes may be old, but I'd say the Yugoslav pilots act like they know their business.

Tito seems to be pleased with what he sees through his glasses. In addition to over \$100,000,000 worth of economic aid, he's received from us in the past year, since May, we're told, the Yugoslavs have been sent several million dollars worth of machine guns, other light arms, ammunition, and signal equipment. Possibly here's some of that signal equipment now.

Now the whole field seems to explode as all units unite in the action that climaxes the maneuvers. The planes again. And now dropping from them Yugoslav paratroopers, making a white pattern against the grey sky.

The Yugoslav Army—a question mark, but just the same, a force to be seriously weighed in the "hot spot" that is the Balkans of Europe.

And so Marshal Tito ends a day with his army pleased with their performance, here in mock battle, but perhaps, like the rest of the world, wondering how they'll do, should a real attack come.

As United States Air Force planes continue to fly at heights of ten miles and more above the surface of our earth, what is being done to provide our men with the latest in equipment and technique to maintain their physical well-being? Here at Randolph Air Force Base a small group of aero-medical scientists at the School of Aviation Medicine are striving to match medical developments with mechanical genius. Reason—in order that our airmen will be given every opportunity to perform at top peak in aircraft of the future. Here is veteran Air Force Surgeon Brig. Gen. Edward J. Kendrick, director of staffing and education for the Surgeon General.

Brigadier General KENDRICKS. We begin in a biochemistry laboratory. The function of this laboratory is to determine the various chemicals of which living matter is composed.

Only by doing that and by comparing the chemical makeup of various types of tissues and living matter can we determine the chemical changes which affect the lives of our air crew members. Once we find significant chemical changes caused by varying conditions of flight, it may be possible to prevent or at least to reduce the effects of a wound, disease, or physical stress. Research in regard to the comfort of our wounded being evacuated from the battlefronts by means of air transportation is given careful thought.

Here, a new type respirator is being given extensive testing. This small compact unit can be used aboard any type aircraft—thus the cumbersome old type iron lung may be eliminated.

Equipment needed by research projects quite often is not obtainable and it becomes necessary for the school to design and build its own. This micro-camera, for instance, is used to photograph interior parts of the body cavities such as the eye, ear, nose, mouth and throat of men just coming out of the high altitude pressure chamber.

Aboard this bomber is a crew who are participating in a human fatigue-testing program. One of the most pressing projects

facing the Air Force is the question of what causes fatigue. What makes a B-29 crew come back from a long flight looking haggard and irritable? Is it muscular weariness—nervous fatigue—or is some inner anxiety the cause? The project of testing human fatigue begins in the laboratory with a treadmill in operation and various tests being made on an airman who walks endlessly without going anywhere. At an operations hangar on the flight line we see four men working on a position-plotting board. These four men, a pilot, an instructor pilot, a navigator, and an engineer, are part of this testing project. They will remain awake and active while the in-flight crew goes about its long training mission.

Then when the crew returns to land at Randolph, the mission finished, they taxi into their parking position on the ramp tired and weary after the long hours in the air. The plane is met on the ramp by men from the fatigue-testing project. These men wait to take the crew for comparative testing with the men who remained on the ground during this flight. Here in a small office, now turned into a laboratory, all eight crew members are given identical tests to determine the degree of fatigue which each has sustained during flight and during the long waiting on the ground.

But wait, that's not all; the two pilots must now go through a coordination test—pilot at left is one who actually flew the mission, while the one at right stayed on the ground.

With the knowledge obtained from this testing project aeromedical science may be able to alleviate some of the discomforts of strenuous missions.

A special project here concerns optics. This is a motion parallax testing machine. The pilot is being shown how to adjust the small steel rod so that it rotates on the same plane as the larger rod. This test proves that man may have depth perception in only one eye thus refuting a long-standing conception that to fly man must have the sight of both eyes.

So, behind the health and well-being of the manpower of the Air Force lies the continuing research of the School of Aviation Medicine. This school symbolized by this pilot and flight surgeon stands today as a living example of the ever-thirsting desire of our men of vision to provide for more and better things for the airmen who fly the limitless skies of tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMICK. All along the front, the reports are only of light enemy contact. Long-range, small-arms fire from enemy forces of platoon and company size, and a sharp decrease in enemy and artillery fire. No significant attacks are being reported, and it looks as if the enemy has ceased aggressive tactics and begun an orderly withdrawal, a withdrawal from positions they had been holding stubbornly and at great cost during the past week. Our next guest remembers when things were quite different. Landing in Korea just a few days after the outbreak of war there, he soon took command of the Fifth Infantry Regimental Combat Team, and fought with it during the break-out from the Pusan perimeter to the Yalu River, and later in the campaign against the Chinese. Awarded the Silver Star and Distinguished Service Cross for his extraordinary heroism and lately returned from Korea to be senior aide to the Army's Chief of Staff, we bring into camera range now Col. John L. Throckmorton.

Colonel THROCKMORTON. The Fifth Regimental Combat Team received its baptism of fire by the North Koreans early in August of last year. Since that time the regiment, together with its supporting Five Hundred and Fifty-fifth Field Artillery Battalion, has performed every type of mission in the book of

war with distinction and success. They fought through the heat and dust of the South Korean summer to hold the southern end of the Pusan perimeter. They destroyed the Red defenses west of Taegu to spearhead the break-out last fall. They then plunged north through Pyongyang to within a few miles of the Yalu River only to be called back to hold a vital bridgehead for our withdrawal after the Chinese struck. During the long cold winter they pushed doggedly forward to regain the line of the thirty-eighth parallel.

I welcome this opportunity to tell you more about the riflemen, gunners, tankers, and medics of this fine combat team of the United States Army, for it is the courage, determination, and spirit of these men that has given the Fifth RCT its enviable reputation. The Fifth RCT is probably one of the most composite units in the Army. Included in our rosters were many Hawaiians, naturalized Japanese, Filipinos, Koreans, and Chinese. In spite of their different backgrounds, however, the men learned well the teamwork and cooperation so necessary for success on the battlefield.

Our prewar training in Hawaii established strong ties and developed mutual confidence between the Infantry and the Artillery, the tankers and the doughboys, and the officers and the men. The doughs soon came to believe that the gunners of the Triple Nickel could shoot faster and more accurately than any other artillery battalion. The artillerymen, on the other hand, always felt secure in position behind the Fifth. The same healthy attitude existed between the rifleman and the tankers. Our regimental tank company was always in there giving maximum fire support to the rifle companies in their job of digging the fanatical North Koreans or Chinese out of their foxholes.

Our doctors and medical aid men quickly gained the wholesome respect and admiration of every GI. It was their job to move over exposed ground under heavy fire to give first aid to the wounded. Many a brave doughboy owes an arm or a leg or even his life to the outstanding work of these men. In battle or during rest periods the medics worked tirelessly to relieve the suffering of the wounded or to improve our sanitary conditions and preserve the health of the regiment.

In the final analysis, however, the greatest share of the fighting and the dirty, disagreeable jobs were borne by the rifleman. His was the job of climbing endless, rugged mountains in the face of enemy fire, of wading through bitter cold streams, of spending sleepless freezing nights in a lonely foxhole searching for enemy movement and of fighting for his life against a ruthless, charging enemy in the darkness.

Every effort was made to clothe and feed the men properly. During the winter we had excellent protective clothing together with warm down-filled sleeping bags. Every officer knew it was part of his job to see that his men received hot food as often as possible. It was exceptional when these men did not eat at least two hot meals a day.

The men in Korea today know they are doing a man's job in a man's way. They have demonstrated their superiority in the face of tremendous odds. Those of you with sons or relatives there should be very proud of their record of achievement and every American should honor those who are preserving our way of life on the grim battlefield of Korea.

Mr. McCORMICK. So, until we turn our cameras upon the Nation's Capital again next Friday to report on the battle of democracy against world communism, this is Robert McCormick putting a period on the forty-fifth Battle Report, Washington.

Your Post Office Is a Business—If We Are Not Going To Operate It as Such, We Might as Well Close It Up and Get a Flock of Carrier Pigeons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRAZIER REAMS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, the biggest operating business in the world is the United States Post Office. Last year it did a business that cost \$2,224,000,000. But it only received as income \$1,667,000,000. That left an excess of expenditures over income of \$546,832,000. The Post Office Department calls it "excess of expenditures over income." The Congress refers to it as the post office deficit.

This is a big business of which you are a stockholder. It is a very vital part of your daily life. I want you to have some facts before you so that you may decide for yourself whether this difference is a deficit or an excess of expenditures over income. By whatever name it may be called it is an additional half billion dollar load for the taxpayer and a headache for the Congress and particularly for the Postal Committees. But, before I leave the subject and leave you the people too depressed over this let me give you some small comfort in the fact that in the past 100 years the post office has failed to pay its way 83 years. Only in 17 years has the excess of income over revenue existed—and they were mostly in war years.

But to a lot of citizens the breaking down of the postal service is worse than the "deficit" to the taxpayer. Congressmen almos daily receive letters telling of delays, missent mail, and curtailment of service. Letters not addressed with the greatest exactitude often bound back to the sender, the one-a-day delivery service in residential districts came last year; there has been a noticeable lack of the cheerful service at the postal windows to which we have been accustomed; and in many other ways it is obvious that the postal service has deteriorated. But let us not assess the blame too quickly. You might fail to include some of the guilty parties. It might come as close home as it did to the new Congressman who was annoyed at some minor irritation caused by lack of the good postal service which he felt he was entitled to. So, he reached for pen and paper to write his Congressman—then it suddenly dawned on him that he was the man upon whom he was about to pour out his complaint. In searching for the causes of the present plight of the Post Office Department and the bases of correcting them, let us look at a little history of this gigantic business which comes so close to the lives of so many Americans.

The first post office in America was established by the General Court of the Colony of Massachusetts 312 years ago in

1639. The court placed an order on the records as follows:

Richard Fairbanks, his house in Boston is the place appointed for all letters which are brought from beyond the seas or are to be sent thither.

Thus was the first post office in Colonial America established.

In July 1775, the Continental Congress established a post-office system with Benjamin Franklin, the printer and publisher of Philadelphia, as the first Postmaster General. A line of post offices was established from Massachusetts to Georgia. In 1789, under the new Constitution, President Washington appointed Samuel Osgood, of Massachusetts, the first Postmaster General. From that time until this day the Post Office has continued to grow and to serve the people of the country. A well-known tribute to the postal service is the inscription which has for many, many years been on the main post office in New York. It is, "Neither snow, nor rain, nor heat, nor gloom of night stays these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds." There are forces, however, which apparently are more effective than snow or rain or heat or the gloom of the night which are now staying these couriers from giving the service that has characterized the Post Office Department through the years.

Let us analyze some of them. In the first place, it is an error to consider all excess of expenditures over revenue as a deficit. Users of the mails should pay a large but a reasonable part of the costs of this service. Every member of the Post Office Committee of the House believes that a considerable part of the half billion dollars which the taxpayers had to make up for the cost of operating the Post Office Department in 1950 should be paid by the users of the mail, but we likewise believe that there is a large part of that which should not be called deficit—that it should be called service or subsidy, just exactly as it is in any other department. Nowhere else in the Government do we find a department charged with a deficit in operation. Many of the departments spend more than the two and a quarter billion dollars which it takes to operate the Post Office Department, and yet there is no reference to a deficit.

According to the Cost Ascertainment Report of 1950, as prepared by the Post Office Department, the only part of the mail which in that year paid its way was the first-class letter mail. In addition to that, the Insurance Division of the Post Office Department showed approximately \$700,000 on the black side of the ledger, and unassignable profits accounted for \$25,000,000 more. Second-class mail, being newspapers and periodicals, showed a loss of \$180,000,000. Third-class mail, which is advertising matter, lost \$130,000,000; and fourth-class mail, which is parcel post, \$77,000,000. Domestic and foreign air mail, which included sizable subsidies to airlines, lost \$85,000,000; the Registry Department, \$12,000,000; money orders, \$23,000,000; and collect on delivery, postal notes, and postal savings added

another \$20,000,000. Added to these nonprofitable items are the franking mail by the Congressmen, which cost a million and a half dollars. The penalty mail, which means mail by the various governmental departments, thirty-seven and a quarter million; free for the blind, \$382,000; and nonpostal service, \$21,000,000.

The question now is how much of this \$546,832,000 can the users of the postal service be reasonably expected to pay and how much should be charged against the taxpayer in the interest of keeping this great postal system going?

My suggestions, as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, are with reference to putting this United States postal service back to its former position of service and efficiency. In 1893, Marshall Cushing, the historian of the Post Office Department, made the statement:

The United States Post Office is the greatest Government department, in all of its phases.

That statement was never challenged at that time, but it would be challenged today. Here are my suggestions for restoring it to that position:

First. Submit to Congress a realistic budget which recognizes that approximately one-fourth of the cost of operating the post-office system is for the service of all the people and that this amount will be appropriated for that purpose and not as a deficiency appropriation to make up for a deficit.

Second. That postage rates be raised on a graduated scale by as much as can be paid without preventing the people from getting the full measure of information and enlightenment from literature, periodicals, newspapers, and books. That, if necessary, in order to pay the remaining three-fourths of the cost of operation that even first-class mail be raised. However, since first-class letter mail seems to be paying its way now I would be loathe to raise it unless good postal service could not be given without it.

Third. Money orders, registry, insurance, special delivery, and collect on delivery should all pay their own way or be abolished. There does not seem to be any demand for the Government to operate postal savings at this time when banks and insured savings are available in every community. This is costing the post office a lot of money and is taking business away from regular financial institutions. This is a three-and-one-quarter-billion-dollar banking business.

Fourth. We must make the operation of the Post Office Department as efficient as any Government business can be made. I know that where the funds to operate a business are voted by the Congress; where the board of directors is a Committee of Congress; where the head of the business is appointed by the President of the United States; and where the customers are the American people that it is difficult to get the highest efficiency. That is for the same reason that any dictatorship is more efficient than a democracy but it does not

mean that it is better or more satisfactory.

The Hoover Commission analyzed the situation in its report to Congress under the caption, "What is wrong with the Post Office?" It made valuable recommendations:

1. The administrative structure is obsolete and overcentralized.

2. A maze of outmoded laws, regulations, and traditions freezes progress and stifles proper administration.

3. Although the Post Office is a business-type establishment, it lacks the freedom and flexibility essential to good business operation.

4. Rates have not kept pace with wages and other costs, and rate-making machinery is inadequate.

5. The service is used to hide subsidies.

6. Political appointment of first-, second-, and third-class postmasters and certain other officials produces inefficiency and militates against the incentives of promotion.

7. Accounts are kept by the General Accounting Office outside the Department and are available to the Post Office for management purposes only after months of delay. Methods of budgeting and appropriation are entirely unsuited to a business of the size and character of the Post Office. The pressure of these forces in a rapidly growing business accumulates to make impossible the most economical and efficient conduct of the service.

Most of these Hoover report recommendations have been put into effect in the post office. They have not been in operation long enough to get the full benefit of these reforms. One that has not been put into effect is the decentralization of authority. Every matter of discretion or judgment from 42,000 post offices must clear through the Postmaster General's office in Washington. That means that in order to get a dipper and water bucket for the postmaster in a village in Michigan permission must be had from the Postmaster General in Washington.

Fifth. The post office needs every possible program of mechanization that it can get. There has not been a great deal of mechanical change in the handling of mail since Benjamin Franklin started putting mail into sacks prior to the Declaration of Independence. Every other industry realizing that manpower was the greatest expense of business has made the arm of man more efficient as his hours have decreased and his pay become greater. Just as the Post Office Committee needs a trained staff to continuously study the question of postal rates, the operations department of the post office needs an experimental staff working on methods and instruments to make the handling of the mail more efficient. It may be necessary to cut down the size and weight of parcel post. It was started out with a 5-pound limitation, then it went to 11 pounds, later to 50, and it is now 70 pounds. There is a bill now before the House to cut down the size and weight of all packages designated for towns where there are express facilities.

Sixth. The question of adequate pay for post office employees is constantly before the Congress. These increases should be granted by a humanitarian standard but it must be granted on the basis of need. A report for 1925 shows that there was a great demand for an increase in salary at that time, but the figures showed that the percentage of resignations for carriers then ran 1.61 to 2.10 percent from the years 1920 to 1923 while among clerks it ran 5.55 to 6.56 percent. Today the turn-over among clerks and carriers is reported for the past 12 months to be approximately 50 percent. In the Detroit, Mich., post office alone, 1,100 postal employees have left the service during the past 12 months and a majority of those left in the lower grades have had to secure outside employment in order to supplement their income.

Government can never pay salaries quite comparable to outside industry in the manufacturing communities yet there was a time when the post office service had an attractiveness about it which drew excellent men. Without continuous employment there can be no efficiency in this organization. From the Postmaster General who acts as the president of the biggest operating business in the world at a salary of \$22,500 down to the clerks and carriers with beginning salaries of \$2,670 a year we are trying to run the greatest business in the world at the lowest pay scale for comparable work in the country. There will always be able men who are willing to be Postmaster Generals for that salary but to have an organization that will operate efficiently the carriers, clerks and other postal employees must have a salary which they can support a family on along with the honor of being in the postal service.

Your post office is a business. If we are not going to operate it as such, we might as well close it up and get a flock of carrier pigeons.

Mankind's Battle for Decency and Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in 1949, I had the great privilege and opportunity, as the guest of Gen. James Van Fleet, our present commander in Korea, to visit the scene of civilization's unending battle with the obscenity that is communism. In 1949, the locale was northern Greece, near the borders of Albania and Yugoslavia. At that time and place, I saw the magnificent spirit and valor of the Greek Army and Greek people.

Since then, Mr. Speaker, the Greek nation, although ravaged by 11 years of invasion, has sent a battalion to fight for human decency in Korea. Their bravery and exploits have become legendary. I

would like to insert here a letter which appeared in an article in the July 7, 1951, issue of the Saturday Evening Post. The title of the article by Harold H. Martin was the Greeks Know How to Die. The letter in question came from tiny Kollandra, in Macedonia, by Joan Nyktas, mother of George. Written in wavering script, it reads:

SIR COMMANDER: With deep sorrow I received your letter telling me of the death of my dear son. It would be a lie if I told you that anything in the world would make us forget that he will never come back to his village, to his wife, his babies, and to me. But I am proud of him, for he died fighting against tyranny, against crime, and for the peace of the world. Sir Commander, I beg of you, because he sleeps so far away, when you come near the place where he is buried, will you kiss the cross upon his grave, and tell him that the kiss comes from his father and his mother, from his wife and his two little girls who will forever honor him. My eyes are full of tears. I have not the courage to write more. May God bless you and all your gallant men.

Mr. Speaker, could any of the greatest men of letters, Homer, or Virgil, or Shakespeare, have said this more poignantly and more effectively?

Timely Advice to the Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include a very thought-provoking article by that eminent writer, George Sokolsky, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald issue of today, July 30, 1951.

In his uniquely clear style, Mr. Sokolsky presents a constructive analysis of one of the most, so far, baffling problems with which this country is engaged, namely, how to convincingly get across to the other people in the world an understanding of the good things of life in America; Lord knows they are well acquainted with the bad through the medium of Russian propaganda.

As Mr. Sokolsky so well implies, it would undoubtedly be a vast improvement in our own propaganda technique, and insure return value on some of the haphazard spending of the taxpayers' money, if the authorities in the Voice of America program would concentrate attention on the world publication of the fundamental principles of our democracy and leave off some of the fantastic embellishments that just evaporate into the thin air.

As has been so aptly said:

Truths oft repeated will, sooner or later, find acceptance.

I understand a new life and new policy is being injected into the Voice of America, and I can think of no better way for the people in charge to start off than with the adoption of the story set

forth by Mr. Sokolsky. I recommend his editorial to these officials and also to the reading of my colleagues.

His article follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

It is, indeed, tragic that the rest of the world so completely misunderstands the United States. The question arises as to whether we understand ourselves. If we do, we have not been able to convey to the rest of the world what it is that we believe.

During World War II, our main propaganda agencies were, of course, the State Department and the OWI, managed by Elmer Davis and Joseph Barnes. Nelson Rockefeller operated a unit that was supposed to produce a good-neighbor policy for Central and South America.

Then along came the Voice of America which is a very expensive organization but somehow it makes no impression on the rest of the world.

Prof. Saul K. Padover makes the point: "Unlike the Soviet Union, the United States has taken no steps to train political propagandists or people to wage psychological warfare. * * * There should be in Washington a high-level staff to set up and supervise a political and operational training center.

"Such an institution should, after severe screening and testing, recruit the ablest and most imaginative candidates regardless of age or sex, and train them both politically and technically.

"This is especially important because all world-political signs indicate that we are in for a long conflict on ideological grounds, and one that will continue whether there is shooting or not. * * *

Our tendency has been to turn this job over to advertising and public relations men. Their training unsuits them for the work. An advertising man does not need to believe in the product he sells. He may be a cigar smoker who despises cigarettes; yet he will write brilliant copy to promote cigarettes. He thinks in slogans rather than ideas.

The current American type of public relations man is a far cry from Lemuel Eli Guigg or Ivy Lee who were idealists. They served not their client as much as the ideas in which they believed and advised their clients accordingly.

Too many American businessmen hire and fire public relations counsel as they do foremen and are served accordingly.

In the battle over ideas, the techniques developed to sell body odors or to write dull speeches for halting industrialists will not serve. There must be faith, sincerity, conviction. Every agent must be fervid, even fanatical in his acceptance of a view.

Let us see what we want to say to the world. It can be stated simply:

1. The United States believes that every individual on the face of the earth possesses inalienable rights, among them life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and the ownership of property protected by law.

2. The United States believes that these rights are not a product of legislation or administration, but that they are manifestations of God's will; that they come from nature's God and nature's law.

3. The United States has no aspirations to increase its territory or to take over any people.

4. The United States believes that every people, great or small, is entitled to a government of its own choice, selected as the people themselves determine without interference by any other government by any means, by war, by propaganda, by infiltration, by intrigue.

5. The United States is committed to an association of nations in which any nation

may be a member if its people so desire. No such association may be regarded as satisfactory as long as independent and sovereign nations are excluded from membership.

Few people in any country believe that the United States has not been using its billions of give-away dollars for some ulterior purpose.

The belief that the United States seeks something selfish and materialistic is so generally held that it can only be the product of our own activities.

Soviet Russia has been magnificently successful in painting America as a selfish, materialistic, imperialistic country that hates all people who are not white.

Professor Padover tells this story:

"This writer heard Asian students say that it is a well-known fact that during World War II the United States dropped the atom bomb on the Japanese because the latter were a yellow race and did not drop it on the Germans because they were white. 'Everybody in Asia,' the students added, 'knows that to be true.'"

It is terrifying how such an utterly false idea can be accepted and spread. Yet, ideas such as these are being circulated and believed throughout the world.

The Philosophy of a Controlled Economy in Our Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
or

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ben J. Williams, former president of the New Orleans Chamber of Commerce, and now a member of its board of directors, recently delivered an address on the philosophy of a controlled economy in our Nation.

The address caused such widespread comment and interest that I have deemed it of sufficient importance to direct it to the attention of this body.

Following is Mr. Williams' address which was delivered over radio station WSMB in the city of New Orleans on July 13:

Inflation means money losing its purchasing power. As inflation goes forward a dollar buys less and less. A dollar today buys a little more than half of what it did in 1939. This has meant hardship and disappointed hopes for all who depend on what pay checks and savings will buy. Yet our inflation has been mild compared with that experienced in some countries where money has become almost worthless. The consequences have been written out for us in lessons of experience.

Runaway inflation would wreck our country as it has wrecked others. The personal injury we would each sustain in the loss of purchasing power is just the beginning of the story.

There are only two forces that can hold an economy together and keep it working. One is an iron-fisted dictatorship which forces people to work and tells them what they can have in return. The other is a system of supply-and-demand pricing based on people's free choice as to what they will produce and what they will buy. In this land of liberty, freedom of enterprise is the guiding star for it measures the result of

our plans and our work, and determines what we may get tomorrow for what we do today. If prices start leaping forward in the worldwide pattern of inflation, our price system will lose its power to hold us together and keep us working for the good of all. Confusion and frustration will take over and incentive will disappear. Production will drift downward. Our present trend in Government which has not enough regard for principle and ultimate consequence will reach its final low level and destroy capitalism—the production-through-incentive system which functions best when there is a minimum of Government restraint and when the value of money is established by competition for different goods and different services. The alternative is a decay of our military and productive power to withstand Communist aggression, the loss of freedom and human dignity, without which everything worth while is lost.

The Communists in their campaign of world conquest may count heavily on inflation to reduce our strength. The time to face the danger is now. There is a sure way for free and intelligent people to prevent disaster.

First, we must put emphasis on production. People must work longer and harder so as to produce enough to supply military needs and at the same time provide for civilian living requirements.

This Nation's world preeminence is founded on its genius for production. We must not shackle it; we must use it.

Second, we must have economy in Government. The nondefense expenditures of Federal, State, and local governments use up an excessive and constantly increasing share of our national income. Public spending bids prices up, just as private spending does. This is the wrong time for governments to venture into new nondefense activities, it is the right time for them to save money in the programs already existing.

Third, we in the greatest degree possible must pay for our defense program with taxes, not with borrowed money. Suppose the Government borrowed billions of dollars from the banks and paid those dollars to people for building guns and tanks and planes. People would take that money and spend it on food, clothing, and other consumer goods. Of course, that would bid prices up which means that the dollar would have less value.

Contemplate this fact regarding a billion. Since the year 50, more than 1900 years have elapsed whereas 1,000,000,000 minutes have not yet elapsed.

How silly it is to reason that billions of dollars may be added to the supply of money without lessening the value of the dollar.

When we as a Nation decide to put more of our productive effort into a defense program, we accept for ourselves some inevitable sacrifice in the things we can buy for our individual use. The right way to take that sacrifice is in the form of taxes assessed against all the people so as to soak up as much purchasing power as the new government spending creates. If we take that sacrifice in the form of taxes, we will be far better off than if we take it in the higher prices that otherwise are inevitable.

Fourth, Government spending for defense must be done with careful regard for the limits of our national capacity. Military officials must avoid the great temptation to be reckless and wasteful in the quantity and quality of their purchases.

Fifth, the expansion of credit to private firms and individuals must be curtailed. Otherwise new borrowed funds would be thrown into the spending stream to bid prices up.

Sixth, people must save money and keep it in fixed-dollar investments such as bonds, deposits and life-insurance policies. The

more we save the less we spend, and the harder it will for prices to go up. It is reasonable and honest to ask people to save if the other essential things are done to justify confidence in the long-range buying power of the dollar.

And, finally, we must recognize that our country is in great danger, and we must dedicate ourselves to its survival as the citadel of freedom. This means we must think less of our immediate personal rewards and more of what we can contribute to the building of our national strength.

If we can put this seven-point program into effect, we can save our country from the dreadful consequences of inflation. The difficulty is that the people are being cheated by the illusion of an easier remedy—one that works on the symptoms of the inflation but only aggravates the real disease. This false remedy is price ceilings. There are three things about price ceilings that the people must understand.

First, they do not stop inflation. If people have money they wish to spend, and there are not enough goods to go around, prices always go up—one way or another. Black markets are only one way. There are many others. Instead of paying more for the same thing, you often pay the same amount for something poorer—that is inflation, too. Goods get shoddier; the good quality lines disappear from the shelves; price-cut sales diminish; you have to buy something you do not want to get something you do want; service grows poorer; you have to stand in line for things; the scarce items come from under the counter; what you can buy depends on how much "pull" you have. Finally, the things you want to buy just aren't for sale. Instead of meat, you have ration coupons for dinner. The people are forced to hold back money they want to spend, so that later, when the ceilings collapse, they can spend it all at once and send prices skyrocketing.

Second, price ceilings cripple production and thereby increase inflation. Under ceilings, no one can afford to produce anything unless he first finds means to determine what constantly changing Governmental regulations will allow him to get for it and whether that is enough to cover his costs and a reasonable profit. Very often, the answer is "No," and production stalls. Often a firm must make the wrong article because price ceilings prohibit making the right one. How can it be otherwise when a group of bureaucrats must make the decisions on business problems they cannot possibly understand? At best, a whole army of people are taken out of productive jobs and converted into price policemen at Government expense. The mere job of keeping up with price regulations is a costly, time-consuming burden. Less goods and higher costs mean more inflation in the end.

And third, the worst of all, price ceilings make it hard for a government to fight inflation because it must deceive people into believing that the hard, sound remedy is unnecessary. They make people think that the Government can stop inflation by saying it must stop, rather than doing the fundamental things that will make it stop. If prices are rising, a law is passed against it—how stupid. Value by force for paper money has never succeeded, not even when the penalty for violating price ceilings has been death. And let us not overlook the fact that bureaucracy is government by men instead of by law, and what is tyranny but the exercise of discretionary power over the life and property of the citizen?

It is deceitful and unjust to encourage housewives and others to sign telegrams and petitions relating to intricate economic matters.

We all wish money to merit increased value in terms of goods, but it is an obvious fact to those who reason soundly that the dollar

is worth not more than it will purchase in a free and open competitive market.

Price ceilings may make sense for the politician who banks upon an ignorant electorate. It makes no sense for a nation of informed people, who take their citizenship seriously, and who mean to keep their freedom alive now and in the years ahead.

For them, the only answer is one that goes to the cause of the disease and cures it. The answer is not simple; it is not easy; it is not compounded of false hopes. It consists of: (1) Production; (2) Government economy; (3) increased taxes from everyone so as not to destroy production incentives; (4) wise military spending; (5) curtailed credit; (6) individual savings; and (7) real dedication to the cause of freedom.

Appreciation for the Home-Town Doctor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, we, as Americans, owe so much to the medical profession. The family doctors, the surgeons, and the specialists have an unparalleled record in relieving human suffering and prolonging human life. Many of them have rendered great sacrificial service for their fellow man.

Because of our deep appreciation for the doctors we are always pleased to read accounts that are written when a community honors their local doctor. Such was the case with reference to Dr. W. E. Shook who lives in the town of Shubert, a town of about 500 population which is located in Richardson County, Nebr.

In connection with the news accounts concerning Dr. Shook, the Lincoln Star of Lincoln, Nebr., published an editorial entitled "End of a Perfect Day." I wish to insert that in the RECORD. It is as follows:

END OF A PERFECT DAY

The news accounts of that community picnic which Shubert tendered to its beloved, faithful country doctor, Dr. W. E. Shook, overlooked the benediction to a perfect day which only Dr. Shook himself could supply.

The crowds were melting away. The program had ended. In one of the speeches, reference was made to the muddy roads over which those present had traveled to express to Dr. Shook the affection a Nebraska community had for him in all his years of loyalty to its people. It had rained a few hours before the picnic.

"These are the kind of roads," one of the speakers said, "over which he has traveled innumerable times in order to be with you when you were sick."

The telephone rang.

A farmer had mangled his hand badly and was in need of medical care.

The good doctor, 78 years young, the center of attention throughout the afternoon, shaking hands, talking with scores of old friends, mingling with the crowds and loving every minute of it, was on his way.

There was the same mud and the same miles to be traveled. Duty was calling, and when duty calls Dr. Shook all other voices are unheard.

To Continue the Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Greenfield (Ind.) Daily Reporter, issue of July 28, 1951:

TO CONTINUE THE MARSHALL PLAN

The Marshall plan (the Economic Cooperation Organization or ECA) is scheduled to die a natural death in 1952. This is the emergency pump devised in 1946 to transfuse money, assistance, and industrial vitality into the veins of war-torn European countries, and was named after then Chief of Staff, now Secretary of Defense, George C. Marshall, because he made the first public presentation of the idea in a speech, although he did not originate the idea.

Congress went for the idea because it was generally recognized that some assistance would have to be given France, Italy, Britain, and the rest to prime their economic pumps, and because there was a definite length of time suggested—expiration in 1952—which kept the venture in the emergency class.

Since that time a lot more billions have been spent, bartered, and given away in the name of the Marshall plan than were originally contemplated, and for purposes which were quite different from the original intentions. Critics of the plan, objectors to its prostitution, were aware of this, but largely bided their time in the feeling that in 1952 this phase would pass.

Since its original establishment, the Communist menace has loomed higher on the horizon. The "Good Old Joe" attitude has changed as our blind eyes have been opened and those who refused to listen to the early warnings of "wolf, wolf," have now become acutely conscious of the menace which quite a lot of us have seen for nearly 20 years.

So the objectives of ECA have gradually undergone a change. Instead of merely helping those who were down to get back up on their feet, it is now being pointed to as the great weapon in the fight against the spread of communism.

Leaders of ECA, supporters of the theory, have insisted all along that its success and accomplishments have far exceeded their fondest dreams and have produced figures to support this statement.

That being the case, if it is really true, this should then mean that by 1952, the ECA should be allowed to follow the original intent of its creators and die a natural death, its purposes well accomplished.

But in the last year, another phase of international help has come forth, largely the result of the Korean fracas, and the sudden hysterical fear of communism's spread. That is military aid in the building of an international force under the North Atlantic Pact designed to be strong enough to first discourage but, if necessary, to resist, military invasion of Western Europe from Russia. We are now spending, and in the future plan a lot more, billions in direct military aid.

But the lovers of ECA, reluctant to see it die as planned, are now attempting to get it in fact, become transmorgified, by tying it onto the military aid plan.

Currently President Truman and also General Marshall as his spokesman, are trying to sell Congress on a total bill of \$8,500,000,-

000 a year for 3 years, or a total of \$25,500,-000,000 for the dual purpose, which would, incidentally, allow ECA to continue to live past 1952, and, still more incidentally, allow the tens of thousands of public office holders connected with it to still fill their jobs and draw their pay, some of it lush indeed.

No wonder Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois, wonders "what they will use for money about the third year."

There is no doubt we will have to help Europe rearm; nor that we will carry a considerable portion of the cost. That will take money. But this business has all the earmarks of the old "tax and tax, spend and spend" political theory which has put us in such a precarious fiscal position in this country, has caused our present inflation, and is at present taking about 30 percent out of every worker's pay envelope. It has all the characteristics of tying everything all together in such a hodgepodge that no one can tell anything about anything, overlapping authorities, purposes, and organizations so that no one will have to be laid off and letting the American people pay the bill again.

Oil Output Boosted in Five Nations To Match Supply Lost in Iran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, recently we have heard thinly veiled threats of gasoline and fuel oil rationing from various of the administration officials who are concerned with petroleum production. Some of these statements imply that rationing will be necessary if the oil output of Iran is lost to the western nations. One cannot help but recall that gasoline rationing has been seriously proposed by some officials not because it is necessary but as a measure to make the public realize what is termed the seriousness of the emergency.

The following article in doubly interesting in the light of these conditions:

OIL OUTPUT BOOSTED IN FIVE NATIONS TO MATCH SUPPLY LOST IN IRAN

(By Ernie Hill)

UNITED NATIONS, N. Y., July 28—British and American oil companies have amazingly stepped up production in five countries to take over completely Iran's world petroleum markets.

The companies are furnishing all of Iran's old customers with all the petroleum they need. Officials say the new production levels can be maintained indefinitely.

This situation, it is disclosed, was made clear to Premier Mohammed Mossadeq in Tehran by President Truman's special envoy, W. Averell Harriman.

Iran, it is pointed out, faces economic collapse without markets for its oil unless it reaches some agreement with Britain on terms of nationalization and marketing.

UNITED STATES AND CANADA AID

The oil fields in Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, the United States, Canada and Venezuela are producing 668,000 more barrels of oil daily now than they were March 20 when the nationalization decree was adopted.

At that time, Iran was producing 700,000 barrels daily, 600,000 of which were exported. It ranked as the world's fourth oil producer behind the United States, Venezuela, and Russia.

Today the oil world is more concerned about an oversupply of petroleum and by-products than it is about a shortage.

Should the war in Korea end and should Iran continue production with British assistance, drastic cut-backs would be needed to prevent the market from glutting.

PERSIAN OUTPUT BOOSTED

The largest increases in production have been made in Kuwait on the Persian Gulf. The Kuwait Oil Co. is owned by the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. and half by Gulf Oil of the United States.

Kuwait production has been increased from 375,000 barrels daily to 641,000, a gain of 266,000 barrels.

The second largest gain has been registered in Saudi Arabia by the Aranco Co., a subsidiary of Standard Oil of New Jersey.

Saudi Arabian production is up from 639,000 barrels daily to 803,000 barrels, a gain of 164,000. On the basis of this increase, Saudi Arabia displaces Iran as the world's fourth largest producer.

Kuwait and Saudi Arabia have absorbed 70 percent of the Iranian market.

Canada has doubled her production in the last 4 months. The increase was from 80,000 barrels daily to 168,000 in July.

The political implications of these production shifts are considered extremely significant.

It places the United States and Britain, as represented by their oil companies, in the position of waging a full-scale campaign to break the back of the Iranian Government.

Iranians here have estimated that they could maintain themselves economically if they could sell 20 percent of the oil previously marketed by Anglo-Iranian. At the present time, their sales are only about 2 percent.

President Truman Insults the People of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks a radio broadcast by Mr. David Lawrence, editor of the United States News and World Report, over the National Broadcasting network on Sunday, July 29. Mr. Lawrence calls attention to lack of judgment on the part of President Truman in his speech at Detroit on last Saturday. It is evidence that presidential advisers and special writers have no idea as to progressive thinking in Wisconsin.

The broadcast follows:

There's really one over-all subject today—the speech the President delivered at Detroit yesterday. For it has in it a variety of questions that all of us are concerned about.

But, before I take that up, I want to call your attention to something significant that happened last week. Congress worked out a compromise on the economic controls legislation which in my judgment will make it possible for the new law to accomplish what people want—a restraint on higher prices

without destroying our economic system and its proper practices.

Speaking of prices, the Department of Agriculture has just announced that the general level of prices received by the farmers of this country tumbled again for the fifth consecutive month. The drop as of July 15 was 2.3 percent below the price level on June 15. Yet the prices the farmer has to pay for the things he buys are unchanged. As a result, the figure for the parity ratio—the official formula for measuring the farmer's position—has dropped sharply. This parity is now at 104, which is 15 percent below what it was at the high point of the postwar period—namely, in October 1946.

Now let me take up the questions growing out of the President's speech at Detroit yesterday.

I'll give you what I think are the constructive points and also some of the negative impressions that flow from that address.

Mr. Truman was right in saying that aggression in Korea was aimed at the whole idea of the United Nations and that the United Nations was justified in resisting that aggression. He pointed out that we could have given up in face of attack, but that we didn't. That is a decision for which our Government and its leadership must be commended.

But the question is "Have we really frustrated aggression and taught the aggressor a lesson?"

The President says: "We do not yet know whether the Communists really desire peace in Korea or whether they simply are trying to gain by negotiations what they have not been able to gain by conquest. We intend to find that out. The talks can be successful if the Communists are in fact ready to give up aggression in Korea."

So in a nutshell we don't know as yet what effect our resistance to aggression has created on the Communists. The President says they are building up armies in Europe and Asia. So are we.

The President thinks the answer is for us to build up our armed strength and that this could prove a deterrent to further aggression, and he expresses the hope that we will not have to use our armed strength.

With this and the other sections of the President's speech dealing with our policy of rearmament and resistance to aggression, all of us can agree. But there was one part of the speech which I think was very unfortunate.

Since that speech was delivered over most all of the radio and television stations of the Nation yesterday, it is most regrettable that Mr. Truman broadcast the mistake that he did. Now let me read you exactly what the President said:

"Never, not even in the bitterest political campaigns, and I have been through many a one, have I seen such a flood of lies and slander as is now pouring forth over the country."

"Now listen to this one. This malicious propaganda has gone so far that on the Fourth of July, over in Madison, Wis., people were afraid to say they believed in the Declaration of Independence. A hundred and twelve people were asked to sign a petition that contained nothing except quotations from the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights. One hundred and eleven of these people refused to sign that paper—many of them because they were afraid that it was some kind of subversive document and that they would lose their jobs or be called Communists. Can you imagine finding 111 people in the capital of Wisconsin that didn't know what the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights provided? I can't imagine it."

"Think of it, in the capital of the State of Wisconsin, on the fourth of July this year, 1951, good Americans were afraid to sign their names to the language of the Declara-

tion of Independence. Think of that in the home State of two of America's greatest liberal and progressive Senators, Robert M. La Follette and Robert, Jr."

"Now that's what comes of all these lies, smears, and fear campaigns. That's what comes when people are told they can't trust their own Government."

After I heard that I telephoned to Don Anderson, publisher of the leading newspaper in Madison, Wis., the Wisconsin State Journal, to get details as to what actually did happen on July 4, last. He said his newspaper was printing a reply to the President in the form of an editorial which will be published tomorrow morning, but he gave me permission to read it to you now. The people of any city, when characterized before the entire Nation in that way by the President of the United States, have the right to present their side, so I will read that editorial to you now:

"President Truman must be in a sorry state of nervous jitters. Either that or he failed to clear his most recent speech with the stylists and researchers who ordinarily read copy on the Presidential pronouncements."

"In Detroit Saturday, the President fell for one of the oldest gags in a city editor's repertoire—the phony petition."

"Because the gag was staged in Madison, the city received some dubious notoriety in the President's address. He cited a feature article in the Capital Times which told of the failure of a reporter to get signatures to a petition which was nothing but sections from the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights."

"Now any city editor worth his salt knows that a smart reporter can get many worthy people to sign the most damaging of petitions. By staging the act properly, the same reporter can get blanket refusals for the most proper or innocuous ones."

"Having seen the Capital Times city editor and this particular reporter in action on the liberal front and amidst the peace crusades over the years, the State Journal hasn't the slightest doubt the July 4 act was carefully staged."

"Consider the background."

"Many Madison people were badly misled last year when they signed the harmless-sounding Stockholm peace petition—a Communist propaganda device."

"On the same day the Times worked its feature stunt (namely, July 4 last) the Madison chapter of the American Peace Crusade circulated a pamphlet calling for the withdrawal of troops from Korea and asking for no more laws taxing the workingman to pay for the rich man's war."

"Put these facts against the setting of a family picnic day. Then take a look at the reporter asking signatures for a long and rhetorical document."

"What sensible person would sign? We wouldn't. Not even today. And knowing and approving the content of the petition."

"Years ago, on a dull news day, we sent a cub reporter out to try to sell a bright new silver dollar for 65 cents. He tried 40 or 50 people on Capital Square before finding a buyer. President Truman would have thought that a reflection on United States monetary values. If it happened now, he'd probably be right."

"Under the proper stimulus, people will sign things. They'll also not sign them."

"We have no quarrel with the Times for working its gag down its particular party line. The July 4 stunt was quite in character."

"For the President of the United States to fall into the trap and use the incident in a major address is an unhappy commentary on the state of his nervous and emotional balance."

Now that's the end of the quotation from the editorial in the Wisconsin State Journal.

of Madison, Wis., in reply to the President's accusations about the people of Madison.

I leave it to you to judge whether Mr. Truman was fair in broadcasting over the major networks and television stations such a loose charge. I leave it to you to decide whether, if any stranger came along with a petition, you would sign it especially if it seemed to favor revolution and the overthrow of government. Even though you knew it was a quotation from the Declaration of Independence, you would wonder just what was behind such a move now and whether someone wanted you to line up behind the Communists who are always taking innocent-looking phrases and putting them into petitions of various kinds. The Truman administration itself has denounced the famous peace petition which the Communists started at Stockholm last year and circulated around the world, getting millions of signatures before innocent people realized it was a phony.

In my opinion, the President owes an apology to the people of the city of Madison, Wis., and to the people of the State of Wisconsin, and to the American people for having given credence to what on its face was a phony petition and a trick. President Truman, through his staff, could easily have verified what was back of that incident. It has been referred to in print many times since July 4 last and should have been investigated thoroughly. It could encourage more phony petitions.

No wonder we are sometimes confused by the speeches we hear from Washington, and were it not for a free press and a free radio, you wouldn't ever learn the other side. The "big lies" will never get anywhere in America if we preserve freedom of speech for all sides.

I am also including, Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Star on last evening, which is also a reply to the intemperate remarks of the President:

THE RIGHT TO BE LET ALONE

A Fourth of July enterprise by the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times gave Mr. Truman the text for a sort of gee-whiz sermon during his Detroit speech on Saturday. "Think of it," he exclaimed, "in the capital of the State of Wisconsin, on the Fourth of July in this year 1951, good Americans were afraid to sign their names to the language of the Declaration of Independence. That's what comes of all these lies and smears and fear campaigns. That's what comes when people are told they can't trust their own Government."

The Capital Times reporter who made this test explains that he took a copy of a petition containing excerpts from the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights to a public park on Independence Day and asked people to sign it. Only 1 out of 112 people approached was willing to do so. At the same time, a petition was being circulated in the same crowd by the American Peace Crusade, asking for removal of American troops from Korea. Some of the people asked by the reporter to sign his petition thought it was the American Peace Crusade petition.

Well, if there is any moral to this story, the Star is inclined to think it is a good one, not a bad one. For it is downright encouraging to note that there are many people left in this country who are unwilling to sign something. The tendency, in recent years, seems to have run the other way. There have been so many joiners of organizations, so many signers of petitions and telegrams to your Congressmen, so many appeals for this and that, so many movements to put pressure on the individual in favor of something or against something, that we are, perhaps,

becoming tardily skeptical. And if this is the case, it is a good thing.

If a newspaper reporter went out on the street and asked passers-by to stop and sign a statement to the effect that they believed in the Ten Commandments, the probabilities are that most of his customers would turn him down. But the results of this experiment would not be convincing evidence that people are against virtue. The more reasonable conclusion would be that people want, more than anything else, the right to be let alone, and the right to mind their own business.

And this, in the Star's opinion, is a worthy aspiration.

John Davies and the Loyalty Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, this morning's press carried news stories stating that the State Department has reinstated Mr. John Davies, who suffered a suspension as a result of charges made against him, which charges were investigated by the Loyalty Board. I do not know Mr. Davies, but I do know he will need fortitude and a philosophical outlook on life to avoid loss of self-confidence and official usefulness as a result of the experience of having his suspension so widely publicized without full disclosure of the charges which brought it about. His difficulties were recently made the subject of a column by Mr. Joseph Alsop. The column is a singular one and worthy of careful attention. Under permission, I include it in our RECORD:

[From the Washington Post of July 25, 1951]

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph Alsop)

BEFORE THE LOYALTY BOARD

Every so often a reporter has a personal experience interesting enough to call for breaking the good rule of impersonality, and telling what happened to him. One such has just come to this reporter, in the form of an appearance before the State Department Loyalty Board in the case of John Paton Davies, Jr.

To be sure, there was nothing very stirring about the hour or so at the hearing. The three-man board, headed by a shrewd, dry-spoken New Englander, Conrad E. Snow, clothes itself in no special majesty. The setting is an ordinary State Department office borrowed for the occasion. After the oath, the routine of question and answer goes forward in an informal but businesslike way. The board seems both sensible and patient. When it is over, your first reaction is, "Well, I thought there would be more to it than that."

On reflection, however, it seems to me that there is more to it than that, which is the reason why the first person singular is being used in this sphere for the first time in 6 years. Here was Davies, after all, formerly a senior member of the State Department Planning Staff, now publicly charged with doubtful loyalty, and publicly suspended from duty on the eve of a most important assignment as political adviser in Germany. Here was his name blackened, his career perhaps permanently damaged, his fortune

already hard hit by all the horrible complications of a sudden change of family plan after the sale of the family house. And all for what? To make a burnt offering with a sweet savor in the peculiar nostrils of Senator McCARTHY and Senator MCCARRAN.

Certainly, if anyone can testify competently as to the sense or nonsense of this proceeding against Davies, it is this reporter; for in the wartime years in Chungking we were, so to speak, competing backroom boys.

Davies was the political adviser of Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell; I was the adviser of Dr. T. V. Soong and Maj. Gen. C. L. Chennault. I fought for airpower and a policy of strengthening the Chinese National Government, and he defended General Stilwell's views and advocated American military aid to the Chinese Communists. Davies was finally defeated when General Stilwell was dismissed. But it was a bitter battle while it lasted, and on the principle that no one knows you as your enemy knows you I think I know John Davies pretty well.

As to his loyalty, no doubts ever occurred to me, even in the most squalid moments of the long, squalid struggle in Chungking. Indeed, the thought that I could not escape as I sat before the loyalty board was the thought that Davies' judgment of the Chinese scene had stood the test of time rather better than my own.

The difference between the two views was simple enough. By the end of 1943 and the beginning of 1944 it was already clear that the regime of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek would succumb to the Chinese Communists after the war, unless something pretty drastic was done. My view was that a Communist triumph could be prevented by replacing General Stilwell with a wiser man, increasing the scale of American aid, and intervening very actively to reform the rotting Nationalist Government.

Given the satisfaction of all these difficult conditions, particularly the indispensable third, I still think I might have been proven right.

Davies held the view, on the other hand, and with many excellent reasons, that the Generalissimo's government was already past saving. If this was the case, the question was not how to prevent a Chinese Communist victory, but how to come to terms with it. Davies also knew certain things that very few people in America seem to know even today—that Mao Tse-tung and his Communists had developed their party and their policy in isolation from and sometimes in defiance of the Kremlin, for example, and that throughout the course of the China war, the only recipient of Soviet aid had been the Generalissimo.

With this special knowledge, Davies made what must now be accounted an extremely brilliant deduction—that Titolsm was possible, before Titolsm had been heard of. Believing Chiang Kai-shek was past saving, believing also in the possibility of Chinese Titolsm, Davies therefore recommended moderate American aid for the Chinese Communists. His avowed aim was to promote their Chinese Communist confidence in America, and thus to achieve a division between them and the Kremlin. And if Davies' recommendations had been followed, I now believe he would have been proven right.

In short, there were two perfectly logical and defensible American policies in China, and you could take your choice between them. What actually happened—what I for one had certainly never foreseen—was that after the dismissal of General Stilwell, we ceased to have any China policy at all. Even when Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer was performing so admirably as military commander, his hands were politically tied; after that, there was total vacuum.

Having no policy led, inevitably, to the present disaster. For this outcome, John Davies, the man being sacrificed to Senator McCARRAN and Senator MCCARTHY, had no more visible responsibility than I. As I thus reviewed the past, it struck me we would be much wiser to start loyalty investigations of the politicians who are now working all-out to destroy the last vestiges of decency and fair play in our public life, than to waste time picking over the bygone views of such men as John Davies.

Boy, Are We Confused

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of July 30, 1951:

BOY, ARE WE CONFUSED

At Detroit Saturday President Truman charged that administration critics are "trying to stir up trouble and suspicion between the people and their Government."

There is no doubt that many people are suspicious of the administration's motives and skeptical of its ability and integrity. But critics of Mr. Truman's government are not responsible for that situation. The Government itself has brought it about.

Take the case of the troops-to-Europe controversy. Last February Defense Secretary Marshall told Senators that the administration planned to send only four additional divisions to Europe, a total of 72,000 men if the divisions were at full strength, plus 20,000 or 25,000 supporting troops, which, with the 97,000 men already there, would make a total ground force of 189,000 to 194,000. Air and naval forces, it was estimated, would make the combined total approximately 250,000.

Marshall's estimates took much of the steam out of the opposition to the proposal to assign United States forces to a European army in peacetime. Consequently the Senate passed a resolution which, however, had no legal effect, approving the assignment of the four additional divisions to the European command and expressing the pious hope that the approval of the Senate would be sought for any additional overseas assignments.

Friday, out of a clear sky, General Marshall told the Senate foreign relations committee that the United States expected to have 340,000 ground troops and 60,000 Air Force troops in Europe in 1952, a total of 400,000.

This not only confused Senators and newspapermen but the Pentagon as well. To quote from an Associated Press dispatch, "highest defense authorities at the Pentagon told newsmen after hours of frantic checking and double checking that they were unable to explain or clarify the basis for Marshall's statement."

But Saturday Marshall confirmed his 400,000 total, explaining that he meant supply and supporting troops as well as combat units.

Thus, according to Marshall's own testimony, the number of supply and supporting troops necessary to maintain 169,000 combat troops has risen from an estimated 20,000 to 25,000 in February to a total of 171,000 in July.

Marshall's estimates may be right today, but if so he was being somewhat less than frank with the Senate last February. Or was the administration planning all along to send more troops to Europe than the number given in the February estimate, and did Marshall let the cat out of the bag?

Then there was the strange case of the Pentagon spokesman who issued a statement Friday saying that, while the U. N. forces have halted their offensive in Korea, the Communists have taken advantage of the cease-fire talks to make a tremendous build-up of their strength.

Friday evening the Defense Department announced that this statement did not reflect official policy or views.

But Saturday in Detroit President Truman said the North Koreans and Chinese Communists were getting a steady flow of new equipment from the Soviet Union for ground and air use and that there were heavy concentrations of Soviet air, land, and sea forces along the Manchurian border and opposite Japan and Alaska.

So who was telling the truth—the original Pentagon spokesmen, the Defense Department which repudiated his views or the President, who restated what the Pentagon spokesman had said?

Is it a case of the administration simply being confused, do responsible officials fear that war with Russia is imminent or are they simply trying to scare the hell out of us in order to get more authority from Congress to control the lives of American citizens?

We note also that Manly Fleischmann, Defense Production Administrator, said Friday that consumers have no reason to worry because of cut-backs in the use of metals for civilian goods.

"Even with our defense production program, we will generally maintain a level of civilian production approximately equal to that of 1949, which certainly wasn't a year of hardship," he said.

If this is true, it knocks the props out from under the arguments of those who say we've got to have more and tougher controls. It supports the position of those who say the only powers the Government needs are credit controls and authority to allocate materials.

These are some of the examples of the confusion, emanating from the Government itself, which has produced a widespread lack of confidence in the Truman administration. The remedy for that unhappy situation is a new administration.

Ambassador Cowen's Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following message of Ambassador Myron M. Cowen to the Filipino people on the occasion of the fifth anniversary of Philippine independence:

AMBASSADOR COWEN'S MESSAGE

Our two peoples are celebrating again today an event of tremendous importance in the history of the Philippines and of the United States: our national independence day. In both countries this day gains added significance with each passing year. Americans are no less proud than Filipinos that on July 4, 1946, the United States fulfilled its

promise and the Filipino people assumed the responsibilities of full and complete sovereignty. On that date, the United States reaffirmed a cardinal principle of its relations with all nations: that every people has the right to be governed in accordance with its freely expressed wishes and to promote its national development in its own way.

On this, the fifth anniversary of Philippine independence, I especially feel that both our nations should soberly review the obligations which we have undertaken with all other free nations of the world and renew our common efforts to improve the conditions of security and freedom for peoples everywhere.

Today, the Philippines and the United States are working together in a free partnership in order to promote and protect the interests common to both. Today, brave Filipino soldiers with their brothers of many nations are fighting magnificently on the battlefields of Korea in order to help a sister nation drive out cruel blood-thirsty aggressors. At home, the Filipino people are making earnest efforts to raise their national living standards and improve their general welfare. The United States, for its part, recognizes these endeavors and is adding its resources to those of the Philippine nation in a joint effort to provide a better and safer life for the Filipino people.

There are some unfriendly voices which are trying to create doubts and fears about our promises to cooperate with the Philippines and safeguard its security. These small voices cannot alter our purpose, deter our efforts, nor mar our friendship. Filipinos and Americans, by continuing to work together in mutual confidence and respect, can proudly show the whole world what cooperation among free democratic nations can achieve.

Down From Olympus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I believe the following editorial from the Trenton Evening Times will be of interest to the Members:

DOWN FROM OLYMPUS

General MacArthur made a stirring and effective political speech before the Massachusetts Legislature Wednesday night. If the Republican National Convention were being held this week instead of next year, this is the address the delegates would cheer to the echo as a keynote utterance. It rang all of the charges with fervor and eloquence. It has everything demanded by the more conservative leaders of the Republican Party.

General MacArthur again stressed the familiar charge, somewhat demagogic, that our foreign policy, or what there is of it, is being "dictated from abroad." In support, he cites his own experience in being relieved of his command for his expressed readiness to meet the enemy commander to discuss a cease-fire while an identical proposal was received so enthusiastically "when made by the Soviet Government."

As has been his custom in his more recent speeches, General MacArthur broadened the scope of his discussion to include matters other than his own problems, military and foreign policies. Excessive taxation, governmental waste and incompetency and the plight of the worker gave added political

overtone to his address. He said he had been warned that his course would "bring down upon my head ruthless retaliation." It is doubtful if these fears are well founded.

The General repeats his argument that we must "outlaw" war. What does he think the United States and other free nations have been trying to do? The Charter of the United Nations opens with the statement that the members are determined "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war," and pledges them to "unite our strength to maintain international peace and security." However, the General has testified that he has "only the barest knowledge of what has transpired in the United Nations" and it may be that he is not aware of this purpose.

Undoubtedly, General MacArthur has descended from his five-star Olympus to the sweat and dirt of the political battlefields. He must be prepared to accept what happens even to the most exalted when one is in the forefront of the political firing line.

Teddy (Bully Bully) Roosevelt and the Big Stick: In the Light of History, Perhaps Not So Bully Nor So Big

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, history seems to slide people and events into perspective.

One of my home-town papers recently said that were Teddy—Bully Bully—Roosevelt around today with his big stick, the Korean situation would be solved in jig time as it was in 1905 when Teddy awarded Korea to Japan in recognition for her defeat of Russia. The people of Korea were shut out, denied their own government.

You will recall Russia moved in on Korea, started to develop timber and mineral concessions which she black-jacked from the King of Korea. Japan slapped her down. The plum, Korea, was awarded to Japan by Teddy who, history tells us, acted as front man for the interests of the four horsemen of the Orient, Muraviev, of Russia, Ito, of Japan, Landsdowne and MacLeavey Brown, of Great Britain.

We were thanked for our gallant gesture, in 1941, by the Japanese with the slaughter of our boys at Pearl Harbor. Had Teddy had more vision at the time of the 1905 settlement, provisions might have been made for the use of Korean facilities in the event hostilities again flared up in the Far East. Thus check-mated, Japan would not have struck at Pearl Harbor.

I trust the U. N. negotiators at Kaesong today will keep an eye peeled on the future. The past aggressors in Korea—Russia, China, and Japan must be check-mated. The people of Korea should not be denied their own government. Korean facilities should be provided for the United Nations in the event hostilities again flare up in the Far East. Such is the lesson of history.

XCVII—App.—303

Graduated Leave

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include here a comparison showing savings to the Federal Government that would be affected by the graduated-leave plan as compared to the Douglas amendment. I believe this comparison is worthy of the study of Members of the House:

ESTIMATED SAVINGS FROM CHANGE OF LEAVE FOR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

The estimate of saving effected by the graduated-leave plan stated in the accompanying table, totaling \$190,000,000, is based on an average annual salary of \$3,278, or \$12.6069, which is the over-all average of leave costs indicated in the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee's report on S. 832. On the same basis, the saving effected

by the Douglas amendment is \$140. The net saving on this basis is \$50,000,000.

The total saving effected by the graduated-leave plan has been estimated by the Senate committee \$178,000,000. This is based on an average annual salary of \$2,860 or \$11 per day for employees having less than 2 years of service, and an average annual salary of \$3,385, or \$13.02 per day, for employees having 2 to 15 years of service.

The cost of placing postal employees under the graduated-leave plan has been estimated at \$13,700,000. The cost if the Douglas amendment were applied would be \$24,200,000.

Additional leave for postal employees would reduce the saving under the graduated system from \$190,000,000 to \$177,000,000, and from \$140,000,000 to \$116,000,000 for the Douglas amendment. The net saving then would be \$61,000,000.

If the committee figures are used, the net saving for the graduated plan would be \$165,000,000, and \$116,000,000 for the Douglas amendment.

The net saving would be \$49,000,000 even if the committee figures are used.

The daily salary average of \$12.6069 used above is believed to be more realistic of conditions prevailing during the expansion for defense. A daily average of \$11 per day for newcomers would be representative of normal recruiting in more nearly normal times.

Savings represented by graduated and Douglas rider leave plans

Length of service	Number of employees	Days saved	Total days saved	Value of days saved over present system (at average of \$12.6069 per day)
Graduated—				
Less than 2 years.....	713, 273	13	9, 272, 549	\$116, 898, 098
2 years and under 15 years.....	978, 831	6	5, 872, 986	74, 040, 147
15 years and over.....	166, 896	0	0	0
Total saving.....	1, 859, 000		15, 145, 535	190, 938, 245
Douglas rider:				
Less than 2 years.....	713, 273	6	4, 279, 628	53, 952, 812
2 years and under 15 years.....	978, 831	6	5, 872, 986	74, 040, 273
15 years and over.....	166, 896	0	1, 001, 370	12, 624, 247
Total saving.....	1, 859, 000	6	11, 154, 000	140, 617, 362
Net saving.....				50, 320, 883

Estimated cost of postal leave changes

Length of service	Graduated-leave proposal			Douglas proposal	
	Estimated number of employees	Days added	Value of days added ¹	Days added	Value of days added ¹
Less than 2 years.....	138, 400	—2	\$3, 489, 590	5	\$9, 283, 180
2 years and under 15 years.....	189, 910	+5	12, 738, 213	5	12, 738, 213
15 years and over.....	32, 390	+11	4, 491, 710	5	2, 172, 559
Total.....	360, 700		13, 740, 333		24, 193, 952

¹ Average annual salary of \$3,488, or \$13.415 per day.

General MacArthur's Boston Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I want to call to the attention of all Members of Congress an editorial entitled "Off the Reservation,"

which appeared in the Trentonian, which serves my district, the Fourth Congressional District of New Jersey.

The editorial follows:

OFF THE RESERVATION

Gen. Douglas MacArthur's speech at Boston could hardly have been classified as an exclusive discourse on military matters. His criticism of administration leaders, his condemnation of "socialization and slavery," his reference to the "covert manipulation of the civil power," his challenge of the concept that the military owes allegiance and loyalty "to those temporarily in executive office"—these and other remarks credited to

him in Boston do not jibe well with his previous assurances that he was an old soldier with no political axes to grind.

The right of General MacArthur to voice his opinions on affairs of public interest should not be questioned.

It should be borne in mind, however, that his long professional background as a great soldier places him in a position where his advice on military problems would carry far more weight than any ideas he might have on subjects with which he has been almost completely out of touch for almost 15 years.

General MacArthur himself must have recognized this in his address before Congress, at which time he made it clear to Members of the House and Senate that he would not be swayed by political considerations in shaping his own future course of action.

Now it looks like he has tossed all five of his military stars into the political arena.

Belt Tightening—Where?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the June 22 issue of the Ithaca (N. Y.) Journal. This editorial points out that while the reductions that Congress has been able to make in the President's "tight" budget have been substantial, they are nevertheless inadequate to check the mounting inflation which confronts us. The editors conclude that the only practical method is the one which I have advanced in legislative form; namely, to reactivate the Hoover Commission to study our entire Government structure and make recommendations to eliminate nonessential activities.

The editorial from the Ithaca (N. Y.) Journal follows:

BELT TIGHTENING—WHERE?

The House in considering a new tax bill which would bring the tax increases voted within the last 12 months to more than \$17,000,000,000, more than the cost of all the 48 State governments together.

A tax increase is one of the steps necessary to offset inflation and most people are reconciled to its need.

Yet it would be more palatable and carry more promise of being effective as an inflation check if the spending side of the ledger underwent equal treatment. The root of inflation is Government spending.

When everybody works 2 days a week to support the Federal Government, most people expect that any further belt-tightening required by the Government will be matched by tightening the Government's belt.

Some tentative pulls have been made at the Government's belt. A combination of a Democratic and a Republican Senator are laboring diligently, if not mightily, on the appropriation bills as they come up. Senator FERGUSON, Republican, Michigan, shoots at the frills and Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, Illinois, takes deadly aim at mounting civilian employment in Government.

FERGUSON says if chauffeurs were refused for official cars, 7,000 full-time employees could be released for productive jobs. Dou-

glas thinks there are too many official cars anyway. So FERGUSON knocks out the chauffeurs and DOUGLAS tears up the car-purchase orders, and both win Senate support on cutting appropriations bills.

Senator DOUGLAS argues that the average Government employee works 1,650 hours a year, as against 1,900 to 2,000 hours for an employee in private industry. He estimates that if Government hours of work equaled those in private industry, the taxpayers would be saved \$200,000,000 a year.

Stanley High recalls in the July Reader's Digest, a House committee that found one copy of a 50-cent magazine cost the taxpayers \$13.89 when procurement charges were added. Drinking cups worth \$2.45 cost \$17.35 for administrative costs.

This is not belt tightening. President Truman describes his budget as a tight budget and dared Congress to find places for real cuts. Congress is finding cuts and making them. It should be applauded.

But significant reductions will not be made by simply paring here and there. Cuts of the size necessary to check inflation require deflation of Government—discontinuing nonessential activities that have been authorized in the past.

The best way yet suggested to do this is contained in a bill by Representative KENNETH KEATING to reactivate the Hoover Commission and instruct it to designate what activities can be discontinued as nonessential. This is the only kind of belt tightening that will match the belt tightening required by citizens by the tax increases.

Economic Pressure Can Force End of Oatis-Type False Trials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the York (Nebr.) Daily News-Times of July 27, 1951. As the protests against the imprisonment of William Oatis rise in fervor, this editorial takes a calm and sensible approach to the problem of what course of action our Nation can take.

ECONOMIC PRESSURE CAN FORCE END OF OATIS-TYPE FAKE TRIALS

How can we prevent Russia and its satellites from continuing to seize innocent Americans on false spy charges?

Nobody but a few irresponsible Senators has suggested we should use or even threaten force. Force may evoke more force, with war the end result. Destruction and the death of possibly millions are a steep price to pay for the freedom of a few men. Especially as there is evidence we can effect their release by other means.

We can't be sure we shall not have war some day with the Communist world. But we are not likely to let it commence over the trial of a William Oatis or a Robert Vogeler on fake grounds of espionage. Or over the prospect of more such trials.

A more common proposal is that we should sever diplomatic relations with any country which thus mistreats or threatens to mistreat our citizens. Presumably no one seriously intends we should do this while an American is actually being held, since this

action would isolate him completely from contact with the United States Government.

Suppose, though, that we decided now to cut ties with Hungary, which held Vogeler but later let him go. Hungary's diplomats in America would, of course, have to go home. We know all satellite embassies and legations are spy centers, so to that extent we would gain.

But we would also lose a listening post in Hungary, where we have a sizable staff and can observe—one way or another—what the Communists are doing. The kind of information diplomatic attachés gather is not made public, but it would be risky to assume it is unimportant to us.

With western reporters behind the iron curtain down to a handful, we're getting a scanty enough portrait of life there. Perhaps they would like nothing better than to have us shut up shop and go home, even at cost of one diplomatic spy headquarters.

Like them, we have spies, too. But it's a lot easier for theirs to operate in a free country like America than for ours to get information in a police state under strict censorship. They might well see themselves the gainers in any break-off.

What about economic sanctions? We've already imposed many trade restrictions. We can do more to strangle satellite trade with us, and influence other western powers to follow suit.

Reports filtering out from behind the curtain indicate that these trade limits really do hurt. Despite all efforts at self-containment, the Communist world needs materials and products the West has. The Reds suffer when the flow is reduced or stopped.

Economic sanctions seem the most promising field to work. Where, as with Hungary, we may fear further arrests of Americans, we can perhaps gradually tighten a clamp on trade with the Reds. Moving step by step would permit us to gage closely the effect the restrictions we're having, and also would leave us something in reserve. An immediate blanket ban would not give us this flexibility, would not keep the Reds guessing as to what was coming next.

This certainly does not exhaust the possibilities. But economic measures definitely can strike a painful blow, and we ought to look to them hopefully if the need arises.

Turns Deaf Ear to the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVINGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John C. Davis from the Cleveland Plain Dealer for July 30, 1951:

Turns Deaf Ear to the Farmer—AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT GIVES NO HEED TO GRASS ROOTS DESIRES

(By John C. Davis)

Theoretically the United States Department of Agriculture is a representative of the American farmer in the halls of the Government. As a representative it should mirror the opinion of farmers. There may have been a time when it did just that but not now.

Today the Department is an unadulterated bureaucracy in which policy is established by the Secretary, a lawyer who has never known any productive work save service in

the public welfare branches of the bureau, and a few similarly trained executives.

Instead of consulting leaders of the major farm organizations, the Secretary and a half dozen socialistically-minded associates decide what they think is good for the farmer and attempt to cram it down the collective throats of the folks who produce our food. Thus was the Brannan plan born. So was it foisted upon the Nation. Today a new plan, equally socialistic, is in the making.

ANOTHER THEORY

The new plan, as announced, will lift the level of production of substandard and marginal farmers—at public expense and at the cost to farmers of controlling their own production.

When the Department is accused of disregarding farmer opinion, and the charge is made every day by farm leaders in and out of Washington, the defense is that the opinion cannot be learned quickly enough; that it is too difficult to consult all of the Nation's 5,640,000 farmers, that if any action is to be taken, it must be done by Washington because American agriculture is too diverse and sectional ever to agree upon any single proposal.

When pushed these agricultural bureaucrats claim that through the PMA, successor to the old AAA, they do sound grass roots opinion. The truth is that State, county, and township PMA representatives only get the right to vote upon a suggested policy formulated in Washington—and Washington counts the votes.

Considering that no PMA policy, even the Brannan plan has ever been turned down by this captive membership, despite the fact that farmers generally do not support the programs, is pretty good proof that the so-called free elections are rigged as are those of Russia.

A pretty good insight into how closely the Department represents the farmers is disclosed by the results of a poll recently completed here in Ohio by the State Farm Bureau. The Farm Bureau polled its membership, by mail, on a number of current questions, all of which have the support of the Department.

PRICES AND WAGES

The first question in the poll dealt with a continuance of price and wage controls. The farmers voted 78 percent against continuing either. The second had to do with the Brannan proposal of letting food prices seek a supply and demand level in the market and then paying the farmer from the Federal Treasury any difference between this level and his cost of production. The farmers voted 94 percent against this method of subsidizing consumers and controlling farm production.

In the field of parity guaranties, the farmers voted 97 percent for full parity if there is any control, but they are against control. They wanted a fluctuating parity level and not the rigid support level advocated by the Department. The votes on the latter two issues were 83 percent for fluctuating parity levels and 87 percent against a fixed, marketing season control.

As a means of controlling inflation, the farmers favored more credit controls, by 68 percent, more production by 91 percent, and turned down higher income taxes by 87 percent, although most of them indicated they would favor tax increases if Government would cut down spending.

A preliminary report reflecting the results of this poll was submitted to the Agricultural Department and Secretary Brannan more than 2 months ago. Did the Department change its policy? It did not. It went right ahead with its socialistic goose-killing and to hell with what the farmer thinks.

Tax on Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK FELLOWS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bangor (Maine) Daily News of Wednesday, July 25, 1951, entitled "Tax on Education":

TAX ON EDUCATION

While Congress plays around with a revision of the income-tax law which, if present barometric readings prevail, will mean an inequitable 12½-percent increase across the board, its Members could do worse than give serious attention to the rock bottom of inequities established by their predecessors.

We have heard argument that the income tax is bad because it hits those hardest who can least afford it.

We have heard arguments that the sales tax is bad because it hits those hardest who can least afford it.

We have heard arguments that any tax is bad because it hits those, hardest who can least afford it.

And so it goes. We will not go into detailed arguments here on the relative merits of any of the contentions. But under the income-tax law there exists a penalty which Congress, in its right mind, could never have intended. It works great hardship on the taxpayer and profits the Government less than peanuts.

The victim is the average student struggling to gain a degree in an American college or university which must, because of deflated incomes, increase its tuition year by year and jack up other fees in keeping with mid-twentieth-century prices.

Economists tell us that 84 percent of the national income is concentrated in the hands of those earning \$5,000 or less. It then follows that from this great preponderance comes a majority of our college students. This is axiomatic inasmuch as there are vastly more earning \$5,000 or less than there are earning more.

As a result, the student from this income bracket cannot possibly tap the family for the \$1,600 minimum necessary for a year's study and leave the folks back home solvent. If he is lucky enough to pick up a few hundred dollars in scholarship aid, he is still several hundred dollars short.

Hence there are two courses open.

He must and does bank every cent possible from his summer earnings. But he cannot exceed \$500, otherwise the family will lose more than it will gain. The breadwinner will lose him as an exemption. But even with this \$500 limit he is still far short of the minimum.

With his board he might make it. In such anticipation he gets a job waiting on table in the college commons—or whatever name the particular college calls it. In return for this work the college, under the old barter system, gives him his board. There is no exchange of money.

Of course, on the \$500 summer earnings his employer deducted the withholding tax and turned it in to the collector of internal revenue. Being under \$600, the entire levy would normally be returnable after the first of the year.

But that's where Two-Gun Sam, formerly and affectionately known as Uncle Sam, comes into the picture, and for keeps. Here's

a guy, Sam figures, who by dint of his own labors and initiative is getting so he can see his way out of the woods. That doesn't fit into the modern scheme of things. Such independence was good for the Nation's youth 20 or more years ago. Indeed, it was worthy of commendation. But that was 20 years ago.

So Sam hauls out one of his guns, holds it to the head of the teen-ager, makes him place a fair and reasonable worth on the board (it averages about \$20 a week) and cuts himself in on it by way of tax. It isn't so bad the first year, although his family stands to lose him as a dependent. Then, the final tax is on about \$140 (his earnings of \$500, plus \$240 for the 12 weeks board up to January 31, minus a \$100 personal exemption).

But the second year really shows up Two-Gun's racket. Then, with the \$500 a constant figure, board earnings for the winter and spring terms combined with the 12 weeks of the following fall, will amount to \$720. So, of the total earnings of \$1,220, \$620 will be taxable—\$85 under current rates.

Considering the fact that the \$1,220 was still some \$380 short, isn't this rubbing it in a bit too much? Some colleges could find the difference in scholarship aid, but a majority just do not have that kind of folding money to dish out to every needy student—and needy students are now in the majority.

In enacting the income-tax law, did Congress ever intend to penalize initiative in a teen-age youngster? Did they intend to tax education?

If not, cannot this phase of the law very properly come in for attention by the revisionists?

How Much Longer Can America Survive a Policy of Deceit, Retreat, and Defeat?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD W. NICHOLSON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Republican leader of the House, at the annual clambake of the Plymouth County, Mass., Republican Club on Sunday, July 29, 1951. The address was broadcast and televised by the National Broadcasting Co.:

These are momentous days for America. We have reached a point where there is growing fear that this great Nation may not survive as a land of free people. We are threatened with many perils, both at home and abroad.

The great needs in America today are hope, confidence, and spiritual security. We have surrounded ourselves with the greatest collection of material comforts ever achieved by man, but our souls are not at peace. A feeling of uneasiness pervades our everyday lives. No one knows what tomorrow will bring.

We are gathered here at Plymouth Rock determined to rededicate ourselves to the courage it symbolizes. This venerated Rock is a token of the determination and strength of the founding fathers who made this land of ours possible. They had the fortitude necessary to meet their problems foursquare.

We today must do no less, or we will fail where they succeeded.

Let us face the facts. In the comfort of our material blessings, let us consider our problems, both foreign and domestic.

In the realm of world affairs we are threatened with Communist domination from abroad.

In the realm of domestic affairs we are threatened with socialist domination from within.

The American people are burdened deep in their souls by fear—fear that if our freedoms are not destroyed from without, they most certainly will be from within.

The truth is that we are cursed with a "milquetoast" Government operating under "milquetoast" policies. Fear has become a national policy.

Every time a breeze wafts from the Kremlin our "milquetoast" leaders in Washington tremble anew. Seeking a peace that is impossible to obtain because of their own blunders, they advocate appeasement and more appeasement. While they appease the Soviet Union grows stronger in armaments and in prestige.

Where in 1945 the awful yoke of communism embraced only 180,000,000 people, today it strangles 800,000,000 people—just six short years later.

What a picture. What a future. Contrast this picture of today with our position of 6 years ago, when we were the mightiest nation of all time.

Can any man—can any party—entrusted with power during this decline of American fortunes say this administration has been successful?

At home we find ourselves gripped by runaway inflation, high cost of living, and unbelievable taxes. A government already vested with more authority than it should have keeps asking for more and more power over the everyday lives of every single American. Spending is heaped upon spending and tax is heaped upon tax to cover up blunder upon blunder and failure upon failure.

Colossal sums are spent on armament, and yet we are told that we are defenseless. A General Vandenberg is forced to testify, after an investment of billions upon billions, that we have only a "shoestring air force."

After investment of billions upon billions in all kinds of socialistic schemes, we are told by the President of the United States that our economy will collapse unless drastic controls are imposed.

After the American people have been milked of billions upon billions in taxes, the President tells us that we are headed for disaster unless more billions upon billions of taxes are imposed.

Can any man—can any party—entrusted with power while we have reached this state of affairs say that the administration has been successful?

Let me go on. Suppose that you owned a grocery store that 6 years ago was the best store and made the most money of any in your community. And suppose that today you found the store broke and faced with an uncertain future.

Would you say that the management responsible for such a change in the fortunes of this grocery store was successful? Of course you wouldn't.

And if you owned stock in that grocery store, you'd know what to do—fire the management.

Let me tell you this: The 150,000,000 stockholders in America weren't all born yesterday. They're going to fire the management in 1952, and make no mistake about it.

From coast to coast the people of America are looking to the Republican Party for deliverance. Our task has been assigned us. Every one of us must bend every effort to justify the faith that is being placed in us. It is up to us to make the Republican Party the dynamic vehicle it should be for the landslide victory that is only a year away.

Yes; we have a role, and we have a message. It is a thrilling message—thrilling because it promises that the generations to come shall walk free and unfettered by the chains of communism and socialism.

Our message is simple: Be strong. Be courageous. And fear only God.

The Republican Party is going to restore to the English language a word which has all but been forgotten. That word is "opportunity." Opportunity to choose your own way of life; opportunity to improve your economic status. Fear is the greatest enemy opportunity has ever known. Strength is essential to freedom.

Our forefathers and their sons and daughters did not migrate to America because America offered fear, but because America offered opportunity.

Here in America a machinist could rise to head a great industry. Here in America an itinerant peddler could some day own a giant department store. Here in America a rail splitter could become a great statesman, and yes, here in America a Missouri farm boy could become President.

The Old Worlds might have their dynasties, their dictatorships, their defeatist philosophies of nazism, fascism, communism, and socialism, but in America a man held his head up and walked free—fearing no one.

I say to you that it is time to abolish Milquetoast government and to fire the bunglers, the defeatists, and the appeasers who are running it.

Imagine our plight in Korea today. What kind of leadership have we anyway?

We sacrificed 150,000 casualties in a treadmill war, and then what do we do? We ask for a truce while our Milquetoast leaders attempt to tell the American people and the world that we will have achieved a victory by ending up exactly where we started.

Maybe some people in the world can be sold such a phony bill of goods, but never the American people.

How much longer can America survive a policy of deceit, retreat, and defeat?

No wonder the American people have risen almost unanimously in their acclaim of that great soldier-statesman, that magnificent man of courage, Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

MacArthur wanted peace, but he wanted peace on our terms, not those of the Chinese Communists. MacArthur wanted a peace that would stick, a peace that would raise the prestige of America to a new high in the eyes of the world.

Can a single person within the range of my voice declare that such a peace is in prospect today? The answer is no—a hundred times no.

The humiliations suffered by our negotiators in Korea are only symbolic of the humiliations that America is suffering the world over because we have no leadership in Washington today. Never was the need for strength and courage and moral fiber so great; never have we had so little when so much was needed.

For 18 long years, our Government in Washington has operated on the theory that give-away programs will solve anything. The solution for every ailment, be it domestic or international, is to spend more money, to offer more booty, to spread the loot. In the mad whirlwind of spending schemes and give-away programs, our master planners have professed surprise that inflation has accompanied their blue-sky operations. From the beginning, these planners have had only one plan, and it called for spending the American people into the strait-jacket of socialism.

It takes no public accountant or college-trained economist to know that the less an individual keeps of what he earns, the less he has to spend and the less he is self-reliant. Any housewife can tell you that.

Yet, we only have to take a look at our financial picture today to realize that the

Federal Government is spending and taxing us into socialism.

Let me give you some figures.

Ten years ago the cost of government—Federal, State, and local—took approximately 14 percent of all our income.

When the war ended in 1945, taxation was taking 27 percent of all our income.

This year the best available figures indicate that taxation will take approximately 29 percent of all our income.

And next year, on the basis of the administration tax bill which was recently passed by the House, over the opposition of myself and an overwhelming majority of my Republican colleagues, taxes will take 31 percent of all our income.

The proposition is as simple as it is evil. When Government separates a citizen from one-third of his income, the citizen is no longer free and independent. He must look to Government for help, because Government has one-third of all he makes. He, along with 150,000,000 other Americans, has become exactly what the Socialists want—an incipient ward of the state.

Just as 14 percent became 29 percent, and 29 percent will become 31 percent, the 31 percent will soon become 35 percent, then 40 percent as it is in Socialist Britain today, then 50 percent, then 60 percent as it is in Communist Russia today. The Socialists will have their socialism, but Americans will have lost their freedom completely. Government, which should be the servant of the people, will become the master.

Yes, the Republican Party has its job cut out for it.

The only way we are going to stop this endless inflation and this ever-growing pattern of controls is to stop this Government spending. And the way to stop Government spending is to stop excessive taxation and stop borrowing.

What this administration wants is uncontrolled Government and a controlled people. What the Republican Party is going to give America is a free people and a controlled Government.

We think it is about time somebody slapped a few controls on Government and took a few off the American people.

The task ahead of us is not an easy one. We must meet the issues head-on, and we must rally to our side those who are convinced that America must be kept strong.

In what we do, let strength, integrity, confidence, and courage be our watchwords.

The future for America is unlimited. Our resources and our resourcefulness are unmatched, if we use both to the best advantage.

What we need are new pioneers, men of vision, men of character, who can look across the horizon and see the wonders of the new atomic age unfolding. Above all else, we must regain and revitalize the moral principles which have made our country great.

Courage must be our badge, and faith—faith in the essential dignity of man and faith in God—must guide us. We can and will triumph.

Porter on Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article

by Philip W. Porter from the Cleveland Plain Dealer for July 30, 1951:

PORTER ON CONTROLS—NEATEST LEGISLATIVE COMPROMISE OF THE YEAR SHAPES UP AS AN INCREDIBLE LAW

(By Philip W. Porter)

Congress has achieved the incredible and impossible in its final draft of the renewed controls bill. It has put a little to satisfy everybody, yet completely satisfies nobody; it pretends to block further inflation, yet opens the door a few inches for more inflation. It was the neatest legislative compromise of the year; and a lousy law.

The net result is that for the next 11 months we're going to have a situation like we had in the last stages of prohibition—a law on the books for the legislators to point to, scads of enforcement jobs for politicians to pass out, and ample liquor (bootleg).

The majority of Congressmen knew all along that they were going to pass a weak renewal of controls. Some cynics figured they had to have a phony law on the books on the off chance that there might be some more inflation next year and they wouldn't be blamed. Some actually don't know enough economics to understand that retail price controls don't and can't regulate prices and never have since the dawn of history. Some wanted just what they finally produced—a law which waters down the previous controls, yet keeps the horde of OPS jobholders on the payroll doing the equivalent of cutting out paper dolls—creating their own confusion, then trying to explain it, with no effect whatever on prices.

STRAIGHT OFF THE COB

And the next time the bleeding hearts and self-appointed friends of the people begin the old moan about lobbying by special interests, someone ought to sock them in the face with the finest example of persistent lobbying in a long time—by the bureaucrats themselves, Mike DiSalle, Eric Johnston, et al. They were at it night and day, full of scares, "bunk," and exaggeration.

Maybe I'm a little dumb in such matters, but I can't swallow the theory that when Government officials lobby it's O. K.—even holy, but when representatives of business, the professions, labor, etc., lobby it's evil. Who cloaked these officials in their righteousness and gave them the right to claim they alone speak the truth? They're just ordinary blokes who put on their pants one leg at a time.

And as for the figures they quoted about the alleged dangers ahead, those were for the birds. They got them from their own offices, and judging from the bungling performance of these offices in other matters the figures were straight off the cob.

There was also considerable bunk in some newspapers that supported the controls bill, which tried to make it appear that anyone who opposed the extension was an enemy of the consumer.

They chose to ignore the main political purpose (not the ostensible one) of the act, which is to perpetuate thousands of newly appointed bureaucrats in office. I was amused when one of the newspaper chains which supported the extension of OPS, carefully skipping this matter of jobs, came out with a ringing plea to abolish further ECA foreign aid on the ground that it is now just something to perpetuate jobs. Sure it is; so is OPS.

Meanwhile, the big laugh is that wholesale prices are still going down, inventories are still piling up and a small recession is under way. Consumers are smarter than politicians. They've produced their own price control—they just quit buying and prices began to waver, then fall.

That's the only way it can ever happen. A quick look through just one issue of a recent business paper reveals the following

items, each indicating high production or a drop in prices:

Average wholesale prices dropped for the eighth straight week. The Dow-Jones index of commodity futures and spot commodities continues down like a ski slide. Sugar shipments are only half the rate of 1949.

STOCKS ARE HIGHER

Leather makers have bought some hides for as much as 10 percent under ceiling prices. Raw cotton has come down from 46 cents a pound to 39 cents in 3 weeks; fiber for October delivery sells for 35 cents. Gasoline stocks in mid-July are 11 percent higher than in 1950. Turpentine has slid from 92 cents a gallon to 65 cents. Stocks of frozen vegetables are 23 percent higher than a year ago.

Mohawk Carpet Co. killed a 15-percent price boost of last winter and is back to December 1950, prices. Cotton, rayon and wool cloth has slipped in price. Shortening oils are down. The soybean crop is up.

Last week a combination TV-radio-phonograph was advertised for \$199. Business is worsening all over. Even the trained seal Government economists, whose stock in trade is predicting inflation, are now hedging. Keep your eye on it.

Speaking of Dangers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the Washington Post of July 28, 1951:

SPEAKING OF DANGERS

In warning of many dangers in his speech before the Massachusetts Legislature General MacArthur came out for a proposition that every democratic people recognizes as being fraught with peril. The principle that he condemned was "that members of our Armed Forces owe primary allegiance and loyalty to those who temporarily exercise the authority of the executive branch of Government." What he advocated was that the Armed Forces owe their allegiance "to the country and its Constitution which they are sworn to defend." While General MacArthur said he had never questioned the authority of the President to relieve him from his far eastern command, this comes close to saying that the President should not have final control over the military.

Of course, the soldier owes his primary allegiance to the country. But how is that allegiance to be manifested? He can serve his country only by strict and full compliance with the orders of the Commander in Chief. The military is responsible to the Commander in Chief and the Commander in Chief is responsible to the people. That is the essence of a democratic system of defense. Take the Commander in Chief out of the equation and we should have chaos or military dictatorship such as that which existed in Japan before the Second World War. There is no more basic principle in the American system than that the military shall be subordinate to civilian command. To throw down that principle while decrying the dangers that beset our civilization certainly does no credit to General MacArthur's sense of proportion.

Considering his high praise for truthful speaking, General MacArthur also discussed the reasons for his dismissal with astound-

ing looseness. He assumed that he was fired for pointing out the strategic relation of Formosa to American defense, for offering to discuss a cease-fire with the enemy, and for answering Congressman MARTIN's questions. Actually, as the Senate hearings made clear, he was relieved of his command because the President came to feel that the general could not be trusted to carry out the policies to which the United Nations and the United States were committed.

Especially disingenuous was General MacArthur's claim that the administration rejected his cease-fire plan and then enthusiastically received "the identical proposal when made by the Soviet Government." The MacArthur gesture was frowned upon because it cut across similar efforts that were being made at a higher level. The confusion resulting from his failure to consult his superiors on so important a matter simply has nothing to do with the fact that cease-fire negotiations were later undertaken with full agreement of the State Department and the United Nations. On the whole General MacArthur's speech was the sort of partisan ranting that one expects from some candidates for elective office. If he is to continue this sort of speech-making, he ought to be in mufti and not in uniform.

Too Dumb To Understand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an editorial from the *Nebragh* (Nebr.) Leader of July 25, 1951. There is no doubt that it points an accurate finger at the anomaly in the present administration, which pleads for economy—for everyone else.

The editorial follows:

TOO DUMB TO UNDERSTAND

In a series of statements and speeches since the outbreak of the police action in Korea, President Truman has told us what we must all do working together to avert the danger of inflation during this crucial time when defense production must have first call on our economic resources.

He told consumers to buy only what they need. He told businessmen to cut down and hold down inventories, to increase the efficiency of their operations as much as possible, and to conserve manpower. He asked everyone to work harder and longer and to forget about increased wages or profits.

The President said his proposals call for patriotism and self restraint, and added, "If we all work together as a team, if everyone does his part, we can beat inflation, we can secure the defenses of this Nation and keep down the cost for the average family."

No one can quarrel with the President's suggestions, but it seems to me that he, as the head of the executive branch of our Government, should see to it that every department, bureau, and agency of the Government puts his suggestions into effect. It seems to me further that since he is Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces that he should also insist that the Department of Defense follow his recommendations. So let's look at the record.

All departments, bureaus, and agencies of the executive branch of our Federal Government are spending more money today than a

year ago and almost without exception have more people on their payrolls than they had when the shooting started in Korea. Some of these nondefense departments spent more than 1,400 times as much in 1950 as they spent in 1940.

During the past year an average of 6,073 new employees per week were added to the Federal pay roll in the executive branch of our Government. It costs you and me and the other taxpayers \$8,300,000,000 per year to pay the salaries of these bureaucrats.

Does this indicate that the President is following the advice he gave the American people on combating inflation, on conserving manpower, on increasing efficiency, on working harder and working longer hours? Or is it a case of "You do as I say, not as I do"? Or is it a continuing application of the Hopkins formula, "The people are too dumb to understand, anyway, so we'll tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect"?

The Department of Defense doesn't seem to have taken the President's advice very seriously. Here are a few examples which will show why I make that statement.

Since the start of the Korean campaign, with less than 2,000,000 men under arms, the Army has purchased 68,000,000 can openers.

During the 9 months ended March 31, 1951, the Quartermaster Corps bought 1,917,000 pounds of black pepper. Maybe this is a new weapon which is used by sneaking up on the Reds and throwing it in their eyes.

The Army set up requirements of 4,636,000 web belts for 1951. This is approximately three belts per man although only one belt is issued per man per year.

On combat boots the Army requirements for 1951 was set at 11,753,000 pairs, of which it expected to use 4,800,000 pairs during the year.

Last January while the quartermaster was buying 5,000,000 pounds of oleomargarine at 25½ cents per pound, the Department of Agriculture was selling 5,500,000 pounds of surplus butter to Italy at 15 cents per pound.

What effect did this large scale "scare" buying have on prices? Since June 1950 the price of Army blankets has risen from \$7.82 to \$16 each. Combat boots went up from \$6.03 to \$11.63 per pair, Army mattresses from \$7.83 to \$13.52 each, and so on and on throughout a list longer than your arm.

Another Star—It Is Lt. Gen. Lewis A. Pick Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues and the country a well-deserved honor which was conferred upon the distinguished Chief of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, Gen. Lewis A. Pick. On yesterday, after confirmation by the Senate of the United States, General Pick was awarded an additional star indicating that he had been elevated to the high rank of lieutenant general in the Army of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join with the other friends and associates of General Pick in extending our congratulations upon this signal honor,

earned and due a great soldier, engineer, statesman, and patriotic American.

Mr. Speaker, only a few weeks ago it was my privilege to make an address on the floor of the House calling to the attention of my colleagues the magnificent accomplishments of General Pick in his career in the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, and even since that short time another chapter has been written in the life of General Pick.

Without warning the skies opened in the Kansas River and Missouri River Valleys and over-night mountains of floodwaters were sweeping the valleys, countryside, and cities of one of the richest sections of the United States, topping the levees of the rivers and destroying lives and property in one of the greatest floods in the history of that section of the United States.

To add to the devastation caused by the terrible flood, the horror and terror of fires caused by the exploding oil in the refineries and tanks and cars and other storage places in the area.

It is not necessary for me to recount this terrible tragedy for it is all too well known.

Who was the first on the scene with the President of the United States?

Gen. Lewis A. Pick, the Chief of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army. Under the experienced supervision of General Pick rescue work was immediately begun and the fight of saving the cities and country from complete destruction was under way.

The part taken in this great flood by General Pick again demonstrates his great ability, leadership, and devotion to the cause that he has given as his life's work. General Pick says that if we had appropriated \$300,000,000 to protect the area flooded it would have saved over a hundred lives and \$1,000,000,000.

No extra star can shine more brightly, nor be more deserved than on the shoulder of Gen. Lewis A. Pick.

Serious Charges Contained in Representations of High Chiefs of American Samoa to Congress—Investigation Should Be Undertaken To Determine Truth of Allegations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, close to 350 natives of Samoa, representing themselves as high chiefs, orators, and duly representatives of American Samoa, on May 2, 1951, addressed to the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of the Navy representations commending the service of Fred I. Simon as attorney general of Samoa and containing charges involving the administration of Samoa that I believe should be brought

to the attention of the Members of Congress. The envelope containing the protest came from High Chief Tuitete and orators of American Samoa.

I ask, therefore, unanimous consent that a copy of this document that has been brought to my attention be incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The administration of American Samoa passed from the Department of the Navy to the Department of the Interior and to civil authority on July 1, 1951. A few months prior to this transfer the administration was placed in the hands of civilians by the Department of the Navy.

Although changes of this kind are often accompanied by disturbances of one character or another and a certain amount of uneasiness and disappointment, the allegations to which this large group of Samoans have affixed their signatures are so serious that they demand in my opinion, the immediate attention of the committees of Congress charged with the responsibility of legislation involving the government of American Samoa.

Action by Congress to provide an organic act for Samoa is long overdue. The organic law for the government of Guam by civilian authorities has been enacted and is now operating with a reasonable degree of success. The administration of Samoa should not be allowed to continue any longer than is absolutely necessary without the enactment of organic law for Samoa.

I bring this protest to the attention of Members of the House because the Samoans are without any direct representation in Congress and because I have among the residents of Hawaii, whom I represent, some 2,000 Samoans who feel a very deep concern about the welfare of their native land. I feel it is my duty to them, as well as to their relatives in Samoa, to ask that the appropriate committees of Congress undertake immediately an investigation of these charges and consideration of the question of providing organic law for Samoa.

I am not informed of the basis of the allegations contained in the representations of the Samoan chiefs and am unable to say whether or not they are true, but I do know that they are supported by a group of men of sufficient number and importance to demand that they receive the most careful attention.

The document of the Samoan chiefs is as follows:

AMERICAN SAMOA, May 2, 1951.

From: High chiefs, orators, and duly representatives of American Samoa.

To: The President of the United States, Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Navy.

Subject: Commendation and petition for the Honorable Fred I. Simon, attorney general of American Samoa.

1. We, the undersigned, whose names appear below, are the highest ranking chiefs, leaders, and heads of various families herewith, extending and conveying the following commendation for our great first civilian attorney general, the Honorable Fred I. Simon, and also request permanently the continuance of his service here in American Samoa

2 We wish you to know that we have conferred the greatest honor within our power to a Palagi (white man), the Honorable Fred I. Simon, the first civilian attorney general of American Samoa. He has succeeded to the title formerly held by A. F. Judd Lalofa, the title of "Warrior Hero Who Conquered the Fort."

3. Our reason is that he, and he alone, has acted the words from your mouth at the Governor's inaugural speech here on February 23, 1951. Also, he, and he alone, has acted the words from the mouth of the Secretary of the Interior in the same speech. Perhaps our skins are brown, but we Polynesians are proud of our brown skins and ancient culture and customs. The Honorable Fred I. Simon has only seen our white hearts, and broken bread with us and called us friend and brother and son. Not so His Excellency, Governor Phelps Phelps, who keeps his fence in his Palagi American Club.

4. We now have been informed that dishonest and evil tricksters have prevailed upon the Secretary of the Navy to recall this first honest and upright American Government official. Why? Is it because he has rid the Samoan people of a dirty moral leper, * * * who has poisoned our young Samoan boys? Why? Is it because he proved that * * * is blinded in the bush with criminals? Why? Is it because he brought courage and peace to our Samoan people? We cannot find out why, but we place our high hopes upon you, and we humbly beseech you to help us find our way.

5. To better acquaint Your Excellency and people interested in the affairs of American Samoa, pertinent information needful to a full understanding of the situation herewith submitted. If we fail to make ourselves clear, investigation is solicited if it deems proper and convenient to Your Excellency, and also the Congress of the United States. You are our altar of hope and confidence, and we pray to you.

6. The operation of the new beginning of our government is in a bad state when wrong legislation or move is attempted not because of right but because of pressure, and when criminal influence counts more than righteousness. The very step we feared of is now taken without consulting us, because, we are the people to make happy or desolate in such government as so concerned. Any immediate change without consulting the Samoan people would only put them in awe and amazement. We fear that wrong advice would only function unsound and unhealthy government. We do not expect to take the wrong direction and reach the right goal. In the light of the circumstances, we feel that communistic policy is on the way and would only lead us to our doom. We should have peace not terror. We have warned His Excellency, Governor Phelps, on his official malaga to us April 24, 1951, but he heeds not.

7. In the meeting of Samoan district governors and county chiefs, Government officials, leaders of the islands, and the attorney general on April 11, 1951, certain questions were brought forward and were discussed in the Fono. Before the closing of the Fono, a secret ballot was taken, and each member cast his vote willingly.

8. On the night of the following day, April 12, 1951, two Samoan chiefs as the governor's alter-ego were sent around on Naval Officer Bewick's car (I. G. No. 2) driven by a Fita in a sailor's full uniform hunting the two district governors, Letuli and Lefti at the dead of night and threatening them of losing their positions unless certain documents signed to nullify all resolutions passed and adopted by the Fono on the previous day. Furthermore, several attempts were made by the governor to confiscate the cards on which our vote was recorded. Why? Will the organic act bring us more gangsters or less? In such mistreatment for Samoans only, or

do palagis (white men) get the same Stalin Gestapo medicines?

9. We who have hope and fought for the Interior Department looked forward to this transfer with hope and keen interest and alertness to avert any obstacles that might hinder the progress of our Government. We have also noticed that Governor Phelps and Attorney General Fred I. Simon were of one body and spirit when first arrived in Samoa, the spirit of good cooperation. Now, unfortunately, these ties of that fine spirit is now broken. Why? We feel our governor takes heed of the advice from bad tricky Navy personnel and ignore that of his legal adviser, the attorney general. We fear the Biblical phrase might come to pass, "A house that is divided amongst itself shall not stand."

10. The promise by the Interior Secretary for an appointment of Chief Justice Arthur A. Morrow to continue his service with the civilian government is completely contrary to the wish of the Fono of American Samoa. The understanding of the Fono is, the committee appointed shall prepare only commendations but not requesting the continuance of their services. So, whoever changed the resolution is responsible for the fooling of Washington and betrayal of his people. We want justice, and we demand it. The wish of the Samoan people must be carried out, not the wish of one man, our two-toned, cunning M. T. Tuaisosopo, speaker of the house.

11. Our Flag Day celebration was canceled and superseded due to the advice of the last naval governor which act was only disparaging the prestige of the first civilian governor. Why? The people of Samoa honored this day highly as a significant event, and also as a sacred function to remind us always of the wise move of our forebears in ceding our respective island Tutuila to the United States of America. Unfortunately, our Flag Day celebration was substituted by the most fearful rape case in the history of American Samoa. We feel that bad navy people here in Samoa summoned all their efforts to run down the beginning of the civilian administration in order to create ill feelings in the hearts of the Samoans toward the Interior Department, as a matter of fact, American Samoa is a paradise to them and they hate to leave.

12. And, to our deep sorrow, His Excellency Phelps Phelps speaks the good words but makes the bad actions.

13. During the short time the Honorable Fred I. Simon was here in Samoa it sure proves success and beneficial to the Samoans. He treated the Samoan people with genuine love and kindness. Everything he did for the Samoan people proves unique and unmeasurable.

14. We, therefore, respectfully request the continuance of his services with full authority in American Samoa, but not to chop him up of his prestige as proposed by the Interior green policy book which was explained to us by the naval Lt. Gov. J. Bewick.

We hope that our commendation and petition will find favor with your benevolent attention.

May God grant you wisdom.

TOFA-SOIFUA.

SIGNATURES

Faumuina (County Chief of Saole), Tutels Ofagallia, Flu, Atiga, Salave's N, Suafe's, Aigamua, E. Avegalle, Tememata I., Fega, To'omata, Laloulu, Ga'i, Tulo, Valeli, Noa, T. Fuamatu, Amilupe, Feagui, Tagoa'i, Upu, Penemafua, Fatu, Faletofo, Auelua, Alo, Auelua, F. Misa, J. Suafu'a, Tago, E. Suapo, N. Tellelo, T. Poti, Sagiao, Fa'a, Soloai, Tualla, Filipo, Fafe, Siulla, Pou, Ieane, Sianava, Tautalafua, Telea'i, Falevalu, Taevala, Lau'e, Fa'ametu, Fa'ateleupu, Faiga, Losa, Sipoua.

Falivae, Siliga, Faasi'i, Atumata, Puletu, A. Lelafu, Mapulifale L. T., E. R. Leese, Vaetuaa, Save, Gage, Tauanu'u, Valfanua,

Vou T., Momesea, Malava F., Vae, Leali'e, Sula, Asuelu, Ma'i, Tolloio, Moe'ono, Tafa'i, Lea, Lalilia, Tusa'u, Tauasafine, F. S. Talpu, T. Puletapua'i, Puni, Pulefa'asina, Mata'ituli, Tapani, Ella, Toga, Maimoi, Matuaaina, Ulefa, Fulu, Suelfo, Kella, Serula, Pese, Nucla, Nu'u, Katie, Akensee, Pulpui F., Satini, Slae, Teliniu, Aventionu.

Pualna, Malava, Matuu, Meetuasivi, Taval, Su'apala, Leeta, Utaga, Valluu Salave'a F., Fualau, Leulua'i, Mugaotege Lava, Lupelolima, Sagatu, F. Taifane, Lile, Lafua, Lila, Li'u, Savali Mui, Oka, Sataraka, L. Valelua, Liulama, Evalimalo, Ta'u'ai, Noa, Ututuvanu, Taulele'a, Tineifili, Lefetali, Teese, Lafi, Afioaga, Feuli, Aveau, Sela, Mati, Moresi, Talafi, Ogeleleatoa, Tifi, Ului, Fellese Sasa, Mele, Kalau, Peo, Fa'avele.

Taipale, Eliu, Simau, Fa'au'uga, Makalita S. Laelase, P. Malla, Milli, Milli, Lia, Salevao, Emeli, Se'U, Aisi, Saina, Fliva, Toeaso, Tua, Aio'o, Evagella, Kini, S. Villamu, Uatea, Teleuvia, Fa'amini, Tau, Veli, Afefe, Lepati, Temasi, Matauaina, Simene, Fau, Ili, Le-seali'i, Florance, Amanda, Sie, Evelina, Sese-fina, Tuaoa, Keli, Anetere'a, Taualima, Le-keri, Sefa'i, Leitutua, Mapulifala L. T., Carl M., Anita, Malu, Matuline, Aete, Senny Meredith, Lepati.

Aventionu, Fevesa'i, Ruta, Tauesesi, Pulpui, Jr., Sosefina T., Faga, Uiese, Asiasiga, Alga, Meatusi, Maititi, Gagasu, Vaimili, Monotaga, Asela, Salla, Lee, Faleatusi, Gafatasi, Valaso, Uiele, Fiapapalagi, Eve, Selepa, Tu'afanu, Fa'asamea, Eka, Scse, Tina, Saituaa, Puletu, Sulu, Salau, E. L. Avegalle, James, Andrew, Ase-ula, Christiana, Aufaga, Richard, Eddie, Bernadette, Eti, Pensa, Vi, Satulasina, Lu'isa I. Grace, Pule, Seife, Lu'isa II, Felele, Billy Meredith.

Fa'avele, Valalae, Tanu, Kelesia, Paulina T. Laau, Fausaga, Merita, Fitu, Pouleva, Fegaula'i, Tatagi, Tala'ave, Felea'i, Muga, Apelu, Maselina, Alpenu, Mamao, Seletai, Fa'amanuia, Sinef, Ene, Manu, Fale, Mui, Fatu, Malaefene, Manuele, Elena, Tavita, Fagasa, Geo, Ieane, Matulena, Chris, Suasa's, Tavita, Adate, Nive, Ronald, Tuteni, Malle, Fa'i, Katalina, Kile, La'aualele, Etelani, Lettie, Vini, Saulleane, Malaetia, Nike, Kitiene.

Papu Satele, Misi Patu, Mela, Atiliano, Vai, Fegaval, Saga, Flisaga, Nu'uauasala, Fatui, T. Talesaga, Taa, Alesli, Atallo, Aeesi, Lalpise, Talasu, Nosa, Lepati, Seuga, Sigifili Maise, Tine, Meauta, File, Faatulu, Aulauamea, Meana, Levi, Eveni, Filimaui.

A Nebraska Sunset

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following reprint of an editorial by the late Edgar Howard which appeared in the Columbus (Nebr.) Daily Telegram. Mr. Howard was the dean of Nebraska editors and had been my predecessor in Congress. This editorial entitled "A Nebraska Sunset" was read during the funeral services for Mr. Howard on July 28. It follows:

A NEBRASKA SUNSET

I have never seen an Italian sunset, but last evening I witnessed a Nebraska sunset beyond compare. It was more beautiful than an artist's dream. Peering through the haze-clouds of uncertain hue the great orb

of day flooded the landscape with a radiance of unspeakable beauty.

I do not know what visions an artist beholds when he views an Italian sunset, but when I gazed last evening upon that marvelous Nebraska sunset I saw visions of every sweet picture in my own memory mirror. I saw the peach-blush bloom on the cheek of my boyhood sweetheart—the golden gleam of a true chum's friendship—the carmine tint of holy mother love.

How many colors does God hang in the sky when He paints a Nebraska sunset more beautiful than any other clime has known? I could not count the colors. It was enough for me to know that they were in number to represent every fragrant flower from my conservatory of memory—enough for me to know that they brought me face to face with every rapture of the years now dead—enough to know that they appealed to me more eloquently than orator's words or author's lines to struggle along the upward way, with promise sure that at the end of the journey I may be privileged to behold upon the horizon of paradise another sunset, and in the radiance of it to count the colors of a welcome smile.

Defense of the Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter entitled "Defense of the Dollar."

This letter is a reprint of one put out by the Whaley-Eaton Service on July 7, 1951, from Washington, D. C., and is sent out by the Empire Trust Co., of New York City.

I call your attention to the importance of the thesis that is developed in this letter and of the very real danger we are in if we do not restore a sound dollar to our country.

The letter follows:

JULY 7, 1951.

DEFENSE OF THE DOLLAR

1 Defense of the dollar is the paramount problem. The critical front is on the Potomac, not the Yalu or the Elbe. Stalin is as keenly aware of this fact as is the President, and the latter goes the limit when he says: "If inflation got away from us and wrecked our savings and ruined our economy, that would be the easiest victory the Kremlin could ask for. Communist Russia could win the whole world to totalitarianism without firing a shot."

2. What does he mean? Not merely that the vested capital of the country will be wiped out, including the worth of pensions, of life insurance policies and of mortgages. He means the destruction of the American system, in terms of politics as well as economics. He means just what he says, namely, that the alternative to a sound dollar is the acceptance of Stalinism.

3 History cannot be mocked. The traditional recourse of the dictator in his quest of power is seizure of the public purse. All other authority follows that. On this account the founding fathers gave the control of money to the Congress and kept it from the Executive. Solvency for years past,

prior to 1933, had been anchored to a natural standard—gold—a rock against which the waves of extravagance could make no headway.

4. That control has been lost. It is no longer a barrier to the whims of the Executive and Congress. Nothing other than a temporary agreement among a few officials restrains the Government from printing money in whatever amount it wishes. It need not go to the public for funds, for it can pour its promises-to-pay into the banking system whenever these officials, or others to follow them, decide again to have the Federal Reserve System "support the bond market."

5 Such dollars have a backing so long as they are receivable for taxes, but they are fiat money just the same. They produce the inflationary gap. They are the lifeblood of extravagance.

6 They are fiat for this reason: Just as they are created by decree of the Government, just so their value can be utterly destroyed by another decree. It is only common sense to realize that a single election can, directly or indirectly, repudiate the public debt in its entirety. It can do so by electing a Congress pledged to appropriate no funds for interest payments. It can do so by boosting expenditures higher and higher to the point where paper money will be of value only to museums. After that, the concentration camps.

7. The States are in imminent danger. They cannot print money. They must use whatever currency the Federal Government foists upon them. Already their tax sources have been invaded. Malignant inflation can deprive them entirely of usable funds. More and more they look now to Washington for what is called, with the illusion of language, Federal aid. They get but a part of what has been taken from them. They cannot, even now, sustain their normal and historic functions without begging from the Federal Capital the means to keep alive. Inflation hastens attenuation of the idea of federation. Tomorrow there may be provinces instead of States, ruled by satraps dispatched from Washington. Constitutions cannot prevail against the power of the purse.

8. All of the foregoing the present Government, directly and by implication, admits. So it cries, "Inflation must be stopped." But who creates inflation and at what paps does it nurse? They who cry "wolf" are the wolves. The theory seems to be that it takes a thief to catch a thief; and what cure is offered? Give us more money. The taxes, already confiscatory, are not enough. The ideal position, says the Government, in effect, is when virtually all profits flow into its coffers; when the people cannot pay high prices because they have not the means to buy more than a modicum even of essentials.

9 Nationalization of profits is the worst form of socialism. When a government nationalizes industries it must at least manage them and be concerned with profits or losses. When it seizes the profits of private industry it absolves itself of risk. Call it cowardice or identify it as a subtle method of accomplishing by indirection what Stalin at least has the nerve to do openly and violently.

10. "How long," asks a Senator, "can American business go on paying from 60 to 70 percent of its income in taxes and survive?" The answer of an official is that, barring a general war, reductions may be permissible after 1955. But taxes then will inevitably be higher, not lower, if inflation has not been stopped in its tracks; and how much longer can the middle classes—the salaried people and the annuitants—survive under present and proposed taxation? The kulaks need not be liquidated, as was the Russian method, by cutting off their heads. "You take my life when you do take the means whereby I live."

11. Confiscatory taxation is inflation. To put \$17,000,000,000 of additional taxes on the economy is to add even more billions to the cost of doing business. Taxes, like wages, are a cost figure. Somewhere, somehow, the high rates that are prescribed to stop inflation actually bring it about. Listen to the President on that point. He says (not with entire correctness) that the entire \$4,000,000,000 of new taxes levied last fall paid for not a single gun because the inflation meantime had raised the cost of Defense purchases by \$7,000,000,000. Consider that—\$4,000,000,000 added to the tax load at a net loss of \$3,000,000,000 to the Treasury. Stalin laughs; we cry.

12. In the shadows of that picture, it is maintained that there is only one answer, namely, to give the Government more power. It wants to put ceilings on prices and to license business. To fortify its demand, officials with one accord, from the President down, keep telling the country that an even more devastating inflation is just ahead. It is an invitation to everybody to rush into the marts and buy at any price. It is a repetition of the warning from the White House itself, last summer, to use dollars quickly because they were certain to depreciate.

13. "We propose," say officials, in effect, "so to expand the facilities of the country that, within a year or two, production will be in such huge volume as to assure competition in the marketplace; we can and will have butter and guns." There is considerable merit in that argument. The American economy, in all truth, is an economy of surpluses. That was true before Korea, and the potentiality grows with the days.

14. But political error can be the snake even in such a promised paradise. Will the private economy expand under the burden of confiscatory taxation, combined with price and allocation controls? Already, there are signs that management is becoming cautious. Who is going to buy a production so vast that it would swamp domestic markets? It may not be practicable to subsidize exports interminably. It may be that point 4, whatever its merits, will not be a powerful force in the world economy until decades hence.

15. An expanding economy is a desirable economy, but not if the expansion is at an explosive rate. Not if the assets of the generations to come are sequestered in advance, not moderately but extravagantly. Ours is a mansion already filled with good things. We have, as Charles Kettering has noted, with 6 percent of the world's land area and 7 percent of its population, 58 percent of the telephones, 76 percent of its automobiles, and 34 percent of its radio and television sets. That is an establishment worth looting—and the doors are left unlocked for any demagog to enter when Federal expenditure is unlimited.

16. This enormous accomplishment has been achieved under our American system of free enterprise, which is quite a different thing from the feudal capitalism which in other places is under attack and we are called on to protect. The Nation can live a long time on its fat unless that fat be squandered.

17. The authorities, with support from both political parties, offer only one solution—higher taxes and more controls. Every proposal from the White House is for heavier expenditure. There must be, its propaganda insists, no slow-down of its welfare projects. It wants to increase them and it uses the necessity of defense as justification for projects that would be of debatable propriety even in normal times. But the more revenue Washington gets the more it is certain to spend. It refuses to recognize that the barrel has a bottom.

18. There has been built up an opinion that it is reasonable to question the practicability of a White House program. Experts

in public relations are summoned to Washington to advise the Office of Defense Mobilization how to coordinate the activities of all the multiple public relations officers of the Government to carry a single message to the public, and sell the idea that not only is the policy of the Government perfect and unassailable but also that its methods of mobilization are beyond criticism.

19 How close are we even now to the one-party system in our Government? It is wise to have partisanship end at the border and to present a united front abroad. But that is quite a different thing from outlawing debate in the formulation of the policy, whatever it may be. Therein lies the fallacy of a bipartisan foreign policy. It is sheer madness to foreclose on discussion. A country under parliamentary forms is in a sorry status if it lacks a loyal opposition. Diplomacy ought not to be deceptive of our own people.

20 The peril is far too great to permit major decisions to be made in secret chambers, even though members of both political parties participate. It is known now that the present danger is largely the consequence of fatal errors made at Yalta and at Potsdam. In the first case, a Chief Executive sick unto death, with his principal consultant in a similar condition, made concessions that poured strength into Stalin's veins. He did this as Commander in Chief, without consultation with Congress and without reference to the people. That was embezzlement of power. Who can assure that it would not happen again, or that another victory in another war might not be bartered away by a well-meaning but incompetent authority? It is the abuse of our own institutions that makes necessary a defense of the dollar.

21 The people are confused because the danger to the country has not been explained to them with vivid clearness. They have been bombarded with a series of generalities, some of which would tax the credulity of infants. "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself," said Roosevelt, but the Washington bureaucracy, including the generals, has again and again, in public testimony, indicated a dread lest a gesture here or an action there annoy the Politburo.

22 It might be supposed that Russia was the giant and this country the pigmy. It may be doubted if the Politburo is more cunning than America in its programing. It is altogether unlikely that its production equals America's in volume or parallels it in quality, over-all.

23 Extravagance in Government can be moderated, and without impairment of defense. The so-called Marshall shield calls for mobilization of our collective production facilities and an arrangement whereby they may move into maximum output by pressing a button. Most of this capacity already exists. After the last war the Government retained 440 of its War II plants as a reserve of industrial capacity. More than half of these—278—are now producing defense items, and another 66 are being reactivated. Defense has already arranged for \$6,000,000,000 additional in plant expansion and tooling, mostly for the production of aircraft. Private capacities have enormously expanded since War II. Atomic warheads, artillery shells and guided missiles are well advanced, as is the use of atomic power for submarines. Together there exists already, with rapidly increasing potentiality, a Marshall shield.

24. Defense is the one great area in which economy can be practiced. Let it confine its actual production to usable hardware. Let there be no such overproduction, say, of tanks, as to overwhelm our storage facilities. This would serve a double purpose,

since it would also tend to minimize obsolescence.

25. Let it be observed, too, that possibly the very hugeness of the appropriations is intended to frighten Stalin, with no present idea of actual use of the amounts in full. Yet Defense will always be tempted to spend whatever is authorized. The "watchdog committee" of the Senate can be of incalculable service to the Nation by keeping its tender fingers in touch with this situation.

26 Inflation has already gone so far that possibly some form of price control is essential, but to be used only if necessary and with great caution. Let there be denial of appropriations for projects that safely can be postponed. Let the Congress wait, at least until fall, before imposing any new taxes whatever. Let aided foreign nations also show restraint in spending their and our money on welfare and postponable projects. Let a spirit of devotion to the public weal be substituted for the extravagant atmosphere that prevails in Washington. In a word, let the bureaucracy become patriotic.

27 The thing that is inflated is the Government. Big government costs big money. Inflation is conceived and born in Washington. Only the Federal Government can spend in unlimited amounts. It alone determines the value of money and the extent of credit because it alone is legally empowered so to do. The administration already has controls adequate to stop the inflation dead in its tracks. It can stabilize the whole economy by utilizing its present powers. It can do so by putting ceilings on expenditures. It can barricade the American system against disaster by itself practicing that economy which it so belligerently calls on the mass public to endure. Congress should insist that it do so.

Paul O'Dwyer's Speech for an Undivided Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, there was recently held in the city of Cleveland a regional conference of the American League for an Undivided Ireland. Present at this conference were over 200 delegates from the seven States comprising this region. All were most enthusiastic and eager to work out a solution to the 30-year-old partitioning of Ireland.

Similar conferences have been held in other parts of the Nation and will continue to be held, until the objective has been attained, namely, the complete reunification of Ireland as it has been through all the ages of its long history. Americans of Irish descent are daily becoming more aroused over this enforced division of their ancient homeland and are becoming more insistent that we in Congress do our part in an effort to wipe out this unwanted border.

During the deliberations in Cleveland, Mr. Paul O'Dwyer, of New York, gave the principal address during the afternoon gathering of the delegates. I desire to

include as a part of these remarks the speech of Mr. O'Dwyer, which was as follows:

Fifteen months have passed since it became necessary for our forces under the flag of the United Nations to join our brethren to halt aggression in Korea in an attempt to correct a great wrong perpetrated on the people of Korea who, like the Irish, have fought so long and so valiantly for their independence. No one can gainsay that the Korean war had its beginning when great powers, including America, failed to take into account the lawful aspirations of the Korean people, and so strangers drew a thirty-eighth parallel, virtually dividing citizens of one country into two factions. Left to themselves, I am sure the Koreans would have worked out their own salvation and it would not have been necessary for anyone to intervene.

If we have learned anything from the lesson of Korea, it is that we cannot afford to repeat the error twice in the same generation. An arbitrary partition can only lead finally to bloodshed. Let us not permit the British to inveigle us into the same mistake in Ireland.

Frankly, we are quite confused by the military strategists these days. We have thousands of pages of testimony pro and con on the value of Formosa to us, but Formosa is at the other end of the world, while scant attention is being paid to an island than can, by reason of its geographically strategic position, be the greatest threat to our safety.

It is the nearest part of Europe to our shores and in these days of jet planes and atom and hydrogen bombs, not even the most unreconstructed isolationist would venture to deny that it could be used by an enemy to our great disadvantage, and we, being aware of the danger, have a sacred obligation to call it to the attention of our fellow citizens. Does our Government have knowledge of this? Do our military experts recognize it? Why should it be permitted to continue? I believe the answer is that our Government knows the facts. No matter how our military experts may disagree about Formosa, they are in accord on the strategic position of Ireland. Winston Churchill said so, and the responsibility for continuing the dangerous evil of partition lies squarely on the shoulders of the leaders of the Republican and Democratic Parties in their blind acceptance of British diplomatic decisions on matters European.

It was necessary for America, in order to control the Communist threat in Europe, to spend huge sums of money to rearm the western nations. We found it necessary to call all nations into one conference for joint protection against Communist aggression, and one nation, Ireland, refused to join. Why did she refuse to join the Atlantic Pact? Was it because she preferred the Communist way of life? Even her greatest critic would deny that. Then what was it? It was because of British insistence that the participating nations should guarantee the territorial integrity of each other for 20 years. This would amount to giving England a 20-year lease on the northeast portion of Irish soil. The British concept of rights and obligations is archaic, backward, and outmoded, and if we follow it, it can only lead us to disaster. Let us leave Ireland for a moment and see what it has done for us in other places.

We almost sacrificed our national honor in 1947 by listening to their advice on the question of Israel and we are now being dragged into the Iranian oil question which should never have occurred if British oil interests and the British Foreign Office had made some attempt to be fair with the Iranian people,

and had not treated those people so shamelessly that they increased the threat of Soviet intervention in that country. It is quite obvious that as far as British foreign policy is concerned, it makes no difference whether Labor or Tory has control. For instance, how could it be good to nationalize steel and coal in England and bad for the Iranians to nationalize oil in Iran. What was the British reaction to this move in the Iranian Parliament? The Iranians must remember that Jews who sought their liberty were publicly flogged in Palestine 5 years ago, and so when British paratroopers were sent to Cyprus with full fanfare, it must have seemed a very ominous move to the Iranians.

I merely mention these events to show the British pattern of performance outside its own nation so that its treatment of Ireland today may be the better understood. A little study of the situation in Ireland would work out to American advantage. The approach of England to Ireland today is as vicious as it ever was during the 700 years it forcibly occupied that island, that from our standpoint, the continuance of that policy while threat of Communist aggression exists is downright stupid.

Why don't they remove their armed forces from northeast Ireland? Why do they not disband their murderous secret police? Why do they propose through their puppet, oppressive laws to make civil and religious rights a complete mockery? Whatever wisdom or cunning there was in British diplomacy in days gone by died with the last generation. What we now behold is a Foreign Office stupidly following a formula that might work in less-enlightened times, not realizing that a new era and new threats have made it as archaic as Elizabeth's galleons, the spears of Cromwell's soldiers, the horsemen of the Earl of Essex, or the mercenaries of Cornwallis.

At this point, I suppose, it may occur to the mind of one of my listeners to inquire as to what period of time in Ireland I am referring, and my answer is now, right at this minute, and I suppose this is as good a time as any to tell about the present plight of Ireland. I shall not attempt to give you a discourse on the hardships the Irish people endured during the 700 years they suffered under British rule. Those were dark days throughout the world. I will confine my remarks to what we regard as enlightened times, nor shall I go beyond events within my own memory.

In 1914, small nations were promised freedom, and in 1918 the Irish electorate voted to establish a free and independent Republic. When they attempted to put the will of the people into effect a cruel war was waged on the people, and the Black and Tans were let loose to inflict their savage reprisals. With the few resources at their command and with the help of friends in the United States of America, the people fought back. When the liberals of the world and the Quakers of the United States of America took a hand to expose these conditions a truce was called, and in 1921 the British Parliament decided to divide the country in two, giving partial freedom to three-fourths of the country and setting up a gerrymandered, puppet government in the northeast sector, now known far and wide by the significant name of the Stormont Government. This existing Government, with its police and army, is financed by you through Marshall plan money. It is a costly operation, and the deficit is made up by the American taxpayer through Marshall plan aid. This division of Ireland can be eliminated by the British Parliament—the same body that gave it life at an hour's notice.

Ireland, like many a European nation, is divided into an agricultural and an industrial area, and to divide these two areas is like ringing a death knell to the economy of the country. Yet, that is precisely what

was done to Ireland and it is such a division that has since that time been maintained.

Some months ago, when I spoke to you, I reported how the rights of about half a million Irishmen living in this area were being shamelessly violated. I can report today that their reign of terror has been greatly intensified. Under the terms of a bill now introduced by the Stormont government, this little British occupied area will be literally a police state. It seeks to prevent every gathering of people who might peacefully seek to protest their unfortunate plight.

Ten days ago we celebrated the glorious Fourth of July, but few were reminded of the events which brought forth that great declaration or the conditions which made it necessary. Suffice it to say that every human right that was violated by the British in the Colonies in 1775 is now being violated in northeast Ireland except that the technique has been improved and the program is executed with greater precision. It might surprise our listeners to know that Irishmen in possession of literature which advocates the complete freedom of their country may be jailed for 14 years, and a man who sings a patriotic song in public may receive an equal term. When a Tyrone jurist, within the past few months, questioned the validity of some of these laws, the reaction of the British-rigged Parliament was spontaneous. The previous measures suppressed freedom of speech in any form. A new measure was immediately introduced which effectively prohibits freedom of assembly. These were the very things our founding fathers fought to destroy and, yet, these are the very things that are being denied to the people of northeast Ireland, and it is a sad commentary that our money is financing the project. The people of Ireland have been patient, but how long they shall continue to suffer under the lash remains only to be seen. Those who know the history of Ireland realize that it will not be too long. Each previous generation of Irishmen was forced to physically resist this type of tyranny. Is it to be expected that this generation will react differently from their forebears? But where does that leave us? We have been duped into supporting an arrangement that threatens to make our position as leaders in a free world completely ridiculous.

We are in partnership with Great Britain and do supply the money to keep her going. And this money of ours is being used by our partner to crush the soul of this great and noble nation. We will not be able to escape the responsibility for these acts of ours. We who know these things must not permit them to happen. We must inform our fellow Americans, knowing as we do that if the American people know the facts, they will not permit this condition long to remain. We speak in defense of a small nation of people who have never sought to conquer another race or group of people, who put the poet ahead of the warrior in its hall of fame, a nation fashioned by the Creator and provided with natural boundaries—the blue sea and a rocky coastline. All the chicanery of little men cannot alter or change it. It was designed by the Almighty to be one nation—the north, the south, the east, and the west.

The poet, Thomas Davis, put it thus a generation ago:

"That chainless wave and lovely land
Freedom and nationhood demand
Be sure the great God never planned
For slumbering slaves a home so grand."

And a free nation it must be, for, in the words of a more modern Irish patriot, Cahir Healy:

"Victory comes, not to those who can inflict the most punishment, but to those who can endure the most suffering."

Opinions of Albanian-Americans on Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call special attention to the report on majority opinions held by Albanian-Americans in Massachusetts concerning communism prepared for Gov. Paul Dever, of Massachusetts, by Mr. Glenn A. McLain, 45 Chase Street, Quincy, Mass. Following is the first part of the report, and I hope to have the second part inserted in tomorrow's RECORD. I would commend the reading of both parts of this report to all Members of Congress and those interested in combating communism here in the United States:

Since the end of World War II and the gradual deterioration of relations between the United States and Russia the actions of a certain group of Albanians in Massachusetts have greatly shocked and offended the majority of the Albanian community. These actions have been viewed with increasing alarm because of Albania's traditional spirit of friendship with America and because Albanian-Americans realized that their reputation as liberty-loving, honest American citizens was being challenged by false propaganda. In some quarters all Albanians were being classified as pro-Communists for three reasons:

1. Albanian leadership in the homeland was communistic.
2. A good portion of the Albanian foreign-language press in this country was not only pro-Communist but violently anti-American.
3. The constant pulpit and public denunciations of America, its form of government, its officials, and its foreign policy by Bishop Fan S. Noll, who is a leader of a section of the Albanian community in Massachusetts.

It seemed especially important in light of the Massachusetts Report of the Committee To Curb Communism, March 30, 1951 (H. Doc. No. 2823, pp. 36-39) that no Albanians were mentioned as being members of the Communist Party or Communist-front groups. Important because minority groups are special targets for Communist organizers. (Ibid., p. 29.) The minority group of Albanians in Massachusetts was no exception to this general statement of fact as an editorial of Zeri Popullit, Tirana, November 18, 1950, No. 246, attests:

"American imperialism is without example in history for its barbarism and its brutality toward humanity. During World War II the name of Hitler stood for that of the most feared man of all time. Everyone wished for his demise. In the year 1950 a man by the name of Truman is taking Hitler's place. The people see in the face of Truman the characteristics of Hitler. Humanity fought and defeated Hitler. So will Truman be defeated in the twentieth century for the good of mankind stands the Soviet giant for the hope and salvation of mankind."

This propaganda, although not printed in the Albanian American press, was distributed at the "Free Albanian Organizations Ball" under the sponsorship of Fan S. Noll. Noll's views in regard to such hate spewing propaganda are well known as a religious sermon delivered by him to his congregation and reprinted in Liria, December 23, 1949, so will explain:

"The Albanians in the United States must regard it as their duty to support the present democratic (Communist) Government of Albania, which is the surest guaranty of its national independence, its territorial integrity, and of the peoples freedom. All Albanians must be united in this patriotic stand in the present crisis."

Such were the words of an important leader of the Albanian community. It was hardly strange that many uninformed people in Massachusetts considered all Albanians in the light of Noll's pro-Communist advocations. The Albanians as a minority group were being "smeared" by the desultory tactics of a few Albanians.

III SUMMARY BACKGROUND HISTORY OF ALBANIANS IN AMERICA, 1900-1951

a. Albanians as American citizens

In order to fully understand the point of view held by the majority of Albanians concerning communism it is necessary to briefly trace Albanian-American developments in this country.

The major portion of Albanians in America came to this country after 1900 (C. A. Chezeze, *Albania, Past and Present* 1919, p. 227). There are approximately 40,000 Albanians in America, with the Massachusetts colony, 10,000 plus, being the largest group at the present time (Ibid., p. 227). The Albanian immigrant in America at the turn of the century was beset by many emotions. He had come to America as the land of opportunity and at first found little of that opportunity. In forsaking a country where "primitive lawlessness was both tradition and fact" (Federal Writers Project, *The Albanian Struggle in the Old World and the New*, 1939, p. 26), he found law and order at the price of losing much of his traditional freedom. "In his far greater dread of the bewildering new life * * * in America, the immigrant almost forgot the old dread under which he had lived in Albania" (Ibid., p. 28). The machine-age civilization in America frightened him and for a while he lost the sense of security in the land that was his cherished right in Albania. The Albanian that worked in the iron foundries, the shoe factories, or the restaurants in Massachusetts and other areas was faced with a life of grinding poverty. Poor housing conditions and arduous toil at low wages were not seemingly conducive to the development of good American citizens. Despite these adverse conditions present in the early 1900's the Albanians of 1951 in Massachusetts are now loyal citizens worthy of the name American. Prosperous fruit marts, ice-cream factories, furniture stores, up-to-date variety shops, coal and wood concerns, tire shops, and restaurants dot the Massachusetts economic map (Ibid., p. 93). Although the professional group of Albanians in Massachusetts is not a large one it promises "to be considerably expanded by recruits from the present generation of students" (Ibid., p. 94). The industry of the average Albanian over the years is a proven economic fact in Massachusetts and other areas in America. As one American writer explains "Rarely * * * does the name of an Albanian appear on the relief rolls" (Ibid., p. 96). The old indifference of the average Albanian in regard to the American customs, American vocational opportunities, and the American spirit of free enterprise has virtually vanished. Albanians have come to realize that a new culture is in the making in America. They are willing to join other minority groups in America to help to build that culture. It is especially significant in view of their inauspicious beginnings in America that no taint of communism has ever been applied to the Albanian minority in Massachusetts or America. (Report of Committee To Curb Communism, op. cit., pp. 36-38.)

b. Albanians as homeland supporters

1. In the Period Before the Communists

The general administrative and political breakdown of the Ottoman Empire in the 1870's first poised the problem of Albanian independence at European council tables. (Writers, *Albanian Struggle*, p. 34.) After the Russo-Turkish War (1877-78), the Albanians petitioned the Congress of Berlin to fully recognize Albanian nationality and autonomy. (M. D. A. E. Von Redlich, *The Unconquered Albania*, Cincinnati, 1935, p. 26.) "The period between the Congress of Berlin to the Balkan wars witness two new phases of the history of Albania. First, the growth of Albanian nationalism, and, secondly, the increasingly complex rivalry of European powers in this region (Edith P. Stickney, *Southern Albania or Northern Epirus in European International Affairs*, California, 1926, p. 13.) After the formation of the Albanian League for the Defense of the Rights of the Albanian Nationality in 1878, nationalism was placed on a solid political footing in Albania. The dormant nationalistic feeling of the Albanians now began to be nurtured by the militant actions of the League, the use of the Albanian language in schools previously prohibited by the Moslems, and the publication of numerous schoolbooks and newspapers in the native language. (Chezeze, *Albania Past and Present*, pp. 213-215.) The winds of nationalism were tugging hard at the Moslem political structure. The storm of fury which was to blow in Albanian independence in 1912 had to blow from Europe to America and back again. The Albanians in America were to provide the financial strength, journalistic talent, and political leaders so necessary for Albania to take her place in the family of nations.

Always generous toward their homeland the Albanians of America have never supported the two great enemies of democracy—fascism or communism. When Bishop F. S. Noll as Premier of Albania "showed his true attachments and inclinations toward communism by entering into diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia and according recognition to a Soviet Russian minister with a large staff who were to use the Albanian capital, Tirana, as a center for Soviet propaganda in Europe," Albanian-Americans failed to support him in his policies. (Von Redlich, op. cit., p. 35.)

The enmity of the Albanian-Americans was further incurred by Noll when Noll founded an Albanian Communist newspaper in Geneva (Liria Kombetare, subsidized by Russia), and when he signed a Bolshevik manifesto in 1927 which was intended to bring about a revolution in Albania and all Balkan states with the purpose of uniting them into a federation of Soviet Socialist republics. (Ibid., p. 35.)

The embracing of communism by the premier scholar and American-educated Bishop Noll led the Albanian American minister Konitz to protest bitterly against Noll's final entry into America in 1930. (Writers, *Albanian Struggle*, p. 19.)

For reasons best known to the United States Government Noll was finally permitted to enter this country permanently, eventually becoming an American citizen. He has failed to change his political spots and his nationalism today is not the patriotic brand of nationalism practiced by Albanian-Americans since the turn of the century. It is the same internationalism of the Communist revolution preaching hate and destruction for the liberties of Albania. Such aspirations are not in any way representative of the Albanian-Americans in Massachusetts or anywhere in the world.

2. In the Period Since the Communists

Any discussion of communism among the Albanian minority group must necessarily touch upon the relationship between Ameri-

can Albanians and their homeland. When the Moscow puppet, Enver Hoxa, took over the Albanian Government in 1945 all the world knew that the Kremlin-sponsored government did not represent the true wishes of the Albanian people. (Sholperia, vol. I, New York, N. Y., May 1, 1951, No. 15.)

The obvious historical facts prove to the most casual spectator of Albanian affairs that dictatorship is anathema to Albanians; however, many unthinking people have confused the facts and syllogistically said, "Albania is Communist, my friend is Albanian—therefore, my friend is a Communist." No statement could be further from the truth. Perhaps the many speeches of Fan S. Noll have convinced many unknowing listeners that the Albanian-American minority group is pro-Communist. Noll's sermon, as reported in Liria, opere citato, December 23, 1949, and the constant anti-American, pro-Communist diatribe in editorials, would be sufficient to smear the Albanian community as a body. The position of the Albanian-Americans in regard to their Communist-controlled homeland is therefore clear.

The Albanian nation is one of those who have written their history with blood. They must continue their warfare for the liberation of their divine land, for the reholing of their historic flag, for the reestablishment of the Albanian race.

With the help of God and the forces of western civilization (not Russia, as Noll suggests), the hour of success will come surely.

"Long live Albania, liberty, and democracy" (Sholperia, vol. I, New York, N. Y., June 15, 1951, No. 18.)

The above expression of Albanian-American friendship as shown by a responsible organ of the Albanian press is quite in contrast with the antiwestern denunciations by Noll. (Op. cit., p. 3.)

c. The importance of Albanian leaders in America

1. The Role of Leadership in the Albanian American Communism, 1900-1951

The great English historian Toynbee has said that every culture and civilization must have a creative minority to lead the social group into true creativity. This law of history is certainly true in the light of the role played by Albanian-American leaders in this country. As the early Albanian immigrant in the 1900's was inarticulate educationally speaking, his leaders were truly a "creative minority."

The work of Christo Dako is the formation of reading clubs for the use of the newly created Albanian newspaper Kombi in 1905. As Albanian literacy grew other clubs of a like nature were formed in local areas of Massachusetts. Fan S. Noll became a leader of the Albanians in America after 1908 when he was ordained a priest by the Russian Orthodox Archbishop Raton. His militancy soon established him as a leader (Writers, *Albanian Struggle*, p. 46), although it was rather curious that he could gain so much prestige so easily. (Loc. cit.) He was born outside of Albania, he lacked the normal ties of village and family which made for successful politicians in the Albanian-American community, and he was not well known in Europe at the time. From the first he used his pulpit for political preaching and he has continued to do so ever since. His scholarly achievements have been many in the years since he received his first degree from Harvard in 1912. (Cf. H. N. Marquis Co., *Who's Who in the East*, Chicago, 1948, pp. 1264-1265, and A. N. Marquis Co., *Who's Who in America*, Chicago, 1949, p. 1836, for a full account of his scholastic activities.) This perhaps accounts in part for his tremendous power and hold over his supporters in the Albanian community today. The facade of learning often covers the hard core of communism or fascism as the actions of Russian and German "intellectuals" have so

often proven in recent years. Others such as Fuchs in Britain, Coplon, and Hiss in the United States, are only a few selected examples of "liberalism" gone astray.

A full list of Albanian leaders would not be within the scope of this report but men such as Konitza, Dako, Chezrezi, and others have effectively led the uncertain, illiterate Albanian peasant of the early 1930's onto the constructive road to American citizenship.

2 The Religious Elements in Leadership

Religion and politics have been often mutual bedfellows in the Balkans. The Balkan countries of Yugoslavia, Romania, Bulgaria, and Albania have been the scene of mass "conversions" when one of the three important religions in the area allied itself with political factions. Such liaisons between religion and politics are not traditional in America. It is to the credit of the Albanian Americans as a group that such central European folk ways and mores have not been allowed to continue in the face of the cherished American constitutional separation of church and state.

A Bishop Noli and his supporters

As the religious leaders among the early Albanian American immigrants were among the best educated it was natural that they should become outstanding leaders in the Albanian communities. Fan S. Noli was one of the first of this type of leader. In view of his later behavior and opinions concerning communism it seemed strange that his church community would tolerate him over a long period of time. His reputation as the "father" of the Albanian Orthodox Church of America, his deeds and title to the property of the St. George's Church in South Boston, his age and great reputation as a scholar, all have seemingly made his position an impregnable one in the Albanian community. Some members of his congregation claim that as religion and politics are not one in America as they are in Albania, Noli's pro-communistic pulpit exhortations are harmless. As communism is an atheistic philosophy, based on world revolution and class hatred the facts would seem to belie the excuses given for Noli. The basic nature of communism is religious as the scholarly historically trained Bishop Noli surely must understand. Communism has its own bible in the works of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin, its god in the person of the deified Lenin and Stalin; heaven and hell (Communist "freedom" versus capitalistic exploitation). Infinite comparisons could be made and the proof of these comparisons can be found by even a cursory reading of the authorities on the subject. Philosophers, theologians, sociologists, and historians (Russell, Graham, Sorokin, Toynbee, Spengler, Shub, Pares, Vernadsky, and many others).

At the present time a schism exists in the Albanian Orthodox Church of America. This schism has not been effected as Noli suggests because of political or religious differences between Bishops Noli and Lepa. It exists solely because Noli's pro-Communist political sympathies have forced him to receive with disdain any suggestion that his spiritual authority can come from any place but Moscow.

The Albanian Autocephalous Church of America as formed by Bishop Noli in 1938 had as its spiritual head the Patriarch in Istanbul. The Patriarch of Istanbul in the Eastern World occupies a position roughly analogous to that of the Vatican and the Pope in the Western World. His connection with the church in America is one of a spiritual nature and is similar to those of the Pope and in no way conflicts with the freedom of the American independent church.

Almost as soon as the Communists seized power in Albania, Bishop Noli made overtures to the Red leaders for recognition of his American Episcopacy. His behavior was

consistent with his long-cherished Communist principles. Negating the very principles of decency which should characterize men of the cloth (if no others) he repudiated Archbishop Kissi who was his former theological associate. Archbishop Kissi had been greatly responsible for the founding of the Albanian Autocephalous Church of America and had ordained Noli. Kissi became the Cardinal Mindszenty, of Albania. In their brutally efficient way the Reds forced a new archbishop of the Albanian church, Pashko Voca, who immediately issued the following statement:

"The Congress unanimously denounces the unfriendly and harmful behavior of its former primate against the church, the people and the country." (Liria, March 3, 1950, vol IX, p. 1)

The usual trumped-up charges were then presented to a Communist court of justice, Archbishop Kissi "confessed," and he was imprisoned. What has happened to him since the trial remains a matter of conjecture.

At the meeting of the so-called congress, the following statements were mentioned as the collective sentiments of the assembled delegation:

"The church must be the center that stimulates the feeling of patriotism, of brotherly love, of unity for the fatherland . . .

"The synod must direct all its activities toward the camp of peace and universal friendship among all peoples, like all progressive churches do under the inspired leadership of the great Russian church" (Liria, ibid, p. 1)

Noli, unconcerned about the unjust repudiation of his theological compatriot, Archbishop Kissi, hastened to mend his political fences. Apparently he was well aware of the protests of Albanian Americans to the patriarch of Istanbul against his pro-Communist activities. As he could never criticize communism because he had advocated it, only one step remained to make his rapprochement with communism complete. That was formal recognition of his episcopacy by Moscow and its stooge in Albania. The semiofficial organ of the Communist government in Tirana (Bashkimi, February 25, 1950) published the following telegram from Noli:

"We are very much pleased with the favorable resolution that was adopted by the third congress of the Albanian Orthodox Church in regards to our petition to come under the jurisdiction of our mother church. We are impatiently awaiting notification by the holy synod.

"Bishop F. S. NOLI."

The holy synod was naturally overjoyed to ratify the petition of Noli's. The acceptance of Noli resulted in twin victories for communism: a propaganda victory, fully exploited by the Communist press; and a religio-political victory for Noli, who was now secure in his episcopacy.

A Great Patriot, Thomas Paine, Nailed the Fatal Defect in Price-Control Schemes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the patriots who fought the Revolution tried price controls in an effort to stabilize the value of their printing-press money,

It did not work then, and it will not work now, unless we can repeal some natural laws, which we cannot do.

Such American heroes as George Washington and Thomas Paine condemned price controls in the strongest possible language.

Today their wise testimony on this subject is discarded.

However, I will make this prediction confidently: That, if the present attempt to fool the people while the value of our currency is destroyed is not soon abandoned, Congress will learn the hard way of the truth of Paine's and Washington's judgment of price controls.

A part of a letter from Thomas Paine to Danton on price controls follows:

I see also another embarrassing circumstance arising in Paris of which we have had full experience in America.

I mean that of fixing the price of provisions. But if this measure is to be attempted it ought to be done by the municipality. The convention has nothing to do with regulations of this kind, neither can they be carried into practice.

The people of Paris may say they will not give more than a certain price for provisions, but as they cannot compel the country people to bring provisions to market the consequence will be directly contrary to their expectations, and they will find dearth and famine instead of plenty and cheapness.

They may force the price down upon the stock in hand, but after that the market will be empty.

I will give you an example. In Philadelphia we undertook, among other regulations of this kind, to regulate the price of salt; the consequence was that no salt was brought to market, and the price rose to 36 shillings sterling per bushel.

The price before the war was only one shilling and sixpence per bushel; and we regulated the price of flour (farina) till there was none in the market, and the people were glad to procure it at any price.

There is also a circumstance to be taken into the account which is not much attended to. The assignats are not of the same value they were a year ago, and as the quantity increases the value of them will diminish.

This gives the appearance of things being dear when they are not so in fact, for in the same proportion that any kind of money falls in value articles rise in price. If it were not for this, the quantity of assignats would be too great to be circulated.

Paper money in America fell so much in value from this excessive quantity of it that in the year 1781 I gave 300 paper dollars for one pair of worsted stockings. What I write you upon the subject is experience, and not merely opinion. I have no personal interest in any of these matters, nor in any party disputes. I attend only to general principles. (From The Essays of Thomas Paine, pp. 58-59.)

Civilian Defense: Uneven Preparations Still Dangerous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, it is always better to be safe than to be sorry. In our civilian defense programing, most

of our largest communities, having gotten over their first fright, are now sinking blissfully in a state of absolute somnolence.

Here and there, as in Utica, N. Y., splendid demonstrations of preparedness have been furnished by an alert city administration in cooperation with all the surrounding towns and villages. The Air Defense Command has gone about its task of recruiting civilian volunteers for large-scale alert practices, but the whole effort has been spotty, poorly publicized, and lacking in over-all results.

With the Korean cease-fire, the danger of being caught napping is rendered all the more apparent. Our people were lulled into unsuspecting sleep at Pearl Harbor by "negotiations." There is good reason to believe that we may be similarly off guard now. The serpent always strikes when the victim is least aware of his presence.

Civilian defense is not a luxury today. It is an expensive necessity. American cities seem to be incredibly blind to the lessons of current history.

State Department Cabal Planned American Domestic and Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN T. WOOD

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr WOOD of Idaho. Mr Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include Information Bulletin No. 151 of July 30, 1951.

If you are wondering how such an insane project from the American standpoint could originate, consider the appended list of names of the planners, which includes Alger Hiss, branded as a traitor and convicted as a perjurer; Harry Dexter White, who escaped conviction only by dying suddenly and mysteriously a few days after appearing before the House Un-American Activities Committee; Julian H. Wadleigh, a self-confessed Communist who admitted passing top State secrets to Russian Communists; Mortimer Snerd Wallace; the Old Curmudgeon himself; and the present Secretary of State—one-worlders all who would reduce America to a mere province in a world superstate in which we would be hopelessly outnumbered and outvoted.

Show me an internationalist and I will show you a potential traitor to the United States.

The bulletin follows:

EXPENDITURES BY THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR THE FISCAL YEARS 1940 THROUGH 1951 INDICATE INCREASING OVERHEAD COST OF NEW DEAL-FAIR DEAL INTERNATIONAL POLICIES

The annual reports of the Secretary of the Treasury, submitted to the Congress for the fiscal years from 1940 through 1950, and the reported expenditures by the State Department for the fiscal year 1951, reveals a growing and costly trend in the foreign policies of the administration whereby the State De-

partment is given public funds and authority never contemplated by the framers of our Constitution.

The reported expenditures, together with the budget request by the State Department for fiscal 1952, totaling nearly \$2,750,000,000 were:

Fiscal year:	Reported expenditures
1940.....	\$24,292,914
1941.....	25,121,083
1942.....	28,912,144
1943.....	33,492,741
1944.....	38,101,003
1945.....	52,289,102
1946.....	¹ 178,291,582
1947.....	² 311,488,859
1948.....	³ 665,769,674
1949.....	⁴ 334,296,767
1950.....	⁵ 361,226,113
1951.....	⁶ 305,375,133
1952 (budget request).....	283,566,476
Total.....	2,742,223,591

¹ Included for foreign economic functions,

\$127,291,582

² U. N. relief and rehabilitation costing \$178,177,135

³ Foreign-aid programs administered by State Department, \$339,162,749

⁴ Foreign aid and U. N. loan accounted for \$66,618,474.

⁵ Foreign aid, loan to U. N., and Children's Fund, \$39,511,586.

⁶ Reported in Daily Treasury Statement, June 29, 1951

NOTE—Details may be found by consulting the annual reports of the Secretary of the Treasury

NEW DOLLAR DIPLOMACY FAILS IN CRISIS

The very fact that our Nation has had to face one emergency after another, notwithstanding the fact that we have poured out nearly \$117,000,000,000 over the past 10 years in outright grants, loans, and credits, and now have perhaps a greater number of potential enemies than we had in 1939, indicates that dollar diplomacy as practiced over the past 10 years is no panacea for the world's ills, economic or social.

Everything considered, it is manifest that the ultimate object of the Department of State's internationalists, one-worlders, up-lifters, and do-gooders is to accomplish the following

1 To raise the standards of living of the rest of the world to those of the United States, although everyone knows that is quite impossible without lowering our standard of living to a lower level.

2 To take the United States into international foreign alliances of the very kind against which President George Washington warned in his famous farewell address, and against which Warren G. Harding, in an address in the Senate in 1921, said

"It is better to be the free and disinterested agents of international justice and advancing civilization, with the covenant of conscience, than be shackled by a written compact which surrenders our freedom of action and gives to a military alliance, the right to proclaim America's duty to the world"

3. To sacrifice and surrender the sovereign, inherent, and unalienable powers of this Republic to the domination and control of foreign nations and foreign-controlled international bodies functioning under the so-called United Nations, several of whom are presently disunited.

4. To establish the welfare state on a semi-world-wide basis.

Proof of these objects and purposes seems to be in the following, among still other things hidden and disclosed:

As far back as February 12, 1942, the Advisory Committee on Postwar Foreign Policy was convened in the State Department. Discussion quickly arose as to whether the

public should be told of the existence and work of that committee. State Department Bulletin 3580, a 726-page cloth-bound book, released in February 1950, entitled "Postwar Foreign Policy Preparation" at page 79 contains the following significant statement:

"The committee agreed that its work should be approached from the general standpoint of the kind of world that the United States desired after the war. It also took the position that the President, in view of his executive responsibilities, would need to have recommendations for action as well as information on all problems on which a national position would have to be taken or an attitude expressed.

"Thought was given to the possibility of informing the public immediately of the establishment and work of the committee. It was felt that circumstances at the moment, when the United States was being driven back in the Pacific and the United Nations' cause was suffering on every front, rendered secrecy imperative until a favorable turn in the war * * * Accordingly the committee's work and existence were kept secret."

Membership of the committee included Henry A. Wallace, Paul H. Appleby, Warren R. Austin, William A. Batt, Alger Hiss, Philip C. Jessup, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Harry D. White, David Niles, Leland Olds, Harry Hopkins, Julian H. Wadleigh, Harold L. Ickes, Wayne Coy, Charles E. Wilson, Eric A. Johnston, Dean G. Acheson, and many others.

Do you wonder what is wrong with our foreign policy?

PAUL O. PETERS.

Diplomatic Blunders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include an article by Rev. James M. Gillis, C. S. P., in his column, What's Right With the World:

SURSUM CORDA OR WHAT'S RIGHT WITH THE WORLD?

(By Rev. James M. Gillis, C. S. P.)

DIPLOMATIC BLUNDERS

A few weeks ago in this column there was a bit of comment on the mistakes of those who have our destiny in their keeping. Soon after that in a newspaper I came upon a favorite quotation of mine. It is the admonition of the Scandinavian diplomat of three centuries ago, Oxenstiern: "My son, see with how little wisdom this big world is governed." That little wisdom may ruin us.

If western civilization is to succumb to the Oriental despotism of the Soviets, it will perish because of the blunders of presidents, premiers, politicians, diplomats, statesmen. They all make mistakes but they seldom confess it. However, Paul Hoffman, who formerly dispensed billions of public money as ECA Administrator, in his recent book, Peace Can Be Won, says: "We should all admit our common error and concede that the weakness of our present situation is the result of our miscalculations as to Russia's post-war attitude. Most of us thought that after World War II she would join us in seeking peace. I certainly did and have no apologies for so thinking."

Not "our miscalculations"

Thanks to Mr Hoffman for his candor, but why does he say "our miscalculations"?

"Our error"? "Most of us"? "All of us"? The fact is that few ordinary American citizens gave Russia credit for being peace loving. Those who did so, or pretended to do so, were at the top and they were blinded by their political prepossessions.

Those who followed Roosevelt did so because of his New Deal, not because of his pro-Russian foreign policy. After Pearl Harbor they accepted the inevitable but they never for a moment trusted Russia. We had before our eyes the fate of Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania. Also there was the infamous Molotov-Ribbentrop pact. Those who, like Mr. Hoffman, thought that Russia would join us in seeking peace blundered inexcusably. If they now feel no compunction, they must be singularly insensitive.

It used to be alleged by those who approved or condoned the shameful doings at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam that the gift of China to Russia (that's what it amounted to) was necessary because we needed Russia's help to defeat Japan. That excuse was false. In 1939 when Russia and Germany ganged up on Poland we—to our shame—helped Russia with lend-lease. We were not yet in the war—officially. But our top men were pro-Russian. They "put it over" on the rest of us.

So, too, for Yalta. In 1945 we had driven Japan off the seas and out of the skies. We needed no Russian help. The atom bomb was already an assured success. Evidence of that fact hitherto concealed from the people was revealed during the MacArthur investigation by Lt Gen Leslie G. Groves, former head of the Manhattan District which built the bomb. We had the Japs on their knees and the bomb was at hand. Those who at that juncture bribed Russia to come in (and what bribe it was) did so for reasons of their own. Now we see that the bribery was a catastrophic blunder.

F D R. responsible

Of course, the fount and origin of all our pro-Russian blunders was the megalomania of President Roosevelt. In a letter to Winston Churchill in 1942 he wrote: "I know you will not mind my being brutally frank when I tell you that I think I can personally handle Stalin better than either your Foreign Office or my State Department." In fact, Stalin played rings around Roosevelt. The President who thought himself so deucedly clever never gained one diplomatic victory over his "dear Joe."

Ignoring the letter to Churchill, the expression "my State Department" (a dead give-away of the deceased President's egotism), let us remark merely that it was not Roosevelt who took Stalin for a ride, it was Stalin who played Roosevelt for a sucker. Such uncouth slang may offend "nice" people, but it is the most appropriate language I can think of to express what happened.

To come to a more recent example of the ineptitude of our diplomats. On June 27, Dean Acheson denounced what he called Iran's tactics of "threat and fear." But on the same day he told the House Foreign Affairs Committee that the United States has "no thought" of intervening in Iran. When is intervention not intervention?

The Iranian blunder

Add a second question. If we hope to be arbiters of peace between Iran and Britain, is it good diplomacy to start by insulting one of the parties to the dispute? Furthermore, we blundered needlessly into the Iranian mess. We encouraged Iran to adopt a strong nationalism as an obstacle to Russian infiltration. When the Nationalists got out of hand and nationalism developed into nationalization, we found ourselves once more in a diplomatic predicament. We cannot exculpate ourselves by accusing Iran and exculpating Britain.

The Iranians declare that Britain doesn't know that the world has changed and that

one of the changes concerns the old system of colonization and exploitation. So much for Britain. But why did we plunge into the dispute, and why do we find ourselves on the side of an outdated imperialism? And since we have gone into it, how can we say we have "no thought" of intervening?

When Jacob Malik made his cease-fire suggestion, Secretary Acheson said that an armistice at the thirty-eighth parallel would be a victory for America. Let's see: We fight for a year, spend \$12,000,000,000, lose 76,000 killed, wounded, and missing, to say nothing of the slaughter of several hundred thousands of Koreans (North and South), and just where we began, and that is victory.

So we continue to stumble and blunder along. If such is our diplomacy we had better pull out of the game. We don't know how to play it.

Open Welfare Rolls to Public View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include an editorial from the Atlanta Journal, as reprinted on July 31 in the Richmond Times-Dispatch, concerning a bill introduced by me and now pending in the Committee on Ways and Means:

OPEN WELFARE ROLLS TO PUBLIC VIEW

Pending in Congress is legislation which would permit States to open their welfare rolls to public inspection without risking loss of Federal funds.

Under present Federal law, States are required to keep these lists secret. Across the country there is growing dissatisfaction with such a requirement.

Public welfare benefits in the aggregate run into millions, and even hundreds of millions of dollars in every State in the Union. The case both for and against secrecy has been ably stated in recent days.

Senator HERBERT LEHMAN pleaded unsuccessfully in the Senate against an amendment which would allow public access to the records. Here is the gist of his argument, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"A situation had arisen in Ohio the previous year, I believe, under a Democratic administration there, in which it was proved that the rolls had been used for political purposes. Letters were sent to the unfortunate beneficiaries of relief, calling upon them to support political organizations.

"The situation was so clear, so sinister, that the Congress of the United States enacted legislation which would prevent such a thing in the future. . . . I cannot picture the damage that would be done if we permitted the use of the relief rolls for political purposes.

"Furthermore, up to 1939, when the legislation prohibiting the publication of the records was passed, the names of those on the relief rolls were used for commercial or other purposes. Threats and pressures were exerted on the unfortunate men and women who were on the relief rolls, not, generally speaking, through any fault of theirs, but simply because of the weight of circumstances which bowed them down."

The case against secrecy is best stated by James S. Pope, a Georgian, who is now managing editor of the Louisville Courier-Jour-

nal. He is serving as chairman of the committee on freedom of information for the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

At the last meeting of that society he made a notable report on how public officials, local, State, and Federal, increasingly often attempt to keep the public business a secret.

In the Atlantic Monthly for July, Mr. Pope has an article on the battle for access to all public records. He concedes, citing essentially the same argument advanced by Senator LEHMAN that there were some respectable grounds for keeping welfare rolls confidential. But he adds:

"This reasoning is based, of course, on a dubious faith that if relief rolls are not made public, statehouse and county politicians will not know who is on them, and cannot bring pressure for political support.

"There are certain social arguments in favor of protecting relief clients. On the other hand, here is more than \$2,000,000,000 a year being disbursed, and no reporter can check on all the reports of fraud that every newspaper receives.

"Sentiment seems to be growing that the necessity to guard an increasingly huge sum from grafters takes precedence over the right of personal privacy. Indiana has repealed her secrecy law, risking loss of some \$22,000,000 of Federal funds. Legislatures in Tennessee, Georgia, Illinois, Florida, and other States have expressed great dissatisfaction with the present policy. Two bills which would destroy the confidential status have been introduced in Congress.

"If this area of secrecy, which has some justification, is opened up to the public view, the effect will be profound in other agencies which have no law to sanction their concealments."

We believe, with Mr. Pope, that the weight of public interest lies against secrecy. We hope that Congress will act in accordance with the wishes of legislatures in Georgia and other States which wish to allow the searchlight of public scrutiny on expenditures of these vast sums of money. The people have a right to know how their money is spent.

Silence Costing Ike a Trial Run

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under the Oregon primary law a thousand voters may by petition have the name of any registered voter of their party placed on the ballot as a nominee for President. The Oregon law provides:

The name of any candidate for a party nomination of President or Vice President shall be printed on said ballots upon the written request of said candidate . . . or upon the petition of 1,000 supporters who are registered voters in the State of Oregon of the political party to which said candidate belongs.

The Oregon Supreme Court has ruled that the official candidate must under this section be a registered member of the party. In Oregon at the present time there is a movement on foot by both the Democrats and Republicans to have General Eisenhower's name placed on the Oregon ballot in the primary election to be held in May next year as a candidate for the Presidency. However,

under the provision of our law, it would be necessary to have his official party registration made known.

I am including as part of these remarks a portion of an article appearing in the Washington Post for Sunday, July 29, written by Robert C. Albright where the Oregon situation is discussed:

SILENCE COSTING "IKE" A TRIAL RUN
(By Robert C. Albright)

A gimmick in the Oregon election laws is jolting plans of independents in both parties to make that State's May 16 Presidential trials the pay-off primary for General Eisenhower.

The stage was all set to enter Eisenhower's name in the Oregon primaries, with or without his consent. All that was needed, most thought, were the signatures of 1,000 Oregon voters.

Democratic State Senator Thomas R. Mahoney already had announced he was starting to circulate a Democratic petition for Eisenhower. Independent Republicans were planning a similar move.

State election officials informally suggested that the sponsors had better take a second look not only at the election law, but at court interpretations of it.

Then it came out. Eisenhower's name can be entered all right, even without his consent, but there's one big proviso. He must be a registered member of the political party under which his name is proposed.

If Eisenhower is formally affiliated with either political party, he hasn't yet said so. If he is going to come out and state his political affiliation—a highly doubtful speculation—he can get on the ballot simply by filing a written request.

The petition which developed because the primary law itself had a sleeper.

Here's how the law reads:

"The name of any candidate for a party nomination of President or Vice President shall be printed on said ballots upon the written request of said candidate * * * or upon the petition of 1,000 supporters who are registered voters in the State of Oregon of the political party to which said candidate belongs."

The catch is in those last eight words. The petitioners would have to know he belonged to their party, and as of this date they don't.

The State supreme court removed any doubt about the requirement in 1928. The court ruled, in the case of State of Oregon versus William Boyer: "The official candidate must, under this section, be a registered member of the party."

A PLUG FOR HOFFMAN

Oregon Young Republicans are trying to persuade Senator WAYNE MORSE, Republican, of Oregon, to let them enter a favorite-son slate in his name in the primary, on the theory that he could hold the delegation for Ike or some other forward-looking candidate.

On his recent trip back home, a delegation of independent Republicans used this argument. "It's our best chance of preventing a victory for TART in the State primary. If Republicans split up behind different candidates, TART will surely beat the field."

MORSE discouraged the idea. He thanked them for the nice compliment, but said he had no illusions about his role in the Republican Party. Instead of working for a candidate, MORSE told them, "Work for the election of forward-looking delegates to the Republican convention who can be counted on to support some such progressive-minded men for the nomination as Eisenhower, Paul Hoffman, or Jim Duff."

It was the first time, in recent months anyway, that former Marshall Plan Administrator Hoffman had been mentioned as a 1952

GOP possibility. Senator DUFF had been discussed mainly as a cog in the draft-Eisenhower drive.

MORSE put Eisenhower's name first, but reminded Oregon Young Republicans: "There are others, too." You see, no one yet has it in writing that the general will be any more available politically than he was in 1948.

Back in Washington MORSE wrote Oregon supporters to the same effect.

"The Republican Party must pick a winner this time," he said. "I am satisfied we could win easily with Eisenhower, Hoffman, or Duff. I am sure we cannot win with a nominee selected by the reactionary wing of the party."

Silver Lining Seen in Cloud Over Iran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD today a news article appearing in the Amarillo (Tex.) News-Globe. This article is of interest to all of us.

SILVER LINING SEEN IN CLOUD OVER IRAN

A silver lining is appearing through the dark clouds overhanging Europe and Iran. Col. Lawrence Hagy and Gen. Ernest O. Thompson told members of the American Business Club yesterday in the Herring Hotel Hagy returned recently from Europe, where he attended the Third World Petroleum Congress at The Hague.

General Thompson, member of the Texas Railroad Commission and American representative to the congress, agreed with Hagy that Gen. Dwight Eisenhower is the man of the hour in the world today. Thompson, home convalescing from a serious illness, said he just dropped in to hear Hagy, who presented the program.

"I returned to America more optimistic over the world situation than at any time since the end of the war," Hagy said. "I spent some time with General Eisenhower, and I honestly believe he is the only man in the world who can pull Europe up by the boot straps and avert another war."

Eisenhower doesn't think Russia wants to fight, Hagy said. Eisenhower wants only 6 or 8 months more to whip the North Atlantic Pact into shape, and the Russian bear will be stopped in Europe.

Hagy labeled the Iranian oil situation as England's greatest blunder. He traced England's domination of its colonies while England was the greatest power in the world and how she has lost out. He revealed that England gave Iran only 25 percent of its oil revenue, while America gives Iraq 50 percent. He said England refused to renegotiate, and the "roof fell in."

Hagy said Iran definitely will be unable to operate the huge refinery and its oil fields, and he doubts that Russia has the technical knowledge to step in and run the operations. Also, Russia could not benefit from the Iranian oil fields because she has no tanker fleet and no waterways to Russia. There are no railroads and no pipelines into Russia.

Hagy said he is disappointed in England, but optimistic that eventually the Nation will solve its crisis. He pointed out that Rome and England dominated the world for hundreds of years and both have fallen. Now the United States is in the same position, but we are paying the way instead of taking from others.

"Socialism has killed the Englishman's incentive to work," Hagy said. "It is a 50-50 bet that the labor government will be defeated in the next election but it will take years to cure the ills of socialism."

There is little war talk in Europe, Hagy said. The people think America is building for war. They can't understand America's armament program unless it is to wage war.

"I tried to tell them we are trying to avert war, not wage war, but they couldn't see it that way," he said.

Hagy praised the Marshall plan but said he wonders if the people of Europe realize its importance to the recovery of their various countries. He said France today is producing 40 percent more manufactured goods than before the war. Italy is in the midst of a building boom comparable to that in Amarillo.

"The entire world wants American dollars and they'll do anything to get them," Hagy said. "Why in London I could order a large steak served in my room while Englishmen get about 2 ounces of meat a week. I could buy cloth in English stores and get a rebate in English money. Prices in England aren't out of line but in France and Italy they are sky high."

Discussing the World Petroleum Congress, Hagy said there were 2,500 representatives from nearly every oil-producing nation in the world present exchanging ideas and discussing their problems.

"If we could arrange more such meetings, I believe the problems of the world could be solved," Hagy declared.

"Do you know who was the best-known man at the conference," Hagy queried? "It was Gen. Ernest O. Thompson. Men from every country wanted to see and talk with him and when he was taken ill he was visited in his hotel room by delegations from many nations who wanted his advice."

General Thompson said he was elated that Averell Harriman was dispatched to Iran and that he has been successful in reopening negotiations between England and Iran.

"It may cost us money getting into the oil squabble, but money is a lot cheaper than the lives of our American boys," Thompson declared.

Gordon Gill was in charge of the program, arranged by Lew Fields.

Blair Jones was introduced as a new member.

Salary Increases for Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee:

I have talked with committee members so many times about this matter that I feel I must apologize for again burdening the members with my views.

It seems to me that any increase granted should be on a permanent basis. Temporary legislation of this type is extremely unsatisfactory and is very unrealistic.

I hope the committee will give every consideration to the matter of eliminating the lower grades. It seems to me that some adjustment should also be made in salary for those employees who have entered the service since July 1, 1945.

I do not want again to repeat the many points I have made on a great many occasions with members of this committee. I think probably most of you are very familiar with my position. Let me conclude by repeating that any increase granted should be on a permanent basis.

Frankly, I do not see how most of these employees are able to provide for their families with the extremely high cost of living that we have and that in all probability is going to increase. They have given long and faithful service and have always been patriotic, conscientious, and valuable employees. They have always been there when the public needed them and they have always responded. Now it is their hour of need and the public must respond to them. They ask nothing but fair play and we must see that they are guaranteed the justice they deserve.

Water Fluoridation in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been demonstrated conclusively that the addition of fluorides to public water supplies results in a 65 percent reduction in the incidence of tooth decay. Research has shown that where fluorides in a concentration of one part per million exist naturally in a water supply tooth decay experience is strikingly lower than in areas with no fluorides. Controlled fluoridation by the introduction of fluoride salts brings about the same beneficial results.

Virtually all national organizations concerned with health such as the American Dental Association, the American Public Health Association, the United States Public Health Service, the American Water Works Association, the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, and many smaller groups have recommended this practice. Their approval has come only after comprehensive study by expert committees competent to judge the evidence.

The findings of the controlled fluoridation studies started in 1945 were not available until after the District of Columbia budget had been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget. In its hearings before the Senate Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee for the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Health Department requested inclusion of an additional item for this purpose. The request, of course, had the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. It had the unqualified support of the District of Columbia Dental Society and the executive committee of the Medical Society of the District of Columbia. The Senate subcommittee saw fit to report this bill out including an item of \$130,000 for water fluoridation.

During World War II one-third of the Nation's dentists were inducted into the armed services to care for the dental needs of our military forces which con-

stituted only 10 percent of the country's population. In spite of this great effort to provide the needed care, the Federal Government is continuing to spend \$40,000,000 annually for reparative dental services for our veterans. Furthermore, our people are spending \$1,000,000,000 annually for dental health services, yet less than one-half of them receive adequate dental care. This situation relates proportionately to the people of the District of Columbia.

The water fluoridation program for the District of Columbia is double-edged. First, residents of the District will receive direct benefits by a reduction of tooth decay by two-thirds, and, second, the approval by the Congress of the United States will be a great stimulus to other cities and communities of the Nation to institute this valuable health program.

Water fluoridation can be brought to our people in the District of Columbia at a very modest cost, \$130,000. It will reduce tooth decay by two-thirds. We can no longer afford to postpone the prompt and widespread application of this preventive measure.

The Greeks Know How To Die

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by Harold H. Martin from the Saturday Evening Post of July 7, 1951. I had an opportunity to observe the Greek Army in their battle against communism in northern Greece in 1949. I can vouch for the sentiments expressed in this article.

THE GREEKS KNOW HOW TO DIE—EVERY HELENE HARASSING REDS ACROSS THE KOREAN HILLS HAS A 2,500-YEAR-OLD WARLIKE TRADITION BEHIND HIM—AND LIKE LEONIDAS AT THERMOPYLAE, EVERY SON OF GREECE IS READY TO DIE BEFORE YIELDING 1 INCH TO THE ENEMY

(By Harold H. Martin)

SOMEWHERE IN KOREA.—Among them are big, dark men from Crete, handsome and hot-tempered. Among them also are calm, slow-moving men from Thessaly, and steady Macedonians, very sure of themselves in battle, and clever men from the Peloponnese, and tall blond mountain men from the villages of Epirus, tough and long enduring. Each in little ways is different from the others, as a Vermonter differs from an Alabamian. There are variations in their speech, in their songs, and in the bouncing dances they perform when, after the fighting is over, they restore their spirits with good Greek wine. But in some respects all the men of the Greek battalion now fighting in Korea are the same. All remember that once long ago in Attica the first great democracy was born, and that for almost 3,000 years their little country has fought against oppression and tyranny, whether it stemmed from Persia or Istanbul, Berlin, or Moscow.

They do not wonder why they left their graystone villages in the mountains of Greece and traveled around the world to

fight. They know. For them, who fought Communists for long years in their own land in one of the bloodiest civil wars in history, there was no other choice a freedom-loving people could make.

"When a dangerous beast is abroad in the world," a Greek officer said, "he must be killed, no matter whether he approaches your door or that of one far off."

To the rank and file of Americans, and to many of the other nations fighting here, the war in Korea is a dirty, bloody, indecisive business the wisdom of which may be hotly debated. To the Greeks it is a holy crusade. In the years of their own terrible war of brother against brother, they learned to hate Communists of any race with a fierce, implacable hate. They have come here to kill, and they carry out their mission with more skill, perhaps, than any other troops in Korea.

They are the old pros of this war. For 11 years they have been fighting in mountain country, first against Germans and Italians, then against their own Reds, and they fight with a foxlike sagacity, a battle know-how that few other troops can match. Their general, Dascalakis, and their colonel, Dascalopoulos, are old fighters, skilled in combat, but they do not give much advice to the battalion commander, Dionysius Arbouris, for Lieutenant Colonel Arbouris is one of the world's great experts on mountain warfare and the tactics of the Communists in the field. The rank and file are younger and less experienced, but they burn with the same hatred of the Communists and the same pride in the fighting tradition of their race. This hatred and this pride go deep. They are bred into them.

When Apostas Stathias, a young lieutenant, was killed, his father wrote to Arbouris:

"DEAR COLONEL: As a father, I feel deep sorrow, but as a Greek I am proud that my son gave his life for his country, his religion, and for human liberty."

"Our ancestors used to say that holier than mother or father, greater than all else in the world, is a man's duty to his homeland. My son believed those words. Today is the 25th of March. All Greeks are very proud of this day which marks their liberation from the Turks. My own feelings are rather confused. There are moments when I feel desperate, knowing I shall never again see my son celebrating with his comrades this day of Greek independence. But at the same time I cannot help being proud when I think that my son, by his gallant death, proved himself true to the example of the heroes who gave us our freedom from tyranny. The village in which I and my son were born is the village of Athanasios Diakos [Diakos was a hero of the Greek revolt against the Turks]. My mother, whom the Communists killed 3 years ago, at the age of 102, was a niece of Diakos. When he was a little boy in school, my son was chosen to put the flowers upon the hero's grave. And now my son is dead. He has fulfilled his destiny as a Greek, and as a descendant of Diakos. Let us be proud of him."

From tiny Kolandra, in Macedonia, Joan Nyktas, mother of George, writes in wavering script:

"SIR COMMANDER: With deep sorrow I received your letter telling me of the death of my dear son. It would be a lie if I told you that anything in the world would make us forget that he will never come back to his village, to his wife, his babies, and to me. But I am proud of him, for he died fighting against tyranny, against crime, and for the peace of the world. Sir Commander, I beg of you, because he sleeps so far away, when you come near the place where he is buried, will you kiss the cross upon his grave, and tell him that the kiss comes from his father and his mother, from his wife and his two little girls who will forever honor him. My eyes are full of tears. I have not the courage

to write more. May God bless you and all your gallant men."

And from Christos Mechos, of Pendolokos: "With sorrow I learn of the death of my brother, Socrates. Nothing, I know, can bring back to me the good comrade I have lost. But I am proud that he died fighting against those Communist criminals who seek to annihilate from the world all kindness and all peace. And I am glad that in that far-off city of Pusan the Greek cross upon his grave will stand as a symbol of the will of the Greeks to fight, anywhere in all the world, for civilization and for liberty."

The will of the Greeks to fight has been amply demonstrated in many a fierce conflict here in Korea—demonstrated with such fervor that the Seventh Cavalry Regiment, which itself cherishes a proud tradition that goes back to Custer and the Little Big Horn, looks upon them not as attached troops, but as their fourth battalion. In a joyful ceremony on Greek Independence day, Col. William A. Harris, colorful commander of the Seventh, presented guidons, hand-sewn by the ladies of the regiment back in Tokyo, to each of the Greek companies, and gave each man of the Greek battalion the Seventh's big yellow horse-head patch to wear on his shoulder. Touched by this gesture, the Greeks, in voices made vibrant by ozo, a powerful spirit of which they are very fond, sang a roaring Garry Owen, the marching song of the regiment, and Lieutenant Colonel Arbousis led a stamping dance called the gerakina in which Harris and his staff, looking somewhat discomfited, took part in the interest of amicable international relations. The Greeks are very fond of Harris, a flamboyant commander who, before he was rotated, used to tour the front in a jeep with a cavalry saddle strapped to the hood.

"He is somewhat mad, this Harris," they say affectionately, "but that is good. All good fighting men are a little crazy."

Though most soldiers are quiet and introspective as they move up toward the battle lines, the Greeks go up singing lustily, belting, "O K., G I! We kill Russky Koreans!" to the American soldiers they pass, and drawing their hands across their Adam's apples while making a harsh rattling noise, "k-r-r-rk," deep in their throats to indicate what they intend to do to the enemy. Once they move into the attack, though, this jubilant mood leaves them. They work silently, coldly, and cautiously. They admire the valor of the American Marines, the French, and the Turks, who are likely to attack in a headlong frontal assault, but they consider this fool-hardy and wasteful of men's lives. They prefer to advance by fire and maneuver, moving in quick, short dashes from tree to tree, from rock to rock. When one approaches to an enemy position draws heavy fire upon his men, a Greek platoon leader does not hesitate to pull them back and try another approach until he finds a route where the fire is less intense. Later, he will describe in detail the manner in which he moved his men, like a general describing the deployment of an army.

"I proceeded thus," a mustached squad leader once explained to Colonel Harris. "The peak where the enemy machine gun was located was very small, so I maneuvered my men 4 yards to the east, 5 yards to the north, and 4 yards to the west again. Thus I was able to come upon them from the rear."

The Greek attitude toward the frontal assault stems from their deep aversion to unnecessary shedding of Greek blood. The ancient glory of their country died, they know, because of the destruction of their manpower in an endless series of wars, and the life of a single Greek soldier today is cherished by his officers. Foolhardiness is not encouraged, and the man who unnecessarily exposes himself is rebuked.

"The Americans," said Costas Triandafilides, an old guerrilla now covering the Greek battalion for the Athens Acropolis, "are valiant men, but in the view of the Greeks they are not very clever in the attack. The Greek commander, when told that he must take a hill within 1 hour, will spend 50 minutes moving his men up slowly, keeping them protected from enemy fire as much as possible. The Americans will attempt to take the hill in the first 10 minutes. They will get halfway up, suffering heavy casualties, and then they will be driven back by a counterattack. They will charge again and again until they take the hill, but the battalion will be riddled. The Greeks, moving with more care, will go into the final assault in full strength."

Once the Greeks reach a position from which they can make their final onslaught they cast away all the caution they have shown in the approach. Shouting, "Aera, aera,"—"Storm, storm"—a fierce war cry which used to terrify the Bulgarians, they leap from the earth and charge intrepidly. "In this moment," they say, "bullets respect the brave man. He who hangs back is hurt."

Once the Greeks come hand to hand with the enemy they are, according to Triandafilides, very calm, very sure of themselves, and very deadly.

"It is an atavism," he says. "It is in their blood since the days when men fought each other with short swords and with spears."

When a Greek is killed in hand-to-hand combat his family and his friends consider that he died gloriously in battle for the honor of Greece. If wounded or killed by mortar or artillery fire, their sorrow is made more bitter by a deep humiliation. After one fierce fight a doctor of the Seventh Cavalry noticed that one seriously wounded Greek was sobbing and mumbling over and over something in Greek the doctor could not understand.

"First time I ever heard a Greek carry on so," he said to a medic. "Usually they don't say a word."

Triandafilides, in one corner of the tent, overheard the doctor's remark.

"He is not crying because of his wound," Triandafilides explained in his slow, precise English. "He is crying because it was not received in battle. He is saying 'What have I done that this shameful thing must happen to me?'"

"What do you mean, not wounded in battle?" the doctor said. "That's a mortar wound if I ever saw one."

Costas shrugged. "It was received while he was in reserve, out of sight of the enemy. To a Greek this is not a battle wound. This is an accident, a misfortune. The bayonet, the grenade, the bullet fired by an enemy whom you are approaching face to face—from these you receive battle wounds."

The Greek attitude toward any wound is extremely casual. Their doctors go with them into battle, bandage them if they are bleeding, and as long as they have two legs to walk on and one hand left to fight with, they continue to fight. American doctors have been disturbed to find on the bodies of seriously wounded Greeks a half dozen old wounds for which they should have been hospitalized days before. They are also extremely difficult to handle when they reach collecting stations where the more seriously wounded are sent back to the hospital. On one busy morning when the doctors had more than they could attend to immediately, a Greek captain with part of his neck muscle shot away rose from the litter on which he was lying.

"I am sorry," he said. "I do not have time to wait for treatment. The fighting continues and I must return to my company." They had quite a struggle getting him into an ambulance.

Though all the members of the Greek battalion are extremely capable in hand-to-

hand combat, particularly with the long, sharp knives which they carry in their boots, in violation of the rules of war and the orders of their commanders, two or three stand out as notably fierce fighters.

One is Lieutenant Missias, of Peter Company, a thin, fragile-looking little man who was wounded eight times in the Greek war and twice again in this one. A humorless fellow, blind in one eye, after one action he came to Triandafilides in a state of agitation.

"My men have broken 10 rifles upon the heads of the Chinese," he said. "I hesitate to call this matter to the attention of the supply officer, for fear he shall hold me responsible for their cost."

Costas, a man who does possess a sense of humor, told Missias that if he would turn in the 200 Chinese rifles his men had collected after the battle, he believed the supply officer would be satisfied.

Another redoubtable Greek is a sergeant named Kyros, nicknamed "The Killer," a waspish little man, thin and hungry-looking, with black eyes that glow strangely. Kyros, an expert with the lonkhi—the bayonet—fights with a fierceness that verges on insanity, and his extreme savagery is puzzling even to his mates, who figure that his family back in Greece must have suffered greatly at Communist hands. On the other hand, the anger that motivates Warrant Officer Christos Svergos, a short, stocky, big-nosed mountain man from Epirus, who fights like an angry grizzly bear and is reported to have killed 30 Chinese in hand-to-hand combat, is well understood. Three of Svergos' brothers were killed by the Communists in the Greek war.

Warrant Officer Psychoyos, an extremely agile dancer of the gerakina when there is no fighting to be done, is an even more savage fighter than any of these. Psychoyos, commander of the Greek mortar platoon, has become a legend in the battalion for the fits of rage into which he flies when he thinks his mortar crews are not firing fast enough.

"Apostolides, you traitor," he bellowed into his radio during one attack, "you dastard, you Bulgarian, why do you dishonor Greece by ceasing to fire the mortars?"

"But, sir commander," his mortar sergeant replied, distressed at being addressed as a Bulgarian, which is the worst epithet one Greek can apply to another, "the Greeks and the Koreans who are bringing ammunition from the foot of the hill cannot bring shells as fast as we are shooting."

"You Levantine, Apostolides. You traitor!" Psychoyos shouted in a frenzy. "I command you, draw your pistol. Shoot one Greek and one Korean. Then shells will be brought swiftly and the mortars of Greece will be glorious."

Fortunately for the ammunition bearers, Apostolides did not receive this order. As Psychoyos shouted, a bullet smashed his Trumaniki—the Greeks call a walkie-talkie radio a "Little Truman"—and he bellowed his order into a tangle of tubes, wires, and shattered metal.

"For some moment he did not notice that his Little Truman had been hit," said Costas Triandafilides, who witnessed the incident, "and continued to shout epithets at Apostolides. He is a very strange man."

Psychoyos' abuse of his sergeant is not unusual in the Greek battalions. Discipline is harsh, and sometimes cruel when a man fouls up. An officer may, without fear of being disciplined himself, curse his men, kick them, beat them with sticks, or shoot them if they show signs of cowardice in battle. But the good soldiers live on terms of considerable intimacy with their officers. They may visit them in their tents, drink with them, eat with them, or joke with them with complete informality.

"Napoleon," says Arbousis, "was right when he said there are no bad soldiers—only bad officers. If you are kind to your men, and treat them well, and set them a good example, they will follow you. You do not shout at them, 'traitors, why do you not fight?' You say instead, 'follow me and we will kill the enemy.'"

Arbousis' nickname among the troops is "the First Scout," which is a high compliment, since the Greeks, with their guerrilla background, consider scouting and patrolling one of the finer of the warlike arts.

According to Maj. James B. Webel, S-3 of the Seventh Cavalry Regiment, they are incredibly good at it. When an American patrol goes out, it keeps going until it draws fire, and then, unless it is led by an extremely capable patrol leader, it returns with a fairly hazy idea of where the fire was coming from. The Greeks, who are old hands at this business, keep moving in until they are surrounded on three sides, and while his rifle-men cover him with fire, the patrol leader crawls about until he has pin-pointed on his map where each gun position is located. The patrol then returns with data of great value to the S-3 in planning future operations.

The Greeks are very careful about making accurate patrol reports. When Lt. Khondro-lyannis Konstandinos returned from the first patrol made by the Greeks, Arbousis asked him the number of enemy his men had killed.

"I killed one. My sergeant killed one," said Konstantinos. "There was much firing and there may have been others. But only these two I saw die. I will not make a false report."

"And your losses?"

"Unfortunately, sir commander, I lost my gloves."

Later, when the battalion moved into the area where the patrol had had its fire fight, they found 13 enemy dead.

The Greek battalion arrived in Korea in December, but saw no hard fighting until January. Unlike some of the other foreign units joining the United Nations forces in Korea, it was no picked group of volunteers, but an ordinary battalion out of a Greek brigade, though its officers were specially selected not only on their combat records but because they could speak a little English. The original plan was to send a whole brigade, but, at the time, the war seemed nearing the end, and the Greek Government, thinking of the millions of drachmas such an expedition would cost, cut the complement down to 1,000 men.

There was a reason for the plan to send a pick-up battalion instead of a specially selected group, though thousands of Greeks stormed the American Embassy, trying to volunteer. "Our government," said Triandafilides, "felt that if a battalion of the Greek Army was not so good as a battalion of volunteers, then we had no army. We also wished the Americans to see how well the ordinary Greek soldier can fight with the weapons they provided us after World War II."

When Harris, of the Seventh Cavalry, was asked if he would like a unit of foreign troops attached to his regiment, he specifically asked that the Greeks be assigned, knowing that they had been fighting almost constantly for a decade and were therefore already combat-wise and hardened.

The Greek unit at first, though, was not very impressive. The American battle dress did not hang well upon the men and they only shaved when ordered to do so. Mountain fighters, accustomed to using mules for transport, their lack of mechanical knowledge was woeful, and they had a peculiar habit of dismantling the carburetors of their trucks every time an engine failed to function, no matter if the trouble was in the ignition system. To them a jeep was a jeep, and when one of theirs broke down they would pick up any other that happened to

be standing by, a habit that came to an abrupt end when a Greek soldier was found driving happily about in the jeep of the division personnel officer. Their appetite for olive oil was insatiable, being exceeded only by the Thailanders' yearning for hot sauce, and this was a burden on the quartermaster.

It was noted, though, that in the coldest weather they kept themselves clean, breaking the ice in rivers to wash their shirts, and bathing themselves in streams when ice lined the water's edge. It was also noticed, as the month wore on, that with the agility of goats, they could carry heavy machine guns and recoilless 75's up hills which left American soldiers, burdened only with a rifle and grenades, panting, and rubber-legged.

After their first big fight all minor irritations were forgotten. On Hill 381, west of Echon, 3,000 Chinese, supported by mortars, made a night attack upon the Greeks dug in on the slopes of this sharp-topped peak. Fighting began at midnight and raged for 4 hours. Three times the Chinese reached the top and three times the Greeks drove them off with bayonets, knives, gun butts, and fists. At dawn only 15 dead Chinese were found, but the snowy slopes were streaked with bloody trails where the Chinese had dragged away their wounded and their dead. The hill was vital to the defense of the sector, for its loss would have exposed the flank of another battalion and probably would have made it necessary for the whole regiment to fall back.

After that fight no man could question the valor of the Greeks in the presence of a trooper of the Seventh without getting his nose busted. The affection between the Garry Owen and its fourth battalion deepened as the regiment fought on into the spring, with the Greeks fighting magnificently both in attack and defense.

The regiment expressed its appreciation in the big celebration on Greek Independence Day, when General Ridgway and all the high brass of the corps came to decorate the Greeks who had performed most valiantly, with Distinguished Service Crosses and Silver Stars.

That made the Greeks feel good. But the thing that pleased them most came late in the afternoon, after all the brass had gone. Some troopers of the Seventh were around, listening to the Greeks singing to the music of accordion and guitar. Then the troopers started singing the regimental song, Garry Owen. One verse of it goes: "We are Irish, Scotch and thrifty, Sergeant Flynn." The troopers sang that one: "We are Irish, Greek and thrifty, Sergeant Flynn." And another one starts:

"Look at Cameron and O'Brien,
Sergeant Flynn.

With a smile, they're fighting, dying,
Sergeant Flynn."

And they changed that one to "Look at Prokas and Pagonis, Sergeant Flynn."

That made the Greeks very happy, very happy indeed.

And the next time they went into an attack, though many of them still used the old war shout, "Aera!" some of them were bellowing a new, strange cry. In heavy Hellenic accents they were yelling, "Garry Owen."

Know Your Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the

Appendix of the Record, I wish to submit an article by the Marine News, of New York, published in the Washington Post, of even date, as follows:

KNOW YOUR WATERWAYS—WATERWAYS OF TOMORROW

European nations, with but a fraction of the wealth of America, develop their waterways to the ultimate. Owing to necessity for economy they learned long ago that no other method of transportation can even approach the low cost of moving certain materials and products over waterways.

The proposed New Orleans Tidewater canal, the authorized Sacramento deep water ship canal, the Cross-Florida canal; the Red River lateral canal, and the Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway will make the Federal waterway system of much greater value to the Nation. Some of America's great rivers have hardly felt the touch of improvement, the Arkansas, White, Red, and Snake among them. Others are only partly developed. The United States, with an area of about 3,000,000 square miles, has only 5 of the 20 great ship canals of the world. Ten of the remaining 15 are in European countries whose total area is only about 500,000 square miles.

The United States has yet far to go in the development of its inland and intracoastal waterways before their potential benefits are even approached.

MARINE NEWS,
GEORGE H. PALMER,
President and Publisher.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

New York Police Department Helicopter Performs Miraculous Rescue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a remarkable operation by helicopter conducted by the New York Police Department on June 28.

The New York Police Department operates a small fleet of helicopters for the purpose of studying vehicular patterns and traffic control, waterfront patrol, land, and sea rescues, and routine transportation, and observation. While such services are performed regularly, this spectacular rescue serves to underline the work the helicopters are doing for the great city of New York.

Similar work for helicopters has been performed particularly during the Tournament of Roses celebration and the famous Rose Bowl game in Pasadena, Calif., my home city, on New Year's day. At this time, when a million visitors jam into our city of 100,000 people, it is necessary to control traffic from a point of vantage high above the streets, transmitting the information to police officers on the ground, in order that the traffic may be kept moving in the right directions.

The helicopter finds news and important uses almost every day, not only in the military undertaking where it has proven of tremendous value, but in the many civil undertakings of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I include an article from the New York Times under date June 29, 1951, as follows:

HELICOPTER LANDS ON CATHEDRAL ROOF, PICKS UP WORKMAN INJURED IN FALL

(By William M. Farrell)

A police department helicopter from Floyd Bennett Field settled gingerly down onto a corner of the roof of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine yesterday afternoon. It took aboard a workman who had been injured there, soared away to a spot in Riverside Park near Ninety-sixth Street, and landed so the man could be transferred to an ambulance. Then it flew back to Floyd Bennett Field to report the oddest and one of the most breathtaking rescues in the police helicopter's brief history.

The suspenseful quality of the exploit derived from the fact that the landing space available on the roof was barely 30 feet square, while the helicopter's rotory blades cut a circle 36 feet in diameter, and its tip-to-tail length was 41 feet. The tail of the craft, therefore, had to be left hanging over the edge of the roof while the pilot balanced there 160 feet above the ground with the help of the rotors.

The victim of the accident that necessitated the aerial rescue was Peter Burr, 51 years old, of 68 West Sixty-ninth Street. He and four other steeplejacks had gone to the roof of the cathedral yesterday morning to refurbish one of two 75-foot steel structures near the front corners of the edifice, which faces Amsterdam Avenue near One Hundred and Eleventh Street.

The man had just lashed a ladder to the girders of the tower near the cathedral's southwest corner. It was about 11:45 a. m. and Mr. Burr was at the top of the ladder. He started to climb down when, according to a fellow workman, the twenty-ninth rung broke and Mr. Burr hurtled down 29 feet. He struck on his right side, fracturing the right hip, and possibly his right leg and several ribs. He also suffered cuts on the face.

But he remained conscious and fully aware of his predicament. The roof on which he lay was 160 feet above the ground. Normal access is by way of a winding staircase, too narrow for the litter on which Mr. Burr would have to be moved.

Two police emergency squads joined Mr. Burr's fellow steeplejacks, and they were prepared to unite in lowering the injured man to the ground—over the side of the roof, by ropes attached to the wire litter. But Mr. Burr demurred at this long, lonely descent.

In this seemingly insoluble situation, Charles Perceval, of Long Beach, one of the steeplejacks suggested that a police department helicopter be called. The call was received at Floyd Bennett Field at 12:45 p. m. Five minutes later Acting Capt. Gustav Crawford and his copilot, Patrolman John T. Jordan, were in the air. At 1:10 they had completed the trip of about 25 miles.

"One good thing about a helicopter," Captain Crawford said later, "is that you can stand still, see whether it's possible to land, and back out if you have to."

TWO-INCH MARGIN OF ERROR

The proposed landing space at the southwest corner of the cathedral's roof was obstructed on one side by the steel tower, which some day will be the skeleton of a 266 foot steeple. A smaller structure blocked another side. But Captain Crawford and Patrolman Jordan eased on in—though an error of more than 2 inches would have caused the rotors to hit the tower and send the craft down the cathedral's side to the ground.

Dr. Ruth Klinghoffer of Knickerbocker Hospital, riding an ambulance from Beth David Hospital, had given Mr. Burr first aid and prepared him for his flight. The injured man was ready and willing. While the heli-

copter poised he was lifted aboard, above the two pontoons that serve in landing on water as well as on roofs and marshes.

At 1:17 p. m., 7 minutes after its arrival, the helicopter took off, while crowds in the street watched. Three minutes later the craft landed and Mr. Burr, who had enjoyed his ride, was shifted to the ambulance and taken to Beth David Hospital. Later it was reported there that his condition was fairly good.

The police department now has a small fleet of helicopters. Its first was acquired September 30, 1948, and tested by Captain Crawford while the then Mayor William O'Dwyer and Police Commissioner Arthur Vallander watched.

Another Case of the Beam and the Mote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a newspaper column written by Mr. Wes Izzard, of the *Amerillo (Tex.) News-Globe*. His remarks are most pertinent on a subject that is of great concern to all Americans:

ANOTHER CASE OF THE BEAM AND THE MOTE

It was with a certain smugness that we read about the shameful Cicero, Ill., riots, occasioned by the attempt of a Negro family to move into an apartment in Chicago's most dubious suburb.

The suburb of Cicero is slightly smaller than Amarillo. It is an industrial town with a smelly reputation. At one time it was headquarters for the Capone mob. Gang murders were a nightly occurrence. Vice and gambling rackets were operated openly. Somebody once said that Cicero had more saloons than grocery and drug stores combined.

The people of Cicero, many of whom speak English with the thick accents of central and south Europe, tolerated all this. But one thing they wouldn't tolerate; and that was a Negro living in their midst.

So when a Negro bus driver with a college education tried to move his family into a Cicero apartment, the self-righteous suburb rose in arms.

There were riots. The family's furniture, including a piano, were tossed out the window and burned in the front yard. The apartment house was hacked with axes and its windows smashed with bricks.

The mobsters were mostly teen-age hoodlums. But adults stood by and cheered them on, and the police did little if anything.

Finally the sheriff of Cook County prevailed on the Governor to call out the National Guard. The soldiers staged a pitched battle with the mob. Several people were badly hurt, 119 were arrested.

Now that's the sort of thing that northern liberals say happens in the South. But this occurred in the heart of Yankeland, where politicians support the FEPC for vote-getting purposes, and where liberal "intellectuals" make speeches and write pamphlets about the racial intolerance of the South.

The fact is, the Negro suffers vastly more from intolerance in the North than in the South, despite Jim Crow.

There are, for example, more successful Negro businessmen in Atlanta, Ga., than in

the State of New Jersey plus all of New England.

The worst Negro slums in the world are not on the tenant farms of Alabama, but in Harlem, N. Y., and on Chicago's South Side.

The so-called Negro problem is working itself out more rapidly than any racial problem in all history; and the Negro is making his greatest advances in the South.

If the northern "liberals" who keep shouting about injustice will clean up their own premises, the advance will be even more rapid.

So the next time somebody from up North starts talking about intolerance in the South, you have a right to ask him smugly "Did you hear what happened in Cicero?"

Improvement in European Conditions as a Result of American Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, Mr. William R. Mathews, editor and publisher of the *Arizona Daily Star*, of Tucson, Ariz., has recently returned from an extensive trip to Europe. His analysis, of the growing strength of our friends in Europe, of the renewed confidence they have to meet the Soviet threat of aggression, and the great improvement which has taken place throughout Europe, physically and psychologically, as a result of our program of assistance under the ECA program, is "must" reading. I ask unanimous consent that two articles on this subject, which appeared in the July 27 and 28, 1951 issues of the *Arizona Daily Star*, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Tucson (Ariz.) *Daily Star* of July 27, 1951]

UNITED STATES EFFORT NOW MEETS RED THREAT—OBSERVER BELIEVES WAR IN EUROPE MAY BE PUT OFF AT LEAST DECADE

(By William R. Mathews)

After making a trip to Yugoslavia, Germany, Switzerland, France, and Britain, I have come home optimistic about the near future. There is not going to be war this year, although there will always be the possibility of a surprise attack.

A stop in Washington on my way home and a talk with Deputy Secretary of Defense Robert Lovett have increased my optimism still more. Our rearmament program is going to be kept within pay-as-you-go bounds. There should be no further inflation. We simply have to realize that we have a long, hard job to do, and that hysteria will harm rather than help.

DIVIDENDS SHOWN

Our diplomatic policy in Europe is beginning to pay off. If we can get through this year without war, the chances are that it can be postponed for a number of years. Our strength, and that of our allies, is mounting to a point that will command respect. If we can learn to be firm without becoming bellicose, there are good chances that a peace, for a decade, may break out in Europe.

The Marshall plan has been one of the cheapest, but most productive, plans for peace that we as a Nation have ever attempted. When it has been combined with the use of a positive political policy in cases like Greece, Turkey, the Berlin airlift, and, more recently, Yugoslavia, we have been making a successful answer to that basic issue of stopping the sweep of communism.

JUST IN TIME

As one who was in Greece and Western Europe in 1947, and who has seen Europe eight different times since 1917, I can testify to the danger that Europe faced in 1947. We got there with our positive program just in time, but not soon enough to save Czechoslovakia. Western Europe and Britain, in 1947, were still groggy from the war. Whoever offered leadership, they would follow.

The contrast between today and 4 years ago is so heartening that I cannot help being optimistic. Western Europe is not going Communist. It is on its feet again and, with a little more help to get it over the final hump of rearmament, it will be able to defend itself.

In my opinion, which many experts will dispute, the workers of France and Britain are better off today than they were during those disgraceful 1930's of unemployment, cowardly pacifism and sterile governments. Conditions are still bad, but they are not as bad for the masses of the people as they were in the 1930's.

EISENHOWER PRAISED

The North Atlantic Treaty, under General Eisenhower, is becoming an instrument of positive strength as he rallies the armed might of the member nations. Ike is doing a magnificent job, and is probably getting more out of them than any other man could get.

Jules Moch, the French defense minister, says that France will have 10 divisions at Ike's disposal by the end of the year. These will be armed with equipment sent from America, which is an example of how our military aid is used. Britain has sent 4 divisions to join our four in Germany. Belgium has three ready. Denmark and Norway have, under the very noses of the Soviet Union, cast their fate with the West and are furnishing battalions of manpower to help out.

ARMS NEEDED

Italy has manpower available and so does Yugoslavia, but it has to be armed. If they are going to be armed in the near future, only America can produce the arms quickly enough.

In time France, Britain, Belgium, Germany, and Italy can produce arms again, but we are going to have to help get those industries started. Thus our military assistance faces the task of furnishing end products like tanks, planes, and guns immediately, but industrial and raw material help for the future.

Marshall-plan aid has already been cut off for Britain, and it can be cut off without hurting France. Belgium is reeking with prosperity. The only countries that do need it are Greece, Italy, Austria, Yugoslavia, and some for Germany.

As I see it, we have risen to meet the menace we face better than most of us realize. If it had not been for our successful program showing our strength, as well as our nonbelligerency, Tito and his group would not have dared to do what they have done.

This break for our side in Yugoslavia is one of historic importance. It shows how strength attracts new sources of strength. Take a look at the map of southern Europe, and note the barrier that Yugoslavia interposes between the Soviet Union, the Adriatic, and the Mediterranean.

[From the Tucson (Ariz.) Daily Star of July 28, 1951]

CHANCE FOR PEACE SEEN AS GROWING—WEST EUROPE STRENGTH, UNITED STATES PLAN OF ACTION REASSURE ANALYST

(By William R. Mathews)

After what I have seen, first hand, of Yugoslavia and its people, I am confident that Tito's decision to turn to the West and to resist Russia is irrevocable.

Yugoslavia was looted by the Russians. The people do see America as a source of strength, and no government of Yugoslavia will dare to repudiate this hope of a better life.

The Yugoslavs will fight, if we give them some guns to shoot. They could not resist a Russian invasion save by taking to the hills. They could defeat an invasion by their satellite neighbors.

When some folks question the propriety of dealing with the Communist government of this country, I cannot help replying that we are engaged in a great political campaign to save as much of the free world as we can from Soviet domination. It is a close campaign.

CONVERTS NECESSARY

I have never seen a close political campaign won without the winning converts from the opposition, or attracting from the other side dissidents looking for a place to express their opposition. F D R would not have been elected in 1932 without the votes of millions of Republicans.

We cannot expect to win our political struggles without taking into our camp dissident Communists who want to get away from Moscow domination and whose faith in communism as a world movement centered in Moscow has been shattered.

SAME FOR SPAIN

The same political principle should apply to Spain. I have enough faith in what we as a Nation stand for to believe that by being friends we can unconsciously moderate Franco's tyranny just as the moderation of Tito's dictatorship has already begun in Yugoslavia. When Rankovic, the Yugoslavia Minister of the Interior (police and justice), announces, as he did early in June, that nearly one-half of the arrests made by the political police during the past year were unjustified, he proclaims a fallibility that no other dictatorship has.

The case of Switzerland is an encouraging one. The people of Switzerland are free because they are so willing to defend their country that every man takes as a matter of course the compulsory military service program that lasts until he is 45. In addition, the Swiss are willing to work. They cannot afford a 40-hour week. They work 48 hours a week, and have to ask for help from no one.

POTENTIAL SOURCE

Germans, too, are at work. They can become a source of strength to the west. They hate the Russians more than any people on earth. If their strength can be integrated with the west, as it can be under the North Atlantic Treaty, the fears of France can be relieved. We Americans have done a good job there, despite some serious mistakes made in the early occupation days.

In getting out in France I found that I aroused a more appreciative response when I explained that we Americans were merely seeking to be on hand at the side of the French when the next war came and to stop an invasion preferably on the line of the Elbe rather than on the Marne. That seemed to make sense to the French with whom I talked.

France, as usual, has her political troubles with their uncertainties and exasperations. Fortunately, France is a rich country. The

new youth crop looks better to me than any other one I have seen over a period of 33 years. France is not going Communist. The moral as well as the financial help that the Marshall plan brought has changed the trend.

BRITISH SITUATION

There is so much vigor and character left in Britain, her political institutions are so strong, that her strength will continue to increase. Unfortunately, so few British people realize that the only way so many, 51,000,000 of them, can continue to live on such a small sterile island is by performing services for the rest of the world, particularly by the development of an empire.

Most Britishers take their empire for granted, while we Americans have been too prone to think, while we build one of our own—in the Pacific for instance—by using just more modern methods, that by fostering economic nationalization in the backward areas we will be enhancing the cause of peace.

On this visit to England I deliberately stayed away from big shots and their sugar-coated explanations of serious problems. Among the British people I found a close comradeship of understanding. They think and act like most of us.

I found no anti-American sentiment among the people and had to hunt up Anaurin Bevan's recent Labor Party manifesto, One Way Only, to get an example of anti-Americanism. He wailed about Britain obeying us obediently, but in the next breath he presented a typical Henry Wallace plan to provide a quart of milk for every Hottentot by Britain, but at American expense.

Within the next year the reinvigorated people of Britain are going to express their growing strength more positively than they have during the postwar years.

OPTIMISM AROUSED

On the basis of what I have seen, the comparisons made possible over a long period of years, I cannot help being optimistic. There is little talk of war in Europe, and no hysteria. There is an acute realization of the danger, but the people of Europe are so close to it, that they would quickly exhaust themselves nervously as well as physically, if they worried about it.

In providing a positive plan of action we Americans have done better than we realize. We have answered that old proverb that "you can't lick something with nothing." A bipartisan foreign policy in Europe is beginning to pay off. The spread of communism has been stopped, if not reversed. The chances of peace have been enhanced.

Income Tax To Finance Republican Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include herewith the following editorial from the New Era of Reading, Pa., an A. F. of L. publication:

INCOME TAX TO FINANCE REPUBLICAN ECONOMY

The Republicans in Harrisburg have a hot potato on their hands. They are trying to

steam-roller through the State legislature a flat income tax of one-half of 1 percent which will hit hardest at the "little fellow" who makes a couple bucks a week in his take-home pay.

Remember, this income-tax idea is definitely a Republican proposal, authorized by a Republican governor and supported by pro-Republican forces such as the chamber of commerce, et al.

Now forget this for just a moment and go back with us to last October and November when a torrid political campaign was being waged for Congress and control of the State government. Remember the Republican theme song then? They pointed with pride to what they called the efficiency of the State regime. They declared that no new taxes would be forthcoming if only the voters would place their trust in the party which stands for "efficiency," meaning, of course, the endowed Republican brass.

And while these Republican tub thumpers were beating their breasts about their efficiency in Harrisburg, they sought to discredit our national administration with the phony slogan, "Tax, tax, tax, and spend, spend, spend."

Many workers may have been confused by this lopsided propaganda. We know from experience that the party of big business always tries to confuse people to get over legislation palatable to big business and distasteful to working men and women. So it was in the election campaign of last fall.

But something seems to have happened since last November. Where are the demands for economy now in Harrisburg? Where is the chamber of commerce in this issue? Down in Philadelphia the chamber has endorsed the income-tax proposal on the grounds that "there is no way out."

Where is the opposition now to the tax-spend-spend cry which the Republicans themselves raised last year? Where are the little Hoover commissions demanding that Governor Fine be stripped of some of his powers and that the State bureaucracy be overhauled? Why doesn't someone demand that the drones on the State highway network be weeded out? Where are the carping critics who always are demanding their pound of flesh by insisting that a Democratic city administration lay off workers?

No, the voices are strangely silent. And the silence proves that their attacks on the Federal Government are insincere and are motivated solely by political objectives. If they really wanted the economy they so solemnly demanded from Washington they would be equally vocal in calling for a housecleaning which is so long overdue in Harrisburg.

Let's make the State regime get its own house in order. Let's demand that the big corporations be forced to carry a bigger load by dipping into swollen war profits. Let's tear apart the State budget and analyze it bureau by bureau with a magnifying glass, or let's do what the Republicans and Dixiecrats usually attempt down in Washington—let's introduce in the State legislature a bill for a flat 10-percent slash in appropriations for all departments. That's the way the Wherrys and the Byrds would do it in the Federal Government, and they get big, page 1 headlines, too.

Now we read that this great and righteous Governor and his boys don't even want to let the public have hearings on the proposed income tax. Just imagine what would happen if President Truman proposed a half of 1 percent increase in Federal income taxes without public hearings. The Republicans would be demanding impeachment.

Organized labor is against the income tax and the sales tax because both are unfair taxes. They hit the wage earner hard but

put an unnoticeable dent in the budgets of rich people. We'd like to see a higher corporation levy plus some of the belt tightening advocated by the economy specialists in Washington. Furthermore, we'd like to see the big press demand public hearings on this important and vital issue, just as they do where Democrats are in office.

We suspect that if the State-wide election were being held today with the public knowing which party is advocating a State income tax, the political seismograph would record a violent revolt against the gang now in power.

If it does nothing else, this State income-tax proposal tells the workers once and for all that the Republican regime is still run by big business, Grundy included.

We Should Hear More About the Responsibilities of European Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States has been asked to authorize a 1952 fiscal-year expenditure of \$8,500,000,000 in foreign-aid programs.

The American people have contributed in tax money for this purpose to date \$81,900,000,000. This total credits approximately \$10,000,000,000 returned in reverse lend-lease and partial repayment of loans.

At least \$14,000,000,000 of that money went to our enemy, the Soviet Union. No repayment, either in money or in kind, has been offered by the Communists or Communist satellites.

It is impossible to discover how much more assistance has been given to Communist countries indirectly, through transshipment of ECA goods and through expenditure of ECA funds to build new industries, which sell much of their output behind the iron curtain.

The new foreign-aid bill contains everything up to and including the kitchen sink.

Funds are requested in this bill for ECA, point 4, special aid to Israel and some other countries, and for economic and military assistance under various mutual-aid agreements and the Atlantic Pact.

The new authorization, if it totals what we are led to expect, would bring American contributions to other nations to nearly \$100,000,000,000 in less than 12 years.

What have we gained by this outpouring of American money? What have we gained by this tremendous drain upon American resources?

A look at the record, as revealed daily by the newspapers, is enough to convince anyone that we have gained little.

It looks as if we had wasted most of our foreign-aid money. We have thrown it down a hundred ratholes. We have tried to buy friends and allies.

By this time, the administration, and Congress itself, should have learned that money buys only fair-weather friends. We should have learned that in times of trouble, international alliances are dependable only so far as they are founded on mutual interests, mutually recognized.

If the other free nations cannot see the real need for cooperation against the Communist world conspiracy, then no money, no economic or military aid of any kind, can buy it.

The situation today proves this. The Atlantic Pact nations are dragging their feet. They talk about their huge military budgets, but the figures show them to be comparatively small. In no instance does the military budget compare, in proportion to the total budget, with that of the United States.

With a total 1951 budget of \$47,200,000,000, the United States set aside \$20,900,000,000, or nearly half, for defense spending. This year, with a total budget in the neighborhood of \$65,000,000,000, we will spend more than \$48,000,000,000 for national defense. That is more than half of the total budget.

Here are some figures, all of them as accurate as can be found, which show how the military budgets of other Atlantic Pact nations compare with ours. The figures are for the 1951 fiscal year.

Military budgets of Atlantic Pact nations 1951

Country	Total budget	Military budget
Belgium	\$1.8 billion	\$313 million
Denmark	\$351 million	\$46 million
France	\$7,523 billion	\$1,704 billion
Greece	\$1,102 billion	\$317 million
Italy	\$2,410 billion	\$500 million
Luxembourg	\$71 million	\$7 million
Netherlands	\$1,512 billion	\$237 million
Norway	\$347 million	\$51 million
Portugal	\$180 million	\$45 million
Spain	\$680 million	\$218 million
Turkey	\$527 million	\$185 million
Great Britain	\$11 billion	\$2,67 billion
United States	\$47.21 billion	\$20,904 billion

Because no other figures are available for this comparison, those for France, Spain, and Portugal cover the 1950 fiscal year.

Here are some figures showing comparisons for the fiscal year beginning in 1951, as to military budgets and gross national products, on both dollar and percentage bases.

Military budgets and gross national products for fiscal year beginning in 1951

Country	National product	Military expenditures	Percent
Belgium-Luxembourg	\$6,582 billion	\$289 million	4.3
Denmark	\$3,02 billion	\$85 million	2.8
France	\$25,378 billion	\$2,45 billion	9.7
Italy	\$14.45 billion	\$915 million	6.3
Netherlands	\$5,209 billion	\$392 million	7.5
Norway	\$1.81 billion	\$91 million	5.0
Portugal	\$1,635 billion	\$57 million	2.9
Great Britain	\$40,335 billion	\$3,64 billion	9.0
Canada	\$19 billion	\$1,52 billion	8.0
United States	\$308 billion	\$48,473 billion	15.7

The foregoing figures, of course, relate to a fiscal year which has only begun. They were gathered from estimates made by various official and nonofficial

sources. It is conceded by those in governmental authority, both in this country and abroad, that they present as clear a picture as may be had of the situation.

Apologists within the Truman administration say the Atlantic Pact nations are doing the best they can. The excuse is that World War II destroyed the industrial potentials of European Atlantic Pact nations in very large degree.

When it is pointed out that European industrial production in general is now above prewar levels, the apologists say that the increased production barely takes care of increased population in the Atlantic Pact countries.

Here, again, are figures to refute those statements, for people who seem to believe that America alone can and should do the whole job of rearming the free world.

Taking the level of production in Atlantic Pact nations during 1937, well before the outbreak of World War II, as the base index figure of 100, the index figures for 1949, 1950, and March 1951 are as follows:

*Production in Atlantic Pact nations
(Using 1937 production levels as 100 percent)*

Country	1949	1950	1951
Belgium	94	98	116
Denmark	138	152	162
France	112	113	126
Greece	87	110	118
Italy	105	119	140
Luxembourg	96	101	119
Netherlands	127	140	158
Norway	132	131	151
Great Britain	116	127	127

While these large increases over prewar industrial production were being registered by the Atlantic Pact nations of Europe, population increases were comparatively small.

Here once more are some figures. They show the percentage increases of population in Atlantic Pact countries between June 30, 1938, and December 31, 1950, as follows:

Belgium, 3 percent; Luxemburg, 3 percent; Denmark, 14 percent; France, 2 percent; Greece, 11 percent; Italy, 9 percent; Netherlands, 17 percent; Norway, 13 percent; Portugal, 16 percent, and Great Britain, 7 percent.

Thus industrial production among the free nations of Europe now stands at an average of 35.2 percent above pre-World War II level, while over-all population growth approximates 9.3 percent.

At the same time, the military budgets of these nations for the present fiscal year will average 5.08 percent of gross national production, as compared with an American military budget of 15.7 percent of gross national production.

The United States is spending nearly three times as much for national defense as its fellow nations of the Atlantic Pact on a percentage basis. And on this same basis it is spending a third more than France, which comes nearest with 9.7 percent.

How long can the United States keep this up without going broke in the biggest way the world has ever seen?

It adds up to one or two conclusions. Have the other Atlantic Pact nations ob-

served carefully what has happened to the people of Korea and to the physical resources and equipment of their country?

Do they want to be defended by the United States in that way? Or do they want to fall into the clutch of the blood-thirsty despot of the Kremlin? One alternative is almost as bad as the other.

They should realize, now before it is too late, that \$8,500,000,000 of American aid, or any other amount this country can afford, means nothing in comparison with their defense needs. They must cooperate by preparing to defend themselves to the full extent of their productive resources.

We hear from London and Paris that the probability of a new world war is remote. We look upon the astonishing spectacle of Britain at Hong Kong, selling the Chinese Reds war materials with which to kill British and American boys. We see this, while the British Prime Minister tells the world that an alliance with Franco's Spain against the Red dictatorship would soil British hands.

We hear too much talk about the rights of other nations. We hear too little talk about their responsibilities.

Unless the Atlantic Pact nations of Europe act now to assume an honest share of responsibilities in preserving the free world, this country would do better to keep its \$8,500,000,000. The money could be better spent in maintaining a strong America; strong economically, and strong in military potential.

Before the Chinese Reds Ran Amok

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following book review from the New York Herald Tribune for July 26, 1951:

BEFORE THE CHINESE REDS RAN AMOK

(Profile of Red China, by Lynn and Amos Landman; 245 pages, New York: Simon and Schuster; reviewed by Harold R. Isaacs.)

Lynn and Amos Landman, two American journalists, have written a brief report that might have been better called the Year of the Honeymoon in Communist Shanghai. They were in the big Chinese metropolis from June 1948 to April 1950. They saw the last miserable gasps of the dissolving Kuomintang regime. They witnessed the Communist take-over. They watched the Communists go to work to begin coping with the enormous problems bequeathed to them by their predecessors. It was, on the whole, an impressive performance. Like many others, including Chinese and foreign businessmen, the Landmans were duly impressed by it.

The trouble is that just about the time the Landmans left Shanghai, the honeymoon was already coming to an end and they give no evidence anywhere in this hasty little book that they were aware of it. The unfortunate result is to make this book sound like an apologia for the Communist regime

which rings with peculiar hollowness in the light of more recent events. These the authors might have been able to foresee, but in any case they could have read about them in their daily newspapers while they were writing their book. Had they done so, a lot of their earlier snap judgments would have had to be revised.

Consider the one rather important matter of Communist terror. In the "year of the honeymoon," the Communists relied on "moral persuasion." Many Chinese and foreigners, including the Landmans, found it a striking change from Kuomintang practice. In the weeks before the Communist conquest of Shanghai, they had watched Kuomintang executioners shoot "subversives" in the streets in grotesque scenes of terror meant to intimidate the population.

The Communists at first displayed an unexpected mildness, an attitude of patient tolerance toward doubters and potential dissenters whose cooperation they needed. At the same time—and this is what the Landmans did not realize or report—they were creating the basic institutions of absolute power which established the primacy of hard and harsh force to be used as soon as occasion required it. The occasion was not long in forthcoming. In the wake of Chinese intervention in the Korean War, a matter which the Landmans touch on only fleetingly, the first strains began to show under the new Communist dictatorship and the regime reacted in a manner characteristic of its kind. It was soon outdoing the Kuomintang with obscene spectacles of mass executions in public places for the obvious twin purposes of eliminating real or potential dissidents and terrorizing the population into submission.

The Landmans wrote the last sections of this book long after these spectacles had begun. There are allusions made to developments as late as April 1951. But they make no reference whatever to the reinstitution of the death penalty by the Communist regime in February of this year or to the launching of the mass purges that have been going on throughout China ever since. On the contrary, they retain among their hard-headed conclusions the assertion that the regime still enjoys the acquiescence of millions of Chinese and perhaps the active support of other millions and go on to declare: "Nor was there in Red Shanghai an atmosphere of fear and terror or of detestation of the government such as was betrayed by the glance of a coolie at a policeman or at a soldier under the old regime. We are informed that this was equally true in other cities."

The Landmans make much of the familiar argument that the ignorant Asian masses have no appreciation of democracy and are interested only in filling their rice bowls. This is true up to a point. But to suggest that the Chinese will for this reason find Communist terror and oppression any more palatable than Kuomintang terror and oppression is to label their essential humanity. The atmosphere of fear and terror that was so absent during the Landmans' stay in Shanghai has certainly been reestablished now not only in Shanghai but throughout the country and this transformation within a few months does much to vitiate the judgment of these authors on what they saw.

Similarly, one wonders what one would hear now from the long list of intellectuals and democratic personalities who adhered to the new regime in 1949 and 1950 and gave the Landmans their various rationalizations for doing so. One of these was Lo Lung-chi, head of the Democratic League, who is today believed to be in virtual confinement in Peiping. Their occasional reservations and doubts (which the Landmans duly report) must by now have been brutally confirmed by events as the dictatorship consolidated itself by its own inherent means.

None of this is said to impugn the attitude of these two reporters or to suggest that their report is politically colored. They attempted to be even-handed and hard-headed. Their object, they say, was to write a book that would not appeal to special pleaders on either side, but simply to report what we saw and heard. Unfortunately, they did not see or hear enough or understand enough of what they did see and hear. They have illustrated in the process what a gross misjudgment it is to identify the Communist movement, as such, with the revolutionary impulses of the Chinese people. They have shown us how much we still have to learn about the nature of the Communist power mechanism.

Investigation of Certain Educational and Philanthropic Foundations

REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution to create a special committee to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of educational and philanthropic foundations and other comparable organizations which are exempt from Federal income taxation, to determine which such foundations are using their resources for purposes other than the purposes for which they were established, and, specifically, to determine which such foundations and organizations are using their resources for un-American and subversive activities or for purposes not in the interest or tradition of the United States.

The resolution is not intended to raise suspicion against all foundations. Those that have restricted themselves to health, medical research, and popular culture have, as a rule, carried on in admirable fashion. In this class there might be mentioned the Kellogg Foundation, the Duke Endowment, the Hayden Foundation, the Mellon Trust, the Falk Foundation, the Donner Foundation, the Milbank Fund, the Commonwealth Fund, and many others; but of those that have operated in the fields of social reform and international relations, many have brought down upon themselves harsh and just condemnation.

To be specific let me give you a few examples of what I am talking about.

The Negro poet, Langston Hughes, author of the poem, *Good-by Christ*, which urges Jesus to "beat it on away from here now" and to "make way for—Marx, Communist Lenin, Peasant Stalin, Worker Me," last heard of as a "poet in residence" at the Rockefeller supported University of Chicago, was the recipient of a Guggenheim fellowship in 1935, and of fellowships from the Rosenwald Fund in 1931 and 1941. In 1946 he received a grant from the National Institute of Arts and Letters.

When Hans Eisler, brother of the top Soviet Agent Gerhardt Eisler, was

about to be expelled from the United States because he was a Communist, Dr. Alvin S. Johnson, then director of the New School for Social Research, intervened and persuaded James L. Houghteling, then Commissioner of the Bureau of Immigration, to let Eisler remain in the United States in order that he might engage him as a teacher in his New School for Social Research. He then secured a grant of \$20,160 from the Rockefeller Foundation to defray the costs of a music study project to be conducted by Eisler at the New School. All of this was done with the full knowledge that Eisler was a Communist and in this country to spread the doctrine of communism.

The writer, Louis Adamic, a member of or sponsor for 38 Communist organizations, and whose entire literary life has been given to propagandizing for Communist Russia—and more recently Communist Yugoslavia—has worked the various foundations for continuous subsidies. At one time he was given a fellowship by the Guggenheim Foundation worth \$2,500. He received a grant-in-aid from the Rockefeller Foundation in 1937. Later, in 1940, he obtained a grant-in-aid from the Carnegie Corp. to enable him to write his book, *From Many Lands*. In 1942 he was given two additional grants-in-aid by the Carnegie Corp. to write *Two Way Passage* and *What's Your Name?*

Through his Communist friends in the information-education branches of the Army in wartime, Adamic was able to arrange for the distribution of 50,000 copies of his book *Native's Return* among enlisted men. This book was distinctly pro-Russian.

The Public Affairs Committee, supported by the Sloan Foundation, was the publisher of another of Adamic's books, *America and the Refugees*.

A grant of \$110,000 was made by the Rockefeller Foundation in 1947 to Cornell University to conduct a study of "civil liberties and the control of subversive activities." The administration of this grant was then turned over to Prof. Walter F. Gellhorn, of Columbia University, who has himself been the subject of investigation by the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives. Professor Gellhorn's qualifications to investigate subversive activities are high-lighted by the fact that he is a member of the National Lawyers Guild and the International Juridical Association. It will be recalled that the Un-American Activities Committee has branded the National Lawyers Guild as the "legal bulwark of the Communist Party" and as "an agent of a foreign principal hostile to the interests of the United States." Attention should also be called to the fact that a committee of the California Legislature described the International Juridical Association as an organization which has specialized in the defense of individual Communists or of the Communist Party itself. It has followed the Communist Party line without deviation.

Gellhorn has also been affiliated with the Open Road, an activity headed by the

millionaire Communist, Frederick Vanderbilt Field, and has outspokenly demanded the abolition of the Un-American Activities Committee.

The Rockefeller Foundation, whose funds have been used to finance individuals and organizations whose business it has been to get communism into the private and public schools of the country, to talk down America and to play up Russia, must take its share of the blame for the swing of the professors and students in China to communism during the years preceding the successful Red revolution in China. For two generations, the Rockefeller Foundation played a guiding role in higher education in China. Over a period of 32 years \$45,000,000 of Rockefeller money was expended in China, most of it going to Chinese institutions of higher learning. If the Rockefeller fund spenders had had even an elementary conception of what was going on among the Chinese teachers and students, they would have taken steps to halt the stampede of the Chinese colleges to communism. When the crisis of the Chinese Revolution came it was the student and teacher element, educated largely with Rockefeller money, who were the backbone of the Red success. Our boys are now suffering and dying in Korea, in part, because Rockefeller money encouraged trends in the Chinese colleges and schools which swung China's intelligentsia to communism.

Again the Rockefeller Foundation, in 1944, made a grant of half a million dollars for the translation and publication in this country of Soviet books. The executive head of the organization which received this grant, the American Council of Learned Societies, was the head of the committee which raised funds for the defense of John S. Service when he was revealed in 1945 as a purveyor of information to the Amerasia spy ring.

Owen Lattimore, who played such an important part in the betrayal of China and the delivery of the mainland of that country into the hands of the Communists, is a past master in extracting money from the various foundations. The Walter Hines Page School of International Relations, which he heads, regularly milks the foundations. For instance, in 1949, the Carnegie Corp. gave Lattimore's school \$75,000.

Guggenheim money was used to spread radicalism throughout the country to an extent not excelled by any other foundation. Among those with Red records who have received Guggenheim fellowships are the following: Louis Adamic, Newton Arvin, Peggy Bacon, Carleton Beals, Albert Bein, Alvah Bessie, Marc Blitzstein, Kenneth Burke, Harriet Buckmaster, Jack Conroy, Aaron Copland, Adolph Dehn, Angner Enters, Kenneth Fearing, Hallie Flanagan, Mordecai Gorelik, William Gropper, Albert Halper, Josephine Herbst, Granville Hicks, Abram L. Harris, Maurice Hindus, Langston Hughes, Rolfe Humphries, Joe Jones, Otto Klineberg, Owen Lattimore, Douglas S. Moore, Carey McWilliams, Lewis Mumford, Alexander North, Max

Nomad, Saul K. Padover, Nathaniel Peffer, Bernard Reiss, Earl Robinson, Isidor Schneider, Harry Slochower, Maxwell S. Stewart, Tom Tippet, Genevieve Taggard, Charles R. Walker, Edmund Wilson, Richard Wright and William E. Zeuch.

The resources of the Rosenwald Fund, now finally exhausted, were disbursed irresponsibly to aid organizations which made a profession of stirring up class and race dissension throughout the South. Among leading Communists and Communist frontiers who received fellowships from the fund were Langston Hughes, W. E. B. DuBois, Claude McKay, Clark Foreman, James Dombrowski, Ira de A. Reid, Lillian Smith, Shirley Graham, Pearl Primus, Horace Clayton, and John P. Davis.

Another notorious situation in the foundation field is the Robert Marshall Foundation. This fund, it has been revealed by the inquiries of the Un-American Activities Committee, is devoted almost exclusively to the aid and subsidy of organizations working for communism in America. One of its trustees, and the dominating figure in the foundation, George Marshall, recently served a prison sentence for refusing to divulge information to the Committee on Un-American Activities concerning the Communist-front Civil Right Congress, of which he is chairman.

The Robert Marshall Foundation, in a period of 2 years, allocated approximately \$100,000 to a group of organizations all of which have been cited by the Un-American Activities Committee as Communist fronts, including the American Youth Congress, the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, the National Negro Congress, and the Southern Negro Youth Congress, which have been listed by the Department of Justice as subversive and Communist.

Mr. Speaker, these instances are only a few examples, among many of the tragic misuse of foundation money. Over a comparatively short period of time, the foundations have become a powerful and unregulated factor in our national life, enjoying Federal subsidy through tax exemption. The Sloane Foundation, which has since changed its policy and is now being careful not to have any more of its funds used for un-American purposes, has recently estimated the annual spending of the foundations in America as \$100,000,000 per year. This huge amount, if administered irresponsibly, can do an incalculable amount of harm in misguiding American public opinion. There are disquieting evidences that at least a few of the foundations have permitted themselves to be infiltrated by men and women who are disloyal to our American way of life. They should be investigated and exposed to the pitiless light of publicity, and appropriate legislation should be framed to correct the present disquieting situation.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the resolution is deserving of the serious consideration of those who fear for the safety of our country.

"While Russia Looks On, in Iran, the Muezzin Calls to Prayer the Moslem Population of a Nation Swept Into the Headlines by Nationalist Unrest; at Stake Is a Significant Portion of the World's Oil Supply, Which Iran Seeks to Seize From Great Britain's Control and Manage Itself"—Battle Report, Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, once again Battle Report, Washington, the National Broadcasting Co.'s weekly teledocumentary, and the Assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman, have brought to 40,000,000 Americans, by way of television and the coaxials, first-hand information on a number of subjects with respect to current activities of their Government here in Washington.

On this program Dr. Steelman had as his guests the following:

Mrs. Mary Markward, who last week appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities and told of her experiences as an FBI informant who became a member of the Communist Party, and its treasurer, here in Washington.

Vice Adm. E. L. Cochrane, Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board, who, in reporting on the splendid work done by the American merchant marine in the Korean War, stated, in part, that—

In the 371 days since fighting first exploded along the thirty-eighth parallel, American merchant ships have carried more than 80 percent of all the men and materials which moved to Korea from the United States or our bases in Japan. In the same historic year the Maritime Administration has taken from its mothball fleet 353 Liberty and Victory ships built during World War II.

Civilian crews manned this vast armada. Operated largely under control of the Military Sea Transport Service, as in World War II, they were the pipeline from stockpiles and production lines in this country to the far-away battlegrounds. Without the availability of vessels broken out of the reserve fleets it certainly would have been impossible for us—or for the entire United Nations—to perform the miracle that has been achieved in Korea.

The Honorable George C. McGhee, Assistant Secretary of State for the Middle East, who made the report on the intricate and delicate situation obtaining in Iran due to the nationalization of the Iranian oil fields. In the course of his remarks, he pointed out that—

The President, the Secretary of State, the American press and radio have, on numerous occasions in recent weeks, emphasized the critical and urgent nature of the Iranian situation. It is indeed loaded with danger. Iran today is balanced on the edge of a precipice.

The United States, for its part, has a deep interest in the continued independence and

territorial integrity of Iran. It has sought also to further the welfare and economic development of the Iranian Nation. When the Soviet Union left military forces in Iran in 1946 we gave strong support to the Iranian case in the United Nations Security Council. As a result of Iran's steadfastness and of her support by the United Nations, in which the United States played an important role, Soviet troops were withdrawn, but the Soviet objective of obtaining control of Iran has remained unaltered and Soviet pressures have continued unabated.

Mr. W. Averell Harriman, who is a sort of roving Ambassador, and who was dispatched by President Truman to lend his assistance in making peaceful settlement of this explosive crisis, was unable to be in the studio in person. However, Mr. Harriman made this transcribed announcement for the battle report program:

I am sorry that I will be unable to appear personally on this program as I had planned.

I am leaving today for Tehran as President Truman's personal representative to talk things over with the Iranian Government in the hope that a solution can be developed for the difficulties that have arisen over the oil question.

An amicable settlement is of great importance—not only to the Iranian people and the British Oil Co—but also to the countries of Europe and the East, who have depended upon Iran for their requirements.

The last but not the least of Dr. Steelman's guests was an airplane pilot, probably one of the most unique men that had ever appeared on the television screen, a distinguished flier in World War II—Bill Bridgeman dropped in his rocket ship from a United States Air Force B-29 while 35,000 feet in the air and started off on his journey at a speed publicly stated to have been in excess of 1,500 miles an hour.

Mr. Speaker, more than ever would I commend the reading of this teledocumentary to my colleagues in this House. I do so because I am convinced that Battle Report, Washington constitutes one of the most progressive steps ever taken in the Nation to bring to the people actual highlights that occur each week which are of vital and significant import to all.

Battle Report, Washington, an NBC sustained program, is produced by Ted Ayers; the technical director is L. A. McClelland; commentary, Robert McCormick; the script is written by Lou Hazam; film director, Bill Brooks; floor manager, Joe Tully; production assistant, Jean Montgomery; art by Joseph Ferrer; music adviser is Fritz Balzer; sound by Bob Haines.

BATTLE REPORT, WASHINGTON

Mr. MCCORMICK The National Broadcasting Co. Television News again focuses on the world in crisis to bring you your Battle Report, Washington.

Washington, whose eyes this week are on the fate of price legislation, the war on the economic front. And the world, whose ears are cocked to reports from a city in Korea named Kaesong, where events may soon spell more war or peace.

We begin your Battle Report tonight with the latest headlines on the Korean cease-fire negotiations.

And now the Assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

Dr. JOHN R. STEELMAN. Tonight I am going to ask you to sit with me while we bring you up to the minute on some of the historic developments of the past week.

First, let us look at the negotiations now going on in Korea. The officers who are conducting them have reported progress but we still do not know whether the Communists really want peace.

On the other side of the world, in far-off Iran there is a dispute which threatens the peace of the world. But, thank God, the wise sons of the ancient Persians have taken up arms to enforce their claims. Mr. Averell Harriman, as a special representative of the President, left this afternoon to assist in the negotiations. In the studio tonight we have the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. George C. McGhee, to tell us more about the situation.

From the Maritime Administration we have a very encouraging report about the steady increase of our merchant fleet. Vice Adm. E. L. Cochrane is here to give us some extremely interesting facts and figures.

A report from the Navy Department wrote a new page in aviation history this week. In Secondo, Calif., a new airplane called the Sky Rocket flew faster than man ever traveled before. The man who piloted the new plane, Mr. William Bridgeman, is with us today to tell us more about that epoch-making flight.

Up on Capitol Hill a charming lady told a remarkable story. She is Mrs. Mary Stalcup Markward, who was an FBI agent for more than 6 years while she was a member of the Communist Party. This past week she testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. But now, America, she is your witness—and here she is—Mrs. Markward.

Mr. Wood. Please tell us your name and occupation.

Mrs. MARKWARD. My name is Mary Stalcup Markward. I am a housewife, and I live in Chesterbrook, Va., a suburb of Washington, D. C.

Mr. Wood. Mrs. Markward, what have you been doing for most of the past 8 years?

Mrs. MARKWARD. I have been a member of the Communist Party in the Washington area serving as an informant for the FBI.

Mr. Wood. How did that happen?

Mrs. MARKWARD. Well, it began in 1943. I was working as a beauty-shop operator. An agent of the FBI approached me as a loyal American and told me that while the Communist Party was working with the United States at that time to reach a victory in the war, he had reason to believe that this organization was a potential danger to America. Upon realizing the seriousness of the situation, I volunteered to help—and discovered that the one way I could help best was to join up with the Communists and learn what I could for my Government.

Mr. Wood. Tell us about it.

Mrs. MARKWARD. Well, to the dismay of my family and friends, I became a Communist, rising from recruit to chairman of the Northeast Club here, then to treasurer of the city organization, and finally to membership on the central committee of district 4 of the party, which covers Maryland and the Capital. I was active for almost 7 years and had to quit in 1949 for reasons of health.

Mr. Wood. How were you able to help the United States, Mrs. Markward?

Mrs. MARKWARD. I sat in on party policy meetings, and so was able to keep the Government informed on the party program and plans. Since I also had access to membership records, I was able to pass on to the FBI the names of numerous members of the Communist Party in Washington and Maryland.

Mr. Wood. What did your experience prove to you, Mrs. Markward?

Mrs. MARKWARD. During the time I was a member of the Communist Party, I became more and more convinced that they were determined to divide and conquer . . .

not only divide us from our allies, but divide our own people. That, to me, is the most important thing they are trying to do today in this country. From what I have learned of Communists, our best course is to beware if we would protect the kind of life we love.

Dr. STEELMAN. Thank you, Mrs. Markward, and now back to Robert McCormick and Battle Report.

Mr. MCCORMICK. On the west coast of the Nation, close upon the sea lanes to Korea, ships of America's merchant marine take on the supplies so essential to the defense of our freedoms in the Far East. For an informed report on how these ships are helping to bolster our strength, Battle Report turns now to a top Government official charged with a great responsibility—the Maritime Administrator and Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board—Vice Adm. E. L. Cochrane.

Vice Admiral COCHRANE. America's merchant marine as well as the Nation's Armed Forces can be proud of the monumental accomplishments during the Korean hostilities.

Whether the current cease-fire negotiations result in a peaceful settlement or whether the hostilities continue, the fact remains: The American way has again proved its ability to shape up to any emergency which threatens our way of life.

To our military forces—to the Army and the Navy and the Air Force and the Marines—must go the major portion of our gratitude for stopping the Communist aggression in Korea. But the American merchant marine—privately owned ships or vessels chartered from the Government and manned by civilian crews—have achieved a record of outstanding accomplishment during the 54 weeks since the fighting commenced in Korea.

It was our fighting men who battled the enemy to a standstill and then rolled them in honorably back. But it was the merchant marine that carried the bulk of the materials which kept the American infantry supplied in battle, which kept our planes in the skies, and our fighting ships at sea. I'd like to tell you about a few of those accomplishments. In the 371 days since fighting first exploded along the thirty-eighth parallel, American merchant ships have carried more than 80 percent of all the men and materials which moved to Korea from the United States or our bases in Japan. In the same historic year the Maritime Administration has taken from its mothball fleet 353 Liberty and Victory ships built during World War II.

Civilian crews manned this vast armada. Operated largely under control of the Military Sea Transport Service, these Government-owned ships were chartered to private operators. As in World War II, they were the pipeline from stockpiles and production lines in this country to the far-away battle-grounds. Without the availability of vessels broken out of the reserve fleets it certainly would have been impossible for us—for the entire United Nations—to perform the miracle that has been achieved in Korea.

But as remarkable as has been the magnificent role of merchant ships in supplying our valiant fighting men, the Korean hostilities have pointed up anew the shortcomings of our merchant fleet.

It has shown us beyond doubt that our Liberties and Victories of World War II vintage could not carry the brunt of global logistic demands in an all-out war. Recognizing this, Congress has provided the Maritime Administration with funds to construct the nucleus of a new fleet of speedy cargo ships. We now are building 30 such ships. To be known as the "Mariner" class, these 20-knot ships will be taking to the sea lanes next year—seagoing insurance that America will always be able to deliver the goods.

And Korea has shown us, too, that we need more speedy troop transports. We now are mapping plans to construct 10 such troop-

ers—insurance that we can and mean to deliver the men anywhere in the world to safeguard freedom. We also need swift tankers in increasing numbers—Korea and the demands of our free friends elsewhere in Asia and Europe have shown us this again. And so we hope to add to our insurance for freedom by constructing at least 10 long-range tankers which the Navy can use in times of emergency and which will bolster our civilian economy in peacetime.

The merchant marine is part of the team—it is not the most important nor the least important member of the team. But its record in every combat in which the Nation has found itself is standing testimony of its necessity in the scheme of things upon which we depend to keep the United States the great nation it is and will continue to be.

Mr. WOOD. Mark down your merchant marine, then, America, as a lifeline to your troops, each vessel launched onto the bosom of the sea sails the seven seas with the productive strength of these United (48) States and returns to them the raw material we need for our democracy's survival. Cargo ship, tanker, passenger vessel, whatever they may be, well might we urge them on with Longfellow's blessing:

"Sail on, O ship of state,
Sail on, O Union strong and great,
Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate."

Mr. MCCORMICK. In Iran, the muezzin calls to prayer the Moslem population of a nation swept into the headlines by nationalist unrest. As tribesmen go through cavalry exercises outside the capital, at stake is a significant portion of the world's oil supply—which Iran seeks to seize from Great Britain's control and manage itself. Convening for another session on this explosive crisis is the Iranian Parliament. And a letter from Premier Mossadegh—welcoming President Truman's offer to send his assistant W. Averell Harriman to discuss the problem. Before taking off this afternoon for Iran, Mr. Harriman gave us this transcribed message for the audience of Battle Report. And here he is now, W. Averell Harriman.

Mr. HARRIMAN. I am sorry that I will be unable to appear personally on this program as I had planned.

I am leaving today for Tehran, as President Truman's personal representative, to talk things over with the Iranian Government in the hopes that a solution can be developed for the difficulties that have arisen over the oil question.

An amicable settlement is of great importance—not only to the Iranian people and the British Oil Co—but also to the countries of Europe and the East, who have depended upon Iran for their requirements.

Mr. MCCORMICK. And now for the latest State Department report on this critical Iranian situation as Mr. Harriman wings his way across the Atlantic, we bring you the Assistant Secretary of State for the Middle East, George C. McGhee.

Mr. MCGHEE. Now, Iranian oil is an extremely complex, delicate, and involved problem. It has long been an inflammatory and controversial matter. The roots of his present crisis, for instance, go back into the nineteenth century.

Although it is the Soviets alone that may benefit from the Iran oil dispute, the sources of the difficulty are to be found primarily within Iran—not outside. They stem from the deep desire of a deserving and underdeveloped people to raise their standard of living, to eliminate poverty, starvation, and disease and to find greater social and political security. The tragedy of Iran is that this vital spirit of nationalism and the legitimate desire of the Iranian nation to receive greater benefits from its oil resources have become

dominated by extreme emotional attitude which often ignores the best interests of Iran itself.

A stalemate between the parties to the dispute has now lasted for almost 6 weeks. As a result, for 3 weeks no oil has left Iran. The whole machinery of processing and production which constituted Iran's largest industry and largest single source of revenue is threatened with collapse. Business depression, unemployment, and even widespread economic chaos may develop at an early date within Iran.

The President, the Secretary of State, and the American press and radio have on numerous occasions in recent weeks emphasized the critical and urgent nature of the Iranian situation. It is indeed loaded with danger. Iran is balanced on the edge of a precipice.

The United States for its part has a deep interest in the continued independence and territorial integrity of Iran. It has sought also to further the welfare and economic development of the Iranian nation. When the Soviet Union left military forces in Iran in 1946, we gave strong support to the Iranian case in the U N Security Council. As a result of Iran's steadfastness and of her support by the U N, in which the United States played an important role, Soviet troops were withdrawn, but the Soviet objective of obtaining control of Iran has remained unaltered and Soviet pressures have continued unabated.

We can be sure that the Kremlin is losing no opportunity to fish in the troubled oil of Iran, for Iran would be a great and strategic prize, quite apart from oil. Control of its territory, an area approximately as large as the United States east of the Mississippi, would put the USSR astride the communication routes connecting the free nations of Asia and Europe.

Thus the issues at stake in Iran go far beyond the exploitation, distribution and use of Iranian oil resources, important as oil is for the security of Iran, for the development of the Iranian economy, and for the nations of the free world that use this oil. They are issues which affect the very foundations of the civilized methods of law and justice which the twentieth century has been trying so hard to establish for settling disputes.

The United States consistently urged moderation on the part of the Iran government and of the British oil interests. We are convinced, as the President said in a press conference two weeks ago, that there is plenty of opportunity for a settlement of the oil controversy on a mutually satisfactory basis.

We have no magic formula for solving this critical problem. Unfortunately, it is not that kind of a problem, but we do hope that before it is too late—and time is very short—some arrangement, temporary if need be, can be found which will permit the Iranian nation to benefit satisfactorily from the exploitation of its oil resources and the West to continue to receive that oil production.

Mr. McCORMICK. Of importance to Iran and all the free world is the mutual security legislation now before the United States Congress. Averell Harriman has a word about that, planned even before he was assigned to his present mission. Once again, Mr. Harriman.

Mr. HARRIMAN. I had wanted to talk to you tonight about the mutual security program, which President Truman has recently recommended to the Congress.

This program, I feel deeply, is of vital importance to our life and security.

Our allies in Europe are building their forces for our mutual defense under the leadership of General Eisenhower—but they need equipment, which only we can supply, to arm those forces effectively.

We must have well-equipped allies. They also require a reduced amount of economic aid to complete the Marshall plan, and to increase their own arms production.

It is also much to our interest to help the under-developed countries improve their economic conditions, and attain political stability.

We need a constant supply—in fact an increasing supply—of raw materials that they can produce.

They need our technical assistance, and some capital, to increase their production of food to relieve hunger, and also to increase the raw materials we require to have a healthy economic life in this country.

Mr. McCORMICK. And now, before we present Battle Report's most unique guest yet, back into the history of flight as a prelude to a glimpse of its amazing future. Graphics by our own picture-minded Joe Ferrier, with an assist by the Government's research agency on aeronautics, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

Mr. WOOD. We begin our graphic history of man's battle to fly with the incredible genius Leonardo da Vinci, whose drawings back in the 1400's revealed a man thinking in the right direction, but with no means of bringing his dreams to fruition.

1783, and a Frenchman named Montgolfier balloons into the air for the first man-carrying flight in history. Balloons quickly become a fad, but, by the time the Civil War rolls round, are used as an instrument of warfare—for reconnaissance.

Comes now the century's turn and the Wright brothers, amazing Kitty Hawk, N C, and a slow-to-believe-it-world with the first heavier-than-air flight—the birth of modern aviation.

Three years later, Bleriot puts aside his crutches and takes off from France to fly across the English Channel to Dover, over water, and for the longest flight yet.

The balloon, in the meantime, develops into the rigid-framed Zeppelin, which, during World War I, terrorizes England.

Seaplanes, too, rapidly advance and, the war over, the Navy sends its flying boat, the NC-4, roaring over the Atlantic to Europe for its first ocean crossing by air.

Some 10 years pass, and then, capturing the public imagination, Lucky Lindy, the Lone Eagle, Charles Lindbergh, makes it himself from New York to Paris and undying fame.

Now the appearance of the transport in the mid-twenties, this all-metal Ford trimotor job proving a rugged and reliable carrier of passengers.

Speed the next goal, and in 1939 the German's ME-109 sets a world record, 469 miles an hour and becomes one of the top Nazi fighter planes in World War II.

The war also sees the birth of the big bomber, the American B 29, a fighting weapon which enables the Air Force to get at Japan, and carries history in the shape of the first A-bomb.

In 1942, the first American jet airplane, a plane driven not by propeller but by a turbojet engine, we secure in reverse lend-lease from Great Britain.

Earlier, Sikorsky's genius gives us our first practical helicopter, a flying machine that can rise vertically, fly sideways, forward, or backward.

This, our own decade, greets the biggest of modern bombers, the B-36, a plane that can fly nonstop 10,000 miles while carrying 10,000 pounds of bombs.

And, not to be outdone, our fighter designers come up with the F-86—the Sabre jet that's beating the Russian-made MIG's in Korea, holder of the official world's speed record of 670 miles an hour.

Then, giving us more reason to hold our hats, and built, like the other recent planes we mentioned, in a three-way cooperative effort between the aircraft industry, the military services, and the NACA, the X-1, the first plane ever to fly faster than the speed of sound.

Thus we come to the Douglas Skyrocket, the Navy sonic research plane which only

last week attained the highest speed and the highest altitude ever achieved by a piloted airplane.

Carried aloft over the Mohave desert by a B-29 mother ship, the small 40-foot Skyrocket was launched in the air and proceeded thereafter under its own rocket power.

The conjectured speed of the Skyrocket—1,500 miles an hour.

We said our next guest was unique. He is, for he is the pilot of this plane. A Navy airman in World War II, holder of two Distinguished Flying Crosses, he is presently with Douglas Aircraft. We invite you now to meet the man who has flown higher and faster than any man in human history—Test Pilot Bill Bridgeman.

Mr. McCORMICK. A nice corny question to get started. How does it feel to go so fast?

Mr. WILLIAM BRIDGEMAN. Actually, I believe that kids in their hopped-up jalopies and motorcycles get a feeling of speed superior than you get in a research ship such as the Skyrocket. To reach the speeds that we do attain, it necessitates that we get to extreme altitudes. There are no clouds up there—nothing to compare your speed with. Some experiences showed us that feeling through the controls gives us an idea of what the ship is experiencing but no actual feeling on the body is felt as far as speed is concerned.

Mr. McCORMICK. Are you pretty busy?

Mr. BRIDGEMAN. Yes; you're busy. You have some 80 instruments to watch and the flight is necessarily, after all, an instrument hop. There is no time to look around. You can't tell what color the sky is, really. Some people have told us it turns to a dark blue but as far as being able to look around and find out for yourself, you are just too busy flying airplanes.

Mr. McCORMICK. Well, do you feel anything going through the speed of sound?

Mr. BRIDGEMAN. In the altitudes that we're using now, no. Going through, because of the fact that we can use a mother ship, a B-29, we launched at an altitude of over 35,000 feet. By the time we go through, we are much higher than that and you don't get the phenomena that we have experienced in some other airplanes. Coming back down, yes, your ship buffets somewhat and at lower altitudes you can feel it.

Mr. McCORMICK. Well, what are the purposes of these fantastic flights?

Mr. BRIDGEMAN. We are stuck with having to develop airplanes. It is a thing that we have to do, for many reasons. We need a ship to go out and find a ship that can act as a laboratory, something that will bring back for us the information. The airplane has sacrificed many pounds to do this. We could use that weight in more propellers but we use recorders and in that way bring back the data that is necessary.

Mr. McCORMICK. Well, you mean in other words, you have to go through this sound barrier if aviation is to progress at all.

Mr. BRIDGEMAN. That's right. We have got to get through and get through safely and take armaments or passengers or whatever is needed through that barrier.

Mr. McCORMICK. Well, how do you land this aerial hot rod of yours?

Mr. BRIDGEMAN. We chose Muroc Dry Lake out in California because we have a space of about 12 miles by 8 that is absolutely flat. The airplane by necessity must come back dead stick so we need an area large enough so that the pilot can make a few normal mistakes and still be able to safely put the airplane down.

Mr. McCORMICK. You mean that you don't make a power landing?

Mr. BRIDGEMAN. No. After just a very few moments of flight, the propeller runs out in the airplane and it then becomes more or less a glider.

Mr. McCORMICK. You're 60,000 feet in the air and no motor, no engine. Do you enjoy that?

Mr. BRIDGEMAN. Actually, it isn't too bad. It is the most effortless, vibrationless, and quiet hop you'll ever experience from that altitude on down.

Mr. McCORMICK. It isn't the most quiet experience I'll ever go through because I never intend to go through it. Well, we certainly admire you, Mr. Bridgeman, and I know you have contributed a great deal to aviation, and thank you very much.

So, until we turn our cameras upon the Nation's Capitol again next Friday to report on the battle of democracy against world communism, this is Robert McCormick putting a period on your forty-sixth Battle Report, Washington.

Smears and Smearers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include herewith an article from the Littleton (Colo.) Independent:

SMEARS AND SMEARERS

Within the past 2 years several words and phrases have been added to the rapidly growing list of terms in common usage which often can be called "smears"—by definition "to besmirch, sully, defame." The smear technique is an old one, though not especially honored. There is some person, group of persons, or some institution whom one does not like. Then, apply to that person, group, or institution words cloudy with ill meaning so that men will easily and inevitably connect the subjects with the colored expressions which are designed to cast all manner of doubt upon the subject's patriotism, religion, cranial capacity, or birth.

By such means is the spirit and conscience of democracy dealt another stinging blow.

Below are a few of the terms coming into accepted use by many circles who are interested in discrediting everything from the State Department to the next-door neighbor.

1. "Intellectual": One who has had at least 2 years of college and preferably four or more; one who is incapable of being "practical" or "businesslike," who has been so softened by books and professors that he is without doubt a fellow traveler or a full-blooded Communist; generally applied to "dreamers in the State Department," "young lawyers in the Interior Department," or "people who read too many books for their own good."

2. "Diplomat": Obviously a sneaky fellow who was picked for his job by the process of elimination in which it was determined that he could give away more vital secrets to enemy agents or betray his nation more times without getting caught than others in the foreign service.

3. "Left winger": A person who once went to hear Henry Wallace speak in 1936; or who dislikes the Chicago Tribune; or who majored in psychology and social science in school; or who favors Government subsidies for other firms besides his own (crazy fool); or who wore a red necktie the night Norman Thomas came to town; or who said, "Franco is as much of a dictator as Stalin, Mao, Tito,

Perón, and all the rest"; or who campaigns against racial prejudice; or who sometimes disagrees with TAIT or MCCARTHY; or who does, says, or believes several thousand other things.

4. "Administration supporter": One who admits the present Truman administration is often wrong, but who won't admit it is wrong all of the time.

5. "Internationalist": A Communist at heart who secretly wishes to turn the United States over to the Reds lock, stock, and barrel.

6. "Pacifist": A person who won't take up arms against anybody including Communists which makes him, since he won't fight Communists, a Communist himself.

The sad fact about smear words and smearers is that many people who employ this device are absolutely convinced that they and their cohorts are the only bearers of the truth and that all who disagree with them are nothing but the devil's own disciples. They are the people who condemn opponents or persons, who for some reason do not subscribe to their line of thought, as pro-Communist or un-American, while they themselves employ the very methods of communism and un-Americanism, namely, character smearing and invasion of personal rights and privileges.

As stated before, the method is old and no more honorable because of its age, or because of who may use it.

It is well nigh impossible these days to remain entirely objective on the great issues of the times, but there is no excuse for deliberately beclouding these issues which are before the public with colored words and phrases which stir up the emotions without stirring up an equal amount of cool reasoning. He who uses these tactics is certainly doing a disservice to his Nation even as the Communist who tries in his way to bring destruction to the land to which he professes to pledge allegiance.

H. H. W.

Report on Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was privileged to insert in the Appendix of the Record the first part of the report on majority opinions held by Albanian-Americans in Massachusetts concerning communism prepared for Gov. Paul Dever, of Massachusetts, by Dr. Glenn A. McLain, 45 Chase Street, Quincy, Mass.

Following is the second part of this report:

THE RELIGIOUS ELEMENTS IN LEADERSHIP: A. M. I. LIPA AND HIS SUPPORTERS

Quite in contrast to the anti-American attitude of Bishop Noli in regard to the majority wishes of the Albanian community has been the position of Mark I. Lipa. Bishop Lipa's episcopacy was formed December 31, 1950, in Boston under his spiritual leadership. (The Evening Gazette, Worcester, Mass., February 23, 1951.) The Albanian-American Episcopacy was formed for two important reasons. First and foremost to combat all atheistic and communistic influences in their midst. (Speech given by Vasil Alarupi before a Boston, Mass., meeting of Albanians, April 15, 1951.) Although

a necessary concomitant to such a reason would be to use any political measures to help remove the influence of Noli, it was decided by Bishop Lipa that he should make no personal intervention in the matter. As a man of God it would not be his duty to sully himself with the political mud, slung by Fan S. Noli. The second goal to be striven for was to preserve the orthodox faith and traditions in the Albanian-American community.

Bishop Lipa was educated in Karcha, Albania, and he received his theological training at the Theological School of Chalcis in Albania. The religious inclination of Bishop Lipa was first noted by the Archbishop of the Albanian Orthodox Church, Christopher Kisi. It has been strikingly evident since the arrival of Bishop Lipa in this country that reasons for his denunciations were political. F. S. Noli was naturally ashamed to countenance the protégé of the man whom he had repudiated in favor of the Communists. Bishop Noli has pulled no punches in his attempt to smear Bishop Lipa, claiming that the pro-Greek sympathies of Bishop Lipa made him unacceptable to the Albanian community.

The accusation falls flat and is totally unsupported by any documentation: Pro-Greek epitaphs are commonly used in criticizing one's political or religious enemies in Albania because of the historical enmity existing between the two countries. Noli has used a convenient "red herring" to confuse the issue.

The supporters of Bishop Lipa fall roughly in two categories. The anti-Communists who petitioned the Holy Synod in Istanbul for someone to take Noli's place and to rid their church of communistic influences. The other group, smaller but rapidly growing in numbers is composed of "centerist" members who because of Noli's scholastic reputation in the Albanian community or because of traditional political conservatism have stayed "on the fence." This middle-of-the-road group, neither pro-Lipa nor pro-Noli are gradually realizing that the only true middle road between the far left (communism) and the far right (fascism) is the democracy of the American republic. The concentration of Bishop Lipa with his spiritual duties and the concentration of Bishop Noli with partisan politics can thus be seen as the real reason for the anomaly that exists in the Albanian church today. Thus the position of the religious leaders in the Albanian-American communities is today, as in the past a basically important one. Let us hope the forces of right not might win the final victory and that the holders of propaganda power will not win over those who hold the basic interests of the Albanian community at heart.

IV. THE BASIC ISSUES AT STAKE IN THE ALBANIAN COMMUNITY

A. Freedom versus totalitarianism

The basic issue at stake in the Albanian community is the same one that confronts the American people today—freedom versus totalitarianism. Freedom to worship free from political taint or influence. Freedom to express one's opinions in public meetings and the free press. The issue of the free press and who controls it is thus one that is vital for protection of the other basic freedoms. The Albanian free press in Boston presents a typical example of the perversion of truth by the pro-Communist by the press.

Since the formation of the first Albanian foreign language newspaper, Kombi, Boston, 1905, the role of the Albanian press has been an important one.

1. Freedom of the press.

(a) Leftist control of informational organs: At first it was necessary to teach the illiterate Albanian immigrants how to read in order for the various papers to be most effectively used in the community. Albanian

newspapers flourished and during the years 1906-39 many newspapers were published in Boston and other parts of the country. Albanian leaders made effective use of their foreign language press in order to stimulate nationalism in the homeland; promote charitable causes in America and Albania; and to effectively stimulate the Albanian-American into participation in community life. Many community leaders became persons of note in the literary world through their prolific pamphleteering and newspaper editorials. Bishop Fan S. Noli has been one of the most active of the Albanian-American religious and political leaders who have used the free press to stress particular points of view. In 1905 he joined Petsi on the newly formed paper, *Kombl*.

In the years since 1905 Noli has been a prolific writer, both on Albanian newspapers and in the general literary field. (A full bibliography of his published works can be found in the card-index files of the Boston public library.)

Noli was sent to Europe as one of the delegates to the peace conference in 1920 (*Writers, Albanian Struggle*, p. 65), and in 1924 he became Prime Minister of Albania after a successful coup d'état. His inability to solve the problems of democratic government was high lighted in the Albanian-American press of that year (Dielli, *Passim*). After a stay of several years in Europe during which time he either promoted, established, or advocated many Communist-front causes (Von Redlich, op. cit., p. 34), he returned to this country in 1930 to stay permanently. An attempt to establish a newspaper, *Repubblica*, to combat the criticism of Dielli was abortive (*Writers*, op. cit., p. 79). Since 1930 he has become the honorary president of Dielli so he has thus effectively stifled the press opposition of his opponents by becoming their honorary president. If you cannot beat them, join them, apparently is good advice.

The position of the newspaper Dielli is summed up by the excellent objective book on the Albanian people, the *Albanian Struggle*, page 128, as follows:

"The Boston Dielli is recognized by the Albanians here as being indirectly subsidized by the Albanian Government. Many are sent to Albania where they are distributed to officials. * * *

Certainly any paper which is being subsidized by the Communist Government of Albania and whose honorary editor has a long record of pro-Communist proclivities should be suspect in the eyes of the Albanian people. Such obvious facts are seldom considered by a great many Albanians in Boston, however, as the only other paper available to them is *Liria* which also is pro-Communist and anti-American in bias. The advice of Goebells, the master Nazi propagandist, has been acted upon by the enemies of democracy and free speech once more. Tell a big lie often enough and all will believe it.

Newspapers are only one aspect of the control of free press and speech by Albanian political partisans. The radio has come in for its full share of attention by the group led by Bishop Fan S. Noli. The long arm of political control has even extended to the Voice of America in the attempt to silence the Albanian forces of democracy.

According to the *New York Times*, Sunday, September 3, 1950:

"Bishop Noli removed Father Rado from his pastorate, the latter said, because he had made Voice of America broadcasts denouncing Communist influence over the Orthodox Church in Albania."

If any lingering doubt remained in the minds of Albanian Americans concerning Bishop Noli's position in regard to the Voice of America, the following excerpt from Dielli (May 30, 1951, p. 3) should dispel it:

"In recent weeks Voice of America, which broadcasts in several languages with a view of counteracting Communist propaganda, has initiated an Albanian-language hour. We have not heard it, and naturally we do not know the line it follows."

The article continues mentioning advice to the United States State Department concerning Albanian Yugoslav, Albanian Italian, and Albanian Greek territorial disputes. A lucid description of those working for the State Department, according to Dielli's point of view, then follows:

It is utter folly to have the so-called Albanian political refugees now in this country broadcast to the Voice of America via the Albanian people. It must be understood that these people, whom we are now coddling, have their hands drenched in the blood of innocent people. They made common cause with the Italians and the Germans, thereby forever discrediting themselves. They are hated in Albania, and, no matter how much we may whitewash them as good little democrats, they are, in the eyes of the Albanian people, renegades and traitors. * * * These people massacred thousands of innocent people, burned and pillaged the country, made common cause with the enemy. In the end they fled for their lives."

The Voice of America could never make sense, the editorial goes on to explain, as it is manned by pro-Greek Albanians and outright Albanian traitors.

In rebuttal to this unprincipled bit of propaganda which helped to buttress Noli's action taken to remove Father Rado, *Spoileria* (vol. 17, New York, June 1, 1951) devotes most of its issue to an explanation of the Voice of America program. The true picture of the American attempt to reaffirm the bond between the Albanian people and the United States is given in this issue.

Another issue of Dielli added further editorial proof for the Albanian people of Boston. This is a typical example of pro-Communist attempts to use American history to document their own distortions of facts. The editorial reads:

"Voice of America is employing Albanian traitors and pro-Greek elements to win over the Albanian people. This is monumental political stupidity. Imagine the Colonial people of the American Revolution responding to the voices of the tory Loyalists. This is precisely what we are doing. We are believing the honeyed words of the Albanian traitors in this country and abroad, who cruelly and unashamedly collaborated with the Fascists and Nazis during the occupation of the country."

Sometimes the techniques of the Communist press demand partial retractions which are unobtrusively inserted so that the press organ can be on both sides. This method was used in Dielli (June 12, 1951, p. 3) when the editorial finished with the following thanks to the State Department:

"We are glad that the Voice of America selected for its first broadcast such genuine friends of the Albanian people as Dr. C. Telford Erickson, Mr. Harry Fultz, and Dr. Nicholas J. Prift; all of them have the interest of the Albanian people at heart, and none of them has any ax to grind."

Are these people the ones who have their hands drenched in blood, who were cruel and unashamed Fascist collaborators? Obviously not but the cover-up had been successful. Now the paper could be on both sides at once. As the apology only occupied seven lines of print and the accusations many hundred lines the effect on politically unaware Albanians can only have been to enhance communism at the expense of criticizing American foreign policy.

No one would criticize the right of any newspaper in America to disagree with any phase of American politics domestic or international. That is in the American tradition. The deliberate distortions of fact in Dielli

and *Liria*, the using of religious power to further subversive activities by Bishop Noli in the case of Father Rado, and the monopoly of news by the pro-Communist press is not in the American tradition.

B. Results of smear tactics by the leftist press, newspapers, and radio

The use of the mass media of information: the radio, the press by the Communists, has not been without its effects on (1) Albanian-American relations and (2) the Albanian-American minority group in Boston and elsewhere.

As yet the pro-Communist advocations of certain sections of the Albanian press, and the activities of certain prominent Albanian individuals has not affected Albanian-American relations. A recent issue of the Appendix of the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*, page A4106, reports the feelings of the Congress of the United States toward Rumania:

"That the Congress of the United States hereby expressed the firm conviction of the American people that the people of Rumania have the right to the basic rights and freedoms for which they have long struggled. * * *

This certainly applies to Albania and the Albanian Americans as well as Rumania. Let us hope that newspaper-sown seeds of hate will fall on barren ground.

The effect of this same propaganda on the Albanian-American minority group has had more far-reaching effects. It has caused many sincere Albanian Americans to swallow the Communist line in regard to international and domestic affairs. For those not of the Albanian community who are familiar with the red slants of Dielli and *Liria*; the pulpit exhortations of Bishop F. S. Noli; or the radio monopoly which the Albanian leftists exercise to bracket all Albanians with the Communists. Such random classifications as "types" is all too common in American life today and are a distinct danger to the Albanian community.

V. CONCLUSIONS

(b) Statement of authorship of this report.

This report has primarily been written in the interests of democracy and free speech in America. My long interest and study of the Albanian people; my researches for the eventual publication of a book on the history of Albania; and my interests in the protection of minorities in Massachusetts and America have all been partially responsible for the writing of this report. The idea of this report was entirely my own, the material was gathered through my own efforts, and I am not receiving any pay for this work. At all times I have sincerely tried to document allegations, objectivize my material, and to be nonpartisan.

This report could well have been triple in size but my main concern has been with objectivity, not volume.

I hope this report is successful in obtaining the results for which it was written.

Respectfully submitted

GLENN A. MCLAIN.

Czechoslovak Trade and Mr. Oatis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the *RECORD*, I include the following radio address delivered by O. R. Strackbein, chairman,

the National Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy, over Station WOL, Washington, D. C., Sunday, July 29:

CZECHOSLOVAK TRADE AND MR. OATIS

The imprisonment of Mr. William Oatis, American press correspondent, by Czechoslovakia on charges of espionage has aroused many emphatic demands from the American people that immediate retaliatory action be taken by the United States. These demands run all the way from proposals that we apply economic sanctions, to the more drastic step of severing diplomatic relations with Czechoslovakia. It may be recalled that in February 1950 we did break off diplomatic relations with Hungary when that satellite country made charges of espionage against our Ambassador, Mr. Donald Heath.

The proposals that call for the application of economic sanctions are aimed at the reduction of Czechoslovak export to this country which in 1950 amounted to about \$25,000,000. This trade provides just that many dollars that may be used to bolster the Communist economy and to build up war industries through the importation by the Communist countries of scarce war materials and military equipment.

Resolutions have been introduced into Congress that call for the termination of our trade agreement with Czechoslovakia and also the termination of most-favored-nation treatment of imports from Czechoslovakia.

These are technical subjects but their implications should be understood by the American people if they are to pass intelligently upon the merits of the proposals of trade retaliation. Most-favored-nation treatment requires that we give to all countries any and all concessions and favors that we extend to any country in particular. The purpose is to avoid international favoritism. The only exceptions are where other countries discriminate against us. We may then withhold most-favored-nation treatment from them.

It is perhaps not generally known that the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 already requires the President to suspend or withdraw, as soon as practicable, trade agreement concessions from Communist countries and all areas dominated or controlled by the Communists. Three weeks ago the State Department, acting under this congressional mandate, notified Russia, Poland, Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria of the termination of most-favored-nation concessions upon imports from these five countries.

This appeared to be a bold step, but actually we did not have a single trade agreement with any of these countries under our trade agreements program. Thus our action in withdrawing most-favored-nation treatment amounted to nothing more than telling those countries that after a certain date we would no longer give them the benefit of lower duties that we had previously negotiated in trade agreements, not with these 5 countries, mind you, but with some 40 other countries.

It is perhaps not generally appreciated that under the most-favored-nation clause, as just described, countries that are not parties to a trade agreement under the trade agreements program and which therefore make no reductions in duty or give no other concession to us or to any other country, nevertheless get the benefit of all the concessions that we grant to other countries, or that other countries grant to us.

In other words, Russia, Poland, Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria have been taking a free ride on our trade-agreements wagon since 1934 when the law was first passed. They could and did sit out all the negotiations between us and other countries and obtained all the benefits free—without giving a single concession in return.

Thus when Congress instructed the President to prevent the extension of all trade-agreement concessions to Communist countries, the State Department in its first bold step deprived the five countries that had been taking a free ride for 17 years from further enjoyment of this bountiful gift.

But the State Department did nothing about our concessions to Czechoslovakia. We import about three times as much from Czechoslovakia as we do from Poland, Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria combined.

Now, there is a reason for this difference in treatment of Czechoslovakia and these other countries. We do have a trade agreement with Czechoslovakia under the Trade Agreements Law. This agreement is a part of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, known as GATT, and was negotiated in 1947.

Before the agreement took effect, that is, before Czechoslovakia ratified it in 1948, that country went behind the iron curtain. Numerous representations were made to the State Department at that time urging that the agreement not be placed into effect. Nevertheless, that Department, after considerable study and some weeks of delay, did recommend to the President that he proclaim the agreement, and this was done.

The fact that we do have a trade agreement with Czechoslovakia means that we reduced our tariff on a list of products that we regularly import from that country. Czechoslovakia gave us some concessions in return. Beyond these duty reductions, of course, Czechoslovakia still enjoys most-favored-nation treatment and therefore enjoys the benefit of concessions that we have made to other countries. In this respect she stands on the same basis as Russia, Poland, Rumania, etc.

The question now arises: Why can we not simply give notice to Czechoslovakia that we wish to cancel the trade agreement that we have with her and also notify her that we are withdrawing most-favored-nation treatment? These are two separate relationships. Obviously she is not treating one of our citizens in a manner indicative of friendship or favored regard.

We come now to the spot that we, the United States, are in, thanks to the type of trade agreements that has been propagated, promoted, and signed by our State Department. On the basis of a law (the Trade Agreements Act of 1934) that authorized the President to enter into trade agreements in which our duties might be reduced (or raised) as much as 50 percent, the State Department has involved us in the general agreement on tariffs and trade. This instrument is composed of 35 articles of complicated terminology that bind us in a manner that almost certainly is unknown generally to the people of this country, and with equal certainty was not contemplated in the simple act of 1934, just referred to. The Oatis case merely throws the spotlight upon the fact.

Can we denounce our agreement with Czechoslovakia today or tomorrow, should we elect to do so? Many people seem to think so.

Article 23 of the general agreement provides the procedure that must be followed. As a first step we must make written representations or proposals to Czechoslovakia. That country must then give sympathetic consideration to our representations or proposals, as, for example, the release of Mr. Oatis.

Then if no satisfactory adjustment is effected between us within a reasonable time the matter may be referred to all the parties to the general agreement. They are called the contracting parties and shall promptly investigate the matter so referred to them and shall make appropriate recommendations to the two countries concerned; or shall give a ruling on the matter.

Consultations may be held by the contracting parties with the two countries and with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. If the countries that are members of the general agreement consider the circumstances serious enough they might authorize us to suspend such of our obligations to Czechoslovakia under our agreement as the countries might determine to be appropriate.

There you have it. We are no longer free to act alone.

We have signed away our freedom of action unless we should elect to denounce and withdraw from the general agreements on tariffs and trade, altogether. This is the agreement that binds us in the manner just described. Then we could act again as a sovereign Nation. But withdrawal from a general agreement with some 40 countries in order to act against one country is a very serious step to take and one that would hardly be considered as feasible.

Undoubtedly then the economic sanctions that have been proposed do not offer a quick means of action. Months might be consumed in carrying out the procedure.

The next meeting of the contracting parties of the general agreement before whom the State Department could bring its case, is not even scheduled before the middle of September. That is nearly 2 months away.

The State Department perhaps regrets that Mr. Oatis cannot be freed today. If so the Department has only itself to blame so far as the use of economic reprisals are concerned. The Department openly, willingly, and with enthusiasm forged the handcuffs that Uncle Sam now wears in this field of action, as a matter of considered and conscious policy.

Should, however, the Department's regret be sufficiently deep there remains the more drastic step of a diplomatic break. By tying its hands against the effective use of the less drastic weapon of economic pressure the State Department finds itself armed only with artillery. This it will find itself reluctant to use as being too loud and explosive in proportion to the weight of the issue at stake. Thus has the failure of the Department to take effective action been compounded.

Directory Overlooks Family Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the Record the following article by Mr. E. E. Patton, which appeared in the Knoxville Journal of July 29, 1951:

DIRECTORY OVERLOOKS FAMILY RECORD

(By E. E. Patton)

When a new Congress is sworn in on January 3 of the odd years a new Congressional Directory is printed. It contains the name and address of each Senator and each Representative, the States they are from, and, usually, a short sketch of their lives. However, this is not always done in the matter of a biography.

For instance, DEWEY SHORT, of Missouri, has been a Member of the House for many years. He was a soldier in World War I; has a license to preach and one to practice law. He is a graduate of Oxford College, in England, and is one of the most effective

speakers, yet the directory for 1951 has this about him:

"DEWEY SHORT, Republican, Galena, Mo." But he has nothing on PAT SUTTON, who represents the Seventh Tennessee District. His biography is as follows: "PAT SUTTON, Democrat, Lawrenceburg, Tenn." The Tennessee blue book shows that he was born at Lawrenceburg in 1915; that he is a college graduate, a licensed lawyer, that he is a Mason, a member of the American Legion, and a member of the Church of Christ.

But it is about a Harrison that I want to write. In the 1951 Congressional Directory, I find that the State of Wyoming is represented in the Senate by one man who was born in Massachusetts and another born in Illinois; that the population of the State is 250,742—just a little more than Knox County. But each State is entitled to two Senators and at least one Member of the House.

Delaware, Vermont, and Wyoming are the only States with only one Congressman. The biography of the Congressman from Wyoming is one of interest. The two Senators from that far-western State are Democrats, but we find this in regard to the Congressman:

"WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, Republican, of Sheridan, Wyo.; born in Terre Haute, Ind., August 10, 1898, attended University of Nebraska; member of Sigma Chi and Sigma Delta Kappa fraternities; served in Army, World War I; engaged in the practice of law, Sheridan, Wyo.; member of the Wyoming House of Representatives, 1945, 1947, and 1949; Secretary of the Wyoming Interim Committee 1947-50; married Mary E. Newton, October 19, 1920; two children, Maribeth Brewer and William Henry Harrison, Jr.; elected to Eighty-second Congress, November 7, 1950."

He did not mention the fact that his grandfather was President; that his great-great grandfather was also President for 30 days; that his great-great-great grandfather signed the Declaration of Independence. Rather modest, I would say.

The first Harrison came to Virginia about 1633-34 and during the next century and a half there were four or five Benjamin Harrisons. The Declaration-signing Benjamin Harrison was born in 1726. He received a classical education. Was a member of the Continental Congress from 1774 to 1778 and as such signed the Declaration of Independence. However, he resigned from Congress in 1778 and served in the Virginia Legislature 1776 to 1782 and from 1787 to 1791. It will thus be seen that while serving in the Continental Congress he was also a member of the Virginia State House of Delegates—two legislative offices at the same time. He served as Governor of Virginia from 1782 to 1784, died in 1791. The congressional biography closes with a surprising sentence, "Interment thought to be in Old Westover Church Cemetery."

Can it be that this distinguished patriot is buried in an unknown and an unmarked grave?

SHAME ON AMERICA

His son, William Henry Harrison, ninth President of the United States, was born February 9, 1773, in Berkeley County, Va.; received a college education and was a licensed physician. He was a soldier in many wars against the British and the Indians and settled in what is now Ohio but then known as the Territory northwest of the River Ohio. He represented this Territory in Congress 1799-1800. He was Territorial Governor of Indiana from 1801 to 1813; was elected as a Whig to the Fourteenth Congress and served from 1816 to 1821; was elected to the United States Senate from Ohio and served from 1825 to 1828 when he resigned to become Minister to Colombia, in which capacity he served from May 1828 to September 1829. He is one of the exceptions in the Presidency, he was a candidate for that office and defeated in 1836,

but was elected 4 years later—the first President to die in office and served a shorter term than any other President.

William Henry Harrison's son, John Scott Harrison, was born 1804; studied medicine but gave it up and became a farmer. He was elected to Congress as a Whig and served 1853-57. Defeated for reelection. He was the son and the father of a President.

Benjamin Harrison, son of John Scott Harrison, grandson of William Henry, and great-grandson of Revolutionary Benjamin Harrison, was born in Ohio in 1833. He was a college graduate; became a lawyer; enlisted as a private in the Union Army in 1861 and came out with the rank of brevet brigadier general. He was defeated for governor of Indiana in 1876, but was elected to the United States Senate and served in that body from 1881 to 1887.

Benjamin Harrison defeated Grover Cleveland for the Presidency in 1888 and was, in turn, defeated by Cleveland in 1892. He was a member of the Presbyterian Church and it is said he passed the collection plate in his church in Indianapolis on Sunday after his retirement from the White House.

Chauncey Depew says he was the greatest lawyer ever to occupy the White House. At any rate, he represented many foreign governments in suits. He was the attorney for Venezuela in its international suit against Great Britain.

Benjamin Harrison, Member of the Continental Congress, signer of the Declaration of Independence, Governor of Virginia.

William Henry Harrison, Territorial Delegate, Congressman, Senator, governor of a Territory, defeated for the Presidency in 1836, elected President 4 years later. His wife did not accompany him to Washington and he died before she got there.

Benjamin Harrison, brigadier general, Member of the United States Senate, President from 1889 to 1893. His father's name was John Scott Harrison, his wife's father's name was John Scott.

WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, grandson of Benjamin Harrison, is now a Congressman from the State of Wyoming. What other family in America can show as many illustrious names?

The Arrival of Henry Kaiser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

MR. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article taken from Fortune magazine that I consider is very illuminating and interesting.

Mr. Kaiser's genius has brought us of the West to new vistas of industry and new concepts of industry employee cooperation and we of the State of California and the West in general are very proud of Mr. Kaiser and his achievements.

The article from Fortune magazine follows:

THE ARRIVAL OF HENRY KAISER

Now that Henry Kaiser has achieved the rank of major industrialist and is widely regarded as quite respectable to boot, where in the whole sensational history of private enterprise is there a success story to match his? Only 13 years ago he was just a prosperous, energetic contractor and dam builder, who for all his ambition to get into processing or factory production had managed,

at the age of 55, to get merely into the production of sand and gravel and workmen's compensation-insurance policies. Today he controls and runs a real industrial empire with total assets of more than \$600,000,000 and sales of more than a half billion, and has by no means finished. Not since the rise of Henry Ford, who in 15 pioneering years built up the assets of one automobile company from \$35,000,000 to \$784,000,000, has any industrial figure come so far in so short a time. And not in all history has any industrial figure successfully got into so many and various projects as Kaiser.

Besides such odds and ends as 25 percent of the West's largest private workmen's compensation-insurance company, several construction organizations with a backlog of more than \$100,000,000, and a sand-and-gravel business that has been netting around three-quarters of a million a year, the Kaiser-controlled companies include the following:

Kaiser Steel Corp., the only integrated steel plant on the west coast, with sales of \$100,000,000.

Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp., one of the "big three" aluminum companies, with sales of \$150,000,000.

Kaiser Metal Products, Inc., a stamping-and-enameling company jointly owned with Sears, Roebuck, with sales of some \$25,000,000.

Kaiser Gypsum, a building-products division with sales of \$8,500,000.

Permanente Cement Co., with sales of \$20,000,000.

Kaiser Community Homes of Los Angeles, which has built and sold about \$30,000,000 worth of houses during the past 2 years.

Kaiser-Frazer automobile company, which in 1950 sold 151,000 cars and grossed \$238,000,000.

Kaiser Engineers, a consulting firm that performs architectural, engineering, and construction services for the public and the Kaiser companies, with a backlog of \$150,000,000.

A Kaiser-sponsored west-coast-wide non-profit health service and hospital system that last year made nearly a million dollars and put it into charity, research, and expansion.

All these are off the Government hook, are strong and stable, and are vulnerable only to gross mismanagement or economic catastrophe. Three are public companies to whose stock and notes the Nation's most conservative banks and investors have subscribed. What is least often noted, most of these successes have been achieved in the 6 years since the end of the war. Kaiser's great reputation, of course, was made during the war. As the man who proposed in 1942 to transport whole armies and their equipment by air, who in the war years built nearly 1,500 ships, some in as few as 4½ days, and who was even ballyhooed for President, he became a national industrial hero such as the country had not known since Henry Ford. Yet Kaiser's achievements since the war, in audacity and timing, probably overshadow anything he did during the war.

KAISER AND THE GOVERNMENT

Almost everybody who knows anything at all about United States business seems to think he knows the secret of Kaiser's success, a colossal ambition coupled with an endless supply of Government money and Government favors. That Kaiser has a colossal ambition needs no qualification. But that Government money alone made him what he is today needs qualification and definition. Let us review the bare facts in the Kaiser-and-Government-money legend up to 1946.

Much is made of the fact that Kaiser started working for Government early. He did. But as an aggressive young paving contractor and a resourceful dam builder, he

necessarily judged his proficiency as a private enterpriser in terms of his ability to land Government contracts in competitive bidding and make money on them. So did his bankers, who thought so well of him he never had trouble raising money for his deals. It is true that Kaiser's second major entry into processing (sand and gravel were first) was influenced by Government policy. At this date, however, the deal seems to rebound almost wholly to Kaiser's credit.

What happened was that he had smarted under the fixed prices of a west coast cement combine for years and wanted to break it. So did the Government. Kaiser saw his chance in 1939, when the United States Bureau of Reclamation called for bids on 5,000,000 barrels of cement for Shasta Dam. Although Kaiser had no cement plant, he worked with his engineers, underbid the combine sharply, raised hell until Washington considered his bid, and looked around for money to build a plant. When his friend A. P. Giannini, of the Bank of America, turned him down because he wasn't a cement man, he went to the RFC's Jesse Jones. Jones laughed at him first, then offered him \$3,000,000 at 5 percent. Once the RFC made the offer, Giannini relented and gave him the money at 4 percent. With this, with \$580,000 of his own and some \$1,750,000 belonging to his contractor associates, including members of the "Big Six," Kaiser founded Permanente Cement Co., which today is one of the world's largest and most profitable cement companies.

When war came, Kaiser just naturally went out for Government jobs—as indeed did hundreds of other industrialists who regarded themselves as patriotic. After Roosevelt's famous 1940 speech calling for 50,000 planes a year, Kaiser plunged himself and his engineers in a whirlwind of activity and came up with a plan to build all the required plane plants at no profit to himself whatsoever, provided he were allowed to operate some of them. Washington expressed amazement and amusement. But Kaiser was not discouraged. He had already got into shipbuilding with Todd and briefly channeled most of his extraordinary energy into more of it.

The story of the phenomenal shipbuilding achievements of Kaiser and his contractor associates has been told often, but the story of just how much Kaiser got out of it has not. At the House merchant-marine investigation in 1946 much was made of the fact that "Kaiser's companies" made a net profit of \$192,000,000 on an investment of \$2,500,000. As so often happens, the facts were set right only after days of involved and repetitious testimony—and after the newspapers had lost interest.

The facts may be oversimplified with tolerable accuracy. The Kaiser investment in shipyards was nearly \$2,000,000 and other investors and banks put up \$30,000,000 more. The profits from the yards Kaiser managed (he owned only one operating company outright and had a small interest in some he did not manage) were \$140,000,000 on shipbuilding, before taxes. After taxes they would have been about \$40,000,000. But Kaiser actually got \$5,600,000 in dividends (before taxes) from all his shipbuilding companies because (1) the other shareholders, of course, got their cut; and (2) two of the most profitable shipbuilding companies showed little profit in the aggregate because they made things other than ships, on which they lost money.

What happened was that Kaiser saw the potential of light metals and persuaded his associates to go along with him into the formation of a company, Permanente Metals, to make magnesium. They balked at putting up their own money, but agreed to pledge shipyard profits against an RFC loan to build a plant. Though profits from Permanente Metals' shipbuilding were \$58,000,-

000, the magnesium losses were \$28,000,000 after amortization, and taxes took \$21,000,000. Thus, the wartime net for the company was only \$9,000,000 after the RFC loan had been paid off.

Kaiser also wanted to go into steel, but his contractor associates were unwilling to go along with him. So Kaiser went it alone, set up Kaiser Co., Inc., which built a steel mill on an RFC loan that it secured with shipyard profits. Through the war Kaiser Co., Inc. made \$41,000,000 on shipbuilding, but lost \$44,000,000 on steel, after amortization.

Some of Kaiser's critics have remarked that if he had been content to stay in shipbuilding and not been consumed with the yearning to be a great industrialist, the Government might have realized some \$100,000,000 more in taxes.¹ But in using his shipbuilding profits to shore up his other deals, Kaiser was doing nothing illegal or unique; every company that draws up a consolidated balance sheet does the same thing. And Kaiser did, after all, risk many sure millions that would have gone to him had he been content with ships.

It is possible that his greatest wartime gain was the experience and confidence his boys acquired as managers of the shipyards and other operations. Men who had hardly turned 30—Henry's son Edgar among them—became accomplished superintendents and general managers, accustomed to directing and dealing with tens of thousands of employees. As for Henry, he spent a good deal of spare time on his dreamboat ideas—his plans for and models of his autos and railroad cars and airplanes, all housed in a small plant near Oakland that he called his hobby lobby.

But what were his tangible wartime acquisitions? Aside from \$5,600,000 in dividends (before taxes), there were three big physical assets, each of which might have been considered as much a source of consternation as of satisfaction. The steel mill at Fontana, encumbered with a \$100,000,000 RFC loan, was inefficient, equipped to make nothing but plate and structural steel and merchant bars, and virtually doomed without expensive additions. The ill-fated magnesium venture had to be closed down, with only a small chemical business and \$3,000,000 in cash left. Kaiser Fleetwings, of Bristol, Pa., an aircraft subcontracting company that Henry had picked up for \$1,695,000 and partially financed with a \$1,000,000 RFC loan, was apparently in extremis. The only going concerns were Gypsum, acquired in 1944 with sand-and-gravel money, and the prewar companies—construction, sand and gravel, cement, and insurance. In short, Kaiser did not have a thing that automatically made him a great industrialist. Something else had to be added. That something, obviously, was management.

KAISER AND HIS SUNSHINE BOYS

The art of managing a dynamic civilian organization, which is the quintessence of the art of leadership, has been analyzed to death as a science, but it remains as much an art as it ever was. The important change has come in the type of man who practices it. The "great" man, the glamorous character who inspired veneration partly because people tend to venerate that which they cannot understand, has all but disappeared from business. He has given way to the more anonymous executive whose natural talent for enlisting the support and best abilities of people expresses itself quietly and unostentatiously. He gets their respect and confidence not because they are dazzled by his halo but because they know his shortcomings as well as his abilities.

¹ Kaiser men automatically retort that the Government has collected, from Kaiser's postwar operation of war plants, some \$139,000,000 in taxes that it might not have received except for Kaiser's enterprise.

Regarded superficially, Henry Kaiser does not seem very much like the latter type. He drives himself and others steadily, blunty, oblivious to everything but the goal. Because his psyche was unscarred by depression—his contracting business, thanks in the main to Government dams, flourished then as never before—he is just a great big optimist. "Since you can't be clairvoyant," he explains, "you have to be an optimist." He is also a dogmatic visionary. His vision and imagination do not express themselves in a perception of the fine relationships between people and things, however. They express themselves in a kind of vast, indiscriminate drive to tackle any plausible project that may come to mind. If somebody could make amphibious office buildings sound possible, he probably would seriously propose to make them. Although he looks about as subtle as an avalanche, he is in some ways a most intuitive man, and consequently he plays his hunches hard. He possesses, in short, many of the characteristics of the autocratic operator who gives orders ex cathedra, keeps talent at a distance, and ruins the dispositions if not the lives of his subordinates and associates.

Actually Henry Kaiser does no such thing. The secret—or the least understood fact—of his success is that he has chosen and built up a group of managers who as a group probably have no peer anywhere. It is not that any one of them is a genius. It is that under Henry they consistently outperform themselves. Kaiser's great talent is his ability to choose good men and get them to work twice as hard, twice as long, and twice as effectively as they would for anyone else. And what is more, he has had the sense and tact to use their talents to compensate for his own deficiencies.

Kaiser has done this simply by letting as many men as possible in on making the important decisions and thenceforth giving them almost complete responsibility. This group-management system developed naturally enough. As a contractor who pooled his talents with other contractors in bidding on jobs, Kaiser early acquired the habit of talking through a problem and coming to a joint decision. He continued to do so in his own company. "On a bidding job," Clay Bedford recalls, "H. J. used to get everybody in and ask for estimates. Then he'd set his price at just half the general consensus and sell like hell. And everybody would say, 'but Henry you can't do it for that,' and he'd ask why and everybody would tell him in great detail. And then he would get convinced and go to twice the figure and sell that just as hard as the first one. He would sit quietly by himself, and then he would make up his mind, and away we'd go."

The system is different today mainly in that Kaiser usually does not make the decision alone. A conference on steel, for example, may start in General Manager Jack Ashby's office, where any number of subordinates are called in, proceed to the office of Eugene Trefethen, adjourn to the executive lunchroom downstairs, pick up again on the Lark on the way to Fontana, and be settled 2 days later in Kaiser's own office. In the end Kaiser's view may prevail, but again it may not. Everybody is not only encouraged but expected to have something to say. Not that Kaiser deliberately baits his boys, he has no sense of humor. "Whenever he says anything, no matter how mild," says one, "he means it. But the point is that it all works out as if he had a sense of humor. He listens to us."

Henry is also candid and guileless with them. Last April, 4 weeks after Mrs. Kaiser died, Kaiser decided to marry her nurse. He called the men together and told them. "I haven't time to do what the other average person does, to slide around corners," he said. "This is a constructive move, and in 60 days I will be a sweeter, simpler, more useful person because of it." Because he is

so candid, he has made his men feel that in some ways they are smarter or more knowledgeable than he; and no men talk more freely about the boss. There are in Kaiser's organization few of the inhibitions that afflict the subordinates of a man who makes it his business to be right all the time. But because they have enormous respect for Henry's courage, candor, and resourcefulness, they overlook his defects and back him with all they've got.

Probably because they have had to think constantly in terms of new things, Kaiser's top men have also developed a remarkable versatility. New assignments for them have often meant a change of function as well as location. A. B. Ordway, for example, began as a laborer in 1912 and has since sold sand and gravel, managed the insurance company, and helped run Richmond shipyards and Kaiser Services, the horizontal company that supplies most of the Kaiser interests with office facilities, industrial relations, legal and financial talent, and so forth. Even Carl Olson, Henry's sand-and-gravel vice president, has moved around in cement and gypsum. About the only exception to the rule is George G. Sherwood, who has been at the helm of the Kaiser treasury for more than 30 years. Yet what with all of Henry's new financial situations, Sherwood has not exactly been in a groove.

The younger men, too, move about a lot. Kaiser discovered that an intelligent and talented executive gains immeasurably from tackling new situations. Once he gains such experience, his very ignorance about a new situation is an advantage rather than a handicap. Kaiser's theory is meeting its supreme test at Kaiser-Frazer, where his "sunshine boys," as they are known in Detroit, are encountering the roughest new situation they could hope to find anywhere (see p. 74).

At the very top of the group versatility becomes virtuosity. Aside from Kaiser himself, who always knows more about the details of his concerns than he seems interested in, there are his two right-hand men; his son Edgar and Eugene Trefethen Jr. Both are about the same age; both have Henry's energy and capacity to concentrate fruitfully on a dozen different subjects in the course of a morning. Because they are not given to extreme flights of creative or emotional fancy, they have made an all-around better impression than Henry. Trefethen might be called Henry's deputy, since he handles everything that Kaiser is interested in; whereas Edgar, although he holds down many jobs, is concentrating on Kaiser-Frazer, of which he is president.

It would be a mistake, however, to get the idea that Kaiser's organization is all fire-works and footwork. One of its distinguishing characteristics is the thoroughness with which it does things. A very important man is George Havas, a Hungarian-born engineer whom Kaiser met in Cuba while building a highway there. Havas heads up Kaiser Engineers, Henry's engineering division, which designed or engineered most of the dams, highways, tunnels, laboratories, water-supply systems that Kaiser worked on before the war, and the steel and cement expansions and so on that he has built since. Havas also does the vital job of researching and reporting on Henry's dreamboat ideas. During the past 20 years there have been few fields of human endeavor that he has not analyzed as something for Henry to get into.

Another example of Kaiser thoroughness is Chad Calhoun, who since 1940 has handled the Kaiser affairs in Washington. He now has a staff of 13 men, but insists he runs no lobbying office. He makes a point of doing no fancy entertaining and making no political contributions. ("The Democrats have let us know it; I guess they sometimes think we're contributing to the Republicans.") The secret of the Kaiser success in getting Government work, aside from

the very positive pressures Henry himself exerts as a public figure, is hard work. Calhoun and his staff devoted their time to following the papers—I. e., keeping a day-by-day check on every certificate of necessity or other paper involving bureaucratic approval, and telephoning or otherwise needling the responsible people. Kaiser's Washington office, which has just moved into handsome quarters in the new Cafritz Building, has never been busier than it is today. As he was last time, Henry is out to get at least his share of defense work.

The Kaiser companies are run to close tolerances, considering their youth and the turmoil they've been through. Salaries, at least at the top level, are relatively low, expense accounts are watched carefully, and the accounting is spectacularly thorough. "Over a period of 15 years I've loaned them two hundred—three hundred million, I'm not sure which," says F. A. Ferroggiaro, senior vice chairman of the board of directors of the Bank of America. "Instead of busting they're getting more solid every day."

It was this solidity that enabled Kaiser to establish himself financially. Late in 1946 Kaiser met George Woods, now board chairman of the First Boston Corp., who took a sharp if not effusive interest in the Kaiser situation. The more Woods looked, the more promising it looked. He went out of his way to intercede for Kaiser Steel before the RFC, helped finance other Kaiser ventures like Metal Products, advised in the K-F crisis, and introduced the Kaisers to the Mellon bank. After lining up 460 security dealers, he took the lead in the steel refinancing, and organized a group to make the original public offering of aluminum stock. "The problem," says Woods, "was mainly to get these boys accepted in eastern banking and industrial circles." That he has, and Woods now functions as a kind of minister of finance, is in touch with the Kaisers and Trefethen nearly every day.

So there it is—a kind of inspired resourcefulness combined with extremely hard work and thoroughgoing day-to-day operations. In his audacious, bumbling, but highly intuitive way Henry Kaiser has built up a management group that provides the perfect foil for his excesses. Journalists and other observers who saw him in his more exuberantly imaginative days had a hard time equating his words with any conceivable deeds. They did not understand that his propensity for letting his landslide of an imagination loose and his habit of donning the savior's cloak, far from being a nuisance or handicap, were a great advantage. Like the antics of a gifted if histrionic conductor, they kept the orchestra whipped up and the public engaged too. So today. The more challenges he throws at his men, the higher they seem to rise to meet them. "You boys," he tells them, "own and run the business." And they go ahead and behave as if they did.

They certainly did in steel and aluminum, Kaiser's two biggest postwar triumphs. In 1940 Kaiser put Havas to work on the subject of an integrated western steel plant, and Havas, contrary to nearly all expert opinion, turned in a report that extolled the economics of locating in the Los Angeles area. Kaiser did nothing about it until late in the year, when his shipyards began to run short of plate. Then he stormed Washington for more than a year trying to get the RFC's Defense Plant Corporation to erect a plant on the coast. DPC eventually put more than \$1,200,000,000 into steel facilities, including \$200,000,000 into a new mill at Geneva, Utah, to be run by United States Steel, but Kaiser got nothing. He borrowed the money from RFC and erected his own plant, securing it with profits from 3 shipyards still unbuilt.

The loan was approved one day in February 1942. Immediately Kaiser called Havas from Washington.

"George," he said, "go out and build a steel plant."

"What kind of steel plant?" Havas asked. "Why just a steel plant—a small one," said Henry. So George Havas, who had previously decided that the seacoast was the logical location, picked a site that met the approval of the military, which specified that it be located at least 50 miles inland. That site was in an orange-grove area near Fontana, in San Bernardino Valley. By early April, when ground was broken, Havas had bought an iron mine and was designing the steel mill. Republic Steel helped with the blast furnace. Then one of Henry's dam-building executives named Tom Price stepped in to help. Forbidden to buy plate-mill equipment from priority-laden Mesta or United, Havas and Price had it made by Lewis Foundry & Machine, which had never built this type of mill before. Unable to obtain unrestricted WPB priorities, they spent \$1,000,000 expediting materials. But they blew in the blast furnace on December 30, 1942, several months ahead of Geneva, which had been started 6 months earlier.

Fontana's war record was good. It made more ship plate than Geneva, and reduced costs steadily. But many heads were shaken about its peacetime prospects. There was little demand in sight for plate, its primary product, and it needed at least \$20,000,000 worth of equipment to diversify. Thus the postwar struggle to make Fontana pay was a struggle to install new machinery. RFC had the \$100,000,000 mortgage, so the battle was primarily with RFC. To Kaiser as to others the RFC displayed the deep contradiction in its mandate, which is to lend money to those who can't get it elsewhere, and yet to make sound loans. Having lent the money for long-term capital purposes, RFC proceeded to watch it as not even the stingiest banker watches working-capital loans. "It cost us a lot of money, the RFC," says Gene Trefethen. "If we'd had only a normal banker-client relation, the plant would have been further along than it is now."

For one thing, the terms of the loan were so onerous that it was hard to put anything away for expansion. As late as 1947 the interest payments left the company with hardly enough for the payroll. Kaiser battled to have the terms revised. He also joined forces with a group of Los Angeles steel users who journeyed to Washington to have the debt revised, but by then revision was politically impossible.

Thus, although the mill operated at 106 percent of capacity in 1947 and showed an operating profit, interest charges were so heavy that there was a loss after depreciation. It was then that George Woods appeared before RFC and testified that it was impossible for Fontana to meet the terms of the loan and build up its resources. He proposed that RFC take second position to a group of private bondholders, among whom he thought he could place \$25,000,000. But RFC turned him down too. In the fall of 1948 Kaiser took advantage of the sellers' market for steel, raised prices about \$30 a ton, and kept them up until the next spring. The howls of dismay were audible in Washington, but nothing came of them. Kaiser's men agree that the good will they lost reduced the value of the \$10,000,000 or so they gained, but as they point out, you can't meet a payroll with good will.

What was as bad as the terms of the debt, they say, was that RFC delayed Fontana in expanding and diversifying out of earnings. In 1945 Fontana was allowed to spend only \$11,500,000 of the \$45,000,000 it wanted to spend, and therefore had to be content with only a continuous-weld pipe mill and a skelp mill to go with it. Not until June of 1948 did RFC O. K. an 86-inch hot-strip mill, an electric-weld pipe mill, and one more open hearth. And Fontana still needed another blast furnace, coke ovens, and other facilities.

Kaiser's case against the RFC, to be sure, was perhaps not so unequivocal as it sounds. Between what he regards as a dead certainty and what a banker regards as a dead certainty there is necessarily a profound gulf. But it seems fairly clear that the RFC, perhaps to avoid even a show of favoritism, went to the extreme of jeopardizing its own investment.

What turned the tide for Fontana was not any relenting on the part of RFC but a stroke of luck and alertness. It so happened that Clay Bedford, who was hunting for something to trade for steel for Kaiser-Frazer, ran across Claude A. Williams, president of Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corp., who had to line up steel before he could get an FPC permit to go ahead with his pipeline. Bedford passed the word along to Trefethen, who made the most of the opportunity. Williams agreed not only to give Fontana a \$53,000,000 order but to advance \$10,560,000 in cash, of which \$9,000,000 was to be applied against a second blast furnace and other facilities. It took 2 months to sell the deal to RFC, but in the end Fontana was expanded and took another big step toward becoming an integrated, low-cost operation.

So finally, in the late summer of 1950, Kaiser and Woods were ready to pull out from under the RFC with their biggest financing to date. The deal raised \$125,000,000—\$60,000,000 in first mortgage bonds, \$40,000,000 in stock units, and \$25,000,000 in bank credit. By that time Kaiser had reduced his RFC debt, out of earnings, from \$123,000,000 to \$91,000,000. Thus there was enough left not only to pay off the loan, but to add \$5,400,000 to working capital and to invest \$25,000,000 in much-needed expansion. The deal was more than the payoff for 10 tough years, it was a kind of official recognition of Kaiser's arrival as an industrialist.

Today there is no doubt at all about Fontana or the early analysis by Kaiser's engineers. Its young operators, headed by George McMeans, have succeeded in reducing its hot-metal costs, despite an 800-mile coal haul by rail, to the very lowest in the country. Although the freight rate on coal is not particularly cheap, the coal is company-owned, coke consumption per ton of iron is among the lowest in the country, and ore comes from a large company-owned open-pit mine at Eagle Mountain, only 150 miles away.

What is equally important—and what Havas and his engineers perceived—Fontana is right in its major market area. That means it enjoys a transportation advantage over eastern mills of anywhere from \$10 to \$30 a ton. Kaiser's men were smart enough to see what now gravels the west coast steel consumers. This "phantom" freight would afford Kaiser Steel a price umbrella until it chose to compete pricewise. In the year ending June 1950 Fontana turned out 1,100,000 tons of ingots and grossed nearly \$85,000,000, on which it earned a net after taxes of nearly \$12,000,000. Despite its rather high capital costs, the ratio of net to sales is right on the national average, and the ratio of gross profit to sales is considerably above it. It can probably break even at 60 percent of capacity. But nobody seems to worry about that; ingot capacity is being expanded to 1,380,000 tons, and a tin-plate mill of 200,000 tons is under construction. Barring economic catastrophe, Kaiser Steel seems to have as bright a future, out there in the Golden West, as any steel operation in the United States.

KAISER'S ALUMINUM

Probably no respectable, nonwar company has ever come up so fast as Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp. Five years ago it consisted of nothing except ambition and the remains of the magnesium operation. Today it is one of the Big Three (after Alcoa and Reynolds), expanding capacity to 540,-

000,000 pounds, or more than the whole United States production prewar. Sales for the current year will be about \$150,000,000, and profits have been running at 12 percent of sales, against 9.8 percent for Alcoa and 7.5 percent for Reynolds.

The story of the company, although a good example of how Kaiser works with his management group, is perhaps an even better example of how he sells his men and carries them along with him when he is on the beam. Kaiser had been interested in aluminum since 1941, partly because he wanted to make aluminum planes, and Chad Calhoun had been making overtures for Government-owned plants as early as December 1944. Then, at the end of the war, there arose the question of what to do with the three small plants and chemical business of Permanente Metals. "To make a masterpiece of understatement," says D. A. "Dusty" Rhoades, the company's general manager, "aluminum was not the only thing under consideration." In January 1946, Havas finished a report on aluminum and it was not encouraging. But Kaiser's enthusiasm balanced the report. And Kaiser—and some of his boys, including Calhoun—was convinced that now was the time to buy facilities and talent cheaply, and that the much-talked-about postwar depression would not materialize. Their belief broke up an old Kaiser partner-ship. At that time Permanente Metals was owned not only by Kaiser but by his contracting-shipbuilding associates, and, on Kaiser's insistence on getting into aluminum, three of them decided to get out of Permanente.

That left the company with about \$3,000,000 in cash. Immediately Kaiser arranged a \$15,750,000 line of credit with the Bank of America, guaranteed as usual by himself and the associates who remained, and rented from RFC three plants that had been operated by Alcoa during the war; a reduction plant and a rolling mill at Spokane and an alumina plant at Baton Rouge. Nearly everybody thought Kaiser was crazy. The Bank of America, Henry's old associates who walked out on him, and even Sam Husbands of RFC saw no immediate future in aluminum. Husbands, after all, had sent out no fewer than 281 letters and wires offering the plants at bargain prices, and got only a few other bites. But rarely have so many wise men been so far off in their predictions. By the time Kaiser Aluminum began to operate (July 1946), the aluminum glut had changed to a shortage, and the newly organized sales department found itself allocating instead of selling metal. By the end of May 1947, after less than a year of operation, the company showed aluminum sales of \$41,700,000 and a net of \$5,300,000.

The company's success emboldened it to start negotiations with General Services Administration for more capacity, and in February 1947, it paid \$3,000,000 for a reduction plant at Tacoma. Then occurred a setback. It was nothing more than the seasonal spring slump, but Kaiser's men still had to learn that business usually fell off in the spring. The rolling mill had to be operated at 40 percent of capacity, and pig had to be stockpiled. But the slump lasted only a short while, and both in sales and in net profit the second year was better than the first. And by July 1948, the company marketed 600,000 shares at \$15 (now selling at \$32, after a 20 percent stock dividend) through the First Boston Corp. and Dean Witter.

About the end of 1949 Kaiser began to needle Rhoades for further expansion. When the spring slump failed to appear, Kaiser increased his needling, calling up for the records and ordering sales charts made every other day. But Rhoades and his men still weren't sure about expansion. "I couldn't prove he was wrong," says Rhoades, "and he couldn't prove he was right." But to be

on the safe side, Rhoades assigned engineers to line up power and machinery. The final decision was to build both a 200,000,000-pound-a-year reduction plant and power facilities in the New Orleans area and to open up Jamaican bauxite deposits.

Immediately after the Korean war started Kaiser bombarding the Munitions Board with wires, "Kaiser Aluminum is prepared to go ahead immediately," he said. "What does the Government intend to do?" Kaiser Aluminum did not, however, announce its plans until Stuart Symington announced the industry program: the Government agreed to underwrite the industry by taking output from all new capacity for at least 2½ years.

It was this guarantee, by a colossal irony, that enabled Kaiser to say that all his companies except Kaiser-Frazer were out of hock to the Government. For immediately it was firm. Woods swung into a prepared campaign to borrow no less than \$115,000,000 from 18 insurance companies and 8 banks. It was enough not only to finance the current expansion program, which is raising capacity by 60 percent, but to pay every nickel of the \$37,394,250 that the company owed General Services Administration for the war plants it first rented and then bought on time payments. The decision was made to borrow rather than issue stock because (1) the Government-guaranteed purchase would enable the company to pay nearly half the money back, and (2) the Kaiser group's equity, now 49.7 percent, would not be diluted.

Kaiser Aluminum has worked hard in what it calls the chemical end of its business—dolomite for roofing and metallurgical purposes; magnesia for many uses; and basic refractories or firebricks for kilns and furnaces. These are turned out in the plants left over from the magnesium experiment—the dolomite quarry at Nativid and the magnesia and refractory plant at Moss Landing, Calif. Currently this "chemical" business amounts to \$8,000,000 a year (against \$1,600,000 in 1946), and probably earns an even higher percentage of profit than basic aluminum.

And Rhoades did not coast along on the fact that primary aluminum has a very comfortable profit margin. The production superintendents and plant managers, some of whom were formerly employed by Alcoa and Reynolds in lesser capacities, are making valuable experiments and innovations. This is perhaps why, despite the disadvantage of scattered plants, involving much cross hauling (alumina is made in Louisiana and shipped to the Northwest for reduction and rolling), the company is earning more money than its competitors who have no such consistent disadvantage.

EVEN MY BOYS GET CONSERVATIVE

Such are the postwar triumphs of Henry Kaiser. What else is to be said about the success of this intrepid entrepreneur and his sunshine boys? What, first of all, is to be said about his talent for pulling at the Government jug? Not even Henry denies he has been helped immensely by it. He only notes that he has not been favored, that on the contrary he has had to fight and even make a nuisance of himself for Government business, that he is not the only one doing so, that he has paid or intends to pay Government money back with full interest, and that he has paid at least as much as the going rate for surplus property. He makes the point, which nobody has yet been able to disprove, that his dealings have been meticulously honest, and that he has usually bent over backward to avoid even any appearance of irregularity. He could make the point that the mighty American entrepreneurs of the past often accumulated their capital by methods that would have landed him behind bars. And he could also make the point that if a free enterpriser be defined

as a man who takes both risks and every legitimate opportunity, he's by definition an outstanding free enterpriser.

He could also make the more timely point that he never went to the Government when he could raise money elsewhere, and that his success is a perfect demonstration of the fact that United States tax laws prevent the accumulation of private risk capital on the scale that it should be accumulated under the enterprise system. History, which seems to overlook in her heroes the traits that irritate their contemporaries, may treat the Kaiser-Government-money theme with great generosity.

Whether history will speak as well of Henry's perspicacity only time will tell. Despite the checks and balances of his managers, Kaiser has made mistakes. He made a mistake on magnesium, and on tentative ventures like helicopters, and maybe he has made one on Kaiser-Frazer. Plainly his greatest victories were in many ways close shaves. When others were worrying about the postwar fate of the expanded far west, Kaiser saw nothing but a bright future ahead of it, and never doubted for a minute that an integrated steel plant there could make good. Yet even a moderate depression might have squeezed him out of Fontana. When all other manufacturers avoided aluminum, he plunged boldly into it. Yet even a year's delay in the pick-up of aluminum demand might have put him out of the running. Unless we assume that Henry Kaiser has occult powers, we must also allow for the chance that Kaiser can and maybe will sometime make a beauf of a mistake. The only problem he has not yet faced is hard time, and it is a major one.

But new influences have been brought to bear. All Kaiser's companies with public ownership now have outside directors, and Gene Trefethen and son Edgar and even Henry himself are meticulous in their relations with these directors, performing the chore of regularly informing them of what goes on in the companies. Kaiser's group of managers, who have been saying no to him for years, can almost certainly be counted on to say no more frequently. Henry himself feels it coming. "They all fall down when it comes to expansion," he complains. "Even my boys get conservative. . . . Gene keeps talking about the cash balance in business, and how he would like a fifty or sixty million cash balance. I never heard of such a thing as a fifty million cash balance in one business. . . . Why, I'd have thirty or forty millions less in Kaiser companies if I'd followed my banker's advice."

Musing in such a mood, he recently told a reporter, "I want a new committee. A dream committee. I want somebody to help me to think up ways to expand."

Next day the reporter mentioned the dream committee to Trefethen. "Dream committee?" asked Trefethen, showing no surprise. "Haven't heard of that one yet."

Dedication of the Golden Slipper Square Club Camp for Underprivileged Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the Record an ad-

dress delivered by me at the dedication of the Golden Slipper Square Club Camp for Underprivileged Children, at Bartonsville, Monroe County, Pa., on Sunday afternoon, July 15, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am happy to take part in these splendid ceremonies because they represent the highest standards of good citizenship in action. Here, in this beautiful region of Pennsylvania, you have created an outstanding example of devotion to human welfare.

You have built a living symbol of the spirit of our Republic—the spirit of helpfulness, good will, and tolerance.

In providing this camp, and through its many other benevolent activities, the Golden Slipper Square Club has gained an honored place among those we are proud to call benefactors of humanity.

It has been the good fortune of the United States that many individuals and families who have accumulated wealth, have contributed so generously to advance the public welfare.

Great foundations have been established for scientific and medical research, for the support of schools and colleges, for art and music and for religious and charitable purposes.

Billions of dollars make up the endowments which enable these institutions to serve our people and to stimulate our material, cultural, and spiritual progress.

These foundations offer a great and convincing argument for the free enterprise system, under which the United States, in the short span of 175 years, has become the wealthiest and most powerful Nation on earth.

They demonstrate clearly that free men and women will serve the cause of human brotherhood so much better than any dictatorship or any army of bureaucratic planners.

This camp is representative of a great and worthy human impulse—to do good, to brighten the lives of children and to help in their development—without regard for race, color, or creed.

No more noble purpose can be served than that which helps guide the footsteps of little children toward a better life.

Everything we possess in America, all of our vast progress, all of our cultural and spiritual attainments—were made possible because our plan of government was based upon two fundamental principles—freedom of the individual and equality of opportunity.

Our Republic was founded upon a philosophy of human dignity and freedom under God. Its ideals are based on the eternal truths of the Holy Bible—the divine teachings that are the essence of every religious faith.

The spirit of tolerant religion has guided our statesmen—soldiers—Government officials—educators, and our people.

The founding fathers planned a government on the proposition that "all men are created equal and that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights." Among those rights they listed "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

It is important to note that they placed emphasis on the pursuit of happiness. They realized that happiness can be attained only by individual effort. No government can guarantee happiness.

The patriots who established American independence prized liberty above life itself. They feared that government could become oppressive.

They knew from the pages of history that an all-powerful, centralized government always produces tyranny and robs the people of their liberty. They believed with Thomas

Jefferson that "the least governed are the best governed."

Therefore, in framing the Constitution, they sought to limit the power of the central government and to restrict its authority over the lives of the people.

Their aim was to create a system under which men would be free to work, to save, to build and to retain the fruits of their labor.

That plan of economic freedom was based on the right of men to own property, and to enjoy the rewards of their industry, initiative, courage, and thrift.

It provided the incentive which unleashed the potential energy and the resourcefulness of free Americans.

It built the greatest empire of industry, commerce, agriculture, and transportation in all history. It gave our people the highest living standards of all times.

But most important, it has held wide open the golden doors of opportunity for every young man and young woman—no matter how humble his origin or his circumstances.

American freedom extends—without limit, equal opportunity for every boy and girl to reach the highest place in industry, business, the professions or in Government.

It has always offered the same opportunity to the boy born in a log cabin as the one who started life in a mansion.

The boy from the city tenement could rise to the same high place as any other.

No barrier prevented the recent immigrant or his son from advancing, equally with the Mayflower descendant.

Our history is filled with shining examples of this truth.

When I think of opportunity I think of the sturdy, courageous pioneers who braved the savage wilderness to find homes where they could be free.

I think of the brave men and women who pushed westward to new frontiers in search of better opportunities for themselves and their children.

I think of the illustrious patriots of 1776 who pledged "their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor" in the cause of liberty and independence.

I think of Abraham Lincoln studying by the light of a log fire to prepare for the great task to which he was called by destiny.

I think of the many hard-working men in the shops and factories who applied American inventiveness to their job and created new machines to lighten the burden of everyday life.

I think of Thomas Edison, Henry Ford, George Westinghouse, Walter Chrysler, Harvey Firestone, and a long list of other American workmen who rose from overalls to leadership in giant industries.

And I think also of the thousands of fine, patriotic citizens who fled from tyranny and persecution in their native lands to find freedom and opportunity—to grow and prosper in the New World.

When I think of all these wonderful elements that have contributed to the greatness of our country I am reminded of the solemn obligation that rests upon each and every one of us.

And that is to preserve for all time the divine endowment of freedom and to hand down in all its strength and glory our rich heritage of liberty, independence, and opportunity.

It is up to us to see that we leave to future generations the same kind of America that we have enjoyed.

Yes; we have enjoyed many blessings, but nevertheless we are not free from danger.

The worst evils that strike at our liberties are public debt, deficit financing, excessive taxation, and extravagant spending by all levels of government.

The high cost of big government can destroy our freedom.

Only 20 years ago the total cost of operating the Federal Government, including the

Army and Navy, was less than \$4,000,000,000 a year.

The budget submitted by President Truman for the present fiscal year, which began July 1, calls for the expenditure of \$71,500,000,000. And it has been estimated that this figure will climb in 1953 to eighty or ninety billion dollars.

In my opinion, that is the road to national bankruptcy and the loss of all freedom. It would centralize in Washington all power and authority and would destroy the sacred right of self-government.

It would place such a heavy burden of taxation upon every individual that it would destroy all incentive.

It would dry up the sources of investment capital upon which we must depend for the expansion of productive industry and economic opportunity.

Unless the present trend of reckless and extravagant spending by Government is checked it will be impossible for any individual or family to accumulate the wealth necessary to establish endowments and foundations such as have been created in the past.

It will be impossible to obtain the voluntary contributions needed for the support of our colleges, our hospitals, our churches, temples, and synagogues, and all other institutions that uphold our cultural and spiritual standards.

It will be a tragic day for America when these traditional factors of the American way of life must become dependent upon the Government for financial aid.

When that day comes, American freedom will hang in the balance. The youth of our land will be robbed of any opportunity to pet ahead America, as we have known it, will be a thing of the past.

Therefore, I plead with you to join in the fight for a solvent America because that means a free America.

I ask you to exert all your influence for the strictest economy, not only at the Federal level, but also by State and local governments.

We must have sound fiscal policies.

We must have a stable currency.

We must have balanced budgets.

In these days of crisis, when the world is threatened by Communist aggression, we must not curtail or halt our defense preparations.

But every other proposed expenditure, not related to the safety and security of our country, must be held down to the bare necessities. This is no time for fancy frills in Government.

In closing I want to congratulate most heartily my brethren of the Golden Slipper Square Club, not only on the splendid camp we dedicate today, but also on its magnificent record of worthy projects undertaken through the years.

Your organization has never sought public acclaim for its good works, but has gone ahead, without ostentation, assisting those who need a helping hand.

To the children who are the guests of the Golden Slipper Square Club I have a word of advice which I hope they will heed now and in later life.

To them I say, Learn the meaning of America. Learn the meaning of patriotism and love of our flag. Learn the fundamentals of good citizenship.

Be true to the teachings of your religious faith. All religions that worship God make up the spiritual strength of our country.

Those of us who are Christians can serve our country best by being better Christians.

The American who is of the faith of Israel can be a better American if he is a better Jew.

Together we can go forward in fellowship and understanding, respecting the rights of each other, and reaching upward for the finer things of life that bring peace and friendship.

Report on European Trip by Members of the Foreign Relations Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Monday night, July 30, I delivered an address by transcription over Station WLS, Chicago, on the subject of the conclusions of the Committee on Foreign Relations as a result of the trip to Europe recently taken by members of the committee. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my broadcast be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WESTERN ALLIANCE IN MID-1951

Friends, I would like to report to you tonight regarding a trip which members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and I made to Europe recently.

During that 14-day trip we traveled over 13,000 air-miles. A trip like that is truly a miracle of the air age. If a passenger plane can travel that far that fast, think what Red bombers could do.

We visited seven countries and heard reports from American representatives in six additional lands. Among the distinguished personages with whom we spoke were His Holiness, Pope Pius, and the following distinguished leaders: Mr. Winston Churchill; President Auriol and Prime Minister Schuman, of France; General Eisenhower, United States Ambassador in Paris, London, Athens, Ankara, Madrid, Rome, High Commissioner McCloy in Germany, General Franco, the King and Queen of Greece, and others.

IS EIGHT AND ONE-HALF BILLION AID TO EUROPE JUSTIFIED?

This trip was paid for primarily out of Economic Cooperation Administration counterpart funds. An absolute minimum was involved in terms of direct cost to you, the American taxpayer. Actually, one of our aims in making the trip was to save money. How? Well, as you know, right now Congress is looking into a huge new \$8,500,000,000 appropriation bill which the administration has sent up to us for consideration. Eight and one-half billion dollars—that is a tremendous amount of money for you, the taxpayers, to spend. It is more than the total revenue of all the 48 States combined. Can that money be justified? Is it worth the sacrifices which our people will be asked to make? The answer to those questions will come partly out of the hearings now under way. But we got a good inkling as to what the answer should be during that 2-week trip.

CAN EUROPE BE DEFENDED?

We held hearings in every country we visited, we discussed matters of state from early in the morning till late at night. We asked questions which you, the taxpayers, might have asked if you were there.

Naturally, we were interested in the financial phase of the problem of Europe's defense. But far more crucial was the fundamental problem: Has Western Europe progressed toward genuine defense? Are our American boys now stationed under Ike Eisenhower holding a defensible position? Will Europe do its share rather than over-relying on American manpower and American money?

Now, friends, what did our Foreign Relations Committee find out? Well, here are a

few of the conclusions which I personally reached.

Here they are:

MARSHALL PLAN HAS WORKED

1. Western Europe has indeed made genuine progress toward full economic recovery. In every country we visited, statistics of production told a heartening story. The Marshall plan has worked. The wheels of industry are rolling. Trade has increased. Our economic aid program, as such, could be wound up relatively soon if—and it is a big if—there were not such a crucial need for strengthening of the military potential of the allied lands. Modern arms and ammunition require industrial production. The economic and military programs are therefore closely intertwined. Future aid, however, must and will be geared toward the manufacture of defense matériel.

THE WILL TO OPPOSE COMMUNISM HAS HARDENED

2. The Western European nations today have increased their will to resist communism. You know, my friends, that all of the aid in the world would matter as naught unless there were a genuine will, intent, and purpose in Europe to hold the fort, so to speak, against the menace of communism. This will to resist has been principally due to the presence of and the superb job performed by our own Gen. Dwight Ike Eisenhower.

Formerly there was a combination of fatalism and so-called neutralism in Western Europe. Peoples of the West felt fatalistic about their chances in relations to Soviet Russia. Twice, Western Europe, particularly France, had been relatively easily invaded by an aggressor. Why risk invasion and occupation a third time, many of these people felt. They were impressed by the Red Army's might, and they did not feel that even the powerful United States could stand up to Soviet Russia's legions. Now, however, the heroism of our own and allied forces in Korea, as well as other actions we have taken, have made a deep and favorable impression on these European peoples.

EUROPE'S DEFENSES CAN'T BE IMPROVED TOO FAST

3. The defenses of Europe, while they are considerably stronger than they were one year and two years ago, are obviously still pitifully weak in relation to the tremendous danger posed by 175 Red army divisions. There is no question but that, as of the present time and for a while to come, Russian forces could sweep to the English Channel if they were ever given orders to do so. We cannot, therefore, improve the West's defenses too fast. Time is of the essence.

CABINET CRISIS UNDERMINING DEFENSE

4. Political instability of Western European cabinets is proving a serious liability. While our committee was in Europe, France and Italy were struggling in a parliamentary crisis. In England, the Laborites, and Conservatives were parrying on the threshold of a possible early election.

Now of this land I know that political stability can't be created on a silver platter. Democracy often involves such instability, but that condition is a grave hazard—a grave luxury—in the Europe of today. There must be a heightened sense of responsibility in politician and public alike in Europe. This is no time for Europe's petty politics as usual. Free processes must be continued because, after all, that is why we are striving to defend our heritage. But freedom is one thing and chaos is another.

GREECE, TURKEY, AND SPAIN SHOULD BE ADMITTED

5. Now, fifth, there are still important gaps in the Western alliance. The three most important gaps could be filled by bringing in Turkey, Greece, and Spain so as to give us the benefit of their great military forces.

No one who recalls the brilliant deeds of the Greek people in defending themselves against communism, nor the heroism of Turkish fighting forces in Korea, can doubt for one moment their right to serve as our full allies.

Insofar as Spain is concerned, it is a fact, of course, that her Government is a dictatorship with which our people do not agree. But for that matter, so is the government of Marshal Tito in Yugoslavia a government which we are eagerly aiding. The important thing is that Spain has some 30 divisions, just as Yugoslavia has one of the largest military forces in Europe. And so, it is essential that we make full use of these forces which are bitterly anti-Soviet.

WEST GERMANY TURNING TO US

6. A sixth conclusion is that Franco-German cooperation, which is a key to Europe's defense, is making some progress. The Schuman plan for industrial integration holds forth great promise for resolving the previous bitter economic and other strife between France and Germany.

As for Western Germany itself, it is increasingly recognizing the need to pitch its lot actively with our side. The best single object lesson as to the meaning of communism is provided by Eastern Germany. Trapped behind the iron curtain, the eastern part of the Reich lives in economic, political, social, and spiritual night. The blackness of tyranny enfolds it with the dark forces of hunger, repression, hatred.

WE DON'T LIKE SPOON-FED REQUESTS

7. A seventh conclusion was that certain of our diplomatic and military officials were still trying to spoon feed Congress and the American people. Time after time, we received hints that we weren't being told the full picture as to the expected amount of men and money that would ultimately be required of us. Again and again, we would inquire as to whether we had been told about all—I repeat, all—the foreseeable requests which would be presented to the Congress. But we were left with the vague feeling that we were still getting the requests piecemeal—in spoon-fed doses.

That is not a factor calculated to succeed with the Congress or with our people. We are entitled to be told the full story as to how many divisions—how many billions—will be genuinely requested in the foreseeable future.

CONCLUSIONS

Well, friends, those, then, are some of my conclusions. I submit them humbly as food for thought for you, the people.

In summary, what we found in Europe was encouraging, but it provided no basis for smugness or complacency. The challenge of communism remains. Progress has been made against it. But the big job is still to be done by ourselves and by others. Too much must not be expected of America, but neither must we be guilty of doing too little. We are a part of the team. By teamwork we can win—we can preserve the peace and preserve prosperity. We will do our part. Let Europe do hers.

Thank you.

Release of Charles Luciano From Prison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the Record a radio address delivered by W. Kingsland Macy, of Islip, N. Y., on July 17, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

W. KINGSLAND MACY CONTINUES FIGHT AND DISCUSSES DEWEY AND LUCIANO

On June 19 I talked to you about keeping the barriers high against the infiltration of Suffolk County by racketeers and gangsters.

On August 21 every Suffolk Republican can strike a blow for good government by casting a ballot in the primary for E. Conway Plummer.

In a broadcast on July 3 I dealt at length with the infamous Hanley letter, and told the public why I refused Governor Dewey's frantic pleadings to destroy this incriminating letter. There is irony in the fact that Governor Dewey, who was clearly implicated in the letter as a participant with Hanley in a sordid deal, is seeking by underhanded methods to strike at my leadership in Suffolk County. Even before last election he turned his lieutenants loose to defeat me for Congress. He seeks my elimination because I would not go along and destroy the tangible evidence of guilt.

Tonight I want to talk to you about the release of Charles (Lucky) Luciano from prison. This is now a foremost topic of public discussion.

Perhaps, in order that the seriousness of Governor Dewey's parole of Luciano may be properly underscored, the subject can best be introduced by giving our listeners a brief quotation appearing in the June 30, 1951, issue of America, a leading national Catholic publication. In dealing with the dope plague in New York City, on page 321 of the issue referred to, America says, and I quote, "Significantly, the rise in dope peddling ('pushing') especially among the young has taken place since 1946, the year Governor Dewey released Charles (Lucky) Luciano from Sing Sing. The Federal Government thereupon deported him. From Italy, according to many officials, he has since poured dope into the United States."

Federal officials know this last sentence is true. Federal Narcotics Commissioner Harry Anslinger has unequivocally stated that Luciano has been on the international blacklist as a narcotics violator. The Senate Crime Committee has declared that Luciano is the master criminal who is directing dope distribution to this country from the sanctuary in Italy, which Governor Dewey made possible for him.

All of this leads directly to the big question, a question being asked daily by millions of deeply concerned and highly outraged Americans—especially mothers and fathers.

Why did Governor Dewey parole Luciano and release him from what amounted to a life term? That leads to a supplemental and equally important question. Why does Governor Dewey continue to remain silent on this matter?

Surely Governor Dewey must know that his continued refusal to make a direct, forthright statement about the Luciano release is a great embarrassment to every law-abiding citizen of New York State. They do not relish the fact their Governor is under a cloud. They wonder unhappily who the Governor's silence is shielding.

Luciano was convicted of white slavery on June 18, 1936. He was sentenced to from 30 to 50 years in the State penitentiary. In his statement to the court before Luciano was found guilty District Attorney Dewey characterized Luciano as the "greatest gangster in America" and said he should be "convicted for the safety of the public." The Luciano incarceration brought to Dewey the plaudits of a grateful public. As he said in one of his evasive comments last fall, when questioned about the Luciano release, "I'm

the guy who spent a year and a half of my life sending him to jail." One wonders if he will spend the rest of his life mutely disregarding demands that he tell why he opened up the jail doors for this arch criminal.

After Luciano had served only 9½ years he was mysteriously paroled by Governor Dewey on January 3, 1946, to the indignation of an amazed public. The parole came 41 years before the expiration of Luciano's maximum sentence. In his report to the state legislature, required by law, Dewey said, and I quote, "Luciano's aid was sought by the armed services in inducing others to provide information concerning possible enemy attack. It appears that he cooperated in such effort."

Any shortening of what was virtually a life sentence handed down by the Court could only be justified by the most cogent of reasons. The reason given to the Legislature by Governor Dewey for Luciano's parole was false as I will prove from the record. The real reason has not been given by him. He has continued to skulk behind a wall of silence, hoping the public will forget that he abused and misused his executive power in paroling world criminal No. 1.

The United States Senate Crime Investigation Committee—the Kefauver committee—tried to learn the real reason for the Luciano release when it held its sessions in New York City last Spring. It failed lamentably.

Shortly after Luciano was released General (Wild Bill) Donovan, former Republican candidate for Governor and the great chief of our wartime Office of Strategic Services, in refuting Dewey's publicly given reason for the Luciano parole, was quoted as saying, "I can tell you very definitely that we never asked Luciano to do anything for the war effort, that we never heard that he did anything and that I don't see what he could have done anyway. It would not have been our policy to have tried to do anything with or through a fellow like that." End of the Colonel Donovan quote.

Under constant prodding last fall, Governor Dewey declared he had released Luciano merely on the recommendation of the New York State parole board. Frederick Moran, Dewey's parole board chairman, rushed into print with a statement that the Board had recommended Luciano's release. Thus cleverly did the Governor try to get himself off the spot. The parole board alibi must strike everyone as utterly ridiculous.

Remember Dewey said he spent a year and a half convicting Luciano. Out of his great knowledge of the man, he, more than any person alive, should have been fortified against any appeal for the release of Luciano. He certainly knew then and knows more now about Luciano and his criminal activities than any parole board possibly could.

Why was Luciano paroled? Colliers magazine had its say on this subject on April 13, 1947. It said, "The answer to Luciano's freedom is to be found in the political power of Costello."

When indignation over the release flared up again last fall Dewey's opponent, former Congressman Lynch, said, "When you play with the underworld once you can never free yourself from their control. Blackmail is one of their best weapons. Frank Costello knows all of the details of the Luciano release. The man who freed Luciano does not dare speak out. For 4 years the question has been asked and you get not one word from Governor Dewey. If he dared, he would have cleaned up the implications at the first interrogation. His silence leaves no doubt as to who are the bosses of the underworld splinter of the Republican Party. They are Lucky Luciano and Frank Costello."

I realize that these are the words of a Democrat and as a lifelong Republican, in common with thousands of other thoughtful Republicans, I hang my head in shame be-

cause a leader in the opposing party is able to make such damning statements and charges and they are permitted to go unanswered.

The record of the Senate Crime Investigation Committee shows there is nothing far-fetched in the charge that underworld beachheads exist in the Republican Party. In the neighboring county of Nassau, which is dominated by County Executive J. Russel Sprague, one of Governor Dewey's chief advisers and henchmen, we find that George Morton Levy, an attorney for Luciano, and a race track operator himself, confessed to the committee that he had called in Costello to guard his track from bookmakers. A Costello riding herd on invading bookmakers would be laughable if it didn't point up sharply such a degrading condition.

Could Costello operate in Nassau County without the knowledge and consent of Sprague who has iron-handed control there, and without the knowledge of Governor Dewey? I'll leave that answer to you.

I am determined to fight to keep that kind of vicious influence out of Suffolk County despite the efforts of Governor Dewey's Conservation Commissioner Perry Durvea and other Dewey hatchet men to drive me out of the Suffolk leadership.

Now to deal with the iron curtain that the Senate Crime Committee encountered when it tried to get an answer from Governor Dewey on the Luciano release.

Among those testifying at the committee's New York hearings was a Col. George H. White, supervising narcotic agent of the United States Treasury. He stated that underworld efforts had been made to induce the Narcotic Division to intercede for Luciano with Governor Dewey. This his Department flatly declined to do. Colonel White also said that others with the same proposition had approached persons in the Army and Navy. He related that a man named Charles R. Haffenden, a Navy Reserve officer attached to Naval Intelligence, had interested himself in the case. Colonel White said that the Navy Department denied this, thus repudiating Haffenden.

I now quote Colonel White's testimony, "Part of the basis for Luciano's eventual parole by Governor Dewey was a letter from Commander Haffenden to the Governor, in which he stated that Luciano had been of great service to the Armed Forces."

Now listen carefully to this next quotation from the White testimony, which supplements General Donovan's. Colonel White said, "An investigation was made of that by myself and others . . . and all of the Armed Forces—the Army and Navy and Marine Corps—and the OSS all categorically denied that Luciano had furnished any information or given any service whatever."

In the light of the White statement, how does Governor Dewey's report to the legislature that Luciano was paroled to aid the war effort stand up?

The Senate Crime Committee considered the White testimony so vital it invited the Governor to appear before it and talk about it. He declined to make the 150-mile trip from Albany to New York City, where he maintains a year-round office, to testify, and informed the committee he would give it the benefit of his views on crime if it would visit him in Albany. This the committee declined to do and repeated the invitation to Governor Dewey to appear before it. You know the net result. Dewey did not testify, and the committee returned to Washington unenlightened.

Recently, the Senate crime committee announced its determination to get sworn testimony about Florida gambling from Florida Gov. Fuller Warren. That is when Governor Dewey announced his intention of visiting the Far East. Feeling possibly the hot breath of the Senate committee getting nearer his neck, he packed up his troubles in his new kit bag. And so he flew away.

Can the seriousness of Governor Dewey's failure to appear before the Senate committee be exaggerated? I think not. The committee is a bipartisan group, concerned solely with uncovering crime. There is something decidedly rotten in this Dewey-Luciano business. Governor Dewey is the only man who can clear it up. The public wants to hear from him. Substitute alibis will not do. If he declines to make a forthright statement voluntarily, he should be compelled to testify. Even the Governor of New York must account to the public for his official acts.

In his just-published book, *Crime in America*, Senator KEFAUVER comments that Dewey's "abstention from cooperation" was "to say the least, disappointing." That gentle reproving slap on Dewey's wrist was followed on July 9 by a breath-taking blow to the Dewey solar plexus that he must have felt in far-off Japan when Senator KEFAUVER was quoted in the New York Herald Tribune on remarks he had made in an interview. KEFAUVER said that governors should be willing witnesses before the Senate committee and then devastatingly added, and I quote, "When they don't come as willing witnesses they convict themselves." Senator KEFAUVER did not say what governors who failed to appear before the committee convicted themselves, but the inference is plain and the words certainly have an ominous ring.

In the public interest I now make a concrete suggestion. I suggest that the Senate Crime Investigating Committee return to New York immediately and that it demand that Governor Dewey appear before it forthwith to explain the Luciano release. The recent shocking dope disclosures call for action.

Unless the Governor clears himself, his Perry Durveas and other lackeys on Long Island and in Albany who seek political destruction of those who like myself are continuing to fight for good, clean government, will be under the continued suspicion of wanting to make another Costello-dominated Nassau County out of clean Suffolk.

Finally, the public is entitled to the possession of all the facts surrounding the Dewey-Luciano episode. Citizens must be relieved of the embarrassment the Governor is subjecting them to. If the Governor continues to remain silent I am fully prepared and documented to deal with the matter again even more extensively.

RFC Loan to American Lithofold Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared regarding investigation of the RFC loan to the American Lithofold Co.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have received a number of inquiries as to whether the RFC Subcommittee intends to investigate the matter of the RFC loan to the American Lithofold Co. These inquiries relate to recent St. Louis Post-Dispatch accounts indicating the possible involvement of Mr. William M. Boyle, Jr., Mr. James P. Finnegan, and Mr. E. Merl Young. This loan, and Mr. Finnegan's alleged connection with it, were first brought to public

attention by Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, when our RFC investigation was nearing a close. There was then no indication of Mr. Boyle's or Mr. Young's possible connection with the matter.

I agree with those who suggest that this matter should be investigated. If the Committee on Banking and Currency determines that the investigation should be made by the RFC Subcommittee, I will not object.

The RFC Subcommittee is a standing legislative subcommittee, although, of course, it has authority to investigate matters under its jurisdiction. It has been my view that the proper function of the subcommittee is to conduct investigations only to the extent that they are necessary for legislative purposes. This we have done, and upon the basis of our investigations, we have recommended legislation. Since the legislative proposals now before the Congress include provisions aimed at the correction of faults exactly like those which may be present in the Lithofold case, I do not see how the investigation of this matter could possibly have any bearing on further RFC legislation at this time. If the facts developed by congressional investigation should bear out the newspaper accounts of this matter, the evidence would be merely cumulative, in support of the subcommittee's previous hearings and report on the RFC. The RFC has been completely reorganized since this loan was made, substantially in accordance with the subcommittee's recommendations.

My view of the proper duties of a legislative subcommittee in conducting investigations, I think, is borne out by the action of the Senate in providing for a permanent, standing Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. This subcommittee has an able chairman, Senator HOEY, a full-time expert staff, and, I presume, ample funds. It has general authority to conduct investigations.

If the Banking and Currency Committee should decide that the American Lithofold Co. loan should be investigated by its RFC Subcommittee, provision will have to be made for both funds and staff. The staff employed in the special study under Senate Resolution 219 has been dismissed and the funds provided for that study have been expended. The subcommittee does not normally have a staff.

Although I shall be bound by the wishes of the Committee on Banking and Currency, it is my opinion that we should request an investigation by the Hoey subcommittee. I intend to suggest to the committee that it refer this case to Senator HOEY's subcommittee, as we have done in other instances.

Assistance by Kansas American Legion During the Recent Flood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. SCHOEPPLE. Mr. President, so many people and so many organizations have contributed so magnificently during the recent flood disaster in my State, that I desire to call attention to their generous activities.

I have received a letter from Irvin L. Cowger, department adjutant, the American Legion, Topeka, Kans., showing the immediate response of the legionnaires of Kansas during the recent

flood; and I ask unanimous consent that his letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ADJUTANT,
KANSAS DEPARTMENT,
THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Topeka, Kans., July 26, 1951.
Senator ANDREW F. SCHOEPPLE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SCHOEPPLE: I'm so proud of the job done by the Legionnaires of Kansas during the recent flood disaster, I want you to know about it, too.

All over the west half of our State Legionnaires got busy early, and every Legion post gathered food and clothing, which were stockpiled principally at Hutchinson, Great Bend, Pratt, Garden City, Liberal, and Colby. From these points the Forbes Air Base sent C-47's, each carrying 5 tons or more, to pick up these supplies and bring them into Topeka, where they were stored at the local Legion post.

From Capitol Post, No. 1, Topeka, these much-needed supplies were trucked to every river town, on both sides of the river, from Salina to Kansas City. The trucks were also furnished by Forbes Air Base.

Over 100,000 pounds were air-lifted in the early stages when it was critically needed by those who left their homes with only the clothes they had on their back.

In all, via airlift and trucks, more than 500,000 pounds were sent to Topeka by the Legion posts in western Kansas.

Practically without exception these materials are being issued from American Legion posts, and everywhere they have a superfluity of clothing—and we still have a large stockpile here in Topeka.

Scores of splendid contributions were made by Legion posts all over the State. For example, at Perry, the Sabetha post and the Leavenworth post sort of adopted that town, and the first morning Perryites were permitted to reenter their little town, these Legion posts had two truckloads of ice, 400 quarts of milk, and other necessities at their disposal.

Certainly many individuals and many organizations did heroic work, and most surely we do not belittle or discredit any of them when we say the American Legion made a gigantic contribution, and, generally speaking, were there first with the most.

With all good wishes, I am
Sincerely yours,

IRVIN L. COWGER,
Department Adjutant, the American Legion.

How to Heckle Stalin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, part of an article by Stanley Frank entitled, "How to Heckle Stalin," which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of July 7, 1951.

This article is not only interesting, but, in my opinion, very helpful in our efforts to bring the truth about the

United States to the attention of the misinformed people behind the iron curtain.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

How To Heckle Stalin (By Stanley Frank)

Millions of foreign-connected Americans now bombard iron curtain countries in a letter-writing campaign to make the Kremlin totter. Discontent grows lushly on communism's home grounds, when Sovietized peasants read, "Dear Vladok: Here nobody steals the milk."

Although the proposition cannot be proved at the corner butcher's, the buffalo nickel is not yet extinct. A 5-cent stamp still sends a letter from the United States to any spot on the face of the earth, a service that possibly makes the nickel as valuable a national asset as the gold in Fort Knox. Christopher Columbus first described the abundance of the New World and the amiability of its natives in a series of letters, and no better medium for spreading the truth about America ever has been found.

Every schoolboy knows why immigrants came to this country. History books neglect to explain, though, how news of the land that offered relief from religious persecution and oppressive social and economic conditions reached remote villages abroad. The answer was obvious, perhaps, in another age, but it needs to be spelled out for a generation that hears and sees far-away places brought into the living room by the radio, international press associations, and television. The great migration to the United States was stimulated primarily by letters sent by relatives and friends to folks in the old country. Now that we need those people on our side—if not on our shores—an intelligent effort is being made for the first time to promote the vast reservoir of good will built up over the years by emigrants. This unique program is the Letters From America campaign, the world's largest, least expensive and most spontaneous information service.

The letters project is the brain child born in May 1950, to the union of two lusty sets of statistics. There are 35,000,000 people in the United States of foreign birth or foreign parentage—almost 25 percent of the population. These first- and second-generation Americans know, better than most people, that they are favored with more personal liberty and an immeasurably higher standard of living than any other nation enjoys. And they write more than 400,000,000 letters a year—60 percent to Europe—telling the folks in the old country all about it.

That's right, nearly a quarter of a billion pieces of personal correspondence are sent annually to Europe, according to United States Post Office figures. Some 21,000,000 go to countries under Russian domination, and the overwhelming majority are boosts for democracy. What is more, the letters are delivered. Mail flows freely between the United States and all other countries except the U. S. S. R. and China. Russia's satellites have a sporadic spot-check censorship, but otherwise do not intercept letters or molest the recipients.

There is substantial evidence that mail penetrates the outer fringes of the iron curtain with little interference. For one thing, the volume of correspondence has remained steady for the last 3 years. People obviously would not continue to write if their letters went unanswered or if they thought they were endangering relatives. . . . They hardly would keep on throwing away their money if it wound up in the wrong pockets. More than 21,000,000 pounds of food and clothing were sent by parcel post to Eastern Europe last year, and prompt acknowledgments—with requests for more of the same—

indicated that the packages were received without undue delay or tampering.

Most Americans probably will be surprised to learn that pro-Soviet regimes permit such extensive communication with the arch-enemy of Mother Russia. A technical problem rather than a tolerant policy has kept open this one channel of free expression to the satellite states. Enforcing an airtight censorship on all incoming and outgoing mail requires a tremendous staff of trustworthy Communists—and there are not enough party members in good standing, apparently, to be spared from more sensitive government jobs. The editors of eight Slavic-language newspapers published in Chicago said recently that they did not know of a single case outside the U. S. S. R. in which the recipient of letters from America got into trouble with the security police for that reason alone.

Conditions are much different inside Russia, of course. The MVD breathes heavily on the neck of anyone suspected of "western deviationism" and mail is scrutinized so carefully that nothing but innocuous family news is passed. Only 440,000 American letters a year seep into Russia, compared to more than 1,000,000 to little Albania, yet that mere trickle has a psychological value that cannot be measured by the volume or the nature of the contents. Most of the letters go to the Ukraine and the three Baltic States—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—where active anti-Communist underground movements are sustained largely by the moral support of countrymen in America.

THE 10-YEAR QUARANTINE THAT FAILED

Sometimes the Politburo must get awfully discouraged trying to maintain a quarantine against foreign contagion. Just when it seems a long period of isolation should do the trick, a group like the Lemkos breaks out in a pro-American rash. A clannish people who come from the Carpathian Mountains and speak Ukrainian dialect containing many Slovak words pronounced with a Polish accent, the Lemkos were completely cut off from all ties with the United States for nearly a decade. In 1947 the 250,000 Lemkos in the Soviet Union were resettled in what had been the German part of Poland as an ethnic buffer against western influences. The Lemkos promptly renewed their long-dormant correspondence with American compatriots who are concentrated in the Shenandoah Valley.

Personal letters, the second-oldest medium of communication among men, still are the most reliable weapons in the battle of ideas. Newspapers, periodicals, and books are suppressed and censored, the radio is used to amplify lies and distortions, pictures are faked and misinterpreted, but the mail gets through to the critical arenas of Europe where the winning of men's minds is the prize.

And the letters carry a note of conviction. That's the big thing. Europeans are weary of strident propaganda and bored to death with ideological gobbledygook. Concerned as they are with survival, they want to know about affairs that always have interested the little people. They want to know how much American workers earn, what food, clothing, housing, recreation, and education for their kids the money will buy. They weigh the promises of communism against the car, refrigerator, and television set Jan and Anna own in America—and what would your conclusion be if Jan and Anna came from your home town and you trusted them?

"I have always believed that personal communications between friends and relatives are more vital and effective in interpreting the life and attitudes of peoples across the borders than any other media of information and communication," says Warren R. Austin, the United States chief delegate to the United Nations.

THE FAMOUS DELUGE OF LETTERS TO ITALY

The impact of American letters on postwar Europe was first demonstrated in the spring of 1948 when the Italian Communist Party, the largest on the Continent outside the U. S. S. R., threatened to gain control of the Government in the impending elections. * * *

The success of the Italian experiment suggested a continuing effort along the same lines in other countries to give a positive tone to our public relations abroad. A group of citizens including Winthrop Rockefeller, Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, Elmo Roper, and Charles E. Slaw looked for a private agency geared to coordinate such a program, and they didn't have to search far. The Common Council for American Unity, an organization with 30 years of experience in helping immigrants solve their problems and integrate their cultures into American life, was a natural for the job. It had a staff familiar with the languages and attitudes of foreigners. It had the cooperation of the extensive foreign-language press which is indispensable to any organized effort involving foreign-born citizens.

The common council set up a letters from America section under Henry L. Munson, an aide to Gen. Omar Bradley during World War II. The program was launched a year ago with a refreshing approach in this day of high-pressure gimmicks and gambits. Old and recent immigrants simply were asked to write regularly to people they knew in their native countries. Well aware of a tendency to brag, Munson and his associates urged them to tell the truth about their living conditions. They stressed the importance of depicting down-to-earth touches Americans take for granted, but which make vivid impressions on foreigners.

Eastern Europeans constantly are astonished that milk delivered on doorsteps in the morning is not stolen, that laundry may safely be left hanging on wash lines overnight. One phrase, as predictable as an affectionate salutation, runs through all letters written by newly arrived aliens: "I have been here — months and nobody has asked me to register with the police yet." They are bowled over by coins left on unattended newsstands and that great American institution, the cafeteria. "The owner of a cafeteria in the Balkans would go broke in a week," a Rumanian said. "The customers would find some way to take two tickets, and turn in one punched for a cup of coffee."

A student from Afghanistan who enrolled at Duke University with a thorough indoctrination of Russian propaganda remarked that the chief gripe he heard from workers here was the parking problem. Women invariably comment that it is difficult to distinguish between a stenographer and an aristocrat, a tribute to another institution, the \$10.95 dress shop. "Although my baby is only 17 months old, she already has eaten more ice cream than I had when I was 42 years old," Sandor Havassy, a Hungarian, wrote home.

Three years ago, Yaroslav Chyz, the common council's foreign-press expert, was a member of the American delegation to the Conference of Intellectuals for Peace, at Wrocław, Poland. An ardent anti-Communist—he fled the U. S. S. R. in 1921 as a political refugee and edited a Ukrainian newspaper in Scranton, Pa., for 17 years—Chyz was hooted down by the Russian clique. After one session he was cornered by Polish students who began heckling him on freedom of the press in the United States. Chyz countered by telling them that German, Italian, and Japanese papers were published without censorship throughout the war, and contrasted that policy with the controlled Communist press. He thought he was doing a great job of convincing the students, but became increasingly uncomfortable un-

der their fixed stares. He suddenly realized they were more enthralled by his clothes than by his arguments—and Chyz hardly is a fashion plate on his salary.

Letters from America has a loftier purpose than touting material benefits. Its chief objective is correcting misconceptions regarding the United States, a formidable task that has become more imperative than ever since Congress in April slashed 90 percent off the \$97,500,000 appropriation President Truman asked for expansion of the Voice of America broadcasts. In 1950, Letters had a L. get of \$41,265, including salaries for 20 part-time translators; operating expenses this year will run to about the same figure. With those meager resources, it would appear that the Letters people are fighting Russia's ponderous propaganda machine with a leaky water pistol, but they have assets that do not show on a balance sheet. They have those 400,000,000 letters a year. They have on their side the foreign-language press and 2,000,000 members of 60 national organizations for foreigners. Most important of all, they know where to concentrate their field of fire.

Before launching letters, the common council made a survey of deep-rooted beliefs concerning the United States prevalent in Europe. Questionnaires were submitted to 1,702 qualified observers in 26 countries, from the Dardanelles to the Atlantic. The answers filled a 136-page book and were a depressing testimonial to the success of Communist propaganda. Despite the billions poured into the rehabilitation and defense of Europe, 25 percent of the experts thought the Marshall plan was a Wall Street scheme to gain economic control of the Continent. The common council admitted that the majority of the observers "can be presumed slightly biased in favor of the United States * * * and cooperated with this survey because of some degree of pro-American sentiment." Yet 25 to 40 percent subscribed to familiar Russian clichés—that American foreign policy was designed to destroy the U. S. S. R., that its atomic stockpile endangered the peace, that persecution of the Negro betrayed its false democracy, and that it was a Nation of uncultured money-grabbers.

Convinced that the best refutation to those charges can be made on a personal level by foreign-born Americans who understand the facts and the issues involved, the letters organization is providing them with such material. Translations of special articles written by Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Bernard Baruch, Paul G. Hoffman, and labor leaders Walter Reuther, William Green, and James Carey, among many others, are sent regularly to 900 foreign-language publications and 195 radio programs. The plan is highly effective in this country. Quotations from the articles or rewritten versions appear constantly in correspondence to Europe.

How effective is the plan abroad? Read Lewis, director of the common council, answers with a candid shrug. "We don't know," he admits. "Breaking down false ideas held by vast numbers is like chipping at a mountain with a spike. There are two factors in our favor. Close to a million chips a day are being made on the mountain, and our technique is right. Advertising and promotion methods have a rasping, offensive quality to Europeans and they are understandably suspicious of anything that smacks of official propaganda. They want desperately to believe someone—and to whom can they turn for the truth if not a relative or an old friend?"

"We must be making progress. The Comics call us every name under the sun—always a sign they're worried. Our best endorsement, though, was a letter written by a Czech to his cousin in Chicago. 'I

have three impressions of America,' the man said. 'One from the Russians, one from the United States Army and one from your letters. I'm depending on the last one.'"

In 1842, a phenomenon historians still refer to as "America fever" swept Scandinavia after letters from Gustaf Unonius, a young Episcopal minister who founded the Pine Lake Colony near Milwaukee, appeared in the Stockholm Aftonbladet.

Foreign governments, alarmed by the stampede to America that was cutting into their economic and military potentials as well as arousing demands for social reform at home, tried to stem it by maligning conditions in the young republic and the "barbarism" of its people. Russia banned emigration in 1860, and Austria-Hungary followed suit in 1877, but that didn't work either. Families spent life savings bribing border guards and buying passage to America, lured by the 160 acres the Homestead Act offered free to all comers. News of the Homestead Act was suppressed in Eastern Europe, but a series of Americanization studies financed by the Carnegie Corp. reported in 1921: "The most general way of learning of such an opportunity was through personal acquaintance or through correspondence with relatives and friends of the immigrant's own nationality who had previously settled on the land." More than 1,000,000 aliens were entering the United States annually when World War I and our subsequent quota laws finally checked the mounting tide of immigration.

Those who do get through the gates write letters that eulogize the Promised Land more eloquently than the florid speeches of professional patriots. From Mrs. Anita Manera, of Dorris, Calif., to Italy: "You should see the schools—magnificent. For education everything is placed at the disposal of the children. Garages, bicycles, poultry yards, fruit in the garden are left unguarded. You can imagine how beautiful it is to live this way and trust everyone."

From Anton Fomin, of Los Angeles, to France: "The word 'laborer' sounds proudly here. It is an honorable profession. The American laborer of middle qualification gets from ten to sixteen dollars a day, the specialists even more. It means 3,500 to 5,600 francs in accordance with the official rates. But you, working as a taxi driver the whole night, get only 800 francs, and Shurochka for a day as a masseuse gets only 300 francs. Everything is said by these figures."

Although immigration was cut drastically in 1924, the United States still retains many characteristics of the melting pot of the early 1900's. Last year 249,000 immigrants were admitted under quotas and the special dispensations granted DP's. According to the 1940 census, 21,996,240 people reported that some language other than English was the "mother tongue" spoken in homes. New York commonly is thought of as the focal point of immigration, but large foreign national groups are scattered throughout the country. Chicago has the greatest concentration of Czechs, Lithuanians, Poles, Slovaks, and Swedes, and the same is true of Cleveland for Rumanians and Slovenes, of Boston for Albanians, of Detroit for Belgians, and of Minneapolis for Norwegians and Finns. There are large colonies of Czechs in Texas, of Danes and Armenians in California, of Croats, Ukrainians, and Lithuanians in Pennsylvania, and of course, Scandinavians blanket the Northwest as the dew covers Dixie.

The catalysts that promote unity in these nationality groups are foreign-language publications, which today have a combined per-issue circulation of 6,000,000. It is significant that approximately half the foreign press is beamed to people whose countrymen

are behind the iron curtain. In the last 4 years papers that follow the Communist line have lost nearly 50 percent of their readers and now command a total circulation of less than 150,000.

The exalted prestige of the foreign-press editor makes him an invaluable ally in the letters campaign. He is the father confessor to subscribers who are confused by strange customs. He is the cultural leader, the social arbiter, and usually the chief strategist in the political intrigues which abound among foreigners. His title and intellectual status, so dear to the hearts of Europeans, lend weight to his opinions and, as a consequence, his views are respected and reflected by his audience. Operating in a small, tight community, the editor is close enough to readers to be shown letters written to or received from the other side. Alerted to watch for new attitudes here and new Communist pitches abroad, the editor sends letters that reveal such trends to New York for analysis by Munson and his staff.

Regardless of eventual results, the letters campaign already has paid a handsome dividend. Correspondence stimulated in Europe has produced massive evidence of violent opposition to communism and the U S S R. In the satellite countries. Dissatisfaction is far more widespread than the democracies have dared to hope. It may well be the reason Russia has avoided a showdown with the West.

One man wrote a former neighbor who had joined the Communist Party: "I earn \$89 for a 33-hour week. I have a car and a five-room apartment and steam heat for my wife and child. I hope you drop dead from envy."

A Lithuanian-American, who had been out of touch with a schoolmate for 20 years, was seized by a bright idea upon learning that his chum was an arrogant party big wheel in their old town. "During the long years of our correspondence," he wrote the fellow, "I never believed freedom of thought and freedom of speech were permitted in the Soviet Union. But the things you said about Stalin in your last letter and your strong criticism of his policy convinced me that a loyal party member does not have to be afraid to say what's on his mind."

He hasn't heard from the guy, and he hopes no one else has either.

The Government as the Country's Ideal Employer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the Record an article appearing in one of the Washington newspapers on July 29, 1951.

One of the Nation's leading newspapers, the Evening Star, of Washington, D. C., has through its very able Government columnist, Joseph Young, called attention to the serious situation confronting Federal employees because of higher pay and more generous fringe benefits provided by private employers. In a courageous and forthright piece of

news reporting, Mr. Young, a veteran observer of the Washington scene, states that the Government is rapidly losing its reputation as the country's ideal employer.

It was my privilege to introduce legislation to bring pay of Government employees more into line with the present much higher living costs, and Mr. Young's article is a definite step toward improving general public knowledge of the problems confronting the employees of the United States Government.

In requesting permission for insertion of this fine article, I should like to commend Joe Young for having written this article, and the Evening Star for publishing it. It is definitely in the public interest to create better understanding of the problems of Government and its employees. We are fortunate to have the finest Government in the world. We want to keep it that way, and to improve it by all means possible. One important method is to maintain high morale among the Federal work force.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FEDERAL SPOTLIGHT

(By Joseph Young)

GOVERNMENT LOSING REPUTATION AS COUNTRY'S IDEAL EMPLOYER

The Government is rapidly losing its reputation as the country's ideal employer.

For years, many people have regarded Federal employment as a very desirable thing.

The pay was good, the vacation time excellent, and "once you pass a civil-service exam, you've got a lifetime job."

This may have been more or less true in past years. But it is not the case now.

For proof, consider the figures issued recently by the Civil Service Commission. They show that more than twice as many Government employees are leaving their jobs to enter private industry than a year ago.

The Government's personnel turnover during the year has reached the staggering figure of 36 percent.

There are many reasons why Federal employment is losing its allure.

For one thing, the Government has been slow to keep pace with private industry in adjusting wages to meet increased living costs since 1939.

The result is that Federal pay, particularly in the middle and upper brackets, frequently lags behind comparable jobs in private industry.

Then, too, most Federal employees do not get the time-and-one-half overtime payments for extra work current in private industry. Only Government workers earning up to \$2,900 a year get true overtime payments. The rest get much less, with some employees getting even less than straight pay for working overtime.

Job security: Reduced job security is another reason why employees are quitting the Government.

Until 5 to 10 years ago Government career employees were fairly certain that if they did their job satisfactorily, they would not have to worry about job security.

But the large increase in Government employment that started with the last war has brought about widespread economy moves in Congress to trim personnel. This is understandable, but, unfortunately, some career employees with as much as 20 to 25 years of service lost their jobs. This has caused apprehension among other careerists. They feel they might be hit in future economy drives.

Leave: Congress is in the process of reducing Government employees' annual- and sick-leave benefits, which, in the past, have been one of the Federal service's greatest employment attractions.

Undoubtedly, the present 26 days' annual leave for classified employees is more generous than you'll find almost anywhere else. But annual leave is different from vacations given in private industry, in that time taken off work by an employee for various reasons is deducted from his annual leave. Tardiness, special errands, family emergencies, and other human factors that prompt private industry workers to take time off without being docked from their vacations, are deducted from Government employees' annual leave.

Then, too, Government workers are allowed to accumulate only 90 days of sick leave, which often isn't enough for long illnesses.

Government workers have no unemployment-compensation benefits.

Also, Federal employees seem to be the whipping boy for some Members of Congress for political reasons. It does the esprit de corps in Government great harm when Federal employees constantly are attacked as lazy, inefficient, and disloyal.

Remedies: By and large, most Government employees do a conscientious and able job. It's for the Nation's own good and protection that the Federal service should be able to recruit and retain the best possible type of worker. That's why the Government should be made more attractive as an employer, rather than less.

Sponsors of the Federal pay raise legislation cite as one of their strongest arguments the fact that a Government salary increase would help to end the wage disparity and cut down resignations. It is expensive for the Government to spend time and money training an employee, only to see him leave after brief service.

Another thing that would help Government morale would be for Congress and the executive branch to develop a budget system whereby personnel reductions would be accomplished gradually. This would eliminate the meat-ax approach that Congress has sometimes taken.

Enactment of unemployment-compensation benefits and strengthening of job-protection rights of long-time employees also would bolster morale in Government.

The Government's executive branch could help also by further modernizing and streamlining its personnel and administrative programs, with a view toward cutting out waste and improving efficiency. If this were done, rank-and-file Federal employees would not have to be subjected to attacks in Congress and elsewhere for policies over which they have no control. Elimination of personal patronage in some Federal offices would also help a great deal.

A New Strategy for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the Record a very splendid sermon delivered by Dr. John T. Wayland, pastor of the First Baptist Church, North Wilkesboro, N. C., on the subject, A New Strategy for Peace.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE

(By Dr. John T. Wayland)

Repeatedly we hear it said that America is adept at winning the war but losing the peace. Our people rise to the challenge of an emergency but seem to lack the patience of the daily battle for peace. In the war of ideologies we so often come off second best even though the weapons of our warfare—ideas and ideals—are infinitely superior to those of the totalitarian states. Paul the Apostle called the Ephesian Christians to a spiritual warfare. "Put on the whole armour of God that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world." Two world wars have been followed by a cold war and thus far a limited hot war. The wars to make the world safe for democracy and to bring peace to mankind have increased the seeds of war. A new strategy for peace is called for. It is the fight for peace by the spirit through consecrated Christian persons who use spiritual weapons.

It is essential for America to be kept militarily strong, but her strength should be joined by that of other democratic states and used through the United Nations. An international police force will always be necessary to curb international gangsters. There is a vast difference between a policeman and a soldier. A policeman represents a majority of the citizens and endeavors to stop the crime without destroying the criminal and his wife and children. He is always responsible to the people for his acts. A soldier forces his will upon the enemy. He is usually a foreigner who seeks revenge and leaves destruction and hate in his wake. Where is the old-time glory in modern warfare?

"War
I abhor,
And yet how sweet
The sound along the marching street
Of drum and file, and I forget
Broken old mothers, and the whole
Dark butchery without a soul."

—Richard LeGallienne.

What has been uppermost in the minds and hearts of the soldiers of World Wars I and II and for what do our boys in Korea pray today? They want to get home to their loved ones as soon as possible, but will fight to the death in order to win the victory for a peaceful world and for some measure of assurance that their sons and grandsons will not have to experience the same horrors through which they are struggling:

"Who goes there, at the dawn,
Across the sun-swept plain?
We are the hosts of those who swear:
It shall not be again."

While the wall of military might holds back the spread of oppression, dictatorship, and war, we must hasten to carry out a new strategy for peace. America is rich in ideas, ideals, technical knowledge, know-how, human services, and in missionary-minded persons. We are far and away ahead of the totalitarian states in these resources. Why not tap this our greatest asset for the sake of human betterment, the spread of democracy, and the defeat of communism? Much of what we know and possess is the development of the rich heritage which has made America great—the faith of our founding fathers in a just God to whom every person and every nation is finally responsible. We are a privileged people. Let us not forget that the misuse of privilege calls for the loss of freedom. That is the lesson of history,

and is as true for nations as it is for individuals.

The American way of life at its best—work, love and worship, neighborliness, "he profits most who serves best," free enterprise, and individual initiative tempered by a sense of social responsibility—all of this should be shared with the rising peoples of the world.

The great movement of our time is not the growth of communism, it is the revolutionary forces, especially evident in Asia and Africa, which declare that millions who are starving physically, mentally, and spiritually refuse to starve any longer. Russia sees in this explosive turmoil the opportunity for communism and sows pretty promises in the seed beds of discontent. Let us see in it the opportunity to be of service to God's children who are hungry and thirsty; who feel like strangers in a world that has despised them; who are naked in embarrassing poverty, sick with divers diseases; and imprisoned both literally and figuratively by oppression and sin. If we play the Christian to these least of Christ's brethren, will we not solve the problem of peace, save the lost, and save our souls?

But how may we do it? Let us as American Christians work with other democratic peoples through the United Nations in sending good-will teams to any country which will receive us. On this team we would suggest a public-school teacher and one trained in mass adult education. Only 17 percent of the people of India are literate. Millions could be taught to read in a few years. A second member of the team would be a farm agent. The basic problem in underprivileged areas is the proper use of the land for the best food production to feed the starving. Great medieval estates would need to be broken up for freeholders. Technical experts, such as engineers of various kinds, should be on the team to lead the people in flood control and irrigation, in power development, in factory management, etc. Certainly physicians, nurses, and public-health officers should go along to fight the disease and illness which sap the strength of the nation.

We would want a Christian minister on the roll, and are inclined to put him first, not for the minister's sake but for what—or rather whom—he represents. The whole project should be thoroughly Christian in motivation. But the presence of a minister raises enough problems to hold up the program indefinitely. On this side denominational and church rivalries and the principle of separation of church and state are a few of several stumbling blocks. On the other side, the people to whom the team would go might resent the intrusion of a rival religion under government subsidy into their land. It seems better to leave the minister off the team, therefore, and endeavor to inspire consecrated laymen with the true spirit of Christ in their work. The various denominations could then send their own missionaries at their own expense. They would undoubtedly find receptive ears in the lands where the good-will teams were bringing applied Christianity.

It is obvious what such a program would do for those who need it, but it would mean fully as much to America. Would she not save her life in losing it for Jesus' sake? In the first place, our country would take a place of noble leadership—a role in which the world likes her best and in which she is happiest. Asiatic peoples are still suspicious of our motives. Imperialism is a ghost that still haunts much of the world.

Secondly, such a program would bring peace to the world and to America. There are not two worlds; there are three; and the third—non-Russian and non-American—is much the largest. This practical program of Christian service would win that third part to the democratic way and Russia would outdo herself to try to follow suit. World

tensions, cold wars, feverish races in armaments would be greatly minimized and the basis for world government—mutual understanding and mutual advantage—would be established.

Third, efficiency in our own governmental affairs would result. With the easing and gradual elimination of the threat of war, government under pressure in an atmosphere of perpetual emergency would become foolish. The excuse for bureaucracy would be eliminated and more efficiency would result. Over 90 percent of our taxes go for past or future wars and they could be drastically lowered and the standard of living raised.

Fourth, our national resources, which suffered such depletion during World War II, would be saved.

Fifth, business would be put to work along constructive lines. A howitzer produces nothing, may destroy a great deal, and is out of date in a few years. A tractor or plow brings food from the earth and renders years of service to mankind.

Sixth, the good-will teams would bring hope to our youth, many of whom are wearing the pall of defeatism. This would be true whether they served on the team or not. "Peace must come as a troubador" calling youth to high adventure. This program would also give another life to older people. A technician about ready to retire could find great joy in giving the last 5 or 10 years of his life training personnel for the teams or going to a foreign land himself.

And lastly, and far from least, such a strategy for peace would give impetus to an upsurge of Christian faith. Paralleled by the regular work of the Christian churches in foreign lands it would constitute missions in the modern manner. It is Jesus' way with the power and efficiency of the twentieth century. It is a call to high, noble, and adventurous living, a call from Him—for us—to help these least, His brethren.

"The soul of Jesus is restless today;

Christ is tramping through the spirit-world,
Compassion in His heart for the fainting
millions;

He trudges through China, through Poland,
Through Russia, Austria, Germany, Armenia,

Patiently He pleads with the Church,

Tenderly He woos her

The wounds of His body are bleeding afresh
for the sorrows of His shepherdless
people.

We besiege Him with selfish petitions,
We weary Him with our petty ambitions,
From the needy we bury Him in piles of
carven stone,

We obscure Him in the smoke of stuffy
incense,

We drown His voice with the snarls and
shrieks of our disgruntled bickerings,
We build temples to Him with hands that
are bloody,

We deny Him in the needs and sorrows of
the exploited 'least of His brethren.'

The soul of Jesus is restless today.

But eternally undismayed."

—Cyprus Mitchell.

Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix to the RECORD, I include a letter

from cotton farmers from Melville, La., in my district, as follows:

MELVILLE, LA., July 23, 1951.

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As you no doubt know, due to a large cotton estimate, speculators are ruining the cotton market for the farmer. If the Government allows this drop in the market to stick, we feel that they are letting us down, since we were asked by the Secretary of Agriculture to produce a 16,000,000-bale crop in 1951. At that time Middling cotton was selling well above 40 cents, and we naturally felt that, even with a large 1951 crop, the price would stay that high.

Ginning will begin in August, and, if something is not done hurriedly, cotton farmers will lose millions of dollars and their confidence in a Government that raises defense workers wages as an incentive to greater production and, on the other hand, penalizes farmers for achieving their goals.

We will appreciate your efforts in preventing speculators and gamblers from selling the cotton farmer short. We ask that you remind your colleagues that malnutrition in the Armed Forces is not conducive to good shooting or accurate atom-bomb dropping.

Yours very truly,

W T. York, L. W. Beard, M J Guideau, Jr., R J Coite, J J Astall, Frank Gerace, Eugene Gordon, J M Janeau, Scott Gordeau, Jack Dondeau, H H. Westerhaus, Leon E Wall, Wm G. McNeil, Joseph Cannatella.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to include herein a copy of resolutions adopted by the St. Landry Parish Farm Bureau, of the parish of St. Landry, also in connection with the situation in respect to the 1951 cotton crop, as follows:

The St. Landry Parish Farm Bureau board of directors met in special session last night to discuss the deplorable situation of the decline in the price of raw cotton and passed a resolution as follows.

"Whereas during this past winter and spring the United States Department of Agriculture began a program with cotton farmers to bring about a production in 1951 of 16,000,000 bales of cotton to be certain of a sufficient supply of cotton for the defense needs, export to foreign nations, and for domestic use, and

"Whereas, at that particular time, due to an abnormally small crop in 1950, the outlook for a good price was very promising, which was an incentive for farmers to utilize all their resources to go all out in helping to accomplish the production of the large amount of cotton needed; and

"Whereas the United States Government, in the interest of national security, took steps to limit exports of cotton, during 1951 the price of cotton declined well below that of the world market. The Government through the Director of Price Stabilization imposed a ceiling price on domestic cotton which again demoralized the domestic market because of discouraged speculation in our normal channels of cotton trade, and

"Whereas the cotton farmers in cooperating with the Government planted a record acreage to cotton at considerable increase in all costs (labor, seed, fertilizer, machinery equipment, fuel, etc.); and

"Whereas the cotton farmers in achieving the goals of the Government now face the possibility of actually losing money after producing a large crop or at least not realize a profit which is guaranteed by our Government to labor, manufacturers, and other groups; and

"Whereas the office of OPS recently granted an over-all increase in price on certain finished cotton goods in order to insure a fair margin of profit to textile manufacturers after granting an increase to textile workers: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by this board in special meeting, That our elected Representatives in Washington should take the following steps to insure cotton farmers a fair profit as guaranteed to afore-mentioned groups:

"1. That the Department of Agriculture raise the floor price from 90 percent to 100 percent of parity.

"2. That the Department of Agriculture increase the export quota of our 1951 cotton to a degree that will stabilize the price of cotton to a figure at least 100 percent of parity."

Results of July 17 Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM PICKETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following results of July 17 poll of Facts Forum ballot:

Results of July 17 poll, Facts Forum ballot

Vote these three "no" or "yes":

	No	Yes
A Should Nationalist forces be permitted and aided to invade the mainland? (Jerry Gilmore).....	28	72
B Should United States resist seizure of Iranian oil reserves through a puppet government? (Neely G Landrum).....	47	53
C Is socialism as dangerous to freedom in the United States as communism? (poll committee).....	22	78
Check two (only) of nine below to be featured in later poll:		
Percent		
Should United States take retaliatory action to effect the release of correspondent William N. Oatis? (Judge T W. Davidson).....	11	
Will inflation be stopped? (Representative LINDLEY BECKWORTH).....	7	
Would control of prices on wheat and steel sufficiently control all prices? (John W. Carpenter).....	2	
Are high taxes deflationary? (Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY).....	8	
Should nonmilitary spending be reduced 25 percent or more? (Hon. Jesse Jones).....	16	
Should all price and wage ceilings be abandoned? (Representative J. FRANK WILSON).....	11	
Should the Federal budget be balanced even if higher taxes and elimination of some desirable Government programs would be required? (Representative TOM PICKETT).....	15	
Should General MacArthur have been removed from his Far East commands? (Martin J. Corbell).....	13	
Should more stringent Federal narcotics laws be passed? (Lawrence DuMars).....	17	
Total.....	100	

The last two questions above ranked third and fourth in the July 8 poll. The two questions below ranked one and two and thereby became questions for feature study and a poll July 31:

Should the crime of advocating overthrow of the Government by force and violence be a capital offense? (Douglas Rolater).

Is public indifference the greatest factor contributing to corruption in Government? (Owen W. Cotton).

Dean Roscoe Pound's Appraisal of Chiang Kai-shek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a speech made by Dean Roscoe Pound concerning Chiang Kai-shek to the Commonwealth Club of California. It is astonishing and pleasing to know that a man of the great ability and recognized standing of Dean Pound pronounces Chiang a really great man.

After 45 years of real friendship with China, we suddenly developed strong antagonism toward Chiang and his government and threw away all the good will that had been developed during that long time. In 1946 we were trying to bring about a coalition government in China and an American executive committee was trying to bring that about. The Nationalists and the Communists met in Peiping with our executive committee for months trying to accomplish this, but the effort failed. In the meantime, the Communists moved a lot of men into Manchuria, where they picked up the arms and supplies left by the Soviets when they disarmed the Japanese Army, and with them drove into China and captured the Government.

Now I do not know what our China policy is. We are objecting to the Communists being recognized or entering the United Nations. We are against the Nationalists and have only the most formal relations with them. Between these two postures China, our traditional friend, has been lost to the free world.

It is refreshing to read what Dean Pound has to say about Chiang and discouraging to realize that our Government should not have recognized this and found a way to continue our cordial relations with China.

Here is what Dean Pound said:

CHIANG KAI-SHEK

I feel strongly about the way a really great man has been misrepresented in this part of the world.

I have seen a few great men and Chiang Kai-shek is by no means the least.

He works hard and devotedly, he lives simply, he tries or did try to conduct a constitutional government under very great difficulties, to adhere zealously to a Bill of Rights when dealing with people whose chief object was to abrogate that Bill of Rights.

I was continually called on to give my opinions on what he could or could not do under the Chinese Constitution.

He did everything in his power to conduct a constitutional government when there was every temptation not to act constitutionally.

I don't think this country has any business today in talking about corruption in the government of any other country.

China for 8 years was in the power of an enemy. For 100 years she has been almost continually in war.

To put the Chinese Republic on its feet after 8 years of enemy occupation was a task of the first magnitude. Chiang Kai-shek was doing great work in accomplishing that.

I have heard complaints about the Chinese financial administration. My grandfather had a small chest filled with the paper used to pay his grandfather for services in the American Revolution. It was not worth a continental.

But the American Revolution was fought on continental currency—the paper money of the Continental Congress—which became a synonym for worthlessness.

It took 7 years, until 1790, before Alexander Hamilton was able to put our money on a sound basis. Yet we complain because the Chinese Republic in 2 or 3 years after an enemy occupation hadn't put its currency on a sound basis. If we judge the Chinese Republic by what we were able to do, Chiang Kai-shek accomplished a magnificent piece of work.

Chiang is absolutely sincere in my experience and exceptionally efficient.

One of the things China needed above everything else is strong leadership. Chiang Kai-shek is one of the few men with the breadth of character and personality that China needs to bring her into modern constitutional government.

Present difficulties go back to Stilwell's insistence that the Chinese Army be redistributed in small units among the Allied Forces.

Chiang had good precedent and excellent reason for not doing so. Wilson refused to do so in World War I when the Allies demanded Pershing's Army be so distributed.

Chiang Kai-shek said: "There are still a few war lords with their own armies—the Communist war lords in the northwest. If I distribute my army as requested, there will be no Chinese officer in command of more than a battalion of men; I'll have to oppose the disciplined armies of the Communists with an army that must be reorganized, re-disciplined, and lacks the experience of large command."

It was the best of reasons, but Chiang has been shamefully abused in this country as obstinate and inefficient.

If he were obstinate, it was obstinacy in doing his duty because to do otherwise would have been fatal to the Nationalist Government.

JUSTICE UNDER THE REDS

To mix Chiang Kai-shek and justice under the Reds in one talk, as I have been asked to do, is a remarkable combination. The two have nothing in common.

When you think about justice under the Reds you can't be thinking about what we think of as the administration of justice.

I began looking into Russian law a good many years ago when, for 37 years, I was teaching comparative law.

I went to China in 1946 as adviser to the Chinese Ministry of Justice. I found some very learned men. But there was an uneasy feeling on the part of some teachers and universities that, though we were getting democratic law, perhaps we were missing something—maybe there was something to be learned from the great experiment in the Soviet Union.

I talked to the Minister of Justice about it. He sent me over to the Russian Embassy. They had shelves and shelves of books—all the books that the Soviet Embassy in Nanking considered necessary in regard to Soviet law.

The thing that struck me at the outset was the enormous amount of window-dressing. When I looked more deeply, I found it was just paper; it had nothing to do with what happened to men and women in the ordinary operations of law in Russia.

You couldn't tell by looking at a code anything about what action would result from a given set of facts. There is no separation of powers. There are various authorities, and orders from any one of them may be in conflict with orders from another.

They have in the form of law utter confusion; that confusion is mitigated and

straightened out by the ultimate authority of the central committee of the Communist Party which is the ultimate source of law, if you call it law, in that government.

In the field of copyright law, it is required of an author that whatever he writes must be written in accordance with the purposes of the Soviet Government—whether it be a novel, a poem, or a play—or it will not be published, and if by chance it is published, it will not be republished. Therefore, there is no such thing as free writing of treatises or of novels or other works of literature in the Soviet Union.

There is a bill of rights in the constitution, for the consumption of those in other parts of the world who want to believe there is a great and beneficent government in Russia.

There are certain things in the human constitution an autocracy always runs into. The Soviet Government has had no end of trouble with peasants who have obstinately tried to assume powers which they consider they were born with, in opposition to the plans of the government for them.

The great bulk of Soviet law is a form of criminal law.

Czarist Russia had a body of secret statutes which were not published but were there to be enforced if need be. The Soviet Government has these also.

There is also the institution of government attorney. He may interfere in any lawsuit at any time. He may reopen a case after final judgment. No court may hear an appeal without bringing in the government attorney.

The administration of justice in the courts from top to bottom is absolutely under the central control of the government attorney. This institution is taken from Czarist Russia. We are told by the Communists that capitalism exploits farmers and labor for the benefit of the capitalists. There is a military and office-holding class today which exploits farmers and laborers in Russia beyond anything ever heard of before. The farmer on the collective farm is as tightly tied to the land as was the medieval cottager to the lord's estate.

The farmer is in actuality working in a government factory to manufacture meat or grain. The laborer is working in a government shop. The great crime is absenteeism. We would call it a strike. It is a serious crime in Russia, and an absentee may be expelled from a collective farm, which means starvation. Large numbers have found that out.

Collective bargaining in that system means acceptance of a contract the significant parts of which are fixed by the government in advance. "Here it is—sign on the dotted line."

With all their talk about the toilers, about how labor is exploited under capitalism, nothing ever seen in the history of law or economics compares in magnitude with the military discipline to which everybody is subject under Soviet justice. You can call it justice if you like.

Blame on the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, public indignation is certainly steadily rising as new instances of corruption in high places continue to come to light. If the

administration will not take steps to clean house, then the only remedy will have to be made effective by a sufficiently aroused electorate at the ballot box. Along this line of thinking, I submit the following recent editorial in the Malden (Mass.) Evening News:

BLAME ON THE PEOPLE

Associate Justice Douglas, of the United States Supreme Court, told an Oklahoma audience that the American people are solely responsible for corruption in government and for the moral breakdown in public life.

Charges are being hurled right and left that the people have lost their sense of moral values, and bad government has taken over as a result. Bad government, in turn, makes for poor citizenship, completing a cycle which is being denounced as vicious.

It is one thing to decry a situation and quite another to supply the remedy. They are aware that crime is flourishing because of bad government. They have read many stories of corruption in high places. Public indignation is rising, but to date it has been futile.

It is not possible to overthrow a government entrenched behind 20 years of tenure and an annual expense account of \$70,000,000,000 without an almost complete reversal of public opinion. But public wrath, now simmering, will finally boil over, perhaps in 1952.

Middle East Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following letter which was published in the New York Herald Tribune of July 30, 1951, is most apropos. I urge all Members to read it carefully:

MIDDLE EAST AID—A PLEA FOR UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE TO ISRAEL AND ARAB STATES

To the New York Herald Tribune.

We, like so many Americans, are much concerned with the fate of the mutual-security program now being considered by Congress. It seems self-evident that this is America's best weapon for the strengthening of freedom everywhere, and nowhere more so than in the strategic and problematic area of the Middle East. We wish, therefore, to plead here for enlightenment and generous support of the aid to Israel, the Arab states and the Arab refugees, proposed by the administration's mutual-security program.

The new Israel is being built on a basis that is sound from the social, economic, and ethical points of view. It is mature enough in its political understanding to be free from the irrational xenophobia that is one of the underlying causes of unrest throughout the Middle East. It is we are convinced a natural ally of the free nations to whose security in the threatened Middle East it can contribute in no small measure by means of its uniquely high standard of technological skill and its trained and hardened youth.

American aid to Israel seems to us thoroughly consistent with the tenor of our entire foreign-assistance program in recent years. Israel is a young and promising democracy; it needs and deserves our help and will richly recompense us. But our help is needed with special urgency, because of the vast, humanitarian task Israel has taken upon itself in absorbing hundreds of thousands of Jewish refugees from Europe and

the Middle East. Even a well-established economy could not easily withstand the impact of this sudden expansion. Israel, for all its present difficulties, has in the past proved its ability to make swift economic adjustments. We believe, therefore, that the sum finally assigned to it should be fully commensurate with its great needs and great potentialities, along the lines proposed by the McCormack-Martin and Douglas-Taft bills to authorize a \$150,000,000 grant in aid to Israel.

It seems to us fitting and proper that the yardstick of great need be applied, as well, to the grants to be assigned to the Arab countries and the resettlement of the Palestine Arab refugees. The sensitive and troubled area of the Arab lands needs large-scale irrigation and reconstruction programs which alone can raise the standard of living of their depressed masses and insure stability and peaceful development.

As the Clapp Commission has pointed out, the solution of the Palestine Arab refugee problem can best be worked out in conjunction with the execution of needed public-works projects in the Arab countries. We have been deeply moved by the plight of the refugees which most of us have seen and studied at first hand and which seems to us particularly tragic because it need not have been, and was not desired nor caused by the new State of Israel. The passage of time and the changes it has effected, has made repatriation of the refugees so difficult that it is almost impossible and far from desirable. We believe with the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine that "having the best interests of the refugees themselves in mind," we must concentrate on the resettlement of the refugees in the Arab countries. We cannot overemphasize how great a contribution to Middle East peace and stability will be made by successful settlement along these lines.

DR. HENRY A. ATKINSON
Rev. Dr. DANIEL A. POLING
Dr. SAMUEL GUY INMAN.
Dr. CARL HERMANN VOSS.

NEW YORK, July 27, 1951.

meet the enemy commander at any time to discuss acceptable terms of a cease-fire arrangement." "Yet," he added, "for this proposal I was relieved of my command by the same authorities who since have received so enthusiastically the identical proposal when made by the Soviet Government."

This is only half the truth. The full story indicates that it was not primarily his offer to discuss cease-fire arrangements with the enemy commander to which the Washington authorities objected, but rather the timing of his message and the inclusion in it of an implied threat that the United Nations might change its previous policy and carry the war to the territory of Red China itself.

General MacArthur also distorts the facts when he says that the same Washington authorities who dismissed him have now received enthusiastically the cease-fire proposal of the Soviet Government. The record shows that the United Nations has made repeated efforts since June 1950 to secure a cease-fire in Korea. Particularly after the Chinese Communists entered the war were strenuous attempts made in this direction.

The proposal for cease-fire talks made by the Soviet Government on June 23 and subsequently concurred in by Communist China and North Korea omitted all reference to position by the Communists which revived some enthusiasm in Washington and paved the way for the current negotiations at Kaesong. Instead, therefore, of American policy following the Soviet line, as General MacArthur implied, it would seem that Soviet policy had come around at least part way to the American line.

Whatever merits there may be to General MacArthur's arguments, one cannot help but question them seriously because of the tactics and methods of reasoning which he employs.

ELTON ATWATER.

Associate Professor of Political Science, the Pennsylvania State College

STATE COLLEGE, PA., July 28, 1951.

Comment on General MacArthur's Boston Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Elton Atwater entitled "Tactics and Reasoning Questioned," to the editor of the New York Times, dated July 28, 1951, commenting on General MacArthur's Boston address.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TACTICS AND REASONING QUESTIONED

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES

Your editorial of July 27 clearly pointed out some of the inconsistencies in General MacArthur's recent speech at Boston. It is disturbing to note that General MacArthur, who portrays himself as a symbol of truth and integrity, resorted in this speech to the stratagem of half-truths in order to support his position and discredit his critics.

He said, for example, that one of the reasons for his dismissal was his readiness "to

Shopping for Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent heretofore granted, I herewith introduce for the attention of yourself and my other distinguished colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of July 30, 1951. It follows:

SHOPPING FOR DEFENSE

Senator LODGE of Massachusetts has presented to the Senate an interesting series of questions and answers between himself and Lt. Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, chief of staff to General Eisenhower in the Supreme Headquarters, Allied Powers in Europe. The questions relate to the effect of possible reductions in the military aid to other North Atlantic Pact countries, now pending before the Senate.

One proposal has been to cut in half the \$8,500,000,000 requested by the administration for military and economic assistance abroad or to spread it over 2 years instead of one. Senator LODGE asked what changes this would cause in the rate of European rearmament.

General Gruenther said the result would be necessarily to reduce by one-fourth the number of army divisions and air squadrons which are expected to be readied by European nations as their part of the mutual aid program by late 1952.

The Senator calculated from announced goals that this would mean a loss in potential armed manpower of 14 divisions and from 15 to 20 air squadrons.

This poses very squarely the decision that is before Congress. Do the proponents of the approximate \$4,000,000,000 cut believe (a) that with that sum they can create and equip more than an equivalent of American Army divisions and air groups, (b) that by retaining that sum in the American economy they can increase its military production potential in more than equivalent ratio, or (c) that it is simply not necessary to go that far in defense preparation against Communist imperialism?

The last hypothesis scarcely requires argument.

If conserving economic potential is the consideration, two points should be remembered; (1) It takes a long time, perhaps more time than a single-handed America would have, to convert from civilian to defense production. (2) To surrender Western Europe would be to give to the Soviets steel production and other industrial capacity very much greater than their own.

If the choice is between military cooperation and "going it alone," Americans may remember how their own vast Federal aid highway system has been built—on a matching basis, States pooling their resources with those of the National Government. Surely it would seem that \$4,000,000,000 will buy more defense if matched, as is intended, with European matériel and manpower than it will buy otherwise.

Moreover, European sentiment at this time has been built up, partly by American appeals, to a willingness to join in a major rearmament effort for defense of the free world. If the United States now backs away from the response to its own urgings, the effect will be what General Gruenther calls "a severe crisis in confidence" and an undercutting of the effort to evoke full-scale efforts from Western Europe in its own defense.

World Government Opposed by Legislature of the State of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a copy of a concurrent resolution by the Legislature of the State of Michigan in which it is on record as opposing with considerable vehemence the idea of a world government. The resolution is as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 31
Concurrent resolution in opposition to world government

Whereas world government, so-called, is a movement on the part of certain persons and groups in this country who seek, under the guise of peace, to subjugate this country to the rule of a world government which would be operated by representatives of nations whose theories and practice of gov-

ernment are opposed to the fundamental freedoms which have been the foundation upon which this country has grown great; and

Whereas world government would mean that our freedoms would be out-voted 5 to 1 by the dictators of the slave states; and

Whereas under world government the American people would surrender their own sovereignty irrevocably and would no longer be permitted to write their own laws; and

Whereas through the past 150 years this country has grown into a great nation because of the idea of individual freedom and initiative and because of that success has proven to be the rock upon which the two World Wars have been won against the two dictators and would-be world conquerors; and

Whereas this country has demonstrated that it cannot be enslaved by force, the willing adherents of a world government idea (in pursuit of a will-o'-the-wisp of peace at any cost) have become tools in the hands of those who wish to conquer this great Nation by other means, and

Whereas this country has demonstrated in four great wars that individual liberty and freedom are worth any sacrifice, and

Whereas all the great patriotic organizations of this country are opposed to the movement. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Michigan is in opposition to the movement for world government as being intended to reduce all the peoples of the world to the slavery of the state-dominated nations behind the iron curtain and the destruction of all the ideas of freedom of the individual upon which this country has become a great nation, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to each member of the Michigan delegation in Congress and to the legislature of each State.

Faltering Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I include an interesting and penetrating editorial from the Stockton Record, published in Stockton, Calif. This paper has a long record of constructive leadership in its field. Also, it is a paper that is not a partisan publication. Its owner, Irving Martin, has been a leader in progressive political matters for half a century. The editorial, unwittingly perhaps, states some of the very questions Congressmen are asking themselves. That is, why have controls not been invoked before? Shortly after the Korean attack the matter came before Congress. Congressman Kunkel, of Pennsylvania, sought in 1950, when the economic control bill was before the House, to have enacted something similar to the proposal of Mr. Baruch. The administration beat that amendment down. However, a controls law was passed and, as everyone knows who reads the papers, nothing very effective was done for months and months. Up to this moment the organization provided for still seems to be uncertain as to what it really

wishes to do. I have talked to several gentlemen in whom I have the utmost confidence, who are personal friends and who have been called here as advisers to the Price Administrator. They have told me that up to date they find very little utilization of their talents. They also find that their suggestions, based on a lifetime of effort and experience in the business world, are not given much attention. This editorial analyzed the situation about as well as any I have seen. I think it indicates that the administration, up to a few months ago, was only half-heartedly supporting the controls program.

Furthermore, it is the belief of many conscientious Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle that the administration has not tackled the real causes of inflation. High prices are merely evidence of inflation. Price ceilings only temporarily stop the inflation at the prices on the items where there is a ceiling. Other steps which could be taken to strike directly at the present serious inflationary trend would be far more effective. The rift between the President and some members of the Federal Reserve Board prevented that agency from taking appropriate steps to control inflation. When one realizes that over the past few years the life insurance policies outstanding have been estimated, by economic and research experts, as having been depreciated in their purchasing power up to about \$100,000,000,000—the estimates vary between \$80,000,000,000 and \$140,000,000,000—one can readily understand why we should take effective steps to halt inflation.

Following is the editorial:

FALTERING LEADERSHIP

In his midyear economic report to Congress Monday, President Truman called for a blood-sweat-and-tears program to bolster American defenses against Communist aggression. The setting had more of the dramatic urgency of Winston Churchill's 1940 appeal, but the hard facts that prompted Mr. Truman's words menace the United States no less than hard facts menaced Britain in 1940. The danger is that the facts will not get the attention they deserve.

In his economic message, the President displayed his two best traits—courage and tenacity. But his very demands for support also showed how deeply he lacks vision and leadership. The Presidential message warned repeatedly of our present inadequacies. Output of planes and tanks is lagging, Mr. Truman said. The Armed Forces must go up through the present 3,500,000-man ceiling. Stiff taxes and controls must be imposed to offset a widening inflationary gap. Further civilian belt-tightening is in prospect, he added.

Yet a balky Congress is threatening to block these new Presidential demands. Many similar ones already have been pigeonholed. Senators and Representatives just do not trust Truman leadership. The reason—

Speaking plainly, South Korea was not invaded Sunday. It was invaded 13 months ago. Quick mobilization, stepped-up production, and rigid economic controls were urged by many last July. Why is Mr. Truman asking for them this week?

Much of the responsibility belongs with the President and his advisers. Convinced that the Korean police action was a local affair and that greater defense efforts would upset political applecarts, they sent word:

"Wait until after the November elections." Congress was told things were not serious yet. Not until the Chinese attacked did the true significance of Korea appear to the soft-peddlers.

By then the opportunity for leadership had been lost. The public was confused. The President's own party, riven with vendettas, refused to respond. Senator Taft and his supporters got their foot in the door. Now, despite all Mr. Truman's zeal, he has a tough selling job to do, and the cost of delay will come high.

Land of Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the business and finance section of the July 23 issue of Time magazine subheaded "The general."

In the article we find the sterling example of these United States as a land of opportunity. It is, in effect, a biographical sketch of Gen. David Sarnoff, president of the Radio Corp. of America. The story of his life contains all the classic ingredients of a success story. Where there are brains, imagination, determination, the United States will give room for their development.

The amazing scope of mind of General Sarnoff together with his vitality have enriched our country and added materially to its progress. If General Sarnoff has received his rewards, the benefits flowing to the United States therefrom are immeasurable.

The above-mentioned article follows:

THE GENERAL

The public scored David Sarnoff's Radio Corp. of America with a lost round last year in the great color TV fight with Columbia Broadcasting System. Sarnoff did not stay down. Last week he showed the television industry a new tube that receives clear, true color, and he showed the public that RCA's color system can do what CBS's cannot; color programs broadcast by RCA can be received in black and white on present sets without any change. It looked as if radio's miracle man had not run out of miracles.

For months, Wall Street speculators have been betting on Sarnoff. So far this year, RCA stock has risen from 16½ to 21½. CBS fallen from 33 to 25½. This trend is the more remarkable because 6 months ago RCA was apparently caught flat-footed when the Federal Communications Commission decided to license the CBS "whirling disc" system for commercial broadcasting. RCA promised a much better system, one that existing TV sets would receive in black and white (unlike the CBS method) without any change in the sets. But the color RCA showed FCC last fall was mushy and CBS's was clear. FCC decided not to wait.

Even then, old radiomen kept their eyes on Sarnoff. He is the man who put radio in the home—and never forgets it for a waking moment. He is boss of RCA with its 52,000 employees (including those of the 238-station NBC radio and television network), of 13 manufacturing plants which

turn out millions of radios, TV sets and hundreds of different electronic gadgets, of a research staff which year in and year out develops new wonders. Would Sarnoff, who boasts that he was born about the same time that the electron was discovered (as if they were somehow twins), allow himself to be bested in the next great advance of the industry that he had led for two decades? Those who knew Sarnoff's vast ability—and his vast pride—thought not. They listened when, coldly eyeing the FCC decision, he said: "We may have lost the battle, but we'll win the war."

SECRET WEAPON

To get the weapon he needed, Sarnoff prodded RCA, not a nimble organization, into an amazing burst of speed to improve its color system. Last week, in his Radio City Exhibition Hall, Sarnoff put on a demonstration for some 200 radio and television reporters, who saw a 20-minute program starring Nanette Fabray and Singer Yma Sumac on RCA's new color tubes. (In RCA's system, the color-television camera breaks a picture down into three colors (red, green, and blue). These color impulses are broadcast, picked up by a television receiver circuit, which sets off three electronic "guns" (one for each color) inside the picture tube. They project the picture on the face of the tube so fast (1,800 times a minute) that the three-color pictures blend into a single all-color one.) There was no blurring or running of colors, even in the fastest movement, e. g., a pair of performing lovebirds flapping their wings. As a show topper, an RCA mobile unit focused on a swimming pool near New York where a troupe of swimmers and divers performed. The outdoor telecast, which RCA explained could just as well be a football game or boxing match, came through almost as clearly as the studio show.

Within 2 months, RCA will start putting on similar public color demonstrations on 100 receivers which will be moved from city to city all over the United States. By broadcasting its color show last week on its regular channel, RCA also showed TV set owners that its system is compatible, i. e., it could receive the broadcasts in black and white. (RCA can also convert existing sets to color.) The new tube's performance was so impressive that such TV competitors as Allen B. DuMont, who has opposed any form of color up till now, changed their minds. Said DuMont: "The RCA picture was good enough to start commercial programs immediately."

Sarnoff is far more cautious. He says: "Commercial color television on a big basis is still 2 to 5 years away. Material shortage, NPA cut-backs on TV production, and defense orders will delay it. On top of that, it will take a long time to get the bugs out of mass production of the color tube."

Many a TV man thinks that Sarnoff's 5 years is too long. One big reason is that when FCC made its decision last fall, TV set makers were almost solidly against the CBS system, because they were up to their ears in orders and wanted to make no changes that might upset sales. Now, TV manufacturers are up to their ears in unsold sets, are more likely to grab at RCA's system, which they think will get customers buying again. RCA has already given manufacturers the blueprints of its color system, to make sets (on a royalty basis)—if FCC gives the go-ahead.

Whatever technical or bureaucratic difficulties may lie ahead of RCA's color system, it was clear from last week's demonstration that Sarnoff was fighting his way out of a tough spot.

For more than 50 of his 60 years, Sarnoff has been doing just that. Driving through obstacles is his habit, his joy, his bitter necessity. He says: "There are three drives that rule most men: money, sex, and power." Nobody doubts that Sarnoff's ruling drive

is power. Says a deputy: "There is no question about it, he is the god over here."

THE HERMITAGE

American business biography abounds in up-from-the-bottom stories; few are quite so dramatic and revealing as Sarnoff's. Owen D. Young said that Sarnoff had lived "the most amazing romance of its kind on record." Horatio Alger himself could hardly have done it in one book; he would have needed *Adrift* in New York, *Nelson the Newsboy*, *The Telegraph Boy* and *Joe's Luck* or *Always Wide Awake*.

Sarnoff was born in 1891, eldest son of a poverty-stricken family in the tiny (pop. 200) Jewish community of Uzlian, in Russia's province of Minsk. His father, who came of a trading family, wanted him to become a trader. His mother, who came of a long line of rabbis, insisted that he become a scholar. Sarnoff remembers that in the world of his childhood, prestige was based not on money but on "the possession of knowledge."

When David was four, the dispute over his future ended; his father departed alone for America. His mother, a strong-willed woman, promptly packed David off to her uncle, a rabbi who lived in a hermitage in Korma, about 150 miles east of Minsk. For about 5 years David stayed there, the only boy in the hermitage, up at 6 to begin his studies of the Talmud that lasted until 9 at night. He was lonely and he remembers those strange years with bitterness. The greybeards in the hermitage did not teach him to count. But those years trained his memory (2,000 words of the Talmud a day) and his reasoning powers. He was set simple ethical problems to work out. Sample: "If you saw an article lying in the street, what rights would you have to it?"

This tutelage ended when David was 9½. His father in America sent for his family. David, his mother and a brother took a ship at Libau, Latvia. "I had never even seen a picture of a ship," says David. His mother, afraid of forbidden food on the ship, had cooked, according to strict orthodox rules, a great hamper of bread, cakes, and pickled meats. She explained that these were to be their only food on the voyage. David saw the food hamper being lowered into the hold. Afraid that it would be lost and he would starve, he dived after it into the hold, dropped 50 feet, scrambled about until he found the hamper and was rescued by a seaman. A sailor who spoke Russian told him: "You'll do all right in America."

He had to. When the Sarnoffs arrived in New York, they found the father broken in health. Ten-year-old David, who could not speak English, became the chief breadwinner for the family, which soon included two more babies. At 4 in the morning he left the family room on the lower East Side to deliver the Jewish Morning Journal, ran errands for a butcher before going to school. He saved enough money to buy a newsstand, sold papers after school until late at night. David, who had a fine soprano voice, also earned \$1.50 a week singing in the synagogue. At 15, on the day before he was to get \$100 for singing during the Jewish holy days, his voice began to change. It was a disaster. He had to quit grammar school to look for a full-time job.

INCIDENTALLY ME

He found one (at \$5 a week) as an office boy, saved \$150 to buy a telegraph key, and taught himself the Morse code. Soon he talked himself into an office job with American Marconi, the United States subsidiary of Marconi's British-owned company. The magic of wireless captured the boy's imagination; so did the personality of Marconi. "I carried his bag, delivered candy and flowers to his girl friends. I admired the simplicity of his approach to problems."

Up to this point, David had merely reacted with extraordinary energy to the responsibilities thrust upon him. Luck put him into the communications business, but had nothing to do with his next step. What he did next may have stemmed from the training in the lonely years in the hermitage at Korma: he sat down and thought out the path to his future. He noted that the company's wireless operators knew nothing about the office and that the office staff knew nothing about wireless. He decided that, as the business grew, it would need a man who knew both.

Sarnoff got his first operator's job on Nantucket Island, a job so lonely that few operators wanted it (\$70 a month, \$40 home to mother). David used his spare time to study books on wireless as tirelessly as he had the Talmud. Soon his expert "fist" could send 45 words per minute steadily for 8 hours—a pace not many could equal. After 2 years there, he got himself transferred to Long Island, at a \$10 cut in pay, so that he could go to night school, where he finished a 3-year electrical-engineering course in 12 months. When his big chance came, he was ready for it. He was an operator in the Marconi wireless station, atop John Wanamaker's Manhattan store, on the night of April 14, 1912, when he picked up a message from steamship *Titanic*: "Ran into iceberg. Sinking fast." For 3 days and nights, the Nation waited breathlessly while Sarnoff, going without sleep, provided its only news of the disaster and survivors. President Taft ordered all other stations off the air to enable Operator Sarnoff to catch the messages.

Sarnoff notes that the *Titanic* disaster "brought radio (and incidentally me) to the front." As a result of the disaster, Congress passed a law requiring every ship with more than 50 passengers to carry wireless. American Marconi set up a school to fill the sudden demand for operators; Sarnoff became an instructor at the school, rapidly moved up the ladder to commercial manager.

THE MUSIC BOX

In 1915 he wrote a historic memo to his boss. Experiments had already proved that wireless could broadcast speech as well as signals, but since anybody could "listen in" on such messages, the wireless companies thought the lack of privacy robbed radio-telephony of any commercial value. (Reginald Fessenden had made such a broadcast in 1906, when wireless operators at sea were startled to pick up the unearthly sounds.) Sarnoff realized its possibilities. In his memo, he proposed to build a "Radio music box to bring music into the house by wireless. Receiving lectures at home can be made perfectly audible; also events of national importance can be simultaneously announced and received." In the turmoil of World War I, Sarnoff's memo was ignored.

At war's end, the United States determined to end the British wireless monopoly. At Government urging, General Electric's Vice President Owen D. Young got G. E., Westinghouse, United Fruit and A. T. & T. to pool all their wireless patents and jointly organize RCA. It took over American Marconi—and Sarnoff. As RCA's chairman, Young was so impressed with Sarnoff's vision and knowledge of wireless theory and practice that he made him general manager.

Sarnoff dug out his old 1915 memo and tried it on Young, who like the "music box" idea. But RCA's directors were willing to risk only \$2,000. Sarnoff gave a demonstration that woke them up. He borrowed a Navy transmitter and helped give a blow-by-blow broadcast of the 1921 Dempsey-Carpentier world championship fight. It created a sensation; about 200,000 amateur wireless operators and others with home-made sets heard it, and spread the news of the wonder so widely that the public clamored for sets. RCA quickly developed the "music

box," and both GE and Westinghouse began making it, with RCA acting as wholesaler.

Everyone thought that Sarnoff was foolishly optimistic when he predicted that \$75,000,000 in boxes would be sold within 3 years. Actual sales: \$83,000,000. David Sarnoff, a prophet with honor, was soon radio's wonder boy, teeming with ideas. Why not, he proposed, put radios and phonographs in a single cabinet, save space, cut costs by using the same loudspeakers. Sales of such combinations soared. Why not start a radio network to improve programs, broaden the market for sets? At Sarnoff's urging, RCA found NBC and the Red Network. Two months later, the Blue Network was added.

CHANGING THE TUNE

The radio field was being invaded by so many newcomers that Sarnoff got worried; he thought RCA should expand into other fields. But RCA's profits were needed to keep pace with the mushrooming radio business; there was little left for the kind of expansion he had in mind. So Sarnoff began his famous series of expansions without cash; he traded RCA products and stock for the companies he wanted. RCA had developed the photophone, a device for talking movies, and traded rights to it to Radio-Albee-Orpheum and FPO Productions, Inc. for 65 percent of their stock. The name was changed to the Radio-Keith-Orpheum (RKO). To get into the manufacturing business on its own, instead of remaining only a wholesaler of sets, RCA swung an even bigger deal, RCA took over Victor Talking Machine for \$150,000,000 worth of RCA preferred and common stock, a price that Wall Street thought far too high. RCA profits continued to soar. In 1929, the company that had hesitated to spend \$2,000 on Sarnoff's music box grossed \$178,500,000 as a result of it, netted \$15,800,000, and was one of the sensations of the big bull market.

Radio stock went soaring from \$2.50 to \$54.9 a share, was split and resplit. Insiders made killings in radio pools, but Sarnoff had a reputation for keeping aloof from such shenanigans. At their height, he sailed to Europe to help Owen Young set up the Young plan for German reparations.

When Sarnoff came back in 1930, he was elected president of RCA and faced the depression. It was forcing many a radiomaker to the wall, but Sarnoff kept on driving ahead. In 1932, the Department of Justice forced GE and Westinghouse to give up their 51.3 percent control of RCA (by distributing their RCA holdings to their own stockholders). In this way RCA achieved independence, but as part of the deal Sarnoff also had to pay off \$17,900,000 that RCA owed its parents. He did it partly when he turned over to them RCA's new skyscraper headquarters in Manhattan (which GE still uses for its executive office), partly when GE and Westinghouse wiped out \$8,900,000 of the debt. RCA had outgrown the building, anyway. For new quarters, RCA took over the biggest building in Rockefeller Center and handed out 100,000 shares of preferred stock as part of the deal.

By then, the depression had hit hard enough so that Sarnoff decided to lighten ship. He started selling off control of RKO and later, on orders of FCC, sold the Blue network (it became the American Broadcasting Co.). In RCA's stock-swapping years, it paid no dividends. The first one was not paid until 1937, nearly 20 years after the company started. Sarnoff has thought it more important to plow earnings into research to keep up with the electronic world. And profits from research have often been a long time coming.

BRAVE NEW WORLD

Television is the best example. In 1923, Dr. Vladimir Zworykin, Westinghouse's Russian-born wizard, invented the eye of the

modern TV camera—the iconoscope, and developed the kinescope. Sarnoff then called television a dream whose shadowy outlines are beginning to appear on the far horizon, and set to work to make it come true. In 1928, RCA opened an experimental TV station in New York and during the next 20 years poured \$50,000,000 into television. At the opening of New York's World Fair on April 30, 1939, Sarnoff made the first United States commercial telecast with the words: "Now at last we add sight to sound."

But even so it was not until after World War II that the mass production of TV sets began.

Out of RCA's big research headquarters at Princeton, N. J., Dr. Zworykin (who joined RCA in 1929) and his colleagues, under Vice President C. B. Jolliffe, brought many other startling developments: the electron microscope, the infra-red sniperscope which enabled World War II G.I.'s to knock off skulking Japanese troops at night, shoran, for accurate blind-bombing. In World War II, RCA turned out an estimated \$500,000,000 worth of devices for the Armed Forces. Now it has big defense orders, many for products no one else can make.

Sarnoff is no scientist yet of all RCA's activities, research is nearest his heart and he is one of the few top men of the industry who can talk to scientists within an interpreter. And research represents tomorrow, expansion, new success which David Sarnoff, after the painful insecurity of his early life, still seeks.

COLLECTORS ITEMS

Modesty, false or otherwise, does not disguise Sarnoff's power and success. His chill blue eyes shine with impatient energy, his boyish, scrubbed-pink face radiates cockiness. All 5 feet 5 inches of his bull-necked, bull-chested figure bristles with authority and assurance. He dresses with conservative, expensive elegance, even carries a gold frame to hold matchbooks.

At RCA he makes all the top decisions, is brusque with slower-witted underlings. He insists that every memo to him must be no more than a page, but allows himself more latitude, has written memos as long as 30 pages. A collection of his better memos, bound in gold-tooled leather, is a prized Sarnoff possession.

To record his accomplishments more fully, Sarnoff keeps a man working on the history of RCA and his life and times (unpublished, it is now in its twelfth volume). He is proudest of the fact that President Roosevelt made him a brigadier general for his work in organizing communications for SHAEF, and he wears a gold ring with SHAEF's flaming sword insignia. He likes to be called General, and everybody at RCA does so. Even his wife and sons Robert, an NBC vice president, Edward, an electric appliance distributor, and Thomas, an ABC employee, so refer to him.

Again and again, he makes two points about his own personality: (1) He loves music, (2) he does not love money.

In the teeth of the realities of commercial radio and TV, he tries sincerely to hang on to his dream of the music box. Sarnoff gets much of the credit for the fact that radio has helped to change America from musical illiteracy to a nation where millions know and love good music. Sarnoff's original idea was that makers of radio sets would sponsor cultural programs. To this day he has little knowledge of radio advertising and he despises cheap radio entertainment.

SHARPS AND FLATS

Sarnoff's closest friends are from the musical world. Occasionally, such friends as NBC Music Director Sam Chotzinoff, Jascha Heifetz, Vladimir Horowitz, etc., stage elaborate costume parties at Sarnoff's home. At a surprise party for Toscanini, the maestro was shown to the sixth floor when he arrived,

asked if he had a reservation, was finally led into what seemed to be a night club. A blare of jazz assailed the conductor's ears. Sarnoff acted as ringmaster in a circus act while Elza Helfetz Behrman, sister of Jascha Heifetz and wife of Playwright S. N. Behrman, rode a make-believe horse. Toscanini sat with his head in his hands all evening, would not look at the show, and was not amused.

Last year, for Sarnoff's birthday, the group staged a satire. Chotzinoff, impersonating Sarnoff, sat at a breakfast table, surrounded by telephones, talked into all of them at once, pounded the table, chewed up cigars. Sarnoff was amused.

Sarnoff likes to tell people that he is not a man of big wealth. Considering that he has been for 20 years at or near the top of an expanding industry, this is a sensational statement—and people who ought to know believe it. He has 5,000 shares of RCA stock and a \$200,000-a-year salary.

His home life is as elegantly comfortable as that of any nonmillionaire in the world. The Sarnoff home in Manhattan has 6 floors, 30 rooms, 2 patios, a barber shop, and a projection room. In almost every room, including the servants', are radio and TV sets, with tuning gadgets concealed among the furnishings.

This ménage is presided over by his French-born wife, Lizette, whom he met and married 34 years ago in the Bronx. Sarnoff explains the courtship: "I could speak no French. She could speak no English. So what else could we do?"

MAJOR WEAKNESS

Sarnoff's lack of interest in some of the commercial aspects of radio may account for the fact that RCA's brilliant record in research and financing has not been equaled by its sales record—until recently. The man who has done much to eliminate this weakness is Frank M. Folsom, one-time vice president of Chicago's Goldblatt Bros. and Montgomery Ward, and chief of the procurement branch of the Navy during World War II, who joined RCA Victor in 1944.

As RCA chairman, Sarnoff lets President Folsom handle most executive details. Folsom is thus the empire's only heir-apparent, but at 57, he is close to Sarnoff's own age. There are a few able younger men coming up, but RCA's major weakness is lack of a solid second echelon of younger executives. Its size often makes it hard for RCA to turn fast enough to cope with the crack team of Paley and Frank Stanton at smaller CBS.

SLOW BUT SURE

CBS got the jump on RCA, not only in color, but in putting on the market 3 years ago the slow-playing record that revolutionized the phonograph business. Not long after that, CBS raided NBC's radio shows, snatched away such top stars as Jack Benny, Amos and Andy. At the time NBC lost the stars; it looked as if it would be hard hit. But Sarnoff has a way of coming out ahead despite defeats. After the rumpus over the long-playing records died down, business for all record companies, including RCA, picked up. Thanks to the astounding spread of television, the network has hardly missed its radio stars.

To Sarnoff, these were all skirmishes, nothing to scare him from his plans to expand RCA into new territory. He is already itching to put RCA into the electric-appliance business. NBC into the movie business (to make films for television), and is planning a "pay-as-you-hear" TV system which would not depend on telephones as does Zenith Radio Corp.'s system (Time, June 4). Above all, he is confident that the vast sums he has poured into research will continue to pay off with more spectacular advances than even his color-television tube.

"Electrons," he points out, "can supply the brains for the control of machinery,

respond to light, color, a wisp of smoke—the faintest touch or the feeblest sound. Today, these electrons can follow a chart, a blueprint or a pattern more accurately than the human eye. Some day, they may even respond to smell and taste. Who would dare predict the future? He is a rash man who would limit an art as limitless as space itself."

The Gains We Have Made

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, repeatedly we hear accusations and charges of a lack of foreign policy and a past complete failure of the present administration in the fields of international relations and security. It is heartening, therefore, to read the following straightforward and unbiased report such as *The Gains We Have Made*, an editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal of Sunday, July 29, which I recommend to the membership:

THE GAINS WE HAVE MADE

Tremendous global developments of the last several weeks have spurred the hope that the free world, working in unity, may yet realize the age-old hope of a peaceful earth.

The basic free-world policy at this moment in history is "containment" of Russian imperialist aggression. The line of defense is long. It extends from Korea through Japan, the Philippines, Indochina, Malaya, and India, to the Middle East, through the Mediterranean and Western Europe to northern Scandinavia. It is a military, moral, and economic line.

The success of the free-world policy has been impressive—in Greece, at Trieste, in Berlin, in Indochina and, now, in the biggest struggle in Korea. There are still weak spots in the defense line—in the Far and Middle East in particular. But the brakes have been applied to the Communist drive. And free-world unity is making terrific strides.

Europe was the free world's most vulnerable spot, the most attractive prize for aggressors. It is in Europe that the greatest gains are being made. The Marshall plan helped put the European economy on its feet. The Atlantic Pact and military aid program are building military forces capable of insuring security. The Council of Europe is spurring action in many fields of mutual endeavor.

The Schuman plan for integrating European coal and steel production and similar plans for agriculture, transport, and civil aviation have brought new conceptions of European unification and laid the ground work for political unity. Age-old currency barriers are being cut by the European payments union. Customs unions are leveling tariff walls and opening doors to trade. British Commonwealth and affiliated sterling-bloc nations have, through loans and trade agreements, stimulated commerce and rehabilitation.

In the Far East progress is slower as new nations, freed from colonial ties, feel their way slowly. But progress is there. With U. N. and American and British aid gains are being made in food production, industry, health, and military security. Korea has given new courage to far-eastern nations which desire to remain free.

The results of this great global program have pyramided progress and now the timetable is being stepped up. Recent weeks have brought many new developments—any one of which would have sufficed for a decade in the prewar world, and many of which would have been beyond the conception of that world.

Five European nations—France, Luxembourg, Italy, Germany, and Belgium—agreed on basic principles for pooling their armies under one command and one banner as the start of a unified European army.

Greece and Turkey, already members of the Council of Europe, have had the way cleared for participation in the North Atlantic Pact. In the making may be a Near East security plan joining them more solidly to the "containment" arc.

Announcement of Japanese peace-treaty plans and the decision of the Allies to end the state of war with Germany paves the way for those defeated nations to play a part in the free world. Supporting those policies is the new Anzac-United States mutual security pact, forerunner of a pact for the Pacific similar to the Atlantic Pact.

Simultaneously, steps were taken to strengthen the European defense perimeter by an agreement for use of Spanish bases by American air and naval forces. The British Commonwealth Colombo plan for far eastern economic development was started with projects for India. The United States point 4 program was developing along broader and sounder lines in Congress.

No period in world history has seen such tremendous developments for mutual aid and security to insure peace and a better life for free men. It has been slow and difficult work in the face of old nationalist suspicions and the tendency of political opportunists to claim "no policy at all" in this great world-wide program. But the struggles of the last few years are now paying off. As General Eisenhower said in London a few days ago.

"Caution that is inescapable in a new and unique enterprise has been replaced by confidence born out of obstacles overcome. * * * If we march together, endure together, share together, we shall succeed—we shall gloriously succeed together."

After Cease-Fire, Can We Have Real Bipartisanship?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the old maxim, "Politics ends where the oceans begin," may well have another testing ground soon. If the cease-fire holds good in Korea, the administration will have another chance to make its old claim of a bipartisan foreign policy really true. There has always been in our history an amazing degree of national unity on the conduct of foreign affairs, once the issues had been clarified. To be sure, we have fought long and hard on policies in the debating stages, but when the chips were down, when any threat matured, we have joined forces and driven political differences out of the arena.

In the decisive questions still ahead—the development of our national strength, the strengthening of the

United Nations as a force for peace, the realization of the Western European coalition, there is room for large-scale agreement between Democrats and Republicans. Here, the issue will be resolved by the extent to which Mr. Truman invites Republicans into Government councils before decisions are made, rather than after they have been reached.

The complex problems are so weighty that they demand of the administration the same kind of foresighted statesmanship which Mr. Churchill displayed in taking Mr. Atlee to international conferences while Churchill was still Prime Minister. If we have this kind of bipartisanship now, we may prevent sorrow and tragedy later.

The Tidelands Cases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following article by George Sokolsky dated July 29, 1951:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

I became interested in the tidelands cases for two reasons, perhaps somewhat different from those which immediately trouble the people of the States of California, Texas, and Louisiana.

The first reason is the constant encroachment of the Federal Government on the revenues of State governments. In some States, in which the Federal Government has established vast national parks and reservations, State revenues are in such a dismal condition that the States turn to Washington for a hand-out.

This is a bad practice. It was part of the theory of the New Dealers that States should be abolished and that the United States should be divided into administrative provinces—nine, if my memory serves me.

Such a procedure would have destroyed the sovereignty of the States and would have established an administrative system that could have been a basis for a totalitarian government.

The scheme failed and has been forgotten, but Federal encroachment on the rights of the States and of the people thereof has continued, often in such small respects that it amounts to a whittling process that can, in time, completely alter our form of government.

The second reason for my interest in the tidelands question is that in the case of the United States against Texas, the Supreme Court, deciding against the State 4 to 3, Mr. Justice Hugo Black and Mr. Justice William O. Douglas employed startling language, as in the California case, which ought not to be permitted to stand as precedent in American law.

The theory that what, at a particular moment, an administration of Government believes to be necessary is ipso facto right is not American but Nazi law.

Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, throughout his long career as an Hegelian philosopher, essayist, and jurist, did believe that law as a function of the power of the state involved no moral criteria, but both the

Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States conceived of law in this country as a limited procedure which, in the case of the individual, must not breach his inalienable rights and, in the case of States, must not invade their jurisdiction beyond the specific provisions of the Constitution.

Whereas the Democratic Party pays lip service to the memory of Thomas Jefferson, the tendency of both the Roosevelt and Truman administrations has been to ignore such limitations on the assumption that the necessities of the Government are paramount.

In the California and Texas cases the Supreme Court upheld this doctrine without, however, a very clear definition of the necessities of the Government.

Moreover, when such phrases are employed as "bare legal title" or "mere property ownership," the peril is far beyond these particular cases.

Our social and economic life is organized around "legal titles." A man has a legal title to his home, his automobile, his furniture, his television set, etc. And that is all that he has. That legal title is his sole right to possess whatever he has, even the suit on his back.

There are countries where a "legal title" does not exist for the individual but is vested in the government. In such countries, the government can, in pursuit of its so-called necessities, divest the individual of his possessions, because the title to the means of production, distribution, and exchange is socially vested in the state.

This is Marxian socialism, now practiced in Soviet Russia and other Communist countries.

When, therefore, a Justice of the United States Supreme Court denounces "legal titles" by using such an adjective as "bare" to describe them, he is moving a step toward the concept that a legal title is unimportant per se.

Ignoring for the moment all other considerations in these Tidelands cases, such a concept as this held by Mr. Justice Douglas must not be permitted to stand:

"Property rights must then be so subordinated to political rights as in substance to coalesce and unite in the national sovereignty."

The American conception of property rights is that they exist by right of law and not by the fiat of the administration in power. Were it otherwise, it would be possible for the Republicans, when they achieved power, to deny property rights to Democrats and vice versa.

As a matter of fact, that process is actually employed today in countries where nationalization is incomplete, such as China and Czechoslovakia, and it was used by Soviet Russia to deprive landowning farmers, Kulaks, of their property.

In a word, here we have an issue that transcends oil and goes to the heart of the American philosophy of life.

Missouri Valley Flood Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, the recent floods in the Missouri Valley have tragically and forcefully called the attention of the Congress and the American people once again to the necessity

of action by the Federal Government to prevent repeated recurrences of floods and the resulting suffering, private loss, and harm to the national economy as well as to the Nation's food supply.

In the past, numerous plans have been advocated as the solution for this problem. Unfortunately, there has been considerable diversity of opinion amongst the proponents of these plans as to which is the best plan. I believe, however, that the Congress and the American people generally, especially those living in the Missouri Valley, are all agreed that some plan is necessary. I would like to see those who are concerned with this problem forget the differences which have separated them and unite behind a plan which, of necessity, must involve some compromise, and present a common front, so that we may move forward expeditiously and effectively toward a solution of the problem.

As I see it, there are five basic factors inherent in any flood-control plan which are as follows:

First. Flood control.

Second. Irrigation.

Third. Navigation.

Fourth. Soil conservation.

Fifth. Power production.

With regard to the first, there is complete unanimity. There is some difference of opinion with regard to the necessity for irrigation, navigation, and soil conservation, although I believe that practically all the proponents of flood control realize that all of these factors are important and to a certain extent must be included in any over-all flood-control plan which will be acceptable to all concerned.

The most controversial element is power production. It is my belief that for the present plans for power production in a flood-control plan for the Missouri Valley must be kept to a minimum. While we all recognize the fact that it is desirable to make electricity available to the largest number of citizens, still we must take into account the existence of private power production and distribution facilities. It is not my intention to deprive investors and private utilities of their capital; nor to destroy large corporations which provide employment in communities in which they serve.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of the Interior, the Army engineers, and the proponents of a Missouri Valley authority, as well as the various flood-control associations, chambers of commerce, and farmers' groups concerned, will come together in a joint meeting for the purpose of exploring and analyzing plans heretofore advocated and then, through a spirit of good will and compromise and a sense of the importance and the immediacy of the problem, arrive at a common plan which can be presented to the Congress.

We have heard many accounts and have seen numerous pictures of the effect of a flood in rural areas. I think, however, that fewer Americans are aware of the devastating effects that a flood has upon an urban area. Although my home city of St. Louis, through a fortuitous combination of circumstances, escaped severe damage from the flood, our sister city of Kansas City was not so fortunate.

I would like to close by including herewith the following article by James Lawrence, editorial writer for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, which appeared in the Post-Dispatch on Sunday, July 29:

IN THE WAKE OF A FLOOD (By James Lawrence)

KANSAS CITY.—The story of a great flood can be told in terms of so many feet of a river stage, in terms of roads closed, bridges washed out, factories flooded, in terms of statistics on the homeless. But that is not what a flood is.

A flood is homes cracked into matchsticks, industrial plants thrown into rubble piles, smokestacks staring above the wreckage, a pervasive odor of decay, a city turned into a battlefield drenched in mud.

The muddy Kansas River is often a slow stream, and a man can sometimes wade across it at Eudora, west of Kansas City. But ever since the Ice Age which helped create the winding river, the Kaw has occasionally flooded out its valley. For a time this July the Kansas lost its quiet and turned the bigger Missouri into its tributary.

From Kansas City west to Lawrence the highway skirts the Kaw valley. There are few crossings of the river, for nearly every bridge on up to Manhattan was flung into the floods, and along the edges of the road now, the fields are full of rippled black silt, with no green thing showing.

WHEN WATER HITS A CITY

Over many acres there are lakes, though the river has receded to its banks. These lakes will remain, to sour the soil and defy the plow, until the sun sucks them away. Back from the road, beyond or in the lakes, there is a white glint from farm homes, some crumpled on their foundations, some floated into trees or banks where they collapsed.

That is a flood in the country. It is an old story, how the water makes a desert of the countryside.

But this concept of a flood would prepare no one for what happens when a wall of water hits a city. What happens to a city is a shock to perception and a challenge to belief.

Southwest boulevard runs northeast from Merriam in Kansas, across the State line and into Kansas City. Near the State line the road touches on the edges of major industrial districts. It threads among small plants, warehouses, oil supply depots, freight yards, homes and tenements, crowded below the terraced skyscrapers of the city.

A few days ago bulldozers, road scrapers, and men with shovels moved slowly down Southwest boulevard to clear the debris, salvage what there was to salvage and make way for traffic. And this is what the motorist could see:

On each side, the pavement was lined with piles of Kansas gumbo and sand three or four feet high. This was no more than the mud and its gluey collection of bottles, dishes, clothing, boards, cans and bricks which had been cleared from the road. Behind these muddy barricades were the ruins.

BRICKS, TOOTHPICKS, MUD

Three-story brick warehouses had collapsed into cones of bricks. A few had resisted. In other cases two or three walls stood, or a chimney or smokestack rose like a pier above the level wreckage.

Frame homes were torn from their foundations and tossed backward. Front walls leaned against rear walls which leaned against trees or rubble, and the trees bent nearly to the ground. The flimsier tenements had vanished into toothpicks.

Mud covered the low-lying railroad tracks and rose over the trucks of boxcars. In the shambled freight yards, boxcars were overturned and their cargoes gone.

The water had tossed large oil and gasoline tanks into tilted angles, and anchored them in mud. Where had the tanks come from?

One had rolled over a shed, smashing it into the flat alluvial land.

All this devastation apparently had come with the speed of the tide which battered and crushed the high levees. These levees had been expected to protect the industrial districts, and instead only added to the haste of the destruction when they gave way.

WHERE WERE THE PEOPLE?

And the people? For the most part, the people of the district were not there.

A few road workers kept scraping a path for traffic. Trucks carried smashed equipment away and new equipment into the area. A scattering of industrial employees worked here and there with shovels and hoses.

But few of those who lived in the area had returned. The Kaw had begun to return to its lazy path, the sun had returned, industry was digging its way back. For too many of the residents the flood had left a place of no return.

Turkey, Sentinel of the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts translated from a series of three articles by Edouard Sablier, published in *Le Monde*, leading Paris daily, on July 6, 7, and 8, 1951, under the headline "Turkey, sentinel of the west." The subject matter of these articles is of great importance to the United States.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TURKEY, SENTINEL OF THE WEST

Since Ataturk realigned the frontiers of the country with those of the Turkish people, the people have lived amid feelings of solitude but also of intense patriotism and pride. These two feelings are expressed especially in regard to the army. The war in Korea has demonstrated the combat valor and heroism of the Turkish expeditionary corps. The whole nation is determined to make every effort for the defense of its territory and, for that, it looks confidently to the magnificent Anatolian soldier. In addition, the army is treated with the greatest care by the government, and its modern organization makes it unquestionably one of the best instruments of Western Europe.

Today the entire attention of Turkey is directed to its frontiers. The Russians maintain their pressure on the straits and the Armenian provinces. The Bulgarians are deporting their Turkish-speaking citizens. Iran and the Arab countries continue their historic antipathy. Only Greece has warmed up toward Turkey, to a certain degree, in the face of the common danger. To the ethical isolation of the Turks is added their strategic responsibility: guardians of the straits, the Turks are searching desperately for whatever can fortify them in their mission.

This situation cannot help but influence their state of mind. Spy consciousness deepens in intensity: until recent days non-Turks, foreigners, or members of minorities did not have the right to an outside an-

tenna for their radio sets. On the Bosphorus nets bar access to the straits. Theoretically no ship can wander in there without a pilot. But the Russians seem ingenious in bypassing the rule; often one of their boats gets tangled in the nets, pays the fine and, next time, tries it again. Sometimes a ship reaches the banks and the press never fails to cry "fifth column."

The Russian is the obsession. In all the speeches and all the articles, he represents the bete noir, or the scapegoat. * * *

Turkish foreign policy is dominated today by one single preoccupation: Adherence to the Atlantic Pact. The entire parliamentary and journalistic life turns around this question. It is not even dictated by diplomatic considerations, but is a veritable affair of passion.

To remain neutral between the Bolshevik east and the capitalist west was a highly honored principle in Turkey, well before the war. The Kemal regime constantly made common cause with the east to counterbalance the overelish aims of the west. Locarno, it should not be forgotten, was followed by a Turco-Soviet pact that Pravda called "anti-Locarno." At the same time, Turkey envisaged taking the lead in an Asiatic coalition of which the treaty of Saadabad seems to have been the first stage. Today there exist few countries so determined to align themselves in the western camp.

At the end of the last war Moscow refused to renew the treaty of friendship; Russian diplomacy demanded a share in the control of the straits, then sketched out claims to the Armenian provinces of Kars and Ardahan. The era of understanding has ended. The Turks are in arms, American credits nourish the superarmament program, military missions are proceeding with the intensive training of three classes now under the colors, while technicians of all sorts are going ahead with the preparation of bases in the Anatolian redoubt.

Turkey doesn't hide its astonishment at the reserved attitude that its request to join the Atlantic Pact meets in European chancelleries. Members of the Council of Europe and of the economic organization (OEEC), having fulfilled all the conditions required by the statutes, disposing of the sponsorship of the United States, Turkey sees herself refused admission to a club where everybody agrees to welcome her without making the slightest gesture to do so.

It was not without long hesitation that Washington consented to become the champion of Turkey in the Atlantic organization. The United States unquestionably is taking on more commitments than it can uphold, a troubling situation in the face of Congress even more than with respect to the Allies. Some time ago, applying to Turkey the fearful conception of the "Breton redoubt," the American military chiefs had suggested a strategic withdrawal of Turkish defenses to the region of Adana, thus underlining the impossibility of defending Istanbul and all of European Turkey. This attitude produced terrible agitation. A wave of neutralism appeared, particularly among those who opposed Turkish participation in the Korean affair because they considered it preferable to concentrate the country's entire forces on its own defense.

Before these reactions, the State Department admitted the necessity of including Turkey in the Atlantic Pact. This procedure would avoid asking new commitments in Congress, at the same time as it would assure Washington that in case of aggression against Turkey the cosigners of the pact would no longer show the hesitation that they demonstrated at the time of the affair in Korea.

Among the numerous objections, tacit or expressed, opposing the Turkish demand, the most widespread is that the inclusion of Turkey would be equivalent to a provocation of the Soviet Union.

The Foreign Minister, Fouad Keuprulu, undertook to refute this argument forcefully: "If our adherence to the Atlantic organization should constitute a provocation for the Soviet Union, what then should be said of the Truman doctrine itself? If Greece and Turkey are juridically covered by the Atlantic defense, that would, on the contrary, be the best assurance of peace and stability through giving a salutary warning to the aggressor."

More serious, it seems, is the objection to bases: in joining the Atlantic Pact, Norway in order to avoid Soviet hostility, believed it necessary to commit itself, to not furnish military bases for the Atlantic armies on its territory. The Atlantic countries feel that if Turkey saw itself obliged to make the same commitments, its adherence to the pact would constitute a loss for the West whose whole interest in this part of the world is precisely to obtain bases.

To which the Turks, with out making precise commitments on the question of bases, reply that at the point where things are, it is no longer a question of illusory arrangements, and that military necessities must take priority over all the rest. Gone is the time when, to the Anglo-Turk and Franco-Turk treaties of 1939, a protocol was added providing that Turkey would remain neutral if the U. S. S. R. was engaged in a conflict in the Mediterranean (which, it may be said in passing, singularly reduced the extent of the Anglo-Franco-Turk alliance).

In reality, between the Western Powers and Turkey, the conversation flows on two different levels. The Atlantic Pact in fact brings no additional advantage to Ankara. The Republican People's Party, gone into the opposition, omits no occasion for underlining this. Mr. Necmettin Sadak, former Minister of Foreign Affairs, set forth his views on this matter: "What's the use of joining the Atlantic Pact? If France and Great Britain alone can reply to an appeal for help in the Mediterranean, it's enough merely to rejuvenate the pact that links us with these two powers by suppressing the protocol that embarrasses us. As for the United States, we all know that they will intervene if they can, and only if they can."

But for Turkey adherence presents a moral advantage: Mr. Keuprulu says: "Today our public opinion is waiting. It considers that we have a right to an Atlantic recognition. We have shown our good will, our fidelity to the principles of the United Nations, and above all, we form an integral part of Europe. Without Greece and Turkey there can be no true European unity. From the military point of view, the defense of the Mediterranean is impossible without these two countries. But all these reasons are subordinate to an argument of a moral order. Imagine the profit that Communist propaganda would earn if we were refused entry and all the sacrifices consented to by our people were deliberately neglected. In Turkey this eventuality would have disastrous repercussions. The terrain would be favorable to a neutralist propaganda that would break down our will to defense. I am sure, not as a diplomat, but as a historian, that this would be for the front of the free nations a moral failure with incalculable consequences."

Frankly, when one sees the present-day disposition of the Turkish people, the hypothesis of a neutrality, even caused by spite, appears little likely. From various conversations that we have had it becomes clear all the same that Turkish participation in a conflict would be immediate only if the country itself were attacked. In the case

where an aggression took place in the neighborhood, the intervention would doubtless be limited, as in Korea, to the dispatch of a symbolic contingent. For if the Turks appear decided to let no one penetrate into their country, they seem very little disposed themselves to go forth from it.

Turkey wants even more strongly to attach itself to the west as the east beckons it dangerously. During my stay in Istanbul a curious zoological auction set India against Pakistan. Pandit Nehru had just sent a gift of a young elephant to the Turkish children; immediately Pakistan announced the shipment of a big elephant for the adults. India countered by sending a monkey, which resulted in inciting Karachi at once to send a panther. Such are the methods, among others, that oriental countries employ to conciliate the good graces of Turkey.

The Turks visibly feel themselves frightened by the appeal of Asia. The Ottoman Empire played an immense role in Islam, but the Turkish Republic is most suspicious of pan-Islamism.

That is why the rulers and public opinion show great coolness toward British intentions. Mr. Morrison, announcing in Commons that Great Britain did not oppose the admission of Turkey into the Atlantic Pact, added, however, that in his opinion there should exist a better solution. This latter, everyone knows, for London is to be found in the conclusion of a Mediterranean or Near East Pact. The Turkish press considers that Great Britain subordinates her whole policy in the Near East to the desire of obtaining supremacy in that region. Otherwise put, that she will sincerely accept the participation of Turkey in the Atlantic organization only if London obtains the supreme command. And the Turks don't want to hear talk of that, at any price. "Everything is happening," said a politician at Istanbul to me, "as if one wanted to cut Turkey off from the west and throw it toward the east. In this case we would be lined up in the category of underdeveloped countries."

Is it understood that this hypothesis hardly pleases the Nation of Ataturk?

After having added brilliant pages to the history of his country during the first war and the revolution, Gen. Refaat Belay is presently the representative of Turkey on the Palestine Refugee Commission. When he visits Gaza, the mukhtar (mayor) kisses his shoulder, as did his father at the time when Refaat Pasha commanded the sector. If the general meets Egyptian officers, they interrogate him respectfully on the details of the campaign against the Suez Canal, which is still at the base of their military instruction concerning that region. At Tel Aviv the Foreign Minister, Moshe Sharett, receives with no less regard the general in whose army he served in other times as an interpreter second lieutenant. And in his presence, Noury Said, Iraq's Prime Minister, slips discreetly over the period when, as an officer in the Turkish Army headquarters, he deserted to join the Anglo-Arab banner of Lawrence.

This is a striking example of what the evocation of their former southern provinces suggests to the Turks. When the Turkish authority extended in the Near East to the Persian Gulf and the Suez Canal, the defense and unity of that region posed no problem. The young republic has deliberately cut itself off from this recent past. One of the principal acts of Ataturk was abolition of the Caliphate, which furnished the Chief of the Turkish State with a temporal authority over all the countries of Sunni Islam. The rulers of Ankara, doubtless, have no desire to tie themselves again with the tradition. But Ankara clearly is wounded when appeal is not more willingly made to her experience.

Several months ago the United States, France, and Great Britain set forth in a common declaration their objectives in the Near East. Turkey, unless I am mistaken, was not consulted. However the permanent aims of her policy coincide with those of the three great western powers—and especially with France—in that they tend to defend the status quo and the peace while at the same time affording a solution to the principal problems of the Near East, such as Israeli-Arab relations and reintegration of the refugees. The future of the Near East depends in great measure on an harmonious cooperation among the four powers.

Since the end of the last war Turkey has sincerely tried to win the friendship of her former Arab vassals. No one takes seriously the fears expressed by certain Arab nationalists lest their countries be implicated in a conflict for the defense of Turkey. The Turks in fact have no need of Arab military aid and have no illusions as to the real value of such aid.

Recently the United States seemed to have suggested to Ankara the idea of putting a little order into the Near East mosaic. The results up to now don't seem convincing. King Abdullah of Jordan has just made a trip, which he desired to be a solemn one, through Turkey. Raised in Istanbul, deputy in the Ottoman Parliament, the Hachemite sovereign is continually looking for a way of retightening links between Arabs and Turks that are rather loose because of the revolt directed by his family. No doubt his joyous character merited him a certain sympathy in Turkey, but on the political plane the results seem just about nil. Several Turkish friends confided to me the amusement that the last caprice of the little King had caused. He had obstinately insisted on camping in a tent that he had raised in the gardens of the palace placed at his disposal.

Several days later, it was the turn of Azzam Pasha to come seeking Turkish suzerainty. The usual repertory of the secretary-general of the Arab League, capable of impressing an Anglo-Saxon audience, was a complete fiasco in Turkey. The press recorded without comment declarations such as that announcing the entry into war of Moslem countries at the side of Iran in case the latter became engaged in conflict with England. But on the whole the Turks showed no enthusiasm for going along with the Moslem countries beyond this moral pact of which Azzam Pasha spoke. In a word, Turkey is willing to busy herself with the Near East sector, but she wants above all to take part in the Atlantic community, which for her signifies especially not being left alone in tête-à-tête with London.

It is surprising to discover how much alive the memory of Lawrence is in Turkey. Officers, traveling companions, newspapermen have told us many times the conditions under which the Hejaz trains were attacked by the Anglo-Hachemite troopers and, above all, how several hundred wounded Turks were massacred in the Damascus hospital after the triumph of the Arab revolt. In this respect the famous "Seven Pillars of Wisdom" are raised like an unsurmountable dam between Turkish policy and British aims in the Near East.

The great argument of the Arab or Moslem rulers who want to drag Turkey into their furrow is naturally the appeal to Islamic solidarity. Inconceivable a few months ago, has this hope today more chances of being realized?

One month to the day after its electoral victory of May 1950, the Democratic Party authorized once again the Ezzan to be sung in Arabic. The Ezzan is the call to prayer launched from the top of the minarets by the muezzins. Desiring to cut off all foreign influences, Ataturk had ordered that

this call, like all the rest of the liturgical language, be done in Turkish. The fact that it can once again be expressed in the language of the Prophet is not in itself a menace to the fundamental lay principle, but the greatest part of opinion sees in this reform a sign of a sliding toward a religious renewal. Is it possible from this to speak today of an Islamic reaction?

Certainly, at first glance, the situation has changed a good deal. Almost everywhere mosques are being built at the expense of the community. The faithful fill the holy places for Ramadan. The Government, after authorizing radio broadcasts of Koranic prayers, has reestablished religious instruction in the schools and reopened certain mausoleums to the faith.

It is possible to multiply these examples. But it seems necessary to receive them with the greatest reserve. In according certain facilities to the partisans of religion, the Democratic Party is paying certain electoral obligations and is taking into account manifestations of public opinion before the elections. Ataturk had imposed his reforms by reducing the opposition to silence. Today the Ghazi is no longer in existence, his regime is more supple, the protestors are raising their voices.

Curious fact: The very ones whom one would tend to consider as natural defenders of the Ataturk reforms sometimes show themselves to be their most violent adversaries. Thus a goodly number of students and professors are in the advance guard of the pan-Islamic movement. Perhaps they sin by an excess of "Kemalism." Essentially beneficiaries of the progressive and national reforms, they often arrive at a racist and xenophobic notion very far from the conceptions of Ataturk, which leads them to combat the democratic and liberal spirit of the regime and to seek in religion an arm against it.

The sparse elements of this political, rather than religious and racial, movement have just united to form the Federation of Nationalists. This has practically no influence, very few newspapers. Recently a sympathetic review, *Orkun*, complained that no big daily had agreed to publish the releases of the federation, and launched an appeal inviting sympathizers to join it en masse.

The immense majority of students has chosen to defend Kemalism. The National Federation of Students, of democratic tendency, and the National Union of Students, whose sympathies are with the Republican People's Party, have adopted an attitude of strict defense of the reforms and of the lay principle. . . .

Likewise some religious sects such as the Tijanis are emboldened more every day to challenge the laic laws. It is impossible not to note an increase in the number of men wearing the turban and of women wearing the veil, which a few months ago would have led to severe punishment.

"On the whole, the Government is determined to defend the reforms and the lay principle. But certain elements in the Democratic Party (among others, Tewfik Ileri, Minister of Public Instruction, is mentioned) openly flirt with the religious movement. President Djelal Bayar, Kemalist from the first day, recently denounced in a speech at the University of Istanbul "the danger of reaction." Several days later the prime minister, Mr. Menderes, declared "There is no reaction." It was left to Mr. Karasmanoglu, Democratic leader, to resolve this contradiction, or rather to make a synthesis of it: "There is no reaction, but only reactionaries."

It is troubling to find that all these politico-religious attempts are happening simultaneously, and at the moment when activities in the same sense are going on in

Iran to lead the Government and the masses to adopt a pan-Islamic policy.

Several Turks believed they could assure us that the common origin of these movements must be looked for abroad. Now it is precisely to put an end to foreign interferences that the Kemalist regime abolished the Caliphate, which was the generator of authority over the whole of Islam but also the cause of vulnerability for Turkey whose foreign policy had to be inserted into the framework of pan-Islamic interests.

Pakistan scarcely hides the efforts it is making at present to bring Turkey to play once again a role in pan-Islamic policy. But the Turks care little to align themselves in a coalition of this sort, if only for fear of being submerged by numbers. If ever an Islamic Holy Alliance should see the light of day, it would be Karachi and not Ankara that would be at the head of it. That is why the authorities look with a rather jaundiced eye on the ceremonies that the Pakistanis organize with the participation of whirling dervishes who, up to now, were formally forbidden by the laws of the Republic.

That said, it does not seem that the equilibrium of modern Turkey is really menaced by the double "black peril"—interior or exterior—as certain defenders of the lay principle are already calling it. If, in the interior, the faithful are again finding, little by little, the right to exercise in full freedom and in the language of their choice the prescriptions of their creed, it appears rather improbable that the fanatics will succeed through this in throwing the victories of the revolution into doubt.

The invitation to the pan-Islamic voyage seems doomed to the same failure. The panthers or elephants of Pakistan continue to fatten in the Istanbul zoo. Abdullah and Azzam can occupy the first page of the newspapers, but Turkish opinion remains cool toward the invitations of these former vassals. And in the barracks, young recruits learn the old complaint inherited from their elders: "He's gone with his regiment to Yemen, and he's never come back again."

The Louisiana Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting the following article by George Sokolsky:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

Up to the present generation, Americans generally took great pride in State history and tradition, and were usually offended by Federal encroachment upon States' rights. In public addresses and private conversation, the reference was "these United States" rather than to "the United States."

Like so much else that has had deep roots in American tradition, this long-held attitude has lost some of its meaning. Maybe it is due to the automobile and good roads or to the radio and television.

I think rather that this tendency should be attributed to the propaganda efforts of the New Deal to make States administrative adjuncts of a national administration.

This propaganda has been continuous and intense for 18 years, during which an in-

creasingly large number of Americans have become interested in or dependent upon Federal Treasury checks.

In the so-called tidelands cases—California, Louisiana, and Texas—the Supreme Court has been laying down doctrine, which, while dealing with oil, can be widely applied to the lessening of the sovereignty of the States.

Mr. Justice Douglas in the Louisiana case stated:

"The marginal sea is a National, not a State concern. National interests, national responsibilities, national concerns are involved. The problems of commerce, national defense relations with other powers, war and peace, focus there. National rights must therefore be paramount there."

The learned Dean Roscoe Pound, who taught law to some of our Supreme Court Justices, asks:

"But as to such things as are specified, namely commerce with foreign states (e. g., obligations) and conduct of war, are not the rights or powers of the United States paramount also over the whole land? Such rights, incidents of external sovereignty, are not incompatible with ownership, dominium, as distinct from sovereignty. For example, the power of eminent domain of the Federal Government extends for Federal purposes over the whole land."

"Private land may be used for national defense throughout the whole land. It is not for that reason excluded from private ownership. Private land may be used for national defense throughout the country and is nonetheless private property because of this."

If Mr. Justice Douglas' theory is correct, why should there be any private ownership of property in the city of New York? The financial affairs of the Nation, insurance, banking, publishing, etc., are concentrated there.

A very large part of the international and domestic commerce of this country either originates in New York or is handled there. The United Nations is situated in that city.

Surely the Empire State tower would, in a war against us, be employed in the national defense. Should it not now be confiscated according to the reasoning of Mr. Justice Douglas?

The intellectual difficulty which the followers of Oliver Wendell Holmes face is that they are forced by their theory of the law to accept it as an instrument for the exercise of power by the administration in authority without moral restraints.

If that theory is applied in all directions, it must produce a state in which no individual can have any inalienable rights.

Yet the Declaration of Independence specifies that that was the reason for the founding of our country.

In the tidelands cases, these decisions probably will not affect the actual production of a barrel of oil for private use for the national defense. Therefore, that is not the issue.

The issue is the right of the State—of any State—to its sovereignty and right of the individual to his property, as the Constitution provides.

It is a question as to whether we are living under the Constitution or under a rule of thumb Federal jurisdiction which Mr. Justice Douglas calls paramount national rights.

As Dean Pound so aptly put it in an article in the *Baylor Law Review*:

"If sovereignty with responsibility for defense and international relations did necessarily and inseparably involve dominium, that is ownership of land, all private ownership of land would have to be given up."

If defense has to be by air, for instance, at what point up in the air do private and State rights end? Dean Pound argues this

point with clear logic, ending with this conclusion:

"Under the conditions of warfare today the argument for national defense would make the United States owner of the whole land as well as the shore of the sea and the sea adjacent to our territory."

Actually, these three decisions of the Supreme Court could by judicial fiat alter the structure of American life.

Can a New North-South Political Alliance Preserve America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interview between the editorial staff of the United States News and World Report and me which appears in the August 3 issue of that important weekly magazine. The theme of this interview is the suggestion that in 1952 a political formula be evolved whereby the people who think alike in America can vote alike regardless of where they live or the political party in which they are registered.

Inasmuch as in many instances the differences within our major political parties as now functioning are actually greater than the differences between the parties themselves as manifested by the votes and pronouncements of top members of both parties in Congress, it would seem that the time has arrived when serious thought and planning should be devoted to developing an alliance between like-minded voters which will put an end to government by minority pressure groups in America. This interview is devoted to an exploration of the possibilities of such a working alliance in the presidential campaign of 1952.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW POLITICAL ALLIANCE

(An interview with KARL E. MUNDT, Republican Senator from South Dakota)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Can the Republicans win in 1952? If so, how—after 20 years of unbroken Democratic success? Does the fact of the solid South leave the balance of power with certain northern groups? Is the North-South coalition in Congress a forerunner of the presidential campaign? Senator MUNDT is one of a number of persons who have been thinking and working out answers to these questions. To get his answers, the editors of United States News and World Report invited him to their conference room. KARL E. MUNDT was a teacher of speech and of social science before he began to apply both fields of knowledge in Congress. He was elected to the House from his native South Dakota in 1938 and moved on to the Senate 10 years later. Senator MUNDT, now 51, has been a farmer and businessman as well as teacher and legislator. In Congress he has been active in foreign affairs. He was a prominent member of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Interest in the proposed North-South alliance recently has taken him into the South on many speaking trips.)

Question. Senator MUNDT, what is your idea of a Republican-Democratic coalition in the South?

Answer. Our proposal isn't exactly a coalition in the South of the Democrats and the Republicans as much as it is an alliance between the Democrats of the South and the Republicans of the North.

Question. In other words, each side would be free to retain its party identity?

Answer. Exactly. And it would merge them together at the electoral college level.

Question. So that it doesn't involve any actual amalgamation of parties as such or interference with freedom of action on the part of either party?

Answer. That's correct. Because that is a very genuine stumbling block and we get away from that. We also get away from the fact that it's pretty difficult in any short-pull effort to induce a majority in the South to join the Republican Party. So we're going to suggest they vote for antiadministration electors, under the banner of the rooster, which is the Democratic emblem in much of the South.

Question. This actually then would be a three-party system, wouldn't it?

Answer. No. After a series of preliminary "make-ready" conferences before the conventions between like-minded Democrats and Republicans I believe the situation might well develop about as follows: In 1952, the campaign would proceed as usual in the North with voters choosing between the Democratic and Republican candidates in the customary manner. But in the South, if the Democratic National Convention is controlled by New Dealers who, it is expected, will nominate a candidate and write a platform which are distasteful and perhaps repugnant to the South, a new procedure would be evolved whereby citizens in the South would once again reassert their independence.

The procedure would differ from State to State, but in general it would follow these lines: In Southern States where the majority of the Democrats are not New Dealers—do not favor the welfare state nor the concepts of Trumanism—Presidential electors would be selected to run on the regular Democratic ticket under the emblem of the rooster but pledged to the people not to vote for the candidates nominated by the Democratic National New Deal Convention. These electors might be committed in advance to vote for the Republican nominees if the preliminary alliance conferences establish the proper background for such a move. Or they might be what they call "free electors," simply committed not to vote for Truman or any other welfare-state candidate for President.

Question. What do you think will happen in the South in the way of a countermovement by the officeholders and the Federal machine? They have considerable political power in the South, too—what will they do?

Answer. They can work it in one of two ways. In Mississippi, for example, they will organize a Truman Democratic group. They will put their electors on the ballot under the donkey instead of under the rooster just as they did last time; they will campaign valiantly for the administration and its electors and probably get less than 12 percent of the votes, because they got 11 percent for Truman last time. That's the way they'll do it in Mississippi.

Now in Arkansas, where the Governor is a New Dealer and may be able to control the electoral machinery, it's entirely possible that he will put the rooster and the Democratic label over the electors there who favor the Truman group, so that in Arkansas those Democrats who are opposed to Truman—who in my opinion are vastly in the majority—will hold a convention, select

their own electors, get a name—call themselves "Jeffersonian Democrats," "Anti-Truman Democrats," "Anti-Socialist Democrats," or whatever they want—put their electors on the ballot. And each group will conduct a fair and honest campaign in the South to determine once and for all whether or not the South favors the welfare-state concept of government.

The Republicans will pull out, or, if necessary in order to keep the Republican Party alive in case this thing peters out—since there may be some State laws that if you don't have a man on the ballot you can't continue the party—they will put the Republican nominees on the ballot but the word goes round that Republicans should vote in the box where the anti-Truman electors are listed.

In Texas a few weeks ago the Governor signed a new bill which facilitates this whole movement, and which was promoted in Texas by some of the folks interested in the alliance program and opposed to New Dealism in all its forms. This provides now that in 1952 for the first time in Texas you can cross-file. There is a device so that you can amalgamate and add together the anti-Truman votes for President. And that was done specifically by those, including the Governor, who are opposed to Trumanism in Texas. Now if in Texas—and that is the key State, really—we can get the ball rolling—and there is enough power down there and enough leadership down there, and enough genuine, rugged Americanism down there if you will find a harness that will fit it—we believe Texas can pull most of the South along on some effective program of political realignment.

NORTH-SOUTH GROUPING COULD ELECT A PRESIDENT—COALITION NOW WORKING—V H Y "DIXIECRATS FAILED"

Two sets of electors

Question. What about the other Southern States?

Answer. In other States where the party machinery is controlled by Democrats favoring the Truman program, those opposing it would nominate electors and run them under some hyphenated Democratic label—Jeffersonian Democrats or Anti-New Deal Democrats, for example. In other words, much the same arrangement would be worked out as was done with the Dixiecrat movement in 1948, but instead of wasting votes on a splinter party with no national connections, the anti-welfare-state Democrats would go to the electoral college with electors ready, able, and willing to associate themselves with other like-minded electors in choosing an administration sympathetic with their viewpoint and consistent with their concepts.

Under either arrangement, two sets of Democratic electors would be before the southern voters in November and they would decide once and for all in a fair and honest poll whether to continue to embrace the concepts of collectivism and complete federalism that are so apparent in the Truman program.

Question. Isn't there a commitment on the part of electors chosen on the regular Democratic ticket to vote for the nominee of the regular Democratic Party?

Answer. It depends on the terms on which they are nominated or selected. If they are selected at a convention down in the South with the understanding that they go as free electors or that they go as electors under the Democratic banners but pledged to vote for this alliance combination which has been worked up, then they're keeping faith with the voters and are in conformity with the law.

Convention strategy

Question. You speak of a convention held prior to the selection of the electors. Is that a State convention?

Answer. Yes. And it is also possible a Dixie Democratic convention might precede these State conventions.

Question. Held before the national convention?

Answer. No; after the national convention. Let me outline this movement as we see it shaping up. We envision that, as we approach election time, it will really become clear to the Democratic South that the results of the Democratic National Convention are going to leave them very, very unhappy. So it has been suggested that delegates be selected by the Democrats in the South who will go to the national convention making an effort to get a restoration of the rule requiring a two-thirds majority to secure a presidential and vice-presidential nomination—which they won't succeed in doing, but they can try; making an effort to bring about a real ringing reaffirmation of the doctrine of States' rights—which they will not be able to do, but they can try; making an effort to have one of their southern sons selected as a candidate for President on the basis that the South has provided the bulk of the strength of the Democratic Party for all these years—that they can do, but they will not succeed.

Then, after they have watched the convention, over their protests, renominate Truman or somebody to the left of Truman; when they have watched the convention, over their protests, put planks in the platform which are repugnant to the people of the South; when they have heard some of the liberal left-wing element of their own party stand up at their own convention and insult them to their face by calling them bourbons and reactionaries and snarl at them at the convention as they sometimes sneer at them on the floor of Congress, it's expected then that, having been insulted, having been rejected, having been disillusioned, they'll be ready to go home and assert their independence as they did in 1948.

Now, the difficulty in 1948 was that when they went home they had no place to go—just a little branch-line railroad called Dixiecrat, which had no real destination but was simply a protest vote that didn't have any genuine effectiveness other than to demonstrate that there is a limit somewhere to the insults southern voters will endure.

What Dixiecrats lacked

Question. What do you mean by no effectiveness?

Answer. No effectiveness because the Dixiecrats had no national connections or cohesion. It just appealed to voters in a few States, and never in their most optimistic dreams did the Dixiecrats expect to succeed in electing a President.

Question. Did they have a separate set of electors in 1948?

Answer. Oh, yes; they had a separate set of electors in 1948. They carried four States. Thirty-nine electors voted for Thurmond and Wright. It wasn't enough to turn the tide, but it was a surprisingly significant vote, considering the short time in which they had to work. It demonstrated that the spirit of independence still thrives in the South.

Question. Well, after a Democratic convention such as you outline, then what happens?

Answer. Then they go home and they hold a convention, precisely as they did last time. But instead of doing what they did last time, which was a futile splinter-party gesture, they then agree to select electors to run as Democratic electors, pledged to vote at the electoral college for some other candidate than that nominated by the New Dealers at the Democratic national convention. Perhaps they may even be pledged to vote for the alliance choice, that is, for the Republican nominees selected at the Republican convention. Having agreed to this joint program, they then hold their State conventions

to put the Democratic electors on the ballot and conduct a campaign in the South strictly between Democratic parties.

You'd have the Truman Democratic Party, the administration Democratic Party, which would probably be referred to by its opponents down South as the Socialist fringe of the Democratic Party, and you'd have the States' Rights Democratic Party, the constitutional Democratic Party, which would be referred to down there as the Jeffersonian Democrats or the Democrats who are in favor of reestablishing States' rights, and their electors would go to the electoral college with that purpose.

ALLIANCE AN ACTUALITY IN CONGRESS ABOUT 15 YEARS

Now, preliminary to all this, some work must be done both by Republicans and by the anti-New Deal Democrats before either convention in order to set the stage for the kind of political alliance operation we've been talking about. It's our thought that these preliminary meetings can be held in large part between Democrats in Congress and Republicans in Congress who, over a period now of about 15 years, have been working together in an alliance which is not a theoretical factor at all but which is an actuality in Congress today.

So that, probably in the Senate or perhaps in the Senate and the House, preliminary considerations would be given to these following objectives: That at the next Republican convention—coming as it must now ahead of the Democratic—having in mind the possibility of what will transpire and what I believe at that time will look like the inevitable outcome of the Democratic National Convention, we should give some thought in the selection of our nominee for President to a man who is personally acceptable to the South. Some of our potential candidates are, some of them are not. But if we decide that we're going to court the South—not capture it, but court support in the South—that we should give some thought to that in the selection of our candidates, and we should also give some thought to southern concepts in the writing of a platform.

Question. In civil rights?

Answer. In civil rights, in education, in socialized medicine, in all matters leading to the concept of the superstate and the preservation of the States' rights concept. We would come out strongly in our Republican platform stating a position that we recognize the responsibility of the Federal Government to provide leadership in making living conditions better and in making health and educational opportunities better, and in eliminating discriminations, etc., but we propose to approach these objectives within the purview of the doctrine of States' rights.

Platform problems

Question. Do you think the Republicans who have already voted for FEPC (Fair Employment Practice Commission) and for other measures of civil rights will be able to remain silent?

Answer. No, I don't think they will be silent. I think they will present their point of view before the platform committee. I think they'll argue in favor of a Federal centralized approach to the problems of education, of health, of housing, and of discrimination. But I propose that those of us in the Republican Party who oppose centralization of power and up to now have remained comparatively silent do not remain silent any longer.

I propose that we present the fact that, if we're going to have a party that presumes to be against the superstate and the complete centralization of power in Washington, we have got to recognize the doctrine of States' rights, which is a peculiarly and uniquely American concept in government.

Question. Is there a possibility that these Republicans who are ardently in favor of civil rights may go out and try to get electors in their States and do the same thing to the Republicans?

Answer. I think that's a possibility. I think that, if this program works out, there is going to be some migration in both directions from one party to the other. But I think that the country desperately needs today a party alignment in which there is a recognizable and defensible philosophy of government imbedded within each party. We lack that today.

Effects in North

Question. Won't you, as a practical matter, be up against the fact that in the Northern States you will be driving the Democratic Party to be the civil-rights party—as it has to be to win the votes in Harlem and elsewhere—and that those Republicans who feel the same way about civil rights will join with those Democrats and carry most of these Northern States?

Answer. No; I don't think that they will. There is, of course, some fear of that on the part of some northern Republicans. There is some pretty clear-cut evidence, however, that there is a tremendous amount of theory in that connection not substantiated by fact, as there is in connection with the alleged opposition to the Taft-Hartley bill. I mean the election of TAFT in Ohio pretty well knocked into a cocked hat a lot of theories about labor's attitude toward the Taft-Hartley bill.

Now, we believe that in the groups, in the colored organizations, among the colored population, and in places where FEPC has been a very definite issue, there are a great many people there who also believe in the doctrine of States' rights. We can present a pretty good Republican position, for example, to those who believe in FEPC, who are largely in the northern cities. We can say: "What party was it that freed the colored men? It was the Republican Party. What party was it that has given the colored man his best opportunity to succeed in this country? It has been the Republican Party under Republican government. What kind of States have given him State FEPC's, to give him a better chance and an opportunity? It has been almost without exception Republican States under Republican governors empowered by Republican legislatures."

Question. Do you think the South would accept the program that these States have adopted in the North?

Answer. The South is completely willing. I have discussed it now in almost every State of the South. The South is not inhabited by sadists who are desirous of penalizing the black man and kicking him around because they enjoy it. Actually, a great many Negroes in the South are very happy and are making rapid progress both economically and politically. The South is confronted with a very realistic problem because, in many areas, over half the people are of the colored race.

Southerners have no desire to hold the Negro down. They want to promote programs in an area where by evolution and by education they must work out a harmonious adjustment. They're not even opposed to State FEPC legislation. They told me in Mississippi: "We're perfectly willing to have an FEPC in Jackson, Miss., manned by Mississippians, progressing at the Mississippi level, at the Mississippi speed to meet Mississippi conditions. What we are afraid of is an FEPC manned in Washington by Northern theorists and liberals who decide to provide in Mississippi the kind of conditions for the colored man that you can provide in New Jersey or New York." And they say it simply won't work, because conditions are different in the South. So they're willing to do that.

SUGGESTED CANDIDATES: TAFT, EISENHOWER, BYRD, RUSSELL

There has been a definite movement in many of the Southern States by which the State and its public officials interest themselves in improving the lot of the colored men. In many areas it has eliminated by States action, and I think that's the right way to do it, the poll tax. They've passed laws against lynching and have done the things that the northern theorists who want to produce utopia out of a hat like a rabbit in 15 minutes by Federal legislation have been unable to do by Federal coercion.

Question. Whom do you have specifically in mind as candidates who might be acceptable to the southern Democrats and the northern Republicans?

Answer. We have tried to keep strictly away from getting a movement of this kind identified with any candidate, because then it becomes the football of every other candidate not associated with it. In talks on this, because everybody thinks in terms of candidates as a tangible outcome of the movement, I have said: "Look, I think a movement of this kind could revolve around and could succeed with two candidates selected almost indiscriminately from the following four." Then I have suggested the names of Taft and Eisenhower and Senator Byrd and Senator Russell, and have said that it wouldn't make much difference to me which of the four were at the top and which of the four were vice president. I think they are four sound Americans who basically would lead this country back to a premise of sound government and sound fiscal policy.

How Taft stands

Question. Isn't TAFT's position on civil rights, however, pretty generally unsatisfactory to the South?

Answer. Not nearly as unsatisfactory to the South as Dewey's position on civil rights was 4 years ago. TAFT has been a middle-of-the-roader on civil rights. We haven't had a vote directly on it. There have been votes on cloture and on other maneuvers which don't look like a vote on a FEPC but which actually were related to it, and he has leaned a bit toward the FEPC crowd, but he hasn't been out giving speeches about it, he hasn't been crusading for it. They have a pretty good respect in the South, I think, for TAFT's basic philosophy of government. He is in opposition to the concept of the strong centralized authoritarian power. He is a respecter and supporter of States' rights.

The key: States' rights

Question. If TAFT abandons, however, a Federal FEPC platform, how much chance does he have for carrying a lot of these areas in the North?

Answer. That goes back to what we were discussing—whether we propose to present to the American voter this time a clear-cut philosophy of Government built around States' rights in a platform which consistently revolves around that concept. We should not again throw the voter another crazy quilt like we threw him last time in a platform where we say in one breath we're 100 percent for the rights of the individual and the rights of the States and in the next breath we're 100 percent for giving politicians in Washington the power to tell him who he can hire in his business. Now Americans generally are just plain basically sound. If we present them such a bewildering jigsaw puzzle as we had in the Republican platform last time, in which we tried to say all things to all men—which to those interested in FEPC talked like it was going to create in Washington the authoritarian power that they have in Moscow, but, in terms of business and farming, talked as if it was going back completely to the

original Jeffersonian concept of States' rights—we fall in our duty to speak frankly to the voters.

Question. In your concept, you would have a Democrat on the ticket, wouldn't you?

Answer. Yes; that's at least one possibility. First, we should get a candidate personally acceptable to the South. Second, we must explore with the South its desire as to whether it would prefer to have a southern Democrat running as Vice President. If we find that it would prefer to have that, and we can determine that by the preliminary conferences, then I think we should say frankly, too, in the Republican convention: "This time we're trying to win a victory for America. We're not so much interested in partyism and partisanship as we are in basic principles. So, we suggest that with our Republican candidate for President we nominate—let's say, just for an example—Senator BYRD, of Virginia, or Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, as Vice President."

That's one conceivable possibility. Another conceivable possibility growing out of the preliminary conferences is this: How would it be, some have conjectured, if in the Republican campaign this time—with this alliance movement in mind and the possibility that some of these southern statesmen would prefer not to run as Democrats for Vice President under the Republican banner—if we nominate the best cast of Republican leaders we can secure as President and Vice President and then 6 weeks to 2 months before the voting time, our Presidential nominee, having consulted with his advisers, announces then the identity of his Cabinet, if he is elected? And in that list include three or four distinguished southern statesmen as Secretary of Agriculture, as Secretary of War, as Secretary of Commerce, wherever you're going to put them.

Suppose the Republican nominee for President announces on the 1st day of October that, if he is elected President, he's going to have a Cabinet comprised of A, B, C, and D and Senator DRICK RUSSELL, of Georgia, as Secretary of Defense—don't you believe that this would help make it easier for southern voters to support the alliance? Or, perhaps, if Senator BYRD could be induced to become Secretary of the Treasury, it would help cement the forces favoring a real Democratic-Republican alliance in 1952. I use the names of RUSSELL and BYRD merely as illustrations—perhaps other equally good southern Democrats could be named so RUSSELL and BYRD could continue their fine leadership in the Senate.

Keeping southern power in Congress

Question. This is in addition to a Democrat for Vice President?

Answer. It could be in addition to or in lieu thereof. It's just one proposed type of strategy. Here's something more which is essential. In these preliminary conferences, if the alliance is going to win, we've got to come to an understanding with the southern leaders in Congress as to what happens to their seniority. That's not unimportant in elections in the South. A Senator and Congressman, I think, has more prestige there than he does in the Middle West. And I think a southern Congressman or Senator probably has a little better personal following than has been developed in many other areas.

Now these officials are important cogs in the electoral machinery and you can't very well expect 15 or 20 southern Senators and Congressmen to get enthused about crusading for a principle and a cause and a ticket which, if it wins, means that they are committing political suicide in Congress and stepping out of positions of importance into positions of unimportance. So we've got to come to an understanding with them that, if this thing operates, the seniority status

of the cooperating southern Congressmen and Senators will be sustained.

So it is recommended that in the organization of the new Congress, assuming that the alliance elects its candidates for President and Vice President, that we caucus together on a basis of position rather than a basis of party. The Members of the Senate and the Members of the House would have a caucus, therefore, of the Republicans and the southern Democrats who have participated in this program for the establishment of the organization of the Senate and for the organization of the respective committees with each man maintaining his seniority status regardless of party. As an example, this would mean that if Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, participates—and, if the program works, Georgia and such States must participate—he would retain his chairmanship of the Senate Committee on Finance because he's the oldest ranking member of either party on that committee. We would put the members around the table in conformity with their seniority status to comprise a majority reflecting a position on principle, not merely a political party.

Question. You'd like to have Speaker RAYBURN on your side, wouldn't you?

Answer. I'd like to have him on our side and I have a hunch that, if things worked out so that he could do that and still be with his own group in Texas, he'd love it.

Question. Then he could be Speaker of the House under your program?

Answer. He could be Speaker of the House under our program—the caucus of like-minded House Members would determine that by their votes.

Question. In other words, you people are willing to make concessions and have got to make concessions in order to accomplish this particular objective, which is a party that is committed to your philosophy?

Answer. Precisely. Because there isn't any chance, in my opinion, for the Republican Party, without making concessions, to get the votes it needs in the South. And, frankly, I don't see any very likely place you can pick up this extra million votes in the North. Certainly to do so you would have to make some concessions to whatever new element in the North you were trying to attract.

Eisenhower's strength

Question. How about Eisenhower?

Answer. That might do it. I think that occasionally a man comes along or perhaps an issue that can unite the country—there may be something involved in the war issue. But I'm looking at the long pull. Suppose we win in 1952—what do we do to stay in following 1956? We would be forced to begin at once, throwing out lures to exactly the same people to whom the New Dealers have cast their seductive bait. As long as we divorce ourselves from over 100 electoral votes in the conservative South, it means that the balance of power in this country is certain to be in the hands of the left-wing groups. So that, to stay in, we Republicans would have to make concessions to the same group to whom the New Dealers now cater so zealously. And I'm no more desirous of seeing the country veer over toward national socialism with a Republican in power than I am with a Democrat. Now, there's some pretty good historic background from which we can draw a lesson.

Question. How much damage would be done to the alliance idea if the Democrats should nominate a southerner, Fred Vinson, for instance?

Answer. I would assume that if they were to nominate a real southerner running on a platform even remotely acceptable in the South, there would not be an alliance idea in 1952. It would defer and delay such a movement. Now in my opinion my guess would be that Fred Vinson would come close enough to answering that definition to make the alliance unworkable, although I am im-

pressed by the number of people in the South interested in this movement who seem to think that Fred Vinson would not be completely acceptable to them.

Question. You've got to have some name down South besides a Republican. You can't have a group of electors pledged to vote for a Republican ticket—isn't that true?

Answer. The electors will be Democrats. They will be pledged to oppose the Truman administration.

Anti-Trumanites this way

Question. But they can turn but one way and that's to the Republicans?

Answer. I don't think that's particularly going to hurt. I don't think if these other preliminary steps have happened, if they can show them about the seniority-status agreement, if they can show them a vice-presidential nominee or Cabinet members, I believe the anti-Truman electors can win in most of the South. The difficulty is not with the leadership and the business echelon.

Now we have made a study of what this alliance has been doing because this isn't something which is just pulled out of the air.

This is something which has been functioning now since 1936 in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. Since 1936 this informal Republican-Democratic congressional alliance has functioned successfully on 35 important and significant roll-call votes; 9 have been in opposition to some suggested step toward socialism; 18 have been in protection of our private-enterprise system; 3 have effected important economies; 2 have been on foreign affairs; and 3 were crack-downs on subversive activities both in and out of Government. These were times when, because of the alliance of the people of the South, Democrats, and Republicans of the North, victories have been won in the votes of Congress. We can provide the date, we can provide the evidence, we can provide the roll calls as proof.

They did this, not once but 35 times since 1936. We simply propose to expand this "congressional alliance" so it can become effective in electing a like-minded President.

Question. If you work out this arrangement to take care of seniority problems for southern Democrats in the House and in the Senate, wouldn't that mean that whether or not the Republicans won the election, they would control Congress?

Answer. No. We wouldn't control it, but the alliance group, or coalition, would control it, because a coalition seems to mean to many people in the South that the Democrats and the Republicans merge their identities in the South, and that's pretty difficult to do.

Question. So that the alliance would organize Congress?

Answer. The alliance controls it now. They don't organize it, but they could organize it, and they could establish a committee set-up and conduct the majority caucus.

We now have an occasional alliance, but it's spasmodic, it's intermittent, it's leaderless, it's thrown together as a creature of necessity and only on certain issues.

It has worked since 1936, and it's working more frequently all the time; it's accelerating. Already it has been the determining factor several times in the current session of Congress.

Seniority for all

Question. When you spoke of seniority you didn't mean just chairmanships; you meant, too, that individual Members would not lose their seniority positions, didn't you?

Answer. Correct. That's exactly what we have to protect and that is almost a must, and that's a new feature of this program. That's one of the new elements of our present proposals.

Question. Do you have time to get this operating this year—it isn't long?

Answer. No; it isn't long, but we can move mighty fast. I would say that there is a good possibility of it moving next year if Harry Truman is renominated.

Question. Well, you're assuming that—

Answer. If he is not renominated, it injures the chances of the alliance. But if, instead of Harry Truman, they nominate Justice Douglas, I would say you haven't injured its chances very much. If instead of that they nominate Chief Justice Vinson, I would say you have injured the chances more seriously.

Question. Unless Vinson's declarations and a platform make it clear that he has taken the northern point of view?

Answer. In which case it actually might facilitate the alliance, because you know how people are. If one of your own turns his back on you, you get pretty desperate and disgusted.

Question. You have an alliance now but the ultimate aim is a party, isn't it?

Answer. Yes. If this thing should work in 1952, we would suggest that in 1953, after the first session of Congress, that there be a post-presidential election convention, led by this President and this Vice President and this positional majority in Congress who would have control of the White House and the Congress. But they have no name. They have no National organization. They have no party. They say, "Well, how about making this thing permanent, get organized so that 3 years from now we can have our own ticket in the field? Let's see if we can't agree on a set of principles built around this dictum of an indestructible union of indestructible States. Let's see if we can't find a label and develop an organization, with a chairman, and find a suitable party name."

AFTER 1952, A REGULAR PARTY WITH A NAME

Some have suggested that the party then be called, in the South, the Democratic-Republican alliance for the next election, and that they work with this new political organization under that name. In the North, it would be called the Republican-Democratic alliance. The two would stem from the same central headquarters. In other words, it would be the same organization, with the order in which the alliance is listed reversed in the North and the South.

This would enable all like-minded people, you see, to join up with the new party. It would compel the opposition viewpoint to organize a second party, and call themselves New Dealers, or Fair Dealers, or Socialists, or whatever they prefer. Then you'd have two real political parties. Each would stand for something definite. The voter would get a choice. For the first time since the War Between the States, the South would get the benefit of a two-party system at the local level, from the standpoint of local campaigns—and that's important because if you don't have that, you soon develop corrupt machines. The biggest dividend, I think, would be that the voter then could go to the polls and help direct the destiny of his Government because he would know he was voting for one concept of government or the other. Within each party there would still be great issues, of course, but you would have a basic philosophical and political basis for cohesion and agreement. We used to have that in the past but that's gone. We don't have any basic difference between our two political parties as they now operate.

A voice for the South

Question. How about the Dixiecrats?

Answer. I believe that that is a movement which has terminated. I think that the people who belonged to it and who lead it are looking for some other more effective device for the elections which lie ahead. I believe they and many others in the South are eager to associate themselves with some national movement to once again give the South a strong voice in the selection and the election of our Presidents.

Will Danger of World War Be Greater After Korea Cease-Fire Than Before?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

WHY HAGGLE ON PEACE TERMS?—ARMISTICE WON'T LESSEN PRESENT DANGER ANYWAY

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Again the President of the United States has warned us of the dangers inherent in the Korean armistice talks.

He has said that already, during these talks, the Communists are building up their armed forces north of the present line, ready, if the talks break down, to hit us a harder blow than they could have without the talks, when General Ridgway was effectively "keeping them off balance."

He has warned that we cannot immediately hope to get our troops out of Korea lest the talks turn out to have been a Communist trap to get us out and then move in again and take over.

Defense Secretary Marshall told the members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee not to expect that peace in Korea would mean that we could take our seven divisions home, still less send some of them to swell the growing American forces in Europe. The farthest—according to Marshall—that we should think of retiring them would be to Japan. Protecting the northern Japanese islands against a Soviet invasion until, a couple of years from now, the Japanese have re-created their own defensive forces, is an unsatisfying prospect. Yet that is the best that the Defense Secretary seems able to offer.

To make the picture worse, all American leaders, beginning with Mr. Truman, have warned and rewarned us not to believe that peace in Korea will lessen the present danger.

The Communists may be planning to wait until the United Nations have rebuilt the devastated Republic of Korea—and then take it over. Or they may invade some other country. If this target happens to lie outside of Asia, say, in the Middle East or in Europe, the masses of Chinese Communists will still remain quite free to concentrate their aggressive might against Indochina or Burma.

RICE MOST VITAL

Indochina and Burma are the twin gates to southeastern Asia. Southeastern Asia holds precisely what the Communists in Asia need most—petroleum, rubber, tin, and, above all, rice. Under normal circumstances China cannot feed its growing millions without some outside rice. In all Asia, only Indochina (once there is peace), Burma and Thailand are able to export rice in any considerable quantities.

Certain it is, however, that without active Soviet participation, which means a world war that would probably not be decided in Asia, Red China is unable to launch any new large-scale offensive so long as its divisions are bogged down in a struggle in Korea. They can do that only if the present armistice talks lead to some sort of settlement.

Considering these facts, one may wonder why the American administration is so eager to end the Korean fighting without total victory, or to end it before the free world has rebuilt its military strength.

Conceivably, the 35 percent of Americans who, according to Gallup, oppose the with-

drawal of United Nations forces from Korea, may have a case.

MOSCOW'S GOOD TIME

Why does the administration disagree? President Truman has recently stated that we are negotiating because the Soviet Union wanted to negotiate. But Moscow was mum about its desire for 6 months during which UN and the United States spokesmen repeatedly expressed our desire to end the Korean fighting. It would be more accurate to say that Moscow consented to let its Asian confederates negotiate in its own good time.

The greater urge is undoubtedly on our side. So once more we ask, why?

Ending a war indecisively just to end a war cannot be the answer, particularly not when such an end would leave the adversary able and ready to attack the free world at some other equally sensitive spot.

There must be another explanation—and there is. Part of it was given by Gen. Omar Bradley when he told the Senators that conflict with Communist China would be "the wrong war, at the wrong time, in the wrong place, and with the wrong adversary."

WHY THE "WRONG PLACE"?

Anybody can understand why American military leaders hate to see our all-too-few ground divisions rubbed away in Korea while the U. S. S. R. is keeping its own forces intact. One can understand an American desire to make up for the years when we failed to rearm. But why in the "wrong place" if, as the administration seems to admit, by fighting in Korea we are perhaps saving southeastern Asia?

The rest of the answer was given by Secretary Marshall to the House Foreign Affairs Committee (July 1, 1951):

"Mr. Judd. Do you believe that the independence of Asia is essential to the independence and security of Europe?"

"Secretary MARSHALL. I do not think that [a Communist Asia] would be fatal to the defense of Europe. . . ."

"Mr. Judd. In my judgment, finding means of keeping Asia out of the Communist fold is just as essential to Europe as it is to send divisions there."

Here is the root of the dispute over Asia that divides the American people. The President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff—up to a point—back Secretary Marshall.

Most Republicans and some thoughtful Democrats, like Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, back Representative Judd.

Which side should the people support? Clearly, to be wrong here is to gamble the safety of the United States.

The Plight of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

AMERICAN LITHUANIAN COUNCIL OF BOSTON,

July 11, 1951.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Lithuanian American people throughout the United States, as well as those Lithuanians privileged to reside in the free countries of the world, commemorated the eleventh anniversary of the resubjugation of Lithuania and the decennial of the first horrible deportations from Lithuania to Siberia on June 16, 1951.

In Boston we observed this occasion with appropriate ceremonies, at which a resolution was adopted concerning the plight of our dear motherland, Lithuania. We enclose a copy of this resolution and sincerely hope that you will find time to read it.

We earnestly hope that you will continue to fight the cause of freedom and do all in your power to help Lithuania and other oppressed nations of the world regain their freedom and liberty.

Yours respectfully,

ALEXANDER CHAPLIK, *President.*

Resolution unanimously adopted at a mass meeting held at the Municipal Building, South Boston, Mass., on June 16, 1951, under the auspices of the American-Lithuanian Council, Boston chapter, in protest and commemoration of the following tragedies which have befallen Lithuania and its people: (1) Eleventh anniversary of the resubjugation of Lithuania; and (2) decennial of the first horrible deportations from Lithuania, when, during one night, the Bolshevik secret police—NKVD—arrested and carried off to the wastes of Siberia 40,000 innocent Lithuanians:

"Whereas the Soviet Union, relying upon the spurious Ribbentrop-Molotov pact of August 23, 1939, and in disregard of all treaties and agreements with Lithuania, including the Peace Treaty of 1920, the Nonaggression Pact of 1926, and the Mutual Assistance Pact of 1939, did occupy Lithuania by most brutal means, and did subject Lithuania to a most cruel oppression; and

"Whereas the Soviet Union, in furtherance of its designs to implant communism in Lithuania and throughout the world, and being unable to bend the resistance of Lithuania to its will, has embarked upon a relentless and unprecedented policy to eradicate the Lithuanian Nation, as attested by the fact that it has already deported or annihilated 800,000 Lithuanians, which constitutes over 30 percent of the entire Lithuanian people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved—

"1. That said resubjugation and genocide being practiced in Lithuania is sorely protested, decried, and deplored; and further be it resolved

"2. That the attention of the United Nations, and of the whole cultured world be directed to the plight of blood-soaked Lithuania, and all effective means be solicited to block the ravisher of Lithuania and to expose him to the nations of the world; and further be it resolved

"3. That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to all Congressmen and Senators of the United States, and to the representatives in Washington, D. C., of the Governments of Great Britain, France, Italy, Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Finland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Spain, Portugal, Belgium and to the press."

AMERICAN-LITHUANIAN COUNCIL,
BOSTON CHAPTER,
ALEXANDER J. CHAPLIK,

Chairman.

J. JANUNIN, *Secretary.*

Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is worthy of the careful perusal of every Member of the House:

KETCHUM-HENNESSEY POST, No. 1515,

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

OF THE UNITED STATES,

Brooklyn, N. Y., July 26, 1951.

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,

Member of Congress,

Washington, D. C.

Dear CONGRESSMAN MULTER: As commander of the Ketchum-Hennessey Post, 1515, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, I have been mandated by the members of my post to transmit to you its proposal against the spiraling cost of living.

At the outset, the Ketchum-Hennessey Post would like you to know that we commend you and your eight fellow Congressmen from Kings County for your splendid efforts in trying to keep both prices and wages in line. However, all your efforts have been frustrated by a sinister coalition in Congress, which at present appears to be in the majority, and whose policies and actions are dictated by the "profit at any cost" lobbyists who are now riding high in Washington.

It is ironic to think that there are in Congress elected officials who have not learned the lessons of the last war and who have permitted themselves to be dominated by these lobbyists and the greedy interests they represent; interests whose lust for excessive profits at any cost is not restrained by the blood and lives of our men in Korea and in the hospitals, nor by the danger to the economic structure of our beloved country.

Without going into the merits of the present control system, the fact remains that since the start of the Korea conflict, more than a year ago, the cost of living has been allowed to rise beyond due bounds and is continuing to rise with no end in sight, while Congress as a whole has made no serious effort to hold a line. If this inflation is permitted to go unchecked, it will not only wreck our economy, but make us a prey to our enemies.

The members of our post, like all wage earners, small-business men, and householders in the country, are finding it impossible to make ends meet. We feel, as citizens and veterans, that the very things we fought and died for are being seriously endangered.

The time is now here when we must take stock of our situation. The time is now here when the Congressmen from Brooklyn must start a campaign in the Halls of Congress to call halt to this undermining of our economic structure.

We petition you, our representatives, to lead the fight for a system of controls that will permit all of us, workingmen, businessmen, and farmer, to live together as an integrated whole without one group taking economic advantage of the others.

Yours in comradeship,

BERNARD HABER,

Commander.

include the following article by Vicente Villamin, published in the Washington Post, July 28, 1951. Mr. Villamin is a Washington columnist for the Manila Bulletin.

PEACE TREATY WITH JAPAN

(By Vicente Villamin)

After more than a year's preparatory work, Mr. John Foster Dulles, special assistant to Secretary of State Acheson, presents a draft treaty of peace with Japan. It is not yet final and is still open to comments and suggestions by interested governments and presumably also by the public.

The 50 nations which declared war against Japan, including Russia but not China, have been invited by the United States to an international conference at San Francisco commencing on September 4 to end formally the state of war with Japan and to agree on the terms of peace.

To date only three countries have registered opposition to the draft treaty. They are Russia, the Philippines, and Nationalist China. Each of them has different grounds for opposition and they are acting separately. Their respective positions may be stated as follows:

1 Russia is against the whole treaty because it is not hard and restrictive enough on Japan and, further, it is not written by herself or jointly by the United States, Russia, Great Britain, and Communist China. She is expected to boycott the peace conference. Communist China, following Russia's example, is opposed to the treaty. But if she comes out from under the Russian hypnosis long enough to study the draft treaty, she would find it to her interest not to oppose it, for she could enter into a bilateral agreement with Japan under its provisions if Japan consented, as she probably would.

Russia has always proved that she can look after her own interests. Whether she signs the Japanese peace treaty or not, she has already received valuable concessions for her 6-day war with Japan. Mr. Dulles said in a speech that after the Japanese surrender "the Russians moved into Manchuria, Port Arthur, Dairien, North Korea, South Sakhalin, and the Kurile and Habonai Islands, thus cashing in on a formal belligerency that had lasted 6 days. In Manchuria they acquired not only Japanese industrial investments valued at \$1,830,000,000 but vast amounts of Japanese armaments and ammunition dumps. These latter were turned over to the Chinese Red armies in direct violation of the explicit agreement they had just made to give military supplies only to the Nationalist Government. The Red armies of China, thus immensely strengthened, then began to win victories over the Nationalist Government." That government, according to Mao Tse-tung himself, the Communist chieftain, had been able to inflict on the Communist armies a total loss of more than 1,200,000 men in 3 years, which showed that it did some fighting.

2. The Philippines is not opposed to the entire treaty but chiefly to the inadequacy of its provisions regarding payment of monetary reparations by Japan to the country that demands it and is entitled to it. Article 14 of the draft treaty admits in principle Japan's obligation to pay reparations, but at the same time makes the categorical statement that she is not in a position to make any payment. This provision rules out the reasonable possibility that Japan in the years to come may acquire, as she surely will, the capacity to pay reparations in amounts within reason. What is the remedy? There should be some technical body like the Dawes-Young Commission, which determined Germany's capacity to pay under the Versailles Treaty that ended World War I, and let it resolve the question of fact of Japan's capacity to pay episodically.

Veterans of Foreign Wars Demand Price Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following letter which I received from the

Peace Treaty With Japan Loaded With Danger for United States Position in the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I

Under the treaty technical service with compensation of Japanese technicians, advisers and industrial facilities is offered to the Philippines. That cannot be considered as a concession on the part of Japan because Filipinos would prefer American and other foreign technicians and advisers to Japanese; and they would not ship raw materials to Japan for processing, but would try and process them locally themselves, thus carrying out their program of industrialization and avoiding the revival of the blasted Japanese coprosperity sphere under which Japan would receive the lion's share of benefits.

The difference of the position of the Philippines on reparations from that of the United States should be noted. The separate, self-governing Philippine Commonwealth had no quarrel with Japan, but being under the sovereignty of the United States she was involved in the war when the latter was attacked by Japan. She made common cause with the United States and fought as best as she could the Japanese enemy. She became a battleground, while the United States did not. She was devastated and lost many lives. The United States can afford to be generous and magnanimous to Japan, but the Philippines cannot. It is only proper and just that Japan should be made to pay both compensatory and punitive damages in the form of reparations. The punitive is not vindictive, but it would serve as a reminder to and a deterrent on Japan against committing acts of aggression in the future.

3 There are two Chinas, the Nationalist and the Communist. The former is still recognized by the United States and many other nations as the legitimate government of China, while the latter has the recognition of Russia and her satellites, Great Britain, and India. Neither China has been invited to attend the peace conference.

Nationalist China naturally is humiliated for not having been invited to the peace conference, for it was that China that fought the war against Japan and helped the Allies to whip her. She will be more humiliated when she realizes that under the draft treaty Japan is in a position to practically sentence her to juridical death and put her out of legal existence. This result would have also the most adverse effect on the political and strategic position of the United States in the entire Pacific area.

This is how that astounding situation will come about. The draft treaty gives Japan the right to choose which China to negotiate her treaty of peace with. It is generally expected that she will choose Communist China, which now controls most of China territorially, for she wants to revive her trade with that country. Those countries which have recognized Communist China would want Japan to deal with her.

If Japan concludes her treaty with that China, that action would virtually mean (1) recognition of the Communist government, (2) acquiescence of the signers of the general treaty to the position of Communist China as legalized by Japan, and (3) enhanced prestige and popularity for Communist China which would serve her well when the General Assembly of the United Nations decides which China should be represented in that world organization. In other words, the action of Japan is bound to have the tremendous actual and psychological effects of putting Communist China forward as the legitimate government of China, and that would be the beginning of the end of Nationalist China.

If Communist China is substituted for Nationalist China in the United Nations, she can rightly demand that Formosa be ceded to her as provided in the Cairo Declaration of 1943, which was signed by President

Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and subsequently by Premier Stalin. It is certain that Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek will not honor the demand for him to give up Formosa to the Communists and he will fight with his 500,000 men supported by the more than 7,000,000 people of Formosa until overcome by superior force. The United Nations would be embarrassed if it helped the Communists and it would be embarrassed if it did not.

But it is the United States that would be placed in the most disadvantageous position of all once it were determined that Formosa should go to Communist China. She would be morally and legally prevented from aiding Nationalist China in resisting Communist invasion of Formosa. If she does not aid Formosa sufficiently and that island falls into the hands of the Communists, all her military and political leaders agree that the position of the United States in the entire Pacific area would be greatly weakened, her western Pacific defense perimeter extending from Alaska to the Philippines, with Formosa as a vital link, would be broken, the new Japan would be isolated from the democratic nations line-up, and the Philippines would be exposed dangerously to Communist infiltration and invasion.

Thus would be the fatal result of giving Japan the right under the draft treaty of selecting for and by herself with which China to negotiate a treaty of peace, that is if she selected Communist China.

What is the remedy? Several might be suggested, but if Nationalist China could not be admitted as a regular member of the peace conference for some overpowering reason, then one possible remedy is to have a provision putting off the negotiation of a Japan-China treaty, if it is going to be with the Communists, until the status of Nationalist China shall have been more specifically defined. After all, most of the expected trade of Japan with Communist China will fall under the ban of the United Nations embargo.

European View of American Treatment of Negroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "The Phantom American Negro." This article, by George S. Schuyler, is condensed from the Freeman. It contains vitally important facts and is well worth reading.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PHANTOM AMERICAN NEGRO

(By George S. Schuyler)

Wherever our citizens travel abroad, they are quizzed about the "oppressed and persecuted" American Negroes. "How can you tell others about democracy when you terrorize and lynch Negroes? Why do you deny them their civil rights?"

"How does it feel," a Norwegian asked me last December in an Oslo hotel, "to be able

to stay in a nice place like this and eat in such a fine dining room?" He would not believe that I had been a guest in fine hotels in the United States.

A Uruguayan cabinet officer discoursed dolefully on the tragedy of the "poor Negroes" of North America until I observed that they owned several times more automobiles than the total number of cars his country boasted, and that in no city in our South were the Negroes as impoverished as the Mestizos I had seen in Montevideo.

Who is responsible for this false picture of the American Negro? The Communists, of course, have done their part in spreading a fantastically biased picture of American race relations. There has been no effective American counterpropaganda. Indeed, Americans themselves have helped to publicize misinformation. The books that literate foreigners have read—Kingsblood Royal, Freedom Road, Strange Fruit, Native Son—all stress hatred between whites and blacks. The news services send abroad mostly the sensational and discreditable items, salted with occasional mention of Marian Anderson, Jackie Robinson, or Ralph Bunche. On the screen, foreigners see Home of the Brave, Pinky, and No Way Out. Small wonder that they believe in this phantom Negro.

Paradoxically, the average white American is as misinformed as the average European, for he has been exposed to the same propaganda in books, magazines, newspapers, and movies.

Actually, the progressive improvement of race relations and the economic rise of the Negro in the United States is a flattering example of democracy in action. The most "exploited" Negroes in Mississippi are better off than the citizens of Russia or her satellites.

In 1865 about 95 percent of American Negroes were illiterate. Today there is little illiteracy among them. The educational systems that have eliminated their illiteracy were voted and maintained by white-controlled counties and States. By 1900 there were a million and a half colored pupils in public elementary schools. Today the enrollment exceeds two and a quarter million. In 1900 there were 92 public high schools for Negroes in the South. Today there are 2,500. Some 10,000 Negroes are graduated from college each year, and there are 70,000 students in attendance—proportionately more than the total number of college students in Great Britain. This climb from chattel slavery is not accomplished in an atmosphere of persecution.

In 1900 it was prophesied that disease would exterminate the American Negroes. Today their life expectancy is 60 years, only 8 years less than that of American whites.

In 1900 Negroes owned 17 percent of the nonfarm homes in which they dwelt. By 1947 they owned 34 percent. Altogether American Negroes now own over 1,000,000 homes. There are 184,000 Negro farm owners, with farms averaging 70 acres. And in the past few years Negroes have themselves financed and erected 25,000 new housing units—quite an achievement for a "terrorized" populace.

A standard Soviet charge is that American capitalists grind down the Negro. The Julius Rosenwald fund expended more than \$22,000,000 largely for Negro education and helped erect 5,000 schools in the South. The general education board, set up by John D. Rockefeller in 1902, has expended 20 percent of its money to advance the education of Negroes, and recently John D. Rockefeller, Jr., gave \$5,000,000 to aid privately owned Negro colleges.

For the past 50 years the economic gulf between Negroes and whites has been narrowing. Negroes own 14 banks, 200 credit unions, 60,000 retail businesses, 26 savings and loan associations, and 25 large insurance

companies with assets of more than \$100,000,000, with a billion dollars' worth of insurance in force in 27 States and the District of Columbia.

Negroes own and publish 150 newspapers and several major magazines with a combined circulation of 3,000,000. Not a single one has been suppressed, south or north, although they are unsparing in their criticism of racial proscription.

More than 1,250,000 United States Negroes are members of labor unions and many predominantly white unions have Negro officers, even in the South.

Segregation in the armed services has been rapidly broken down since 1944. Today training schools for all services are fully integrated racially, and there are some 3,000 Negro commissioned officers.

The process of integrating the Negro into the national social structure has been faster in some States than in others, and the record of the inhumanities attending the process has been deplorable in many areas, but in spite of all this there has been amazing and unprecedented adjustment within the memory of living men.

Here, then, is the real Negro in American society, not the phantom Negro of the anti-American propagandists native and foreign. Admittedly we still have a long way to go, but instead of being apologetic about this record, Americans should be proud that their free system has been capable of such elasticity.

Congressmen: Beware the Meat Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot resist calling to the attention of my colleagues the item which appeared in Time magazine of July 16, 1951. Could it be that the distinguished French Senator had voted in favor of eliminating slaughter quotas? The item follows:

TABLED?

The ferocity of French politics is well known, but in the case of Senator Victor Blaka-Boda, of French West Africa, it seemed to have reached new heights. Deputies of France's new Assembly, meeting for the first time last week, stood around on the floor of the Chamber uneasily discussing the senator's fate. Rumor had it that the senator had been eaten by his constituents.

Blaka-Boda used to be a witch doctor on Africa's Ivory Coast. As long as he stuck to spells, charms and incantations, he was all right. His troubles started when he began to occupy himself with such potent magic as ballot boxes and election campaigns. He took the Christian name Victor, joined the fellow-traveling Rassemblement Démocratique Africain, was elected to the French Senate. A small, thin, worried-looking man, the ex-witch doctor did not take to light-hearted Paris, made only a few appearances there, always seemed to his colleagues in the Senate to be thinking of home. Home he went. On some political business on the Ivory Coast, Senator Blaka-Boda was driving through darkest Africa in January 1950, when, at Bouafé (population 1,000), the car broke down. Instructing his chauffeur to

repair it, Senator Blaka-Boda strolled off into the jungle to stretch his legs. That was the last of the senator until, in November, some charred bones were found in the jungle. They were shipped to Paris for examination, and last week it was announced that the bones were Blaka-Boda's.

Cannibalism used to flourish on the Ivory Coast. Paris heard that the senator was either: (1) devoured by cannibals who, for reasons of their own, were mad at him; or (2) murdered in conventional fashion by political enemies. By and large, Paris preferred to believe theory No. 1.

Explorer Dedicates Life to Stopping Future Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York World-Telegram and Sun of July 21, 1951:

EXPLORER DEDICATES LIFE TO STOPPING FUTURE WARS—GENERAL RIISER-LARSEN VOWED PEACE CRUSADE AS HE LED NORWEGIAN TROOPS IN WAR

(By Frederick Woltman)

Arctic explorations and the need for a stronger world organization may seem poles apart as conversation pieces. But they're the favorite topics of a sturdy Norwegian of 61 whose pale-blue eyes accentuate the deep creases in a face hard-bitten by the winds of the frozen north.

He is Maj. Gen. Hjalmar Riiser-Larsen, famous explorer and aviator who commanded Norway's air forces in World War II. He arrived here recently as new president of the World Movement for a World Federal Government.

The general today recalled an exploit which made air history. That was in 1925 when he piloted Roald Amundsen and Lincoln Ellsworth on the first flight to the polar regions. Their two primitive flying boats were forced down by fog between ice floes 120 miles from the North Pole.

His take-off, which saved the renowned explorers and both crews, was one of the most exciting in aviation.

"The ice closed in, so we had to skid one of the planes from floe to floe," he said. "Then, after about 2 weeks, we found a long one, 1,300 feet. For 8 days we stamped down the snow with our feet. We marked the runway with black paper from the back of films."

GRAZES FLOE

Riiser-Larsen, then a naval air captain, ordered everything dumped overboard, including a vest-pocket camera Amundsen had carried for years. With his passengers huddled in the center of the plane, he pulled the boat into the air at the end of the ice. But only after the hull had grazed the next floe.

"Everybody embraced everybody else," he said. "And Amundsen gave me a piece of chocolate he had saved."

In 1928 the young Norwegian captain headed another daring flight to the Far North in an amphibian, from Spitzbergen. He helped locate Italian Gen. Umberto No-

bile and the marooned crew of the dirigible Italia.

Over the next 5 years he led three arduous dog-sled expeditions into the Antarctic, discovering, mapping, and claiming important unexplored land along the Atlantic coastline for King Haakon VII.

LED AIR TROOPS

Now Norway director of the Scandinavian Airlines, General Riiser-Larsen came to the United States to attend the annual general assembly of the United World Federalists at Des Moines, Iowa, last month.

It was during the war that the general got interested in world federalism as a means of establishing permanent peace. He then had 3,000 Norwegian air troops under him in Canada and England, escorting convoys, patrolling the coast and fighting.

"Their parents were in Nazi-occupied Norway," he said, "so they came to me with their troubles. We lost many of the boys and few ever expected to return to Norway. They all hoped and begged that this would be the last war in the world."

"So I promised if I ever got home to use all my spare time working to stop future wars."

Today, with atomic bombs to speed the destruction of civilization, the general is determined there shall be no next world war.

BLESSED BY VATICAN

When he was elected president of the organization to succeed Britain's Lord Boyd Orr in Rome last April, General Riiser-Larsen and 30 world government delegates were invited to the Vatican, where Pope Pius gave the movement his blessing from the papal throne.

"The Vatican had carefully gone into the question and it was of great importance to us," he stated. "While the Scandinavian countries are not Catholic, we regard the present Pope as one of the great cultural leaders of the world."

His movement claims 28 affiliated groups in 27 nations, with a membership of two to four million. The largest is United World Federalists in America. Its immediate objective is to revise article 109 of the United Nations Charter so as to strengthen the General Assembly and make it a democratic world parliament. The veto power, which gives the Soviet bloc the whip hand, would be abolished.

"If we had that today," he explained, "the United States would not have to bear the brunt of the fighting in Korea. The UN could allot troop contributions. Each nation would surrender only its right to wage war on other countries. The Atlantic Pact countries have done that already among themselves."

ALMOST FLUNKED

In 1915 he was the first pupil in Norway's first military flying school. But he almost failed to make the grade.

That's because he tipped 200 on the scale, and excess avoirdupois, in the early days of flying, ended aviation careers. The youthful, overweight cadet made it, however.

With the German invasion of Norway in 1941, the world press services reported that the Germans had killed the noted explorer. Instead, he was watching the airborne attack from the roof of naval air headquarters in Oslo.

"I then heard Quisling wanted to arrest me for refusing to surrender the airport. So I just stayed at home, which was the last place they would look," he said. Later he escaped to England with important data on Hitler's air-invasion tactics.

His 3,500-mile expedition to Queen Maud Land and Hearst Land, Antarctica, 8 years earlier made page 1 headlines all over the world. And nearly cost him his life.

ADRIFT 5 DAYS

An ice floe broke off and carried General Riiser-Larsen and two companions out to sea. Their supplies and 55 huskies were lost. The men drifted 5 days, as the sea ground their floe smaller and smaller.

"We sent out radio calls on a set with a dynamo operated by pedals like a bicycle," he recalled. "A floating Norwegian whaling factory picked up the messages and sent one of its fleet, the *Globe* No. 5.

"One morning we saw two masts of a whaler passing us over the horizon. We hurriedly wirelessly the factory. The two masts slowly changed course. When they came in line with our ice floe, we knew we were saved

The World Over, Poles Lead in the Fight for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, composed of representatives from all over the world, has been very successful fighting the Communist infiltration into trade unions. In this respect, the work of the confederation supplements our efforts in behalf of European recovery, and united the working trade unionists of the world behind the movement to do away with communism, and to spread democracy and freedom throughout the world.

In trade-union endeavors are projects to promote a better understanding of the peoples of the world. The article *The World Over, Poles Lead in the Fight for Freedom*, by Hilton E. Hanna, which appeared in the *AFL Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workers* magazine, and which was recently brought to my attention, exemplifies the type of work they are doing.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the article and believe its contents merit our consideration:

THE WORLD OVER, POLES LEAD IN THE FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

(By Hilton E. Hanna)

On May 3, 1791, not many years after our American Constitution was adopted, the Poles up and adopted one of their own. Ever since then May 3 is recognized and observed as Polish Independence Day—just as we celebrate Fourth of July.

In Chicago alone, upward of one hundred thousand Poles or Americans of Polish birth or extraction gather at the Kosciuszko monument on May 3 each year to watch and join the colorful parade and applaud the speeches pledging new allegiance to America but vowing also that Poland will never, never be forgotten. The event is observed, just as sincerely and patriotically—though perhaps not always on so spectacular a scale—wherever Poles are found.

For the sake of the record let's place events in their correct order. While the constitution approved by Poland in 1791 was pat-

terned somewhat after the American Constitution, the basic idea of democracy had been practiced and adopted as a way of life in Poland at least 500 years before there was a United States of America.

It is worth noting that during the Convention of 1787 when the founders of our American Republic were looking around for forms and types of government to adopt, the political system of Poland was frequently referred to as being nearest what we wanted. Alexander Hamilton, first Secretary of the Treasury, even proposed that our Chief Executive be elected for life, like the Polish king.

On the other hand there is no denying the fact that Poland, like France, was greatly influenced by the American Revolution. . . . The success of our venture in self-determination has literally set the world on fire with the freedom bug. We actually started something.

Poland adopted Christianity in the year 966. For centuries she existed as an odd country among peculiar neighbors. Down to this very day Polish temperament and the role of her country in the promotion of civilization is hardly understood.

At a time when the divine rights of kings held sway over most of the known world and the individual human being was treated like so much paving material in the building of empires, Poland was a thriving commonwealth, which included Lithuania, Byelo-Ruthenia, and the Ukraine, dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal, entitled to serve God after the dictates of their own hearts, speak their minds—by tongue or pen—as their better judgment directed, and receive the help of their fellow men in the pursuit of happiness for themselves and their families.

Immediately after it was founded in 1364, the University of Cracow became the rallying center and cultural haven for European scholars expelled from their own countries whether because of religious, scientific, or artistic nonconformity. History Prof. Hermann Aubin, of the German University of Breslau, points out in his books that German settlers who went to Poland in the Middle Ages were attracted there mainly by Polish tolerance and by the freedom of thought and speech they found there.

The Jews, persecuted, hunted and hounded elsewhere throughout Europe, found an early sanctuary in Poland. The Statute of Kalisz, in 1264, gave them cultural autonomy and their own coinage. It was the only document of its kind in all Europe.

The spirit of tolerance and understanding in Poland is probably nowhere better illustrated than in its dealing with leaders of the Protestant Reformation. Predominantly a Catholic country, Poland, nevertheless, issued a royal decree in 1563 giving full freedom and protection both to the leaders of the Reformation and their followers. Furthermore, the Polish Catholic clergy, itself, joined in opposing the severe penalties imposed by the Bohemian Council of Constance on those whose religious views differed from their own.

Nor is that all. The laws of Poland which protected the Jew and the Protestant also extended the principle of equality to the Eastern Church. As a result, members of the Greek Orthodox Church, for instance, were admitted as full-fledged members of the Polish Parliament.

This Christian-democratic tradition which has characterized Poland through the years was specifically incorporated into the Act of Lublin, 1569, which united Poland and Lithuania to form the Republican Commonwealth of Poland-Lithuania. It was confirmed by the Constitution of May 3, 1791, and extended by the later Constitution of modern Poland.

The American Revolution struck a familiar note with the Poles. Many Polish Patriots came over and joined the fight. They have been fighting for us and the cause of freedom ever since.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko and Casimir Pulaski were indeed military geniuses who rendered invaluable service to our cause during the Revolutionary War. For that they have been universally recognized. But that is only part of the story. These Polish patriots were also symbols of the eternal struggle of the human spirit for freedom from bondage, persecution, and dictatorship of any kind.

It is of no little significance that Kosciuszko liberated the serfs on his own large estate in Poland. Then when leaving the United States in 1797, after his second visit, he further demonstrated his genuine concern for freedom of the individual by leaving his entire American fortune to Thomas Jefferson for freeing and educating the Negro slaves.

The document speaks for itself:

"I, Tadeusz Kosciuszko, being just on my departure from America, do hereby declare and direct that should I make no other testamentary disposition of my property in these United States I hereby authorize my friend, Thomas Jefferson, to employ the whole thereof in purchasing Negroes from among his own or any others and giving them liberty in my name; in giving them an education in trade or otherwise; in having them instructed for their new condition in the duties of morality which may make them good neighbors, good fathers and mothers, husbands and wives in their duty as citizens, teaching them to be defenders of their liberties and country, of the good order of society and in whatsoever will make them happy and useful; and I make the said Thomas Jefferson executor of this."

Well might we join Teodor Josef Konrad Korzenowski, himself a Pole—Joseph Conrad to you—foremost English-writing novelist of the early twentieth century in quoting Thomas Campbell:

"Hope, for a season, bade the world farewell
And Freedom shrieked—as Kosciuszko fell."

It was the Poles, under King Jan Sobieski, who, by timely assistance to the Austrians, in the Battle of Vienna against the Turks in 1683 saved Europe for Christianity.

In education, literature, art, science, music, and other technical fields of endeavor the Poles "hold their own" as compared with any other nationality groups. An abbreviated list of famous Poles would include Mikolaj Kopernik (Copernicus), whose discoveries in the sixteenth century are the basis of present-day studies of astronomy, Madam Sklodowska-Curie, Nobel Prize winner, discoverer of radium; Olszewski and Wroblewski, scientists who first liquefied air, Chopin, Moniuszko, and Paderewski, music; the latter also patriot and statesman. Baudouin de Courtenay, Rozwadowski, and Jerzy Kurylowicz, linguistics; Oskar Halecki and Kucharski, historians; Kochanowski, Rymont, and Sienkiewicz, literature; the latter two Nobel Prize winners. Matejko, Kosak, and Wyczolkowski, painters; Stwosch and Ostrowski, sculptors.

Kosciuszko and Pulaski won fame for themselves and country during the Revolutionary War but they were not the first Poles to cast their lot with America. The first Poles came to America with the Second Supply, October 1608. They came, employed by the Virginia Company of London, as experts and instructors in the manufacture of glass and pitch, tar and similar products which England then imported from Poland. Capt. John Smith spoke very highly of them in his *True Travels* and other sources confirmed his respect for their contributions.

The record shows that as the Poles came they settled in increasing numbers in New York, Texas, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Kentucky. They played a prominent part in the settlement of the section of the United States known generally as the West and Midwest—Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Indiana, Massachusetts and Connecticut are other States with large numbers of inhabitants of Polish origin and descent. It is estimated that all together there are about 5,250,000 Polish-derived Americans in the United States. They rank as the third largest national group in the country, next to the Germans and the Italians.

Like other groups, the Polish-American has made notable advances in every field of endeavor in which he has been engaged. This is true in Government, labor, the professions, business, industry, agriculture, or wherever else he has gone.

In the industrial life of the Nation the contribution of the Polish-American is substantial in such areas as textiles, coal mining, the production of iron and steel, meat packing and retailing, and related industries.

His traditional love of freedom and the fuller life for himself and his fellowman makes the Pole an almost ideal trade-unionist. He is dependable and trustworthy. Without detracting in the least, from the contributions of others, the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America can testify that its present position of influence and service is due, in no small measure, to the doggedness, determination, and stick-to-it-iveness of many of its Polish members when the International Union was passing through its darkest days.

Poland, like every nation in world history, has had her ups and downs or less rosy days. She has been divided and partitioned, overrun and occupied. And she has been faced with domestic problems that brought her almost to her knees. One such era was the period between the two World Wars.

In a very real sense Poland found herself in a predicament. Internally she was literally bled white by the horrors and destruction of the war and the ravages of starvation. It was her misfortune to fall under the control of leaders and forces at least alien if not downright hostile to democratic practices and Poland's liberal heritage. For the most part her friends and neighbors deserted her. * * * It was a most trying time in her history.

In spite of these obstacles, the democratic forces and traditions that had become part and parcel of Poland's national life were sufficiently strong to wrest a considerable amount of land reforms from the landlords. This survival of the democratic spirit was also able to modify, where it was unable to prevent, reactionary practices in the field of civil liberties. Poland was nationalist. But minority groups, nevertheless, still had the right of appeal and the right to be heard. The country was badly bent but not quite broken.

The spirit of Poland and her sons and daughters never shone brighter than in World War II. She was dismembered by her neighbors both from the east and the west. Her peoples were assaulted and slaughtered. Her churches desecrated and her land laid waste. Her government fled into exile. She was mortally wounded but she kept the faith. She never lost hope.

She lives now in hope. The so-called iron curtain is not so solid or soundproof that the fighters for freedom, whose ancestors saved the west for Christianity, can't see and hear what we say and do, on this side of the curtain, to give substance to their faith.

While the democracies search frantically for friends behind and around the iron curtain, let us not forget Poland and the Poles.

Servicemen's Readjustment Act for Veterans of Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a copy of a bill which I have introduced to provide certain educational and training benefits to veterans who served in the active military, naval, or air service on or after June 27, 1950, which, of course, means the Korean veterans.

The text of the bill follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That section 1, title I, Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection known as subsection (h) and to read as follows:

"(h) Any person who served in the active military, naval, or air service on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall thereafter be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, shall be entitled to education or training subject to the provisions and limitation of part X of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended."

SEC. 2. Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new part to be known as part X and to read as follows:

"PART X

"1. Any person who served in the active military, naval, or air service on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall thereafter be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress (hereinafter referred to as the basic service period), and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable, and whose education or training was interrupted by reason of his entrance into the service, or who desires a course of education or training for a period of not in excess of 12 months, and who either shall have served 90 days or more, exclusive of any period he was assigned to a civilian institution for a course of education or training under the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force which course was substantially the same as established courses offered to civilians, or as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies, or shall have been discharged or released from active service by reason of an actual service-incurred injury or disability, shall be eligible for and entitled to receive a course of education or training under this part. *Provided*, That such course shall be initiated not later than 2 years after the date of his discharge unless he shall, within the 2-year period and prior to termination of the basic-service period, return to active duty in the Armed Forces, in which event his 2-year period shall cease to run until his subsequent discharge: *Provided further*, That no such course of education or training shall be afforded beyond 7 years after the termination of the basic-service period: *And provided further*, That any such person who had not passed his 23d birthday on June 27, 1950, or the date he entered the service, whichever is later, shall be deemed to have had his education or training interrupted.

"2. Any such eligible person upon application to the Administrator, shall be entitled

to a course of education or training to assist him in attaining an educational or vocational objective for a period not to exceed the time such person was in the active service on or after June 27, 1950, and before such date as shall thereafter be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress (the basic service period), exclusive of any period he was assigned to a civilian institution for a course of education or training under the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force which course was substantially the same as established courses offered to civilians or as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies, but an eligible person whose education or training was not interrupted by reason of his entrance into the service shall not be entitled to more than 12 months of education or training under this law: *Provided*, That in no event shall the total period of education or training under this part X, or under both this part and part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, exceed 48 months: *Provided further*, That his work continues to be satisfactory throughout the period, according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the institution: *Provided further*, That for veterans in schools regularly operated on the quarter or semester system, wherever the period of eligibility ends during a quarter or semester and after a major part of such quarter or semester has expired, such period shall be extended to the termination of such unexpired quarter or semester. In all other institutional courses, wherever the period of eligibility ends after a major portion of the course is completed, such period may be extended not more than 9 weeks to completion.

"3. (a) Such person shall be eligible for and entitled to such course of education or training, in full time (or the equivalent thereof in part-time) training, as he may elect, and at any approved educational or training institution at which he chooses to enroll, whether or not located in the State in which he resides, which will accept or retain him as a student or trainee in any field or branch of knowledge which such institution finds him qualified to undertake or pursue. *Provided*, That prior to the applicable delimiting date for initiating his course and subject to the limitations of subparagraph (c) of this paragraph 3, such person shall be entitled to change his course of education or training once without approval from the Administrator: *Provided further*, That the Administrator is authorized to approve additional changes of course of education or training when he finds that—

"A. The veteran is not making satisfactory progress in his present course and the failure is not due to his own misconduct, his own neglect, or his own lack of application; or

"B. The course to which the veteran desires to change is more in keeping with his aptitude, previous education, training, or other such pertinent facts, or

"C. A course to which the veteran desires to change, while not a part of the course currently pursued by him, is a normal progression from said course and will enable him to attain his educational or vocational objective, or

"D. There exist other most cogent reasons for the change.

"*And provided further*, That any such course of education or training may be discontinued at any time, if it is found by the Administrator that, according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the institution, the conduct or progress of such person is unsatisfactory.

"(b) Any such eligible person may apply for a course of instruction by correspondence without any subsistence allowance: *Provided*, That one-fourth of the elapsed time in following such course shall be charged against

the veteran's period of eligibility: *Provided further*, That the Administrator shall have authority to contract with approved institutions for such courses if he finds that the agreed cost is reasonable and fair: *And provided further*, That the provisions of paragraph 5 shall not prevent the payment of such agreed rates.

"(c) The Administrator shall refuse approval to any course elected or commenced by a veteran which is avocational or recreational in character. The following courses shall be presumed to be avocational or recreational in character: Dancing courses; photography courses; flight and glider courses; bartending courses; personality-development courses; entertainment courses; music courses—instrumental and vocal; public-speaking courses; and courses in sports and athletics such as horseback riding, swimming, fishing, skiing, golf, baseball, tennis, bowling, and sports officiating (except applied music, physical education, or public-speaking courses which are offered by institutions of higher learning for credit as an integral part of a course leading to an educational objective); but no such course shall be considered to be avocational or recreational in character if the veteran submits complete justification that such course will contribute to bona fide use in the veteran's present or contemplated business or occupation; and the Administrator may find any other course to be avocational or recreational in character.

"4. From time to time the Administrator shall secure from the appropriate agency of each State a list of the educational and training institutions (including industrial establishments), within such jurisdiction, which are qualified and equipped to furnish education or training, which institutions, together with such additional ones as may be recognized and approved by the Administrator, shall be deemed qualified and approved to furnish education or training to such persons as shall enroll under this part: *Provided*, That wherever there are established State apprenticeship agencies expressly charged by State laws to administer apprentice training, whenever possible, the Administrator shall utilize such existing facilities and services in training on the job when such training is of a year's duration or more: *Provided further*, That any school operated for profit shall not be deemed to be qualified and approved for the enrollment of veterans not already enrolled during any period in which the Administrator finds that it has fewer than 25 equivalent full-time students or one-third of the equivalent full-time students enrolled (whichever is larger), paying all of their own tuition without rebate or scholarships: *Provided further*, That no school or course shall be deemed qualified and approved unless the Administrator finds that it was in operation for a period of 1 year immediately prior to the date of approval, but this shall not require or permit the disapproval of (a) any course in a public school or other tax-supported school, (b) any course in an institution which has been in operation for a period of more than 1 year which does not completely depart from the whole character of the instruction previously given by such institution, or (c) any course in an institution which has been in operation for a period of more than 1 year, by reason of a change in the location of such institution from one point to another within the same general locality: *Provided*, That upon the certification of any State approval agency, that a new or existing institution is essential to meet the requirements of veterans in such State, the Administrator in his discretion may approve such an institution notwithstanding the provisions of this paragraph.

"5. (a) The Administrator shall pay to the educational or training institution for each person enrolled in a course of education or training an amount not to exceed one-half of such tuition and fees as are charged regular nonveteran students of the same category, but in no event shall the total amount paid by the veteran and the Administrator exceed that charged to other students in similar category within the institution for the successful pursuit and completion of the course: *Provided*, That in no event shall such payments, by the Administrator, with respect to any person, exceed \$300 for a full-time course for an ordinary school year: *Provided further*, That no payments shall be made to institutions, business or other establishments furnishing apprentice or other training on the job: *And provided further*, That, subject to the first proviso hereof, where the enrollment in any course in a nonprofit school (including an institutional on-farm-training course) consists of fewer than one-third of the students enrolled paying all of their own tuition, the Administrator shall determine a fair and reasonable rate to be paid for such course by the Administrator and the veteran. *And provided further*, That as to any veteran who pursues a course of education or training full time or part time without subsistence allowance, the Administrator shall pay to the approved institution the charges for tuition and fees required of other students for the successful pursuit and completion of the course by other students in the institution, or the fair and reasonable rate established in applicable cases pursuant to the third proviso hereof, but not in excess of the rate of \$600 for a full-time course for an ordinary school year.

"(b) In any case where it is found that an overpayment to a veteran of subsistence allowance (which overpayment has not been recovered or waived) is proved in a hearing before the Committee on Waivers of the appropriate Veterans' Administration regional office to be the result of willful or negligent failure of the school to report, as required by applicable regulation or contract, to the Veterans' Administration unauthorized or excessive absences from a course, or discontinuance or interruption of a course by the veteran, the amount of such overpayment shall, at the discretion of the Administrator, constitute a liability of the school for such failure to report, and may be recovered by an offset from the amounts otherwise due the school or in other appropriate action: *Provided*, That any amount so collected shall be reimbursed if the overpayment is received from the veteran. This provision shall not preclude the imposition of any civil or criminal action under any other statute.

"6. (a) While enrolled in and pursuing a course under this part, such person, upon application to the Administrator and certification of actual attendance each month shall be paid an allowance for subsistence, supplies, and equipment beginning with the first day of required attendance and ending with the last day of required attendance of a given academic year or other enrollment period, including not in excess of 30 days in a calendar year for absences authorized by the institution or establishment and days when the institution is not regularly in session, not counting as absences week ends or legal holidays established by Federal or State law during which the institution is not regularly in session: *Provided*, That (1) while so enrolled and pursuing a course of full-time institutional training, such person shall be paid an allowance for subsistence, supplies and equipment of \$80 per month, if without a dependent or dependents, or \$110 per month if he has one dependent, or \$125 per month, if he has more than one de-

pendent, and (2) while so enrolled and pursuing a course of part-time institutional training, or a course of institutional on-farm training, or a course of apprenticeship training, or other training on the job, or a combination course, such person shall be paid an allowance for subsistence, supplies, and equipment at the rate for a full-time course, of \$70 per month, if without a dependent or dependents, or \$95 per month, if he has a dependent or dependents: *Provided further*, That while so enrolled and pursuing a course of institutional on-farm training, or a course of apprenticeship training, or other training on the job, such allowance for subsistence, supplies, and equipment shall be reduced each 4 months as the course progresses in the ratio that such 4 months' period bears to the total length of the veterans' approved course under this part, converted to the next higher 4 months' interval in the case of a course which is not equal to an exact multiple of 4 months: *Provided further*, That such person attending a course of less than one-half time basis shall not be entitled to an allowance for subsistence, supplies, and equipment: *Provided further*, That at the beginning of the veteran's course, or enrollment period, and each 12 months thereafter, if continuously enrolled, the Administrator shall require a report of income from productive labor reasonably to be expected by the veteran during his enrollment period or the next 12 months' period if he will be continuously enrolled, and the veteran's allowance for subsistence, supplies, and equipment shall be adjusted prospectively so that in no event shall the rate of such allowance plus the income from productive labor reasonably expected to be received by the veteran exceed the rate of \$2,580 for a 12-months' period for a veteran without a dependent, or \$3,300 for a 12-months' period for a veteran with one dependent, or \$3,540 for a 12-months' period for a veteran with two or more dependents.

"(b) For the purpose of this part, a trade or technical course, offered on a clock-hour basis below the college level, for training in those occupations which are customarily learned through apprenticeships or other training on the job shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of 36 hours per week of attendance is required.

"7. Any such person eligible for the benefits of this part, who is also eligible for the benefit of part VII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), may elect either benefit or may be provided an approved combination of such courses: *Provided*, That the total period of any such combined courses shall not exceed the maximum period or limitations under the part affording the greater period of eligibility.

"8. No department, agency, or officer of the United States, in carrying out the provisions of this part, shall exercise any supervision or control, whatsoever, over any State educational agency, or State apprenticeship agency, or any educational or training institution: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be deemed to prevent any department, agency, or officer of the United States from exercising any supervision or control which such department, agency, or officer is authorized, by existing provisions of law, to exercise over any Federal educational or training institution, or to prevent the furnishing of education or training under this part in any institution over which supervision or control is exercised by such other department, agency, or officer under authority of existing provisions of law.

"9. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and empowered to administer this title, and, insofar as he deems practicable, shall utilize existing facilities and services of Federal and State departments

And agencies on the basis of mutual agreements with them. Consistent with and subject to the provisions and limitations set forth in this title, the Administrator shall, from time to time, prescribe and promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out its purposes and provisions.

"10. The Administrator may arrange for educational and vocational guidance to persons eligible for education and training under this part and, if the Administrator requires such educational and vocational guidance, he is authorized, in his discretion, to defray, or reimburse the veteran for, his traveling expenses to and from the place of advisement. At such intervals as he deems necessary, he shall make available information respecting the need for general education and for trained personnel in the various crafts, trades, and professions: *Provided*, That facilities of other Federal agencies collecting such information shall be utilized to the extent he deems practicable.

"11. (a) As used in this part, the term 'educational or training institutions' shall include all public or private elementary, secondary, or other schools furnishing education for adults, business schools and colleges, scientific and technical institutions, colleges, vocational schools, junior colleges, teachers colleges, normal schools, professional schools, universities, and other educational institutions, and shall also include business or other establishments providing apprentice or other training on the job, including those under the supervision of an approved college or university or any State department of education, or any State apprenticeship agency or State board of vocational education, or any State apprenticeship council or the Federal Apprenticeship Training Service established in accordance with Public Law No. 308, Seventy-fifth Congress, or any agency in the executive branch of the Federal Government authorized under other laws to supervise such training.

"(b) As used in this part the term 'apprentice or other training on the job' shall include courses offered by establishments approved by the appropriate agency of the State or the Administrator whenever such courses of apprentice or other training on the job are furnished in accordance with the following provisions:

"1. Any establishment desiring to undertake an apprentice or other training-on-the-job program will be required to submit to the appropriate State approving agency a written application setting forth the course of training for each job for which a veteran is to be trained. The written application covering the training program will include the following:

"a. Title and description of the specific job objective for which the veteran is to be trained.

"b. Length of the training period.

"c. Schedule listing various operations for major kinds of work or tasks to be learned and showing for each, job operations or work, tasks to be performed, and the approximate length of time to be spent on each operation or task.

"d. Wage or salary to be paid at the beginning of the training program, at each successive step in the program, and at the completion of training.

"e. Entrance wage or salary paid by the establishment to employees already trained in the kind of work for which the veteran is to be trained.

"f. Number of hours of supplemental instructions required.

"2 The appropriate approving agency of the State or the Administrator may approve the application of the establishment when such establishment is found upon investigation to have met or made provision for meeting the following criteria:

"a. The training content of the program is adequate to qualify the veteran for ap-

pointment to the job for which he is to be trained.

"b. There is reasonable certainty that the job for which the veteran is to be trained will be available to him at the end of the training period.

"c. The job is one in which progression and appointment to the next higher classification are based upon skills learned through organized training on the job and not on such factors as length of service and normal turnover.

"d. The wages to be paid the veteran for each successive period of training are not less than those customarily paid in the establishment and the community to a learner in the same job and who is not a veteran and are in conformity with State and Federal laws and applicable bargaining agreements.

"e. The job customarily requires a period of training of not less than 3 months and not more than 2 years of full-time training: *Provided*, That this requirement shall not be applicable to courses of apprentice training.

"f. The length of the training period is no longer than customarily required by the establishment and other establishments in the community to provide the trainee with the required skills, arrange for the acquiring of job knowledge, technical information, and other facts which the trainee will need to learn in order to become competent on the job for which he is being trained.

"g. Provision is made for related instruction for the individual veteran who may need it.

"h. There is in the establishment adequate space, equipment, instructional material, and instructor personnel to provide satisfactory training on the job.

"i. Adequate records are kept to show the progress made by the veteran toward his job objective and a periodic report showing the conduct and progress made in the course of training on the job will be provided for the Veterans' Administration.

"j. Appropriate credit is given the veteran for previous training or job experience, whether in the military service or elsewhere, his beginning wage adjusted to the level to which such credit advances him and his training period shortened accordingly. No course of training will be considered bona fide if given to a veteran who is already qualified by training and experience for the job objective.

"k. A copy of the training program as approved by the State agency is provided to the veteran and to the Veterans' Administration by the employer.

"l. Upon completion of the training the veteran is given a certificate by the employer indicating the length and type of training provided and that the veteran has completed the course of training on the job satisfactorily.

"3. The Veterans' Administration is not authorized to award the benefits under this part, if it is found by either the Administrator or the appropriate State approving agency that the course of apprentice training or other training on the job fails to meet the requirements of this paragraph.

"(c) As used in this part the term 'institutional on-farm training' shall include any course of instruction approved by the appropriate agency of the State or the Administrator. Such course shall be considered a full-time course when it combines (1) organized-group instruction in agricultural and related subjects of at least 200 hours per year—and of at least 8 hours each month—at an educational or training institution, with (2) supervised-work experience on a farm or other agricultural establishment. To be approved, such a course shall be developed with due consideration to the size and character of the farm on which the veteran is to receive his supervised-work

experience and to the need of the veteran, in the type of farming for which he is training, for proficiency in planning, producing, marketing, farm mechanics, conservation of resources, food conservation, farm financing, farm management, and the keeping of farm and home accounts. Such a course shall, in addition, satisfy the requirements of the following:

"1. If the veteran performs part of his course on a farm under his own control—

"a. He shall receive not less than 100 hours of individual instruction per year, not less than 50 hours of which shall be on such farm—with at least two visits by the instructor to such farm each month. Such individual instruction shall be given by the instructor responsible for the veteran's institutional instruction and shall include instruction and home-study assignments in the preparation of budgets, inventories, and statements showing the production, use on the farm, and sale of crops, livestock, and livestock products;

"(b) He shall be assured of control of such farm (whether by ownership, lease, management, agreement, or other tenure arrangement) until the completion of his course; and

"(c) Such farm shall be of a size and character which (1) together with the group instruction part of the course will occupy the full time of the veteran, (2) will permit instruction in all aspects of the management of a farm of the type for which the veteran is being trained; and (3) if the veteran intends to continue operating such farm at the close of his course, will assure him a satisfactory income under normal conditions.

"2 If the veteran performs part of his course as the employee of another—

"(a) He shall receive, on his employer's farm, not less than 50 hours of individual instruction per year (with at least one visit by the instructor to such farm each month). Such individual instruction shall be given by the instructor responsible for the veteran's institutional instruction;

"(b) His employer's farm shall be of a size and character which (1) together with the group-instruction part of the course will occupy the full time of the veteran, and (2) will permit instruction in all aspects of the management of a farm of the type for which the veteran is being trained;

"(c) His employer shall agree to instruct him in various aspects of farm management in accordance with the training schedule developed for the veteran by his instructor, working in cooperation with the employer.

"3 The Veterans' Administration is not authorized to award the benefits under this part if it is found, by either the Administrator or the appropriate State approving agency, that any approved course of institutional-on-farm training fails to meet the requirements of this subparagraph (c).

"(d). 1. In order to secure or retain approval to train veterans, any school operated for profit will be required to submit to the appropriate State approving agency a written application, in form and contents prescribed by the State approving agency, setting forth the course or courses of training. The written application covering each course must include the following:

"a. Title of the course and specific description of the objective for which given.

"b. Length of course.

"c. A detailed curriculum showing subjects taught, type of work or skills to be learned, and approximate length of time to be spent on each.

"d. A showing of educational and experience qualifications of the instructors.

"e. A description of space, facilities, and equipment used for the course.

"f. A statement of the maximum number of students proposed to be trained in the course at one time.

"g. A statement of the educational prerequisite for such a course.

"2. The appropriate approving agency of the State or the Administrator may approve the application of such school when the school is found upon investigation to have met the following criteria:

"a. The curriculum and instruction are consistent in quality, content, and length with similar courses in the public schools or other private schools with recognized and accepted standards.

"b. There is in the school adequate space, equipment, instructional material, and instructor personnel to provide satisfactory training. When approval is given, it shall state the maximum number authorized to be trained in each course.

"c. Educational and experience qualifications of the instructor are adequate as determined by the State approval agency.

"d. Adequate records are kept to show attendance, progress, and conduct, with periodic report to be provided to the Veterans' Administration; and there are clearly stated and enforced standards of attendance, progress, and conduct.

"e. Appropriate credit is given for previous training or experience, with training period shortened proportionately. No course of training will be considered bona fide as to a veteran who is already qualified by training and experience for the course objective.

"f. A copy of curriculum as approved is provided to the veteran and the Veterans' Administration by the school.

"g. Upon completion of the training, the veteran is given a certificate by the school indicating the approved course, title, and length, and that the training was completed satisfactorily.

"h. Such additional criteria established by the State approving agency as it may deem necessary for approval of schools training veterans under this part.

"3. No new course, or additions to the capacity of an existing course, in any school operated for profit, shall be approved if the State approving agency shall determine that the occupation for which the course is intended to provide training is crowded in the State where the training is to be given and that existing training facilities are adequate.

"4. The Veterans' Administration is not authorized to award benefits under this part if it is found by either the appropriate State approving agency or the Administrator that the course offered by a school operated for profit fails to meet the applicable requirements of this subparagraph (d) or the Administrator finds that the school has submitted willfully false or misleading claims.

"12. The appropriation for the Veterans' Administration, 'Administration, Medical, Hospital, and Domiciliary Services,' shall be available for necessary expenses under this part of Veterans Regulation 1 (a), and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional amount or amounts as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes hereof. Any such appropriation shall also be available for use by the Administrator in reimbursing State and local agencies for reasonable expenses incurred by them in (1) rendering necessary services in ascertaining the qualifications of industrial establishments for furnishing on-the-job training to veterans under the provisions of this part of such regulation, and in the supervision of industrial establishments furnishing such training, or (2) furnishing, at the request of the Administrator, any other services or facilities in connection with the administration of programs for training on the job under such provisions, or (3) rendering necessary services in ascertaining the qualifications of profit institutions for furnishing

education and training under the provisions of this part of such regulation and in the supervision of such institutions."

SEC. 3. Any person who served in the active military, naval, or air service on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall thereafter be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, shall be entitled to job counseling and employment placement services subject to the provisions and limitations of title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended.

SEC. 4. This act may be cited as the Korean Conflict Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

DESCRIPTION OF DRAFT KOREAN CONFLICT SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT GENERAL

The draft bill attached hereto has been prepared by the various interested agencies within the executive branch of the Government. It is a synthesis of their sometimes divergent views and to this extent is not completely satisfactory to any single agency. However, the general objectives of the bill (including the objectives of the changes from the provisions of the GI bill) are endorsed by all the participating agencies. While there are some differences of opinion between agencies as to the best means of achieving these objectives, the specific provisions of the bill are a compromise which adequately represents the views of the agencies principally concerned.

In addition to providing more adequate safeguards against excessive expenditure of public funds than did the GI bill, the draft bill would be much simpler to administer and would more adequately assure the veterans of good quality training.

The following statement (1) describes the major provisions of the draft bill, and (2) points out the major differences between the draft bill and the GI bill.

MAJOR PROVISIONS OF BILL

The bill provides education or training to any veteran of 90 days' military service since June 27, 1950, with other than a dishonorable discharge, whose training was interrupted by reason of his entrance into service, or who desires a refresher course. Time spent while in military service in courses substantially the same as civilian courses would be deducted in the determination of eligibility and entitlement. Veterans who had not passed their twenty-third birthday on June 27, 1950, or the date they entered service, whichever is later, would be deemed to have had their training interrupted. The amount of training to which the veteran would be entitled is computed on the basis of 1 month of full-time training for each month of active service. The provisions of the bill would enable each trainee to complete at least one school term. The individual veteran whose training was interrupted will have a maximum entitlement of 4 years (48 months) under this proposed bill. Other veterans would be entitled to a maximum of 1 year (12 months). Training received under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act and under the draft bill could not exceed a total of 4 years. The veteran must enter training within 2 years after his date of discharge and complete training 7 years after a date to be established by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress.

Types of training provided include college, below college (trade and vocational), job, and farm. Avocational or recreational training would be prohibited.

The bill provides that subsistence, supplies, and equipment allowances in the fol-

lowing maximum amounts would be paid to all full-time trainees:

	Veteran with no de- pendents	Veteran with 1 dependent	Veteran with more than 1 dependent
On-the-job trainees.....	\$70	\$95	\$95
Institutional trainees....	80	110	125

Where the veteran had other income from productive labor available, his total income, including subsistence, could not exceed \$215 if he had no dependents, \$275 if he had one dependent, or \$295 if he had more than one dependent. No subsistence would be paid for less than half-time training. All income from productive labor would be considered in arriving at the amount of subsistence to be paid.

The draft bill provides that the Government will pay one-half of the cost of tuition and fees up to a maximum payment of \$300, except that where no subsistence is paid, the Government will pay the full cost of tuition and fees.

The bill establishes minimum standards for on-job training, for schools operated for profit, and for institutional on-farm training.

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs would have the authority to approve or disapprove all changes of course after the first. He would be prohibited from authorizing benefits where training is substandard, or where fraud has occurred. He could provide vocational advisement and guidance to all veterans eligible for education or training, and reimburse veterans for travel expense incurred when advisement and guidance was required.

The bill also assures veterans of service since June 27, 1950, of job counseling and employment-placement services comparable to those granted World War II veterans by title IV of the GI bill.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DRAFT BILL AND EDUCA- TION AND TRAINING PROVISIONS OF GI BILL

Eligibility: Eligibility requirements would remain unchanged from those under the GI bill, except that for the veteran to be eligible for a full 4 years of training his education or training must have been interrupted by reason of entrance into service. Veterans who had not passed their twenty-third birthday on June 27, 1950, or on the date they entered military service would be deemed to have had their education or training interrupted. Veterans whose training was not interrupted would be eligible for a maximum of 1 year of training.

Experience with the GI bill has indicated that a substantial amount of the training granted particularly in the latter stages of the program, was not a result of readjustment needs or of interference with education or training by military service. Rather it was the result of the veteran's interest, apart from his military service, either in further education or training or in the cash benefits associated with the training.

The original GI bill had a restriction in it similar in type to that proposed, but it was removed by amendment. Its removal relieved VA of the administrative burden it imposed, when the agency was having difficulty in processing the tremendous volume of work resulting from the mass demobilization at the end of World War II. The administrative burden imposed on VA under current conditions would be relatively small. The restoration of this type of limitation will more adequately assure that the veteran's need for training is associated with his military service.

Entitlement: The GI bill formula for computing education and training entitlement was very heavily weighted in favor of the man with short service, providing that he had at least 90 days of service. A full year of training was available to every eligible veteran, plus an additional month for each month of service. Under this formula a man with 89 days' service would not be eligible for any training, whereas a man with 91 days would be eligible for 15 months of full-time training. While under the circumstances surrounding World War II mobilization and demobilization, there may have been more justification for this bias in favor of the man with short service, current conditions would not appear to justify providing 15 months' training (one and two-thirds school years) to men with only 3 months' service. No definite information is available as to the average period of entitlement under the proposed month-for-month formula, but it appears likely that it would approximate 24 months (two and two-thirds school years). Minimum entitlement would be one school term, since the veteran would be eligible to complete any term more than half over at the time his entitlement ran out. The maximum amount of training to which any man would be entitled under this proposed bill is 4 years. Veterans whose training was not interrupted would be entitled to 1 year of training for refresher purposes. Training received under the GI bill would be deductible from the 4-year maximum.

Deadlines for entering and completing training would be reduced from 4 and 9 years, respectively, as they were established by amendments to the GI bill, to 2 years after release from active service and 7 years after the date to be established by proclamation or resolution. This reduction is consistent with the more favorable circumstances surrounding the demobilization of veterans of Korean service. Since there will be a much smaller number of servicemen to be discharged, the schools will not have the waiting lists of trainees which forced many veterans to postpone training after the last war.

SUBSISTENCE, SUPPLIES, EQUIPMENT

The amounts paid for subsistence would be no different than under the GI bill. However, to the subsistence allowance would be added \$5 per month to cover supplies and equipment. This would enable the veteran to purchase supplies and equipment himself and would relieve the Government of the administrative burden of purchasing these items. Available information indicates that \$5 per month is somewhat more than the average cost to the Government of these items under the GI bill. Income ceilings under the draft bill would be increased \$5 to compensate for supplies and equipment expense.

The subsistence would not be paid until after attendance certification, rather than without such certification as is the practice under existing law. This would largely eliminate the major cause of overpayments to veterans.

The draft bill also differs from the GI bill in that no subsistence would be paid for less than one-half time training. Provisions pertaining to the payment of subsistence to institutional on-the-farm trainees have been modified to make them more consistent with on-job-training subsistence provisions. With respect to subsistence payments for these two types of training, the bill also provides for the automatic adjustment of subsistence payments, as the course progresses, in accordance with a preestablished formula, rather than for adjustment on the basis of the changing relationship between income and ceilings, as was the case under the GI bill. The revised procedures would greatly simplify the administration of these portions of the program.

TUITION

Whereas under the GI bill the full cost of tuition and fees (up to a maximum of \$500, less supplies and equipment) is borne by the Government, the draft bill provides that where subsistence is paid to the trainee the Government would bear one-half the cost of tuition and fees, up to a maximum Government payment of \$300. This change is designed to accomplish two objectives:

(1) To eliminate a substantial part of the administrative burden both upon the VA and upon the schools that has resulted from the "customary" and "reasonable" cost concepts under which VA negotiated with schools training GI bill students.

(2) To give the veteran a financial interest in his own training.

Many of the difficulties experienced in administering the GI bill were a result of the fact that normal competitive factors were not operative, since there was a large supply of trainees and all funds for tuition were provided by the Government. The payment of one-half of the tuition by the veteran will restore, in part, this normal competitive element to the situation. With an investment of his own in the training, the veteran will in many instances be more discriminating in his choice of courses and schools, and he will also consider more carefully the basic question of whether he should enter training at all. This provision to give the veteran a financial responsibility will in most instances make unnecessary the cost formulas used in the past by VA for arriving at tuition payments.

Where no subsistence is paid, the Government would pay all tuition and fees up to a maximum of \$600 for an ordinary school year.

TYPES OF TRAINING AVAILABLE

The same types of training would be available under the draft bill as under the GI bill.

CHANGES OF COURSE

The GI bill, as amended, provides for the approval by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of all changes of course from one general field to another after the first such change. This provision was added to the original bill by amendment and was designed to reduce the volume of indiscriminate course-jumping by trainees. The draft bill provides for the approval by the Administrator of all changes of course after the first, and outlines the bases for the approval of such changes. This revision will for the most part limit course changes after the first to those instances where (1) the trainee is not making satisfactory progress and the failure is not due to his own misconduct, neglect, or lack of application; (2) the new course would be more in keeping with the trainee's aptitude, experience, etc.; or (3) the new course is a normal progression from his present course. All changes, including the first, would require approval by the Administrator, if made after the deadline date for initiating a course (as is the case under the GI bill, as amended):

AWARD OF BENEFITS

The draft bill provides that the Administrator may deny benefits for job, farm, or profit school training if either he or the State approval agency finds that the course fails to meet the requirements of the law or if fraud exists. Under the GI bill, the Administrator could deny benefits only if he found fraud to exist. He could not deny benefits for substandard training if the school was approved by the State approval agency. Experience has shown that this separation in the GI bill of administrative responsibility from financial responsibility has caused substantial waste of public funds and of the time of veteran trainees. The draft bill provision is designed to eliminate this waste.

William N. Oatis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the *Christian Science Monitor*, Wednesday, August 1, 1951:

THE OATIS CASE

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

WASHINGTON — William N. Oatis, an American reporter who served faithfully the concept of free journalism, is still behind bars in a jail in Czechoslovakia manned by Communist secret police trained by men from Moscow.

Efforts by the State Department to secure his release, and in the meantime the right of consular access, so far have failed.

Congress has become interested in the case. A half-dozen resolutions proposing various forms of reprisal against the Czech Government are pending in the legislative hopper. A number of our legislators have berated the State Department for its failure to obtain release for Mr. Oatis.

This is a case where it is easier to criticize the State Department than it is to suggest an effective remedy.

So far, the ideas formulated in Congress are either unrealistic or would damage the interests of the United States more than they would penalize the country which is guilty of violation of contract and decent international behavior.

An example of the unreality of some of the proposals is one for the arrest of 10 Czechs for every missing American. That might work except for the fact that there literally are no Czechs under the present judicial jurisdiction of the United States except for (1) refugees from the present Communist regime and (2) Czech diplomats. Obviously, arresting persons of the first category would merely delight the Communist regime in Czechoslovakia. Arresting Czech diplomats would only invite reprisals on American diplomats in Prague who there perform the useful task of observing events in that country for our better knowledge.

One facet of this case so far overlooked in the debate is that the State Department does have upon its head some degree of responsibility for the arrest and imprisonment of Mr. Oatis. This responsibility derives from past behavior of the Congress.

And it arises from the fact that the State Department allowed a precedent to be established in Czechoslovakia for the illegal seizure of American citizens without vigorous reaction from Washington.

In the summer of 1949, two American citizens disappeared in Prague—Noel and Herta Field. Also the brother of Noel Field, Hermann, disappeared somewhere in the course of an air flight between Warsaw and Prague. Later, an adopted daughter of Noel Field disappeared in Berlin.

The State Department made routine inquiries about the four members of the Field family, but it never pressed the Czech Government as it pressed the Hungarians in the Vogeler case, or is pressing the Czechs now in the Oatis case.

There was a reason for the relative disinterest in the Field family. Noel Field had Communist connections in his past. Whether he was ever a party member has not been

established. He did have many active Communist connections. He also served American intelligence during the war in Switzerland when he acted as a channel of communication to both German and French undergrounds for the United States Office of Strategic Services.

Obviously the State Department, under constant drumfire from Congress for alleged softness on communism, was not eager to go all out in behalf of the Field family. It did not. And there was no great protest.

But this relative apathy in the Field case now bears its evil fruit at the expense of Mr. Oatis. The Czechs got away with the disappearance of the Fields. Three American citizens disappeared from inside their borders. No one did anything about it vigorously. The evil precedent was established.

The only possible basis for the rescue of Mr. Oatis is his American citizenship. The rights of the American citizen were neglected in the Field case. Now everyone wants to revive them in behalf of Mr. Oatis. But rights once neglected and compromised are harder to revive. The situation suggests that the rights of citizenship are a seamless garment to be upheld for all, regardless of personal worthiness.

World Government Opposed by California Department, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I am including a resolution adopted at the thirty-first encampment of the Department of California, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, at Santa Cruz, Calif., June 24-27, 1951. This great patriotic organization will have no part in the move for one world as proposed by the United World Federalists.

Whereas the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is on record as opposing any form of world government in which the United States of America would surrender any of its sovereignty; and

Whereas the World Federalists movement is sponsored and backed by an organization known as the United World Federalists; and

Whereas it now appears that these organizations may be infiltrated by subversive elements and devoted to the task of making the United States a subject state in a world government and depriving American citizens of their citizenship and of their rights and protections under the Constitution; and

Whereas it further appears that the organizations sponsoring this movement have unlimited funds with which to propagandize and attempt to influence legislation in furtherance of their aims, which funds it is believed are derived from subversive sources: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be requested to appoint a committee to investigate all phases of the World Federalist movement, including the purposes and aims of their sponsors and backers, the source of funds used to further such aims, and the methods employed to influence legislation in furtherance thereof.

Czechoslovakia Should Be Disciplined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Members of Congress from Ohio at their weekly meeting yesterday took note of the unlawful and unjust imprisonment of William N. Oatis by the authorities in Czechoslovakia. By a unanimous vote they instructed me as the chairman of the delegation to write a letter to President Truman sending him their views as expressed in resolutions that they at that time had adopted. In compliance with those instructions I wrote President Truman a letter which includes these resolutions. The letter including the resolutions is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., August 1, 1951.

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Republican Members of Congress from Ohio at their weekly meeting today accepted the following resolutions concerning the imprisonment of William N. Oatis by the Government of Czechoslovakia

"Resolved, That all commercial relations with Czechoslovakia should be terminated immediately and should be resumed only if and when the Government of Czechoslovakia restores William N. Oatis to his freedom; and it is further

"Resolved, That if the said William N. Oatis is not restored to his freedom within a reasonable time that the Department of State should take steps to evacuate all Nationals of the United States in Czechoslovakia with the view of severing diplomatic relations with that Government."

The Ohio Republican delegation is as follows: CHARLES H. ELSTON, WILLIAM E. HESS, WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, CLIFF CLEVINGER, CLARENCE J. BROWN, JACKSON E. BETTS, THOMAS A. JENKINS, WALTER ELLSWORTH BREHM, JOHN M. VORYS, ALVIN F. WEICHEL, WILLIAM HANES AYRES, J. HARRY MCGREGOR, FRANK T. BOW, FRANCES P. BOLTON, and GEORGE H. BENDER.

As chairman of the Ohio Republican delegation in the House of Representatives, I was authorized and instructed to transmit to you a copy of these resolutions and to express to you the hope that you will give this important matter prompt and serious consideration.

Respectfully,

THOMAS A. JENKINS,
Chairman, Ohio Republican Delegation, House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are tremendously interested in the alacrity with which the authorities in some of the foreign countries throw our citizens into prison upon the least provocation and without regard to the comity that exists between nations and without regard to law and to common decency.

The newspaper correspondents are naturally very much interested for the imprisonment of this man is due to his efforts as a newspaperman. But the

freedom of the press evidently does not count for so much in that country.

The conduct of Czechoslovakia in this Oatis matter indicates her lack of appreciation of the many trade concessions that the United States has extended to her over the violent protests of many Congressmen who have for years been seeking to protect the interests of American industries whose products have had to compete with cheap foreign labor. The pottery and the glass manufacturers of the country have suffered great commercial distress because of trade agreements made by American authorities in favor of Czechoslovakian industries. The same is true with reference to shoe manufacturers and textile manufacturers and many others.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the President will demand that justice be done immediately. I further hope that American trade authorities and diplomatic authorities will show a greater desire to look after the best interest of America as against the interest of these ungrateful foreign countries.

Hospital Survey and Construction Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from *Valor*, August 1951, by John W. Cronin, M. D., F. A. C. S., Chief, Division of Hospital Facilities, United States Public Health Service, Washington, D. C.:

THE NATIONAL HOSPITAL SURVEY AND CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

(By Dr. John W. Cronin)

There are dangers in building small hospitals, and these must be considered in the administration of the Hill-Burton program. Methods of avoiding them must be worked out in a feasible, practical way. Small hospitals cannot always provide the variety of service that can be given in larger hospitals. Low occupancy rates are frequently found in the small hospital. There is a relationship between demand for hospital care and the ability to pay for it, and the lower the financial resources of the community the lower the use of the hospital beds. Due to relatively low income of small towns and rural communities, charges for hospital care must be kept comparatively low. As a result, the small hospital in a small community has found it difficult to set aside sufficient funds for the purchase and maintenance of modern equipment, or for the employment of specialized personnel. The temptation given to a small-hospital staff to perform services beyond their skills may bring harm to the patient.

There is a real need for the small facility in many small communities and rural areas. We do not believe in the indiscriminate building of small hospitals in all rural areas. We do believe that the provision of such facilities where they can effectively serve their purpose of bringing needed medical

services to the population is acceptable. This requires careful study and sound community planning. Small hospitals should not stand alone but should share with the larger hospitals of the hospital service area and accept services and assistance as well as render services and assistance to those hospitals. This is the basis of the coordinated and integrated hospital system. It is the key note of modern medical care. Such plans as the Rochester, N. Y. plan; the Bingham Associates (Mass.) plan; and those in Virginia, Michigan, Kansas, and North Carolina among others are pointing this way.

The Division of Medical and Hospital Resources works very closely with the Division of Hospital Facilities in the Public Health Service in developing guide lines for the National Hospital Construction program. When we realize that for nearly 20 years the hospital plant of this country lay dormant we know the need is great. In the depression years money was not available for hospital construction; during the war years materials were used for purposes other than hospitals. The normal attrition rate for hospitals is estimated at \$75,000,000 per year. At \$13,500 per bed that means a 6,000 bed loss per year. A review of the State plans above shows that we now have about 1,000,000 beds and based on the formula toward which we can build as stated in Public Law 725, Seventy-ninth Congress we need 900,000 more beds for normal peacetime.

(The formula is roughly 45 beds per 1,000 population for general hospitals; 2 beds per 1,000 population for chronic disease; 5 beds per 1,000 population for mental and 2.5 beds per average annual death (1939-44) for tuberculosis; and one health center per 30,000 people.)

With the onset of the Korean incident on June 25, 1950, the need for and value of all our health resources became greatly enhanced. The Hill-Burton program will undoubtedly in time be geared to new and greater responsibilities in line with the defense of the Nation. Its scope and content will be changed to meet the need. It should not be forgotten that we are only slowly making an inroad on our normal peacetime need.

TRENDS

The trends of the national hospital program can be summed up as follows:

1. The development, slowly but surely, of hospital services in needy areas, especially in rural areas.
2. The establishment of the hospital as the health center of the community.
3. The regional coordination of hospital services.
4. The coordination of hospital and public-health services.
5. The strengthening of the centers of medical education through acquisition of facilities to permit these centers to play their vital and much-needed role.
6. The demand for the general hospital to be more truly general and include services for the mental, tuberculous, and chronic type of patient.
7. The realization that prepayment plans for hospital care are the only sound, feasible plan.
8. The fact that good planning, good design and construction, and good administration is the basic tripod of success for hospital services to the patient.
9. The programs of basic research and consultation are imperative to each aspect of that basic tripod.
10. The need for and value of regional health councils to determine health needs of the region and community, evaluate existing facilities, and determine methods and means of acquiring the needed additional facilities and services.

11. The fact that local community, State, and Federal groups can successfully work together toward a common goal and achieve it.

12. Modern medicine demands a health promotion, health maintenance, and health conservation type of program, rather than just the treatment of disease.

The objectives of the national hospital program are being reflected in the trends being manifested. In short, the objective is to make possible the provision of quality medical care as economically as possible to those receiving it and as conveniently as possible for those who have the responsibility of providing it to the patient.

The cut-back of \$550,000,000 in the appropriation for the operation of the Federal Government during the fiscal year 1951 included \$75,000,000 of Hill-Burton funds. The effect on the States is to require a great deal of replanning and reconsideration of plans already made. This is currently being done. Many communities which had planned on acquiring hospitals may have to have their projects postponed until a later year.

The division operates through the 10 regional offices where a typical staff consists of a program director, a health program representative, an architect, a construction engineer, and a mechanical engineer. The staff at headquarters is divided into a program operations branch consisting of individuals trained in medico-socio-economic aspects of hospital services; the technical services branch made up of architects, construction engineers, mechanical engineers, specification and estimates experts, wage-rate authorities, electrical engineers, and others; the equipment section with trained equipment personnel; the program evaluation and reports branch with personnel trained to obtain adequate reports and to evaluate them; the information section and the usual administration, fiscal and budget personnel. A very close liaison is maintained with professional groups throughout other divisions of the service as well as non-Federal governmental and private organizations since the national hospital construction program in its ramifications directly and indirectly affects our daily lives and professional careers. The national hospital construction program is a fine example of how the local community, State and Federal Government can cooperate in achieving a common goal of better medical care for those who need hospital services.

National Clay Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a House resolution officially proclaiming the week of August 19, 1951, as National Clay Week throughout the Nation.

By passing such a resolution, the House of Representatives would pay fitting tribute to one of this country's basic industries, an industry which has contributed in countless ways to the Nation's health and welfare. So numerous, so diversified, have been the contributions of clay products to our progress as a Nation and as a people, that merely to list them would be a task of Herculean proportions.

Clay products and their varied influence on our way of life are in evidence in all fields of human activity. In the home, in the factory, on highways and byways, on the Nation's farms, on almost any type of construction or engineering project you would care to mention, products made of clay, the raw material of a timeless industry, are serving in some vital capacity. These products include such invaluable tools of progress as clay pipe, brick, refractories, china, pottery, and tile. Probably no other industry in existence makes such widely contrasting products from a single basic material—length of clay pipe as large as 36 inches in diameter, designed to be buried underground for centuries, is formed from a mass of stiff clay. And from this same basic ingredient is made such a vastly different item as a base for a delicately modeled figurine, designed for display in art collections.

Certainly no other industry boasts a documented history that dates back 6,000 years—4,000 years before the birth of Christ. Ancient civilizations not only constructed drainage lines, but they also left records of their existence on clay tablets.

Yes, clay products have been in the vanguard of civilization's progress since the dawn of recorded history. The story of clay has gone hand in hand with the age-old saga of mankind's constant struggle to make the world a better, more healthful place in which to live.

Although the clay industry had its inception so many centuries ago in ancient, long-dead civilizations, the technique of making products from clay has kept pace with the steady advancement of knowledge and technology. And, as had been true in virtually every field of industrial and commercial enterprise, the clay industry has made by far its greatest forward strides in the United States. The story of the clay industry in this country has been one of resourcefulness, ingenuity and development that epitomizes the American free-enterprise system.

The clay manufacturers of the United States have constantly improved their products through better equipment, better manufacturing methods and greater know-how. From the old potter's wheel which was the main unit utilized in the old days, equipment employed in clay manufacturing has undergone constant refinement until today, the clay industry is one of the most modern and completely equipped in the land.

From the excavation of fire clay or shale from surface or underground mines to the loading of finished products by speedy, efficient lift-trucks, the business of making clay products is an up-to-date, streamlined process. And, throughout the production process, skilled specialists utilizing highly sensitive and accurate tools, maintain a never-ceasing vigil on product quality. The wide range of clay products that move out daily from the spacious yards of the Nation's clay factories are of uniformly high quality and dependability.

And the clay industry is not resting on its hard-earned laurels—not by any means. A never-ending program of research and experimentation in modern,

completely equipped and staffed laboratories, present an indisputable guaranty that the quality of clay products will continue to improve, and the efficiency and volume of clay production will continue to expand.

Yes; clay has long been a key factor in the Nation's development. But, today, more than ever, this basic material of the earth is of paramount importance. Korea and the threat of international conflict are putting added demands on industry. And the big burden of maintaining our civilian economy while rearming our Nation and our allies falls upon United States manufacturers. Demands upon the clay industry are keeping pace with this trend. Clay pipe and other products of clay are performing yeoman service as materials for the defense rearmament program.

It is no surprise that clay products are being drafted in project after project, rushed into construction to meet expanding needs. Clay products are on the job in countless essential-defense industries, in atomic-bomb plants, in military installations both here and abroad. And clay products are meeting ever-mounting requirements for additional sewerage and sanitary facilities, both public and private, and for new factories, airports, highways, railroads, hospitals, and schools.

In performing these many jobs with outstanding success, clay products at the same time release other materials critically needed in the defense program. Clay is classified as a noncritical material, and is in abundant supply. Yes, war or peace, clay is always on the job, serving the Nation's health, welfare, and security.

With the essentiality of clay never more apparent than it is today, it is only fitting that the Nation set aside a special week to honor the industry. Already, elaborate plans are under way for the celebration of National Clay Week during the week of August 19. Clay-products plants throughout the country will observe this week and will open their doors to the American people for a firsthand look at the modern methods and facilities utilized in the present-day clay manufacturing.

Focal point of this observance will be Uhrichsville, Ohio, located in Tuscarawas County, generally regarded as "the clay center of the world." A large share of the Nation's vital clay production is concentrated in Tuscarawas County, and the community of Uhrichsville will pay tribute to this great industry which has figured so prominently in the growth and progress of that city, of Tuscarawas County, and of the Nation. A gala week of festivities has been planned, and countless thousands are expected to converge on Uhrichsville for this significant occasion.

It will be my pleasure to participate in the final day of these festivities, on August 25. On that day I shall be privileged to attend the annual picnic of the United Brick and Clay Workers.

I am certain that no finer group of workers can be found in this country. I am extremely proud of the fact that they are my constituents, for their skill and

their long record of cooperation with leaders of the industry have been great factors in the tremendous growth of the clay industry in Tuscarawas County.

Official recognition of the week of August 19 as National Clay Week by the Congress of the United States would represent the crowning touch to an already outstanding program that will commemorate one of our country's most important industries. By passing this resolution, the House will be conferring a richly deserved honor on the clay industry and the many thousands of Americans who are associated with it.

I strongly urge that you endorse this resolution to officially set aside the week of August 19-25 as National Clay Week throughout the United States.

One-Way Freight Rates Abolished

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on day before yesterday the people of the Southern and Western States, the 32 States south of the Ohio River and west of the Mississippi, won the greatest victory they have achieved in the last 50 years, when we induced the Interstate Commerce Commission to readjust its regulations and wipe out that one-way freight rate with which we have been punished for more than a generation.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] deserves a great deal of credit from the people in the South and Southwest for the able leadership which he has exerted over a period of years in the accomplishment of this abolishment of the one-way-freight rate.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to compliment the gentleman from Mississippi on behalf of the people of the Midwest for his untiring efforts in behalf of the abolition of the one-way-freight rate.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

As we all know, the areas north of the Ohio River and east of the Mississippi have been provided cheaper freight rates for materials hauled the same distances than those charged the people south of the Ohio River and west of the Mississippi.

This, in itself, was an unjust discrimination that should have been abandoned long ago. In fact, it should never have been permitted in the first place.

But in addition to that, the people in the Southern and Western States, that

is in the States south of the Ohio River and west of the Mississippi, have been punished by a one-way freight rate that has prevented them from processing their own materials and developing their own resources.

To give you an example of what this means, there has been a different charge imposed on shipping processed materials from any State west of the Mississippi or south of the Ohio into this protected area from that charged for shipping the same materials out of that area into any of the Western or Southern States.

Here are examples.

I know a firm in the district I represent that was doing business with another firm in New England. The New England firm shipped this local concern a consignment of goods by mistake. It should have gone to another customer in some other section of the country. When it arrived, the recipient shipped it back over the same road by which it came, and it cost twice as much to ship it back as it did to ship it down there.

A firm in Kansas, manufacturing the same articles that are manufactured in one of the Northeastern States, found that to ship its goods to a certain city in Ohio, which was exactly the same distance from both places, was compelled to pay 65 percent more freight than his competitor behind the iron curtain paid for shipping the same goods the same distance to the same customer.

I am told that a former President of the United States had a consignment of goods shipped from New York to a member of his family in one of the Southwestern States. For some reason it was not delivered, but was shipped back over the same route, and it cost twice as much to ship it back as it did to ship it out there.

Only a short time ago, the enterprising citizens of a certain locality in the district I represent made arrangements for the construction of a small factory. They found on investigation that this one-way freight rate would penalize them \$550,000 a year.

The same thing would have happened if this plant had been in Tennessee, Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, or any other State south of the Ohio River, or in Missouri, Oklahoma, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, Montana, South Dakota, Colorado, Texas, or any other State west of the Mississippi River.

We have been trying for years to get this injustice removed; but the same selfish interests that got it imposed in the first place concentrated their efforts to block its repeal.

They have even tried to mislead the railroad employees into the belief that removing this outrageous regulation and giving justice to the people in all the States in the Union in transportation rates, would throw them out of work. When the truth is that it will stimulate progress, increase the amount of freight hauled and employ more men.

The same influences have turned heaven and earth to try to block the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway, which, when completed, will provide the short missing link in our internal waterway system, as

well as the missing link in our national defense program.

It would not throw a single employee out of work, but would stimulate transportation and cause the employment of more men than are now employed by the railroads in that area.

This project has already been approved by Congress. It is now written into the law of the land. More than half of the route from the Gulf to the Tennessee River has already been constructed, or will be when the Demopolis Dam, which is now under construction, is completed.

As I pointed out the other day, it will cut the water distance between the Gulf of Mexico and our atomic-bomb plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., by more than 800 miles; and will cut the water distance between Mobile and our new atomic-bomb plant at Paducah, on the Ohio River, by more than 300 miles; and will cut the cost of transportation between those points to the irreducible minimum.

It is the only possible way to provide what will amount to a slack-water route from the Gulf of Mexico to the Great Lakes, and to all points on the upper Mississippi to Minneapolis and St. Paul; and to all points on the Ohio River all the way up to Pittsburgh, Pa.; and ultimately to all points on the Missouri River all the way to Fort Benton, Mont., as well as to all points on the Tennessee River all the way up to Oak Ridge where our atomic-bomb plant is located, and at the same time, save the swift current of the Mississippi for downstream traffic.

But the same lobbyists, that have been fighting the elimination of this unjust one-way freight rate, are attempting to mislead Congress into refusing appropriations to speed up the construction of this Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway—the missing link in our great inland waterway system, as well as the missing link in our national defense program.

They knew that this Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway would do more to eliminate this one-way freight rate than anything else, unless the Interstate Commerce Commission came to the rescue of the South and West, as it did on yesterday, and wiped out these discriminations.

The American people owe the present members of the Interstate Commerce Commission a lasting debt of gratitude for this service.

If everybody in the United States realized just what this far-reaching decision means, there would be a celebration in every State south of the Ohio River and west of the Mississippi.

From a transportation standpoint, the Western and Southern States will no longer be treated as conquered provinces.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in this battle a long time. I have contacted the Members of Congress of both Houses, and of both parties, from every State whose people have been adversely affected by these unjust discriminations and I am glad to report that, without regard to party, they have responded most generously in their appeals to Interstate Commerce Commission to wipe out these discriminations and insure justice in

transportation rates to the people of every section of this country.

That goal has now been attained through this regulation.

As I said, it is one of the greatest victories ever won for the people of those 32 States south of the Ohio and west of the Mississippi Rivers.

Souvenirs of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of Wednesday, August 1, 1951:

AMONG MY SOUVENIRS

There is a dividing line between souvenirs of war and spoils of war. There is another dividing line between liberating a friendly nation and defeating an enemy nation. In the confusion of war and in the widespread enthusiasm of victorious troops for collecting souvenirs, both those dividing lines are easily crossed.

The \$100,000 leopard-skin rug sent home from Korea by an American sergeant is a case in point. While doubtless purchased in good faith by the soldier from a Korean seller who had somehow come into possession of it during the time Seoul was repeatedly changing hands, the fact remains that it is a Korean national treasure which belongs to the Republic of Korea. We are sure it will be so recognized by the soldier in question and by his family, and will find its way back where it belongs.

But the record of American troops in the last war indicates the need for higher standards in such matters. The many GI's lost their lives stopping for souvenirs in the midst of battle. Too much happy-go-lucky looting accompanied the arrival of the Yanks even in liberated areas. Too much trading in misery resulted in picking up hard-earned treasures for a song on rapidly organized black markets.

Such happenings, to be sure, are the usual accompaniment of war. Among the Americans they were frequently balanced by an easygoing generosity toward conquered and occupied peoples. Yet, despite this mitigating factor American troops showed themselves less disciplined than some others in respect of the property of other peoples. The wealthiest nation in the world cannot afford this kind of souvenirs of war.

An Editor's Viewpoint on Floods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Stanley Matzke, the farm editor of the Nebraska State Journal, has written a very enlightening editorial regarding the flood situation about which we have heard so

much on the floor of the House recently. I feel that the membership should have the advantage of his statement, and by leave granted me I include Mr. Matzke's statement with my remarks:

MORE OR LESS PERSONAL

As the waters of the most devastating flood in the history of the Middle West recede, leaving death, destruction, and desolation in their wake, its terrible implications are being cited to prove many things by many people.

Those who advocate the authority method of resource development say, "See, if we had a Missouri Valley Authority it never would have happened."

Those who have opposed the Pick-Sloan plan of valley development are certain that the Kansas flood proves that this multiple-purpose program of water use and control is nothing more than wasteful pork-barrel spending.

FLOOD POST MORTEM

Those who fail to see the relation of rain falling on land and those same raindrops collected into flood depths 8 miles wide say, "You can't do anything about it."

Those who emphasize conservation insist that adequate conservation practices and structures on the land would have been the answer to greatly reducing the damaging effects of runoff waters which are still roaring across Kansas and Missouri bottom lands.

Those who call conservation's effect on runoff absurd and claim that only by building huge dams can we hold back floodwaters are loud in their criticism of Congress for not having authorized more multimillion-dollar appropriations for dam building.

Those who oppose both reservoirs and on and in the land moisture retention say, "There you are. The only way to stop floods is to speed the water on down the valley with deeper, wider, and straighter channels and to keep it off of property with levees."

And then there are those who use this greatest tragedy the Middle West has ever suffered as an argument against aid to foreign countries, for more electrical power or navigation development, for their own pet theories and plans and against those of their opponents.

You can hear—and read—Kansas' tragedy used as an argument for everything under the sun except the one basic thing involved—the effective control of surface waters.

IT WILL HAPPEN AGAIN

And while the arguments rage, little people and big industries are digging themselves out of the mud which once was good productive topsoil on someone's farm. Are wishing the water in their homes, and business places, and factories, and anywhere else, on somebody's farm or in the Gulf of Mexico. And are wondering how soon it will happen again.

And it will happen again and again. With increasing intensity as each period of heavy precipitation removes more and more of our absorbent topsoil.

It will happen again and again and again. Unless it stops raining.

Or unless a complete program of runoff and erosion control is applied to every watershed. A program which begins by holding as much water as possible on and in the land where the rain falls by full conservation treatment on all the land.

Which slows down the runoff by adequate soil cover on the land and in the waterways.

Which provides retention and retardation of runoff waters on the upper tributaries and little streams and creeks.

And which provides final protection by providing adequate storage and channel facilities on the main stream to hold and safely dispose of the waters which abnormal conditions, like those causing this year's floods, allow to collect in the flood plain.

Folks interested in stopping flood damage and in building for continued prosperity based on proper use and conservation of our land and water resources are little interested in the side arguments.

They want the problem attacked at every point, not just where it will serve some special interest, whims, or fancy.

And they insist that effective runoff control must begin at the very top of every watershed and continue all the way down. This is the kind of program contemplated by the coordinated efforts of the Corps of Army Engineers and the USDA Soil Conservation Service in their present survey of the Salt-Wahoo watershed.

STANLEY A. MATEKE,
Farm Editor.

Amendment of Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the enactment of H. R. 3298, passed by the House yesterday, will be of great benefit to the druggists of the country and to the general public.

One of the leaders in bringing this bill before the House was the Honorable KENNETH ROBERTS, of Alabama. Mr. ROBERTS presented a very good explanation of the bill in an address over Station WSB, Atlanta, on July 28. Under unanimous consent, I include a copy of this address:

Ladies and gentlemen, I should like to talk to you today for a few minutes about a bill which was introduced in the Congress by the Honorable CARL T. DURHAM, a Congressman from the State of North Carolina. This bill is known as the Durham-Humphrey bill and was introduced in the Congress as House Resolution 3298. The bill seeks to amend section 503 (b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. Hearings on this bill began on May 1 and continued through May 5, 1951, before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of which I am a member. The Federal Food and Drug Act was enacted in 1906 and the law was amended in 1938 and also in 1944.

There are approximately 52,000 drug stores and approximately 110,000 druggists who handle most of the drugs in the country. A recent writer on the subject has estimated that there are around 375,000,000 prescriptions filled annually, therefore, it is easy to realize the importance of this legislation. Then, too, one of the necessary items in the family budget is that of doctors' fees for prescriptions and drug bills. I do not suppose there is a family in this country which escapes these costs. Many families unfortunately find these costs to be quite heavy.

Dr. Paul Dunbar, Food and Drug Commissioner, at the convention of the druggists in 1948, said that once a prescription is filled it is "like a canceled check" and it is, therefore, unrefillable. He insisted in his talk that a new written prescription from the doctor was required before a druggist can provide another supply of medicine. He also stated in this same speech to the druggists that the prescriptions taken over the telephone were illegal and hence, that druggists who had been dealing in telephone prescrip-

tions were in violation of the law. This was quite an alarming thing to the druggists of this Nation. It is common knowledge that doctors frequently call druggists on the telephone in emergencies or in cases where the doctor is away from his office; perhaps, at the patient's home and gives an order for a supply of medicine over the telephone. The druggist who is naturally desirous of supplying the physician's demands and desirous also of taking care of his customer, has been operating in an illegal zone for some years, in the opinion of Dr. Dunbar. The druggists being responsible citizens in the communities in which they live resented this fact that we had a law which made it necessary for them in their customary practices to become law violators and were anxious to remove this impossible situation.

One of the main purposes of the act is to reduce the cost of medication to the consumer. The law aims at reducing the need for doctor's prescription for many well-known household remedies. The present law requires a written prescription each time a prescription for these simple remedies is refilled. H. R. 3298 would repeal this requirement. H. R. 3298 will decrease the necessity for prescriptions and thereby decrease the cost of medical care. There are many ways in which this reduction of cost will be attained if this bill becomes law. First of all, H. R. 3298 amends the present law and permits the druggists to dispense drugs when the prescription is telephoned in by the doctor. Secondly, H. R. 3298 will also amend the present law and permit the druggists to refill a prescription without consulting the doctor if a prescription calls for drugs which are not specifically required to be dispensed by prescription only, and even if the drug is required to be sold only on prescription this law specifically provides that the druggists may dispense the drug upon the oral authority of the doctor provided the druggist himself reduces such oral authority to writing and files it. Third, H. R. 3298 further reduces the requirements for a doctor's prescription since it provides a means of limiting the number of drugs to be sold on prescription only. It authorizes a legally constituted governmental agency to select the drugs to be so restricted and it further protects the public in view of the fact that the law limits the selection of the list so restricted to those drugs which are habit-forming, or to drugs which, after investigation and an opportunity for a public hearing, have been declared to be unsafe or ineffective for use without the diagnosis and supervision of a licensed practitioner.

This bill will remove the druggist from being placed in jeopardy by circumstances which he is powerless to prevent. They are tired of being forced to violate the law and the consumers of this country are tired of having to get refills of prescriptions for such household remedies as charcoal, nose drops, and epsom salts. It seems to me that the druggists and consumers of this country want this authority placed in someone's hands to say what drugs should be sold on prescription and what drugs can be sold over the counter. I have had many letters, telegrams, and conversations with druggists in my section of the country who tell me that this is a good law and that it is legislation which is in the public interest. I feel that the Federal Security Administration has in the foods, drug, and cosmetics enforcement section and also in its research division many able scientists and I believe that the interests of the public are amply protected by the fact that a public hearing is to be held and that any party aggrieved in such public hearing has a right to appeal to the circuit court of appeals to protect whatever rights may have been damaged by the decision of the Administrator. Whatever dangers may be present in this law, I

feel, are overcome by the tremendous advantages which will be flowing to the public by the adoption of this legislation. I hope and trust that the Members of Congress will see fit to adopt this vital legislation.

It was a pleasure to talk to you on this Report from Congress. This is Representative KENNETH A. ROBERTS, of the Fourth District of Alabama.

The Missouri River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, my State of Nebraska is enjoying 100-percent public power. The organizations behind Nebraska public power are operating very successfully. They pay annual taxes in the State of Nebraska amounting to over \$315,000. Officials of the public power organizations in our State are deeply interested in soil conservation, flood control, irrigation, and additional electric energy. Hearings were recently held by a congressional committee on appropriations for flood control. Among the prominent witnesses appearing before that committee was Mr. C. C. Sheldon, of Columbus, Nebr., who is a director of the Consumers Public Power District. By leave granted me, I include his remarks before that committee:

Members of Congress have been elected to outline and provide for certain activities of our Government. In that capacity the Pick-Sloan development of the Missouri River Basin has been approved and various agencies authorized and directed to design and construct the project.

Plans have been prepared, schedules of progress established and appropriations for construction requested and granted. The work is well under way and on schedule.

Now there appears a danger that appropriations may be reduced to an extent that will disrupt the schedules. This would cause serious consequences in many areas.

All of our defense agencies are concerned about a possible shortage of power.

Any interruption in the progress of construction of a project, such as the one under consideration, is expensive in many ways. Delays cause waste of material as well as time. The carrying charges and depreciation on partly completed construction add greatly to the ultimate cost.

In making this statement I represent the board of directors of the Consumers Public Power District of Nebraska. Like Members of Congress we are elected by the people of a subdivision of the State.

We want to cooperate with the Federal Government and the other nine States in the Missouri River Basin by using the amount of power allotted to us from that produced by the Pick-Sloan development. We have all of the transmission and distribution facilities required to this within the State of Nebraska, but our plans will be of no avail if the construction is delayed until our power supply is exhausted.

The people who elected us, look to us to have their power available when they turn the switch.

Do you wonder that we are concerned? Very, very much concerned.

Every other supplier of electric power looking to the same source for his requirements is in the same precarious position.

The sequence is simple. Each purchaser looks to his supplier. We must cooperate or chaos results.

There is another consideration of prime importance and general concern. The conservation of our natural resources.

High among them is our running water. Every drop allowed to reach the sea without rendering its fullest service is a loss that cannot be retrieved. And that is not the whole loss because every kilowatt of power that might have been generated by water, but was not, has consumed the fuel required for its production which might have been saved for other uses.

These considerations have been presented because they are my immediate responsibility but when you add these to the overwhelming need for flood regulation you have a demand that cannot be ignored.

The soundness and magnitude of the Pick-Sloan concept marks a high in engineering and technical skill.

The wisdom and statesmanship expressed in its approval, authorization, and continued support mark a corresponding high in a much-neglected field of national endeavor.

The action of our Congress and the devotion of our technicians are thoroughly appreciated and we cannot believe that any action at this time will be permitted to destroy this magnificent conception.

Endless Slaughter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article, written by Norman Sweet, from the News-Sentinel, Fort Wayne, Ind., June 26, 1951:

ENDLESS SLAUGHTER

With 20,000,000 of Red China soldiers to be potentially thrown in the Korean war; with no opportunity to destroy war supplies in Manchuria; with 50,000,000 more Red China soldiers to be thrown in when they're slaughtered, the present Korean war is endless, but America's soldiers and economic security is not.

Russia keeps this New Fair Deal administration fluffed and full of fear that they might come in if we do. Are we to lose by degrees—or win by one master stroke?

This is war; brutal, insane, illogical war, and Congress should wake up and bomb supplies wherever they are without one moment's delay. War front, home front abruptly ended their broadcast, when Cecil Brown asked if the GI's morale wasn't very low about the endlessness of this war, because while the Red China soldier potential was endless and could go on for 10 years (Marshall), or 20 to 50 years for that matter, I add until we destroy the food and military supplies in Manchuria, for soldiers cannot fight without food and military supplies.

This is the big issue which General MacArthur rightly advocated and was discharged for, and, I intend to have this letter published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as soon as locally published, so that the entire Congress may read, and ignore, and continue this endless slaughter of American boys.

Dr. Frank J. Prout, President of Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, down through the years Ohio has been known as a State of universities and colleges, and to this distinguished group Bowling Green State University has earned its way. The rise of the university can be particularly attributed to the untiring effort, vision, and abilities of Dr. Frank J. Prout, of Sandusky, Ohio. He comes from a family of early pioneers in the Firclear District of Ohio of the great Northwest territory, and has spent many years in the field of education. His effort and achievement at Bowling Green State University is a lasting memorial crowning the work of a lifetime, especially being a worthy contribution in the field of education for those in the low-income group. His accomplishment of building at Bowling Green State University is described in the Bee Gee News of the university and is included:

PROUT STORY SEEN IN NEW BUILDINGS (By Don Tindall)

It was shortly after his appointment that President-elect Frank Jay Prout told a student newspaperman, "I shall do my best to help make Bowling Green State University a bigger and better institution." Now his record speaks for itself.

When Dr. Prout took over his duties as president in April 1949 there were nine brick buildings on campus and the library. The number of brick buildings now totals 39, along with such frame structures as the commons, east and west halls, north dorm, and the temporary annexes behind the women's gym. In other words, the number of buildings has more than quadrupled in 12 years, despite a wartime period when building construction stopped.

To make room for all these buildings campus acreage has been doubled from 105 to 240 acres.

The third president of this 37-year-old institution has watched enrollment more than triple from 1,228 to 3,743, with a peak of over 4,600.

Accreditations by national and regional bodies have increased from two to five. The library, now undergoing enlargement in one of the latest construction projects, contains 115,000 bound volumes, as contrasted to 55,000 when Dr. Prout came to the university.

The graduate school, ever increasing in number of courses offered and size of faculty, has been established. Bowling Green has become one of the few educational institutions in the Nation to house a cerebral-palsy center.

National defense has certainly come in for its share of President Prout's administrative ability. During World War II, university facilities were used to train the V-12 and V-5 units. A Reserve Officers' Training Corps, with a limit of 500 men, has become well established. Just this year has seen an Air Force clerk-typist school located here and plans are already completed to have an Air Force ROTC on campus next fall.

As one of their most ardent boosters, Dr. Prout has seen Bowling Green's basketball and debate teams become nationally known.

The student body, increasing in size and cosmopolitanism, has been delegated more authority with the creation of student court and the faculty was given a more active voice in administration by the university senate. Almost 40 States are now represented at the university, with nearly 50 students coming from foreign countries. All the students have benefited by the increased number of course offerings made by the three colleges and the graduate school.

A loyal and active member of Phi Delta Theta himself, Dr. Prout has displayed more than a passive interest in the nationalization of local sororities and fraternities. Whereas there were only a few local groups in 1939, there are now 11 national sororities, 16 national fraternities, one local sorority, and two independent societies.

If a visitor from Missouri had to be shown what Dr. Prout has accomplished in his 12½ years as president of the university, probably the best way to convince the disbeliever would be to take him on an extended tour of the campus.

First of all, we would point out the 10 buildings that were here when Dr. Prout took over—the administration building, the laboratory school, the old science building, or Moseley Hall, the library, Shatzel Hall, Williams Hall, Koh Hall, the practical arts building, men's gym, and the women's gym.

Then perhaps we could point out the construction going on at the present time: The library addition, the new Delta Zeta house, and additions to dormitories on Fraternity Row. Already in the planning stage is the million-dollar Student Union. Not readily visible would be all the changes and improvements made possible for numerous departments.

Dr. Prout wasted no time in his new capacity as president in 1939 in getting the construction ball rolling. The Natatorium was dedicated soon after the new president was appointed; then came the Falcon's Nest in 1941, and Johnston Hospital in 1942. The Airport and Bricker Field were completed in time to be used during the war.

World War II and its demands stopped the construction, but failed to halt the planning. Sorority Row, probably one of Dr. Prout's most ambitious projects, was completed as soon as conditions would permit. What was once a tree-filled park is now the site of nine sorority houses and one independent dorm.

Enrollment boomed after the war; dorms had to be obtained to house all the men. The seven brick structures on Fraternity Row were rushed to completion, but room still had to be found for the freshmen and independents. So from nearby Camp Perry came North Dorm, East and West Hall, the Commons, and what was to become the Gate Theater. The Stadium was remodeled to make more beds available. Fourteen huts and over 100 trailers housed the students who could not get rooms in the campus dorms or off-campus accommodations.

Once the wartime restrictions were taken off, new buildings appeared in rapid succession. Construction was not the only solution to expansion. The old factory on the corner of Wooster and Thurston was purchased and remodeled into Ivy Hall, housing two fraternities. The Urschel property was bought, adding two more brick structures to campus housing facilities.

But if any one term can be used to designate Dr. Prout's administration, it is construction and expansion. The modern and beautiful Fine Arts Building houses one of the best departments in the State. A cerebral palsy dorm was built to house the patients enrolled in the therapy center. Two

large men's dorms, housing 80 men apiece, went up east of the commons.

Just this fall the campus welcomed the replacement of the old power plant by a functional, yet good-looking central heating plant. Shortly after Christmas, the plain white chapel, now complete with flower landscaping and authentic rail fence, was dedicated. And then came what has turned out to be the last dedication in which the 68-year-old president will take part, the official opening of the 783,000 chemistry laboratory unit of the new science building.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Dr. Prout for his achievements in the field of education which merit a well-earned retirement as one of Ohio's first citizens.

Foreign Aid? Nobody Can Tell What It Will Cost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the foreign-spending program of Mr. Truman's administration has reached such fantastic proportions that the experts sent to testify before House committees cannot unravel the mysteries of it.

Mr. George Sokolsky correctly points out in an article today in the Washington Times-Herald that this country is headed for trouble, perhaps bankruptcy, unless our policies are changed. I include said article as part of my remarks:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

Dean Acheson has established \$25,000,000,000 as the minimum amount that the United States will have to allocate for European military aid until 1954. Apparently, it is Government policy to give away an amount of wealth by one means or another each year as a means of maintaining its type of economy as well as to protect Europe.

Senator ROBERT A. TAFT stated the case of these expenditures as follows:

"I pointed out that even a country the size of the United States had definite economic limitations, and that those limitations are more severe when applied to a 10-year mobilization program than to a brief war.

"I criticized the Government because no one has analyzed for the people the ultimate cost of what is now proposed by a dozen different departments. I estimated that the total of all these proposals might amount to \$85,000,000,000 a year, mostly for Armed Forces, and that this total might, in my opinion, bring inflation, hardship, instability and damage to that very productivity which is our greatest asset in time of war and peace."

When a country spends itself into bankruptcy, symbolized by inflation, depreciation of currency and a diminishing standard of living, the effect can be as devastating as war itself—as a defeat in war.

Even if we accept the entire Marshall-Acheson program of a defensive war, of a stalemated world armed to the teeth, we nevertheless need to have some concept of its cost both in dollars and wealth.

The latter is particularly important, for while the expenditures in dollars affect the immediate purchasing power of the people,

the expenditure in wealth involves the reduction of the reservoir of natural resources upon which the economic and political power of this Nation stands.

Thus far, no precise data is available on many subjects. For instance, the United States is putting into the pot at least \$5,000,000,000 a year in foreign military aid.

What is Great Britain putting into that pot? What is France putting into it?

Their figures are confused because the American contributions to each country have to be traced and deducted from any estimate of what their contributions are in terms of both dollars and wealth.

When, prior to World War I, Great Britain was the principal nation on this earth and a vast empire, her access to natural resources and to manpower was enormous. Today the British Empire has ceased to exist; each so-called dominion is an independent state which acts independently on important issues.

The British Foreign Office speaks only for itself; it cannot speak for Canada, the Union of South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, India, or Pakistan.

Senator TAFT shows how confusion exists in high places when he recounts:

"It was in March 1950 that General Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified they were satisfied that a budget of \$13,000,000,000 for fiscal 1951 and a million and a half men in uniform was about sufficient for the interest of the country.

"He said: 'We do not have any way of knowing whether this figure should be \$13,000,000,000, \$14,000,000,000, or \$15,000,000,000. We think we must not spend this country into economic collapse and spoil our industrial potential.'

"He testified: 'The Joint Chiefs of Staff never went along with this great big feature of \$20,000,000,000.' He testified that if he came and recommended a \$30,000,000,000 budget for defense he would be doing a disservice and that 'maybe you should get a new Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.' Now they want \$50,000,000,000 or, according to some reports, \$100,000,000,000."

General Bradley can, of course, say that he did not know in March 1950 that the Korean war would occur. I do not believe that he would say that that changed everything, for actually it changed nothing since Yalta, which occurred in February 1945.

When Gen. Douglas MacArthur accused the administration of having no policy his reference dealt directly with the problem we are here discussing. For if Russia is our enemy now, Stalin laid down the program of that enmity at Yalta and again at Potsdam in 1945.

Maybe, to give them the benefit of the doubt, the administration has been hoping that Stalin would drop dead or that some other act of God might save them.

The greatest cost in dollars and wealth comes from this lack of a sharply defined policy. It means that often we pour both down a bottomless pit. In Korea it even made American lives cheaply expendable.

Alteration of Certain Bridges Over Navigable Waters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the Truman-Hobbs Act, whereby the Federal Government shares in the cost of altering

railroad bridges over navigable streams when such changes are required for the improvement of water navigation, was passed on June 21, 1940.

It did not anticipate the increase of automobile traffic, with the extra burdens imposed upon the States for the building and maintenance of highways to service the tremendous volume of land transport.

There is one serious blind spot in this law which, without intent, favors waterborne and railroad carriers over automobile traffic. This is all the more difficult to understand when one considers that highway transportation, serving for more passengers, and expediting the delivery of freight in trailers of boxcar size, is becoming the circulatory system of this Nation.

Why it should be subordinated to the needs of coastal or inland shipping and the railroads may be described as an oversight that stands in the way of progress.

My State of Massachusetts is engaged in a great and difficult program of highway expansion that is a must if our Commonwealth is to serve the needs of its business, its commerce, and its citizens.

We will have to dig deep, via taxation, to pay the costs of these improvements, without making the highway program subsidize other forms of transportation. We expect that the Department of the Army in furtherance of the national-defense program, will soon require bridge alterations, but we hope that the Truman-Hobbs Act will be amended, to distribute the costs on an equitable basis. Publicly owned highway bridges merit the same financial help for alterations which is presently extended to privately owned bridges used by the railroads.

To be consistent, there can be no distinction between the two.

The Department of the Army, if anything, should be concerned with land transport.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, as part of its civilian-defense program, is marking certain highways with signs indicating that they will be reserved for emergency use in the event of an attack.

The Army, of course, will not want priority traffic to be slowed up by bridge bottlenecks. It will, looking at the overall problem, insist upon sufficient elbow room on the navigable streams and on the elevated highway that crosses it. And it should logically support the contention that all such bridge alterations as required are deserving of a financial assistance from the United States Government.

Even back in 1940 it should have been the other way around, with the Federal Government sharing the costs with the State government before helping the privately owned railroads.

Be that as it may, our present responsibility is to amend the law so that public bodies such as a State, city, town, or county will not be forced to pay the entire cost of alterations on bridges that may be required by the Department of the Army.

The present drain of such expenses, made mandatory upon us by an outside authority, diverts funds from the highway program for the benefit of those

who profit by water transportation and reduces in proportion the improved facilities for travel that we have promised to the motorists of Massachusetts.

The change in the law that we recommend will not weaken congressional control over the waterways of this Nation, as delegated to it by the Constitution.

The purpose of the change is to afford some relief to the States in complying with the orders of the Department of the Army.

A few figures will demonstrate that Massachusetts needs this relief.

For the construction of 12 highway bridges over navigable waters in recent years our State has had to pay nearly \$5,000,000 in terms of present-day costs just to meet the needs of water-borne traffic. In addition, our Commonwealth has to spend \$100,000 a year in raising and lowering bridges for the convenience of those who use water transportation.

In Boston Harbor there is a bridge under construction which is costing the Commonwealth \$4,000,000. Alterations ordered by the Army for sole purpose of widening the channel beneath must be paid for out of money taken from the regular highway fund.

There are two other Boston bridges that must also be changed, not to meet the needs of highway transportation, but for the improvement of a water-transport facility.

It is the policy of the Congress to oppose the diversion of highway funds, but the Truman-Hobbs Act as it stands violates that intent.

The President's Water Policy Commission has recommended that the cost of altering highway bridges to meet navigation requirements should be borne jointly by the water project and the highway interests on an equitable basis.

I sincerely hope that the House Committee on Public Works will soon program H. R. 3764 and S. 1608 so that all interested parties may be given an ample opportunity to be heard on these important bills.

How Can Full Confidence Be Placed in an "Expert" Who Can Be So Wrong on the Most Important Issue of Our Time—The Nature of Communism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News for August 1, 1951:

THIS IS ACHESONISM

John P. Davies, Jr., veteran career Foreign Service officer, has been cleared and returned to active duty without prejudice and with full confidence of the State Department, after a hearing by the Department's Loyalty and Security Board.

Since neither the charges against Mr. Davies nor the evidence relating thereto

have been disclosed, it is not possible to make an independent evaluation of this finding.

However, it is not necessary to go beyond Mr. Davies' own official reports to form an estimate of his qualifications as a political expert, particularly where communism is involved. It is in order to do so since Mr. Davies is expected to be assigned as a political adviser to the United States High Commissioner in Germany.

In recommending an American policy for China November 15, 1944, Mr. Davies said, in an official report to the Department: "A coalition Chinese Government in which the Communists find a satisfactory place is the solution of this impasse most desirable to us. It provides our greatest assurance of a strong, united, democratic, independent, and friendly China—our basic aim in Asia and the Pacific."

When a man so naive as to believe that a government satisfactory to the Communists could be independent of Russia and friendly to the United States can qualify as a State Department political expert, how can the public be expected to follow such leadership?

By contrast there is the case of Angus Ward, a real expert on communism and the Soviet mentality, through his long service in China, Manchuria, and Russia itself.

Because of his fidelity to American principles, the scholarly Mr. Ward spent long dreary months in a Communist prison at Mukden. Upon his return to the United States, his reward for a long career of distinguished service was an assignment to an obscure post at Nairobi, in Central Africa.

When a man who understood communism and was opposed to it is banished in this manner, and when one of the Department's choicest plums is given to an official who so misunderstood communism that he was sympathetic to it, it is easy to see the kind of influences which are running the State Department.

Some departments need a new broom, but this one should be given meat-ax treatment.

Tidelands Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Arthur Krock, the distinguished Washington correspondent of the New York Times, regarding the proposed tidelands legislation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, July 25.—The States are up in arms, with force they have not mustered hitherto, over the question of Federal or State ownership of submerged lands and their products, including the oil beneath the marginal seas. Though the Supreme Court decided that the central Government has proprietary rights as well as political sovereignty in these marine areas off Texas, California, and Louisiana, a broader conflict growing out of these decisions is raging in Congress and the State capitals.

This week the House is expected to dispose of the Walter bill, specifically assigning to the States all ownership rights within their original boundaries over the yield of sub-

merged lands, inland and coastal. Original State coastal boundaries vary from 3 miles into the Atlantic and Pacific to 9 miles into the Gulf of Mexico and more for Texas. The Senate will soon be voting on a similar proposal. Its advocates are pressing hard for favorable action, but they are not sure they can obtain it by the two-thirds approval necessary in both branches to override an anticipated veto by the President.

The appeal they are making is impressive, however, for the two-thirds they did not muster when Congress previously assigned the products of the marginal seas to coastal States and the President vetoed the bill. In certifying State ownership of all submerged lands within their original boundaries, and reserving to the Federal Government its paramount powers in national defense, international affairs, interstate commerce and navigation, they have greatly increased the number of beneficiaries. The new bill assures State ownership of many more products than the oil which was at stake in the Texas, California, and Louisiana cases; hence its supporters hope to attract many votes in Congress they did not get before.

Under the inland submerged areas now included in the bill are sand, gravel, shell, kelp, iodine, gold, fish, stone, sodium sulphate and other products over which States now assert ownership. Government attorneys in arguing the oil cases gave numerous assurances that the Central Government laid no claim to these and did not intend to do so. And the justices who found against the three coastal States at the bar made note of this proclamation of policy.

DISSENTERS SEE THREAT

But the three dissenters in the Texas case argued that the majority's reasoning offered a foundation for the claim of Federal ownership over submerged lands inland and left room for its validation by the Supreme Court at some later date. In their protest, Justices Reed and Minton wrote:

"The needs of defense and foreign affairs alone cannot transfer ownership of an ocean bed from a State to the Federal Government any more than they could transfer iron ore under uplands from State to Federal ownership. National ownership is no greater in respect to the marginal sea than it is toward every other particle of American territory."

In other words, the dissenters said that the basis of the majority finding—the political sovereignty of the Federal Government in every area of the Union—was a threat to private and State ownership of submerged products which had been established by the Court for more than a hundred years, and Justice Frankfurter drew a somewhat similar inference.

The States were quick to avail themselves of this reasoning, and it was elaborated in a memorandum which was furnished to every Member of Congress this week. "A barrage of false and misleading propaganda emanating from Federal lease applicants and executive agencies of the Federal Government," said this memorandum, "has clouded the issue. . . . These propagandists would have the public believe that the issue involved nothing but tidelands oil and that corrective legislation [the pending House bill] restores and confirms submerged-lands ownership to only three States."

THE WYOMING EXAMPLE

"The truth is," the paper continued, "that each of the 48 States has submerged lands and many valuable resources to which State ownership would be restored and confirmed [by the pending bill]. The ownership of the States to this type of property would be destroyed by the Supreme Court's tidelands decisions"; and it cited, as precedent for the House bill, an instance in which the Supreme Court "took from Wyoming a section of school land which the State had claimed in good faith for 57 years," after

"oil valued at more than \$3,000,000 had been discovered on this section," and Senator O'MAHONEY induced Congress to restore title to the State.

In a floor speech yesterday Senator CONNALLY, of Texas, brought up another point on which supporters of the pending legislation rely. This is the fact that in the Texas case a minority (four) of the Supreme Court overruled many past decisions. Because two Justices excused themselves, the case was decided by less than a majority or a quorum of the Court. This is being used as an argument for those Members of Congress who hesitate to undo by statute a Supreme Court finding.

This factor of a minority ruling appeared only in the Texas case because, unlike Louisiana and California, its original boundaries included the entire continental ocean shelf. But if that dulls this particular point with some State delegations they have a choice of many others.

Truce in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Members of the Senate a timely and thought-provoking editorial by Paul C. Smith, editor of the San Francisco Chronicle. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUCE IN KOREA IS NOT PEACE

To the American soldier, sailor, or marine, none of whom in history has ever had the least desire to conquer the rest of the world, the term "cease fire" is the best command in the whole military lexicon.

If this command is actually given on the Korean front as a result of the present confused truce maneuvers, there will be rejoicing amongst the men who have had to take the punishment of war for the past 12 months. This is understandable. It is also understandable that there will be rejoicing amongst the families of the men who have been fighting or are about to fight. All their fellow citizens will share sympathetically their sense of personal relief that the great personal hazards of the moment are abated. This, too, is understandable.

But there are other factors involved that call for the searching, dispassionate attention of all those who bear the responsibility for sound, democratic decision. They demand consideration, even though they may tend to dilute the gaiety with which the prospect of armistice is being approached.

When and if the cease fire command materializes, it should be understood that a truce on or near the thirty-eighth parallel represents neither victory nor peace for the more or less free states of the United Nations bound together in opposition to the international Communist conspiracy. Such a truce does not guarantee settlement in Asia, and it certainly does not guarantee peace and accommodation in the world.

Gains may be made from such a truce but the truce itself does not represent the gain. Real gains can be achieved only by a tough, resolute and realistic approach to the re-

actionary Communist threat that still menaces the principles upon which our revolution is founded. A truce does not represent the achievement of peace and security to those nations who believe in the dignity and integrity of individual man. It by no stretch of the imagination represents an opportunity to "return to normalcy." Even if there is a cease fire in Korea, the struggle must go on.

It is possible that the advantages to us will be many but those advantages will be realized, if at all, only by firm and resolute diplomacy over a long and dangerous period by the United States and her allies in the United Nations.

The immediate advantages of such a truce are primarily on the side of the enemy. Russia will liquidate a situation costly to her, and free herself to produce more and greater tensions elsewhere. The leaders of Red China will, for the time being, escape the consequences of a defeat it is within our power to administer.

Red propaganda channels will exploit the cease fire by every conceivable means. The Communists now dominating China will have a freer hand to consolidate their gains on the Chinese mainland. The resources of Russia will be freed to support other satellites in pursuing the will and the plan of the Kremlin.

All these factors constitute chances worth taking only if the American people have the good sense to maintain and increase the pace of their present development of military power, and only if American leadership is firm and resolute in handling the problems that lie ahead. Specifically, this means the patient mounting and pitting of power against power, and the scrupulous avoidance of appeasement.

There were sighs of relief from mothers and wives and soldiers and soldiers-to-be when in 1938 Mr. Chamberlain alighted from a flight to Munich, and waved a scrap of paper into the eyes of newsreel cameras with the statement that the scrap of paper promised peace in our time.

The sighs of relief were understandable then, even as now. But it must be understood that peace in our time is not yet achieved. There is still a world settlement to be made and while we may hope to make it without global war, we must still be prepared, upon all fronts, for the undiminished possibility of that war.

Neckyoke Jones Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD today another Neckyoke Jones Says column, published in the July 28 issue of the Sheridan Press at Sheridan, Wyo.:

NECKYOKES JONES SAYS

"Did you seen where Genrul Marshall said he was 'shocked' at the letdown of Americans since the armistick talk started?" I enquiries of Greasewood today. "Yessir" he refurbishes, "but he ain't half as shocked as the American people is at his astin' for 25 billyun dollars to pass out to Eurup in the nex' 3 years. Cripes! The Genrul don't say where he thinks the money is comin' from. Not havin' ever earned a dollar in his

life—an' always havin' been livin' off the publick—he probbly don't know that some folks works for a livin'." Then some talks about havin' a army man fer presyident! Of course army men isn't the only fellers who spends money. It costs the country, accordin' to figgers jest give out, 2 millyun dollars a year to enjoy the luxury of Harry Truman—more'n twict as much as F. D. R. cost the people—an' he wasn't no piker when it comes to spendin' public money! Between the Genrul an' Harry's steamboat—it looks like the party is gittin' expensive. The publick either don't know or don't give a damn—so whatever comes in the future there won't be no one to blame but the home folks." Greasewood's quit worryin' for fear he'll git ulcers, and besides he ain't got no yatch to sail on Goose Crick. Hopin' you are the same, I am

Yure fren,

NECKYOKES JONES.

Proposal of J. Edgar Hoover for President Brings Many Letters of Approval

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, on July 19 I delivered a speech in this House reporting and endorsing a grass-roots suggestion by a constituent of mine in the Third Michigan District that the Republican Party nominate J. Edgar Hoover for President in 1952.

At that time I described the suggestion as "a blast of fresh air."

My mail indicates that a great many other people throughout the country feel the same way about it.

I have received scores of letters enthusiastically endorsing J. Edgar Hoover for President. There have been three letters critical of the suggestion.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include excerpts from typical letters written by Americans throughout the country welcoming the "blast of fresh air":

A Chicago woman writes:

It has always been my contention that the truly great statesmen are those men with ability and leadership, combined with honesty and ideals, and to me J. Edgar Hoover is synonymous with all these attributes.

What an inspiration to the youth of America, if our President were an example of what hard work, with an aim to protect each individual's God-given rights, could accomplish.

Almost without exception, everyone with whom I discuss [the suggestion] agrees with your "Hoover for President" idea wholeheartedly.

Here is what an attorney from Albion, Mich., in my district, writes:

I was very happy to read your suggestion. I sincerely agree with the qualifications that you stated, as those necessary for the 1952 candidate. There was something very refreshing about the whole suggestion.

From a Mitchell, S. Dak., woman:

Congratulations for a brilliant suggestion: J. Edgar Hoover.

We so desperately want someone good and decent, fine, and honest. He has a splendid record and reputation.

Several people have commented that they are almost embarrassed to think they hadn't thought of him.

J. Edgar Hoover would have my full support.

A Kirksville, Mo., businessman writes:

A fine idea and an elegant choice for President. If he will run he will be elected by the greatest majority any President ever received.

From a Watervliet, Mich., woman:

I think J. Edgar Hoover would be fine. Anything but what we have.

From a Kalamazoo, Mich., man, a constituent of mine:

I would highly commend your suggestion. When I contemplate the remaining months yet to run under the present administration, I am very much afraid that the status of our national affairs in domestic matters will very much demand a man of his caliber.

Again from Kalamazoo, Mich., the senior member of a prominent law firm writes in behalf of himself and his wife:

As you know [we] are nonpartisan voters. We have always supported the man we believed best fitted for the office regardless of party affiliation.

We have your release suggesting J. Edgar Hoover as Republican nominee for President in 1952. We have given this considerable thought, and the more we think about it, the better we like it.

From Salem, Mo., a gentleman writes:

I am in favor of your suggestion of J. Edgar Hoover as a 1952 nominee for President. Would like to start a J. Edgar Hoover Club in Dent County, Mo.

A St. Louis, Mo., man, who describes himself as "an ex-serviceman and weary Democrat," writes:

We have long considered Mr. J. E. Hoover to be our most popular citizen. We believe he has the admiration of this entire Nation and would be just the leader to restore to it the confidence in our Government that has been so thoroughly dissipated.

Having been associated with Washington for so long, Mr. Hoover's knowledge and ability are naturally far superior to a proposed military candidate whose chief fitness for this very demanding position would seem to be merely a fine and pleasing personality.

Our present situation demands a leader of no less executive stature than Mr. Hoover's, and we believe he would be the choice of every State in the Union.

From a retail merchant in my home town of Battle Creek:

Your suggestion of J. Edgar Hoover is a 10-strike.

A former Battle Creek man, now a deputy sheriff in an Arizona county, writes:

Good for you and J. Edgar Hoover. Push him.

From Springfield, Ohio, a gentleman writes:

I sincerely approve this suggestion. Let us not let this idea die. I am prepared to form a Hoover-for-President committee.

A Detroit woman who is a registered nurse connected with a boys' club says:

America now needs a candidate such as J. Edgar Hoover and you can expect the sup-

port of me and my family. What can we do to help?

A Battle Creek, Mich., woman, owner of a jewelry store, writes:

Just the thought that J. Edgar Hoover might become our "flag bearer" is refreshing.

Again from my district, a Hillsdale, Mich., couple writes:

Most people one talks with seem to feel that there should be someone elected to head our Government whom we could trust and have confidence in. We certainly need a change, and that badly. The name of J. Edgar Hoover is like a blast of fresh air. His many years of experience and knowledge of affairs in Washington and the United States, and his past record of achievements, speak so well for him.

From Dowling, Mich., a member of the Pilgrim Holiness Church writes:

I am back of the idea 100 percent. I can think of no man who would stand a better chance than he, and certainly he is a man who has won the respect of all except the underworld, regardless of politics.

This was brought to the attention of the church in our midweek prayer meeting. It seemed to meet almost unanimous approval.

Certainly our Nation needs to do some house cleaning and returning to the fundamental Christian principles and liberties of our forefathers. We must either do that or meet with certain national disaster under God's hand of judgment.

A farmer living near Charlotte, Mich., in my district, writes:

It is hoped if J. E. Hoover could be nominated that he would be elected and able to clear Government of racketeers and form a workable policy at home and abroad.

It is evident that many are sick of rank deals and will not vote for candidates that go along with them.

A Detroit woman writes:

It was gratifying indeed for you to spearhead a drive to draft J. Edgar Hoover, and [I] know that the real Americans want a candidate that they can vote for, not an internationalist.

An Albion, Mich., businessman says:

I would be delighted [with Hoover]. You are right that the people want honesty and competence in Government.

From a Kalamazoo, Mich., paper-mill executive:

You might be surprised how many ordinary people, regardless of party affiliations, would back [Hoover]. Count on me and a good many other Americans to back him.

From three Battle Creek, Mich., businessmen:

We are proud of you at the selection of J. Edgar Hoover to lead the party in 1952. The whole district is with you.

From a Winfield, Kans., housewife:

I can think of no other man on the public scene who would be more qualified for the Nation's top job.

Who is better equipped to recognize and combat the enemies of our Nation, both foreign and home grown? Crime, corruption, and communism would turn white with fear were he to enter the White House. He is a man that the youth of our Nation can look up to with honor and respect.

If he carries into the Nation's highest office his habit of thrift, the American taxpayer would indeed rejoice. Does any other Government agency but the FBI ever turn back unused sums?

And from the young Hillsdale, Mich., businessman who originally suggested the name of J. Edgar Hoover for the Republican nomination for President comes this further word:

The interest [has] both amazed and pleased me. To the extent that I have visited and discussed with many Republicans in Hillsdale, their reception to such a movement is unanimous. They agree that we need a man of his unquestionable honesty, respect, and ability [and] that it is now a matter of self-preservation to boom such a movement.

We invite you to join [the first J. Edgar Hoover for President Club] as a charter member.

An Artillery Officer's Experiences in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have in my hand a letter from 1st Lieut. Paul R. Teetor, Jr., to his parents, who live in Vermont. Lieutenant Teetor was a bombardier during World War II, and was attached to the Eighth Air Force in England. His plane was shot down over Germany and he was a prisoner of war for 16 months. Lieutenant Teetor was practicing law at Middlebury, Vt., when called to active duty with Forty-third Division. He is now an artillery officer.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOMEWHERE IN KOREA,

June 20, 1951.

DEAR MOTHER AND DAD: I have time just for a brief note. I am still not up front but closer to it. Today we rode by truck up from the Division Replacement Center near Seoul to Division Artillery headquarters where I am spending the night. Tomorrow I should be sent to a battalion. I must be careful about telling you where I am but probably it is proper to tell you that I am on the central front. The ride would have been quite beautiful but for the vast quantities of dust thrown up by such military traffic. This is really very mountainous country, more so than I had realized. It is like the Green Mountains only on a bigger scale. Every gap is a Lincoln Gap. My earlier depreciation of Korea war damage I must withdraw. It is terrible. The Seoul area which is the only metropolitan center is just beginning to be reopened. Most of the population has yet to return. While many if not most of the private homes there are little touched, absolutely all industrial and other large structures are wrecks. Above Seoul, even the villages are largely shambles, Chunchon, the only good-sized town I have seen in this area, was not completely leveled like Caen and St. Lo in Normandy but it is the next worst thing that I can recall. There are still some refugees on the road. In one village I saw the longest chow line that I have ever seen.

Last night I had one of those rare exhilarating experiences induced by moonlight that literally bathed the world. As I looked

out to the vast mountains of Asia silhouetted in the distance, I felt an extraordinary sense of spiritual strength. Before my mind passed the pictures of Leonidas at Thermopylae, Martel at Tours, and Sobiesky at Vienna, each withstanding in turn the hordes of Asian conquest, thereby making possible the continued growth of our distinctive western culture with the great promise that it holds out for the future of mankind. Something of the same sort is upon us today. I make no more of this Communist wave than another chapter in the age-old story of Asiatic despotism rising to sudden power in the righteous wrath of miserable millions but doomed by its inherent limitations of inevitable degeneration into the same corruption and misery out of which it arose. Set against it, I see the genius of our own western culture, kindled in little democratic Greece so many centuries ago and nurtured through many vicissitudes, in spite of the recurrent attacks from out of Asia, into that wonderful world we call America, where freedom and democracy have reached such heights. I thank God for our towering strength, itself a product of that freedom, and I pray that it may be our "last best hope" that will govern earth when these terrific struggles have run their course rather than the deadening hand of Asiatic despotism with which we have now come to grips. I am proud and even joyful to be able to take part in the battle for our priceless heritage here and now in this far off little land of Korea where the issue has been joined. In the perspective of world history I cannot really doubt that it will be our way which survives to posterity.

As I thought of these things I also thought of my wife with whom I am so happy, and of my daughter of whom I am so proud, and of you two who have been my guardian angels for so many years. I felt that you were with me in spirit, and I knew that only the things of the spirit really mattered.

PAUL.

The Tideland Oil Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Tideland Myth," which appeared in the Washington Post this morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIDELAND MYTH

The House of Representatives did a sorry piece of business on Monday when it voted, 265 to 109, to give away to certain individual States the fabulously rich area of the marginal sea which the Supreme Court has held belongs to the entire Nation. Behind this colossal grab of a vital national resource lies a twin deception embraced by supporters of the Walter bill: (1) That the marginal sea is indistinguishable from the tidelands or inland waters; (2) that somehow traditional States' rights were violated by the Supreme Court decisions in the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases.

The marginal sea, the only area involved in these cases, is the strip of submerged land lying seaward of the low-tide mark to the traditional 3-mile limit of national sov-

ereignty. Tidelands are the strip lying between the low-tide and high-tide marks. Inland waters, as the term implies, are rivers, lakes, bays, and other ocean areas within coastal indentations. From the early days of the Republic, tidelands and inland waters have been held to belong to the individual States; no claim of title to them has been made by the Federal Government. All that the Supreme Court did was to assert that the Federal Government, as an attribute of national sovereignty, possesses paramount rights in and full dominion over the marginal sea—outside the tidelands and the inland waters.

Proponents of the Walter bill have pretended to see in this decision a threat not only to the tideland oil interests of Texas, Louisiana, and California, but a threat also to the fishing interests and harbor installations of the 18 other coastal States, and even to the river-bed and lake-shore ownership of completely landlocked States. That this amounts to nothing more than a hobgoblin conjured up to gain the support of inland Congressmen was made plain on Monday, when supporters of the Walter bill voted down amendments offered by Representatives MANSFIELD and CASE specifically renouncing any Federal claim to tidelands or inland waters. No such quitclaim legislation is necessary, of course, but these amendments would have quieted any fears concerning the tideland and inland waters, had the fears been genuine. The Walter bill is aimed, obviously, not at settling States' rights respecting tidelands and inland waters, but at grabbing the marginal sea, and even, in addition, a large portion of the Continental Shelf lying beyond the marginal sea. Its supporters went so far, indeed, as to reject an amendment restricting the grab to the 3-mile limit.

The House ruled out on a specious point of order Representative MANSFIELD's amendment or substitute bill providing for Federal management of the marginal sea and dedicating the revenue to be produced from it to a program of Federal aid to education. This would provide a wise and magnanimous resolution of the long controversy. It would make possible a prudent conservation of the submerged oil in the interest of national defense while at the same time furnishing the means to deal with an urgent national problem—the crisis in the country's public schools—in the interest of the whole American people. This proposal will be advanced again, under bipartisan sponsorship, when the Walter bill reaches the Senate. It cannot be ruled out there on an arbitrary point of order. And it should not be ruled out on any fictitious plea of States' rights. In the Congress of the United States the Nation's rights ought to be considered paramount.

The Place of Television in Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, it has been most reassuring to note the great interest educators are taking in television and what contribution television may make to educational processes. An editorial in Broadcasting magazine of July 23 discusses this matter most interestingly and pointedly. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATORS ADVISED

A stop, look, and listen sign has been hoisted beside the tracks of steamed-up educators who want to own and operate a non-commercial television station for educational purposes.

The sign bearers are Col. Harry C. Wilder, president, WSYR-AM-TV Syracuse, and D. L. (Tony) Provost, business manager, WBAL-AM-TV Baltimore and acting general manager of Hearst Radio Inc.

Both men hold positions in operations which embrace more than one broadcast property. WBAL-AM-TV is owned by Hearst, whose properties include WISN-AM-FM Milwaukee. Hearst Consolidated operates WCAE Pittsburgh. Col. Wilder, in addition to his WSYR post, is president and stockholder of WELI New Haven and WTRY Troy, N. Y.

They feel the educators' problem of where to get the funds to operate and the broadcasters' dilemma of how to meet educational program demands can be met by broadcaster-educator cooperation.

On the practical level, they are convinced that this cooperation, as exemplified by the "Syracuse U. TV Plan," and as contemplated by an excursion into educational TV in the fall by WBAL-TV, is workable and serves both parties with a minimum of burden imposed.

Noting the fierce fight waged in Washington between educators and commercial TV forces, which resulted in the FCC allotting * * * new TV channels to educational stations, Colonel Wilder said the issue has resolved into the question of "how long such ear-marked channels should be held open for education institutions."

DEPRIVE PUBLIC?

"In other words," he said, "should the public be deprived of program service on these channels for a period of years waiting for educational use?"

Colonel Wilder wishes to underscore what he calls the "common sense compromise" offered by the Syracuse U.-WSYR operation.

The plan saves a university heavy TV investment in transmitters and a station plant because the station provides these facilities. The university, Colonel Wilder continued, only has the smaller investment in studios and program facilities. Use of university facilities for many of its own live shows, he points out, creates a large revenue source for the university.

Another "practical reason" why the plan "does not soak up funds" of the university, according to Colonel Wilder, "is the limitation on how many good TV programs any university can create, produce, rehearse, and put on the air."

"It has been demonstrated on the campus here that three of four hours weekly is the absolute limit of university educational programs that can be aired of the high standard the TV audience requires and that the institution must have."

"When a university owns the complete station 12 hours average daily must be filled with consequent sacrifice of quality and proportionately higher expenses," Colonel Wilder explained. "To supply 100 hours weekly instead of three to four hours places a crushing burden on the educators, based on the Syracuse experience in 1950-51."

WSYR-AM also cooperates with Syracuse U. and has been doing so since 1932, Colonel Wilder, a pioneer in educational-broadcasting endeavor, points out. The TV plan was started in 1949.

Colonel Wilder's comments follow the pattern set in a letter by a Syracuse U. graduate student, working toward a master's degree, which was sent to Senate Interstate Com-

merce Committee Chairman Ed C. JOHNSON, (Democrat, Colorado). The Senator forwarded a copy to FCC (Broadcasting, Telecasting, July 9).

DASHEFSKY LETTER

In his letter, Sidney Dashefsky opined that educational institutions and commercial TV station operators can do the best educational job if they work together.

In announcing the WBAL-TV project to start this fall, Mr. Provost said the services of a complete professional creative staff will be made available to colleges and universities desiring to put their own shows on TV. The station will offer educators at least 1 hour "class A" time.

WBAL-TV said it was instituting the program in order to assist and expand educational television in Maryland. The "package-staff" is to include a professor, director, writer, set designer, and announcer, and will be similar to that of a mobile unit. It will go directly to the schools and participate in story conferences, casting, and rehearsals prior to any on-camera activities, the station announced.

This plan, WBAL-TV said, is the answer to the school that cannot get into the business of broadcasting and lacks the personnel with professional know-how to take full advantage of the facilities offered.

Elaborating, Mr. Provost said time has been available for Maryland institutions which want to put on shows but that they have lacked people who knew how to do the necessary job. "We want to get Maryland colleges and universities into the television act on a sound and permanent basis as soon as possible," he said, adding that the station is "setting aside several commercial programs to accommodate the scheduling of this series in prime evening time."

Arnold Wilkes, WBAL-TV program manager will supervise the "educational creative unit." Mr. Wilkes, former instructor in speech and dramatics at Middlebury (Vt.) College, held the post of director at WRGB (TV), Schenectady, N. Y., and WSYR-TV before joining the Baltimore station.

WBAL-TV reported that 12 Maryland colleges are going ahead with plans for fall programs. Conferences have been held with the Baltimore Board of Education looking for a series of programs to start after Labor Day.

Endorsement of the program has come from Dr. H. C. Byrd, University of Maryland president, and Mrs. Eleanor B. Kane, radio-TV education specialist for Baltimore's department of education, WBAL-TV said.

The United States Is a Republic, Not a Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "This Is a Republic; Democracy a Misnomer," published in the Norristown Times-Herald, of Norristown, Pa., on July 25, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS IS A REPUBLIC; DEMOCRACY A MISNOMER

We are getting rather weary of hearing America called a democracy; particularly so

in view of the antics by European countries calling themselves democracies.

America is not a democracy and never has been.

Democracy was a form of government shunned by the founding fathers of this Nation when they adopted the Constitution in Philadelphia.

They considered monarchy, perhaps a bit seriously for a moment or two, but democracy was cast aside as a scourge. It is a word that, because of its misuse and deliberate misinterpretation by some of our highest public officials in the last two decades, should be at least figuratively discarded from our American vocabulary; literally, so far as application to our own Nation and its form of government is concerned.

The American form of government is that of republic. We seem to have forgotten that. It no longer seems to be taught in the schools. The National Education Association, for example, no longer refers to republican form of government in its literature. It never refers to Americanism. It refers only to democracy and uses the word in a manner to imply that Americanism and true democracy are synonymous, or that the latter is an objective of the former. (The NEA boasts that its membership includes a vast majority of the educators of the nation.)

In Washington, and in state capitals, political leaders prate of democracy. There is no talk of republican form of government or what it means. Little talk of Americanism except the effort to imply that we can forget it if we seek democracy.

Actually, democracy, in its ultimate end, becomes socialism, which is a step in the direction of communism, though the actual philosophies of each differ from the other. In the end, democracy means mobocracy, which can be solved only by dictatorship. We have been following that course in this nation far too much of late; the pretense to the public that this is a democracy in which each person is a ruler, but with an authoritarian over-all rule essential to maintain the fallacy.

In other words, that philosophy is what "democracy" as practiced and preached at the highest governmental levels in this nation actually has produced—or tended to produce—and that is what democracy always must produce. Consequently, it is time to get rid of the word and to understand its meaning in its modern practical applications as well as in its original meanings. There is no reason to substitute the word "democracy" for "Americanism," even though there were unanimity of thought that we would apply the full and true meanings of "Americanism" to "democracy." What's wrong with "Americanism," either as a word or as a philosophy?

Russia claims to be a full democracy. It labels its sections of Berlin with big signs—"Entrance to Democratic Berlin," etc. And the signs are not too far wrong in their basic meaning and application. That should be enough to make Americans stick to their own word and forget Russia's.

Are Farmers Making Too Much Money?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I made a speech by transcription

over radio Station KXXX, of Colby, Kans., entitled "Are Farmers Making Too Much Money?" Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a revised draft of this speech:

I am grateful to the management of Station KXXX for this opportunity to talk to those who comprise its listening audience in Western Kansas and adjoining States. My subject is Are Farmers Making Too Much Money?

Here in Washington and in all of the eastern cities we hear the constant refrain that food prices and farm prices are too high and that farmers are getting rich at the expense of the rest of the people. We read articles and editorials in the big-city newspapers and in nationally circulated magazines published in the East all of which add up to the charge that farmers are making too much money. Maybe some who are listening to me have been misled into thinking that this is true. What I want to point out in the few minutes I have with you is that facts and figures do not bear out the contention that farm and food prices are high in relation to other prices or that farmers are making too much money compared with other people.

GOOD FARM PRICES IMPORTANT TO EVERYONE IN KANSAS

But before I give you these figures I want to point out the importance of fair farm prices to everyone who lives in an agricultural section. In Kansas and surrounding States agriculture is the basic industry. Take all of the agricultural income out of this area and four-fifths of our people would have to move out—I don't care whether they live on farms, in small communities, or in the cities—with agricultural income gone there just wouldn't be anything to maintain normal business activity. If farm prices were suddenly cut in two and that condition continued for any length of time, half the businesses in Kansas would fold up. Thousands and thousands of people would lose their jobs. Churches and schools would close or have their activities reduced because we wouldn't have the money to keep them going. Railroads would curtail service. We couldn't maintain our highway system or the other activities of our State and local governments. Kansans should know this, but I fear that there are people even in Kansas not actually engaged in farming who overlook the fact that the well-being of themselves and their communities depends almost entirely upon the prosperity of agriculture.

FARMER'S INCOME ABOUT HALF THAT OF NONFARMER'S

Well what about it? Are farmers making too much money compared with other people? The Department of Agriculture has plenty of figures on this subject. The most important and pertinent are those which show that for 1950 the average annual income of persons living on farms was \$804 and the average annual income of people living off of farms was \$1,548. In considering these figures we must keep in mind that there are wide variations in farm income just as there are in the incomes of those living off of farms. The significant thing is that the average farmer makes just about half as much as the average nonfarmer.

FARMERS GET LOWEST PAY OF ALL

Secretary Brannan has figured it out in another way. He says that for 1950 if we broke down the income from farming of all persons on farms and took into consideration the number of hours they worked, the amount of money they had invested, and the management that was required to carry on farm operations, it would amount to 49

cents an hour for labor, 5 percent interest on the investment, and nothing for management. That compares with the 1950 average of \$1.46 an hour for manufacturing workers, \$1.17 for retail trade workers, and \$2.03 for building construction workers (keeping in mind, of course, that these are average figures). The farmers' 5 percent interest allowance compares with profits in 1950 of 15 percent on net investments of manufacturing corporations after taxes. So you see when we look at the figures we find that instead of making too much money, farmers are making far less money considering their labor, investment, and management than people engaged in other lines of activity, many of which have nothing like the importance of farming or require the education and skill that a farmer must have.

MOST FARM PRICES ARE BELOW PARITY

Another basis for comparison is that of parity which has been generally accepted as representing a fair scale of prices for agricultural products—yet most agricultural prices are below parity today. A good many farm prices have actually declined in

recent weeks, as every farmer knows. Yet industrial wages and prices are steadily increasing.

HOW HIGH ARE FOOD PRICES?

There have been few times in the past when an hour's work in a factory would buy as much food as it does right now. We can talk all we want to about high prices and low prices, but it is what a man can buy with his wages that counts. A few weeks ago the Secretary of Agriculture submitted official figures to the House Committee on Agriculture showing how much food can be purchased with an hour's factory labor today as compared with various periods in the past. The figures speak for themselves. Not only do food prices now compare as favorably with wage rates as they have in the past, but it must be remembered that the quality of food on the market now is higher than it has ever been. Moreover, it is processed and distributed under sanitary conditions and packaged for convenient handling and use to an extent never known before.

The figures submitted by Secretary Brannan are as follows:

Quantity of each item that could be purchased with 1 hour of factory labor, United States, designated years

Item	Unit	1914	1919	1929	1939	1949	February 1951
Bread, white	Pound	4.0	4.8	6.4	7.9	10.0	10.0
Round steak	do.	.9	1.2	1.2	1.8	1.6	1.5
Pork chops	do.	1.0	1.1	1.5	2.1	1.9	2.0
Sliced bacon	do.	.8	.9	1.3	2.0	2.1	2.3
Butter	do.	.6	.7	1.0	1.9	1.9	1.9
Cheese	do.	1.0	1.1	1.4	2.6	2.7	2.6
Milk, fresh (delivered)	Quart	2.5	3.1	3.9	5.1	6.7	6.9
Eggs, fresh	Dozen	.6	.8	1.1	1.9	2.0	2.5
Oranges	do.		.9	1.3	2.3	2.7	3.2
Potatoes	Pound	12.4	12.6	17.7	26.3	25.5	36.3
Tomatoes (canned)	No. 2 can		2.0	4.4	7.4	9.2	8.4
Margarine	Pound		1.2	2.1	3.9	4.5	4.0

NOTE.—Prices and earnings used were compiled from Bureau of Labor Statistics data

One thing more should be mentioned and that is that there is no other country in the world except Australia where a given amount of work will buy as much food as in the United States. Even in most of the advanced countries it will buy far less. In Russia a man would have to work 7 hours to buy the amount of food he can buy in this country for 1 hour's work, assuming that the food were available in Russia which it isn't.

EASTERN PRESS WOULD EXPLOIT THOSE WHO LIVE IN RURAL AREAS

Many more figures are available to show that farmers are not making too much money, but these figures do not seem to mean a thing to many people in the eastern cities and to the press in those cities whose editorial articles indicate that they look upon the farming sections of this country as areas to be exploited, like empires of the past exploited their colonial possessions.

If the people who are opposed to fair prices for agricultural commodities were not so shortsighted, they would realize that if any part of our economy is sick and out of harmony with the remainder, then the whole Nation suffers. This has been demonstrated time and time again in the economic history of our country.

IT'S TIME FOR FARMERS TO TALK BACK

I think it's time for farmers to talk back on this question. Businessmen and workers, and everyone else in our agricultural sections, should talk back too. Our incomes and living standards as well as our future as an important part of the Nation depend upon a fair relationship between farm prices and other prices. The people in our cities should be told what it means to them for

farmers to have fair prices and good incomes. They should be told of the economic disadvantages from which farmers suffer and it should be made clear that farmers have nothing to say about the price they receive for their products. When they go to market, they must take what buyers and middlemen offer them or haul their products back home. Few people in our cities understand this.

OUR FARMERS ARE THE BEST IN THE WORLD

A moment ago I said that with one exception, there is no country in the world where a given amount of work in a factory will buy as much food as it will right here in the United States. Nor is there any country where a smaller proportion of the people are engaged in producing food than here. Eighteen percent of our people living on farms produce enough food and fiber for all the rest of us, and its good food and plenty of it. In the more backward countries the situation is just reversed. It takes the work of 85 percent of the people to produce the food for such nations, and in many cases it is a very meager supply of food. Famines and starvation are frequent.

Eighteen percent of our people can feed the rest of us because we have a rich soil, because most of our farmers are educated and skilled and because we have the great advantages which go with labor-saving machinery. But we can maintain the fertility of our soil and keep up our research and educational programs and improve our machinery and techniques only if farmers receive their fair share of the national income. It can't be done if farmers as a group are forced to accept the inferior economic position which the metropolitan press of this country would assign them.

FARMERS ARE NOT GETTING RICH

Are farmers making too much money when per capita farm income is \$804 per year, when the 18 percent of the people living on our farms received in 1950 only 9 percent of our national income, when the returns from farming last year amounted on an average to 69 cents per hour for labor, 5 percent on investment, and nothing for management? No; farmers are not making too much money.

Indiana Welfare Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate action of the Indiana Legislature last spring in passing a law, in violation of the Federal statutes, calling for the publicizing of welfare roles prohibits Federal welfare funds from being allotted to Indiana.

The following is a statement by Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, and also legal opinions, findings of fact, and conclusions of law, substantiating the necessity for him to follow the Federal law and deny relief allocations to the State of Indiana:

STATEMENT BY OSCAR R. EWING, FEDERAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATOR

I deeply regret having to make this decision disapproving the Indiana State plans for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children and aid to the blind. However, the Indiana legislature has given me no choice and I am compelled by law to do so.

Congress appropriates money to be granted to the States to help pay the costs of these assistance programs. But long before I became Federal Security Administrator, Congress specifically provided that if a State wishes to receive Federal money for these programs, the State must first submit and have approved a plan for each program, which "must * * * provide safeguards which restrict the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients to purposes directly connected with the administration" of the particular assistance program.

The State of Indiana complied with this requirement of the Federal law from the time it became effective in 1941 until July 20 of this year when chapter 321 Indiana laws 1951 became effective. This law repealed every vestige of the safeguards previously contained in the Indiana law against the use or disclosure of such information. In fact, insofar as disclosure is concerned, the new Indiana law now requires that lists of the names, addresses, and amounts received by recipients "be open to public inspection." It is true that the law also contains criminal penalties for—but no "safeguards" against—the misuse of information regarding recipients of assistance. However, insofar as disclosure is concerned, there are not even any criminal penalties against this.

Before chapter 321, Indiana laws 1951, was first passed by the Indiana Legislature, the State was notified by Mr. Arthur J. Altmeyer,

¹ In the matter of the amendments to Indiana State plans for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children and aid to the blind necessitated by ch. 321, Indiana laws 1951.

Commissioner of Social Security, in response to an inquiry from Mr. Maurice O. Hunt, administrator of the Indiana Department of Welfare, that if the bill became law grants of Federal funds would have to be discontinued. I understand that Mr. Hunt took appropriate steps to transmit this information to the legislature. The legislature, however, went ahead and passed the bill. Then the governor vetoed the bill and sent it back to the legislature with a message saying that if it was enacted, the Federal Government would have no option but to discontinue Federal grants to Indiana. The legislature, nevertheless, passed the law over the governor's veto.

It now becomes the duty of the Federal Security Administrator, under a requirement of the Federal law, to say whether or not Indiana's plans for aid to the aged, dependent children, and blind persons as amended by chapter 321, Indiana laws 1951, meets the requirements that Congress has stipulated. I have reached the only possible conclusion, namely, that these plans do not meet the requirement of the Federal laws. I hope and pray that this decision, which I am compelled to make, will deprive no beneficiary of the assistance payments to which he or she is properly entitled. But if it does, full responsibility rests on the Indiana Legislature which passed the bill after being fully advised of the probable consequences of its enactment.

If the State of Indiana wishes to appeal to the courts from this decision, I will do everything possible to expedite the proceeding. Since the State would be a party to such proceeding, the State may wish to ask the United States Supreme Court to permit a direct appeal to that Court. If no appeal is taken, then so far as I can see, the only way that the State of Indiana can again receive Federal moneys for these assistance programs will be for Congress to make appropriate amendments in the Federal law or for the Indiana Legislature to amend its laws so as to provide the safeguards required by the Federal statute.

IN THE MATTER OF THE AMENDMENTS TO INDIANA STATE PLANS FOR OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE, AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN, AND AID TO THE BLIND NECESSITATED BY CHAPTER 321, INDIANA LAWS 1951

OPINION OF FEDERAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATOR

The original Social Security Act was enacted August 14, 1935. Its preamble stated that it was "An act to provide for the general welfare by establishing a system of Federal old-age benefits, and by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for aged persons, blind persons, dependent and crippled children, maternal and child welfare, public health, and the administration of their unemployment compensation laws, to establish a Social Security Board; to raise revenue, and for other purposes."

This law established, among other things, comprehensive Federal-State programs of public assistance for aged persons, blind persons and dependent children. These public assistance programs were to be operated by the States with the Federal Government contributing specified proportions of the money paid to beneficiaries.

In order for a State to receive Federal money under any of these programs, the State was required to have previously submitted and to have had approved by the Social Security Board a State plan. (The powers and functions of the Social Security Board were subsequently vested in the Federal Security Administrator.) The Federal law provided that a State plan, in order to be approved, must contain certain specific provisions, none of which are relevant here.

In 1936 the State of Indiana submitted for approval plans for old-age assistance, aid

to dependent children and aid to the blind, pursuant to the Indiana Welfare Act of 1936 (ch. 3, Indiana acts of 1936, special session). These plans were approved April 7, 1936 and Federal grants have been made to the State of Indiana with respect to such plans continuously from April 1, 1936, to date.

In 1939, Congress amended the Social Security Act and added to the provisions which must be contained in State plans for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children and aid to the blind a new provision. This amendment to title I of the act relating to old-age assistance was that a State plan "must, effective July 1, 1941, provide safeguards which restrict the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients to purposes directly connected with the administration of old-age assistance."

Identical requirements were added to the statutes relating to the programs of aid to dependent children and aid to the blind.

In 1941, the Indiana Legislature amended section 93 of the Indiana Welfare Act and added sections 93a and 93b. The amendments and additions, together with other provisions already embodied in the law, were obviously for the purpose of furnishing an adequate legal basis for amending the Indiana State plans so that they could contain provisions that would meet the requirements of the 1939 amendments to the Social Security Act referred to above. Section 93 as so amended in 1941 and as amended in 1943 and 1945 in certain respects not material here reads as follows:

"Confidential nature of records: All records concerning any applicant or recipient of assistance contemplated in part III of this act shall be confidential, and the use or disclosure thereof shall be restricted to purposes connected with the administration of assistance under this act: *Provided, however*, That applications for assistance, awards, modification or revocation of awards and amount of payments to recipients, shall be open to the inspection of duly elected State and county officials, and to township trustees for purposes connected with the administration of public assistance."

The 1951 Indiana Legislature enacted chapter 321, Indiana laws 1951. This law became operative July 20, 1951. The foregoing language contained in section 93 of the Indiana welfare law was eliminated and instead such section now reads as follows:

"Sec. 93 The county welfare board of each county shall on or before the thirtieth day of each January, April, July, and October, file with the county auditor, each member of the county council, prosecuting attorney and all township trustees of such county, a complete report showing the names and addresses of all recipients receiving payments under this act, together with the amounts paid to each during the preceding quarter. Said report shall also show the names and addresses of and salaries paid to all employees of the county welfare board.

"The reports so filed with the county auditor shall be securely bound by him in a separate record book provided for that purpose, which said book and all reports contained therein shall be and the same hereby are declared to be public records and shall be open to public inspection at all times during the regular office hours of said county auditor. Provided, however, that nothing herein contained shall be construed to authorize or require the disclosure of any records of the public welfare department pertaining to adoptions or pertaining to children heretofore or hereafter placed in foster homes for adoption or other purposes."

Chapter 321 also amended sections 93a and 93b of the Indiana welfare law in the following manner (material added by chapter 321 is italicized, material deleted is

shown in black brackets and unchanged material is in ordinary type).

"Sec 93a. Misuse of public assistance information: Except as provided in this section [, or for purposes directly connected with the administration of this act in accordance with the rules and regulations of the state department and public welfare], it shall be unlawful for any person, body, association, firm, corporation or other agency to solicit, disclose, receive, make use of, or to authorize, knowingly permit, participate in, or acquiesce in the use of, any lists or names [of, or any information concerning persons applying for or receiving public assistance pursuant to the provisions of the welfare act directly or indirectly derived from the records, papers, files or communications of the State or county or subdivisions, agencies or offices thereof or acquired in the course of the performance of official duties other than as provided in this act], for commercial or political purposes of any nature, or for any purpose not directly connected with the administration of public assistance."

"Sec 93b. Penalty: Any person, body, a association, corporation, firm, or other agency who shall willfully or knowingly, violate any provision of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$25 nor more than \$1,000, to which may be added imprisonment in the county jail for any determinate period not to exceed 60 days. If the violation is by other than an individual, the imprisonment may be adjusted against any officer, agent, employee, servant, or other person of the association, corporation, firm, or other agency who committed or participated in such violation and is found guilty thereof.

"*Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent a grand jury or prosecuting attorney from securing by subpoena such records or information as may be necessary in the investigation or prosecution of any criminal charge. All financial and administrative records shall be subject to inspection and audit and may be utilized in determining the sufficiency of appropriations or tax levies. By financial and administrative records shall be meant any records utilized in the operation of the department except those containing or showing information concerning individual recipients or applicants for assistance or giving lists of such recipients or applicants."

When the amendments to sections 93, 93a, and 93b became effective, the Indiana State plans for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind were amended accordingly. This compels the Federal Security Administrator to decide whether these plans as so amended must be disapproved for failure to comply with the provisions of the Social Security Act which say that a State plan "must . . . effective July 1, 1941, provide safeguards which restrict the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients to purposes directly connected with the administration" of the three several programs.

The amendments to sections 93, 93a, and 93b completely wiped out all provisions in the previously existing statutes which required that the records concerning applicants and recipients of assistance be kept confidential. These amendments do not leave a vestige of a safeguard which would restrict the disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients. Indeed, the amendments categorically declare that quarterly reports of county welfare boards to county auditors showing the names and addresses of recipients, together with the amount paid each, are to be public records and open to public inspection. By no stretch of the imagination can Indiana's State plans for public assistance, when so amended, be deemed to conform to the requirement of the Social Security Act that such plans

"must . . . provide safeguards that restrict the . . . disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients to purposes directly connected with the administration" of the assistance programs.

But the Social Security Act says that the State plans must also provide safeguards that restrict the use of information concerning applicants to the same purposes. Here, the failure of the Indiana plans, as amended, to comply with Federal law is not so clear because the amended statutes do provide criminal penalties for misuse of such information. The question is thus raised as to whether or not the criminal penalties now contained in the Indiana statute can be regarded as safeguards against the misuse of the information.

Originally, the word "safeguard" was used to describe a body of soldiers detailed to protect a particular person or piece of property. It was something quite apart from and in addition to the criminal punishment that might result from assault on the person or trespass upon the property. The idea was that something was set up that would prevent a particular result from happening. Webster's New International Dictionary (2d ed.) defines the term "safeguard" as "3. A means of preventing some undesirable outcome or tendency."

Where a statute requires machinery to be safeguarded, it means that there must be some physical attachment or structure that will prevent contact with moving or other dangerous parts of the machine. It would, therefore, seem that the Indiana State plans for assistance, as amended by chapter 321, also cannot be approved because such plans do not provide safeguards which restrict the use of information concerning applicants and recipients to the purposes specified in the Social Security Act. Whether or not in some instances it may be impossible to do anything more to prevent misuse of information than provide criminal penalties raises questions that need not be decided at this time. Certainly, in this case, the Indiana assistance plans, as amended by chapter 321, cannot be held to contain the safeguards against misuse of information that are required by the Federal law. I must hold, therefore, that the Indiana State plans for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind, as amended by chapter 321, Indiana laws, 1951, do not contain provisions that are required by the Federal law and consequently cannot be approved.

OSCAR R. EWING,
Federal Security Administrator.
JULY 31, 1951.

IN THE MATTER OF THE AMENDMENTS TO INDIANA STATE PLANS FOR OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE, AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN, AND AID TO THE BLIND NECESSITATED BY CHAPTER 321, INDIANA LAWS, 1951

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Findings of fact

1. The Social Security Act (42 U. S. C., sec. 301 et seq.) vests in the Federal Security Administrator all functions regarding the approval of State plans and other aspects of the administration of titles I, IV, and X of the Social Security Act. The Federal Security Administrator has delegated to the Commissioner for Social Security Authority, among other things, to approve State plans and amendments to State plans. The Commissioner for Social Security and the Bureau of Public Assistance, which is under his direction, have authority, among other things, to negotiate with and advise States concerning their plans and the requirements of the Social Security Act.

2. The State of Indiana has had plans for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind approved under titles I, IV, and X, respectively, of the Social Security Act. State plans for these programs formulated and submitted by the State

agency were by their terms founded upon the Indiana Welfare Act of 1936 (ch. 3, Indiana Acts of 1936, special session) and have been amended from time to time to reflect certain amendments of the Indiana statutes and other changes. These State plans were initially approved on April 7, 1936, with Federal grants commencing as of April 1, 1936, and Federal grants have been made to such State with respect to its approved plans continuously since that time. The Indiana State agency supervising the administration of such plans is the department of public welfare.

3. The Social Security Act was amended in 1939 to require that effective July 1, 1941, State plans for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind "provide safeguards which restrict the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients to purposes directly connected with the administration of" old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind. Sections 2 (a) (8), 402 (a) (8), and 1002 (a) (9) of the Social Security Act.

4. Subsequent to 1939, the Social Security Board and its successor, the Commissioner for Social Security, advised the State agencies administering public assistance of the nature of the requirements cited in the preceding paragraph, particularly in releases sent by the Executive Director of the Social Security Board to such State agencies on November 15, 1940, and May 7, 1941, and in the Handbook of Public Assistance Administration of the Bureau of Public Assistance, part IV-7000.

5. Part IV-7000 of the Handbook of Public Assistance Administration was distributed to the State agencies administering public assistance programs under the Social Security Act as an attachment to State Letter No. 61, dated January 7, 1946.

6. Section 93 of the Indiana Welfare Act prior to 1941 contained provisions for the protection of some assistance information but did not contain safeguards with respect to application for assistance awards, modifications, and revocation of awards. In 1941 the Indiana Legislature amended section 93 and added sections 93a and 93b, which provided for the protection of all public assistance records and made the misuse of assistance information a misdemeanor. (Ch. 179, sec. 8, Indiana Acts of 1941.) The 1941 amendment provided the State with a specific statutory authority for meeting the requirement cited in paragraph 3, supra. This law was amended in 1943 and 1945, in respects not material here.

7. Senate bill 86 was introduced in the 1951 session of the Indiana Legislature to amend the legislation cited above, and versions of this bill were transmitted to the Commissioner for Social Security by the administrator of the Indiana Department of Public Welfare on February 8, 1951, and March 1, 1951, with requests for comments regarding conformance or nonconformance with the mandatory requirements of the Social Security Act described in paragraph 3, supra, and the administrator of the Indiana Department of Welfare was notified by a telegram dated February 13, 1951, signed by the Director of the Bureau of Public Assistance, and a telegram dated March 2, 1951, signed by the Commissioner for Social Security that senate bill 86 did not conform to the provisions of the Social Security Act.

8. The Governor of Indiana vetoed the version of senate bill 86 finally enacted and in his veto message, dated March 5, 1951, informed the senate that reliable information from the highest Federal sources and the advice of competent legal counsel lead him to the conclusion that the bill did not conform to the requirements of the Federal statute and that it appeared to him that the Federal Government would have no option but to discontinue grants to Indiana.

9. Senate enrolled bill 86 was enacted by the legislature over the veto of the Governor

and became chapter 321 of Indiana laws of 1951, to become operative upon publication and promulgation.

10. Chapter 321 was submitted to the Commissioner for Social Security by the administrator of the Indiana Department of Public Welfare as an amendment to the Indiana plans for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind.

11. In the letter from the administrator of the Indiana Department of Public Welfare, dated April 17, 1951, which submitted chapter 321, a request was made for a hearing regarding the conformity of the Indiana plans for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind as amended by such chapter, with the requirements of the Social Security Act. Pursuant to such request the Federal Security Administrator on April 25, 1951, notified the administrator of the Indiana Department of Public Welfare that such hearing would be held on May 15, 1951, at his office in Washington, D. C. Such hearing was held on that date with the Attorney General and other representatives of the State of Indiana in attendance, as shown by the transcript of proceedings.

12. Chapter 321, Indiana Acts of 1951, amends section 93 of the Indiana Welfare Act and as a result of such amendment deletes the following provision from that section:

"All records concerning any applicant or recipient of assistance contemplated in part 3 of this act [part 3 includes old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind] shall be confidential and the use or disclosure thereof shall be restricted to purposes of administration of assistance under this act . . .";

and, among other things, requires that reports shall be filed each quarter with certain county officials, including the county auditors, showing the names and addresses of all recipients receiving payments under part 3 of the Indiana Welfare Act, together with the amounts paid to each during the preceding quarter. The attorney general of Indiana, however, has expressed the view that their requirement of reporting is inapplicable to the program for aid to the blind.

Reports are required to be bound by the county auditor in a separate book " . . . which said book and all reports contained therein shall be and the same hereby are declared to be public records and shall be open to public inspection at all times during the regular office hours of said county auditor."

13. In addition, chapter 321, Indiana Acts of 1951, amends section 93a and 93b of the Indiana Welfare Act as indicated in the following quotation (material added by ch. 321 is italicized and that deleted is shown in black brackets):

"SEC. 93a. Misuse of public assistance information: Except as provided in this section[, or for purposes directly connected with the administration of this act in accordance with the rules and regulations of the State department of public welfare.] it shall be unlawful for any person, body, association, firm, corporation, or other agency to solicit, disclose, receive, make use of, or to authorize, knowingly permit, participate in, or acquiesce in the use of, any lists or names [of, or any information concerning persons applying for or receiving public assistance pursuant to the provisions of the welfare act directly or indirectly derived from the records, papers, files, or communications of the State or county or subdivisions, agencies or offices thereof or acquired in the course of the performance of official duties other than as provided in this act.] for commercial or political purposes of any nature, or for any purpose not directly connected with the administration of public assistance.

"SEC. 93b. Penalty: Any person, body, association, corporation, firm, or other agency who shall willfully or knowingly, violate any

provision of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be punished by a fine of not less than twenty-five [(\$25)] dollars nor more than one thousand [(\$1,000)] dollars, to which may be added imprisonment in the county jail for any determinate period not to exceed sixty [(60)] days. If the violation is by other than an individual, the imprisonment may be adjusted against any officer, agent, employee, servant, or other person of the association, corporation, firm, or other agency who committed or participated in such violation and is found guilty thereof.

["Provided, That nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent a grand jury or prosecuting attorney from securing by subpoena such records or information as may be necessary in the investigation or prosecution of any criminal charge. All financial and administrative records shall be subject to inspection and audit and may be utilized in determining the sufficiency of appropriations or tax levies. By financial and administrative records shall be meant any records utilized in the operation of the department except those containing or showing information concerning individual recipients or applicants for assistance or giving lists of such recipients or applicants."] "

14. On May 10, 1951, the Department of Public Welfare of Indiana distributed legislative DPW Digest No. 26 to county departments of Public Welfare and county auditors and submitted it as an amendment to the Indiana plans for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind. This bulletin transmitted a copy of chapter 321 and explained the criminal provisions regarding the misuse of lists. With respect to who may inspect such lists in the county auditor's office, it states on pages 2 and 4:

"The second paragraph provides that the quarterly report so filed with the county auditor shall be securely bound by him in a book provided for that purpose, and that the book and all reports contained therein are declared to be public records and open to public inspection in the office of the county auditor

"It should be noted that the quarterly reports as filed with public officials other than the county auditor, are not declared to be public records which are open to public inspection "

"The law requires that the county auditor surround the special book with the same safeguards that surround the book containing the record of old-age assistance liens in the county recorder's office, and not authorize, knowingly permit, participate in, or acquiesce in the use of, any list or names for commercial or political purposes of any nature, or for any purpose not directly connected with the administration of public assistance."

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Section 1 of title I of the Social Security Act, as amended, authorizes appropriations "For the purpose of enabling each State to furnish financial assistance, as far as practicable under the conditions in such State, to aged needy individuals. * * * The sums made available under this section shall be used for making payments to States which have submitted, and had approved by the Federal Security Administrator, State plans for old-age assistance." Section 2 (a) of said title provides in part that "A State plan for old-age assistance must * * * (8) effective July 1, 1941, provide safeguards which restrict the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients to purposes directly connected with the administration of old-age assistance."

2 Section 401 of title IV of the Social Security Act, as amended, authorizes appro-

priations "For the purpose of enabling each State to furnish financial assistance, as far as practicable under the conditions in such State, to needy dependent children. * * * The sums made available under this section shall be used for making payments to States which have submitted, and had approved by the Administrator, State plans for aid to dependent children." Section 402 (a) of said title provides in part that "A State plan for aid to dependent children must * * * (8) provide safeguards which restrict the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients to purposes directly connected with the administration of aid to dependent children."

3 Section 1001 of title X of the Social Security Act, as amended, authorizes appropriations "For the purpose of enabling each State to furnish financial assistance, as far as practicable, under the conditions in such State, to needy individuals who are blind. * * * The sums made available under this section shall be used for making payments to States which have submitted, and had approved by the Administrator, State plans for aid to the blind." Section 1002 (a) of said title provides in part that "A State plan for aid to the blind must * * * (9) provide safeguards which restrict the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients to purposes directly connected with the administration of aid to the blind "

4 Chapter 321 of the Indiana Acts of 1951 amends the existing Indiana State plans for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind, and this makes it necessary for the Federal Security Administrator to examine the amended plans in order to determine whether or not they conform to the requirements of the Social Security Act for plan approval.

5. The Indiana State plan for old-age assistance as amended, by chapter 321 of the Indiana Acts of 1951, provides no safeguard which restricts the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients to purposes directly connected with the administration of old-age assistance, and such plan, therefore, cannot be approved by the Federal Security Administrator.

6 The Indiana State plan for aid to dependent children, as amended by chapter 321 of the Indiana Acts of 1951, provides no safeguard which restricts the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients to purposes directly connected with the administration of aid to dependent children, and such plan, therefore, cannot be approved by the Federal Security Administrator

7. The Indiana State plan for aid to the blind, as amended by chapter 321 of the Indiana Acts of 1951, provides no safeguard which restricts the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients to purposes directly connected with the administration of aid to the blind, and such plan, therefore, cannot be approved by the Federal Security Administrator.

OSCAR R EWING,

Federal Security Administrator.

JULY 31, 1951.

Blow for Blow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of August 2, 1951:

BLOW FOR BLOW

When it comes to the Communist regimes of Czechoslovakia and Hungary every American has a right to be vindictive these days. We should all feel a glow of satisfaction at the way the White House and State Department are hitting out against the men and administrations responsible for such recent crimes as the imprisonment of Associated Press Correspondent William Oatis in Prague and the deportation of thousands of innocent middle-class people from Budapest. In quick succession we have had the Truman statement last Friday denouncing Hungary for the deportations, the moves to withdraw tariff concessions from Czechoslovakia and other iron-curtain countries, and the announcement yesterday by Secretary Acheson that the United States is noting "the identity of individual Hungarian officials, including the highest authorities," who have any responsibility for the deportations.

One's only regret is that it is impossible to hurt the men responsible in more effective fashion. The action on the Czechoslovak tariff concessions is typical. It will hurt the Prague regime somewhat because they need dollars and they have been selling goods in the United States at an annual rate of more than \$30,000,000 this year. At the same time Czechoslovakia has for several years been integrating her economy with the Soviet bloc, so there is not a wide scope for inflicting damage. Because of Czechoslovakia's and Hungary's historical, traditional, and cultural links with the West they have been forced by Moscow to be especially rough and tough with Americans, and now as a consequence we have been forced into stronger countermeasures. So the iron curtain perpetuates itself, which in a sense is what Moscow wants. However, there is no choice, and nothing could be worse than to take the insults lying down or ignore what is happening to men and women behind the iron curtain who are being persecuted because they are on our side.

The Truman and Acheson statements will give heart to those in the satellite countries who are suffering from these measures by making them realize that the United States is concerned and is doing its best to help them. Our recent moves are in the right tradition of the American defense of liberty and human rights and they are fitting policies for a great power.

Bender Challenges Democrats on Civil-Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago the Democratic Party adopted a platform in its national convention calling for a continued battle to establish civil rights.

In these words, they told the people:

The Democratic Party commits itself to continuing its efforts to eradicate all racial, religious, and economic discrimination.

The President made one of his most vigorous campaign arguments upon the basis of this pledge. He was hailed as a champion of all minority groups because

he risked the displeasure of the Dixiecrats.

What has happened since the elections of 1948?

We have had a few words of lip service to these ideals, but there has not been a single effective voice raised on this entire subject from the White House down to the Democratic leadership of both the House and the Senate.

This is another instance in which promises and solemn assurances have been studiously ignored by the administration once it has won votes on the strength of those promises. It is the most blatant and irresponsible kind of political hypocrisy.

I challenge the President and his advisers to take the initiative in carrying out the pledges they made: the right of full and equal political participation through the elimination of poll taxes; the right to equal opportunity of employment through the enactment of fair employment practices measures; the right of security of person through anti-lynching legislation; and the right of equal treatment in the service and defense of our Nation through regulations in all branches of our Military Establishment achieving this objective.

Let us put all the cards on the table and see which political party in America stands truly for civil rights.

Prices Under New Controls Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine article written by our colleague, the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], entitled "Upward Price Trend Seen Under New Controls Act."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UPWARD PRICE TREND SEEN UNDER NEW CONTROLS ACT—BETTER THAN NOTHING, SAYS MOODY, BUT INVITES INFLATION, BLACK MARKETS

(By BLAIR MOODY, United States Senator from Michigan)

WASHINGTON, July 30.—The final draft of the new National Production Act, approved by the Senate Friday and up for House action today, is better than nothing, but falls far short of what the American people have a right to expect from their Congress.

It clears the path for price increases all along the line. This is the official report being prepared for President Truman by his top stabilization officials, Eric Johnston and Michael V. DiSalle.

It will permit, for example, an increase in automobile prices of as much as 11 percent. This is the preliminary estimate of the OPS Manufacturing Division.

It opens the gates wide to an uncontrollable black market in beef, making effective control of meat prices in the consumers' behalf virtually impossible. This situation

is so bad that the chairman of the Senate conferees, Senator MAYBANK (Democrat), South Carolina, who fought through sessions with the House for a stronger bill, plans to introduce a new, separate bill for licensing and quotas for slaughterers.

The Senate had to swallow the conference version because the alternative would be expiration of the present law on Tuesday night and collapse of the entire system of material allocation and direct and indirect controls on which our military mobilization is based.

This could flood OPS with so many individual applications for adjustment, DiSalle anticipates, that the agency would find it almost impossible to handle them.

BUILT-IN INFLATION

It contains a profit-margin provision which amounts to automatic built-in inflation. If a company's costs have doubled since Korea, it can price its goods so as to double its profits and DiSalle cannot interfere. This is contained in the provision which freezes not dollar profits, but percentage profits, into the law. An item costing \$100 with a 10-percent margin yields \$10 profit. If costs rise to \$200, the same 10-percent margin, now protected, yields \$20.

The first 10-percent roll-back of beef prices was saved. The two additional projected roll-backs are outlawed.

The key of the difficulty in the new law is the provision regulating price adjustments from present ceiling levels, both roll-back and roll-forward. The ostensible objective of this clause is constructive. As described by the committee.

"This roll-back amendment will permit the administration to roll back the price of all gougers to a fair and reasonable level, but will protect the fair and reasonable profit of those who have merely added to their pre-war price the necessary and unavoidable costs of doing business which they have since incurred."

ALLOWS ROLL-BACK

The provision would permit roll-back of prices to pre-Korean levels, with all costs of all kinds added, except those found by the President to be excessive.

This is the general structure of the Johnston formula followed by stabilization authorities. So far as it goes, it hits profiteers who marked up their profits after Korea without relation to increases of costs. From this standpoint it is an improvement over either the Senate or the House bill, but by providing that each firm must be processed separately, it threatens the foundation of workable pricing.

The amendment submitted by Senator CAPEHART, Republican, of Indiana, specifies that costs for "material, indirect and direct, labor, factory, selling, advertising, office, and all other production, distribution, transportation, and administration costs except such as the President may determine to be unreasonable and excessive" must be included in each price.

OPS executives anticipate three to four million separate applications for price-increases as quite possible under these provisions. They report that there are 3,000,000 companies handling soft goods, 1,250,000 in the service trades, 3,000,000 dealing directly with consumers. One firm, Du Pont is reported to market 300,000 different products.

CAN'T BUILD PLANTS

The bill falls short of the public interest also by errors of omission. It provides no authority for governmental construction of war plants during the emergency, though 74 percent of all war plants built in World War II were financed in that way. It thus leaves the Government helpless if private firms are reluctant to proceed.

Despite these and other faults, however, the bill renews basic powers indispensable to the war effort. If the President should veto it, and call on Congress to do better,

there would ensue a period of confusion during which he would lack powers to grant priorities and allocate scarce materials, to condemn properties, to control rents, and to grant some very limited subsidies to stimulate the production of raw, nonprocessed, nonagricultural items.

Senator SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, one of the Senate managers and chairman of the Small Business Committee, got through his Smaller Defense Plants Corporation, with special powers to help small business. Regulation W, limiting credit on consumer purchases, was relaxed, with the current limitation of a maximum 15 months in which to pay moved to 18.

This applies chiefly to automobiles, regarded as essential defense transportation, in view of the policy of dispersing defense plants. Rental increases will be held to 20 percent, including those granted since the war. The provision which would have allowed local communities to veto rental controls in defense housing areas was wiped out.

One Senator, a veteran of the conference, described it as "the best of two bad bills." Top administrators, faced with the task of checking inflation with the leaky dike it provides, take a much dimmer view. So, it is a good long-run bet, will the consuming public.

Southern Voters Can Save Freedom in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in a recent address to the American Plant Food Council at its annual convention in Hot Springs, Va., I suggested that if private enterprise, individual initiative, and the constitutional rights of States and individuals are to be preserved in this country, the voters of our 12 Southern States must assume their full share of the Trojan efforts which will be required to keep America free. It may well be true that Republican voters in the North alone will not be able to turn back the trends toward socialism or to muster the votes to offset the seductive lures of the welfare state and those who would give America away a billion dollars at a throw as a tried and tested device for winning an election at a time.

I have discussed this political predicament in many Southern States, Mr. President, pointing out that except for the fact that in each of the last few elections—the gallant Dixiecrat diversion of 1948 excepted—the entire Southland has embraced the concept of the superstate and the all-powerful Government by throwing its entire electoral vote into the camp of either Roosevelt or Truman. America would long ago have voted out of office those who would spend-all rule-all, and direct-all from the Capital City of our land. Except for Rhode Island, every State in the Union outside of Dixie has in one of the last few elections registered its opposition to the welfare-state doctrine and the complete centralization of all authority in Washington by the only means available to Americans—

by voting for a Republican Governor, Senator, or Representative, and in many cases voting Republican all the way across the boards. Even such States as New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada, Oklahoma traditionally Democratic in complexion—have thus struck back against the forces of collectivism.

However, the faithful, unfaltering, steadfast support of Trumanism and the New Deal-Fair Deal concepts by the States of Dixieland has been sufficient to elect and reelect those who would be king, "again and again and again." Today nobody in America is precisely sure as to what must be done to undo the damage this has done to our constitutional American concepts of States' rights and individual freedoms. It is, however, becoming increasingly clear that the Southern States hold the key to this situation. Without the concerted support of the 12 Southern States, there is no doubt that in 1952 Trumanism and its whole coterie of planners and dreamers will be retired from public office. Will the South measure up to its challenge in 1952?

Mr. President, that question is one which must be answered by the sturdy, proud, independent, and patriotic people who comprise the voting force of our 12 Southern States. It is my studied opinion after many visits to Dixie that the South is one of our great bastions of human freedom, of private initiative, and of States' rights. I believe there is a limit to the insults and the abuse which the once-proud and spirited South will accept from the political overlords of the New Deal and Fair Deal political control posts. I believe the spirit, the pride, and the independence of the South are still operating factors despite the records of the past few elections, in which southern voters have given servile obedience to the New Deal-Fair Deal bosses, whose orders I am confident must have been most repugnant to a majority of the spirited citizens of Dixie.

I gather this from the reactions of the many public audiences which I have addressed in nearly every Southern State these past 10 months. I believe that because of the courageous voting record of many—although unfortunately not all—of the southern Senators and Representatives who sit in Congress. I feel sure of that because of what I have read in hundreds of letters reaching me from southern citizens. I am convinced of that because of the gallant fight made by the Dixiecrats in 1948 and their surprising strength in winning 39 electoral votes despite the fact that only 4 States of the South were then ready to recoil against the whiplash of political abuse heaped upon them by the city machine bosses and the left-wing pressure groups controlling the National Democratic Convention of 1948.

Mr. President, I believe all this despite the strange paradox which in the last few national elections has found most of the South voting for an administration and a philosophy of government which is inimical not only to the South, but also to all America. Habit is a relentless master, and it takes time and courage and leadership to break the voting habits of the South. I feel confident, however,

that what started in 1948 will gain strength in 1952. If those who think alike in America will work together and vote together I cannot believe that a matter of semantics and a problem of labels is going to compel the South to continue voting for people and platforms repugnant to its citizens and destructive of our American way of life.

For over a year, by one method or another, Mr. President, I have been suggesting methods and procedures by which like-minded southerners and northerners might merge their voting strength to rescue America from the shoals of socialism. It is not an easy problem to solve, but neither is it impossible. I shall continue my efforts, aided by what support there is available from sources both in the South and in the North. Freedom must not be permitted to perish in America because there are not those who believe principle is mightier than partisanship.

In yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page A4862, under the heading "Can a North-South political alliance preserve America?" I inserted the staff interview which the editors of United States News and World Report recently did with me on this subject. That interview is published in full in the August 3 issue—now on the newsstands—of United States News and World Report. In concluding these remarks today, I am asking leave to reprint at this point an article on this subject I wrote for Collier's magazine, and which was published in the July 28 issue of that magazine. I invite others, both in and out of public life, both in the North and in the South, to start asking themselves seriously and statistically now the question, "What must be done in 1952 to make certain that the current trends toward socialism and insolvency in America are stopped?"

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD THE GOP MERGE WITH THE DIXIECRATS?

(By HON KARL E MUNDT)

The Republican Party will win next year and its philosophy remain a strong force in America for many years to come, if it forms an alliance with the South, and develops the alliance into a new party with a new name. I believe this coalition of voting strength essential not only for the Republican Party and our two-party system, but also for the most effective fight possible against communism in America. This is not a wild swing by a groggy fighter hoping to land a lucky haymaker. It is a reasoned conclusion I have come to after many years in politics. Let me explain it quickly before you decide that my long fight against communism, as a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and now in the Senate, has affected my balance.

Exposure and prosecution of criminal Communists in the United States is essential, but we cannot win the great fight against totalitarian techniques by defensive warfare alone, even if scores are sent to jail, as they should be, and other scores are fired from Government jobs which they never should have held in the first place.

A fundamental tenet of the Communist movement is to set up an all-powerful central government, with control over religion, the press, transportation, communication, manufacturing, distribution, farming—over all activities. I have visited nearly every Communist country in the world, and found

everywhere the same pattern—a strong central government run by a few men who tolerate no opposition.

Communists often use non-Communists to set the stage for a coup d'état by concentrating power in the hands of a selected small group. Then if—as demonstrated in Czechoslovakia—it becomes desirable to capture the country for communism, all that is required is to change a few leading actors on the government stage.

I certainly do not say that the Democratic Party is Communist at heart or in purpose. But I do say, and the record plainly supports me in this, that it has for some years, under the New Deal and the Fair Deal, moved toward a socialized Nation and concentrated power in Washington. This is a move toward socialism, and socialism is a long step toward communism. Purity of motive does not offset the grim fact that socialism requires a powerful central control over human activities, and sooner or later a Socialist nation will be a pushover for the Communists, who will have to get control of only a few politicians to have control of the people.

That's a possibility in our own United States. It is a possibility I want to make highly improbable, if not entirely impossible, by maintaining a balanced two-party system, with the Republican Party standing foursquare against any and all approaches to, and encroachments by, communism, whether the approaches be deliberately and maliciously planned, or the result of political policy aimed at winning the next election by some giveaway program to appease a special interest group. The challenge of socialism and communism must be met by a determined party of opposition.

But if the Republican Party's foursquare stand is to be effective, we Republicans must win the Presidency once in a while, along with congressional majorities. How can we do this so long as we remain a sectional party, excluded for practical electoral-vote purposes, from 11 Southern States? That handicap is too heavy for us to carry. The Democrats have been starting off with almost half enough electoral votes to win. We have got to get support from the solid South, and we can do this only by going to the South for cooperation, not by telling the South to come to us.

I can talk about this, I hope, without having a carpetbagger label glued to me. My State, South Dakota, was not in the War Between the States. It was not even a State at the time of that war, and its few settlers, including my ancestors, were busy fighting Indians, not Confederates.

It will be futile for the Republicans to try again, as they have done in the past, to outpromise the Democrats. They are experienced and skilled operators in the dispensing of public money, while we have not had a chance to do more than declare verbally our generosity with the people's money, and the recipient voters of the Northern and Western States, aided by their reluctant brothers from the South, believed the bird-in-hand theory and have turned us back again and again and three more agains.

We have tried, also, to echo Democratic appeals to minority and pressure groups, but this hasn't worked either. We have tried just about everything except an alliance with the South. I think it is time to do that, so that we may stop operating as a sectional party, confined to three-fourths of the States. It is mighty difficult to win a horse race with a three-legged horse.

A study of the Congress over the past 12 years, of Southern State legislatures and of southern governors, suggests to me that the South is the natural and logical source of new strength for the Republican Party. If the United States Senators and Representatives, the State legislators, and the governors in Dixie represent the true South, it is plain that the Fair Deal Democratic Party does not. Every major piece of socialistic Fair Deal legislation that has been stopped in Congress

in recent years has been stopped by a combination of southern Democrats and Republicans. But for this informal, unorganized, undirected alliance that exists in the Congress, our country today would be much farther down the road to socialism, and the radical special interest and pressure groups would be riding high.

Plainly, there is strong political kinship between Republicans and the South. Their viewpoint is similar, their fears are similar. They both stand against an overpowerful central government, and for maintenance of local and State responsibilities. That means they both stand for what used to be known as State rights, a fundamental American concept, a bulwark of liberty, a safeguard against the kind of centralized government control that could lead first to socialism, later to communism. So long as we maintain 43 indestructible States the Communists will be unable to dominate the people by merely gaining control of the Government at Washington. State resistance will be the toughest obstacle they ever ran against.

I have had a careful study made of the voting records in the Congress of southern Democrats, and it shows plainly that they are not Fair Dealers. On many significant issues they join Republican Representatives and Senators, or the Republicans join them. For example: on the subversive-activities measure (the Mundt-Nixon bill) in 1948 only 16 northern Democrats voted "yes," while 47 voted "no," but 88 southern Democrats voted for this bill, and only one against. These 88 southerners joined 215 Republicans to give a majority in the House.

Similar line-ups, representative of what seems to be the true sentiment of the South, could be cited by the baker's dozen, in House and Senate. In 1939 there was a proposal to investigate the National Labor Relations Board. Seventy-nine southern Democrats in the House joined 151 Republicans for a majority, while 24 other Democrats voted the other way. On the Smith antistrike bill of 1941, the House vote showed 104 southern Democrats joined 123 Republicans, while 25 other Democrats were in opposition. So runs the story of a political alliance that has existed in fact for years, but has not been formalized. The time is here, right now, for this common interest to be recognized in all its potentialities by the Republican Party.

I have spoken to perhaps 20 groups in every Southern State except Louisiana, and the reaction to the alliance I am proposing and promoting has been positively thrilling.

QUOTES FROM SOUTHERN PRESS

The Commercial Appeal, of Memphis, Tenn., on April 9 of this year said: "The fact is that southern Democrats and northern Republicans think and feel alike on issues of essential importance, and have in increasing measure for the last dozen years or so. The potential values of the situation, however, can be only partially realized until there is a political regrouping."

From the Columbia Record, South Carolina, March 20, 1951: "As long as the South votes predictably Democratic, no matter how reluctantly or sullenly it offers up its kept votes to the city-machine bosses now controlling the Democratic Party, it will be disregarded and damned by both parties."

The Jackson Daily News, Mississippi, April 10, 1951: "Just about this time next year, maybe sooner, you are going to be hearing some lively echoes of a political speech delivered in Jackson on Monday afternoon, April 9, by Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota."

Letters from every Southern State come to me. From Florida: "I beg of you not to let this movement die." South Carolina: "I heartily agree with you. * * * We certainly want a change in 1952." And so on.

A citizen develops the sinews of citizenship only by exercising its privileges and

meeting its responsibilities, and he can get that experience mainly at the local and State levels. The more he passes responsibility to Washington, the less his capacity for self-government. The Republican and Democratic Parties have exchanged positions about the functions of States. Once States' rights was the battle cry of Democrats; now it is a Republican tenet of faith. I am convinced it still is close to the hearts of southern Democrats.

The South lost its influence in the national Democratic Party in 1936 when it surrendered the two-thirds rule in the national Democratic convention. Prior to that change the southern Democrats had to be listened to because no Democratic candidate for President or Vice President could win nomination unless he had two-thirds of the delegates.

When the South gave up its veto power, derived from the two-thirds rule, control of the national Democratic Party passed to the political machines and big-city bosses outside the South. These new managers made any and every kind of appeal to the non-southern vote because they knew the South was "in the bag." The Democratic machine politicians of the North have been the main beneficiaries since 1936 of the old southern prejudice against Republicans, dating back to the War Between the States and reconstruction.

This prejudice has produced bizarre political results. A Harlem voter in New York, eager for a compulsory fair-employment-practices law, votes the Democratic ticket. So does a Georgia watermelon grower who thinks the idea originated in hell. The theoretical Socialist fresh out of some eastern university votes the Democratic ticket because he thinks the party is going his way; the Mississippi individualist votes the same ticket because he just can't bring himself to cast a Republican ballot, lest his ancestors leave off resting and begin revolving in their graves.

We Republicans can do something about this illogical political set-up if we use imagination and common sense. In 1948, four Southern States abandoned the national Democratic Party, for their own Dixiecrats. But when they walked out on the Democratic Party they really did not have anywhere to go. Every voter knew the Dixiecrat ticket was, in effect, a protest. It had not a chance to win, but it did have a chance to cause trouble to the Democrats, and very nearly did.

In the course of American political history there have been numerous splinter parties—Free-Sollers, Populists, Bull Moosers, Wallace Progressives, Dixiecrats—but since the earliest days two major parties have been characteristic of our system. Never have we had more than two major parties at any one time for any length of time. I hope this will continue to be true.

There is not a chance for southern Democrats to recapture their former party. It is irrevocably committed to a viewpoint that is not southern, and to nonsouthern special-interest groups. There is not a chance for southerners to have real national influence so long as they remain tied to the national Democratic Party. Only in the Halls of Congress where they find support from many Republican Members do the southern Democrats have real influence left. The South cannot nominate a Democratic President or even a Democratic Vice President who comes from below the border States.

My record will show that I have voted along with numerous southern Democrats against every important issue that would have promoted socialism in our common country. A large number of Republican Congressmen can say the same thing. This explains the brakes that have been put on the Fair Deal. But operating from the caboose is a poor way to run a railroad. Those of us who fear

and detest socialism as a step toward communism, whether we come from South Carolina or South Dakota, from the Atlantic or the Pacific seaboard, should combine and win the Presidency. Then we would have charge of the locomotive, not merely of the caboose.

The southern Democrats are in a trap. The easiest way out is for them to vote the Republican ticket next year, but I am afraid not enough of them would do that to carry many Southern States. They might want to. Some of them would. Several southern Senators and Representatives have spoken to me privately in approval of my one-man crusade for a Republican alliance with their South, but they ask—and political expediency requires this—that their names not be used. They know that when voting day comes thousands of their constituents, especially the elders, could not overcome the ancient feeling that the Republican Party is the traditional enemy of their social customs. This feeling, implanted in their minds and emotions when they were children, is as firmly lodged as their religious convictions.

So, somehow we must find a formula, a technique, a procedure that will allow southern Democrats to become politically free, without any feeling of besmirchment. The old prejudice no longer has any foundation in existing conditions. Its tyrannical reign should be broken.

When this is done the South will have two effective parties, which all of its leaders tell me, privately or openly, would be good. Southern States no longer would be slaves to any political label. Their voters, white and black, would move from party to party as voters in so many other States have done.

And when the solid South breaks up under some such alliance as I am proposing, we shall have two national parties that make more sense than they do now. Then there will be the possibility of clear issues between the two national parties, and millions of voters who in 1948 said, "What's the difference?" and remained at home on election day, will see there is a difference. Only about half our qualified voters cast ballots in the presidential election of 1948—an unhealthy situation that would not have existed if the two parties had not been so much alike.

Before our convention, we could confer with southern leaders about the possibility of an alliance ticket, with perhaps a southerner for Vice President, and with a platform that is not repellent to the South. I believe most Republicans would be happy to have a man like Senator BYRD of Virginia, Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, or Senator RUSSELL, also of Georgia, on their ticket. Doubtless there are many others who would be satisfactory to North and South.

If this alliance can be effected, formally or informally, before the Republicans meet to nominate their candidates, I believe most Republican delegates would be pleased. They want to win. They want to build party strength for the future. Without any offense to the regular Republicans, this invitation for participation and assistance can be extended to the southern Democrats.

In some Southern States the alliance ticket might be put on the ballot as the ticket of the Democratic organization in those States. It might appear as representing some segment of the Democratic organization. Of course, any qualified southern voter would be free to vote the Republican ticket if he wished to, but in order to persuade those who might not be willing to do that, I suggest the possibility of special nominations within the Southern States. Each State could cooperate with the alliance in conformity with its own laws and conditions.

This amalgamated party would need a name, and since I began talking about it I have received many letters suggesting names, such as American Party, National Party, Independence Party, Democratic-Republican

Alliance, or Republican-Democratic Alliance, Freedom Party, Liberal Party, and a few others.

It is interesting that not one of the scores of persons who have suggested names has wanted to call it the Conservative Party, and several have urged that the word "conservative" not be used. Unfortunately, in American politics that good word has become a sort of smear, an indication of "old-fogysm," looking backward, and the like. This is a pity, for what I am proposing is, in effect, a conservative party, to match strength with the radical party that now runs things. I am certain that if this alliance party gets going, the Democrats will do their best to hang the word "conservative" around our necks; and I am equally as certain that we can hang the word "radical" around theirs. The word "radical" smells much worse than "conservative."

THE CHAIRMANSHIP'S PROBLEM

When I first began sowing the seeds for the alliance between Republicans and the South, some of my colleagues in Congress said that such a party, if successful, would play havoc with committee chairmanships in the Senate and House, many of which are now held by southern Democrats. But I do not see this as a serious problem. The existing seniority rule could be followed for all Senators and Representatives, whether Democrats or Republicans, who come from States that gave their electoral votes to this alliance ticket.

This means that Senator GEORGE, for example, would remain chairman of the Finance Committee if Georgia voted the alliance ticket.

My earnestness in this ambitious enterprise and the earnestness of others is demonstrated by the fact that I am now working to form a National Bipartisan Committee on Realignment, or something like that, to make a preliminary study of the ways and means to get this idea going. A State-by-State study of election laws might be wise, if not necessary, so that we can make our fight intelligently and legally in every State. I hope we soon may be able to raise at least \$50,000 to finance this study, to be printed as a brochure before convention time next year, and to be used as a sort of handbook of procedure.

Since I became deeply interested in this plan, I have studied the situation in Great Britain, and find that if all the voters who opposed the Labor-Socialist outfit had concentrated on one opposing party, the Laborites would not have won. So, to some extent anyway, Britain went Socialist because the opposition was not united, but was split between Conservatives and Liberals. I am trying and hoping to develop a political formula whereby we may prevent a similar development in the United States by making it possible for all the opponents of the socialized nation to unite. This can be done. It should be done. But it can't be done without Dixie. The key to America's political future is in the South.

Our Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted me, I should like to insert in the RECORD the following tribute to the State of Ohio, written

by Daniel Francis Clancy, of Springfield, Ohio.

Mr. Clancy is the only man except the late Ernie Pyle to win two consecutive National Headliner Club awards for outstanding achievements in journalism. A newspaperman in Indiana and Ohio for the past 10 years, he has also written tributes to three other States: Indiana, Kentucky, and Louisiana. His *It's Indiana* has been described as "already having taken its place among the historic hymns of homage to Hoosierdom." He is a member of the Indiana Society of Chicago and of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. Two of his editorial sketches were reprinted by papers over the Nation during 1949 National Newspaper Week.

OUR OHIO

(Sesquicentennial sketch for 1953)

Beautiful Ohio, commonwealth of corn, cattle, and wheat, fertile farms, industrial initiative, and political power. State stretching from wind-lashed Lake Erie to the moon-silvered shores of the Ohio River. Home of Presidents, the Harrisons, Hayes and Harding, Grant and Garfield, McKinley and Taft. Railroads rumbling across Indian paths of the past. Cleveland, center for steel and ore, Akron, rubber capital of the world; Cincinnati and sidewheelers. Cars converged around country churches on sunny Sunday mornings. Green-flagged fields of waving corn. Autumns with the OSU band blaring on the giddidon, and hushed harvest fields stretching away into a saffron setting sun. Birthplace of the airplane and electric light. State that produced the Wright brothers and Artemus Ward, Tom Edison and Clark Gable, Mark Hanna and Sherwood Anderson, Paul Dunbar and "Hell 'n Maria" Dawes. Boys with books and girls in gingham who grow into fine fathers and mellow mothers. Spring in Springfield, summer in Sandusky, autumn in Ashtabula, and winter in Wapakoneta. Annie Oakley and O O McIntyre. Cash registers and Coxey's army. Where pioneer scouts watched Indian canoes glide down blue-green curving streams; "hi" in the middle and round on the ends. The Buckeye State. Ohio and home.

Are We Losing Friends Abroad?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Are We Losing Friends Abroad?" delivered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] on July 25, 1951, at the third annual Colgate Foreign Policy Conference at Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARE WE LOSING FRIENDS ABROAD?

The answer I have for that question is very clear and very human. It is, "No—but—." This answer is not mine. It has come to me in seven languages from 17 countries in the free world, and from more

than 40 people. About half of these are native citizens of the countries from which they write, and the other half are from Americans living and working in these countries. None of my correspondents is a politician or is connected with a government—ours or any other—and none is a journalist. They include, among others, an emeritus university professor, several lawyers, some men in business—large and small, one man in his country's labor movement, several clerks, and two housewives. Except for three of the Americans and one Belgian, I have never met any of them personally.

In making my request for their opinions, I quoted the phrase which is the title of my assignment—"Are we losing friends abroad?"—and at the beginning it is interesting to observe that this phrase created an almost universal reaction of resentment. They were disturbed to think that the citizens of the United States could have any such idea.

My report to you is a rather hurried classification and an analysis of these replies, and this creates obvious limitations. I myself am a limitation. I have never been abroad. Then there is a limitation of time, measured both as the time available for a Senator to study these letters in the middle of a strenuous session, and the 28-minute limit to this presentation. Then, too, I recognize that my sampling is small and that it stretches very thin over many countries, and that my correspondents, not knowing how their letters might be used, have probably been very cautious. I tried to meet this contingency with the promise that their anonymity would be religiously preserved.

With my reading, other limitations began to appear, and I think they are worth mentioning. First, neither the question nor the answers have any meaning so far as the members and supporters of communism are concerned. These are not our friends, and so long as the present Russian-American relations continue, will actually work against us. The second limitation grows out of the fact that the answers to our question have both short-term and long-run implications. I am eliminating references to the short-term implications because these are apt to fluctuate violently in response to events, to statements by Government leaders, both official and unofficial, and to reports and editorials in the press. Then, too, politicians on either side often find it of current political advantage to work violently for or against friendship. Since such changes disappear almost as rapidly as they occur, I am sure we can ignore them and concern ourselves only with the more fundamental aspects.

From this angle let me repeat that I believe we are not losing friends abroad. This is the underlying theme of all the letters I have received, but nearly every one of my correspondents immediately qualifies his affirmative statement.

My reaction to these letters could be described thus: There is a strong cable of friendship that has been slowly woven over the years which ties us to all other free nations. Into it have gone the strands of family kinship, of a common love for liberty, of understanding, and of gratitude. To this has been added lately the steel wire of material self-interest.

This cable is strong, firmly anchored in the past, and appears capable of sustaining friendship into the foreseeable future. No one expects it to break, but we and they are constantly putting strains on it. It is of these strains that my correspondents write, hoping, of course, that through better understanding they may be eliminated.

Let us talk first of the strands that went into the weaving of this cable. An analysis of the letters would indicate that there are many, five of which are probably the strongest and most important.

The first of these is the tie of family blood and nationality. From every one of these lands, particularly the old countries of Europe, immigrants have come to us in the United States, and family ties stretch back from all parts of our country to every country in Europe. As is usually the case, these ties mean more to the part of the family which stayed home, but I am sure every man in American politics realizes how important the homeland ties can be to national minorities here, too. These ties are kept strong by correspondence and by visits in both directions.

On the national scale, the strength of this tie of association is built on the memory of shared experiences in war and peace and is sustained and strengthened by the increasingly closer relations between men of common interests—vocational, philosophical, or commercial. The American engineer has a tie with the engineer in Belgium. The American exchange professors and students create a bond wherever they go. The relationship of seller and customer works both ways. So the tie of kinship and association, both personal and national, is resilient and real.

The second tie is philosophical, created by our mutual devotion to human liberty. For this reason my correspondents point out that, while our national customs may be different from theirs, their way of thinking and their pattern of living is much more nearly comparable to ours than to that of Russia or its satellites.

The third tie is that created by increased contact. The peoples of these nations are coming to an increasing understanding of American life. This is being achieved through all the obvious contacts. Tours and visits promote it. The demonstration of American industrial techniques, offered with unexpected liberality, helps to build it. The increased foreign circulation of American magazines and books broadens it. One correspondent from Brazil believes that the recent opening in that country of examples of the most modern American retail stores, filled with America's finest merchandise, has had a remarkably favorable effect.

The fourth bond might be described as the bond of gratitude. It grows directly out of our service at their side through the events of recent years—out of our participation in the wars which either saved their country from capture or, later, won its freedom—out of the Marshall plan—and out of our willingness to assume leadership in the world organization needed today to defend freedom. The selection of General Eisenhower was mentioned by many as a welcome symbol. But a few of the bolder writers remind us that there are evidences of our own ingratitude. They say we like to forget that there was a time when we needed and welcomed both military and financial help.

But finally, most of them guardedly admit that the consideration of practical benefits must be acknowledged as a binding force. Some of my more frank correspondents point out that our Marshall plan aid has been appreciated because it does represent material wealth—actual dollars—and that through it we are only sharing the benefits accruing to us because while their economies were devastated by war ours was untouched. One of the Americans who wrote me reminded me that "gratitude is often a lively sense of favors still to come."

From other letters it is evident that there are those, particularly in Europe, who realize that they are making a choice between two economic systems, of neither of which they completely approve. Some of the citizens of Europe's socialistic states mistrust both American capitalism and Russian communism, but, after weighing all the factors, prefer to work with us as the lesser of two evils. As time goes on and the pressures increase, the lines between these two alterna-

tives are more sharply drawn. While the groups which prefer us are growing in size, those who prefer Russia are growing in the intensity of their opposition to us.

The final observation in this field of practical self-interest is that, as some of these people remind us, they feel safe with us. Compared with Russia, we have a high degree of unselfish disinterestedness. We are not planning to take over either their country or their colonies.

These, then, are the threads and cords out of which the cable of friendship that binds us together has been woven. Kinship, common love of liberty, some understanding and gratitude, and the strength of material self-interest. Having described the cable, let us turn then to the consideration of the strains being put upon it which we must relieve if we are to hold and strengthen our friendships. I think it is natural that my correspondents should point out chiefly these strains and tensions for which they hold us and the United States responsible.

As I studied the letters, it became apparent immediately that the first group of problems, which are in the minds of nearly everyone that wrote me, are those that are fundamentally human in their natures. They are the national counterparts of those which could be expected to develop between any two men different in age, background, and traditional interests. This very quality suggests the obvious device that I shall use to describe the problem.

Let us imagine two men, one the symbol of ourselves in the United States, the other the personified symbol of all other nations out of which our people have come and for whose friendship we are now concerned. Our own symbolic counterpart we might call "Sam." Theirs must have a name, too, and I tried hard to think of one common to all nations. But I finally gave up and shall call him "Uncle."

In many ways the word "Uncle" describes this symbol rather well. He is older than "Sam." He stayed behind in the old family home and kept up the family customs and traditions. We in America would probably say he is of the old school. On the other hand, "Sam" pulled out early, came to the new world, and has done remarkably well. "Sam" is rich, smart in a practical way, modern, competent, and I'm afraid rather sure of himself.

Things have not been going too well with "Uncle" lately, and "Sam" has been going back to help whenever he was needed. Since he went back the last time, he stayed around.

Now so long as "Sam" and his "Uncle" only saw each other occasionally, with their party manners on, there were few personality problems. But now, as always when two people of widely different backgrounds and objectives must work together, they face a difficult period of adjustment to each other.

"Uncle" is the older of the two. He remembers the days of his youth and his strength and regrets the evil times which make him partially dependent. He cannot help but be reminded of the difference because "Sam" has moved in and is shouldering much of the responsibility, making many of the decisions and paying many of the bills.

Now that "Uncle" is seeing more of "Sam," he is deeply aware of the differences in their sense of values. He cherishes tradition. "Sam" is inclined to ignore it, this hurts. He recognizes in "Sam" many of the desirable qualities of youth—vigor, industry, courage, strength, and above all, generosity. He is profoundly grateful for what seems disinterested altruism. But he also sees that "Sam" has some of the weaknesses of youth. He finds him a little intolerant, a little too impatient, in many ways inexperienced and indifferent. "Sam" shows a tendency to go off "half cocked" sometimes, and this, coupled with his characteristic of driving straight to the point without going through

the motions required by protocol or tradition, often hurts "Uncle's" feelings.

When "Uncle" has one of his bad days, as we all do, he is apt to add to this list of shortcomings a lack of appreciation of beauty in the old things, a little too much commercialism, a tendency to show off his wealth and his power. When "Sam's" money bids prices up so "Uncle" can't buy or makes a deal that "Uncle" hoped to have money enough to make for himself, you can't blame him for a little twinge of jealousy. These human differences create tensions that in themselves seem unimportant. But among nations, as between individuals, it is the differences in the point of view and the personality clashes, the fancied slights, that set off the fireworks and make the headlines. Our only hope is that no one will get so involved in questions of prestige and "face" that retreat to understanding will be impossible.

Fortunately, all believe that the strength of this relationship is secure, that Sam and Uncle will stand together, that they will forgive each other, and as the new relationship matures, will find the power to reduce these tensions to insignificance, though they probably never will completely disappear. At the moment, then, they counsel that there is great need for patience, understanding, and consideration on the part of all of us in the United States, for whom Sam has been the symbol in my little fable.

Leaving that allegory, let us turn to the second and most important field of criticism—our foreign policy. Here the comments become pointed and often charged with emotion. They fall into two distinct areas. The first grows out of our relations with Russia during and immediately after the war. The second is described as our Government's policy of anticolonialism.

These phases of our relations with Russia seem to disturb our friends most. First, we helped Russia, both during the war and after, with arms, supplies, and materials for production through lend-lease. The people near the Russian border feel this most. The people of Finland have always admired us, today they still trust us and forgive us though they cannot forget that we failed them in their time of crisis. The second criticism comes from France and the Low Countries. It is that after the war, we were solely responsible for letting the Russians into the heart of Europe so that today their outposts are far west of their previous frontiers. One Frenchman notes that the Russians are only 150 miles from Paris. One Austrian complains that though we were in Vienna first, we have now allowed the Russians to take over their most fertile lands. Of the two occupations, they preferred the German rule.

Third, our sudden concern today about the defense of Europe, contrasted with our lack of concern at the end of the war, makes them a little cynical. The fact that we let the Russians in and then pulled out ourselves, leaving their nations without effective defense, gives them justification for the belief that our foreign policy is unstable, that it blows hot and cold. After they have lived literally within the reach of the Communists for 6 years, they are surprised that we take for indifference their inability to whip up new emotions for our sudden concern. They wonder if our concern now is not more for our own safety than theirs.

Looking back at our relations with Russia during and after the past World War, there are, apparently, still many in Europe who feel that our foreign policy must have been influenced by the Kremlin, either directly or without our knowing it. The latter seems to them, in some ways, to have been the more serious possibility. They believe that we have been stupidly taken in. One writer says that he believes we deserve the war in

Korea; it may teach us a good and needed lesson and be worth all our losses if our eyes, at least, have been opened. The phrase "anticolonialism" describes the second foreign policy question that, apparently, is exerting a strain on our mutual friendship. All European nations with colonies are aware of it, but it is most real for the Dutch and French, who are now facing the threat of communism in their East India colonies. All who wrote me on this subject express the belief that it is part of the basic American foreign policy to expect the European countries to give up their colonies. They see in this an expression of warped attitude. Because it is our own policy to have no part, as a nation, in a colonial empire, they feel that we cannot fairly impose this same point of view on any other nation.

One writer indicated that he thinks we are making a misinterpretation of our own history. Because as a colony we won our independence from Great Britain in the eighteenth century, he believes we regard similar revolutions as desirable and proper wherever they may occur. But he points out there is no similarity between the American Revolution and the present situations. The American colonists were Englishmen, by any standard peers of their fellows in the mother country. Our revolution produced a division among equals, and after the war the successful rebels actually demonstrated that they were the ablest architects and exponents of self-government in all the world. On the other hand, European colonial territories are peopled by races without a tradition or experiences of freedom. Admitting their past mistakes, my friends plead that in later years their countries have made rapid progress in health, education, social advancement, and political skill of the people under their rule. But they insist that no native nation in the Far East is ready for self-government, and they take a little wry delight in reminding us that after 50 years of unselfish effort, marked by the lavish expenditure of money, our own much-heralded experiment in granting freedom to the Philippines has not, from where they sit, been an unqualified success. They remind us that in spite of all the warnings we had about the infiltration of Communists in the Philippines, and all our efforts to support the elected government there, the Communists have, apparently, grown stronger and the government weaker since we left there.

They are surprised and disappointed that our leaders could not see this danger. During the thirties, communism was successfully planted in China, ready to exploit every opening. Their chance came when a vacuum was inevitably created by World War II—first by the Japanese victory which drove the European governments out of their East Indian colonies and by the later Japanese defeat. Far from sensing and blocking Communist plans, we actually aided their success. One Frenchman pointed out that our foreign-policy makers created in Indochina a situation identical to that in Korea when we allowed the Chinese instead of the French to take the Japanese surrender at the eighteenth parallel, just as we allowed the Russians to enter the war and take the Japanese surrender in Korea at the thirty-eighth parallel.

They feel that we did this in part, at least, because of this policy of anticolonialism. They say that, when natives in colonial territories talk of freedom and self government, we accept their representations at face value, but, say the French, we are apparently too naive and inexperienced to see that these supposed indigenous movements are at once the mask for communism and its tool. They hope that Korea will have opened our eyes and changed our policy—a policy which one Frenchman with a North African background calls unjust, inconsistent, and built on an almost criminal lack of understanding. It

is interesting to observe that, while many Americans have felt that in the fight against communism in Europe was much more important in Asia, some of the difficulties in Europe lead us right back to mistakes in Asia.

From a Dutch letter I got my most disturbing implication. One correspondent says bitterly that many people in the Netherlands believed that, as a quid pro quo for the Marshall plan aid to Holland, their government had to agree to the eventual surrender of its East Indian colonies.

These are some of the highlights of what my more than 40 correspondents have said in answer to your query, "Are we losing friends abroad?" Let me summarize and make a personal observation as I conclude. We are not losing friends abroad. Whatever our difficulties, we are drawn together by ties of kinship, association, and mutual interests. Though we occupy a position in the world today that many European nations have occupied in their turn at some point in history, they recognize that we have the money, the military might, and the leadership the free world needs. Our greatest weakness, apparently, is our inability to measure up to the responsibility of leadership. Apparently we do not yet appreciate the implication of the old motto, "Noblesse oblige." Instead, to draw on a typical American experience, we may be said to resemble the rich boy who owns the baseball, the gloves, and the bat. The other kids want to play, but if there is to be a game at all, they know they had better be nice to us because we can always take our stuff and go home.

In the Russian pattern of life the commissar has no obligation to concern himself with or consider the interest or welfare of any man or nation below his own level. But in our American definition of leadership in liberty, there is an implied responsibility for understanding—and true understanding is a two-way street. There is a challenge in the statement of an Argentine youth who quotes his father as saying, "I admire the American, but I do not love him."

Apparently our greatest official failure in the State Department and on the part of its representatives in foreign service lies in this area of understanding. While the Communists seem to be able to get down to the people and capture the minds of millions, with all of our programs and all our money we still have not reached the hearts of the people because we apparently are not willing to make the effort to understand their needs, traditions, and problems. I am sure we can beat Russia in the field of physical combat, but we are not doing so well in the battles for acceptance in the minds and hearts of men. The people of our own country, on a commercial level, are the greatest salesmen in the world. Although the oft-quoted statement, "The customer is always right," may be an exaggeration, it suggests a point of view which we seem to have been unable to apply in our foreign relations.

I shall close with a quotation from one of the letters I received. It came from Sao Paulo in Brazil. It is written in Portuguese, and the translation isn't mine:

"The United States does not under any circumstances wish to see her own mistakes, but is always trying to meddle in the affairs of others, always trying to see what is wrong with her equals. It is always disagreeable to see that in spite of continuing to preach that all of us are free, equal, and sons of the same God, that all of us have the same rights, and that all should be left to live according to our conscience without the interference of anyone, it is her manifest attitude to meddle, if not openly, at least under cover, not only in the international affairs which do not concern her but often in the internal affairs of her sister nations. We are much concerned over the fact that the North American government, having won the

war, cannot strengthen the peace. The United States does not know how to treat her old friends; even worse, she does not know how to keep those who should still be able to trust her government, since, as the leader and most powerful representative of the free nations, she should be the model for all of us."

Are we losing friends abroad?

The answer is "No," but neither are we making much progress in building new ones. The ties of association and self-interest seem to be strong enough to carry our friendship through the threat of the enemy to our common freedom. But we are putting many strains upon it—strains which we, with the opportunity for leadership, must seek to remove.

Our greatest difficulties arise out of the fact that we seem to have been unwilling to make the effort to understand the peoples we seek to help. In our anxiety to have them understand us we have probably forgotten that true understanding is a two-way street. This is not an insurmountable task if we undertake it immediately and with the characteristic vigor which our European friends admire.

Helping the Disabled Is Good Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, we have failed to recognize the need for remedial legislation as well as governmental programs making full use of the services of the disabled and physically handicapped of our Nation. There are thousands of these individuals who are worthy, industrious, and patriotic citizens, who, under existing regimes, are unable to secure the employment which they are fully qualified to perform. In many cases their qualifications are even higher with respect to some specialized activities than are those of the physically able.

I include as part of these remarks an article by Paul A. Strachan appearing in the Washington Post of July 29 discussing this timely problem which I hope will secure favorable consideration:

HELPING DISABLED IS GOOD BUSINESS

(By Paul A. Strachan, president, American Federation of the Physically Handicapped)

Too many persons know too little about the movement to aid the physically handicapped in this country.

Vocational rehabilitation—man's retraining to skills within his capacity—is as old as the caveman's first concern for a crippled brother. Vocational rehabilitation as good business, however, is relatively new.

It had its beginnings in America during World War I, when a public demand developed for the Federal Government to set up a vocational-training program. Concern then was principally for disabled veterans.

Leading the fight was Arthur S. Holder, with the help of the A. F. of L. A national vice president of the International Association of Machinists and a representative of the A. F. of L.'s powerful Metal Trades Department, Holder knew when to act.

"We must put this over during this war while people's minds are on the honors of disablement," he insisted.

At that time there were groups which saw in vocational rehabilitation the seeds of revolution, if not the complete dissolution of our Republic. It would have been easier then, with their vociferous support, to have started a euthanasia league to kill off the cripples.

The beginnings were called "pilot programs," and their fumbblings and inefficiencies can be traced partly to inadequacies of the act itself. The Federal Board for Vocational Education started out as little more than a recommending agency.

Then the work of the Board was merged with that of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance (now Veterans' Administration), and the VA unquestionably has been the real force behind the development of rehabilitation of the physically handicapped.

With crippled veterans of the Marne and Belleau Woods as material, a working program was developed. Much of that early day work was done at St. Elizabeths Hospital, because there were no VA hospitals or facilities.

America's real pioneer in vocational rehabilitation, the late Dr. Ira D. Scott, was an official of the Board for Vocational Education. When the Board was absorbed by VA, he went along.

For some 20 years after the Federal Board for Vocational Education lapsed into a non-entity, rehabilitation slumbered as a minor division of the Interior Department's Office of Education. The leaders of the program boasted that "only 22 men did all the work for the whole United States," an astonishing statement when you consider that there are millions of handicapped, and that their problems are greatly varied. If the handicapped had had adequate attention, it would have taken thousands of trained specialists.

Necessity eventually caught up with these "experts." World War II found them totally unprepared. The present rehabilitation program dates from the passage of the Barden-LaPollette bill in July, 1943, although there are grave faults in that act.

One of these is its dog-chasing-his-tail feature. A handicapped person can go to a State rehabilitation service and be told that if he can locate a job, the service will give him the necessary treatment and training. So he applies for a job and is told by industry that if he is rehabilitated, then he will be given a job.

Rehabilitation had never been sold to the public, and handicapped persons were still looked upon with aversion and distrust by potential employers. This writer set out to change that thinking in September, 1940.

Nearly 5 years of campaigning resulted in the institution, in 1945, of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. There now have been six such annual weeks. During these periods, through the Federal and State employment services, 160,646 handicapped persons have been placed.

It is estimated conservatively that more than 350,000 other handicapped have been put to work through the movement since 1945.

Obviously, the program has paid for itself. These handicapped workers have received an estimated \$750,000,000 in salaries and wages and have paid taxes of \$160,000,000.

Still the need for rehabilitation is staggering. Probably one out of every five persons, or about 30,000,000 of our population today, is physically handicapped. Of this number, between 5,000,000 and 7,000,000 are severely disabled, including about 3,000,000 who are beyond rehabilitation. That leaves possibly 4,000,000 who could be treated and trained for work which would pay all or part of their way.

It is astonishing but true that there is no one place in the country where a handicapped person can be treated medically or surgically

or therapeutically; be given vocational guidance and counseling; be provided with the necessary education and training, and then be placed in a suitable job.

The Federal Government should take the lead. A start could be made by regrouping the 35 Federal agencies which now deal with the handicapped problem. They are scattered everywhere.

What can be done to develop an effective rehabilitation program, one based on the concept that rehabilitation isn't worth a tinker's dam unless it ends with a job? Congress has a way before it now, in a bill to establish a Federal agency for the handicapped. Its salient features include:

1. Provisions for maximum extension of medical services, vocational guidance and counseling, education and training or retraining, and full employment opportunities to citizens handicapped by physical or mental disabilities.

2. Effective coordination of Federal functions relating to rehabilitation and employment of the handicapped.

3. Establishment of an independent Federal Agency for the Handicapped, operated for housekeeping purposes, in the Labor Department.

4. The setting up of an Office of Services for the Blind within the agency, to coordinate the numerous agencies now aiding the blind.

5. Provisions for special programs for the severely handicapped, including sheltered workshops.

6. Establishment of Cooperative Enterprises for the Handicapped, with an initial appropriation of \$10,000,000.

7. Establishment of 20 rehabilitation centers for the handicapped.

8. Provision for \$60-a-month financial grants to those too severely handicapped to be rehabilitated.

9. The setting up of a \$10,000,000 Handicapped Revolving Loan Fund, from which States could borrow when their own funds are exhausted.

10. Provisions for special grants to handicapped persons who require home training.

11. Establishment of an advisory council on affairs of the handicapped, comprising three representatives for employees, three physically handicapped persons, three representing farmers and stock raisers and three experienced in the arts and sciences, or public affairs.

The Lead Miner and the Present Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMER H. BUDGE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by Felix Edgar Wormser, secretary, Emergency Lead Committee, and vice president, St. Joseph Lead Co., before the Idaho Mining Association at Sun Valley, Idaho, July 10, 1951.

Mr. Wormser not only pays well-deserved tribute to the mining industry of the State of Idaho, but skillfully develops the problems facing the future of the mining industry. The questions raised in regard to the advisability of maintaining a reasonable tariff on lead, keeping an open market, eliminating the

inequities under price control as presently set up, and keeping government out of the mining business are worthy of serious consideration by every Member of Congress.

The problems discussed concern one of the basic industries of our Nation. If these problems pertaining to the production of lead are left unsolved and unanswered the whole Nation will suffer. Mr. Wormser points out that foreign lead is being bought at about 23 cents per pound in the United States and at 26 cents in Europe while the ceiling price established by the Government is 17 cents.

THE LEAD MINER AND THE PRESENT EMERGENCY

It isn't only the potato that has made Idaho famous. There is, for example, the little-known fact that Idaho, since 1944, has become the most important zinc-producing State in the Union, and that for many years it has been the principal silver-producing State. Last, but not least, Idaho holds second place as a lead-mining State. This is a most impressive record. But I didn't come all the way out here to Idaho to help out the local chamber of commerce. Rather, I want to salute the mining men of your association, who are so willing to help in any common effort to better the mining industry. One of your most distinguished citizens, J. B. (Barney) Haffner, of Kellogg, is, as you know, the chairman of the Emergency Lead Committee which did so much active work in Washington on the lead tariff, with particular attention to the impact of currency devaluation on lead mining in the United States. I am sure it was through the efforts of many of you in this room that your great State adopted a strong resolution condemning currency devaluation and memorializing Congress on the subject.

Indeed, I know of no more important subject facing the world today than a return to honest money throughout the world—a return to the gold standard, but I haven't time this morning to discuss gold with you, as I want to touch upon the immediate problems facing us all in still another emergency—the rearmament emergency. But before I do, let me report to you that the work of the Emergency Lead Committee was a splendid example of the results that can be achieved when we pull together. The Emergency Lead Committee's detailed and unchallenged analysis of the adverse effect of foreign-currency devaluation on the competitive position of the lead miner in the United States is now history. Our study was brought to the attention of the Senate Finance Committee and will be found as part of the recent hearings in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951. At those hearings the State Department took the position that anyone allegedly injured by currency devaluation should seek relief through the provisions of the escape clause in trade agreements. We requested protection against the effect of monetary manipulation.

Apparently, rather than risk complications with the International Monetary Fund, by specific reference to currency devaluation, Congress liberalized the Trade Agreements Act, and especially the escape-clause provisions, so that should devaluation of currencies or other injurious action again occur, the likelihood of relief is considerably increased.

For the time being, while lead is subjected to price ceilings below the world market, the tariff becomes of secondary importance, but from a long-range point of view, the lead tariff is a most useful incentive and will be necessary as long as we have a protected economy in the United States.

There is a movement under way to suspend the lead tariff, as has already been done in copper. If the suspension is coupled with the proviso that the tariff is to be restored should the lead price drop below the ceiling, the miner need have no fear of the consequences. Suspending the lead tariff will be of little assistance to consumers so long as the foreign price of lead is well above the domestic ceiling. Foreign consumers can easily outbid the American manufacturer. Before closing these brief comments on the lead tariff, I should like to remark that the lead tariff today is the same as it was a year ago, or when the Emergency Lead Committee was organized.

Ever since the fateful year of 1914, with the exception, perhaps, of 2 or 3 years, we have had one national emergency after another—two world wars, the longest depression in our history, and now a new species of emergency rearmament. The Emergency Lead Committee was well named. What a tragic era. We pass from one emergency to another with such rapidity that the senses become somewhat dulled. It is sad to contemplate, but we will probably be living in emergency periods for the rest of our lives. Let us, therefore, try to analyze the latest emergency, to see how it differs from others.

Ostensibly the country is arming to meet the menace of communism. The present defense emergency differs sharply from a war emergency, in that (1) world trade is being carried on vigorously—and I might even say normally. The economic or living standards of country after country are being gradually raised. (2) There is no wartime destruction of factories and homes, but casualties are being suffered in the Korean conflagration—largely by the United States. (3) There is only a modest diversion of manpower from farm and home to the Armed Forces, and only a relatively small diversion of materials specifically to arms production. (4) The monetary or fiscal burden is vastly smaller for direct military expenditures. Nonmilitary expenditures are at a continuing high rate.

The distinction between the rearmament emergency and a war emergency is important, because many Government controls willingly tolerated and necessary in wartime are inadvisable and indeed unworkable in peacetime. They are difficult to enforce on a free people and are often so poorly administered that they become deeply resented. Our neighbor to the north, Canada, has publicly recognized this principle and does not have the controls on prices and allocations we have adopted. On the other hand, our Government is proceeding under the assumption that ever more stringent controls are needed, but the reason given now is not so much the need of accommodating the requirements of the defense program for materials, as it is the fear of inflation.

Inflation is now the bugaboo. As the rearmament program requires only a small part of our domestic production, one might expect that the best policy would be for the Government to make certain that any rearmament program is adequately served with men and materials, that it is given the priority it deserves, leaving the rest of the economy to its own resources. On the contrary, depending upon the action of Congress and the manner in which the emergency program is shaping, we may anticipate that controls may penetrate further in every direction to make an ever tighter strait-jacket for our economy, all allegedly to curb inflation.

And while our own Government departs more and more from a free enterprise economy, other countries, competitive lead producers, are significantly surprisingly loath to imitate us. I have already referred to Canada, but Mexico, Peru, and Australia should be added to the list. It is true that some of these countries have already suffered an extraordinary amount of government inter-

vention in their own internal affairs, but in sharp contrast today we see them preserving the precious freedom of an open market for the lead and zinc they export, comprising the major part of their output. Any internal price control of these countries would affect only a small part of their lead and zinc sales.

The most important control of all those exerted by our Government is price control. So let us try to examine dispassionately what price control is doing, and may do, to the mining industry in Idaho and elsewhere. Price control has been instituted by Congress to curb inflation. Yet it ought to be easy to draw upon the experience of history to tell us whether or not Government price control is effective. It has been tried many times in the past. One of the worst things we can do is to deceive ourselves, and yet, price control is not only deceptive, but misleading in operation.

The Foundation for Economic Education, a scholarly group of the highest standing, states that price control to control inflation is shown to be "economic quackery." The best informed and wisest students of the subject will agree with that point of view. The foundation has this to say in an analysis of inflation: "Not only do Government-controlled prices lie, but the process also rapidly promotes dishonesty among all groups—merchants, producers, consumers, Government employees, everybody. . . . The shortages that result from price and wage controls are purely a legal creation, created by the price-control law and nothing else. . . . In an otherwise free economy the success of any price-control law can be measured by the extent of the shortage it creates or the decline in production which it causes."

Inflation is cruel. No one can rightfully object to inflation control, but as it is the Government itself which creates inflation it is the Government itself which must and can correct it through proper taxes, credit controls, and curtailment of its own expenditures, which is bitter political medicine.

I had occasion recently to examine the items which enter into the cost-of-living index so commonly used today in adjustment of labor rates and in measuring the extent of inflation. The index is prepared from an average of 192 items comprising goods and services. Broadly speaking, they are food, wearing apparel, rent, fuel and electricity, house furnishings, and a few such items as transportation, medical care, recreation, and household operation. Only a cursory inspection of the list shows that the consumption of lead and zinc by Americans in their everyday occupations plays an exceedingly minor part in the cost of living index. Wide fluctuations in the prices of nonferrous metals cannot begin to compare, in their impact upon the cost of living, with wide price fluctuations in foodstuffs, or the clothes we wear, or the rent we pay. That is fundamentally the reason why the Government can afford to be liberal in the treatment it accords the ceiling prices of metals, and yet they are currently under rigid controls, whereas agricultural products and other items entering more prominently into the cost of living have only a slight check rein placed upon them.

Now let us see what price control is doing in lead. Since the first of this year, the ceiling price of lead under the general freeze order of the OPS has been 17 cents per pound New York. By comparison, lead sold at 21.50 cents per pound New York during the latter part of 1948, and the first few months of 1949. The world market today is 21 cents and over, and if you ask me what constitutes the world market, in the face of the controlled economies existing in various parts of the world, I would say it is the price at which lead is being sold by competitive producing countries, Australia, Canada, Mexico, Peru,

and others. Information on these transactions, as published by the press, states that foreign lead is being bought at above 23 cents per pound in the United States, and at 26 cents in Europe. Suffice it to say that the lead produced in Idaho and elsewhere in the United States is now comparatively cheap lead. The ceiling price of 17 cents established by the Government is far below that of other countries paying wages a fraction of our own.

The result of this simple situation is that a great many American lead consumers are being deprived of imported metal they need just now for conversion into various manufactured products. (Ceiling price controls on many manufactured lead products preclude purchases of higher priced foreign lead for importation into the United States.) Imports have therefore declined sharply. For the first 4 months of 1951, 72,000 tons of lead in all forms were imported into the United States, compared with 140,000 tons for the same period in 1950. I would not be surprised to see the imports of lead for this year, unless controls are modified, drop from the high of 550,000 tons in 1950 to perhaps, and this is a guess, 250,000 tons. This will create a hardship for many users. Domestic mine production in 1951 will probably be about 400,000 tons. Lead from scrap may also amount to 400,000 tons, but the reduced imports will pinch consumers.

Obviously, it is not the tariff which is preventing the importation of lead, but the great disparity between foreign prices and the ceiling here, which consequently diverts lead to Europe. Currently, a few users of lead are willing and able to pay 21½ cents or more for the lead they require, and they are buying it from Mexico, Canada, Australia, and elsewhere. The lead miner in Idaho, especially the lead miner with marginal operations, may well ask himself, How come? Why shouldn't the same consumer be allowed to buy lead from him in Idaho at 21 cents rather than from a competitor in Mexico paying a fraction of his wages? Why isn't Idaho's lead just as valuable and good as the Mexican? Why should the domestic consumer be subsidized at the expense of the Idaho miner? Why shouldn't ceiling prices be uniform for all classes of lead, domestic, foreign, and scrap, if we are to have ceiling prices?

Many inequities have grown up under our emergency control in its toleration of multiple prices for identical items. Grave discrimination has occurred which affects the moderate-sized and small miner and small user, far more than it does the larger companies.

It is not only during the rearmament period that the United States needs huge tonnages of lead, currently averaging about 10,000 tons per month or 1,200,000 per year. We can predict with considerable assurance that the industrial economy of the United States is on a plateau far higher than it was 10 years ago, by reason of population growth, and that we may anticipate a consumption of close to a million tons of lead per year for our normal requirements, except for depression periods. With the steady growth in population, not only in the United States, but all over the world, requirements for nonferrous-metal production will increase. Consequently, it would appear to be sound public policy to encourage prospecting, exploration and development of as many new mines as can possibly be found, if the future is not to disclose a serious deficiency in metal production. The National Minerals Advisory Council has given serious consideration of long-range policies which the Government might advocate to increase lead production, and has recommended revision of our tax laws affecting mining, as well as suggesting realistic periodic revision of price ceilings during the emergency. So far, nothing has come of this sound advice.

Without price controls, the lead market would undoubtedly be more attractive to the prospector and small-mine owner than any market we have had since 1948, but the lead miner is being put in a peculiar position. He is being told, in effect, by his Government, "You shall receive and accept no more than 17 cents for your lead, despite the fact that your Mexican neighbors can get 20.5 cents, or any price they choose in the world market; and you may not export your lead, either." Obviously, when the price of a commodity is established by Government compulsion at a level below the world market, there is an aspect of confiscation involved, which the small miner might quite properly resent, especially if he does not ask the Government to step in and help him when metal prices are at panic or distress levels.

One of the consequences of the unrealistic ceiling price on lead will probably be a retarding of the development of our own still large native resources. Of course, Government may well contend that raising ceiling prices gives the large and efficient corporation unparalleled profits, and so it does. When, however, you consider the fact that an excess-profits tax is in existence, and that the Government desperately needs large revenue from taxes, and that a period of high prices gives an opportunity for mining companies to dip into marginal ore reserves that would otherwise be noncommercial and thereby mine in the highest interests of conservation, then you must conclude that there are benefits to be derived from high prices as well as disadvantages.

As controls grow, the Government is veering more and more toward converting price control into profit control. Some ceilings are specially based upon a yardstick of 85 percent of the profits in a base period, 1946-49. When we touch profits, we touch the heart of the American free-enterprise economy. Disturb profits and you disturb incentives. Give the Government the right to control profits and you are well on your way to a socialistic economy. I wish there were time to expound on this fascinating subject. If you are going to control profits in mining, then you have to control the grade of the ore mined, wages paid, salaries paid and other elements entering the cost of doing business.

Many Americans are apologetic about the American system of free enterprise and our profit economy. I think we ought to stand four square in defending. Nothing in the world comparable to the American profit or incentive economy has ever shown greater results in elevating the standard of living of people. Profits are nothing to be ashamed of in our free economy—they regulate themselves. They are the crux of our capitalistic economy. There ought to be more apostles of capitalism. I am driven to this conclusion by observations on my first trip to Europe a few months ago, when I saw for myself how people live in those countries under different economic systems, and how much lower their own standards of living are than ours, despite their much vaunted social legislation, or shall I say, socialistic legislation.

All I am trying to point out in these brief comments of mine are my firm conviction that we ought to do everything we can to defend and advocate free markets, and to resist unnecessary Government intervention into our business. I am reminded of the warning, or words of advice, given me by one of Idaho's greatest statesmen, Senator William E. Borah. I used to call on the Senator periodically in Washington, and I remember that during the depths of the depression in the thirties, I discussed with him a plan of Government aid which might help cure the unemployment in the lead- and zinc-mining industry. He told me at that time that although the plan might be economically feasible, he agreed that even if we were successful in persuading Congress

to go along, the Government price tag attached would not be worth the effort. I have never forgotten his wise words. I think we can handle our difficulties in any emergency, short of war, individually. War is the only exception I make.

Once a nation embarks on the use of controls, or government planning, there is no limit to its field of operations, for it soon finds that the first control imposed will generally not work, and other controls have to be added, until the economy is saturated with them. That is what is happening in lead. Look at the sequence of events: (1) A ceiling price is established—the price proves too low to attract necessary imports, (2) imports are drastically curtailed; (3) domestic users, with minor exceptions, are unable to import the tonnages they require, (4) shortages are artificially created, inviting partial government allocation at first, and ultimately inviting complete allocation, with end-use controls. This may be good politics, but it is poor economics.

Picture the amount of Government supervision and paper work necessary to make this machine function, not only in lead, but in other articles. Do you think it is worth it? Already discrimination is beginning to appear. Just recently one segment of the lead-consuming industry was favored with mandatory allocations of lead at the expense of other claimant industries. This is just the beginning of more and more discrimination, which is inevitable, as Government officials charged with the administration of the controls vainly attempt to answer questions that a free market would automatically supply. We must not be too critical of those who administer the controls. They are undoubtedly doing the best they can. The trouble is with the law which makes such controls possible, and which divides the controls among a multiplicity of agencies, all of whom have to be consulted before definite action can be taken.

You may have read of the formation in recent months of an international materials conference, another international organization, this one with the objective of a more equitable distribution of the scarce materials of the world among the consuming nations, meaning, I take it, that the United States has been absorbing more than its share and depriving other countries of the metal they need. This premise is highly debatable, and today it is invalid for many metals, because foreign countries are very wisely reluctant—or coy—to establish ceiling prices on a level with our own. In fact, many countries haven't any ceiling prices. They therefore only need go into the world market and purchase lead and zinc from South America, Australia, and elsewhere, which we need, at prices just a bit higher than our own ceiling prices.

It seems to me that representatives from foreign countries on the International Materials Conference Commodity Committees can have things more or less their own way if they will counsel their own governments to refrain from establishing ceiling prices, or if, when they establish them, they do so at a rate above our own. Then they can have all the lead and zinc they can buy, particularly if we, through Marshall-plan aid or other governmental assistance, provide some of the funds to help them do so. The International Materials Conference has also recently been discussing the possibility of world-wide end-use controls. The mind staggers at the vast national and international bureaucracy that is growing up under the cloak of rearmament and to control inflation. Maybe all this is necessary, but I doubt it.

The Government has not, of course, been oblivious to the predicament of the lead consumer who, because of price and profit controls, as I have indicated, is unable to import the lead he needs to supplement that available from domestic mine and scrap pro-

duction. It is reported that the Government is now considering entering the world market to buy lead at above ceiling prices and resell it to domestic consumers at a loss, to protect the ceiling it has established. Such a program would, in effect, subsidize the foreign producer and the domestic consumer. The American lead miner may be pardoned for feeling that such an arrangement is manifestly inequitable in subsidizing foreign competitors paying low wages.

If it is the intention of the Government to purchase foreign lead at higher than ceiling prices, then it seems to me that the Government should either be prepared (1) to buy lead from producers in Idaho and elsewhere at the same price, or (2) to pay the Idaho miners the difference between the price it is willing to buy foreign lead and the domestic ceiling, or (3) it can raise the domestic ceiling to the price it is willing to pay for foreign lead. There is no other course for a world commodity which the Government alone is helpless to control.

What does all this add up to? On balance, the domestic ceiling price of lead is being depressed below a true market level by the main strength of the Government, presumably so that the cost of living may be kept down, insofar as it is affected by the price of lead. By how much, you ask? So small an amount, I don't think it is measurable. On the debit side, however, unless controls are soon modified, the result is less lead for gasoline to drive your car, or lower octane ratings for gasoline, and, therefore, more gas consumed, less lead to paint your house, less lead to install phone and power cables, less lead for plumbing supplies, and many other everyday uses, so that the Government resorts to total allocation to divide the remaining supply during a shortage created largely by its own policies. And allocating a supply to civilian uses in peacetime—or war—creates a good many thorny problems. Who gets the lead? The plumber, the painter, or the candlestick maker? The small manufacturer—the large? What standard of consumption will be used? What a headache for all. In addition, your tax bill may go up to pay the taxes needed, in part, to cover the losses that may be incurred by the Government in subsidizing foreign lead producers, or subsidizing domestic lead consumers. Here is planning in action. Do you feel it is deep in your interest and in the interests of the public? I doubt it.

When I see what is happening today, my own faith in free markets—and I admit I have a one-track mind on the subject—my faith is fortified. And why not? The declared enemy today is communism, which stands for government intervention and ruthless compulsion in every walk of life. I don't want to see the mining industry so enmeshed in Government controls and regulations while fighting communism that, when the battle is over, we find we have adopted the very practices we condemn in others—and have sacrificed our priceless heritage of initiative and strength.

Pilot Starts Sixty-seventh Year of Continuous Publication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal about the little man

and the small independent merchant and the greatness of our heritage and the priceless gem of freedom and how all of this is rolled into what is America today. We should indeed hold all of these close to our heart and stand unyielding beside these ideals whatever may be the flow of the tide.

I should like to call to the attention of the Members a fine example portraying all of these attributes which have made America great—the birth, life, and development of a small, independent newspaper in northern Colorado, together with the pathos and progress which attends man's dedicated search for a means to better the environment in which he finds himself.

Here is recorded a struggling infant in a new and untamed area and the march of events which saw such infant transformed into a sturdy institution with a place of honor in its community and among its contemporaries.

As long as there remains freedom for the editors and publishers of these small, independent newspapers to seek out and print the news as it happens, and not as someone thinks it should happen, and to comment thereon, then we may be assured that America will remain great and strong.

[From the Steamboat Pilot of July 26, 1951]

CELEBRATING BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY

The Steamboat Pilot, pioneer newspaper of northwestern Colorado, this week starts on its sixty-seventh year of continuous publication. It is the oldest business establishment in this part of Colorado and has not missed an issue since the first one went to its subscribers on July 31, 1885.

It is a ripe and healthy old age, but the Pilot does not intend to rest on its laurels just because of its years of existence. It constantly is on the alert for means of giving better service to its readers and to increase its value to the rich and prosperous section that it serves.

The Pilot was founded on a platform of service to this great and prosperous section. Through the years it has battled constantly to promote the growth and welfare of this area. It will continue to do so.

The growth of the Pilot has not been mere chance. It has grown because it constantly is on the alert to make it a better newspaper and of increased service to northwestern Colorado.

The early struggles of the Pilot are not going to be recounted here. It started when there were only five houses in Steamboat Springs and hardly a score of residents in a section larger than New England. It had faith then and it has faith now. We are not going to let the weight of years bog down our youthful spirit of enthusiasm and optimism.

The Pilot is known far outside the borders of Colorado as an outstanding weekly newspaper. It has never been content to rest on its laurels but constantly has been improving. Today it has one of the most modern printing establishments in the State and its circulation is exceeded by only two or three weekly newspapers in Colorado. It has a circulation that reaches practically every home in a vast area and thus is an advertising medium that cannot be excelled.

The Pilot is old in years but young in enthusiasm and it hopes to continue on for another 66 years giving increasingly better service to the vast and prosperous section that makes up northwestern Colorado. It is dedicated to supporting every worthy cause and will continue to do so and to work for the growth and development of Colorado.

This Nation Must Not Relax Its Vigilance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, it may come as something of a shock to one Wyoming newspaper editor, but I find myself in the position of agreeing with President Truman.

This may be something unusual, but President Truman and I see eye to eye on at least three points, judging from the President's recent address in Detroit, Mich.

Those points: First, that this Nation faces grave danger of being plunged into another global war; second, that this Nation must not put implicit trust in the "good faith" of Communist peace negotiators; and third, that this Nation should not relax its vigilance nor its determination to strengthen our defenses.

It is interesting, to me at least, that on all three points I have the drop on the President—I cannot be accused of crying "Me, too," because I got in the first lick on all three.

I believe that many Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle are of like opinion on these important points. I do not believe there will be much argument on any of them.

But there my agreement with the President's remarks at Detroit comes to a stone wall. I will not agree that a program of smear and defeatism has emanated from any source other than those close to or controlled by the administration. What may have been interpreted—to the administration's convenience—as smear tactics have been in fact honest efforts to expose corruption in high governmental places, those efforts exerted by patriotic citizens, not all of them Members of Congress, interested in seeing honesty and moral integrity restored to our Government.

Defeatism has been an attitude fostered by administration henchmen in devious ways for many months, with the sad result many otherwise sound-thinking Americans are taking the bait.

I for one still have unshaken faith in our American fortitude and our American capacity for production, be it for war or for peace. At the moment, unfortunately, the Nation must be geared for war—not to seek war but to defend ourselves against aggression should it come about. But we must never lose sight of the fact that we are basically a peaceful people and that ultimately we will return to peacetime activities. Thousands upon thousands of American men and boys have died to guarantee that we will remain basically a peaceful people, a nation dedicated to living in peace in a free world. We must never lose sight of that dedication, regardless of the present international situation.

Someone once defined peace as "that interval between wars," and events dat-

ing from World War I would seem to bear him out.

But while we keep our powder dry, and for the time being prepare for any eventuality, we should at the same time keep an eye on the future, on the day when power-mad tyrants are put to rout and when peace shall reign supreme over the world.

Canadian Ambassador to United States Discusses Certain Phases of the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by the Honorable Hume Wrong, Canadian Ambassador to the United States, in which he discusses certain phases of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project:

REMARKS BY HUME WRONG, CANADIAN AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES, AT THE DINNER IN CELEBRATION OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH BIRTHDAY OF DETROIT, JULY 24

The invitation to attend today's ceremonies described the theme of the birthday festival as follows: "By focusing attention on nearly 150 years of harmony between the United States and Canada, Detroit's two hundred and fiftieth birthday festival will give expression to the principle that all nations can live side by side in peace when friendship dwells in the hearts of their citizens." Certainly the affairs of Detroit and the affairs of Canada have been pretty thoroughly mixed up ever since that day 250 years ago when Cadillac's brigade of canoes, ending their long journey from Montreal via the Ottawa River and Lake Huron, swept down the Detroit River and made their landing on this site.

There is nothing that I can tell a Detroit audience about the intimacy which exists between the people of this great city and the people who live in Canada across the river in Windsor and its neighborhood. It has been remarked that the international boundary between the United States and Canada, along all its enormous length, separates the two countries without dividing them. At no point in its 5,500 miles, from Atlantic to Pacific and again from Pacific to Arctic, is this more true than here, where the line runs along the narrow waters of the Detroit River and separates without dividing communities on either side, communities bound tightly together by bridge and tunnel and ferry, as well as by fellowship and good will.

The turbulent history of Detroit in its early days as an outpost of Canada, first of French Canada and then after 1760 of British Canada, included many incidents of war and bloodshed—Indian wars, wars between the French and the British, the conspiracy of Pontiac, the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812.

That unhappy war, was, of course, the last period of fighting, invasion and counter-invasion, here and elsewhere across the boundary. Since the fighting ended in 1814, I believe forever, armed forces from the two

countries have only crossed the river to join in civic celebrations and parades, and recently on occasion to train together as friends and allies against a common enemy.

Far be it from me to try to lecture the citizens of Detroit on the history of their own city. A historic civic birthday, however, is an appropriate occasion for glancing backward through the years, for recalling old unhappy far-off things and battles long ago, if only to compare the past with the present and to measure some of the changes which have taken place.

I may permit myself to repeat one historical anecdote. It was, as you know, not until 1796, 13 years after the Treaty of Paris, that the Stars and Stripes were for the first time raised over the town. One would think that many of the people of Detroit would have been embittered because of this long delay. This does not seem to have been altogether true, for it is recorded that 4 years later, on June 4, 1800, all the public officers and leading citizens of Detroit crossed to Sandwich to help celebrate with their Canadian neighbors the birthday of King George III. This was a foretaste of the relationships across the river which have now happily prevailed for many years.

The history of the relations between Canada and the United States is reflected in detail in the growth of cordiality and interdependence between the Canadian and American communities along the Detroit River. Although 138 years have now passed since the last act of warfare, perhaps we should remember, even on an occasion such as this, that there have been ups and downs in the dealings between its two shores.

I might illustrate from my own experience, as for most of the last 25 years, I have been concerned, in one capacity or another, with the official relations between Canada and the United States. The first important piece of work in which I was involved, in 1927, was a matter intimately affecting Windsor and Detroit. A sudden change in the immigration regulations in Washington threatened to cut off from their livelihood many of the large number of Canadian residents who were employed in Detroit—the so-called commuters. It was a serious issue which aroused hot feelings across the river. After hard work, detailed negotiation, and some concession it was settled in our usual manner; the resulting compromise certainly did not satisfy everybody in either community, but it worked well enough to make the situation tolerable.

At around the same period there was plenty of trouble about another sort of traffic from Windsor to Detroit, traffic of a nature which it might be impolitic to specify in detail beyond mentioning that it seemed to meet an illegal but not easily satiated need of many Detroiters. This traffic also engendered hot feelings, especially in Washington, and brought about lengthy negotiations before a satisfactory agreement was reached. Fortunately, not very long after, the traffic became legitimate again—and it still flourishes.

When in Detroit I cannot resist from mentioning in passing a third and current difficulty which concerns this area. The failure to cope with it is causing a good many Canadians to feel frustrated. Nineteen years have gone by since the first agreement jointly to construct the St. Lawrence project was signed in Washington, and 10 years since a revised agreement, designed to meet criticisms of the earlier treaty, took its place. But all this time there has only been snail's progress toward congressional approval; at times, indeed, crab's progress would be a more accurate description, for the motion has sometimes been backward. We sorely need in Canada both the power and the means of deep-water navigation to and from the

Great Lakes which the project will bring. There are parallel needs in the United States. Must we wait much longer for the start of this development, which would almost certainly have been begun long ago if the St. Lawrence had not been a boundary water?

Matters such as these illustrate something which people are sometimes inclined to forget—that there are certain to be a great many difficult problems to resolve between two very large countries, no matter how friendly, which share a continent between them. Many are apt to assume that the happy state of affairs between Canada and United States has come about, and continues automatically. But there is in fact plenty of need for clear thinking, solid work, and tolerant understanding in conducting public business between our Governments. Were it not that, to use again words I have already quoted, "friendship dwells in the hearts of their citizens," those responsible in Washington and Ottawa would have a great deal more to worry about.

This long-standing friendship is of growing value today, and will be of still greater value in the future; for the affairs of Canada and the United States, both public and private, are getting mixed up with each other more thoroughly all the time. It is, for example, a surprising reflection that it was only just over a decade ago that the question of the joint defense of the North American Continent for the first time began to receive the serious attention of the two governments, in the grim days when the Nazi armies had overrun Western Europe. This is now, of course, a very active subject of joint planning and joint action.

In the larger arena of world affairs it is only 6 years since the Charter of the United Nations brought together for the first time the United States, Canada and many other countries in a great international organization dedicated to the solution of international disputes by peaceful means. It is just over 2 years since the United States for the first time entered into an alliance in peacetime with Canada, the United Kingdom, France, and eight like-minded countries, which had become vividly aware that the United Nations, no matter how useful its work, could not alone provide for their security in the present dangers. It is just over a year since for the first time a flagrant armed challenge to world security was met, under the leadership of the United States, by collective military action, in which troops from the United Kingdom, Canada, France and 12 other countries are now joined in Korea with the forces of the United States to uphold the cause of the United Nations. It is only a little over 6 months ago since for the first time a decision became effective to set up as a deterrent to war and integrated international force built from the armies, navies, and air forces of the North Atlantic countries, and a great American General was called from his retirement to head it.

These achievements are of a scale and character which no one could conceivably have imagined as possible a very few years ago. They have been made possible by the leadership rightly and boldly undertaken by the United States, and I take pleasure in emphasizing this in the presence of the Secretary of State. There is still a long and hard way to go, there are other bold steps which free nations will have to take for the first time, before we can hope to feel any reasonable assurance that our free world is not going to be engulfed again in the most irrational of human pursuits, the waging of general war. We must still be ready to devote a most distasteful proportion of our energy and resources to defense. We must strain ourselves to this and today and next month and the year after next and perhaps the decade after next.

Here, in one of the greatest arsenals of the free world, I am glad to speak this evening from the same platform as the Secretary of State of the United States, the French Ambassador and the British Ambassador. The history of Detroit has been closely involved in one way or another with that of all our countries. Likewise the past, present, and future of Canada is bound up with each of them; with the United States by ties too many to enumerate of friendship, of common aims, of self-interest, of the joint heritage of a rich continent; with France by ties of history, of racial origin, of rich tradition, and for many of my countrymen of common language; with the United Kingdom in countless ways, by ties strong and tried, which have changed and developed through the years as Canada emerged by peaceful evolution from colonial status into complete sovereignty, while remaining a member of that remarkable and undefinable association of independent states, the British commonwealth of nations.

What conflicts there have been between our four countries are matters of past history. They now stand together, in a period of strains and stresses which sometimes seem barely tolerable, as partners in a joint enterprise, the stakes in which are the highest that anyone can imagine.

We Can't Go It Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES H. DUFF

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the Record an address entitled "We Can't Go It Alone," which I delivered at the World Affairs Institute of the University of Denver, at Denver, Colo., on July 23, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WE CAN'T GO IT ALONE

(By Senator JAMES H. DUFF)

We belong to a generation plagued by the perpetual threat of war. Never in history has such a devastating series of wars occurred as in our time. This situation stems from a vast variety and accumulation of causes. However complicated the background, the period in which we live is surely one of the most revolutionary in the whole history of civilization.

In this strange, up-ended and troubled world, those desiring peace are faced by obstacles and road blocks everywhere they turn. But the enormous difficulty of the problem does not lessen the necessity for its solution.

A continuation of the world along the road we have been traveling for the past three decades will surely lead in the final analysis to chaos, and perhaps the ultimate destruction of civilization itself as we know it.

America entered World War I to help make the world safe for democracy. Despite the immensity of our sacrifice and the sincerity of our purpose, the exact opposite was the result. Less than 20 years after we sent our first expeditionary force to Europe, Hitler menaced the whole world with a warfare of

unexampled ferocity and a philosophy intended to oppress and tyrannize all who disagreed with him.

America fought World War II to free the world from the threat of the police state and the tyranny of the human mind. World War II was brought to a successful conclusion only as a result of the might and the power of the Armed Forces of the United States.

At the conclusion of World War II, America had the greatest military force in history, but shortly thereafter we allowed that force to deteriorate in accord with the intense desire of the American people for peace and out of respect to our antagonism against the maintenance of large bodies of Armed Forces in times of peace.

Russia, our former ally, meanwhile took advantage of America's desire for peace to gain thereby a position of preeminent and menacing importance by building up its own armed forces to a height and power never dreamed of before. This change about whereby American military power declined as the might of the Russians was rapidly built up gave Russia overwhelming military superiority. Thereby Russia became a menace to the peace of the whole world, because that predominant military power was used to threaten, and in many cases to intimidate and coerce, free nations.

By the immense expansion of military might, coupled with the use of that might for the purpose of territorial aggrandizement and domination of nations useful to its plans, Russia has shown a fixed purpose to dominate the world.

In the 6 years since World War II, with practically no loss of manpower and no serious dislocation of national plans, Russia has overrun and subjugated most of its neighbors, obtained control of Eastern Germany, built up a strong striking force there in the very heart of Europe, and extended its effective influence eastward more than 2,000 miles across Asia all the way to the Korean Peninsula and the Pacific Ocean. Russia has built up a strong striking force in the Far East to threaten Korea and Indochina and Japan; in the Middle East to threaten India and the Iranian oil fields, and has directed and compelled the immense build-up of all her satellites opposite Yugoslavia.

This deployment of Russian power is tremendously significant because it is the type of pattern indicated if military activity were intended on a number of fronts in different areas at the same time.

No possible explanation can be made for this extraordinary build-up of Russian military power at a time when all free nations were allowing their own power to decline, except on the hypothesis of a determination to start another war to attempt to dominate the whole world.

With this dark picture can there be any hope for peace? That question is on the tongues of all well-disposed and freedom-loving people.

This we know for sure—with Russian power as overmatching as it is today, we cannot look forward to peace with any assurance, merely by wishing for it.

Nothing has been clearer in the past one-third century than that only the strong have a chance for peace and security, and even survival itself.

In our time unpreparedness has been the outstanding invitation for wars of aggression. By that standard, world war III is as sure as tomorrow, at the discretion of Russia, unless the free nations put their military house in order immediately—not to encourage world war III, but as the only possible assurance and preventive against it.

The drop in the military power of the United States when compared with Russia's

build-up is appalling. At the outbreak of the war in Korea, Russia had 175 battle-ready divisions, without counting the divisions of her satellites or her own divisions in reserve and subject to call, while this magnificent country of ours had permitted our power to drop to a position where we had only 10 Regular Army divisions, all undermanned and under-equipped, at the end of 6 years following World War II.

As late as March of this year, Gen Hoyt S Vandenberg, Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force, referred to the Air Force of the United States as a shoestring air force, presumably as compared with the immense air force of Russia.

General Vandenberg this year also made the following observations. "Should war come, we can be expected to destroy no more than 30 percent of the planes making an attack in strength on the United States before their bombing missions are completed."

"The bleak and blunt evidence of the last war proved conclusively that no bombing attack mounted in sufficient strength by the American, British, or Germans ever was turned back by the most strenuous defensive action. The offense always has had a crushing advantage in aerial warfare, and there is no prospect that the balance will change in the foreseeable future."

"There is a dangerous delusion that radar screens and complicated electronic devices will give us an airtight defense against bombing. We could build a steel fence 5 miles high around the 17,936-mile perimeter of the United States. We could place an unbroken line of radar screens on top of the fence, ring our cities with automatic anti-aircraft guns and perfect a foolproof warning system for distinguishing between friendly and hostile aircraft approaching our boundaries around the clock. We could put an umbrella of interceptor planes over the entire country—and we could not keep out a determined enemy attacking in strength."

This month, before a committee of the United States Senate, Senator HENRY CANOR LODGE, of Massachusetts, who has specialized in attention to and the requirements of the Air Force, made the statement that it would require \$32,000,000,000 to bring our Air Force up to what it must be in order to provide the superiority necessary for our adequate protection.

Last month, Gen Carl A Spaatz, former Chief of Staff of our Air Force and designated by General Eisenhower as "the world's greatest air strategist," made this statement:

"From the best available published figures it can be concluded that, in numbers of front-line modern aircraft available for an air battle over Western Europe today, Russia holds at least a 10-to-1 margin; and on the basis of our present production tempo, even if we assume no increase in Russia's current air strength (an implausible assumption used only to emphasize our own position), it can likewise be concluded that the free world will still be on the short end of at least a 5-to-1 margin in Western Europe at the end of 1952."

"Command of the air over Europe and Asia has been lost to the free world since the end of the last war and will continue to be lost to it for some time to come. If there is a surer way to national suicide, in a world threatened by international bandits, I have yet to hear about it."

The great cities of America are within easy reach of the Russian air force and its atomic bombs. If Western Europe is not denied to the Russians, the great industrial areas of the United States will be subject to rapid and continuous bombing from the air by the Russian air force.

Several months ago a British jet bomber flew from Western Europe to eastern North America in only 4 hours and 37 minutes.

Last month a single aviator in a one-engine plane flew from Oslo, Norway, across the North Pole, to Anchorage, Alaska, non-stop.

Two weeks ago a flight of our own bombers flew all the way from Texas to England, non-stop.

Invention and discovery have completely destroyed the isolation formerly provided by distance so that today neither the oceans nor the distance that separate us from our enemies are any longer a safe and sure protection as they were in other days.

All the free world was sharply awakened from its lethargy in June a year ago by the vicious and unprovoked attack by Russian puppets in Korea. As a result of that awakening, the free world at the moment is mildly preparing for a defense against Russian aggression.

The greatest danger today is that the free world will be lulled into a sense of false security by the Russian proposed cease-fire in Korea. No greater mistake could be made than to conclude, as a result of an agreed cease-fire in Korea, that it means a cease-fire everywhere. In Indo-China, in Iran, in Yugoslavia, and in a number of other critical points, volcanic explosions may occur at any moment and without notice of even greater violence than the tremendous warfare that has now been carried on in Korea for more than a year.

A completely adequate preparation for defense is the only hope for a bright tomorrow. Everybody knows that America desires only to be let alone. We covet no one's dominions. We desire no one's wealth. But for us in America it is enormously important to keep in mind constantly that the menace of Soviet imperialism is a danger of a different character than anything we have faced before.

Russia's ambitions for expansion and world dominion have assumed an affectation of interest in underprivileged people when it merely uses that assumed interest for the purpose of advancing selfish ambitions. Like a pickpocket in a crowd, yelling "thief" to distract attention, by similar method to conceal its motives, Russia itself has been the thief of other people's lands and possessions and freedom. Nevertheless, Russian imperialism and the various imposters of communism have penetrated into places otherwise inaccessible and impossible.

We must realize that the various troubles fomented by Russia since World War II in Greece, during the Berlin airlift, in the campaign in Korea, the disruptions in the Middle East, the continued menaces to Yugoslavia, the irritating tirades by Russian spokesmen against alleged and faked American imperialism, are all parts of a strange and new and unusual procedure. They are episodes in a creeping, methodical, and diabolical plan of Russia to take over the world at its own time and in its own discretion and by its own methods.

The difference in the character of the crisis that faces us today must be studied and understood because it is that very difference that makes it so dangerous to those of us who have never seen exactly that kind of pretense before.

Here in America, besides maintaining the greatest living standards in history, in the past 5 years we have given away \$80,000,000,000 in foreign aid, whereby the productive capacity of Western Europe alone is up between 30 percent and 40 percent of what it was even at the highest peak before World War II.

We think of aiding. If we could only think of the danger in the same terms that we think of good will, then we would not

be lulled into the feeling of the false security that may follow a possible cease-fire in Korea.

In Korea, Russia pretends a desire for peace. But actions still speak louder than words. While temporary peace may suit the present purpose of Russia as a result of the tremendous military reverses suffered by its puppets in Korea, nevertheless what is happening in Hungary, in Iran, and in Czechoslovakia, and in the Russian satellites bordering Yugoslavia, all give the sure impress of oppression and hatred and intransigent communism, which seeks to dominate the world.

In the last few weeks Archbishop Groesz was tried and convicted after a forced confession before a Communist tribunal in Hungary, just as Cardinal Mindszenty was 2 years before, and as were a group of Protestant ministers by the same methods and procedure. In Czechoslovakia two priests and five aides have just been condemned to death as spies for alleged "aid to American imperialism." And in the same country in the current month an American newspaper correspondent of the highest standing and the greatest integrity, by a confession, has also been coerced into admitting that he was a spy for the western powers "in a plot that would not even stop at murder." By a strange coincidence all these trials are highlighted by the confessions of the defendants to acts completely out of character with anything consonant with their previous history. Everyone placed on trial confesses. This procedure is merely a throw-back to the brutal days of the Dark Ages when no alleged criminal was imprisoned or executed without a previous confession. Everyone knows that those confessions were obtained by physical or moral torture that overcame the will of the confessor.

In Korea today Russia pretends a desire for peace—peace in the place where it sought war a year ago and where that war has resulted in disaster to the armies of its puppets. But in other places where Russia exercises complete tyrannical control, we find a pattern of brutality and purge and deportation and trial by torture, showing that whatever its pretense, the Russian attitude is fitted to best serve its purpose of world aggression and conquest.

And as Russia suddenly shifts its public propaganda to the appearance of a desire for peace, let us not forget, as we seek to appraise the sincerity of this change, that in this very year 1951 the Russian military budget is \$24,000,000,000. This is double what it was only 2 years ago when Russian preparation vastly out-topped ours, and greater that it was in at least 2 years of World War II.

For the purpose of further comparison let us also remember that the pay of a private in the Russian Army is only \$7 a year. The lowest base pay of a private in the American Army is \$1,080. And the over-all cost of maintaining an American soldier in the field, allocating to each soldier his proportionate share of the over-all cost of the Military Establishment is \$10,000 per man per year.

To be safe we must look into more than appearances in this world of supercharge and tension.

It would be a dire outlook indeed if these were the only factors bearing on the situation today. With these alone and with the free peoples disunited and unprepared, world war III would seem as inevitable as tomorrow. But in all this darkness and gloom certainly there is a ray for a good tomorrow if the free people will only make themselves competent to win that peaceful tomorrow.

Eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty in today's world, but with eternal vigilance there also must be eternal hard work and eternal preparation for defense.

It is necessary to know the danger. But knowing it will be of no avail unless we are prepared to meet it. That means preparation by all free people everywhere.

There must be a strong and full coalition of the free nations and there must be a substantial contribution to the common pool of effort and preparation and sacrifice if freedom is to be saved. The United States cannot do all the fighting and the paying and the dying. America cannot go it alone. It requires the united efforts of all the United Nations—each doing a full share.

Whatever our glorious history, whatever our magnificent qualities, whatever our extraordinary natural resources, the fact is that we do not have the manpower to meet the Russian menace alone on a world-wide scale.

Less than 2 months ago, Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, stated that he was frightened by the Nation's approaching dangerous manpower shortage for both military and civilian needs. General Hershey said that selective service would have a very tough job meeting the 3,500,000 Army goal even by the fall of 1952.

In the twenty-sixth report of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the United States Senate, presented to the Senate on June 19, the following statement was made:

"Today the great weakness of America is lack of manpower. Of resources and technology and industry and arms, we have much; of men, we have few. We are, thus, weakest where our enemy is strongest, for the enemy's great strength is manpower."

That statement alone ought to be sufficient to persuade even the most doubtful that it is necessary for the free peoples to have a coalition if we are to be strong enough to meet this new menace of tyranny.

The free peoples must be united in the determination not to be enslaved by Russian imperialism and also must be powerful enough in the union of their military might to defeat Russia—should Russia start world war III.

In this unsettled world, it is clear that America must continue to aid those willing to make common cause with us. The American people are anxious to aid those who are anxious to aid themselves. But due to the immense draft on our resources for foreign aid, the time has come when all those who receive foreign aid must show aggressively their willingness to collaborate effectively with this program for defense. It is not enough for them to close their eyes and hold a hat in their hands and expect to wake up and find manna from America. There is need for the European countries to make a greatly increased effort in the direction of their own defense. As of now they are far behind what we are calling upon our own people to do—despite what we are doing for them in our aid program.

The time is so critical, the danger so great, and the response so necessary, that the time has come for all nations bent on freedom to get together for a common purpose and a common objective.

This struggle for freedom against slavery is world-wide and all out. Therefore, the tactics and the strategy and the plans of the free people must be world-wide and all out. No nation can go it alone.

All the free nations ask is that they be permitted to run their own governments in their own way, as their own people want them run, without any type of outside pressure or interference. On those ample and just terms peace is available today world-wide if the Soviet Union would sincerely endorse that simple formula.

It is not only necessary for us to know how peace may be obtained, it is also necessary for Russia to know and to realize that peace is possible on just terms.

This Nation is the last strong road block against world-wide domination by Soviet imperialism. The ultimate destruction of the United States thereby has been and still is a major objective of Soviet policy. This menace to our existence as a nation can only be met by an effective foreign policy.

Under the existing critical world situation, it is imperative that the foreign policy of the United States must not be permitted to depend solely upon the will of one political party. When any essential phase of our foreign policy is limited in its development and approval merely to one party, then that policy lacks the unity and backing essential to its success at a time when unity is absolutely necessary for its success. Inevitably, one-party policy comes under continuous political attack by the other party as a matter of the very character of politics itself.

Unless the United States adopts and maintains a foreign policy truly bipartisan in character, it is clear that during campaigns when the President and the Congress of the United States are standing for election, the whole free world will be unsettled during the full course of such a campaign since only the result of the campaign will determine the foreign policy of the Nation.

In this period of extraordinary world-wide crisis and danger, such uncertainty over a considerable period could be fatal. No further argument should be necessary to prove the absolute necessity of a bipartisan foreign policy in this extreme crisis.

A bipartisan policy means exactly what the words imply—a policy adopted by both parties. A policy by the party in power, handed to the party out of power, is not a bipartisan policy. A bipartisan policy can only be achieved by a contribution by both parties to its formation. The primary responsibility for the approach to such a policy inevitably must come from the party in power, since the party in power has the veto over procedure.

The North Atlantic Pact is a supreme example of the achievement that can be attained by a truly bipartisan policy. Since the problem of meeting the Russian menace is now world-wide in extent, it is clear that a similar approach is imperative with respect to bipartisan foreign policy on a world-wide scale.

If the crisis in today's world is as grave as all appearances indicate it is, then the hour is already late for a complete understanding between the two great parties in the United States as to how we are to meet this crisis.

There must be a give and take in this situation and there must be as much give and take as is necessary to achieve a common purpose. No possible excuse can be found for failure to agree on methods necessary to preserve our very existence as a nation.

An accord between the parties on these matters will not only provide a formula for peace, but also a constructive plan for the kind of action necessary to guarantee victory if Russia decides to begin world war III.

We must approach the various difficult problems facing us, not under the fear that war is inevitable, but with the fixed determination that by constructive action we can and will have peace.

Irrespective of what happens in Korea, Russia must be made to understand that further aggression can only result in another world war. If Russia can also be made to understand that it can have peace with this country by refusing to interfere with the lives of the people who don't want war, then there is in the making a successful formula for world peace.

Such a role by the United States will make us a strong leader of the free nations, able to defend ourselves against assault and also wise enough to lead the way to peace with all those who have a sincere desire for peace.

Midwest Floods**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. CLYDE R. HOEY**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a timely editorial from the Scotland Neck (N. C.) Commonwealth, written by Mr. Eric W. Rodgers, a thoughtful and well-informed editor of my State. This editorial sets forth the value of flood-control projects and emphasizes the great savings in life and property effected by proper flood control.

I wish to give my hearty approval to the general policy of controlling the floods along our rivers and streams, but I do not favor creating any more kingdoms on the order of the Tennessee Valley Authority; or such as is proposed for a Missouri Valley Authority. I think flood control should be authorized, controlled, and directed by the Congress and not by any authority created for that purpose.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAYBE THE MIDWEST FLOOD WILL OPEN OUR EYES

For the past 3 weeks the Midwest area of the United States has been in the grip of a major flood. In fact, it is reported to be the most costly flood in the Nation's history from the standpoint of property damage. As the flood moved toward the Mississippi River, the estimate already was \$750,000,000 damage, with 17 persons dead and 75,000 driven from their homes. The full story is being told this week as the flood moves into the Mississippi area, where it conceivably may increase the damage by many millions. In the path of the flood is the great city of St. Louis and the tremendously valuable agricultural area south of that point, not to mention numerous towns and small cities which are likewise subject to the ravages of the water.

The Corps of Army Engineers has waged the fight against such floods over a long period of time. But sometimes there is a major flood which overwhelms man's puny efforts at control and does tremendous damage. There also is another factor involved, that Congress will not appropriate sufficient funds to provide adequate flood control until after major damage has been done. For instance, there has long been before Congress a definite program for control of the waters which are now on a rampage, but Congress has never been willing to set aside the funds. Now \$750,000,000 is being washed down the river in property of individuals, and many lives have been lost. Those lives could have been saved, conceivably, had Congress appropriated only a portion of \$750,000,000 to control the same rivers which are now causing that much damage. The engineers may have not done enough and may have not gone further enough in their control program, but they have been limited by the funds which Congress was willing to appropriate.

All of which comes back to what is known as the "pork barrel" bill which comes before Congress each year. Years ago, some jackass, thinking that he was coining a very cute phrase in his opposition to expenditure

of public funds for relief of this sort, characterized the rivers and harbors bill as "the pork-barrel measure." The phrase has stuck because the politicians have used it, and the man who originally conceived of the phrase may have been the instrument of incalculable loss and damage to his country. But nevertheless every year when Congress gets the rivers and harbors bill before it, it is confronted with this same "pork barrel" argument, and the engineers and the public, which is involved in the various areas, are constantly fighting an uphill battle to obtain protection against the forces of nature on a rampage.

What is included in the so-called pork-barrel bill each year? Well, there are such things as dikes and dams along the Missouri and the Mississippi and the tributary rivers so as to hold back the waters when they rise to unprecedented heights. There are items like that providing for Buggs Island Dam on the Roanoke River to hold back the floodwaters of this great stream and end forever such ravages of nature. There are items such as the widening and deepening of Oregon Inlet and New Inlet and Carolina Inlet on the North Carolina coast so as to provide greater protection for the men who follow the sea, so that they may get into a safe harbor quickly in times of storm, and also that the fish may have passage of sufficient depth to travel into the inland sounds. There are also such items as the long-deferred project of deepening the Morehead City Channel and building a jetty out to protect Atlantic Beach from the ravages of the surf before it is in the sad plight of Wrightsville Beach and Virginia Beach.

But all these worthy items are classified as pork-barrel legislation by opponents. As a matter of fact, included in the rivers and harbors bill is much legislation for the benefit of the people and for the economic development of the country and for the protection of posterity.

At the present time the tremendous flood in the Midwest is said to have done \$750,000,000 damage. By way of comparison, nine and a half dams of the extent and cost of the Buggs Island Dam could have been built. A major portion of the Tennessee Valley development could have been handled with this money. Every channel and inlet on the east coast of the United States could have been deepened and widened and maintained and dredged for years to come with tremendous economic benefit to the people.

But because some jackass long ago designated such expenditures as pork-barrel legislation, probably because he was opposed to any social legislation with economic possibilities, there has been a tremendous uncontrolled flood in the Midwest these past 3 weeks, and the people of that area are paying the price.

The Red Poppy: A Communist Play Mr. Morrison, of England, Might Have Asked Stalin to Explain**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am told that a recent Communist prize-winning play in the Orient was called *The Red Poppy*. It is an example of Soviet perversion. In his next article in *Pravda*, Mr. Morrison, of England, might well

ask Mr. Stalin to explain how the play is intended to promote peace and good will, a Kremlin-professed objective.

As you know, the red poppy is a symbol of freedom in the Orient. A classic Chinese ballet is called the *Red Poppy*. Communists borrow the title—as they have the words "democracy, peace-loving, and so forth—and spin their play of hate and perversion, thus:

Two ships come into port. One is Soviet skippered, the other American. The Soviet captain rallies his crew. "Look yonder," he says, "look at those poor, naked, bleeding American sailors lashed to the boom, being bull-whipped by their skipper." The Communist crew is aghast.

The Red captain, bellows: "Go yonder to that capitalist tub of blood. Fetch those poor, naked, bleeding Americans. Bring them to our good ship, freedom's ship, the *Red Poppy*."

An Astounding View From MacArthur**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. GUY M. GILLETTE**

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Astounding View From MacArthur," published in the *Des Moines Register and Tribune*, of July 31, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ASTOUNDING VIEW FROM MACARTHUR

There was a paragraph or two in General MacArthur's address in Boston last week which we found pretty shocking. It was this:

"I find in existence a new and heretofore unknown and dangerous concept that the members of our Armed Forces owe primary allegiance and loyalty to those who temporarily exercise the authority of the executive branch of Government, rather than to the country and its Constitution which they are sworn to defend.

"No proposition could be more dangerous. None could cast greater doubt upon the integrity of the armed services. For its application would at once convert them from their traditional and constitutional role as the instrument for the defense of the Republic, into something partaking the nature of a pretorian guard, owing sole allegiance to the political master of the hour."

If this rhetoric has any meaning at all, it means that the armed services do not owe their primary loyalty to those who exercise executive civilian authority, and that a commander in chief is nothing more than a "political master of the hour."

In a democracy, all of our executives are "temporary"—a condition which General MacArthur obviously looks upon with some contempt. They are "temporary," because the people choose them, and may therefore dismiss them and elect others if they wish to.

It happens that the people elect the heads of this pitifully temporary executive branch of government. It happens also that the Constitution makes the Chief Executive not

only the supreme head of our Government, but the Commander in Chief over all the Armed Forces specifically.

When General MacArthur says that this concept of civilian executive authority over the armed services is new and heretofore unknown and dangerous, he is wrong three times. It is none of those. It is as old and as well-known and as safe as the Constitution itself. It is ridiculous to imply that the armed services could rush off and "defend the Constitution," while contemptuously disregarding the authority of the executive branch of government.

When General MacArthur implies that respect for the civilian executive branch casts doubt on the integrity of the armed services, he is again wrong. We may sometimes have weak executives; that is one of the risks that a democracy takes. But it is still a safer principle to have them popularly elected and to insure their authority over the military than it would be to give the military a free hand, uncontrolled by the elected civilian government.

This is inherent in the very philosophy of democracy, and it is terribly revealing for General MacArthur to speak his mind so clearly on this subject. The acts which brought about his removal for repeated insubordination now become, we think, a little more understandable.

A Reporter-Senator Reports on the Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Reporter-Senator Reports on the Senate," by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY].

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A REPORTER-SENATOR REPORTS ON THE SENATE (By United States Senator BLAIR MOODY)

From inside, the United States Senate looks very different—even to one who has watched it closely from the Press Gallery for 18 years and long ago came to know and like most of its Members. I found that out on my first roll call.

To even an intimate onlooker the Senate gives the impression of a leisurely gentlemen's club—which uses up some 10 months a year to do a 3 months' job, enjoys free haircuts, engages in bitter but quickly forgotten flare-ups, and customarily practices a unique form of mutual insult, by neglecting to stay around and listen when one of its Members sets out to save the world by what may be (to him, at least) a history-making speech.

From the gallery the Senate seems a body whose own rules frequently tie it into knots. It is a group that makes a great deal of noise about economy but has continued year after year a system which neglects to give its Members adequate information on where money can be saved without damaging the public interest, and where it can't. It is an organization that can turn a 500-word point of argument, into a tintinnabulation of 10,000 silvery phrases. It enjoys a singular code of intramural courtesy and personal camaraderies, even among men who endeavor regularly to chop up one another into political ham-

burger. It also has a high average degree of ability and devotion to the public interest.

Senators are popularly supposed to have worries only 1 year in 6, when they stand for reelection. This, theoretically, leaves them with plenty of time to cogitate over the problems of the world and become expert before each issue reaches the point of decision. The general impression in the Press Gallery is that Senators are not exactly overworked.

Not all of these impressions, absorbed by osmosis during nearly two decades in the corridors and cloakrooms, of course, are wrong. But it is surprising how the perspective changes when the same set of facts are viewed, even more intimately, from within.

It still seems true that, while it undoubtedly is the world's greatest deliberative body, the Senate is also so deliberate that the result adds up to procrastination. As a member of the Press Gallery I could never see any reason why Congress should stall away the first 4 or 5 months of every year doing almost nothing, and then rush through legislation just before a series of midsummer deadlines without adequate consideration of many points on their merits. I can't see the reason for that yet.

The waste of time through individual wordiness is as irritating downstairs as upstairs, if not more so, because, believe it or not, the job of being a Senator is tougher, and more exacting, and requires more hours of harder work than being a Washington correspondent.

There seems no way—short of a change in the Senate rules requiring that all oratory be germane to the issue, as the House rule does—to make some of the boys sit down when they should sit down. They waste the time of men who have no time to waste. That is one reason for the custom of just not being there when general debate is in progress.

Yet, a great fund of solid information is developed on the Senate floor. If no committee meetings were allowed during Senate sessions, and speakers were required to keep to the subject, there would be a higher average understanding of what each issue is all about when the roll is called.

My education as a Senator began with my first roll call. The issue was whether the MacArthur hearings should be open or closed. As a newspaperman I have always been for open covenants openly arrived at. My instinct was that the MacArthur question had become political and the country should have every scrap of information about it.

The vote was going to be close. On the first and crucial roll call it was actually 42-40. As I entered the Chamber a Republican from the eastern "internationalist belt," for whom I have always had especially high regard, said casually, "You're not going to vote to close these hearings, are you?"

As a new Senator, just hiring my staff, I had been forced to miss the outline of the case by the chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia, and also the heavy attack from across the aisle. I told my Republican friend, "I don't see how I can. But I'm going to find out about it now."

I walked down the aisle to talk with the majority leader, Senator ERNEST W. McFARLAND, of Arizona—seated front row, center-aisle-left. One of the sharpest changes of opinion resulting from my move from gallery to floor was in my attitude toward McFARLAND. As a reporter I rated him quite a good fellow and a pretty fair choice for the leadership. From the floor he is tops on both counts. He knows how to handle men. Several of my old colleagues upstairs asked me later whether I had gone down to get my marching orders. As a matter of fact, it was just the opposite. This was a conversation I shall never forget.

I whispered in his ear, "Ernest, I hate to leave you on my first vote. But I don't see how I can vote for closed hearings. You know my newspaper background. Why don't we open them up?"

Here was a defection which might reverse the result of the roll call. McFARLAND never batted an eye. He whispered, behind the back of his hand: "That's all right, BLAIR. I'll never ask you to vote against your convictions." Then he added: "This vote is not political. DICK RUSSELL is absolutely adamant that it would be impossible to conduct these hearings in the open without letting information out to the enemy. Vote as you like, but I'd advise you to talk with Dick."

Back up the aisle, I expressed my position to the Senator from Georgia. "That's all right, Blair," he said. "We're all independent around here. Heaven knows, I'm off the reservation often enough."

I asked RUSSELL to come out into the cloakroom and explain why he felt the hearings could not be opened. He pointed out that all of our secret war plans, all of the private teleconversations between MacArthur and the Joint Chiefs of Staff had been asked for by the committee. It wouldn't be possible, RUSSELL argued, to run the hearings open up to a point—with the Senate caucus room jammed and the klieg lights glaring and television cameras rolling—then shoo everybody out while General MacArthur or General Bradley or Admiral Sherman disclosed a bit of secret information, then herd the crowd back in. The story of our policy in the Pacific, as each witness saw it, was a single piece. If he could not speak freely, the hearings would be worthless.

"Tass has ordered a transcript of these hearings," Senator RUSSELL told me, as I already knew. He then explained the system by which verbatim coverage of these hearings, with only vital secrets deleted, quickly were made available to the press. "I am not going to let them have any of our war secrets with my vote," RUSSELL said. By the time he had concluded, I had decided RUSSELL was right.

No one had tried to pressure me or even asked me to change my vote during those hours off the reservation. And my respect for the judgment and responsibility of the Senate leadership had been enhanced.

I have found that to be the system in this gentlemen's club. The leadership explains the situation, but you make up your own mind. If you cannot go along, the leaders assume you have your own reasons and respect your right of independence. I had never so fully realized that as a newspaperman.

The different perspective one gets of the Senate from an inside view has many aspects. For example, I have felt critical for years of the sparse attendance on the floor during all but final phases of a debate, even on many important issues. As a newspaperman, I often found myself interested in the presentation of some Senator, obviously obsessed with his subject, informed, analyzing it well. More than once, from the gallery, I thought to myself that if these statesmen would only stay on the job and listen to one another, some of their votes would be more intelligently cast.

Yet since my appointment to the Senate, I have found it difficult to spend time on the floor myself. There have been presented in debate a number of important matters by Senators for whose views I have the greatest respect, but I have been able to hear them only in what has been, to me, inadequate fractions. Nor has it been, as I sometimes faintly suspected of other Senators, that I have been spending my afternoons at the ballpark.

To keep up with what has been going on, I have had to assign two members of my staff to capsuling, on a sheet or two of paper,

what has been said by the leading proponents and opponents of each issue. This system has seemed very unsatisfactory to me. I would like to be privileged to hear in full the arguments for and against each proposal on which I must vote. There just isn't time.

I am conscious of many shortcomings as a newspaperman, but during 28 years in the profession I can never remember having been accused of laziness. The blunt fact is that I have never worked so hard or so long in my life as during these months as a Senator.

Part of this, of course, results from newness in the office. I get a large number of invitations to speak in my State, which I endeavor to accept when they are for week ends and therefore do not interfere with Senate business. On a recent week end, for example, I spoke at three meetings, only one of which was political, on a Saturday night. I had planned to stay overnight in Detroit to attend a picnic being given in my honor at Portage Park, near Jackson, the next afternoon, and return to Detroit that evening to speak again before an internationalist group.

Then Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt urged me to appear on her television program the same Sunday afternoon in New York to discuss the issue of inflation. As a member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, I have deep convictions that to allow skyrocketing prices to burn out the substance of our economy at a time when we need internal as well as external strength to assure our own survival would play into the hands of the Kremlin. I did not see how I could refuse. Yet the Portage Lake affair had been arranged in my honor by men whom I regard highly, and it was too late to change the date.

I made the three meetings in Detroit Saturday evening and caught the midnight air-coach to New York. Getting to bed about 5 a. m., I slept until early afternoon, participated in Mrs. Roosevelt's discussion, caught the 4 10 p. m. plane back to Willow Run Airport, Detroit, arriving at 6 55. At Willow Run there was a little group to meet me. They announced that they had hired a small plane to fly me the 40 miles to the picnic, then back into the old Detroit City Airport, which is too small for the modern big airliners. In a little four-seater Cessna, we landed at Waterloo, Mich., on an abandoned field with knee-high grass that nearly lived up to its name. We drove 15 more miles by car to the picnic, returned just as darkness fell, and ploughed our little plane through the long grass, just barely getting airborne as we reached the end of the runway. As our pilot skimmed skillfully past some woods, I was almost ready to swap my Senate seat for that old first-row spot in the Press Gallery.

Another phase that keeps the job from being a sinecure is the mail. Contact between the people and their Representatives is an essential part of democracy, and I often invite audiences to write their views to me—and to other Members of Congress. But in those early days there was in addition a huge pile of congratulatory mail. There were more than 1,800 letters of this type requiring particularly personal answers, and as this is written they are not all answered yet.

Surprising to a former newspaperman also is the quotient of misquotation that becomes a Senator's lot. Most news stories are accurate. But because I told a recent meeting of the Detroit Bar Association, during an appeal for a return to an unpartisan foreign policy, that the extreme right often plays into the hands of the extreme left, I was quoted as saying Republicans are as bad as Communists. Obviously, the reporter had not been at the meeting, but had taken the word of a personable judge whose thinking lies slightly to the right of Louis XIV. A

correction was quickly and generously made, but I think I understand a bit better now the impact of a news story on a public man's appetite for breakfast.

Even without the mail and the speaking schedule, the job of being a Senator is proving far more exacting than my association with Senators had led me to suspect.

The core of the Senate is its committee system. In committee assignments the Democratic leadership gave me far greater recognition than I had any right to expect. I was assigned to Banking and Currency—which put me squarely into the anti-inflation fight, a welcome opportunity—and Executive Expenditures, which was equally welcome because I believe Congress will not make real progress in saving money until it alters its budgeting system.

When I was named to the Banking Committee, for example, a succession of witnesses had been urging Congress to destroy the dike of resistance to inflation. In order to cross-examine such witnesses it is, of course, necessary for a Senator to attend the committee meetings. These start at either 10 or 10:30 and often continue through the day, with an hour or so out for lunch, even though the Senate convenes at noon.

But the Expenditures Committee has been meeting at the same time as the Banking Committee. When the Banking group gathers at 10 30 it is sometimes impossible to attend Expenditures for half an hour. Before being named to any committee I had attended all of every session of the hearings on MacArthur and the Far East. But with two committees of my own running obviously my opportunity to hear the Joint Chiefs of Staff and others was limited. There were moments when I should have been glad to be quadruplets—in order to attend both the Banking and Expenditures meetings, the investigation of far-eastern policy, and be on the Senate floor itself.

The day, however, does not start at 10 a. m. I try to see all the people from my State who come in to see me, even if only for a moment. That means that the only time to transact office business is before 9 a. m. or late at night.

I have been reaching my office on most days shortly after 8, and for a few days, as I have already related, it had to be 7 a. m. This my old newspaper colleagues will recognize to be a substantial departure from custom.

Most Washington newspapermen know much of the complex internal web of friendships, resentments, personalities, and issues that make up the real fabric of the United States Senate. As in the relationship within the press gallery itself, you like many men with whom you often disagree totally. One gets to know the sincerity, or lack of it, the individualisms and idiosyncrasies, the personal convictions and the foibles, and the chance possession of great power on some particular question that sometimes is decisive in molding the great policies of our time.

Party lines sometimes mean much, one finds in the Senate; sometimes little. The best public men never expect a Senator or anyone else to follow them against his convictions. When I reminded President Truman, after my appointment, that I was a congenial independent and could no more be a rubber stamp Senator than he had been, his reply, with a big smile and strong handshake, was: "Fine, get the facts and vote your convictions and I'll be delighted."

The internal courtesy and consideration of Senate members for one another is great. It is a tradition. There are, of course, bitter jealousies and animosities, which periodically flare out. But Senators realize that the problems and pressures of varying parts of the country differ. They are gentlemen, even though in the broiling heat of political debate they may not always sound like it.

This is an unusual opportunity I have been given to serve our country, and, in these times, it is a unique challenge. As a newspaperman, one reports and interprets the facts and perhaps has a slight impact on the public opinion which basically guides men in public life. As a Senator, one responds to public opinion, comes to grips with his facts and votes his conscience.

I am enjoying the responsibility. And I'm going to do my best to make a contribution to the public interest.

Point 4: Charity Without Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our foreign policies in the Orient are so ill-advised, it is alarming to note the essential falsity of the impressions given the American people about point 4, the administration and State Department's world relief program, by at least two of our leading magazines, both in recent articles.

Given the run of Life to tell about Asiatic misery and its possible remedies, James A. Michener, author of Tales of the South Pacific, has made use of supposedly true statistics to show the reader that Asia is less densely populated than the State of Rhode Island. Implied is the thoroughly false conclusion that since Rhode Island's superior standards in the face of density of population are attributable to the American way of life, it is only necessary to send some point 4 missionaries, financed by the American taxpayers, to the thin population of Asia in order to create a Pacific paradise with something of the romance of Mr. Michener's book.

Point 4 plenty is, of course a Fair Deal way of outdemagoging the Kremlin with promises of peace and prosperity. But must we even falsify the record in order to justify playing Santa Claus to the whole world, assuming, as I do not, that we must play Santa Claus in the first place?

Most dismaying on this score of trying to get at the truth is the confusion created by such careless journalism. I refer particularly, Mr. Speaker, to a featured article entitled "Point 4: Hope, Not Charity," in Pathfinder, July 11, 1951.

We believe—

Says the editor, in stating Pathfinder's bias, that—

we can best support freedom by printing facts without bias, because we think that all the facts are on the side of freedom.

Then why in the name of freedom were the essential facts of overpopulation and its relation to starvation in India not even mentioned in this article? Because they were inconsistent with the romantic appeal of the hope, not charity headline? Such treatment could not present a more completely biased

account of the problem. The truth is exactly the reverse of the headline statement; point 4 is a tax-supported charity, a dole, and presents, in the plain maternalism of its offering, no hope whatever for removing the "human misery, the chief incubator of communism," which—again quoting the article—"must be wiped out if the West is to survive. Point 4 counters the vague, rosy promises of communism with positive action for better food, better health, better schools. It may well prove a decisive weapon in the cold war."

Facts that weigh against the attainment of stated goals are carefully omitted in these articles—and in pleas before Congress for appropriations of the taxpayers' money to support these giveaway projects. These regular omissions confuse the Congress by making the critics of point 4 and similar schemes appear to be contending that the food supply of India, for example, cannot or or—admitting that it can—should not, be increased. This implication is plainly false. But if the reason for such efforts be stated as self-interest because "it may well prove a decisive weapon in the cold war," that is even more false.

It is, of course, statistically true that "the average Indian farmer produces about one-twentieth as much as his American counterpart," to quote Pathfinder again. But it is not true that the farm workers of India and the United States are counterparts and therefore should, and could, become equal in welfare by the use of the same industrialization in India as in America.

Why are our farmers not counterparts of those in India? Because the Indian farmers are far too numerous and therefore have less land per capita. The land available declines in productivity per capita for every worker added to the labor force so employed. Does it follow, then, that we can or should remove these extra workers to city industries and thereby get them off the land for the sake of a mere statistical change? Would this put India on the American level of security? Most certainly not. The amount of food available is not increased by factories. It might even be decreased by less intensive culture for lack of the land labor needed.

Foreign investments will produce the machinery to do the work so as to free labor to make a living in factories at better wages, is the point 4 reply. But where are the better wages in terms of food to come from? No land is added to the farmers' equipment; if he trades his product for mechanical services, that does not increase the product which has to be divided up for feeding an ever-increasing population.

So, what it comes down to, is that American capital—not Indian capital—is supposed to invest in Indian industries so that labor may be employed in India to produce what we shall be asked to remove tariffs on in order to import from India things which we should produce by American labor at home, so that the wheat we have already loaned them can be paid for in dollars. Obviously this loan cannot fail to become chronic even if our Government does invest abroad

and undertakes to furnish food in exchange for Indian labor, a doubtful possibility at best.

This has all been described in the chapter of a new book, *Population on the Loose*, entitled "It's a Small World," written by Elmer Pendell. This misery of India, and the fact that the possible and desirable improvements in per acre—not per capita—yield by better-bred and better-nourished crop plants cannot possibly wipe out "human misery, the chief incubator of communism," is clear also from any reasonable and full understanding of the earth's content and capacity for population.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I have seen with dread the explosive situation in Puerto Rico; their labor has even been transported to the beet fields of my district in an effort to relieve their misery temporarily. I know that there is no possible result but pyramiding difficulties in any program other than a direct attack on the birth rate, while in desperation we slow down programs to reduce the death rate.

There will soon be no surplus food in North America; this is clear from the rate of our own growth in population. Even less can there be any surplus coming from Russia. The Kremlin's program for breeding cannon fodder to supply "operation meat grinder" makes that certain. To make this clear to the Congress, I present a few paragraphs from Robert Cook's chapter, *Two to Two Billion*, in his *Human Fertility: The Modern Dilemma*, which follow:

The new pattern of a balance in numbers, through deferment of deaths and births which caused the leveling off in the Western World, has hardly begun in Asia. Hence a population explosion on that already overcrowded continent is a disturbing possibility.

In India an upward trend due to a minimal impact of the new techniques has been developing for more than a half century. The British conquest of the subcontinent began about the time of the American Revolution. Nearly a century elapsed before British India experienced the full effect of a discontinuance of local wars between the native princes. Then the British pax plus at least a minimum public-health program was reflected in a speed-up of population growth.

In comparison with what the United States has been able to do in Puerto Rico, the British influence in India has been less pervasive. Starvation, disease, and destitution still continue to take a frightful toll. Between 1875 and 1900, it is estimated that nearly 24,000,000 people died of famine. In 1945 alone, some 5,000,000 died. Many millions are chronically underfed, with a diet yielding not more than 1,750 calories per day. Cholera has continued as a constant threat. Between 1900 and 1930, deaths from this disease alone totaled over 10,000,000. Plague has caused about 13,000,000 deaths since 1896.

In spite of these flare-ups of famine and disease, India's population has grown, somewhat irregularly but with increasing speed. The annual gain of births over deaths is now well over 3,000,000 per year, and the population is increasing about 12 percent per decade. Between 1921 and 1941, years of sustained increase, India added 83,000,000 to her population, which now numbers near a half billion. Said the India Health Survey in 1945: "This history of the growth of population in India,

therefore, seems to illustrate the contention of Malthus that disease and famine impose checks on an unlimited growth of population. . . . We recognize that the advance of science, careful planning, and concentrated effort on the part of the community to develop the country's resources may make possible the support of a largely increased population on even a better standard of living than that which exists at present. We feel, however, that such measures can constitute only a temporary expedient, because a limit to economic productivity will be reached sooner or later, and uncontrolled growth of population must, as far as we can see, outstrip the productive capacity of the country."

The rapid gain in numbers in India since 1880 strikingly illustrates a remarkable phenomenon of population growth. The improvements in health and living conditions which the British were able to initiate in India have been, in terms of western standards, quite insignificant. Yet, trivial as these improvements might superficially appear to be, they have proved ample to initiate a profound change in the population picture. Long before there is nearly enough food for an adequate diet, the first effect is to lower the death rate and to increase the number of survivors. What the United States so abundantly demonstrated on the single island of Puerto Rico, the British have proved for a subcontinent, where the doubling of numbers amounts to hundreds of millions, and where the overwhelming majority of people are still very near actual starvation.

Across the Himalayas from India lies China, the home of a full quarter of the human race. China is a land of demographic mystery and paradox. For ages, the land of China—much of it man-made desert—has supported the densest continental population found anywhere on earth. Even to this day, no one knows just how many people live in China, for a census has never been taken. Guesses by experts place the total at between four hundred and six hundred million.

Malthus' principles are perfectly illustrated in China. A high birth rate is kept in check by a high and fluctuating death rate—which over the years holds the number of people virtually at the limit of subsistence. Any moderation of the grim conditions of life is balanced by an immediate increase in number of people at a new, precarious balance. Like Puerto Rico, China is a population powder keg which could be ignited by bungling good intentions. If a full-fledged public-health program could overnight be initiated in China, the increase in numbers of human beings could easily total between ten and twenty million per year.

The other single large mass of world population is represented by the 193,000,000 citizens of the Soviet Union. There we find a unique situation. In many parts of the world, populations are growing by default as a result of the impact of vital tools on death rates and birth rates. Since the disappearance of Hitler and Mussolini, no country on earth except the Soviet Union is actively promoting a larger population. The Communist masters of Russia have a conviction amounting to a mania that overpopulation is impossible. This doctrine has obvious political implications, since it tends to swamp the world with Communist babies. Large families are encouraged by an elaborate propaganda campaign; mothers of six or more children are showered with honors and adulation. Even without this program, Russian population has grown rapidly, from 40,000,000 in 1800 to 193,000,000 in 1950. It is expected to reach 250,000,000 by 1970.

Mr. Speaker, need more be said to show how futile a point 4 program is when propounded as a "decisive weapon in the cold war" with the Kremlin?

Are Family Allowances on the Way?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Are Family Allowances on the Way?" by J. Benjamin Beyrer, assistant professor of social work at Florida State University. This article appeared as a feature in Public Welfare for April 1949, the monthly journal of the American Public Welfare Association.

This article is indeed a provocative one, which deserves the consideration and study of every Senator. It discusses a problem which eventually must be met in the reexamination of our entire social-security program.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARE FAMILY ALLOWANCES ON THE WAY?

(By J. Benjamin Beyrer)

Not so long ago we were living in a predominantly agricultural era; today our economy is predominantly urban. In that change have come a multitude of problems—one of which is the fostering, maintaining, or restoring of family stability. Formerly the family was a satisfactory economic unit as well as a social unit. The cost of clothing and feeding children was small, and many of their needs were met from within the family's own production of goods and services.

Children had economic value in those days. Within a few years after their birth they were performing useful chores that equaled or exceeded the cost of their care. Having and raising children was a profitable business. Now in our city-dwelling and mechanized rural society it seldom is. With the best of social and health reasons in mind we have enacted legislation regulating child labor. Present-day Betty and Johnny have few or no chores to perform, and they spend more of each year for more of their childhood in school.

The family economic security once contributed by the labor of children is largely a thing of the past. The cost of educating and rearing a child has increased astronomically. Family allowances are a means of maintaining family stability. The United States is the only major industrial nation in the world still without such a system.

DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE

Family allowances? What does the term mean? Not even all social and public welfare workers are familiar with it. Briefly, it is a system of periodic payments to anyone who has the care, custody, and maintenance of a child. It has been called by its detractors a "baby bonus," a "diaper dole," a system for producing more cannon fodder, an indiscriminate subsidy to the birth of more defectives. Those who believe in its great social values have referred to family allowances as a "children's charter," "the greatest single reform since the adoption of free education," "salaries for mothers," while some think it might best be called a system of distributive justice.

Dramatically we had presented to us not long ago in the newspapers of Florida the pitiful story of parents who wished to give away and get rid of their seven children, because they no longer could endure their inability to meet the minimum basic needs

of these children. The plan which is proposed will guarantee the minimum basic needs of all children.

Children have more than a dollars-and-cents value to their parents. They mean so much in joy, love, and downright fun. But, we must be realistic—the more parents think about the welfare and future of their children, the cost of their education and nurture, the less likely they are to have them. Nearly everyone knows that the number of persons in the American family grows smaller and smaller. Why? Because most young couples are confronted with a voluntary choice of poverty for the sake of children. The use of artificial and natural means of achieving planned parenthood is believed to have become more widespread.

INSURES ESSENTIALS

The philosophy of family allowances is supported in the Federal income-tax exemptions for children. However, it is unfortunate that at present those with incomes in the higher brackets get the greater tax savings. Those families of low income derive almost no tax relief from the Federal exemptions for dependents. Our existing old-age and survivors' insurance program, benefiting only those over 65 or the survivors of persons who had covered employment is available to only a fraction of our population. It does not meet the need of the great mass of employed parents in caring for their children.

Family allowances will meet the hazard of providing properly for the maintenance of children by placing a floor under a family's costs of child care. They are not meant to provide more than limited and partial support. They are a reward to those who perpetuate our country. Proper care of the coming generation insures the greatest asset for the future our State and Nation can possess—a healthy and educated youth. Family allowances will insure for every child the basic, essential, staples of life—food and clothing.

With family allowances we also gain anti-depression insurance. Consumer purchasing power is increased and stabilized. In a period of widespread unemployment there will be less totally decreased earnings. With the same total family income the family without children can easily maintain twice as high a level of living as that family with three or more children, or can accumulate savings. Productivity is the basis for present-day wages and salaries. Wage rates are based on a man's work and not in the size of his family. To a degree family allowances adjust income to the number of dependents.

It is common knowledge that families at the bottom of the income ladder have more children than those on the higher rungs. This has disturbing possibilities on the size and quality of future generations. To be sure, the slice of security is wafer thin for the families in which a large number of the children that will be our future generation are growing up.

REDUCES INEQUALITY

The single man who is a tool and die maker, or farmer, or mason's helper works side by side with the man who is the father of five children, yet each receives the same wages. In fact, the real wages of the man with a large number of dependents may be considerably less than those of the wage earner who has no children or whose wife is employed outside the home. "From the social and national point of view the man who undertakes the responsibility of rearing new citizens under decent standards is more deserving, and from the financial point of view, he bears too great a burden."¹ Family allowances are a means of cutting down the high spots and filling in the valleys of these

burdens; they are a means of smoothing out inequality. Those parents who contribute the lifeblood of our country and State are entitled to the Nation's help in reducing their unequal handicap.

In our country during World War II, family allowances were paid for wives and children of servicemen, without any means test, without any proof of need, but merely by virtue of being the wives and children of a serviceman. The tremendous social gain that this represented has temporarily been lost. It must be followed up.

This is not a hair-brained idea dreamed up by an impractical social worker or professor. Family allowances paid for all children is a democratic system, and as it makes possible more equitable distribution of the pay for goods and services it is a religious precept. No realistic parent will be encouraged to produce additional children for the small benefit of \$7 a month. Neither Canada or any other country using family allowances found any increase in its birth rates attributable to this system of benefits.

That the idea has already been accepted in principle in our country is illustrated by the payment of additional salary for additional dependents by the Columbia Conserve Co. and Bennington College among others. We tax the bachelor and spinster for the support of public schools, playgrounds, and school lunches though they have no children.

The Hansen report released by the National Resources Planning Board mentions family allowances as one of the definite steps needed in our country to maintain a high level of consumption and production. Now, for reasons which need not be considered here, it is quite customary for our country to follow other nations about 40 years later in enacting social legislation. But, that social lag has now about exhausted its 40-year delay. The time has come for one of our States to take the action that will eventually bring our Federal Government into the scene.

FINANCE PLANS

We may expect the same steps in social progress to be followed in obtaining family allowances that our States and Nation pursued in moving to unemployment compensation, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind and others. Therefore, we may expect that first one State, and then several others will adopt plans for family allowances, and eventually our Federal Government will participate. Wisconsin, Illinois, California, Indiana have scored notable firsts in social legislation. There is no reason that Florida should not be added to this historically honorable list.

The country to the immediate north of us, our good neighbor, Canada, has had family allowances in effect since 1945. Mexico has family allowances. In Australia, New Zealand, Belgium, Denmark, France, Italy, Norway, Rumania, Russia, Spain, Switzerland, Sweden, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, and Uruguay there are systems of family allowances.² England's system of family allowances is now in operation.

Not only does the writer wish to propose a system of family allowances for Florida, but the author is going to place his head on the block so to speak, by suggesting some additional tax sources to finance the plan. As nearly as can be estimated at present, not all of these taxes would be necessary to finance family allowances. The additional sources are suggested so as to provide some alternatives.

Some features of the system would be:

1. First, it is proposed that the State of Florida pay \$7 a month as a family allowance for each child under the age of 16.

² U. S. Department of Labor, Family Allowances in Various Countries, 1944-45, Bulletin No. 853, Washington, 1945, pp. 1-21.

¹ R. B. C'rry, Family Allowances in Canada, Public Welfare, March 1948, p. 50.

2. There would be no means test.

3. To be eligible the children of the grantee or payee must be in regular school attendance between the ages of 6 and 16 except during vacation periods, unmarried, and living in Florida, and have resided in Florida for 1 year preceding application. The latter requirement is necessary in view of Florida's transient population.

4. Payment will be made only to a parent or relative providing maintenance for the child. Ordinarily this will be the mother.

5. Administration of the system will be vested in the State welfare board. This agency is chosen because it is already familiar with meeting human needs from public funds, and with the verification of eligibility. The Florida Industrial Commission is suggested as an alternative administrative agency.

6. It is granted that the cost of maintaining a child of 14 is greater than caring for one aged 2, but the program takes a long-term view of 15 years, and the benefits are not expected to meet the total cost of child raising. It is also true that in the family of six children or so, the cost of maintaining the fifth and sixth child is probably less than that of the first children by virtue of handed-down clothing, school books, and toys. Nevertheless, the program has among its purposes that of rewarding parents, and the tenth child is as valuable an asset to the State as the first. By keeping the flat scale of \$7 monthly per child, administrative problems and costs are greatly reduced.

7. The benefits are presumed to be used directly or indirectly for children and we may rest assured that in 99 percent or more of our families they will be.

8. Our low ADC grants can be supplemented by the \$7 monthly family allowance.

9. How the money will be spent is a question that no doubt has arisen in the minds of many. Since family allowances provided from funds raised by taxation represent a transfer of purchasing power from those of higher income, who will pay a large part of the new taxes, to those of lower income, who will pay none or only a small part of the new taxes, this will mean that the money will be spent on the necessities of life. From the experience of many other countries we can be certain that there will be increased purchases of milk, clothing, better housing, school books, medical care, footwear, and the more nutritious foods such as meats, cereals, fresh and frozen vegetables and fruits. For some it may mean a raincoat and for others children's books that they might otherwise never even see.

All children in the State who are eligible will receive the benefit regardless of the income of the family. This means for example, that a family with an annual income of \$15,000 and one child would receive a family allowance in 1 year amounting to \$84, and might easily pay additional taxes to support the program amounting to \$300 a year. The family with an annual cash income of \$800 and one child would also receive a family allowance of \$84 a year and perhaps pay no additional taxes to support the program, or taxes so low that \$5 would be a more likely figure.

NO MEANS TEST

By eliminating the means test the program becomes available to all. There is no stigma of relief or being only for the needy. The children of Judy O'Grady and the colonel's lady receive equal benefits under the program. Eligibility is terminated by leaving school, attaining the age of 16, moving away from the State, death, or marriage.

There is more likelihood that the benefit will go directly to the child when the mother is the payee. The mother will seem more

rewarded for her efforts, and the income to the mother may add to her status in the family group and make for more family stability. The father or other relative within the first degree of blood relationship may be grantee or payee.

The State and district welfare boards are already acquainted with the requirements of Federal grants-in-aid, and it is hoped that Federal participation will soon become a part of the system. The State welfare board also has field or unit offices in every county of the State. The State and district welfare boards are already providing services to people without a means test, for example, child-welfare services and adoption services.

A simple application form would be filed with the district welfare board which issues to the grantee a booklet of coupons or checks redeemable in cash. This booklet contains the simple terms under which payments cease as mentioned in a preceding paragraph. The booklet will have one coupon for each month. The date of each coupon will be the monthly anniversary of birth. By using a booklet of checks or coupons the expense of monthly check mailing is avoided. The book of coupons can be issued for 1 year or 5 years or whatever length of time is practicable.

The program should have administrative costs not exceeding 1 percent of the benefits paid. Verification of birth and the other requirements can proceed after application. The program assumes that most people are honest when dealing with their Government. Penalties for intentional fraudulent use will be provided.

TAX BASIS

There are 582,589 children in Florida under the age of sixteen according to the seventh census of the State of Florida.³ While less than this number attend school, it is to be hoped that one of the social accomplishments of the program will be that all children under sixteen will remain in school. There will be less necessity for parents to feel that they must have the earnings of children in this age group. At \$7 a month this means a total cost of approximately \$4,000,000 a month. This will include the administrative costs, because not all of the children under sixteen will be eligible; some will not have resided for 1 year in the State, some will be married, and some of the parents in the upper income brackets will probably not bother to make application for the benefits.

There has never been a popular tax. No tax will be agreeable to many people. Any new form of taxation must be considered the lesser of several evils. With the help of Wilson K. Doyle⁴ it is proposed that the program be financed from the general revenues of the State which will be increased by some of these means:

1. Better collection of existing taxes, particularly the intangibles tax.

2. Reduced cost of tax collection and administration.

3. A tax of 15 percent on all hotel, tourist court, and rooming house bills that exceed \$3 per day per person. The same tax will apply to all rentals for less than 6 months' duration that exceed \$75 per month per family unit.

4. A specific sales tax on luxury items, such as beer by the bottle and bottled soft drinks.

5. An increase in the existing State inheritance tax.

6. A State gross income tax of 1 percent on personal income with an exemption of \$2,500 for married persons and \$1,000 for

³ Commission of Agriculture, the seventh census of the State of Florida, Tallahassee, 1945, pp. 64-67.

⁴ Head of the department of public administration, Florida State University.

single persons. This tax to be one-fourth of 1 percent on manufacturing, wholesale, and corporate income. A constitutional amendment will be necessary to impose this tax.

In conclusion, it can be pointed out that while the United States has trailed many years behind the other countries of the world in social legislation, the day has come for us to adopt family allowances. And in the same historical perspective, as Florida and several other States inaugurate programs of family allowances, then the Federal Government will participate in the program and give the help of that Government's greater power to levy and collect taxes.

VARIED BENEFITS

For the parents, there are many possibilities, both material and spiritual, of which we can name but a few. For those parents who have willingly sacrificed many things that they might legitimately have had in order that their children might have adequate food, shelter, and medical care, allowances would release a part of their income for their own use for things which are beyond the bare necessities of life. Perhaps greater than anything else, there would be hope and courage for the future. Thus, they might have a share in the full life.

For society, there are the benefits of good citizenship, community health, cooperation, and prosperity. There is the possibility that the proper number of children in each family may produce a better balanced community and react favorably on the general prosperity of the community. There is the possibility of saving part of the enormous sums society now pays to meet its health bills, its juvenile delinquency and its poverty bills. It is time to match modern knowledge with the appropriate action. Let us bring our social legislation into balance with scientific achievement. A brighter world awaits our children.

The President of the United States Keeps a Pledge to the People of Asia, in Spite of Being Whiplashed by Livid and Baffled Critics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, about a year ago the President of the United States made an eight-point pledge to the people of Asia. In spite of being whiplashed by livid and baffled critics for hewing to the promised line, the President kept his word. A lesser man would have quailed; some did. Happily, not Mr. Truman.

It was Saturday night, September 9, 1950. "Fight or die" was the password of our troops in the Pusan perimeter. Over the radio, the President addressed an anxious America. In the Korean struggle, he said:

We must keep clearly in mind what we believe in and what we are trying to do; we want the rest of the world to understand our aims and our hopes.

To fulfill this aim the President in simple language outlined eight points

of American foreign policy in the Far East:

1. We believe in the United Nations.
2. We believe the Koreans have a right to be free, independent, and united.
3. We do not want the fighting in Korea to expand into a general war.
4. We hope in particular that the people in China will not be misled or forced into fighting against the United Nations and against the American people * * *.
5. We do not want Formosa or any part of Asia for ourselves.
6. We believe in freedom for all nations of the Far East.
7. We do not believe in aggressive or preventive war. Such war is the weapon of dictators, not of free democratic countries like the United States.
8. We want peace and we shall achieve it.

The President said:

We invite all the nations of the world, without exception, to join us in this great work, the Korean struggle has shown us again all the misery and horrors of war.

The North Koreans had learned that the penalties of armed conflict "fall as heavily on those who act as tools for the Communist dictatorship as they do on its victims."

There will be no profit for any people who follow the Communist dictatorship down its dark and bloody path.

He continued:

Against the futile and tragic course of dictatorship, we uphold, for all people, the way of freedom, the way of mutual cooperation, and international peace.

At this critical hour in the history of the world our country has been called upon to give of its leadership, its efforts, and its resources to maintain peace and justice among nations.

We have responded to that call. We will not fail.

Critics, you agree, do you not?

We Menace the Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 11, the Subcommittee on Federal Relations with International Organizations of the Committee on Expenditures of the Executive Departments held hearings on H. R. 3406 and H. R. 3697, two identical bills which would create a commission to make a study of the administration of overseas activities of the Government and to make recommendations to Congress with respect thereof.

I was particularly impressed with the testimony of Edward J. Gaskin, a Panamanian, who, as a noncitizen employee of the United States Government, heads Local 900 of the Government and Civic Employees Organizing Committee—CIO. Under my unanimous-consent request, I am printing in the RECORD at this point an article by Harry Conn, member of

the staff of the Public Affairs Institute, which appear in the July 9 New Republic and which deals with the work of Mr. Gaskin and with the problems in the Canal Zone which might well be surveyed by a commission created under provisions of H. R. 3406 and H. R. 3697. The title of the article is, "We Menace the Panama Canal":

Emile Benjamin, skilled carpenter, is employed by the United States Government in the Panama Canal Zone to teach carpentry. Though not an American, he must abide by American laws and customs that rule the 10-mile stretch across the Isthmus.

Benjamin is a Negro and teaches in a segregated high school. Segregation of blacks and whites is one of the American customs brought to the Canal Zone when racial segregation and discrimination were unknown. Benjamin cannot venture into the better hotels and restaurants in the zone—they are reserved for the whites. He needs more money on which to live so he also teaches at night school. Here several of his students are white Americans and on the day they complete his course and are hired as carpenters in the zone they will be making three, four, or five times as much as their instructor.

Emile Benjamin is one of the 15,100 non-United States citizens employed in the Canal Zone, who live as aliens in their own country. Fortunately for America, Benjamin has not been lured toward communism, and neither have most of his fellow workers. Yet today, the Panama Canal, strategic artery of America's defense, is an area alarmingly fertile for Communist impregnation. And the American administration of the Canal Zone, in the mode of nineteenth century colonization, has made this possible.

In the mind of the native Canal Zone worker, America and American democracy do not stand for basic freedom for all citizens. America means to them low wages, high living costs, discrimination, and segregation. Miraculously, in such an atmosphere, no native leader espousing the cause against America has risen. This is due, at least in part, to the fact that one of the foremost native leaders in the zone, Edward A. Gaskin, has been tirelessly fighting for zone workers and just as tirelessly preaching the true principles of American democracy.

A Negro, short and stocky, 33-year-old Gaskin is a principal of an elementary school in the zone and president of local 900 of the CIO's Government and Civic Employees Organizing Committee, to which a majority of the zone workers belong. He led the fight several years ago to organize this union in opposition to the United Public Workers, eventually expelled from the CIO under charges of Communist domination. That successful battle, so completely ignored by the American press, is believed to have removed a genuine threat to the Canal.

Gaskin is visiting the United States. He sits on the edge of his chair and with pleading eyes presents a picture of injustice with an eloquence rarely heard today. Gaskin refers to 1903 when the United States leased the Canal Zone from the Republic of Panama in perpetuity and amazed the world by building the "Big Ditch." As part of a "gentleman's agreement" with Great Britain the United States developed a Caribbean wage scale under which the workers of the Caribbean countries were paid approximately what they would receive in surrounding areas. This was deemed necessary in order not to upset the economies of these countries. So, two pay scale were established in the zone, a local rate and a United States rate. Today the average local-rate pay is 55 cents an hour compared to the American rate of \$2.15, a fantastic spread.

The Caribbean wage scale did not work extreme hardship in countries such as Costa Rica, Colombia, Jamaica, and Trinidad where the cost of living was low. This was also true of Panama in 1903 when the American dollar was worth five times the Panamanian Balboa. But today the two currencies are used interchangeably. Prices in the zone are at least as high as in the United States, and it costs as much for a Panamanian to live as for an American. Milk is 27 cents a quart in Panama today; eggs are 82 cents a dozen, and other prices are comparable down the line. Their Jim Crow housing, almost all lacking modern plumbing, stands in startling contrast to the clean and modern quarters of the American workers.

Before the arrival of the Americans at the turn of the century segregation and racial discrimination were unknown practices to Panamanians. It is forever brought home that these are strictly American importations because when Panamanians leave the zone, even to cross the street to Colon, in the Republic, they leave segregation behind.

The Panama Canal Zone is the show window of democracy for all Latin America to witness. The sight has not been a pretty one for the many dark-skinned peoples of these countries to the south. The many citizens of Costa Rica, of Colombia, of Salvador who have contracted to work on the Canal in the last half century have returned to their lands with stinging words about the American system which metes out countless injustices to a man because he is of a darker race. Today Americans wonder why these people have no real heart for pan-Americanism.

The feelings of the people of Panama were vividly shown last November 3 when the Republic celebrated its Independence Day. School children, carrying the many flags of the United Nations as they marched, received warm applause. When an American veterans' group from the zone paraded with the Stars and Stripes they were greeted by a sickening silence. An editorial last January in the Panama Tribune, a respected weekly, put this silence into words:

"The administrative powers—the Bourbons—of the Canal Zone seem to have learned nothing about the changes in the world today; nothing of the advancing concepts among mankind, of new religious tolerance, of new understandings, of new social give and take. Nor do they seem to have forgotten anything they learned about the fallacy of human superiority and inferiority.

"Because a policy has been in effect over 'a number of years' it is not necessarily justifiable in principle in the light of changing conditions. The results cannot be said to be good when they are a cause of constant grievance and complaint. It would seem that in the forward march of the world's teeming millions, our friends in the Canal Zone are not only standing still, but feel that everyone in the parade is out of step but they."

This is the charge against the United States at a time when this country has undertaken to defend freedom, truth, and the rights of man throughout the world against those who would destroy it. Apparently, though, it has little concerned the Governor of the zone, Brig. Gen. Francis K. Newcomer, who told the Hoover Commission in 1949: "The organizational position of the Panama Canal has been satisfactory, and it is doubtful if it can be improved upon."

The State Department is apparently well aware of the seriousness of the Canal Zone problem. It was the American Ambassador, Monnet B. Davis, who sent Gaskin to the United States to study democratic trade-union practices, well knowing that he would also strive to reach the right people and present his case. However, the hands of the

State Department are tied. Action must be taken by the Defense Department which has steadfastly refused to alter present patterns in the zone fundamentally. As regularly as Local 900 of the CIO-GCEOC offers Governor Newcomer detailed recommendations for changes they are rejected. The most recent rejection was accompanied by the statement that "It is believed that this (wage) policy has been fully justified, both in principle and results, over a long period of years."

In September, Ed Gaskin will return to his native Panama and to his job in the segregated school system in the Canal Zone. His hope is that he can offer proof to his young, dark-skinned students that the benefits of a democracy are for them, too. "If we cannot do this," he said, "we cannot be responsible for the future of the Panama Canal or the security of the United States."

The Russian People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following article by Eugene Lyons:

A NEGLECTED ELEMENT IN THE WORLD EQUATION. THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE (By Eugene Lyons)

Opinion polls do not thrive too well under dictatorships. In the Soviet Union, besides, foreign journalists are carefully sheltered against free contact with the local population. Some of them have found it convenient all the same to apprise their readers, now and then, that Ivan Ivanovich, the average Soviet citizen, holds precisely the same views on home and foreign affairs as his bosses in the Kremlin. Why they should consent to transmit such nonsense is a mystery this essay will not explore.

The assumption that the rulers of Soviet Russia and the ruled see eye to eye is the tallest and most pernicious of the big lies nurtured by Soviet propaganda. It uncritical acceptance has been the distinctive hallmark of the regime's journalistic friends and press agents. We find it at the core of all pro-Soviet books. Its classic formulation was achieved many years ago by a correspondent who wrote that Stalin's ruthless methods fitted to the Russian character and folk ways in that they established Asiatic absolutism.

These writers unfortunately fail to explain why, if the views of the dictatorship and those dictated to are so harmonious, the Kremlin needs the greatest police force and the bloodiest terror in all history to hold down its loyal subjects. Even an authoritarian government hardly assigns a major slice of its resources and manpower to police purposes just for the fun of it. Facing the myth that the Bolshevik regime and the Russian peoples are one and indivisible, common sense cannot dispose of such realities as the following:

1. The political police establishment of the Tsars, the Okhrana, dreaded in its day and rightly reviled by the civilized world, got by with four or five thousand officials and operatives. Its Communist successors—the Cheka, GPU, NKVD, now MVD and MGB—requires more than 2,000,000, aside from millions serving as agents and informers, willingly or under duress, without formal membership in the police system.

2. In the darkest years of Tsarist oppression, political prisoners and exiles rarely exceeded 50,000. Today, according to the more conservative estimates, there are at least 12,000,000 prisoners in concentration camps, isolators, and penitentiaries, and millions more exiled to harsh Siberian, Arctic, and central Asian regions.

3. Chistkas, or purges, of every segment of the Soviet population, including the ruling party itself, are a constant feature of life under the hammer and sickle. At peak moments, such as the blood-trial period of 1936-38 or the panicky cleansings just after the recent war, literally millions are affected. But at no time in the last three decades has there been a complete cessation of the process of "liquidating" supposed traitors, deviators, spies, saboteurs, and other enemies of the people—a euphemism for enemies of the dictatorship. In the present phase, virtually every department of national life is being subjected to intensive purging, with war veterans, intellectuals, Jews, industrial, and collective-farm administrators among the most prominent victims.

4. The citizen's right to leave the country, which neither the Czars nor Hitler completely denied, does not exist under the Soviets. Attempts to escape without permission are punishable by death, but thousands take the risk continually notwithstanding. In effect the entire population is thus captive. The Kremlin knows better than any foreign experts that if the Soviet frontiers were opened, the most gigantic exodus in all history would follow.

5. When the Germans invaded the Soviet Union, the regime swiftly jettisoned its Communist slogans and propaganda, restoring old-fashioned appeals to patriotism, blood and soil, pride in Russian history. It even restored substantial religious freedoms; church bells, forbidden since the early thirties, rang out once more even over the official radio air waves. This dramatic reversal in the hour of national peril, after a quarter of a century of unlimited propaganda and terror, amounted to a confession that Communist indoctrination had failed utterly, that the government had not succeeded in selling its ideology to its subjects.

6. In the early months of the Russo-German war, before Nazi brutalities and insults had changed the climate of Russian sentiment, millions of Red troops surrendered without genuine resistance. The invaders were met joyously by the people of Byelorussia, Ukraine, and later the Caucasian areas. In no other conquered country did the Germans—until their own stupidity intervened to change the picture—find such eager cooperation on the part of the local populations.

7. Over a million Soviet men voluntarily donned German uniforms to fight against the Bolsheviks. ROA—the Russian Army of Liberation—organized by the Germans under command of a former Red army hero, Gen. Andrei Vlassov, counted more than 200,000 volunteers. It was held down to that figure by Hitler's justified fear that this army would turn against him after the defeat of the Soviets; actually nearly 2,000,000 Soviet citizens tried to enlist in this formation. At that the Vlassov army was the only significant force the Germans were able to raise among their enemies.

9. The most unfortunate of the secret agreements compounded at Yalta—an undertaking by Britain and the United States to force Soviet citizens liberated from prisoner-of-war and forced-labor camps to return to their native land—was made at Stalin's insistent demand. It was a demand without precedent in modern times. The "beloved leader" of victorious Russia knows that millions of his subjects, washed beyond the Soviet frontiers by the accidents of war, would try to evade repatriation. Despite the shameful American, British, and French use of force to drive them home,

hundreds of thousands—workers, peasants, soldiers, intellectuals, former Communists, a true cross-section of the Soviet peoples—succeeded in evading this fate. They chose freedom at the price of penury, sacrifice of homes and careers, persecution, and an outlaw status, rather than resume the hated yoke of communism.

9. Desertions from the Red Army occupation forces in Germany and Austria assumed epidemic proportions, despite the incredible American policy (in the early stages, at any rate) of driving the fugitives back to be hanged. The runaways included everything from simple soldiers to commanding generals, and even officers of the intelligence elite. To isolate its troops from contact with the local populations, the Kremlin has been obliged to impose drastic safeguards that in effect make its troops prisoners. Moreover, the occupation forces are replaced at frequent intervals to hold down the incidence of "infection" by western ideas. The stream of deserters has been slowed by these countermeasures but by no means stopped.

10. Not since Japan was opened to the outside world in the last century has any nation cut itself off so totally from the rest of mankind. There is every evidence of panic fright in the extremes to which Stalin now carries his efforts to seal off his prison-state hermetically against non-Soviet thought, culture, science. "Cosmopolitanism" and "kowtowing to the West" are the newly forged Soviet labels for the dread crime of sympathy for western ideas—a crime for which thousands of Soviet writers, artists, teachers, students, scientists, historians, and Communist officials are paying with their liberty.

This inventory could be continued to book length. It makes gibberish of the fable of unity between the Communist masters and their long-suffering slaves. The nature of an ailment can often be deduced from the medicine administered. The measure of the Russian people's opposition to their Soviet fate is in the vastness and ferocity and persistence of the Red terror.

Never before, in a world that included the Nazi and Fascist systems, has a state been compelled to develop such a colossal mechanism of surveillance and repression, terror and torture, censorship and intimidation. No government on record has felt it necessary to invent so many "crimes against the state" or to employ the death penalty so recklessly as an instrument of its rule.

The authorities as a matter of course tap the telephones of their subjects and open their mail. Every apartment house, office, plant, and subdivision of a plant, every high school and university and military installation, has its contingent of police overseers and informers. The secret police actually has branch offices on the premises of larger factories, mines, educational and scientific institutes, hotels, railroad stations. Every functionary important enough to have a secretary or chauffeur knows that these employees are reporting not only on his conduct but his political mood. No regime in the annals of man has diverted so much of its income and energies and personnel to internal security—to its own defense, that is to say, against its citizenry.

The notion that the peoples of Russia bend their necks meekly to the Soviet yoke is a cruel libel. It simply does not jibe with the unabridged compulsion applied by the government; with the hordes of political prisoners; with the perpetual alarms over sabotage and espionage and plots. It does not jibe with the suicidal resistance of the peasants to collectivization, the workers' sullen and often murderous reaction to the Stakhanov or speed-up system, and other episodes of the convulsive mass resistance that is the sum and substance of Soviet history.

Contrary to wide misconceptions on this score, both the Italian and the German people accepted their respective totalitarian chains more quickly, with less hostility, than the Russians. In a single camp within an hour's drive from Moscow during the construction of the Moskva-Volga Canal with slave labor, there were more political prisoners than in all Fascist Italy. The carrying out of any of the gigantic GPU projects—the White Sea-Baltic Canal, or the second Trans-Siberian rail line, for instance—concentrated more "enemies of the state" than all the prewar Nazi camps put together.

The cleavage between rulers and ruled in the U. S. S. R. simply cannot be exaggerated. The Communist tyranny was imposed on the peoples of Russia by an infinitesimal minority, and has been maintained by unprecedented force—the physical force that breaks bodies and the propaganda terror that mangles minds and poisons souls. From the day the Bolsheviks usurped power there has been in effect a continuous civil war between the regime and its subjects. Russia is in the final analysis an occupied country.

The propaganda fable of perfect rapport between the regime and the people is not merely false. It is deeply mischievous, for it raises artificial walls between the free world and its potentially most valuable allies: the peoples of the Soviet Union.

Fortunately those walls are at long last being razed. The truth a few of us have been shouting unheeded for so many years—that a deep gulf separates the Soviet dictators from their victimized population—is finally being understood. How quickly and how wisely its implications will be grasped and exploited remains to be seen.

The resolution introduced by Senator BRIEN McMAHON and a large group of colleagues, asserting American friendship for the Russian people, is symptomatic of a new attitude here which, we may be sure, sends a chill down Stalin's back. A number of American organizations dedicated to friendship with the peoples of Russia, over the heads of the Kremlin gang, have sprung up spontaneously in recent months. One of them calls itself significantly, Friends of Fighters for Russian Freedom. A private group has been set up, under the awkward but accurate title of the American Committee for Freedom for the Peoples of the U. S. S. R., with the explicit purpose of helping Russian émigrés to fight for the liberation of their country. Even statesmen begin to draw a sharp line between the people and the government of the Soviet Union; witness the phrasing of the British note to the Soviets on February 17 last.

A new element is thus being added to the East-West equation. More accurately, it is being belatedly recognized, for it was there all the time. That element, the Russian people, can be more decisive than the atomic stockpile in determining the ultimate answers to the questions that today plague a divided world.

The Flood Lessons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SID SIMPSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Quincy (Ill.) Herald-Whig of August 2, 1951:

THE FLOOD LESSONS

One of the Nation's worst floods of disaster proportions ends as the Missouri delivers its recent swollen flow into the Mississippi, which will carry it to the sea. Half a million persons were forced to leave their homes, and some estimates of the damage run as high as a billion dollars. It may be extravagant to spend too much money for flood control, but the lesson in this one is that it is quite as absurd not to spend enough.

The floods came mostly out of the Kaw or Kansas River and its tributaries. They might have risen in rivers farther north. The estimated flow of the Missouri at its mouth ranges all the way from 4,200 cubic feet per second to 900,000. The factors that make the difference are melting snow in the high plains and mountains and rain down below, pouring in water at the same or different seasons of the year. Nature has her own system for getting rid of this water. She broadens the beds of the streams. The result is a catastrophe, because farms, towns, and cities have been located on the bench lands.

Nature also has her own moods for bringing rain or snow. The technique of river control calls for mastery and use of water by many devices. There is contour plowing, cover crops, reforestation, and so on; big and little upstream reservoirs; irrigation systems; dams for flood control, power, and navigation; the deepening of channels and, within limits, the construction of levees. Some of these projects have been carried out in the Missouri Valley. There is what is known as the Pick-Sloan plan, which calls for building storage reservoirs back on the smaller streams that would retard the headlong flow of water into the main streams. But this plan is only a famous compromise between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Corps of Engineers. It lists about 100 dams, of which a dozen are finished or under construction. The cost? It would take about two floods of the proportions of the present one to match the cost item.

Reached as a compromise the Pick-Sloan plan is not so much a plan as a collection of ill-assorted projects. The Missouri River has not had the thorough study to which it is entitled, from source to mouth, with an eye to over-all control. No one has reconciled irrigation with navigation, power with flood control. But this would be a propitious time to make this study, while people are sweeping oily scum out of their households and before another flood of the same kind comes.

The trouble seems to be that humanity failed to administer the flow of the river, and nature continued to operate after her own, often exceedingly costly, plan.

Students Make Good Neighbors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor:

STUDENTS MAKE GOOD NEIGHBORS—AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM THE SOUTH
(By Max K. Gilstrap)

NEW ORLEANS.—A field worker in Venezuela stopped with poised machete flashing in the sun to ask about the Sugar Bowl game in New Orleans. A young foreman in a Co-

lombian textile plant talked enthusiastically about Louisiana State University. Young executives in Puerto Rico, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Jamaica, and Trinidad spoke with nostalgia of their college days in Mississippi State, Gulf Park College, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Harvard, and Midwest State universities.

The traveler in the Americas quickly becomes aware of the importance of student interchange in inter-American relations. In the unprejudiced minds of young Americans such schooling is developing an understanding that will unquestionably prove a decisive bulwark in hemispheric and world peace.

Here in the South where a reciprocal trade program with Latin America is gaining momentum, there has been launched a significant cultural and educational exchange program which holds bright promise. Already its participants include students from the mid-South and from all 21 Latin-American Republics.

The program is run by Mario Bermudez, able, energetic director of International Relations for International House in New Orleans, under supervision of an advisory committee headed by A. E. Hegewisch, former president of International House. It was launched in 1944 with 300 students; now there are 900 attending 16 schools and colleges in Mississippi and Louisiana. Concurrently a reciprocal flow of United States students to Latin America is under way, beginning with summer courses sponsored by International House in the universities of Yucatan, Mexico; San Jose, Costa Rica; and Medellin, Colombia.

Mr. Bermudez says the program promises to spread over a large part of the mid-continent and possibly other parts of the United States. Such a prospect, he says, is possible because of the enlarged United States defense program. With many GIs gone, there is a shortage of United States students. Universities have their machinery already set up; professors are hired; classroom and housing facilities are available.

Mr. Bermudez talks of the interchange student plan in terms of a multiple variety of types and ages of students and financial arrangements. About 40 percent of the Latin-American students take 4-year courses. Some enroll in summer courses of 7 to 10 weeks. These usually pay their own expenses which average \$200 besides transportation costs. Most of them live with families in Mississippi or Louisiana towns where their schools are located.

Under another arrangement, professional persons, many of them married, are interchanged in similar positions across the Gulf and Caribbean. This is done with negligible expense other than transportation costs. Such arrangements enable the workers to obtain broader training, make lasting contacts with families in the countries, and promote their businesses.

Some students such as a Nicaraguan editor, wife, and daughter come to the middle South to study special courses in grammar, composition, culture, history, and natural sciences. A group of 35 seniors from the National University of Colombia is making a tour July 1 to August 14, to inspect engineering projects, public-works factories, and schools in mid-America.

The big problem in student interchanges, Mr. Bermudez said, is transportation. Most students pay for their travel but from countries such as Chile, Paraguay, and Argentina it exceeds an entire year's tuition. Help has been given by the Grand Colombiana Fleet, a joint company of Colombia, Venezuela, and Ecuador, which offers free passage for scholarship winners. Two American air lines offer the same consideration. It is hoped that special ship and air-line rates can be arranged for general interchange students.

From an extended trip through Latin America Mr. Bermudez and Clay Shaw, director of International Trade Mart, have found

warm enthusiasm for the cultural interchange program. Cooperation in the United States has been received from such organizations as the American Council on Education and the Pan American Union.

As an increasing number of good neighbors knock on each other's door and stay a while, the outcome, in Mr. Bermudez' opinion, can only be the achievement of the common aim of good will and understanding.

Let Free China Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Milwaukee Sentinel for August 3, 1951, is a ringing challenge to the administration's stupid policy in China that has prevented the free forces of China from opposing the Chinese Moscow dominated Reds.

As this editorial well points out, if we had had a realistic policy in China based on principle and not upon political expediency—if we had not been controlled by the counsels of fear emanating from the United Nations—our casualties in Korea would have been much less than they now are.

There seems to be no hope of curing the blindness in the administration, but editorials such as that in the Milwaukee Sentinel will help to awaken the people of America to a return to principle and honesty and courage in dealing with foreign nations.

I submit herewith the editorial:

LET FREE CHINA FIGHT

The most significant military event in China since the inauguration of Korean truce negotiations is the highly successful operation of Chinese Nationalist refugee forces against the Communists along the Burma border.

This is not a guerrilla action in the usual sense, because it involves an organized force of some fifteen thousand trained troops under competent command, and nearly two-thirds of Yunnan Province was occupied and held.

Since there are many hundreds of thousands of Chinese Nationalist troops available for similar operations, it is a matter for interesting and puzzled speculation that American policy makers still refuse to permit the Chinese people to fight for the liberation of their own country.

In fact, it is the greatest mystery of the war that has been raging in Korea for more than a year that the American Government has been willing to sacrifice 150,000 American casualties in fighting the Chinese Communists, but has adamantly refused to let the free China forces attempt a diversionary movement which would have saved thousands of American lives and would probably have ended the war many months ago.

Why is the American military and political command at the highest levels so determined to keep the Chinese Nationalists out of the war against the Communists, when they not only have a great stake in the struggle themselves but could vastly reduce and perhaps eliminate altogether the necessity for America's tragic investment in the conflict?

General MacArthur was removed from his Pacific command for giving offense to his political masters in Washington on many oc-

casions, and one of these occasions was that on which he earnestly and vigorously advocated the encouragement and support of the free Chinese.

Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, who has few peers as a specialist on the military problems of the Far East, is out of the military service of his country, at least in part because he thought Chinese patriots willing to fight to liberate their country should be allowed to do so.

Gen. Matthew Ridgway, who agreed with General MacArthur on the use of Chinese Nationalists, has been compelled to conduct the war in Korea with no better hope than that of humiliating stalemate because of the incomprehensible stupidity of his bungling superiors.

If 15,000 Chinese guerrillas can take over two-thirds of a vital border province in a few days, what a foolish and fatal mistake it is to immobilize the millions of fighting men free China could eventually utilize against our Communist enemies.

And yet our most competent and experienced military leaders are either exiled for advocating this sound policy or are compelled to conduct futile and bloody wars in keeping with senseless policy which serves the purposes of our enemies as well as if that were the real intention.

Inflation and Foreign Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include the following radio speech which I recently gave over Station WJR at Detroit:

For the past 2 weeks the House of Representatives has been considering legislation to extend the Defense Production Act which has in it the President's economic controls program. There has been a good deal of misrepresentation in the press and over the radio concerning this legislation and much of it emanates from the President's propaganda organization. The President, of course, would like to blame Congress for his failure to effectively control inflation. But the facts are not on his side.

Early last fall, shortly after the Korean war started, Congress passed the present economic controls law. The public should know that Congress last August, on its own initiative, passed this legislation which authorized the President to impose controls on prices, wages, and credit. Mr. Truman did not suggest this action by Congress. As a matter of fact, he did not favor it. He declared in his press conference on August 10, 1950, that the Government was capable of handling inflation with existing machinery. He thought there was no need for a revival of OPA. But in spite of the President's protests, Congress did pass the economic controls bill because it was thought that the Korean war and the defense program engendered by it, would start an inflationary process which ought to be immediately controlled. Thus, in spite of the President's shortsightedness, Congress gave him a controls law on September 8, 1950. Notwithstanding the fact that prices were going up by leaps and bounds and hoarding was being engaged in by suppliers and distributors, thus sending prices higher, the President blindly refused to act. The result was that between June 27, 1950, the date the Korean war started, and Jan-

uary 26, 1951, the cost of living went up 7 percent, and the cost of food 8 percent. But in spite of this precipitous rise in prices, the President stubbornly refused to impose controls and it wasn't until January 26, 1951, 7 months after the Korean war started, that any price controls were put into effect. Moreover, the efforts of Mr. DiSalle, the Price Administrator, and his office, have proved ineffective to accomplish the job which Congress instructed him to accomplish. Between January 26 and June 1, the cost of living and the cost of food went up another 2 percent. The plain truth is that every month since the Korean war started, without exception, the cost of living has risen. Thus, it is clear that although the President has had ample and complete authority from Congress to control prices and inflation, he has refused and neglected to do it. Naturally, this situation is embarrassing to the President and he would like to get off the spot. That is the reason he is having his propaganda experts make it appear that Congress, and not the administration, should bear the responsibility for the failure of the economic controls program during the past year.

No one in his right mind wants to add to our inflationary problems. It is for that reason that I have voted in support of the extension of economic controls. I should say frankly that I have very little confidence that the President and his agencies will do any better job in the future than they have during the past year. But I want the record to be straight so the American people will know who is responsible for any further dislocations in our economy.

While most of us agree that economic controls are necessary to prevent further inflation, controls in themselves will not cure our difficulties. The most we can do with controls is to apply the brakes against the already existing pressures. But everyone should clearly understand that the real answer to our inflationary trouble is to stop doing the things that have caused the inflation.

While most people readily understand the harmful effects of inflation in their day-to-day standards of living, the average person does not give too much thought to the causes which create this condition. Hence I would like to discuss with you briefly some of the many phases of this problem.

As a basic proposition the inflation which has enveloped this country is largely due to our extravagant spending programs. The tremendous cost of World War II gave us our initial start, and we have been pyramiding on it ever since—until we have finally reached the point where it has virtually wiped out 50 percent of the savings of all of our citizens. In the 10-year period since 1941 this Government has given away in foreign-economic-aid programs approximately \$62,000,000,000. Of this amount Britain got thirty-five billion; Soviet Russia, eleven billion; France, six billion; China, three billion; and smaller amounts to practically every other nation on the face of the globe. This does not include, of course, the President's recommended \$8,000,000,000 economic and military-assistance aid to Europe for the next fiscal year. This figure, when added to the amounts previously expended on "give-away" programs, brings the total to the staggering sum of \$90,000,000,000.

Add to this the cost of the Korean war, the cost of our present defense program, together with our current domestic expenditures, and you have a rough idea of the rate and extent at which we are spending our money. It is an oversimplification to say that we are spending more than we can afford to spend, or more than we are taking in. These facts are so simple that it is difficult to believe that they are responsible for our troubles. But if you want to translate the effect of this spending on your own individual situation, there are several ways of doing

so. For example, if you had a savings account of \$1,000 in 1941 and did not withdraw it from the bank until today, it would be worth a little less than \$500 of your original investment. In other words, the Federal Government has in effect made a capital levy of \$500 against your savings. It is exactly the same thing as though the tax collector went to your bank, without your consent, and withdrew \$500 from your account. If you had life insurance or bonds or similar investments, exactly the same thing has occurred. Inflation has robbed life-insurance policyholders of one billion since 1940, and the average citizen has less real insurance protection than he had 10 years ago. Can you visualize then what another 10 years of this spending program will do to your own security, to say nothing of its effect on the integrity and solvency of your Government.

The cold fact is that we cannot continue to support the rest of the world and fight other nations' wars, without paying the penalty here at home. This penalty is being inflicted upon people who are giving the lives of their sons on foreign battlefields and the rest of the hardships that go with it. Our living standards have been reduced by increased prices and other inflationary pressures. I receive letters every day from people who are living on small salaries, pensions, or annuities who can hardly keep body and soul together. Last year Congress very wisely increased social-security benefits for millions of our people, but the inflation that has come about in the past 8 months has more than wiped out those increases, so that the people on social security today are worse off than they were before the increase was made. The same may be said of wage increases. Before the wage earner gets home with his next check the increases in prices have virtually wiped it out.

Something can be done to remedy this desperate situation, but the people must be awakened and aroused to the danger of our foreign policy spending programs before it is too late.

Everyone agrees that we must spend every dollar that is necessary to strengthen our National Defense Establishment so that we can defend this hemisphere from any kind or type of foreign aggression. We have the resources and the means to establish and maintain such a defense system. We can build and maintain the biggest navy and the strongest air force on earth. We can provide sufficient manpower and atomic weapons to implement such a force. And we can do all these things without taxing our people to death or ruining our economy.

Our difficulty arises from the obligations we incur over and above what is necessary for adequate defense of our own country. It arises from the fact that in addition to supporting our own economy and maintaining adequate defenses we have been committed by the President—without our consent—to a program of supporting the domestic economies of Europe and Asia, and to defending those areas against aggression in any form.

For more than a year we have been engaged in a senseless war in Korea. God grant that some settlement of that conflict can be made at an early date. Almost any settlement, within reason, is to be preferred to the further loss of American lives in a contest that can never justify the American casualties already sustained. The problems of Asia are insoluble. The turmoil on that continent is centuries old, and it is nothing short of ridiculous to assume that we can bring order out of chaos on that continent by alternately fighting wars there and spending billions for rehabilitation. The social and economic conditions under which 500,000,000 Asiatics are living, and have been living for centuries, cannot be improved by our engaging in bloody wars or by solutions dreamed up by economic planners in this country. We

can, by sheer stupidity, bring our own standards of living down to a level of the Asiatics. But we simply do not have the resources, the ability, or the know-how to bring their standards up to ours. The sooner we stop trying it, the better off we will be.

Our foreign-policy program in Europe is likewise in a deplorable state. Ever since the end of World War II, we have been supporting England and Western Europe. The President intends that we not only continue to support those nations but is sending troops and military supplies so that we can fight world war III in their behalf. The nations of Western Europe are not at all worried about world war III, because they have every confidence that we will fight such a war for them if and when it comes and that we will rehabilitate their countries and support them after it is over. No wonder our citizens are asking their Congressmen the question, "How foolish can Uncle Sam get?"

In spite of our generosity through foreign-aid programs—in spite of our commitments to fight their wars—the plain fact is there is not a single European or Asiatic nation upon whom we could place complete reliance if need for their help arose. This has been dramatically demonstrated by the attitude of our so-called friends in the Korean war. It is our boys who are doing the fighting and dying. Their boys are staying at home. Thus, it should be abundantly clear by this time that our extravagant and fabulous foreign-policy program is the direct cause of our inflationary troubles here at home. Even if it were desirable for us to take all of the world's burdens on our shoulders, and the responsibility for fighting its wars, the truth is that we cannot successfully carry such a load. We do not have the manpower or the resources to sustain these broad commitments unless we want to run the risk of destroying the solvency and integrity of our own Government and the security of our own people. These are calculated risks and we should not take them without having our eyes open. If we continue on blindly, we may save Europe or Asia but lose America in the process.

More Tax on Beer Hits the Workingman and Plays Into the Hands of the Prohibitionists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting herewith an article from the CIO News for August 6, 1951, which points out with significance the drive to tax beer out of the reach of the workingman. This drive plays right into the hands of the prohibitionists as the article well points out.

Herewith is the article:

PROHIBITION WEDGE—YOU WON'T LIKE HIGHER TAXES ON YOUR BEER

Prohibition must not be reimposed on the United States under the guise of a tax law, President Karl F. Feller, of the CIO Brewery Workers, last week told the Senate Finance Committee, now considering new tax legislation.

"Fanatical forces of prohibition, which are ceaselessly active in our National and State capitals, view any increase in alcoholic beverage taxes as a step toward prohibition,"

Feller said. He branded proposed increases "unfair, ill-advised, and short-sighted."

Moreover, Feller pointed out, a higher tax rate may actually mean much less in total tax income. He warned that additional taxes on beer, "the workingman's drink," might place it beyond reach of the public and destroy the industry.

Feller said that in recent years "the size of the beer glass has been shrinking and its price has been rising," primarily because of increased taxes. He noted that the Federal tax on beer has jumped from \$5 to \$8 a barrel, while State taxes range from 62 cents per barrel (in California) to \$14.40 (in South Carolina).

OTHER TAXES

There are also numerous additional local taxes, Federal and State license and permit fees, as well as general corporation taxes on breweries.

The union president said that the "saturation point" on beer taxes has already been reached and that diminishing returns have already set in. In 1947, he pointed out, the amount collected in Federal beer taxes amounted to almost \$703,000,000, but in 1950 the total fell to \$662,000,000.

Many of the same facts also apply to proposed increases in the taxation of distilled spirits from \$9 to \$10.50 per proof gallon, Feller said.

Heavier taxation, he warned, would bring back the racketeer, hijacker, bootlegger, and speakeasy and would be an invitation to organized crime on a national scale.

"This committee and this Congress," he added, "have no mandate to reintroduce national prohibition. I assume that this Committee and this Congress are too well aware of the social catastrophe which is called the 'noble experiment' to even contemplate its restoration."

Feller's remarks underscored the fact that a higher tax rate alone does not necessarily mean a higher tax income for Uncle Sam.

FIGURES SUPPORT CIO

The CIO in previous testimony has urged that most of the increased taxes necessary to pay for defense should be obtained through increases in the excess profits on corporations and by plugging loopholes in the present tax law.

Figures released by the Department of Commerce last month reveal that private industry wage-and-salary income is falling off, although the total of personal income is increasing.

Wages and salaries were at about the \$140,000,000,000 annual rate in May, about \$1,000,000,000 lower than in April, but personal income totaled \$249,500,000,000—about \$500,000,000 more than in April.

This means that most of the increase in personal income came to those on farms, and in farms and in business, in dividends and interest, rents received by landlords, and other types of individual income.

In other words, the workers' wages fell by \$1,000,000,000 while gains to capital went up \$1,500,000,000.

Corporation profits are more than double the previous record set in World War II, but spokesmen for big business are trying to pressure Congress to shift most of the tax burden upon the lower-paid wage and salary workers.

RAILROAD'S PLEA

Typical of their approach is the statement of the Association of American Railroads to the Senate Finance Committee. The AAR said proposed increases in corporation income taxes would hamper the railroads in expanding to meet the needs of the defense program.

J. Carter Fort, representing the association, claimed that railroads must rely primarily on earnings to finance expansion.

Fort conveniently forgot that the railroads are among the big benefactors of the

tax-write-off scheme made possible under the terms of the Defense Production Act.

Corporations have been getting certificates of necessity permitting them to write off 50 to 85 percent of the cost of new facilities within 5 years. Nearly 3,000 such authorizations, amounting to \$8,500,000,000, have been granted.

In the week just before Fort testified, more than \$140,000,000 of \$395,000,000 approved that week under the program went to railroad equipment and expansion projects. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co. alone got concessions on a project costing \$51,936,200.

Building Strength for Peace, Prosperity, and Democracy—Inflation and Deflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the deafening din of criticism, unsoftened by the music of unity, common effort, or alternatives fully spelled out, is often discouraging and unworthy of our intelligence potential. However, it seems that in each hour of need the impetus of the challenge raises up a dedication somewhere to its solution. I am pleased to bring to the attention of the Members an outstanding example of just such a response to a present crucial challenge: two resolutions adopted by the executive committee of the Farmer's Union in a recent meeting in Denver, Colo. It is my considered opinion that this family-farm group always demonstrates its progressive spirit through constructive programs for the common good.

In that these resolutions offer alternative solutions to fit the alternative problems which may arise out of today's difficulties, I do not believe I should endorse the outlined solutions 100 percent. Neither should those who are inclined to disagree with the Farmer's Union condemn these suggestions without noting their value.

Let us rather view these flexible outlines, predicated upon different courses which may develop, in the manner they suggest; that is, avoiding minor pitfalls and personal proclivities, use these to hammer out a common program for the common good of all men everywhere.

We all agree that we have at least two major problems, Russian imperialism and the inflation generated by our varied programs against that evil force. Would it not be in keeping with the general welfare to work out a common defense against both?

The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTION ON BUILDING STRENGTH FOR PEACE, PROSPERITY, AND DEMOCRACY

Farmers Union believes that the guiding principle of our foreign policy should be the earliest possible attainment of a world brotherhood of prosperous democratic nations living at peace with one another under international authority with limited sovereignty.

There are today two major threats to true world brotherhood and peace:

One is the existence in the free world of uncorrected and indefensible evils which provide the seedbed for agitation, uprising, and revolt. The other is the fact that Russian rulers, instead of cooperating to end these conditions under free governments, have revealed imperialistic world aims and a determination to exploit every wrong for her own imperialistic purposes.

We must end starvation, exploitation, feudalism, dictatorships, and other real injustices outside the iron curtain or be prepared to take major blame for any world cataclysm which may follow. We must stop being miserly about point 4, economic aid, and technical assistance. We must cease making partners of despotic governments and launch, through the United Nations, a campaign to create a world that is truly free, in which men may find justice through democratic and peaceful processes.

The record thus far fails to reveal any Russian desire to work with other nations to achieve free world objectives. She has established totalitarian regimes in satellite countries. She has engaged in subversion and destruction within many nations. She has sponsored armed revolts and military aggressions.

It is clear that time to establish freedom and equity must be bought by the creation of military as well as economic strength throughout the free world. For that reason, the executive committee endorses the full support which we have given to Federal action to build these strengths outside the iron curtain.

The executive committee is meeting at a time when the immediate intentions of the Russian Soviet rulers as to future moves are uncertain. Russia may or may not want a genuine cease fire in Korea; Russia may or may not want an honest peace settlement in Korea; Russia may or may not plan to sponsor an extended period of pseudo peace to cause the free world to relax. And it is conceivably possible that Russia may have finally decided to cooperate with United Nations in the building of a true world brotherhood of prosperous democratic nations under a limited world government.

If an honorable and genuine cease-fire agreement is effected, negotiations should be begun immediately to develop a genuine, honest, and permanent peace in Korea. There can be no genuine lasting peace or prosperity in Korea unless the peace terms provide for free democratic elections and allow and encourage the emergence of a democratic, independent united Korea.

In the meantime, the United States and the rest of the free world should be building economic and military strength and political understanding as rapidly as possible, in the interest of a prosperous peace if attainable and for better defense if that becomes necessary. So that we will be prepared to take the most appropriate action whatever the intentions of Russia turn out to be, we recommend that the President of the United States direct the mobilization authorities to develop complete comprehensive and detailed programs with integrated scheduling of actions and movements to fit each of at least three different possible situations:

I. No cease fire in Korea, or a cease fire in Korea but outbreaks elsewhere;

II. Cease fire in Korea but no early peace settlement, or a peace settlement followed by obvious plans for early aggressive Russian expansion elsewhere; and

III. An early peace settlement in Korea accompanied by concrete Russian peace moves. (These might be for the purpose of providing an atmosphere of false security and relaxation or that might be a genuine desire to promote a world brotherhood. Since the latter circumstance is so improbable, it would take a lot of fundamental

moves on the part of Russia over a considerable period of time before we could afford to consider that we can actually plan on an extended period of world peace.)

While we do not possess the technical information that would be required to prepare complete blueprints for each of the programs to meet each of these three contingencies we do wish to present a few recommendations with respect to each:

I. In case of no cease-fire in Korea, we recommend that the presently established targets for military mobilization be continued with some immediate improvements in the methods, procedures, and programming of the mobilization effort. The executive committee believes, on the basis of information it has studied, that because of a production-restrictionist philosophy and a failure to do a complete job of scheduling and programming mobilization authorities have planned for and allowed too little resource exploration and development, too little expansion of plant capacity, and given too little attention to efficient utilization of manpower.

The result of these weaknesses is in the mobilization program that the increase in total production each year is about half of what it should be and that the amount of resources and processed goods that must be diverted from civilian channels is considerably greater than it would otherwise have to be.

We, therefore, recommend that the President of the United States direct the Office of Defense Mobilization to adopt whatever changes in philosophy and working methods as are required to develop a completely scheduled program from basic resources to finished products that will bring about an annual increase in total output each year of approximately 15 percent rather than the presently contemplated 5 to 7 percent.

We also urge the adoption by Congress of the entire \$8,500,000,000 of foreign assistance recommended by the executive branch together with the specific recommendations contained in President Patton's recommendations to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives.

II. Cease-fire in Korea but no early general peace settlement in Korea, or a Korean peace settlement accompanied by saber rattling elsewhere. The development of either of these circumstances would, it seems to us, indicate that Russia had no real peace intentions but did intend to hold off for a few months or years in starting new armed aggression.

Such a development, it seems to us, would allow the diversion of a limited amount of funds and resources from the manufacture of military end products that have a rapid depreciation and obsolescence rate, to more fundamental steps in building the economic and military strength and political understanding of the free world and of our own nation. We recommend that in case of a bona fide cease-fire in Korea unaccompanied by disturbances elsewhere the United States divert funds from the manufacture of military end-products to (a) fundamental projects of resource exploration and development, (b) to vastly expanded scientific and vocational education and training, and (c) to more rapid expansion of basic plant capacity. We urge that this program of resource development, plant expansion, and vocational and scientific training be pursued with the same vigor and same care for scheduled programming as we have recommended for the program in case of no Korean cease fire.

III. An early Korean peace settlement accompanied by concrete Russian peace moves. In case of the program to meet this situation we recommend that large sums be diverted from the manufacture of military end-products to projects that will contribute materially to the building of the economic

strength and political understanding of the free world.

In this program, the total national effort should be the same as in the other two plans, but the allocation of funds and resources as between different components of the programs should be greatly different. Funds should be diverted from the domestic manufacture of military end products to both domestic and foreign economic development projects.

These economic development projects would be incorporated into a total integrated, completely scheduled programing of actions and movements to vastly speed up resource exploration and development throughout the free world, to move forward with scientific and technical training as rapidly as existing supply of trained personnel will allow, and to take whatever steps are necessary to increase communication and transport and to expand manufacturing and farm productive plant capacity throughout the free world.

The completely scheduled plan to meet this situation should be developed now so that it can go into operation without the kind of delays and mistakes that usually have accompanied our shifts of emphasis, from civilian production to military production and back again.

While the executive committee is not dealing with the problem of economic stabilization in this statement, we do want to recommend that provision should be made to finance each of these plans with pay-as-you-go taxation buttressed with whatever honest controls over credit, savings, and wages and prices as are required from time to time.

The executive committee is conscious that the matters covered in this statement are of vital importance to every member of the Farmers Union as well as to every person in the free world. We know that they are subjects upon which it is of utmost importance that our Nation make wise decisions. We hereby direct President Patton to bring this statement to the attention of the highest military and civilian officials of this Nation that he continue his efforts to see that the principles we have stated are incorporated in the policies of the Federal Government.

RESOLUTION ON INFLATION-DEFLATION

Farmers Union believes that the economy of the free world and of the United States should be developed and geared to the production of a sustained and ever-expanding abundance. The modern highly developed economic system is a delicately balanced mechanism and its parts are highly interdependent. The economic system works rather well when all of its productive resources are fully employed, using the most highly developed technology available, and when all of the goods produced can be purchased with the income paid out in their production.

However, in some periods, such as the decade of the thirties, income does not flow to consumers as rapidly as goods are produced, and deflation results. In other periods, such as during World War II, the income that workers, farmers, and other owners of productive resources receive increases faster than the quantity of goods that can be purchased with that income because a sizable share of the produced goods is pulled out of the flow to consumers and is put into stockpiles or into military use.

The basic fact of inflation is the so-called inflationary gap. This gap is the amount by which earned incomes exceed the net value of produced goods that are available for purchase by consumers. Because the economy is operating at full tilt, the total amount of goods produced usually increases rather rapidly compared to previous periods. But since a certain share of the produced goods is not available for consumer pur-

chases, the real level of living of the people is not as high as it would be if all of the goods were available to them. If the increased amount of goods taken out exceeds the increase in production, the average-person real income must fall.

Regardless of what financial or statistical manipulations are engaged in, we cannot escape paying this cost in the year in which it is incurred. The arguments over taxation policies, credit and monetary policies, and price and wage-control policies are arguments over who in the economy is to pay this cost and in what proportion to others in the economy.

There are basically five different ways by which the cost resulting from diversion of produced goods from consumer channels may be absorbed by the economy:

1. **Inflation** This method allows prices and wages to rise to the place where the increased cost of the items that can be purchased just equals the total income available to consumers. By this method groups with relatively fixed incomes pay a very heavy share of the extra cost, while the lower income groups that are required to spend a greater share of their incomes for immediate consumption pay a relatively heavier share of the cost than the higher income groups.

2. **Taxation** By this method the Government collects in increased taxes the cost of the expenditures on the goods taken out of consumer channels. By this method the cost is levied on different people in accordance to taxation schedules and kinds of taxes used. If the bulk of the taxes is collected through graduated personal and corporation income taxes, inheritance taxes, and excise taxes on luxuries, the cost is borne by different people in a rough correspondence to their ability to pay. A retail sales tax or a general transaction tax on the other hand would cause low-income people to absorb proportionately more of the burden.

3. **Savings** If the people will put into savings an amount of income equivalent to the value of the goods that are taken out of consumer channels, that amount of purchasing power is saved or deferred to another day and does not have an inflationary effect in the current period. Obviously the people who save must forego expenditures to the amount of the required savings.

4. **Credit restrictions.** In normal periods a considerable amount of purchasing power is derived from borrowed funds. For temporary periods this added purchasing power can be dried up by credit restrictions which reduce the amount of credit outstanding. However, once outstanding credit balances are reduced the continuation of credit restrictions has no further deflationary effect, although relaxation of the restrictions would, of course, be inflationary.

5. **Wage and price control** When prices start up they cause a rise in the cost of living which in turn requires laborers to demand and be able to obtain higher wages which in turn increase the cost of production of commodities. Price and wage controls are used to try to hold the economy steady during times of scare buyings and in the periods when increased taxation, greater savings and credit restrictions fail to take hold and stop inflation. Even though taxes and savings were increased sufficiently over a year's time to take up the inflationary gap, the balance between increased income and decreased flow of goods to consumers would vary from week to week and from month to month. This causes recurring inflationary surges. Wage and price controls are necessary supplements to increased taxes, savings and credit restrictions in an inflationary situation.

Farmers Union's position on inflation control is solidly based upon our understanding of these economic facts. The Farmers Union anti-inflation program calls for all four of these anti-inflationary devices: increased progressive taxation, a plan for in-

come deferment based upon the income taxation principle, selective credit restrictions, and an honest genuine wage and price control system.

The executive committee of the National Farmers Union commends President Patton and his staff for their efforts to bring about the enactment of legislation and promulgation of administrative rulings that would put the Farmers Union anti-inflationary program into operation. We view with considerable misgivings the failure of both the executive and the legislative branches of the Federal Government to adopt this program.

In the economic stabilization program adopted under the Defense Production Act of 1950, jawbone inflation which characterized the last half of 1950 was replaced by the built-in legalized inflation that characterized the manufacturers' general price regulation. Amendments to the proposed Defense Production Act of 1951, recently adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives, go even further in the direction of legalized inflation. In its failure to provide for increased taxes in the amount of \$15,000,000,000, being content with less than half this much, the House of Representatives has demonstrated a desire to have about half of the increased cost of the mobilization program levied in accordance with ability to pay with the other half of the cost levied, through inflation, most heavily upon those who are least able to pay. We urge that the Senate enact tax increase legislation that will bring in increased taxes of at least \$15,000,000,000.

No group but Farmers Union has recommended the use of a progressive system of income deferments to absorb that part of the inflationary gap not absorbed by increased taxes. We urge that such a system be adopted at once.

We are meeting at a time when the final outcome of taxation and wage and price control legislation is uncertain. However, there is every indication that taxes will not be raised enough, that no income deferment plan will be put into effect, and that the so-called wage and price control provisions of the Defense Production Act will be in fact a system of legalized inflation.

The result of this combination of circumstances will be extremely painful to people of fixed incomes and will result in family farmers being subjected again rather soon to the old familiar squeeze between rising costs and falling incomes.

The cost-plus-85 percent profit price ceiling amendment adopted by the House and later rejected would have insured a continued rise in the prices of manufactured products, as will many of the weakening amendments that were adopted. This price rise will, of course, bring about an increase in the farm production expenses and family living costs. These higher prices for manufactured commodities will also absorb urban purchasing power which will have a tendency to reduce the consumer demand for and the price of the products that farmers have to sell, particularly in view of the present prospects for a total farm production considerably above any previous year. The result will, of course, be that the parity index of the things farmers buy for production and family living will continue to rise, while farm commodity prices fall to support levels.

We view with alarm the fact that farmers are facing a period when agriculture will be suffering the ills of deflation compounded with the costs of inflation in the rest of the economy.

We therefore urge that our officials make every effort to bring about the enactment of the 100 percent of parity price support bill, with coverage of all bona fide farm commodities. If farm prices do not fall below parity, these programs would not have to be used, but with all other prices rising and prices of farm commodities falling, family farmers would be required to assume too

great a financial sacrifice, particularly in view of the magnificent response they are making to the Government's pleas for increased production this year.

If Congress should adjourn (1) without enacting tax legislation providing for sufficient increased revenue to balance the Federal budget, (2) without providing the executive branch with appropriate authority to establish and operate adequate and honest credit restriction and wage and price control, or (3) without taking the flexing provisions out of the present farm price support laws we urge the President to call a special session of the Congress to be devoted to those highly important matters.

The Word Is "Controls," but It Means Tyranny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including the following challenging editorial from the Omaha World-Herald:

THE WORD IS "CONTROLS," BUT IT MEANS TYRANNY

Those who search for a guiding principle in the congressional actions on price controls will search in vain.

There is none.

It is true that a small group of left-wing zealots fights valiantly for every totalitarian proposal. It is also true that a right-wing group takes a steadfast stand in defense of American freedom.

But in between is the vast, amorphous majority which sways this way and that, yielding to one lobby here and another there, accepting one roll-back while scorning another—and seeking always and above all to avoid record votes.

Thus the controls bill, when it comes out of conference committee for the last time, will express no coherent philosophy of American Government, but rather will echo the teeth-chattering fears of small politicians who dread to face the issue.

What is the issue?

We think it is simply this. American freedom, from now until the end of the Republic.

President Truman and his colleagues say that this "emergency" will last only 2 or 3 years—that by 1954, at the latest, it will be possible to cut down the huge defense and foreign-aid budgets, reduce taxes, and relax the economic controls which are now being imposed.

This newspaper does not possess the gift of prophecy, but it does have a memory for recent events.

It recalls that the rearmament program of 1939 and 1940 was to be only a temporary and strictly precautionary program, which (as the then President solemnly assured the people) would make it unnecessary for the American people to send their sons overseas to die in foreign wars. It recalls that each of the foreign give-away programs sponsored by the present President—including the pending eight-and-one-half-billion-dollar-a-year plan—has been advanced as a short-term proposition.

In view of experience, it would be somewhat naive to expect the spending bureaucracy to proclaim in the near future that the crisis had passed, that the budget

should be slashed, and that economic controls safely could be abandoned.

As a matter of fact, there is no reason whatever to expect an early change in the world's political climate.

The Stalin regime appears to be seated firmly in the saddle in Russia. So long as it remains there—with or without Stalin's living presence—the United States will have to be ready for trouble. President Truman and his colleagues have stressed that point repeatedly.

In the face of this danger, it is completely unrealistic to pretend that this country can build up its military forces for the next 2 or 3 years and then rest on its oars.

Military machines, especially airplanes, grow obsolete quickly, and soldiers lose their military skills unless they are kept in training. Thus, a razor-sharp national defense will require large spending, year after year, for research, for factory production, and for manpower.

That is the prospect which this country faces, and for which it should be preparing, without any illusory talk about a transient emergency or temporary programs. It should plan a defense which the people can carry—without giving up the freedoms which they love, and which are the real secret of their great economic strength.

The word "controls" is a euphemism. It means the same as "depotism" and "tyranny" meant in an earlier day. It represents an attempt to bureaucrats to abolish the free market, and eventually other freedoms, so that they, the bureaucrats, may rule by decree.

So far as old-fashioned, free Americanism is concerned the dangers represented by government control of the activities and transactions of private citizens are scarcely less ominous than the danger of communism.

Yet few Congressmen seem willing to face that manifest truth. Under the heavy political pressure applied by the administration and other groups, many of them abandon democratic principle and yield to bureaucratic authority. And while so doing they hide behind the pretext—ready-made for them by the administration—that the collectivist measures enacted now are not very important because they are only temporary and will be wiped out in a couple of years.

There is one thing that this country needs vastly more than airplanes or atom bombs, and that is simple courage. Not much of it has been shown in this session of Congress.

A Patriotic American Writes His Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, the writer of the letter which follows is an esteemed constituent of mine, Mr. Henry Toelke, of Binghamton, N. Y.

Mr. Toelke is a keen student of government and has been a valued contributor to my large correspondence from home ever since I have been in Washington.

In 1939, when I first ran for Congress, Mr. Toelke was prominently mentioned as a candidate to fill out my predecessor, Bert Lord's term. While at that time Mr. Toelke was regarded as my opponent, we have since become warm

friends and I have obtained much sage counsel and sound opinion from this worthy gentleman.

As operator of a local book and manuscript store, Mr. Toelke is an avid reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which my office sends him regularly.

I take pleasure in extending in the Appendix a recent letter of Mr. Toelke to me:

BINGHAMTON, N. Y., July 25, 1951.

HON. EDWIN A. HALL,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In reading the discussions of the inflation issue on the floor of the House, as appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the thought came to mind of very important roll-backs seldom mentioned and yet should be discussed and action taken on the legal robbery of Uncle Sam in acquiring strategic material needed for our national defense.

Refer to the outrageous increase in prices for steel, rubber, tungsten, copper, lead, etc., since the Korea conflict started. How about roll-backs on those items, which it has been stated will mean a tremendous loss of \$7,000,000,000?

Washington has a flair for asking our people to sacrifice. How about a little sacrifice on the part of these gougers in national defense materials? How about some sacrificing in nonessential positions in government? Oh, no; anything but that.

Our bloated billionaire corporations are at it as heretofore. These war profiteers again seek Uncle Sam to build defense plants for them. And, when the shooting stops turn the plants over to the corporations for about 1 mill on the dollar. That's one way to make a few more billionaires. That's been the game of the rich patrioteer after the past two wars. What suckers we are.

For economic justice

GLENWOOD BOOK MART,
H. TOELKE.

Unjust Treatment of Naval Reservists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, for the past several months I have been doing my best in a constructive way to expose the injustices many reservists are being subjected to.

This morning I received a letter from another disgusted sailor who informed me of the poor mess being given the men. He states in his letter that during an inspection the officers discovered articles of food that had been removed from the galley.

A bulletin, including the plan of the day, dated August 3, 1951, was enclosed in his letter. That part of the bulletin dealing with the inspection and the stolen food is printed below.

I do not approve of stealing, nor do I approve of the Navy paying \$1,500 for the food listed. If they are paying such prices, it is no wonder our defense costs are so high.

According to a Washington wholesaler in food products, the items listed below

could be purchased for approximately \$218.

The bulletin follows:

During the surprise inspection, the following items of stolen food was discovered in the various compartments of the ship: 3 cases of fruit cocktail, 5 cans of salmon, 60 pounds of frozen peaches, 60 pounds of frozen strawberries, 60 pounds of frozen cherries, 1 can of peach preserves, 4 cans of grape juice, 1 silex, 7 cans of figs, 1 can of coconut, 9 cans of sardines, 1 can of olives, 12 quarts of milk, 2 bolognas, 1½ cases of crackers, 11 cans of tomato juice, 10 pounds of sugar, 3 cans of peanut butter, 1 can of prune juice.

This amounts to about \$1,500, much of which was expensive perishable items. The general mess will have to be curtailed to absorb any losses. Theft on this scale is a reflection on every man aboard and in particular the worthiness of petty officers involved to continue to wear their stripes. While further action is being contemplated, holiday routine and movies and ship's service will be secured through Sunday and all hands not on watch will turn to Saturday and Sunday to chip and paint the ship's sides and mast.

In the future petty officers in charge of a compartment or area will be responsible and held accountable at "captain's mast" for illegal possession of stores, materials or tools found in their respective compartments.

Korean Deal Will Benefit Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, from the Washington Evening Star:

KOREAN DEAL WILL BENEFIT REDS—COMMUNISTS HAVE EVERY REASON TO ACCEPT PROPOSAL FOR DEFENSE LINE ALONG PRESENT POSITION OF FORCES

(By David Lawrence)

The Communists have every reason to accept the United Nations proposal for a defense line marked by the present position of the military forces in Korea. Logically, the Reds have so much more to gain than to lose by agreeing to it that they can well afford to give the U. N. something to "save face."

For if the thirty-eighth parallel isn't the exact armistice line and a zone a few miles north of it is established as a basis for the cease-fire, the U. N. can say that it achieved something beyond what South Korea had when the aggression started more than a year ago. Since the United States and the U. N. have announced that the original purpose—to repel aggression at the thirty-eighth parallel—has been achieved already, the Allies cannot make much of an issue or resume fighting just because of a disagreement on the armistice line.

The Reds, on the other hand, would be acquiring undisputed possession for the indefinite future of virtually all of North Korea. This is the biggest stake of all, for which they gladly would terminate the fighting now, knowing that by so doing, they keep the U. N. forces bogged down in Korea for years to come.

From a propaganda standpoint, the Communists benefit a great deal, too. For they

know full well the U. N. troops will not be withdrawn, because there is no guaranty in sight or likely to be given that would insure against a recurrence of aggression at any moment. The demand that there be a withdrawal will, however, be repeated by the Communists at frequent intervals and the U. N. will be exhibited in propaganda as occupying Korea allegedly against the will of the inhabitants.

The Allies have fallen into the Communist trap on the negotiating tactics. By insisting that all "political questions" be excluded from the armistice negotiations, a cessation of hostilities is brought about without settling the real matters of substance—the establishment of peace throughout Korea and the withdrawal of all foreign troops. Knowing in advance the U. N. attitude, the Communists have tried adroitly to insert these two main political issues in the armistice negotiations, no doubt expecting rejection. The U. N. representatives have gone on record, on instructions from the home governments, as refusing to discuss these issues.

If this goal—a cease-fire around the thirty-eighth parallel and without a political settlement—was what the U. N. really wanted all the time, then the record will show that the same thing might have been obtained on March 24 last when General MacArthur offered to arrange with the enemy field commanders a cease-fire without discussing any political questions. The American Government and the U. N. failed to back up the MacArthur proposal. The general was never told at the time that the President or the United Nations had decided to negotiate on this or any other basis. Inaccurate statements have been made in the press that the general was so informed and that he knew negotiations had begun. But the verbatim record of the Senate hearings reveals that both General Collins and Secretary Acheson testified flatly that the far eastern commander was never given any such word.

What did happen was that the American Government immediately repudiated in public General MacArthur's overture broadcast to the enemy commander as a piece of psychological warfare.

The excuse given in Washington for failing to endorse the MacArthur move was that his message to the Communist commander had in it a few phrases saying the U. N. threatened to expand the war. It did draw attention to the weak position of the enemy and stated that if the United Nations decided to carry the war to the enemy bases the Reds wouldn't have a chance for victory. The enemy had not been using pussyfoot language in its broadcasts either, and probably were not offended by General MacArthur's words. It is incredible that the phrase describing the more advantageous U. N. military position last March could have been the actual basis for the refusal of the Reds to consider what he offered them.

The real reason undoubtedly was that the Communists did not think at that time that the U. N. would arrange a cease-fire between enemy commanders and leave North Korea in the hands of the Communists, which for all practical purposes it will be. Naturally, after the dismissal of General MacArthur and the public statements of our officials that military means would not be used to seek pacification of all Korea, the Reds, through Malik, jumped at the chance to get what they are getting now—a cease-fire without a political settlement.

Once the fighting stops, the Reds know the U. N. will not resume hostilities just to gain possession of North Korea. The Communists are back about where they started from in June 1950, and have subjected the United States to a terrific expense, a dislocation of its military forces in the world, and the loss of 80,000 casualties. And it remains to be seen whether Communist aggression has been repelled in Korea or elsewhere in the world.

Reducing the Federal Waste Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include my radio interview with Col. Edward A. Sherman, executive director, Massachusetts Committee for the Hoover Report, over Station WEEI on August 4, 1951, as follows:

Colonel SHERMAN. In this series of broadcasts we are bringing into your homes the voices of men who have been chosen as our leaders—our Representatives in Congress, men upon whom we have placed the extraordinary responsibilities urgently demanded by the critical period in our history in which we are living these days.

Our guest on this broadcast is the man selected by the citizens of the Seventh Congressional District to represent them in Congress, a man who is known and respected not only by those of his district and his political party but by all the citizens of Massachusetts no matter what their partisan affiliations may be. Folks meet Democratic Congressman THOMAS J. LANE, of Lawrence.

Congressman LANE. We, as a united people, have dedicated ourselves to a life-or-death struggle to resist and discourage the spread of communism.

To strengthen ourselves for that test, we are mobilizing the human and material resources of this Nation.

But that effort will be endangered if the over-all guiding hand—the Federal Government—remains bogged down in a mess of duplications, contradictions, and inexcusable waste.

In fact, the conspirators in the Kremlin are counting upon us to do just that. They believe that we will wreck ourselves through our own excesses. In their book, the material abundance and productive genius of the American people will become so tied up in a traffic jam of extravagance and mismanagement, that the Communists will find it easy to step in and take over.

We have this clear warning before us. Either streamline the organization and functions of the United States Government—or it will collapse like a building that becomes wider with each story that is added to it.

This danger has been developing for some time. The present and continuing world crisis has brought it to the critical stage. Every President since Theodore Roosevelt has sensed that Government was getting too big and was getting out of hand. Overwhelmed by minor details and needless contacts, every President has tried to bring some order out of this chaos. But this requires congressional action—backed up by citizen support—to cut through the red tape and bureaucratic opposition.

Like the fat lady in the circus, Government is becoming so big—with double chins—and overlapping belts of superfluous flesh—that it can't see its own feet. And the bigger it becomes, the less work it can do—except to lean on us with its crushing burden.

Come to think of it, Ed, I have never heard anyone maintain that a second chin—serves any useful purpose.

Colonel SHERMAN. Just excess baggage—Congressman LANE. As one wit put it, "The greatest export of Washington, D. C. is waste paper." Like all humor, it is composed of some truth and some exaggeration.

From my own experience in Congress, I can tell you that we become exasperated by the jungle of bureaus, and the multiplicity

of hands through which applications must pass before anything is cleared for action.

The frustration experienced by veterans—and by income-tax payers—by civil service applicants—and now by businessmen—in dealing with the mystifying language of Government regulations, and in filling out endless forms—is something that shouldn't happen to any human being.

Washington swims in paper. Vouchers pour in by freight cars. This flood is something that Federal employees cannot cope with. It is humanly impossible to carefully check—or even find—all these forms and their long-tailed copies. The question naturally arises as to why all this baffling paper work should be required in the first place.

There is no valid answer, except that bureau chiefs fear any cut-down in their staffs and their prestige. We see emergency agencies, still in business long after the emergency has passed. Letters and papers and forms are kept in circulation in order to create a deceptive air of indispensability.

This useless work bears heavily upon the career employees in Government. It explains, in part, the rapid and expensive turnover in Federal employment. People want to do work that has some meaning.

Colonel SHERMAN. For there are lots of folks in Government who really want to do a job, not just hold a job.

Congressman LANE. In May of this year, the Joint Congressional Committee on Non-essential Expenditures estimated that the Defense Department would hire 440,000 new civilian workers—and 450,000 replacements—during the ensuing 14 months, on the basis of the proposed military budget.

Note that the turn-over anticipated is greater than the number to be hired. No private business could operate under such wasteful conditions. If every worker hired, quit after a few months, a company would never be able to train and assemble an efficient corps of workers. And the expense involved in keeping records of these comings and goings would add to the overhead. The committee also discovered that over 90,000 soldiers and sailors were doing clerical work when their prime job should be learning to handle the planes, and ships, and guns for the defense of this Nation.

These instances—and many more that could be quoted—reveal the misuse of personnel in the operation of our sprawling Government.

Now I have the highest regard for the average Federal employee. I want to see his status improved. This will require an overhaul of the personnel system by which we hire, classify, and promote Federal workers.

Employees of the Government of the United States include both those in the military and those in the civilian departments.

Colonel SHERMAN. Can you say a word about the morale of our civil-service people, Congressman LANE?

Congressman LANE. We know that morale—the feeling that one is doing a useful job, backed by the incentive that recognition will be forthcoming for doing a better job—is necessary for the mutual progress of employer and employee.

This holds for Government as well as for private business.

An employee cannot do his best when he is surrounded by waste, confusion, and uncertainty.

Just as we are developing career system through the ranks of the Armed Forces—assigning men to responsible tasks where they can also learn, giving them clear-cut goals to work for and be proud of, welcoming suggestions for improvements from them, providing adequate pay and opportunities for promotion—so must we do the same for the civil service.

By so doing we will help our Government to become more efficient and less costly—that's what your Massachusetts Committee for the Hoover report calls for, Ed?

Your committee is composed of public-spirited citizens who seek support for the current movement—based upon the nonpartisan studies made by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government—to promote economy and efficiency in the management of our big Government.

We must streamline government so that it will continue to give us the necessary services that we require of it, without taking too many tax dollars from our pockets. And we all pay heavy taxes, whether we know it or not. Because the price of everything that we buy—even down to the lowly loaf of bread—is made up of many hidden taxes in addition to the cost of the necessary labor and materials.

When the Congress authorized a study and search for a plan to reorganize and improve our Government, President Truman, a Democrat—and Republican Representative JOSEPH MARTIN, who was House majority leader at the time—chose ex-President Herbert Hoover to head the Commission. This was done because of Hoover's great and deserved reputation as an organizer and administrator.

Three hundred of the Nation's ablest experts were enlisted into 24 task forces for investigation and analysis. After long and intensive work they came up with their recommendations. Many of them are now in effect, but any slackening of public demand for the fulfillment of the whole program will leave the job half-done.

Colonel SHERMAN. Congressman LANE, of all the areas covered by the Hoover report what field are you most concerned about?

Congressman LANE. Ed, tonight, in the brief time at my disposal, I can only skim the surface of one report—that dealing with personnel.

Even with a perfect organizational chart, the Federal Government cannot operate efficiently and economically, without able, enthusiastic workers. The Government's greatest single problem is how to secure—and keep—able men and women in its service.

Presidents, Cabinet members, Senators, and Representatives—and certain patronage appointments—come and go, depending upon changes in the political climate. But the day-to-day work of Government must have a basic continuity, built upon a real career civil service. We cannot afford the upheavals of the old days—for example, let us take the local level—when the first act of a newly sworn-in alderman was to fire most of the employees under his control and fill their places with his own, inexperienced friends. Transient political chiefs should determine policy on the national level. But we must have career employees to carry on the work.

The entire personnel system of the United States Government is clogged with frustrating red tape. Supervision is overcentralized in the Civil Service Commission. Recruiting machinery is slow and cumbersome. Little effort is made to recruit really promising young men and women and train them for the higher professional and administrative jobs. Of the best who are secured, many are forced to quit because of low Government pay. Government workers are disgruntled by inconsistent pay schedules, slow and uncertain promotions, lack of opportunity to offer criticisms and suggestions.

In one bureau checked, 24 subordinates receive as much compensation as their chief.

Colonel SHERMAN. That certainly is not conducive to good morale.

Congressman LANE. It certainly is not. Four to 8 months often elapse between announcement of examinations for a Government job and an actual appointment to the job. Recruiting consists mainly of posting notices on postoffice bulletin boards. No effort is made to enlist bright young college seniors as private businesses do. Planning and administration of the personnel program have not kept abreast of the times.

The Hoover report's objective is to select the best employees on merit, free from politics, and provide incentive and opportunity for advancement while eliminating waste—in brief—to encourage those who want to do a good day's work and to earn a chance to get ahead.

A few of the Hoover recommendations in this field have been accomplished. Salaries for top Civil Service positions have been increased. There has been some improvement in classification and procedure. A further achievement was the substitution of a performance rating system for the outmoded and cumbersome efficiency rating system.

With the vigilant support of you, the folks at home, so much more can be done.

The 15,000 basic skills in the Government service must be given—coherence, direction, common impulse, and daily leadership and drive.

Young men and women must be given a clear, manifest, and substantial inducement to seek career in public service.

Improved salaries, standards, and opportunities—these are imperative. Personnel operations should be decentralized in order to cut red tape. Modernized training and promotion programs should be instituted to help conscientious career employees.

The Civil Service Commission can put these and many other proposals into effect by administrative action on its own initiative.

The remaining recommendations of the report for better personnel management are being considered by the House and Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committees.

The Massachusetts Committee for the Hoover Report asks you to bear in mind that "You will get as good Government as you demand—or as poor Government as you will tolerate."

Invitation to Soviet Russia To Respond to Friendship Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday I released to the press a statement on the subject of an invitation to Russia's leaders to respond to the friendship resolution which we in the Congress recently unanimously passed. At that time I promised to insert in the RECORD the interesting exchange between the Communist Party newspaper, Pravda, and the British Foreign Secretary, Herbert Morrison. I am happy to do so at the present time.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the text of this exchange be printed in the RECORD at this point and that it be preceded by the statement which I issued yesterday.

There being no objection, the statement and correspondence were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY INVITES RUSSIAN PARLIAMENT OR LEADERS TO RETURN GREETINGS OF McMAHON RESOLUTION BY ANNOUNCEMENT OF PRO-PEACE ACTION IN KOREA; PROMISES TO PUT RUSSIAN MESSAGE IN CONGRESSIONAL RECORD IF REDS WILL RECIPROCATE

I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the very interesting exchange between the Communist Party newspaper, Pravda, and British Foreign Secretary Herbert S. Morrison. I believe that the fact that Pravda printed

Mr. Morrison's message to the Russian people is a very favorable omen which I, for one, would like to interpret as a possible sign of a better day—of possible closer relations between the Russian and western peoples and the press of the east and west.

I think, therefore, that this exchange is worthy of being preserved in the archives of the Congress in the RECORD because perhaps it is a symbol of the fact that the Russian people may be allowed to read more and more in their own newspapers about the real sentiments of the peoples of the west.

At this time I should like to invite Russia's leaders to respond concretely to the McMahon resolution of friendship, of which I am a cosponsor. By leaders, I refer to (a) The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet (Council) of the U. S. S. R. (which is the continuing unit of what is the equivalent of our Congress) or (b) the 14-man Politburo (the top leaders of the Communist Party) or (c) equivalent high officers or groups. (It should be noted that the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R., consisting of two chambers, meets only once every 2 years, while the Presidium is in continuous session and would be the most feasible group to respond.)

So far, the McMahon resolution has unfortunately been met with complete silence in the Russian press and its receipt has not even been acknowledged by the press or by Nikolai Shvelin, chairman of the Presidium, who serves as President of the U. S. S. R. If Russia's leaders, possibly including Marshal Stalin, would respond to that resolution, I am sure that the response would be of great interest to the world, and I, for one, would be delighted at the very minimum, to place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF GENUINE PEACE IN KOREA WOULD BE BEST MESSAGE

Let such a response include announcement of some definite action—rather than mere words—whereby Soviet Russia could demonstrate concretely its desire for peace. A concrete demonstration, for example, would be the announcement that Red China has been advised to move no further reinforcements into Korea, and even to withdraw some of her latest reinforcements and to accept the present military lines for armistice-agreement purposes so as to break the stalemate at Kaesong. Such action would speak volumes and would be one of the most encouraging of all messages for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or for the world press.

The people of Russia should have no fear of the west. Obviously, we want to be friends with the Russian people; we feel that the ideas by which we live would be very helpful for the people of Russia to live by. We do not, however, desire to impose our will or our ways on the Russian people or any foreign people, and all that we ask is that the leaders of Russia cease trying to impose their will on other peoples.

We will eagerly await Russia's response and trust that it will consist of more than an expected rebuke from the New York Daily Worker.

No one is naive enough to think that a verbal response from Russia would of itself change the grim record of recent years, but perhaps it could be an omen of actions leading to genuine understanding. News of suggestion of an unbreakable, an honorable peace in Korea coming from Moscow is what we will hope and pray for—particularly those of us on the Foreign Relations Committee who have been working for a long time on cementing the bonds of international friendship.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of August 1, 1951]

PRAVDA SAYS MORRISON MASKS AIM TO NULLIFY "PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY"

LONDON.—The text of the Moscow Communist Party newspaper Pravda's reply to

British Foreign Secretary Herbert S. Morrison's message to the Russian people:

"In his statement, Mr. Morrison raises two groups of questions: questions of domestic and foreign policy.

"1. Domestic policy: Mr. Morrison asserts that in the Soviet Union there is no freedom of speech, no freedom of the press, no personal freedom.

"Mr. Morrison is deeply mistaken. In no country is there such freedom of speech, freedom of the press, or personal freedom, freedom of organizations for workers, farmers, intellectuals, as in the Soviet Union. Nowhere are there so many workers' and farmers' clubs, so many workers' and farmers' newspapers, as in the Soviet Union. Nowhere has the organization of the working class reached the stage that it has in the Soviet Union. It is an open secret that the entire working class, literally all the workers of the U. S. S. R., are organized in trade-unions, just as all the farmers are organized in cooperatives.

"Does Mr. Morrison know of this? Evidently he does not. Moreover, apparently he does not even want to know of this—he prefers to draw his data from complaints coming from representatives of the Russian capitalists and landlords, who were driven out of the U. S. S. R. by the will of the Soviet people."

CAPITALISM CONDEMNED

"In the U. S. S. R., freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of organizations does not exist for enemies of the people, for the landlords and capitalists overthrown by the revolution. Nor does it exist for incorrigible thieves, for subversive agents, terrorists and assassins sent in by foreign secret services for the criminals who shot at Lenin, who killed Volodarsky, Uritsky, Kirov, poisoned Maxim Gorky and Kulbyshev. All these criminals, from the landlords and capitalists down to the terrorists, thieves, assassins, and subversive agents, are out to restore capitalism in the U. S. S. R., to restore the exploitation of man by man, and to drench the country in the blood of the workers and farmers. The prisons and labor camps exist for these gentlemen, and for them only.

"Surely it is not for these gentlemen that Mr. Morrison seeks freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and personal freedom? Surely Mr. Morrison does not think that the peoples of the U. S. S. R. would consent to grant these gentlemen freedom of speech, freedom of the press, personal freedom, and, hence, freedom to exploit the working people.

"Mr. Morrison makes no mention of other freedoms of much greater significance than freedom of speech, freedom of the press, etc. Specifically he does not say anything about freedom from exploitation for the people, about freedom from economic crises, from unemployment, from poverty. Perhaps Mr. Morrison is unaware that all these freedoms have existed for a long time in the Soviet Union? And these very freedoms are the basis of all the other freedoms. Does not Mr. Morrison bashfully keep silent about these basic freedoms because, unfortunately, they do not exist in Britain and British workers still suffer from exploitation by the capitalists, in spite of the fact that the Labor Party has now been in office in Britain for 6 years?"

ATTLEE REGIME SCORED

"Mr. Morrison asserts that the Labor government is a Socialist government and that the radio broadcasts organized under the supervision of such a government should not meet with any hindrances by the Soviets.

"Unfortunately we cannot agree with Mr. Morrison. At first, when Labor had just come to power, one could have thought that the Labor government would take the path of socialism. Subsequently, however, it turned out that the Labor government differed little from any bourgeois government anxious to

preserve the capitalist system and insure impressive profits for the capitalists.

"The profits of the capitalists in Britain, are, indeed, growing from year to year, while the wages of the workers remain frozen, the Labor government protecting this regime of exploitation directed against the workers with every possible means to the extent of persecuting and arresting workers. Surely such a government cannot be called a socialist government?

"One might have thought that with the coming of Labor to power capitalist exploitation would be abolished, that steps would be taken to insure the systematic reduction of the prices of mass consumer goods, that the conditions of the working people would be radically improved. Instead of this, we observe in Britain the growth of capitalist profits and the freezing of workers' wages, a rise in the prices of mass consumer goods, and so on. No, we cannot call such a policy a Socialist policy."

BBC REPORTS ASSAILED

"As for the British broadcasts to the Soviet Union (BBC broadcasts), they are known to be aimed primarily at encouraging the enemies of the Soviet people in their efforts to restore capitalist exploitation. Naturally, the Soviets cannot support such antipopular propaganda which, moreover, constitutes interference in the internal affairs of the U. S. S. R.

"Mr. Morrison asserts that Soviet power in the U. S. S. R. is monopolized power, since it represents the rule of one party, the Communist Party. Arguing along this line, one can come to the conclusion that the Labor government is likewise a monopolized government, since it represents the rule of one party, the Labor Party.

"This, however, is not the point. The point is that the Communists in the U. S. S. R., in the first place, do not act in isolation, but in a bloc with nonparty people, and, in the second place, that in the course of the U. S. S. R.'s historical development the Communist Party proved the only anticapitalist, people's party.

"In the course of the past 50 years, the peoples of the Soviet Union have tested in action all the principal parties that existed in Russia—the party of the landlords (the Black Hundreds), the party of the capitalists (Cadets), the party of the Mensheviks (right-wing Socialists), the party of the social revolutionists (the defenders of the kulaks), and the party of the Communists. In the course of the revolutionary developments in the U. S. S. R., the peoples of our country swept aside all the bourgeois parties and made their choice in favor of the Communist Party, considering this party to be the only anti-landlord and anticapitalist party. This is a historical fact. Naturally, the peoples of the U. S. S. R. are giving their wholehearted support to the Communist Party which has been tested in battle.

"What can Mr. Morrison put forward against this historical fact? Does Mr. Morrison think that for the sake of a dubitable rigmarole with an opposition the wheel of history should be turned back and these long-deceased parties brought back to life?

"2 Foreign policy. Mr. Morrison asserts that the Labor government is for strengthening peace, that it does not in any way threaten the Soviet Union, that the North Atlantic Pact is not an aggressive pact but a defensive one, and that if Britain has taken the road of an arms drive this is because she has been compelled to do so inasmuch as the Soviet Union did not demobilize its army sufficiently after World War II.

"There is not a grain of truth in all these assertions of Mr. Morrison's.

"If the Labor government is really for the preservation of peace, why does it reject a five-power peace pact? Why does it oppose a reduction of the armaments of all the great powers? Why does it oppose the prohibition of the atomic weapon? Why does it

persecute those who champion the cause of preservation of peace? Why does it not ban war propaganda in Britain?

"Mr. Morrison wants his words to be taken for granted. But Soviet people cannot take anyone's words for granted. They demand deeds and not declarations.

"Equally unsound are Mr. Morrison's assertions that the U. S. S. R. did not demobilize its army sufficiently after the Second World War. The Soviet Government has already stated officially that it demobilized 32 age groups, that its army is at present approximately the size it was in peacetime before the Second World War, and that the British and American Armies, on the contrary, are double the size they were before the Second World War. Nevertheless, unsubstantiated assertions are continually advanced against these irrefutable facts."

ARMY LABELED DEFENSIVE

"Perhaps Mr. Morrison would like the U. S. S. R. not to have an army sufficient for defense? An army is in general a great burden for the national budget, and the Soviet people would willingly go to the length of doing away with a regular army, were it not for the danger from without. But the experience of 1918-20, when the British, the Americans, and the French (together with the Japanese) attacked the Soviet Union, attempted to sever the Ukraine, the Caucasus, central Asia, the Far East, and Archangel region from the U. S. S. R. and tormented our country for 3 years—this experience teaches us that the U. S. S. R. must have a certain minimum regular army necessary to defend its independence from imperialist invaders. There is no instance in history of the Russians attacking the territory of Britain, but history has witnessed a whole series of instances of the British attacking the territory of the Russians and seizing it.

"Mr. Morrison asserts that the Russians declined to cooperate with the British in the German question, in the question of European recovery. This is quite untrue. Mr. Morrison can hardly believe this statement himself. In reality, it is known that it was not the Russians, but the British and Americans who refused to cooperate, since they knew that the Russians would not agree to restoring fascism in Western Germany, to converting Western Germany into a base for aggression.

"As for cooperating in the matter of European economic recovery, far from rejecting such a cooperation, the U. S. S. R., on the contrary, was the one to propose it on a basis of equality and observance of the sovereignty of the European countries without any dictation from abroad, without any dictation from the United States of America, without the enslavement of the countries of Europe by the United States of America."

"VOICE OF PEOPLE" NOTED

"Equally groundless are Mr. Morrison's assertions that the Communists came to power in the people's democratic countries by violence, that the Cominform engages in the propaganda of violence. Only those who have set themselves the aim of slandering the Communists can permit themselves to make such allegations.

"Actually, as is known, the Communists came to power in the people's democratic countries as a result of general elections. Of course, the peoples of those countries threw out the exploiters and all kinds of agents of foreign secret services. But again, such has been the will of the people—the voice of the people is the voice of God.

"As for the Cominform, only people who have lost all sense of proportion can assert that it engages in the propaganda of violence. Cominform literature has been pub-

lished and is being published. It is known to everyone. It completely repudates the slanderous fabrications about the Communists.

"In general, it must be said that the method of violence and acts of violence is not the method of the Communists. Quite the reverse: History proves that it is the enemies of communism and all kinds of agents of foreign secret services that practice the method of violence and acts of violence."

DEFENDS COMINFORM

"One need not go far afield for examples. Quite recently the Premier of Iran, the Premier of the Lebanon, and the King of Jordan were assassinated within a short space of time. All these assassinations were perpetrated with the aim of forcibly altering the regime in these countries. Who assassinated them? Was it, perhaps, the Communists, the supporters of the Cominform? Surely it is ridiculous even to ask such a question. Perhaps Mr. Morrison, being better informed, could help us to clear up this matter.

"Mr. Morrison asserts that the North Atlantic Pact is a defense pact, that it has no aggressive aims, that, on the contrary, it is directed against aggression.

"If this is true, why did the initiators of the pact not invite the Soviet Union to take part in it? Why did they fence themselves off from the Soviet Union? Why did they conclude it behind the U. S. S. R.'s back and in secrecy from it? Has the U. S. S. R. not proved that it can and is willing to combat aggression, such as Hitlerite or Japanese aggression? Surely the U. S. S. R. did not fight against aggression any worse than, say, Norway, which is a party to the pact. How then are we to explain this surprising incongruity, to say the least?

"If the North Atlantic Pact is a defense pact, why did the British and Americans not agree to the Soviet Government's proposal to have the nature of this pact discussed in the Foreign Ministers' Council? As is known, the Soviet Government offered to have all the pacts it has concluded with other countries discussed in the Foreign Ministers' Council. Why are the British and Americans afraid to tell the truth about this pact, and why did they refuse to have the North Atlantic Pact discussed? Was it not because the North Atlantic Pact contains provisions about aggression against the U. S. S. R., and the sponsors of the pact are compelled to conceal this from the public? Was it not for that reason that the Labor government consented to Britain's conversion into a military air base of the United States of America for attacking the Soviet Union?"

ATLANTIC PACT PLAYED

"That is why the Soviet people regard the North Atlantic Pact as an aggressive pact directed against the U. S. S. R.

"This is borne out most strikingly by the aggressive actions of the Anglo-American ruling circles in Korea. For over a year now the Anglo-American forces have been tormenting the freedom-loving and peaceful people of Korea, destroying Korean villages and towns, murdering women, children, and old folks. Can those sanguinary actions of the Anglo-American forces be called defense? Who will claim that the British troops in Korea are defending Britain from the Korean people? Would it not be more honest to call these actions military aggression?

"Let Mr. Morrison point to a single Soviet soldier who has discharged his gun at any peaceful people. There is no such soldier. Then let Mr. Morrison explain properly why British soldiers are killing peaceful citizens in Korea? Or why, for that matter, British soldiers are dying on foreign soil far from their native country?

"That is why the Soviet people regard present-day Anglo-American politicians as instigators of a new world war."

[From the Christian Science Monitor of August 1, 1951]

MORRISON'S MESSAGE TO RUSSIAN PEOPLE CHALLENGES KREMLIN SECRECY

LONDON.—Following is the text of British Foreign Secretary Herbert S. Morrison's message to the Russian people published in the Moscow Communist Party newspaper Pravda of August 1:

"In a speech last month, I asked for this opportunity to have a message of mine reproduced in the Soviet press. I did so because I felt that while our papers were always ready to publish declarations by your leaders, British Government spokesmen were not properly reported in your newspapers.

"Knowledge of the truth is essential to understanding between peoples. But truth can only be arrived at if there is freedom to hear different points of view. Only then can people sift them and determine for themselves what they consider to be the truth. In Britain we impose no restrictions on access to all available news and views so the people can make up their own minds for themselves. Their views are neither made for them nor dictated to them.

"People can only draw independent conclusions properly for themselves if they have full knowledge of what is happening in the world around them. From our acquaintance with your press and radio, it seems to us that it is different in your country. Many facts and views are withheld from you, and there is no freedom of speech and free access to knowledge of how the rest of the world lives and thinks, which is essential to understanding of each other. This ignorance creates fear and suspicion of the motive of other peoples. I regret, therefore, that full knowledge of what is happening in my country is not available to you."

SOVIET BAR TO TRAVEL

"If you were able to meet more British people or free to travel to Britain, this ignorance could be broken down. I know that in the Soviet Union you meet very few British people, and, even when you do, you do not feel free to speak freely to them or with other foreigners and to exchange your ideas or hopes or fears. This is not our fault. Hundreds of thousands of our people go abroad for their annual holidays each year, and I am sure many would be glad to spend their holidays, if they could, in the Soviet Union. Your Government, for reasons I cannot understand, refuses to let you travel freely.

"You could learn more about us, too, if our newspapers and periodicals had free circulation in your country, which they have not, or if you could listen freely to our radio.

"Even that your Government makes difficult because, although we transmit broadcasts to the Soviet Union in Russian daily at 6:15 a. m., 5:15 p. m., and 12:15 a. m., Moscow time, they are artificially and intentionally jammed by your Government. I wonder why?"

ARBITRARY ARREST HIT

"What has your Government to fear? I wish it would follow our practice—broadcasts in English from the Soviet Union can be freely listened to and not only the British Communist daily paper but Pravda itself can be bought. Our view is that in a free and enlightened democracy everyone is able to judge for himself the truth of what he hears or reads.

"In Britain we set great store by such manifestations of personal freedom.

"Among them is the freedom from arbitrary arrest. If the police take someone into cus-

today, he must, within a maximum of 48 hours, be charged with an offense in open session in a court of law which is entirely independent of the Government, and he is always assumed innocent until proved guilty.

"British citizens are not removed from their homes, they are not deported, they are not sent to labor camps. If there is a knock at the door in the early morning, there is no fear that it is the police. It will probably only be the milkman or the postman. I wonder whether all of you can honestly say that you have this same sense of personal security which every British citizen enjoys. We prefer the situation whereby the Government, no less than the private citizen, is bound by law and the State has no unfettered power of arbitrary action.

"Among the other freedoms which the British enjoy are those of assembly. Persons of the most varied opinions can freely associate together and organize themselves into political or other societies whether in support of or opposed to the government of the day. This freedom, combined with others including freedom of speech and of the press, insures political freedom, which enables free choice of governments by the people themselves."

POLITICAL FREEDOM CITED

"In Britain, therefore, the different political parties, including Labor, Conservative, Liberal, and Communist, are free to express their different programs, to nominate their candidates, and put their views to the people, whether critical of the Government or not. Any evening in Hyde Park, the largest park in central London, spokesmen representing a variety of views can be seen speaking to crowds of Londoners and, if they wish to, freely criticizing the Government. Among them, most evenings, can be found Communist speakers.

"No group has a monopoly of power in Britain. Immediately before the war, the Conservative Party was in power, but in 1945 exercising their free choice of government through elections held by secret ballot and with candidates of two or more parties to choose from in the constituencies, the people of Britain elected a Labor and Socialist government. Since then that government, with no challenge of violence, has peacefully pursued its policy and the opposition its right to criticize and oppose.

"Nonetheless, much to our regret, it has been found necessary to divert much of our national energy to rearmament for defensive purposes. I would like to make it clear to you why we considered this necessary. You are told we are warmongers, that, in alliance with the other countries of Western Europe and the United States of America, we are arming to the teeth to attack the Soviet Union, that we are engaging in an arms race, that we are preparing for a new war. That is not true. None of it is true."

PEACE AIMS STRESSED

"The British people, who shared with the Russian people the sufferings of the Hitlerite war, do not want a third world war. We are a peaceful people who want to feel secure, but we are ready to make sacrifices to defend our democratic way of life and preserve the freedoms we enjoy. Our alliances are defensive alliances. With you we have the Anglo-Soviet treaty of alliance concluded in 1942. The North Atlantic Treaty is another defensive alliance. They are not directed against anyone except aggressors.

"Why is it, then, that we have considered it necessary to build up our strength and to devote so much of our national resources to rearmament when we would rather devote them to improving the standard of living of all of us?

"To be frank with you, it is because of the policy which has been pursued by the Soviet

Government since the end of the war. At the end of the war, we had hoped that the wartime cooperation between the great powers would continue and become strengthened in peace. We expected and strove for cooperation with you in the United Nations. But alas our hopes were disappointed. They were changed to doubts by your government's refusal to cooperate in Germany and in the economic rehabilitation of Europe."

RUSSIAN ARMED THREAT

"These doubts were confirmed as we watched the imposition of Communist regimes in Eastern Europe and the establishment of the Cominform. For if, as your leaders tell us, Communist and non-Communist states can live together in the world, why is it necessary for your government to pursue a policy and to found organizations whose only purpose seems to be to stir up trouble and international hatred?

"We saw that, while we had demobilized and disarmed, your government had retained vast armed forces and military establishments in being. Gradually we came to realize that the lack of balance in military power between the Soviet Union and the western powers was endangering our very existence, and that the lack of balance must be redressed. We did not want to turn over our resources to a new defense program, we wanted to carry on with our economic recovery. But we concluded that we must be strong enough to make clear that aggression, from whatever quarter it might come, could not succeed against us if we were to fulfill our purpose of avoiding war. For that is our main purpose—to avoid war, to preserve peace. It is the purpose of all our foreign policy and of all our diplomacy.

"Peoples everywhere are today afraid of war. We should like to see the causes of this fear removed and all grounds for suspicion and distrust between nations eliminated. On behalf of the British Government, I can assure you there is no reason to have any fear of our policy toward the people of the Soviet Union.

"I hope what I have written so frankly will help to bring about a better understanding between our peoples and that, now Pravda has opened its columns to me, I shall have further opportunities of putting the British point of view before the Russian people and of answering any observations which Pravda may wish to make.

"I send you the friendly greetings of my fellow countrymen and our sincere wish for the genuine cooperation of your country in advancing the peace and progress of the world."

St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, under permission, I insert in the RECORD two newspaper stories giving evidence of the consistent support for the St. Lawrence seaway and power project among the young and thinking citizens in our communities. Such a group is the AMVETS, whose State convention has publicly de-

clared support for the development of the St. Lawrence Basin:

[From the Marquette (Mich.) Mining Journal of July 20, 1951]

AMVETS SUPPORT SEAWAY PROJECT

GRAND RAPIDS.—American Veterans of World War II (AMVETS), opening their annual State convention here today, pledged to support the proposed St. Lawrence waterway project. The executive committee in a preconvention session said the project was a military necessity.

[From the Bay City (Mich.) Times of July 20, 1951]

AMVETS SUPPORT SEAWAY PROJECT

GRAND RAPIDS.—American Veterans of World War II opened their annual State convention here today, pledged to support the proposed St. Lawrence waterway project.

Jack H. Hamm, of Detroit, public-relations director, announced action on the St. Lawrence question by members of the executive committee Thursday night in a preconvention session.

He said it had been decided by the committee that the project was a military necessity.

The West Point Situation—The Military Should Stop and Consider

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed distressing to learn of the action of the military in connection with the dismissal of the 90 cadets from the West Point Military Academy. I do not care to be in the embarrassing position of condoning any wrongdoing, but I do think for the general welfare of the country it would not be very desirable to allow the military to do something that will be regretted for all future time.

It should be realized that they are dealing with boys at West Point, and any hasty action is going to affect not only the lives of these young boys, but their families as well. If there was ever a time when "to err is human, to forgive divine," it is now, and this philosophy should be adopted in dealing with the problem at West Point.

I would very much dislike to see any action taken that will be regretted later, and I would suggest that a cooling-off period of 30 days be granted until all of the facts involved in the incident can be explored.

I do not care to discuss what has happened in the executive branch of our Government, but we must keep in mind that many recently reported happenings are not good examples to the boys of our country.

The military should remember that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones. Within the past few

days we have observed the fact that the military took a man like Major General Crawford, who admitted that he misappropriated Government property, stating that he had done nothing more than many others but the others had not been apprehended—and instead of discharging him in disgrace, he was transferred to a station in Germany and we hear no more of it.

Neither is it too inspiring for the cadets at West Point to observe the military grafting from the Government. Even going so far as to haul the Vice President around the country when he is getting two or three thousand dollars for some of the speeches he has made. These young men at West Point might feel rather justified in cutting the corners and peeking over their shoulder in an examination.

My appointments to West Point and Annapolis are made on a civil-service examination basis and I do not know at this time whether or not any of them are included on the list to be expelled, but I do feel that the boys have been subjected to the wrong kind of discipline. I do not wish to imply that we should adopt the "spare the rod, spoil the child" attitude but the punishment should fit the crime.

It is a sad commentary when one realizes the little effort that has been taken to drive out the pinks and punks operating in and out of Government, and then the military takes such rigid action against boys who are willing to fight and die for our country. Reports reveal that 25 percent of the 1950 West Point graduating class have made the supreme sacrifice in Korea and no one knows what the future holds for those who follow.

Community's Responsibility in Use of Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Community's Responsibility in Use of Handicapped Cited," by Howard A. Rusk, M. D., which appeared in the New York Times on Sunday, July 15, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows.

COMMUNITY'S RESPONSIBILITY IN USE OF HANDICAPPED CITED—CONFERENCE SEES INABILITY OF STATE AND FEDERAL AID TO REHABILITATE NEEDED WORKERS

(By Howard A. Rusk, M. D.)

ANN ARBOR, MICH., July 14.—Two hundred persons representing labor, management, legislative bodies, citizens' groups, agriculture, and public welfare met for 3 days this week with an equal number of specialists in medicine, public health, social welfare, psychology, rehabilitation, and employment to

discuss rehabilitation and utilization of the handicapped worker over 40.

Cosponsored by the University of Michigan, the Federal Security Agency, the Michigan Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, and the Michigan State Medical Society, the conference was the fourth in a series of such annual meetings on problems of aging conducted by the university's Institute for Human Adjustment. The conferees, who represented 24 States and 3 foreign nations, had as their first objective the determination of how the Nation's manpower supply for mobilization could be expanded by rehabilitating the handicapped worker over 40 into the labor force. They did not lose sight, however, of the equally important permanent social and economic gains that would accrue to the disabled individual and to the Nation through such a program.

The conference confronted these facts:

1 While the population of the United States has doubled since 1900, the number of persons over 65, and proportionately over 40, has almost quadrupled. In 1900, four Americans in every 100 were over 65; today the proportion is almost 8 in 100.

2 While the percentage of the population 65 or older is increasing, the trend in the relative number of workers among older persons has been downward. In 1890 the percentage of men 65 or older in the labor force was 63.2; in 1950 it was 45.

3 In 1948 about 3,500,000 of the 11,500,000 persons 65 and over had no money income of their own, of the 7,500,000 with some income, almost half had less than \$500 a year.

4 Although illness is no respecter of age, persons in the middle and later years are more apt to be disabled. In one comprehensive study, the rate of acute and chronic illness among persons over 65 was 279 in 1,000 as compared with 171 among persons of all ages.

Their general conclusion was that no single unilateral action by any group could provide a solution. All types of skills and disciplines are needed to assist in resolving the interrelated medical, social, psychological, and economic problems faced by the older disabled individual.

COMMUNITY RESPONSIBILITY CITED

There was general agreement at the end of the 3-day session with the statement made in the conference's opening session by John L. Thurston, Deputy Federal Security Administrator, that the provision of such services was primarily a community rather than a Federal responsibility. Mr. Thurston asserted that although Federal programs of medical research, social security and vocational rehabilitation should be continued and expanded such Federal action should be primarily catalytic to local community action programs.

Particular emphasis was laid by the conference on the need for developing dynamic programs of rehabilitation in general hospitals as an integral part of medical care. There is great need, it was agreed, for the development of more large and coordinated community rehabilitation centers for teaching, research, and the care of patients with severe disabilities. But as the community hospital is the foundation of general medical care, the great bulk of rehabilitation services, particularly for those with less severe disabilities, they noted, must be given in such hospitals.

Few hospitals, they asserted, now have the staff, facilities, and equipment for such services. The greatest obstacle to the more rapid development of such services, both in general hospitals and specialized rehabilitation centers, is the lack of trained personnel.

Much of the failure of older persons to get needed rehabilitation services, they added, resulted from the lack of public funds, both State and Federal. Within their limited funds, it was asserted, public and voluntary

agencies have tended to concentrate on the rehabilitation of younger persons whose problems are more easily solved. Unless this is changed and public and voluntary agencies provide more service, Harry Becker, director of the social security department, United Automobile Workers, CIO, said the unions would attempt to write rehabilitation services for their disabled members into collective bargaining agreements.

CHANGE OF ATTITUDE HELD NEEDED

Although they recognized that there was great discrimination of the older worker in employment, the conference decided that the solution could be found only in increased understanding and a change of attitude by labor, management, the professions, and the public. Solution would not come, they said, from compulsory legislation that would require employers to hire certain quotas of either aged or handicapped persons.

Even on the question of the legislation proposed this week in Congress by Representative JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York, to make discrimination in hiring against workers over 45 an unfair employment practice, the score or so of persons queried by this writer expressed doubt as to its practicality. As one replied:

"Our primary problem is to get increased understanding by management, shop foremen, and others that people should be hired or retired on the basis of ability, not age and disability. Government compulsion, even to that degree, would probably negate rather than create the development of that understanding."

The conference showed that complex social problems can best be approached by responsible persons representing all elements of society voluntarily meeting in free and open discussion. Such a meeting was particularly refreshing in this particular period of history.

You'd Never Know the Old Place

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following article from the August issue of Nation's Business by Mr. Hodding Carter, a distinguished writer, of Greenville, Miss.:

YOU'D NEVER KNOW THE OLD PLACE—NATIVE SONS, RETURNING TO THE OLD HOMESTEAD, WILL BE SURPRISED NOW TO FIND CATTLE ON DEEP SOUTH ACRES ONCE GIVEN OVER TO COTTON THAT HAS MOVED TO THE WEST

(By Hodding Carter)

The parishioners of St. James Episcopal Church, of Greenville, Miss., were startled one communion Sunday last fall by the footgear of a kneeling male communicant. The stranger at the altar rail wore shoes that were pointed and extended far inside the trouser cuffs, and were supported by 3-inch heels. Unmistakably, the otherwise acceptably dressed worshipper was wearing cowboy boots. Probably a Texas visitor, they surmised, or even the star performer of a wild-west show.

But the wearer of the unorthodox boots was neither. He was, instead a bona fide Texas rancher who had migrated with five cow ponies, two ranch hands, 400 head of cattle, a round-up dog, and an attractive family to the greener pastures of the new cattle country in the lower Mississippi Valley.

Though his boots were a little surprising, the people of what is called the Mississippi Delta—that flat, alluvial land running south from Memphis to Vicksburg and lying between the Mississippi and Yazoo Rivers—were not otherwise astounded by his arrival. For more than 5 years, cotton's ancient kingdom, from Georgia to the banks of the Mississippi, has been growing as accustomed to the round-up and the stockyard auction as to the lint that clings all fall to the suits of the planter and the cotton classers.

This land, once prostrate from a one-crop cotton economy, also has been meeting other newcomers set apart less by their garb than by their occupations. Among the new citizens of the little river city in cotton's old kingdom could be counted several south Louisiana Cajuns, drawn to the Delta because they were experts at rice growing, and rice was becoming a major crop on the black, clayey buckshot along the river.

Their fellow newcomers to the Delta included Scandinavian-American dairymen from Wisconsin, attracted by the prospect of year round grazing and mild winters; an Iowan who knew about the management of grain elevators; a brisk Missourian who superintended the gigantic, newly constructed soy bean elevator and processing plant; an Arkansas hill-man who had gone into large-scale chicken processing, and two young New York brothers on whose newly acquired plantation grazed 600 head of sheep.

All of them, cowboys and Cajuns, Swedes and hillbillies and up-State New Yorkers, are human evidence of an amazing shift in agricultural operations. The changes are most pronounced in the South but they are taking place elsewhere in the nation as well; if the outsider is coming into the old cotton South to diversify and enrich its agriculture, and if most of the long-time citizenry are beginning to do the same thing, other southerners are following cotton on a long journey west.

Out in the Southwest and on the west coast, men who once talked only of livestock, or orchards, or large truck farming enterprises are shifting cotton's center to their irrigated lands. Corn to North Carolina, wheat to the East, cattle and corn and oats to the deep South, cotton to the West—not by happenstance or, at the other extreme, through Government order, but as the end result of a variety of agriculture programming.

It is difficult to determine the primary credit for this potentially most enriching and salutary development in the history of American agriculture. Certainly the original farm program back in the early thirties withdrawing lands from production of row crops, and putting a premium on soil conservation and new crops and healthy agricultural practices, hastened the day.

Equally certain, the new breed of farmers, developed in the agricultural colleges of the country, are more receptive to experimental change. The dictates of relative yields per acre, especially in a day of rising production costs on all fronts, make it imperative that the farmer turn from one staple to another or from staple to specialties in terms of what pays him best.

The demands of a wartime economy are significant too, as witness the upsurge in cotton planting—reversing the new trend in the deep South with not altogether fortunate results—because of the Government's demand for 16,000,000 bales in 1951.

These factors all have contributed to greater or less degree. But they are not as apparent, or as dramatic, and probably are not as productive of results as have been the more individualized relationships between the farmer on the one hand and on the other the field representatives of Federal and State agencies whose primary function is agricultural education. The State extension services, the scattered agricultural experimental stations, and the patient, sweating, dedicated county agents are all heart-

ening examples of Federal-State cooperation with the individual on a voluntary basis. They prove and prompt and persuade, and the farmer listens and generally follows suit, because he has learned that these educators talk sense.

Only a quarter of a century ago, probably a majority of southern farmers laughed at the agricultural scientists, the men who thought book learning had something to do with farming. Now, the agricultural experiment stations are visited by the multiplied thousands of believing farmers; the friendly agent is listened to, and the bulletins of the extension services are read and put into practice. And latterly the soil mappers have made the farmer think twice before he decides what to do with that pesky 100-acre tract.

This kind of governmental participation in farming practice is voluntary, or largely so, and it is likely to remain that way. As a reporter who has been covering the Department of Agriculture in Washington for many years explains:

"With planting patterns as they are at present, our farm output has about reached its limit. The best promise for any sizable increase is a more efficient use of the land, such as growing cotton in areas that produce the most per acre, and transferring the displaced crops to other sections which can produce them in equal measure. Thus cotton planting is increased in California and decreased in Georgia, while beef, dairy, or vegetable production is decreased in California and encouraged in Georgia. Another goal is economy in transportation. In World Wars I and II our most acute shortages often were not the result of an over-all scarcity in those commodities but rather the inability to transport them to the consumer."

Already the farmer has been conditioned to such a voluntary program, if it should be adopted, by the work of several agencies: the Soil Conservation Service, the Extension Service, the Production and Marketing Administration, the Forest Service, and the Rural Electrification Administration. They have been preaching selective agricultural production since the 1930's, and especially since World War II, at the level of the individual farmer.

So it is that historical patterns are being overturned, and that the transition will be hastened by education and by defense needs. The Nation will prosper.

As a case in point, take the production of cotton in Alabama and Georgia. Georgia's 10-year average was 243 pounds to the acre, and Alabama's 272 pounds. On the other hand, two newcomers to cotton production, California and Arizona, respectively, produced in 1950, 770 pounds and 634 pounds to the acre. Last year's total production in Georgia was only 510,000 bales and for Alabama 580,000, while California produced 880,000 bales and Arizona 428,000 as against a 10-year average of 188,000. It's easy to see in what direction cotton is heading.

But before feeling sorry for Alabama and Georgia, take a look at what is happening to livestock. Especially in the past 5 years, cattle raising has been encouraged, and new types of grasses, legumes, and other forage crops developed for the once worn-out cotton lands. Today, western cattlemen, accustomed to a ratio of 10 acres to 1 one of cattle, gape at a deep South production record of 1,200 pounds to the acre on once abandoned land.

In 1950 Georgia's and Alabama's and Mississippi's cattle increased more than 11 percent, while the Nation showed only a 3-percent rise—and California and Arizona actually declined 1 percent.

An even more emphatic demonstration of change appears in a comparison between the number of cattle in the legendary cattle-raising West, and in the South Atlantic States: 13,345,000 in the West, and 20,035,-

000 in the South Atlantic. And while the South showed an over-all increase of about 7 percent, the West showed a decline of 2 percent.

The same trend is apparent in dairying. The number of dairy cattle in the North Central States, including Wisconsin, decreased 1 percent in 1950 over 1949, while the number increased 4 percent in the South Atlantic and the South Central States in the same year.

Nor are these revolutionary switches restricted to cotton and cattle. Thanks to new hybrids and anhydrous ammonia applications, the South is now producing, on once exhausted lands, corn yields as great as or greater than those on the much higher-priced lands of the Corn Belt. A North Carolina experiment has shown that it cost only 71 cents a bushel to produce 81 bushels of corn per acre in contrast to \$1.24 a bushel on land producing only 23 bushels.

This development and cultivation of plants resistant to or adaptable to climatic peculiarities has other startling aspects. Dr. Robert M. Salter, Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering at the Agricultural Research Center, Beltsville, Md., predicts that the cost of growing wheat in huge yields per acre on irrigated eastern coastal land will some day be considerably less than for smaller yields on the southwestern plains.

This can be accomplished, he believes, through relatively inexpensive supplemental irrigation in the humid Eastern States.

"There are thousands of farms in the humid States where water is available and where the necessary investment in supplemental irrigation—light, inexpensive mobile systems—might pay off. There are more than 100 medium and large rivers in the eastern United States that flow year round. Adjacent to them are more than 50,000,000 acres of well drained land. Modern engineering would permit tapping these streams for supplemental irrigation without damming them.

The opportunities to supplement rainfall on the rich valley lands of the eastern United States are enormous. During the last few years, supplemental irrigation has been tried by farmers in the humid region with profitable results on orchards and on small fruit and vegetables and with encouraging results on pastures and certain field crops.

So much for the bright side of a transition that is both inevitable and, for the land and most men, promising. There remains the mounting problem of human displacement. It is considerably easier to effect an agricultural revolution than to make room for those who are uprooted by that revolution.

There are in the Southern States, more than 6,000,000 people—most of them Negro—who are being disadvantageously affected by proper land use.

The more skillful and better educated are finding a place on the tractor's seat and in the plantation mechanic's outbuilding, and are earning more than their fathers dared dream of. But they will be at best no more than one in four when the transition is complete.

It is estimated that Mississippi has lost since 1940 more than 250,000 of the 1,000,000 Negroes who made up approximately one half of its population ten years ago. Alabama and South Carolina will show a smaller but as significant a decline. The big cities of the East, and now more especially those of the Middle West and the Far West can tell you where many of them have gone, but they cannot give the answer as to how the newcomers and their gathering brothers will be absorbed. The switch to cattle and to new crops, and the mechanization of the southern farm, helps the majority; in terms of national defense and the restoration of the land, the change is welcome; but for the minority which weighs upon America's conscience, no profit accrues.

Evidence of Supreme Being Seen by Natural Scientists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent heretofore granted, I am privileged to present herewith an article by the Associated Press, dated August 2, 1951, printed in the Christian Science Monitor.

Quoting distinguished scientists as it does, this article I hope will have a direct relationship to an awareness of being more humble.

In asking that this article be carefully read, I wish to respectfully state that I feel that America must not only get on her knees, but America must stay on her knees.

Mr. Speaker, do you know of any thought more important to mankind than his relationship to God?

The text of the article herewith follows:

EVIDENCE OF SUPREME BEING SEEN BY NATURAL SCIENTISTS

NEW YORK.—Does a natural scientist, unraveling the secrets of the physical universe, find any evidence there for the existence of God?

A national magazine says "Yes" to the question.

The report was contained in an article in Collier's based on a series of interviews with atomic physicists, astronomers, biologists, anthropologists, and mathematicians. It was headed "What scientists believe." The reporter, Howard Whitman, quoted all but a few of those he interviewed as saying they believe in a Supreme Being.

Their reasons, the article said, are varied. Some of them, after years of studying the patterns and laws of physical life, have arrived at the conclusion that a superior intelligence must have arranged these systems. Mr. Whitman quoted Dr. Jan Schilt, head of the astronomy department at Columbia University, as saying:

"The hope and faith of astronomers is that eventually we will find that it is so because it could not be otherwise. The greatest shock would be to find that it all just happened by chance."

One researcher, Dr. J. B. Rhine, of Duke University, told the reporter that the spiritual quality of man could be proved, scientifically, in the laboratory.

Dr. Rhine, a psychologist, has devoted most of his career to a series of experiments in "extrasensory perception." They have attempted to determine whether the human brain can reach out and obtain information beyond the limits of the five physical senses—whether an "extraphysical" factor exists in human beings.

Collier's said Dr. Rhine replied: "The question of the human soul boils down to this: Is there anything spiritual in human personality? We have proved in our laboratory that there is. We now have experimental evidence that such an extraphysical factor exists in man."

For centuries, the questions of proof, evidence, and demonstrability have constituted an abyss lying between the natural scientist and the man of religion.

The natural scientist refused to accept anything on faith. If a phenomenon could

be measured, set down in formula, and repeated invariably, he believed it. Without this evidence, he rejected it.

Some researchers still hold to that position, the article said. One told the writer that a god of love would not have permitted the existence of the materials from which the A-bomb is made.

Another said, however, "as I work at the atomic pile, I feel that God is there, I have faith that in the long run atomic energy will be beneficial."

Still another replied "Where did mass and energy come from? We know we can't make it. We have found laws to prove we can't make it. There must be a higher power who can make it."

The magazine quoted Dr. Robert A. Millikan, California physicist, as saying "just how we fit into the plans of the Great Architect and how much He has assigned us to do, we do not know—but fit in we certainly do somehow, otherwise we would not have a sense of our own responsibility."

Education in Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the following article which appeared in the May 1951 issue of the Smith Alumnae Quarterly:

DESTINY IN THE CLASSROOM

(By Katharine Asher Engel, president, National Council of Jewish Women)

(The National Council of Jewish Women is now in its fifty-eighth year of a broad program for human betterment. At the close of the last war, it undertook the most ambitious overseas program in its history. Council provides aid to Israel education and awards scholarships which enable Jewish leaders in the fields of social work to take advanced courses in American universities. In the following article, Mrs. Engel describes the cultural quandary of present-day Israel and the role the organization plays in helping to resolve it.)

In a people's struggle to survive, its soldiers fight the battle of the moment, but its teachers fight the battle of eternity. Today in the new nation of Israel, the power of the classroom to shape a people's destiny is being put to one of the severest tests in history. A flood of eastern peoples is now inundating the occidental country of Israel. Whole segments of the Near East—people whose habits and ideas have been virtually unchanged since ancient times—are transplanting themselves from their ancestral ghettos to the land promised of old. They are coming as peaceful settlers, and in high hopes, and they are being welcomed as equals.

These newcomers are all Jews, but mostly middle eastern Jews, quite different from the longer-established European-grown residents of Israel, the sophisticates of modern humanism. The ingathering has set in motion a huge ethnic whirlpool in the little country. While it might have daunted a less adaptable or less dedicated people, the Israelis have no intention of stemming the tide.

They hope that western civilization will emerge predominant; they hope that the ancient habits of the newcomers will contribute to the cultural blend of the nation without overwhelming it; that an amalgam

of east and west will emerge embodying the best that each has to offer. But because of the sheer mass of the influx from the east, this means they will have to bend every effort, short of halting the immigration itself, to prevent the country from succumbing to the backwardness, the traditional preoccupation with the past, of these incoming easterners. And they are enacting one of the most valiant episodes in the history of nations.

In view of the events of the last 2 decades, what they are attempting is quite logical. Not long ago, as a hunted people, driven into the streets of Europe, slipping through the woven mesh of death camps, they pursued the dream of a place where they would be welcome. They won such a place. And then they had to win a new struggle to hold it—a war against seven neighboring nations which had overwhelming superiority in numbers and equipment.

THIRD PHASE OF STRUGGLE

The assimilation of unlimited immigration is the third phase of the struggle. And they are fortified spiritually to tackle it. The idea of a homeland has taken powerful hold on their minds. What they had lost and sought and regained, having once become a vision, has remained a vision. It is as though they have been permanently wonder-struck at having a country.

Israel is a little larger in size than the State of Rhode Island. Her present population is about a million and a quarter—almost double her 630,000 population in 1948, at the close of what the Israelis call the war of independence. Her industry and resources are still largely undeveloped. Living standards have been lowered considerably by the necessity to stretch available income over increasing numbers of people. Yet she expects another 500,000 newcomers, or a 40 percent increase over the present population, during the next 3 years.

The country has already absorbed a majority of Europe's displaced Jews and almost all the Jews of Yemen. The immigrants who are pouring in now come from Morocco, Algeria, Egypt, Iraq, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Kurdistan, Afghanistan, Tunis, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania. They are the poor, the sick, the persecuted, streaming over the floodgates to what they hope will be a better life.

If you can picture the typical man of the Arab world riding on a donkey while his wife follows from behind, you get an idea of the cultural problems the middle-eastern immigrants are bringing with them to Israel. The men are accustomed to being supported in no small part by their women and children; the women are accustomed to serving, inconspicuously. Ordinary sanitary facilities are unknown. Eating utensils, chairs, and beds are curiosities.

Typical is the instance of a group of Moroccan arrivals who entered a bus in an Israeli city one day and sat down on the floor. One of the other passengers pointed out to them that there were benches for their use. They sat on the benches until the westerner alighted; then they returned to the floor. The habits of centuries aren't broken by a word.

There is no condescension in the Israeli attitude toward immigrants. The latter are "different," and some of the differences will have to be overcome. Since the birthrate of the immigrants is among the highest in the world, the Israelis know that their western culture is in danger of being engulfed.

With the same sobriety with which they undertook the enormous burden of accepting almost the entire Jewish population of the Middle East, they realize that the changes that can be wrought in the traditions of the adults are limited. To the next generation, however, they hope to impart the full benefit of western culture. Naturally, this hope rests mainly with the schools.

The old dictum of H. G. Wells that history is a race between education and catastrophe is applicable to Israel today.

EDUCATIONAL CHAOS

The schools of Israel, however, present a picture of confusion. While they are doing the job with gusto, they are seriously hindered by their own division into separate systems, or, more accurately speaking, trends. Interested groups which developed control over the schools under the indifferent permissiveness of the mandate government still retain it. As a result, there are four separate types of elementary schools, all supported by the government but run in accordance with the variant consciences of the orthodox (Mizrachi) party; the extremely orthodox (Agudat Israel) party; the all-Israel labor confederation (Histadrut), and the secularist, business-oriented General Zionist Party.

These groups also sponsor the high schools, which support themselves by charging nominal tuition fees; and they are jealous of their prerogatives. Although this situation is the major thorn in the side of educational progress here, it is not the only one. There is also an acute shortage of teachers in the country.

One of the most hopeful aspects of the Israel education scene is the School of Education of Hebrew University in Jerusalem, where nonpartisan teachers are being trained in increasing numbers. The orientation of the school corresponds roughly to that of the General Zionist, or "general" trend in the lower schools; that is, it is not interested in inculcating any special ideal beyond the over-all one of patriotism.

Since it is the only institution in Israel which is training teachers and administrators for secondary schools, its graduates some day will be the backbone of a normal and uniform educational system in the country. Even now the school is setting high standards for teachers, and is arming its students with advanced and specialized techniques for dealing with the multiple chaos that they will have to help overcome.

A majority of the students at the university—about 2,000 at present—plan to teach; and they take courses at the School of Education. It is, by and large, a foremost weapon in Israel's struggle to reestablish cultural order and remain a modern, democratic society.

Israel's survival as an independent and reasonably advanced nation concerns not only the Israelis. Her performance in the war against the Arab countries has won her high importance in the global calculations of the western allies. Now considered a western outpost and a stabilizing influence in the Middle East, she recently was granted economic aid under the point 4 program of the United States.

COUNCIL AIDS THE SCHOOL

A number of private American organizations, too, are engaged in helping Israel. The National Council of Jewish Women is among them. With long and continuing experience on the educational and social welfare fronts of the United States, council recognized several years ago the crucial role in which the times were to cast the School of Education, and undertook to give it financial support. With the exception of the rent-free quarters supplied by the university and of a few small grants from elsewhere, it is now sponsored solely by council. Its faculty and student body have doubled since council aid began in 1947.

With the guidance of a board of foremost American educators, the school is pioneering new methods and ideas with which to meet its heavy responsibilities. It is operating an experimental nursery school and kindergarten, and a high school where students do their practice teaching. It plans to institute an adult educational program.

We of the National Council of Jewish Women derive something more from our support of this endeavor than the personal satisfaction of taking part in something worth while. We know that, as Americans, we are acting directly in our self-interest. For certainly it is the interest of America, in these times, to swing the cultural balance of Israel from the authoritarianism of the ancient east to the better way of life of the free world.

"How I Became a Dope Addict Before I Was 18"—Lucy Hooked on Heroin by Friend's Coaxing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted me, I ask that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the second of a series of articles on teen-age drug addiction published recently by the Long Island Daily Press:

"HOW I BECAME A DOPE ADDICT BEFORE I WAS 18"—LUCY HOOKED ON HEROIN BY BOY FRIEND'S COAXING

(By Geraldine Scott)

Lucy had met Ralph at a jazz concert and soon began to visit his shabby, one-room apartment in a cheap rent district of the city. Her feeling toward him was one of helpless physical attraction, intensified, no doubt, by the fact that she had become a marijuana smoker.

"I was still trying to avoid my parents' constant questions," Lucy said, continuing her story in the sunny living room of her parents' home in a well-to-do suburb. "Then Ralph offered me a solution to the whole problem. He suggested I move in with him."

"By that time I was hooked on 'H'—as heroin is known in the trade. I didn't graduate to it just like that. It was Ralph's constant coaxing that won me over. Everybody who is a heroin user always wants to get everybody else hooked on the stuff. They hate a knocker against narcotics."

"At least that's how it was at first. Soon I found out my problems were multiplied by the hundreds."

At Ralph's insistence, Lucy stole out of her house one night with two suitcases full of clothes. She moved in with Ralph. That night they "celebrated" by giving her a shot of heroin.

"I used to watch Ralph get a fix (that's what the users call taking a shot) and I would see him turn from someone sullen and indifferent into a gay person I loved. I knew that smoking pot made me feel as if I were riding on top of the world. Of course, between reefer I was moody and nervous. But Ralph would manage to keep me supplied, just as Hank had."

I asked Lucy if she had taken any money with her when she left home and she redented in painful embarrassment.

"I knew my mother had her own little fund in a teapot in the kitchen," she said finally. "There was \$200 in it. I took that."

Narcotics agents say that, according to interviews with youthful dope addicts they nab, some other form of delinquency always comes before the dope. Lucy is a comparative exception. In her case things were reversed. However, police will admit that there are undoubtedly many teen-age users of

dope whose cases never come up in the courts because their parents find out in time and manage to hush things up.

Lucy went back to the night in Ralph's apartment that she took her first fix of H.

"Ralph started me on speedballs, which are half cocaine and half heroin. I took to it like a kid to candy. I liked it immediately. All of a sudden everything in life seemed to be clarified. No more worries, no more problems."

Lucy's \$200 soon disappeared, most of it spent for heroin. Soon she found out where Ralph got his money. The pawn ticket for the gun that he had dropped at her parents' home had been swapped back. He would disappear some nights with the weapon. Then he would come back with varying amounts of money. Ralph was a thief and a robber.

At that point, Lucy recalls, her upbringing got the best of her for a while. She told Ralph both of them ought to get jobs.

"I had bleached my hair a dizzy sort of blonde color, thinking it would help hide me from my parents and the private detectives they hired. My skin became a sickly yellowish gray almost as if I had jaundice. I had gone from 120 pounds to about 105. I looked frowsy and terrible and nobody would hire me."

Then one night Ralph didn't come home. Lucy waited in terror until he finally returned the following afternoon. He had been picked up for questioning by a policeman and released.

"Ralph asked me to marry him. He said we ought to take precautions in case he was arrested again. First of all, it would look better if we were married instead of living together. Secondly, he gave me instructions on getting stuff to him in case he was kept in jail."

The marriage, Lucy said, was meaningless.

"All you want to do is get fixed up and then sit around with other hypos and maybe listen to jazz. You don't talk too much. Loud noises bother you. You don't care where you live or how you look as long as you've got H. Most hypos are just plain dirty."

"By the time you find out there is no glamor or fun in being hooked on narcotics, it's too late."

Ralph's predictions came true. A few weeks later he was arrested by a narcotics squad agent. A policeman came to the apartment to question Lucy. When he left, she packed her clothes and left, too. She found a furnished room in a different part of the city.

"I remembered all the ways Ralph had told me to get H to him in jail. I knew he had taken a small supply hidden on his person. He told me if he was kept in jail to write him a letter on paper soaked in a strong heroin solution. I was to dry the paper, soak it again, dry it, and so on. This way a lot of heroin is absorbed. When a user in jail gets a letter he thinks has been soaked, he takes a spoonful of water and heats it with a match. The warm water soaks up the dried heroin on the paper. It doesn't make a strong solution, but it's better than nothing."

But Lucy didn't write to Ralph or try to see him. First of all, she was afraid for herself. Second of all, she was out of money. And she craved H.

"Oh, how I craved it. I was lost, but good."

So strong was her desire that Lucy had to make a decision about earning money. She could think of only two easy ways. One was to start picking up men for money. Her suburban upbringing cast that aside.

"By that time I had a 2-cap (capsule) a day habit. That isn't gigantic—some hypos take 10 caps a day. But it was big enough to make me decide to try to earn money by peddling the stuff to others."

Lucy had gone with Ralph several times to buy heroin. She knew a few people in the business. She decided to offer herself as a seller of dope.

"It can be a profitable business, all right. Why does it cost so much? Because of enforcement. The police, the narcotics agents keep the price up by catching up with so many sources of the stuff. If they didn't, many more people would be taking dope, believe me."

Hiroshima

REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, today an American plane is dropping flowers upon the city of Hiroshima to mark the sixth anniversary of the dropping of the atomic bomb. This should be a splendid symbol of the friendship which the people of America bear for the people of Japan and of the aspirations of both nations for lasting peace. One of the heroes of Hiroshima was Dr. Kiyoshi Tanimoto, pastor of the Methodist Church. In February of this year Dr. Tanimoto visited our country and I had the privilege of talking with him. It was evident that he entertained no bitterness toward the United States and that, if his people had felt any resentment over our action, such sentiment had vanished as a result of occupation policies which he described as compassionate and constructively helpful.

Dr. Tanimoto's interpretation of the significance of Hiroshima is presented in a recent article by Glenn Everett in the columns of the Messenger, an outstanding church publication. As a Christian minister, Dr. Tanimoto is doing much to strengthen the ties between our nations and to give voice to the hopes of millions of people in both hemispheres for a just and lasting peace. In the faith of such men as Dr. Tanimoto and in the application of Christian principles to the problems of our world can be found the best assurances of peace based upon justice and freedom.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Dr. Tanimoto's account, as follows:

On the morning of August 6, 1945, we in Hiroshima underwent one of the most terrible experiences in the history of mankind when our city was struck without warning by an atomic bomb.

I was helping a friend move some of his household possessions into the suburbs, he having helped me the week before move some furnishings of my church, since we were told by authorities to anticipate an attack on Hiroshima, though we supposed it would be fire bombs from B-29's, such as Tokyo and other cities had suffered, not by a new secret weapon. I happened to be behind a hill 2 miles from the spot where the bomb exploded and thus was protected from its burning flash. However, we saw the flash, many times brighter than the sun, streak through midair, and we were instantly filled with terror. Instinctively I dived be-

tween two rocks in a garden and in about 10 seconds a great blast of air struck me. Five miles away my mother-in-law reported they heard a great explosion, but in Hiroshima itself it was too deafening to be heard by the human ear.

I ran to the top of the hill and when I reached there I could see the whole city was on fire. Then I realized it was a total attack, and that all of Hiroshima had, in an instant, been blasted and set afire. Within 10 minutes up the hill toward me came a most dreadful procession, thousands of people seeking to escape from the center of the city. Shocking to say, many were completely naked, their clothes entirely burned off. Great strips of burned flesh hung from arms and chests. Though many were in great pain, all were suffering from such a state of shock that there were no outcries. The silent procession was unearthly. I thought I was seeing a procession of ghosts.

My mind shrank with horror at what I saw, but I ran toward the city, toward my home and church, and the neighborhood association for which I had responsibility as leader. All the way I met more thousands of these pitiful victims. Then for a long time I was blocked from reaching the central island of the city by the intense heat of the fires.

There followed many dreadful hours I do not like to recall. My wife and child fortunately made good their escape from the debris of our house, though many thousands were burned to death when trapped in the wreckage of buildings.

When at last I reached my church, it was in ruins and all else around it. Of my neighborhood association of 150 persons only 30 survived, and of those many others were doomed to keen disappointment to learn many months later that they too must die—victims of radiation sickness. The official figures say 100,000 died in Hiroshima of the attack, but actually I am certain it was 170,000, with 80,000 more dying later indirectly of injuries or hardship.

For many days we did not learn what it was that struck Hiroshima, only that it was a new weapon. Only later did we learn that it was an atomic bomb and that we had been the first human beings upon whom this dreadful weapon has been used.

How did the people of Hiroshima feel about the bomb, those fortunate ones who survived, though often with the loss of all members of their family and possessions? They said simply, "Shi-kata-ganai (it cannot be helped)."

This was their reaction because this had been war. The Japanese people themselves had nothing to say about entering the war. They were led by dictatorial leaders and had been trained to do what the Emperor and government directed. But they realized that Japan's leaders had started the war at Pearl Harbor. Pearl Harbor led to Hiroshima. So it could not be helped.

The Japanese mind has an oriental fatalism that is strange to the West. We have been accustomed since the earliest remembrances of history to earthquakes, typhoons, famines, and other natural disasters which take many lives. So the atomic bomb was accepted in the same spirit as a natural disaster, though it was a much greater disaster than the people of Hiroshima had ever seen before.

Within a few days the Japanese people learned from their Emperor that it was necessary to surrender, and as quickly as the war had begun 4 years before, it now ended. Then came the American troops. The people of Hiroshima, having seen the atomic bomb, expected dreadful treatment at the hands of their enemies. But the Christian character of the American people now in peacetime asserted itself.

The first troops of the occupation, instead of levying hard new sacrifices upon the

people of Hiroshima, expressed most heartfelt sympathy for the pitiful state in which they found them. Instead of asking the people for tribute, in the manner of oriental conquerors, they gave us gifts of food. The people were amazed.

Near to Hiroshima was a camp where American prisoners of war had been confined. These prisoners were liberated as soon as word of the surrender had come. We knew that they had been most harshly treated because our military dealt so with their own Japanese civilian prisoners, and would have dealt thus with me had I been put in prison for pro-American feeling as was many times threatened during the war.

Yet when these prisoners marched through the suburbs they had with them packages of food and chocolate which had been dropped to them from airplanes by the American Red Cross. And seeing the children, who, having lost their parents in the atomic attacks, were without food and care, these soldiers, though hungry themselves, gave the famished children their chocolate. At first, the children were afraid to touch the gifts. Then a Japanese soldier who was with the Americans, as guide, said to the children and the adults standing by, "Take the candy; it is not poison."

The children swooped in on the gifts and ate ravenously and followed the American prisoners along the road in a laughing and affectionate mood. Many were the adults who wept openly to see such a sight. Thus was Christian love able to prove itself a more powerful weapon than the atomic bomb in winning Japan.

The atomic bomb had not destroyed the will of Hiroshima. Those who were left would have fought on. But when they saw such Christian compassion and spirit as was displayed by American soldiers after the surrender, they realized America was a good Nation and there was much bitterness against our own Japanese leaders who had led the people into war against such a Nation.

A SPIRITUAL REBIRTH

There now came in Hiroshima a most wonderful spiritual rebirth. Although the people had suffered greatly and there were many now feeling great loneliness because of loss of all their loved ones, there seemed a new spirit to rise from the ashes. People turned toward God in their moment of supreme disaster. They found in God a comfort.

There were six preachers of the Christian faith left in Hiroshima. Our churches were destroyed and all other buildings were now hospitals for the injured, so we went for our services to the great plaza where had formerly stood the railroad station, and there we preached the gospel of Christ. Many came and listened, often 200 or more. They stood silently, having nowhere to sit, and they remained thus, never going away while the service was in progress. Each of the preachers spoke in turn a message of evangelism. Six preachers, each talking half an hour, made a 3-hour service, but the people never left, and afterward they asked for Bibles that they might study the new religion which preached redemptive love.

This was a moving sight to see. A visiting Army chaplain, after attending a service, took me to his tent, and there showed me all his possessions, Bibles, hymn books, vestments and other things, and said that I must take what I needed. I could not accept such generosity, but he pressed upon me a great armload of things. Thus did the universal love of Christ which can unite mankind manifest itself. We are serving together the same Lord and Father, the conqueror and the conquered. And all are brothers again.

I lay ill for 2 months with the effects of radiation sickness which I had contracted by being among the wounded immediately after

the bombing. There came to me a young woman from my congregation who was filled with sorrow. She said, "This bomb was God's judgment upon us. We were not filled with love of God and did not do His bidding. We must learn to live better and then no such judgment will be visited upon us again."

This is typical of the spirit of those who survived Hiroshima. We are ashamed that we have taken up arms and war in the past and desire to make it unmistakable now that we wish only peace. We are ashamed, too, that we did not do more to help the injured and dying in Hiroshima, but thought only of ourselves and often ran away. Japan has had a new spiritual reawakening and Hiroshima has in particular experienced it in this catastrophe. This has been a great period for Christian evangelism in Japan.

MATERIAL AID

Great though the spiritual rebirth of Hiroshima was, we faced in the Christian churches many practical problems of rebuilding. Since all our parishioners had lost their worldly possessions and were themselves the recipients of charity, we had no money with which to rebuild, but were dependent on the gifts of our friends abroad for quite some period. The financial problems which are common to all churches were to us most difficult and have limited our work to much less than it should have been.

On August 6, 1948, on the anniversary of the bomb, which is to all people of Hiroshima a day of most special remembrance for the thousands who have died, we organized and inaugurated the Hiroshima Peace Center Foundation. We want in the future to make Hiroshima a great center for the international movement for peace. We who have suffered so much from war, who offer the vivid proof that war, if it continues, will destroy mankind's civilization, desire to make of our sacrifice a symbol. We wish to labor for peace as hard as previously man has labored for war.

The Peace Center Foundation has two purposes. The first is educational. Japan has been raised for many years on a feudalistic concept of nationalism. The school children of Japan were scarcely taught that other nations existed. All attention was centered on the divine Emperor. The Emperor has now shed his divinity and Japan has entered upon the international scene ideologically as well as politically. Our people need much education about the United Nations and about international cooperation in general to accept this ideological change. Already we have held in Hiroshima, last August 6, a conference of students and teachers who pledged their support to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organizations (UNESCO) and promise to further its aims in Japan. We hope to hold other such conferences in Hiroshima, which to all Japan and to most of the world has a special significance as a place to hold peace conferences.

Also the literature which we publish will, for the world in general, have much significance, and win an especially attentive audience, for all know deeply how we feel and how great is our testimony against war.

The second purpose of the Peace Center Foundation is to render social service. Hiroshima has many unique problems because of the atomic devastation. The most touching of these is our orphans. Over 6,000 children lost their parents on that single day. They are now entering school and need guidance and protection. The Peace Center is administering the work of the moral adoption program.

Also we have juvenile delinquents who because of disruption of family life have been led astray and live on the streets. We have many old people whose families are gone and who lack means of support. For all these

and for the many others who hunger and thirst, we feel it our divine command to bring help. With such funds as are available to it, the peace center will labor to dress these remaining wounds of war.

We people of Hiroshima are convinced that as long as a Christian conscience rules America's foreign policy and as long as this Nation remains dedicated to the ideals of a Christian world peace wherein all nations and races may be brothers in the oneness of God's love, this world is safe. We pray that the people of America may fulfill their destiny to be God's agents of bringing peace to all mankind.

We are praying for the leadership of America in this hour of crisis. We are praying because we have found that God's love is a greater weapon in the destiny of man than the atom bomb.

Fraudulent Propaganda Concerning the Covenant of Human Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, false propaganda concerning the proposed Covenant of Human Rights which in due time will be presented to this country for ratification is being unwittingly circulated by teachers in our public schools, superintendents, church organizations, civic organizations, or any organization that will distribute the literature.

The document that is being circulated, publicized, and extolled is a document called the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This document contains the contents of a declaration passed by the United Nations December 10, 1948. It was not passed in the form of a convention or treaty—it was passed as an expression of principles upon which all members of the United Nations could agree. The fact is that almost anybody would approve the general statements. It is in a class with those documents declaring that the moving parties are against sin.

This document was prepared and circulated by the United Nations Department of Public Information, March 1949. It has, therefore, been circulated throughout the United States for over 2 years.

This universal declaration of human rights is not the proposed human rights covenant which is intended to reach this country as a convention of the United Nations, to be approved by the Senate of the United States. Why was this document named the "Universal Declaration of Human Rights," and the actual proposition to be put up for our approval, labeled the "Covenant of Human Rights?" The explanation seems plain. By the circulation of a document on human rights to which almost everyone agreed, the people of the United States could be propagandized to approve the actual Human Rights Convention which is vicious and contains within it the seeds of

the destruction of our Constitution and laws.

Other conventions will come before the Senate, in fact one is before it now—the Genocide Convention which is also vicious and designed to destroy our liberties. It is, therefore, inescapable as a conclusion that the circulation of this innocently worded document was premeditatedly circulated by the United Nations to inoculate the people and kindle in them a desire to insist upon the approval of a far different but almost identically labeled document, which when approved may destroy free speech, free press, and our criminal jurisdiction for the protection of our citizens.

This fraudulent decoy which is being circulated states as to free speech as follows:

Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression, here follow words amplifying this right.

Now what does the real human rights convention say about free speech?

Everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression, subject to such restrictions as are provided by law or are necessary for the protection of national security, public order, safety, health, or morals, or the rights, freedoms, or reputations of others.

Our Federal Constitution provides, concerning free speech:

Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging free speech, or the press; or the right of the people peacefully to assemble and petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

In the Covenant of Human Rights free speech is so hedged in with restrictions and conditions that if carried out there will remain no free speech; there will remain no free press.

In the Genocide Convention which is now before the Senate and recommended for approval by the President, there is a provision that any statement made which hurts the feelings of any group or any member of a group is not only a crime, but the jurisdiction to try a person for that crime is transferred to the judicial branch of the United Nations. Suppose I say in North Dakota that Marshal Stalin is a murderer and that he has slain millions to dispose of those whom he is afraid will supplant him; I would be injuring the feelings of Stalin and his group of dictator supporters. Being a member of the United Nations, Russia would enter a complaint against me for the crime. Where would I be tried? In North Dakota, or anywhere in the United States? No; I would be tried for my alleged crime wherever the judicial branch of the United Nations determined. I could be sent to Russia for trial. Even though I had spoken the truth about Stalin, I would find myself being tried for a United Nations crime in the very country whose feelings I had hurt.

Anyone can see that this destroys our Constitution completely in the protection of life and liberty. It destroys our judicial system designed for both the protection of the public and the accused.

I do not believe that the educators of the United States would circulate this "bogus" universal human rights document if they knew they were circulating and extolling an entirely different document than the actual one proposed for the adoption of the Senate. It is the slyest, the most incipient, the most cowardly attempt that could be devised by the United Nations to put over the various conventions that are to come before the Senate of the United States for ratification.

The crime of such a campaign of propaganda lies in the fact that our children are being indoctrinated with a program on general human rights, and this leads them to approve a different document of human rights which may destroy our Constitution and laws of this Union and the constitutions and laws of the various States of the Union. This propaganda is more dangerous to this Republic than anything the Communists have yet done to destroy it.

If time would permit I could go further and take the provisions one by one in this universal human rights document, and then go over the provisions of the covenant of human rights and show conclusively that the first is objectionable, while the latter contains, when approved by the Senate, the vicious power to take away the liberties of the people of the United States.

The propaganda has gone so far in our schools that important newspapers like the Christian Science Monitor carry items such as the following:

HUMAN RIGHTS TO BE GALLUP ESSAY THEME

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights has been selected as the theme to be developed by American high-school children for entry to this year's Gallup award competition. The award is made each year to 50 high-school newspapers for services to advance the cause of world peace and mutual understanding among peoples of all nations. School papers are urged to organize one major activity a month illustrating some aspect of the declaration, such as sponsoring a model session of the Human Rights Commission, or showing a UN film on the subject. (UNESCO World Review.)

Just remember that the Covenant of Human Rights is not discussed at all. The whole discussion centers around the Universal Human Rights Document, which is not the document that will come to this country for approval. Those who are behind this campaign to explain one thing in order to put over a far different thing are either guilty of perpetrating a perfect fraud on the school children of the United States or are entirely ignorant and unaware of what they are doing.

My conclusion is that not only educational people but many people including the august court of appeals of the State of California have been misled by this universal human rights document. In the case of Fujii against the State of California, where the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, as approved by the Senate were under consideration, the court, in order to bolster up its decision, that the Charter as approved by the Senate was the supreme law of the land, referred to and quoted from this universal human rights document, which the court should have known, or by

the exercise of ordinary inquiry could have known, had no force and effect in this country. It appeared that the court, in determining that the Charter, as approved, superseded the laws of the State of California and annulled them, was in search of more authority to sustain this stand, and therefore quoted from a document which had no standing in this country.

The lamentable thing about the circulation of this document of Universal Human Rights is the fact that the taxpayers of the United States are paying for it. What is the United States actually paying toward the support of the United Nations? Total assessments for 1951 were \$47,798,600, of which we paid \$19,529,204, or more than the total payment of 56 other countries. We pay over six times as much as Russia, three and a half times as much as Great Britain. We pay six and a half times as much as France, and the United States and Great Britain pay over half of the whole cost of keeping up the United Nations. Then, again, Britain borrows the money from us so that we are paying that bill also. With loans and gifts to every country on earth except Russia, we are paying the entire bill except \$3,000,000.

The countries who pay practically nothing have a voice in putting on these assessments. Are we always to remain as an impotent Santa Claus in an organization banded together to preserve the peace? What have these 56 countries who vote assessments against us done in the Korean War? What will they do in any war? If we are to pay the expenses of the United Nations, the expenses of armed demonstrations, and furnish the men to be killed while these other countries complacently sit on the side lines and say, "Sic 'em," anyone ought to see that we are into something that we should get out of at the earliest possible moment.

Truce and Peace Aren't Synonymous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Truce and Peace Aren't Synonymous," from the Mason City (Iowa) Globe-Gazette of recent date.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUCE AND PEACE AREN'T SYNONYMOUS

It would be sheer folly to hazard a precise forecast about the ultimate outcome of the current truce negotiations in Korea. There are too many imponderables for even an educated guess. But there are some things that appear reasonably sure.

Foremost is the certainty that the life-and-death struggle between communism and the free world—or between the new Russian imperialism and the United States, if you prefer to state it that way—will not be re-

solved by any decision or course of action growing out of the present negotiations.

If a real armistice is reached—and this is by no means assured at this time—it will be no more than an armed truce. The Communist world can be counted on to step up preparations for the next phase of the struggle. So also will the free world if it is capable of an intelligent realism.

FOR THE KREMLIN TO SAY

What happens next in the contest for world domination on the one hand, survival on the other, is dependent on the Kremlin. The advantage which always resides in a power bent on aggression is with our adversary. He can pick both the time and the place of the next open warfare.

Will it be Germany? Will it be Yugoslavia? Will it be Formosa? Will it be Indochina—or India? Or will it be oil-rich Iran flush against the Russian border? The last possibility looks most plausible, but the Stalinists are capable of a deceptive change of pace. They're not always governed by the obvious logic of a situation.

The Kremlin can be counted on to proceed with its nefarious plot to absorb the free nations of the world while talking peace all the while. Its preparations for war will be carried on behind an iron curtain and out of sight but its peace talk will be in raucous voice for all to hear.

A TEST FOR AMERICANS

This situation is going to present an acid test for the people of America. It's going to require a lot of vision and courage to keep our preparedness efforts at their maximum in the face of a lull in the fighting. Our apathy in this matter can be the Kremlin's one most valuable ally.

Then, too, there will be those who will be expecting our boys—all of them—to clear out of Korea the day after the truce is signed—assuming that a truce is signed. That just isn't the way things are going to work out.

In the first place, the prospects of an early truce are extremely dim. Even if the Communists had been defeated to the point of having to capitulate, they'd haggle and argue. That's what they did after running out on their allies in World War I.

But now—and we may as well face this fact—the Communists are bent on making it appear that they're in the driver's seat. They've taken a shellacking in Korea but they haven't as yet approached the necessity of surrendering in the field. There's a vast propaganda value in making it appear that they—rather than the UN—are dictating the terms of peace.

MERE PREVIEW OF FUTURE

Even in the preliminary meetings concerned merely with setting up a tentative agenda for the subsequent parley, the Communists have tried the patience of the UN representatives. What we've had is no more than a tiny preview of what lies ahead.

The pattern for an endless controversy has already been cut. It centers about the insistence of the Communists that the neutral zone be established along the thirty-eighth parallel, as distinguished from the present battle line, and the demand that all "foreign troops" clear out of Korea.

Whether the thirty-eighth parallel or some other line be accepted as the center of the buffer territory is probably of no more than psychological importance. But for the UN to agree to the withdrawal of all foreign troops from the peninsula would be to toss the South Koreans into the bear cage like so much raw meat.

ROTATION MAY BE SPEEDED

And herein lies the real reason why an early return to America of all our fighting forces in Korea isn't in the cards under any conceivable circumstances. If truce efforts fail, they'll be needed for further fighting;

if truce efforts succeed, they'll be needed for occupational duty.

All in all, the most that can be reasonably expected is that the cessation of fighting will make it possible to speed up the rotational plan. This will mean a reduction in the length of service for those now on duty in Korea and for those who subsequently are dispatched there for their tour of duty.

In the event of a truce at this time, or rather in the early future, there shouldn't be such a lag in business, and particularly if we avoid that apathy to the Communist peril to which I referred at the beginning of this talk with you.

That truce would not mean peace—real peace, that is. The cold war would continue. Actually our expenditure for military preparedness next year promises to be substantially greater than it has been this year, even including the cost of the Korean police action. And the year following it may well be larger still—totaling as much as \$60,000,000,000.

TREND TO BE UPWARD

While there may be some temporary slumps and transient unemployment incident to the retooling for this stepped up production of the materials of war, the general trend seems almost sure to be upward.

This year's national income was at the rate of \$300,000,000,000 for the first 6 months of this year. It may dip for a few weeks but those in position to know expect it to go higher than ever in the final quarter. Until the Communist threat has been eliminated, the military will be claiming at least \$50,000,000,000 a year as a regular budget item.

"If we can reach a truce that ends the Communist aggression in Korea," Defense Mobilizer Wilson has pointed out, "we will have won a great victory. But it will not be the final victory over aggression. Our position will be infinitely stronger than it was before Korea—but still we will not be safe."

The over-all problem will be to build an invulnerable military while at the same time maintaining an economy of abundance. I for one believe that this is possible—and particularly if the individual citizen can be brought to think more about producing more than about shorter hours or higher pay.

AGREEING WITH ACHESON

Dean Acheson, our Secretary of State, has aroused the ire of more than a few Americans by contending—along with Defense Mobilizer Wilson—that a settlement of the Korean War at the thirty-eighth parallel will constitute a victory for the UN. Far more often than not with respect to our Asia policy. I've disagreed with Mr. Acheson. But in this case I'm definitely in his corner.

To evaluate the results of our Korean police action, it's necessary to consider what would have happened if we hadn't raised a hand. This, it seems to me, rather than the extent to which we've beaten the enemy on the field of battle must be our criterion for judging.

Without the resistance on the part of UN—or United States, as you prefer—all of Korea would have fallen into the Communist basket, like a ripe plum. Before now that peninsula—pointed like a dagger at Japan, as somebody has observed—would have become a well-disciplined satellite state.

Before now too, it's reasonable to assume, the Communist march would have proceeded in other directions. The same energy exerted by the Chinese Reds in Korea assuredly would have meant overrunning Formosa.

A BLOW AT CONFIDENCE

Further to the south Communist China could have thrown more troops into French Indo-China and by this time there would be heavy Communist pressures building up in Malaya and in India.

Not to be neglected or minimized either would be the effect of a spineless United States on Japan and the Philippines. Both the Japanese and the Filipinos recognize that their security against communism rests heavily on the power of the United States—and, just as important, on the willingness of the United States to use that power.

Seeing Korea fall into Communist hands without raising a hand would have caused the Japs and the Filipinos to leave our camp and take refuge in what has come to be known as neutralism.

Somewhere along the line, unless we were ready to give up without a fight, we had to say to the Kremlin: "This far and no further." That line has been drawn. Joe Stalin has been put on notice that he will be held accountable for any and all future aggressions. That's the true meaning of the police action in Korea.

Your Government's Tarnished Word

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Freeman, of July 16, 1951. It recites just a few of the brazen deceptions by which this administration has tricked the American people during the last two decades, while its Secretary of State talks about "integrity." One can only ask in sadness: What integrity?

The editorial follows:

YOUR GOVERNMENT'S TARNISHED WORD

One-third of the adult population now living cannot remember the time when the American citizen's normal reaction was this: "If the Government says it's so, it is." You might denounce the Government for any other reason, but neither the integrity of its word nor the good faith of its promises was ever debated.

Now the intelligent citizen is so cynical that when he reads in his morning paper that the Speaker of the House or the Secretary of Defense, on leaving the White House, has said the situation is worse than anybody can imagine, he looks to see what bill happens to be pending in Congress. It may be the universal military training bill, and if that is it he says "So it is time to scare me." And nobody is scandalized when the Wall Street Journal prints this from its Washington Bureau:

"Scare tactics rehash old reports to get fresh backing for Truman's plans. The Government does not expect Russian forces to fight in Korea. Rearmament schedules assume Russia isn't ready for world war III. But officials here want to keep the people primed for a big military build-up, foreign aid, UMT and controls."

Whether the correspondent's deduction is true or not in a particular case is not the point. The point is that now everybody takes it to be a matter of governing technique that news will be slanted, handled and timed in a manner to move people in their emotions, even to influence their everyday behavior. It is as if somebody in government should say: "There is too much scare buying. We have gone a little too far. Let's ease it up." Then for a few days the news is that there will be plenty of civilian goods. In a little while somebody says: "We've gone too far.

People are complacent. We'd better stir them up." And suddenly the news is worse.

If you could draw on a chart two lines, one to represent this change in the way people think and feel about government and the other to represent the rise of the Welfare State, you would be struck by the fact that they move together. Such is the malice of events called irony. Paternalism in government has a kind of moral disability. If you are going to decide what is good for people, instead of letting them decide that for themselves, then you must treat them as children. You cannot be entirely frank with them, for if you are they may frustrate your good intentions and defeat their own welfare. Besides, there are situations, you are sure, when people cannot be trusted with the truth.

Until 1933 ours was the only Government in the world that had never broken a promise to pay or repudiated the word engraved upon its money and its bonds—not since the beginning, when one of the first acts of the United States, with no treasury and no revenue, was to undertake to redeem at face value all the forlorn debt paper issued during the War of Independence to raise money.

When the wreck of that tradition came before the Supreme Court in the gold cases a majority of the judges said there was nothing to do about an act of immorality committed by the sovereign power of government; but the minority said this was "repudiation and spoliation of citizens by their sovereign * * * The loss of reputation for fair dealing will bring us unending humiliation * * * The impending legal and moral chaos is appalling."

This occurred in the nighttime of the great depression. The Government's intentions were beneficent. Its idea was to relieve debtors and raise prices. And the people cried out acclaim of a government that would lead them the short way out of a frightful depression. The flash of expediency had overcome the spirit of good faith. The justification was that the flesh was in terrible pain. All the moral implications were swept under the rug. But when people have applauded their Government for breaking its word to ease them out of an economic crisis, how honestly may they expect it to behave in a political crisis? They were to find that out.

In view of the inner history already revealed, it is not strange that millions of people now believe President Roosevelt "lied" the country into World War II. That is bad enough. Yet worse for public morals is the fact that many believe this who ardently defend him for having done it. They say: "It was necessary. There was no other way to save the country."

In 1941 Roosevelt himself wrote: "There can be no question that in 1939 the people of the United States were determined to remain neutral in fact and in deed." That was the problem he had to solve. In the 1940 campaign he had said: "I am fighting to keep our people out of foreign wars." And again, "As your great Secretary of State said last night, 'Outstanding is the wholly unwarranted and utterly vicious charge that the President is leading us into war.'"

Immediately after Mr. Roosevelt's third election in 1940 came lend-lease. A few weeks later Mr. Hopkins, as the President's personal representative, was in London telling Mr. Churchill for sure that the United States would see England through; and on April 3, 1941, Admiral Stark, Chief of Naval Operations, was writing to all fleet commanders: "The question as to our entry into the war seems to be when and not whether."

By any previous interpretation of international law, it was an act of war for a government to give arms and munitions to a belligerent nation. Therefore, lend-lease was an act of war; yet to the people and to Congress

it was represented as the supreme measure short of war.

The Government's own afterthought on lend-lease may be found in a public document entitled "International Transactions of the United States":

"With the passage of the Lend-Lease Act on March 11, 1941, the United States openly allied the welfare of the United States with that of the United Kingdom and other countries fighting the Axis."

Of this alliance Robert E. Sherwood, in *Roosevelt and Hopkins*, said: "If the isolationists had known the full extent of it, their demands for the impeachment of President Roosevelt would have been much louder." But Mr. Sherwood is among the eulogists.

After lend-lease the United States Navy actively protected the flow of lend-lease goods to England. To convoy the shipments would be so obviously an act of war that the word convoy was taboo and the fact was for a long time denied. All the United States Navy was doing was to patrol the Atlantic.

The trouble was that Hitler would not attack. And what Mr. Roosevelt needed to release him from his antiwar pledges was an attack. Came October 1941, and still no attack. Robert E. Sherwood quotes Harry Hopkins as having said of Mr. Roosevelt's dilemma at that time: "He had said everything 'short of war' that could be said. He had no more tricks left. The hat from which he had pulled so many rabbits was empty."

Then suddenly the problem was solved. The nature of it was defined by Henry L. Stimson in his diary, November 25, 1941, as the problem of how to maneuver the Japanese into the position of firing the first shot.

After Pearl Harbor the people were united. It would seem to have been no longer necessary to bamboozle them. Yet never could they be sure they had the truth. The worst single shock was Yalta. At the Yalta conference, secretly, our ally China was sold out to Stalin. By that act of betrayal the history of the modern world was altered, and we may be dealing with the consequences for a hundred years.

When Mr. Roosevelt returned from Yalta he addressed a joint session of Congress and said: "Quite naturally, this conference concerned itself with the political problems of Europe—and not the Pacific war." For military reasons it may have been unwise at that time to tell how Stalin had been bribed to enter the war against Japan; but would not silence have served? Why the positive denial of a truth about the Pacific war that was bound to come out when Stalin claimed his loot? The stupidity of it leaves but one plausible answer. Manipulation of the truth had become a habit of Government.

In the recent great debate on foreign policy, involving the power of the President to dispatch troops to Europe, the painful theme was distrust of the Executive.

When in 1949 the Senate ratified the North Atlantic Treaty, it did so upon positive assurances from both the State Department and the President, first, that nothing would be done to implement the treaty without the approval of Congress; and second, that the treaty in no way obligated this country to contribute troops. The State Department, speaking for the President, said "Any future military-assistance programs involving Atlantic Pact countries will be prepared and submitted to the Congress." And about troops, when the Secretary of State appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, the following exchange occurred:

"Senator HICKENLOOPER. Are we going to be expected to send substantial numbers of troops over there as a more or less permanent contribution to the development of these countries' capacity to resist?"

"Mr. ACHESON. The answer to that question, Senator, is a clear and absolute 'No.'"

Then suddenly the President announced that he was going to send a substantial number of troops to become a part of Europe's defense army and that he had the power to do so without the approval of Congress. That is what set off the great debate. There are two matters here. One is the broken word; the other is the question of troops at all. When Mr. Acheson was confronted by the Senate with his own statement about sending troops to Europe under the North Atlantic Treaty—"The answer to that question, Senator, is a clear and absolute 'No.'"—his defense was to say that he must have misunderstood the question.

Where there is no trust, secrecy is a gnawing worm. The worm in this instance was the Brussels secret. In December 1950, Mr. Acheson sat with the North Atlantic Treaty Council in Brussels. On returning he reported that the structure of the international army, how it should be composed, of what troops, and where the troops should come from, had all been determined. This was called the Brussels agreement. The Senate wanted to know what was in it. Did it call for four American divisions only—the number the President was going to send immediately? But the State Department refused to divulge the agreement.

The Senate then asked General Eisenhower about it. He said, "I am not dodging the question. I know nothing about it." Why not? It was his army.

So the great debate closed with a resolution saying it was the sense of the Senate that although it approved of sending four divisions, already on their way, no more should be sent without the approval of Congress—and the Brussels agreement was still a secret. Neither the people nor the Senate could be trusted to know our commitments.

It seems to have become psychopathologically impossible for the State Department to make a simple, unequivocal statement about foreign policy. What it says today will be reinterpreted and explained tomorrow. A few weeks ago Dean Rusk, its chief publicity officer, made a formal speech which was understood both here and abroad to mean that American policy in the Far East had hardened toward Red China and changed oppositely toward Formosa and the Nationalists. At a press conference the next day the Secretary of State said there had been no change of policy and that he was unable to find in the Rusk speech anything to suggest that idea. Simply, the world was wrong.

A few days later Mr. Acheson, appearing as a witness before the Senate committee sitting in the MacArthur case, protested against making public a top-secret policy information paper issued by the State Department in 1949 about Formosa, on the ground that it purposely misrepresented American policy, and he was led from there to admit calmly that the Voice of America was used, when necessary, to disseminate false propaganda.

In the course of that same hearing he offered a second and entirely new apology for the Yalta agreement that sold our Chinese ally out to Stalin. The first official apology was that Stalin had to be bribed to enter the war against Japan. Now Mr. Acheson says that was not the reason at all. The Yalta agreement was simply a matter of yielding to the inevitable, because Stalin had already made up his mind to move in and take what he wanted, and there was no way to stop him. Which version is true? And why was it necessary to reprocess the first one?

At the last annual meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors the committee on freedom of information made the following report:

"We editors have been assuming that no one would dispute this premise: That when

the people rule, they have a right to know all their government does. This committee finds appalling evidence that the guiding credo in Washington is just the opposite; that it is dangerous and unwise to let information about the Government leak out in any unprocessed form."

In the beginning was truth, and at the end will be truth. It is the interim we live in.

The Report on the Maryland Senatorial Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN WELKER

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* an article entitled "Is the Report on BUTLER Serious?" written by David Lawrence and published in today's issue of the *Washington Evening Star*.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

IS THE REPORT ON BUTLER SERIOUS?—ANALYSIS BY SENATORS OF ONLY ONE SIDE IN MARYLAND ISSUE RAISES QUESTION OF DOUBT ON ITS AIM AND PURPOSE

(By David Lawrence)

Is the Senate Subcommittee on Elections in earnest about cleaning up American political campaigns or is its latest report on the Maryland contest just a piece of ephemeral publicity?

The report calls attention to the fact that it is "the inherent right under our system of government of each State to choose its representatives in Congress," and that the Senate "in exercising its constitutional right to be the judge of the qualifications of its Members must guard against usurping such right of each State and must require the strongest and most substantial evidence before unseating a Senator and nullifying the action of the electorate of a State."

Thereupon the subcommittee says flatly that "the facts developed from the evidence before this committee are not sufficient in our judgment to recommend the unseating of Senator BUTLER."

If the committee had stopped there, its work would have been in keeping with tradition. But the committee issued a long analysis of the campaign criticizing the tactics and statements of only one candidate, the Republican, ignoring entirely the famous whitewash report which was sponsored earlier by the opposing Senator, a Democrat, and formed the basis for the bitter campaign itself.

To deal only with one set of unfair attacks and not with an earlier set of unfair accusations which furnished the provocation is not to make an impartial study. There is another committee of the Senate under the chairmanship of Senator McCARRAN, of Nevada, which now is investigating un-American activities and Communist behavior and it is taking up some of the same charges which, due to the Tydings committee whitewash, aroused anti-Communists not only in Maryland but outside of that State who helped to defeat the Democratic candidate, Senator Tydings. Nobody can justly question the loyalty or the patriotism of the former Maryland Senator but there are many who have questioned and will question his judgment in failing to make a thorough in-

vestigation of the charges before his committee as defined in the Senate's resolution which ordered the inquiry.

The Senate subcommittee is right in denouncing the innuendoes that were used in the campaign against Senator Tydings. Likewise, it candidly admits that no specific standards of improper campaign conduct or acts have been set up as guideposts.

It is conceded by the Senate subcommittee that the issue as between fair comment and political defamation in the conduct of a campaign is a novel one. It then proceeds to make some suggestions for legislation which would not only be wholly impracticable to carry out but would result in Federal laws certain to be declared unconstitutional.

The remedy of the aggrieved candidate has been and always is to sue for libel under State laws. The much-discussed and properly denounced tabloid newspaper, especially printed for the campaign, which showed Senator Tydings in a composite photograph sitting alongside of Earl Browder, a Communist witness at the hearings, and which bore a caption that implied the Senator was treating the witness sympathetically or with excessive politeness, is not a violation of Federal or State laws dealing with elections. The picture was labeled composite. It was despicable and utterly indefensible from the standpoint of fairness but so also are many of the political cartoons distributed during campaigns and printed in regular newspapers. This practice is fully protected by the Constitution.

The subcommittee goes too far, therefore, in recommending legislation to cover all types of composites whether they be newspaper pictures, voice recordings, motion pictures, or any other means or medium of conveying a misrepresenting composite impression.

This would certainly rule out many cartoons and one wonders what political majority in the Senate or House is to pass judgment on fairness or unfairness of such cartoons when a defeated candidate makes a squawk.

If any Senate committee really wants to investigate unfair tactics in political campaigns, there are other things worth examining as examples too, such as the innuendoes cast by President Truman himself in 1948 that Governor Dewey was giving aid to the Communists, the dirty-politics charges in the recent Lehman-Dulles senatorial campaign, and the scurrilous literature circulated in 1950 against Senator Taft in Ohio. At an outing given by a CIO union during the campaign a big picture of Senator Taft was displayed under which only his initials—"R. A. T."—were printed in large letters and onlookers were offered a chance at 10 cents to throw a baseball to hit the photo in the face. Also there was circulated in different parts of the State a photo of Senator Taft taken many years ago at a public forum at which Earl Browder had also been invited to speak. The photo showing Taft and Browder was prominently flaunted by opponents of the Senator and was never disavowed by the opposing candidate; in fact, he is accused of flaunting it himself. He lost and what he did would not be subject to Senate rules of conduct or discipline.

Nor should the anti-Semitic and anti-Catholic literature circulated in the mails during and between political campaigns be overlooked or the activities of national labor unions which invade various States with crews of campaign smearers who continue to receive salaries from unions, in violation of Federal law. Corporation employees also give their time to campaigns and keep on receiving their regular salaries. This needs no Senate investigation—just some prosecutions by the Department of Justice.

The answer to much of this type of thing, to be sure, is "pitiless publicity." Extreme tactics usually boomerang and make votes for the candidate who is attacked. But it will disappoint many observers to read that this Senate subcommittee seems to have lost faith in the capacity of the people to deal with these matters themselves at the polls. For the subcommittee says:

"It is not a sufficient defense to say 'let the people themselves judge the charges.' The fact is that the people themselves are not in possession of sufficient reliable information upon which to judge irresponsible accusations of disloyalty."

And who in this case kept the people from making that very judgment when the charges of disloyalty against various persons involved in making Government policy were being examined last year by the Tydings committee? It was a group of loyal, patriotic, but mistaken Senators who voted for secret sessions and then by a partisan vote adopted a staff-written report which was drafted in such a manner that the real evidence could not be appraised by the press and impartial observers.

Breakdown of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, since 1940 the United States taxpayers have sent \$81,950,000,000 to foreign countries. Of this, \$32,682,000,000 has been spent since the end of World War II. Here is the breakdown of expenditures:

*United States foreign aid, July 1, 1940—
Mar. 31, 1951*

Lend-lease.....	\$49,092,000,000
European recovery.....	9,585,000,000
Civilian supplies.....	5,623,000,000
UNRRA, post-UNRRA, and interim aid.....	3,526,000,000
Philippine rehabilitation.....	623,000,000
Korean and far eastern (Chinese area) aid.....	290,000,000
Mutual defense assistance.....	837,000,000
Greek-Turkish aid.....	654,000,000
Chinese stabilization and military aid.....	625,000,000
Technical assistance and inter-American aid.....	196,000,000
Special British loan.....	3,750,000,000
Export-Import Bank.....	3,141,000,000
Direct loans.....	2,883,000,000
Loans through agent banks.....	258,000,000
Credit agreement offsets to grants.....	1,256,000,000
Surplus property (including merchant ships).....	1,334,000,000
Other.....	1,374,000,000
Total.....	81,905,000,000

Here is the breakdown by countries:

Austria.....	\$785,000,000
Belgium-Luxemburg.....	818,000,000
British Commonwealth.....	35,857,000,000
Denmark.....	236,000,000
France.....	6,847,000,000
Germany.....	3,304,000,000
Greece.....	1,350,000,000
Ireland.....	131,000,000
Italy.....	2,530,000,000
Netherlands.....	1,223,000,000

*United States foreign aid, July 1, 1940—
Mar. 31, 1951—Continued*

Norway.....	\$300,000,000
Sweden.....	99,000,000
Trieste.....	41,000,000
Turkey.....	366,000,000
Czechoslovakia.....	222,000,000
Finland.....	145,000,000
Poland.....	465,000,000
U. S. S. R.....	11,241,000,000
Yugoslavia.....	386,000,000
American Republics.....	1,356,000,000
Israel.....	56,000,000
Australia.....	925,000,000
Canada.....	175,000,000
China.....	3,102,000,000
India.....	790,000,000
Indonesia.....	155,000,000
Iran.....	32,000,000
Japan and Ryukyu Islands.....	2,101,000,000
Korea.....	441,000,000
New Zealand.....	256,000,000
Philippines.....	826,000,000
Saudi Arabia.....	36,000,000
Union of South Africa.....	95,000,000
Other.....	16,456,000,000

Transfer of District Office of the Veterans' Administration at Boston to Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following brief relative to proposed consolidation of Boston district office of the Veterans' Administration with Philadelphia, Pa., district office:

BRIEF RELATIVE OF PROPOSED CONSOLIDATION OF BOSTON DISTRICT OFFICE OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION WITH PHILADELPHIA, PA., DISTRICT OFFICE

This brief has been prepared and submitted by the employees of the VA district office, Boston, Mass., for the purpose of presenting from a labor and economic standpoint the effect upon interested personnel and their dependents of the proposed consolidation of the Boston, New York, and Richmond district offices with the Philadelphia district office.

On July 26, 1951, the personnel employed in the VA district office, Boston, Mass., were informed that it was proposed to abolish the Boston district office. It was stated that this was to be done without affecting service to the veterans and their dependents by the transfer of records and of interested personnel to the district office at Philadelphia, Pa., where the records and personnel of the district offices at New York and Richmond, Va., were also to be housed.

Personnel of the Boston branch and district office, which has been in existence since 1946, had no intimation that such a move was contemplated. The disastrous economic effect on 837 employees and their families was not immediately realized. However, after short consideration, when the awareness of the abrupt change in the domestic economy and the educational transition became apparent, it was thought that if these factors could, in their over-all effect, be brought to the attention of proper authority, consideration might be given to further study of this situation to prevent its summation.

ANALYSIS OF CONDITIONS AFFECTING EMPLOYEES
OF BOSTON DISTRICT OFFICE

This compilation made as a result of 453 questionnaires answered voluntarily from a total of 837 employees affected by this transfer.

1. Average age—34:	
Age by groups:	Percent
20-29—88.....	21
30-39—235.....	56
40-49—44.....	10.5
50-59—45.....	10.5
60-69—5.....	2
2. Average years in VA—5 years:	
Less than 5—146.....	37.04
5 to 9—239.....	60.69
10 to 19—3.....	.78
20 to 29—4.....	1.01
30 to 39—2.....	.50
3. Average years in Government—8 years:	
Less than 5—72.....	18.20
5 to 9—202.....	51.26
10 to 19—106.....	27.00
20 to 29—9.....	2.28
30 to 39—5.....	1.26

This figure does not include any military service.

4. Number of GI mortgages—65.....	\$500,715.00
5. Other mortgages—38.....	\$209,900.00
6. Average rent paid by persons not owning property.....	47.40
7. Average number of rooms rented.....	5
8. Total monthly rent paid by 205 persons answering questionnaire.....	9,716.95
9. World War I veterans affected by transfer.....	44
10. World War II veterans affected by transfer.....	309
11. Disabled veterans included in items 9 and 10 affected by transfer (65 percent).....	229
12. Widows of World War I veterans affected by transfer.....	14
13. Widows of World War II veterans affected by transfer.....	5

ORGANIZATION AND FUNCTIONS OF THE BOSTON
DISTRICT OFFICE, INSURANCE SERVICE

Organization

1. Office of the Director.
2. Administrative Section.
3. Operations Review and Audit Section.
4. Premium Accounting Division.
5. Disability Insurance Claims Division.
6. Underwriting Division.

Function

Responsible for the administration of the laws of national service life insurance as they pertain to veterans separated from active service and those veterans in active service remitting premium payments direct to the Boston district office.

Guided by the provisions of national service life insurance laws also processes applications for reinstatement, conversion to permanent plan insurance, renewal of expiring term insurance. Responsible also for granting loans and cash surrender of insurance and makes all changes affecting national service life insurance such as: Reductions in the amount of insurance, change in plan of insurance and beneficiary and optional settlement authorization.

Receives, accounts for, and disposes of insurance remittances and payments received in the district office; maintains premium records on national service life insurance accounts.

Makes determinations and awards benefits in national service life insurance disability insurance claims.

In addition to the preparation of correspondence pertinent to the accomplishment of the major functions above outlined, it is also necessary to prepare Seventy-third Congress, and all amendments thereto, as well

as Public Law 141, Seventy-third Congress, Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, Public Law 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, Public Law 483, Seventy-eighth Congress, the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, with all its amendments, including Public Law 589, Seventy-ninth Congress, as well as the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951, Public Law 23, Eighty-second Congress.

To establish one's entitlement or non-entitlement to the benefits outlined above, requires not only the exercise of professional skill in the application and interpretation, orally or in writing, of the pertinent VA laws, regulations and procedures, but also, among other things, the following:

1. Development, assembling and evaluating of evidence.
2. Determinations as to the validity of claims, dependency, continuous cohabitation, income, validity of legal documents, relationship, marital status, character of discharge, line of duty, sufficiency of service, jurisdiction, findings of fact of death, processing of appeals, including hearings, waivers and forfeitures, need for field examinations, need for fiduciaries to receive payment for minors and incompetents, and ratings as to service connection for both disability and cause of death.

In addition, appropriate records and a ready reference file are maintained currently.

ORGANIZATION AND FUNCTIONS OF THE CLAIMS
SERVICE OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION
BOSTON DISTRICT OFFICE

Organization

1. Office of the Director.
2. Dependents and Beneficiaries Claims Division.
3. Dependents Pension Board.
4. Adjudicating Section.
5. Reimbursement Section.
6. Claims Records Section.
7. Computing Section.
8. Stenographic Unit.
9. Typists Unit.

Function

Responsible for the adjudication of claims and authorization of payments for death benefits filed by the survivors of deceased servicemen, including widows, children, parents, brothers, and sisters, arising under all laws pertaining to World I and World War II veterans, as well as to veterans who served in peacetime subsequent to July 15, 1903, including the Korean cases.

The particular claims include those for compensation, pension, national service life insurance, servicemen's indemnity, burial allowance, as well as accrued disability compensation, pension, retirement pay, readjustment and subsistence allowances.

The pertinent laws relating to these benefits, among many others, include Public Law 242, Sixty-eighth Congress (World War Veterans Act of 1924), Public Law 2, replies to correspondence presenting all types of inquiries related to national service life insurance. At present with insurance records readily available urgent questions on insurance problems are being settled as a result of telephone calls received not only from the Boston area but from all parts of the New England area. An almost equal number of veterans make personal contact with this office and with insurance records readily available the action requested by the insured is completed while the veteran is present.

Comments

Presently the Boston district office, insurance service engages 746 employees servicing approximately 320,000 active national service life insurance accounts. The vast majority of these employees are young veterans accomplished in insurance matters after nearly 6 years of insurance work with this office. For the many who are married it

will be impossible to transfer and failure to obtain a job in the insurance field will cause them to take jobs in other fields where without experience in the selected new field will naturally cause lower salaries to be offered and resultant hardship in these times of higher prices for everything.

PERSONAL FACTORS INVOLVED

In March 1946 the Veterans' Administration sought adequate help for its Boston branch office, now district office, to service the claims of the next of kin of deceased veterans, a great majority of whom resided in metropolitan Boston and other parts of New England. The need for qualified legal and clerical personnel was urgent. In response many attorneys and others who had been recently separated from military service, accepted appointment as adjudicators, attorney reviewers, and many other positions. These appointments were filled mostly by lifetime residents of Boston and vicinity. The record discloses that during the period of accelerated decentralization, even amidst the great confusion that accompanied the transition which inaugurated the 13 separate branch offices, excellent service was rendered to the deceased veterans' next of kin in processing their claims for death pension, compensation, statutory burial allowance, and national service life insurance.

This group experienced the transition from branch office to district office with its resultant reduction in force and succeeding reductions in force brought about through various factors. During all of this time, however, the same high standard of service continued to be given the widows, children, and dependent parents of deceased veterans, to which they were entitled.

Most of the professional personnel in the claims service and insurance service are married, have two or more children, are over 40 years of age, attorneys, lifetime residents of Massachusetts, and have been with the Veterans' Administration over 5 years. By accepting the appointment with the Veterans' Administration, they have removed themselves from other opportunities in the professional, industrial, or commercial field. Due to their age or the nature of a service-connected disability, there is little opportunity for them to obtain commensurate employment in private enterprise. Under the present civil service regulations other Government agencies in the locality can only offer them temporary indefinite positions at lower classifications. They are now faced with a dilemma with no horns to grasp.

If they move to Philadelphia, as most of the professional personnel will be required to do if they desire to retain their status in the Veterans' Administration, they are faced with many problems, including adequate housing within their means, schooling, temporary separation from their wives and children, permanent separation from their parents, friends, relatives, and business contacts, and future insecurity. The latter problem will inevitably arise when reduction in personnel appears warranted as a result of consolidation. Many of this group have purchased homes in Massachusetts through the aid of a GI loan, and face loss of their equity by reason of forced sale.

Among the stenographic, typists, and clerical personnel of the Claims Service are widows of veterans, wives of disabled veterans, disabled veterans, and others, some with 15 to 25 years of service in the Veterans' Administration. In general, this group is the sole support of their families. Due to the pay grade of a large proportion of this group, it would not be economically feasible for them to move to Philadelphia. Consequently, they are left in a very precarious position with respect to employment after giving many years of service to the Veterans' Administration.

The Claims personnel have been trained at great expense to the Government. The group contains key personnel in the operation of death claims activities. If it became necessary to replace them, the Government would have to undergo further expense for a considerable period of time in training such replacements, particularly with respect to adjudicators and attorney reviewers, and in the interim service to the next of kin of deceased veterans would deteriorate.

It is apparent that the moving of the Boston district office to Philadelphia will create undue personal hardship, sacrifice, and confusion among the personnel, which would seem to be out of all proportion to any saving to the Government which might appear obtainable through that process. It would seem that the above-mentioned personal factors should rightfully be taken into consideration in making a decision of such magnitude.

EFFECT ON VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

It is a basic policy of the Veterans' Administration to render service and assistance, personal, whenever possible, to veterans and their dependents.

It appears that such personal assistance cannot and will not be administered if the functions of the four district offices in question are centralized at Philadelphia.

Outlined herewith are some of the reasons in support of the foregoing contention:

(a) Centralization will eliminate for all practical purposes possibility of personal contact by claimants outside the immediate area of Philadelphia for the purpose of processing their claims. However, personal contact is essential in many cases involving a variety of situations which arise in the processing of death claims. Often contact must be made not only with the claimant but with relatives or neighbors of a deceased veteran or of the claimant for the purpose of clarification or establishment of questions of marital status, dependency, loco parentis, and cases in which the industrial and medical history of a deceased veteran must be established from the date of discharge from service to the date of death.

(b) Personal hearings on appeal before the professional personnel who have adjudicated and disallowed a particular claim will in practice be eliminated inasmuch as the great majority of claimants will not be financially able to journey from their homes in New England to Philadelphia.

(c) The proper performance of duties by professional personnel who make determinations as to entitlement to death benefits will be complicated and rendered more difficult in many cases by inability to make personal contact with claimants. In such cases centralization will require clarification of the issues by means of field examinations which are cumbersome, expensive, and, in general, not to satisfactory, a method of obtaining such necessary information.

In addition to the lack of personal contact ensuing from the centralization of the case folders consideration must also be given to delays in adjudication of claims and consequent hardship to claimants in necessitous circumstances due to the transmission of the claims folders between regional offices and the centralized office in Philadelphia.

The transmission of folders will be required in cases involving the appointments of fiduciaries for minors and incompetents, in cases where hearings must be held upon claims for reimbursement for unauthorized medical expenses, hearings on appeals and determinations by chief attorneys on submissions of questions of law involving marital status or other domestic relations. The desirability of minimizing rather than the increasing of the constant shipping of claims folders between offices is apparent.

In the event of centralization, during the veteran's lifetime his insurance records will

be maintained at Philadelphia, while his claims folder is maintained at the regional office in the State where he resides. Upon his death these files must be combined. Accordingly, action by the district office at Philadelphia with respect to any claim for compensation or pension would have to await receipt of the claims folder from the regional office. At present such action may be taken without appreciable delay in most instances, since the claims folder will be readily available within a short time. Indeed those located in the Boston regional office require only the transfer from one floor to the next in the same building. Also, documents necessary to the immediate adjudication of claims, such as death certificates, autopsy protocols or other vital statistics are locally available.

When death strikes the veteran, his family are often in dire need of advice and assistance, which can only be given by personal contact. Many times they are also in great financial stress. It is in situations of this type that the Veterans' Administration should be able to afford the maximum in quick, efficient, and sympathetic consideration of the dependents' claims and be able to render decisions thereon with the minimum of delay.

HOME OWNERSHIP

The proposed transfer of the Boston district office of the Veterans' Administration to Philadelphia, Pa., would directly affect the ownership of homes owned by 113 employees in the Greater Boston area, as shown by replies from 452 questionnaires returned (from a total of 831 employees).

This survey revealed that 65 employees answering the questionnaire had GI mortgages totaling \$500,715. Other types of mortgage totaled \$209,900.

The Federal Government has a vital stake in the ownership of these homes, especially those which were acquired through a GI mortgage.

Now, these employees, if the district office is moved to Philadelphia, would, in most instances, have to sacrifice their property and receive whatever a quick sale would realize.

It is a well-recognized fact that residential property when forced on the real-estate market for a quick sale results in the property being sold for less than its real worth, and the loss, of course, would be suffered by the employee veterans.

The employee veteran, having exhausted his eligibility to loan-guaranty benefits in the purchase of his Boston home under the GI bill, would find it almost impossible to buy a home in the Philadelphia area, since he would not have such benefit available in applying to the mortgage-lending institutions in Philadelphia.

With banks becoming more reluctant to loan their funds for periods of time long enough for the mortgagor to pay off his mortgage in full, the transferred employee would find ownership of a home in Philadelphia, of necessity, must be deferred for a long time.

From a contented Veterans' Administration employee working toward the day when his Boston home would be free and clear of all obligations, he would find that this vision, which is one of the cornerstones of the American way of life, would not be his to enjoy in working for the Veterans' Administration in Philadelphia.

ECONOMIC EFFECT ON METROPOLITAN BOSTON

A business leader in Boston recently referred to the "denuding of Boston and its environments of its talented and specialized employables." This, of course, specifically refers to the class commonly called the white-collar workers. The removal of approximately 800 workers and their families from the Veterans' Administration in Boston to Philadelphia would really amount to the Government adding to the confusion in displacing specialized help. These people who constitute the stable element, the mid-

dle class, are the backbone of any community, the people who are a leveling influence, and much needed where they are.

The loss of these Veterans' Administration employees to the Boston area would result in a serious and noticeable decline in purchasing power in the area, since the workers are steady and constant and are of a level income group with continuous operating expenses.

EFFECT ON EDUCATION

A survey based on 452 questionnaires returned (from a total of 831 employees) discloses that the children of school age among such employees displaced by the centralization to Philadelphia totals 453 of which 28 are attending college; 44 are attending high school and 106 are attending grammar school and 275 are under school age. It is conservatively estimated that this total will be three times greater when the children of the employees of the New York and Richmond district office are considered.

The school facilities of the Germantown area of Philadelphia, if similar to other United States communities, would be unable to accommodate so large a number of new pupils without the construction of new school buildings—a program which could not be completed in less than 2 years.

Between 1949 and 1950, the normal decrease in elementary school attendance in the city of Boston was 2,000 pupils. The withdrawal of such a large body of additional pupils brought about by the contemplated merger would further adversely affect the Boston school system.

Of paramount importance to the Veterans' Administration employee parents of children of school age is the detrimental effect such a move would have on the educational progress and the emotional development of such children.

Being unable to finish the school year 1951-52 at his present school, the entire school year would be lost to the child. Adjustment to the different methods of instruction would very likely result in the child being compelled to commence school in the Philadelphia area one grade lower, thus causing his education to be retarded by two full years.

The withdrawal of a child of elementary school age from his school associates necessitating a start in a new school and development of new friends is universally recognized by authorities on child behavior as having a definite impact on the child's emotional structure.

THE EFFECT OF INFLATION ON A FEDERAL EMPLOYEE

The impact of inflation in the United States since 1939 has been felt by every community and by every family within the community. It has been even more of a burden on the employee of the Federal Government, since salary increases received have not been commensurate with the rise in the cost of living, and where added to a basic wage already low by comparison with that received in private industry.

Inflation is considered by both major political parties as an insidious force in this country. Should it not be adequately controlled, it may well be said that it could cause a condition equivalent to that of any dangerous influence to the American way of life. As a result of this increase in the cost of living, a Federal employee has not only made no progress in implementing his savings over the last decade, but has had to dip into those accumulated, if any, to meet the needs of his family.

A sudden dislocation of the employee who owns his own home, purchased in many instances through the GI bill of rights, almost invariably means a loss of the meager equity built up in the property. This is axiomatic where a quick sale of real estate is necessary.

On the other hand, in a city where several hundred families are immigrating a seller's market immediately prevails and those persons who do purchase a home will be forced to make financial commitments in most cases beyond current means. Leases and rents will rise to the maximum, wherever possible.

GI Education and Training Program has Proved of Untold Benefit to Many Thousands of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the House Select Committee To Investigate Veterans Education and Training has not as yet made a final report of its investigations, studies and findings over a period of several months. However, the National Commander of the American Legion, Erle Cocke, Jr., has set down his own observations and views concerning the Veterans Education and Training Program in a very excellent article in the August 1951 issue of the American Legion magazine. In his very fine article, Commander Cocke makes an appraisal of the affirmative side of the program and makes known the great benefits and advantages which have been possible through this program—observations and appraisal with which I am in agreement, believing as I do that while there have been regrettable and, in some instances, outrageous abuses of this great program, the over-all and final result has been highly creditable and in line with the intent of Congress in enacting legislation in this regard.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, the article which Commander Cocke has written in this connection and which is entitled "Those Incredible GI Students." The article is as follows:

THOSE INCREDIBLE GI STUDENTS—HOW 8,000,000 WAR II VETS MORE THAN JUSTIFIED OUR FAITH IN THEM

(By Erle Cocke, Jr.)

I heard a wonderfully inspiring story the other day from Cecil Munson, the American Legion's chief of vocational training and education. While in Texas recently, Cecil visited the farm of a veteran who had learned modern farming methods under the education-training program of the GI bill of rights. Although the farm was located in one of the poorer sections of the State, the GI's land was fertile and prosperous, and the farmhouse was equipped for good living. The veteran expressed thanks for the GI bill. He said that it had raised him from a tenant with a bleak future to the level of an independent farmer with a promising future.

"The GI bill training has changed the world for me," exclaimed the sun-bronzed ex-GI. "Believe me, mister, if I learned nothing else from my schooling, I learned this: I'm going to see to it that my children also get an education."

In this little story is the boiled-down wisdom and foresight and faith of the Amer-

ican Legion's leadership which fought to establish the GI bill of rights in a battle which at one period had to be fought against the bitter opposition of the other major veterans' organizations. In this little story is summed upon the long-range benefits of the GI bill's education and training program. For the GI bill has not only plowed up new opportunities for hundreds of thousands of veterans of World War II, but it has also planted the seeds to provide new and brighter horizons for future generations of America.

After 7 years, the education-training program of the GI bill—along with the vocational rehabilitation program of the Disabled Veterans Act—has outstandingly withstood the test of time. The program has proved to be one of the finest things America has ever done for the men and women who served in uniform. But even more important, it has proved to be one of the finest things done for the prosperity and security of the entire Nation.

Today, virtually everyone joins in a song of praise for the GI bill's educational provisions. Yet, only a few years back there were many doubts, outside of the Legion, that the program would succeed.

The critics and the cynics had a field day. Education and training require time, effort, and perseverance, they cried out, whereas the veterans are impatient, and lazy, and want their benefits handed to them on a platter. The veterans won't go to school, hooted the detractors of education for GI's.

Even in high places, in Government and in education, fears were voiced that the program would attract relatively few ex-servicemen. When the GI bill was first being discussed, in the summer of 1943, a special committee appointed by President Roosevelt estimated that only one out of 12 World War II veterans would care for postwar education or training. About 18 months later—shortly after the passage of the GI bill—the War Department took a sampling of its officers and enlisted men, and came up with the conclusion that only 3 out of 10 servicemen had any plans, definite or tentative, to enter training or schooling after their discharge from the Armed Forces. As late as August 1945 the Saturday Evening Post featured an article which announced that The GI's Reject Education on the fragmentary evidence that only 1.5 percent of the first 12,844 veterans of World War II had decided to take advantage of their educational opportunity.

The estimates, the surveys, and direful predictions proved to be wrong, incredibly wrong.

By 1946, the amazing rush of the ex-GI's into school and college, into job and farm training, convinced even the most obstinate skeptics that the veterans were eager to make use of their GI bill educational rights. The rush, too, fulfilled the average American's faith in the purposes and goals of our ex-servicemen. The average American had supported the GI bill with bales of letters and telegrams to Congress in the days when passage of the bill hung by a thread.

In 7 years of the GI bill of rights—Public Law 346—more than 7,350,000 veterans of World War II have received training in the school, on the job, and on the farm.

In 7 years of the Disabled Veterans Act—Public Law 16—some 572,000 ex-GI's went after vocational rehabilitation.

Latecomers this spring bring the over-all total close to an even 8,000,000.

That means that more than half of the men and women who saw service in the Second World War availed themselves of the opportunity to improve themselves, to make themselves better earners, better providers, better producers, better-informed American citizens.

What a deafening reply these silent statistics give to the mockery of those who sneered

that the veterans want "hand-outs on the half shell," who crowed that the veterans would ignore any solid benefit which required work and study on their part.

Nearly \$12,000,000,000 has already been spent by Uncle Sam to provide training and schooling, with tuition, books, equipment, and subsistence, for the veterans who responded to the GI bill. Even in these inflated times, \$12,000,000,000 is a pile of money. Was this tremendous expenditure worth it?

A careful answer to this question was recently reported to Congress by the House Select Committee to Investigate the Education and Training Program under the GI bill (the Teague committee).

"The good that has been accomplished and which will show itself more clearly in each succeeding year and in succeeding generations is incalculable," reported the committee.

If we take a close look-see, and analyze the response of the veterans to the educational provisions of the GI bill, here is what we find:

More than 2,480,000 veterans continued their education and training at some 3,000 college-level schools, including colleges, universities, professional and technical schools, junior colleges, teachers colleges, law review colleges, music schools, and hospitals offering residence training to physicians. At least 400,000 of the veteran-students have completed their courses.

More than 3,360,000 veterans sought to improve their education and training in below-college-level schools, attending approximately 17,500 technical institutions, business schools, secondary and elementary schools, vocational and trade schools, flight schools, and farm training schools. Over half a million of these veteran-trainees completed the full training period.

More than 1,600,000 veterans took on-the-job training courses. More than 625,000 veterans went into on-the-farm training. And the programs are still going on.

We've all seen the newspaper headlines and heard the talk about the racket veterans schools, about the veterans who went to school for the free ride and subsistence, and other examples of abuse. Though all too true, these reports are misleading.

For example, the facts and figures show that a bare few veterans sought to use their training rights to prepare for such doubtful careers as the rumba, samba, or waltz.

In its detailed report to Congress last year, the Veterans' Administration showed that most veterans in training chose courses in fields which demanded considerable professional or technical skill—occupations which in general offer greater prestige, greater family security, and higher earning power. This observation underlines the serious intent and purpose of the GI students.

Nor did the veterans go scrambling after their education and training simply to get a degree or diploma, any degree or diploma. More than 800,000 of the veterans took the intensive VA guidance tests before choosing their career courses. More would have taken advantage of the scientific guidance to help select a career had VA been able to make available more facilities and trained personnel to run the vocational guidance clinics.

A breakdown of the ambitions of the veterans in training, according to the latest available figures (October 1949), shows that one out of every three ex-GI's aimed to be a professional man. The meaning of this figure becomes clear when we learn that a survey of the Armed Forces personnel for June of 1945 shows that only 2 out of every 100 men in uniform (2.2 percent) had been in a professional job before going into the military service. Only 4 out of 100 (4 percent) of the male working population were in professional occupations, according to the latest available census figures.

The statistics also show that the same push to improve their knowledge and skills characterized those veterans who sought, and are seeking, to improve themselves with courses aimed at bringing them into the semiprofessional occupations, the managerial occupations, and the skilled crafts.

The present ticklish world situation and our own partial mobilization makes it necessary for us to measure the value of the GI bill training from another point of view—that of its contribution to the national defense.

Again we glance at the statistics and we find the veterans in college flocking to the courses in engineering, physical and natural sciences, medicine and dentistry, and scientific agriculture. Other popular studies on the college level are the humanities, law, and the social sciences, such as economics and history, all of which provide the necessary background for future leadership of our country.

Below the college level, the veterans have pursued courses mainly in agriculture, business, engineering, mechanical crafts, refrigeration and air conditioning, commercial art and design, radio and other communications. On-the-job training has produced accountants, journalists, engineers, lawyers, decorators, commercial artists, draftsmen, laboratory technicians, photographers, surveyors, craftsmen, as well as diversified trained men in the managerial and clerical career fields.

In stressing the drive for the professions, I don't want to overlook the importance of the GI bill in encouraging the basic three R's—reading, 'riting, and 'rithmetic. An incident illustrating this point occurred at Urbana, Ill., where 40 veterans were enrolled in a carpentry course in the public-school system. The ex-GI's were asked what they would like to learn most of all in addition to their carpentry. To the surprise of the school officials, the veterans unanimously replied: "We'd rather learn how to read and write better, than study anything else."

Veterans' education and training hit its all-time peak in December of 1947—3½ years after the passage of the GI bill—when 2,516,000 ex-servicemen crammed into the Nation's classrooms and job-training programs at one time. There's been a decline since, but as late as March 1, 1951, there were 1,670,000 veterans undergoing training.

First to attain its high point was job training, in January of 1947. The following December, college training marked its all-time high. It was not until 2 years later, however, that the below-college-level education program rose to its crest. Institutional on-the-farm training did not reach its peak until the summer of 1950, and this program has grown right up to this summer's deadline.

There are those, of course, who warned that no good could come of the rush to school. They said that the great mass movement of ex-servicemen into the Nation's schools lowered training standards and afforded the veterans cheap degrees or diplomas. Foremost, and most widely publicized, among those who sold short the aims of the GI bill and underrated the aspirations of the homecoming veterans was Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, then chancellor of the University of Chicago, an educator with an international reputation.

Only a few months after the passage of the GI bill, Dr. Hutchins made a few colorful comments about the GI educational program in a popular weekly, comments which were widely quoted in the press. Said Dr. Hutchins:

"Educational institutions, as the big time football racket shows, cannot resist money. The GI bills of rights gives them a chance to get more money than they have ever dreamed of and to do it in the name of patriotism.

"They will not want to keep out unqualified veterans; they will not be allowed to, for the public and the veterans' organizations will not stand for it.

"Colleges and universities will find themselves converted into educational hobo jungles. And veterans, unable to get work and equally unable to resist putting pressure on colleges and universities, will find themselves educational hoboes * * *

"The result will be that both the educational system and veterans will be demoralized."

What a sad prophecy! The National Education Association's Department of Higher Education informed the House Veterans' Committee recently that "the education of veterans in regular public and nonprofit educational institutions has been one of the brightest pages in the history of American education. * * *

"From their intimate experience in the education of veterans * * * the college and university faculties of the United States have become convinced that a tremendous value has accrued to the Nation as a result of the enactment by Congress of this (GI bill) far-sighted legislation," the NEA told Congress.

The fact is that the veterans made a terrific impact, for good, on the American system of education. The colleges alone received more than \$2,000,000,000 in tuition and fees, which provided 65 percent of the colleges' income. This \$2,000,000,000 was "enough to make a vast difference in the financial status of these colleges and universities," according to Benjamin Fine, the education editor of the New York Times. The tuition, along with the billions more in subsistence, permitted tens of thousands of veterans to go to school who otherwise couldn't afford to do so.

Not only did the GI bill revive and strengthen long-established schools; it created new ones. A congressional committee recently reported that public and independent schools in existence prior to 1944—when the GI bill was adopted—were too few to meet the demands of the veterans desiring training, and that there was a serious shortage of schools, especially in the southern states. VA figures now show that 7,600 new institutions for education and training were stimulated into being by the GI bill. Many public schools added vocational departments and other special divisions to meet the needs of the school-bound veterans. And in some States, such as New York and Massachusetts, junior colleges were established to catch up with the rush to the classroom. Many of these are now making higher education available to townsmen who could not afford to go away to college.

The veterans streaming onto the campus challenged their teachers to take another look at their teaching methods and philosophy. Reviewing the seven years of the GI bill, a recent article in *School and Society* commented: "The veterans have brought stability, maturity, higher standards of work, and a broadened adult viewpoint to the classrooms and the campus." Under the barrage of questions shot at them by the knowledge-questioning ex-GI's, many professors were forced to junk their 20-year-old classroom lecture notes, and to start thinking in terms of today and tomorrow, instead of yesterday. The veterans placed a high value on their limited time and funds. They refused to accept shallow, shoddy answers. They demanded answers which were practical and realistic in keeping with their serious outlook. The veteran students—half of whom had one or more dependents—were willing to study hard, and, as a rule, took on more class work and tougher courses than the nonveteran students.

Yet, in spite of his heavier school work load and responsibilities at home, the GI student proved, in many cases, to be a better student than the nonveteran. A year after the GI bill program got going, Williams College was able to report that it had had the highest scholastic average in its history "entirely due to the presence of serious-minded veterans." A similar checkup at Ohio State University disclosed that more than 14,000 ex-GI's in a student body of 24,000 were doing "significantly" better than the non-veterans. There were similar reports from other schools.

A most thorough study of GI schooling has been made at Brooklyn College, which made a detailed investigation of its scholastic records for the period between February 1946 and June 1949.

The study showed that the veterans held a "slight but consistent superiority" in school work over comparable nonveterans.

The results of the study, said Dr. Harry Gideonse, president of this college with a tradition of serious, bright students, "dispel the initial fear expressed in some quarters that the money spent in the education of the veterans might be substantially wasted, or that the college campus would be flooded with poor students."

The fine job of the veterans on the college campuses has been repeated in the other phases of GI bill education and training.

In on-the-job training, for example, the Sales Executive Club of New York reported that the mature attitude of the veterans gave them a "slight but definite edge" over nonveterans in the field of salesmanship.

Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., replying to a survey by the Sales Executive Club, said:

"The average age of our sales force has been lowered 10 years since the war because the veterans have come out with a mature attitude toward life and are ready to assume responsibility more quickly. They are easier to train and average more pay than other salesmen of equal background and age who were not in the Armed Forces."

In the same survey, General Foods, one of the first major corporations to be approved for on-the-job training, stated that it had not been disappointed in any of the ex-servicemen trained and hired under the GI bill program.

More recently, the National Association of State Ap-praisal Agencies sent out a questionnaire to some 19,000 employers participating in the on-the-job training program. Employers replying to the query said they wanted to continue their job training program, by a vote of 3 to 1. When asked, "In the light of your own experience, do you consider that the on-the-job training program has been... worthwhile?" the employers overwhelmingly O. K'd the program by a vote of 6 to 1.

A high light of this survey was that more than one-third of the veteran trainees had been hired by the firms which had trained them; and that half as many trainees again, according to the certain knowledge of the employer-trainer, were employed elsewhere in the kind of work for which they had been trained. From the survey, it was estimated by the Teague committee that 65 percent of the veterans in the on-the-job training program had reached their employment objectives. "This figure," comments the Teague committee, "is considered highly satisfactory in the light of the normal results of established educational programs."

Much publicity has been given the curious sidelights of on-the-job training, such as learning how to operate a mink farm, raise rainbow trout, blow glass, or climb steeples—all of which, incidentally, are honorable occupations. Little publicity has been given, however, to one of the truly fine achievements of the on-the-job training program—apprenticeship training. Today, three out of every four apprentices training under the high standards of the United

States Bureau of Apprenticeship are veterans. Already 63,000 veterans have achieved the respected status of journeyman-craftsman. This number will rise to between 150,000 and 200,000 within the next 2 years. As many more ex-GI's who began but did not finish the apprenticeship-training program, nonetheless have improved their skills, knowledge, and earning power.

Institutional on-the-farm training was the last of the GI bill training programs to get going in a big way, but even so, it has already had a splendid effect on the Nation's agricultural methods, practices, and operations.

"I was opposed to the program," a western Congressman told me, "because I felt that the Government was already meddling enough into our farms without the on-the-farm training."

"My son, however, insisted on taking the farm training, and soon, I discovered, he knew more about efficient, productive farming than I did. That made me change my mind about the farm-training program."

The farm-training program gave the veterans a push to buy, rent, or lease their own farms. In many areas the program boosted farm incomes. It has led to more farm production and to widespread soil conservation activities, and it encouraged farm improvements for better living.

A check by Veterans' Administration last year showed that 94 out of 100 veteran farm trainees either owned or operated their own farms, a strong testimonial to the value of the program in helping make independent farmers out of veterans.

Here are some other encouraging reports from around the country:

In Texas, veteran farm trainees have invested \$100,000,000 in land, homes, stock, and farm equipment. In Pennsylvania the average net income of GI farm trainees has risen from \$400, before starting their courses, to \$1,400. In a Minnesota county, the average net worth of 31 veterans who completed their training was 5,220 as against \$1,960 when they started. In three West Virginia counties, veteran trainees have been averaging more than 100 bushels of shelled corn per acre where the area-wide yield is only 43 bushels per acre. In North Carolina veterans built 15,000,000 feet of terraces to conserve soil, replanted 6,000 acres of land in trees, and limed 105,000 acres of farmland, all in a single year; in Georgia, 21,000 farm trainees developed 150,000 acres of pasture from eroded red clay land that at one time was considered virtually worthless.

In such ways have schooling and training below the college level enriched not just the veterans, but the Nation as a whole.

A sampling of veterans' reaction to their training in less-than-college institutions discloses that the ex-GI's, almost to a man, spoke out in their belief that the good their courses had done was worth the money expended by the Government. A large number of replies expressed thanks to the Nation for giving them a chance to learn useful skills. Those veterans contacted in the survey voted three to one that they had found a job as a direct result of their training. The results of this survey are most significant, in the opinion of the Teague committee—an opinion shared by the American Legion.

Each year, over the 7 years of the GI bill education and training program, there has been a hue and cry raised about the abuses and rackets in the program. These abuses showed up in on-the-job training, flight training, farm training, in proprietary schools, and sometimes even in nonprofit institutions.

All too often, veterans have been blamed for the abuses which have cropped up in fly-by-night schools. Not one veteran has ever been in a position to abuse his privileges under the GI educational program without the deliberate connivance or the

incompetence of elected or appointed public officials.

The Teague committee—recognizing that the vast GI bill program included as many veteran students as the entire population of the continent of Australia—found unmistakably that the abuses were relatively few.

Nevertheless the crooks and the bunglers have gotten the headlines. So, on the shoulders of those who have corrupted or mismanaged their little corners of the GI bill rests a far worse crime than their own petty thievery or incompetence. Their abuses, seen out of perspective by the public, have endangered confidence in GI training.

In this article I hope I have helped to restore the perspective. GI education has cost twelve billions. The United States will easily profit more than \$500,000,000,000 from GI education. That sum is not hard for a nation to come by during the lifetime of 8,000,000 men and women who earn more, pay more taxes, produce more, buy more, spend more, farm better, and build better—and do it all more wisely—than they would have without GI education. It is very likely that far more of the postwar prosperity of this Nation than anyone might imagine is due directly to the GI bill. We must not ever let the bloodsuckers on the fringes, or the phony prophets, persuade us to go back to the days of veteran apple-peddlers, bonus marchers and bread lines. The GI bill way is the right way and the wise way—and in the long run the profitable way—to absorb wartime veterans into a bigger and better national economy.

The GI education and training program expires for most World War II veterans this summer. Its incredible record since World War II proves without question that the program must be continued for the veterans of Korea—and for the benefit of the Nation.

The Constitution of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an essay written by Miss Gloria Andrews, of 1238 North Artesian Avenue, Chicago, Ill., a student at the Tuley High School, which is located in the Eighth Congressional District. I have the honor to represent, entitled "The Constitution of Illinois."

She won first place in the annual essay contest conducted by the American Legion, Department of Illinois, 150,000 participating throughout the State. It truly demonstrates the progress of better education in the public-school system, and I am happy that this honor has been bestowed upon a student in my district.

The essay follows:

THE CONSTITUTION OF ILLINOIS

(By Gloria Andrews)

In 1818, the State of Illinois was admitted to the Union. A brief document, whose main provisions had been taken from the Constitutions of Kentucky, Ohio, New York, and Indiana, became the first Constitution of Illinois. This document provided for three departments of government furnishing the important check and balance needed for a successful governing body. Because the

memory of tyrannical Governors like Berkley, Stuyvesant, and Andros was vivid in the minds of the people, the executive power was very weak and the Governor lacked a sole veto while the legislative branch was given extensive appointing privileges. Although the inhabitants were given no chance to ratify it, the constitution contained a suffrage clause giving the right to vote to all white male inhabitants, who had resided in Illinois for a period of 6 months. These votes were to be given viva voce.

Then, in 1848, the State adopted a new constitution. This was similar to the first but extended the executive and curbed the legislative power by giving the sole veto to the Governor. As the people, recognizing the voting aloud was detrimental to a proper election, had cried out against voting viva voce, the new constitution provided that all white male inhabitants, living in the State for 1 year, were qualified to cast their vote by secret ballot.

The year 1870 brought another constitution to the people of this State. This one had a preamble stating the purpose of the document as had the Federal Constitution. Article 11 of the constitution of 1870 provides freedom of speech, of the press, rights to trial by jury, to assemble, to petition, et cetera, in a bill of rights.

This constitution has been brought up to date by the gateway amendment after five defeated proposals since 1891. November 7, 1950, Illinoisans, remembering the slogan "Open the gate to a better State," went to the polls and finally passed it. The gateway amendment allows three articles to be submitted before the general assembly, our legislative body, instead of only one. Now a majority of all electors voting at the election or two-thirds of those voting on the proposition is required to pass the proposal. Future amendments may presently be submitted either on separate ballots or in a separate column on the ballot. Previously the form of this ballot was determined by action of the general assembly.

An unusual aspect of our State constitution is that it provides for minority representation. Joseph Medill, of Chicago, is responsible for this. He sponsored the idea to destroy the strong sectional feeling, a remnant of the bloody Civil War, which divided northern and southern Illinois.

According to this plan, which is used for electing State representatives from senatorial districts, a voter casts three votes. He may cast one for each of the three representatives or he may split his three votes between two candidates. The third method is referred to as "plumping."

This is a good plan, because it allows unpopular, yet sometimes better qualified men, the opportunity to win. Very often people are against a new plan, method, and man simply because they are new. Knowledge or dislike may not be a factor. True, everyone likes familiar things, but familiar things do not always make an efficient government. In Illinois, advocates of an unpopular representative may influence their friends to plump the vote, thereby often benefiting the State.

Like all good things, our State constitution has been criticized. It has been called the constitution of horse-and-buggy days. It is true that the constitution was originally drawn up for an agricultural State and now Illinois is an industrial State, but despite all this, it is still considered one of the best models of State constitutions. As for the argument that an old constitution is ineffective and behind the times, it cannot be condemned because of age. Consider our Federal Constitution. It is 163 years old and has stood the test of time.

With the foresight of our statesmen, in the future the Constitution of Illinois will be not only one of the best models, but the best.

Congressman Dempsey Gets Action**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, during his singularly successful career, our distinguished colleague from New Mexico, the Honorable JOHN J. DEMPSEY, has learned a great deal about how to get things done, and done quickly. His skill and ability are now paying dividends, not only to the citizens of New Mexico but also to the citizens in all of our districts who find it necessary to purchase new automobiles.

Due to the efforts of Congressman DEMPSEY, each new automobile is now sold equipped with a spare tire, the cost of which is included in the sale price of the car. The National Production Authority order which forced a new-car purchaser to buy a spare tire separately has been revoked. Before revocation of the needless order, automobile dealers were compelled to deliver new cars without spare tires, but the retail prices of the cars were not reduced by an amount equivalent to the retail cost of an extra tire purchased separately. Since there was no restriction on the sale of tires, the new-car buyer desiring a spare tire found himself able to get one by buying it separately and paying for it considerably more than he would have paid had the tire been included as standard equipment in the usual manner. All of this did not make sense to our colleague, Congressman DEMPSEY. He decided to do something about it, and he did.

When the explanations of the National Production Authority proved wholly unsatisfactory, our distinguished colleague prepared an amendment to the Defense Production Act nullifying the useless order, and serving notice on the National Production Authority that he would air the whole matter on the floor of the House if the situation were not immediately remedied. A few days later, the order was revoked, and the spare tire is back in its proper place, and, what is more important, it is included in the sale price of the car. This means a saving to every automobile purchaser.

Every Congressman sees many wrongs which he would like to see righted, but time, red tape, and other factors often prevent him from having the satisfaction of decisively finishing that which he starts out to do. Here is a case where an exceptionally able Representative not only started out but finished the job. I am sure you will all wish to join me in thanking Congressman DEMPSEY for eliminating at least one needless and unjust Government order. During his four terms in this Congress, his two terms as Governor of the great State of New Mexico, and his tenure in other important offices, our colleague, JOHN J. DEMPSEY, has acquired a know-how that makes him an exceptionally valuable Member of this Congress.

XCVII—App.—311

**World Government Repudiated by
Legislature, State of Delaware****EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including a resolution approved by the Legislature of the State of Delaware on the subject of world government. This resolution is in opposition to any form of world government. The resolution verbatim is included as part of my remarks:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 4

Concurrent resolution in opposition to any form of world government

Whereas the Sovereignty Preservation Council of Delaware, composed of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, the National Sojourner's, Council of Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware are interested in the resolution presented below; and

Whereas in 1943 a resolution was introduced into the general assembly asking it to petition the Congress of the United States to call a conference of nations to create a limited world government, and said resolution failed to pass; and

Whereas, again in 1949, a similar resolution was introduced into the general assembly and it also failed to pass; and

Whereas a world government would deprive the citizens of the United States of inalienable rights, privileges, and immunities now guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas in the present crisis it is highly important that the citizens of the United States present a united front against any and all forces that tend to destroy our American heritage; and

Whereas Delaware was the first State to ratify the Constitution of the United States and therefore should be the last to take any action which would weaken or destroy it; and

Whereas the general assembly is composed of senators and representatives, elected by the people of Delaware, who are sworn to uphold, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States and the constitution of the State of Delaware. Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Delaware (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the General Assembly of Delaware is unalterably opposed to any and all plans, programs, and proposals which tend toward the development of any form of world government.

Behind the Front Page**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. CLINTON D. McKINNON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1951

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Speaker, at the request of my good friend, George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, I

am pleased to submit the following newspaper article from the Akron Beacon Journal of July 29, 1951:

LET DEALERS SELL FIFTH TIRE

EDITOR, BEACON JOURNAL:

I am not a member of the National Association of Independent Tire Dealers. However, I did have a hand in its formation as secretary-manager, 1935 to 1940.

Prior to that, from 1923 to 1925, I was president of the National Tire Dealers Association. I was an active independent tire retailer from 1909 until 1935. I believe due to this experience in the rubber tire industry I should be in a position to evaluate the over-all on the spare tire on new automobiles, and what it meant to efficient independent tire dealers throughout the Nation.

I am referring to the editorial which appeared in the Beacon Journal on July 20, Fifth Tire Again. It is a strange coincidence that similar types of editorials appeared in many leading publications throughout the United States.

It is true, and rightfully so, that the tire dealers of this Nation, through their national association, as early as 1928 opposed any and all action that would prohibit them from having equal opportunity in supplying consumer requirements on the fifth or spare tire.

It probably will be found that during the 20-year period some 50,000,000 units of spare tires and tubes have gone exclusively through the car manufacturers, denying the right to 300,000 independent tire dealers to participate in that business. You must bear in mind that major tire manufacturers expect their dealers throughout the Nation to give service both on original equipment and spare tires when called upon by the user.

Shortly after the Korean outbreak, purely as a conservation measure to help the Government, the writer, through his own private services, as recommended by subscribers, urged that the spare tire be eliminated during the emergency. That was the proposition.

We know from experience that good usable used tires could have been used during the emergency, with no great hardship on the automobile owner.

It can be said without a question of doubt that any ruling coming out of NPA was largely influenced by other than tire dealers throughout the Nation.

It is true that during the life of the ban the order was meaningless and that the new-car owner could get the spare tire through independent dealers or automobile dealers, and in this respect it may be found that major tire manufacturers might have been shipping the spare tire direct to automobile dealers, bypassing the independent tire dealer. I said "it may be found."

The inference in most editorials is that in the allowance made to the car purchaser minus the spare tire, the tire dealer was making the difference in what the user had to pay. That is erroneous. No tire dealer bought new tires at the price that was allowed by the automobile manufacturer to be deducted from the list price of the car.

It is true that with the allowance that the automobile purchaser received from the car manufacturer for the tire which was not delivered, the tire dealer not buying the tire in the first instance from the tire manufacturer couldn't hope to furnish the new tire at the allowed price.

If there has been any annoyance or needless additional expense to the car purchaser, the responsibility rests with the suppliers of original equipment tires and the car manufacturers themselves and not with the independent dealers.

The dealers have a justifiable right in demanding of our Government relief from this

monopoly existing these past 20 years between the four major tire manufacturers and the car manufacturers, denying the right to independent dealers to participate in a free competitive market for consumer requirements. All pressure is being used through Government agencies and congressional committees to have this issue explored for the first time in 20 years.

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President, National Federation
of Independent Business.

BEHIND THE FRONT PAGE

(By Robert H. Stophar and James S. Jackson)

FIFTH TIRE

In the controversy over whether automobile manufacturers should be allowed to supply a fifth tire with a new car, the Big Four of the rubber industry have been used as whipping boys for both sides.

Publicly, the rubber companies have said nothing, because they don't want to alienate either group of good customers—the automobile makers or the independent tire dealers.

Actually, the rubber people probably have been pretty well satisfied with the course of events. When the Government's ban on the fifth tire went on last April, rubber was short. The ban may have made it possible to supply a few more tires to dealers during the spring season.

Now that rubber is more plentiful, the companies are undoubtedly content to have the tires flowing again through normal channels. They may make a little less profit per tire on the huge orders from the auto firms but they consider this a backbone of their business.

Conflict

Spokesmen for different labor groups have popped up on both sides of the fence in commenting on the Government's ban on fifth tires, which was recently rescinded.

The Railway Brotherhood's newspaper, Labor, favors having the fifth tire on new cars. In a recent editorial it blasted George J. Burger, writer of a letter in today's Sunday Forum, and the Big Four tire companies as being responsible for the ban.

The editorial said, in part: "It appears that the fifth tire ban was wanted by a combination of big business—the Big Four tire manufacturers—and small business—Burger's organization. Their demand was gladly granted by businessmen who came from the tire industry to act as Government officials in the NPA."

In direct contrast, Frank Edwards, radio broadcaster for the American Federation of Labor, blamed the big rubber companies for prying off the ban on the fifth tire.

In a broadcast on July 6 he said:

"The four big rubber companies which dominate the tire market have won another victory over their competitors and the consumers. Beginning next week, the Government will permit manufacturers of new automobiles to sell spare tires with the new cars."

"The story behind the deal is this: Four big tire companies furnish those tires. Representatives of those same companies are in key positions of the Government agency that issued the order banning the sale of spare tires. It was expected that a panic market would develop, enabling the tire companies who supply the car makers to unload at fancy prices. Nothing of the sort occurred. Customers bought that extra tire at lower prices from independent dealers. So the National Production Authority reversed itself and, starting next Monday, the dominant tire makers will once again supply all five tires on each new car at a nice profit to the car manufacturers and the four big rubber companies—Goodrich, Goodyear, United States, and Firestone."

Note 1: The most common complaint heard during the period when the fifth tire was

banned was that customers had to pay more for a spare than it would have cost them if it had been included in the price of the car.

Note 2: The United Rubber Workers of America, whose members make the tires, has not taken a stand on either side of the fifth-tire controversy.

The Gossett-Lodge Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, among the legislative contributions of our former colleague, Hon. Ed Gossett, during his outstanding service in the House is the proposal to amend the electoral college procedures, known as the Gossett-Lodge amendment.

The Arkansas Gazette recently referred favorably to Mr. Gossett's efforts to secure a more acceptable and democratic method of choosing the President and Vice President, and, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the Gazette editorial, as follows:

Once again the constitutional amendment to give the people a more influential voice in electing Presidents has been started through Congress. For the third time the House Judiciary Committee has approved the Gossett amendment, which provides for dividing the electoral votes of the States in direct proportion to their popular votes. At present all of the electoral votes of any one State go to the presidential candidate with a majority of the popular votes in that State. Under this system, a candidate with a minority of the popular votes in the Nation as a whole can be elected Chief Executive. Presidents Adams, Hayes, and Harrison were elected by minorities.

Last year the Senate approved a measure which would have prevented this from happening in the future. But the House killed the companion bill in the lower Chamber by a 76-vote majority. Most of the opponents of the amendment, sponsored by Representative Ed Gossett, of Texas, were Fair Deal Democrats and Old Guard Republicans. The opposition of the Fair Dealers evidently stemmed from a feeling that the proposed change would lessen the influence of the big cities from which most of them come. This may be true, but the change is still needed; many of the big population centers now wield disproportionate power. The opposition of the conservative Republicans apparently grew out of a feeling that the greater efforts they would have to exert in the South as a result of the amendment would not yield correspondingly greater support for the GOP. The South, however, ought to be included in the strategic planning of the Republicans; otherwise it will never shake off its slavish adherence to Democratic symbols.

Regardless of what the special interests of some Congressmen may dictate, the Gossett amendment is for the good of the country as a whole. It is a measure to make the method of electing Presidents more democratic. Congressmen pay lip service to democracy every day. Here is a chance for them to demonstrate that they mean what they say. Proposals to reform the present electoral system have come before Congress from time to time ever since the disputed election of 1824, in which John Quincy Adams and John C. Calhoun were chosen President and Vice President only after the contest had been

carried to the House of Representatives. Congress should not let another presidential election go by without acting to revise the system.

Controlled Materials Plan Is the Wrong Road in a Free Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, governmental interference in the matter of controlled materials will soon disrupt our economy if the plan is not ended very soon. The power to allocate critical materials wherever and whenever the Government wishes amounts to a considerable power and puts American business in the hands of Government agencies which can thereby exercise the power of life and death over every business firm in the United States. Already we have seen that certain preferred industrial organizations have received the profits of this plan. On the other hand, we have seen well established business organizations suffer from this abuse of governmental policies. As part of my remarks I am including an editorial that appears in Barron's for August 6 entitled "The Wrong Road," and surely the controlled-materials plan is the wrong road in a free economy.

THE WRONG ROAD—CMP SHOULD BE ELIMINATED, NOT EXTENDED

Ten days ago Chairman Eugene Grace, of Bethlehem Steel, came out flatly for limiting steel allocations to direct military orders which are at best taking 10 percent of the steel output of this country.

Last week Mr. Manly Fleischmann, head of the Defense Production Administration, took Mr. Grace's advice in reverse. He announced that his pet controlled-materials plan, under which steel, aluminum, and copper are currently being allocated to many types of nonmilitary production, will be further extended to cover every sector of the American economy.

We believe that Mr. Grace is eminently right in his position and Mr. Fleischmann is eminently wrong, and this for reasons that go far beyond the usual arguments adduced against CMP. Mr. Grace pointed out that even the present plan creates confusion, inefficiency, and black markets. All this is true. Yet, even if Mr. Fleischmann can make his scheme work smoothly, it is still wholly suspect. Indeed, it is precisely when controls do work smoothly and are actually enforceable that a free society should be most on guard.

If the country were at total war, then no doubt total allocations would be necessary. Under present circumstances, with military orders actually falling (\$1,000,000,000 in July against a previous monthly rate of over \$3,000,000,000), extension of CMP is both dangerous and unnecessary. The automobile industry, which so far has been exempt from the plan, but which now would go under it, offers the clearest evidence that Mr. Fleischmann is proposing nothing that the law of supply and demand wouldn't do better. It is a well-known fact that cuts so far effected in automobile production through general limitation orders on raw materials (rather than by outright alloca-

tions) have just about equaled declining demand for cars. All that the National Production Authority has so far achieved in Detroit has been to institute a kind of quota system which penalizes the most efficient producers and helps the least efficient. General Motors, to take a single example, has probably absorbed less of the market for cars than it might have captured. Kaiser-Frazer, which recently had to borrow from the RFC to float its inventory, has been by the same token helped.

Application of the controlled materials plan to automobiles will perpetuate this unsavory situation which is all too reminiscent of the days of the NRA. Its dangers, however, do not end with fostering a kind of Government-sponsored cartel scheme. The basic danger of the controlled materials plan is that it puts into the hands of Government life and death powers over what every firm in the country and every industry may or may not produce. Up to now the Government has sought to draw a distinction between industries that are defense supporting and those that are not. It has included in the defense-supporting category such items as storm windows, freight cars, farm equipment, and oil-drilling equipment to mention but a few. Its attempt to manage the output of these industries has scarcely been successful. The super-freight-car program was first initiated to overcome shortage. Now it is continued to create a reserve. Tomorrow the industry may well be restricted to prevent glut. A generalized CMP means simply that the mismanagement of freight cars will be applied everywhere.

But it is not only in terms of current production that the controlled materials plan and other devices come close to having the effect of socialization. The heart of capitalism is after all the free flow of capital into those enterprises which can prove to investors that they need it and can reward it. The CMP, combined with certificates of necessity, which allow rapid amortization of new facilities, substitutes in this vital investment sphere centralized government decisions for decentralized private decisions. Under CMP rules, the firm with a certificate of necessity can get all the steel, copper, and aluminum it needs for its new plant. The firm without a certificate is apt to be left in the cold.

This power to channel and to stimulate investment wherever government wishes is a fundamental power. It is the essence of all Russia's 5-year plans or of the late Hermann Goering's 4-year plan for Germany. And to a peculiar degree and unnoticed by Congress or the public, Mr. Fleischmann is running just such a plan. To the degree that this plan stimulates total investment, as it has done, it is just as inflationary as its German and Russian predecessors. It has intensified and prolonged the American boom, and has laid the ground for trouble when the so-called war plants are finished. It is also completely arbitrary. It involves not only steel and aluminum capacity as sometimes supposed. For no particular reason the Government has given aid to a \$600,000,000 expansion of the pulp and paper industry and similar aid to the producers of nylon, acrilan, and dacron whose connection with defense is, to put it mildly, tenuous. At the same time the vital machine tool industry has gone begging until recently.

Mr. Fleischmann may, of course, be right that if war comes it will be won by the Fourdrinier roll—the Voice of America needs lots of paper. Or, he might be wrong. The point is that the administration's use of allocation and other powers already goes far beyond what the present situation requires or what a free society, short of war, should tolerate. Continued for years—and no real termination date has ever been set for Washington's defense effort—the present process

can erode away the very essence of capitalism—the free market. That is why in advocating that allocation of steel be limited to direct defense needs Mr. Grace of Bethlehem put forward a proposition that deserves support. And that is why Mr. Fleischmann in extending the controlled materials plan to everything is driving hell-bent down the wrong road.

The Cotton Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. BROOKS Mr. Speaker, in sharp contrast to the situation existing a year ago, this country has every prospect of having an abundant supply of cotton available during the next 12 months. Twelve months ago we were on the ropes, so to speak, in the sense that we were short of cotton badly needed for munitions and equipment for defense. European nations experiencing the first budding desire of wanting to rearm themselves for defensive purposes against Russia likewise needed cotton for munitions and equipment. Our supply was short and, to conserve the limited amount available, an embargo against the export of cotton was brought into being. At one time there was a grave threat that, even with the embargo, this country would not have enough cotton to get through the 12 months' period before the present crop came on the market.

The Agriculture Department sent out the word of distress to our cotton farmers, and now the reports which I get from Louisiana are to the effect that an abundant crop is forecast. It is just beginning to be picked and within the next few weeks will be in full flow toward the cotton gins throughout the Southland and to the domestic and world markets. Our people are talking about a bale and a half to two bales to the acre of cotton.

The Agriculture Department gave acreage figures which indicated a crop in excess of 16,000,000 bales, and there is talk of a 18,000,000-bale crop. Eleven million more acres were planted in cotton this year than previously. I do not know what the amount of the harvest will be, whether it will be much in excess of 16,000,000 bales or under this amount.

In Louisiana the Farm Bureau Federation has recommended that this country begin to stockpile cotton. I believe this is an excellent idea. In time of emergencies such as this, we should not again be caught short of cotton needed for defense purposes. If, as now appears reasonably certain, we will have a large surplus of cotton and the price goes down to parity, this should be a good time for our Government to stockpile a reasonable amount of cotton. Several million bales might be purchased this year and a stockpile of 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 bales might be in order. This would carry out the recommendation of the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation and at the same

time would protect our country from another severe shortage of cotton as we had last year. The time to act on this subject is now before the cotton crop reaches the market.

Kaesong and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, we should not forget that the cease-fire talks at Kaesong originated with the Soviet's Malik, and that the course of these negotiations is becoming strangely reminiscent of the efforts of the Foreign Ministers Deputies to agree on an agenda at Paris. These efforts dragged through 74 sessions from March 5 to June 21, came to nothing and were used throughout as a propaganda springboard by Stalin and others.

General Ridgway should know from as many of us as possible that the American people fervently want peace but a peace that can be relied upon. General Ridgway should carry on the negotiations so long as he is convinced they are sincere and that there is a reasonable chance for honorable agreement consonant with the mission to repel armed aggression so vital to the United Nations and the United States. General Ridgway should know that there is no need for dragging on hopeless negotiations giving the Communists broad propaganda advantages and perhaps military advantages as well, out of concern lest there be a public opinion at home which is so desperate for a cease fire as to wish to grasp at straws.

General Ridgway should not worry about the home folks right now. They know the score a lot better than the Communists think they do.

[From the New York Times]

MISTAKE AT KAESONG

The United Nations has now had the assurance that the presence of an armed marching column of Communists in the middle of a supposedly disarmed and neutral negotiating area was all a mistake and that it won't happen again. This incident, which led quite properly to an interruption of the cease-fire talks, is illustrative of the difficulties that the United Nations faces in negotiation. There has been evidence, from the beginning, that there was no real meeting of minds, no sound identity of purpose, as between the opposing parties. What is being attempted by the United Nations is, at best, the effort to make something good out of a bad situation.

There are two major obstacles to any really fruitful discussion, and both have become increasingly stubborn. The first is the manifest intention of the Communists to use the whole matter of cease-fire discussion as a propaganda instrument. Thus, in the beginning, it was apparent that the first meeting was framed to give the illusion of a United Nations surrender and a plea for peace terms. It was necessary to suspend the talks until the physical aspects of that frame-up were rectified. Its propaganda

aspects have not yet been corrected by the Communists and we have no reason to expect that they will be.

Subsequently the talks had to be broken off when the United Nations negotiators could not have unimpeded access to the negotiation area. This also was remedied, after a fashion, when the United Nations delegation showed its intention of standing firm.

The ensuing deadlock over the agenda was the result of the Communist attempt to get a political commitment from the United Nations after the discussion of political questions at this time had been specifically eschewed in the earlier agreement. This appears also to have been a matter chiefly of seeking an exploitable propaganda advantage. In the later stages, however, when the real division on a demarcation line stalled the negotiation, it took on the aspects of a genuine political maneuver.

At this point the second obstacle becomes apparent. The United Nations has agreed to this negotiation simply because it wants to stop the shooting in Korea. There is, and there can be, no assurance that this desire is reciprocated. The United Nations has no way of knowing whether Mr. Malik put out his peace feeler because the Communists wanted to make a peace or merely because they wanted a breathing spell to regroup defeated forces for a new assault. A further possibility, of course, is that the Communists supposed that they could gain through negotiation major political ends they had failed to gain by resort to arms. This last supposition gains credibility by virtue of the Communist insistence on the thirty-eighth parallel as a truce line. The implication that the partition of Korea would thus have a cloak of agreed legality is inescapable.

This all comes down to a situation that is little short of preposterous. We are trying to negotiate in good faith. At the same time we have no confidence whatever that there is any good faith on the other side. We have deliberately put on boxing gloves to get into a ring with an opponent equipped with brass knuckles. We know in advance that every single thing we do or say will be subject to the most systematic campaign of misrepresentation. We know that our actions and our desires and our motives will be lied about, and that the lies will have as much circulation as the Communists can possibly give them. More than that, we know that if we make a single slip, yield at a single point, our own good faith will be exploited against us. We can try as hard as we will not to make mistakes on our side. We can confidently expect them from the other.

This is not normal negotiation by any definition. It is a phase of cold war in which we have had little experience. We want to stop bloodshed if we can. The choice, in honor, does not lie with us—that is, with the U. N.—and has not so lain from the beginning.

Jesus, Prince of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the sermon, Jesus, Prince of Peace, by Dr. James W. Fifield, Jr., of Los Angeles, has so impressed me that I have obtained permission to insert it in the RECORD.

The patriotic devotion of the average American causes him to tend to put a halo around our high officials and their offices, and, as Dr. Fifield says, the people do not want to believe there has been betrayal in high places and that our leaders sold us out to Stalin at Yalta and Potsdam and thereby set the stage for the tragedy which is consuming the lives of American boys, threatening our security, and endangering civilization itself.

Nor do they want to believe that the moral and spiritual concept of our Nation and its leaders has dropped to the lowest level in our history.

Nevertheless, I am sure the reading of Dr. Fifield's sermon will cause us to stop and think—if not pray.

JESUS, PRINCE OF PEACE

(By James W. Fifield, Jr., D. D., minister of the First Congregational Church of Los Angeles, December 3, 1950)

This sermon has been rankling within me for a long time. Last Friday a widow whose 19-year-old son has presumably been killed in Korea, telephoned me expressing shock, sadness, and also bitterness. When she said, "There is nothing much that I can do but bear my sorrow, for no one will listen to anything I say," I resolved to be her spokesman. I think her bitterness is justified. Our casualties in Korea already are the third largest of any war in our history.

The day in which Jesus walked the earth as the Prince of Peace was not unlike our own. He indicated people must live together in order to live at all. Palestine had actually been fertilized by its best blood. The Assyrians and Babylonians had recurrently come from the north, the Egyptians from the south, and finally the Romans had made their conquest of Palestine. For generations there had been armistice after armistice but no peace.

Americans have been stunned by the developments within our country and the world during these past years. A friend of mine said two wrestlers banged their heads together so hard that they fell down senseless. The first one to come to and get up, jumped on the other and won the bout. Our people, like those wrestlers, have been stunned. We hope that they will wake up before our mortal enemy pounces upon them.

We have not wanted to believe that there was betrayal in high places for we have always kept a halo around certain offices in our country. Even when we disliked things that were happening and were suspicious of things we saw, we were unwilling to throw mud because of patriotic devotion.

Here's a letter from a man who has just gone back into the Army after 3 years of civilian life. He comments that it is an "unrecognizable Army." He says that they have nothing to fight a war with and no will to fight one, anyway. In my contacts with personnel at Army installations, I have heard young lads inquire, "What are we going to fight for?" They feel it is unfair to send them out to fight without adequate preparation to win another victory when the splendid victory so heroically won in World War II has been literally thrown away. Their question, "What would we fight for?" is not easy to answer. If there were clear and righteous issues and honorable, competent leadership, all would be ready to make whatever sacrifices were required and eagerly.

There is deepening anxiety everywhere and especially among more thoughtful people. War budgets are expanding. Matériel and personnel are being drafted. New appropriations are being rushed. The use of atom bombs is being considered. The crisis comes nearer each passing day and our Nation, having been unprincipled in its policies, must

now reap as it sowed, according to the teachings of Jesus and the laws of God.

We encouraged Russia's dream of world domination. At Yalta and other conferences our leaders betrayed us, sold us out, insisted that Stalin take even more than he had dared request, incredulous as that seems. We do not yet know the extent of our commitments because our State Department has resorted to secret diplomacy. We implemented Russia's visions with money and matériel, as well as by the betrayal of our allies in her behalf. Our betrayal of China and of European nations now behind the iron curtain is one of the blackest pages in American history. In South America, Europe, and the Orient, we have tried to purchase power, friendship, and good will with money, ignoring the Christian precept that spiritual values cannot be bought with money. Tasting power, we have made commitments which we cannot possibly keep. "The chickens are just beginning to come home to roost." Korea is only the first of our pledges calling for redemption. Other commitments made by our officials represent betrayals of a rank and desperate sort.

We have used the United Nations as a screen, just as England and France used the old League of Nations. The League was conceived by idealists with the finest of motives but, alas, it was doomed through misuse. No doubt, the originators of the United Nations included many noble idealists. But Alger Hiss and others, who are at least suspect, implemented the vision in ways which caused the United Nations to hamstring the free world. It is not right for those guilty of treason or suspect to be out on bail when our boys are being killed in Korea.

Some of you still believe in the United Nations. I respect the sincerity of your belief but do not share it. Use your own judgment concerning the United Nations. We dare not be unrealistic or impractically idealistic in such matters when our boys are dying in Korea.

There are only two real powers in the world today—the United States and Russia. The other allies do not really count in determination of major issues. The United Nations is what America wills it to be. It is certainly true that the United Nations would not move contrary to America's will, because America's withdrawal would mean its total collapse. In practical effect, it is the United States and Russia that are fighting in Korea.

While we have been engaged in this international debacle, the moral and spiritual altitude in our Nation has dropped to a new low, in part because of the example of the Federal Government. The mass corruption of the population is the fault of pressure groups, unscrupulous politicians and boss-rule. Many in this congregation, today, stoop to things they would not have done a year or 2 years ago. Business ethics, social ethics, personal ethics are often gutter level, as reflected by comic sheets, gangster movies, radio programs, magazine articles, and so forth. It is probable that American morals are at the lowest level in our Nation's history including the carpetbagger era at the close of the Civil War.

Many of the things which I am saying, you have been thinking but have not said because, stunned, like the wrestlers, you hoped they were not true or because you did not wish to offend. Perhaps you trusted our leaders because you or your relatives are on Government payrolls or receiving subsidies. Many have become unspeakably beholden to our Government.

This situation is so serious that there is no easy solution. However, the situation is not hopeless, and with courageous action and God's help, our Nation and our civilization can yet be redeemed. The pattern for redemption and for effective, practical action is as follows:

1. First, repentance for past sins and errors. The starting point to forgiveness and redemption is repentance. There is no other starting point. This is no time for arrogance in high places or low. We need to admit the folly of our ways, and to repudiate leaders who have betrayed us and our allies, whether knowingly or in ignorance. We cannot have too much sentiment about leaders in Washington when our youth are being killed in Korea.

2. We must clean out our own fifth column. In Government this means that every person, either guilty or even suspect, should be summarily and immediately eliminated. This includes those who profess a so-called socialism which is veiled communism. But we must also eliminate those guilty and suspect of communism in our trade unions, our schools, our colleges, our newspapers, our magazines, our business organizations, and even our church officials. We must ready ourselves for a finish fight—the stake being survival.

3. We must aid every responsible nation that fights communism regardless of whether there is any other point of agreement in culture or religion or politics. We need every ally on which we can count in this great moral struggle.

4. We must find ways and means to enlist anti-Communists behind the iron curtain and make them effective as rebels, arming them, and directing them. This may be one of the most important steps which can be taken.

5. We must break relations with Russia. We should never have recognized her present regime. We must also break relations with her satellites and drive out all Russian agents and agents of all satellite nations from our country. We must stop shipping matériel to Russia or to any satellite nation or to any other nation which will not give solemn assurance that it will not reach Russia or a satellite of Russia.

6. We must eliminate Russia from the United Nations. If that cannot be done, then the United States must withdraw from the United Nations, and promptly. We must stop the daily insults and intrigues which emerge from hostile, plotting, scheming, dangerous delegates, and hangers-on at the United Nations.

7. We must require all our allies to take the same steps, terminating their associations with those whom we plainly label as our enemies. The resources of the United States cannot continue to support enemies or even neutrals. They must be used only for ourselves or for our allies in this great conflict.

It is not easy to speak thus of the United Nations. Sufficient to say that if those who set up this organization conspired to make it a handicap for world peace, they have succeeded too well.

Our so-called bipartisan foreign policy has been no foreign policy at all. Stalin is the foulest dictator and antichrist of all recorded history. He has been responsible for the murder of more than 15,000,000 persons. It is asserted on presumably responsible authority, that the Communists, who are now mopping up in China, are murdering 10,000 a day, so that Mao Tse-tung, although second to Stalin as a murderer, is daily increasing his score. Until recently our Government's official position was that the Communists in China were not Communists at all; that they had no relationship to the Kremlin in Russia, and that they were only agrarian reformers. During the last 18 months, the policy of our State Department has been to let the dust settle, and it has settled all over us. It is the Chinese Communists, directed by Moscow, that are killing American soldiers in Korea.

If, as Gen. Omar Bradley states, all our Armed Forces are presently engaged in Ko-

rea where we are suffering serious reverses, then it is fair to say that the victory of World War II, achieved by the devotion of our fighting men, has been utterly thrown away. The billions spent for armament, et cetera, have been wasted and our huge debt has bought only destruction of American honor and ideals plus concentration of power in unworthy bureaus and persons. This is betrayal. Critical and extreme as the words sound, it is fair to say that this Nation which, under God, had a special place of privilege and responsibility in the sun, has sold its glorious birthright for a mess of pottage and the pottage smells.

This crisis has been as much, or more, our making as Russia's. Indeed, Russia could not have done what she has to develop it without our active cooperation and even our leaders' prodding. There have not only been international blunders, but immoral sins against God which call for penitence and contrition. We must entreat God to forgive us for failing to meet our great responsibilities and opportunities as a nation and must remember that we, individually, constitute our Nation. All the blame for its mistakes cannot be put on its leaders. The process of redemption, therefore, must start in us with positive and affirmative action. Each of us must vow to do and think and say only that which is wholly true and honorable without any compromise or any exception. We need to listen again to the voice of conscience illuminated by the teachings of Jesus concerning the laws of God. The time for wishful thinking is past. There must be an end to all shades of gray. Things must be black and white—not right or left, but right or wrong.

We must respiritualize our family life and our home relationships. After that we must realine our relationships with individuals and organizations, revitalizing our devotion to the good and severing all other relations. What I am proposing is a Herculean task, but it might save civilization. Nothing less will. Unless courageous, moral, and spiritual action of a sort which will secure the help of God is taken, we shall drift on and on along the road to Communist world domination in which life will become mere existence, in which God will be banished, or damned, and in which dark ages will again be the lot of humanity. By next May a billion two hundred million souls, more than half the people on this planet, will probably be within the orbit of Communist control. This need not be. We should not be defeatist. We cannot give up the future of our children and grandchildren to such a despicable outlook. God forbid—no; not God forbid: we must not put the responsibility for this upon God. Rather, let us, with God's help, forbid and prevent this terrible tragedy.

It is time for the American people, who, like the wrestlers, have been stunned beyond expression, who have felt the very things they were seeing couldn't be true, who have been betrayed, to wake up, get right with God, and realistically face the situation. However well we have been doing, it has not been well enough, for the forces of good and of God are losing ground daily in the world. Each of you must do better, and at once. I shall endeavor to do better, too. This sermon is an earnest effort to help sound the alarm. I think it is the kind of realistic, frank, plain-spoken sermon which would be preached today, in the interest of peace, by Jesus as the Prince of Peace. I hope you will quote it widely but accurately.

"If this be treason, then make the most of it." Let us pray.

The Future of Carson-Newman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Herbert Acuff, Knoxville, Tenn., who is president of the International College of Surgeons, delivered the alumni address at the centennial celebration of Carson-Newman College, Jefferson City, Tenn. It impressed me so much I have obtained permission to insert it in the Record:

The address follows:

THE FUTURE OF CARSON-NEWMAN

It is indeed a very great honor for me to represent the alumni of Carson-Newman College on the significant occasion of its one hundredth anniversary. I shall attempt to evaluate some of its many achievements in the past, to survey its potentialities for the future and discuss some of the conditions which materially concern the alumni of this college.

During the recent campaign for expansion of Carson-Newman College, a rather careful survey disclosed that we have more than 2,000 alumni scattered throughout many States in the Union. In the very beginning, may I say that I have an abiding faith, and at the same time a complete assurance, that the destiny of Carson-Newman College lies safely in (1) its past record of noble service, (2) in the support of the Baptist cooperative program, and (3) in its loyal, growing, and supporting alumni.

To the graduating class of 1951—the centennial class—I have the signal honor of bidding you welcome to the alumni association of your great alma mater. You are to be congratulated on having arrived thus far on your road of life. It is now that your hour of decision is at hand. Many opportunities suggest themselves for your life's vocation. Your decision should be made only after weighing carefully every detail, every eventuality and every potentiality germane to a life's vocation, not only in the immediate period but in future years as well.

Life's span of active years is all too short for a bountiful fruition in whatever field you may choose, and therefore your decision should be sound and firm, your pursuit unswerving and your ambition determined if you would achieve the success you have set for your goal. Lack of decisions means delay. Delay means sacrifice of time, and time is the precious gift of life.

Decision for a life's program today must take into consideration the political and social pattern under which one shall live, one's own academic and/or technical preparation and one's flexibility of personality to meet the changing trends of the time.

Personality is indefinable. Some of its treasured physical attributes take origin in genetics, such as the black hair, the blue eyes, the fair skin, and other tangible features of one's physiognomy. One's personality from early childhood and adolescence is directly dependent upon the parental guidance, upon the types and character of associated interests, upon the groups of people, higher than one's own level in age and mental development, where emulation is unknowingly practiced, in the pupil and teacher associations. These are decisive factors in the passive molding of character and personality in the formative years. When entering upon the road to business,

however, you have passed the tender indulgence of parents in childhood; your teachers are no longer present to solve your problems; you face a cold, calculating, business world where excuses, however plausible, will not suffice—only performance counts. Here it is that ability, personality, and attitudes reflect their true value and are largely in one's own hands. Fortunate indeed is that person who arrives at the threshold of his career, armed with adequate preparation, which may well be an asset common to many, a convincing personality with a dominant regard for integrity, an ambition and physical stamina to enable him to attain his objective.

The time will inevitably come when the business and professional world will call upon each of us for an accounting of the manner in which we have utilized our talents. Upon such an evaluation may depend promotion in business, position in society, the choice of yielding to malfeasance in positions of trust or a courageous integrity against political intrigue.

Let us not be deceived. The character we develop, the personality we maintain in later years of life, are molded by our associates, the books we read, the friends we make, the habits we form, the desires we create—all are woven into the pattern of our lives.

My admonition to you, the graduates of the centennial class of 1951, is to further pursue your preparation. Problems and complexities of life will confront you in the most insidious ways. You must have the preparation and the fortitude for decision which comes only from a well-founded, basic education supplemented by experience.

Today and in every phase of our times, the yardstick must be science. It paves the better way when applied to basic agriculture, manufacturing, commerce, art, law, medicine, astronomy. It has harnessed electricity and more recently the atom and made them subservient to the work and will of man. What a challenge and what far-reaching potentialities are yet lying dormant in the mysteries of chemistry. Truly, science knows no confines, no country of preference; it is the patrimony of all humanity, the torch which lights the civilized world. In the wake of its revelations, civilization must move and progress. Its laws are immutable. Its secrets are locked in the cryptic vaults of the cell, the ion, the atom.

In the evolution of science, however, with its startling revelations for man's convenience, we must keep an alert vigilance on the government in which we live; we must participate in its activities; we must in every instance exercise the sovereign right of the ballot; we must fight, if need be to death, to preserve our free way of life. Regrettably, there are those living in America today who would renounce our present system of government as being obsolete and not adapted to the problems of modern times. In my humble opinion there have never been more flexible documents by which to pattern our changing economy than the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights.

It is the prerogative and duty of every American to regard with suspicion those who would constantly change by statute the basic structure of our Government, who would curtail the inherent rights of State government and the priceless heritage and freedom of the people themselves.

We must beware of those who would point to an utopian way of life, who would capitulate the pride of individual independence for a State or Federal dole. Such a practice connotes perpetuity in office, dictatorship, and ultimate socialistic tendencies, the results of which have lowered the level of the social and political economy of those once proud nations across the sea.

We owe an obligation to those of our population who are in the extremes of life. The youth we nurture with care and in them confidently place our trust and hope for the future; to those hallowed lives of advanced age, we bow in respect, and freely accept our responsibility for their care and protection. I would remind those individuals who seek patronization from Government and State agencies that self-reliance begets independence, and that collectively or as individuals they must never permit the bureaucracies to pauperize and wrest from them the priceless heritage of inherent freedom. Let us subscribe to the inalienable principle that all men are created for usefulness and postulate the question, "Who does not desire to fulfill the design of his creation?"

If we in America maintain steadfastly our individual independence, we shall hold no fear of maintaining collective solidarity. It has been my privilege recently to travel in Europe and observe the decadent states and ruins of those once resplendent empires. We in the blessed United States have a heritage of freedom in speech and action which is not now enjoyed by the people in other lands. We have but to remember that these fine people across the sea and our forefathers have a common ancestry. They have sacrificed their freedom, that once proud leadership in many of the arts and sciences, to the causeless, vicious, designing ravages of war. The teachers, the preachers, the scientists, the agriculturists, the businessmen of Europe could not prevent such a catastrophe and calamity perpetrated by the ruthless, designing dictators; but so far in our country, with humility and gratitude to an all-wise and far-seeing providence, we still hold these priceless liberties intact.

Do not many of those fine people cling steadfastly to the same ideals we enjoy? Do they not deserve our assistance now as they have helped us in the past? Students of our country in every branch of art and science have long journeyed across the sea to the many temples of erudition and have learned much from the great masters of yesteryear. May we in America never forget that kindness nor discount those opportunities.

If it is orthodox for us to assist in the economic recovery of commercial Europe through the Marshall plan, it is not only orthodox but our fraternal obligation to aid, encourage and assist in every possible way the rapid return of the schools, colleges, arts and sciences of those countries to the high level of predicator days. In many of these countries, the march of the dictator, with his promises of vast material possessions and global prestige, was paid for in national bankruptcy, destruction of cities, schools, churches, and homes. Such naive acceptance of bombastic prating by people of culture and pride has been both mystifying and perplexing beyond hope of comprehension.

Our American conception of life and living has never sought territorial expansion by conquest. We have no plans for aggression. We have no objectives which need clash with the peaceful aims of any nation. We believe in the return of sovereign rights and self-government to all the peoples who have been deprived of them by force. In our Christian schools of America, so beautifully typified by Carson-Newman College, we shall strive to promote freedom of expression, freedom of religion, and the honest, unbridled practice of the democratic way of living in all of the peace-loving countries of the world.

In the hearts of living men throughout the world must come a transformation of thought and purpose. There must be an abrogation of selfishness, lust for power, territorial conquest, and leadership. Before

such a movement can become collective it must be individualistic. I would not abandon, I would increase, the appeal to men's sense of justice, that arbitration, and not war, is the humane way to settle disputes and adjust differences. I would emphasize the truth—that two or more philosophies of living may exist in our world as friends and mutual benefactors instead of death-threatening enemies. Still living in this world are millions of people who are animated by such a spirit and desire. They live in the ranks of controversial sides. It may yet come to pass that in their dogged persistence such a hope for the world may lie.

The aggressor forces of the world today threaten our noble professions in every walk of life. They would usurp the high levels of attainment realized only after a century of assiduous effort and turn backward the progress we have achieved by diligent labor and which we cherish second only to our religion and our homes. Chaos, unrest, suspicion, and greed face us as we grope our way in the most momentous epoch of world history.

Religious liberty and education must never capitulate. We must unite our thinking, our activities, on a universal level, ever keeping sacred the fact that men with such a philosophy shall move onward and upward toward a destiny which aspires to no ulterior objective, but would, in humility and prayer, seek to penetrate ever deeper into the hearts of men with an unswerving faith in the destiny which guides our way and a yearning altruism for humanity.

Today this country needs a revival of the philosophy of sound and safe American Government. From this we have been and are drifting far afield and peril lies ahead. Never has our country needed a leadership without ulterior purpose and political design as at this very moment. We need a state of government which is neither autocratic nor despotic.

We have grown powerful and prosperous in the democratic way of life where government is our servant and not our master. The continued strength of our Nation lies, as it has in the past, in the strength of a virile, unshaken, and abiding faith in the Constitution of the land, and in its adaptability to changing conditions in a changing world.

The alumni of Carson-Newman College and allied institutions throughout our land are now and shall continue to be the citizens of the hour into whose hands the care of culture, religion, and government must rest. There is a God-given privilege. It is a serious responsibility. It deserves militant prosecution.

As we stand at the close of the century and realize that our school has withstood the ravages of five wars and two great depressions, and has grown stronger and better through them all, we must then contemplate the future of the second century. Carson-Newman must expand its services to meet the demand of its community. Every student cannot or will not go to a State university. We must bring agriculture and engineering facilities to the boys in the rural communities, perhaps not on the advanced scale as in universities, but including soil analysis, hydroelectric energy, mechanics, chemistry, physics, et cetera.

How long shall we as a great community college deny those fine young men and women the scientific training they must have if we preserve our precious land and its soil? East Tennessee country is especially adapted to livestock raising, which demands more permanent pastures, more animal husbandry, a program in veterinary science by a veterinarian who might well teach and practice in the community.

We must supply the training to the programs which furnish our subsistence. We may shrink from such an expanded program, but the patronage of the landowners of east Tennessee will finance the inauguration of such departments, and grants-in-aid assistance will further develop such a program.

Lastly, I would invite your consideration of a concrete plan by which the alumni of Carson-Newman College shall become more interested, more closely related and more articulate in the physical expansion, the student growth, the increased perimeter of service, a greater diversity of departments, an increased number of teachers and preachers giving to our schools and our churches better trained men and women. I would commend the work and influence of the Bulletin. It might well be expanded to even greater proportions.

I would indulge the hope that within 2 decades Carson-Newman College would be able to consolidate and supply leadership for a vast majority of those remaining schools and churches related to its geographical realm of service. I am happy to note the establishment of a public relations department with an able director. This is a department long past due but most welcome now.

What a continuity of interest.

What a wholesome, balanced support for Carson-Newman.

What a victory for Christian education, and therefore, what a bulwark against those forces which subscribe to no form of religion but seek to destroy, with an overbearing arrogance, the stoical fortitude with which we would defend to death the ramparts of a Christian America.

The Christian schools of our country, without tax patronage, depend upon their natural flow of students, contributions, endowments from friends and alumni, and denominational support. I would strongly urge a more closely related program by the college with its alumni. Every class which leaves our college should be organized into its alumni family.

We shall never compromise our religious teaching—rather we shall seek to enlarge and expand it in every way possible—but we cannot and we must not become or remain a Bible school only, when less than 25 percent of our student enrollment is in the ministerial category. Every student who enters Carson-Newman may not desire to enter the ministry, therefore, provisions must be made for a diversity of departments.

A rotating advisory board from the alumni would be of inestimable value to the president, faculty, and board of trustees. I hold in the highest esteem the present management and faculty of the college. They are capable, ambitious, and progressive. It is our privilege and duty as alumni to assist them further in the growth and expansion of this great temple of preparation for the reason that among the alumni are numbered men and women of all levels of life—businessmen, manufacturers, executives, lawyers, jurists, doctors, teachers, and preachers. The degree of managerial success in their respective endeavors has been comparable to that of any similar group in our land. With renewed and additional interest by the alumni in their beloved alma mater, it is little short of an extravagant speculation as to the attainment of this fine school.

To my fellow members of the alumni of Carson-Newman College, I would venture the suggestion that no investment of funds—in cash, in stocks in land, in insurance—could ever pay greater dividends than an investment in human values—in the youth of our day and the citizens of tomorrow.

As we train and inculcate the young people of our age, so will be the thought and

action of the generations of the future. Ours is a responsibility; it is an opportunity. May we, individually and collectively, assume our responsibility and grasp the opportunity to work for, contribute to and promote by word and deed our great tried and trusted college. It has behind it a century of laudable achievement in the perpetuation of free enterprise in our economy, democracy in government and the unbridled, unrestricted teaching of Christian education.

To such a program for Carson-Newman today, for posterity tomorrow, let each of us dedicate our effort, our substance, our prayers. The mechanics and implementation of such a program is the joint responsibility of management, faculty, public relations, and the board of trustees. To Carson-Newman, from such contemporary correlation of effort, will come support, both physical and spiritual, endowments, scholarships and an expanded base of experience and achievement, from which we shall enter, with confidence, the uncharted corridors of the second century.

What About Bill Oatis?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House I include the following timely editorial from the present issue of the weekly Brooklyn (N. Y.) Record-Bay Ridge Record. It is particularly timely in view of the vote expected to take place here in the House tomorrow on the pending Oatis resolution reported out by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The editorial reads as follows:

WHAT ABOUT BILL OATIS?

The iron-curtain countries have totally destroyed anything even remotely resembling a free press within their own borders. Now they are trying to make certain no news concerning them, save for official government handouts, reaches the rest of the world.

That is about the only logical deduction that can be drawn from Czechoslovakia's conviction of William N. Oatis, an American and an Associated Press correspondent, on charges of spying out state secrets and reporting slanders and lies, and his sentencing to 10 years in prison.

So far as can be ascertained, Mr. Oatis' crime consisted of trying to do his job properly. He did what every good reporter in every free country does every day—that is, he sought and reported the news. As is customary with every press service, his superiors in the AP organization gave him assignments and he did his best to carry them out. These assignments were in no way unusual, and none of them could be considered spying as that word is understood in the Western World, but in the Communist world, "spying" means anything which displeases the heads of state. The laws are so drawn that anyone, citizen or foreigner, can be severely punished for saying and writing things which wouldn't cause an eyebrow to be lifted elsewhere.

Mr. Oatis' ordeal followed the usual pattern. He was held incommunicado for 70 days. He was not allowed to contact his friends or American officials. The State De-

partment has formally charged that his so-called confession was prepared by the Czech secret police, and that he rehearsed it under police direction. This confession, the State Department added, was only the admission of an American reporter that in the high tradition of his profession he was attempting, under the most unfavorable conditions, to report a true picture of conditions and events in Czechoslovakia as he saw them. It said further that Oatis' conviction shows that the present regime in Czechoslovakia fears truth, hates liberty, and knows no justice.

The Western world has learned something about how confessions of this character are obtained. The victim is subjected to merciless questioning. He is given little food. He is kept awake for days and nights on end. He is alternately threatened and cajoled. He is beaten. The whole idea is to break down the will—to bring the man to a point of mental and physical exhaustion and despair where nothing matters except to escape his tormentors. He will sign and agree to anything. This happened to Robert Vogeler and others. It undoubtedly happened to Oatis.

What can the Government do to protect our newsmen in the Communist nations? Alexander Jones, president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, has suggested that, in reprisal for the treatment of Oatis, the trade privileges now given Czechoslovakia in the American zone of Germany be withdrawn. Others think we should go much further. As an example, the Portland Oregonian said editorially, "If the United States does not get its back up soon, these kidnappings, pseudo trials, extorted confessions, and imprisonment of Americans will become chronic. Our Government should give immediate study, with a view to action, of the possible effects of making the iron curtain a two-way barrier; that is, the withdrawal from outlaw nations of all American nationals and the complete severance of diplomatic relations, plus an airtight ban on all commercial transactions between these countries and the United States."

Madison's Fair Name

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the people of Madison, Wis., the capital of the Badger State and metropolis of the Second Congressional District, need no defense in this Chamber. A week ago Saturday, however, President Truman, in a scattershot attack upon his political enemies, cast aspirations upon the people of our capital and State university city. He branded Madisonians as a scared, timid, and confused populace for failing to sign a fake petition circulated by a reporter from a newspaper noted for the efforts of its editors to suit the news or make the news to fit a peculiar preconceived pattern. Many substantial Madison citizens have written to express their resentment.

The text of one such letter, typical and explanatory, follows:

DEAR GLENN: In President Truman's Detroit speech he made something of a point

that 112 persons in Madison refused to sign a declaration containing excerpts from the Bill of Rights and the Declaration of Independence. His tone was rather clear that his intent was to cast aspersions upon either the forthrightness or the valor of Madison residents. Either we failed to believe in those precepts or we did not have the guts to stand up and be counted. He did not accuse this seat of learning as containing people too dumb to understand the quotations contained in the paper.

But here comes the explanation: The paper was circulated by the Capital Times and I, for one, would not sign my name to the Ten Commandments or the Lord's Prayer when submitted by that source, knowing there would certainly be an ulterior or adroit purpose.

In justice to the people of Madison, I think that a proper statement of this fact should be inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Anyway, the signing of a paper or petition does not necessarily mean too much. I remember years ago in Rhinelander that a petition to hang a very popular citizen by the name of Baldwin drew some 800 signatures and none of the signees recognized the hoax.

With best regards.

Further explanation of the ridiculous nature of the petition is contained in the following editorial from the Wisconsin State Journal, Madison's leading newspaper:

TRUMAN JITTERS INTO A RUSTY TRAP

President Truman must be in a sorry state of nervous jitters.

Either that, or he failed to clear his most recent speech with the stylists and researchers who ordinarily read copy on Presidential pronouncements.

In Detroit Saturday the President fell for one of the hoariest gags in a city editor's repertoire—the phony petition.

Because the gag was staged in Madison, the city received some dubious notoriety in the President's address.

He cited a feature article in the Capital Times which told of the failure of a reporter to get signatures to a petition which was nothing but sections from the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights.

Now any city editor worth his salt knows a smart reporter can get many worthy people to sign the most damaging of petitions. By staging the act properly, the same reporter can get blanket refusals to sign the most correct or innocuous ones.

Having seen the Cap Times city editor and this particular reporter in action on the liberal front and amidst the peace crusades over the years, the State Journal hasn't the slightest doubt the July Fourth act was carefully staged.

Consider the background. Many Madison people of good will were badly burned by signing the harmless-sounding Stockholm peace petition, a Commie propaganda device.

On the same day the Times worked its feature stunt, the Madison chapter of the American Peace Crusade circulated a pamphlet calling for the withdrawal of troops from Korea and asking for no more laws taxing the workingman to pay for the rich man's war.

Put these facts against the setting of a family picnic day.

Then take a look at the reporter asking signatures for a long and rhetorical document.

What sensible person would sign?

We wouldn't! Not even today, and knowing and approving the content of the petition.

Years ago, on a dull news day, we sent a cub reporter out to try to sell a bright, new silver dollar for 65 cents. He tried 40 or 50 people on Capital Square before finding a buyer. President Truman would have thought that a reflection on our monetary values.

If it happened today, he'd probably be right.

We have no quarrel with the Times for working its gag down its particular party line. The July Fourth stunt was quite in character.

But for the President of the United States to fall into the trap and use the incident in a major address is an unhappy commentary on the state of his nervous and emotional balance.

Career Versus Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Career Versus Conscience" that appeared in the July 1951 issue of the American Foreign Service Journal:

CAREER VERSUS CONSCIENCE

The Foreign Service officer today is searching his conscience and examining his job in a way previously unknown to his experience. He sees questioned the duties of a profession in which he had taken pride from the day of his entry into the service. He finds that a calling which has claimed his abiding loyalty and his unexpressed but deep sense of devotion to country, is being assailed and degraded by irresponsible demagogues. He discovers that what he may report objectively, sincerely, and confidentially can at some time be distorted and publicly held against him. He learns that his associations can be suspect and that, instead of performing his duty by acquiring the widest possible acquaintance in the country of his assignment—as he was ever taught by his superiors and by formal instruction of the Department—he is condemned for his initiative in attempting to meet individuals of unorthodox beliefs in order to understand and assess their motives and opinions.

The choice is before him. Shall he remain in the Service, resolved to report only what will harmonize with the temper of the times and what cannot possibly be publicly held against him 5 or 10 years from now? Shall he report honestly and fearlessly and "as he sees it," knowing the dangers of honesty and the risk to his career and his reputation? Or shall he resign from the Service to seek fields where his talents will be less circumscribed and his future less in peril?

For an editorial such as this to appear would have been incredible a few years ago. Yet such has been the effect of happenings of the last years that, at the very moment in history when the Foreign Service should be at the peak of its capabilities, when it should be best prepared to meet the terrible responsibilities of a period of decision between war and peace, it should itself become besmirched before the eyes of the American people, its confidence, courage, and very belief in its own principles and precepts, seriously if not irreparably damaged.

If truly the traditions and behavior of the Foreign Service officer are to be changed, then new instructions to that effect should be issued. If it is to be crime to meet a known Communist, a known Fascist, or a member of the Black Dragon Society, Foreign Service officers should be forewarned. Up to now they have thought it important to obtain first hand the opinions of a great variety of individuals, particularly those of differing ideologies. Many thought there was some sense in the axiom "know your enemy," and that political reports, to be valuable, should not be confined to mutual admiration conversations among friendly and agreeable allies.

Furthermore, if the reporting officer is to refrain from criticism of the policies of foreign governments, he should be so informed. Up to now, he has not considered how his words would look neatly arranged on the front page of the New York Times. He has thought that he might speak in confidence to the interested people in the Department and that he might expect them to read, consider, and then to disregard or accept his analysis as they saw fit. He was not writing for a wider public and his rhetoric was chosen not for reader appeal, but for conciseness and clarity.

The new hazards to political reporters in the Foreign Service are particularly grave for specialists. The officers who, for a combination of peculiar reasons hard for the nonspecialists to understand, have studied exotic languages and lived in atmospheres far removed from our own cultural inheritance, seem to have become particular targets of attack. The consequence is that these specialists apparently cannot be assigned to posts of their specialty and must be scattered far and wide to be safely removed from any contact with the leprosy attached to their former careers.

Thus a new pattern seems to have developed, as yet not formally communicated to the field. One apparently should not only write for the record, and pleasantly, but once slandered irresponsibly in public—and without recourse to self-defense—one becomes disqualified thereafter for service in the area of one's specialty. So we have the posts of Ruritania staffed with people who have never before been to Ruritania and know no syllable of Ruritanian. Meanwhile language officers, trained at great expense in Ruritanian and with experience and accomplishments rated high (if you count the opinions of their fellow officers, their efficiency ratings, their promotions, and the number of commendations they have received), are basking in the pleasant climes of places where Ruritanians are unheard of and unknown, and security from association with ticklish problems is assured.

Courage is needed, on the part of the Department and of the Government. If there are disloyal members among us, no one will resist their removal forthwith. But if the rest of us are loyal, let the Department have the courage to defend our loyalty and to reaffirm a creed of the Foreign Service—to serve to the best of ability, to observe keenly, to report what is seen and heard and felt, without inhibition, fear, or mental reservation—to know our enemies as well as to cultivate our friends, and to pursue as best we can the honorable profession we have chosen, in the constant and undeterred conviction that ours is the first line of defense of our country.

The people of the United States will understand these ideals and respect our determination if they see it clearly demonstrated before them. Without our determination and their understanding, the future of the Foreign Service is black indeed.

A Stable To Be Cleaned**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. ERNEST K. BRAMBLETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Monterey Peninsula Herald of August 1, 1951:

A STABLE TO BE CLEANED

(By E. K.)

Within the past week or two the following items have been included in the news:

Sam Mason, described by Senators as "a highly successful con man," testified that he had found that the easiest way to extort money was to tell his clients that he needed cash to bribe Government officials to obtain from them what his clients wanted. His victims included some church people who apparently regarded this procedure as necessary and normal.

A brigadier general, relieved of his command of the Detroit Tank Arsenal for accepting gifts and favors from contractors dealing with his Army installation, said: "I did nothing that anyone else wouldn't have done—only someone caught me at it."

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, a reliable newspaper, reported that William M. Boyle, Jr., Democratic National Committee chairman and close friend of President Truman, was paid \$8,000 by the American Lithofold Co. shortly after the firm had obtained a \$565,000 loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The company's application for the loan had previously been three times denied. Boyle says this was a "legal fee" for services not connected with the RFC loan, but the Post-Dispatch reports that the company listed the payment as a "commission."

Another close friend of President Truman, James P. Finnegan, resigned as internal-revenue collector for eastern Missouri as a Federal grand jury was investigating charges that he had used his office to promote personal business. Finnegan happens to be vice president of the American Lithofold.

And—as if to top these items—came word from Washington that Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer had granted a diploma of honor and a wage increase to a Government employee, Mrs. Helen Mathelson, for honesty in refusing a bribe, offered by a New York export firm to facilitate license appropriation handling.

These disclosures followed many others concerning 5-percenters, patronage peddlers, tie-ups between officials, and the underworld and assorted evidences of laxity and corruption under the Truman administration.

The worst feature of these cases is the indication of a very wide acceptance of the idea that corruption, favoritism, and dishonesty abound in our Federal Government—and of a resignation to it. Apparently many people generally considered as honest have come to the conclusion that the only effective way to do business with the Government is join in the corruption.

High administration officials themselves seem to share this acceptance. Otherwise, we don't see why they should confer special honors on a Government employee for not taking a bribe. In their eyes there would appear to be something quite exceptional about such common honesty.

We will say parenthetically that we do not share this feeling. We believe that most Federal employees are honest and do not expect special awards for ordinary integrity.

But it is plain that there is widespread corruption in the Truman administration, especially in near-high quarters. We have no accurate scale for measuring such corruption, but it is our considered opinion that there has been more of it under Harry Truman than under any previous President, that the standards of his administration in this respect are shoddier than those of the Grant or Harding administrations.

One reason for this, of course, is that the scope of the Federal Government has greatly expanded since the days of Grant and Harding, that it now exercises such controls over all of us that there is a vastly greater field for corruption.

But this increased power is all the more reason for honesty in government.

Lack of official integrity—and especially general resignation to the lack—has wrecked many a government, has undermined many a civilization. One of the most recent to fall of its own rottenness was the regime of Chiang Kai-shek.

With our democratic system on trial before the world and with its survival threatened by our enemies, we cannot afford the luxury of a Federal Aegean stable.

There must be a clean-up and it must come swiftly. In coming columns we shall discuss what people can do at a local level to try to bring it about.

The American Story**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I insert in today's RECORD an editorial from the Sundance Times, published at Sundance, Wyo.

I believe this editorial, which tells the story of another Wyoming community, may keynote much of this Nation's trouble today. Entirely too many people are afflicted with the mistaken belief that "my vote doesn't count." Too many people stay away from the polls and then express dissatisfaction with the public officials other voters have elected.

Voting is more than a privilege, Mr. Speaker. It is a duty delegated to every qualified citizen, and this duty should be performed by every qualified person at every election, be it a local school, municipal, State, or national election in character.

It seems to me that the Sundance editorial strikes the real sore spot of our Nation with the suggestion that the last chapter to the American story could be written "if someday enough people do not vote."

I quote the editorial:

HULETT—THE AMERICAN

Another chapter in the American story has been written in Hulett. It was completed Friday in the municipal election of that new town.

The story, which has told of the life of this Nation since the first chapter was writ-

ten in 1776, shows the strength and the weakness, the desires and the complacency of the American people.

The Hulett chapter is no different from the many other chapters of the story, except in geography. It tells of the basic tendency of the American people to fight hard for something and then lapse into the dreamlike security of complacency.

The people of Hulett voted hard for the incorporation of their community and won that incorporation and the status that goes with it by an overwhelming vote.

They fought hard and won and fell back to rest. Hulett voted 97 to 26 for incorporation with a total vote of 123.

Friday, in the election to name the town's first mayor and city councilmen, only 70 people considered it important to go to the polls. There were 139 persons eligible to vote.

The percentage of complacency is clear. And it has been the same in every chapter of the American story—a story of wanting, fighting for the right to vote, and then not exercising that right.

The American story is endless with a new chapter written with every election.

But it could end if someday enough people do not vote.

Industry's Efforts To Tell Its Side of Any Controversy Drowned Out by Wave of Government Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the discovery that man's mind can be molded by government is one of the tragedies of this age. Most people believe anything the Government says, forgetting that government is directed by human beings with the same selfish impulses as the common citizen, and that many statements issued by Government sources are propaganda, pushing a point of view or creating more jobs.

Statements put out by industry are almost invariably jumped on by left-wingers as half-truths, propaganda, and the utterances of greedy interests. It is difficult for these writers to see that the profit-making of the free enterprise system can also be in the public interest. These left-wing writers, who promote big government along leftist lines, believe that there is a contradiction in profit making and the public interest. If industrial statements are not discredited they are at least distorted, picked apart, or thrown in the wastebasket.

A clash of viewpoints between Government and industry always occurs when industry attempts to take its case to the public through the press and the radio. At that moment Government springs into action and, of course, always gets the lion's share of the space. This is possible because too many Members of Congress, with too little respect for the burdens of the taxpayers and the sacrifice made by the bond buyers, appropriate such fantastic sums of money to Federal agencies that they are financed

sufficiently to overwhelm the reading and listening public with Government propaganda.

During the past two decades it is conservative to observe that more money has been spent by Government, for Government propaganda and for the purpose of promoting Government views, than during all of the previous history of the United States.

The net result of this Government propaganda causes millions of people to believe that Government has all of the facts at hand and that Government is telling the truth while industry is merely trying to rook the public and grab off more profits. Many people actually believe this. Government propagandists are smart enough to know that if a slanted or even untruthful statement is repeated often enough the public will eventually accept it as the truth.

The recent statement by Mr. John M. Otter, president of the National Foundation for Consumer Credit, illustrates private industry's difficulty in getting the facts before the public when those facts are contrary to the Government's position. In this case the Government was forced to admit, painfully and tardily, that the National Foundation for Consumer Credit had been telling the truth all along.

Seldom does industry have the opportunity to have its statements confirmed by the Government itself, particularly when there is such a difference of opinion between Government and industry as there is over the question of regulating installment credit sales. In this case there is documentary proof of the confirmation, and I doubt that the proof would have ever come to light had the President's economic report not been made public.

The National Foundation for Consumer Credit is a nonprofit organization of manufacturers, retailers, and distributors all over the country who have banded together to tell the story of installment credit. The economic contribution of installment credit is a dramatic chapter in our history, and the story should be told to the American people. There are left-wing groups in this country who would like to see installment credit outlawed altogether. These same people forget that mass production depends upon mass sales and that mass sales, in turn, depend upon installment credit. We could never have had mass production in this country without installment credit, and the left-wingers can shout all they want, but they cannot disprove this statement.

The full statement of Mr. Otter, who is also vice president and general sales manager of the Philco Corp., Philadelphia, reads as follows:

The report confirms in detail exactly what this organization has been telling the public for months.

On page 194 the report states: "Durable-goods inventories of retailers rose about 41 percent" in the last year. If the report included only items covered by regulation W, the figure would be closer to 55 percent.

In other words, furniture, rugs, carpet, linoleum, refrigerators, washing machines, radios, television, and household appliances are jam-packed on the shelves of retailers

who have been forced to buy these articles but can't because of the present Federal law which says they must make heavy down payments and pay off the balance more quickly than is possible for the working family.

If the retailer could sell this stuff he would not be forced to run to the bank for additional credit, which is the clearest type of inflation.

A responsible branch of the Government, with millions of dollars at its disposal for economic research, now supports in detail what the economists of the National Foundation for Consumer Credit have been saying for months.

The President's economic report is the best argument I have yet heard for the outright scrapping of regulation W.

Regulation W has received great attention by reason of what the President and others have had to say about inflation. This is one of the indirect controls, but it is one of the minor elements in this field of credit. The real place to restrict credit for the purpose of preventing inflation is first in the field of the Federal Reserve banks and, second, in the commercial credit field. The President can use regulation W to the limit and leave free to operate the Federal Reserve banks and the commercial banks, and inflation will be little influenced. The President can use regulation W and the commercial banks and the credit issued by the Federal Reserve banks can still create more inflation than the direct controls of price control or the regulation W program or the restriction of credit by the commercial banks can adequately deal with. If the President really wants to prevent inflation he can effectuate this by controlling the credit extended by the commercial banks, the insurance companies, and the Federal Reserve banks.

Price- and Wage-Control Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial published in the Sheridan (Wyo.) Press, which points out that the Congress was not lax in recognizing the dangers of inflation but rather extended to the administration the power to cope with them at a time when controls—as the lesser of evils—might have done some good.

I do not favor controls, believing them to be a rather superficial means of combatting inflation without striking at the real cause. But I do think that President Truman has completely reversed his course in recent months, and in a too-little-too-late move hopped on the controls bandwagon.

The editorial follows:

CONGRESS MOVED FIRST

Compromise price and wage control legislation will go to the White House after both

Houses have approved a conference committee report.

The President almost certainly is going to show his displeasure with the measure which does not provide for all of the roll-backs which price control authorities instituted. It does not go as far as an absolute sort of way as those now in charge of price control had urged. Prices are permitted certain adjustments in line with cost increases and agricultural prices are protected from less than parity ceilings.

Because of this disparity with Presidential and price official views, President Truman will seek to blame Congress for failure to halt a trend toward more inflation. The chief purpose of this attempt, of course, will be to pass the buck for the responsibility of any rising costs which may reach the consumer.

But when the President takes steps to shift the blame for any new inflation, it will be recalled by many that a year ago it was Congress which sought to freeze prices and wages before their upward spiral was begun in the early weeks of the Korean war. At that time Congress worked out legislation authorizing the President to freeze prices and wages, but restricted any price freeze which was not also accompanied by a wage freeze.

Right here, Mr. Speaker, let me point out that while the administration forces in Congress were howling for a strong controls program they let slip through their fingers the only real opportunity to exercise complete controls.

On a tentative nonrecord vote, the House approved the Davis amendment, which would have rolled back everything, prices and wages alike, to the July 7 level for a temporary period of 120 days. This would have afforded an opportunity to survey the situation and regroup our forces against inflation, while, at the same time, all prices and wages would have been held to the July 7 level.

But when it came to a final roll-call vote, what happened? Despite the nonrecord vote of 180 to 151 approving the Davis amendment, when it came time to be counted by name, the same administration forces which had been clamoring for controls voted this amendment down, 243 to 172.

I want to note it here, Mr. Speaker, that I voted for the Davis amendment. I repeat that I do not believe in controls; but if we must have them, I believe such a program should be fair to everyone—we should not put ourselves in the position of restricting prices but letting wages spiral unchecked, nor should we clamp down on wages and permit prices to continue to skyrocket. Under the Davis amendment, everything would have been treated equally—the roll-back to July 7 would have been definite and specific; there would have been no room for political maneuvering.

The editorial continues:

The President hesitated to exercise the authority which Congress had placed in his lap, and as a result soaring prices followed. In this instance Congress was taking the lead in an anti-inflation program. The President hesitated to make it effective.

That would seem to make the President and Congress about even when blame is placed for failure to halt soaring prices. If anything, congressional action taken a year ago stood a better chance to hold the line against inflation than anything done now.

The West Point Affair**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, like every other American citizen, in or out of Congress, I have been terribly shocked at the news which has come from West Point. It has always been taken for granted by people the world over that honor was held sacred by the undergraduates and graduates of West Point; therefore, a violation of the code of honor, established at the Military Academy since its foundation, indicates a deterioration of character and of the appreciation of the truth. Whether the undergraduates at West Point are the victims of laxity on the part of those who manage the institution or whether it is the result of their own moral turpitude, the fact remains that the high standard of morality and honesty and truthfulness, cherished by West Pointers all over the world, has been desecrated, and those guilty of such desecration should be punished.

In all the reports I have read in the newspapers, I have yet to note a statement from any of those who have admitted their guilt expressing regret for what has happened. There is no repentance shown for the damage done to others and to the good name of West Point and little thought seems to have been given to what the founders of our Republic termed "their sacred honor." Can it be that due to the scandals and lax morals apparent in our public life today honor is no longer considered sacred?

In December 1950 I wrote Maj. Gen. Bryant E. Moore, then Superintendent of the Military Academy, as follows:

It has come to my attention that First Lt. John F. Green, who signs himself as assistant football coach on Army Athletic Association letterhead, is advising young men in my district how to secure appointment to the Military Academy.

From what I have heard, Lieutenant Green is selecting young men on the basis of their athletic ability and I am writing to inquire just what Lieutenant Green's duties are at West Point.

My appointments are made solely on the basis of the civil service competitive qualifying examination, and I know that a great many other Members of Congress adopt the same procedure. I do not believe it is in the interest of amateur athletics or in the interest of the Academy to campaign in an effort to secure exceptional athletes as members of the Cadet Corps.

In due time I received his reply dated December 28, 1950:

Your letter of December 21, with reference to Lt. John F. Green's giving advice about West Point to men in your district, has been received.

Lt. John Green is temporarily on duty at West Point in the athletic office as assistant football coach. He is a very able young officer. If he has given information to athletically inclined young men in your district, it is possibly because they asked for

it, though not necessarily. A great many young men, hundreds of them with what they consider to be athletic backgrounds, apply to us for this kind of information, the same as they do to Annapolis, Yale, Princeton, and other institutions. Frequently such letters are written by the boys' coaches or members of their families.

Young athletes are inclined to be leaders, and a cadetship at West Point is of interest to them. Many of our cadet athletes subsequently become fine leaders in the service. I could give you many examples.

From the third paragraph of your letter it would appear that you object to our interesting young athletes in cadetships at West Point. I would agree with your views if participating on varsity athletic teams were not incidental to their primary purpose of coming to West Point. The only thing we can suggest to them, if they can succeed in getting in here, is the implied obligation of a lifetime of service to the country. There are no other inducements of any kind, no extra privileges, no "jobs," no let-up of the hard requirements put on a cadet. If they are willing to go to all the trouble of securing cadetships, it would appear that they really want to come to West Point.

In reply to his letter, I wrote on January 2, 1951, as follows:

Thank you for your letter of December 28, and I am glad to have your explanation of the activities of Lt. John Green, who, I have no doubt, is a very able young officer.

I have no quarrel with your statement that "young athletes are inclined to be leaders," but as far as I can see, it has nothing to do with the point I raised. Whether you know it or not, West Point has been carrying on a campaign of proselytizing for good athletes, and I am not in favor of that kind of policy, especially when some of your outstanding athletes leave the service shortly after graduation to continue their career as professionals. I can assure you the country does not approve of that.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no question, in my mind, that the intense desire to produce winning football teams has warped the moral thinking of those who have been administering the affairs at the Military Academy.

In completing my remarks, I am glad to include an editorial which appeared in the Asbury Park Press of Sunday, August 5, entitled "West Point Scandal." This editorial in a concise, clear, and straightforward American fashion has looked this question of sacred honor straight in the eye and has clearly set forth the need for a return to the standards of the founders of our country, who did not compromise with honor but treated it as something to be revered and held sacred. The editorial follows:

WEST POINT SCANDAL

There has been considerable comment in these columns emphasizing the apparent decline in the moral standards of this country and suggesting that too many men in high places were leading the parade toward lower concepts of personal and public conduct.

Now comes the report that 90 cadets have been discharged from West Point for having violated the established honor system and cheated in tests and other classroom work. A competent board investigated the situation and its findings appear conclusive.

There is something shocking in the West Point case. It was disgusting enough that basketball players from other colleges admitted taking bribes to hold down the score of games for the benefit of gamblers. The

Military Academy, however, was considered in a position by itself. Its codes of conduct have been in effect for more than a century. And so rich was its tradition of honor that the corps of cadets was considered above approach. Under such circumstances the Nation is not only stunned but doubly ashamed that scandal should have run wild in its Military Academy.

It has already been observed that the West Point case points further to an alarming deterioration in the Nation's moral fiber. There is no question of the need for a reformation that will revive and popularize the traditional rules of honor and integrity. And once again we contend that there is no better way to begin this reform than to start at the top and demand a higher level of conduct in the top layers of Government.

Most of the young people who are today deviating from the path of decency and honor come from families who have impressed upon them a high moral code. But all citizens, and especially young people, look beyond their own families and their friends and take their moral leadership from the prominent personalities and the celebrated names who hold positions of trust and glory in Government. And when those in this position betray their trust and disregard the rules of honor they provide a cogent lesson in dishonesty and loose conduct for millions of young people.

We urge upon the American people a crusade in the name of the decency and high moral standards that made this country great, strong and respected throughout the world. And we recommend that this crusade begin by restoring decency to the top level of Government. For it is there that the standard is set. Today that standard is disgustingly low. And such scandals as that which has rocked West Point and stunned the Nation are but a symptom of national leadership that has failed itself to adhere to the traditional codes of decency and thereby has depressed the moral level of the entire Nation.

Waterway Issue**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks in the Appendix, I include an article by Alfred D. Stedman, a member of the editorial staff of the St. Paul Pioneer Press, St. Paul, Minn.

The article is as follows:

WATERWAY ISSUE

In the harnessing of waters, the Midwest is the Nation's forgotten child. Why? Why is the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway endlessly blockaded? Why are the Missouri's uses buried repeatedly under the muck and wreck of floods? How does this happen when our Nation with its TVA tames the Tennessee, builds vast water systems for other regions, and votes billions to help foreign countries harness their rivers for prosperity and defense?

As to this region's waterways, our Government seems to have abdicated its powers. Who have been the real rulers on the seaway issue? Not the two political parties—both are its pledged supporters. Not all the United States Presidents in a quarter century—these have been unanimously for it.

Not the Nation's responsible defense authorities—these have affirmed the urgent defense needs of seaway navigation and electric power. Not the House of Congress—its Members have just been denied even the democratic right of a vote on the issue. So the seaway is now reduced to a slim chance as a Senate foreign-aid bill rider.

No; on this issue special interests have ruled. They have blocked waterway projects competing with them. All these special interests in the past have been heavily endowed, not to rule the Nation but to serve it as, indeed, in their economic fields, they have done well. They are the railroads, given huge grants of public land and money; eastern and Gulf ports, improved with vast Treasury funds; and power companies, given river rights and franchises.

For their special benefit, the public use of public waters is now being barred. The Great Lakes system can't fully serve the national safety, just when Russia is augmenting her military power with a shipway linking Black Sea, Baltic, and ocean. Harboring the Missouri is being botched by the Pick-Sloan plan that the Hoover Commission condemned as being no plan. And now Congress is even refusing this region water power from the Missouri's publicly built dams, unless it is filtered through power company hands and lines.

Of course the railroads, ports, and power companies have every right to uphold their economic interests in Congress or anywhere. But does this mean that the Government should abdicate its democratic powers to them?

Here may be a coming issue. It may appeal to Midwest industry and agriculture that are paying severely for floods and lack of deep outlets to the sea. It may strike home with those who believe that public rule should not abdicate to private rule of public resources. Or else the special interests can go right ahead denying full use of those water resources to the Midwest.

United Fund Campaign for Charities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THURMOND CHATHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WINSTON-SALEM, N C, August 1, 1951.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CHATHAM: I assume you have not been too ill to read the newspapers and you have perhaps noted the suggested investigation by one of your fellow Congressmen of the American Red Cross due to its rather bigoted and arbitrary stand as regards fund raising. We have just run squarely into it here, having established a United Fund which is to be all inclusive, resulting in one annual campaign for all charities, and although we do not have the final answer, it is understood that the local chapter of the Red Cross will have to decline our invitation to cooperate due to the stand and hard and fast rules of the national organization.

Of course the Red Cross stands to lose more than we do, but certainly they are butting their heads against a stone wall because the United Fund movement is going all over the country, and most industries where this plan is adopted in their cities refuse allow Red Cross to come into their plants for any additional campaigns.

You may gather that I am heartily in favor of the investigation suggested, and I think it might go even further because I understand that the National Red Cross has never published nor made known any figure revealing its sinking fund or surplus. It is reported to be in the millions, and in spite of such emergency or sinking fund or surplus, there is never a disaster that the Red Cross does not go out and try to raise more millions as they are now doing for flood relief in Kansas.

I understand that the National Red Cross threatens the local chapter here with all sorts of dire results if they join in our United Fund campaign, including the loss of their charter locally. In Bristol, Tenn., where the local chapter joined in such a United Fund campaign the money collected for Red Cross was ordered by national headquarters returned and the local chapter ordered to conduct its own individual campaign, otherwise, it would lose its charter and perhaps suffer the elimination of all local services.

I trust that this does not leave you completely cold in spite of your condition, and that you are sufficiently recovered to add your voice in protest against any such high-handed arbitrary procedure. I think it is time that this American-supported institution act American, and I think if the investigation included Basil O'Connor, a worse scandal might result than some of the ice box and fur coat scandals in Washington.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH P. HANES.

The Growth of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in 1939 the total world population was 2,170,000,000. At that time 7.9 percent of the world population was under Communist control. In 1950 the world population was 2,264,563,771. At that time 34.4 percent of the world population was under Communist control.

In 1939 the so-called iron-curtain countries were limited to the U. S. S. R., with a population of 170,467,186. In 1950, however, iron-curtain countries expanded at a terrific rate and as follows:

Country:	Population
Albania.....	1,121,000
Austria (Soviet zone).....	2,277,000
Bulgaria.....	7,021,000
China (excluding Tibet and Formosa).....	454,867,000
Tibet.....	3,000,000
Czechoslovakia.....	18,490,000
Germany (Soviet zone).....	18,490,000
Hungary.....	8,833,000
North Korea.....	9,000,000
Outer Mongolia.....	900,000
Poland.....	24,775,000
Rumania.....	15,873,999
Yugoslavia.....	15,751,953
U S S R.....	211,384,985

The total population in the iron-curtain countries shown in the above table included Yugoslavia and the U. S. S. R. for a grand total of 770,458,938.

World communism is still on the march, and in 1950 over one-fifth of the land area of the world was under Communist control. In addition over one-

third of the world population was also under Communist control.

In a 33-year span of communistic activity we find that the growth of world communism at the present-day strength is 312.5 times greater than when the movement got under way. In April of 1917 there were 80,000 party members. In 1950, there are 25,000,000 world Communist Party members.

The question arises how effective are our American foreign policies in preventing the growth of world communism. It would seem by the above figure that they are having but little effect. In view of this fact our spending abroad should be drastically reduced.

Small Business Representation in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the segment of our economy often referred to as small business constitutes a very important element in our enterprise system.

Small businesses often develop into large business and, of course, large industry feeds on the support extended to it by small business.

It is very important that small business always has in Washington a representative of character and integrity and who knows official Washington so as to better understand the flow sheet of legislation as it affects all industry.

Don O'Brien in his July 7 column had some kind words to say about George J. Burger, who is well known on Capitol Hill and who is one of those connected with small business. Mr. O'Brien's column is herewith submitted for the RECORD:

VERMONT VIGNETTES

(By Don O'Brien)

INTERESTING PEOPLE FROM A WRITER'S LOG

Somehow, history has a way of repeating itself for this reporter—and it's a pleasant experience.

Here's one echo from the days when I was trying to a big city feller.

I interviewed Thomas J. Watson, chairman of the board of IBM Corp., when he was here for the golden wedding reception of Ambassador and Mrs. Austin.

The last time I interviewed Mr. Watson was in 1940, when I was with the World's Fair press department. IBM had a big exhibit there and I remember Mr. Watson, then president, as a man with a great desire to emphasize the cultural things—as he did at the fair.

I also wrote a couple of articles for Think, the magazine he established for the IBM personnel—exclusively a cultural and informative periodical.

One of the first things that was impressed upon me when I got the writing commission was that the company was not to be mentioned.

That rule still holds, Mr. Watson assured me. Think is not a "house organ," it has no business "angle"—just an interesting and

educational publication. Because folks wanted it, its circulation spread beyond IBM. Mr. Watson told me when he was here it now sends out some 75,000 copies all over the world—over and above the organization people for whom he started it.

I also remember that Mr. Hackett, the editor then and now, schooled me in the style requirements—which were strict.

A fighter

Another old friend cropped up recently—in the news, this time, and I'd sure like to have a visit with him in person.

His name is George J. Burger. He and his family were neighbors of ours for 25 years in New Rochelle.

When I say George Burger is a fighter, I don't mean with gloves in the ring. He's a two-fisted scrapper for other folks—and for an idea and an ideal—and he doesn't bother with gloves.

George Burger is executive vice president in Washington for the Association of Small Businesses. I may not have the name technically correct, but it's a Nation-wide organization devoted to the interests of the small, independent businessman.

When I first knew George he had a large tire and supply business. He began to fight the battles of the independent tire dealers whom he served.

Next I knew, he was executive secretary of the Independent Tire Dealers' Association, scrapping with both fists, publishing a bulletin in their interests—and making frequent trips to Washington. Now he's the champion of all small-business men.

George Burger knows Senators and Congressmen and a lot of other higher-ups in Government and business. Quite a few have run up against his determination. Some have seen the justice of his ideas and gone to bat for him.

But for or against him, those who get to meet him in one way or another come away with a wholesome respect for him. You can't help it.

George Burger is that kind of man. You'd like him, neighbors, any Vermonter would.

In Justice to the People of American Samoa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of August 3, 1951:

IN JUSTICE TO THE PEOPLE OF AMERICAN SAMOA

In justice to the people of Samoa—who are virtually wards of the United States Government—Congress should immediately investigate the charges by Samoan chiefs which have been placed before that body.

On request of a large group of American Samoans, including many chiefs and other traditionally important and responsible persons, Delegate FARRINGTON has placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the demand for an investigation.

This is a critical time not only for American Samoans but for the entire policy of United States civil administration in Pacific Islands of the trust territory.

Mismanagement in any one area will inevitably reflect upon the entire program of transferring Guam, American Samoa, and

the trust territory from Navy to civilian control and administration.

American Samoa has been under American protection and under naval administration for more than half a century.

Appreciative as they were of the many benefits, including peace, public education, and health measures, brought through the naval administration, the Samoans have for years sought a larger voice in their government. Not getting this under Navy rule, they began years ago to agitate for civil rule.

After World War II this came to fruition. Civil rule was authorized and the date of transfer set up by Executive order of the President of the United States.

The decision to transfer American Samoa from naval to civilian administration was followed by more than 2 years of preparation.

The responsibility for the new civil administration fell on the Pacific Division of the Office of Territories, Department of the Interior.

As the date, June 30, 1951, for transfer from the Navy to the Department of Interior approached the natives of American Samoa quite naturally felt uneasy about the future.

They had been long under the carefully patterned procedure of the Navy. The Navy had been at once their "guide, philosopher, and friend." They had looked for half a century to the Navy not only as their final authority in all kinds of local and island problems, but as the chief source of their livelihood.

With all this uneasiness these trusting Samoans had high hopes that the new life under civilian rule would bring them the happiness and satisfactions which an increasing measure of self-government should bring them.

For the people of American Samoa are not primitive barbarians. They are not homeless savages. They are not untutored cave-men.

On the contrary, they are highly intelligent, proud of their ancient traditions of prowess, sensitive alike to slights or to considerate treatment by the "palagis" (foreigners).

The United States Congress cannot allow this request for an investigation to go unheeded.

It is at once an indignant demand for justice from a Polynesian group taken under America's wing, and a cry for help from a bewildered, disappointed people who rely utterly on the power and good will of America.

An impartial committee of Congress should be sent to American Samoa without delay. This committee should be made up of men who understand the sensitiveness of the Polynesian people and the background of ancient island history which is theirs.

Unless this is done there will be two results.

1 Increasing unrest and protest from American Samoa.

2 A question as to the competence of the civilian administration of all the areas lately taken over from the Navy.

Agricultural Production in North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN H. KERR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD, I include a press release of the Bureau of the Census with reference to the agricultural production in North Carolina.

I am very proud of the record made by the Second Congressional District of North Carolina in this report of dollar production per acre of the 25 leading agricultural counties in the State of North Carolina. There are 8 counties in the Second Congressional District and 6 of those counties are listed among the 25 mentioned, Wilson, Greene, Edgecombe, Lenoir, Halifax, and Bertie. Wilson County ranks No. 1 and Greene County ranks No. 2. The farmers of North Carolina are employing the best methods in farming, and these methods are paying fine dividends.

NORTH CAROLINA'S RANKING COUNTIES ON DOLLAR PRODUCTION PER ACRE

WASHINGTON, D. C.—The 25 counties of North Carolina whose farmers were most efficient in achieving high dollar production per acre, had revenues ranging from \$84.20 to \$32.93 per acre from their 1949 operations, according to the 1950 census.

No. 1 county in value of production per acre was Wilson, which had 4,303 farms averaging 48 acres in size, and producing \$17,412,800 worth of products. It produced 28,659,386 pounds of tobacco from 22,001 acres. It harvested 17,557 pounds of lespedeza seed, 102,962 bushels of sweetpotatoes, and 47,772 bushels of Irish potatoes. It also had more than 150,000 pounds of peanuts.

Second county was Greene with production of \$76.53 per acre. It sold more than \$11,000,000 worth of products, including 19,981,619 pounds of tobacco from 15,918 acres, and 75,692 pounds of peanuts. It also had large production of sweet potatoes.

Third county in production per acre—with \$71.37—was Pitt County, largest producer of tobacco in the State. It raised 38,057,376 pounds of tobacco in 32,096 acres, 181,314 bushels of sweetpotatoes; 126,734 bushels of Irish potatoes; 31,564 pounds of lespedeza seed; and over 7,000,000 pounds of peanuts. Total production of this county exceeded \$22,000,000.

Nash County was next with \$59.65, with nearly 30,000,000 pounds of tobacco and 3,500,000 pounds of peanuts.

Fifth county was Edgecombe with \$55.20 per acre and 19,000,000 pounds of tobacco, 256,000 pounds of lespedeza seed and 19,000,000 pounds of peanuts.

Sixth was New Hanover County with \$53.67 per acre and with only 401 farms averaging 70.7 acres. It had a substantial production of vegetables, whole milk and small production of peanuts and tobacco.

Lenoir County was seventh with \$51.85 on 3,781 farms averaging 60.9 acres in size. It had 21,566,867 pounds of tobacco from 18,200 acres, large production of potatoes, lespedeza seed, and small production of peanuts.

Johnston County was eighth with 8,097 farms averaging 51.6 acres and earning \$51.78 per acre. Its total sales exceeded \$21,000,000, including 34,188,564 pounds of tobacco.

Wayne County was tenth with 4,915 farms averaging 59.2 acres and earning \$50.40 per acre. It has 22,500,000 pounds of tobacco from 18,815 acres.

The other counties, with revenue per acre, follow in order: Martin, \$49.59; Robeson, \$48.55; Harnett, \$46.28; Columbus, \$45.62; Wake, \$41.53; Hartford, \$41.30; Vance, \$40.04; Pasquotank, \$39.02; Franklin, \$37.09; Beaufort, \$36.59; Craven, \$34.40; Chowan, \$33.91; Duplin, \$33.88; Halifax, \$33.66; Cleveland, \$33.57, and Bertie, \$32.93.

Bertie grew nearly 30,000,000 pounds of peanuts. Halifax had approximately 36,500,000 pounds of peanuts and Chowan had almost 10,000,000 pounds.

Why Should the Federal Government Break Faith With Its Employees?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the Record an article appearing in the Government Standard, official newspaper of the American Federation of Government Employees, which outlines the obligation of the Federal Government to grant adequate sick and annual leave to its employees.

This article is from the pen of James A. Campbell, national president of AFGE, a veteran of 36 years in the Federal service.

His organization contends that efforts now under way to cut Federal leave will have disastrous consequences through the loss of key personnel, whose main inducement to stay in government has been the more generous leave provided.

Mr. Campbell's article is worthy of consideration by every Member of the House and Senate.

The article follows:

For these many years an important consideration in Federal job recruiting has been that Uncle Sam was able to offer more liberal leave, although it was not always possible to offer as much pay as private employers.

The more generous vacation time was an inducement to many employees to enter the Federal service.

That this has been beneficial to the Nation as a whole goes without saying, because our Government has attained a high degree of efficiency, exemplified in the pre-eminent place of the United States among world nations.

This inducement in recruiting has no doubt been an important factor in bringing into the service—and keeping them there—some of our most able public servants. And able public workers are legion, despite anything you may read or hear to the contrary.

The offer of longer leave rights is tantamount to an implied contract on Federal working conditions. Any departure from the present 28 days annual and 15 days sick leave is a violation of this agreement by our Federal Government to provide this amount of leave as a basic and fundamental feature of their employment.

All employees on this leave schedule were hired on the expectation that they would have it as long as they served. Now so-called economy advocates arbitrarily decide that they will take away from employees some of their leave rights.

This is a breach of faith. Quite apart from the fact that real economy has not been demonstrated, such a move will have a disastrous effect on Federal recruitment and will be a severe blow to United States employee morale generally. It represents a violation of a promise or undertaking to grant that amount of leave for the duration of Federal employment.

This great Nation was built on a foundation of trust and confidence; trust in our friends, our coworkers, and fellow citizens.

Without respect for an oath or an agreement, no individual can long enjoy the confidence of his fellows.

The same is true of nations in their obligations to their citizens and to one another.

We believe that it is a breach of faith to reduce employee leave when it was one of the prime inducements in bringing people into Government service.

Our great Nation is not a country that welves on its obligations. Why, then, should this implied contract to grant full leave to its employees be thrown overboard at this time?

It is a step backward in labor-management relations. With technological advances, the trend everywhere is toward more leisure or living time for all workers.

As a Nation we have led the world in improving living and working standards for all of our people. Why go backward?

Our Nation has too proud a reputation for living up to its word to be placed in the position of taking away from one large and important segment of our citizens, that, which by long-standing agreement, is morally and lawfully theirs.

We admire Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, for his great abilities. We differ with him completely on his effort to cut down Federal employee leave.

Some headway has been made through our friends in Congress to retain the present leave schedule. We believe postal leave should be brought up to the same level as classified leave.

We will continue to strive, in the face of heavy odds, to prevent a leave cut.

But most important, we ask the Congress to forestall a reduction in leave because it will be nothing more than a violation of a promise of long standing of the people who serve in the Government of the United States.

JAMES A. CAMPBELL,
National President, AFGE.

Voice of Council of Free Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include two statements, one by the Council of Free Czechoslovakia and the other by the Conference of the Representatives of Central and Eastern Europe, which condemn the action of Red-dominated Czechoslovakia in the trial and imprisonment of William Oatis. I believe that the more is made known how we in this Nation feel—and especially those whose origins are in that part of Europe—the more the Communists will be served notice that they are bucking against a tide of fierce indignation from those who hold dearly right and justice.

STATEMENT OF THE COUNCIL OF FREE CZECHOSLOVAKIA

The mock trial of William Oatis by the Communist regime in Prague has been rightly repudiated as a travesty of justice defying all dictates of humaneness and violating the freedom of press and expression. It remains for a Czechoslovak voice to brand it as a provocation of the United States, the traditional friend and wartime ally of the Czechoslovak people. This unpunished intention of the alien satellite regime to humiliate the leading democratic power is designed to awe and discourage the Czechs and Slovaks into abandoning the hopes for liberation they pin on the people and Government of the United States. Thus, the sentence imposed on an

innocent American citizen and newspaperman amidst vain protests of the free world is as much an assault on the morale of the Czechoslovak people as it is a calculated insult of its friends and allies in the struggle for freedom and democracy. On both heads the Council of Free Czechoslovakia condemns it and calls for justice and reparation.

Until these are done, Mr. Oatis will share the heroic fate of so many Czechoslovak democrats. His personal tragedy high lights the price in lives and freedom paid by innumerable, known and anonymous, Czechs and Slovaks put to death or imprisoned on charges all too similar to those brought against Mr. Oatis: Espionage activity against the Communist regime in favor of the West. Now, in a very real sense, William Oatis has become an ambassador of the American people to the imprisoned people of Czechoslovakia. His credentials are shared suffering and common hope for an early deliverance. There can be no moral truce in the struggle against forces bent on crushing innocent men and freedom-loving peoples as long as men like Oatis and his fellow sufferers all over the world are being deprived of life and liberty by the agents of a universal evil.

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 11, 1951.

COMMUNIQUE ON THE TRIAL OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS CORRESPONDENT WILLIAM N. OATIS

The conference of the representatives of Central and Eastern European countries attended by democratic representatives of Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, and Yugoslavia, dealt at its July meeting held on July 24, 1951, in Washington, D. C., among other things with the case of William N. Oatis. The conference based its discussion on the report submitted to that end by the Council of Free Czechoslovakia.

The Central and Eastern European Conference condemned unanimously the arrest and sentencing of the American journalist. It recalled that in countries under Communist rule even courts are but executory organs of the political will of the Communist dictatorship and that Communist laws are deliberately contrived so as to render possible the representation of each and every act of political arbitrariness and violence as the implementation of right and justice. The conference expressed the conviction that the arrest, sentencing, and continued imprisonment of William N. Oatis in Czechoslovakia despite numerous diplomatic representations, together with similar cases in other countries behind the iron curtain, are motivated by the desire of the present rulers to undermine the authority and the prestige of Western Powers in those countries. The Communists propose to demonstrate on incidents of this kind before the oppressed peoples the alleged weakness of the Western Powers. They do so in the awareness that the resistance in the iron curtain countries is primarily nourished by the hope and trust the imprisoned peoples pin on the Western Powers and particularly the United States. Hence, the Communists seek with all available means to impair this hope and this trust in order to undermine the spirit of resistance and thus to facilitate and finally to accomplish the process of consolidation whose completion is so ruthlessly sought by the Soviet Union.

The conference voiced unqualified sympathy with all endeavors and measures which, without additional prejudice to the prestige of the United States, may result in an early release of William Oatis.

In conclusion, the Central and Eastern European Conference expressed its confidence that a timely exposure of the ultimate background and far-reaching objectives of incidents like the Oatis trial will contribute to the proper evaluation of the major political issues involved.

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 25, 1951.

Congressional Investigations**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. M. G. BURNSIDE**

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a week-end visit in my district. The citizens felt that Congress was placing more emphasis upon investigation than upon passing the proper legislation and then investigating if there are any shortcomings of the departments in carrying out this legislation. Otherwise, the Congress enables the executive branch to carry out which is the true function of Congress. If the executive branch does not properly function Congress steps in.

One of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, apropos of exposures at West Point, has suggested a congressional investigation. Another has said that if any member of the faculty is guilty he should be prosecuted. I in no way feel that any student should be protected in a violation of the rules of the Academy. However, since it is the honor system itself that made the exposures and their report is accepted by authorities and justified disciplinary action is being taken, it remains the function of the Department of the Army to carry out the house cleaning and it is not a proper matter for Congress.

I realized that my colleague said if a faculty member is involved. This, in my opinion, is an oblique method of at least undermining confidence in the faculty. It is very easy to throw out an insinuation accepted by a great number of people not based on facts. I could very easily say if a minister, teacher, or a member of his family were guilty of subversive actions, he should be prosecuted.

I cannot help remembering that during debate on the war manpower bill a great number of the minority were very concerned about placing the welfare of our young people in the hands of the military. Strong attacks were made upon the officers of our armed services in spite of the fact that they had done a magnificent job in winning World War II and many had won the awards set up by Congress for meritorious and brave actions. Yet these same people did not hesitate to attack the President when he removed a general for overstepping his authority on matters that would affect not only armed services but the entire Nation.

In my opinion the action taken by the Department of the Army and the authorities at West Point, without any investigation from Congress, demonstrates again the high type of personnel in our armed services. While this is a matter of great importance, the Army has demonstrated its willingness and ability to handle the matter, and it seems to me there are matters concerning legislation demanding the attention of Congress which supersedes the job being well done by the proper agency.

I might state that no appointee of mine is involved in this important matter at West Point.

Welfare of Alaska Natives**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. E. L. BARTLETT**

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial from the Anchorage (Alaska) Daily Times of July 30, which I believe will be of great interest to the friends of the Alaska Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts. The welfare of these good American citizens is of utmost importance. Their progress is Alaska's progress.

A NEW DAY FOR NATIVES

Without fanfare in the form of an official announcement, the Alaska Native Service has adopted a new policy that is one of the greatest steps forward in the administration of native affairs.

The policy is based on an elementary decision as to the fundamental objective of the Federal agency. The Alaska Native Service has finally decided what they are trying to do.

Instead of aimlessly endeavoring to meet the Federal responsibilities toward natives, the agency has decided that the objective is to bring the natives into the white man's way of living. First result of the decision is the initiation of a program that is tantamount to a new colonization effort.

The natives are being moved out of their primitive habitats in remote areas of Alaska. They are being brought to the areas where there are opportunities for employment. They are being placed in positions where they have incomes and can live and work and play on the same basis as whites.

This new life replaces the subsistence problem they have had for many generations. Instead of devoting full time to the task of finding food and providing clothing and shelter for themselves, they will be given the opportunity to earn money to purchase the necessities and, if they are frugal, the luxuries and pleasures that mark the white man's way of life.

This is a fundamental decision that has been long overdue. Until very recently the Alaska Native Service did not know whether its object was to perpetuate the native as a curious race separate and apart from the white man, or whether it was seeking to teach the natives how to become a part of the American way of life.

The colonization feature resulting from the decision has already brought the relocation of many hundreds of natives.

The Alaska Railroad has furnished employment for 200 Eskimos brought to the rail belt from isolated camps in the Arctic. As railroad workers they have been found to be excellent. It is entirely likely that more will be employed in the future.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration has found Indians and Eskimos capable and dependable workers on the widely scattered building projects throughout the interior. Contractors have likewise found the native labor pool adept in building airfields and other installations in Alaska.

The fisheries have discovered that the natives are excellent workers in canneries. The annual migration to Bristol Bay from many interior communities has been increasing in the last few years.

Eskimos have made their appearance in Anchorage for the first time. Local establishments are finding them capable and dependable workers.

Carried to the ultimate, the integration of natives into the white economy could add

as many as 30,000 persons to the white economy.

The natives will be permanent additions because they are in Alaska to stay. They will never be boomers trying to make a quick stake and get out. Their presence should go far in overcoming the problem of turnover in employment. They won't take off for California when the first snow appears on the mountain tops.

This great decision had to go through the highest channels for clearance in Washington. It supersedes the fancy theories that the Federal Government should seek to improve the native economy and preserve it for antiquity. It also makes it possible for natives to help themselves instead of applying for doles under the Territorial welfare program.

Sincerity of the Interior Department in administering the new policy is indicated in a recent order by Secretary Chapman revoking the edict by his predecessor which authorized the creation of reservations. The order applied to the Barrow and Shungnak Reservations, pointing out that the Eskimos in those areas voted against reservations.

The order is significant in that it backs up with action Secretary Chapman's declaration that there would be no more Indian reservations established in Alaska. It also precludes the possibility that another election would be held with the hope that the Eskimos might change their minds.

Further action resulting from the new policy is that of turning over the Territory more and more responsibility for educating natives. The Alaska Native Service is rapidly abandoning its school system so that the natives can be integrated with others. Federal funds will be turned over to the Territorial school authorities instead of being administered separately.

Health services conducted by the Federal agency are also being turned over to the Territory, supported by Federal funds.

In short, the Alaska Native Service has finally decided that the welfare of the natives should come first. Instead of using the people to perpetuate a bureaucracy, the agency is going to put itself out of business by building up the natives to a point of self-sufficiency and independence in the white economy.

There will be many new problems as the natives take to the white ways, but the unlimited opportunities open to them are well worth the effort.

The administrative officers who figured in making this great decision are to be congratulated for their courage and foresight.

Los Angeles Housing**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues will be interested in the following letter written to the Wall Street Journal by Mr. Nathan Straus, of New York City, who was formerly a member of the New York City Housing Authority and later Administrator of the United States Housing Authority:

LOS ANGELES HOUSING**EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:**

When a Wall Street Journal economic report is grossly inaccurate, it's news. Yet a recent article on the public-housing program in Los Angeles seems to deserve that characterization.

1. The allegation: The new Government-backed public-housing project will add 45,000 more people to the 48,000 who live in public-housing units. When the project is completed, one in every 20 Los Angelenos will be a public-housing tenant.

The truth: Of the 48,000 persons now occupying public housing, approximately 21,000 occupy temporary war housing, which it is the very purpose of the new program to replace. Instead of 93,000 public-housing tenants there will be, when the present program is completed, approximately 72,000. This amounts, not to 1 person in every 20, but about 1 person in every 30 in the city.

2. The allegation: A recent survey shows that 2,000 dwellings renting for less than \$40 a month are vacant. This survey is said to have covered only one-third of the city's 425,000 rental units.

The truth: According to a report of the Residential Research Committee of Los Angeles, a nonprofit private organization devoted to housing research, vacancies in single family dwellings renting for \$40 a month or less have dropped to eight-tenths of 1 percent. Vacancies in all unfurnished multiple dwellings are only 1 and nine-tenths percent. Since there were, according to the United States housing census of 1950, 67,445 substandard dwellings within the Los Angeles City limits, it is certain that the few dwelling units available at less than \$40 a month are "slums."

The Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles is attempting to relocate approximately 1,700 families living on slum sites chosen for the new housing program. The Los Angeles Apartment House Owners Association has not been able to find even one livable dwelling unit within the means of the displaced families.

3. The allegation: A big-mass-housing builder has just completed some two-bedroom apartments at a cost of \$5,000 each, contrasted with a cost of \$11,000 each for local housing-authority units.

The truth: The \$11,000 estimated cost of public housing is an all-over figure, which includes the cost of slum elimination, land acquisition, site improvement, utilities, and the building of sidewalks and streets. The \$5,000 cost quoted for the private builder covers only the cost of the building.

The apartments to which the builder makes reference have not two bedrooms as alleged but only one. The total area of each dwelling is 480 square feet, as compared with the Los Angeles Housing Authority minimum standard of 575 square feet. The houses are jerry-built with rough pine outside stairways similar to emergency war-housing construction. The FHA refused to insure a loan for this housing. Such construction spells future slums. The fact that it is permitted is evidence of an inadequate local building code.

The builder claims that the rent is \$45 per month. This, however, does not include a gas range or refrigerator for which he charges an additional \$3.50 per month. Utilities, amounting to \$6, are also extra. So the real rent for these tiny one-bedroom apartments amounts to at least \$54.50 per month, compared to \$32.50 for a two-bedroom unit including range, refrigerator, and also utilities in public-housing projects.

4. The allegation: There has been a roar of protest against the public-housing program in Los Angeles.

The truth: The city council recently approved the public-housing program by a vote of 10 to 5. Such approval was due to the overwhelming support of practically every organization of disinterested citizens, including all the local veteran organizations, all the local labor organizations, and more than 70 other civic groups.

A little squeak of protest came from the Los Angeles Apartment House Owners' Association, the National Association of Home Builders, and the Los Angeles Real Estate Board.

5. The allegation: More housing is not needed because the Housing Act of 1949 was passed when housing was admittedly scarce and these conditions no longer exist.

The truth: There are just about as many occupied slum dwellings in 1951 as there were in 1949 when Surg. Gen. Leonard A. Scheele stated: "Los Angeles' slums breed tuberculosis; rates nearly 8 times higher than the better districts, and venereal-disease rates 13 times higher."

According to a carefully documented article which appeared in the Atlantic Monthly: "Slum housing, which comprises about 20 percent of this country's residential areas and contains at least a third of its population, yields only 6 percent of the real-estate tax revenue that is the mainstay of municipal governments. In return for that 6 percent, slums require, on a national average, more than half of the available medical and institutional care, half the time of the police, more than a third of the time of the fire departments, and most of the welfare benefits." Thus, even the annual contribution from the Federal Government to make up the difference between the economic rent of public housing projects and the rent that low-income families can afford to pay amounts to less than the concealed subsidies paid for the most highly subsidized housing in America—the slums.

The only people opposed to an expansion of the public housing and slum-clearance program are (a) those who are misinformed and (b) those who have a selfish interest in maintaining existing slums and housing shortages. The, latter group is engaged, through a powerful and sinister lobby in Washington, in adding to the numbers of the former. During the single year 1949, according to a congressional committee, this lobby engineered the mailing of 1,000,000 pieces of anti-public-housing propaganda under the congressional free mailing privilege—which means at the expense of the taxpayers.

NATHAN STRAUS.

Letter From Hon. Carl Vinson, of Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

MR. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from Hon. CARL VINSON, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, which reads as follows:

DEAR MR. GAVIN: The statement you made to the committee in executive session on July 20 in regard to the release of information respecting the B-36 bomber impressed me a great deal.

Insofar as I am concerned I want you to know that in my opinion you are not responsible for this unauthorized release of highly classified military information. I want to make this statement to you since your name has been mentioned in connection with this matter by press and radio commentators.

I have the greatest confidence in you. You have rendered outstanding service to the committee. On two different occasions I have requested you to go abroad to study highly classified military matters for the committee, and after these trips you have

submitted to the committee and to the House of Representatives comprehensive and very worth-while reports. It is to be deeply regretted that your name was ever mentioned in connection with this unauthorized release of classified material.

Insofar as I am concerned you have a clean bill of health. You are at full liberty to publish this letter or make any disposition of it that you wish.

Sincerely,

CARL VINSON,
Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, it is most satisfying to me to receive such a letter from the very distinguished and able chairman of the Armed Services Committee, whose work in behalf of national defense has won for him the hearty commendations of the Members on both sides of the aisle.

The Fair Deal in Hells Canyon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN T. WOOD

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

MR. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been directed to the appended article by Raymond Moley, nationally known news columnist, which appeared in the August 6 issue of Newsweek.

Never before in the history of the development of the Federal power bureaucracy has there been such a bare-faced steal of the people's natural resources, for the sole benefit of the power kingdom, as is evidenced in this projected costly "fetus" of the Department of the Interior.

This brain child of Truman, Chapman, Raver, and others, happens to be located in my district in Idaho; and this bid to grab off the electric power of my district to sell down the river to the coast cities and California without any remuneration whatever to my home folks certainly shall receive my earnest and unrelenting opposition.

The "weasel words" of the Department of the Interior, purporting to grant benefits to Idaho in lieu of their stolen power, completely fail to convince me this project is not basically federally organized banditry.

The article follows:

FAIR DEAL IN HELL'S CANYON

(By Raymond Moley)

CALDWELL, IDAHO.—The Snake River, despite its sinister name, is the best-behaved domestic servant in the Nation. It is also one of the most useful. It rises in Yellowstone Park and enters Idaho at an altitude of more than 6,000 feet and winds through that State for 700 miles. Then it reaches the border of Oregon and finally leaves Idaho at an altitude of 600 feet. That decline of more than a mile provides a source of vast water power and irrigation. The Snake's volume of water is copious, steady, and continuous. The river stays at all times in its narrow, sometimes deep channel and hence manifests none of the capricious,

destructive habits of the Mississippi, the Missouri, and the Columbia. It provides fertility, power, and glory for its master, Idaho. The Snake and its tributaries are dammed and tapped again and again. Without it, southern Idaho would be a barren series of brown hills and valleys. With it, southern Idaho is a rich, prosperous home for a sturdy, industrious, conservative population.

Up on the border of Oregon, the Snake rushes through Hells Canyon at tremendous force. This opportunity for Federal spending has been under the greedy eyes of the busy bureaucrats of the Bureau of Reclamation for a long time. They have drawn up plans for a great dam, the highest in the Nation, exceeding the Hoover Dam by many feet. To build it would be the summit of the Bureau's ambition. Truman has included it in his grandiose Fair Deal and incorporated in his budget a large sum for its initiation. This proposed dam would be almost exclusively for the generation of electric power. None of the land of Idaho would be fertilized by it. Moreover, the State would get little or none of the electricity. That would be carried to Oregon and Washington in the Bonneville pool.

IDAHO PEOPLE OPPOSE DAM

As far as I can determine, the people and the public officials of Idaho are overwhelmingly against this Federal project. Their concern is not merely because they would get no benefit from it, but because it would prevent the development of power and irrigation which is greatly needed and which would not require the expenditure of Government money. For the State of Idaho is thrifty. It views a State deficit as a shame and a disgrace. It is also conscious of the cost to the Nation of the Hells Canyon project, which will probably run to much more than a billion dollars. The initial estimate is \$476,000,000, but judging from other Federal projects, it would cost three times that to the Nation's taxpayers.

Instead of this great Federal expenditure, an alternative is proposed by the Idaho Power Co., which serves the State and, according to everything I hear, serves it well. The company wants to build five low-head dams upstream from the Hells Canyon site to serve the needs of Idaho. Its application to build the first of these has been before the Federal Government since 1947. The Hells Canyon project has held it up and if constructed would flood the available sites for these privately financed dams.

NEW BURDEN ON TAXPAYERS

Thus, the issue is joined between a great new burden on the taxpayers of the Nation and a development which would cost the taxpayers of the Nation and the State nothing, but instead would provide new tax sources. To this traveling taxpayer from another, far-distant State, it would seem that, since the people of Idaho prefer the privately financed development and since they have a moral claim on the waters of this great river, Congress should never authorize the Federal dam. As far as western Oregon and Washington are concerned, their needs can more than adequately be supplied by projected dams on the Snake within the borders of Washington. There are also several projected sites on the Columbia River.

But in the Federal bureaucracy ambitions are illimitable; concern for taxpayers negligible; the drive for a public-power monopoly intense; and Interior Department propaganda copious and costly. As has been the case in other such projects, discriminations in favor of public power and against private power are all to be legally incorporated. Thus, hang the expense and hang the free economy

Do Reds Want Cease Fire?—Why Not; They've Nothing To Lose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

REDS NEGOTIATING IN GOOD FAITH?—WHY NOT; THEY'VE NOTHING TO LOSE

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

People who have been wondering whether the Communists in Korea are negotiating "in good faith" have an answer in their swift acceptance of General Ridgway's ultimatum on conditions.

Of course they are—as far as Communists can be in good faith when dealing with non-Communists.

The Red generals at Kaesong are trying to get out of the gigantic error they made in June 1950, when they attacked the Republic of Korea under the impression that the United Nations and the United States would not defend their protegee.

Instead of completing a rapid conquest of South Korea, the Communist bloc now finds itself saving North Korea only through the unexpected reluctance of its adversaries to extend the conflict. It cannot be sure how long that reluctance would last.

Instead of successfully shooting their way into the United Nations and taking over Formosa by bluster, the Chinese Communists seem barred from either, perhaps for keeps.

Instead of confronting a world public-opinion prepared, as in the case of Czechoslovakia, to condone their aggression, the Kremlin crowd finds the non-Communist world—or much of it—committed to collective rearmament. Such a rearmament, furthermore, includes three things which the Kremlin has reason to fear—United States industrial power (including predominant super-bomb production), a rearmament West Germany, and a rearmament Japan.

Compared with these three threats, the conquest of little Korea—even if it could be achieved by further fighting, which it cannot—must look to Joe Stalin like peanuts.

PEACE CAMPAIGN NOTHING NEW

The obvious thing to do is therefore to call off the Korean campaign on the best possible terms as part of a peace campaign aimed at dividing the non-Communist countries and preventing their further rearmament.

This peace campaign is not new. It has been gradually developed over the last 2 years as an alternative to military aggression. A first move was the collection of millions of signatures "for peace."

Now that armed aggression has proved locally disastrous, the Kremlin has ordered the peace campaign stepped up.

For some months now, Communist radio transmitters have been hinting at Moscow's desire for a five-power pact to take up where the wartime alliance left off. This desire became clearer during the recent four-power talks in Paris. The desired pact would embrace the five veto-wielding countries at the UN Security Council—with one difference. Red China would take the place of National China, thus giving Stalin two of the five voices.

Then—Moscow hopes—these five powers would take up one after another outstanding

causes of tension and get rid of them. One such would be the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Another would be the rearmament of West Germany, a third the rearmament of Japan, etc. Since the U. S. S. R. and China could count upon the support of neutral India, of some discontented Arab States, and of pacifists and pro-Russians elsewhere, they might well hope to accomplish at least some of their purposes. To any still unconvinced westerners, the Polish Communist radio recently gave away the game:

"All over the world," a Polish commentator explained, "people are looking beyond the Korean cease-fire talks to the No. 1 essential for easing international tension, the conclusion of a five-power peace pact." (Warsaw in English to the United Kingdom, July 11, 1951.)

Forewarned is—or should be—forearmed.

DOORS TO FURTHER CONQUEST

Moreover, even if ending the fighting in Korea does not succeed in lulling the democracies back to sleep, it is still to the advantage of the Communists. It will enable them—if they choose—to transfer their military effort from a country like Korea, whose conquest leads nowhere, to other places—Indochina, Burma, India, Iran—each of which is a door to further conquest.

As matters now stand, ending the fighting in Korea will leave the Asian mainland almost as defenseless as in June 1950. It will find the Middle East in even greater disorder. It will find Europe still imperfectly rearmament, its defense efforts constantly being mined by political termites.

In view of the let-down already visible in Washington, London, and Paris, Moscow may conclude that a new act of Communist liberation will find the western peoples disinclined to oppose it by arms—particularly so if it is limited to an area where western leaders have indicated a merely secondary interest.

With such pleasant prospects ahead—at best, a new period of phony peace which Moscow can use further to increase its lead in armaments; at worst, the seizure of more promising pastures—why should not the Communists at Kaesong be negotiating in good faith? They have everything to gain and—at the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea—literally nothing to lose.

Don't Delay Longer on Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, early statehood for Alaska and Hawaii has the unequalled support of Kiwanis International. At the thirty-sixth annual convention, held in St. Louis June 20, 1951, this resolution for statehood for our two incorporated Territories was adopted:

Be it resolved by Kiwanis International, That the admission to statehood of Alaska and Hawaii is in the national interest, and we urge the Congress of the United States to give immediate and favorable action on their petitions for statehood; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the

Speaker of the House, and each Member of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, public sentiment throughout the Nation in favor of statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska is just about as unanimous as it can be on a proposition of this kind. The statehood bills should be passed this year so that State governments can be organized without further delay.

Troops for Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times for August 7, 1951:

TROOPS FOR EUROPE

The United States is as clearly committed as a country could be to the proposition that our own defense against the forces of aggression is bound up with the defense of our allies against those forces. Through the harsh experience of two world wars we have learned that collective security is the only principle on which man's hopes for peace and freedom can be safely based. We have supported it in the Charter of the United Nations; we have spelled out our position with unmistakable clarity in the North Atlantic Treaty; we have suited action to words in Korea; we have restated these beliefs in the great debate held last winter and spring on the issue of sending American troops to join the international defense forces under General Eisenhower on the Continent of Europe.

The declared policy of the American people is to support, build up and participate in the creation of an adequate defensive structure in Western Europe. That is why several divisions of our Army are already there. It is why important units of our Air Force are already there. It is why significant elements of our Navy are there. It is why we are helping to man the outposts of Berlin and the long line separating the free from the slave world in Europe.

The policy was set by the President and it was reaffirmed by the Senate in its resolution of April 4. In the debate that preceded adoption of this resolution it was made clear by the administration that a total of four American divisions was all that was contemplated for dispatch to Europe, in addition to the two already there at that time. In our view, the number of troops to be sent neither was nor is a matter for congressional determination. While it was advisable from the viewpoint of public policy that the Senate endorse the administration's intention to send troops to Europe, it was quite another thing for the Senate to set itself up as a military board passing judgment on the number of soldiers to be sent overseas in furtherance of an approved policy. And yet that is what it proceeded to do, expressing its "sense" that not more than the four additional divisions should be sent abroad without express congressional approval. It was generally understood that not over 200,000 American troops would be involved.

Now it turns out that the total actually contemplated was 400,000, according to Secretary Marshall—or 344,000, according to General Collins. In any case, it is far above the 200,000 mentioned a few months ago,

even though the number of overseas divisions has not been changed. The conclusion is inescapable that the administration spokesmen either were not entirely frank in their discussions of numbers last winter or did not take full account of the auxiliary troops that would inevitably have to be sent in support of six divisions. This is not a satisfactory way of dealing with Congress, and it is unfortunate that the misunderstanding should have occurred.

But in our view it would be exceedingly unwise for Congress, in pique, to adopt any of the newly revived proposals to establish a legislative limitation—for example, in the form of an amendment to the pending military appropriations bill—on the number of American troops to be sent abroad. Apart from its destructive influence on American prestige, such a measure would have the moral effect of writing off as expendable those units already overseas. It would cast doubt upon the seriousness of American intentions to carry out our part of the North Atlantic Treaty obligations. It would inject both Houses of Congress into a field of technical military judgment that, even with the best will in the world, they are not competent to enter. The United States is committed to full support of the defense of Western Europe and, in our own interests, we ought not to hamstring ourselves in carrying out that policy.

VA District Office Must Remain in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that plans were recently announced by the Veterans' Administration to remove the VA district office from New York to Philadelphia, where it is to be merged with similar offices from other cities. In the release issued on July 26, 1951, announcing this transfer, Carl H. Gray, Jr., Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, states as follows:

The savings resulting from the abolishment of the New York district office alone have been estimated at \$1,000,000 a year. The figures include about \$478,000 in salaries, \$488,000 in rent and maintenance, and the remainder in other items such as communications and tabulating activities."

Further in the same release Mr. Gray adds:

Those now employed in the three district offices—Boston, New York, and Richmond—will be given the opportunity to move to Philadelphia to work in the new office. Any vacancies created by VA employees not desiring to transfer will be filled locally.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this is not only a case of false economy but the figures as listed by Mr. Gray are misleading and present an erroneous picture of the situation. The proposed plan will not result in any appreciable saving, but it will bring about a good deal of confusion, dislocation, hardship, and various other difficulties involving hundreds of thousands of veterans, their dependents and beneficiaries.

How Mr. Gray hopes to save \$478,000 in salaries in New York by his willingness to retain these employees on the payroll if they move to Philadelphia, or by replacing them with others if they refuse to move with the office, is something which I have not yet been able to figure out. If he can perform such wonders, then we are wasting Mr. Gray's talents as a financier; we should put him to work on our national budget.

His rental figure, it seems, is also highly exaggerated. The VA office occupies only part of a building located at 346 Broadway, where it rents 180,000 square feet, at a cost of \$1.25 per square foot, which, according to my way of reckoning, comes to \$230,000. This is less than half of the figure quoted by Gray. By removing the office to Philadelphia, additional space will have to be acquired there. Presumably, it will be obtained at a reduced rate, but it will still amount to a sizable sum. Where does the saving come in here?

If Mr. Gray is seriously interested in saving taxpayers' money, he will not find it by running off to Philadelphia. There is a better way. The VA New York regional office occupies a building at 252 Seventh Avenue, where some 150,000 square feet of space is available. Why not move the district office into this unoccupied space and thereby institute a real saving?

I am, of course, very much upset by the fact that some 2,000 VA employees, many of whom are disabled veterans themselves, are in danger of losing their jobs. That would mean dislocation and hardship for 2,000 families. For some unexplained reason, the Veterans' Administration is willing to dispense with the services of so many trained, experienced, and loyal employees, and to take on others whom it will have to train all over again. Does that make for efficiency and economy?

Most of all, however, I am very much disturbed by the fact that removal of this office from New York will cause great hardship to hundreds of thousands of veterans and their beneficiaries. New York has more than a million war veterans. They have used and continue to use the facilities of the VA office for the manifold services it offers them in helping them with their problems. While some of these are routine matters, many require personal contact and follow-up. By removing this office to Philadelphia it will incur additional expense and discomfort for veterans or dependents in attempting personal contact which they now have in New York. Instead of improving the service to veterans and their families, that service will now deteriorate and will result in great dissatisfaction and constant complaints.

For all these reasons stated, I feel that we must act promptly in forestalling such action on the part of the Veterans' Administration. I am, therefore, introducing a bill which provides that a VA district office shall be maintained in New York, notwithstanding the recent announcement of the Veterans' Administration. In view of the urgency of the matter, I request that the committee to which this bill will be referred give its immediate consideration to it.

The West Point Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. MUMMA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, once again the question of morals and ethics in our Government has been brought to the foreground by the current West Point story. There is an almost unanimous wave of pity for these youth of our Nation. At the same time there is a question in the minds of nearly everyone as to whether their actions have not been condoned in certain quarters for one reason or another.

My own personal reaction is that by precept and example their elders in Government service, from the highest level down, have failed to give them an ideal for which to strive. We read constantly of similar cases where the code is being strained, if not actually broken, by those in the highest offices of our Government.

What the public wants is for each and every public officer to uphold the trust placed in them. We will then pull ourselves above the present level, whether it be in questionable business deals with governmental agencies or slanted testimony by public officials and the like.

It seems to me there is a lot of good sense in an editorial on this West Point situation appearing in the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot of August 6. Pursuant to the permission granted me, I include this editorial in my remarks. It is as follows:

THEY WOULD NOT LIE

Happily, our Army is somewhat better at fighting wars than at handling public relations. Otherwise, this would hardly be the land of the free, even though it might be the home of the late brave.

A news announcement of major interest to all the country rarely has been so fozzled as the story of West Point honor code violations.

At first, it appeared that 90 cadets had been caught cheating their way through school and had been dropped from the Academy. But now it may or may not be 90, and they are either in or out or awaiting further investigation, and they may not have been cheating in their own behalf but merely helping out a friend or just pretending they did not see what was going on.

In contrast to the confused but coy Army administration, the accused cadets themselves are doing a better job of public relations just by saying frankly what they feel and suspect and know.

Two highly important facts have been brought out by the accused cadets:

1. Cribbing has been going on for years under the honor system and there has been widespread knowledge of it.

2. Any of the accused could have escaped punishment merely by swearing falsely that he had not violated the honor code.

This last certainly puts a rich premium on perjury. A young man has only to put his name to a lie to save his career from ruin and his family from disgrace. And there is almost no chance that the lie would ever be exposed.

How many people in daily life could withstand such a temptation?

How many among the cadets' superiors in the Army? In Government?

How many who cannot resist a deep freeze or a fur coat or a favor from a Government contractor could face loss of a life's work and still refuse that inner voice teasing, "Oh, go ahead and sign—it's only a formality—who'll ever know?"

Yet, 90 cadets faced with expulsion did resist that temptation to lie their way to safety.

Some of them were honor students guilty of giving a lift to a roommate at a school where every minute is used to train men to give everything—even life—for the cause in which they serve.

Some were bright football players, guilty of helping a duller man who might be a teammate in a game where every move is dedicated to sacrificing the individual for the advancement of the team.

Of course, others of the 90 were poor students who might have passed their classes handily if they had not been burdened with the additional job of practicing and playing big-time, two-platoon football. But theirs was not to quarrel with that box-office policy set for them by the Army, they merely had to produce the touchdowns.

Perhaps still others of the 90 did nothing more than ignore what everyone for years seemed to know was happening . . . but they admitted it.

The 90 who refused to perjure themselves have admitted violating the West Point code of honor. But, in the eyes of their fellow Americans, they have abided by a still finer code of honor. They will be forever rated above those who lied their way to safety—and the accused cadets say perhaps as many as 200 did that.

The whole business is a mess. A system exists which puts a rich reward upon lying and which punishes only those caught. The rule is that every graduate starts with a clean slate. If he cheats his way through school without admitting it or being caught, he is in the clear. The accused cadets believe that many of the last few graduating classes got through in just that way and are now serving in the Army without reproach.

Thus the premium is not so much upon honorable conduct—whatever the system's founders may have hoped—as it is on not being caught.

The Army's administration, however, is responsible for thoroughly botching the whole business. Apparently a situation of wide extent and long standing was uncovered. Instead of evaluating it and stopping it quietly but effectively with reasonable punishment and immediate de-emphasis of big-time football, somebody decided to do it the hard-headed way.

As a result, our principal ground officer school will be sorely disrupted.

One of our proud institutions is unnecessarily besmirched before the whole world, including the Red world.

Flood Relief Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith the text of a letter from Milton C. Tainter, executive director of the Kansas City and Jackson County Chapter of the American Red Cross to the executive secretary of the Missouri State Council of Brewery Workers.

The Missouri State Council of Brewery Workers meeting in a 2-day convention at Kansas City, Mo., July 27 and 28, unanimously voted that the first order of business on convening of the convention would be to take positive action in making financial contribution to the flood relief funds in that area. Affiliated locals of the Missouri State Council of Brewery Workers are as follows: Local Union 46, Kansas City, Roy Fulton, secretary; Local Union 93, St. Joseph, Jos. Serocki, secretary; Local Union 187, St. Louis, Nicholas Ludwig, secretary; Local Union 246, St. Louis, Vincent Stiebel, secretary; Local Union 279, St. Louis, Kenneth Beerhalter, secretary.

Besides this contribution of \$2,500, other brewery workers local unions have also contributed to the Joint Labor Committee for Flood Relief. This contribution is just one of the many that are made throughout the year for worthy causes. Other organizations receiving financial help from the brewery workers are, to mention a few, the National Society for Crippled Children, the Easter Seal Agency, the veterans at Walter Reed Hospital, Percy Jones Hospital, Wood Memorial Hospital, Riley Memorial Hospital, Indianapolis, etc. The brewery workers are to be congratulated for their public spirited generosity.

AMERICAN RED CROSS.

Kansas City, Mo., July 27, 1951.

Mr. LOU A. GRIESEDECK,
Executive Secretary, Missouri State
Council of Brewery Workers, Kansas
City, Mo.

DEAR MR. GRIESEDECK: Please express to your convention assembled, our sincere appreciation for your check of \$2,500 given by the Missouri State Council of Brewery Workers to the American Red Cross flood-relief fund. In behalf of the thousands of individuals in the flood area, we accept your generous contribution for their relief.

Mrs. Alice B. Hons, one of our volunteers who worked with us at the disaster control headquarters through the entire emergency period, has told me of your offer to use her on the broadcast of the Cardinal's game of Sunday afternoon. We feel that this, too, is a generous contribution, for it will bring to thousands of Cardinal fans the opportunity of hearing a volunteer worker who was at the scene during this emergency and thus many more dollars will undoubtedly be contributed to the American Red Cross flood-relief fund. Mrs. Hons will be available to you for the trip to St. Louis Sunday.

Again thanking you for your generous contribution to the flood sufferers through the American Red Cross.

Sincerely yours,

MILTON C. TAINTER,
Executive Director.

Our Failure, Senate's Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the failure of the Ways and Means Committee to include in the Revenue Act of 1951 the taxable income of some 35,000 tax-exempt profit-making corporations,

such as cooperatives, building and loan associations, mutual savings banks, and so forth, is a travesty upon justice and a cruel joke upon every taxpayer in America. The Senate Finance Committee has the tax bill under consideration at the present time. I hope the Senate Finance Committee will do the job that the Ways and Means Committee failed to do. In that connection, and for the benefit of the Members of the other body, I include the following excellent editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch of August 1, 1951:

A DEVICE TO PROFIT BY TAX EVASION

One of those Alice in Wonderland tax stories came over the wire the other day. It said that Assistant Treasury Secretary E. H. Foley had written a letter to House Speaker SAM RAYBURN, calling attention to a loophole in the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. RAYBURN, in all seriousness, said that a tax now levied on the sale of sawed-off shotguns, "a favorite offense weapon of gangsters," was being evaded. The gangsters, it seems, buy shotguns with a regular-size barrel, and then use a hacksaw to shorten them for lethal effectiveness at close range.

Mr. Foley suggested to Mr. RAYBURN that this loophole be plugged by amending the Revenue Code to require payment of the tax before the shotgun barrel is truncated.

If it has taken you 22 seconds to read this far, the interest on the national debt accumulated in those 22 seconds amounted to approximately \$3,480. We doubt very much that the amount of revenue realized by plugging the "sawed-off-shotgun tax loophole" will suffice to pay even that tiny fraction of this fixed burden in the Federal budget.

However, there is little doubt that Congress will so amend the code, if for no other reason than to escape the stigma of favoring gun-toting gangsters.

But there is grave doubt that Congress will refuse to plug the biggest tax loophole of all—the special-privilege exemption under which the profits of cooperative corporations have remained untaxed.

Failure of Congress to plug this big-as-a-barn-door loophole will cost you (the taxpayers) anywhere from a third to a half-billion dollars a year.

You will have to go far afield to find a better illustration of the proverb about "swallowing a camel but straining at a gnat."

The viewpoint of ethics and economics the proposal to tax co-op profits (including those camouflaged as "patronage dividends") is sound and just. But with a presidential election looming on the horizon, politicians in Congress are scared stiff of the farm bloc, which has looked upon tax exemption of its co-ops as a sort of God-given right, very much as the "butter bloc" for 50 years arrogantly maintained its right to tax oleo-margarine.

Professor O. Glenn Saxon, in testifying before the Senate Finance Committee recently contended that the Government (meaning the taxpayers) loses "more than \$1,000,000,000 a year" in taxes that could be collected from all now privileged tax-exempt groups, including the co-ops, mutual companies, and Government corporations.

"There is not the slightest chance Congress will tax patronage dividends," snapped Senator TAFT, the self-constituted conscience of the Republican Party.

"That's because Congress doesn't understand they're really profits," retorted Saxon.

TAFT's reply was beamed right to the farm bloc:

"Congress does understand," he said, "what these farm co-ops are for—to enable

farmers to buy things cheaper and sell their products for more."

A century ago farmers formed co-ops to find more efficient methods of selling their crops to distant markets. There was a real need for these organizations; the individual farmer could not have solved the problem single-handed. But today these agencies and their urban counterparts have degenerated into tax-dodging devices whose profits (under whatever alias) are not so much the result of more efficient management and purchasing as of their exemption from taxation.

It is safe to say that if these corporations' profits were taxed, the game would no longer be worth the candle, and most of them would collapse. As of now, they are in effect tax-supported.

The taxes evaded are paid by citizens who enjoy no tax-evasive privileges. Thus we have one class of citizens deriving a profit from taxes paid by their less-privileged fellow citizens.

This inequitable and economically indefensible state of affairs might never have been emphasized in Congress, were it not for the fact that all-time high corporate and excise taxes are now in prospect. What was a nominal difference, negligently condoned, has now become a grave injustice and a heavy load, measurable in billions of dollars over the long years of defense spending that confront the Nation.

This inequity must be wiped out. The selfish interests of a farm bloc (already guaranteed security by parity payments) should not be maintained at the cost of the vast majority of citizens.

As for Senator TAFT, who has championed this injustice, it would be well for him to remember that the free-enterprise system which he so valiantly defends will be increasingly vitiated if socialized, tax-exempt business groups, by reason of the privilege he condones, continue to shift the tax burden that is rightly theirs onto the shoulders of tax paying, free-enterprise competitors.

"How I Became a Dope Addict Before I Was 18"—Lucy Turns Peddler To Pay for Her "Fixes"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted me, I ask that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the third of a series of articles on teen-age drug addiction published recently by the Long Island Daily Press:

"HOW I BECAME A DOPE ADDICT BEFORE I WAS 18"—LUCY TURNS PEDDLER TO PAY FOR HER "FIXES"

(This is the third in a series of articles about 19-year-old Lucy D., who managed to shake off the vicious habit of taking dope, into which she had slipped when she was first out of high school. There are undoubtedly hundreds of boys and girls like Lucy on Long Island, although most of them never come to the attention of authorities because their parents step in just in time. In the first two installments Lucy, only daughter of a nice suburban family, told

how she accepted her first marihuana cigarette on a date and kept smoking reefers until she could not do without them. She told how she graduated to heroin when she fell in love with Ralph, 20-year-old addict. She left her family to live with Ralph, married him and then, when he was picked up by narcotics agents in their shabby flat, she decided she would not contact him in jail. Lucy took her own furnished room in another part of the city and being completely out of money, decided to peddle dope so she could keep herself supplied with the stuff.)

(By Geraldine Scott)

The first thing Lucy did when she decided to try to make money by peddling dope was to contact some of the people she had seen Ralph buy H (heroin) from. One of them, the proprietor of a fairly nice restaurant, liked the idea of having a young girl work for him. He even offered to advance her enough money to take a nice apartment if she would be a regular peddler for him.

"The thought occurred to me that it might be easier for my parents to find me nearer home," Lucy said. "But by that time I was gone. I couldn't wait to get my next fix of H, and I had no money to buy it. I accepted Mr. B's offer."

With the help of "friends" of Mr. B., Lucy was set up in an apartment.

"They thought of everything. It was an expensive place in a new development, about \$125 a month, I think, although Mr. B paid the rent all along. It had a rear exit so customers could contact me without attracting attention. It even had a brand new garbage disposal so I could get rid of the stuff if I thought police were getting too close."

Lucy leaned back on the sofa in her parents' living room, closed her brown eyes, and answered my question about the technique of using H.

"Users never bother with hypodermic syringe and needles any more. This is because it's a violation of the narcotics law to have them in your possession. Now they buy needles used by diabetics, which do not come under the narcotics law. You can get them in any drug store two for 18 cents.

"The fix liquid is drawn into an eye-dropper, and the needle is attached to the dropper with a strong piece of paper, like a strip cut off a dollar bill. I tried using Scotch tape, but that slips when wet. The money paper is strong even when wet, and it stays in place."

Soon Lucy's customers began to contact her. As a plain user of dope she had met many fellow hypos at parties. Most of them, she soon realized, were hoodlums and thugs like Hank, who had given her her first marihuana reefer, and Ralph, her husband, whom she never cared to see again. But her customers were different types, from wealthy socialites to slum-area juveniles.

"The rich ones apparently got the habit because they were bored and didn't have anything to keep them interested. They were secret users who never mingled with other hypos. They had plenty of money, so they didn't have any worries about getting the stuff. Many of them were young—some in their teens and early twenties."

One of Lucy's customers was a young girl later sent to prison for using children to peddle dope.

"Her story was typical, I guess. Her mother died when she was 1 month old, her father remarried soon afterward and had other children. He never wanted her. She was shifted from relative to relative and finally, when she was 16 she went out on her own. She was a bitter kid, and it didn't take much to turn her into a hypo. But when she came to me I never dreamed she was using kids to unload the stuff."

Some of Lucy's customers followed the oldest profession to get money to buy dope. Others were shady characters who were not dope addicts.

"Their bosses explained it would be much easier for them to peddle dope than to pursue their usual activities. But they wouldn't touch the stuff themselves. They used to look at me in contempt when they came to buy H."

Lucy was making good money as a dope peddler. But she knew she had changed from a pretty girl into an unattractive, dissipated one. She had bleached her red hair blond, hoping to avoid recognition by police whom she knew were searching for her as a missing person. The weight on her once nicely-rounded 5 feet five figure had gone from 125 to about 103. Her skin was pimply from the sweets that all hypos crave along with H. She was a worried young lady when she was between shots, but a "contented" one when she was "fixed."

"Most people don't know how physically dangerous the actual use of H gets. After you start taking a fix in the main line (that means the artery) you're in trouble because you run out of arteries. When you're taking a fix seven or eight times a day, mostly in your arms, they get sensitive and it hurts a great deal to push that needle in. One arm wears out and then the other and you get desperate. But you stand the pain because it would be worse without the heroin."

"I nearly lost my foot once because I tried a fix in my leg and got an infection. Girls have it tougher than boys because their arteries and veins are smaller and not so strong."

Since her recovery, Lucy has had plastic operations on her arms to eliminate the needle scars she incurred while taking her shots so many times a day. But she still has a couple of scars to remind her of her kick-off misery.

"One thing I'd like to say," Lucy stated thoughtfully. "A normal average kid can't be seduced by an ogre with a dope needle. He or she has got to be willing or eager to try Marihuana, though, is a different story. That's how I started. But I admit I was a crazy kid. I just didn't know what I wanted."

Lucy added that she thought druggists could help narcotics officers by being suspicious of anyone coming in to buy a spike—the addict's name for a diabetic needle.

"You can hardly do without a needle. A few users sniff cocaine and heroin, but that isn't very satisfactory and it's extravagant, takes too much to get any effect. I never could. It tickled my nose so much it got red and inflamed."

Hypos have various hiding places for their spikes and eyedroppers. A few teen-aged boys who were still in high school used to tell Lucy they would tape them to trees and poles near the school.

"Girls can pin it to their brassieres. They're comparatively safe because they can be searched only by women cops. By the time a matron gets on the job the girls have had a chance to go to the bathroom and ditch the stuff."

"In the poorer sections people hide their stuff in vacant lots."

Lucy's job as a dope peddler had other disadvantages. She could never stay too long in one apartment, for fear one of her customers would get picked up and squeal.

"With Mr. B's help, I was a very careful worker. Once he took me to a party at the home of one of his biggest peddlers. When I walked in there was a sort of buffet of narcotics and stimulants on fancy plates on the table. On one plate there was a fine grade of heroin, on another morphine, another cocaine, and plenty of pot sticks of

good grade. They had opium, too; you could smoke, chew, or shoot. Opium's a luxury dope. You can only get it through the high racket circles."

Don't Stray From the Fundamentals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has given a great deal of consideration during the past few months to the question of price control and particularly controls on beef. There has been a great deal of debate on both sides of the issue. This issue has been analyzed by A. L. Smith, extension animal husbandman, and Dr. Tyrus R. Timm, extension economist and professor of agricultural economics, Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College System, and their views are thought provoking for those of us interested in this vital issue.

Their article in July 1951 issue of the *Cattleman* follows:

DON'T STRAY FROM THE FUNDAMENTALS

(By A. L. Smith, extension animal husbandman, and Dr. Tyrus R. Timm, extension economist and professor of agricultural economics, Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College System)

Recognize, appreciate, and work with—not against—the fundamental forces which through the years and under free competition have set cattle and beef prices.

This is our advice to folks generally and particularly to those public servants who have the responsibility of administering the Government's price control program and to those citizens who believe Federal intervention in the cattle and beef market place is necessary.

Here are some of these fundamentals, as we see them, worthy of everybody's consideration:

1. Seasonal and annual price changes play a dominant role in guiding the production and distribution of cattle and beef.

2. Sharp and often unexpected changes in the weather, in feed supplies, and in the meat purchase patterns of consumers call for numerous seasonal and annual readjustments by stockmen and middlemen.

3. Changes in the production and distribution of cattle and beef, occasioned by unforeseen developments, usually costs the stockman some more money—particularly if resulting losses in beef supplies are to be cut in a minimum. Producers will not spend additional money unless there's a good prospect of a reasonable profit from it.

4. Setting a price at the beginning of the production season and then trying to get the production which will sell at that price, doesn't work very well in the cattle business. Probably, production depends about as much on the weather, parasite infestations, diseases, and other variables as upon the producer's and even the Government's planning.

5. The livestock market historically has been wide open and highly competitive. Free competition, the bulwark of our economic system, has been its very core. No individual stockman has been big enough to influence the market significantly. It is in this "economic climate" that the cattle business and

its cost and income patterns have been forged.

6. Substitution of one meat for another as relative price advantages occur has been the rule—not the exception—in the free market. For example, Dr. E. J. Working of the University of Illinois found in his studies on beef and pork that with the exception of the years in which World War II price controls and rationing were in effect, there existed "a close inverse relation between the price ratio and the consumption ratio" of pork and beef.

"In almost every year," Dr. Working continued, "when the price of beef rose relatively to that of pork, there was a corresponding decline in the consumption of beef relative to the consumption of pork. Similarly, a decline in the price of beef relative to pork results in a rise in the beef-pork consumption ratio."

These considerations should govern us in deciding the answers to our two big really important questions about inflation.

1. Can Uncle Sam harness the attendant economic forces well enough to control cattle and beef prices by direct controls—ceilings, subsidies, etc.? And if he can—

2. What will be the long run effect of these controls upon the world's most efficient production and distribution system of cattle and beef?

The answers—which no one knows for sure—are of vital concern to each of us—producers, middlemen, consumers, and Government representatives alike. We must come out with the right ones and soon.

Acheson's Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the *Jackson (Mich.) Citizen-Patriot* of August 4, 1951:

ACHESON'S POWER

The investigation of the State Department proposed by Representative MEADER appears to be in order.

At this moment the State Department seems to be running the Government.

Maybe the investigation suggested by Mr. MEADER would show how the State Department does it.

At the very least, Secretary of State Acheson apparently runs the Defense Department, the White House, and is calling the turn on foreign-aid programs, such as ECA.

The day-to-day news verifies this belief.

The negotiations at Kaesong are looking toward a military cease-fire and do not constitute a peace conference.

Yet Secretary of State Acheson was the one who announced that a buffer zone at the thirty-eighth parallel would be rejected by the United Nations. Apparently the views of the U. N. military commanders did not become official until they were approved by the State Department.

The State Department engineered the neat trick grabbing at the peace straw offered in a routine speech by Russia's Malik. General Ridgway—and General MacArthur before him—had proposed battlefield negotiations, but nothing happened until the State Department moved in.

President Truman, in press conferences and in official action, faithfully echoes the Acheson line of the moment. He handed ECA over to the State Department, although this move is unpopular in Congress.

A new tip-off on the power of Secretary Acheson came when newsmen revealed that Air Secretary Finletter and other civilian brass in the Defense Department learned of the late Admiral Sherman's mission to Spain only when they read about it in the newspapers.

Acheson and Secretary of Defense Marshall, himself a former Secretary of State, made the decision and sent Admiral Sherman on behalf of the Joint Chiefs of Staff without bothering to notify the civilian heads of the Armed Forces.

State Department approval of the mission appeared to be enough to set it in motion.

There are many other signs of the strength of the Secretary of State, who does not have the confidence of Congress nor of the people, but is very solid at the White House.

An investigation such as Representative MEADER proposes could be very interesting.

What Goes on Here Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fairmont (Minn.) Daily Sentinel, issue of Tuesday, July 31, 1951, entitled "What Goes on Here Department":

WHAT GOES ON HERE DEPARTMENT

As of June 30, 1950, the total United States debt was \$255,222,000,000.

That, most of us will admit, is a figure beyond our poor comprehension.

But, on a per capita basis, it means for every man, woman and child in the United States, the debt is \$1,693.67.

That begins to mean something.

We have another figure, based on the \$255,222,000,000 national debt, that may mean something to our people.

On the basis of our 1950 population, which was 25,543, it means that Martin County's share of the national debt is \$43,261,412.81.

Reduced to a per township basis, that means \$2,163,070.64 each for every one of our twenty townships.

Martin County's \$43,261,412.81 share of the national debt is \$23,826,604.81 more than the total 1950 assessed valuation of all real estate and personal property of record.

On the \$43,261,412.81 debt Martin County's share of the national debt, the interest, figured at 2 percent per annum (low enough, it seems) our bill for interest amounts to \$865,228.24 a year.

And Washington talks about another \$8,500,000,000 to be used for arming Europe, with enough more in the next 3 years to make the total for this purpose hit \$25,000,000,000. That would add another \$7,210,235 to Martin County's debt, with no provision for interest.

Take it from there. Our adding machine and electric calculator just blew a fuse.

Small Defense Plants Administration— Financial Assistance To Be Rendered Small Business Under the Defense Production Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members of this House to the far-reaching provisions in the Defense Production Act for rendering financial assistance to small business. This may well prove to be one of the most effective vehicles Congress has yet created for bringing the smaller plants of this country into the defense effort.

The Defense Production Act Amendments of 1951 establish a revolving fund of \$100,000,000 to enable the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to small-business firms. The Small Defense Plants Administration is to recommend these loans, although final authority rests with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Loans may be made for various purposes, including the financing of plant conversion and expansion, the acquisition of equipment and supplies, the conducting of research and development work, and the provision of working capital. Loans may be made directly or in cooperation with banks and other lending agencies through agreements to participate in insurance of loans, or by the purchase of participation or otherwise.

This lending power is thus concentrated in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Small Defense Plants Administration has no power to make loans and no money to lend. Its function is that of determining need and of making a recommendation. Congress wisely decided not to set up another lending agency.

In exercising this lending function the Small Defense Plants Administration and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will not encroach on the operations of private banks. The latter have the first opportunity to make the loan. If local banks are prepared to supply the capital, there will be no necessity for action by either the Small Defense Plants Administration or Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Existing sources of capital must be exhausted before either agency can act.

There can be no question as to the reality and seriousness of the difficulties confronting small-business concerns in obtaining credit. The story that was told to the House Small Business Committee at its recent Nation-wide hearings was very impressive. There is no doubt that many small firms have found it impossible to engage in defense production because of the lack of capital.

The small-business unit is generally much weaker than the large enterprise in respect to his financial resources. Frequently he is utterly unable to meet the normal requirements of a sound bank loan. He is launching on a new venture. He has few assets to pledge. His future is uncertain. He is discouraged by the complicated red tape and delay. We were told that many small-business men, after weeks and even months of seeking financial assistance, have given up all hopes of engaging in defense production.

Frequently the small plant needs only a modest loan—sometimes only a few thousand dollars—to be able to make a real contribution to the defense effort. A small addition to the plant must be built. Some special machines must be acquired. Working capital needs to be increased. Without these facilities no procurement officer will place the contract. Without the contract the loan will not be made.

In World War II the Smaller War Plants Corporation received over 9,000 applications for loans, nearly 6,000 of which were granted. The value of these loans exceeded \$500,000,000. Nearly two-thirds of the number of these loans were for amounts less than \$25,000 and about 95 percent were made to firms employing fewer than 250 workers. It is interesting to note that losses amounted to less than 1 percent of the total amount loaned in spite of the fact that the borrowers could seldom meet standard credit tests.

We may confidently expect that the financial difficulties confronting small business will be removed once the Small Defense Plants Administration begins to function. Under courageous and imaginative leadership, the Administration, with the cooperation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation with its \$100,000,000 of new money, should break this log jam of red tape and indifference and proceed vigorously to make full utilization of the productive resources of small plants.

Facts Forum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some information concerning the Facts Forum:

FACTS FORUM AWARDS (OPEN TO THE PUBLIC)

MONTHLY MOTTO AWARD

Sixty-four dollars will be paid each month for a motto for Facts Forum to use. Mottos should be brief—that is, The Truth Shall Keep You Free. The first monthly award will be made August 5, the next August 20, and thereafter on the 20th of each month. Each person may submit only one motto at

a time, but it will be entered in all judgments unless it wins or is withdrawn.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Those writing letters to editors dealing with subjects of any questions in Facts Forum polls will be awarded each biweekly polling period: \$50 for best letter, \$40 second, \$30 third, \$20 fourth. Send a clipping of published letter showing date and name of publication in which your letter appeared.

MEETING PROGRAMS

The closing date of this contest has been moved to August 22, 1951, and the awards increased.

Fourteen awards are offered for the best papers on plans for meetings. First, \$200; second, \$150; third, \$100; fourth, \$75; next 10, \$30 each. Each paper must describe a complete plan for a meeting of one or more forums. A plan should be for an audience of a stated size and for some certain age group. Each paper should provide for certain procedures such as panels, debates, speeches, book reviews, contests, games, acts, skits, movie shorts, playing wire or tape recordings, etc.

Papers will be judged on the merit of the plans. Those of equal merit will be further judged for clarity and neatness.

All of above contests are open to those who do not belong to Facts Forum as well as those who do. Participants are requested to explain the contest to their friends.

Decision of the Facts Forum awards committee will be final.

Material submitted will not be returned but will become the property of Facts Forum for its use.

Mail entries for all contests to Facts Forum Awards Committee, 720 Mercantile Securities Building, Dallas, Tex.

Call your friends to watch for Facts Forum television teen-age panel, Should More Stringent Federal Narcotic Laws Be Passed? WFAA, channel 8, Thursday, August 2, 7 p. m.

Consult your television schedule each Thursday for Facts Forum programs. Watch for and tell your friends of copies of Facts Forum polls appearing in newspaper ads.

If you wish to participate, call or write Facts Forum, 720 Mercantile Securities Building.

John Kee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter received by me from our former colleague, the Honorable Pete Jarman, now American Ambassador at Canberra:

AMERICAN EMBASSY,
Canberra, July 27, 1951.

HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND RAMSAY: I have just read with keen interest and appreciation your very appropriate remarks about the passing of our dear friend Judge Kee in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 8. May I take the liberty of commending you heartily on these appropriate remarks and saying something that I

think you already know; that is, that had I been present it would have afforded me pleasure, although with tears in my eyes, to have indulged in similar references of appreciation of the life and service of this great man, the passing of whom, as was so appropriately indicated by all of you gentlemen, was such a great loss to his State and Nation.

I am delighted to learn from my secretary as I commenced dictating this letter that Mrs. Kee has very appropriately been elected to succeed him in the House.

With kind personal regards to you and yours, I am,

Yours sincerely,

PETE JARMAN,
American Ambassador.

Moscow's Red-Letter Day in American
History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, to keep the record straight and to refresh our memories as we attempt to repair the damage that was done in November 1933 by the signing of a treaty with Soviet Russia, I call attention to the timely warning issued by Mr. Edward A. Hayes, then national commander of the American Legion, in an address he gave at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier on November 11, 1933, just 5 days before President Roosevelt recognized Soviet Russia. As part of my remarks I am including a portion of Commander Hayes' remarks which appear in the current issue of the American Legion magazine:

THE AMERICAN LEGION OFFICIALLY OPPOSED
THE SIGNING OF A TREATY WITH THE
SOVIET

Speaking at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Washington on November 11, 1933, just 5 days before President Roosevelt signed the treaty recognizing Soviet Russia, National Commander Edward A. Hayes said: "He [the unknown soldier] would understand the Legion's attitude that opposes the official recognition by the United States of strange tenets, admittedly and avowedly intended to destroy through violence and revolution the structure of our Government and the family relationship that is the keystone of that structure. He would tell you to beware of questionable commitments that would tend to tie the hands of those of us who would keep our Americanism; to beware of bizarre associations just because they might benefit someone financially."

Mr. Speaker, Edward A. Hayes, now a prominent citizen of Chicago, Ill., was wise enough to understand the full meaning of the treaty which was then pending before President Roosevelt. He said that we should beware of questionable commitments, and we know today that the treaty which he has referred to has caused the American people and the free world untold suffering and the end is not in sight.

On November 16, 1933, when the treaty was signed it was indeed a red-letter day for Moscow and a black day for the United States and the free world.

Psychological Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is necessary that I give you a parable.

Legend has it that, in ancient Rome, a ragged pagan priest appeared before the Roman Senate and announced that he had in his possession the nine lost books of mysteries. These he offered to Rome at a great price.

Legend has it that the Roman Senate refused his offer. Then, in full sight of the legislators, the priest burned three of the nine precious books. He turned to his audience and asked them to buy the remaining six books at twice the original price of the entire nine. He was again refused. The priest burned half of the remaining books, leaving only three. The Roman Senate hurriedly met his terms. They bought, for Rome, those books spared from the flames.

But they paid three times the price for three books which they would have had to pay for the original nine.

This, Mr. Speaker, is my parable.

In 1949, many months before the beginning of the Korean war, I said on the floor of this House:

This Congress has a great stake in psychological warfare. By means of a special committee on psychological warfare, this House could go on record as seeking the necessary legislative groundwork for securing a psychological warfare agency in the event of a war emergency, with the least possible waste of money and with the least possible waste of time.

To this end I introduced House Resolution 374 in the Eighty-first Congress.

In August 1950 the establishment of a National Psychological Strategy Board was announced. The Department of Defense, the Joint Chief of Staffs, the Department of State, and the Central Intelligence Agency were requested to designate representatives to sit on the Board. The National Security Resources Board and the Economic Cooperation Administration were invited to provide liaison representatives.

Today, in August 1951, the Psychological Strategy Board, under the chairmanship of former Secretary of the Army Gordon Gray, has only begun to function.

Mr. Speaker, this House has only recently concluded a heated debate on the appropriations for the Voice of America. Single scripts, isolated productions of this agency, have, in my opinion, been overemphasized during the course of this

debate. One Member has said, in effect: "This is a good script. Therefore, the Voice should have more money." Another Member has said, in effect: "This is a bad script. Therefore, the Voice should be given less money."

I contend that both approaches are at fault.

Our domestic commercial radio programs do not get high or low Hooper ratings on the basis of a single script. These ratings are given as the result of careful examination of total production efforts which cover weeks and months of continuing broadcast.

The hearings held and the reports made by a special committee on psychological warfare could accomplish the viewing of psychological warfare as a broad, total effort.

Such a committee would not conflict or encroach upon the field of appropriations. The Appropriations Committee could utilize or ignore the findings of such a committee as it saw fit to do so. Nevertheless, those findings would be available at hand—for use.

Such a committee would not conflict or encroach upon the field of foreign affairs. The Committee on Foreign Affairs could utilize or ignore the findings of such a committee as it saw fit to do so. Nevertheless, those findings would be available at hand—for use.

I do not think of such a committee now—nor have I ever thought of it—as a "watchdog committee." That name is justifiably odious to many Members.

Rather, I still think of it—and I have always thought of it—as a burglar-alarm committee. Its findings could ring a bell in the minds of members of permanent committees, and these members could act on their own initiative.

I have in my hand an instance—a real, not a hypothetical, instance—of what this proposed committee might do to set off such a burglar alarm in the minds of members of the properly authorized permanent committees.

In the examination of all psychological warfare material from all agencies participating in this activity, it would have been certain that this document would have reached the attention of the staff of the proposed committee.

This document, *America Today*, in its special July 4, 1951, edition, as produced by the State Department, was a formidable publication. For the most part, it is printed in the Chinese language. It contains informative material about Patrick Henry, Thomas Jefferson, Alexander Hamilton, John Adams, Tom Paine, James Madison, Abraham Lincoln, and others. It contains the Star-Spangled Banner, the Bill of Rights, and the Declaration of Independence.

My colleagues of the House Committee on Un-American Activities have all too often witnessed Reds scurrying to hide behind the protection of the Constitution.

The special Fourth of July issue of *America Today* was circulated in the British Crown Colonies in Asia, Hong Kong and Singapore, as well as other danger points in southeast Asia.

This part of the Declaration of Independence—undated—would sponsor revolt in Hong Kong against the British:

The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these States.

An undated Declaration of Independence would not distinguish George III from the "present King," George VI.

Patrick Henry pulled no punches against the England of his time. But does *America Today* of July 4, 1951, emphasize that Patrick Henry of 1775 is the speaker, not someone named Patrick Henry in 1951? Do the people of Singapore know that?

Here is what Tom Paine, firebrand of the American Revolution, has to say in *America Today*, July 4, 1951, issue, in Chinese and English: "Britain, with an army to enforce her tyranny, has a right, not only to tax, but 'to bind us in all cases whatsoever,' and if being bound in that manner is not slavery, then there is not such a thing as slavery upon the earth. Even the expression is impious, for so unlimited a power can belong only to God."

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe that Thomas Paine was right in every word quoted 165 years ago. I do not concur in all that he said then at this precise moment.

I believe, heart and soul, in the Declaration of Independence.

I have sworn to uphold the Constitution.

Yet, the writers of *America Today*—issue of July 4, 1951—have reversed the old process, instead of forging swords into plowshares, they have forged our plowshares of liberty into swords to be used against our current ally, Great Britain.

I hold no brief for the present Socialist Government of that country.

Yet, we have fought a common foe in World War I, World War II, and in the Korean war.

I would not have a publication of the psychological warfare branch of the Department of State foment a revolt in British crown provinces.

Mr. Speaker, this instance which I have brought forward here does not prove the Voice of America to be either good or bad. It does show that a House burglar alarm committee should be on the alert, so that the proper permanent committees of the House might act.

This House needs a special committee to study psychological warfare.

UNCLASSIFIED FOREIGN SERVICE OPERATIONS
MEMORANDUM

JUNE 21, 1951.

To: The Department of State.
From: American consul, Hong Kong.
Subject: I. e.: Press: *America Today*, special July 4 issue.

Transmitted herewith are six copies of the special July 4 issue of *America Today*. The contents are as follows:

Cover: George Washington.

Inside front cover: Declaration of Independence.

1. The Bill of Rights: Locally produced illustrations on the meaning of the Bill of Rights.

2. Speech by Patrick Henry: The famous "Give me liberty or give me death" speech of Patrick Henry.

3. The Liberty Bell: A picture and a commentary on the Liberty Bell.

4. Executive order by President Truman: An order by President Truman establishing a commission for the commemoration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. One picture.

5. Picture of Alexander Hamilton.

6. Abraham Lincoln: Locally produced illustration of Lincoln's visit to the Civil War front.

7. Lincoln documents: The Emancipation Proclamation and a letter to Mrs. Bixby, the latter a bilingual.

8. Tom Paine: A quotation from *Common Sense*, and a locally produced sketch of Tom Paine. The quotation is bilingual.

9. America and Modern World Revolution: A locally produced article on the permanent aspects of the American Revolution.

10. Jefferson's inaugural speech.

11. Picture of Jefferson.

12. Picture of John Adams.

13. Speeches by Woodrow Wilson: Excerpts from two speeches—his war message to Congress and his final address as President.

14. American inventions: Locally produced illustrations showing how the United States has contributed to scientific progress.

15. Completion of the transcontinental railway: Locally produced illustration showing the final linking of the Nation by rail.

16. The Fourth of July: An article by Ralph Bunche on the meaning of the American Revolution.

17. Betsy Ross and the American Flag: Picture and locally produced item on the making of the American flag.

18. Benjamin Franklin as an inventor: Picture and locally produced item on the scientific contributions of Ben Franklin.

19. Picture of James Madison.

20. Address by Franklin D. Roosevelt: A speech made by President Roosevelt on Armistice Day 1940. One picture.

21. Picture of the Statue of Liberty.

22. The Alamo: Article on the heroic stand of the defenders of the Alamo.

23. The Star-Spangled Banner: Illustrations locally produced.

24. Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.

Back cover: The Lincoln Memorial.

Distribution is as follows: Hong Kong, 27,100; Manila, 10,000; Taipei, 15,000; Singapore, 3,800; Kuala Lumpur, 3,000; Djakarta, 2,000; Surabaya, 2,000; Medan, 2,000; Saigon, 5,000; Bangkok, 5,000; Rangoon, 4,500; Hanoi, 3,600; Pusan, 8,500; Tokyo, 8,500.

Citizen Gossett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

MR. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I have known Ed Gossett and his family since I have been in Washington and have found Ed Gossett to be a true friend and a highly capable Congressman. A simple statement which appeared in Lynn Landrum's column in the *Dallas Morning News* effectively sums up my sentiments and the sentiments of many of Ed Gossett's colleagues. We all wish

well for Ed in his new undertaking and know that his place here in Congress will not be easily filled.

The statement follows:

THINKING OUT LOUD
(By Lynn Landrum)

CITIZEN GOSSETT

Texas loses and Dallas gains today. Ed Gossett is leaving Congress as the Representative of the Thirteenth Texas Congressional District to practice law in Dallas.

It is unfortunate that the expenses of being a Congressman exceed the income of that position. The demands of the job are so great that a Member of Congress has to neglect either his sworn duty or his family's interests—unless he has an independent source of support for his old age.

Mr. Gossett leaves public service at a critical hour. His resignation will be a loss, no matter who succeeds him in his district. This will be true because he has made so many friends on both sides of the partisan line in the House that his influence runs far beyond the seniority privileges which normally come to a man with 12½ years of service.

These friendships have been made by a frank and obliging personality; it is true; but they have been cemented by a firm and independent loyalty to inward convictions. Gossett has been a fighter—with a smile.

The Fight for Tax Equalization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SIDNEY A. FINE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, on June 20, during the debate on the closed rule under which the tax bill was to be considered in the Committee of the Whole, I urged the Ways and Means Committee to amend the tax bill to provide the same tax exemption for governmental pensioners now provided for social-security pensioners and railroad pensioners. I suggested a separate vote on the question by the Members of the House for an immediate determination of whether or not retired public employees are to be treated differently taxwise. My remarks appear on page 6835 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 20.

Although the Ways and Means Committee did not respond favorably to my proposal, I was furnished with an unofficial compilation of the reasons advanced against exempting pensions, annuities, and retirement pay. These reasons have now been fully analyzed and answered by Ralph L. Van Name, secretary of the New York City retirement system, one of the country's experts in the field of pension and retirement administration.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith my correspondence with Mr. Van Name, which includes the arguments pro and con on the question of equalization of tax exemption. I do so for the express purpose of making available to the members of the Senate Finance Committee, now considering the tax bill, as well as all Members of the

Senate, all facets of the problem to the end that the long fight waged by Congressman KROGH, myself, Mr. Van Name, and the many civil-service and public employee organizations listed in my statement of June 20, may be won.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 22, 1951.

Mr. RALPH L. VAN NAME,
City of New York Board of Estimate,
New York City Employees Retirement System, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. VAN NAME: You have received by this time a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 20 containing my statement on the equalization of tax exemption to governmental pensioners. I am enclosing a copy of a memorandum which has been prepared at my request embodying the arguments utilized by those who voted against Congressman KROGH's proposal in the committee. This is merely a compilation of the argument advanced.

Since we have met with unsurmountable difficulty in the House by reason of the closed-rule procedure I have this day written to both Senator LEHMAN and Senator IVES, enclosing both my statement as well as copy of the enclosed memorandum. It was my request of each of them that they see their way clear to do what they can with the Finance Committee of the Senate. I think it would be well for you to prepare and submit to them a reply to said memorandum so that they may have before them all of the pros and cons on the subject. Please be good enough to forward a like copy to me.

I think you should know that it would have been most difficult in the light of the procedure laid down by the Rules Committee to have obtained a clear and decisive vote on the specific question. All negative votes on either the rule or the tax bill would not indicate a positive vote in favor of your proposal. There would have been no guaranty that if the bill were referred back to the committee and reconsidered that Congressman KROGH's proposal would have then been favorably received.

Under the circumstances I think you should direct your attention now to the action to be taken in the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

SIDNEY A. FINE,
Member of Congress

JUNE 22, 1951.

MEMORANDUM

Subject: Reasons against exempting pensions, annuities, and retirement pay by a specified amount such as \$1,400 for retired public and private employees.

An exemption of the retirement pay of retired persons in a flat amount would be discriminatory against those persons who have retired on income from their savings. Such an exemption would also be discriminatory against wage earners who could rightly contend that their ability to pay income tax on a given amount of income is no greater than that of a retired person receiving the same income. As a matter of fact, their ability to pay tax might be less than that of a retired person since a retired person has an assured income and is thus in a better position to reduce living costs by residing in a less expensive community which, as is well known, they often do. Also, retired persons are generally relieved of personal expenses normally incident to earning a living.

A more equitable and nondiscriminatory method of relief is that which is granted by exemptions and credits since it applies to earned income as well as to annuities and retirement income. Present law already takes care of retired persons by providing persons who are age 65 or over with an addi-

tional exemption of \$600 a year. This additional exemption for aged persons means that a man and his wife who are over age 65 may now receive an adjusted gross income up to \$2,675 without paying an income tax. Each of them receives a personal exemption of \$600 and also the additional exemption of \$600. This adds up to \$2,400. When the 10-percent standard deduction is taken into account this amounts to giving such married couples an exemption of \$2,675.

The argument is often made that at the present time, a discrimination exists because railroad retirement benefits are exempt from tax by law and social-security benefits are exempt by Treasury regulations. When this is analyzed, it can be seen that discrimination does not exist to the extent often claimed since for the month of April 1951, the average railroad retirement annuity was \$82.65. This amounts to a yearly annuity of \$991.80. In the case of social-security benefits the average benefit is now \$43 a month or \$516 a year. The additional exemption of \$600 which is granted to persons age 65 or over amounts to a total exemption of \$1,333 a year when the standard deduction is taken into account. This means that in the average case persons drawing railroad retirement and social-security benefits are not benefited by an exemption of these benefits from tax since all aged persons are exempted up to \$1,333 per year.

CITY OF NEW YORK
BOARD OF ESTIMATE, NEW YORK CITY
EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM,
New York, N. Y., August 7, 1951.
Hon. SIDNEY A. FINE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FINE: In your recent letter you were good enough to send me a summation of the arguments which are said to move Members of Congress against extending to pensioners from 6,000,000 governmental positions—Federal, State, city, court, and teaching—the exemption up to \$1,800 extended by Federal law and Internal Revenue ruling to 45,000,000 employees covered by social security as they retire.

I enclose herewith memorandum replying to arguments opposing greater income-tax exemption for pensioners.

Governmental pensioners seek no exemption which Government does not see fit to extend to industrial pensioners. Less than that, governmental pensioners will not willingly accept.

Very truly yours,

RALPH L. VAN NAME,
Secretary.

MEMORANDUM REPLYING TO ARGUMENTS OPPOSING GREATER INCOME TAX EXEMPTION FOR PENSIONERS

Argument 1: Discrimination against persons who live on their own savings would be shown by exempting pensioners and not individuals.

Answer 1: The discrimination is not theoretical; the discrimination is now practiced wholesale by the United States Government. The Federal Government now exempts up to \$1,800 social-security income of 45,000,000 of the low-paid and high-paid in industry, a majority of the country's workers, as they attain age 65, whether their other income is \$5 or \$50,000. The Federal Government also discriminates to exempt the pension of millions of military personnel, railroad workers, printers, and so forth, to a greater or lesser degree, while the few self-supporting aged individuals and 6,000,000 governmental employees, as they retire, are income taxed.

The practice is no longer based on size or need, since the new social-security untaxed pensions will average as high as taxed governmental pensions, Federal, State, city, court, and teaching.

As to total, report of the Senate Committee on Finance accompanying submission of the present new social-security law, indicates the prospect of addition of another tax-exempt \$1,000,000,000 a year to the social-security rolls in the next year or two.

Many high-bracket taxpayers are being professionally advised to pay their \$54 a year (1½ percent of \$3,600) not only because of the possible \$1,800 social-security pension itself, but for the \$1,800 tax exemption which is worth an additional \$1,800 a year to a taxpayer in the 50-percent bracket.

Only fear of loss of present right to retire before age 65 with taxpayer assistance prevents huge groups of local governmental employees in many States from electing entrance upon tax-exempt social security at \$54 a year or less. Meanwhile, the Federal Government taxes not only the below-age-65 pensions of governmental pensioners, but the over-65 pensions comparable in amount and average to social-security pensions to be granted under the recently adopted social security tax-exempt scale.

No sound reason can be given for exempting from income tax social-security pensions of the high-paid and low-paid, while taxing governmental pensions, Federal, State, city, court, and teaching, up to \$400 as proposed in the tax bill now under consideration in the Senate Committee on Finance.

Argument 2 Young wage earners are entitled to exemption equal to that granted to the aged retired.

Answer 2: The Federal Government conspicuously neglects that precept. It assists States in granting relief up to \$900 a person out of taxes paid by the young. It exempts up to \$1,800 pension payable to most pensioners (Federal, State, and city pensioners excepted), then it limits millions of single, young wage earners to less than \$700 exemption.

(a) Their income may be less certain.

Answer (a): Wage earners are not taxed on the wages they may earn; only on wages actually received. They meet inflation with increased wages.

Governmental pensioners on fixed income and increasing income taxation have no recourse but again and again to reduce their standard of living as Government, again and again, taxes and taxes, spends and spends.

In millions of cases, measured by reasonable and widely accepted standards, Government is now forcing these fixed-income, taxable governmental pensioners beneath the subsistence level. With its own retired civil-service workers, for example, it goes through the business of increasing somewhat their inadequate pensions, on the one hand and, on the other, taxing at 20 percent pensions in the \$700 to \$1,800 range from which nongovernmental social-security pensioners—the retired from 45,000,000 in industry—would be totally exempt.

The \$700 to \$1,800 wage earner may look for increased income as inflation proceeds; the \$700 to \$1,800 taxed governmental pensioner not only does not rise with inflation, it is further reduced by increased taxation as well as by decreasing purchasing power.

(b) They may have to live in more costly neighborhoods.

(c) They may have greater day-to-day expense.

Answer (b-c): The heavy sickness and disability special requirements of the aged so far exceed those of young and vigorous workers that Government and private groups vie to provide partial assistance for the peak need.

Congress, in 1950, lifted social security from the pauper assistance stage for far fewer to the \$1,800 maximum self-help basis for industrial workers, 45,000,000 of them. Congress rightly regards aged income in the lowest \$1,800 area as appropriate for exemption regardless of exact lesser exemption limits of young workers.

Notwithstanding tax-free assistance up to \$900 regardless of age and tax-free social-security pension up to \$1,800, Congress has continued to tax aged governmental pensioners in the lowest \$1,800 area. Much of the cheerfulness with which industry's workers, 45,000,000 of them, pay their annual social-security contribution \$54 or less springs from the knowledge that not only pension income to \$1,800 but tax exemption to \$400 and more is being purchased.

Actually, young wage earners need not be exempted in the same degree that the pensioned aged should be exempted, because, generally, they like the practice of paying during their productive years for prospective tax-free existence on a lower (usually half-pay) standard of living in old age.

Unfinished business dictates that the remainder of the aged, those retired and retiring from 6,000,000 governmental positions be given tax privileges identical with the majority of the other aged.

Argument 3: Married persons over 65 are said to have \$2,675 tax exemption—four \$600's adjusted upward on the return to \$2,675.

Answer 3: 45,000,000 industrial employees, as they attain age 65, may have up to \$4,475 exemption—\$2,675 as above, plus up to \$1,800 tax-free social-security pension. Governmental pensioners receiving \$1,800 Governmental pension, would have \$1,800 less exemption Congress may properly determine the tax exemption ceiling. It is inexcusable that, year after year, Congress compels its own employees and the employees of local government to pay up to \$400 more income tax than the pensioners of private industry.

Example: A married 65-year-old bus driver on the privately owned Third Avenue Railroad in New York retires on \$1,800 social-security pension with \$2,675 other income, all totally exempt from income tax. A married 65-year-old bus driver on the parallel municipal bus route in New York retires on \$1,800 municipal pension with \$2,675 other income. The latter will pay, depending on exactly the new scale of taxation, \$350 to \$400 income tax from which his privately employed fellow-union member is tax free. Thanks to Federal discrimination, one takes home \$1,800 pension; the other, \$1,400.

That \$400 governmental tax discrimination on \$1,800 pension income of two men of identical title and wage in the same union, is a matter of serious economic and political importance to more than 30,000 members of the Transport Workers Union and to the over-all CIO organization.

If Federal discrimination of this sort is not ended, pivotal States and districts will be won and lost in protest against congressional neglect, year after year, to equalize pension-income taxation.

Argument 4: It has been argued that since social security, until recently, averaged only about \$516 a year and railroad pensions less than \$1,000, whereas all over 65 are exempt to \$1,333 and married couples to twice that sum, the average social-security and railroad pensioners are not benefited by their additional special exemptions, running up to \$1,440 and \$1,800.

Answer 4: Averages are what they are because of the lesser and greater than average figures commingled to make the average. That some railroad and social-security pensioners receive less than \$1,000 and less than \$516 as they do, does not, of itself justify exemption of railroad and social-security pensioners whose pensions of \$1,440, more or less, keep the low average from falling lower.

In the next year or two, with the addition of \$1,000,000,000 a year to the social-security rolls, as expected by Senate and House taxing bodies, the present averages will become inconsequential and obsolete. Congress need not apologize for deliberately passing the present social-security law to

greatly increase the social-security average. Taxation of the \$1,400 pension which combines with the \$400 to make the average, should not stand or fall because of \$400 treatment. Each level should be determined on its merits.

POSITIVE REASONS FOR GREATER TAX EXEMPTION OF AGED GOVERNMENTAL PENSIONERS

Limited exemption from income taxation of the aged governmental pensioners is to be justified for the following reasons:

1. Income taxation of the aged is uneconomic. Never before has income-tax law condoned \$1,800 tax exemption of most pensioners and withheld it from other (governmental) pensioners.

It is as sound economics to untax people during their unproductive years as to tax them during their earlier productive years. Thus is provided fair and equal treatment to each citizen at successive stages of each citizen's life.

2. Anticipatory taxation of the aged before old age is preferable and is preferred by young and old.

3. Government revenues would not suffer by anticipatory taxation (taxation during productive years). The Government itself has argued at times that social-security-tax exemption is inconsequential. Exemption of fewer (one-seventh as many) governmental pensioners would be of less consequence. The small amounts involved have been noted in official reports to the tax-making committees of the Senate and the House.

4. Taxation of long-lived aged pensioners substitutes high income taxation for lesser inheritance taxation. The income of the long-lived aged pensioner is possible through forfeitures of the short-lived which the long-lived inherit. Other heirs share \$60,000 estate exemption; here, too, governmental pensioners are the forgotten "stepchildren."

5. Pensioners commonly retire on about half pay, that is, pensioners are commonly persons who have been accustomed to a standard of living double that possible for the remainder of life. Considerations of decency should prompt lighter taxation for their few remaining years.

6. If it is social security for private industry, Congress makes \$1,440 tax-free available after as little as 1½ years and after contribution by the worker of as little as \$81.

If it is governmental pension, Congress taxes \$1,440 pension income, \$288 annually, more or less, after a lifetime of service. Why?

7. Tax exemption of social-security pensioners was begun when the pension was small and the recipient poor. Under 1950 social-security law, taxpayers in the 50-percent bracket have the equivalent of \$3,600 additional other income, since they would pay \$1,800 tax were it not social security.

With this Government bounty to the rich, there is no sound basis for withholding tax exemption in the \$1,800 area to underpaid, underpensioned Government workers one-seventh as numerous, and with one-seventh the income of 45,000,000 industrials.

8. In both Government and industry, employer contributions for employee pensions are generally tax-exempt on the way in. In industry they are also exempt on the way out via social security. Government employer money, on the other hand, is not exempt on the way out to the pensioner. It is taxed at 20 percent, more or less, compared to industry's zero. Why?

The overtaxation of governmental pension cuts two ways. It reduces the governmental pensioner's take-home pay and his standard of living. It compels taxpayers to raise additional millions of tax money to be siphoned from the local treasury to the Federal Treasury via governmental pensioner taxation—money that would not reach the Federal Treasury from private industry. Why the discrimination? Why?

9. Congress does not seek a profit from social-security operation. It would be

pleased if the Government were to break even.

Besides huge sums for the needy poor, New York City raises \$100,000,000 a year for staff pensioners—persons retiring from its employ. New York City's staff-pension appropriation must be as large as \$100,000,000 annually because the Federal Government, which seeks no profit from industry's contribution for pensions, collects an income tax, beginning at 20 percent, from those whose pension income is derived from New York City taxpayers' local tax payment.

What have the States and cities done that their taxpayers and their employees retired should be worse treated taxwise than industry and industry's 45,000,000? Local taxpayers and State and city pensioners are also people—and voters.

10. Finally, unquestionably, present congressional treatment of the governmental pensioner is unplanned, inadvertent, accidental. Present congressional treatment cannot be condoned or justified. Congress need not apologize for or explain its past neglect. It must begin now equal tax treatment of industry's pensioners and Government's pensioners.

Income of Aged Persons, 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the deplorable fact that many of the aged citizens of our country are bypassed and are left without sufficient income to meet the bare necessities of life is shown by a late report entitled "Income of Aged Persons, 1948" by Jacob Fisher, of the Division of Research and Statistics in the Office of the Commissioner of Social Security, which appears in the July issue of Social Security Bulletin.

I call attention particularly to the following statement in Mr. Fisher's report:

The Bureau of the Census estimates that, among the 11,000,000 aged 65 years and over in 1948, about 3,500,000 had no money income (as defined) that year and that, of the 7,500,000 with money income, about 2,300,000 had incomes of less than \$500 and about the same number fell in the class \$500 to \$1,000. There were about 1,400,000 persons in the class \$1,000 to \$2,000, about half that number with incomes from \$2,000 to \$3,000, and close to half a million in the class \$3,000 to \$5,000. Perhaps 170,000 had incomes between \$5,000 and \$10,000, and a possible 60,000 had incomes of \$10,000 or more.

The full report is as follows:

INCOME OF AGED PERSONS, 1948 (By Jacob Fisher)

Data from the income-tax returns for 1948, recently furnished the Social Security Administration by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, fill an important gap in available information on the income of aged persons in that year. Under the Revenue Act of 1948, special exemptions of \$600 for age or blindness may be claimed by the taxpayer for himself or for a dependent spouse. The number of returns with special exemptions, arrayed by size of income, are of particular interest because of the clues they offer to the number of aged persons with incomes in the middle- and upper-income brackets. For

reasons noted below, the tax returns are not a reliable guide to the number of aged in the lower-income groups and tell us nothing about the total number of income recipients among the aged.

The major source of information on the income of the aged in 1948 remains the Bureau of the Census survey of April 1949.¹ The results of this survey, based on interviews conducted in a representative sample of approximately 25,000 households, are summarized in table 1. The income being discussed, incidentally, is money income only. In the census estimates, the income excludes not only income in kind (value of farm produce consumed by the family, contributions received in the form of food, clothing, and the like, and free shelter), but money receipts as well from the following sources: withdrawals from bank deposits, loans, tax refunds, gifts, lump-sum inheritances or insurance payments, and income derived from the sale of assets.

The Bureau of the Census estimates that, among the 11,000,000 persons aged 65 years and over in 1948, about 3,500,000 had no money income (as defined) that year and that, of the 7,500,000 with money income about 2,300,000 had incomes of less than \$500 and about the same number fell in the class \$500 to \$1,000. There were about 1,400,000 persons in the class \$1,000 to \$2,000, about half that number with incomes from \$2,000 to \$3,000, and close to half a million in the class \$3,000 to \$5,000. Perhaps 170,000 had incomes between \$5,000 and \$10,000, and a possible 60,000 had incomes of \$10,000 or more (table 1).

How does an income distribution based on the tax returns with a special exemption compare with the distribution developed by the Bureau of the Census? Before an answer is attempted, the limitations of the income-tax return as a source of information on the income of the aged should be looked at.

To begin with, not all income is reported to the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Fewer than half the income recipients among the aged in 1948 filed income-tax returns for that year, to judge from the fact that special exemptions for age or blindness were claimed in about 3,400,000 returns only (table 2). The half or more of the aged income recipients who did not file an income-tax return were all or nearly all in the low-income brackets. They included persons all or most of whose income was derived from the following tax-exempt sources, which bulk large in the income pattern of the aged:

(1) Gross income from taxable sources (earnings, dividends, interest, rents, etc.) of less than \$600; (2) old-age assistance and other forms of public assistance; (3) benefit payments under old-age and survivors insurance, the railroad retirement program, and the program for veterans; (4) annuities and pensions (for that portion representing a return of premiums paid in by the taxpayer); and (5) gifts, bequests, inheritances, and contributions by relatives.

Income derived from these sources is not only exempt from income tax but, except for wage and salary income in item 1, is not reported as income, and hence is not reflected in table 2, among whose 52,000,000 returns are some 16,000,000 with reportable but not taxable income.

A second possible limitation relates to the fact that the special exemption may be

¹ Bureau of the Census, *Income of Families and Persons in the United States, 1948* (Current Population Reports, Consumer Income, series P-60, No. 6). Additional data from the same survey may be found in the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, *Low-Income Families and Economic Stability* (81st Cong., 1st sess.), 1949. Similar estimates for 1949 appear in the Bureau of the Census report, series P-60, No. 7.

claimed for either age or blindness.² The income-tax form contains separate entries for exemptions for age and for blindness, but information is not available on the number falling into each of these groups. The limitation is not serious, however. On the basis of earlier experience with the special deduction of \$500 for blindness of the taxpayer, available in 1947 and earlier years, the Bureau of Internal Revenue is inclined to believe that the number of exemptions for blindness included in the total number of special exemptions is not large. Persons 65 years of age and over outnumber the blind of all ages about 40 to 1. It would be reasonable to assume that not more than 2 or 3 percent of the special exemptions were for blindness, although the proportion may have been higher in some income classes.

TABLE 1.—Persons aged 20 and over and persons aged 65 and over, by money income, 1948

[In thousands]

Money income	Number of persons aged 20 and over	Persons aged 65 and over	
		Number	As percent of persons aged 20 and over
Total number in population ¹	95,910	10,980	11.4
Number of persons without income	30,570	3,190	11.4
Number of persons with income	65,340	7,490	11.5
Less:—			
\$1 to \$499	8,550	2,320	27.1
\$500 to \$999	8,530	2,260	26.5
\$1,000 to \$1,499	7,450	960	12.5
\$1,500 to \$1,999	7,170	510	7.1
\$2,000 to \$2,499	8,730	400	5.3
\$2,500 to \$2,999	6,590	280	4.2
\$3,000 to \$3,999	9,990	350	3.5
\$4,000 to \$4,999	3,950	130	3.3
\$5,000 to \$5,999	1,780	80	4.5
\$6,000 to \$9,999	1,510	90	5.8
\$10,000 and over	800	60	7.5

¹ Represents estimated civilian noninstitutional population of the United States in April 1949 and includes approximately 393,000 members of the Armed Forces living off post or with families on post.

Source: Estimated from Bureau of the Census, "Income of Families and Persons in the United States, 1948" (Current Population Reports, Consumer Income, Series P-60, No. 6), table 12.

A third possible limitation concerns the inclusion of joint returns of husband and wife in the count of both the total number of returns and returns with special exemptions. Of the gross total of 52,000,000 returns, 29,700,000, or 57 percent, were joint

² Two exemptions may be claimed by an individual who is both aged and blind. Some idea of the number of such individuals may be obtained by comparing the total number of extra exemptions with the number of extra exemptions in the joint returns of husband and wife. The difference in table 2 between the number of returns with special exemptions and the number of such exemptions is 907,375. This is presumably the number of returns with two exemptions. (Four exemptions could be claimed on one return filed by an aged and blind person who has an aged and blind spouse, but the number of such cases is probably quite small.) The extra exemptions in the 1,988-, 208 joint returns of husband and wife with special exemptions (table 3) numbered 897,842, nearly all of which may be presumed to represent special exemptions for an aged or blind spouse. The difference between 907,375 and 897,842—about 10,000—may be taken as a rough indication of the number of individuals claiming exemptions for both age and blindness.

returns. Joint returns with special exemptions numbered 1,988,208, or 58 percent, of all returns with special exemptions (table 3). The close correspondence in these two proportions suggests that the presence of joint returns in the data introduces no special problem affecting the over-all proportion of returns filed by aged persons.

Most joint returns represent one income split between husband and wife for tax purposes; about 1 in 4, however, to judge by data from the returns for 1943 and 1944 (similar data are not available for later years), cover the incomes of two income recipients. The relevant consideration is the extent to which the individual incomes in the returns with two incomes, when distributed within the appropriate income classes, would affect the number and proportion of returns with special exemptions—those filed by aged persons—in each income class. It would be reasonable to assume that the effect in general would be to redistribute in lower income classes the individual incomes now merged with those of the spouse and scattered all over the income scale but relatively more frequent in the middle- and upper-income brackets. If the 1-in-4 ratio for double incomes in joint returns can be assumed for joint returns with special exemptions in 1948, then it is likely that there were about 3,900,000 aged income recipients represented in the tax returns rather than 3,400,000; and that the 1,000,000 income recipients in the 500,000 returns with two incomes were located at lower levels on the income ladder than the places the 500,000 individuals now occupy in tables 2 and 3 by virtue of the additional income of the spouse. In sum, the presence of joint returns in the income-tax data probably results in some overstatement of the income of the aged, but how many are affected and by how much their income is overstated is not known.

TABLE 2.—Federal income-tax returns by individuals, taxable and nontaxable, by adjusted gross income classes and by number of special exemptions for age or blindness, 1948

Adjusted gross income	Number of returns	Returns with special exemptions for age or blindness		Number of special exemptions claimed for age or blindness
		Number	Percent of all returns	
Total.....	52,072,006	3,388,154	6.5	4,295,529
No adjusted gross income.....	326,309	38,599	11.8	48,435
Under \$500.....	3,299,919	178,514	5.4	212,106
\$500 to \$999.....	4,471,102	468,122	10.5	562,275
\$1,000 to \$1,499.....	5,178,887	523,484	10.1	646,210
\$1,500 to \$1,999.....	5,966,397	462,513	7.8	586,014
\$2,000 to \$2,499.....	6,296,154	404,395	6.4	525,942
\$2,500 to \$2,999.....	6,163,256	311,233	5.0	409,843
\$3,000 to \$3,999.....	9,356,741	406,789	4.3	527,126
\$4,000 to \$4,999.....	5,094,747	197,660	3.9	507,081
\$5,000 to \$5,999.....	2,310,295	101,125	4.4	130,909
\$6,000 to \$6,999.....	1,162,828	63,973	5.5	82,800
\$7,000 to \$7,999.....	590,026	38,406	6.5	50,140
\$8,000 to \$8,999.....	354,540	27,686	7.8	36,338
\$9,000 to \$9,999.....	248,517	21,049	8.5	27,762
\$10,000 to \$14,999.....	958,204	104,076	10.9	138,250
\$15,000 to \$19,999.....	185,076	26,640	14.4	35,620
\$20,000 to \$99,999.....	52,725	9,588	18.2	12,928
\$100,000 to \$499,999.....	15,716	4,002	25.5	5,420
\$500,000 or more.....	504	210	37.2	260

¹ Includes joint returns of husband and wife.

Source: Preliminary data, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Statistics of Income for 1948.

Of the three limitations, the first, relating to the nonpresence in the income-tax returns of several million aged persons with low incomes, is the most consequential. Useful

comparisons between census estimates and estimates based on Bureau of Internal Revenue data on the number of aged in specified income classes can be made only for incomes large enough to be reflected in the tax returns. Ordinarily the minimum income for this purpose would be \$600, but because a considerable number of aged persons in the income group \$600 to \$1,000 have income from tax-exempt sources, enumerated earlier, it is advisable perhaps not to compare the estimates for incomes of less than \$1,000. Even in the \$1,000 to \$2,000 class, enough exempt income is probably received to make the tax returns an unreliable indicator of the incomes of aged persons in this bracket.

The data in tables 1 and 2 indicate that in the income classes between \$1,000 and \$2,500, the Bureau of the Census estimate is consistently larger than an estimate derived from income-tax returns, the difference narrowing as \$2,500 is approached. Beyond this figure the income-tax source yields the larger estimate, the spread between the two estimates increasing with size of income. In the class \$10,000 and more, the estimate to be derived from the tax returns is more than twice as high as the census estimate.

How are these differences to be interpreted? Bureau of the Census estimates are based essentially upon the memory of the person interviewed. There is some evidence that persons reporting their income to an interviewer tend to understate income. Occasional earnings, gifts, small dividends, and public assistance payments received for a brief period are likely to be forgotten a year later. The household member usually interviewed, furthermore, is the housewife, who may confuse take-home pay with total earnings and who sometimes may not be aware of the full amount of her husband's earnings or of other sources of income of which he may be the recipient.

It would be reasonable to conclude that many of the persons in the census estimate

shown in table 1 belong in a higher-income bracket than the one in which they have been placed as a result of the survey. A redistribution of the individuals involved, on the basis of more complete information, could conceivably yield larger totals in all the classes beginning with \$1,000 with perhaps no reduction in the size of the group with incomes less than \$1,000, since some of the persons classified by the Bureau of the Census as not in receipt of any money income in 1948 probably had some income in that year, as will be noted later, and belong in the \$1 to \$499 group.

Still another problem is presented by the fact that the census income distributions are based on a sample of the population and not on a complete census. No matter how carefully a sample is selected, inflation of the results to yield estimates for the total population inevitably entails some degree of error. The sampling error is particularly large where small numbers are involved. One reason for the increasing disparity at the upper end of the income distribution between census estimates and income-tax returns is the growth in sampling variability as the number of persons affected declines.

Considerations of a different character are involved in the income-tax data. Aged persons reporting incomes of less than \$1,000 to the Bureau of Internal Revenue represent only a small part of the total number in this class, for reasons cited earlier; the same thing, to a somewhat lesser extent, is true of the group with incomes between \$1,000 and \$2,000. Since the exempt-income sources need not be reported, many individuals are lower in the income scale shown in table 2 than they would be if all income were reportable. As in the case of the census estimates, therefore, adjustment of the data to reflect income distribution more accurately would necessitate an upward redistribution of the individuals affected. The upward adjustment is appropriate, however, for the lower end of the income scale only.

TABLE 3.—Federal income-tax returns by individuals, taxable and nontaxable, by adjusted gross income classes, joint returns of husband and wife, and number with special exemptions for age or blindness, 1948

Adjusted gross income	All returns			Returns with special exemptions for age or blindness		
	Total	Joint returns of husband and wife		Total	Joint returns of husband and wife	
		Number	As percent of total		Number	As percent of total
Total.....	52,072,006	29,695,806	57.0	3,388,154	1,968,208	58.1
No adjusted gross income.....	326,309	210,961	64.7	38,599	18,647	48.3
Under \$500.....	3,299,919	396,624	12.0	178,514	62,470	35.0
\$500 to \$999.....	4,471,102	1,061,539	23.7	468,122	173,425	37.0
\$1,000 to \$1,499.....	5,178,887	1,906,277	36.8	523,484	246,311	47.1
\$1,500 to \$1,999.....	5,966,397	2,588,124	43.4	462,513	272,959	59.0
\$2,000 to \$2,499.....	6,296,154	3,197,176	50.8	404,395	266,801	66.0
\$2,500 to \$2,999.....	6,163,256	3,753,312	60.9	311,233	213,948	68.7
\$3,000 to \$3,999.....	9,396,744	7,067,034	75.2	406,789	300,591	73.9
\$4,000 to \$4,999.....	5,094,747	4,313,046	84.7	197,660	144,599	73.2
\$5,000 to \$5,999.....	2,310,295	2,068,472	89.5	101,125	72,814	72.0
\$6,000 to \$6,999.....	1,162,828	1,042,331	89.6	63,973	42,423	66.3
\$7,000 to \$7,999.....	590,026	522,916	88.6	38,406	25,924	67.5
\$8,000 to \$8,999.....	354,540	309,592	87.3	27,686	18,424	66.5
\$9,000 to \$9,999.....	248,517	215,409	86.7	21,049	13,913	66.1
\$10,000 to \$14,999.....	958,204	825,595	86.2	104,076	67,881	65.2
\$15,000 to \$19,999.....	185,076	159,225	86.0	26,640	17,706	66.5
\$20,000 to \$99,999.....	52,725	44,920	85.2	9,588	6,506	67.9
\$100,000 to \$499,999.....	15,716	12,898	82.1	4,002	2,747	68.6
\$500,000 or more.....	504	355	62.9	210	116	55.2

Source: Preliminary data, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Statistics of Income for 1948.

At the \$2,750 level the number of joint returns of husband and wife (among the group with special exemptions for age or blindness) becomes larger than the number of one-person returns, a situation which calls for a downward adjustment to take account of the double incomes in some of the joint returns. The two adjustments may

cancel each other out in the \$2,500 to \$3,500 class, but beyond this interval the net effect of the adjustments is probably in the direction of a lower income classification for the individuals concerned.

If the modifications that seem indicated in the census estimates and the income-tax data are given effect, a rough picture of the

income distribution of aged persons would look somewhat as follows:

Among the 11,000,000 persons aged 65 years and over in 1948, about 3,000,000* had no money income, about 2,500,000 had money income of less than \$500, and about 2,300,000 had money income between \$500 and \$1,000. Income recipients in the class \$1,000 to \$2,000 numbered perhaps 1,600,000. About three-quarters of a million were in the income class \$2,000 to \$3,000; about half a million in the income class \$3,000 to \$5,000; about two hundred thousand in the class \$5,000 to \$10,000; and about one hundred thousand had incomes of \$10,000 or more.

Examination of the relative frequency of aged persons in the different income classes indicates that there were somewhat more aged persons in the low-income groups than would be expected from their proportion in the population or among income recipients, and that they constituted a smaller-than-proportionate share of the persons in the middle-income groups. These findings correspond with our general impressions concerning the place of the aged in the country's income structure. What is not generally known, however, is the relatively large place that they occupy in the high-income group.

In 1948 approximately 1 income recipient in 10 was 65 years of age or over. Among persons with incomes of less than \$1,000, however, about 1 in 4 was aged. The ratio dropped to 3 or 4 per 100 in the income classes from \$3,000 to \$4,000 and then rose again. At the \$10,000 level, perhaps 10 in every 100 income receivers were 65 years of age or over; at the \$50,000 level, perhaps 16 in every 100, at the \$100,000 level, perhaps 23 in every 100. Though the high-income aged persons were few in absolute numbers, they comprised an increasing proportion of the total group of recipients in the higher-income brackets.

Census data on living arrangements and studies made by the Social Security Administration of the circumstances of old-age and survivors insurance beneficiaries and old-age assistance recipients provide a basis for some observations concerning the major

sources of income in the different income classes.⁴

The 3,000,000 in the no-income group included some persons living on withdrawals from savings and sale of assets. More than 9 in 10 were living with related persons and presumably were being supported by them in whole or part. More than 8 in 10 were women, almost half of whom were living with a husband who was probably an income recipient.

Almost half the 2,500,000 persons with money incomes less than \$500 were old-age assistance recipients; about one-quarter were old-age and survivors insurance beneficiaries. Probably fewer than 10 percent had any income from employment. More than three-fourths were living with related persons and may have been supported in part by them.

Old-age assistance recipients and old-age and survivors insurance beneficiaries comprised the bulk also of the 2,300,000 persons in the income class \$500 to \$1,000. More than 6 in 10 may have been supported in part by the relatives with whom they were living.

Earners probably outnumbered assistance recipients and old-age and survivors insurance beneficiaries among the 1,600,000 persons with incomes between \$1,000 and \$2,000. There were more beneficiaries of social insurance and related programs than there were assistance recipients, the reverse of the situation in the income classes below \$1,000. The number living with relatives was proportionately larger than among persons in the \$500 to \$1,000 class, but probably more of such related persons were dependents rather than sources of support.

At income levels above \$2,000 the relative number of persons with income from employment increased. There was a sharp decline in the number of old-age and survivors insurance beneficiaries, and there were no public-assistance recipients.

The pattern that may be traced shows, in brief, a shift from complete or almost complete dependence on relatives in the no-income group to support of relatives as income rises; considerable dependence on public-assistance income in the very low income brackets and some dependence on this source in the moderately low brackets. Social-insurance-benefit income bulks large in the moderately low income group and becomes less prominent as one leaves the low-income group. At the \$1,000 to \$2,000 level earnings from employment tend to replace relatives, public-assistance, and social-insurance benefits as a major income source. Considerably further up the income scale—at the \$100,000 level, to judge from the income-tax returns, for persons of all ages, but probably at a lower level for aged persons—income from accumulated assets (dividends, interest, and so on) becomes more important than earnings.

Additional information on the relative importance of these sources of income at various income levels may be available shortly as a result of special tabulations planned by the Social Security Administration from schedules taken by the Bureau of the Census in the course of its postenumeration survey.

⁴The estimates are based in part on estimates of the incomes of aged old-age and survivors insurance beneficiaries and of old-age assistance recipients, prepared by the Social Security Administration for the House-Senate Joint Committee on the Economic Report and published in the committee's report on low-income families (pp. 11, 12).

What Is the United Nations?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following article which appeared in the August 1 issue of the *Christian Century*:

WHAT IS THE U N ?

As negotiations in Korea drag along toward a cease fire, debate has already started over who won. Partisan politics being what it is, this debate can be expected to continue, and perhaps intensely, up to the day of next year's Presidential election. The Truman administration naturally is claiming a victory. We fought, say its spokesmen, only to stop the Communist aggression and to prove that such aggression does not pay. Haven't we done this? This claim conveniently forgets the U N resolution of last October 7, which called for creation of a united and democratic Korea—a directive which, under the circumstances, could only mean winning a military victory up to the Yalu.

While the Truman administration is claiming victory, the Republican opposition just as vigorously will be claiming surrender. It won't use that word, it will charge that an armistice which leaves the Communists in control of North Korea and unpunished for their attack on the south is appeasement. When the administration calls on its opponents to tell what they would have done rather than accept the truce which now seems available at the thirty-eighth parallel, they will evade that question as far as possible and concentrate on the appeasement accusation.

I

It is not our present purpose to assess these partisan claims. Yet there is one claim now being put forward which seems to us unwarranted and freighted with trouble for the future. This is the claim that Korea has proved that the U N can put military forces into action capable of defeating aggression. With this goes the implication that, in view of the Korean outcome, the U N should—and will—go ahead to build its international police force to a point where it can hold in check or mow down any transgressor.

To us, this seems a dangerous misreading of what has happened in Korea. True, the Communists have been stopped at the thirty-eighth parallel. True, a U N force, in which 16 nations participated (though not all with fighting units), did it. Nevertheless, the whole Korean affair has been surrounded by "buts." But for Russia's absence from the Security Council, no U N resolution calling for military action could have been adopted in the first place. (The Kremlin won't make that mistake again.) But for what seemed the requirements of United States prestige in the Far East, shattered by what had happened in China, there would have been far less pressure for American intervention. Our military leaders were afraid of it; the MacArthur hearings showed that the swift decision to go in came from the State Department and the White House. As Louis Johnson, at that time Secretary of Defense, testified, the Joint Chiefs of Staff just kept still and accepted orders, little as they liked them. But for the reasons which they had for needing to stay on good terms with the United States, it is

* The number of persons in the no-income group in the census estimate is 3,500,000. That the size of this group is overstated becomes evident from an examination of the number of aged persons with income from known sources. According to the Bureau of the Census report, "Work Experience of the Population in 1948" (Current Population Reports, Labor Force, series P-50, No. 15), 3,460,000 persons aged 65 years and over in December 1948 had some paid employment during the year. In the same month, 1,581,000 aged persons were receiving old-age and survivors insurance, 682,000 were on the benefit rolls of other social insurance and related programs, and 2,495,000 were receiving old-age assistance. After allowances are made for an overlap between old-age and survivors insurance and old-age assistance equivalent to 10 percent of the insurance beneficiaries and an overlap between all forms of social insurance and employment equal to 10 percent of the insurance beneficiaries, the total number with income from these sources is 7,800,000, or 300,000 more than the census estimate of aged persons with income. Since several hundred thousand aged persons must have had money income from other sources only (commercial insurance annuities, industrial pensions, dividends, interest, contributions from friends or relatives) the number with no money income could not have been larger than 3,000,000 and was probably below that figure.

doubtful whether even the minority of U. N. members who joined in the Korean police action would have done so.

In pointing out these "but's," we are not aspersing the course followed by the U. N. We are glad there was as much support for this policy as there was; otherwise the U. N. would have disintegrated right there. In view of the record, however, we believe that the "meaning" of the military action in Korea has been simply that nations—inside the U. N. and out; working with the U. N. and against it—when it comes to going to war continue to follow what they consider their immediate interests. That was true for the nations which sent forces to fight for the U. N. It was true on the other side. Russia and China were not moved by U. N. condemnatory resolutions, but when their interests told them to extricate themselves they did so, regardless of where that left the Korean Communists.

In other words, despite all theories of collective security and international action against aggressors, going to war is something which still has to be justified to the people who do the paying, the fighting, and the dying as a sacrifice demanded by national interest. Otherwise, the war sacrifices cannot be maintained. The reason why the United States Government was so ready to respond to Mr. Malik's first hint of the possibility of a cease-fire was that this justification of national necessity for the Korean intervention had begun to lose its power to convince the masses of the American people.

II

Now, if such have been the realities of the military action in Korea, what meaning have they for the future of the United Nations? For one thing, surely the flimsy nature of U. N. military guaranties must be clear. A time may come—we trust it will—when the U. N. will evolve into a world government, and as such will have available a U. N. force capable of policing the world. But when that time comes the policing problem will not be one of coercing or holding in leash the whole of the geopoliticians' vast "Heartland." It will be the relatively simple one of suppressing pirates, contraband runners, and similar minor offenders. At the present stage of history, the concept of a standing U. N. force to control major aggression is an illusion. The provisions for such a force in the U. N. Charter are window dressing and no more.

This was the position taken by the Christian Century when the U. N. was formed at San Francisco. We are more convinced of its correctness today than we were then. Since the Korean outbreak the U. N. has adopted the so-called Acheson amendments. One of these affects to put teeth in the military clauses of the Charter by requiring each member state to tell what forces it will earmark for immediate use at any time by the U. N. The United States itself showed what this particular Acheson provision amounts to by telling the U. N. that it would not earmark any specific forces but might be expected to respond to any future U. N. call on its merits. Other nations, which has fought beside us in Korea, are following the same course.

What is really involved here is the present nature of the U. N. What purpose does it exist to fulfill? Is it an organization to raise and employ military forces on a scale sufficient to be a terror to all evildoers? Or is it something else? On this basic question, we believe that the Quakers who drew up the recent report on foreign policy, Steps to Peace (see Quakers Never Give Up, May 30), were right and that Mr. Acheson's move to transform the U. N. into an armed alliance was wrong. A U. N. attempting to maintain and use an international army in a world divided between great power blocs is a U. N. headed toward disaster.

No U. N. army can cope with major aggression. The terrific time the U. N. has had with the Communist aggression in Korea should be a sufficient warning on that score. At the start, Korea looked like nothing more than a fairly simple police action. What would have happened had China officially come in? The U. N. army would probably have fallen apart. If not, there would certainly have been recriminations between the peoples of the participating nations on a scale to have undercut any campaign against China proper. And if Russia had come in? At that point, of course, any pretense of U. N. police action would have vanished; that would have been world war III—and the disintegration of the U. N.

III

What is the U. N.? At present the U. N.'s role is to provide a meeting place and a forum in which a continuous process of discussion and negotiation can be carried on among the nations as an alternative to war. What the limitations are on what the U. N. can accomplish through the discharge of that role, we do not know. The Quakers (to refer once more to their report) think that the nations in the U. N. have not gone very far yet in developing the possibilities of negotiation, and the remarkable Quaker record in securing a common mind out of all sorts of combative situations makes their judgment regarding this important.

We admit that it is not and will not be easy to get far in the U. N. along the path of discussion and negotiation with the Russians and their Communist satellites. There will be many times when the infuriating tactics to which the Red delegates resort in the Assembly, in the Security Council, in the commissions and committees will tempt our frustrated representatives to feel that if they could only pull a gun on their Communist tormentors, sweet reasonableness would ensue. But for the U. N., pulling a gun is the way to disillusionment and shipwreck.

A cease fire in Korea, if it is attained, will give another chance to recall the U. N. to its true purpose. Those who hope to see the U. N. develop into an effective agency for world understanding will do well now to forget the illusory Acheson army. Fighting is not the U. N.'s role. Negotiation is. Now is the time to get that fact thoroughly planted in U. N. thinking. And as an incentive for so doing, we wish that every delegate and employed officer of the U. N., every foreign office official and every legislator in U. N. member nations, could be required to read and reread that portion of the Quaker report (pp. 31 through 47) which deals with the possibilities and means for developing the U. N. as a world center for constant and undespairing negotiation.

Some Fancy Accounting in Arizona Water Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to an interesting article by Mr. Raymond Moley which discusses the central Arizona project. This fantastic project is of such dubious economic feasibility that the attempt to foist it upon the Nation constitutes a threat to the whole reclamation program so vital to western de-

velopment. In order to authorize this project, it would be necessary to cast aside and ignore all previous standards by which economic feasibility has been determined. Here is a project which would cost the taxpayers of the United States at least \$2,000,000,000 in interest losses alone, while it would at the same time directly benefit large landowners in Arizona who would be required to pay absolutely nothing for having their underground water supplies replenished for use on their lands.

Even the sponsors of the project admit that their economic feasibility claims are predicated in large part upon construction of a dam at Glen Canyon, although the bill authorizing the project specifically prohibits the building of the Glen Canyon Dam. There are so many glaring fallacies in the reports and evidence reportedly justifying the project from an economic standpoint that one is amazed to see the project seriously considered in spite of the unquestioned political influence of its sponsors. It is a monstrous example of economic insanity wedded to political pressure.

The article follows:

SOME FANCY ACCOUNTING IN ARIZONA WATER PLAN

(By Raymond Moley)

BOISE, IDAHO.—As I have traveled westward, through Yellowstone Park and into this productive and prosperous basin of the Snake River, my major reactions have been to the natural treasures and beauties of the region and to what strong and energetic people have done with and for these advantages.

We seem to be far from the perplexities and strife of international affairs, higher taxes, and economic controls. Certainly, it would seem that the devious ways of Government bookkeeping would have little to do with all this natural wealth.

But the connection is real and important and very serious. Two illustrations will suffice for this point. The first is almost humorous. The second involves the entire future of the development of areas such as this. Both have to do with the fact that, as years pass, it is becoming more and more expensive to reclaim waste land in the West and to make it fit for human habitation and individual enterprise.

The original principle followed by government in reclaiming land by irrigation and other improvements was that the farmers who were benefited should repay the costs over a period of years.

This principle was willingly accepted by the hardy people who settled on such land. It is the principle that should be followed for all time.

But it is to the interest of some bureaucrats and politicians to undermine this principle and at the same time to create a state of dependence by some on others and to reap political advantage from such dependence.

The method followed by such bureaucrats and politicians is to rig Government bookkeeping to make it seem that great reclamation and power projects are paying for themselves, while in reality a generous subsidy is being paid by Federal taxpayers.

In the Senate debate last month on the great central Arizona project, it was pointed out that the Bureau of Reclamation had assigned as part payment for that project the so-called recreation benefits.

This means that it is estimated that a certain number of people will come in the course of a vacation to see the dam. Their expenses all the way from home and back will be estimated, expenses for railroad fare or gasoline, lodgings, and food. These will

be totaled and set off against the cost of the project to the Government.

This sounds almost too fantastic to be true. For the money these curious people spend does not come back to the Government at all. It is not a legitimate item to set off against cost. It goes to innkeepers, gas stations, and railroads. The taxpayer makes it up when the cost of the project is met.

Another trick is more complicated and more serious. It has to do with what is called the interest component in a reclamation project.

In the beginning and for half a century, the farmer was supposed to pay over a period of 40 years the original cost of the irrigation project and the maintenance expenses.

Now, since many of these projects produce not only irrigation but electric power, the idea has been developed that the interest component in the proceeds of the sale of power should not be returned to the Treasury, but to a fund under the control of the Bureau of Reclamation which can be used to finance other new projects, thus loading the taxpayer with the cost of subsidizing power users.

This idea is cropping up in new projects. Thus, what started as a self-sustaining enterprise of Government will, unless stopped by Congress, end in a gigantic paternalism. This is just another example of the decay of morality in a socialistic government.

The Method of Selection of Candidates for Admission to the Military and Naval Academies Should Be Reviewed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the greatest contribution Congress can make to the situation created by the West Point scandals is to seek out the root causes of the dishonesty which has been revealed and try to prevent a repetition.

No doubt a general lowering in moral standards with a bad example set in high Government circles has been a contributing factor. Without question the young men involved can point to more serious examples of betrayal of trust and disloyalty to country which have either gone unpunished or with a slap on the wrist. Yet it seems to me a more basic cause may be the reason why widespread cheating exists at the Military Academy. Perhaps the fault lies, at least in part, with Congress. Before we search elsewhere for reasons we should be sure our own house is in order.

It has long appeared to me highly questionable whether the candidates for nomination to the service academies should be named primarily by Members of Congress. What peculiar qualifications does a Senator or Representative have which enables him to select young men who are likely to make the best Army, Navy, or Air Force officers?

I appreciate the importance of a wide geographical distribution of the candidates, since they should be representative of American youth and will be called upon in later life to command troops

drawn from all parts of our country. I am not at all sure, however, that a higher caliber of youth in both character and ability would not result from selection through a process of competitive examination or screening by an independent board or otherwise. I confess that I have no positive alternative to suggest. It may well be that careful study would reveal that the traditional method of selection by those chosen to represent the people in their respective States is the best method which can be devised to insure that top men are chosen for the service academies.

The recent tragic disclosures, however, have reinforced my impression that this entire matter of selection should be thoroughly canvassed. With that end in view, I am introducing a resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Armed Services to conduct an inquiry and make recommendations with regard to any changes which should be made in the public interest in the manner of selecting and nominating candidates for admission to the Military and Naval Academies.

Military Appropriation Bill, 1952

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the hearings on the 1952 military appropriation bill, which lasted some 11 weeks, the Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Appropriations called a special session to hear General Marshall, the Secretary of Defense, and General Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. That was on July 18, only 3 weeks ago. We were anxious to review with them the latest developments in the uncertain world situation with particular reference to the military-preparedness program which the pending bill is designed to further, and to have the benefit of their latest judgments and opinions because by reason of their positions they are our foremost leaders in the military field. Their testimony is extremely timely, and to the point, and might well be read by every American. It is not too lengthy, and I believe it highly desirable to include it in the RECORD.

The printed transcript follows:

WEDNESDAY, JULY 18, 1951.

CURRENT STATUS OF MILITARY PLANNING
(Witness: Hon. George Catlett Marshall, Secretary of Defense.)

Mr. MAHON. Gentlemen, we have called this special session to hear General Marshall and General Bradley.

General Marshall, of course, we would like to visit with you and have a statement from you, and then we can take General Bradley, and thereby we will not hold both of you here throughout the hearings.

We began hearings on the 1952 military budget shortly after the budget was presented to us. We began hearings early in May. I think we have had about 11 weeks

of hearings—at least, this is the eleventh week. We finish the hearings this afternoon.

You were busily engaged on the Senate side at the time we started; otherwise we would have had the pleasure of having you before us earlier. We did have the privilege of hearing a statement from General Bradley at that time, but we did not complete, and will hear him again.

Of course, this is a tremendous budget, General Marshall, in the neighborhood of \$60,000,000,000. The taxpayers are impatient about the ever-increasing costs to the Government, the high taxes, and yet with the disturbed world conditions they want to be adequately prepared for what might hit us as a nation in a troubled world.

There is much feeling among the people generally and among the Members of Congress that the military people do not conserve manpower and dollars as well as they should; in other words, that some of the appropriation to the military does not buy the maximum of defense. Of course, we are anxious to get a dollar's worth of defense for every dollar spent, and I am sure that represents your views.

EFFECT OF DEVELOPMENTS IN KOREA ON 1952 BUDGET

Now, another thing that has come into the picture has been the developments in Korea. The question will be asked on the floor by Members of Congress and by the American people, of course, as to what impact should the recent turn of events have on this military program? In other words, can we now assume that our build-up could proceed at a slower pace? I do not think any thoughtful American, in view of the prospect which will be facing us because of the world picture, could think that we could let down our guards and disband our military forces. That is not in the picture. We realize that.

But, can we stretch out our efforts over a longer period of time, particularly some of our procurements? For example, the Army has come in and asked for ordnance to the tune of \$8,500,000,000. That is a tremendous figure.

Now, could we proceed on that at a rate, say, instead of \$8,000,000,000, at a rate of \$5,000,000,000 or \$6,000,000,000 or \$4,000,000,000? In other words, phase this procurement out over a longer period of time. Is that practical?

In view of the turn of events in the Korean war, should we restudy the emphasis which is to be placed on the defense program and perhaps reshape this budget to some extent?

We want to have confidence, when we take this budget to the floor, that when we are asked by Members of Congress whether we need such a large budget, that we can tell them it is needed and why.

Another thing, when we take the bill to the floor we want to be in position to assure our colleagues that this money is needed and is needed now and we do not want to be in the position of having the Defense Department come back a little later and say, "We have reoriented ourselves in the light of developments in Korea; we have changed the program; we do not need all of this money which the bill provides."

Of course, we would be happy if that sort of thing could develop with complete safety and security to the Nation, but the point we want to make is that we need a realistic view of this whole thing; and, I would like to say this before I stop these remarks:

If you change the views which you express this afternoon, prior to the time we bring this bill to the floor for consideration, and if you determine upon a reshifting of the program or reduction in the program, will you make known to the committee your decision on that matter in time for us to take advantage of the decision which you might have made?

Against that background of remarks which I think represents generally the thinking of

the members of the committee, we would like for you just to tell us what you think of the present situation.

Secretary MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, in the first place, I see no reduction. I might say this, that I think it is quite possible that when the final determination is made—the final decision, in October—that we will possibly be involved in approaching the Congress for certain increases, particularly for 1953 and 1954.

I regard this appropriation bill in a very considerable measure as a major capital investment, in contrast with the maintenance items concerning pay, uniforms, and items of that character. I look at it in a sense that it is a capital investment which will not require replacements for quite a period of years, varying for example, with 3 years on pursuit planes, 6 years on the types of larger planes, and 8 years for most of the tanks.

Of course, it does involve continued maintenance charges against the items that are not held in storage.

I think I can best explain my own reaction to this by stating that I have been deeply concerned over what I have read in the press and what I have heard over the radio in regard to the fears expressed as to the Korean armistice being a Communist trap, involving some clever procedure, which will react seriously to our disadvantage. I regard Korea, except for the tragedy of the casualties, I regard the Korean affair—except for those tragedies—as an incident in the world situation, and I am distressed and deeply concerned at this talk about the trap or the clever procedure that may be facing us in Korea; because I think the trap and the cleverness are entirely on the part of the Soviet Government, addressed to the world situation.

It is most distressing that by a single speech, they, the Soviets, could develop an attitude of relaxation, of a let-down in our defense program on the part of the American people. It is tragic that we should be so susceptible to propaganda, that a single speech would create a state of mind that can very seriously react to our disadvantage in the world picture.

That is the trap, that is the cleverness, and the ready response to it in America is tragic. We should not change our whole procedure every time the Kremlin decides on some new front. That, to my mind, is distressingly serious because with so little effort they have accomplished so much to our great disadvantage. The fact that within a few days after Malik's speech we should have calls on the selective-service offices from men inquiring as to whether or not they should now report is indicative. It is more serious to have Reserve officers, who should know better, should be better informed than these younger fellows, write to the War Department asking whether the Department still wants them to report.

SOUNDNESS OF 1952 BUDGET

I think in a sense that answers the questions as to this particular appropriation bill, except as to specific items contained in the estimate, with which you may disagree. We have tried very hard in the preparation of these estimates—particularly Mr. Lovett and his immediate assistants—to go through it with extreme care, to eliminate the unnecessary, and to make certain that the estimates are on a very solid basis; and have also tried to avoid those small things like the question of can openers which are essential but which detract from an understanding of our basic requirements in relation to a \$60,000,000,000 bill.

INTENTIONS OF SOVIETS IN KOREA

Mr. CANNON. When, General Marshall, do you think it will be unquestionably evident as to what the real intention of the Soviets is?

Secretary MARSHALL. That is a very hard question to answer, Mr. CANNON. I think it

will be quite a period of time; it will take time to prove good faith, which involves a rather lengthy procedure. Just how soon we can reach a correct conclusion with respect to the Soviet, in view of our past experiences, is something that each of us has to decide for himself, having in mind the previous record of frustration, disruption, and complete ignoring at times of even the minor relationships in international procedure.

FUTURE COURSE ADVISED

To my mind the important thing now is that we appear before the world as determined, implacably determined, to get ourselves in such a strong position that the Kremlin will not dare to upset the peace of the world.

There are deterrents at the present time, particularly atomic, and it is a debatable question as to how long that will act as a deterrent, but I think that a determination to go ahead is most imperative and will be an impressive factor. We should not suspend our efforts merely at the call of the Soviet Government.

Such a program takes a long time. Much lead time is involved, and as I said, a large part of this budget represents materials that really are a capital investment.

If you will recall, when I came up even in November and December, on the 1951 appropriation bill, I found considerable disagreement with many among the Members of Congress, and I think members of the committee, who thought I was asking for far too little. I was completely opposed to going all out at that time. I thought such recommendations were more of an emotional reaction because of our difficulties in Korea. I am now satisfied that I was right.

Mr. MAHON. I might say you probably have reference to another committee rather than this committee, with respect to the method of build-up, but I know there was a lot of impatience and uncertainty on the Hill with your unwillingness to call for unrealistic forces.

Secretary MARSHALL. My thought on that, Mr. Chairman, was that we must do this tremendous business in an orderly manner, and that if we overextended ourselves we would get ourselves in a very weak position. I feel that we did hit a pretty good pace at that time. I feel that attitude has been confirmed today.

There are things we can still do within the appropriation to a large extent which are administrative procedures, in order to increase the number of divisions without calling up additional men, and build up the naval arm in certain specialized lines with no increase, or a minimum increase, in men.

We have larger considerations in connection with the air, but we will lose nothing, I believe, by waiting until October to reach a firm conclusion in that matter. The issue to my mind is that we must be able and determined to build up the strength and not be wobbling back and forth at every dictation of the Kremlin.

EFFECT OF CESSATION OF HOSTILITIES IN KOREA

Now, specifically as to the termination of hostilities in Korea: That would have certain immediate effects on the pipeline; we would have to maintain certain efforts, but they would be somewhat reduced. While the reduction in the number of men sent out would immediately build up the availability for creating divisions which we want, from that point of view, it just helps us to go ahead with the program a little more rapidly.

The cessation of hostilities and of the demand on replacement armament, particularly of material involved in campaigns, would enable us to go forward more rapidly with our commitments for European rearmament. We have had to cut back on some of them in the face of Korea. In other words, cessation of hostilities in Korea would enable us to do more rapidly some of the things that we are scheduled to do and have

been forced to slow up because of conditions in the Korean area.

Now, as to troops, a great deal is still to be desired. Assuming we get the armistice, and assuming that within reason we get a political agreement, as to the future relations in Korea, and matters in the Far East, we have yet the decision to make as to when we might reduce, for instance, the Japanese garrison, or how the deployment of troops to the Far East might be adjusted.

In other words, the main effect of the cessation of hostilities aside from the terrific casualty lists, would be to make it possible for us to proceed in a more orderly manner toward building up our over-all program.

I think that just about covers my discussion of most of the points that you mentioned, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MAHON. We have devoted many hours and days to the consideration of the budget, and we do not need to talk about that now, because we have been going over those matters in great detail.

NO REDUCTION IN MILITARY PERSONNEL RECOMMENDED

Do I understand you to say that, in your judgment, regardless of developments in Korea, a minimum force of about 3,500,000 should still be firm, and that we should not reduce the military matériel?

Secretary MARSHALL. That is it exactly.

Mr. MAHON. With respect to about 45 percent of this budget, which is for procurement—I spoke of Army Ordnance, and we can speak of many other types of military hardware—with respect to those things should we taper off or should we proceed along the basis which has been presented to us?

Secretary MARSHALL. I am firm in my conviction you should proceed along the basis which has been presented to you.

You made one comment, Mr. Chairman, which I did not speak about, that is, the taxpayers—which naturally concerns me and all of us a great deal. I was particularly interested in an inquiry this morning from, I think, Mr. McNeill.

(Off-the-record discussion.)

POSSIBLE REDUCTION IN 1952 BILL

Mr. MAHON. In view of the temper of Congress and the desire for reducing appropriations, if some reduction is to be made in the military budget, in your opinion which one of the services is best prepared to accept a reduction—which is now in best position to perform in the event of an all-out war within the near future, say within the next 2 years?

In other words, in what area, regardless of the service—and I do not wish to put you on the spot with respect to any of them—in what area, perhaps, could we slow down, reduce the cost? And you say we do not want to reduce the number of men in the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Of course, we have got to pay them, we have got to feed them, and we have got to clothe them; so where do we get to some place where a reduction might be made with the least injury to the national defense needs?

Secretary MARSHALL. I would not want to try to answer that question off the cuff without conferring with the Chiefs of Staff.

You will recall that the budget has had considerable screening. For example, you know it started off with \$104,000,000,000, and then got to \$48,000,000,000, and then moved back up to \$60,000,000,000.

Mr. MAHON. I realize that.

NUMBER OF CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

Mr. MAHON. Here is something that concerns us; there is a popular view in and out of Congress that military people use too many civilian employees, that we have the proposition in this budget to have 1,500,000 civilian employees in fiscal 1952. In this budget there is a request for approximately

260,000 additional civilian employees, bringing the total to 1,500,000.

Now it is true that some of them will be the so-called blue-collar workers, working in ordnance plants and places of that kind, but it would be almost like throwing a dash of cold water in the face of Members of the House to say, gentlemen, we have got a bill which provides for an additional 263,000 civilian employees for the military department. You get what I mean?

Secretary MARSHALL. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. What is the answer to the feeling that you are overdoing this business of civilian employees? I realize you are not definitely in that picture.

Secretary MARSHALL. Well, I am.

Mr. MAHON. What is your reaction to it?

Secretary MARSHALL. My first reaction is the question whether we let the soldiers or the civilians do some of the work. We have tried at every point to see how we could get a proper balance between the two. I checked up and I found that we had scheduled, I think, 50,000 less civilians than the budget provides for.

Mr. TABER. On the other hand, you were 142,000 below the figures that were given to us as the budget estimate of what the figures would be on June 30.

Secretary MARSHALL. The only point I can give was this reduction of 50,000 in the planned build-up.

Mr. TABER. On June 30, according to Mrs. Rosenberg, the figure was 142,000 below the figures that the budget has estimated, when they came up here.

Secretary MARSHALL. Well, she has the actual figures. That is her field.

USE OF MILITARY MEN FOR SEMISKILLED WORK

Mr. MAHON. If the war in Korea should end, is there any reason why some of these trained men doing semiskilled work, when they return to this country, cannot they, in some cases, do some of the things these civilians are doing? There seem to be two sides to the picture.

Secretary MARSHALL. In regard to that, I would say that the veterans that come back have been highly useful in connection with the developments in recent combat.

So far as the question of soldiers in place of civilians, I think that is a question that the Congress would want to consider—to what extent we utilize the physically capable among the soldiers in certain grades for certain of the jobs. One very serious question is that of who you want to do the job that has to be done.

As to the combatant and career men, there are all sorts of jobs for them to do in order to improve their service. There is another factor, which I am not sufficiently well based on at the present time to go into, but there are certainly a number of these people that we have used as soldiers on certain jobs which are being taken over within the Department.

On one side, of course, it cuts down on the number of civilians. So you have the two factors to consider.

The men with the battle experience coming out of Korea have an important place. The more of them we get back here, the more effective is our training tempo. And we have to consider that in connection with the long time that it takes us to get these National Guard divisions ready for combat.

After the hostilities started in June, the National Guard divisions were brought in—in September—and, of course, selective service did not really begin to produce until November. Those latter men have not finished their training yet. That is the tragedy of time that we cannot continue to accept in the present international situation.

We are trying now to build up all of our man factions in this country, particularly with the introduction of universal military

training, with the most skillful instruction personnel that we can get, and that must come from the veteran. With these new divisions, it makes a great difference in the time of their availability, having these key-men conducting the training. I think you have to consider what it means to take, we will say, almost a year in order to get a division ready for combat. That is a very costly delay.

I should like to give you this example off the record.

(Statement off the record.)

We are up against the same thing when it takes so long to get these divisions ready. And we reduce the cost materially if we can make very rapid development. These veterans who are coming back from Korea as instructors are very much involved in that.

LIKELIHOOD OF ALL-OUT WAR

Mr. MAHON. Let me go to a much broader picture and then bring my interrogation to a conclusion. What is your considered judgment, General, as to the likelihood of a major war now as compared to 2 or 3 months ago?

Secretary MARSHALL. I would say that it is just about the same as 2 or 3 months ago. There has been a constant build-up in the Soviets and their satellites, of their military strength. Unfortunately we do not know a great deal about it.

Mr. MAHON. The likelihood of an all-out war is still an ever-present consideration?

Secretary MARSHALL. I think it is continuing and, from the viewpoint of the enemy's build-up, it is increasing.

(Statement off the record.)

CESSATION OF HOSTILITIES IN KOREA

Mr. MAHON. General, when may we reasonably expect to know whether or not there will be a cessation, over a period of months, of the actual shooting war in Korea?

Secretary MARSHALL. I do not know. I have been continually involved in these conferences, and they are some of the most frustrating things that you can imagine. It would appear that the Communists very much want this armistice. On the other hand, they will act under instructions and might be implacable along certain lines, just as the recent prolonged effort that was made in Paris resulted in nothing. And there they were merely discussing the agenda. Here we are getting around to a decision for the agenda. The most critical factors have all to be decided thereafter. After that there is the execution of the armistice. Then follow the diplomatic decisions which would involve the United Nations on the one side and the Communist group on the other.

Mr. MAHON. Would it be fair to say, then, that if we pass this bill through the House and the Senate during the next 6 weeks we will not know during that period of time just what may result in Korea?

Secretary MARSHALL. I do not think you will know, sir.

Mr. MAHON. We hope to take this bill to the House by the 15th of August and pass it.

Secretary MARSHALL. I should think it would be very helpful if you did act before any armistice comes to a final decision, because I think it will help us very much in getting the decision that we want. In other words, this bill is a declaration of determined intent, and that is the most helpful factor we can emphasize at the present time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. SHEPPARD, have you any questions?

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, General Marshall, it is your feeling that if this particular overture of peace was deliberately planned for strategic purposes, to lull us into a state of apathy, as it were, that the speedy enactment of this appropriation bill as a preparedness measure would have a salutary effect?

Secretary MARSHALL. Exactly that, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. As against taking the reverse position?

Secretary MARSHALL. Exactly that, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Personally, I am very well pleased with your statement. I think it would be one of the most tragic things in the world for this Nation to permit itself to get into the state of thinking that it was in at the cessation of World War II. If we had not been so fast in our disarmament then, perhaps we would not have so much of a bill to pay today.

Secretary MARSHALL. I think, to repeat a little of what I have already said, the most tragic fact is that in the way of public reaction we are so easily led by the nose. I do not think we ought to admit any such docile and dangerous tendency as that.

Mr. SIKES. I have no questions at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I agree with Mr. SHEPPARD. I think it would be a very dangerous thing for us to be lulled into a sense of security, especially at this stage of the game.

I should like to ask Secretary Marshall one question which I think he will want to answer off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. MAHON. Have you any questions, Chairman CANNON?

Mr. CANNON. I have no questions at this time.

Mr. TABER. I do not think I have any questions at this time.

ADEQUACY OF 1952 PROGRAM

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have two questions, Mr. Chairman, the first of which is for the record. Do I understand correctly, General, that the committee is to understand from what you have said that under all the existing circumstances you feel that the program represented by the appropriation request now before us is the maximum program which it is advisable for us to undertake at this time?

Secretary MARSHALL. Not the maximum necessarily, sir. But I think it is the essential program at this time. On the question as to whether this item or that item is well- or ill-advised, so far as cost estimates are concerned, and things of that sort, you have had many witnesses to testify regarding thereto.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. So far as your own judgment is concerned the program represented by the request before the committee is what you consider adequate under all the circumstances?

Secretary MARSHALL. At the present time; yes, sir.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TABER. General, is our position with reference to the Soviet getting to a point where the trend is more our way than it is their way?

Secretary MARSHALL. We are still at a great disadvantage, but we are progressing more rapidly to strength than they are. Their further increases in ground strength will be limited.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. MAHON. General Marshall, on behalf of the committee, I want to thank you for your appearance and your very helpful exposition of the situation.

Secretary MARSHALL. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman; and thank you, gentlemen.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 18, 1951.

MILITARY PROGRAM FOR 1952

(Witness: General of the Army Omar N. Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.)

GENERAL STATEMENT

Mr. MAHON. General Bradley, we should be pleased to have from you at this time a general statement on the budget for the

Department of National Defense, for the fiscal year 1952.

General BRADLEY, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, during the time that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have considered our needs for the fiscal year 1952, we have had the usual consideration of the long-range plans for our country's security; we have seen the crystallization of planning in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, including the establishment of a Supreme Command in Europe, and there has been the sharp impact of events in the Far East. These three factors have required a very critical strategic analysis by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The result—the major force requirements set forth in this request—is probably the most studied opinion on our needs in the Armed Forces that the Defense Establishment could provide.

We believe that our long-range defense measures must include. Forces in being to avert disaster and to retaliate in case we are attacked, and a mobilization machinery in the Armed Forces and in industry which can be thrown into high gear if we face an all-out war. Obviously, our long-range program must be within our national means; and it must be consistent with the attitudes of the American people toward their own defense. The American people have never maintained in peacetime and we are not asking now, forces in being large enough to win a major war.

MILITARY OBJECTIVES

In broad outline, the basic military objectives which have guided our strategic analysis are these. To build sufficient force is soon as practicable to act as a deterrent to further aggression, to create sufficient power to prevent disaster in the event war is forced upon us, to provide an immediate capability for quick and strong retaliation in case of an attack upon us; and to produce a firm base upon which to build, as quickly as possible, that power necessary to assure victory should we be forced to engage in all-out conflict. These are our basic objectives—any provisions short of these would invite disaster.

As the leader, and by far the strongest, of the free nations, the urgent requirement of the first objective—that of building sufficient force to deter further aggression—rests largely upon the United States. Our immediate concern in this undertaking is, of course, the support of our forces in Korea. For programing purposes of the services certain assumptions have been made regarding the scale of our Korean support and its duration. The validity of these assumptions is problematical, but it is hoped that the requirements for this operation will fall within the assumed limits.

It has been pointed out by previous witnesses that in this defense budget we have, with certain exceptions, made no specific allowances for combat-consumption rates during fiscal year 1952 for the Korean conflict.

RESULT OF PEACE IN KOREA

Because the cease-fire negotiations are under way at this time in Kaesong, many people believe that the possibility of an armistice will have a considerable effect on the amount of necessary expenditures for defense for fiscal year 1952. Perhaps it would be appropriate to discuss this possibility for a moment.

We Americans believe in a peaceful world, and want peace in Korea as soon as possible. But the cease fire, and armistice that we so earnestly desire, may lead to our undoing, unless we take steps to prevent such undoing.

For if peace in Korea means a let-down in defense, we have lost the time that our valiant soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines—and our allies—have bought for us and other free nations.

If peace in Korea means a let-down in production, we will be cutting back on weapons just as we have begun to modernize and properly arm our forces.

And if peace in Korea means a let-down in our will and enthusiasm for adequate preparedness, we may be handing our future chances for freedom to those who wish to enslave us.

We must realize that peace in Korea is not a promise of permanent peace throughout the world. The armistice out there in the Far East will mean that the United Nations have met one more challenge, have won another tough engagement over oppression and tyranny. It will mean that we have a chance to be better prepared to meet any future challenge. We must make the most of the good chances that are offered us.

On the other hand, if we cannot reach agreement with the Communists in Korea, it will be obvious to everyone that the load has not been lightened, and the defense preparations must go on.

Armistice or no armistice, then, we must be prepared for the next challenge; and we must continue to pursue that first objective I mentioned before—building sufficient forces to deter further aggression. In addition to our own defenses, we must assist in the provision of those additional forces which, in concert on a global basis with those of other free nations, will foster the containment of communism within its present bounds.

If containment does not work and aggression is not deterred, then we must have the power to prevent disaster in the event of war, and the capability of sharp and aggressive retaliation in case of attack. Included in these objectives is the power to defend the Western Hemisphere, to protect its industrial potential to the greatest practicable degree, and to develop our strategic air offensive to insure, when necessary, the immediate interference with enemy industrial capacity. Though the passage of time will bring increased allied assistance in furtherance of these objectives, their essential minimum cannot be delayed, and its provision, therefore, rests primarily with the United States.

In addition to maintaining sufficient forces in being to stave off national military calamity, we are trying to provide a force that can retaliate immediately—a force that can hurt the enemy, slowing down both the strength and tempo of his attack upon us while our mobilization gets under way. The nature of this retaliation force changes with the conditions of war and the weapons of war. It is almost redundant to point out that the shape and form of our retaliatory forces have changed materially since World War II.

The initial retaliation against an enemy by strategic bombing will be provided if the air power and the necessary Army and Navy support to seize and hold the bases from which to operate, are in our hands the moment an emergency arises. The closer the bases are to the enemy the easier it will be, and the less costly it will be, to provide a sustained retaliatory air attack. Our strategy does not include a retraction of all of our military power to the continental limits of the North American Continent when we are attacked.

As a third requirement, our forces in being must include a sufficient mobilization base so that, if necessary, we can push the throttle of mobilization forward and expand our forces efficiently and quickly to meet the threats, and eventually to take the offensive against the attacking enemy.

This third requirement—a broad base of strength from which we can expand—is probably the most important of them all. Heretofore broad oceans and strong allies have protected us during mobilization. Next time the clouds of war may give little warning and we may have no time for this third important part of our security.

When we discuss the mobilization base, we include the National Guard and the Reserve forces which are traditionally the backbone of the United States defense. The Regular forces must meet the first blows and also contribute to the military training and educational facilities which are necessary for the expansion, and furnish the cadres for those divisions, ships, and air groups that will be called for in all-out mobilization. But we must shorten the time before our Reserve components are ready for combat.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have recommended to the President and to the Congress that about 3,500,000 men in uniform are necessary to meet the present threat as far as they can foresee. They have said that any time the situation changes for the worse they would have to ask for more men and women on active duty. Throughout the manpower hearings the Defense Department witnesses stressed the need for a better state of readiness for the Reserve components as necessary adjuncts to our security provisions.

But basically the combined mobilization planned for must provide these things: The men and materials to continue the effort in Korea if no armistice is agreed upon; the same to fulfill the present world-wide commitments, including the occupation tasks, and support for the forces of the North Atlantic Treaty; the increase in our Armed Forces now planned, including additional air forces in 1952; and, finally, war reserves of equipment that have been somewhat depleted by the Korean fighting.

Men without equipment cannot meet security needs. So there is first emphasis on industrial mobilization, with a simultaneous development of a manpower program to give us a well-trained Reserve for years and years to come.

I have reviewed the objectives and the considerations on which the Joint Chiefs of Staff have based the force and readiness levels of this appropriation request. Examination of the individual service programs will show that the forces scheduled for overseas deployment are planned to be fully manned and equipped. In the continental United States, however, approximately an 85-percent manning level has been generally accepted. Mobilization reserve levels set forth in the programs average only a 3 to 6 months' supply, and although such levels can be accepted during the period of force build-up, they should be materially increased as soon as production rates are improved.

In determining these force requirements and the general criteria which have guided the services in their program development, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have kept in mind the economic and industrial impact of the over-all program. Therefore, the forces and their support, in their opinion, represent the absolute minimum consistent with our national objectives and the current situation. We, therefore, recommend the appropriation request that is now before you, in the belief that it is essential to meet the urgency of our position. It is not only possible, but probable, that some upward revisions will be required during the coming months. If and when such revisions are deemed essential, the Joint Chiefs of Staff will not hesitate to convey new recommendations to the Secretary of Defense and to the President.

Mr. MAHON. That is a very excellent statement, General, and we thank you for your appearance here.

POSSIBLE CHANGE IN PROGRAM

If the military requirements are resurveyed, so to speak, late this year—say in October or November, as anticipated—do you think the likelihood is that there will be a decrease in our over-all preparedness program, or a steady build-up on the framework which we are now laying, or a precipitous increase? That question is based upon

the technical assumption that we will not be in an all-out shooting major war at that particular time.

General BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I believe that we all understand that if this fighting in Korea keeps on for some time we are going to need something additional, which was not included in this budget.

Mr MAHON. That is right.

General BRADLEY. When we prepared these recommendations last fall we had to make some assumptions. For budgetary matters, we assumed that the fighting in Korea would be over as of the end of the last fiscal year, so we did not include Korea in the fiscal year 1952 budget, with certain exceptions. How much we will have to include in a separate supplemental request we do not know and will not know until some time this fall.

Mr MAHON. Could it be probable that you would not have any supplemental request?

General BRADLEY. Well, my understanding of the services is that they will have to have something to replace what they have used up during this year.

Mr MAHON. During fiscal 1951?

General BRADLEY. Fiscal 1952.

Mr MAHON. Yes.

General BRADLEY. Which is not included in here, and which is really coming out of stocks.

As General Marshall pointed out, it is coming out of equipment which we had hoped to furnish countries under the foreign-aid program.

I would say chances are pretty good that we will have to have something to cover the Korea expenditures.

As to the other part of your question, whether or not we will see fit to recommend any increase in forces for 1952, I think that depends very largely on the attitude that develops in these negotiations in Korea and the general world-wide situation which may confront us between now and sometime this fall. The services, I know, feel that in their expansion to date they have developed some weaknesses within their own organizations which probably need to be filled up. Just what they will come in for, and what the Joint Chiefs of Staff will approve I do not know yet because they have not made decisions on any specific program which they would recommend to the Secretary of Defense.

MILITARY STRENGTH

Mr MAHON. Under any circumstances can you foresee a recommendation by the Joint Chiefs of Staff that our Armed Forces of 3,500,000 men and women would be reduced below that figure during the current fiscal year, and a reduction over-all in the military build-up be made?

General BRADLEY. No, sir. I would say if there is any change in it the chances of recommending some slight increase in it are of greater probability than recommending a decrease in it.

I might elaborate a little bit more on what General Marshall said on that. We believe that the Communists were really hurt in Korea. That is why they want to call it off. However, there has been nothing said about changing their announced long-range intention of sometime ruling the world; so that I do not think that we should jump to the conclusion that this is any indication at all that they have changed their over-all attitude that the two, communism and our form of government, cannot live in the world together. I think we must be very careful not to accept this as an end.

As I tried to point out, to me we have met one more challenge, and successfully. When there will be another one or where it will be no one knows.

Some people say, "Then why have a settlement in Korea, so long as you are accomplishing so much?" I do not think that is an answer, either.

PROCUREMENT LEVELS

Mr. MAHON. Would it be safe for us to reduce the level of procurement? Not that the items would not eventually be delivered, but could we reduce the rate of the build-up? Just for illustrative purposes, I have made reference to Army Ordnance requesting more than \$8,000,000,000. We could make reference to similar items in the Navy or to items in the Air Force. My point is this: Could we slow down on this huge procurement program safely?

General BRADLEY. Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not feel qualified to discuss in detail whether or not any of that particular program can be delayed, because that is outside my province.

Mr MAHON. Yes.

General BRADLEY. But I would like to say this in answer to it in general. Most of those items, or a lot of those items, are very long lead-time items, or at least your expensive ones are, and you will not be getting them until possibly late 1952 or 1953 and some of them in 1954. In my opinion, those are the dangerous years.

May I go off the record just a minute?

Mr MAHON. Certainly (Discussion off the record.)

Mr MAHON. Mr. CANNON, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, is here with us.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr CANNON. General Bradley, I think you have given us a very informative resumé of the whole situation. It is not a very encouraging one, but there is nothing about the prospect of war which is encouraging.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr MAHON. Mr. SIKES?

(Discussion off the record.)

POSSIBLE BUDGET REDUCTION IN 1952

Mr SIKES. In the event the committee or the Congress should decide that cuts of some magnitude are essential in the proposed budget, is it your feeling that such cuts as must be absorbed can best be taken in civilian personnel or in major procurement or in military personnel?

General BRADLEY. I am not sufficiently acquainted with the details and effects of such cuts to answer that question, sir. You are getting into things I do not know anything about, sir, as to just what effect each one of these would have on the various services.

Mr SIKES. That is all.

Mr MAHON. Mr. RILEY?

Mr RILEY. I have no questions, Mr. Chairman, except to thank General Bradley for coming before the committee and giving us his statement.

Mr MAHON. Mr. TABER?

TIME RUNNING IN FAVOR OF UNITED STATES

Mr. TABER. General, do you figure that time is running in our favor or in favor of Russia at the moment?

General BRADLEY. I think it is running in our favor at the present time, and that it will continue to run in our favor for a couple of years at least.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Mr. TABER. What do you think about the NATO picture? Is there any real initiative and real support for the operations over there?

General BRADLEY. I think the spirit of the European members of NATO has improved very materially during the last year or year and a half. I was in France and England about a month and a half ago. It was the first time I had been there for about a year or a little over a year. In addition to talking to the military people in those countries, I talked to General Eisenhower and his staff, and I talked to a number of civilians. I talked to a number of Americans who live in those countries who have a pretty wide knowledge of Europe. From all of them I

gained the idea that the spirit and the will to get going on this thing had improved very materially.

You say, "Has it improved enough to make them get this thing done?" I would say it has improved enough to get it done, but whether or not it will be as fast as we would like to see it done is another matter. I do not know.

They have different problems from those we face. They have all increased their defense budgets since Korea started. The smallest one, of course, was Portugal, which has only increased its budget 2 percent. We have increased ours over 200 percent. Canada increased hers over 200 percent. Other countries run from 50 to 60 or up to 90 percent increase, which is very encouraging.

When we agreed to assume some responsibility for the leadership in Europe, by furnishing General Eisenhower as the commander of Europe, we did it with the thought that his presence and his enthusiasm and prestige would have some effect on the raising of the spirit of these various countries. We think it has done that. We think it has had a great deal to do with raising the spirit of these people and increasing their willingness to build the security forces up to the point where they will become a deterrent.

PRODUCTION POTENTIALS

Mr TABER. I am not going to ask you for details, because I do not think we ought to have them at this time, but do you think they are producing anything like what they should in the line of munitions and ammunition?

General BRADLEY. Well, that is in my opinion the most complex question connected with this problem. Let us take France as an example. I think France is the key to the European set-up. France has now improved her industrial capacity until it is about 135 percent of its prewar industrial capacity.

The question immediately arises, "Why can they not convert a lot of that to making equipment and so forth for themselves?" In my opinion they can. In my opinion they can convert more of it than they have converted to date.

However, I realize after going into all of the angles like raw materials, low wages, the difference between wages and the cost of living, and the fact that they have not yet caught up on civilian production since the war, which makes for that differential, and their finance problem, that possibly we should not hurry them too much.

May I go off the record just a minute to illustrate that?

Mr TABER. Whenever you say.

General BRADLEY. Yes, sir. (Discussion off the record.)

ATTITUDE OF EUROPEAN NATIONALS

Mr TABER. From the military standpoint, General, have you noticed any marked improvement in the seriousness and the willingness of the people of Europe to defend themselves?

General BRADLEY. Yes, I think I can answer that positively, and I can illustrate here, that a year and a half ago, when I was in France, I heard remarks by Frenchmen that they did not see any hope and they were going to try to get their investments out of the country.

That attitude changed, or they would not have been able to build up their industrial production to 135 percent of what it was. It changed somewhere between a year and a half ago and now, and you get expressions of hope that can be illustrated in the great mass of the French people of recovery in France and of the ability to defend France.

Mr. TABER, there is one other angle to this which I think would be of interest to the committee. Just before I came over here, I received a report from our observers in France on the July 14 Bastille Day parade,

which I think is indicative of the whole new spirit of France. If you will permit me, I would like to read some extracts from it:

"The traditional 14th of July parade down the Paris Champs Elysées was enthusiastically applauded by large crowds which hung on despite poor weather. In sharp contrast to previous years, the parade was the biggest and most impressive since the liberation. Jets overhead, display of new matériel of French manufacture, and perfect discipline of foot troops in new-type uniforms attracted and captured public attention. The press in general proclaims the parade a great success and devoted space to detailed description of new weapons.

"We were especially impressed by the well-organized demonstrations and feel that the Government achieved its purpose of stirring public interest in the military accomplishments, in their effort to rebuild a strong and modern army. The parade was definite proof to the French people that they have made marked progress in the rearmament program."

ADEQUACY OF 1952 PROGRAM

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. General, I have just one question on the record which I have asked of others with primary military responsibility: Do I understand correctly that in view of all the circumstances by which we are confronted, it is your opinion that the programs represented by the requests for appropriations now before us, represent the fastest build-up that we should attempt at this time?

General BRADLEY. From what we know at this time, yes.

Mr. SIKES. General Bradley, the committee wishes to express its appreciation for your most helpful presentation. We are always glad to have you with us.

Mr. MAHON. Yes, we appreciate the statement and your customary helpfulness to this committee and the Nation.

Hail to the Coast Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the Meriden (Conn.) Record of August 4 entitled "Hail to the Coast Guard," sending greetings on behalf of the people of Connecticut to the United States Coast Guard upon the occasion of the one hundred and sixty-first anniversary of its establishment.

As a member of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy in New London, Conn., I had the pleasure recently of visiting that excellent institution. We in Connecticut are justly proud of the Academy's fine record in preparing young men for their future roll as Coast Guard officers and for upholding the high tradition of that service.

HAIL TO THE COAST GUARD

It was 161 years ago today that the United States Coast Guard came into being. This unique service, which works in peace as well as in war to safeguard the lives and property of Americans, was founded by Alexander Hamilton, the first Secretary of the Treasury.

The Coast Guard enjoys a unique status among the services, in that it is always actively on duty. Its wartime functions, in close cooperation with the Navy, are but an extension of its peacetime duties. The saving of lives at sea, operating lighthouses, manning the iceberg patrol, inspecting civilian craft, and in a multitude of ways serving the needs of the citizens who live by and on the sea constitute the work of the Coast Guard.

The Coast Guard's tradition of service is an honorable tradition, fortified by 160 years of valiant performance above and beyond the call of duty. To the Coast Guard we send greetings on behalf of the people of a State which has long been conscious and appreciative of the work of the men who have made *semper paratus*—always prepared—their practice as well as their motto.

Philosophy of Freedom Has Achieved Miracles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, the power of freemen with unfettered minds to overcome all obstacles in the preservation of their freedom was the theme of an eloquent commencement address delivered at Stanford University, my alma mater, on June 17 last by Eugene Meyer, chairman of the board of the Washington Post.

The address follows:

President Sterling, members of the Stanford faculty, members of the class of 1951, and their friends, my presence at this occasion is in a sense an act of self-indulgence. I can never resist a good excuse to return to my native State. I was born in Los Angeles more than three-quarters of a century ago when that great metropolis had some 8,000 inhabitants.

Let me confess at once that I had to overcome a deep prejudice before I found the courage to accept the honor of addressing you today. It is a prejudice against old age. I have always preached—on the basis of experience—that old men are dangerous—dangerous, that is, when they give advice or hold on too long to positions of authority. I agree with what Owen Young said on his seventy-fifth birthday, "that more harm is done by old men who cling to their influence than by young men who anticipate it." I think that is one of the reasons why we are in so much trouble today. There are too many old soldiers still in command of the Western World who haven't faded away.

But I overcame my prejudice and came here today. I did so because I remembered my pessimism as a young man when I realized that the price of an acre of land in what is now the city limits of Los Angeles had risen during my boyhood from \$2 to \$20. What a pity, I thought at that time, that I wasn't born soon enough to grow up with the country.

So when I considered President Sterling's invitation I said to myself perhaps the worries of this generation that they were born too late are just as real and just as unfounded as was my youthful pessimism. As a matter of fact, my whole life experience has been marked by a series of national crises, one seemingly more alarming than the last—crises of all kinds, military, economic, political, social, that appeared to threaten

our very existence as a nation. Yet by intelligent cooperative action, by self-confidence, foresight, and hard work, our people emerged from every one of these well-nigh catastrophic events stronger, wiser, and more conscious of the latent power of freemen.

Today we face what again seems to be the worst of all crises. Once more disaster seems to threaten all that we have built, all that we are and all that we hope to become.

I would not pretend that I am untroubled by the challenges that face us. Only a fool could be unconcerned. But for two reasons I am confident about the outcome:

First, I believe that heaven really does help those who help themselves.

Second, I believe in the proven ability of the American people to "help themselves" in surmounting difficulties. It stems from the vitality of their tradition, the strength of their intelligence, and the decency of their character.

So it may be that in my role of the ancient mariner I can be of some help on the navigational problems that lie ahead for you. Despite the cliché, history does not have a habit of repeating itself. History does, however, have a fundamental continuity, and I would like to offer you some suggestions from the segment of history I have lived through since that June day 56 years ago when I, too, endured a commencement address.

In those years I have had unusual opportunities to witness the economic development of our country. And because that period of economic history is closely involved with the present situation, I want to review it briefly here today.

If one took a quick look at the American economy of 1895 and then at the economy today, it would be easy to conclude that utopia had arrived. For in those 56 years our national income has risen in dollars 15 to 18 times; the purchasing power of an hour's wages of our workers has trebled, average hours of work have been cut one-third; and our people receive nearly 65 percent of the national income in wages and salaries, as compared to about 50 percent in 1895.

Clearly, that is a monumental accomplishment, and, looked at in isolation, it would appear to be a conclusive answer to any competing system or ideology. But that is a picture of the long run. To understand the discontent of the present and the desire for change expressed in proposals, sound and unsound, constructive and destructive, we must look to the short-run behavior of our economic system; nor should we ignore the fact that our economic conditions have a profound effect upon the whole world.

Since 1895 I have had a close view—sometimes uncomfortably close—of four periods of serious panic and depression. (I shall skip over some minor troubles which have been euphemistically described as recessions, disinflations, and the like.) You can see from the long-run trend I have cited that these depressions did not prevent our making the greatest economic progress the world has ever witnessed.

Yet to take too much solace from this is to miss the major point. These depressions put a very heavy price on our progress—a price of social unrest, of individual catastrophe, of human suffering. It is all very well for scholars and statesmen and businessmen to sing psalms of praise about long-run progress, but hunger can get very intense in the short run and can, indeed, transmute a short-run human being into a long-run corpse.

And so I think it has come about in my time that the people of our country and of many other countries have made a resolve. It is not written in constitutions or party platforms, but it is, nevertheless, a real and lasting resolve—that the social cost of major depressions is too great a price to pay. That resolve is a dominating fact of our times—one that will shape much of the history that this graduating class will live through.

Now, let us look for a moment at those four major panics and depressions that I referred to as occurring since 1895. It is essential that we understand something about them in order to gauge where we are going, for if our people have resolved against permitting a recurrence of their social costs we have two broad choices:

On the one hand, it is up to us to make our system a more stable one and at the same time keep it in harmony with traditions of freedom.

If we fail to do so, we may be doomed to the regimentation of socialism or even the familiar terror of tyranny which nowadays operates under the label of Stalinism.

An analysis of those four depressions is relevant to the choice we make. As I look back on them one dominating factor emerges—those depressions were all man-made. They all resulted from human ignorance and human mismanagement. They were created by sins of omission as well as commission. None of them was caused by great forces of nature which man cannot control. That is their dominating characteristic. And it is a heartening fact. For if these crises in our economic record were caused by man's ignorance, then it should be possible for man's intelligence to prevent similar catastrophes, or at least keep them within bearable limits.

Let us review those four depressions briefly.

The first period involves the panics of the 1890's. These panics—and they were really severe—were due to the rapidity with which we built up our capital plant, especially our railroads, on funds borrowed from foreign investors. We were pushing railroad development because our population was rapidly increasing and because we wanted that population in order to develop the country's resources. It was a period of private enterprise at its best and also its worst. It was full of daring of a constructive kind, but it lacked restraints necessary in the public interest.

The boom was followed by the bust. The bubble was burst by the silver interests. Their proposal in Congress in 1890 for free coinage of silver ended in a compromise which compelled Government buying of 4,500,000 ounces a month. Even this compromise not only stopped continued foreign investment but also resulted in wide withdrawal of funds and distrust of our monetary stability. This caused an outflow of the gold reserves behind our greenbacks and the resulting money panics of the 1890's. Bryan's defeat in 1896 and the election of McKinley created renewed confidence in our currency and we came out of the panic. A new era of development and progress followed.

But we did not yet grasp the need for banking and currency reform.

The panic of 1907, the next major disturbance, was a violent one. The panic followed a boom period with great stock market speculation arising out of improved business conditions and a higher level of construction activity than was healthy in view of the limits to the credit expansion possibilities of our financial machinery at the time. The situation was in some ways comparable to the overexpansion of credit we witnessed last year. It called for moderate, intelligently directed credit restraint. But there was little public discussion of the dangers in 1907 and no adequate machinery to meet changing needs of business for credit and currency. The element of elasticity in American finance was largely in the hands of private foreign investors and foreign banking institutions, and ultimately the Bank of England which was then a private institution. And the Bank of England's course of action—not made public at the time or even understood since—was for a short time very drastic. It caused such an extreme currency crisis that on one day funds were completely absent from the call loan market in New York City.

There followed a depression in business volume and prices, and unemployment on a considerable scale.

After these two panics, both a result of our inelastic currency, the Congress passed the Federal Reserve Act in 1913 to provide a currency capable of expanding and contracting in response to business activity and to improve our banking system in other respects.

The next major depression was short but it was very acute. It caused distress to every branch of our national economy. It came in 1920 as a result of the dislocations of World War I. The cause was the first emergence of a situation now very familiar—that is, the so-called dollar shortage of our overseas customers whose economies had been upset by war. Because of the blindness of certain Treasury officials, the export finance powers of the War Finance Corporation were suspended just when they were most needed. As a consequence, our essential foreign markets disappeared and, in addition to causing needless suffering abroad, there resulted an unnecessary disaster here at home.

I made a public attack on the Treasury at that time in these words:

"The cheeks of the children of Europe are gaunt with hunger, but the cottonseed that would furnish them the needed fats is rotting on the fields of Mississippi, they walk in tatters, and the cotton fields are white with cotton it does not pay to pick.

"The sleek, breeding herds of the prairies, whose get is needed for the coming years, are led to slaughter because our financial leadership in the Treasury confesses itself impotent.

"The corn and wheat of our great granary States lie in the bins because the farmer cannot sell, in the present demoralized market, without making himself a bankrupt, yet we are told by the head of the finances of this country that 'nothing can be done.'

"The factories of New England are idle and their labor unemployed, not because their product is not wanted, but because our domestic and international organization for the production and distribution of goods is suffering a breakdown, yet we are solemnly advised that 'nothing can be done.'"

The policy of the Treasury Department was overridden by Congress in 1921. Export credit facilities were reestablished and provision was made for carrying and marketing agricultural products for the necessary longer periods.

These measures revived our economy and made the depression a short one. The revival was rapid, but the cause and cure were very little understood. So great was the ignorance that the Republican Party in later years never corrected the erroneous claims of the Democratic-campaign orators that this had been "another Republican depression." The fact is, of course, that depressions have no party preference—and this one happened to be a Democratic one resulting from the mistakes of the Treasury Department at the end of Wilson's administration.

Let me add here that, in publicly attacking the do-nothing policy of the Treasury in 1920 I was not advocating any system of planned economy. I was opposed to such an economy then, and I am opposed to it now. I was urging rather the adoption of temporary and emergency measures designed to meet an unusual and critical situation, to stimulate and encourage the normal functioning of existing agencies, and to alleviate suffering and hardship.

I have always felt that there was real danger in the overcentralization of power in Washington. Local control of local affairs—a fundamental principle in the thinking of our founding fathers—has always seemed to me to be the right political philosophy, even in situations where Federal cooperation and assistance were needed. And that applies to the financial, social, and economical fields, as well as to the political field.

Early in our history a great battle was fought about the Bank of the United States.

Today we have in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation a credit bank of the United States. In 1931, I participated in the drafting of the bill creating the Corporation and urged its passage before committees of Congress. But, in doing so, I emphasized that it was justified only as a temporary measure to meet an extraordinary, unusual, and critical situation and stressed the vital necessity of competent and conscientious, as well as courageous, administration. The Corporation, however, continued on after the emergency, and, as the revelations of the Fulbright committee have shown, it is now nothing like the institution that it was intended to be and was, in fact, at the beginning. In my judgment, no institution which provides a pipe line from the Treasury to the voter can, in the long run, be administered in a way that will avoid the corrupting influence of political pressures.

The last depression was the great one that began in 1929 and affected the whole world in the thirties. The major causes for this boom-and-bust period were mismanagement of the war debts and reparations, unsound lending of American capital abroad, and excessive and unsound real-estate financing at home. The real-estate boom started as a program to fill a legitimate need—the lack of housing, factories, and office buildings caused by the low rate of construction during and immediately after World War I. It ended in a speculative frenzy with capital funds provided through the public sale of securities and by mismanaged mortgage guarantee companies. The frenzy spread to other markets than real estate. At home the collapse was deepest in heavy industry and construction activity.

The disaster became world-wide largely because of the economic follies committed in the Treaty of Versailles and of our failure to remedy them during the 1920's.

The depression at home was longer than it need have been mainly because the Roosevelt administration, in relying principally on stimulating consumer activity, neglected to take steps to revive heavy industry and construction, which are far more fundamental.

Those, in sketchy forms, are the characteristics of the four major depressions of my time. They were all, as I have said, man-made. They were all—in large part at least—avoidable. That they were not avoided was due in substantial part to a general ignorance of economic affairs, an ignorance which in many quarters took the form of ardent belief in a doctrinaire concept of *laissez faire* in extreme form. Neither radicals nor reactionaries conceived of a middle course.

To the reactionaries, the panics and depressions, the mass unemployment, were regrettable but unavoidable blemishes that were justified by long-run progress. To the radicals, the panics were undeniable proof that a wholly new system was essential. Neither could envision what I believe is the great development of our time. And that is an evolutionary development of a system of economics which is congenial to freedom and which depends in turn on freedom for its strength.

To speak in terms of oversimplification, our system of economics must wrestle with the dilemma that while man cannot live on bread alone he nevertheless cannot live without bread. The stand-pat reactionary adherents of *laissez faire* were unprepared to recognize the urgent claims for bread. The radicals succumbed to the fallacious idea that man's only needs were material.

This is the essential conflict between freedom and security. Some reactionaries were so doctrinaire in their concept of freedom that they even persuaded an errant Supreme Court to hold inviolable what they called the "freedom" of child labor to contract for self-exploitation. And the radicals' position led to another form of reaction—statism, which

in Russia insists that security is so important that it becomes necessary to put 1 person out of every 12 in prison camps to guarantee security.

Both of these opposite positions are presented as logical; at least they pursue their reasoning to "dryly logical extremes." But the nonsense of this was explained by Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes when he told us that, "A page of history is worth a volume of logic." That is to say, man is not a dryly logical animal, but instead the genius of man is to pursue the problems of life practically and experimentally.

And that I take it is just what we have been doing in this country since its founding. We have been working away experimentally and practically toward finding enduring solutions to our problems. Mr. Jefferson, the philosopher, could write the most eloquent and ringing demands for freedom; while Mr. Jefferson, the practical statesman, could advocate some censorship of college textbooks. Mr. Lincoln, the libertarian, could denounce totally the iniquities of slavery; while Mr. Lincoln, the Unionist, could flatly state that if necessary to save the Union he would retain slavery.

Such paradoxes of expression can be blithely denounced as hypocrisy by the authoritarian. They will be recognized by others as acknowledgment of the power of reason and of the wisdom of experience.

And, as I see it, the same approach represents the heart of the matter when it comes to our economic path. The heart of the matter is reason, experience, and a wise adjustment to changing conditions. That is to say—and this, of course, involves an act of faith—an abiding belief in the value of continuous pursuit of knowledge. We must be confident that, if the prior aberrations of our economic system have been man-made, it follows that it is possible for wiser men to avoid much of this in the future.

How do we do this? I can suggest no exact formula—no quick and easy economic panacea. But I think I can suggest that evidence exists that we are acquiring the kind of practical and experimental knowledge I earlier referred to.

Let's go back for a moment to the panic of 1907. It was preceded by an abuse of credit expansion similar to that we witnessed in 1950. The Bank of England—then a private body—dealt with it, and dealt drastically with it rather than taking moderate and sensible measures. And most important of all, the Bank of England acted privately with no public discussion or even announcement of its policy. The bank did not act thus because it was malicious. Private, unannounced action was natural in the setting, and it would have been impossible in fact to have developed any significant public discussion of the matter at the time. Action not talk was customary in such matters.

Contrast the situation involving the over-expansion of credit last year. In the first place, the institution required to make the decisions was one with an explicit public interest—the Federal Reserve Board. Moreover, there was the liveliest sort of discussion about what the Federal Reserve should do and about the conflicting claims of the Treasury. I do not mean to overpaint the picture and claim that this question came before the attention of this graduating class with quite the impact of the difficulties of Ingrid Bergman and Roberto Rossellini, or of the then bliss of Rita Hayworth and Aly Kahn. But in relative terms, the credit expansion issue reached an audience far wider than could have been imagined in 1907 when such subjects were reserved for a corporal's guard interested in the higher mysteries of finance.

It is this broadening area of interest in the significant that gives me definite hope for your future. It is this widening of knowledge that permits me to come to a university feeling as a colleague. For if institutions of

higher learning such as Stanford are the root source of knowledge, it is also true that journalism represents the medium whereby knowledge may be associated with day-to-day existence.

It is true that there is no inevitable connection between either a university or a newspaper and the sincere search for truth. Universities can be debased; can be and have been turned from the light of reason by Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin, Peron—and even by forces in this country. And it is equally true that Hitler debased a once noble Frankfurter Zeitung, that Stalin publishes a perverted Pravda, that Peron suffocated La Prensa, and that megalomaniacs at home can plot a course 180 degrees away from honorable newspapering.

But those evidences of perversion do not condemn the concept of a university or of a newspaper. On the contrary, they are reminders of the eternal earthly struggle of good against evil—a struggle which, it seems to me, often helps to freshen and revive the good and protect it from the atrophy of complacency.

Your future hopes, if I am right, lie in the proper use of the powers of universities and the press and other means of pursuing knowledge. For as I see the main challenge of the twentieth century, it is to maintain the proposition that knowledge and reason offer the true pathway for man: It is a pathway through which your generation can find an acceptable solution to the competing claims of freedom and security if you refuse to be shackled by dogma. There is already emerging in our economy—as a result of the free inquiry of free minds—real progress toward a practical answer for giving man some measure of abundance, and doing this without state controls that take away his liberty.

One hears talk about the need of "perfecting" this progress. While you may at your ages dally for a while with ideas of perfection, I hope before you come to my age you will have realized that perfection had best be reserved for heaven. If, in place of perfecting, you can in our generation render this evolving system somewhat less imperfect, you will have made real progress in this field of economics. And this almost certainly will lead to more important progress in the field of world peace.

I felt in the twenties—and still feel—that world peace was impossible if Germany was to be kept in economic chaos. But in the glitter of the Charleston, bathtub gin, and F. Scott Fitzgerald, there was little serious concern with the problem.

Today—as I dimly perceive it—a similar though different basic problem confronts your generation. The underdeveloped areas of the world, which is to say a majority of the human race, are not willing to linger patiently in poverty. They are looking for an opportunity for progress. They have a choice, even though it is an illusory one, of associating with Communist tyranny if no other choice is offered. We have an opportunity, a difficult one but nevertheless an opportunity, of offering them a workable chance to choose the path of freedom. By hard work, by creative thinking, by perseverance in the task, you can create for them that opportunity. Or by default, as my generation defaulted on the problems that created World War II, you can give to the world the most ghastly holocaust in the history of man.

I have no belief that I—nor any one of another generation—can spell out an answer for you. My only hope is that I can suggest a broad and challenging avenue of approach.

That is the approach of the free and inquiring mind. It encompasses an act of faith in the worth and decency of mankind. It rests upon the democratic belief that thought and action are mutually enriching when both are free. It implies a courage

of the highest order—a courage that totalitarianism's tyranny and dictatorship can be routed by the arsenal of freedom. It recognizes that freedom cannot be splintered into tidy pieces but must be a unitary whole. And so it rejects the idea that political liberty can be retained in an atmosphere of economic regimentation. It rejects the fraud of Stalinism that man is an economic being and can become a robotlike occupant of a slave society. It rejects the anti-intellectualism of all terrorists who are willing to imprison the free mind or indulge in any other depravity that may yield them power.

Freedom, of course, has its true foundation not in rejection but in affirmation. It affirms the cardinal fact that man—every man—has an awesome importance because he is put here in God's image. In this country which has been congenial to freedom from its inception, our greatest man gave homely expression to this fact, when Lincoln stated that God must have loved the common man because he made so many of them.

Freedom affirms this, and implicit in the affirmation is a belief in the immeasurable powers for good of the unfettered mind.

It is this affirmation which has raised this great university and continues to inspire it. It is this affirmation which gives strength and guidance to all of us who value the search for truth in daily living.

In a world of calumny and threat and darkness—foreign and domestic—it is but natural that such vaulting aspirations are under attack from tyrants and from those anxious to impose tyranny.

Your generation may well determine the course of history for centuries in the awful choice that faces you. My generation can offer as our most substantial contribution the value of our experiences including our mistakes—and our faith, as I said at the outset, in the as yet unfathomed power of freemen wholeheartedly committed to the preservation of their freedom.

I know of no better parting thought for you than one expressed some years ago by my friend Louis Brandeis:

"If we would guide by the light of reason, we must let our minds be bold."

Truman's Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1951

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following very interesting editorial, written by Mr. Robert Ingalls, from the Corvallis (Oreg.) Gazette-Times of August 3, 1951:

TRUMAN'S AGE

While the guessing game concerning General Eisenhower's candidacy for President goes merrily along, it might be well to look on the other side of the fence and see what Harry might be thinking about. Among other matters that must be considered, is the problem of his age.

If he should run again and be elected (God forbid) he would be the oldest man ever to be inaugurated President of the United States. He would be 68 $\frac{2}{3}$ years old on January 20, 1953. The record up to the present is held by William Henry Harrison, who was just a few days over 68 when inaugurated in 1841. Buchanan in 1857 and

Jackson in 1833 (second term) were just under 66.

For that matter, no defeated major-party Presidential candidate has ever been as old as 68 on election day. Henry Clay was 67 in 1844, Lewis Cass was 66 in 1848, as was Gen. Winfield Scott in 1852. The elder Senator La Follette was 69 in 1924, but he was running on a third-party ticket.

It is another story on Vice Presidents. ALBEN W. BARKLEY was 71 at his inauguration in 1949, Charles Curtis was 69 in 1929, as was George Clinton away back in 1809. Henry Gassaway Davis, defeated Democratic vice presidential candidate in 1904, had seen no less than 80 summers. The combined ages of Truman and BARKLEY at their inaugurations in 1949 was higher than the combined ages of any other President and Vice President on inauguration day.

Harry might well take a leaf from the book of the great Charles Evans Hughes, defeated Republican Presidential candidate of 1916. At the time of the 1927 election he issued a statement declaring, "I am too old to run for President." He would have been not quite 67 on inauguration day, 1929.

Armed Forces Personnel Freedom to Communicate With Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr JAVITS Mr. Speaker, with millions of Americans serving in the Armed Forces and with the new emphasis upon a civilian army—America's traditional weapon against dictatorship and oppression—the right of Armed Forces personnel to communicate freely with Members of Congress is of the utmost importance. It will be recalled that the Congress endeavored to preserve this right inviolate by a new provision contained in Public Law 51, the Universal Military Training and Service Act, amending section 4 (a) of the Selective Service Act to include the following:

No member of the Armed Forces shall be restricted or prevented from communicating directly or indirectly with any Member or Members of Congress concerning any subject unless such communication is in violation of law, or in violation of regulations necessary to the security and safety of the United States.

I have just had an interchange of correspondence with the Secretary of Defense on the implementation of this section of the law and the intent of the Armed Forces in construing it so as to give the maximum freedom to personnel. This correspondence will also be of interest to Members who may have had similar experience involving their own constituents, and I append it hereto:

JUNE 15, 1951.

HON. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have a number of letters from men in the services who have been considerably shaken by the case of Lt. J. G. Evans, who was relieved of duty by the Navy and deprived of his commission

after making some strong statements about the President and the Secretary of State. The men who have written to me would like to know what they may or may not do in respect of criticism of governmental policies or people in Government at home or abroad outside the military service and therefore not touching on military discipline, military law, and the customs of the service.

In the amendment to section 4 A of the Selective Service Act just passed the question of communicating with Members of Congress is dealt with, but this leaves a wide area of communication untouched. I would very much appreciate an expression of views from you on this timely and important subject.

Sincerely,

J. K. JAVITS,
Member of Congress.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, July 11, 1951.

HON. J. K. JAVITS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. JAVITS In response to your letter of June 15, 1951, I do not believe that there is anything in connection with the Evans case or with the customs and regulations of the three services concerning public derogatory statements about officers and officials of the United States that should cause any conscientious serviceman concern. I am enclosing for your information copies of regulations of the Army and the Air Force, with pertinent sections marked, and extracts of pertinent Navy regulations. These regulations are now being studied with a view to possible revision in light of the Selective Service Act of 1951. I should also point out to you that article 88 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, which became effective on May 31, 1951, makes it a court-martial offense for military personnel to use contemptuous words against the President, the Vice President, Members of Congress, and other high officials of the National and State Governments.

It must be recognized that, in addition to strict compliance with pertinent regulations, the propriety of public comments of a member of the military service frequently depends upon the position and assignment of that individual. Frequently an individual in the military service may be placed by his superior officers in a position of trust where the international situation or other factors involved may be of such a delicate nature that any public comment contrary to the policies of the service or of the United States would prevent that individual from performing his duty adequately.

The value of an officer in any of the services depends in considerable measure upon his ability to exercise good judgment, and his activities in this field might well be an important indication of that ability. For example, an officer serving as military attaché or as liaison officer with foreign troops would demonstrate folly by issuing public statements of a derogatory nature about the nationals with whom he is connected.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL.

UNITED STATES NAVY REGULATIONS (1948 EDITION)

ART. 1248. Communications to the Congress

All petitions, remonstrances, memorials, and communications from any person or persons in the naval service, whether on the active or retired list, addressed to the Congress, or to either House thereof, or to any committee thereof, on any subject of legislation relating to the Naval Establishment, whether pending, proposed, or suggested, shall be forwarded through, or as authorized by, the Secretary of the Navy.

ART. 1249. Dealings with the Congress

No chief of a bureau, office, or division, or other subordinate in the Navy Department, and no person in the naval service shall apply to either House of Congress, or to any committee thereof, or to any Member of Congress, for legislation, or for appropriations, or for congressional action of any kind, except with the consent and knowledge of the Secretary of the Navy; nor shall any such person respond to any request for information from either House of Congress, any committee of Congress, or any Member of Congress, except through, or as authorized by, the Secretary of the Navy; except as provided in sections 102, 103, 104, and 859 of the Revised Statutes.

JULY 17, 1951.

HON. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY. Thank you for your letter of July 11 with respect to the customs and regulations of the services regarding expressions of opinion by servicemen. I note that you feel that certain revisions in these regulations have to be made in conformity with the amendment to section 4 (a) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act providing that "No member of the Armed Forces shall be restricted or prevented from communicating directly or indirectly with any Member or Members of Congress concerning any subject unless such communication is in violation of law, or in violation of regulations necessary to the security and safety of the United States."

I note that the regulations of the Navy Department, particularly articles 1248 and 1249, would require revision in view of the quoted provision of the law. It seems to me that the important point made in the law is the word "directly" and secondly the interpretation which will be made of the words "regulations necessary to the security and safety of the United States."

The services, of course, have the right to protect classified material but it seems to me that beyond that it was the intention of the Congress to completely preserve the right of direct communication by the men in the services. I do not consider article 88 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice to controvert the quoted provision of the Draft Act but rather to characterize communication which would be in violation of law. The important right to be preserved is that of communication unhindered and not through channels so long as it is neither contemptuous nor deals with classified material. The prohibition on the uttering of contemptuous words would seem to take care of discipline.

I hope very much that this is the way in which the Defense Department intends to construe and administer the law and I would very much appreciate any expression of policy from you on this subject.

With best wishes, believe me.

Sincerely,

J. K. JAVITS,
Member of Congress.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, July 26, 1951.

HON. J. K. JAVITS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. JAVITS This is with regard to your further letter, dated July 17, 1951, on the subject of the customs and regulations of the armed services regarding expressions of opinion by servicemen.

As I indicated in my letter of July 11, 1951, the service regulations on this subject are being studied with a view to possible revision in the light of section 4 (a) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act. I shall see that the suggestions in your letter are

considered in this connection and that copies of the regulations, as revised, are furnished to you.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL.

A Fearless Editor Defends an American Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, when I introduced H. R. 4780, a bill to fix bail of a convicted Communist at \$1,000,000 for each day he stays out of jail, a great hue and cry went up from certain left-wing editors.

Ridicule and abuse were hurled my way from Red sympathizers, and even the voices of some right-thinking Americans were subdued, perhaps in apprehension.

All the more reason why the country should be grateful to the fearlessness and courage of the editor of the San Francisco Examiner who defended the Hall bill in a recent editorial, which I insert herewith:

WHY TREAT TRAITORS BETTER THAN MURDERERS?

It is simple common sense and it is also sound justice to withdraw the privilege of going free on bail from convicted traitors, as Representative HALL of New York has proposed.

By amending the Federal Criminal Code, Mr. HALL would forbid the courts to extend bail, pending the outcome of an appeal, to any defendant convicted of treason, espionage, sedition, or subversive acts.

The need for such a revision has been made clear by the success of 4 of the 11 convicted Communist leaders in evading the prison sentences imposed on them on charges of advocating the violent overthrow of the Government.

These men had been permitted to go free on bail pending the outcome of an appeal to the Supreme Court.

But instead of surrendering when the Supreme Court upheld their sentences, the four simply vanished.

By forfeiting the \$80,000 bail that had been posted for them, they made it plain that the putting up of bail bond money provides no guaranty against the flight of defendants in cases involving disloyalty to the United States.

For the time being, at least, the four powerful Communist leaders have contemptuously evaded the just punishment imposed on them by a jury and a judge.

They have avoided the confinement that would have made them harmless.

They are still at large and free to pursue any course of treachery or sabotage against their country that may be dictated to them by their masters in the Kremlin.

And no doubt \$80,000 seems to those whose sinister cause they serve a very small price to pay for keeping them free and active.

Obviously the only way to make sure that individuals convicted of subversive crimes serve the sentences imposed upon them is to put them in jail and keep them there until any appeals they may make shall have been settled in the higher courts.

They do not deserve the privilege of freedom on bail because, as Representative HALL accurately observes:

"Persons convicted of these crimes against our country are in a special unholy category"

There is, actually, no category of criminal as low as traitors or as little deserving of consideration.

Even murderers, abhorrent as is their crime, are less cruel and unfeeling.

Yet convicted murderers are legally denied the privilege of bail and even persons charged with murder but not yet tried are only rarely admitted to bail.

Should traitors, who with their betrayals, secretly and callously endanger the lives of thousands of their fellow citizens, and who strive relentlessly for the destruction of the Nation itself, be better treated by the law than ordinary murderers?

We must, as Representative HALL recommends, put an end to the "ridiculous codding of these vicious Reds." We must close their every avenue of escape.

Mr. HALL's amendment should be promptly enacted into law.

Government Feeds Inflation While Pretending to Oppose It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Freeman of July 16, 1951:

C FOR COUNTERFEIT

A decent respect for the symbols of government makes it impossible to characterize properly a message from the President of the United States to the people on the terrors of inflation, in which the cause of inflation is never mentioned. It could ruin us and enable Stalin to take the world, if "it got away from us," he says; yet he treats it as something that just somehow happened, like an act of providence abetted by the National Association of Manufacturers and all "the selfish interests."

The facts about inflation are desperately simple.

Prices rise for only one reason—ever: because there is more money than goods. There may be either a scarcity of goods or a plethora of money. In this case there is no scarcity of goods; the cause of inflation is the fantastic increase in the supply of that irredeemable paper currency which we take to be money. We are obliged to take it to be money because there is no other kind. A New Deal law says there shall be no other kind and that to make bargains or contracts in any substitute for it is unlawful. But it is not money, save only in the sense that a counterfeit bill is money if you spend it without getting caught.

The only way to stop inflation is to stop the printing of irredeemable paper money.

Who prints it? The Government prints it. Who invented it? The Government invented it.

With what intent did the Government invent it? With intent to cause inflation for political ends. It was a device to convert its own debt into money. That gave it free billions to play with.

How does the Government convert its own debt into money? That also is simple. It works so:

The Government sells bonds. A bond is its I O U. How will the bond be paid when it comes due? In irredeemable paper money. How is that irredeemable paper money secured? By Government bonds.

Thus an I O U on one shape of paper is secured by an I O U on another shape of paper—as if, on going to the bank to borrow money on your promissory note, you were asked by the banker, "What security can you give me for the payment of this note when it comes due?" and you should answer, "Another promissory note. Give me the money on this one and put the other in your safe." If the banker said, "O. K.; here's the money," he would be on his way either to bankruptcy or to jail—unless the borrower at his window happens to be the United States Government. That makes it legal.

The Government alone is responsible for inflation. The danger is not, as Mr. Truman says, that inflation will "get away from us," but that it will get away from Government.

One of two things is true: either the President is ignorant of the facts, or he pretends not to know them. To tell us, as he does, that inflation can be stopped by a law forbidding prices to go up, is to tell us a false thing. The utmost we could do with such a law would be to postpone the consequences for a little while, with the certainty that later they would be all the worse for having been temporarily suppressed.

Suppose price controls did work for a time, so well that every housewife came home from market with money in her purse, having been able to satisfy her wants at the lower prices fixed by the Government. What would she do with the money? There it would be, a potential inflationary force, the problem, the cause of inflation, being that the amount of irredeemable paper money in people's hands has been increasing faster than the supply of goods.

So long as this process continues, controlling prices by law—even though it works briefly—is like holding down the safety valve while the pressure goes on rising in the boiler. "I can't do the whole job by myself," says the President. "It is up to all of us," he adds. So let us all swing our weight on the safety-valve rope and all blow up together.

The New Deal financed its revolution by inflation, designedly, and failed to bring about recovery. What saved its recovery program was a defense program, also largely financed by inflation, intentionally; then World War II, heavily financed by inflation, of course, as all wars now are.

Since World War II every grand policy conceived by the Government, domestic or foreign, has been inflationary. And now, coming to a much costlier defense program, and notwithstanding a terrific rise in taxes, we are facing for the next year a deficit of the order of fifteen billions. With that fiscal calamity in view, you might think the Government would be cutting its nonmilitary expenditures to the quick. No so. Its expenditures for nonmilitary purposes are at this moment the highest ever known.

How shall one explain the President's high disregard for statistical demonstrations by Senator BRAN and others that the Government's nondefense spending might be cut eight or nine billions with no crippling effects? The answer must be that it has a secret faith. Ectoplasmic money has never failed it yet. When the billions are needed they can be called out of the void, from utter nothingness. That it believes. That has been its experience. Which means, no matter what the President may say to the contrary, that the Government is counting on inflation still.

Whatever inflation may do to others, it does not impoverish government, for two reasons: First, as Government prints the paper money, so it spends it first, before its

effect on prices has been felt. Secondly, there is a long way to go before the cost of engraving a paper dollar will exceed what it will buy in the market place; and before that may come a regime that will reduce money to the status of a ration card.

Consolidation of Offices in Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to prohibit the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs from transferring or consolidating any offices or making extensive reductions in force until 60 days after notice of such proposed action has been given to the appropriate committees of both Houses of Congress. For the second time within a period of a few months the Veterans' Administration has sought to consolidate offices which, in the opinion of many Members of Congress, would be detrimental to the service the veterans are entitled to. We believe that those proposed consolidations would not have brought about additional efficiency nor even saved any money to the taxpayers in the operation of the Veterans' Administration. If anything, less efficiency was likely to result. The undue hardship that would be imposed upon the employees of the Veterans' Administration and their families is alone sufficient reason to oppose those changes. Such proposals are destructive of the morale of the employees in these offices.

Passage of my bill will give assurance to them and to all veterans that the matter will be carefully studied in the future by the appropriate congressional committees before such proposals are effectuated.

Plan To Abolish Football at West Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from today's Hartford Courant commenting on a proposal made by the junior Senator from Connecticut, Mr. BENTON, and supplement this with the column written by Bill Lee, sports editor, in the Courant on Monday, August 6, under his copyrighted caption "With malice toward none." The editorial mentions Mr. Lee's analysis:

SENATOR BENTON'S PLAN TO ABOLISH FOOTBALL

Senator WILLIAM BENTON is farther off base than usual in his recommendation that

football teams be abolished at West Point and Annapolis. Football, he says, is a cancer at these institutions and should, therefore, be extirpated. On this matter Mr. BENTON's views are completely at variance with those of Bill Lee, the Courant's sports expert. The latter believes that guilt lies less on the heads of the young men involved than on the eager-beaver politicians and brass hats who have been bitten by that bug of victory at any price. To support his position Mr. Lee cites the pleasant example of happy Herman Hickman at Yale, and the similarly healthy atmosphere that prevails at Amherst, Williams, Wesleyan, Trinity, and other small colleges where young men still enjoy the game of football.

Perhaps Senator BENTON went off half-cocked on this one. Anyway, he would profit greatly from reading Mr. Lee's views on the subject. The cancer is not football, as Mr. BENTON so superficially surmises. Basketball has been subject to fixes, but that does not mean that the game itself is inherently evil. The evil lies in the hearts and the minds of the parasites, political and otherwise, who have forgotten that football is just a game.

The evil goes even deeper than building a football machine through manipulation of congressional appointments to West Point and Annapolis. Things like the West Point affair have their counterpart in the atmosphere of amorality that has been developing in Washington under Mr. Truman, which is infecting the whole country. It is the kind of amorality that leaves men unmoved by the spectacle of a Supreme Court justice receiving a deep freeze from a little, cheap-John racketeer, or of a White House secretary getting a mink coat from a successful RFC loan applicant. It is the kind of amorality that causes officialdom to blink stoically at influence peddling, and that accepts without hesitation the philosophy that all life is a racket, so why not get yours while the getting is good?

Even Senator BENTON is not entirely free from onus. During recent investigations he admitted that he had received political cash contributions that he had not listed. These were used to buy and distribute reprints of a speech he made. A small thing, yes, and others do far worse. But it illustrates the manner in which corners have been cut in high and low places in recent years. Indeed, there is something slightly ridiculous in the fact that one Democratic Senator is now seeking to develop a written code of ethics for public officeholders.

If one adds all these matters together, they represent something infinitely more dangerous than the fall from grace of some young men at West Point. If football is a cancer to be extirpated from our service institutions, what can we call the politicians who continually cut corners on accepted standards of morality? Shall we extirpate them?

WITH MALICE TOWARD NONE

(By Bill Lee)

It makes a man a little sick in the stomach to learn that 90 West Point cadets are being kicked out of the Academy for cheating at examinations in violation of an honor code that has existed for more than 100 years.

But it makes this one man even sicker to hear Senator FULBRIGHT, Democrat, Arkansas, raise his hands in righteous anger and propose that Army and Navy abolish intercollegiate athletics.

The Senator from Arkansas is suggesting a cowardly action by the United States Military Academy. He is suggesting that the men responsible for molding the future leaders of the military forces of the United States break ranks and flee in disorganized retreat.

There should be an immediate and thunderous repudiation from West Point of Senator FULBRIGHT's easy way out. Without a

moment's delay it should be made plain that West Point will play out its 1951 schedule even if every game is lost, which is probably what will happen.

Reports indicate almost the entire varsity football squad is involved. This means that Coach Red Blaik will face the most arduous coaching assignment of his life. But it will be an honest squad of unsolicited and inept football players who may have more fun taking their beatings than the high-pressure stars would have had shooting for another typical Blaik season.

INVARIABLY GOOD FOOTBALL TEAMS ARE RECRUITED

Senator FULBRIGHT's outpouring of wrath would have been more acceptable if he had also suggested an investigation of some of his own colleagues, who may have cooperated in dispensing congressional appointments to likely football material.

Most of the appointments to West Point come from Members of Congress, and it is evident that all the great football players who have passed through the portals of West Point in the last 10 years did not win competitive examinations with nonathletic candidates.

West Point is no different from any college or university that has a powerful big-time football team. Such teams are not accidental. Without exception they are recruited. Outstanding prep-school and high-school athletes are induced by one means or another to accept financial aid or such other inducements as the college sees fit to offer them.

Thus the whole structure of football at West Point in recent years has contributed to the breakdown of the moral code and the responsibility rests as much with the high brass as it does with the cadets being kicked out of West Point under shocking and unhappy circumstances.

The condition here is not entirely unrelated to the recent basketball fixes. That was cheating in another form and responsibility for the breakdown belongs, to some extent, with the college presidents and athletic directors, whose flirtation with fame and fortune brought the disgraceful conditions about.

High brass must have decided that West Point should have football teams powerful enough to meet and defeat the best college teams in the country. At least, the higher-ups must have condoned such a program.

SOME DO IT RIGHT AND HAVE FUN, TOO

In order to build great football teams at West Point there had to be collusion in the matter of appointments. All-America football players do not enter West Point or any other college by accident and rarely without particular inducement.

Senator FULBRIGHT has been described as a long-time foe of commercialism in college athletics. If he is that, he has this carping critic's support right down the line. Pre-occupation with the moneyed phase of college athletics is the source of most of the evil, but when Senator FULBRIGHT suggests the way out is to abandon intercollegiate athletics altogether he is unmindful of the fine institutions of our country who conduct their athletics with sanity and good sense and have a lot of fun doing it. What his personal experience may have been as president of the University of Arkansas I have no way of knowing.

Representative PORTER, Republican, of Michigan, made more sense when he said the ousted cadets are the victims of a system and that the responsibility belongs to the Military Academy and not altogether to the comparatively few cadets involved.

There is an unholly amount of pressure on a football player in the "league" Army plays in. With the withdrawal from big time commercial football of NYU, Fordham, and Columbia, New York papers adopted West

Point's team for its own and the pressure generated from the pages of the metropolitan press has been out of all proportion.

West Point played many of its big games at Yankee Stadium and the Navy contest at some such place as Philadelphia's Municipal Stadium, where 100,000 persons paid into a gate of better than a half million dollars. This is big business and no two ways about it.

If you ask me, the finest tradition of Army football stems from the day when its football games were played on the military reservation at West Point. Knute Rockne and George Gipp of Notre Dame played there and the Army-Notre Dame game was a thrilling, glamorous thing long before it was engulfed by the big business of its transfer to Yankee Stadium, where it ultimately grew too big for its boots and had to be discontinued.

What has happened at West Point is a heartbreaking thing, but it is one little spot on the cancerous growth of intercollegiate athletics. Much more is needed than investigations and studies. There had better be some concerted action before it is too late.

The colleges had better put their own houses in order instead of junking things like the NCAA sanity code and rushing to scrap the freshman rule on the flimsy excuse that the present military situation is comparable to World War II.

Critics like Senator FULBRIGHT, however, should be told that football and sanity are not incongruous at Trinity, Wesleyan, Yale, Amherst, Columbia, and other such spots. If Herman Hickman can make the transition from all-winning West Point to Yale, where it is not uncommon to lose two or three games each season, and still keep the happiest grin in America, it must be possible for the football factories to reform and still have fun.

How Would You Reorganize United States?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD for the attention of Members of Congress an article by George Mellen, of Honolulu. The changes he proposes in our methods for selecting public officials are both original and provocative. They are deserving of the thoughtful attention of all students of our Government.

Following a distinguished career in the field of promotion and advertising, Mr. Mellen retired from active business to devote himself to study of government and other problems of human relationship.

His article follows:

How Would You Reorganize United States?
(By George Mellen)

"What Has Happened to You" in Reader's Digest for July 1950 is John T. Flynn's warning that you are being sucked down to ruin in the vortex of national debt. Nothing in the article suggests anything you can do about it but mourn and write to your Representative in Congress.

To test the editorial viewpoint of Reader's Digest I outlined a plan of action and

sent it in on July 17, 1950, as set forth in the following paragraphs. Response, dated July 28:

"Your discussion is interesting and provocative and we have read it with genuine appreciation of your point of view. But, unfortunately, the piece does not fit in with our editorial needs, and we are returning it with regret."

About 3 months later the magazine Life (November 13, 1950) asked editorially: "How bad are United States politics?" Its own guess included the plaint that "the quality of our politics has not kept pace with its increasing importance * * * and too many of our politicians, as currently spawned, are just not good enough to see us through the atomic age." An afterthought was that the independent voter could do something about it but suspected that the only thing wrong with the independent voter is that he doesn't know his own strength. Life offered no suggestions for improvement of political spawning methods, nor use of the independent voter's strength if he did know it.

With the thought that a provocative answer to Life's question might be better than none I sent my outline in on November 27, 1950. Response, dated January 23, 1951:

"It was good of you to forward the outline. We have read it with a great deal of interest but we cannot make use of it [as] most of Life is written by members of our own staff."

Both Reader's Digest and Life are in the multimillion reader class and that is achieved by editorial judgment nicely keyed to the fact that most of us enjoy a gripe but are bored with diagnoses seeking the cause of it. Hence many are the gripes and few the probes for causes in the pages of our press, on the air, and from the platform.

Nevertheless "What is happening to you" and "Bad United States politics" are not your depreciating dollar, your soaring taxes, your fantastically deepening national debt, your bungled foreign relations, and so on, but the cause of them. And the cause, as in any other enterprise, is bad management. Back of bad management must be incompetence, at least, and back of that the system through which incompetents, or worse, are employed. In this case the political machinery of your Nation. What's the matter with it? Obsolete, perhaps, if that is the word for eighteenth-century methods in mid-twentieth

Today no scientist, mechanic, nor roustabout of 1850 could believe the instruments of his calling today, much less manipulate them offhand. But any Member of the Twenty-third Congress, revived à la Fra the Phoenician, could sit in for any Member of the present session without briefing, and nobody note the shift. Any Rip van Winkle who heard the campaign speeches of Millard Fillmore for President and contemporary pleas from candidates for every office down to dogcatcher could walk into any political meeting today and hear nothing new.

How would you go about retooling your Government for "atom age" production?

Some of us think that the place to begin is with you as an essential ingredient for construction of a broad base such as that upon which rests the American corporation, its stockholders. We think that our Government might be set up to combine the best and most appropriate features of the successful American corporation for commerce and industry, especially those with extensive foreign relations, for scientific research, trust administration, insurance, banking, and so on. That American organization of private enterprise is efficient cannot be gainsaid. It has won two frightful wars, and if another comes, American efficiency and American honesty—never forget that—must win it.

American organized private enterprise is no longer in the experimental stage. It is working so well that it is the wonder and envy of every people on earth, including Britain, the mother of organized private enterprise. It is the rational extension of individual enterprise; the right to go in there and try—win, lose, or draw—and may God be with you. And He will, because He invented competitive private enterprise when "the first morning of creation wrote what the last dawn of reckoning shall read." By that law you must hide, fight, or run away. And as you have no armor as the turtle, no speed as the antelope, you must fight, mainly with brains given you in lieu of brawn. That is the measure of freedom and security you must accept.

Private enterprise, individual or organized, must make a profit or quit. There is no reason why the United States of America cannot operate at a profit out of which to pay its way and, in time, perhaps, pay you cash dividends instead of picking your pocket. Imagine what a political movement could do with that promise and plan. Practical, too, because America's natural resources and know-how provide the means.

Government has one legitimate function: to charter and protect righteous private enterprise. It is a service of vital, primary importance and as such is worth a fair price. But the price could as well be paid at the source as collected in myriad bites at fantastic expense to both government and business.

Further, to be fair, the cost of a charter should be fixed and subject to revision not oftener than, say, every 5 years, so that it can be projected into cost of doing business and included in prices. That would mean a universal sales tax which seems the only just and reasonable tax because ability to pay is proved by payment, and because payment is for something the buyer wants, there is no extortion as in arbitrary tax. The system is old, and current, on many luxury items. Use it on all.

That's how it looks to some of us. A working plan could be expected from an able national board of directors. Almost certainly they would not continue the present tax hotchpotch nor the mystic maze of import tariffs if they expected to discharge their obligation to operate the Nation at a profit.

Production of all kinds can be and ought to be by private enterprise, from heavy machinery to light entertainment and from hydroelectric plants to peanut stands.

Before sketching our idea for government set-up as a corporation, let it be said that the faults, failures, and skulduggery of corporations has been a natural manifestation of human behavior and must be expected in any form of association. Certainly our present political system is not blameless on that score and it is doubtful that any corporation or other form of enterprise for profit ever has plunged so many into so much misery as history records for the faults, failures, and skulduggery of governments since "the Assyrian came down like a wolf on the fold" and, finally, down and out.

One good reason why corporations for conduct of private enterprise cannot carry evil intent to crushing ends is that they must show a profit or quit, and profit comes from customer good will and nothing else in the last analysis. Revenue cannot be raised for long by taxing the stockholders.

The only enterprises consistently and continuously in the red are those collectivist activities conducted by your avowedly capitalist government. Dean of them is the Post Office, the chronic deficit of which is made up by taxes levied upon you, whether or not you mail so much as a post card and, worse, upon common carriers that suffer through Post Office competition. Other

communistic services, increasing in number at a rapid rate in recent years, are doing badly at a loss work which could be done well by private enterprise under public utility franchises. In a constant tizzy defending itself against communism, it seems that an effective move for America would be to abolish its collectivist enterprises and go on the offensive with all-out capitalism. To continue half capitalist and half Communist is rather silly. One or the other is right. Both cannot be.

But how, say you, are we going to confine government to governing and keep it out of the hands of incompetent and venal personnel? How frustrate the pressure groups always eager to corrupt them?

The answer is provided by human nature in action. Crooks we have always with us. Also the weak and the venal. There is no 100-percent purity possible, any more than there is in nature any 100-percent security possible. But we know that the weak and those who use them do not last long in private enterprise. A corporation cannot afford continued malfeasance any better than it can nonfeasance.

To achieve workable freedom from those risks Government can do as private enterprise does; pick personnel with character and ability commensurate with the job to be done and pay the top commercial wage for it. Which brings us to the point of how a stock company the size of the United States of America could organize practically for picking that type of employee, from board of directors to doorman.

First, let's admit that you can know very little, often nothing essential, about any candidate beyond the borders of your own bailiwick which, to take a unit well established in this country, is the county. If that is true, as indicated by persistent local interest, pride, and preferment, and the immemorial tribal instinct of mankind confirms, we can begin with a county board of directors. Many States have too many counties, several of which can be merged now that transportation and communication reduce time and distance in doing business with the county seat. To make sure that a board of directors comprise only those men and women big enough for the job, every candidate must have established a reputation for civic sense, honesty, ability to team it with others, and for undivided loyalty to county, State, and Nation. That would mean an offer of pay equal to that offered by private business for equivalent full-time service. It would mean also a tenure of office long enough to render public service worthwhile, and security keyed to qualification and to nothing else. Lastly, positively it would mean divestment of all private interests for profit.

Minimum age for a candidate could be 40, because few men and women get life well in hand before that age. That is based on the average, as boy wonders are as scarce as Winston Churchills and less gratifying, which brings us to retirement age limit, again based on the average at risk of losing the Churchill bonus, of 65. Term of office throughout should be 25 years with retirement pay for honorable service keyed to its length. Maximum age for a candidate could be 60, as less than 5 years in office would not tempt the right type with a rich store of experience and ripe judgment. There would, of course, be resignations, disabilities, deaths, and removals for cause.

Size of a county board would depend somewhat on the number of political subdivisions existing or deemed practical but from each there should be elected one member and one associate, both to serve full time and either to have full power in the absence of the other but the member polling the larger vote to be recognized as leader. This should minimize nonfeasance through

absenteeism and as two heads are better than one, make for good judgment and lighter labor.

Voting power would be the total of votes counted at the latest election (a proxy of every voter) thus automatically taking care of reapportionment annually. Elections should be annual, as the rhythm of existence is annual. Skip a year and interest sags. At the start, terms on all boards could be staggered but age differences, disability, resignations, death, or removal for cause might, within a few years, furnish new candidates enough openings.

Instead of nominations, either by convention or primary, let there be an examining board before which all candidates must appear. Any candidate who passes need only file and pay a nominal fee to have a place on the ballot. No party labels permitted. Affiliate as he or she may wish unofficially, the candidate must go before the people as an individual. Voting machines should be compulsory, to avoid spoiled ballots and to expedite election procedure.

Examinations of candidates must be open, on the air by radio or television, or published in the press. With TV, voters could see and hear a candidate under better conditions than in the hubbub and often rowdy political meeting.

One thing certain, the existing method of getting candidates on a ballot is silly if not vicious. To qualify, any lunkhead or crook needs only to put up a nominal entrance fee and get a few friends, equally worthless or dangerous, to endorse an application, with always the public danger of getting nominated and elected. Public exams for ability and character, the age restrictions, and no party affiliation would give ward heelers and pothouse politicians less than half a chance to function.

With election of a county board of directors, the voter will have made intensive, intelligent, and full use of the franchise. That would be the only election. How that would give every voter representation at the State capital and at Washington is revealed as you read on.

First duty of an elected county board would be selection by secret ballot from its own membership of a member and associate of the State board of directors, ex-legislature. On the State board the voting power of each county would be the total of votes cast at the latest election, thus taking care of reapportionment for the State.

First duty of a State board would be election from its own membership of a member and associate for the national board of directors, ex-Congress. Voting power to be the total of votes counted at the latest election, thus taking care of national reapportionment year by year and giving every voter in every county of the Nation a voice in its affairs.

Terms of office on all boards to be 25 years or to retirement.

First duty of the national board of directors would be appointment of a national general manager, ex-president, who would be free to pick his own subordinates from first assistant manager, ex-vice president, down.

The national board of directors would appoint a Supreme Court of, say, 18 members who would choose their own chief. A court of nine is not, nor has it been for a long time, equal to the load of today. Nine members sitting would, perhaps, constitute a court thus applying the same manpower reserve as for boards of directors by an associate for each member.

Two other appointees of the national board would be the attorney general free to build his own department, and the national auditor with like freedom to choose his subordinates.

As for the military establishment, the feeling grows that it could well be made a public

utility under obligation to maintain internal law and order and to prevent foreign aggression by nipping such political schemes in the bud. Here again there must be incentive and reward and obligation to make good or make room for some one who can. No national board of directors pledged to profitable conduct of the country could tolerate the present unwieldy anachorism. Long past is the day when a nation can depend on patriots leaping from the plow into the battle line or upon teen-age conscripts.

The military establishment of today is for grown men with taste and temperament for it as a career, with man-size pay and proper leadership and organization. We have come nearer to it, perhaps, with our marines than has any other nation unless we count the French Foreign Legion which, by the way, might be a pattern for the international police force which the modern world must have, soon or late, to survive and for which our Marine Corps could well be a neat nidus.

We have our choice of two ways to abolish war. One, keep on killing people (customers) and destroying their property (buying power) until all survivors are poverty stricken, or two, show other nations that good management can make any nation profitable to its people. That means slapping down, before he gets a good start, any demagogue anywhere, and that hasn't been done since 1914. The present and projected armament race can be nothing less than a tragic absurdity.

Coming back to the State board of directors, it would hire a State general manager, ex-governor, who would pick his own subordinates from first assistant ex-lieutenant-governor down. A supreme court and a State auditor would be named by the board.

Each county board would hire a county general manager, free to build his own staff, including city managers, ex-mayors. All appointments to be for life or to retirement at age 65, for satisfactory performance, or for failure to make good, an ouster forthwith.

Discipline is as natural and necessary as incentive and reward, so there must be some provision for ousting any member of any board of directors, as well as for appointees. It would seem that the offender's fellow members in secret ballot might be the best form. Perhaps there should be ratification of their act at the next annual election, yet that seems superfluous. No board is going to deprive itself of a valuable member, nor ought it be forced to drag a liability. None will deny that evils no end arise from causes in the obsolete set-up of our Government, namely, short tenure of office and low pay. A term of 2 years is absurd. Four years isn't much better, as an incumbent is out, or threatened with ouster, just about the time the work is well in hand. If good work has been done, a successor can wipe it out. Personnel are hired and fired right down the line for political reasons, disrupting operations in cities, towns, counties, States, and the Nation.

Having to run for reelection every 2 or 4 years is bound to take time and money. The time is yours. You are paying the incumbent to do the work he was hired to do, not to electioneer. The money too often is raised by mortgaging honor. "A rat race," as one Congressman called it.

If public office offered an assured career with good pay and authority to select able subordinates, it would be a foolish executive indeed who would tolerate even one incompetent, lazy, or dishonest member of a staff. And it would be an equally daft board of directors who would risk an attractive life career, assured by good performance, by foisting upon any appointee subordinates to destroy him and consequently themselves.

One of the most disgusting sights in America is the Chief Executive of this great Nation campaigning, with all that it implies,

for reelection to the high office he holds. And that applies to any public office. How long would a private enterprise last if the directors, executives, and all hands had to campaign for reinstatement every 2 or 4 years, always under the shadow of ouster through no fault of their own?

Granting that politics, as commonly understood, cannot be eradicated without depriving the individual citizen of his freedom of choice, it can be controlled more successfully by examination of candidates, lifetime terms of office, abolishing reelections and ruling out official recognition of parties than in any other practical way.

Doubtless, you are wondering how procedure as suggested above can get started. Who, for instance, would compose the first jury to examine candidates and how created? First, remember that evolution, not revolution, is being considered. Steps are taken from where we are as we are. Creation of the first jury of examiners could be by the county legislative body, the Governor of the State or by a high court as in naming trustees of an estate. Obviously the board should comprise, besides a medical doctor for physical examination of candidates (no sick person can deliver consistently good service in any job) eminent representatives of a county's normal activities. Needless to say that the board must be carefully recruited and amply paid.

To effect some of the reforms suggested, amendments to the Constitution, and to those of all the States, would be necessary. But, fortunately, the Constitutions are subject to amendments and have had many. America is committed to debate for renovation of its Government as better than bloodshed and devastation. And now it seems frightfully apparent that we are faced with facts demanding immediate debate, not between political parties on time-worn petty controversies but between our elected Representatives sitting even now as a national board of directors to determine the best means for survival of the United States of America as a free Nation, able to lead less fortunate nations out of bondage and by American common sense and good will to justify their faith in us.

God helping us, we can do no other.

Aluminum and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on July 20, 1951, two new pot lines were dedicated at Jones Mills, Ark., at the plant of the Reynolds Metals Co. The principal speaker on that occasion was Hon. W. Stuart Symington, Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The subject of his address was Aluminum and National Defense. In my opinion the address was very important, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALUMINUM AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

(Address by W. Stuart Symington)

It is a pleasure and an honor to be with you all at Jones Mills today. My own home joins your great State. It is good to get back to the Middle West.

Nearly every year, for many years, I have visited Stuttgart, for reasons that have had nothing to do with aluminum.

I am glad to join today with the countless friends of Richard Reynolds, Sr., and his four distinguished sons, Marion Caskie and Keen Johnson and all the rest, in order to pay tribute to an American pioneer and his organization for their work in the aluminum industry, an industry which is so vital to the future of our country.

I am also very glad to pay my respects to Senator FULBRIGHT as I visit here with his friends. Bill underwent a slight operation this week and therefore I am surprised and pleased he is with us. His counsel has been wise and cooperative ever since I took on this RFC work some weeks ago.

We do have with us, however, your senior Senator and neighbor, JOHN MCCLELLAN, one of the constructive statesmen in the Capitol today. I am most honored to be one of his host of friends.

It must be a source of pleasure and pride to every citizen of Arkansas to realize the extraordinary capacity and integrity of its representation in the United States Senate.

I share your pride also in my feelings toward BILL NORRELL, your fine Congressman. He and I have been friends since my very first days in Washington.

Today we have gathered together to celebrate another milestone of progress in the history of Arkansas and the history of aluminum, the metal that looks like silver, but does so much more for so much less.

The Reynolds Metals Co., superlative in aluminum production is a monument to the way in which the Government can sustain our free-enterprise system. It also illustrates how Government can keep the enterprise system competitive as well as free.

No enterprise aided by the RFC has contributed more to national security than Reynolds Metals. The story is worth telling and retelling.

Aluminum was first produced in this country in 1890. Until May 1941 it was made by but one company. Then Reynolds Metals, a fabricator of aluminum, brought in its first virgin aluminum production, at a plant located near Sheffield, Ala., named Listerhill in honor of the distinguished senior Senator from that State.

The officers of Reynolds Metals tell me that in seeking to embark upon the undertaking which created the first competitive source of aluminum in the Western Hemisphere, it ran into many difficulties. Among the most important of these was the company's inability to borrow, from any private financial institution, the relatively small amount then sought to build a small plant in the State of Alabama and a small plant in the State of Washington.

Unable to borrow the needed \$15,800,000 from private sources, Reynolds management turned to the RFC.

This was in the summer of 1940, when Hitler's program for world conquest was well on its way.

Reynolds furnished collateral in the form of first mortgages on its then existing plants and facilities.

In record time Reynolds brought its Alabama plant into production, requiring only 5 months and 28 days from the breaking of ground. The Washington plant's first aluminum also broke all records.

Before either of these plants could be completed, however, the United States called upon Reynolds to further increase its contemplated capacity; in fact the Government twice asked Reynolds to accept additional loans from the RFC.

Reynolds Metals, therefore, with the aid of RFC, brought about the first independent production of aluminum in the Western Hemisphere, at a time when it was vitally needed for our national security.

During the war years, this company produced and delivered to the Government at

the rate of 160,000,000 pounds per annum, which was approximately 50 percent of the country's maximum previous annual production per year prior to 1940.

Reynolds produced this amount of virgin aluminum, and also fabricated many millions of pounds for the aircraft industry, a truly superlative record.

People might wonder how the Government fared moneywise under these RFC loans to Reynolds as it obtained these vital war materials; and especially because of recent criticism of this great agency, despite its contribution to our national welfare.

I am glad therefore to furnish the details of this Reynolds financing a typical illustration of the best in RFC operations.

As of August 1, Reynolds will have repaid to the RFC approximately \$20,000,000 on principal, plus about \$14,000,000 in interest, or a total of \$34,000,000.

This latter figure is within \$12,000,000 of its total aggregate borrowings.

Reynolds still owes RFC \$26,000,000, which it is paying off in annual installments at an interest rate of 4 percent.

In addition, as a result of these borrowings from RFC, since the first loan was made, Reynolds has been able to pay the Government some \$55,000,000 in Federal taxes.

Finally it is estimated that by the time Reynolds repays the \$26,000,000 still due RFC, the company will have then paid to the United States Treasury some \$100,000,000 in excess of its total borrowing from the Government.

Consider also what these operations have meant to the living standard of thousands of people, in Arkansas and other States.

This is good government, good business, and good Americanism. In fact the whole transaction was good, for everybody but Hitler and Stalin.

For some years now my own life has been associated with aluminum.

There was a day not so long ago when only one company produced this metal. That was a dangerous situation for our national defense.

Then too, there once were people, so-called experts, but with little vision, who asserted before World War II that aluminum production of around 150,000 tons annually would be ample for any emergency.

These critics were later forced to take cover from a storm of disapproval, as the United States raced to arm against Hitler; and the capacity of aluminum was thereupon increased many times over, prior to the end of World War II.

After World War II, then what to do? Should we in effect revert back to one company as the producer of aluminum, or should we continue in this industry the doctrine that has made American production supreme, by nailing the word "competitive" into our free competitive enterprise system.

Some of us thought yes—others no. I will never forget a meeting in 1945 in the office of the Attorney General of the United States. At this meeting an elderly gentleman, representative of an old school that has little to do with southern hospitality, asserted, "If I offer the best food in town, why shouldn't I receive all the business?" The answer—and to my way of thinking the answer ended the matter—was, how do you know you would offer the best food in town if somebody else was allowed a kitchen?

From then on we got down to business; and what we view with pride here today is one of the results.

There are those who have been, and are, skeptical about the further growth of aluminum. I do not share that skepticism. I believe that the production of this metal, one of the most plentiful materials on the face of the earth, will expand much further.

There are many reasons for this belief. Today aluminum production in this country is less than three-fourths of 1 percent of steel production. Yet even now we are sam-

pling the building of bridges with the lighter metal.

Today aluminum furnishes much of the future of our Nation's security, in planes, on ships, in missiles, in ammunition, and in countless other uses.

Not the least of these other uses is that it is the logical supplement, and/or substitute, for ever diminishing copper as the conductor of electricity in this electrical age.

Equally important, aluminum is the only major material I know whose price over the years has fallen almost continuously. Higher costs, or the evil of price control through cartels and monopoly, or both, have resulted in exactly the opposite trend in other metals.

Today, therefore, my friends, we may well be at the end of another beginning, in that aluminum plants, including fabricating plants, should continue to grow, over many parts of this country, with hydroelectric power if that is available; with other fuels if such power is not on hand.

More of these additional plants may well be constructed in your great State, near the largest source of American bauxite.

A plant around here is far from bases from which enemy bombers, loaded with atomic weapons, could suddenly dash.

Such a plant would also be far from coasts where enemy submarines might surface to launch guided atomic missiles.

Recently there has been much agitation for the United States to add even more money to the hundreds of millions of dollars already invested in foreign countries for the production of aluminum.

Well, it is nice work if you can get it, and you cannot blame other governments for trying.

No American is more anxious than I to see every pound of goods and equipment necessary to support our position of defense for ourselves and the free world furnished just as promptly as possible. As example, it would be unthinkable not to rush to General Eisenhower anything and everything necessary for him to obtain that military position he considers necessary to carry out the mission for which our Government sent him to Europe.

But why build up foreign industry against the bitter protests of our own industry when, from a strategic standpoint, to do so would be directly contrary to the logic of all our other planning?

When the German saboteurs of World War II were caught after landing from their submarine, it soon became common knowledge that perhaps their primary targets for destruction were the aluminum plants.

That was wise planning on the part of the Nazi warlords because the aluminum industry is a core of all national defense planning.

It is the base of all airplane production. It gives the modern lift.

If, because of power economy, it would be right to build new aluminum plants on northern outskirts, then why is our new and greatest aviation research center located in Tennessee?

Production of atomic bombs requires very great amounts of electric power. Why then has the new center for this production just been placed in South Carolina?

The answer is obvious to any schoolboy—and yet some of us have been ridiculed in the press for not adding further to the outside aluminum empire.

For years it has been world knowledge that the Soviets were moving a vast amount of their industry behind the Urals, presumably in order to place it as far as possible from the strategic bombing of any possible enemy.

No doubt they noticed how relatively easy it was for allied planes to crack the Ruhr, but how very difficult it was for the same planes to knock out such Nazi Eastern European plants as the Skoda munitions works in Czechoslovakia.

It must bewilder these Soviets, as they move their own industry deeper and deeper into their heartland, to read of a program, supported in many quarters, to locate some of our most vital war industry on the perimeter of our northern frontier.

In opposing further financing of foreign aluminum corporations on the, in effect, polar fringe, Jess Larson, one of the ablest men in Government, and I, were in good company. Nobody opposed it more firmly than the entire Reynolds organization.

Most articulate in opposition was their counsel, a great American patriot, the former Secretary of War, Judge Robert P. Patterson.

There have been some who imply that those who favor this policy would also favor writing off our northernmost lands.

What an absurd deduction.

As a result of experience in the Air Force, I know that not only the defense, but the successful defense, of such of our possessions as Alaska, is absolutely essential to the security of the United States.

Based on the concept of any future war, however, would we build an atomic bomb plant in such locations? If not, why an aluminum plant? Because as I said, aluminum gives us our lift—and airlift today is necessary to deliver the one weapon we all know is the chief deterrent to war.

It is time, if there is time, to become realistic in our thinking, because there may be a day, soon now, when the Soviet atomic stockpile becomes large enough for them to think they are able to do the job in one vast devastating surprise attack.

When that day of possibility comes, the time to rearm in relatively leisurely fashion has gone forever.

Our position will then be somewhat similar to that of England in the late thirties, only worse, because we were behind England, but who is behind us?

Our noble allies are in front of us, but who is behind us, with men and money and guns.

So above all, let's be realistic, because in realism lies strength. The biggest fool is the fool who for any reason—fear, desire for profit, desire for political gain—fools himself.

Let us not be like the able but gullible American who stated after leaving Yalta:

"We really believed in our hearts that this was the dawn of the new day we had all been praying for and talking about for so many years. We were absolutely certain that we had won the first great victory of the peace. . . . The Russians had proved that they could be reasonable and farseeing and there wasn't any doubt in the minds of any of us that we could live with them and get along with them peacefully for as far into the future as any of us could imagine. . . . I think we all had in our minds the reservation that we could not foretell what the results would be if anything should happen to Stalin. We felt sure that we could count on him to be reasonable and sensible and understanding."

That was in 1945. Surely by now we should have learned our lesson about such misty thinking, thinking which if not discarded may well cause the downfall of our Nation.

But we haven't. As example, only recently, on a national broadcast the former chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission attempted to give us justification for his opposition to the building of the best atomic weapons the fact he was dissatisfied with administration decisions about the military budget.

If because we believe in the Christian ethic, and therefore would not deliver a sudden surprise atomic attack, who can be sure whether Stalin is glad or sorry about the current vast defense expenditures. He and his totalitarian economists, in a land where the coin of the realm is the order of the dictator, know full well the grave dangers creat-

ed for our capitalistic state by such expenditures over any extended period.

Therefore we must handle all mobilization effort with the same efficiency as displayed in this operation we dedicate today.

Samuel Johnson long ago defined a corporation as "not a mere parcel of boilers and vats, but the potentiality of power well beyond the dreams of avarice."

In dedicating these new facilities of the Reynolds Metals Co., may I borrow from the immortal Dr. Johnson; because we here dedicate not a collection of pot lines and casting plants, rather the potentiality of realizing the dreams of free men for a free world.

Born of the enterprise of free men, these structures represent far more than the hope of a business enterprise for profit. They symbolize the strength and power of America to safeguard its security and the security of its allies—and in more pleasant times they represent the steady upward march of our standard of living.

This great new industrial development is the result of realistic teamwork between industry and Government; and there must be more of such teamwork if we are to survive the growing dangers of this atomic age. There must be realism and frankness and truth in all our dealings.

From under white crosses all over the world come the shades of our beloved youth, who died that you and I might preserve our freedom. They whisper, "Remember us, and face up to the truth, so that you and your children can remain free."

Responsibility in the Press and in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, politically inspired attacks on our Secretary of State continue. At the same time the Soviet press names Secretary Acheson as the chief architect of the effort against the Kremlin. Against this background there was delivered in Portland, Oreg., last week a speech by the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] on the subject of responsibility in the press and in politics, which is particularly appropriate. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator's remarks before the Press Club of Oregon on August 4, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RESPONSIBILITY IN THE PRESS AND IN POLITICS (Address by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER)

The topic that I have given myself tonight has within it the conception of a joint responsibility—responsibility not only in the press, but also in politics. Responsibility on the part of our legislators in Washington is no less important than responsibility in the press and I would be less than frank if I did not say to you tonight that I have been terribly disturbed in the past months by the irresponsibility shown by some men in both Houses of Congress. I am not talking about honest-to-goodness criticism. We need more of that—our system of government is based on the necessity of constructive criticism. We need more constructive ideas. But what I think is regrettable is the lack of responsibility in some of the attacks on men in public life, and in the

attacks on our policies, that are neither constructive nor would it appear delivered with any other purpose than to cause disunity among our people. Now I want to be perfectly clear about what I mean.

I have not always supported the foreign policy of this administration.

At times I have disagreed, and I have said so openly. I have believed, for example, that our administration has not gone far enough in pushing for a real federation of the countries of the North Atlantic area. I have offered what I believe to be sound reasons for asking now for a conference to discuss steps to strengthen this community of nations with a common design to resist Communist aggression and to live in peace. This is criticism of the foreign policy of our Government. But I hope it is, and mean it to be, constructive criticism.

What I am concerned about, for example, are the violent, personal attacks made on men who are honestly devoting themselves to the service of their country. There has been in Congress a so-called get-Acheson drive. This is a case in point. What are the nature of the charges against the Secretary of State? Are they charges that he is incompetent? Are they charges that he is ill-informed or lacks understanding of the problems that face our country? Are they charges that he is dishonest or of low moral character? No. They are none of these. What are they then? Well, the charges are that the Secretary has sold out the American people, or something equally irresponsible. Now as I have said, I have not on every occasion agreed with the Secretary of State. But I think I know an honest, hard-working man when I see one. I can recognize such a man in Dean Acheson.

His policies and programs, for the most part, have been constructive and imaginative. I would not say, on the other hand, that we have not made mistakes, but in the face of the greatest menace that has ever faced this country, I submit the Secretary of State has played a leading part in mobilizing the free world to a recognition of the threats and in getting the nations of the free world together to do something about it. I believe that it is noteworthy that Secretary Acheson was identified with the formulation of the Marshall plan; it was noteworthy that he was instrumental in launching the North Atlantic Pact, and in recommending a workable plan for helping the nations of Europe to strengthen their own defenses. Secretary Acheson took a leading part in urging United Nations collective action in stopping aggression in Korea. Under Secretary Acheson, a start has been made towards a Pacific mutual defense system. It was Secretary Acheson's recommendation that makes it possible for the United Nations General Assembly to bypass the veto-ridden Security Council. The Secretary, then, has a substantial record of accomplishment. While he has erred occasionally, I say that those who launch personal attacks on Mr. Acheson might well oppose his policies as such—in speeches and in votes in the Congress—instead of descending to slanderous attacks that would confuse the issues before the American people. There is also a small group who misinterpret our action in Korea. I would like to talk to you for a moment about this, because I know how important Korea must seem to you on the west coast who see the ships and men coming and going directly to the battle area.

There is a small group today who say that we should not have withdrawn our troops from Korea in the first place. But these same men said nothing when these troops were withdrawn in 1949. There is a small group today who say that we should not have gone into Korea to stop aggression in June, 1950. But when our troops moved in, these same men expressed almost universal approval. My good friend Senator McMahon has called this 20-20 hindsight. I think that very aptly describes their views.

Now just what has Korea meant to the free world? I think that it has meant a number of very important things to the American people, and for that matter, for freedom-loving peoples everywhere. Let us look for a moment at some of the things that the action of the United Nations in stopping aggression in Korea means to the free world.

At the outset it might be well to consider our objectives in Korea. When the North Korea Communists set out to conquer Korea south of the thirty-eighth parallel, this was an attack on the independent Republic of Korea, which the United Nations itself had helped to establish. Our objective, then, in going into Korea, was a military one; it was—and there are the very words used in the U. N. resolution passed June 27, 1950—"to repel the armed attack and to restore international peace and security in the area." That continues to be our objective. If the cease-fire talks now under way are successful, the United Nations will have been successful in obtaining this objective. Now, there has been another objective in Korea—a political objective—to secure a unified, free, and independent Korea. That is still our objective. But neither the United States nor the United Nations has sought to pursue our political objective through military means. That is an important distinction and one that must be borne in mind. The United States must continue to try through peaceful means to assure free elections throughout Korea, so that real unification may be accomplished. But if the United Nations takes upon itself to seek this unification through military means, we, ourselves, will be resorting to the Communists' own tactics and cast doubt throughout the world on our intentions everywhere. Now, it should be made very clear that when the United Nations forces pursued the enemy north of the thirty-eighth parallel last October, this was done only after the Reds rejected a new cease-fire offer and then the pursuit was for military reasons—that is, for the protection and security of our forces. For obvious reasons, we must now be certain that our cease-fire agreement is at a defensible position.

So, in thinking about Korea today, I believe it is important to bear in mind our objective—to stop aggression and restore peace in the area. Now, let us look for a moment at what the United Nations action in Korea has meant to the free world.

Here for the first time in history of man nations banded together to stop aggression. This is a tremendous step in the direction of establishing real peace in this world. Sometimes we forget that only a few years ago the League of Nations fell on this very issue. But in the United Nations action in Korea we see collective action through armed resistance to aggression. Our losses in Korea have been for a noble purpose. Our sacrifices in Korea emphasize sharply that there is no easy short cut to the establishment of a community of nations that can live together peacefully under an enforceable system of law and order.

Second, United Nations resistance to aggression in Korea has brought new hope and courage to free men everywhere. For the farmer in Turkey, or for the shopkeeper in Denmark, knowledge that his country can look with confidence for collective support should aggression threaten his land is inspiring comfort for one across the border from the Soviet stronghold. The citizens of the free world, as a result of United Nations action in Korea, have a new bond and deeper mutual faith. It is true that not all the nations cooperated as fully as we would have liked in Korea, but we must remember that this is our first collective action, and new methods even in our daily life do not always catch hold rapidly. Some of these nations are engaged in fighting communism elsewhere—the British in Malaya, the French in Indochina. These, and others, have commit-

ments to increase their armed strength in Europe to meet the threat of aggression at their very doorsteps. But the aggression in Korea has alerted all the free nations and it has stimulated them to greater efforts to build up their own strength. We have shown the aggressors of today that they can't get by with a Munich, Ethiopia, and Manchuria.

Third, United Nations action in Korea has thrown off Communist plans for the conquest of all southeast Asia. Pressure on Indochina has relaxed, and progress is being made to strengthen Thailand and the Philippines and Indonesia. Certainly, after the U. N.'s prompt action in Korea, Soviet puppets and satellite leaders will think twice before allowing themselves to be pushed into any venture such as that in which the leaders of North Korea have found themselves.

So if the current talks bring peace to the area, the United Nations forces will have recorded a monumental achievement.

Some of the small group who criticize every action of this Nation in the foreign field would minimize this achievement. I say that it will go down in history as a great milestone in man's everlasting search for peace.

We ask what more can our country do to prevent the spread of communism among the earth's peoples, and at the same time avoid the outbreak of a world war that might destroy much of civilization as we know it today. In considering these issues, I believe that we must never forget that our objective is peace. Just as collective action has shown the way in meeting aggression in Korea, I believe that we must continue to move forward in building structures for collective security elsewhere in the world. Above all else we must work for a body of world law, vigorously and intelligently enforced. For centuries man has been searching for ways of establishing peace. In primitive times man fought for food and survival. Later he joined in larger and larger groups for mutual protection. In the same way, nations have moved into loose federations for mutual protection. The League of Nations and the present United Nations are the result of earlier experiments with leagues and ententes—none of which was strong enough to stand the test very long. Today, the free nations of the world must go ahead much further than they have in joining together to be strong in the face of a new threat. I have criticized our own Government for not pushing ahead faster in uniting the free peoples of the world. The countries of Europe have made great strides in breaking down old boundaries, and in overcoming animosities that have plagued the continent for centuries. But they must go further, and I am happy to see that General Eisenhower himself is urging them to go ahead in this direction. The Atlantic Pact is an instrument set up to keep the peace. But if this group of nations is to have real strength, it must have the authority to present a united front and to repel aggression promptly if necessary. Along with a number of my colleagues, I have sponsored a resolution calling for our Government to take the lead in bringing about a conference to study ways of strengthening the North Atlantic alliance of nations. If our country will take this step, I am convinced that such a conference would make such recommendations that would find approval among the American people as well as among the peoples of the other Atlantic nations. What this resolution proposes is only that we call such a conference. Recommendations would be submitted to the peoples of these nations for approval. I am not proposing that the United States give up any degree of sovereignty. What I do propose is that we explore now—while we have the opportunity—means of strengthening the Atlantic community so that it can grow so strong that no aggressor will dare attack any of its members. We have seen the principle of collective secu-

city in action in Korea. We can recall from this experience one great lesson that our forefathers learned in the days when they established this Nation: Together we stand, divided we fall.

The United States must take the lead. We must show vision and courage. Time may be short. It is up to the United States to show the way.

Oxford Presbyterian Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared about the annual homecoming day of the Oxford Presbyterian Church, in my home county of Rockbridge, Va., celebrated last Sunday. My statement includes a brief historical sketch of the church and the settlement of the Valley of Virginia by the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Last Sunday it was my privilege to attend the annual homecoming day of a historic Presbyterian Church in my home county of Rockbridge called Oxford. The morning devotional hour included a sermon by the scholarly pastor, Dr. George West Diehl, on loyalty to what the church flag represented and loyalty to what the American flag represented as a test of a good Christian and a good citizen. After a bountiful basket picnic on the spacious church lawn the afternoon session included devotional singing, an address by me entitled "The Mission of the Church," and the dedication of the church flag and the American flag.

In the dedication of the church flag the following ceremony was used:

Leader: "We welcome this ensign of the militant church of the living Christ and in its place in the front of the worshipping congregation is symbolic of the church's place in the minds and hearts of the people."

Hymn 294. "Onward, Christian Soldiers" (1, 4)

Leader: "In deep appreciation for all donations of the church of the living Christ through all the ages, given to those who have dared to seek the higher life"—

People: "We dedicate this flag."

Leader: "To the martyrs and reformers whose witness to the truth has given us religious liberty and an open Bible"—

People: "We dedicate this flag"

Leader: "To the memory of our sturdy forefathers who set up this church on the frontier as a testimony of their Christian faith and as a bulwark against religious tyranny"—

People: "We dedicate this flag"

Leader: "In gracious appreciation for the faithful who maintained a high standard of Christian faith through the years, bequeathing to us a glorious heritage"—

People: "We dedicate this flag"

Leader: "As a testimony of our acceptance of the challenge that has been transmitted to us and our earnest purpose to fight the good fight for Christ and the right as He leads us to see it"—

People: "We dedicate this flag."

The dedicatory prayer.

Hymn 253: "O Jesus, I Have Promised" (1).

And this was the ceremony used for the dedication of the American flag:

Leader: "In a day when human rights are wantonly violated, the foundations of our country flouted as errors, and an ideology that would make us a nation of slaves besets us, we do well to place before us, even in the sanctuary, this symbol of our beloved Nation."

Hymn 338: "My Country, 'Tis of Thee" (1, 4).

Leader: "To our forefathers, acting on the principle that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, who chiseled a new nation from the wilderness"—

People: "We dedicate this flag"

Leader: "To the memory of those who fought in the defense of those principles, giving 'the last full measure of devotion'"——

People: "We dedicate this flag"

Leader: "In honor of those who answered the call of duty and returned to enjoy the victories they had won"—

People: "We dedicate this flag"

Leader: "In honor of those of our congregation who have served as servants of the public, furthering the cause of good and stable government"—

People: "We dedicate this flag"

Leader: "In honor of the honest citizenship of our congregation, humble, serving, and fully determined that, come what may, 'the government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth'"——

People: "We dedicate this flag"

The prayer of dedication

Hymn 339. "O Beautiful for Spacious Skies" (1, 2).

I desire to stress this statement made in the dedication of the church flag: "To the memory of our sturdy forefathers who set up this church on the frontier as a testimony of their Christian faith and as a bulwark against religious tyranny" Many are familiar with the beauty and fertility of the Shenandoah Valley but many are not aware of the fact that the first settlers came to the Valley of Virginia in search of religious freedom. Germans from the Palatinate of the Lutheran faith first migrated to Pennsylvania in search of religious freedom and from there into the northern counties of the Shenandoah Valley. Their outstanding leader was Gen Peter Muhlenberg, a preacher of the Lutheran faith, who in the Revolutionary War was commissioned a colonel by George Washington and eventually rose to the rank of major general. Incidentally, his brother from Pennsylvania was the first Speaker of the United States House of Representatives. Those Germans who settled in the valley, commonly called "Valley Dutch," loved not only religious but political freedom and constituted some of the finest soldiers who served under General Washington.

The early settlers of the valley were known as Scotch-Irish. They were Scotchmen from the Protestant counties of Ireland who migrated first to Pennsylvania and in 1732 commenced their migration into the Valley of Virginia.

The British King had instructed a Virginia Governor named Alexander Spotswood to explore the area of Virginia lying west of the Blue Ridge Mountains for the purpose of perfecting British defenses against the French and Indians, and in doing so made possible the migration from Pennsylvania into the Valley of Virginia of the splendid group, commonly called Scotch-Irish of the Presbyterian faith.

When Governor Spotswood and the Knights of the Golden Horseshoe returned to Williamsburg they told of the beauty and fertility of the land west of the Blue Ridge and asked for settlers but in that day

and time when the western boundary of Virginia extended to the Mississippi River and its Northwest Territory to the Great Lakes, Virginians living east of the mountains looked upon the entire area west of the Blue Ridge as a wilderness filled with wild Indians and wild beasts.

In 1701 the Virginia House of Burgesses offered settlers free land in the valley, with tax exemption for 20 years but the Virginia low-landers were not interested.

In 1732 a Scotch Presbyterian named Joseph Hite obtained a large grant a few miles south of Winchester and brought in 16 families from Philadelphia. At a meeting of the synod of Philadelphia in May of 1739, John Caldwell, whose grandson was the great John C. Calhoun of South Carolina, offered a resolution, which was adopted, petitioning Governor Gooch, of Virginia, to permit Scotch Presbyterians to settle in the valley. The letter which the synod sent to Governor Gooch said that the settlers were loyal to King George but were of the persuasion of the Church of Scotland and asked "liberty of their consciences and of worshipping God in a way agreeable to the principles of their education."

In his reply, which was dated May 28, 1739, Governor Gooch said that these settlers might be assured "that no interruption shall be given to any minister of your profession who shall come among them, so as they conform themselves to the rules prescribed by the Act of Toleration in England by taking the oaths enjoined thereby, and registering the place of their meeting and behave themselves peacefully toward the Government." And to the people of eastern Virginia Governor Gooch said that these people, whom he knew to be firm, enterprising, hardy, brave, good citizens and soldiers, would form a natural barrier against the hostile Indians.

One of the Indian forts built by those Scotch-Irish Presbyterians was located on Buffalo Creek in Rockbridge County and named Oxford. During weekdays it served as a school, on Sunday as a church and at all times as an Indian fort. The church was built on land donated in 1752 by a large landowner of eastern Virginia named Borden. From that church went a company of soldiers under the leadership of Captain Hall to the relief of General Washington at Point Pleasant.

Other Scotch-Irish Presbyterians who figured in the settlement of the valley and West Augusta and who played a prominent part in the Revolutionary War were the Lewis and Preston families. In 1743 the Virginia Council authorized Thomas and Andrew Lewis, sons of Col. John Lewis, of Augusta, to take up 30,000 acres in the basin of the James above the mouth of the cow pasture. That area, now in Alleghany County, was then a part of Augusta, as in those days, Augusta extended to the Mississippi River on the west and to the Great Lakes on the north. The Lewis family built Fort Lewis and Fort Dinwiddie.

Another fighting name among the colonial settlers was Preston. In 1756 Capt. William Preston, on orders from Maj. Andrew Lewis, built a fort on the bull pasture. In 1769, then a colonel, he acquired lands on Potts Creek. He was a son of the first John Preston to own lands on the cow pasture, the father of James P. Preston, a Governor of Virginia and grandfather of William C. Preston, a United States Senator from California. The Scotch-Irish pioneers of the valley have a right to be proud of the fact that the John Preston family produced 10 United States Senators.

The exercises last Sunday at old Oxford Church carried for me a deep significance. The principles for which those Scotch-Irish settlers had fought, bled and died was never more seriously threatened than it is today by the antigod ideologies of communism.

It was an inspiration to me to see the descendants of those sturdy pioneers assembled to renew their allegiance to the faith of their ancestors. In closing my remarks on that occasion I said:

"If the world is better today than it was 2,000 years ago, and I think that it is, it is due to the teachings of the Prince of Peace and of the little band of disciples who carried on the mission after the Master's death. If the priceless principles of political and economic freedom which were born of the brain and purchased by the blood of our founding fathers are passed on to generations yet unborn it will be because the Christian men and women such as I have the privilege of addressing today revitalize the faith that was Abraham's, the humility and gratitude that were Job's, and the zeal that was Paul's. In a world filled with wars and rumors of wars, of bitterness, distrust, envy and greed that is the mission of the church."

State Department Budget Slash

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, my very distinguished constituent, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, has recently written a column commenting on the regrettable action of the House Appropriations Committee in cutting United States contributions to the U. N. and other international organizations. I ask unanimous consent that this column, with whose conclusions I heartily agree, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There also appeared in the Washington Post of July 27 an editorial on the same subject entitled "Trimming the U. N." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of July 31, 1951]

STATE DEPARTMENT BUDGET SLASH BY HOUSE IS NOT WISE

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

HYDE PARK, Monday.—The action of the House Appropriations Committee in cutting the budget of the State Department for foreign contributions is something everyone of us should consider carefully. If we feel strongly about it, I think we should let our Representatives know how we feel, since the Senate will shortly take action and there may be some chance to restore some of the cuts.

The budget submitted to the House by the State Department contained a request for \$30,684,476 for the purpose of meeting the legal obligations of the United States to U. N. and other international organizations. Subsequent changes in requirements made it possible for the State Department to make a reduction in its original estimate and it voluntarily asked for \$30,297,861 which was all that was required.

On July 24, the House reduced this amount by \$3,297,861 and authorized \$27,000,000. In addition, the House voted on July 25 to further restrict the U. N. payments to any of these international organizations to 33 1/3 percent of the annual cost thereof. It

should be noted that there are organizations in which our country has borne a new heavier percentage than other nations—in some cases a very much heavier percentage. But an agreement has been reached that in 1952, which is only 1 year, the United States subscription would be reduced to 33 1/3 percent in many instances.

This action of the House will mean that to U. N. itself we will be in default by quite a large sum, and in lesser amounts we will be in default to nine other international organizations, including the Pan American Union, UNESCO, World Health Organizations, and the International Labor Organization.

Of course, the Soviets will say, in effect, that for all the assurances given by the State Department, they can never count on the United States. They will point to our Congress as being at odds with the State Department and try to show that it is evident the United States never did have any interest in the U. N. or in making any international organization work. They will say that they, in the Soviet have been so much more honest.

They will claim they have stayed out of organizations where they felt they were unable to pay their share, but wherever they had an obligation, they have done all they possibly could to fulfill the obligation. It will sound so virtuous on their part and we will be made to appear dishonorable and selfish.

I realize fully what it means in sacrifice to every American family to accept the international obligations which are ours today. But I cannot believe that our people want to put themselves in a position where they do not keep their word for one more year.

The word given has to be given by responsible people on the administrative side of the Government, and, of course, the Congress has to back up that word. It can quite rightly, I think, advise the administrative part of the Government that it should not undertake to contribute more than a certain percentage in a future year. But not to come through with promises made seems to me harmful to our position not only as economic leaders but even as military leaders.

Our Government is one government in the eyes of the world, not two. And the division between legislative and administrative does not mean much to other parts of the world. Other people will think of us as a government that has kept its word or gone back on it. Therefore, I hope the Senate will take a more statesmanlike view than has the House.

TRIMMING THE U. N.

[From the Washington Post of July 27, 1951]

The House cannot have been thinking as a responsible body of the United States Government when it voted on Wednesday to pare American contributions to international organizations by \$2,300,000. The blow was compounded yesterday by adoption of the Williams amendment limiting all such contributions to 33 1/3 percent of the agency budgets. These contributions are moral, if not legal, commitments agreed upon between American representatives and the agencies concerned. This cut from the \$29,300,000 voted by the Appropriations Committee would affect not only the scheduled regular contribution of \$16,400,000 to the United Nations proper, but also the support of specialized agencies such as the World Health and Food and Agriculture Organizations. It also would impair the United States contribution to the Organization of American States, which depends on this country for two-thirds of its budget.

Apparently the House believes that the proportionate share paid by the United States toward the support of these organizations is excessive. The richest Nation in the world must assume responsibility commensurate with its position. In any case, the

way to affect a reduction, if that should be desirable, is through future negotiations. For the United States to let the United Nations down after waging a war in Korea to uphold the principle of collective security embodied in the U. N. would hardly be to invite the kind of support for the U. N. we have been demanding of other countries. We have invested multiple billions in military defense of the peace; \$29,000,000 is a paltry enough sum to be devoting to the securing of peace through international understanding. Surely the Senate can be counted on to reverse this action.

Fourth of July Address by James Montgomery in 1841

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD remarks made on the Fourth of July 110 years ago by James Montgomery, the son of a Revolutionary War veteran.

What Mr. Montgomery then said should inspire us to strive to preserve our liberties and the fundamental principles of our Government for which our forefathers made such sacrifices and underwent such hardships.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS MADE ON JULY 4 BY JAMES MONTGOMERY

Fellow citizens, the celebration and commemoration of signal days, and signal events, is no new thing in the world, nay my friends it is almost as old as time itself, for 6 days only were elapsed from the beginning of what we call time when the great Creator of Heaven and earth celebrated, if I may so speak, the seventh day as a day of rest, which was the first day that ensued after He had finished the works of creation, and ever since that time it has been our bounden duty to remember the Sabbath as a day of rest. Remember the Sabbath Day to keep it holy is the announcement of the God of Heaven and earth to us all, but alas how many of us are wanting, yea, I may truly say that we are all wanting in our obedience to this high and reasonable command of Heaven. Here my friends we have the highest authority for celebrating a certain day and event and that celebration is to continue as long as time lasts. Hence, fellow citizens, we may learn that there is nothing immoral in the celebration of certain events so that it is done from a right principle to a right end, that is that we may return gratitude and thanks to God for all His mercies and that we may be instrumental in preserving the blessings we enjoy to ourselves and our posterity.

But as I intend great brevity, and as neither time nor capacity at present will permit me to enter into details respecting the celebration of many memorable events I shall content myself at present by referring you to a few instances when the people celebrated days in remembrance of signal deliverances. The first instance that I shall refer you to is the deliverance of the children of Israel from Egyptian bondage, and you all know that the Passover was instituted on that memorable event and you

also know, or ought to know, as I presume you have all read your Bibles, that the Hebrews celebrated that feast with great solemnity as long as the patriarchal government lasted, and indeed the practice of it was never totally disregarded or lost until after the coming of the Messiah. The next instance of this kind that I refer you to is the deliverance of the Jews from the wicked devices of Haman in Queen Esther's time. You know that that young Jewess ventured her life to save her people from utter destruction by going into the king at a time when she was not called for, it being a law of that government that any person who went into the king's court without being called for was to be put to death.

What a contrast there is between this despotic law and the laws of the King of Heaven and earth which authorizes and even invites the most unworthy to come into his presence to obtain mercy and find grace to help in every time of need. Here, however, we may learn what a great deliverance may be achieved by the heroism of one individual and that too, by the most delicate and beautiful females in all the country. What a blessing women are to men, sometimes.

In consequence of this great deliverance of the Jews from utter destruction by the wicked devices of Haman, the 2 days following the day of the month in which they were delivered were celebrated yearly with joy and gladness throughout all the Provinces of Persia, and that these days should be remembered and kept through every generation, every family, every Province, and every city, and that these days of Purim should not fall from among the Jews nor the memorial of them perish from their seed.

With these precedents before us shall we be told that we have no right or that it is not our bounden duty to celebrate our deliverance, not indeed from Egyptian bondage, nor from the wicked devices of Haman but from the unjust and cruel devices of King George III and his despotic advisers, who wished to deprive us of our natural and inalienable rights, and by imposing burdens on us that were too intolerable to be borne by freemen. And thank God, although nothing appeared more remote than our independence from the design of the king and his barbarous counselors, their intolerances were instrumental in the hand of an all-wise and overruling providence of making us declare our independence and of giving us a name among nations of the earth. And shall we be so ungrateful as not to celebrate with joy and gladness such a glorious event? I say, shall we who have so long enjoyed the glorious privileges achieved by our fathers on that memorable day, the Fourth of July 1776, show ourselves unworthy of such privileges by passing over unheeded and uncelebrated the yearly return of that eventful day? Do I not hear you all say, as it were, with one voice, "No, I shall never show myself so unworthy of these privileges as not to remember with delight and gratitude that glorious day when we by the manly declaration of our fathers burst the shackles of tyranny and oppression and took our name among the nations of the earth.

But someone may be ready to ask, How shall I show myself most worthy of the glorious privileges announced by the Declaration of Independence? I answer by adhering strictly to principles of the Declaration itself. That is that all men are born equally free and independent and have inherent and undefeasible rights among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty and of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property and reputation, and of pursuing their own happiness.

Whenever we infringe on any of these undefeasible rights we violate the principles of

the Declaration of Independence. We shall, therefore, show ourselves most worthy of the privileges we would wish others should do to us, that is we must be honest to ourselves and honest to our neighbors, we must lay aside every unreasonable party prejudice, which has been the cause, the great break-neck cause of the downfall of every republic, that I have any knowledge of. The Jews, a highly favored people, by a part of them desiring to have a King sit over them lost in a great measure their liberties by it. And finally by their party prejudices, and rancorous divisions among themselves they lost their city which appeared to be impregnable and with it their liberties and even their name as a nation. The Carthaginians, a brave and generous people, a people who were favored with or produced some of the bravest military captains the sun ever shone on and at one time bid fair to conquer the Romans, that was when Hannibal, their principal general was in Italy and had overrun the country in such a manner that to all human appearance there was nothing to do but to take the city of Rome and country would be conquered but there was in Carthage a party that used every influence in their power to prevent the success of Hannibal, that party chose to see their country and city sink into ruin rather than that Hannibal, their own general, should have the name of conquering the Romans, and in this way they lost their own city and liberties by their unreasonable party prejudices.

The Greeks, the most polished and ingenious people as to science and literary acquirements of any other people then in the world, with some of the greatest orators and military chiefs at their head that the world has ever produced lost their liberties by it. And the Romans who were among the bravest of the brave, by dividing and following different and unprincipled leaders, lost their republic by it and tamely submitted to the despotic rule of kings and emperors.

Let us, fellow citizens, beware lest we dash ourselves to pieces and destruction on the same ruinous rock for party spirit when rushed in on without any regard to virtuous principles is the canker-worm, that in my opinion, is above all other the most likely to eat out and undermine our liberties and that too before many of us are ever aware of it. I say then in conclusion, let us wake up and be honest to ourselves before it is too late, let us elect honest men to office, and particularly let us elect honest William Henry Harrison the true democratic candidate for President, then our civil and religious liberties will be safe, our lives and property will be safe, our Republic will be safe, safe now and safe forever, all of which may God in His mercy grant is the prayer of your fellow citizens, for after all, honesty is the best policy.

Benton Does a Favor for the Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN WELKER

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "BENTON Does a Favor for the Republicans," published in the Washington Times-Herald of August 9, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

BENTON DOES A FAVOR FOR THE REPUBLICANS

The second biggest windbag in the Senate is BENTON, of Connecticut, first honors in the gaseous diffusion system being held by HUMPHREY, of Minnesota.

BENTON's latest is a motion that the Senate expel Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin. He offers as exhibit A in his evidence the report on the 1950 Maryland senatorial-election campaign made by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Rules.

What does that report actually say, leaving aside for the moment its significantly chosen recommendations?

WHAT DOES THE THING SAY?

It says that the people of Maryland by a 43,000 majority elected JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Republican, to the Senate. They also legally fired Millard Tydings, Democrat, out of the Senate. The report concedes that exhaustive efforts have failed to show any ground for further attacks on Senator BUTLER's right to his seat.

That concession leaves the Democrats in a hole, of course, for the whole excuse for the investigation into the Maryland election was that the voters' will was somehow denied by their throwing Tydings out of public office and 'nto lucrative activities on behalf of the Dominican sugar interests.

Either the election was illegal and fraudulent, or the investigation was. It now is clear that the investigation, not the election, was a fraud.

The recommendations in the report are equally as fraudulent as its purpose and everybody who has had a hand in writing, spreading, and flapping hands of horror concerning it, knows that very well.

We will follow with interest and will faithfully inform the reading public on the continuing career of the committee's suggestion that special laws be written to censor campaign literature.

WHAT IS IT FOR?

The very nature of the recommendations signed by Senators MONRONEY, HENNINGSON, HENDRICKSON, and SMITH expose the true purpose of the investigation if the findings had not. The object of the game was to alibi the Democrats' defeat in 1950 and to provide some Democratic campaign literature for 1952. The Democrats well know, if Republicans do not, that the 1950 election showed that the people of Maryland are sick of Democrats.

The Maryland voters not only elected a Republican Senator, but also a Republican governor and other Republicans right on down to the grass-roots county offices even in Prince Georges County, which has been Democratic since the party's origin.

It is hypocritical and fraudulent to suggest that Senator BUTLER was elected by any except the public's majority vote, and the squawks of the losers about the incidental activities involving Senator MCCARTHY and other BUTLER supporters, including this newspaper, are the bunk.

How much of all this blather would be going on if BUTLER had lost? That's the acid test and everybody knows the answer.

Not that we have any kick about the horror-shouting. The more the better, for the more there is now, the plainer the reason shows itself.

The campaign document signed by Senators MONRONEY, HENNINGSON, HENDRICKSON, and SMITH is an attempt to hide the fact that the Democrats have flopped in Maryland and are headed for more of the same.

It is an attempt to intimidate and frighten Republicans everywhere into backing away from a fight, simply because the fight is a hard one and the Democrats are gifted at every gutter and barroom trick.

Thus BENTON has done Republicans everywhere a great favor. His attack on Senator

MCCARTHY makes it irrevocably clear just what the Maryland investigation was for, just what it accomplished and just how it is supposed to be used further.

AND WHY DOES BENTON RUN?

Now is the hour to meet these smear artists head-on, and all that need be asked them is this:

"Where were you when Alger Hiss was on the witness stand?"

For never let it be forgotten. The firing of the Democratic Party in Maryland was the voters' reaction at the first available opportunity to the truth about just one traitor in the State Department.

Senator MCCARTHY has put himself on the front line with those who are trying to get the rest of the truth onto the public record.

Another who is trying to get that same truth onto the public record is Senator PAT MCCARRAN, Democrat, of Nevada. Why doesn't BENTON move MCCARRAN's expulsion from the Senate, too? The same issues are involved, the same problems, and the same smears. MCCARRAN has been called every name that MCCARTHY has been called by the same people. And for the same basic reason.

On the one side is an urgent personal need to hide treason and explain away betrayal. On the other is a solid resolution to drag the truth about the Roosevelt-Truman era out onto the public record, for it is only that truth which can save us.

Once the voters see—as they have seen in Maryland—who has stood for and who has stood against communism in the United States of America, the rescue of this nation from crooks, traitors and Stalin is certain.

Election of Liberal-Minded Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPEL
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, on August 6 the President of the United States released to the press a letter which he had sent to Mr. Philip Murray, president of the CIO. Among other matters discussed, including his approval of the Missouri Valley Authority—MVA—the President saw fit to make reference to three key flood-control dams which had been proposed on the Kansas River and its tributaries to be built right where this flood hit, as he said.

He indicated that two of these Kansas projects had not been authorized by Congress and that the third, while authorized, had not been started, all because of the opposition of officials and congressional representatives of the State of Kansas. Mr. President, at a later date I shall have something to say about this, in order to keep the record straight.

The press reports following the President's release of this message indicated that he, the President, thought that these States in the Missouri Valley Basin, and I presume Kansas, should send more liberal-minded Representatives to the Congress of the United States if they expected to have any relief from flood damage. At any rate,

that is how I read the press report covering the President's letter.

On August 8, 1951, the Washington Post ran an editorial entitled "Who's a Liberal?" I think this editorial sums up in a brief, concise way what should be said about the President's reference to liberal-minded Members of Congress in relation to the present floods in the Missouri Valley, and, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO'S A LIBERAL?

President Truman did not help his reputation with his juvenile remark about the need to elect more liberal-minded Members of Congress to prevent floods in the Missouri Valley. This sort of bastardization of the word liberal is in keeping with the debasement of democracy and peace to connote precisely the opposite of their original meanings. Is one to infer that conservative Members of Congress are somehow for floods?

If Mr. Truman meant to say that something a whole lot more comprehensive than the Pick-Sloan plan is needed to cope with the causes of floods in the Missouri Valley, we would agree heartily. Even here, however, the President works both sides of the street. He plumps for a Missouri Valley Authority and at the same time criticizes Congress for cutting flood-control appropriations some at least of which were intended for projects directly antithetical to the valley-wide concept. If there ever is to be a comprehensive approach to the resources of the Missouri Valley, including flood control, the matter will have to be put upon a higher plane than political ideology.

Persons who support such valley-wide development ought to realize that the doctrine plan for a Missouri Valley Authority simply is anathema to many of the residents of the Midwest whose cooperation would be necessary to make it succeed. It is time to drop labels and hew to principles—and the principles which in our opinion ought to govern the development of the Missouri are: (1) Breadth of program sufficient to encompass all resources and agencies; and (2) consultation with the people of the region with a view toward representative participation in management. Playing politics with flood control is no way to obtain it.

Low Estate of Public Morals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Low Estate of Public Morals," published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of August 6, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOW ESTATE OF PUBLIC MORALS

The discharge of 90 West Point cadets for cheating at examinations is only one facet of the many-sided problem of moral disinte-

gration nationally that is causing many persons to wonder whether America is going down the path of decay that caused the Roman Empire to fall. It is a sobering thought. But the facts must be faced.

The West Pointers were dishonest. They cheated. Some did so because they couldn't play football and keep up with their studies. Others who were not athletes cheated because that was the easy way to make passing grades.

The excuse of the athletes accents the abnormality of thinking in many institutions of higher education as to the part sports should play in college life. The necessity of having a good team to assure big revenue to build a bigger stadium to make more money has led many of our colleges into the evil devices of buying players, of competing in the open market for a star halfback. Some colleges have recognized the error and have deemphasized sports, as should be done.

At West Point the incentive was a bit different because Uncle Sam foots the bills there, but there was the incentive for the individual to "make" a team that was tops or near it in the Nation. So, if practice on the field interfered, cheat a little and make the necessary grades.

But fundamentally what happened at West Point reflects a present distorted attitude toward old-fashioned honesty and integrity that pertains not only in our schools but in America's social and political life.

It is seen in the high places in Government, which after World War II practiced plain deception on the people. We were told no secret agreements had been made with anybody. Later, we discovered pacts were signed at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam that made the Korean war inevitable.

In the New Deal era was born the idea that an administration can perpetuate itself in power by buying the voters with hand-out money. Remember how Harry Hopkins tapped the WPA till to win an election in Kentucky? During that era was born the fiction that cities and States as well as individuals need not look to their own resources or ingenuity to survive—let Washington do it. Out of the mating of depression and political trickery, came the insidious thinking by millions of Americans that hard work is positively silly, that if one does work, do the least possible, draw the biggest pay possible—and strike for more.

The youths, such as the West Pointers, with whom we are concerned today, were babies then. They have grown into manhood and an environment of take-it-where-I-find-it entirely alien to the American tradition. They are the unpretty fruit of the mistakes of the past two decades.

What do we see in Washington today? Corruption and scandals. The close link between the underworld and politics was revealed by the Keftauver committee. The Fulbright committee turned the spotlight on the RFC and the influence peddlers, some within the shadow of the White House, who sold their contacts for a price.

We hear of doubtful goings-on in the Government department that collects our income taxes.

We hear of patronage bought and sold like so much goods over the counter.

An Army general sees no wrong in accepting gifts from those with whom he does Government business, nor in diverting Government materials to private use.

The chairman of the Democratic National Committee yells "smear" when it is discovered that he is on the payroll of a St. Louis company for the ostensible reason that he has influence on RFC loans.

The close personal friend of the President, a major general, has a desk in the White House where he conveniently hands out receipts for deep freezers presented him gratis and which he distributes where they will do good politically.

Campaigns for the Senate in Ohio and Maryland last year were conducted along lines that set a new political low.

So, when 90 West Point cadets stray from paths of honesty, when nauseous revelations are made of the bribing of college basketball teams, when youths charged with robbery stand up in court, as they did in New York, and brazenly admit their guilt, but excuse it by saying that "everybody's doing it," when teen-agers become delinquent via the narcotics road, when too many youths of both sexes flout the laws of chastity and decency—when these derelictions of the youths of our lands are totted up, there comes a time for sober questioning among the adults.

Where does the fault lie? In the home? Perhaps. In the schools? In part. In the churches? In part. But in the main the fault lies in that nebulous field of public morals and spirituality which was so highly cultivated by the founding fathers and which of late has been so scantily tilled. Among too many of us the accepted premise is that anything is fair unless we are caught; that each of us is entitled to something for nothing, that the world owes us a living; that an honest day's work for an honest day's pay is almost unethical; that gypping the other fellow before he gypps you, is the only policy that pays off.

The level of public morals is low. Unfortunately, the good example is not set in Washington. The President is victimized by his friends, but a false sense of loyalty prevents him from moving forthrightly against them. His reluctance condones wrongdoing. Leadership in both parties is weak, because it is consistently attuned to the next election, not to what is best for the public welfare. In fact, public morals are low because politics at all levels is played at a historic low. The one is the coadjutor of the other.

Yet, we strut the earth telling everybody else to look at us and see democracy in fairest flower—and please copy; we'll foot the bill. We wonder, for instance, what Pravda will have to say about the 90 West Point cadets.

The time is here for moral regeneration. West Point is just one item in the sad chronology. The Roman Empire fell, not because it was overwhelmed from without but because it decayed from within. If this is an appeal for a return to the day-by-day practice of old-time religion, and respect for God's moral law, so be it. When the moral fabric of a nation begins to unravel, it is time to do some patching before the entire garment is gone. The cause and effect of this deterioration nationally will be issues in next year's presidential campaign.

Reply by Nikolai Shvernik, President of the Soviet Presidium, Referring to the "Friendship Resolution" and Editorial Comments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Monday of this week, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the exchange between British Foreign Secretary Herbert Morrison and the Communist Party newspaper, Pravda. I stated that up until that time the Russians had not responded to the Friendship Resolution

which we in the Congress had passed. I stated further that I trusted that a real response would come in the form of affirmative Soviet action aimed at definitely moving forward the progress to world peace, rather than a mere accumulation of peace propaganda.

The reply has now come in from Mr. Shvernik. Unfortunately it seems to be just one more instance of Soviet misuse and violation of the natural desire throughout the world for peace. Once again, the Soviets have asked for a Big Five Conference, presumably to settle issues which they could have settled a hundred times previously in the United Nations and affiliated bodies, if they had really a genuine desire to do so. Once again they have tried to pretend that they are extending the olive branch, whereas actually they are merely preparing the way for trapping more gullible people in their net.

The peoples of the world will not fall for the Russian trap.

I promised, however, to place Mr. Shvernik's reply, when it was received, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and I am happy to fulfill that promise at this time. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that at the conclusion of my remarks there be printed the text of Mr. Shvernik's letter to Secretary Acheson and President Truman, as well as the text of the resolution of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R.

Basically, we are still awaiting affirmative Russian action to be demonstrated at Kaesong, and elsewhere—action which will show that the Russians really mean business and intend to halt their warlike steps.

Finally, I ask unanimous consent there be included the texts of a Christian Science editorial which appeared in the August 3 issue regarding the Morrison-Pravda exchange, and a Milwaukee Journal editorial of August 7, regarding the Shvernik reply.

I for one feel encouraged that at least there has been a slight chink made in the iron curtain. Pravda and Izvestia themselves at last got around to printing the Truman-Shvernik exchange. I am convinced that more can be done along this line with patience on our part and a little bit of cooperation on the Russians' part. We will never allow the Russians to play us for a fool, but neither will we throw up our hands in complete disgust and assume that nothing can be done toward encouraging a genuine world peace movement.

Phony peace congresses set up by the Russian stage masters at which their puppets dance are not the answer to peace, but genuine actions are. The next step is still the Russians'. May it be an affirmative, genuine, sincere step.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution and the editorials, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of August 7, 1951]

SOVIET LETTER TO TRUMAN URGES FIVE-NATION PEACE PACT

WASHINGTON.—Following is the partial text of the State Department announcement

making public a letter from Nikolai Shvernik, president of the Soviet Presidium:

His Excellency DEAN G. ACHESON,
Secretary of State of the United States of America,

YOUR EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of July 7, 1951, and of the enclosed resolution of the Congress of the United States of America and to transmit to you a resolution of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

This resolution expresses the feelings of sincere friendship of the peoples of the Soviet Union toward the peoples of the whole world—it speaks of the fact that the Soviet people is unified in its attempts to establish a stable peace and to eliminate the threat of a new war.

The Soviet people has no basis for doubting that the American people also do not want war.

NONBIAS STRESSED

However, the Soviet people know well that there exist in some states forces which are striving to unleash a new world war, in which the circles in question see the source of their own enrichment. The peoples of the Soviet Union believe that there will be no war if the peoples take into their own hands preservation of peace and defend it to the end, unmasking the attempts of those forces which have interests in war and which are trying to draw the people into another war.

I share your opinion that a desire for peace and brotherhood exists in the hearts of a majority of people. Therefore, governments which not with words but with deeds are striving to support peace must encourage by every means the peaceful strivings of their people.

The Soviet Government assists in every way the unification of the efforts of the Soviet people fighting for peace with the efforts of the peoples of other countries. It hospitably receives communications of peace from any country and by every means contributes to the intercourse of the Soviet people with the peoples of other countries placing no barriers in the path.

There is no doubt that friendship between peoples which is mentioned in your communication presupposes the development of political, economic, and cultural relations and connections between peoples on a basis of equal rights. There is also no doubt that a most important step on this road must be the elimination of any discrimination with regard to the Soviet Union on the part of the American authorities.

CURB ON ARMS VITAL

The duty of all peace-loving peoples consists in steadfastly carrying on a policy of war prevention and preservation of peace, of not permitting arms races, of attaining limitation of armaments and the prohibition of atomic weapons with the establishment of inspection over the implementation of such a prohibition, and of cooperating in the conclusion of a five-power pact for the strengthening of peace.

The conclusion of such a pact would have an exceptionally important significance in the improvement of Soviet-American relations and the strengthening of peace among peoples. Such a pact would raise the confidence of all peoples in the preservation of peace and, moreover, would permit the possibility of limiting armaments, of lightening the burden of military expenditures which lie with all their heaviness on the peoples' shoulders.

In implementing the indicated measures, the American people will always find full cooperation on the part of the Soviet people, who unalterably defend the cause of peace.

I hope that the text of the resolution of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will be brought to the attention of the American people.

I take this occasion to request you to transmit to the American people my greetings and good wishes from the people of the Soviet Union.

NIKOLAI SHVERNIK,

*President of the Presidium of the
Supreme Soviet of the Union of
Soviet Socialist Republics.*

Moscow, August 6, 1951.

THE RESOLUTION

A resolution of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R.

His Excellency **HARRY S. TRUMAN,**
*President of the United States of
America:*

Being informed of the joint resolution adopted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, which was transmitted together with a letter from Mr. Truman, President of the United States, on July 7 of this year, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, combining the work of both Houses—the Council of the Union and the Council of the Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R.—considers it necessary to make the following statement:

"1. Expressing the will of the peoples of the Soviet Union for peace, the Soviet Government always conducts a policy directed toward strengthening peace and establishing friendly relations between states. The principle of this policy was laid down in the peace decree adopted by the Second Congress of Soviets on November 11, 1917, as soon as the Soviet state was formed. Since that time the foreign policy of the Soviet Union has remained unchanged, being directed toward the strengthening of peace and friendly relations among peoples."

(After stressing earlier Soviet proposals for "general reduction in armaments" and "prohibition of the production and utilization of atomic energy for war purposes," the resolution of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet went on:)

"2. In the resolution of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, it is stated that the American people deeply regret the presence of 'artificial barriers' that separate them from the peoples of the Soviet Union."

DENIES WALLS AGAINST UNITED STATES

The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R. must state that the foreign policy of the Soviet Union does not place any obstacles in the way of friendship of the Soviet people with the American people or with other peoples, and does not create any obstacles to the establishment of business, trade, and friendly relations between them.

However, this cannot be said of the foreign policy that is being conducted by the organs of authority of the United States. This is true not only by such facts as the systematic refusal on the part of the American authorities to issue visas for entry into the United States to agents of Soviet culture and their expulsion in spite of permits for entering the United States previously received through legal channels but also a number of other measures of the Government of the United States of a discriminatory character with respect to the Soviet Union.

(The resolution quoted 11 specific instances of discriminatory measures that occurred during the period of 1948–51. Most of the incidents concerned the allegedly unjustified searching of Soviet vessels in American ports, and detaining of Soviet couriers equipped with diplomatic passports. Also denounced were an alleged recent "hoiigan" attack on the secretary of the Soviet delegation to the United Nations and United States steps to cut down western trade with the Soviet Union and its satellites. The text continued:)

Thus, all these facts bear witness that on the part of the organs of power of the United States of America there is carried on a policy of discrimination toward the U. S. S. R. and artificial barriers are being set up which interfere with the free intercourse of the Soviet and American peoples and which are pushing our countries apart from each other.

ATLANTIC PACT ASSAILED

There arises a legitimate question how to reconcile the statements contained in the resolution of the Congress of the United States regarding the necessity for the elimination of barriers in relations between the peoples of the two countries with the above mentioned acts of the American authorities.

The Soviet people have no doubt that the American people, like all other peoples, do not want war. However, as history shows, questions of peace and war are not always decided by the people. The statements of many responsible representatives of the Government of the United States of America, and also of members of the Congress of the United States, contain direct appeals for the unleashing of aggressive war against the peoples of the U. S. S. R., for the use of weapons of mass destruction against the peaceful population. Such statements, which contradict not only the interests of peace but also the elementary requirements of human morality, must call forth condemnation on the part of the Congress of the United States.

3. The Government of the United States of America came forth as the initiator of the establishment of the North Atlantic military union directed, it is clear, against the U. S. S. R. It has established a wide network of military bases on foreign territory near the frontiers of the U. S. S. R. and, in infringement of obligations taken upon itself, is putting into effect the remilitarization of Western Germany and is reestablishing Japanese militarism. At the same time, there is being implemented in the United States of America a gigantic armament program.

The Government of the United States has unalterably refused all proposals of the Soviet Government aimed at strengthening peace and international security. Thus, up to this time there has not been achieved an agreement for the conclusion of a peace pact between the five powers, for the prohibition of atomic weapons, and for the establishment of inspection over the implementation of this prohibition, and also for the limitation of armaments and armed forces. In the resolution of the Congress, the thought is set forth that now the path is open for the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. At the same time, there is no doubt that only after the prohibition of atomic weapons can atomic energy actually be used for peaceful purposes, for the welfare of peoples.

DUAL POLICY CHARGED

The Soviet people are daily convinced that the policy and actions of the Government of the United States of America diverge from its verbal declaration regarding the preservation of peace, and equally from the peace-loving desires of the American people, and that there are being established conditions for the further worsening of relations with the Soviet Union, although no danger has threatened and does not threaten the United States from the Soviet Union.

4. It goes without saying that one can only welcome the approach of the Congress of the United States to the Soviet people and its appeal for the strengthening of friendly relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. However, an approach by words with an appeal for cooperation in the improvement of relations between the U. S. S. R. and the United States and in the strengthening of international peace can give positive results only in the event that there is no divergency between it and the deeds of the Government of the United

States, the policy and actions of the Government of the United States of America.

However, inasmuch as the Congress of the United States states that it is seeking a path toward the improvement of relations with the Soviet Union, it can have no doubts that such attempts by the Congress will find a response in the peace-loving efforts of the Soviet people and the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union.

The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet considers that one of the serious steps on this road could be the elimination of the discrimination toward the Soviet Union in all fields of international relationships which hinder normal relations between our countries.

A still more important step in the matter of improving relations between our countries and strengthening peace between peoples could be the conclusion of a peace pact between the five powers, to which could also adhere other states which are striving to strengthen peace.

The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has no doubt that all peoples striving for the preservation of peace would greet with great satisfaction the conclusion of such a pact.

The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet expresses the hope that the Congress of the United States of America will bring the present resolution to the attention of the American people.

AUGUST 6, 1951.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of
August 3, 1951]

DEBATE: NEW STYLE

First, Foreign Secretary Morrison challenged Moscow's Pravda to print a complete statement by him or Prime Minister Attlee in the same way that declarations by Soviet leaders are fully and freely reported in the western press.

Second, Pravda said yes—if it might publish a reply at the same time and have its reply reproduced in the British newspapers.

Third, Mr. Morrison wrote a fine, forthright statement of the freedoms enjoyed by Britons and the reasons why those same peace-loving Britons were willing to rearm in order to protect their freedoms from destruction by an aggressive and expansionist Soviet Union.

Fourth, Pravda wrote a reply (at twice the length) categorically denying Mr. Morrison's assertions and assuring the Russian people that they alone enjoy true freedom, a freedom threatened only by the warmongering of such capitalist nations as Britain and America.

Fifth, the two statements were printed in Pravda and for once gave the Russian people a chance to hear something other than the stentorian voice of their own propagandists interpreting the aims of the western democracies.

Sixth, the two statements were published in more than 20 British newspapers with easy confidence that a comparison of the two would automatically expose the hollowness of the Soviet claims—already familiar through long and weary reiteration to their readers.

Seventh, the case rests, as the facts of the incident speak to democratic ears more loudly than all the thunders of protestation rising from behind the iron curtain. What they say to Russian ears is anyone's guess.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of August
7, 1951]

RUSSIA DONS PEACE FACE

Russia has two faces to present to the world. One is the face of snarling menace. The other is the face of sweet amiability. They are alternated as the men in the Kremlin choose.

After months of menace, the face of sweetness and light now shines on the free world.

The latest example of this is the letter from President Shvernik to President Truman. It dusts off the familiar Russian proposal for a five power peace and disarmament pact, a proposal that has been defeated twice in the United Nations. The reasons it was defeated were twofold: It ignored the U. N. and implied "big power" rule of the world; it provided, in detail, for agreement on Communist terms.

The Soviet change in attitude was first noticeable with the speech of Jacob Malik in which he said that peace was possible in Korea. Immediately other signs began to appear. The Russians resumed participation in four power talks in Berlin. They began to show up at social functions over the world, dropping hints of peace.

Russians even attended Fourth of July celebrations in foreign capitals and flew the American flag on the Fourth from their Washington embassy. The president of Moscow's city soviet rushed off to attend the Paris 2,000-year anniversary fete. The Communist press began talking about co-existence and the "traditional friendship" between Russia and the West.

In Moscow a new publication the News, appeared and was dedicated to proving that Russia has always loved Britain and the United States. In Geneva the Russians informed the U. N. that they wish to take part in East-West trade talks. The Kremlin pushed Korean peace talks and permitted its stooges to back down on several preliminary points of difference in negotiations aimed at cease-fire agreement.

In Moscow, Malik has assured a visiting delegation of Quakers that Russia wants peace, is not trying to export revolution, and isn't conducting an anti-West propaganda campaign. He feigned surprise that anyone would believe anything else.

Does all this indicate a change in Soviet policy which, as President Truman said in his economic message to Congress, "has no other purpose than to blackmail the free world into submission to Communist domination"?

We will believe it indicates a sincere change at our own peril.

Soviet Russia has always used the alternating policy of head patting and shin kicking. Where there is weakness, Russia moves in to exploit it by terror, intimidation and outright aggression. Where there is strength Russia seeks to lull her intended victim into letting down its guard.

For the time being the method of menace has failed. Determined opposition broke the Berlin blockade, saved Greece and Turkey, began rebuilding Europe and unifying it for security purposes. Finally, aggression in Korea was met with strength and stirred the free world to unprecedented rearmament and mutual action for defense. Menace has not worked. The Kremlin has donned its mask of peace.

For the free world this is equally dangerous. Moderate and soothing words from the Kremlin are, as the Italian paper, *Il Corriere della Serra* says, cause for alarm, "for a violent bolshevism will frighten even the simple minded, but when it talks of peace and understanding it is liable to win adherents even in unexpected quarters."

Even a few weeks of the Soviet reasonableness has proved this. The Korean peace bid brought a let-down in urgency over the world. The American Congress showed less interest in halting inflation. Richard Stokes, British minister of materials, said "it looks as though our defense program is not going to be so immediately necessary as it was a few days ago." Signs of a let-down seemed general.

We should know through experience that if Russia eases up on international tensions it will be because Russia is faced by strength that the Kremlin isn't ready to defy. If the free world now slackens in its devotion to the policies which created its present position of strength, it will only open the way for

Russia to resume aggression in the near future.

It would be folly to view President Shvernik's words and other Russian talk about peace in any other light.

Dog Days for Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Washington Post of Tuesday, August 7, contained an interesting column by the well-known and highly regarded Washington correspondent, Mr. Marquis Childs. His subject was Dog Days for Congressmen, and in covering it, he has given his idea of a typical day in the life of a legislator.

I realize that there is little in the article which is not already known too well by the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives. However, because of the accuracy of the picture which Mr. Childs has portrayed, I believe that his column will be of interest to the readers of the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOG DAYS FOR CONGRESSMEN

(By Marquis Childs)

TYPICAL SCHEDULE

With the onset of the dog days there are always two theories about how to bring a lagging, reluctant Congress around to a sense of duty and action. One is the nose-to-the-grindstone thesis which holds that the more they suffer, the more they are likely to stop stalling and get down to work.

But this is a risky procedure, since it can produce intense irritation and highly irrational behavior. Senator TOM CONNALLY exhibited that last week when he blew his top at ECA Administrator William C. Foster, who had come before the Foreign Relations Committee to explain how policies laid down by Congress on foreign aid were to be carried out. A crotchety 74, CONNALLY is a sort of bunion barometer of the temper of the Hill.

The alternate theory is to call a recess of 6 weeks or so. This allows the overworked, overheated Members to go home and find out what people are thinking, or maybe just take a rest. Or, if they are Senators who are not up for reelection next year, they can get off to some cool place for a long rest. Then they come back refreshed in the early fall.

While rumors of a recess beguiled Congress for a time, the administration has settled on the grindstone approach. Majority Leader ERNEST McFARLAND is setting a target date by which time Congress will have wound up its business and be ready to start home. That date is September 15.

Not a single regular appropriation bill has been finally passed by both Houses. Foreign aid in the amount of \$8,500,000,000 and a military budget of \$60,000,000,000 are little items still in committee stage. That target date is a wistful hope, with the realists assuming it will be October 15 or later before Congress clears out.

So the poor Congressman is stuck with it. Consider his day. It is filled with harassments, pressures and, above all frustrations.

He wakes early, because of the barking of the neighbor's dog, to the realization that it is to be another hot, sticky day. He is alone in the house, left to the not-so-tender mercies of an indifferent servant. The family went back home in mid-July. (Just before his wife went away she said, "Well, if you ever want the children to know what they're supposed to call home, we ought to go back and open the house even though I dread it.")

At the office his secretary greets him with a list of the people he's got to see. And they're calling from the recording room to say they're waiting for him to make the record of the forum discussion on the new price control law. At 11:30 he's got to shake hands with two groups of high school kids from back home. The secretary notes that they both want to have photographs taken with him.

Two committee meetings are on the morning schedule, and one is especially important since Eisenhower's top assistant is going to testify on foreign military aid. But he promised the chairman of the subcommittee considering the Agriculture appropriation bill that he would look in for at least a little while.

His administrative assistant walks down to the recording room with him to talk about the delegation flying in from the home State in the late afternoon. They want to know why that natural gas pipeline has not yet been approved by the Interior Department.

For one reason or another, he is called off the floor a half dozen times after the session begins. He asks unanimous consent to put into the record a speech by the chairman of the conservation commission in his State. The chairman is sitting in the gallery and later he takes him to lunch in the Senate dining room with his wife and her mother and several friends.

The delegation from back home arrives in a pretty sullen mood about delays and red tape in Washington. "So this is the organized confusion you call Government, is it?" the chairman says snappishly in greeting him in the fancy hotel suite the group has taken for headquarters. Through dinner and far into the night the Congressman talks with them; about the reasons for the delay, the scarcity of steel, the importance of the armament program. But he can see that he is not making much of an impression. "You better come home and tell that to the chamber of commerce," says the head of the delegation, "they're getting pretty impatient."

Back in the empty house at last, he sits down to scrawl a note to his wife. " * * * Getting fed up with all this * * * think sometimes it isn't worth it * * * feel sure I could make a pretty good living practicing law back home * * * "

He does not tell her about the note from the real-estate agent saying that the Washington house they rent is to be sold and they will have to find a new place to live. So on and on it goes, and ahead is '52 and still another campaign.

Tuttle Creek Dam in Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Randolph (Kans.) Enterprise of July 31, quoting Prof. J. O. Jones, professor of

hydraulics at Kansas University in opposition to the Army engineers' proposed Tuttle Creek Dam in Kansas.

I am sure the Senators are aware that I have long contended that flood-control work should start at the heads of the creeks and out on the land where the water falls as rain. Professor Jones, who is a specialist in the field, confirms my belief and says that instead of spending \$68,000,000 on Tuttle Creek Dam to protect the people in the lower Kaw Valley, we need to spend \$1,000,000 on each of 68 small retention dams at the heads of the Kaw River tributaries and protect the whole valley.

The article reveals that Professor Jones was acting dean of the Kansas University Engineering School from 1942 to 1948.

I offer the interview with him to indicate to Members that men expert in the field believe that the Army engineers' proposed works will prove grossly wrong.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**KANSAS UNIVERSITY ENGINEERING PROFESSOR
FOR A RETENTION DAM SYSTEM**

A member of the flood-control advisory committee to the Kansas Governor today denounced the proposed system of reservoir dams on the tributaries of the Kansas River and advocated a system of small retention dams.

Prof J. O. Jones, professor of hydraulics at Kansas University, told the Journal-World that Tuttle Creek Dam and others like it proposed by the Corps of Engineers "won't do the job."

"We don't need big dams," he said. "Instead of spending \$68,000,000 on Tuttle Creek Dam to protect the people in the lower Kaw Valley, we need to spend \$1,000,000 on each of 68 small retention dams at the heads of the Kaw River tributaries and protect the whole valley."

"It's time we started worrying about the entire valley, the people on the little streams that get floods every year instead of looking at the people in a major disaster that happens only once maybe in 15 years. We must not forget towns like Marlon, Valley Falls, Marysville, and Waterville."

He added that Tuttle Creek Dam would probably be built because public pressure would demand that something be done immediately.

He pointed out that one of the most successful flood-control projects is the Miami Conservancy which is a series of retention dams on the Miami River above Hamilton, Ohio.

"Tuttle Creek Dam would not have averted this disaster," Jones declared. "This was an unprecedented storm. We already had received a nearly record amount of rainfall in June. If all the proposed reservoir dams had been built, they would have been filled by June rainfall by the time these last disastrous rains hit them. The spillways would have been discharging water more rapidly than the riverbanks would have carried it, and we would have had this flood."

For support of his statement, Professor Jones, who was acting dean of the Kansas University engineering school from 1942 to 1948, cited the Kanapolis Dam.

"A 5-foot overflow occurred between Marquette and Kanapolis during this current flood, and Salina has received two major floods since Kanapolis Dam has been completed. This shows the Kanapolis Dam is not what it was cracked up to be."

The hydraulic engineer did say that he felt nothing could have averted this flood,

however. "Engineers would call this a 100-year flood, meaning that it would happen only once in 100 years."

He continued by saying that the Corps of Engineers are making predictions which future history will prove grossly wrong. "Hundred-year floods happen infrequently, but it is impossible to predict at present when another flood is coming."

"When a flood which will top the 1951 flood will occur is impossible to tell," Jones said. "The Corps of Engineers is merely guessing when they make their predictions. Our records on floods are only about 40 years old. When the records are 300 years old, we will be able to make predictions on floods and may be able to tell when the next flood is coming and how big it will be. Until then any engineer who says a dam will handle such and such a flood is putting himself out on a limb."

Retention dams are better than reservoir dams, Professor Jones contends, because they are not kept full, but are used only when the river begins to rise. This allows more space for the water and also keeps the dams from filling up with silt. A steady current through the dam keeps washing the silt down.

"Another reason it is better to have retention dams which are put into use as storage facilities only in flood times is that more land can be farmed around the dam," he declared. "Of course no one lives within reach of the retention dam waters, but farmers can lease the land to farm. Nine years out of ten they will probably not be flooded. This allows more of the fertile, river-bottom farm land to be farmed than if the fertile river-bottom land was kept covered by reservoir dam waters."

"The Corps of Engineers wants multiple-purpose reservoir dams because they can heap intangible benefits onto the river such as wildlife conservatory, recreation, and the silliest reason of all, improvement of navigation on the Mississippi River below St. Louis," he said emphatically. "This allows them to overestimate the benefits and thus build bigger dams."

He attributes what he considers a major fallacy in the Corps of Engineers principle to the 1927 act of Congress. The law only specifies that the benefits exceed the cost. To Jones this is a mistake. He believes that the projects should be planned so that the difference between costs and benefits is greater than the cost. In other words so that benefits increase at a faster ratio than the cost. "Privately financed projects are planned that way; why shouldn't Government projects be the same way?" (Lawrence Journal-World)

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS IS ACHESONISM

John P. Davies, Jr., veteran career Foreign Service officer, has been cleared and returned to active duty without prejudice and with the full confidence of the State Department, after a hearing by the Department's loyalty and security board.

Since neither the charges against Mr. Davies nor the evidence relating thereto have been disclosed, it is not possible to make an independent evaluation of this finding.

However, it is not necessary to go beyond Mr. Davies' own official reports to form an estimate of his qualifications as a political expert, particularly where communism is involved. It is in order to do so since Mr. Davies is expected to be assigned as a political adviser to the United States High Commissioner in Germany.

In recommending an American policy for China November 15, 1944, Mr. Davies said, in an official report to the Department: "A coalition Chinese Government in which the Communists find a satisfactory place is the solution of this impasse most desirable to us. It provides our greatest assurance of a strong, united, democratic, independent, and friendly China—our basic aim in Asia and the Pacific."

When a man so naive as to believe that a government satisfactory to the Communists could be independent of Russia and friendly to the United States can qualify as a State Department political expert, how can the public be expected to follow such leadership?

By contrast there is the case of Angus Ward, a real expert on communism and the Soviet mentality, through his long service in China, Manchuria, and Russia itself.

Because of his fidelity to American principles, the scholarly Mr. Ward spent long, dreary months in a Communist prison at Mukden. Upon his return to the United States, his reward for a long career of distinguished service was an assignment to an obscure post at Nairobi, in central Africa.

When a man who understood communism and was opposed to it is banished in this manner, and when one of the Department's choicest plums is given to an official who so misunderstood communism that he was sympathetic to it, it is easy to see the kind of influences which are running the State Department.

Some departments need a new broom, but this one should be given meat-ax treatment.

Conditions in the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "This Is Achesonism," published in the New York World-Telegram and the Sun of Wednesday, August 1, 1951. In the light of recent comments, and of the remarks this morning by my distinguished colleague from New York, I feel that this editorial should also be read by all the Members of both Houses of the Congress.

**The Pick Plan for Flood Control
the Lower Missouri River**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the July 26 issue of the Overbrook Citizen, of Overbrook, Osage County, Kans.

This article is a protest against efforts to stampede approval of huge appropriations for the so-called Pick plan for flood control in the lower Missouri River.

I am advised that the big flood control meeting held in Kansas City recently was completely in the control of the United States Army engineers and that at least one State delegation was advised that the Army engineers had suggested formation of a lobby to pressure this Congress for appropriations to Army reservoirs.

This article, by a Kansas country editor, seems to me a very significant account of that meeting and other happenings in the basin.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRY STAMPEDE TACTICS TO GET WAY WITH PICK FLOOD-CONTROL PLAN—ATTEMPT TO BYPASS DEMOCRATIC PROCEDURES MEETS RESISTANCE

Most Kansans probably don't realize it but a lot of things pertaining to their personal interests have been happening this week in the name of flood control.

The Overbrook Citizen editor had opportunity to watch some of the wheels turn and some of the wheels were pretty big and they turned in a fashion to suggest anyone who dared to stand in the way might get flattened out. But it didn't quite work that way.

Tuesday we attended a meeting of officers and directors of the Kansas Soil Conservation and Flood Control Association in Topeka. This organization is composed of 14 member groups of the major valleys in Kansas. They originally organized to promote small retention dams in the uplands operating on the draw-down principle instead of the huge reservoirs advocated by the Army engineers.

Be it said that the flood-control action was at something of a stylike prior to the big flood. Several of the watershed groups had had plans drawn for multiple-dam flood control but lacked power to get a congressional go-ahead. The Pick-Sloan backers were active on the other hand, plugging for the big dams down on the main streams. The politicians, recorgnizing a hot potato, mostly got on a high fence and stayed there. A hearing was held in Topeka last fall at which nothing was decided.

Then came the 1951 flood and its heavy toll of destruction and flood control suddenly loomed as a must. The Kansas City Star, wielding the big political stick for Kansas and Missouri—and favoring the Pick plan—decided the time was ripe to bundle up the whole business and get the Pick dams on order before any opposition would have time to express itself and while the whole Nation was still reacting to the big headlines about Kansas and Missouri.

A gigantic show was organized and staged in Kansas City yesterday. Present were governors of five States, including Ed Arn, of Kansas, and Val Peterson, of Nebraska, the latter a long-time champion of Pick dams. Also Senators FRANK CARLSON and ANDY SCHOEPFEL, of Kansas, and several Congressmen were present. A Who's Who in big industry group were there to lend power to the picture. General Pick and a staff of subordinates were very much on hand. Representatives from Federal agencies concerned were there—Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation, etc. Agriculture, under Brannan, has devoted all its attention to selling socialism and shirked the task of promoting the welfare of the farmers in the flood-control controversy. Soil Conservation has been meek and lamblike, opposed to the big dams but unwilling to stand up and be counted. Only General Pick, of the Corps of Engineers, is blatantly on record, and, of course, he thinks his dam plan is the acme. Quite a

number of Kansans are of opinion that Pick should be reminded of another general who was recently demoted because he dared to step over into the realm of civilian decision. Pick has made MacArthur look like a small-time operator in that regard.

The big drums of the Kansas City Star boomed and rumbled all last week trying to create a false picture of a great mass swing for the Pick plan. Roy Roberts, the man in control of Star policy, undertook to play god and order the destinies of the people in the wide area of the Missouri River Basin. Maybe he has been successful and maybe he hasn't. His thinking on the matter is fairly obvious and sound up to a certain point. Roberts and political team began with the fact that the recent disaster proves need for flood control. They know the workings of democracy, that the democratic process is slow except when emergencies can be dramatized to force action.

DEMOCRATIC ACTION BYPASSED

Up to that point the Citizen's editor would go along and inform Mr. Roberts. Officers of the Kansas Soil Conservation and Flood Control Association and most everyone else in Kansas were willing to present a united front for flood control, if just a little bit of democratic compromise were included.

But Roberts and company figured one step further. It was their belief that the only method was to adopt the Pick plan since it is already blueprinted and ready to launch and since their sympathies were for the plan anyway. They were fully aware that there is a large reservoir of opposition to the Pick plan in unmodified version. Yet they hoped to stampede Congress by painting a false picture and getting it accepted as true before the opposition could stir itself. They were not willing to permit any single shred of compromise.

Indicating the thickness of the grease on the skids, the official representative of the Marais des Cygnes Valley was none other than Lamar Phillips, of the Ottawa Herald staff, who has been doing a Fuller brush act with Pick dams for several years without any great success or following in the valley area.

The Overbrook's editor, along with a small number of men and women from over the State, had the impression the Kansas City rally was open, which it was, and that there would be opportunity for democratic expression of opinion, which there wasn't. Gov. Val Peterson put on an act of incensed piety at the final meeting when the Overbrookian broke up the love feast by taking the floor and claiming that there had been no opportunity for discussion or hearing of any sort. Peterson tried to be oily and slip out of the embarrassing situation, was challenged again, lost his poise and shifted over to the pose of champion of democratic action. Maybe it was a futile gesture, but the valley group got its statement of policy and recommendations for sensible flood control read before the assemblage and Edith Montfort, of Reading, Kans., stated the case for retention dams in brilliant manner, pointing out that the committee's resolution ignored the method entirely by talking of soil conservation and big dams. There was no hope of winning a vote, so no action of that nature was tried.

NO PLACE FOR DISCUSSION

Last on the program was to be an organizational meeting of the valley residents. The rebellious coterie from Kansas innocently attended since they were valley residents. Phillips was chairman and routine procedures went along until Mayor Gage, of Kansas City, made the mistake of giving an impassioned talk in favor of the Pick plan. This started another argument. The Overbrook editor made a sincere plea that all camps get together and work out a program satisfactory to the majority; then stand

united in demand for flood control. The group in charge of the meeting made it brutally plain that only the Pick plan was to be advocated. It wasn't an open meeting at all.

The situation took on a comic touch when a farmer not with the State association group, took the floor and made an excellent plea for the small-dam system, pointing out that there are thousands of farmers living up on the small creeks who get flooded a dozen times a year and that the big dams would do nothing for them. The meeting stage managers hastily adjourned the meeting.

CONSIDERABLE OPPOSITION

In the meantime the considerable voice of opposition to a one-way ride with General Pick has begun to make itself heard again—a little late in this case, but enough to indicate that Senators and Representatives had better watch their commitments if they want to stay vote happy.

The Topeka Chamber of Commerce held a meeting Tuesday and passed a resolution that the flood-control problem be surveyed by a coordinated group of agencies, the equivalent of saying that it not be left entirely to the Army engineers. Topeka is one of the cities worst hit by the flood and its businessmen can't be accused of indifference to suffering or remoteness of concern.

A member of the flood-control advisory committee to the Kansas Governor, Prof. J. O. Jones, professor of hydraulics at Kansas University, Tuesday declared in the Lawrence Journal-World that the big dams of Pick-Sloan won't do the job and came out stanchly in favor of a system of small retention dams.

The story comes down from Salina that the Kanopolis Dam was badly handled and failed to do its control job. Towns of Marion and Florence, Kans., two that suffered as much as any on a ratio, are reported to still be in favor of the small retention dams.

The general public, vitally concerned whether in the valleys or not, has not been consulted in any way, and there are a great, great many Kansans who appreciate the common-sense value of retention dams over the Army engineer monsters.

If everyone in the State knew of the power play to push the Pick plan across there would be a lot of angry Jayhawkers. And every Kansas politician who allows himself to be stampeded into the scheme will have a lot of fast talking to do.

A PERSONAL NOTE

The story ends with a note by the editor. Our interest in the problem of flood control started as interest in what would be best for the general welfare. We have no personal or financial stake in the game whatsoever. Our conclusions as to the right or wrong of the matter resulted in affiliation with the people advocating a modified version of Pick-Sloan with retention watershed dams being used in highly cultivated plains regions. The Kansas Association sort of adopted us, and almost before we knew it we were into the fight—knuckles, teeth, and typewriter.

At Kansas City we probably antagonized a greater number of important people than has been done by a single citizen in years. We took our course in full consideration of the possible cost because we were convinced that a great, grave, and costly error was being jammed into action.

There will only be one major effort for full flood control, only this one chance to get the job done, so it becomes vastly important that the right formula be decided upon. True wisdom comes only through the democratic process and from God, not from people trying to play God. Sacrificing all sense derivative from competition in order to bypass the democratic process may well result in disaster far greater than that of the recent flood. History is full of examples.

The important people, the big names of Government and those manning the big propaganda mediums have no monopoly on right. There has been and is a united demand for flood control, but this unity is threatened by those who would use the suffering and loss of the great disaster to bulldoze across their pet method instead of seeking the best method.

The sin of whatever of wrong results will be theirs. If necessary unity is destroyed they must bear the guilt. The Middle West is still in America, and America is still a democracy. And the mill of democracy still grinds out the best answers when it is allowed to operate.

Troops to Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, many Members in Congress were more than mildly surprised at the statement made some few days ago by General Marshall with reference to the number of Americans who were to be sent across the Atlantic to Europe. Some pretty definite statements were made as to the limited number that were to be sent from our shores to Europe when this matter was under discussion several months ago.

When General Marshall emphatically stated that the War Department was going to send 400,000, editorial comment followed in many sections of our Nation. There appears an editorial in the *Topeka Daily Capital* under date of August 6 entitled "Situation Uncertain," that lays it on the line, and Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as one of many editorials that touch on this serious determination.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SITUATION UNCERTAIN

The country remains in the dark as to what our actual plans are with respect to sending troops to Europe.

At the time Congress approved the general program of contributing United States forces to the organization to be headed by General Eisenhower, it was understood that Americans would comprise about 100,000 men. Later, the military began talking about 200,000. And still later, Defense Secretary Marshall threw all concerned into more confusion when he said he would send 400,000 across the Atlantic.

Marshall explained, after the Pentagon had failed to do so, that he had hiked the figure to 400,000 in order to include supporting troops—not just those to be used for combat.

Strangely enough, no official had mentioned such a distinction before and Congress was led to assume that the total would be much less than Marshall's top figure.

To make the matter all the more puzzling, we must now ponder the testimony of Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, Eisenhower's chief of staff in the European area.

Gruenther was called back to Washington to give testimony at a secret session of a Senate committee. The United Press stated that the general said that American arms—not men—is the big problem Europe expects us to solve. It is Gruenther's idea, apparently, that Europeans are able to provide the bulk of the manpower but not the weapons.

Meanwhile, there is increasing pressure from the Air Force to build up its European strength, on the theory that ground troops cannot be trusted to hold against the Communists unless there is more air power overhead.

Here we have Marshall calling for twice as many men as Congress had been led to believe were wanted; Gruenther saying the need is for arms rather than men; and the Air Force insisting upon a greater European strength which would involve men as well as arms.

What Congress has a right to know is just what the military of the United States is planning to do, at what cost in manpower, weapons, and dollars and what the Europeans will do for themselves.

Sooner or later, Congress must draw a line and say "no more beyond this." Otherwise, the military will keep insisting upon more and more of a European build-up.

Clouding the situation still more is the fact that so many American officers and enlisted men are permitted to have their wives and children with them at European bases.

A disturbing article in *Collier's* magazine declares there are thousands upon thousands of American dependents there, and that this not only causes added expense for our Government but tends to refute the idea that danger is imminent. According to the article, a great many officers and enlisted men who should be devoting their entire time to supposedly pressing military matters are supervising grocery stores, administering schools, acting as chauffeurs, and engaging in all sorts of activities not even remotely concerned with defense against the Communists.

Our military leaders in this country picture Americans as trying desperately to build up their forces so they can help "hold the line" in the event of a sudden Russian invasion. But if such an invasion should come, it is pointed out, they would be burdened with the immediate task of evacuating their families.

If the possibility of war in Europe is imminent, as our military leaders say when they go before Congress to ask for added millions of dollars to finance more troops, the maintenance of American families in Europe is foolhardy. Families have no business in the front lines of any war, either actually started or expected to start.

Construction of Dam at Roanoke Rapids, N. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIS SMITH

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from the column Raleigh Round-Up, by James H. Pou Bailey, a son of the late distinguished

Senator from North Carolina, Josiah William Bailey, which appeared in the *Catawba News-Enterprise* and in other North Carolina State papers of July 20, 1951. This has to do with the attempt of the Interior Department to block the building of a great power project in North Carolina at Roanoke Rapids by the Virginia Electric & Power Co., even after the Federal Power Commission had authorized its continuation. This proposed power installation would have been about ready for operation now but for the obstructions placed in its way by one governmental department after another, and after the proper one having authority had approved its building. The people of the community most affected are indignant at the efforts of the Interior Department in this regard.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RALEIGH ROUND-UP

(By James H. Pou Bailey)

GOVERNMENT VERSUS BUSINESS

The Federal Government about 3 years ago said it wanted to build a gigantic dam at Roanoke Rapids. Virginia Electric & Power Co. said it wanted to build the dam and would spend about \$25,000,000 of its own capital over a 3-year period to develop power for distribution to 450,000 customers in Virginia, North Carolina, and West Virginia.

The matter was turned over to the Federal Power Commission for study to determine if VEPCO or the Federal Government should build the dam and provide the facilities.

Frank A. Hampton, Yadkin County native and many years assistant to the late Senator F. M. Simmons as senior attorney for the Federal Power Commission spent many months on the report.

Last April as a year ago he came out with his voluminous and shocking recommendation: that VEPCO, and not the Government, should build the dam. Since he is employed by the Government and has made a career of working for it, he no doubt gave his employer every benefit of any doubt. But he just couldn't see it and sided with private enterprise. You would have thought that was the end of it. Then you do not know the power-hungry Interior Department, whose Secretary, Oscar Chapman, said his Department would protest the ruling made by the Government's attorney.

Hampton has admitted privately within the past year that some of his Fair Deal friends have looked daggers' points at him since the ruling. The Hampton clan is not given to fear and he stuck to his guns.

Secretary Chapman, with the support of billions upon billions of tax money gathered from private-power companies and others, has moved steadily ahead in efforts to block private-power VEPCO. Last week, this paragraph moved over the Associated Press wires from Richmond, Va.: "The Federal Government went to court today in a new effort to prevent the Virginia Electric & Power Co. from building a gigantic dam at Roanoke Rapids, N. C."

On September 4, the Federal appeals court will review the case.

While the people plead for economy in Government, the Government is going to court in an effort to prevent private enterprise from expanding (and thus paying more taxes) and to fix it so that the Government can spend another \$25,000,000.

Proposed Construction of Roanoke Rapids Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a very splendid editorial from the Greensboro (N. C.) Daily News relating to the action of the Interior Department in hindering and delaying the construction of a dam on the Roanoke River at Roanoke Rapids, N. C., although the Federal Power Commission, after holding a complete hearing, granted the application of a private utility company to build this dam.

Hon. Oscar Chapman, Secretary of the Interior, declares in one breath that eastern North Carolina needs more power and that there is a shortage of power in all that region, and yet for 2 years he has prevented the building of a dam at Roanoke Rapids that would supply that power because he wants to wait and have the Government build the dam instead of having a private utility company build it.

The Government has not appropriated any money for this dam, and will not make an appropriation for this purpose for a long time to come, and should not make any at all when a private company is ready, able, and willing to build the dam, thus saving the taxpayers the expense of its construction.

A large group of citizens from all walks of life in the Roanoke Rapids area of North Carolina came to Washington recently and tried to prevail upon Secretary Chapman to withdraw the litigation which he had instituted to prevent the building of this dam, but without success.

It is rather disturbing to have one agency of Government, in this instance the Federal Power Commission, grant the application for the building of the dam and then have the Interior Department, another agency of Government, stall and delay and seek to defeat the carrying into effect of the order made by the Federal Power Commission. This would not be so serious but for the fact that in the meantime the people of eastern North Carolina are denied the power which they so much need, all because the Interior Department wants the Government to get further into the power business.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POWER IS WHAT COUNTS

While the Daily News looks with some favor on public power, especially where private companies cannot or will not do the job or are in any wise disposed to gouge the public, it seems to us that Secretary of Interior Chapman's continuing attitude toward the dam which the Virginia Electric Power Co. proposes to build at Roanoke Rapids is arbitrary and unwarranted.

The situation boils down to the provision of power which that part of North Carolina and neighboring Virginia needs and wishes.

If the Government could go ahead with its Roanoke River Basin development, that would be one thing. But it cannot at present, and there is no assurance whatever when it can, regardless of how pending court decisions turn out. After all congressional appropriations are necessary for any such project, and the attitude of Congress has been repeatedly shown. The outlook for heavy defense spending in the future strengthens belief that it will be increasingly difficult to get funds for butter to go along with our guns.

Meanwhile a private power company, in this instance VEPCO, is ready and waiting to proceed with the project in accord with the reiterated wishes of the citizenry of the area which is to be served and the hard-won approval of the Federal Power Commission.

It is difficult for us to see, under these realistic circumstances, how or why a Cabinet member should be allowed to use his high office to block progress and at best hold the situation status quo for years.

Northeastern North Carolina needs power, and whoever can or will provide it, under proper regulation and control, should be allowed to do so in the very name of that economic and social progress to which Secretary Chapman, in his particularist approach, is avowedly committed. What the folks around Roanoke Rapids wish is to get that dam going and the power therefrom flowing into a richer, fuller life.

They Pushed Out the Library Walls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Karl Detzer, published in condensed form in the Reader's Digest:

THEY PUSHED OUT THE LIBRARY WALLS

(By Karl Detzer)

(Condensed from the Saturday Review of Literature)

One day last spring a Louisville, Ky., woman approached the reservations desk of her city's free public library. She placed the four packages she was carrying in a wheeled wire basket like those which grocery chain stores provide their customers, and then said to the girl at the desk, "I'd like a framed picture for my living room, please."

She was told that most of the 100 originals and reproductions in the library's lending gallery were already out on loan. But she did find a watercolor by a Kentucky artist which she liked. A librarian stamped her card and the picture was hers for the next month.

Next she went to the library's record room, listened through earphones to passages from a dozen records, then borrowed five on her library card. At the book desk she picked up a couple of books—then went downstairs to a softly lighted room where a score of other taxpayers were enjoying television.

Later, at home, along with thousands of other Louisville citizens, she tuned her FM radio to Station WFPL, to hear the Chicago Round Table, followed by a half hour of Mexican folk songs and then 80 minutes of Brahms. This 250-watt station is owned by

the Louisville taxpayers. The public library runs it.

From its collection of 7,500 records and wire and tape recordings, for 14 hours a day, WFPL broadcasts good music, significant speeches, French lessons, open forums, condensed versions of current books and plays, and, by special permission, transcriptions of the best network shows. It also transmits hundreds of other programs each week over a city-wide system of leased telephone wires to Louisville's high schools, the municipal university, all branch libraries, the school for the blind, children's hospital wards, and the city's psychopathic ward.

High-school teachers need only call the library to bring into their classrooms, at any hour, recorded radio programs on whatever subject their pupils are studying. These recordings may be masterpieces of prose and poetry read by famous actors, or the actual voices of Amelia Earhart, Will Rogers, Thomas Edison, and other famous persons of the recent past.

Schools, clubs, and individuals may also borrow films from their library's collection of 550 motion pictures. Last summer a neighborhood grocer, worried about idle youngsters on the streets, borrowed films from the library and set up a screen in the lot beside his store. Each evening 50 to 150 children watched free movies instead of roaming the streets.

In 3 years 3,000 adults have enrolled in the library's free "neighborhood universities." Classes are held four evenings a week in four branch libraries. Professors from the municipal university teach subjects which range from music appreciation to the natural sciences.

By businesslike techniques, Louisville has kept the cost of her library's extra services, including radio, purchases of films and records, rental of leased wires, and all salaries, to about 12 cents a year for each of the city's 368,000 inhabitants.

Behind the plan to take the library to the people who pay for it are two energetic 44-year-old officials known to most of their fellow citizens as "Skip" and "Charlie." Skip is Clarence Reginald Graham, public librarian. Charlie is Mayor Charles P. Farnsley. It was he who started it all. Graham makes it tick.

A little over 75 years ago the Louisville library was privately owned and operated at a profit. Then a group of citizens decided it should be free. They bought a collection of books, lent them at no cost and supported the project with a lottery. Eventually they bought a business building where the library was housed until 45 years ago. Then Andrew Carnegie gave Louisville its present library building. The original structure was leased to a department store, and its rentals pay a large part of the library's annual expense. The library still is not city owned; a board of trustees, appointed by the mayor and city council, holds the title as a nonprofit corporation.

About 25 years ago Louisville built a bridge across the Ohio River and bonded the city to pay for it by charging tolls; any money left over in the toll fund after the bonds were retired was to be spent by the mayor as he saw fit. Three years ago when the last bond was paid Mayor Farnsley found a surplus of \$50,000.

Farnsley had served on the library's board of trustees and knew the institution needed money. He walked into Graham's office and startled the librarian by laying a check for \$50,000 on his desk. "Here's some money, Skip," he said. "Now, tear down the walls. Take the library out to the people."

¹ See Here's a Mayor Who Knows How To Get Things Done, the Reader's Digest, November, 1949.

Graham's first move was to set up the broadcasting studio. The other innovations followed soon after. In the main reading room of the library and in the 10 full-time branches, record players and head sets are available. Most of the listening sets are in constant use.

This was not the first time in Farnsley's regime that the library had broken with tradition. After he became mayor, Farnsley and the board agreed that the "White Only" signs must come down. There were a few dissenting rumblings but nothing happened—except that Negroes and whites used the library in perfect amity.

Television in the libraries caused some of Louisville's cultural eyebrows to lift sharply, but statistics show that in each branch the advent of television stepped up book borrowing by 46 percent in 2 years. It's easy to stop at the desk after watching a show and pick up a book to take home.

When a local educator complained about the cultural level of the average television program, Mayor Farnsley replied, "I'd rather the people came to their branch libraries to watch the shows than go to the saloons."

Farnsley talked the Art League into turning over its fine collection to the library for loan to Louisville's homes. Art dealers greeted the innovation coldly, but soon found that it paid. After living with a picture for a month, a citizen may decide that he'd like to live with it always, whereupon the librarian puts him in touch with a local dealer and arranges a pay-as-you-go plan.

Thus the librarian and the mayor work together to "push out the walls" and take books, music, art, and education to the people. Graham, who last year was president of the American Library Association, stated his credo in a message to that organization.

"The librarian," he said, "must be not only a scholar and educator; he must promote his library's goods with the skill of a huckster." That may be heresy in some library quarters, but in Louisville it's working out fine

deduction for entertainment expenses, in addition to the regular optional deduction."

Of course, Uncle Sam still has a war on his hands and needs money to build up his forces to defend the American people, including the gentlemen who advise how to cheat the Government on taxes, and the businessmen who pay for that advice. But both put dollars before patriotism.

Want to know who is eating those thick, juicy, and tender steaks which ordinary Americans can't afford? It's corporation officials, and the customers they are entertaining at the best hotels and restaurants, largely at Uncle Sam's expense. He also pays for theater tickets, night clubs, and all sorts of other costly entertainment.

"In New York," says financial writer J. A. Livingston, "night clubs thrive on the expense accounts of businessmen, who let Uncle Sam share their entertaining. High-priced cars, used for business, but also for personal enjoyment, are partly paid for by the Government."

The Wall Street Journal reports that "a credit system for eaters-out and night-clubbers" has been a great success from the start. Why? Because it has a big attraction for businessmen. It gives them a ready-made expense account which they can use to reduce the taxes on the profits of their corporations.

Every tax dollar lost in this way means another dollar of taxes must be paid by other people, including those who can't afford to spend a dime for entertainment. Who is responsible for this outrageous gyp business?

It's the Internal Revenue Bureau that let's them get away with it. The Bureau could and should crack down.

Stand for Freedom, Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I enclose an editorial from the *Huntington (Ind.) Herald-Press*. This editorial indicates the mounting indignation at the challenge to the constitutional rights of a sovereign State as indicated by the arbitrary withholding of Indiana's own tax money by the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency:

STAND FOR FREEDOM, INDIANA

Oscar Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, has thrown down a challenge to the people of Indiana that we must accept with speed and vigor. He has told the people of this State that unless we bow to the dictates of his agency, unless we change our laws to suit the secret purposes of the FSA, we shall not receive a nickel of the tax money collected from our people for the welfare of our own aged, blind, and poorer citizens.

Ewing arbitrarily announced his decision to the press before he informed the Governor of Indiana of his action. He has given the Attorney General little time to present Indiana's views on the constitutionality of this decision to the courts. He has acted summarily without a thought for the unfortunate people who may have to suffer the consequences of his decision or for the rights of the people of his native State to run their own affairs.

And Ewing has shown, by this action, more clearly than any other Federal official has ever shown, how great the powers of the Federal Government over the lives, the property and the liberty of the American people has become.

Indiana can either knuckle down meekly in cowardly surrender to this challenge to our constitutional rights as a sovereign State, or we can accept the challenge and combat it with all our resources. We cannot believe that the people of Indiana will tamely submit to this expatriate Hoosier who seeks to make an example of his native State to tighten the grip of the Federal Government over the people.

The final solution, the final victory for Indiana and for States' rights will have to come either in the courts or in Congress. Meanwhile Indiana can take care of its own welfare program with its own resources without Federal aid.

County councils, on whom the main burden of continuing the welfare program will fall, should insist that every possible cut in welfare spending by county welfare departments be made. If it is clearly necessary to spend more money for welfare than can be collected in taxes, funds can be raised temporarily through bond issues. Then if Indiana wins its battle with the Federal Government and our rightful funds are restored to us, any deficits can be paid off.

If Indiana should lose this struggle for States' rights, it will be clear to the people of the United States that the traditional liberty of the people and the sovereignty of the States is lost. For if the Federal Government can force the States to write laws and administer them and keep information about the spending of tax money a secret from the people who pay the taxes, then our constitutional system is dead. It will take a Nation-wide political campaign to restore to the people of America the form of government that they never knowingly or willingly decided to change.

Top officials of Indiana's State Government in both parties, for this is certainly no partisan issue, should enlist the support of the governors of all the 47 States. They should insist that the scores of Members of Congress who believe in States' rights and the sovereignty of the people support Indiana in this major test of constitutional government.

This is Indiana's great opportunity to lead this Nation toward greater individual liberty, toward a return to representative government, toward the restoration of the constitutional rights that have been taken from us by subterfuge, indirection, and secrecy.

If the people of Indiana will stand steadfast together against this threat to their rights, they can start a prairie fire of resistance to bureaucratic dictation that can, in the end, strike off the socialistic shackles that have been forged in Washington by those who would enslave the people without their consent or knowledge.

Proposed Military Spending Drives America Into Communism By Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the military spending plans which H. R. 5054 embraces do not constitute genuine na-

Unscrupulous Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from *Labor*, the national weekly newspaper, issue of Saturday, August 11, 1951:

CHEAT UNCLE SAM—TAX BUREAU SHOULD CRACK DOWN ON BUSINESS ENTERTAINMENT

Some gentlemen in New York would like to help labor cheat Uncle Sam. They tell us so, in a circular letter suggesting how it can be done. Of course, this newspaper has no use for such advice, but a lot of businessmen are gladly paying the price for it.

"Simply return the enclosed card," the letter says, and "our expert staff" will "point out tax strategies . . . provide recommendations on capitalizing on new tax changes."

In particular, the letter promises advice on "how to handle entertainment expenses," in such a way as to unload most of the cost on Uncle Sam. "Our tax analysts," it says, "have prepared a complete study on the tax aspects of entertainment."

They can even show an unscrupulous businessman "how to secure the full tax

tional defense. Instead, they take us toward national socialism and suicide. This spending is based on an alleged imminent military threat to our national security. This concept has been characterized as "pure nonsense" by our most able military authority.

This spending program goes far beyond our national defense. It embraces most of the errors I anticipated on March 18, 1947, on the floor of this House.

With those fears now confirmed by Truman's policies, my duty is clear. That duty is to oppose these colossal military spending schemes, even though they carry the sacrosanct label of national defense.

Of course, military appropriations that have for their sole purpose the defense of our country will always have my support.

But I will not vote for global military spending that seems to guarantee ultimate victory for communism in America by inflation. We have been on that road too long already.

Moreover, all history records that such gigantic peacetime military spending does not create security. Instead, it operates to provoke full-scale war and ends in catastrophe.

Gold Reserves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted to me to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a letter to me commenting on the gold reserves which I think very timely and worth the attention of every Member of Congress who is interested in a stable currency, a sound monetary policy, and who is concerned about our present and continuing inflationary processes which, of course, have existed ever since the deflationary pressures of 1929 to 1933.

The letter from Mr. Frank Lilly, of Spokane, Wash., follows:

DEAR WALT: Thanks for sending me the report giving selections from foreign transactions of the United States Government, by the United States Department of Commerce, and specifically calling my attention to the tabulation of the gold purchases and sales which I have found very interesting. This, by the way, is the first breakdown of the gold transactions that I have seen.

I was struck by the fact that this report was made in connection with foreign aid, and it certainly shows that we have given the foreigners a great deal of aid in the form of gold. It is true that \$3,000,000,000, which is the approximate total loss to date, since September 1949, does not sound very large in these days of astronomical figures but it represents the required legal backing for \$12,000,000,000 of currency. Incidentally, the foreigners are giving the gold they are getting from us a much higher value in their

economies than we do in ours, which, of course, gives them a decided advantage.

In every one of the reports made by the Treasury Department and the Department of Commerce, I have noticed that invariably the explanatory notes gloss over our loss of gold by stating in one way or another that, "Even after this reduction, gold holding on March 31, 1951, were in excess of \$21,900,000,000 and constituted over three-fifths of the world's known supply." See page 5 et seq. of this report.

They do not tell us that in losing \$3,000,000,000 of gold we lost almost half of all the gold this country produced in the last 150 years because that gives one an entirely different basis upon which to evaluate our loss of the last 2 years. Nor do they say anything about the fact that we have less gold in proportion to our debts and correlated obligations than any of the countries that we are aiding with our gold.

Actually, we do not have, as stated in this report, "over three-fifths of the known world supply" of gold but only about half of the known amount, which includes gold not presently in the central banks but gold that has gone into private hoards.

I do not need to tell you that figures do not mean very much unless properly evaluated and the figures on our gold losses have not been properly evaluated, either by our Treasury Department or the Department of Commerce. One other point in this connection that should be recognized by Government officials is that our supply of gold should increase on the average approximately \$1,000,000,000 a year; thus, instead of having lost only \$3,000,000,000 in a little less than 2 years, we have actually lost close to \$5,000,000,000.

In September 1949, the total amount of gold was \$24,800,000,000. As of the present time, holdings are \$21,758,000,000. In other words, we have lost more than three billion of gold as compared with the statement in the report of the Department of Commerce that since the foreign devaluations of September 1949, United States gold stocks have contracted by more than one and seven-tenths billions.

This last statement that gold stocks have contracted more than one and seven-tenths billions, is, of course, correct if we take into consideration the word "more"; but it seems obvious that the comment was made with the intent of putting a gloss on the real facts.

It is gratifying to me to know that you are very much interested in monetary matters and I have often wished that you were on the Banking and Currency Committee because I know that you would stir things up. It is true that you are doing a good job on the Appropriations Committee in an effort to hold down expenditures. This is important but, to my way of thinking, nothing could be more important than the soundness of our monetary system which is now, and for several years past has been, unsound.

FRANK.

Congressional Immunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Purpose of Stunt Is Achieved,"

by David Lawrence, discussing the question of congressional immunity.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF STUNT IS ACHIEVED—McCARTHY DEMONSTRATES VALUE OF CONGRESSIONAL IMMUNITY AND WHY HE THINKS PRESS RECOGNIZES ITS ADVANTAGES

(By David Lawrence)

Senator JOSEPH McCARTHY, of Wisconsin, Republican, has given a public demonstration of the importance, as he sees it, of congressional immunity—and why he thinks the press, too, recognizes its advantages.

Congressional immunity is the right of a Member of Congress to say what he pleases on the floor or in a committee proceeding and yet to be free from prosecution for libel or slander by those individuals who may consider themselves unjustly attacked or subjected to ridicule.

The Wisconsin Senator offered on a television program to make public the names of the 29 employees of the State Department who, he says, are now being investigated by the Department's loyalty board in connection with charges involving security risks.

But promptly the moderator of the television program declined to have the names given, and Senator McCARTHY said he understood and sympathized with the desire of the broadcasting company and the sponsor to avoid responsibility for such disclosures.

So the Wisconsin Senator announced that he would meet the next morning at his office the reporters from the press associations and give them the names for publication. He said he not only would announce the names but would permit the reporters to give his own name publicly as their source or authority for the information. He made, however, one condition—that the press associations assure him in advance they would print the 29 names.

The press associations declared that they would give no guarantees in advance that they would print anything about anybody, and that if Senator McCARTHY issued the names, they would then decide on their own whether or not to publish them.

Mr. McCARTHY, of course, knew that the moment the names were printed all immunity vanished not only for him but for the press associations as well, as all the newspapers served by them which printed the names. There is no certainty that the individuals would refrain from filing lawsuits against the newspapers and sue only the Wisconsin Senator, though the press would be jointly liable with him. If he issued the names and they were not printed anywhere, the Senator could be sued for disseminating slander to reporters. He would then have to stand alone in court in his attempt to prove the charges.

But the purpose of the stunt was achieved. What Mr. McCARTHY wanted to do was to emphasize the real reason for congressional immunity—to protect not only members of Congress but the newspapers and periodicals which desired to publish the information made available by Members of Congress and governmental agencies. Without congressional immunity, many a scandal, like the recent revelations of the RFC, would appear in print in only a few publications ready to risk lawsuits. Nation-wide publicity on such wrongdoings would occur rarely.

Curiously enough, the Constitution says nothing about protecting officials of the executive branch of the Government from lawsuits over what they say in their statements or speeches. In some cases already litigated, the courts nevertheless have held that official statements on Government business issued by an executive department is as immune as the proceedings of Congress from suits for libel or slander.

There have been suggestions lately—principally from critics of Senator McCARTHY—that congressional immunity be abolished. Again and again it has been asserted that the Wisconsin Senator would not dare repeat outside of the proceedings of Congress some of the charges he has made concerning individuals who he claims are Communists or Soviet agents. While the Senator did not charge any of the 29 State Department employees with disloyalty or affiliation with the Communist cause, he did seek an opportunity to demonstrate that even so innocent a governmental proceeding as a mere inquiry into charges of disloyalty—which conceivably could wind up in a clearance of all 29 of any wrongdoing or disloyalty—runs into the hurdle of refusal to print unless someone utilizes his congressional immunity to make the information privileged.

So the answer to the congressional immunity problem is not to dare a Member of Congress to repeat the attack outside Congress but to find some means, through the court of public opinion or at the polls, to impress Members of both Houses with the need for self-restraint, or at least restraint while official investigation are under way and before conclusions or findings have been made.

The Imprisonment in Czechoslovakia of William N. Oatis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, patience is a virtue, and more controversies have been settled satisfactorily by patient efforts to arrive at a solution reasonably than ever have or will be resolved by rash and precipitate action. There are times, however, when patience ceases to be a virtue and degenerates into a vice.

Our Nation has been patient, extraordinarily patient, in efforts to arrive at a peaceful settlement of many claims against the Communist governments. This has been so not only as to matters which are admittedly controversial in their nature, but likewise as to many instances of outright injustice and disregard of international rights and obligations, which have been perpetrated by Russia and various satellite governments in the past few years against this country and its citizens.

Such a case is that of William N. Oatis, Associated Press correspondent, recently exposed to an alleged trial and convicted unjustly on an alleged confession that, in connection with his duties as Associated Press correspondent, he had acted as a spy for the United States Government.

Recently the board of directors of the Associated Press went on record as condemning the farce of the Oatis trial and conviction and demanding that every effort be made to effect his release. On Saturday the directors of the American Newspaper Publishers Association likewise expressed themselves in forceful manner on the travesty of justice represented by Czechoslovakia's treatment

of Mr. Oatis, viewing it as one more effort on the part of Communist countries to destroy a free press for a free people.

On Tuesday of this week the Overseas Press Club of America formally urged the President to take strong action to obtain the release of Mr. Oatis. The steps they propose include the severance of diplomatic as well as trade relations, a ban against entry into this country of persons of Czechoslovak nationality, cancellation of visas of all Czechoslovak persons in the United States under the auspices of their government, freezing of all Czechoslovak assets in this country, and closing the West German-Czechoslovak border.

Mr. President, I am convinced that the people of our country concur wholeheartedly in this statement by the board of directors of the American Newspaper Publishers Association. They realize that Mr. Oatis was not convicted because of any actual transgression of Czechoslovakian laws, but is now in jail simply because he is an American citizen, engaged in semiofficial activities, and thus a prime target for Communist hatred of all things American, and for Communist desire to weaken the prestige of this Government abroad.

There is pending before the Foreign Relations Committee a resolution which I submitted several weeks ago, urging that the Senate express the sense of this body to the effect that Mr. Oatis has been treated in a viciously unjust manner, and that every effort must be made, through expulsion of Communist correspondents in this country and economic sanctions, as well as through appeal to the United Nations, to focus world indignation on this deplorable action by Czechoslovakia, with the object of bringing about the prompt release of Mr. Oatis.

This is not just another incident, to be glossed over and forgotten after perfunctory representations by our State Department. It is a matter that approaches in importance, from a psychological standpoint, the all-out military efforts which have been conducted by this country to stop Soviet military aggression in Korea.

It is a matter so grave that it deserves an important place on the agenda of foreign activities of our country at the present time. I trust that it will be accorded such consideration, and that continuing and the strongest possible efforts will be maintained so that this individual injustice may be promptly corrected, and, vastly more important, that America may let the world know in no uncertain terms that such premeditated insults and aggression against any of its citizens anywhere in the world will no longer be accepted without positive action by our Government.

I ask unanimous consent that the accounts of the action by the directors of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association, containing the text of their resolution, and of the Overseas Press Club of America, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the accounts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWSMEN ASK ACTION TO GAIN OATIS' RELEASE

NEW YORK, August 7.—The Overseas Press Club of America announced today it had urged President Truman to take "strong action" to obtain the release of Associated Press correspondent, William N. Oatis, sentenced to 10 years in Czechoslovakia for alleged spying.

The club, composed of 750 active and former foreign correspondents, proposed six possible courses to be taken, one after another, until they produce results. They are:

1. Severing diplomatic relations with Czechoslovakia.
2. Breaking off trade relations with Czechoslovakia.
3. Sealing off the West German-Czechoslovak border road and railway traffic.
4. An absolute ban against entry into the United States of all persons of Czechoslovak nationality.
5. Cancellation of visas of all Czechoslovak persons in the United States under the auspices or permission of the present Czechoslovak Government, and their deportation from the country.
6. Freezing of all Czechoslovak assets in the United States.

OATIS CASE IS CALLED RED EFFORT TO DESTROY FREE PRESS FOREVER

NEW YORK, August 3.—Directors of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association said today that the imprisonment in Czechoslovakia of Associated Press Correspondent William N. Oatis is "one more effort" by Communist countries "to destroy forever a free press."

In a resolution adopted by its board of directors, the ANPA termed the trial of Mr. Oatis for espionage a "travesty of justice" and said it should "serve as a dire warning to all free people of the ruthless nature of Communist countries."

Oatis was sentenced to 10 years in prison.

EXPRESSES INDIGNATION

The full resolution follows:

"The board of directors of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association hereby expresses its indignation at the travesty of justice as evidenced in the so-called trial before the state court in Prague, Czechoslovakia, a charter member of the U. N. of William N. Oatis, a correspondent of the Associated Press, who has been convicted of espionage and sentenced to serve a 10-year prison term by this court.

"Mr. Oatis has been employed by the Associated Press as correspondent since 1937 and in that time has built for himself a record of integrity, competence, and accuracy.

"His arrest on April 23, his being held incommunicado, denial of the right to be represented by counsel of his own choosing, and being forced to testify against himself are all in contravention of the very elements of justice. His 'guilt' consisted of reporting established facts and developments in the country to which he had been assigned—the duty of a reporter—by the press service which employed him."

DIRE WARNING SEEN

"His treatment at the hands of Czechoslovakia should serve as a dire warning to all free people of the ruthless nature of Communist countries which have no conception of freedom of the individual: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the board of directors of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association denounces in strongest terms the so-called trial and the conviction of William N. Oatis and that it offers its wholehearted support to the Associated Press and others

who are exerting themselves in his behalf; and be it further

"Resolved, That the board of directors records its deep sense of recognition of the fact that this was not, in fact, the trial and conviction of a newspaperman, but was actually one more effort on the part of Communist countries to destroy forever a free press for a free people."

Americanism or Marxism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 6, 1951

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, the question of whether we shall continue in the same way of life that our Nation was accustomed to during the days from 1776 until recently or whether we shall continue to follow the path of least resistance to big Government control over every activity of our citizens is a serious one.

In this connection I wish every Member of this House, and each of the Senators, would read and understand the following condensation of a speech given by George O. Browne, immediate past president of Optimist International, when he keynoted the thirty-third annual convention of that service club at Detroit, Mich., June 27, 1951.

I have been associated with Mr. Browne since I joined Optimist Club No. 1 of Optimist International in 1937 at Indianapolis and have always been amazed at his willingness to drop the conduct of his own successful business to work to achieve the objectives of this service club. He is truly an example of the highest type of businessman.

The above-mentioned follows:

AMERICANISM OR MARXISM

(By George O. Browne)

During this past year, in view of world conditions, and after careful analysis of the over-all outlook, it seemed to me that as Optimists, if the tremendous expenditure of time, money, ideas, and energy around our slogan "Friend of the Boy" is to continue to have a true value to our countries, it was equally important that the youth we elect to guide be assured of a free country in which to live, with the result that my talks and discussions throughout all my travels has been a challenge to us as Optimists to take an active interest in good government to the end that the fundamental principles of freedom would be retained.

Today I am privileged to keynote this thirty-third annual convention of Optimist International, and I do so most humbly, but with firm convictions, and a sincere optimistic philosophy that, recognizing conditions whatever they may be, regardless of how black the picture, the only successful solution to any and all problems is through an optimistic approach.

AMERICANISM OR MARXISM

There is a price on human liberty. That price is the willingness to assume the responsibility of being free men.

We American people have been living in a state of crisis for the past 21 years. Each

day has been faced as a condition of the gravest emergency. Over 50 percent of the voting population of our country are apparently unfamiliar with any other conditions ever existing in America.

Few Americans realize that for hundreds of years prior to 1776 human beings in the populated areas of the world had been struggling against tyranny and slavery—against forms of government that took away man's freedoms, the very freedoms that were his as a gift from the Supreme Deity.

Few Americans today seem to understand when we refer to the Revolutionary War, that it was a revolution—a revolt by human beings against their government—that it was a "blood revolution" in every sense of the word—that it was as flagrant a violation of the existing laws in America as has ever been perpetrated in the history of North America.

Possibly we have the idea that those early American colonists were thinking of establishing a new nation here in America when they instituted that Revolution—that they knew exactly what they intended to do if they were successful in their efforts. Nothing could be further from the truth.

As Secretary of State James F. Byrnes so ably stated it:

"Our forefathers came to this country not to establish a government, but to escape the tyranny of government. They were not seeking security. They were seeking the opportunity to enjoy freedom."

Having suffered the tyrannies of government both in their home lands and in the Colonies here in America they looked with suspicion on any and all known forms of government. They definitely believed that the gravest and most constant danger to a man's life, liberty, and happiness is the government under which he lives.

Those ancestors of ours did recognize that all civilization is a balance of selfish interests, and a government is necessary as an arbiter among those interests, but that government must never be trusted—must be constantly watched—and must be diastically limited in its scope, because it, too, is a selfish interest and can automatically become a monopoly and devour the civilization over which it presides unless there are definite and positive checks on its activities.

With those fundamentals as the background of their thinking, our founding fathers did establish a government, and at the same time established a new philosophy of government. There was no other government exactly like it in existence and to this day no other government has entirely duplicated it.

PRINCIPLES OF GOVERNMENT

That government which they established, and which to me is Americanism, was founded on just three fundamental principles. First, freedom of the individual. Second, unlimited opportunities for all. Third, a government as the servant of the people, to interfere as little as possible in the lives of the people, to be an arbiter of their interests and to protect them in their necessary dealings with foreign countries.

Thus began the "world's greatest enterprise in freedom." The Constitution, and ultimately the Bill of Rights, is a monument to our forefathers' distrust of the Government, and the division of power between the legislative, judicial, and executive branches succeeded so well for more than 150 years in keeping government authority in its place that we, as Americans, considered our Government as a wise and benevolent institution, capable of assuming the whole burden of social and economic justice.

The "American experiment," composed of free men, depending upon themselves, in 150 years made the greatest economic progress of all times, and under this new philosophy of government built the greatest Na-

tion in the world by any yardstick you care to use as a measurement. There is nothing in the history of humanity that compares with this achievement. Through all these years we, on the North American Continent, have been the envy of people all over the world. We have been known as the New World—The Land of Opportunity.

In 1917, while World War I was in progress, the people of Russia rose in revolt against the tyranny of the Czars and it appeared they had succeeded in throwing off the shackles of human slavery they had endured for centuries. For 7 or 8 months they enjoyed freedom even as you and I—held a free election—elected their representation to go to Moscow and establish a form of government similar to that in the United States. The representatives went to Moscow—they entered the Kremlin with high hopes and lofty ideals and objectives. There a small group of men with guns herded them into an assembly room and announced that they were taking over the government—those who objected were liquidated. Thus the Bolshevik Government of Russia came into being, with possibly not more than 100,000 followers out of a total of 150,000,000 Russian people. Joe Stalin, in a very minor role, was in that group of 100,000. Even that group did not know exactly how they were going to handle the problems of government and eventually intrigue and bloodshed led to an overthrow of the self-appointed leaders of bolshevism, and the new group established the present form of government we know as communism, whereby the government planned the economic and social lives of the people. Today out of more than 180,000,000 people in Russia, there are about 3,000,000 members of the Communist Party—about equal to our present number of Federal employees.

Following World War I defeated Germany, with the conquering nations sapping her entire resources, was trying to set up a representative form of government with many of the characteristics of Americanism. But lack of understanding on the part of the masses, restrictions imposed by the conquerors, paralysis of industry, lack of sound currency, uncontrolled inflation, tremendous unemployment, poverty and hunger, made the people ripe for the remedies offered them by a former corporal in the German army, a paperhanger, who had read a book explaining how government could solve the economic and social problems of masses of people. About the same time in southern Europe, in Italy, where depression had set in, unemployment was prevalent and people were discontented and unable to adjust themselves to a post war economy, the editor of a weekly newspaper was advocating a change in government so that the power and authority be given to government to solve the economic and social problems of the people.

Meanwhile the stagnation of post war depression was rolling over all the countries of Europe into Asia and Africa even into South America. Groups in all countries were advocating having government control of economy and social planning.

In England, the so-called Labor Party, that had been advocating government ownership of nation-wide industry, redistribution of wealth, and government control of economic and social problems for almost 50 years, increased its pressure on the working people, many of whom were unemployed.

By this time in America such words as communism, nazism, fascism, socialism, and similar titles were becoming commonplace. On the surface each appeared to be different from the other. Some were advocating overthrow of government by force, others by the ballot box. In later years, these groups were actually at war against each other.

We, in America, were not much concerned as to what was taking place. Having had two political parties in America for years, both of whom believed in the fundamentals of our form of government, and neither showing any desire to deviate from that course, it was difficult for us to believe that anything serious would come from all this political activity in Europe.

ENSLAVEMENT OF THE PEOPLE

Apparently we believed the mouthings of the leaders of these new movements and failed to look for the basic principles upon which all planned to operate. It is apparent now, as we review our history in the past 25 years, that, as President Truman recently stated, all had just one objective—"enslavement of the people." We know, today, that in spite of the difference in names and the color of the shirts they wore, in each country they were, advocating the same ultimate objective, "Government control of the economic and social life of the people."

Our ancestors came to America to escape the tyranny of that type of government. That form of government is as old as civilization. The pharaohs in Egypt, caesars, the czars, the kaisers, British kings, colonization, war lords in China, ad infinitum through history that has at all times been the prevailing form of government.

In modern times the proponents of this civilization old theory of government were not students of political history.

They had to have some more modern version from which they gained their knowledge. Karl Marx's Theories of Government gave them the detailed patterns that could be followed in setting up a form of government that would vest sole authority in a central governing body to control the economic and social lives of the people and make them beholden entirely to such governing authority. At least everything that has been done in the past 50 years, in the trends of government throughout the world can be found in Marxism.

Marx did his research and wrote his theories while residing in England; he probably had more ardent followers there than any place in the world. He also was a news correspondent for British newspapers and covered the War Between the States here in America.

CLEAR THINKING NEEDED

Why do we continue, knowing the facts, to refer to communism as something different from socialism, nazism, fascism, etc? Why not be honest with ourselves and give it its true name, Marxism? Then we can clear our thinking and recognize that there are just two different ideologies of government—Americanism or Marxism. The one is freedom—the other is slavery. The only difference that exists between the form of governments in the various countries today is the degree toward which they have progressed to the ultimate goals of Marxism. Some are closed than others, but all are well on the road.

Recognizing that all these isms—except Americanism—represent a degree of Marxism, which is government control of the economic and social lives of its people, let's take a look at what is happening in our own countries.

Up until 1930-32, when the world-wide depression finally caught up with the people of North America, American people were going blithely on their way living up to precepts of our founding fathers, as free Americans, depending on ourselves, exercising our initiative and self-reliance, full of hopes and ambitions, and giving little thought to our Government, which with its checks and balances was performing strictly as prescribed by Constitution and the laws enacted by our elected representatives, who as our ancestors intended, were normally honest and incompetent amateurs.

When the impact of depression hit us, unemployment rose, businesses failed, we became panicky. We were "soft." Many lush years of living, much of it beyond our means, with our futures mortgaged for several years ahead in our desire to have all the luxuries that our great creative and productive abilities under free enterprise and unlimited opportunity for all had made possible, found us as citizens totally unprepared to cope with adversity. We did not want to face reality, cut our standard of living back to our income, take work of any kind to keep family and body together. No; we wanted a quick, easy way out. In typical human-nature fashion we refused to admit our own mistakes and sought an alibi.

SOCIAL-SECURITY FIASCO

Social security became a law—a clear abrogation of man's inherent rights. It is absolute dishonesty on the part of Government because as the Government continues its spendthrift policies and continues to build up deficits it has destroyed the purchasing power of the American dollar to the point where any return to the wage earner will be a mere pittance and represents no security at all. If the millions of working people in America who apathetically allow Government to deduct their social-security dues, could understand the bureaucratic absolutism that has been built up and what this will do to them and their children, they would repudiate the whole dishonest business at once. They do not know that the moneys paid in have practically all been expended for other governmental schemes and all that remains is a Government's promise to continue to take enough money annually away from the present and future generations to meet these so-called security payments—and that same Government every hour continues to go farther and farther into debt.

They do not know that when a government takes over the people's economic life it becomes absolute, and when it becomes absolute it destroys the minds, the arts, and the liberties of the people it governs. It is no accident that these same practices were in operation or advocated in all the countries following the Marxian theories long before they became established in America. Men who are fed by their government will soon be driven down to the status of slavery. Had we adhered to our Constitution, this monstrosity would never have been foisted on the American people.

Subsidies to farmers, encouraging overproduction of items not needed, creating fictitious retail markets, and eventually dumping and destroying the produce acquired by such false values. The developments from that point on have been so rapid it is practically impossible to keep track of them.

A Federal Security Administration—one of the greatest stealers of liberty and freedom ever established. A public-welfare deal whereby the Federal Government collects money in taxes from those willing to work, and who are thrifty and industrious, makes a deal with each State to return part of the funds to the State for welfare and relief, provided the States put up an equal amount. Very cleverly the law creating this octopus, giving this bureau sole authority to make its own rules and regulations and judge the equity of its own deeds provided a secrecy clause making it illegal to divulge any information as to how the funds were spent, who received them, or what purpose they served. The records today disclose that each year this bureau has expended more and more funds for welfare and relief at a time when the total number of people employed has risen from 35,000,000 to over 63,000,000 people, and the national total income has expanded from \$65,000,000,000 to an estimated \$300,000,000,000 for 1951. Thank God, this is one place where American people

are beginning to assert themselves. My own State of Indiana led the way by enacting a law opening the welfare records for public inspection. While the law was being nursed through regular legislative changes the giant Federal Security Administration fought it with every known tool of blackmail and gangsterism—threats of cutting the entire State off from Federal welfare funds were promised. Other States are following.

In our softness we have no conception of what Patrick Henry meant when he said, "Give me liberty or give me death." Even back in those days of Revolution we had plenty of so-called statesmen and leaders who wanted to compromise with England and work out a deal, even as we have today. We, as Americans, must come to realize and believe that life is infinitely less important than freedom. Our political leaders told the youth of America that in 1918, again in 1941, and they are telling them that in 1951, as they send them away to die "to make the world safe for democracy."

Are these things we have been doing to our form of government a part of the principles as established by our forefathers?

A free man has a value to himself and to his country—a ward of the state is useless to himself and to the world, but he can be useful as a tool of the state that controls him. He votes in America. In other countries he is nothing more than slave labor serving his political masters.

Let's look a little further. Government ownership and competition with private business. The Tennessee Valley Authority, established for national defense and flood control, generating power and selling it at substantially below its actual cost. The deficit is made up by taxpayers' money, the large part of which comes from areas far remote from the sections enjoying cheap power at other taxpayers' expense. Why? Why isn't a fair price on the basis of cost of production used by this Government agency? You know as well as I, it is again a government trying to hoodwink the people into believing that their government is a great humanitarian looking out for their welfare. Now the Missouri Valley Authority is being created. A few weeks ago I flew over the great Bonneville Dam on the Columbia River. Two years ago I visited Hoover Dam at Boulder. Flood control? Yes, by all means. Government competition in business? No. Do you know that the several Government agencies, Army engineers, Department of Reclamation, and Department of Interior, and heaven only knows how many more, have 16 of these great projects on the drawing boards which if put into operation on the same basis as TVA will enable the Government to take over the electrical, public-utility business of the entire Nation?

I could go on indefinitely with public housing, slum clearance, compulsory savings, tax withholdings, socialized medicine, Government subsidies, Brannan plan, and each and every one of them controlled and operated by a Government bureau, making its own laws, rules and regulations, serving as its own jury and judge as to the proper conduct of its affairs. Again I say, make no mistake about it—literature released by the Federal Security Administration where social security and various public assistance programs including socialized medicine, compulsory health insurance, etc., are being advocated states—and I quote—"Social security and public assistance programs are a basic essential for attainment of the 'socialized state' envisaged in a democratic ideology. A way of life which so far has been realized only in a slight measure." Latest additions proposed are free—I love that word—hospital service for millions of people 65 years or older, and finally a "Fed-

eral Agency for Handicapped" on which 13 separate bills have been introduced to extend medical, surgical, and therapeutic services, vocational guidance and counseling, education and training, and placement in suitable employment, if possible for 28,000,000 such citizens. In Russia it's communism, in England it's socialism, in America it's Government-planned economy and Government-planned social progress.

Let's be realistic—let's be honest with ourselves—it's Marxism, and it makes no difference what other high sounding name you give it or in what country you find it.

This is not a political issue in terms of Republican or Democratic Party in the United States. In both parties can be found these followers of the Marxian ideologies and in both parties there are staunch supporters of the fundamental principles of Americanism. To preserve their position in Government many of those who honestly believe in true Americanism have had to straddle the fence because of the gullibility of the American people in their acceptance of these Marxian theories.

The answer is education—taking an active interest in Government—combining our efforts with those of all other service and patriotic organizations to sell Americanism to all.

It's time to fight. It's time to prove whether or not we deserve the heritage given to us by our forefathers. It's time to demand that our Government be restored to those who are Americans, and it's time to throw out the anti-Americans.

Have we the courage of Patrick Henry? Can we stand up and say, meaning every syllable of it, "Give me liberty or give me death"?

The Lowe Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include an article from the Sidney Telegraph by Jack Lowe, entitled "The Lowe Down."

Mr. Speaker, Jack Lowe is one of the outstanding editors of a live newspaper in western Nebraska. His remarks on the propaganda put out by the OPS is to the point. I am sure every newspaper editor would react in the same way. I commend the reading of the article to my colleagues:

THE LOWE DOWN

(By Jack H. Lowe)

Every week a cheery little greeting comes to my desk from the Office of Price Stabilization. It starts out with an affable "Hello Nebraskans" and it proceeds to reassure us that if we'll just sit back and relax and leave everything up to Uncle Sam we needn't fear any harm from those bad boys who are trying to hoist prices and boost inflation for their own selfish benefit.

I guess there's something wrong with me because I don't get as much enjoyment out of these dispatches as one should. Maybe it's because I don't read them very thoroughly. I read the first couple or three but the guy who composes them seems to be in a

rut and it got so I could just about recite the contents before I opened the envelope.

I'm not one of those who have a stroke every time someone mentions a Government employee, in fact, I willingly admit that it's a big Government and it takes a lot of people to run it. Government workers are much like private-industry employees—some of them earn their money and some of them don't. You can't condemn an entire system just because there are a few rotten apples in the barrel and I hold no brief for the die-hards who would do away with all Government pay checks.

I do get a little annoyed, however, when my wastebasket fills day after day with Government bulletins, such as this OPS folderol. I'm in the paper business and in order to stay there it may be necessary to slip into the black market. Thus, it is not comforting to contemplate the fact that certain governmental agencies are using paper like crazy, while the rest of us are going crazy trying to buy it.

I don't need any reassurance from the OPS that we are being saved from the inflationary wolf. If the boys in OPS are doing a good enough job it won't be necessary to prove their point with weekly small-talk bulletins. Where I would like to see the results is on the price tags of the things they are supposed to be controlling. So far, I hear a lot of talking but I don't see any results.

There's a story going around about the efficiency expert who was called in to check on a Government agency. He asked his first victim, "What do you do?" "I don't do nothing," was the reply. To the same question his second victim gave the same reply. "Well, what we've got to do first," the expert declared, "is to eliminate this duplication."

I have a sneaking suspicion that OPS would make a lot more friends among the press if it would eliminate these weekly greetings. Newspapersmen don't like to be reminded that the public isn't smart enough to take care of itself. Most reporters are fair judges of human nature and they haven't reached the point where they think the average American needs a guardian.

Many times in this column I've complained because I didn't know enough about what the Government is doing. After reading my OPS propaganda I think it was much nicer the other way.

Please, fellas, call off your dogs.

"American Air Power Is Answer to the Red Army—A Powerful, Long-Range Air Force Is Now Generally Conceded To Be the Principal War Deterrent, and Is Today the Principal Weapon of Our Defense of the Western Hemisphere and the Free World"—Hon. Carl Vinson, Chairman, Armed Services Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, I visited with a friend who lives in one of those New York skyscraper apartment buildings—thirty-eight

floors above the street. As I looked out across that great city, it seemed that—with outstretched hand—I could actually touch the clouds.

Across the billions of dollars worth of great skyscrapers, I could see the fringe of Central Park—and the great panorama that stretched before me in the distance. My friend said to me, "Frank, just what will America do if Russian planes break through our air defenses and, after having dropped an atom bomb, continued their aerial operations against our country with that great air armada they recently exhibited in Moscow?"

I told him that, in a large sense, he could quiet his fears—that, for more than a quarter of a century past, CARL VINSON, of Georgia, had devoted his life to looking to the defenses of our country—and that he would continue to do so as long as life remained in his body. Moreover, I said:

The traditions that CARL VINSON—the Nation's most outstanding military authority—will leave behind are certain to survive as long as civilization lasts.

Mr. Speaker, it is needless to tell you how surprised I was to receive, last Saturday, from my friend in New York, a clipping taken from the New York Journal-American, the final of a series of five articles written by the Hon. CARL VINSON, and headed, "Plare supremacy held key to survival of the United States."

Mr. Speaker, I called our good friend, Edward C. Lapping, head of the Washington press bureau of the New York Journal-American in the Press Galleries, and asked him if he could furnish me with the entire series of articles that were written by CARL VINSON. This, Mr. Lapping has done, and with thanks to him and the consent of my colleagues, I propose to extend my remarks in the Record and insert therein those articles as written by CARL VINSON at the conclusion of this statement.

I have often pondered, Mr. Speaker, on just what we junior Members of the House would do if and when we no longer have you all older and more experienced in legislative matters to council us in our every doing. Members like ADOLPH SABATH, "BOB" DOUGHTON, your own good self, SAM RAYBURN, CARL VINSON, "BOB" CROSSER, DAN REED, ROY WOODRUFF, JOHN RANKIN, CLARENCE CANNON, JOHN TABER, EUGENE COX, JOE MARTIN, and others—all of them veterans Members, and all of whom were highly trained and skilled in the intricate matters of legislating in this Congress when I walked down the aisle for the first time, nearly 16 years ago.

The counterpart of these elder statesmen in the House are found at the other end of the Capitol—they live in the personalities of the Honorable Senators KENNETH MCKELLAR, WALTER GEORGE, CARL HAYDEN, TOM CONNALLY, "DICK" RUSSELL, HARRY BYRD, PAT MCCARRAN, ALLEN ELLENDER—all of whom have left an indelible impression upon the pages of world history in these last two or three decades.

Chairing or otherwise active in directing their special committees, these men

have brought centuries of calm and dispassionate prudence, sagacity, and wisdom to this Nation's Congress—and, certainly, their concerted, disinterested, bipartisan actions—without the blaring of trumpets or any fanfare whatever—have, on many, many occasions in times of crises—saved this country.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to realize that the lacquer and polish that was on the new hardware of your first office door in Washington had not worn off when you first came to this House. More difficult still is it to believe that when the distinguished chairman of the House Rules Committee, the Honorable ADOLPH J. SABATH, first came to Congress that Members of neither House nor Senate of the United States had so much as an office wherein they could hang their hats. In fact, in those days, the Representatives' and Senators' office was frequently found to be in their hats as well as in their pockets because it was in their hats and pockets that many Members carried their bills, reports, notes for speeches, and much of the correspondence that was vital to that days' effort in either the House or the Senate.

It is unnecessary for me, Mr. Speaker, to point out that America was then a very small Nation. Not even recognized as a first-class world power—it was never invited to sit down at any international conference. Then, we had less standing in the world affairs than do some of the smaller American Republics today.

Many fail to realize that it was not until the full military, naval, financial, and productive might of these United States was unloosed upon the armies of the Huns and the Kaiser of Germany in World War I that America even began to emerge as a first-class power. But America has certainly traveled far, and, more certain, she has learned also to travel fast since those days.

Morally, spiritually, physically—in the matter of our agricultural production, our finance, our industry, commerce, transportation, and trade—we have progressed steadily under the care and the guidance of the superb leadership of the elder statesmen of this Nation. Though there are but few left with us now—thank God—they still remain to train the junior Members of this body how to carry on in the long-established American tradition, and the way and practices laid down by the founding fathers.

Mr. Speaker, the two attributes that make for statesmanship in this House are not things that can be found written down in ink on paper. The men of whom I have spoken live as pillars of cloud each day and of fire by night—to light for us, the younger Members, the pathway to what we have all come to call the American way of life.

I have heard criticism of the manner in which we select those Members who are to serve as chairmen of various committees. I doubt if there can ever be devised any manner that is better suited to the American system of government of choosing those who preside over our committees than that long tried and

proven system of entrusting the chairmanship to the senior member on the committee of the party in power. The highest expression of service that a man can give to his colleagues in this body is the measure of service that he renders in filling the chair of some important committee of this House.

Mr. Speaker, there is no man within the sound of my voice but who realizes the long, hard, arduous years of service that are necessary to bring one to a chairmanship on an important committee—but, once there, the welfare of that segment of government with which his committee is charged, rests largely in the hands of the committee chairman.

Mr. Speaker, all that I have said is apropos of but a few words of commendation that I want to pay to one of the most beloved, respected, wise, sagacious, experienced, and active committee chairman that this Congress has ever had. I speak of none other than the Honorable CARL VINSON, of the little inland town of Milledgeville, Ga., who today is not alone known to every member of the Politburo but equally so in every chancellery throughout the world.

Someone one time said "that CARL VINSON is the United States admiral of the ocean and the seas, field marshal of the armies of the United States, and, as for our great United States Air Force, that he is wing commander of everything."

Time was when he was charged only with chairing the Naval Affairs Committee of this House, over which he presided for nearly 20 years, but these were in the old unreconstructed days before the Armed Forces were unified and solidified, and when the total budgeted military appropriations were in millions of dollars rather than in the tens of billions of dollars—as of today.

Some there are who point out that unification has really brought about more military establishments than ever before—but, certainly, insofar as CARL VINSON is concerned, it has brought about the solidification in him of power—probably greater than was ever reposed in one man in the history of this world.

But, Mr. Speaker, CARL VINSON has the wisdom that comes with years. He is a living exemplification of the adage taught me by my father when he said—more than a half century ago, "My son—a man, to be wise—must, in time of crisis, know exactly what to do next," and we know that CARL VINSON always knows what to do next.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, these are times of peril in this world, not alone with respect to international affairs, but with respect to national affairs within our own country. No one knows better than does your own good self how much this Nation desires peace. Certainly, no one knows better than do you, the reluctance with which we arm not only ourselves, but freemen everywhere. Not alone against the communistic Slav nation of Russia and her satellites, but against the yellow hordes of Chinese Communists, now on the rampage.

Mr. Speaker, it is a godsend that this Nation has, in the personality of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House, a man of great power, of great wisdom, prudence, and great trust—one in whom this Nation and the world can put its trust and reliance in this dark hour of civilization.

Mr. Speaker, to paraphrase the words of a great poet:

When Nature wants to drill a man
And thrill a man,
And skill a man,
When Nature wants to mould a man
To play the noblest part;
When she yearns with all her heart
To create so great and bold a man
That all the world shall praise—
Watch her methods, watch her ways!
Watch how she ruthlessly perfects
Whom she royally elects;
How she hammers him and hurts him
And with mighty blows converts him
Into trial shapes of clay which only Nature
understands—
And while his tortured heart is crying and
he lifts beseeching hands!—
How she bends but never breaks,
When she uses whom she chooses—
And with every purpose fuses him,
By every art induces him
To try his splendour out—
For Nature knows what she's about.

But, Mr. Speaker, when—

Lo, the crisis! Lo, the shout
That must call the leader out.
When the people need salvation
Doth he come to lead the Nation—
Then doth Nature show her plan
And the world has found—the man.

And CARL VINSON is just such a man—a man who can do more work on more things at the same time than any other man I ever knew.

Mr. Speaker, there is unified agreement on every hand that the one thing which has thus far contained the hordes of Communist Russia from making war upon these United States has been the existence of the United States Air Force, the United States long-range intercontinental bomber, the B-36, and our possession of the atom bomb.

In recognition of our power to make effective and almost annihilating strategic attack and the further fact that if and when world war III comes that victory will be achieved in the air, Russia has gone all out in an endeavor to match our prowess in the air.

Accredited military leaders now advise us, however, that the Russian Government * * * actually outstrips us at least in the number of modern planes she now has, but, be assured, indeed, that will not be for long.

We in this House know that the Armed Services Committee, formidable as it is, consisting of 35 members, will bring forth the solution. While there may be some dissention prevailing among the juniors on that committee, theirs are but little voices heard but faintly when Mr. VINSON and his Republican but American bipartisan leader of the minority, the Honorable DEWEY SHORT, together with the older statesmen on the committee, settle the high as well as low affairs of national differences—Army, Navy, Air

Force, Marines, Coast Guard, or whatever they be—that are brought before their committee.

Mr. Speaker, in his speech at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston, the Honorable Winston Churchill who shared with Franklin D. Roosevelt and CARL VINSON the reputation of being the greatest proponents of "Big Navies" and who had heretofore placed their firm reliance on strong "Naval Forces" to win wars had this to say:

For good or for ill, air mastery is today the supreme expression of military power, and fleets and armies, however necessary, must accept a subordinate rank. This is a memorable milestone in the march of man.

It is, therefore, no surprise to me, Sir, for me to read last night, that our great chairman of the Armed Services Committee should have yesterday issued a statement about air power which was in part reported by the press as follows:

As regards the Air Force expansion, Mr. VINSON stated: that in supporting 138-combat wings he is mindful of a number of considerations that made the expansion appear to him to be decisive. Primary among these, he said, "is the fact that the development of air power has, in combination with new weapons of mass destruction, changed the entire strategic situation.

Chairman VINSON then went on to say:

This country is today vulnerable to air attack. The most effective defense against such an attack is adequate air power to meet it, and, above all, to strike back at its sources. It is impossible in modern warfare to postpone or avoid decisive action in the air. No matter how much strength we may be able to assemble on the ground or the sea, we cannot hope to defeat Soviet power unless we have superior strength in the air. Air warfare, once begun, moves very rapidly toward a decision. If the air battle is lost, the war is certain to be lost. In order to win the air battle, we must have in being an Air Force superior to any that could be thrown against us. An Air Force of the size that I propose is essential for the defense of our allies and for our own security.

The airplanes that this force would require, in addition to the number planned for the 95-wing Air Force, can be provided without the construction of a single new aircraft factory. The immediate outlay for additional base facilities would be in the order of \$400,000,000. Finally, the 138-combat-wing force will require the addition of approximately 300,000 airmen.

Because of the long lead time required for the development and manufacture of present-day airplanes, particularly those of the bomber type, and for the training of airmen, this program will take several years to complete. If we are to have this force in time, the decision to allocate the necessary resources must be made immediately, and the funds should be included in the next budget to be submitted to the Congress.

I have complete confidence in the ability of American industry and engineering talent to produce air power on this scale. The broad base for production expansion laid down during the past year has already begun to justify the investment. Last month, the aircraft industry, under its gathering momentum, produced more airplanes than the schedule called for. The requirements of the 138 combat wing Air Force can be met by the addition of extra work shifts at the factories, more production tools, and the proper allocation of materials.

Mr. Speaker, there is much matter of such vital importance to the Nation contained in the articles written by the Honorable CARL VINSON. It is because of that fact that, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include the same in the RECORD.

In the first of these articles, Chairman VINSON discussed the several types of attack that might be directed against the United States to bring it under the yoke and domination of communistic Russia—and stressed particularly the vulnerability of direct military attack on Alaska, Canada, and the United States. He indicated that the northwest approaches were most vulnerable by air and described the types of aircraft which the Soviets now possess.

He also discussed the recent Moscow air show and talked of the new bomber being built by the Russians—larger than our B-29's—and which bears some resemblance to the B-36.

"Having a range of action," Chairman VINSON declared, "exceeding 2,000 miles, they would be enabled to bomb the northwest corner of the United States and return therefrom to bases in Russia."

"Ordinary bombers," he said, "are not destructive enough to make one-way missions, in which all the bombers are lost, worth while to the attacker except in rare instances. Atomic bombs, however," he declared, "are worth while."

Pointing out the hazard to the Nation of delivery of A-bombs by submarines, Chairman VINSON concluded this article with a vivid and graphic statement as to why the perils of sabotage are always present.

His first article reads as follows:

ENEMY COULD BOMB OUR CITIES, RAID TRADE, AND USE SABOTAGE

WASHINGTON, August 1.—For a generation the Western Hemisphere has been the arsenal of freedom. Today it is also the principal stronghold of freedom.

For the first time in world history the Eastern Hemisphere is threatened with complete domination by a single power.

Only the spiritual and material strength of the Western Hemisphere can prevent that power from spreading over the greatest land mass on earth—the Continent of Eurasia.

If such a catastrophe should occur, the Western Hemisphere would stand alone in its fight for freedom and would have to carry the burden for all mankind.

QUESTION ARISES

The question at once arises, just how can our hemisphere be threatened in these times?

Three major types of attack are available—first, and most evident, the direct military attack; second, and less often considered, an attack on trade routes and on sources of strategic materials, and third, and often overlooked entirely, coordinated acts of sabotage and subversion.

As for the first, the direct military attack, Alaska, Canada, most of the United States and the northeast approaches thereto are vulnerable to air attack by the Soviet using types of aircraft which they now possess.

ENLARGING AIR FORCE

We know that the Russians are rapidly enlarging a long-range striking force similar to the one we used with such decisive effort against Japan in World War II.

They now have hundreds of long-range bombers similar to our famous B-29's.

Recently the Russians staged an air show over Moscow on Air Force Day, which the Russian newspapers called "the favorite festival of the Russian people," and showed for the first time a new bomber which is even larger than the B-29 and bears some resemblance to our B-36.

This new bomber undoubtedly has a considerably greater range than the TU-4, or B-29 copy, which they have been building for several years.

CAN CARRY A-BOMBS

All of these planes can carry atomic bombs of the powerful Nagasaki type. They have a radius of action exceeding 2,000 miles, which would enable them to bomb the northwest corner of the United States and return to bases in Russia.

Of course, their one-way, one-refueling range of action will enable them to reach practically all of the United States and down into Mexico.

We know also that the Russians are increasing as rapidly as they can their stockpile of atomic bombs. This stockpile may be approaching 100 of these terrible capsules of destruction.

Ordinary bombs are not destructive enough to make one-way missions, in which all bombers are lost, worth while to the attacker except in rare instances. Atomic bombs, however, are another matter.

ARE EXPENDABLE

Delivered against vital targets, they may bring results well worth the expenditure of the planes and crews carrying them.

We know the Russian psychology well enough to anticipate that such attacks would be made in the event of an all-out war.

For the first time, then, we have a very critical and difficult requirement of developing a strong defense against air attack from the Eastern Hemisphere which lies to the north of us as well as to the east and to the west.

Ground attack against our hemisphere is, very obviously, much less of a problem and likelihood than the air attack.

ASSAULTS POSSIBLE

But even here, against such areas as Alaska and Greenland (not including strategic Iceland), and against specific targets accessible to troop-carrying submarines, assaults are possible from the sea and air which must be countered in this hemisphere's strategic plans.

Crippling assaults on major bases in this hemisphere from the ground and from the sea are well within Russian capabilities; and if all the Eastern Hemisphere fell within the Soviet grasp, that capability would increase enormously and confront us with a potentially explosive situation.

THREAT FROM SEA

The surface threat from the sea is and will remain negligible so long as America maintains its great naval superiority, a situation likely to continue for many years, provided we maintain, in our defense councils, an adequately balanced military and naval leadership.

So, in summary, our greatest threat, from military action against the Western Hemisphere is from the air; and next, from submarine action, not excluding the delivery of the atomic bomb by that means.

The second major type of threat is the possibility of attack on trade routes and sources of strategic materials.

NEED RAW MATERIALS

Although we commonly lose sight of this fact because of our vaunted industrial progress, there is no escaping the dependence of American industrial might upon the

receipt of raw materials such as uranium ore, tungsten, chromite, manganese, bauxite, tin, columbite, copper, and petroleum which come from various sources outside of the United States, including South America.

The movement of these materials can, of course, be interrupted by air, sea, or ground attack—at the present time, more probably by submarine and air attack than by ground action.

And, as for the third major type of attack, sabotage of industrial facilities and other critical installations of this hemisphere on a major scale would seriously affect our capabilities to support the war effort.

Because of the nature of this form of attack, our facilities are always vulnerable.

In the second of the series, Chairman CARL VINSON discoursed on hemispheric defenses, and told of the plans and the accomplishments that have been made to unify the nations of North and South America. He vehemently declared that—

Action by all is vital, while the varied nature of possible attacks against the Western Hemisphere, and terrible destructiveness of modern weapons, make it evident that our defense against such attacks must be a concerted all-hemisphere defense rather than a defense attack by America alone.

The defense of this hemisphere is conditioned upon what happens in Canada, in Central or in South America, as well as what happens in the United States.

In pointing out the progress that had been made for mutual assistance and hemispheric solidarity, Mr. VINSON cited the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance which, he said, "provides that an armed attack by any state upon an American state shall be considered an attack upon all of them."

The second article in the series by Congressman CARL VINSON, reads as follows:

ACTION BY ALL VITAL TO HEMISPHERE

WASHINGTON, August 2—The varied nature of the possible attacks against the Western Hemisphere and the terrible destructiveness of modern weapons make it evident that our defense against such attacks must be concerted, all-hemisphere defense rather than a defense attempted by America alone.

The defense of this hemisphere is conditioned by what happens in Canada, in Central America, and South America, as well as by what happens in the United States.

Our Monroe Doctrine must be a common effort, not an exclusively American effort, if we are to develop a sound hemispheric defense.

And what is being done in the defense area? Are we developing a sound, unified approach to hemisphere defense on the part of the American Republics?

STARTLING SCOPE

It is startling to know the scope of this effort.

In all of our planning and building for defense of North America against the increasing threat of air attack we are cooperating closely with the Canadians.

Matters affecting the common defense of North America are handled by three boards or committees having combined Canadian and United States representation.

Moving south to Mexico, the United States and Mexico have a mutual arrangement for defense planning known as the joint Mexican-United States Defense Commission.

Before proceeding on southward to see what other military cooperation exists, we

had better examine our treaty obligations with South and Central American Republics. The Inter-American treaty of reciprocal assistance provides that an armed attack by any state upon an American state shall be considered an attack on all of them.

OBLIGATIONS

It is important also to know that this treaty obligation taxes hold when an armed attack occurs within any part of a tremendous area—the territory of any American state or within any portion of a specified area embracing both North and South America, including Canada and Alaska, together with Greenland, the Arctic and Antarctic regions of the continent, and all of the area lying between.

The obligation for common defense in this hemisphere is, therefore, clear and unmistakable.

What international organization sees that this community of defense is worked out? This is the Hemispheric Inter-American Defense Board.

HEMISPHERIC

We have in this Board a military organization consisting of military representatives from all the American Republics with the exception of Panama. Its job is to work out the long-range problems of the defense and security of the hemisphere.

Needless to say, the problems involved in transforming our political objectives into worth-while military measures in Latin America have been very great. However, there has been general agreement that standardization of military equipment, training, and doctrine are essential.

Standardization following United States patterns has been accepted.

As a practical means toward attaining this standardization, most of the Latin-American nations asked the United States to provide Army, Navy, and Air Force missions to assist in the training of their armed forces.

MUTUAL MISSIONS

These missions have been established and are being maintained by the mutual support of the Latin Governments and the United States.

At the same time, the United States has invited Latin-American officers to attend service schools in this country.

Take, for example, the naval problem. There are United States naval missions in Haiti, Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Chile, and Brazil. We also have an advisory group in Argentina.

Our people in these naval missions are actively assisting the countries concerned in operating their navies along the same lines and using the same principles and the same standards that we use in the United States Navy.

Many American naval officers are assisting as instructors in the war colleges of these countries.

In addition, there has recently been transferred to Brazil, Argentina, and Chile two light cruisers each.

A bill is now pending in the Congress, which I have introduced and which has passed the House of Representatives, to transfer three destroyer escorts to Peru and two to Uruguay. When it is passed, it will also provide important additions to these nations' navies.

In his third article on hemispheric defense Chairman CARL VINSON wrote, in part, as follows:

I am glad to report that the actions taken to meet the various problems have been numerous. Army ground combat forces in Alaska have been recently increased in order to provide additional security there. The antiaircraft units in the Army within the

United States have been doubled. The various operating agencies of vital facilities have been fully informed in the industrial mobilization program, and told of missions designed to prevent sabotage and to increase the security.

In general, the great detail of planned program have now been translated into action programs which now look to the increased security and defense of not alone the continental United States but both continents in the Western Hemisphere.

Chairman VINSON concluded by stating:

The largest bombers today can fly so high that they are invisible to the ground observer and almost completely safe from detection by any fighters which happen to be in the air unless these fighters are guided by radar stations on the ground.

But a complete radar net is indispensable if our fighters are to intercept and shoot down any of the bombers that might attack us.

The third article in that series reads as follows:

HEMISPHERE ACTS TO PREVENT ATTACK

WASHINGTON, August 3.—As to what is being done by our country to meet defense problems peculiar to this hemisphere, let me take the Army first.

Our Army's problems created by the vulnerabilities I have previously described as regards the Western Hemisphere are varied.

They include assistance to agencies operating critical facilities to prevent sabotage and subversion.

STRONGER GARRISONS

Of course, they include the strengthening and support of Army garrisons and outposts protecting the approaches to the Western Hemisphere and the rebuilding and modernizing of the armies of our allies in the Western Hemisphere and Western Europe.

I am glad to report the actions taken to meet these various problems have been numerous.

Army ground combat forces in Alaska have been recently increased to provide additional security there.

The number of antiaircraft units in the Army within the United States has been doubled.

A separate antiaircraft command for the continental United States has been established and is now in operation and integrated into the air defense system.

STUDY TARGET AREAS

Vital target areas have been studied and plans made for their defense. Some units are actually on site right now while others are stationed in the vicinity of their objectives to be defended, and prepared for rapid movement thereto.

Moreover, areas of the United States requiring other ground forces for the defense of vital targets have been surveyed and plans made for their defense.

The operating agencies of vital facilities have been informed of their plans in the industrial mobilization program and told of measures designed to prevent sabotage and increase the security of such facilities.

Since the start of Korean operations the army has increased from 10 under-strength divisions to 18 full-strength divisions, including the supporting units.

MILLION TRAINED

More than 1,000,000 men have been trained in the Army in the last year.

We are maintaining a Western Hemisphere reserve, with plans for its use in various parts of the hemisphere.

Maneuvers have been carried out to test the defenses of the hemisphere, and great em-

phasis is now being placed on the air mobility of all units in the Army.

I should like to mention specifically, also, that our antiaircraft defense is being greatly accelerated.

Down in the Caribbean area our Army forces have also been increased, and extra measures against sabotage and surprise raiding action have been placed into effect.

CLOSE COORDINATION

The quantitative and qualitative aspects of using civilian auxiliaries in the United States ground antiaircraft defense program is being tested in the Canal Zone, and the closest coordination is being achieved with our allies in that area in order to strengthen these important defenses.

I have no doubt that the forces now being used for the defense of this region will soon be further increased to counter a more imminent threat than now exists.

Our principal defense against air attacks, of course, is interceptor fighters. A year ago we were extremely deficient in this type of plane, as we were in all types of planes. But after months of effort we are just beginning to remedy these deficiencies.

The creation of the complicated machines of modern air warfare takes a great deal of time. The old days when a nation could spring to arms overnight are so far gone that we may as well forget them because they are totally inappropriate for air warfare.

TWO YEARS NEEDED

Springing to arms in the air takes at least 2 years after all the experimenting, planning, and designing has been accomplished.

Another necessary part of air defense in these days of fast and high-flying bombers is a complete radar warning and control net. The largest bombers today can fly so high they are invisible to the ground observer and almost completely safe from detection by any fighters which happen to be in the air unless these fighters are guided by radar stations on the ground.

Radar still has its limitations, and under certain conditions bombers can slip through even a complete radar net, so that we need organized ground observers to help out.

But a complete radar net is indispensable if our fighters are to intercept and shoot down any of the bombers that might attack us.

In the fourth of the series of articles written by Chairman VINSON, he stressed the danger to America's outposts—Alaska, Greenland, and Newfoundland—and told of the difficulties which are met in endeavoring to persuade this country that Russia's development of the atomic bomb requires drastic action to improve our defenses.

Mr. VINSON stated:

Recent maneuvers in Alaska have proven that Territory to be a theater in which, generally speaking, only air warfare is possible. The movement of armies on the ground is almost prohibited by impassable snows in winter and bottomless muck in summer.

Greenland is considered a part of this hemisphere. It would be disastrous for these islands to fall into Russian hands—and we have no intention of letting this happen.

Newfoundland is situated on the best air and sea routes to northern Europe. It is also of considerable importance—and we do have bases there—bases which are just as vital to our defense as are those bases in Alaska.

Mr. VINSON concluded by stating:

To this end, we are building more and more all-weather interceptor planes which

carry a special airborne radar designed to assist in intercepting attacking bombers under all conditions.

His fourth article reads as follows:

VINSON POINTS TO VITAL PLANS OF ATTACK
WASHINGTON, August 4.—For some reason it was difficult to persuade people in this country that Russian development of the atomic bomb required drastic action to improve our defenses.

During the past year we have made much greater progress and we already have been able to provide radar installations in the vicinity of some of our most vital targets.

We must, of necessity, concentrate our defenses around these vital target areas because it would be unwise to scatter them in an attempt to cover the entire North American continent.

So tremendous is the task involved that many more months will pass before even these vital areas will have the radar and fighter planes which have been planned for their protection.

In Alaska the construction program, both for air bases and for radar installations, is also being pushed, but we are handicapped by the shortness of the season during which construction is possible. It should be remembered that although we have established small centers of civilization in Alaska, it is still a vast and almost impassable wilderness.

Recent maneuvers there have proved that Alaska is a theater in which, generally speaking, only air warfare is possible. The movement of armies on the ground is almost prohibited by impassable snows in winter and bottomless muck in summer.

We can only hope to defend about four strong points which protect our important air bases and a naval base. These bases must serve for both bombers and fighters and they play an important part in our strategy despite their nearness to Russian Siberia.

Relatively small army units must also be stationed there as a defense against airborne troops.

GREENLAND IMPORTANT

But attacks against the northwestern portion of the United States by bombers from Russia would not necessarily pass over the Alaskan defenses.

To the northeast two large islands play a vital part in the defense of North America against air attack.

Greenland is considered as a part of this hemisphere. It would be disastrous for these islands to fall into Russian hands. We have no intention of letting this happen.

Newfoundland, which is situated on the best air and sea routes to northern Europe, is also of considerable importance, and we have bases there which are just as vital in many ways to our defense as are the bases in Alaska.

SPEEDING INTERCEPTORS

One of the principal complications of defending against such an attack is the increasing capability of bombers to find their targets at night and in all kinds of weather.

We are building more and more all-weather interceptors which carry a special airborne radar designed to assist in intercepting attacking bombers under all conditions.

We do not have enough of these planes, but we are making encouraging progress in building them.

In addition to the possibility of devastating air attacks against us, we have to consider that airborne troops might be used on a small scale against certain targets, so we are maintaining a small reserve force of army troops, highly mobile, for deployment anywhere on the continent to meet such an attack.

We have other small ground units at various critical spots to guard against sabotage and airborne attack.

Our limited amount of antiaircraft is being set up at the points where it is likely to be most needed.

Mr. Speaker, in the fifth and final article of that series dealing with hemispheric defense, CARL VINSON pointed out that the Air Force is the answer to the Red army.

Suggesting that the huge population of Russia gives that nation the edge in ground warfare, Mr. VINSON made it emphatically clear that this country must rely upon a dominant Air Force if it remains free.

He indicated that improvements in harbor defenses are necessary to prevent Soviet submarines from sneaking in and depositing atom bombs, and that while our Army must be numerically small, as compared to the Soviet Army, because of our smaller population, Mr. VINSON declared:

It is even now a highly mobile force of greater fire power and effectiveness, as the North Koreans and Chinese Communists recently have learned.

In conclusion, Mr. VINSON declared:

We have to build these forces to greater size and readiness, and as we assume that burden we move toward our goal of guaranteeing the integrity and security of the Western Hemisphere and of the free world.

The final article reads as follows:

AIR FORCE IS ANSWER TO RED ARMY

WASHINGTON, August 4.—Guided missiles doubtlessly will be perfected some day to such a degree that they will become an important factor in intercontinental warfare. But at present long-range missiles of this type are too inaccurate to be a principal threat.

Their defensive use, against attacking aircraft, is more promising.

Submarines present the greater naval threat to this hemisphere today because the Russians would be able to operate at least a few submarines off our coasts.

These submarines could lay mines which would interfere greatly with our shipping. They also could make direct attacks against shipping.

SUBS COULD SNEAK IN

Improvements in harbor defenses are necessary to prevent Soviet submarines from sneaking in and depositing atomic bombs.

Easiest method for an enemy to introduce an atom bomb into a harbor is to conceal the bomb in the hold of a merchant ship. There is no easy solution to this problem, but serious as it may be, such a method would have only limited usefulness to an enemy during a major war.

Despite the fact that we are by no means invulnerable to attack today, the job of defending the Western Hemisphere is much easier than it would be if we had no friends and no bases elsewhere in the world.

As long as Western Europe remains outside Russian control, and as long as the peoples of Africa and of southern Asia remain free to assist us, prospect of a successful defense of this hemisphere is not discouraging.

Although the Russian Army is the greatest and most powerful land force on earth, we still have—and we must by all means maintain—the most powerful long-range air force—to strike all the way to the source of enemy strength if that strength is used against us in open warfare.

This is generally considered to be the principal war deterrent today—and if so, it is the principal weapon of our defense of the Western Hemisphere and of the free world.

NEED TACTICAL AIR STRENGTH

In addition we must maintain much more powerful tactical air forces in our Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps. We must retain the world's finest and greatest Navy, which assures us continued communications with allies throughout the world and with our neighbors to the south, and which assures free application of our national power where we will.

Our Army must be numerically small as compared to the Soviet Army because of our smaller population, but it is a highly mobile force of great fire-power and effectiveness, as the North Koreans and Chinese Communists recently have learned.

We have to build these forces to greater size and readiness, and as we assume that burden we move toward our goal of guaranteeing the integrity and security of the Western Hemisphere and of the free world.

Regulation of Use of Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a letter from the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], which clearly indicates the responsibility and desirability of the States to exercise their sovereign rights. These rights have been protected in the Defense Production Act by an amendment which I introduced and which was accepted by the Congress insofar as the regulation of natural gas is concerned. I ask leave to insert herewith a copy of the letter from Senator BRICKER together with an article carried in the New York Times on August 7, 1951, which indicates the ever-present danger of the attempts of Federal bureaus to flout the will of Congress and continue upon their road of regulation and eventual socialization:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,

August 7, 1951.

DEAR FRANK: I want to take this opportunity to congratulate you on the fine work you did in persuading the House of Representatives to accept your amendment to the Defense Production Act which will enable the State public utility commissions to continue to regulate the use of natural gas.

As you know, there was no comparable amendment in S. 1397, the Senate's bill to amend the Defense Production Act. In my judgment, however, the Senate would have adopted an amendment identical with your own had it been aware of the plan of the Petroleum Administration for Defense to invade a field of natural gas regulation in which State regulatory commissions are better qualified and are already exercising jurisdiction. I have no doubt that the majority of the Senate conferees on the bill to amend the Defense Production Act shared this view when they accepted the Bow Amendment.

Your amendment offers State governments an opportunity to demonstrate that they can

play an important role in the defense effort. If limitation orders on the use of natural gas continue to be administered efficiently and economically by the States, we may then consider what other defense activities could be performed better at State and local levels. The possibility of serious natural gas shortages this winter in particular localities presents a real challenge. I am confident that the State regulatory commissions will meet these shortages with regulations which are adequate, selective, and flexible, and which subject business, labor and homeowners to a minimum of inconvenience. All this will be in happy contrast to the maladministration which inevitably attends the centralization of regulatory authority here in Washington.

Today's New York Times carries a story on page 38 which indicates that the Petroleum Administration for Defense plans to pressure the public utility commissioners of 15 States into adopting its own proposed order prohibiting the use of natural gas. If this report is correct, it means that the clear intent of Congress is being flouted. I hope that the public utility commissioners who are to meet with officials of the P. A. D. realize that Congress had more faith in their regulation than that proposed by the P. A. D.

If the Secretary of the Interior continues to try to usurp State authority in violation of the clear intent of the Congress, I think we should consider the possibility of divesting him of his responsibilities under the Defense Production Act of 1950.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. BRICKER.

Following attached article from the New York Times, August 7, 1951:

RESTRICTIONS SEEN FOR NATURAL GAS—STRONG INDICATIONS ARE ORDER WILL BE ISSUED THURSDAY BY GOVERNMENT AGENCY

WASHINGTON, August 6.—There were strong indications today that a Government order restricting sales of natural gas would be issued Thursday, to take effect immediately.

Officials of the Petroleum Administration for Defense would neither confirm nor deny this.

However, they invited commissioners of 15 States, in which the order is likely to apply, to a conference here Thursday at 9 a. m., eastern standard time.

It is expected the order will be presented to the commissioners along with an appeal for their cooperation.

The recently enacted Defense Production Act contains a provision that no limitation can be applied in any State where a local regulatory commission is satisfied that it has the situation under control.

One official, who declined use of his name, said it was likely the order would be read to the commissioners with the understanding that, "here it is—you can kick this order in the teeth if you want to, but here is what will happen if you do."

What will happen, in PAD's contention, is that there will be a serious gas shortage next winter.

The proposed order would prohibit use of natural gas for heating any newly constructed homes. Sales to new large-volume consumers, such as industrial establishments, would be permitted only under PAD licensing.

PAD says the basic reason for the proposed order is a shortage of steel, which has prevented completion of a number of important pipeline projects.

PAD invited to the conference the public utility commissioners of Virginia, Maryland, West Virginia, Ohio, Wisconsin, Michigan, Indiana, New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware, New Jersey, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire.

Boss of Overseas Bases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD a news story by Edward J. Michelson on Edward T. Dickinson.

Ed Dickinson has had a remarkable record both in Government and private industry. It is indeed fortunate that, in times like these, the Government can avail itself of the services of this outstanding individual. That he has made a great personal sacrifice to serve his Government goes without saying, but the United States gains by Ed Dickinson's devotion to his country.

Mr. Speaker, the article carried in the Washington Evening Star of August 4, 1951, follows:

BOSS OF BASES IN THE WILD BLUE YONDER

(By Edward J. Michelson)

The United States Air Force has acquired a husky ex-marine with extensive diplomatic, military, and industrial experience as director of the \$3,000,000,000 public works construction program at home and abroad.

Edward T. Dickinson, 40-year-old secretary to the little Cabinet group of Army, Navy, and Air Force Secretaries, has been assigned to oversee the building of new installations from New Hampshire and Newfoundland to the Middle East and the Western Pacific.

Mr. Dickinson's job, expected to last a year, is the latest in a career that started with a cafeteria dishwashing job in the Bronx, N. Y., in June 1932, the month he was graduated from Yale.

From the Bronx and dishwashing, Mr. Dickinson moved to a Brooklyn bank whose responsibilities included the finances of the Brooklyn Dodgers' baseball club. Then he sold insurance for 2 years in Manhattan, going on to the United States Steel Corp. as executive assistant to the late Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., then board chairman, to take charge of research.

"I guess that I am the only Yale man who received his degree and a certificate from the New York City government qualifying me as a dishwasher in the same month," Mr. Dickinson observed.

"Furthermore, I landed in Government as a result of a task assigned to me by the steel company."

That was in 1939-40, when Mr. Dickinson was sent to Washington to report on the New Deal's temporary National Economic Commission. Mr. Dickinson encountered such prominent New Deal economists as Leon Henderson and Robert N. Nathan.

The next thing we knew, his employers in Pittsburgh were asked to lend-lease him to Donald M. Nelson, Director of the War Production Board, for a planning assignment. This led to Mr. Dickinson's appointment as chairman of WPB's Executive Committee, which planned the conversion of American industry to all-out war mobilization basis.

Once that planning work was completed, Mr. Dickinson tried to get into uniform, despite a White House order freezing key civilian officials in their governmental jobs. Mr. Dickinson was accepted by the Marine Corps, commissioned a second lieutenant, and assigned to Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan's Office of Strategic Services.

Much of what the young man did in war-time is classified in the archives of Central Intelligence, but it is known that he went into France before the D-day landings in Normandy as part of an Anglo-American intelligence team that achieved a distinguished record.

With his return to civilian life as a reserve lieutenant colonel, Mr. Dickinson has had about a year's duty in private life—as an executive of J. Arthur Rank's international motion-picture production enterprises. He was called back into Government in 1948 by Paul G. Hoffman, then organized the Economic Cooperation Administration.

Mr. Dickinson quickly became known to the press corps as head of an ECA division that did the "banking" chores of the multi-billion-dollar foreign economic aid program. He dealt with the foreign technical and procurement missions sent to Washington to explain how much they needed to rebuild their national economies, how they would use the money, and to what extent they would restore their farm and industrial production to prewar levels. As a key aide to Mr. Hoffman, Mr. Dickinson traveled throughout western and southern Europe, checking up on the use of such American help.

More than a year ago, as the emphasis switched from economic to military aid, following ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Mr. Dickinson's travels were extended to the Far East. He was sent to Indo-China, Siam, Burma, Malaya, Indonesia, Formosa, and India to report on the military needs of non-Communist, southeastern Asia. He also was one of the three-man interdepartmental coordinating committee set up to work out the military-aid-to-Europe scheme known as MDAP, mutual defense aid program.

Mr. Dickinson also has been testifying frequently on Capitol Hill in closed-door committee sessions on the justification for outlays to help countries build up their resistance potential against Communist aggression.

Mr. Dickinson emphasizes that the Defense Department is not seeking to build an "Iron ring" around Russia, as the new military public-works program has been described.

"We found in ECA that the weaker a nation is, the more susceptible it is to Communist penetration. What has been accomplished in Greece and Turkey is to strengthen the free world in the Levant, not to put ourselves into a position to attack any one."

The Nuremberg Trials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, as time goes by it becomes increasingly apparent that the wisdom of the Nuremberg trials will come back to haunt us.

It was thought by many that the Nuremberg trials would have laid down a basis for international law, but more people are beginning to feel, as stated in the editorial entitled "Nuremberg Again," in the Chicago Daily Tribune of August 9, that—

Far from strengthening the foundations of international law, it has profaned the ideals of equal justice before the law.

The editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of August 9, is as follows:

NUREMBERG AGAIN

The American Bar Association Journal for July contains two articles that contradict each other. One is a defense of the Nuremberg trials by John J. Parker, chief judge of the Court of Appeals of the fourth circuit, who served as an alternate member of the Nuremberg court. The other is by Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes, the historian, who reviews two books dealing with the Roosevelt diplomacy.

There are two quotations both dealing with how the United States got into the war.

Dr. Barnes says:

"Mr. Roosevelt led us into war by the series of deceptions which culminated by inducing the Japanese to make their 'surprise' attack on Pearl Harbor. The formula, as revealed by Secretary Stimson's Diary, was to maneuver the Japanese into 'firing the first shot.' It worked out with complete success, though Mr. Roosevelt and top officials in the Army and Navy knew many hours in advance that the Japanese blow was about to fall and had agreed nearly a year before that, if Japan ever made a surprise attack, it would, in all probability, be made at Pearl Harbor."

Judge Parker says, "The evidence leaves no doubt that the cowardly attack by the Japanese on Pearl Harbor in December 1941 was the result of German aid promised Japan."

Dr. Barnes has studied all the relevant documents, including those made available at Nuremberg. Judge Parker, it appears from his paper, has studied only the documents that were introduced at Nuremberg and thinks that, because the record is a very long one, it includes everything that is relevant. He seems to have forgotten that documents bearing on the Hitler-Stalin alliance were excluded to spare the Russians embarrassment. The oversight is a serious one because it enables him to conclude that the trial was fair and that its influence has been salutary.

Judge Parker does his skillful best to answer the many criticisms of the Nuremberg proceedings, including the charge that they were ex post facto and that Russians, though equally guilty, were not tried, and, on the contrary, were represented on the bench. As his interpretation of the attack on Pearl Harbor indicates, however, his mind is closed to the possibility that our own diplomacy was bent on war. He makes much of the fact that the Russian judge could be outvoted, and he assumes that the American, French, and British judges were representing national viewpoints which were wholly above reproach. The more the evidence accumulates, the less tenable this thesis becomes.

Judge Parker allows himself to say that the trial was of value "chiefly because it strengthened immeasurably the foundations of international law."

If that means anything, it means that the trial discouraged aggression and totalitarian brutalities such as the enslavement of captive peoples. He ought to look around him, at Korea, for instance, or any of the satellite countries.

First the North Koreans, then the Chinese, violated the international law that was "immeasurably strengthened" at Nuremberg. Then—and this is more significant—the members of the United Nations, with the fewest exceptions, steadily sought to save the aggressors from humiliation or punishment. Judge Parker seems to have forgotten that the United States itself accepted a proposal to end the present war on an understanding that Communist China would eventually be rewarded by recognition and the acquisition of Formosa.

Hitler's henchmen were hanged, among other reasons, for their murder camps and their slave-labor battalions. Can Judge Parker say that the sentences have altered Soviet practices in Russia or the satellite countries?

Can he find any evidence that the punishment of the Germans for "violations of the laws or customs of war" have tempered subsequent behavior? Naturally he can't because men today remember that if the Germans were punished for their shooting of hostages, etc., the victors were not punished for the senseless bombing of Dresden, for example, or the brutal destruction of Hiroshima after the Japanese were already suing for peace. Was the sinking of hundreds of merchant ships by our submarines, without warning, in accordance with "the laws of war"?

To accuse Judge Parker of special pleading is, of course, not to say that the men convicted at Nuremberg should have gone unpunished. It is to say that a law which is aimed only at the vanquished is not law. The right way to have dealt with Hitler's lieutenants was to turn them over to German courts—or Polish, Czech, Norwegian, or French courts—to be tried for murder and usurpation and whatever other crimes they committed, that were clearly defined as offenses when the crimes took place. There is little chance that the guilty would have escaped.

The Nuremberg court was a victors' court, a fact that is obvious, though Judge Parker tries to disguise it. Far from strengthening the foundations of international law, it has profaned the ideals of equal justice before the law.

Congress Urged To Determine Troop Commitments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have long been convinced that the American people want Congress to recapture the constitutional powers upon which this Republic was founded; to protect this Nation against future undeclared wars, so-called police actions and repeated emergencies whereby homes are broken and Americans shipped out on the spur of the moment to fight and die on foreign soil.

The following editorial from the August 5 issue of the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier is an example of a justified revolt against usurpation of power by the Executive:

CHECK ON TROOP SHIPMENTS NEEDED

Under existing law, there is no restriction whatever on the number of American troops which can be sent anywhere in the world by the President's order.

The Korean War proves, moreover, that the President is able to send large numbers of American men into combat on the other side of the world without consulting Congress. By calling the conflict a police action, he may thus evade the constitutional provision that only Congress may declare war.

This is too much power and responsibility to place in the hands of one man. Even if the public had complete confidence in the administration it would be unwise to

allow the President that much power. It is through such precedents that dictatorships are created.

Unfortunately, furthermore, a recent example indicates that the administration is not above tricking Congress and the public. Earlier this year when Congress was discussing possible legislative restrictions on the number of troops to be sent to Europe, defense department officials testified that they planned to send four additional divisions. According to the standard size of United States divisions, this would mean an additional 100,000 men to be sent to join the 120,000 men already on occupation duty.

Acting on this assumption, the Senate adopted a resolution which approved "present plans . . . to send four additional divisions of ground forces" but declared that no further forces should be sent without further congressional approval. This was not legally binding on the President; but it represented the prevailing and publicly expressed belief that the total force in Europe would not exceed 220,000 men.

Defense Secretary Marshall at the time did nothing to correct this misapprehension, if it were that. A few days ago, however, he calmly announced that the United States planned to have 400,000 men in Europe—nearly twice as many as the previous estimate. Had Congress realized that the Defense Department desired to send that many men it would probably have adopted legally binding restrictions on the total allowed.

Such a restriction, however, may still be imposed. If the administration is not going to be frank and honest in telling Congress about its plans, then Congress will have to arrive at what it considers a safe figure and compel the administration to abide by it. Sentiment for such a restriction is growing in Congress and the Marshall incident has caused the reintroduction of restrictive amendments to appropriation bills. The question of drafting and sending men abroad is the greatest power that a government can exert over its citizens. To say that Congress does not have the right to regulate and restrict this process is to deny the whole concept of representative government.

Korean Ill Wind and the Marines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to insert at this point in the RECORD, a news article out of the Christian Science Monitor which I think will be of interest to the House:

KOREAN ILL WIND AND THE MARINES (By Harlan Trott)

WASHINGTON.—Korea has been the Marine Corps' salvation, at some military experts see it. A year ago, this elite organization was wasting away, methodically being whittled down for the sake of economy. As its size was reduced, its functions were absorbed. Marine aviation was cut to the vanishing point. When the conflict commenced in Korea, the corps was unable to assemble a single, full-strength division and the closest marine troops to Korea were thousands of miles away.

Today the Marine Corps is a revitalized service, and congressional plans have progressed to the point where at least a 300,000 and perhaps a 400,000-man corps will be al-

lowed under law, including a stronger marine air arm. Moreover, the outlook is good for including the Commandant of the Marine Corps either as a full-fledged member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff or as a consultant to it.

For this improved position, the marines are thankful and the country is fortunate. In the uncertain, dangerous days ahead, despite the imminent truce in Korea, the need for a stronger, expanded Marine Corps is more evident than ever.

Though it shouldn't have been necessary, the marines proved their usefulness and value in Korea. In this the publication of a letter which characterized the marines as the Navy's police force played a measurable role. Even such a once-upon-a-time critic of the marines, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, became an ardent leatherneck backer. Korea, said General MacArthur to one Marine general, would once and for all solidify the corps' position in the country's military structure. If this prediction proves correct, the country gains in strength and security.

What have the marines done in Korea to achieve this?

1. The Inchon landing. From a scant 12 months' perspective, this almost impossible feat has gained the reputation of being the outstanding amphibious assault of military history. A month after the marines landed and captured Seoul, the downfall and destruction of the North Korean Army were complete. Any fair-minded observer who has studied this operation will agree that only the marines with their background, experience, and day-by-day training could have brought it off. Amphibious warfare is specialized work for which only the marines and the Navy are prepared.

2. The now classic Hungnam evacuation, or as the marines call it, "the attack toward the sea." Outnumbered 10 to 1, isolated for 10 days, the Marine division fought its way out of a Chinese trap to freedom, bringing all of its equipment with it. If any battle proved that the average American can be trained to be a superb soldier, that battle did.

3. The marines' specialized version of close air support. Flying from two small Navy jeep aircraft carriers, the marines demonstrated techniques of using airplanes for ground fighting which proved far superior to the Air Force system. The marine airmen were themselves experienced ground fighters, and understood the problems and language of the foot soldier. Secondly, their planes and weapons were designed for the task. Napalm, the jelled gasoline fire bomb, was their specialty and was used with consummate success in Korea.

4. The individual marine. In Korea he used four weapons almost forgotten in the 1951 fog of atomic clouds and jet smoke; his rifle, his hand grenade, his bayonet—and his intelligence. Well-trained, well-led, well-equipped, the leathernecks' consistently excellent performance in Korea reawakened the American people to the need and usefulness of this elite organization.

We have talked with many marines and naval officers, all of them battle-tested officers. The consensus is that a larger but still volunteer Marine Corps, protected by law, with the Commandant seated as a consultant to the JCS, is a wise move. Few of them, however, wish to see the corps divorced and given autonomy from the Navy. The corps is inextricably joined with the Navy, and if their unique abilities are to be maintained it must remain as part of the Navy.

No credence is given to the idea that an expanded corps will constitute a second army. The specialized marines, say the experts, will be the ever-ready fire brigade ready for instant service anywhere the Navy takes them. If another perimeter war breaks out in Iran or Indochina, Denmark

or the Dardanelles, as it did in Korea, at least two divisions of marines will be on the spot and landed to protect American interests until the Army arrives.

Recently military writers have repeated the theme that "militarily Korea has been worth while." In the case of the marines this overglib statement is even more true. There might have been no victory in Korea without the marines, and there might have been no marines without Korea.

Allied Arms Chaos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, in the very near future, the House of Representatives is going to debate the foreign-aid bill and, although there is recognition of the need for aid to our foreign allies, there is a grave doubt in the minds of many people as to whether or not our foreign allies are doing their share toward helping themselves.

Mr. William Stoneman, of the Chicago Daily News foreign service, points out in the article below the fact that the United States, Britain, and France have almost completely failed to standardize their weapons. No agreement as yet has even produced a standard caliber for infantry rifles or a standard type of artillery piece.

It would seem a matter of common sense that insofar as we will be called upon to furnish the bulk of the money and the bulk of the arms equipment that an agreement should quickly be reached so as to prevent an enormous duplication of effort and expense.

Mr. William Stoneman's observations on this important phase of arms standardization as reported in the Chicago Daily News of Tuesday, August 7, are as follows:

BARE ALLIED ARMS CHAOS (By William Stoneman)

LONDON.—American opposition to Britain's new .28-caliber rifle has advertised a fact that North Atlantic officials have previously made every effort to hush up, play down, or ignore. That fact is that the United States, Britain, and France have almost completely failed to standardize their weapons.

Endless conferences between highly paid experts of the three countries have not even produced agreement on a standard caliber for infantry rifles or a standard type of artillery piece. There has been agreement on only two really important things:

All countries of the North Atlantic Treaty have theoretically agreed on a standard screw thread. If the theory is converted into practice, you will be able to fit an American bolt into the British nut of the same gage.

The French have agreed to produce weapons which will take ammunition made for American standard 105 and 155 millimeter artillery pieces.

There have been other achievements in the direction of standardization, but most of them stem from the fact that so many NATO countries are being equipped with American weapons. But Britain and France have refused to go over in toto to American designs.

Their refusal is thoroughly justified in some cases. But all along the line American, British, and French officers and officials have refused to agree on standard designs where they were obviously desirable.

The answer is that standard designs should have been imposed on the member countries at the very beginning before most countries were tooled up.

In the particular instance of the .280 rifle the British argue that they must adopt the new weapon for several reasons:

1. The old British infantry bolt-action rifle is completely obsolete and a new auto-loading weapon must be adopted.

2. It is better for them to adopt the .280 than the American .30-caliber Garand because the Garand itself is obsolescent and the .280 is a superior weapon.

3. The .280 is extremely light and of revolutionary design. Waste of ammunition will be avoided by adjusting the gun to prevent firing in bursts. Americans have argued that British soldiers would lose all of the advantage of the light ammunition by firing it too much "on automatic."

The question which is bound to linger, irrespective of the outcome of this controversy, is how much money has been paid to how many different men for not agreeing on this subject many months ago.

The West Point Scandal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, judging from the letter printed below, many Americans are concerned about the happenings at West Point. Mr. Stein has put forth his views in a very clear manner. I hope many of us will consider his opinions.

BARBERTON, OHIO, August 5, 1951.

Hon. WILLIAM AYRES,

Member of Congress for Akron District, Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. AYRES: I guess you have seen the newspaper reports about the cheating scandal at West Point, and perhaps have had other, more detailed information about it. I want to give you a few of my thoughts regarding the naval and military academies and feel sure that you will be interested since you are one of the few Congressmen who has shown concern over the treatment of the Reserves, and enlisted men generally.

My own navy experiences convinced me that the men chosen to be officers were not, as a whole, especially well qualified for their work. Many were too immature to lead, many were frankly indifferent to the welfare of their men, most of the junior officers didn't even seem to care much about helping get their work done by their men. I think that the trouble stems directly from the method of apportioning the appointments to the service academies.

The present system of allowing the Members of Congress to select the candidates for entrance examinations is defective in many ways. The appointees are boys, not men, and they cannot be expected to know that they want military careers; consequently many of them leave the services after serving the minimum required time, and the citizens of the Nation lose a man educated at their expense. Again, to place boys into a school in which the emphasis is on obedience and discipline will make, in 4 years,

men who will have lost their mental independence, and will rely on regulation rather than reason, authority rather than right, and precedent rather than justice. The court-martial system of military justice and the recent scandal at the Detroit Tank Arsenal, as well as the Navy supply corps disgrace in Hawaii during the war, will bear out this contention: that West Point and Annapolis produce more than Eisenhower and Bradleys. And while formerly, when a Congressman's or Senator's constituency was smaller, and class educational distinctions made the range of candidates even narrower, the people's Representatives to the Federal Government may well have been the best selectors of future officers for the Armed Forces. I doubt that any man, trying to represent 50,000 or more people, at least 500 of whom will annually be boys potentially candidates for the service academies, can possibly know anything about very many of them, or even take the time to examine those who show a desire to take the examinations. And even under the best of circumstances this system gave no guaranty, or even any real reason to believe, that the cadets would for the most part become men who would stay in the military and naval services.

I should like to see the congressional appointment system abolished, or greatly curtailed, in favor of selection of future officers from the enlisted men of the Army and Navy, as is now done to a small extent. In this way men would be entered into West Point and Annapolis, and they would be men who knew the military life first-hand, had had the experience of being commanded, understood the difference between a good and bad officer, and who liked the military life well enough to stay with it. I suppose that some of the more childish activities of the schools, such as football, would be put into their proper place, and that there would be complaints about having to defer marriage to the age of 24 or 25 but, from the point of view of procuring officers who would serve for 10 or 20 years (the law should be changed from the present 3-year-after-graduation requirement), and give mature, intelligent direction to the Army and Navy, such minor losses as Army families, athletic teams, and perhaps even some of the privileges of rank are unimportant. And I think you are one Congressman who is not unduly concerned over the possible loss of a valuable patronage you now control, although the loss of such a privilege as handing out a few free college educations a year is not a thing many men would deny themselves. I have a distinct idea, gained from recent news articles and the resignations from the Academies after the close of the late war, that some Army officers and Congressmen considered football ability rather than ability and desire to serve as the criterion of eligibility for entrance.

In brief, I think the present method of selection of candidates for training as Army and Navy officers is obsolete, and should be replaced by selection from applicants with several years' service as enlisted men in the service in which they want commissions.

WILLIAM B. STEIN.

Rescue Our Missionaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Pilot of August 4, 1951:

RESCUE OUR MISSIONARIES

There has been a noticeable decline in interest among our American people in the conferences being held in reference to the question of a cease fire in Korea. The heat, the baseball pennant race, the television of a wrestling match, or the stench created by the sputtering out of the latest marriage of a Hollywood star, all seem to be more important.

In the easy way of people who are accustomed to having their every want satisfied we take it for granted that our desire for peace also needs only to be talked over with somebody or other to be fulfilled. In Korea, however, there are many people, our own people, who must be shocked, horrified, "let down" and legitimately infuriated by our attitude.

Among them is a small group who are truly the most forlorn of the forgotten. These are the devoted missionaries, Catholic and non-Catholic, who for no motive save that of extending the sweet Gospel of Jesus Christ have devoted their lives and their energies to the people of the Far East. They have been taken captive by the Communists with all the grief that that implies, not the least of which is the interruption of their good and noble work.

We ask now if these Americans are included in the Korean conferences, point 4 of which refers to "arrangements relating to prisoners of war." Our spokesmen have put the question for us to the chief of the Communist delegation. They have received, at best, loose and ambiguous replies.

This matter of the missionaries is too important to be lost in the general confusion of things. In the name of right and decency, we have a duty to watch news reports of the negotiations carefully. Amid the hooting and horn-blowing that greets the announcement of an armistice the voices of the men of God crying in the wilderness may not be heard.

A Good Suggestion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Journal-American of August 2, 1951:

The suggestion made by a reader of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, and printed in an adjoining column on this page, for adequate and merited recognition of Gen. Douglas MacArthur at the Japanese treaty ceremonies in San Francisco in September, will strike a responsive chord in the minds of the American people.

Surely the peace we now enjoy with Japan and the formal treaty perpetuating it are attributable to General MacArthur more than to any other man.

The American victory in the war against Japan was achieved under the brilliant military leadership of General MacArthur.

The subsequent occupation of Japan under his administrative leadership is universally recognized and acknowledged as the most constructive program of postwar rehabilitation ever undertaken by a victorious nation within the territories of a vanquished power.

Within the space of 6 years, Japan has not only been made capable of restoration to a peaceful place in the world family of free nations but has given proof of being worthy of the respect of her former enemies.

General MacArthur accepted the administrative responsibilities of the Japanese occupation with the intention of achieving that objective, and most of the rest of the world was either skeptical or openly scoffed.

But the treaty which will be formally signed in San Francisco will attest his success, for the very first time in human history, in accomplishing first a victory and then a peace designed to increase and perpetuate the concepts of brotherhood which constitute the world's best safeguards against future war.

Surely the peace treaty with Japan should be written into the permanent record of world history with full and proper recognition of the indispensable contributions of General MacArthur to the triumphs of American military power and the policies of American administration which made it possible.

It is a matter of unconscionable injustice to General MacArthur that he has been deprived of the opportunity to participate personally in the final dramatic and historic chapter of the Pacific conflict in which he commanded the American Armed Forces so magnificently.

It is a matter of great mortification and humiliation to the American people that petty politicians, solely for the purpose of concealing their own mistakes, have had the power as well as the shameful desire to send General MacArthur into exile at a time the highest and best of the world's honors should be paid him.

But it would be an even more shameful thing if the San Francisco ceremonies attending the signing of the Japanese Treaty should not be conducted with all possible recognition of his honored and respected and beloved name.

The Eisenhower Myth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial published in the Washington Times-Herald under date of August 8, 1951, and entitled "The Eisenhower Myth." The editorial follows:

THE EISENHOWER MYTH

Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., of Massachusetts has launched a boomlet for himself as candidate for the Republican presidential nomination in 1952. Observers experienced in politics call this a transparent maneuver. LODGE will be up for reelection next year and the political wisecracks say that he is fearful of being trimmed. They say that he wants to bill himself for the role of favorite son in the hope of getting a clutch on the Massachusetts Republican delegation to the national convention, so that he can throw the delegation to General Eisenhower and thus advance a claim to the vice presidential post if Eisenhower is nominated.

The chief support of Eisenhower for the nomination comes from people like LODGE who have slipped or are slipping. Governor Dewey, of New York, twice an also-ran in the race for President, has now settled down in the role of spoiler in the hope of killing off

the chances of Senator TART, the logical candidate. Dewey is out for Eisenhower. So is Senator DUFF of Pennsylvania, whose hold on the Republican Party in Pennsylvania is slipping. Former Senator Harry Darby, of Kansas, who held the post by appointment for 13 months, then bowed out of the picture, is another of these disappointed king makers.

Aside from such people as these in the Republican Party, the ballyhoo for Eisenhower as a Republican nominee comes from New Dealers, New Deal propagandists, Europe Firsters, and other brands of world savers. Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, a New Dealer, has gone so far as to propose that Eisenhower be nominated by both parties, which amounts to an endorsement of totalitarian one-party government. Columnists and commentators playing the New Deal game are constantly whooping up Eisenhower. So is the un-American press in New York.

Before these self-seekers proceed too far, they ought to appraise all of the handicaps under which Eisenhower would labor as a candidate.

As a Republican candidate, Eisenhower would be a joke. He was one of the coterie owing his advancement to George C. Marshall when the latter was Mr. Roosevelt's Army Chief of Staff. To put Marshall into that post, Roosevelt had to jump him over 34 senior officers. For Roosevelt and Marshall to install Eisenhower as supreme commander in Europe necessitated jumping him over 366 officers who ranked him. Eisenhower achieved his advancement through New Deal patronage, and he is not likely to forget it.

After the end of the war, it was Mr. Truman who appointed him Chief of Staff, which was as high as he could go in the Army. When he completed his tour of that office, Eisenhower was picked up by the extremely wealthy internationalists comprising the board of trustees of Columbia University and was named president of Columbia. But Truman kept showering favors upon him. When the new Joint Chiefs of Staff in the unified Defense Department fell to quarreling, Truman called Eisenhower back on leave from Columbia to serve as an unofficial referee.

When the administration determined to send American troops into an Atlantic Pact army in Europe, Eisenhower, with the support of the Truman administration, was given the job of commander of the European army. He conducted a preliminary tour in Europe and came back to lead the administration's propaganda for this venture. He thereby repaid the favor of being appointed commander, even though, in an unguarded moment later, he made it plain that the European army is militarily useless. He said he thought it could hold the Breton Peninsula, which was equivalent to saying that it could not stand up to a Soviet attack anywhere east of a point where it would stand with its back to the sea.

Mr. Truman recently referred to General Eisenhower's obligations to him by stating that the general was free to do what he pleased politically in 1952, but the President said he felt confident that Eisenhower would pursue the line of duty. This was an indirect hint to Eisenhower to keep off Truman's preserve.

Not only does Eisenhower labor under the handicap of an obligation to Truman and the New Deal, but his supporters must also be aware that his candidacy would bring his military record in World War II under review. His military biographer, Capt. Harry Butcher, says that it was a byword among American officers that "Eisenhower is the best general the British have." Eisenhower got this reputation by acceding to a British war plan calculated to allow the British commander, Field Marshall Montgomery, to achieve all of

the decisive break-through to achieve victory.

Montgomery fell on his face each time he tried, but that did not prevent Eisenhower from diverting supplies from General Patton's unstoppable American armor at a time when Patton thought he could wind up the war. These supplies were given to Montgomery for the ill-conceived parachute attack designed to seize the mouth of the Rhine—a maneuver that ended in failure.

Long before the campaign in Europe, Eisenhower had shown his partiality to the British. It was he who helped cover up the errors of the British Gen. K. A. N. Anderson, which led to the Allied defeat at the Kasserine Pass in North Africa, and it was he who, by dismissing the American general, Lloyd Fredendall, cast the stigma for that set-back upon American arms.

Nor will Eisenhower's political decisions at the time victory in Europe was within Allied grasp pass unchallenged. It was he who called off General Bradley's victorious armies when they were across the Elbe, thus reserving for Russia the enormous political advantage of capturing Berlin. This decision certainly is not unrelated to America's later difficulties with Russia in maintaining the right of ingress and egress at Berlin—difficulties which necessitated the costly airlift at a later time.

Eisenhower it was, also who turned General Patton from his unchecked advance upon Prague and let the capital of Czechoslovakia fall to the Red army. Very few blunders of the war have had more calamitous consequences than the decision to yield Berlin and Prague. It was little wonder that Eisenhower was received in Moscow and there awarded a Soviet military decoration for his contributions to Stalin were great.

Nor will some of Eisenhower's other acts and utterances escape critical scrutiny. When he wrote his war memoirs, he was favored with a special ruling by the Bureau of Internal Revenue which permitted him to account for his royalties as a capital gain—a favor accorded no other author. It meant a difference of \$600,000 in tax on a million-dollar deal and permitted him to pocket three-quarters of a million dollars, instead of \$150,000, which was all that anyone else could have kept.

Eisenhower's remarks before a Congressional committee that "nominal pay"—perhaps \$10 a month—was ample pay for transcripts is not going to endear him with the lower ranks of the Army. His order during the advance into Germany to "shoot everything that moves" will not commend him to humanitarians, and his remark at the time of assuming command of the European army that henceforth he must consider himself as only one-twelfth American is not likely to commend him to patriots.

But perhaps the General's greatest handicap is the ambiguity of his political attachment. He has refused to declare himself either a Democrat or a Republican. There are reports that in his younger days in Abilene, Kans., he was a registered Democrat. If any party should be so unwise as to cast aside its own outstanding leaders, whose convictions are a matter of public knowledge, and to seek as a candidate a man who has consistently rebuffed and repulsed it, that party would proclaim itself devoid of principle and self-respect. It would condemn itself as interested only in winning office for the sake of jobs and patronage. It would humiliate itself by advertising its utter want of conviction. It would so exalt one man as to dedicate itself to personal government.

Those who hope to profit by hitching themselves to Eisenhower may be in for a cruel disillusionment. Their man is very vulnerable. So far he has got off lightly because he has adopted the pretense of being above politics. People recalled that in 1948 he disavowed any interest in the New Deal

nomination, saying, "It is my conviction that the necessary and wise subordination of the military to the civil power will be best sustained and our people will have greater confidence that it is so sustained when life-long professional soldiers in the absence of some obvious and overriding reasons, abstain from seeking high political office."

Once Eisenhower abandons that position and jumps into the political arena, his opponents will be less charitable. They will begin exploring the Eisenhower myth and showing out of what material it has been created.

Bob Angers' Column

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the phenomenal success of Mr. Thomas J. Watson, chairman of the board of International Business Machines Corp., was built around the simple slogan "Think." The complexity of our problems as Congressman could be simplified and the burdens of the demands made upon us could be lightened if we devoted a few minutes before commencing work every day to just plain thinking.

This morning I read the column of Mr. Bob Angers in the Franklin Banner-Tribune. It made me realize how patriotic yet how sensible our people are. It impressed me with their generosity, tempered with good judgment. In other words, it made me think. I commend this article to you, my colleagues. In this great land of ours you and I do not even have to agree with all Bob Angers has to say; just so he helps us to think our way through during these critical times.

The article follows:

THE COLUMN

To the great American bread line this column is respectfully dedicated.

Giveaway programs have gotten to be somewhat of a phobia in your land and mine. We give away automobiles, deep freezers, and college scholarships at the drop of the merchandising hat. Most of the time the giveaway is tied in with a promotional campaign designed to make the public conscious of a certain product and create a desire to buy that product. Sometimes the programs are a nuisance, but generally they provide good entertainment and the prizes are worth the effort.

But it appears like the giveaway has been given the wrong slant at the so-called diplomatic level of our Government.

Solid Americans hate communism, socialism, and fascism with a passion. They recognize the danger they pose to Americanism. And they'll do almost anything to combat them. In fact, they've done almost everything to oppose them and know that the battle never ends.

American lives and treasure have been poured into the struggle and Americans have not been mealy-mouthed about the sacrifice. They clipped the Kaiser's wings in World War I and broke out the shears when his Nazi counterparts set out to rule the world. Japan felt the American whiplash after Pearl Harbor, and Russia and her stooges in Korea

have had their rose-colored glasses smashed by a solid punch in the nose.

We have shown a willingness to help anyone who wants to play on our team, including a lot of our former enemies and men like Franco who stood ready to hop on Hitler's band wagon with a knife in his hand to slip in our back.

Sometimes America looked like an international Santa Claus riding a big red fire engine in four different directions at once. Arms, food, clothing, medicine, scientific assistance, and money have gone out in generous doses to Greece, France, England, Turkey, Finland, Holland, Norway, Africa, Israel, Iran, Spain, India, China, Russia, the Philippines, South America, Japan, Germany, and a hundred other places.

Two and one-half world wars have made most of us internationalists in our thinking. We despise war and its misery and waste, and that's been a big reason why we've been a party to conducting the biggest bread line in the history of the world.

Not many of us are so proud but what we haven't accepted a helping hand in a moment of despair. But most of us have enough pride to want to stand on our own two feet at the earliest date. And it's that ingrained principle of Americanism that makes us ask questions about some of the people abroad that seem to be making a profession out of living off American handouts.

God helps people who help themselves, and it's about time that that adage be applied to American diplomacy. Let's help people who deserve help and who, in some measure, indicate that they want to help themselves.

Our economic capability is limited. America has only so much wealth and resources that she can expend before she reaches the danger point of economic collapse. Today our tax burden borders on the same percentage that caused the fall of the Roman Empire. And can you see the end in sight? We can't. If American policy is to be guided by the principle that the outstretched hand from abroad is the signal to reach for your pocketbook.

Anyone who exhibits a sincere desire to do battle with communism is deserving of the support we are financially and militarily able to give him. However, we should have a good look at people like Tito and Franco before opening Fort Knox. France and Italy have shown some resiliency since the war, but they have a whole lot of dirty dishes to wash before they put on new white skirts. Socialism, as advocated by some of our British friends, is contrary to our own free-enterprise thinking. Something for nothing is a false concept. Whereas we don't want to tell another country how to run its affairs, we should at least be good bankers and reserve the right to ask how they propose to pay their debts. A time limit on a loan will result in more satisfactory payment than the open note.

Wheat for the starving Indians? Yes. Arms for our embattled allies? Yes. Money for our destitute friends? Yes. But in each instance let's do business on a business-like basis. Determine the need. Determine our ability to provide the goods. Determine the time limit and conditions. Determine whether or not it is in the best interest of the United States.

America has its own problems and its own needs to satisfy. We have a never-ending battle against disease. We have to figure out a way to lessen the number of traffic deaths on the highways. We have to break up the unholy alliance of the gambler and the corrupt politician and restore moral dignity to public office. We've got to settle the tidelands issue at an early date. There are roads and hospitals to build, crops to harvest, children to educate.

We're not so preoccupied with our own pressing problems that we overlook the as-

sistance we can render abroad. On the other hand we want to be free agents and shouldn't get so ensnared in foreign affairs that we can't put out our own fires.

The bread line has its place, so long as we don't have to mortgage the kitchen and shoot the cook in order to pay the bills.

Surplus Food Acquired in Parity Program Has Been Distributed to Hungry People—Congressional Authority for Use of CARE's Facilities Wisely Exercised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions I have presented to the House some of the details of a remarkable record being made by CARE, a private, nonprofit organization which has been recognized by the Congress as an effective agency for overseas relief. This organization is acting in certain areas as a representative of the United States in the program of food distribution.

The shadow of hunger still casts a pall over many countries, although United States governmental aid has done much to relieve suffering through food grants. Governmental food grants naturally tend most often to take the form of loans to purchase supplies. Food is thus made available in the stores of shortage areas—but too often those who are hungriest do not have the money to pay for it.

It is a most happy circumstance, therefore, when food can be brought, free, to people who need it sorely—a happy circumstance and one that merits public attention.

Such is the case in a program of international food aid that has been made possible by the joint participation of the United States Government, the American people, and CARE.

Our Government's part in the program came when—by act of Congress—millions of pounds of farm surplus, which had been bought by the Department of Agriculture to support parity prices, was made available, without charge, to welfare agencies for relief distribution.

CARE's part came in applying for a large share of this agricultural surplus, to be delivered to the hungry and needy in food-short countries across the seas.

And the American people's part in the program comes in generously contributing the funds to cover CARE's cost of handling, processing, shipping, and distributing this food.

The farm-surplus distributions are being made in addition to the nonprofit agency's well-known service of distributing its own CARE package assortments of food, textiles, books, and other needed supplies to the people of Europe and Asia.

For the farm-surplus program CARE acquired from the Commodity Credit Corporation of the Department of Agriculture approximately 43,000,000 pounds of agricultural commodities—milk powder, egg powder, butter, Cheddar cheese, and dried beans.

This was food which had been lying useless in our warehouses—food which Communist propagandists throughout the world had been quick to seize upon as an example of the selfishness of our democracy. People who are hungry are easy prey to such claims. But now this food is bringing sustenance to millions of people overseas—and every pound CARE delivers is unmistakable proof of the concern of Americans for the welfare of their fellow men.

It is in Yugoslavia—a country the Cominform is most anxious to recapture—that these food gifts are making the greatest impact. I am advised by Paul Comly French, the able director of CARE, that the agency is distributing the bulk of the farm surplus it acquired—36,294,668 pounds of milk and egg powders—to relieve the hunger caused by Yugoslavia's unprecedented drought last year.

Under the CARE plan, each \$5.35 contribution from an American donor guarantees that a 300-pound unit of farm-surplus supplies—200 pounds of milk powder and 100 pounds of egg powder—will be divided among 100 needy Yugoslavians. The distribution is made on the basis of 2 pounds of milk powder and 1 pound of egg powder per person—the equivalent of 8 quarts of milk and 3 dozen eggs.

The recipients of this free American food come from special categories of persons—young children, expectant mothers, invalids, hospitals, orphanages, students, old-age homes, and the people of areas which suffered most severely from the crop failures. Those categories were agreed upon by representatives of CARE, the United States Embassy at Belgrade and Yugoslav Government welfare officials. It was also agreed that recipients would be chosen purely on the basis of need without political, religious, or other discrimination.

Distribution of the food is made on a monthly basis through Government food outlets in the six federated republics of Yugoslavia. Those certified to participate receive a special CARE ration card which they present at their local food shop. As they receive their CARE ration, each recipient signs a special receipt. Each list of 100 persons is then turned over to the CARE mission in Belgrade, which sends a microfilm copy to CARE headquarters in New York for forwarding to the donor who contributed \$5.35 for that particular 300-pound consignment.

These lists also serve as a guide for six trained American observers CARE has stationed in Yugoslavia to check on the distribution. CARE's observers make field trips to visit the food distribution shops, and—from the names and addresses on the receipts—make spot check to the recipients' homes. They make certain that the rations are being issued equitably, that the people know how to

use the powders, and that they know the food has been provided as a free gift from the American people.

So far two million persons—one out of every eight Yugoslavs—are participating in the CARE-ration distributions. By the time the program is completed, an estimated 4,000,000 persons will benefit. CARE's observers, who have complete freedom to travel wherever they wish, report that virtually everyone in the country knows about the free food that is being sent by Americans. The Yugoslav press and radio have given wide coverage to the program and word-of-mouth has spread from grateful recipients to their relatives and friends in every city and village. Everywhere, the people express their gratitude to their American friends.

But Yugoslavia is not the only country whose people are benefiting from the surplus-food gifts. Needy persons and institutions in Austria, Great Britain, France, Western Germany, Greece, Italy, Norway, and India are being helped by the remaining 6,788,362 pounds of surplus commodities which CARE acquired.

Those supplies—milk powder, egg powder, butter, cheddar cheese and dried beans—have been supplemented with additional items CARE purchased on the regular market and have been assembled in two types of units: A \$5 family package, containing 24 pounds of food, and \$125 institutional package which contains 954 pounds of food in the European assortment, 710 pounds in the units being distributed in India.

For this part of its surplus-food program, CARE follows its customary procedure for package deliveries. American individuals or groups who subscribe the parcels may designate the country and the type of person or institution they wish to help. Overseas representatives of CARE and its 27 American member welfare agencies select the recipients on the basis of greatest need. Delivery is made in the name of the donor, and CARE returns a receipt giving the name of the recipient, so that a direct person-to-person link is established.

A total of approximately 202,000 family and institutional packages have been assembled by CARE for distribution in the eight countries. Displaced persons and destitute university students in Western Germany, famine-sufferers in India, war orphans in France are among the hungry who are being reached by these friendship-gifts from Americans.

A fact which has surprised both CARE representatives and United States Government representatives overseas is the wide coverage these CARE surplus-food distributions have received from the local press and radio in every country. It is as though everyone is anxious to spread the word of the help that will reach the most helpless of the people.

The retail value of the total 43,000,000 pounds of surplus commodities which CARE received is estimated at \$10,500,000. To cover the cost of its handling and distribution overseas, CARE is asking the American people for \$1,423,000.

Those are small sums in comparison to the \$11,000,000,000 worth of foreign assistance we have given through the

Marshall plan in the past 3 years. Yet, dollar for dollar, the release of surplus foods to CARE is one of the best investments the United States Government has made.

It has made it possible for CARE in the name of the American people, to reach directly millions of persons who need to know that America is their friend and is anxious to help them. It is bringing a return of friendship and good will that will pay important dividends in the years to come—the years that will determine the outcome of our efforts to help build a world of freedom and peace.

Harry J. Anslinger, United States Commissioner of Narcotics, Warns Us That "The Narcotics Peddler Does Not Kidnap Children; He Destroys Them"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday August 9, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, during the past several months the spotlight of public opinion has been focused on the dope traffic as radio, television, and the press united to emphasize the dire effects that have followed the illegal sale and use of deadly drugs.

As the American people were told of the vicious criminal racket which operates throughout the Nation, it is apparent that it has become so widespread in its operation that no man, woman, or child is immune from its destructive effects. In fact, it is revealed that our teen-age population has been a fruitful source for the traffic in deadly drugs and that boys and girls of high-school age have succumbed to its evil influences.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to the following address on the subject by Hon. Twain Michelsen, judge of the superior court of the city and county of San Francisco, delivered on July 15, 1951, over radio station KYA:

Before proceeding with my discussion of the illicit narcotic traffic, I wish to acknowledge, with a deep sense of appreciation, the generosity of Jimmie Tarantino in turning over to me the facilities of this station, which means all of his usual Sunday broadcast-time. He asked me if I would impart to you the benefit of my many years of study of the most vicious criminal racket ever to fasten itself upon the people of the world. Because Mr. Tarantino is himself crusading against the dope traffic, I have accepted the offer of his radio time.

So that you, my listeners, may gain even a slight insight into the enormity of the narcotic traffic, let me say in passing that it goes back deep into the centuries. And, as always, cruel and pitiless exploitation, sitting high on the throne of profit, has been its evil guiding spirit. I shall discuss this subject in two general phases. Today, I shall briefly touch upon the international aspect of the traffic; next Sunday, at this same time, I shall discuss specific cases, as they affect local and national levels.

The world is indebted to Harry J. Anslinger, United States Commissioner of Narcotics, for the zeal and devotion with which he has pursued the dope assassin into hidden parts of the world. Handicapped as he has always been by an all too limited Bureau personnel, he has, nevertheless, carried to many countries the light by which vigorous, though limited, suppression of the dirty commerce in contraband narcotics has been accomplished. During the life of the now dead League of Nations, he was one of the American representatives on the Opium Advisory Committee of the League, and there his powerful voice was always raised in opposition to the international intrigues that spawned the opium monopolies in the Far East. By his side, in the field of decency and common morality, there stood the fine figure of Director Russell Pasha, of the Central Narcotics Intelligence Bureau of Egypt. It was he who first sounded the warning that the Suez Canal was "wide open to smugglers of narcotics." It was he who confided to the people of America that "the majority of Manchukuo heroin destined for America is being routed from the Far East ports through the Suez Canal." In his clear voice, speaking in terms of spiritual values, as well as in warning of the insidious entrapments of the international drug peddler, he said, and I quote: "The world keeps on saying that it is agreed to stop narcotic traffic, conventions are signed and ratified, blacklists of proven international traffickers are drawn up and exchanged, and yet no finality is reached in dealing with these international rogues who seem able to pass free and unmolested in many countries of Europe and the Far East. Their continued existence and ever-green activity is a sad reflection on the world's lack of joint determination to be done with these plague carriers."

Again, this same spokesman for emancipation from the awful degradation and slavery of drug addiction, made the following striking statement: "The whole question of the drug situation in the Far East was so fully dealt with by the representative of the United States of America in the session of the advisory committee (of the League of Nations) at Geneva, that I do not propose to enlarge upon the subject except to say that it is rapidly becoming the most serious menace of the civilized world." Nor has the picture changed since those fateful words were spoken in the late thirties. Indeed, the traffic in dope has become more monstrous, more shocking, until now the world is reeling under its murderous impact. In urging the Government of Egypt to close its doors to some five-hundred-odd persons who had been deported from his country, Director Russell Pasha sounded this frightening note: "I trust that the Egyptian Government will stand firm and remain adamant in refusing reentry into this country of these incorrigible foreigners who so nearly brought Egypt to its death."

There you have it, ladies and gentlemen, a traffic in poison, a traffic in murder on the installment plan, a traffic that so nearly brought Egypt to its death. And do not lull yourselves into a state of complacency and indifference by assuming that what happened in Egypt cannot happen here. It all but happened in China, in India, and it was the diabolical plan of the Japanese war lords, before the outbreak of World War II, that it should happen in America. Let it be said here that one of the greatest stumbling blocks to the winning of the fight against the narcotic traffic lies in public apathy, and indifference to the utter seriousness of the traffic. For instance, are you interested to know that while America is spending close to a billion dollars a month in fighting the British-recognized Communists in Korea, Communist China, herself,

according to Commissioner Anslinger, is one of the two major sources of supply of heroin which is now undermining the health and morals of thousands of the youth of America? Does it interest you, Mr. and Mrs. America, that Commissioner Anslinger, when he appeared before the Senate Crime Investigating Committee recently, stated with what must have been bitterness in his heart, that "The narcotics peddler does not kidnap children—he destroys them?"

Does it interest you to know that during World War II, according to congressional records, "opium monopolies were stubbornly maintained by governments other than ours," that 2 percent of the entire revenue of the Dutch East Indies was derived from smoking opium; that in British Burma 5 percent of the country's revenue was similarly derived; that in the British Federated Malay States it was 6 percent; that in British North Borneo it was 10 percent; that in British Sarawak it was 11 percent; that in the British Unfederated Malay States it was 12 percent, and in the British Straits Settlements it was 20 percent? There has been a breakdown in the family of nations in relation to this death-dealing commerce, just as there has been a breakdown somewhere in the American family in relation to widespread narcotics addiction; there is a breakdown, too, in the forces of law and order, and in the courts throughout the land, in the giving of probation and suspended sentences, and light jail sentences, to the crookedest and most unconscionable of all criminals, the dope peddler. Recently the eminent columnist, Sokolsky, referred to parents who are jittery over the widespread narcotics investigation, not knowing what is happening within the four walls of their own homes. He lays down the forceful principle that, and I quote: "Neither the police nor the schools can do much in combatting social evils without the cooperation of parents, particularly among children whose parents have so lost control of the family that it has practically ceased to exist as a social unit. . . . No matter what progressive educators say about the social value of self-expression in a democracy, children who grow up like alley cats, without moral restraints and inhibitions, will not resist the temptations of their environment. Those restraints and inhibitions must be developed in the home."

You see how closely related the two philosophies are: Commissioner Anslinger and Director Russell Pasha point to the world's lack of joint determination to be done with the national and international dope racketeer, while Sokolsky places a part of the blame squarely in the lap of the indulgent and neglectful parent in relation to the narcotic addiction of his own child.

What Director Russell Pasha has said of Egypt, can be applied to the great opium monopolies fostered in India, first, by the British East India Trading Co., the property of the House of Sassoon, later taken over by the British Government itself, both of which laid waste the physical and moral substance of the poverty-stricken masses of that great country of innate culture and spiritual attainment. The British Crown itself received subsidies from and fed on this filthy business, until, at the close of the century, there were no less than 10,000 emporiums where opium could be purchased openly under government protection and license. This subjugation of the people of India, under the imperialistic heel of Britain's opium monopolies, presents one of the blackest pages in the history of the world, as does her opium record in China, where, for over a century, the Chinese have fought bitterly to throw off the curse of drug addiction. China fought two short wars with Great Britain because of the opium traffic;

she lost both, and was compelled by Britain to accept legalization of the business. Hong Kong was one of Britain's grand prizes, snatched from the lap of the gods of war and dope, just as Hong Kong today is one of her prizes, through which the potentials of war are flowing to the common enemy, and through which, during this very hour, there is a reported flow of heroin from Tientsin and points in Manchuria. Commissioner Anslinger recently stated, "It is reported that the former heroin manufacturing factories in Tientsin, North China, and Manchuria have resumed operations, and there is evidence that some of this heroin is finding its way into the United States by way of Japan."

He further states that this heroin was allegedly smuggled into Japan aboard a British aircraft carrier from Hong Kong. Thus we find that Communist China is opening the floodgates of contraband narcotics, just as the Japanese war mongers did in their narcotics invasion that struck deep into the heart of China. It is disconcerting news, as Commissioner Anslinger says, that Communist China proposes to offer 500 tons of opium for export. And that is only the beginning. Anslinger sounds the warning, too, that Italy, Turkey, and Greece are exporting large quantities of contraband narcotics, including heroin. "These stocks," he says, "constitute a great danger in the illicit traffic in various countries, particularly the United States, where large quantities have been smuggled from Italy" and which illicit diversion "has reached teenagers in several countries."

Mexico, too, offers a disturbing example of failure of joint determination to be done with the narcotics racket. In 1947, the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations passed a resolution requesting the Government of Mexico "to take appropriate measures, in fulfillment of its international obligations under the narcotics conventions, to suppress the illicit cultivation of opium." There existed then in Mexico between 10,000 and 12,500 acres of poppy fields, producing from 32 to 40 metric tons of opium, and Commissioner Anslinger has stated that "it is reported that between 20 and 30 secret landing strips for airplanes have been constructed in Mexico to handle the transportation of narcotics from Mexico to the United States." In pleading for a stop to this narcotic invasion, Commissioner Anslinger warns: "The United States is concerned over the narcotics situation in Mexico because most of the narcotics produced are intended for smuggling across the border into our own country and are a serious menace to the health of our people."

He states further and I quote again: "The marijuana traffic is particularly serious along the Mexican border, and the flow of this drug from Mexico remains unabated." With a force of about 270 persons, the Federal Bureau of Narcotics cannot suppress these smuggling activities; nor can the Customs force, with its reduced personnel. The Kefauver committee has recommended an increase in the personnel of Federal law-enforcement agencies, especially the Narcotics Bureau. In a stirring plea for increased Federal appropriations with which to fight the dope racket, Lyle Wilson, a United Press staff writer, wants to know, "why the Bureau of Narcotics has been the forgotten agency of Government. How come," he demands, "we will be spending in the next fiscal year 15 times as many dollars to control disease of farm animals and poultry as we will spend on narcotics control?" Put this same question, ladies and gentlemen, to your Congressmen, and insist upon an answer. And put to yourselves this question: What are you going to do about the web of crime, degeneracy, and death that this infamous dope traffic is weaving about the heart of America, and your children?

**Thank You, Jersey Journal—Congress, I
Am Sure, Will Retain the RFC Law to
Help Business Weather Gales and
Misfortune.**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of my district, the Thirteenth Congressional District of New Jersey, which includes Bayonne, with its great naval base and a part of Jersey City, with its politically astute citizenry, I here express my thanks to the Jersey Journal, a home-town paper, for its forthright opinion on the RFC law and its retention.

I recently wired the editor of the Jersey Journal requesting an editorial opinion on the RFC. Should the law be retained or revoked, and the corporation dissolved? Some feel that the RFC has outlived its usefulness and that banks and the Federal Reserve Board are sufficient to nurse the needs of business. Herbert Hoover, for one, would abolish the RFC.

The editor of this home-town paper graciously responded to my request. I am sure the information contained in the below-listed editorial from the Jersey Journal of Wednesday, August 8, 1951, will serve to beat back and defeat those who would abolish the RFC:

**KEEP RFC LAW, BUT STAMP OUT USE OF
INFLUENCE TO SECURE LOANS**

The conflict over the question in Washington as to what ought to be done about the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will be answered by a large portion of the public and by investigators of that problem this way.

Retain the Federal Reconstruction Finance Corporation, but

1. Tighten it up so as to safeguard the millions of dollars that are being loaned to business under that law

2. Stamp out, by nonloophole law, anything that looks like purchase of influence to get loans from the RFC, but do not reject any application for a loan after it is settled that the loan will be utilized to save an embarrassed business and put it on its feet again

It was toward the end of President Hoover's administration, in 1928 and 1929, and on the eve of the depression period that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation law was enacted by Congress. The law was passed to save and brace up legitimate business that needed additional funds, but could not get them from the existing banks because the loan would conflict with the stringent bank regulations which opposed loans to a business not solvent or in imminent danger of insolvency

President Roosevelt's administration, in 1929, enlarged the law and it served a useful purpose in the gloomy depression period and saved many a business from going over the precipice.

Great enterprises that could not have obtained loans from banks got loans from the Government under the RFC law at terms more liberal than those which banks were allowed to make.

Moreover, such loans, in the majority of cases, were so safeguarded that the Govern-

ment in only a very small number of cases lost money. In the vast majority of loans the business helped was able to repay the loan in a fixed period, according to agreement. In that way investments were saved while an army of employees were protected against want.

It is true that in recent days, as the pressure for loans has increased, Washington has been fed with stories of influence bought to get loans. There have been fantastic yarns about vast sums paid to men of influence to use their power to get loans from the RFC, but in many of these cases confirmatory proof has been lacking. In a few cases stories of large sums paid for influence have been confirmed.

What should be done is to discourage in every possible way the use of money to get loans by the purchase of political influence in Washington, and then let the law continue to help business weather gales and misfortune.

**Korean Campaign Veterans Educational
Benefits**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star:

THEY DESERVE EQUAL TREATMENT

Simple justice requires enactment by Congress of legislation to end the discrimination which now exists between veterans of World War II and those of the Korean campaign. Some of the inequities already have been corrected, but others remain, particularly in the field of benefits under the so-called GI bill of rights. A bill introduced jointly by Senators GEORGE of Georgia and KERR of Oklahoma, is one of several intended to insure equal treatment for those who are fighting and have fought for their country in far-away Korea.

The George-Kerr bill would give to Korean war veterans education and training advantages similar to those extended to other veterans. Under the proposed legislation veterans of 90 days or more of active service since the start of the Korean war would be eligible for 1 month of free training for each month of service. Veterans whose schooling was interrupted by active military duty would get a maximum of 4 years' education or training. Those who had not been in school at the time of call would be entitled to a year of the benefits.

It was not until a Korean veteran was denied treatment at a Veterans' Administration hospital in Arizona last May that a law was passed giving such men full hospitalization privileges. The veteran, a former marine, had been turned away from the hospital because the Korean outbreak was not a "war" within the meaning of the law as it then stood. Under the old law only men with wounds or other ailments incurred in actual combat could be hospitalized by the VA. The law was amended to authorize treatment for non-service-connected ills as well as combat disabilities.

Korean veterans also are given free insurance by the Government, but with restrictions not imposed on World War II policies, which were paid for by the soldiers. The

new policy is a term-insurance plan which cannot be converted to other forms. Burial benefits of \$150 are provided in addition. The Government also provides compensation for service-connected disabilities.

The Veterans' Administration is said to be preparing a bill along the lines of the George-Kerr bill, but more restrictive in its benefits. The purpose of the VA measure would be to extend to Korean veterans all of the rights accorded to veterans of World War II, with conditions based on lessons learned in administration of the GI bill of rights. Legislation of this sort is long overdue.

It's About Time

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker. It is about time.

The disclosure that \$217,000,000 in projected foreign aid has been earmarked for the Chinese Nationalist Government on Formosa is heartening to every enemy of communism, but it remains to be seen whether the proposal represents a real change of heart by the Truman administration or is merely another smokescreen to deceive the American people.

For 6 long years Secretary of State Acheson has been the chief architect and salesman of policies that could lead only to the complete overthrow of the legitimate Nationalist Government of China and complete victory for the Communists. Even when the Republican Eightieth Congress voted, over administration protests, to furnish \$125,000,000 in military aid to the Chinese Nationalists, the State Department subverted the will of Congress by throwing every possible obstacle in the path of actual delivery of the aid. The State Department proved itself a master of paper shuffling, haggling, and delay. Instead of bullets and bread, the Chinese Nationalists often received the State Department's polite regrets.

Another reason for questioning the sincerity of the present proposal is Secretary Acheson's recent statement that there has been no change in United States policy toward China, despite a speech by Assistant Secretary Dean Rusk suggesting a new and friendlier attitude toward the Nationalists. Eighteen months ago President Truman insisted that the United States "would not provide military aid or advice to Formosa." If Mr. Acheson's recent statement is true, now can the earlier policy laid down by Mr. Truman possibly square with what Mr. Rusk is now telling the Senate committees?

I hope that the catastrophic anti-Nationalist policy of Messrs. Truman and Acheson is indeed dead, at long last, and that they now intend to help our anti-Communist friends in China. If such a policy had been adopted 6 years ago, China, the hub of the Orient, would still

be in friendly hands, there probably would have been no Korean war, and 80,000 American casualties would never have occurred.

**Samoa Chief Disappointed and Provoked
by Budget Under New Administration—
High Chief Tufele Asks Support of
Governor in Request for More Funds**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I have received a most interesting letter from High Chief Tufele, of Ta'u, Manu'a in American Samoa, protesting strongly against the funds allowed the administration of American Samoa under the proposed appropriation for fiscal year 1951-52.

High Chief Tufele is among the outstanding leaders of American Samoa. Although he has differed sharply with other high chiefs of Samoa on questions involving the administration of the islands by civil authority, he is respected by all who know him for his leadership and deep and sincere interest in the welfare of his people. His views, therefore, are deserving of the most careful consideration.

I offer this communication from High Chief Tufele as further evidence of the widespread dissatisfaction that is currently developing in Samoa and again urge that an investigation immediately be undertaken by the appropriate committee of Congress for purposes of appraising this situation from every standpoint and taking the necessary steps to bring about enactment of an organic act.

The government of the people of Samoa is at present and has been for more than 50 years conducted without the authority of organic law. This has, from time to time, made them the victims of serious abuses of authority. As far back as 1930 a joint committee of Congress recommended the enactment of an organic law to protect the Samoans in this fundamental right. Up to the present nothing has been done to fill the need despite continued representation. Now the inauguration of civil government makes it imperative that such a law be undertaken promptly.

This is a task that is long overdue. I strongly urge that it be undertaken at once.

The communication from High Chief Tufele follows:

DISTRICT OF MANU'A
(TA'U, MANU'A).

Pago Pago, American Samoa, July 6, 1951
The Honorable JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON,
Delegate from Hawaii,
House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

TALOFA MR. FARRINGTON: Since you and I hold common interest and mutual understanding in the needs and problems of our Polynesian people, especially the Hawaiians and the Samoans, I take this liberty to make

this communication for your information in relation to the present economic condition of our people and Government. And while this letter comes to you, my sympathy goes to our first civilian Governor, the Honorable Phelps Phelps, who has found conditions here quite unfavorable to his administration, since the Department of the Interior survey team which visited Samoa in April-May last year had failed to obtain a full study of our economical needs before making its report and preparing its first budget for the Government of American Samoa for 1951-52.

It is needless for me to remind you of my opposition against the idea of changing the Navy Department's administration in American Samoa at this period in favor of a civilian agency, due to the fact that I realized the people of Samoa and its Government were happy and have been enjoying life under the Navy regime. On the other hand, I had feared that such quick change would have only resulted in economical chaos and political division and discontentment among the people of Samoa if Washington and our Government should fail to fill the needed needs. But, in spite of this, Washington ordered the change. And because of my love for our people and my concern about our future, I had to disregard my opposing position for the sake of harmony and unity of my people; and, too, for our noble relationship with the United States. I have pledged my cooperation and support to Governor Phelps for his administration, just as I have served and supported the naval regime.

However, I should like to remind you that some of our people were induced to believe in some false promises by the sponsors of the new change movement. And to assist the inexperienced natives to support such movement, they were caught under the soft and easy-going nature of our race of which they should not be blamed.

As you are well aware of our race's human trait, under this particular environment, sometimes they try to be loyal—or want to be loyal—to everyone at one time but yet, in most things they do or say, as a rule, they are not sincere nor they have deep concern as to how the other fellow feels toward what was being said and done. And facing a serious mistake is not seriously considered because, in my honest opinion and experience, of the soft and free environment in which they live, and, too, they do not take into consideration the seriousness and importance of responsibility. To try to reconcile the inexperienced and insincerity of political mind, with a small group of experienced men with American ideas of government, is just like that phrase "You can lead a horse to the river, but you cannot make it drink."

While the Samoans were debating the changing of administration, the sponsors of the Issue, together with Mr. Emil J. Sady's mission to Tutuila and Manua at the end of 1948 and the first part of 1949, told and promised the people that under the Interior Department Samoa would and could have a much higher and better standard of life. As a result, after Mr. Sady had departed from Samoa, the cry for "a new change" or to "remove the Navy" spread like hot lava throughout American Samoa. The inexperienced and easy-going Samoans, with selfish individuals, had to ride in the chariot of the "false prophets." They were convinced and took for granted that under the civilian administration Samoa's bread and butter will just flow from the benevolent United States Government, and that a "gold mine" would be found in every corner of American Samoa. Mr. Sady's mission planted this picture in the minds of the people.

Permit me to quote here some of the Interior Department representative, Emil J. Sady, statements to chiefs of American Samoa, January 1949:

1 President Truman was astonished at the changes of opinion as regards naval admin-

istration or a civil government. He considers that some enemy has been at work in Tutuila. Mr. Sady has been commissioned to look into the matter and explain the idea of civil government.

2 "You are civilians the same as I, and no civilian can be satisfied with a military government."

3 The civil government does not intend to change the customs of the Samoans, particularly in regard chiefly to titles and land. No white man will be able to acquire Samoan land. If a Samoan wishes to sell a piece of land to someone else he will have to inform the Faipule (legislature) who will consider whether after the sale enough land will be left for the family. The Faipule will decide whether the sale can be made or not.

4 The Samoans will enjoy the title of American citizens and will be able to settle in the United States and buy land there if they wish, but the people of America will not be able to do the same in Samoa.

5 With regard to the discussion that has been going on about taxes, the civil government will not impose taxes, except in the case of those whose income exceeds \$5,000 a year. Few Samoans have so much, therefore in practice they will pay no taxes at all.

6 Hospitals will be supported at government expense and the Samoan medical practitioners will be sent to the American universities to take their degrees as doctors and will act in that capacity in Samoa.

7 No taxes will be imposed for schools, which will likewise be supported at Government expense. There will be no personal tax, nor any house tax, except in the case of hotels and houses for rent.

8 The people will be better off than before. Two million dollars will be appropriated for Tutuila the first year.

9 The new civil governor will not have the same authority as the naval governor, nor will he be able to act in an absolute and military fashion.

The purpose of my being in Tutuila again this time was to attend the special session of the Fono to discuss and decide on the first budget of the Interior Department's administration for 1951-52. And we were expecting to be adjourned in 2 or 3 days. But, instead, we were in session 9 days, the longest special Fono, so far, in the history of our legislature. This is due to the fact that Samoa, including the sponsors of the movement for change, is disappointed and provoked with this budget which was born from the report of the survey team which I have already mentioned.

To enlighten you with some of the survey team's report you may wish to be assured that on page 1016 of the Interior Department's appropriations for 1952 hearing before the House Committee on Appropriations, Eighty-second Congress, and part 2 of the report says:

"The estimated total budget for the government of American Samoa is \$1,278,000 for budget year 1952. This is a reduction in costs of operation over fiscal year 1950 of \$489,180, nearly half a million dollars, etc."

The proposed budget is much too low to meet the economic needs of the government, in comparison with that of the naval administration, and adding to this were some of the indirect privileges which were deriving from the navy activities and from its personnel, including the Fitaifita Guard—fat income of which a very good proportion had been a great boast and asset to the island government revenue.

The people of Samoa were also unconsulted by the survey team with their mission. Consequently, the Fono voted unanimously in rejecting the budget and the survey team's so-called Green Book, which is now to be the guide of the new administration. And instead, the Fono has voted to ask the Governor to use his own good judgment, with the advice of the Fono, to promote means that would fill the necessary needs,

etc., before a new budget would be provided. And the only solution I can see is our Governor's proposed trip to Washington in or about the last week of August, next month, to seek more financial assistance from Washington.

I truly feel that Governor Phelps' position, in facing such unfortunate situation, should not be jeopardized by some other people's mistake, since I understand he was appointed Governor 9 months after the survey team had made its report. But as I have said, because of the inexperience of our people in American ideas and ways of government, some of them are accusing some innocent persons and the Interior and Navy Departments. Yet, on the other hand, Governor Phelps, after his arrival and installation, has publicly pledged his willingness to cooperate with the people and to accept advice from them in order that he could work with our citizens. And that is what he is now doing, devoting his full time to study closely the heart of Samoa's problems. And for this reason, with his deep interest and sympathy in the welfare of Samoa and its future, the Governor is now winning the hearty support, sympathy, and respect of the Samoans. And when he goes to Washington the Governor will be accompanied by the soul and prayer of the people. Personally, I am in full support of his administration and the purpose of his visit to Washington.

May I say this as an honest statement: Samoa will long remember and appreciate their relationship with the Navy because it has kept up its moral obligations to the Samoan people and their needs, by upholding and for the constant build-up of our economic, health, education, and social life which made the people of American Samoa the proudest of the South Pacific. Through this progress and the preservation of the land, our customs, traditions and culture for the last 51 years Samoa should be maintained as the symbol of American leadership for every race and every people to enjoy life as they were given them by its birth and by God. And I certainly believe the United States Government will not allow its child to be decayed because of a small amount of financial help.

Knowing your interest and sympathy in the course of our people's life, I am very happy to know that Samoa has an understanding friend in Washington who can transmit the spirit of their message to the President and the Congress of the United States. And I am sure when Governor Phelps comes to Washington he would want to confer with you on the purpose of his visit. With your kind brotherly help I feel certain our Governor's mission will not be fruitless, and which will mean so much to the happiness and bright future of your Samoan brothers.

May all the good blessings of our Lord pour upon your head, and that you may have every strength, wisdom and courage to carry our friends' hopes in the field of essential responsibilities.

Ia soifua and aloha nui loa,
TUFELE-FA'IGA'OGA.

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the President is making his own "investigation" into charges that the Democratic na-

tional chairman received fees from a St. Louis company which received a RFC loan. When does he finish the investigation; 1960?

A Model for Screening Academy Aspirants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Krock, from today's New York Times:

IN THE NATION

(By Arthur Krock)

A MODEL FOR SCREENING ACADEMY ASPIRANTS

WASHINGTON, August 8.—Plans for a congressional inquiry into conditions at West Point, as an outgrowth of the cribbing scandal, appear to be suspended for the present. But a limited investigation could have constructive results. Under the direction of Senator RUSSELL, head of the Armed Services Committee, such a review would be kept free of headline hunting, lapses into sentimentality, and interference with the Army's handling of the immediate matter. The same could be expected from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments through the subcommittee of which Senator HOVER is chairman.

A pertinent subject

This committee has developed and practiced a written code which is a model for all investigations. Senator RUSSELL, in the MacArthur hearings, followed an admirable if unwritten one. Both should guide any committee of inquiry, whether or not composed of a congressional group. And one thing open to useful examination originates in Congress itself. This is the course pursued by Members of Congress in selecting their nominees for the student bodies of the two service academies. Though the West Point scandal affects only a small percentage of the cadet corps, the subject is pertinent.

Methods of congressional selection have been the special study of at least one Member, who has applied his research effectively and well. He is Representative JOHN F. KENNEDY, of the Eleventh Massachusetts District, hero of a great Navy exploit in the Second World War. When a youth from his district gets a nomination to West Point or Annapolis he has gone through a screening process carefully and scientifically calculated to assure that he will finish his course with honor and become a professional soldier or sailor to whom the security and moral reputation of the United States can be entrusted. None of his nominees has yet failed to make or hold the grade.

Results of the study

Mr. KENNEDY's study led him to the conclusion that the nominating system generally employed by his colleagues does not enforce essential standards and is responsible for the fact that quotas of the Service Academies go unfilled and too many graduates abandon their military careers. It persuaded him also that West Point scouts follow a bad practice in using the nominations assigned to the Academy to recruit and help to admission as many athletes as they can.

This practice is a matter for Congress as a whole to correct; it is within its province.

But the nominees from his district are Mr. KENNEDY's own affair and he has concentrated on their selection. While it is true that a large number of his colleagues require competitive tests (the civil-service designating examination), they often choose their nominees on other grounds—to pay political debts or to please influential families and friends. Mr. KENNEDY traced to this method some gloomy statistics he collected on "undesirable attrition," the term used to describe nominees admitted as cadets who later were detached by the military authorities.

Mr. Kennedy's system

In the Eleventh Massachusetts District the first step is to announce open competitive examinations. Those applying are then given a physical test on Army-Navy standards, the study having disclosed the fact that many nominees fall on this test at West Point and Annapolis. The next move is to examine applicants for aptitude and achievement under a system specially developed by the Civil Service Commission. There follow tabulation and estimation of the records made by the nominees in colleges and secondary schools where deans and headmasters are asked to fill out a very searching questionnaire into the applicant's character and personality.

All these hurdles successfully passed, the surviving applicants appear before a selection board. On this there are three members—a clergyman who was an Army combat chaplain, a psychologist in the Harvard Medical School, and a retired Army doctor who specialized in interviews while in the service. This board, after concluding its labors, gives each nominee his competitive rank, chooses the winners, and notifies them that they have been selected for appointment. After that, of course, they must pass the tests required by the Academies.

Available for all

The study on which this careful screening is based was costly to Mr. KENNEDY, and most Members of Congress could not have undertaken it for that reason. But now it is available to all of them, and they are at liberty if they choose to introduce in their districts this system of selection or to improve it by their analysis of the study. The record and findings of an investigating group might be of additional assistance in producing, and putting to general congressional use, standards and procedures for choosing nominees to West Point and Annapolis that could root up one of the causes of conditions which are of national concern.

It is of vital importance to assure that the two service cadet corps will always live up to their obligations to the United States, in the Academies and afterward, and remain as symbols of the finest moral, mental, and physical elements of the American society. This necessity, brought acutely to mind by the West Point story, can be met in good measure by broad application of the system established by Mr. KENNEDY.

Disgraceful Practices in National Arsenal Plant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including an AP dispatch out of Detroit, Mich., which appeared in the Milwaukee

Journal of recent date illustrating, if true, the disgraceful plant practices in an Army tank arsenal at Detroit. It is inconceivable that this condition could exist.

ARSENAL ENGINEERS QUIT IN DISGUST

DETROIT, MICH.—A former engineer at the Army's tank arsenal here was quoted by a Wayne County official Saturday as saying he quit his job in disgust over waste of money at the Government plant. The engineer, Frank Mitchell, told the official:

"It took 7 days of milling and machining to turn out a gun breech, and it cost \$1,000 in wages alone. They waited until the breech was completely machined before X-raying the metal for flaws. Out of every 11 X-rayed while I was there, 10 were thrown out.

"I merely suggested that they X-ray the casting before they machined it to save all that work and expense. I was told to mind my own business or I would be out of a job."

Mitchell also said that 3,000 blocks, used to check precision instruments, were sold to a new employee.

"A week later," Mitchell said, "the employee quit his job and sold most of the blocks back to the arsenal at a profit."

"That was too much for me," Mitchell said. "So I quit and got another job."

West Point Dismissals May Bring Wider Probe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pensacola (Fla.) Journal:

WEST POINT DISMISSALS MAY BRING WIDER PROBE

The rumpus at West Point, where 90 cadets have been discharged for cheating on examinations, is not likely to die down soon and may result in further repercussions which will reach to higher authority than the cadets themselves.

It appears that the dismissed cadets are not going to take it lying down. From statements made by some of them, the cribbing was more widespread than the record 90 dismissals indicate and it has been going on, not for 4 or 5 years, but for 12 or more.

But even if it has been in practice by some for only 4 or 5 years, it would appear that the 1950 and 1951 graduating classes contained some of those who cheated. Yet none of those graduated have received any discipline.

The cribbing, or obtaining outside help, as the official report gave it, stems from the cadets receiving questions of past examinations and preparing their answers. But the queer part of it is that these same questions were asked year after year to class after class.

This is a peculiar way for instructors to conduct examinations. Naturally students will ask each other what questions were asked and try to post themselves on the possible questions.

But for instructors to ask the same questions time after time is an indication that the instructors were too lazy to prepare new sets of examination questions for each suc-

ceeding class or year. This, to say the least, shows that instructors were not giving their all to their work, or that they were intentionally asking the same questions to permit cadets to prepare themselves for passing the tests. Certainly it is a peculiar system and will not be found in any ordinary college.

No one set of questions would prove the fitness of the cadet. Training should be primarily to make the cadet use his brain, to know how to think, not to be able to answer a static set of questions by rote.

The situation resulting from the many dismissals and the hearings which may follow is likely to bring a deeper investigation into the methods of instruction and tests at the Military Academy and may spread to training academies of other branches of the armed services.

Plan for Flood Losses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the editorial from the Kansas City Times of Monday, August 6, which I include herewith discusses S. 1935 and H. R. 5022, companion bills introduced on Wednesday, August 1. The editorial points up the urgent necessity of prompt action by the Congress to assist in restoring the situation in the flood-devastated areas of Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma.

PLAN FOR FLOOD LOSSES

The question of direct aid for the flooded tens of thousands is now before Congress. Companion bills introduced in both houses by Senator THOMAS C. HENNING, JR., and Representative RICHARD BOLLING call for the creation of a flood-claims commission to handle the job.

The urgency of direct restitution should be too obvious to justify much argument. While many of the larger businesses can probably manage to rebuild with their own resources or loans there is a sharp limit. Tens of thousands of families and small businesses are wiped out. Without some direct aid a considerable number of the larger businesses will be seriously crippled.

Families that have lost their homes and life savings present the powerful human appeal. This area and the Nation are also confronted with a far-reaching economic problem. A total loss of a billion dollars is too much to be carried by the home owners, farmers and businessmen of one area. Without major aid the best that could be hoped would be a heavily mortgaged population.

Any aid program necessarily assumes an orderly plan of administration. The Hennings-Bolling proposal for a flood claims commission strikes us as the logical method. The formula for distributing aid raises the most complicated problem and we don't pretend to know what it should be. It is hard for anyone to know prior to actual experience with the problem. Within limits considerable latitude should be given the commission.

There isn't much time for arguing the details of a formula in advance of setting up a commission. Such an official body is needed desperately today. Up and down the river valleys families and businessmen are trying to figure their way out. Local plans are going

ahead. The Kansas City, Kans., plan for rebuilding a large part of Armourdale with rental housing is one example. Many homes that represent life savings may not be rebuilt. What can these people expect?

The big question is how far the Federal Government will come into the picture. Considering that the Government now has a policy of appropriating billions for a multitude of purposes, most people think it will surely recognize a widespread flood disaster. But nobody knows. Populations are set adrift in an atmosphere of uncertainty. Until there is a Federal policy, local plans are made in semidarkness.

The Hennings-Bolling companion bills should bring the problem to a head—and quickly.

Oil Grab by Bureau Exceeds State Fears

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am directing to the attention of the House a most illuminating article which appeared in the New Orleans Times-Picayune of Sunday.

If ever the insidious hand of the Department of Interior was exposed in connection with the theft of the tidelands, it has been exposed in this article.

This is a typical example of what can be expected as long as the Federal Government persists in its policy of destruction of the sovereignty of the individual States and the power grab, through sheer might and paramount dominion of the Government over a less powerful State.

Those who scoffed at the suggestion that inland States would suffer now see the real menace behind this proposition where it develops that the Federal Government is not only interested in what they call the tidelands but in any piece of ground under which there is oil no matter where it is located.

But read this most informative article for yourself and see the plot unfold:

OIL GRAB BY BUREAU EXCEEDS STATE FEARS— ARBITRARY LINE TAKES IN CLOSE-BY FIELDS (By David Kleck)

Unless Congress enacts new legislation, Louisiana faces a loss of land and underlying minerals which will be unexpectedly staggering.

State officials expected heavy losses by Louisiana as a result of the United States Supreme Court decision giving the tidelands to the Federal Government. However, the loss which they anticipated does not compare with the loss which the State will suffer if the Federal Department of the Interior has its way.

Within the past few days the Interior Department showed its hand. Judging by the area it is claiming, the department classes as tidelands almost anything that is damp and produces oil.

As the House of Representatives was considering the quitclaim bill, which it passed Monday, the United States Solicitor General, Philip Perlman, was sending two Coast and Geodetic Survey charts to the Louisiana attorney general. A heavy line superimposed on these charts represents the Interior Department's conception of the Louisiana seaward boundary.

Oscar Chapman, Interior Secretary, says that these charts speak for the United States.

This graphic interpretation of the broad language of the Supreme Court decision against Louisiana not only claims 26 offshore oil and gas fields, but, by virtue of peculiar meanderings, the line claims at least two more and parts of four other fields lying in the marshy, ragged Louisiana shoreline.

The Supreme Court decision gave the Federal Government ownership of the minerals "underlying the Gulf of Mexico lying seaward of the ordinary low-water mark on the coast of Louisiana and outside inland waters."

The charts indicate that Perlman and the Interior Department have decided to their satisfaction that these words are sufficient authority to run their so-called boundary line into water areas such as Atchafalaya Bay, historically a bay (and not part of the Gulf of Mexico) since Louisiana entered the Union.

This bay, in which the line is drawn with some exactness, contains two fields which are therefore claimed by the United States: Atchafalaya Bay gas field and the Rabbit Island oil and gas field. To emphasize just how official the Interior Department considers this line, it has issued orders effectively stopping exploratory operations in these areas by the Texas Co. and Shell Oil Co.

As a result of the drilling ban, both companies stood to lose numerous 3-year leases granted by the State. Since drilling before the end of the primary term was necessary to hold the lease, and this was, in effect, prohibited, the Louisiana mineral board alleviated the severeness of the Federal interference by extending primary terms 2 years.

Besides circumventing these two fields, the Perlman line crosses the Belle Isle, Holly Beach, Timbalier Bay and Grand Bay fields, the last-named producing over 10,000 barrels daily. Federal authority has already been exerted in portions of these producing regions jutting over the so-called boundary.

Under provisions of the quit claim bill passed Monday by the House, Louisiana would be protected from any liberal interpretation of the Supreme Court language and the consequent encroachment on the State's resources. Title out to the 3-mile limit would be given to Louisiana and California, and in the case of Texas, to the 10½-mile mark, due to terms of the treaty by which it entered the Union.

Royalties from oil operations between these belts and the edge of the Continental Shelf would be given to the States at the rate of 37½ percent. The Federal share would be given, not to Washington bureaus, but to retirement of the national debt.

Interior's so-called boundary line, never recognized as anything but a draftsman's line by Louisiana officials, came into open discussion at the July 26 meeting of the State mineral board. Certain offshore tracts had been offered for bids and Chapman had written O. G. Collins, chairman of the mineral board, asking that they be withdrawn from leasing.

Chapman protested that the board was offering leases owned by the United States and referred to the superimposed line on the charts where, he said, "was delineated the line claimed by the United States as the landward boundary of offshore area covered by the decision and decree of the Supreme Court in the case of the *United States of America v. State of Louisiana*."

In addition, the Chapman letter particularly described segments of the line in words. Using the term "ordinary low-water mark," which hardly anyone can determine along the shifting Louisiana shoreline, he described the Perlman line across Breton Sound

and around Timbalier Bay, locations of the nine protested tracts up for lease.

Louisiana legal officials noted that Chapman's language implied he was acting for the United States. They searched for the authority for either the Solicitor General or the Interior Secretary to delineate Louisiana's boundary. The found none.

Chapman's protest brought a written reply from John L. Madden, Louisiana assistant attorney general, who conceded receipt of the charts and said in part:

"However, only the charts are official, not the line superimposed thereon by someone presuming to act for the United States in attempting to fix the boundary between the inland waters and those extending seaward from the low-water mark.

"This action, in superimposing the line, was not made under court directive, and, in the absence of the consent and approbation of some authorized representative of the State of Louisiana, must be viewed as being unilateral in nature."

The mineral board then advised all parties that "no lands are hereby offered for lease which might cover any property over which the United States might hold paramount rights and power." But at the same time the board refused to withdraw the protested tracts on the grounds that it had no power to disclaim any Louisiana rights or to agree to a line of demarcation.

Of the nine protested tracts, two were awarded Kerr-McGee Oil Industries, Inc., paid a \$101,000 bonus for a 1,377-acre tract in Breton Sound, and Gulf Refining Co. paid a \$48,950 bonus for the eastern one-third (950 acres) of the disputed tract in the South Timbalier area. It is in this disputed area of Breton Sound that numerous New Orleans residents have filed lease applications with the Federal Government.

To the west and north of the Perlman line, the Interior Department had previously expressed disinterest by means of a letter to the Shell Oil Co. This area was leased in April. More than 63,763 acres were awarded to various companies for a \$2,695,941 bonus, an average of \$42.28 an acre, compared to the Federal leasing figure of 50 cents.

In regard to the disputed tracts, C. J. Bonnacarrere, secretary of the Mineral Board, said that should the Perlman line ever become official (it bisects both awarded tracts), the Louisiana lease in the area of the Federal claim would be invalid.

Oil observers at the Mineral Board hearing noted that the Kerr-McGee Co. had asked that the protested tracts be put up for bidding. This company is owned in part by Senator ROBERT F. KERR (Oklahoma, Democrat), who was one of President Truman's staunchest defenders in the General MacArthur controversy. This fact lent encouragement to the idea that this time the President may not veto the bill as he has previously indicated he will do.

With evidence that the Interior Department regarded this line on the charts as the official claim of the United States, the Washington correspondent of the Times-Picayune asked Interior officials to cite the authority for the so-called boundary.

Attorneys for the Department said that the Supreme Court decision was the basis for drawing the demarcation lines and that the general formula for Louisiana territorial waters was set forth in the California case.

The Supreme Court decision against Louisiana is couched in broad terms. A review of the decision against California shows that the Court, in both the decree and decision, spoke only of "lands, minerals and things underlying the Pacific Ocean lying seaward of the ordinary low-water mark on the coast of California, and outside of the inland waters, extending seaward three nautical

miles and bounded on the north and south, respectively, by the northern and southern boundaries of the State of California."

Although Interior Department attorneys cite this type of language in both the Louisiana and California cases, it appears that some unusual interpretation has been evolved to permit the plotting of a line with considerable accuracy. These attorneys added, that if Louisiana does not agree with the line, it has the right to resist the Federal claims through court action.

Legal authorities predict that, if the quit-claim bill fails, Louisiana will be involved in this type of litigation for years to come. While the Supreme Court language does not contain a directive for the use of a formula, it appears that the solicitor general, in drawing the line, used a geometric formula proposed by the American delegation to a conference on international law at The Hague in 1930. This conference did not result in any treaty or convention.

The Louisiana legal position, in part, is indicated by these comments of legal officials:

1. The Supreme Court did not authorize use of the formula.

2. Even if the formula is reasonable, Louisiana might apply it in one way, the United States in another. "It depends on who has the pencil."

3. The Supreme Court language speaks of the Gulf of Mexico as being the boundary of Louisiana, yet the Perlman line intrudes into numerous bays.

4. The Federal official who draws this line has the same authority to correct it tomorrow as he has to draw it today.

A perusal of the Perlman line shows it to be generous to the State in character, relatively speaking, in Chandeleur Sound before it swoops down into Breton Sound at a point where a gas field is shut in. Little oil has been discovered in this section of the State. Virtually no oil has been found in either St. Bernard or Orleans parishes which abut this area.

The Perlman line strikes into the Plaquemines Parish shore at the exact spot where a promising oil field, Coquille Bay, is being developed. It then goes down, presumably on the low-water mark, to slice off a section of Grand Bay, and in the Delta section, it dips in East Bay enough to claim the South Pass block 24 field.

Off Iberia Parish, the line shoots into Atchafalaya Bay in such a northerly manner as to nip the Belle Isle oil and gas field and then completely circumvents the Rabbit Island and Atchafalaya Bay fields.

When questioned, attorneys for the Interior Department said that whether there is oil production or not is wholly immaterial in setting forth the delineation of the marginal lands.

The language of the formula only emphasizes the difficulty that would be encountered in attempting to derive it from the language of the Supreme Court. In reference to bays and similar inlets, it says:

"For indentations having pronounced headlands no more than 10 nautical miles apart, a straight line shall be drawn across the entrance; the envelope of all arcs of circles having a radius equal to one-fourth the length of the straight line shall then be drawn from all points around the shore of the indentation; if the area enclosed by the straight line across the entrance and the envelope of the arcs of the circles is greater than that of a semicircle with a diameter equal to one-half the length of the line across the entrance, the waters of the indentation shall be regarded as interior waters; if otherwise, the waters of the indentation shall be regarded as open sea."

"Where the headlands are more than 10 nautical miles apart, the line shall be drawn across the indentation through the point nearest the entrance at which the width does not exceed 10 miles, and the same procedure shall be employed to determine the status of the waters inside the line."

Even if this formula eventually becomes official, it poses a question of applying it to the shifting Louisiana shore line, the marsh and "floating islands" areas that change nearly every time they fall victims to storms and hurricanes. Since determination of the boundary involves consideration of the "low-water mark," the finding of this line sets forth a legal problem of truly incredible magnitude.

In the California case, the special master appointed by the Supreme Court to aid in determining the boundaries, said in his recent report that "ordinary low water" could be determined from observations of the Coast and Geodetic Survey over a period of 18.6 years. "Ordinary low-water mark" is taken as "the intersection of this plane of the mean of all low waters with the shore line."

The problem of applying this reasoning to the Louisiana shore line, if even to determine the unofficial boundary directed by the solicitor general is apparent. Chapman, in his letter of protest, specified that the Perlman line be drawn, using "low-water marks," but as Mineral Board Secretary Bonnacarreire says, "Who knows what low-water marks are? I don't."

Another protest against the "arbitrary manner" of attempting to define Louisiana's boundary without foundation in law, was delivered by State Land Register Lucille May Grace.

In compliance with the court decree that Louisiana account for all revenue from the offshore areas since June 5, 1950, Miss Grace compiled her report and forwarded it with vigorous protest.

Her report showed that in this period Louisiana received \$2,413,371 in bonuses and rentals from leases in the claimed area and \$1,193,291.57 in income from offshore production, a total of \$3,606,662.57.

Bolivar E. Kempt, Jr., attorney general, in forwarding the report, said:

"She points out that no specific line had been agreed upon by Louisiana to indicate such separation and that her report has been made in protest.

"I would also like to emphasize the fact that this statement—of income—has been made without knowing the exact area involved in the suit aforesaid and that a correct report cannot be made until such line is definitely fixed and agreed upon."

Just what process will be employed in determining a 3-mile boundary off Louisiana, in the event the quitclaim bill passes into law, has not been indicated. Legal authorities admit the impractical aspects of adding 3 miles to the present arbitrary line created by Solicitor General Perlman.

Although the bill will not give Louisiana full ownership of the vast offshore area the State helped to develop, it will—

1. Protect Grand Bay, Belle Isle, Timballier Bay, and probably Rabbit Island and Atchafalaya Bay. It will also prohibit Federal encroachment on such expanding bay fields as Coquille Bay.

2. Give the State ownership to these fields: Creole (307 barrels daily), block 33 West Cameron (58 barrels), most of Bay Marchand (5,968 barrels), block 24 South Pass (1,863 barrels), and most of Main Pass, block 69 (6,048 barrels).

3. Allow State leases outside the 3-mile limit to be exchanged for Federal leasing. It thus prohibits any group from employing the Federal Mineral Leasing Act to gain offshore leases at 50 cents an acre. It has

been noted in this connection that off the coast of Cameron Parish and Texas a group of 18 cooperatives filed in 1947 Federal lease applications for 1,800 square miles of coastal water bottoms. These cooperatives, although domiciled all over the United States, filed in the same manner and applied for leases side by side.

Although the bill does these things, legal authorities warn the Congress should immediately set about determining the line of demarcation, if it passes, else litigation and subsequent problems might be dogging the offshore operations for years to come.

Four Prayers for Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I take particular pleasure in inserting the following article which appeared in Pageant magazine, including prayers by four of our Nation's foremost clergymen:

FOUR PRAYERS FOR AMERICANS

In a grim world of retreating freedoms, with atom warfare an ever-present fear, Independence Day has become more than a patriotic anniversary in which Americans commemorate old sacrifices and prepare themselves for the new challenges that lie ahead. Today, Independence Day has become also a time of spiritual stock taking; an occasion of somber spiritual reflection when millions of our citizens realize anew they must turn to divine help to guide them through the crises imperiling their hopes and lives. In keeping with the grave spiritual demands made upon our people in these troubled times, four of the Nation's foremost clergymen have written for Pageant Independence Day prayers, emphasizing the eternal principles that must prevail if freedom survives.

"SAVE US FROM OURSELVES"

"(By the Reverend Patrick J. Peyton, CSC)

"Hail, full of grace. From the cross you were bequeathed to us as our mother, the last gift of your dying Son, so we, your children everywhere, claim your loving intercession with our Father. And because the church in the United States has placed itself under your special protection, we in this land urge a double claim upon you—our mother and our lady.

"Mary, be with us in these dangerous times. Bring God's blessing on our leaders; obtain that they shall be led by Him. Bring God's blessing on all who take up arms to defend our country. By God's grace fortify us against whatever dangers may strike at us from abroad or from within. Above all, save us from ourselves. Inspire and teach us to live God's way at home.

"Mother of the holy family, take under your mantle the families of America, custodians of the soul of the Nation. Daily family prayer used to be a custom in this land. It is no longer. The family is the weaker for it. The Nation is the poorer. By your own prayers, to which God always listens, implant that saving custom in the American family again, and in that way strengthen the bonds of love that hold the family together, foster the spirit of partnership be-

tween man and wife, instill the love of God in His children. Teach us that if enough families pray together they can save the world.

"Mother of love, teach us to love one another. Bring God's blessing also on the Russian people, teach them also what you teach us, and bring us all into our Father's house.

"Queen of the family rosary, we ask it in His own sweet name."

"WE SHALL MARCH WITH HOPE"

(By Dr. Julius Mark)

"O Lord, God, Father of all men, we turn to Thee in humility and gratitude as have countless generations of Thy children throughout the ages.

"We are humbled by the thought of Thy power and majesty. We become conscious of our weakness in the presence of Thy limitless might. We turn to Thee in contriteness of heart that a part of Thy strength may find a habitation in our souls.

"Grant, O Father, that we may ever prize as our most precious possessions the freedoms which belong to all Americans. May we never cease to be grateful unto those who sacrificed and died that the liberty which was born on these shores might be preserved. Remove from our hearts every vestige of religious intolerance, racial prejudice, and social arrogance.

"It is not Thou, O loving God, who hast forsaken us. We are lost, because we have abandoned Thee. Thou art with us as always, an ever present help in time of trouble; pleading with us to hold fast to the radiance of Thy presence. May we heed Thy call in humbleness of spirit and return to Thee and live.

"Strengthened by the conviction that Thou art ever near, determined to recapture the courage of heart and forthrightness of purpose which the consciousness of Thy presence will bring us, rededicating ourselves to the matchless principles of freedom and justice which our founding fathers labored to establish in this blessed land, undaunted by the sacrifices which the defense of our liberties may entail, inspired by the will to do everything within our power to translate into blessed reality the dream of one world firmly founded on an enduring peace and one humanity living in accordance with Thy teachings of mutual forbearance and mutual understanding, we shall march, with courageous faith and lofty hope, toward the Promised Land of universal brotherhood.

"To achieve this purpose, which we are assured is Thy will, may the words of our lips, the meditations of our hearts and the works of our hands be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our Strength and our Redeemer. Amen."

"KEEP ALIVE THE FAITH"

"(By Dr. Ralph W. Sockman)

"Eternal and ever gracious God, in whose law is our life and in whose love is our hope, our hearts are filled with gratitude for this good land which Thou hast given us for our heritage. Humble us with a sense of our deep debt to those whose pilgrim feet opened the paths of opportunity and laid the roads of liberty. May the memory of our fathers' sacrifices make us worthy to be their sons.

"Sober us by the thought of what others have done for us and enlarge our vision of what we can do for others. Help us to be equal to our high trusts, reverent in the use of privilege, just in the exercise of power, and generous in the protection of weakness. May we so follow in the footsteps of those who worthily went before us that we shall leave a better land for those who come after us.

"O Thou Eternal Spirit, in whom the dreams of men are born, keep alive in us the

hope and faith which sustained our founding fathers when this Nation was young and weak. Preserve us from needless fear and false trust. Make us ever mindful that our real strength is righteousness and our true greatness is service. Let not the darkness of these days dim our confidence in the ultimate triumph of truth and justice.

"Save us as a people from violence, discord, and confusion. Bless our land with the benefits of true learning, honest industry, and sound judgment. Restrain the passions of men that greed for gain shall not corrupt the public conscience or weaken the respect for law. Grant wisdom to our leaders and loyalty to our citizens that with malice toward none and charity for all we may do the right as Thou dost give us to see the right.

"O God, grant us grace to see the goodness of those nearest to us and to feel brotherly toward those far away. Guide our President and the rulers of all nations in the paths of peace and may they so persevere in the pursuit of justice, that strife and hate shall give way to brotherhood and good will. May Thy whole family throughout the earth find food for the body, faith for the mind, and hope for the heart so that the old wounds of war may be healed and new ways of fellowship may be found. These favors we ask in the name of The All Highest. Amen"

"MAKE OF THY CHILDREN ONE HUMANITY

("By Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick)

"Eternal Spirit never far from any one of us, but most near when we most deeply feel our need of Thee, we lift to Thee our prayer on behalf of our Nation.

"Thanks be to Thee for the heritage of her great tradition. We humbly acknowledge that we are the children of sacrifice. Our liberties have been purchased by the courage and self-denial of our sires, the blood and tears of martyrs and the faithful toll of many nameless heroes have made possible our freedom. Grant us a just sense of our unpayable indebtedness, and gird us with resolution so to live that our children's children shall rise up to call us blessed.

"Amid the bewilderment of these present days be our guide and stay; save us from confusion of mind and futility of life; let not love of ease sap our courage, nor dismay spoil our faith. Match us with the need and challenge of our time, and as Thou hast entrusted our Nation with great power, so bless her with character and leadership, devotion, and self-sacrifice, that we may prove worthy of our high opportunity.

"We pray for the peace of the world. Cast down the pride and arrogance of tyrants; uphold all endeavors to unite the nations in amity and good will; forgive and override our embittered divisions of nationality and race; save us from war's suicidal self-destruction; and grant that as we have conquered distance and made the world one habitation, so by Thy grace we may conquer misunderstanding, hatred, and violent strife, and make of Thy children one humanity.

Grant to us one by one such inner resources of strength and courage that we may be not the victims of our disturbed time, but the creators of a nobler nation and a better world. Make us worthy citizens of our country; let not our loyalty fail, or our self-sacrifice prove unequal to the need. Arouse us from lethargy, apathy, and self-seeking, to withstand the evils which afflict our people from within and the dangers which threaten them without. Grant guidance to our leaders. And now in our day of need and opportunity, make us strong to do Thy will, and resolute to fulfill for the future the promise of our Nation's past.

To this end may we have wide margins of reserve around our daily need, and deep wells from which to draw our fortitude, our wisdom, and our faith. Amen."

Fiscal Year Ends on Record Note— 2,486,755 Civilian Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, figures are now available on the end of the fiscal year which departed on June 30, 1951, unmourned and unsung. The executive branch of the Federal Government wound up its work with 2,486,755 civilian employees on your payroll, to whom we paid out the sum of approximately eight and one-half billion dollars in wages.

Just to keep things moving along on a fine, high level, your Federal agencies added 15,697 men and women to the rolls in June, from civilian offices alone, and the military departments hired 27,952 civilians to keep them company, for a grand June total of 43,649 new names on the payroll.

If you are wondering what these people are all doing, you have many folks right alongside you. Some of these who are wondering are included in the lists of those employed. They are put to work at trivial tasks which many of them find impossible to justify. Others simply sit around waiting for assignments. A filing clerk employed in one office tells me that she is paid \$50 a week for work that a 10-year-old could do and she is ashamed to take the money.

Sweat on, Mr. Taxpayer, sweat on.

Fourth of July Issue of the New Yorksky Dennik

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES G. DONOVAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, there are published in my district, on the upper East Side of New York City, two valiant newspapers, the New Yorkske Litsky, printed in Czech, and the New Yorksky Dennik, printed in Slovak.

On the Fourth of July this year, these papers published statements and articles by outstanding political figures and distinguished Members of Congress. These included the Vice President of the United States, Hon. ALBEN BARKLEY, Hon. ERNEST W. McFARLAND, the majority leader of the Senate, Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY, minority leader of the Senate, the Honorable JOHN McCORMACK, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, leaders of the House. They also contained statements of the following Members of the Senate and House of Representatives: Hon. WILLIAM BENTON, Hon. HARRY P. CAIN, Hon. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Hon. THEODORE F. GREEN, Hon. WARREN

G. MAGNUSON, Hon. BRIEN McMAHON, Hon. WALLACE F. BENNETT, Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, Hon. BLAIR MOODY, Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Hon. MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Hon. A. J. SABATH, Hon. KARL STEFAN, Hon. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, Hon. J. K. JAVITS, Hon. JOHN LESINSKI, Hon. ANTONI N. SADLAK, and Hon. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI.

In recognition of the magnificent service rendered by these newspapers, I should like to include in my remarks a letter sent to the editor of one of these papers by the American Heritage Foundation.

THE AMERICAN HERITAGE FOUNDATION,
New York, N. Y., July 18, 1951.

Mr. ANDREW J. VALUCHEK,
New York Dennik,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR Mr. VALUCHEK: I cannot overlook the opportunity to express my sincere thanks for your magnificent support in devoting an entire issue of the New York Dennik to advertisements and editorial material commemorating the 175th Anniversary of the Signing of the Declaration of Independence. Yours was the outstanding contribution in the foreign language field, and will not be topped by any of the thousands of other publications that carried the commemorative stories of Rededication throughout the land.

I know you will be pleased to hear that our national program of Rededication to the principles of Independence and Democracy was an unparalleled success. Seventy-three major cities held special commemorative ceremonies and 10,000 smaller communities gave special and sober significance to the anniversary. It was truly a day of rededication and encourages the American Heritage Foundation to believe that it is possible to continue this program throughout the remainder of the year as other significant national holidays and anniversaries occur.

The highest reward of good citizenship is good government. The recent anniversary program convinces us that the American people as a whole are alert to the dangers that confront us and willing to participate in any worthy program that will help to preserve and maintain our precious heritage.

We look forward to working with you again in the near future.

Very sincerely,

C. M. VANDEBURG,
Executive Consultant.

Music and Musicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the New York Herald Tribune on July 29, 1951, under the heading "Music and musicians," in reference to S. 1553.

The author of the article, Dr. Virgil Thomson, is not only a distinguished American composer, but a critic of note, who has served as music critic of the New York Herald Tribune since 1940, and

is the author of books of musical criticism, including *The State of Music* and *The Musical Scene*. A native of Kansas, Dr. Thomson is a member of the National Institute of Arts and Letters, and a chevalier of the French Legion of Honor. He holds degrees from Harvard and Syracuse Universities.

Among some of Dr. Thomson's distinguished contributions to American music are two operas, two symphonies, a number of choral works, and works for small instrumental groups, as well as incidental music for plays and films. His most recent film score was the music for the documentary film *The Louisiana Story*, which won for its composer even more acclaim than his previous musical scores for the United States Government documentary films, *The Plough That Broke the Plains*, and *The River*.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUSIC AND MUSICIANS: THE KEFAUVER AMENDMENT

(By Virgil Thomson)

One of the curious results of the recent investigation by a senatorial committee into organized interstate crime has been the proposal in Congress by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, of an amendment to the Copyright Act. This law, passed in 1909, determines, along with other matters, the royalty due to copyright owners of musical works whenever these latter are made into gramophone records for purposes of sale. It also provides the legal basis for the collection by musical copyright owners of performing-rights fees. Such fees have been held collectible by Supreme Court decision for the use of music in restaurants, dance halls, hotels, and the like places, whether or not admission is charged. Other decisions have established the principle that radio broadcasts constitute performance for profit, within the meaning of the act, and are subject to copyright charges. Also that public playing of mechanical reproductions constitutes performance of a musical work.

JUKE-BOXES PAY NO ROYALTIES

Our copyright law is far from ideal, but it does offer protection to authors and composers in all the main marketings of their work save one. That one is the nationally popular juke-box.

For reason unknown to this commentator the authors of the Copyright Act specifically exempted from any payment of performing-rights fees musical uses that involve coin-operated machines in establishments where no admission is charged. In 1909, of course, such uses were minor—in a few penny arcades and the lower saloons. But in the last 20 years the juke-box has become hugely popular. And although it contributes, along with all the other forms of mechanical transmission, toward reducing radically the composers' and publishers' profits from sheet music sales, efforts to remedy the injustice through amendment of the copyright law have consistently failed in Congress.

RACKETS IN THE INDUSTRY

Senator KEFAUVER has found a new approach to the problem, namely the interest our Federal Government has in not being defrauded of taxes. It seems that there are 500,000 juke-boxes in operation in the country and that the annual gross intake of these is around \$500,000,000. They are mostly owned and serviced, moreover, by large

organizations in which criminal elements seem to have penetrated. Evidence of widespread gangster control of the juke-box owner-distributor industry was found by congressional investigators in cities as far apart as New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Kansas City, Miami, New Orleans, and Duluth. Nobody knows just how much money is made, who gets it or what methods of brute force are employed in its collection.

AMENDMENT'S TRIPLE ARM

Now the Federal Government not only enjoys receiving the taxes due it; it also aspires to put down criminal organizations. And prosecution for nonpayment of income tax is one of its arms. The Kefauver amendment to the copyright law gives it a further arm. It requires all companies owning or servicing juke-boxes to declare to musical copyright owners (or their agents) every month all the records that have been available in all the machines under its jurisdiction during that time. The great collection societies such as ASCAP and BMI are thus brought into the picture, with the same rights of policing public taverns, demanding certified accounts and suing for redress in the courts that they enjoy with regard to other royalty collections. These certified accounts will be available, moreover, to the tax authorities. The whole juke-box industry will be thrown open to inspection through establishment of the copyright owners' right to collect performance fees. The fact that composers and their publishers will receive money hitherto denied them by law corrects a long-standing injustice, and this advantage is reinforced by two others, which facilitate the collection of Federal taxes and hinder the operations of organized interstate crime.

HOW IT WORKS

The amendment specifies the payment of 1 cent per record side per week (a side being defined as 4 minutes or any fraction of that) as due for the presence of any disk in any jukebox. The charge is small and the accounting not difficult. Establishments charging admission are exempted, since they already pay, no owner or licensee of a jukebox being liable to pay a copyright owner twice for the same usage. Tavern-keepers owning a single juke-box are also exempt, unless the machine is serviced, under contract, by a larger firm.

The amendment seems to have been carefully reflected and phrased. The benefits offered composers are obvious. A loophole long obnoxious to them in the copyright act would be closed by its enactment. Congress has previously refused, however, to vote for that closing. The Kefauver amendment now offers Congress the inducement of augmented Federal revenues and also an instrument for exposing to public view (and court action) criminal parasites that have fastened themselves onto a legitimate industry.

the House of Representatives to create a Special Committee To Study Psychological Warfare.

Important contributions to the study of psychological warfare are being made daily. These contributions are being lost because they are being sent out in all directions. They are not being concentrated in the files of a single committee or commission so that this complex art of moving minds may be scientifically studied.

The late Will Rogers usually prefaced his remarks with: "All I know is what I read in the papers."

Mr. Speaker, what do we, as Members of the House, read in our CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Let us look over a single issue—that of August 6, 1951.

Senator MUNDT—page 9475—suggested that refugees from behind the iron curtain be trained to spread the story of freedom and returned, with the disguise of plastic surgery, to be literally the newsboys of liberty.

Senator McCARRAN—pages 9486-9488—brought out that effective propaganda is inseparable from effective national policy.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] proposed—page 9504—that Stalin be challenged to permit the Voice of America one jam-free hour of broadcast to the Russian people.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH] included in his extension of remarks—pages A4912-A4913—an article by Eugene Lyons, an experienced veteran of psychological warfare, entitled "A Neglected Element in the World Equation: The Russian People."

Senator WILEY—pages A4920-A4923—extended his remarks to include an invitation to Soviet Russia to respond to the congressional resolution of friendship for the Russian people.

Each speech, each extension of remarks to which I have here called attention, has been a contribution of value to the sum total knowledge of psychological warfare.

Will this Congress permit these contributions to be lost?

Mr. Speaker, I answer this question with another question.

Will this House support a Special Committee to Study Psychological Warfare where these contributions will be preserved and used?

Special Committee To Study Psychological Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there is a very real need for

Doorway to Slavery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted me, I ask that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the fourth of a series of

articles on teen-age drug addiction published recently by the Long Island Daily Press:

"HOW I BECAME A DOPE ADDICT BEFORE I WAS 18"—ARREST COMES AS RELIEF TO A BETRAYED LUCY

(Fourth in a series of articles telling the sordid story of Lucy D., who became a dope addict and peddler before her eighteenth birthday. In previous installments Lucy told a reporter how she got into the dope habit by accepting a marijuana cigarette from a boy friend who told her, "Everybody does it." She switched to heroin after falling in love with Ralph, 20-year-old "hypo," going to live with him in his flat and then marrying him just before he was jailed by narcotics agents. By that time Lucy was such a confirmed addict herself that, in order to get money, she began to peddle dope. Soon she was making money, but she had shriveled from a healthy pretty girl to an emaciated, blotchy-skinned fearful woman, free from worry only when she was under the effects of H")

(By Geraldine Scott)

While Lucy was selling heroin and cocaine for a living, she knew she was in constant danger of being arrested. She knew Mr. B., her friend who supplied her with the stuff and paid her a good commission, had been to prison at least once.

"But when a man makes several thousand dollars a week, a year and a day's sentence in jail can be worth it," Lucy commented. Especially for a man like Mr. B., who was not a hypo himself.

"Many of the big poddlers aren't"

When Lucy's husband, Ralph, was picked up by the police, Lucy was questioned briefly and released. She quickly left Ralph's apartment for good and made no efforts to see him, despite his careful instructions how she was to try to smuggle H to him while he was behind bars.

"I didn't know any policeman could tell just by looking at me that I was a hypo. I didn't know I had been released in the hopes that I would lead narcotics agents to bigger bait."

Lucy kept moving from place to place while she peddled her dope. Her apartments, always in nice residential areas with convenient entrances, were soon hangouts for a small group of addicts.

"We would take our fixes and just sit, listening to jazz. That kind of music sounds wonderful when you're high. When you're a hypo, you live in a world of your own. You have two purposes in life. You live for your fix of H and you do things only to get money to buy the H."

Another teen-aged girl, May, became a member of the crowd that would gather at Lucy's.

"My troubles started when I let May come live with me. She was a beautiful girl. Her parents were religious people and had been strict with her, but she had a bad love affair and wanted to die. She was only 16, but could not get over it. Someone gave her heroin and she decided to go for a slow suicide."

Then Lucy discovered whom May had loved.

"It was my husband, Ralph. He was about to get out of jail and she said she planned on seeing him. I hadn't been in touch with him since the day he was picked up, and I didn't even want him to know where I was. I told May she'd have to leave. She didn't like that and went off in a huff."

"I scrubbed everything up good the night she left and had just taken a fix when the doorbell rang. I wasn't worried very much when I opened the peephole and they asked for May because I knew I was cool (not hot

or likely to be arrested). I had never been arrested. But I didn't think it was a customer. They always telephoned before they came. I slammed the peephole shut."

"Then a man's voice said, 'Open the door. This is the narcotics bureau.' I grabbed my outfit and what stuff I had in the apartment, threw it in the garbage disposal unit and breathed a sigh of relief. They broke in the door before I could open it. I felt cool and confident. But not for long."

May had betrayed Lucy. She had left her kit with some H in a drawer in the kitchen and the agents went right to it.

"So they had me. All of a sudden I didn't care. I was so tired of the way I had been living I was relieved that it was all over."

"I never would have had the courage myself to kick it off, but now that I was going to have to do it, I was almost glad. Of course I was terrified at the thought of the pain I was going to face. I never had endured it, but I knew others who had and I remembered what they told me."

From the narcotics agents, who remained to question her for 3 hours, Lucy learned Mr. B. had been arrested. The agents took over her telephone and took all calls from her customers.

"The agents being there was almost a relief. It was the first time for months I had a chance to talk to real people. People outside our circle."

"I began asking the agents what jail I would go to and how long I would be likely to stay. At that time I figured on a year and a day sentence—the usual one."

"As I said before, a short sentence is worth it to the big wheels. A long one is a different story."

Dr. Arthur Prudden Coleman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute today to a great American educator and, with it, offer for the RECORD his recent statement entitled "Understanding the Russians." I refer to none other than Dr. Arthur Prudden Coleman, president of Alliance College, Cambridge Springs, Pa.

Dr. Coleman, after serving in the Armed Forces of the United States in World War I, completed his studies for a bachelor of arts degree at Wesleyan in 1920. Thereafter, his post-graduate study took him to Yale, Columbia, the University of Prague, as well as the Universities of Krakow and Warsaw. In 1925, his well-earned doctor of philosophy was conferred upon him at Columbia University.

After teaching languages at Olivet College in Michigan, Dr. Coleman became professor of Slavic languages at Columbia University. It was at Columbia University that Dr. Coleman's courageous action in the cause of freedom brought about national attention.

In 1948, Columbia University accepted a Polish chair from the Communist-controlled regime in Warsaw. This provided for an annual \$10,000 grant from

the Soviet satellite regime in Poland. It should be pointed out that to the present day, Columbia University continues to accept this grant. This is difficult to understand in the light of the present international situation and, more so, in the light of our knowledge of the insidious workings of communism throughout the world. Numerous protests made to Columbia University have proved futile and no satisfactory explanation has been given to date for its continued acceptance. Columbia University's acceptance of this grant, in 1948, was too much for the "Connecticut Yankee stomach" of Dr. Arthur Prudden Coleman. Resigning in protest, Dr. Coleman wrote:

I stated that I was sorry to go and would stay (1) if the courses were withdrawn; (2) if the \$10,000 already accepted were devoted to the purchase of needed scientific instruments for the devastated universities of Poland; (3) if President Eisenhower would investigate Stalinist infiltration at Columbia.

Dr. Coleman further emphasized:

These were rejected and I walked out determined to fight publicly the prostitution of American Slavic departments by means of Communist subsidies.

The resignation of Dr. Coleman heightened the protest of conform funds that were beginning to be accepted by American colleges to institute various chairs related to Slavic study and teaching.

Dr. Coleman's background should serve to make for better understanding of the following statement released by him:

UNDERSTANDING THE RUSSIANS

The news that comes to us from the outside world these days is frightening indeed. At last, it seems, we are beginning to reap the whirlwind we sowed the seeds of at Tehran and Yalta. Crisis impends in the Far East. But the seeds of this crisis were sown in Europe. The cloud no bigger than a man's hand from which this tempest has grown first took form in Europe on the very territory from which the ancestors of 6,000,000 loyal Americans of Polish extraction once emigrated. The misguided policy which has led us to the far-eastern clash was begotten by our State Department in Eastern Europe. Now its liquidation proceeds apace in the Far East, but only its liquidation, not its origins. The origins were in Eastern Europe. In Korea, all our errors of judgment with respect to the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe have come together in one awful culmination, and brought us to the brink of Armageddon.

Yes, the Korean crisis is the fruit of our policy as a Nation with respect to the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe. What has that policy been, and what is it still today? Let the man who was one of its chief architects tell you. Let George Kennan, one of the master minds of our State Department, define that policy.

In an address delivered recently before the Russian Institute at Columbia University, and reprinted in shortened form in the June 26, 1950, issue of the New Republic magazine, Kennan gives us a clear exposé of our State Department's policy. "Understanding the Russians," Kennan's address is called, and this title in mockery, I have taken from him as the title of my own analysis of what is wrong.

As we read Kennan's words, we are at once brought up sharp; for here, in clearest terms,

is a confirmation of our people's worst suspicions. In clear outline, and coming from such a source it can certainly be taken as official, we have the pattern of thinking that has prevailed in our State Department for at least 6 years now. Here we have the policy that has brought up by one false step after another to our present deadlock with the Soviet Union, and, specifically, to the Chinese crisis.

Kennan's statement is, first of all, a masterpiece of omission and evasion. It is a plain sidestepping of the central issue in our dealings with the Soviet Union. The central issue in those dealings should properly be the question of the races other than the Russian who are now held bound within the Soviet grip. Kennan has not a single word to say on this issue.

As everyone who has studied history knows, Russian foreign policy has since the time of Peter the Great had a single fixed idea driving it forward. That idea is that the Russian state cannot fulfill its destiny, cannot even in fact exist as a state, until and unless it embraces within its sphere of influence all the Slavic branches. This means not only the Orthodox Slavs of Serbia and Bulgaria whose culture has the same roots as the Russian, but also the western Slavs—Poles, Ukrainians, Slovaks, Lusatians, Czechs, Croats, and Slovenians—whose culture, along with our own, derives wholly, or, as in the case of the Ukrainians in part, from Rome and the West.

This fixed idea of Russian policy, this idea that never changes though the centuries elapse, is never once mentioned by Kennan in his address before the Russian Institute. In complete silence, this architect of policy for our State Department passes over the aspect of Russian thinking that is at once most central and at the same time most crucial for us in our relations with the U S S R.

From the policy which I have referred to above, the Russians have never, I repeat, deviated in all the centuries. At times they have been able merely to inch forward in the direction of its realization. At other times they have gone forward to their goal with leaps and bounds. The latter we have seen them do in our own time, and with the sanction of our own State Department.

Yet nowhere, in his whole address, as reported in the New Republic does this spokesman for our Nation's policy at any time, either directly or by implication, once refer to this fixed idea of the Russian policy.

What Kennan does do, on the other hand, is spend long paragraphs in an effort to show us why we as Americans must be patient and tolerant and infinitely forbearing with the Soviet Union. Kennan is, of course, as a patriotic American, against communism. But despite this, his plea turns out almost as an apology for communism, as he urges us, the American public, to be endlessly patient with the evils of communism. The Russians, Kennan argues, have suffered so long and so bitterly through the centuries; have patience, you Americans, with their struggles upward. They lived for so long, these Russians, as Kennan says, "in archaic darkness and intolerance," forgive them now. Be tolerant with the Soviet system, he tries to persuade, and help the Russian people as they strive to emancipate themselves, ever so painfully, from the grip of ancient usage and symbols. Never forget, this official of ours urges, that in the Russian people there is "immense good, immense faith in humanity," and a profound belief in certain abstractions such as decency, honesty, kindness, and loyalty.

Of course Kennan is right. Of course we must be patient with the Russian people, and pity them, as they rise from the darkness of the past. But what about the people

who are the victims of the Russians, the people who are slaves, today, because they stand in the way of the realization of Russia's ancient and fixed idea? What about expending a little patience on them, a little effort in order to understand their point of view? What about a little pity for their fate, the more so as they are, culturally, our brothers born.

It is here that we find the terrible and tragic fallacy underlying Kennan's smooth reasoning. In all the dealings of our State Department for the last 6 years and more the effects of this fallacy are to be seen. Daily we have been led, by this cruel and unsound reasoning on the part of our officials deeper and deeper into the abyss, ever and ever further on the road, not of understanding the Russians, but actually of utterly and completely misunderstanding them.

Kennan wants us to understand the Russians. Yet, he and other officials like him have consistently misunderstood them. For they have evaded, as we have said, the principal issue in Russia's thinking with respect to the outside world. They have sidestepped the central matter of Russia's thinking with respect to the outside world. They have sidestepped the central matter of Russia's relations with the rest of the Slav world. These other Slavs, Russia has always considered her own legitimate prey. Yet, in all Kennan's address, there is no mention whatsoever of this. In his tender and nostalgic concern for the Russian people, among whom he has spent much time and whom, understandably, he loves, this State Department spokesman has permitted himself to forget the very existence of at least half a dozen peoples. In his sympathy for one race, he has shown himself willing to throw half a dozen races straight to the wolves. He passes over in silence the horrible massacre in Katyn Forest of 4,000 Polish officers.

This is the great and tragic fallacious premise on which all our foreign policy for at least 6 years has been built. Russia's fixed idea of absorbing, often by violence, the other Slavs has been whitewashed. It has been accepted as inevitable, and its manipulators the most skillful diplomats in the world, have been given the green light. Poles and Czechs, Slovaks, Ukrainians, Croats, and Slovenians, and other Slavs of western orientation, have been viewed as proper material for Communist, Stalinist exploitation. This is putting it brutally but truthfully, nevertheless; this is the way the State Department, in its heart, has for too long felt about the matter.

As long ago as in 1930 I saw with my own eyes the origins of this policy. In the summer of that year I was in Warsaw when the Sherwood Eddy party came through on its way back from the Soviet Union. The members of the party were all leaders of American life. Perhaps the most conspicuous of the group, both because of his height and his high position, was the Honorable Francis R. Sayre, who figured recently in the news in connection with the Alger Hiss case. The Eddy group was rapturous in its praise of what was then called the great experiment, and full of the wonders of the new gospel. The lecture on Polish culture which Paul Super, as director of the Polish YMCA, had arranged for the party in Warsaw was listened to politely but with pleasant unbelief and often downright skepticism. Only the paradise to the east captured the imagination of the party, and they had no patience with the slow evolution going on in other countries like Poland.

It was then that the nefarious policy we have been following since 1944 got its start. In the early thirties, Americans by the carload made the great pilgrimage to the Red god in Moscow, and all too many of the pil-

grims came away captivated. It was a great trip, every minute of its guaranteed enjoyable by a well-drilled army of modern Potemkins, and those who took part in it were all too often deceived. All too many have looked back to those days with nostalgia ever since. George Kennan does this.

Kennan and his associates in the State Department are victims of that old mood, which saw everything that transpired in the Soviet Union as either good, or, in the light of history, forgivable. Toward the Soviet Union they wore blinders, and refuse to see things as they really are. Mainly, they take no cognizance of the central purpose of Soviet policy, the fixed idea of which I have spoken above.

So our officials go on telling us, Forgive the Communists and pity them. Be patient with Stalinism. Look with tolerance and forgiveness on the new, Red, tsardom that has replaced the white. Do not be disturbed when this new terror far outstrips the old Romanov terror in spreading its evil tentacles about the Slavs of the West.

It is a dreadful thing to have to report the above. We who are familiar with Eastern and Central Europe know how desperately fallacious the advice is. We know that the Red tsardom of Stalin is infinitely more dangerous to the world than the white tsardom ever was. As a people we Americans had no use for that, because by tradition we are against hereditary absolutism in any form. But with Stalinism; ah, here many high experts do not even recognize the danger, much less combat it. Here we Americans are childish and gullible. Be patient with the Red tsardom, our officials counsel, even forgive its brutalities. Not only that, some even go so far as to see in Stalinism a very force for good. Some are urging that Stalinism is playing the role of deliverer in the case of such peoples as the Poles and the Ukrainians, Slovaks and Czechs. Daily I read statements in the American press to the effect that these branches of the great Slav family naturally belong inside the Stalinist empire. This is a monstrous lie, as the Polish American Congress has proven.

Understand the Soviet Union, Kennan exhorts. To which I reply: Alas, we understand the Red tsardom only too well. Poles and Ukrainians, Czechs, Slovaks, Croats, and Slovenians, and the other Slavs understood the policy of their neighbor centuries before our State Department officials were born, the poorest displaced person can testify. It is rather into a complete misunderstanding of Soviet policy and ideals that these officials have led us. It is high time the tide was checked, and the officially created misunderstanding reversed. Our policy of appeasement of Soviet sophistries must be reoriented.

Do not lose heart. The tide can be turned. Slowly we shall forge ahead, if only the whirlwind now loose in the Far East, which had its source in eastern Europe, does not prove too great for us to cope with short of a general cataclysm.

We must hang onto the thought that, in the long run, justice does prevail. We must not give up, but keep fighting in the hope that at long last we may have a part in seeing that justice is done in the heartland of Europe, among the people of Poland and all the other countries tragically located between the German lands and the Soviet Union.

We must train for our State Department experts on the Far East and on eastern Europe who have a heart as well as an intellect. Not only the little man but the small country has a right to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.

Poland must be free with all the other victims of Soviet imperialism.

ARTHUR PRUDEN COLEMAN.

Consolidation of Veterans' Administration Offices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

AUGUST 9, 1951.

The Honorable EDITH N. ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN ROGERS: We, veterans of World War II, have just learned that you have introduced a resolution to rescind the so-called economy consolidation of the New York, Boston, Richmond, and Philadelphia offices of the Veterans' Administration.

It is with a sincere and appreciative feeling of gratitude that we take this opportunity to thank you for your spontaneous indignant reaction to a move which so completely disregards the principles of true economy and the welfare of loyal American war veterans. We wish to assure you that the stand you have taken is shared by all the able and sympathetic members of the New York delegation and by many of the delegations of other States.

It is gratifying to know that in our hour of need we were fortunate to find men and women of your caliber in Congress who saw fit to champion the cause of the veteran.

Sincere thanks,

Morris Cohen, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Vincent Burke, New York, N. Y.; Sartora Tharl, Bronx, N. Y.; David Stein, New York, N. Y.; Howard Blincoe, Williston Park, Long Island, N. Y.; Salvatore J. Sciocelli, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Benjamin Elherfer, New York City; A. L. Kupper-Smith, Bronx, N. Y.; Lorraine Clark, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Christine F. DuVall, Huntington, Long Island, N. Y.; Maxwell Lefler, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Louis Nathan, Brooklyn, N. Y.; G. A. Jackson, Brooklyn, N. Y.; George F. Urban, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Jack Amir, Bronx, N. Y.; James B. Grant, Jamaica, N. Y.; Irving Jumbler, New York, N. Y.; Thomas R. Matthews, New York, N. Y.; Michael Jacob, Staten Island, N. Y.; Alex Slutzky, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Richard S. Nieves, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Nicholas A. Rodolles, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Theophilus Brown, Bronx, N. Y.; John Sheehan, New York, N. Y.; Sidney Glaser, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Charles Levin, Brooklyn, N. Y.

AUGUST 9, 1951

The Honorable EDITH N. ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN ROGERS: We, veterans of World War II, have just learned that you have introduced a resolution to rescind the so-called economy consolidation of the New York, Boston, Richmond and Philadelphia offices of the Veterans' Administration.

It is with a sincere and appreciative feeling of gratitude that we take this opportunity to thank you for your spontaneous indignant reaction to a move which so completely disregards the principles of true economy and the welfare of loyal American war veterans. We wish to assure you that the

stand you have taken is shared by all the able and sympathetic members of the New York delegation and by many of the delegations of other States.

It is gratifying to know that in our hour of need, we were fortunate to find men and women of your caliber in Congress who saw fit to champion the cause of the veteran.

Sincere thanks,

Emily W. Shy, Bronx, N. Y.; Charles A. Gibbs, Jr., New Rochelle, N. Y.; D. E. Lorelli, Elmhurst, Long Island, N. Y.; John A. Lupiano, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Harry Sfarli, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Barnett Hoffer, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Joseph P. Montandrea, Staten Island, N. Y.; Harold T. Berron, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Sidney P. Haber, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Eve A. Foster, Brooklyn, N. Y.; J. LaPonti, Flushing, N. Y.; J. K. Hendry, Brooklyn, N. Y.; H. Stark, Staten Island, N. Y.; J. Raftery, Astoria, Long Island, N. Y.; Butler Coopersing, Bronx, N. Y.; F. P. Faluotico, New York, N. Y.; F. Noble, Jamaica, N. Y.; A. A. Franila, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Jack J. Poggerale, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Victor J. Muth, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Abraham Zoebe, Brooklyn, N. Y.; John H. Meyer, Whitestone, N. Y.; Sidney Holtzman, Bronx, N. Y.; Ramon Kase, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Elston S. Mas-siad, Jr., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Saul Weber, New York, N. Y.; Anthony Marraudino, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Charles Tan-zosh, Brighton, N. Y.; Maurice Blum-berg, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Bernard Levine, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Emanuel M. Seiken, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Fred Cardwell, New York, N. Y.; Louis Alerto, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Peter T. Maggioro, Brooklyn, N. Y.; John J. Quail, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Al Glen, Jamaica, N. Y.; R. Schwartz, New York, N. Y.; J. P. Zneiorlis, Jr., Richmond Hill, N. Y.; Noel Bryce, Brooklyn, N. Y.; P. Callahan, Long Island City, N. Y.; B. Liberat, Yonkers, N. Y.; Bertha R. Isenberg, New York, N. Y.; Norman Goldstein, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Anthony Bramardi, Brooklyn, N. Y.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,

New York, N. Y., August 9, 1951

The Honorable EDITH N. ROGERS,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN ROGERS: We, veterans of World War II, have just learned that you have introduced a resolution to rescind the so-called economy consolidation of the New York, Boston, Richmond, and Philadelphia offices of the Veterans' Administration.

It is with a sincere and appreciative feeling of gratitude that we take this opportunity to thank you for your spontaneous indignant reaction to a move which so completely disregards the principles of true economy and the welfare of loyal American war veterans. We wish to assure you that the stand you have taken is shared by all the able and sympathetic members of the New York delegation and by many of the delegations of other States.

It is gratifying to know that in our hour of need we were fortunate to find men and women of your caliber in Congress who saw fit to champion the cause of the veteran.

Sincere thanks,

Philip Freiman, Louis Landman, Eugene M. Smith, Georgine Fitzgerald, Orlando J. Taddorsen, C. Carroll, Olivia Wyndham, Pat L. Vecchione, Edwin A. Homerling, Adam F. Deutschman, Stanley L. Cohen, Louis V. David, Charles A. Grecco, Hannah Weisblatt, Lawrence Newman, Nathan Helfand, Frances Edwards, Phillip S. Carson.

Need for Two-Party Politics in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks, an editorial that appeared in the Evergreen Courier, Evergreen, Ala., under date of July 19, 1951. The writer of this editorial clearly stresses the necessity for a vigorous two-party system in the South. I commend this editorial to all House Members:

TWO-PARTY POLITICS

We are sincere in our belief that the South as a section of the United States would fare better in every way if two-party politics prevailed in this section. We believe that the people of the South should realize that they must progress politically just as they must progress commercially, industrially, and agriculturally. This is a new day in the South and it is time for a new dawn in southern politics.

We do not look for active two-party politics in the South without proper leadership. Some of our political leaders must have the intestinal fortitude, the guts if you'll pardon us, to abandon the National Democratic Party in fact as well as in principle. We believe it is their moral obligation to furnish the lead in developing the other party, the Republican Party.

Of course, the Republicans must not sidestep their responsibilities in the South's political transformation. They must do away with this idea that the South is already in the other fellow's bag and campaign actively here. They must put up war funds to develop strong State organizations. Above all if they want our support they must adjust some of their party principles to conform with southern ideals that must not fall, State's rights, segregation, and decentralization.

But, we cannot go to bed and await the dawn. We must fight the encroachment of Truman's socialistic administration in every way possible. And if we would have two-party politics we must vote our convictions, whether they lie with grandpappy's party or not.

Organic Act To Guarantee Future of Samoa Asked by High Chief Mariota Tuiasosopo; Says Promises Unfulfilled and Samoans Deceived

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I offer for publication the first of a series of articles written from Pago Pago, American Samoa, by Richard A. Greer, in which he outlines the

point of view of High Chief Mariota Tulasosopo, speaker of the house of representatives, on current developments in Samoa.

The position taken by High Chief Tulasosopo emphasizes the importance of prompt consideration by the appropriate committee of Congress of legislation to provide organic law for the Samoans.

The article by Mr. Greer is from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, and is as follows:

HIGH CHIEF CHARGES INTERIOR MADE PROMISES BUT BROKE THEM

(By Richard A. Greer)

This is the first of a series of articles about American Samoa to be written by Mr. Greer, a former instructor at Kamehameha School for boys. The articles are particularly timely in view of the recent petition to Congress from Samoan chiefs asking for an investigation of civilian administration in the islands. Mr. Greer resigned his position in June to return to the South Seas for an extensive tour as a free-lance writer. He was a instructor at the American High School in Pago Pago during 1949-50 when on leave of absence from Kamehameha where he had taught since 1946.)

PAGO PAGO, AMERICAN SAMOA, August 6.—Mariota Tulasosopo is one of American Samoa's most prominent citizens. He is of high Samoan rank, heads the department of Samoan industry, and occupies the speaker's chair in the house of representatives.

Today he gave his views on the new civilian government that the Department of the Interior has officially operated since July 1.

"At the start," said Mr. Tulasosopo, "I would like to congratulate Gov. Phelps Phelps. He is a fine executive and is very popular with the Samoan people. He has proved his sincere interest in our welfare.

"Despite this, government under Interior has not begun well; nor has it made a good impression on the Samoans. During the period of political friction that occurred when the change-over from Navy to Interior was being discussed, a definite minority of the native people favored Interior control.

"Today I estimate that 90 percent of Samoans want Navy control to continue until a satisfactory organic act can be framed. This act, unlike the present proposed one, must guarantee the future of Samoa.

"Also, during the period of discussion, representatives of Interior came to Samoa. They made many promises. Nearly everyone here accepted these, as my people look on the promises of white men much as they look on the promises of God. But we were deceived."

EXAMPLES GIVEN

"Here are some examples:

"1. Interior told us that transfer of control would not necessarily remove the military Samoans interpreted this to mean that the Fita Fitas (Samoan naval unit) would remain. But at once this group was broken up. Many families were separated when former Fita Fitas went to Honolulu to join the Regular Navy. Samoa lost a payroll of \$200,000.

"2. Interior told us not to worry about money, because the department could get money from Congress more easily than the Navy could. But appropriations have been much smaller than formerly.

"3. Interior told us that medical supplies and personnel would not be reduced because of the transfer. But today we have fewer supplies and personnel.

"4. Interior told us that Samoa would receive special Federal aid for education. This aid has not appeared.

"5. Interior told us that wages and employment would rise after the change-over. Interior is now reclassifying wages, and it is possible that they may go up later. However, Samoans want an increase now because our cost of living has risen almost 20 percent recently. The level of employment is not being maintained.

"6. Interior made political promises. One of these was that our land would be protected—that non-Samoans would not be allowed to buy it. The proposed Organic Act contained a clause giving us such protection.

"But an identical clause in the Organic Act for Guam was struck out by the Senate on the ground that it was discriminatory. The Organic Acts for Guam and Samoa also provided that each possession would be represented in Washington by a commissioner.

"This clause also was struck from the Guam Act, I can only thank God that Guam got the treatment first. As soon as we found out what had happened, the legislature of American Samoa sent a dispatch to Washington asking that the Samoan Organic Act be held up."

GOT FAVORABLE ANSWERS

"I can conclude this part of the story by saying that we in Samoa have raised every possible question, and that in every instance Interior gave a favorable answer.

"Another cause of trouble is that certain personnel sent to Samoa by Interior proved highly objectionable. Nearly all have been unfamiliar with Samoa and Samoans.

"Originally it was planned that there would be a period of a year (July 1, 1950-July 1, 1951) in which Interior people would be here working with the Navy to learn the job and the place. Instead, the transition came suddenly, and the new Government personnel were not ready."

TRANSPORTATION BROKE DOWN

"The break-down of transportation that occurred when the Navy left has brought hardship to Samoa. Navy ships and planes stopped coming. No others took their places. Stocks on hand were limited. Now we must go for long stretches without flour, sugar, meat, etc.

"It would be unfair, however, to imply that Interior has brought no satisfaction. At his inauguration the Governor read letters from President Truman and Secretary of the Interior Chapman. These guaranteed the protection of land as well as of Samoan customs and culture.

"The messages were received with great joy, since they build confidence that no steps will be taken to break the letter or the spirit of the treaty which our chiefs made with President McKinley when Samoa was ceded to the United States."

MERCHANTS ARE HAPPY

"Samoans who have adopted European ways of life and who no longer live under our matai system feel that under Interior they will have more freedom to participate in government and society. In other words, they feel that there will be more democracy. Local merchants are happy so far. They are making more money.

"The Navy commissary store is closed, and everyone must buy from privately run business. It will be hard, though, to build up enthusiasm for Interior unless it gives better financial support. This is needed urgently now.

"You ask if I think Interior will succeed. There are really two questions in that one. The first is: Will Interior succeed in meeting its own aims? The other is: Will the Samoan people be happy? I cannot answer the first question."

"IT'S" OUTLINED

"As to the second, I should say that the Samoan people will be happy if:

"1. Land continues to be protected as at present. Our Samoan matai system of economic and social organization depends on control of the land. It will die if the land goes. What will take its place?"

"2. Our economy continues to be based on products of the land and not on wage income. Otherwise our way of life will disappear. At present only 500 of our 19,000 people are working for cash.

"3. Samoan culture and customs are preserved. An active educational program is needed to do this.

"4. The Samoan legislature has power to control business in Samoa and to protect the Samoan people from exploitation. Interior now encourages outside firms to come in. This means that Samoans will be employees only. Therefore the only income that Samoa gets will be from wages. Profits will go elsewhere."

NO BIG BUSINESS

"There is little chance for big business to develop here. We need all the financial support that such small business as we may develop can give us.

"An exception to the above is such enterprises as the new fish cannery. This business requires large capital outlay and does not in any way diminish the resources of Samoa or use lands needed by our people.

"It may seem that Samoa is judging the new government before it has had a chance to prove itself. That is not our intention. We realize that it will take some time for Interior to get its program into operation.

"We do, however, feel that it is our duty to make suggestions that will help the program succeed. Samoa is waiting and hoping.

Successful Conclusion of Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the war in Korea is under discussion by negotiators at the present time, with, I am afraid, very little prospect of a satisfactory solution. The present Joint Chiefs of Staff have no program as a result of which they see a prospect of a successful conclusion of the trouble we are now in. Is it not about time that something was done by the military establishment to create a policy that might bring victory?

The people are about fed up with the way that the thing has been carried on and the utter lack of terminal facilities which the war seems to present the way it is being conducted.

For the information of the Congress, I am calling attention to part 2 of the hearings upon the Department of Defense appropriations, pages 71 and 72:

[Excerpt from Department of Defense Appropriations Hearing for 1952 (Army)]

SUCCESSFUL CONCLUSION OF KOREAN WAR
(P. 71-72)

Mr. SCRIVNER. On page 2 of your statement you use the phrase: "Ering the war in Korea

to a successful conclusion." What do you conceive the successful conclusion to be and how long is it going to take us to reach it?

General COLLINS. Of course, that is really out of my field.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Well, that would be military, would it not, to bring it to a successful conclusion?

General COLLINS. Well, it could be brought to a successful conclusion from a military point of view in a number of different ways. Actually the ultimate decision as to what would be a successful conclusion is not made by military men. It will have to be made by the Government as a whole.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Yes.

General COLLINS. I would say if the Chinese Communists were to withdraw from North Korea and we went back to a condition which existed prior to the attack of the Communists into South Korea, and could then, from there, go on to a sound negotiated organization and peace, which was what was to have happened prior to the North Korean attack, that it would have been a successful operation. Certainly then the Communists would have been driven from South Korea. Their aggression has been very costly to them. That would be in my opinion, a victory from a military point of view.

Mr. TABER. Do you see any prospect of that happening?

General COLLINS. I cannot see any immediate prospect, Mr. TABER, but I do not think it is impossible of happening.

Mr. TABER. The thing that bothers me, frankly, is that the military in control at the present time have no program and no prospect that they can call attention to that will bring the thing to a head and clean it up. Is that not about right?

General COLLINS. We certainly cannot guarantee any program.

Mr. TABER. You do not have any program you think would bring it to a head?

General COLLINS. We believe that the program that we are now following in Korea, Mr. TABER, will ultimately bring a successful conclusion. Not in the immediate future.

Mr. TABER. In 10 years?

General COLLINS. Yes, sir. I would certainly hope much before then.

Mr. TABER. Not much less.

General COLLINS. I would not hazard a guess—

Mr. TABER. No.

General COLLINS. As to whether it would be a year or 2 or 3, it would be difficult to estimate.

Mr. SCRIVNER. In other words, there is not anything now, as we see it, of any definite character that would give us any idea upon which we could base our thinking as to how long the Korean war may last?

General COLLINS. Nothing definite; no, sir.

Navy Department which eminently qualifies him for the position which he now holds. I know that Mr. Kimball will keep in the forefront of the minds of the Members of Congress and of the American public the importance of the great American Navy as an indispensable element in our defense team. There have been times in the past when the Congress and the public were inclined to forget this fact. Experiences in Korea have proved once again that we need a strong Navy if we are to have a sound national defense.

I am sure that Secretary Kimball is keenly aware of the fact that although a continent, North America is an island mass, and that we need a Navy not only to defend our shores from an invading force but also to maintain the lines of commerce around the world. With a strong Navy we can also make certain that any future war is fought in the enemy's back yard—not in ours.

I would like to include herewith an article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on Sunday, August 5, 1951, which is as follows:

NAVY'S DAN KIMBALL, A ST. LOUIS DYNAMO—NEW CIVILIAN HEAD OF NAVY IS EXPECTED TO SPEED TEMPO IN THE PENTAGON—PROMOTED FROM UNDER SECRETARY AFTER MATTHEWS NAMED AMBASSADOR TO IRELAND—STUDENT AT SOLDAN HIGH SCHOOL—SUCCESSFUL IN BUSINESS

(By Raymond P. Brandt)

WASHINGTON, August 4.—Dan Able Kimball, the new Secretary of the Navy, is a 55-year-old, 6-foot plus native St. Louisan whose formal education ended during his second year at Soldan High School. Kimball was promoted from Navy Under Secretary to Secretary when Francis P. Matthews finally accepted President Truman's offer to name him the American Ambassador to Ireland.

There will be a change in the tempo of the huge Navy establishment as the result of Kimball's rise to the civilian directorship of an organization with a capital investment of more than \$75,000,000,000 and a personnel force of 1,000,000 uniformed men and women and 435,000 civilian workers. In money terms alone the Navy has more physical assets than the combined wealth of the country's 10 largest corporations. Its inventory of more than 2,000,000 movable items is valued at \$12,000,000,000.

Kimball is an energetic, happy-natured gregarious business executive who makes quick decisions to get things done; Matthews, a Nebraska lawyer turned financier, is on the shy side, with a preference for the background except in Roman Catholic and humanitarian activities. The retiring Secretary will be more at home in the American Embassy in Dublin than he was at the Pentagon. Kimball will be in his natural element bossing the Navy.

As Under Secretary, Kimball served as operating vice president of a governmental enterprise with global ramifications. While the Secretary is more concerned with higher policy, the Under Secretary devotes most of his time to administration, the budget, legislative matters and personnel. Kimball, with 2 years' experience as Under Secretary, will be in a position to supervise much more closely than Matthews.

Interviewed in his Under Secretary's office in the Pentagon, surrounded by valuable naval pictures assembled by former Under Secretary W. John Kenney, Kimball appeared to take his promotion in his easy-go-

ing strike. He is 6 feet, 3 inches tall, and weighs 212 pounds stripped. His deep voice is in keeping with his size. His blue-gray eyes go with his ready smile.

As in all the new offices of the top military, he has several large leather lounge chairs and a sofa for informal conferences. Kimball likes to do his talking in this corner of the room, where he can stretch his long legs on a low table and at the same time reach for a telephone. The interview was interrupted six times by telephone calls. He handled that business quickly without losing track of the questions.

"I was born in my grandfather's home on the corner of North Taylor and Labadie," he said, "and you can't throw a stone in St. Louis without hitting one of my kinkfolk."

"My grandfather, a steamboat captain, had lived in Hannibal and I have relatives there. My grandmother went to school with Mark Twain. My father was an insurance man and my mother, Mary Able was born in Memphis."

"I got my early schooling in Pittsburgh and Texas and came back to St. Louis to enter Soldan. During the Civil War my grandfather was one of the few steamboat captains to have the run of the Mississippi River and he brought cotton up North for the Unionists. We had a claim of \$90,000 against the Government for unpaid cotton and Speaker Champ Clark tried to get the money for us. When we thought everything was all right and we were going to be rich, Congress passed legislation outlawing all such claims."

"Things weren't going so well for us in St. Louis so we moved to Los Angeles when I was 15 years old. I had to quit Soldan during my second year. I had played center on the football team. I was a skinny fellow then."

"In Los Angeles I went to work in an electric automobile garage instead of going to school. Back in St. Louis I had worked in an electrical carriage shop owned by Dwight Blossom, who lived in a big house across from Soldan. I liked machinery and automobiles and I stayed at the electrical job till 1917 when I enlisted in the Army Air Force Jimmy Doolittle and I were in the same squadron and we were commissioned second lieutenants the same day. I came out of the Army Air Force in 1919 as a first lieutenant."

The Doolittle friendship lasted through years. When Kimball was appointed Assistant Navy Secretary for Air in March, 1949, he bet Doolittle, who had become a lieutenant general, that the Navy job was only "temporary" and that he would be back in private business in a year. Doolittle was generous and gave him a year and a half. When that time had elapsed and Kimball was Under Secretary, Doolittle proposed that the money be given to some worthy cause. The "worthy cause" selected was a dinner at the F Street Club for a group of their friends.

Shortly thereafter Kimball gave another dinner—for women White House correspondents who had been excluded from the annual dinner of the White House Correspondents' Association. This subtracted nothing from his popularity. It was a typical gesture for Kimball, who likes fun and knows how to get along with people.

When he returned to California from the World War I Army, he joined the General Tire & Rubber Co. as a salesman and signed up with the International Correspondence School for a course in electrical engineering. Within a year he became the Los Angeles sales manager, and within a few years he was named sales manager for 11 Western States. He came to Washington in November 1941 as a vice president of the company, to see what it could do in the war effort.

Reminded that this was before Pearl Harbor, he replied: "Sure, but everybody knew

Hon. Dan A. Kimball

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL
OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of deep gratification to the residents of the city of St. Louis that a former St. Louisan who was born in our city has been appointed and confirmed as Secretary of the Navy.

Dan A. Kimball has a background of experience both in business and in the

by that time we were going to get into the war."

Kimball was told that his company could best serve the war effort by going into the manufacture of rockets and guided missiles. This was an entirely new field, not only for the company but for almost every other business organization. Kimball took over in his breezy but efficient way.

The result was the Aerojet Engineering Corp., a subsidiary of General Tire. Kimball was made executive vice president. Among its other contributions was JATO—jet assisted takeoff—for naval planes and from carriers and heavy seas. It is now used in civil aviation.

Kimball was in and out of Washington during the war and postwar years. During these visits he met John L. Sullivan, then an Assistant Treasury Secretary and later Under Secretary and Secretary of the Navy. Sullivan is responsible for persuading Kimball to come directly into the Government. Kimball has cut all ties with General Tire.

The new Secretary has great energy at work or play. He arrives at his office in the Pentagon at 8 a. m. and starts digging into the paper work and conferences. His associates say he can go through a voluminous and detailed contract or military paper in half the time needed by ordinary persons. He uses the telephone whenever possible. For the more relaxed problems he likes to have guests in for luncheon in a small room off his main office.

He has a private pilot's license and on Government business he flies whenever he can, sometimes taking over the controls for a while. He served as Assistant Secretary of Air for 2 months before becoming Under Secretary of the Navy in May 1949.

As Under Secretary he speeded up defense unification by being an ardent team man with his two opposite numbers, Archibald S. Alexander of the Army and John A. McCone of the Air Force. These men talk the same language, lay all their departmental cards on the table, and work out the conflicts that plague the three services. Each official has the highest regard for the other two.

Because of his team play and his gregarious nature, Kimball is a favorite of President Truman, who likes his earthy language and his direct approach.

The new Secretary has all the outward appearance of a successful businessman and Truman asked him one day:

"How come you are a Democrat?"

Kimball replied by telling a family episode. One of his grandfathers was found crying during a political campaign. A distressed friend asked the old man why he was in tears.

"I've been a good Democrat all my life," the grandfather replied, "but I just can't vote for Bryan again."

While Kimball thought his job in Washington was temporary, Mrs. Kimball, to whom he was married in 1925, kept their home in Los Angeles. She has moved to Washington. The Kimballs have no children. She was Dorothy Ames, of Chicago.

The Secretary is more at home on a golf course than at official functions. His best score this year was a profitable 82. He is notable for his spectacular sport shirts and shorts, usually of Hawaiian design. He is an inveterate smoker of fine cigars and, like President Truman, takes his occasional bourbon with branch water.

As a busy Under Secretary he has not had much time for serious reading. He says his ICS course to electrical engineering enables him to read blueprints and that the demands of his office require the reading of lengthy official reports, several newspapers, and a couple of news magazines. Of the six

volumes of naval history of World War II, he has found time to read only four. Now that he will have an Under Secretary to take over many details of administration, he hopes to read the rest of this series.

Presidential Veto of H. R. 3193 and H. R. 3549

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following copy of a letter sent to me, written by Omar B. Ketchum to Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN, chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

AUGUST 7, 1951.

Re Presidential veto H. R. 3193 and H. R. 3549.

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN,
Chairman, House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RANKIN: It is the opinion of this office and the Veterans of Foreign Wars that President Truman was hasty and ill-advised in vetoing H. R. 3193 and H. R. 3549, which were approved by the House and Senate after most careful consideration. Consequently, we are urging the Congress to override the vetoes of these two bills.

It should be pointed out and emphasized that H. R. 3193 was intended to provide a special pension allowance, in accordance with American history and tradition, for those World War I and II veterans now on the pension rolls who are so helpless or blind or so nearly helpless or blind as to require the constant aid of an attendant. This type of a benefit is not something new and has been applied to Spanish-American War veterans for many, many years. In fact, on July 30, 1947, President Truman approved Public Law 270, Eightieth Congress, which increased from \$100 to \$120 monthly, the pension payable to Spanish-American War veterans who are so helpless or blind as to need an attendant.

It is estimated, based on figures obtained from the Veterans Administration, that H. R. 3193 would benefit approximately 20,000 World War I and II veterans who are presently receiving monthly pensions of either \$60 or \$72 (average about \$63) now on the pension rolls of the Veterans Administration. The first year's cost of the proposed increase for this small group of helpless veterans would be approximately \$13,680,000. Surely this cannot be considered as an excessive cost for our helpless old veterans when we are appropriating billions for the relief of foreign nations.

The bill, H. R. 3549, which was also vetoed by the President, would have modified the pension eligibility requirements for a few old widows of veterans of the Civil War, Indian Wars and Spanish-American War by eliminating the requirement for proof of dependency. This change in eligibility requirements was suggested by spokesmen from the Veterans Administration during hearings on the subject before the House Veterans Committee and was accepted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. There is no doubt but what Veterans' Administration

spokesmen made this suggestion because there was only a handful of the old widows involved and that the cost of a few additional pensions would be less than the administrative costs in trying to determine dependency. The cost of this legislation was so negligible that no attempt was made to provide an estimate for the Congress.

May we respectfully urge that action be taken by the appropriate leadership of the Congress to give the members of Congress an opportunity to override or sustain the veto of the President with respect to these two bills.

Respectfully yours,
OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Director.

Appropriations for Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, it is a little amazing that President Truman should take the Congress to task about appropriations to prevent floods in the Missouri Valley. His remarks, "It would be necessary to elect Members of Congress from the great Midwest who are more in sympathy with the idea of flood control," seems a little ridiculous. The President has a short memory on some things.

I remind you that on August 3, 1946, one day after Congress had adjourned, President Truman saw fit to issue an Executive order that froze the funds designated for public works, including flood control. The order was dated August 2, and the echoes in the Halls of Congress had hardly died away when he took this step to stop the work on flood control. The bill had been signed just 10 days before, after it had been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and passed by Congress. The appropriation had been sent to the President for his approval or disapproval. When he signed the bill, in the presence of a score of Members of Congress, there were pictures taken and pens passed out to those who sponsored the flood-control bill. He called it a great forward step. This was just 10 days before he issued his famous freeze order which stopped the forward march of flood-control work. He made inoperative, without approval or even consultation with Congress, the appropriations designated for flood control.

It was the opinion of many men at that time that he was without statutory or constitutional authority in taking such a step. With that thought in mind, I introduced House Joint Resolution 176, on April 22, 1947, which had for its purpose preventing the Chief Executive from freezing and making impotent the funds as provided by the Congress for flood control and other public works. It was my contention that if the President could nullify the acts of Congress for flood-control work, he could do the same

for a part or all of any appropriations. If the Congress once concedes that the Chief Executive has this power, then the Congress would lose control of the purse strings and popular self-government under the Constitution, would be at an end.

When the President complains about appropriations for flood control today, he should remember the action he took on August 3, 1946.

Foreign Aid Commitments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an editorial published on August 6 in the Casper (Wyo.) Tribune-Herald upholding the obvious intent of Congress to insist upon close scrutiny of foreign aid commitments, and the widespread feeling among Members of Congress that this country should withhold aid from nations selling arms or other materials of military value to Russia or Soviet-dominated areas.

I am very gratified to read this editorial in one of the leading newspapers in my State. It reaffirms my position, which I believe to be in accordance with the thinking of my own Wyoming people. Correspondence received in my office has given ample indication of this viewpoint, but publication of this editorial lends even more strength to my own position.

For a long time now, Mr. Speaker, I have expressed exactly this view: That the United States should give more thorough study to foreign aid proposals and that we should insist that the dollars we send abroad not be turned against us, directly or indirectly.

I do not oppose foreign aid within the limits of our ability and to truly friendly nations. Let me make this point very clear. But I do oppose spending ourselves into national bankruptcy—an end result which would destroy not only our own Nation but perhaps also the very nations we bankrupted ourselves to assist. I oppose with equal vigor sending aid to nations which use this American aid to further their own ends with nations considered unfriendly to us.

We find ourselves, sometimes, in the embarrassing position of man's best friend, the hot-dog. We feed the hand that bites us.

Since the Casper editorial reflects this view much more skillfully than I can, I quote it herewith:

Looking ahead, we'd say that getting foreign-aid cash and considerations from Uncle Sam isn't apt to be as easy in the future as it has been in the past.

Just the thinking of Congress seems to indicate that old Uncle Sammy isn't going to be quite as loose with the small change as he has been of recent years.

The move now in Congress is to get through a bill that will prevent American military, financial, or economic aid from being given to any country that is selling arms or other materials of great military value to Russia or any of the nations now directly under Russian domination.

The administration is kicking a little at this one. The point is made that some of these nations selling strategic materials to the Reds are also selling them to us and that we must not jeopardize our own supply. Also, the point is made that it is almost impossible to determine what is a strategic material. Under certain conditions foodstuffs come under the heading of strategic materials and so would many other very ordinary run-of-the-mill items which many countries are now selling to Russia and her satellites.

Nevertheless, approaching the problem from the standpoint of the value these several nations are receiving in military aid and economic aid, we believe that they should play ball to the extent of not aiding and abetting the Russian cause by supplying that cause with materials of strategic value.

After all, the American taxpayers have been sold the foreign-aid program on the grounds that it was necessary to our own security in that it would strengthen these nations that receive it and thereby make them less likely to fall for the Communist system and less likely to fall prey to any Communist aggression against them.

That is the point as we believe the American people understand it.

Then it does not seem logical that we should strengthen one of these nations at the expense of the American taxpayer so that the nation receiving the aid can build new factories to supply Russia with greater quantities of bomb detonators each year. We are simply defeating, by that action, the very thing we started out in the first place to achieve.

Let Congress snug up the purse strings on foreign aid. We cannot dictate and should not dictate how another nation runs its own affairs but, let us remember that this cash going out for foreign aid is American cash and we have every right to establish the conditions under which it can be granted.

The theory behind the foreign-aid program is that it is designed to strengthen the free world. Supplying arms or minerals or other strategic materials to the Reds is going counter to that program.

Congress is on the right track.

Letter From Florence C. Moulton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES P. NELSON

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following letter:

AUGUST 6, 1951.

Mr. CHARLES P. NELSON,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NELSON: You were in our town the Fourth of July, and I heard your talk in part and I remember the words you said toward the end, about the fear existing.

That fear is well founded, but the Government can eradicate it not by broadcast-

ing a lot of courage propaganda but by doing some common-sense things for a change.

I always had the feeling that Congress represented the people and that the mass of the people could not be sold a bill of goods. "You can fool some of the people some of the time, and some of the people all of the time, but not all of the people all of the time." The 1950 elections were an indication. But too many people have fallen for the propaganda mills the administration has put out to keep itself in power. When 40 percent of the middleman's income is taken in taxes, there is a work slowdown, because there is no incentive to work in order to give 40 percent of it to a bunch of stupid spenders who have made about all the mistakes in the book, causing Mr. and Mrs. Middleclass to greatly lower their standard of living. When there is a work slowdown, companies fail, there is unemployment, and the Government does not get so much in taxes. The open and the hidden taxes are now so great that the law of economics which cannot be propagandized is beginning to take effect.

I lived through the 1929-33 depression, but many have not. There are some false myths being circulated and emphasized:

1. The one about the shortages of things. Really, we have too many subsidized surpluses.

2. The worthlessness of our dollar myth. Dollars can buy very well now. Try paying cash on the barrel head.

3. The war scare with Russia. She is dangerous but a bluff. We can outproduce her and should stop being so scared. If we were one-half as loud about our confidence as she is, we'd outbluff them.

4. Make saving instead of buying more attractive by raising the interest rate on bonds and savings accounts and do not tax away the thrift of the common people. A government produces nothing; it can only spend what it takes from the workers.

I notice that Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, the former Presidential adviser on economics, resigned to stump against crazy spending. I heard him in Wellesley, Mass., last November.

European countries do not dare to waste the way America does. If just the dreadful waste everywhere were halted, we would not need to be taxed so. I heard once over the radio a broadcast for inexperienced office workers at \$2,600, no experience needed, and a place to live for Washington jobs. What private business could dare to try such a dangerous practice? Lately there was a broadcast about a law for general wage hike in proportion to hike of living costs. All small businesses and lots of large ones would fail or fire half their force if this crazy and artificial rule went through.

It just seems to me, an innocent bystander, that Washingtonian planners have gone plumb, screeching crazy in their last-stand tries to keep on maneuvering this artificial prosperity picture. What most of us already have and probably will have for untold years ahead is blood, sweat, and continuous toil, but they do not dare to tell us that after 1920.

As I see it, the United States of America is now on the brink of a blow-out, by timetable about comparable to September 1928, maybe later, in a supersucker period. One cannot stop the storm but look diligently for a shelter. A lot of debt-ridden populace have none.

Do your part on voting on the side of common sense on all bills that come up. I notice how circumspect all the really good government people are. They deal in historic generalities because present actualities are so stoked with dynamite.

Sincerely,

FLORENCE C. MOULTON.

St. Lawrence Seaway**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. CLARE MAGEE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Speaker, we in the Missouri Valley believe that the growth and health of one area promotes that of the entire Nation. Our fate is especially linked with the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, which is not only vital to hemispheric security but vital to the economic health of the Missouri Valley. Under authority granted, I include in the Record an editorial on this subject from the Milwaukee Journal of Saturday, July 14, 1951:

It has always been hard to convince a western Nebraska or Montana farmer that he should give two hoots whether Milwaukee or Detroit were ever connected to the sea or where the steel mills got their iron ore.

It wasn't that the western Nebraska or Montana farmer shouldn't give two hoots—it's just that nobody had ever effectively showed him why he should.

An important step has now been taken to overcome that indifference among midwestern States not bordering on the Lakes. At the first governors' conference of inland America, held recently in Omaha, the seaway was offered as a vital project for the continued growth and economic health of the entire Midwest. The case for the seaway was offered with evidence, and it got a good hearing.

The conference, called by Govs. Mennen Williams, of Michigan, and Val Peterson, of Nebraska, was designed to work out a plan for interregional cooperation. Nebraska and other Missouri Valley States are deeply interested in Missouri Valley flood control, irrigation, transportation, and hydroelectric power development. The Lakes States are interested in St. Lawrence transportation and hydroelectric development. Yet both areas, intertwined in the heartland of America, have joint interests in a mutual industrial-agricultural economy. Each area needs the other to prosper to the fullest extent.

As Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of the Army Engineers and coauthor of the Pick-Sloan plan for the Missouri Valley, told the conference, the Missouri Valley development is 40 percent completed and on its way to realization. But the St. Lawrence seaway has not been started—and yet is almost as vital to the Missouri Valley as the river development itself.

Is that too strong a statement? Conference speakers didn't think so. As Governor Williams and General Pick told the conference, the industrial pattern of the Midwest may change if Labrador's iron ore does not get adequate seaway facilities. Without ore, steel mills will move east. Without steel mills, industry will concentrate in the east. Without expanding industry, the Midwest will have a dominantly agricultural economy.

With the seaway, steel will stay in the Midwest, and so will industry. Further, agricultural and industrial products will find cheap transportation to the east coast. Wheat from Nebraska or Kansas, for instance, will no longer have to go all the way by rail, or be transferred from lake vessels to barges to ocean vessels at Albany. Wheat could go to any seaport in the world after being loaded at Duluth, Milwaukee, or any other lake port.

Thus the seaway would have lasting and direct benefits to Midwest States which do not border the lakes. The Omaha conference was the first big attempt to sell that idea. It's a sound idea. It needs more selling. We hope that the conference and lakes leaders will continue the sales job they have started so effectively.

Annexation Covenant**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article by Wright Morrow, Democratic national committeeman, from the Houston Post of August 8, 1951:

ANNEXATION COVENANT—TIDELANDS DECISION
BREACH OF FAITH—CONGRESS SHOULD REVERSE

(By Wright Morrow)

Recent discussions in the newspapers concerning the Texas tidelands deal with a subject vitally important to Texans—as well as all good Americans. Statements made by Price Daniel, attorney general, are authoritative. He is a student of the subject and is the lawyer for Texas in this case. Statements by Drew Pearson, self-appointed adviser to Texas people, should have no weight, but, unfortunately, no matter how misleading his statements, he has a wide audience. The purpose must be to confuse the issue because the facts are so very plain.

Now comes along Senator Burton K. Wheeler, who turns out to be the lawyer for applicants for Federal leases, which explains his opposition to recognition of the rightful ownership of Texas to her tidelands.

The editorial in today's Houston Post—about Senator Wheeler's claim—is highly commendable. The plain truth is that the Supreme Court of the United States has by judicial edict abrogated the solemn agreement made by the Republic of Texas and the United States in 1845, recognized as absolutely valid for more than 100 years. This decision should be reversed by Congress, which has the right and power to do so. Here are the facts:

Texas was an independent republic; a sovereign nation. Texas owned vast unappropriated public domain. For eight years she maintained her independence and was recognized as a sovereign nation by many prominent nations, including Great Britain, France, and the United States. Texas also owed a very considerable debt. Her people desired to become a part of the United States. There was objection to the annexation of Texas in the Congress of the United States because of the fear that such action might bring on a war with Mexico, and also saddle the Government of the United States with the Texas debt. (Sounds strange now that anybody in the Congress would be worried about a debt of a few million dollars.)

In 1844 a proposal was made by Texas that she would become a member of the United States, would cede her public lands to the United States, which country would in turn, assume and agree to pay the public debts and liabilities of Texas. Though this proposal was advocated by President Tyler, it was re-

jected by the United States Senate by a vote of 35 to 16.

In 1845 the political situation became more propitious. The President-elect, James K. Polk, had been elected on a platform which included the annexation of Texas. The resolution finally providing for the consent of Congress to the annexation was passed by the House in January and the Senate in February and signed by President Tyler as one of his last official acts on March 1, 1845.

The provision in the earlier proposal under which Texas would have ceded her public lands to the United States was deleted and the resolution passed, specifically provided that Texas should retain all her vacant and unappropriated lands lying within her limits, as well as her debts. The specific language in the resolution is this:

"Texas shall also retain all the vacant, unappropriated lands lying within its limits to be applied to the debts and liabilities of said Republic of Texas and the residue of said lands, after discharging said debts and liabilities, to be disposed of as said State may direct."

By resolution of December 19, 1836, the First Congress of the Republic of Texas established the boundary of Texas in the Gulf of Mexico three marine leagues (approximately 10½ miles) from shore. This was the condition and the boundary at the time of the annexation of Texas in 1845.

President Tyler, in his message to the Congress, advocating the annexation of Texas, used this language:

"Texas voluntarily steps forth, upon terms of perfect honor and good faith to all nations, to ask to be annexed to the Union. As an independent sovereignty her right to do this is unquestionable."

On June 1, 1845, the Senate and House of the Texas Republic passed a resolution providing consent on the part of the government of Texas, reciting in a preamble the specific terms of the offer of statehood contained in the joint resolution of the United States Congress. In addition, Texas provided for a constitutional convention to be called in Austin on July 4, 1845, to write a constitution for the new State of Texas. This convention met and during its proceedings ratified and accepted the "proposals, conditions and guaranties" contained in the resolution of the Congress of the United States. On December 8, 1845, the Congress of the United States accepted the terms and formally admitted the State to the Union.

This is a positive, accurate and true statement of the historical record showing that Texas did retain all of its vacant and unappropriated lands lying within its limits when it became a member of the United States. Those lands included the submerged lands for three marine leagues (approximately 10½ miles) from shore, seaward into the Gulf of Mexico. This was the exact situation and the boundary of Texas at the time she became a member of the Union and no honest person can differ with this historical statement. This position has been recognized and maintained since the year 1845—more than a hundred years. For the first time, by the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, the solemn covenants and obligations taken by two sovereign nations were abrogated and nullified.

The people of Texas regard this decision as a complete breach of faith. This is the property of Texas and the revenues that have come from such lands have been appropriated by Texas to the upkeep and maintenance of the public-school system. Whether these lands be valuable or not is incidental. They belong to the State of Texas, and have been taken under a doctrine strange to our law creating a new concept of paramount right which, while

disclaiming the ownership, nevertheless, embraces all rights of ownership, including the right to take the property and all of its resources

We complain that other nations have expropriated private property; we certainly cannot condone the taking of property under such judicial interpretation contrary to the Constitution and without compensation to the owner.

The only way this decision can now be avoided is by the Congress of the United States. A few days ago, the House of Representatives in Washington passed a bill by an overwhelming vote recognizing that these tideland areas belong to the several States, giving effect to the title as it has stood for a hundred years. The same bill is now pending in the United States Senate. In all good conscience, as well as by every legal yardstick, Congress should recognize this ownership and every Texan and every American who believes in upholding constitutional rights should communicate with his Senator or with any Member of the Senate whom he knows, urging immediate passage of this bill. If the President should thereafter veto it, the same should be passed over his veto. The fact that Texas has a larger claim than the other States is due simply to the fact that under the boundaries fixed by the Republic of Texas—an independent nation—prior to her annexation, she is entitled to the 10½ miles seaward. The other States have a similarly righteous claim to that part of these areas within the limits of their respective boundaries.

There has been continuous misleading propaganda that this was an oil company fight. This statement is not true. I am sure that any oil company or any individual who sought to develop any of these submerged lands or to purchase any of them would naturally want to know where the title was before dealing for it. But quite aside from the value of these lands for oil or any other purpose, they are rightly the property of these sovereign States and to refuse to recognize that the decision of the Supreme Court in this matter is wrong, is a serious threat against our American system of constitutional government. The issue has been clouded in the public press, confusion does exist to a large degree caused by discussions of columnists like Drew Pearson (if, indeed, there are others like him).

The interest I have is that I am an American citizen who believes in the preservation and maintenance of our free constitutional government. The attempt to take these submerged lands by judicial edict is an unwarranted use of the judicial power and announces a doctrine entirely new and strange to American jurisprudence.

I cannot urge too strongly that every man and woman who wants to maintain our system of government, who believes in right and justice, should communicate immediately with anyone they know in Congress, particularly in the United States Senate, urging this bill be considered and passed immediately with an overwhelming vote.

Parental Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Jonesboro Evening Sun, Jonesboro, Ark., of Thursday, August 2, 1951:

PARENTAL DELINQUENCY

Fred C. Baxter, referee of the juvenile court in Detroit, has retired after many years service. He had become a recognized authority on matters pertaining to youth, particularly those who came before the court charged with delinquency.

His parting words when leaving the position where he served so long and so well were "Our present crop of youth is as good as any. I wish I could say as much for their parents."

There is a statement which could be pondered long and well by modern parents. What Fred Baxter says amounts to this: The youngsters are all right, and whatever trouble they get into can be blamed on their parents. That is the conclusion of a man who has been handling youth for many years.

Parental neglect is responsible for youthful delinquency. There is evidence of that on every hand. Family life no longer exists in many homes. Families broken by divorce are responsible for considerable juvenile delinquency, but youngsters who lack the influence and example of parental interest furnish the major share of juvenile cases.

Few boys whose fathers have time for them get into trouble. Girls who look upon their mothers as their best friends and companions are seldom seen in a juvenile court. It may sound old-fashioned and fundamental, but families who meet regularly around the dinner table have few problem children.

If society paid more attention to parental delinquency, youngsters would be less of a problem.

An Example Given

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MYRON V. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to submit an editorial of July 31 from the Independence Daily Reporter, Independence, Kans., entitled "An Example Given." This editorial sets out the example of what private enterprise can accomplish when emergencies arise, as in the instance of the recent disastrous floods in Kansas:

AN EXAMPLE GIVEN

A railroad is a large complex business, big as some Government agencies, yet the Santa Fe got its trains running while Federal agencies were getting ready to give relief to flooded businesses. Furthermore, it proposes to rebuild dikes to protect its tracks in the Argentine district without waiting for the Government to unwind its red tape, and hopes it will be repaid.

Newspapers in the area published despite flooded-out plants and the big regional newspaper, the Kansas City Star, delivered its paper by all sorts of expedients. It got the papers into some places where they were not receiving even first-class mail.

The greater flexibility and drive of private enterprise was in many instances giving a good example during flood times of its ability to get its job done better and faster than Government.

There are areas of human activity in which Government has its place and the resources to give aid not otherwise available, but the floods have shown a good example of how much better private enterprise does what it can.

Address by Hon. George D. Aiken, of Vermont, Before Missouri Farmers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who, in my opinion, is the outstanding authority in our country on agricultural legislation, this week delivered an address at the annual convention of the Missouri Farmers Association, Inc., at Columbia, Mo. I commend the address to the attention and study of my colleagues and of the American people, and I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

After several years of frustrated hopes, I am very happy at last to attend this meeting of the Missouri Farmers Association.

I have followed your work for a long time.

I know full well the great good which this organization has done for the farm people of Missouri, and the splendid example you have set for rural America as a whole.

At this time, I want to personally thank you for the signal honor you conferred upon me last year even though I could not be with you at the time.

The distinguished service award of the Missouri Farmers Association now occupies a conspicuous place on the wall of my office and often serves to inflate my spirits and renew my courage when it seems as if it might be futile to go on fighting for the objectives which one knows to be right, but apparently never quite attainable.

Washington is a beautiful city. To the visitor it is impressive, inspirational, and grand.

There is much that the casual visitor does not see, however.

He does not know of the emissaries of special interests and pressure groups that day after day concentrate their efforts on that beautiful Capital.

Your Member of Congress does, however, and so do those engaged in the other branches of Government.

At times we get rather cynical and suspicious and have to get out into the grass roots in order to restore our faith in human nature, and that may be another reason why I am with you in this great farming State of Missouri today.

You are holding this meeting at a time when the world is more on edge and uncertain as to the future than at any time within our memory.

A state of political and economic tension exists over most of the globe.

If there is any part of the world where this tension and uncertainty is most acute, that part is probably the United States.

Are we headed for war or peace? Does the future hold promise of ever-greater prosperity or possible depression?

Can democracy survive or will government by monopoly take over in America, as has happened in many other countries?

I would like to survey briefly the events of the past 15 months in order to provide a background for our discussion on the place of agriculture in our affairs today.

Only 14 months ago, the economy of our country seemed headed for a slump or at least a descent to lower levels.

Over 3,000,000 men were unemployed. Except for a few heavy industries, the lag in production and construction created by World War II had been largely overcome.

Farm prosperity was on the skids to such an extent that limitations on growing certain crops had been invoked.

Congress increased the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation from \$4,750,000,000 to \$6,750,000,000 for price support purposes.

Nearly \$4,000,000,000 had actually been spent on loans and purchases of farm commodities by Government as of June 1, 1950.

Then came the Korean outbreak and the situation changed virtually overnight.

The trend toward depression was definitely off. Unemployment began to ease off. Demand and prices stiffened.

Consumer prices, particularly prices of meats, shot up sharply, although there was no increase to speak of in the price of farm animals for several months afterward.

Our Armed Forces in Japan were sent into Korea to hold back the Communist forces from the north while in this country reservists and National Guardsmen were called to the colors in ever-increasing number.

Orders for war materials increased the tempo of our industrial plants and as more and more men were put back to work in industry, purchasing power increased and along with it the demand for more civilian goods and a higher standard of living.

The Korean war definitely warded off serious economic trouble for the United States.

After the North Korean invasion, the President requested Congress to give him certain powers to deal with the situation.

He asked for higher taxes, for power to allocate critical materials, more drastic controls over credit, etc.

He did not ask for price and wage controls and it was generally understood that he did not want them at that time.

Congress, however, felt differently. We did not know how long the war would last or how quickly and to what extent it might spread.

Prices and wages were on the upgrade already.

So in the Defense Production Act of last September 8, Congress made provision for price and wage controls which the President could exercise when and if he found it necessary.

Price and wage controls are not a cure for inflation.

They cannot even prevent inflation.

But if properly and promptly exercised, these superficial remedies can hold the line to a reasonable degree until the more basic remedies for inflationary causes can be applied and the need for direct controls is abated.

CANADIAN EXAMPLE

Instead of freezing prices and wages promptly last fall, the Government actually took steps which tended to increase prices.

It is true that credit controls were strengthened and taxes increased.

This undoubtedly has had a beneficial effect on the situation.

But while these practical basic controls were being applied, there was being made available to banks through the purchase of Government bonds by the Federal Reserve banks some \$8,000,000,000 of new credit. It was not until March this year that steps were taken to stop this inflationary practice.

Had this new credit been used for purposes of increasing productive facilities, it would not have been harmful.

But, as a matter of fact, some 60 percent of it was made available to dealers, processors, and speculators who used it to bid up prices of many commodities, with cotton leading the way.

The situation was still further aggravated by a series of scare pronouncements predicting scarcity and higher prices to come.

This induced considerable panic buying in late fall and early winter.

By January the President concluded the time was ripe to impose price controls.

I am not going to discuss the operations of the price-control program to date.

My vocabulary is totally inadequate, and besides everyone here knows what has happened as well as I do.

You know of the Nation-wide propaganda campaign by the metropolitan press and others—even high Government officials themselves—to make it appear that the farmer and not the "love of money" is the "root of all evil."

You know only too well how the roll-back on beef in May took \$500,000,000 from the farmer without reducing consumer prices a single penny. You know too that only a half dozen farm commodities are selling above parity today.

Every farmer in America can thank his lucky stars that when the Defense Production Act, with its provision for price controls, expired on July 1 of this year, the Eighty-second Congress stepped forward and said to the control boys, "You are going to stop right here. You cannot go on with your plans to further throttle the American farmer and make him the scapegoat for everything that goes wrong." Not horse-meat—horse-sense Congress.

The price-control law enacted by Congress a few days ago gives the President all the power he needs to adequately control inflationary tendencies as far as price and wage controls alone can do so.

Let us hope this power will be used wisely. It will not control the billions upon billions of cost plus contracts.

So let's not discuss price controls further but consider where we are now and what we have learned from our thirteen months of crusading in Korea.

First, as I have already said, the Korean war warded off depression by skimming off the surplus labor supply of the Nation through the increase in the Armed Forces, by increasing consumer purchasing power, by Government buying, and by creating an added demand for consumer goods which were coming into heavy surplus.

And where are we today? Instead of the predicted shortages, there are still surpluses of almost every kind of consumer goods on the market.

Even the restriction on the use of materials for the manufacture of goods has so far failed to materially reduce the output.

For the first 6 months of this year, there actually came off the assembly lines more automobiles than were produced during the corresponding months of 1950.

There are heavy supplies of almost every farm commodity except finished beef and a promise of heavier surpluses to come with the autumn.

The industrial productive capacity of the Nation is increasing tremendously under the new tax deferment plan which enables manufacturers to amortize the cost of a new facility over a 5-year period instead of the usual 20-25 year period.

Certificates of necessity amounting to \$8,450,000,000 had already been approved as of July 27 of this year.

The Congress has been told that General Motors alone is constructing 41 new plants at a cost of \$245,000,000 although only about 10 percent of that great corporation's existing facilities are presently engaged in producing war materials.

It is apparent that the productive capacity of the United States will soon be so great that except in times of all-out war we can maintain a force of 5,000,000 men in the armed services and still be able to produce all the civilian goods which we will need.

Should the time come when war clouds no longer threaten and the enormous pro-

ductive capacity of American industry is no longer needed for war preparation we will be confronted with a problem of major degree.

What a tragedy it is that as a Nation we must rely upon war or the threat of war to maintain full employment and economic prosperity.

What a challenge to us all to find some other way to maintain prosperity in the midst of plenty.

It is against this baffling background that we must view the American agricultural scene today.

From here on I will devote myself to the consideration of those things which pertain particularly to the American farmer—his hopes, his prospects, and his problems—your problems and mine.

Like American industry the American farmer can, if not hamstrung or hog-tied by too many rules and regulations, produce far more than enough to meet the needs of the country for food and fiber.

Those who say we are nearing the limit of our capacity to produce are looking through dark-colored glasses.

True, we must guard against the loss of our land and forests by floods or other causes.

That is just what we are doing, although our pace may be too slow in this respect.

If we take care of our land, however, continue our scientific research, and keep abreast of new developments, we can far exceed our present production or needs for the foreseeable future.

Although this is not the place to discuss the comparative merits of the agencies, I will say here that over the country as a whole, the Extension Service, the Production and Marketing Administration, and the Soil Conservation Service have all done splendid work in preserving and improving the land and water resources of our farms.

I give these agencies much credit for the 35-percent increase in production which our farmers made during World War II.

The increased productivity of our farms has brought with it certain problems.

It is so easy to overproduce now.

As a sponsor of the Agricultural Act of 1948 and a supporter of the amendments offered in 1949, I can say that I believe the laws now on the statutes give the farmer reasonable protection against bankruptcy caused by overproduction.

Some people think that price support legislation is designed to guarantee the farmer a profit. That is not so.

The primary purpose of price supports is to encourage the production of an adequate supply of food and fiber and to build a defense against economic depressions for the whole country.

Although we have been hearing most about price ceilings lately, it is a certainty that we will be hearing more about support programs from now on.

We will apparently have another splendid crop year nationally with heavy surpluses in some commodities.

The Government purchase and loan program will again become increasingly important by harvest time this fall.

The increased activity of this program will be the signal for renewed and intensified attacks upon our farm people by those who will use the support program as an excuse.

The farmer is today subject to attack on two fronts.

On one front by those who would break the independent political power of American agriculture, which today is greater than our numbers would indicate.

On the second front we are continually under attack by those who would break the economic power of the farmer thus making him an easier subject for exploitation for profit.

So long as the farmer had a mortgage on his farm and stock; so long as he was willing to pay what price was demanded and sell for what the market would pay; so long as he left the farm just once a year to attend the county fair; so long as his children quit school at 15 and so long as he voted the straight ticket, he was a pretty good fellow and not subject to abuse and criticism.

But, when he showed up in town in good clothes and driving a new car to meet the kids coming home from college, and when he began to ask questions about the fellows he was asked to vote for, and when he joined with his fellow farmers to make lower-cost purchases or higher-priced sales, he became transformed into a sinister being whose main purpose in life is to gouge the consumer and to deprive the gentlemen of the commodity markets and the farm supply monopolies of their traditional right to make a few million honest dollars.

He was no longer a simple-minded patriot, but a menace to society that had to be dealt with.

Agriculture traditionally has been a target for those who either want to exploit farmers directly or use them as decoys to draw attention away from the real offenders in the grab-bag groups.

For too many years, the farmer has supplied food and fiber at prices far below what he rightfully should have received. Many farmers went broke doing it.

In recent years, since the farmer has been doing better in making a living, there is a tendency to blame him for everything that goes wrong, and to point the finger of scorn at him if he makes a profit, or to play him against other groups in accordance with the "divide and conquer theory."

Those who do this seem to forget that we are operating under a capitalistic system, where profit is the economic yardstick.

Is it so unjust that the farmer should make a profit as industry does?

The fact that the farmer's profit is so much less than industry's should not bar him from the right to make some.

The farmers of this Nation have been, and still are, the main bulwark of our democracy.

The farmer's traditional self-reliance, his fortitude, his propensity for hard work, and his love of freedom have contributed greatly to the perpetuation of our way of life, and our form of government.

Perhaps the greatest pitfall the farmer faces today is the temptation being held out to him to barter these sterling qualities for an easier, seemingly surer gain—short-lived though it surely would be.

To yield to this temptation now would undermine the source of our strength at the very time we need it most.

It would be tragic, indeed, if the American farmer should be lured into the belief that only the genius of an all-powerful, benevolent state can provide the answers to our problems in peace and in war through regulation and control of our daily lives.

Those who would break the independent political power of the farmer would make him dependent upon Government payments for a sizable portion of his income—that portion which represents the difference between profit and loss.

There is no denying the fact that this is the road that leads to political servitude.

It is no idle saying that with control of the purse string goes the creeping paralysis of absolute control.

The recent proposals to freeze parity, which is the farmers economic yardstick—by calculating it only once a year—the effort to freeze ceilings on farm commodities below parity—some far below and the demand for authority to establish general consumer sub-

sidies are all steps which if granted would put the squeeze play on the farmers.

For many years I have advocated a plan whereby people with little income can be sure of enough to eat.

I have not and do not now advocate a general food subsidy for all.

Such a course at this time would be not only expensive but contributory to inflation as well.

Furthermore, I insist that any consumer subsidy at all should be labeled for what it is and not charged up to the farmer as part of an agricultural-relief program.

As farmers we have as much right to a fair price in the market place as has anyone else

The best hope for farmers to stand off the forces of either political or economic monopoly is for them to stand together.

As you well know, a strong rallying point for farmers is the farm organizations.

The unorganized farmer today would fall an easy prey to organized political or economic exploitation.

Your Missouri Farmers Association is an outstanding example of what farmers can do through organized cooperation, functioning through able leadership.

By all means we must maintain and strengthen our farm cooperatives.

Cooperatives have been a powerful factor in combating monopoly and keeping alive the spirit of free competition in America.

They, in the truest sense, represent real economic democracy, because they are owned and controlled by the farmers who use them. Cooperatives have come a long way in America.

Today there are more than 19,000 farmer-owned and controlled cooperative associations and mutual companies in the United States

That figures out at an average of more than 6 co-ops for each of the 3,000 counties in the country.

There are 282 farmer marketing and purchasing cooperatives in Missouri alone

That is why so many of you live in good homes, cultivate good farms, and send your children to college.

The figures I have been giving are separate and apart from the nearly 1,000 locally owned and controlled rural electrification co-ops throughout the Nation.

Here in Missouri, the REA program has made characteristic, tremendous strides forward.

There are 48 REA co-ops in your State, 43 of which are in operation now and 5 in the process of starting operation.

The number of electrified farms in Missouri has increased from 17,893 or 6.4 percent of the farms in the State in 1935 to about 160,000 farms or around 70 percent in 1950.

Every REA co-op in Missouri is paid up to date as of March 31, 1951, in principal and interest on its loans and \$800,000 in principal has been paid in advance of due date.

This is a record of which you may be justly proud.

This is an investment which you will have to fight for if you would maintain it.

During the last 15 years, the average Missouri farm has doubled the per month consumption of electricity.

The rural electric co-ops were organized to serve territory which public utility operators said could not be economically served.

They predicted that anyone—including the cooperatives—would go broke trying to serve the areas that now are being served.

The percentage of electrified farms in the United States has increased from 10.9 percent in 1935 to 86.3 percent in 1950, and these co-ops are still going strong.

Now that the co-ops have done what the corporations said was impossible they are

being subjected to an all-out attack intended to either destroy them or bring them under control of the corporate monopolies.

They need to have an ample, continuing supply of electricity at reasonable rates and sufficient transmission lines of their own to guarantee that service will continue to be available to co-op members.

Day after day, 365 days in the year, the electric power monopolies are working for legislation that will require the co-ops to buy their power from the private utilities and to transmit power only over company-owned transmission lines.

If they succeed in this scheme the time, effort, and expenditures made to date by REA cooperators will have been in vain for farmers will still be at the mercy of the utilities in the pricing schedule and in the transmission of power

The electric light corporations have designated the last week in August as Rural Electrification Week.

What effrontery it is that these corporations who did everything within their power to prevent the extension of cooperative electric lines into the farming areas should now have the nerve to claim credit for bringing light and power to 3,000,000 farm homes which are served by the REA

They want the public to think the job is done and that they did it

So long as 30 percent of the farms in Missouri are still without light and power the job is not done.

The monopolies are just up to their same old tricks of trying to prevent any development in the field of electric service which they cannot control. They use the divide-and-conquer theory on regional basis—Missouri Valley versus St. Lawrence

Their ultimate aim is unquestionably to take over or control the cooperative systems of the country.

This is no time for complacency just because most of our farms are now served with electricity.

The REA is in danger. Farmers must fight to save it, and fight hard

A continuing threat to co-ops in general is the insidious and relentless propaganda campaign that is being waged against them.

Those who do not like the competition of cooperatives want to see them destroyed at any cost and by any means.

The ringleader of this attempt to discredit the co-ops is the so-called National Tax Equality Association

This association with the high-sounding name has been labeled "an unscrupulous racket" by Congressman DANIEL A. REED, of New York

A long list of contributors to the NTEA was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 20, 1951, by Congressman REED.

This is a revealing list and shows that the main contributors to this attack on farm cooperatives are the power interests, grain dealers, lumber groups, and fertilizer interests.

The enemies of farm cooperatives try to give the impression that co-ops do not pay taxes.

We all know that the co-ops pay taxes like any other business on real estate, personal property, equipment, occupational licenses, social-security taxes, various excise taxes, sales taxes, and use taxes.

Congress has never considered it proper or advisable to tax patronage refunds in the hands of the cooperatives, since the co-op members themselves pay income taxes on these refunds.

And if I read the signs correctly, the present Congress will never be a party to any effort to destroy farm cooperatives—but will tell the "unscrupulous racketeers" referred to by Congressman REED just where to get off.

All farmers, both co-op members and non-co-op members, need to be on the alert

against the forces that would destroy them, and make them puppets of monopoly empires.

Big government and big business—both can be monopolistic. Both can be equally dangerous insofar as the welfare of the rank-and-file citizen is concerned.

A lesson we must learn well is that we have to be alert on the home front as well as on the international front.

So long as the forces of aggression abroad are on the prowl, we need to keep our Nation strong—so strong that others will be afraid to attack us—but this effort will be for naught if in the process we lose either our economic or political freedom right here at home.

We must not overlook the fact that America's main strength is in ourselves.

Just as our Nation so often in the past has faced many hours of need, this again is America's hour of need—need for true faith in democracy and sincere devotion to the cause of freedom—need for men and women of character and of courage who will neither be bought nor scared nor fooled.

Whenever our country has been in need, the farmers have been in the forefront ready to do their part in a crisis.

Organized agriculture can make tremendous contributions to the defense of the Nation against any foreign foe.

Organized agriculture can be the first line of defense against loss of our political or economic freedom at home.

There is no higher example of the effectiveness of farm organizations than the Missouri Farmers Association.

May your good work continue on an ever improving basis.

Enact H. R. 1896 and Relieve the Milk Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we are continually confronted with schemes to control the cost of living, with certain administration spokesmen constantly clamoring for more and more power in order to put the producers of this Nation into more and greater strait-jackets.

Once more I wish to call attention to H. R. 1896, a bill which I introduced to authorize the shipment of grade A milk into the District of Columbia. This legislation will not create any new jobs on the Federal payroll; nor will it require any interference with the normal channels of trade.

We hear much about the good-neighbor policy, but we would like to have the Congress be good enough to Wisconsin and other Midwestern States to allow grade A milk to be sold in the city of Washington.

Washington is the only city over which the Congress has the direct responsibility. In allowing grade A milk to be sold in Washington at a reasonable price, no doubt the consumers of other cities would see the light and permit the good products of Wisconsin to be sold within their

condines on the basis of scientific facts and common sense.

Wisconsin produces over 10 percent of the milk of the Nation and can supply more grade A milk than any other State at the present time. It is prevented from marketing this milk in Washington by artificial trade barriers and discriminatory regulations, but the Congress can change this situation any time it wishes to do so.

Means have been devised for concentrating milk, thereby reducing the transportation charges by two-thirds, which places the Midwest closer to the Washington markets.

One dairy plant in my district has an intake of over a million pounds of milk a day and many other reliable milk co-operatives and privately owned dairy plants in our State have equally large intakes of milk. If some of this milk could be brought into Washington and distributed, it would not be necessary to curtail the supply of milk at Fort Belvoir and other Army camps as it is at the present time. We must remember that this dairy product constitutes 30 percent of the consumer's needs and yet it only costs 15 percent of the consumer's dollar.

I am asking that this bill, H. R. 1896, be passed so the milk companies of Washington may sell this grade A milk the same as any other grade A products.

Flight to Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on August 6, 1951, entitled "Flight to Freedom":

FLIGHT TO FREEDOM

The news about Poland is good and loud. In the last 2 days the free world has been treated to the thrilling stories of Poles who risked their lives for freedom. First there was the mutiny on a Polish mine sweeper, with a dozen crewmen taking asylum in a Swedish port. Then came the melodramatic tale of four Polish youngsters who fled to Sweden in a ramshackle airplane after overpowering airfield sentries and eluding military pursuit. Now these are only episodes involving a few people, but they speak with a simple force capable of only one interpretation. The state of affairs inside Poland is obviously bad from the viewpoint of Stalin and Molotov. Just how bad is a matter for speculation, but these heroic escapes are the best kind of evidence that the Poles have had enough of their Russian slave masters. Marshal Tito was quite evidently not speaking utterly through his hat when he said some days ago that Poland is in a state of revolt.

We applaud the bravery of the Poles who chased everything for liberty, and hope that Sweden will provide real refuge for them and all others to come. These breaks for freedom show the Russians have not yet

managed to crush the human spirit in Poland, and that this satellite state will require force, and then more force, to be kept in bondage to the Kremlin. Stalin and Molotov must be worried, and for good reason. In the end, no amount of force can keep Poland under heel. We hope there is plenty of trouble inside Poland; the more of it the better toward hastening the day that tyranny collapses of its own weight.

I Am a Bureaucrat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, there was published in the spring issue of the Public Administration Review, the Journal of the American Society for Public Administration, an article entitled "I am a Bureaucrat," by Wycliffe Allen. This is a pseudonym for a Government employee who has written here what I consider a very interesting commentary on the present mental attitude and plight of thousands of Government workers. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I AM A BUREAUCRAT

(By Wycliffe Allen)

According to both the press and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am one who gormandizes at the public trough. I am the incarnation of all the sloths through all the ages. I live off the hard-earned salaries of neighbors and the profits of tax-paying industries.

For this parasitical existence, I give, apparently little value. I am supposed to put in, each day, 8 hours of cat naps intermingled with pen-pushing. I am believed to manufacture red tape in amazing quantities and to protect myself from reformers by means of the greatest lobby in Washington. The movie industry, like the cartoonists, finds me a fit subject for ridicule.

Still, be what I may, I am a good portion of the brain, arms, and legs by which our national hopes and aspirations are brought to their fruition. During war and in all peacetime emergencies, the administrative machinery of which I am a part is an essential ingredient in whatever is the country's formula for winning through. And yet, in spite of whatever may be my successes, as a bureaucrat my loyalty to the Government for which I work is questioned indiscriminately and constantly.

For years, standard Federal practice has required the fingerprinting of all new or transferred employees, with copies to the FBI. Yet recently Congress appropriated \$20,000,000 to investigate me all over again. That I survived is a minor matter.

So now, investigated, fingerprinted, reinvestigated, I am a provedly loyal Federal bureaucrat—an officeholder. How did I get that way? Well, public belief to the contrary notwithstanding—I worked for it.

In the beginning, a careless college question, tossed during a swimming pool chat, cast the die. "Ever think of public service?"

I thought of city, county, State, and Federal Government. County governments I discarded; they were, it seemed to me, "the black continent of American government." That left cities, States, or the Federal Government. Each of these offered a challenge. In varying degrees they faced the problem of maintaining political decisions as the essence of democracy, while improving efficiency of operations and decisiveness of action.

After a graduate year of intensive scholastic effort, I gained employment with an industrial engineering organization which devoted its full activities to city, county, State, and national governmental organization and techniques. Subsequently, for the greater part of a decade, I hit the sawdust trail of improved local government administration. World War II tossed me into administrative military service. When World War II was over, I competed for, and won, what is considered a well-paying job in a Federal agency, well-paying, of course, by public employment standards, not by any others.

Thus you, the tax public, have paid my salary, directly or indirectly for over 15 civilian and military years. What has my work meant to you? With many other bureaucrats I have played a small part in improving the level of service you receive from government for the price you pay. Many cities and some States can now make numbers of so-called business-managed industries look a ledgerly red by comparison. In the past 20 years, interest in effective operations has mushroomed among public officials. In addition to the usual night school and correspondence efforts of ambitious clerks, key administrators—city, State, and Federal—have been willing to study specialized college courses on their own time and out of their own pockets. City managers travel at night halfway across a Midwestern State to hold weekly seminars on management techniques, with a managers' correspondence course as text. Finance officers, assessors, personnel men, public works officials avidly complete correspondence courses from the Institute for Training in Municipal Administration, and study at the extension courses in their city as they work toward a graduate college degree. Their annual standard of comparison is not the personal profit sheet but improved effectiveness of service. Many operations, in government as elsewhere, are susceptible of cost analysis; it has been applied with zest. Yes, you'll find cost accountants, systems accountants, industrial engineers in the public service, though without the titles or salaries of their industry counterparts. They are all bureaucrats—like me.

Occasionally I read with envy of some of the administrative practices in industry. An industry may rely almost completely on sales to the Federal Government for its balance sheet profits, but the "protectionist," red-tape-creating devices you have forced on me are not extended to it. Pounds of regulations, inspections, internal audits, and post-audits, the General Accounting Office and the Civil Service Commission—all of these were created by you in laws so written that the conclusion to be drawn from them is inescapable. You do not trust me to do a job without circumscribing restrictions, not unless it is a job in private employment.

So you protect the purity of public business by legal red tape. I have seen competent staffs struggling for several years to try to cut away needless and costly strictures in administrative channels. For the most part these were created by your fear of me and fellow bureaucrats, a fear extended through your legislative representatives.

Abonders shun the Federal service, with its stiff bonds for certifying officers, its General Accounting Office audits, and its various investigatory agents, including Treasury agents and the FBI. Nevertheless, you load Federal employees down with triple pro-

cedural checks and minutiae. Our accounts are not designed primarily to serve useful administrative purposes. The design is that they shall be kept in such manner as to allow the General Accounting Office an easier audit, and also to permit congressional inquiries to be answered rapidly.

You make us hire employees in 1950 by methods prescribed as an aftermath of a disappointed job-seeker's assassination of President Garfield in the 1880's. You make us discipline employees by means of a letter-writing etiquette reminiscent of Victorian parlors. You make us fire them by legal document. When your congressional representatives cut appropriations, the resulting layoffs are carried out by regulations operating in such a way that master mechanics or naval gun foremen with 20 years of experience are laid off while a war veteran with 1 year of service remains, secure as long as he earns a "good" efficiency rating. "Good" represents far less than a numerical average. Career service? What happens to the 20 years of training and skilled experience the Federal Government loses? You concede this to be a waste of money and men? And yet you do not correct it—you, working through your representatives.

There are not only wastes to be corrected, there are basic inequities, too. Assuming your desire for improved governmental service, bureaucrats can see but three reasons why you do not make your views known to your legislators.

First, you don't really care. Government exists only as a whipping post for after-dinner bull sessions. It affects no other part of your life.

Second, you think in the terms of programs and ideas, but not of the details required to carry them out. Perhaps your Congressman thinks the same way. An economy committee of the House or Senate might, if it meant business, call upon the General Accounting Office, the Civil Service Commission, and the Bureau of the Budget to assist it in saving Federal funds by pointing out to the committee administrative anachronisms or needless details required by Congressional legislation. But does it?

Third, you are doubtless a member of one or more organized pressure groups acting on your Congressman to secure favorable legislation, or to lay before Congressmen sentiments accurately reflecting public opinion. Your group may concentrate on the Federal Government for direct economic gain, as have the labor groups, or the National Association of Manufacturers. Or it may expect the Federal Government to save its individual consciences for its having failed to do, as private individuals, what the Government is requested to do. In this connection, the privileges legislated for veterans in the Federal service are of interest when compared with industry practices toward veterans. Or, finally, your pressure group may concentrate on the Federal Government as a sounding board for broad ethical, theological, economic, or social convictions affecting a way of life. As such it may be responsible for a new basic law. Laws have to be administered.

Federal agencies are thus created to meet needs. Generally speaking, those needs are impressed on Congress by constituents. If you care to review events leading up to the creation of one more Federal agency, you may find its ghosts in your pressure closet. When a Presidential reorganization or Hoover Commission report threatens your independent agency, your anguished cries bear no relation to the improved services that might result. When economy is called for, you demand cuts in all appropriations except those for your pressurized baby. Initial cuts in the budget recommended by the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate disappear, and the budget as passed may be as large as, or larger than, that submitted by the Chief Executive. So I, the

bureaucrat, catch the hot potato—and hold it. There is no other receiver. Provided with an appropriation to carry out a given program, I hire employees to do the job. Immediately arise the cries, "Too many employees," "bureaucratic waste," "empire building."

Yes; I am a bureaucrat, a public officeholder. I am proud of that fact, proud that I serve with other bureaucrats dedicated to performing the work of the Federal Government as effectively as you permit us to do. Naturally there are a few drones among us bureaucrats, but surprisingly few. You will find their counterparts in industry in as great or in greater numbers.

Partisan politics is no problem in the Federal administrative service. As in industry, it is office politics which causes the havoc, office politics based on cliques, personalities, and ambitions. Even so, we have no sixth vice presidents, in charge of the executive lunchroom, who are related to the board chairman.

Your Federal Government is the largest corporation on earth. Many of its administrative ills are common to any organization plagued with bigness, private or public. Many, too, will be corrected only when individuals and groups look beyond their special interests and accept an occasional bureaucratic recommendation in the interests of all. Your Federal Government has become big because the fancied or real needs of people were translated by their representatives into law. The only possible profit sheet for Government must be in terms of services rendered now or human and physical resources developed for posterity. Working for such a corporation is a challenge which requires considerably more than 8 hours of my day, bureaucrat though I be. You would be shocked at the pleasure I get from snipping red tape here and improving a process there. For I am a taxpayer, too.

Taxes Set Record in 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "Taxes Set Record in 1950," issued by the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, yesterday.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAXES SET RECORD IN 1950

Federal, State, and local Government tax revenue in 1950 amounted to a record \$54,-626,000,000, according to a report on governmental revenue in 1950 issued today by the Census Bureau. This was 2 percent above the 1949 amount. The previous high of \$54,495,000,000 was for 1948.

The 1949-50 increase was the net result of a small decrease in Federal collections and of marked increases in State and local government tax yields. Tax revenue of the Federal Government decreased slightly from \$37,810,000,000 to \$37,684,000,000. State taxes rose from \$8,349,000,000 to \$8,940,000,000, or 7 percent, and local government taxes rose from \$7,417,000,000 to \$8,002,000,000, or 8 percent. These amounts relate to net revenue in the various fiscal years, after deduction of tax refunds.

Total tax yields in 1950 were equal to \$360 per person. About 70 percent of this amount, or \$248 per capita, was collected by the Federal Government. The States received \$59 per person, and local governments the remaining \$53 per person. Tax revenue in 1942 had amounted to \$23,027,000,000, or \$171 per capita.

Taxes provided 95 percent of the \$57,565,000,000 total of governmental revenue in 1950, the Census Bureau report shows. Charges for governmental services and other nontax revenue produced the remaining \$2,939,000,000.

Because of financial grants and tax sharing as between the Federal Government, States, and local governments, each level finally has for its own direct spending a different amount than it collects in taxes and charges. Taking account of such intergovernmental transfers, the Federal Government had 63 percent of total governmental revenue in 1950 "for its own purposes," local governments 23 percent, and the States 14 percent.

Taxes on individual income provided 29 percent of all governmental revenue in 1950, the Census report shows. This source yielded \$16,472,000,000 or \$109 per capita. About 95 percent of this amount was collected by the Federal Government. The 1950 yield was 2 percent higher than in 1949 but was substantially less than the record \$19,762,000,000 collected in 1948.

Sales and gross receipts taxes and customs provided \$12,986,000,000 in 1950 as compared with \$12,596,000,000 in 1949. This category includes excises and selective sales taxes, such as those on gasoline, alcoholic beverages, and cigarettes, as well as "general" sales taxes.

Corporation income taxes amounted to \$11,043,000,000 in 1950 as against \$11,844,000,000 in 1949. These amounts compare with the high of \$15,547,000,000 set in 1945, when the World War II excess-profits tax was in force.

Property taxes amounted to \$7,366,000,000 in 1950 as compared with \$6,842,000,000 in 1949 and \$4,544,000,000 in 1942. Local governments collected nearly all of these sums, the States receiving only about \$300,000,000 annually. Property taxes provided 52 percent of total local government revenue in 1950. In addition to tax revenue, local governments received fiscal aid amounting to \$4,166,000,000 as well as \$1,377,000,000 from charges and miscellaneous nontax revenue.

Social insurance taxes provided nearly 7 percent of total governmental revenue in 1950, the Census report shows. Death and gift taxes and other minor tax sources accounted for about 5 percent.

Veto of H. R. 3193 and H. R. 3549

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 10, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and telegram:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Washington, D. C., August 9, 1951.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: The Disabled American Veterans protests the veto by the President of the United States on August 6, 1951, of the bills H. R. 3193 and H. R. 3549.

Historically, the Disabled American Veterans has always been a "single purpose" organization dedicated to the welfare and rehabilitation of the service-connected wartime disabled. In protesting the Presidential veto of H. R. 3193 and H. R. 3549, we are cognizant that the provisions of these two bills are designed primarily for veterans, or their dependents, eligible for non-service-connected pensions. Our endorsement of these two bills, however, is justified by the knowledge that many veterans in receipt of part III benefits should actually be service-connected.

H. R. 3193 is applicable only to those who are blind or helpless because of physical or mental disability and require the regular aid and attendance of another person. To deny to this small segment of veterans of World War I and World War II sufficient pension to employ the services of an aid appears extremely inequitable. It must be borne in mind that veterans of the Spanish-American War have already been granted a pension equal to that provided by H. R. 3193. An additional factor that should be considered is that it is far more costly for the Veterans' Administration to maintain these blind and helpless veterans in a hospital than it is to provide them with a pension of \$120 a month.

With respect to H. R. 3549, its application is so limited that the Veterans' Administration was not requested to give an estimate of the cost when under consideration by the Congress.

It is understood that the bill would add a very limited number of widows of veterans of the Civil War, Indian War, and the Spanish-American War to the pension rolls and at an age when their remaining life expectancy is of extremely short duration.

Your assistance in effecting the passage of H. R. 3193 and H. R. 3549, despite the veto of the President of the United States is sincerely solicited.

Respectfully,

FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
National Legislative Director.

BOSTON, MASS., August 9, 1951.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Massachusetts veterans bitterly disappointed by President Truman's veto of H. R. 3193 and H. R. 3549. The action of the President in vetoing a bill to provide a pension increase to helpless and blind veterans of World Wars I and II is inconsistent and indefensible. The veto of proposal for the modification of eligibility requirements for a few old widows of Civil, Indian, and Spanish-American wars is equally unjust and indefensible. The Department of Massachusetts Veterans of Foreign Wars therefore, in the name of justice and decency, urge you to override the President's veto.

TIMOTHY J. MURPHY,
Department Commander, Veterans
of Foreign Wars.

Moral Leadership: Our National Necessity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include a very timely and thought-provoking editorial by Mr. George So-

kolsky, which appeared in the Times-Herald issue of August 9, 1951.

With scholarly conciseness, Mr. Sokolsky analyzes one of the most challenging problems of the hour and presents some constructive suggestions which are worthy of wide dissemination and interest, especially to those who occupy positions of public leadership.

His article follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

Senator FULBRIGHT's proposal, which amounts to shifting the West Point scandal to an investigation of intercollegiate football, is not sound. The problem is not football; it is the morals of a nation. It is not whether subsidized, paid athletics in the colleges is to be forgiven; it is rather that something has gone out of this Nation when cheating is taken as lightly as fixing, which used to be called graft.

It is easy for those who think only in the terms of immediate party politics or, even worse, of their personal friendships to shunt off everything that happens into the category of the usual.

But those who insist upon a moral criterion cannot help asking, "Why is it usual? Why has it become usual?"

It is possible to say that the twentieth century is not the nineteenth century, but that does not mean that the twentieth century is an improvement on the nineteenth or even on the twelfth century. What is called modern does not necessarily mean better as anyone who listens to Bach and Shostakovich on the same program knows.

If by improvement we mean that an automobile is a superior means of locomotion to a horse and buggy, or that a gun is superior to a bow and arrow, then we have made very great progress.

But when the morals of man are considered, we are halted by the astonishing retreat of the twentieth century with its excess of divorces, its broken homes, its emphasis on homosexuality, its acceptance of materialistic Marxism in wide areas that were so recently Christian, its avoidance of such concepts as faith, honor, dignity, sacrifice. If we assume that God is old-fashioned and that his natural law is superstition, then we must not be shocked by what happened at West Point.

These 90 men accused of cheating contend that they are not the only ones and that it has been going on for some time.

Does that make it right? Is that an excuse for conduct? Because some men are dope peddlers, is dope peddling justified? The position is so illogical that the men who use it as an excuse display their unworthiness.

This is a question that Americans have to answer if they wish to preserve our Nation and our civilization. It is impossible to say that "deep freezers," "mink coats," fixers close to the White House, and incident after incident of loose morals in high places are usual in all governments. In our long history such incidents have been unusual.

These are the clinical evidences of a decaying civilization, just as wholesale and prolonged cribbing at West Point is a symptom of degeneracy among our Armed Forces. For these young men, under the circumstances of West Point education, could not have engaged in this practice without officer connivance. This undoubtedly is their real defense.

These symptoms need to be studied back to their causes. When there is such widespread degradation among the people, it means clearly two things:

1. The moral leadership of the Nation is inadequate for influencing oncoming generations in decent, dignified leadership and living;

2. The religious training of youth is inadequate to sustain them through the trials of life by precept, inspiration, example, and by supplying the automatic restraints of moral conduct.

The individuals involved in the West Point scandal will suffer personal indignity and a loss of great opportunity, but there is much more to this. This Nation is now challenged by an incident which involves all our children. What is being done in our schools to build character? The public-school ideal was designed not only to teach reading and writing, but to breed a race of decent, honest, God-loving human beings. What happens to our children in the first years of their lives? This we need to understand if we are to grasp our current apathy concerning indecencies.

It may require moving deeply into the whole question of national morals, of up-bringing, of education, of purely functional schooling without religion.

We need to know why our people are not outraged at the shameless corruption of our country. Something has gone terribly wrong with us, and we need to know what it is and why it happened.

It Could Happen Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MYRON V. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the disastrous flood that has just taken place in Kansas, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to submit an editorial from the *Arkansas City Daily Traveler*, *Arkansas City, Kans.*, of July 30, entitled "It Could Happen Here." This editorial very well explains how industry is affected without proper flood protection:

IT COULD HAPPEN HERE

On top of all its direct losses from the great flood, Topeka was hit last week end by another kind of blow as a result of the Kaw's mighty rampage. It lost a big industry to the river.

The John Morrell meat packing plant in Topeka will not reopen. Company directors feel the cost of rehabilitating the big establishment from river damage is too great to justify continuing the operation.

Loss of 1,200 Morrell jobs is certain to prove something of a shock to the State capital, particularly coming on the heels of the flood itself. Topeka is big as Kansas towns go, however, and the city has been booming lustily. The set-back is likely to be a temporary one with the slack quickly absorbed.

The Morrell decision, however, is one which deserves due attention in Arkansas City. This community's largest industries also are situated in the river valleys—the Santa Fe, Maurer-Neuer, Kanotex and Arkansas City flour mills to quote the top of the list. They are potentially just as vulnerable to flood invasion as was John Morrell in Topeka. The ultimate results of such a disaster might prove just as costly to the community or even more so.

The experience of Topeka, Kansas City, Manhattan, Ottawa and other unfortunate Kansas cities proves conclusively the grim necessity of maintaining the most complete flood protection humanly possible. The Kaw's unprecedented rampage illustrates

clearly the folly of resting on historical performances.

Arkansas City should do everything within its power to continue the ceaseless job of improving its river defenses. What happened in Topeka might just as easily have happened here.

Republican Eightieth Congress Vindicated by Events

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, remember President Truman's 1948 campaign accusation that the Republican Eightieth Congress was the worst in the Nation's history? That vicious libel has recently received repudiation from an unexpected and highly qualified source.

Democratic Chairman CARL VINSON, of the House Armed Services Committee, told the Rules Committee on August 6 that the Republican Eightieth Congress had done "much more" to build up the defenses of the country than was done by the Democratic Eighty-first Congress. Mr. Vinson said that the Republican Eightieth Congress established a "magnificent" record in the field of national preparedness and had voted defense appropriations that went "far above" the requests of the Truman administration.

This week the House approved a \$56,000,000,000 defense appropriation bill for 1952. This action was preceded with warnings that "we are not now strong enough to exert the maximum force for peace in the world" and with expressions of concern over the "race against time" in achieving maximum defense.

I voted for these necessary, unavoidable defense appropriations—as I have consistently done in the past. But I voted for these appropriations fully aware that the amount of the appropriations and the present concern over the race against time are both immensely increased because the Truman administration thwarted and stymied the preparedness measures voted by the Republican Eightieth Congress. The American people need to understand that fact.

This "worst" Eightieth Congress voted expansion of the Air Force to 70 groups and appropriated funds for that purpose; President Truman impounded \$978,000,000 of those funds and cut the Air Force back to 48 groups.

This same Republican Eightieth Congress appropriated \$189,000,000 for a superaircraft carrier. President Truman scrapped construction of the carrier in 1949, after it had been started, with an immediate and subsequent waste of millions. Carrier construction was later resumed at three to four times the original cost.

The Republican Eightieth Congress re-enacted the Selective Service Act and

authorized an armed force of 2,000,000 men. President Truman cut that figure to 1,459,000 and suspended the draft for a considerable period of time.

I voted for all of these defense measures in the Eightieth Congress. Nor is that all.

At the time the President was launching his so-called foreign-aid programs "to contain communism" I fought in Congress to halt shipment of oil to Russia and demanded that we stop shipment of other war materials to the Soviet and its satellites. I personally halted the sale of \$828,000,000 worth of machine tools to Russia. I cited the hopeless inconsistency of squandering billions of dollars on aid to European countries to halt communism while we were authorizing a loan to Soviet-dominated Poland.

Moreover, beginning in 1946, I urged withdrawal of diplomatic recognition of Russia, and I proposed that we "draw some lines" and say to the Russians, "Thus far and no farther." I warned repeatedly that a soft, vague, inconsistent foreign policy was being followed by the State Department, and I cited unmistakable evidences of communistic influences in high administration circles.

Beginning with the initial British loan and the aid-to-Greece programs, I warned that the billions then asked for foreign aid were only the prelude to many more billions. I said repeatedly that this spending would create dangerous inflation in this country. I warned repeatedly that, despite administration assurances to the contrary, this foreign-aid program would prevent neither war nor huge defense expenditures. And I particularly warned that the "new departure" represented by the Greek-aid program would ultimately involve American manpower. Here is what I wrote in my *Washington News Letter* of March 26, 1947:

This new departure will mean . . . the stationing of thousands of American boys in strategic spots throughout the globe . . . not immediately, but eventually.

Developments have shown that I was entirely right, just as developments have vindicated the record of the Republican Eightieth Congress in the matter of national defense. Yet the administration is still following its 1948 strategy of trying to cover up its blunders by smearing those Republicans whose record has been vindicated by events. The American people must not be fooled again.

Does Our Foreign Policy Deter Communism or Does It Instead Make Communism's Victories Possible?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, except for the foreign policy followed by the

Roosevelt and Truman administrations, Russian communism today would be out of existence except for possible remnants in the caves of the Urals.

No unbiased student of world affairs will deny the soundness of this observation.

American intervention in World War II, plus lend-lease to Russia with no questions asked, plus the Communist-inspired unconditional surrender and the Morgenthau vengeance plan, plus other blunders, gave the fruits of World War II to the men in the Kremlin.

Those gains the Russians did not win—, instead, they were given to communism by the American Government.

The fact that the administration may not have intended those consequences in no way alters their reality.

The obvious question from the consequences of those actions now becomes: Is our present foreign policy going to be discovered a few months or years hence to have been a similar tragic combination of sucker plays into the hands of the Soviets?

Members who are not willing to blindly follow the administration line, and who are willing to brave the smears of the administration propaganda machine, will be interested in a recent analysis by Women's Investors Research Institute of our chronic failure foreign policy. A meaningful section of that study follows:

FOREIGN POLICY A CONTINUING FAILURE

The present foreign policy of this country to establish a durable peace in the world by bringing security to Western Europe is not new. That was the underlying theme of the lift the arms embargo legislation in 1939 and Lend Lease I in 1941. Both of these proposals were advanced by the same general coterie as programs which would keep the United States out of war and bring security to Western Europe.

Both programs failed—but the foreign policy continued the same.

That policy also was the foundation of the Bretton Woods agreement—failure of which was followed by the Marshall plan. And, as the Marshall plan began to crack at the seams, the North Atlantic Pact was pulled forth like a rabbit from a magician's hat.

Again the same sponsors, Secretary Marshall, Secretary Acheson, Deputy Secretary Lovett, General Bradley, and their congressional admirers, said it would do the job of itself, but the record shows they dropped hints that, instead of actually regarding it only as a measure for the best interests of the United States, they believed it to be the stepping stone that would take the United States into some form of a world government.

Thus, this foreign policy has been kept alive for years by the simple technique of never disclosing to Congress or the people the next step in the program that must be accepted to keep alive this policy with continuing transfusions of American dollars and blood.

Always, each new scheme is put forth as the final one; with promises that no more will be needed. However, careful examination of testimony reveals hints are dropped that more is to come—or later events establish the next phase actually is under secret preparation while the planners are publicly stating nothing more will be needed. * * *

FOREIGN-AID PROGRAM CONTRIBUTES TO COMMUNIST PLANS

The evidence seems to establish that the present foreign policy of this country will

not defeat the Communist program for world empire, rather, if it is continued, it can well contribute to the ultimate success of that world empire plot.

Should Congress continue to accept the statements of these individuals—whose plans always have failed—and approve the present multi-billion-dollar program now before it or—should it refuse consideration until it has had time to submit the foreign policy to a thorough and searching study?

Of course, Members who advocate this latter approach will face the danger of smear attacks from those forces in this country and abroad who wish to compel Congress to commit the United States irrevocably to this international army project and its many ramifications.

However, these same forces also are insisting—as part of this program—that Congress compel the youth of this country to face—with courage—the danger of war in Europe and elsewhere in support of the present foreign policy and its global commitments.

If it is a question of Members of Congress being asked to risk political careers or the youth of the country being compelled to risk their lives for a policy and program that apparently cannot achieve its stated objective—should that decision be too difficult for Americans?

WILL CONGRESS CHANGE MANAGEMENT OR POLICY?

The United States Government today is the biggest business in the world. The executive branch is its management, Congress is its board of directors, and the citizens of the United States are its stockholders.

If the management of a private corporation continued to dissipate its assets and insisted upon carrying forward a policy which resulted in one failure after another and was heading that corporation into bankruptcy—while its principal competitor continued to grow and expand its business—the board of directors of that corporation either would change that management and/or its bankrupting policies or face removal from office and legal action by the stockholders.

Under our constitutional form of government, Congress has the power not only to change the management of the Government, but also to compel a change of Government policy, foreign and domestic.

The Constitution grants Congress the power to impeach the President or any Cabinet officer, and the Senate has the power to remove any Cabinet officer by simply, through a majority vote of those present and voting, rescinding its previously granted approval of that officer's appointment.

Is it not time that Congress began to exercise some of these constitutional powers for the protection of the citizens and their savings and for the survival of this Republic with its capitalistic system?

MARCH 17, 1951.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5054 and the other gigantic military spending schemes which go along with it, are a reckless dissipation of our economic resources.

General MacArthur said at Boston, July 26:

The free world's one great hope for survival now rests upon the maintaining and preserving of our own strength. Continue to dissipate it, and that one hope is dead.

I submit that H. R. 5054 continues and accelerates the dissipation of our strength. Why do we learn nothing from the succession of bloody blunders of the past decade?

Why Americans Don't Vote—10 Commandments To Get Out the Vote in 1952

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I am appending hereto 10 commandments to make 1952 a record electoral year developed by Dr. Ernest Dichter, of New York. It is Dr. Dichter, a psychological consultant to business and public institutions, who is responsible for developing so much of the basic research on this subject. He began his study of why so many Americans do not vote in Portland, Maine, in 1948, and brought these results to me. As a result of his study and the implementation of his recommendations through the work of the Greater Portland Research Council, voting in that city rose by one-third in 1 year. I became interested in the subject and introduced House Resolution 89, providing for the appointment of a select committee to determine why so many eligible Americans do not vote—generally about 50 percent in Presidential and 40 percent in congressional elections.

Dr. Dichter's 10 commandments on voting follow:

1 Stop urging citizens to vote by saying it is their duty to vote. It's like telling a consumer to buy a certain brand of soap because they ought to. You have to sell voting with the same technique that national advertisers use.

2 Stop talking about how few people vote. It makes those who do vote more self-conscious and tells the nonvoter that he's not the exception. This removes the feeling of guilt and permits him to continue as a passive observer of the Nation's political life.

3 Make the idea of voting a pleasure. Call in your city's top radio, television, and show people and glamorize the whole voting process.

4 Have your local newspapers run series of picture interviews with prominent and average citizens in which they are asked why they do vote, but not why they do not vote.

5 Encourages debates in the old American tradition. The more the citizens are steamed up on the issues, the better the chance that they will become voters; also, if you're looking for an edge on your opponent, be the one that calls for the debate.

6 Before registration time comes around, have your high-school and elementary-school children visit with city, State, and local officials. When they come home with their impressions, they can help inspire the folks to register to vote.

7 Ask your newspapers to set aside a page, and your radio and television stations to reserve a regular period of time, during which voters can see in print, hear and see in action, the candidates and their views—and the more candid the better. A number of American newspapers already have run election battle pages.

8 Open the channels of communication between the citizens and elected officials. One community has worked out plans for

free telephone service whenever a citizen wants to call the mayor. Ideas like this work.

9. Encourage development of local town-hall meetings. Discussions of issues 52 weeks a year make voters.

10. Take a tip from successful advertising campaigns. When you publicize that John Smith has switched to voting, it makes thousands of others think that voting is a good idea. Use mail, billboards, newspapers, car cards, radio, and television for this.

Plant Dispersal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, President Truman has instructed the various Government agencies to bring about dispersal in direct contravention of the action of Congress last month.

As the RECORD plainly shows, the committee bill amending the Defense Production Act of 1950 was brought into the House with the provision to force plant dispersal on many of our industries.

This was to be done by refusing Government loans; certification for amortization under the Internal Revenue Code; access to Government-owned equipment, facilities, or processes. The provision was rejected by the Congress.

The President has today directed Defense Mobilizer, Charles E. Wilson, to go ahead with the dispersal program in defiance of Congress by withholding certificates of necessity; allocations of critical materials for construction purposes; Government loans and, by implication, defense contracts.

Nothing could be plainer concerning the intent of Congress than the rejection by the Congress of legal authority to accomplish what President Truman now seeks to do by extra-legal procedure.

The Congress has, indeed, fallen to a low estate when the executive branch continually circumvents its wishes by subterfuge, indirection and outright defiance.

The future of our Republic has unquestionably reached a critical time when the President of the United States resorts to methods which have been the chief weapons of the very dictatorships we fought to eliminate in World War II.

Once upon a time when we had men in office who respected the authority of the Congress, and when we had a Supreme Court which would deliberately and conscientiously examine the proceedings of the Congress to determine congressional intent, such flagrant disregard for the will of the people's elected Representatives was almost unknown.

What kind of example does the President of the United States set for the world when he borrows pages from the abhorrent doctrines of Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin in violation of both the intent of Congress and the constitutional oath which he is sworn to uphold?

No one will quarrel with the desirability in some cases of plant dispersal, but it is obnoxious to any true American when it becomes a fixed Government policy to force dispersal by such methods.

If the Government can capriciously force entire industries to move from one part of the country to another, then there is nothing to prevent the Government from employing the same methods to move entire segments of our population from one section of the country to another. Let that day arrive and the average American citizen will be no better off than a Soviet slave.

Resignation of Dr. Condon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. VAIL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Speaker, the announcement today of the resignation of Dr. Condon prompts the following comment:

JOINT STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMEN VELDE AND VAIL

We note with deep satisfaction the resignation of Dr. Edward U. Condon as Chief of the National Bureau of Standards. This separation has been too long delayed in the light of the wealth of documented material establishing Condon as a security risk, the term applied to him by the Committee on Un-American Activities of the Eightieth Congress, which was impeding in its investigation by the action of the President in impounding the FBI file recording his activities, notwithstanding almost unanimous passage of a House resolution requesting the surrender of said file.

The reasons assigned for his resignation and the commendatory letter of acceptance by the President are hardly consonant with a communication received by Congressman VELDE from Secretary of Commerce Sawyer under date of July 30, 1951, reading in part as follows:

"Absence from the city has delayed my reply to your letter of July 19, in which you request that my department consider the data submitted by you with a view to bringing the information to the attention of our loyalty board.

"As a matter of fact, some weeks ago I was sent some information with reference to Dr. Condon which I immediately turned over to my security officer, Col. Newman Smith, with instructions that it was to be carefully studied and if such course were justified turned over to the departmental loyalty board for consideration. I have asked Colonel Smith to review the speech made by the Honorable RICHARD B. VAIL was attached to your letter. I shall, of course, be willing to submit to that board any additional evidence now held by your committee bearing upon the question of Dr. Condon's loyalty, and I would appreciate receiving from you any information which you feel should be submitted to the loyalty board, or I will be glad to have my security officer contact you or your committee to that end."

We believe that the mutual expressions of Condon and President Truman represent an effort to cover up the real cause of separation which is made apparent by the foregoing. His resignation under fire is too significant to justify confidence in the assigned reasons.

Jesus, the Master Economist of All Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, I have just read a very interesting article in the Lookout of July 29, 1951, entitled "Earning More Than a Living," by A. B. Segur, president of A. B. Segur & Co., industrial engineers of Oak Park, Ill. In this article, Mr. Segur very carefully reasons from premises to his conclusion that Jesus is the master economist of all times. This is a worthy exposition and challenges our serious attention during these times when there are so many fly-by-night, would-be economists attempting to lead us astray and get us to follow some wild economic theory.

The article follows:

In our colleges there is a study known as economics which, briefly stated, is the science of making a living. We claim to have learned a great deal about economics in the last 100 years. Whole libraries are given over to the subject, and there are definite and fundamental rules or laws of economics.

After we have studied all the books in these libraries and listened to profound professors teach lengthy and complicated courses in economics and then read Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, we discover that every one of the laws of economics has been definitely stated and fully explained by Jesus, the great Teacher. There is nothing about the science of making a living that Jesus did not explore thoroughly with His disciples. He is the master economist of all time.

Not only did He state these fundamental laws, He illustrated them in a way all can understand. As an example, let us consider just one of His laws of economics, or of making a living.

If we ask any group of 10 young people, "What do you plan to do when you finish school, and why?" at least 8 of the 10 will answer that they are planning courses that will yield large returns in money, honor, or coveted position. Perhaps one or two will explain that they are seeking the greatest opportunity for service to their fellow man. If the 10 are observed throughout their lives, it almost certainly will be found that those who receive the greatest rewards, including the most money, are those who think in terms of service rather than in terms of material return. They derive more happiness, as well as more fame, money, and other benefits that life has to offer.

What does Jesus have to say about this principle of economics? We read in Matthew 20: 28, 27, that "Whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant." This law of economics is repeated and defined and illustrated again and again in the four Gospels.

In Matthew 25: 14-19 it is illustrated by the parable of the talents, repeated in Luke 19: 12-26. Jesus showed that a man is rewarded in accordance with his success in discharging his responsibilities. The man in the parable who did a good job was well paid. The man who did not properly discharge his responsibilities was condemned. There was no reward for the man who rendered no service.

Jesus was not content with these statements, although they are so clear that anyone can understand them. In part of the

lesson text for August 5, Luke 12: 13-21. He uses a different approach to the same subject. This time it is a rich farmer, a moneyed man who might be counted as a success in the eyes of the world, who is the failure. Note that this man was not condemned because he had much wealth. He failed because he did not discharge the responsibility that went with that wealth. He had more than he needed, but it did not occur to him to devote his surplus to the benefit of his fellow men. He was incompetent; a failure. The judgment passed upon him is identical with that passed upon the man who failed, as told in the parable of the talents. He had rendered no service, therefore, there was no place for him in the scheme of things relating to the kingdom of heaven.

But even the parables were not enough. Jesus dramatized His teaching in regard to this single law of economics when, during the tender moments just before the last supper, He washed His disciples' feet.

Paul, in his writings, simply tells us how to put into use these teachings of Jesus. We read in the second portion of Scripture given for the study of next Sunday's lesson, II Thessalonians III: 7-10, how the great apostle applied this principle of economics, which Jesus had taught. Said he: "For even when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if any would not work, neither should he eat." Paul's point was this: I earned my food; I paid my way. I was a good example of what a Christian ought to be and do.

Now let us return to the 10 young people who set out to make their way through life, as mentioned earlier. Some of them will think, as many people do, that the success of Dr. Ivy in discovering new drugs to cure cancer, of Edison in inventing the electric light, of Steinmetz in the development of alternating current motors, of Fulton in devising the steamboat, of David Livingstone in the exploration of Africa, and of other notable men and women is attributable to the fact that they had exceptional ability and opportunity. Not so. As we become acquainted with successful people we learn that they generally are quite ordinary folks. They recognize that they have a responsibility, that there is some great duty that means more to them than life itself. Time and effort mean nothing as they pour their very lives into their work. And then, because they spend more time and more effort than others, they emerge as more successful than others.

On the other hand, we read about racketeers and gamblers, along with those who corrupt their office and betray public trust. They operate under the fallacy, which is directly opposed to the fundamental law of economics taught by Jesus, that they can get something for nothing. This fallacy motivates the gambler, the thief, the grafter, the crook—and while it may lead to temporary affluence and power, its inevitable end is failure.

But let us not blame only those who are branded as criminals. They are at fault, but unless there were those who wanted something for nothing at gambling, or who wanted to violate the laws of society under the assumption that they are not to be restrained as others are restrained, there would not be any place for them.

Broadening our view, let us look to the recent history of all the totalitarian movements—fascism, nazism, communism. Back of every such movement are people who feel that, through their leaders or through their systems, rewards can be obtained without responsibility. They seek to avoid individual responsibility, and thus they lose their freedom.

In our own country there may be many things about government that are objectionable, but the responsibility rests with the

individual. If he can be educated to look first to the discharge of responsibility and then to the rewards, we need have no fear of the future. The laws of economics taught by Jesus never have failed, nor will they ever fail.

As for our individual hopes and aspirations, as we face the subject of making more than a living out of this life, let us take courage in the fact that the opportunities offered by this old world are not exhausted. Instead, there are thousands of great opportunities yet to be discovered and developed. The future will bestow its rewards upon those who look first to their responsibilities toward their fellow men—those who decide that to be great is to be servant of their fellow men, diligent, purposeful, persistent.

Every good farmer knows that stored wheat is likely to be eaten up by weevils. Storage is both dangerous and expensive. And in the industrial field we recognize many abandoned manufacturing plants that once represented prosperous organizations, but the owners attempted to take their ease, to live off the past, to rest on their oars, with the result that their plants got behind the times, their assets disappeared. Individuals are like that. If an individual tries to keep his reserves in storage, bestowing his time and efforts upon himself and himself only, he eventually faces difficulties.

An individual, a corporation, a church, or a government succeeds only when the inevitable law of economics, the ten-talent principle enunciated by Jesus, is followed.

Young Men Fear Present Trend Toward Centralization of Power in National Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received a letter from Mr. Lee Price, Jr., president of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, in which he states that—

Through their representatives in convention, a hundred and forty thousand thinking young men of America recently expressed themselves on a matter of concern to all of us.

Mr. Price enclosed with his letter a resolution adopted by the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce in convention assembled at Miami, Fla., June 8, 1951, which follows this introductory statement, and speaks for itself in most eloquent, patriotic, and forthright American language, that we all should be able to understand. Mr. Price says that this resolution expresses our belief in the subject and our fears for the loss of individual rights, and yes—eventually liberty itself.

This resolution clearly shows that our young men fear the present trend toward centralization of power in National Government, as clearly set forth in their resolution, as follows:

FEDERAL ENCROACHMENT

Whereas there exists in this Nation an undesirable trend toward the centralization of power in our National Government to the hurt, destruction, and detriment of State and local government; and

Whereas the usurpation of power by the Federal Government is inimical to the best interest of our people and of good government, Federal, State, and local, and will tend to ultimately place in jeopardy our American way of life; and

Whereas this trend has become further intensified and augmented by recent court decisions whereby the Federal Government has obtained ownership to public lands and lands adjacent to the shores of the coastal areas of the sovereign States of the Union, which rights and properties were heretofore recognized as being vested in the States by previous judicial decisions, treaties, and legislative enactments; and

Whereas it is the consensus of this convention that these decisions have established dangerous legal precedents rendering all States and subdivisions of local government vulnerable to the dangers of further nationalization of properties, both public and private, without compensation, including the material resources of coastal and submerged lands and including oils, minerals, marine animal and plant life. It is the further consensus of the convention that these decisions, in effect, destroy valuable legal precedent and legislative enactments, and that they obliterate certain treaties whereby one of the States of the Union was admitted to statehood; and

Whereas it is the consensus of this convention that national defense will benefit most and the American Nation will be made safer by continuing the development of our national resources under State and local control and through private enterprise; and

Whereas the only recourse now available to the States and persons so affected by these decisions is the enactment of legislation by the National Congress whereby the land and property so affected by said decisions will be by the Federal Government conveyed back to the States and persons heretofore recognized as being the owners of said property: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce in convention assembled in the city of Miami, Fla., on this the 8th day of June 1951, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to forthwith and immediately enact suitable legislation to curb the existing trend toward nationalization of these properties and resources, and further that said legislation conveyed back to the States and persons heretofore recognized as the owners of said resources and properties, the said resources and properties affected by said decisions, be it further

Resolved, That the Congress be memorialized to otherwise enact legislation giving proper recognition to local and State governments and terminating the trend toward nationalization which now exists; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread at large upon the minutes of this meeting, that a copy of same be forwarded to the President of the United States of America, the Supreme Court of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Hungarian Deportations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM C. LANTAFF

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, since its advent to power the Communist regime

in Hungary, in the manner of all tyrannies, has engaged in constant aggression against its own people. Incapable of maintaining its authority under circumstances which would permit the free expression of the popular will, it has ruled from the very first by force and terror, by the systematic suppression of all human rights and freedoms, and with the intervention and support of the Soviet Union in derogation of the Hungarian people's independence. It is now employing the cruel device of deportations on a mass scale in order to crush even passive dissent and to frighten all elements of the population into active support of and participation in the Communist program.

I am gravely concerned at this tragedy which is taking place in Hungary. I cannot escape bitter depression at the thought of these thousands of helpless and innocent people—good people—who have been evicted from their homes, who have been forcibly removed to detention camps and other locations throughout the countryside, from which they may undergo still further deportation, and who have thus been deprived of all rights and liberties by a ruling minority unbouedly ruthless and despotic.

We here in this House have much to occupy our attention, and some of us may not have paused to consider the full extent and effects of this latest demonstration of Communist savagery. The expulsions began in Budapest a little over 2 months ago, and have since continued from that city and from other urban centers in Hungary. They are not aimed at any special group, but are directed at Catholics, Protestants, and Jews alike, and include the very young and the very old, the sick and the well. These thousands of Hungarians, who have been characterized by the Communist authorities as undesirable, were evicted from their homes on a few hours' notice. They were not told where they were going, and they did not know whether they might ever return. Those who may survive the shock of their uprooting, of forced labor, of separation from other family members and friends, and of other countless cruelties can only exist from day to day in total despair and with dark foreboding of their ultimate fate. Needless to say, this action of the Hungarian regime has intensified to a new pitch the state of fear which prevails in that unhappy country.

We here in America have reacted with deep abhorrence to these new violations of the rights of man. Our Government has already charged the Hungarian Communist regime with willfully and systematically violating the human-rights provisions of the Treaty of Peace, and has stated its intention of submitting evidence of these violations to the Secretary-General of the United Nations. The President and the Secretary of State in recent statements have denounced in the strongest terms the deportations being carried out by the Hungarian Government and have affirmed that the United States will also present in due course to the Secretary-General all available evidence on these acts which involve

the further wanton suppression of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

We must assuredly do all that we can to render effective our condemnation of these outrages by the Hungarian Communist regime and to check any further such assaults upon humanity. The time has long since passed when we could stand by silently while untold numbers of our fellow men are enslaved and murdered. Having fought two great wars within our lifetime which have involved the great issues of human rights and freedoms, we know that attacks on these principles anywhere may eventually threaten our own rights here at home and that a policy of systematic persecution on the part of any government is the rightful concern of all governments which believe in and practice respect for human rights and freedoms. Communism, like nazism, is a godless and inherently evil thing. It is a creeping menace to liberty, peace, and progress, and, as such, it must not be permitted to wield and extend its brutal power or one day it may engulf us all. Throughout their history the American people have been devoted to the proposition that every human being has inalienable rights and that he must not be arbitrarily deprived of these rights or of his liberty without just cause and due process of law. If we and the other free peoples of the world are to maintain our way of life, our self-respect, and our spiritual and moral integrity, we must be prepared to stand up and defend that proposition again and again until it is established firmly throughout the entire world and the ordinary people of any nation can go in peace about their daily work, free from fear and terror such as that which grips the people of Hungary.

I respectfully urge the Members of this House to support any action on the part of our Government which may be designed to expose Communist violence and oppression in Hungary and elsewhere and to check the barbarities which have outraged the conscience of civilized mankind and brought calamity to untold numbers of innocent and helpless human beings.

Administration Attempted To Write Rigid Economic Controls Into the Defense Production Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received one of the most interesting letters I have received recently. It is from one who understands the American free-enterprise system, and pleads for the protection of the principles of this system which are, or should be, precious to every American. It is an intelligent exposition of the folly and the fallacy of the New Deal program of price controls, roll-backs, and other

numerous phases of the New Deal program of planned economy which were attempted to be written into the Defense Production Act, recently passed by Congress. The act as it passed apparently did not place the President, his New Deal advisers, and those who are ever found trying to take unfair advantage of someone else, in the position they doubtlessly coveted. The printed bill which was submitted to the House of Representatives for consideration, contained 84 pages, and it dealt with numerous subjects, although some of them were rather remotely connected with the defense program. Read what this clear-thinking American has to say about the way the administration attempted to write rigid economic controls into the Defense Production Act:

We are alarmed by the tremendous propaganda campaign sponsored by the administration in an effort to write rigid economic controls into the Defense Production Act. Apparently, the Democratic organization is attempting to deluge Congress with protests on high prices, and labor leaders are exhorting members of unions to contact their political representatives demanding a price roll-back.

The party line seems to be directed at meat prices, but it is apparent that the real objective is to roll back prices on many manufactured commodities, and force strict economic controls on industry for an indefinite period.

No mention is made of excessive Government spending or inflationary fiscal policies. Neither is there any suggestion of rolling back wages. Obviously, the basic cost of any commodity or service is wages, and we all know there is a definite relativity between increases in wage rates and end prices.

We believe that prices on manufactured products generally have been stabilized under the General Ceiling Price Regulation effective in January 1951. Since that time, prices on many commodities have declined, and the economic law of supply and demand will control prices much more effectively than any artificial Government control.

In our judgment if all prices on manufactured products were rolled back to pre-Korea levels, the cost of living would not be materially reduced, and the loss of tax revenue would necessitate new taxes with the net result of reducing the purchasing power of the average worker.

It may seem dangerously premature to talk of eliminating emergency Government controls while all-out war is still an imminent possibility. However, such controls can undermine our economy, and if the Russian Communists can force us to maintain indefinitely a rigid system of Government controls, they will have won a tremendous victory.

The suggested controls under the Defense Production Act would surely chisel at the foundation of our normal economic system and so long as we have these controls many of our key business decisions will be made in Washington bureaus rather than by businessmen based on sound economic principles.

As we see it, our problem is to increase our capacity to produce, so that we can carry both a major military program and an expanding civilian economy. With the increased production facilities which will be available in many industries in the coming months, we believe this goal is attainable, especially if we are reasonably free from unwarranted restrictions and controls.

We believe that you are in agreement with our philosophy, and we hope that you will use your influence to protect the principles of our free enterprise system, which are precious to every American.

Democratic Lawyer Believes Truman Administration Is Deliberately Attempting To Destroy American Way of Life Through Excessive Taxation

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of a most interesting letter from a prominent lawyer of the State of Oklahoma, who says:

I have been a Democrat all my life, but I am not a Socialist. I believe in our American institutions, and I am intensely interested in their preservation, but I am convinced that the socialistic administrations of Roosevelt and Truman have done more to undermine and to destroy them than have all of the evil acts of all of their predecessors combined.

In the next paragraph of the letter, this Oklahoma attorney says that the Truman administration is deliberately attempting to destroy the American way of life through excessive taxation.

The statements in this letter are worthy of the most serious consideration and concern of the people of this country. The author of this letter does not reside in my congressional district. He resides in one of the strongest Democratic sections of our State. His sentiments are those which are expressed in the letters of many others who write similarly on this and other controversial issues of the day. The entire letter, which is dated July 19, 1951, omitting the salutation and signature, follows:

I sincerely hope you can see your way clear to vote against the proposed increase of 12½ percent in income taxes which is now under consideration.

You know and I know that this increase is not necessary if the Government will just curtail its extravagant expenditures for non-military purposes and foreign aid. This can be done without in the least interfering with our preparedness program.

Taxes are already so high that there is no longer any point in trying to increase one's income, and the increase in taxation now contemplated will serve to completely destroy all incentive to individual effort. One hears this on every hand.

When the amendment authorizing the levy and collection of taxes on incomes was first proposed, its proponents ridiculed the idea that any administration would ever be so utterly foolish as to levy a tax of 10 percent on incomes, but we now find ourselves facing a proposed levy in excess of 90 percent on incomes in the higher brackets, and this is confiscation.

If any relief from this unjustified and unbearable burden is to be expected, it is very clear that it must come from Congress and not from the socialistic administration now in charge of our Government, and it is to you gentlemen that we appeal.

I have been a Democrat all my life, but I am not a Socialist. I believe in our American institutions, and I am intensely interested in their preservation, but I am convinced that the socialistic administrations of Roosevelt and Truman have done more to undermine and to destroy them than have all of the evil acts of their predecessors combined.

Truly, the power to tax is the power to destroy, and we firmly believe that the Truman administration is bent, not on the preservation of the American way of life, but that it has deliberately set about to destroy that way of life through excessive taxation, and that its aim is to erect a socialistic state on the ruins of the Republic established by our fathers.

Men of your caliber surely see where we are headed and must realize the ever increasing momentum with which we are drawing toward the destruction of all that has made America worth while, and I appeal to you to forget politics and to vote against this iniquitous measure and to thereby—to some extent at least—aid in curbing the reckless and needless extravagances of an administration which has so clearly demonstrated that it has neither the desire nor the inclination to curb itself.

Mutual Security Bill

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement presented to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs during recent hearings on the mutual security bill by Mr. Cass Canfield, a distinguished American publisher:

My name is Cass Canfield. My address is 49 East Thirty-third Street, New York, N. Y. I am a vice president and a member of the executive council of United World Federalists, Inc., an organization devoted to supporting and strengthening the United Nations. I am also chairman of the board of the publishing house of Harper & Bros., New York.

I am appearing before your committee today to testify in support of a feature of the mutual security proposals which are before you—specifically the program of economic aid to underdeveloped areas, commonly known as the point 4 program.

There is tremendous support for this program all over the country. As a publisher I come in frequent contact with the thinking of the American people, and I can assure you that in the whole field of American foreign policy no subject excites the imagination as greatly as this does, and no subject is quite as popular with the reading public or the lecture-attending public. People see in this bold, new program a truly great approach which makes clear to the world America's peaceful and benevolent intentions and at the same time demonstrates dramatically those productive and technological skills which make us a great and formidable power.

For these reasons, I am a little dismayed that in the present bill the point 4 features are not clearly labeled as such, but are scattered throughout the bill in various places. The program which is carried on by the Technical Cooperation Administration in the State Department in cooperation with other departments of the Government, is certainly point 4. And so also is a good deal of the ECA program in southeast Asia and its program in the dependent overseas territories of Africa. According to the report of the International Development Advisory Board, all of these activities together accounted for the expenditure of nearly \$300,000,000 during the fiscal

year which has just ended. ECA programs in the underdeveloped areas differ somewhat from TCA work in that ECA supplies some capital grants and materials as well as technicians. But these are all point 4 in the broadest sense. The excellent work which is done by the Institute for Inter-American Affairs is also point 4, as we use the word, and it has been carried on most successfully for many years. It is now under the supervision of TCA.

All of these point 4 programs have proven themselves. Dollar for dollar they have been the very best bargain that the United States could ever obtain. The few dollars we spend for technicians who show people how to increase their own wheat crop, might cost no more than one shipload of wheat, yet this investment returns dividends year after year. It not only frees the United States of the need to make contributions which it might otherwise make—it earns for us the lasting good will of the people to whom we have given the very best kind of help, the help which enables them to help themselves. And it helps to make them strong in a very real sense; strong in materials, strong in health, and strong in self-respect, so that they are the more effective allies in peace or in war.

There is still another avenue of point 4 work which we feel is most useful. That is the technical assistance which is made possible through grants to the United Nations and its specialized agencies. The skills which are so desperately needed in underdeveloped areas are not the very highly trained aptitudes of Detroit, but are rather simple carpentry, farming, and manufacturing methods which abound in many countries. We do not have to use our own valuable manpower to teach these skills. The use of a simple plow can be taught to an Indian by an Italian as well as by an American. And when we make these gifts through the United Nations we are making not one friend but many. We are bringing together nationals of many countries in a joint venture which will cement the bonds of all of our countries. We are avoiding the accusation of seeking to dominate the world. And above all, we are helping the United Nations to grow into the strong, important, and useful agency for world law that we all want it to become.

I hope that when the present bill is disposed of this Congress will have time and opportunity to return to the point 4 proposal and to discuss it again in the light of the great proposals which were made in the report, *Partners in Progress*, by the International Development Advisory Board. I refer particularly to the proposals for an International Development Authority and an International Finance Corporation, both of which would be related to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, which is a U. N. agency. These are long-range programs, and the basic legislation for them must be started now if it is to bear fruit within the next few years.

I would like to point out also that in addition to the scientific and professional personnel which the point 4 programs are now using overseas, the technical assistance work could be well augmented by working farmers, shop and mill workers, and by other typical United States citizens. These people could participate actively in the community life in other nations and teach the magnificent skills that have made possible the high living standards which we have in the United States.

I have not testified on the other portions of the bill, because ours is a limited purpose organization. I would like to say in passing, however, that in the present unsettled international scene, the United States has no choice but to build strong defenses and to aid in building the defenses, economically and militarily, of the entire free world. We

feel, however, that at the same time that we build our armaments, we should present to the entire world a proposal for what President Truman has called "foolproof" universal disarmament under world law. We must confer upon the U. N. additional powers which are carefully limited and defined but which are adequate to prevent aggression and maintain peace.

I say that we should urge this at the present time for several reasons. First, even if these proposals are not accepted, the fact of making them in all sincerity will demonstrate to the entire world that the United States is truly a peace power and the United States is interested in abolishing war. It will be of tremendous value to us in winning the confidence and support of people everywhere. It will provide substance to the message of the Voice of America and greatly heighten its effectiveness. The United States has during the last 5 years, carried on a benevolent and altruistic program of foreign aid which is without rival in history. We have labored constantly for peace, and yet the Russians have succeeded in many parts of the world in convincing people that our intentions are warlike. It is urgently important that we make the world realize that the United States, while building strength, is seeking peace and is planning foundations upon which permanent peace can be built.

I also urge this course because bills like the one we are discussing today, involving the authorization of billions of dollars in expenditures, make it plain that until some method of permanent world peace is devised, the citizens of this country, and indeed the citizens of every country in the world, will have to make tremendous sacrifices. The high American living standard which we now enjoy cannot indefinitely continue if larger and larger portions of our income must go to the tax collector. And yet until a really foolproof U. N. peace plan is adopted, we cannot afford to drop our guard for a single instant. This is a tremendous dilemma to which I hope the members of this committee will devote their early attention.

Red Cross United Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the American Red Cross is a great, humanitarian organization which has always had the respect and cooperation of all of our people, and the support of so many of our outstanding citizens.

At this time, however, the great humanitarian work of the American Red Cross is being endangered by the willfulness and dictatorial attitude of the national board, in their edict that the southeastern chapter of Pennsylvania covering the counties of Philadelphia, Montgomery, Chester, Bucks, and Delaware, disassociate itself from the United Fund. This edict is arbitrary and illogical and may cost the Red Cross many precious dollars in its forthcoming campaign. The fact that so many public-spirited citizens who have worked long and tirelessly for the Red Cross in both fund-raising and administration, have resigned in protest against the national

board's attitude is proof that there is something wrong in the relations between the top governing body and its regional affiliates. Certainly the men in a community know their own situation best, and it has been proven that the Red Cross has obtained more funds through the United Fund campaign among industries and business establishments than they received in the past through their individual drives. At a time when the Red Cross needs good public relations so badly and funds with which to carry out their important and vital activities, the arbitrary action taken by the national board can cause a breakdown in the second largest Red Cross unit in the country.

This action on the part of the national board has resulted in tender of resignation by the chairman of the southeastern chapter, Mr. Arthur C. Kaufman, one of our outstanding citizens in Philadelphia whose record of service to the Red Cross is well known. I am including herewith the letter of resignation submitted by Mr. Kaufman, which points up this problem and the problems presented in this situation:

AMERICAN RED CROSS,

Philadelphia, Pa., July 27, 1951.

To the Board of Directors, the Southeastern Chapter American Red Cross:

About 1 year ago I accepted the chairmanship of the southeastern chapter of the American Red Cross in an earnest endeavor to bring some order out of the chaos which then existed.

After having served on the board and the executive committee for a great many years—and having worked on many annual fund drives—I realized fully the immense task ahead, which could only be accomplished over a period of years.

During my tenure of office, with the help and cooperation of the staff, the executive committee and the board of directors, some progress has been made, although there is still much to be done to modernize and "democratize" the chapter if it is to serve the people of this area properly.

Here, as elsewhere in the United States of America, it should be recognized that many of the shortcomings of the Red Cross are because of the smugness and reactions by policies of the national body, which is most unfortunate in a charitable organization chartered by the Congress of the United States—and, as such, intended to serve all people of this country regardless of race, creed or color.

Obviously, any local chapter can go only so far in a broad approach to its problems when the guiding principles of the national organization are based on such narrow thinking as that voiced by a member of the board of governors who inquired recently whether I knew that "the Red Cross had done thus and so for 70 years."

The most recent of these manifestations of the bigoted policy of the National Red Cross has been its arbitrary ruling that the southeastern chapter (the second largest in America) must withdraw from the local United Fund. This manifesto was issued with a complete disregard for the wishes of the people of this community who have unequivocally voiced their desire to give their money in a single annual drive. Business, industry, and the recognized representatives of organized labor have made it crystal clear that this is the only way they intend to support charitable organizations, including the Red Cross, and all Philadelphia newspapers have enthusiastically supported the plan.

Because of this, the executive committee and board of directors of the southeastern chapter of the American Red Cross almost unanimously voted to join United Fund in its 1951 drive, which was most successful. In this joint endeavor every step was taken to protect the best interests of the Red Cross. Notwithstanding our sincere efforts, the chapter has been publicly rebuked and humiliated by the national body.

As one who, in common with many other members of our board, gives freely of his time and efforts in behalf of civic and charitable enterprises, we feel this was entirely uncalled for, and the many letters we have received from businessmen, women, industrial leaders, and Philadelphia labor organizations, as well as the editorials in the Philadelphia newspapers, have confirmed our judgment in this matter. Further, we do not believe it is possible to carry on successfully the splendid and necessary work of the Red Cross in this area without the full support of all the people.

And, finally, we are convinced that unless the Congress or the people of the United States bring about a reorganization of the National Red Cross toward the end that it be an organization of the people—instead of following the dictates of a traditional minority—it cannot properly carry on its work as "the greatest mother of them all."

So, for these reasons, it is with profound regret that I find it necessary to tender my resignation as chairman of the southeastern chapter of the American Red Cross, and I hereby do so, same to take effect at the convenience of the board of directors.

In retiring as chapter chairman, I express my wholehearted appreciation to the fine members of the staff, to the board of directors, and to the members of the executive committee who have so sincerely given of their time and energies in my support.

ARTHUR C. KAUFMANN.

Mr. Speaker, the national board has been urged to reconsider its attitude and take remedial action to avert the spread of the situation, which threatens to become general in all parts of the country and which would unnecessarily hamper the great humanitarian work of the American Red Cross, which is indeed a matter of national interest and one which should engage our particular attention.

Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and newspaper articles:

LEVITTOWN CIVIL DEFENSE CORPS,
Levittown, N. Y., August 8, 1951.
Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN ROGERS: This letter is deliberately addressed by me as director of civil defense for Levittown, Long Island, N. Y., to a Member of Congress from another State. My reason for writing to you is that I wish to stress a national challenge and its reflection on the local level.

In Congress the Members are constantly confronted with the problems of creating and

maintaining a system of civil defense which covers the Nation. Here in Levittown we are, perhaps, somewhat removed from the over-all strategic level of Capitol Hill—but, by the same token, Capitol Hill is removed from our immediate province.

Civil defense in Levittown, and in thousands of communities throughout the country, is a community endeavor. It has called forth the best efforts of the best elements of the community. But, even in our almost 100 percent support of civil defense here, we can use help.

Specifically, we respectfully urge the Members of Congress to remember that they are leaders of their own communities' civil defense efforts. We ask the Members of Congress to aid the work of their local civil defense groups, to lend the weight of their office and of their prestige. You, as individuals, can help your civil defense in your own community, by urging people to join, by using your influence with them to enlist them in the community effort.

It would be nice to feel that, with all the work to be done by Congress, this task could get on without you. Personally, however, I think it is even nicer to feel that each and every Congressman can and should play such a key role in his own community's civil defense.

I write this letter, not as one of your constituents, but rather because of your past record of civic vigilance and understanding. Please pass on to your colleagues this sincere request for their support "on the old home grounds."

Respectfully yours,

[From the Levittown (N. Y.) Tribune of August 2, 1951]

AROUND THE GREEN
(By R. E. A.)

AN OPEN LETTER

To the honorable J. RUSSELL SPRAGUE,
County Executive, Mineola, N. Y.

We note the appointment this week of Cyril J. Ryan to the position of civil defense director for Nassau County. It is reassuring to note that the new director comes to his post with a wealth of previous experience as leader of Freepart's CD efforts during World War II and again during the present emergency.

We should like to call your attention to the director of this community's civil defense program, Robert E. Lackey. He has so ably organized the Levittown CD that many in this community are confident that he could be of inestimable value as an aide to the new county director.

Guiding the civil defense program for Levittown, a community of 60,000 people, has been a challenge which Bob Lackey has met successfully. His experiences here, plus his natural ability for creating confidence and respect among his staff workers, lead us to suggest that his services be utilized for the common good of the county.

Sincerely yours,

R. E. A.

[From Newsday of July 30, 1951]

ONE-MAN DRIVE BOOMS LACKEY FOR BIG CD POST

LEVITTOWN.—A one-man effort to boom Levittown's CD director for the top CD job in the country was launched last night by a prominent Levittown businessman.

Harry Diamond of the Levittown Exchange Club and Chamber of Commerce, and assistant auxiliary police chief, predicted that in a matter of days a grateful community will flood County Executive Sprague's desk with written recommendations for Robert G. Lackey to fill the post vacated by Lt. Gen. Cornelius Wickersham last month.

Wickersham, while in office, was lavish in his praise of the blinded veteran who in 12 months' time has set up what has been called the best local CD program in the country. Lackey was originally appointed to his present post by Wickersham, who had been advised of Lackey's coordinating ability by Sprague.

Said Diamond last night, "Lackey's popularity transcends politics. Every organization is back of him. Lackey is the type of man who inspires confidence—he is honest, sincere, has an excellent memory, and a terrific faculty for coordinating."

Diamond added that "considering the job that Bob Lackey has done—unparalleled by any other local director"—it would seem "more than wise and profitable" for the county to appoint Lackey to the post.

"Aunt" Jennie Wanzor, Republican committeewoman for the Levittown area, when told of the expected flood declared herself "1,000 percent behind Bob Lackey."

Vocational Training for Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following editorial published in the Mobridge (S. Dak.) Tribune under date of August 2:

The National Congress of American Indians, in annual convention last week at St. Paul, adopted resolutions asking more vocational training for Indians in high school, more adult education on reservations, and scholarships for outstanding Indian students. These requests are logical, and fit in with bills which West River Congressman E. Y. BERRY has introduced to make benefits like rights under the GI bill available for the Sioux. Representative BERRY has lived on Standing Rock Reservation for many years as lawyer and newspaperman, and is offering the best approach to the Indian problem that has appeared.

While United States Exhausts Its Resources, the Kremlin Drives for Conquest of Remaining Areas With Undeveloped Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arnold C. Schumacher from Economic Trend Line Studies, a weekly letter of economic analysis:

MINERAL RESOURCES, THE BLUE CHIPS IN THE INTERNATIONAL POKER GAME

For almost 6 years the world has lived in an atmosphere of growing tension between two major power blocs. The Soviet Union, together with its satellites, has shown every

intention of aggression, either indirectly by promoting unrest or by direct military action. The fighting in Korea is supported primarily by the Soviet Union and the United States as one test in the struggle against Communist imperialism. There is every indication that this world tension will continue for many years, and the danger is always present that it may explode into a full-scale world war.

Modern warfare is a contest, the outcome of which depends mainly on access to raw materials and productive capacity. Individual nations, when faced with invasion, may put up a heroic defense of their homeland and offset, to some degree, the superior equipment of their enemies. England and Russia were two prime examples of this type of fighting in World War II. However, in the long run, it is still superiority in weapons and resources which decides victory. The will to resist is no substitute for planes, tanks, and guns; and if the Axis Powers would have had access to the rich resources of the Western Hemisphere and Africa, in all probability England and Russia would have gone down to defeat in World War II.

Whether the present struggle is decided in future years by a relatively peaceful process of attrition or by another great war, the final victor will be that group of nations which controls the advantage in raw materials. The products of modern technology depend on a rich supply of minerals. Processing and manufacturing capacity is of no use without them, and with it processing and manufacturing plants can be built. Therefore, it is very important that the United States and other countries outside the Russian orbit, which are trying to build a united front against communism, keep the advantage which they now have in mineral resources.

The mineral resources of the world can be divided into seven zones for purposes of analysis. The strategic value of these areas vary greatly, and essentially, they are the chips in the present international poker game.

Zone I The Western Hemisphere, North and South America. This area is the richest storehouse of minerals in the world and contains the world's principal supplies of copper, coal, iron, lead, nickel, petroleum, sulfur, phosphates, antimony, bauxite, fluor spar, and zinc. These two continents also have the greatest industrial capacity and the largest pool of technology and skill of any area of comparable size. The great oceanic and Arctic barriers serve as a magnificent natural protection against invasion by a foreign enemy.

Zone II Australia, South Pacific, and New Zealand. This region has had a long tradition of ties with the Anglo-American culture and contains important sources of lead and zinc as well as lesser supplies of nickel, copper, chromite, tin, and uranium.

Zone III British Isles, Spain, Portugal, and Africa south of the equator. Because of rich and undeveloped resources in the southern half of Africa, this area is probably the most vital to the Western Hemisphere. That portion of Africa which lies south of the Sahara Desert supports the world's largest chromite and uranium production. It is the heartland of diamonds, cobalt, tantalite, and columbite and contains important deposits of manganese, tin, copper, mica, graphite, platinum, and antimony.

Zone IV. Western Europe, the Scandinavian countries, and northern Africa (except Egypt). This region is rich in coking coal, cobalt, potash, mercury, and iron ore. It also has the greatest concentration of skilled labor and manufacturing capacity of any area outside of North America.

Zone V. Arabia, Egypt, Iran, and Iraq. Contrary to popular impressions, this area is not as vital as certain others in the defense of the West. The Near East's only important

mineral resource is petroleum, and while these countries play an important role as the oil barrel for Europe, their value is otherwise limited. Some reserves of manganese and sulfur are present, but these are not significant in the world picture.

Zone VI. India, Indochina, Malay States, Dutch East Indies, Philippine Islands, and Japan. Southeastern Asia, together with Japan and the Philippines, form a heterogeneous mixture of cultures and peoples, characterized by low living standards and seething political unrest. This zone is the world heartland of tin and natural-rubber production. Important reserves of petroleum, chrome, manganese, and bauxite are also present. While the region is important in the world mineral picture, it is not vital to the West, and it presents serious political management difficulties.

Zone VII. U. S. S. R., China, Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, and Manchuria. The Soviet sphere is well supplied with antimony, chrome, manganese, nickel, phosphates, potash, platinum, and bauxite. Iron ores not already being used are believed to be of low grade and poorly located. It does not seem probable that the area contains sufficient known quantities of such vital minerals as petroleum, copper, lead, and zinc to support a prolonged global war.

The following tabulation shows the latest estimates of mineral resources, as a percentage of world total, located in each of the seven zones outlined above. It will be noted that zone three provides the greatest supplement to Western Hemisphere resources.

Percentages of world total mineral resources

	Western Hemisphere	Australia, South Pacific	British Isles, Spain, and South Africa	Western Europe and Scandinavian countries	Arabia, Egypt, and Iran	India, southeast Asia, Philippines and Japan	Soviet sphere
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Antimony.....	50	2	13	9	1	25	
Asbestos.....	60	15	4	1	20		
Bauxite.....	60	6	8	18			
Beryl.....	55	2	10	3	30		
Chromite.....	5	3	34	24	14	20	
Cobalt.....	10	3	80	4	(?)		
Copper.....	62	1	20	6	2	9	
Diamonds.....	5	95					
Iron ore.....	45	10	20	5	20		
Lead.....	50	18	10	13	1	8	
Manganese.....	9	21	7	3	15	45	
Nickel.....	80	3					
Petroleum.....	66	1	1	16	2	14	
Steel (capacity).....	47	1	11	20	3	18	
Tin.....	20	1	15		58	6	
Tungsten.....	21	5	22	3	12	37	
Zinc.....	56	11	6	14	1	12	

Source: Engineering and Mining Journal, June 1951.

CONCLUSION

Serious deficiencies in the Western Hemisphere are confined to chromite, diamonds, manganese, tin, cobalt, and tungsten. Of these, adequate supplements are available from zone three (mainly southern Africa) in diamonds, cobalt, chromite, and manganese. Substantial additions of tin and tungsten are also available. If the Soviet Union should gain control of zones four and five the Communist bloc would increase its mineral position enormously. Such an acquisition would greatly alleviate shortages of petroleum, iron ore, copper, zinc, and steel-making capacity. If, by chance, the Communist coalition should acquire the resources of the Middle East, Western Europe, and Africa, then they would have an advantage over the rest of the world and very possibly realize plans for world domination.

The United States in future years will be forced to rely to an increasing extent on foreign sources of minerals in order to keep its

huge manufacturing capacity in operation. Several countries which can export large quantities of raw materials to this Nation suffer from unstable political systems and undeveloped economies. It is of prime importance that the United States take whatever action is necessary to help these countries realize their potential wealth and see to it that the returns are used to help raise living standards in backward areas. The famous so-called point 4 of President Truman has this as its stated objective. However, much greater reliance should be placed on getting private capital to do the job. Adequate guarantees of protection of property and proper agreements on the distribution of profits should encourage private investment abroad, and this would remove a part of the burden from the American taxpayer and provide efficient development.

The Issue Is Not TV, But Fair Play

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in accordance with the permission granted during the debate today, I present for printing in the RECORD the article entitled "The Issue Is Not TV," written by Telford Taylor.

The article is as follows:

THE ISSUE IS NOT TV, BUT FAIR PLAY—TELEVISION IS ONLY THE MEDIUM; THE NEED IS FOR HIGHER STANDARDS IN CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS

(By Telford Taylor)

Some friends of mine have vacationed for many years in Maine at the home of a picturesque and elderly resident who sets his face sternly against all intrusions of the machine age. Perennially inconvenienced by the lack of a telephone, my friends recently obtained his grudging consent to install one. A few days later they discovered the old gentleman hopping excitedly in front of the theretofore hated instrument and shouting into it, no doubt addressing some equally venerable crony. "By gum, Elisha, this is the coming thing!"

Ever since the opening television broadcasts of the Senate crime hearings in New York City, most of the American public has found itself in the same situation as the Maine gaffer. Television is not merely Arthur Godfrey and Milton Berle and Howdy Doody. It is not only the entire gamut—from excellent to execrable—of "entertainment." It is, essentially, a device which enables multitudes to view and hear, from any distance, happenings and occasions of the most diverse description. This is the primary lesson of the Senate crime hearings, so far as concerns television.

It is a lesson that should have been learned much sooner. This is not the first time that a public event has scored a hit on television. Last fall, telecasts of the United Nations sessions on the Korean question aroused intense public interest and much comment in the press. Nor was the crime investigation the first dramatic congressional inquiry to be televised. As long ago as 1948 the House Un-American Activities Committee hearings involving Alger Hiss and Whittaker Chambers were watched on television.

In large part, the terrific impact of the New York crime telecasts derived from the

cumulative conditioning of the television public which had thus already been accomplished. The crime hearings, however, seem to have caught the rhythmic moment and precipitated full awareness of the almost boundless opportunities inherent in television communication.

But excitement over the opportunities must not be allowed to obscure the risks and responsibilities. Did the televising of the Kefauver hearings manifest a valuable new ingredient of democratic government? Or did it, rather, exploit and aggravate the sensational features which all too frequently disfigure congressional investigations? What about the rights of the witnesses who were haled before the committee and subjected to the heat, glare, and public exposure of news reels and television in addition to the barrage of questions from the committee members and counsel? These and other problems have aroused grave concern and should be settled by debate rather than default.

In addition, there is the question whether governmental proceedings other than congressional investigations will soon become targets of the television camera. Shortly after the conclusion of the New York crime hearings, great controversy arose in New York City over proposals to televise the city council finance committee's hearings on an increase in the sales tax. An anti-sales tax citizens' committee asserted that "a real public hearing today means that the public is entitled to see it on a television screen."

Televising of Senate and House sessions have been publicly urged, but for the time being this does not seem to be a probability. And so far no one has seriously suggested televising court proceedings. These possibilities must be kept in mind to check the general soundness of one's conclusions, but for the moment the propriety of televising congressional investigations is the issue on the floor.

In approaching this question, the historical origins and constitutional basis of congressional investigations must not be overlooked. By nature, the investigative power is part of the process of legislative decision, and its main purpose is to furnish the legislators with information necessary to a considered decision. Nearly a century ago Judge Daly, of the New York Court of Appeals, described the investigative power as extending to "any matter affecting the public interest upon which it may be important that the legislature—should have exact information, and in respect to which it would be competent for it to legislate. The right to pass laws necessarily implies the right to obtain information upon any matter which may become the subject of a law." And in the exercise of this right, the power of the legislature "to compel witnesses to appear and testify before its committees, and to punish for disobedience" is a necessary concomitant.

The purpose of the Kefauver hearings, accordingly, was not to decide whether Frank Costello or any other person had been guilty of a crime. The facts disclosed by the investigation may, indeed, bear on such matters, but the committee's authority under the Senate resolution which established it is to study "whether organized crime utilizes the facilities of interstate commerce . . . for the development of corrupting influences in violation of the laws of the United States or of the laws of any State," and on the basis of its study to bring before the Senate "such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem advisable."

It is fundamental, therefore, that neither Costello nor any other witness was on trial and that the hearings were in no sense a judicial proceeding. Yet, indubitably, thousands of people who read the newspapers or watched the television screen assumed or concluded that the hearings indeed consti-

tuted a trial. Even journalistic comment on the hearings has been replete with references to the trial, court attendants and other verbiage suggestive of judicial proceedings.

These misunderstandings, indeed, are the basis of one of the objections most strongly raised against televising the hearings. It is argued that television gave wide currency to the erroneous notion that the guilt or innocence of the witness was being adjudicated.

But is television the culprit here? Nearly every well-publicized congressional inquiry, where the conduct of individuals is scrutinized for its bearing on questions of legislative policy, has precipitated the same confusion. One need only recall the public reaction to disclosures about the transactions of Charles E. Mitchell, Albert H. Wiggin, the Van Sweringen brothers, and other leading financiers who were grilled by Ferdinand Pecora in the Senate banking investigation of 1933-34.

If misunderstanding arises, to be sure, television will spread it; but if action is taken to correct misunderstanding, television will spread that, too. Rather than sacrifice the benefits of public enlightenment, to which television can contribute so effectively, it would seem wiser to turn the advent of television into an occasion for improving congressional committee procedures and clarifying their nature and purpose in the mind of the public.

Another argument is that televising a witness' face and behavior in the witness chair violates his right to privacy. Under the laws of New York and other States, an individual is protected against unauthorized publication of a person's appearance and testimony in official public proceedings.

A witness in such hearings may refuse to divulge information which bears no reasonable relation to the object of the proceeding. But if he has knowledge of relevant facts, what he has to say and his manner of saying it are subject to official and public scrutiny.

Here again television presents no new basic issue. If a witness can be required to appear and testify on the record before a public sitting of the investigative body, if the record of his testimony may be printed and distributed in official reports and quoted in the press, and if—as has long been the practice—the press and newsreels may publicize his appearance visually as well as verbally, there is little logic in drawing the line this side of radio and television.

For the public character of legislative inquiries (unless security considerations require secrecy) is no superficial appendage, but highly functional. In judicial proceedings the public is admitted in order to minimize the risk of secretly corrupted Star Chamber proceedings. But the public is not expected to participate in or influence the actions of judge or jury; on the contrary, the utmost precautions are taken to insulate them from outside pressures. The legislative process in a democracy, by contrast, should be responsive, though not immediately submissive, to the expressions of the electorate.

The public, in short, is entitled not only to receive the information uncovered in legislative investigations but also to comment on it and supplement it by petitions and letters to the legislature or through other appropriate channels. Public participation is an organic part of the legislative process, and it is a necessary part of the lawmakers' burden that the lightning of the public's anger should beat about their heads and the sunshine of its smile warm their hearts. This is why maximum publicity, within the limits of decorum and fairness, is desirable.

But if the right to privacy is not a valid test, most assuredly fairness is. Even though congressional hearings are non-judicial, and guilt or innocence is not at stake, unproved charges made and incom-

plete facts divulged in the course of an investigative hearing can have the most disastrous effect on individual reputations. If the televising of hearings tends to make such hearings unfair, then either the televising should be foregone or steps taken to mitigate its dangerous effects.

There are, it seems to me, three principal respects in which television may tend to undermine the fairness and decorum of congressional investigations, unless preventive measures are adopted:

1. Excessive noise, light, heat, or other disruptive circumstances: Much has been said, and rightly, of the glare of lights and general disturbance which now accompanies an important congressional investigation. It is unfair to a witness to subject him to the interminable popping of flash bulbs, the heat and dazzle of klieg lights and the jumping about of innumerable photographers seeking new angles. Furthermore, these things make a Roman holiday of the occasion and degrade the lawmaking process.

It is not generally realized, however, that television is not the sole or even the principal offender. At the New York crime hearings the television cameras were placed in the corners of the room and were relatively unobtrusive. In large part, the glare and heat of lights and the flash bulbs and almost incessant motion were due to the newsreel and press photographers.

Nearly, if not quite all, of this disturbance is wholly unnecessary in a chamber which is properly equipped. At the United Nations, television cameras are located in glass booths, the room is brightly but not oppressively illuminated, and the camera work proceeds practically unnoticed. At the Nuremberg trials, newsreel and other cameras were likewise confined to corner booths and other inconspicuous vantage points, and their operation in no way detracted from the solemnity and quiet of the proceedings.

There is no reason why similar restrictions cannot be enforced in congressional hearings and every reason why they should be. Neither flash bulbs nor the clicking of cameras nor any moving about of press representatives within the "operational area" of the hearings should be permitted while the committee is in session. Installing the necessary booths will run up the costs. But if congressional hearings are important enough to be photographed and televised, they are important enough to justify the expense of preserving the proper atmosphere, in fairness both to the witnesses and to the legislative process itself.

If these precautions are observed, I do not think that "mike fright" or "stage fright" will discomfort many witnesses. It is, in any event, the inherent tension of public controversy that is the primary cause of nervousness. The microphone has become a standard item of furniture in large public rooms, and witnesses may legitimately be required to accommodate themselves to it. No doubt the witness who is poised and articulate, or who conveys an impression of simplicity and sincerity, will appear to best advantage with the public. But this is characteristic of all human intercourse, and these qualities are just as valuable before a jury as before the microphone or camera.

2. Incomplete presentation: One of the most serious hazards is that television may carry only the sensational parts of a hearing, or that the portions selected may distort or "slant" the presentation. This may occur by design, by accident, or by the pressure of commitments to broadcast other programs during the course of the hearings. Of course, this risk is not peculiar to television; it is also inherent in newspaper coverage. But variety in reporting techniques and editorial points of view is at least a mitigating factor in the case of the press. Moreover, even though scurrilous and one-sided journalism may be tolerated in our society, these

qualities cannot be allowed to pervade the radio waves.

It is highly necessary, therefore, that television broadcasts of congressional investigative hearings be complete, or if unavoidable circumstances necessitate selection, that the most scrupulous fairness be exercised so that the nature of the selection does not work to the damage of any individual or to the prejudice of a fair presentation of the issues. Congressional committees should not permit broadcasts of their hearings without advance plans and assurances that satisfy these standards.

3. Commercial sponsorship: Only one of the national networks which carried the New York crime hearings obtained a commercial sponsor—Time magazine—for these programs. The propriety of allowing a private concern to exploit for commercial advertising a governmental proceeding has since been much debated. For the defense it has been argued that sponsorship helps the networks meet the costs and thus encourages them to carry more of such events than would be the case if sponsorship were prohibited.

However, it may be doubted whether this would be the effect in the long run. Private concerns sponsor programs for advertising or good-will advantages. In the nature of things, they will seek to capitalize on the most "colorful" hearings or portions of a protracted hearing. If commercial sponsorship is permitted, the networks will come to depend on it, and the inevitable result will be selective coverage based on advertising considerations—the very outcome which it is vital to avoid.

Furthermore, one cannot overlook the possibility that a venal committee and an uninhibited advertiser might prostitute the investigative process and concoct a show to the political advantage of the one and the financial benefit of the other. And in any case, it would be most unfortunate if the determination whether or not to broadcast a governmental proceeding or a part of it should hang upon the advertising judgment of a commercial concern. Rather we should continue to enforce the public interest responsibilities of the networks, perhaps assisted by grants from nonprofit foundations, and eventually supplemented by the operations of noncommercial radio and television stations.

Nor is the question of taste a trivial one. It has been argued that advertising sponsorship of the KERAUVER telecasts was no more to be condemned than advertising in newspapers, the circulation of which was raised by coverage of the hearings. This overlooks the basic difference between use of the same general medium and direct sponsorship of the coverage itself, as if an advertiser bought and paid for the newspaper space in which the press accounts were carried.

It simply is not seemly that Presidential addresses, proceedings of Congress, and its constituent committees, or other official events should come to us "by courtesy of" soap, beer, or bubblegum, or even any less personal and more dignified commodity. All considerations lead to the conclusion that commercial sponsorship should not be permitted.

No doubt there are problems to be worked out in addition to those discussed above. Now that millions of people can be given a window through which to watch congressional investigations, it is high time that the general standards of procedure should be overhauled and raised, in the interests both of good legislation and fair play for individuals. Under proper safeguards, the televising of public hearings should be a highly beneficial thing, both in principle and in fact. The citizen's opportunity for direct contact with governmental proceedings has been greatly enhanced. If the opportunity is intelligently exploited, our democracy will be strongly reinforced.

**Needed: Freeway From the Holland Tunnel to the Bayonne Naval Base—
Defense Department and State of New Jersey Could Amortize the Cost**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it was my intention to introduce an amendment on the floor of the House today to H. R. 4914, a bill to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes.

My amendment was to provide about four million dollars for the construction of a desperately needed freeway from the Jersey side of the Holland Tunnel to the Bayonne Naval Base, a magnificent and vital Defense Department installation.

While the House sat in Committee I discussed the proposition with several of my distinguished colleagues who so ably serve on the Armed Services Committee. It was while the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], its distinguished chairman, so forcefully drove home the merits of H. R. 4914 and the justification for the funds to be appropriated.

I deferred presenting my amendment when I was advised that it was not within the purview of the bill under consideration. There seems to be no provision today, as there was in World War II, which would allow the Federal Government to pay for a road serving as ingress or egress to a Defense Department installation, not even to the vital and critically situated Bayonne Naval Base at Bayonne, N. J. Consequently the modest and hard-working people of Bayonne and Jersey City must continue to pay to upkeep the totally inadequate roads leading to and from the base. If they should rebel and seal off the roads, no doubt the Bayonne airlift would come into play. But that is no solution.

Mr. Speaker, the proposition my amendment proposes is merited. It has been researched and studied for many years. The night before Pearl Harbor naval officials were ready to move on phases of the project. Pearl Harbor embarrassed them. They dropped it.

I am happy to report that all are alert to the situation and the needs involved. The Navy is cooperating. An Army engineer was in my office last week. We discussed the freeway and its relation to the defense set-up.

Mr. Speaker, the above is a thumb-nail run-down. I intend to bring the State of New Jersey into the picture with the Department of Defense on this glaring injustice. I trust it will not be too far distant when the freeway from the Jersey side of the Holland Tunnel to the Bayonne Naval Base will become a reality.

**The United States State Department and
American Policy in the Far East**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, at the invitation of the American Legion, Department of Maryland, I attended an address by Mr. Alfred Kohlberg at the Baltimore Polytechnic Institute. The meeting was sponsored by American Legion, Department of Maryland; American Legion Auxiliary; Catholic War Veterans of Maryland; Jewish War Veterans of Maryland; Baltimore Kiwanis Club; International Federation of Catholic Alumnae; the Military Order of the Purple Heart; the Minute Women of Maryland; the Civitan Club; the Knights of Columbus; the Maryland Committee for Constitutional Government; and the Maryland Action Guild.

The senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR] was also present. At the meeting Mr. Kohlberg made certain allegations and charges against one man in the Government of the United States and against another man who is being considered for appointment to high office in Japan. Those charges to me were so serious that I requested that a transcript of the speech be sent to me, so that I could place it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have received an estimate of the cost of printing the address, and I am advised that the cost will be \$389.50. I request unanimous consent that the speech be incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(The address is as follows:)

Judge Smith, Mr. Burkhardt, the senior Senator from Maryland, and the junior Senator from Maryland, the officers and members of the committees of the patriotic organizations that sponsored this meeting, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a great honor, and I greatly appreciate the privilege of appearing before you tonight. I have long—although I was originally a Californian and have lived for 35 years in New York—I have long had an attachment to the Free State of Maryland. My father was born here in Annapolis, although taken to California as a boy, many, many years ago, of course.

Coming down here I noticed the signs on the parkways leading out of New York—great big signs, at least 10 feet high, reading, "In case of enemy attack on New York City this parkway will be closed to all except civil defense and military vehicles." That is what we have up now at the entrance to our greatest city, 6 years after unconditional victory in every part of the world, in the Atlantic, the Pacific, in Europe, in Asia, and in Africa. Something surely has gone wrong that we have come to that.

Last month, flying from Northolt Airport, outside London, to Ireland, the driver who drove us out to the airport called my attention to a monument, a marble shaft, recent-

ly erected, he said, and on it was the inscription: "In memory of the Poles who died in the service of the RAF, 1941-45." That inscription and that shaft are, I think, a measure of the moral sickness that pervades the world today, the moral sickness which has gone to the depths of a pride in depravity. For remember those years, 1941 to 1945 and what Britain, and we with her, did to Poland. In 1943 at Tehran two-fifths of Poland was turned over to Stalin. In February 1945, the rest of Poland was sold out. It was sold out secretly in both cases; and the public statement in the first case said nothing about it, and in the second case it called for democratic elections which Poland has had—Soviet style. And, while that sell-out was going on, the Poles fought in the RAF and they fought at Monte Cassino with our boys.

The history of the past has been full of betrayals, but this is something new in betrayals. Betrayals are old, but pride in betrayals is something new. Even Machiavelli told how to betray your allies when it paid, but to cover it over, a sort of letting them fall, but don't let it look as though they were pushed. [Applause.] Remember that Polish betrayal was a joint American and British venture. The agreements at both Tehran and Yalta were signed "Churchill, Roosevelt, Stalin"—in that order. Maybe you remember that little special incident with regard to Poland.

I am taking Poland first, because of the monument, and because it set the picture early, as early as 1943. The story of the 16 leaders of the Polish underground in 1945; in March or April 1945, just before VE-day. Those 16 leaders were urged by us and Great Britain to make themselves known to the Russian Army in Poland so that they could negotiate a so-called coalition government. They had made themselves known, on our advice, and they had disappeared, and at the U. N. conference in San Francisco in April 1945 somebody brought the question up and we were bothered as to what had happened to these 16, and Mr. Molotov didn't know. But, finally, the word came out of Moscow; they were in jail in Moscow, and so then we went ahead with the conference. And, one of those men has since escaped, I believe, and told the story, the story of what happened to them, how they were taken, but of course we went ahead and signed up with Stalin in San Francisco.

Well, we don't have time to go into all the betrayals—it is such a common story now, but China was the worst of all the betrayals, because unfortunately, it was almost a 100-percent American job. We didn't get much aid from Britain in the betrayal out there. I can't say they didn't go along, but they just didn't have the power or authority to help out very much. And having betrayed China to the Communists in a long series of steps, some of which I will come to later on, we are now preparing to finish China, to turn over the guerrillas and the forces of the Republic of China on Formosa, and in order to do that, we will also have to betray Korea, and betray our own dead in Korea.

That may not be so easy. I think Americans, like you, will make that difficult, as you more and more come to realize it and as the picture becomes clearer, as it will become clearer, in the year or maybe the 6 months or the year and a half ahead of us. And our Government will have to do it very slowly, step by step, but I have the utmost confidence in the men who have bamboozled and fooled and misled our leaders that they will succeed in accomplishing their end, as they have in the past. In fact, I believe that whatever it is that's going to come out of this deal in Korea, and out of the fighting

in Korea, and out of the gradual betrayal of Formosa, and what remains of Free China, I think it must already be agreed to, and I wouldn't be surprised if it was already in writing. I'll come back to that with the evidence that we have that that is the case a little later.

But I first want to go back and look at the past and see how we got here.

Now, I am going to say things that should be shocking to an American audience, and I am going to say nothing that isn't so; if I only think it is so—I will point out that it is only an opinion. And this kind of criticism, I know, shocks Americans, it should be shocking to have to have such criticism presented to you, but I would like to go back to a great Democratic President, Woodrow Wilson, who said, "There should not be less criticism in time of war, but more. Honesty and competence require no shield of secrecy." Spoken as a true American.

I wonder how many of you can take your memories all the way back to the Atlantic Charter? It's been pretty well forgotten, but we all knew about it only a few years ago. That was what we fought for, you remember, in World War II. It was signed in August 1941, but it was signed again, more officially, on January 1, 1942, by 26 allied nations, including the U. S. S. R. And then it was signed later by all the other united nations as they came into the United Nations, I think a total of 55 in the end. The terms of the Atlantic Charter, the principal terms were three—first they pledged themselves to seek no aggrandizement—territorial or other; the second was: no territorial changes except by the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned, and thirdly, the right of all people to choose their own form of government. That was what we fought for, and as I say, all the United Nations, including Russia, signed it.

At the end of the war fought for those principles, we were unconditionally victorious. We had at that time the largest Air Force and the largest Navy in the history of the world, and the most powerful, if not the largest, Army in the history of the world. Our military allies at that time numbered 1,760,000,000 people, of whom only 190,000,000 owed allegiance to the Kremlin. Nearly 1,600,000,000 made up our free allies. By right and by force, we should have been able to impose our will, which was the Atlantic Charter, on the world, but there was something rotten somewhere inside.

We had already destroyed the Atlantic Charter before the end of the war, at Tehran and at Yalta, and when Harry Truman became President on April 11, 1945, though we were at the height of our military power, something was wrong inside with our Government; we had made pledges secretly to Stalin which broke the public pledges of the Atlantic Charter. The ailing President Roosevelt, surrounded by Hiss and Harriman and Hopkins and Marshall had been too weak to resist the demands of Stalin.

But Truman was not bound by those secret agreements of Roosevelt, though they were in writing. They were secret; he was bound by the public pledges of the Atlantic Charter. For some reason or other he chose to live up to those secret agreements and abandon the public pledges. There was no reason for it—it wasn't force—we had the force.

Russia was a shell at the end of the war. Half of European Russia was destroyed—20,000,000 Russians were dead, that is, both troops and civilians, and remember, after all, there are only 100,000,000 Russians in the whole world. The population of the Soviet Union is double that, but only half of them are Russians. Nobody was afraid of

Russia then, although Russia had long since proclaimed her aims of conquest to the world and we giving in to it. Nobody at that time was afraid of Russia. Any statements that may be made now that we had to give in to Russia because of fear, you all know are untrue, because if you think back to 1945, you know that not only was no one afraid of Russia, but it was perfectly ridiculous to tell any American that we had to worry about Russia at that time. And darn few Americans did worry about her at that time.

But today, who is afraid of Russia? Well, we know that General Marshall and General Bradley are afraid of Russia. [Laughter and applause.] And I say that not in a humorous vein, because they are competent military men. They told us in their testimony that they were afraid to do this and that, to back up our boys in Korea, when they were in the extremities of last December, because they were afraid that Russia might come in.

And we know that Secretary Acheson and President Truman are afraid of Russia. And I say that, not knowing their reasons. Military reasons are those of General Marshall and General Bradley. But again I say there are only 100,000,000 Russians in the whole world—we surely aren't afraid of 100,000,000 Russians, there is something else we are afraid of. And, of course, General MacArthur put his finger on that when he said our enemy is not Russia, our enemy is world communism. [Applause.]

Last December an intelligence officer of one of our armed services, whom I have never seen before or since, was sent to interview me by his superiors about an article I had written several years ago, telling about a secret agreement of Potsdam, which is still secret, by the way, and the terms of which I still do not know. And he read that article and he thought I must have known more than I put in the article. But I always know so little, that I put it all in, I didn't know any more and I couldn't tell him any more than what was in the article. [Laughter.] Well, he said, we thought you might know more, we thought you might have the key to what is puzzling us. He said, we can't figure out why this Government, and why our military commander, General MacArthur, does not take the obvious military countermeasures in Korea, in China, and so on. And I said, what are those countermeasures that are obvious, that he should take out there?

Well, he said, arm the guerrillas, start a fire in back of the Chinese Communists who are attacking us in Korea, give some more arms to the Nationalists and let them get ashore in China, and start more trouble. Blockade China, stop the tin and the copper and the rubber and the cotton and all the other things, machine tools, even, going in at that time. Bomb installations that are serving them, both in North Korea, some of which we have never yet been permitted to bomb, and Manchuria, and wherever else it would count.

I said, well, I don't know the answer to that one, but I think the President has stated that, you don't need to come to me, in his statement of June 27, 2 days after the war started. He said that we would not extend the war; he said we would prevent Chiang Kai-shek from attacking the China coast; he said we would stop the blockade of the China coast. "Oh, I know he said that, but he can change his mind, there must be something more binding than that, something that keeps us from taking these obvious military countermeasures."

Well, I couldn't help him any more; but how did we get to this? There is some reason in back of it, the answer to which I do not know, and that reason did not come

out in the MacArthur hearings, because it can't be the fear of Russia that stopped us from taking those measures; I just don't believe that. Remember that Russia today, the Kremlin, rules 800,000,000 people, but still only 100,000,000 of them are Russians. Five hundred million of them are Chinese, or 475,000,000, they say. It took a lot of help from somewhere for the Soviet Union to be able to take over those 600,000,000 people, since the end of the war.

Somebody stopped General Patton from taking Prague, and General Keating from taking Berlin, just before the end of the war, and somebody issued the orders which were relayed by General Eisenhower, drawing back our forces, in some cases over 100 miles, from areas we already occupied, after VE-day, which areas we then turned over to the Russians. And in that area, from which we drew back, was part of Saxony and part of Thuringia, and all of the province of Jachymov in Czechoslovakia, and in those three areas are the Erzgebirge, the ore mountains, the area in which Russia is now mining its uranium. Who caused us to draw back and turn over that uranium area to Russia? Those are things we do not know.

We cannot blame it on the generals, they have to follow orders, or else, as we have now learned. [Applause.] And we can't blame it on the United Nations, because that was an American order, even though at the very time the United Nations was sitting at San Francisco with Alger Hiss as Secretary General, and Julian Henry Wadleigh as Director of Research of our own American delegation to the U. N. So if Alger Hiss didn't know the answers, when the Senators and college presidents and commanders from the Pacific wanted to know the answers, why Alger referred them to Julian Henry, who had the answers in his Research Department. The answers were the same in any case, anyway.

Now, the United Nations was set up by those people, much smarter than Mr. Acheson. Mr. Acheson isn't as smart as you all give him credit for—he's just their lawyer. [Laughter and applause.] And I think he's a good lawyer. But he isn't the man that has the ideas; they have to dig it up for him, as he said, when he was before the committee. The U. N. was set up by those same people, Alger Hiss was Secretary General of our delegation to the U. N. at Dumbarton Oaks, and right at Dumbarton Oaks it was fixed.

The only thing that was added later, really, was the veto and that isn't of the utmost importance—all the rest of it is full of—what is it they call them in the airplane industry?—bugs.

Remember, the Russians are tough, as diplomats—they are tough as conspirators, as diplomats they are tough for Russia—they never give in until the last gasp. Our diplomats are not that tough, they are not that tough for us, anyway and, therefore, they have had the worst of it all the way through, and then they have discovered afterward that down somewhere in the line of command, there have been some of our diplomats that were tough, but they were also tough for Russia.

Now the China story is a long one, and I won't try to go into the details of all the different things that were done, but I would like to touch a couple of high spots. I would like to call your attention to a book that is easy to read, is on the best sellers' list, and gives a great deal of the details, but gives it interestingly, and that's the book recently issued by Freda Utley called *The China Story*. [Applause.] She makes clear in there, as was the fact, that at the end of the war in the Pacific, our prestige was tops.

I was there a little more than a month after VJ-day. I traveled through west and south China and along the coast, and I saw that. The Chinese, every one of them down to the little boys in the streets, knew who had won the war in the Pacific; they knew who defeated the Japs, and they knew they hadn't done it. They knew they had held on for 8 years, and held on and held on, but that the victory was an American victory.

They knew that the Russians had come in at the end; they knew that the British and the Anzacs had small forces, but there was no doubt in the mind of any of the Chinese in China at that time that we had won the war and any ticket that we had wanted to write at that time, we could have written. We had the force; we had the prestige, both.

Now, at that time, just after VJ-day, a report was sent from China by our top man there—I am not going to mention his name tonight because he will be out of the Government almost any day now—our top man sent this report, and he recommended the following: Remember, he was still foolish enough to think we were obligated to the Atlantic Charter. He recommended that the United States guarantee the personal safety of the Communist leaders, and guarantee their right to carry on throughout China as a political party, but on condition that they surrender their arms. And he gave reports on the number of troops they had—they had about 125,000 to 250,000 tough guerrilla fighters, very badly armed—and this man had under his command 4,000,000 Chinese troops and an American Air Force and service of supply.

And he said, if the Communists will not accept this, I recommend that I disarm them by force, surround and disarm them, and that we then guarantee the personal safety of their leaders and their right to carry on as a disarmed political party. Well, that was exactly what the Atlantic Charter called for. Elections to be held, he said, when China had been thoroughly pacified under U. N. or United States auspices.

Well, what was wrong with that? Nobody knows what was wrong because it was never answered. Many men in Washington have seen that report at that time, in the State Department and in the various intelligence services. The report was never answered; he was never given a yes or no. After General Hurley resigned General Marshall was sent out there to force a coalition, if possible, on the Chinese Government without disarming the Communists. Fortunately, he failed; had he succeeded there wouldn't be any Chinese left on our side today.

As I said, I can't go into all the things that were done to destroy the Nationalists and help the Communists in China. We destroyed the reserve ammunition of the Nationalists which lay in India at the end of the war. That story has all been written up, and you will find it in Freda's book.

We also, as you probably mostly know, put an embargo—General Marshall put an embargo—on ammunition and arms to Nationalist China, so they couldn't even buy any ammunition to replace the other. We had armed 39 Chinese divisions during or just at the end of the war, but we left them with almost—well, we left them without reserves of ammunition. At the time that General Marshall put an embargo on any further ammunition or arms, he told a friend of mine. "As Chief of Staff, I armed over 30 Chinese divisions; by a stroke of the pen I have disarmed them."

But that sell-out is still continuing; what we started in China we are still continuing to do. Last November one shipload of supplies for Formosa left San Francisco, allocated to them by General MacArthur. In December two shiploads went. The total of the three shiploads was nearly 30,000 tons. In December the State Department learned

about it; they hadn't known about it, because General MacArthur had done it right through the supply office in San Francisco. So the State Department said this must be regularized. So they negotiated an agreement with Chiang Kai-shek's government, which was signed on February 9. They told the Chinese that we expect to send you \$50,000,000 of supplies in the first half of 1951—150,000,000 from July 1, 1951, to July 1, 1952, and 150,000,000 in the next fiscal year.

But after this agreement was signed—they didn't say that in the agreement—then they said, well, we will have to send a military mission out there to study your needs. Although MacArthur had a mission there, they sent a new mission headed by General Chase, and General Chase is out there now. There are about 1,200 Americans with him; they had promised the Chinese at that time a total training force of 2,000. I don't know what General Chase has reported; I don't know what the ideas of Washington are; I don't know what they intend to do in the future, but I can tell you that not one pound of supplies has left the United States for Formosa since December. Whether by ineptitude or by intention, they stopped the flow that MacArthur started, and that flow has not restarted yet. And that is the kind of thing, again and again, as you will see in Freda Utley's book, that caused China to fall to Communists.

Just take a broad look at it—in less than 6 years, during which General Marshall, Secretary Acheson, and President Truman have been in complete control of our China policy, they have succeeded in turning 475,000,000 friends and allies into 475,000,000 enemies, willing or unwilling. In those same 6 years, or a little less, another American, General MacArthur, succeeded in turning 80,000,000 Japanese enemies into 80,000,000 friends. [Applause.] And now a part of the picture, that fits all of the rest of the picture, is that as a result of that situation we fired MacArthur and keep the others. [Laughter.]

Why talk about China so much? Of course, they only make up a fifth of the manpower of the world, and very little industry, it's true. But if we ever get in a real war with the Soviet Empire, what we are going to need is manpower; we can supply the matériel. And there the manpower is available, if we can get it back again, if we have the means to get in. Americans of standing in the past have again and again said that China is the key to the world, not only the key to Asia. That it is the key to Asia I think is clear to nearly everybody. There is no real native force in Asia, other than China. I mean in east Asia.

John Hay, Secretary of State, in 1899, at the time of the proclamation of the open-door policy, said, "He who understands China, religiously, politically, and economically, has the key to history for the next 500 years." Well only 50 years have gone by, but it's beginning to look as though John Hay was right. And another great man in his way made a statement very similar to that. His name was Lenin, and he said, "When the millions of Asia join the banner of the revolution its success will be assured."

Because American lives have been sacrificed by our stupidity, that may be treason, and because they will be sacrificed in the years to come, it seems almost sacrilegious to talk just of money. But money, I think, must be considered, because if we run out of money, that means out of resources, and if we run out of resources, we will have to lose more lives. This year our President is asking for \$8,500,000,000 for Europe, I think \$6,500,000,000 of it for arms. And we will have to pay the taxes for it. Now why? Well, one of the reasons is that we destroyed our surplus in Europe, we destroyed it in Asia, we destroyed it in the Pacific islands.

The Hoover report, written in 1948, reported that we had 89 divisions fully armed at the end of World War II, and when that report was written we only had the arms left for 18 divisions. What happened to the arms of the 71 divisions? Well, many of you men here tonight must have seen some of that destruction going on in Europe—I saw it going on in India. It went on even in China. We blew up some of our stuff there so the Chinese couldn't have it, and now we have to manufacture it all over again. More money and more taxes, and higher cost to do it now.

Now, let's go back to Korea, where we came in.

The stated United Nations objective in Korea was to bring about an independent and unified Korea. That was stated when they authorized General MacArthur to go above the thirty-eighth parallel. Now, that objective is gone, like our objective of the Atlantic Charter. In fact, on March 15, according to the testimony before the Senate committee, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the State Department had a meeting, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff asked the State Department for a statement of our objectives in Korea. What was that? Ten months after the war had started in Korea the Joint Chiefs of Staff were still trying to get a statement of our objectives. And what happened at that meeting, according to the testimony before the Senate committee, it was laid over, the matter was laid over, and if there has ever been a statement of our objectives presented to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, it still remains not public.

But what's cooking now? Well, I'm not sure, but I think an informed guess may very well be made, and it would be something like this: The cease-fire deal that is being worked out in Korea, between the generals, is only a sort of shadow-boxing. The real agreement was probably made in Paris by Mr. Jessup and Mr. Gromyko. In other words, I think the political terms are more or less in agreement already, and the cease-fire, which is going to be nonpolitical, is just a matter of form to make us think maybe we are getting somewhere. Now, Mr. Jessup is a student of Professor Lattimore of your city—he was his student for many years. But I even saw—I cannot believe—that our \$250,000,000-a-year State Department would turn over the matter of the settlement of this war in Korea to a general. I don't think they leave that authority to a general—I think they tell the generals, as they always have in the past. The generals are only sent in to get the humiliation of going in with a white flag of truce among armed Chinese Communists. The generals follow orders; the State Department tells them what to do, so we must presume that whatever is going to be done has already been worked out by the State Department, and they aren't going to court a failure, so they must have an agreement with Russia, and where that could have been made, other than Paris, I am not sure.

I'd like to say that I don't consider all that \$250,000,000 we spend on the State Department as waste. There is a little of it that I consider not waste. That is that small part of it that goes to pay the salaries of the good Americans in there, whom I call the pro-American underground, who pass on information of what is going on. [Applause.] As I said before, I will tell you when I am guessing—what I am telling you now is only an informed guess, but it's important to watch. What I told you previously are facts; this I'm not sure of.

It's important to watch what develops, and not be fooled by the patter of the magicians who are putting the rabbit in the hat, that they are going to take out afterward. Let's watch them put the rabbit in the hat if they do it.

No arms to the Nationalists, remember, and none to the Koreans, since the war started, except those that we took into our own forces, I understand. General MacArthur asked for arms for the Koreans and they offered him 150,000 1903-type Springfields and some machine guns. He couldn't send men into battle—the Koreans aren't any too good anyway—either North or South—as fighters, and he couldn't send them into battle armed that way, so he said that would be fine for the Japanese police. And so the 150,000 Springfields were sent to Japan, and they are there now, but they are not being given to the police. They are in storage by somebody's order or other. At present, they still remain in storage in Japan.

Now, I said there was some evidence to back what I thought was going on in Korea. James Reston, of the New York Times, on July 1, who is recognized as a State Department leak—trial balloon fellow. He said that day that the prospects for democratic unification of Korea are not good. Korea, he said, is very likely to take on the coloration of its two big neighbors—Red China and Soviet Russia. They both border on Korea. Now I quote: "The prospects for unification and democratization of Korea are frankly not good." And then he said, "Even if the Korean people give up the good fight and go Communist, it cannot be said that the Korean war is a failure." Now, that's a fine thing to tell the fathers and mothers of the boys who have died or been wounded out there. And yet that's Mr. Reston's leak.

Now, another one, yesterday. Mr. Hamilton, the New York Times correspondent at the U N, said that the final communization of Korea is inevitable. We're getting ready for it; you see, they're preparing us. Just think of it; we didn't have the courage to back our boys to the hilt; to bomb their enemies, to blockade them; we were afraid to go quite that far and now we're going to desert their graves, if these statements are correct. Now, how are they going to make the Koreans like communism? Well, that's very easy—you make them like communism the way the Chinese like it, the way the Russians like it, the way the Poles like it—of course, with a gun or the secret police.

But let's look at some of the characters who have brought this about. One of them is a man with whom I used to be acquainted—Owen Lattimore. Now, according to the testimony of Louis Budenz, former managing editor of the Daily Worker, and a man who finally saw the error of his ways, and made such atonement as a man can make, who has done what a Communist has done, by going to our authorities and telling them what he knew. He testified under oath that Lattimore had a direct line to Moscow.

Last year—I have a photostat of it here—I wrote a letter and sent it to quite a number of papers. This one is from the Christian Science Monitor. And from this letter, I will just read one short paragraph. It says: "March 18, 1947, I published the statement that Mr. Lattimore 'maintains liaison with heads of Communist parties; reportedly operative for Soviet military intelligence in Far East.' On May 23 of this year I repeated the above. I am financially responsible, yet Mr. Lattimore doesn't sue me." The rest of the letter I don't need to read.

Right now, Mr. Lattimore may have reformed; I only know about his past. [Laughter.] If so, he has kept this reformation secret; unlike Mr. Budenz he hasn't gone to the authorities and told them all he knew. In 1943, Mr. Lattimore, on returning from China, published a statement in a book about Chiang Kai-shek. Well, I have to find that one, but he hasn't been back in China since, except for 2 weeks with Henry Wallace in 1944, and 4 days with Ed Pauley in 1946. In other words, all his own knowledge of China is prior to 1943. In 1943, in this book,

in other words, his own knowledge—on-the-spot knowledge ending at that time, he said—the book, by the way, in case you want to get it, is published by Claremont Colleges, Claremont, Calif., called America and Asia, by Owen Lattimore—now quoting: "Many people talk of the danger of civil war in China at the end of this war, but I think that the danger of civil war in China is probably less than the danger of civil war in many countries in Europe." If you will remember what I told you about the general's recommendations for preventing a civil war in China, I think Lattimore was right, in 1943, when he said there didn't need to be a civil war in China, and of course if there hadn't been a civil war in China there wouldn't have been any war in Korea. Because there wouldn't have been any Communist China to start it.

Now I quote again the rest of Lattimore's paragraph: "One reason is that we have in Asia a world statesman, a real genius in Chiang Kai-shek. What may be called the functional test of the historical importance of Chiang Kai-shek is the fact that throughout an already long political career, he has grown steadily greater and greater." Now, that's not what Mr. Lattimore is saying now and he hasn't been there since. There is a reason for it, and the only reason I can see for it is that the Communist line agreed with that in 1943 and agrees with what he says now.

But I want to go on to another matter that concerns him, I think, and that is the question of the ORO. The Operations Research Office of the Department of the Army which since last year has been operated by Johns Hopkins University under contract. I have their letterhead, which states that on the letterhead. So I had our magazine, the Freeman, write them and ask for a copy of that contract, and the answer from the ORO was that the contract with Johns Hopkins is classified, therefore we may not have a copy. Now, what is the ORO—I didn't know when I first saw that letterhead, so I inquired, and the ORO is a research division that studies the effect of weapons before they are used—the probable effects, not like the weapons evaluation which studies them after they are used. So the ORO gets all the information on the secret weapons that we are developing before they are even in the stage of being actually put together—when they are being planned, projected. They get the information, and then they make studies, psychological and others—of what the effect of the weapon would be—would it scare the enemy population or the Army, or would it only make them madder—what would it be likely to destroy, and so on. Now, that contract, I understand, and I haven't seen the contract, the contract with Johns Hopkins is being carried out, that I know, but I understand that it is being carried out by the Page School of International Studies. Now, I don't know what personnel of the Page School are carrying out that contract; that's all secret. But it's the Page School, and I don't think that that's the kind of contract that I would let out to the Page School of International Studies until I knew a lot more about Owen Lattimore than those people seem to know.

I would like to say one more thing about Professor Lattimore—two more, in fact. One of them is that he poses as a scholar. Now, I do not hold against him the fact that he never attended a university, but I do hold against him on that pose the fact that he is a propagandist. A scholar and a propagandist can't mix. You can be one; I am one. He also is the same as I am. I am not a scholar, and he is not.

The other thing I would like to say before leaving him is a bit about his book, Ordeal by Slander. I feel duly grateful to him for putting me in that book so much. People who never heard of me before seem to now know that I am around, at least. I am

going to give you a 1-minute review of the book. You may not think it is very erudite, but I make no such pretenses.

When the book starts in, Professor Lattimore is in Afghanistan, finding out how we can give away some extra millions of dollars to the dear old Afghans. And then while he is there, he hears the terrible news that a terrible fellow by the name of McCarthy, whom he didn't even know was in the Senate, had denounced him. And he got some telegrams and he decided, frankly, to hell with the Afghans; he was going to come home and look into that. [Laughter.] So he came home via London and was met there by one of the editors of the Sun, who advised him how to meet that situation. And he came back and he found this was simply terrible—this so-and-so in the Senate had charged him with being the agent of a foreign government, to wit, the Soviet Union.

And then, according to the rest of the book, he went on, and he really made mincemeat out of the Senator, according to the book, and furthermore, it turned out, according to his book, the Senator didn't even know what he was talking about, because all he was doing was mouthing the long-since discredited charges of a fellow by the name of Kohlberg. [Laughter.] And then, to make it complete, he discovered that this guy Kohlberg looked to be an agent of a foreign government, to wit, the Chinese Government, so the circle was then complete—McCarthy shouldn't have charged Lattimore with anything at all, he should have charged Kohlberg with being a foreign agent of a foreign government, and yet poor old Kohlberg, somehow or other, hadn't suffered any ordeal such as Lattimore went through. I don't know why—I must have a very thick skin. [Laughter.]

Now, I would like to say, as long as I have mentioned the Sun, that I have a high regard for the Sun, it always has been known as one of the outstanding papers of America. And I have a high regard for people who have a fundamental and abiding faith in human nature. And I see that the Sun has that; they had that in the case of Alger Hiss, they had it in the case of Owen Lattimore. [Laughter and applause.] In looking through Lattimore's Ordeal by—what was that—Ordeal by Slander a few days ago I saw a letter in there from a professor from my town, at Bronxville, Westchester County, N. Y. This professor teaches at Sarah Lawrence College, which makes all the other colleges you might have in mind look very pale by comparison. And this letter was written to Mr. Lattimore, and he put it in the book and it is 100 percent for Lattimore.

Now, I know that professor. I went to one seminar of hers—a seminar on Karl Marx—a very interesting subject these days, and this professor said that Karl Marx's outstanding quality was his belief in the perfectability of human nature. And so when I saw how the Sun kept to that belief in human nature, I thought, now, there, that is truly Marxist. [Laughter and applause.] And I only wish that that quality would continue and not grow so thin when they get around to the China lobby, but maybe they will get around to us, too. [Applause.]

Secretary Acheson told the Senate Committee that he never favored recognizing the Chinese Communists, and I don't think anybody took him up on that one. But here is an interview in the Pathfinder magazine of September 21, 1949—it is an interview with Philip Jessup, although it doesn't say directly that it is an interview, but it has his picture and at the time I inquired in the Pathfinder, and found it was an interview. And it is headed "Why We'll Recognize Red China"—and remember, Philip Jessup at that time was the head of a three-man committee making our far eastern policy.

But Mr. Acheson is on record, prior to that, in the spring of 1949, Jessup was just echoing him. He sent two identical notes, or nearly identical, one to the American Consul-General in Nanking. (Our Ambassador had run away by that time—the Communists had Nanking then) and a duplicate note to Colonel Barrett, our military attaché in Peiping. And these notes, Barrett was to present to the military and the Consul-General to the civilian Communist authorities. These notes offered to recognize Communist China and give them financial assistance on two conditions; if they would agree to these two conditions. The first condition was that they would recognize the validity of the commercial treaty that we have with China—and the second was that they would not tie their policy too closely to the U. S. S. R. Now, these were secret notes—but the Communists you never can figure.

The Communists answered them; and they answered them in the newspapers out there. [Laughter.] They said as to No. 1, about the commercial treaty, we can discuss that later. Then they said as to No. 2, Red China's relation with any third power are not subject for discussion with the United States. That told us off. Now, those notes are available, of course, from the State Department, but I haven't seen them, not the text, but the substance of them was published in China.

Now here is a Communist Party in the State of New York reproduction of a mimeographed statement sent out to their sections. It says, "To all sections and counties, Dear Comrade." Well, I'm not one of the Comrades, but I got this, and it says this is a program for action on China—March 1, 1949—prior to these notes, and it gives three demands. No. 1, demand congressional investigation of the Chinese lobby in Washington. Well, the Government is awfully slow getting around to that one. No. 2, demand a new China policy—an end to all forms of American intervention in China. I am now just reading the beginning of each sentence; "Preparation by our Government to recognize the government which the people of China are now establishing, and planning now by our authorities for genuine and self-respecting cooperation"—you know, financial aid, mentioned in the note. [Laughter.] That was the Communist policy March 1. The others that I read to you were a little later, after the Communists already had Nanking, maybe in the summer of 1949, and now Senators Morse and McMAHON are just getting around to the China lobby, more than 2 years late. Now Secretary Acheson said something which I would like to take up for a moment, if I may go on for a little longer, about a young man known to many of you people here in Baltimore, Lt. Irving Short. [Applause.]

This is before the Senate Committee. I will read what Acheson says: "I have read all of this material yesterday afternoon"—that was about the China Lobby—" . . . and with one exception to which I shall revert in a moment, these are all hearsay statements. The exception to that is an alleged attempt to violate the law against recruiting in the United States for foreign armies. On that point, however, the file ends up with the fact that the person who was engaged in this allegedly illegal activity died, and that brought an end to that particular effort." Now, I think a number of you know that Lieutenant Short played with that idea of enlisting Americans to fight the Communists in China under Chiang Kai-shek. He never got any further than the thought, and I still think it is no crime to have a thought, particularly as Communists and Nationalists Spain, Great Britain in the early years before we were in the war, both the Israelis and the Arabs

and other nations have enlisted Americans who wanted to fight for them, and Acheson and the State Department said nothing about it. But this man didn't enlist anybody; he only thought about it. He went out to Formosa, he hitch-hiked out on a plane that carried some correspondents, and after the war started in Korea, in August, he went up to Tokyo to reenlist in our Army. When they sent him for his physical there in Tokyo, they found he had a fever and thought it was malaria, and stuck him in the Army hospital in Tokyo, and he died 3 days later of polio. Now, there's a fine young American, smeared by the Secretary of State, who says he has the facts. I don't like that sort of thing in Baltimore, Washington or anywhere else.

Another character worth looking at is John Paton Davies. He is the far eastern member of the Policy and Planning Board of the State Department, a very important position. In 1949, I think it was in October, he called in the Central Intelligence Agency, two men high in the Central Intelligence Agency, and he suggested they should have a top-secret committee to advise them on China. He said it shouldn't be set up in Washington, but in New York, or Boston, and nobody in the CIA should know about it, except the head of the CIA and one contact, and he said I recommend six people of top competence to you. The six he recommended were Prof. and Mrs. John K. Fairbank, of Harvard; Edgar Snow, Agnes Smedley, Anna Louise Strong, and Dr. Benjamin Schwartz, of Harvard.

Now, I don't know anything about Dr. Benjamin Schwartz, I have never run into him. I know about all the rest. And you may know about some, and the strange part of it is that at the time he made that recommendation it was 8 months after the MacArthur report had been made public revealing that Agnes Smedley had been a Soviet Intelligence Agent in China and Japan both.

Now, another one—John K. Emerson—who was in the papers a little while ago. They said he was being considered as civilian head of Japan, under Ridgway—that Ridgway was so busy with the war that he couldn't carry on as both civilian and military head. John K. Emerson is the man who took United States staff cars, he was on SCAP, and he went to Sugama Prison and brought out the Communist leaders, as soon as General MacArthur signed their release. He brought them out to Tokyo, where they had 100,000 people to cheer them. He drove them up to that Communist meeting in American staff cars. But that just shows where his heart is—but in 1945, January 1945, he wrote a report from China to the State Department recommending that when our Army landed in Japan, that we set up a civilian government and that civilian government be made up only of Communists, because, he said, all the other parties in Japan are Fascist. The Communists are the only democratic party so we must be careful to use only the Communists for the civilian government of Japan.

Now, let's take another one—remember, these are not somebody down at the level of clerks—these people are high, making policy, telling Mr. Acheson what to do, because he is no authority on China.

J. Donald Kingsley—he's not in the State Department, he was assistant to Oscar Ewing, Deputy Administrator of the Federal Security Agency in 1949. But, from 1942 to 1949, first the Civil Service Commission and then the President's Loyalty Review Board could not clear him. His case was constantly sent back for more information, and, finally, the information became so much that in 1949, he resigned. And the matter was closed when the President's Loyalty Review Board put

up a flag against him so that if he was ever considered by any agency in the Federal Government, they would be warned that his was a case that couldn't be passed. Where is he now? He is the Director of the United Nations Rehabilitation Commission—I don't know the exact name of it—he's the fellow who is going to have—or has already—no; I think he's getting—\$250,000,000 from the United Nations for the rehabilitation of Korea. Of course, the United States is only going to put up \$163,000,000 of that \$250,000,000, which is a real break for us. [Laughter.] But Mr. Kingsley is going to have it.

The guy against whom the flag still stands in every Federal agency; he's going to put his people in there; he's going to say which Koreans get what and which don't. His past has a lot of things; I won't go into his whole record; it is much too long.

Now, maybe none of these people are Communists today—I don't know. Maybe Mr. Davies isn't, maybe Mr. Kingsley, maybe Mr. Emerson, maybe Mr. Lattimore, maybe Mr. Jessup, I'm not saying they're Communists today, I don't have inside information, but if they are not Communists, at least they're all prisoners of their associations, and of their past, and of their illusions. They are not the kind of people—they're the people we should have gotten rid of instead of MacArthur. [Applause.]

Remember, with these people running our affairs, Americans were shipping and American ships were carrying oil, rubber, steel, machine tools, and all sorts of things to our enemies right while we were fighting in Korea, until Senator HERBERT O'CONNOR raised a fuss and stopped it. [Applause.] And some of our so-called allies are still carrying that stuff in, almost openly, or openly, and a considerable amount, as you may know, Senator, is going in clandestinely from Hongkong. There is a very funny case in Hongkong—there is a law suit by a Communist trading firm that bought gasoline, which is prohibited export to Communist China, bought it in Hongkong, smuggled it out on junks, and when they got it into Communist China, they found it wasn't gasoline—it was just water in gasoline tins. [Laughter.] And now they are suing the Chinese fellow in Hongkong, so you don't have to guess that it is going on.

Now, as I said, in all of Asia, all of East Asia, the only anti-Communist native forces are the forces of Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa, the guerrillas in China, and the Filipinos. There are no other native forces in East Asia who are anti-Communists; and, of course, the Koreans. Now, we are not giving them arms. We stopped the arms flow to Chiang Kai-shek; none are going to the guerrillas; the Filipinos are getting little or nothing. As a matter of fact, I think it's being seen to that we won't be able to give them any, if we change our policy, because we aren't making the kind of light arms they need.

Yet, in the Philippines they have a rebellion. There are at least 60,000 Communist guerrillas in the hills there.

And when we leave Japan under this treaty, what's going to happen? If all the rest of Asia is Communist, they will have to go, because they have to eat. And they have to do business with Asia to eat. They don't raise enough food to feed themselves. And if Japan goes, Asia is gone, and if Asia goes, Europe becomes our permanent pensioner. Without the oil of the Middle East, without the rubber and tin of southeast Asia, without the markets of Asia, why, we've got Europe to support forever.

The Europeans look east. I just came back from Europe. The Europeans look east, and they see a big, tough power—the Soviet Empire, with plans to conquer the world, and no fooling. And they look west

to us and they see a big power, too, but not tough—just big and soft, with no plans, no plans to counter that—just some plans to meet it where it hits—but no plans to counter. It is a terrible picture to them—you can't really blame the Europeans for wishing they could stay neutral somehow or other when the real show comes, although I don't think they can.

But we don't have any plans, we don't even have military plans. Back in December in 1947, Mr. Forrestal ordered plans drawn up—two sets of plans—one in the case of immediate emergency, and one a long-range military plan. Believe it or not—how long ago is that? 3½ years?—those plans are still not drawn, or at least not approved. No plans have been approved. Who stopped it? I don't know exactly. Now, what plans do we have? Well, we've been told that we have a plan of containment, although that isn't spoken of much anymore. It was proposed 2 or 3 years ago by a Mr. X in *Foreign Affairs Quarterly*—Mr. X turned out to be Mr. George Kennan, a very able man. But, that's being dropped.

After all, it's 18,000 miles around the borders of the Soviet Union. There are too many Koreans and Irans all around there—we can't go in and fight every time they step out in any one of those. But let's remember, that while it is 18,000 miles around, and we can't garrison those 18,000 miles, there are not enough Americans—the Soviets can't garrison those 18,000 miles, either. It's just as far for them as it is for us, and there are many places in those 18,000 miles where they have enemies—enemies that want to fight, and will fight, with American material and American direction.

The Koreans, the Chinese Nationalists, the Chinese guerrillas, the Turks, and many of the people behind the iron curtain—the Poles, the Bulgarians, the Hungarians, we can reach some of them, they will fight. We can make that border a border of weakness for them, instead of weakness for us. And if we did that, we would be using that which we can spare—material, instead of that which we will run short first if a real war comes—and that's Americans.

Now, the future course of history is clear. There are two alternatives ahead of us in the long future. Peaceful agreement between the East and the West, between the slave world and the free world, is out. That is not going to be one alternative.

The Communists have always proclaimed that—we're beginning to learn it. They have said that the two alternatives are that either they will gradually take over the rest of the world, as they have been gradually taking it over in the past 6 years, and in the course of that take over there will be several wars—indecisive wars. That in the course of those wars, we will get weaker. Because, of course, they're not getting any weaker in the Korean war—there are not even any Russians in there. We will get weaker, and a half-destroyed world that will come out of it is the breeding ground for communism. It's a kind of setting they like. That is one prospect.

The other prospect is that we will overthrow that Communist dictatorship, not kill the Russian people, not destroy the 800,000,000 people behind the iron curtain, but aid them to destroy the tyranny that rules over them. We must take one of those courses. There is no other choice. Our present attempt to find a means of agreement for a world half-free, half-slave, is out. But, our first task, and that's the only task we need concentrate on now, is to clean our own house. [Applause.]

We must stop betraying our own friends—friends who are fighting on our own side. We can't betray any more. We shouldn't have betrayed those we did. Let's stop now.

We must separate the traitors in our midst from their dupes and the well-meaning people who don't know what it's all about. [Applause.] To do that, we need a congressional resolution declaring world communism and all its satellites and subsidiaries the enemies of the United States under article 3, section 3 of the Constitution. [Applause.] That will give the dupes and the sympathizers and the foolish a cut-off date to separate themselves from the hard core of traitors that make up the hard shell of the Communist Party, both the open and the hidden party.

We don't need any more point 4 or ECA or Voice of America, or any more allies to invite for a free lunch. All we need to do is be Americans again. [Applause.] We don't need Denmark or Holland or Belgium or France or England or China. They need us. [Applause.] And when they know where we stand and that we are to be relied on, they'll be bombarding us. We won't have to try to buy them, because you can't buy them, anyway.

The night before Trenton, on the day before the attack on Trenton, Gen. George Washington issued an Order of the Day, which read: "Put none but Americans on guard tonight." [Applause.] That's our task. Party doesn't matter. Herbert O'Connor [applause], Pat McCarran, Bill Knowland, Douglas MacArthur [applause] party doesn't matter. And those who went along, both Republicans and Democrats who went along in the so-called bipartisan steps to our disaster, we can't use anymore. They are tied to the past. [Applause.] It doesn't matter how good their intentions have been. They have failed. We need other Americans there. [Applause.] And in getting rid of those men, again it doesn't matter whether they're Democrats or Republicans—whether their name is Austin, or Dulles or Dewey or Vandenberg, or Tydings or McMahon or Connally. They have failed for whatever cause. We can't use them any longer. [Applause.]

We need Americans of vision, of understanding and stature, and above all, of courage, and honesty and truthfulness. We've had enough double-talk. And in spite of our infiltrated colleges, press, radio and Government, the vast majority of Americans are sound, even if confused. And when we put sound unconfused Americans on guard in Washington, Americans will be united—we won't longer have a disunited country. That's the way to get unity, because we will then have a plan. The timid, the weak, the fellow-travelers, the beggars, the cowards, wherever they are abroad, in whatever government, we can't use. So, let's stop worrying about how to please them or how to make them love us; let's appeal to the men of strength and courage abroad. They will be on our side when we exhibit those qualities.

Now, I'm going to close with two sentences from a great American, Robert Lansing, Secretary of State to Woodrow Wilson. He sent this letter to Henry Cabot Lodge, the grandfather of the present Senator, who was then chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He prepared a study of the intentions of the Bolshevik Government—this was in October 1919, 32 years ago. And this is what he said, he summed up: "The study which has been made of the Bolshevik movement, some of the results of which are furnished herewith, show conclusively that the purpose of the Bolsheviks is to subvert the existing principles of government and society the world over, including those countries in which democratic institutions are already established. They have built up a political machine, which by the concentration of power in the hands of a few and the ruthlessness of its methods, suggests the Asiatic despotism of the early czars."

Now, every man—this is official State Department gospel based on documents. It has never been changed. There have been later studies; they have all agreed with it. Every man who posed as an authority on Russia or on communism, or any man in our State Department who told us anything that was different from this, was either a faker or a secret Communist, and it is the job of the Senate and the House to find which are which and have them both out. [Prolonged applause.]

Extension of Interstate Oil Compact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, this morning the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported favorably Senate Joint Resolution 42, which would give the consent of Congress to the extension of the Interstate Oil Compact.

I offered an amendment which was not adopted. However, I believe the purposes of that amendment will be a matter of considerable interest to many of my colleagues. While there will be a minority report filed, I want to take this opportunity to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD and to discuss the reasons why I will offer it again when the legislation comes before the House. The amendment would insert a new section at page 16 of the resolution after line 18 and is as follows:

SEC. 2. The Attorney General of the United States shall make a continuing study of action taken under the compact set forth in section 1 of this act, with particular reference to whether any such action is inconsistent with the purposes of, or contrary to the limitations and restrictions contained in, such compact. The Attorney General shall report to the Congress from time to time, but not less often than once each year, the results of such study.

And on page 16, line 19, renumber section 2 accordingly.

The history of the Commission dates back to June 15, 1934, when the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee was authorized and directed to make a thorough investigation of the petroleum industry. That investigation was conducted with the assistance of an able staff of experts and included hearings in the following principal oil-producing States: California, Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Michigan, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Texas, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

A comprehensive report was made on January 2, 1935. It did not recommend legislation for a number of reasons, there being two important ones. First, there were two cases pending before the Supreme Court of the United States involving the adoption of the petroleum code under the National Industrial Recovery Act. Second, efforts were then

being made by the governors of the oil-producing States to effect an interstate compact.

It is important to note that the report referred to a recommendation of the Federal Oil Conservation Board in 1932 that producers of petroleum be relieved of Federal antitrust legislation, to aid in voluntary cooperation in endeavors to limit production of crude oil in the United States and also to a proposal for voluntary unit development or cooperation voluntarily among all the owners of an oil field for its economic operation by a Federal law lessening the restraints of the antitrust laws.

So at the very outset a solution of the problem of waste became clearly involved in the possibility of actions which would violate the antitrust laws.

The report included a paragraph which now, 16 years later, is most pertinent in considering the necessity of the proposed amendment:

We are convinced that not sufficient attention is being paid to the interest of consumers of petroleum products. Settlements of so-called price wars, which result in some cases in an increase of 100 percent in the cost of gasoline, strain the credulity of the observer on the theory that they just happened without prearrangement in view of the fact that the Sherman Antitrust Act is still the law of the land, except insofar as temporarily it may be suspended by the operation of the National Industrial Recovery Act, we think that the fixing of gasoline prices is a matter worthy of close and constant scrutiny by the Department of Justice.

Subsequently the Supreme Court of the United States found that section 7-C of the National Recovery Act was unconstitutional.

On July 14, 1935, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported favorably H. R. 9053, which would have regulated interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products, established the Petroleum Administration Board, and ratified the interstate compact which had been entered into by a number of States.

One of the important reasons given for the creation of the Board was that it was to be "the agency of the entire country and not the agency of the producing States alone."

However, this bill did not become law. Rather, Public Resolution No. 64, Seventy-fourth Congress, was enacted on August 27, 1935, in substantially the same form as Senate Joint Resolution 42, now reported to the House.

Article V of the compact was then and is now identical. It reads as follows:

ARTICLE V

It is not the purpose of this compact to authorize the States joining herein to limit the production of oil or gas for the purpose of stabilizing or fixing the price thereof, or create or perpetuate monopoly, or to promote regimentation, but is limited to the purpose of conserving oil and gas and preventing the avoidable waste thereof within reasonable limitations.

Certainly one can be in entire agreement with the specific purpose of the compact as expressed in article II: "To conserve oil and gas by prevention of

physical waste thereof from any cause." This is entirely laudable and in the interest not only of the producers but of the consumers of petroleum and petroleum products and of our national defense.

Nevertheless, this clear limitation under article V of the compact itself recognizes the obvious possibility that actions could be taken, quite beyond the purpose of conservation, which would be both in violation of existing laws and very detrimental to the best interests of the consuming public and of our national security.

When hearings were held by the committee on the pending resolution, a letter from the Department of Justice to the chairman, dated April 25, 1951, was submitted to the committee. It recited briefly the purpose of the resolution, the fact that 20 States are participating and the statement that the compact has been considered generally as a necessary arrangement among oil-producing States to conserve the Nation's crude-oil reserves. The letter then included the following sentence:

Whether the joint resolutions should be enacted involves a question of policy concerning which this Department prefers not to make any recommendation.

Because of this sentence, members of the committee requested that a representative of the Department should be a witness before the hearings were concluded. On June 12, Hon. H. Graham Morison, Assistant Attorney General, and head of the Antitrust Division, testified. His testimony appears in the hearings from page 77 to page 107, and I am certain that a reading of the questions asked him and of his replies should be most convincing as to the wisdom and necessity of adopting the above amendment when the bill comes to the floor of the House.

At this time I shall only include excerpts which I believe will demonstrate the importance of favorable consideration of the amendment.

The following excerpt covers Mr. Morison's further explanation of the sentence contained in the letter:

Mr. HARRIS. You are familiar with the letter that was written to the committee about this legislation.

Mr. MORISON. I am not, sir. I have read it since I understood the committee was interested in having me testify. I have seen it.

Mr. HARRIS. As I recall, the letter says that this is a matter of policy for the Congress, and that the Department of Justice therefore does not make any recommendation on that.

Mr. MORISON. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. What is the meaning of that?

Mr. MORISON. We feel, Mr. Congressman, that this is a matter of legislative policy; that it raises no question, insofar as the Department is concerned, as to which we feel requires any comment from us. The history of this thing, I believe, is stated. The Department, at the time the Interstate Oil Compact first came up for congressional approval, took the same position. Since that time, there have been almost 15 years of operation. So far as we are concerned, so far as any advice that has come to us, no facts have been given to us to justify our belief that we have any objection to its operation.

Mr. HARRIS. You mean you have no objection to the compact, then?

Mr. MORISON. No, sir. I want to state again that our position is that we are taking no position for or against it. We feel it is nothing that concerns the Department which requires any position. We think it is purely a matter of legislative policy. If the Congress feels in its judgment this is proper and appropriate legislation—

The following excerpts address themselves to the interest of members of the committee in the consideration which has been given to the operations under the compact since its inception in 1935:

Mr. HALE. Then all the people in the Department are in favor of a strictly hands-off policy; is that right?

Mr. MORISON. No, Mr. HALE; on the contrary; I speak, of course, only for officials. We do not control the thoughts and opinions of individual employees. There may be someone who does not agree with this. But, so far as those charged with the official responsibility are concerned, I know of no one who disagrees with the position which is the Department's position.

Mr. HALE. The Department's position is not to have a position?

Mr. MORISON. Mr. Congressman, I might say, with reference to well over 40 percent of the bills submitted to the Department by the Congress for comment, that is our position: that it is a matter of legislative discretion in which we have no position. Obviously, that would have to be so.

Mr. HALE. We have thousands and thousands of bills which do not by any stretch of the imagination involve monopolies or restraints of trade, but this is a bill that involves monopolies and restraints of trade right on the nose. Article V of the compact says:

"It is not the purpose of this compact to authorize the States joining herein to limit the production of oil or gas for the purpose of stabilizing or fixing the price thereof, or create or perpetuate monopoly, or to promote regimentation, but is limited to the purpose of conserving oil and gas and preventing the avoidable waste thereof within reasonable limitations."

That is the recital of self-righteousness.

Mr. MORISON. Mr. HALE. I will have to say that, so far as the bill is concerned, the bill properly says it is limited. If what you are inferring is that it goes beyond this, and that this is a cover for a conspiracy and if you are saying that, in the guise of conservation, major oil companies are really subverting State officials charged by law of their several States to carry out the laws of their States with reference to honest conservation, then that is something else.

I might say, if that were established, so far as the Department of Justice is concerned, we would not be inhibited in the slightest from bringing an antitrust suit based upon those facts and findings. And, I might say, I think we would win it.

Mr. HALE. Yes. But you would bring the antitrust suit against the oil companies and not against the several States.

Mr. MORISON. I am assuming that is what you are inferring. If you are inferring something else, I have a little difficulty with it, because you would have to infer that State officials are corrupt.

Mr. HALE. I am not suggesting anything of the sort. But this is not a compact between private corporations; it is a compact between sovereign States.

Mr. MORISON. That is right, sir.

Mr. HALE. I presume—I do not know about this because I have never given it any thought—that sovereign States who conspire in violation of the Sherman Act would be treated just the same as individuals. Is not that true?

Mr. MORISON. That is a pretty tough constitutional question, Mr. HALE. I would like

you to forgive me for not answering, because it would take a little thinking on my part to think it to the end.

Mr. HALE. I do not know, but I would suppose so.

Mr. MORISON. Mr. HALE, I might say this: that anything that this committee conceives, if this is a genuine problem and you have facts which have been adduced before the committee that would indicate, through the conspiracy of major oil companies and their effect upon regulatory bodies of the States, that in the name of conservation that is a cloak for price fixing, then I think possibly that the committee might want to consider tightening this compact and putting limitations upon it. I have no objection to that.

Mr. HALE. If I entered into a contract with Mr. HESLTON and Mr. DOLLIVER for restraining trade, and I put a provision in the contract that what we were going to do was really very nice, and we did not intend to infringe against the Sherman Act, the Department of Justice would not be particularly influenced or impressed by that recital; would it?

A mere recital in the contract that the parties to the contract are not intending to do any harm is not a matter which would influence the Department of Justice in any degree; is it?

Mr. MORISON. No, sir. I think I see what you mean, Mr. HALE, I think the choice you are saying here that we have is that you recognize on the one side oil States who have in oil their greatest natural wealth, involving the employment of hundreds of people in their States, and the States' desire to conserve and not permit the physical wastage of that tremendous asset; that is a legitimate thing which Congress would not want to prevent. On the other side, what you are saying is that the effect of conservation inevitably, even if it is honest, is going to have an effect upon the commerce in oil because, to the extent that you prevent the competitive withdrawal of oil, you diminish the supply of oil which goes into commerce. I think that is a balancing of national interest, and again I have no position in that. I just feel I cannot.

Mr. HALE. I want it very clearly understood that I am not intimating or implying by anything I said any corruption or any lack of sincerity on the part of any representative of any State.

Mr. HESLTON. Mr. Morison, you are familiar with the final report of the Special Committee To Study the Problems of American Small Business in the Senate, which was filed January 31, 1949; are you not?

Mr. MORISON. I read that last evening, I must confess, Mr. HESLTON. You must remember I am a little new to this trust-busting. I have only been in office about 3½ months. But I read that very hurriedly last night. That was in the Eightieth Congress, I believe.

Mr. HESLTON. That is right. That is an official report of a congressional committee.

Mr. MORISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. HESLTON. As such, I assume it is a matter of some interest to the Department?

Mr. MORISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. HESLTON. I wish you would comment specifically on certain of the language in that report. Referring to the legislation which is now in existence, and which this bill would continue, it says that it "authorized States producing oil to enter into a compact for the sole purpose of studying co-operation between the various oil- and gas-producing States and recommending conservation measures that will better conserve oil." Then it sets out article IV, which is article V in the bill, and then it says:

"Despite this provision the executive secretary of the compact testified that the purpose of State proration laws was to 'prorate

to market demand' and that, when you limit to market demand, 'of course you affect price.'"

Is that a matter of some interest to the Department of Justice?

Mr. MORISON. Yes.

Mr. HESLTON. In view of that language you say that the Department has no opinion to express on this pending proposal one way or another?

Mr. MORISON. No. Let me make myself clear again. Our interest in anything that goes beyond the intent to effect conservation will be continuing, and we will certainly take action if we find that to be so.

Mr. HESLTON. If you found that to be so, would you be here recommending this legislation?

Mr. MORISON. Mr. Congressman, again let me try to give you the dilemma I am struggling with. Here is an act that the record shows has been in operation 15 years. The Secretary of the Interior, I understand, has testified, and a great many private people, that this has worked well for conservation.

Mr. HESLTON. You are not going to rest your case on the opinion of another department; are you?

Mr. MORISON. No, sir. I was trying to explain to you the kind of dilemma you put me in, because I do not believe I can honestly answer your question, because it would assume, as I have tried to point out, that we must oppose this because either on the one side, as Mr. HALE says, regardless of all interests, it in effect reduces the amount of oil to be withdrawn and, therefore, is a restraint of trade, or, second, as you are suggesting here, it might be utilized for an illegal purpose. I am just in an awful dilemma to take an honest position.

I want to help you in any way I can, to be frank with you, but I hope you share my dilemma.

Mr. HESLTON, I might say this: That if the committee, having heard a great many witnesses—and I assume you have—if you have made an inquiry, and if you have found or do find that the actual operation of this has been that in the name of conservation it has merely been a device by which they only withdraw what the market demand is—in other words, if withdrawal of oil is only set to market demand—then I think that it might well be a danger.

Going back to the intent that these States say—that the purpose of this bill is for conservation—and then to make this relate to conservation and not to market demand, that would be perfectly appropriate, I think, for the committee to consider.

Mr. HESLTON. Do you know major companies themselves or the purchasers of oil present to the several State boards their anticipated purchases?

Mr. MORISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. HESLTON. And then the allowables are fixed in some degree related to that.

Mr. HARRIS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I will have to object to that, because it is not a matter of fact, when the operation of these commissions is well known. I raise this question because the facts are well known that these allowables are usually set by bottom-hole pressure of wells and other factors to produce oil at a degree that the best conservation of withdrawals can be utilized.

Mr. HESLTON. Mr. Chairman, I am only paraphrasing what has appeared in testimony before the Senate committee repeatedly. I am not asserting that it is a fact. I will rephrase the question if my colleague objects to it.

Mr. HARRIS. The only thing I hope you understand that I am objecting to is what I believe may be construed by some to mean any effort to read a lot of things into the hearing that are not actual facts and to try to get the Department of Justice to give

different answers which they have stated very definitely they cannot give.

Mr. HESLTON. I would like to utilize the facts as they exist on these three points; so, strike the question from the record.

As a matter of fact, if allowables are related historically during the operation of this compact so that it appears that there is a definite relation between the amounts that the companies state that they will purchase and the amount that is finally fixed as an allowable, would that create in your mind some question as to whether there was in fact more than just conservation involved, or rather a device of fixing price or stabilizing price or doing some other thing? Like Mr. HALE, I do not want anybody to interpret this as meaning that I assert that any agency of the States is consciously doing this thing. But I do submit that the Department has a very real responsibility in a field which may affect not only the oil producers but the oil users. I think the oil users have a right to ask the Department to look into it.

Now, in terms of that in the Mother Hubbard case, the sixty-seventh allegation is:

"67. The operation of the present structure of the oil industry has resulted in the production of crude oil, necessary for the safety of the Nation, not on true conservation principles but on the principle of price maintenance."

What possible interpretation can anybody place upon that language except that the Department of Justice felt uneasy in 1940 and made it a part of a case of record that that was actually the condition that existed in the oil-producing picture. Do you not see what sort of dilemma you leave us in when you come in here and say "We have no opinion one way or another"?

Mr. MORISON. Mr. Congressman, let me reaffirm what I have said before. I am a lawyer, mind you, and I know what it takes as a matter of evidence to prove your point in court.

Mr. HESLTON. Most of us are lawyers, too.

Mr. MORISON. Yes, sir; I know that. I am just pointing that out again. If, as a matter of evidence, I can find that oil companies have conspired through whatever means—conservation or whatever method used—to fix prices, I promise you that you will have a lawsuit mighty quickly. The proof of that pudding is that, in the case we are now prosecuting on the west coast against Standard of California, that is a basic allegation. But we have yet, other than the inference you suggest here—and that I submit, Mr. Congressman, is really a matter, in view of your enthusiasm for the point and undoubtedly your knowledge and information and learning about it—that this committee ought to thoroughly consider. But we have not received to this date, as to the operation of the Interstate Oil Compact, any such proof that could stand up in court.

Mr. HESLTON. Let me refer to another committee of Congress, and point out a recommendation that has been part of the public records since January 31, 1945, the committee consisting of 12 members of the other body. So far as is indicated in the report, this is a unanimous recommendation. [Reading:]

"It seems to the committee that the Interstate Oil Compact Commission has gone far beyond the laudatory purposes cited in its compact, the basis upon which the Congress acted in approving same. Hence, it is recommended that the appropriate committees of the Congress look into the operation of the compact with a view to either repealing the authority or the enactment of proper amendments to safeguard the public interest."

Do you not think, as a matter of fact, that constitutes just as much a warning to the Department of Justice as it does to this

committee or any other committee of Congress?

Mr. MORISON. We do not need a warning, because we are constantly in every phase of American industry wherever we find monopoly practiced or indicated.

Mr. MORISON. The point I want to make which I think will answer your question is this: You are quite right if, on the basis of that report and on the basis of the testimony adduced here, you feel that the provisions of this act do not pin it down to what you call "honest conservation." I think it would be quite appropriate for the committee to do that, but I am in an impossible situation.

Mr. HESLTON. I say to you that this committee has a legislative responsibility and will try to discharge it as it has in the past. But the executive department has a responsibility and a very large one to enforce the laws Congress has passed, including the Sherman Act and any other antitrust act.

Mr. MORISON. That is right.

Mr. HESLTON. And when a committee of Congress says to the public and to you that this program has appeared to go further than the Congress intended it to go, why should not the Department of Justice address itself to that immediately?

Mr. MORISON. Because, Mr. Congressman, as I pointed out to you before, we have not one scintilla of evidence and we have worked the oil industry constantly, and we are continuing to do it in segment suits in every aspect of the oil industry. We have not any evidence beyond what you have read from the report of the Small Business Committee of the Senate.

Mr. HESLTON. And the press release of the Attorney General.

Mr. MORISON. That did not relate to the Interstate Oil Compact.

Mr. WOLVERTON. What, if any, consideration was given by the Department of Justice to the purpose of this bill? Has it been a matter of consideration?

Mr. MORISON. Yes, Mr. Congressman. The bill before us was submitted in somewhat similar form as early, I believe, as 1935, and it has been renewed and extended, and each time has been referred in due course to the Department of Justice, and this is the consistent position that we have taken on every occasion.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Does legislation of this type carry any implications with respect to consumer interest or the public interest?

Mr. MORISON. I do not believe I understand you, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Do you see in legislation of this type the possibility of the public interest being avoided?

Mr. MORISON. No, sir; I cannot see that. If you are speaking again, as I was talking to Congressman HESLTON—

Mr. WOLVERTON. I have in mind this particular thought, which was a part of my remarks when this bill was before the House originally in 1935:

"We must never overlook the fact in considering any legislation that has for its purpose the control or limitation of production that the price to the consumer is thereby affected, and if there is no governmental supervision or control, the price will be an increased price to the consumer. Whenever the available supply of any commodity is reduced or limited, the direct result is an increased price to the consumer. This is particularly true when applied to any natural resource, such as oil."

That is what I have in mind when I ask the question whether this type of legislation in your judgment could adversely affect the public interest.

Mr. MORISON. I do not believe I can answer that, Mr. Congressman. I will tell you

why. Certainly it is true, it is simple economics, that a commodity in general demand and use, a natural commodity which is limited artificially or by regulation from supply, is going to be affected as to price as long as the rule of supply and demand is in effect. But the reason for my dilemma is this, that I think this committee recognizes that inevitably in this, as for instance in farm legislation, there must always be a balancing of interest. There is no true black and white. I think if honest conservation measures are to be engaged in by States, I think it is a matter that is legitimate, and one that Congress can consider, and unless it finds it unreasonably affects the people of the United States, it will probably approve it.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Have you made for your Department any study of the effect of this act, since its original enactment?

Mr. MORISON. No, sir; we have not made one directed at this particular aspect. We have constantly been examining the whole oil industry in its various ramifications.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Do you think that the reduction of production could adversely affect the public interest by reason of the resulting rise in price? Do you not think that is a matter that should have constant supervision?

Mr. MORISON. Yes, sir; I agree with you. I do not think that is wholly within my bailiwick. I have got to have a little bit of help on that. First, I am not a geologist or oil man myself. I would say in the executive departments there would be many who could give better light on such aspects than I could. For instance, I think that in the Department of the Interior, which has to do generally with the conservation of our natural resources of all kinds, is a group of people who might have a lot more information and advice than I would about it.

I think there is no better evidence of the imperative necessity of directing the Attorney General to make a continuing study of action taken under the compact and submitting regular reports to Congress than the response to the question of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON]:

Have you made for your Department any study of the effect of this act, since its original enactment?

Mr. Morison's reply was:

No, sir; we have not made one directed at this particular aspect. We have been constantly examining the whole oil industry in its various ramifications.

Such a general examination certainly does not constitute an adequate study of the operation of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission to determine specifically if any action has been taken which is inconsistent with the purposes of or contrary to the limitations and restrictions contained in the compact.

Finally, the following excerpt deals with the problem of the responsibility in the Federal Government to make certain that the limitation contained in article 5 of the compact is carried out and not violated:

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I have two questions I would like to ask of the witness.

Directing your attention to article V of this proposed legislation, which sets forth, "It is not the purpose of this compact to authorize the States joining herein to limit the production of oil or gas for the purpose of stabilizing or fixing the price thereof, or create or perpetuate monopoly, or to promote regimentation, but is limited to the

purpose of conserving oil and gas and preventing the avoidable waste thereof within reasonable limitations," whose duty is it in the Government to observe whether that provision is carried out and not violated?

Mr. MORISON. I will tell you what I conceive, Mr. Congressman, to be my responsibility of the Department of Justice Antitrust Division, and that would be, as I have stated before, that if this article V should be violated by participating oil companies in these various States, and we could find such evidence, either upon complaint of a citizen or upon our own investigation, it would be my duty to bring a suit based on those facts.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I fully appreciate that. But I am asking who is the watchdog as to the effect of that section and whether it is carried out? Is there any governmental agency that has the direct duty of doing so?

Mr. MORISON. I would assume that my division, Mr. Congressman, would have the greatest responsibility for that. There may be others. I do not know. I keep speaking about the Interior Department, because I think of them in terms of this kind of project that they would have a continuing interest to watch this. I may be wrong.

Mr. WOLVERTON. That section was put in the bill originally for the very purpose I tried to emphasize: for the protection of the public interest. The very fact that it makes reference to monopoly and regimentation, and all the other elements that enter into Antitrust Act provisions indicates to me that the responsibility was upon the Attorney General. If there is any doubt about it, would you have any objection to an amendment being made to this bill that would make that clear?

Mr. MORISON. No, sir; I have no objection whatever if, in the wisdom of the committee and Congress, it is desired.

With the Department of Justice admitting its general responsibility in this field, the fact that it has not made any survey or study of the effect of the compact legislation since its original enactment, and offering no objection to an amendment placing such a responsibility unequivocally upon the Attorney General, it is difficult to understand the opposition to such an amendment. I hope that it will appeal to a substantial majority of the House as a sound proposal in the public interest.

Africa in Our Defense System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers, retired, has been making valuable contributions in the press, magazines, and on the radio wherein he sets forth his views in the light of his experience on our national defense program. In the current issue of the Freeman, General Fellers again points out the importance of Africa as a strategic base for operations. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including this article and

I commend it to the attention of all House Members:

AFRICA AND OUR SECURITY
(By Bonner Fellers)

The Iranian-British oil dispute is sinister. Nationalism, fanned by Communist agitators, is sweeping the Middle East. Under State Department guidance we are alined with the British whom we grant primary interest in this area and whose policy we have followed blindly. It is to be hoped that the Harriman mission may succeed and thus mark our first deviation.

The Arabian-American oil arrangements have been so satisfactory that it would be logical if the Iranians, who lack technicians and oil know-how, turned to American oil operators to find the experts they urgently need. But the British anticipated this. And our State Department, contrary to America's best interests, let it be known to our oilmen that they should extend no help to the Iranians. The Iranians have asked for West German oil technicians. But here also the British can and doubtless will prevent this aid by insisting that the allied powers refuse exit visas.

The explosiveness of the oil dispute is magnified by the fact that a British token-force intervention might also prompt the Red Army to move. Once in the Middle East, Soviet forces would be inclined to remain, for there lies an estimated 50 percent of the world's known oil reserves. The annual production is 60,000,000 tons.

WORLD COUNTERTEST FOR OIL

Europe's economy is dependent upon oil from the Middle East. If this were denied to Europe, we would be sure to supply the deficit. Last year the United States consumed 300,000,000 tons of oil, some two-thirds of the world's production. The Western Hemisphere can meet our peacetime oil demands, but if we were compelled to supply the oil for Europe, rationing would be necessary. And in time of war, oil from the Western Hemisphere alone could not meet the needs of ourselves and our allies.

Russia's oil position is more precarious than that of the United States. So far as can be determined, her annual production, including that of satellite Rumania, totals about 36,000,000 tons; by restricting civilian consumption, she could meet her wartime requirement.

While both the East and the West could fight a war without oil from the Middle East, it is to the best interest of each to see that the other is denied this rich prize.

Oil is the lifeblood of modern war. It would be naive for us to expect that Russia does not have a program to seize the oil fields of the Middle East either on the pretext of preserving peace or as the initial act of hostilities. It is to be hoped that the State Department will not permit the British-Iranian dispute to develop into a deadlock which would invite the participation of the Soviet Union.

Our problem therefore—in peace or war—is to prevent Russian seizure of the Middle East with its great oil resources, its freedom-seeking people, and its vital lines of communication. We must seek closer relationships with this strategic area. At present administration leaders seem to entertain a pious hope that our allies, or possibly just fate, will do this job for us.

SAFEGUARDING THE MIDDLE EAST

Some argue that a heavily armed Turkey—whose eastern frontier juts halfway along Caucasasia's southern border—could threaten Russia's supply line south through the heart of the oil lands. The fallacy of this lies in the fact that, if Russia strikes, Turkey's forces could be destroyed or paralyzed by the Red air force.

Others hold that our Mediterranean or Red Sea fleets, with carrier-borne aircraft,

could destroy Russia's rail transportation or pipelines leading from the oil fields. It is also suggested that Marines could be landed to hold oil installations for our own use. But in World War II, because of enemy air action, Britain was unable to use the Mediterranean supply route for her desert campaigns. On May 22, 1941, the German Luftwaffe struck the British eastern Mediterranean fleet and all but destroyed it. On the basis of this experience we cannot count on effective Allied fleet operations in the Mediterranean or the Red Sea until the Soviet Air Force is defeated.

Should Russia strike Europe, the Red Army, with strong air support, would be able to attack in such overwhelming numbers that it is doubtful whether European air bases could be held for any appreciable time. Such United Nations air forces as were based in Europe when the war started would be largely tactical and engaged in supporting our ground forces. Thus they would be unable to intervene in the Middle East.

There are some who argue that from air bases in England, strategic air forces could deny Middle Eastern oil to Russia by striking oil installations. But England would be subject to heavy attack by the Red Air Force V-1's and V-2's (new version) and possibly even to airborne invasion. There is always the possibility that, to save her population centers from atomic assaults, England understandably may be forced into a position of neutrality.

Sound military planning cannot place complete reliance upon bases in England and Europe. The vital principle of flexibility in planning demands we make extensive use of bases in Africa.

In relation to the Middle East, Russia enjoys a decided military and geographic advantage. With her primary trust in a vast land army, Russia's technique is to expand her borders by means of Red army tanks and bayonets supported by a tactical air force. Red army forces in Caucasasia can move quickly toward the adjacent oil fields of the Middle East; there are and there will be no Allied ground forces sufficient to stop them.

Air power offers the only effective countermeasure against Russian occupation of the Middle East. The deeper the Red army moves into this priceless strategic area, the more its supply lines can be disrupted by air strikes. In addition, air power can deny the oil of the Middle East to Russia by destroying the refineries, pumping stations, and storage tanks, by breaking pipe lines, and by disrupting any rail or truck transportation that might be attempted.

Until full-scale, intercontinental air warfare develops into a reality, overseas air bases are essential. It would be terribly costly, if not impossible, to hold air bases on the continent of Europe. Our ground forces, along with those of our Allies, would have to be expended in an effort to stop the full weight of the Red army, and there is every indication that such a sacrifice would prove to be futile.

AFRICA'S NATURAL BARRIERS

It is much easier to hold bases which have the protection of natural barriers—bodies of water, mountain ranges, or deserts, or combinations of these barriers. Relatively small ground forces can hold these naturally protected bases because only a fraction of the Red army could be thrown against them. Bases protected by bodies of water would force the Red army into airborne or overseas operations. Bases protected by deserts or mountains make supply difficult for the enemy, and the terrain limits the size of his forces which can be transported over or across the barrier.

A small, highly trained and mobile ground force, with adequate air protection and support, can defend air bases in Africa. The

Mediterranean and the Red Sea, joined by the Suez Canal, are formidable barriers against land invasion of Africa. Russia is inexperienced and ill-equipped for amphibious operations. If we can achieve air supremacy, no large expeditions across the Mediterranean or the Red Sea could reach the coasts of Africa intact.

Crossing of the Suez Canal by a land army could be effected, but the isthmus of Suez is so narrow and exposed that concentrations highly vulnerable to air attack would be necessary. The supply route from Russia for such a force would lead across hundreds of miles of desert. Air power could find and destroy vehicles in this bright and open terrain with very little difficulty.

Our own air supremacy—if we were to have it—and small ground forces defending African bases, could defeat enemy airborne invasions. Our fighters could shoot down most of the troop-transport craft. Those which did not get through would be highly vulnerable to antiaircraft fire in the vicinity of our bases. Paratroopers could be disposed of by small ground forces, especially trained and equipped for mobile warfare across the open desert.

Nor would the Russian occupation of Europe necessarily threaten our African bases. Advocates of the ground defense of Western Europe often claim that we must hold Europe to secure Africa. There is a fallacy in this reasoning. The Russian forces are prepared to expand on the land mass of Eurasia. Their best avenue of approach to Africa leads directly from Russia into the Middle East, not to Africa via Europe.

Even if all Europe were to fall to the Red army, the natural barriers which protect Africa would remain. Russia's possession of Europe would improve her chances for success in an airborne invasion of Africa, but airborne invasions are never possible against a strong air force.

LAND INVASION UNLIKELY

If we control the air over Africa there is little likelihood that Russia would attempt land invasion of that continent. We are now planning a series of bases from Morocco along the north coast of Africa, to include the Suez Canal and Bagdad. Engineer troops have been assigned to putting these bases in readiness to serve air combat units. But France is reluctant to permit American ground defense forces to be stationed on the bases. If war comes, and France is forced to become neutral, our best North African bases might also be neutralized. The south fringe of the Mediterranean could be reached by Russian light bombers as the Red army moved into Europe. But such bases would be very useful for strategic and tactical missions at the outbreak of hostilities and in winning the battle for air supremacy. It is in the direct defense of these bases that our own meager ground forces should be employed.

In a war against Russia we would do well to consider Africa as a vast north and south corridor offering bases from which air power could strike and destroy Russia's war potential and prevent the consolidation of Soviet strength in Europe. An air route with limited facilities already exists from Takaradi on the Gold Coast to Khartoum on the Upper Nile. This route is some 2,000 miles south of the nearest base Russia might acquire in Europe and is therefore relatively safe from fighter and medium bomber attack. Only Russia's best strategic bombers—unescorted—could strike this line of bases. Although air supply through these bases would be feasible, it might be possible to build a railway from the Gold Coast to Khartoum. Such a line would have enormous commercial value.

Sea communications from the United States to the Gold Coast will be much safer

from submarine attack than routes to European bases. Soviet submarine bases initially will be in the Baltic—a round trip distance of some 12,000 miles from the Gold Coast.

As the line of air bases is advanced north down the Nile, the Red air force might be compelled to strike. If we have built air supremacy—as we must if we are to keep the peace or win the war—the battle of the air might be won in African skies. Once we win the battle of the air from bases in Africa, a shield of protection can be extended over the people of the Middle East and Europe, and a Red attempt to occupy and exploit these areas would be doomed.

From these African bases, our bombers can reach the Baltic. Across the area from the Baltic to the Black Sea are four main rail routes leading from Russia into Europe. It is these lines of transportation on which the Red army must rely if the invasion of Europe is attempted. They could be readily severed and kept severed—by air strikes from African bases. With American air supremacy established in Africa, it is most doubtful whether Russia would dare to attempt the invasion of Europe. If she did attempt it, her entire Red army could be cut off from its home base.

From African bases, if we build air supremacy, a war against Russia can be won.

EUROPEAN RELUCTANCE

Force of circumstances may compel us to turn to Africa for our most effective overseas air bases. In Europe there is reluctance, if not outright opposition toward preparation for war. Many Europeans admit willingness to do almost anything to keep out of world war III. Nor can we really blame them. The lessons of Korea are still vivid. Collective security failed to save the South Koreans. In spite of our good intentions and 150,000 American casualties, Korea has been destroyed. Can the U. N. in ground combat do better against the Red army of Russia than against the Red Chinese? Why should European cities and populations be ground to destruction by Russia's vast land army, if Allied air supremacy can prevent it?

France has hesitated to make air-base sites available to us. She also has refused to allow American troops, sent to protect her frontiers, to be stationed within her borders. For political reasons we have refused until recently to seek bases in Spain and made no effort to take advantage of Spain's spiritual and geographic strength. Greece and Turkey offer base sites so far forward that even if any aircraft could be held on the ground, they would suffer heavy losses from Red air force strikes.

OUR DIPLOMATIC BLUNDERS

With the most extensive and defensible air-base sites lying in Africa, the United States unfortunately has done nothing to make its forces welcome there. On the contrary, we have short-sightedly supported European imperialism which has turned the local populations against us. This bitterness arises largely because we deal with north African and middle-eastern peoples through the French and British rather than directly.

In Morocco we have enjoyed friendly relations for a century. Both France and the United States, under the Protectorate Treaty of 1912, have recognized the sovereignty and independence of the Sultan and the territorial integrity of Morocco. But in arranging for American air bases in Morocco, obviously to enhance France's prestige locally, we have dealt with the French and bypassed the Sultan. Unless the Sultan signs the agreement giving us the use of these bases, in the eyes of the Arabs we are committing aggression.

The situation in Egypt—a sovereign power—is somewhat similar. Here the occupation of the Suez Canal area by British troops, and the stationing of foreign troops

in the Egyptian Sudan, causes mounting bitterness among the people. We have made arrangements with the British to use the Suez air base without asking the consent of the Egyptian Government. As a sovereign power, friendly to the United States, Egypt deeply resents this.

In Bagdad also we have dealt with the British and put the Government of Iraq second in matters affecting the security and welfare of Iraq and its people.

The creation of the State of Israel, which resulted in nearly a million Arab refugees, has added to the turbulence. Fear that economic considerations may compel Israel to expand her tiny borders by force aggravates this complex problem, for which the Arabs hold the United States considerably to blame.

Communist propagandists make the most of the trying Palestine situation, disseminating such slogans as "American aggression through Israel," "The coming war for oil," "More United States dollars for Israel—more trouble for the Arabs."

To all this our representatives in the Middle East make little or no reply. Our Government cannot be unaware of this problem, for our official and business representatives in the Middle East have clearly and fully reported these Arab-Moslem sentiments. But no adequate remedial action has been taken.

Saudi Arabia is one happy exception. There our Government has dealt directly with the local government. There American oil companies have made mutually beneficial business arrangements. There we have the important Dhahran air base. There Communist penetration has failed. This situation could be duplicated elsewhere in the Middle East were we to establish the same forthright relationships.

If war is thrust upon us, to secure American aircraft from the sabotage of hostile local populations near our bases would require more ground forces than we can spare. Yet all we need to do to insure the friendship of the Arab and Moslem peoples is to revert to our traditional American attitude toward peoples who, like ourselves, love freedom.

The Arab world would normally turn toward the United States. Its religion rejects communism. The Moslem faith is founded partially upon the teachings of Christ. It teaches freedom, individual moral responsibility, sacredness of private property, and an abiding conviction that in all things the Divine Spirit knows best.

Yet, as communism makes heavy inroads in the Middle East, we make no attempt to use these spiritual values in the struggle. Rather, we try to combat communism only with dollars and other material assistance. While we rely upon the indirect approach through European colonialism, Russia fans the flames of nationalism as she furthers her own imperialistic expansion. The Communist leaders are too clever to preach communism. They have gained their hold on the people by offering to help them achieve freedom from imperialistic domination and economic exploitation.

AFRICA'S HIDDEN RESOURCES

The solution is simple. Merely by recognizing the political independence of the various Arab States of Africa and the Middle East, we can reestablish a firm and lasting friendship. What these people want is not the ECA give-away program. Their good will cannot be bought. They want political equality. Economic aid alone will not satisfy; they welcome help which will help them to help themselves. Unless we recognize national aspiration, the Middle East and Africa will be lost to the free world.

The economic development of Africa and an increasing flow of oil from the middle east are essential ingredients to a flourishing European economy. Africa's population of 100,000,000 is, and will be for generations, predominantly agricultural. Thus raw materials of Africa complement the manufactured goods of industrial Europe.

Under free enterprise development, both Africa and Europe can be made to thrive.

It is high time that the Europeans took themselves off the American dole. They can help to unlock Africa's hidden treasures to the mutual benefit of themselves, the Africans, and the American taxpayers. The advent of refrigeration, of air conditioning, of air transportation, and man's victory over tropical diseases, all help to make Africa ripe for development.

The best air force in the world based in a friendly Africa can be the key to peace. It would be neither provocative nor vulnerable. It would be a constant and dependable deterrent to any aggressive move by Russia.

But Africa must be regarded as more than a military opportunity. A friendly, open-handed and direct approach to the peoples of Africa and the middle east can make possible the development of long-neglected human and natural resources for the benefit of all mankind.

Closing of Veterans' Administration Offices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and Journal of the Massachusetts House of Representatives:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Boston, August 8, 1951.
Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mrs. ROGERS: The Massachusetts House acted unanimously on my petition in re closing VA office (district) today.

In addition to the hardship on widows and minor children, this move would cost our State plenty. The veterans' services of the Commonwealth would have to take up slack while this so-called economy move is taking place. Then, again, the service from Philadelphia would never be adequate.

The legislature was much interested in the increased cost to us, and I succeeded in getting their ear on that point alone.

Best wishes,

FRANK TANNER.

JOURNAL OF THE HOUSE

TUESDAY, JULY 31, 1951.

Met according to adjournment, at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer was offered by the chaplain, as follows:

"Almighty and Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, once again we ask Thy blessing upon the Speaker and the members of this house of representatives, and all who are associated with them in their important work as legislators for our Commonwealth.

"Endow all of us with the moral integrity and courage to play the game of life in a big, manly way.

"Help us to think clearly and to act courageously, conscious of no fear except the fear of failing to do our very best. We thank Thee for the many sincere and honest men and women, who are giving so generously of themselves to the public service of the people of our State and Nation, and who make the standard of their actions adher-

ence to truth and righteousness. In a word, O Lord, help all of us to be faithful to the trust placed in us by Thee and by the people whom we are privileged to serve.

"These blessings, we ask in the name of Christ Jesus, our Lord. Amen."

SPECIAL REPORTS

Special report of the department of mental health authorized (under ch. 23 of the resolves of 1951) to continue its study of the advisability of making psychiatric service available to the district courts, received July 30, was referred, under rule 28, to the committee on public welfare. Sent up for concurrence.

Special report of the metropolitan district commission (under sec. 12 of ch. 306 of the acts of 1949) relative to the progress of work done by said commission in connection with the accelerated highway program, received this day, was sent to the senate for its information.

PETITIONS

Petitions severally were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. Tanner, of Reading, petition (subject to joint rule 12) of Frank D. Tanner that Congress be memorialized to take the necessary steps to prevent the closing of the district office of the Veterans' Administration in Boston and the removal thereof to Philadelphia.

By Mr. Canavan, of Revere, petition (subject to joint rule 12) of Harold W. Canavan and another for an investigation by a special commission (including members of the general court) relative to premium charges used and charged by insurance companies for all forms of motor-vehicle insurance.

By Mr. Chadwick, of Winchester, petition (subject to joint rule 12) of Harrison Chadwick for increasing the scope of the investigation by the commission established to examine the structure of State government by including therein a survey of the salaries of officers and employees of the Commonwealth holding unclassified positions.

Severally, under rule 28, to the committee on rules.

PAPERS FROM THE SENATE

The house resolve providing for an investigation by a special commission relative to the elimination of traffic hazards and congestion at the Middlesex Street crossing in Lowell (house, No. 778, changed and amended) came down passed to be engrossed, in concurrence, with an amendment inserting after the word "sums", in line 15 (as changed), the words "not exceeding in the aggregate, one thousand dollars," and the amendment was referred, under rule 46, to the committee on ways and means.

A report of the committee on cities asking to be discharged from further consideration of the petition (accompanied by bill, house No. 2687) of Philip A. Chapman relative to increasing the salaries of the assessors and deputy assessors of the city of Boston, and recommending that the same be referred to the committee on municipal finance—accepted by the senate, was considered forthwith, under rule 57; and it was accepted, in concurrence.

A petition (accompanied by bill) of John B. Hynes, mayor of Boston, John F. Collins and members of the house of representatives for legislation relative to the transfer of certain parcels of land on Tremont Street, in the Roxbury district of said city, came down referred, under suspension of joint rule 12, to the committee on cities; and it was referred, under rule 38, to the committee on rules.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

By Mr. Toomey, of Cambridge, for the committee on ways and means, that the order relative to authorizing the committee on counties to sit during the recess of the general court for the purpose of studying relative to defining the law relating to justices of district courts (house, No. 2664) ought to

be adopted. Referred, under joint rule 29, to the committees on rules of the two branches, acting concurrently.

By Mr. Toomey, of Cambridge, for the committee on ways and means, that the resolve reviving and further continuing the special commission established for the purpose of erecting a war memorial in the city of Westfield (house No. 87) ought to pass.

By Mr. Wood, of Easton, for the same committee, that the bill providing for the construction and operation of an emergency floating boom across the Chelsea River between the cities of Boston and Chelsea (senate No. 569, amended) ought to pass.

By Mr. Giles, of Methuen, for the same committee, that the bill relative to motor vehicles and trailers operated or propelled under plates issued to manufacturers, repairmen, or dealers and to the excise thereon (house No. 2669) ought to pass.

Severally placed in the orders of the day for the next sitting for a second reading.

By Mr. Tilden, of Scituate, for the committee on ways and means, that the bill providing that certain former employees of the Commonwealth, and its political subdivisions, who have been retired, may waive their rights to certain increases in the annual amounts of the pensions, retirement allowances, annuities, or other benefits payable to them and persons claiming under them (house No. 2628) ought to pass with an amendment. Placed in the orders of the day for the next sitting for a second reading, with the amendment pending.

By Mr. Toomey, of Cambridge, for the committee on ways and means, that the house should concur with the senate in its amendment of the house bill relative to the compensation of the chairman of the State planning board (house No. 2656).

By Mr. Tilden, of Scituate, for the same committee, that the house should concur with the senate in its amendments of the house bill relative to the amount of State aid for public schools in certain towns (house No. 2655).

Severally placed in the orders of the day for the next sitting, the question, in each instance, being on concurrence.

By Mr. Skerry, of Medford, for the committee on municipal finance, reference to the next annual session (under joint rule 10), on the petition (accompanied by bill, house No. 1408) of the Massachusetts Federation of Taxpayers Associations, Inc., for legislation relative to limits of indebtedness in cities and towns.

By the same member, for the same committee, reference to the next annual session (under joint rule 10), on the petition (accompanied by bill, house No. 2031) of John B. Hynes (mayor of Boston) relative to the salary of the chairman of the board of real estate commissioners of the city of Boston, the compensation and duties of the auctioneer of said board and of public auction sales of property of said city.

By the same member, for the same committee, reference to the next annual session (under joint rule 10), on the petition (accompanied by bill, house No. 2581) of James P. Meehan (mayor) that the city of Lawrence be authorized to borrow money for school purposes.

By the same member, for the same committee, reference to the next annual session (under joint rule 10), on the petition (accompanied by bill, house No. 2640) of Robert C. Boudreau and others (selectmen) that the time be extended within which the town of Ware may borrow money for school purposes and increasing the amount which may be so borrowed.

By the same member, for the same committee, reference to the next annual session (under joint rule 10), on the petition (accompanied by bill, house No. 2841) of Isaac A. Hodgen and others (selectmen) that the time be extended within which the town of Belchertown may borrow for school pur-

poses and increasing the amount which may be borrowed.

By Mr. Wondolowski, of Worcester, for the committee on public service, reference to the next annual session (under joint rule 10), on the special report of the commissioner of administration (under authority of sec. 7 of ch. 7 of the general laws, as amended by ch. 610 of the acts of 1948) recommending legislation to establish the salaries of said commissioner, the comptroller, the budget commissioner, and the State purchasing agent in the commission on administration and finance (house No. 2657).

Severally placed in the orders of the day for the next sitting, the question, in each instance, being on acceptance.

ENGROSSED BILLS

The engrossed bill making certain changes in the law relative to veterans' benefits (which originated in the house), in respect to which the senate had concurred in adoption of the emergency preamble, was passed to be enacted; and it was signed by the speaker and sent to the senate.

Engrossed bills—

Further defining the term "trailer", as used in the motor vehicle law (which originated in the senate); and

Authorizing the town of Randolph to pay a pension to Adolph O. Christiansen, a former superintendent of schools in said town (which originated in the house);

Severally reported by the committee on engrossed bills to be rightly and truly engrossed, were passed to be enacted; and they were signed by the speaker and sent to the senate.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

The house bill relative to the pardoning of felonies (house No. 2282), reported by the committee on bills in the third reading to be correctly drawn, was read a third time; and it was passed to be engrossed. Sent up for concurrence. Rule 15 was suspended, on motion of Mr. Ayers, of Weston.

The house bill making it unlawful for certain persons to operate or cause or permit the operation of a motor vehicle or semi-trailer unit the weight of which exceeds the limit provided by law or the registered weight (house No. 2698), reported by the committee on bills in the third reading to be correctly drawn, was read a third time; and it was passed to be engrossed. Sent up for concurrence.

At 26 minutes after 11 o'clock a. m. the speaker declared a recess, there being no objection; and at 21 minutes after 1 o'clock the house was called to order.

The house bill increasing the salaries of justices in certain district courts (house No. 2675, amended) was read a third time.

Pending the question on passing the bill to be engrossed, further consideration thereof was postponed, on motion of Mr. Plunkett, of Lowell, until after disposition of the remaining matters in the orders of the day.

Subsequently, the remaining matters having been disposed of, the bill was considered further.

The committee on bills in the third reading reported, recommending that the bill be amended by substitution of a bill increasing the salaries of the justices, clerks, and assistant clerks of certain district courts (house No. 2703), which was read.

After remarks Mr. Plunkett moved that the amendment be amended in section 3 by striking out the words "district court of Peabody," and by inserting after the word "dollars", in the last line thereof, the words "the salary of the justice of the district court of Peabody shall be \$4,000"; and these amendments were adopted.

Mr. White of Lynn then moved that the amendment be further amended by inserting after section 3 the following new section: "Section 3A. Said chapter 218 is hereby further amended by striking out section 80, as most recently amended by chapter 799 of the acts of 1949, and inserting in place thereof

the following: Section 80. In courts in which the salaries of clerks are established by section 79, the salaries of first assistant clerks shall be equal to 75 percent, and the salaries of all other assistant clerks shall be equal to 70 percent, of the salaries of the clerks of their respective courts."

After debate this amendment was adopted.

Mr. Glaser, of Malden, then moved that the amendment be further amended in section 2 by striking out the third and fourth sentences and inserting in place thereof the following: "The salaries of the clerks of said district courts shall be equal to 75 percent of the justice of their respective courts, except the clerk and assistant clerks of the central district court of Worcester. The salaries of the first assistant clerks of said courts shall be equal to 75 percent, and the salaries of the second and third assistant clerks of said courts shall be equal to 60 percent, of the salaries of the clerks of their respective courts."

After remarks on the question on adoption of the amendment moved by Mr. Glaser, Mr. Telford, of Plainville, moved that further consideration of the bill be postponed until Monday next; and after debate the motion was negatived.

The amendment moved by Mr. Glaser then was adopted.

The amendment recommended by the committee on bills in the third reading, as amended, then also was adopted. The substituted bill (see House, No. 2703, printed as amended) then was passed to be engrossed. Sent up for concurrence. Rule 15 was suspended, on motion of Mr. Glaser, of Malden.

Mr. Chadwick, of Winchester, asked unanimous consent to withdraw the motion made by him on Thursday last—for suspension of rule 28 (3) so that he might offer, from the floor, the petition (subject to joint rule 12) of Harrison Chadwick for increasing the scope of the investigation by the commission established to examine the structure of State government by including therein a survey of the salaries of officers and employees of the Commonwealth holding unclassified positions.

There being no objection, the motion was withdrawn.

The motion of Mr. Ayers, of Weston, that rule 28 (3) be suspended with reference to the petition (subject to joint rule 12) of J. Robert Ayres, Christian A. Herter, Jr., William P. Constantino, and Philip F. Whitmore for a legislative amendment to the constitution providing a limitation on the time of sessions of the general court, was considered.

After debate on the question on suspension of rule 28 (3), Mr. Ayres moved that rule 102 be suspended in order that debate on the pending motion might be unlimited; and after further debate this motion was negatived.

The house then refused, by a vote of 62 to 62, to suspend rule 28 (3).

The house bill relative to the duties of the assistant commissioner of State airport management (house, No. 1682) was read a second time.

Pending the question on ordering the bill to a third reading, Mr. Glosky, of Beverly, moved that it be amended in section 1 by inserting after the word "commissioner", in line 12, the words "and shall serve in a dual capacity as legal counsel and assistant commissioner without additional compensation."

After debate the amendment was adopted, and the bill, as amended, was ordered to a third reading.

Under suspension of the rules, on motion of Mr. Chapman, of Boston, the bill (reported by the committee on bills in the third reading to be correctly drawn) was read a third time forthwith; and it was passed to be engrossed. Sent up for concurrence. Rule 15 also was suspended, on further motion of the same member.

The recommended house bill placing, the office or position of secretary, State racing

commission, and of chief accountant and supervising racing inspector of the State racing commission under civil-service laws (house, No. 2191) was considered.

Pending the question on ordering the bill to a third reading, Mr. Richter, of Brookline, moved that it be referred to the next annual session; and after remarks on this motion, further consideration thereof was postponed, on motion of Mr. Harrington, of Everett, until after disposition of the remaining matters in the orders of the day.

Subsequently, the remaining matters having been disposed of, the bill was considered further.

After debate on the question on referring the bill to the next annual session, 67 members voted in the affirmative and 27 in the negative.

The sense of the house then was taken by yeas and nays, at the request of Mr. Walsh, of Lynn; and on the roll call 139 members voted in the affirmative and 86 in the negative, as follows:

Yeas: Allen, Frank H.; Anthony, Charles H.; Armstrong, John A.; Asiat, John George; Aspero, Joseph A.; Ayers, J. Robert; Babcock, Josiah; Bacheller, Everett B.; Baker, Clifton H.; Barnes, Cyrus; Bayley, James C.; Beach, Raymond H.; Bessette, G. Leo; Bisbee, Charles A., Jr.; Bliss, Carlton H.; Bly, Belden G., Jr.; Boot, Frank E.; Boudreau, Samuel J.; Bowker, Everett M.; Brennan, Jeremiah F.; Bresnahan, Daniel J.; Bresnahan, John C.; Brown, Clarence B.; Brown, F. Eben; Brox, John; Bryan, Walter D.; Burke, Harland; Burke, James A.; Cahoon, Oscar J.; Campbell, Eldridge E.; Catino, Michael; Chadwick, Harrison; Chamberlain, Wendell P.; Collins, J. Everett; Coltun, Harry; Constantino, William P.; Costello, John W.; Cournoyer, Leo J.; Cowing, William A.; Cuffe, Walter A.; Curtiss, Sidney Q.; Davis, John A.; Dean, George W.; DeSaulnier, Edward J., Jr.; Doherty, Thomas J.; Doncaster, James R.; Dorman, Allison R.; Duggan, Henry M.; Durkin, Philip J.; Dykeman, Arthur H.; Enright, Thomas E.; Farnam, C. Eugene; Farrell, Thomas F.; Ferguson, Charles E.; Fitzgerald, Peter F.; French, Stephen L.; Gallagher, Francis T.; Gibbons, Charles; Giles, Frank S., Jr.; Glaser, Louis H.; Glynn, William A.; Gott, Hollis M.; Gray, Thomas T.; Greene, George; Haller, Frederick C., Jr.; Hannon, James E.; Harding, Francis A.; Hays, William E.; Herter, Christian A., Jr.; Higgins, Albert F.; Hodgen, Isaac A.; Hoff, Olaf, Jr.; Holman, Charles F.; Hull, Richard L.; Hurlburt, Walter F.; Hutchinson, Fred A.; Iannella, Christopher A.; Jenness, William W.; Johnson, Adolph; Johnson, Ernest A.; Johnson, Stanley E.; Jones, Allan F.; Joyce, Francis X.; Keenan, Henry E.; Keenan, William F.; Keith, Alfred B.; Kelleher, Charles T.; Key, Thomas E.; Kimball, Philip K.; Lee, Carter; Lindstrom, Francis W.; Lombard, Gerald P.; Longworth, William; Lord, Raymond J.; Lucey, C. Gerald; Lynch, John Pierce; Mahan, Arthur U.; Marston, Charles S., 3d; McCarthy, Michael J.; McEvoy, Joseph F., Jr.; McInerney, Timothy J.; McNamara, Francis H.; Milano, Joseph A.; Miles, Sherman; Milne, Arthur W.; Mullaly, Charles A., Jr.; O'Connor, John H., Jr.; Palmer, Raymond P.; Parenzo, Anthony; Parsons, Eben; Perreira, Antonio; Pessolano, Michael P.; Putnam, Harold; Quinn, Philip A.; Rawson, George E.; Richter, Hibbard; Roberts, Albert E.; Russell, Howard S.; Sanderson, Kendall A.; Saulnier, Joseph D.; Seibell, Anthony M.; Seibel, Edwin A.; Skerry, Michael F.; Smith, Fletcher, Jr.; Smith, Roy C.; Snow, H. Edward; Szetela, Walter F.; Tanner, Frank D.; Telford, Clarence F.; Thresher, Irene K.; Tynan, John T.; Vaites, Theodore J.; Ware, Martha; White, Richard J., Jr.; Whitmore, Philip F.; Williams, David B.; Wood, Albert E.; Worrall, Alton H.; Young, Arthur E.

Nays: Artesani, Charles J.; Bagley, Earle S.; Batal, Michael J.; Beades, John J.; Blake, Fred A.; Bradley, Manassah E.; Canavan, Harold W.; Caples, Richard R.; Carr, William F.; Carroll, Michael J.; Chapman, Philip A.;

Chmura, Stephen T.; Coady, Thomas F., Jr.; Condon, James F.; Conley, Joseph T.; Cronin, Vincent F.; Desmond, Cornelius, Jr.; DesRoches, Theophile J.; Donlan, Edmond J.; Driscoll, Charles D.; Dwyer, John J.; Feeney, Michael Paul; Flaherty, Thomas M.; Gallant, John L.; Gay, Peter B.; Glosky, C. Henry; Good, Francis J.; Gorman, Edwin D.; Graham, Joseph P.; Harrington, Fred C.; Hodder, J. Alan; Hurwitz, Nathaniel M.; Iannello, Charles; Jackson, Herbert L.; Kahalas, Abraham H.; Kaplan, Charles; Kerr, Edward L.; Kiernan, Cornelius F.; Kirlin, William W.; Kitchen, Thomas E.; Lally, Bernard M.; Lane, Edmund V.; Leahy, Joseph F.; McCarthy, Frank D.; McCarthy, Paul A.; Means, Augustus G.; Mirsky, Wilfred S.; Morton, William D., Jr.; Murphy, John E.; Murphy, Robert F.; Murray, Cornelius J.; Nagle, Harold C.; O'Brien, James A.; O'Brien, William T.; O'Connor, David J.; O'Dea, James L., Jr.; Oliveira, Frank B.; O'Rourke, John J.; Palmer, Harold A.; Patrone, Charles L.; Piemonte, Gabriel Francis; Plunkett, Patrick F.; Porter, George W.; Pothier, Harvey A.; Pressman, Meyer; Randall, William I.; Rowan, William H. J.; Ruether, Richard A.; Shea, John M.; Skladzien, Charles J.; Spurr, Thomas H., Jr.; Sullivan, Jeremiah J.; Sullivan, Walter J.; Sullivan, William F.; Sylvia, Joseph A., Jr.; Thompson, John F.; Tilden, Nathaniel; Tivnan, Robert X.; Toomey, John J.; Umana, Mario; Wall, William X.; Walsh, Joseph F.; Ward, Joseph D.; White, Malcolm S.; Whitmore, Howard, Jr.; Wondolowski, Stanislaus G.

Yeas 139, nays 86. Therefore the bill was referred to the next annual session.

Mr. Walsh, of Lynn, then moved that the house adjourn; and the motion prevailed. Accordingly, without further consideration of the remaining matters in the orders of the day, at 10 minutes after 3 o'clock, the house adjourned, to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

Shall Spain Be in the Western Alliance?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on the 29th of July the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and I participated in the CBS radio program known as the People's Platform, at which time we discussed the question, Should Spain Be in the Western Alliance?

As I believe this discussion may be helpful in connection with our consideration of the Western Europe collective security situation, with the approval of the Senator from Washington, I ask unanimous consent that a transcript of the program be incorporated in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the discussion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNOUNCER. The Columbia Radio Network invites you to another session of People's Platform with Stuart Novins. Our question today "Should Spain be in the Western Alliance?" Our guests Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, and member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, Republican of New Jersey, and member of the Foreign Relations Committee. This broadcast was recorded in the Senate

radio gallery, and here to open the discussion is Chairman Stuart Novins.

Mr. Novins. These past few weeks Spain and Franco has popped prominently into the news again. The late Admiral Sherman, the great, highly honored American, went to Madrid to discuss with Franco the possibility of certain commitments to the anti-Communist bloc. These past 2 weeks also, congressional committees have been to Europe to examine conditions there in relation to our western defense pattern.

Senator SMITH, you were in Europe with your committee, watched closely the developments concerning Franco. I think you have spent some time with Franco. I wonder if you would give us your opinion—what do you think the United States position should be regarding Spain and our western defense strategy.

Senator SMITH. Let me just say briefly that I was a member of the Foreign Relations Committee that just had a 2-week trip to Europe, where we covered France, England, Spain, Greece, Turkey, Rome, Germany, and back to France. The picture of Spain at the western end of the Mediterranean was one of the most important pictures that we saw. We had the privilege of talking with Mr. Franco, himself, to get an idea of what his feelings were about the matter. I got an idea in France and England about the feeling of those countries toward Franco's participation and, of course, being in Spain, itself, we felt the full significance of that Iberian Peninsula and the whole picture, especially the Mediterranean area. I can say that my feeling is that it is most important for us in our whole Atlantic Pact set-up to work up some program whereby the manpower of Spain, the location of Spain, and Spain, in general, should be a part of our North Atlantic defense, and especially a part of the Mediterranean picture.

Mr. Novins. All right, thank you, sir; now let's turn to Senator Magnuson and find out what his opinions are.

Senator MAGNUSON. Thank you, Mr. Novins, but I somewhat disagree with my distinguished friend from New Jersey. I think before we embark upon aid to Spain we ought to divide the basic problem into two parts—one, whether or not Spain will be of any military aid to us in our over-all fight against communism in Europe and elsewhere, and the other whether or not we are going to embark upon a program of aid to Spain for the rehabilitation of Spain itself. The second question, of course, poses many political problems, whereas the first question, of course, is a military question. Now I'm just wondering whether Senator Smith could tell me—for I'm sure the Joint Chiefs of Staff haven't told the Congress—just what military aid Spain can be to us.

Senator SMITH. Well, I can give you a little light, I think, on both the economic and military. Of course, economically Spain is all shot to pieces. She needs economic help, and Franco—Mr. Franco was wondering why, when we were helping these other countries, we didn't talk in terms of the economic condition Spain was in and didn't consider Spain in connection with the Marshall plan, for example. Now, the military aspect, it seems to me, would be simply this: the location of Spain, and the Pyrenees Mountains, and the whole set-up on the western end of the Mediterranean indicates that Spain is a natural as part of the North Atlantic defense. And, of course, the possibilities of air bases in Spain is one of the things we have all been thinking about, but most important, irrespective of Spain's manpower, that second, the air-base problem, is one that we are all very much concerned with, and, I think, although I can't speak for Admiral Sherman, who, in my judgment, was one of the outstanding men in our military set-up—Admiral Sherman, I'm sure, was there discussing the base problem. And it was that prob-

lem that we were all particularly interested in. I might add, however, Senator, that Franco told us that he had available, if the proper arrangements could be made, a manpower that might total 2,000,000 men, but they'd need equipment. We would have to do something about it. In answer to a question from me he said he would be willing if those men should move outside of Spain, in common defense, provided a treaty arrangement could be made. [Simultaneous talking.]

Senator MAGNUSON. Well I was going to ask that question whether or not they would move outside. Of course, we are thinking now in terms of the four major Mediterranean countries—the four powers, namely Spain, Greece, Turkey, and Yugoslavia, but whether or not—

Senator SMITH. Don't forget Italy.

Senator MAGNUSON. Italy—whether or not—well our treaty sort of holds that down a little bit, which ought to be revised, incidentally. But, whether or not Spain would move out her 2,000,000—they have a conscription in Spain that starts at the age of 21, and the trained military manpower according to Harrison Baldwin, of the New York Times, they claim to be 2,057,000. I suppose that's the figure that Franco gave you.

Senator SMITH. The round figure of 2,000,000.

Senator MAGNUSON. But he says that many observers estimate that 400,000, including about 25,000 officers, of this number are now under arms, so that would mean that Spain's military is more potential than actual. Now, if we are going to rely on Spain geographically and go behind the Pyrenees Mountains, that would mean that all of Europe would be lost. I don't know what good Spain would be if Europe is all gone.

Mr. Novins. I wonder if I might ask a question about that gentlemen, and before I do I want to explain that bell we just heard in the radio gallery is not an alarm clock, but a call for a vote downstairs. In connection with using Spain for a geographical value I'm wondering about the effect on France, on England, and Western Germany also—are they going to feel there that what we are doing is retreating behind the Pyrenees and that we are going to let the rest of the Continent be run over.

Senator SMITH. The suggestion of retreating behind the Pyrenees—I don't think that's ever been in the picture of any discussions I've heard. The feeling was that Spain, located as it is, is an ideal place for bases—that's the principal thing discussed in the military discussions I heard. Then the question came up whether Spain would defend that area—in case you want to defend those bases—and secondly, whether Franco would be willing to have his troops move out and join the European divisions, in case of an invasion by Russia of Western Europe. And, he said he would be willing to do that provided he could get arrangements with the other countries that would be satisfactory to Spain. Of course, it is a big if—you might never get to any agreement.

Senator MAGNUSON. Let me ask this question of the Senator from New Jersey: Is this predicated upon pure military aid to Spain—that he would move his troops out, if necessary, or does he want to tie the string of economic aid to Spain along with it?

Senator SMITH. We didn't develop any details whatever because we didn't have any time to. We didn't go there with the idea of negotiation; we were simply trying to see from him what his attitude about it was. There is no doubt in my mind that what he said was that he would like to be associated with the Western Powers. There was no doubt in my mind that he did not want to be neutral in case of an invasion of Europe by Russia. He was afraid of Russia and he wanted to be allied with those who were opposing Russian communism. But, he said,

he realized he couldn't be in the Atlantic Pact because England and France wouldn't let him; and I wouldn't advocate his being in the Atlantic Pact. I would advocate the approach to Spain in sort of a Mediterranean set-up with Turkey.

Mr. Novins. Of the four or five countries.

Senator SMITH. Well, I figured Spain on the one end, Greece and Turkey at the other end; possibly Iran. Of course, Turkey thinks Iran ought to be brought into the thing; north Africa, certainly Spanish Morocco, French Morocco, and so on; Italy, certainly; possibly France might come in some part of a set-up of that kind, although France wouldn't want Spain in the Atlantic Pact, which is supposed to be limited to democratic and free countries, and they say, of course, that Spain isn't a democratic and free country. I think, if you had two different set-ups brought together through the joint membership by the United States in both groups, the Atlantic Pact in this group, and a formula could be worked out, or the alternative a bilateral arrangement between the United States and Spain, where we would have access to bases there for the Air Force to help to develop in order to have that big deterrent to Russia making this attack.

Senator MAGNUSON. Well, of course, that approach might be somewhat different—put a different light on the military aspects of our relations with Spain. But the trouble with all this has been—even the discussions on the Spanish loan in the Senate here last year—that based upon the fact that there is a suggestion that Spain ought to be a part of the North Atlantic Military Pact. Well that naturally presupposes that we expect to go behind the Pyrenees Mountains. Now I don't know what good military Spain would be then because that would mean that all Europe would be gone. Now, if we are going to have another Mediterranean pact—or a Middle East pact—then possibly we might consider this situation.

I've heard no suggestion of a Middle East Pact—but the suggestion I've heard which makes me very dubious about military aid to Spain is to get Spain—get Greece and get Turkey into the so-called North Atlantic Pact of Nations.

Mr. Novins. What would be the position of Tito's Yugoslavia on such a pact?

Senator MAGNUSON. Well, I don't know what the military position would be; of course, if they both had a common enemy why—somewhat similar to our situation now with Japan—we have a common enemy in the Far East, but surely politically there would be nothing but a clash [speaking simultaneously].

I think two dictator countries—one of them a nationalist communistic country and the other one a pure Fascist country—both of them run by dictators. I—

Mr. Novins. I want to explain, Senator, that the only reason I raise the question is because I would like to get your opinions on the political implications of working with Franco apart from the military value. Do we face a problem in some of the other nations—

Senator SMITH. We certainly do, because you probably can't get all the nations of the Atlantic Pact, and it requires unanimity to bring in any other nation, you can't get them to vote "aye," if they won't vote "aye." I'm against raising the issue. I simply want to raise a question of whether in light of the European situation we don't want to use all the forces we can get in such way as we can get them to resist the great threat of Russian communism. Now, the Greeks and the Turks want to be in the Atlantic Pact, they think they are left out of the family, and I am very sympathetic with them. I'm in favor of Greece and Turkey being in the Atlantic Pact. It may be wiser, however, to keep the Mediterranean by itself. We just sounded out the Italians, a little bit on this idea, and the Italians seemed to

be favorable to us considering it. That wasn't official, it was just informal conversations. But, I can conceive of a Mediterranean pact, there wouldn't be any question of retiring behind the Pyrenees, nobody is thinking in terms of that; it is a question of whether you have behind the Pyrenees areas where you can have a "jumping-off" place for the main thing that will deter Russia which is our air power and the use of the atomic bomb, and the use of Spanish bases is a most important thing in the minds of the military people I have talked with abroad. I didn't hear a single person suggest we wanted a place to retreat to; nobody wants to retreat, we want to move out in case this terrible thing comes.

Senator MAGNUSON. Why not use then the bases that we have in other European countries? I don't know why Spain down there is so important—the only time it might become important is if we were forced behind the Pyrenees—or second, if we wanted to use Spain in reverse, so it wouldn't get in communistic hands. In other words, we'd aid Spain only to keep it Spain.

And we don't want Spain to be neutral either; we want Spain to be on the job, if an attack comes. Of course, the history of Spain has in the last war been that we couldn't rely upon that Government at all. Mr. NOVINS. Well, has that situation changed?

Senator MAGNUSON. I don't know; that's what I'm worried about.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Novins, we just have a call for a vote; could we retire for a few moments and then continue this discussion.

Mr. NOVINS. Yes; I'm sure we can, Senator, let's call an adjournment. We are back in the Senate radio gallery again, and our gentlemen, our participants for this afternoon have come back from voting on the floor. This is rather unusual procedure, but I'm delighted that you could get down there and get in the battle, and then come back and pick up our discussion again on Franco.

I wonder, Senator MAGNUSON, you suggested that this problem, in your opinion, breaks down to two points—first, the military side; purely what is the military value of aiding Franco; and, secondly, are we going to get into a program of economic aid, and now the question I raise is, How can you divide those things? If there is military assistance in the form of armaments or money for armaments isn't that, in effect, strengthening the Franco regime?

Senator MAGNUSON. Well, I don't think so, it probably would; you can divide it because Spain is in such a desperate economic state, that any money we send over there, of course, might be swallowed up in some way indirectly to aid her economically, but I think we have to divide it, because the only justification anyone has given in this whole picture of aid to Spain is based on the purely military basis. In other words, they say we have to do this sort of thing because Spain is valuable to us in a military way. Now, I am sure, regardless of what my colleague Senator SMITH thinks about Franco, I am sure that Franco's visions and the Spanish Government's visions are, if they are going to participate in the military way, particularly, say that they will take their men out of Spain—that there is going to be a nice long string attached—"You've got to help us otherwise in some other ways, too"—and I don't think that we can get away from that and that might involve us in much more than we are thinking about in the way of aid, and the only justification that anyone has ever espoused for aid to Spain, has been the military justification, but I don't think that's Spanish thinking. Spain wants to get in on the pact—and maybe we should as a military reason—but economically I'm afraid we are going to get into pretty deep waters.

Mr. NOVINS. I wonder, Senator, if you would tell us if you would support military aid to France if it could be demonstrated that that aid was effective?

Senator MAGNUSON. I would support it, if the Joint Chiefs of Staff could point out to me that they would be militarily valuable—I still can't see that now.

Mr. NOVINS. Would you go beyond that to some kind of economic aid?

Senator MAGNUSON. I won't go beyond it—right now, under present circumstances, with the Spanish Government as it is because I think it would involve much more political trouble and do much more harm in the putting together of the free nations of Europe, than it would do good.

Senator SMITH. I don't want to be misunderstood on that—I think I agree with that last statement of Senator MAGNUSON that there is no doubt that support now for Spain would look like a backing up of the Franco regime and it not only is unpopular in England and France and other countries, but also Spain, itself. There is a large element in Spain that would resent our aiding the Franco government, as such—on the other hand, there is great suffering in Spain today—and perhaps I'm too easy on those things—just like I felt like giving aid to Yugoslavia because of the suffering there and the starvation there—wheat to India, and my instinct—I feel today the Spanish people are distinguished from the Government whatever the Government may be and have been friendly to the United States, since the Spanish War. We have had very fine relations—I have many friends in Spain, as I am very fond of the Spanish people in this country, and I don't see any reason why we should throw over and ignore the suffering of the Spanish peoples because of this political difficulty with Mr. Franco. I admit the difficulties in it, and I admit that we have a long way to go in negotiation before we get at a destination that would be satisfactory, but I do feel that we shouldn't turn our back on people who are suffering, if there is any way we can aid them without overstraining our economy, but I do think entirely aside from the question of manpower and whether you cross the Pyrenees or not—this base question is very fundamental.

You've got Gibraltar, you've got the whole area on the southern end of Spain there right into the Mediterranean that can't be ignored in any effective set-up if we are going to stop this terrible Russian communism.

Senator MAGNUSON. Granting, allowing all the power we can get, if we can do it legitimately, and I think we should be thinking in those terms.

Mr. NOVINS. Senator SMITH, I think it was while you were in Europe we got reports back here in the United States about some proposed changes in the Franco government; did you get any information on that while you were there?

Senator MAGNUSON. Well, he made the change while you were there; didn't he?

Senator SMITH. He made one change that was very unpopular. He appointed in his defense department a man who had been mixed up with Hitler during the war and decorated by Hitler, been the leader, I think, of the so-called Blue Legion or something where Hitler's—

Mr. NOVINS. Blue Division, I believe.

Senator SMITH. That irritated the French people no end. I'll say this for the French people that I've talked to—prominent Frenchmen—that their feeling is against Mr. Franco not against the Spanish people. They would like to renew friendly relations with the Spanish people. They said that to me.

Mr. NOVINS. Well, how do—

Senator SMITH. I think it is the same in England. The feeling is against Franco and

his dictatorial regime and the things that he has done that they resent.

Mr. NOVINS. If I'm not mistaken, we tried to carry on a campaign throughout the world of increasing our friendly relations with the peoples of the countries even though we didn't particularly approve of the governments involved.

Senator MAGNUSON. Even offering friendship to the Russian peoples like [speaking simultaneously].

Mr. NOVINS. Now, if you translate that into terms of Spain and Franco, how can we best handle ourselves in order to reach the Spanish people?

Senator SMITH. That's one of the puzzles we have to face—I haven't got the answers to them. All I'm saying is—it seems to me you've got a situation there that can't be ignored—just because of this difficulty with Franco, we oughtn't to say we are bankrupt in ideas—we are bankrupt in diplomacy—or bankrupt in thinking through what's the best way to do it. Now, let me say a word for Mr. Griffith, our Ambassador. He has come—after being there 6 months—to the conclusion that we should have Franco—he thinks that it can be done, that we can have a good influence on Franco and help him, and we can improve some of these conditions. I'm bound to say on the other side that some members in our organization here—our own State Department set-up are very doubtful about it. There isn't agreement all the way through. I'm talking out of school a little bit on this, but there isn't agreement all the way through as to how the best way to do this thing or whether we should do it at all.

Senator MAGNUSON. I think it is obvious of course, there isn't an agreement on this—and the whole thing, the whole subject has been broached because of the one thing we need—certain parts of Spain for bases and for military purposes.

Senator SMITH. And that's—

Senator MAGNUSON. That's precipitated the whole thing. Now, if that is correct and if the military men say that we need it—and show the Congress that a base in Spain is much better than a base in France or a base down in north Africa, while well and good, let's go over and ask Spain how much she wants for that piece of land and rent it just like we do in lots of other places in the world, and then we won't get mixed up with this political controversy. Because, in the meantime—

Senator SMITH. You want a coldblooded [speaking simultaneously].

I've no objections to that as a start—I'm just arguing that with the whole situation and, I think, the whole committee felt the same way, there must be some way to bring the asset of the Iberian Peninsula with its geographical location and with its manpower, if you will, into this picture and capitalize it in connection with our collective security program for Western Europe.

Senator MAGNUSON. We had better start on a Mediterranean pact—rather than that—I'm afraid you are not going to get the North Atlantic Pact countries.

Senator SMITH. I said that I prefer it, I think it is more practical. A Mediterranean pact—between us and Spain for the bases, but I think a Mediterranean pact, which would include Greece and Turkey—the east end as well as the west end, as a Mediterranean proposition and not base it on democratic, freedom-loving countries and all the preambles we have in the Atlantic Pact—don't argue about the Atlantic Pact, don't try to get them into the Atlantic Pact. But get them in, as a beginner, in the Mediterranean pact for mutual security.

Mr. NOVINS. Gentlemen, what effect would any aid that we gave to Franco have on the peoples to whom we are trying to sell the idea that we are a democratic country.

Senator SMITH. You have a backfire resentment. I get in my mail the fact that—I've simply suggested that we should do something about this—it brought me lots of letters from people in my own State—that I'm sympathetic with them. They just think that it is perfectly terrible we should even think in terms of this terrible man, but I say this—that having met Mr. Franco, having talked with him, I didn't find a swash-buckling, boastful fellow, I found a fellow who said—please ask me questions because I want to tell you what my problems are. He said you people talk about freedom, I agree with them, but we've had revolution and revolution and revolution and chaos and destruction and brothers killing brothers and sisters killing sisters here—we've had to have a strong hand to deal with this thing and before you can give all those freedoms here—you are talking about—freedom of the press and so forth that we were chiding him about—he made a pretty good case out for the chaos—that sometimes ensues when you have to have somebody, like a man on horseback, for a time at least. I said to him when this period is over are you willing to take a position right now that you will put back into Spain those freedoms that we believe in—in the western countries? He said of course I will, I'm doing this just because of the emergency. Now, this might be window dressing—it might have been just a great big bluff—I'm not necessarily saying that I believe what he said because his record is pretty bad as far as dictatorship—

Senator MAGNUSON. I was just going to suggest that he has been at it a long time, and I don't know of any reforms that have shown up just yet.

Senator SMITH. Griffiths pointed out to me that some of the charges against him—for example, in some of the areas where Protestants cannot bury their dead in daylight; those kind of religious charges. Those aren't true; there are isolated cases where there was some wrongdoing by some curae or something in his particular district, but, generally speaking, he says the Catholic Church hasn't been nearly as bad as the stories that have been gotten out about it. And I'm inclined to feel that that is right. I think Griffiths is very fair about it.

Mr. NOVINS. Gentlemen, we are talking about aid, and I'm wondering if you would care to guess how much aid.

Senator SMITH. Well, of course, when you speak of over-all figures, he had a grandiose idea that if they had a little matter of \$500,000,000 they could put up their water power, develop transportation, and so on. We heard those stories. But what we have done, I think, is authorize a \$62,000,000 loan, export—

Senator MAGNUSON. Export-Import Bank. Senator SMITH. They have made loans up to \$17,000,000.

Mr. NOVINS. That's not the military angle. Senator SMITH. No; that's just economic. Mr. NOVINS. What about military aid.

Senator SMITH. I saw no figures at all of what it would cost—I haven't heard it even discussed—the military end of it.

Senator MAGNUSON. Well, it would probably cost into the hundreds of millions to get the 22 divisions—or the 2,000,000 potential—that Spain has and it would take a long time to train them. I think what we'd better do, if we need bases in Spain is just to go over and negotiate with the Spanish Government to have the bases, and pay them rental.

Senator SMITH. I have no objection to that as a first step in a reapproachment, I might say, I don't see any reason to go in there and equip an army at the present time, I don't think that we've gotten that far.

Mr. NOVINS. Senator SMITH, if we went in and simply on a straight business deal said we wanted to buy so many square miles for air bases and so forth—and we will give you

so much money in rentals—would that have any immediate effect on the political side, would that be easier for some of these other democratic countries to take?

Senator SMITH. I don't think—in the long run—that either England or France would object to our making arrangements with Spain whereby we would have the use of those bases; we might put some money into fixing up the bases and make runways for our big bombers and so forth. I think Britain and France both would not object to that, but I heard, although in the papers they came out with objection when it was rumored that that was what Sherman was going to do when he went there.

Mr. NOVINS. I wonder how much of the British objection, Senator SMITH in your opinion is due to their own political situation at home. How far can the Labor Party go in—

Senator SMITH. Very, very much is due to it because, as you know, the labor groups all over the world are opposed to doing anything for Spain, and the British Labor Government would be very much embarrassed if they did anything, and the French Labor Unions would be against it.

Mr. NOVINS. Well, that isn't the basis of the French objection.

Senator SMITH. Our labor unions here—I think both the AFL and the CIO. No, it isn't entirely the basis, but it is there. There are some strong labor unions in France that are opposed to the recognition of Franco.

Senator MAGNUSON. Well, I think that the Senator from New Jersey will agree with me that right now—with all these factors involved—if the military really believes sincerely that this is going to be some help to us in a military way, that probably what we'd better do is not deal with Franco or Spain except to go over there and negotiate for the use of those bases—pay 'em whatever they are worth, and that would give Spain some American dollars which, in effect, would trickle through its own economy and help it somewhat. We would have the bases for military purposes and we would be able to stay out of these terrific political complexes that are involved.

Senator SMITH. Well, I think that the Senator from Washington has expressed the line of thinking that has been going on in the minds of people who are starting something in this direction—that's probably the way to start.

Mr. NOVINS. I wonder if you would venture a political guess—what kind of a bill do you think will come out of this, and when is any action likely to be taken?

Senator SMITH. I don't think there is any contemplated bill on Spain. I think that this leeway in the present legislation, with 10-percent clause for shifting around in dangerous areas that would permit us to put some of the funds in this \$8,500,000,000 bill into the Spanish situation, if there was a crisis calling, for example, to put some money into a base there for sudden use. I think we've got leeway in this bill.

Senator MAGNUSON. Ten percent would be about as much as if you directly appropriated over-all as a whole for the Spanish situation.

Senator SMITH. The leeway is there. If our Joint Chiefs felt—suppose Russia attacks through Germany and our Joint Chiefs felt we needed a base there suddenly—to do some backfire that we could use that 10-percent leeway in this bill without mentioning Spain in the bill at all.

Mr. NOVINS. Senator, this is a little bit apart from Franco—Senator SMITH—but in your trip over to Europe you had an opportunity that you pointed out earlier to look at some other countries—what is your general impression of the defense situation over there?

Senator SMITH. Well, I'm very glad to say this. I was there a year ago and I was

very much depressed when I was there a year ago. I think that in the last year two things have changed the spirit of the people to a very large extent—one is the realization of the reality of the Korean incident that irrespective of how that comes out, they see a real something there that is a very grave threat to the world peace. They also see that the United Nations action there and no matter how it comes out, it was prompt action to resist aggression.

Mr. NOVINS. Do you agree, Senator, that General Eisenhower is an indispensable man in Europe.

Senator SMITH. I don't agree with the implications that have been going on about that statement because I feel that General Eisenhower is doing a first-class job in Europe, but I want to say right here that I would lean over backward to keep any political discussions out of our relationship with General Eisenhower.

Mr. NOVINS. [Laughing.] That was an unfair question.

Senator SMITH. Whether he is indispensable in Europe or not he might be indispensable here. He will have to decide himself where he could be the greatest—

Senator MAGNUSON. Some Republicans think he is indispensable over here.

Mr. NOVINS. Thank you very much gentlemen, for coming in and talking about this problem on "What should we do about Spain."

ANNOUNCER. From the Senate Radio Gallery, you have just heard the six hundred and fifty-ninth broadcast of People's Platform with Stuart Novins. Our question today, Should Spain be in the western alliance?

Joining Mr. Novins were Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, and member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees, and Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, Republican, of New Jersey, and member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Oath of Loyalty to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a summary of remarks I made last Friday morning before the annual convention of the American Legion, Department of Pennsylvania, at Pittsburgh, on the subject of the taking of oaths of loyalty by American citizens.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"I cannot understand why any American who is true to the principles of our country should hesitate for one moment to take an oath of loyalty," Senator MARTIN said.

"Every real American should be proud to proclaim his Americanism, especially in these crucial times when our ideals and our way of life are under attack from those who would destroy freedom in every part of the world where freemen enjoy the blessings of liberty.

"I cannot understand why any real American should refuse to stand up and declare publicly that he is not associated, and would never be associated, with any Communist

group or any other organization that advocates the overthrow of our Government by violence.

"Above all, the teachers to whom the youth of our land are entrusted, should show by example that they are 100 percent in loyalty, 100 percent in patriotism, and 100 percent in support of the American concept of free Government.

"The Legion was the first to propose that the teachers in our colleges take an oath of loyalty.

"In my mind there is no question about the loyalty of an overwhelming majority of the teachers.

"But we must not close our eyes to the increasing spread of Communist doctrine upon the campuses of many of our institutions of higher learning.

"We must not ignore the menace of subversive teachings which are shaking the faith of our young people in the principles of our Republic.

"That is why I was shocked and sorely disappointed when the heads of some of the largest educational institutions in Pennsylvania announced that they were not in agreement with the proposal of the American Legion.

"I want to say now that the Legion was right and the college presidents were wrong.

"Loyalty is a fundamental in the preservation of our freedom. I firmly believe that a public declaration and an oath of loyalty would be a great forward step toward the suppression of subversive teachings on the college campus."

Senator MARTIN gave high praise to the Legion's Americanism campaign as an effective weapon in combating the activities of Communist propagandists among young people. He asked the Legion to work with increased effort for more thorough teachings of American history in every school and college.

"The real meaning of America can be understood and appreciated only through the study of our history and by learning of the sacrifices through which the United States reached greatness among the nations of the earth," Senator MARTIN said.

"We have made substantial progress since we were shocked to learn that history was being neglected in many of our schools. Nevertheless, we must work harder than ever to make American history a basic course of instruction all over America, from the small country schoolhouse to the great colleges and universities."

Senator MARTIN also appealed to the Legion membership to take leadership in the fight for clean, decent citizenship without which, he declared, we cannot have sound or honest government.

"The American Legion has always been vigorous and outspoken in its demands for a strong national defense," Senator MARTIN continued.

"It has been in the forefront of those who saw danger to our country in the neglect of our defensive strength.

"I do not think of national defense in terms of military preparation alone.

"The American Legion can help build America's defense by spearheading a crusade for a moral and spiritual America that will obey and respect the laws of God and man and will battle against corruption wherever it may exist.

"The American Legion can help build America's defense by opposition to waste and extravagance in Government and by fighting for policies that will preserve the solvency of our country.

"You are a great and powerful organization. You have the spirit and the will to fight for America.

"You have led the fight for patriotic Americanism. Now I appeal to you to take leader-

ship in the fight for a solvent, dynamic, spiritual America that will have the power and the strength for victory to bring peace, freedom, and justice to all the world."

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials; one entitled "Hand Wringers and Sleeve Tuggers," the second entitled "Aid for Formosa," both dealing with the subject of our attitude toward communism, which appeared in the Pittsburgh Press of August 9, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAND WRINGERS AND SLEEVE TUGGERS

Under its present leadership, the State Department's basic policy is to go slow, play cautious, and be nice.

That's the way it has been trying to deal with the Moscow gangsters and their stooges in Communist-controlled countries. That's the way it has been handling the Oatis case. And that's why William N. Oatis, an American newspaperman, is still in a Czechoslovakian prison.

Congress is assumed to speak for public opinion. But when Congress, reflecting public opinion, sets out to pass a tough, hard-hitting resolution in the Oatis case, it finds the State Department lobbyists tugging at its sleeve and saying "go easy."

The Department says it has been taking feasible steps to obtain the release of Mr. Oatis.

It has made polite overtures to the Communist hoodlums in Czechoslovakia and received snarling, impudent rebuffs.

It has cried "shame" and "outrage" at the Czech Communists—protests which sounded good for home consumption, but were ignored by the Czechs.

It has moved to erase the preferential tariff on Czechoslovakian goods sold here. But that doesn't stop the flow of American dollars to the puppet state, dollars which are used to help build up the Moscow war machine.

The steps taken by the State Department haven't hurt the Czech Communists. Cutting off trade and breaking diplomatic relations would hurt.

But the Department's lobbyists tell Congress our embassy in Prague is valuable as a listening post and as a symbol.

Our ambassador in Prague is a virtual prisoner. The Communists let him hear what they want him to hear and no more. They have forced him to cut his staff to the point of uselessness. He is a symbol, all right—a symbol of the futility of trying to do business on a decent basis with Communists.

Ambassador Briggs hasn't been permitted to see Mr. Oatis before or since his trial, or even to send him the little comforts the worst criminals are entitled to receive in any United States penitentiary.

All the feasible steps the State Department keeps saying it has taken have failed. They have not even produced a reasonable or polite reply from the Czech Communists.

Mr. Oatis is still in jail.

Hand wringing and plaintive protests won't get him out.

And the State Department, which ought to be soliciting the strongest kind of public and congressional support, instead is lobbying against the very help Mr. Oatis needs the most,

AID FOR FORMOSA

If the United States intends to take a firm stand against communism anywhere in Asia, then President Truman is right in asking for a modest-aid program for the Chinese Nationalist forces on Formosa.

The appropriation requesting \$307,000,000 is less than we are spending on some countries which do not have anything like Formosa's potentialities.

There is little point in giving arms to a country until it has troops to use them. Chiang Kai-shek has at least 400,000 troops in need of equipment. This is the largest anti-Communist military force in Asia.

The policy of waiting until an area is under attack before going to its rescue is exhausting and self-defeating. Americans can't do all the fighting. They should not be doing any fighting at all when there are natives willing to fight in their own defense if given the weapons.

We waited until it was too late adequately to arm the South Koreans, and have paid for that mistake by a fearful toll in American blood. The mistake should not be repeated in Formosa.

Russia is on the march and the West is on the defensive. This permits the Soviets to seek out the soft spots and limit their adventures to areas where they are most likely to succeed. This situation will prevail as long as we are content merely to repel aggression. And wars aren't won that way.

The Communists will retain the initiative in the present struggle until the free nations are strong enough not only to challenge communism anywhere and everywhere, but to move against it if that becomes necessary.

Communism will begin to lose its dynamic force when it can no longer advance. All its successes have been achieved by force or intimidation and it has shown little capacity to consolidate its gains by winning popular support.

Once the Reds have been checked, revolts can be expected in their rear, because the areas under their control are seething with discontent. The constant purges are evidence of that.

If Formosa is armed, it can defend itself against a Communist attack. It also can be in readiness to support revolts against the Communists which may occur on the mainland.

That threat should tend to lessen pressure on other areas. Aggression will not be so inviting when it is confronted by the prospect of a strong counterattack.

National Security Resources Board Chairman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "NSRB Chairman," which appeared in the Washington Post of August 11, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NSRB CHAIRMAN

Release of the new National Security Resources Board pamphlet on industrial dispersion, *Is Your Plant a Target?* is evidence that the NSRB has not been idle despite its lack of a Chairman in the formal sense. The long-range planning agency has been without a Chairman since W. Stuart Symington was appointed to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in mid-April. There is an important distinction, however, between the present status of the NSRB and the damaging hiatus of 15 months that occurred before Mr. Symington's appointment in April of 1950. Upon Mr. Symington's departure his functions were assumed by the former executive officer, Jack Gorrie. Mr. Gorrie appears to be doing a competent job of supplying leadership and rescuing the NSRB from the sort of overconcentration on current operations into which Mr. Symington led it.

President Truman was wise, in our opinion, not to go through with his earlier reported plan to make W. Averell Harriman the new NSRB Chairman in addition to his other job as Foreign Relations Coordinator. NSRB is too big to be slighted with half-time attention; it also requires a particular type of staff work, anonymous and unglamorous, which can peer into long-range future needs and advise the President. Actually, for all practical purposes Mr. Gorrie is the Chairman, with merely the prefix of "acting" before his name. In a sense NSRB functions dovetail with the more immediate planning duties of Defense Mobilizer Wilson, with the NSRB taking up where Mr. Wilson leaves off. Continuity is provided by the fact that both Mr. Wilson and Mr. Gorrie attend meetings of the National Security Council. The important thing, of course, is to make sure that all facets of planning are covered, and so long as they are who holds what title does not particularly matter.

The China Policy and Freda Utley's Book, the China Story

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, on June 5 last I made an address in the Senate dealing with our China policy and with Freda Utley's book entitled "The China Story." This address set in motion a correspondence between Mr. Lester Markel, Sunday editor of the New York Times, and myself.

In justice to all concerned, and to the possible public interest involved, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the correspondence.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, first in order is Mr. Markel's first letter to me, dated June 18, 1951. The letter is as follows:

THE NEW YORK TIMES,
Times Square, June 18, 1951.

HON. OWEN BREWSTER,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BREWSTER: I have been abroad and on my return I find the CON-

GRESSIONAL RECORD of June 5, in which is reported a speech by you on March 17 referring to the New York Times Book Review.

There are statements made in that speech and implications that are both inaccurate and distinctly unfair. The charges made by Miss Utley in her book are not new, nor is this campaign a new one. As a matter of fact, this attack was made, in its most comprehensive and most vicious form, in the American Legion Magazine for February. In connection with that article, we prepared a memorandum, a copy of which is attached, in which the charges are fully answered.

The New York Times does not employ Communists, has never employed them, and, as I need not tell you, has been opposed to all totalitarian movements from the very beginning. This policy, of course, holds for the Book Review. We would not knowingly print a review by a Communist or by anyone who sympathizes with Communists.

It is unfortunate that these charges have been given additional distribution by you, and I feel strongly that you owe us a correction. If there are any questions you care to put to me in connection with these statements, I shall be more than glad to answer them.

Yours sincerely,

LESTER MARKEL,
Sunday Editor.

Second, I present Mr. Markel's memorandum. This memorandum purports to deal with an article in the American Legion magazine. I refused to discuss the memorandum with Mr. Markel since it concerned something I knew nothing about.

The memorandum is as follows:

MEMORANDUM ON THE IRENE KUHN ARTICLE

The basic charge made by Irene Kuhn in her article in the American Legion magazine is, in substance, this: that the New York Times Book Review is favorable to books sympathetic to communism and unsympathetic to books of an anti-Communist character. We believe that anyone who is a regular reader of the Time Book Review will refuse to take this charge seriously.

Mrs. Kuhn has tried to build a case on less than a dozen reviews selected from the New York Times Book Review in the last 5 years and has ignored countless others which would disprove her argument.

For example, in 1950 the book review covered 52 books dealing with Russia, communism and allied subjects. The majority of these were, broadly speaking, anti-Communist books. It is significant that Mrs. Kuhn selected for discussion only 3 of these 52 books. It seems fair to assume that her silence about the other 49 indicates that she has little or no complaint about the reviews of these books.

Most of Mrs. Kuhn's examples are taken from reviews printed several years ago and most of them deal with China. The views held about China today differ widely from the views held when these books were first written, as do also the views about Russia (although the view of the Times has not changed: from the beginning we have condemned the Russian regime as a brutal dictatorship).

The point of view expressed in the books on China attacked by Mrs. Kuhn was, in reality, shared by an overwhelming majority of Americans in China. Mrs. Kuhn implies that the authors of these books or the reviewers were Communists or Communist inspired, but she offers no proof of her charge.

Mrs. Kuhn pays particular attention to two books—*Seeds of Treason* and *Ordeal by Slander*. Both of these were reviewed by members of the New York Times staff. It is the firm policy of the Times that no Communist shall be a member of its news or editorial staff. If Mrs. Kuhn has evidence

that this policy is being circumvented, she has failed thus far to produce it.

Mrs. Kuhn's article contains such sweeping statements as these: "Books have become transmission belts for insidious propaganda for treason," and "Communists spot their agents or sympathizers among the reviewers." Mrs. Kuhn does not name a single reviewer as a Communist agent or sympathizer and she does not designate a single book as insidious propaganda for treason. Presumably the laws of libel have something to do with Mrs. Kuhn's failure to be specific.

Mrs. Kuhn seems to assume that all anti-Communist books are per se good books and should be praised. But the fact is that like other books, they vary in quality and we deem it the function of the reviewer in these cases, as well as in all others, to distinguish between the good and the bad.

One other point in the American Legion magazine presentation deserves attention. There appeared as a panel illustration for the article reproductions of the jackets of 10 books. The caption for this illustration was title: "The Commies have done their best to keep these books out of your hands. . . ." Except for *Seeds of Treason* and a passing reference to *Assignment in Utopia*, none of these books are mentioned in the article. All but 1 of these 10 books were quite favorably reviewed by the Times.

Our responsibility in the book review, as we see it, is to select honest, qualified reviewers and to let them have their say. Certainly, under that definition of our aim, any Communist would be ruled out. That has been and continues to be our policy.

LESTER MARKEL,
Sunday Editor.

On June 28, 1951, I sent this reply to Mr. Markel's first letter:

JUNE 28, 1951.

Mr. LESTER MARKEL,
Sunday Editor, New York Times,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR Mr. MARKEL: I have your letter of June 18 referring to my Senate speech on June 5 which dealt with the China policy, Miss Utley's book, *The China Story*, and a survey of book reviews in the years 1945-50.

You speak in your letter of an article in the American Legion magazine of February. I have never read the article and so am not able to discuss it.

In referring to my speech you say: "There are statements made in that speech and implications that are both inaccurate and distinctly unfair."

Please tell me what statements are inaccurate and what implications are unfair.

Cordially yours,

OWEN BREWSTER,
United States Senate.

Mr. Markel, on July 17, 1951, replied to my request for particulars as follows:

THE NEW YORK TIMES,
Times Square, July 17, 1951.

HON. OWEN BREWSTER,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BREWSTER: You ask "what statements are inaccurate and what implications are unfair" in your speech of June 5.

In the first place, the tables which you inserted in the RECORD and which appear on pages 6145 and 6146 carrying the following heading: "Nonfiction books on China published in the United States and reviewed in the New York Times Book Review, 1945-50, inclusive." Only that half of the list appearing on the left-hand side of the page correctly refers to the New York Times.

You allege that "often they (writers on China) reviewed one another's books." That statement is not true. It would be more accurate to say they "seldom reviewed one another's books." Among the 35 books on China listed in your chart, only two books

were so handled—Annalee Jacoby reviewed John K. Fairbank's book, and Professor Fairbank reviewed the Jacoby and White books. During this 6-year period 18 different reviewers appraised the 35 books on China covered in the Sunday Times Book Review.

You make this statement: "The tables demonstrate the remarkable success of this effort to explain in glowing terms the Chinese Communist cause." As proof of this statement, so far as the New York Times is concerned, you cite only a review by Nathaniel Peffer of a book by Gunther Stein published in 1945. In that connection there is a quotation from the China Story by Freda Utley—a book and writer you highly endorse. On page 143 of the China Story Miss Utley refers to Tillman Durdin, then and now correspondent of the New York Times in China, as "politically one of the best-informed correspondents" (incidentally, Mr. Durdin has written both book reviews and magazine articles for the Sunday Times). Miss Utley says, "It was also Durdin who gave me what is probably the fundamental reason why so many American correspondents in China fell under the Communist spell during World War II. 'You must understand,' he said, 'how easy it was to believe in the Communists. It was so utterly hopeless in Free China. The graft, the misery, the lack of will to fight any more. Even I felt that it could not be worse, and must be better in Communist China!'"

The implications of your remarks seem to me obvious—that those in charge of the New York Times Book Review during this period were either fellow travelers or dupes. That was the charge made in extenso in the Kuhn article in the American Legion magazine—an article endorsed, by footnote, in the Utley book. That is why the memorandum I sent you is pertinent.

The New York Times does not employ Communists, has never knowingly employed them, and has been opposed to all totalitarian movements from the very beginning. This policy holds and has always held for the book review.

In sum, I think your charges, and more their implications, are distinctly unfair and unfortunate and that they should be corrected. I believe the facts warrant that this correction should be made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in a position of prominence equal to that of the original allegations.

Yours sincerely,

LESTER MARKEL,
Sunday Editor.

Finally, Mr. President, I present my detailed rejoinder to Mr. Markel. In this letter I say that since he insists that the points he raises be given space in the RECORD I have taken this means of satisfying his contention.

My reply, as of August 13, 1951, is as follows:

MR. LESTER MARKEL,
Sunday Editor, New York Times,
New York City, N. Y.

DEAR MR. MARKEL: I have your letter of July 17 with its continued comment on my Senate speech of June 5 which dealt with the China policy, Miss Utley's book The China Story and a survey of book reviews in the Sunday Times and Sunday Herald Tribune in the years 1945-50 inclusive.

You are correct in your reference to the misplaced tables in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 5, 1951 (pp. 6145, 6146). This was a printer's error and on June 7, 1951, long before your original letter of June 18, request was made from the Senate floor that the tables be corrected. This was done.

The tables were corrected, as shown in the attached reprint of the speech, and will so appear in the RECORD.

You refer once again to the memorandum which you issued concerning an article in

the American Legion magazine. As I said before, the memorandum is meaningless, so far as my speech is concerned, for I have never read the article referred to and so cannot discuss it.

Now, before I take up your other charges, I would like to make some general statements.

I have been a Member of Congress for 18 years and a Senator since 1941. In those years I have had to deal repeatedly, in one way or another, with questions involved in Far East policy. In line of duty I have been out to China myself. It is not a situation in which I, and other Senators, have had to act for the first time.

The conduct of the United States foreign policy in the Far East has long been a matter of intense worry and concern in the Congress. If you do not already know it, I may tell you now that one of the reasons for the anxiety has been the long standing practice of the administration generally and the State Department in particular, to withhold from Congress information of what they were doing in China. The Marzani case, the Hiss case, the Wadleigh confessions, the Amerasia case and numerous others deepened suspicion and reacted upon the congressional anxiety over the China policy.

The abrupt dismissal of General MacArthur precipitated the Senate investigation, with which, no doubt, you are familiar. Almost coincidentally with the MacArthur dismissal came the publication of Miss Utley's book, The China Story. I read it and was more than impressed by it.

To me the book was of unusual value because it assembled and made available to the public for the first time a mass of information about the China policy hitherto scattered or—to the public—unknown. I determined to call this to the attention of the Senate and did so in my speech of June 5, 1951.

In the course of reading Miss Utley's book I was much struck with the section on the book reviews. I have been a tolerably constant reader of both the Sunday New York Times and Herald Tribune for many years and the passages in the Utley book referred to crystallized an uneasy feeling which I had had for a long time. This feeling derived not from someone else's opinions but from my own more or less casual reading of book reviews over the past 5 years or so. It had seemed to me that somehow the dice were being loaded.

Once I had read this section of Miss Utley's book, I determined to have a look at the record myself. With that in mind I inspected the reviews of books on China as they appeared in the New York Times and New York Herald Tribune Sunday book reviews for the years 1945 to 1950, inclusive. What I discovered more than confirmed what Miss Utley had said and what my uneasy feelings had suggested long before. Upon what I found I wrote my Senate speech.

You spoke in your original letter of a "Campaign." I may say that my remarks were a part of no campaign whatever. They were based upon my own experience as detailed above.

Now for your charges.

You say: "You allege that 'often they (writers on China) reviewed one another's books'." That statement is not true. It would be more accurate to say they 'seldom reviewed one another's books'. Among the 35 books on China listed in your chart, only two books were so handled—Annalee Jacoby reviewed John K. Fairbank's book and Professor Fairbank reviewed the Jacoby and White books."

Your statement is hair splitting. In my address I dealt specifically with the trend of the book reviews in both papers and said so repeatedly. Turn to both tables in the reprint and see for yourself. If you insist upon the Times table alone, look at this

group of authors, reviewed in the Times; Owen Lattimore, John K. Fairbank, Annalee Jacoby, Harold Isaacs, and Robert Payne. Now look at this list of reviewers: Owen Lattimore, John K. Fairbank, Annalee Jacoby, Harold Isaacs, and Robert Payne.

Why do you drag Mr. Tillman Durdin into this discussion and say that he has written book reviews for the Sunday Times? My speech covered specifically the years 1945 to 1950, inclusive. Show me the place in the table, which covers those years, where Mr. Durdin had a book published or reviewed one for the Sunday Times.

You quote me as saying "The tables demonstrate the remarkable success of this effort to explain in glowing terms the Chinese Communist cause." Then you yourself say: "As proof of this statement, so far as the New York Times is concerned, you cite only a review by Nathaniel Peffer of a book by Gunther Stein published in 1945."

Very well, let us look at the record.

Let us also begin with the original reference to Peffer's review of Gunther Stein's The Challenge of Red China (New York Times, Sunday, October 28, 1945.)

Says Peffer: "There is something in Communist China that captures the imagination of all sorts and conditions of men. * * * It must be emphasized that Mr. Stein is a competent reporter and that he documents his facts."

In my speech, after quoting Peffer's review, I then referred to the fact that when the Army published a report prepared by General MacArthur's staff in which it was stated that Stein, according to records discovered in Japan, had been a member of a Russian Communist spy ring in Asia, Stein fled this country within 24 hours. So far as I know, he has never dared to return.

The Times published Peffer's warrant of Stein's "competence." Has Peffer revised his judgment and has the Times ever published such revision, if any?

Let us proceed.

In my speech I said, referring to the foreign service officers and the book writers, "Here, in this heterogeneous group the germ of the fatal coalition idea which subsequently became the basis of United States China policy was cultivated and promoted."

Observe a quotation from Edgar Snow's review of Owen Lattimore's book Solution in Asia in the Times for February 25, 1945. After citing Lattimore's eminence as an expert, Mr. Snow goes on, partly quoting from and partly commenting on the Lattimore book itself:

"The Communists control a territory with 80,000,000 people; they have expanded 'not because they subdue people by armed force but because the people support them'; basic economic conditions under Communist rule are better than under Kuomintang rule; many non-Communists live peacefully in their areas and support the regime, and 'the political structure under the Communists is more nearly democratic than under the Kuomintang.' At the same time Lattimore stresses at considerable length Chiang Kai-shek's role as something which rises above the limitations of one party rule. He does not consider the Generalissimo a dictator so much as the focus of a coalition of political forces representing the different economic and regional forces inside the country. * * * Lattimore thinks he (Chiang Kai-shek) need not fear losing his authority in a government in which party differences with the Communists could be reconciled by democratic processes."

Mr. Markel, where, in this review is there any warning from the Great Lattimore and/or Snow of the disaster to the United States which a Communist success in China would represent? And how effective were those "democratic processes" in reconciling Chiang's differences with the Communists?

Chiang balked at the coalition, our Government, and State Department did their best to ram it down his throat. How do you like the prospect as of now, Mr. Markel?

One further comment on this review. Mr. Snow says:

"This book brilliantly illuminates the main questions of our time in Asia, and how they could be answered by an intelligent, vertebrate policy. In the opinion of this reviewer, however, in order to win acceptance for such measures we need a new philosophy in Congress, which in turn (and alone) could impose it on the State Department."

The sardonic implications of this passage are sublime. For your information, Mr. Markel, I may say that I believe in the period covered there has been no limit to which the State Department would not go in suppressing, distorting, and concealing from Congress what it was doing in China.

Let us proceed.

Here is a passage from Edgar Snow's review of Harrison Forman's report from Red China, as it appeared in the New York Times for March 11, 1945. For a devious, insidious propaganda job I think it would be difficult to beat.

"Within this year, we shall be obliged to make a decision in our policy toward the forces locked in this dispute, for it concerns the operation of our military plans to recover North China and Manchuria. We shall have to choose, before then, whether to continue to give all military aid and economic cooperation to the Generalissimo's anti-Communist government at Chungking, even if his troops begin to try to move into areas in the northern Provinces now already freed of Japanese by the Chinese partisans (which have political administrations of their own) or whether to aid both groups impartially. This problem is likely to become much more complex, rather than less so, as we approach the day when Soviet arms must surely intervene to hasten the end of the war in Manchuria and Mongolia.

"Harrison Forman's report from Red China, with its fresh vivid and comprehensive account of the battle for life and freedom under China's partisans (that is, the Communists) is therefore an extraordinarily timely book and of considerable historic as well as contemporary value."

Let us proceed.

Here is Annalee Jacoby, reviewing John B. Powell's *My 25 Years in China* in the New York Times for December 16, 1945:

"He (Mr. Powell) is, of course, perfectly entitled to his view of a presently controversial situation. But he makes the serious error of allowing it to distort his interpretation of history by dragging the Red Menace by the scruff of the neck into situations where it hardly seems at home."

Mr. Markel, wouldn't you say that Miss Jacoby was doing her best to soft-pedal "the Red Menace" in the passage cited?

Let us proceed.

Here is John K. Fairbank reviewing *Thunder Out of China* by Theodore White and Annalee Jacoby in the New York Times for October 27, 1946.

Did the Times give the reader any warning about Fairbank? On the contrary he was represented as an authority. At the end of the review, the Times identifies Fairbank as follows: "John K. Fairbank, Associate Professor of History at Harvard, began his studies of Chinese language and history at Oxford as a Rhodes scholar. Since 1932 he has spent nearly half his time in China, during the war in government service at Chungking and more recently, as head of the Department of State's cultural program."

I suppose you might contend that identifying Fairbank as head of the Department of State's cultural program constitutes a

warning to the reader, but I will not debate that.

Let us have the passage from Fairbank's review of the White-Jacoby book. The Times typographical arrangement does not always make it clear when Fairbank is quoting the book or talking for himself. You must be the judge. Nevertheless look at this passage:

"Equally striking is the picture of the Communists, who worked with history as if it were a tool and with peasants as if they were raw material; they reached down into the darkness of each village and summoned from it . . . such (word omitted by the Times) the Kuomintang nor Japan imagined could exist . . . if you take a peasant who has been swindled, beaten and kicked about for all his waking days and . . . treat him like a man, ask his opinion, let him vote for a local government, let him organize his own police and gendarmes, decide on his own taxes and vote himself a reduction in rent and interest—if you do all that, the peasant becomes a man."

Mr. Markel, do you get a warning of the dangers of communism out of this passage? Mr. Fairbank says of the authors that "their grasp of the facts cannot be questioned nor their passionate Americanism." In my judgment the passage quoted is admirably designed to give the reader the impression that the Chinese Communists are noble liberators. I leave it to you to judge the quality of the White-Jacoby passionate Americanism.

Let us proceed.

Here is a passage from Annalee Jacoby's review of Holger Cahill's *Look South* to the Polar Star as it appeared in the New York Times for February 9, 1947. Miss Jacoby is talking now, not Mr. Cahill:

"The Chinese Communist program of local democracy was gathering ragged groups who for the first time believed promises worth fighting for, and fought Japanese, puppets and government troops. Already—though not many saw it then—the Chungking government was beginning to dissolve into corruption and oppression."

Mr. Markel, in my speech I said:

"In general, though not in every detail these books assumed a common pattern arguing two fundamental points:

"First. The government of Chiang Kai-shek is vicious, corrupt, decadent and tyrannical.

"Second. The Chinese Communist movement is healthy, vigorous and, in most respects, an admirable effort to attain justice and liberation."

Does not the passage from Miss Jacoby's review illustrate exactly the attitude I was trying to illustrate?

Let us proceed.

Here is a passage from Owen Lattimore's review of Israel Epstein's book *The Unfinished Revolution in China* as it appeared in the New York Times for June 22, 1947:

"In the last 10 years American writers have taken the lead over all others in raising the level of description and analysis in writing about China. From Edgar Snow's *Red Star Over China* to Theodore White and Annalee Jacoby's *Thunder Out of China* the list of names is distinguished—and most of these writers won their distinction solely or primarily by what they had to say about China. Israel Epstein has without question established a place for himself in this distinguished company. . . . It is noteworthy that the recent and current trend of good books about China, well documented and well written, has been well to the left of center. The writers either throw their weight into criticism of the Kuomintang, like Mr. White and Mr. (sic) Jacoby, or into outspoken support of the Chinese Communists, like Mr. Epstein. . . . There is no question about Mr. Epstein's partisanship. He not only justifies Chinese Communist policy but he justifies it and Russian

policy in relation to each other and in relation to American policy. But the over-all American interest in China has moved beyond partisanship. We need to be able to tell whether an author is partisan or impartial; but we also have a right to demand that he present enough facts for us to be able to form our own opinion. Mr. Epstein has presented enough facts for this reviewer, at least, to form an opinion."

I shall not comment on this passage beyond saying that I believe it bears out, utterly, the argument I made in my speech.

Let us proceed.

Here is a passage from Robert Shaplen's review of Robert Payne's *The Revolt of Asia* as it appeared in the New York Times for September 28, 1947:

"He has a convincing triumvirate of heroes, . . . Shjarir, the diminutive former head of the Indonesian Government; . . . Nehru, of India, and Mao Tse-tung, of Communist China. His chief villains are Chiang Kai-shek and the Kuomintang . . . he believes implicitly in . . . the best features of reform in Communist China. . . . The Revolt of Asia . . . stands with Harold Isaac's recent *No Peace for Asia* as a useful and well-written study of the East in turmoil."

Mr. Markel, do you not think that this passage bears out what I said in my speech?

Let us proceed.

We have had Fairbank quoting glowing passages about the Chinese Communists from Miss Jacoby as cited above. Now we have Miss Jacoby telling all and sundry how superb a character Mr. Fairbank is in her review of Fairbank's *The United States and China* in the New York Times for July 11, 1948:

"Only a foolish man or a remarkably learned one will write a book about China for the next few years. After *The United States and China*, there's not much left to say. I can't remember another volume which holds, packed so tightly, as much scholarly information about a single subject. . . . Fairbank probably knows as much about China as any other American. He went to that country in 1932 after studying at the University of Wisconsin, Harvard, and Oxford; he came back an authority on western imperialisms and their impact on oriental societies. He taught Chinese history at Harvard, where he set up one of the most comprehensive China programs in our country. His is not a pale and bookish China, nor a country remembered from calmer pre-war days. He understands the mess it's in today; he returned only recently from a tour of duty as director of the United States Information Service in China. . . . Fairbank believes that China's economic system is probably heading toward socialism rather than capitalism. What form of socialism will depend, of course, upon the kind of government which controls it. He believes that no matter what the outcome of the civil war, this will be an authoritarian bureaucracy. . . ."

In my speech, Mr. Markel, I said, "The praise was glowing, but a spoonful of criticism was often put in to give the right tint of impartiality. A master propagandist could not have done a better job."

When Miss Jacoby says "He (Fairbank) believes that no matter what the outcome of the civil war, this will be an authoritarian bureaucracy . . ." she isn't putting in a spoonful of criticism. She is subtly trying to pin a fig leaf on Mr. Fairbank—just in case.

You do not think so? Then turn to Fairbank's review of Gerald Winfield's *China's Struggle for Survival* as it appeared in the New York Times for December 12, 1948.

Says Fairbank:

"Now that the bankruptcy of our made-in-Congress aid-to-China policy has proved

again that American arms shipped abroad do not necessarily protect the American way of life, we can try to construct a new China policy."

Did you read this passage before the Times put it in type, Mr. Markel? It strikes me as outrageous. It is most certainly true that Congress did its utmost to aid China and who frustrated the effort? The very administration which, the Times book review said, Mr. Fairbank represented in Chungking and whose State Department cultural program your paper says he headed.

There was, among other things, an embargo clamped on arms shipments to China and it wasn't Congress that laid that embargo. It was done by the State Department in their effort to force Chiang to adopt the coalition policy. I wish you would read the second chapter in Miss Utley's book called *Too Little Too Late—The Facts About Aid to China*.

Let us proceed.

You have had great regard, it seems, for Annalee Jacoby's talents. Here is a passage from her review of General Chennault's *Way of a Fighter* as it appeared in the New York Times for January 30, 1949:

"He (Chennault) adds that this same dictator (Chiang Kai-shek) 'thoroughly understood the Communist motives and techniques and knew that a Communist minority in a coalition government would actually result in complete Communist domination of China.' Perhaps, but how could a man so wise fail to see that this was preferable to complete Communist victory in the field?"

I shall abstain from comment on this propagandist gem and let the exhibit stand for itself.

In my speech, Mr. Markel, I said:

"It is not to be supposed, Mr. President, that this trusty band could hit the bull's eye every time. A score of 100 percent was perfection not quite to be achieved.

"For example, in the course of 6 years, in the Herald Tribune Weekly Book Review, two volumes on China are reviewed by the reliable Arch Steele, the far eastern correspondent. Similarly in the New York Times we can discern some skepticism in three reviews by Stuart Lillico. Other examples might be given.

"But, by and large, Mr. President, the boys and girls who, in the old-time phrase, were determined to carry the message to Garcia, scored a triumph. On the whole it was as successful a selling job for communism as has ever been done here."

Not the sentence "Other examples might be given."

I will now, to sum up this lengthy reply, cite for you one of these examples, a passage from Robert A. Smith's review of Hollington Tong's *Dateline: China* as it appeared in the New York Times for April 22, 1950:

"There are two aspects of this book that make it important at this time.

"First, it recalls, points up and illustrates what many Americans often forget: that China was fighting for her life a long time before Pearl Harbor. Much of the talk of the 'ineptitude' of the Chinese Government (some of it official) bypasses the days in which China fought alone."

This was a point heavily underscored in Miss Utley's book and in my speech, a point which most of your reviewers carefully ignored. To continue with the quote of this particular review:

"Dr. Tong makes a calm appraisal of why the Chinese Government got a 'bad press' in 1944 and 1945 and why the Chinese Communists got such a good one. Basic was the conflict between the majority of the correspondents and Chiang Kai-shek over the nature of the Communists.

"Many of the correspondents insisted that the Communists were just another political party in the strictly American sense. They thought Yen-an should have as good a chance as the Republicans, or at least as Norman Thomas would have in this country. Chiang regarded the Communists as a conspiratorial fifth column whose aim was the overthrow of China. Subsequent events have proved that Chiang was right."

I submit, Mr. Markel, that Mr. Tong and Mr. Smith and myself are right. And I submit that your contentions will not hold water.

You say in your letter "The implications of your remarks seem to me obvious—that those in charge of the New York Times Book Review during this period were either fellow travelers or dupes."

I never said anything of the kind. Here is what I actually said.

"In some way or other—I do not pretend to know how it was done—the authors of these books managed to endorse each other's wares with remarkable success. Often they reviewed one another's books. It was all very skillful * * *"

"And where this crowd really went to town was when they swung the hatchet on the few authors and journalists who tried to warn Americans of the Communist peril."

But I now say this: On the basis of the record it seems very clear that some more than casual effort, some peculiar and deliberate intent, was working somewhere. On the basis of the record I believe that some investigation, some heart searching, and some admissions are due from the Times rather than the sort of protest shown in your correspondence with me.

In the last paragraph of your letter you say:

"I think your charges, and more their implications, are distinctly unfair and unfortunate and that they should be corrected. I believe the facts warrant that this correction should be made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in a position of prominence equal to that of the original allegations"

I do not make any concession whatever to your charges (save for the printer's error cited and for which, as I say, provision was made for correction before you ever raised your voice) but I do admit that our exchange of views should most certainly appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

With that in my mind I shall insert this entire correspondence, including my reply, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In this way not only you, but the public, will have available every exhibit in the exchange.

Cordially yours,

Industrial Dispersion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from this morning's Washington Post entitled "Industrial Dispersion," together with a release of the National Security Resources Board under date of August 10 on the same subject.

The Post editorial comments favorably upon the announcement of the National Security Resources Board that Government programs for the expansion of national defense will be used to encourage industrial dispersal.

I desire to recall the fact that a report prepared by the staff of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, dated June 30, 1951, set forth the basic economic and military justification for a dispersal program. This document has been one of the most popular of committee publications. We have already distributed 3,000 copies on request, and our supply became exhausted. The resolution adopted by the Senate on August 9 made the report a Senate document (S. Doc. 55) and copies may be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents at 30 cents each.

There being no objection, the editorial and release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of August 13, 1951]

INDUSTRIAL DISPERSION

The refusal of Congress to attach a dispersal amendment to the Defense Production Act does not necessarily imply, as Representative MARTIN charges, that the President's own plan for encouraging industrial decentralization flouts the will of Congress. Certainly there are no legal obstacles to carrying out the Presidential orders. As a matter of administrative discretion, he has instructed Government agencies (1) to grant certificates of necessity providing for accelerated tax amortization to the greatest extent practicable to facilities which meet executive dispersal standards, (2) to give primary consideration to dispersal factors in locating facilities built by the Federal Government, and (3) to award defense contracts in such a manner as to make maximum use of such facilities.

Assurance is given that the President's plan would not cripple established industries or entail any extensive shifting of existing plants. But it would discourage new construction in already congested areas, in disregard not only of considerations of military security but also of the economic consequences of trying to get more production from such areas. In a study prepared for the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, *The Need for Industrial Dispersal*, it was pointed out that cities often become inadequate or inefficient for modern production methods. Owing to housing shortages, workers may have to travel long distances to reach the office or the factory. Moreover, the cost of policing and servicing overcrowded municipalities is increased by plant expansion. Construction costs and taxes are also higher than in less congested areas. In short, excessive concentration would add greatly to the cost of the defense program, as well as to the vulnerability of industry to enemy assaults.

By establishing new plants in underdeveloped areas with adequate potential labor supplies and transport facilities opportunities will be afforded smaller businesses and industries to participate more directly in the defense effort and add to the Nation's productive capacity. We conclude that the President should be commended for his initiative in launching a program that aims to achieve greater military security along with fuller utilization of our reserves of manpower and other productive resources.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD,
August 10, 1951.

An illustrated booklet entitled "Is Your Plant a Target?" explaining a new program for industrial dispersion designed to minimize the effects of any atomic bombing attack on the United States, was issued today by the National Security Resources Board.

The Government called upon local groups to draw up their own voluntary plans for locating new industry away from present concentrations, and said the distance need not be great—as little as 10 to 20 miles, and on rugged terrain even less.

Jack Gorrie, Acting Chairman of the Resources Board, said in a foreword to the booklet, "The risk of an all-out atomic attack on the United States grows greater each day, since we are no longer the sole possessor of the secret of the atomic bomb. This means that no industrial area in the Nation can be considered safe from attack."

"The protection of industrial production is essential to survival in case of war. Increased and sustained production is the backbone of national security."

The brochure emphasizes that industry can qualify for Federal incentives by locating new plants within local marketing areas. It contains nothing, however, to discourage construction of new defense industry in areas far remote from the larger centers.

The Federal incentives available are: certificates of necessity for accelerated tax amortization, allocation of critical materials for construction, defense loans, and defense contracts.

In providing these aids, which have been in use since the start of the defense mobilization program, the Federal Government is to consider satisfactory dispersion to the greatest extent practicable.

The pamphlet shows in detail how dispersion can be accomplished entirely within local marketing areas anywhere in the country by selective use of space on a relatively small scale.

The booklet was based on a pilot operation conducted in Seattle, Wash., by representatives of industry, labor, and local government. Gorrie outlined this four-point program to accomplish industrial dispersion:

"1 It is designed to disperse new industry and expanding industry—not to move established industry.

"2 No region of the country is to be built up at the expense of another.

"3 Industrial dispersion can be carried out if such deployment is confined to each local marketing area.

"4 State and local governments, in cooperation with private enterprise, are called upon to take the initiative in this defense objective. The Federal Government will provide encouragement and technical guidance."

Gorrie said, "Industrial dispersion is the employment of the simple military measure of using space for defense against attack. Space is employed on the battlefield to protect men and supplies. This creates a multiplicity of targets and thus reduces the vulnerability of any one concentration."

"These recommendations are flexible guides for doing an industrial dispersion job. They can be adapted for the varying industrial dispersion problems in all sections of the Nation. Above all, the recommendations for industrial dispersion presented in this booklet recognize that the job can best be done by private enterprise with cooperation and guidance of national, State, and local governments."

The booklet points out the potential role of local committees in taking the initiative for deployment of industry in their own

areas. It tells what kind of area is suitable for small groups of plants, and points out step by step how local committees can get a dispersion program on its way.

As the first step in local procedure, the booklet suggests the organization of a task force through the leading civic association, to include representatives of industry and labor, the professions, and government—"men who are public spirited, realistic, experienced in dealing with problems affecting all groups and interests."

Copies of the booklet can be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., for 25 cents each.

NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL DISPERSION POLICY

The strength of our national defense and in fact of our continued existence as a free nation depend largely upon our industrial capacity. The core of this capacity, so essential to our survival, lies within a relatively few densely built up centers.

Since 1945, we have experienced a period of unprecedented industrial expansion, but, except for a few examples, there has been no pronounced trend away from these concentrations. Some \$18,000,000,000 in new plants and equipment were spent annually during the past 4 years, largely in areas already highly industrialized.

Although we are increasing our defense efforts, the danger of atomic attack grows and demands that new and more positive policies be put into effect to obtain added security for our industrial establishment without jeopardizing its productive efficiency.

In September 1948, the Government, through the National Security Resources Board, issued a report, National Security Factors in Industrial Location. The report stressed the fact that dense agglomerations of industrial plants were inviting targets for the enemy and that plants separated in space would better survive atomic attack.

These general conclusions are as sound today as they were 3 years ago. On these first principles of security our basic policy still must rest.

Since publication of this report, several factors have added to the urgency of the problem:

1. The evidence that Russia had a successful atomic explosion.

2. The probability that a strong enemy air attack could penetrate any defenses.

3. The outbreak of hostilities in Asia as an indication of the semi-peace conditions under which we are living.

Obviously, in the light of the above, what was, in 1948, a set of desirable objectives, is today a subject of major concern and one vital to our national security.

It is recognized that the major centers of industrial production have become highly integrated and that a part of their efficiency is due to their concentration.

A dispersion policy to be effective and realistic must not be allowed to cripple the efficiency and productivity of our established industries, lest the remedy become worse than the ill.

Our policy, therefore, must be directed mainly toward the dispersal of new and expanding industries.

Sites which meet dispersion-security standards can be found in local marketing areas adjacent to industrial or metropolitan districts in all sections of the country.

Thus, this policy can be made to fit the economic and social pattern of any part of the country.

The fullest cooperation of industry, labor, and local and State governments, together with all of the measures which the Federal

Government can take, will be needed to alleviate the present situation. With the necessary technical guidance, as well as the positive inducements which we will give, much can be accomplished.

All departments and agencies of the Government concerned with this problem will be called upon in carrying out a coordinated policy leading to effective industrial dispersal within the concepts described above.

To this effect, the following measures will be taken:

1 To the greatest extent practicable, certificates of necessity, allocations of critical materials for construction purposes, and emergency loans growing out of defense production will be confined to facilities which meet satisfactory standards of dispersal.

2 Primary consideration to dispersal factors will be given in locating facilities built by the Federal Government.

3 Defense contracts will be awarded, and planning under Department of Defense production-allocation programs will be conducted in such a manner as to make maximum use of facilities located in dispersed sites.

William N. Oatis

REMARKS

OF

HON. O. K. ARMSTRONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, a dispatch from Mr. Ray Brock, noted journalist, now in Istanbul, Turkey, indicates that William N. Oatis, an American citizen and Associated Press correspondent in Prague, recently tried and convicted by Communist leaders of the Czechoslovak Government, is getting the "full treatment" of confinement and torture in his prison. The dispatch informs us that every brutal, cunning method of inquisition known to the dread Russian MVD—the secret police—is being used to bring Mr. Oatis to the point of death. He is being subjected to solitary confinement in a small cell. There are endless questionings under blinding floodlights, periodic beatings, the use of drugs, starvation, and unspeakable indignities.

While the State Department carries on feeble "negotiations" on the subject of Mr. Oatis' release, it is possible that Mr. Oatis' life may soon be ended and there will be nothing further to negotiate about.

The rights of a free press and of press correspondents everywhere are on trial in this matter. The whole free world should rise in righteous indignation and take steps both to secure the immediate release of Mr. Oatis and to insure that American citizens are not subjected to such Communist "drumhead" trials and imprisonments in the future. The dispatch follows:

WILLIAM N. OATIS AND COMMUNIST CRUELTY
(By Ray Brock)

A Slovak underground agent, a former assistant military attaché in a nearby Balkan

capital, slipped into Turkey with first-hand information on Oatis' confinement, his condition, and positive assurances that Oatis will be dead of malnutrition, shock, and sheer brutalization, unless he is released from his vile prison cell within a matter of weeks. The Soviet press may then be expected to issue the usual communique that Oatis was killed while "trying to escape" or that he died of some vague disease.

"Gun-boat diplomacy" is perhaps out of date, and even the British sat out the sentences and imprisonments of a group of British engineers who were hurled into the notorious Ljubianka prison in Moscow in 1933, for alleged sabotage. But the case of William N. Oatis is an outrage meriting something more than the platitudes of Dean Gooderham Acheson. The impotence of the American State Department, the United States Congress, and the President, himself, to do anything—even to communicate with Oatis—is typical of the low prestige, influence, and power of the West in Central Europe, the Balkans, and Middle East today.

Bill Oatis has been sentenced to 10 years of the vilest imprisonment, with the attendant tortures, privations, and inquisitions peculiar to Soviet methods, for having done nothing more than perform the routine duties of an American foreign correspondent. According to my Slovak informant, Oatis is being subjected to day-and-night, around-the-clock, inquisition. He is denied anything but a slim bread ration and gruel—enough to keep him, temporarily, alive—and is subjected to beatings, druggings, and sleepless hours of repetitious questioning designed to break his will, his morale, his health, and elicit the usual "confession" of espionage, sabotage, and acts against the Czech Communist Government and the Soviet Union.

This correspondent is personally familiar with the efforts and intervention of Secretary Acheson on the behalf of another celebrated political prisoner and, as far as I am concerned, I'd rather be dead. The previous prisoner was Gen. Draja Mihailovich, Commander in Chief of the Serbian Chetniks, who, callously abandoned by the OWI, the OSS, and the misinformed western press as an Axis "collaborationist," was run down, ultimately, by Tito's Communist partisans.

Half dead of typhus, ravaged by the hunger and privation of his years of guerrilla warfare against the Germans, Italians, the Croatian Fascist Ustashi, Mihailovich was subjected to intolerable tortures, drugged, beaten to insensibility, revived, and tried before a Communist court in Belgrade. The Serbian general then confessed, almost inaudibly, to alleged accommodation with—Winston Churchill's phrase—the Axis enemy. Mihailovich was taken to the subbasement of Belgrade prison and riddled with sub-machine-gun fire, riddled so as to make the body unrecognizable. Then the mangled corpse was tossed into a hidden grave, to prevent Serb Loyalists from retrieving it for honorable burial.

Before and during the trial of Draja Mihailovich, this correspondent headed a mission to Washington to intervene on the general's behalf with the State Department and the President. This mission included on its roster such responsible and liberal figures as Dorothy Thompson, Edgar Ansel Mower, international journalists of undisputed renown; Christopher Emmet, a recognized free-rights crusading journalist; David Martin, journalist, writer, and author of *Ally Betrayed*, a documented history of Mihailovich's campaign; and 37 United States wartime pilots, bombardiers, navigators, and gunners who had parachuted into Mihailovich-led Yugoslav territory, had been saved, protected, and repatriated to the

Allied lines. The fliers chartered a plane at Chicago, foregathered from their scattered home cities, and flew to Washington to join me. We approached the State Department and the White House for a hearing—with affidavits from all the fliers who, parachuting from disabled bombers into Mihailovich territory, had eye-witnessed his campaign against the Axis enemy, and who had been flown out to Allied air bases in Italy from a clandestine field constructed by the Chetniks.

But the pro-Soviet influence was still in the ascendancy in official Washington in the early summer of 1946. Acting Secretary Acheson, counseled by Alger Hiss, flatly refused to see the fliers or any members of the Mihailovich mission. The worried President was advised by Hiss to give the American airmen the brush-off. He did so. This correspondent, at a Presidential press conference, was told that the President had turned the matter over to his military aide (General Vaughan) and that was as far as it would go. It went further, however.

Warned by the then Near Eastern Desk Chief of the State Department, Wallace Barbour, that the American airmen were preparing to make a public statement on the issue, Dean Acheson relented. He agreed to a 5-minute conference. The head of the fliers' delegation, David Martin, and I, stayed for 45 minutes. We laid the affidavits before Acheson. We pointed out, with documents and unimpeachable proof, that Mihailovich stood in peril of political murder for nothing more than defense of his homeland—on orders from the Yugoslav Government in exile in, first Cairo, then London—against the Axis and later Communist depredations by the pillaging partisans of the Communist terrorist Tito. Acheson then, as now, was aware that the State Department, the OWI, and OSS were honeycombed with Communist and pro-Soviet employees.

Dean Gooderham Acheson, at the end of the 45-minute conference, firmly assured this correspondent, David Martin, and the designate head of the United States airmen's mission, that "everything possible will be done to insure that General Mihailovich will be liberated."

Mihailovich was machine-gunned to death, after his mock trial, a scant few weeks later. Research discloses that the extent of Acheson's intervention was a weakly worded aide-memoire—very similar to the notes relating to William N. Oatis.

Much more than the fate of William N. Oatis is at stake presently, although the life of a working foreign correspondent should be enough to stir the State Department to action. The sworn affidavits of 37 United States airmen, representing more than 600 allied fliers, American, Scots, British, and Australians, attesting Mihailovich's loyalty, fell on completely deaf ears at the State Department.

Despite the eloquent appeals and outraged editorials of leading American newspapers, the State Department and the White House have apparently done nothing but issue routine protests and threats of futile economic sanctions against, of all people, the Czechs.

William N. Oatis, Associated Press correspondent, is a tortured prisoner of the Soviet Union. Seized by the MVD, tortured by their skilled and brutal agents, flung into solitary, beaten, drugged, and forced to a typical Soviet confession—this American citizen and newspaperman is nearing exhaustion and death today in a prison cell in Communist Czechoslovakia.

This correspondent is, admittedly, no Tom Paine. But we could use a Tom Paine right now, if we had one.

The Arizona Water Grab

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention of the Members of the House to an excellent editorial on the fantastic central Arizona project, which appeared in the Los Angeles Sentinel on August 2, 1951:

THE ARIZONA WATER GRAB

Too few Californians have bothered to study the implications of the long-contested central Arizona project—and the effect the fantastic proposal will have on California economy.

What is the central Arizona project? It is a so-called reclamation project to take Colorado River water to land in the central part of Arizona, near Phoenix. Proponents of the project claim it's construction is to provide a rescue supply of Colorado River water to 226,000 acres of war-born land in Arizona.

According to an official estimate of Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman the project's total cost to the Nation as a whole would be \$2,075,729,000. Based on the provisions of the central Arizona project bill S. 75, and on the following specified conditions: Construction cost estimate of \$708,000,000; an interest rate of 2½ percent; an 8-year construction period; and a 75-year financing period.

Principal features of this proposed project are: (1) Bridge Canyon Dam on the Colorado River, above Hoover Dam; (2) Parker Dam pump lift, to raise irrigation water a total height of 985 feet; (3) Aqueducts and canals to transport water a distance of 315 miles to grow ordinary field crops.

We object to Arizona's efforts to secure an unprecedented hand-out of public funds for private gain. Consider this:

The citizens of California face a heavy new Federal tax burden which would be imposed upon them to subsidize private-land owners in Arizona.

The average subsidy for the 420 largest Arizona land owners involved would be \$5,550,000 each.

As a Federal taxpayer, you would be expected to contribute to an irrigation scheme that would spend \$1,838 an acre to put water on land worth only \$300 an acre.

Landowners in Arizona would pay less than 1 percent on the interest cost of the project, while the residents of the 47 other States, who will receive none of the benefits, would pay 99 percent.

This speculator's dream would consume more than 500,000 tons of steel and vast quantities of other critical materials needed for ships, tanks, and other vital elements in the Nation's defense program. Building this costly project would injure—not aid—our country's defense effort.

Why are Californians so concerned over the outcome of the project? Because Arizona wants an increased supply of Colorado River water to use on 226,000 acres of privately owned land. The only way Arizona can get this new water supply is by taking it away from the people of California. And to do that, we feel it is worth repeating, an additional tax burden of some \$2,000,000,000 would have to be saddled on the already overloaded taxpayers of all States. The Colorado River water Arizona wants would serve

more than 5,000,000 people in California, where no Federal subsidy would be required. The people of California own this water by virtue of long-standing contracts with the United States Government.

In short, the fantastically expensive Arizona reclamation project is not truly a reclamation project at all—it's a speculator's windfall.

Great To Be Crazy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I believe the editorial, Great To Be Crazy, by Wilbur D. Matson, editor of the Morgan County Herald, McConnelville, Ohio, is worth the reading by every Member of Congress and the public generally, and for that reason I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

GREAT TO BE CRAZY

The other morning we arrived at the Herald office in conformity with a third of a century's custom. We were cogitating over an article we had read in Collier's the night before by David E. Lillenthal, which said India and Pakistan are on the edge of war, about which shall possess Kashmir. Mr. Lillenthal, the author, said the issue is whether the historic region of Kashmir and Jammu shall be a portion of India or of Pakistan.

The dispute may involve 360,000,000 and, as we are up to our neck in the U. N., the outbreak of war would, undoubtedly, put the United States into another and even bigger and better war than Korea. We felt uneasy over the situation. Sure, if anyone wants to fight, anywhere on the round globe, we must get in on one side or the other, but whether we are for Pakistan or whether we are for India, aye, there's the rub. We need more wars. There's no doubt on that score. Two World Wars and Mr. Truman's police action in Korea are not enough for one generation. If we have the misfortune to get peace in Korea, a dispute between Pakistan and India affords a much better opportunity to call out the five-star generals and a few more millions of good American boys for the slaughter, and everyone will have a good job and enjoy more employment, fulfilling the Truman promises of prosperity for all, especially the bureaucrats and five percenters.

After all, the U. N. must engage in constant wars to keep world peace and it is our manifest American destiny to bankrupt ourselves and supply the men and the money for policing the round globe from Timbuktu to Greenland's icy mountains which, by the way, we need for an airfield to help maintain peace for dear old England and the U. N. By the way, where is Pakistan?

In a confused mood, we decided to go to the post office and see whether a heavy dew on Federal Creek had shut off the morning mail from Athens. En route we met a matron of the village with a hometown Herald. "I'm sending it to my boy in Austria. He's helping keep the peace for the U. N. in the old kingdom of Franz Joseph. How glad I am that he can fight and die for dear old Austria. Isn't it a lovely day?" We replied dully

that it was. Next stop was near the post office where we noted a number of young men, in the main, at the armory, applying for unemployment compensation in a time when wars and public doles have sent the wheels of industry spinning at a furious rate and anyone who will work and is not entirely incapacitated, mentally and physically, can obtain employment.

Then we met a boy from an Army camp who told us he was home on leave and, in a few days, would be sent to an unknown destination on one of the oceans. "We've got to defend the thirty-eighth parallel," he said. "If we don't get it, the Communists will beat us to it." "Sure," we assented with enthusiasm. "We've got to have the thirty-eighth parallel." Anyway, you can't have a police action without a line to dispute over. Again, as Woodrow Wilson said when we failed to join the League of Nations, we broke the heart of the world. It's up to us now to gather up the pieces and put them together. Do I hear voices in the air? And it's my hope that we wind up the thirty-eighth parallel on a spool and put it in the national museum as a memorial to the great sagacity of Mr. Acheson's State Department which successfully gets you into war and makes business, thus reversing the policies of such old fogies as John Hay and James G. Blaine, who tried to make friends and keep the Nation at peace.

By then, we had arrived at the post office and, although our eyesight is not what it used to be, noted a panorama of legs among four young girls in shorts, apparently suffering from the heat. When a young fellow, we had to pay a quarter to see a similar exhibition at what in that crude era was called a leg show. We, undoubtedly, are making progress in dress.

Somewhat groggy and bewildered and feeling as though on a roller coaster for the first time, we came back to the office in time to sell some Heralds, just off the press. A customer who wanted an ad dropped in and stopped to chat. "You know," he said, "the neighbors out our way tell of a man who has a fine farm, all the latest machinery, and plenty of stock, whom they swear gets welfare checks. Don't say anything about it. It's ag'in the Federal law to hurt anyone's feelings who is a relief client." A Malta friend arrived by that time and was philosophically summing up the national situation. After a few sarcastic remarks on the "mores" of this strange period, his summation and final conclusion was that "everybody is as crazy as hell and, maybe, I'm crazy, too." En route to dinner, as we passed "Deac" Ralston, sitting out in front of his home, we told him of our Malta friend's analysis and he laughed and replied, "Has he just found that out? I've known that since they elected Roosevelt for a fourth term and followed up with Truman. I thought everybody was on to that by this time." It's great to be crazy and, peace, it's wonderful.

facts are brought to light about which the public would not be informed were it not for newspaper editorials and press notices. Recently Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, has been in the limelight not because of any outstanding or specific performance in his own State but because of the interest that he has manifested in the coming national campaign. In fact, Tom Dewey has been issuing statements supposedly for the benefit of the Republican Party. He has declared his preference for candidates and made emphatic statements about what such candidates must stand for. A thorough analysis of Governor Dewey's record is contained in an editorial published in the Chicago Daily Tribune under date of August 10, 1951. The editorial should receive as much and as wide publicity as it is possible to give to it. It contains some enlightening as well as startling disclosures about the past and present performances of the twice-defeated Republican candidate for President.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I also include an editorial. The editorial is entitled "Tom Thumb Up to Date," and herewith follows:

TOM THUMB UP TO DATE

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, twice defeated as Republican candidate for President, continues to haunt the party. He has been declaring a preference for General Eisenhower as the party's nominee in 1952. This amounts to an acknowledgment that, so far as his personal prospects go, he is washed up as a candidate in his own right. The people tried to make that clear enough to him in 1944, but his vanity was such that he could not be convinced until they had repeated their expression of distaste at the polls in 1948.

Dewey started off like a rocket as the boy gang buster, and he looked plausible as a candidate in 1940, when he was opposing Roosevelt's designs to put the Nation into war. He got a lesson in the Republican convention that year when the late Thomas A. Lamont, of the house of Morgan, pulled the wires to get the nomination for Wendell Willkie, once a Democrat. Willkie was as much of an interventionist as Roosevelt, and the big idea of the wealthy Anglophiles in the East was to deny the people the right to vote for somebody who intended to stick by his word that the United States would not be taken into war. They knew where Roosevelt stood, and they knew Willkie was just as hot for getting into war as he was. So Dewey was shunted aside.

He got the idea after that experience. The illumination required that he discard his principles and become as foreign minded as the rest of the New Deal Republicans who won acceptance from the international bankers and like-minded world savers. The transformation was complete about the time that the Republican conference was held at Mackinac in 1943. He said there that "we have had a de facto military alliance with Great Britain practically ever since the War of 1812" and went on to urge a post-war alliance with England.

Dewey did not allow history to trouble him, conveniently overlooking the Oregon boundary dispute, the British designs in Texas and California, the British role in the Civil War, and the Venezuela boundary controversy. He knew what the England firsters in Wall Street wanted of him, and he

The Political Activities of Gov. Tom Dewey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, it frequently happens that through the arduous and indefatigable efforts of the press

gave it to them. His reward was the Republican nomination in 1944.

Dewey distinguished himself in that campaign by the "me, too" tactics upon which he subsequently took out a copyright. He pledged himself not to make an issue of Pearl Harbor, although he knew that the administration had cracked the Japanese code before the country was taken to war and that the Roosevelt administration's account of how hostilities began was spurious. As the Germans had informed Japan in 1941 that there were reasonable grounds for suspecting that America had broken the Japanese code, the information was not vital to military security, but it was important to Roosevelt's political security.

Dewey thought it was a moral victory to lose to Roosevelt by "only" 3½ million votes, but he failed to acknowledge that most of the votes he received were anti-Roosevelt, anti-New Deal, anti-fourth term, anti-Communist, anti-Sidney Hillman, and anti-PAC.

When 1948 rolled around, the Republicans disregarded the party tradition that no defeated candidate should be renominated. Dewey grabbed the nomination from better men and then proceeded to reenact the fatal strategy of 1944.

Harry Truman looked like a pushover and should have been. His popularity had reached the vanishing point when the nominating convention gathered, and even Paul Douglas, Jake Arvey, and the Roosevelt boys wanted to dump him for Eisenhower. But he got the nomination by default and came out of his corner throwing everything convenient to hand, while Dewey pursued what he mistakenly conceived to be a high-level campaign with a total absence of content. Again millions of Americans who wanted someone or something to vote for stayed home on election day and Dewey lost his sure thing.

It didn't cure him. In a Lincoln Day speech in 1949, he had the temerity to advise anyone who differed with his tactics of yessing the New Deal to get out of the party and counseled those who thought that his twice-tested formula for defeat was stupid and craven to "go out and try to get elected in a typical American community and see what happens to them." A good many candidates dedicated to fighting Trumanism, root and branch, did just that in the congressional elections of 1950. Unlike Dewey in his Presidential waltzes, they won.

The fact was that in his losing campaign of 1948 Dewey ran substantially behind the Republican congressional candidates in a majority of districts, even though Truman had based his campaign on slanders directed against the previous Republican Congress. The little man from Albany he almost wholly ignored.

Yet, Dewey persisted in his mistaken notions so that, in a speech at Princeton University early in 1950, he decried the epithet "me, too," and predicted that to listen to "the croaking voices of reaction or isolation"—i. e., to those who thought that the way to beat Trumanism was to offer an alternative to foreign intermeddling and to the whole spendthrift socialism of the opposition—was to invite defeat at election time. He said that if such views were to prevail, the Democrats would win every time. What had they been doing in the four succeeding elections?

When Truman embarked on the Korean lunacy, Dewey was all in favor of it. He cautioned Republicans last December that this was not the time for further criticism of the administration's foreign policy. When, with Dewey, is it ever the time? He was for everything that Truman did, but for more of it. He wanted an Army of 100 divisions raised overnight at astronomical

cost. He wanted everyone, man or woman, registered to be conscripted for national service. He was, indeed, a valiant enemy of communism every time the waiters started to gather up the dessert plates at a public banquet.

But he was not so heroic a warrior when Soviet officials in the United States kidnaped a runaway Russian school teacher named Oksana Kosenkina, who didn't want to be sent home to Russia, and held her prisoner in the Soviet consulate in New York. When a writ of habeas corpus was sought for her release, the Russian Embassy in Washington protested to the State Department and the State Department prevailed on Dewey to urge the courts to withhold issuance of the writ. The delay was sufficient to cause the despairing Mrs. Kosenkina to cast herself from a third-floor window in the New York consulate. She was gravely injured, although she subsequently recovered. If Dewey had had the spunk to tell the State Department that nobody, constitutionally, could withhold the issuance of the writ, the teacher would have been liberated and the tragedy averted. But, as usual, his knees wobbled in the clutch.

There was general relief last year when Dewey announced he would not run for a third term as governor. At the eleventh hour, following a meeting with Winthrop Aldrich, of the Chase National Bank, who wears two British decorations, Dewey changed his mind. Aldrich apparently convinced Dewey that England and the Chase National needed him. Besides, the banker said, there would be no campaign contributions for Joe Hanley, Dewey's lieutenant governor, who had the inside track for the Republican nomination for governor.

In a celebrated letter written by the heart-broken Hanley, who was fobbed off to run and lose against HERBERT LEHMAN for Senator after Dewey supplanted him in the race for governor, Dewey's lieutenant told how his boss had told him he must stand aside, sugaring the order with the promise of a fat State job if he should lose to LEHMAN. Later gossip held that the Wall Streeters had rigged a deal whereby the New Deal would put up a nonentity against Dewey for governor in return for running Hanley against LEHMAN. Dewey and LEHMAN were both internationalists, and their Wall Street supporters wanted both to have a cinch race.

That's the way it worked out. Hanley was rewarded with a State sinecure which, together with his pension rights and other perquisites, gives him an income of about \$22,000 a year. There is a criminal statute covering bribes and promises to win nomination for office, but no one had invoked it. Equally unsavory was the story brought out by the Senate Crime Committee of how gambling at Saratoga has run wide open under Dewey although his State police drew up reports showing the extent of this illegal activity.

Dewey's record bears out the celebrated judgment of Mrs. Kenneth Simpson, widow of the former Republican Congressman and Republican National Committeeman from New York State, who said, "You have got to know him to dislike him." The voters know him sufficiently well to want no part of him, and that's why he's for Eisenhower.

What that support means will be made more clear when the New York delegation to the 1952 Republican National Convention establishes its position. It will be well advised to follow the course of the rest of the public and tell Dewey that he speaks only for himself. It should be clearer to politicians than to men of other trades that there is no percentage in accepting orders from a dying duck.

Right to Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Muskegon Chronicle, Muskegon, Mich., August 8, 1951:

RIGHT TO TIDELANDS

Fortunately, the real fight over ownership of offshore lands where rich oil deposits have been found will come in the Senate, where a bipartisan effort will be made to retain Federal ownership and to earmark Federal revenues obtained from oil leases on these lands for the Nation's schools.

This time the fight was a pushover in the House, whose Members voted 265 to 109 to give States a quitclaim title to these much disputed offshore lands. The battle in the House was fought largely on States' rights, which is at best a great oversimplification of the issue.

The bill which has now gone to the Senate confirms and establishes "the titles of the States to lands beneath the navigable waters within State boundaries and to the national resources within such waters and lands" and provides for "the control, exploration, development and conservation of certain resources of the continental shelf lying outside State boundaries."

There never has been any question, and is none now, of the right of States to ownership and use of lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries, nor to lands adjacent to States under inland waters. The long dispute involves only what are known as the marginal ocean coastal area and the continental shelf lying outside of coastal State boundaries.

The Supreme Court has ruled twice in recent years that these marginal areas are under Federal jurisdiction. Thus the House action, stripped of its confusions, is primarily an attempt by legislation to reverse the Supreme Court.

Representative GEORGE MEADER, of Ann Arbor, the only Michigan Republican Member of the House to vote against the States' rights appeal, likewise was the only Michigan Member to present a thoroughgoing analysis of his vote. "From a legal point of view," Mr. MEADER said, "the bill must be one of two things: (1) An effort to reverse the Supreme Court, or (2) a donation of Federal lands to the States."

On the first point Mr. MEADER makes the logical claim that while Congress is justified in changing its own acts to reverse the effect of a court decision, it is a violation of the separation of judicial and legislative powers to reverse the Court in a situation involving not a statute but an interpretation of the Constitution.

On the second point Mr. MEADER says sensibly that he "cannot find justification for transferring the natural resources which belong to all the people of the United States to any limited group, whether they be the citizens of States or other segments of the population."

Proponents of this transfer to States have always called their legislation the "tidelands bill," which is itself a complete misnomer. Tidelands constitute the area that is alternately covered and uncovered by the tides, and the Supreme Court has repeatedly held

that the States have clear title to such lands, together with the beds of their own inland navigable waters.

It is important to bear in mind that the lands in dispute, despite all the clever subterfuge, are not tidelands at all. They begin at the lower water mark where the tidelands end, and there has never in our history been any decision of the Supreme Court dealing with such submerged lands which held that jurisdiction of them lies elsewhere than with the Federal Government.

There is no possibility of a parallel situation in the Great Lakes, and thus the talk of the "dangerous precedent of national control for the future, if not now," is pretty far-fetched. The House action is a gift to the three States of Texas, Louisiana, and California, where rich oil lease rights extend beyond the tideland area, the revenue from which those States quite naturally want for themselves.

Possibly in their desire to be anti-Truman—who vetoed a similar bill 2 years ago—this time more House Members than ever have joined the questionable tidelands pressure group. They have filled both counts in Representative MEADER's indictment. They have tried to set up the judicial branch as secondary to the legislative and have voted to give away to three States important ocean property rights the benefits of which belong to all the people and which in the past have never been held to be anything but federally controlled.

If such action were taken by State legislatures, it would be understandable. In the Congress of the United States, however, the Nation's rights ought to be considered paramount.

Soap-Box Derby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was a great day for Akron, Ohio. It was a greater day for the Nation. For the fourteenth annual Soap-Box Derby was run at Derby Downs at Akron, Ohio.

With the world in a turmoil, it was truly an inspiration to see the youth of America perform. Scandals and corruption rising from sporting events had been disheartening. The annual Soap-Box Derby is one sport that will never be subjected to "fixing." You cannot destroy the integrity of youth. These young red-blooded Americans, who build their own little racers, put sportsmanship, honesty, and fairness above everything else.

Only one young man could win first place in the field of 141 contestants. The 140 who did not win put forth their best effort, and in the true American tradition extended their hearty congratulations to the winner, Darwin Cooper, of Williamsport, Pa.

We need not be fearful of our future if our boys can be given the opportunity to appreciate competition and incentive.

Next year I would like to see as many Members of Congress accompany the contestants from their districts to the fifteenth annual Soap-Box Derby, to be

held in Akron, Ohio. It will be an inspiration to the Members to witness the American way of life in action. Our future is in the hands of our youth. They deserve our support.

An Affirmative Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I intend to offer an amendment to the foreign-aid bill which is expected to come before the House of Representatives this week.

My amendment will have the same essential purpose as H. R. 3798, which I introduced April 23, 1951, to create a Commission on Aid to Underdeveloped Areas. This bipartisan commission would have the task of studying the obstacles and barriers presently limiting private investment in foreign areas and recommending ways and means of eliminating or minimizing such barriers.

Today I received a statement from Mr. Howard S. Piquet, senior specialist on international economics, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress. This statement consists of analytical comment on H. R. 3798. I wish to make this analysis available to the Members of Congress to assist them in their consideration of the amendment I intend to offer.

For the purpose of acquainting the Members of the House with the background and experience of Mr. Piquet, I precede his analysis of my bill by an excerpt from Who's Who in America:

Piquet, Howard S., economist; b, Brooklyn, N. Y., July 4, 1903, s. Samuel D. and Laura E. (Mann) P.; B S., New York U., 1924; M. A., U. of Calif., 1926, Ph. D., Princeton, 1930; m. Dorothy Virginia Burke, Dec. 23, 1930; children—Dorothy Vanna, Howard S., Barbara. Instructor, Princeton, 1928-32; asst. prof. econ., New York U., 1932-34; economist, U. S. Tariff Comm., 1934-37, chief of econ. div., 1937-43, Secretary Section on Distribution, United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture, Hot Springs, Va., 1943; exec. sec. and dir. of investigation United Nations Interim Commn. on Food and Agr. 1943-45; adjunct prof. economic theory, Grad. Sch. of Am. U., Washington, D. C., since 1934. Special Adviser, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, 1945-46, exec. sec. Inter-agency policy com. on rubber, 1945-46, senior specialist on internat. economics, Legis. Ref. Service, Library of Congress, since 1946; mem. prof. staff com. on Fgn. Affairs, Ho. of Reps. (deputy staff dir. Ho. Select Com. on Foreign Aid). Mem. Am. Econ. Assn., Phi Beta Kappa, Zeta Psi. Author: Building and Loan Associations in New Jersey, 1930, Outline of the New Deal Legislation, 1933; Functional International Organization in Annals Am. Acad. Polit. and Social Sci., 1945; the International Charter in Proc. of 1948 Econ. Inst. U. S. C. of C.; numerous articles on tariffs and internat. orgn. Home: 2209 Yorktown Road NW, Washington, D. C. (Who's Who in America, 1950 51.)

COMMENTS ON PROPOSAL OF REPRESENTATIVE MEADER

There is much that can be said in favor of the proposal that a special commission along the lines of the Hoover Commission be created to plan, and later on to advise the administration of, the point 4 program. There is constant danger of pouring out millions of dollars too quickly in the form of well-intentioned, but poorly conceived, foreign aid. The granting of aid of the developmental type is more of a psychological than an administrative problem. The Representative's interpretation of the objectives of the point 4 program is quite apt, particularly his concept of vacuum areas and his desire to shift our policy from the negativism of containment to a positive psychological offensive. The big problem in connection with the point 4 program is knowing what it is that we want to do. In final analysis our objective is freedom, the immediate problem is to define it in practical terms.

The principal points made by the Congressman are listed below together with a few comments on each:

1. The commission which he proposes would be a study group rather than an operating body.

This is desirable since the essence of the job is imaginative planning rather than push-button operation. Some people might be disposed to say that the point 4 program has already been discussed to death. The trouble, however, with present arrangements is that actual planning and administration are being carried on by the administration. With the two parties so evenly balanced in Congress and with the bipartisan foreign policy already a thing of the past there is some doubt whether the point 4 program can be administered along present lines on anything other than a political basis. Whether or not this is true, the fact remains that there will be doubt in the minds of many which is almost as bad as if it actually were so. Consequently, if a bipartisan or nonpartisan commission were to be set up it might have the effect of rendering the program less political.

2. The Commission would be bipartisan.

As stated above, this is all to the good, but how practical is bipartisanship in the field of foreign policy right now with the 1952 election campaign so close at hand?

3. The Commission is to be endowed with fact-finding powers.

It is true, of course, that the existing point 4 organization has the power to make fact-finding studies. It is free to make such studies and investigations as it wishes. The proposed Commission, however, would have the power of subpoena. Whether this power would add anything to the powers the administration now has to secure facts is an open question.

One minor question might be raised regarding section 2 (b) of the proposed bill. This is the section that has to do with membership on the Commission. It requires that of each class of members not more than one-half shall be from each of the two major political parties. This could be interpreted as requiring that there be at least one-half Republicans and one-half Democrats on the Commission. Might it not be better, and not in conflict with the ideals of bipartisanship, if it were to be required that not more than one-half should be from any one political party? This would make it possible for some of the appointees to be unaffiliated with any political party. It would seem that what is really aimed at here is a nonpolitical or nonpartisan approach to the problem rather than a narrowly conceived bipartisan approach.

If a commission along the lines proposed were to be created, it would have the further advantage of keeping the point 4 program

separate from other foreign-aid programs. One of the criticisms that has been leveled against the new foreign-aid bill (now under discussion in Congress) is that it would lump together all foreign aid including, according to some plans, military aid. Aid of the ECA type, military aid, and point 4 development aid are all quite different and since point 4 aid in terms of money cost is so much smaller than the others, there is danger that if it were to be combined with the others, it might be submerged and lost sight of. One of the important aspects of the development program is its psychological effect on foreign peoples. The Rockefeller report (issued last March) in certain respects lost sight of this fact. It would combine the acquisition of strategic raw materials with the point 4 program. If the inhabitants of foreign countries get the idea that we are interested exclusively in our own preservation militarily and interested in their development only in a collateral way, they might well feel resentful of anything that we might do.

The point 4 program is a long-run program. Units of time with which it is concerned are not days, months, or years, but decades or even generations. In fact, it probably should not be called a program at all. It is, rather, a frame of mind, an evidence of willingness and desire on the part of the people of the United States to lend a helping hand to their fellow beings in less fortunate lands. It is a program which would help other people to help themselves; it is not charity. To confuse it with more short-lived programs such as the military assistance program might be to defeat the purpose of the program itself. This might be one of the strongest reasons for setting up a commission along the lines proposed by the Representative.

Mr. Speaker, I also desire to call the attention of the House of Representatives to the testimony I gave before House Foreign Affairs Committee, as well as that in support of my bill offered by the Detroit Board of Commerce.

This testimony appears on pages 777-831 of the hearings on the mutual-security program, printed copies of which were first available today.

Aid for Formosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial published in the Knoxville (Tenn.) News-Stentinel under the date of August 9 entitled "Aid for Formosa":

AID FOR FORMOSA

If the United States intends to take a firm stand against communism anywhere in Asia, then President Truman is right in asking for a modest aid program for the Chinese Nationalist forces on Formosa.

The appropriation requested, \$307,000,000, is less than we are spending on some countries which do not have anything like Formosa's potentialities.

There is little point in giving arms to a country until it has troops to use them. Chiang Kai-shek has at least 400,000 troops

in need of equipment. This is the largest anti-Communist military force in Asia.

The policy of waiting until an area is under attack before going to its rescue is exhausting and self-defeating. Americans can't do all of the fighting. They should not be doing any fighting at all when there are natives willing to fight in their own defense if given the weapons.

We waited until it was too late adequately to arm the South Koreans, and have paid for that mistake by a fearful toll in American blood. The mistake should not be repeated in Formosa.

If Formosa is armed, it can defend itself against a Communist attack. It also can be in readiness to support revolts against the Communists which may occur on the mainland.

If There's Any Let Down, It's Not From the Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shelbyville (Ind.) News of August 8, 1951:

If There's Any Let Down, It's Not From THE PUBLIC

For some weeks now, we have been listening to scolding speeches by high Federal Government officials—from President Truman on down the line—indicating that there has been a let-down on the part of the American public in the matter of military defense efforts.

As far as we can find, there has been no let-down of any kind anywhere along the line as far as the American people are concerned. Government and military officials very likely know this, but they fear that the public will cry for cut-backs in defense expenditures. There has been no such demand of any consequence, and appropriations for defense still are being voted by Congress.

About the only thing that the public has demanded is a sensible reduction in non-essential expenditures. It appears that the public has demanded this kind of cut-back with the knowledge that the Nation can't very well go ahead with outsize domestic and military spending at the same time.

We believe that the big need is a greater unity between the people and the Nation's leaders. This cannot be achieved unless and until the public is given more facts regarding actual national and international conditions and more honesty on the part of leaders who have assumed too much of the attitude that the people, after all, are largely a pack of morons and would be better off if kept in ignorance.

We know of no time in this Nation's history when the people at large ever underwent a let-down in a time of national crisis. The United States, while a peace-loving Nation, has been remarkable for its ability to face and to overcome the greatest of obstacles.

In this present period of strife, the American people are doing and will continue to do all in their power for the welfare of the country. Their leaders could help by keeping their big mouths shut except when they are ready to give the people some facts, and to do it with honesty and sincerity.

Cicero, Take Notice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Brooklynites are always proud of the example they set to the rest of the world.

An example of true brotherly love occurred last week. It should not go unnoticed.

The following news item from the Brooklyn Daily Eagle of August 9, 1951, preaches a sermon that bears repetition. Need I say more?

WHITE NEIGHBORHOOD MOURNS FOR LITTLE NEGRO BOY IT LOVED—"DOESN'T SEEM RIGHT WITHOUT HIM," MANY SAY AT RITES FOR "CAMPY," 7, DROWNED AT PICNIC

(By Leslie Hanscom and Ken Johnston)

A brokenhearted Brooklyn neighborhood turned out en masse today to pay its last tribute of affection to a little 7-year-old boy who had won his way into the hearts of all.

Most of the mourners, including more than 100 boys and girls, were white, though the lad they mourned, little Gerald (Campy) Rice, was a Negro.

Youngsters and grownups alike, interviewed as they made their way to the Church of God to attend services for the boy, agreed he had been the most popular kid on the Emerson Place block between DeKalb and Lafayette Avenues.

"It just doesn't seem right around here without him," said a mother, her eyes moist with memories.

DANCED IN STREET

"Everybody in the neighborhood liked him—not a person didn't like him," said another mother.

"He ran errands for all the neighbors—he'd do anything anyone asked him," said Mike Carboni, 14, of 352 Lafayette Avenue.

"He used to dance in the street and he danced so fast you could hardly see his feet," said Frankie Mariono, 8, of 247 Emerson Place.

Campy lived with his parents, Joseph and Geneva Rice, at 253 Emerson Place, in the middle of the block occupied predominantly by white families. And he was the best-loved youngster on the block.

Patrick Wrenn, 8, who lives at 255 Emerson Place, said Campy "could beat me up if he wanted, but I liked him just the same. We used to have great times together."

DROWNED ON PICNIC

Campy was drowned Sunday while on a community picnic. Wading in Jamaica Bay near the Canarsie Pier, he stepped into a hole and disappeared. His body was recovered and police worked 2 hours trying to revive him.

He won his nickname, Campy, from his prowess in street ball games. "He could throw a ball like this," said Al Addonizio, 8, of 249 Emerson Place, demonstrating with a quick snap of the wrist, "and it would go over the roof—just like a clout off the bat of Roy Campanella of the Dodgers."

The scores of children and parents attended services at the church, Lafayette Avenue and Taaffe Place, conducted by the Rev. Norman T. Garrison, assisted by the Rev. C. Christian.

They went back to the Emerson Place block afterward. The kids were quiet, like their parents.

No one danced in the street today.

Abdication of State Powers Inexcusable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement I made public August 10, 1951, relative to an apparent abdication of State powers by a representative of the Michigan Public Service Commission. This action seems particularly indefensible in view of steps taken by the Congress to maintain State authority over use of natural gas.

My statement is as follows:

There are all too abundant grounds for complaints regarding actual and attempted Federal usurpation of State rights and powers. But it should never be forgotten that these rights and powers may as readily and irretrievably be lost through abdication of the rights and authority by State officials.

I have just been advised that a representative of the Michigan Public Service Commission has this week notified officials of the Petroleum Administration for Defense of the Department of the Interior that the State of Michigan is waiving its authority to control and restrict use of natural gas in favor of the Federal agency. This abdication of power, heretofore exercised competently and adequately by the Michigan Public Service Commission, has apparently been made in the face of specific action by the Congress reserving such authority to the States.

My information is that Mr. Jack Cushing, chief engineer for the Michigan Public Service Commission, on Thursday of this week, attended a conference of representatives of various States with PAD in Washington, and at that time notified the Federal agency that Michigan is "happy to comply" with the recent order of the Secretary of the Interior restricting use of natural gas and restricting installation of natural gas equipment. I am advised that Mr. Cushing likewise notified the Federal agency that Michigan would not elect to certify that the State agency is exercising regulatory control over natural gas usage and distribution.

This action spurns the provision written into the National Production Act (H. R. 3871) under the sponsorship of Congressman FRANK T. Bow, of Ohio, with the specific view of preventing Federal usurpation of State rights, duplication of adequate State regulatory agencies and powers, and centralization of controls in Washington. The Bow amendment provides:

"No rule, regulation, or order issued under this act which restricts the use of natural gas (either directly, or by restricting the use of facilities for the consumption of natural gas, or in any other manner) shall apply in any State in which a public regulatory agency has authority to restrict the use of natural gas and certifies to the President that it is exercising that authority to the extent necessary to accomplish the objectives of that act."

It is my understanding that Michigan is one of only two States which is declining to make such certification—in other words abdicating the State right and authority which Congress took pains to safeguard.

I am very curious to know whether this action was taken with the authority of the Michigan Public Service Commission. I wonder whether it was taken with the knowledge, or on the orders of the Governor of Michigan. And I wonder whether the

people of Michigan, including, particularly, natural-gas users, approve of this needless delegation of authority to Washington by State officials in the face of congressional efforts to protect and maintain State control and State authority.

It is a somewhat novel form of frustration to me, as an elected Representative from Michigan, to experience this sort of rejection by State officials of congressional effort to preserve and maintain State rights and authority. In view of hundreds of communications which I have received in recent months demanding curtailment of the powers of the executive branch, I am doubtful whether the people of Michigan will be pleased with this abdication, apparently engineered from Lansing.

The Small Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two newspaper items—one which appeared in the Houston Post, and one which appeared in a paper in Augusta, Ga.:

[From the Houston Post of July 30, 1951]

ALLOTMENT EVILS

LINDLEY BECKWORTH, the industrious Congressman from Gladewater, is apprehensive of the renewal of evils of cotton allotments, which were lifted after last year's fiasco. He doesn't seem particularly enthusiastic for this form of government control. And the evidence he presented on 16 pages of the July 10 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the results of a comprehensive study, abundantly support his position.

He cited many glaring inequities in allotments to counties in his district, reported in letters from farmers and county secretaries of the Production and Marketing Administration. Some farmers were cut down to less than an acre for cotton; some veteran cotton growers were not allowed to plant any at all because they raised none during the test period from 1946 through 1948. Some correspondents said the small allotments had forced them off the farm.

A few brief excerpts:

Dan C. Owen, Tyler: "It is estimated that at least 500 will be forced off of farms due to insufficient cotton acreage."

Roy E. Barnett, Quillman: "The number of farmers that received 5 acres of cotton or less was 1,248. Each (new) producer received 1 acre to 1.1 acres."

T. C. Mewborne, Eustace, Tex.: "They said I owed them \$108.50 for growing a bale of cotton in 1950, because I did not sign a contract. My allotment is 3.8 acres. My tax is so high * * * everybody left the farm and went to town to work."

Dave Fuller, Wills Point, Tex.: "In 1949 D. L., Jr., and I ginned 74 bales of cotton; in 1950 we ginned 37 bales, 14,000 pounds of vetch, 600 bushels of corn. After expenses were paid we paid no income tax—expenses got it all."

T. L. Vincent, Carthage, administrative officer, PMA: "I hesitate to estimate the number of tenants that will be without homes as a result of the small allotments in this country. * * *

Along with these and other letters, Representative BECKWORTH inserted in the Record

one from C. J. McCormick, Under Secretary of Agriculture, including this sentence:

"Secretary Brannan and I feel strongly the need for all farm organizations and public institutions concerned with agriculture to unite in a definite, vigorous program to strengthen family farming in America."

He can say that again. But family farming will not be strengthened by a system of scarcity which forces thousands off the farm because they cannot make a living on the acreage allotted them—and at a time when the price of cotton is peak high. The appalling testimony cited gives compelling force to Mr. BECKWORTH's statement that if and when the cotton-allotment program is revived it should have "more fairness and more justice and more equity."

LINDLEY BECKWORTH SAYS, "CROWDING OUT SMALL FARMER THROUGH ALLOTMENT PROGRAM"

The plight of the small farmer in the South in the matter of acreage allotments was described vividly in Congress recently by Representative LINDLEY BECKWORTH, of Texas.

The Representative from Texas, whose father was a native Georgian, and who has relatives in Augusta and Wrens, Ga., has long been a champion of the small farmer, who he says is being crowded out through the allotment practices being used under the farm control plan.

In his address before Congress on July 10 Representative BECKWORTH cited figures to show that the refusal of allotments to small farmers in 1950 large enough to make cotton farming profitable for them resulted in small harvest inadequate to the demand.

Now these allotments have been removed and Secretary of Agriculture Brannan is urging cotton planters to plant more and more cotton with the result that a crop of from 16,000,000 to 17,000,000 bales is forecast for this year, he said.

This large crop will result in the imposition of more controls and the small farmer will be left out in the cold again unless provisions are made to protect them, he pointed out.

He pointed to the fact that not only are the small farmers militated against, but that the lion's share of allotments go to some counties while other counties are left with little or no cotton from which to derive their livelihood.

Representative BECKWORTH was speaking primarily of Texas, but it was brought out by Representative WILLIAM J. BRYAN DORN, of South Carolina, during the discussion, that the same conditions apply in South Carolina, where last year people had to plow up some of the acreage planted only to find themselves being begged to plant the staple this year.

Citing the disparity of allotments in various States and counties he cited figures, for instance, Jefferson County in Georgia had 1,149 allotments on 28,714 acres in 1950 for an average value per allotment of \$1,591 while down in Mississippi Coahoma County had only 928 allotments on 109,076 acres to produce 93,660 bales for a value of \$18,166 per allotment.

Citing the disparity between allotment values in counties where large landowners or absentee owners of large tracts hold sway figures for Calhoun County in Mississippi revealed that 1,843 allotments on 20,262 acres produced 8,543 bales at a value of only \$730 per allotment.

In Texas the same condition prevailed with Anderson County, for instance, having 2,574 allotments on 17,455 acres producing only 2,030 bales for an average allotment value of only \$141, while King County, with only 82 allotments on 11,523 acres, produced 5,057 bales for an average allotment value of \$11,100.

He also cited figures to show that while the price of cotton has been fixed at a ceiling of 45 cents a pound in the United States, it is selling for 85 cents a pound just across the Texas border in Mexico.

The whole allotment is out of kilter not only in cotton but in peanuts, cattle, and other farm products, with the small farmer being left the leavings or nothing at all, he pointed out.

The Congressman from Texas is waging a battle to end this disparity and to make the allotments more equitable if they are to be imposed.

Extension of Interstate Oil and Gas Compact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, a minority report has been filed this afternoon in connection with Senate Joint Resolution 42. Since it will not be available immediately in printed form and since it is probable that this bill will come up for action some time during the week, I am including the text of that report for the information of the Members of the House.

It will be noted that the amendment suggested does not affect the language of the compact in any respect. Rather, it seeks to establish a clear responsibility in the Department of Justice to make certain that in the operation of the compact there are no violations of existing laws. In that respect, it is no more than a specific implementation of article V of the compact. The Department of Justice admits its own general responsibility in this field. In his testimony, its representative stated that during the nearly 16 years of the compact's existence it had made no study of the effect of the law. He stated that he would have no objection whatever to an amendment that would make this responsibility clear. Under these circumstances, the adoption of the amendment would be in the clear public interest.

The text of the minority report is as follows:

The undersigned support the extension of the Interstate Oil and Gas Compact, but with the following amendment:

"Page 16, after line 18, insert the following new section:

"Sec. 2. The Attorney General of the United States shall make a continuing study of action taken under the compact set forth in section I of this Act, with particular reference to whether any such action is inconsistent with the purposes of, or contrary to the limitations and restrictions contained in, such compact. The Attorney General shall report to the Congress from time to time, but not less often than once each year, the results of such study."

"And on page 16, line 19, renumber section 2 accordingly."

We are in entire agreement that the express purpose of the compact as expressed in article II, "to conserve oil and gas by the prevention of physical waste thereof from any cause" is entirely laudable and in the

interest not only of the producers but of the consumers and our National defense.

However, we wish to point out that within the compact itself, article V gives clear recognition to the possibility of actions quite beyond that purpose, which could be both in violation of existing law and most detrimental to the best interests of the consuming public and of our National security. The text of that article is as follows: "It is not the purpose of this compact to authorize the states joining herein to limit the production of oil or gas for the purpose of stabilizing or fixing the price thereof, or create or perpetuate monopoly, or to promote regimentation, but is limited to the purpose of conserving oil and gas and preventing the avoidable waste thereof within reasonable limitations."

In connection with the consideration of this question, the committee had before it the following letter from the Department of Justice:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, April 25, 1951.

HON. ROBERT CROSSLER,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for the views of the Department of Justice concerning the joint resolutions (H. J. Res. 206 and H. J. Res. 211) consenting to an interstate compact to conserve oil and gas.

The resolutions would give the consent of the Congress to the extension and renewal for a period of 4 years of the Interstate Compact To Conserve Oil and Gas, originally entered into in 1935 by the States of New Mexico, Kansas, Oklahoma, Illinois, Colorado, and Texas. The compact has since been extended and renewed five times with the consent of the Congress and, unless again renewed, will expire on September 1, 1951. The number of participating States has increased from 6 to 20, including Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and West Virginia. The compact has been considered generally as a necessary arrangement among oil-producing States to conserve the Nation's crude-oil reserves.

Whether the joint resolutions should be enacted involves a question of policy concerning which this Department prefers not to make any recommendation.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Yours sincerely,

PEYTON FORD,
Deputy Attorney General.

Because of the sentence "Whether the joint resolutions should be enacted involves a question of policy concerning which this Department prefers not to make any recommendation" members of the committee requested that a representative of the Department of Justice be called to testify further and on June 12 Hon. H. Graham Morrison, Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, came before the committee.

In explanation of the Department's position, he said: "We feel, Mr. Congressman, that this is a matter of legislative policy; that it raises no question, insofar as the Department is concerned, as to which we feel requires any comment from us. The history of this thing, I believe, is stated. The Department, at the time the Interstate Oil Compact first came up for congressional approval, took the same position. Since that time, there have been almost 15 years of operation. So far as we are concerned, so far as any advice that has come to us, no facts have been given to us to justify our belief that we have any objection to its operation."

Thereafter the witness was questioned at some length by the committee as to the attention given to the operation of the compact since it was first agreed to in 1935. This testimony will be found from page 78 to page 107 of the hearings. While the witness told the committee that the Department of Justice had a definite and continuing interest "in anything that goes beyond the intent to effect conservation" and would certainly take action if the facts justified it, when he was asked the following question, "Have you made for your Department any study of the effect of this act since its original enactment?" he made the following significant reply: "No, sir; we have not made one directed at this particular aspect. We have constantly been examining the whole oil industry in its various ramifications."

Later his attention was directed to article V of the compact and he was asked whose duty it was in the Government to observe whether that provision is carried out and not violated. The following excerpt from the hearings constitutes full justification for the necessity in the public interest of the adoption of the amendment which is to be submitted:

"Mr. MORISON. I will tell you what I conceive, Mr. Congressman, to be my responsibility of the Department of Justice Antitrust Division, and that would be, as I have stated before, that if this article V should be violated by participating oil companies in these various States, and we could find such evidence, either upon complaint of a citizen or upon our own investigation, it would be my duty to bring a suit based on those facts."

"Mr. WOLVERTON. I fully appreciate that. But I am asking who is the watchdog as to the effect of that section and whether it is carried out? Is there any governmental agency that has the direct duty of doing so?"

"Mr. MORISON. I would assume that my division, Mr. Congressman, would have the greatest responsibility for that. There may be others. I do not know. I keep speaking about the Interior Department, because I think of them in terms of this kind of project that they would have a continuing interest to watch this. I may be wrong."

"Mr. WOLVERTON. That section was put in the bill originally for the very purpose I tried to emphasize—for the protection of the public interest. The very fact that it makes reference to monopoly and regimentation, and all the other elements that enter into Antitrust Act provisions, indicates to me that the responsibility was upon the Attorney General. If there is any doubt about it, would you have any objection to an amendment being made to this bill that would make that clear?"

"Mr. MORISON. No, sir; I have no objection whatever if, in the wisdom of the committee and Congress, it is desired."

There is no disposition on the part of those who sign this report to assert that there is clear evidence of any violations of existing law. However, there is no question but that there is no representative in the Commission charged solely with the responsibility of expressing the point of view of the consuming public and urging consideration of that point of view. When the Congress first passed the legislation consenting to the compact and at the time of each renewal, it was clearly indicated that in the operation of the compact there was the possibility of going further than conserving oil and gas and preventing avoidable waste, with the result of either stabilizing or fixing prices, creating or perpetuating monopolies, and even permitting regimentation. It is equally clear that the Department of Justice has not made any report to the Congress as to the operation of the Commission since its creation. Our efforts are directed solely to providing a specific and immediate means of guaranteeing to the Congress and to the public that the full facts will be developed and

that, if there are any violations of existing law, they will be reported promptly to the Congress.

CHAS. A. WOLVERTON.
LEONARD W. HALL.
JOSEPH P. O'HARA.
ROBERT HALE.
JOHN W. HESLTON.
HARMAR D. DENNY, Jr.

Diplomacy's Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the August 11, 1951, issue of the Saturday Evening Post:

DIPLOMACY'S DUTY IS THE DEFENSE OF OUR OWN INTEREST

Castlereags, Palmerston, John Hay, Queen Elizabeth, Bismarck, and any of the great diplomatists of the past would have laughed their heads off at the idea that a distinguished scholar should take time to defend the thesis expounded by Dr. Hans J. Morgenthau, of the University of Chicago, in a book called *In Defense of the National Interest* (Knopf), that "it is not only a political necessity but a moral duty for a nation to follow in its dealings with other nations but one guiding star, one standard for thought, one rule for action: The national interest."

That would have seemed commonplace to John Quincy Adams as it does to Winston Churchill. Many of our American ills come from our having forgotten it so completely that one seldom hears national interest mentioned even when we engage in wars. The spread of democracy, the defeat of fascism, the improvement of the global standard of living, the creation of collective security—all these are cited, and all are important. Nevertheless, none of them is a legitimate objective for America unless it has some relation to the basic interest of this country. Whatever the differences in interpretation, Secretary Acheson recognizes this principle as surely as does Senator TAFT.

This theme as ably advanced by Dr. Morgenthau might well be used to inform our diplomats. His main thesis—namely, that our policy both for Europe and for Asia should not be ideological, theological, or sentimental, but should promote the security and interest of the United States—is incontestable. To our way of thinking, he is rather too trusting in regarding Chinese Communists as leaders of a genuine revolution. And his specific suggestion that we should attempt to reach some kind of agreement with Russia—since it is in the interest of both countries to avoid atomic war—is speculative. The question here is whether a settlement is possible with a regime which is committed to revolutionary conquest. And American national interest would hardly be promoted by an agreement which formalized recognition of Soviet conquest.

Translating his theories into terms of American experience, particularly during and after World War II, Dr. Morgenthau explains that national interest guided our policy through the difficult times after the Revolution, when Washington resolutely refused to embroil the country in the ideological struggle between Great Britain and revolutionary France. Even the Wilsonian pref-

erence for stating national aims in idealistic terms did not mean that we acted contrary to national interest in World War I. Our intention was to protect the European balance of power, in which our interest was very real.

The same can be said for our intervention in World War II, but certainly not for our part in ending it. Because we permitted our chauvinistic emotions to lead us to accept unconditional surrender, as a legitimate war aim, and because we ignored our real interest in a balance of power, both in Europe and in Asia, we now stand in serious danger of the catastrophe that can happen to nations which, as de Tocqueville put it, "abandon mature design for the gratification of a momentary passion." We not only forgot that we had national interests worth protecting, we forgot that other countries had interests that they were certain to defend with all the power at their command. Consequently, when the chips are down we are astounded to find that other countries do not rush into battle to defend a concept, an ideology, or free elections somewhere, but only when their vital interests are at stake. Isn't it time we grew up?

All this undoubtedly puts a big question mark after the United Nations. Dr. Morgenthau finds that organization futile as a body before which the peace-loving, law-abiding nations summon the criminal aggressors, and where the latter veto the former with monotonous regularity. He believes that the United Nations has its uses, especially in settling conflicts among small nations, but when threats of major conflicts arise, the arena is no longer the U. N. but an old-fashioned diplomatic conference where negotiation in smoke-filled rooms is possible on the basis of power and interest.

Perhaps the best quotation with which to end a piece like this one is from that master of the art of politics, Winston Churchill: "The human race cannot make progress without idealism, but idealism at other people's expense and without regard to the consequence of ruin and slaughter which fall upon millions of humble homes cannot be considered as its highest or noblest form." In other words, it is idiotic to talk about defense of morality if that means stripping ourselves, by aimless dispersions of power, of the ability to defend anything.

Merl Young Sells House That Government "Jack" Built

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, the following advertisement appeared in Washington newspapers yesterday:

Purchasers of Kenwood property have social privileges at the Kenwood Golf and Country Club. This residence is of stone and brick, one of the handsomest in this area of large homes. Living room 34 by 17, dining room 20 by 17, butler's pantry, a beautiful large kitchen with two refrigerators, separate breakfast room with imported tile floor, also tile powder room; large screened porch with awnings. Upstairs the master bedroom is 34 by 17 with private bath including tub and separate glass-door shower. Two more large bedrooms, another bath, sundeck, storage attic. Maid's room and tub bath. Two car garage. Wall to wall carpet on both

floors and handsome window draperies also included. We invite your inspection.

According to news articles describing this advertisement, the owner of the property is Mr. Merl Young, who figured recently in the scandal surrounding the granting of RFC loans and the use of White House connections in obtaining such loans. It will be recalled that Mr. Young's wife, a former White House secretary, received a mink coat as a result of these transactions.

In reading over the many favorable features of this property, I note several omissions which no doubt will greatly impair salability of the swank mansion. I am sure that would-be purchasers of real estate here in Washington will be disappointed to note that the ad does not indicate the amount of storage space available for mink coats. I am also confident that no 5-percenter's home would be complete without deep-freeze facilities. It is highly probable that the lack of these facilities influenced Mr. Young's decision to dispose of the "house that Government jack built."

Tighe Woods and the Office of the Housing Expediter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, passage of the Defense Production Act amendments of 1951 also signaled the end of a small but justly famous agency, the Office of the Housing Expediter.

The rent-control functions formerly handled by OHE are now entrusted to a new agency, the Office of Rent Stabilization, with former Housing Expediter Tighe E. Woods serving as Rent Stabilizer.

I want to pay tribute in passing to the now defunct Office of the Housing Expediter and particularly during the time it was administered by Mr. Woods.

Mr. Woods took an agency which was beaten and battered and in which the employee morale was reduced to an all-time low.

He brought that agency to a position of respect and esteem and he restored confidence in the hearts of the agency employees so that they once again carried out the tradition of the Government servant and gave the public, regardless of race, religion, political affiliations, the courteous and efficient service which was the tradition in the Federal service as I have known it for many years.

Mr. Woods taught those bureaucrats—as they are called today—to have respect for themselves and to have respect for their fellow men. He repaired the damage done to their self-respect by those people in our midst who delight to malign and criticize and condemn their fellow men because of the hatred which is in their hearts.

In addition to this singular public service, Mr. Woods was responsible for a new department in Government administration, through a program of community participation in the administration of rent control. Mr. Woods set up local volunteer committees which were representative of the affected interests under rent control and he invited these local committees to inspect the rent-control operation and make any suggestions for streamlining operations and improving service to the public. These local committees also acted as local boards of directors and assured their neighbors of fair and understandable administration of a Federal program in their community.

Mr. Woods deserves great credit for the bold and forward-looking innovation in Government administration, an innovation which brings the strength and vigor and vitality of our democratic way of life into the administration of a Federal program with great benefit to everyone concerned.

Letter From a Soldier in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, too often the news we get from abroad, even from areas under American control where foreign censorship does not prevail, is either sugar-coated or distorted to create something sensational so as to increase circulation.

The portion of a letter which, under unanimous consent, I insert herewith, is neither sugar-coated nor sensational. It is, rather, a simple, direct narration by a young soldier to his parents in Oconomowoc, Wis. This young man's mother forwarded the excerpt to me because she thought I would be interested. Indeed I was, both because of the contents of the excerpt and because of my personal acquaintance with the young soldier. I believe my colleagues will be interested, too, and I believe they will find the excerpt thought provoking:

JULY 26, 1951.

Yesterday I went up to Heidelberg with the laundry truck and it turned out to be some trip. In miles the distance isn't far, but when you go on these poor roads that are in Germany it takes a while to get there. We had to wait 2 hours to unload because of the many trucks that were in line and while we waited we got to talking with the girl that counts our bundles and keeps the records on what we turn in. She had a very surprising story to tell. We all know that the Germans aren't happy about the Americans being here, but it was amazing to hear her say the things she said since she is hired by the United States Government. She told us that for sure the Germans would rise up and defeat the American Army; she said that we were completely the fault for the Russian power of today; also, that Americans were so yellow they wouldn't attack the Germans until they were down on their knees and she also

said that the next war would start in Iran. She sure was bitter. I asked her why the people would turn on us after we had done so much for them since the end of the war, such as to give them food, keep clothes on their backs, and get fuel for their homes in these cold winters. She only said that that showed how stupid the Americans were and that the Germans would stab us in the back as soon as they could. Her main idea seemed to be that we should keep our nose in our own business.

He Should Be Secretary of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I have read and reread, with fullest approbation, the address on foreign policy and the global propaganda war against communism, delivered a week ago today by the distinguished Member of the other body, the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

I regard this address as one of the most significant and constructive statements of a genuinely American foreign policy that has been offered since that unhappy day in November 1933, when the Roosevelt administration disregarded precedent established by both Democratic and Republican administrations and extended diplomatic recognition to Soviet Russia.

If there are any Members of this House who have failed to read the full text of that address, I earnestly commend it to their thoughtful consideration. It is found on page 9486 of the RECORD of August 6.

In this speech the senior Senator from Nevada, who is performing a magnificent service to the Nation as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, urges the breaking of diplomatic and commercial relations with all Communist countries. This is a step which I have repeatedly advocated for more than 5 years.

In addition to this proposed action, the distinguished Member of the other body outlines a program of fundamental American principles and procedures, for seizing the initiative in foreign policy, in behalf of American interests and in behalf of justice and human freedom in the areas of oppression throughout the world. And he proposes complete and official repudiation of past diplomatic blunders which violated those principles.

So far as I am concerned, the reading and rereading of the address by the senior Senator from Nevada has left one dominant reaction—a profound wish that this able and outspoken American might be the Secretary of State of the United States, with the opportunity to translate into reality the genuinely American foreign policy he so ably and eloquently advocates.

It is, I fear, too much to expect the present administration to turn its back on the present feeble policies and incompetent leadership in the field of foreign affairs.

The Kansas-Missouri Floods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under authority to extend my remarks in the Appendix to the RECORD, I wish to submit editorials from the Kansas City Star, of date August 8, 1951, and from the Kansas City Times, of date August 9, 1951, giving their views in regard to the importance of immediate action for the protection of this great section of the United States for protection from floods in the future, as follows:

[From the Kansas City Star of August 8, 1951]

START FLOOD CONTROL NOW

This Congress can restore hope to the flooded thousands and flooded industries by a full-scale start on flood control. It can act on the whole program in Kansas and Missouri—do everything that can be done this year—and still the cost will be small. All the money that could be spent intelligently this year would probably be little more than the cost of the 1951 flood to Manhattan, Kans., alone.

There is real hope of action in the interest shown by Congress. Within the last week the members of the key House subcommittee on flood control and other members of the Public Works Committee came out to see for themselves. We have had other visits by influential Senators and House Members. Most Members of Congress from both Kansas and Missouri are genuinely aroused. If there is to be any action this is the time.

Except for a very few projects, we are starting from general paper plans that haven't even been authorized by Congress. The desperate need of the flooded valleys is definite action on flood control which means both reservoirs and levees. Recently the people who wait for action have heard a lot of theoretical argument over labels for the plan. Some call for Pick-Sloan, some for MVA and some for the Hoover report.

The only plans that are anywhere near the action stage are those that have been drawn for specific locations. Roll them together and give the plan a new label, if you like. We would be glad to settle for the name of emergency flood-control program or anything else. We can argue later about labels or methods of administration.

Here are the things that can be done this year:

At this end of Kansas the two projects that have been authorized and studied are the Tuttle Creek Dam on the Blue River and the Toronto Dam on the Neosho. Farther west several dams planned by the Bureau of Reclamation have been authorized. So have floodway plans for Wichita and Hutchinson. All these could get under way this year. The preliminary work that can be done the first year is comparatively inexpensive.

The greater number of proposed dams affecting the flooded areas of Kansas and Missouri have never been authorized. This Congress can start action by authorizing all of

them and appropriating the money for the detail engineering studies. At best none of these would be ready to use any construction money until next year.

Probably the experience of this biggest flood will show the need for addition of some dams that don't even exist on paper. Some of the smaller rivers have caused damage on a scale to justify major protection. There should be an over-all study for future guidance.

The rivers of this area—the Kaw system, the Marais des Cygnes-Osage, and the Arkansas system—have served an ultimatum with the demonstrated power of their floods. The cost of reasonable protection is only a fraction of the price of the damage in one terrible year. And these building costs could not reach their peak for several years.

This part of the United States looks to Congress for the kind of action that says it shall not happen again.

[From the Kansas City Times of August 9, 1951]

UNITING AGAINST FLOODS

From the devastation of flood the people of this area are rising with a greater show of unity than we have ever seen before. Of course they still hold their own ideas on methods behind the labels of MVA or Pick-Sloan. A large share of the farmers put first emphasis on a bigger soil conservation program that includes many little retention dams on the creeks. Others directly exposed in the city or farm areas of the valleys are likely to think first of big dams.

Whatever the approach or belief in theory the main goal is the same. It is a goal of a better and more prosperous country with its floodwaters harnessed to become the servant instead of the enemy of man. And right now the call is for action.

This week the Missouri Farmers Association threw its powerful influence on the side of action and thereby set an example for unity. As the representative of thousands of farmers the association has put its emphasis on stepped-up soil conservation with direct flood control starting from the small creeks. For flood-control management it takes the MVA approach. But it is also calling for a quick start on dams and levees that are far enough along in the planning stage to be started soon. A similar approach has been taken by Howard A. Cowden, president of the Consumers Cooperative Association. "Floods call for common action," he said in a signed editorial in the association's publication.

In Missouri the CIO holds firm to its stand for an MVA, but it has gone on record for action on the dams and levees that can be started or authorized now. It reserves its right to work for its own views on administration while the construction is under way.

These organizations are setting the pattern of unity for a flood-control program—one that can start now with an excellent chance of winning the race with the next big flood.

Between the sincere soil conservation and big dam advocates the principal argument is on emphasis. The future of this part of the country calls for both. We must do everything possible to control the floods all the way from the little creeks to the big reservoirs. And we must save the land. As the MFA resolution pointed out this flood's devastation to the land may be more costly in the long run, than the damage to all other property. Once washed away the land is gone.

The Department of Agriculture's soil conservation and retention dam program has been accepted and supported by the Missouri basin but it still waits on action by Congress. It goes hand-in-hand with the plan for reservoirs and levees. Speaking before the MFA convention Secretary Charles F. Brannan gave an excellent outline of the

possibilities in stepped-up soil conservation.

When the structures of flood control are rising in the valleys the management problem can be solved along practical lines. The first point of the MVA advocates is management here in the basin and that isn't particularly controversial. The Pick-Sloan supporters have recognized the fact that a completed flood control system serving various purposes will require management on the ground. They think in the general direction of a legalized interagency committee with power to act. We see nothing here that can't be handled by a reasonable spirit of compromise and common sense. As the program moves along practical consideration will probably influence the final decisions.

In the meantime the believers in flood control and soil conservation are rallying for a program starting where it can start this year. That is the powerful basis for unity and out of unity should come action. Straight ahead lies the goal of subdued flood waters turned to the service of man.

The Gentleman From South Carolina: A Great Legislator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD an article on the gentleman from South Carolina, the Honorable JAMES P. RICHARDS, written by Robert K. Walsh and carried in the Washington Evening Star of August 13, 1951.

Mr. Walsh is to be commended for writing a good article about a good man. Quiet and unassuming though he is, Chairman RICHARDS has qualities of steel and a character above reproach. His fairness and understanding have won for him the respect of not only the Foreign Affairs Committee but the membership of the House of Representatives and the Senate as well.

South Carolina is to be congratulated that one of her sons has made such a magnificent reputation and the United States is extremely fortunate that, in times like the present, it has DICK RICHARDS as chairman of one of the great committees of the Congress.

LEGISLATOR WHO LEGISLATES QUIETLY

(By Robert K. Walsh)

Genial JAMES PRIOLEAU RICHARDS is a good reason why the House Foreign Affairs Committee is making more than a ripple in international waters usually churned by its mightier congressional counterpart, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Precedents can be cited for his part in gaining more recognition for the House group of which he became chairman last May. But his methods and progress are certainly unusual under the circumstances.

This likable, good-looking, 56-year-old South Carolina lawyer, a Democratic Member of the House since 1933, is an avowed middle-grounder. He dislikes shouting and demanding and viewing with alarm. And he fights shy of being colorful.

Representative RICHARDS, nevertheless, has done some highly important speaking and recommending and forward-looking in recent

weeks. His outwardly easy-going manner does not hide qualities of energy and determination as well as tact and a degree of independence from partisan or sectional pressures.

As for color, it is true he won't let the homespun wear too thin. Behind his engaging grin there was something of a hurt look when he pleasantly protested recently against news stories describing him as a "tobacco-chewing chairman." He moved to strike out the words tobacco-chewing as being neither accurate nor germane.

When Mr. RICHARDS came to Washington from Lancaster, S. C., where he had been probate judge, he probably was the last to suspect that one day he would sit at the head of the long table in the House Foreign Affairs Committee room.

His overseas contacts had been mainly military. In 1917, a few days after the United States went into World War I, he also went in as a private. He came out in 1919 as a lieutenant who had served with a trench mortar battalion in France.

While his principal legislative pursuits centered on measures to extend farm mortgages and rescue farms lost in the depression, he showed interest in international affairs at a time when domestic difficulties were the big concern of Congress. He was put on the Foreign Affairs Committee in 1935.

Comparatively little known to the general public or to some otherwise supposedly very important people here, Mr. RICHARDS—for all his unobtrusiveness—caused some wonder when he moved up to the chairmanship.

Was he a Dixiecrat? Was he a down-the-line Truman man? What did he think of the State Department and what did the State Department think of him? How did such labels as "internationalist" or "interventionist" fit him? How would he handle the Foreign Affairs Committee? It includes such diverse personalities as Representatives FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, JR., WALTER JUDD, FINCHES BOLTON, MIKE MANSFIELD, CHRISTIAN A. HERTZ, the venerable CHARLES A. EATON, who had been Republican chairman of the committee, and B. CARROLL REECE, who had been Republican National Chairman.

For all his addiction to hard work, Mr. RICHARDS seldom seems to be in a hurry or to want to hurry anyone else. At hearings on the mutual-security program, he let the questioning of witnesses go round and round. He also called frequent night sessions.

So far as the record and observation show, he has never lost his temper. His questioning of Secretary Acheson, for instance, has been pointed at times but always pleasant. The committee, in general, has followed that example with most witnesses.

It hasn't been all talk and no action. His sponsorship of the grain-for-india bill, which he changed from a grant to a loan provision, his handling of legislation to end the state of war with Germany, and his stand for a resolution on the imprisonment of Associated Press reporter William Oatis, carefully avoided what he considered extremes.

The bill he personally introduced to cut \$700,000,000 from the \$8,500,000,000 foreign-military and economic-aid program sought by the President is another example of the way he works. It also will offer a major test of his influence.

Mr. RICHARDS insists that the cuts he suggests won't harm the program which he unqualifiedly supports. But his quiet move may have taken the steam out of Republican efforts to cut the program by many more millions. It also seems to have taken the sting out of any complaints that he kow-towed to the State Department.

The odds are that most southern Democrats, however unfriendly to the administration and to huge foreign outlays, will

side with Mr. RICHARDS instead of with the Republicans. Perhaps some Republicans will, too.

That is what Mr. RICHARDS means when he says he is a middle grounder.

The St. Lawrence Story—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the first of a series of articles entitled "The St. Lawrence Story" which appeared in the August 7 edition of the Minneapolis Star. This article deals with some of the aspects of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project which make its construction necessary in the interests of the American people. I suggest that this article be read by every Member of Congress.

THE ST. LAWRENCE STORY—CENTURY'S DREAM OF DEEP SEAWAY NEARER REALIZATION

(By Leo Sonderegger)

Some day a heavy cargo ship with the taste of Atlantic salt on her bow will follow the long meander of the St. Lawrence seaway up through the Great Lakes to drop anchor in Duluth Harbor.

Some day a long ship laden with iron ore from Labrador will steam a thousand miles inland to dock at Ashtabula on Lake Erie.

The long Sault Rapids of the St. Lawrence will plunge in harness, some day, and send out an expanding circle of power and light in the Northeast.

These things will come, probably in our generation, and with their coming one of the big dreams of this Nation will be fulfilled. It is the dream of a deep-water channel from the Atlantic Ocean to the heart of America.

The dream has touched the imagination of Americans for more than 100 years. It has loomed and faded, until many men no longer pay attention to it.

CANADA MAY BUILD SEAWAY ALONE

The how and why of the dream have long been answered. Only one real question remains: When?

Those who champion the seaway believe that its coming is inevitable, even though it has been scuttled repeatedly in Congress. If this country fails to go ahead with the project, they say, then Canada will do the work on her own—2 years from now, maybe 5 years, but relatively soon.

Those who have fought the seaway do not admit, for the record, that it is bound to come. They have stalled its development for years and say that they can keep on stalling it.

But even some of the chief opponents acknowledge privately that completion of the project envisioned a century ago is a matter of time, and that time is running out.

"We know it's coming," one of them said recently. "We're only putting off the evil day."

TWO-WAY FLOW OF TRADE

When she drops anchor, the ship reaching Duluth Harbor will have voyaged perhaps 5,500 statute miles from her home port—more than 3,000 across the open Atlantic, and another 2,300 to the center of this continent.

She will be fat with a cargo from foreign countries, ready to unload it and return with whatever the Midwest provides.

The ship's burden will be a droplet in a stream of freight whose tonnage eventually will be measured in tens and scores of millions. The stream will flow two ways, from the Plains country to eastern markets and the sea, and from the East to the Midwest.

The great mass of it will be cargo shipped in bulk—wheat, petroleum, iron ore, coal. But this ship in the harbor of Duluth is a symbol.

When she weighs anchor, she will go down the Lakes—down Superior, down Huron, down Erie, and Ontario. There she will begin to feel the pulse of the St. Lawrence on her hull. She will nose into the steady flow of the river as many ships before her have done.

But when she reaches Chimney Point at Ogdensburg, N. Y., now the outer limit of deep-water navigation from the Lakes, she will only speak the shore and steam ahead down river.

Where the little ships that carry a meager two or three thousand tons have edged a tortuous way past the rapids in 14-foot canals, she will navigate 30-foot locks and go on down to Montreal and the widening Gulf of St. Lawrence and the open sea.

A man-made channel past the Long Sault rapids will take the ship within sight of a powerhouse thrust across the river from Barnhart Island to the Canadian shore.

Men aboard her will hear the generators humming with electrical energy drawn from the leaping current at the rate of 2,200,000 horsepower annually.

These things are the practical stuff of the dream: A deep roadway for ships; plentiful, cheap power for the northeast and Ontario.

Most of the ship channel already has been gouged out by nature, with some assistance from man. The bulk of the remaining work lies within a 114-mile stretch of the St. Lawrence from Ogdensburg down to Montreal.

When that is finished, there will be a water lane at least 27 feet in depth from the gulf to the head of the Lakes.

CHANNEL CAN CARRY MOST CARGO VESSELS

None of the great ocean liners could negotiate a channel of that depth. The battleship *Missouri* would come a cropper as she did on the mud in Chesapeake Bay. But 27 feet is enough water to handle a substantial majority of the world's cargo vessels with pay loads.

Thirty feet would obviously be better, the marine engineers say, 35 feet better still. But a 27-foot channel would be a practical fulfillment of the dream.

That kind of a channel would place the upper Midwest at one end of a long sea arm extending to the world. It would provide cheap transportation for the products of an area more richly endowed with natural resources than almost any other on earth.

It would give that broad region easy access to goods from overseas. Millions of people would reap direct benefits, and the entire Nation would ultimately be strengthened.

Those are well-honed arguments that men have used for more than a generation. Within the last year or two the champions of the seaway have been hammering the opposition with a new argument. In some ways, it is the most powerful they have ever had.

The new argument goes like this:

The readily accessible iron-ore reserves of the Mesabi Range are dwindling under heavy war and domestic pressure. Our steel needs are swiftly rising, and we will require many millions of tons of foreign iron ore from the rich deposits in Liberia, Venezuela, and Labrador.

Although the first two of these sources will be helpful in peacetime, if war comes, the

thin line of ore ships could be snipped on the high seas by enemy submarines.

WORK COULD BEGIN WITHIN 90 DAYS

But with the seaway, Labrador ore could be brought directly up the protected inland route of the St. Lawrence to the Great Lakes iron ports.

Physically, the project is ready to go. Detailed plans and specifications have been prepared, Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of Army Engineers, says the work could begin within 90 days and be completed in 5 years or less.

The Governments of both countries stand ready to proceed with construction of the seaway. Their readiness has been clearly stated in writing for two decades. But Congress, for reasons that will be brought out in succeeding articles, has repeatedly shied away from action.

The behavior of Congress has run true to form at this session. Although the seaway proposal did come closer to approval than at any time since 1941, when the chips were down the House Public Works Committee tabled the measure late in July.

Even so, proponents insist that this year's battle is not yet finished. There is a thin chance that they may still get a spaw bill out onto the floor of the House or Senate.

Canada is watching all this with interest and growing impatience. Her eagerness to get on with the job has been sustained at high pitch for more than two decades.

But the Canadians are getting tired of waiting. Various officials have said, more or less bluntly, that if the United States will not go ahead, maybe Canada ought to do it on her own.

Our neighbors to the north have hinted at such a possibility before. This time they may mean business.

Toll Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to have my own remarks inserted in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the *Elkins Inter-Mountain* of Elkins, W. Va.:

TOLL HIGHWAYS

"Realistic road planners all over the country are coming to the conclusion that the only solution of the problem of high cost of construction and maintenance is the toll road," said the *Charleston Gazette* in an editorial yesterday.

The *Gazette's* comment is of interest in this area which is presently deeply concerned in the projected east-west transcontinental Crozet superhighway. This road would be financed with tolls.

The *Charleston* paper continued:

"It is particularly pleasing to us that West Virginia is in the vanguard in this sort of forward-looking planning. The Princeton-Fairplain road, upon which considerable engineering has already been done, is a departure from the original north-south highway idea but does not by any means rule the latter out.

"Since 1933 highways in many parts of the United States have been wearing out faster than they can be adequately repaired or reconstructed. Everyone knows that West Virginia is confronted with this problem which seems practically insurmountable."

able because of the high cost of construction and the lack of sufficient public funds.

"That the toll road is the only apparent answer is realized by 28 States that have under consideration building toll roads and 18 have some sort of toll-road legislation in effect. Among the latter is our own State that has shown admirable foresight in providing a law that at least at this time seems adequate.

"Since the completion several years ago of the Pennsylvania Turnpike that immediately proved successful beyond the fondest expectations large financing institutions have been showing a friendly and cooperative attitude toward the matter of providing the money to build this new type of road system. Their engineering organizations make intricate surveys relative to costs and probable volume of traffic and when they give the go signal to a State road department on a project it is practically in the bag if the road department is ready.

"The theory that those who use the highways ought to be willing to pay for them has met with approbation by a surprisingly large number of travelers. Instead of going out of their way to avoid the mileage cost, many do the reverse and travel farther in order to get on a toll road. They figure that the saving of time and gasoline and the increased safety is more than worth it.

"The toll-road idea is in its infancy but it is a rapidly growing baby. There are now more than 424 miles of main toll routes in the Nation, 350 miles are under construction and more than 1,200 miles are being authorized or planned. It has been found that in States where the faith of the State is placed behind the bonds for construction, great savings in interest costs are possible.

"Almost every mile of a modern toll road is a scenic route. Rights-of-way are sufficiently wide to preclude the possibility of unsightly restaurants, filling stations, and other buildings encroaching. Only such facilities are allowed near the highway as are constructed according to rigid specifications as to appearance, service, and operation. Rentals for the areas they occupy are additional revenue producers. Landscaping goes with the job.

"The inadequacy of road systems all over the country, the high cost of construction, and the increasing number of accidents caused by bad roads, poorly planned and worn-out, is a problem that must be met and without delay.

"The only solution yet found is the toll road."

The toll roads which have been completed or are in the planning state are all of the super variety. They offer the motorist special service for his toll dollar. The idea is not entirely foreign to our present method of financing highway construction. In West Virginia, for example, motor-vehicle license fees and gasoline taxes are supposed to be earmarked for highway construction and maintenance and the user in reality pays for the privilege of using the roads. The toll road therefore is only an elaboration of the existing system.

An easy out—not trying hard because it seems hard and trying.

The Seaway Story—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the second of a series of articles entitled "The St. Lawrence Story" which appeared in the August 8 edition of the Minneapolis Star. This article deals with the navigation aspects of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

THE ST. LAWRENCE STORY—SEAWAY PLAN
WOULD STRAIGHTEN, WIDEN 114-MILE "COW-
PATH"

(Second of a series)

(By Leo Sonderegger)

The road a ship follows on the long inland voyage from Duluth to the Atlantic Ocean is 2,200 miles of broad highway and 114 miles of cowpath.

The basic idea of the St. Lawrence seaway project is to straighten out the cowpath, widen it, pave it with a 27-foot channel that the big freighters can navigate.

There are some other things to be done, but that is the nub of it.

The cowpath section is a reach of the St. Lawrence that surges in a mighty turbulence, except where the river widens now and again, from Ogdensburg, N. Y., to Montreal. The cargo ships cannot run its white water. They crawl past in a series of canals only 14 feet deep.

The little ones crawl past, that is, the canallers and the vessels with shallow draft and a relative handful of cargo in their holds. The long ships and freighters that handle iron ore and wheat on the lakes do not venture beyond Ogdensburg.

By the same token, deep-draft vessels that cross the Atlantic are stopped by shallow water at the other end of the rapids. The deep channel from the sea extends only to Montreal.

CANALS DATE BACK TO MULE POWER

The little 14-foot canals that bypass the rapids were dug by Canada on her side of the river more than 50 years ago. They date back to the days of the towpath and the mule-drawn barge and have not been materially changed since then.

The locks on these shallow canals are only 250 feet long. They were built to take grain ships with a normal load of less than 30,000 bushels.

But by 1910 the grain men were loading 200,000 bushels into one vessel and the locks were already out of date. They are toys compared with the giant Soo locks that gulp a 600-foot-long ship from Lake Superior and ease it down onto Huron.

After the seaway has been cut through they will continue to be useful, but only to canallers and the little ships that lug two or three thousand tons of freight.

The seaway is not a virgin project. A good deal of work already has been done. A notable part of this is the Welland Canal and its eight locks that enable ships to surmount the mighty escarpment of Niagara Falls.

WELLAND CANAL WORTH THREE HUNDRED AND FIFTY MILLIONS

Canadian engineers figure that duplicating the canal and locks would cost something like \$350,000,000 today. Canada also has spent a lot of money, and intends to spend more, on deepening the channel to 35 feet from Montreal a thousand miles downstream to the sea.

The United States has done some work on deepening of channels. We also built the huge MacArthur locks at Sault Ste. Marie as an emergency project early in World War II.

This is what remains to be done:

Sixty-eight miles of the cowpath section, from Montreal upstream to St. Regis, N. Y., lies entirely within Canada. She will provide a 27-foot shipway and the necessary locks.

Working upstream from Montreal in the Lachine section of the river, the Canadians

will construct a 10-mile canal and two 800-foot locks, thence a channel dredged in the open waters of Lake St. Louis. That lake and Lake St. Francis, a few miles upstream, are both really wide places in the river.

In the Soulanges section between them Canada will finish deepening the canal that bypasses the existing Beauharnois powerhouse. There also will be two 800-foot twin locks in this area. The channel will be continued by dredging in shallow St. Francis Lake, which extends about 30 miles up to St. Regis.

It is above St. Regis in the International Rapids section that the major navigation and hydroelectric works of the seaway project remain to be accomplished. There, the boundary line cuts directly through the river for 46 miles.

TO SUBMERGE TOWNS ON 30-MILE STRETCH

The work to be done jointly by the two governments will change the whole aspect of this section. The river will be widened—a mile in some places, 3 or 4 in others. Towns on both sides for a distance of 30 miles will be submerged.

Most of the flooding will be caused by a dam across the Long Sault rapids, and by the powerhouse extending from Barnhart Island to the Canadian shore.

There also will be another dam at Iroquois Point near the upstream end of the International Rapids. A system of dikes will be constructed.

The navigation channel, partly in the river and partly in land cuts, will have three big locks. Each one will be 800 feet long, 80 feet wide, 30 feet deep. The land cuts will bypass the Long Sault and the Iroquois Dam.

When that work has been completed there will not be much left to do. In the Thousand Islands section running down from Lake Ontario to Ogdensburg, removal of a few scattered rock shoals will complete work done jointly by Canada and the United States between 1929 and 1933.

Canada will increase to 27 feet the channel depth of the Welland Canal, whose locks are 30 feet over the sill.

The United States will be responsible for deepening the channels connecting Lakes Superior, Michigan, and Huron.

This country also has agreed to deepen the Huron-Erie connecting channels that run down the St. Clair River, Lake St. Clair and the Detroit River. The channels are now generally 25 feet down-bound and 21 feet up-bound.

EXPECT TOLLS TO PAY COST IN 50 YEARS

One primary source of controversy has been the cost of all this work. The present estimate calls for expenditure of \$818,063,000, of which Canada would pay \$251,269,000 and the United States \$566,794,000.

In the eyes of many observers, although the cost is high, it does not seem out of line with anticipated benefits.

The Department of Commerce figures that potential traffic will range from 57,000,000 to 84,000,000 tons annually. Tolls are expected to pay for the project in about 50 years.

Canada has agreed to the principle of tolls, although actual figures have not yet been fixed.

Experts in the Department of Commerce estimate that by far the biggest freight item on the seaway will be iron ore. Thirty to thirty-seven and one-half million tons of ore a year will move up the channel to Lake Erie when shipments hit their peak, the House Public Works Committee was told.

The Commerce Department estimates also include 6,000,000 to 20,000,000 tons of petroleum, 6,500,000 to 11,500,000 tons of grain, 4,000,000 tons of coal, about 11,000,000 tons of general cargo, and 25,500,000 to 42,000,000 tons of ballast shipping.

Once the seaway channel is put through, the long ships that handle Mesabi ore on the

Lakes will also carry Labrador ore up the St. Lawrence. Even with the toll, the ore will make the long run more cheaply than by rail from Montreal.

It is also foreseen that some of the ore ships will take on a cargo of grain for the trip back down the St. Lawrence. Both Canadian and United States grain moves down the channel now, but in quantity limited by capacity of the little canals.

SEE GREATER WORLD MARKET FOR WHEAT

The Commerce Department people are rather cautious when they talk about grain shipment. They think the tonnage is likely to be nearer the minimum figure of 6,500,000 tons than the 11,500,000-ton maximum.

Some other proponents of the seaway are more optimistic. They believe that American and Canadian wheat will find an increasing world market under the combined influence of increased production and cheap seaway transportation.

These men, the ones caught in the dream of the seaway, are inclined not to think much in terms of tonnage estimates and toll revenue. They believe that seaway traffic will eventually exceed the most optimistic estimates now being made.

The pattern of their thinking is the shuttle pattern the ships weave on a great inland shipway, bearing ore and coal and grain and the things men create by their labor.

They envision many ships moving inland with cargoes of goods from abroad. They see the ships going back with the products of the great American hinterland.

It is the stream of ships they think of. They believe that it will come to pass.

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted, I am including as part of these remarks the lead editorial from the Oregon Daily Journal in its issues of August 6, 1951, entitled "Flood Control":

FLOOD CONTROL

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, which is generally admired by American editors for its vigor and independence, gets completely off the beam in commenting on the Missouri Basin flood.

It takes the Corps of Engineers to task for its failure to prevent or reduce the appalling flood damage which now approaches \$1,000,000,000. It calls the comprehensive Pick-Sloan plan for Missouri Basin States a makeshift substitute for a Missouri Valley Authority. It suggests that things would have been different under an MVA. It talks of politics and boondoggling. It recommends a thoroughgoing investigation by the Congress.

We disagree on all counts.

First, the Corps of Engineers, prior to the development of the Pick-Sloan plan, was responsible for navigation and flood-controlling levee work along the Big Muddy. It was not responsible for the reclamation, irrigation, storage reservoir, or soil-erosion programs which, under the Pick-Sloan plan, are delegated to the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of Agriculture.

Second, by the Post-Dispatch's own figures, the Army engineers had spent only \$300,000,000 on the Missouri River system up to 1945

and has had only \$600,000,000 for navigation and flood-control work up to last year. Its share of the three-department Pick-Sloan program is approximately \$1,300,000,000, or approximately one-fourth of the estimated cost of the Missouri Basin project.

It is obviously unfair, therefore, to charge the Corps of Engineers with full responsibility for controlling Missouri Valley floods. It takes scores of storage dams on upstream tributaries, thousands of ponds and small reservoirs on farms and ranches to prevent quick runoffs and provide irrigation water. It takes soil-saving stock ponds, the planting of moisture-holding grasses, terracing, diversion ditches, and small-stream improvements to make an effective soil-conservation program. None of this is the responsibility of the engineers.

As for the efficacy of another valley authority, on the TVA pattern, as contrasted with a coordinated interagency basin program, we'll take the coordinated interagency program. If TVA is the test, such a program costs less money and does not become involved in competitive businesses and does not endanger basic water rights or civil liberties. If river and harbor work, flood control and reclamation work involve politics and boondoggling, as the Post-Dispatch charges, the felony would be compounded under a valley authority with arbitrary power and a capacity for capricious action without local controls.

Finally, asking the Congress for an investigation of the Army engineers and of flood-control work on the Missouri is asking Congress to investigate itself. After all, the Congress has been directly responsible for the snail's pace at which the Pick-Sloan plan has been put into action. For example, the House cut also \$200,000,000 from flood control and navigation requests for the current fiscal year. But the Senate, jolted into realization of Missouri Valley needs, is now considering the restoration of the full amount.

Senator FRANK CARLSON, Kansas Republican, points out that a \$115,000,000 appropriation for three key projects—Tuttle Creek, Milford, and Perry Dams—would have reduced materially the \$1,000,000,000 property damage charged to the floods. Yet the Congress has failed to provide funds for any of them.

Perhaps the Post-Dispatch should consult the 13 Senators who have just surveyed the flood-damaged Missouri Basin. Deeply shocked, they have vowed to speed up the comprehensive flood control-reclamation program. The Pick-Sloan plan, if you please. And Representative Brooks of Louisiana adds: "A little money timely spent might have saved this great section of the Middle West from some of this appalling loss of life and property."

Maybe we're learning—albeit the hard way.

The MacArthur I Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Gen. George C. Kenny is one of the greatest air commanders the world has yet produced. As the commander of our Air Force in the Pacific war, his record of accomplishments was phenomenal, particularly when we consider the obstacles he had to overcome. It was with his leadership that our airmen destroyed the air power of Japan. After the war he became

commander of the Strategic Air Command of the United States. His last assignment was to command the Air University.

His most recent accomplishment has been the writing of a book entitled "The MacArthur I Know." Gen. George C. Kenny is better able to appraise the character, leadership, and patriotism of Gen. Douglas MacArthur than any Member of this Congress, the President or any of his Cabinet, or any of the high Pentagon commanders. The smear artists on Capitol Hill do not know General MacArthur.

Mr. Speaker, the following article is taken from General Kenny's book. It was written by the general who knows MacArthur and his work better than any other American except his wife, Jean. I recommend this entire book to the American people and to this Congress. Let us study the opinion of a man who knows the truth rather than the slander and abuse of the little characters in Washington and elsewhere who are masters at the art of tearing down great men. This article is the thirteenth chapter of General Kenny's book.

THE MACARTHUR I KNOW

(By Gen. George C. Kenney)

CHAPTER XIII

At the beginning of this book, I warned the reader that I was a MacArthur man. I also stated the belief that this did not jeopardize my ability to assess him objectively.

Some readers might question that last statement, but, in the final analysis, my conception of objectivity is based on fundamentals.

Has Douglas MacArthur served his country well?

My answer is "Yes," and I believe the record will support me.

Has Douglas MacArthur been motivated by personal ambitions or by patriotism?

To my mind, few men have been more selfless in service to their country regardless of the effect of their actions on their own personal fortunes.

It is interesting to note that the most severe critics of Douglas MacArthur seldom question his accomplishments, past or present.

Lacking anything concrete to work on, they base their objections to MacArthur upon trivialities and false impressions that attempt to portray a personality which actually does not exist. They make disparaging remarks about his rhetoric, his references to religion, his Philippine marshal's cap. They take great delight in telling and circulating stories reflecting upon his sincerity, his patriotism, and even his personal courage. The adjectives "bombastic," "flamboyant," and "egotistical" have become almost standardized in their reference to Douglas MacArthur. Few of his critics have ever seen MacArthur, still fewer have ever talked to him. None of them has ever been closely associated with him.

Few great men of our history have escaped this type of slander and abuse. Washington in the military field, and Lincoln in the political, are two examples. There are many others.

No apologies are needed for a record as broad in scope and as vast in achievement as that of MacArthur. That record speaks for itself: brilliant leadership and victory in two World Wars; amazingly successful administration of a conquered country after nearly 4 years of bitter warfare; unflinching defense of American ideals and principles in peace and war.

But I would like to add a final word, not of MacArthur the soldier or of MacArthur

the administrator. This word is of MacArthur the man.

He is as warm and as human in person as he is brilliant in leadership. He is as generous of his time, his talents, and his friendship as any man I have ever known. He has a grand sense of humor and a kindness in him that I have seldom seen matched.

He has a sincere and almost parental concern for those he calls his friends. I am fortunate enough to be one of those people. In that respect, it is difficult for me to be wholly objective.

To those who say, "Yes, but he has given his friendship to so few," I can only reply that I have never seen anyone—military or civilian—offer their loyalty and their friendship to MacArthur and not have it reciprocated many times over.

There are those who criticize his optimism and attribute it to egotism. Perhaps if they had been with us in the critical days at Port Moresby in late 1942—when his fate as a leader hung on a tenuous balance of supply that my pitifully small and overworked Air Force was barely able to maintain—they would not find optimism a character failing.

Optimism is axiomatic with leadership. And in those grave days and hours, four words from MacArthur meant as much to me as a new squadron of airplanes. Those words were

"George, we'll do it."

That attitude breeds victory and success—in wars and in the terribly critical struggles of today aimed toward the prevention of another world catastrophe.

Yet, I believe I shall continue to remember and admire and respect him as my friend just as much as I remember and admire and respect him as one of America's greatest leaders.

I shall also remember other things about MacArthur. The quick sympathy that frequently crosses his face, the sudden hurt when he would hear that one of my youngsters had been lost, the friendly and constant concern for the relatives of those fighting with him as comrades in arms, and for those comrades themselves.

No man ever sacrificed his meager command more sparingly nor grudgingly. To Douglas MacArthur, every American life—private to general, soldier or civilian—was something precious to be hoarded at all costs.

Those are fundamental characteristics of a great leader.

Today, as he has been for many years, Douglas MacArthur is still the subject of controversy and still one of the most important figures on the national and the international scene. It will probably always be so.

I do not expect every reader of this book to accept completely my evaluation of Douglas MacArthur. But they might be interested in an evaluation that was given me by a member of a friendly power in the United Nations several years ago:

"Thank God, Josef Stalin doesn't have men like Douglas MacArthur on his side."

Supreme Court Justices as Character Witnesses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include

editorials from the Jacksonville (Fla.) Times-Union, the Ironwood (Mich.) Globe, and the New York (N. Y.) World-Telegram, commending my legislative suggestion to prohibit Supreme Court Justices from testifying as to matters of opinion.

I am convinced that this bill would fill a very real legal gap which became apparent during the Hiss case. The purpose of my bill is to prevent future instances of character endorsement by members of the high court and also to spare them the embarrassment of refusing to testify in behalf of acquaintances and/or friends, if they do not wish to do so.

The editorials follow:

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Times-Union of July 15, 1951]

FEDERAL JUDGES SHOULD BE EXEMPTED AS WITNESSES

Suppose some smart lawyer, as Representative KEATING, New York, Republican, expresses it, should subpoena most or all members of the Supreme Court as witnesses in a lower court trial, what could be done about the case if it were appealed to the highest court?

The answer is Nothing, for the Justices appearing in the case would thus be disqualified from passing on it.

That such would be the case was demonstrated in the Alger Hiss trial when Justice Reed was subpoenaed by the defense, and Justice Frankfurter appeared as a volunteer witness. They disqualified themselves when the conviction was appealed to the Supreme Court.

Representative KEATING is on solid ground, therefore, in introducing his bill barring Justices of the Supreme Court from testifying as character witnesses, or on matters of opinion.

The bill already has been endorsed by a subcommittee, and is scheduled for early consideration by the House Judiciary Committee, and it ought by all means to be enacted into law. It might also include members of the Cabinet, and thus save the country of such humiliating incidents as that of the Secretary of State appearing as a witness for questionable characters, as in the case of Dean Acheson for Hiss.

[From the Ironwood (Mich.) Globe of July 14, 1951]

JUDGES AS WITNESSES

Justices of the United States Supreme Court would be barred from testifying as character witnesses, or on matters of opinion, under a bill soon to be considered by the House Judiciary Committee and endorsed on July 9 by a subcommittee. Representative KEATING (Republican, New York), who introduced the bill, has declared that he was motivated by the appearances of Justices Frankfurter and Reed as character witnesses for Alger Hiss (in his first trial).

Justice Reed had been subpoenaed by the Hiss defense, Justice Frankfurter was a volunteer witness. Chief Judge Magruder of the United States court of appeals in the first district was also a character witness for Hiss.

An alternative bill, introduced by Representative SMITH (Republican, Wisconsin), would provide simply that no Federal judge could be compelled to testify as to character or to appear as a witness if similar testimony could be obtained from other witnesses.

Representative KEATING points to the possibility of some smart lawyer subpoenaing most or all members of the Supreme Court as witnesses in a lower court trial. Then the court would be unable to pass on an appeal in the case. Reed and Frankfurter both disqualified themselves in the Hiss appeal.

An earlier case, of 1905, has been unearthed in which two Supreme Court Justices appeared on the list of witnesses. There is no indication that they were actually called to the witness stand.

Prior to making its favorable report on the Keating bill the house subcommittee had received a letter from Chief Justice Vinson, declining comment on the measure. Vinson said he and the other justices felt that they should not go on record. Deputy Attorney General Ford had advised the subcommittee that the Justice Department also preferred to make no recommendation.

[From the New York (N. Y.) World-Telegram of July 12, 1951]

KEATING BILL SHOULD PASS

The Keating bill, which would forbid the appearance of United States Supreme Court Justices as character witnesses in Federal trials, has won the unanimous approval of a House Judiciary subcommittee. We hope this means speedy passage of the measure by Congress.

This bill, sponsored by Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York, was a natural and proper result of public shock when Supreme Court Justices Felix Frankfurter and Stanley B. Reed took the stand as character witnesses in the first trial of Alger Hiss, whom a second trial convicted as a perjurer.

Even more than an obvious impairment of judicial propriety, prestige, and dignity was involved in this unprecedented appearance of high court judges as witnesses in a criminal trial.

Later, in fact, when the Hiss case went to the Supreme Court on appeal both these Justices, along with a third, were plainly disqualified, leaving only six of the Court's nine judges to decide its action.

We believe some of these Justices themselves might welcome a plain prohibitive law that would rid them once and for all of the slightest obligation to become character witnesses.

At least we are sure a vast majority of the public, after what it saw in the Hiss case, can heartily approve the purpose of the Keating bill. Congress should hasten to pass it.

International Peace Garden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRED G. AANDAHL

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. AANDAHL. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial is taken from the Jamestown Sun, published at Jamestown, N. Dak., and was written by Mrs. A. P. Haglund, of the Medina Homemakers Club.

In this period of international crisis, it is encouraging to know that people in local communities have confidence in an ultimate international relationship that will eliminate the constant threat of world-wide war. The long-time friendly relationship between the United States and Canada, symbolized by the International Peace Garden located along the northern border of North Dakota, helps to chart the way to the final objective.

INTERNATIONAL PEACE GARDEN

A great number of minds are concerned today with problems of peace, not only world problems but national and local problems as well. Their eyes are focused on a

seemingly distant objective, now somewhat distinct but oftentimes vague and "will-o-the-wispish". It permeates the thoughts and every way of life of millions throughout the world.

A much smaller number of persons have acquainted themselves through the printed word of the tangible results of similar peace efforts in the past, but an even lesser group has seen this peace pledge, namely the international peace garden which lies in the Turtle Mountains on the boundary line between Canada and the United States.

Dedicated on July 14, 1932, in the presence of over 50,000 persons, this peace garden is a solemn pledge of two great nations to continue forever the peace which had existed between them for then more than a century. Their fears and horrors of modern warfare are being only too vividly realized in today's conflict in Korea, and more than ever the ideals and principles embodied in the establishing of the International Peace Garden must be perpetuated at all costs.

The International Peace Garden comprises an area of about 2,200 acres, 888 of which are on the United States side, situated on the longest unfortified international boundary line in the world. The formal area comprising about 160 acres equally distributed on each side of the international boundary line is now partially developed. Plots in this area have been allotted to various organizations who are providing funds for the development and maintenance of such plots. An interesting cairn built of common field stones and standing equally on Canadian and American soil bears this inscription:

"To God in His glory. We two nations dedicate this garden and pledge ourselves that as long as men shall live, we will not take up arms against one another."

Upon viewing the garden, there comes to mind Henry Wardsworth Longfellow's lines:

"Where'er a noble deed is wrought,
Where'er is spoken a noble thought,
Our hearts in glad surprise
To higher levels rise."

It appears our Canadian friends have taken the lead in beautifying this garden. In addition to a profusion of flowers, many evergreen trees have been planted adjacent to the formal gardens, and along the highway on the Canadian side. The American citizen is equally eager to share in perpetuating a visible principle in such noble beauty.

What an opportunity for the Homemakers of America to take up this project! How much more firm the pledge of peace were a tree planted by the Homemakers one for each State in the Union, as well as the Hawaiian and Alaskan Homemakers: a voluntary consecration of American womanhood to bonds of peace and good will.

The poet, Lucy Larcom, expresses a beautiful thought in her poem, Plant a Tree, when she says

"He who plants a tree, plants a hope, a joy, love;
He who plants a tree, he plants peace."

MEDINA HOMEMAKERS CLUB,
MRS. A. P. HAGLUND.

Decentralize Our Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the problem of decentralizing our cities in the United States has be-

come an orphan in our defense program. No arm of the Government has seen fit to take any action on this problem. As long as we continue to have congested industrial areas we will have attractive targets for enemy bombs. During the debate on the Defense Production Act, the House Banking Committee offered an amendment which would have strongly encouraged the dispersal of new industries. Unfortunately, this amendment was defeated.

I believe there was a misconception among many of those who opposed this amendment in that they thought that their home States would lose some of their industries to other sections of the country. This would not be so. Adequate decentralization for the purpose of lessening damage from enemy bombing does not require that industrial plants be erected in the sparsely settled States or that they be moved from New England to the South.

All that is necessary is that any new proposed plants be about 15 or 25 miles outside of our large cities. Thus, New England, for instance, need not fear losing industry by a program of decentralization. All that is required is that any new plants erected in New England be distributed about so that they will not increase the potential damage from enemy bombing in an already congested area.

On June 20, 1951, I introduced H. R. 4529. This bill would amend the amortization provisions of the income-tax law. It would grant accelerated 5-year depreciation on new defense plants only when these plants are located in a secure area which is not likely to be subject to atomic attack.

A secure area is defined in the bill to be an area "relatively secure from direct attack by an enemy of the United States, by reason of absence of population concentration, industrial congestion, and strategic targets." The President or such officer as he may designate would make the determination as to secure areas.

I enclose herewith an article which appears in the Reporter of August 21, 1951, which presents a strong case for dispersion of industry:

OUR CROWDED TARGET AREAS—GOVERNMENT AND INDUSTRY, IGNORING THE LESSON OF NAGASAKI, HAVE NEGLECTED OUR BEST DEFENSE AGAINST THE A-BOMB: DISPERSION

(By Ralph E. Lapp)

American industry, greatly expanded during the Second World War and further enlarged in the postwar years, is now being fortified to the extent of over \$20,000,000,000 to meet the urgent demands of our present mobilization. Despite our industry's already dangerously high vulnerability to atomic attack, new war plants are still being located in critical target areas.

Last fall the National Security Resources Board was assigned responsibility for approving pieces of paper called certificates of necessity, which permit a company to write off, for purposes of tax saving, the cost of new plant construction over a period of 5 years rather than the usual 20 to 25. Subsequently the Defense Production Administration was made the certifying authority, and up to the present date more than \$8,000,000,000 worth of certificates have been approved. Roughly 40 percent of the dollar value of this new construction has

been slated for metropolitan areas. The enormity of this defiance of the simple rules of atomic common sense is only slightly lessened by the fact that some of the plants are not to be built right in the center of metropolitan areas (presumably because such areas are too heavily populated or have too high tax structures).

A House subcommittee investigating the granting of certificates of necessity has reported: "Under the present policy (of granting certificates of necessity) no effort is made by the Government to control the location of new facilities through certificates; the selection of the site is left entirely to the applicant." The report concludes "after studying all aspects of this matter . . . the failure on the part of administrators of the program to make any effort whatever to locate new industrial facilities with regard to military security is most illogical and unreasonable."

PRE-ATOMIC MOBILIZATION

It is especially paradoxical that NSRB should rubber-stamp certificates of necessity without considering the national security, because that very agency has shown in its brochure, National Security Factors in Industrial Location, that it understands dispersion of plants to be basic defense against A-bombs. This reads: "The whole problem of industrial dispersion boils down to a common-sense application of the old adage about not putting all of one's eggs in one basket . . . The job of dispersion is one that industry must assume, both for its own protection and that of national security."

The Office of Defense Mobilization has dodged the industrial dispersion issue, apparently because it considers it politically infeasible and because it prefers to concentrate on "getting the job done." Our present mobilization effort has thus become in this respect a postscript to the Second World War program. Industry, with ODM's blessing, is following the well-traveled but now dangerous road of preatomic mobilization. With but minor exceptions this road has been followed in our entire industrial development since VJ-day. Five years of unprecedented construction have witnessed an annual expenditure of about \$18,000,000,000, the bulk of which has been funneled into our largest metropolitan areas.

HOW FAR IS ENOUGH

Data compiled for 35 prime target areas, almost all of which are metropolitan, reveal that 58 percent of the Nation's industrial product by dollar value originates in these manufacturing centers. Chicago alone accounts for 7 percent of the total. Anyone who has looked down upon a large city from an airplane knows how plants are usually crowded within city limits. To be sure, some industry has moved out to the country, but not far enough out, and open space around the plant is soon filled with the outspread from the city.

Dispersing manufacturing facilities beyond city limits can be an effective defense measure if the dispersion distance is considerable and if permanent open space is maintained between the city and the plants. Just what is meant by a considerable distance? In some cases the dispersal distance should be as high as 20 miles, for example in the case of huge plants which necessarily attract other smaller industries. In other instances a few miles may be sufficient.

Since our industrial plants represent fixed investments of long duration in the sense of national security, their defense must be planned not just for the weapons of today but for those still below the technical horizon. In this connection, a New York industrialist told his colleagues: "Don't try to protect your plants. If you locate in the suburbs, 5 years from now the A-bomb will be so much bigger it will get you anyway." Such pessimism is not warranted, since every

weapon, even the H-bomb, can be combated with the proper use of space. In fact, unless industry goes underground (and this is generally regarded as impractical), our only defense weapon is space.

The combination of official secrecy and unrestrained guessing has discouraged many industrialists from any kind of action. When the Atomic Energy Commission detonated A-bombs near Las Vegas early this year, light flashes were visible from points 400 miles distant. These tests convinced many laymen that the H-bomb had been ushered into the world, even though the Atomic Energy Commission later denied it. Tersely worded official statements from Eniwetok about weapons several times more powerful than the Hiroshima-Nagasaki type" compounded the confusion.

Industry cannot be expected to erect defenses against unknown weapons. Nor can it safely proceed in its planning on the basis of information passed out over Washington dinner tables. The facts about the power of new weapons already have been brought out in testimony before a congressional committee considering the dispersal of Federal agencies. Top AEC officials were called upon to advise what would be judged to be a safe distance for establishing six new agency sites close to Washington, D. C. They stated that 12 miles would be adequate from the standpoint of the probable power of new atomic weapons and 20 miles for other possible weapons.

As long as the Government keeps data essential for sound industrial development secret, and until ODM changes its short-sighted policy of giving industry free rein in plant location, there will be further concentration of war plants in prime target areas.

THE PENTAGON'S ALOOFNESS

One might expect the military services to exert influence in safeguarding their future tanks, planes, and ships. The late Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, testifying before the Senate inquiry into the MacArthur ouster, commented on the reasons for Soviet hesitancy in plunging into a third world war: " . . . the deterrent to war with us is the realization of our technical and industrial potential, the forces we have, our ability to expand them, that there is the realization on the other side that if a general war comes they will be defeated." Yet the Military Establishment has never announced any policy on the security of the Nation's war plants. On the other hand, it seems to have gone out of its way to emphasize our vulnerability to air attack.

An exceptional instance in which the military intervened in plant location was in the transfer of the Boeing Aircraft Corp.'s B-47 production from Seattle, Wash., to Wichita, Kans. W. Stuart Symington, as Secretary of the Air Force, personally strong-armed this relocation. The case is worth discussing because Seattle reacted vigorously and constructively. Its chamber of commerce realized that the Boeing incident could well condemn the city as a site for future industrial growth. To counter this threat the chamber of commerce announced an approach to industrial mobilization in which dispersal of key industries plays an essential role. Certain areas judged to be out of bomb range have been designated for new manufacturing facilities. Time must elapse before the effectiveness of the Seattle plan can be assessed, but certainly the basic philosophy behind the scheme is heartening. Milwaukee is likewise adopting a progressive attitude toward industrialization, not because it suffered a Boeing incident but because it has an enlightened mayor, Frank P. Zeldner.

Any same program of dispersal must begin with a critical evaluation of the present vulnerability of existing war plants. In the

language of the war planners this means that there must be a target analysis of United States industry by men who look at our industrial concentrations through the eyes of Soviet strategists. Target analyses have already been made by the Air Force and by the National Security Resources Board, and only recently two new groups have set to work on the task—the Industry Evaluation Board in the Department of Commerce and the Facilities Protection Board of the National Security Council. NSRB itself has started a new attack upon the over-all problem and is currently formulating a national policy for industrial dispersion. Announcement of this policy is expected from the White House some time this summer.

BROODING YANKEES

Anticipating President Truman's policy statement, Representative JAMES T. PATTERSON, Republican, Connecticut, has taken issue with dispersal by quoting the Bridgeport Post "a scheme to fill up the empty spaces of the South and Southwest, not by enterprise, not by the long process of building up a place in industry through merit and competition, but simply by deliberate brutal Government action transferring established industry from one section of the country and planting it somewhere else through the manipulation of Government contracts." A group of Congressmen, for whom Representative PATTERSON is a spokesman, have been increasingly worried about the loss of industry from New England ever since the much-publicized uprooting of the Chance Vought Aircraft Co., from Stratford, Conn., near Bridgeport. The long-distance move, in this case to Texas, paralleled the Boeing case. Together they form the two big exceptions to the rule of nondispersal.

New England need have little fear that the administration plans to parcel northeastern industry out to the rest of country. But if the policies now being developed are put into effect, New England along with the rest of the Nation will find that it is no longer at liberty to select new plant sites without first considering national security. The Government has a number of powerful tools that can be used to persuade industry if the latter should disregard atomic vulnerability. One, already mentioned, is the certificate of necessity. Others are loan guarantees, direct loans, direct supply of equipment, allocation of critical materials, and preference in the awarding of military contracts. No new mechanisms have to be invented to put the pressure on industry, they exist but have not been put into effect.

Certain critical industries, evaluated as absolutely essential to war production, may have to be shifted to new locations. This does not mean they will be lifted bodily out of New England and set down in Kansas. More likely the Government's policy will be to recommend the relocation of plants somewhere within the same market area but well outside of bomb range. Such drastic action will be limited to relatively few plants, but as plants become obsolete the companies concerned will be encouraged to build elsewhere if the old location is vulnerable to attack. Many plants, especially those in the chemical field or where technological advancement is very rapid, go out of date in as little as 5 years.

THE PRICE

An argument frequently advanced to block dispersal is that it will cost too much. Although it is absurd to think of dispersing all industry, even this colossal task is not nearly so unattainable as it might seem. A rough estimate of the replacement cost for American plants, arrived at by adding up (in terms of 1950 dollars) the prewar United States industrial plant cost, the amount of wartime construction, and the very considerable additions to the total since the war,

puts the replacement cost at slightly more than \$300,000,000,000. Since we are spending an average of about \$18,000,000,000 per year on new construction and equipment, simple mathematics would indicate that we could replace our total industry in about two decades. The actual process is, of course, more involved than simple arithmetic, and the time required would be longer, but no one proposes that we demolish our present economy and completely replace it.

If we subtract plants that are not essential to war production, we eliminate about 60 percent of the total. Furthermore, since some of these plants are peripherally dispersed, are in small towns, or are not even in target areas, the amount of industry for hypothetical relocation would be further reduced. The dollar total thus involved would probably become about \$90 billion.

This figure drops further when one considers that equipment could be reinstalled in relocated plants. Since equipment costs usually outweigh direct plant-construction costs by a factor of between two and three, it may be deduced that with our present outlays for new construction we can replace our most vulnerable essential plants in about 10 years. It must be emphasized that this is selective dispersal applied only to critical plants which are judged to be in target areas. Selective relocation obviously should not and cannot take in such installations as breweries, soft-drink bottlers, department stores, or dry cleaners.

Six years ago in Nagasaki the Mitsubishi Steel Works and a score of other factories were, much like United States plants today, turning out war goods. Then came the fateful day when the atomic bomb was introduced to Japanese industry. Yet, judged by six postwar years of unrivaled construction and concentration of plants, United States industry has apparently not learned the lesson of the twisted girders and crumbled walls of factories built too close together.

THE UNWARY EAGLE

Businessmen point out in their own defense that they have not been encouraged to disperse and that the Government has announced no program for industrial relocation. They are, of course, correct, for it is a case of multiple negligence. The Pentagon says dispersal is not its responsibility. Put to the test, NSRB and ODM have both refused to come to grips with the problem until now. Only at this late date, with defense construction well under way, is NSRB valiantly trying to put teeth into a sound dispersal policy. Meanwhile the steady agglomeration of defense plants in overcrowded target areas keeps on adding to the country's vulnerability.

A Libyan fable chronicled by Aeschylus may well be pertinent to American industry. An eagle stricken with a dart said, when he saw the fashion of the shaft, "With our own feathers, not by others' hands are we now smitten." Perhaps the moral of the fable, the omen of Nagasaki, and the new drive within the NSRB may yet jog the lagging memory of United States industry.

West Point's Honor System Is as Broad as a Man's Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Star of August 12, 1951, published

an article written for the AP by Capt. John S. D. Eisenhower, son of General Eisenhower with reference to West Point's honor system. Captain Eisenhower, 29 and a 1944 graduate of West Point, is assistant professor of English at the Military Academy. His article is timely and deserving of a wide audience and I include it here as a part of these remarks:

WEST POINT'S HONOR SYSTEM IS AS BROAD AS A MAN'S LIFE

(By Capt. John S. D. Eisenhower)

(The following article was written for the AP by Capt. John S. D. Eisenhower, son of General Eisenhower. Captain Eisenhower, 29 years old and a 1944 graduate of West Point, is assistant professor of English at the Military Academy.)

WEST POINT, N. Y., August 11.—When the Superintendent of the United States Military Academy announced recently that approximately 90 cadets were being dismissed for cheating in academics, the result was a storm of publicity and, from some quarters, protests. Almost all Americans were apparently handicapped in their judgment of the matter by strong misconceptions.

Some writers regarded the system as cruel; some, as a means of preserving outworn traditions of chivalry and feudalism; some, as mysterious. Actually the West Point honor system is neither cruel, feudal, nor mysterious. Except for the wider scope which it embraces in a man's life, it is not fundamentally different from any other school's honor system—its purpose is simply to develop honest men, straightforward, and able to take responsibility for their action.

INDOCTRINATED EARLY

This development begins early. Upon entrance the new cadet has the principles of the system carefully explained to him, and he immediately begins to live by the practical application of these principles. Briefly, they mean that a cadet does not lie, cheat, or steal. His word and his signature are above question. He is honor bound to report any violations that come to his attention, for the honor system is above personal friendship. He knows that a single intentional violation of the code means that he will leave West Point.

In addition, the cadet learns of immense benefits which accrue to him through the honor system—not only the luxury of leaving valuables carelessly around the room but also the realization that he is living in a society where each man's word is his bond, whether it be the word of cadet to officer or officer to cadet.

ADMINISTERED BY CADETS

The cadet honor committee, comprising representatives elected by the cadets themselves, administers the system. The new plebe soon learns to come to a member of this highly respected body with any problem he has concerning honor.

The honor system is so much a way of life at West Point that the normal cadet soon accepts it as natural. The day never passes in which a cadet does not make some official statement, which, because of the system, is unquestioned. Many of the privileges accorded the Corps of Cadets are possible only because of the honor system. The application of the honor system to the academic arrangement at West Point is taken completely for granted. The cadet assumes that the honor system works.

MAJORITY ARE ADAMANT

The greatest teacher of the West Point honor system, overlooked by many of the recent comments on the subject, is the fact that it is administered and perpetuated almost entirely by the corps of cadets.

It is regrettable in the recent scandal that so much attention was paid to the testimony of a few offenders and so little attention was paid to the remainder of the corps who stood adamant against those who had broken their code. The honor system is vital to West Point. The ability to live by that system is a requisite for a man who is preparing to be an officer. If a man cannot understand and adhere to the code while he is a cadet, there seems a grave danger that he will not be able to adhere to it under the much greater stresses of his officer service—a service which may mean 40 years of increasing responsibility.

Red Chinese Continue Persecutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith still more reports of the religious persecution which has been going on for a long time in China. These reports tell of the expulsion of the Jesuit missionaries and of a Maryknoll missionary's 5 months' imprisonment in a Communist prison. I include a news item from the Brooklyn Tablet of June 9, 1951, and one from the NCWC News Service of June 18, 1951:

[From the Brooklyn Tablet of June 9, 1951]
CHINA REDS EXPEL BISHOP, JESUITS—USUAL FAKE PRETEXT RESORTED TO BY COMMUNISTS

TOKYO, June 5.—Continuing its efforts to drive all foreign-born Catholic missionaries from China, the Communist regime has expelled 74-year-old Bishop Jean de Vienne from his see of Tientsin and ordered him to leave the country.

Furthermore, the Red regime has ordered during the past week the expulsion of eight other missionaries, including six American Jesuits, and organized mass meetings, which will probably be followed by new arrests and expulsions.

According to the Reds, the bishop admitted his "errors." Among the seven admissions alleged by the Communist papers are the fact that he had organized the Legion of Mary in his diocese; that he had opposed the regime-sponsored so-called reform movement for the church, and that he had distributed Catholic pamphlets which explained the Catholic position on communism and the "independent church movement."

The expulsion of six Jesuits of the California Province from Nanking followed months of propaganda attacks through the Communist press and public demonstrations which accused them of being "imperialists" and "cultural aggressors."

The expelled Jesuits are: Revs. Louis J. Dowd, Joseph B. Donohoe, Gerald J. Pope, Edward J. Murphy, and Philip J. Ollger, and Brother James Finnegan. Fathers Murphy, Pope, and Dowd had previously been imprisoned. The priests were formerly engaged in teaching at their school in Nanking but were forbidden last December to continue their work.

Two other missionaries expelled were Rev. Edward Moffett, of Newark, N. J., a Maryknoller, and Rev. Francois Duffay, of the Paris Foreign Mission Society. Father Moffett was first arrested last August while on a mission trip to a village and charged with being an "American agent" working with

counter-revolutionaries. Released after some weeks, he was again imprisoned last December. Father Duffay was accused of forbidding the use of his church for political meetings and of spreading rumors.

[From the NCWC News Service]

UNITED STATES PRIEST TELLS OF 5 MONTHS IN RED PRISON IN CHINA; SAW FRIEND TORTURED

HONG KONG, June 14. The harrowing details of 5 months in a Communist prison during which he was sentenced to be shot and was forced to watch the torture and execution of a friend were revealed here by a 29-year-old Maryknoll missionary from Newark, N. J., who has just been banished from Communist China.

The priest is the Reverend Edward J. Moffett, now at the Maryknoll Language School here, resting up from his imprisonment. Thin and pallid, he is nevertheless full of excellent spirits and more inclined to talk about the humorous details of his prison life than his own suffering.

"I was first arrested last July," Father Moffett said. "At that time I was on a mission trip to one of the country villages. The Communists accused me of meeting and associating with reactionaries, hiring reactionaries to teach in our school and traveling without a pass. I was held in various jails for 2 months before being released."

Father Moffett returned to his mission where he was kept confined to his house along with his pastor, the Reverend Russell Sprinkle, of Middletown, Ohio. On December 20, both priests were taken into custody and led off to jail.

"Father Sprinkle was arrested because as pastor he was considered responsible for my activities," Father Moffett declared. "This was the only charge leveled against him. I was charged with the same accusations made in my first arrest, and some new ones were added. The Reds accused me of giving money to the underground movement, of accepting bandits into the Catholic Church, of associating with vagabonds and idlers, of preaching in my sermons about the atomic bomb and airplanes in order to arouse the people against the government and of making secret visits to country villages."

"Also in jail with us was a friend, a young man, who had been arrested with me in July, and who had been held continuously. He served as one of our teachers. The Reds accused him of being a leader in the underground. He was anti-Communist and had fought against them in a peasant uprising in which more than 1,000 Communists were killed. But he was no leader in the movement."

"The part of my imprisonment that I want to forget the quickest was when I was forced to watch this poor farm boy being tortured. The Reds had strung him up by the thighs and brought me in to watch his sufferings. They used all kinds of tortures to force a confession from him. At last when he could stand no more pain, he agreed to sign any confession they desired. After this was done, he was executed."

Father Moffett said that the Communist tribunal also sentenced him to death. The priest was to be killed by a firing squad.

"The day I was to be executed found me well prepared to die," the young, blond priest said. "But the Reds didn't come for me. I prepared myself for death the next day, and the next. After a few days the strain of constant preparedness for death was too much. I went back to my ordinary prison routine, and my regular prayers."

"Those days of waiting to be shot taught me an important lesson. Real preparation for death doesn't consist of an emotional readiness. What is needed is a constant act of the will which unites ourselves to God under all circumstances."

During his entire imprisonment Father Moffett was able to say mass each day.

"In a way I cannot explain, some hosts and wine were sent to the prison with some food," Father Moffett explained. "I was able to get a little mass booklet with the essential ritual prayers that had been printed for just such occasions as the one we were in. Of course, I could not use vestments or a chalice.

"On Christmas Day Father Sprinkle and I said three masses each. The one who was saying mass would lie horizontal on the floor, pretending to be resting. The other would sit alongside blocking the guard's view, and pretending to be talking.

"I was even able to bring holy communion to other Catholic prisoners. I would hear confessions while pretending to talk to them. Because of our proximity to the public latrine, prisoners were allowed to go there without permission."

During his imprisonment Father Moffett could get little food brought in from the outside, because he had no money, and the Christians were poor. On feast days the Christians would send in bananas, a few eggs, and an occasional bit of tobacco.

During the early days of his arrest Father Moffett was confined to an old temple. He was held incommunicado. Father Moffett asked the old temple guardian if he had any tobacco. The old man offered to buy some in the market, but Father Moffett had no money. He did have a comb, so he asked the temple guardian to sell the comb in the market and buy a bit of tobacco. That night as Father Moffett was falling off to sleep on one of the temple doors that had been taken down to make a bed for him, he was awakened by shaking. It was his old friend. The man pressed some tobacco into the priest's hand, and then gave him his comb. The tobacco was a gift of the old man who didn't have enough money to support himself.

"On May 21 Father Sprinkle was released from prison," Father Moffett said.

(Father Sprinkle, according to the latest report, has returned to his mission at Kwel-ping in Wuchow diocese, Kwangsi Province. Known as the most bombed priest in China, Father Sprinkle was reported to have had 1,000 converts with Father Moffett last year. Going through numerous bombings, Father Sprinkle escaped serious injury until he suffered a fractured skull during a raid near the end of the Japanese war.)

"I expected that my death sentence was about to be carried out. Then on the Feast of Corpus Christi, May 24, the Reds told me that my sentence was commuted and that I was to be immediately expelled from the country. After my release I discovered that the people of my parish back home had ended a novena of prayers at the very time of my release. I think that their prayers played an important part in my freedom."

Father Moffett was taken under guard from the prison. The Reds took him to Wuchow by boat, where he was lodged in prison for 3 nights. He was not allowed to see anyone and could not get any information on other Maryknollers in jail there. Then he was taken to Canton, where he spent another night in jail; finally he was escorted to the Hong Kong border, where he was released.

"I am going back to the United States for a rest," Father Moffett concluded, "but I would much rather be going back to China. The Chinese people are a wonderful people. I hope the situation clears up soon so that we can get back to our missions. My prayers every day are for the Chinese people. I pray that this terrible curse of communism be taken from them."

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of August 10, 1951:

FOREIGN AID

The Brookings recommendations on the administration of foreign aid break away from one report after another which other private bodies have been making on the subject. It rejects division of authority over our foreign-economic aid in the executive branch. The State Department, it says, should ordinarily be the agency to administer foreign programs and should be responsible for interagency coordination of foreign affairs. This, it seems to us, should go without saying. Ideally, the State Department should become a series of interlocking units, and this is what the Brookings report seems to envisage. The suggestion is eventually that a sort of subdepartment of foreign-economic affairs within the State Department be created and that the State Department be reformed on the model of the present Department of Defense. Already the groundwork has been laid for such an evolution. For instance, the Technical Assistance Organization and the Institute of Inter-American Affairs have virtual autonomy in the State Department.

The Brookings study excepts from State Department rule only special-purpose agencies and military assistance. What is meant by special-purpose agencies is not spelled out in the summary. Presumably this is to allow for the completion of the emergency work of ECA. In this respect, however, the Brookings report recommends an enlargement of the functions of ECA. Technical assistance, for example, would be monopolized by ECA. If this means the incorporation of the Technical Assistance Organization (point 4) which is now in the State Department, we are against it. So are we opposed to the suggested transfer to ECA of export controls from the Department of Commerce. Here it seems to us that the Brookings report is trying to saddle upon an emergency agency permanent or semipermanent functions.

As to the administration of military assistance, the recommendations follow the present practice, whereby Defense, State, and ECA are represented on an interdepartmental committee. Here are united the functions of policy making, determination of needs and availability, and procurement. Members of the committee report back to their department heads, and over all is the National Security Council. This system seems to be working well enough, and it is difficult to think of another arrangement that would do better. No organization, however, is better than the men who compose it, and no organization is perfect as a piece of machinery; so that a premium, which the Brookings study stresses, is put upon the recruitment and training of first-class personnel.

The main lines of the Brookings report deserve close study by legislators whose animus against Secretary Acheson or the State Department are inclining them in the unrealistic direction of a separate and independent department for the administration of foreign aid. The fact is that those who

want a truly separate agency will never realize it, except on paper. Even a separate department would in the nature of things be compelled to consult the State Department on policy matters. There must be one source of responsibility for purposes of accounting to Congress. This is made amusingly plain in one of the bills which sets out a separation of powers and then nullifies that objective by saying that nothing in the provisions shall absolve the diplomatic arm of responsibility. The separatists cannot have it both ways, and, if their plan is put through, then we shall invite a pass-the-buck Government on the policy level and confusion and conflict in administration abroad.

Woe at West Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial taken from the Daily Calumet, one of the Chicago newspapers, relative to the difficulties confronting many of our cadets at West Point. This editorial is an expression of opinion which I believe is worthy of the attention of the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. While we cannot condone the action of the cadets, one must confess there are too many examples of wrongdoing on the part of officials on the national level, and if we are going to expect a high standard of morality among our young people, we should set the pattern from the top levels of executives in Government down. The editorial of the Daily Calumet of Tuesday, August 7, 1951, follows:

WOE AT WEST POINT

(By Col. H. F. Wolf)

The lives of 90 members of the United States Cadet Corps at the United States Military Academy have been altered materially by their mass expulsion from that historical institution on the grounds they cheated in examinations. For sheer sensation it ranks with the resignation of almost half of the cadets in 1861, who quit the campus high on the Hudson to fight against the Stars and Stripes.

Dismissals came last week after an exhaustive investigation lasting months. It was brought out that as long as 3 years ago cadets carried examination questions to their brother-in-arms. Exams are written in sections at West Point—the same set of questions obtaining for all taking the same course.

Official Washington was shocked, predicating statements on the "sullied honor of the cadet corps, the degeneration of the moral fiber of the youth of the country," and statements of like hue. It's all hokey.

Helping a pal with his examinations by slipping him a copy of the questions in advance is not to be condoned, per se. However, we fail to see how the foundations of security of this country has been shaken by the cadet's first-hand brush-up before the showdown hour in the classroom. The same thing, without question, goes on within the walls of almost every institution of learning.

West Point has made a mountain of a molehill

The accused embryo officers should not escape punitive measures. There are many ways in which to mete out retribution to students who crib, extracurricularly. Dismissal means disgrace. This is punishment far in excess of the charged irregularity.

Washington yells about honor. The Nation's Capital, seat of mink coat deals, deep freeze gifts, Reconstruction Finance Corporation scandals, accusations of treason in the State Department, high-handed political manipulations, and general intrigue of a high order, has set the pace of honor.

If the oldsters fail to set up a standard of decency and integrity, what can we expect from our citizens of tomorrow, who daily view the scene?

Who are the 90 discharged cadets? The public is entitled to know, since it foots the bills. More importantly, it is only fair to cadets who have been sent home because they flunked an examination, or for other honorable reasons. Suspicion, unjustly, will attach to them.

It is to be prayed the Congress will institute an investigation. When it does, it will find the examination scandal boiled to an undesirable infraction of the rules. It is our guess then the lawmakers will adopt resolutions to reinstate the naughty 90. Congress should

War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial.

"Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed." (UNESCO GIST editorial)

Those who get a close view at ports of embarkation of the ebb and flow of boys headed for the battlefields and of those returning—some without arms or legs, some without sight, some on stretchers never to walk again, some paralyzed never to move again—get a realistic, heart-rending picture of the horrors and sacrifices of war that should be seen by those who casually refer to troops as so many toy soldiers to be moved around in the international chess-game of power politics.

Instead our boys in uniform should be visualized as the cherished sons of loving mothers and proud fathers, as fond brothers, or as the husbands of adoring wives, or the fathers of little children who love and worship their dads as idols.

Some have said that statesmen who make decisions on peace or war, misery or happiness, plenty or famine, health or pestilence for millions of people, should visit veterans' hospitals frequently to get a more realistic picture of the human sacrifices to the god of war, and there to obtain fresh inspiration and determination to do their utmost to see that world problems are solved around the conference table instead of ultimately futile attempts to settle them on blood-soaked fields of battle, that the principles of Christianity govern in the affairs of men and not the rules of barbarism, and that God-made peace shall prevail instead of man-made war or hell. (Fred Burdick.)

Unrest Spreads Behind "Curtain"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Drew Pearson, from today's Washington Post:

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

UNREST SPREADS BEHIND "CURTAIN"

(NOTE TO EDITORS.—Drew Pearson is on another tour of Europe, studying conditions there in this period of world tension and crisis. This is the first of his cabled dispatches from Central Europe.)

NEAR THE IRON CURTAIN, IN CENTRAL EUROPE—If there was ever a time when propaganda was needed to encourage and stimulate the people behind the iron curtain, now is it.

Already the people of the satellite countries and even many in Russia proper are torn by doubt, dissension, and distrust. Their restlessness has been churning for some time but now it's near the boiling point.

There have been reports in previous years of trouble behind the iron curtain, but never so many as now. Two hundred Communist leaders in Bulgaria are reported under arrest; 22 Soviet generals and high Soviet officials have died mysteriously in the last 7 months; 4 Czech generals have been arrested or committed suicide in 6 months; 9 of the highest officers in the Polish Army were tried for treason; 12 Polish seamen on a minesweeper mutilated, locked up their officers, and deserted to Sweden; four young Poles fled to Sweden in a stolen bullet-riddled airplane; three Lithuanians locked up other crew members on a Russian trawler and escaped.

Why people rebel

This throbbing unrest inside the iron curtain has been caused in part by Soviet war preparations which have been going on for some time. When a government takes too much of the necessities of life—food, fuel, consumer goods—away from its people they rebel. When a Polish miner who hates Russia anyway is ordered to work harder to produce war material for communism, he gets restless. To illustrate the seriousness of this situation and the importance of intensifying our propaganda, here is a brief summary of the best underground reports I can get of what is happening behind the curtain:

Czechoslovakia The Czechs have now recovered from the stunned apathy which followed the initial seizure of their country by Moscow and are beginning to get their courage back. A serious food shortage, blamed on the Russians, is partly responsible. On top of this the Voice of America, which predicted the arrest of Foreign Minister Vladimír Clementis and four other Czechs had its effect.

Poland: Resentment against Moscow is so serious that Vyacheslav Molotov, now the No. 2 man to Stalin and seldom seen in public, made a special trip to Warsaw to warn the Poles against following Tito.

Bulgaria: A peasant revolt has held up delivery of wheat to Russia and brought a battery of Soviet officials hurrying into Sofia. About 15,000 have been added to the 30,000 already in concentration camps, while treason trials have shown that the Agrarian (or peasant) Party, once the strongest in

Bulgaria, now operates a powerful underground.

Rumania: Minister of National Defense Emil Bodnarus has been arrested and there have been mass evacuations of those suspected of disloyalty to Moscow.

Hungary: Deportation of thousands of Hungarian peasants to concentration camps to face slavery and death have been recently denounced by United States Secretary of State Acheson. The leader of these mass arrests is Bela Szanto, Moscow-trained Hungarian especially sent to do the job. Szanto is a ruthless butcher who has already jailed 70,000 peasants because they have held back their grain or refused to collectivize their farms.

East Germany: Moscow's efforts to build a Communist German army have been partly frustrated by the desertion of officers of the People's Police to Western Germany. Three separate undergrounds operate among the Russians and Red army personnel inside Germany.

Golden Anniversary of the Gillette Safety Razor Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the history of the Gillette Safety Razor Co., which company I am proud to have located in my district, is one of courage and determination on the part of the late King C. Gillette who invented the safety razor, and an illustration of an outstanding example of able management as well as splendid relationship and cooperation existing between management and labor during the 50 years of this company's existence.

This company is celebrating its golden anniversary. From a small and unknown company in 1901, it has grown to the largest of its kind, and one of the largest of any kind, in the world, and its time-honored product, the Gillette Safety Razor, is known wherever the sun rises.

The inventive genius and original thinking of the late King C. Gillette, whose name is known throughout the civilized world, and the establishment and progress of this company, is typical of American initiative, American grit, and American achievement.

On May 2, 1951, at the 1951 Massachusetts Dinner of the Newcomen Society in North America held in Boston, Mass., the Gillette Safety Razor Co. was signally and properly selected to be recognized by this society, the broad purpose of which society is as stated by Charles Penrose, senior vice president for North America, the Newcomen Society of England:

Were American Newcomen to do naught else, our work is well done if we succeed in sharing with America a strengthened inspiration to continue the struggle toward a nobler civilization—through wider knowledge and understanding of the hopes, ambitions, and deeds of leaders in the past who have upheld civilization's material progress. As we look backward, let us look forward.

On the occasion of the dinner last May, Joseph P. Spang, Jr., the president of the Gillette Safety Razor Co. since 1938, one of our country's leading industrialists and an outstanding American, was the guest speaker.

Mr. Spang's address, which I herewith include in my remarks, is interesting and inspirational. It follows:

This year, the Gillette Safety Razor Co. is celebrating its golden anniversary. We are doubly proud, therefore, to be honored by this distinguished society on the occasion of our fiftieth year.

It is not enough, though, to be proud of merely having existed for a period of time. Age of itself is no recommendation. What we like to feel is that our company has grown up in the tradition of American industry. That it has made its contribution to the American system, that we are somewhat typical of hundreds of other American business firms.

Like hundreds of other firms, our company started out modestly in 1901; our company pioneered. It brought something new to the American, and to the world scene. It brought something to the consumer which contributed to the rise in our standard of living.

Our company started in the creative mind of one man—one man with an idea. Call it a dream—he did. But it is the American dream. Without such practical dreamers, without such men with the drive to translate their ideas into reality, to have them furthered by a succession of imaginative men, the progress of this great Nation of ours would have been at a much slower pace.

This was the dream: to invent a practical product, needed, welcomed, and bought by the American public—not as a fleeting fad—but as an indispensable part of its daily life—today and tomorrow.

It has been called the little man's American dream. But it is not. Little men do not have the power of projection required in the fulfillment of this idea. The dream must flow from an agile, unfettered brain. It must develop from a personality willing to realize: "I am, in name, Everyman. I know what he wants."

King C. Gillette had the dream. He had the idea and the personality. The quick inspiration was plucked when ripe; happily at a time when speed—an important part of his inspiration—was to become synonymous with America. After years of experimentation, the first Gillette Safety Razor was marketed. This was in October 1903, the year of the historic flight at Kitty Hawk.

King C. Gillette had his product—needed, certainly, by men plagued with the age-old problem of what to do about the beard. It was still to be welcomed, though, and bought not only in America but around the world.

The translation of that dream into a safety razor in every man's hand was the solution of a problem old as recorded history. Hair on man's face—or the need for removing it—had been the concern of kings and poets, of statesmen and generals.

Beards have been, depending upon the swing of history, a conclusive sign of manliness, a mark of dignity; a mortal danger to warriors, a stamp of uncouthness—even insanity. The clean-shaven face at other times through the centuries has signified extreme youth or effeminacy, or identified a man's occupation, or signaled his degree of civilization.

Alexander the Great, realistic commander that he was, considered the beard a downright menace to his Macedonian troops. He commanded them to nick off their whiskers because, he said, they would thereby remove the all-too convenient handle by which an enemy could seize them, preparatory to removing the head from the shoulders.

The Roman poet Ovid who lived 2,000 years ago was concerned about man's beard. In his *Lovers' Handbook*, his advice to young men in pursuit of their light of love was:

"Let exercise your body brown:

Don't slobber: see your teeth are clean:

Your hair well cut and brushed quite down:

Your cheeks close shaved with razor keen:

Your toga spotless, white and neat:

Your sandals fitting to your feet."

With the collapse of Roman civilization and the surge of barbarous peoples throughout Europe, the beard became a symbol of full-grown manhood, only boys and eunuchs went without one. Consequently, to be shaved was a terrible humiliation. Strong, warlike men, patriarchs and kings were bearded. The way to insult a man was to pull his beard. King John of England, when he visited Ireland in 1185, gave deadly offense to the Irish chieftains by plucking at their flowing chin lambrequins.

Yet, in Ireland the statute enacted by a parliament at Trim, in 1447, stated that no man—unless he wished to be taken for an Englishman—should have a beard above his mouth. The upper lip had to be shaved at least every fortnight or be of equal growth with the nether lip.

The razor—the straight razor—came into daily use in England during the Restoration (1660). Charles the Second was a personable man and a "dandy." Coming from the fashionable French Court, where he had been exiled, he had a strong influence upon men's fashions in England. He wore curls and was shaven except for a few hairs of a mustache. In imitation, young men began to wear ringletted wigs, and to shave their faces. But Charles' brother, who subsequently became James the Second, was without facial adornment of any kind. From that time beards disappeared until about the time of the Battle of Waterloo.

It is true that the second Lord Rokeby was wearing a beard in 1798, but as a consequence he was reckoned an eccentric, a writer of that time said of him that "he was the only peer and perhaps the only gentleman of either Great Britain or Ireland who was thus distinguished."

Peter the Great of Russia looked to western Europe for ideas to make his barbaric nobles more suave and civilized. He felt that an important step in this was to have them shave clean in the French and English manner. So, to accomplish this end, he taxed the whiskers of his subjects and shaved his own.

Byron, like Ovid, felt man's preoccupation with his beard worthy of poetic mention. It was the thinking of many in Byron's time that Adam wore the first beard, since he came into existence in the prime of life. Byron thought that the necessity for shaving was one of the questionable gifts passed on by Adam to his progeny. He wrote in *Don Juan*:

"That since this fall, man for his sin
Has had a beard entail'd on his chin."

Yet, it was on the written advice of a quite young lady that Abraham Lincoln grew a beard. The young lady, Grace Bedel, aged 11, writing in October 1862, just before the election, suggested to Abe that he would be more dignified with a beard. Further, she hinted that while some of her four brothers would vote for him anyway, the addition of the beard might sway the votes of the undecided remainder.

In Europe, until 30 or 40 years ago, to be smooth shaven was an indication that a man was an actor, a servant, or a priest. Footmen whose attire was the court dress—knee breeches and white silk stockings—had

to be clean shaven. Also butlers, coachmen, grooms, jockeys, and hunt whips had to be clean shaven. But the chauffeur, a newer type of servant with no tradition back of him, was allowed to be mustached.

Up to the advent of the safety razor men had resented any rule that tampered with their beards or whiskers. As an example, in 1907, there was a serious waiters' strike in Paris against the rule of hotels that waiters must be clean shaven.

Thus it can be readily seen that man's beard has played its role in our changing history. And though the problem of man's beard, and what to do with it, dates back thousands of years, it was not until 50 years ago that a slow, painful, even dangerous operation—shaving—was changed to one which could be performed with speed, ease, and comfort.

The man whose idea was destined to change the face of half the world's population was King C. Gillette, a traveling salesman and a good one. He was a big man physically. He was expansive. He loved to entertain. In the fashion of the day, his wavy black hair was carefully parted in the middle and complemented by a heavy mustache above the wing collar and the handsome stuck pin. This picture of the man is well known all around the world.

The character of the man was filled with contradictions. As a salesman he earned as high as \$6,000 a year before the turn of the century. That was high pay. But, although untrained mechanically, he was obsessed with the desire to invent something—preferably a ten people would use, throw away, and buy again. As a means of discovering such an item, Gillette systematically went through the alphabet listing every conceivable material need of man, always trying for that one big idea.

It came to him one morning in 1895. He was living in Brookline, Mass., United States of America, at the time. In his own somewhat flowery words, he described the conditions under which the idea came to him, as follows:

"On one particular morning when I started to shave, I found my razor dull, and it was not only dull, but it was beyond the point of successful stropping. It needed honing, too, for which it must be taken to a barber or to a cutler. As I stood there with the razor in my hand, my eye resting on it as lightly as a bird settling down on its nest—the Gillette razor was born. I saw it all in a moment, and in that same moment many unvoiced questions were asked and answered, more with the rapidity of a dream than by the slow process of reasoning.

"At that time, and in that moment, it seemed as though I could see the way the blade could be held in a holder; then came the idea of sharpening the two opposite edges on a thin piece of steel that was uniform in thickness throughout, thus doubling its service; and following, in sequence, came the clamping plates for the blade, with a handle equally disposed between the two edges of the blade. All this came more in a picture than in thought as though the razor were already a finished thing and held before my eyes. I stood there in a trance of joy at what I saw. Fool that I was, I knew little about razors and practically nothing about steel, and could not foresee the trials and tribulations that I was to pass through before the razor was a success. But I believed in it and joyed in it."

Immediately, Gillette wrote to his wife who was visiting in Ohio, and said: "I have got it; our fortune is made." But eleven long, and trying years were to pass before he got a single dollar in dividends.

A driving force in Gillette's obsession to invent was his strong belief in the necessity for devices which would save man's time,

increase his comfort, and give him more freedom for other activities. This thought was expressed time and time again in early Gillette advertisements. In one, printed in 1906, the theme was stressed in the copy, under a picture of George Washington. It read: "George Washington gave an era of liberty to the Colonies. The Gillette gives an era of personal liberty to all men." The advertisement continues with: "If the time, money, energy, and brain power which were wasted in the barber shops of America were applied in direct effort, the Panama Canal could be dug in 4 hours."

Just where Gillette got his statistics for this broad statement remains unknown.

Gillette was 40 years old when he conceived the idea for his safety razor. He was born in Fond du Lac, Wis., on July 5, 1855, the youngest of three sons and the fifth of seven children of George Wolcott Gillette and Fanny Lemira Camp, the authoress of the White House Cook Book. He was educated in the schools of Chicago, but destruction of his father's possessions in the Chicago Fire of 1871 forced him to shift for himself. He married Atlanta Ella Gaines, of Willoughby, Ohio, and had one son.

Once Gillette had hit upon the idea which he believed in and joyed in, he lost no time in translating his vision into reality. On the day of the razor's inception, the inventor went to Wilkinson's hardware store on Washington Street, Boston, and purchased pieces of brass, some steel ribbon used for clock spring, a small hand vise, and some files. With these he made the first crude model. He also made many sketches, some of which have been used in patent suits and were useful in establishing the time and to some extent the scope of the invention. Eight years were to elapse, however, between Gillette's conception of the safety razor and its introduction to the market, in October 1903. In those 8 years, Gillette's efforts to get expert technical advice and to interest financial backing met with the frustrations which inventors have experienced throughout the ages. He was advised by cutlery and toolmakers to drop his radical idea. His proposal did not appear to be within the bounds of reason, and his friends looked upon it as a joke. They often inquired laughingly: "Well, Gillette, how's the razor?"

Of this period, Gillette wrote: "If I had been technically trained, I would have quit."

Actually, 5 years were to pass before Gillette's razor was anything more than the crude model he himself made. Then, in 1900, through Edward J. Stewart and Jacob Hellborn who, with Gillette were the original incorporators of the Gillette Safety Razor Co. (on September 28, 1901), William E. Nickerson came into the picture. Nickerson was a graduate of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and a very successful mechanic. It was his mechanical genius which really got Gillette's safety razor under way. True, the idea was Gillette's, but its development into a practical usable instrument was the work of Nickerson. Gillette himself stated this, writing in 1918:

"I believe Mr. Nickerson, by luck or by providential design, was the only man in the world who could have perfected the razor, and our factory today in its machines and mechanism is testimony of the mechanical genius and resourcefulness of this remarkable man in overcoming obstacles, in arriving at simplicity and efficiency. The most marvelous fact of this wonderful man is his ability to construct in thought an intricate mechanism with hundreds of parts and many accurately timed movements without drawing a line on paper until it is completed and operating in his mind, and when the machine materializes it works as he saw it in his mind's eye."

With the mechanical development of the razor in the capable hands of Nickerson, it became necessary to raise money for starting development work. It was decided that an effort should be made to raise \$5,000 by organizing a company with a capital stock of \$500,000 consisting of \$50,000 shares of \$10 each, to be sold in 20 blocks of 500 shares each. The 20 blocks were all taken up in a short time, but most of the purchasers bought more to please their friends than because they expected to receive any great return on their investments.

One of the blocks of stock was sold by Mr. Stewart to a Pittsburgh bottle manufacturer, who bought the block so that Stewart would purchase bottles from his company. The Pittsburgher paid \$250 for his block of 500 shares, which he considered of no value and presumably filed and forgot. Four years later, when Gillette had a pressing need for all the stock he could obtain, he paid the Pittsburgher \$62,500 case for the 500 shares.

The \$5,000 raised through the sales of the stock was soon spent and the company was \$12,000 in debt. It was at this time that John Joyce of the firm of Curran & Joyce, an investor who had amassed a considerable fortune as a wholesale and retail liquor dealer, came to the financial rescue of the company. He agreed to finance the company to the extent of \$60,000 and from that time on the company progressed rapidly. In 1903, the first razors were marketed. Sales were 51 razors and 168 blades. But, in 1904, sales leaped to 90,844 razors and 123,648 blades. The Gillette Safety Razor Co. was on its way.

The speed with which the Gillette safety razor and Gillette blades gained public acceptance and use was truly phenomenal. 1905 saw razor sales quadrupled over those of 1904, reaching 276,577 razors. Blades sales increased nearly tenfold to the startling figure of 1,186,908. This amazing rate of increase continued. By 1908, blade sales had passed the 13,000,000-per-year mark, and by 1917—just 14 years after introduction of the products—razor sales reached the million-plus mark, and blade sales were over 120,000,000 annually.

During these years, the international operations of Gillette kept pace. Factories were opened in England and Canada; branches and sales agencies were spreading to every major market in the world. The familiar picture of King C. Gillette was fast becoming one of the world's best-known trade-marks. The man with the heavy mustache, wing collar, stickpin, and wavy black hair was recognizable in the farthest reaches of civilization. And well it might be, since it is estimated that Gillette's picture, used on blade wrappers, has been printed more times—roughly 100,000,000,000—than any other businessman's in history.

On one of Gillette's many world trips he toured Egypt. He climbed on a camel to visit the pyramids. A crowd of natives gathered and began pointing at the visitor, scraping their faces with forefingers bent to simulate razors. That was how well known his picture had become.

Perhaps he planned it that way, for there's a rather interesting background story to the adoption of King Gillette's picture as a trade-mark. In considering what to use for a trade-mark, nothing was overlooked in attempting to get world-wide identification as quickly as possible. The suggestion was made—possibly by Gillette himself—that what was needed was a label or mark as internationally recognizable as a United States \$1 bill with the George Washington portrait on it. Then and there, it was decided to use the boss' picture. Indeed, until the early thirties, the wrappers were printed in

green ink, reminiscent of United States currency.

What Gillette could not foresee was the use of blades themselves as currency. Today, in some remote parts of the world, Gillette blades are used as a medium of exchange. And, as recently as 5 years ago, our blades were used as currency in Czechoslovakia and Italy, being exchanged for fruits and vegetables in barter arrangements. Before that, in the twenties, Gillette blades had a fixed currency rate in France and could be used for many purposes.

In a very few years, the home company had gone a long way from its first manufacturing space. This was a small room at 424 Atlantic Avenue in Boston, over a fish store and next to a wharf where city garbage was dumped into scows. It was in this highly perfumed atmosphere that the first Gillette razors and blades were made. It was on April 1, 1905, that the company moved into the first of the 11 interconnected buildings which now comprise the company's United States plant in South Boston.

As amazingly rapid as was Gillette's growth during the first 14 years of the company's operations, it was in 1918 that the company's products began to sell in quantities never dreamed of by its inventor.

On one fine morning late in 1917, King Gillette raced into his office with another one of his visionary ideas. It was this: give a Gillette razor to every soldier, sailor, and marine as he entered the Service. An excellent idea, said company officers, but one that could be improved upon. Instead of giving them to the servicemen, sell the razors, at cost, to the Government and let Uncle Sam do the presenting. This was done, with the Government buying 4,180,000 Gillette razors. It was really this wholesale sampling of millions of men just reaching shaving age that gave the self-shaving habit to the Nation. Cartoons of the day showing a man shaving, invariably showed the safety razor. Sinclair Lewis in his famous novel *Babbalanza* opened the book with his hero raking "his plump cheeks with a safety razor." That year, 1920, Gillette dividends reached \$3,000,000. The revolt against the straight razor was by now so complete that new pull-man cars had a slot in the men's washroom for used blades.

Sales of both razors and blades following the First World War continued at a rate more than double the immediate prewar years. But a storm was brewing; on November 15, 1921, Gillette's basic patents were to expire, leaving anyone free to make the razor and the blade. Manufacturers were preparing to flood the market with imitations. In a bonded warehouse in Chicago, tens of thousands of Japanese-made razors were actually waiting for the November 15 deadline. The company met this crisis and successfully passed it by bringing out new models, including one to sell for a dollar, 6 months before the expiration of its patents. Until this time the razors sold for \$5 and up. In the year following the expiration of its patents, the company made more money than in any preceding.

In 1926, on the company's twenty-fifth anniversary, King Gillette wrote: "I was a dreamer who continued in the path where wise ones feared to tread, and that is the reason, and the only reason, why there is a Gillette razor today. Of all the little things that have been invented it is one of the biggest little things ever issued from the United States Patent Office. Over 140,000,000 razors and 6,000,000,000 Gillette blades have been sold from the time of the company's incorporation in 1901. The future holds wonderful possibilities for increasing users."

Since 1925 the company has continued its amazing growth. In the late twenties and

early thirties, factories were opened in France, Germany, and Poland. We were making Gillette blades in Brazil as early as 1934, and opened a new Gillette plant there in 1943. A factory in the Argentine had been opened the year before, 1942. Our Swiss plant started production in 1946. The most recent addition to Gillette's foreign family is a factory opened in 1949 in Mexico City.

At one time in the history of our company we could proudly boast that distribution of our products was limited only by the boundaries of the earth. This was an accomplishment achieved in the first 25 years of the company's life. Today we can no longer make that same statement. An iron curtain has been drawn—an iron curtain that even our sharp blades cannot cut through.

We did, for many years, export our products to Russia, before and after the revolution. Even today in Soviet Russia the blades used are called Gillette, spelled phonetically in Russian letters, but believe me, they are most inferior—we know from having had some tested. We even have reason to believe that some honest-to-goodness Gillette-made Gillette blades are in use in Russia today—in very high places.

Our English associates inform us that at the Paris Peace Conference, there was a request to one of the Allied officials for Gillette blades, said for the personal use of M. Molotov. Prewar, the Russian Embassy in London used to order hundreds of blades at a time, and these, it was rumored, were for the chin of Stalin himself.

Our company's relations with the Soviet Union throughout the years have been, to say the least, somewhat guarded, particularly on our part. The Soviet has always wanted, even demanded a lot more than we felt even approximated a fair business arrangement. And when, after many years, they were unable to negotiate for what they wanted, they just plain came and took it.

Back in 1920—22 years ago—our company sent a commission to Russia at the invitation of the Soviet Government for the purpose of investigating the feasibility of establishing and operating a plant in that country. It is to the everlasting credit of the members of that commission that they saw how unpalatable working and business conditions were in Russia 22 years ago—a time when we were wooing the Soviet, a time just before the Russian Government was officially recognized by the United States of America. The commission quickly realized the sociological conditions and governmental philosophy could never be compatible with our own.

Other reasons cited by the commission as being factors unfavorable to our company manufacturing razors and blades in Russia were cold, hard business reasons. If the plant were established, we were to get out of Russia after 15 years of operation—get out completely, and turn the plant, machinery, and trained personnel over to the Soviets lock, stock, and barrel with no remuneration whatsoever. No wonder the commission balked. Here are some of the other reasons, sounding most up-to-date but set forth 22 years ago:

Profits cannot be exported for 7 years (leaving us 8 years just to get our bait back);

The present (Soviet) government exists because of the ignorance of the masses and the use of severe measures exercised by a minority;

The fundamental principle of communism is state ownership, and regardless of an agreement, our success would be limited by the desires of the Government.

That's enough, don't you think? A far cry from our healthy, competitive, free enterprise system.

But despite this, and despite the fact that Russia slammed an iron door in our face, the Soviet eventually did get Gillette equipment, in fact, they stripped an entire plant of ours.

During the closing days of the European phase of the Second World War, you will recall that it was touch and go as to whether Russian or American troops would enter Berlin first. It is also common knowledge that the Russians did get there first, by agreement. In Berlin, just across from Tempelhof Airport, stood Gillette's Berlin factory—considered one of the most modern factories in all of industrialized Germany. A strange thing is that with Tempelhof, a prime target for Allied bombers, every building within miles was razed except the Gillette factory, and it suffered almost no damage at all.

Tempelhof and our factory lie in the American Zone, but before we got there the Russians had entered our plant and taken out every bit of machinery—machinery which produced over 500,000 blades and 1,000,000 razors a year—and moved it into the Russian zone. That was quite a move, since that is heavy machinery.

What happened to that machinery? Is it now turning out Gillette blades for Stalin? No, it isn't. That machinery, worth hundreds of thousands of dollars, today is standing in the open in the Russian zone, rusting and rotting away.

Introduction of Gillette razors and blades throughout the world was accompanied always by unusual, even weird experiences. In India, for example, Gillette products were introduced in 1908. They were introduced by the firm of Muller & Phipps. It was Mr. Louis Phipps himself who pioneered the safety razor in that country, despite the fact that he was the proud possessor of a fine set of seven straight razors in a handsomely embossed case, one razor for each day in the week. He still has this set which he has preserved as an antique—or so he tells me.

But the story goes that before he could gain any acceptance of the safety razor, he had to abandon use of his straight razors and go out on the street corners himself and shave with a Gillette—thus convincing the street barbers that a Gillette razor was easier to use than the crude implements they employed in hacking off a customer's beard.

From South America, and not too long ago, we heard a story from one of our agents who penetrated far into the jungles—into territory where supposedly no white man had ever set foot. The natives in that section were unconquered, living in roving tribes, always keeping out of reach of civilized man. This agent came across one of these natives, and discovered him to be wearing a crudely strung necklace of Gillette blue blades. Where he had got them, and the fate of their former owner, are questions our agent was much too wise to ask.

During these years of world expansion in the twenties, every effort was made to get the Gillette razor in the hands of as many men as possible. The idea of making a profit on the razor became unimportant. The razor became a break-even product, sold at cost. The idea was to get it out; get it in use. The more razors out, the more blades used. For this reason, many and novel methods of distribution were employed.

That period might well be termed the "give away" years.

Many manufacturers whose product could absorb the cost of the razor were induced to give one away free with each unit purchase. Grocery stores in large numbers, particularly the chain stores, gave a razor free with the purchase of tea, coffee, spices, beverages, extracts, candy, and canned goods.

One dealer sold 100,000 boxes of marshmallows by giving a Gillette razor free with

each purchase. Another, 70,000 pounds of coffee—a razor free with each pound; another 2,000,000 tubes of a new shaving cream, just being offered for sale. An overall manufacturer put a Gillette razor in the pocket of each pair of overalls. Razors also were used to stimulate the sale of such varying products as pocket knives, canned meat, and ladies toilet goods. Wrigley took 1,000,000 Gillette razors to use as chewing-gum premiums.

In the 6 or 7 years immediately following the expiration of Gillette's patents, blade sales multiplied four times.

Those "give away" years are but a distant memory today, difficult of recollection when contrasted with the demand for our razors at present. Today, and for many years past, our razors have been sold as fast as we could manufacture them—sold at the rate of some 10,000,000 yearly.

The twenties were happy years for the company, just as they were for many other American companies. The events of the 1930's had not yet cast their ominous shadow.

The depression had begun its spread when, in 1930, Gillette merged with Auto-Strop. Despite the deep dip in the business cycle, our company built for the future. The entire process of manufacturing blades was changed—a major step forward in such trying times, but management knew that in the long run—and quite a run it was in those years—that the new process was bound to prove infinitely better; that blades of a higher quality would result.

Up until that time, all blades were sharpened individually, a slow process which tended to limit production. Our present method of making blades, known as the strip-sharpening process was then introduced. To visualize this process, think of a reel of motion-picture film. Enlarge the reel three or four times, and substitute blade-width steel ribbon for the film, and you will have the picture. These reels of steel ribbon, after undergoing many preliminary processes, such as hardening, etching, and lacquering, feed into huge sharpening units; and blades come out sharpened, cut, and stacked at the rate of about 450 per minute. The blades and the blade steel are never touched by hand during the entire sharpening process.

Throughout the thirties the company experienced some of the same problems confronting all American business. But it did not sit back and wait for better times. It continued its experimentations, always seeking for the better product. The one-piece razor was brought out, first radical change from the original Gillette razor. The company brought out an electric razor, and a good one. The manufacture of this razor was abandoned when it developed that the dry shaver was not to occupy too important a place in the shaving field. Management also decided that balancing a dry shaver on one shoulder and a safety razor on the other was somewhat inconsistent. Shaving creams were added to Gillette's line during this period.

The most important advertising event in the history of Gillette Safety Razor Co. during this period, came in 1939. That was the year which saw the beginnings of our "Cavalcade of Sports" broadcasts. We first broadcast the world series in 1939. Again, undertaking this promotion was a bold step. The cost of sponsoring that one event ate a large hole in our advertising appropriation. That it was a good move has proven itself, and today we are most happy that we have acquired the rights to this outstanding event for the next 6 years, both on radio and on television.

As you all know, we broadcast and telecast most of the major sports events in the Nation—football, boxing, and horse racing.

With the advent of the Second World War, our factories in South Boston, London, Paris, and throughout the world, were partially converted to the manufacture of war matériel. In Boston we made a fuel-control unit which was a part of a carburetor and was used on nearly all our military aircraft. We also made a highly secret device used on naval mines.

During the war years, our production of razors and blades was so small, comparatively speaking, that nearly all of this production went to the men in the armed services. The situation was similar to that of the First World War. Men in the services used over 12,500,000 Gillette razors and over 500,000,000 Gillette blades.

We also made a few blades and razors for our Cloak and Dagger boys—the OSS. We were asked to make German-type razors to such fine detail that they would pass for a made-in-Germany razor. This we did, and our secret agents, parachuted behind the lines into Germany, had in their toilet kits razors that could not be detected as anything but a German razor—made right in south Boston, United States of America.

Following the Second World War, Gillette business again increased with a tremendous surge. Where the First World War had taught millions of servicemen the self-shave habit, the Second World War taught additional millions the daily-shave habit.

Other product development continued. Gillette was first to come out with a blade dispenser, which permits the easy and quick loading of an unwrapped blade without its ever having to be handled by the shaver. Then followed a double-duty dispenser with a compartment for used blades.

And, having been successful over a period of nearly 50 years at shaving hair, we started waving it in 1948 with the purchase of the Toni Co.

Acquisition of Toni broadened the base of Gillette's operations. For the first time the company entered the woman's market. We expanded in a field already well known to us. Distribution channels for Toni are almost identical with those of Gillette. Basically, both Gillette and Toni products have to do with hair.

Toni's quick, successful rise has been one of the outstanding American business stories in recent years. Almost overnight, it seems, the leading question of the day became: "Which Twin Has the Toni?" That slogan and the Toni twins became internationally famous. When Toni products were introduced in England, six sets of twins were flown to London where they quickly became as well known as they are in this country. Home perms—as the English call them—are now given in the Scandinavian countries, in South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, and in some South American countries. Toni is extremely popular in Canada.

In a period of less than 5 years, the hair-waving practices of American women changed. Before Toni, nearly all waves were given in beauty parlors. Today, 50 percent of all permanent waves are given in the home. Toni continues its dominant position of leadership in this field.

This brings us pretty much up to date. King Gillette, the founder of our company, retired from active participation in 1918, and moved to California. He retained the title of president of the company until 1931, 1 year before his death.

This is our story. We like to think of it as typical of the American business success story. The company had its inception in a dream—the American dream. It began small, and grew steadily throughout the years to its present position. We are proud of our 50 years of progress; proud to be celebrating our golden anniversary this year. Proud to be honored by the Newcomen Society in North America.

We feel we have played a part in keeping with the tradition of American industry—to place on the market a needed product; to strive constantly to improve its quality; to produce it in tremendous quantities; and to sell it to the consumer at the lowest possible price consistent with a fair profit.

Representative Wilson D. Gillette, of Towanda, Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article taken from the *Daily Review*, of Towanda, Pa., of August 8, 1951, concerning our late colleague, Wilson D. Gillette:

United States Representative Wilson Darwin Gillette, 71, one of Bradford County's most distinguished citizens, died at his home on York Avenue, Towanda, at 7:50 o'clock Tuesday morning and out of respect for him the House in Washington adjourned for the day.

Mr. Gillette's death was announced in Congress by Representative SIMPSON, Republican, Pennsylvania, who described the Towandian as one of the most stalwart Pennsylvania Members of Congress.

Although ill for many months the Congressman had appeared to be gaining when he was stricken with bronchial pneumonia a week ago. His condition soon became critical.

Mr. Gillette, a former State Representative, had represented this area in Washington since 1941 when it was still the time-honored Fifteenth District made famous by David Wilmot and Galuska Grow. In later years it has been the Fourteenth District, which for one term even included Lycoming County with its city of Williamsport.

Mr. Gillette was born in Sheshequin Township, Bradford County, July 1, 1880, a son of Burton J. and Flavia (Crotsley) Gillette. He received his early education in the Ulster schools and later was graduated from the famed old Susquehanna Collegiate Institute in Towanda.

After leaving school he worked for his father on the home farm in Sheshequin for about 4 years. It was while he was still there that Mahlon C. Cranmer, a native of Burlington, went to Sheshequin on a lumber job and boarded at the Gillette home. Mahlon and Wilson became close friends and decided to try their luck together.

IN LIVERY BUSINESS

Both accepted positions as clerks in Carners' general store in Athens where they were employed until 1908 when they decided to come to Towanda and go into the livery business. They opened an establishment on Bridge Street, continuing there for about 5 years. Then they decided that the automobile, not the horse, was the coming thing in transportation, so they opened a garage in the block at the northwest corner of Main and Elizabeth Streets. In 1913 they took over the Ford agency.

In 1914 the late James E. Meredith erected the stone block structure at the southeast corner of Main and Elizabeth Streets and the firm of Gillette & Cranmer moved in on a lease. In 1922 the business was incorporated under the name of Gillette & Co., and it

continued as such until Mr. Gillette went to Congress and the business subsequently was sold to Shores & Schmieg, the present owners.

In 1930 Republican leaders of the county were looking for the strongest possible candidate for State representative and settled on Mr. Gillette because of his outstanding reputation as a man of high character and business acumen. That their judgment was good was shown by the great popular support he received not only in the election that year but also in five subsequent elections. He became, at Harrisburg, a member of the appropriations, highways, motor vehicles committees of the house and under the Republican administration was chairman of the all-important highways committee. Because of his long term of service at the State capital he was one of the most influential members of the lower house of the legislature in determining the policy of the Republican organization.

Consequently it was only natural when Col. A. G. Rutherford, of Honesdale, then representing the Fifteenth District in Congress, died in 1941, that Mr. Gillette should be considered the logical man to succeed him.

On August 27, 1941, conferees from the eight counties of the district met at Hotel Jermyn, Scranton, and unanimously chose the Towandian as the Republican nominee for Congress. In the November election he easily defeated District Attorney George O. Wagner, of Danville, the Democratic candidate, and has represented the "horseshoe" district continuously since that time.

He was sworn into office in Washington, December 4, and his first vote was cast in favor of the declaration of war against Japan on December 9.

Five times he was reelected to Congress where he has served on a number of committees and for the last several years held an assignment to the important Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. As a member of that committee he made a trip a few years ago to England and Sweden to study the effects of socialized medicine.

Mr. Gillette was always a staunch Republican who could be depended upon to stick by the party through thick and thin. His loyalty never wavered and he made that quality count in getting results wanted by people of his home district.

Mr. Gillette was a member of Union Lodge, No. 108, F. & A. M., Union Chapter, No. 161, Royal Arch Masons, Northern Commandery, No. 16, Knights Templar; and Irem Temple, Mystic Shrine, Wilkes-Barre.

FAITHFUL CHURCHMAN

For many years he has been one of the most prominent and faithful members of the Towanda Methodist Church. For years he served not only as a member of the official board but also as trustee and a member of the important pastoral relations committee.

He was one of the early members of Towanda Rotary Club and also was one of the early backers of the Towanda Chamber of Commerce when it was getting established.

On August 20, 1902, he married Miss Winifred Vought who survives him. Other survivors are a sister, Mrs. William H. Ransom of Towanda; and three cousins, Mrs. Myra McClen of Towanda; Mrs. B. M. Ayers of Wilkes-Barre, and Mrs. Bert Johnson of Sayre.

The body will be taken to the Methodist Church Friday afternoon and will lie in state there from 1:30 to 2:45 o'clock. Funeral services will be held there at 3 o'clock with burial in Oak Hill cemetery where the Masons will have charge of the services at the grave.

PRaised IN CONGRESS

In Congress yesterday, many joined in praise of Mr. Gillette following the announcement by Representative SIMPSON, Represent-

ative GRAHAM, Republican, Pennsylvania, called him a "man of intense patriotism and strong spirit" while Representative WALTER, Democrat, Pennsylvania, described him as a "great patriot and great public servant". Representative GAVIN, Republican, Pennsylvania, said Mr. Gillette was strongly devoted to the interests of his people.

Other tributes came from Representatives V. N. ZANDT, Republican, Pennsylvania; PRIEST, Democrat, Tennessee; DAGUE, Republican, Pennsylvania; HALE, Republican, Maine; BROWN, Republican, Ohio; TACKETT, Democrat, Arkansas; FLOOD, Democrat, Pennsylvania, and EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, Republican, New York.

Before adjoining the House out of respect to Gillette, Speaker RAYBURN named the following 12 Members from Pennsylvania to represent the House at the funeral:

Representatives WALTER, Democrat; EBERHARTER, Democrat; SIMPSON, Republican; FENTON, Republican-Labor; GRAHAM, Republican; KELLEY, Democrat; GAVIN, Republican; MCCONNELL, Republican; MORGAN, Democrat; DAGUE, Republican; FLOOD, Democrat, and O'NEIL, Democrat.

Broadcasting to Eastern Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Brutus Coste, formerly of the Rumanian Diplomatic Service:

BROADCASTING TO EASTERN EUROPE

(By Brutus Coste, formerly of the Rumanian Diplomatic Service)

Materially crushed, the peoples of Eastern Europe are far from being morally conquered. Their spirit is not yet broken. But there can be no doubt that it is slowly yielding to hopelessness and even to despair.

Rightly or wrongly, these peoples feel that they were betrayed and abandoned by the Western World, which appears to them to be almost exclusively concerned with its own salvation from the Communist flood. Their hopes for an early liberation were high in the first years of Communist domination. But as time went on they saw how the Communists ignored and even flouted the opinions, feelings, and reactions of the Western World, and how Soviet power was steadily gaining ground. As a result they became increasingly susceptible to Russian propaganda—not to all propaganda, but to one idea which is being constantly hammered into their minds; namely that the victory of the Soviet Union and of communism is inevitable.

This propaganda has been partly effective for the simple reason that the developments of the last years, as they have appeared to these disappointed peoples, have seemed to confirm it. Communist doctrine, Communist promises and particularly Communist achievements have not won the peoples of Eastern Europe to communism. They may influence the very young subjected to the most systematic and tenacious conditioning ever known. But in general the Communist myth only impresses people in countries where Soviet troops and Communist governments are a fairy tale picture, known

only from books and films. It is sterile in the countries which have actually experienced communism.

The peoples of Eastern Europe know from hard experience the relative merit of communism and democracy, however imperfect the latter. They do not have to be lectured on the value of freedom. As a letter from behind the iron curtain says: "When a man is hungry, you do not feed him on savory descriptions of choice food. If you can, you give him food. If you cannot, you hold out to him the hope that he will get food before he starves to death."

I have seen other letters saying that, whenever lectured on the merits of democracy versus communism, people feel that this is adding insult to injury. They have the impression that the Western World believes that they voluntarily chose communism, and that this was due to their ignorance. They, on the other hand, believe that they have fallen under Soviet-Communist domination because of the failure of the Western World to understand in time the real nature of communism and of Soviet imperialism.

I am far from advocating the elimination from propaganda addressed to Eastern Europe any discussion of the merits and problems of democracy. I simply want to stress that emphasis should not be placed upon it. The peoples of Eastern Europe are already sold on the idea of freedom. What they need is preparation for the day when they will be free again.

According to recent reports, there is a widespread impression in Eastern Europe, an impression which is also shared by many political exiles, that the Western World is inclined to believe that once enlightened by propaganda, once given the true facts, the eastern peoples will be able to take their fate into their own hands, and that, without any further support from the outside, they will one day be capable of overthrowing the present regimes.

From their own experience through the past years, the eastern peoples know that the sporadic resistance movements which can be organized on a small scale with local means can only have a nuisance value. They cannot achieve decisive results. The Communists have had enough time to reduce these peoples to what Burnham so aptly calls an "amorphous mass," leaderless and unorganized. All political leaders and most of the potential leaders are rotting in prisons. All the truly national organizations have long ago been suppressed or transformed beyond recognition. Economic power is concentrated in the hands of the governments to the point where no individual, except for members of the Communist elite, has more than is strictly necessary to sustain life. In consequence, there are no local sources of funds, without which large-scale subversive activity cannot be organized.

Under these conditions, the Soviet-enslaved peoples—scattered individuals facing an all-powerful, all-pervasive and totally unscrupulous police state—have a feeling of impotence. Propaganda must, therefore, aim at instilling not only hope, but faith and certainty in the eventual defeat of Soviet-Communism. It must promote a sense of moral unity and solidarity among the majorities in all these countries. It must instill in them a feeling of belonging to Europe, and the confidence that they will ultimately regain a place in the European community.

There is today an inarticulate awareness that purely national solutions cannot protect Eastern Europe against the recurrence of the tragedy which has been its lot not only in the past 10 years, but during the greater part of its history. This awareness has to be fostered and made more articulate.

It must be demonstrated that the nations of the free world appreciate that Eastern Europe is an integral and essential part of Europe, and that they recognize that no lasting solution of the political and economic problems of Western Europe is possible as long as the eastern half of the Continent remains enslaved. This would go far to convince the peoples that the West has powerful motives to work for their liberation and would refuse any deal implying the acceptance of Soviet domination over them.

To be fruitful, western propaganda must smash the idea that communism is the "wave of the future." News reports and commentaries should, therefore, avoid representing western policy in purely defensive terms. The fact that the Atlantic Pact has been discussed in such terms has had disheartening effects. In broadcasts addressed to Eastern Europe it is essential to represent the Atlantic policy only as a necessary first step in a global policy aimed at the establishment of a free world. The objective of such propaganda must be nothing less than substituting for the myth of the inevitability of Soviet-Communist victory, a burning and fighting faith in the inevitability of the victory of freedom and democracy. This is the only way to stave off the most immediate dangers—demoralization, hopelessness, and resignation.

I have tried to present an outline of what I would call Operation Morale. This is an essential preliminary to any action. Such an operation should be followed by the organization of passive resistance. For this, broadcasting will be the only means of giving advice and direction. The final operation, when the time comes, will, of course, be the organization of active revolt. (The Public Opinion Quarterly.)

Campaigners for Decency Need Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article taken from Our Sunday Visitor calling attention to the need for stronger laws to ban sale of indecent literature:

[From Our Sunday Visitor, Huntington, Ind., of August 5, 1951]

CAMPAIGNERS FOR DECENCY NEED HELP—WOULD AROUSE PUBLIC AGAINST LEWD LITERATURE—PASSAGE OF BILLS BY CONGRESS WOULD AID IN NATION-WIDE DRIVE

For 15 years the Catholic bishops and clergy and both Catholic and Protestant lay groups have been fighting the very worst evil prevalent in the United States, namely, indecent literature.

Canada, South America, and even pagan India have protested against the lewd literature sent into their countries from the United States, claiming that it had a demoralizing influence on their people.

For a long period of time nearly 100 magazines published in this country were denied admission into Canada.

It must be said to the credit of most Americans that whenever their attention was called to the seriousness of filthy printed matter, whether in regular periodicals, or

comics, or so-called pocketbooks, their reaction was an indignant one, and they always showed a willingness to get into an active campaign to clear the community of such filth, and thus make it more safe for youth.

However, the campaigns were never long-lived. The apostles for clean literature have assumed that if most sellers of magazines, comics, etc., once agreed to clean up, they had done so for good. However, that has not been true. Leave the sellers unmolested for a month or two, and many of the filthy magazines will be back.

Action has been taken by law to ban indecent literature in every State of the Union except one, but just like the law which deals with the sale of contraceptive devices, the laws passed against evil literature years ago are no longer enforced. Presently there are two bills before the Congress of the United States. These two bills, namely, Senate bills Nos. 27 and 34 have been passed by the Senate, and are now before the House Committee on the Judiciary. Great pressure is being brought by many organizations, and even by a number of newspapers (on the principle defending a "free press") to prevent their passage in the House of Representatives.

We cannot believe that anyone, whether an atheist, a Communist, a defender of the principle of "free press," would allow most of this literature to enter his own home and be read by his children. There is absolutely no reason for the publication of such vile and demoralizing printed matter except that of profit to the publisher.

There are plenty of morons in the United States, plenty of people who, misguided and misled earlier in life, have an appetite for stories and pictures and photographs dealing with sex perversion, and there are plenty of unscrupulous men who are ever ready to feed that urge.

Before World War I, there were no lewd magazines published in the United States. During the depression, when youth was unemployed and had lots of leisure time for reading, the first of the evil magazines came into being. They grew quite steadily until World War II when it was supposed that several million troops in many army camps might like that kind of mental pabulum, and then the worst of them all were started for circulation among our boys in service.

TWO SENATE BILLS

The Senate bill passed on January 29, 1951, reads:

"Whoever knowingly transports in interstate or foreign commerce for the purpose of sale or distribution any obscene, lewd, lascivious, or filthy book, pamphlet, picture, film, paper, letter, writing, print, silhouette, drawing, figure, image, cast, phonograph recording, electrical transcription, or other article capable of producing sound, or any other matter of indecent or immoral character, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years or both.

"The transportation as aforesaid of two or more copies of any publication or two or more of any article of the character described above, or a combined total of five such publications and articles, shall create a presumption that such publications or articles are intended for sale or distribution, but such presumption shall be rebuttable.

"When any person is convicted of a violation of this act the court in its judgment of conviction may, in addition to the penalty prescribed, order the confiscation and disposal of such items described herein which were found in the possession or under the immediate control of such person at the time of his arrest."

Senate bill 34, passed on the same day, amends the first paragraph of section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code as follows:

"Every obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, filthy, or vile article, matter, thing, device, or substance; and * * *

"Sec. 2. The fifth paragraph of section 1461 of title 18, United States Code, reading 'Every letter, packet, or package, or other mail matter containing any filthy, vile, or indecent thing, device, or substance; and,' is hereby repealed."

We have been dealing with this situation for 15 years, and have learned from our experience that the owners of the better magazines can be easily induced to "come clean" habitually. Occasionally even they have offended rather seriously, but it was because they wanted to satisfy themselves that their readers would want or would not want "over-sexy" stories.

Owners of a dozen or even of 20 magazines, some of which offended against the code of the National Organization for Decent Literature, have either discontinued the publication of the offensive ones or have so adjusted their contents to the NODL code that they create no more trouble for the national organization. In fact, the editors of several of them are on the most friendly terms with the head of the National Organization for Decent Literature and have thanked him over and over for helping them to produce better magazines.

The ones which protest most against interference are the ones who could not continue the publication of their periodicals if the second-class mail privilege was withdrawn from them. Recent Postmasters General have been quite cooperative with the NODL, and when it was pointed out to them that certain magazines were actually lewd either in reading matter or illustrations or advertisements, the second-class mail privilege was usually withdrawn.

OFFENDING COMICS

A few years ago one comic after another began to offend against the very reasonable moral code adopted for comics. You need not be told that these do harm to the minds and hearts of children at a time when the moral law should be deeply embedded in their lives. Today the National Organization for Decent Literature lists more than 90 comic magazines which are utterly unfit for anybody to read, and, therefore, has listed them as disapproved.

When it was discovered that many periodicals had, out of a sense of decency and in compliance with demands made by the readers, adjusted their contents to these demands, the so-called pocketbook came into being publishing the filthiest stories which reputable magazines refused to accept. Being smaller in size and cheaper in price, high school students became their chief patrons. They could not bring a regular size magazine home without their parents discovering it. But they could bring home these pocketbooks and we have learned from many sellers of such pocketbooks that the children pass them on to one another.

WHAT YOU SHOULD DO

We would like to have you write to your Congressman to vote for the passage of two bills which have already been adopted by the Senate, and then we would have you write a letter, or to call on the person in your own community from whom you have been buying magazines, requesting him not to handle any indecent periodical or print or comic or pocketbook.

In many cities of moderate size all these magazines are not procurable, but they can be found in some stores in all our large cities. In such places a real organization is needed. The city can be districted into small precincts and visited by people within that particular locality, who patronize, for instance, the druggist for other things. They

can, as patrons of the store, reasonably request that the filth be kept away not only from youth but from all. The druggist is very amenable to such solicitation because he observes every year a "Pure Drug Week." The principle he applies to drugs for the body should hold equally for drugs for the mind and soul.

If you would do a real turn for God, for morals, for your country, for our rising generation, then you should actually wish to get into this crusade. Do not depend on "George doing it for you." Let George do it for himself and you do it for yourself.

Their Place Is on the Bench

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include three editorials dealing with legislation to bar Supreme Court Justices from acting as character witnesses.

The editorials, which appeared in the San Diego (Calif.) Union, the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, and the Harrisburg (Pa.) Evening News, follow:

[From the San Diego, (Calif.) Union of July 16, 1951]

JUDGES AS WITNESSES

An interesting aftermath of the Hiss case is the consideration of a bill by the House Judiciary Committee which would prohibit Judges of the Supreme Court appearing as character witnesses or witnesses on matters of opinion. During the trial of Alger Hiss, later convicted of perjury, it will be remembered, two Justices of the highest Court appeared to testify to his good character, Justice Frankfurter and Justice Reed. Justice Reed appeared on subpoena. Justice Frankfurter as a voluntary witness.

Representative KEATING, of New York, sponsor of the proposed law, argues that "some smart lawyer" might subpoena most or all of the highest Court Justices in a given case. Having served as witnesses, these Justices would automatically be disqualified for passing on an appeal. It may be recalled that, after their appearance in behalf of Hiss, Justices Reed and Frankfurter disqualified themselves when the appeal reached the Supreme Court. If all, or the majority of the Supreme Court Justices should serve as witnesses in any case, the situation would be absurd, to say the least.

The judicial attitude, of course, should be one of absolute impartiality. A proper conception of judicial ethics would dispense with the need for Representative KEATING's proposed measure.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News of July 24, 1951]

THEIR PLACE IS ON THE BENCH

Under a bill being considered by the House Judiciary Committee and previously endorsed by a subcommittee, justices of the United States Supreme Court would be barred from testifying as character witnesses, or on matters of opinion.

The sponsor of the bill, Representative KEATING, Republican, New York, says he was motivated by the appearances of Justice Felix Frankfurter and Stanley Reed as char-

acter witnesses for Alger Hiss during the latter's first trial.

Justice Reed had been subpoenaed by the Hiss defense, while Justice Frankfurter appeared voluntarily. Another character witness for Hiss was Chief Justice Magruder of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Also pending is an alternative bill introduced by Representative SMITH, Republican, Wisconsin, which would provide simply that no Federal judge could be compelled to testify as to character, or to appear as a witness, if similar testimony could be obtained from other witnesses.

Representative KEATING points to the possibility of some smart lawyer subpoenaing most or all members of the Supreme Court as witnesses in a lower court trial, placing the court in the position of not being able to pass on an appeal in that particular case. Because they were character witnesses in the Hiss trial, Justices Reed and Frankfurter disqualified themselves to pass judgment on the appeal of the convicted spy.

The congressional subcommittee which has already endorsed the KEATING bill sought an expression of opinion from members of the Supreme Court, but Chief Justice Vinson, as spokesmen for the justices, said he and his colleagues felt that they should not go on record.

Likewise the Department of Justice also notified the subcommittee that it did not care to make any recommendation either for or against the proposed measure.

There can be no doubt but that legislation of the type sponsored by Representative KEATING has merit. However, the subject is of such importance that it should be studied from every angle before it comes up for final action.

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) Evening News of July 14, 1951]

JUDGES AS WITNESSES

Supreme Court Justices would be barred from appearing as character witnesses or in testifying on matters of opinion in a bill now under consideration in Washington.

Representative KEATING, of New York, who introduced the bill, said he was motivated by the appearance of Justice Frankfurter and Reed as character witnesses for Alger Hiss, now resident at Lewisburg, Pa. The Congressman points out the possibility of some smart lawyers subpoenaing most or all of the Justices, thus making it impossible for them to pass on an appeal later.

Even though both Reed and Frankfurter disqualified themselves in the Hiss appeal, KEATING thinks that the danger is still present and wants to insure that it cannot recur.

If Supreme Court Justices could vote on the bill, Representative KEATING should have no trouble getting two loud "Yeas" from two very red-faced members of that Bench.

Alaska Defenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Louis R. Huber, which appeared in the August 7 issue of the Christian Science Monitor on a subject of vital concern to

the entire country, the defense of Alaska:

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA.—Alaskan defenses are growing steadily stronger. They will be completed in 3 or 4 years, and then our northland will be a strong bastion against transpolar aggression—and one from which we can expand as required.

Yet even when they have been perfected, our northern fortifications will contain certain weaknesses which only the liveliest vigilance will make strong. If, as Gen. "Billy" Mitchell so prophetically stated, "He who holds Alaska will hold the world," it must be remembered that strong muscles still must do the holding.

That is the impression this reporter gained from a 2-week tour of Alaskan bases, from talking to commanders in the Alaska field, and from flying over a large portion of the strategic north.

Those who are on guard today along the Arctic reaches of the continent have a keen awareness of weakness as well as strength; our northern soldiers, sailors, and airmen have a thoroughgoing conception of the potential enemy, and they are determined not to be caught napping.

RUSSIA'S STRENGTH

Russia's greatest strength lies in her land armies, and we know there are many thousands of Soviet troops well trained in Arctic warfare. They could move across the winter ice into Alaska. We are much more vulnerable from an army moving overland up here in winter than in summer," Lt. Gen. William E. Kepner, commanding general of the Alaskan Command, told me.

On the map, he pointed out, Alaska is a large land mass about one-fifth the size of the United States—"but don't let that fool you. Essentially the Northland is a collection of islands, sprinkled over a sea of tundra, separated by unscalable mountains, and faced on three sides by two oceans—one of them frozen—and a sea."

In summer the "islands" where man has scratched a foothold are connected tenuously by some 3,000 miles of highways, by 500 miles of railroad, by two long navigable rivers, and by seaways that thread along 26,000 miles of coastline.

A VAST WHITE LAND

In winter the southern seaways remain open, but northern Alaska freezes up. The tundra turns into a vast white land of silent and all-but-deserted frozen prairie, river valleys, rolling hills, and scattered forests.

Where you couldn't possibly walk in summer because of soggy tundra, thousands of lakes, and swift rivers, in winter the land becomes easily negotiable for him who is prepared.

Right now, unfortunately, we have too few fighting men who are prepared—hence the emphasis is on Arctic indoctrination. Each winter more and more men are trained to live and fight and survive in the intense cold that sweeps across interior Alaska.

This concept of Alaskan defense, by the way, centers on the vast bulk of central, northern, and western Alaska. The panhandle, or southeastern Alaska, is rugged, mountainous, and more easily defended.

The all-round tactical solution to Alaska's strange make-up consists of heavily fortifying the largest area. It is the belt which runs from the naval headquarters on Kodiak Island and Seward on the southern coast, along the Alaska Railroad through Anchorage and up to Fairbanks in the interior.

"If we hold this belt, where our air power can be concentrated, from here we'll hold all Alaska. But don't mistake me; we aim to keep aggressors away from all parts of Alaska, no matter where they may strike," said General Kepner.

He compared the defense of Alaska with the operation of a spider's web—the Kodiak-Anchorage-Fairbanks belt being the center of the web. Let an aggressor touch any outermost strand, and that aggressor will be stung almost immediately by a swiftly moving airborne spider.

Today there are few enough spiders, and the web is weak in some places. General Kepner admits this, and realizes the greatest calamity for the northland would be a let-down in the present program of increasing Alaskan defenses.

That calamity, by the way, according to Alaskans was occurring a little more than a year ago. It was stopped by the invasion of Korea and the determined, continual complaints of Alaskan civilians.

One of the operators of airlines across the north Pacific put it this way to the United States Senate "task force" which went north last October to investigate Alaska preparedness:

WITHDRAWAL ORDERED

"A 100-percent withdrawal of the Air Force was ordered from the bases of Shemya, Adak, Adak, Umnak, and Cold Bay on June 30, 1950. This would not only have crippled our north-Pacific air route, but would have left undefended five of the finest airfields in the world, costing hundreds of millions of dollars to build.

"It would have deprived us of weather forecasts from this area—the Aleutian islands—where all weather affecting North America originates."

Perhaps, said this individual, it was more than a coincidence that the Communists moved into Korea about the time some of the Aleutian airfields were supposed to have been closed.

Any traveler flying over Alaska is impressed with the all-embracing magnitude of the land, which is still mostly wilderness despite the expansion which has taken place since we bought it from Russia in 1867. The greatness of the land overshadows the tiny scratches man has made.

From 5,000 feet and a distance of 10 miles even Anchorage, along with nearby Elmendorf Air Force Base, Fort Richardson, and their combined population of around 35,000, seem puny. Yet they form the largest concentration in Alaska's total 130,000 population.

The Alaska Highway leading to Fairbanks from the Canadian border, the Richardson Highway running inland from Valdez on the coast, the Steese Highway north from Fairbanks, the Gie: n and Tok Highways connecting Anchorage with the Richardson and Alaska Highways, and the Haines Cut-off running southward to the Inside Passage—all these are insignificant yellow lines across the summer-green tundra.

Heavy supplies for the "strong belt" come up mainly by ocean steamer, of course. They travel the sheltered inside passage northward from Seattle for 1,000 miles and then cross the Gulf of Alaska to Seward and Whittier, where they are transferred to the Alaska Railroad.

GREATER SHIPMENTS

If war should come, this route would be the main artery of supply—though highways and airways would then carry greatly increased tonnages. The Gulf of Alaska segment of the ocean route admittedly is wide open to submarine attack. However:

"Germany presented quite a submarine problem too, and we solved it," says General Kepner.

For the past 6 months greater shipments have been hauled from the States to Alaska than were hauled during any similar period in World War II—and the tempo of these shipments will continue for a long time.

This will mean more fighter planes ready to take to the air on a moment's notice, more facilities for housing heavy and medium bombers which would fly north from the States should hostilities begin, and adequate living quarters for thousands of soldiers, sailors, and airmen yet to come north from the States.

Alaska's "belt of strength," for all its apparent insignificance to the casual observer, is being made constantly stronger. Eventually it should be so strong that—if we continue our vigilance—aggression against any part of Alaska just would not pay.

Why Asia Hates Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Pearl S. Buck, Nobel prize winner and authority on Asia, has written a challenging article in Look magazine entitled "Why Asia Hates Us." This is an important subject and the people of the United States must recognize that China is going to play an important part in world affairs for the next hundred years. I include her article as part of my remarks:

WHY ASIA HATES US

(By Pearl S. Buck)

AFTER LOOKING UP TO US FOR YEARS AS THE SYMBOL OF FREEDOM, SAYS A NOTED OBSERVER, THE PEOPLE OF ASIA NOW FEEL WE ARE EMPIRE BUILDERS OURSELVES

Once the peoples of Asia were our friends. Now they are bewildered by us and wounded. They hate us. Harsh words are flung at us from everywhere in Asia.

Some of us cry out with indignation, "Look at what we have done for them. Look at the missionaries we have been sending for generations to China. We are always giving relief here and there and everywhere."

But anger and resentment are useless. Nor can we simply shrug our shoulders and not care whether we are liked or not. Asia is most of the world, the peoples of Asia are most of the world's peoples. And in our struggle against communism, it is of the greatest importance to us what they think of us.

Therefore, let us, in common sense and prudence, ask ourselves why we are hated.

WHEN ASIANS LOOKED TO US WITH FERVOR AND HOPE, WE TURNED AGAINST THEM

If I had to simply reason why we are so hated, I would say that it is because the Asians feel that we have deceived them. They feel we have taken sides against them. We have destroyed their ideal of us. There is nothing so necessary as an ideal, at least to an Asian; nothing so precious as the need to trust someone.

We were the trusted, we were the admired. To them we were the good, not really for what we had done, but for what we were.

Americans had once been colonials, too, subjects of the English, who not only held India and Malaya and Burma but also held great pieces of Chinese soil; whose ships sailed into their inland waters; whose hold was unshakeable upon the customs receipts and upon the Chinese ports; who had fought wars to force the sale of opium upon China.

OUR RECORD WAS GOOD

Americans had never done any of these things. We had no ports, we did not take the customs revenue, we never fought the Chinese. We had even kept other powers from dividing up China. More than that, in times of famine food came from the Americans as it did not from anywhere else, and American missionaries were kind and good.

But, above all, so far above all for the Asian peoples that it was almost the only significance, America was a republic, a place where people ruled themselves by choosing their own governors, and a place where there was plenty for everybody. It could be done. In Asia, therefore, it could be done. They would learn from America.

That all this is now changed, and that we have come to be hated, is not because we are really hateful. There is nothing in the essential American nature as it is found in the vast average of our people that should be hateful to the peoples of Asia. On the contrary, we are far more likeable to Asians than most of the peoples of Europe are. Our frankness, our humor, our generosity, our practicality, our ability to make friends anywhere, all are qualities that the Asian likes and understands.

It is true that, by the standards of the average Asian, we are vulgar. It is also true that the conduct of Americans in the Armed Forces did deeply shock the peoples of Asia. The drunkenness alone was repulsive. It was also a shock to the man of Asia to discover the venality of many Americans. Asians are used enough to corruption and bribery, but somehow they did not expect Americans to exhibit these evils. They were too idealistic about us. Nor were the Asians reassured when they saw our haggling over food for India.

But it is not over these things that the peoples of Asia have turned against us. Where we have deceived them, they feel, is in the ideal of freedom.

All the great good of America came, Asians used to say and believe, from the fact that we are a free nation. People must be free, they declared, before they could achieve that wonderful American way of life. As the end of World War II drew near, they looked to us with fervor, hope, and certainty.

One day when I picked up the morning newspaper, I saw instantly that we had struck the first blow for our own destruction.

The blow fell at the San Francisco conference. What happened was reported in the New York Times in an article carrying the headline: "United States will oppose colonial liberty—Americans indicate line up with Britain and France against an independence pledge."

Imagine, please, you who now read this, what it means to people who have hoped for one thing above all else, and this for generations; to have looked so long to one source only for help, then to have that one declare himself against such help. Imagine, if you can, the surge of bewilderment and despair that flooded into Asian hearts when they heard that we were on the side of old empire and therefore against them.

By a few sentences, spoken by an American official delegate in the congress of the peoples in San Francisco, we laid the way for all that has happened since.

Our delegates at San Francisco were good people, but none of them knew Asia. Few of them had ever read the history of Asia. But above this ignorance of our delegates, the tragedy is that we, the American people, did not know the events that were to be unleashed by the opposition of our delegates to colonial liberty.

What has happened since has been the inevitable consequence of an attitude of mind, a policy, which has denied again and again the true ideals of our people. Thus it was

made plain later that we would not join wholeheartedly in a plan for the administration of food on a world scale; a plan that could have put an end, once and for all, to that obsolete and inadequate relief work that wastes so much of our money. Instead, we declared to the world—that is, our representatives did—that we would use food as a political weapon, and so we have done.

WE HAVE UPHELD ONLY THOSE WILLING TO TAKE DIRECTION FROM US

We have proceeded in the most provincial and local-minded fashion to act everywhere in the world without reference to other peoples. We have upheld only those persons who were willing to take direction from us; usually persons rejected by their own people and who followed us for the most corrupt reasons of personal power and gain.

Communism is not important to any people in Asia. Freedom is of the first importance, for they are convinced that only with freedom have they the chance to build a better life. Freedom and the chance to build a better life, that is all they ask. If communism does not give them these two conditions, they will reject communism.

What a fearful loss it was when, in our blind localism, we threw away the peoples of Asia and thought that we could do without them! It was such an unnecessary loss; we could so easily have kept them with us, for we had their support, their faith, their love.

LOST OPPORTUNITY

We had, and we have, the ability to help them, and to help them is to help ourselves. We have thrown all that away and we have instead their hatred, their enmity, so that the incredible, monstrous fact is that the Chinese, who were never our enemies and are not our enemies today, have actually been at war with us, their sons killing ours and being killed by ours.

From the folly of San Francisco, when all Asia sat at our feet, has sprouted, like branches from a noxious tree, one folly after another.

It has been agony to those of us who know Asia, and who have watched helplessly; for there was no way to reach the ears, or minds, of those who were committing the follies. Final agony now is to travel among our own people, as I have done, and to find that our people themselves feel betrayed somehow by those who have been so foolish.

Our people are for the freedom of other peoples. Our people, by and large, are for organizing the distribution of food so that everybody has enough to eat. Scientists and food experts tell us that there is plenty of food in the world for all, and much more than could be grown on land and in the sea. None need be hungry. We have knowledge enough, too, to make people more healthy everywhere and to save the lives of children.

It would take little indeed to make the world a better place; little except organizing leadership. We could so easily provide this leadership toward peace, out of our own experience here at home, and in the doing communism would be defeated once and for all. The practical idealism that is really the genius of our American people could find its glorious expression and the whole world would benefit.

Yet, at a crucial moment on the life of the world's people, our course has lain in ignorance, and there now falls upon us the weight of past history in Asia.

ONLY OUR DEMOCRATIC WISDOM AND EXPERIENCE CAN WIN ASIA

The people of Asia are saying that Americans are no different from other white people. They are saying that it was only when we had no material need of empire that we did not attack them as the others

did. They think that we have now come to the point of such need and that we will try to make an empire in our time. All empire begins in trade, and so, the Asians fear, will begin our new empire.

It is easy, if one knows Asia's history, to see how the peoples over there would think that of us. It is their final despair.

I do not think it was communism that made the Chinese soldiers fight against us in Korea. They fought because they believed that we are the new empire builders and Communist propaganda seized upon their fear; the same old fear that made Japan our enemy.

They have fought, those Chinese, to keep us from the soil of Asia, which is their soil. Korea has always been a danger spot, a gate into Asia. No foreign western people will be tolerated there.

It would be one more folly on our part did we believe that we can ever establish in Korea a government favorable only to the United States. If that seems unreasonable to any American, let him imagine the Russians taking over Mexico and establishing there a government favorable only to the Soviet Union. We would not tolerate it. So is Korea joined to the very soil of Russia and to China's soil, and is separated from Japan by only a narrow strip of water.

Korea should be like a Switzerland in Asia. Neutrality must be the goal, a sternly guarded and constantly maintained neutrality. Only so can the Korean people be independent until the nations are ready to set up world government.

Let us prepare now, and let us have, ready and waiting a government set up under the guardianship of the United Nations, with Korean advisers but for the present no Korean administrative officials. Let the most active of those officials be men of other Asian countries.

LET US ACT NOW

Let us at the same time have ready and announce at once, continually and everywhere, plans for the reconstruction of Korea, with the funds provided and waiting. These plans should be basic, in housing, transportation, hydroelectric power and food supply.

What we do for Korea should then be the blueprint for the rest of Asia, except that other peoples do not need the guardianship of the U. N. Some of the smaller nations may ask for it as protection against greedy neighbors. The people of Formosa already want it. But all peoples will welcome and cooperate with plans that will help them to find for themselves freedom and economic betterment.

Let us not be deceived by the excuses of dead empire, which complained, for example, of the birth rate in India. The facts are that India's rate of increase is less than our own and India's density of population only one-third that of England's—yet no one suggests that England cut her birth rate. Twenty-three percent of India's soil could be and is not available for agriculture.

The situation of Asia's peoples is not complex. Those who talk about complexities are those who want to muddy the waters for their own ends.

And what next?

Only that we Americans must work entirely through and with the United Nations in the making of plans and in their execution.

We Americans are fortunate that there is now the United Nations. Anything we do alone, as Americans, will be suspect in Asia for a long time. We have to prove ourselves all over again. We have to demonstrate our ideals on a world scale.

This can be done through a sincere and wholehearted support of the United Nations, a support we have never yet given. We

must put aside our defensive behavior and act with integrity and moral, as well as practical leadership.

Let us do so without blame to others. I can bear with equanimity the rantings of Russians in public places, but I cannot endure the same behavior, I do not expect it, from our American representatives.

Long ago in China, my old Confucian tutor used to make me write every day this teaching of the wise man: "The superior man blames himself, the inferior man blames others."

Without more waste of time and life in blaming others, let us put to the use of all peoples the wisdom and the experience of our democratic way of life.

Here is our conquering weapon against communism. Here is the way to win Asia back. There is no other weapon, no other way.

Five Great Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, those of us who were listening to the radio Sunday afternoon were privileged to hear a most interesting and inspiring address by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In these days of denunciations and counterdenunciations, I thought it might be well tonight to speak about five Americans, who are in danger of being forgotten but who by their work and lives have helped to make us all better men and women.

The first is John Woolman, the Quaker tailor who was born early in the eighteenth century, lived a life of apparent obscurity but who was the spiritual fountainhead of the antislavery movement in America. Slowly it dawned on Woolman as a young man that slavery was a great moral wrong. Human beings were treated as property and frequently overworked and cruelly handled. The system brutalized both the slave and the master. But it was widespread and it was profitable. Almost no one questioned it and most men of means owned slaves. But Woolman's inner voice would not let him rest. It told him slavery was wrong and that he should bear testimony against it, so he quietly traveled over the country speaking at Quaker meetings and to individual Quakers, urging them to stand out against slavery.

One by one, the Quaker yearly meetings passed resolutions asking all their members to free their slaves. Woolman was then given one of the most disagreeable jobs a man could have. He was appointed to a visiting committee to call on Quaker slaveholders and get them to free their bondsmen. He did this for years with such gentleness and humility that few harsh words were ever spoken to him and by 1775 the Quakers had freed their slaves without a cent of compensation and were out from underneath the great curse of slavery. Freed from the profits of this institution, they furnished in the next three-quarters of a century the

spiritual shock troops of the antislavery movement.

How much better it would have been had others followed the example of Woolman and his associates? Had this been done, we need never have had the Civil War with all of its terrible loss of life, and the relations between the races and the sections would today be infinitely more friendly. But because the people would not follow John Woolman and the way of love, they had to take John Brown and the way of force, with Grant to boot.

The second man I want to speak about was a black-bearded German immigrant who fought in the Civil War, came to Chicago, practiced law, and in 1892 became Governor of Illinois. His name was John Peter Altgeld. At a time when women worked 12 hours a day or more in factories, he helped pass an 8-hour law—the first of its kind in this country. Resentful of injustice, he pardoned a group of anarchists who had been convicted of murder in connection with the Haymarket riots. He did this not because he sympathized with their aims, which he did not, but because he believed with reason that they had not received a fair trial and that there was no adequate evidence to indicate their guilt. But perhaps his noblest act was at the completion of his term. He had been beaten for reelection and he had lost his fortune. At this very juncture, Charles T. Yerkes, the corrupt streetcar magistrate, was getting from the Illinois Legislature a 50-year franchise for the use of Chicago's streets without compensation. Yerkes went to Altgeld, offered him \$500,000 in currency which was in a safety deposit box in Chicago, if he would allow the bill to become law without his signature. Altgeld was sorely tempted. He took the key to the box, counted the money, found it was not marked, and then took counsel with his conscience. At the eleventh hour, he returned the key to Yerkes and vetoed the traction bill with a stinging message which concluded, "I cannot sell out the people of Chicago." Then, his term over, beaten and disgraced, and with only \$7 in his pocket, he took the day coach to Chicago. The only man who met him was Joe Martin, the former gambler who loved Altgeld with all his heart and who had a keener insight into true virtue than most of the self-righteous people.

It was of Altgeld that our prairie poet, Vachel Lindsay, wrote:

"Sleep on, Eagle forgotten,
Under the stone,
Time has its way with you
And death has it own."

But Lindsay continued: "To live in mankind, is far, far more than to live in a name." The tenderness and the integrity of John Peter Altgeld lives on in the people of my State of Illinois and elsewhere.

The third person was Jane Addams, the miller's daughter, who started Hull House in the slums of Chicago in 1889 and who for nearly 50 years fed the hungry, clothed the naked, and cared for the sick in body and soul. Nor did she stop there. Miss Addams and her associates opened the first playground, established day nurseries, started the Juvenile Protective Association and the juvenile court, took care of immigrants, got the garbage out of the streets and alleys and helped with protective legislation for women and children. Believing that the poor should have beauty as well as bread, she sponsored dance classes and a little theater, organized a music and an art school and developed an industrial museum which preceded the great museums of Munich and Chicago. Out of her insight into the humanness of the human heart, Jane Addams became one of our most penetrating and poignant writers. Her books such as *Twenty*

Years at Hull House, Democracy and Social Ethics, New Ideals of Peace, The Spirit of Youth, and the City Streets and The Devil-Baby at Hull House are part of the permanent classics of our literature. A devoted worker for peace and international understanding, Jane Addams went further than most of us would go but she sowed on a wide scale the seeds of active good will.

A citizen of the world, she was also firmly rooted in Halsted Street and the Bloody Twentieth Ward, of Chicago. She combined both character and culture to a rare degree and after knowing her for many years, I would say she was one of the two authentic saints whom I have ever met.

My fourth and fifth selections were both United States Senators. Namely, Robert M. La Follette, of Wisconsin, and his friend and fellow fighter George W. Norris, of Nebraska. La Follette, early in his career, had to decide whether or not he should make public an attempt to influence improperly the supreme court of his State. He decided to do so and was immediately attacked on the ground that he had betrayed a confidence. After several defeats, he was finally elected Governor of Wisconsin in 1900. Here he pushed through numerous reforms such as the establishment of a State income tax, the regulation of private utilities based upon a physical valuation of their property, a reform of the general property tax, the building up of the State university into one of the great free institutions of the land, a workmen's compensation act for industrial accidents and a host of other reforms.

One of these reforms was to establish a genuine system of civil service for State employees. This was 50 years ago; so that Wisconsin ranks with Massachusetts and New York as one of the pioneers in this movement. A problem which always comes up when civil service is first put into effect is what to do with the existing employees who were originally appointed on political grounds. Should they be turned out or retained? If they are of his own party or group, a Governor generally tends to blanket them in as permanent civil servants and thus try to give them permanent jobs. If the employees belong to the opposition, however, it is a common practice for a governor to oust them, replace them with his own men and then put these under the protection of civil service.

But this tends to poison the system from the very start. For when the opposition takes power, they cannot be expected to abide by the results. The new regime will therefore get rid of those who have the jobs on one pretext or another and give the positions to their own followers. Under these conditions, a true merit system becomes impossible and civil service a more or less hypocritical farce.

When La Follette became governor, his enemies manned the State jobs and he must have been sorely tempted. But he refused to fire his opponents and instead gave them civil-service tenure. No one could legitimately doubt his sincerity after that and as a result the merit system has probably been developed more fully in Wisconsin than in any other State. For that full credit should be given to Robert M. La Follette.

La Follette was then elected to the Senate and immediately started out on a vigorous program to preserve competition and prevent monopoly. When he first rose to speak in the Senate, all his Republican colleagues left the Chamber but the time came when not only the whole Senate but the whole country listened when he spoke. He passed a law to protect seamen and worked constantly for a proper physical valuation of the railroads to squeeze the "water" out of their capitalization. His son, Robert M. La Follette, Jr., who succeeded him, served for

20 years more and by his skill and fairness won the title of the "Senators' Senator."

George W. Norris was a Nebraska lawyer who came to Congress in 1902 and found it dominated by big business. The House of Representatives was then ruled by Speaker CANNON who in effect appointed all committees and decided which Congressman should be permitted to speak and which bills could be called up for action. Norris stood this as long as he could and then with a few other Progressive Republicans joined the Democrats to replace the absolute monarchy of the Speaker with what has turned out to be the tempered autocracy of the Rules Committee.

Coming to the Senate in 1912, Norris served in that body for 30 years. He was active in every good cause, but his two greatest works were, first in getting the so-called antilame duck amendment passed which made Congress more responsive to the popular will and secondly, in creating, with Franklin Roosevelt's help, the Tennessee Valley Authority, which has done so much to build up that area. A hard-boiled and cynical politician once told me of Norris, "You can't buy him, nor flatter him nor frighten him. He always does what he thinks is right." And then wistfully with tears running down his face, he said, "I wish I could be like George Norris." And I would add that many of us believe he was the finest and purest Senator of the last century.

In these days of strain and turmoil, we can take strength in the examples of John Woolman, John Peter Altgeld, Jane Addams, Bob La Follette and George Norris, who served the people of this Nation. They were bitterly attacked and criticized in their day, but their lives have stood the test of time.

In the words of George Eliot, they have joined "the choir invisible of those immortal dead, who live in minds made better by their presence." But at times one hopes that mankind can recognize such men and women while they are living and not merely after they have died. I shall close, therefore, with the final words of Bernard Shaw in his play, Saint Joan: "O God that madest this beautiful earth, when will it be ready to receive Thy saints. How long, O Lord, how long?"

Stephen T. Early

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following broadcast by Earl Godwin:

This program is known as Earl Godwin's Washington, and this is Washington's Earl Godwin making a special broadcast on this Sunday morning for the people in Washington, many of whom knew Stephen T. Early, who died yesterday, the lad who did so good a job as a reporter for the Associated Press in the days when Franklin Roosevelt was Assistant Secretary of the Navy that in later years Mr. Roosevelt lifted Steve right out of a comfortable and well-paying job in the news reels and made him one of that famed trio of secretaries of the New Deal. Early, Louis Howe, and Marvin McIntyre, and now these men who sat at the source of history and who helped make history have all passed

on. Perhaps to review things with "the boss"—that is the term that Steve and McIntyre used—in affection and reverence. I did not know Louis Howe, except in a formal casual manner, but the two others I knew from the days when we were reporters; \$35 a week was good pay; at any rate, that's all a good reporter got when he should have been getting that much every day. I think I can recall times when we all would borrow a dollar from one another—a dollar seemed to go round and round amongst us on Thursday, the day before payday.

My regard for Steve Early was above the average from the earliest days of our acquaintance. Looking back at it, there comes to me a notion this very early regard was due to a recognition of fine quality and character which has its foundation in the fine strain of good breeding, good family—and by good family I mean the strain of blood which has in its character arrived at by testing—getting over the hard places with honor and integrity and dignity, and being able to look any man in the face and tell him to go to—a phrase I can repeat to myself but I will refrain on this Sunday morning from being too outspoken.

That fine character from well-bred ancestors kept Steve Early on the right path and on equitable terms with the rocking world of events during the whole of the New Deal, for he served Franklin Roosevelt from inauguration day until that tragic day down at Warm Springs. Steve never lost his sense of proportion.

I hasten to say that the good Virginia family of Earlys contained the famous Jubal Early, Confederate cavalry leader who was one of the reasons why the North had a rough time in the Valley of Virginia. The town which can be proud to claim the honor of Steve Early's birthplace is a typical town on the eastern slopes of the Blue Ridge—Crozet is the name. If there is an Early Street or Avenue there may I suggest that they nominate a thoroughfare for that distinction and name it all the way Stephen T. Early Highway.

Well, in the days when Steve Early and Franklin Roosevelt were getting acquainted; Steve as a reporter, Roosevelt as Assistant Secretary of the Navy and part of the time Marvin McIntyre working on the Washington Times when Frank Munsey owned it, and later working as a civilian publicity man for the Navy, Roosevelt showed that amazing and explosive spirit which did things for the Navy in the face of the Old Admiral Cluque which was strong as horse radish in those days. Roosevelt ordered built ships that Congress had never authorized and then got Joseph Kennedy to build them. Joe was afterwards in the Roosevelt administration; his final post being that of Ambassador to Great Britain. His son is now a great success as a Member of Congress from Massachusetts. Roosevelt made news of a delightfully refreshing variety as Assistant Secretary of the Navy and he never got over the habit of calling his superior Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels "Boss." Called him "Boss" even when President; and Roosevelt made Daniels Ambassador to Mexico.

I do not know how many publicity men the Navy has today. But in the day I am now recalling the Navy had just one; and the Navy never missed hitting the front pages—why should it? That one man was Marvin McIntyre and his Navy boss was a naval officer named John Heffernan. The millions of dollars now spent on Navy publicity seem to me to get no more of it than Commander Heffernan got with Marvin McIntyre, acting as contact man, leg man, and editor for the entire Navy.

Steve Early was still a reporter for the Associated Press when the Wilson adminis-

tration fell before the onslaught of normalcy and the election of Warren Harding. He covered such tremendous stories: Among them the burial of the unknown soldier at Arlington, followed by one of the greatest and most completely sincere strokes of American statesmanship, I refer to the offer of Secretary of State Hughes to organize the world into a pact for the reduction of armaments, and thus take the burden of the costs of armies and navies from the backs of the people of the world and reduce the militarism which has some part in the launching of wars, say what you will. That was just as sincere as is our own offer today to use atomic energy for peaceful, constructive purposes and lay aside the atom as a weapon.

The nations of the world all yammered and stammered and then just had to sit down and sign the treaty, which reduced Japan to the proper proportion as to her battleships and did other things of a like nature. We scrapped certain ships and we alone of all the nations kept to our reduction promises. By the time we had kept our promise and the others had gone ahead building navies, it looked as if we were inviting trouble for ourselves. I recall Representative CARL VINSON, of Georgia, chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, getting up and raising a terrific rumpus about this thing I'm telling you—our pure but weak attitude as to naval strength—and from then on we have become the strongest Nation. Let us keep that way as long as we have to live in a world of pirates and liars.

Steve reported much of that, and the episode which stands out most brilliantly in his reporting career was the attention to duty which gave him the scoop of the century—the death of President Harding. He was the reporter in the St. Francis Hotel at San Francisco who stayed on the job while every other man left—rather naturally because we had been assured that all danger of the President's death had passed. We had been on a long, grueling death watch, and when the word came that it would be safe to leave we piled over to the Bohemian Club and relaxed.

Steve Early did not go. He stayed on the story. Now, that particular type of stick-to-it-iveness is characteristic of certain newsmen and it is just that quality which riled the Czechoslovakian barbarians who struck at American Reporter William Oatis like an infuriated rattlesnake.

Harding's sickroom was on one floor of the hotel. Steve's room and office, with a telegraph instrument and operator in it, was on the floor either above or below—I have forgotten that detail. But he kept his eye on the Presidential suite. Early in the evening he saw commotion; someone rushed out; a nurse rushed in. Mrs. Harding rushed in and out, and Judson Welliver, a White House public-relations and contact man, came bursting forth.

Steve's trained senses told him what had happened. He asked the all-fulfilling question of Welliver, "When are you going to issue a bulletin?"

Whatever answer he got caused him to hot foot it to his hotel room and office. He told the Associated Press from there, "Get ready for extra." Newspapers got out extra editions in those days before radio. And when the official bulletin came, Steve beat the world by a long series of minutes, which is a great feat in the news game.

Steve was in a lucrative job in a news-reel company when Franklin Roosevelt decided to run for the nomination, and he picked Steve to help him, also McIntyre. The two remained through the nomination race and the campaign and became secretaries. Steve was one of the greatest successes on his job at the White House that any man could have in any job. He was a practical,

hard-headed, unemotional newsman. He had no fanciful theories. He knew how news develops and how it should be covered. He was loyal to his boss, the President, but at no time did he depart from his manner and method of handling news from the White House nor dealing with the newsmen of press associations and newspapers covering the White House. He had a high regard for the ethics of the newspaper and news profession, and he had no fear of Franklin Roosevelt. Steve was never a mere yes-man, and he was, I guess, the only man in that coterie who had no hesitancy about walking in on his boss if the occasion demanded, even if the boss was shaving.

I am positive that Steve's conservative nature, although he was a Democrat, led him into political and economic beliefs now and then contrary to the boss, but it never showed. He could handle his emotions and personal views so well that he never lagged in the job he was doing. He gained the respect of one and all because everyone knew Steve was all wool and a yard wide and genuine in his character.

He went back into private business shortly after Mr. Truman became President. He helped Truman get going and again went back into private business. Then later, when Louis Johnson was made Secretary of Defense, both Truman and Louis wanted Steve to help, and Steve gave up a good income to go back to the Government as No. 2 man in defense under the new law. One of Steve's crusades was to try to get some life into the other members of the United Nations and get them to send adequate force and aid to our side in Korea. I can tell you now that he and I worked together on that. He, of course, being the important member, but he fired me with the idea that the United Nations was simply laying down on the job; and some of them are yet.

There has never been any question about the high ethical attitude Steve assumed toward his job, one of the most influential in the world.

I suppose actually 10,000 people would give their shirts and other treasures to have been close enough to Steve to influence him to start something—to get a job, to get the boss to look favorably on this or that.

Steve never enlarged the circle of his acquaintances. He never followed the Washington cocktail trail. He could have written the book of all books about the New Deal. Perhaps he should have done so, for the benefit of facts and clarity and truth, but his attitude (as far as he explained it to me) was that he did not believe in capitalizing on his close acquaintance with Franklin Roosevelt. A high-minded attitude, not universal in these days of quick jobs from official pull.

We were speaking of the situation regarding Bill Oatis and the Czechoslovakian episode the last time I saw Steve, a few days ago at a luncheon at the Capitol in Leslie Biddle's office. There, too, were Gen Omar Bradley and Senator Joe O'MAHONEY, all of us good friends.

We brought up the subject of Senator O'CONNOR, of Maryland, who wants iron curtain newsmen in this country treated exactly as those countries treat American newsmen. I recalled to Steve that in his day at the White House (before we declared war on Germany) there was at least one Nazi spy who attended the President's news conferences legally and technically properly under the guise of a legitimate German correspondent. We all knew that Curt Sell (that's his name) telephoned everything off the record—secret and what not—right to the Nazi embassy. I was president of the White House Correspondents' Association and protested Sell's appearance. Steve told me then that the President knew about it and wanted to show

the world that he and we were not afraid to have a known spy in our midst, and incidentally, Steve told me that President Roosevelt sometimes very cleverly used this man Sell, by putting out something that would be labeled secret or background, but which was more or less of a booby trap, just to make sure this tricky stuff reached Hitler for whatever purposes Roosevelt had in mind.

The St. Lawrence Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Seaway Proponents Strong, but Foes Out-Maneuver Them," by Leo Sonderegger, which appeared in the Minneapolis Star of August 11, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ST. LAWRENCE STORY—SEAWAY PROPO-
NENTS STRONG, BUT FOES OUTMANEUVER
THEM

(By Leo Sonderegger)

(Fifth in a series)

Getting an objective picture of the St. Lawrence seaway project is not like scooping high-grade iron ore from an open pit mine. It is more like the tough job of extracting iron particles from taconite.

For half a century the seaway proposal has given rise to surveys and reports and arguments and counterarguments, to dreams and statistics and flag waving and ax grinding, to stern warnings and cries of demagogery.

The result is a mass of material as resistant to appraisal as taconite is to giving up its iron. This article and the next two will seek to clarify the main streams of the controversy.

The seaway project has not been stalled for lack of able champions. Every President since Woodrow Wilson has favored deepening the St. Lawrence channel. Every official body that has studied the matter has reported favorably.

The Government has not been alone in advocating the seaway. Powerful labor and farm bodies have thrown their weight in its favor. Recently some influential business interests have joined up.

The support has been strong. But the opposition has been stronger, and more adroit.

The eastern railroads fear that they would be hurt by the seaway, so they fight it. Their chief comrades in battle have been the port of New York and other Atlantic and Gulf ports, the coal companies, some eastern utilities, the United Mine Workers, the non-operating rail brotherhoods.

FOES USE TWO WEAPONS

Proponents of the seaway have repeatedly been fought to a standstill by this phalanx. It has made brilliant use of two principal weapons: argumentation, and selective political pressure.

Men have talked of a deep seaway into the continent for more than 100 years. The talk was stepped up half a century ago when the United States-Canadian Deep-Waterways Commission made a survey and said the prospects were good.

The talk lagged again, but after World War I an international joint commission established by the boundary waters treaty of 1909 went out for another look. It conducted hearings in both countries and added its favorable recommendation to that of the earlier group.

President Coolidge appointed a St. Lawrence Commission and made Herbert Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, its chairman. Hoover's group also reported favorably.

He continued his interest when he became President, with the result that a treaty providing for joint construction of the project was signed by Canada and the United States in 1932.

PEARL HARBOR PREVENTED VOTE

The treaty received only 46-42 approval in the Senate, rather than the two-thirds majority needed for ratification.

To replace the treaty, an agreement requiring only a simple majority in both Houses of Congress was negotiated with Canada in 1941. The House Rivers and Harbors Committee approved it in November, but Pearl Harbor kept it from coming to a vote.

Most of the time since, the chances of seaway legislation have not seemed robust. It has been bottled in House and Senate committees. The railroad interests have whitelighted airtight stoppers.

Historically, the division in Congress has not been on party lines, but on the basis of local, sectional, or purely economic interests. This year, the dormant political angle was stimulated by a Republican leader who urged his colleagues to vote against the seaway rather than let the Democrats take credit for it.

Whether or not he was successful, the fact remains that when the House committee acted on the measure 10 out of 12 Republican members voted against it. Of the committee's 15 Democrats, 10 voted for the project.

SEAWAY FOES USE NEGATIVE ARGUMENTS

Those who oppose the seaway are necessarily on the defensive; they are fighting a delaying action. They have fought this kind of action successfully for years.

Their arguments are negative: The project is not necessary, it would be too expensive, it would not be used as much as its proponents claim, it would be difficult to defend in time of war, it would hurt railroad and port business.

Proponents of the seaway have the advantages—and the disadvantages—of being on the positive side. They make broad assertions with regard to seaway potentialities, but theirs is the burden of proof.

Spearhead of the opposition is the National St. Lawrence Project Conference. Most elements against the seaway have joined this group.

More than 60 percent of its financial support comes from the Association of American Railroads, another 10 percent from the coal companies. Dozens of chambers of commerce dangle from its letterhead but contribute no funds.

Chairman of the project conference is Carroll B. Huntress, vice president of Republic Coal & Coke Co. of New York. Huntress is a man with a strong east-coast orientation and a jaundiced view of his opponents' motives.

SEES POLITICS AT BOTTOM OF SEAWAY

He is suspicious of President Truman's reasons for pushing so hard for the seaway. He purports to believe that talk of the project's importance to national security is nothing more than camouflage of the administration's real purpose.

To him, the motivation can be summed up in one word—votes.

He lumps together all the Government's top witnesses—Dean Acheson, Secretary of State; Charles Sawyer, Secretary of Commerce; Defense Secretary Marshall; Defense Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson, and others—

with the comment, "After all, they're all in the Army."

When Huntress was asked about the railroads' claim that the seaway would hurt their business, he commented, "If what they say is true it would wreck 'em; if what they say is not true, it would be a tremendous fiasco."

Huntress and Dr. N. R. Danielian, executive head of the rival Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, are pretty much agreed that the effect on the railroads is the crux of the disagreement.

Huntress said, "It would be very difficult for the railroads to go against it if it could be clearly shown that it would be paid for by tolls." That would end talk of subsidized competition.

Danielian put it more bluntly: "The only issue is: Are the railroads going to be hurt or aren't they?"

Danielian is a Harvard doctor of philosophy who has championed the seaway for 10 years. In the process he has become the Nation's best informed authority on the project.

Most of the time his work has been generally a lone-wolf proposition. In the past year or so, however, the American companies interested in the Labrador iron-ore deposits have bolstered the association with new money, new arguments, and solid political influence.

FINANCIAL COMPARISON IS CALLED UNFAIR

The new money has given the association funds to more than match those of the project conference. Workers in Danielian's office insist, however, that the financial comparison is not a fair one.

They claim, with justice, that the opponents have not only their stated funds but the services of a network of railroad employees more or less committed to working against the seaway.

The opponents counter with an even more obvious truth—that the St. Lawrence association works closely with Federal departments and can draw on them for propaganda materials.

At any rate, the sound of the grinding of axes is heard in the land whenever the St. Lawrence seaway is argued.

Not all the proponents have motives of flawless altruism; nor do all those who fight the seaway do so from a narrow and selfish viewpoint.

But, generally speaking, those who favor it grind the big ax of national interest, while those who oppose it grind little axes of sectional and economic interest.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my report to the people of Pennsylvania on August 13, 1951, entitled "Happenings in Washington, Program No. 47."

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON, PROGRAM NO. 47
(Broadcast by United States Senator EDWARD MARTIN, of Pennsylvania)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another discussion of happenings in Washington.

In these days of anxiety the American people are worried about war, high taxes, high prices, foreign spending, political corruption, bureaucratic extravagance, and the activities of disloyal elements who prefer communism to Americanism.

Each of these is a source of danger to the safety and security of our country and a threat to the American way of life. There is good reason for every patriotic citizen to be deeply concerned about them and to look to Washington for protection against these dangers.

In this broadcast I want to talk about one of the most important problems to come before Congress. I refer to the taxes which you pay to support the spending by the Federal Government.

This is a subject which should have your close attention because of the cost of government has now reached the highest point in our history except for 2 years at the height of World War II. It affects every citizen. It is your money—taken out of your earnings—that pays every dollar spent by Government.

You know that no government—Federal, State, or local—has a single dollar of income except that which it takes from the pockets of the taxpayer.

No one—rich or poor—escapes the tax collector. Even those whose income falls below the minimum income tax rates pay their share indirectly through hidden taxes included in the price of everything they buy.

Since June 28, the Finance Committee of the Senate, of which I am a member, has been holding hearings on a new tax bill. It had been passed by the House a week earlier after the Ways and Means Committee worked on it for 4½ months.

It provides for financing all the functions and services of the biggest corporation in the world—the United States Government.

That corporation has 150,000,000 stockholders—150,000,000 Americans whose hopes and aspirations—whose sacred freedoms—are directly at stake in its success or failure.

To operate this vast enterprise we now have more than 2,500,000 employees on the Federal payroll, at an annual cost to the taxpayers of \$8,500,000,000. This payroll alone is more than the entire cost of the Federal Government in any peace time year prior to 1940.

In the new tax bill, now being considered, we have to raise the money to meet that payroll.

We have to meet the tremendous costs of our defense program, which means preparation for any eventuality, including the possibility of another world war.

We have to consider the President's proposal that we spend \$8,500,000,000 for military and economic aid to foreign nations in the hope that they will fight on our side if the world is plunged into war.

We have to raise the money—about \$5,500,000,000—to pay the interest on the national debt—the biggest burden of debt ever carried by any nation in all history—more than a quarter of a trillion dollars.

These items are only a few of the high lights. The list is long and the total is staggering.

But the most important objective we must keep in mind is to preserve and encourage the free enterprise system under which we have established the greatest industrial production and the highest standard of living in the world.

We must make certain that we preserve initiative and incentive in order to maintain our economy at its greatest strength through continued growth and expansion of productive enterprise.

We must distribute the tax burden equitably so that each citizen will have to assume no more than his fair share. We must preserve opportunity for the worker and the

little-business man to get ahead and prosper.

Last January the President of this great corporation, the United States of America, told us that he will have to spend \$71,500,000,000 to run our business for a single year which began July 1. This startling figure was \$30,000,000,000 more than was spent in the fiscal year 1951. Later the estimate was reduced to \$68,400,000,000.

At the same time we were told by the President's financial experts that existing tax levies would produce revenues of \$55,000,000,000.

That would mean a deficit of more than \$13,000,000,000.

Now, there are three methods the Government can adopt to meet a situation in which expenditures are in excess of income.

One is to raise taxes by an amount sufficient to balance the budget.

A second method is to go into deficit financing and borrow the difference, thus increasing the already swollen debt.

The third way, and unquestionably the best for the Nation and the people, is to reduce expenditures by applying strict economy and increased efficiency in every department of Government.

And when I say every department I include the military, where I am certain millions of dollars could be saved without curtailing the defense program by careful scrutiny of every item of expenditure.

I am convinced, through studies that have been made, not only by Republicans, but by able, economy-minded Democrats, that Government spending can be cut deep enough to balance the budget with a minimum of new taxes.

But the Truman administration does not believe in economy. It did not offer a single recommendation for cutting down the size or the cost of the giant bureaucracy it has created. On the contrary, President Truman declared that his spending proposals could not be cut and challenged Congress to do so.

He demanded that Congress add \$10,000,000,000 in new and higher taxes on top of the back-breaking burden of taxation under which the American people are now struggling.

If the President had his way it would mean the addition of \$20,000,000,000 of taxes since June of last year.

The House refused to accept the President's \$10,000,000,000 proposal and the bill as passed by the House reduced the new tax levy to \$7,200,000,000.

That was the amount in which the bill came to the Senate Finance Committee.

Many Members of Congress in both Houses are worried because we feel we have reached a point in taxing the American people beyond which we cannot go without robbing the average citizen and without placing the national economy in danger of destruction.

When the bill was being discussed in the House of Representatives, Congressman RICHARD SIMPSON, dean of the Pennsylvania Republican delegation, said we have not only reached the bottom of the tax barrel, but we are cutting into the wood.

I agree with Congressman SIMPSON.

It would mean that nearly 30 percent of our entire national income would go to pay the cost of Federal Government alone. And when State and local taxes are added it would require every worker in the United States to work one day out of every three to pay his tax bill.

Since our committee began its hearings we have heard testimony from nearly 200 witnesses. In addition, several hundred statements and briefs have been filed which must be analyzed by the committee.

We heard from representatives of farm and labor organizations, manufacturers, mine operators, small-business men, bankers, economists, and tax experts.

We heard spokesmen for the Truman administration protest against the cut made by the House in the President's request for a \$10,000,000,000 increase in taxes.

We heard arguments for new types of taxes which it was claimed would produce sufficient revenue without hardship on anyone.

We heard arguments against almost every class of excise taxes.

Some who appeared before us were perfectly willing to tax the other fellow—so long as their particular product was left untaxed.

The hearings have been concluded and we are now meeting in executive session to study the various proposals and suggestions.

Without predicting what the final outcome will be, I am sure I am safe in saying that the Senate committee will cut below the 7,200,000,000 figure in the House bill.

Many of us on the committee have been insisting that appropriations not related to national defense should be cut to the bone.

Considerable progress is being made in that direction. The House has acted on nine appropriation measures and has cut below the President's budget requests by \$1,400,000,000.

Five of these bills have been passed by the Senate and they have been sent to conference to compromise their differences.

I believe deeper cuts could and should have been made and I consistently voted for amendments to reduce these appropriations.

I am still of the opinion that six to eight billion dollars should be hacked out of the President's budget.

If this were done we could balance the budget and any thought of a ten billion tax increase could be dismissed.

We must still pass on the appropriation for the armed services and the President's request for \$8,500,000,000 for military and economic aid to Europe.

This \$8,500,000,000 requested for foreign aid is more than the total taxes collected last year by all the 48 State governments combined.

Pennsylvania's share of this \$8,500,000,000 amounts to \$612,000,000 or enough to run the whole State for a year.

In the face of present conditions, I believe a substantial cut can be made in this appropriation.

How can we justify the spending of our taxpayers' money for economic rehabilitation in Europe and at the same time bear the cost of furnishing them with arms and other military equipment?

My fellow Pennsylvanians, I have stated many times that one of the strongest bulwarks of defense is to keep our country solvent.

It is imperative that we cut Government spending. We must be willing to do without nonessential Government services even though they may be desirable in normal times.

We must be constantly on guard against the proposals of a socialistic nature which are offered under the false label of national defense.

We must constantly guard against taxes so high that they result in confiscation of the citizen's income and his property.

That was what Chief Justice Marshall had in mind when he warned that the power to tax is the power to destroy.

Congress must use that power wisely so that we do not destroy our freedom through economic collapse.

Let me say, as emphatically as I know how, that national bankruptcy, here in the United States, is a greater danger to the future of America and the world than any threat of Communist Russia.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

Education and the Productive Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address by Dr. Earl J. McGrath, United States Commissioner of Education, at the 1951 commencement exercises at Bryant College, Providence, R. I., on August 10, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EDUCATION AND THE PRODUCTIVE CITIZEN

It is often said that the greatest single asset of the United States is the productivity of its people. Our homes, cities, farms, schools, hospitals, appliances, wonder drugs, and highways all attest to the tremendous material progress we have made. This country's high standard of living has made us the envy of the rest of the world, and the American industrial machine is without parallel in either peace or war. Businessmen, farmers, scientists, laborers, engineers, clerical and professional workers—every segment of American society contributes the know-how which makes possible our technological progress and our constantly expanding productive capacity.

A good share of the credit for American productivity must go to our schools and colleges. There is strong evidence that the more highly educated the citizen, the greater the likelihood of a successful and prosperous Nation and of the development and maintenance of a high level of living. In recent years the fact that education and economic productivity go hand in hand has been well substantiated by many studies, including some made by the United States Chamber of Commerce. Publications issued by that organization show that education pays, that it is an investment in people which yields high economic dividends. As graduates of Bryant College, with its notable record in the field of business education, you may be expected to add convincingly to the proof that education steps up living standards. The economic productivity which I am confident you can develop and sustain will reflect credit on this fine institution and the work you have done here.

But productive citizenship in the mid-twentieth century goes far beyond the economic realm. Our Nation has adopted a long-term program of building and maintaining the defense of freedom. Together with our allies, we are mobilizing to meet the threat of Communist imperialism. We have set upon this course because it is a necessary step in deterring the enemies of democracy from further aggression, and because it offers the best guarantee of national security in the tragic event that a global military conflict should be forced upon us. In accepting the responsibilities of international leadership in the fight against totalitarianism, we have made it clear that we intend to lead from strength.

Mr. Charles E. Wilson, the Director of Defense Mobilization sounded the keynote of America's defense effort recently when he said: "It's strength that works; let's work for strength." To my mind, that dramatic phrase is also the most effective way to summarize the job which will face the members of this graduating class for some years to come.

If it is "strength that works" during these years of tension and crisis, then what kinds of strength must we build? And how can each of us, as productive citizens, help "work for strength?" I should like to discuss these questions briefly with you today, first, by reviewing the strengths we must develop and, secondly, by giving specific attention to the major contributions which your education at Bryant College should enable you to make to the national welfare.

I believe that we must build and maintain our national strength along five fronts: the military, the economic, the political, the psychological, and the moral. The struggle with Communist imperialism is total, encompassing every phase of our society. The disciples of the Kremlin are dedicated to the destruction of all free institutions. To them, the military conflict is but an extension of the battle which they wage relentlessly along the other fronts. The only way to thwart their strategy of subversion and aggression is to strengthen our defenses on every front, the nonmilitary as well as the military.

Since the United Nations moved to halt aggression in Korea, we have been rapidly rebuilding our military establishment. During the next few years many of you will be called upon to lay aside your personal plans and serve in some branch of the Armed Forces. The discussions which preceded the recent amendment and reenactment of the Selective Service Act demonstrated clearly, I believe, that the great majority of our people recognize the necessity of maintaining a strong defensive military position. Those who cherish freedom must be equipped and prepared to defend it.

Secondly, our national economy is being expanded and strengthened to meet the needs of the free world. Through the mutual security program now under discussion in the Congress, we hope to continue the economic and military assistance to our allies which we began so dramatically in 1947 with the Greek-Turkish aid programs and the Marshall plan. The public support which the American people are giving the defense mobilization and foreign economic assistance programs is encouraging evidence that we understand the international role our country must continue to play in promoting economic stability throughout the free world.

Thirdly, in the political realm the United States has taken the lead in strengthening the powers of the United Nations, in supporting the specialized United Nations agencies, and in encouraging the establishment of regional collective security arrangements among the free nations, such as the Inter-American and North Atlantic Treaty Organizations. Our record in world affairs since 1945 is unmistakable proof that we intend to give strong and continuing leadership to the development of an international community dedicated to the maintenance of peace with justice.

On the fourth front, the psychological, the problem of meeting the Communist threat becomes more complex. In recent months we have taken steps to counteract the Kremlin's big-lie propaganda campaign with our own campaign of truth. The Voice of America, together with the privately sponsored Radio Free Europe, is reaching people behind the iron curtain with the truth about their despotic overlords, the achievements of the collective efforts of free nations against communism in Korea, and the record of American democracy. (This campaign is greatly feared in the Kremlin—so much so, in fact, that the Soviet Government employs 1,000 transmitters and over 5,000 laborers in a concentrated round-the-clock effort to jam Voice of America broadcasts.) Our educational exchange arrangements, in which teachers and students go to live and work in other countries, and the

point 4 program for giving technical assistance to the world's underdeveloped areas are likewise proving to be strong psychological, as well as material weapons. They let other people see us as we really are and observe our attitudes, our habits, and our free institutions. Almost invariably we win support for democracy in general and our own country in particular.

It is my belief that Americans generally are awakening to the need for strengthening, the fifth, the moral front, in the present conflict. We are beginning to realize that it is impossible to draw a sharp line between foreign and domestic policy. Our actions at home are inextricably entwined with our policies abroad. There is a growing understanding among us that America's role in world affairs can be seriously jeopardized by inconsistencies between what we profess to believe and what we actually do. If we wish to win the ideological war for the minds of men, we must prove to the peoples of Asia, Africa, the Near East, and South America, as well as to our European allies, that American deeds match the American creed. We must show that we really believe in freedom for all without regard to race, creed, color, or national extraction; and that our policies and practices at home and abroad reflect these convictions.

Those are the five kinds of strength we must build and sustain during this prolonged period of world tension: military strength to deter aggression and defend the free world in concert with our allies; economic strength to stabilize and immunize free economies against the Communist virus; political strength to rally the partisans of freedom to the cause of collective security and international cooperation; psychological strength to counter the propaganda of communism with the truth about democracy; and moral strength to prove the rich spiritual qualities inherent in our way of life.

It's that kind of five-front "strength that works" in these perilous times, and the rate at which we continue to increase our total strength in the months and years ahead will depend primarily on our effectiveness as productive citizens. Graduates of Bryant College, schooled in business education, will have continuing and oftentimes unique opportunities to add new, broad, and exciting dimensions to the concept of productivity. I should like now to outline some of those opportunities for you, to show how you can help your country "work for strength" along the five fronts I've just discussed.

I have already spoken of the personal contribution which many of you will make to the strengthening of our Military Establishment. But the responsibility to serve in the Armed Forces or to assist with the defense effort in some other capacity is only part of the job we now face in connection with the military effort. The Communists are past masters at throwing their opponents off guard and softening them with conciliatory gestures. Today, after our experiences of the past 6 years, it seems impossible that Americans and the other free peoples would allow themselves to be thrown off balance again, that propaganda could talk us into letting our guard down once more. But a strong military position is difficult to acquire and still harder to maintain. Unless we study and understand Communist tactics for what they are—carefully planned campaigns which include deceiving periods of peace and quiet—we run the grave danger of falling into their trap, of letting our military muscles grow weak and flabby. We must have an alert, enlightened public opinion therefore to support our military program—a public opinion that refuses to compromise our national security. That puts the ultimate responsibility for developing the Nation's military posture squarely up to all of us as citizens.

Graduates of this institution should be particularly qualified to render significant services to the economic phase of the mobilization program. With your training in business education, you should understand the intricacies of the free economy, the close relationship which exists among all segments of society, and the contributions which each group—business, labor, agriculture—makes to the total national interest. Many of you will probably be working in distributive occupations and therefore you will be sensitive to many problems that often make it difficult to buttress our tremendous capacity to produce goods with an equitable system of distribution, a system designed to make more goods increasingly available to more people.

Your insights into business administration will help you to lead your countrymen in the fight against our No. 1 domestic enemy—inflation. All of our leaders and economists agree that inflation is a most serious threat to our national well-being and to our international position. Mr. Wilson has stated that the internal dangers from inflation would wreck our economy and bring about extreme social disorganization. It was Lenin, the founder of modern Russia, who said that "the ruination of a nation's currency is the easiest route to revolution." There is much evidence in contemporary international politics to prove that Lenin's midcentury followers are counting on an economic collapse in the United States.

If the concept of productive citizenship is to mean anything at all, it seems to me that it should mean working together to strengthen the Nation's economic system. The factors which contribute to inflation are extremely complex; in order to stop it, therefore, it is necessary for each of us to understand these complexities and act to solve the problem in all of its phases. Prices, wages, profits, national expenditures, taxes, credit, currency policies, farmers, laborers, businessmen, industrialists, Government, salaried people, consumers—all of these factors and groups affect and are affected by the national economy; hence, each is related directly or indirectly to the problem of inflation. Solving that problem is a long, hard, painstaking process requiring knowledge, patience, and determination. All Americans should be working day in and day out to fight inflation, and citizens with backgrounds in business education, because of their special qualifications, should be leading the fight.

The success of American efforts to build political strength in the international community will be measured, in the last analysis, by the breadth and depth of our knowledge about critical world problems and by the extent to which each individual citizen applies that knowledge through active participation in public affairs. For example, today large portions of the world, such as southeast Asia and the Near East, are in the throes of social and economic revolution, characterized by rapid change of political institutions and the growth of nationalism. The Communists take every opportunity to channel those revolutions to their own ends. It is necessary that we understand what is going on in those regions and what the Communists are trying to do there.

If we are to check the spread of communism we must study its strategy and tactics; we must know something about its origins, history, theories, recent developments, and practical consequences on the world scene, no matter how repugnant these things may be to us individually or to our national ideals. If we are to be politically strong, we must not allow ourselves to be maneuvered by our opponents into a defenseless situation, where reason and objectivity and clear thinking are deposed by panic and hysteria and ignorance. Misinformation and intel-

lectual blindness are poor weapons with which to fight the disciplined, subtle, fanatic followers of Lenin and Stalin.

The productive citizen in a democracy knows that he shares the responsibility for deciding critical public issues. It matters not what his specialized vocation may be. Citizenship knows no occupational lines. Whatever your specialized field may be, however competent and efficient you are in exercising your particular vocational skills—your education and training will have come to nought unless you recognize a broad-gauged concept of productive citizenship; unless you help your country work for political strength in world affairs by taking an active interest and part in national and international problems.

On the psychological front the Communists breed strife, suspicion, and distrust among all groups in society—turning labor against management, race against race, neighbor against neighbor. Communism magnifies all political and economic differences into major social ruptures. It thrives on hate and fosters insecurity. It helps engender poverty while claiming to work for plenty. It preaches peace and foments war. It masks injustice, violence, and terror with propaganda slogans about justice and democracy.

We must continue to build strength to meet communism's psychological weapons head on. I have already mentioned the campaign of truth our Government is waging through its information and exchange program—programs which urgently deserve our thoughtful study and support. But beyond that I believe graduates of Bryant College will be equipped to make particularly significant contributions to the psychological struggle against communism in their everyday lives. First of all, you can contribute by developing your occupational competency—your on-the-job productivity—to the greatest possible degree. Communism fears our free productive system because it is tangible and forcible evidence that gives the lie to radio Moscow's incessant charges of "decadent capitalism." By doing your job and doing it well you are helping to forge the weapon of truth about American productivity.

You can also help strengthen freedom's cause psychologically by cultivating socially constructive attitudes toward the people you work with, by recognizing the dignity of work, and by striving to develop better relations among all groups contributing to our economic system. The relations of the worker to his employer, the relations between coworkers, the relations between the worker and his community—these are critical areas in human relations that should be of deep concern to men and women with business training and education. Today the worker must be socially and civically skilled—competent in the art of working cooperatively and living together with his fellow community builders. Those are skills that the Communists don't want us to develop, because once again it gives the lie to their campaign of hate and coercion. A united nation is not easy to conquer.

Building strength on the moral front is perhaps the greatest challenge of all to productive citizenship. For the major problems of our time are moral problems. We cannot hope to answer critical social, economic, and political questions unless we first know what it is we believe in and what we are willing to defend. The challenge confronting us, as citizens, today is as great as that which faced our forefathers over 150 years ago. Then, Americans stated their convictions in a document which thrilled the entire world. "We hold these truths to be self-evident," said the Nation's founders—and our cherished ideal of equality of opportunity was born. The beliefs expressed in the Declaration of Independence and the Preamble to the Constitu-

tion were a ringing answer to the despotism of an earlier day, a reaffirmation of the great moral tenets of our western Judea-Christian civilization. Today, we must reaffirm those convictions in tones no less ringing, in answer to a new despotic ideology which seeks to destroy liberty and justice.

The need for an overwhelming build-up of America's moral and ethical strength was recently summarized by Gen. Omar Bradley, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in the following words: "We have too many men of science, too few men of God. We have grasped the mystery of the atom, and forgotten the Sermon on the Mount. We live in a world which has achieved brilliance without wisdom, power without conscience; a world of nuclear giants and ethical dwarfs. We know more about war than we know about peace."

Graduates of our colleges and universities like yourselves have been given the education which can be used to good advantage in living a satisfying personal life. You also have a moral responsibility to use your abilities in creating a better society in America and in the world at large. Concern for the welfare of other men, cooperation with them for goals so worthy as to be universally valid, conviction that such ideals will triumph over lower, more materialistic aims—these moral imperatives are the guideposts to productive citizenship, the wellspring of the "strength that works." I am confident you will work to help your Nation build that strength.

Letter to President Truman From Soviet President Shvernik

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Strictly but Strictly Phony," published in the Chicago Daily Sun-Times and reprinted as a public service by the International Latex Corp., of Dover, Del., in the New York Times on Monday, August 13, 1951.

This editorial shows that the recent peace message from Soviet President Shvernik is a renewal of the same two-faced Soviet policy of talking peace while creating and fostering strife and war.

In reprinting this editorial, the International Latex Corp. has reminded the United States public of the many previous instances in which Communist peace propaganda was poured forth at just the right time to camouflage the Soviet's aggressive efforts at world domination.

We are engaged in an ideological battle for the minds of men. Phony peace propaganda is just as much a part of this battle as is a campaign of military aggression. It is not easy to recognize and combat a false world or idea, but we must do so if we are to win the confidence of the world and enlist ever-broader support in our efforts to put down and prevent aggression.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of August 13, 1951]

STRICTLY BUT STRICTLY PHONY

Americans should beware of being fooled by the Russian Government's latest tactic in the cold war.

The "peace" message sent to President Truman from Soviet President Shvernik is no peace message at all. It is a double-edged propaganda device.

It obviously was written for the Russian masses and as material for United States Communist stooges. It is designed to intensify the suspicion and fear of Russians against America. It tries to convince the American people that it is our elected leaders, and not the Kremlin bosses, who poise the world on the edge of atomic warfare.

The proposal for a five-power peace pact is not new. This was contained in a Soviet resolution turned down as mere propaganda by the United Nations last November.

The latest piece of double talk from the lords of the Kremlin contains downright lies. It says the Soviet Union made repeated proposals for a peaceful settlement of the Korean conflict. Those proposals were blackmail demands, from Stalin himself, that his Red Chinese pals be admitted to the U. N. and allowed to take over Formosa. These had nothing to do with Korea's right to self-government.

And get this. The Russians say flatly that as a result of their recent intervention there has been "a cessation of military activities in Korea."

That's the tip-off that the resolution is primarily designed for home consumption. Russians are being led to believe the war in Korea is over, as a result of kindly suggestions from peace lover Stalin.

It is obvious that the Russian bosses wrote their latest literary epic as an answer to the resolution of friendship for the Russian people passed by Congress and sent to Russia by President Truman on July 7.

In the month that has elapsed, the Russian press hasn't touched the resolution. Every day the Voice of America taunted the Russian leaders to print it. Now that they have rigged up a reply, we can expect America's friendship resolution to be passed on to the Russian people, along with the lying rebuttal.

Much is being made in some circles over the fact that the latest message from the Soviet Union follows other "peace overtures." These include Soviet U. N. Delegate Malik's suggestion for a truce in Korea, the publication of a new English-language periodical, News, which takes a friendly attitude toward outside nations, and the revival of the Soviet line about peaceful coexistence.

The record shows Russia talks peace out of one side of her mouth and strife out of the other.

In 1946 Stalin talked about "friendly and lasting cooperation" while his delegates were torpedoing the Baruch plan for international control of atomic energy. In 1947 Stalin told Harold Stassen he wanted to cooperate with the United States, and 2 months later Russia withdrew from a conference on the Marshall plan.

In 1948 Stalin sent a peace message about coexistence to Henry Wallace which was followed shortly afterward by the seizure of Czechoslovakia and the blockade of Berlin.

The Korean war was triggered off 3 months after the phony Stockholm peace hullabaloo.

And, even while Shvernik makes his play to the American people, Communists are whooping it up against us in East Berlin. The Soviet press tells Russians that displaced persons from Europe are being sold into slavery in the United States. And Pravda, the official Kremlin paper, reminded its readers less than 3 weeks ago of Stalin's

own words that "the Soviet Union is the base of the world revolutionary movement."

In the latest Soviet policy statement, the claim is made that "the Soviet Union has no aggressive plans and does not threaten any country or any people."

This will be grimly humorous to the Poles and Czechs who are caught in the Soviet embrace. It will hardly be convincing enough to relax conditions in Yugoslavia or Iran.

This country must always be ready to talk peace any time that the Russians show sincere signs that they are not engaging in a Marxist tactic of strategic but temporary retreat from their goal of world domination.

But while the Kremlin sends out peace doves (chiseled out of ice in this cold war) General Ridgway is getting a taste of what it's actually like to try to get real peace with the Communists. They are slippery. They break agreements.

General Ridgway is showing on a small scale how we must deal with the Russians on a big scale:

Meet with them. Talk with them. But be ready for a double cross and be prepared to shoot from the hip. (From the Chicago Daily Sun-Times.)

(Presented as a public service by International Latex Corp., Playtex Park, Dover, Del.)

The Forgotten Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Forgotten Man," written by William G. Sumner and published in the United States News of several years ago. The editorial still seems to be highly up to date.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the United States News of November 2, 1936]

THE FORGOTTEN MAN

(By William Graham Sumner)

Now who is the forgotten man? He is the simple, honest laborer, ready to earn his living by productive work. We pass him by because he is independent, self-supporting, and asks no favors. He does not appeal to the emotions or excite the sentiments. He only wants to make a contract and fulfill it, with respect on both sides and favor on neither side. He must get his living out of the capital of the country. The larger the capital is, the better living he can get. Every particle of capital which is wasted on the vicious, the idle, and the shiftless is so much taken from the capital available to reward the independent and productive laborer.

But we stand with our backs to the independent and productive laborer all the time. We do not remember him because he makes no clamor; but I appeal to you whether he is not the man who ought to be remembered first of all, and whether, on any sound social theory, we ought not to protect him against the burdens of the good-for-nothing.

In these last years I have read hundreds of articles and heard scores of sermons and speeches which were really glorifications of the good-for-nothing, as if these were the

charge of society, recommended by right reason to its care and protection. We are addressed all the time as if those who are respectable were to blame because some are not so, and as if there were an obligation on the part of those who have done their duty toward those who have not done their duty.

Every man is bound to take care of himself and his family and to do his share in the work of society. It is totally false that one who has done so is bound to bear the care and charge of those who are wretched because they have not done so. The silly popular notion is that the beggars live at the expense of the rich, but the truth is that those who eat and produce not, live at the expense of those who labor and produce.

LOTS OF OUR LAWS MERELY CREATE JOBS

I have shown how, in times past, the history of States has been a history of selfishness, cupidity, and robbery, and I have affirmed that now and always the problems of government are how to deal with these same vices of human nature. People are always prone to believe that there is something metaphysical and sentimental about civil affairs, but there is not. Civil institutions are constructed to protect, either directly or indirectly, the property of men and the honor of women against the vices and passions of human nature.

In our day and country, the problem presents new phases, but it is there just the same as it ever was, and the problem is only the more difficult for us because of its new phase which prevents us from recognizing it. In fact, our people are raving and struggling against it in a kind of blind way, not yet having come to recognize it. More than half of their blows, at present, are misdirected and fall of their object, but they will be aimed better by and by.

There is a great deal of clamor about watering stocks and the power of combined capital, which is not very intelligent or well-directed. The evil and abuse which people are groping after in all these denunciations is jobbery.

By jobbery, I mean the constantly apparent effort to win wealth, not by honest and independent production, but by some sort of a scheme for extorting other people's product from them. A large part of our legislation consists in making a job for somebody.

MUCH WASTE IN MISUSE OF PUBLIC FUNDS

Public buildings are jobs, not always, but in most cases. The buildings are not needed at all or are costly beyond what is useful or even decently luxurious. Internal improvements are jobs. They are carried out, not because they are needed in themselves, but because they will serve the turn of some private interest, often incidentally that of the very legislators who pass the appropriations for them.

A man who wants a farm, instead of going out where there is plenty of land available for it, goes down under the Mississippi River to make a farm, and then wants his fellow citizens to be taxed to dike the river so as to keep it off his farm.

The California hydraulic miners have washed the gold out of the hillsides and have washed the dirt down into the valleys to the ruin of the rivers and the farms. They want the Federal Government to remove this dirt at the national expense.

The silver miners, finding that their product is losing value in the market, get the Government to go into the market as a great buyer in the hope of sustaining the price.

The National Government is called upon to buy or hire unsalable ships; to dig canals which will not pay; to educate illiterates in the States which have not done their duty at the expense of the States which have done their duty as to education; to buy up

telegraphs which no longer pay; and to provide the capital for enterprises of which private individuals are to win the profits.

We are called upon to squander millions on swamps and creeks; millions on the Mississippi River, and many more millions to pensions. This is the great plan of all living on each other. The pensions in England used to be given to aristocrats who had political power, in order to corrupt them. Here the pensions are given to the great democratic mass who have the political power, in order to corrupt them.

We have several hundred thousand Federal officeholders and I do not know how many State and municipal officeholders. Of course public officers are necessary and it is an economical organization of society to set apart some of its members for civil functions, but if the number of persons drawn from production and supported by the producers while engaged in civil functions is in undue proportion to the total population, there is economic loss.

If public offices are treated as spoils or benefices or sinecures, then they are jobs and only constitute part of the pillage.

VOTERS REALLY ARE TO BLAME FOR BAD LAWS

On every hand you find this jobbery. The Government is to give every man a pension, and every man an office, and every man a tax to raise the price of his product, and to clean out every man's creek for him, and to buy all his unsalable property, and to provide him with plenty of currency to pay his debts, and to educate his children, and to give him the use of a library and a park and a museum and a gallery of pictures. On every side the doors of waste and extravagance stand open; and spend, squander, plunder, and grab are the watchwords.

We grumble some about it and talk about the greed of corporations and the power of capital and the wickedness of stock gambling. Yet, we elect the legislators who do all this work. Of course, we should never think of blaming ourselves for electing men to represent and govern us, who, if I may use the slang expression, give us away. What man ever blamed himself for his misfortune? We groan about monopolies and talk about more laws to prevent the wrongs done by chartered corporations. Who made the charters? Our representatives. Who elected such representatives? We did. How can we get bad lawmakers to make a law which shall prevent bad lawmakers from making a bad law? That is, really, what we are trying to do.

If we are a free, self-governing people, all our misfortunes come right home to ourselves and we can blame nobody else. Is anyone astonished to find that men are greedy, whether they are incorporated or not? Is it a revelation to find that we need, in our civil affairs, to devise guaranties against selfishness, rapacity, and fraud? I have ventured to affirm that Government has never had to deal with anything else.

THE FORGOTTEN MAN IS MADE TO FOOT THE BILL

Now, I have said that this jobbery means waste, plunder, and loss, and I defined it at the outset as the system of making a chance to extort part of his product from somebody else. Now comes the question: Who pays for it all? The system of plundering each other soon destroys all that it deals with. It produces nothing. Wealth comes only from production and all that the wrangling grabbers, loafers, and jobbers, get to deal with comes from somebody's toil and sacrifice. Who, then, is he who provides it all? Go and find him and you will have once more before you the forgotten man.

You will find him hard at work because he has a great many to support. Nature has done a great deal for him in giving him a fertile soil and an excellent climate, and he

wonders why it is that, after all, his scale of comfort is so moderate. He has to get out of the soil enough to pay all his taxes and that means the cost of all the jobs and the funds for all the plunder.

The forgotten man is delving away in patient industry, supporting his family, paying his taxes, casting his vote, supporting the church and the school, reading his newspaper, and cheering for the politician of his admiration, but he is the only one for whom there is no provision in the great scramble and the big divide.

Such is the forgotten man. He works, he votes, generally he pays—but he always pays—yes, above all, he pays. He does not want an office; his name never gets into the newspaper except when he gets married or dies. He keeps production going on. He contributes to the strength of parties. He is flattered before election. He is strongly patriotic. He is wanted wherever, in his little circle, there is work to be done or counsel to be given. He may grumble some occasionally to his wife and family, but he does not frequent the grocery or talk politics at the tavern.

Consequently, he is forgotten. He is a commonplace man. He gives no trouble. He excites no admiration. He is not in any way a hero (like a popular orator); or a problem (like tramps and outcasts); nor notorious (like criminals); nor an object of sentiment (like the poor and weak); nor a burden (like paupers and loafers); nor an object out of which social capital may be made (like the beneficiaries of a church and state charities); nor an object for charitable aid and protection (like animals treated with cruelty); nor the object of a job (like the ignorant and illiterate); nor one over whom sentimental economists and statesmen can parade their fine sentiment (like inefficient workmen and shiftless artisans). Therefore, he is forgotten.

All the burdens fall on him, or on her, for it is time to remember that the forgotten man is not seldom a woman.

GOVERNMENT IS ADDING TO HIS BURDENS

It is plain enough that the forgotten man and the forgotten woman are the very life and substance of society. They are the ones who ought to be first and always remembered. They are always forgotten by sentimentalists, philanthropists, reformers, enthusiasts, and every description of speculator in sociology, political economy, or political science.

If a student of any of these sciences ever comes to understand the position of the forgotten man and to appreciate his true value, you will find such student an uncompromising advocate of the strictest scientific thinking on all social topics, and a cold and hard-hearted skeptic toward all artificial schemes of social amelioration.

If it is desired to bring about social improvements, bring us a scheme for relieving the forgotten man of some of his burdens. He is our productive force which we are wasting. Let us stop wasting his force. Then we shall have a clean and simple gain for the whole society.

The forgotten man is weighted down with the cost and burden of the schemes for making everybody happy, with the cost of public beneficence, with the support of all the loafers, with the loss of all the economic quackery, with the cost of all the jobs. Let us remember him a little while. Let us take some of the burdens off him. Let us turn our pity on him instead of on the good-for-nothing. It will be only justice to him, and society will greatly gain by it.

THREATS TO SECURITY OF HIS EARNINGS

The forgotten man is never a pauper. He almost always has a little capital because it belongs to the character of the man to save something. He never has more than a little.

He is, therefore, poor in the popular sense, although in the correct sense he is not so. I have said already that if you learn to look for the forgotten man and to care for him, you will be very skeptical toward all philanthropic and humanitarian schemes. It is clear now that the interest of the forgotten man and the interest of the poor, the weak, and the other petted classes are in antagonism. In fact, the warning to you to look for the forgotten man comes the minute that the orator or writer begins to talk about the poor man. That minute the forgotten man is in danger of a new assault, and if you intend to meddle in the matter at all, then is the minute for you to look about for him and to give him your aid.

Hence, if you care for the forgotten man, you will be sure to be charged with not caring for the poor. Whatever you do for any of the petted classes wastes capital. If you do anything for the forgotten man, you must secure him his earnings and savings, that is, you legislate for the security of capital and for its free employment; you must oppose paper money, wildcat banking, and usury laws and you must maintain the inviolability of contracts. Hence you must be prepared to be told that you favor the capitalist class, the enemy of the poor man.

What the forgotten man needs, therefore, is that we come to a clearer understanding of liberty and to a more complete realization of it. Every step which we win in liberty will set the forgotten man free from some of his burdens and allow him to use his powers for himself and for the commonwealth.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Irony Fearfulness Is Delaying the Seaway," published in the Minneapolis Star of August 11, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN IRONIC FEARFULNESS IS DELAYING THE SEAWAY

Leo Sonderegger's reports on the St. Lawrence seaway project, now running in the Star, are a fine example of how a fresh eye sees things that a tired eye misses. Sonderegger recently came to the Star from the Providence (R. I.) Bulletin.

As he makes acquaintance with the seaway project for the first time, Sonderegger reacts with something like amazement that this entirely logical North American internal development should have been delayed so long.

To upper midwesterners who have lived for years with the self-serving obstructionism, the interregional log-rolling, and seaboard short-sightedness that have blocked the project, these snares seem a sort of fact of life to be accepted like human orneriness.

To a newcomer, encountering them for the first time, they seem shocking in the light of the resources wasted and the senseless hobbles placed on the free growth of the country's great and growing heartland.

The delay in completing the seaway puts the country in an almost shameful position. America could divert the waters of the Colo-

rado to southern California, turn the State's Central Valley into a productive garden, harness the energies of the Tennessee and the Columbia—but the most logical development of all it cannot touch.

And this is the same country that can find billions for the development of Europe and Asia, and that talks of point 4 programs for undeveloped areas.

Sonderegger discovers that interests that have blocked the seaway for years now concede they can't block it much longer. The key to this is the brutal fact that either a channel to deep water will be opened to let in offshore iron ore, or the steel industry will leave the Great Lakes Basin.

To a long-time supporter of the seaway like the Star, this has been obvious for some time. It has also been obvious that when the seaway opens, established patterns of commerce and transportation in the upper Midwest will be wrenched and shifted.

Fear of the stresses a new transportation artery will cause—unwillingness to embrace change in confidence that it will mean progress—is at the bottom of the decisive margin of remaining opposition. This fear is an ironic thing.

In the committee vote that postponed the seaway yet another year, Republican members of the committee voted almost solidly for delay. Had two minority members switched to support, the project would have carried.

The irony of all this is that it was the Republican Party that opened the public purse nearly a century ago to push the railways across the western prairies and mountains before there was anything for the railways to haul.

Price Roll-Backs and the Capehart Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, Woodrow Wilson once said that the Congress is divided into three branches: the House, the Senate, and the conference committees. Of necessity, the conference committee, in ironing out differences between a House and a Senate version of a bill and in reaching compromises, must be given extensive powers in the writing of legislation.

The conference committee on the Defense Production Act amendments of 1951 sat through long, punishing hours, and worked diligently to bring out a bill under heavy pressure from an impending deadline of July 31, when the basic law was to expire. So what I say is not meant in the way of criticism.

It should be remembered, however, that one of the most important provisions of the conference report, which has since come to be known as the Capehart amendment, dealing with limitations on price roll-backs, was suggested in the early hours of the morning, after an exceptionally long session, and was adopted by the Senate little more than 12 hours later. It is virtually impossible for any group to foresee the ramifications of such an amendment in so short a time.

Now there has been time to study the amendment and we know more about what it means. Mr. Alfred Friendly, of the Washington Post, has written a clear and comprehensive article about the effects of the so-called Capehart amendment, which appeared in the Washington Post of August 13, which I ask be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

One of the purposes of placing a limitation on roll-backs, I believe, was to reduce the uncertainties under which business would have to operate. The conclusion I draw, both from letters I have been receiving and from this article, is that the Capehart amendment has not reduced, but has added to the uncertainties of business activity.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW LAW FELT LIKELY TO FORCE PRICES UP
(By Alfred Friendly)

The amendments to inflation control legislation recently adopted by Congress permit prices to be stabilized—but on a plateau substantially higher than at present and at a date still far in the future.

This is the judgment of officials whose job it has been to analyze the new law and to try to carry it out. They have determined on a policy of tough enforcement, but are frank to admit that in certain fundamental areas, administrative problems are almost insuperable.

The result, they feel, is that the law will serve as a positive impetus to higher prices, literally commanding that ceilings be raised.

STRONG ENFORCEMENT PLANNED

Economic Stabilizer Eric A. Johnston was reported to have told the President's Defense Mobilization Board last week that as a result of the amendments Congress made in extending the Defense Production Act, living costs will rise from 5 to 8 percent in a year's time.

Top officials of the Office of Price Stabilization see it about the same way.

Confronted with several possible courses of action on the law, the administration has determined to seek as strong an enforcement of the measure as it can. The alternative, which was to decontrol entirely, in the hope that a free market would lead to a stable price level not too much higher than that obtainable under the feeble law, was an attractive one, but was finally rejected.

The principal reason for this decision, it is known, is the world shortage of metals. Without price controls, items such as copper, zinc, steel, aluminum, and some of the special nonferrous alloy elements would soar out of sight—and inevitably drive other prices up with them.

WORST SINGLE FEATURE

OPS and other administration figures concerned with stabilization are agreed that the worst single feature in the new law is the so-called Capehart amendment.

Dreamed up at 3 o'clock one morning in a Senate-House conference committee meeting, it is more inflationary than any provision in the bills when they originally passed in either Chamber.

It provides that no matter what ceiling OPS may provide for an item or an industry, any person may obtain a price ceiling for his product that reflects all his added costs from the period before Korea until July 26, this year.

Previously, the OPS policy was to set price ceilings based on the pre-Korean level plus all direct cost increases since then, that is, increases in the cost of labor and materials, for the most part. As long as the industry's profits were maintained at previous average

levels, the individual manufacturer had to absorb any increases in indirect costs, such as overhead, advertising, selling, etc.

TRICKS OF ACCOUNTING

Now, however, a manufacturer can obtain a ceiling that reflects increases in all his costs, direct and indirect.

At first glance, that sounds fair enough. But the curious fact is that most manufacturers simply do not know what their unit costs are. Not 1 out of 10 has records that really show the increase of his indirect (as distinct from labor and materials) costs since Korea.

Moreover, in the present stage of the art, one man's cost accounting can be just about what he wants it to be.

A revealing example is an experiment made by a rubber company which figured out the unit cost of one of its products by six different systems of accounting, all acceptable as proper methods. The result was six different figures, varying from the lowest to the highest by 100 percent.

Suppose that manufacturers apply to OPS for 100,000 new ceilings, a moderate estimate. Suppose also OPS can examine their books and records and verify their costs in 3 days, an equally overoptimistic assumption. That would mean some 300,000 man-days of work to be done, necessitating the doubling or tripling of the OPS staff. And even if the job were undertaken, it would be, as indicated above, almost impossible to challenge the cost figures presented by each company in the first place.

As a practical matter, then, OPS is left in the position of pretty much having to grant every higher ceiling price that is demanded. If any industry-wide price is set, it will have to be at the cost level, figured by the Capehart amendment system, of the highest-cost producer.

COULD EXPORT INFLATION

Under the amendment, a manufacturer could buy some metals abroad, at black-market prices double or triple the present domestic ceilings, and force OPS to set a ceiling for his product that reflected the black-market price of the metal. The effect of such a practice on driving up the world price of scarce metals, and exporting our own inflation to our allies abroad is obvious.

The large auto companies have already applied to the OPS for price increases under the Capehart amendment averaging 9 percent. Those increases, plus the higher prices now going into effect for barbers and beauty shops—the new law exempted them from all price ceilings—will alone account for about 1-percent increase in the cost of living, officials calculate.

Another damaging provision in the new law provides that wholesalers and retailers must be allowed to take their pre-Korean percentage mark-ups on the things they sell.

Previously, OPS had restricted them to their old dollars-and-cents margins. Thus, earlier this year when a 3-percent price increase was granted to the auto makers, the percentage increase to the consumer was only about 2 percent, for the seller was allowed to add to his price only the exact amount of the increase to the manufacturer.

Note how this will work in the future. Say that a wholesaler buys a product for \$10, applies a 30-percent mark-up and sells it for \$13. Assume that under the Capehart amendment, a new price ceiling for the manufacturer is set at \$12. Under previous OPS policy, the wholesaler could add his former dollars-and-cents margin, \$3, and sell the article for a new price of \$15.

LIKE ROLLING SNOWBALL

Now, however, he can continue adding his 30 percent, and sell the product at 30 percent above his \$12 cost, at \$15.60.

This addition of the percentage mark-up can and will accumulate like a rolling snow-

ball, at every selling stage from the manufacturer up through the jobber and retailer.

With price ceilings subject to advances of this sort, and with profits therefore mounting, the reaction of labor is not hard to figure out. Under such conditions, the attempt to keep pay ceilings at more or less their present levels will be doomed.

Officials think it makes little sense even to attempt holding the line at its present point and are struggling only to keep wage increases down to a fair ratio with price jumps.

Government analysts of the new legislation believe that not until most of all the added costs up to last July 26 have been taken into account in new and higher price ceilings, can the cost of living once again be stabilized as it has been for the past 3 or 4 months.

The upward adjustments, they think, will go on for the next 9 to 12 months.

Moral Rearmament

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, last week a graphic record of how the principles of moral rearmament have helped to settle many business and labor troubles in Miami, Fla., was brought to the attention of Congress in special ceremonies in the offices of the Speaker of the House and the Secretary of the Senate here in the Capitol Building. The record has been compiled in a book entitled "An Idea Takes Wings," which was presented to Mr. RAYBURN and Mr. Biddle.

Presentation of the book was made by the entire crew of a National Airlines DC-6 with members of the Florida delegation attending the ceremony. A message to the Senate and House from Mayor William M. Wolfarth, of Miami, was presented along with the book.

The National Airlines crew, which is based in Miami, was selected to make the presentation because a threatened pilot strike was brought to a screeching halt last January when the pilots and management of the airline announced they had reached complete agreement on a long list of grievances after both sides had applied to the dispute the principles of moral rearmament—complete honesty and not who is right but what is right.

Members of the National DC-6 crew participating were Capt. Samuel Stola, First Officer W. H. Wieland, Flight Engineer William McKendree, and Stewardesses June MacDonald and Nina Davis.

The presentation here in Washington is a part of a world-wide plan conceived by Mayor Wolfarth and a group of Miami-based pilots to take this Miami story to all of the principal cities touched by airlines operating out of Miami, including North and South America and the capitals of Western Europe. For example, Pan American World Airways pilots are delivering copies of the book to 45 Latin-American cities, all on the same day, August 16.

Copies of this book will be distributed to all Members of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the story from the Miami Herald of July 4, 1951, announcing this plan, plus the text of the letter which Mayor Wolfarth is sending to Members of Congress with the booklet *An Idea Takes Wings*.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IDEA ON WINGS—PILOTS TO FLY STORY OF MRA ACROSS NATION

Airline pilots, sold on moral rearmament for settling their own grievances, will fly that story to two continents.

Plans for the unusual program were laid Tuesday at a meeting of pilots, flight attendants, and MRA leaders with Mayor William M. Wolfarth.

The pilots will deliver personal letters from the Miami mayor to mayors of all principal cities touched by airlines operating out of Miami. With them will go the profusely illustrated booklet called *An Idea Takes Wings*.

This is the story of how principles of MRA stopped a threatened pilots' strike against National Airlines last January. It also is a story of MRA in Miami and of its aims in combating communism.

"We will be salesmen in flight," W. T. Babbitt, regional vice president of the Air Line Pilots Association, said. "We will try to blanket the country with the MRA story."

The plan is for pilots to deliver the letters and booklets in person to the mayors in their offices.

Pan American World Airways pilots have a bit different program. They plan to have senior representatives of the line arrange for airport ceremonies in 45 Latin-American cities where stops usually are no longer than 20 minutes.

"We'll pile the whole crew out of the airplane and make the presentation," Capt. Richard Morrissey said. "It will take about 2 weeks to get things lined up, but we expect to be able to cover the whole of Latin America in 24 hours."

CITY OF MIAMI, FLORIDA,
August 6, 1951.

Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: It is with a great deal of interest that I take this opportunity to call your attention to the wonderful work that is now being accomplished through moral rearmament.

I am enclosing a booklet, *An Idea Takes Wings*, which tells how a near miracle in improved human relations was wrought earlier this year in Miami, Florida, my city.

Through moral rearmament, the great force to which I referred above, a long-drawn-out misunderstanding between pilots and management of National Airlines was settled. Mistrust was replaced, almost magically, by mutual respect and complete agreement. This has been followed by equally impressive developments in other airlines.

The booklet tells how these and other magnificent victories of moral rearmament have caught the imagination of this community and of many leaders of American life throughout the Nation.

This booklet tells how a great and growing force for good will and peace among men might well end up in saving the world from the chaos toward which it sometimes seems to be heading and I feel sure you would like to have a part in this wonderful work.

Very sincerely,

WILLIAM M. WOLFARTH,
Mayor of Miami, Fla.

The Delaware Memorial Bridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J ALLEN FREAR, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which appears in the souvenir program issued for the celebration of the dedication of the Delaware River Memorial Bridge, which will take place tomorrow, August 15. The statement was prepared by Mr. J. H. Tyler McConnell, of the Delaware State Highway Department, and Mr. W. A. McWilliams, chief of the Delaware River crossing division.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DELAWARE MEMORIAL BRIDGE

The Delaware Memorial Bridge, containing the sixth longest suspension span in the world, is the culmination of 2½ years of dramatic marine and highway construction which was preceded by many years of careful planning and study. It involved the expenditure of some \$44,000,000 and for the first time physically connects the States of Delaware and New Jersey. By connecting these great States with a four-lane divided highway of concrete and steel, it affords a vital and much-needed link in their respective highway systems and greatly strengthens the transportation network of the Nation.

Pleasure, business, and commercial vehicles traveling along the Atlantic seaboard, whether between the great industrial areas such as Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Wilmington, Baltimore, and Washington, or from any of the metropolitan areas of the East to Florida or the Southeast, will find that the use of the bridge will save them at least half an hour and frequently many times that in crossing the Delaware River. When used in conjunction with the soon-to-be-completed New Jersey Turnpike, a saving of several hours can be realized. During the first year of operation it is anticipated that the average daily traffic over the bridge will be 13,000 vehicles and that on peak days over 30,000 vehicles may use the bridge. The bridge is designed to accommodate any vehicle regardless of size or weight which could legally operate over the highways of the State, even though such vehicles were lined bumper to bumper over the four lanes of the bridge.

The Delaware Memorial Bridge will keep alive and improve those American habits of industry and pleasure which have so unalterably committed this country to highway transportation. In order that these benefits may be enjoyed at once, the bridge is being opened to traffic immediately upon its structural completion even though such use is in advance of the final completion of painting, lighting, and other finishing work.

The bridge, including its approaches, extends for a distance of 3½ miles with the bridge itself measuring more than 2 miles from abutment to abutment. It has a suspended span of 2,150 feet in the center with side suspended spans of 750 feet each. The clearance under the center span is 190 feet above mean high-water which is sufficient to permit the channel underneath to accommodate the largest naval and commercial vessels afloat. This is a necessary requirement since the Delaware River alone affords access to the port of Philadelphia,

its large navy yards, and other shipping centers which crowd its shore.

The piers of the two main towers of the bridge extend 89.5 and 118.5 feet, respectively, below the average river level to a foundation of stiff marine clay. The cables over the tops of these towers are 440 feet above the water, giving to the structure a maximum over-all height of 558.5 feet, which is roughly equivalent to the height of a 45-story office building.

The huge anchorages which hold the ends of the cables on which the actual bridge floor is suspended have over-all heights of 233 and 257 feet, respectively. Two hundred and twenty automobiles could be parked on the area of clay covered by one of these anchorages, the lowest portion of which rests under water in a 32-foot thick layer of 27,000 cubic yards of concrete which required seven and one-half continuous days to pour. The concrete in one anchorage alone is sufficient to have paved a 24-foot wide concrete highway for a distance of 23 miles, and contains over 5,000 tons of steel.

The clay beneath the major foundations was compressed during construction and will continue to consolidate at a decreasing rate until final stability is attained. During the construction period, these massive supports have settled an average of 3 inches, which is actually less than was predicted. An additional downward movement of about 4 inches is anticipated before they come to final position after some 50 or more years of use.

The towers, cables, suspending and suspended structure contain over 20,000 tons of steel and enough pencil-sized wire in the cables to measure 50 times around the State of Delaware. The total amount of structural steel used throughout the entire project is approximately 43,000 tons. Notwithstanding this, the structure is necessarily designed to perform in a flexible manner. Under various conditions of loading, winds, and temperatures, the tops of the towers are expected to move as much as 14 inches toward the shore line and up to 15 inches toward the main span. The accompanying up and down motions at the center of the main span will raise the roadway 4 1/4 feet or lower it 6 1/2 feet. Under the greatest anticipated wind velocity, the main suspended span may move as much as 8 1/2 feet from its normal position. All such movements, however, occur so slowly and cover such a period of time as to render it imperceptible except with instruments.

The entire planning and construction of the project was carried on under the direction of the Delaware State Highway Department and was financed on a self-amortizing basis by bond issues authorized by the Legislature of the State of Delaware. The completed project is dedicated as a magnificent memorial to those men and women of the State of Delaware and of the State of New Jersey who gave their lives in the Armed Forces of the United States of America during World War II.

J. H. T. McCONNELL,
W. A. McWILLIAMS,

WILMINGTON, DEL., August 1, 1951.

The St. Lawrence Story—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the third of a series of articles entitled "The St. Lawrence Story,"

which appeared in the August 9 edition of the Minneapolis Star. This article deals with the power aspects of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project:

THE ST. LAWRENCE STORY—GREAT SOURCE OF POWER WASTED AS SEAWAY LAGS

(By Leo Sonderegger)

(Third of a series)

The mightiest undeveloped source of hydro-electric power on the North American Continent is bleeding its strength into the Atlantic because Congress has not approved the St. Lawrence project.

Since the enabling agreement between Canada and the United States was negotiated in 1941, more than 18,000,000 kilowatts of power that could have been produced from the Long Sault has drained away.

Since the original treaty with Canada was signed in 1832, the loss has amounted to nearly 36 million kilowatts.

Those figures compare with annual needs of about 300,000 kilowatts to run the city of Minneapolis. If the comparison were made on the basis of kilowatt hours, the unit that home electric users find on their monthly bills, the figures for Minneapolis would be well over the billion mark. Those for the Long Sault project would be astronomical.

A little arithmetic produces the fact that six cities the size of Minneapolis could have been lighted and powered by the Long Sault's energy during all those years.

PROJECT RANKS WITH GRAND COULEE

This kind of figuring is not entirely fair to those who oppose the project. It ignores the obvious fact that there will have to be a long period of hard work between official approval and the actual production of power.

But the figures translate into tangibles the meaning of the congressional delay. And they underline the magnitude of this phase of the St. Lawrence development.

The biggest power project in the world is Grand Coulee Dam. Its ultimate capacity will be 1,974,000 kilowatts. At present, following installation of the sixteenth of 18 generators just last April, its capacity is 1,758,000 kilowatts.

That is slightly under capacity of the projected Barnhart Island powerhouse on the St. Lawrence. There, the Long Sault will generate 1,881,000 kilowatts to be divided equally between Canada and the United States.

TREMENDOUS WATER FLOW IS UNIFORM

A good measuring stick in the Midwest is the Missouri Basin development, with its several dams scattered over many hundreds of miles. Initial capacity now under construction is something over 600,000 kilowatts. Another 1,782,000 kilowatts has been authorized.

Two things give the St. Lawrence River its prime value as a source of hydroelectric power. One is its tremendous flow, an average of some 237,000 cubic feet per second. The other is the uniformity of that flow.

The seaway is a series of steps from Lake Superior, 601 feet above sea level, to the Atlantic. The descent of this staircase by a great bulk of water builds up vast energy.

The long row of turbines spinning at Barnhart Island would extract some of that energy to the tune of 2,200,000 horsepower a year.

The Great Lakes not only account for the size of the flow, but they provide a reservoir which keeps it remarkably uniform through wet months and dry. The maximum flow is only a little more than twice the minimum.

That is of major importance in the production of power. The engineers don't have to worry about creating a new reservoir. They already have one containing about half the world's sweet water.

On other big power-producing streams the problem of variation in flow is much greater. TVA engineers, for example, had to contend with a ratio of 115 to 1 between maximum and minimum flow on the Tennessee River in the Wilson Dam area. At the Bonneville Dam site on the Columbia River the ratio was 33 to 1.

Two dams and a powerhouse are contemplated to harness the Long Sault Rapids. The main works would be footed on Barnhart Island in the vicinity of Massena, N. Y.

A dam would connect the American shore with the island. And from the other side of the island the 3,600-foot powerhouse, really an extension of the dam, would be pushed across to the Canadian shore.

About 22 miles upstream, near the start of the International Rapids section, a control dam is planned at Iroquois Point. This would regulate the flow and maintain the normal Lake Ontario level.

ONTARIO, NEW ENGLAND, NEW YORK NEED POWER

The power generated by these works will have no direct effect in the Midwest. Its impact on the national economy will be relatively minor except in an important but narrow field. In the Northeast and lower Ontario, however, it will mean new strength for years to come.

A 300-mile circle drawn with Barnhart Island as its center encloses an area with a growing and thus far insatiable appetite for electrical energy. The need is great in New York and the New England States. In Ontario it is acute.

Lionel Chevrier, Canadian minister of transport, has pointed out that the Long Sault is Ontario's last chance. If that is not exploited, the province will be forced to turn to steam plants to keep the wheels of its expanding industry going.

Steam plants, which virtually double the cost of power, are the alternative to hydroelectric developments in the Northeast, also.

Ontario and New York State have sought to develop the St. Lawrence power themselves. They want permission to go ahead and let the navigation phase come along whenever Congress gives the nod.

The Federal Power Commission turned down their application after public hearings. This action was taken because the Commission, according to its chairman, concluded that the power project "should be undertaken by the United States itself as a part of the St. Lawrence development."

FOES CLAIM POLICY HIDES REAL REASON

Opponents have not hidden their suspicion that the real reason can be stated more boldly. They say the administration fears that permitting New York to construct the power facilities would rob the seaway project of strong eastern support.

It is clear that the administration does fear this. John E. Burton, chairman of the power authority of the State of New York, put the matter bluntly:

"They (the administration) in effect have held power in the New York area in ransom to bring along the seaway."

This may or may not be the administration's chief motive in insisting that the seaway and power project be considered as a unit. Actually, the question is not vital.

One point stressed by those favoring the seaway is worth particular attention. Plentiful, cheap power, they say, is increasingly important in the production of defense—or war—matériel. Our shield of airpower is a shield of aluminum, and power in a quantity is a prime requisite for manufacturing aluminum.

ALUMINUM PLANT NEEDS CHEAP POWER

It happens—but really by design, seaway opponents hint—that one of the Nation's major aluminum plants is located at Massena, N. Y. That is almost on the site of the proposed dam and powerhouse. This plant turned out great quantities of aluminum for

World War II. It was reactivated not long ago.

To keep on producing, the Massena plant has to draw its power from some distance away. It does not have access to the thundering energy of the St. Lawrence but uses power generated by coal and steam.

Because of that, the Government is paying a premium of 6 cents a pound for every pound of aluminum the plant manufactures.

South Carolina's Fourfold Pattern of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, South Carolina's remarkable economic progress is attracting the attention of the entire Nation. This development is reaching phenomenal proportions. South Carolina has the climate, natural resources, and a people unsurpassed. The State has a sound progressive legislature and its chief executive is internationally famous and respected, in addition to being an excellent governor. The story of South Carolina's growth and the opportunity it offers can be obtained from Gov. James F. Byrnes or the Honorable Charles Plowden, the able director of our research, planning, and development board in Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, the following article deals with the amazing program now under way in South Carolina. This article, from the May 1951 issue of the *Progressive Farmer*, was written by William Poe after a recent trip to South Carolina:

SOUTH CAROLINA'S FOURFOLD PATTERN OF PROGRESS—A DYNAMIC COMBINATION OF AGRICULTURAL, INDUSTRIAL, AND EDUCATIONAL ADVANCES PROMISES BALANCED PROSPERITY FOR THE PALMETTO STATE

(By William D. Poe)

From Clemson to Charleston, from the mountains to the sea. That was the trip we made recently. We saw a lot of South Carolina, heard a lot of its people talk. And we liked what we saw and heard.

In a way, the trip constituted national recognition for the State. For we were accompanying the agricultural committee of the American Petroleum Institute. Eighteen of its members came from all over the United States—one from Canada—to observe South Carolina's progress on the tour arranged by Clemson College.

Beginning with a full day at Clemson, we made a two-day swing across the State by chartered bus. To Anderson, Blackville, Orangeburg, Summerville, and Charleston we went. And before us spread the new State pattern of progress that is bringing with it a richer way of life.

It is a broad pattern of progress—a dynamic pattern. Fourfold in its scope, it embraces:

1. More power.
2. More and better education.
3. "Two-armed farming"—crops balanced with livestock.
4. New industries—agriculture balanced with industry.

Let's see how each of these four elements fits into the picture of progress we found everywhere.

I. THE PLACE OF POWER

"There simply isn't enough power in a mule to support a family. Yet for many years our farmers struggled to prove there is."

So wise Extension Director D. W. Watkins told our group. From 1940 to 1950 the number of tractors in South Carolina increased 487 percent—the greatest increase made by anyone of all the 48 States in the Nation. As the number of tractors has gone up, the number of horses and mules has gone down. On our entire swing clear across the State we saw scores of tractors at work. How many teams of mules? Only two. South Carolina is casting off outmoded methods, is gearing itself with efficient production tools. And an important byproduct of this transition is the release for productive use of thousands of acres formerly required to feed the work stock.

Another vital power development is in rural electrification. In 1939 only 14 percent of the State's farms were electrified. Today only 13 percent are without electric service—87 percent have it. Electricity is generating power for both better farming and better living.

A third form of power we saw is irrigation—the power to supply water when needed. On the truck farm of Newman Buck, Charleston County, we saw a dramatic demonstration of the possibilities of supplementary irrigation. His drainage ditches feed runoff water from heavy rains into three farm ponds. In times of drought, water is then pumped from these three reservoirs onto thirsty crops. We saw his portable system irrigate a large field of cabbage. In a few minutes time he could move it to another field to water another crop.

At Clemson we saw tangible evidence of the State's emphasis on power development. There a modern \$250,000 agricultural engineering building has been completed to project all modern forms of power to the farmer. Keen young Agricultural Engineer George Nutt and his staff are proud of their new building, eager to press it into full service of the State's agriculture.

So much for the first part of the South Carolina pattern for progress; South Carolina is developing the power to do a good, efficient production job.

II. THE RULE OF EDUCATION

But power without knowledge of how to use it is of little value. The farmer needs sound education and guidance to keep abreast of all of today's rapid scientific developments. Clemson College, through its extension service, experiment station, and resident teaching, is constantly advancing vital information. Listen—

Four-H clubs have an enrollment of 51,000 boys and girls, more than 1,100 to the county.

FFA members total 7,299, more than 150 to the county.

Veterans-on-farm training classes have a total of 12,892 enrolled, more than 275 to the county.

What does all this mean? Simply that South Carolina is now developing a whole new generation of farmers who are attuned to science and progress.

The Soil Conservation Service's outstanding job in planning land use and helping farmers conserve soil, water, and timber resources is shown by this fact: Farm plans have been made for almost half the State's individual farms. Free services are available to farmers who request them. "Soil conservation men down here have turned literally worthless land into top-notch pastures and truck farms," a Charleston County farmer told us. The handiwork of these scientific soil savers is written indelibly on the land of the entire State.

County agents, vocational agriculture teachers, soil conservation specialists, experiment station specialists—all are at work in

the vast task of education. And in most cases there seems to be fine cooperation among them. Said Anderson County Agent J. H. Hopkins as he showed us through the county's \$300,000 agricultural building (which incidentally was built without Federal aid): "All agricultural agencies in the county have their offices here. We have a county agricultural council with a representative of each agency as a member. The chairmanship is rotated each year. We work together harmoniously. This cooperative effort has played a big part in our county's progress."

Nor is Negro farm education being neglected. One of the finest dairy herds we saw was at South Carolina A. & M. College, the Negro land-grant college at Orangeburg. This college has 1,288 students, with 150 enrolled in agriculture. Graduates go out over the State to lead their race in farm and industrial progress. Young Negro farm boys have their own organization, similar to FFA, with 1,970 members.

Such is another part of the pattern of progress. Farmers and farm boys are getting sound training for modern farming.

III. BALANCING CROPS WITH LIVESTOCK

"Twenty-five years ago," said Clemson Agronomist H. A. Woodie, "South Carolina was growing 2,000,000 acres of cotton but had almost no pastures worthy of the name. Now the State is growing only about 1,000,000 acres of cotton, but it is pushing hard toward 1,000,000 acres of improved pastures. We are making a successful effort to balance crops with livestock."

Although the coldest winter since 1879 had just ended, we almost never got out of sight of green pastures on our swing from Clemson to Charleston. A few years ago most of these fields now nourishing livestock would have been bare, bleak, and idle—idle except for the erosion that would have been busy after every shower—with farm hands and mules awaiting the cotton planting season.

"Agronomists from other sections say no other area can match the South in livestock production," continued Mr. Woodie. "We have the advantages of (1) a longer growing season, and (2) cheaper land. Also (3) winters are so mild no expensive buildings are needed. Folks are coming into South Carolina by the hundreds from many States. They are buying land we used to think worn out for \$40 an acre and converting it into good pasture."

At Clemson and at Edisto and Summer-ville branch experiment stations we saw intensive work under way on year-round pastures and pasture drainage.

That's another part of the pattern: South Carolina is diversifying its agriculture, is balancing crops with livestock.

IV. BALANCING AGRICULTURE WITH INDUSTRY

"For many years South Carolina has had nearly as great cash income per acre of cropland as Iowa. But we have had five times as many people per land unit as they have. To get greater per capita income we must increase the size of our farms and decrease the number of people on them."

So said Clemson's C. G. Cushman, leader in dairy extension work. Grassland farming requires much less labor than crop-farming and is bringing on just such a translation. And in crop-production tractors are displacing farm hands. Where are the surplus people going—those no longer needed on farms? Into industry, most of them. South Carolina has been one of the leading States in the Nation in increasing industry since the war. And many of its farm people are filling the thousands of jobs that industry is providing.

Since 1945 more than 800 new industries have been built in the State at a total cost of \$385,000,000. Major expansions have been made in more than 1,000 additional

plants at a cost of \$269,000,000. Notable among the new industries is the tremendous Du Pont plant near Camden. The Singer Sewing Machine Co. is building a \$10,000,000 plant near Clemson. The vast textile industry in the Piedmont is booming. Near Charleston there is a potential industrial area of nearly 10,000 acres with a fresh-water supply so abundant it has drawn national attention through a leading article in the Saturday Evening Post.

But by far the most spectacular recent industrial event in the State is the erection of the United States Government's \$600,000,000 H-bomb plant on a site of some 250,000 acres along the Savannah River. This plant will employ an estimated 8,000 workers. Its effect depicts in miniature what the coming of industry is doing all over the State. Farmers in the area know it will make farm labor scarce. They are rushing to buy more farm equipment. This will enable them to tend more land, will eventually mean larger farms.

That rounds out the fourfold pattern of progress: South Carolina is balancing agriculture with industry.

Such is the fourfold pattern we saw spread itself before us as we rolled from the mountains to the sea. It is a dynamic pattern, at times ruthless. But the direction is ever onward and upward. It was fascinating to watch this ancient agricultural State casting off the shackles of a one-crop system and marshaling all its forces for the better day ahead. And South Carolina farmers and agricultural leaders are the vanguard of this new forward march.

Power of Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address entitled "The Power of Choice," delivered by Archibald MacLeish, at commencement exercises at Radcliffe College, and published in a recent number of the Atlantic Monthly.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE POWER OF CHOICE
(By Archibald MacLeish)

I

What is in question in this country is the survival of the American confidence that men can choose the future.

For some weeks past we have been listening to a national argument which the American press agrees to call the Great Debate. The consensus of opinion seems to be that the press is wrong: that the Great Debate is neither great nor much of a discussion. Senator WILEY's early demand that the highest and most responsible military officer of the Republic be required to testify to what the Senator called personal feelings and private animosities raised understandable doubts as to the elevation of the proceedings. And the effect of the whole dispute on the Congress and the country has been something less than illuminating. When the principal arguments were all in, the popular verdict apparently came to this: that General MacArthur was wholly right and that General MacArthur's opinions were altogether wrong.

Nevertheless the press, for once, was wiser than the people. The confused and interminable altercation now going forward in Washington and in the Republic is, without any doubt whatever, a debate, and the debate deserves the adjective. Upon its issue will depend the kind of country this country is to be.

What is in debate is not merely our policy in the Far East, whether or not the Korean war should have been extended to China. What is in debate is the underlying question General MacArthur was obliged to face when his proposal was challenged on the ground that the extension of the Korean war might mean war with Russia and so a third world war. What is in debate is the view of human history, of the freedom of human choice, which we as Americans are prepared to hold.

In the past it has been our American conviction, a conviction implicit in our actions rather than explicit in our words, that history is made by men, not men by history. It is not only possible, we have thought, but a self-evident truth that a free people, if it possesses the virility and the inventiveness and the daring, can choose for itself the kind of world it wishes to live in and then create that world. A free people is capable, that is to say, of the pursuit of happiness, the pursuit of human happiness. We have not believed that men's lives, or the forms of their societies, or the future to which they are committed, are determined in advance by the patterns of the stars or the prophecies of the books or the necessities of the blood or the character of the countryside into which they are born, or even by the laws of economics. Above all, we have not believed, as older societies believed before us, that the events of human history, either disasters or triumphs, are inevitable.

The whole idea of the inevitable has been repugnant to us. Nothing, we have opined, is inevitable but death and taxes. Anything else in the world can be changed, including—including particularly—the prophecies. Anything else can be changed and, for the most part, has been: forms of government, dogmas of belief, methods of husbandry, habits of life, even the man himself, even the compulsion of the blood, the shape of the head, the length and weight of the body, and the color of the hair. We have had no respect for fate, we worshiped God, not fate. We have had no particular reverence for history; we believed in men, not history. History was the history men made, not the veiled divinity that told them what they had to be.

Our confidence, in brief, was in the future. Which is to say that our confidence was in the power of human choice to make the future. We considered that a free people can make the future for itself, master its destiny.

That was the American position: the position made evident in our actions from the first movement west across the continent; made articulate sometimes also in our words. We had no illusions about the orthodoxy of our view. We knew perfectly well that the great majority of mankind disagreed with us and always had. The orthodox conception of man's place in the universe, man's relation to time and to event, had always been the very different conception that man is the victim of the inevitable, whose only escape from the ineluctable design is to accept it. The authors of that reckless and willful phrase about the pursuit of happiness in the Declaration of American Independence had every reason to know how their affirmation would be received in older, wiser, and less courageous countries. We have learned since, throughout the history of our literature, how stubborn, how bitter, and how vindictive that reaction can be:

how scornfully the believers in fate can speak of our precarious belief in man and in man's future; how sneeringly the servants of determinism can dispose of our "idea of progress," as they choose to call it; how contemptuously the worshipers of certainty can dismiss our self-confidence, our self-reliance, above all the rash implety of our willingness to think for ourselves, and say as we think, and do as we say.

Nevertheless, and until this time, we have held to our convictions. We have nourished an inarticulate belief that there is a relation of some kind between the individual human freedom we mean to have and the rejection of the dogma of inevitability. Freedom and inevitability, we have thought, cannot live together. No nation can be free which does not keep the future open in its people's minds.

Now, it appears, we are no longer certain. The world has changed. The dogma of inevitability has made new converts throughout half the earth, and the menace of their fanatic faith has made still further converts, even among us. Fear has accomplished what persuasion never could. Americans—many Americans it seems—are ready to accept the doctrine of inevitability for themselves and to force it on their fellow citizens. Unless we accept the inevitable, they tell us, the inevitable will destroy us. And the country listens, ponders, doubts. And the issue is joined. The petty debate over the personality of a man becomes the great debate over the destiny of the Republic.

II

The MacArthur controversy is, of course, the occasion of the Great Debate, not the cause. General MacArthur did not invent the view of human history he apparently accepts. The controversy which centers on his name has, however, posed the underlying issue in terms which no one can mistake, and has related it to a decision which the country, largely because of the controversy, can no longer avoid. That decision is a decision affecting our survival as a people and, very probably, the survival of our world.

Only on the surface is the difference between MacArthur and his critics a military difference. Actually it is a difference of belief, a difference of essential philosophy—a difference touching the freedom of the people of the United States to choose, in the greatest dilemma they have ever faced. Fundamentally what General MacArthur and General Bradley disagree about is the freedom of the people of the United States to pursue their traditional policy of peace and the defense of human liberty in the modern world. To General MacArthur the risk of Russian intervention and, so, of world war should not deter us from extending the Korean war to China and winning a victory, because the risk of Russian intervention has already been taken: because events, that is to say, are out of our hands. To General Bradley, the chance of Russian intervention should deter us because events are not out of our hands—because, as the general puts it, we have avoided war with Russia thus far and if we can continue to avoid it long enough we may be able to avoid it altogether.

Neither general knows or pretends to know what Russia will actually do. Both agree that Russia may attack us at any moment—that the rulers of Russia will be restrained neither by humanity nor by moral scruple—only by fear. Both are aware that the Russians themselves regard war between the Soviets and the United States as inevitable—their doctrine of economic determinism makes it so. The difference between the two men is a difference as to our freedom of action under these circumstances. To one, we can still choose between the struggle for freedom and peace on the one hand and world war on the other; to the second, we are already, in effect,

at war—the millstones are turning, the grain must be ground.

This is the difference also between the two opinions which have been formed, regardless of party, behind the principal figures of the debate. Those on the one side talk in terms of what they call realism and courage, by which they mean the realistic acceptance of the inevitability of war, and the courageous adoption in China and, presumably, elsewhere of a policy based upon what they regard as the unblinking recognition of that fact. Those on the other continue to talk in terms of hope, contending that we have not yet lost control of the great election between peace and war; that it is still possible, if we have the courage and the patience, to avoid world war on the one hand and Communist domination of the earth on the other.

To men of the second opinion there is room for maneuver in the narrow strait between these two dangers. We can make ourselves too strong to attack and too important to the world to isolate; the party of peace and the fortress of power; the standard of effective freedom to which men, still free, can rally. We can gain allies for ourselves and arm them. We can strengthen the economy of the free world and build backfires of hope in the exploited areas where hunger and despair make tinder for the Russian torch. We can put together regional alliances—strong points of mutual confidence such as the Atlantic Pact—with in the structure of the United Nations and find means to give the defeated peoples of Germany and Japan a stake in the common future. We can implement the Charter of the United Nations by building out of the United Nations command which already exists in Korea a permanent United Nations police force and so enlist the universal longing for peace behind our purposes rather than the purposes of the Russians. We can turn our faces toward a free and peaceful future for the world, planning it, organizing it as we can under the point 4 program or otherwise, giving mankind a measure of hope instead of a certainty of slaughter, and so breaking the evil spell the Russians, with their alternatives of spiritual slavery or inevitable war, have woven.

III

To men who hold the first opinion—to the realists—all this is folly if not actually something worse than folly. It is folly to talk of avoiding war: we are already at war. So MacArthur: so Wedemeyer. It is nonsense to concern ourselves about what our allies think: our allies have no choice, they will think as we think or go without. So MacArthur: so the McCormick-McCarthy fringe. It is ridiculous to offer relief to suffering peoples: there is no time for relief—we cannot even be sure the grain we send to the starving in India will help us. As for the United Nations and regional alliances and the Atlantic Pact—all this is legalistic trifling. In the last analysis there are only the Russians and ourselves. The chips are down. The time has come to act; to act in China—to act wherever action is necessary—to act, that is, by force.

It is this latter position which reveals the true issue of the great debate. If you ask the realists why the chips are down; why there is no time; why war with Russia and hence world war is inevitable, they will reply, many of them: Because the Russians are committed; because the Russians will allow us no time; because the Russians say war is inevitable. But this can hardly be the actual reason. No American believes, and least of all the patriotic Americans who urge this view upon the country, that the Russians possess the exclusive power to decide the future for us all: that American intentions no longer count in the great decision. Certainly no American who knows

the facts of record could believe anything so humiliating to his country and so false. It has yet to be demonstrated that American determination and persistence, backed by American strength and the strength of our friends in the free world, are incapable of deterring the Russians from an action which would precipitate the most terrible of all wars—a war fought with the weapons of extermination. On the contrary, the facts of record powerfully suggest that the Russians have already been deterred and may be deterred again.

No, the real reason why the advocates of this opinion believe in the inevitability of a war which has thus far been avoided—a war which no one wants and every decent man must dread for the world's sake if not for his own—the real reason why the advocates of this opinion believe in the inevitability of war is that they accept the inevitability of war as dogma. War between the United States and Soviet Russia is inevitable to them, not because we cannot continue to avoid it in the future as we have in the past, regardless of Russian desires, but because war between the United States and Soviet Russia is inevitable. It is not that they want war. MacArthur's partisans are no more the war party than Truman and Acheson and Marshall and Bradley are friends of the Communists. Both characterizations are insults to the public intelligence. MacArthur is doubtless as honest in saying that he hates war as Acheson in demonstrating by the record of his office that he has been one of the foremost opponents of communism. But MacArthur and his supporters, however they may hate war, accept it. They accept it as already here. They accept it as inescapable. They accept it as inevitable in the nature of things. They accept it for reasons beyond reason. And, accepting it, they reject as weakness, or as folly, or as what they call appeasement, the notion that the United States can continue to avoid war and still stand firm: that a free people can shape the future for itself even in a world which holds the Russians: that men can master their destiny even though destiny presents itself in the vast, impersonal terms in which it shows itself to us, and even though whole peoples make a religion of submission to it.

Whether General MacArthur's "realists" realize it or not, it is their position and not the position of their opponents which approximates the philosophy they detest—the philosophy all decent men detest. The dogma of the inevitability of war between the United States and Russia is Communist dogma. Its origins are Marxist. Long before it was orthodox belief among MacArthur's followers here, it was orthodox belief among the Communists in Russia. A full generation ago when the economic and political interests of the United States and the Soviet Union conflicted nowhere on earth and no American newspaper publisher—not even the most unprincipled—shouted for a Russian war, war between Russia and the United States was already official doctrine in the Soviet Union. The commissars had consulted the oracles. The sacred viscera had been observed. The holy texts had been deciphered and the flight of birds. War was in the tarot cards and war would therefore come. Why? Because the theory said so. Because the words were written in the book.

The whole proposition was, in its origins, a product of authoritarian superstition—a superstition which reads the future of mankind in the tea leaves of the economic systems: War or peace, life or death. And it was by authoritarian propagation that it was domesticated in this country. The first to tell us that war between the Soviet Union and the United States was inevitable were former Communists, men who had left the discipline of the Communist Party but had

not lost the habit of the party's thought. And the first to welcome the assurance were those in the United States whose inclination had always been authoritarian and who found authoritarian ideas—even the ideas of their enemies—more palatable than a traditional American liberalism they had never understood.

Indeed, even at the present moment, the propagation of the dogma of inevitable war by certain politicians and certain publishers pursues the authoritarian pattern. Those who criticize the dogma are to be silenced. An administration policy aimed at the avoidance of war is to be discredited as motivated by Communist sympathy if not actually by subversive purpose. Advocacy of peace is to be stigmatized as treason to the United States. And the full Communist doctrine of the inevitability of war between the United States and Russia is to be forced upon the country as American doctrine until—ultimate irony—all who refuse to accept it can be denounced as Communists.

What the consequence of the great debate will be in terms of military policy is not, I think, in doubt. The country plainly prefers our present attempt to shape a future narrowly for ourselves between the two disasters of war and communism to any "realistic" alternative thus far advanced. Indeed the country would welcome a determined and an idealistic effort to make that future more truly ours in place of the mere negation of communism which we seem now to intend. We do not want war with Russia or with anyone else, and we will avoid war so long as it is in our power to do so. We are not yet convinced that we have lost that power.

But whether, in rejecting the proposal now before us, we will reject also the authoritarian philosophy on which that proposal rests, depends upon our willingness to see what the issues of the great debate actually is.

Those who would impose the dogma of inevitable war as the determining consideration in the great decision we have to make are so vociferous in their claims of superior patriotism that they may confuse the actual issue in the minds of many men. The actual issue is whether we still believe, in a time of totalitarian governments and authoritarian ideologies and the mechanization of human life, in the proposition which the founders of this republic regarded as self-evident: Whether we still believe that history is lived by men, not men by history; whether we still regard the future as open to our aspirations, not foreclosed to us by our fate; whether we still think of the "arable field of events"—Kant's great phrase—as arable by men, not frozen around them by any icy will; whether we still consider mankind to be capable of the pursuit of happiness or whether we have grown ashamed of that highhearted language and think of men now as mechanical figures helpless in the predetermined web of time.

The actual issue, that is to say, is the issue which torments our generation everywhere: the choice between the belief in ourselves and the belief in authority, in the predetermination of events. It was never, perhaps, in human history, more difficult or more dangerous for men to believe in themselves. But it was also never more necessary—never more necessary, surely, for us in the United States. For unless we can hope, unless we can keep the future open, unless we can continue to believe in our power to shape the future for ourselves, the future will be war and the war will be destruction for the world. It is, to me at least, inconceivable that in a country in which the tradition of belief in man is as vigorous as it is with us—a country shaped, indeed, by that tradition—the dogma of inevitability should take hold. And yet the seed is here. The labor is to crush it.

Southeast Kentucky Affords One of the Very Best Locations for New Industrial and War Plants—There Is an Abundance of Surplus Labor, Excellent Railroad Facilities, Plenty of Coal and Electric Power, and a Keen Desire Among All the People That New Plants Be Located Among Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES S. GOLDEN

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, with the tremendous expansion of the industrial might of America and with the desire to disperse many of our industrial and war plants in localities where there is not presently a concentration of industry, southeastern Kentucky affords some of the best locations in all of the United States for this purpose.

Coal, which is one of the basic industries and which supplies fuel and power for most all other factories, industry, and plants, is there in abundance. We have excellent railroad facilities extending north, south, east, and west. The recent decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission to readjust freight rates so that there will be no further discrimination against the South will remove a serious handicap that has existed for more than 50 years.

The climate in this section is moderate and at the present time there is more unemployment in southeastern Kentucky than most any other place. An abundant supply of labor of all kinds can be had and the chambers of commerce and other civic organizations in the 17 counties of southeastern Kentucky, comprising the Ninth Congressional District, are all organized and working toward the plan of inducing new industrial and war plants to locate in this section. Every help and inducement will be afforded to our local citizens and the United States Government will give to new factories and plants connected with the war effort tax advantages that will materially assist them in the construction and operation of new plants and branch plants in new territories.

This section of Kentucky lies in the valley of the Cumberland River. Tremendous new developments of water power and electricity have just been installed in this region and Cumberland Lake, created by the Wolf Creek Dam across Cumberland River, has created one of the largest inland lakes in America, it being more than 100 miles long, and tremendous amounts of hydroelectric power will be available.

This section of southeast Kentucky is protected by mountain ranges and is far separated from other industrial centers that may be attacked in case of war.

To further illustrate in more detail the great opportunities in this section for new business, I am attaching hereto and

making a part hereof, two articles taken from the current edition of Kentucky's Business Magazine. One of these articles is entitled "Coal: Foundation of the Defense Effort." The other article is entitled "The Cumberland River," giving a detailed description of the \$100,000,000 dam and electric installations in the Cumberland Valley.

The very large generating plant of the Kentucky Utilities Co. creates an abundance of electric power and is centrally located in this section of southeast Kentucky.

Timber and all of its products can be produced in abundance in southeast Kentucky.

The articles follow:

COAL. FOUNDATION OF THE DEFENSE EFFORT—KENTUCKY'S BLACK DIAMOND PRODUCTION HAS CLIMBED TO 15 PERCENT OF THE NATION'S TOTAL

If all the coal produced in Kentucky last year were made up into two separate freight trains, one train, originating at Hopkinsville, would be long enough to branch into every major city from Michigan and Minnesota through Alabama and Louisiana. The other would be made up at Middlesboro, from a zig-zag route across all States in the East, and extend to London, Paris, Berlin, and Stockholm.

More than 87 percent of the State's 77,900,000-ton output was, in fact, loaded on freight cars for shipment to at least 36 States and almost every European country east of the iron curtain. Eight and one-half million tons stayed at home to warm Kentucky's homes and power her industries.

The eastbound superfreight train would get its 55,900,000-ton load in the bountiful fields of eastern Kentucky, whose product is sought as a source of coke and chemicals, as well as for home heating and a variety of other manufacturing uses. The Hopkinsville special's 22,000,000 tons would come from the 13 coal-producing counties of western Kentucky, whose yield is widely used for general steam purposes and in the domestic field.

Kentucky's over-all production figure for 1950 was 24 percent higher than for the previous year. The war in Korea brought notice that the United States must undertake a gigantic mobilization program, and coal—of necessity—was first to be alerted. As long as materials of protection and destruction are to be delivered on a mass-production basis, coal will remain the basic ingredient in the formula.

The importance of coal in modern warfare was well recognized during World War I, for it was then that Lloyd George, Prime Minister of England, made this significant statement: "In peace and in war, 'King Coal' is the paramount lord of industry. It enters into every article of consumption and utility."

England's first minister of World War II also paid special tribute to coal's role in the conflict. It was in October 1942, that Winston Churchill included this famous remark in one of his numerous famous addresses: "War is made from steel and steel is made from coal. . . . coal is the foundation and, to a very large extent, the measure of our whole war effort."

One of the principal uses of coal in wartime is in making the coke that is essential for making the steel that goes into airplanes, tanks, guns, ships, ammunition, land mines, underwater mines, jeeps, radar and radar equipment, and numerous other items of armor and armament. And from coal comes explosives, synthetic rubber, road tar for landing strips, protective coatings for all types of implements, and countless other war products of the chemical laboratory.

SHIPMENTS ABROAD

Besides meeting these demands and filling its normal peacetime requirements, the United States coal industry has been called upon to make up serious shortages that have threatened the economy of all the nations of West Europe. From the less-than-a-million tons of American coal that went to Europe last year, trans-Atlantic shipments for 1951 must be in the vicinity of 20,000,000 tons if cold homes and shut-down factories are to be prevented in allied nations. A considerable part of the United States coal going overseas will come from the mines of Kentucky.

The combined resources of eastern and western Kentucky give this State one of the most generous supplies of bituminous coal in all the world. The State's original coal reserves have been set by the United States Geological Survey at 123,000,000,000 tons, with only about 2,000,000,000 tons having been extracted in the past century and a half of mining activity.

But nature alone is not responsible for the fact that Kentucky is the Nation's third largest producer of bituminous coal, exceeded only by West Virginia and Pennsylvania. Since the close of World War II, operators in this State have opened or placed in development a total of 48 deep mines with a daily capacity of 500 tons or more each. In addition, many smaller mines and a number of surface mines have been opened, and the new capacity more than offsets mines that have been worked out, retired for obsolescence, or closed for other reasons.

MECHANIZED MINING

Heavy investments in modern machinery have made the American coal industry the most highly mechanized and efficient in the universe. Through mechanization, coal mines have become mass production factories both underground and above ground, and today's miner is a skilled operator of power equipment. He works in an industry where about 98 percent of all coal is cut mechanically, and where over 75 percent of it is loaded mechanically.

In the evolution from the pick and shovel and horse-drawn wagons to electric drills, cutters, loaders, and transportation equipment, coal mining has become progressively safer, and America's bituminous mines have set new safety records in each successive year since 1948. The industry spends \$80,000,000 annually on safety methods, equipment, and instruction.

Mining communities in both eastern and western Kentucky reflect the progress that has come about in recent years. One of the best paid workers in all industry, the coal miner has a standard of living so far above that of his contemporaries in other countries that comparison would be uncharitable. Electricity, movies, radio, and the automobile have brought the same social benefits to coal regions in the United States that are available in metropolitan areas, and there are public schools within proximity of every family. Indeed, Kentucky colleges and universities can always point to outstanding scholars and star athletes in their student bodies who are offsprings of mining families.

HISTORY OF KENTUCKY COAL

The first reference to coal in Kentucky, according to Howard N. Evenson, nationally known coal historian, was made in 1750 by travelers who wrote of a "coal land" near the present site of Middlesboro. By the early part of the next century, coal was brought into Lexington and Frankfort from Lee and adjacent counties. Meanwhile mines were developed in Henderson, Davies, and other western Kentucky counties, and by 1830 coal was being transported by barge to Louisville from these fields.

Coal was gradually replacing wood in all the cities and towns where it became available, but with the advent of the Civil War

most of the mines in Kentucky ceased operations and the State's total production dropped from a high of 181,400 tons in 1860 to only 4,100 three years later. But it started up again in the following year, and climbed steadily to go over the million-ton mark in 1879.

Kentucky has finally become established as a coal State, yet it was not until after World War I that the State contributed a substantial percentage of the Nation's total output. In the period of 1920-29, 10 percent of America's coal supply came from Kentucky. The figure went up to 12 percent in the 1940-49 decade, and a new high of 15 percent was reached in 1950.

As production methods have improved, so has the quality of Kentucky's coal. To increase the utility value of the product and to make it more attractive to consumers, operators have built giant preparation plants that screen, size, grade, and wash the coal before it is sent to market. By December 1949 there were 52 mechanical cleaning plants in operation at Kentucky mines, and the number has risen considerably in the past year and a half.

STATE CONSUMPTION

For State consumption, most of Kentucky's coal goes to retail merchants for delivery to homes, schools, commercial buildings, apartment houses, and farms. Coal performs a host of duties on the farm. One new development is a stoker-fired crop curer to dry hay in the summer and corn in the fall, and another is curing tobacco through coke, which is made from bituminous coal.

On the industrial side, utility plants are using more and more coal to provide the power for producing electrical energy. Last year Kentucky's power-generating plants used 1,616,000 tons of coal—an increase of 32 percent over 1949. Manufacturers in Kentucky consuming large quantities of coal include food processors and tobacco companies; and industries specializing in primary metals, stone, clay, glass, chemicals, lumber and furniture, and textiles and apparel.

Railroads serving Kentucky are themselves important coal consumers. Last year 4,370,000 tons of coal were purchased by the Illinois Central, 3,132,000 by the Chesapeake & Ohio, 2,628,000 by the Louisville & Nashville, and 1,331,000 by the Southern.

In the near future, according to fuels experts, gasoline and oil will have to be extracted from coal if there is to be enough liquid fuels to go around. The United States Bureau of Mines is experimenting successfully with coal hydrogenation at its plant in Louisiana, Mo., and Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman is advocating construction of similar plants on a commercial basis in order to safeguard America's oil supply. Such a project, according to Mr. Chapman, is the first step to allow coal, the largest fuel reserve in the United States, to begin to carry some of the heavy demands for liquid fuels.

The coal that comes from Kentucky's mines is highly satisfactory for conversion to liquid fuels. When the new industry is born, Kentucky will have ample supplies for use in the synthesis process. Meanwhile, the State's 2,360 mines and 69,135 production workers are in the middle of the Nation's mobilization effort, and from all indications the freight trains of coal produced during the current year will be even longer than the ones which carried the all-purpose fuel out of the fields of eastern Kentucky and western Kentucky to a thousand-and-one jobs in 1950.

THE CUMBERLAND RIVER

In the spring of 1750—when Kentucky was still a vast hunting ground in which the savage tribes of Cherokees, Creeks, Catawbas, and Shawnees stalked elk and buf-

falo—Dr. Thomas Walker and his sturdy band of pioneers made their way westward to Cumberland Gap. Passing through the gap, into Kentucky, the Walker party followed the "great war road," which was to become known as "the wilderness trail." On Easter Sunday, March 15, the company set up camp on Clover Creek. Two days later, Dr. Walker went hunting down the creek. Approximately one mile below camp at the mouth of the creek, he came to a river which, he says in his journal, "I called Cumberland River."

The Cumberland River of today is a far cry from the sleepy stream of the eighteenth century which the Indians had dubbed Shawnee River. Today, the Cumberland ranks as one of Kentucky's vital river arteries.

What is the value of a river? Is it to be measured by the richness of the soil in its basin or the productivity of the land that surrounds it? Is it to be judged by the amount of kilowatt-hours of electricity which are created by its great dams or by the amount of industrial development along its banks? Is it to be graded by the commercial tonnage which passes up and down its course or by the growth of the communities located along its path? The Cumberland, which winds its way through the mountainous country of eastern Kentucky and then returns to the Commonwealth in the western part after a sojourn into Tennessee, fulfills all these requirements.

CIVIL WAR OPERATIONS

As early as 1840 the Cumberland had become an important transportation artery. During the Civil War the Confederacy relied upon the Cumberland for carrying all of its manufacturing equipment to Nashville—a key manufacturing center for the rebel States during the war. Commerce on the river was never completely sealed—even by orders. In November 1861 a confiscated Union steamer and barge, captured near Memphis, was loaded with much-needed gun mounts and manufacturing equipment. Its destination was Nashville. All hands aboard the ship were Confederates dressed as Yankees, and the equipment, packed to resemble cotton bales, was forged with the official seal of the customhouse inspector of the Union Army. The boat had to travel northward on the Mississippi River to the Ohio, then up the Ohio—through Union-held territory—to the Cumberland. Union guards, checking the customhouse seals and noting on the orders that the shipment was consigned to "Union men," gave permission for the boat to pass up the Cumberland to Nashville. The safe arrival of this equipment is credited with the forestalling of the fall of Nashville for several months.

The upper Cumberland was used by the Confederates for getting coal and salt out of the area to their war plants in and around Nashville. Shipments down the Cumberland were heavy until that city fell to the Union forces on January 16, 1862.

COAL OR IRON?

Long before the Civil War and until that conflagration caused an abrupt stoppage of all manufacturing in the area, the lower Cumberland Valley—from the mouth of the river near Smithland to the Kentucky-Tennessee border—thrived as one of the leading iron and steel-producing centers of the Nation.

There is evidence of the operation of a steel mill near Kuttawa as early as 1837. The furnaces were operated by a man named Kelley, who developed and first used the Bessemer process for steel making. Between 1841 and 1862, furnaces were in operation in Trigg and Lyon Counties. General Grant's campaign in western Kentucky in 1862, however, forced their closure. After the War Between the States and during the reconstruction period that followed, the mills once again went into operation, reaching their greatest expansion in 1890, when a huge

mill at Grand Rivers turned out boiler plate, chains, and kettle steel. These forerunners of today's giant steel industry used Kentucky iron deposits, which geologists have found along the Cumberland basin from end to end. The discovery of the rich, accessible Mesabi Range deposits and the high cost of coke drove the Cumberland's steel makers out of business.

The presence of iron ore throughout the Cumberland Valley was first authenticated in 1875, when Nathaniel Southgate Shaler, teacher of paleontology at Harvard University, conducted a geological survey of the region. Of course, Kelley and other iron-making pioneers were familiar with the lower Cumberland deposits many years earlier, but Shaler's survey gave the first account of industrial possibilities for the upper Cumberland.

When officials of the Louisville and Nashville Railroad learned of Shaler's plans to survey southeastern Kentucky, they immediately employed him to report on the advisability of extending that firm's railroad lines into the Upper Cumberland area. His surveys showed, in addition to coal deposits, the presence of rich iron ores all along the valley. He advised the railroad to build its lines immediately so that it might tap what Shaler referred to as "one of the Nation's most promising industrial areas." Foremost in his mind was iron. Coal was secondary. It seems rather ironical that, to this date, the L & N, which followed Shaler's recommendations and constructed a line to the area, has not yet pulled out a car of iron ore. Its early location in that area, however, has given the line transportation franchise on one of the Nation's richest coal fields. Shaler was sure that the ore could be pigged and shipped at a profit—even to Europe. He advised the establishment of manufacturing industries within the valley. Unfortunately, his dreams of industrial development in the Upper Cumberland area have not yet come true, although recent moves have rekindled the spark of industrial potential for the region.

TOPOGRAPHY

The Cumberland River—one of the major tributaries of the Ohio River—is located entirely within the States of Kentucky and Tennessee. The basin, somewhat crescent shaped, embraces a large part of southeastern Kentucky, the northern part of Middle Tennessee, and a wide corridor across Western Kentucky. It is bounded on the north by the watersheds of the Kentucky and Green Rivers and minor tributaries of the Ohio, and on the south and west by the watershed of the Tennessee. The total area of the Cumberland basin is 17,720 square miles, of which 7,560 square miles are in Kentucky.

The topography of the basin varies from rugged mountains in the eastern portion to a rolling plateau of the western part, with elevations ranging from 4,150 feet above mean level in the Cumberland Mountains to 302 feet in the pool water at the mouth of the river—an average slope of 1.2 feet per mile along its 693-mile course.

PLANS FOR DEVELOPMENT

As the river began to take a place of national importance, Congress in 1870 and again in 1875 authorized surveys of the river. Upon these surveys was based the initial project for navigation improvement. Throughout this 81-year span from 1870 to 1951, the Corps of Engineers has been actively engaged in improving the Cumberland in accordance with congressional authorizations with major emphasis presently being placed on the development of flood control, power and navigation features, but fully integrating a well rounded utilization of the water resources of the Cumberland Valley.

The present plan for the development of the Cumberland River provides for the effective utilization of all the water resources through the construction of 16 projects. The exploitation of the hydropower potential

of the valley, the control of devastating floods, and the improvement of navigation facilities all have been given major consideration.

This plan includes Wolf Creek Dam on the Upper Cumberland, Dale Hollow Dam on the Obey River, Center Hill Dam on the Caney Fork River, Stewarts Ferry Dam on Stones River, Three Island Dam on the Harpeth River, and Rossview Dam on the Red River for flood control and power production. For power production and navigation improvement, three structures on the Upper Cumberland designated as Old Hickory Dam, Carthage Dam, and Celina Dam were also authorized. Three additional projects on the lower Cumberland were also authorized for navigation improvement; namely, Cheatham, Dover, and Kuttawa (Eureka). Bills have been introduced, however, in the present session of Congress to modify the plan of development for the lower Cumberland utilizing the original Corps of Engineer recommendation for a two-dam system. It now appears likely that the section of the river below Nashville will be developed by the construction of the lower Cumberland Dam near Kuttawa, Ky., and the Cheatham Dam near Ashland City, Tenn., in lieu of the three-dam plan as presently authorized.

Of the six authorized multipurpose projects, two have been completed and one is now under construction. The Dale Hollow Dam was completed for flood-control purposes in 1943 and the powerhouse was placed in operation in 1948. This dam, located in Tennessee, impounds Dale Hollow Reservoir, a large portion of which is located in Kentucky. The Center Hill Dam was closed during the past year and was effective for flood-control purposes during the past winter. Construction of the powerhouse at the Center Hill project was completed during the current year. The Wolf Creek Dam is complete and the reservoir impounded. Construction of the powerhouse is being continued at an accelerated pace. Initial power from this project will be produced in the fall of the current year with completion of the powerhouse scheduled for 1952.

In addition to the 12 authorized projects, four other projects near the headwaters are proposed for later development. These projects are identified as Rockcastle Narrows on Rockcastle River, Laurel on Laurel River, and Helenwood and Devils Jump on the south fork of the Cumberland.

The completion of the six multipurpose projects will control the flood run-off from approximately 66 percent of the watershed, and will provide complete protection for the Cumberland as far down as the city of Nashville, and to a large extent for Clarksville and the lower Cumberland. Flood control benefits from the Dale Hollow, Center Hill, and Wolf Creek projects are estimated to have exceeded \$2,000,000 during the period 1943 through the 1950-51 flood season in the Cumberland River Basin alone. Additional benefits were also apparent in the Ohio and Mississippi River basins.

A POWER PRODUCER

The estimated annual energy output from the entire system, including the lower Cumberland project, if authorized, will approximate 3,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours. The annual energy output from the Wolf Creek project alone will exceed half the total industrial, commercial, and domestic consumption of the greater Louisville area served by the Louisville Gas & Electric Co.

Commerce on the Cumberland is increasing annually and reached an all-time high in 1950 of 1,560,000 tons. The principal commodity moved last year was petroleum products; however, there was a marked increase in the tonnage of package freight over preceding years. Another major item is that of newsprint paper which moves over an all-water route from Labrador to Nashville.

The comprehensive improvement of the Cumberland River Basin has one of the

highest benefit-to-cost ratios of any project presently underway. In determining the economic justification of the projects, all charges including construction, operation, maintenance, and interest on investment are average for amortization over a 50-year period. In the case of the Cumberland River Basin project, \$1.63 in benefits is returned for each \$1 of investment.

VACATIONLAND

While flood control, power, and navigation are the prime objectives in the development of the Cumberland Valley, other features of the water resources will be utilized to the fullest extent. A reservoir management program is developed for each impounded reservoir which provides recreational benefits for the maximum number of people and includes provisions for reforestation, pollution abatement, malaria control, agricultural and grazing utilization of marginal lands, preservation of game and fish, and other sustaining benefits for the general public.

No story of the Cumberland River would be complete without mention of Cumberland Falls—one of Kentucky's leading tourist attractions and the highest falls south of Niagara. The falls and its rare moonbow are the major attractions at the Cumberland Falls State Park—a 1,098 acre expanse of beautiful forested land in Cumberland National Forest, offering swimming, hiking, picnicking, and horseback riding to the tourist.

Lake Cumberland—the 101-mile-long body of water impounded by gigantic Wolf Creek Dam—is destined to become one of the Nation's best fishing spots and recreational areas. Construction of several small cottages along the lake's shores is already under way. Additional development is scheduled as soon as building bans are lifted by the Government.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Just now are the dreams of Surveyor Shaler becoming a reality. Although coal mining and agriculture are the two biggest operations along the winding route of the Cumberland, heavy industry has been eyeing the valley for possible plant sites during the past year or two. This is particularly true in the lower Cumberland region around Kuttawa, Grand Rivers, and Iuka.

The Great Lakes Carbon Co. recently purchased 600 acres of land near Grand Rivers on the west bank of the Cumberland. Many big-name companies in the field of synthetics are also considering locating in the area.

The Cumberland River has become a vital factor in the economic welfare of Kentucky. Since Dr. Thomas Walker charted the Wilderness Trail across the river over 2 centuries ago, the development of the area has been nothing short of miraculous.

Improvements have stepped up considerably in the past 3 decades and it is doubtful that anyone familiar with the river today can accurately conceive the vast importance of the Cumberland River in the years to come.

Great Increases in Value and Production in Eastern Oregon Farm Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LOWELL STOCKMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of the Census has just made a

summary of the reports from the 1950 census of agriculture with respect to the 18 counties in the Second District of Oregon which I have the honor to represent in the Congress. The figures in this report indicate the great progress which has been made in these counties which are east of the Cascade Mountains in Oregon during the past 5 years and show substantial expansion in production and values.

The following news release issued by the Bureau of the Census on July 29, 1951, indicates what an important contribution the Second District of Oregon makes to the economy of the Nation, and I am, therefore, glad to have the following release included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the facts set out in it may be available to all Members of the House and the Senate:

According to the 1950 census the increase in values of farm and ranch land and buildings in the 18 counties constituting the Second Congressional District of Oregon exceeded \$300,000,000 during the 5 years since the 1945 Census of Agriculture. Farm and ranch income in this area represented by the sale of farm products increased proportionately during this period.

The 14,985 farms and ranches in this vast area containing 15,479,992 acres reported a value in 1950 of \$462,858,949. The reported values of the 15,445 farms existing in this same area in 1945 were \$261,517,355.

Sales of farm products resulting from 1949 production in these 18 counties amounted to \$137,254,690 compared with \$109,019,968 5 years earlier.

The Second District of Oregon is one of those few unique congressional districts in the United States in which the acreage and the magnitude of agricultural operations are out of all normal proportion to the human population. In 1950 census enumerators found only 247,383 people in this vast area, but there were 725,806 cattle—an increase from 714,523 5 years earlier; 484,534 sheep—a decline from the 616,961 figure in 1945, and 74,738 hogs—a decline from the hog population of 101,330 in 1945.

It is easy to compute that if every one of the 435 Members of the House of Representatives represented as many acres as Congressman LOWELL STOCKMAN represents, the United States would have to contain more than 6,700,000,000 acres of farm land, which would be more than six times as much farm land as there is today in the United States. Moreover, if every Member of the House represented as many cattle as Mr. STOCKMAN does there would be 315,725,610 cattle on American farms—nearly four times as many as now exist.

With the exception of Hood River where more intensive, smaller-unit operations prevail, nearly everything in the Second Congressional District is of giant proportions.

Eight of the eighteen counties have more than 1,000,000 acres of land in farms and ranches, and no county in the district, with the exception of Hood River, has less farm acreage than 445,226, which Jefferson County has. Hood River's farm acreage is 42,691 and at the other end of the scale is Umatilla with 1,527,807 acres in farms and ranches. Approximately 400,000 acres was added to the farming area of the district in 5 years, and this fact, combined with the reduction in number of units from 15,445 to 14,985, served to keep the average size of farm tracts close to the figure of 1945 when the average size was 976.03 acres. The 1950 average size of farm tracts was 1,033.03 acres.

Of the 14,985 farms and ranches 13,289 are reached by electricity and their average monthly electric bill is \$9.82. The district

contains 1,269 farms or ranches that had sales of farm products exceeding \$25,000. The ratio of tenancy is low in the district and made a still further reduction during the last 5 years from 14.3 percent to 13 percent.

Dollar value of production per acre varies greatly in these 18 counties, depending on the character of operations. In Hood River County, farm sales per acre were equal to \$136.46. In Malheur the figure was \$17.54 per acre; in Umatilla \$14.50; in Deschutes \$12.87; in Klamath \$12.78; in Sherman \$12.11; in Jefferson \$10.25, and in Union \$10.13. Lowest dollar production per acre was in Wheeler with \$2.07. The production per acre for the entire vast area was \$8.86 average, compared with \$7.23 5 years earlier.

The average value of land in 1950 was \$29.90 per acre against \$17.34 5 years earlier. Of the \$137,254,690 of farm-product sales, \$75,320,594 represent sales of crop products and \$60,722,758 represented livestock and livestock products. The ratio of increase in the last 5 years was greater in the latter category. Highest volume of product sales was \$22,162,330 in Umatilla. Malheur had \$21,429,811 and Klamath \$14,608,478. Indicating its more intensive production from smaller acreage, Hood River had sales of \$5,825,703. The smallest farm revenue was registered by Wheeler County with \$1,703,850.

The Washington Press Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Independent Editorial Services, Ltd., for August 9, 1951:

THE WASHINGTON PRESS CORPS

The art of compounding the infinitely intricate affairs of the Government into simple, declarative sentences which the average reader can understand is not the work, ordinarily, of privately employed newspaper and radio people.

It is the task of information personnel employed by the Government, and no charge is more vicious, baseless and untrue that the Government employs "hundreds of press agents."

Without these specialists, little of the news of the doings of Government would ever be generally known, for the Government has no gazette or official publication to tell what it is doing.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is the organ of the legislative branch. Most of the time it is very instructive reading, although the matter is poorly presented according to our modern views.

But there is just no way for the bureaus to publish their regulations and such of them as are of general interest are given to the press. Those of special interest are generally handled by the press. But all of them come out of government in the traditional, stilted style which require expert treatment at the hands of trained people before they become lucid and readable.

To call a man or woman who labors in the field of public information a "press agent" is just a smear. By far the greater number of those employed in this work, serve the press and information agencies, and if the bill for their services were presented to the newspapers the howl would be heard from coast to coast.

Therefore, when John Jones, Washington correspondent of a local newspaper, writes glibly for day after day on many subjects, economics, politics, defense problems and the like, he gains an undeserved reputation of being a big brain.

The work is done for him in 9 cases out of 10 by diligent workers in the various departments. The average Washington correspondent does not have the time to dig up a story in his daily round. Hence the hand-out system, and hence the temptation on the part of the bigger bureaucrats to salt the hand-outs with mention of their deeds.

Our Government information division started all releases with the name of the head of the agency, and that "worthy" rarely knew about the story or its subject matter. The press quickly eliminated his name and a different system was brought about. The new system was to use his name in the second line because it was harder to cut out.

It does not seem possible to cover the news of Washington without the hand-out system or without the commentators. They serve to complete the Washington picture, hit-or-miss at times, but it is the best picture discernible until the Government has an official publication covering all acts and regulations.

Johnson Committee Work Shows Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINGATE H. LUCAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Worth Star-Telegram of July 30, 1951:

JOHNSON COMMITTEE WORK SHOWS BENEFITS

Two reports heard by the Senate preparedness subcommittee must have been gratifying to its members as evidence that they have done their job well. The reports showed that the United States now is approaching the point of self-sufficiency in regard to rubber and that its reserves of tin are sufficient to place it beyond the danger of being held up by price-gouging in that strategic material.

Both these developments are of inestimable value to the Nation's defense effort and to its civilian economy. And the outcome of United States policies in regard to these materials undoubtedly will have its effect on both the supply and the price of other imports which are essential to the rearmament program. This means that the country will be assured of at least the minimum quantities of these materials necessary to defense, and that they will be obtainable at a price which will not add exorbitantly to the cost of the arms program and put additional pressures behind inflation.

For this happy situation, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas and his Senate subcommittee are entitled to full credit. The subcommittee has drawn most attention by its hard-hitting reports on the needs and shortcomings of the defense program in this country, but it has done equally effective work in dealing with problems involving critical materials which must be purchased abroad.

As the Korean war broke out and foreign interests foresaw a heavy demand for certain of their products for military purposes, the prices of these items began to soar. Prime examples of this were natural rubber, mainly a product of southeastern Asia, and tin,

whose price and chief sources were controlled by a foreign cartel. The Johnson committee immediately insisted upon the reactivation of more Government-owned synthetic plants to make the United States increasingly independent of foreign sources of supply. It also spurred an arrangement by which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation became the only importer of tin and recommended that it stop all purchases until that vital metal reached a more reasonable price level.

Both these recommendations have paid off by putting the United States in a position to meet its needs for critical materials from abroad, and at a price which will not prove disruptive to our economy. In concrete and demonstrable terms, as well as in its more intangible effect in accelerating the tempo of the defense effort and correcting some of its errors, the Johnson subcommittee has performed and continues to perform a valuable service for the American people.

Governmental Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following remarks of Dean Paul H. Appleby, Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y., at a lecture of the Annual Harvard Summer School Conference on Educational Administration on July 23, 1951:

EDUCATION AND GOVERNMENT

The day I was invited to speak to you I received a letter from a daughter which shaped my plans for this discussion. Trained as a psychologist, now a housewife, she is a member of an adult study group in a certain city. She wrote not in the concern of a psychologist, but in a concern acquired perhaps as my daughter, to say: "Whenever we are discussing anything involving government, there is disclosed by members of the group a general conviction that politics is evil, and that people who work for the Government are generally crooked, incompetent, and arbitrary." The members of her group are good and educated American citizens, rather typical, in fact, of those having a good deal of social leadership. The convictions my daughter reported are widely shared, but are, I believe, seriously erroneous.

Also widely shared, I believe, is a conviction that democracy is good—even democracy as practiced here in the United States. The wide holding of such conflicting beliefs cannot but reflect great confusion, some great failure in understanding. Criticism of government is essential to the democratic way, but to accept criticism which is pointed actually toward perfecting government as meaning that politics and the agents of government are largely evil, is to turn counsels of perfection into counsels of cynicism and despair. Politics is the special hallmark of democracy, the prime method of democracy, and democratic government is the peculiar agent of popular, diversified politics. Politics, politicians, and government are one and inseparable, and in the large are entitled to respect, and even devotion, while at the same time subjected to our judgment keenly discriminating between better and worse politicians, better and worse aspects of government, better and worse political struc-

tures and functions. We often hear as the counsel of reform, "Let's take it out of politics." This means literally "Let's take it out of democracy, let's put it where the people will not have the capacity to control it." This always means that some group less than the public will have the capacity to control it; that is not democracy, unless the public consciously elects that course, and unless the public is left in a position to reassert its capacity for control.

Why are we confused about such matters? I suppose it is because civilized life as a whole is confusing. Civilization brings so much variety and complexity into life that it is very much harder to understand life than it was in earlier times. Perhaps the problem is simply illustrated by a true story concerning the Manhattan Project in which the atomic bomb was developed. That understanding, as you know, was chiefly a project in the science of physics. In one of the important work units where nearly all concerned were physicists, the physicists were so specialized in various aspects of their science that they could not communicate effectively with each other. An English professor was brought in and given the job of facilitating communication between those physicists, it was a full-time job.

Now if one looks broadly at society he sees a proliferation in specialization, in fields of learning, in fields of work, in situations, in organizations, in preoccupations. All this creates whole new vocabularies, even though all in one language in a single society, a new and unprecedented Babel of tongues. Areas of ignorance for any one person expand much faster than he can enlarge his learning and understanding. The task of relating all these things to one's own life is enormously difficult. The English professor working successfully in the Manhattan Project at relating a group of physicists to each other would himself be at a great loss in relating chemistry, law, medicine, physics, English, French, philosophy, political science, bricklaying, local government, automotive mechanics, meteorology, State government, the United Nations, dairy farming, wheat farming, and National Government—to name just a few of the elements of society which must be taken into account.

All of our pluralism, if it is to be truly enriching and meaningful, must somehow be related. Most of our energies are expended in differentiating ourselves, our competences, our interests and points of view. The result is a greatly increased interdependence. The task of dealing in relationships must be attended to. This is done, so far as it is done, primarily in three ways. One of these is the intellectual way; we all develop more or less some philosophy, some rationalization relating us to society and life. One of the ways is the functional way; we take one job to engage in an activity which is a part of a large, organized activity, which, in turn, chiefly through other specialized employees is more or less related to other organizations with other groups of functions; in this way we have a sense of playing a part and of being related, without seeing very much of the ramifications of our relationships. The third way is the way of politics, whereby in debates and through adoption of complementing and integrating activities of government we compromise, balance, and equate all of these pluralistic factors. Without such means of managing our relationships, pluralism could not endure, civilization would not be manageable or feasible. In the effort to make sense out of things, desperate resort would be to the cruder, impoverished order of authoritarianism. Government is the crucial general device of generalization, in a world distinguished by specialization. Governmental generalization of the social scene there has ever been and always will be. The paramount issue is not more government or less government, but the kind and quality of

government. And in the whole long history of mankind no theory or practice of government has demonstrated such capacity for relating and serving pluralistic values with equity and compassion as democratic government achieved through popular politics. Politics is not dirty business, politics is the only calculus man has ever been able to develop capable of systematically and functionally equating many, diverse, and unlike values for whole peoples.

Education, of course, is a principal source of the specialization which begets complex pluralism. It is not strange therefore, that educators as specialists often act like other specialists in taking a parochial view of affairs. I have heard one eminent scientist—not a social scientist—proclaim publicly that “only a scientist has any right to be President; only scientists have any right to be Cabinet members.” I have dealt with foresters who thought that no President was qualified to deal with governmental matters adequately unless that President was a forester; economists tend to feel that only an economist should be President; lawyers, industrialists, merchants, bankers, cotton farmers all tend to have similar attitudes. Any one of us, indeed, is likely to think it very regrettable that our friends haven't had the experience we've had and come to the conclusions we have reached. This is an unconscious inclination to authoritarianism, with ourselves constituting the authority, of course. The alternative is political leadership, politically arrived at, politically controllable and politically removable.

Education, in spite of its bent for specialization, has a function of generalization, of providing a rationale for the relating of one's self to others and to society and the social complex. The secondary schools are on the whole more constantly conscious of and struggling with their obligation in this direction than are the colleges. The secondary schools and their personnel have, therefore, a very great obligation to try to help relate their students to politics and government. Since so many of the secondary schools are public schools, they have another reason for understanding the public function as contrasted with the private function. While education, because of its peculiar character, must be especially free from restraints that would impair that character, education has also a peculiar obligation to live up to its public function. This is true of all education, whether public or private, but it is peculiarly true of public education. It must be so organized and conducted as to be reflective of and responsive to the aspirations and concerns of the society appropriate to it.

The public character of public education is perhaps hard to see when it is discussed merely as education. In those terms the whole matter is likely to be dismissed as something that only educators are competent to determine. This is exactly equivalent to saying that only economists should determine public economic policy, that sociologists should determine public social policy, and that political scientists should determine political policy. That wouldn't work, and it isn't democracy. I read a few years ago a long paper written by a chairman of a sociology department—not in my university—the whole point of which was to contend that no one except the members of the sociology department should have any right at all to determine anything involving the conduct of a sociology department. The writer of that paper did have one sentence in the course of his 70 manuscript pages in which he casually admitted that “sometimes for budgetary reasons the administration would have to make some decisions affecting the department.” That one sentence identified but evaded all the problems he was seeking to address. There is an institutional responsibility, and an adminis-

trative role for the institution, there is for the institution a public responsibility, and consequently there is a role for the public.

In a democratic society, therefore, education has a public responsibility, and a definite relationship to the public. Public education in particular has this relationship. Public educational administration is, therefore, a branch of public administration. It has not been sufficiently considered in this light. While making the point, I must myself confess that I have not pursued the study sufficiently in those terms to venture in one lecture to carry that point further.

What I should like to do this evening is, with the foregoing remarks as background, to turn to the other point of common concern as between teachers in general and teachers of government and public administration. This is the point already suggested, that teachers in their aspect as participants in general education have special need for an understanding of the generalizing organ of society that is government. For this purpose I have it in mind rather briefly and dogmatically to challenge some of the common beliefs about our Government.

It is commonly believed that nearly all public employees are put in their jobs by partisan politicians for partisan purposes, that consequently these employees work only casually and have party service more in mind than public service. President Jackson asserted that “to the victor belongs the spoils,” and it might therefore be believed that in his administration he turned out all, or nearly all, of the incumbents of positions in the National Government, and appointed persons of his own choosing. There was no civil service then, of course. Yet two studies by historians arrive at surprisingly similar results. One reports that in the eight entire years of the Jackson administration only 16 percent of the national governmental personnel was displaced. The other puts the figure at 17 percent. Those in the know would guess, too, that not nearly all of the replacements were made from Jackson's own party. The Government was relatively simple in those days, but it required continuity and a good deal of expert knowledge and skill, without which the administration would get into so much trouble as to hurt itself more than it would gain by giving jobs to its partisans.

Today, these needs for continuity and expertise are vastly greater, and of course we have an extensive civil-service system. Today, according to studies I have made, just about one-half of 1 percent of the jobs in the National Government can be dispensed with partisan considerations in mind; the actual number is probably smaller. It is highly significant that after 18 years of having a Democratic President and a great growth in number of personnel in the National Government, the voting in suburban Virginia and Maryland has grown steadily and rapidly more Republican. The only part of Virginia where Republican strength has increased in these 18 years is in the Washington suburbs, where it has grown enormously. The same thing is substantially true in Maryland. The vote in those areas is more heavily Republican than it is in the Nation at large. No one knows the situation in the District of Columbia, where there is no popular franchise, but one would guess that the same partisan trend has been present there. Technicians seem to be preponderantly Republican. Republicans may argue that this is a result of their special competence. The Democrats may argue that it is a result of the narrowness of technicians.

It is commonly believed also that the National Government has been growing in size by taking functions away from State and local government. While some functions have been so assumed or partially assumed by the National Government, this is not the explanation for any large part of the growth

of National Government. In any case, to offset the movement of affairs to the national level, there has been at the same time a very great growth by State and local governments. Their growth has been most rapid during the period of most rapid growth at the national level. And during the same period the growth of State and local governments has been enormously more rapid than ever before. The States altogether spent just \$180,000,000 in 1902, and in 1950 they spent almost exactly 13 billions. The growth in the National Government has been overwhelmingly in the field of national defense, international affairs, and in handling the fruits of war, as in the Veterans' Administration. Before the Korean affair, more than 80 percent of the expenditures of the National Government were in that general area of activity, and the personnel had a roughly comparable deployment. Before Korea, there were almost 2,000,000 civilian employees of the National Government, of whom about 750,000 were employed in the defense establishment. Add those in the State Department, the Atomic Energy Commission, Central Intelligence, ECA, other foreign activities, the Veterans' Administration, Treasury employees handling debt and other fiscal matters largely the product of war, and we account for very substantially more than half of all civilian personnel—a number about equal to the total of military personnel. Of the remaining civilians, just about half are employed by the Post Office Department.

Lump together the military personnel and civilians engaged in international, defense and fruits-of-war activities, and we find certainly more than 75 percent of all public personnel at the national level accounted for. Add the postal employees, the internal revenue employees engaged in collecting taxes, those in the Weather Bureau, research agencies, statistical agencies, the Bureau of Public Roads, and others engaged in rather non-controversial programs, and we account for all but a very small percentage of the National Government's personnel. Many employees in the General Accounting Office, the Civil Service Commission, and the Office of Central Services are indirectly engaged in defense and war-related work.

It is commonly believed, as I have already suggested, that public employees are in some special degree dishonest. I wish to assert a contrary view: that Government itself reflects especially elevated aspirations of the people, and that on the whole the National Government operates on a higher ethical level than any other heavily action-laden organization. This is true in part because many of the special influences that would lead to favoritism at a lower level of government or in other types of organizations tend to cancel themselves out at the national level. In other words, there would be no net political gain at that level in responding to certain types of particular influences; responding would irritate as much as, or much more than, it would please. Many astute politicians believe, for example, that there is no net partisan gain at the national level in patronage. And certainly to award a contract to a firm other than the low bidders would arouse bitter hostility on the part of all other bidders.

The ethical performance is supported, too, by red tape. That is a chief purpose of red tape, much of which is imposed by Congress and the rest by administrators to make sure there can be no undue favoritism, no conspiracy, that everything is done by group judgment, checked by other groups, and records made easily facilitating review and investigation. A business consultant who has come to high success and prominence in his profession came into the Government during World War II. He there complained to me that the Government was wasteful in the lengths to which it goes to prevent venality. “In business,” he said, “when we get the losses of that sort down to a small

decimal percentage of the business done, we know it doesn't pay to try for a still further reduction. But in Government you don't care how much you spend." I told him that the values were not the same, that in Government we were concerned about conserving the moral capital of our society. I think as laymen you will agree that just now some very mild irregularities which may not reflect any real perversion of Government are the most serious political liability of the present administration. Certainly long-lived politicians and officials at the national level know that it is good politics to avoid even the appearance of wrong-doing. We expect much more of our National Government in this respect than we do of any other organization. That, of course, is as it should be. Local Government has a much more difficult job. It deals with the hard business of crude forces straining at elementary standards of social order, deals with it close up. It also faces influences that do not cancel themselves out so fully as the same influences do at the National level. Corruption of Government in every important way, let me remind you, stems from private efforts to corrupt it.

It is one of the virtues of democratic government that its agents seek to please all comers as much as possible. This is truest in agencies responsible to politically responsible officers. And of course this virtue may become a vice. More often, it is subject to weak or inadequate judgment about how fairly to dispense governmental services. Public officials who are thought to act arbitrarily, don't wish to be arbitrary; they wish to please. They usually appear to be arbitrary because of systematic restraints on them, operating in the direction of general equity, and because of their own desire to please others than those who are before them. They must seek the general public interest more than the service of particular interests brought before them.

The most important problems of morality in government are problems of equating legitimate but different private interests—farm and labor, industry and commerce, producers and consumers in their manifold interactions. Central to morality in this sphere is political responsibility. A one-party jurisdiction, and any jurisdiction where the opposition party is not a constant threat, is less responsibility handled than a jurisdiction where the outcome of elections is always uncertain. Agencies not subject to control by identifiable officials who can be politically removed, are not truly responsible. We tend too much to create autonomous structures within government. We tend to have too much bloc government, and too little majority government. These are problems of high importance in governmental and political organization. (FS story, central control and responsibility.)

Let us turn now to the problem of governmental efficiency. It is commonly believed that government is notably inefficient, just as it is believed that business is notably efficient. The public doesn't scrutinize public administration rigorously—especially at the national level, where 5,000 correspondents and reporters apply themselves to that job, where the opposition party is trying constantly to find things that may even appear questionable, where interest groups are vigilantly contending with each other and critically watching governmental units affecting them. The scrutiny tends to make government more efficient. Very few citizens have ever thought about how to think about relative efficiencies.

I began to consider that subject as a young man. Publishing a small newspaper and engaging in the printing business, I found myself often unable to compete in the printing field with other, usually larger, printing establishments. I began to talk whenever I could to those who ran various sizes and

kinds of printing businesses, exploring the question of printing efficiency. I shall not burden you with the details of the story, but I think it may be useful to show where my thinking led. I got to considering the relative efficiencies of the New York Herald-Tribune printing plant and the Saturday Evening Post printing plant. Both, obviously, are printing plants, and one might think them, therefore, comparable. Yet I concluded that no one could ever tell which was the more efficient. The Herald-Tribune plant was not designed to, and was not desired to, produce the Saturday Evening Post; the Post plant was not designed or desired to produce the Herald-Tribune. About all one could say is that the Herald-Tribune plant is the most efficient plant for producing the Herald-Tribune anyone has been able to devise and develop, and the Post plant is the most efficient plant for producing the Post. Both are subject to improvement tomorrow, next week, next year, next century.

The Government of the United States can also be improved tomorrow, next month, next year, next decade, next century. But it must be improved in terms appropriate to its peculiar character. No activity within the Government is or should be precisely like, or precisely evaluated, in the same terms as some similar-appearing activity in other organizations. Everything in the Government is and should be somehow affected by its peculiar public character, its peculiar political character. In the large, the Government is very difficult indeed, and in the large, we damage it rather than improve it when we try to make it "like business," which is just about as sensible as trying to make business like Government.

Chester Barnard, long-time president of the New Jersey Bell Telephone Co. and now president of the Rockefeller Foundation, has said in his classic book, "The Functions of the Executive," that there is no objective test of efficiency except survival. Thinking of that sort should turn us away from such familiar clichés as "that government is best which governs least." Such a dictum rates alongside the one that "that meat market is best which gives shortest weight." I cannot find any source in Jefferson for the cliché. It comes rather, I think, from Herbert Spencer, the philosopher-prince of the politically illiterate.

Our own sense of the values of government comes clear when we face the problem of governmental survival. We then act as if we knew that the Government of the United States is the best mechanism for producing the Government of the United States that all of us—including the tens of thousands in the Government and in academic specializations who most constantly work at it, have been able, up to now to produce. When war comes, we look afresh at that Government which we have, in the democratic way, been treating with jealousy, criticism, and abuse as "the Government." For its survival we then offer our resources, ourselves, and our sons in militant devotion to our Government—the generalizing vehicle of our highest common aspirations.

Doorway to Slavery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted me, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the

last in a series of articles on teen-age drug addiction published recently by the Long Island Daily Press:

"HOW I BECAME A DOPE ADDICT BEFORE I WAS 18"—LUCY ENDURES AGONIES IN KICKING OFF HABIT

(Last in a series of stories on the ordeal of Lucy D., teen-ager, who became a dope addict and peddler before her eighteenth birthday. These articles have been presented because many addicts now being picked up on Long Island are 19. Furthermore, hundreds of other teen-agers who succumb to the habit without knowing its horrors, never come to the attention of authorities because their parents find it out in time and see to it that they are cured. Yesterday, after nearly a year of living only for "fixes of H" (heroin), Lucy was arrested as a dope peddler by Federal narcotics agents.)

(By Geraldine Scott)

Kicking off the narcotics habit means days and nights of agony, Lucy told me during our final chat in the pleasant suburban apartment of her parents.

When anyone involved in the dope racket is arrested there is generally complete cooperation among Federal, county, and local police authorities. Consequently, Lucy was sent to a city hospital so doctors could determine how far gone an addict she was.

"By that time I had been spending about \$15 a day of my \$150 a week earnings for H. Any doubts that I had about undergoing the ordeal of being cured ended when my mother came to the hospital."

Tears filled the eyes of Mrs. D. who had been present while Lucy told me her tragic story.

"I thought I would faint when I saw my child. She was so pitifully thin, her eyes were completely sunken, her once pretty skin was all broken out."

"And that horrible blond color I had dyed my hair," Lucy giggled. She had done that, at the start of her addiction, so that her parents and the police would be less likely to locate her. Now her hair was back to its natural auburn color and she was almost back to her normal weight. But her skin was still spotty. She had told me she felt it would never be really fine texture again.

Because Lucy had been arrested by Federal agents, she was tried in a Federal district court. With the aid of her parents, she managed to convince the judge she really wanted to be cured. The rate of cure among dope addicts is not high. Once picked up, a large percentage are rearrested after their release. The judge arranged for Lucy to be sent to a Federal hospital for dope addicts at Lexington, Ky. There are two such Federal institutions specializing in mental hygiene for hypos. The other one is at Fort Worth, Tex.

The agonies of kicking off the habit began for Lucy at the hospital the day after she had been arrested.

"My nose began to run. My eyes watered. By night I was in bad shape. They had to give me a shot of morphine."

With her mother as escort, Lucy was sent to the hospital at Lexington to begin her cure.

"It took me 2 months—two horrible months.

"I was just left alone, with a cot, a blanket, and a toilet. Every 2 hours someone would come by to look at me. Meanwhile, I felt as if I were covered with lacquer, and one by one the layers were being pulled off until just your nerves are left. Then you have a dull aching in your bones and you throw up. All your body begins to function normally again, and it is utterly horrible.

"You can't catch your breath. You want to scream. It's merciful when you lost consciousness."

For the first week she was in the hospital, Lucy couldn't lie still. Her bones ached and she had pains in her stomach. Her temperature was 104. Her legs ached unbearably.

At one point they had to strap her down. She didn't sleep a wink the first week and had to be fed intravenously.

At the end of the first week, Lucy recalled, "I could breathe again." But it took a month before she felt anywhere near normal and another month of consultations with the hospital's specialists to assure herself—and them—that she was cured.

Despite the insistence of most policemen that youthful dope addicts are generally out-and-out juvenile delinquents who tried other law-breaking operations first, Lucy believes dope addicts should not be put in jail. She remembers the tales her former friends used to tell.

"If you're a girl thrown into jail, you're usually surrounded by pervers. And all they talk about is dope. It's a strange and unreal world. They give you candy to lure you. They become your friends. And when you're released, where do you go?"

"Your new-found friends take you under their wings. If you haven't been fixed before, they'll take care of that right now. When you run out of money, you learn to hustle. All that is important now is to get money so you can continue to be fixed. So you're picked up again and thrown into jail. Another 90 days. And out again and back to your friends. It's a vicious circle."

Lucy says anybody who claims he or she is taking dope for mental kicks is lying.

"I'm thinking of that woman blues singer and of a young male band leader. That's what they said when they were arrested. But it's strictly physical, don't let anybody kid you."

It's been more than a year over again. Her marriage to Ralph was annulled.

"I'm not likely to see him again. He jumped bail the last time he was arrested."

For 6 months Lucy recuperated at home, taking vitamins to help her regain physical normality. Then she took a job in a department store in her home town. She hopes her day-to-day contacts selling pretty clothes will encourage her to keep building herself up—to keep trying to become as pretty as she once was.

There's an old saying, "Once a hype, always a hype," but I don't think that's entirely true. I think if you're young enough and haven't been on it too long, there is hope.

"But you must always keep building a wall around yourself and talking against it. That's why I think it would be a good thing to have a narcotics anonymous started. There's one in New York. A man named Dan Carlsen has done wonders in helping many users to get straightened out. It would be a place for ex-users to gather like alcoholics do and talk against their habits."

Lucy also believes there should be special hospitals in every State to care for dope users. Obviously, the two Federal institutions cannot handle every addict and must pick the ones most likely to be cured.

Finally, Lucy says she never would have been cured had it not been for the understanding and patience of her parents.

"It wasn't their fault that I became a user of dope, although in most cases of teen-agers succumbing the parents are to blame. Teen-agers' use of dope always goes up in postwar period, the narcotic agents told me. That's because parents were so busy making money during the war they neglected their children. After the war, it's too late. The kids are busy breaking the law."

This story doesn't have a rose-colored ending. Lucy isn't dating again, yet. She's still a pretty lonely girl and she knows it will take some time before she feels physically attractive enough to go out socially, and whenever she toys with the idea of going out on a date she remembers that fateful

date with Hank, the boy who gave her her first marijuana reefer.

"I hope all the teen-agers who are tempted to fool around with marijuana, heroin, or cocaine will read my story and stop before they fall," Lucy D. declared. "It's no good, kids. Stay away from it."

"That is just the beginning on the road from which, too often, there is no turning back."

OPS Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the following exchange of correspondence between myself and the Kansas City office of the Office of Price Stabilization might be of interest to Members of Congress and the public as an example of the lack of candor with which serious requests for information and explanation apparently are treated. My letter, which follows immediately, is sufficient, I believe, to fully explain the matter about which I wrote and I feel that no further comment should be necessary:

Mr. STEPHEN MILLETT,
Office of Price Stabilization,
Kansas City, Mo.

DEAR MR. MILLETT: A cartoon entitled "Mike at the Dike" and a statement entitled "Crumbling Dikes" and "The Lesson To Be Learned" recently were sent to me with a notation that they originated in the Kansas City office of OPS.

If this is true, I suggest most strongly that it was in very bad taste to capitalize upon a serious flood disaster to propagandize for the Office of Price Stabilization. Further, I am most interested to know how many of these cartoons and statements were prepared and distributed; (2) the cost of such preparation and distribution, and (3) under what authority was this money expended?

Your immediate and complete answer to these questions is requested.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

Below quoted is the answer to the above letter:

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: I have been planning on writing to you for several days to express my appreciation of your support of the legislation in regard to price and wage controls. I was glad to get acquainted with you when I was in Washington several months ago.

Your letter of August 1, in regard to the cartoon entitled "Mike at the Dike" has been referred by me to the regional office of OPS for attention. Mr. H. Roe Bartle is the regional director, with offices at 112 West Ninth Street. I am now the district director of OPS for 66 counties in the western half of Missouri and 2 counties in Kansas. Our district office is located at 220 Admiral Boulevard.

The cartoon was prepared by and mailed out by the regional office. I happen to know that the cartoon was prepared prior to the disastrous flood that struck the two Kansas Cities.

While we are on the subject of price controls, I would like to call your attention to an editorial by Malcom Forbes in the August 1 issue of Forbes Magazine of Business. I hope that we will always merit your support.

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN J. MILLETT,
District Director.

Prevent World War III—Help the Slaves of the Communists Overthrow Their Tyrants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on March 16, 1950, at the University of California, Secretary of State Acheson said:

However much we may sympathize with the Soviet citizens who, for reasons bedded deep in history, are obliged to live under it, we are not attempting to change the governmental or social structure of the Soviet Union.

On April 22, 1950, in Washington, D. C., before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, the Secretary of State said:

We do not propose to subvert the Soviet Union. We shall not attempt to undermine Soviet independence.

The above position, still the administration's policy of appeasement, abandons the people now enslaved by the Communist tyranny. It fails to recognize, and it fails to make an ally of, the strongest force against communism in the world—the hatred of 800,000,000 people for police state rule by murderers and their burning desire for liberation.

Under this present incomplete foreign policy we are faced with either all-out war or long years under a garrison state.

The alternative to this bleak prospect is the adoption of a positive foreign policy of aiding these millions of Russian and non-Russian people to overthrow their Communist oppressors.

Such a positive foreign policy particularly recommends itself because—

It is the only just policy. The present policy of avoiding subversion of the Soviet Communist regime implies acceptance of the barbaric regime as a legitimate form of government contrary to the sound principles of our own Declaration of Independence.

It is the only humane policy. To refuse to assist our brothers in Europe and Asia who have fallen among thieves, in servile fear of the thieves, is the epitome of a despiritualized philosophy. We must remember that each of the 800,000,000 victims of Communist oppression is a man of flesh and spirit, identical to ourselves as a creature of God.

It is the only sure policy. There is no sounder base for a government than on the expressed will of the people. What surer policy can we follow than to try to help these victims of communism

establish their own government? The present policy of perpetual containment promises no betterment and no end except in a destructive war.

In the following article which I include herewith, Mr. Koslaw Byela, a former general staff colonel of an eastern European army, tells how we in America can help these poor unfortunate people overthrow their oppressors.

Mr. Byela, whose real name I withhold for security reasons, is the author of various military books and studies, and a former professor in military schools. He comes from a country which is today enslaved by the Communists, a man of experience and with a brilliant career.

When World War II started he was appointed chief of the military cabinet by the prime minister of his country. He was taken prisoner, escaped, and became an underground leader and guerrilla commander. Later he was recalled to the war ministry of his exiled government.

During his war adventure Mr. Byela closely collaborated with United States Army Intelligence.

CAN WE PREVENT WAR IN EUROPE?—CAN WE WIN A WAR IN EUROPE?

(By Koslaw Byela)

The answer is yes. We can if we know what to do and are determined to do it.

We should realize first of all that unless certain factors are taken fully into consideration our strategy and our defensive preparations in Europe are not only inadequate, but are based on a wrong concept of war. I fear that the most indispensable factors for preventing a war, or for fighting a war if it starts, have been neglected, misunderstood, and forgotten.

No one will object to the great amount of energy and money we are devoting to organizing divisions for a conventional war front. But all who know the conditions and the situation in Europe and the strategy of the future war must certainly deplore the fact that we are giving so little, in fact practically nothing, to support the unconventional front which already exists in the countries behind the iron curtain. Unfortunately, this front is almost unknown and is consequently ignored.

Do we believe tanks, planes, and bombs alone will be sufficient? Do we think the atom bomb will win the war for us? Do we imagine that American and European divisions, even if available in time and placed along the Rhine, in Germany and in Austria, just by their presence there alone, will frighten the Soviets and force them to renounce their plans of aggression? Stalin would like us to believe just that. Russians do not fear our armed strength. They have the manpower and the arms to oppose us. Russian manpower is expendable. Russian losses in battle would never be counted or even considered. The Russian youth has already been lost to its families forever. Stalin reasons that great losses on both sides would weaken our morale and leave his own most sensitive points untouched.

If we think that our victorious armies might penetrate into old parts of Russia by taking their territory, we are also mistaken. Napoleon's tragedy of 1812 would be nothing compared to ours. There are other more effective ways of reaching the Russian people and given the chance, the Russian people will do the job of freeing themselves of communism.

SOVIET SABOTEURS POISED FOR ACTION

The Soviet concept for future war foresees and prepares long in advance not only for a

war with armed forces but for an underground war with fifth columns, guerrillas, and sabotage; a war in which the fighting between two ideologies will engage every Communist and non-Communist; a war waged behind the lines, over there, here in the United States, practically everywhere where its forces can contribute to victory in any way, by any means—fair, brutal, or not.

A Soviet army of saboteurs, guerrillas, and underground workers is being built up all over the world. Special undercover forces have been organized in France, Italy, Germany, Belgium, and the Netherlands to support the Red Army and its advance toward the Atlantic Ocean. Other forces are being trained in Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, and in the Balkans, Greece, Turkey, and Yugoslavia. The importance of these armies to Soviet strategy should not be minimized.

It is a well-recognized fact that the mobility of motorized troops today makes the Soviet European front comparatively narrow, and that the great speed and radius of action in modern aviation threaten the flanks and close rear of a Red army advancing toward the west, especially where they will be exposed on the Baltic seacoast. The Soviet planners are well aware of this danger and intend to eliminate it.

First, they will open the Baltic Sea to allow their strong Baltic submarine fleet to emerge and attack European maritime communication lines across the Atlantic. The Kattegat and Skagerrak have become the No. 1 Soviet objective of the war, of more importance than Murmansk.

In order to open these straits they plan to attack and occupy Denmark and the southern part of Sweden. A part of the fleet and the bulk of Soviet airborne troops will be employed in this operation. Today they are hurriedly constructing large army and naval bases and depots along the entire south Baltic seacoast intended exclusively for these operations.

The undercover forces in Sweden and Denmark will plan an all-important role in these actions. In addition to these regular missions of sabotage, espionage, signaling the disposition of allied troops and fleets, great dependence will be placed on them for the successful establishment of beachheads. Russian troops notably lack experience in this highly complicated, difficult, and risky undertaking.

In the Balkans the pro-Soviet fifth column will greatly facilitate the liquidating of the Balkan danger for the Red Army and in capturing the Dardanelles, which is considered today as Soviet objective No. 2 in the European war theater.

These Communist masses, the army outside mother Russia, have already received their instructions and orders from Moscow. When mobilization is declared and the war starts they will take full-scale action. As the Soviet troops near their borders they will increase the strength and ferocity of their activities.

Can we believe that these forces will not carry out their orders? Can we suppose they will remain passive and help their own governments in the struggle against their brother Soviets? Even today they are doing all they can to harass economic and social stability and generally weaken their own countries. They do not consider themselves traitors but believe that they are performing sacred duty.

The magnitude of our danger can be foreseen today if we are realistic enough.

UNITED STATES ALWAYS ON THE DEFENSIVE

And what are we doing today?

We are consistently ignoring the facts, or if we do recognize them at all, we consider them only in a defensive sense.

Why do we allow ourselves to be placed in the risky position of a defender on all fronts? Why are we constantly the defender

who humbly pushes away the enemy's strokes? Why should we not employ the same means and the same tactics? Why not beat the Soviets at their own game?

When we think of the future we have too much confidence in ourselves and underrate the danger. Perhaps we trust too much in our superiority in techniques, production, inventions, and atom bombs. We should know that these alone are not sufficient for waging and winning wars. Victory depends on other elements also. The morale, not only of the troops, but of the population will be among the most decisive factors. And this is as true for the enemy as it is for us.

Perhaps we may think that underground activities, sabotage, espionage, fifth columns, guerrillas, etc., are not honest means. They are not. Nevertheless, we all should know that some such force forms an integral part of each army, an indispensable arm, a necessary operation in time of war. Stalin is particularly stressing this type of warfare and exploiting it ruthlessly. We have to face this fact openly. We must counteract it and fight fire with fire.

UNITED STATES HAS ALLIES BEHIND IRON CURTAIN

Unless we radically change our concept to match the Soviet concept we will involve ourselves in unnecessary sacrifices and losses of life. We should count not only on ourselves but on the European armies and particularly on the potential that already exists behind the iron curtain. This last is strongly emphasized and should become an indispensable arm of our strategic forces. To deprive our own planners of this powerful force would be to place them in a decidedly disadvantageous position.

Inactivity in this field will certainly contribute to the prolongation of a war and perhaps to the loss of a war itself.

The American public should be informed that the enslaved peoples of Europe hate communism and would like to be free of it and that they are asking each day for our encouragement and help. These people can constitute a front which extends from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea, a front which is 500 miles deep and has the strength (not counting the Russian masses) of 120 millions of democratically minded people, a front which if organized and put to work might well be the equivalent of more than 50 United States divisions on the Rhine.

The "soldiers" of this front are composed of men and women, young and old, who are ideologically opposed to the Soviet and are already psychologically prepared for battle. They have the will and determination to fight for their freedom. For them tomorrow may settle the question of life or death. Today they are on the spot. They are a positive force and might well be a decisive factor because they represent a tremendous majority of the population. If they grow stronger and stronger—and they will—if we help them, the Soviet leaders will be forced to ask themselves seriously whether they can afford to start aggression with such a force practically in their midst.

If this force cannot actually prevent Soviet aggression it would at least be able to delay the action. And the importance of delay cannot be overestimated. Time is the most necessary element in our strategy.

And what if the Soviets start the war this year or the next? We may be sure they will outnumber the American and European divisions on the front. But will they outnumber our "invisible" front line troops from the Black Sea to the Baltic? The answer is no. This they can never do unless they withdraw their troops from these countries and give them complete liberty and freedom. Until such improbable time the people will continue to resist communism to the utmost of their abilities.

It might be said that we will get these people in trouble if we encourage and support them now. But this is not true. We have connections with the underground there and know the facts. The Soviets can do no more than they are doing already. They have prepared long lists for deportation and are keeping these lists up to date. When the call for mobilization comes the Soviets are prepared to cart these people off by the thousands and massacre them if they attempt to resist. And they will resist rather than face the prospect of slavery in the concentration camp.

UNDERGROUND NEED OUR HELP

According to the numerous daily reports we receive through our channels the people of these countries have their own secret organizations, their resistance groups and armed men in the woods. They are engaging today in sabotage and small harassing acts against the Communist rulers and authorities. Where active resistance is not possible the masses resist passively. Against Communist terror they respond with terror. The numerous trials reported in the Communist papers and the more numerous unreported trials secretly reported to us confirm the actual state of affairs as they exist in the countries behind the iron curtain today.

The people of these countries will fight whether we lead and support them or not. But they are asking for our help. They say that we should lead them. They know that a unified leadership guarantees the coordination of action and insures the timing which is very important.

Should we deprive ourselves of this, our strongest and most effective arm?

And what exactly can these people do?

And how can we help them do it?

These questions can best be answered in the words of the underground leaders themselves. Here is what some of them say:

"We will undertake full strength action at the time mobilization is called for we are sure that this is the right time to start and that mobilization means war. Our goal will be to harass the mobilization plans and paralyze the satellite armies. Every one who understands mobilization in our countries knows full well that it is a most delicate and sensitive operation and its success depends entirely on the will of the population. We are the ones who must give the soldiers to the armies. We are the ones who must give our horses, carts, and trucks. Without them the army cannot mobilize and move.

"We plan to cut off the railroads and other communication systems which are indispensable for the mobilization and concentration of troops against the west. If we have the means we will be able to paralyze the communication system, delay military transports and poison the food and water. The confusion we will create will certainly lead to delaying the aggression and might even have greater repercussions. With vital communications cut the Soviet troops will find themselves threatened on all sides.

"We can very easily organize armed resistance of formidable proportions. All those on the black list for deportation and forced labor will be the first to flee to the woods with no other choice but to fight. Those who refuse to respond to the mobilization call, deserters from the troops and hundreds of thousands of others will join them. It is not too much to expect we might eventually have almost completely armed units with us. We will certainly have a number of people for whom we must provide arms.

"We will need explosives for harassing transportation and communication lines. We will need radio sets for good communications between us and abroad. We will need printing presses and small radio broadcasting stations. But above all, we will need good, capable technical leadership to channel our efforts in the right direction, according to the means of United States strategy.

"Our front is large and deep. If we employ all our means, military and political, in all fields of activities, our territory could become an enormously large area in which great numbers of enemy troops would perish.

"Psychological warfare against enemy troops, sowing disobedience and sapping morale, will contribute perhaps ever more than rifles.

"Soviets are not morally strong. The average Russian lacks morale not because he fears United States armed might or the atom bomb but because he suffers the hardships of communism. Many Red soldiers from the last war saw better life and prosperity in the 'capitalistic countries' than in their own homeland. Everywhere in Europe they met friendly people. They are convinced by all this that they have been misled by the Communist Party. We have an excellent opportunity at this critical time to affect the morale of the Soviet soldiers quoted in our own countries. The more Soviet troops that are concentrated in our areas the more we can do.

"Our own native sons are not Communists. The Soviets can expect but little from them. They might try to deport them to the interior of Russia as security troops but we foresee mass desertions, disobedience, and revolts.

"With your help our front will grow stronger and stronger. We believe that it will not cost too much money and we are positive that each dollar will be repaid a thousandfold. You could not make a better investment for a better world, for humanity and your own safety. The money you spend to organize one division alone could support many armies here.

"If such a strong front were organized today it could delay the beginning of a war. If we could make it as strong as we wish it could perhaps prevent a war. But if the Soviets do attack, you may be sure our forces will be of enormous importance and a definite influence on the final decision.

"And we have the opportunity now to organize such a front. Communism, oppression, liquidations, deportation, concentration camps and general misery have ranged all chances on our side. This is an indisputable fact."

The above is what the underground leaders in the enslaved countries of Europe think and propose. And they are right. They are not trying to discover America. They are proposing to do what the Soviets have been doing for a long time.

The war potential of these countries is very large. Poland can mobilize 2,250,000 soldiers. Eastern Germany can raise 1,750,000. Czechoslovakia 1,250,000. Rumania 1,600,000. Hungary 900,000, and Albania 125,000. This constitutes an army of approximately 8,000,000.

COUNTERREVOLUTION A REAL POSSIBILITY

We cannot expect to have these millions entirely on our side but we can expect to deprive the Soviet of its use. Furthermore, the troops of these armies if transferred into Russia as unemployable on the western front might well become a destructive element in the part of the Soviet empire. If properly prepared they might start a counterrevolution.

And what about a counterrevolution in Soviet Russia?

Some people think that a counterrevolution in Russia is Utopia. Some think that it is not possible today. But others, who know Russian history, who understand the soul and mentality of the Russian people, think that it is possible. The Polish journalist and political writer, Ryssard Wraga, author of works on Soviet Russia, agrees with the view of all Russian patriots "that only revolutionary methods can bring positive results in the struggle against Bolshevism." He goes on to say in the January

1951 Eastern Quarterly, "the relative passivity of the people, caused as it is by overwhelming terror, does not necessarily preclude that a tyrant should be considered as the genuine representative of the national will. Bolshevism is acting against the interests of the Russian Nation just as it acts against the interest of other nations subjugated by it. Russian hatred of Bolshevism is immense and the revolutionary passions accumulated in the Russian masses against the government and its agencies are infinite. The question that arises today is not how to stir up or rouse this force, but how to organize and direct it."

We should not forget that the Russians hoped to rid themselves of communism and the Kremlin leaders when World War II started. In the first 8 months of Hitler's aggression more than 3,500,000 of Stalin's first-line troops surrendered or deserted to the German invasion. It was a political not a military surrender. Even the Russian population greeted the German troops as liberators and offered their services under arms.

GERMANY'S FAILURE IN RUSSIA

Stalin was saved from the complete disintegration of the Red army and from the danger of a counterrevolution by the ignorance of Alfred Rosenberg, Hitler's adviser on Russian ideology.

When the Nazis started to massacre the Soviet prisoners of war, the deserters and the Russian population wherever they went, the Russians then realized that there was no sense in exchanging Stalin's tyranny for Hitler's. Hitler's promises were lies. The war was not being waged to smash communism but for the annihilation of the Russian people: for the German Lebensraum thus one tyrant helped the other tyrant.

I, myself, witnessed the loading of German trucks with Soviet dead. This was in the prisoner of war camp in Nuremberg in the autumn of 1941 where I was brought to die. Heaps of dead Russians were thrown in the trucks like firewood. From the window of my barracks I conversed with Russian soldiers. "We die here like flies," they said. "We have nothing to eat. Ten grams of bread and ersatz tea is all we get for a day. Each morning trucks are loaded with our dead comrades. They are exterminating us." As they spoke they were eating grass from the ground, like cattle. They hardly moved because their bodies were like skeletons.

But in spite of this ruthless Nazi policy of extermination, more than half a million of Stalin's soldiers enrolled in the General Vlasov's army to fight against communism on the side of the Germans. The Azerbaijan, Tartars, and the Great Russians joined. The Cossacks alone raised an army of more than 50,000 men.

Today many experts on bolshevism think that Vlasov's action is the best proof of how much hatred and despair has been stirred up among the Soviet Russian people by Stalin's rule in the Communist system.

Wraga says "the Vlasov army was unquestionably a spontaneous move, and it is extremely tragic that the victorious west helped the Bolsheviks to liquidate the leaders and a large majority of the partisans of this movement."

And it is true that no nation gave more support to the Germans than the Russians did. What a contrast to World War I when tyrant Emperor Nicholas II was ruling Russia in the Kremlin. Not a single captured Russian soldier joined Kaiser Wilhelm's army. Not one donned the Weermacht uniform.

But what about the morale of the Russians today?

The present day living conditions in Soviet Russia are not better. The deportations, forced labor, concentration camps, the extinction of family life and church, poor

clothing, bad food, and the fear of persecution, are the normal schedule. It is the same, if not worse than it was before World War I.

Millions of POW's, deserters, deported persons, and Soviet troops have returned to Russia since World War II. Some of them were immediately liquidated. Some were deported to Siberia as dangerous germs. Posters were put up warning the people, Do Not Believe All Returned Soldiers. Those who survived have convinced their closest friends that at this time nobody wishes to annihilate the Russian people, that the cause is one of self-defense, shared alike by the Russians and the peoples of the west.

In conclusion, I can only repeat that our policy should be to approach and deal with the people behind the Iron curtain. They are a powerful factor on which we can count in fighting totalitarian tyranny. If we help them they may destroy war before it starts.

Our strategy should be to use the same means the Soviets are using to destroy us. The possibilities are enormous. The chances of success are far greater for us than for the Soviets. And the opportunity is ours for the taking.

If we hope to be the arsenal of democracy, then we should not hesitate. Every dollar may spare the life of one of our American boys.

American Legion Has Done Much Valuable Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on Tuesday, August 14, 1951. The editorial entitled "Legion's Opportunity" follows:

LEGION'S OPPORTUNITY

Veterans and nonveterans alike will congratulate the American Legion today on the dedication of its handsome new building at Sixteenth and K Streets NW. The seven-story limestone structure, which on its outside wall bears a striking relief composite of soldiers from 1917 on, is not the national headquarters of the Legion. That remains in Indianapolis, but the fact that a new building is necessary to house the Washington staff is evidence of the impact of the American Legion on national affairs. Likewise, the Legion's thriving membership running into the millions is testimony to the fact that it continues to capture the allegiance of veterans of both the first and second World Wars.

The Legion has done much valuable work in citizenship and allied activities. In an age in which more and more and more of the male citizens are becoming veterans, the responsibility of veterans' organizations increases. By force of circumstance, if for no other reason, the veterans' welfare and the national welfare are becoming synonymous. The constructive field for veterans' activities lies now not in partisan or class appeals, but in broad efforts to inculcate the responsibility that belongs to American citizenship. So long as the Legion views the veteran in the larger context of his duties as well as his rights, it will continue to thrive.

President and Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of this morning relative to the record of the Eighty-first and Eighty-second Congresses as compared to the record of the Republican Eightieth Congress.

The Washington Post has generally taken a position favorable to the administration on the various legislative issues. But even the Washington Post has to admit that the Republican Eightieth Congress' record is superior to the present Congress on both a quantitative and qualitative basis. Facts are facts.

The fact is that the Republican Eightieth Congress had a program and it courageously put that program into effect. The fact is that the Republican Eightieth Congress served the best interests of all the people, with special favors or benefits to no particular group or segment of our economy. The fact is that the Republican Eightieth Congress dealt with fundamental and basic problems, without fear and without favor.

The American people now realize how they were misled by the Truman campaign of misrepresentations and distortions of fact in opposition to the Eightieth Congress. The American people now realize that the Truman program has been nothing more or less in substance than special benefits for each and every group that cannot possibly be granted without destroying the rights and privileges of all groups. He promised something for everyone which in the end would mean nothing for anyone.

The American people want again a Congress like the Republican Eightieth Congress that will deal with fundamental problems rather than one that is floundering with empty political promises.

The editorial follows:

PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS

The Eighty-first and Eighty-second Congress have been less active in passing legislation than their Republican predecessor and have given little heed to White House recommendations. W. H. Lawrence points out in the New York Times that the Eightieth Congress had passed 388 public laws by August 10, 1947, the Eighty-first Congress had passed 220 public laws by the same date in 1949, and the present Congress only 110 by August 10, 1951. Quantity, of course, is very poor gage of a legislature's performance. However, on a qualitative basis the record is perhaps even less favorable to the present Congress, as indicated by the nature of the recently enacted controls bill. The President is said to be so chagrined that he is contemplating a barnstorming trip around the country as a method of putting pressure upon Congress.

The primary cause of the disappointing legislative record to date is the lack of cohesiveness within the majority party. The

administration has a majority only on paper. Actually many Democratic Senators and Representatives from the South are hostile to most of the administration's domestic program. But this is not the whole trouble. Mr. Truman has failed to supply the cohesiveness that is needed to hold his party together. Even many legislators who are in sympathy with his program have lost all incentive to cooperation. For example, Senator DOUGLAS has been alienated by the President's stubborn insistence on appointing to the Federal bench in Illinois two men who are far less acceptable to the bar than the candidates recommended by the Senator. Senator GILLETTE had a similar experience. Senator FULBRIGHT has not been happy about having his good work in the RFC investigation called asinine. In considerable part the gulf between Congress and the White House is of the President's own making.

Can this situation be remedied by a stumping tour to arouse public sentiment? We doubt it. Any direct assault upon Congress under its present leadership would probably add bitterness to the present lack of confidence between the White House and Capitol Hill, for the President would in effect be assailing the legislative leaders of his own party. The immediate result might be less (and worse) legislation. And the hope for long-range improvements would be slender, for this would involve the replacement of legislators who are dragging their feet, and, as President Roosevelt's efforts showed in 1937, any White House campaign to "purge" members of the President's own party is likely to backfire.

Indiana Must Have Additional Federal Judges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by H. B. Snyder of the Gary (Ind.) Post Tribune reveals Indiana as an "orphan" State in the Federal Judiciary Department.

A number of States in the Union with one-half of Indiana's population have twice as many Federal judges. The Federal court docket in Indiana is so congested with pending cases that it would take several years to clear the docket if Indiana had two more Federal judges. One of Indiana's two Federal judges has been in the hospital for several months by reason of overwork.

ANOTHER JUDGE FOR INDIANA

A third Federal judge for Indiana would be provided by a bill just approved by the House Judiciary Committee. The new jurist would be a "roving" judge, serving as needed in both the northern and southern districts.

On the basis of comparative figures, Indiana should have the additional judge. Fourteen States smaller than Indiana have three, four, or five judges. Each of the Hoosier districts has about 2,000,000 population, while the average Federal judge in the Nation serves about 640,000 people.

There's Illinois, for example, with not quite twice the Indiana population but with 12 Federal judges. Because of the overload of work on the two Indiana courts, it frequently has been necessary to call upon an Illinois judge for help.

The average case load for the Indiana courts is 418 annually, as against a national average of 205. The southern Indiana district last year had the heaviest load of any district court in the country, and the northern district was far above the average. Judge Luther M. Swygert, of Hammond, is off the bench now because of illness blamed on overwork.

Probably many Federal judges aren't working up to capacity; extra courts often have been created in the past as nice bits of patronage—judges are appointed to lifetime jobs at quite satisfactory pay. But it does appear that Indiana has been getting short-changed in the judiciary business.

The "roving" judge proposed in the Senate bill would be a welcome helper to Judges Swygert and Steckler. However, it's doubtful if that would be a long-range solution to the problem. There probably should be four Federal districts in Indiana with a judge permanently assigned to each.

The Late Quintus E. Camp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the disabled veterans of this country lost a loyal friend in the sudden passing of Quintus E. Camp, who was the assistant national director of claims for the Disabled American Veterans.

Mr. Camp was a disabled veteran of World War I, who had devoted all of his life since 1919 to the cause of the disabled and their dependents. He was a native of Toomsba, Miss., and had held every post in the Gulfport, Miss., DAV chapter. In 1923 he became national service officer for 11 Southern States with offices in New Orleans.

In 1934 Mr. Camp was transferred to the Washington office of the DAV, and in 1935 he became claims and appeals representative for the American Legion. He was made a member of the rating schedule board of the Veterans' Administration in 1944, and a year later became assistant national director of claims for the DAV.

Members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs have depended a great deal upon the advice and judgment of Quintus Camp. His wide experience and broad knowledge of the technicalities of veterans' claims was invaluable in the consideration of legislation. He testified many times before our committee, and always commanded an attentive and interested audience.

He was a kindly man, as thousands of disabled veterans can testify. He loved his work and died doing it. He passed away in his sleep yesterday while attending the national convention of the Disabled American Veterans in Milwaukee, Wis.

All who knew Mr. Camp will miss him greatly. To his widow goes the sympathy of hundreds of friends they had made during a long, happy life together.

German Competition With American Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce into the Record the following letter which I received from Mr. Walter Siegerist, a constituent of mine from St. Louis:

Thank you very much for your letter of May 31, and also the copy of the Department of Commerce letter of May 16.

I am glad to note from the Department of Commerce letter that they have received similar complaints, as they call them, from other United States firms. However, they really have not added very much in the way of additional information, because we had already learned from our own experience that deliveries of the German firms are rather extended. I might add that we have been offered such things as roll forgings for our straightening machines at prices that are about 60 percent of the United States prices, these prices are delivered in St. Louis, however, we are not interested in bothering with these items of German manufacture because of the uncertainty of delivery, the uncertainty as to the quality of the goods, and thirdly, the extremely long delivery they always offer.

I am greatly chagrined, however, by what seems to be a lack of understanding on the part of the Department of Commerce. I refer to the statement as follows: "with respect to the constituent's comments about prices paid for raw materials by German firms, it is important to keep in mind that the west German recipients of raw materials are charged the full landed cost in German currency, whether or not the materials are ECA financed." I am aware of this practice, as a matter of fact, this is true for all ECA operations in all other countries but the Department of Commerce should learn some day that a Nation's economy is no different than an individual's economy. If all of the credits added together do not equal the amount owed, then there is a deficit and, if somebody doesn't make up the deficit, the individual or the nation must get busy and produce more or do without, because eventually it will not be possible to continue to get things without paying for them. I believe that I have a good understanding of what is going on in Germany, because, as you recall, I spent my own money to go to Frankfurt to have a whole day's conference with the Joint Export-Import Administration (JEIA) at their request on this very subject of the dumping of German goods all over Europe.

I think that the question to ask the Department of Commerce is what difference does it make how many German marks the recipient must pay for the goods if these German marks do not reach the manufacturer who delivered the goods. Furthermore, the \$64 question is, Who determines what the full landed cost of the raw material price is, expressed in German marks? This is the one question I finally pinned down when I was in Frankfurt. There is no answer that will stand up under a free-trade definition. The answer is that some official or committee of JEIA decides what the landed cost in German marks is.

You and I know that if the German people would be required to pay all of the cost of the expense of the occupation, plus all other costs, then they would be required to price

their exports so that they could balance the German marks received for the export against the German marks they must pay out to get the raw materials. At the present time, the United States taxpayer is making up a very large portion of this lack of balance, plus all of the expense of the United States occupation, plus 90 percent or more of the expense of the French and British occupation. That is why every manufacturer in the United States is being sold down the river by our Government when he loses an order to a German manufacturer regardless of what part of the world he loses it in.

I came to the conclusion after my visit to Frankfurt in 1948 and I still am of the same opinion regarding this export trade matter that we will have difficulty as long as the following procedure exists.

1. The German manufacturers have the know how to manufacture certain special machinery and machine tools that they have always been accustomed to furnish to the industries in the continental countries, Great Britain, and to some extent in the United States.

2. The French-, German-, and United States-occupied areas of Germany still manufacture practically the same items they did before under the classification of peacetime products. Only the so-called implements of war are forbidden.

3. The processes of foreign trade have not changed. When one country delivers something that crosses the border into another country it is essentially a barter transaction. Germany delivers a machine to Switzerland to the Von Moos Iron Works, where my company recently lost an order for a centerless bar turner. The Von Moos Iron Works bought this machine because they could purchase it at between one-third and one-half of the price of the American machine. It is true that the delivery time was somewhat extended, but they anticipated their needs more than 12 months in advance and, therefore, delivery time was not so important.

4. The Germans have a signed contract, the German manufacturer named his price in German marks, we will assume that 18 months have passed and the machine has been shipped out of the British section of Germany into Switzerland. Now what happens. My understanding is that the German manufacturer could not get permission to ship the machine until he got a license from JEIA. Therefore, the British give him his German marks at the time the shipment is made or whatever time it is agreed upon, but, nevertheless, the German manufacturer receives German-mark credit. He perhaps now gets credit through the British either in pounds in London or in Swiss francs in Switzerland. However, in 1948 he could not get credit in Swiss francs because the British wanted the Swiss-franc credit. Therefore, the German manufacturer got British-pound credit.

5. The German manufacturer now has some British pound credit. He wishes to buy raw material or even finished material. It is true that he will pay for this on the basis of the landed cost in German currency but it is all a farce because some JEIA committee or official supervised the granting of the credits in the first place and who, I ask you, determines the value of the German mark with reference to other currency?

The only conclusion I can reach is, that you can't beat this game as long as the British and French, plus our naive Fair Dealers are mixed up in it.

With best personal regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

WALTER SIEGERIST.

P. S.—It might be interesting to learn from your brother in Zurich, how many French and British are "holidaying" in Switzerland this summer. I was astounded

at the number that were there in the summer of 1948. Put this down as a fact, every vacation spent abroad by a national of a nation receiving a hand-out from the United States is paid for by the United States taxpayer or by an increase in our national deficit.

Why Not Subvert the Soviet Union?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the weak, defensive position taken up by Secretary of State Acheson that we must not dare attempt to subvert the Soviet Union finds little support from people who have studied the possibilities of psychological warfare.

I include herewith an article by Paul M. A. Linebarger, which appeared in the April 1951 *Nation's Business*. Mr. Linebarger served in the Psychological Warfare Branch of the Military Intelligence Service in World War II:

HOTFOOT FOR STALIN

(By Paul M. A. Linebarger)

How much do you think it costs Russia to scare the United States, including you and me? Has it ever occurred to you that the Politburo is waging a fantastically cheap war against us? They are—because it is not only the Red Army that is frightening us, but the Communist use of satellites and fifth columns throughout the world.

It's a thrifty business, this Red subversion. So thrifty in fact that it's possible the Communist movement in the United States, far from costing the Russian people or Government any money, actually has shown a net profit to the world Communist movement.

But this isn't the only way that Americans pick up the tab. Parrying these Russian attacks with such weapons as the Marshall plan, ECA, point 4, and military aid runs into billions of dollars. It is rare for our expenditures in these categories to be less than \$1,000,000 per country aided per year.

Why is there such a tremendous disproportion?

Why can the Russians start sedition, subversion, or armed insurrection for a few hundred thousand dollars and have us spend billions in warding it off?

The answer is simple: Revolution is cheap and war is expensive. Starting trouble costs very little money. Meeting trouble or suppressing it costs a lot of money. As long as the Russians are attacking and we are defending, the disproportion will remain. Somebody could argue, "Why don't we spend the same kind of money on the same kind of thing?"

The catch is obvious. Subversion is an offensive weapon, not a defensive one. It operates against settled communities. We cannot counteract one fifth column with another. Therefore, except for limited cases, no matter how cheap and attractive the opportunity may seem, we cannot do much if we confine ourselves to our own or allied territory.

Subversion operates against the status quo, against life-as-usual. Therefore, if we are going to attack low-cost Communist subversion from our side, we've got to do it in their areas. This means attacking them by subversion, either within the U. S. S. R. or in

the satellite countries. Once we do this, we shift from high-cost orthodox warfare into low-cost subversive activities.

Why haven't we done this? Or are we doing it so secretly that the American people themselves don't know it?

Take the second question first. I don't think we are doing it, at least not on an effective scale. Subversion is secret, but its consequences are not. If we had a fifth column inside Russia, the Soviet Union would be screaming much more loudly about American spies and counterrevolutionaries than it is now doing. Furthermore, we aren't likely to have a fifth column abroad unless it is supported by the people at home, not only financially, but morally. We couldn't have a secret war so successful that its results were secret.

Suppose we don't operate inside Russia now—why don't we? There are several reasons which can be epitomized like this:

1. Subversion is unfriendly.
2. It is not nice.
3. Americans don't believe in interfering with other people's lives.
4. We can't do it.
5. We should use the Army, Navy, and Air Force instead.

Let's take these arguments one by one. Perhaps it would have been too unfriendly of us to have planted a fifth column inside Russia a few years ago when she was getting her networks in shape within the United States and Canada. I don't see how anyone could support this argument now.

Again, some officials say that revolutionary techniques are not nice. But subversive techniques at least avoid mass battles. The cost of subversion in nerves is great. Measured in number of lives lost, it is not so bad.

The idea of noninterference is also obsolete. Interference is already occurring. Washington and Moscow are acting as poles of power and there is not much neutrality left anywhere on earth.

Another objection is based on the assumption that Americans can't do the job. This line is silly. Plenty of Americans already have learned the job.

For example, Col Ray Peers was in command of the hush-hush OSS Detachment 101 which operated with Lt Gen Joseph Stilwell's very loose permission in Burma. He started with only 20 Americans and at war's end had accounted for 5,447 Japanese. The secret of his success lay in rallying the wild jungle people of North Burma, giving them arms and elementary indoctrination. The Kachin tribesmen learned so well that they not only shot up a whole Japanese division during the war, but still are intermittently shooting up the present Government of Burma.

Dr Gordon Seagrave was convicted recently of treason by the Burmese Central Government for having given medical aid to Kachin rebels, who were first brought into being as a military force by the few dozen OSS agents sent in to raise a disturbance behind the Japanese lines.

There was the case of the imaginary "Commander Norden" of the United States Navy who performed the amazing radio feat of talking German U-boats up from the depths of the Atlantic to surface and surrender when their craft became damaged, rather than fight to the end as the Nazis Government had expected them to. This was one of the "special operations" undertaken by the American Navy's secret outfit headed by Rear Adm. Ellis Zacharias.

Zacharias used a brain trust of two brilliant Hungarians, Stefan Possony and Ladislav Farago. But in both the cases cited above the commanding officers were Americans—Zacharias an Annapolis graduate and Peers a regular Army man.

We don't even have to use regular military personnel. Preston Schoyer was one of the

most dangerous men in Japanese-held eastern China during World War II. With the help of Chinese unfriendly to the Japs, he circled around and around the outskirts of occupied Shanghai, tying up hundreds of Japanese in the search for him and creating the illusion of secret American forces deep within enemy territory.

Schoyer was a member of our air rescue service and his job consisted of trying to get American pilots out from behind Japanese lines. In peacetime, he is an instructor in English literature and a novelist.

Another American—whom I cannot name because he has friends whom Communists might punish—operated entirely as a civilian. This man somehow or other accumulated 20,000 armed local boys under his personal command in China and was busy fighting both the Axis and the Communists, even then active in the area.

There's no end to the stories that can be told about adventurous Americans. Under the name Carmichael Smith I published a spy story called *Atomsk* about a nervy American, who looked like a Japanese, getting in and out of a Russian atomic plant 2 years ago. Soon after the book was published I talked to an American officer whose real-life exploits had topped the wildest adventures of my imaginary hero. When I told him what my spy novel had been about he said:

"You couldn't get anybody to believe that. It's too wild * * *."

All this officer had done was to ride around on trains in enemy territory, stealing documents by the process of walking into enemy headquarters, picking them up, putting them in a briefcase, and walking out. His work was technically espionage, but the knowledge that he existed, conveyed to the enemy mind, was a form of psychological warfare.

Americans can do the job. We have Americans of every size, color, language, and skill—Japanese-Americans, Russian-Americans, Ukrainian-Americans, Hindu-Americans. There isn't any kind of American we haven't got.

So why insist that we fight with armed forces only? Revolutionary techniques can fill in a tremendous gap between our global commitments, for one part, and our military, logistic, and financial capacity to put actual armed forces around the Soviet Union, for another part. Half a billion dollars is very little money in orthodox military terms.

Russia's downfall could be gotten ready by the use of three instruments: (1) Political warfare; (2) white psychological warfare; and (3) black psychological warfare.

Political warfare consists of the use of politics to supplement the winning of war or to achieve purposes comparable to those usually accomplished by war.

White psychological warfare is the term for propaganda carried on in the open.

Black psychological warfare is the trade name for secret propaganda, waged either by disguised agents or by other clandestine means.

What could we accomplish with \$500,000,000 spent on black operations directed against Russia and her satellites?

Let's guess at the budget. Three armed rebellions at \$50,000,000 each; another good-sized underground just short of rebellion for \$50,000,000. Forty major political conspiracies at \$2,500,000. Twenty thousand rumor-mongers, saboteurs, assassins, racketeers, and other revolutionists at an overhead cost of \$20,000 per man. These are guesses, but they are pretty good guesses. Would \$500,000,000 be worth while?

No. It would be a complete waste if money alone is spent. We can't buy enthusiasm. We can't buy hope. We can't buy martyrdom or heroism. We can get these intangibles only by offering the offensive spirit ourselves, only by being willing to look beyond the downfall of the Communist regimes to a good world for the whole human

race. The moral effect, the nervous and emotional wear and tear of deciding to support our own fifth columns against Russia would be substantial.

For \$500,000,000 plus enthusiasm, on the other hand, we could launch a massive and terrifying campaign of political, white, and black psychological warfare and some economic warfare against Moscow.

Even if we did not stop Russian aggression for the time being, we could cause it to falter. By taking the offensive we could make the U. S. S. R. and its satellites spend big money in meeting our small money. Increased police measures, lower economic production, higher defense budgets, greater security expenditure, wider and more wasteful deployment of troops and police—these would be some of the initial results of Americans giving a hotfoot to the Politburo.

Political warfare could support anti-Soviet governments-in-exile for all the iron-curtain countries. Take one example.

The world needs a democratic Russian Government very badly. Obviously such a government cannot be set up in Russia in the face of millions of informers, spies, militarized and special police, but an anti-Stalin government could easily be set up outside of Russia. Even if Russia's seat in the United Nations were not given to the new government, it could at least send its own delegation to protest in proper form every time Stalin's delegate opened his mouth. The Russians themselves have a case against Stalin, and if they know that others outside of Russia are encouraged to work for their liberation, we may get a real reaction.

We even have our choice of leaders for such a democratic Russian Government. In the United States we have the last legitimate president of Russia, Aleksandr Kerenski. He represents the first wave of refugees who left after World War I. Then there is Constantine Boldyreff, another leader who left after World War II. There are hundreds of others.

Often governments-in-exile can exist on the basis of recognition by only a few governments. The Royal Hungarian Government is, for example, still recognized by Franco Spain. The Spanish Republican Government is still recognized by Mexico. Recognition helps the governments-in-exile to keep going. Such exile governments send their own spies back to home territory to obtain information, sabotage military preparations, rescue political prisoners or captive workers, and provide a safe haven for defectors.

Along with prodemocratic governments, we could help set up friendly armies from the iron-curtain countries. We would challenge the Reds with the presence of a liberation force which might be turned against them and set up a way to support those who escape from Communist dictatorships.

What can we do with Polish majors, Russian lieutenant colonels, Bulgarian captains who come over to our side? What can we do with members of the Red secret police who are fed up with the totalitarian way of life? Such men would find our democratic, free enterprise society bewildering. If they could join armies on our side for a while, it would ease the shock of leaving their friends and families. General Anders' Polish Army and the Russian Liberation Army could be reconstituted almost immediately; many staff and commanding officers survive. Other units could be added.

Communism is multinational. Many armies will be needed to stop and to defeat it. America should not be so proud that it tries to maintain a monopoly on dying; if other people want to shoot Communists, too, we can help them get set.

A few months ago I talked with a prominent Communist political officer who had just deserted the cause and who was temporarily locked up, for his own safekeeping,

in the military prison of an anti-Communist government. I said:

"Don't you realize that many other Communists have had to leave communism for reasons of conscientiousness? Don't you realize there are many others like you who have seen the cruelties and mistakes of Stalin and who would welcome you in carrying on the real fight for human decency and the welfare of the common people of the world—the fight against Stalin?"

The man's eyes shone. He almost looked as though he were going to cry, saying, "No, no, I never heard of them. . . . Where are they . . . ?"

Another technique consists of splitting the Communists apart from each other. Tito already has broken loose from the dictatorship of Moscow. Another Communist leader, now living in retirement on Formosa, is the last president of the Chinese Soviet Republic, Chang Kuo-tao. President Chang did not salvage his brand of communism from the clutches of Mao Tse-tung.

Perhaps it is not too late to help turn the Chinese Communists against Moscow. Communist leaders both big and little break away in the satellite countries almost every week. Country by country the United States would have a major decision to make.

Should we support the all-out anti-Communists like Kerenski and Boldyreff, or should we help the heretic Communists like Tito and Chang Kuo-tao?

In Burma, India, and Ceylon there are rebellious factions of the Communist movement; in Hungary, Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia there were. The Communist schismatics in Eastern Europe did not, with the exception of Tito, obtain our effective help in time to stay alive.

In many situations we might find it necessary to support secretly or openly both the anti-Communists and the schismatic Communists for the time being.

White psychological warfare could take the form of the Voice of America for example. The Daily Worker is an example from the Russian side. In each case the source of propaganda is what it professes to be.

This type of warfare can supplement subversion. It can encourage the overthrow of dictatorships. It can promise a point of refuge. It can boast about the clandestine operations without giving them away.

Without adding anything to its present budget, the State Department—under its Voice of America program—could boast about the effectiveness of the espionage sabotage, subversion, and other activities carried on behind the iron curtain.

When I was one of a small group of Army officers detailed to the Office of War Information policy center during the war, I found that one of the allied themes most certain to get a heated axis response was the statement that we had friends in their territory.

Right now Mao Tse-tung's radio is boasting about how many thousand American-inspired spies the Chinese Communist police and army are catching. What would happen if they came to the point where they really believed that a big American-supported revolutionary network was moving into China? At the other end of the Communist world it's the same story. The trials at Budapest, Bucharest, and Prague keep harping on the theme that capitalism has corrupted once-honored Communist leaders. If we give them a taste of the reality we can count on them to expand the story themselves.

Black psychological warfare would involve either Americans or anti-Stalin Russians publishing underground newspapers within Russia. Combined with political warfare, it would attempt to organize Russian intellectuals, technicians, workers, and peasants into conspiratorial groups designed to overthrow Stalin with or without the help

of the United Nations or American Armed Forces, when the time came for Russia's liberation.

In specific cases, sabotage, assassination, and similar methods might be needed. The value of subversion lies in the effects to be derived from it.

Black psychological warfare could do to Russia exactly what she is doing to America, while giving the Politburo no more legal grounds for war against us than we already have for war against international communism.

Finally, economic warfare techniques would supplement these other open, semi-secret, and secret methods of attack-short-of-war. The Russians are known to have printed excellent counterfeits of United States currency. They are known to have sabotaged factories, to have encouraged the destruction of raw materials, to have promoted economic chaos within non-Soviet countries. Americans are just as bright as Stalinist Russians and anti-Communist Russians are probably brighter, when it comes to working on Russian territory, than either Americans or Stalin's career boys.

There is no trick in the whole Communist arsenal of subversion which we could not match if we decided to do so.

Such a program could start with \$500,000,000. That amount spent on ordinary weapons will produce three divisions at the front; with economies it might produce five of six. But \$500,000,000 for subversion would have the effect on Communism of at least 30 American divisions.

With that sum we could turn the cost accounting of black strategy the other way around. We could let the Russians spend the big money fighting our little money. We could let them wonder about where we were going to strike at them next.

Not only where, but at whom? And with what? And through whom? And when? And why?

If we spent \$50,000,000,000 on defense. I suggest we spend one one-hundredth that much on the revolution for freedom. The methods might not be tidy, but the goal, a free and democratic Russia in a wholly constitutional and war-free world, is worth almost any price the human race is able to pay.

William Randolph Hearst

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, we were saddened to learn of the passing of William Randolph Hearst, Sr., the renowned newspaperman, author, and legislator.

Mr. Hearst was one of the early pioneers of our great and ever-expanding newspaper and publishing business. He was a devout advocate of the free-enterprise system, and dedicated his life to freedom of expression as provided for in the Bill of Rights of our Constitution. Mr. Hearst's life was a very rich and full one, studded with innumerable good deeds and worthy accomplishments.

To the bereaved Hearst family, I would just like to say that your profound loss is being shared not only by the great enterprise William Randolph, Sr. represented, but by the Congress and all the American people as well.

International Kiwanis Convention Adopts Timely Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent heretofore granted me, I am pleased to herewith call to your attention and the attention of each and every Member of the Eighty-second Congress, the resolutions which were adopted by the thirty-sixth international convention of the International Kiwanis at St. Louis, July 17, 1951.

Having been presented with the first past-president's pen of the Long Beach, Calif., Kiwanis Club, and having been a member of that club for many years, I am not unmindful of the very inspiring and constructive patriotic devotions of the rank and file members of the International Kiwanis.

In addition to the text of the following resolutions, I find that the annual report of the secretary, O. E. Peterson, shows amongst other things, as follows:

Monthly club reports vibrate with thousands of such heartwarming examples of Kiwanis in action. Typical of the innumerable services rendered by clubs the past year are such items as those: Over 2,138,000 young people were provided with supervised recreation; nearly 10,000 baseball and other athletic teams were sponsored; almost 61,000 youths were helped through conservation of hearing activities; 7,033 juvenile delinquents were assisted, 3,298 scouting and camp fire units were sponsored, or an average of one per club.

In the field of community and national services we find nearly 42,000 Kiwanians serving on local school boards, hospital boards and other civic boards; over 140,000 farmers entertained at Kiwanis-Farmers meetings; 2,235 separate activities promoting economy in government, 2,087 physically handicapped persons employed; Government savings bonds sold by Kiwanians exceeded \$7,500,000; over \$9,750,000 raised for the Community Chest, Red Cross, polio, cancer and tuberculosis.

The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE THIRTY-SIXTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF KIWANIS INTERNATIONAL AT ST. LOUIS, MO., JUNE 20, 1951

AGGRESSIVE CITIZENSHIP

Whereas we are the trustees of freedom in our land and in our time, and upon us fall the duties, the responsibilities and the opportunities of preserving and maintaining our individual liberties and democratic institutions; and

Whereas democracy at home can be lost by default if, through apathy, indifference, neglect, we fail to make intelligent use of our elective franchise; and

Whereas in this crisis of our nations, greater efficiency in government, balanced budgets, and the elimination of nonessential expenditures become vital to our continued free existence; and

Whereas it has been demonstrated through the valuable services of the Hoover Commission in the United States that great possibilities exist for the promotion of economy and efficiency in our governments but there still rests upon us as citizens the duty to create and sustain a reawakened public conscience that shall serve as our safeguard

against unnecessary governmental expenditures: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by Kiwanis International, That we foster a better understanding and appreciation of our voting privileges and urge that every citizen vote in all elections; that we insist upon the elimination of unnecessary governmental functions and other waste; that we renew our demands that the recommendations of the Hoover Commission be made wholly effective and implemented.

ORGANIZED CRIME

Whereas the disclosures of the Kefauver committee of the United States Senate and other agencies have revealed corruption of public officials and law-enforcement officers, and the existence of organized crime operating defiance of law and public decency: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Kiwanis International, through its clubs and members, maintain a sustained effort to induce all legislative bodies to enact effective laws to prevent these illegal and immoral practices and to enforce severe penalties on all those guilty of such offenses.

INTEGRITY IN PUBLIC OFFICE

Whereas the investigations of the Fulbright committee of the United States Senate have revealed practices among officials in Government which are base and mercenary and in flagrant disregard of public welfare: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Kiwanis International vigorously condemn all such misuse of official influence and power; and be it further

Resolved, That Kiwanians awake from general complacency and fulfill their citizenship responsibilities by denouncing the improper use of public office and by seeking the election and appointment of men of unquestioned honor and probity.

INFLATION

Whereas the present inflationary trends are recognized as a serious threat to national solvency and the security and well being of our people: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Kiwanis International commend those legislative committees and individual Members of Congress and Parliament who are endeavoring to eliminate and curtail unnecessary and extravagant budget items, and that we extend to such representatives all possible encouragement and support by refraining from all demands upon governmental bodies which tend to cause unnecessary governmental expenditures, and be it further

Resolved, That we urge all citizens to accept their responsibility to make this resolution effective, working together as partners in our economic system and avoiding all such action as will lend impetus to inflationary trends.

COMMUNISM

Whereas there are many subversive forces seeking to overthrow the Governments of the United States and Canada; and

Whereas Kiwanis International has always opposed and vigorously continues to oppose communism in any form; and

Whereas these subversive groups attempt to use the names of outstanding people and organizations of unquestioned integrity to further their unlawful purposes: Be it

Resolved, That we urge all Kiwanians and Kiwanis clubs to investigate thoroughly all organizations, committees, and individuals asking support or endorsement before permitting or countenancing the use by such bodies of individual endorsement or sponsorship by Kiwanis; be it further

Resolved, That we cooperate with the proper authorities of Canada and the United States in reporting any subversive activity which may be dangerous to the internal security of our respective countries; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the support of the general public in banning Communists from Federal, State, provincial, or local governmental payrolls, and from offices or positions of public trust.

UNITED NATIONS

Whereas history shows that peace is the product of law and order; and

Whereas disarmament and world peace can only be achieved by world order under international law; and

Whereas the United Nations as presently constituted, although it has many notable accomplishments to its credit, lacks authority to enforce its orders and decisions, and under its present charter is incapable of restraining any nation which may foster, foment, or wage war: Be it

Resolved, That Kiwanis International reaffirms its complete confidence in the purposes of the United Nations, and gives wholehearted support to its ideals, aims, and objects, and calls upon the leaders of Government in the United States and Canada to initiate such amendments to the United Nations Charter as will strengthen the United Nations, so that it will be capable of insuring world peace and securing to all peoples their right to maintain their own domestic, political, economic, social, and religious institutions, be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of Canada, and all members of the Federal legislative bodies of both countries.

THE KOREAN WAR

Be it resolved, That Kiwanis International express its deep sense of obligation and gratitude to all who are engaged in the military service of our countries, and our sympathy to those who have sustained casualties; be it further

Resolved, That all Kawanians cheerfully and promptly make all necessary sacrifices to win the war and assure a world at peace.

CANADA-UNITED STATES FRIENDSHIP

One of the principal objectives of Kiwanis International is the fostering of friendship, good will, and understanding between Canada and the United States.

The attainment of this ideal has been made possible by the fact that our peoples have never permitted artificial barriers to stand between them but through personal contacts, cooperative association, and mutual understanding, have reaped the benefits of active individual participation in those human relationships which bring peace on earth and good will among men.

The harmonious relations between the peoples of Canada and the United States are conclusive evidence that common understanding and respect between peoples and nations provide the best answer to problems of international peace and security: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Kiwanis International shall continue to stress as one of its major objectives an increasing appreciation of the benefits which both countries enjoy from the friendly relations between Canada and the United States, and advance this practical example of how two nations and two peoples can live harmoniously as neighbors when each respects the rights, privileges, and achievements of the other.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

Be it resolved by Kiwanis International, That the admission to statehood of Alaska and Hawaii is in the national interest, and we urge the Congress of the United States to give immediate and favorable action on their petitions for statehood; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, and each Member of the Congress of the United States.

LABOR MANAGEMENT

The continued success of our economic system of free enterprise requires the cooperation of labor and management. This cooperation can result only from a complete and thorough understanding of the aims and desires of each group. It is essential that leaders from labor and management meet and discuss in an objective manner their common problems. We believe that Kiwanis should take the initiative in bringing labor and management together. We recommend that Kiwanis clubs actively strive through club programs, labor-management committees and use of the membership classification of organized labor, to bring labor and management into a closer and more harmonious relationship.

INDIVIDUAL ENTERPRISE

Whereas there is a growing tendency in the United States and Canada to substitute state socialism for private enterprise; and

Whereas our countries have achieved the highest standard of living known and afford the greatest economic opportunities to the individual under a free competitive enterprise system which, in two world wars has demonstrated the power and accomplishments of freemen acting through private initiative; and

Whereas there is at present a concerted effort by individuals and groups to substitute state socialism for the present free-enterprise system and democratic form of government: Be it

Resolved, That Kiwanis International does emphatically condemn and deplore this tendency and energetically opposes socialistic encroachment upon all fields of private enterprise as contrary to our way of life. We urge that Kiwanians wage a vigorous campaign of education to expose the false premises of socialism and to impart the knowledge of the benefits enjoyed under a free and independent economy.

DISABLED VETERANS

Whereas we are mindful of the disabled veterans in Government hospitals and at home, and we realize that were it not for the patriotic sacrifices made by these loyal and faithful members of the Armed Forces of these nations, we would not now enjoy the liberties and blessings of free men. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge our families and friends to show them greater consideration by more frequent visits and other manifestations of appreciation; be it further

Resolved, That all Kiwanis clubs be asked to broaden the scope of their activities to demonstrate to our sick and disabled veterans that their services were not in vain, that we are ever mindful of their part in the preservation of these nations, and that their sacrifices are continually in our memory.

SAFETY

Whereas the loss of life and injuries due to traffic accidents constitute a great national calamity, and it is apparent that most of these accidents are due to negligence and carelessness, and are avoidable: Be it

Resolved, That all Kiwanis clubs attack this problem on a community basis, giving accident-prevention programs a definite place among their activities; and be it further

Resolved, That we favor uniform traffic laws, their rigid and impartial enforcement, and that driving instructions and safety programs be made a part of the curriculum in our schools.

CONSERVATION

Whereas for the welfare of our nations it is fundamental that we properly conserve our natural resources, make proper use of our soil, and increase the fertility thereof;

Whereas Kiwanis International has for many years encouraged and supported programs looking toward improvement of soil

practices and expansion of conservation methods: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we continue to encourage and support this work and endeavor to obtain a more coordinated and constructive conservation program; that we request our clubs to cooperate in further development and extension of these projects so that our natural resources may be better conserved for the benefit of ourselves and our posterity.

SUPPORT OF CHURCHES

Whereas we are living in an era of unrest and uncertainty when the thinking of national and world leaders is confused because of the stress of national and world conditions; and

Whereas this confusion and uncertainty in material and mundane affairs has permeated the moral and spiritual thinking of our peoples and is having a disturbing effect on their faith in the future and their faith in the Almighty God: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Kiwanis International reaffirm its strong faith in the true and everlasting God and the religious concepts of Canada and the United States; that we reiterate our faith in the future of our homes, our churches, and our schools—the great institutions of our nations; and that we rededicate our efforts to maintain high spiritual ideals in our lands; be it further

Resolved, That Kiwanis clubs continue their active support of the churches and their programs devoted to raising the moral and spiritual level of our peoples; and that all Kiwanians be encouraged to work incessantly through their homes, churches, and schools to renew and to strengthen the spiritual lives of our people, our communities, and our nations.

YOUTH

To the youth of our international sphere will come the task of preserving the ideals of our way of life. Knowing that proper preparation is essential for their work in the years ahead, we hereby recognize our responsibility to assist in their training and education. We pledge the efforts of our clubs in the sponsoring and furthering of youth activities that we may do our part to foster character building, citizenship understanding and leadership among the youth of today—the men of tomorrow.

NATIONAL KIDS' DAY

Whereas National Kids' Day has now become an integral part of the Kiwanis youth program and is a major contribution to the work of the National Kids' Day Foundation: Be it

Resolved, That all Kiwanis clubs are urgently requested to participate in this movement in September of each year and make it an annual project of primary importance in their club program of youth activities, thereby acquainting the public with the interest of Kiwanis in the life of the young people in their communities.

V. I. P.'s

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. MCGUIRE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial entitled "V. I. P.'s," from the Meriden (Conn.) Record of August 13. This editorial points to the shameful exploitation of servicemen that is so prevalent in com-

munities surrounding military areas, a situation that President Truman and many of us in Congress have condemned on numerous occasions:

V. I. P.'s

The President's got something there. When he calls the great body of young servicemen V. I. P.'s meaning very important persons, he hits the nail on the head.

The President made his reference to V. I. P.'s last week when he was dedicating the Presidential lounge in the Union Station in Washington. He dedicated it to the young people who are in the Armed Forces. "We ought to see to it that they have proper recreation, decent housing for their families, and the kind of treatment they deserve in the towns and cities of this country. They have not been getting the right sort of treatment. Let us give it to them," he said.

The President had reference to the prejudice and discrimination raised against servicemen in many areas, especially near large military installations, where men off the post are often exploited. Lack of recreation facilities, poor housing accommodations for their families, and a general bilking by shopkeepers and proprietors of restaurants are among some of the accusations often made by servicemen.

The President's designation of the men in service as V. I. P.'s is a recognition befitting their status, for they are very important persons; very, very important, in the present state of world affairs. And it behooves all citizens to treat them with the consideration, courtesy, and friendliness which they are entitled to.

The Dream of Two Jerseymen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, no sweeter character has ever blessed the earth with his presence than Joseph P. Tumulty, who served as Secretary to President Woodrow Wilson during his two terms in the White House. Recently there has been published a book Joe Tumulty and the Wilson Era, written by Prof. John M. Blum, assistant professor of history at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. A review of the book and comments on the character and personality of Mr. Tumulty recently appeared in the Newark Sunday News, Newark, N. J. The article is written by one of its distinguished correspondents, Mr. Henry Suydam, who is thoroughly familiar with the personality and accomplishments of Mr. Tumulty as well as with the political history of Woodrow Wilson. I take pleasure in including in my extension of remarks this article by Mr. Suydam:

THE DREAM OF TWO JERSEYMEN STILL BRIGHT IN MAN'S HOPE

(By Henry Suydam)

It is almost a commonplace that Presidents of the United States, whatever their achievements in the domestic realm, arrive at the end of terms with the hope of being remembered for some outstanding accomplishment in the field of foreign policies.

Without question it is Mr. Truman's ambition, through the United Nations and

western rearmament, to prevent a third world war. It was Mr. Roosevelt's aspiration to win the Second World War, a goal that was in sight before his death. Mr. Hoover will be remembered for his moratorium on inter-Allied war debts, Mr. Coolidge for the Kellogg-Briand Pact outlawing war, as it was hoped; Mr. Harding for the first great effort at limitation of naval armaments and for the attempt to stabilize the political and geographical balance of the Pacific.

The name of Woodrow Wilson will ever be associated with the idea of maintaining peace through international organization. That the United States declined to become a member of the League of Nations and that the League failed to do not diminish Wilson's tragic fame. The vision of Wilson as a peacemaker has become dimmed in some memories, but it never faded in the heart of his New Jersey secretary, Joseph Patrick Tumulty.

ORIGINS

Mr. Tumulty, who went from the Horse-shoe in Jersey City to the White House, via Trenton, is the subject of an excellent portrait from the pen of John M. Blum, assistant professor of history at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, working under a grant from Harvard University. (Joe Tumulty and the Wilson Era, Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, Mass., \$4.)

Of the Wilson era an enormous amount has, of course, been written. Mr. Tumulty himself has written about it, in Woodrow Wilson as I Know Him. The late James Kerney, editor of the Trenton Times, wrote Political Education of Woodrow Wilson. These dealt, in part, with Wilson's nomination for Governor of New Jersey in 1910, his difficulties at Trenton, his clashes with some of the leading Democratic politicians in this State, who had helped him to the governorship and his preparations for the Democratic National Convention at Baltimore in 1912, which nominated him for President on the forty-third ballot.

FATHER AND SON

Much of this material is recited in detail in Mr. Blum's book, with special emphasis, of course, on the rise of Mr. Tumulty to prominence, first, in New Jersey, then in the Nation, because of his association with Wilson. The relationship was at the beginning and even in the earlier phases of Wilson's Presidential tenure of the order of the relationship between father and son, for Wilson, despite his final bitter experiences at Princeton, was affectionate and appreciative of the qualities of those close to him. It was not until the harrassments of the White House began to change him that he became suspicious, resentful, and, after his illness, querulous, unstable, unpredictable.

Mr. Blum, author of this new work, was born in 1921. It was in 1921 that Woodrow Wilson, stricken in health, left the White House. Mr. Tumulty retired, too, to the financial compensations of a private law practice. Thus Mr. Blum never saw the subject of his book in the secretarial office.

SPIRIT

Whether he knew Mr. Tumulty afterward, there is no evidence. If not, he has, to a remarkable degree, caught the spirit of the man. Mr. Blum is the first to have been given access to Mr. Tumulty's private papers, and perhaps that is the reason. He has further had the benefit of conversations with several members of the White House staff during the Wilson era, with various of Mr. Tumulty's associates, and with his children.

Still, there was a sensitive, lifting quality about Joe that is hard to put down on paper. He had the mobile face of an actor and much of what actors call "projection." You felt his presence in a room, and it was a good feeling. He exhibited, with middle

age, an appearance of real distinction. He was the most generous of men, even to those to whom he had no reason for gratitude.

Volatile, romantic, and imaginative, qualities without doubt derived from his Gaelic blood, Joe Tumulty had an enormous range of interests. Yes, he was a patronage dispenser, familiar with the ignoble, practical side of politics. But his acquaintanceship at the White House was far broader than political. He was interested in all that revolved around the Presidential office—persons, events, manifestations of human behavior.

He liked personalities of the theater and stage, artists, writers, and, above all, newspapermen. He did not like all newspapermen, but whether he liked them or not, he fought their battle, for he thought a free press was essential to a free government.

GRAND MANNER

In Wilson's time there was but one Presidential secretary, not three as there were from Hoover on. Mr. Tumulty carried out his secretarial duties in the grand manner. Woodrow Wilson was the passion of his life. His unstinted and unquenchable admiration for Wilson withstood all discouragements.

When Wilson died, Joe saw a vision—a vision of peace. It has never faded. Perhaps, please God, Wilson's dream which came to be no less Tumulty's will still come true.

The St. Lawrence Story—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the fourth of a series of articles entitled "The St. Lawrence Story," which appeared in the August 10 edition of the Minneapolis Star. This article relates to the importance of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project in guaranteeing to this country an adequate supply of iron ore:

THE ST. LAWRENCE STORY—GROWING STEEL DEMAND BOOSTS SEAWAY BACKING

(By Leo Sonderegger)

(Fourth of a series)

The final barrier to approval of the St. Lawrence seaway project may be unlocked with a key of iron.

The highest defense officials in the country are rattling this new key in an old lock, and the opposition does not relish the sound it makes.

Much of the seaway debate in recent months has oscillated between two vast magnetic poles. One of these is the Mesabi range in northern Minnesota; the other is the iron hills that rise deep in the Labrador-Quebec wilderness 1,500 miles to the north-east.

Positive and negative currents of argument flow steadily between these opposite poles. The argument principally concerns two sides of a single coin:

How great are the Mesabi reserves, and how rapidly are they dwindling?

How badly do we need the Labrador deposits?

It has been known for a long time, of course, that the iron ore reserves of the Lake Superior region are not bottomless. But

the ravenous demands of the allied war machine in World War II, coupled with steadily mounting steel needs in the foreseeable future, have given the problem a sharper focus.

HIGH-GRADE ORE IS LIMITED

The hills of Minnesota have provided the bulk of this Nation's iron ore for two generations. It is not a simple matter to figure out how much is left. All a layman can do is consult the experts. The experts differ.

Interpretations of what the experts say differ even more. It seems reasonable to conclude, however, that there is a sharply limited reserve of high-grade, direct-shipping ore that can be mined by open-pit methods.

That is the kind of ore the Mesabi Range has been famous for, the kind that is scooped out of the earth, dumped into cars and trundled off directly to the ore ships.

Just how many years' supply of this top-notch ore remains, no one knows. Some experts think it will be gone in 10 years, some add a few to that.

Their estimates express in figures what the mammoth Hull-Rust-Mahoning pit expresses in physical terms: Where a hill of iron rose 50 years ago there now is a 3-mile-long crater dug by man.

DISCOVERIES KEEP PACE WITH MINING

It is true, of course, that ore-supply figures are not static. New reserves are steadily being proven. The discovery of ore has almost kept pace with the mining.

It is also true that Minnesota tax policies encourage the mining companies not to "discover" ore on their land until it is needed for operations. However, there is not much doubt that the days of easy scooping are nearly past.

The mining people have a word they like to use—expansible. The direct-shipping ore is the rapidly expansible kind. If needs suddenly rise, as in time of war, production can be doubled by putting more steam shovels and railroad cars to work.

The other ores, the underground stuff and the middle-grade ore that requires beneficiation, are not as expansible as the direct-shipping ore.

Taconite is even less so, because obtaining iron from this extremely hard rock is practically a manufacturing process.

If the question is narrowed down to supply alone, it is apparent that the Mesabi is going to be producing substantial amounts of iron ore for a long time to come. The limits on taconite are astronomical.

Nevertheless, the fact remains that the hills of Minnesota have been turned inside out and shaken of their iron for half a century. No matter how hard we shake the hills from now on—by scouring bedrock, by utilizing ores of lower and lower grade, by speeding up production from taconite—our blast furnaces will yawn for more than the Mesabi can give them.

DEMANDS FOR STEEL CONTINUE TO GROW

A year ago the annual capacity of our steel industry was about 100 million ingot-tons. It was expected to go up to about 102 million tons by the end of 1952, with a probable rise to as much as 110 million by 1960.

Now, with the Korean war and our mobilization program superimposed upon an expanding economy, steel is expected to hit the 110,000,000 figure by the end of this year. The National Security Resources Board (NSRB) says that by 1960 capacity will be some 130,000,000 tons.

There is a growing shortage of scrap. This means that to turn out 130,000,000 tons of steel in 1960 we will need about 160,000,000 tons of iron ore. Where will it come from?

NSRB figures that the Lake Superior region will be producing about 80,000,000 tons annually at that time, exclusive of taconite.

An optimistic estimate for taconite provides another 15,000,000 tons.

Other domestic sources and the Steep Rock deposits in Canada north of Lake Superior are expected to boost the total to 120,000,000.

Seaway opponents make much of the Steep Rock reserves. Their argument is that as the Mesabi shrinks there will be plenty of ore from Steep Rock and, thus, no real need for the Labrador ore.

There is a lot of contradictory testimony as to the amount and quality of reserves in the Canadian deposits north of Lake Superior. Apparently much of the ore will have to be mined by costly underground methods.

It seems a fair conclusion, after the available evidence has been considered, that Steep Rock is not the answer to the iron problem.

A domestic total of 120,000,000 tons leaves 40,000,000 tons to come out of foreign reserves. The Security Resources Board thinks that deposits in Venezuela could provide half of that by 1960, with places such as Sweden, Chile, and Liberia good for another 4 or 5 million tons.

The big trouble with these sources is that, in wartime, the ore ships would be prime submarine targets. This brings the discussion, in what seaway proponents consider an eminently logical sequence, to Labrador.

FOUR HUNDRED MILLION TONS PROVED IN LABRADOR

The hills there have not been shaken of their iron. They are still green with forest, waiting for the great shovels to begin their work.

The Labrador deposits are rich and large, and rapidly expandable. Some 400,000,000 tons have been proved. Estimated reserves are much greater.

The M. A. Hanna Co., a Cleveland mining firm, and five American steel companies have joined forces with the Hollinger mining interests of Canada to exploit the Labrador deposits. More than \$200,000,000 is being poured into the development.

A railroad line is being constructed from Seven Islands, a St. Lawrence River port town, 350 miles north to the mining concession on the Labrador-Quebec border.

The schedule calls for the first shipments of ore in 1954, with 10,000,000 tons a year moving by 1957. Facilities for a 20,000,000-ton operation are being installed.

The trick is to get the ore from Seven Islands, terminal point of the company railroad line, to the Midwest steel mills.

With the St. Lawrence seaway, huge carriers of the lake type could haul the Labrador ore to the Erie ports that have gulped Minnesota ores for 60 years. Even with the contemplated toll of about 50 cents a ton, this would be the cheapest way of doing the job.

THREE ALTERNATIVES CONFRONT SHIPPERS

There are three alternatives. One is to ship the ore from Seven Island out the gulf and down the east coast some 1,500 miles to Baltimore or Philadelphia. From there it could be transported by rail 400 or 500 miles out to the lower lakes furnaces.

A second alternative is to ship ore in big vessels up the deep channel from Seven Islands to Montreal, transfer it to rail cars there, and trundle it down to the mills.

The third alternative is to transfer the cargo from big ships to canallers at Montreal and send it up the present 14-foot canal route to the Erie ports.

Any of these alternatives or a combination of them would make the seaway unnecessary, the railroad people claim. They contend they could handle the entire Labrador production.

The railroads point out that plans already have been made to ship 10,000,000 tons of

ore from Labrador without benefit of the seaway. The steel companies do acknowledge that they could move this tonnage by using the alternatives outlined above. They are much less optimistic about handling double that amount.

The argument boils down to three elements: the danger of open sea transport, the high cost of rail shipment, and the railroads' capacity. The railroad people don't make a very good case on any of these points.

The submarine danger in time of war is obvious. The cost differential between rail and water transportation is well known.

As for the third point, capacity, the burden of proof rests with the railroads. It is significant that they have no adequate answer to the perennial complaint of a boxcar shortage.

Experience the past winter in Minnesota doesn't argue very well for their ability to transport large quantities of iron ore over long distances. An experimental haul of an intended 3,000,000 tons fell far short of the goal.

The railroads hint at the obvious, which is that interests exploiting the Labrador deposits are pushing the seaway mainly because it would give them a favorable mine-to-mill haulage rate.

The steel companies also recognize the obvious; they admit that low cost transportation is what they are after. But they insist that part of their zeal springs from the hazards of supplying the furnaces in wartime without an inland water route.

That is the main consideration, so far as this Nation's present interests are concerned. Top security officials are convinced that the seaway is the answer. Heavy odds say they are right.

Caught in a Trap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, home folks just cannot understand why it is that our Representatives in Washington—at least those who profess they are for economy and efficiency in the Federal Government—vote for appropriation bills calling for the expenditure of billions of dollars.

An illustration of why, no matter how determined one may be to prevent waste and unnecessary spending, he is caught in a trap, is found in this week's proceedings in the House which culminated Thursday in the passage of a bill calling for \$56,000,000,000 for the armed services. Now, many of the Congressmen know—they just do not think—they know—that the bill carried several billion dollars which, if good judgment and sound thinking was used, would not be needed.

One example: To aid in salvaging surplus property, the Army asked for \$10,000,000; the Navy, \$4,000,000; the Air Force, \$3,000,000. Have your 8-year-old girl or boy add the three. The result will be \$17,000,000, but in the bill, the request was for \$25,000,000—just a slight error in addition of \$8,000,000. One would think that when this error of \$8,-

000,000 was caught and called to the attention of those handling the bill on the floor, the amendment to make the correction and save the \$8,000,000 would be accepted. But no. We had to have a vote on it. That just illustrates how millions and sometimes billions are appropriated and afterward spent and how difficult it is to cut appropriations.

But you ask if I and other Congressmen know, as we do know, of so much waste, extravagant buying and downright corruption, why did we vote for the bill. The reason is very clear and it is also humiliating.

Over the years, in spite of everything which I, and others of like mind, have said and done—and it has been more than a little—the administration and its advisers have encouraged, harbored, had on the payroll in policy-making positions, Communists whose objective was the destruction of this Government, wasters who insist upon needless spending.

Sincere, patriotic individuals believe that world peace can be brought about if we join, and become subservient to, some Old World organization, aid other nations with our dollars and matériel, participate in wars which it is said would establish peace. The net result has been that we have contributed more than \$117,000,000,000 to aid other nations, that we fought World War II and are now in world war III.

Our men are fighting and dying in Korea. If administration plans go through we will soon have 4,000,000 men in Europe and however much we may deplore and resent our present situation, I and other Members of Congress, cannot refuse to vote the money needed to feed, clothe, and equip our own men who, some without their consent—others despite their protest—have been conscripted to fight abroad.

I want no part of the Marshall-Acheson-Rosenberg program which, to date—unintentionally, if you will—has aided the Communist cause, given China to Russia and if followed to the bitter end, will destroy us as a Nation just as certainly as would Stalin's army if it were victorious.

But, while I will vote funds to protect and aid those of our men who are fighting—even though they fight for other nations—I will not vote away our dollars to aid other nations if and when it is clearly shown that by following such a course we will, as was last week stated editorially in the Saturday Evening Post "by aimless dispersions of power," strip ourselves "of the ability to defend anything."

THERE IS A LIMIT

For the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1951, the Congress gave the armed services \$56,000,000,000. Of that amount \$20,000,000,000 remains unexpended though obligated. Yesterday, the House gave them for this fiscal year another \$56,000,000,000. Today comes the authorization for \$4,800,000,000 additional to build bases abroad. Soon will come a request for \$8,500,000,000 more for foreign aid. I had no part in getting us into this mess—I hope to help get us out. That is better than \$69,000,000,000—but

not all of the program. This is on top of a national debt of \$260,000,000,000. If you are interested, figure your share of this debt. And still there's more to follow. No one knows how much.

If a majority of our people still think that the New Deal, the Fair Deal, and wars abroad are necessary or desirable, I hope they will take at least one more look before election day in 1952.

Floods and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRAZIER REAMS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a portion of an editorial in the Toledo Blade of August 10, 1951, entitled "Floods and Politics:"

President Truman is quite right when he charges that politics has had a lot to do with blocking efforts to get on with a comprehensive flood-control program for the Missouri River Valley. He's right, too, when he contends that the people in the States most directly affected will have to play some politics of their own by electing the kind of men who will take the lead in getting congressional action.

If it appears that we're using the word politics ambiguously in this discussion, it's just the inevitable result of an old American custom of assigning an element of approbrium to the word which it really doesn't deserve. For politics actually is the word which best describes the process by which representative government is carried on. That the process may be, and often is, abused doesn't alter the fact that things get done by governments by means of politics or they don't get done at all.

There has been talk of need for a comprehensive Missouri River Valley program for a long time. But because it has been mostly talk up to this time, so little has been done that the most elemental problem—flood control—has been neglected.

This delay is due in part to the fact that it has been impossible to get any agreement among the representatives of the States most directly affected on the kind of program they want. It is due in part to the lack of strong and consistent congressional and executive leadership which insists that something be done. And it is due in part to the fact that the voters of States like Kansas, Nebraska, Missouri—which are right in the heart of the Missouri River Valley—send to Congress the kind of men who scream bloody murder about socialism and paternalism whenever a comprehensive program is mentioned.

If there is to be such a program of flood control and conservation for the Missouri River Valley, which might or might not be patterned after TVA, it must be a single, inclusive plan, administered by a central agency. Experience has proved that there is no other satisfactory method, especially in an area so sprawling.

To secure congressional approval of such a program is going to require political activity on the part of many people. President Truman must apply pressure, practice cajolery, and be as enthusiastic for a Missouri River Valley program when he talks with congressional leaders as he is when speaking for

public consumption. The men who represent these States in Congress must compromise their differences and agree on a program that will meet the area's needs. And perhaps the voters of States like Kansas, Nebraska, and Missouri will have to engage in politics themselves by electing as their representatives men who understand the problem and the need to do something about it.

Yes, floods and politics definitely are related. For it is only through politics that the necessary steps can be taken to do something about preventing floods, instead of bemoaning them after they have happened.

The President's Gift Elephant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, as every Member of this body knows, the problems confronting one occupying an elective office are numerous and complex. I think that most of my colleagues will agree that the frequency and complexity of the problems increase in direct proportion to the importance of the office and the number of citizens eligible to vote for the candidate. This being the case, I think that we are all inclined to be sympathetic to the problems which confront anyone occupying the office of President of the United States.

The present incumbent of that office has had more than his share. There have been the deep freezes, the mink coats, those in the official family who could not resist temptation to turn a fast buck in the commodity market and others who could not help thinking of the RFC in terms of fees and personal aggrandizement. Then, too, there were those letters which constituted a continuing temptation and a continuous problem.

One would think that such travails would be more than the fair share to be visited upon a single individual. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, such has not been the case, for now there comes the biggest of all embarrassing problems—physically, that is—in the form of a Cambodian elephant now en route from the King of Cambodia to Blair House. And Job thought he had trouble!

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the external physical limitations of Blair House. Some are even familiar with its internal limitations. I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that I have lain awake at night and devoted many sleepless hours to thinking about how to fit a Cambodian elephant into the confines of Blair House or its limited back yard. Despite these cerebrations, I have found no answer. Therefore, I am all the more sympathetic with the person to whom the solution of this exceedingly difficult international problem will be entrusted. He is truly on the spot.

Although I have not been informed as to the identity of this individual, I

can think of several who are eminently qualified from background, training, and experience. First and foremost is the great panjandrum of the White House entourage—Gen. Harry Vaughan. Truly he would cut an impressive figure seated in an elaborately brocaded howdah atop the Cambodian elephant. What better coign from which to display his manly chest resplendent with the foreign decorations which he has been receiving in such large numbers of late? How dashing a figure he would be en route from his home in Virginia to the White House. What an attraction for the tourists. And what an adornment for parades in honor of visiting dignitaries or in observance of national holidays. Of course there would have to be a mahout to control the elephant and insure the safety of General Vaughan. Perhaps Mr. William Boyle would be available for this chore, although I do believe that his availability might be dependent upon the monthly retainer fee which went with the job.

But, on the other hand, it might be that this is primarily a diplomatic problem involving international relations of a high order. After all, the gift of an oriental potentate cannot lightly be brushed aside or relegated to the ash heap. To do so might cause grave international complications. It might involve us in a war or at least cause a friendly ruler—as a result of hurt pride—to seek solace and comfort from the Red Bear which roams at large behind the iron curtain. That being the case, perhaps it is a problem for the State Department. I am sure that some of the master minds, the bright young men who in such large numbers inhabit that Department of the executive branch of the Government could come up with a solution. Probably some of the junior geniuses who planned and executed our strategy in China since 1945 are now at liberty. I refer, of course, to the "let the dust settle in China, they're only agrarian reformers" strategists. They have held themselves out as specialists in oriental problems. I would like to see what they can do with this one. The solution might be as brilliant as was the one they worked out in China.

Mr. Speaker, I am not alone in my concern over this important impending international incident. Far from it. Many others have cudged their craniums, beat their brains, gestated their gray matter, nonplussed their noodles, and crebrated their cerebellums, all to no avail, in an attempt to find a solution. It is time we turn it over to better minds for solution.

As corroborative evidence of what I have just stated, I would like to include an editorial which was printed in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat for Sunday, August 5, which is as follows:

COUP DE GRASS

On the basis of reports from usually unimpeachable southwest French Indochinese sources at this moment there is en route from the King of Cambodia to President Truman, one de luxe model elephant—either *loxodonta africana*, the kind with the big flapping ears, or *elephas maximus*, the one that looks better than it hears. Whichever,

it is a sort of thank-you note on the hoof, inspired by the President's recent accreditation of Cambodia's first Minister to Washington. That's what comes of being kind to people—they send you beasts and things.

Anyway, now comes the crisis-facing. Blair House being a trifle on the cramped side, what does one do with an uninvited elephant? Is the problem referred to a Be Nice to All Gifts No Matter What Department headed perhaps by Major General Vaughan, or does the President simply dash him off one of those famous notes guaranteed to shrivel anything to desk size? So far Mr. Truman has confined himself to a casual hint about hieing him off to the Washington Zoo. But can you do that to a Cambodian elephant arriving first cabin and with diplomatic certification? Anybody can be sent to a zoo; in fact more people need to be. The fact he would probably be happier there than hanging around Mr. Truman's Federal jungle takes no thought of protocol.

There is, however, one way out of this lethal international situation. Lately Mr. Truman has been losing his zing. His barbs are slipping, no pyrotechnics in his tongue. How can he expect to cling to the White House like that? So how about tethering this ageing, hungry elephant just outside the door. It might remind him of something.

The Oatis Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Newark (N. J.) Star-Ledger of August 14, 1951:

UNITED STATES SENATOR MARGARET CHASE SMITH SAYS UNITED STATES MUST RETALIATE FOR JAILING OF OATIS

As a former full-time newspaperwoman, I may be less objective than I should be about the Oatis case—the imprisonment of William N. Oatis, Associated Press correspondent in Prague, whom the Communists of Czechoslovakia have jailed under false charges of spying. But I don't think so. More than just an individual American is involved.

Nothing less than the prestige and the free position of the United States is involved. Oatis was jailed only for doing his job—legitimate news reporting. He was not spying—unless reporting the truth is spying. Of course, in the Communist countries telling the truth has become a crime. And that was the crime of William Oatis.

It is even more than that. Actually, the Czech Communists just wanted to make an example of some American to show the rest of the world how they could kick the United States and its citizens around and get away with it.

The objective is clear—to ridicule the United States through pushing around one of its citizens on charges that the Czech Communists knew the rest of the world wouldn't believe. They didn't want the rest of the world to believe the charges, because the more obvious the mockery of the charges, the more emphatic the slapping that the Red Czechs were giving to the United States.

The Czech Reds, in trampling and reviling the rights of an individual American,

have insulted and defied the United States and every citizen of our country. They haven't hit just William Oatis. They have hit you.

The first step of our country was to make diplomatic complaints. To the Czech Reds this was only a sign of weakness. They slapped us in the face again and rebuffed our complaints with a derisive snarl. Then Congress started speaking up through its Members and in the consideration of resolutions of condemnation.

That is fine. But words are not enough. They roll off the Communist like water off the back of a duck. Action is vital here. The Communists have no capacity for reason or discussion. They have no respect for human dignity. They respect only action that hurts them either economically or physically.

For a muchly maligned State Department, it must be said that it has taken some effective action after its diplomatic words and the words of Congress have failed to make the Red Czechs realize that they are not going to get away with this without retaliatory action. The State Department has moved to curtail trade with Czechoslovakia. And that will hurt because the Czechs need American dollars.

I hope Congress will pass the stiffest possible resolution to let the Czech Reds know they can't get away with it and to encourage the State Department to take faster and stiffer action if Oatis is not released.

We've restricted trade. It may be necessary to cut off all trade with Communist Czechoslovakia to get justice and raise the American flag out of the dirt that they have trampled it in before the whole world. I am sure that if true Czech patriots and leaders like Benes and Masaryk were alive they would feel that way.

Iron Curtain Must Be Pierced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Drew Pearson, from today's Washington Post:

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

IRON CURTAIN MUST BE PIERCED

(This column was written from Europe which Mr. Pearson is now touring.)

NEAR THE IRON CURTAIN IN CENTRAL EUROPE.—The most important answer to the alarming question put before Congress recently by Secretaries Marshall and Pace—"Will there be war with Russia soon?"—lies in the long stretch of barbed wire extending from the Black Sea to the Baltic which Winston Churchill named the iron curtain.

Most Americans, including the United States Government, have neglected the importance of this barrier between east and west.

We have failed to realize that there will always exist the danger of war with Russia as long as this curtain exists; as long as the Moscow radio can tell the Russian people anything they want about us and the Russian people have no way of knowing the opposite; and as long as there is no free parliament, no free church, no free press, no free public opinion to prevent the Kremlin from declaring war.

We have also failed to realize that even if we fight a war with Russia and win, actually our victory will be temporary unless we can convert the Russian people to friendship with the United States of America. Until we have done that, we shall have to fight wars all over again.

Finally we have failed to realize that Russia has never been conquered by force of arms. Napoleon tried it and got bogged down on the road to Moscow. Hitler also tried it and got swamped in front of Stalin-grad.

But the Kaiser, having been stopped in Latvia, picked up Lenin in Switzerland, put him on a special train with drawn blinds, and sent him to Russia. It was after this that Russia, under a new Bolshevik regime, finally surrendered.

In other words, it was propaganda and politics which really defeated the Czar.

Weather balloons

That is the one reason why I have been hammering home the idea that we should use any and all kinds of propaganda, including weather balloons, to penetrate the iron curtain and get the truth to the people of Russia and the satellites.

No matter what else is happening inside Russia, one thing is certain. Stalin has imposed the iron curtain for the specific reason that he fears contact between the Russian people and the outside world.

He knows and a small segment of the Russian people also know, how American and Soviet troops drank vodka together, toasted their mutual friendship together on the shores of the River Elbe at the end of the war.

He also knows how soldiers of the Red Army who have visited Vienna, Warsaw, Prague or even shell-pocked Berlin, have returned to tell their friends about the culture and economic progress of the free world lying beyond the Soviet border. Some of these soldiers have shown such enthusiasm over the West and such skepticism over communism that it has been necessary to isolate them, following their discharge, from their native villages.

Stalin also knows that when the Nazis advanced into Russia in 1940 the astounding total of 3,600,000 Russians surrendered to the Germans.

We in the West did not know about this wholesale surrender until after we had seized German documents and interviewed German officers after VE-day. But Stalin knew. And he knew that the German Army never would have penetrated Russia as it did if many of the Russian people had not actually welcomed it, and if whole segments of the Red Army had not been eager to surrender.

The Kaiser's army in 1915-17 advanced only to Riga. It never actually reached the soil of Russia proper. Hitler's army in 1940 marched two-thirds of the way across Russia, right down to the Caucasus. In other words, the Czar, with all his tyranny, commanded more loyalty than Stalin.

These are some of the reasons for the iron curtain. These also are some of the reasons why we must make the iron curtain a lace curtain if we are to prevent war; if we are to win permanent peace over a period of years.

Counterpropaganda

Propaganda balloons floated across the iron curtain have their drawbacks. If they disrupt satellite and Russian public opinion enough, the Kremlin is bound to start the rumor that they are carrying bacteriological warfare—germs aimed to ruin the crops of the Communist people.

The Kremlin may also plant a bomb with an alleged propaganda balloon, arrange to kill someone and then claim that Westerners are trying to murder the Russian people.

Some counterpropaganda like this is almost certain to happen. But when two na-

tions suffer such strained relations as the United States of America and U. S. S. R. you can't make those relations any worse, and sometimes revolutionary methods and radical surgery improve them.

Independent States: "Quo Vadis?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in this day and time when some would change the watchword of our country to "security" instead of "opportunity," it is reassuring to know that there are still people actively working at the task of preserving America as the land of opportunity and the home of liberty.

The last few years have brought us face to face with the problem Benjamin Franklin had in mind when he said: "We have a Republic, if we can keep it." We are now solemnly asking ourselves the question, Can we keep this Republic which has belonged to us for 175 years? In the period which lies immediately ahead of us, we shall have the answer. If we Americans of this generation have in our make-up the stamina, endurance, courage, and patriotism, which the Americans of Washington's generation possessed, the answer will be "Yes." If we can forget self, if we can regard security in its proper relation to other things, if we can forget ease, idleness, and gain, and plan to transmit to our posterity for generations to come the government of liberty, freedom, and opportunity, which our ancestors established and transmitted to us, then the answer will be "Yes."

If, on the other hand, we cannot look at this thing we call security in its proper perspective, if we cannot look to the future instead of the present, if we cannot think of posterity instead of ourselves, if we will not take the time and the trouble to face the facts as they are and to understand them and then face the sacrifice and hardships which those facts make necessary, then the answer will be "No."

I do not believe that regimentation has replaced liberty in our national conscience. I do not believe that America is willing to trade unlimited opportunity for uncertain security.

I have had the privilege to look at Plymouth Rock in Massachusetts where the Pilgrim Fathers stepped ashore in 1620. I have seen replicas of the crude one-room houses they built there with their hands. The floor was dirt, and they cooked in the fireplace. A ladder led to the loft where the children slept. There was a musket on the wall, and a fence around the fort. This was the only security which they knew, and they furnished this security themselves.

Associate Justice Bond Almand, of the Supreme Court of Georgia, is one of those who understands America and ap-

preciates what it stands for. He delivered an address to the Georgia Bar Association at its annual meeting at Savannah, Ga., on June 1, in which he dealt realistically with these matters. In that address Justice Almand said:

I speak for a hardy race of men and women, who carved out of the soil, forests, and rivers of North America a free and independent Nation—loving freedom and liberty, fearing a just God, and restrained only by a Government of their own creation as to their own conduct which affected injuriously the rights of others.

I know of no one better qualified to speak for this hardy race of men and women than Justice Almand. He has spoken eloquently for them and their descendants, and for us of the present generation. His address is one which should be read and studied by good Americans everywhere. Pursuant to leave granted, I insert his address herewith:

INDEPENDENT STATES: "QUO VADIS?"

It seems to be an unwritten axiom that an appellate court judge should be a tongueless mummy, who is confined to recording his opinions in legal tomes where they are thus embalmed and interred, to be read in most instances only by the lawyer who lost his case. It is said that such a judge may speak on the Constitution, the glory of Greece, the grandeur of Rome, and the price of peanuts in Patagonia. But about politics, religion, or economics, no. On all these subjects, about which he is required to know something, he is required, it is said, to be voiceless.

There are but few general rules without an exception, and without doing violence to the rule or offending those who, in their robes symbolizing a funeral silence, think that judges should only en banc discuss the problems of the State and Nation, I think I have found a ground upon which I might speak publicly upon a living subject. According to law, I am still a lawyer. Before I was a lawyer, I was an American citizen. At my birth I inherited the rights, privileges, duties, and liberties of a Government that my forebears for eight generations, as colonists and Americans, had, through sweat, blood, and tears, helped to create and preserve for my generation. So, speaking as their representative, I bring myself within the exception to the general rule of judicial silence.

I speak for a hardy race of men and women, who carved out of the soil, forests and rivers of North America a free and independent nation—loving freedom and liberty, fearing a just God, and restrained only by a government of their own creation as to their own conduct which affected injuriously the rights of others. For those that built their homes without an FHA loan; that tilled the soil without a government subsidy; that educated their children without public funds; that for 4 years fought for their rights and lived in abject poverty under the bayonets of a military government; who reconstructed their social and economic structures without the aid of a Marshall plan or point 4 program; who knew not of vitamins, penicillin or Hadaool, but with asafetida, calomel and sassafras roots lived on the average beyond their Biblical span; families that supplied the needs of their neighbors when sickness, death and adversity struck; a race sturdy, self-reliant and thrifty, who believe that one was only entitled to what he had earned—not a day's pay for half a day's work—that never had the benefit of Government charity and never wanted it—who in old age never had their mental peace or happi-

ness marred with worries about a monthly pension check, and why "that rich and ungrateful Government did not make it larger."

As one of the inheritors of the benefits and blessings handed down to a free America, I am honored to speak for those who now sleep in peace.

The query topic of this address is taken from an ancient legend, which relates that Saint Peter, fleeing from Rome and away from death, met his Lord Christ on the Appian Way, and said to Christ, "Domine quo vadis," which translated, means, "Lord, whither goest Thou?" "To Rome to be crucified again," was the reply. St. Peter thereupon turned back to Rome and his own martyrdom. Some may say the States, as we understand their powers and functions historically under the Constitution, have already been merged and submerged with the Federal Government, that they are martyrs to federalism, and therefore this subject is obsolete. But though sound principles of government, like truth, may be crushed to earth, they never die, but live to rise again. There is still hope for the return of a government of laws under a written constitution—a government of free and independent States—a government that exists to preserve and protect the individual rights and liberties of all the people against tyranny of political expediency—one that does not exalt the few at the expense of the many—a government that should remember from the basic experience of its creation that taxation with misrepresentation is just as bad as taxation without representation.

In this era, when democratic governments are falling like tenpins to the onslaughts of totalitarian dictators and socialistic dreamers, many thoughtful political students in the United States are apprehensive that the strongest democratic nation on earth may succumb to the ideologies of either state socialism or communism. These fears exist notwithstanding the fact that we have 48 independent States and a Federal Government that governs only by virtue of a Constitution written and adopted by separate sovereigns whose creation and existence is controlled by written constitutions adopted by the will of the people of the respective States. All of the constitutions being adopted by a society that believes in the following principles:

(a) All governments owe their creation and existence to the consent of the governed,

(b) That government is merely the agency to whom the governed have delegated certain powers for their protection and the mutual welfare of all;

(c) That the best society is one that is least regulated;

(d) That inherent in all men are the basic freedoms of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness in the individual; the private ownership of property, and that government is instituted to protect these rights, and not to destroy them;

(e) That the right to change the form of government is reserved to the people and is delegated neither to the legislative nor the judicial departments of government.

Today some of the charges made are as follows:

1. The Federal Government is exercising powers not granted to it by the Federal Constitution.

2. The States are no longer individual sovereigns in powers not expressly granted to the Federal Government, but are fast becoming mere voiceless geographical areas exercising only taxing and police powers of local government.

3. That under the granted powers to tax for purposes expressed or implied and to regulate interstate commerce, the Federal

Supreme Court has upheld acts of Congress that have changed our form of government.

4. That under assumed powers, private business and individuals have been so regulated, regimented and controlled by the central government that the basic freedoms guaranteed by the Federal Constitution have been impaired if not destroyed.

5. That by construction and judicial legislation, the Supreme Court has in effect amended the Federal Constitution, whereby the powers reserved by the States have been taken away without a formal amendment to the Constitution.

In assessing the reasons for the complaints we hear today about the centralization of government and the trend toward socialism, the invasion of States' rights—and seeking to find the answer to the question of where we are going, we have divided our subject into four phases: First, the Federal Union of States as conceived by those who wrote the Constitution; second, the assumption of power by the national Congress arising from so-called national necessity and the retention thereof in normal times, with the aid of the Federal judiciary; the atrophy of State power by the States' defaulting in the performance of their duties; and fourth, the need for a rebirth and resurgence of the early American concept that a government of men rather than of laws ultimately leads to man's enslavement.

I

All of you, I am sure, are acquainted with the story and occasion out of which the Federal Union was founded. The Constitution as finally written was a compromise between the delegates of the large and powerful States with the representatives from the smaller and weaker States. The smaller States were apprehensive that if the Federal Government was granted too much power, it would work to the ultimate injury and destruction of the smaller States, and after the Constitution was adopted in convention, before the smaller States would ratify it, they were assured that by virtue of article 10 of the Constitution, all powers that were not expressly granted to the Federal Government would be reserved by the States. The letters of Hamilton, Madison, and Jay, now known as the Federalist, were written and published in the nature of what we today call propaganda, to assure the smaller States that no harm would come to them by reason of the adoption of the Federal Constitution. Though Alexander Hamilton led the fight for a strong central government, the ideas of Mason and Luther, who held the view of Thomas Jefferson, won out over Hamilton in the convention. At that time it was thought that the chief powers that the Federal Government would have to be concerned mainly with were, the raising of armies for national protection; the power to tax for the support of the Federal Government; and the freeing of interstate commerce from restraints and interferences by the various States.

The framers of the Constitution did not reach into the ethereal blue and draw therefrom a new system of government. Nor was the Constitution the result of divine inspiration, although the framers had, in my opinion, divine guidance. That document was written by thoughtful and serious men, who knew the good and bad of all civilized governments that had previously existed. They were acquainted with governments that were ruled by hereditary kings, by ecclesiastics, by emperors, by despots, by military dictators, by pure democracy or mobocracy, and by parliaments. In the creation of the Federal Union by the consent of two-thirds of the 13 States, they sought to create a Federal Government having limited expressed powers and reserving to themselves all the powers not delegated, whereby the National Government would be a rep-

resentative, and not a democratic, form of government, in which the States, as such, would be represented by Senators chosen by the respective States, and the people would be represented by Congressmen chosen by the people of their respective districts. As an independent and separate check on both the legislative and executive departments, they created what was unknown up until that time—a judiciary that would have authority to interpret the Constitution and declare invalid, with finality, the acts of either of those departments outside of the Constitution.

The framers of the Constitution were familiar with the treatises of political philosophers from Plato to Rousseau. They were acquainted with what John Locke had written in 1690: "The legislature cannot transfer the power of making laws to any other hands, for it being but a delegated power from the people, they who have it cannot pass it over to others." The people "retain the supreme power of saving themselves from the attempts and designs of anybody, even of their legislators, whenever they should be so foolish or so wicked as to lay and carry on designs against the liberties and properties of the subject."

II

In the early beginning of our history there was not much litigation in Federal courts, and for the first few years of its history, the Supreme Court played very little part in the formulation of governmental policies. It is said that John Marshall took the blueprint of the Federal Government and was the judicial carpenter who constructed the Federal Government. Certainly, by his opinion in *Marbury v. Madison*, he left no doubt as to what power the Supreme Court had. Though commerce in the early days was confined to business carried over post roads and navigable streams between States, the interpretation of Marshall in *Gibbons v. Ogden* has been stretched and expanded until today any transaction between individuals or businesses that involves the slightest or remotest effect on or concern of interstate commerce or communication has been held to be interstate commerce. It is doubtful that if John Marshall were alive today he would say that the ruling in *Kirschbaum Co. v. Walling* (316 U. S. 517), which holds that the wages and hours of a person running elevators in an office building where a small percentage of the occupants therein were carrying on transactions in regard to interstate shipments, constituted interstate commerce and was subject to Federal legislation, is a direct blood descendant of *Gibbons v. Ogden*.

The charge is frequently made that since 1932 our country has gone through a political and economic revolution, and that practically overnight our form of Government has been changed. Some attribute these revolutionary changes to the fact that we have become primarily an industrial Nation; while others charge that the change has been due to a change in the personnel of the Supreme Court in the last 14 years. We will not pause here to examine the causes of background out of which these charges arise, but since these radical changes have been brought about by reason of approval of the Supreme Court of the United States, which approval was a complete reversal of many previous decisions of the same court, it is important to examine the substance of the last charge.

In the period between 1937 and 1947, there was a complete change in the personnel of the Supreme Court of the United States. Between January 1935, and May 1935, that court declared invalid 11 pieces of congressional legislation, which dealt with conditions growing out of the depression. Practically all the New Deal economic and social program was set aside by the Court as unconstitutional, but when the new appointees

comprised a majority of the Court, on reenactment of the laws which had been declared to be unconstitutional, such reenacted laws were declared to be constitutional. To uphold the Agricultural Adjustment Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, and the National Labor Relations Act, the commerce clause of the Constitution was stretched to cover all acts or services that were closely or remotely connected with the physical acts of transportation or communication. In *National Labor Relations Board v. Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.* (301 U. S. 1), it was held "The congressional authority to protect interstate commerce from burdens and obstructions is not limited to transactions which can be deemed to be essential part of a flow of interstate or foreign commerce. Burdens and obstructions may be due to injurious action springing from other sources." How far this doctrine has been carried is illustrated by *Wickard v. Filburn* (317 U. S. 111), which holds that a farmer raising 23 acres of wheat, none of it being produced for interstate commerce, was subject to marketing penalties under the Adjustment Act; and further, by the recent case of *Amalgamated Association of Street Electric Railway & Motor Employees of America v. Wisconsin Employment Relations Board* (71 Sup. Ct. 359), decided January 9, 1951, which held that Federal labor legislation applied to a privately owned utility whose business activities were carried on wholly within a single State and prevented local regulation. The power of Congress to tax for the payment of benefits under the Social Security Act was upheld in *Helvering v. Davis* (301 U. S. 619). Under the interpretation by the Court of the words "general welfare," as contained in article 1, section 8, paragraph 1 of the Federal Constitution, it was held that the concept of general welfare is not static but adapts itself to the crises and necessities of the time, and that the courts should not overrule the determination by Congress of what acts come within general welfare, unless the congressional legislation is plainly arbitrary. Under this interpretation, there are now pending many bills in Congress which would impose many billions of dollars in taxes for the support of many social welfare schemes. By Court decision, the power of Congress to regulate commerce of navigable rivers has been expanded to include the power to control nonnavigable tributaries, on the theory that the water from the smaller streams go to make up a navigable river. *Oklahoma v. Phillips* (313 U. S. 508). So, if you are planning to build a minnow pond on your farm across a creek ankle-deep, that eventually finds its way into a navigable stream, you had better find out first from Washington whether it will consent or not.

It may be true that in a national emergency such as a national economic depression, to preserve the Nation it is necessary that individual rights of citizens be subordinated to the general welfare of all. Such Government action may be compared to the quarantine or isolation of an individual who has smallpox. His right to free movement is restricted until he has recovered, in order to protect those who have not had smallpox, but his restraint ends when he is well again. It is not so with Washington. Laws restricting individuals, regulating business, and the multitude of administrative agencies, when there is no depression, still carry on.

All the radical changes which have occurred during the last 18 years were initiated and enacted by a Democratic Congress and approved by a court whose majority were members of the Democratic Party. This Party was founded by Thomas Jefferson, and the Democratic Party today calls itself the party of Jefferson, and annually pays tribute to his memory, and loudly proclaims that the program of today is the program of Jefferson. This, notwithstanding the fact that in

actuality the central government at Washington comes nearer to carrying out the view of Alexander Hamilton. The platform of the National Democratic Party has no more resemblance to the political ideals of Jefferson than the Queensbury rules have to the Ten Commandments.

At the next annual Jefferson Day dinner, sponsored by the Democratic Party, there should be read the following letter written by Thomas Jefferson in 1825, less than 7 months before his death:

"I see as you do with the deepest affliction, the rapid strides with which the Federal branch of our Government is advancing toward the usurpation of all the rights reserved to the States and the consolidation in itself of all powers, foreign and domestic; and that too by construction which if legitimate, leaves no limit to their power. Take together the decisions of the Federal court, the doctrines of the President, and the misconstruction of the constitutional compact acted on by the legislature of the Federal branch, and it is too evident that the three ruling branches of that department are in a combination to strip their colleagues, the State authorities, of the powers reserved by them and to exercise themselves all functions, foreign and domestic. Under the power to regulate commerce, they assume indefinitely, that also over agriculture and manufacture and call it regulation to take the earnings of all those branches of industry and that too the most depressed and put them into the pockets of the other, the most flourishing of all. Under the authority to establish post roads, they claim that of cutting down mountains for the construction of roads, or digging canals and aided by a little sophistry of words, 'general welfare,' a right to do not only the acts to affect them, which are specifically enumerated and permitted, but whatsoever they think or pretend will be for the general welfare."

At this dinner, let them read what Woodrow Wilson in 1890 wrote: "Government . . . is the organ of society; its objects must be the objects of society. . . . It is an organized association of individuals for mutual aid. Mutual aid to what? To self development. There must be constant adjustments of governmental assistance to the needs of a changing social and industrial organization. Not license of interference on the part of government but strength and adaptation of regulation. The regulation I mean is not interference; it is equalization of conditions so far as possible, in all branches of endeavor, and the equalization of conditions is the very opposite of interference."

If our National Government continues its present trend by becoming Socialistic in nature, or using the sugar-coated phrase "welfare state," the historians of the future will probably attribute the cause to three things: First, the change in electing United States Senators, from election by the State legislatures to that of popular vote by the people; second, granting to Congress the power to levy an income tax without limit; and third, the construction by the Supreme Court of article 1, section 8, paragraph 1 of the Federal Constitution as to the power of Congress to levy taxes for the general welfare. When the framers of the Constitution adopted the provision regarding the election of Senators by the legislatures of the respective States, they did so on the correct premise that each State would be equally represented in Congress, and the Senate would be a check rein on the legislative action of the House of Representatives—the Senators would represent the States in their relation to the Federal Government and the lower House would represent the people. In electing Senators by the people of the entire State, the candidates for that office now have to be all things to every various and diverse group in the State, and the chances are that more demagogues will be elected to the Sen-

ate than to the House. When the States ratified the income-tax amendment without restriction as to the percentage of levy that Congress could impose, they placed it in the power of Congress to tax 100 percent of your income. With this unlimited source to tax, is it any wonder that a candidate for Congress promises, if elected, to vote public funds for every conceivable plan of subsidy and grant? When the Supreme Court held that when Congress determines what causes and necessities require Federal aid and assistance under the power to tax for general welfare, the States cannot be heard to complain, and the courts are powerless to interfere unless the congressional action is plainly arbitrary, it turned Congress loose to expend public funds for every conceivable project or scheme. The result of this ruling will be, as Justice Roberts said in *United States v. Butler* (297 U. S. 1). The obliteration of the individual States and "the United States converted into a central Government exercising uncontrolled public powers in every State of the Union, superseding all local control or regulation of the affairs or concerns of the State" (p. 77).

There exists today big business, big labor, and big Government. The small-business man and average wage earner, professional or otherwise, is being pulverized like a grain of wheat in a roller mill in the contest between labor and management, with the Government, though solicitous for the welfare of the thrifless but unconcerned about the frugal who pay most of the tax, following the policy of compromise and appeasement.

Let us take a look at big Government. Today the Federal Government owns in the continental United States 412,000,000 acres of land, or the equivalent of the territory of the five smallest States of the Union; at the end of the calendar year 1950, the number of civilian employees on the Federal payroll exceeded two and a half million persons—more in number than all the people in the States of Arizona, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Vermont, and Wyoming. There are so many agencies of the Federal Government scattered over the United States that even Congress itself does not know the number, the amount of its credit in the form of loans or guaranty of loans, exceeds that of the 10 largest banks and insurance companies of the United States. It is the sole umpire in the adjustment of disputes between labor and management of 60 percent of the industrial and business enterprises of the Nation. When the Government reaches a point where it tells a business how much it can charge for its products or services and how much it must pay to its employees, and what it must do with its profits, if any, the next stage is ownership of the business.

III

At the time of the adoption of the Federal Constitution we followed, in all the main essentials, the form of the English Government. The economic philosophy of Adam Smith, and the common law of England as portrayed by Blackstone, were the basic principles inherent in the foundation of our Government. Under that system, the natural rights of men were deemed to outweigh the divine right of kings, or the despotic power of Parliament. Man was free to acquire or produce property and carry on his business or trade in a free competitive society, without restraint or interference from any one except where his actions might injure the public. Under that system developed what is known as the American system of free enterprises, or what is commonly called the capitalistic system. As evils or hurtful practices which were injurious to the common welfare appeared, the State or Federal governments, by legislation, regulated and controlled these harmful trends. All of this being done without the Government becoming the competitor of private business or adopting rigid control over

the demand and supply of commerce, industry, agriculture, or labor. Under this system, the Nation has survived 10 major economic depressions, 5 foreign wars, and 1 internal war. Today it is the strongest and most powerful nation on earth. Financially and industrially, it is supporting other nations all over the globe, most of whom are socialistic in their form of government. Since July 1, 1945, we have aided them in the sum of more than \$30,000,000,000. The Socialists and Communists who claim that the American economic system is a failure cannot point to a single communistic or socialistic system existing today that has a longer existence than 30 years. The proof of the success of the American system may be found in its continuous life of 164 years.

Not until 1933 did the doctrine of State paternalism take an appreciable hold on the American system, and then only after the individual States had defaulted in their duties and obligations did the National Government step in and assume whatever obligation local governments owed to the unemployed, the aged, and the indigent. Then followed grants of financial aid and assistance by the Federal Government in the construction of schools, hospitals, airports, dams, and other local public projects that were primarily obligations of local government; then came subsidies to agriculture and processors of agricultural products; establishment of housing authorities, financing of rural electrification, and then followed the control of labor relations; and of wages and hours between practically every class of employees and employers. Practically all of these matters were essentially local in nature, yet the States without any concerted action or opposition permitted, and in some instances abetted, this whitewashing away of States' obligations.

The proponents and purveyors of a paternalistic theory of government, in advocating the golden ideal of universal freedom from ignorance, poverty, disease, and insecurity, have led this generation to believe that these goals can be achieved without sacrifice or work, when in truth and fact the cost must be borne by the people themselves. The slogan seems to be, "Don't worry about tomorrow."

Public education has traditionally been thought to be a matter for local governments—for village, town and county. What has happened in Georgia is typical of what has occurred in many States. First the State took over the financing of elementary schools and high schools. The local communities then levied taxes for schools and looked to the State to supplement the teachers' salaries and provide free textbooks. The result has been that the eight large counties now provide 40 percent of the revenue used for the operation of local public schools. In setting up a State-wide standard of pay for teachers and a sound educational program, the cost of the State-operated public schools of Georgia has increased from \$25,000,000 to more than \$40,000,000 in 15 years, and today it is said that to maintain the required minimum standard for common schools a sum exceeding \$85,000,000 will be necessary.

The general assembly of 1949 submitted to the voters of the State a question, among others, as to whether the people wanted the general assembly to raise or add new taxes which would be sufficient to raise enough revenue to maintain the minimum standard program, which would require an increase of approximately \$40,000,000 a year. This referendum was overwhelmingly defeated by the voters, not on the basis that the people did not want better schools and better teachers, but one of the controlling factors in this result was the feeling that it would not be long before the Federal Government would provide the necessary grants of financial assistance to the State educational system that would answer this need. The

electorate apparently were ignorant of the fact that for every \$5 sent to Washington, less than \$1 comes back to the State. In the words of ex-Congressman Summers, of Texas: "We send a shirt to Washington and get a shirt tail back."

We cannot escape the conclusion, from a study of what the makers of the Constitution conceived to be the relationship between the several States and the Federal Government, but that the Central Government in Washington today is exercising many powers and functions that belong to the States. Nor can we place the blame solely on the Federal Congress, but the primary cause has been the Supreme Court and its interpretation and construction of Federal powers. The Federal court today is not the judicial branch of the Government that Hamilton, Madison, or Mason, nor its carpenter, John Marshall, thought it would be, namely, the ultimate, unbiased, and independent umpire of the validity of the acts of the executive and legislative branches of the Government. We are fast receding to the condition that the makers of the Constitution sought to prevent: that of making Congress the supreme authority on the constitutionality of their laws. If the Court is to follow the theme that the acts of Congress are presumed to be the Alpha and Omega as to what is best for the people, and Congress considers it to be its duty to pass bills that are drafted by the executive head of the Government as must bills, and the President's justification is that the bills represent what he promised to get elected and, therefore, are mandates of the people, then we have neither a republican (representative) form of government nor any need for a written constitution. If a law is to be sustained or rejected according to the tabulation of votes at the last Presidential election, then, as Lord McCauley predicted in 1857, our Constitution is "all sail and no anchor."

The slogan of States' rights has now become a feeble cry, and when some political statesman raises his voice to plead the rights of the States he is shouted down by those who have no conception of our constitutional history. The disappearance of States' rights and the assumption by the Federal Government of the powers and duties of the States over local matters is chiefly due to the fault of the States. During the last 40 years the States have sold their birthright for a mess of pottage. Beginning with the construction of national highways, they have constantly gone to Washington with hat in one hand and an empty purse in the other, begging for financial assistance. They have never hesitated to seek financial aid for needs that are local, such as support of the poor, the needy, unemployment, health, farm subsidies, education, etc. All of them being matters which are of local concern and over which it is the duty of the local governments to administer. In defaulting in their own duties, they have in effect acquiesced in permitting Congress to take over ungranted powers. They have protested only in those matters that affected them in political and social matters, such as elections, administration of criminal laws, and attempts to change their social customs. The Southern States have never failed to take hand-outs from Washington, or refused to take help, on the basis of States' rights, so that today when they protest against economic or social legislation, the rest of the Nation think they are talking only of civil rights, and place little weight on the cry of States' rights.

IV

Now, when we find our National Government controlling and regulating nearly all phases of local economic and social relations and raise our voices against the trend toward a socialistic state, we have got to do more than merely "shout" about States' rights. The protest must be planted on the sound and fundamental ground that our

National Government exists by virtue of a written Constitution which was brought into existence by the express consent of the States, and that the Constitution does not authorize a change in the nature or form of our Government except by consent of the people; and if the people of this Nation want to change or not change the form of their Government, they ought to be given an opportunity to say so.

Demagogic office seekers, in order to get elected, promise every kind of free service, and when elected urge and promote all sorts of fantastic legislation, that has encouraged gullible and unthinking people to believe that they can get something for nothing. What is needed in this country is a movement back to honest thinking and honorable leadership. Back to the basic common morality that one is entitled only to what he earns.

The States formed the Union. The Federal Constitution was of their making. If we are to remain a Federal union of independent States, it will be through the will of the States. If we drift into a paternalistic nation of subservient and puppet States, the fault will be that of the States.

What we need today is a great awakening among the States and the assumption on their part of their duties and obligations as to government in local matters.

Finally and foremost of all, we need a spiritual awakening. We need leaders who have the exhortative energy of Amos; the crusading spirit of Saint Paul; the fervent faith of St. Augustine; the devotion to duty of Robert E. Lee; the rugged righteousness of Grover Cleveland, and the dauntless defiance of Patrick Henry.

Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I have done considerable research over many years regarding the position of Russia in the family of nations. One of the most interesting discussions of Russia I have read is contained in a special bulletin dated March 15, 1951, and prepared by William J. Baxter, of the Baxter International Economic Research Bureau. The subject of this special bulletin is *How Strong Is Russia*. Because this bulletin was marked confidential I secured written permission from the Baxter International Economic Research Bureau to place this report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore, under permission granted by the House of Representatives, I present this article for the information of all Members of Congress:

How Strong Is Russia?

(NOTE.—This survey on Russia is a condensation of an exhaustive series of reports on Russia originally sent to clients.)

The greatest fraud perpetrated on the American people during the past several years has been the build-up that has been given Russia both as a military and an economic power. Is it any wonder that the people have been scared out of their wits at the thought of war and the seeming inevitability of defeat at the hands of Russia and its satellites?

Well, before World War II had ended I realized that Russia would never cooperate with us or the Western World. She considered the period of peace nothing but an armistice before the beginning of world war III. Nevertheless, I also felt that Russia was far from being prepared for any world war III and that while she would make every attempt to get something for nothing, she would definitely halt short of a major war. That country of almost 200,000,000 people saw the American machine in action; saw it defeat the two major industrial powers of our civilization—Japan and Germany. Joe Stalin himself recognized the enormous power which we had generated when we came to his aid. Stalin's recent statement is especially noteworthy in one of his rare public utterances that war was not inevitable. Russia's direct and indirect threats have fooled no one, least of all Joe Stalin himself, as to the comparative industrial strength and war potential of the United States and Russia with all her satellites.

LET'S DISTINGUISH THE FOREST FROM THE TREES

What a road we have traveled since 1914 when the American people were relatively a tax-free and happy people, the envy of the entire globe. The people, especially our youth, may ask—what is it all about? Why are we and the world involved in these constant wars? Everyone knows that in the last century Britain was the most powerful empire in the world and her Navy ruled the seas. Toward the end of the last century, however, it was quite evident that the British were slipping badly and that other Europeans, particularly the Germans, were capturing one market after another from British business. This was due to a combination of forces, including the greater energy of the Germans, their ability to excel in science and mass production, and also the fact that the British were tired out after a long period of domination. German shipping was challenging the British merchant marine. By 1914 the powerful German steel industry had not only caught up with the British steel industry, but were edging ahead of it.

History teaches us that when the dominance of a great empire is threatened the result is war; and so a war broke out between Germany, France, and England. We became involved in that war with the promise that Europe would reform and that Wilson's 14 points for a better world would be adopted by the various European empires. Our victory in that conflict temporarily set Germany back and postponed the breakup of the British Empire. In its management of the American people and in indirect control of our State Department's policies during that period, the British Foreign Office showed the genius that has always been the product of its endeavors for the British Empire. When the war was over, Clemenceau and Lloyd George threw the idealistic American program out the window, and we were rewarded for our efforts to save the British Empire with taxes and debt.

THE SECOND CHALLENGE: GERMANY AND JAPAN

I have always maintained that no power or group of powers could stop the forces of Nature. I have said (even when the view was most unpopular) that during the industrial age there were three powers in the world that showed that they were the leaders in conforming to Nature's requirements in scientific mass production. Why nature picked these three countries from all the other 80 in the world and gave them this genius, we do not know. We do know that Germany has consistently been the outstanding nation in Europe in our time in the science of mass production and in scientific achievements both in peacetime and in wartime projects. We also know that of all the peoples of Asia, in this mass-production period, for some reason or other, only the Japs

had the "know-how." I have said that one could destroy all the motor factories in Detroit and all the machines in them, but if the American people still had their engineers with their "know-how," the buildings and the machinery would soon be replaced and new records and achievements made.

And so, in the twenties and thirties it was quite evident, after you compared English production with the new production of Germany, that the defeat of Germany and the "victory" of the British in World War I hadn't changed any basic trend. In world trade and in world production the Germans were going ahead and the British, year after year, were declining and actually living on past savings. There was no physical evidence that the first great conflict had changed any basic trend at all amongst the major nations of the world.

By 1939, then, the British Empire was challenged for the second time, not only by a powerful Germany but by a new empire in Asia—the Japanese empire. Throughout Asia and many parts of the world the Japanese were so efficient that they undersold almost everybody. All the European empires of Asia, including the British, the French and Dutch were in jeopardy as the Japanese merchant marine and Japanese industry marched ahead. Few appreciate the size and importance of the British Empire or the fact that one-third of the world's population is directly or indirectly under its control. This time the threat to the empire was a double-edged sword—that of Germany in Europe and the Japanese in the Pacific. Once again the American people came to the rescue and with their fantastic mass-production machine defeated the other two scientific powers of the world—Japan and Germany—while at the same time conducting a record internal boom at home and supplying scores of allies with all types of money and materials. One of our so-called partners was Russia, with the result that the very people now in the State Department encouraged the American people to believe in such phony propaganda as the motion picture, *Mission to Moscow*, etc.

WHY AMERICA OUTSHINES RUSSIA

At this point we would like to review the history of Russia throughout the entire industrial age in the past 150 years and see if it means anything that throughout this revolutionary period in world history no government has ever been able to make Russia a paying proposition. Only recently, we listened to a leading banker in almost semi-hysterical terms state that Russia was stronger than we were today. Isn't that an amazing and rather foolish statement to make, considering our strength in science, industry, and agriculture as a result of 150 years of work and steady progress? It is recognized that Russia had very little when the Communists came to power in 1919. Therefore, if as a result of 31 years of their system they could accomplish as much as we have in one-fifth of the time, one would then have to admit that their system was better than ours today. Of course, this is nonsense. In this report I would like the readers to keep in mind the date of the American Revolution in 1776, and the beginning of the industrial revolution at about the same time. We shall show you that practically every social experiment conducted in Russia since 1919 was already tried in the United States long before the Russians tried it. We shall show also why during this glorious period of industrial expansion that the standard of living of the American people went to the highest in the history of civilization and that Russia had, on the contrary, been a consistent failure. We must also call your attention to the fact that every bit of progress in Russia in this last period had been dictated by either British, American, or German engineers. Today, as for some years, neither the British nor our-

selves is contributing and the German help is coming only from the pressure being exerted on the individuals who are operating only under duress—a very poor basis for a program of development.

There was a period in history when wars were always won by countries with the greatest number of land soldiers, no matter how illiterate and undisciplined these soldiers were. The progress of industrial civilization has been carried to the point where wars are now fought by scientists and by industrial machines, and not by "strong backs and weak minds." It can be definitely proven that the Russians have never come up to the definition of an industrial power by making the changes "that transformed a people with peasant occupations and local markets into an industrial society with world-wide connections." If you doubt this, simply glance at the records of the Japanese people in transferring their peasants into industrial workers and building up a huge world-wide business. Why is it, you will ask, that Russia has been so far behind the world procession that it isn't even funny. Nature has played that big part in this matter. Everyone knows that the Torrid Zones of the Equator are not great industrial areas and it is just as bad in an industrial age when a country is located in an area that is too cold both for vegetation and for human energy. Do you want proof of this? Well, if you took a map of the world and took the record of the unit of automobiles, steel, and other products produced, you would find many interesting facts, some of which are:

1. That the greatest area of production of wealth in the entire world has been around the Great Lakes of the United States where it is not too hot and not too cold but rather a moderate, vigorous area of high energy for human beings and of soil fertility.

2. You would find that above 45° north latitude that as you go north the standard of living declines. For example, the northern part of Canada has been of little or no value to Canada in the actual production of wealth during the industrial age.

It is a provable fact that throughout the whole period of the industrial age the real production of wealth had taken place in a limited climatic area of the world, and you should always remember that the same factories that produce peacetime products in terrific quantities can also be turned into enormous giants that make the death-killing instruments in time of war.

THE HISTORY OF RUSSIAN FAILURE

It is impossible to overstress the part that revolution and transportation have played in the history of countries. If one will review the period of time when Russia was a great power and examine the reasons for her decline, one could more easily understand her limitations. In the 11th Century when the remainder of Europe was getting nowhere, Russia was a dominant figure in world trade which at that time was chiefly carried out by caravans. Its geographic position was such that the caravans from the east bringing spices and fine clothes from the Orient had to traverse the broad expanse of her land and use her waterways to reach the merchants from the western lands. It is hard for the younger generation today to believe that there was a time in history when the cheapest and most efficient way to get goods from Asia to Europe was by horse caravans across the enormous Russian land areas. But in that period of "horse civilization" Russia was at the crossroads and became the market place of that traffic. Kiev, as its center, was a rich and splendid city of the "horse civilization," but by the 12th Century Russian traffic declined. The center of energy in Europe was transferred to Italy under the stimulus of the crusades and the change of the method of transportation to ships instead of caravans.

RUSSIA: THE WORST CREDIT RISK IN THE WORLD

We can perhaps understand the financial headache that Russia has always had if we study the past financial problems of Canada. The geographical position of Canada and the type of people are, of course one thousand times different than that of Russia. But, like Russia, Canada has always suffered from a serious economic cancer—that cancer being the fact that Canada would be better off if she could do away with half of her territory and be a smaller, compact, and more efficient, economic body. Even to this day, Canadian credit has never recovered from the stigma of the Grand Trunk Railway failure a generation ago. Why did the Grand Trunk fail, and why has Canada's railroad system always been a financial burden to that country? Look at the map and you will see that after trains leave Niagara Falls that the number of cities from which they can collect paying cargo is very few indeed, all the way to the Pacific coast. Now the same thing has been true in Russia. The country covers two continents so that no one has ever been able to make Russia a paying proposition. As a matter of fact, the Russians have never been able even to build a decent railroad, but time and again have had to call in French capital and engineers and German aid. You can produce, for example, the finest pair of shoes in the world in Moscow and by the time you get them on the inefficient Trans-Siberian Railroad to Asia, the shoes will cost so much that nobody could buy them. In other words, it is important for you readers to remember that the very factor the Russians brag about—their immense size—has always been the biggest drawback to the finances and stability of Russia. Whenever her national finances have been subjected to even the slightest strain, they have collapsed. From the time of Peter the Great, the tendency has always been for Russian debts to accumulate faster than revenues were collected.

RUSSIA SEEKS SEA OUTLETS

Strengthened by the flow of foreign loans, the Russians felt themselves strong enough to attempt to round out their empire by acquiring sea frontages and ports at the expense of some of her weak neighbors. To gain outlets to the sea, Russia waged wars. Internally she had expanded without much difficulty as, in most cases, her people merely settled on lands that had been occupied by wandering tribes intent on finding grazing land. But to find outlets to the sea, she had to engage in battle, twice with the Turks and then in the First World War. Her war in the Far East with the Japanese can also be said to be waged for an outlet. These were the four major wars that the Russians engaged in between 1848 to 1914. All others were minor, but these four were bloody, costly, and very humiliating to Russia.

After 1848, Czar Nicholas I, feeling assured of the aid of England's assistance in partitioning of the possessions of the "sick man of Europe," launched the Crimean War. At first successful, the Czar was to find out that he did not have the support of England and the rest of the Continent. Such aid went, rather, to the Turks, as the European countries feared the consequences of Russia's conquests in the Baltic. But deprived of Europe's support, Russia made a very poor showing in this war. Her armies were poorly supplied and hampered by poor transportation. The inefficiency of the whole Russian administration was glaringly exposed and the consequences were that Russia had to accept an humiliating peace treaty in Paris in 1856, whereby she gained nothing and lost much. Financially this campaign against the Turks left the Russians exhausted once again. In 1855 her debt reached 262,000,000 rubles, and at the peace table in Paris in the following year, her paper currency amounted to 735,000,000 rubles in spite of the fact that 321,000,000 rubles had

been extorted by a levy on all businesses and institutions with funds in the empire.

Czar Nicholas II, who ascended the throne in 1855, waited 21 years before tearing up that humiliating treaty of 1856 and renewing an attack on the Turks. He thought that the turmoil in Europe, occasioned by the Franco-Prussian War in 1870, would prevent the European nations from interfering and aiding the Turks. Turkey in 1877 was massacring thousands of Bulgarians and Yugoslavs who were revolting under her rule. This time neither England nor France raised a finger to prevent the allied Russian and Rumanian armies from marching up to the outskirts of Constantinople and dictating the peace of San Stefano on Russia's own terms. But this victory soon fell out of her hands. Her finances plagued her. Paper issues of her currency now amounted to 1,200,000,000 rubles and her bonds were selling in the markets of Europe at a discount of 26 percent. No sooner had the peace of San Stefano been signed than England and France stepped in and insisted that the treaty be revised. The Treaty of Berlin of 1878 that supplemented the earlier treaty, compelled Russia to give up her control of Bulgaria, allowing her only to take a part of Armenia and of Rumania. After this second turn of events for Russia in her attempt to get an outlet through the Dardenelles, Russia never attempted to attack Turkey again, confining herself to gaining control over the Balkans by intrigue and diplomacy. The longing for an outlet was still there, but it had to remain unsatisfied, as neither her finances nor her capabilities permitted her to wage a war which would involve the more energetic and resourceful nations of Europe.

Due to a peculiar combination of circumstances which are attributable to her huge size, her unwieldiness, her geography, and the temperament of her people, no Minister of Finance in Russia, whether in peace or in war, was ever able to keep the cost of government within the funds of the revenues. When Vycknegradsky, Count de Witte's predecessor took office in 1887, another crisis was reached. A panic broke out in 1888, as the ruble fell 50 percent; and had it not been for an unusually abundant harvest, a complete collapse might have occurred.

Nevertheless, at this critical stage of finances, an unexpected turn of events occurred which favored Russia financially, though she had not contributed anything to bring that condition about. Capital began to flow into Russia at an increasing rate. The French, after the Franco-Prussian War and the resulting consolidation of the German states into a Germany of the First Reich, felt herself isolated and vulnerable without an ally on the Continent. To get an ally, France loaned money to Russia. From 1888 to 1897, a total of 1,000,000,000 rubles were invested by the French in Russia, half of which was invested in the railroads. France had been making loans to Russia before 1888; in fact, ever since the Franco-Prussian War. This source of capital will be taken up again when the industrial development of Russia will be discussed. But, notwithstanding all this inflow of foreign capital, the Government budget continued to show deficits. In 1900 that deficit amounted to 160,000,000 rubles (\$80,000,000). The budgets of that period were made to show a surplus although the debt continued to climb each year. Count de Witte is credited with reforming the Russia governmental finances. Actually, he was only favored in being the Minister of Finance in Russia at a time when the flow of capital from France was the greatest. He could borrow money from France at a time when France was most anxious to loan money to Russia, hoping thereby to gain an ally.

Japan declared war on Russia in February 1904, but the Russians felt sure of an easy victory. A dwarf, with 45,000,000 population, was trying to scare a giant of 130,000,-

000 population. Painful indeed was Russia's surprise when her armies in Manchuria, where all the fighting took place, were defeated time and time again with terrible losses. The supposedly impregnable Russian fortress of Port Arthur, in Manchuria, was forced to surrender. A large Russian fleet, which had sailed around the Cape of Good Hope to the Far East, was totally destroyed. The Russians had difficulty in transporting troops and supplies across thousands of miles of an inadequate and poorly constructed railroad. The military system was unbelievably inefficient. Stupidity and carelessness were revealed on the part of both officers in the army and civil officials. Russia was glad to accept an invitation from President Theodore Roosevelt for peace negotiations at Portsmouth, N. H. That peace was a blow to Russian pride, since she had to give in to a little upstart. All hope of acquiring Korea was abandoned, and the southern part of Manchuria was handed over to Japan. This was the third of three great conflicts in which Russia had engaged. Each one had ended disastrously and humiliatingly for Russia.

The people in Russia, after their humiliation before the world, blamed the autocratic Government. Nearly all sections of the population were now discontented with the ruling regime. They were to be found among various conquered nationalities; among the intellectuals, the professors, and the writers whose radical theories the Government had failed to stifle, among the peasants who had received some concessions but wanted more, among the industrial proletariat which was inclining toward socialism, among the capitalists and the middle class who desired a constitutional form of government, and there was even some discontent among some of the nobility who promoted liberal ideas. Thoroughly alarmed by all this opposition, the Czar issued his manifesto of October 1905, in which he promised freedom of conscience, of speech, of assembly, and of union, and also proposed a new Duma to be elected by all classes of the people. With this manifesto the Czar forced a breach in all the opposition to his rule, as it failed to satisfy only the revolutionary peasants who wanted land and the industrial workingmen who wanted socialistic reforms. These two classes continued their struggle alone and increased their opposition after 1907, when the new reforms of the Czar were put into effect. The peasants began to form cooperative associations and the industrial workers organized strikes. By the summer of 1914 there was a great strike in Petrograd, and it seemed that the discontent was so great that it almost seemed like 1905, when the Czar faced the opposition of a whole nation. The Government seemed to have no way of meeting this growing opposition.

At that time, a series of shots were fired in Sarajevo, in Serbia, then a part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Those shots reverberated in every capital in Europe since the heir to the Austro-Hungarian throne had been assassinated. All this gave Russia an opportunity to champion the cause of the Serbs, a Slav race, in order to solidify race feeling at home and abroad. She made her demands on Austro-Hungary and brought a barrage of demands of all European powers on each other. At once the great World War was started with its world-convulsing results.

But before that war ended, Russia was completely exhausted and the government collapsed. The Bolshevik Revolution ended a dynasty and a new regime rose to power on the discontent of the peasants and the industrial workers. An unwieldy empire, ruled by an autocrat who had dominated a sluggish people, disappeared. The result was a complete liquidation of all the billions of rubles of foreign loans that had been made to Russia. In the place of that regime arose communism, a new experiment, that had

been idealized by philosophers, but had had little practical trial. The form of government changed, but the country remained the same in size and in unwieldy bulk and the people also remained the same, temperamentally and racially.

Long prior to the outbreak of the Korean war, in fact, by the fall of 1949, I was convinced that Russian propaganda was successfully scaring the world and convincing everyone that she was ready to take on the United States any time and that she had a vast and efficient machine to do it. The amazing thing to me was that this conviction had permeated the highest levels in Washington, including the State Department. What better evidence of confirmation of the success of the Russian propaganda could we have than the spectacle of the heads of the governments of Great Britain and France flying to the United States to beg our leaders not to take the retaliatory step of bombing China when she had sent hundreds of thousands of Chinese soldiers across the Manchurian border into Korea in the fall of 1950. The European statesmen feared Russia and, through the United Nations, tied the hands of our military leaders in Korea. In order to get the real lowdown on this supposed strength of Russia, we sent our own men to Europe a full 7 months before the Korean war. A second on-the-spot appraisal was completed only recently. Many months were devoted to the gathering of important data and material that was not otherwise available.

Before going into these excessive and extensive findings which I will summarize in this section as briefly as possible, I would like to review the long and continued failure of Russia and the Russian people.

RUSSIA IN A JET-PLANE AND DIESEL-ENGINE AGE

We have seen how in the days of horses Russia was a great power and how her decline began when it became cheaper for maritime powers to ship goods. In the early stages of the industrial revolution, England became the greatest power in the world due to a number of factors including the possession of enormous amounts of coal and the invention of steam power. She also had favorable political institutions and advantages of climate and geographical position to help her in the exploitation of this coal. But the greatest factor in making England a top power was the invention in 1769 by Watt, making steam the servant of man's will. By this invention of the separate condenser he produced a new type of engine. This was followed by the invention of the power loom by Cartwright in 1785. In addition, two Englishmen named Darbys and Cort created a revolution in iron by inventing methods of using coal instead of charcoal in blast furnaces and forges.

The nineteenth century was the century of steam, but the Russians remained dormant throughout this period. Before its close, man had discovered in electricity an even more valuable servant. Later we entered the age of gasoline engines, Diesel engines, and, finally, jet-propelled engines. The progress of Russia in any of these fields during this entire period of industrial revolution was very small indeed. It was proven time and again that the Russian peasant was all right in the age of horses when he worked with his hands, but that his very mentality was not equal to the fast development of the machine age. Another contributing factor was the fact that Russia's oil resources were not sufficient for the development of a great industrial power. An example of the difference between American oil reserves and production is seen in the fact that there are single American oil companies that produce more oil in a single year than the entire production of all of Russia.

The experience of our own military men during World War II was a convincing proof of the inability of the Russian peasant to

understand modern machinery. So much material, trucks, tanks and planes were being ruined by inefficient and incompetent servicing, that the British and ourselves were forced to send in maintenance crews to insure continued operations of the instruments of war we were furnishing the Russians.

THE INADEQUATE RAILWAY SYSTEM IN THE SOVIET UNION

The Soviet Union has 71,790 miles of railroad. This is somewhat less than one-third the mileage of the railroads in the United States. The Soviet Union has, however, more than three times the amount of total land area of continental United States. The Soviets point out that railroad building in Russia started only 2 to 5 years after it started in the countries of Western Europe. But the first railroad in Russia was a 10-mile road that was built in 1837 and ran between St. Petersburg (now Leningrad) and Transloge Selo (now Pushkin). It was hardly anything more than a short commuter line. Their railroad building took place between 1868-74 when 7,473 miles of track were laid and also between 1891 to 1900 when 13,552 more tracks were laid. These railroads were almost entirely built with foreign capital and owned by foreign investors. Foreign capital continued to flow into Russia up until the outbreak of the First World War. French, Belgian, German, British, Canadian and United States (in the order of their amount of investment) financiers and industrial concerns provided credits and organized industries at an accelerated rate during the 5 years preceding 1914.

We have tried to analyze the amount of railroad construction in various epochs of economic life in Russia. The Soviets do not give statistics and write their economic history as if the railroad system in Russia had greatly expanded and improved. We have discussed this matter with two Russian engineers, one of whom was a construction engineer on the railroads prior to 1917, and uncovered the following facts from them:

	<i>Estimated mileage</i>
By 1917, the total in Russia was-----	41,000
There was also under construction and nearly completed in 1917 (the time of the Revolution)-----	10,000
Built under the plans and direction of the Soviets between 1917 to 1940, before the Second World War were-----	13,000
Built during the Second World War were -----	4,000
Built after the Second World War to 1950 were-----	3,790
Therefore, total in 1950 is-----	71,790

RUSSIAN RAILROADS ARE STILL INFERIOR

Let us jump to the year 1939 when Hitler and Stalin had signed an agreement of collaboration, and see what the condition of the Russian railroads was at that time. By that year no new main railroads had been built toward the west. Those for which the Soviets claim credit had been started and almost completed before 1917. These are among the 10,000 miles of roads that had been nearly finished before the 1917 Revolution, to finally total 25,000 miles. To show you the difference in railroad management, when the Germans met the Soviets at the 1939 Russian frontier, the Germans had 30 different railroad lines with 50 tracks to link up with only 15 Soviet railroads running on 20 tracks. In the 23 years since the revolution, 13,000 miles of track had been added to the Russian railroad system, whereas in the 23 years before the 1917 revolution, 28,000 miles of railroad had been built. During the last war, the Soviets lost through destruction by the Nazis, 15,800 or 55 percent of the locomotives; 428,000 or 45 percent of their freight cars, in addition to 15,000 bridges and 4,100 damaged railroad stations.

Most of the Soviet's railroad system is antiquated. Most of the freight cars are of the small two-axle type, of 15- to 16½-ton capacity, only one-third as much as American cars. The Russians are now building four-axle freight cars at Sverdlovsk of 60-ton capacity. We have been told by an observer that whole trains of such empty new cars went eastward to points beyond the Urals last year. In 1949 Russia claimed to have produced 190 locomotives, the United States built 1,487. There are no Diesel locomotives in the Soviet Union. The older locomotives and some of the new ones are not powerful. Few trains run faster than 30 miles an hour. There are some electric locomotives for the electrified parts of the railroads. Of the 11 lines running out of Moscow, 4 are electrified; the one to Yaroslavl for about 50 miles, the others to Trans-Siberia, Baku, and the Crimea for shorter distances. Out of Leningrad, one road is electrified for a short distance. There are also other short stretches as at Sverdlovsk, and in a few parts of Asiatic Russia. The newer types of Russian locomotives are known as the IS, FD, and the SO types, with an axle load of from 15 to 20 tons. The most powerful new locomotive is the LOK, made at Kulbeyhev, of which about 200 were made to 1948 and 1949. These are mostly used on the Trans-Siberian road and on the faster trains. The construction of passenger cars is negligible. Russia never had many passenger cars comparable to the most ordinary American coach. We understand that the passenger cars on the faster trains are of foreign origin.

HIGHWAYS AND ROADS IN THE SOVIET UNION

The Soviet Union, with over three times as much land as the United States, has 480,000 miles of roads, of which less than 10 percent are paved. The others are hardened gravel surface or ordinary dirt roads. The United States has 3,250,000 miles of roads, of which over half are paved, either asphalt or concrete. But we have been told by competent Russian engineers that of the 480,000 miles of roads in the Soviet Union, only 40,000 have been built by the Soviets since the time of the Revolution in 1917 to the present time. In the latest 5-year plan, it was proposed to build about 1,500 miles of roads each year. The following are among the paved roads in the Soviet Union:

	<i>Approximate miles</i>
To the west:	
Moscow to Minsk (concrete)-----	700
Moscow - Kiev - Kamenetz-Podolsk (concrete)-----	1,200
Moscow-Slutsk (asphalt)-----	800
To the north: Moscow-Leningrad (asphalt)-----	800
To the south:	
Moscow-Kharkov-----	900
Moscow - Gorky - Kuibyshev (this part is new)-----	1,200
Leningrad - Vitebsk-Kiev-----	1,500
To the east: (Partly hard-surfaced)	
From Gorky-Kazan-Sverdlovsk- Omsk-Novosibirsk-Tomsk-Keme- revo to Lake Balkal-----	5,000
Also unconnected with European highways in the area of the Aral Sea to Alma Alta-----	2,000
Grand total-----	17,100

(The other paved roads of about 20,000 miles are in scattered parts. All distances of above roads are estimated in an air line rather than exact mileage.)

North of the Trans-Siberian Railroad, which runs approximately at the fifty-fifth latitude in Asia, there are hardly any roads to speak of. Even if there were roads here they would be of little value to the economic life of the area, as they would be covered by ice and snow for the greater part of the year. The paved roads are narrow, hardly wide enough to permit two cars to pass each

other without turning out. It is only where they run close to the larger cities that the roads become somewhat wider. In the area around Moscow the roads widen out into three lanes. These have been widened merely by adding the hard-surfacing material to the sides of the original paved road. Such work has generally been done since the end of the last war by German prisoners of war.

In her system of highways, the Soviet Union has the same handicap that she has in her inland waterway transportation system. Most of the country lying north of the forty-fifth latitude means that the roads are not open and passable for the entire year. Snow and ice make the roads not only hazardous but to a great extent impassable. The unpaved roads of which some are hard-surfaced and the others just plain dirt, are notoriously impassable in the thaws of the spring and the rains of the autumn when wagons, trucks, and cars sink into the mud. There is clear evidence of a shortage of road building and maintenance machinery in the small amount of road building that is being carried on at the present time. Before the embargo on shipments from the United States to the Soviet Union, 38 percent of all Soviet purchases in the United States represented road machinery. Since then, shipment has stopped. The Soviets are having difficulty in meeting the small quota of 1,500 miles a year.

AUTOMOBILES IN THE SOVIET UNION

The Soviets claim that motor transportation in the U. S. S. R. was created under the Soviet power when, as a matter of fact, the use of automobiles in the Soviet Union experienced the same evolutionary growth that it did everywhere else in the world, only at a much later date than in the great nations of the Western World. In 1914 there were about 9,000 automobiles in Russia and when the first 5-year plan was put into effect there were 19,000. All of these cars were of foreign make, as it was not until about 1930 that the first automobiles were made in the Soviet Union. In 1938 the number of automobiles in use totaled 760,000 and by the end of the present 5-year plan in 1950, the number is expected to reach 1,700,000. Actually, at the end of 1949 the number in use totaled 1,300,000 of all types. The number of automobiles and trucks registered in the United States today totals some 48,000,000.

In 1949 the Soviet production of trucks and passenger cars totaled 250,000 as compared with a production total of 6,000,000 in the United States. As is to be expected the production of trucks exceeds that of passenger cars. Soviet automobiles are produced at the Stalin automobile plant in Moscow, the Molotov automobile plant in Gorky and at another plant in Yaroslavl. Soviet plants produce the following trucks: The 1½-ton GAZ; the 3-ton ZIS; and the 5-ton YAG and the following passenger cars: The M-1, a Soviet version of a 1933 Ford for the low-priced field; the Pobjeda (Victory), a four-cylinder car which was sold in 1949 for 18,000 rubles or \$3,600, at the then prevailing rate of exchange. Some 1,600 of Moscow's taxis are of this type. The ZIS-110 is a copy of the American Packard. Virtually a custom-built car, its price is so high that it is only used by officials. The Soviet 5-year plan envisages construction of three new automobile factories, completion of three others now under construction, and enlarging of four additional plants. The Stalin works in Moscow produce the 4-ton ZIS-150 truck and passenger cars. The Gorky automobile works, which formerly manufactured the 2½-ton GAZ truck, will produce passenger cars also. The automobile factories at Jaroslav now make the 7-ton JAS-200 and have begun manufacturing of a 45-ton truck which is made with one or two trailers. The 5-passenger Pobjeda, the 7-passenger ZIS-110 and the Moskvic are the passenger cars now

in mass production. The Moskvic accommodates 6-passengers and will be cheaper than the ZIS-110.

We have been told by competent persons who are familiar with Soviet automobiles that they tend to be inferior to American and other cars and that this is especially true of the lower-priced car. Their average life is 10,000 miles after which time a complete overhaul is necessary. As much as 30 percent of all cars are continually laid up for repairs at any given time. The demand for spare parts has never been satisfied in Russia. Another drawback of the Soviets is the quality of their gasoline. Their best gasoline is comparable to American third grades. The boast of the Soviets that their output of gas-generator vehicles is increasing, is an admission that they are confronted with a shortage of gasoline. The Soviet Union is so short of oil that even with the small amount of automobiles in use, as of the present, she is not able to keep abreast in her production with the demands; and the scarcity of lubricants, in particular, has led to extensive efforts to save and refine motor oil.

The dependability and the efficiency of Soviet automobiles is best shown in pointing out that in the last war, if the Soviets had not been given trucks and cars under Lend-Lease, the troops of the Western Allies would have overrun all of Germany from the western to the eastern borders of the Reich long before the Red army would have been coming along charging on horseback or chugging along in their own cars.

AIR TRANSPORT IN THE SOVIET UNION

Naturally, transportation by air in the Soviet Union means something quite different than in the countries of the Western World. Air transportation, used by civilians in preference to other modes of travel, does not exist in the Soviet Union. That form of travel is confined to official use and to cargo-carrying of needed materials to centers of production, when the time factor is important. The ratio of freight carried in relation to passengers is much higher in the Soviet Union than in the United States. One outstanding item that is shipped by air freight, which has little bearing on industrial production is furs. In this case air transport is used as these are brought in from northern Siberia, an area far removed from the Trans-Siberian Railroad and where there are few roads, probably none of which are paved.

Air transportation radiates from only one hub in the Soviet Union. A glance at the map of air routes shows that there are at least nine routes from Moscow and two additional ones to points in the Arctic Ocean which operate irregularly. At no point does it seem possible to fly from one to another point directly unless Moscow is either the point of arrival or of departure. The air route map of the Soviet Union clearly shows that Moscow is the nerve center for the whole of the Soviet Union and substantiates an observation frequently made that Moscow is the "push button" center for the whole Soviet Union, and that no section of the far-flung union is either in touch or familiar with any other part of the union except through the central head. The planes that are used on these routes are those that constitute the reserve planes of the Soviet Air Force. Numbering upward of 10,000, many of them are wooden planes. Contrast this picture with our own in which every town of even medium size has its own airport and its regular traffic. Contrast this picture with the story of our development of jet planes, our international air traffic, and even our organized air express traffic. The comparison is ludicrous in the extreme.

Let us study an interesting angle of the reasons why Russia has been such a complete failure in this industrial age. Every one of you remembers the great conflict between science and religion a generation

ago. The religious leaders, in many cases, stated that science was anti-Christ and that in time the spread of scientific education would create a Godless nation. But here indeed is one for the book. The Russians in copying American forms of industrialization did away with the religious aspects of the American community. Wouldn't you naturally think, then, that the Russians would have started all types of scientific schools throughout Russia to educate her young men to become chemists, engineers, mathematicians, etc.? Fortunately for western civilization, she did no such thing but rather, as I shall show later in this series, concentrated all of her efforts on creating political scientists and hotheaded revolutionists. We, the religious people, tripled and quadrupled our investments in such brilliant institutions as the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Carnegie Tech, California Tech, to mention but a few of the many wonderful scientific schools of learning. In other words, the religious nation developed scientific education, whereas the irreligious nation was dumb enough to overlook its importance in peace and war when manpower is worth almost nothing in comparison to scientific brain power. Possibly the basic reason for this was that the Russian student never had the aptitude for this type of learning and neither the Russian Government nor Russian private business had the money to buy the equipment and carry out the experiment. We have found out in our work that there are American corporations that spend more annually in research in industry than does the entire Russian Government itself. It is not improbable that most of the Russian leaders, who have never been outside of Russia, haven't the slightest conception of American scientific growth which has been so great that we have even solved the problem of distance—so fast is the American flying equipment of today.

DID THE RUSSIAN LEADERS WALK INTO A TRAP?

During this period of war crisis you undoubtedly will hear more and more as to how strong and smart the Russians are—and as proof of this claim you will hear a great deal about how much territory they control in Europe and Asia. I have said before that the very thing the Russians brag about—their size—is Russia's greatest weakness. We are convinced that Stalin and the Russian Government have just been plain everyday "suckers" for walking into a trap and getting so overextended all over the world. It is a smart man who knows his own limitations and does not spread out too thin. It is also a smart man who has sense enough in any program he undertakes for his country not to "take on" as opponents every single religion in the world. It is bad enough to have as one's opponents the most powerful nations in the world and the business interests of the world, but if for good measure one attempts to take on all the religions of the world, he deserves to have his head examined. Every one of you readers knows what has always happened in Europe whenever one individual got "too big for his breeches." It is an old, old story from that point when almost everyone begins to gang up on him—and that is exactly what is taking place in Europe.

Now, if the Communist civilization had been a whole of a success and also a higher type of culture than that of the other countries the Russians have occupied, it would be one thing, but the provable fact is that we have the biggest failure in Europe—Russia—trying to impose her system on countries with a higher culture than Russia. In the dairyman's terms, Russia represents grade D milk that is being mixed with the grade A of central Europe with a result that they are getting all grade D milk. In other words, the occupation of these widespread areas in Europe, whether it be Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Finland, or Rumania, has not increased the

standard of living of either the peasant or the industrial worker but, on the contrary, it has tended to bring the living standard of these countries down to the animal level of the Russian peasant. Consequently, there is a paralysis of trade in these areas and the creation of a very great feeling of hatred for everything communistic. So let no one tell you the fact that Russia's size—which really means that she has spread out so thin and making enemies everywhere—is an asset for the Russians and something we have to be afraid of. That type of dumb management we simply do not have to fear.

THE LIFE OF THE RUSSIAN PEASANT AT THE PRESENT TIME

To find out what the life of the Russian peasant is after an entire generation of Communist management, one of our staff interviewed, at the border area of the Red zone, individuals who had recently come from Russia and were in a position to give factual account of conditions. We particularly tried to get interviews and information from those who had technical training. An interview with one individual in his middle thirties, who had been a student of economics and who had also been employed as a sort of efficiency expert in a coal mine in the Donetz Basin, was particularly enlightening:

"The village of Schachtynsk has several general stores which sell meat, textiles, cosmetics, toilet articles, and other similar articles, in a sort of general fashion. Bread, however, is still to be bought only in special stores and is in short supply.

During the daytime there is not much life in the village as a great number of the inhabitants are at work in the mines. Heavy drinking is the great joy and solace of the Russians. Beggars are to be found outside of every store, among them the old people, no longer able to work.

"The principal diversion in the evening is a visit to the local clubhouse, situated alongside of a small park, which is the center of the whole social life of the village. It is the largest building in the village, but it does not have a toilet in it.

"Placards, exhorting the worker to work harder and to work for greater glory of the state, in many colors, are found in the most conspicuous places.

"Thirty kilometers away is the city of Schachty. There is one trolley line in that city, but as late as 1947 the cars were still very old and without any panes of glass.

"The houses are all little blockhouses of wood. Furniture and furnishings are primitive. A bed is only found in the house of the more well-to-do. Generally, there is one table and some benches. The most interesting fact is that in all the houses there is an ikon corner, decorated with pictures of the Virgin and other saints. When one sees villages of this type for the first time from a distance, with their dilapidated thatched roofs of straw and their broken and patched-up windows, they look as if they were abandoned huts. It is astonishing that they are inhabited, and beneath their wretched roofs and forlorn exteriors, an active life goes on.

"In Russia everyone has to work in order to live. I have seen women in advanced stages of pregnancy, bending and lifting while at work. One I saw was digging the hard ground with a hoe. When I asked her why she did such work she answered by saying that she had to work to live. For her work this woman was paid about 400 rubles a month."

Our informants told us that when the Russian people are alone they compare their lot with that of the Germans, who they look upon as well-fed, who lived in better houses, who had better clothes, and above all who are doing so in the economy of a defeated nation. The Russians, who themselves regard the result of the war as a victory for Russia, live in misery. The dyed-in-the-wool Communist is the only one who speaks

differently. Russian peasants still refer to the era of the Czars as good times, when so much could be bought for so little.

Old newspapers are a particularly valuable commodity, not only as newspaper, but as cigarette paper. This is not just an occasional matter. The price of a daily newspaper is 15 kopecks (0.15 rubles). When a Soviet worker cannot buy a current newspaper, he buys an old one. The price of the old newspaper, however, is not 15 kopecks but a whole ruble. It is a well-known fact that officers in charge of German war prisoners withheld newspapers from them for weeks at a time and sold these newspapers for a ruble apiece, rather than deliver them to the addressees.

Every one of our informants assured us that what they told us were facts from their own observations, not what they had heard or had been told. They insisted that everything they said had been lived and experienced by themselves and by themselves alone. When you get reports of this type first hand and when the people who are giving them to you are so obviously sincere, you naturally wonder why the people themselves continue to put up with existing conditions.

The answer is an obvious one. The Russian people have been under the heels of their rulers all during their national history. They have, under the force of circumstances, never developed the independence of thinking that characterizes the American and live in fear of the bureaucrats who are their present rulers. The Russian people are like sheep and live in constant terror of the "wolf." They neither know how to do anything to help themselves nor do they have the inborn courage necessary to do anything to better their situation. Only those few who, members of the Russian armies, have seen how the outside world lives can clearly see the failure of communism at home. They have proven so dangerous that upon their return home from garrison duty in Germany and Austria their units are immediately split up and the individual soldiers scattered, so as to keep them under close surveillance at all times.

Let us start, then, in 1919 with a Russian Government having absolutely no debts of any kind. There was not a country in the world in so enviable a position. Suppose, for example, either the city of Chicago or the city of New York were to go into bankruptcy, thereby wiping out all its obligations and starting with a clean slate. It is obvious, then, that from that point on you could have the worst management in the world in charge of any of those cities, and the managers could not help but make what appeared to be a brilliant record for a number of years. Or, even the dumbest businessman can, for a time, make a success under favorable conditions, and so the very same thing applies to a country. It would not make any difference as to what type of system ran the country. When you come into office after a country is down to zero and been through the wringer, you can only go in one direction, and that is up. And so in the earlier years of the communistic experiment there was some improvement and it appeared to many social reformers that here at last mankind had found a practical application of the Golden Rule in everyday life. But after the picture unfolded theoretical economists and liberals all over the world became disillusioned, and finally now in the year 1950 we have the Reds deserted and practically hated by the liberal writers of all the neutral countries.

A CONFESSION OF BANKRUPTCY

If one needed any further proof of the bankruptcy of the Russian system let him but note what happened in Russia in December of 1947 when their Government devalued their currency by 90 percent, thereby repudi-

ating most of the debts that they owed their own people. Many reformers used to say that the Communists in 1919 could do nothing with the people who had been brought up under the old system. These people's minds were too rigid and so the whole program had to be based on starting over with the youth of 1919 who had open minds and who could be trained to be real friends of the people. And so let us assume we have a boy of 15 under the Russian system of 1919, inspired by all the fanatic enthusiasm in the world to help his country and his people. Nearing 50 years of age now, this individual has lived a lifetime during which every year he has been promised utopia and the millennium. If he saved his money and bought Russian Government bonds he found in December 1947 that even these were repudiated. He now finds that he is eating less than what he did a generation ago. He finds that after he had been promised a new home, new consumer goods, new automobiles, he is now practically an old man too cynical to listen any longer to promises of pie in the sky bye and bye.

While this has been going on the American worker has had an entirely different experience. As contrasted with the Russian worker, the American worker has the know-how—and it is almost an insult to American intelligence to state that Russia is stronger than we are and that the Russian system will sweep the world. Besides, the inexorable laws of nature have played a very important part in preventing the poor Russian peasant from rising above the existence of an animal due in a large part to the dispensation of rainfall, winds, storms, and all that goes to make up climate generally. One-sixth of the earth's land or at least the greater part of it is prevented by high mountains from receiving the benefits of favorable winds that bring moisture to growing crops. No government, however, can do much about changing such a condition. Thirty years ago the harassed Russian peasant did not realize this and thought that any change would bring about an improvement.

Let us start off with a few simple ABC facts. Everyone knows that not a single industrial plant was destroyed in the United States as a result of World War II. Actually, we calculate that in 11 years from 1939 to 1950, American industrial capacity was increased at a rate which in peacetime would have required 27 years. Now, if you will understand that just the opposite situation took place in Russia, you will readily see through the colossal industrial bluff she is now putting on. Most people have forgotten that when the Germans invaded Russia that the Soviets themselves advocated a "scorched-earth policy" and told their own people to destroy factories, machinery, railroads, etc. The Russians themselves even partly crippled the great Dnieper Dam. Some of the lighter machinery in the Russian plants was removed and sent to the other side of the Urals.

But the real destruction of Russian industrial capacity as well as agricultural capacity, came when the German generals decided to get out of Russia. According to Nikita Khrushchev, one of the fourteen members of the all-powerful Politburo, it will take at least until 1955 to completely replace this destruction. The losses in factories, farm machinery, and livestock was enormous. The railroad system came out of the war shattered. An unbombed station was a curiosity. A system that was never adequate for a modern industrial nation had to have 9,000 miles of rail replacement and 1,800 bridges rebuilt and a great amount of locomotives and rolling stock replaced, which had been damaged or taken away by the retreating Nazis. Just before they left, they razed the Dnieper Dam to its foundations and blew up all nine of the giant turbines. The steel mills of the Donbas had to be rebuilt. But all this reconstruction has

been retarded because of the lack of transportation to carry the necessary coal, iron ore, and machinery.

Remember this statement about the devastation caused by the war was not made by an enemy of Russia but by one of the 14 powerful members of the Russian Government. In other words, the Russian Government, which was weak industrially back in 1939, has not even made up these losses whereas in the United States the war gave an enormous impetus to our ability to produce.

OIL PRODUCTION

Under the current 5-year plan, a total oil production of 35,400,000 metric tons is expected by the end of this year. Of this amount, 17,000,000 metric tons is expected from the Baku area alone. Even if achieved, this would be well below the 22,000,000 tons estimated to have been produced in that area in 1940. The Soviets say that production in this area fell during the war, mostly as a result of the cessation of most new development work while greater emphasis was put upon increasing the output of oil in areas farther to the east.

But, while the Baku area is behind in technological progress, the geological explorations in the newer areas to the east is not proceeding satisfactorily. Soviet efforts to tap petroleum by sinking wells under the Caspian Sea has not been successful. Undoubtedly, the Government of the Soviets is looking everywhere for oil, but the total that they are obtaining at the present time is no more than 33,000,000 metric tons from their whole vast area of land. Currently, the United States is producing upward of 315,000,000 metric tons of oil each year, or about 10 times as much.

Imagine one company, the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, produces more oil than all of Russia and its satellites combined. The same can be said for United States Steel, only one of our big producers in this country.

THE SOVIET INDUSTRIAL SUPPLY SYSTEM

The supply system in the Soviet Union is operating poorly, causing serious hindrances to production. In a recent article in *Leninigradskaia Pravda*, a factory director complains of the harm done to production. Needed materials often arrive late, forcing factories to cease or partly curtail output. Raw material and semifabricated goods frequently do not meet specifications, so that they cannot be used at all. In Leningrad, according to the article, hundreds of government offices employ thousands of persons who are supposed to facilitate necessary transactions between different enterprises. But these work so poorly and are of so little help that many factories have to spend time looking for the items with which their work can continue. The situation is so bad the director complains, that to meet its need for electric lamps, motors, transformers, optical equipment, and forgings, his factory has had to start production of these items itself. Yet, at the same time, in Leningrad, itself, there are large factories producing all these items.

Anyone who is worried about over-bureaucracy in this country should learn more about the tremendous bureaucracies and inefficiency that operate in Russia proper. Our staff went to the trouble of studying the industrial supply system.

For this condition, the director blames the overly bureaucratic organization of the Soviet industrial supply system. Factories adjacent to each other are not allowed to supply each other's needs if they belong to different ministries. These and other restrictions tie them hand and foot, the director complains.

A similar situation exists in the local consumer goods industry in Moscow, the *Moskovskaya Pravda*, complains. In Moscow, the supply system is working so badly that it is estimated that they will fail to receive about

600,000,000 rubles worth of raw materials, which is about one-third of their total needs. Because of the lack of materials, these enterprises will not be able to achieve this year's output plans for such goods as furniture, phonographs, children's bicycles, aluminum utensils, and knitted goods. To get around supply difficulties, some factories in Moscow do not produce articles for which they are best fitted, but only articles for which they are able to obtain materials.

This lack of coordination, causing a stagnation in industrial production is due to other reasons besides the one that the director of the Leningrad factory complained. It is indeed true that the bureaucratic organization of the Soviet industrial system takes all orders from Moscow for everything that is done anywhere in the Soviet, whether it may be in consumer goods or in enterprises more directly concerned with national welfare. The whole is set up as a "push button" economy, with no tie between industrial units that are interrelated.

But there is still another reason. And that reason has only become an issue and a factor since March 1948, when the American ban on the export of all articles that are strategically important went into effect. Dr. Nicholas Nyaradi, former Hungarian minister now in exile states that he observed how important Czech and Hungarian war plants stopped the production of tanks, army trucks, and railroad engines for lack of ball bearings, and there are numerous other cases where the Soviet war industry was slowed down because of a lack of parts that had come from the United States. This condition not only affected war industries, but it naturally also effected the production of all capital goods and heavy industry, as well as consumer goods. While this factor will not cause a standstill of all Soviet production, it is a mighty deterring factor in an all-out effort. Even if the flow of goods had not been shut off, the distribution of all kinds of goods and materials would still run into difficulties. It just seems that the country and the people as a whole lack the ability to run any distribution system with any degree of efficiency.

After 31 years of operation the fact is that the Russian people are at least as badly off as in the days of the Czar. A system which has been working even under more ideal conditions has been a colossal failure in Russia. Every attempt has been made to cover up the facts, but the failures of industrial production have been so great that it has been impossible to keep such failures out of even the Russian press.

The Russian newspaper, Pravda, has continually reported disciplinary action against plant managers who seem to be the chief scapegoats for the Russian failure.

The chief engineer in a bicycle plant was sentenced to 5 years for producing bicycles of low quality.

The chief of the technical control department in one of the coal mines was sentenced to 6 years imprisonment for dispatching substandard coal. The deputy chief of loading at the same plant was sentenced to 5 years' loss of liberty.

Similar towns with respect to production of low-quality footwear, low-quality bread, clothing of inferior quality, cultivator wheels and parts, cigarette tobacco, and practically every other commodity produced in Russia, have appeared in the news in increasing numbers during recent years.

EFFICIENCY OF SOVIET WORKERS

But even allowing for the "boon-doggies," who are the surplus workers on the collective farms, and contribute hardly anything to agricultural productivity, it soon becomes apparent that the productivity of a Soviet worker, whether in agriculture or in industry, is low in comparison with the productivity of the workers of other countries. The United States, with a farm population

of one-third as much as the Soviet Union produced more net farm output than the Soviet Union by 50 percent. For the industrial workers, the showing is hardly any better.

Reading Soviet reports about the productivity of workers, one receives an entirely erroneous impression. To read of the feats of a Stakhanovite worker, one would think that these were supermen, performing unheard amounts of labor and producing great amounts of material. Naturally, there are some who work faster and better than the average, but that is something that is not unique to Soviet Russia. It is a common experience everywhere.

HOW GOOD ARE THE RUSSIAN SCIENTISTS?

It is a known fact that this country has practically a monopoly on the industrial scientists of the world, and as a result, a monopoly on industry. The greatest mistake made by the Russian revolutionaries was the liquidation of most of the scientists that they inherited in the technical schools established by the Czars. Lenin and Stalin, as well as other Russian leaders, as former revolutionaries, were far more interested in developing political scientists and did not devote too much time to industrial or other real scientists. Their success in political science is well known to the world, especially since they have succeeded in their propaganda in carrying such a tremendous bluff to the point where they have convinced international statesmen and world leaders that they have the stuff.

Our staff investigated fully not only the methods used in the Russian educational system but also checked carefully on the number of scientists that Russia has within its borders. A good many people feel that Russia was successful in capturing the German scientists and putting them to work to improve the living standards of the Soviet Union. Here is what we found on the German scientists:

NUMBER OF GERMAN SCIENTISTS BEFORE THE WAR

From the following table the detailed number of German scientists are given for each profession for the year 1940. This list gives a total of 7,308 men of science in Germany in 1940. This number only includes the number of top men in science. These men were outstanding authorities in their respective fields and had important positions in research or in the higher schools of learning.

Prewar Germany had 60,000 engineers (Walter de Greneyter, Berlin), comparable to the level of an American or a British holder of such a title. Kurschner's "Gelehrten Kalender" enumerated 14,000 names of the holders of high degrees in all branches of learning. In this list the following is the number of those holding high degrees in all the sciences, as distinguished from the academic subjects:

Astronomy and astrophysics.....	72
Biochemistry.....	284
Botanists.....	240
Chemistry.....	526
Forestry.....	108
Geodetics and mine surveying.....	64
Geography and cartographers.....	120
Geologist.....	220
Geophysics and meteorology.....	121
Irrigation.....	86
City planning.....	52
Agronomists, general.....	28
Agriculture and plant culture.....	117
Agricultural chemistry.....	60
Drainage engineers.....	19
Agricultural management, economy..	39
Agricultural machinery.....	22
Dairy management and bacteriology..	29
Veterinarian.....	74
Mathematics and theoretical mechanics.....	274
Medicine:	
General.....	18
Anatomy, histology.....	119

Medicine—Continued

Eye specialists.....	92
Bacteriologists.....	186
Surgeons.....	288
Social medicine.....	57
Medical history.....	34
Gynecologists.....	121
Throat, nose, and ear specialists....	98
Skin and venereal disease specialists.....	94
Internal medicine.....	312
Pediatricians.....	82
Pathologists.....	111
Physical therapy.....	140
Pharmacology.....	71
Physiology.....	221
Psychiatry.....	164
Dental specialists.....	102
Mineralogy.....	109
General natural sciences.....	61
Pharmacosis, chemotherapy.....	78
Physicists.....	342
Physical chemistry.....	122
Technology:	
General.....	8
Construction.....	311
Mining.....	128
Transportation.....	16
Electro-technics.....	159
Technological history.....	15
Machinery.....	252
Sanitation, motors, marine, and aircraft:	
Mechanical.....	130
Photography.....	33
Textile technology.....	182
Hydraulics.....	35
Industrial technology.....	60
Veterinarians.....	108
Military science.....	99
Zoology.....	144

Total of all German scientists... 7,308

The countless numbers who left Germany in the first wave that commenced shortly after Hitler came to power is not included in the above list. We have been given to understand that they were easily 10 percent of the number on the 1940 list. The greater number constituted a gain for the United States as none went to Russia.

WE GOT THE CREAM OF GERMAN SCIENTISTS

While all this was going on you would naturally ask what were the American authorities doing? You never hear anyone come up to you in the street and say, "The United States will knock the stuffing out of the Russians because we got not only one but two major groups of German scientists." As I mentioned before we practically got all of the scientists that left Germany just before or after Hitler came into power, and we are very happy to tell you that at the end of the last war, the United States was "Johnny on the spot," and did an excellent job of getting far more German scientists to come to the United States than the Russians did.

It was but natural that a great amount of red tape had to be unwound before these German scientists could be brought to the United States. First they had to be screened for their political opinions. Some had to be "denazified" while for others this procedure was bypassed. Then there was an understandable amount of resentment among Americans against bringing in the nationals of a former enemy country. And lastly, there were immigration laws, forbidding the migration of enemy nations. This proved a formidable obstacle, and the first comers entered the United States as employees of the military and occupation forces. There is no doubt that the numbers of German scientists who wanted to come to the United States would have been greater had these obstacles not been so formidable. As it was, the first comers were not paid any salary for their work in the United States. They received only subsistence and their salaries were paid out to their families in

Germany. These families were lodged in two villages in the Black Forest, all the inhabitants of which had previously been removed elsewhere, so that the families of the German scientists could be kept apart from the rest of the population, as far as possible. These families were also amply supplied with food and were generally spared the rigors that the rest of the Germans had to put up with after their country's defeat.

Unlike the Russians we did not shout to the world that we were taking the German scientists. This whole matter was handled by the Americans very furtively, and perhaps overly so. The Russians, on the other hand, in their part of Germany went about this matter very openly. They tried to lure the German scientists with promises of higher pay than what had been paid to them before and during the war with attractive promises to take care of the scientists' families, although these promises have only been partially kept. However, it is very evident that the lot of the former German scientists in the Soviet Union is not good today, as we found their infrequent letters are very guardedly written and betray a hope of some day returning to Germany. However, with

all their efforts and their promises, the Soviets were not too successful in recruiting the German scientists. They were certainly not successful in getting them in any great number voluntarily. We will now examine to what extent they were successful in getting the German scientists involuntarily.

Forschung und Forschungsinstitute of Joseph Bader (Munich 1941) lists 66 institutes of research at government level in Germany in 1940. Included in this number are 32 Kaiser-Wilhelm institutes for various kinds of scientific research and four for academic sciences. Of the remaining 30 institutes, the greater number were small and connected with some university. There were two large institutes in this last group—the one the Physikalisches Technische Reichsanstalt in Berlin, had six departments with a total of 121 scientists and 142 specialists, and the Deutsche Versuchsanstalt fuer Luftfahrt (German aviation experimental stations) with a total stated personnel of 1,581 for the year 1936, (figures for later years not given for military reasons) and distributed in all parts of Germany.

The following Kaiser-Wilhelm institutes were located in the Soviet zone of Germany:

	Location	Scientists	Specialists
Kaiser-Wilhelm Institut fuer Leder (leather)	Dresden	51	17
Kaiser-Wilhelm Institut fuer Bastforschung (research, textile)	Sorau (now Poland)	(1)	-----
Kaiser-Wilhelm Institut fuer Bio-Chemie	Berlin, Dahlem	15	20
Kaiser-Wilhelm Institut fuer Zuechtungsforschung (plant culture)	Muencheberg	36	-----
Kaiser-Wilhelm Institut fuer Chemie	Berlin, Dahlem	22	17
Kaiser-Wilhelm Institut fuer Physikalisches Chemie und Electrochemie (physical and electrical chemistry) ²	do.	40	60
Kaiser-Wilhelm Institut fuer Physik ³	do.	(1)	-----
Observatorium des Sonnenblichvereins und das meteorologische Institut der Kaiser-Wilhelm Gesellschaft (institute for sunspots and meteorology)	Nauzig	(1)	-----

¹ Not given.

² This is the institute in which atom research was conducted under Professor Thiesen.

³ This institute was founded in 1937. The Rockefeller Foundation made a grant of 1½ million reichsmarks, direction of Professor Dilge.

These are the principal German research laboratories, at the Government level, to which the Soviets had access in 1945. Out of 32 Kaiser-Wilhelm Institutes, we were able to locate 25, and of that number 10 were accessible to the Soviets. Of course, it was but natural that a great number of the Government research institutes should be located near the capital city, and as the Soviets were the first to enter the Capital after the German capitulation, they were in a position to take a first pick. But that pick principally consisted of the installations, as the scientists and top specialists generally fled. Those who elected to stay and are now working for the Soviets will be discussed a little further on in this study.

We found that at Aachen none of the staff went to the Soviet Union. Back in 1938 Prof. Josef Harich went to Moscow as an instructor in physics and is still there. Prof. Josef Mathias, textile technology, went to Prague and has been trying to come back. At Darmstadt none of the professors went to the Soviet Union, but several are in the United States. At Karlsruhe not any of the professors went to the Soviet Union, but several went to the United States, among them Professor Hildemann, who is at Silver Spring, Md., and Professor Sperhake, who is in Washington. At Munich no one left for the Soviet Union. One went to Vienna and one is in the Tyrol. Professor Thomasch went to England and Georg Joos is in the United States. At Stuttgart none went to the Soviet Union. Professor Ewald is in England; Professor Bonnetz is in Turkey and Professor Madellum and Kamm are in America. At Berlin the technical high school, is now called the technical university, and is not located in the Soviet sector. From here only Professor Vollmer went to the Soviet Union. At Hannover one professor went to the Soviet Union.

The eighth technical school at Brunswick we did not visit. It lies between Berlin and

Hannover, and there is no reason to believe that it would show up any differently in the number of its teaching staff. With reference to the two technical high schools now in the Soviet zone it is not possible to obtain any specific information. It is certain that neither of these two schools have had any additions to the staff from either the western zones of Germany or anywhere else in the Western World. On the contrary, we found that in the university town of Goettingen in the British zone, there is a registry bureau for teachers and professors at which there are applications for placement from some 300 professors now in the Soviet zone, who want a professorship in a university or technical high school in Western Germany.

SCIENTISTS IN PRIVATE INDUSTRY

The Zeiss optical works at Jena was the largest single industry in Germany, and as it is located in the Soviet zone, it is now being operated as a Soviet trust. To get the facts about what happened to the Zeiss optical works, one of our men went to Oberkochen in Bavaria, where the remnants of that industry have reestablished themselves in a former Nazi war production plant. Here 1,400 are now employed, which is just a fraction of the number that were employed by Zeiss at Jena, where in 1937 the total number employed amounted to 6,000. From Dr. S. C. Meyer, the director of the plant, we learned that when the war ended the Americans took about 60 percent of the top men of the whole Zeiss industry out of Jena to Oberkochen, that 10 percent went elsewhere leaving 30 percent of the top men at Jena. The plants and installations were twice dismantled, first by the Americans and then later by the Russians, and 94 percent of the total installations were removed in both dismantlings. The Russians took about a third of all Jena installations to Krasnororsk, near Moscow, together with a great number of

the technicians. The Soviets also took a great amount of the Schott optical plant, which manufactured optical glass for the Zeiss plants.

Dismantling of the Zeiss plant was stopped by the Russians on October 22, 1946. From then until April 17, 1948, the Russians rebuilt the plants at Jena, allegedly to bring about German reconstruction. We learned that on the night of April 17, 1948, the Russian administration of the Zeiss plant told the top men among the German technical workers to come to a celebration for production achievements. While this took place, the doors were locked and that night some 300 of the remaining top Zeiss specialists were forcibly transported to the Soviet Union, together with their families. Today, Jena is known as V-E-B or Optik Carl Zeiss Volkseigenes Betrieb. It is a state industry, employing some 12,000 men which is twice as many as were at Jena in 1937 but not as many as in wartime. We found that among the 1,400 now working at Oberkochen were a high percentage of the specialists of Jena. This number is in contrast to the 300 specialists that the Soviets took to the Soviet Union. The Americans got the greater amount of the installations and the greater amount of the key men. The Soviets got about a third of the original installations. While this gain is important to the Soviets, an indication of the caliber of their output is that the Leica cameras of Soviet make are greatly inferior to the Leica cameras of German make. Their relative merits we found are easily ascertainable.

GERMAN SCIENTISTS IN THE SOVIET ZONE

In atomic warfare one of the most important groups of scientists to have is physicists. There were 342 physicists in Germany in 1940. This is but a drop in the bucket compared with the physicists in the United States. Our staff found that the Russians got about 12 percent of the German physicists. We found the names of these 38 men given below and made a careful check wherever possible as to the abilities of these men the Soviets obtained. We made no attempt to get the list of German physicists that came to the United States although it was larger than the following list: Prof. F. Hertz, Dr. Riehl, Professor Vollmer, Dr. Born, Dr. Farber, Dr. Gutscher, Dr. Kuehne, Dr. Riewe, Dr. Schuetz, Dr. Winkler, Dr. Schutz, Dr. May, Dr. Bushbeck, Manfred V. Ardenne, Dr. Fritz, Professor Habann, Dr. Lertes, Dr. Roetger, Dr. Tonnlvy, Dr. Wolf, Dr. Orthmann, Dr. Steenbeck, Dr. Boegehold, Dr. Capeelen, Dr. Critz, Professor Haeuser, Professor Lubeck, Dr. Tronsdorf, Dr. Slegmund, Dr. H. Straubel, Professor Pose, Dr. Stendal, Dr. Boegel, Dr. Caties, Dr. Gorlich, Dr. Kotowski, Dr. Papello, and Dr. Schuhmacher.

Professor Hertz is one of the great gains for the Soviets. He was a Nobel prize winner who had been in charge of the Siemens Research Institute in Berlin. He was one of the few who did not get out of Berlin, but preferred to stay in his institute at Berlin-Charlottenburg. Hertz, in the later years of the war, was not in accord with Nazi principles and had collected a small intellectual group about himself who were in sympathy with communistic ideas. Similarly minded also was Prof. Peter Thiesen, whom we have already mentioned as having been in charge of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute of Physical and Electrical Chemistry in Berlin-Dahlem. He is known to have been in opposition to the Nazi Party as early as 1943, and to have been associated with the group around Prof. F. Hertz. He left his chemical institute intact for the Russians and he, his assistants, and equipment were transported to Sukhum in Georgia, Republic of the Soviet Union.

The third well-known figure among German scientists now in the Soviet Union is Manfred V. Ardenne, a young man whose renown has extended beyond Germany as he

was referred to as the "German Edison." His specialty was radar and he had made a giant spectograph that is useful in uranium experiments. His name frequently appears in American newspapers and magazines, especially since President Truman announced the Russian atomic explosion in September 1949, as being an outstanding researcher in atomic energy. However, from an interview that we have with Prof. Werner Heisenberg, who was the first to make an atom bomb for the Germans and is a coworker with Prof. Otto Hann, a Nobel prize winner and the discoverer of the feasibility of smashing an atom, in Goettingen, we gather that Manfred V. Ardenne is not considered as a top scientist by other German first-grade men, but rather as adept at ballyhoo.

But Professor Heisenberg rated two others, now in the Soviet Union, quite highly. They are Dr. K. Riehl and Dr. Bevilgua, who worked on refrigeration at the Kaiser-Wilhelm Institute in Berlin-Dahlem and has also done valuable work in the making of bombs. Another pupil of Heisenberg, Professor Doppel, is working for the Soviets in collaboration with Professors Berthard and Steinbeck. Also working on atomic research in Russia are said to be Dr. Felix Hammer-schmid, Dr. Franz Lerchner, Dr. Hans Ohnesorg, and Dr. Hans Joachim Born. Dr. Everst, who had worked on mercurial lamps of very high capacity, is also said to be helpful in this field.

Second only to atom bomb research in general interest is the role played by the German scientists in submarine boat development for the Soviets. The snorkel-type U-boat fell intact into the hands of the Soviets. Here the Soviets have the assistance of Professor Vollmer of the physical chemistry department of the Berlin Technical High School. Dr. Heinz Froehlich, specialist in submarine accumulators and storage batteries is said to be living near Moscow and to be engaged at an institute of the technical high school there. Work on the Soviet submarine is being done at Leningrad. The type of snorkels that the Soviets found at Stettin were the latest German models. They were capable of remaining under water for 22,000 miles. In the first 3 years since the end of the war, Life has estimated that the Soviets have built over a hundred boats of this type.

However, here in the United States, Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Forrest P. Sherman's announcement about an atomic-powered submarine indicates that a revolution in ship propulsion is taking place. The Snorkel's larger batteries, and more powerful engines have made the submarine a powerful strategic threat. Atomic power will give submarines and ships generally practically unlimited cruising endurance and great speed. Submarine troop-carrying, cargo ships, and missile ships are now part of the United States Navy and antisubmarine submarines are under construction. The Saturday Evening Post issue of July 22 has a wonderful article about atomic submarines, by Vice Adm. Charles A. Lockwood, former commander of submarines in the Pacific.

Dr. Werner von Braun was the original builder of the V-2 for the Germans. He himself is at White Sands, N. Mex., where he has a team of about 150 German specialists working with him. We found that a few of his assistants are, however, working in the Soviet Union.

The exact total of German know-how in the Soviet Union is not known. It is very evident, however, from our analysis that the number is not anywhere near as high as guesses of between 20,000 to 50,000 that appear in the American press from time to time. Even the lower figure is too high, if the number of German scientists in the Soviet Union should include the level of engineers, technicians, and master workmen.

Such estimates cannot be reconciled with the number of people engaged in technical work in any part of Europe. European countries are small in comparison with the United States and even Germany never had industrial plants or research organizations that were at all comparable in size to similar organizations in the United States. The largest industrial plant in Germany, Zeiss at Jena, had a peacetime working force of 6,000 men. A plant having that many employees in the United States is not rated as one of the giants. All Germany only had 7,308 top men of science.

Of the level of engineers, technicians and master workmen, the number, according to our best estimates, in lieu of Soviet statistics, is between 10,000 to 15,000 which is a greater number than we have from Germany of that level. But of scientists and specialists from Germany, the United States has the greater number, as we have shown that the tendency for the top level was to leave their place of work, if there was danger, and to flee toward the west. The engineers and technicians that the Soviets did gather up they used first in the repairing of the damaged German installations in what is now the Soviet Zone. This happened in the case of the rocket experimental station of the B-M-W at Zuehlisdorf near Berlin, where already by the summer of 1945, experiments were being carried out on an extensive scale on the testing platforms. At Halle the Russians used a former aircraft plant for the making of rockets, employing most of the staff of Junkers Aircraft from Dessau and Kothen. The German technicians here were told by the Russian plant director that they would remain in Germany. The pay was high, according to German standards, the technicians earning from 2,000 to 8,000 Reichmarks per annum and good food rations. The Oberspeck Cable Works, in the eastern part of Berlin, became the gathering point for the atomic, radio, and electrical specialists. The V-1 and the V-2 rocket experts remained at Peenemunde, on the North Sea. The optical experts were gathered at Jena and Chemnitz for the textile industry and Stettin was the place of assemblage for the submarine workers.

GERMAN SCIENTISTS WHOM THE SOVIETS DID NOT GET

As we have already shown, the Soviets began looking for the German scientists as soon as they came into Berlin and that they began their round-up in May 1945. With names and lists that had been supplied by their secret police, they hunted up the ministries of the German Government in the different institutes and searched through such files that were still intact. But the results were far from gratifying to the Soviets. Those in charge of the search, found that the police lists were incomplete and inaccurate and the majority of the scientists were not to be found.

One of the top men gave us the following account of the frantic Russian search for the German scientist Saenger:

"Among the material gathered at Peenemunde was a treatise called the Saenger-Project. Copies of this treatise were also found in Berlin and Halle. It contained physical, mathematical, chemical and gas-dynamical data about a stratosphere rocket bomber, whose speed, radius of flight and carrying capacity exceeded all previous marks. It was claimed to be capable of making a non-stop round-the-world flight.

"Soviet scientists admitted that it was possible to build such a bomber. Orders were given to look for Saenger. A special plane flew in vain to Vienna as he was known have lived and worked there. The search was fruitless. The Soviets also looked in vain for Saenger's capable assistant, Frau Bredt, an outstanding mathematician. Stalin seemed disturbed that Saenger was not found and called Berlin on the long distance telephone, ordering the search contin-

ued and said to the effect that 'We need planes of the Saenger type. If we are able to bring this project to a realization we must by all means do so. If we had planes of that type, it would be much easier to deal with Truman.'

We were told that when the Soviet officer who was assigned to look for Saenger got back to his post in Berlin, he and his family took the first opportunity to flee. He got away safely and is now far from the Soviet Union. We were told that there were in all 60 copies of the Saenger-Project, of which the Soviets have three. Others must have been found in other parts of Germany and are very probably in the hands of the Western powers. Saenger is now in France working with the Georgi group. Frau Bredt is, we believe, in Sweden. Our informant added that he thought the Saenger-Project was feasible, but that the Soviets would not be able to use the plans of the Saenger-Project as they do not have the ability.

France: Besides Saenger, France has acquired a number of German scientists and specialists on jet and rocket motors. Among them were the directors of the B-M-W in Berlin-Spandau on jet development. Dr. Oestrich is also in France with the greater part of his staff and Deplom-Ing. Schneider, the head of the research department for rocket development. Schneider was also with B-M-W, but from the branch of the company at Allbach near Munich, Bavaria. Also in France are Professors Nallinger and Wieberer of the Vienna Technical High School. These last two are a further illustration of the tendency of scientists to flee from east to west, as Vienna is now under Soviet influence.

England: In England, some 100 Germans work in the Royal Aircraft Establishment at Farnborough, in the rocket experimental station at Wascott and Bucks and with various industrial firms. The rocket specialists are the most in demand. The outstanding one in this group was chief engineer of design, Schmid, of the Walther Rocket plant at Kiel, who, however, was killed in 1948 in an explosion with several of his German coworkers. There are also aerodynamical German engineers and German metallurgists working in England.

Australia and Canada: In Australia, German scientists are working on rocket experiments with native scientists on projects that are so gigantic that they will require the services of some 20,000 workers in industry. There are some 200 specialists in Canada. Among them is Professor Bergold, biochemist of the Max Plank Institute. His work on the chemical destruction of insects is so important that his Canadian assistants rate his contribution to Canada as worth millions of dollars every year.

GERMAN SCIENTISTS IN THE UNITED STATES

Of the number of German scientists and specialists who went to the United States, one estimate states that 500 went to the United States until 1947, and thus the number now is 2,000 for both scientists and specialists and top technicians. At the time of the Fuchs case in February 1950, a witness testifying before the National Defense Committee stated that there were 600 German scientists in the United States engaged in the development of military science. Of these, 93 were returning to Germany and 362 had then taken out first citizenship papers and the relatives of 233 of these scientists had also taken out such papers. That figure included only those in military work. A great number, however, are otherwise engaged. Scientists are still leaving Germany at this time, principally for France and the United States. So that the estimate of nearly 2,000 top German scientists in the United States at the present time is very probably correct.

The value of the German scientists to the United States has been variously estimated.

The Army has stated that in rocket research alone, the United States has saved \$750,000,000. The magazine Time has placed a value of \$1,000,000,000 on the work of the German scientists. General Putt of the United States Air Force estimates that the total gain to the United States in their work in addition to the captured plans amounts to several billions of dollars. It has been said that the United States knowledge of rockets leaped 10 years by the know-how gained from the rockets of the German scientists.

The Moscow radio on July 2, 1950, proclaimed that: "At the beginning of 1946, 18 Japanese specialists were sent to the United States—bacteriologists, who zealously handed over to their new masters all their material on the production of the bacterial weapon."

It stated that the work was being carried out in secret laboratories in Maryland and in the bacteriological detachments of the American Army in Massachusetts and Utah.

GERMAN SCIENTISTS STILL IN GERMANY

The great number of the German scientists remained in Germany. In general it may be said that those who had a job and were not otherwise forced remained. That accounts for the high number among the schools of higher learning who remained in Germany. Those who left Germany generally worked for the government and had ceased to operate for private industry that had been either bombed out or dismantled. But even among those who lost their connections there were a great number who remained in Germany. Some have turned down the most tempting offers to leave the country. Among those who remained are Prof. Otto Hahn and Prof. Werner Heisenberg, the first of whom is the father of atomic energy research and the other was the first to apply the principle at atom-smashing. Both are at the Max Plank Institute in Goettingen. They are established in a new, modern institute and were very happy in their work when we visited them. A Professor Reppe preferred to stay in a detention camp in Germany when asked to go to the United States. When Professor Butenandt, who pioneered in synthetic rubber, turned down an offer to go to Switzerland, the students of the University of Tuebingen staged a large torchlight parade in honor of the renowned scientist, also the holder of a Nobel prize.

We have shown that in the early part of this chapter that on the basis of a breakdown of the industrial population of Western Germany, as against the same type of population in the eastern part of Germany, that there must have been three times as many scientists in the western part. Therefore, out of a total of 7,300, there are some 1,800 scientists in the eastern zone. As a great number fled out of the eastern part before the Soviets came in from the east, it is hardly possible that the number of top men that remained for the Soviets was more than one-third of that number, or 600. From our observations covering months of work over there, even one-third can be said to be a high average. In the case of the Zeiss experts, it was a whole lot less. And that was the largest industry in Germany in one place. The total number who went to France, England, Canada, Australia, Switzerland, in all probability reach 600. The testimony at the Fuchs investigation in Washington stated there were 600 scientists in the United States from Germany who worked in military plants alone, and that it was possible that the total German scientists in the United States at this time amounted to 2,000. This total of 600 for the Soviet Union, 600 for all the other countries of the Western World, and 2,000 in the United States would leave 4,108 scientists as still in Germany without any deductions for deaths or retirement.

This estimate of over 4,000 scientists still in Germany is confirmed, we estimate from a

source that has just been made available. One of our German correspondents writes us that a new handbook of German scientists has just been published listing 7,000 scientists as now employed in all German technical universities, music and art, colleges, scientific institutes, societies and periodicals. Evidently this new handbook includes professions and grades of teachers that we did not include in our table. However, the number listed in this new handbook confirms our estimate of over 4,000 German scientists, at the level discussed in this chapter.

Our estimate of 600 German scientists now in the Soviet Union is a figure that is arrived at after the sifting of a great amount of material and checking of data, in lieu of actual statistics. It is an answer to those who say that the Russians have the German scientists, whenever the weakness of the Soviet educational system is shown and wherever the quality of Soviet science is demonstrated. We have here shown that the number that the Soviets gained approximated the number that were gained by all the western powers, excluding the United States whose own particular acquisition therefore represents a clear advantage to the western powers, without any offsets. Then, when it is remembered that the gain by the United States is over and above what was needed, as the United States on its own possesses a preponderance of world know-how, it becomes unforgettably apparent how puny was the gain that the Soviets achieved through the German scientists.

The informant in Sweden says: "There are three Atomgrands. The one in the Kusbas region, the other near Lake Balkal, near the borders of Outer Mongolia and the third east of the Urals northwesterly of Magnitogorsk. The plants are underground. The Swedish sources claim that here laboratory bombs are produced under forced conditions under the orders of the Politburo, who are insisting on speed. But these sources say that the bomb the Soviets finally succeeded in making was not the bomb that had been used by the United States on July 15, 1945, at the Alamogordo Air Base in New Mexico and later against Japan. The Soviets lacked the knowledge of the proper amount of U-235 needed to touch off a fast chain reaction by the neutrons. So they developed a bomb that was similar to the one that the Germans had made experimentally during the war, using deuterium or heavy water. The Soviet bomb explosion of July 1949 does not prove that the Soviets now know as much as the western powers about the atom bomb. It does prove, however, that the Soviets are desperately trying to catch up to the knowledge that the western powers have of the atom bomb by taking short cuts. That explosion proves that the Soviets are at least 4 years behind and that the time lag is likely to continue, it may even increase, as the Soviets have the hardest work ahead of them in atom bomb production. It was harder for the United States to put the bomb into production than to find out how to make it. But the United States has solved the production problem. The Soviets must still start quantity production of uranium 235. Until she has a stockpile of the fissionable raw materials she will not have a single bomb, much less a stockpile."

RUSSIA AS AN INDUSTRIAL POWER BELONGS IN THE MINOR LEAGUE

Rather than rely on false Communist statistics we were interested in getting firsthand data on conditions in Russian industry. We thought it would be a very difficult job at the beginning to locate any great number of individuals who had recently left Russia and were in the states bordering on Russia. We found, however, that there were thousands of such individuals and our task was nowhere as difficult on this matter as we expected. As a matter of fact, any client himself, if he knows these languages, can

easily do the same thing we did to find out basic facts. We did not find a single person who was at all impressed with Russia's accomplishment in industry. What few good things she has are practically all imitations of the products of western countries, particularly Germany and America.

As an industrial power we found Russia about where the United States was in 1890 and 1900. As compared with either Germany or Japan, Russia's position is indeed pathetic. Most of the people interviewed were dumbfounded that Americans believed that Russia was making a real progress in industry. It is true she is making a few reasonably good armament products such as tanks, artillery, and certain types of short sawed-off guns. In modern warfare to succeed (as both Germany and Japan found out) one must be an all-around power and not have a few good specialized products.

Even a third-class industrial power can pull a surprise attack in a distant area of the world like Korea and look fairly good for a short time. But after the element of surprise is overcome then the inherent facts will come out that she simply has not got the stuff to play in the big league.

WE HAVE NO REASON TO FEAR RUSSIA OR CHINA

Just what goes on in the mind of the average American when he thinks of the United States fighting the 470,000,000 people of China? First, he has been sold a propaganda of fear so that the very thought frightens him. He reads detailed accounts about the wonders of the "crack" Fourth Route Army which the Chinese Reds propose to fight us with. Well, I have read account after account about the "crack" Red Chinese divisions, and you would gather from these accounts that practically every one of these Chinese soldiers was a West Point graduate. By what stretch of the imagination can one classify the Red Chinese divisions as crack divisions in western terms? Whom did they ever fight? Could it be that they got their reputation by running after the broken-down Chiang Kai-shek troops and that they proved themselves to be the better runners? Could it be that a miracle has been accomplished and that suddenly the illiterate Chinese are able to handle the modern machinery of modern war, thereby becoming fighters capable of getting "in the ring" with big timers?

Actually, I believe the attempt to scare the American people to death because of the prospect of fighting China calls for the belly laugh of all time. Here we have a country that has taken on and at the same time defeated the two greatest industrial powers in the world—Germany and Japan—and now we are supposed to shake in our boots at the prospect of fighting broken-down China. The very thought that you can scare people about all this is a good indication of the type of cockeyed thinking that is going on in this country. Let me give you a few A B C facts regarding China:

1. Believe it or not, there is not a single modern steel mill in all of China, and she is supposed to be able to fight a war.

2. In modern war, ground troops are a liability if they cannot be supplied with mechanized tanks and protected by air power consuming high-test airplane gas. For all practical purposes, there is not a gallon of high-test gas produced in China and her total production of crude oil is only 47,000 barrels a month. Can you imagine that? A little over 1,000 barrels a day which any single third-class industrial plant in the United States alone would consume.

3. As far as transportation in all of northern China is concerned, it is entirely done by horse and cart.

4. Believe it or not, as regards the making of modern weapons, China has no munition factories except for those making hand-made primitive weapons. Here is a country that is largely relying on American weapons

which our State Department practically presented them with at different times; or is relying on gifts of second-hand weapons from the Russian Reds, and which must be hauled overland thousands of miles. As contrasted with these primitive weapons, the United States has such powerful machines that on one single day this week they were able to wipe out 90 percent of a city of 85,000 people.

Frankly, I can only consider the attempts to measure the strength of China against that of the United States as a colossal joke. At the start of the Korean war, the Russian Reds were supposed to have hundreds of wonderful modern submarines ready to smash our Navy upon its arrival. When the showdown actually came with whatever submarines were there, they gracefully chose to say, "Excuse, please." Then, too, the Reds were supposed to have all types of planes that could run rings around the planes of the most modern and industrial power in the world. Again, after a few encounters they, too, followed the same course as the submarines in gracefully backing out. I am convinced that as stupid as the Russian leaders have proven themselves to be that they are not dumb enough to fight a war with us and lose face completely in Asia after seeing what happens to any primitive military and industrial country when it comes up against a first-class twentieth century power.

For that matter, let us look at a few simple A B C's as regards the difference between the horse-drawn civilization of the Russian Communists as against the mechanical power machine of the United States. The one figure that measures the power of a nation is the amount of mechanical horsepower produced in each country, whereas last year the United States controlled two-thirds of the world's horsepower and Russia controlled only 10 percent of the same horsepower. Here are the two figures in productive horsepower which show the power of the United States over that of Russia. In addition we show also the remaining horsepower in the rest of the world.

Comparative productive horsepower for the year 1950

		Percent
United States.....	6,452,000,000	65.0
U. S. S. R.....	984,000,000	10.0
Rest of world.....	2,495,000,000	25.0
World total---	9,932,000,000	100.0

ARE WE GOING TO FIGHT MIDGETS OR GIANTS?

If we were threatened with war by powerful industrial countries like Germany and Japan during the height of their power, we might have something to worry about. But I see absolutely nothing to be concerned about when we are being threatened by nations like Russia and China that are still using methods of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in order to conduct a war.

Now you can always built up a case to claim that the United States is completely unprepared as compared to previous wars which we decisively won. But actually, despite all the gloom, we are better prepared before the big battle with Russia starts than we have ever been in entering a war. In the first place, our Navy and merchant marine are just about 100-percent built already. Whereas at the beginning of World War II we had but a few Army camps ready, today we have all the Army camps of World War II available on a very short notice. At the beginning of World War II—when we fought the two greatest mass-production powers in the world at the same time in the case of Germany and Japan—we had but a modest aircraft production capacity. Today, this productive capacity is tremendous. China, on the other hand, does not have a single factory that can produce an airplane, and anyone who tries to win a war today

with manpower and not airplanes is just insane. Whereas Russia always has had a small airplane capacity compared to ours, and many of them producing wooden planes, our aircraft capacity as a result of World War II and the ensuing years is today by far the greatest of any country in the world. The plants do not have to be built, the men do not have to be trained, and the machine tools and metals are readily available. As contrasted with this, a substantial part of not only Russian aircraft plants, but every other type of plant was seriously damaged in World War II, whereas not a single American plant was damaged. One can safely say so soon after World War II that no country in all history ever had such a powerful armament machine ready to go into action on short notice.

Let's drop the old slogan, "See America First," and use instead "Know America First." Our organization, in its daily work, is familiar with a substantial part of this country's research of both a war and peacetime nature, and when you compare it with anything else in the world you just have to enjoy a good belly laugh. It would be one thing if the American scientific and industrial machine was just a theory which had never been tried and proven in actual practice. It was only a few years ago that it dumb-founded the entire world in its actual operation. How soon it is forgotten that, even before the postwar expansion of our industrial machine, during the last war it was turning out every single day of the year 4½ merchant vessels. Remember, this is not a month or a year, but 4½ merchant vessels every day. It was turning out over 1,800 airplanes a week and has still greater capacity for production today. It was also turning out Navy combatant vessels of different types at the rate of 1½ for every single day of the year.

We are firmly convinced that any reasonable analysis of comparative war strength between Russia and the United States is about as sensible as comparing the strength of an infant with a full-grown man. War is a mechanized thing today, and science, mass-production know-how, and oil have replaced men as its sinews. Don't be misled by the propaganda of fear which is the natural result of misinformation, and, above all, don't sell American industrial know-how short. We are the No. 1 power of the world and will continue to be for a long time.

WILLIAM J. BAXTER.

Consolidation of Veterans' Administration Offices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

AMERICAN LEGION SERVICE COMMITTEE,
Jamaica, Long Island, August 10, 1951.

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN: You no doubt have received several letters concerning the transfer of the Veterans' Administration District Office which handled insurance and death claims to Philadelphia within the next 6 months, transfer to be completed within 18 months.

As rehabilitation chairman of the Tenth District (Nassau, Queens, and Suffolk) and service director of the Queens American Legion, I attended a special meeting held August 9, 1951, by the Queens County delegates, and it is our opinion that the following facts, if considered will be sufficient to warrant the cancellation of the present move which is certainly not a move toward economy. The American Legion believes in economy in Government expenses to keep down the tremendous income taxes.

However, this move by the Veterans' Administrator Gen. Carl A. Gray, Jr., is not an act of economy. This consolidation is an additional expense and burden upon our Government.

The following facts are as stated to the best of our knowledge and belief:

Whereas New York is a thickly populated veterans' area, and any move to another State would effect a great hardship on those doing business with the district office regarding loans, insurance and death cases, and for the widows and children who are beneficiaries of deceased veterans. Between the years 1928 and 1934 the New York regional office handled all claims of living and deceased veterans.

It has not been stated heretofore that on policies which have a loan value a veteran who needs money can go to this insurance company and get it immediately. It is false economy to say that these claims can be adjudicated through the mail box.

1. In urgent cases when a veteran appeared before 11 a. m. requesting an insurance loan he would have a check the same afternoon.

2. When a veteran died his claims folder being in the New York regional office was picked up, transferred to another section, adjudicated immediately upon proper credentials and for filing forms P 22, 530, and 534.

The two foregoing paragraphs are economy. The reason—no mail box, no transfer of case files from one State to another.

The consolidation of insurance and death claims at the regional office, 252 Seventh Avenue, New York, would effect economy. There would be no delay. A man could pay his premiums, borrow on his policy and upon his death the claims could be immediately adjudicated.

Therefore, we of Queens County American Legion ask our Congressmen to show General Gray that this is false economy, that the only way to effect economy in the Veterans' Administration is to consolidate the district office with the regional office.

The details involved in the moving, expediting of office equipment, required space to be made available in Philadelphia, and the great number of employees with families, owning their homes, which would have to be disposed of and which would entail a great loss, real-estate market being what it is today, all tend to show that the anticipated move is anything but economy.

Therefore, be it resolved to immediately abandon the moving of the district office to Philadelphia, Pa.

Respectfully,

MICHAEL J. OFFELT,
Rehabilitation Chairman, Tenth District,
New York, Service Director, Queens
County American Legion.

AUGUST 9, 1951.

HON. EDITH N. ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN ROGERS: We, veterans of World War II, have just learned that you have introduced a resolution to rescind the so-called economy consolidation of the New York, Boston, Richmond, and Philadelphia offices of the Veterans' Administration.

It is with a sincere and appreciative feeling of gratitude that we take this opportunity to thank you for your spontaneous indignant reaction to a move which so completely disregards the principles of true economy and the welfare of loyal American war veterans. We wish to assure you that the stand you have taken is shared by all the able and sympathetic members of the New York delegation and by many of the delegations of other States.

It is gratifying to know that in our hour of need, we were fortunate to find men and women of your caliber in Congress who saw fit to champion the cause of the veteran.

Sincere thanks,

Herman Asners, John C. Schmidlin, Caslinne M. Anohor, Allen Schiff, New York, N. Y.; Marcus Hartman, Joseph F. Petendree, Bronx, N. Y.; Irving H. Richmond, John R. Pilazzo, Brooklyn, N. Y.; William Spina, Franklin Square, N. Y.; Joseph E. Jeantel, Corona, N. Y.; Charles Augere, Bronx, N. Y.; Sheldon Beeman, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Charles E. Franzinck, Staten Island, N. Y.; Louis Childs, Jamaica, N. Y.; Charles L. West, Marino M. Lewnes, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Domiano T. Coppa, Henry Holmes, Bronx, N. Y.; Ephraim Ed. Kaufman, Stanley Strumber, Brooklyn, N. Y.; David Lerner, Herbert J. Schming, Agnes J. Galm, Rafaela Santos, Arnold Shining, New York, N. Y.; David Fink, Bronx, N. Y.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN: Under date of July 26, 1951, Carl R. Gray, Jr., administrator of Veterans' Affairs, issued a release announcing plans for the consolidation of the VA district offices now located in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Richmond, Va., into one area office to be located in Philadelphia. These offices handle the insurance and death claim benefits. Mr. Gray stated that this move will result in an estimated savings of nearly \$2,000,000 yearly.

We earnestly request that the two United States Senators from New York together with the State congressional delegation follow the example of the Massachusetts delegation and investigate the claims made by Mr. Gray as they effect New York State.

We believe that the figures as given out by Mr. Gray in his release as they relate to New York are erroneous and misleading. We are convinced that his plan will not bring about a saving by reason of the closing of the New York district office.

In the release Mr. Gray states: "The savings resulting from the abolishment of the New York district office alone have been estimated at \$1,000,000 a year. The figures include about \$478,000 in salaries; \$488,000 in rent and maintenance, and the remainder in other items such as communications and tabulating activities."

Further in the release regarding personnel Mr. Gray makes this statement: "Those now employed in the three district offices (Boston, New York, Richmond) will be given the opportunity to move to Philadelphia to work in the new office. Any vacancies created by VA employees not desiring to transfer will be filled locally." Judging from these two statements it would appear as though he would save \$478,000 on salaries in New York but spend that much in Philadelphia to replace them.

Regarding the saving of \$488,000 in rental, that too appears to be greatly exaggerated. First of all the VA occupies only a part of the building at 346 Broadway, or 180,000 square feet at a cost of \$1.25 per square foot or \$230,000. This figure would be brought down further by deducting the cost of space to be used in Philadelphia. Whatever saving

that might be made by moving to Philadelphia could be made right here in New York City by moving the district office to the VA building now housing the New York regional office at 252 Seventh Avenue where ample space is now available. Mr. Gray knows that 150,000 square feet was available in that building when he planned to move the activities of the Brooklyn regional office to that office several months back. It is still available.

We believe in fairness to all concerned that Mr. Gray should make available the exact figures showing actual savings, if any, that will accrue if this consolidation is carried out. That figure should take into consideration the actual rental cost of the space now occupied at 346 Broadway; the cost of moving this enormous activity to Philadelphia; the cost of space in Philadelphia for this New York case load; the cost of moving employees who would transfer to Philadelphia, and the cost of training new employees to take the place of those who would not make the change. Then deduct from that, the saving that could be made by consolidating the activities of the New York district office at 346 Broadway with the activities of the New York regional office at 252 Seventh Avenue where space is now available. We believe that the savings in dollars and cents for Uncle Sam, if any, will be greatly offset by the loss of employment for many with years of service in the VA; plus the loss of many employment opportunities in New York City, together with the disadvantage that VA clients will have to endure in securing that which they are rightfully entitled to by reason of the fact that the office administering these benefits is to be located many miles away in another State and city. Mr. Gray pointed out in his release that the new district office will continue to be as near as the corner mailbox for those paying their insurance premiums. For reasons known only to him he makes no statement regarding the many problems confronting claimants and service officers which cannot be handled or adjudicated through the corner mailbox.

Since 1923 the American Legion, through national convention mandates has been calling upon the Veterans' Administration to decentralize the adjudication of death and insurance claims to regional offices. These resolutions have been consistently and repeatedly presented to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. In 1950 the American Legion insurance advisory board, made up of leaders in the insurance field, went on record with the opinion that better service could be rendered policyholders and their beneficiaries if disability and death claims of United States Government life insurance and national service life insurance were settled at the regional office level, with centralization of premium payments and insurance underwriting.

The Veterans' Administration objection to our recommendation is that it would create an immediate need for additional personnel at the regional office level. We believe that a further study would reverse that opinion in view of the manpower needed to handle these cases in either the present district offices or the area offices contemplated in the new plan. The most important consideration overlooked by the Veterans' Administration is the difference in time required to adjudicate an insurance or death claim in an office far removed which has to be done through the corner mailbox as compared to the personal action that can be taken by all concerned in the regional office. That is a most important point that should be weighed when considering this matter.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS in an article published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 30, 1951, under extension of remarks, stated: "Taking the district office from Boston (the

same applies to New York) will be a great economic loss to that area, and give poorer service to veterans and their families and cause many to lose their jobs. The Veterans Administration was created to serve the veterans. Moving the office to Philadelphia will hurt that service."

Mr. Gray in his release stated that this move would be started in 6 months and completed in 18. It has been brought to our attention that the move has already been started.

Your individual and collective efforts in behalf of the veterans and their dependents in New York State will be appreciated.

Yours for the Legion,

JOSEPH P. PICCIRILLO,
Chairman, Department of Rehabilitation Committee.

Approved by:

Dr. JOSEPH R. HAWN,
Department Commander.

P S.—The enclosed resolution regarding this move was adopted at the Nassau County convention. It will be confirmed and adopted at the department of New York convention scheduled to be held in New York City, August 9, 10, and 11, 1951.

Salute to Sweden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in our prayers for the release not only of Bill Oatis and of Frank Noel, Associated Press men, but of all people suffering at the hands of Communist captors, surely there is room in our hearts for an expression of gratitude to a gallant friend of freedom. I refer to Sweden.

Bold in its stand against Red demands for their return, chivalrous Sweden has offered sanctuary to the 12 seamen and the 4 flyers who recently fled the barbaric tyranny of the Soviet-controlled Warsaw regime.

Yesterday I requested the Department of State to transmit a letter of thanks for the above to His Majesty, the King of Sweden.

Mr. Speaker, with your kind permission, I should like to list below, my letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C., August 13, 1951.

His Majesty GUSTAVUS VI ADOLF,
King of Sweden.

MY DEAR KING GUSTAVUS: Would you please accept these humble thanks from the Representative of the Thirteenth Congressional District of New Jersey for the gallant place your country is taking in the fight for freedom.

I refer especially to the courageous action taken by members of Your Majesty's Government relative the recent escapees from Communist-dominated, Communist-despised Poland.

True to the traditions of your great people and your glorious kings, I am sure that you will not fail at any grunts that might be snorted from the direction of the Soviet bear for the release of these unfortunates.

I beg of you, King Gustavus, please do not repeat the tragic error that we made at the

end of the World War II, when we considered the Soviet a true and honorable military ally, and turned back to them, unwilling and unfortunate prisoners of war—to be slaughtered. We have learned our lesson.

May the glory of God shine on you and your people for this kindness.

Sincerely,

ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
Member of Congress.

Patriotic American—Alfred Kohlberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, these days a person who seriously exercises his energies in behalf of what he believes is best for America never knows whether he will be praised or damned for his efforts.

Alfred Kohlberg, an American merchant, has done a great deal of business with the people of China for many years. As a result of these personal contacts with the Chinese people he foresaw long ago the tragic course of our foreign policy in the Far East. His strenuous efforts to awaken the people in America, both in and out of the Government, to the Communist danger in China has brought him considerable abuse by those who would defend our ill-fated policy in China.

The Passionist Fathers, a Catholic missionary society, who have engaged in missionary work in China for many years, recognize Kohlberg for the true American patriot that he is. I include herewith the following article about Mr. Kohlberg, which appeared in the June 1951 issue of the Sign, a magazine published by the Passionist Fathers:

ONE-MAN CRUSADE—ALFRED KOHLBERG, No. 1 HEADACHE OF THE COMRADES, PARTICULARLY THOSE WHO FOULED UP OUR CHINA POLICY
(By Irene Corbally Kuhn)

One day last January, Government truckmen, armed with a Senate subpoena, pulled up at a farm near Lee, Mass., and hauled away 70 metal files of correspondence and documents stored there by the Institute of Pacific Relations. Whatever the outcome of the congressional inquiry based on the haul, it marked the climax of a process begun 5 years earlier by a stubborn little patriot named Alfred Kohlberg—importer, philanthropist, and self-educated authority on communism and far-eastern affairs.

Having stumbled on what, in his view, looked remarkably like Red skulduggery in the Institute—of which he was an active member—Kohlberg had launched a one-man campaign for an honest investigation of the outfit. Stymied in this effort, smeared for his pains, he dug in still deeper. And once aroused by the odor of Communist infiltration, he followed its trail in a dozen different directions. By this time, it is safe to surmise, he must be regarded by the comrades and their camp followers as their No. 1 headache.

The State Department's Far East policy has been the chief object of his bulldoglike min-

istrations. During the Tydings committee whitewash hearings last fall, those growing out of Senator JOE MCCARTHY's charges, Kohlberg was billed by hostile commentators, quite erroneously, as the bete noire behind the Wisconsin marine. His influence has been suspected, quite correctly, behind such anti-Communist enterprises as the American China Policy Association, the newsletter, Counterattack (famous for its publication of Red channels), the now-defunct monthly, Plain Talk, its current fortnightly successor, the Freeman, and the American Jewish League Against Communism. Indeed, whenever a new drive against the Stalinist brethren is in the news, it has become routine to look for this calm, quiet-spoken, relentless businessman behind the scenes.

It was back in January 1946 that high officials of our State Department became aware of a persistent buzzing and ringing in their heads and ears. The more they shook their heads, the more insistent the noise. They did not realize it then, but Alfred Kohlberg had initiated his private war on their far-eastern policy. Now, 5 years later, the war is still raging. There have been no conclusive victories on either side. But in the swift, bloody rush of history in Asia, Kohlberg has chalked up a depressing number of pyrrhic victories as time and again his predictions of catastrophe for Uncle Sam in that part of the world have become tragic actualities.

When the first small rockslides of Kohlberg's avalanche of criticism and protest began falling on the heads of the State Department officers, they were dismissed or ignored. No one "important" in the Department had ever heard of him. He was not an "expert" in the diplomats' sense of the word and apparently represented only his obscure self. His views, therefore, were considered worthless by the code-and-courier crowd. They have changed their minds since then.

State Department officials were not alone in their ignorance of Alfred Kohlberg. Beyond his business circle, his neighbors in suburban Bronxville, a small group of old China hands, and an even smaller group of long-time militant anti-Communists, few other Americans knew his name. And even among his professional colleagues and personal associates, few knew him really well. He is a man adept at protective coloring.

Faintly rotund, prematurely bald, and with a curiously enigmatic smile as his constant expression, he might have sat as the original model for the Chinese god of happiness. Although well-to-do, he is indifferent to externals and to any kind of show, and has been called by his friends "the worst-dressed man in New York," an accolade that merely makes him chuckle. He has extraordinary poise and coolness and a dry, crackling, subtly sarcastic wit. He has the unusual ability of making his personality felt as a strong, vital force even when he is merely sitting quiet, listening. In an argument, he is a deadly sure shot, developing his point of view deftly and then waiting for the proper moment to demolish an opponent's stand with one piece of indubitable fact, presented with sweet reasonableness. Like a plastic toy loaded at the base, he cannot be toppled, no matter how far he is pushed.

Nor will he compromise on a principle; once he has determined the principle at issue, nothing will shake him from it. He does not, for example, weaken his position by admitting flaws on his own side. One long-time friend said of him: "Alfred doesn't make the mistake of being a liberal who dilutes his views. He has a kind of narrow militancy about them that strengthens them beyond measure. He's a man of firm convictions—not merely opinions—a natural-born fighter."

Kohlberg's militancy in political convictions came relatively early in life. He was among the Republican rebels who split from the party in 1912 to support Theodore Roosevelt and his liberal Bull Moose campaign. Since then he has returned to the Republican fold, but he still considers himself a liberal in the original definition, holding to government by law instead of by administrative fiat.

By far the greater part of his energies until about 10 years ago, however, was devoted to his business—the importing of Chinese textiles and embroidered linens. It was a business he had begun in San Francisco, his birthplace, after schooling in the University of California and a brief career in job printing.

Kohlberg is gifted with daring practicality, willingness to try anything, and sympathetic understanding of other minds, which he has been able to put to good use in commerce. Almost single-handedly, he built up a real cottage industry in southeastern China, supplying linens from Ireland, basic designs from the United States. Shortly before the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese war in 1937, he had 100,000 Chinese needlewomen, working under contractors, readying linens for export to him.

His enlightened business methods have made his firm an outstanding one and have paid off in unusual human dividends. Virtually all his employees own stock in the company; most have been with him anywhere from 10 to 25 years. In China he has built a reputation over the years for scrupulous honesty and fair dealing.

When he returned to China after the war, when his business had been suspended for the duration of the hostilities, he found that he had been repaid in kind. At the time of Pearl Harbor, Kohlberg's firm had 3,500,000 pieces in work in China. When the Japanese struck, he simply wrote off that shipment as a complete loss. Early in 1946, however, he discovered that his workers had managed to store away nearly 70 percent, secreting it from the Japanese behind false walls or in underground caches. Some of the Chinese had gone to great lengths, often at great personal expense, to hold up what they considered their end of the bargain. They had salvaged for him more than \$100,000 in goods.

As a matter of course, Kohlberg took over all living expenses for his employees in China for the 4 years of the war. "They risked their lives to fulfill their contract and save my goods, even when they could have made a fortune from selling them in the black markets," he says, matter of factly. "I just put them back in business."

That reputation for fair dealing which paid off so handsomely in China is as much a part of Kohlberg as his skin. When he returned with this unexpected bonanza, he was in a position to corner the embroidered linen market, had he been so minded. Instead, he advertised to his old customers that he could take care of them on the basis of prewar goods at prewar prices. "Anybody else," a business competitor said, "would have taken advantage of that kind of situation to exploit the market. It was typical of Alfred that he didn't."

In prewar days, Kohlberg had made some 35 trips to the Orient. When we went to war with Japan, Kohlberg, then 55 years old, volunteered his services. He was an old hand at cross-country and all-weather flying. The Army Air Force used him as a pilot in the antisubmarine patrol of the Gulf of Mexico, flying protection for the convoys.

Later, still during the war, as a director and chairman of the executive committee of the American Bureau for Medical Aid to China, he continued to fly on periodic inspection trips. Despite his long business

association with China, his many friendships among the Chinese, he neither speaks nor understands Chinese. But he never let this handicap his movements. Repeatedly, without an interpreter, he struck out deep into the interior of China, to tiny villages and settlements, isolated Chinese army camps and training schools, to see for himself how American medical supplies were being used.

On one of these trips, quite by accident, he stumbled on what was to become his major concern and preoccupation in the years that followed. The seemingly phlegmatic business man was converted into a focused one-man crusader against Communist influences in American life and especially American policy in Asia.

"It was in 1943," he recalls. "I was in Chungking and got to talking to some of our Embassy officials there. They told me that Chiang Kai-shek was stockpiling tanks and guns he'd got from us under lend lease, hoarding them for future use against the Chinese Communists. He wasn't using them against the Japanese, they said.

"I got kind of sore at that, and a few weeks later, in Kunming, I repeated these charges to Brigadier General Arms, who was in charge of the infantry training school there, under Stilwell, preparing Chinese forces for the Burma campaign. I asked the general why we had no control over Lend-Lease equipment for China. 'But we do' General Arms told me. I insisted that I knew differently and repeated what I'd been told at the Embassy in Chungking. The general just looked at me a moment and then proceeded to give me the low-down facts."

The gist of it was that everything by way of munitions that had come into China had been delivered to him. The Chinese had received nothing directly as yet, and were not going to get one gun or one round of ammunition until Stilwell's forces were fully supplied.

"This was in August, 1943," Kohlberg said. "Nothing came through from us on lend-lease for the Chinese armies until the autumn of 1944. The Embassy story was made up out of whole cloth. The Nationalists couldn't have hoarded anything because they hadn't received anything."

Kohlberg was extremely disturbed. Why should American diplomats go out of their way to discredit our Chinese ally? He found other lies being circulated, a pattern of hostile propaganda.

"At first," he explains, "I didn't attribute it to Communist influence. A man doesn't think right off of traitors in his own government. I thought of them as liars, not Communists. Then I began looking into the Institute of Pacific Relations, to which I'd contributed time and money—I was still giving money to it then. The IPR was full of men who prattled the same line as those officials in Chungking. And the State Department, I knew, was drawing a lot of its personnel and consultants from the IPR."

Kohlberg did a simple thing which clinched his suspicions. He went back over a year of the institute's publications, pronouncements, and activities. Nearly all of these, he discovered, ran fairly parallel to the Communist Party line on China. He wrote an 88-page pamphlet detailing his findings and conclusions and sent it, plus an open letter, to all trustees of the organization as well as others interested in the Far East.

A hot controversy was touched off. The IPR board retaliated by attacking Kohlberg. He tried, without success, to get the story before the American public. He began to realize that there was a pattern to it all and to understand that it was a pattern designed by Communist-minded strategists. While there were a great many well-meaning innocents at the top of the institute roster, he found, the mischief was down below on the

operational level. It was there that his demand for an objective investigation by neutral outside people was blocked.

Characteristically, Kohlberg began to read his way through Marx's Das Kapital, the Communist manifesto, the constitution of the USSR, proceedings of Communist International Congresses. When he felt he was adequately fortified by knowledge of communism and its methods, he carried the war to the enemy. In 1946, he founded the American China Policy Association, a group of American experts on China dedicated to exposing the Communist direction of the campaign against Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist regime and to informing the American people of the nature of the menace to the United States of America in a communized China. A barrage of carefully documented pamphlets and hard-hitting open letters poured out from the association headquarters. These were usually addressed to the Secretary of State, the President, or influential Members of Congress, and frequently revealed unpublished or suppressed information.

Kohlberg's tactics soon began to make an impression. Owen Lattimore, State Department consultant, charged that Kohlberg was in the pay of the Nationalist Government and was, besides, the undercover head of a China lobby. Both charges were absurd myths and merely gave Kohlberg more opportunities to ask embarrassing questions about Lattimore and his friends in relation to American policies that were clearing the road to power for Stalin's Chinese puppets.

The charges, however, were eagerly picked up and elaborated by self-styled liberal publications and commentators. Kohlberg's repeated demands that he be heard by congressional committees where he was being smeared were simply ignored. Only the Department of Internal Revenue took official cognizance of the accusations—by seeking evidence of those fabled payments from the Chinese Treasury.

After 2 months' combing of both Kohlberg's and his wife's financial affairs, the agent reported that Kohlberg had overpaid taxes in the amounts of \$188 and \$108 in 1946 and 1947, respectfully. Kohlberg, an inveterate letter writer, sent a caustic letter to Secretary of the Treasury Snyder in which he commented acidly on the deplorable waste of time and money involved in the just-concluded investigation. Shortly thereafter, he received a bill for \$32,000 from the Internal Revenue office for items it had decided, on second thought, to disallow as deductible after having approved them. He was delighted—it was just the kind of fight he likes, and he is now cheerfully engaged in court action on the issue. In any event, no slightest trace of the mythical Chinese payments showed up.

Since his introduction to the workings of the Communist conspiracy in China, Kohlberg has steadily broadened his campaign against it. He has contributed thousands of dollars to the fight and keeps his check-book handy, though he is the shrewd businessman at all times in judging worth-while anti-Communist causes. He has arranged his business affairs so that he now devotes about two-thirds of his time to reading, lecturing, writing to defeat communism.

Kohlberg views the torrid controversy on our Far East policy, which he helped expose, with quiet detachment and even a certain amount of mordant humor. Like the still, fixed eye of the tornado, he rides calmly in the center, unruffled by the violence of the forces around him. He doesn't deny that he enjoys his role enormously. It provides a perfect outlet for his combative propensities, his brimming sense of satire and, above all, his old-fashioned American patriotism.

All Must Share Blame With West Pointers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted, I am including as part of these remarks an editorial from the August 7 issue of the Oregon Journal entitled "All Must Share Blame With West Pointers" which is well worth a wide reading audience. The editorial follows:

ALL MUST SHARE BLAME WITH WEST POINTERS

The I-get-by policy of many Americans is bearing sorry fruit. The belief that the real crime consists in getting caught rather than in the cheating or the misconduct is held by all-too-many Americans. And the West Point scandal proves it.

West Point is not the only school where cheating goes on. It is doubtful whether many high schools and colleges are free from it. Even honor system schools run up against the principle ingrained in most persons against reporting on our mates. As children in kindergarten we learned not to be "tattletales" before we learned our A B C's. Squealers and informers are disliked. We are told to be good sports. The honor system must break down that prejudice before it can succeed. The West Point cadets admit they shielded their friends.

Football is taking a beating for its professionalism and its demands on the players—but note that of the 90 suspended at the academy only 44 were players. Thus the explanation for cheating is an excuse and not the reason, although it may have contributed.

Faculty members cannot be in the clear. The stupidest of professors must have detected cheating since the West Point trial admittedly goes back several years. Honor system or no honor system, they have their responsibilities. In some schools football-crazy enthusiasts on the faculty have conspired at making ineligible men eligible to play football. And fellow students often pass their completed papers to distressed fellow classmates who are close to the borderline. School pride and spirit, you know. Bill has got to be in the lineup Saturday—or we get licked by Mudtown U.

Congress now turns a sour eye on the Academy. Football must be deprofessionalized. Yes, but how about the special trains that carry Senators and Representatives to the Annapolis-West Point game each year?

And what is more important, how about Congressman BREHM, convicted of demanding kick-backs from old women employed in his office, still sitting in Congress and making laws for us taxpayers?

And what about us? Did you pad your expense account when you made your last income tax? Did you list every dollar of income or cheat some on your own account?

Where does this little white lie and cheating really originate? Did the West Point cadets come from homes where it was condoned?

If football takes too much time—and it does—then let's reduce the pressure by fewer games. Place less emphasis on profit for the college involved. West Point is spending \$300,000 football profits on a plushy golf course.

Cheating at West Point or any other school is inexcusable. Gentlemen and officers are not cheats—or should not be, but some

highly placed Army officers have got away with sickening lack of morality and been protected by their superiors.

The issues contain a lot of "if's" as indicated. There should be a way to salvage these men, not bad fellows at heart. The lesson is a tough one. It should have been prevented, and could have been, by better faculty supervision.

But, obviously, stealing Army commissions—that is what cheating at West Point means—must be ended.

The Nation, however, stands indicted with the disgraced cadets—the administration, Congress, the Academy faculty, and all of us who believe that discipline and morals and honesty are mere words.

Definite Action Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following editorial from the New York World-Telegram of August 13, 1951.

Mr. Speaker, William N. Oatis is a young American, jailed on trumped-up charges by a cynical and sinister foreign power, and as such he is entitled to expect this country to intercede for him and to take the most vigorous and even drastic action necessary to effectuate his release.

But, as this editorial points out, the Oatis case is only the culmination of a long and intolerable series of actions against American nationals living and working behind the iron curtain. However, as a newspaperman, Bill Oatis happens to symbolize one of the great freedoms for which America stands—one of the freedoms without which liberty cannot exist—freedom of information and of the press. If we are going to temporize on the Oatis case, returning "a tap on the wrist for a kick in the pants," then we had better advise freemen everywhere to abandon the ramparts and take to the storm cellars.

FUTILITY OF TIT FOR TAT

Every time the Communists say a bad word to us, we reply in kind, although usually after our officials have taken 2 or 3 weeks to make up their minds. And every time they kick one of our guys in the pants, we tap one of theirs on the wrist.

This might be amusing, or no worse than irksome, if it were a couple of boys in a shin-skinning contest.

This is not a diplomatic tea-table brawl. It is a war, a fighting war on some fronts, a war of nerves and propaganda on others, much of it a war of economic maneuver and political manipulation.

The point is, they always are on the initiative. If they are slowed or stopped on one front, they break out elsewhere. Whether it is a big or little incident, it always is their incident. Our action is purely defensive.

ALWAYS ON THE DEFENSIVE

This time it is the Communists in Poland, ordering us to shut down our information service in Warsaw, although under the usual

Communist restrictions it could not have been of much use.

So we counterpunch by telling the Red Poles to close down their propaganda office in New York.

It was the same with the other Russian satellites.

The Rumanians expelled our information service in Bucharest. In return, we closed their commercial office in New York. When they restricted the travel of American officials in Rumania, we did the same to their officials in Washington. When they said two of our diplomats had to leave, we sent two of theirs home.

After Hungary had jailed and abused American citizens in that country, and otherwise insulted and humiliated the United States, we closed up their consulates here.

We broke off diplomatic relations with Bulgaria, but only after they had beaten us to it by declaring our minister there "persona non grata."

DEFINITE ACTION NEEDED

In Czechoslovakia, William N. Oatis, an American newspaperman, has been in a Communist jail since April. After a rigged trial, he was sentenced to 10 years.

Our State Department has cried out in anguish, deplored, condemned, and railed at this outrage.

But we have just received a new Czech Ambassador in this country. We have not jailed, ejected, or restricted any Czech Communists—nor any of their Russian mentors. We have not cut off trade or diplomatic relations.

Congressional proposals for strong retaliation against the Czech Communists have been opposed by State Department lobbying.

Speaking out of his long experience in trying to deal with Communists, Gen. Mark Clark said recently that whenever the Russians have been met by definite action, not appeasement, "that's when they stopped and listened."

The actions of the satellites are all part of the same Russian pattern—the same Russian purpose. The Communists will not be deterred or stopped by minor reprisals.

If the Reds and their stooges will not do business on a dignified, decent basis, then there is no gain in trying to do business with them at all. It is neither becoming nor useful for a great nation like the United States to engage in purely defensive tit-for-tat with such people.

Veto of H. R. 3193 and 3549

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegrams:

WASHINGTON, D. C., August 10, 1951.

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

House Office Building:

Principles involved in veto messages on H. R. 3193 and 3549 demand passage over objections. Cost involved is negligible when measured against need for relief. We join with other veterans in asking that you use your influence to have House override.

E. B. MATTHIAS,

Chairman for Legislation,
United Spanish War Veterans.

CAPE MAY COURT HOUSE, N. J.,

August 13, 1951.

HON. EDITH N. ROGERS,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.:

My congratulations to you for asking Congress to override the President's veto of H. R. 3193 and H. R. 3549. I shall endeavor to send you my 20 veterans' organizations support. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY J. VOLTE,

Cape May County Service Officer.

A Few Kind Words for Harry Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. MCFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by one of the leading American historians, Henry Steele Commager, on the record of President Truman. The article, entitled "A Few Kind Words for Harry Truman," appears in the current issue of Look magazine.

Mr. Commager points out that President Truman has done more to fight the forces of aggressive communism than any other world leader, with the possible exception of Winston Churchill. He expresses the belief that the verdict of history will find that the Truman administration made many great advances for America and the free world.

I am fully convinced that many of the political attacks now being launched against the President will prove to be the manufactured products of cynical critics. I think Harry Truman is a great American, and I am glad to see a historian of Mr. Commager's stature giving recognition to Mr. Truman's courage and vision. I do not agree with some of Mr. Commager's criticisms of Congress, but I do believe that his article comes close to being a correct picture of the major achievements of a fine Democratic President.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FEW KIND WORDS FOR HARRY TRUMAN—WHEN HISTORY BRINGS IN ITS VERDICT WE MAY FIND OUT THAT HE HAS BEEN DOING AN OUTSTANDING JOB AS PRESIDENT

(By Henry Steele Commager)

Some months ago President Truman, smarting perhaps under criticism which had reached new heights, or depths, of billingsgate, observed that the final verdict on a President cannot be made in less than a generation; and that when it comes it will emphasize not the day-by-day squabbles of party politics but the great positive achievements. He believed, he added, that there were a number of these to the credit of his own administration.

He was right on both counts. He was right in saying that the verdicts of contemporary critics and of the historian rarely agree. Every one of those Presidents whom we now call great was denounced by his contemporaries as a weakling or a tyrant, a tool

of the privileged interests or a demagogue, a marplot or a traitor.

Washington himself was not immune from this kind of abuse. The last years of his Presidency were embittered by a campaign of vilification. Jefferson was denounced as an atheist, a tool of the Jacobins (the Communists of that day), a demagogue, a tyrant, a coward, a liar, and almost everything else that those past masters of invective, the New England Federalists, could think of.

Jackson was portrayed as ignorant, illiterate, and uncouth, denounced as "King Andrew," charged with immorality and even with murder. Lincoln was reviled for his lowly birth, compared in appearance to an ape or a baboon, accused of telling ribald stories on battlefields and funny stories at Cabinet meetings, charged with subverting the laws and the Constitution, with reckless interference with the military conduct of the war, with blundering in the domestic and incompetence in the foreign fields.

The vilification heaped on Wilson passed the bounds of decency. He was a dictator and a tyrant; he had abandoned the Monroe Doctrine; he had pusillanimously surrendered to Mexico; he had lowered the Stars and Stripes over the Panama Canal; he was immoral in private life as in public.

The attacks on Franklin D. Roosevelt are so fresh in our minds that we can still blush for them; nothing, apparently, was too indecent or too profane for his opponents to say. He was a traitor to his class and eventually to his country; he had sold out to the British and then to the Communists; he fomented class war, he undermined private enterprise, he tried to destroy the American system; he joined hands with the spoliemen and bosses to corrupt the Government. And, as Roosevelt said in his teamsters' union speech, not content with attacking him, his critics attacked his little dog, Fala.

So in a sense Truman shouldn't complain. He is in good company. And he doubtless knows enough about American politics to know that this is what a President has to expect. It was Horace Greely, Presidential candidate in 1872, who said he didn't know whether he was running for the Presidency or for the penitentiary. Yet, in another sense, Truman has a right to feel aggrieved. He might well ask what it is that he has done.

By all normal standards, his administration has been one of almost uninterrupted and unparalleled success.

At no previous time have Americans enjoyed such widespread prosperity. Unemployment has all but disappeared; farm income and labor income are higher than ever before in peacetime, and even corporation income and dividends are at an all-time high. There have been no great crises in domestic affairs—unless inflation is such a crisis, and Truman has fought inflation consistently.

In world affairs, American power and prestige remain high. So President Truman is probably right in asserting that the verdict of history will not be the same as the verdict of contemporary critics.

It is a pretty safe prophecy, too, that Truman is right on his second point—that history will credit his administration with important achievements. For 6 years now, while critics have belabored Truman for venial sins, for tolerating a General Vaughan, for permitting the taint of corruption to reach high places, for replacing faithful New Dealers with cronies who have no real interest in progressivism, for loyalty to friends instead of to principles—Truman has gone ahead and chalked up one achievement after another in both foreign and domestic affairs.

The most important accomplishments are clearly in the foreign field. If we are to generalize here, we can say that no other President except Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt

has appreciated as fully the extent to which American power involves American responsibility.

In foreign relations, President Truman has revealed a firm grasp on the necessity of combining vigor with moderation, generosity with tolerance, a zeal for peace along with readiness for war. Here he has displayed an understanding of the nature of the problems confronting the democratic world.

Perhaps the first indication of this came with the President's advocacy of a substantial loan to Britain—a proposal which had the isolationists fighting George III all over again. The loan bill was passed and that money primed the pump of British economy, enabling it to start on the road to recovery. Soon there was a more serious challenge to American resourcefulness and readiness. When, early in 1947, the British announced that they were no longer able to carry the burden of the defense of Greece, Truman moved quickly to take over the responsibilities they had theretofore fulfilled. He seized the opportunity not only to save Greece from Communist domination but to promulgate what is known as the Truman doctrine.

One of the primary objectives of the foreign policy of the United States (he said in a message to Congress) is the "creation of conditions in which we and other nations will be able to work out a way of life free from coercion. . . . It must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures."

ACHESON SPEAKS OUT

After the Truman policy declaration, and after military aid to Greece, came the Marshall plan. It was in May 1947, that Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson announced that Europe must be made self-supporting and that the United States was prepared to help out to that end. The next month, Secretary of State George C. Marshall, in an address at Harvard, elaborated on this theme. Britain, France, and other western European nations responded with enthusiasm; and out of all this came the European Recovery Program—a program that pledged the United States to finance European economic recovery over a period of 4 or 5 years.

In boldness, in hard-headed realism, in imagination and vision, it was a program comparable to lend-lease. Republicans fought the proposal as they had fought lend-lease, as for that matter they had fought every major item in the program of internationalism. But after a full-dress debate, and after the Russians moved into Czechoslovakia, ERP went through, and an initial appropriation of \$4,000,000,000 guaranteed a fair trial. That it has been successful beyond even the hopes of its sponsors is a matter of record.

Economic aid was crucial, and with that aid Western Europe started on the long road to recovery. But ERP was designed for Europe only. Already President Truman was contemplating American aid on an even larger scale. Even American resources would not stretch to Marshall plans for every continent, but American resources in skills, techniques, organization, and brains might be still more valuable than American money.

That was the principle behind the famous point 4 proposed in Truman's inaugural address. Point 4 caught the imagination of the world. But a reluctant Congress made only grudging appropriations, and for 2 years the program has limped along without accomplishing what was expected of it.

Economic recovery of Europe was a long-range affair. Before it was even partially complete Russia might strike or might persuade Communist elements in Western European countries to revolt. To strengthen immediate barriers against communism, Tru-

man next proposed a military pact. "The determination of the free countries to protect themselves," he said, "will be matched by an equal determination on our part to help them to do so."

The idea of a powerful Anglo-American alliance had been broached by Winston Churchill in his Fulton, Mo., address, and Churchill, too, had worked for the creation of Western European union. Now Truman proposed that the United States move in with large-scale military aid to supplement the large-scale economic aid already transforming European economies.

Out of this came the Atlantic Pact—the first peacetime military alliance in our history. It provided that "an armed attack against one or more of the members should be considered an attack against them all." And when Truman persuaded Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower to take the post of supreme commander and weld together the disparate defense systems of Western Europe the military balance of power in Europe began to right itself.

THE REPUBLICAN CHALLENGE

The Atlantic Pact was passed with bipartisan support, but when, in 1951, there came the problem of implementing it with American troops, the Republicans went into the opposition. That opposition took the form not only of challenging the possibility and the value of saving Western Europe but of challenging the Presidential power over the Nation's Armed Forces. This was the kind of challenge that Truman could not avoid and would not have avoided if he could have done so. Clearly, he had the Constitution on his side, and history and common sense as well. President Truman won a practical victory, though not a complete one, in that historic debate.

In other fields too, Truman's foreign policy will appeal hopefully for a favorable verdict from history. When, in 1948, the Soviet took advantage of a failure in the Potsdam agreement to provide for American access to Berlin and instituted a blockade, Truman met the challenge with the spectacularly successful airlift. Later, his administration formulated a German policy that went far to bring Germany back into the family of Western nations and to heal some of the deep wounds of war. When there appeared some danger of Italy's going Communist, the Truman administration moved to meet the crisis—and met it.

Thus, even before the Korean crisis, President Truman had displayed in the field of foreign relations firmness, vigor, courage, and vision. The invasion of South Korea presented a challenge to the United States and the United Nations firmness, vigor, courage and again Truman acted with boldness.

HE DID NOT DRIFT

We have only to contrast this action with the shilly-shallying of American policy toward the Manchuria invasion of 20 years ago or toward Mussolini's attack on Ethiopia, to appreciate the extent to which Truman had learned the lessons of history.

The invasion of Korea had another consequence of far-reaching importance. Ever since his accession to office, Truman had been calling for the rebuilding of our Armed Forces and the development of our military productive capacity.

To most of this program, Congress was deaf. The Korean War speedily changed the situation. Under the compelling pressure of military realities, Congress accepted the Truman program, voted immense sums for the military, stepped up taxes, organized production and created an army big enough to meet aggression wherever aggression should strike.

That Truman's record is less impressive in the domestic than in the foreign field

will not be denied. He has not been able to carry Congress with him. Nevertheless, the Truman administration will be credited with the following body of domestic legislation: The reorganization of Congress; a National Security Act unifying the armed services; an Atomic Energy Act that guarantees civilian control of the whole atomic-energy program and greatly enlarges that program; an act increasing the number of displaced persons who might come to the United States; increasing Federal aid to education; the extension and liberalizing of social security; steady advances in the field of civil rights; progress in slum clearance and housing, and the maintenance of rent control.

Two negative acts may be counted in the long run, as important as any positive acts. These are the veto of a bill that would have handed over the immeasurably valuable tidelands oil, property of the whole American Nation, to a few States and the veto of another bill that would have exempted natural gas from Federal regulation.

The list of proposals that President Truman has urged upon Congress and the Congress has rejected makes, it is fairly safe to say, a record that will not redound to his discredit. Congress has refused him an effective civil-rights bill; it has refused effective measures against inflation; it has ignored suggestions for further Federal aid to schools and public health; it has rejected a far-sighted conservation program; it has failed to act on findings of investigations of monopolies.

All in all, here is a record that is not only respectable but impressive. We cannot know what verdict history will pronounce upon it, but we can make a pretty good guess.

THE TRUMAN PARADOX

It will perhaps record the curious paradox that a man charged with being soft on communism has done more than any other leader in the Western World, with the exception of Churchill, to contain communism; that a man charged with mediocrity has launched a whole series of far-sighted plans for world reconstruction; that a man accused of being an enemy to private enterprise has been head of the Government during the period of greatest prosperity for private enterprise; that a man accused of betraying the New Deal has fought one Congress after another for progressive legislation.

A good part of the hostility to President Truman is like the hostility to Secretary Acheson; it means merely that the opposition wants an issue and a victim. That there are many things amiss with the Truman administration no one in his senses will deny. But it seems clear that the verdict is so far favorable, and that much of the criticism that fills the air is directed not to Truman's failings but to his successes.

A New Look at Public Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call attention to the figures in an editorial from the Los Angeles Times of August 9, 1951. I hope, Mr. Speaker, you will observe several details; for example, local industry will build for \$5,000 a unit the housing which costs the Federal Gov-

ernment \$11,000 a unit. Observe also that Los Angeles has 2,000 empty units renting for \$40 or less. Most important, that of the future influence on units and taxes of a movement which controls approximately 5 percent of the city's rentals.

The editorial follows:

A NEW LOOK AT PUBLIC HOUSING

When the Federal Housing Act of 1949 was passed, the mayor of Los Angeles, armed with the prescribed resolution of cooperation from the city council, hurried to Washington to get a cut of the boodle. He came home with an authorization for 10,000 low-rental housing units—\$110,000,000 worth.

A STARTLING PICTURE

The attitude was, at the time, that if they were going to hand out Federal largesse Los Angeles should not lose its place in line. Now, 2 years later, there are some misgivings about this housing boon, guaranteed by the Federal Treasury. It now seems likely that the 11 housing projects will cost Los Angeles taxpayers something after all, and it is certain that one of the projects at least will ruin the value and desirability of a good many middle-class homes. The home owners are fighting tooth and nail to block the blighting bureaucrats and the battle hangs in the balance. Congress may come to their aid by reducing the unit building authorizations, but that battle in Washington is not yet decided either.

Meanwhile a look at the over-all housing picture in Los Angeles may startle some citizens who believe that a little low-rental housing for the poor is a worthy Christian benevolence easily afforded by the Federal Government which spreads its favors around the globe.

ONE PERSON OUT OF 20

If Congress does not cut the year's building authorizations and if the embattled home owners lose their fight to restrain the Los Angeles Housing Authority the 10,000 low-rental units probably will be completed by 1954. These units will house about 45,000 persons. There are already numerous low-rental public-housing units in Los Angeles in which 48,000 persons dwell. The total of public-housing tenants then will be about 93,000. Los Angeles has a population of 1,954,000, therefore almost one in 20 of the inhabitants of the city—about 4 3/4 percent—will be a public-housing tenant.

The bureaucrats of the Housing Authority will be far and away the greatest landlords in the city (the fourth largest in the United States, in fact). The power potential of landlordism on this scale hardly needs to be pointed out. The Housing Authority bureaucracy, gerrymandering low rents in the 10,000 projected rents, could almost sway the city. The power to control a man's home is coupled here with the authority to give him something for nothing and that adds up to a tremendous primal influence. One man said, "I know of no way by which I could control a country better than by the control of the housing situation."

This is socialism that no longer creeps. And it is not a socialism of necessity. When the Housing Act of 1949 was passed there was still a feeling of urgency in Congress. The wartime housing shortage was being overcome by private builders but a showing could be made that some public housing, particularly low-rental housing, was still going to be needed.

AT TWICE THE PRICE

Some of us did not wholly agree and we are borne out by developments. While the Housing Authority pushes ahead toward its 10,000 new low-rental units a private landlords' survey finds (in June 1951) that there are 2,000 vacant apartments in Los Angeles

which would rent for less than \$40 a month. The average rent in the Housing Authority's units will be \$32.50. The private survey, incidentally, covered only a third of the city's 425,000 rental units.

The cost of those public-housing units is another shocker. The 10,000 would be built for a total price of \$110,000,000. (This money, by the way, is to be raised by selling bonds guaranteed by the Federal Government. The Housing Authority here is empowered to issue such bonds. However, the Federal Treasury may be tapped for deficits.) Ten thousand units for \$110,000,000 means an average price of \$11,000 a unit. One outraged Los Angeles mass builder said: "We just completed some two-bedroom apartments at a cost of \$5,000 each, less than half the cost of these projected public-housing units being built, reputedly, for only the poorest of the poor."

It used to be said half-jokingly that the very poor and the very rich receive the best medical service. This may become partly true of housing, although the poor in this instance will not enjoy the charity of the doctors but the money of the taxpayers.

The threat to Los Angeles taxpayers deserves a separate chapter. On another day we shall show that Mayor Bowron's assurance that Los Angeles was getting something for nothing from the Federal Government is a painful delusion. Because this projected low-rental housing will, if completed, almost certainly raise the local tax rate.

Official Recognition of Federal Employee Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, on the very first day of the present session of the current Congress, I introduced a bill, H. R. 571, designed to give official recognition to Federal employee organizations. As matters now stand these employee groups have no official entree to Government departments for the presentation of grievances in behalf of their members. The purpose of my bill is to give Federal employee organizations the same standing as other unions have with respect to labor-management relationships.

On Tuesday, August 14, a subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, of which the present speaker is privileged to be a member, held public hearings on my bill. One of the witnesses heard by our subcommittee was Mr. William C. Doherty, able president of the largest group of organized Federal employees, the National Association of Letter Carriers.

The testimony given by Mr. Doherty was outstanding. In his statement he pointed out that Government has failed to adopt management and personnel policies long ago adopted by progressive private management. This failure has proved to be costly to the taxpayers of this nation, and has also resulted in inefficient Government service.

As Mr. Doherty so ably underscored in his testimony, the present poor mail

service can be directly traced to the failure of the Postmaster General to consult with Congress, the mail users, or the employees. The unilateral action of the postal management in curtailing mail services has been one of the most costly blunders in the history of this Nation. It has all but wrecked the morale and efficiency of the service, a mistake that would not have happened had there been a law compelling the Postmaster General to take counsel with the employees before he issued his directive.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include Mr. Doherty's statement for the information of all Members of Congress:

STATEMENT BY WILLIAM C. DOHERTY, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS, ON H. R. 554 AND H. R. 571, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE, HOUSE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE, AUGUST 14, 1951

For the record my name is William C. Doherty. I am president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, which represents more than 100,000 city, rural, and village delivery letter carriers throughout the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Hawaiian Islands.

I am accompanied here this morning by our vice president, Daniel R. Sullivan, who has been a letter carrier working out of the San Francisco, Calif., post office for the past 45 years; our national secretary, Jerome J. Keating, who has been a letter carrier in the Minneapolis, Minn., office for the past 27 years; and our assistant secretary, Reuben B. Kremers, who is from Seattle, Wash., where he has been a letter carrier for the past 37 years. I, myself, have been on the rolls of the Cincinnati, Ohio, post office as a letter carrier for the past 28 years. Thus, between us, we represent approximately 131 years of service as letter carriers. I feel that we have considerable background in the postal service and that our combined experience gives us some degree of authority to talk about postal matters. We feel particularly qualified to speak about the bills before this distinguished subcommittee, which are measures to recognize employee organizations.

We are very happy to place the endorsement of our organization on Congressman RHODES' bill, H. R. 554, as well as the measure introduced by Congressman WITHROW, of Wisconsin, H. R. 571.

In the light of events that have transpired during the past several years, particularly in the postal service, I can think of no greater need in our particular field, outside of a pay increase, than legislation that would recognize employee organizations. We earnestly hope that Congress will give employees a voice in policy changes that affect their working conditions, their health, their wages, and all the other aspects that go into the day-to-day job of Government employment.

We are gratified to note that the bills before you would grant this recognition with an accompanying obligation for management to do so without restraint, coercion, interference, intimidation, or reprisal. For the past year and longer there has been a vicious wave of coercion and intimidation going on in the Post Office Department directed toward the employees. Employees who have the temerity, if you please, to speak out against poor working conditions, poor postal service, and reprehensible management policies are summarily charged with bad faith, disloyalty to the person of the Postmaster General, and a whole host of other equally asinine, trumped-up charges. This is neither the time nor the place to go into that subject. It is, however, a condi-

tion that points up the urgent need for legislation that will give the employee a better break than he is now getting under a system whereby the Postmaster General, through his Inspection Service, is at one and the same time the accuser, prosecutor, judge, and jury. The legislation before you would prevent the system of "thought control" that is being pursued by the present postal administration. There is no place in America for that sort of thing. And thank God for that.

Basically these bills would do more than officially establish and recognize Government employee organizations in government. They would also affect a long-felt need of the employees by establishing a labor-management relationship between Government and employee groups.

Government has given a helping hand to labor-management committees in private industry but for the most part has not applied the lessons thus derived to its own household. As a result of this failure to follow its own leadership, management and labor, as well as the public interest, has suffered. Government cost today is the highest in our Nation's history; personnel turn-over has reached catastrophic proportions.

The same things accomplished for private industry through labor-management councils can be done for Government. Progressive management in the commercial world long ago realized that complex relationships among the various levels of management and labor were quickly and economically settled across a conference table. Government at times seems unaware or reluctant to admit that teamwork pays dividends. Yet paradoxically it encourages and even insists on arbitration between labor and management outside government.

Employees in the Federal structure have obligations and duties, as well as interests and claims in no less a degree than workers in private industry. It has been demonstrated in private industry that policies from the top level are more readily assimilated and followed by employees when they understand them, and after they have had an opportunity to eliminate potential grievances. The same should hold true for Government. Under the system now in vogue in most Federal agencies, adjustment of grievances—real or fancied—are attempted only after the fact. A real labor-management program would insure a positive approach by eliminating potential friction.

There is nothing radical or even new in the thought behind H. R. 554. Except that it would obligate department and agency heads to follow methods and procedures already adopted with outstanding success by private industry. Admittedly that would be quite an effort in some Federal agencies. The Post Office Department, for example, probably would rather cave in at its foundations than admit that cooperation, not antagonism, is the key to good service, low operating costs, and high employee morale.

As a matter of fact, the Post Office Department would be the ideal agency to use as a test tube for the program contemplated in H. R. 554. With considerable justification the postal service under the present administration has been accused of being "the least efficiently operated department in the entire Government." More than 900 pages of detailed instructions go to make up a maze of outmoded laws, regulations, and traditions. Prior to the April 17, 1950, curtailment of mail, the Hoover Commission summed up the philosophy of postal management as "sluggish, irresolute, and wasteful, rather than imaginative, decisive, and cost-conscious." That damaging indictment has been compounded in all its implications since the curtailment of mail and elimination of certain postal functions.

The chaos, confusion, waste, and hardship following the curtailment of mail, directed by the Postmaster General in April, 1950,

is an outstanding example of what could have been prevented by a real, honest-to-goodness labor-management relationship between the agency and the employees. In this instance not only did the service itself suffer, as did the employees, but the invisible partner in every labor-management relationship—the public—likewise suffered tremendous inconvenience, as well as unaccountable financial losses. The Postmaster General consulted neither Congress, the mail users, or the employees before issuing his hasty, ill-advised curtailment order. As a result there has been resentment from all elements concerned, and rightfully so, in our estimation.

Years ago the late Mr. Justice Brandeis stated that employee efficiency depended upon consent. You cannot legislate efficiency any more than you can legislate goodness or morality. No intelligent private management would inflict radical changes in working conditions, hours of employment, and other conditions of employee welfare on his workers without advising his employees in advance. It is not our thought that a labor-management program should dictate policy, but it has been proved time after time in private enterprise that employees respond more willingly and more intelligently to a radical change in their employment when they understand what management is attempting to do and they are told precisely how it will affect their employment, their economic status, and their health.

The Post Office took unilateral action in the matter of the curtailment of mail. That it has been a colossal failure and a costly venture to the taxpayers, as well as a terrific hardship on the employee, is easily understood.

Today as never before there is a real need to pump life and instill progressive thinking in the postal service. Right now it stands at low ebb in efficiency, employee morale, and public opinion. A genuine attitude of trusteeship would automatically meet this challenge. The present postal administration, however, is content to busy itself attempting to shift the blame to Congress, mail users, and the employees.

There is another logical reason to support the need for a labor-management program in the postal service. The fact that key positions in the Department, as well as postmasters at all first-, second-, and third-class offices, are regularly filled from time to time by appointment creates a hardship on employees. This lack of continuity in management leaves employees defenseless and at the mercy of the incoming regime with respect to management and personnel policies. Proved procedures and mutually satisfactory personnel relationships are too often swept aside with each change of top level or local command. A labor-management set-up would guarantee a continuity of time-tested personnel policies, regardless of the turn-over at the administrative or postmaster level.

There have been half-way and piecemeal attempts in the past to accomplish some of the things that flow freely from labor-management councils. For example, Public Law 600, approved August 2, 1946, authorized awards to employees for ideas and suggestions to improve Government operation. The establishment of the system itself dates back to 1943. In the postal service this program does not admit rank and file representation on the panel designated to judge suggestions. For this and possibly other reasons the system has proved to be a dud in the Post Office Department. Without representation there is less incentive for rank and file employees to participate. Congress has sharply criticized the present postal administration for the relatively poor record of the service in this suggestion program. It is not likely there will be any noticeable improvement until employees are made to feel

they are a part of the team, not merely a minor cog in the wheel.

On the other hand, it is significant that the agencies with the best record along these lines are those with employee representation on committees functioning on an advisory basis, variously known by an assortment of titles. Basically this representation constitutes a phase of labor-management relationship.

Within the last month the Post Office Department has announced an experiment in collecting and delivering mail. It is proposed to equip letter carriers with scooters or motor bikes of various designs to be used in the collection and delivery of mail. This represents a very radical change in letter-carrier employment. It also carries with it a very significant possibility that the safety and health of the letter carrier will be affected. To my best knowledge, there has been very little consultation by the Department with respect to this innovation, except perhaps with the people selling this equipment to the Government. Certainly the organization that represents the men who will be forced to use these contraptions has not been consulted. The men themselves have not been consulted. While I cannot speak for the Congress, I doubt very seriously if it has been consulted.

Earlier in my statement I mentioned in passing that the speaker and his colleagues sitting at this table represent more than 131 years of postal service, which is to say 131 years' experience in delivering mail. Simple honesty compels us to state that we could give helpful suggestions to this new program. As matters now stand, we are receiving complaints from the men who have been assigned to this scooter experiment. They are not questioning the merit or the wisdom of inaugurating a change in the postal service; rather, they are telling us of the defects in the equipment. They are suggesting improvements in the manner in which the routes are being assigned and so forth. They are concerned with their own safety in operating these light scooters in heavy traffic. There are complaints about employees being obliged to pay for a license to operate the equipment. In other words, the Department simply dropped the entire experiment in the laps of the employees. Later on, after letter carriers are maimed, and even killed, their widows and children will have the cold consolation of getting a "so sorry" note from the Department. We are all for taking the weight off the backs and legs of our letter carriers, but we do not propose to have the legs of our people taken off in the process. The experience of the employees thus far might well be applied to the program with an accompanying savings to the taxpayers of this Nation. Certainly the morale of the employees could be much greater if they were given an opportunity to understand what is behind the program and what they could do to make it a success.

From a safety standpoint, it does not appear as if this association will be able to accept the type of equipment proposed by the Post Office Department in this scooter experiment. However, because we have no entree for our suggestions or thoughts to the Department, they will have to be made after the grievance has arisen, whereas a labor-management program would have ironed out these potential grievances before the fact.

There are dozens of other examples we could point out wherein the employees have been bypassed in matters which affect their health and welfare. It is little wonder that the Post Office Department has made little headway during the past few years in improving the service. Indeed, it has degenerated month by month, and year by year. A good portion of this degeneration can be attributed to the fact that the present postal administration prefers to conduct the operations of the Department from an ivory tower without reference to Congress, the

mail users, or the employees. This has proved a very costly venture and it will not improve until Congress passes legislation that will give people who have honest opinions and constructive criticism to make an opportunity to give voice to their position.

I might say in closing that the Hoover Commission suggested the establishment of an advisory committee to assist in the management of the postal service. That board was proposed in February 1950 and confirmed by the Senate just about a year ago. In March of this year the Postmaster General lately announced that up to that time this Citizens' Advisory Board had held but one meeting. Significantly enough, there is no employee representation on this advisory board, although the original recommendation specifically stipulated that different elements of the public would be represented.

This committee can do a real service not only to the employees, but to the people who use the postal service by reporting H. R. 554 or H. R. 571.

We appreciate the courtesy extended us to appear here this morning and we sincerely hope you will favorably report out a bill that will direct the recognition of bona fide employee organizations.

The Marine Corps Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein a copy of a letter addressed to the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee under date of August 10, by Vice Adm. G. F. Bogan, retired, in which he endorses the Marine Corps bill reported by the committee.

I am presenting this for the RECORD as it presents the point of view of a high-ranking naval officer of distinction. I wish the House to know that the position taken by the Navy Department on the bill does not necessarily represent the opinion of leading naval officers who, by virtue of being retired, would feel no compulsion—legal, moral, or otherwise—to have to support policy determined by superiors.

The letter follows:

AUGUST 10, 1951.

HON. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee,
House of Representatives, Wash-
ington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. VINSON: Being familiar with your efforts as a Member of Congress and as a patriotic citizen to foster legislation enhancing our national security through improvements in the Defense Department, I have been deeply interested and sometimes shocked in reading testimony in the hearing on the Marine Corps bill, S. 677. My own efforts to suggest improvement in the somewhat unilateral functioning of that Department under the National Security Act of 1947 led to my retirement in February of 1950.

My association with the Marine Corps began in 1917 when I was a junior officer in one of the escort ships taking the first troops, both Army and Marines, to France. That association continued through the years. In many of the marine landings in the Pacific during the last war I commanded the naval

air support which provided tactical air assistance during the beachhead phase and later moves inland. Among those operations were Saipan, Guam, Pelelieu, and Okinawa. Each one demonstrated the efficiency, courage, and proficiency of the Marines in a highly specialized, thoroughly skilled aspect of war.

It is my considered opinion, reached after many years, that the United States Marine Corps has no equal as a fighting organization in any nation in the world, including our own. The amphibious doctrines followed by our own and other armies in similar attacks were developed solely by the Marines with somewhat grudging assistance and skepticism by our Navy.

That, however, is only one facet of the Marines' combat readiness. To the limit of their manpower and weapons, the Marines fight superlatively in any element and under all conditions. I believe those views are shared even by the very people who would oppose public recognition of the organization by denying it full participation in the meetings which determine its function, its stature, and its destiny. Only the Commandant and his staff, through knowledge and recognition of the problems of the corps and their unique experience in combined operations, can adequately represent the Marine Corps and speak its views.

I believe that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as presently constituted, have a preponderantly land-locked viewpoint, not commensurate with the military requirements of our Nation. I am also convinced that the addition of the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Joint Chiefs of Staff would greatly improve the balance, judgment, and decisions of that body.

The other feature of the bill, i. e., the size of the Marine Corps and its supporting air wings, is an unavoidable responsibility of the Congress. It is not the prerogative of the Secretaries of Defense and the Navy to specify the strength of the Marines in relation to the Navy, nor is it a question of duplication. There exists no duplicate of the Marines.

It is my earnest hope that you and the distinguished members of your committee will not waver in your support of this measure, as amended by you, to the end that our Nation's defenses may be radically and permanently improved.

Respectfully,

G. F. BOGAN,
Vice Admiral, United States Navy
(retired).

Jewish Sanitarium and Hospital, Brooklyn, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Vincent R. Impellitteri, mayor of the city of New York, has proclaimed the week of September 23 to 30 as Jewish Sanitarium and Hospital for Chronic Diseases Week.

I am proud of the fact that this hospital is located in the Tenth Congressional District of New York. This non-profit institution was founded in 1926 by Max Blumberg, a leading businessman of Brooklyn, who contributed very generously of his time, his energies, and his funds to various philanthropic causes.

The Jewish Sanitarium and Hospital for Chronic Diseases was established to care for the victims of cancer, arthritis, diabetes, multiple sclerosis, muscular dystrophy, Parkinson's disease, cerebral palsy, polio, and heart diseases among others. It has grown through the years until it now has a bed capacity in excess of 800. Under the leadership of Isaac Albert, who has been president for the past 8 years, it has become one of the largest of its kind in the country. Patients are accepted without regard to race, creed, color, age, place of residence, or ability to pay. In 1950, with the opening of its fourth building, a new concept of medicine was inaugurated, not only to give custodial care to those who required it, but also to help those who could be helped and send them back to their friends and families. New medical laboratories were opened for research into the cause and cure for various chronic ailments. A rehabilitation center, one of the largest of its kind in the country, was opened to bring back to partial or normal use, fingers, hands, arms, and legs, which have been crippled by various chronic diseases.

In his proclamation, Mayor Impellitteri has urged the men and women of our city to support this institution in carrying out its highly important work on behalf of hundreds of our citizens who are afflicted with chronic diseases. The people of Brooklyn are fortunate indeed to have known the good and kindly Max Blumberg and his concern for the sick. Like Abou Ben Adhem, he loved his fellow men and borrowing the words of the poet, we say "may his tribe increase."

Freedom Balloons Require Skill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Drew Pearson from today's Washington Post:

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

FREEDOM BALLOONS REQUIRE SKILL

(This column was written by Mr. Pearson in Europe which he is now touring.)

SOMEWHERE NEAR THE CZECHOSLOVAK BORDER.—Anyone who thinks it's easy to launch freedom-friendship balloons across the iron curtain has another guess coming. Once the balloons are in the air, nature and the fact that winds of freedom blow from west to east takes care of the rest. But the real job is getting them into the air.

And that boils down to assembling hydrogen, tanks to put it in, trucks to haul it in, German workers to fill the balloons with hydrogen and, on top of all this, keeping the operation secret from the curious German population which loves intrigue. The man who deserves the chief credit for overcoming these headaches is Harry Andrews and the Dewey & Almy Rubber Co. who, without knowing a word of German cajoled, coaxed,

and wheedled nearly 1,000 hydrogen tanks from firms all over Germany, collected them all in one place and got them filled with hydrogen. It takes so much hydrogen to carry 15,000,000 pieces of literature across the iron curtain into Czechoslovakia that Andrews collected just about every tank in West Germany.

You can imagine the curiosity of the local tank distributors wondering why one man was going around picking up this colossal number of hydrogen containers. They popped the question to Andrews every time he brought in a new load, and he deserves a diploma in career diplomacy for expertly ducking these questions.

CURIOSITY AROUSED

It was a little harder for him to duck the questions from the 40 men recruited to fill the balloons.

They were to be taken near the Czech border every night, a 5-hour drive from Munich, begin launching balloons at about midnight, finish work at 4 a. m., then get home at 9. Naturally they wanted to know where they were going and what they were going to do.

However, after getting them a nice new bus in which to ride to the Czech border every day, they finally signed up for this mysterious assignment.

Another problem involved in sending balloons into Czechoslovakia is that it is such a narrow country you can easily overshoot the mark. In other words, if the balloons drift too far, they land in Poland where Poles can't read the Czech leaflets. Therefore it has been necessary to balance a payload of pamphlets against the wind currents in order to get the balloons to travel the right distance. It has been necessary to shift the launching site every night, depending on the winds. For this reason, we never know until our meteorologist gives the word around noon each day which way to head our truck caravan. The caravan totals nine trucks, two of them 20-tonners carrying hydrogen cylinders, balloons, 2,000,000 leaflets, and one motor generator which lights up the countryside sufficiently to arouse every farmer in the neighborhood but not sufficiently to give as much light as needed for the delicate operation of tying the nozzles of 2,000 balloons and doing it in record time.

The reason for night launchings is that the balloons are scheduled for arrival at 6 to 8 a. m., just as the Czech people are going to work. Two types of balloons are being used. One regular rubber balloon, manufactured by Dewey & Almy, carrying a load of about 3½ pounds, or 2,200 leaflets

SPECIAL BALLOONS USED

The other is a pillow-type balloon made by General Mills, which also contributed generously of its experts and time to help this operation. The pillow balloon, while carrying a lighter load, comes down to earth and bounces along the ground in an eerie fashion, bound to excite curiosity. Across its side, in large red letters is written "Svoboda", which means, freedom. Incidentally, Svoboda is the name of Harold Stassen's grandfather and it is especially appropriate, as an American of part Czech descent, that he is attending this launching.

Nobody should get the idea that this friendship balloon barrage to the people of Czechoslovakia is going to free that country overnight. It isn't, though it is especially timely coming as it does when the Czechs have imprisoned American newsmen William Oatis on trumped-up charges. It also comes at a time when unrest in Czechoslovakia has reached greater intensity than ever before.

However, this balloon barrage is merely a test—a test of what individual Americans working separately from their Government can do to promote people-to-people friendship and to make the iron curtain a lace curtain.

PROPAGANDA RAISES DOUBT

Its aim also is to raise doubts in satellite minds as to the why of the iron curtain. Why does their Government refuse them contact with the free peoples of the west? What has Stalin got to fear from contact between them and the free peoples of the world? What is he ashamed of? In brief, why the iron curtain?

Moscow, of course, will probably scream that this is a violation of international law or that we are dropping poisonous candy to the children of Czechoslovakia or disseminating anthrax, wheat rust, potato bugs, or other germs in bacteriological warfare. However, there's no international law forbidding one country to launch balloons in another country; if the winds carry them into certain other countries, that's a law of nature—not international law.

Addresses at the Minnesota-Dakotas District Kiwanis Convention by Hon. Alexander Wiley, Rev. Terence J. Finlay, and Ronald Reagan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Monday, August 13, it was my pleasure to address the district convention of Kiwanis International in Bismarck, N. Dak., on the subject of Kiwanis answers the challenges of 1951. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I have in my hands also at this time a copy of Kiwanis magazine, of August 1951. This is the convention issue describing the principal addresses and resolutions adopted at the thirty-sixth convention of Kiwanis International in June 1951, at St. Louis. Some 10,000 registrants were on hand for the convention, and they had not only the time of their lives, but they contributed to the sound thinking of this Nation and to the focusing of attention on important national issues.

There were a great many important addresses delivered before the convention, and it would be difficult indeed to choose from among those which were the most significant. One of the most interesting, however, in my opinion, was delivered by Rev. Terence J. Finlay, of St. John the Evangelist Church of Ottawa, Canada. This address pointed out the responsibility which each of us has to maintain the freedoms of which we are heir. Whereas most addresses speak of our rights, this address rightly spoke of our obligations.

Another address of interest, taking a tack somewhat different from the usual discussion of the subject, was that delivered by Mr. Ronald Reagan, president of the Screen Actors' Guild. This address was entitled "Motion Pictures and Your Community." It answered certain false notions which are being spread intentionally or unintentionally about the motion-picture industry and about those

who are members of it. It pointed out that the American cinema is composed, by and large, of honest, hard-working, patriotic Americans who yield to no group in their devotion to this country and in their Americanism.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the text of the Reverend Finlay's address and Mr. Ronald Reagan's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD following my own address.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN, ACTING RANKING REPUBLICAN, SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, BEFORE THE MINNESOTA-DAKOTAS DISTRICT, KIWANIS CONVENTION, BISMARCK, N. DAK., AUGUST 13, 1951

KIWANIS ANSWERS THE CHALLENGES OF 1951

Speaking to you is indeed a privilege and a pleasure. To speak to a Kiwanis district convention is like coming home. It only seems like yesterday that I was privileged to be governor of the Wisconsin-Upper Michigan Kiwanis District, and yet, as we reckon time, I would have to roll back the pages 18 years. Yes; it is a real homecoming for me.

The spirit of Kiwanis objectives

Back in our yesteryears, our talks before Kiwanis revolved around the so-called objects of this great institution. I think those objects of Kiwanis are great stuff. They have been related in other terms, time and time again, throughout humanity's history, but they can never be said too much, or too often, especially if the spirit instead of the mere letter is vitalized in their saying.

An understanding of, a utilization of, a demonstration of, the truths contained in these objects would make any individual more adequate to meet the challenges of life. And if every Kiwanian became a living exponent in word and deed of the spirit of the objects of Kiwanis, he would contribute to the adequacy of the Nation in no little amount.

Let me read these objects to you:

1. To give supremacy to the human and spiritual, rather than to the material values of life (There you differentiate our way of life from communism.)

2. To encourage the daily living of the Golden Rule in our human relationships. (There you find the "open sesame" to real living.)

3. To promote the adoption and the application of higher social, business, and professional standards. (There you apply the morality so badly needed to daily living.)

4. To develop by precept and example the more intelligent, aggressive, and serviceable citizenship. (There you forget self in the interest of the Republic.)

5. To provide through Kiwanis clubs a practical means to form enduring friendships, to render altruistic service, and to build better communities. (There you forget self again in the interest of your local community, in getting rid, for example, of chiselers, crimesters, and racketeers.)

6. To cooperate in creating and maintaining that sound public opinion and high idealism which make possible the increase of righteousness, justice, patriotism, and good will. (There you join hands with folks of kindred mind, to bring the fruits of the spirit into the open.)

The challenge for a rebirth of morality

Now, my friends, I should like to speak to you about what I feel to be a Kiwanis-type answer to the challenges facing America and the peoples of the world. Perhaps the most important of these is for a rebirth of public and private morality. That, in a word, is what our "objects" call for.

In both the national and international spheres, there is considerable indication of a relapse in such morality. I am not one of those, however, who feels that the situation is all grim and discouraging; on the contrary, the very forces that have been disintegrating society have set in motion counterforces that are seeking to rebuild.

It is the aim of Kiwanis International to serve as one of the great building forces on the world scene by making the "objects" of Kiwanis vital in the lives of its members. If you and I would be adequate in serving as individual builders, we must learn about the world in which we live, its problems, and particularly we must learn about the disintegrating forces, how to combat them, and then go to work and do the job before us.

The awakening as to communism since 1945

Now, what about the challenge in the world scene? When hostilities came to an end in 1945 you will recall there was no peace or security. Yet our leaders had thought that they could live with little problem from the Communists. Realization came only slowly that the Soviet leaders were out to dominate and communize the world. Wherever the Red Army went it stayed, and wherever it stayed the Reds created a brutal police state and liquidated the opposition. Where the Red Army did not go the Communists used other methods, seeking to penetrate and take over. They infiltrated labor unions, organized strikes, published newspapers, operated radio stations, spread rumors and hatred, and poured their propaganda into the minds of the people. France and Greece, Italy and Turkey were slated to be taken over, the same as the Baltic states had been.

The conflict of freedom versus slavery

This presented a problem for your Government in Washington. We had been sucked into two world wars. The American people would have preferred to have followed the policy of no foreign entanglements laid down by President Washington. However, through the inventive genius of man, the world had been contracted so that every nation was in every other nation's back yard.

We knew that the Kremlin was on the march. In 6 years she has absorbed 7,500,000 square miles of new territory and over 500,000,000 people, and she has been seeking also to absorb Asia. Already she has taken into her orbit Poland, the Baltics, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Czechoslovakia. In these states not only national freedom but individual liberty have gone out the window. Even in 1946 we saw that the Soviet and its satellites had been interfering with the work of the United Nations. A conflict soon became apparent—a conflict not only of ideas but a conflict which involved the liberties of the free peoples of earth. A conflict that was old—that went back through the centuries of mankind's march upward—a conflict of freedom versus slavery.

President Roosevelt thought that he could deal with the Kremlin. But before he died, it is said that he became aware of his mistake. The Kremlin blocked our land access to Berlin so we were put to the additional cost of the airlift, with numerous aviators' lives lost and some \$600,000,000 spent.

Recognizing the interdependence of nations

The statesmen in Washington became aware of the fact that something had to be done. The Charter of the United Nations had generated the hope that it would provide a deterrent to aggression and a bulwark for peace. With it had developed the hope that the nations would take appropriate action resulting in economic and political stability among the signers thereof. Thinking people had come to realize that events in other nations would inevitably have an effect in our own Nation; war anywhere was dangerous; famines, depression, or epidemics

in one part of the globe were dangerous to another part thereof. All this had brought about the United Nations organization as well as subsequent acts on our part, including the Marshall plan, point 4 to and for underdeveloped areas, and various relief programs. MacArthur in Japan made the 80,000,000 Japanese people friends and allies. Our occupation of Western Germany made it possible that the people in our zone would enjoy liberty and economic health, which was a tremendous contrast to what the German people were experiencing in the Russian zone.

No real escape from war except by collective action

The American people wanted to live in peace, but they knew that they could not live in peace unless America was secure. The real problem that confronted America was how to go about bringing about security and peace. In pre-1940, the French people had falsely thought the Maginot Line would give them security. We ourselves had thought that two oceans would automatically save us from war. We now know that there is no real escape from war unless it could be found through nations joining together, dedicating themselves to peace and creating sufficient might to deter any aggressor.

We had hoped, as I said, that the United Nations would do the job, but it has no law-making power and no enforcement power. Russia's veto has stymied the UN Security Council. We had seen how the Soviet Union had moreover violated the spirit of the Charter time and time again. Each nation (and the Soviet was one of them) had solemnly promised to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state. Yet we had seen how by the threat or use of force the Kremlin took over Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, Albania, the Baltics, Eastern Germany, and, finally, Czechoslovakia.

Importance of Greece and Turkey

We had been developing both peaceful and military use of the atom bomb since Hiroshima; we had taken vigorous action in 1947 when we went to the assistance of Greece and Turkey. That was a very important step. It stopped the Russians in their tracks, particularly in Communist-invaded Greece. These two nations are on the flank of Russia, and if the Russians should attempt to take Europe, we could penetrate the underbelly of that continent through those nations. Airfields in Greece and Turkey could put out of business Russia's gasoline supply in Grozny, Baku, and in Rumania.

We knew that postwar Europe's economic and industrial system had been pretty well shot to pieces by the havoc of war. Millions of homes had been destroyed. As a consequence, the Marshall plan came into existence. I was in Europe in 1947. I have just returned from Europe a few weeks ago. I was during this last trip in Greece and Turkey also, and I am here to report we have saved Europe and Greece and Turkey from being taken over by the Russians. We have resuscitated their economies. We have brought back a spirit or will to resist. Yes, it has cost money, but I look upon the investment much as I do the paying of insurance premiums on my house and property. We shall probably spend something like \$8,000,000,000 to aid and rearm these countries this next year. This is approximately 3 percent of our national income, which is something like \$234,000,000,000.

In my opinion, we cannot afford to do otherwise. I know that there are those who disagree with me. But when you think what another war would mean, when you think what has happened to those countries that Russia has taken over, I feel sincerely that for the present at least that there is no other course than to get ready and get those who will fight with us ready also. That is what

we are doing under the North Atlantic Treaty and the aid programs. You know that our policy is to seek to build healthy economies in our allied nations without injuring our own; to build a collective defense through the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty, and the Rio Pact; to help other nations arm themselves for defense. We believe that the Kremlin knows no other language except force and the presence of force.

The nature of the Communist foe

Let us analyze a bit more closely precisely the force against which we have taken these costly steps. It constitutes the foremost disintegrating force on the world scene. It is a force which expresses itself in many ways; militarily, it expresses itself in the powerful Red army, the largest standing army in the world, consisting of 175 divisions, easily increased by mobilization to 5,000,000 men, plus the forces of the satellite states.

Politically, it expressed itself in the Communist International, whose headquarters in Moscow, send out instruction for the international conspiracy aimed at violent revolution against other orders and nations.

Psychologically it expresses itself in a war of ideas against all of the values of the west—against Christianity, against the concept that man is more than a brute material force, against the concept that there is more to life than class warfare and the lust for power.

Economically, communism expresses itself in cutthroat competition by mass cheap goods, produced by slave labor, flooding the markets of the world.

Steps the west has taken against this force

As I have pointed out, the peoples of the west have only slowly awakened to this threat to their way of life. Gradually they have set up their bulwark to defend their institutions. It took the North Korean invasion of June 1950, and the Red Chinese invasion later on, to fully alert many naive people to the danger of world communism.

Here in this country, it was only after a long series of shocking domestic revelations that many people in high places woke up to the fact that this constitutional Republic of ours was in danger.

What were those revelations? Well, take the story of Alger Hiss, who was Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference in San Francisco which set up the international charter, Alger Hiss who later turned out to be a perjurer.

Consider the story of Elizabeth Bentley, who had two college degrees but who was willing to sell her country out and who has since seen the "light."

The story of Judith Coplon, who worked in a high position in the United States Department of Justice and proceeded to turn over our secrets to a Red agent.

The story of Klaus Fuchs, the notorious British atomic spy.

The story of assorted American atomic espionage agents—two of whom are now awaiting death in the electric chair.

The story of William Remington, who was actually cleared of disloyalty charges and was later proven to be guilty of those very charges.

These and other exposés have shown the American people the absolute importance of vigorous enforcement of the internal security law if we would keep this Nation free.

Don't get the idea that all the leading Reds have been taken care of. On the contrary, the most dangerous part of the Red conspiracy, like the most dangerous part of an iceberg, is the part you cannot see. It is underground, functioning secretly and swiftly for the Kremlin's will.

Limitations on America's resources

Now, my friends, I need hardly tell you that your American budget is today heavily strained by domestic and foreign costs of combating communism. The American taxpayer today is bending under the heaviest burden in our peacetime history. He knows and his Government should know that he

cannot carry the rest of the world on his shoulders, financially, politically, or militarily. He knows that each nation must do its part, must contribute its proportionate share, unlike in Korea, where Uncle Sam has carried an unduly heavy share. The taxpayer, too, knows that in many instances, considerable amounts of the money which he has paid for by his hard-earned taxes have been dissipated—squandered down ratholes.

Meanwhile, sound projects in our own country have often been rejected; projects like the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway, which would mean so much to our own future development here in North Dakota and in neighboring States.

In approaching the foreign-aid problem, we must ever bear in mind the words of St. Paul: "If any provide not for his own and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith and is worse than the infidel."

If we are adequate to our own needs, we will be fulfilling that basic spiritual concept. Meanwhile, however, there are other fronts on which we can answer the challenge to public and private morality which I mentioned to you earlier in the address.

Combating disintegrating immoral forces

You and I know from the headlines in recent months that the revelations about communism in our midst have been matched by the shocking stories of moral disintegration. A few of these readily come to mind:

1 The story of shady influence in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation—the selling of Government favors for mink coats, deep freezers, etc.

2 The story of crime and corruption in America's cities, which we of the crime committee have brought before the public view.

3 The story of the mass breaking of the traditional code of honor at West Point, our Nation's military academy.

4 And a great number of other instances of moral breakdown

Now what is the cause of these developments? It is not enough to say that after every war, there is a certain moral let-down. It is not enough to say that modern society has become so complex that individuals often lose their foothold, so to speak.

Excuses and alibis to justify our inaction—yours and mine—will hardly suffice to change the present picture.

The home, the church, the school

What you and I have to do as Kiwanians and as leaders in our communities is to recognize our personal responsibilities. You know, my friends, that there are three great forces in the life of every community. They are. (a) the home, (b) the church, (c) the school.

If those three forces break down; if they fail to inculcate particularly in the Nation's youth the need for high moral action, then the sort of situation revealed in recent headlines is almost inevitable. What I urge you, therefore, to do, my friends, and what I feel is my responsibility to do as an individual citizen is to help make the home, the church, and the school more adequate to meet their duties. Each of these places must become a vital constructive force in the life of the individual citizen.

The lessons we learn at mother's knee; the lessons we learn from our minister; the lessons we learn from our school teachers, should be the type that previous generations would learn from those celebrated McGuffey Readers, wherein youngsters were taught the need for righteous conduct, for the highest standards of thinking and living. That is not an "old-fashioned approach"; that is plain horse sense for 1951 and any year.

The Constitution, America's greatest contribution

The home, the church, and the schools must cooperate moreover in raising the sights of our people so that we will all see that we

have been blessed with a pearl of great price; namely, the Constitution of the United States. This great document, with the Bill of Rights, is by far America's greatest contribution to the world's civilization.

Why? Because it set up for the first time in world history a tripartite system of checks and balances whereby power, instead of being centralized in the hands of one man or group who could abuse it, was divided among three separate and coequal branches of government—legislative, executive, and judicial.

On first glance, one might not think that this system is so unique or important, and yet if you will reflect for a moment, my friends, you will see why it is so valuable. In other countries power became autocratic and centralized. In prewar Japan, it was lodged exclusively in the militarist clique; in Russia it is in the crafty hands of Josef Stalin and the Politburo gang; in other lands, it is in one class or a king or a dictator.

But in this country, no single individual or group controls. Each group is checked and balanced by other groups, so as to prevent abuses.

If there is crime or corruption in a community, there will be a courageous newspaper which will fight it. A minister will rise in the pulpit against it. A chamber of commerce, Kiwanis Club, an American Legion post, a VFW post, a woman's club will individually and collectively serve as a force to fight the menace to their community. This is what is meant by the check-and-balance process on the community level.

This is what we must have more of if we want to keep America free.

So long as there is free competition of ideas; free competition of economic, political, yes, even religious thought, we of this Nation will continue to enjoy the great blessings which have been ours since the founding of the Republic.

Conclusion

My friends, I want to thank you for the opportunity of being with you today. As I have previously stated, it is always a joy to return to Kiwanis. One of the great experiences of my life was to serve in 1933 as district governor for Wisconsin-Upper Michigan. Those were the dark days of the depression.

It is our hope and prayer that those days will never return. We can make sure that they will not return by preserving the great values of which I have spoken today, by striving for a rebirth of public and private morality. In that way, America, on the home scene and in the international scene, may continue to play her great role of leadership.

Thank you.

[From the Kiwanis magazine of August 1951]

FREEDOM, OUR INHERITANCE

(By Rev. Terence J. Finlay)

During the years of my membership in Kiwanis I have always been impressed by the appropriate and suggestive themes which have been given us year by year through the executive officers. Never has there been any finer than the one given us this year and being used for this international convention—Freedom Is Not Free. It has been well said that those living beside church bells grow so accustomed to their ringing that they fall, after a while, to notice them. This is also true of some of the great bell notes contained in the words "democracy" and "freedom." These words, with their tremendous implications, have through frequent use become so familiar to the people on this North American continent that we are in grave danger of taking our democracy and freedom for granted. Therefore, it is of the utmost importance that we be jolted out of our indifference by our theme, Freedom Is Not Free.

What is freedom? Here is one definition. It is the ability of a man to live his life completely and unrestrictedly. Let me hasten to add, this freedom must never degenerate into license. We have a very striking illustration of the misuse of freedom given to us in the Bible. Here is a young man who sought his freedom from all home ties and responsibilities. He took his share of his inheritance from his father and went away into a far country. There he went out with the kind of friends he wanted to go with. He lived just as he wanted to live. He indulged himself in every passion. He did what he wanted to. He was free and the poor fool ended by being a slave, without any money and without his fair weather friends. He found himself with the beasts of the field and sought to satisfy his hunger with the crusts thrown to the swine. It was there, we are told, "He came to himself." He realized how foolish he had been and said, "I will arise and go to my father's house." That was the beginning of a new life for him—a life of real and lasting freedom.

You see what I am driving at. Freedom is not free. It means discipline. Discipline is a word we are not particularly fond of in our countries—yet even though we hate all dictatorships, with their conception of disciplined duty to the state as the highest goal, we must admit that they have disciplined their people to an idea and that is why they are strong, enthusiastic, and aggressive.

It is my belief that we of the democracies and the free people of the world should learn this hard lesson of discipline. There are far too many people in both our countries who keep prattling about their rights as individuals, who should be more concerned with living up to their duties and responsibilities to their country, their church, and their families. I confess that they do not seem glamorous or exciting, but they are absolutely necessary if we are to survive.

It was a workingman of France who sent a message to one of his close friends in America after France fell. He said, "Tell all your friends in America why France fell. France fell because her people looked on life as an easy thing. She became complacent and looked on the state as an everlasting milch cow, from which she could get everything and give nothing. She thought more of her rights than her duties—every citizen of France did—and then France fell."

Just 2 weeks ago a brigadier general of the United States Marine Corps arrived back in this country after 9 months in Korea. He was interviewed and asked for his opinions regarding the progress of the campaign. He replied buntly, "I will venture no opinion, but I will tell you this, we are up against a tough and ruthless enemy. I come back to this country and I find that what the American people want to do is fight a war without getting hurt. Here everyone is trying to get the other fellow to carry the burden." Those are not my words, but they are just as applicable to my country as to yours. We all need to be reminded forcibly and bluntly that freedom is not free.

People who return to our countries after visits abroad nearly always remind us that we are privileged to live in the freest part of the world. Never let us forget that this freedom has been purchased by the sacrifices of our forefathers. I believe that with all its faults our democratic system of government is the finest in the world. We in Canada are proud of the fact that we can trace our freedom of government back to the time of Magna Carta, and it should be a source of gratification for us to remember that we are bound together in our countries by this common ideal. Our peoples have always fought against tyranny and bondage. We believe with you in the immortal words of your great President, Abraham Lincoln, in "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." We in Kiwanis are like-

wise pledged to support that kind of government. Let us see that we do it. There are always those who are critical of the Government, but it has been said that a people only receive the kind of government that they deserve.

Are we showing in our actions the integrity and the wider vision that we expect from our elected Representatives?

Our freedom is bound up in our spiritual inheritance, for faith fosters freedom, and without faith there can be no freedom. The religious freedom we enjoy in America was purchased by the sacrifices of those early settlers who came from Europe determined to establish their homes and bring up their children in a new atmosphere. The early churches were built because the people realized the necessity of worship. They knew that it wasn't enough to have food, clothing, and shelter. They needed something more—the opportunity of worshipping God according to their own particular custom. One of the tragedies of our day is that so many of our people have forgotten that we owe our freedom of worship to those early pioneers.

What we need is not a watered-down, weak, or divided Christianity, but a strong, militant, united Christianity to preserve our freedom and point the way to the paths of true peace. A Canadian told me only a little while ago of an experience that he had during the midst of the blitz on Britain. He entered a large home in London which had been hit during the raid and badly damaged. He saw this inscription over the fireplace: "Peace is for those strong enough to defend it." We should be tragically aware of this truth by now.

Let's keep it that way.

[From the Kiwanis magazine of August 1951]

MOTION PICTURES AND YOUR COMMUNITY (By Ronald Reagan)

I would like to talk to you as a travel narrator would talk about a very strange and foreign land. But it is a foreign land which has more actual press coverage than any other locality in the world except the Capitol in Washington, D. C. Some 450 correspondents cover the daily activities of the motion-picture industry in Hollywood, Calif. Yet this remains the least discovered place on earth.

Probably more misconceptions and misinformation exist about the people I work with, the people in my industry and my town, than any other spot on earth. Part of this is due to the fact that among these 450 newspaper people that are there doing an honest job of gathering and reporting news we have attracted many camp followers. These are people who do not have the journalistic integrity to go through the task of gathering and reporting news honestly. With only a few hundred newsworthy names to deal with every day and a column to fill, they have chosen the easy path of gossip. They have the mistaken idea that the American people want to hear the worst instead of the best. And when they are hardpressed to fill their columns, they invent what does not happen.

The result is that among you and your communities and out through America there exists an idea that the people of motion pictures are crazy, extravagant, immoral, fickle, and are flitting from one husband or wife to the other, with no regard for each other. There exists also the idea that if we are interested in politics at all, it is because we are Communists.

The statements I have just made are not out of my own mind but are the result of a survey to find out what you people do think about those of us in Hollywood. Consequently, you will be a little surprised to learn that the people of motion pictures are not the troubadours, the strolling players who used to come into your town and live out of a trunk for a week and then pass on. Being

a part of the community now, and because the mechanical nature of motion pictures is so difficult, they have to go to work in the morning like everyone else, and they come home in the evening like everyone else. They have lawns to mow and they own their own homes. Seventy percent of them are high-school graduates or better, as against the national average of 28 percent. Seventy-nine percent of the people in my industry are married; 70 percent to their first husband or wife; 70 percent of them have children; 85 percent of them are regular members and attendants at the churches of Hollywood.

They constitute 1 percent of the population of Los Angeles. They contribute annually 12 percent of all the money in Los Angeles that is contributed to charity. Twenty-five percent of the personnel in the motion-picture business were in the Armed Forces in the last war.

Well, these are just a few of the things about our community that make us rather proud. Some of the things we feel a little badly about. We feel badly that the divorce rate in Hollywood is 29¹/₁₀ percent. We feel worse that the national average is 40 percent. We wish that the rest of the country could catch up with us.

Because the public has a misconception about us and because there is so much apathy about us, certain enemies of ours—enemies of democracy and our way of life—think they have found a leak in the dike. They have found a way to attack some of our American institutions and our American principles by way of the motion-picture industry. What we must all learn is that you can't lose a freedom any place without losing freedom every place.

If you are going to let one segment of society or one area of the country become maligned without insisting that the truth be known, all other segments and areas are subject to similar fates.

You know that the Communists have tried to invade our industry and that we have fought them to the point where we now have them licked. But there are other more insidious and less obvious inroads being made at our democratic institutions by way of the motion-picture industry. For example, no industry has been picked for such discriminatory taxes as have the individuals in the industry of motion pictures, and you don't realize that because the average citizen is too prone to say, "They are all overpaid in Hollywood, so let it go at that," but if they can get away with it there, it is aimed at your pocketbook and you are next.

Another one of the insidious infiltrations and the worst on our American freedom is by way of censorship. There isn't an American who wouldn't stand up and strike back at the imposition of controls on our freedom of press and freedom of speech, and yet here, for the last 15 years, we have been permitting it in spite of a self-imposed production code by the motion-picture industry. We have political censorship in 8 States and over 200 cities in the United States.

Do you realize that we are raising an entire generation of Americans in this way to assume that it is all right for someone to tell them what they can see and hear from a motion-picture screen? Isn't it a rather short step from there when they have grown up to tell those same people, "Well, we might go just a little further. It is all right for us to tell you what you can read." And from there you don't have very far to go to telling them what they can say and then what they can think.

I wanted to correct the misconceptions about Hollywood so you could take a word or two of it back to your communities because this is your struggle, not alone ours. The reason I want to say all of this to you and ask you to take it back to your communities is because we feel that we are operating in the best manner of free enterprise, be-

cause never once has our industry asked for Government aid nor any subsidy of any kind. We still stand today as one of the greatest fields of opportunity. We are in the American way. You can come into our field and the heights are unlimited, based only upon your ability and your talent.

We feel that you people should join us now in the struggle to preserve some of these freedoms, some of these American principles that are being nibbled away through our industry. In short, we would like to invite you to be on our side because we feel that we have been on your side for a very long time.

Application of Villisca Farmers Telephone Co. for an REA Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, for many years I have been greatly interested in the REA program and what it could do for the farmers in my State of Iowa and elsewhere throughout the Nation. During this long period in which I have supported the program in the Congress and as a private citizen, I have seen it accomplish much in promoting the welfare of many rural communities by helping the farmers provide themselves with low-cost, dependable electric power. This accomplishment in rural electrification is one reason why I became one of the sponsors of the rural telephone loan program which was enacted 2 years ago.

Experience through the years has demonstrated the fundamental interdependence which exists between farmers and the rest of the Nation. For that reason all of us have had to be concerned with efforts to achieve higher agricultural production, greater rural economic security, and better farm living. We have made outstanding progress toward these objectives, and I take pride in the fact that the progress has been made through the farmers' own initiative in applying modern farming techniques. Electricity has been a powerful aid to farm families in their progress.

One case in point is the revolution which modern electric equipment has made in dairying by saving labor, increasing production, and improving the quality of the product. This is, of course, just one example.

In my State, the years since 1935, when REA was established, have seen the number of farms having central station electricity increase from less than 15 percent, in 1935, to more than 90 percent now. We have 55 local farm groups who have obtained REA loans to do a big part of this job. These local co-ops have over 50,000 miles of power line in service and several generating plants in operation to serve more than 125,000 rural families.

Iowa's record of repayment on REA electrification loans is equally gratifying. Iowa borrowers have paid \$16,500,000 in

principal and interest on their Government loans. This includes \$2,500,000 paid on principal ahead of schedule. Not a single borrower was behind on its REA loan payments.

In view of this record in electrification, we are looking forward to the same kind of progress in the rural telephone field. Farmers have as much need for a telephone as a businessman in town. No one would think of running a business without telephone communication.

The REA telephone loan program is still very new. However, it has been moving along. At the present time, loan allocations have been approved for five borrowers in Iowa. This means that 555 families will get telephone service for the first time and 5,394 will have improved service.

The new program is encountering problems also. I was greatly disturbed to read recently newspaper accounts about the handling of a telephone loan at Villisca, Iowa. Because of my interest in the REA program, particularly the new telephone program, I felt it highly important to get all the facts on both sides of this case.

I have before me copies of correspondence which I received from REA. In view of the fact that the critical side of the story was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I feel that in fairness the correspondence should also be inserted to make the record complete, and I make that request.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., August 10, 1951.

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE,

United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: We appreciate your interest in the Villisca telephone loan allocation and are glad to give you all the information we can regarding our handling of this case. At the time the Red Oak Express newspaper issued its critical story about us, we wrote to the editor giving all the facts and pointing out particularly the information which he had omitted altogether or had misstated in his story. A copy of this letter, which we believe makes a complete statement of the case, is enclosed. If there is anything further we can give you, we will be glad to do so.

Sincerely,

CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Administrator.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 23, 1951.

THE EDITOR, RED OAK EXPRESS,
Red Oak, Iowa.

DEAR SIR: Our attention has been called to an article in the June 11, 1951, issue of the Red Oak Express concerning the rejection by the Villisca Farmers Telephone Co. of a REA loan.

The article, as reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, contains a number of statements and conclusions which are at variance with the facts or fail to take into consideration facts not mentioned. As a result, the reader not familiar with the facts cannot help but pass unfair judgment on the Rural Electrification Administration and its administering of the rural telephone loan program.

We believe that you would not intentionally misinform your readers and that, therefore, you will welcome and give sincere consideration to the following comments prompted by the article.

As you probably know, the United States Congress has assigned to REA the responsibility for two loan programs, the rural electrification loan program which has been in effect for 16 years, and the rural telephone loan program which was authorized less than 2 years ago. We believe that the more than 100,000 farm and other rural families in Iowa which are now enjoying dependable electric service at reasonable cost as a direct result of REA loans to 55 new Iowa business enterprises—the rural electric cooperatives—would readily testify to the fact that their experience with REA does not bear out any accusation of wanton waste, high-handed extravagance, and misadministration on the part of REA. Let me assure you that it is our sincere and earnest endeavor to apply to the administration of the rural telephone loan program the same high standards of ethics, efficiency, and spirit of service to rural people which are responsible for the Nation-wide high regard of the rural electrification loan program.

The delays in approving a loan for the Villisca Farmers Telephone Co. were neither intentional nor the result of any complacency on our part. We recognize our obligation to expedite loan applications as rapidly as possible. We deeply regret that, due to the time required for the recruitment and training of qualified personnel, the development of basic policy and procedures, and the research and special studies needed to provide sound guide lines for the launching of a long-range program in a new field of service to the people, we could not act on the flood of early applications as quickly as the applicants expected or as we would have liked to be able to.

The account in your newspaper leaves the impression that REA, without prior knowledge of the applicant, attempted to force a loan on the applicant in an amount far in excess of need. For the record, let me say that the matter was taken up with the applicant and that a change in the amount of the application to about \$300,000 was agreed to in writing by the applicant before we started to process the final allocation papers.

Let me note also that the reference in your article to a fee for engineering expenses to an REA engineer to supervise the project is obviously based on a misunderstanding. Neither the salary nor the expenses of any REA employee are paid out of loan funds or charged in any way to a REA borrower.

The engineering fee item included was for the estimated cost of the services of a private engineering firm to be selected and employed by the applicant for the purpose of preparing plans and specifications and supervising construction of the facilities to be built with the loan. This is in accordance with a policy and practice which has proved very satisfactory in the rural electrification loan program, both from the standpoint of the REA borrower as the owner and operator of the facilities and from that of REA as a protection of the Government's loan investment. Many rural people would have enjoyed better telephone service if rural telephone companies in the past had more generally made use of the services of qualified engineers for design and construction supervision of their systems.

Permit me to call your attention to two major requirements of the Rural Telephone Loan Act. One is that the Administrator, in making a loan, shall make sure that the loan will provide adequate service to the widest practical number of rural users. The other is that the Administrator must certify that in his judgment the loan will be repaid with interest within the specified period, usually 35 years.

Satisfactory service to the largest practicable number of rural people during the life of an REA loan obviously offers the greatest assurance that a rural telephone company will operate successfully enough to repay the REA loan. But satisfactory service over a period of 35 years can be expected only if the telephone system is properly designed, constructed, and equipped.

It was the considered judgment of our telephone engineers and specialists who reviewed the application that, on the basis of extensive recent experience in the telephone industry, a loan of \$175,000 would be far from adequate to complete the rehabilitation, expansion, and improvements necessary to assure good area-wide telephone service. They estimated the cost of what would be required and recommended a loan in that amount. They felt that, from the standpoint of loan security, the larger loan would be safer than a loan in the amount originally asked for, which would not be enough, at today's prices, to accomplish the desired objective fully. They recognized, of course, that a "patchwork" job could be done for considerably less money although it would not last as long, give as good service, and would cost more in the long run to maintain.

The implication in the article, that REA loans are a waste of taxpayers' money, has no basis in fact. REA is prevented by law from making grants or giving subsidies. We make only loans, at 2 percent interest, which must be repaid over a maximum period of 35 years. Therefore, REA loans do not constitute a tax burden. And that they are not wasted nor a loss to the Government is clearly shown by the excellent repayment record of a thousand REA borrowers of rural electrification loan funds. With loans totaling well over \$2,000,000,000, less than one-half of 1 percent of the amounts due cumulatively in interest and on principal of the loans is overdue more than 30 days. You will agree that this is an outstanding record for any lending institution to point to. And not least among the reasons for such a repayment record is REA's insistence on high construction standards where REA loan funds are involved.

Persons familiar with the REA program in the rural electrification field know that REA has been and is still making every reasonable effort to keep construction costs down. We are doing the same in the rural telephone field. But we do not believe that savings in construction costs which are made at the expense of quality and adequacy of a utility system are real savings, nor that they will in the long run mean lower rates or good service.

There is still another point which should be clarified. An REA loan made in a given amount does not mean that the borrower is obligated to borrow the entire amount whether he needs it or not. A loan contract for a given amount merely obligates REA to earmark that much of its loan appropriation for the particular borrower. Funds are advanced to the borrower as needed, with interest charged only on the funds actually advanced. If the projected construction can be accomplished at a cost below the estimate for which the loan was made, the borrower, of course, will not need to borrow the full amount of the earmarked funds. Since all contracts are let by the borrower, not by REA, the borrower is assured of the full benefits of any savings below estimated costs.

For REA to approve a loan for an amount smaller than experience indicates adequate to do the job might create all sorts of difficulties later on. It might prove a disservice to the borrower and to the rural people expecting to get good telephone service, because of ensuing delays in completion of construction which would be necessitated by the company's inability to finish the job

without supplementary loans. And it would most certainly subject REA to deserved criticism from the rural people as well as from the Congress.

You will be glad to know that the attitude shown by this applicant toward REA is by no means typical. In general, loan applicants are more charitable, patient, and understanding of the steps and measures which a Federal lending agency is required to observe. We have received many expressions from borrowers of their satisfaction concerning their relations with REA. And we sincerely believe that the management of the Villisca Farmers Telephone Co. would have found little cause for further criticism if it had decided to accept our loan and advisory services.

While we regret the circumstances leading to the company's decision not to make use of an REA loan, we recognize that the Villisca Farmers Telephone Co. was under no obligation at any time to accept a loan from REA. For the sake of the rural people who depend upon it for service, we sincerely hope REA. For the sake of the rural people who way, will be able to accomplish the desired system improvements and expansion.

Sincerely,

GEORGE W. HAGGARD,
Acting Administrator.

Government Spending and Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by myself, and published in the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot-News on Sunday, August 12, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As your guest columnist I want to direct attention to a problem which has given me a great deal of anxiety.

It has a direct bearing upon the future of our Nation as a land of freedom and opportunity.

I am particularly concerned because it affects the lives of our young men and young women and the generations that will inherit America in the years ahead.

One of the greatest responsibilities we have today is to preserve for the youth of tomorrow the freedom, advantages, and opportunities which America has offered in the past.

We are living in a time of superlatives. We have big Government, big business, and big labor. We have more wealth than any Nation in the world.

At the same time we have the biggest debt, the biggest budget, the biggest and most expensive government bureaucracy, and the highest taxes in all our peacetime history.

In the last 20 years, the Federal Government has grown so big and complex that we are spending almost 30 percent of our national income to keep it going.

That is today's picture of Federal spending. Nevertheless there are those in Government who predict an annual budget that will reach \$100,000,000,000 in the next few years.

This situation is alarming. To me it is terribly frightening, but many accept it with complacency, without seeming to realize the

dangerous implications and the inevitable result.

As a member of the Finance Committee of the United States Senate, I have a share of the responsibility for writing a tax bill that the American people must pay.

That is a grave responsibility because it has a direct bearing upon the problem which, as I have stated, is giving me so much concern—the preservation of the freedom, advantages, and opportunities upon which the greatness of our Republic was built.

History teaches that more nations have been destroyed by excessive taxation to support extravagant and wasteful government than by invading armies.

When government drains off the earnings of the people to the point of confiscation and oppression, the individual is robbed of incentive, initiative, and self-reliance.

Freedom of the individual is destroyed, all progress is blocked and government steps in to assume dictatorial powers over the lives of its citizens.

From my study of the new tax proposals I am convinced that we have reached the saturation point beyond which we cannot go without peril to the safety and security of the worker, the farmer, the small-business man, and the Nation as a whole.

To impose heavier taxation upon the people, or to increase the national debt by deficit financing will only postpone the day of reckoning which must come sooner or later.

When that day comes, American opportunity will be a thing of the past.

Our Government has grown so big, so costly, and so wasteful, and we have assumed obligations of such global proportions that tax revenues from big business are only a drop in the bucket compared with our tax needs.

With this expansion has come the increasing need to dip deeper into the pockets of the individual taxpayer, and each year take a larger share of his earnings.

When the average citizen is required to work 1 day of every 3 to pay the cost of government, it is time to call a halt.

Otherwise no boy or girl in America will be able to look forward to a savings account, to a chance to get ahead, to go into business, to invest in productive enterprise, or to create new jobs for others.

Those avenues of progress were open to the young man of the past. They gave the young man in overalls a chance to become his own boss, and opened the way for the development of our industries.

They offered rewards for hard work, thrift, initiative, energy, and resourcefulness.

When I think of opportunities of the past, I think of Thomas Edison, Henry Ford, Walter Chrysler, George Westinghouse, and a long list of other American workmen who rose from the shops and factories to leadership in giant industries.

I want to see America strengthened as the kind of country that will hold out the same golden hope of opportunity and achievement.

I want to preserve the kind of freedom that places in the hands of American youth the direction of his own destiny without dependence upon Government. How can this be accomplished?

First, the people of the United States must demand that the Members of Congress reverse the whole extravagant spending trend of recent years.

The brakes must be jammed on before we rush headlong into financial collapse.

Government spending must be reduced to the lowest possible minimum consistent with a sound national defense.

There is nothing complicated about this policy. It requires a strong and determined citizenry, and representatives in both Houses of Congress with the will, the spirit, and the

courage to say "no" when the bureaucrats, the socialistic planners, and the selfish pressure groups demand new and bigger appropriations.

Taxes can then be reduced and new advances in our national economy will again open the doors of opportunity to the youth of America.

Useless Extravagance in Reports of the Library of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the Record as part of my remarks a letter I have received from a constituent who resides in Alexandria, Va. I shall not identify the correspondent, because he is a responsible official in the executive branch of the Government, and I assume he would not wish to be placed in a position of criticizing a legislative branch agency.

However, this letter is pertinent to the so-called publicity amendment which I have been offering to the appropriation bills as they have been considered by the Senate. The letter relates to annual reports by the Library of Congress and their useless extravagance of words and phrases which, even if they are grammatically proper, are so stilted and over-written that they are unintelligent short of academic analysis. These reports constitute a horrible example of some of the useless expenditure of manpower, time, effort, payroll money, paper and printing costs which my so-called publicity amendment is designed to reach.

I appreciate this letter, and I hope the Senate Appropriations Committee, and the subcommittee considering the legislative appropriation bill, will note it carefully. I hope the Library of Congress will regard it as constructive criticism and concern itself with simpler and less verbose reports about the great work it does. It would cost much less and be much more effective.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I have just been fascinated by two volumes released by the Government. In the process, I have also developed a slow burn.

I have reference to the 1949 and 1950 annual reports of the Librarian of Congress. These reports contain between 200 and 300 pages, printed on best quality paper and handsomely bound in buckram. I quote below a few selections from the introduction contained in each of the annual reports. The first quotation appears on page 11 of the 1949 report:

"But if the Library is, as it is designed to be and as, in the past, it most assuredly has been, a popular institution, popularly supported, administered and sustained; if it is, invisibly perhaps, but nevertheless indivis-

bly and integrally a part of the intellectual endowment of every citizen; if solely to diffuse, it has scrupulously amassed the recorded knowledge it contains, if it belongs to the experience of its days; if it is sensitive to the expectations of it and applies whatever strength it has to their fulfillment; if learned spuriousness cannot taint, nor curtain, nor embarrass, nor divert, nor betray, nor in any way diminish its steadfast demonstration of the freedoms of inquiry and access and discovery and choice; if its ambitions do not exceed its opportunities for useful service; if it has acquired and exploited for perfected special skills; if it is an active agent as well as an obedient servant of the nobler energies of a people; if it is aware of, and disturbed by, and in rebellion against, its own shortcomings; if performance of duty is its single purpose and its duty, the enrichment of society; if its traditions are not marcescent, but alive, adaptable and approved; if hollow precedent does not exact conformity nor impose requirement; if there is confidence in its maturity; if through age, it has attained character, an identity, a realization, 'non faciat ea, quae iuvenet; at vero multo maiora et meliora facit' (Cicero: De Senectute, vi: 22-23), then the passage of its first 150 years may merit some attention."

As my old uncle would say, "A man who can understand that is fit to be President." I think you will agree with him. Page 32 of the 1949 report contains another interesting paragraph, which is quoted below:

"Some write in the clumsy characters of children, some in finely shaded Spencerian, some in the legibility produced by keys struck upon inked ribbon against a piece of paper, some in formality, some in familiarity, some in the bewildering idioms of countries left behind, some in hard-wrought felicities. Their questionings are conveyed on penny post cards, on lined leaves ripped from notebooks, on flower-decorated paper, or on bond with letterheads handsomely embellished and engraved."

What these gentlemen are trying to say, I believe, is that they do receive letters, some handwritten and some written on a typewriter—almost everybody does. The 1950 report also contains many gems.

I bring these to your attention because you have a reputation for showing a proper respect for the taxpayer's dollar, as well as a current interest in the money being devoted by agencies to publicity. It would be interesting to know how much money has been expended by the Librarian of Congress and, at his order, by the Government Printing Office for the preparation of these annual reports. I would expect the price per copy would be rather astounding.

I do not expect a reply to this letter. It is merely conveying information to you which I believe will be interesting to you.

Tidelands Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an excerpt from an editorial entitled "Hint of Danger," published in the Houston Chronicle and Herald of August 8, 1951, dealing with the question of the tidelands oil.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HINT OF DANGER

The only argument for Federal seizure of the tidelands which has any appearance of validity is the claim that the oil underlying those lands should be conserved for use in war. Actually, the argument is wholly invalid because the Federal Government could assume control of all the Nation's oil resources in the event of an emergency.

There has been no indication that the Interior Department, which aspires to administer the tidelands, intends to withhold them from mineral exploitation. The Department merely wants to have charge of leasing the mineral rights and distributing the income.

Increases in Rail Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Rail Boost Fires," written by Alfred D. Stedman, and published in the St. Paul Sunday Pioneer Press of August 12, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RAIL BOOST FIRES

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

Fanned by the new rail rate boost just granted, forces are converging to stir up an old regional transportation question again. One force is generated by the railroads' part in defeat of the St. Lawrence seaway that would help the Midwest. Another is generated by the shortage of boxcars that is blocking elevators and snarling grain traffic again this year. The absence of many of the Northern Lines' cars on those very eastern railways that have led in defeating the Great Lakes seaway hits the Grain Belt recurrently and hard. The Midwest can have neither the seaway nor the boxcars that the seaway would help make available here.

Further, the rail rate boost is to be the sixth successive increase granted by the Interstate Commerce Commission since mid-1946. Rates on wheat and potatoes, for instance, are up more than 50 percent since then, not counting the new boost now authorized. With freight rates up and wheat prices down, the amount of rail transportation that a bushel of wheat can buy has fallen to the lowest point in a long time. Farmers and consumers are being asked to pay freight rates to cover, not just the costs of moving freight, but deficits on passenger services besides.

Of course, it would be silly to imagine that the railroads can be compelled to go on increasing wage, fuel, steel, building, tax, and other costs without either increasing freight rates or else injuring their service. They must have had a very good case for the latest 6-percent rise (they had asked 15 percent) or it would never have been granted in the face of stiff opposition from Government price and farm agencies.

So it is not the rate increase of itself alone, but this boost in relation to continued blocking of the seaway and recurrent

boxcar shortages that generate the heat. All this is tough on this region's railroads. Why? Because these railroads are natural allies of middle America's agriculture and industry; next to people and soil they have applied an absolutely basic element in this region's development; they fervently want a faster return of their cars to the Grain Belt from eastern lines; they are on the short end of even the freight rate increase, getting only 6 percent as against the eastern lines' 9 percent; and they surely stand to share in any rise of this region's prosperity resulting from opening the seaway.

Thus the fires set by rail opposition to the great national defense and Midwest improvement project that is the seaway may turn out to be hot. And one trouble is that they threaten to burn the wrong finger.

RFC: An Outdated Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "RFC: An Outdated Agency," which appeared in today's edition of the New York Times.

Mr. President, I commend to the attention of all the Members of Congress, who may still be in doubt regarding the ultimate disposition which should be made of this agency, this editorial, which I feel is very forceful and forthright in its expression.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RFC: AN OUTDATED AGENCY

President Truman, after conducting his own personal investigation of the alleged improprieties against William M. Boyle, Jr., in connection with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, has announced that he is "exonerating" the chairman of the Democratic National Committee of the charge against him. "I have the utmost confidence in Mr. Boyle," said the President, "and I believe the statements that he made to me, and I believe also that the investigations which I made in the RFC cover the matter fully."

The charge against Mr. Boyle was made by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. According to this newspaper, Mr. Boyle was employed as counsel for a St. Louis concern, the American Lithofold Corp., at \$500 a month at a time when he was a member of the Democratic National Committee. Shortly after the company retained his services, it is alleged, it was granted an RFC loan, although three earlier applications for loans had been rejected. It was implied that as one of the highest of the higher-ups in the Democratic Party and a strong supporter of the President, Mr. Boyle had lent his influence to Lithofold, thus enabling the company to obtain the loan previously denied it. Mr. Truman, in dismissing the case against the National Committee chairman, does so on the ground that latter was not selling influence, but merely his legal services.

There will be many persons, we think, who will feel that the President's exoneration of this high-ranking member of the Democratic Party would have been more convincing if

it had included some measure of documentation. Such persons may consider the charges to be so serious and the case so important that it should be explored more fully. But are we to go on forever trying to run down charges against every individual who takes advantage of the morally insidious dual character of the RFC to use the institution as an instrument for financial or political aggrandizement, as the case might be? Or are we to do the intelligent thing and rid ourselves once and for all of the corrupting influence of this agency, which was erected 20 years ago to deal with a temporary emergency and has perpetuated itself as a potential paradise for political shysters and chiseling businessmen?

Owen J. Lattimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Lattimore to the Stand Again," published in the Herald-News, of Passaic, N. J., on August 10, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LATTIMORE TO THE STAND AGAIN

When Judge Stanley H. Fuld ruled that it's libelous per se to call anyone a Communist unless the man admits it, he had in mind the harm an unjust accusation could do, now that the whole country knows who its real enemies are. Unwittingly, however, the Fuld dictum helped the Reds. Many timid writers and lawyers are now afraid to identify Communists who don't deny their party affiliation.

You can give Manny Cantor his proper designation without risking a libel suit. The former Passaic Communist is the party chairman in Mercer County—or was, before his unexplained disappearance and the abandonment of his Trenton office. You can put the Red label on Martha Stone, the Paterson woman who became State chairman of the party in Newark. Emil Asher is a Communist, too. He's Miss Stone's husband. He was union business agent for electrical workers in the Passaic area until he showed his hand. The union workers got Asher's measure when he arranged a Passaic rally for Gerhard Eisler, the Soviet agent who eluded the FBI and escaped to East Germany aboard the *Batory*. Asher is now party chairman for Passaic County.

You'd be sued for libel if you put a Red tag on Prof. Owen Lattimore, director of the Walter Hines Page School at Johns Hopkins and former adviser to the State Department on far eastern policy. But Senator Joe McCarthy could and did. Speaking on the Senate floor, with congressional immunity, McCarthy described Lattimore as the top Soviet espionage agent in America.

Last night Peter Edson, Scripps-Howard columnist, wrote that "McCarthy has never repeated his charges off the floor of the Senate . . . where such remarks are privileged." Edson seems to forget that McCarthy wanted to give his State Department suspect list to a senatorial committee. It was Scott Lucas, then Democratic majority leader, who repeatedly insisted that McCarthy make the names public on the Senate floor.

Edson and other writers keep saying that McCarthy wouldn't take Lattimore's dare to say on a public platform what he said in the Senate. They seem to forget that soon after Lattimore's lawyers threatened suit, McCarthy addressed the Marine Corps League in Passaic at a public meeting, with reporters and cameramen present. There McCarthy cited the records of Lattimore, John S. Service, and Dr. Philip Jessup, our ambassador at large. Again he invited Lattimore to sue. No mention was made of espionage and party membership, but he laid everything else on the line.

On April 20, 1950, the Senator addressed the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington, citing a deadly parallel between Russia's and Lattimore's programs for Asia. Of that perennial joiner, Dr. Jessup he asked, "Why does he always join Communist fronts? Why not anti-Communist organizations? Again he exposed the records of the men he criticized.

Professor Lattimore had his day before the Millard Tydings committee, which whitewashed the Truman administration. He defended himself in a book and on the lecture platform. He will soon have his opportunity to be heard again publicly before Senator McCarran's judiciary subcommittee which is investigating the Institute of Pacific Relations, whose magazine, *Pacific Affairs*, was edited by Lattimore from 1933 to 1941. Pat McCarran is a Democrat but he's not conducting a whitewash.

McCarran isn't Lattimore's only accuser. Pro Louis Budenz, of Fordham, was managing editor of the *Daily Worker* before he gave up communism. When Budenz was executing Moscow's orders, he said he was told by Jack Stachel, one of the 11 party leaders convicted of conspiracy, to "consider Owen Lattimore as a Communist." Gen. Alexander Barmine, former Red army intelligence officer, now in charge of the Voice of America's Russian broadcasts, said the Soviet military intelligence chief, Gen. Jan Birzin, told him in 1933 that Lattimore and Joseph Barnes, American newspaperman, were two of "our men." That was the year when Lattimore took over *Pacific Affairs*. It was also the year when he brought out his book *Manchuria: Cradle of Conflict*, in which he had some nice things to say about Russia and the Communists.

Lattimore, who is clever as well as belligerent, knows how to present a case for himself. If McCarthy is unable to show that he is a card-carrier or spy, the Senator has shown the company the professor and some of Secretary Acheson's men keep, and the Senator's not through yet.

Principle Versus Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the National Tribune of August 16, 1951:

PRINCIPLE VERSUS DOLLARS

Mr. Congressman, on August 6 President Truman saw fit to veto two measures that relate to veterans and their dependents. We would discuss briefly with you the issues involved because they concern national policy.

H. R. 3549 relates admittedly to only a small handful of elderly widows—perhaps

100 of them—who married their soldier husbands in late years. The bill would remove the necessity of their proving "dependency" in order to receive modest monthly pensions of \$48, but the Chief Executive believes the treatment suggested would constitute a "dangerous precedent" and that it would be a "departure from social policy."

It is your job, Mr. Congressman, to determine both precedent and social policy in this country. The few women concerned here must be 60 years of age, and most are much older. Theirs were not fly-by-night marriages for pension purposes, and they must have lived continuously with their soldiers for 10 or more years next preceding their deaths. They need help now, and we cannot believe fair treatment to them will endanger our social structure. We feel we can afford to be a little generous with these Civil War, Indian wars, and Spanish-American War widows, and we think you will agree with us that it is a shame to make them subscribe to a pauper oath. Considering also the fact that the Veterans' Administration testified an administrative saving can be made by enacting this bill, we expect you will support it by your vote when the measure again comes to you for final action.

The other bill is H. R. 3193. The policy involved here is as old as the country itself, not new as Mr. Truman's advisers suggest. What is new is the idea advanced in the veto message that a man who serves his people in uniform in time of war should be accorded no different treatment than any other person whose security was defended by such as these. The bill would permit payment of a pension of \$120 monthly to part III beneficiaries who are so badly disabled that they require the constant aid and attendance of another person. Although pending legislation suggests an increase of 10 cents a day to help them to meet present high living costs, and all payments are subject to income provisions, these veterans are conigned to their homes or hospitals—many of them blind or bedridden—and they must have constant care. They are already pensioned, but they cannot eke out an existence and afford a nurse on their present small payments. Could you, Mr. Congressman, meet these obligations on \$60 or \$72 a month?

It is all very well to make scare headlines by saying that this bill might cost four hundred million a year a half century hence, but we can imagine nothing more cruel than to insult such badly disabled war veterans by doing so. That is inexcusable. It seems quite proper these days to spend billions on the countries whose soldiers fought these veterans, but we consider it dastardly to do so at the expense of former heroes who are now flat on their backs. The veterans of this Nation cannot subscribe to such a policy. This measure creates no hand-out, no giveaway program, no racket—it simply compensates fair treatment to those who need it.

Mr. Congressman, so long as we must fight wars they must be paid for and those who suffer must have proper care. If President Truman and his advisers believe what they say in these messages, and if they feel that all veterans who become disabled in after years should be treated solely under social-welfare laws, we challenge them to support legislation to draft all resources in time of stress, and subject all persons to the low pay, discipline, and punishment that is accorded to men in uniform. That would be more logical than the new and unproved ideas now being advanced by the White House. Of what purpose is it to fight communism abroad when such thoughts as are contained in these veto messages encourage discord at home?

If you, as a Member of Congress, believe that veterans of America's wars are to be treated only as human derelicts, to be included in welfare payments as are all others of the luckless poor, we shall expect you to

vote to sustain the President's observations. If, on the other hand, you feel that war veterans and their loved ones have given more to the security of this Nation than those who were privileged to remain securely at home, we shall expect you to cast your vote to override the vetoes of these two bills. Somehow we feel confident you will recognize the difference between principle and dollar decisions. This is not a case of political courage; it is one of morals and common decency.

Reply to Extension of Remarks by Congressman Wood, of Idaho, Congressional Record, July 19, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY L. TOWE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, on July 18, 1951, there appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under the extension of remarks of Hon. JOHN T. WOOD, of Idaho, a statement by one John McBride, which I think should be brought to the attention of the House. These remarks have to do with the silver situation. I have the greatest respect for my colleague from Idaho, and I am sure that he will be as concerned as I am with one of the statements made by Mr. McBride. The particular statement I have reference to is as follows, and I quote:

It may startle most Americans to know that of the more than \$26,000,000,000 of United States paper currency in circulation, only silver certificates (less than 10 percent) have anything behind them but debts.

I do not condone the present monetary situation in this country which I think is unsound and inflationary. Nevertheless, for a Member of the House to sponsor a statement that there is nothing but debts behind 90 percent of our paper currency in circulation is a very serious matter, and if true it should startle the American people. The truth is that the law requires that our paper currency, other than silver certificates, be backed 25 percent with gold. Actually today this paper currency is backed with nearly double that amount of gold. It is true that you cannot get this gold, but nevertheless it is there. Mr. Speaker, irresponsible and incorrect statements such as this only further confuse and disturb the American people, and in my opinion Members of Congress should be particularly alert to prevent such occurrences.

If Mr. McBride wants to startle the American people he should tell them the truth about the silver situation. He points out that the law requires 77 percent of an ounce of silver to be set aside to back each paper dollar issued by the Treasury. He also points out that this silver is today worth about 70 cents. What he fails to tell the American people is that silver is a commodity which varies in value whereas gold, which is our standard money, has a constant value of \$35 per ounce. This value is guaranteed by law. The value of silver,

on the other hand, is determined by what it will bring in the market. This value is at present controlled by producers of silver and Mexico. In other words the silver backing paper money fluctuates. Obviously then, silver should not be used to back our currency. It has a very proper use in our currency system for subsidiary coins such as the half-dollar, quarter, and the dime. Otherwise it is not needed in our monetary system. The Government has accumulated nearly 2,000,000,000 ounces of silver whose true worth is what it will bring in the open market. The first step in a return to a sound-money basis which Mr. McBride advocates should be the repeal of the silver-purchase laws which require the Treasury to keep purchasing silver regardless of need.

The Benton Resolution for the Expulsion of Senator McCarthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Get McCARTHY Still the Order," published in the *Huntington (W. Va.) Herald-Dispatch* of August 9, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"GET McCARTHY" STILL THE ORDER

Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin, has so upset the administration's political playhouse by his relentless ment-ax attacks on Communists and fellow travelers in Government that he has for some time been the Fair Dealers' No. 1 enemy and a target for every contrivable smear.

The latest attempt to "get McCARTHY" is the resolution to expel him from his seat.

Stooging for the resolution in the Senate is Senator WILLIAM BENTON, Democrat, of Connecticut, whose philosophy and activities have brought him within the range of McCARTHY's guns and who would seem to be better qualified to perform as a Truman kitchen-cabinet errand boy than a hatchet man assigned to trim the Wisconsin battler down to size.

Senator McCARTHY attacked the sinister Red web that had been insidiously woven into the fabric of official policy-making Washington since before the outbreak of World War II with a double-barrel shotgun loaded with scatter shot because by no other method could even the edge of the target be hit behind the determined, desperate New Deal-Fair Deal-Truman administration cover-up.

When circumstances compel the use of scatter shot, some who are innocent may get hit.

But any objective appraisal of what has transpired since the McCARTHY anti-Red attacks began points up the one important fact, namely, the Commies and their fellow travelers, the Hesses and all the rest who had infiltrated our Government, wouldn't be on the run or in prison today, if it were not for McCARTHY's relentless, uninhibited,

meat-ax assaults on not only the known but the suspected enemies of America.

Hardly an area of inquiry initiated by Senator McCARTHY has failed to turn up evidence of the Red taint, and most of them have been the objects of belated investigation and prosecution by Government agencies which should have performed their duty months or years before, without the prodding of a public aroused by McCARTHY'S charges.

A Senate whose membership continues to stomach the rottenness of the Missouri gang that has captured the White House, whose majority party will permit itself to be led and spoken for by a William Boyle, that will blink at all the thievery and influence peddling, the St. Louis election scandals, and the sordid pages without number in the Truman administration's record of political chicanery is a dubious instrument to entrust with such a loaded resolution as Senator BENTON has introduced.

It is a stacked partisan deck to begin with, and the vote by the Rules Committee yesterday demonstrated anew the willingness of some Republican Members of the Senate to play a sell-out game with the Fair Dealers for personal reasons of pique or preferment.

Senator BENTON'S asserted complaint is based, of course, on the Maryland election which unseated Senator Tydings, whom Senator McCARTHY charged influenced the celebrated committee "whitewash" of the inquiry into Red influences in the State Department. The real complaint of the Fair Dealers, however, is Senator McCARTHY'S success in blasting away the administration's cover-up.

Tribute to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "History Will See Truman," which was published in the August 13 issue of the Fairmont Times, of Fairmont, W. Va.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HISTORY WILL SEE TRUMAN

President Truman is characterized as a man of "firmness, vigor, courage, and vision" by Henry Commager noted author and professor of history at Columbia University. Writing in the issue of Look magazine, just released, Dr. Commager declares that by all moral standards President Truman's administration "has been one of almost uninterrupted and unparalleled success," and he predicts that history will recognize it as such.

Recalling that every President we now call great was denounced by his contemporaries, Dr. Commager asserts that President Truman was correct in saying that the verdicts of contemporary critics and of the historian rarely agree.

Citing President Truman's record, Dr. Commager states in Look that at no previous time have Americans enjoyed such widespread prosperity, nor ever before in peacetime have farm, labor, and corporation incomes been at a comparable peak. However, Dr. Commager says, the President's most important accomplishments "are clearly in foreign fields. If we are to generalize here," he writes, "we can say that no other

President except Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt has appreciated as fully the extent to which American power involves American responsibility."

In foreign relations, Dr. Commager contends, President Truman "has revealed a firm grasp on the necessity of combining vigor with moderation, generosity with tolerance, a zeal for peace along with readiness for war."

Dr. Commager admits that the President's record is less impressive in the domestic than in the foreign field, but he points out that in spite of Congress' opposition Mr. Truman's administration must be credited with a large body of significant domestic legislation including the reorganization of Congress; a National Security Act; increasing Federal aid to education; the extension and liberalizing of social security; and steady advances in the field of civil rights.

That there are many things amiss with the Truman administration no one in his senses will deny, Dr. Commager concludes in Look. "But it seems clear," he says, "that the verdict is so far favorable, and that much of the criticism that fills the air is directed not to Truman's failings but to his successes."

Senator McCarthy Debate With Marquis Childs and Marshall McNeil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "McCARTHY and His Critics," published in the Passaic Herald-News of August 8, 1951, discussing my appearance on the Meet the Press program on August 7 last.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

McCARTHY AND HIS CRITICS

Newspapermen often squirm in their seats when Hollywood's movie-makers present the news room as it is not. They feel embarrassment when smart aleck writers from the Rountree-Spivak "stable" fire impertinences and loaded questions at public officials whom these columnists do not like, during televised Meet the Press interviews.

Many men of the "working press" had a half hour's enjoyment at home last night when Senator Joe McCARTHY turned the tables on two hecklers. Marquis Childs, a New Deal columnist who pontificates from a Washington ivory tower, probably wishes he had not gotten fresh with the Senator, who pinned his shoulders to the mat more than once. Marshall McNeil, whose gauche-erie about crap shooting slapped back at him, knows now he ought to read his own Texas papers.

Left wingers and phony liberals have be-deviled McCARTHY and twisted his words ever since the Wisconsin Senator invited attack by every administration spokesman with his charges that Communists and fellow travelers had wormed their way into the State Department. When his detractors snipe at him from ambush he cannot get at them. But when they meet him face to face, he is their match—"standing off or rough-and-tumble." Moreover, the old marine enjoys it, and he comes prepared.

Missouri Basin Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Record, I include herewith two articles, the Missouri Basin Problem, and, Definitions: MVA, Pick-Sloan Plan, Missouri Basin Interagency Committee, taken from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Sunday, August 5, 1951:

THE MISSOURI BASIN PROBLEM—NINE DISASTROUS FLOODS IN 9 YEARS RAISE VIGOROUS NEW DEMANDS FOR UNIFIED CONTROL PLAN IN VALLEY—IMMEDIATE NEED IS TO GET MONEY FROM CONGRESS AND AROUSE PUBLIC SUPPORT; NEXT IS DECISION ON PRESENT VOLUNTARY COOPERATION OR BASIN-WIDE CONTROL

(By Richard G. Baumhoff)

After the ninth flood in the Missouri River Basin in 9 years, demands are being renewed vigorously "to do something about it." This time the huge damages, coupled with loss of life and severe disruption of the heart of the Nation, put fresh urgency in the demands.

Last month's inundation, which reached levels exceeded only slightly by the record flood of 1844, occurred principally along the Kansas River and its tributaries in Kansas and along the Missouri River from Kansas City to St. Louis. The overflow then followed the lower Mississippi. With the flood waters receding, review of the situation by the Post-Dispatch shows that two elements are outstanding.

The immediate question: Obtaining big appropriations from Congress for carrying out extensive existing plans for flood control. In many important instances this involves obtaining local public support, which now may be more readily forthcoming than heretofore.

The long-range question: Whether a single, unified, specifically chartered administrative agency shall supplant the present divided authority and voluntary coordination. Such a unified agency would be regional, charged only with duties in the Missouri basin, unlike the existing set-up operated by branches of Federal departments with headquarters in Washington and responsibilities throughout the Nation. The long-proposed Missouri Valley Authority, or conceivably some variant, would constitute such a regional administration.

The existing so-called comprehensive plan for development of the Missouri Valley, being coordinated by the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee, contemplates expenditures aggregating \$13,930,538,702, according to the latest available compilation. That figure is about 2 years old. It includes more than a billion dollars earmarked for flood control.

A revision is under way now, which, it is expected, will show an increase of about 10 percent in the over-all program—about half of the increase being attributed to inflation, the remainder to addition of new projects to the plan.

This means that the existing official plan calls for eventual total expenditure of about 15½ billion dollars. This would be mainly Federal money, but nearly one-third would represent private investments on the land of the basin, and the balance would be expended by the States and local governmental units.

The program includes flood control; irrigation; hydroelectric power; navigation; ex-

tensive soil conservation and many other related measures dealing with the land; extensive stabilization of small watercourses; recreation facilities; fish and wildlife promotion, and many lesser related subjects.

Expenditures on the program so far are estimated to have exceeded \$1,358,285,000. This is largely for work since 1945, but includes some old projects such as Fort Peck Dam, also all past navigation work.

Principal divisions of the latest, or 1949, compilation of the program, are:

Corps of Engineers.....	\$2, 102, 400, 751
Bureau of Reclamation.....	3, 290, 579, 217
Other Interior Department bureaus.....	23, 777, 159
Agriculture Department, for the extensive basin pro- gram awaiting approval by Congress.....	3, 092, 328, 000
Private expenditures in con- nection with above agri- culture program.....	5, 030, 550, 000
State and local governmen- tal expenditures on above agriculture program.....	380, 638, 575
Miscellaneous State expend- itures.....	10, 265, 000
Total.....	13, 930, 538, 702

The Agriculture Department's program contemplates total expenditures, Federal, private, State and local, as above, of \$8,503,516,575. A considerable part of this huge undertaking would have important incidental effects contributing to flood abatement, this refers to soil conservation, small watercourse stabilization and forest and range land improvement measures.

The Interagency plan contemplates comprehensive development, dealing with all major resource needs of the basin. That is the ideal also for an MVA or any other form of administration. An essential difference at this point of development, as between interagency and MVA, for example, is the form of management, rather than the general characteristics of the plan. Any plan that would meet with general public approval now undoubtedly would have to take all aspects of development into consideration.

There has been no definitive breakdown or allocation of eventual costs as between the various functions of the interagency plan, but a start in this direction was contained in the report early this year of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission. This division was as follows:

Flood control.....	\$1, 005, 000, 000
Irrigation	2, 585, 000, 000
Agriculture program (other than irrigation) (Federal only)	2, 860, 000, 000
Hydroelectric power.....	849, 000, 000
Navigation	350, 000, 000
Municipal water supplies.....	43, 500, 000
Total	7, 692, 500, 000

Such allocations as the foregoing are essentially arbitrary, being related to the so-called benefits of the various functions. Much flood-control effect is obtained from multiple-purpose dams, and it would be virtually impossible to segregate exact physical costs by functions.

The plan of flood control—by just what means and at just what locations floods could be curbed—might be changed under some change in management. It could be changed under the existing form. Indeed, it has been altered markedly in the Osage subbasin of Missouri and Kansas and is under process of radical change in the Grand River subbasin of northern Missouri. A proposal for extensive enlargement of the plan in Kansas is pending in Congress.

The Army engineers, who have the legal responsibility for flood control now, have said that design of projects presently proposed

might be changed as a result of findings in the recent flood.

Background of the failure to build numerous flood-control projects in the rich, populous lower end of the Missouri Basin, especially in Missouri and Kansas, was told recently in considerable detail in two articles in the Post-Dispatch, last July 3 and July 20.

SOIL CONSERVATION NOT ENOUGH

Repeatedly through recent years the argument has been made by some persons that thorough-going soil conservation would abate floods, as it would appreciably reduce the runoff of storm water and melting snow as well as preserve needed land. However, even the Federal Department of Agriculture—which has had a tremendous program for soil control and related measures throughout the Missouri Basin pending in Congress without action for almost 2 years—does not claim that soil conservation alone could prevent floods. It is generally agreed by engineers and other well-informed specialists that dams and levees are vital elements in flood control.

There also is general acceptance throughout the Missouri Valley of the idea that flood control is only one of numerous undertakings to be dovetailed in conserving and developing all natural resources of this area. The basin covers a sixth of the Nation, but has only about a twentieth of the country's population.

DEMANDS FOR VALLEY AUTHORITY

The Missouri Valley Authority has long been the outstanding specific proposal for unified regional administration. Severe floods in the Missouri River in 1943 and again in 1944, during World War II, started the demands for doing something about the great, unruly stream.

Early in 1944 the Pick plan was issued by the Army's Corps of Engineers. It dealt essentially with flood control in the humid eastern end of the valley. This was followed speedily by the Sloan plan of the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation, dealing chiefly with irrigation in the dry western portion. The authors were Lewis A. Pick, then Missouri River division engineer for the Army engineers, now a lieutenant general and Chief of Engineers, and W. G. Sloan, then an assistant regional director of the Reclamation Bureau, now retired.

It was at once apparent that there were conflicts of ideas and jurisdiction. It was then that the Post-Dispatch devoted its entire editorial space, Sunday, May 14, 1944, to a now famous editorial. This was titled "One River—One Problem" and addressed to one editors of the Missouri Valley. It proposed creation of a Missouri Valley Authority, a Government corporation, to carry out the development of this basin in the pattern of the successful Tennessee Valley Authority, established in 1933.

"The time has come," said the opening statement of the editorial, "to recognize that the Missouri River is one big river presenting one big problem."

ESSENTIALS OF MVA IDEA

It cited the following "essentials of the TVA idea" as the design for an MVA:

"A Federal autonomous agency, with full authority to make decisions within the region.

"Responsibility to deal with resources as a unified whole, clearly fixed in the regional agency, not divided among several centralized agencies.

"A policy, fixed by law, that the Federal, regional agency work cooperatively with and through local and State agencies."

"This newspaper," the editorial added, "confesses an error of the past—a preoccupation with the interests of its own section, to the exclusion of those of Montana, Kansas, Nebraska, and the Dakotas."

Widespread attention was attracted by the editorial and by the consistent policy

of the Post-Dispatch ever since in reporting comprehensively and objectively news developments in the MVA movement and subsequent activities and in maintaining editorial demands for unified regional administration. The appeal to editors in the original editorial, however, attracted more support from newspapers and magazines in other parts of the country than in the Missouri Basin.

PICK-SLOAN PLAN COMPROMISE

Meanwhile, the governors of the 10 States of the valley, through their Missouri River States Committee, realized the need for reconciling the Pick plan and the Sloan plan. By the autumn of 1944 they had brought this about and Congress received the famous Pick-Sloan plan. This was quietly enacted into law in the 1944 Flood Control Act, passed late that December.

In the summer of 1945 the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee was formed as the extra-legal, voluntary coordinating body. It consists of one representative each from six major Federal departments concerned with the basin and five governors delegated by their States' committee. Pick-Sloan has been expanded by addition of some projects, including notably some big ones authorized earlier, and also including some activities of the States. Thus the undertaking has become in reality the interagency plan.

The great bulk of expenditures have been by the Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation. Most of the work has been and is being done, so far, in the middle and upper portions of the basin. The Army engineers have declared—and there is evidence in verification—that either serious public opposition or changes in plans demanded locally have prevented them from proceeding with many projects in the lower or eastern end of the valley.

MURRAY'S SERIES OF MVA BILLS

The first MVA bill was introduced in Congress August 18, 1944, by Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Montana Democrat and liberal. Like its successors to date, it failed to progress. The second bill, in 1945, was referred by President Truman, then Vice President, to unfriendly Senate committees, an action for which he was roundly criticized by MVA backers. The measure did not reach the Senate floor. Truman in the electoral campaign of 1944 and since he became President, has made statements seeming to give some support to the MVA idea, not backed by action.

A third bill followed, then, in 1949, the fourth and, finally, the fifth, presented last July 23.

President Roosevelt approved the 1944 Flood Control Act with the "distinct understanding that it is not to be interpreted as jeopardizing in any way the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority." Roosevelt died in the spring of 1945, while the second MVA bill was pending. He had been the vigorous backer of the long efforts of the late Senator George W. Norris to create the Tennessee Valley Authority.

VARIOUS OBJECTIONS MET

In the course of the series of MVA bills various changes have been made in an effort to meet criticisms and overcome objections. Opponents still maintain that powers of the MVA, as they have been proposed, would be too broad and far-reaching. One of the favorite attacks on MVA has been that it would be a socialistic superstate, based at Washington, out of reach of the people, whereas the interagency method is represented as the essence of democracy.

As a matter of fact, the MVA scheme would require a direct regional administration, subject only to the normal powers of Congress, whereas the interagency constituents are part of the federalized system of Government wholly dependent on Washington. The last MVA bill specifically provided that MVA, a management agency, could arrange with

existing agencies, such as the Army engineers and Reclamation Bureau, to handle construction of projects for which they are especially qualified.

Questions frequently asked are: What is the MVA plan? How would its projects differ from the Interagency plan?

There is no MVA physical plan. It would not be feasible to set one up by the congressional bill. Establishment of a plan would be the first duty of an MVA if and when established.

The MVA bill specified, however, that basin development projects for which Congress already has made appropriations should be retained in MVA's plan "insofar as practicable." This makes the likelihood slim for any radical change from existing physical plans, as Interagency's work has gone so far already.

AROUSED PUBLIC SUPPORT NEEDED

For a time there was a vigorous organization backing MVA, the regional committee for a Missouri Valley Authority. Its main support came from labor and liberal elements. A principal financial backer was the CIO, while much of its push came from the National Farmers Union. This organization has become dormant. Senator MURRAY, leading congressional backer of MVA, has become preoccupied with various other interests, especially since he became chairman of the Senate's Labor and Public Welfare Committee in the current session.

Members of the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce voted 776 to 700 in favor of an MVA in a secret vote taken among the 3,270 members in April 1945.

The question now is whether the impetus of the disastrous flood will be sufficient to arouse support for funds for flood control and support for a unified regional management of the basin's development.

DEFINITIONS: MVA, PICK-SLOAN PLAN, MISSOURI BASIN INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE

Three terms recur frequently in discussions of the flood-control problem and other matters concerning the great watershed of the Missouri River. These are Missouri Valley Authority, Pick-Sloan plan, and Missouri Basin Interagency Committee.

They concern an area covering one-sixth of the Nation, including about half of the State of Missouri. It stretches from the Missouri River's mouth just north of St. Louis to the Continental Divide in the Rocky Mountains, from central Colorado to the Canadian border of Montana.

Definitions of these terms follow:

Missouri Valley Authority: This would be a planning and administrative agency to handle unified development and management of the natural resources of the whole watershed. It would be a strictly regional organization, in the nature of a Federal Government corporation, operating only in this valley, and with its officials and staff situated within the valley. It would follow the pattern of the successful Tennessee Valley Authority. An MVA has been proposed in a bill now before Congress.

Pick-Sloan plan: This term is loosely applied to the existing plans of existing agencies for development of the basin. It represents a 1944 merger of the Pick plan of the Army's Corps of Engineers, which was based on flood control and kindred subjects, and of the Sloan plan of the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation, which was pitched on irrigation and related fields. Gradually since 1945 the plan has in actuality been expanded into an interagency plan of the interagency committee. The latter plan is an effort to achieve a more comprehensive development, covering a greater field of activity. It has absorbed some projects dating from both before and after the more limited Pick-Sloan plan.

Missouri Basin Interagency Committee: This is a voluntary or extralegal coordinating agency for the valley work, established in 1945 by a similar national committee at Washington representing six major Federal departments. It holds public meetings nearly every month in various parts of the basin and through technical staffs of the respective departments, carries out its coordinating endeavors. Federal departments represented on the basin committee are: Corps of Engineers, Interior (including Bureau of Reclamation and other agencies), Agriculture, Commerce, Federal Power Commission, and Federal Security Agency (representative chiefly of the Public Health Service). The 10 States in the basin are represented with a strong voice in Interagency by a delegation of five Governors chosen by the Governors' Missouri River States Committee.

Proposed State Television Network in Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on Sunday evening, July 29, 1951, Mr. George E. Sokolsky broadcast a statement over the facilities of the American Broadcasting Co. under the headline "Shoot the works" regarding a proposal to establish a State television network in Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOOT THE WORKS

The General Assembly of Pennsylvania has before it a bill, No. 784, which interests me because it is indicative of a general unwholesome trend in this country for the Federal Government, the States, and municipalities to compete increasingly with private enterprise.

It used to be said that when private enterprise failed, it was the duty and obligation of government to step in.

But that is not true of radio or television. They are, on the whole, well-managed organizations, performing a useful service, doing it better than anywhere else on earth, although still not good enough, and making a profit at it.

This Pennsylvania bill is only important because it shows that the politicians cannot keep their hands off things. Because there has been an important discussion concerning the use of television for educational purposes, particularly as regards children, these Pennsylvania politicians jumped the gun and want to set up a costly system, competitive with private enterprise. If they get away with this proposal, it will be followed in other States and will place upon the taxpayer another unjustified and heavy burden.

This is the preamble of the Pennsylvania bill No. 784:

"To provide for the establishment of a State television network to be licensed by the Federal Communications Commission for noncommercial educational service authorizing the survey and purchase of necessary sites and equipment providing for the

construction of a master station and subsidiary stations as may be needed for State-wide coverage creating within the department of public instruction a division of audio-visual education and defining its powers and duties conferring powers and imposing duties upon the superintendent and department of public instruction and making an appropriation."

I note that they start with a \$100,000 appropriation. That looks small enough, but it is only a starter. It strikes me, after reading all that the politicians put into the bill, that a first expenditure of \$25,000,000 would be low. And that is a first cost. This television network is to be operated without any revenue, which means that every year there would have to be appropriations to keep it going. Those appropriations could become enormous.

For instance, how many cities are to have booster and subsidiary stations? I note that the bill calls for schools of the air, whatever that may mean. There will be a widespread distribution of scripts and transcripts. And, of course, land and buildings will be bought all over the place, probably marble front buildings with the politicians' names on the cornerstones.

This Pennsylvania bill for a State television system is an example of what Senator BYRD of Virginia has been quarreling about so valiantly, the habit of politicians of spending this country into bankruptcy. It is like the discovery by the Washington Times Herald of millions of dollars of office desks and furniture in forgotten warehouses in Washington. It is why the Hoover Commission reports have not been implemented. Had they been, this Government of ours would have saved some money.

"Shoot the Works!" is apparently the motto of our era.

And we are shooting the works. I suggest that citizens watch in their own States for such fandangles as this Pennsylvania bill. This is a good time for retrenchment not for expansion. Our citizens got a pretty good education without television and I do not see that we are producing such a wonderfully educated race of men with all the new and so-called progressive ideas that have come into our educational system in recent years. The intelligence tests during World War II, after a generation of fussing over the schools, did not prove the worth of so-called progressive education.

Apart from that, I do not like to see the politicians get their hands on the means of expression of this country. There is too much propaganda. The State Department, for instance, maintains a vast propaganda force designed to influence the minds of our people. Actually, we should make up our own minds and the politicians should be subordinated to the will of the people.

It is scandalous that General MacArthur should have felt that he had to say this in Boston:

"I have been warned by many that an outspoken course, even if it be solely of truth, will bring down upon my head ruthless retaliation—that efforts will be made to destroy public faith in the integrity of my views—not by force of just argument but by the application of the false methods of propaganda. I am told in effect I must follow blindly the leader—keep silent—or take the bitter consequences.

"I had thought Abraham Lincoln had pinned down for all time this ugly code when he declared: 'To sin by silence when they should protest makes cowards of men.'"

Surely, something has gone wrong with the American conception of liberty if anyone would dare say to any citizen that he may not speak his mind on a public question.

There is danger for all of us when the

Government—when any agency of government—Federal, State, or municipal—takes over the control and management of the means of expression. Look what Hitler did to the magnificent German people by use of the radio. He hammered their minds on the anvil of government propaganda until he virtually drove them into a madness that made them morally and spiritually comatose.

There is too much Government propaganda and too little truth. For instance, the other day, Dean Acheson announced to the world that by 1954, European military aid will cost the United States \$25,000,000,000. If that is what we have to pay to get allies, I suppose we have to do it.

But I could not help wondering what the British and the French are putting up. How much? How much in money or wealth is anybody else putting up?

I should like to see some figures on what General Eisenhower is accomplishing in Europe. I see a lot of photographs. I see a lot of handshaking in those photographs. But I see no statistics.

If you have a Government-owned television network, competing with private, free stations, you will have lots of speeches on how excellent the Government is. Obviously, there is already too much Government in all countries which puts a ceiling on individual initiative and ingenuity.

The McCarran committee has opened its hearings of its investigation of the Institute of Pacific Relations. The first witnesses were Edward C. Carter who for many years managed the Institute, and Frederick Vanderbilt Field, who used to be its financial angel.

Field is now in jail in connection with the bail cases involving Communists in New York with whom he has had many public and long associations.

The first evidence produced a curious letter from Owen Lattimore to E. C. Carter in which Lattimore congratulates Carter for his support of the position of the Communists in China.

The disclosure of that letter, written in 1938, is possible because of the seizure of the files of the institute from Carter's barn in Lee, Mass. There were thousands of documents, some of which I have seen. This Lattimore letter is of such a nature that it raises anew the charges of Senator JOE McCARTHY.

Many regard Senator McCARTHY as a wild man who makes charges without investigation. He had made severe charges against Lattimore which the Tydings committee last year investigated. Senator Tydings whitewashed Lattimore and was defeated in the subsequent election.

But now we have this letter in which Lattimore not only congratulates Carter but instructs him. I shall read the pertinent words:

"For China, my hunch is that it will pay to keep behind the official Chinese Communist position—far enough not to be covered by the same label * * * for the British, scare the hell out of them in a polite way * * * for the U. S. S. R.—back their international policy in general, but without using their slogans and above all without giving them or anybody else an impression of 'subservience.'"

You will find that this letter comes up again and again in this McCarran investigation. It is the key to much that happened to make the State Department so tolerant of Communists up to the Korean War. And Senator PAT McCARRAN can't be called off. He will fight this thing through. His committee will fight this thing through until we know the truth.

General MacArthur said:

"I shall raise my voice as loud and as often as I believe it to be in the interest of the

American people. I shall dedicate all of my energies to restoring to American life those immutable principles and ideals which your forebears and mine handed down to us in sacred trust. I shall assist in the regaining of that moral base for both public and private life which will restore the people's faith in the integrity of public institutions and the private faith of every man in the integrity of his neighbor.

"I shall set my course to the end that no man need fear to speak the truth."

Green Tomato Auctions Start

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article taken from the Wilkes-Barre Record on August 10, 1951, entitled "Green Tomato Auctions Start":

GREEN TOMATO AUCTIONS START—FIRST OF SERIES SLATED TODAY AT SYBERTSVILLE

Green tomato auctions, an industry that has grown locally to \$750,000 annually, will get underway in Luzerne County today with the opening sale at Sybertsville, Conyngham Valley, starting at 3 p. m. Auctions will be held at the same hour Monday, Wednesday, and Friday of each week.

Luzerne County Farm Agent James Hutchison said last night the Carverton auction will start Saturday at 3 and will be held Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday of each week.

Bloomingsdale auction will start August 18 at 11 a. m. and will continue each Tuesday and Saturday until frost.

For the past 15 years farmers of the second largest vegetable-producing county in the State have been growing tomatoes for the "Green Wraps" markets.

"Green Wraps" is a name given to tomatoes picked green and sold to buyers who, in turn, sell them in the South as "pink" tomatoes, or to New York packers who "pink" them by sprinkling water and providing extra heat, causing tomatoes to pink more readily.

Tomatoes grown in the upland soils of the county and particularly the volusia clay loams, are especially fine for green wrapping. Mostly of the Rutgers variety, they are solid and pack well, retaining a fine flavor even though not actually ripened on the vine.

These tomatoes must be picked at precisely the right time, approximately 5 to 7 days before they ripen on the vine, or they will not ripen properly in the markets. They are graded for size and shape and until recent years were wrapped in thin glazed paper and packaged in 30-pound bags or 12-quart climax boxes.

In 1946, farmers organized the Carverton Upland Tomato Growers Association, Inc., under the supervision of the Luzerne County Agricultural Extension Association, and started a tomato auction. It is held 3 days a week and attended by most of the buyers who are interested in shipping tomatoes to New York and Philadelphia, or even as far away as Miami, Fla., and New Orleans, La.

The participating farmers drive their truck loads past the auction block, giving each buyer an opportunity to get an over-all view of each load. One basket, picked at random by a disinterested party, is dumped for the buyers to further see the quality of tomatoes

offered for sale. The tomatoes are sold to the highest bidder with the guaranty that each basket on that load will be as good as the sample.

Before the auction was started, farmers were getting 35 or 40 cents for a half-bushel basket of tomatoes. The average price the first year of the auction was \$1.24. Prices varied according to the quality of tomatoes and the amounts required by the buyers. In addition to the additional profit realized per basket of tomatoes, the growers had further advantages in that they were practically assured of a market for their crop, and they were fairly certain that they would be paid according to the quality of their own goods, and not just receive the price of the day.

Buyers were also pleased with this method of purchasing large quantities of tomatoes, because it was no longer necessary for them to go from one farm to another to bargain for the quantity and quality of tomatoes they wished to pack.

Here they were able to view all the loads and compare them before the auction began, and then get a closer view of a sample basket as each load was auctioned off. Since the farmers had meetings in which correct methods of selecting and grading tomatoes for market were demonstrated, the tomatoes as a whole were superior to those purchased in the valley before the auction, and because all tomatoes were guaranteed to be good as the sample basket, buyers were able to be fairly sure of what they were getting, and the price varied largely according to quality.

Many buyers no longer wrap the tomatoes and put them in lugs. Instead, they are washed, sized, placed in Flafield crates and loaded immediately into trailer trucks which carry up to 400 crates or 800 half-bushel baskets. Thus the tomatoes could be put on the road for their final destination within a very short time after being purchased.

There are now three tomato auctions in this vicinity. Some of these offer as high as 10,000 baskets for sale on a good day. The region is known as the great tomato valley. It is conceded by all tomato buyers that the best tomatoes in the world are grown in the Wyoming Valley.

Western Europe Feels "No World War III"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copyrighted article containing an interview with Archbishop Cushing, who has just returned from Europe, dealing with conditions in Western Europe, and particularly in Spain. The article has already been read by more than 1,000,000 citizens of New England, and I think it would be well to share it with other citizens of the country. It was published in the Boston Advertiser of August 17, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WESTERN EUROPE FEELS "NO WORLD WAR III"
(By the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing,
D. D., archbishop of Boston)

The feeling in Western Europe today is that there will be no world war III.

This is the message I bring to the people of Boston and New England following our pilgrimage to Portugal, Spain and France, which was dedicated to world peace.

After talking with religious and political leaders in Western Europe I have found the consensus to be that the United States has averted an all-out war—at least for the time being—by showing the world its determination to halt Communist aggression.

The United States has told Russia in no uncertain terms it will fight if necessary to destroy the evils of communism and to preserve democracy. And western Europeans believe that this show of unflinching strength by America has made the Russians retreat from their policy of world military conquest.

However, this European optimism must not be allowed to deaden America's awareness of the Communist menace. The United States must not forget or ignore the fact that Russia still is bent upon the conquest of religion and the conquest of democracy.

What Russia does not dare do militarily at the moment, it will redouble its efforts to accomplish by its undermining sabotage tactics.

As long as the Communist spectre hovers over the world, the United States must continue to increase its military and political defenses.

Moreover, the people of the world who earnestly desire peace, must pray to Almighty God for peace.

The purpose of our pilgrimage was to pray for peace. The real solution to world peace can be obtained only by prayer and true religious living.

When we pilgrims debarked at Lisbon, Portugal, we were tired and worn from our arduous trip. Our minds were heavy because when we left Boston, on July 15, the world crisis was bleak.

But after visitations to the Shrine of Our Lady of Fatima, and the numerous other sacred shrines of Spain and France, our entire outlook was changed.

I talked with religious and political leaders of Western Europe, in addition to any number of people in all walks of life.

It was then I began to gather that war to the Western European is not nearly so apparent and inevitable as it is to Americans.

The people with whom I spoke can't conceive how Russia would dare war upon America. But, if the Russians prove to be that foolhardy, it was reassuring to know that Western Europe is prepared to jump to democracy's defense should a third world war break out ultimately.

Despite the common belief in Western Europe that another war will not occur at least for many years, the people of Spain and France are fully aware of the Communist menace. They are bitterly opposed to any appeasement of communism. They are ready and willing to fight any threat of Communist aggression toward their nations.

I had a conference lasting an hour and a half with Gen. Francisco Franco of Spain.

There are those who dislike General Franco. They argue against any aid to his government and to the people of Spain.

But after talking with General Franco I have come to the conclusion that his government is vitally necessary to the preservation of democracy in Western Europe.

General Franco assured me that the Spanish people have the will to fight any threat of Communist aggression in Western Europe. The Franco government has a standing army of 2,000,000 men—all remarkably trained soldiers.

If we do not accept Franco's military aid, we face chaos in Western Europe. After my talk with General Franco, I am convinced of his sincerity to aid the democracies. Franco, regardless of what some people think of his political views, is a man of great faith.

America must afford economic and political aid to General Franco's government so that Spain can help do our military job in Europe if a war with Russia should break out sometime in the future.

In this message, I also want to tell the people of the Boston Archdiocese that my prayers were offered daily during the pilgrimage for their spiritual and temporal well-being.

To the wives, parents, and other relatives of our men in the Armed Forces from the Boston Archdiocese, may I say that special prayers were offered up every day at all of the shrines we visited for your loved ones in battle.

The pilgrimage was very arduous, but the blessings and fruits of our visitations to the Shrine of Our Lady of Fatima, and all of the other shrines cannot be measured.

After recovering from a very bad cold which I acquired during the pilgrimage, I now feel quite well and am overjoyed with the prospect of arriving back in Boston late tonight.

As you know, we dock in New York today, and then entrain for Boston.

It was wonderful to have made the pilgrimage. We feel our prayers have been answered.

It will be wonderful, also, to be home again among the people of the Boston Archdiocese.

Give Me the American Sinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article commenting on world affairs by Mark A. Graubard, guest editor of *Skol*, the University of Minnesota student publication, which appeared in the March 1951 issue.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

My love for the underdog had lain chained and muzzled for years in punishment for his meddling habits, but at last broke out of his bondage. How long, he thundered, will this slander of America go on? Abuse, if you like, America's institutions, here uncouthness, ambitions, and brutality but spare something, for charity's sake; her youth perhaps, her womanhood (women and children, you know); spare perhaps a few kind words for her generosity, or—here I cut him short with one goodly blow of repression and a guilt complex. Enough of that, I said. You want to get me in trouble with my friends, my respectable neighbors, bosses, students, and the public?

And I am not kidding either. Can you imagine what would happen to anyone hereabouts who dared assert that America is not the vulgar country our intellectuals declare her to be; that Congress does represent the people; that Wall Street or big business does not run the country; but Congress and the President, the people's choice for good or evil; that a Senator who gets half a million votes is not quite the stupidest man in the State, but by and large represents the voters more faithfully than any highbrow would; that Americans are far more generous, less concerned with the dollar than Europeans, whose hunger for money is pathological, though understandable; that the American novel is not quite

rubbish; that even Hollywood has produced some daring and valuable pictures; that the easy-going American college student may be juvenile but is decent, willing, and unpolluted by as much provincialism, social and intellectual snobbishness as beset his European cousins; that—etc., etc. Don't assert it brother. The abuse that greeted a Senator who said there were more men like Hiss in the State Department will hit you in the face, and if you are not a marine you may even be flooded by it. (Had the loon said there were 200 Fascists and militarists there he would have been hailed a hero.) So relax, find another underdog, and be on good behavior. Please.

And life will go on for *Homo Americanus* as before. If he is a small town storekeeper who minds his own business and mows his lawn, he will be a Babbitt. If he loves culture and yearns to go abroad he will be a Dodsborough. If he belongs to Rotary or Kiwanis to be a good fellow, listens to shady jokes once in a while, and creates in his clubs the biggest lecture market in the world, he is a gregarious boob. If he buys a painting and feels grand and artistic because the Mrs. yearns for a little culture, he is a money-eyed vulgarian. If he distributes \$42,000,000,000 in foreign relief and rehabilitation, he is merely filthy rich, and if he expects some favor or friendship in return he is a Shylock and selfish. If backward nations beg him to invest money in their neglected lands, he is an imperialist, and if he frees the Philippines he is an oppressor. If he distributes nickels to barefoot boys in Spain who follow him doggedly with outstretched hands, he scatters lightly men's sweat and blood. If he is a GI away from home giving kids gum and candy, he is uncouth; if he seeks a girl and gives her money because she is so poor and he can't give her a sonnet or a rose, he is cheap. Brother, there simply is no hiding place down here.

I took a European visitor to lunch last summer. On the lawn in front of Coffman Memorial Union sat a sweet thing gazing romantically toward the west, her eyes fixed on the Foshay Tower. Her boy friend lay on the grass with his head in her lap. The visitor frowned—such manners on a campus of a *universitatus*—no culture—these Americans. Oh, in Europe students are students. They wear university caps, carry Latin books, have mistresses, discuss Nietzsche and Leibnitz, and then marry decent girls in church.

Madame Pandit came to Minneapolis. Schools closed. Women ran to hear her platitudes. Editorials honored her. A noble foreign visitor. A few weeks later she appeared on a TV interview show, told Americans they were vulgar and cared only for money, were hysterical, distributed aid to dump their excess goods (while her brother is furious because we dump none on him) have no competent spokesmen, and if we only let her, she would do an excellent public relations job for us.

I was at two British universities and at Zurich. (I had a visitor's card with a police stamp, and knew I was abroad.) For an American student to criticize local politics or customs there, in letters or speeches, was unthinkable. But here our campus daily prints constant abuse from Dutch and German and Austrian and Norwegian students, and everybody exults in Amens. I have still to read an editorial in the same, praising some American Senator, or newly passed law, or some meager lesson we are reluctantly learning in our struggle to be left alone to enjoy our prosperity and our goal of the Fair Deal, or our amateurish attempts at strengthening our security, threatened from within and without. But I am forgetting the madmen in Washington, the hysteria, the witch hunt in present day America where life is such that, as Professor Wirth of Chicago puts it, "everyone suspects his neighbor." Alas, the only hysteria I have

found so far is the passion and frenzy generated when those worthy critics get together to shout "Hysteria!" "Witch hunt!" and then proceed to accuse, abuse, and vilify our culture, leaders, institutions, intentions, and our weak and inexperienced efforts at survival. But then I am only a smug middle class mentality, pooh. But since I have thus been caught redhanded, here is my confession:

Give me the simple-minded American student with all his faults, but free from nineteenth century medievalisms, petty European hates, snobbishness and provincialism. Give me the GI sentry in Germany who looked blank as he chewed his gum and listened to Margarette Buber (Under Two Dictators) seeking refuge behind American lines, and finally said, "O. K. sister. Go through." Said she, "I never heard such a beautiful arrangement of words before in my life." Give me the American sinner of the South and the North, and I still think that with some educational skill and understanding my future is more secure than with embittered, conceltd, and harassed Germans, Russians, or Rumanians. As to American culture, I wish I had more time for its science, literature, exhibits, concerts, and plays.

General Eisenhower's Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of August 14, 1951:

GENERAL EISENHOWER'S VIEWS

The dangers of any major cut in the \$8,500,000,000 foreign-aid program, which is facing crucial legislative tests this week, have now been laid before Congress by General Eisenhower, and Congress can ignore his views only at the risk of imperiling the task for which he was sent abroad, which is to organize the first-line defense of both Europe and the United States. As reported by a Senate subcommittee, General Eisenhower holds that the Western World is exposed to the constant threat of a Soviet army of 4,000,000 men backed by 20,000 war planes, not to speak of another million men in the satellite armies, that this threat compels the earliest possible conversion of Western Europe into a military bastion, which can be done only with American military and financial aid; and that the loss of this bastion, which would leave us standing alone in a hostile sea of communism, would make any attempted savings on our aid program payayune.

What is more, he holds that what must be done had best be done quickly, for "if we drag this job out, we fail." At best we would get half the result at twice the cost. He goes so far as to suggest—for the benefit of Congress, but also of Europe itself—that if we can't do the job in a reasonable length of time it can't be done at all and we had better get out. But he is confident that, given proper support, the job can be done. The material, intellectual, spiritual, technical, and professional resources of the free world are, in his view, so superior to those of the iron-curtain countries that fright or hysteria becomes ridiculous. But these resources must be mobilized to be effective,

and that requires the joint effort of both the United States and Europe.

In this joint effort the United States must provide some initial military forces which may have to exceed the six divisions already scheduled. But in the main the United States is called upon to provide the guns while Europe provides the bulk of the men. The subcommittee is frank in stating that Europe's progress in mobilization is far from satisfactory, but at least one of the factors in its delays is the lack of equipment from the United States, whose production program is just getting under way. Given adequate equipment, the European members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization can provide at least 3,000,000 men, and countries now being associated with the Atlantic defense system, such as Greece, Turkey, and Yugoslavia, can provide at least a million more, and every dollar saved on the foreign-aid program means so many fewer Europeans available to fight for themselves and for us.

Formosa as Bastion of Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Formosa as Bastion of Free World," written by May Craig, the well-known Washington correspondent of the Gannett papers in the State of Maine, written as a result of her recent tour through the Orient and particularly her visit in Formosa and conference with our American Minister, Hon. Karl L. Rankin, of Maine, incidentally, one of the most experienced of our career diplomats, and one who has been in key spots in troubled areas all over the world following his internment by the Japanese in the Philippines and his later service in Greece and the Orient.

This report seems most pertinent as we contemplate the consideration of the proposed Japanese peace treaty and its relation to the Chinese Nationalist Government in Formosa.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORMOSA AS BASTION OF FREE WORLD

(By May Craig)

TAIPEI, FORMOSA.—Two principal questions arise out of the complex situation in this key spot in the Pacific which yet so closely affects all the world. The most immediate is why the Chinese Nationalists are so upset about the proposed Japanese peace treaty, which they have not been invited to sign as one of the allies, in San Francisco, in September, and what can be done about this difficult situation created by their exclusion.

The other question is the future of Formosa, the home of the anti-Communist Chinese, the seat of the Nationalist Government in exile from the Communist-held mainland of China.

I asked these two questions of our American minister here, Karl L. Rankin. He is a calm, quiet, career diplomat, experienced in trouble spots. He was in Belgrade, interned for 2 years by the Japanese in Manila after Pearl Harbor. He was sent to

Greece when we were saving that key Mediterranean spot from the Communist guerrilla and propaganda war, sent to Shanghai but never got there because the Communists got there first, thrown out of Canton, then a term in Hong Kong. Now here.

As to the Japanese treaty, Mr. Rankin said that the Chinese Nationalist Government on Formosa, and many elements friendly to this Government, both Chinese and other nationalities, are deeply hurt by the omission of Nationalist China from the list of countries invited to sign the multilateral treaty. Their chagrin parallels that of the Philippines and Korea, though for reasons which differ in detail.

It is not hard to understand these bitter feelings in the countries so intimately involved in the war with Japan, Mr. Rankin says, and he has been in the Far East long enough to have an understanding of Oriental psychology. The bitter feeling is particularly true in free China, which lost all but a small fraction of its huge territory and population as an indirect result of the war, he says.

"Moreover, the Chinese Nationalists say and believe, that the influences which exclude them from the treaty are the same which favor extinguishing what remains of China's independence by turning over Formosa to the tender mercies of the Communists," Mr. Rankin says, and this is important in the great conflict between free world and Communist world which is shaping up on a global scale, with the fate of freedom in the balance.

"No less important in Nationalist Chinese minds is the necessity of continuing their mission on Formosa, which is to provide a rallying point which some day will play a vital part in liberating their homeland from the Communist yoke.

On the other hand, we may expect a growing realization among Chinese outside the iron curtain that the draft Japanese Peace Treaty, as published July 12, 1951, protects Chinese interests as well as any such document could be expected to do with or without the signature of the Nationalist Government.

"Careful study of the draft also will reveal to them few if any political features to which China could object, other than its omission from the list of signatories. It may also be expected that Free China, in general, will come to accept, as many of its leading citizens already do, the paramount importance to the Free World of a magnanimous peace treaty with Japan, including as many important countries as possible, and to be signed at the earliest possible date.

"There will remain the delicate but essential task of restoring normal relations between Japan and free China as soon as possible, along lines similar to those of the draft treaty. Despite all that has happened in the past, the good will and common sense existing on both sides make success both possible and probable. Any necessary support from friends abroad should not be withheld."

My own conversations with Japanese in Japan, with Chinese here, with Americans all over the Far East, confirm Mr. Rankin's sober words, and go further—that it is a mistake not to include Nationalist China in the Japanese treaty, to demonstrate that we mean what Assistant Secretary of State Dean Rusk said in May, that not only do we repudiate claim of the Red Chinese Communists that they represent the people of China, but that we reaffirm our position that the Nationalist Government, now seated in Formosa, is the true representative of the Chinese people.

If we are not to include Nationalist China in signature, as an ally in the multilateral treaty to be signed in San Francisco, then we should at least use our influence, which there is no use denying we have, to promote

an early treaty between Japan and Nationalist China. This influence should be used while we still have it, to shut out the Reds and to weld Japan and Free China in the anti-Communist crusade.

Coming to the second question, the future of Formosa, Mr. Rankin said: "Formosa can be the bastion; it can also be the show window and a rallying point for all Chinese who love freedom."

"Formosa," he said, "is so inextricably connected with most of the major international problems of the Far East that before considering its future, several prior assumptions are necessary. Suppose, for example, that substantially the present status quo is preserved on Formosa, until a satisfactory degree of peace and security can be established in the western Pacific."

This would allow for whatever military and economic strengthening of Formosa as is required to deter or defeat the attack which the Communists have repeatedly vowed to make. "Perhaps," Mr. Rankin says, "they will make the attack anyway, or maybe some new aggression elsewhere in the Far East would involve Formosa indirectly. There are so many possible combinations of factors, such complex speculations do not get us anywhere, do not permit us to see ahead with any clarity."

"So we come back to the only single assumption which involves a good measure of probability as well as enough known facts to give us a glimpse ahead—that Formosa will, with American help, remain outside the Iron curtain. From this point we can consider the prospects of our cooperative effort, with the Chinese, in strengthening the island's defenses and its economy. Fortunately, there is a great deal to start with. The armed forces include more than a half million men, a majority of whom have received considerable training and whose present equipment, while inadequate in amount, is by no means negligible. Formosa's industry is small but capable of considerable expansion at no great cost, while its agriculture produces more than enough food for the island's population of 8,000,000. Of this number, more than a million are children in school."

"The death rate on the island compares favorably with America and Europe, while law and order are on as satisfactory a basis as anywhere in the Far East."

"On such foundations a United States military and economic aid program is developing which promises to produce on Formosa a genuine situation of strength. This strength will be both a deterrent to further Communist aggression and an example of what international cooperation in the free world can accomplish in promoting the general welfare of a people." And then he re-emphasized that Formosa can be a bastion of this free world, a demonstration of democracy, a show window and a rallying point.

The Fulbright Exchange of Students Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star today. It is an excellent discussion of the exchange-of-persons program made possible by the law en-

acted on August 1, 1946, which I believe is making a real contribution to better relations among the peoples of the world. I believe this article will be of interest to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAMED FULBRIGHT ACT HAS SENT 1,907 ABROAD

In a world where Paris and Patagonia seem little farther than New York, more and more young Americans are packing their bags and setting off for study and travel in foreign lands.

The famed Fulbright Act has made a major contribution to this temporary exodus. It became law on August 1, 1946, when, amending the Surplus Property Act of 1944, it enabled a portion of the currencies and credits of other countries accrued by the United States through the sale of surplus property to be used for educational purposes.

Since then, the Fulbright program has sent 1,907 Americans from 48 States and the District of Columbia to study, teach, lecture or conduct research abroad, while 1,731 nationals of other countries received awards for similar projects here. Also, 646 foreign students have received scholarships for study in American schools in their home country. The competition for next year's awards closes October 15, 1951.

Although only graduate students are sent, college students may apply in their senior year for a grant to pursue graduate study overseas. According to Dr. A. J. Prohl, Fulbright adviser at the University of Maryland, students' interest does not seem to become sparked until they are seniors, although earlier interest can obviously be a boon to successful candidacy.

Candidates for study abroad must also be United States citizens, have a satisfactory knowledge of the country in which they plan to study, good health and a suitable plan of study or research.

The program of study planned, together with the qualifications the student has to carry it out, is the prime consideration, of course. But another important qualification is how well the students selected will represent America abroad, and how successfully they are apt to adjust to foreign ways of living. In remote regions, students must be virtually encyclopedias, full of knowledge on all manner of things American. And they must also be capable of understanding the people of the country which is their host.

It is quite important for students to have counsel, according to Dr. Prohl. When a student expresses interest in the program, his adviser discusses his background and plan with him, and suggests the university he might attend most profitably.

The volume of applications for Fulbright grants is tremendous, and that of student applications is particularly impressive. Walter Johnson, chairman of the Board of Foreign Scholarships, has stated. In all, approximately 600 American students went overseas last fall as Fulbright scholars—and some 7,000 applications were received for those 600 spots. To date, the following 21 countries have signed agreements to participate in student exchange, and several more may be included this year. Those now participating are Australia, Austria, Belgium, and Luxembourg, Burma, China (suspended), Egypt, France, Greece, India, Iran, Italy, Korea (suspended), the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand, and the United Kingdom.

England is students' first choice, according to information we obtained from the Division of Exchange of Persons of the Department of State, with the preponderance of applications for Cambridge and Oxford. The reputation of these schools, together with the absence of a language barrier in England, places them at the top of the list.

Second in popularity is France, with Italy third. The ratio varies, we were told, but in general about five or six times as many applications are received for these countries as there are scholarships available.

Grants, always awarded in foreign currencies, include cost of schooling, living expenses, and transportation to and from the foreign country. No additional provisions are made for married students.

Under the act, programs are put into effect only after an executive agreement has been signed between the United States and each participating country. The amount available in each country depends upon the sales of surplus property to that country and on the terms of the sales agreement. So, in England, France, and Italy the expenditure of the equivalent of \$1,000,000 annually is authorized while in Burma, New Zealand, and the Netherlands the equivalent of from \$100,000 to \$300,000 is available each year. It is anticipated that most, if not all, of the programs will be carried on for a period of approximately 20 years, and may involve as much as the equivalent of one hundred and fifty million American dollars.

When the competition closes in the fall, all applications are sent to the Institute of International Education and reviewed by committees especially organized for this purpose, made up of prominent educators and specialists in various subject-matter fields. These committees recommend panels of candidates for each country, normally in excess of the actual number of opportunities. These names, as well as the applications of all rejected candidates, are forwarded to the Department of State for final consideration by the 10-member Board of Foreign Scholarships, appointed by the President. Applications of recommended candidates are then sent to the appropriate binational foundation or commission overseas which determines whether the project of each applicant can feasibly be undertaken in that country, and also arranges affiliation with an institution of higher learning there. When the applications are returned to the Department of State, the Board then selects the recipients.

More than 800 American colleges have appointed Fulbright advisers to receive applications on their campuses, and to give information to interested students. Here is a list of advisers at schools in this vicinity:

Donald Derby, assistant to the president, Fulbright program adviser, the American University, Washington, D. C.

Dean J. M. Campbell, college of arts and sciences, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Sister Mary Justine, registrar, Dumbarton College, 2935 Upton Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Dr. Paul Locher, assistant professor of history, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.

Alan T. Delbert, George Washington University, Washington, D. C.

Dean William Stuart Nelson, Howard University, Washington, D. C.

Dr. Sadie St. Clair, Miner Teachers' College, Georgia Avenue and Euclid Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Dr. C. Grove Haines, School of Advanced International Studies, 1906 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

Mr. R. Bruin, Jr., business manager, South-eastern University, 1736 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Sister Ann Francis, dean of students (FSA), Trinity College, Washington, D. C.

Assistant Prof. Ethel Summy, education and psychology, Wilson Teachers College, Washington, D. C.

A. J. Frahl, acting head, foreign language department, University of Maryland, College Park, Md.

B. M.

President Truman's Third-Term Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by George Rothwell Brown relating to President Truman's campaign for a third term, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of August 13, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

President Truman's third-term campaign under the personal direction of Democratic National Chairman Boyle, is developing on the pattern first revealed at the meeting of the party leaders at Denver, in June.

The Washington administration was feeling the terrific impact of the scandals which had been dragged into the light by Democratic Senate committees, and the disclosures by KEFAUVER's television brigade of the tie-in between crooked politics and the underworld in big Democratic cities.

The decision was reached to meet these shattering assaults on the New Deal Party's integrity by the methods of counterattack.

The Republican opposition was branded the party of the smear, and an effort to fasten the war label on it was begun.

Republicans in Congress were falsely charged with having cut or refused appropriations for the development of the resources of Western States.

President Truman, in his letter to Philip Murray, adheres to the Denver pattern by charging the Republicans in Congress and in Kansas with responsibility for the vast flood damage in the recent disaster.

He ignored the fact that on August 2, 1945, he had by Executive order curtailed congressionally authorized expenditures for flood-control and river and harbor work by more than \$300,000,000, and that his own Budget Bureau had reduced funds for these purposes for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951, by \$344,777,200.

Earlier, on June 28, President Truman went overboard and declared that the aim of his administration was world peace and that he was dedicated to that goal. By inference the war party label was pinned on the GOP.

"They," he added, referring to those who have been opposing his socialistic money-squandering schemes, "are using the smear and the big lie for personal publicity and partisan advantage, heedless of the damage they do to the country."

"Never, not even in the bitterest campaigns, and I have been through many a one, have I seen such a flood of lies and slanders as is now pouring forth over the country."

Truman thus faithfully followed the new Democratic Party line, which is to meet legitimate criticism with the most vicious forms of attack.

The President's letter to Murray is a clear indication that he is after the electoral votes of the Midwest States, most of which he carried in 1948, and has confirmed the opinion that he will seek to succeed himself next year.

On the same day that Truman spoke at Detroit, Boyle, in a speech in New York, had

the superlative audacity to say that the President had been "a pioneer in acting to make sure that our Government was kept free of disloyal persons or anyone who might be a risk to our security."

Truman's disastrous "Red herring" remark in the Alger Hiss case, and the refusal of his Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, to "turn his back" on this jailbird perjurer, must be met in the approaching presidential campaign.

The technique is the smear. Thus, Senator BENTON steps up, and adds his contribution to the new party line.

His resolution that Senator JOE McCARTHY, of Wisconsin, resign or be expelled from the Senate follows the Denver pattern.

McCARTHY, who has won Nation-wide acclaim by his State Department exposure, is a menace to the third term in 1952. He must be destroyed or discredited.

It will be recalled that in every State where McCARTHY spoke last year in behalf of Republican candidates they were elected.

It will also be recalled that Connecticut Republicans gave McCARTHY the cold shoulder, with the result that Republican candidates were defeated, and two New Deal Democrats survived the Republican landslide.

BENTON must stand for reelection in 1952, and it is probable that Connecticut Republicans will not make the mistake they made in 1950, but put up a strong candidate against him, with support from McCARTHY.

McCARTHY, who comes up himself next year, will be under a mud barrage from now on. The dirtiest campaign in history is under way.

The Railroad Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I desire to include in the RECORD a heart-rending letter that has been received by Mr. T. C. Carroll, president of the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, from an aged widow of a deceased railroad employee who lives in Tennessee and who badly needs immediate assistance in the form of increased benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act. There are many similar cases coming to light daily. As the Members of the House know, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is now considering H. R. 3669. Should this bill be enacted into law, the woman who writes Mr. Carroll and who is now receiving \$28.60 a month, would receive an increased annuity amounting to \$52.90 a month. This increase, as provided in H. R. 3669, would almost double this widow's monthly allowance. It is distressing to me after reading this letter to contemplate the proposals that the Congress has heard regarding railroad retirement. Some railroad labor organizations representing a small minority of the total are asking us to enact legislation which would increase this woman's benefit by \$3 a month. This is totally inadequate and completely indefensible. I urge that the Congress immediately adopt H. R. 3669 in order that conditions

described in the letter below can be alleviated. The letter follows:

COOKEVILLE, TENN.

Mr. T. C. CARROLL,

President, Brotherhood of Maintenance-of-Way Employees:

I am writing you to see if there is a way you can help me to get my railroad pension raised. I am only getting \$28.60 a month and I can hardly get by on such a little, while I am very thankful for that much.

My husband had 36 years on the railroad and he passed away February 7, 1945, and his birth date is June 2, 1882, and my birth date is September 13, 1884. After my husband, James P. Jackson, passed away, I did not get anything from the railroad retirement until I was 65 years old and then I have got \$28.60 since then. But I haven't got any other income, only this \$28.60, and I know you surely can understand how hard it would be to try to pay room rent and get by, and things are so high to live on. Surely there is some way you can help me to get my pension raised so I could get by. I am not able to work and sure have no other income, only this. Will you please help me to get this pension raised? I pay \$12 a month for room rent so you can see how much I have left to live on. I know you can understand how it would be to try to get by on so little.

I do hope and pray to the Lord you can and will get my pension raised so I can live on what I get. Please do what you can for me on this. I will be so thankful for all that can be done for me.

Thanks to you,

Mrs. MARY LEE JACKSON.

Anti-McCarthy and Anti-American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Anti-McCARTHY and Anti-American," published in the Chicago Daily Tribune of July 23, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANTI-McCARTHY AND ANTI-AMERICAN

Republican Governor Kohler, of Wisconsin, has put in their place the Democratic smear artists of the State who are conducting a campaign against Senator McCARTHY, which they quaintly call Operation Truth. For some strange reason, the smear bund thought the Governor would go along with them and solicited a meeting. He undeceived them.

Noting that they are primarily concerned with getting newspaper publicity, he suggested that they could get more of it "if you will denounce the condonation of Alger Hiss by Dean Acheson, if you will exorcise the Missouri ballot frauds, the mink coat, home freezer and RFC scandals, the Kansas City killings of Democratic leaders in Democratic headquarters, and the general incompetence of the Democratic Party in the Nation."

On the specific issue of McCarthyism, as the smear artists like to call the Senator's attacks on communism within the administration, Governor Kohler referred to the Tydings committee whitewash, remarking

that McCARTHY's charges have not had a full or a fair hearing. He added that the Senator's activities pleased "neither the Communists nor certain Democratic leaders."

Like every other thoughtful citizen, Governor Kohler has no difficulty in seeing through Operation Truth. Senator McCARTHY's enemies have no wish to discuss his charges against Communists in the State Department. He has too much ammunition. The street corner gossip they are circulating against him is all in the nature of personal attacks, unrelated to the issue he has posed to the Nation. In short, they are dragging red herrings.

Typical of their charges is that the Senator violated the law when he ran for the Senate while a member of the bench in Wisconsin. That so-called crime certainly did not impress the voters of Wisconsin. They knew all about it, and they elected McCARTHY. The Senate refused to consider the matter.

The Madison Capital-Times and the Milwaukee Journal, which have been spearheading the drive to smear McCARTHY, cannot be called anti-Communist. The Senator has charged, in fact, that the Capital-Times had a party liner as one of its editors. The two newspapers may be against exposing communism in the administration from an excess of New Deal zeal, but whatever their motives, they are serving the Communist cause. As for those people who are mildly anti-McCARTHY, they may also consider themselves mildly anti-American.

Activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thorough statement made before the Banking and Currency Committee this morning by Mr. W. Stuart Symington, Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The statement covers the activities of the Corporation since Mr. Symington assumed office as Administrator, and I believe it should be included in the RECORD in order that Senators and others may understand what the RFC is doing under his administration.

I have been informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript will make 3 3/4 pages of the RECORD, at a cost of \$307.50.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a pleasure to appear before this committee.

The hearings before the RFC subcommittee raised important questions concerning the administration of the RFC. Steps have been taken to eliminate the causes for such questioning, and I would like to comment briefly on our present policies.

I am convinced that 99.9 percent of the RFC organization are honest, conscientious, and capable Americans. These people are determined that the RFC will again be known throughout the land as an example of honesty and integrity in Government.

The present activities of the RFC fall into two major groups. One has to do with the

lending of money, the other with the purchase and production of certain strategic materials. I will discuss the latter first.

RFC has jurisdiction over the production of synthetic rubber; also the refining and smelting of tin, and the production of abaca.

During the last year the requirements for these materials have greatly expanded; this as a result of the current mobilization program now being superimposed on an already full economy.

Under the authority of the Rubber Act of 1948, as extended by Public Law 575, RFC has expanded its operations in the synthetic rubber-producing facilities owned by the Government.

The above law specifies that synthetic-rubber-production facilities shall be maintained at an annual rated capacity of not less than 600,000 tons of general-purpose rubber, and not less than 65,000 tons of special-purpose rubber.

As a result of two outstanding reports on rubber by the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Forces Committee, the production of synthetic rubber was rapidly increased.

This recommendation proved wise, because already the above statutory capacity has proved insufficient. Already synthetic rubber at the rate of 950,000 tons is being programmed for the fiscal year 1952. To accomplish this goal, 11 additional facilities have been placed in production; 28 are now operating.

Without subsidy, the RFC is now selling synthetic rubber, at no loss, for less than half the world price of natural rubber.

It is estimated that 65 percent of the rubber now being used in American production is synthetic rubber.

Farmer, worker, and businessman all travel to work on rubber; and use it daily in countless other ways. The importance, therefore, of this RFC synthetic rubber program cannot be overemphasized.

May I insert in the record at this point this chart? [Chart not printed.] It illustrates graphically: (1) The increasing production of synthetic rubber, and (2) the favorable price relationship of synthetic against natural rubber.

Synthetic rubber would not have reached this advanced state of usefulness without research. The RFC synthetic-rubber research program, carried on in conjunction with many rubber manufacturers, has resulted in outstanding developments.

Included in this technical progress is the program of oil-extended rubber, a development that will increase the total supply of rubber with much less use of those components formerly necessary to produce the synthetic material.

Another development is cold synthetic rubber, a product that has proven superior to natural rubber in many applications.

Already it has been demonstrated that cold synthetic rubber for tread stock on tires has 20 percent to 30 percent better wearing qualities than natural rubber.

Improvements in the manufacture of synthetic rubber latex using the cold rubber process have resulted in a product now generally recognized to be as good or better than natural latex for the majority of uses.

Further research in this field is continuing, in order to secure superior products.

The significance of this program, to an America literally transported on millions of tons of rubber annually, is very great; because until the RFC synthetic-rubber program became a reality, nearly all rubber was controlled by either foreign governments, or foreign corporations set up by private interests with the approval of their governments.

To advise the RFC in its administration of the rubber program, we have established a Rubber Advisory Committee consisting of the following representatives of both large and small rubber companies who operate the

Government's rubber plants: John L. Collyer, president, B. F. Goodrich Co.; H. S. Firestone, Jr., chairman, Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.; A. L. Freedlander, president, Dayton Rubber Co.; Frank D. Hendrickson, president, American Hard Rubber Co.; H. E. Humphreys, president, United States Rubber Co.; P. W. Litchfield, chairman, Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.; Everett Moras, president, Simplex Wire & Cable Co.; Thomas Robins, Jr., president, Hewitt-Robins, Inc.; J. Penfield Seiberling, president, Seiberling Rubber Co.

We have had many highly constructive meetings with the members of this advisory committee.

Another strategic material in the RFC program is tin.

Unlike natural rubber, tin has no substitute except those our research laboratories are working hard to create. This country relies entirely on foreign sources for that tin necessary to produce tin plate, bearing babbits, solder, and the many other industrial uses.

During the last war, when the major sources of tin, Malaya and Indonesia, were cut off, the RFC built a smelter at Texas City, Tex., to process low- and high-grade tin ores from South America.

This smelter has been in continuous operation since 1941. It is now producing many thousands of tons of tin metal a year, about 50 percent of our current industrial consumption.

Several months ago, another classic Government report from the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee was released on tin. This report showed in convincing fashion how disastrous to the American taxpayer was the operation of this foreign cartel in the current rising demand tin market caused by mobilizing an already full economy.

The purchase of tin by the United States Government has now ceased, until such time as reasonably fair prices can be obtained from those foreign suppliers.

Immediately after the outbreak of the Korean war last June, the New York price of tin rose steadily, from 78 3/4 cents a pound to \$1.83 last January. At that time domestic prices were frozen. Foreign markets continued to rise, however, the Singapore price reaching \$1.93 on February 14.

The above Senate report, coupled with changed Government buying policies, resulted in a sharp decline in tin prices to \$1.34; but supported by the cartels, the price worked back up to over \$1.50.

This time, however, America was determined to cease buying at these exorbitant prices. As a result, the world tin price began to really fall. As of Monday, it was \$1.004.

The current RFC sales price is \$1.03.

May I insert in the record at this point these charts which illustrate the story of tin prices. [Charts not printed.]

The availability of RFC stocks, plus the production of the Texas City smelter, have proven a valuable asset in the struggle for a fair tin price to the American producer and consumer. Reductions already obtained under the above program will result in the saving of many millions to the American taxpayer. If this recommended policy is continued, within the next 2 years the savings will run into hundreds of millions of dollars.

What the foreign tin interests of the world should realize is that, unless they approach this whole problem realistically—to wit, a fair profit only—they are ultimately ruining their greatest market because, in addition to further curtailment of nonessential uses, American laboratories, faced with these exorbitant prices, are working hard for adequate substitutes.

Based on the present price and amount of production of synthetic rubber, the natural-rubber people could tell the tin cartel a lot about what may happen to their largest market if the United States is forced to continue to face exorbitant prices.

The total amount involved in this RFC tin-rubber program is expected to run around \$700,000,000 in the fiscal year 1952.

Aside, therefore, from its more generally understood lending function, RFC has a significant role in the field of critical materials—a field in which both during and after World War II it has had a record of outstanding success.

In addition to rubber and tin production, RFC operates five abacá-fiber plantations in Central America, with a total of 25,000 acres now under cultivation. Those plantations produce 30,000,000 pounds of fiber a year.

Abacá, better known as manila hemp, is another material for which this country must depend upon imports. It is used principally in the production of marine cordage—an item vital in the defense program.

During the last war RFC was authorized to produce abacá in Central America, in order to alleviate the loss of hemp from the Philippine Islands. Because of defense requirements, authorization for the operation of those plantations was continued by the Congress after the war.

During the current fiscal year RFC, under congressional directive, is increasing the area under cultivation to 50,000 acres. This expansion will be completed in 1952.

In summary, the problem of those materials is primarily one of obtaining those raw materials essential for that American production necessary to protect both ourselves and our allies. If our economy is to survive the unprecedented cost of this vast mobilization effort, however, these necessary materials must be obtained at a fair price.

So much for the materials division of the RFC

Now as to its lending functions.

Since 1934, when direct lending authority to business enterprises was granted, the RFC has authorized 62,154 business loans in the amount of \$4,900,000,000. Bank participation in 25,925 of these loans aggregated an additional \$538,000,000.

Presently there are 11,493 loans and commitments outstanding in the amount of \$696,000,000, with bank participation in 4,037 of these aggregating \$48,000,000.

Shortly after I took office, we had the managers of the 32 field offices come to Washington for a general discussion of our policies. This meeting convinced us that there ought to be a new statement of lending policies so that there could be a uniform basis for the exercise of business judgment on the part of the agency managers.

Immediately thereafter we issued a directive on lending policies which furnished the criteria for the types of loans RFC should make as well as those for the types which should not be made. Recently RFC lending policies were more fully and formally defined in a policy statement approved by the Loan Policy Board which was set up under the present reorganization of this agency. The members of the Loan Policy Board include Secretary Snyder, Secretary Sawyer, and the Administrator and Deputy Administrator of the RFC.

A copy of this policy statement is attached. Some of its high lights are as follows:

Under the new policy every loan must serve the public interest as well as the private interest of the borrower. It can serve the purpose by helping a borrower to contribute to the defense program or to provide essential civilian goods or services.

RFC loans must conform to the anti-inflationary policies of the Government. To protect against an inflationary effect, a loan must be used to produce an equivalent amount of essential goods or services.

No loan may be made unless the applicant can show in writing that financing is not available from banks or other sources on reasonable terms. We are requiring that a borrower show evidence that he has tried to get the financing from at least three financial institutions when available.

We want to be very sure that the RFC is not in any way competing with private banking. We also want to encourage bank participation to the greatest possible extent.

No loans may be made to bail out other creditors.

No loans may be made to luxury hotels or to places deriving their principal income from the sale of intoxicating liquors.

No loans may be made to gambling establishments.

We have instituted a policy of full disclosure on RFC loans. In accordance with the views expressed by many of the members of this committee, we announce that we would do our best to conduct the RFC's affairs in a "goldfish bowl." We stated it as our conviction that where the taxpayers' money was being loaned the taxpayers had a right to know all the facts.

Other policy and organizational changes which have been put into effect may be summarized as follows. Since May 7, 1951, the RFC has—

(a) Established the policy of having all loan authorizations, except disaster loans, made in the Washington Office to assure uniformity of actions through decisions emanating from one central authority.

(b) Modified the Corporation's regulations requiring registration of attorneys or representatives of applicants, borrowers, or others so as to provide that officers of corporate applicants or borrowers come within the category of those required to register.

(c) Established a policy whereby all sales of securities or property held by the Corporation shall be made on competitive bidding, which may be by sealed bids or at auctions, depending upon the type of collateral.

(d) Established an Office of Loan Agency Management, responsible for the general supervision of the operations of all loan agencies.

(e) Issued broad general authorities to the Director, Office of Personnel, thereby streamlining this operation and eliminating the presentation of all personnel matters to the Administrator.

(f) Increased the personnel of the Office of Investigation.

(g) Reorganized and strengthened the Corporation's fiscal department, and reestablished fiscal divisions and changes in loan-agency operations to provide for the orderly and efficient transaction of fiscal functions.

(h) Reduced the number of statistical and other reports required of the Corporation's loan agencies.

In addition to the business-loan program, the RFC also makes loans to persons or enterprises which have suffered from a major disaster. To date we have made over 26,000 loans totaling \$63,000,000 in this program, of which 997 loans totaling \$4,000,000 are outstanding. By law these loans can be made without collateral. They are, in effect, character loans, and it is interesting to note that virtually all of them are repaid in full. The percentage of loss is very low—about 10 to 12 percent.

The RFC is playing an important role in the present flood disaster in the Midwest.

To facilitate and speed up processing of applications for disaster loans for flood sufferers, the following steps have been taken:

1. The Kansas and Missouri flood areas and Ottawa County, Okla., have been declared disaster areas as required by the RFC Act. These three areas are under the jurisdiction of the RFC Loan Agencies in Kansas City, St. Louis, and Oklahoma City, respectively.

2. The Kansas City Loan Agency has established seven emergency branch offices in the Kansas area; the St. Louis Loan Agency has set up three emergency branch offices in the Missouri area; and the Oklahoma City Agency has installed an emergency branch office at Miami, Oklahoma. This makes a

total of 14 RFC offices which are handling disaster loans in the flood areas.

3. The 11 emergency branch offices are empowered to make loans on their own authority up to and including \$5,000.

4. The managers of the RFC loan agencies in Kansas City, St. Louis and Oklahoma City continue to have the right to make disaster loans on their own authority up to and including \$20,000. This authority has now been broadened to include loans from \$20,000 to \$50,000, providing they have the approval of the RFC Advisory Committee in the area.

5. In the interest of speeding up aid to flood sufferers, the RFC has obtained the cooperation of local banks to receive and process applications for disaster loans up to and including \$5,000. While the RFC must approve and make these loans, this system of bank cooperation is making it possible for flood sufferers to receive loan commitments as early as possible so they in turn can proceed immediately with rehabilitation efforts.

At the present time the RFC has a revolving fund of \$40,000,000 for disaster loan purposes and about \$4,000,000 of this was previously committed, leaving about \$35,000,000 for the present flood emergency.

Up to today we have received about 500 applications for disaster loans in the flood areas. These have ranged from a \$75 loan to replace a kitchen stove to a \$500,000 loan to restore a grain elevator. The total of these disaster loans so far has been about \$10,000,000 and they are coming in at an increasing rate.

To date in Kansas we have made 61 disaster loans totaling \$564,000; in Oklahoma 86 loans totaling \$116,500; and in Missouri 3 loans totaling \$3,750.

Also in the disaster area the RFC helps in another way. We were informed by the Department of Agriculture that there were between three and four billion bushels of water-soaked grain in flood-damaged elevators and in railroad cars. This amount of grain will make between seven and one-half and ten million gallons of alcohol. The RFC uses alcohol in the manufacture of synthetic rubber. We indicated to alcohol distillers that we would consider the purchase of alcohol made from this flood-damaged grain at prices not over 70 cents per gallon delivered.

At a 70-cent price for alcohol, the distillers should be able to pay in the neighborhood of \$1 per bushel for the water-soaked grain. This compares with distress sales which were being made to feeders at prices as low as 15 cents per bushel.

In this way the RFC is obtaining alcohol at about 15 cents a gallon under the market; at the same time giving the Kansas and Missouri grain people a fair price for water-soaked grain.

The RFC also serve as fiscal agent for the Defense Production Administration. It handles loans granted by DPA from funds authorized by the Defense Production Act. It does not review these loans from a credit standpoint, merely handling same as fiscal agent.

The authority and therefore the responsibility for such a loan should be concentrated in one agency, and the President now has under study a plan for effecting such a consolidation within the RFC.

In the RFC is a final Board of Review, consisting of the Corporation's five probably most experienced loan examiners. It is a significant fact that not one loan approved by this Board of Review has been the subject of criticism in the recent congressional investigation of this agency. Every loan criticized was approved by the RFC Board of Directors against the recommendation of its own Review Board.

Under the reorganized set-up, the Administrator does not undertake to reverse the recommendations of the RFC's Board of Review without giving his reasons in writing.

During the current period of defense production, RFC will have its role in supplementing credit available from other sources. Experience in the last war and the current expansion proves that guaranteed loans will meet only part of the credit needs of defense mobilization.

This country is now in a period of expanding production, expanding economy controls, and rising costs. Such conditions will require many businesses to secure credit assistance, especially as the smaller businesses attempt to shift from peacetime products to defense items.

Based on past experience, it is anticipated that RFC loans to industry in the fiscal year 1952 will increase about one-third over the current fiscal year. Many of these loans will be to relatively small subcontractors, typical small-business men, whose attempts to add their productive facilities to the defense job might otherwise be either hampered or eliminated through lack of credit. In this connection RFC is specifically charged with carrying out the loan program for small business provided in the amendments to the Defense Production Act of 1950.

May I insert in the Record at this point this chart which presents the history of RFC loan activities. Note the sharp rise and fall of loans during periods of recession and expansion. [Chart not printed.]

The present position would seem comparable to that in 1941 prior to the major war expansion.

The above summary of what the RFC is doing as presented to you today would seem to end any discussion as to its value, but there are certain additional factors I present for your consideration.

In an effort to both preserve its freedom and at the same time maintain its high standard of living, America has now accumulated a staggering debt. Its Government must nevertheless face up to all the implications of this debt, at the same time the rise of Soviet communism forces us, for security reasons, to embark on another vast program of mobilization and expenditure.

Nowhere in the economy is the resulting impact of these hundreds of billions of dollars of debt felt more heavily than in our private banking system, and in the credit facilities that system is normally expected to extend.

In the past banks paid money on your and my deposits; and therefore it was necessary for them to lend money in order to make money for their stockholders.

Today, however, with their walls bulging with those Government securities necessary to handle the problem of this gigantic public debt, they pay little or no interest on your and my deposits; but they obtain a large portion of their earnings from the Government funds they purchase with the money their depositors have placed in their care.

Under these circumstances it is obvious that the lending policy of a bank can be handled on a far more fastidious basis than before. A bank can just about eliminate any element of risk in its loan policies and still make money.

Some element of risk in lending, however, has heretofore been considered an important aspect of our private enterprise system.

May we point out that RFC pays interest to the Treasury on a substantial part of the money it loans to small business.

Another aspect is that banks are willing to still incur risks on private loans; but at interest rates far above the normal value of money. RFC is a great deterrent against excessive interest charges because it can lend the little-business man if he cannot obtain a loan, with proper collateral, on reasonable terms.

This I believe—that under the steady march in this country toward the big—big government, big business, big taxes, America is steadily moving toward a con-

centration of wealth—and a concentration of the power behind that wealth—which in a relatively short time may put us perilously close to socialism.

As a wise man said to me years ago, the walk from trusts, cartels, and monopolies to socialism is just a step across the street.

Almost certain progress toward that undesirable form of government is the elimination of the smaller-business man through the restriction, or withdrawal, of his credit, at the same time there is a continuous increase in the size of his large competitors.

That is what has happened in certain countries which formerly were considered the master prophets of the private enterprise system.

For such reasons as restrictions on total lending authority, restrictions on the amount that can be lent to any individual, banking policy not to lend on fixed assets, and banking policy not to make term loans, it is becoming more and more difficult for smaller businesses to obtain credit, on reasonable terms, despite such businesses nevertheless possessing what was formerly considered adequate collateral.

As the current world situation develops, with its grave impact on the American economy, this credit vacuum is becoming more apparent; and we believe it will get worse instead of better. There is no more difficult time for small business than in a mobilization conversion period.

It would seem that one real and practical finger in the dike against this trend toward socialism through the abolition of small business is the RFC.

As the large corporations in our great industries continue to grow, any credit problem becomes less. But as the national debt mounts under the spur of this new mobilization, the credit problem of the little-business man becomes steadily more acute.

I have had as much experience as most in direct contact with working men and women in plants. Most of these citizens, regardless of their wages, have a desire—a hope. They want to break away from the wage, and have, and have their children have, their own business, which they hope will grow.

Even though today ever mounting taxes make it more difficult for them to save their "stake" to get started, they still have that hope, which in the past has been an inherent part of the American way of life.

The RFC cannot give them the venture capital to start a business.

No matter how hard it is to begin, they must save or borrow elsewhere the original capital required.

Surely, however, they should not be rubbed out of the business they have started with their savings because of credit conditions which have risen as a result of other conditions far beyond their control.

I believe that any organized effort to abolish the RFC is just another blow at small business, in favor of the trust, the cartel and the monopoly. I believe that the perpetuation of small business in this country is vital to preserve our system of free enterprise. I believe this agency is essential in order to prevent the entrance over here of one of the many "isms" now plaguing both the governments and the plain people in the lands of all our enemies, and many of our allies.

Speaking of foreign countries, an apparent development in the United States is becoming more and more perplexing.

Since VJ-day, to help the people of other lands, the American taxpayer has contributed over \$30,000,000,000.

Today the Detroit mechanic, the Kansas farmer, the Texas cattleman is heavily taxed to help preserve his counterpart in many countries; and under proposed programs he is going to be taxed a lot more.

In the present world crisis, it is our responsibility and our national policy to make

grants and loans to foreign countries to aid them in withstanding the spread of Soviet aggression.

This is a responsibility which we must all face up to.

Things have come to a pretty pass, however, if at the same time we are giving tens of billions of dollars to the little people—and the big people—of foreign countries, we nevertheless won't allow our neighbor down the street, who has served us well over a period of years, the loan of a few dollars necessary to maintain his established business when he is caught in economic conditions beyond his control.

Why should American citizenship be a deterrent to obtaining aid from our Government, especially when in this case the aid must be backed by collateral?

If we are interested in giving tens of billions of dollars to preserve the free enterprise system in other countries, why should we not be interested in lending a few million dollars to preserve free enterprise in this country?

Another group would abolish the RFC because of corruption. There were conditions in this agency which merit criticism. They have been changed; but a continuing analysis of the operating efficiency and integrity of the agency, just as in private business, will continue.

What an absurdity, however, to imply that, because of possible corruption resulting from inefficient management, a Government agency should be abolished, regardless of its contribution to the American people and their economy.

It would be just as logical to say that the Departments of State or Defense should be abolished because several officials were found dishonest.

The important point to consider is, does the RFC contribute a necessary function during these critical days?

Aside from its position in defense loans, or in the handling of critical materials, I believe RFC is a true bulwark against all "isms," through the preservation of independent business.

I believe, therefore, that its continuation is essential to the preservation of the American system of free enterprise.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION,

Washington, D. C., August 7, 1951.

LOAN AGENCY BULLETIN No. 2127

Subject: Loan policy statement No. 1

In accordance with section 6 of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1951, the Loan Policy Board of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, composed of the following members, all ex officio: Stuart Symington, administrator, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as chairman; Peter Bukowski, deputy administrator, Reconstruction Finance Corporation; as vice chairman, John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury; and Charles Sawyer, Secretary of Commerce, have approved the attached policy statement No. 1 establishing general policies which shall govern the granting and denial of applications for financial assistance by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Agency managers are hereby instructed to follow the policies set forth in such statement.

LEO NIELSON,
Secretary.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION, LOAN POLICY BOARD.

POLICY STATEMENT No. 1

The purpose of this document is to establish the principles and policies to be followed by the RFC in the conduct of its lending operations, including participations in loans.

The general policies are contained in part I. These general policies incorporate the statutory requirements of the RFC Act and expressions of congressional intent as to the manner in which the loan operations of the Corporation should be conducted. In addition, there are included various standards, implementing the statutory provisions and the expressions of congressional intent.

In the pursuit of the objectives of the RFC Act, the general policies of the RFC shall, to the maximum extent possible, be correlated with the general programs and policies of the Federal Government such as the present anti-inflation and defense-mobilization program. Accordingly part II of this statement of loan policies prescribes additional loan standards to be followed during the present period of mobilization and rearmament. The standards in part II are not in substitution for, but are supplemental to, the general standards embodied in part I.

These standards for loan policies are not intended to and cannot be automatically operative in each individual case. Accordingly, appropriate instructions and interpretations will be issued from time to time to the several managers of RFC loan agencies.

PART I. GENERAL LOAN POLICIES

A General objectives: All loans by the RFC must be of such character as to accomplish one or more of the stated objectives of the RFC Act, namely, to aid in financing agriculture, commerce, and industry, to encourage small business, to help in maintaining the economic stability of the country, and to assist in promoting maximum employment and production.

B Specific statutory restrictions: All loans by the RFC must at all times meet the following requirements of the RFC Act:

1. That no financial assistance be extended unless the credit requested is not otherwise available on reasonable terms. No loan shall be made in competition with private sources of credit. Loans shall not be made to an applicant where credit is available from private sources unless the terms, including the interest rate at which the credit is so available, are clearly unreasonable. In most cases, it should be insufficient to find only one commercial bank unwilling to grant the loan. The applicant should show why he should not dispose of a marketable asset in order to obtain all or any portion of the funds needed.

2. That all securities and obligations purchased and all loans made be of such sound value or so secured as reasonably to assure retirement or repayment.

3. That all loans made and all obligations and securities purchased, except those of public governmental agencies, mature in 10 years or less.

4. That in agreements with banks to participate in loans wherein the Corporation's disbursements are deferred, the amount of the Corporation's participation be limited to 70 percent of the balance outstanding at the time of disbursement in those cases where the total amount borrowed is \$100,000 or less, and be limited to 60 percent of such amount in those cases where the total amount is over \$100,000.

5. That no loan shall be made to any State, or political subdivision thereof, for the payment of ordinary governmental expenses as distinguished from specific public projects.

6. That loans to common carriers, such as railroads and airlines, must meet the standards set by the regulatory agencies, specifically the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board, in addition to the usual standards for all RFC loans.

7. That loans to financial institutions must meet standards set by the Treasury and are subject to Treasury approval.

8. The objective in emergency disaster lending should be to relieve the hardships

attendant upon such disasters. Such loans are not required to meet all the credit standards governing loans for normal purposes.

9. That no director, officer, attorney, agent, or employee of the Corporation participate directly or indirectly in the deliberation upon or determination of any question affecting his personal interests.

C. Implementation of basic statutory provisions: In addition to meeting the general objectives and requirements of the RFC act, all loans shall be made in accordance with the following principles:

1. The primary consideration in determining whether to grant a loan shall be the interest of the general public rather than the interest of the individual borrower.

2. Loans shall not be granted which in effect would promote monopoly.

3. In carrying out the objectives of the RFC act, particular consideration shall be given to the credit needs of small-business enterprises.

D. Particular types of loans which do not qualify: 1. No loan shall be made to "bail out" creditors, i. e., to pay off creditors who are inadequately secured or likely to sustain a loss.

2. No loan shall be made primarily to re-finance an existing debt.

3. No loan shall be made for effecting a change in the ownership of a going business or for purchasing an interest in such business.

4. No loan shall be made for acquiring, constructing, or improving real property which is to be held for investment.

5. No loan shall be made for speculative investments or purchases.

6. No loan shall be made to an eleemosynary institution.

7. No loan shall be made to any newspaper, magazine, radio broadcasting companies, or other similar organizations.

8. No loan shall be made for providing capital to an enterprise engaged in the business of lending.

9. No loan shall be made for operating an establishment whose income is derived in whole or in part from gambling or from rental of the premises for gambling or from rental of the premises for gambling purposes.

10. No loan shall be made for operating an establishment whose income is derived predominantly from the sale of alcoholic beverages.

PART II LOAN POLICY IN PRESENT EMERGENCY

In addition to the loan policies prescribed in part I hereof, the following principles shall be effective during the present period of defense mobilization and rearmament:

1. All loans by the RFC must assist, expedite, increase, or maintain the production of goods or services necessary to meet either military requirements or essential civilian requirements.

(a) The receipt of a "certificate of necessity" for accelerated tax amortization or the receipt of a defense contract (either a prime contract or subcontract) or a purchase order by the borrower or the existence of a national shortage of a commodity or service or proof of a regional (normal market area) shortage so great that minimum needs cannot be met at reasonable prices may be considered as evidence that the loan is for a defense purpose or an essential civilian requirement.

(b) Loans for the maintenance of existing production, processing, and orderly distribution of goods and services which are customarily recognized as necessities as distinguished from luxuries, may be considered loans for essential civilian requirements.

(c) Loans for conversion to essential production may be considered in the interest of national defense.

2. In each instance it should be determined as far as possible whether granting a loan will or will not be inflationary. For a loan to be considered noninflationary, the

finding should indicate that the loan will produce either an increased supply of essential goods or services or the prevention of a decrease.

LEO NIELSON,
Secretary.

The St. Lawrence Story—VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the sixth in a series of articles entitled "The St. Lawrence Story" which appeared in the August 13 edition of the Minneapolis Star. This article discusses the St. Lawrence seaway and power project as a vital link in America's national-defense system.

ST. LAWRENCE STORY—ALL AGREE SEAWAY WOULD AID DEFENSE

(By Leo Sonderegger)

Opponents in the controversy over the St. Lawrence project are agreed on one thing. Both sides acknowledge that the seaway's importance to national security, as a safe route for vital iron ore, is the central question just now.

The lead-off witness for the opposition went so far as to say before the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives:

"I want to state at the outset that the railroads would not for one minute oppose this project, regardless of its economic unsoundness, if they thought its construction was required in the best interest of national defense."

It is scarcely necessary to add that the railroads have managed to resist the national security argument. They and other opponents of the project say the argument is faulty for several reasons.

In the first place, they assert, there is no pressing need for Labrador iron ore, because Lake Superior reserves are still adequate. They contend that the long, narrow channel would be highly vulnerable to sabotage or air attack.

CITE DRAIN OF MONEY, MATERIALS

In any case, they claim, existing means of transportation are adequate to handle any prospective tonnage of ore from Labrador.

Besides, it is argued, even if the project were really of importance to our defense, this would be a poor time to start it. Construction would be a drain on money, strategic materials, and manpower required in our current mobilization effort.

Opponents also claim that, once the project was finished, it would become a burden on the Nation's protective machinery. There would have to be elaborate precautions, they say, against a raid that could put one of the locks out of operation for months.

This point also is used to oppose the government view that development of Great Lakes shipbuilding facilities would be helpful to defense.

Another major argument against the project is that it would cost too much, especially at a time when our economy is being strained to embrace the defense and mobilization program. Here is a summary of this argument:

The present cost estimate is approximately \$818,000,000, of which this country's share is \$566,794,000. Even this is a very material underestimate of the ultimate cost.

Besides, the totals presented to the House committee include nothing for deepening of the many Great Lakes harbors that would expect to share in the seaway business.

The Army engineers estimate about \$14,000,000 for providing entrance channels and turning basins to outer docks at 10 United States harbors. The actual cost of fitting these harbors to handle ocean vessels would be many times that amount.

On top of all this, there is the fact that actual costs of some government projects have been much greater than the original estimates.

Seaway opponents also find fault with the assertion that the United States and Canada will share about equally in the financial burden.

TOLL PLAN CALLED IMPRACTICAL

The self-liquidation theory has few takers on the opposition side. This is pretty much a smoke screen, in their view, intended to hide the fact that the seaway will be a subsidized transportation system operating in competition with the railroads.

They believe the toll plan is impractical because it creates a dilemma: high tolls will drive away prospective shippers; low tolls won't bring in enough money. At any rate, they say, there just will not be enough traffic to justify the project.

This matter of prospective use is one of the biggest bones the debaters gnaw on. Enemies of the seaway say the department of commerce estimates are way off on two points, capacity and traffic potential.

Theoretical capacity is something quite different, they point out, from actual capacity under operating conditions. It is easy to arrive at a figure of, say, 60,000,000 tons a year by assuming that a steady stream of large, fully-loaded vessels will steam through the Welland canal as fast as its locks can work.

But under actual conditions the ships won't be pushing up the canal, bow to stern. Nor will they all be either large or fully loaded; some will be small canalers that take up lock space without adding much to the tonnage figure.

FIGURES ON OIL, ORE CALLED UNREALISTIC

As for the administration's potential-capacity estimate of fifty-seven to eighty-four million tons, the opponents say these figures are in the realm of dreamland.

Individual commodity figures in the department's 1951 estimate are regarded as quite unrealistic. Much is made of the fact, for example, that the total includes six to twenty million tons of petroleum, despite the department's admission that "no accurate predictions of the petroleum traffic over the seaway can be made."

They also scorn the department estimate of thirty to thirty-seven and one-half million tons of iron ore and claim there is no likelihood of its hitting even the minimum figure. They don't think anything like 4,000,000 tons of coal is going to move via the seaway, either.

Whatever capacity and traffic potential are discussed, channel depth is not far behind. Seaway opponents say the projected 27-foot channel would exclude all but 9.5 percent of oceangoing vessels that fly the American flag.

On the other hand, it is noted that 41 percent of all foreign ships could navigate the 27-foot channel. The conclusion is that a swarm of vessels from other countries, operating cheaply because of much lower wages, would dominate seaway traffic and cut into the legitimate business of American shipping.

Opponents of the project are suspicious, too, that the 27-foot channel is only an opening wedge. Once that has been approved, they foresee, Congress soon will be asked for money to deepen the channel to 30 feet. That would boost the cost to well over a billion dollars, maybe more than a billion and a half.

ONE-HUNDRED-MILLION-DOLLAR LOSS SEEN BY RAILS

There is one final major question, the most essential one of all so far as the railroads and port cities are concerned. That is the matter of how they are going to be affected financially by the seaway.

The opponents find it difficult to discuss this without seeming to argue against themselves. That is, they contend on the one hand that the seaway traffic will be much less than is estimated, and on the other hand they say that it will seriously hurt their business.

Generally, they resolve the apparent discrepancy by saying that whatever traffic the seaway carries will be just that much taken away from the ports and railroads.

The Association of American Railroads claims that the loss to its members might range from \$100,000,000 to \$25,000,000 a year.

The ports generally steer clear of estimates, although a spokesman for the Port of New Orleans figured it might lose out to the tune of more than \$90,000,000. The Port of New York claims that it would be robbed of half its foreign commerce.

This business-loss argument is tied in with another—that the seaway would be an "iceaway" about 5 months of the year. In order to carry the freight when ships can't operate in the channel, the railroads say, they would have to maintain a large amount of stand-by equipment.

RAILROADS PROVIDE CHIEF OPPOSITION

There are numerous other arguments against the seaway, mostly of minor significance. One item of more than minor importance, however, is the specific opposition to the power phase of the project.

The private utilities are natural opponents of this big Federal hydroelectrical development. They contend that there is no power shortage in New England and New York. They claim they can handle all the expansion that is necessary.

The fact remains that although power is an important part of the picture, the strongest opposition is still coming from the railroads.

Gregory S. Price, assistant general counsel of the Association of American Railroads and "whip" for opposition witnesses, testified before the Public Works Committee last April. He promised that others would discuss economic aspects of the seaway question "such as the effect on the national transportation system of providing a subsidized competitor."

Whereupon Representative JONES of Alabama inquired, "Is that not really your chief opposition to this whole thing?"

Prince replied, "That is the basic complaint."

GI Housing Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have just received an excellent letter showing housing conditions among the GI's. This letter, from a young man with a family, is bright and cheerful. At the same time it is pathetic in a larger sense.

It seems tragic to me that Americans trying to rear families are having to live under conditions which we would not want or permit in the rearing of our

families. To try to rear a family in a one-room trailer, regardless of how fine it may be, is far below our standard of life. We in Congress do not approve of this, nor do we condone it. Those of our people who are in uniform should be given as soon as possible reasonably good places in which to live as American citizens.

The letter is as follows:

AUGUST 9, 1951.

DEAR OVERTON: I see where the LDO promotions are out. I think I was a little too late getting squared away on mine as I didn't even get an honorable mention. Anyway, I'm still able to apply one more year. However they are still making temporary officers, and I'd even like that.

I was promoted master sergeant last month, so the only thing left is a commission or warrant officer, and I understand that there will be no more warrants.

A large number of us are greatly interested in this housing subcommittee, and for a good reason. Don't laugh, but I broke loose and bought a house trailer. Have you been inside one of these 1951 jobs? I have a 35-foot lighthouse with two bedrooms, one with a large regular bed and the other with bunk beds for the two little Indians. It has a regular home type bath with shower, commode, and other fixtures. The wife loves the kitchen, which has an electric refrigerator, butane gas stove. We have been using one bottle of gas now for 8 weeks; a refill costs \$2.50—cheap cooking. At present we, with about 150 others, have our trailer on the base, however we found that we are paying \$17.75 per month for space and having to dig separate septic tanks for each trailer. The trailer owner has to do this himself. On the Great Lakes Training Center base at Chicago we found that the trailerite is paying \$12.50 per month with sewage and other services that we can't get. So most of us are moving away from the Government park to public parks where we get the sewage connections and services for \$15 per month.

You know, I believe that after looking into the matter, Congress can find a real savings in self-supporting trailer parks at every installation. More married NCO's and company grade officers are finding every day that they can save money and time by buying a trailer. I will wager that you would find over 20,000 trailer owners in service and there would be more if they had a place to park them at the assigned duty station. One example is me, of course. I used to have to move my furniture and personal effects at Government expense. I am entitled, as a master sergeant, to 4,500 pounds and I had that much. You know what van and freight rates are and you also multiply that by a goodly number of married men and you will find a large round figure. You can go into any trailer salesroom near a military installation and I'll also bet that 99.99 percent of the persons there are married NCO's and officers trying to buy a trailer.

With a few parks and an ease-off in credit on the purchase of a trailer I think this housing shortage in regards to the military would be about 40 percent over with. A trailer park has no repair bill or maintenance problems. At around \$12.50 per month a 100-unit park would show a profit to the Government over utilities. Hope you look on my ideas with favor and interest. I have quite a bit on the problems on such installations.

Hope you remember that deer season opens here in October and I am counting on you hunting with our party. We hunt every other Saturday during season. We had a wonderful time last year. In fact I got my season's limit of two. The turkey are increasing and are wilder than ever. So we

should have a good season. Oh, before you think of it, my trailer sleeps seven, so don't worry on that account. Be sure and let me know and we'll show you how the upper half lives and operates.

When you have time drop a line and don't forget where I live. You have my office phone, and I live on the post in Trailer Park.

Yours,

DAVID.

Independence Day, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Independence Day, 1951," published in the Pratt (Kans.) Daily Tribune of July 4, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDEPENDENCE DAY, 1951

"And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

With these closing words, a small band of pioneer statesmen declared 175 years ago today their independence from British rule and domination, taxation, and other abuses charged in the Declaration of Independence, the anniversary of which Pratt is observing today in true holiday fashion.

They so cherished independence from foreign dictation and influences that they pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their honor to the defense of that independence.

During the era that followed, many lives were lost, many fortunes were spent in the fighting that ensued to keep the pledge our founding fathers had made. There were days when it appeared that we may have lost our cause, days like those at Valley Forge, where the Divine Providence, upon whom the Declaration signers placed their faith, stepped in.

No nation in the world's history has such an honest, such a determined, nor such a glorious background.

The war over, we began to build and grow under a form of government the world had never known. Britain kicked up more trouble in 1812, and again we won. More years passed until we found ourselves divided between the North and the South. We settled this and three more wars.

Through these years we were being served by Chief Executives, Senators and Congressmen, and Supreme Court Justices who held sacred the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

We guarded zealously our independence from foreign entanglements. We handed down from one generation to another Washington's famous words: "Avoid foreign entanglements."

During these many years we grew and grew and grew. We produced the world's best inventors, the world's best industrial system, the world's best transportation and communication systems, the world's best educational system—the world's best everything.

We continually set a pattern for others to follow, but they did not. The British, from whom we declared ourselves independent,

continued to cling—and still are—to rule by the Crown. No country was wise enough to observe what we were accomplishing under our private enterprise and capitalistic system. Instead, they professed hatred for us from time to time, but when, one by one, they got into trouble they showed no qualms about reaching out for our capitalistic dollars.

More years passed and Franklin Roosevelt became President. One of his earliest acts was to take over the air mail. A dozen fliers died. Here was the first attack upon the private enterprise system that made America. On July 5, 1935, Mr. Roosevelt wrote a letter to Representative Samuel B. Hill in which, commenting upon the McGuffey coal bill, he said this: "I hope your committee will not permit doubts as to the constitutionality, however reasonable, to block the suggested legislation." Here was the first attack upon the Constitution.

Mr. Roosevelt became friendly with Winston Churchill—he's the fellow who said he had hoped and prayed for the day when America would get into the Second World War. Mr. Roosevelt met Mr. Churchill in the North Atlantic. Mr. Roosevelt then went to Yalta and Tehran. Here he tossed to the winds the complete independence we declared 175 years ago today.

More years passed and now we have Harry Truman. He attacked the Constitution by going into a war in Korea without the consent of Congress, which the Constitution clearly says is the only power that can declare a war. Oh, yes, Mr. Truman says it is not a war, but when there are more than 70,000 casualties among our young people, it is war and nothing else.

Within recent weeks there has been talk of an armistice. Commenting the other day, our Secretary of State, Alger Hiss' friend, Dean Acheson, said openly that there cannot be an armistice until the rest of the so-called United Nations agree.

There's the story. Independence day, 1951, finds us devoid of our independence from foreign influences. The boys of the last 20 years have cast our lot with the quarreling countries across the world.

During all of the years we unitedly remained aloof from foreign influences we never knew traitors within our Government. Today, high and low national public officials are going to jail for attacks upon our country. Even Congressmen are getting jailed. We have sunk to the lowest level of governing we have ever known.

Today, too, we are a controlled people. We are becoming as controlled as our forefathers were controlled by Britain. We are losing our independence at home as we have lost it internationally.

We need a new declaration, a declaration of removal from office of the whole crowd; the crowd that shouts speeches on Independence Day and forgets the historic background of the day the rest of the year.

Public Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, public housing is an urgent necessity for millions of people residing in our large urban centers. Although considerable progress has been made in the city of New York, our city housing authority reports that it has 460,000 applications on file

from that many families who are desperately in need of adequate housing.

The low-income wage earners are anxiously looking to Congress to help provide decent housing for them and their families, and in this way aid in reducing delinquency and improving health conditions in the congested slum areas. Two years ago Congress initiated a forward-looking program of public housing which, it was hoped, would gradually eliminate the deplorable slum conditions. That program has already been drastically cut. Instead of 135,000 low-rent housing units to be constructed per year, at best we can now hope for 50,000 units.

In the bill coming up before this House today, we shall have the opportunity to vote for decent housing and the construction of 50,000 housing units this year, or we shall turn the clock back and condemn thousands of low-income families and small children to the miseries of the filth and disease-ridden slum dwellings which are a disgrace to our cities. I urge most earnestly all Members of this House to cast their vote for decent housing.

In this connection, I commend to the attention of my colleagues a very fine article which was published recently in the Christian Science Monitor on public housing in New York. This very interesting and informative article is as follows:

PUBLIC HOUSING SCRUBS UP PART OF NEW YORK SLUMS—NEW DWELLINGS DOT EAST RIVER FRONT

(By Mary Hornaday)

Thomas Jefferson warned in a letter to James Madison in 1787 that urbanization would destroy democracy, but he hadn't foreseen what has happened on New York's lower East Side in the last decade or so.

Practically the entire East River waterfront from Fourteenth Street down to the famous Brooklyn Bridge today is taken up with public housing recently constructed or soon to be built for the lower-income-earning groups of this metropolis.

Take a look from the top of the Empire State Building or the round-Manhattan sightseeing boat and you cannot help being impressed that here is the answer to Socialists and Communists who claim that living conditions of the masses cannot be improved under the private enterprise system.

ELEVEN PROJECTS

Today there are 11 publicly subsidized or partially tax-exempt projects on the lower East Side. The line-up runs from Fourteenth Street down—Jacob Riis houses, Lillian Wald houses, Vladeck houses, and Governor Smith houses with spaces in-between for other projects awaiting State and Federal funds.

Today 60,000 families of many nationalities are living in public housing in New York City—on a completely interracial basis. Apartments for 44,000 more are in the construction or approved-plan stage; yet there is nowhere near enough room for thousands still clamoring to be lifted out of vermin-infested old-law tenements. The New York City Housing Authority still has 460,000 applications on file.

Though it began in the depression when Franklin D. Roosevelt and his cohorts were looking for economic pump primers, the job of East Side rehabilitation has been greatly expedited by the economic prosperity of the last few years.

TAX EXEMPTION

Postwar prosperity has enabled New York City to expand its low-cost housing program

with a type never before attempted in the United States. Public housing has been built without a cash subsidy with rents high enough to cover all operating costs and debt services. The city grants tax exemption in the value of the improvements.

This is the first time that a public housing program has been designed to operate wholly on rental income and to meet the great need of families, especially of veterans, who could afford slightly higher rents than those of fully subsidized housing.

Prosperity has helped the East Side in other ways. The Bowery will probably be the Bowery for a long time, yet the homeless men who congregate in its saloons and missions have felt the backwash of economic improvement.

OLD LANDMARK CHANGES

Just in the last 6 months the number of men served in municipal lodging houses has dropped 30 percent. The Hart Island rehabilitation program, begun about a year ago for the homeless men who drift in from all over the United States, has also begun to make a dent on this degraded section of the metropolis.

Another old landmark is also undergoing a change. Brooklyn Bridge, made famous in photographs and jokes from 1883 to 1903, when it was the world's longest suspension bridge, is getting a \$6,900,000 modernization. Two roadways of 30 feet each are being built on the Manhattan and Brooklyn approaches, with room for six lanes of traffic.

CHILD CARE CENTERS

New York's Chinatown, colorful to tourists but distressing to sociologists, was also slated to undergo slum clearance, but after a hot debate these plans have been shelved. "If you tear down buildings to put up new ones it will put the merchants out of business," complained Shavey Lee, Chinatown's perennial mayor.

It is still too early to tell statistically just what the fruits of a better East Side will mean in improved public health and reduction of delinquency.

More than half the new housing sites are devoted to open spaces, including playgrounds. There are social and craft clubs, gymnasiums, child care centers, citizenship and adult education classes, and related community activities.

The accomplishments to date have their critics among their friends as well as among their enemies of public housing.

Lewis Mumford, author and city-planning expert, has kept up a running criticism in the New Yorker magazine. His May 6 criticism was typical: "At the end of a dozen years of zealous construction the New York City Housing Authority is further away from a good civic standard for the rebuilding of the great city than it was when, in 1937, it completed Harlem River Houses. . . .

"As I have said before, these new housing estates are, in such essentials as air, light, open space, and quiet better than the quarters provided for the upper-income groups on Park Avenue. . . . The most disturbing thing is that . . . the land is as densely populated as it was when it was covered with over-crowded slums."

RECORD RELIED ON

State Housing Commissioner Herman T. Stichtman also has been critical. He says the city has allowed too much concentration of lower-income groups without sufficient provision for their employment nearby. By eliminating streets, he says, they have created a traffic maelstrom.

Mr. Stichtman is in favor of redevelopment on a neighborhood basis.

But the city-housing planners are content to rely on their record. They think they have done the best that could be done in a

crowded place like Manhattan. The inhuman conditions of New York slums and sweatshops became infamous as the influx of Italians, Russians, Greeks, Slovaks, and Poles succeeded earlier waves of north Europeans, driven to the shores of the New World by potato rot and political oppression.

MARKED GAINS

The color of Italian fiestas with the garlands of overhead lights and the Orchard Street pushcarts are still there, but the filth and common-use toilets have begun to disappear.

The hacking that Congress has recently done on public housing will hit New York City hard. New York alone would like to have Federal money for more new apartments than Congress is allowing for the whole country. The city money is all committed. The State has some money that it hands out in what appears to the city to be dribbles.

And still there are thousands of families in New York who qualify for public housing who would like to move in.

Water Development in the Missouri Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED G. AANDAHL

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. AANDAH. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, August 13, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] spent an hour on the floor of the House presenting a very fine analysis of the water development program in the Missouri Basin. Much time was devoted to the need for the various Federal agencies supplementing each other in the work that was being done.

On December 1, 1950, at the last meeting of the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee that I attended as Governor of North Dakota, and as a member of the committee, I made a statement reflecting on the past work of the committee and outlining the future objectives.

I trust that this statement carries information that will be of value to the Members of Congress, and I am therefore here inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE MISSOURI BASIN INTER-AGENCY COMMITTEE: WHAT IT HAS DONE, WHAT IT CAN DO

(By Gov. FRED G. AANDAH.)

My fellow citizens, in order to understand the past work and future opportunities of the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee it is advisable to review the conditions that stimulated its establishment. Since the time that white people as a part of the westward expansion of our national population first settled in the basin, the local inhabitants have been talking about, working with, battling the deluges of, and suffering the limitations of the water resources of the area. Without the rain and snow that makes the river the area would be a desert waste. Man has always tried to use the water resource for his best economic advantage. In its natural state it would water the fields, forests, and meadows, furnish

transportation, water for human consumption and dispose of sewage for limited population. But we are an expanding Nation both in population and in economic capacity. We have reached the point where it is necessary to harness the water resources of the area and use them to the maximum.

Community leaders from throughout the basin have been urging water resources development for many, many years. Some work has been done by private groups and political subdivisions. Full comprehensive development of this enormous river system, however, is so expansive, the multiple benefits of many single projects so widely dispersed, the repayment for reimbursable portions of the initial construction cost extended so far into the future and the intangible and unassessable benefits for the basin and the entire Nation so large, that the basic development immediately gets beyond the scope of private groups and political subdivisions including the States, and properly and wisely becoming a Federal function. All through the years community leaders have therefore gone to the Federal Government and its departments urging and requesting that studies be made and the work be started and offering the cooperation of the local groups and political subdivisions.

The most impelling water project requirements of the basin are flood control and reclamation through irrigation. For 40 years and more the Department of Interior through the Bureau of Reclamation has been effectively wrestling and solving problems of irrigation in the Western States. For even a longer period the Corps of Army Engineers for national defense throughout the Nation have successfully been allocated the work of harbor improvement and development of river navigation which has logically expanded into flood control clear up to the source of each stream. It was perfectly natural that these departments should on their own initiatives explore the water-development potentials of the Missouri Basin and it is equally natural that the local people went to them for aid in this great problem.

Two men of outstanding ability and great depth of vision, Gen. Lewis A. Pick, of the Corps of Engineers, and W. G. Sloan, of the Bureau of Reclamation, in response to nationally assigned duties in the area and the continuing requests of the local people each formulated a basin-wide plan for comprehensive development and each, of course, placing the greatest emphasis on that particular phase of the work in which his department was engaged.

At about this time local interest prompted the voluntary organization of the Missouri River States Committee made up of the 10 governors and two other members from each State in the basin appointed by the governor. This committee organized and crystallized local thinking and discovered the great theme of unity of basin-wide purpose. Water stored in upstream reservoirs to give downstream flood control could there be used for multiple beneficial purposes before it was again turned loose to flow downstream to give adequate water supply for municipal use in dry season.

With a new burst of enthusiasm and justified confidence the States committee, the Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of Reclamation went to Congress with a growing vision of beneficial basin-wide development. Congress, somewhat sympathetic to a sizable project to help fill the anticipated postwar economic slack and eager to stimulate an expanding future economy, after requiring the initial coordination of the Pick and Sloan plans authorized in the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, this vast program of comprehensive basin-wide development to start shortly after the close of the war.

With this background, the logic of Congress in giving the primary construction and

operation responsibilities to the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation becomes apparent. Although not specified in the Flood Control Act of 1944, it was soon evident that the Federal Power Commission, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Commerce also had definite responsibilities in the basin development and should adjust and expand their programs accordingly. Long-established Federal law directing the activities of each of these Departments fortunately make it mandatory that they work in cooperation and in harmony with the States and their political subdivisions.

Thus, as World War II ended, there unfolded in the Missouri Basin a plan for the development and wise use of the water resources, closely associated with the soil resources, in which several Federal departments and the States would have closely interwoven duties and responsibilities. Out of this combination of circumstances has grown an outstanding example of successful, true American voluntary coordination without the establishment of centralized authoritarian procedure.

The Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee, organized at the start in 1945 and now made up of representatives of five Federal agencies and five governors from the basin, is the unit that has cleared thinking, crystallized opinions, broadened understanding, and charted the way for coordinated purpose and achievement. This is the forty-fifth meeting of the committee. It has met once a year in each of nine States where major planning and construction is under way. Generally each department at each meeting summarizes the progress of its plans and work in the State, and associates it with the entire basin. The governor and his associates in the State present their opinions and desires. The cooperative response and the resultant effective coordination has far exceeded the highest hopes of the sponsors. It satisfactorily has done a job that many theorists said would be impossible. It has successfully brought together the best information and ability that the several departments have acquired through years of Nation-wide experience and unified them to meet the specific problems of the Missouri Basin. Our meetings have been filled with a full, free, and open expression of opinions, many of which have been conflicting, but out of those opinions and answers has come a mutual adjustment of thinking as justified by the additional basic information. We cannot always be in full agreement on every detail, but our association in this committee has developed a firm unity in the broad purposes and objectives of comprehensive basin-wide development. It is also pleasant to note how early suspicions and jealousies have disappeared as association has developed mutual confidence and appreciation. We have all discovered that the job is so big that it will require every resource that each of us can make available for many, many years. Our big task is to find ways and means of getting the entire job done. Each in his own field has more than he can do without trying to absorb the duties of someone else.

Much thought has been given to the question of where the final authority to make decisions should be vested. As previously stated in this paper the program is of necessity a Federal function. Each Federal department under the prerogatives and limitations given it by Congress should make the final decision on what it can advisedly do. If it is a question of the installations needed to give adequate flood control we should look to the Corps of Engineers with their years of Nation-wide experience in such work for the final answer. If it is a question of

the advisabilities of irrigating a certain tract of land we should look to the Bureau of Reclamation with its many years of rich experience in the arid and semiarid regions of our country. If it is a question of soil conservation or adaptability of crops we should look to the Department of Agriculture. If there is conflict among departments or among governors representing areas let us try to iron them out on a voluntary basis in the Interagency Committee and as a last resort they can be settled in Congress where the specific directives, authorization, and appropriations are and must be made. The value of the long experience of the well-established Federal departments is of such paramount importance in this broad and comprehensive work that is being done that it would be little short of an invitation to mistakes and delay to not leave the duty of decision with the qualified department as we now have it. This statement of course is made with an awareness of the fine cooperation among all the groups involved as required by law and stimulated by the functioning of the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee.

My high esteem for the coordinated plan of basin development as now approved by Congress and the effectiveness of the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee as a means of attaining the full measure of desired coordination on a voluntary basis is by now apparent. The personnel in the membership of the committee is constantly changing. On August 16, 1945, at its second meeting I appeared before the Inter-Agency Committee not as a member but as a witness. The committee was then composed of General Crawford for the Corps of Engineers, Mr. Comstock for the Department of Interior, Mr. Green for the Federal Power Commission, Mr. McClymonds for the Department of Agriculture and Governors Grisswold, Ford, Hunt and Donnelly for the States. At this meeting, Mr. Green is the only original member still on the committee. In the meantime there have also been General Pick, Mr. Meehan and Mr. Davlin as former members of the committee. This is the last meeting for Governor Michelson, myself and, I believe, Mr. Sloan. But with the changing membership of the committee the spirit, the purpose and the high objectives still go on. I have often marveled at how quickly new members become familiar with the program and sense its opportunities for basinwide unity and high achievement.

Much has been accomplished during the past five years. The biggest and most comprehensive river development program ever envisioned by man has moved far along into the construction stage. Additional water is being brought into the basin by tunnels under the Continental Divide. The largest rolled earth filled dams in the world are being built. Expansive new acreage of irrigation will be added. Flood damage will be reduced to a minimum. Hydroelectric power will be developed to the maximum capacity of the streams. Wildlife and recreation will be given new avenues of development. The Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee is a pivotal point around which the planning and coordination of this tremendous undertaking is being done. Is it any wonder that the representatives of the Federal agencies have given all meetings about a 98-percent attendance and the Governors a 62-percent personal attendance with representation at practically all other meetings.

The work of the committee as measured by the accomplishments of the past 5 years both in unity of thinking and actual construction work in the field is a challenge to ensuing memberships. The new membership, I am sure, will pick up where the old

has left off and move on to still higher achievement.

There is one parting thought that is tremendously important to our area, to our Nation and to our American way of life. The objective of the Missouri Basin development is not to give Government ownership to anything that can be done effectively by private enterprise. Its big purpose is to conserve and make more abundantly available a neglected inexhaustible natural resource for the use of the people through the avenues of private enterprise. Private enterprise is the spark plug that has made American production click. It has given us a greater wealth of consumer goods available to the rank and file of our people than has ever been or ever will be possible under any other economic system. It is the tax base that supports our cherished form of government for a free people. In the Missouri Basin program we are working to make a new resource available and provide for an expanding economy but should not absorb the established or potential functions of private enterprise.

We are in the midst and a part of a great program. We must plan carefully and keep our feet on the ground. The people of our local communities are our firmest foundation. We must work with them avoiding all unnecessary centralized authority and stimulating their initiative and their prosperity.

Civil Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Friday I had inserted in the RECORD a letter from Robert E. Lackey, civilian defense director of Levittown, Long Island, in which Mr. Lackey reminded me that Members of Congress have a special responsibility toward civil defense on the local level. He urged Members of Congress to lend the weight and prestige of their office to civil-defense units in their own communities and to encourage people in their communities to join this effort.

Here is a blind man who is leading the way in American civil defense. Mr. Lackey and the civil defense unit he has organized in Levittown are worthy of the greatest praise. Lackey is a blinded war veteran—he lost his sight during the landing at Saipan—who devotes practically all his spare time to the Levittown civil defense program. During the day he is employed by the Veterans' Administration.

Levittown, which is a 90-percent veterans' community, has about 1,500 participants in the civil defense program. Veterans know what war is like at first hand. Under Mr. Lackey's supervision, Levittown has its own shortwave radio station built and operated by some 50 Levittown "hams." It has central headquarters set up and operating, and district offices at seven interior shopping centers where defense workers are to report in an emergency. Levittown has its own ambulance and squad car with

public address system, a 200-man auxiliary fire unit and 300-man auxiliary police unit. Trucks and taxis with two-way radio are ready to swing into action. Levittown has had several practice alerts—all very successful.

Levittown is ready for an atomic attack, and it is also ready to serve as a refuge for New Yorkers in event of an attack on our largest city.

The Nation's civil defense program is of the greatest importance. Right now, it needs the proverbial "shot in the arm". I suggest that Congress can give its greatest encouragement to the program now by lending support to civil defense programs in our own States and communities. And other communities would do well to follow the example of the Long Island town of Levittown.

Interview on Pro and Con Radio Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following interview of Frank Bourgholtzer with Representative CLARENCE J. BROWN, Republican of Ohio, on Pro and Con program, National Broadcasting System, Friday, August 10, 1951:

Mr. BOURGHOLTZER. Congressman BROWN, it's good of you to appear on this program at the end of a hard legislative week. The House of Representatives has just passed the largest appropriation bill in the peace-time history of the country, which carries funds of more than \$56,000,000,000 for the Defense Department. As a Congressman, what is your opinion of this huge appropriation for national defense?

Congressman BROWN. Well frankly, Mr. Bourgholtzer I doubt if any appropriation bill has ever gone through the national House of Representatives on which the average Member had less information than on this huge peace-time defense bill. Fifty-six billion dollars is a lot of money. It is difficult to comprehend how much \$56,000,000,000 really is. It is not only fifty-six thousand million dollars, but it is also approximately twice as much as the entire cost of the United States Government from the beginning of our Republic, back in 1789, until World War I began in 1917—or two times as much as we spent on all Federal Government in the first 128 years of this Nation's history—all appropriated in one single bill to run the Defense Department for a single year, or until June 30, 1952.

But that is not all. As soon as the House approved this \$56,000,000,000 defense measure it took up the Military Construction Bill to authorize spending an additional \$5,700,000,000 for building new military and naval bases and installations; to be followed this next week by the Administration-sponsored \$8,500,000,000 foreign aid bill, of which approximately \$6,500,000,000 is for sending military supplies to other nations.

The big \$56,000,000,000 defense bill was brought to the House floor after the Appropriations Subcommittee had spent 11 weeks

in hearings and took 3,500 printed pages of testimony. Members of the House not on this subcommittee had only a few hours in which to read these 3,500 pages of hearings, the 158-page committee report, and the 60-odd pages of the bill itself. So it was impossible for most of us to learn whether the many huge items contained in this bill were really justified or even necessary. We had to accept the bill on faith, even though there was a strong feeling the military might be running a bit wild in its demands.

Frankly, I am rather certain the Defense Department, the administration, and the generals, at least, asked for as much as they expected to get, and probably far more than actually necessary to give America the kind of a defense it must have in these troublesome days.

But the Congress is charged with providing an adequate defense for this country and we had to accept the judgment of military officials on the largest defense appropriation bill in the peace-time history of the Nation.

There is one thing I do want to emphasize, Mr. Bourgholtzer, and that is, the Congress of the United States, as representatives of the people, has the responsibility of seeing to it that the money we have appropriated for defense purposes is not wasted. We need, and should have, some sort of a "watch-dog" committee in the House to see to it that the \$56,000,000,000 we have furnished for national defense is spent wisely and well. It won't hurt a bit if the boys in the Pentagon know the Congress is checking on every expenditure they make. We owe that to the taxpayers of America.

Mr. BOURGHOLTZER. Well that is quite a statement, Congressman BROWN. It reminds me that a little less than 3 years ago your party—the Republican—was in control of the House and Senate. You say the Eighty-second Congress was practically legislating in the dark when it passed this huge \$56,000,000,000 appropriation bill. Was the Eightieth Congress legislating in the dark when you Republicans were voting appropriations for the military?

Congressman BROWN. The answer, Mr. Bourgholtzer, is an emphatic "No." We did not legislate in the dark. We knew exactly what we were doing. And I might add, if President Truman had followed the direction and properly administered the defense legislation sent him by the Republican Eightieth Congress we would not have been passing a \$56,000,000,000 defense appropriation bill in the House this week. I might go even further and say that in all probability we would not now be engaged in a war in Korea.

During the Republican Eightieth Congress the House Appropriations Committee had a large staff of nonpartisan investigators and experts who gave us the benefit of their knowledge and experience, not only in connection with military questions, but on all the ramifications of this huge Government of ours.

But speaking of the military: I am sure you will remember the Eightieth Congress fixed the size of our Armed Forces at a little over 2,000,000 men—2,040,000, I believe—and provided the funds therefor; but that President Truman and his then Secretary of National Defense decided only a little over 1,400,000 men were needed in the armed services at that time.

You may also remember that the Republican Eightieth Congress authorized an Air Force of 70 groups, and furnished the funds therefor, only to have the President say a 48-group Air Force was enough, and refuse to enlarge the Air Force or to use the money we had furnished for that purpose.

The Eightieth Congress authorized an expanded naval air program, including a super-aircraft carrier upon which work was begun

and then ordered stopped by the President and Secretary of Defense Johnson, at a dead loss of about \$20,000,000. You may also recall how we blocked the attempt to put the Marine Corps completely out of business.

All of this was going on while President Truman was running up and down the country denouncing the Eightieth Congress. But now the story is different. We have three and one-half million men in our Armed Forces; we have an 89-group Air Force—with more groups to be added later—and, believe it or not, we are now building that new superaircraft carrier, just a little smaller and much more expensive, of course, than the one we authorized, after more than 2 years of precious time has been lost.

Why, Mr. Bourgholtzer, we were so far ahead of the President and his administration in preparing our national defense for these troublesome days that early this week the Democratic chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, CARL VINSON, in appearing before the Rules Committee, frankly admitted that the Republican Eightieth Congress had actually done more to build a strong national defense than any peacetime Congress in our history, and far more than the Democratic Eighty-first Congress which succeeded it.

Mr. BOURGHOLTZER. Well, I can see you are proud of the record of the Republican Eightieth Congress on defense matters, Mr. BROWN. I think you will concede, however, that it would have cost a lot of money to have done all the things the Republican Congress proposed for national defense, isn't that right?

Congressman BROWN. Of course, that is right, but only about half as much as it is costing now, and it would probably have prevented most of the recent Communist aggression, and many of the tragic deaths of American boys on the battlefields of Korea.

I do hope the American people, and you, Mr. Bourgholtzer, will never forget that the Republican Eightieth Congress not only provided the funds for a strong national defense, but we also balanced our national budget, and created such a large surplus that, for the first time in nearly 20 years, heavy payments were made on the national debt. In addition to all this, Federal taxes were reduced for the first time in more than a generation—reduced by more than five and one-half billion dollars a year—and more than 7,000,000 low-income Americans were taken entirely off the tax rolls.

Compare this record, if you will, with the huge tax increase voted last October, or the new \$7,200,000,000 tax bite voted by the House a little over a month ago, and now pending in the Senate.

Mr. BOURGHOLTZER. But, Mr. BROWN, it is claimed that the world situation has worsened since the Republican Eightieth Congress sat on Capitol Hill. What do you think about that?

Congressman BROWN. Well, I'll agree, Mr. Bourgholtzer, the world situation has not improved under the administration's weak foreign policies. You will remember, of course, that the Republican Eightieth Congress did do everything within its power to get Mr. Truman to change his policies concerning China. Also that the President and the Ambassador to China, General Marshall, along with Dean Acheson and others in the administration, were so determined the Chinese Reds must be taken in and made a part of some sort of a coalition government in China, that the money and military supplies the Eightieth Congress had voted to help the Nationalist Government hold the Chinese Reds in check were held up and not used for that purpose for 11 months or more. Had the Republican-sponsored aid program for China not been sabotaged the chances are

the Nationalist Government, which was friendly to us, would still be in control of China today, and our American boys would not now be fighting the Chinese Reds in Korea.

You may remember, too, Mr. Bourgholtzer, as I am sure many Americans will, that the Republican Eightieth Congress, seeing the need for a balanced and sensible foreign policy for both Asia and Europe, enacted the Greek-Turkey aid program, the interim-aid program, and the ECA. And it was the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg, a Republican, who steered through the Eightieth Congress the resolution which made possible the North Atlantic defense pact.

Mr. BOURGHOLTZER. And what about this present Eighty-second Congress, Mr. Brown? What kind of a Congress is it?

Congressman BROWN. Well, Mr. Bourgholtzer, this Democratic controlled Eighty-second Congress has broken all records for doing nothing.

By August 1 of this year not a single major appropriation bill had cleared the Congress or reached the White House. Up to August 1, the Eighty-second Congress had passed only 108 public laws and 186 private bills. Only four major measures went through the legislative mill in the first 7 months of this present Congress—the Trade Agreements Extension Act; the emergency food relief bill for India; the bill continuing selective service, and the measure extending the Defense Production Act.

In the first 7 months of the Eightieth Republican Congress we had enacted 388 public laws and 131 private bills, including every single appropriation bill for running the Federal Government; measures to strengthen the drive for world peace and to provide foreign relief and aid. We also approved the Inter-American treaty for the defense of the Americas, and four peace treaties with defeated European nations, as well as established our trusteeship over the Pacific islands formerly under the rule of Japan. We also helped thousands of displaced persons find havens of safety, and extended the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

We passed the Taft-Hartley Act over the President's veto, adopted housing legislation which promoted the greatest home-building boom of all time; passed numerous bills to meet the needs of our war veterans; provided for a long-range agricultural program for the benefit of the farmers; appropriated more money for reclamation and the development of the West than any previous Congress; voted large sums for research on cancer, heart, and mental diseases, and the construction of new hospitals; and also created the Hoover Commission—through my bill, by the way—from which has already resulted savings in governmental costs of more than \$2,000,000,000 a year. All of this mind you in addition to balancing the budget and reducing taxes, as I mentioned a moment ago.

The Republican Eightieth Congress, Mr. Bourgholtzer, had a record of which all America can be proud.

What we need in Washington today more than anything else is a leadership with the mental capacity, the intellectual grasp and the moral fortitude to cope with world communism abroad and the trend toward state socialism here at home. Until America is given leadership of principle, courage, conviction, and integrity the Nation will continue to flounder in the sea of indecision, confusion, colossal waste, and corruption which threatens to engulf us. As never before we need honesty, decency, and moral integrity in Government, and courage and faith in high places, if we are to prevent world war III and maintain individual liberty and sound government here on this continent.

"Let George (Uncle Sam) Do It" Still Attitude of Europeans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Indianapolis Star of August 12, 1951:

"LET GEORGE (UNCLE SAM) DO IT" STILL ATTITUDE OF EUROPEANS

(The writer has just returned from a trip through Italy, Spain, and France. The report on conditions in Europe today is based on first-hand observations.)

(By Steffan Andrews)

NEW YORK.—"Let George do it" is still the predominant attitude in Europe today.

France, Spain, Italy, and to some extent even England are still relying on outsiders to solve the myriad of lingering postwar internal problems facing them six long years after the war.

And the only outsider in the picture is "George." In this case it is merely another name for Uncle Sam and his open-handed generosity with American taxpayers' hard-earned billions.

The impression of a reporter after a quick, first-hand investigation and an on-the-spot observation in such capitals as Rome, Paris, Madrid, Lisbon, and London is that Europeans seem to have lost the knack of solving their problems.

They are still so apathetic and "neutralist" on the continent that they not only expect Americans to fight communism for them but also to keep pouring money indefinitely into their countries in the hope this eventually will solve their internal difficulties.

That, in a nutshell, is the answer to the No. 1 question that inquiring friends have been shooting at this reporter since his return from Europe. Here are answers to some other questions:

Question Do we have any real friends in Europe?

Answer. Yes. England is a real friend, despite the occasional brickbats the Socialists toss in our direction. You cannot help admiring the British. They have "guts" and they are really trying to do something about their problems, too.

Question. Will the French fight now that we have given them \$2,000,000,000?

Answer. I seriously doubt it. Anyone who relies on the French to do anything these days ought to have his head examined. That goes for all our Marshall plan officials who have been pumping us full of these rosy propaganda stories.

Question. How about Spain? Would Franco fight on our side?

Answer. I think so.

Question. Do you think we would be bolstering totalitarians by making a military deal with him?

Answer. Perhaps. But the thing to remember is that Franco's Spain would be insurance for us. After all our postwar aid, we cannot be sure of anyone but England. If the French again fold, Spain would be our second line of defense.

Question. Just what is wrong with the French?

Answer. Just about everything. They are old and tired. They have no vitality for anything. They want the easy ways out

of any problem. And the easy way is to keep accepting United States dollars and do nothing.

Question. Is communism still growing in Europe?

Answer. No; it seems to have been stopped. But the thing to remember is that the biggest danger perhaps is not the number of Communists but the growing feeling among Frenchmen and a lot of Europeans that they somehow can sit out the fight between communism and democracy.

Question. How can Europeans have that attitude?

Answer. They simply seem to have the feeling that it is a fight between the United States and Soviet Russia.

Question. How about Italy? Is it making progress?

Answer. Yes. Premier de Gasperi played it smart. He never fell for the line that you can cooperate with the Communists, hence he never took them into the Government. They are still on the outside looking in and probably will remain that way until they splinter away from the Cominform.

Question. How are the people? How do they look?

Answer. Well fed everywhere, particularly in Italy. There is plenty of food, but prices are exceedingly high—especially in Paris.

Veto of H. R. 3193

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

VIRGINIA CHAPTER,
PARALYZED VETERANS OF AMERICA,
MC GUIRE VETERANS' HOSPITAL,
Richmond, Va., August 11, 1951.

VIRGINIUS DABNEY,
Editor, Richmond Times-Dispatch,
Richmond, Va.

DEAR MR. DABNEY: In accordance with our recent phone conversation, I am writing this letter to express further our viewpoints regarding H. R. 3193, the bill (vetoed last Monday, August 6, by Mr. Truman) which would have increased the non-service-connected pension for those permanently and totally disabled veterans who are in need of the constant aid and attendance of another person. However, after giving the matter further thought, I am asking that you do not print this letter, since our primary interest is that you have a complete picture relating to this bill and will, therefore, be in a better position to judge its merits. We are hopefully expecting Congress to override the President's veto, and in that event, with these additional facts, I feel sure that your newspaper will take a more favorable stand on this legislation.

You have always made a very commendable effort to see things clearly and we feel that you followed that policy in expressing your views in last Thursday's editorial, "Thank you, Mr. Truman." You were put to extreme disadvantage in this case, however, by Mr. Truman's press release and also by his veto message to Congress. His press statement did not even mention that this pension affected only that small group of permanent and total disabilities who are in

constant need of aid and attendance. This alone alters the picture considerably.

Perhaps Mr. Truman is not entirely responsible in this case—it is very possible that he has not been given all the facts which would enable him to see exactly what the bill entails. Unfortunately, in the many years of the existence of our comparatively small national veterans' organization, the Paralyzed Veterans of America, we have never been granted an opportunity to express our views directly to the President on any legislation affecting us. Had the President been shown the true meaning of his bill, we like to believe that he would have taken an entirely different stand.

We are enclosing a copy of the analysis of H. R. 3193 by the House of Representatives Veterans' Affairs Committee which was presented when reporting the bill to the House floor. It was approved unanimously by this committee, and we are told, also passed the House without a dissenting vote. The Senate Finance Committee, headed by Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, and further bolstered by such economists as Senator TART and Senator BYRD, of Virginia, approved this legislation unanimously and, with virtually the same analysis as the Veterans' Affairs Committee, reported the bill to the Senate floor 5 days after it passed the House. It was passed on a Consent Calendar, where it took but one objection to shelve it. This objection was not to be had. Let us tell you further why there was no objection.

The attached analysis sheet points out that the \$120 rate of pension sought in this bill already applies to veterans of the Spanish-American War at this time. H. R. 3193 was presented in an effort to equalize this disparity between the veterans' groups of the different wars.

We have at this time disabled men in our hospitals who have been there for years awaiting an opportunity to leave. The present pension of \$60 or \$72 per month will scarcely buy more than their necessary medical supplies. Many have tried and still try to work for their living outside of the hospital, but even those successful in finding employment have been unable to continue for any length of time because of a very limited work tolerance. It must be pointed out that the permanently and totally disabled man who can work a consistent 8-hour day, is very much the exception. Our men, who are subject to many ever-present medical problems, disorders, and extreme fatigue, would find themselves within reach of making their own living outside the confines of a hospital, if this bill raising their pension to \$120 would become law.

At this time our Government pays \$25 per day or approximately \$9,000 per year for each of these veterans who has been waiting for many years, hoping to find some way of returning to a more normal way of life. Which is better, to pay these men \$720 more per year or to continue at the present rate of \$9,000. True, we cannot close down the hospitals, and therefore we cannot expect to save our Government the full \$9,000 by vacating a bed; but if our present patients do not get this opportunity to leave, we will be forced to expand our existing facilities to accommodate the ever-increasing numbers of casualties resulting from the Korean conflict.

Mr. Truman puts great emphasis upon the disparity between nonservice and nonmilitary disabilities, yet he accepts very matter-of-factly the existing disparity between service-connected and non-service-connected disabilities. Many of our nonservice cases received their disabilities a matter of days after being discharged from service, but the fact remain they were not in service at the time they became disabled. By the same token, although in most cases, through no fault of their own, the

same fact remains that these nonmilitary disabilities did not serve in the Armed Forces of their country.

In view of these and other facts contained in the Veterans' Affairs Committee analysis sheet, can you view this as bad legislation? Are these men, who willingly served their country in time of war, deserving of an opportunity to live more normally again? Can the true cost be as high as is estimated? Can it possibly, in these cases of men untouchable by insurance companies because of short life expectancy, ever multiply to our President's very high stab at the century-end cost? We think not, and repeat again that we like to believe Mr. Truman was not aware of its true significance and value when he chose to send his veto message on this bill.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD T. WHALEN,
Legislative Representative.

Tensions in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the following summary of views expressed by Prof. Taraknath Das, as one of the participants in a panel discussion entitled "Tensions in the Middle East" on July 9, 1951, in one of the sessions of the Institute of Public Affairs, at the University of Virginia. I regard Professor Das highly, and I am favorably impressed with the contribution made by him to the conference mentioned above. However, there are a number of remarks made in the article with which I am not in accord. I have, therefore, appended to the end of this extension a number of footnotes in explanation of the areas of disagreement between us.

Professor Das' summary follows:

TENSIONS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(By Prof. Taraknath Das)

In the area between Egypt and India—as we may define the Middle East—the causes of tension are many. Besides the over-all problem of Soviet efforts to penetrate into the area and the present intense conflict over Iranian oil, we must list Anglo-Egyptian disputes over the Sudan and the Suez Canal, the problem of Arab-Israeli relations, including the vexed Arab refugee problem, the Egyptian blockade of Israel-bound vessels passing through Suez, Syrian opposition to Israel's drainage project in the Huleh swamps, the permanent status of Arab Palestine. In addition, India's foreign policies affect the whole of Asia, while additional sources of conflict are Pakistan's relations with her two neighbors, Afghanistan and India, and subversive Communist agitation in Pakistan.

Let us examine these issues briefly. The British desire to create an independent Sudanese state is bitterly opposed by the Egyptians who wish to give the Sudanese full local autonomy while federating the Sudan with Egypt. To one who has studied British procedure and arguments in partitioning other countries, British concern for minority rights and self-determination in the Sudan becomes suspect. One reaches the

conclusion that a Sudanese program which will intensify existing anti-British feeling in Egypt must be avoided. For rapprochement between Britain and Egypt is of utmost importance to the entire free world.

Ever since, through the farsighted statesmanship of Disraeli, Britain managed to get control of the Suez Canal, domination of the lands around the Canal has been the crux of British policy. There is nothing in international law to prevent Egypt from nationalizing the Canal when the 99-year lease of the Suez Canal Company expires. But an Egypt in control of Suez and allied with Soviet Russia would be highly prejudicial to the Atlantic Pact powers and the forces friendly to them in the Middle East. Hence, it is of the utmost importance that American, British, French and Egyptian statesmen devise a formula which will be satisfactory to Egyptian national interests as well as to the needs of the free peoples.

It would clearly be to the advantage of Egypt, in this tense situation, to come to terms with Israel, so that those two advanced Middle East states might cooperate toward greater security and progress. I sometimes hear vague talk of the possibility of such a settlement, but at the same time Egyptian and Israeli spokesmen continue to exacerbate matters by making public statements to the effect that the breach between the two countries cannot be healed. Certainly, as long as Egypt blockades Israel there is no possibility of a peace settlement. The blockade has been strongly protested by the United States, Great Britain, Australia, Norway, for since it involves oil which might otherwise be refined at Haifa, it touches Western interests to the quick.

It is of immeasurable importance to the future of the Middle East that the Arab League powers recognize that Israel is a fact which cannot be wished out of existence or destroyed by a new Arab invasion. Once Israel's existence is recognized, Arab hostility would, with inevitable logic, have to give way gradually to collaboration with Israel. This is not so impossible as it may sound. It was the program of the late Emir Faisal who welcomed Zionism to the Middle East as a future aid to the Arabs in the development of their territories.

In the framework of over-all collaboration, Israeli swamp reclamation would come to be seen as being what it really is—beneficial to the Arabs as well. Such projects would then cease to be sources of conflict and become factors towards cementing friendlier relations.

Essentially neither the Jews nor the Arabs can or should pursue a pro-Russian policy. Their friendship to the West will be strengthened if the Anglo-American powers and their friends in the United Nations encouraged Arab-Israeli cooperation. This will be possible if powerful forces in Great Britain and the United States foreswear their present sympathy for anti-Semitic thinking, on the one hand, or political Pan-Islamism, on the other.

Racial or religious exclusiveness of the Pan-Islamic or anti-Semitic types lead to intolerance of minorities and ultimately to refugee problems, as we see in the sad cases of the Arab refugees from Palestine or the vastly more numerous Hindu refugees from Pakistan. In the special case of the Arab refugees, it is beginning to appear that they might be best readjusted by making their homes in underpopulated Arab countries, with the aid of internationally administered funds to which Israel would contribute for compensation. The approach of combined resettlement and development work suggested by the Clapp Commission remains

See footnotes at end of article.

valid and should be the foundation stone of aid to the Arab refugees.

Certainly no area of the world needs large scale development more urgently than the Middle East.

Students of world affairs cannot ignore the fact that international tensions are caused not merely by international rivalry, but are often the direct result of internal conditions affecting the well-being of the masses. Poverty and depressed conditions lead to national disunity, civil wars, and revolutions, resulting in serious national weakness which invites aggressive action from expanding imperialist powers.

The Near and Middle East today are characterized fundamentally by abject poverty of the masses and workers, due primarily to the feudal land system. Whenever there are expressions of unrest among the masses of the Middle East, we are at once told that this is due to Soviet Russian plots and intrigues. To be sure, Soviet Russian governmental agents—Russian and native—are always alert to opportunities for spreading disaffection among the masses, but their propaganda alone cannot bring men to riot and revolt. Ordinary human beings are extremely conservative and do not wish to risk their lives to bring about a change in the social order unless they have reached the point of desperation. Full recognition must be given to the fact that the masses of the Middle East are reaching that stage.

The newspapers daily print items about unrest in the Middle East—attempts by peasants to take over the properties of landlords in Egypt, Iraq, Iran, Pakistan, and India. We read of the growing strength of left wing political groups in country after country.

It is often said that Islam immunizes the Moslem peoples against Communist propaganda. The Moslem countries are regarded as the bulwark against Soviet Russian imperialism trying to penetrate into the Middle East. Pakistan, in particular, is considered a dependable ally of the Anglo-American powers against communism. But the fact is that it was a Communist plot, headed by the chiefs of the general staffs of Pakistan and others, that recently almost overthrew the present government of Pakistan. The rise of the Tudeh Party in Iran, too, disproves the assertion that Islam is the best antidote to communism.

Social revolution in the Middle East cannot be checked by wishful thinking. The standard of living of hundreds of millions in the region must be raised by internal reforms, sponsored by the local governments and aided by the Government and people of the United States. It is here that point 4 program can play a great and crucial role, welding together diverse parts of the world toward freedom.

The case of Iranian oil is an aggravated example of the social tensions affecting the Middle East. Persia has been a pawn ever since Tsarist Russia and Britain tried to partition it between them as part of the attempt by the Triple Entente to check Germany and her Berlin-Bagdad Railway and German-Turkish collaboration in world politics. Persia is still a pawn and Persian nationalists and every self-respecting Persian resents this.

One of the most revealing items regarding Persian oil came out of the recent hearings regarding the ouster of General MacArthur. It was the information given by General Hurley to the late President Roosevelt that continued exploitation of Persian oil by the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. (which is controlled by the British Government which owns more than 60 percent of its stocks) will result in serious discontent in Persia which will be used by Soviet Russia. He suggested that Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. and other Middle Eastern oil concerns should take the initiative to make more equitable

arrangements regarding royalties, etc. Heeding this suggestion, American oil concerns have made greater concessions to the Arab States regarding royalties. Had the British Government followed this precedent, there might not have arisen the present crisis.

To look at the present crisis realistically, one will have to acknowledge that Iran, like Mexico and other countries, can, by exercising the sovereign authority of the state, cancel a concession and nationalize an industry. This is not contrary to the practices of international law. The Labor Government in Britain which has nationalized its coal industries cannot very well take exception to Iran's right to nationalize the oil industry. But it must be understood that Iran must not expropriate private property without just compensation. Adjustment of compensation should be arrived at between Britain and Iran, and the Government of the United States should use its influence to bring about a peaceful solution of the issues involved.² The Government of the United States should, however, be careful not to take any action which may give the impression that the Anglo-American powers are in concert against Iran. Landing British forces in Iran might well have serious repercussions in the whole of the Middle East and even lead to world war III.

The possibility of Iranian nationalists who are not pro-Soviet, seeking Soviet support, must not be ruled out. This can be clearly understood if we take into consideration certain developments in the situation in China after World War I. To my personal knowledge, the late Dr. Sun Yat Sen, after World War I, tried to enlist the cooperation and support of America, Britain, and also Japan toward abolition of extraterritorial jurisdiction in China, but the statesmen of those nations, largely through British influence, ignored Dr. Sun's legitimate pleas, while the Government of Soviet Russia formally gave up all extraterritorial rights and concessions in China. This situation forced Dr. Sun, who was pro-American and pro-Japanese and had always been suspicious of British and Russian imperialism in Asia, to seek Soviet Russian aid. Then came the importation of Soviet experts into the Republic of China under the Kuomintang regime. And we know what has happened in China, step by step, leading to complete Communist control.

In the present Anglo-Iranian crisis, American statesmanship should be directed toward the preservation of American interests, not following the British anti-Iranian program blindly. It cannot be overemphasized that if the conduct of the American Government in relation to the present Anglo-Iranian dispute is anti-Iranian, there will be very serious effects all over Asia, even in Egypt and Turkey.³ Today all Asian statesmen of any consequence must think and act in terms of Asian independence and sovereignty, and all of the Middle and Far East countries are in full sympathy with the present Iranian efforts to divest the country of British control. Any false step on the part of American statesmen will rouse Asian antagonism and raise louder cries of American imperialism siding with the British. Let us hope that American statesmanship, seeking to cooperate with the British, will be successful in solving the present crisis in Iran and solidifying the common interests of the Anglo-American and Asian peoples to uphold world freedom, rather than playing into the hands of Soviet Russia.

If we move further east to Pakistan, India, and Afghanistan, we find that tension between India and Pakistan and Afghanistan may have most far-reaching and disastrous consequences to the whole world. This is

not understood by the majority of Americans, even American experts on the subject, who have tended to make the British point of view their own.

The very creation of Pakistan by partition of India is an indictment of British rule. In pursuance of the policy of "divide and rule," the British authorities deliberately led up to partition.

Let there be any misunderstanding, let me acknowledge the fact that there was a very small group of Pan-Islamists in India during the latter part of the nineteenth century and the early days of the twentieth century, but not until 1940 did the demand for partition of India come from the Moslem League. It came then under the leadership of Jinnah, who in his early days had prided himself on being "an Indian first and a Moslem afterwards." The seed of this idea that Moslems and Hindus are different nations was sown by British officials who in 1905 introduced communal representation into Indian political life in the Morley Minto reform scheme. The Moslem League and the British authorities nurtured the seed of disaffection for 35 years, and in 1940 the demand for partition of India came to the fore in Indian politics.

In 1947 when the British found that they could not remain in India as rulers, they decided to leave India in partitioned, not united form. Mr. Churchill agreed to support Indian independence, provided that the Moslems of India were given a separate State—Pakistan, which would have territories in the northwestern part of India adjoining the Persian Gulf and Afghanistan and western India (Punjab) and in northeastern India (eastern Bengal) adjoining Tibet, Burma. This was a monstrous scheme from the political and economic points of view, and unfortunately the leaders of India, such as Mr. Nehru, did not have the vision or courage to oppose partition effectively because they held that after the British got out, Pakistan and India would become a United India.

In supporting the Moslems of India, the British hoped to use the Moslem blocs of western Asia as an obstacle on the path of the Soviet march towards the Persian Gulf and the Middle East, while in the East they anticipated using eastern Pakistan, Burma and Malaya to check the Russians and Chinese.

The Indian people cannot help feeling that any nation that supports the cause of partition of India cannot be a friend of India. This is one of the facts in the Indian attitude of nonhostility to Soviet Russia and China. They feel that the Anglo-American Powers are for Pakistan and against India, as has been demonstrated in their attitude on the issue of Kashmir. The Anglo-American powers seem anxious to appease the Moslem world even to the extent of hurting the vital interests of 340,000,000 Indians.⁴

The reflex of this is the growth in India of a trend towards Russo-Chinese-Indian collaboration in world politics which is dangerous for America and the people of India and the world at large. The only way for the free powers to counteract this is to adopt a positive policy which will lead to Indo-Pakistani cooperation, not at India's expense, but in terms of the development of federalism in India and Pakistan so that Pakistan would be analogous to the province of Quebec in Canada. Today more than 35 to 40,000,000 of Moslems live in India and enjoy equal rights. Just as Catholic and French-speaking Canadians in Quebec are Canadian citizens and Quebec is an integral part of the dominion, so Pakistan must in the course of time be reunited with India in a new United India which will pursue a policy of collaboration with America.

See footnotes at end of article.

See footnotes at end of article.

Playing Pakistan against India, to check the possibility of the development of a strong united India, is as dangerous as it was to play Japan against China to avert what was called the "Yellow Peril." That policy, originated by the British, Germans, and Russians, did not serve to maintain western or white supremacy in Asia. If a similar policy is adopted by America now, it will also fail and ultimately help the cause of Soviet Russia.

American scholars tend to think exclusively in terms of Europe, and of Asia incidentally; but I venture to predict that Asia is the key to the future destiny of mankind and that cooperation between Asia and America is the most important factor in the field of world politics and one of the best hopes for the future peace of the world.

FOOTNOTES BY CONGRESSMAN CELLER

¹ I have yet to note that Israel has stated that the breach between her and Egypt cannot be solved by peaceful settlement. Frankly, Egypt deserves the condemnation of the world for her refusal to allow cargoes destined for Israel to go through the Suez Canal. It is, indeed, hoped that the resolution sponsored by the United States, Great Britain, and France now pending before the Security Council of the United Nations will pass. If Egypt continues to act in violation of international law and ignores the action of the Security Council, economic sanctions should be invoked against her.

² Since this address was delivered by Professor Das, President Truman has most effectively and graciously interceded, with a view toward resolving the difficulties between Iran and Britain. Presently, the President's special adviser, Mr. W. Averell Harriman, is in Tehran and has partially succeeded already in leveling off the sharp edges of the dispute.

³ The attitude of the United States has never been, and is not now, anti-Iranian.

⁴ I emphatically disagree with Professor Das in his implication that the United States seeks to appease the Moslem world as against India. We have just completed arrangements for the shipment of 2,000,000 tons of grain to India. That was no mere gesture of friendship. It was an act of the uttermost friendliness to India. I, personally, espouse the cause of India on the issue of Kashmir. Reasonable men may differ with me and with Professor Das on this subject. That need not necessarily make them anti-Indian and appeasers of Pakistan and the Moslem world.

Point 4 Expanded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following editorial which appeared in the Sioux City Journal, Sioux City, Iowa, on August 12, 1951:

POINT 4 EXPANDED

As hearings continue in Washington on the administration's point 4 plan to aid foreign nations, charges are being made that the program has been enlarged from its original concept.

Disclosure of dissatisfaction among members of the Senate Foreign Relations and

Armed Services Committees was made public by Senator TOM CONNALLY, an administration Democrat. He said some members had "expressed concern at the expansion of the technical and economic assistance programs beyond the original concept of point 4."

Enlarging upon the Connally statement, Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH of New Jersey criticized point 4 experts for promoting wholesale farming in the world's backward areas. Too much stress is being laid on furnishing such materials as farm machinery, he said, in the program for which the administration has asked \$67,000,000.

The so-called point 4 plan is included in an \$8,500,000,000 foreign aid authorization bill now under consideration by the committees. What it actually amounts to is a continuation and expansion of the old Marshall plan under another title.

Testimony reveals that agreements already have been reached to furnish 32 countries with technical assistance. This represents no small job. It puts the United States in the position of playing Santa Claus to most of the world, despite the unalterable fact that we cannot afford it in view of our national debt of over \$250,000,000,000 heavily increased taxes, unbalanced budgets, and the forthcoming heavy expenditures in our defense-war effort.

If we must buy the good will of the so-called backward countries to save them from communism, as we are planning on doing through the point 4 scheme, one wonders what will happen when we cut this flow of money and materials from Uncle Sam's horn of plenty.

Even the most philanthropic fair dealer cannot believe we will be able to continue doling out billions to the backward areas of the world forever. Someday it will have to stop. What then? The administration hopes, and indeed it is only a hope, that communism will have been stopped by then and the recipient countries will be back on their economic feet.

This same hope was held out for the Marshall plan countries back in 1948. Yet today, about 3 years and quite a few billion dollars later, we still are furnishing tremendous sums to the very countries which we were told would be in shape to do the job themselves by this time.

Aid to other countries promises to be a continuing drain on our resources. Two world wars already have taken their toll of our manpower and our wealth. Another may be on the way, one which promises to make the other two appear small by comparison.

The prudent course would be to conserve our strength, to make absolutely certain we will have what it takes to win a long and bloody war if we are forced into it. We cannot achieve that goal by dissipating our wealth.

Does Our Foreign Policy Play Into Russia's Hands?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD the following article by Dorothy Thompson which appeared in the Ladies' Home Journal and which has been sent to me by Mr. Crawford Wheeler, of Nyack, N. Y.

Miss Thompson questions this administration's foreign policy, in Europe and

Asia, suggesting that in Asia we have played into Stalin's hands by backing internationalism when the whole continent is seething with nationalism and revolution. A war in Europe, she believes, would "break down the last remnants of a political, social, and economic order," and while it might result in the overthrow of the Stalinist regime, "it is hardly conceivable that it would result in the kind of social order we should like to see."

This country—

Miss Thompson writes—

during the whole Truman administration has been too much under the domination of military and strategical thinking, and terribly lacking in both historical sense and political imagination.

The full text of Miss Thompson's article follows:

WAR AND REVOLUTION

(By Dorothy Thompson)

I doubt whether the political leaders of the west, and especially of the United States, are giving sufficient thought to the historic interrelationship between war and revolution.

We wish to halt the spread of communism, and picture it as extending itself by the armed forces of the Soviet Union and its satellites. To counter this, we are building up force to frighten the Communist states into caution, and, if they attack, to defeat them.

But the question which ought to be more seriously explored is whether a revolution can ever be checked by armed force. Revolutions, to be sure, carry on wars; but wars create the revolutions. For war is itself a revolution, embodying the very spirit of violence in its most complete expression, infecting the human spirit, accustoming men to hideous cruelties, dislocating stable economies, and intensifying all the grievances and injustices which are present in every society, by adding to them the supreme injustice— injustice against the very order of nature. For in the order of nature, the sons of men bury their parents, but in the order of war, the parents bury their sons.

Both ancient and modern revolutions illustrate the truth of this interrelationship between war and revolution. The French Revolution, which for those who passed through it was anything but the expression of liberty, fraternity, and equality, and was instead anarchy, mob rule, terror, people's tribunals, tumbrels, and the guillotine, followed three centuries of almost perpetual war. The great revolution did not break out all at once. Revolutions never do. Revolution was a gradually mounting thing, imperceptible at first to those who were destined to be its victims, finally exploding in the great torrent of 1793.

The financing of the American war (for the embarrassment of England, with whom France was at war) played a definite role in the French Revolution. It bankrupted France. External struggles greatly increased the power of seceding generals, led to violent monarchist reactions further inflaming an oppressed population, and created hordes of émigrés who played a disastrous role abroad, in bringing into being an anti-French war coalition.

The war against this coalition could only be conducted by radical leaders able to resuscitate the people in the name of revolution itself. It was the revolution which created Napoleon Bonaparte. He was eventually defeated, though it took all Europe to do so. And although the allies restored a Bourbon to the French throne, the restoration was only temporary. For no restoration has ever long survived a revolution. France lost the war, but not the revolution.

The Russian revolution was even more patently the offspring of war—and a war which Czarist Russia invited, though she did not initiate it.

A handful of Bolshevik agitators could never have seized power in Russia but for the anarchy accompanying collapsing armies, and the cry of a war-weary people for peace. The Russian masses knew nothing of Marxist theory. The Bolsheviks succeeded because—apart from their promise of land to the peasants—they were the only peace party. The revolution started with a naval mutiny, followed by large-scale desertions from all forces. The first Red army was made up of these seceding officers and soldiers out to disarm others who, wanting to continue the war, were aided by the western allies who were still fighting Imperial Germany. The western interventionists kept on supporting the "Whites," even after the war with Germany was over, and the civil war then took on the nature of a national struggle against foreign interventionists.

Thus, though the Germans had been the original enemy, and though they had extracted, at Brest Litovsk, a brutally hard peace, the national struggle entirely changed its nature, and became directed against the antirevolutionists allied with the Western Powers. It was successful.

The Chinese revolution was also a direct result of over a decade of war. Poverty is endemic to China, landlordism, the depredations of war lords, overpopulation, Government weakness plus corruption had been part of the China story for centuries. But war intensified economic suffering. In China, as in Russia, an international war turned into a civil war. One can argue that the outcome was determined by Russia's arming the Communists from the Japanese arsenals in Manchuria, while the western Allies gave meager support to Chiang Kai-shek's forces. But no one can say with authority that if the West had supported Chiang more vigorously the outcome would have been different.

The historical record of successful armed foreign intervention against revolutionary forces is very poor indeed. For there is a characteristic of all revolutions of which history has a record. They succeed only when they have united the revolutionary creed and order with the national will.

This evolution occurred in Russia by grace and aid of the German attack. In anticipation and apprehension of it, following the rise of Hitler to power, Stalin purged the so-called Old Bolsheviks. Why did he do so? That the original revolutionary leaders so ruthlessly exterminated were guilty as charged no one who read even the Russian account of the trials can believe. But the original revolutionaries were men of European background and trained in internationalism. Stalin (like Robespierre) was a nationalist. He would not risk the counsels of men who for a generation and more had had ties abroad, even though those ties were with foreign Communist Parties. He knew that a successful war can be fought against a foreign invader only on the basis of patriotism.

There is another characteristic of revolutions. External interventions always accelerate their extremisms, as they pursue and persecute every person even suspected of foreign sympathies or connections.

It looks, therefore, as though it were best for more conservative societies to let revolutions run their course, and to hold aloof from them, not rush into them.

In Asia, in particular, the contemporary revolutions are a combination of social revolt—accelerated by sufferings of the past war—and national revolt from centuries of colonial imperialism and western interventionism.

If we do not understand the British attitude toward nonintervention in China, it

is because, I believe, we have not shared the British experience in Asia.

India and Pakistan have been kept, with however tenuous ties, within the British Commonwealth and out of the Soviet sphere of influence, only because Great Britain voluntarily left India without firing a shot. Suppose she had insisted on her "rights" in India? Is it possible to believe that men like Mr. Nehru would have been in power today? On the contrary, the power would have passed to revolutionary leaders who would immediately have been supported by the Soviet Union. It would be a supreme irony if the United States, by repelling aggression in Asia—actually by intervening in a civil and revolutionary war—should only succeed in driving India and Pakistan out of the British Commonwealth.

In Asia the Soviet Union has acted with great adeptness. Stalin is supporting Asian nationalisms, while the policy of the U. N. bloc, led by the United States, has been to support international intervention. I cannot see how this can have any other result than further to solidify the national spirit with the revolutionary order.

U. N. internationalism cannot, at this stage of history, exercise any pulling force upon countries animated by a furious revolutionary, nationalist and anti-Western spirit. The one thing that would certainly tighten and prolong the Russian domination of China would be a war in China between the West and the Red government. For this reason alone the war in Korea has been wholly in the Soviet interest.

As for Europe, the thought that it could be saved for any order of liberty and law by another war fought on its soil cannot be entertained by anyone with a political mind. Another war would break down the last remnants of political, social, and economic order, already undermined by the last war, and regardless of the machinations of the European Communist Parties.

Military minds can figure out how a war can be won—that is their training and business. But they have never been able to envision the social, economic, and political consequences of even a victorious war.

This country, during the whole Truman administration, has been far too much under the domination of military and strategical thinking, and terribly lacking in both historical sense and political imagination.

War never creates the conditions for a serene and reasonable social and political order. It is, for instance, possible that another war would result in the overthrow of the Stalinist regime. But it is hardly conceivable that it would result in the kind of social order we should like to see. The more probable result would be ungovernable anarchy.

This I write down in this year of decision in a plea for a more cautious and prudent foreign policy. Revolution is not stopped by war. War is the culture in which it flourishes.

Truman's "Airpork"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, although unsuccessful in stopping the authorization of a \$19,019,000 Federal hand-out for the construction of a huge airport at Grandview, Mo., this fight is not yet over. An appropriation for this purpose

must still be approved, and if the House Appropriations Committee fails to remove this item from the bill I will certainly offer an amendment on the floor to do so.

This is but another example of the continued gouging of the taxpayers that is being approved by Congress under the guise of defense. It is a shoddy and unthinkable deal, as well described in the following editorial from the August 14 issue of the Chicago Tribune:

TRUMAN'S "AIRPORK"

Tucked away in an appropriation bill calling for \$5,750,000,000 in "military construction" is an item of \$19,000,000 to expand the airport at Grandview, in Jackson County, Mo. Grandview was the home of Mr. Truman's mother; Jackson County is his bailiwick; and the small field at the town is used principally to receive the Presidential airplane on flying visits to the old stamping ground.

Grandview has not the slightest strategic importance, but the continental air command, which has the Air National Guard under its direction, has announced plans to remove its headquarters from Mitchel Field, Long Island, to this community. If Grandview weren't associated with Truman, nobody would ever have heard of the place or considered it.

If a hayseed Congressman succeeded in dragging down \$19,000,000 for the old home town, he would feel justified in taking a few bows around the cracker barrel. But, somehow, dulled as the sensitivity of the American people may be to spoils politics, they don't quite expect this sort of thing from a President. They ought to know their man better. Truman's favorite dish is pork.

The Most Successful War on Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the Record Interpretation and Comments taken from Economic Trend Line Studies, and written by Chester D. Tripp.

This is a very interesting discussion, in which the idea is developed that war in the eighteenth century was more or less decisive, somebody won or somebody lost. But it seems in the twentieth century nobody wins a war, not even those who come out on top.

The war in Korea would be a typical example of what Mr. Tripp is concerned with in this essay. How can you win a war when you place on the backs of the winners, not only the cost of the war, but the cost of rehabilitation of the country losing the war.

The above-mentioned follows:

INTERPRETATION AND COMMENT

(By Chester D. Tripp)

THE MOST SUCCESSFUL WAR ON RECORD

I believe it was Dr. Johnson who observed that the major part of written history up to his time involved telling the story of struggles. We refer to these as wars. This is really a strange situation because the more civilized man becomes, the more he accomplishes that has nothing to do with warfare and these accomplishments should have

an ever increasing place in historical reference.

The conspicuous place that the story of warfare assumes in history may be due to its spectacular aspects. As a rule wars have been dynamic and decisive, and it is probably easier to write and read about them than some of the slow abstract developments that have evolved from the spiritual side of man, even though they seem fundamentally much more important than the use of the battle-ax or the machine gun.

Up to the eighteenth century or Johnson's time, war was more or less decisive—somebody won and somebody lost—and the stream of history was thereby diverted. However, if we can judge by the twentieth century experience, nobody wins a war, even the group on top loses. This has been true of late and will probably be more true from now on unless the type of tools of warfare can be radically changed, and it may be that such a change is taking place without our realizing it.

As one reviews the development of warfare, he is impressed with the fact that all the refinements are attained by increasing its violence and that when violence reaches a certain point, general devastation is the result. The man with the first stone mace had a big advantage over an unarmed opponent, but the bow and arrow and the spear made the mace rather obsolete. Every form of offense has evolved some method of defense that progressively increased the violence and the cost. The bow and arrow gave way to the crossed bow, the crossed bow to black powder, and black powder to TNT; the muzzle-loading rifle was simply an ancestor of the machine gun; and finally the use of atomic energy, for the moment at least, has clapped the climax.

It is literally true that from now on no nation can better itself by fighting a major war. The devastation that can be caused on both sides could cancel out the progress of the past hundreds of years. We have literally reached a point where warfare must be abandoned as a means of settling a controversy, or some new technique will have to be developed that could do something toward eliminating the frightful expense of modern conflict.

It is in the realm of such developments that perchance our enemy is working, perfecting something new that may be infinitely more potent than even atomic energy. I refer to the undeclared war and the subtle techniques that go with waging it.

It has finally dawned on the American people that we are in the midst of a serious struggle with the Russians. It is not a struggle that started last month or last year, but it has been growing more serious and more widespread since the close of World War II. The interesting thing about it is that the Russians rather realistically recognize the facts and have been pointing out in their periodicals and in their speeches that all they have to do is give the hated capitalists time enough and they will defeat themselves by their own efforts. It is their open claim that when our great capitalist economy becomes sufficiently congested and involved in maladjustment, that we will collapse of our own weight and then the world will be safe for a rapid spread of free democracy from the Russian point of view.

It seems to me that there is much to be said in support of the Russian thesis. Relatively speaking we are distorting our economy enormously, we are liquidating our strength on old-fashioned methods, while the Russians go on playing us like a fish on a line waiting for the day of exhaustion to come to pass.

It is certainly a fact today that we are expending fantastic effort and treasure on a side show of warfare, while to date the Rus-

sians have not lost a single man and very little equipment. In addition, they are clearly masters of the situation because they are in a position to needle us in half a dozen other directions, where again there would be no relation between our efforts and expense compared with their own.

Is this all just an accident; or, have they with realistic cunning developed a technique that may be altogether as important as the best efforts put out by our scientific brains and our enormous industrial establishments. It may be that they fully realize that the further we go in technical warfare the more expensive it gets and that the antidote from now on is going to be in the realm of mental activities which involve a good deal of training but very little expenditure of energy. It might be interesting to try to appraise what their new techniques are and to put some small part of the enormous energy and resources that we are pouring into the conflict into trying to combat it in kind.

In many ways they have an advantage no matter what we do. They are using every chance they can find to muster the ignorance, misery, and dissatisfaction in the world for the benefit of their cause. At first thought this seems to be a difficult thing to combat and our reaction to date has been to try to remove the misery and poverty of life by improving the standards of the whole world. This, however, on the face of it, is a program involving centuries, not years or months, and for 6 percent of the world's population to try to straighten out the other 94 percent to a point where they are satisfied with their condition, is a little too foolish to consider. However, it is simply perfect from the Russian point of view.

Their next most important tool as I see it, is their organization for the dissemination of information which is certainly world-wide and which effectively contacts the class of people that could rally to their cause. There is a fair smattering of communism everywhere in the world but there is a mighty small smattering of free enterprise in Russia where all the forms of freedom are legal enemies of the state. For the time being it is the greatest disadvantage to our cause that subversion can be practiced rather openly in all democratic areas but subversion of our type is not tolerated for a minute on the other side of the curtain. The mere fact such a situation exists points to one of the great weaknesses of democracy—our great belief in individual liberty is one of our great liabilities in combating what I am inclined to refer to as really modern warfare. Before we get through we may be forced to compromise with our democratic aspirations, and, in a controversy of this kind, insist on bilateral arrangements as far as free speech or individual freedom is concerned.

I think it is a fair statement that from now on no nation can indulge in the luxury of old fashioned warfare violence without ruin following in its wake. In addition to the damage that weapons can do to our economic and social organization which have taken centuries to build, a present-day war can absolutely bankrupt a nation within a short period of years. The great middle class, which the English and ourselves have up to now put such weight on, the class which is the backbone of any democratic practice will be eliminated, as its savings and its security go glimmering as a result of exhaustive taxation and deficit spending.

The whole structure of what we consider important may disappear for centuries to come. We have the best scientific brains in the country working on new inventions of destruction and mobilizing the means of producing them, but, outside of ECA and the Voice of America, we are doing almost less than nothing to show our less fortunate

brethren around about the world what our type of social organization might do for them. I know at the best the problem would be a difficult one but it is not an impossible one. I cannot feel that the idea would take more brains than to build an atomic bomb but it would take more patience, more wisdom, and more understanding of the other fellow's problems.

There are some serious reasons to believe that if democracy is eventually to be saved, some new types of weapons will have to be made effective, and, if we can judge by the Russians' success to date, these weapons will be more involved with the subtleties of the human mind than with inventions of destruction. It is pretty safe to say that today the Russians are waging the most successful war in history, successful because of its limited cost in men and material, successful because it does not of necessity carry in its train its own destruction.

William N. Oatis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following resolution from the Madison County (Ind.) Industrial Union Council in behalf of William N. Oatis:

Whereas Indiana's native, William Oatis, is now imprisoned by the Communist Government of Czechoslovakia; and

Whereas the Government of the United States recognizes that his conviction is a fraud, and

Whereas we have confidence in the President and the Congress of the United States, we the Madison County Industrial Union Council (CIO) do hereby respectfully petition and resolve that we favor any action necessary to be taken by our Government to facilitate and expedite the immediate release of William Oatis: Be it

Resolved, That the fraudulent conviction of this courageous newspaperman is a threat to the freedom of all men and uncompromising and militant action must be taken by our leaders; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the two Indiana Senators and the United States Representatives from the Fifth Indiana District, the President of the United States, Philip Murray, president of national CIO, and Neal W. Edwards, president of Indiana State Industrial Union Council, CIO.

DALLAS W. SELLS,
Recording Secretary.

Veterans' Home Loan Guaranty Entitlement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the amendment on the

captioned subject that I proposed today to S. 349, the Defense Housing Act, two letters were mentioned in the debate. They refer to H. R. 1014, a bill I introduced January last to accomplish the objective of my amendment. The text of these letters is appended hereto:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN

WARS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., February 26, 1951.

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JAVITS: This is to thank you for your letter of February 23, 1951, and enclosures, in reference to H. R. 1014, your bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 with respect to the guaranteeing of home loans.

The objective appears to be highly meritorious and although we have no national encampment mandate on the subject, it is believed our national legislative committee will authorize this office to support your bill.

Your correspondence is being kept before me for further attention at the earliest practicable date and commending you for your efforts to liberalize the existing law and regulations governing home loans, I am

Sincerely yours,

OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Director.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Washington, D. C., March 27, 1951.

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JAVITS: In reply to your letter relative to H. R. 1014, a bill to amend Public Law 346 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, I am pleased to be able to advise you that the Disabled American Veterans will support this legislation.

While we have not received any correspondence from veterans relative to this subject, we do feel that the Congress intended the veteran should have the maximum use of the \$7,500 entitlement, under section 500 of Public Law 346, even though he may have used a portion of such entitlement in a previous loan.

If and when hearings are held on this measure by the Veterans' Affairs Committee the DAV will appear in support of it.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
National Legislative Director.

The Peace Conference in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Washington News of today, which bears the title "Ridgway's Firm Stand," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

This editorial calls to mind a statement I was privileged to offer on the subject The Puzzle of Korea, to the Washington State Association of the Loyal Order of Moose on July 19, 1951. There are some observations in this statement which, in the light of what is and is not now taking place in Korea, may be of

interest to my colleagues. I would suggest to those who are concerned that they consider the conditions which the Korean National Assembly on June 29 resolved should be met before any cease-fire was agreed to on or about the thirty-eighth parallel. What was a tragic situation when the Korean cease-fire talks began has become more tragic with the passing of each day.

I also ask unanimous consent that my statement to the Washington State Association of the Loyal Order of Moose be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PUZZLE OF KOREA

(By U. S. Senator HARRY P. CAIN)

Mr. Director-General Giles, Mr. General Chairman Sartori, members of the Loyal Order of Moose and Americans all, you may take as being a happy fact that I was deeply pleased and complimented by the invitation to address your convention here in Spokane. Your favor has brought me home; it permits me to join with an order whose principles and membership are noted throughout the country for outstanding loyalty and patriotism, and this favor offers me an opportunity to discuss with you the puzzle of Korea.

There was in your written invitation a paragraph which was particularly appealing to me. It was pointed out that the Moose lodge is intensely anticommunistic. It was emphasized that your members belong to all parties except the Communist Party and that by a resolution adopted at a national convention several years ago, membership in the Communist Party automatically causes any individual to be immediately dropped from the rolls of the Moose. By this action, you have given full evidence of your conviction that Communist aggression seeks only to destroy and devour freedom and free institutions throughout the world. It is good to be in the company of those who recognize the enemy by his intentions and are determined to stop that aggressor whatever the cost and sacrifices may be.

It is not possible for me to accurately define tonight what the United States and the United Nations are endeavoring to accomplish in Korea. It is a sad fact that as a Member of the Senate, and as a member of the Senate's Armed Services Committee, I do not know. All that any of us presently know is that the allied supreme commander in Korea is conducting consultations with the enemy supreme commander in Kaesong, which may lead to a cease-fire, to be followed by an armistice that may result in a peace treaty. If or when a peace treaty has reached the stage where it ought to be ratified, no one yet knows to whom that treaty will be offered for study and ratification. I need not remind you that after 13 months of war, the United States has never, by constitutional means, acknowledged that a war exists. I do not understand why a major war should be undertaken without congressional sanction and then be concluded by having the Senate of the United States ratify a peace treaty.

If, by way of argument, we assume that the peace treaty in question is not to be submitted to the Senate for consideration and ratification, then we must assume that any war of the future in which America may be engaged will be started, managed, won or lost, and concluded without any participation by the legislative branch of our Government. To me, this is a preposterous and suicidal prospect but this prospect is a definite possibility. You have previously heard almost nothing about this

serious and complex question. Yet it stands out as one of the strange and bewildering factors in the puzzle called Korea.

On June 29 our supreme commander, General Ridgway, as gallant and able an officer as lives, offered to negotiate an armistice with the Communist commander aboard a Danish hospital ship in Wonsan Harbor. This offer was approved by all members of the United Nations fighting in Korea.

On July 2, the North Koreans and Chinese Communists accepted via Radio Peiping, the United Nations proposal for a meeting to discuss a truce. The Communists ignored the suggestion to meet at Wonsan, and instead proposed that the meeting be held in the area of Kaesong, south of the thirty-eighth parallel.

On July 3, without a single word of objection, the Allies agreed to Red proposals that cease-fire talks open July 10 at Kaesong. In my considered view, the Allies, by accepting the enemy's terms as to place and time, gave to that enemy an unlimited propaganda advantage to which he was not entitled, and as a result of which millions and millions of individuals in the Far East are convinced that the free forces were required to wave the white flag of surrender and forced to sue for an armistice. Only a limitation on time keeps me from adequately defining the evil results to flow from our unwillingness to demand that the enemy meet with us on a neutral, nonbelligerent vessel.

I must tell you this about Kaesong and why it was strategically advantageous to the enemy for discussions to be held in that enemy-controlled city. Late in the fourteenth century in Kaesong—then the flourishing capital of the ancient Koryu Kingdom—the ruling dynasty was brought to an abrupt end by a coup d'etat which was triggered by the assassination of the Prime Minister. While crossing the beautiful stone Sunjook Bridge late one night, the Prime Minister was treacherously waylaid and stabbed to death, his blood seeping over the stones of the bridge. To present times, the Sunjook Bridge mysteriously turns red occasionally, and Koreans will tell you that it always becomes crimson when traitors and evil-doers are loose in the land. If the Sunjook Bridge still stands in the rubble city of Kaesong, will it turn red again during the cease-fire negotiations?

Ironically, it was in the Kaesong area that the officials of the ill-fated United States-U. S. S. R. Joint Commission met to arrange the futile unification conferences held in Seoul and Pyongyang during 1946 and 1947. Soviet intransigence during those meetings prohibited any settlement and resulted only in the thickening of the iron curtain at the thirty-eighth parallel. It is a bitter coincidence that it was also near Kaesong that the United Nations Commission on Korea sought in vain to cross the thirty-eighth parallel into North Korea in 1948 for the purpose of holding and supervising nationwide, free elections.

You have often heard the Korean conflict defined as being a "police action." From the day this improper label was first used, informed Americans have bitterly opposed its application to a war which is today the fourth largest in our Nation's history. Total casualties on both sides exceeded 1,000,000 in the first year of the war. American battle and nonbattle casualties approximated 150,000 in the first year of the war. The total casualties in the first 12 months were greater than the combined totals of the War of the Revolution, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, and the Spanish American War.

On June 27, 1951, several days after Jacob Malik, a Russian spokesman, proposed discussions "between the belligerents for a cease-fire and an armistice providing for the mutual withdrawal of forces from the

thirty-eighth parallel," our American Secretary of State testified before your House of Representatives to urge approval of the administration's \$8,500,000,000 foreign military and economic-aid program for next year. He said it remains United Nations policy to unify Korea, if possible, but not by armed force. The Secretary stated that if the Chinese Communists had not intervened in the war, the campaign directed by General MacArthur probably would have resulted in the unification of North and South Korea. In this testimony the Secretary of State said more. He declared that ending the war along the thirty-eighth parallel would constitute a United Nations victory.

It is not possible for me to reconcile this attitude of the Secretary of State with the United Nations declaration of October 7, 1950, that the goal of the free members of the United Nations was a unified, independent, and democratic Korea. This resolution was approved by an overwhelming vote of 44 to 7 but not until the United Nations had created a unified command in Korea last July and directed it to carry out our political mission by military means. Military means were not authorized and employed until political discussions and diplomatic efforts directed at unifying Korea had broken down and failed utterly after years of effort.

I find it impossible to reconcile recent statements by the Secretary of State with what our President said to the Nation after he had returned from talking with General MacArthur on Wake Island last October. The President said, from San Francisco, on October 17:

"We talked about the plans for establishing a 'unified, independent, democratic' government in that country in accordance with the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations. It has been our policy ever since World War II to achieve these results for Korea. Our sole purpose in Korea is to establish peace and independence. Our troops will stay there only so long as they are needed by the United Nations for that purpose. The only victory we seek is the victory of peace. The United Nations in Korea are making spectacular progress. The North Korean Communists still refuse to acknowledge the authority of the United Nations. The United Nations forces are growing in strength and are now far superior to the forces which oppose them. The power of the Korean Communists to resist effectively will soon be at an end."

All of this tells us plainly that for some months after the Korean war began, it was the determination of the United Nations to provide whatever forces might be required to restore order and freedom to Korea. You never heard of a proposed or intended armistice at or about the thirty-eighth parallel until the nature and character of the Korean conflict had been changed following the entry of the Red Chinese aggressor into that war.

What puzzles me is why we free people should wage one kind of war against one aggressor in Korea and another kind of war against another aggressor in Korea. Like many another American, I thought in the beginning, and believe today, that our determination and mission was to restore freedom to all of Korea. I shall not forget that approximately one-third of our present 80,000 battle casualties were suffered north of the thirty-eighth parallel. Many a brave and duty motivated American, and allied soldier is buried and will remain forever above that parallel.

The thirty-eighth parallel in Korea is a new question to many an American. It is an old question as far as history is concerned. We ought to talk about this question and about Korea for just a little while.

I have a great respect, a greater sympathy, and some understanding of and for the

Koreans. Were I to do nothing other than compliment their patience, faith and courage, and define what the Koreans believe must be established before any possible peace treaty is ratified, this would constitute a constructive contribution I would gladly cross the country to make. History is full of forgotten men, forgotten purposes, and forgotten principles but Korea stands on the brink of becoming a forgotten nation. We are so likely to be over-impressed and deluged by the admonitions, declarations, and predictions of the high diplomats who serve the United Nations and our aggressor enemies that we are inclined to ignore the feelings and the rights belonging to these millions of human beings whose nation stands in danger of being totally devastated and ruined by the surging tides of battle between the belligerents.

Have you previously been told that Korea is the twelfth largest nation in the world with a population of 30,000,000? Are you aware that two-thirds of what remains in this population is south of the thirty-eighth parallel. Do you know that Korea has a recorded history of some 42 centuries? In all of these more than 4,000 years of existence, Korea has never committed an act of aggression north of the Yalu River.

In 1895, the Korean Empress was murdered by the Japanese and the Emperor was imprisoned. In 1896, the Emperor and the Crown Prince, who was held prisoner by Japan, escaped and took refuge in the Russian Legation. The Koreans attempted to set-up a new form of government under the influence of Russia. The Japanese about this time, offered to divide Korea with Russia and the thirty-eighth parallel was to be the dividing line. Both Russia and Japan had their eyes on Korea for many years prior to this date, each believing that eventually they would hold all of Korea.

On February 23, 1904, the Korean Emperor was forced to sign a treaty of alliance with Japan, which allowed Japan to make Korea a base of operation against Russia. In return, the Japanese definitely guaranteed the independence and territorial sovereignty of the Korean state.

In 1905 under the peace treaty between Russia and Japan, held at Portsmouth, N. H., Russia then insisted on the territory in Korea, north of the thirty-eighth parallel. Japan having won the war, notwithstanding they had offered to make this deal with Russia, decided that Russia was to have no part of Korea.

In 1919, President Woodrow Wilson in his 14 points, declared that all nations should have the right to self-determination. Dr. Syngman Rhee, who is a graduate from Princeton University, was a very close and personal friend of President Wilson. The Koreans believed that the President of the United States would break the shackles of the enslavement of the Korean people by Japan.

Though we remain in doubt tonight concerning the terms to be insisted upon by the United Nations before any cease-fire, armistice, or peace treaty is agreed to, we have no doubts concerning what the Koreans believe are fair terms to justify hope for a lasting peace. On June 29, the Korean National Assembly unanimously resolved that there ought to be no cease-fire on or about the thirty-eighth parallel unless five conditions were met. They are:

1. The Chinese Communists must withdraw beyond the Korean traditional boundary into Manchuria without causing any further harm to the lives and property of the civilian population of North Korea.

2. The North Korean Communists must be disarmed.

3. The United Nations must agree to prevent any third power from giving assistance to the North Korean Communists, militarily or financially.

4. The official representatives of the Republic of Korea shall participate in any international conference or meeting which discusses or considers any phase of the Korean problem.

5. No plan or program or course of action will be considered as having any legal effect which conflicts in any degree with the administrative sovereignty and territorial integrity of Korea.

In my view, these conditions must be accepted if there is ever to be any durable or lasting peace in the Far East. If we free people refuse to demand their acceptance now or if we fail to fight to impose these conditions on the aggressor, we shall merely pave the way for a far greater future disaster than the one which engages our attention now.

In 1943, at Cairo, the United States was one among other nations which solemnly pledged that Korea must be set free.

In 1948, the United Nations General Assembly created the government of the Republic of Korea as a sovereign nation.

In June of 1950, the United States and the free members of the United Nations set forth upon a crusade to protect the integrity and to restore the sovereignty of a new republic which those nations had created only several years before.

It was this manifestation of Christian faith and determination which caused General MacArthur to say to the Veterans of Foreign Wars last August:

"The decision of our President on June 27 lighted into flame a lamp of hope throughout Asia that was burning toward extinction. It marked for the Far East the focal and turning point in this area's struggle for freedom. It swept aside in one great monumental stroke all of the hypocrisy and the sophistry which has confused and deluded so many people distant from the actual scene."

In our 13 months of war, the free nations won a war against the North Koreans and have reached the stage of no contest with the Red Chinese. More than 10 percent of the total population of Korea has been killed or maimed or injured. Korea today is not a fit place in which to live. Its cities and towns and factories have been demolished and swept away. All that Korea can look forward to is an opportunity to rebuild and re-create her broken institutions and bodies. These achievements are humanly possible provided Korea is given a chance to reestablish herself as a sovereign nation. Without this hope, and expectation, we must not believe that any Korean has much to live for.

Some of you may recall that on March 24, 1951, General MacArthur stated that "Within the area as military commander, I stand ready at any time to confer in the field with the commander in chief of the enemy force in an earnest effort to find any military means whereby the realization of the political objectives of the United Nations in Korea might be accomplished without further bloodshed."

The State Department subsequently stated that "The political issues which General MacArthur has stated are beyond his responsibility as a field commander, and are being dealt with in the United Nations and by intergovernmental consultations."

General MacArthur offered to meet with the enemy because he was operating under orders and directives which would actually prevent him from seeking to accomplish our political objectives through military means, as he had been ordered to do in the early months of the war.

As long ago as late December of 1950, General MacArthur was advised that he could expect no substantial reinforcements from the United States and no additional units of troops from among our allies. General MacArthur was instructed to fight with what he

had and to expect no more. He was likewise prohibited from using the maximum striking power at his disposal because of restrictions on the naval and air arms under his command.

I can readily understand why the free forces in Korea are required to look to a cease fire or armistice to carry out our political objective in Korea. It has been understood for a long time that the free forces would not be provided with either the personnel or the equipment and matériel required to crush and repel the aggressors by military means. Under these limitations the accordian war in Korea could go on indefinitely with no positive decision being reached by either side. Under these circumstances Americans and our friends would be required to continue to offer their lives on the altar of futility. One must be puzzled by this fact that America has long been engaged in a vicious war in which American forces are prevented from utilizing their maximum strength, and are required to fight with inadequate numbers.

This being clear, I shall remain puzzled all of my life over the fact that our supreme commander was dismissed for having offered to discuss a possible truce or armistice with the enemy military commander, while those who dismissed him waited 3 months to jump at the first opportunity offered by a Russian spokesman to seek a cease fire and armistice in the field.

If there is a way to call off the killing in Korea while making certain that the mission which took the free nations to Korea is accomplished then we want to stop that killing at the earliest moment. General MacArthur sought to explore this opportunity 3 months ago. Such a possible opportunity is before us right now. Let us briefly examine it.

As I see the possibilities, one of three things can result from the consultations being held now in Kaesong:

The first: It is possible that political and diplomatic means will be employed following the cessation of military activities to consummate an independent and unified Korea. Our Secretary of State and other United Nations members have stated that when the actual fighting has stopped, "regulation channels and conferences" could then be used to achieve the "political" goals. Unfortunately, however, not a single word has yet been said by any responsible American official or allied representative concerning precisely how, when, where, or with whom such political discussions will occur. What are our political plans? How can they be carried out? What new diplomatic methods can be used to be successful this time where diplomatic methods have failed in years gone by? The free members of the United Nations attempted repeatedly before the war began to negotiate with the Communists on the political level for a unified and independent Korea. Every attempt, when reason and high principle were used as weapons, failed.

The Communist aggressors are not likely to give ground politically while they remain in a position of diplomatic strength. They must recognize as signs of major weakness the current statements that the only goal of the war was to force the aggressor back to the thirty-eighth parallel. If this was the intention of the free nations, which it obviously never was, then the war could have been ended last fall when the tide of aggression had been pushed back to that line. If this had ever been an intention, who is to explain the puzzle which is apparent when we remember that the free forces reached the shores of the Yalu River last November?

How can it be claimed that political discussions will accomplish in the future what both bilateral talks and unenforced United Nations resolutions have failed to produce in

the past? There is no real likelihood, in short, that the proposed military cease-fire will be followed by a successful diplomatic settlement of Korea's future.

The second: It is possible that the cease-fire deliberations can result in the springing of a gigantic trap on the United Nations armies. It would be relatively simple for the Communists to declare in any stage of the military negotiations that some minor infraction or some misinterpretation on our part invalidated our original pledges. The time-consuming truce talks could be used by the Reds as a breathing space, as a much needed pause during which communication lines could be repaired, war matériel stockpiled, and fresh armies organized. Should we agree to a cease-fire truce on or about the thirty-eighth parallel, the United Nations forces would abandon favorable defenses and return to a militarily untenable line. The Reds could be planning to re-launch an invasion during the winter months when weather conditions are favorable to their type of warfare and when that same weather would work the greatest hardships on the free forces, as was the case last winter.

The third: The most likely result of the Kaesong discussions, from an optimistic point of view, will be a real cease-fire to be followed by long months, and perhaps by long years, of endless political and diplomatic negotiations on the question of establishing an independent, unified Korea. It by no means follows that a satisfactory peace follows a cease-fire. There is reason to believe that a suspension of military action and the initiation of diplomatic maneuvering is to the advantage of our enemies and the Soviet Union at this time. Unless the previously mentioned conditions are accepted in any armistice terms, I should think that the Kremlin would reap these benefits: (1) It can pose as the initiator of peace; (2) it tightens its hold on China and avoids the dilemma of either sending more supplies to the Red Chinese or watching the rapid disintegration of a satellite army; (3) it stops the huge losses in Communist matériel and men, and at the same time ties down large American and much smaller Allied forces in Korea; (4) as a result, the Kremlin will be free to move in other directions as it pleases and (5) most importantly, the interminable political parleys will leave Korea smashed and still divided—to be used as an object lesson by the Kremlin to show any threatened Asian nation what will happen to it if it should decide to resist Red pressures.

The only conceivable consequence, from my American point of view, which we must permit to come out of the war is a unified and independent Korea. In part, this is a selfish view but it will always remain as a realistic view. A united Korea would be a valuable asset to the free world. A divided Korea would be a continuing and amazingly costly liability. If any decision permits Korea to remain divided by an artificial boundary line, the economic life of Korea will remain disrupted and she will become an economic burden on the United States. Politically, the Republic of Korea will be faced with conditions of terror and tension until an ultimate settlement is reached. Morally the spectre of the 3,000,000 Korean civilian casualties and the utter devastation of the Korean countryside will haunt the conscience of the free world and point an accusing finger at the diplomats who are willing to permit the dead to have died in vain and willing to place the living in further jeopardy.

What I have said to you tonight will be deeply disturbing to most of you. There is no help for this distress which I share with all of you. I have tried objectively to relate the facts in the puzzle of Korea as I understand them to be. I stand among those of you who pray and hope that our negotiators will demand justice for Korea. I am with

you who believe that the free nations must do for Korea what we would expect others to do for us under comparable circumstances.

We want to help unify Korea because we are Christian people. We want to give independence to Korea because we are Americans. We must make Korea free because for as long as any part of Korea remains in bondage, the aggressors will be inclined to ravage and despoil other nations who do not possess sufficient power to defend themselves against those who rule by tyranny and oppression.

If the free nations can provide Korea with freedom, unity, and independence through conferences at an armistice table, so much the better for everybody. If, however, these ends are not attainable through conferences, then we free people must, if we hope to live in a future free world, fight with every weapon at our disposal to accomplish these ends.

A marauder has been ravishing and seeks to devour a precious segment of freedom called Korea. Unless that marauder is stopped cold, crushed and repelled in Korea, or accepts the conditions laid down by the Koreans, he will seek to carry out his determination to devour freedom everywhere. The only possible way to avoid his intentions for the future is to stop him now, at the conference table or on the field of battle.

Freedom has designed its own standard by which it wishes and seeks to live. The time has come for the free peoples of our world to live up to and carry out their own bold declaration of faith and purpose. Our only weakness in Korea is that we have failed to obey our own instructions. It is never too late to right a wrong or to live up to one's responsibilities.

Our leaders have said repeatedly that free people hate war, but that they love their liberties more. We have said that we will not stand by and see these liberties destroyed. We have said that we want peace in Korea and throughout the world, but that it must be a peace founded upon justice. We maintain that this American policy is as old as our Republic, and that it is stronger today than ever before. We clinch the argument by stating that we intend to keep this policy inviolate.

If only we mean what we say, peace with unification can be restored to Korea and free men can walk erect throughout the world. If we betray our own words and fail to live up to what we say we mean, then freedom for you and me has gone forever.

Korea is but a symbol of the opportunity available to freedom throughout the universe. For us to fail to restore independence to Korea is for us to acknowledge the supremacy of tyranny and slavery. How foolish, cynical, and futile for us to even entertain the thought.

[From the Washington News of August 16, 1951]

RIDGWAY'S FIRM STAND

In his extraordinary session with news correspondents in Tokyo this week, General Ridgway cogently summed up in one sentence the reasons for the United Nations' adamant stand on a demarcation line in Korea. He said:

"We propose we shall have a line—if and when we are attacked again—we can defend."

The U. N. commander insisted he was not charging bad faith to the Reds, but in all truth he was taking a literal and most sensible view of the issue which has deadlocked the two delegations at Kaesong since July 27.

It is a crucial issue which could bring complete collapse to the truce talks overnight. And General Ridgway is well within his rights in breaking them off if the Reds persist in their demands. For him, it is a purely military question, involving the only guarantee with any degree of security for

our troops against a new and overwhelming surprise in Korea.

The question is essentially this: The Communists want a demilitarized buffer zone along the thirty-eighth parallel. The Allied forces are now firmly entrenched on a line that runs from just below the parallel on the west to a point roughly 35 miles above the parallel on the east. If General Ridgway should accede to Red demands, the Allies would have to withdraw, giving up ground won at the cost of many casualties.

More importantly, it would mean the Allies would have to take up a virtually indefensible line twice before overrun by the Reds with comparative ease.

There never has been any certainty that the Reds want to reach an agreement in good faith, even on the cease-fire proposals. It is known that since the Kaesong talks began, 6 weeks ago, the Chinese Communists and North Koreans have built up their forces for a potentially massive drive southward. In the light of our bitter experience with the Communists, who respect neither agreement nor the ordinary patterns of decency, how can anyone expect the U. N. commander to pull back to a precarious military position to satisfy Red demands as a price for continuing the truce talks?

The only agreement the Reds will respect, we know from experience, is one that can be enforced with arms. General Ridgway is playing his cards exactly right.

"I accept nothing on faith," he told his press conference. "My primary consideration is the security of my troops."

Hope may be dimming for the eventual success of the long, exhaustive negotiations at Kaesong, but it is reassuring to know our military commander has not deviated from his objective; that he is not interested in an armistice at any price.

Symposium on World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Sunday, August 12, issue of the *Wichita Beacon*, of Wichita, Kans., contained an interesting symposium on world affairs. It presented the views of nine of my colleagues and myself on the subject of our future international relations.

I think that Mr. Louis Levand, publisher of the *Beacon*, is to be congratulated for presenting these views to his readers. Although each of the comments represents an individual approach to the problem, there are a good many similarities in viewpoint.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the symposium be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE 10 UNITED STATES SENATORS GIVE THE BEACON THEIR VIEWS ON WORLD AFFAIRS

Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama: I am against the go-it-alone policy. The free world can stop the onrush of communism, but working separately the democracies are doomed. Therefore, I favor: (1) Continuing support and strength to United Nations, as the best single hope for world peace. (2) Adequate military and

economic aid to other countries that will join us in opposing the would-be world dictators. (3) Building a strong defense here to discourage aggressors from attack on us, and organizing offensive forces that can defeat any aggressor nation. (4) Remaining willing at all times to settle differences with other nations by negotiation and peaceful means, but always on honorable conditions absolutely devoid of appeasement in any form.

Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Republican of Maine: I think most every well-informed authority will agree that our foreign policy should be twofold: (1) To make aggression as unattractive as possible, and (2) to make cooperative peace as attractive as possible. Most of us support international economic schemes, such as the Marshall plan, to effect peace. But many of us oppose proposals for matching our military strength with our international economic goals. Before we can even approach a guess as to how large our armed services should be we must have some idea of what we want the size of our military force to do. We should make it crystal clear to the politburo that we will back our firm talk. Russia must be convinced that we mean what we say.

Senator PAT MCCARRAN, Democrat, of Nevada. Against our adversary (Moscow) who recognizes no rules, we cannot afford to play the game (war) according to Hoyle's rules or Emily Post's. Our hands have been tied behind our back, while Moscow acts with both hands free. Our propaganda must be in deeds as well as words. I urge five points: (1) Breaking relations with all Communist countries; (2) expel Russians and their puppets from all societies; (3) officially condemn the Kremlin for their crimes—slave labor, police terrors, mass murders (genocide), aggression against neighbors, denying civil rights, and so forth; (4) full support of underground insurgents against communism; (5) open cooperation with all fugitives from communism.

Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, Republican, of Ohio. We Republicans are constantly met with the statement: Nobody should question the recommendations of our military, nobody should question the foreign policies of our State Department. We who do question are immediately smeared by the administration press, by radio and television critics, and charged with torpedoing the "bipartisan policy," which hasn't existed since 1948. But it is true the great power of Russia today was built by the policies of Roosevelt at Tehran and Yalta and by Truman at Potsdam and by their acceptance of the theory that communism was a "form of democracy" and Russia was a peace-loving, liberty-loving democracy. Under such delusions we established the Russians in Berlin and Prague and Vienna.

Senator HARRY P. CAIN, Republican, of Washington: America's destiny has never before been so dependent on the outcome of a presidential election. This has become clear as crises and emergencies and startling events and wars follow one another over the Nation's news pages. I think it increasingly evident that whether or not we shall finally fall over the brink into a cesspool of socialism, corruption, and ultimate disaster, our fate will be determined at the 1952 polls. I was first to advocate rearming of Japan and China against the Reds, and also for incorporation of Spain, Greece, and Turkey in our European alliance. Spain is the only really tenable area in Europe today, protected from Red armies by the Pyrenees, as Britain is by the English channel.

Senator JAMES E. DUFF, Republican, of Pennsylvania: The United States faces a fight for its very existence. Never before has our Nation been in such mortal danger. We allowed our Military Establishment to fall apart for 5 years after the last war. Russia meanwhile was building its war power. To-

day it completely outmatches the might of all the free world nations combined. A year ago the Russian-inspired sneak attack in Korea almost won out. It caught us totally unprepared, unexpected. The Reds hoped to seize Korea, later Japan, still later the Philippines. But they missed the boat somehow. This week we have another fake peace proposal from Russia. Shall we shake hands in amity with a fellow that holds a dagger ready to stab us in the back?

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin: A 13,000-mile trip through Europe showed a group of us that the challenge of communism everywhere still remains. Only teamwork with our allies can do the big job that faces us. Here is what I found, in a nutshell: (a) The Marshall plan has worked. Western Europe has made great progress toward full economic recovery. Their production often exceeds prewar production. Their economic and military programs intertwine; (b) The general will to oppose communism has hardened, become firm. This will resist the enemy gains point from General Eisenhower's policies. (c) Europe's defenses can't be improved too fast. But they're pitifully weak compared to the 175 Red army divisions that may attack them.

Senator EDWARD MARTIN, Republican, of Pennsylvania: Years ago American citizenship was a protecting shield the world over. It was insurance against mistreatment, insult, and robbery. All nations respected Americans and our passports. That respect was earned by a firm, straightforward policy, backed by a courageous State Department. What now? You all know. Weakness makes Americans abroad the victims of injustice; American missionaries arrested and expelled, American businessmen tortured, forced to make false confessions for their lives; American reporters tortured, denied contact with our Government by arrogant satellites of Communist Russia. Teddy Roosevelt showed us how to speak softly, but carry a big stick. Now, we have a pink-tinted State Department making policies, selling out our reputation and prestige.

Senator BURNET MAYBANK, Democrat, of South Carolina: "There is nothing more urgent or important to our military program now than the work of the Atomic Energy Commission. The A-bomb alone has saved us thus far from a global war. Russia's respect for atomic power has preserved Europe's borders from Communist hordes. I am happy to be chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee handling their funds. We face two paramount threats: Externally, the ever-spreading scourge of communism; internally, the ever-mounting hazard of inflation. The first monster threatens the entire world. The second has a devastating appetite, capable of paralyzing our entire economy. It is easier to discuss these twin threats at the same time. They are part and parcel of the same diabolical scheme to wreak havoc and chaos on our people.

Senator OLIN JOHNSTON, Democrat, of South Carolina: The Federal Government's multi-billion-dollar foreign-aid program is designed to send us into economic ruin or give us a black eye before our political allies abroad. We are undertaking a financial responsibility unparalleled in world history. The time has already arrived when this should be greatly decreased generally and terminated in many instances. But when steps are taken in this direction it will seem like "taking the bottle away from a hungry baby." That will mean ill-feeling abroad. If we continue this spending program, it will be with money we do not have. Our taxes will rise again and again and again. We have already expended far more abroad than will ever be spent on our needy people here at home. I see the result as an advance of Socialist thinking and planning.

The West Point Case**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, in yesterday's Washington Post appeared an exceptionally fine letter from a West Point cadet entitled "Cadet Speaks," dealing with the honor system at West Point and the recent violations which have been so widely publicized. This cadet points out what a comparatively small number of boys at West Point are involved in this affair, and emphasizes the fact that we should not condemn the others because of the few who have gotten themselves into trouble. His letter certainly shows the deep feeling of the cadets for their motto, "Duty, honor, and country," and I feel it is a fine expression of the attitude of most of the boys there.

I might add that I am very proud to say that none of the boys I have appointed to West Point have been involved in this matter in any way.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CADET SPEAKS

I am one of the 2,400 cadets at West Point and, the motive for writing this is to be found in the multitude of newspapers that spread throughout this great country of ours and reach the eyes of all our people.

It seems to be somewhat misunderstood what has happened at West Point and some of the statements of our distinguished Senators have really caused me worry; especially those who suggest "the abolishment of West Point." It seems to me that these men wish to extinguish one of the greatest lights that burns for democracy and freedom, and has lighted the way for us in times of peril, by the production of some of our finest and greatest military leaders, for many decades.

We at West Point feel that the honor system is one of the bulwarks that has supported and developed the fine men that have graduated from the Academy. It has not produced merely good men, but the best men. We all know this system and have lived by it. We have had complete faith in our fellows and never once doubted them or their actions. It certainly was a blow to us all, but we do not feel prejudiced in any way. We know and like these men. They are fine fellows, but, and I emphasize, they violated what we all upheld and so they must pay as others have. (Here I wish to pose a question: Why don't people judge West Point by the 2,300 men remaining instead of the 90 who have erred?)

They should not be entitled to violate this code and receive some sort of punishment different than those who have been dismissed in the past. It seems that if these men had been firm in their respect for West Point and its ideals and had really wanted to be the kind of men that graduate, they would not have committed themselves to what they did.

I imagine that it is somewhat hard for you to understand why we feel the way we do, but I ask you to look at our shield and emblem where you see duty, honor, and country. These are not words only, but they really mean what they say, and what they

stand for is what we stand for. There is no glory mentioned there and men do not and should not come to West Point for glory in any one form or another.

I feel that the thousands of men that have graduated feel the same as I do. I, myself am only an average cadet, with average marks, and am from an average American family. There are hundreds like myself that go to school there and we work hard and we play hard.

It simply boils down to the fact that these cadets violated our honor code. Cadets, other than these, learned of these violations and investigated these men and found that they had done wrong. As I heard mentioned by another man, "Black is black and white in white and no light gray lines can be drawn in between." These men did wrong, and they must pay fully; if I did wrong I would pay the same penalty; and if any man does wrong he also is expected to pay the same penalty.

Again I say that West Point and her honor system is one of the greatest educational bulwarks in this world. If people wish us to produce as we have done in the past, then I feel that they should respect us and our honor system and I'm sure that West Point never has or never will fail the American people when called on for military leadership.

A CADET OF '53.

WEST POINT.

The Tidelands Issue**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. ZALES N. ECTON

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Tidelands Issue," published in the Washington Star on Sunday, August 12, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TIDELANDS ISSUE

There is reason to doubt that the Senate will go along with the so-called tidelands bill that the House has enacted by a vote of 265 to 109. In any event, if it ever reaches the President in its present form, the bill—sponsored by Democratic Representative WALTER, of Pennsylvania—is almost certain to suffer the same fate as similar legislation in the past. That is to say, it will be vetoed, and the chances of overriding the veto will be slim at best.

All this is fairly predictable because the bill is wide open to challenge on the ground that it is far too sweeping in the way it would quit-claim Federal rights to oil and gas deposits within the seaward boundaries of the coastal States. Although its critics have resorted to grossly exaggerated attacks on it, it falls considerably short of offering a good compromise settlement of the highly complicated issues involved in this long-standing Federal-State dispute over ownership and control of the vast mineral wealth in the submerged lands off our shores, particularly off Louisiana, Texas, and California.

The Supreme Court, in its historic decisions of 1947 and 1950, has affirmed that the Federal Government has paramount rights to the resources of the coastal lands beyond the inland waters of the States. What still remains to be determined, however, is the precise dividing line between those rights and the States' interests. Accordingly, in an ef-

fort to settle the question, the Walter bill provides that everything within the seaward boundaries of the States should be regarded as belonging to the States. Generally speaking, the boundaries would be those claimed by the States at the time of their entry into the Union. In most cases, the line would be 3 miles from the State's coast line, though for Texas, in keeping with the treaty ratified when it joined the Nation, the distance would be 10.5 miles.

For the sake of settling the dispute, the Federal Government might well agree to this provision of the Walter bill if the provision itself were definite and final. Unfortunately however, the bill declares that any State, if it can get the approval of Congress, may in the future extend its seaward boundary beyond three geographical miles, or beyond 10.5 miles in the case of Texas. In other words, the legislation, far from putting an end to the issue, would encourage the States to expand their claims in the years ahead and engage in recurrent legal controversy with the Federal Government. Moreover, it would entitle them—especially Louisiana, Texas, and California—to 37½ percent of all the royalties and other proceeds earned from the development of oil and gas deposits in the submerged lands recognized as belonging to the whole Nation, not merely to a few States.

If Congress would enact legislation definitely fixing the seaward boundaries along the lines suggested by the Walter bill (but without that bill's loophole for expansionist claims in the future) and if the revenue from the Continental Shelf beyond those boundaries were earmarked in the law for the entire Nation (without big special hand-outs to a small minority of privileged States), there would be little reason for a Presidential veto. At any rate, such a measure—which would uphold States' rights, but still recognize Federal paramountcy over submerged lands containing perhaps 70 or 80 percent of our offshore wealth—would serve the interests of the country as a whole more effectively than the one approved by the House.

As matters stand today, the offshore wealth is not being developed or exploited. This is so because the oil companies—as a result of the Supreme Court's decisions—have been enjoined from doing anything about it until the Federal Government and the States agree upon a firm delimitation of their clashing claims. It is certainly to the interests of all parties concerned—not least the American people—that Congress should legislate a compromise settlement less vulnerable to a veto than the Walter bill.

The Army Reserve Program**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Rooked at Rucker," which appeared in a recent issue of the Swift County News, published at Benson, Minn. The editorial deals with the inefficiency with which the Army operates its reserve program.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROOKED AT RUCKER

A typical example of how inefficiently the Army operates its Reserve program is the

taking of men from the Forty-seventh Infantry Division at Camp Rucker, Ala., as replacements for the soldiers now returning to the States from Korea under the rotation program.

How badly the Army has botched the Reserve program at the very start is well known, but a year after the war has been going on it is still tactlessly stepping on the toes of many servicemen.

Many of the men joined the National Guard years prior to their recall to active duty January 16. Most of them are veterans of World War II and have several years of longevity. The rest of the men who joined the National Guard prior to its mobilization the first of this year joined because they felt as long as they had to go into the Army, they might as well take their training with men from their home.

That was one of the big selling points of the National Guard program. Learn and train with men from your own home town, the posters blared at the young eligible men. They fell for the bait, and are now starting to know how the Army keeps promises.

They will now be sent as infantry replacements to the Far East command or Korea. They will be thrown in among men they have never seen before. Ask any veteran of World War II and he'll tell you that the life of an infantry replacement was the toughest thing he had to face in the Army. The Army has a "plausible" excuse for the calling of men from the Forty-seventh. It says that the men are members of the Army and hence subject to go anywhere on the international checkerboard the service beckons. No one can dispute that. But to sell a man a bill of goods and then casually overlook the promises that lured him into the Army is rather callous and certainly not profitable.

With such tactics, it is small wonder that the Army has a hard time filling its Reserve ranks during times of peace. With such tactics it kills all incentive a civilian might have for joining a National Guard or Reserve unit.

The way it handles men once it gets them in the Army has created a deep feeling of mistrust that is not easily overcome.

Perhaps we're prejudiced because we saw the Benson National Guard leave here January 16 for Camp Rucker and know most of the fellows in the unit. We just wonder how the Army ever expects to build its Reserve program again with such flagrant abuses of the men once they are in the service. The seeds of discontent will bear fruit in the years to come when the Army again seeks to build its Reserve program.

Two men from Benson have already been taken from the division, and more are to go in the next call, which is expected to be out this week. The thought of going overseas wouldn't be so repugnant to most men of the Forty-seventh if they could go with the men with whom they have trained for the past 6 months.

In one swoop, the Army has gained perhaps 3,000 replacements at the cost of perhaps killing a future Reserve program.

Believe It or Not

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter

written by our colleague from Georgia [Mr. CAMP]:

BELIEVE IT OR NOT

My dear constituents, on Thursday, August 9, the House passed H. R. 5054, the largest peacetime appropriation ever made by any government in the history of the world. It is for the amount of \$56,000,000,000 to arm this country and prepare it to meet any threat to its security. This amounts to \$367 for each man, woman, and child in this country. It is hard to conceive of this vast amount of money. If it were coined into gold dollars, there would be 66,670 tons of these gold coins. If loaded into freight cars, each car carrying 40,000 pounds of gold or \$16,800,000, there would be 3,334 carloads of it. If these cars were made up into trains of 40 cars each, there would be more than 83 trainloads. If these trains were traveling over the same railroad at 15 minute intervals, it would take 48 hours, or 2 days and 2 nights, for them to pass through your town. As one Member said, "This is a lot of dough." It requires this sum to arm, equip, and maintain our Armed Forces of three and one-half million men. When this huge sum is expended, we hope that we will have an Army, Navy, and Air Force equal or better than that of any country in the world and sufficient to protect us.

Within a period of 60 days, this money will begin to be spent at the rate of \$1,000,000,000 each week. This money will go into the hands of our people and unless the strictest controls are exercised by the Government and by every man, woman, and child in the country, there may be rank inflation.

Everyone of us should guard against inflationary practices of every kind. We should not buy anything we do not need or can do without, and above all, we should not hoard food, clothing, or any other necessity.

I fear that many of our people do not realize the seriousness of this undertaking, and I hope that all of us cooperate toward the end that we will not be engulfed by the enemy of inflation at home while trying to protect ourselves against the threats of enemies abroad.

The weather is hot up here and we are working long hours in the hope that we may finish before September 1 in order to have a little rest.

Hoping to see you soon, I am

Sincerely,

SIDNEY CAMP,
Member of Congress.

A Conference on Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, following the recent disastrous floods the Lincoln Journal newspapers of Lincoln, Nebr., called a conference on the subject of flood control. It was held at Lincoln, Nebr., on August 11, 1951, and was attended by 280 weekly and daily newspaper representatives and farm and community leaders from Kansas and Nebraska. I would like to insert that resolution in the RECORD. It is as follows:

Whereas at this meeting assembled this 11th day of August 1951 at Lincoln, Nebr.,

there are assembled several hundred residents of eastern Nebraska and eastern Kansas, to discuss methods of flood control; and

Whereas the sentiment of the meeting is quite generally in agreement that the only sound approach to the flood-control program is an over-all, coordinated, cooperative approach consisting of a sound soil and water conservation program on the tributary watersheds, combined with both small and large retention structures on the minor and major tributary streams, together with such major, main channel structures as are indicated to control water that cannot be controlled in small watersheds; and

Whereas there have already been formed and are being now formed many organizations on a small watershed basis which are prepared or will be prepared to utilize Federal assistance in the full development of their soil- and water-control programs: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this body does therefore petition Congress to proceed immediately to make funds available to individual watershed groups who are prepared to utilize such funds to expedite progress and completion of conservation and flood control measures within their respective watersheds.

GI Education Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I also wish to include in the RECORD the following article from the New York Times of July 23, 1951. This article deals with the benefits derived by the Veterans under the GI education bill. It gives a graphic illustration as to how millions of our veterans have gained an education which they otherwise would have not had an opportunity to obtain. Many of them are now lawyers, doctors and other professional men. As they helped America on the battlefield in the last war, so they will help America on the home front through their education. Our country has gained immeasurably through their hard work and study. A great deal of conversation is being made about the wasting of the taxpayers' money, but it is my belief the GI education bill was one of the best investments this country ever made and the educational program of the bill was a worth-while service both to the veterans and to higher education generally.

The Times article follows:

GI CALLED CREDIT TO UNITED STATES EDUCATION—MATURE, SERIOUS STUDENTS DID MUCH TO RAISE STANDARDS, COLLEGE OFFICIALS DECLARE

(By Benjamin Fine)

The GI education bill, which enabled 2,350,000 servicemen to attend colleges and universities, and another 3,430,000 to go to technical and vocational schools, has left a permanent imprint on American education. Because of their maturity and seriousness, the veterans changed the general attitude toward schools and colleges.

These conclusions were reached in a survey of 30 representative colleges and uni-

versities, conducted by the New York Times. The study indicated that the influence of the veterans on education had been significant and wholesome. The campus "rah-rah" spirit has been, to a large extent, replaced by a down-to-earth, scholarly attitude.

After Wednesday, no veteran will be eligible to begin training under the GI bill, which already has provided for 8,170,000 veterans an educational and training that cost \$14,000,000,000.

Virtually all the educators reached in the survey urged that Congress extend the provisions of the GI bill to include men now fighting in Korea or those who have been drafted.

FEW WENT "JUST FOR THE RIDE"

In the opinion of the educators, few ex-servicemen attend college "just for the ride" or to "get on the gravy train." Contrary to fears expressed when the bill was adopted in July 1944, the educators held that the men who studied under Government subsidy were serious minded, attended to their studies, and in all other respects were a credit to their institutions. Indeed, for the most part they got higher grades and did better work than their civilian classmates. In almost every respect, the average veteran was a superior student on the campus and in the classroom.

To a considerable extent, the veteran tended to be more vocational minded than the nonveteran. He was interested in courses that would prove worth while or assist him directly in his profession. For that reason, he was more impatient with cultural courses that did not contribute to his technical training.

But the veteran also changed the general attitude of the public toward education, the survey showed.

Several educators pointed out that a feeling had developed among parents that their sons must get at least a college education if they were to amount to anything or be able to compete in the professional labor market.

A significant influence of the veterans on colleges was the change in teaching methods. Because the veterans were more mature, instructors were able to go to the heart of a problem without too much preliminary introduction. In the opinion of Dr. William H. Coleman, dean of the college at Bucknell University, the GI's stimulated better teaching. A survey taken at Bucknell showed the importance of student attitude and maturity.

Those who made the lowest grades as pre-war students showed the most improvement in the postwar years. Dr. Coleman noted that the veterans had a steady influence on the campus, as their greater experience and maturity made their college work take on new meaning.

Similarly, officials at the University of Pennsylvania pointed out that the interest taken by the veterans in their studies had set a helpful example for the student body as a whole. There was a definite feeling on this campus that the educational program of the GI bill was a worth-while service both to the veterans and to higher education generally.

From the University of Illinois, Dr. Robert G. Bone, director of the division of special services for war veterans, said the faculty had been stimulated because the GI was not afraid to ask questions or to discuss any point with the teachers.

TEACHERS KEPT ON THEIR TOES

"More than one teacher has told me that he had to be on his toes in his classes after 1946 as never before," Dr. Bone commented.

"We have statistics each semester showing conclusively that the scholastic average of the veteran was higher than the nonveteran (the married veteran was higher than the unmarried veteran). The percentage of vet-

erans placed on probation and dropped has always been lower than the nonveterans."

James C. Dolley, vice president of the University of Texas, brought out that the GI's did consistently better academic work than nonveterans—about one-half a letter grade higher on the average. He added:

"The GI's toned up the general level of scholarship. When they took part in student activities—such as student government—they were more mature and practical in their approach to problem solutions."

The coordinator of veterans' education at Northwestern University, Dr. Chester Willard, said the veterans had entered wholeheartedly into the varied activities of life on the campus and had contributed a notably serious attitude and agreeable pleasant courtesy which remains from their military discipline."

That the higher academic standards brought about by the GI's will be lasting is apparent from the comment made by many educators. Stanford University officials pointed out that the intellectual curiosity and maturity of the veterans broadened the scope of many classes. This has been carried into the postveteran period, as professors have become accustomed to a higher level of student performance. Similarly, Dean Fred C. Cole, of Tulane University, observed that most of the veterans came specifically for an education, and their presence increased the intensity and seriousness of the educational process.

According to officials at Columbia University, the GI bill opened a new era in American higher education. It was characterized as one of the wisest educational expenditures the Federal Government has ever made in behalf of the people.

"The veterans brought to the Columbia campus an atmosphere of seriousness of purpose and a sense of responsibility," the officials stressed. "They became interested in the more serious phase of college life. They are vitally concerned with public affairs, with world problems, and are equipping themselves for sound citizenship."

Florida University reported that the GI brought about an atmosphere of more mature judgment and of serious study, generally raising the spirit and morale of the student body. He contributed to a general revision of the curriculum and helped bring about a more wholesome attitude toward the responsibility of higher education to the people.

EFFECT ON EDUCATION

Dr. George L. Cross, president of the University of Oklahoma, was of the opinion that the ultimate effect of the GI's on the campuses of the Nation would be improved teaching. He said the GI bill was one of the best investments this country ever had made.

Praising the GI's on the campus, Dean William C. DeVane, of Yale University, said the veterans had set a pace in academic excellence that had been revivifying for American higher education.

"Most of us here at Yale feel that the GI bill has been an extremely worth-while investment for the country and for higher education," Dr. DeVane declared. "Very few of the GI students abused the privilege of having their tuition and expenses paid. The contributions that they made beyond the classroom were equally useful. They brought maturity and seriousness to such extracurricular affairs as they were interested in, and it is not too much to say that they quickened and improved the life of the college."

Dean John C. Weldin, of the University of Rhode Island, pointed out that as a rule, the veteran was more responsive in discussion and more demanding of the instructor than the younger nonveteran students. He be-

lieved the veterans would leave a permanent effect on the educational program of the institution because "the quality of the work in the classroom, once raised, remains on a higher level than it had been previously."

The views expressed by Dr. George E. Vander Beke, registrar and director of admissions at Marquette University, typify those of other educators reached in the survey. Dr. Vander Beke listed these contributions made by the veterans to the campus: They supplied incentives for a revision of methods of teaching and courses of study; they generated a renaissance of healthy school spirit, and they actively participated in civic and community campaigns.

Dr. Nils Y. Wessell, vice president of Tufts College, pointed out that the GI brought to the American college campus a maturity and seriousness of purpose that has made its impact on the nonveterans. The overseas experiences of the ex-servicemen helped make college students more conscious of international affairs and problems.

"Although the veterans in many instances had difficulties in readjusting themselves to scholastic work," Dr. Wessell said, "their definiteness of purpose and determination enabled them to overcome many difficulties. Unquestionably, the educational investment the country has made in the GI has been worth while for the men themselves and for the Nation as a whole."

Price It in Blood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of August 13, 1951:

PRICE IT IN BLOOD

The Census Bureau has announced Federal tax collections alone last year averaged out at \$248 for every man, woman, and child in the United States, or roughly double the bite of 8 years ago. That figures right at \$1,000 of hard-earned cash taken from every family of four.

Will anybody be shocked into action? No. Most will read, recall his Federal income tax was less than that, then dismiss the whole thing. That is why Federal spending soars year after year and few Congressmen make any real effort to economize. The taxpayer forgets that no person who buys anything escapes a Federal tax; that the direct income levy is often a minor part of what he pays annually. In 1950, less than half of that \$248 average came from individual income tax.

So maybe what we need is to start expressing these Federal extravagances, not in terms of now-meaningless dollar sums, but in terms of the number of American families whose entire tax burden would be spent for a given Government gimmick.

For example, those office divans a defense agency recently bought for a mere \$40,000. That's the whole painful tax take from you and 39 of your neighbors who haven't the time or the money for a luxurious divan in the office.

Or take the two Treasury officials who, with their wives, flew to Idaho at a Federal cost of \$2,000 to make a convention plea that individual citizens curtail their spending.

Aren't you happy to know that you and one other family earner sweat blood for an entire year to pay the equivalent of this merry junket's cost?

Or, to get down to "legitimate" spending, take the \$35,000,000 the President wants for the start of a \$4,000,000,000 point 4 program to de-backwardize alien natives who hadn't for a thousand years thought of themselves as backward until Mr. Truman popped off. That amounts to the tax take from 35,000 families, or the population of a nice-sized town whose business would boom if that sum were spent there.

Perhaps a more realistic wording in legislation would help wake up Congressmen and taxpayers. So we recommend the preamble to each money bill introduced, instead of reading "A bill appropriating \$10,000,000 for the expansion of whiffenpoofery," should read "A bill bleeding 10,000 families for the expansion, etc., etc."

St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the August 13 edition of the Detroit News:

CONGRESS' RECORD IS SHAMEFUL

It is true, unfortunately, that the latest setback given the St. Lawrence seaway in the House Public Works' Committee was the work of "powerful lobbyists."

That explanation of how the national interest came to be thwarted was given by M. J. Coldwell, Canadian political leader, in a lecture comparing the Canadian with our form of government. Such an outcome on an issue of national importance would have been impossible or nearly so at Ottawa, he said, which, again, is correct.

Our form of government has become in modern times extraordinarily susceptible to minority-group pressures, a fact most glaringly instanced by the seaway's own dismal story. Indorsed and urged by every national administration for more than 30 years, the project nevertheless has yet to win approval by Congress. Neither major party, when in power, has been more successful than the other in accomplishing its enactment. Our form of government has not given us the strict party responsibility favored by the parliamentary system, which, at its best, must be conceded to excel ours in accurate expression of the majority will.

The part played by lobbyists in the seaway's committee defeat was clearly shown by analysis of the vote. Few votes against it were cast by members with an obvious motive based on sectional jealousies. The rest could have been influenced only by the spadework of private interests—mostly rail, coal and power—that, for their own reasons, long have fought the seaway.

It is not a pretty state of affairs when such interests can determine our action on a project called by highest military authority vital to national defense. The legislative history of the seaway reflects shame on the American Congress. The merited rebuke by the Canadian statesman, it is hoped, will inspire it to do better next time.

What's Right With the Democratic Party?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, during this era of the "big lie," the smear, and the sneer, it is refreshing and inspiring to hear authoritative voices raised in defense of what is good and right, not only with the United States but with those entrusted with the task of governing it. The very distinguished president of the Los Angeles Daily News, Mr. Robert L. Smith, on July 19 addressed the Democratic Luncheon Club of Los Angeles. His remarks have been the subject of widespread comment in California, and I am sure they will prove of interest to every Member of the House. Under unanimous consent, I insert Mr. Smith's address in the RECORD:

WHAT'S RIGHT WITH THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY?

(By Robert L. Smith)

Chairman Arnold, members of the Democratic Luncheon Club, and distinguished guests, just 2 years ago, from this same vantage point, and using this same microphone, I addressed your organization on the subject, What's Wrong With the Democratic Party? When your chairman, George Arnold, asked me to speak to you today I was struck with the idea that it might be provocative and perhaps constructive to examine the other side of the coin through discussing What's Right With the Democratic Party?

Perhaps it's because we enjoy, and sometimes abuse, freedom of speech and freedom of press, or perhaps it's because millions of our citizens have never had it so good—whatever the reason, important segments of our populace have developed into chronic "ferminsters." Whether it is the Sunday morning quarterbacking of Saturday's USC-Notre Dame football game, or the way the administration, any administration, is running the Government, they're "agin" it, in a vocal and often bellicose manner. When General Knudsen, who, you will recall, was head of the War Production Board in World War II, was asked what he thought of the human race, he reflected for a few moments, and said: "They're mostly good, God-fearing, well-meaning people, but 95 percent of them are adept at taking things apart, and only 5 percent adept at putting them back together again." Mind you, he wasn't referring exclusively to Republicans either; the percentage must be even higher there.

This ferminster psychology, which in some cases is nothing more than a byproduct which provides a safety valve in our democratic form of government, but in other cases, unfortunately, is fraught with more dire implications, has made it popular to criticize leadership in any form, from the football quarterback to "that man (any man) in the White House."

Most people who have had occasion to go to Washington, and, indeed many who have not, seem to consider it fashionable and smart in a sophisticated sort of way, to refer to Washington as a madhouse and generally to disparage all that goes on there. As a member of two governmental committees which meet frequently in Washington, I have had occasion virtually to commute be-

tween Los Angeles and our Capital and, in addition, to gain considerable insight into the workings of our various governmental departments, military, social, and economic, and I can say to you, based on this experience which extends over a considerable period of years, that most of the men, and most of the departments in Washington are doing an outstandingly efficient and effective job against formidable obstacles. Because the Democratic Party is the party of the people, it is therefore a very human party, and subject to human frailties. To say that the administration and the people in it have never made any mistakes would, of course, be fatuous, but when we consider the enormous size and scope of the present problems which confront our Government, and when we consider the social, economic, and military advancements which this country has achieved in recent years, in all objectivity it must be conceded that somebody in Washington is doing something besides collecting deep freezers and mink coats.

Now then, let us analyze some of these social, economic, and military achievements. In other words, as that happy warrior Al Smith would have said, let's look at the record:

The administration has broadened the base and extended the benefits of social security by the enactment of the new social-security law.

The administration has established a farmers' agricultural adjustment and price-support program which, in 16 years, has increased the farm income by 800 percent, while substantially reducing interest rates on farm credit, and reducing farm mortgage indebtedness 50 percent and farm mortgage foreclosures by 95 percent.

The administration has established a soil-conservation program, a rural electrification program, and has developed water resources which have directly benefited millions of our citizens and, indirectly, contributed to our expanded economy and increased standard of living.

While on the subject of an expanded economy and increased standard of living, let us point up the fact that, whereas the administration believes that our over-all economy can be expanded to support both our civilian and our defense requirements, the reactionaries contend that our economy cannot support such a program. What is the real answer based on our actual experience from the beginning of World War II to the present time? Immediately after Pearl Harbor these same disciples of doom said civilian living would have to be cut to \$66,000,000,000, the 1933 low, as compared with the 1940 level of \$72,000,000,000. But what actually happened? By war's peak, production for civilian use had been boosted to \$112,000,000,000, while we had superimposed on our civilian economy another \$100,000,000 for war materials. In other words, despite dire predictions to the contrary, the over-all standard of living actually rose substantially during World War II. For example, just prior to Korea, in terms of real dollars (corrected for inflation) our standard of living as measured by total consumption was 52 percent greater than in 1940; the amount put aside in personal savings was 111 percent greater, and liquid assets held by individuals 102 percent greater. This experience shows that in order to support the increased financial burden of necessary defense, it is not necessary to cut living standards or to compromise our American system. We can, if we put our minds, our hearts, and our know-how to the task, have an expanding economy which will support strong defense and, by 1955, raise our standard of living one-third above 1949 levels. This is not merely my opinion, this is the opinion of unbiased financial and economic authorities.

While disgruntled Republicans carp about deficit financing (at the same time reflecting their opposition to increased taxes by their votes in Congress) the administration has not resorted to deficit financing and, in fact, has operated in such a manner that the net balance of income over the past 5 years has been seven billion more than expenditures, and there is now a budget surplus of more than \$3,000,000,000. This "squand money" policy of the administration is in no small way due to John Snyder, our Secretary of the Treasury, who spoke to your group here just a few weeks ago.

With increased demands, principally military defense expenditures, Secretary Snyder warns that higher taxes, wage and price controls, and limits on credit are necessary if we are to continue on a pay-as-you-go basis without cutting into essential civilian requirements. Yet the very Republicans who claim to be sound money men are opposed to higher taxes, opposed to controls, and opposed to credit limitation. Moreover, these self-same Republicans would, on the one hand, have had us reduce military defense expenditures and, on the other, risk a third world war by pursuing MacArthur policies in Asia.

The administration has neutralized Red aggression in Europe by setting up first the Marshall plan, then the North Atlantic Treaty organization, and finally a Supreme Allied command under Eisenhower. We have taken the lead in establishing and co-operating fully in the operation of such international organizations as the United Nations, the Food and Agricultural Organization, and the World Bank. When communism threatened Greece and Turkey, we sent aid to those beleaguered countries, and today they stand firm in democratic ranks. Incidentally, 88 percent of the Democrats voted for this aid, while 80 percent of the votes against it were Republican.

We came to the aid of the peoples of France and Italy in their struggle against the political cold war onslaught of communism. In each of these countries communism has been defeated in two free elections since 1947. There is no longer danger that they will vote themselves into the hands of the Soviet Union. We came to the aid of the people of Berlin when the Kremlin tried to take them over. We and our allies kept Berlin alive by the historic miracle of the airlift, and, as a result, Berlin is free today.

The administration has given new hope to industrial and business enterprise all over the world through point 4, which offers under sound conditions capital and American know-how to countries whose resources and industrial potentials have not heretofore been adequately developed. In line with its policy of aid to impoverished nations the administration insisted upon sending grain to India over bitter Republican opposition.

The administration invited the Republicans to join in a bipartisan foreign policy and in both words and action lived up to such a policy. Typical are the important posts in government which have been given to Republicans such as General Marshall and John Foster Dulles. Conversely, at one of the most crucial periods in our international life the Republicans completely scuttled this bipartisan policy with the passing of their distinguished leader, Senator Vandenberg.

While the Republicans have employed witch hunts, smear campaigns and personal vilification of administration leaders, and resorted to red herring tactics, the administration has actually prosecuted and jailed Communists, while the McCarthys and Hickenloopers have merely given lip service to this problem in an effort aimed not to rid the country of Communists per se, but to embarrass and heckle the administration. The Republicans have done their best to use the Kefauver crime committee as a means

of proving that the administration is corrupt. Let's quote Senator Kefauver personally on this subject:

"The impression seems to have gotten around as a result of the investigations which the Senate Crime Committee conducted, that political parties and their leaders are dishonest, crooked, and bound up with crime and criminals. That impression certainly is most erroneous and wholly unjustified.

"There are crooked politicians, Republican and Democratic, and we exposed them wherever we found them. There also are crooked businessmen. Crooks have been discovered in the labor movement. Happily, they are a very small minority. In no case do I believe that they reflect the morals of the whole. Conversely, those who charge that they do should have another look at their own morals. . . .

"We must remember that this crime committee of which I was chairman was sponsored by the Democratic majority, that its membership was Democratic in the majority, and that it exposed corruption and crime wherever they were found, letting the chips fall where they may."

The administration stopped Red aggression in its tracks in Korea, and its faith in the United Nations as a world instrument for good was confirmed last June when the Security Council acted swiftly to condemn this Soviet-sponsored aggression of the North Koreans. As it has met other sharp issues, boldly and without fear, the administration met the Korean issue and by so doing checked and confounded the plans and timetable of the Soviet aggressors.

A year ago Korea appeared as an easy conquest to the Soviet rulers in Moscow and their agents in the Far East. But they were wrong. Today, after more than a million Communist casualties, after the destruction of one Communist army after another, the forces of aggression have been thrown back on their heels. They are back behind the line they started from sulking for peace.

Things have not turned out the way the Communists expected.

The United Nations has not been shattered. Instead, it is stronger today than it was a year ago.

The free nations are not demoralized. Instead, they are stronger and more confident today than they were a year ago.

The cause of world peace has not been defeated. On the contrary, the cause of world peace is stronger than it was a year ago.

We have been fighting this conflict in Korea to prevent a third world war. So far we have succeeded. We have blocked aggression, and we have kept the conflict from spreading. The attack on Korea has stimulated the free nations to build up their defenses in dead earnest. Korea convinced the free nations that they had to have armies and equipment ready to defend themselves. The United States is leading the way, with defense expenditures of \$40,000,000,000. Other nations are devoting a large share of their national effort to our mutual defense. Never before in history have we taken such measures to keep the peace. Never have the odds against an aggressor been made so clear before the attack was launched.

We have the United Nations which expresses the conscience and the collective will of the free world. We have the Organization of American States which is building the strength of this hemisphere. We have the North Atlantic Treaty which commits all the nations of the Atlantic community to fight together against aggression. We have unified land, sea, and air forces in Europe, under the command of General Eisenhower. We are strengthening the free nations of the Far East and setting up collective security arrangements in the Pacific. Most important of all, we have shown that we will fight

to resist aggression. The free nations have fought and won in Korea.

Never before has an aggressor been confronted with such a series of positive measures to keep the peace. Never before in history have there been such deterrents to the outbreak of world war.

Despite the pomp and circumstance and the histrionic folderol which accompanied the removal of General MacArthur, despite his admitted genius, glamor, and articulation, the three-ring circus which the Republicans made of this incident has finally boomeranged to the point where most thinking people consider the removal action justified and necessary as shown by current opinion polls.

This boomerang reaction was predicted in a poll conducted by Elmo Roper among 332 officially credited press correspondents. Seventy-two percent of these correspondents thought the majority of the American people would finally come to believe that the removal of MacArthur was justified and right, while only 16 percent thought to the contrary. Three percent said it would depend on the outcome in Korea. Incidentally, 85 percent of these correspondents thought from the beginning that the removal of MacArthur was justified and right, while only 13 percent disagreed, and 2 percent didn't know.

The administration has steadfastly believed in and fought for economic controls as a curb for inflation during periods of emergency, yet it is the Republicans who have screamed the loudest about inflation who are responsible for the impotent, watered-down controls bill now in effect.

Now, in conclusion, let's summarize. There are bound to be flaws in any party organization, particularly one as fluid, as dynamic, and as progressive as the Democratic Party. Moreover, in the nearly 20 years during which that party has been in office this country, and the world, have been confronted with the most colossal problems within the memory of man. From the greatest depression on record, through the most devastating global war in history, to the atomic and electronic age which has produced the grim, tense, cold war in which we are today engaged. Yet, when you add up the plus and minus columns, there's a big net profit. The record of the Democratic Party over these years is a record of achievement and progress, and a record of which to be proud, and the program of the Democratic Party, not only then, but now and for the future, is a program of which to be proud. Moreover, the unfortunate fact must be weighed that most of the objectives achieved during the Democratic administration were achieved against strong Republican opposition—an opposition which has degenerated to a point where the Republican Party has become a party of negation and sterility. As a strong believer in the two-party system, I, for one, would like to see the Republican Party come up with an affirmative, constructive perspective and program. It would be good for all America if they did, but up to now they just haven't.

Nevertheless, the cold, hard facts are that under the stewardship of the Democratic Party the United States of America is stronger today than ever before in its history. Our free enterprise economy is the most productive in the world. More people are gainfully employed at higher wages than ever before, and corporate earnings are at the highest level on record. No other form of government promotes the general welfare of its citizenry as vigorously or as effectively as does our American democracy, nor has any nation ever assumed world leadership on the same high level of unselfishness and humanitarianism as has America in our time. Thus the Democratic Party remains the party of peace, the party of prosperity, and the party of the people.

Military Appropriation Bills**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, we have just passed two gigantic military appropriations bills—appropriations that will shock our economy and will plunge our people much deeper in debt. The administration has given the armed services a blank check, drawn on the tax money of our Government. The chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services has told us that this is only the beginning of their requirements—that more and greater demands are to come. We are not "let in" on the plans of the administration, but we are told that unless this great amount is approved our armed defense effort will fail.

The Congress and the people of this country are placed in a most embarrassing position. Through its leaders, the administration states that any deviation or questioning of this armed services budget will be an aid to the Kremlin and will be a vote of no confidence in our boys fighting in Korea.

The second appropriations bill is for construction of new installations. It proposes to scatter tens of millions into the building of various Army camps, of airfields, and of other facilities. The armed services ignore the fact that less than six short years ago we had sufficient installations to train more than 15,000,000 men to win World War II. Yet, today we are asked to build scores of new installations while so many of the established ones are abandoned and allowed to grow over with weeds.

In my own State of Indiana there are two fine air bases that have been abandoned. I do not want at this time to ask for any favors for my own State, but across the river in Illinois is located one of the really fine airfields of the Nation—George Field. It was constructed at a cost of many millions of dollars. Adequate housing is available. If needed, the airplane runways can be extended to any desired length. Yet in the planning of the armed services groups this field is to be ignored and abandoned with scores of others.

Unnecessary, extravagant and wasteful spending of money, of material, or of manpower can never help our country; but it can lead to the ruin of our economy. Lenin once said that America will spend itself into ruin. Could this be a specific example of what Lenin had in mind? The reliance upon wealth as power is dangerous. It is a sign of decadence, such as Croesus eventually realized, in that great riches are not sufficient protection for man. In our country today it would seem we are using as the measuring stick of national defense how much we spend and not how much we accomplish. Every combat soldier knows that wars are won by the courage and bravery and intestinal fortitude of the men on the battle line and

not back in the palatial officers' clubs or fine polo fields of extravagant installations. We cannot make an impregnable America by merely voting more and more money, if it is wasted and used unwisely. Every bit of money and material that is used in unnecessary installations injures the potential defense effort of America just that much, and cripples the economy that has made America great.

There are many of us here in Congress who demand that before the wild extravagant appropriations of the armed services be listed as "must" legislation, the services utilize the great installations we already have, that they make a sincere and honest effort to eliminate waste of the taxpayers' money, such as is illustrated by the abandonment of George Field in Illinois and of other similar facilities all over the Nation.

**Consolidation of District VA Offices
Detrimental****EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. THOMAS J. LANE**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter from George W. Grader, department commander, the American Legion, Department of Massachusetts, Inc., Boston, Mass.:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF MASSACHUSETTS, INC.,
Boston, Mass., August 14, 1951.
Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN. Thank you for your letter of August 8 with an attached copy from the Veterans' Administration at Washington signed by Mr. Clark, Deputy Administrator.

It seems to me that his letter is quite similar to the public release that went out in which they claim a great deal of savings in salaries and rents by moving the Boston office to Philadelphia. However, when one analyzes the matter it does not figure out. It seems to me that if it takes 100 people to handle a certain amount of cases in Boston, it will be just as expensive in personnel to handle the same amount in Philadelphia. I do not see where there would be any savings of money in salaries.

If the rent is \$1 25 a square yard in Boston, to handle the same amount of files, it will be approximately as expensive per square yard in Philadelphia; so I do not see where they are saving any money in rents. True, Mr. Clark states that the Government owns the Atwater Building in Philadelphia, but in lieu of rent there will be heat, cleaning, repairs, etc., which would offset rent if the building were owned.

Therefore, his statements of savings seem to be far afield. We here in the Legion feel, and readily so I believe, that any consolidation would be detrimental to the service of the veterans, widows, and orphans that a grateful Government, some years back, through its Congress issued them. It seems to me that it is up to this same body at Congress to see to it that these imposed injustices do not occur.

I appreciate your interest deeply as well as the other Congressmen and Senators who have also signified their intent to do everything to see that the veterans who have made this country safe for democracy are given a democratic regime.

My warm personal regards, and with kind wishes, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. GRADER,
Department Commander.

**How Rent Control Boomerangs Against
the Public****EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Lee Thompson Smith dealing with the experiences of other countries with rent control.

It is a thought provoking article which I feel merits the consideration of all of us. At the very least we must recognize that there is no real substitute for individual freedom and initiative, and that once artificial government controls are imposed there are invariably demands for their broadening and continuation. Controls have been demonstrated to be the means by which an economy of abundance is converted into an economy of scarcity, where everyone is the loser.

The article follows:

HOW RENT CONTROL BOOMERANGS AGAINST THE PUBLIC—MANY NATIONS SHOW TRAGEDIES OF RENTAL HOUSING HAMSTRUNG BY THE ABUSES OF EMERGENCY REFORMS

(By Lee Thompson Smith, chairman, executive committee, Home Title Guaranty Co.)

In the world's reckless turn toward the left, which has been manifest now for many years, there have been innumerable instances of the people selling their birthright for a pottage of lentils. But I have never personally encountered a more striking international panorama of this folly than that which I was privileged to study at a recent conference in Paris.

Nation after nation revealed its sorry plight as delegates described wretched housing conditions and general construction dilemmas foisted on the public through the abuse of rent control. In each case, between the lines of statistical reports, ran tragic overtones of the people being deprived of decent and adequate places to live and to work simply because of bureaucratic dictatorship.

The conference was the organizational meeting of the International Confederation of Real Estate Agents, attended by 350 experts. Delegates from nine of the most civilized countries in the world participated in the panel discussions, including 26 delegates from the United States.

And the most amazing lesson of the 4-day deliberations was that you do not have to go behind the Iron curtain to find people so complacent that they allow their pockets to be picked by ideologists.

It is a lesson we should study and learn by heart.

Perhaps one of the frailties of human nature is the capacity to turn a reform into a vice, but when a necessary expedient in an emergency, such as rent control, once becomes rooted in bureaucracy, it inevitably becomes perpetuated to a degree that boomerangs against everyone.

This has been demonstrated in country after country. The consequences are extremely serious. When the people of war-torn nations are denied the possibilities of rehousing because of arbitrary and impracticable bureaucratic decrees, the situation is tragic indeed.

France, for example, admits that it has learned that a sure way to stop all residential rental building is to impose rent control. Holland finds its housing situation alarming. In Norway, where rents have been the same from 1939 to 1951, the country realizes that it will be plagued with a housing shortage until 1969. In Austria, where some rents have been held to the equivalent of 10 street car tickets, houses have fallen into disuse, building credits have disappeared, and the housing crisis is described as unimaginable.

Black markets in rooms have developed in Vienna with 1 room bringing more than 30 times the amount of legal rent fixed for the entire apartment.

"Wherever a policy of rent pegging has been enforced, the ultimate outcome has been catastrophe," declared M. Claudius Petit, French minister of reconstruction and town planning, in summarizing the work of the congress at the final session.

Yet rent control, per se, is only half the story. Once natural economic laws are surrendered to the arbitrary power of governmental office—no matter how competent and honorable the officeholder may be—confusion and far-reaching injustice are inevitable results.

Cuba, for example, finds itself with two classes of landlords and two schedules of rents. There, two buildings of equal value and appointments are rented in a ratio of 1 to 35 because one was built before 1937 and one after that year. The result is that the one class of landlords is economically prohibited from carrying out indispensable repairs, expected by tenants when they see such repairs made in an equal building on the other side of the bureaucratic fence.

Deep-seated evils develop. Good will between tenants and landlords is destroyed. Tenants are taught to disregard all of the responsibilities of the owner. Socially dangerous falsehoods are sown—the tenant is always right and the landlord always wrong. The virtues of thrift and the painstaking building up of private property are confused with greed and clouded with suspicion.

But worst of all, official thinking is twisted and the very purpose of rent control is distorted. This happens when the cart is placed before the horse by fixing rents to produce an arbitrary small profit rather than to regulate rents in harmony with economic trends. In other words, the private assets of an owner are examined as a factor, rather than the possibilities of encouraging rental construction.

For example, when Switzerland was faced with the necessity of easing rent control in order to stimulate some construction, it apparently did not weigh the needs for continuing the system, nor the capacity of the public to pay in accordance with greater incomes. It merely adjusted rents to allow landlords to obtain a return of 3.8 percent on invested income on buildings erected before 1943. And it allowed a return of 6.8 percent on buildings erected after that year.

Even this recognition of a minimum income was granted in the teeth of bitter opposition in Switzerland.

The plight of France has been notorious. Rent control which began in World War I has never been shaken off. Minister Petit reported that retail prices in France have soared to more than 135 times their 1914 level, and building costs have climbed to 120 times that level, while rents are still only 7 times what they were in 1914. The result has been paralysis in rental construction.

France had half a million homes entirely bombed out in World War II and more than a million and a half damaged. But another two million French homes have been allowed to fall into disrepair by the suffocation of rent control. The region of Caen through which our invasion of Europe was made, supplies a pitiful case. Caen sums up its report:

"For those who suffered a total loss, their house will be rebuilt in 5, 6 or 10 years perhaps. For those who lost only their source of rental income, it is wretchedness."

Belgium, on the other hand, has taken this bull in hand to the extent that the prospects for reconstruction were looking bright at the start of this year until new rises in the costs of materials and labor, coupled with the armaments budget restricting building credits, began to apply the brakes.

Little Holland's story sounds statistically familiar to Americans, except that we had no Rotterdam deliberately rubbed out by Nazi terrorists.

"Up to May 9, 1940, eve of the German invasion of the Low Countries, rents which were regularly fixed by free and independent agreement between the parties concerned, had remained at a fairly low level." Holland reported to the congress. "Large numbers of houses had been built during the depression. Hence rents for working-class dwellings, built between the wars, had fallen to 80 percent of their original level, and middle-class rents were down to 62 percent."

"In December 1940, the occupation authorities published the rents decree of 1940, pegging rents at the level they had reached on May 9 of that year."

"After the liberation of the Low Countries (May 5, 1945) the 1940 decree remained in force, and the situation remained unchanged until the end of 1950. On last January 1, the 1951 rents law came into force. It allowed a 15-percent increase on the legal level of rents. While the general cost-of-living index showed an increase from 100 in 1938 to 216, rents are now only 15 points above 1938."

We have heard of that 15-percent rise above depression rents in this country.

Public housing, of course, no matter how uneconomical, has been a tempting plum for the bureaucrats in most countries. By hobbling private industry by making rental construction virtually impossible under current costs, socialistic experiments are subsidized and the public is hoodwinked. In Britain's experiment in socialism private construction is effectively throttled.

The resultant crisis abroad has reached the point where M. Petit urged the following on the departing delegates:

"The idea of a Marshall plan in this field would surely be an excellent one."

"Our American friends, whose frankness is exceeded only by their sense of reality, might understand that property investments have a higher economic and social value than industrial equipment credits."

"Who cannot see the 10,000 well or better housed families are a factor equally powerful and far less burdensome than the upkeep of a military division?"

This, indeed, is something to ponder in our cold war against the destructive ideologies at work in the world today. But also there is something to ponder in the manner in which our western economic order has been betrayed by the tourniquet of rent control un-

reasonably tightened on one of its most vital arteries.

Can we fight the forces of slavery with this economic handicap? If we persist in the debilitating practices that have wrought such havoc elsewhere, to whom can we turn for a Marshall plan of resuscitation?

Off-the-Reservation Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it was most interesting to read that top brass in the Detroit office of ordnance was transferred overseas because he used some surplus property to build a row-boat and was entertained by those who were receiving contracts at the hands of the Detroit ordnance office.

Mr. Speaker, the Rossford Ordnance Depot at Rossford, Ohio, in my district needs some special attention in the way of investigation as to what has been going on there. I am informed that Rossford Ordnance Depot is part of the Detroit Ordnance District. It has been proclaimed that the Rossford Ordnance Depot is the largest pool of motor vehicles and parts in the world. That it has a record of every motor vehicle owned by the War Department. And for the money invested in warehouses and parts it surely ought to be the greatest motor vehicle pool to service and maintain these vehicles. In fact, the authorization bill for the Armed Forces passed on Friday last requested the sum of \$8,313,533 for Rossford Ordnance, for expansion, so I believe that the operations of the Rossford Ordnance Depot should be completely investigated before millions more are wasted while no efficient use is made of what is already there.

Yet last year with all the equipment, motor vehicles, and their records, the work was not done by this great depot of motor vehicles. There was painting off the reservation while a \$11,000 paint-spraying equipment remained idle simply by saying there was no drying room. The repairing of motor vehicles after being shipped in from around the country and overseas was by off-the-reservation spending at a maximum cost of \$3,600 per vehicle, while there was this great investment in motor vehicles, parts, and equipment to perform the service. I am informed that it was not let out by bids, that such contractors even purchased parts while there were parts by the millions stored in Rossford Ordnance Depot. And that those connected with Rossford Ordnance, instead of performing its own service, farmed out repairing, installation of windshields, painting, and other items even though this vast investment in warehouses, plant machinery, and parts existed in Rossford Ordnance Depot.

Mr. Speaker, how much off-the-reservation moneys were spent by the depot on

the outside? It was not let out by bids and even these contractors on occasions purchased parts in their repair work, while the ordnance depot was supposed to be the War Department's greatest pool of motor vehicles and parts. And that Government equipment, machinery, and other things were freely off the reservation put out for non-Government use.

Mr. Speaker, the investigation of the Detroit district ordnance area should certainly take in Rossford Ordnance Depot as to what it has been doing at least covering the past 5 years. Because of its equipment and parts, motor vehicles came to Rossford Ordnance for repair, but instead of doing the work the Rossford Ordnance Depot farmed it out. What sense was there in bringing motor vehicles from great distances and from overseas, when upon arrival at Rossford Ordnance the work was not performed there?

This whole matter has been quiet over a period of time and I believe that there should be a full and complete investigation of not only the Detroit ordnance district office but those reservations under it, especially Rossford Ordnance Depot. It should be examined thoroughly by a committee of this House as to its transactions for the last 5 years in view of what has gone on, and as to what use is being made of the greatest motor-vehicle pool, when parts and machinery are available for use, yet not performed on the reservation. And also especially in view of an admonition claimed to have been made by top brass that the men must stop "all this talk about work being sent out of the depot or be laid off."

Mr. Speaker, I call special attention to the Armed Forces Committee and the House Expenditures Committee for a thorough investigation of all the records of Rossford Ordnance, with reference to its operation, as to its not performing work in the way of painting, installation of windshields, paying repair bills, and authorizing outside payment of as much as \$3,600 per vehicle while machinery and equipment are or should be at Rossford Ordnance. In view of the fact that there have been established irregularities in the Detroit district office of which Rossford Ordnance is a part, I believe a special committee should hold hearings. People who have worked in the plant at Rossford Ordnance are fearful of reprisals on testimony but I am sure that a committee of the House can go through what has happened so as to stop the wasteful use of Government money.

Mr. Speaker, with the exposure of irregularities in the Detroit district ordnance office and the transfer of a top brass to overseas assignment because he built a rowboat out of surplus property, I believe that the operations of Rossford Ordnance Depot should be thoroughly gone over with reference to its off-the-reservation spending covering automobile painting, automobile repairs, truck repairs, putting in glass windshields, and other off-the-reservation expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, if the top brass was transferred for using surplus property to

build a rowboat, surely it is worth while to examine into the off-the-reservation expenditures at Rossford Ordnance Depot, at Rossford, Ohio. And I believe that a committee of this House, through investigation, should be able to find out how much money has been spent off-the-reservation by the Rossford Ordnance Depot, the details concerning such expenditures, and the use of the reservation property for non-Government uses, so that these matters might be completely examined into with a view of stopping any irregularities as to future expenditures in which the sum of \$8,313,533 was authorized last week for Rossford Ordnance Depot expansion.

Matanuska Valley and Palmer, Alaska, Advance—Alaska: The Land of Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, because of its important position in the defense of our country, and also because of the tremendous opportunities still existing in Alaska for young men and women, I felt sure that Members of Congress and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would be interested in an editorial article concerning the Matanuska Valley and the progress it has made during the last 16 years.

I am happy to get permission to insert into the Record the editorial written by William L. Baker, editor and publisher of the Ketchikan (Alaska) Chronicle in the issue for Monday, July 23. Mr. Baker has just completed a trip throughout most of the Territory of Alaska and has related his impressions and observations in a series of editorials in his excellent newspaper.

The article follows:

PALMER—After 16 years of pioneering, the Matanuska Valley project has arrived. The town of Palmer, once a wide place on the Alaska Railroad, has been incorporated this year with a population of about 1,000, the business district has grown from a few operations owned by the co-op to almost 100, and the beautiful, picturesque valley boasts 3,500 to 4,000 persons, most of them living in part off the farm produce of the valley.

It was a bleak day in 1935 when 202 families arrived in the valley, refugees from the dust bowl of the Middle West, which had had its share of drought and depression. Of those original 202 families, 41 still are in the valley farming, 2 or 3 are in business in Palmer, and 15 others are living in the Anchorage area, some of them farming near Alaska's largest city.

Chief cash crops of the colony are its milk and potatoes, with smaller vegetables coming next. The Matanuska Valley Farmer's Co-operative Association did a gross business last year of \$2,251,260, of which dairy products were the largest item. Milk brought in \$400,000, and the dairy operates a reconstituting plant for the Army at Fort Richard-

son, mixing the ingredients of milk in "iron cows" at a gross of around \$500,000 per year. Butter production was stopped recently, but ice cream is being developed into a major item and its production is being expanded.

Typical of the pioneers who have stayed and made good is Carl Meier, mayor of the newly incorporated town. Originally from Duluth, Minn., the father of five children, he has replaced Walter Pippel as a produce farmer. He operates four trucks, making trips to Valdez each week, and to Anchorage two or three times a week. He and his boys also make coal and oil deliveries in the valley.

Walter Huntley, a member of the Alaska Senate, who came north from Sault Ste Marie, Mich., is another prominent colonist, about to become third division United States marshal. Two of his children who came north in 1935 are now married to Alaskans and two who were born in Alaska are living here in town. Mrs. Huntley is Palmer's postmistress.

Kenneth Foster, who came from Stevenson, Mich., operates Ken's Electric Shop in Palmer, selling appliances and doing much of the wiring work in the valley.

Everett Yohn, from Tomahawk, Wis., and Moose Lake, Minn., operates the valley grocery store. His wife, Jean Mae, is the daughter of Col. I. M. Sandvik, formerly of Moose Lake, Minn. He is one of the second generation who have stayed in the valley and made good.

Oliver Onkka, who came with his parents from Ontonagon County, Mich., is head of the Alaska Road Commission for this district. He is taking his family back to Michigan to visit in a few weeks.

Of the 202 farms in the original colony, 43 have been paid for in full although the owners had 30 years to retire their loans to the Alaska Rural Rehabilitation Corporation. The farmers devoting most of their land to producing ensilage of peas and oats and feeding their own dairy cattle, average around \$1,000 per month gross. The colony operates a bottling and distributing plant in Anchorage.

While many of the original settlers went back to the States—as did a large proportion of those who started out to Oregon and California a century ago—some took jobs with the Alaska Railroad or on military bases, because of the high wages being offered. Some of the colonists have jobs in town or in Anchorage and let their families run their farms. But growth in the valley seems to be steady. Last year and this about 75 homes were begun in the valley or in Palmer proper, including a 25-unit Alaska Housing Authority project. The town now boasts a theater, a weekly newspaper, six grocery stores, two department stores, eight garages and service stations, three doctors, one dentist and various other businesses. The colony itself operates a warehouse, a hardware store, selling appliances; a feed and fertilizer store, a trading post (grocery and department store), a garage and a municipal water system.

Palmer is headquarters for construction of the Eklutna power project, money for which has been appropriated by the United States Congress last year and this. The Army's big Fort Richardson base wants part of this hydroelectric power, and so does the city of Anchorage, its 30,000 people (greater Anchorage) sprawled all over Cook Inlet's shores.

First time we visited the colony in 1939 someone told us that the two mountains which stand as landmarks are also keynotes to what took place in the Matanuska colony. To the south is Lazy Mountain—influential on some of the settlers who wouldn't put in the work necessary to succeed. To the west is Pioneer Peak, the inspiration of those who stuck it out and made good.

Their story is the story of all who have stayed on in Alaska, a land that is not easy to understand, but a land that can reward those who—as Robert Service put it—"Learn to obey."

On Spanish Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Danbury News-Times regarding aid to Spain. This is an excellent, hard-boiled, and realistic editorial which reflects my views and the views of millions of other Americans:

AID TO SPAIN

The die-hard opposition to help Spain help us in case of trouble dies very hard indeed.

Public and private citizens who are complacent as we toss billions all around the world, some to countries which either could not or would not lift a finger to help us if we became involved in a war with Russia, balk at giving a few millions to the only government in all Europe which is 100 percent anti-Communist.

We are glad to note that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has approved an appropriation of some \$400,000,000 to Spain, with no strings attached. A subcommittee had wanted to put conditions on the appropriation. One was that no money be sent to Franco unless his government promoted the freedoms cherished by the Spanish peoples. Quite sensibly the full committee ignored this recommendation.

What we want from Franco now is help in building defenses in Europe against communism. Spain, the military experts tell us, is vital in any successful defense of Europe against possible attack by Russia and her satellites.

We need bases in Spain, we need ports, and we need the aid of Franco's large, efficient, and experienced army. This army at present is poorly equipped. But, while we are arming the nationals of some European countries who appear a little less than wildly enthusiastic at the prospect of fighting Communists, there is not the slightest doubt how Spaniards feel about communism. They hate it and all its works, and realize full well that Stalin would take great delight in conquering the Iberian Peninsula, and planting the hammer and sickle banner there.

The opposition to Spain has stemmed from some who are johnnie-come-latelys to the anti-Communist camp. The pro-Red group in our own State Department was determinedly anti-Spain and anti-Franco for years. It sided with the Red groups in the United Nations, which caused us to sever diplomatic relations with Spain some years ago. Dean Acheson, whose turnabout on the Spanish question has been amazing, declared only a few years ago that we would never have anything to do with Franco until a jury system, freedom of press, of speech, and religion were adopted in Spain, although we have kept up diplomatic relations with Russia, which has none of these.

We could wish there were more freedom in Spain, and we could wish Franco were less of a dictator. However, we do business with a great many countries of whose governments we do not fully approve.

If Franco can help us in our fight to preserve our world, let us have done with all this nonsense, and get him lined up efficiently on our side. We can do what we will to bring about reforms in Spain after the present crisis is over. If, that is, we should think it was any of our business.

Flood Controllers Should Study How Oklahoma Does It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT M. COLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Elmer T. Peterson from the Saturday Evening Post of August 4, 1951:

FLOOD CONTROLLERS SHOULD STUDY HOW OKLAHOMA DOES IT

(By Elmer T. Peterson)

With almost monotonous regularity come reports, usually in spring or early summer, of floods in the great agricultural valleys. With corresponding monotony the tendency seems either to regard these visitations as unpreventable acts of God or to build huge downstream dams in an effort to contain the torrents after they have got well under way.

Oklahoma, forced by climate and the character of its soil to work faster than usual in the conservation movement, comes up with a prescription that rejects both alternatives. And it works.

One of the wildest actors in the State is the Washita River, whose gullies frequently evident in the red mud it carries down into the Red River. In its valley are the beginnings of a project to prevent floods by the same kind of foresight that stops cancer. The method is to halt the evil right where it begins—in the gullies, in the furrows and right up to the stalk-and-root system of grass. Defeating each individual floodlet before it gets started means defeating the big flood, for the river has no way of getting water except from its tributaries.

In May of 1950, 13 inches of rain fell within 36 hours on a section of West Owl Creek, south of Purcell. This is the lowest official report. Other reports ranged upward as high as 15.5 inches for that area. This part of West Owl Creek had been given a thorough soil-conservation treatment, including the use of grass, contour farming, terracing and the building of smallish detention reservoirs, a degree larger than the average farm pond.

In previous years, downpours of less intensity and volume had produced destructive floods, destroying crops and contributing to the main rush of water down the valley. This year the creek stayed within its banks until it had flowed 1 mile past the last conservation-treated section of its valley. By that time the creek had received run-off from untreated slopes, and it began to go out of its banks. The detention reservoirs took care of a substantial proportion of the run-off. The surface treatment held back another substantial share. A regulated flow from a draw-down valve in each reservoir kept the creek within banks. The three-fold system worked even better than had been figured in advance by the conservation engineers.

On May 16, 1951, the Sandstone Creek watershed of 65,000 acres, southeast of Cheyenne, received a downpour ranging up to 4.57 inches. A similar system of detention dams and conservation practices had been not quite completed. The runoff water did not even come up to the draw-down pipes. In other words, none of the permanent pools was filled. Sandstone Creek, which in previous similar storms had been a bad actor, was perfectly tame and did nothing to augment the flow of Washita River, though other creeks in that part of the State were doing great damage.

Barnitz Creek watershed, near Clinton, during the same wet period, received 13 inches of rain within 24 hours, according to several unofficial gage tests. It has an area of 4,000 acres and is equipped with two detention reservoirs with two smaller dams upstream from them, besides the usual surface treatment of terracing, regrassing, and the like. It stayed within its banks while neighboring creeks did great damage with equal precipitation.

"We planned it that way," said one of the conservation technicians. All these agricultural-flood-control-project reservoirs are engineered in advance to hold considerably more runoff water, in proportion to drainage area, than the big Army-engineer projects in the same region. The huge dams built by the Army engineers and Reclamation Bureau have come under heavy fire in recent years. Since one of the chief functions of the big dams, according to the promoters, is flood control, it is up to the opponents of the big projects to propose a practical substitute. They will do well to make a close study of the Washita program.

The Adoption of a Flag for the American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I extend my remarks in the RECORD on H. R. 5172, a measure which I have introduced, providing for the adoption of a flag for the American merchant marine.

Although approximately 23 countries have merchant-marine flags, which are separate and distinct from the national colors, our American merchant marine has no such ensign. In order to provide for this omission, I have introduced H. R. 5172, which amends chapter 1 of title 4 of the United States Code, entitled "The Flag," by adding a section at the end thereof providing for an American merchant-marine flag.

The bill provides that our merchant marine ensign shall be 13 horizontal stripes, alternating red and white, and the union of the flag shall be a large white anchor set diagonally in a blue field, with the stock of the anchor at the top of the field nearer the hoist. In fact, it will be the same as the national colors with the exception that the anchor appears in the blue field instead of the stars.

I believe that a special flag for the American merchant marine will be a

great contribution to the morale and will enhance the prestige of our ships in every port of the world. The display of the proposed merchant-marine flag on American merchant vessels would be voluntary and would not and could not replace the national ensign of the United States. The merchant-marine flag might be flown from the bow of the vessel where the Union Jack is usually flown.

I do not anticipate any objections to this legislation, which seems so desirable and has the support of those most interested in the development and expansion of our merchant marine.

New Oil Fields

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, with the present unsettled condition of the world today with its many possibilities of war, it is imperative that the principal sinew of war in modern times, oil, be available to those who prize their liberty and wish to preserve it.

The new discoveries of oil in the United States which may result in vast oil fields and vast quantities of oil should be very welcome news to the people of the United States.

The New York Times of July 25, 1951, has this to say about new oil fields:

NEW OIL FIELDS

What may well be the beginning of a new major domestic oil source in the northern Middle West is indicated by two recent important finds 100 miles apart, one last April in North Dakota and another in the past fortnight in Montana. For several decades this country has depended heavily, though not exclusively, upon southern and western areas—such States as Louisiana, Texas, and California. If these new finds in North Dakota and Montana presage the opening of comparable rich fields they are of great importance. The mounting number of cars and oil heaters in this country is steadily increasing our consumption of this material, while from a global point of view the shadows over the future of oil production in the Middle East, particularly Iran, make it most desirable to increase production from more certain sources, as in this country, as rapidly as possible.

In our gratification over these new finds we should not lose sight of the factors which made it possible for oil to be discovered at depths of 7,000 to 11,000 feet underneath the earth. The contributions of geologists, drilling technicians, and related specialists are, of course, of the highest importance, for they make possible the location and then the reaching of this buried treasure. But important, too, are the enterprise and the willingness to bear risks which motivated these efforts. Wells that find oil are well publicized, but the large number which are no more than dry holes in the ground are recorded only in red ink in private ledgers. The men and organizations who search for oil at fantastic depths risk millions in such ventures, and frequently lose them. But they continue even after repeated disappointments because on balance profits can be made if a reasonable proportion of suc-

cesses is attained. In this activity, as in many others, the role of the profit motive in inducing socially useful action is of primary importance, a fact which our people and our legislators might well keep in mind.

A Campaign Against Rent Abuses and Intolerable Living Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, El Diario De Nueva York is an outstanding liberal Spanish newspaper published in New York. At this time it is waging a campaign against rent abuses and intolerable living conditions, as they affect Puerto Ricans, Negroes, and other minority groups.

On July 8, 1951, it published an editorial, which I am inserting in the Record, which summarizes its aims and shows what it is accomplishing. If more newspapers would join in the fight with El Diario, the battle to wipe out slums and provide decent living conditions at fair rentals, would soon be won. The goal is aptly stated in the concluding paragraph of their editorial:

Our campaign for decent living conditions at fair rentals is the cornerstone of our extensive program. We shall persevere in our efforts, with your help and God's guidance, as the framers of our Constitution so aptly phrased it: "To secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

My sincere congratulations to El Diario De Nueva York on the splendid job it is doing.

The editorial follows:

THE HOUSING AND RENT RACKET—AS OUR CAMPAIGN DEVELOPS

Our campaign against rent abuses and intolerable living conditions, as it affects lower-income persons generally, and Puerto Ricans and Negroes particularly, has awakened hope in the hearts of many of our readers and friends. Inspirational ideas seem to be endless. We summarize and reflect upon some of the reactions and suggestions of our readers and well-wishers.

1. "You are performing a service in the highest and noblest traditions of journalism by shedding light where darkness and indifference prevail." We are flattered and are fully aware that we have undertaken a full-size job. But this is a function of a newspaper in a democracy—to demonstrate to its readers and followers that democracy is real—and surely every effort to promote equality and reestablish self-respect and dignity in the citizen, however humble he may be, is a service in the cause of democracy. Beaten and oppressed men and women cannot be good Americans. We aim to establish equality in rents, in living conditions, in enforcement of the laws as concerns rents and living conditions, in hopes and aspirations, in opportunities, in employment, in the pursuit of happiness, in purchasing, and (when necessary) in borrowing. We know that God helps those who help themselves, and we shall therefore do our utmost to help ourselves, not for purely selfish reasons, but to prove to ourselves, to all Spanish-language newspapers throughout the world, and to our good neighbors everywhere, that democ-

racy and equality are real and alive and available for all who seek true self-government. We hope that the Voice of America will follow our campaign and report to its far-flung audiences how in America, how in New York City, the capital of the United Nations, right is might."

2. "Your campaign will be ignored by the authorities because you represent neither a pressure group nor a block of votes," is a friendly observation we have been hearing. As a newspaper we cannot ignore that challenge to the time-proved truism that the pen is mightier than the sword. We accept that friendly challenge and dedicate ourselves to help the last Spanish-speaking arrival to master the English language in order to make himself better understood; to teach our brethren the fundamentals of American citizenship and history and make him a respected voter; and to guide in the obligations and responsibilities of American citizenship."

3. "Why don't you stress the importance of Puerto Ricans and Spanish-speaking citizens in the defense effort and in keeping America strong?" has been urged upon us. We have no facts to indicate whether Spanish-speaking citizens are contributing more or less than their share in the defense efforts—probably to the same degree and extent as any other group of Americans—but we are keenly aware of a special service we can and will render to make America stronger, better understood, and better loved and appreciated. We are peculiarly equipped to help our fellow-citizens to speak and understand Spanish to facilitate and encourage their traveling in Spanish-speaking areas all over the world and we are also especially equipped to act as hosts to visitors whom we shall invite in great numbers from Spanish-speaking countries who may wish to see for themselves the miracle of America. We are working fervently to aid in this manner so that all ears in Spanish-speaking territory all over the world may become deaf to Communist overtures. This is a special mission which we Spanish-speaking citizens have—which other foreign-language groups have—which with God's help we will accomplish. We have a job to do and we will do it magnificently."

4. "You, by your campaign, are uniting Puerto Ricans to cooperate in a way as has never before been done in New York," is what someone whispered last night. We hope that is true and shall try to make it truer. Given a chance to save a dollar here and there, without having to turn it over to oppressive landlords, installment sellers, and finance companies, we shall be able to build our own churches and hospitals; our own old-age homes and our own recreational and resort facilities for the entire community to benefit."

Our campaign for decent living conditions at fair rentals is the cornerstone of our extensive program. We shall persevere in our efforts, with your help and God's guidance, as the framers of our Constitution so aptly phrased it:

"To secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

Additional Revenue With No Hardship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include

the following editorial from the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass., August 13, 1951:

NEW SOURCE FOR REVENUE

With the State and Federal Governments always looking for more and more juicy sources to tap for more revenue to keep the Government running, why not tackle legalized racing?

While the State does take a bite out of the horse and dog tracks, there's every reason to believe that they are not only making money but they are making plenty of it. We have our own two examples close by—Suffolk Downs for the horses and Wonderland for the dogs.

Why not levy 5 percent tax on all parimutuel tickets and a 10-percent tax on all track receipts?

And how about a tax on each race horse and greyhound, too?

Taxes such as these imposed by the Federal Government would raise an estimate \$500,000,000 in a year and help the poor taxpayer a great deal.

After all, you don't have to gamble if you don't want to—and it's definitely a luxury.

NPA Construction Order Defies Interpretation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on August 9, I telegraphed an Iowan as follows:

NPA's so-called freeze order, entitled M-4A, August 3, 1951, is a nightmare of confusion, entailing new regulations, multiple amendments, and revocations pertaining to six previous lengthy orders. Confusion is so compounded that mobilization agencies themselves are unable to agree on interpretation.

I feel certain that other Members of Congress, attempting to obtain information and interpretation for their constituents, encountered this nightmare and probably are still struggling with it.

The following article from the August 11 Washington Evening Star details much of the confusion:

WEEK-OLD CONSTRUCTION ORDER STILL CONFUSES OFFICIALS AND BUILDERS

If anybody in the construction industry—or in the Government itself—thoroughly understands the new NPA construction limitation order issued a week ago, we have yet to locate that person.

Indeed, the confusion about the latest National Production Administration order is so great as to represent a classic in this sort of thing, in the opinion of persons we have talked to.

One Government man directly concerned said this:

"The whole thing would be funny, if it were not so gruesome."

A representative of the Associated General Contractors of America, queried by the Star, said he didn't believe anybody could fully understand the order as it stands today.

ALMOST INCOMPREHENSIBLE

"It will need an immense amount of interpretation, and even then I cannot see that it will be anything other than so complex as to seem almost incomprehensible. We have

never had anything so mixed up as this is, in all my recollection."

The comments of Government people themselves reflected unmistakable skepticism about the workability of the order.

One Government official closely connected with administering the regulations said flatly he doubted that parts of it would be enforceable.

"If you can't get people at the operating level of Government to understand it, how are you going to get builders to understand it?" he said.

JOB WAS COLLECTIVE EFFORT

Writing the regulations was a collective effort. Team after team of National Production Authority lawyers contributed to it, as well as other officials.

Seemingly so vast was the confusion that the first time the text was distributed to newspapermen it was found to be of a sharply different "earlier draft" than the agency had finally adopted and meant to distribute.

At a press conference called by Manly Fleischmann, NPA Administrator, for the morning of August 3, it was found the text wasn't available at all. When newspapermen returned in the afternoon to a postponed meeting with Mr. Fleischmann, the text still wasn't ready. Shortly afterward, copies arrived and were distributed, and it was this text which was found to have been an early draft that had been sent to the printer by mistake.

The regulation in "final" form was not distributed to newspapers until the following Monday, and officials then discovered that it still needed correction and clarification. Attempts have been made to do this all week with, apparently, little success.

"EXPLANATORY" INFORMATION

As late as last night, NPA issued "explanatory" information in a release which announced two changes in the order and included "administrative interpretations."

The wry comment of one official in connection with this release was:

"This is an attempt to explain some of the things that are in the regulation which the regulation itself doesn't make clear."

One other Government agency and two construction trade associations also issued their "interpretations" of the order this week.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency gave its version of the procedures set up for home builders to follow in obtaining controlled materials; the National Association of Home Builders supplied its members all over the country with an "analysis" of the regulations, and the Associated General Contractors of America—a trade organization of construction firms—also turned out its own analysis.

EVEN ANALYSES NOT SIMPLE

None of these analyses succeeded in being very simple, apparently, because—as one Government official said—"the order itself is an unbelievably complex mechanism that leaves a great deal for subsequent interpretation."

The new regulation, or order, is called M-4A. When it was distributed, the National Production Authority attached to it controlled materials plan regulation 6, direction 1 to regulation 6, amendment to delegation 14, revocation of M-4, revocation of delegation 7, and a copy of—to use NPA's own brand of contractions—form NPAF-24A. All this was done so that people would understand the new order better.

Which may give you an idea of why being a nonlegal NPA employee—not to mention being a builder—is getting to be somewhat complicated.

The simplest thing you can say about M-4A is that it replaces a previous order called M-4.

STARTED AS SIMPLE ORDER

M-4 started out as a mild little NPA regulation which became effective October 26, 1950, and which banned construction of new buildings for amusement, recreational, or entertainment purposes. That was all.

But gradually M-4 was made tougher, through amendments, to hold down both residential and commercial and industrial building.

When the so-called controlled materials plan of allocating scarce materials went into effect, July 1, M-4 was amended to bring construction under the controlled materials plan (CMP) on a "permissive" basis. A builder could be under CMP, or he didn't need to be, as he wished. That was a little over a month ago.

Now the whole M-4 set-up is tossed out the window and the M-4A regulation has been put into effect to take its place. The controlled materials plan is no longer "permissive" in regard to the construction. It now is to be applied to all construction, beginning October 1.

BREAK FOR HOUSING SEEN

Under the M-4A regulation, however, NPA says housing will get a good break in that the regulations "remove the necessity of applications to NPA for permission to begin construction or to get allotments of materials for buildings or projects using relatively small amounts of steel, copper, and aluminum."

In the home-building field the new regulation removed the recently imposed 2,500 square-foot limitation on houses, which replaced the likewise short-lived \$35,000 cost limitation.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency's interpretation of the regulations says that now you can use any amount of controlled materials you want to if they are used before October 1, with the exception that you can't use any aluminum and you can use copper only for certain purposes.

After September 30 a builder will not be permitted to start or continue home construction unless he obtains an authorized construction schedule and a related allotment of controlled materials, or unless the construction requires no more than the quantities of controlled materials obtainable by self-authorization.

SELF-AUTHORIZATION SYSTEM

Self-authorization is a system set up under the new M-4A regulation, which allows builders to certify themselves to receive certain materials.

They will be allowed to do this, says the Housing and Home Finance Agency, provided they will not need—for a single-family house—more than 1,800 pounds of carbon steel and 38 pounds of copper products or 1,450 pounds of carbon steel and 160 pounds of copper products.

Maximum material schedules are, likewise, set up for two-family, three-family, and four-family homes.

In the case of apartment buildings larger than four-family, builders will be permitted to go ahead before October 1 if they do not require more than 25 tons of carbon steel or more than 2,000 pounds of copper, and if no aluminum or stainless steel is required, HHFA said.

KEY PROVISION OF ORDER

"Beginning with October 1, all residential construction must be specifically authorized, either by self-authorization, as in the case of one-to-four-family structures requiring no more than stated quantities of controlled materials, or by an authorized construction schedule of allotment of materials, as in the case of all multiunit structures," HHFA said.

A key provision of the new order is that after September 30 no one will be able to

buy controlled materials for construction except with a CMP authorization—either a self-authorization or one granted by the agency after an application is filed, the Associated General Contractors' analysis pointed out. (You probably will have a tough time getting such materials up to that time without authorization, but if you can get them it won't be illegal.)

SIGNIFICANT POINTS MADE

AGC's interpretative statement to its members made other significant points:

1. New construction requiring more than specified amounts of controlled materials can be started without an application being filed provided all controlled materials needed are delivered by September 30, and provided the job is not a multiunit apartment building or of the recreational, entertainment, or amusement type.

2. Projects of this kind now under way can be completed without filing an application provided the controlled materials are delivered by September 30.

3. Projects under way for which less than specified amounts of controlled materials will be required per quarter may be completed without filing an application.

4. New applications must be filed for authorized construction schedules and related allotments of controlled materials in the case of projects already under way which will require delivery of greater than specified amounts of controlled materials after September 30.

5. Some construction projects already under way, particularly commercial, probably cannot be continued in the fourth quarter of the year because NPA will not grant allotments for delivery of materials in this quarter. This will mean that such projects may have to shut down for lack of materials, though if they have been legally started NPA will not halt them.

The contractors' group told its members NPA said that very little, if any, new commercial construction can expect to receive allotments of controlled materials in the fourth quarter of the year.

By NPA interpretation, said AGC to its members, contractors may use, at any time, materials in their possession on September 30.

In its explanatory release last night, NPA discussed how the order would apply to various special situations. These interpretations of the order served partly as the basis for the explanation sent by the Associated General Contractors of America to its members.

SPECIAL SITUATION CITED

One special situation explained by NPA was as follows:

"(a) A prime contractor has 50 tons of steel and 1,000 pounds of copper in his inventory. He desires to build a motion-picture theater or other table I category which will not require more than that amount of controlled materials.

"Under section 4 of Order M-4A, he may not commence construction unless he is granted an exception under section 7 of that order. Since the proposed construction would not result in a diminution of the controlled materials allocation available for distribution this fact will be considered in processing the application for exception.

"(b) If a motion-picture theater or other table I category is now under construction pursuant to an exception granted under NPA Order M-4, and if it will require more than 2 tons of carbon steel or 200 pounds of copper for completion, the prime contractor may not continue with the construction unless he receives an authorized construction schedule and related allotment under CMP Regulation 6. However, if the prime contractor needs no more than 2 tons of carbon steel or 200 pounds of copper to complete the theater, he may continue with the con-

struction, but he may not self-authorize his orders for delivery."

This may give you a general idea of why we haven't yet located anyone in the construction business—or in the Government itself—who thoroughly understands the new construction regulations.

Covenant of Human Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a number of editorials and an article dealing with the proposed Covenant on Human Rights. The editorials and article deal with the basic matter which I have been discussing this afternoon, and which I discussed before the Senate some 2 or 3 weeks ago, the Covenant on Human Rights. We learn from the report from Geneva yesterday that there is some indication that the State Department is finally awakening to the danger that is presented in these conventions and covenants.

One of the editorials is entitled "An International Joker," published in the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer of July 25, 1951. There is also an editorial entitled "How To Muzzle People," published in the Wall Street Journal of August 16, 1951; an editorial entitled "U. N. and the Press," published in the New York Daily Mirror of August 2, 1951; an editorial entitled "Undermining American Rights," published in the Cincinnati Enquirer of July 29, 1951; and an article entitled "Beware: One World Welfare State," written by James Ratliff and published in the Cincinnati Enquirer of July 29, 1951.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of July 25, 1951]

AN INTERNATIONAL JOKER

Senator JOHN W. BRICKER, of Ohio, is the author of a resolution declaring that the proposed international Covenant on Human Rights is not acceptable to the United States. It calls on President Truman to instruct American representatives at the United Nations "to withdraw from further negotiations with respect to the Covenant on Human Rights, and all other covenants, treaties, and conventions which seek to prescribe restrictions on individual liberty which, if passed by the Congress as domestic legislation, would be unconstitutional."

Among the rights which the proposed covenant attempts to define are freedom of the press and freedom of religion. But there is a joker in the covenant. Both of these rights are subject to limitation and restriction, as BRICKER pointed out recently on the floor of the Senate.

For example, the section on freedom of the press contains this provision:

"The right to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas carries with it special duties and responsibilities and may therefore be subject to certain penalties, liabilities and restrictions, but these shall be such

only as are provided by law and are necessary for the protection of national security, public order, safety, health or morals, or of the rights, freedoms or reputations of others."

Likewise, the section on freedom of religion is modified by the statement that "freedom to manifest one's religion or beliefs shall be subject only to such limitations as are pursuant to law and are reasonable and necessary to protect public safety, order, health or morals or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others."

Obviously any dictator who was bent on destruction of the free press or curtailment of religious freedom could find legal sanction for his acts in the exceptions cited above. He would merely need to induce a subservient legislature to pass laws giving him the authority to suppress publications which he deemed to be inimical to "national security, public order, safety, health or morals" or to ban the teaching of religious beliefs under the guise of protecting "public safety, order, health or morals."

There are two reasons why the United States should not give its approval to such hypocritical doctrines or to any international covenant which modifies in any degree the rights guaranteed to citizens of this country under the Constitution.

One reason is that if we were to approve the covenant we would in effect be sanctioning abridgment of freedom of the press and of religion in every dictatorship in the world which presently engages in these practices or might attempt to do so in the future.

The other reason is that we would be opening the door to the enactment of laws in this country abridging freedom of the press and destroying religious freedom.

This would come about because approval of the proposed covenant would be in the form of ratifying a treaty, and, as Senator BRICKER pointed out, article VI of the Constitution places the Constitution and treaties on an equal plane of supremacy.

It is undisputed, BRICKER said, that a treaty ratified by the Senate overrides inconsistent provisions of Federal law, State constitutions, State laws, and State judicial decisions.

And it is quite possible that some Supreme Court—that was subservient to the administration, such as the Court which President Roosevelt wanted to establish under his Court-packing bill—would rule that a so-called covenant of human rights, ratified by the Senate, would take precedence over the Bill of Rights in the United States Constitution.

Senator BRICKER made an able presentation of the hypocrisy of the proposed covenant and the dangers inherent in its ratification, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 17.

His purpose, he said, was "to bury the so-called covenant on human rights so deep that no one holding high public office will ever dare to attempt its resurrection." He does not want the United States delegates to the United Nations to secure its adoption by that body, and then to have the administration tell the Senate that it must be ratified to avoid the embarrassment that would arise from its rejection.

The Plain Dealer believes the Senate should adopt BRICKER's resolution promptly, so that there will be no misunderstanding about the opposition of the United States to this international joker.

[From the Wall Street Journal of August 16, 1951]

HOW TO MUZZLE PEOPLE

The United States has rejected and denounced the United Nations' proposed freedom-of-information treaty. It was the only possible thing it could do.

Thanks to the insistence of certain nations—not Communist, as it happens—this pact would suppress more information than

it would free. It specifically provides not only for suppression of news but also for prosecution of news organizations publishing things likely to injure the feelings of other nations or undermine friendly relations between peoples or states.

No American needs to have spelled out for him the implications of this kind of talk. It simply provides a great bludgeon for governments to use to prevent publication of things they don't happen to want published. But we are not concerned here simply to pat the United States negotiators on the back for avoiding so obvious a trap. On the contrary, we think they—that is, the executive branch, which is responsible for treaty making—are due for some scolding.

In the first place, they should not have allowed this insidious treaty to have got as far as it has. It has been in the works for a number of years, but it was clear almost from the outset that it could only turn out the way it has. And it isn't simply a case of error seen in time and no harm done.

Even without United States signature, the treaty may still be approved by other nations—and invoked against United States newsmen in those nations. The United States might not have been able to prevent this in any case, but instead of taking a leading part in the negotiations, it might have used its influence to scotch the whole idea in the first place.

More importantly, we think it is time the executive branch awakened to the fundamental fallacy of global treaty making under the aegis of the U. N. The fallacy is the assumption that all nations (these days it's been modified to all non-Communist nations), though they may differ superficially, have essentially the same noble aims and the same type of democratic political institutions.

They do not, of course, and the result is that in just about every case the treaty draft which emerges succeeds in effectively negating the noble aims which activated it. Thus we have seen a treaty to free trade which could only have accomplished its further restriction. There is kicking around a U. N. treaty on human rights which could be interpreted to deny at least some of the rights actually guaranteed under the United States Constitution. Now we have the treaty on freedom of information which would in fact muzzle it.

In negotiating such treaties among governments with divergent purposes and outlooks, something has got to give. The very real danger is that what will be compromised are the rights and liberties of United States citizens.

[From the New York Daily Mirror of August 2, 1951]

U. N. AND THE PRESS

Some politicians believe that there is no harm in whittling away a little human freedom at a time. But experience is that when the strong, protective layer of a free public opinion is destroyed the inner core of human liberty can rot away.

Take a look at articles 13 and 14 of the Covenant on Human Rights, which the United Nations is seeking to impose. Article 13 says:

"Freedom to manifest one's religion or beliefs shall be subject only to such limitations as are pursuant to law and are reasonable and necessary to protect public safety, order, health or morals, or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others."

Compare that very involved limitation on the practice of religion with the simple affirmative statement in the Constitution's first amendment.

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right

of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Article 14 of the Covenant places the same restrictions and limitations upon a free press, and in addition it is provided that a signatory to the Covenant may cancel a free press "in the case of a state of emergency officially proclaimed by the authorities . . ."

Figure out for yourself how easy it is for politicians to proclaim emergencies. If that were all they had to do, they could abolish the free press and you would read only what the State Department and the Voice of America chose to hand you.

The United States (with France and Mexico less so) is just about the only country in which a treaty becomes the law of the land, once it is ratified.

We are stuck with the provisions of article VI of our Constitution, which makes a treaty supreme law of the land—"anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

No matter how this provision is twisted by the advocates of "one world," our courts are already deciding as the Constitution provides, and long-standing laws are being declared unavailing since we signed the Charter of the United Nations, which, so far as the United States is concerned, is a treaty.

So, if this Covenant on Human Rights is ever ratified by the Senate, religious freedom and freedom of the press can be limited and even abolished in the United States.

Don't say that it cannot happen. The people of California never realized that their land laws would be decided on the basis of the Charter of the United Nations, but that happened.

In a test case (*Sei Fujii v. State of California*) involving alien land laws, Judge Emmet H. Wilson said: "The Charter has become 'the supreme law of the land' and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

He then declared the California alien land laws, passed 30 years before, invalid.

In fact, under this covenant, the imprisonment of William N. Oatis, the American reporter, by Czechoslovakia could be justified. If the government wants to call him a spy, that makes him a spy.

Few Americans, we are sure, ever bothered to read the Charter of the United Nations. But now we are all stuck with it. Even fewer read the Covenant on Human Rights, which is a very obnoxious document.

It ought to be read by everybody. Then tell your Senator that you will bat his ears down if he votes for it.

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer of July 29, 1951]

UNDERMINING AMERICAN RIGHTS

It was an unusually well-documented attack which Ohio Senator JOHN W. BRICKER made on the floor of the Senate last week against the proposed United Nations covenant on human rights, and it is not surprising that in the wake of Senator BRICKER's arguments there have come various other expressions of opposition to a treaty which might undermine American constitutional guaranties of freedom of religion and the press.

Typical of the reaction was the expression of Democratic Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, who asserted: "I am in favor of international cooperation, but I am not in favor of trusting the rights and liberties of the American people to any international agreement."

Senator BRICKER did not mince words in his denunciation of the covenant, which he described as "the instrument for destroying freedom of the press in America" and possessing "the power to destroy religion." The

Ohioan traced the background of the proposed covenant, citing the assistance given to its preparation by a Harvard professor whose appointment was sponsored by Alger Hiss, and linking the sponsorship with others who have been outspoken critics of the type of free press we have in America. Senator BRICKER asserted that the nominal sponsor, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, was blissfully ignorant of the covenant's effects, and that President Truman doesn't understand enough constitutional law to know what the covenant might do.

There are several potentially deadly jokers in the seemingly innocuous covenant on human rights. The language of the proposed covenant provides for certain restraints and limitations of both the freedom of the press and the practices of religion. Significantly, these restraints would apply in times of emergency, and the interpretation of their necessity would be left to the Government.

As Senator BRICKER pointed out, we have been living in one kind of an emergency or another ever since the first days of the New Deal, and there is still no end in sight. Therefore the danger of Government censorship would be an ever-present one under the terms of the Covenant.

What about the Constitution's guaranties of freedom of the press and freedom of religion? Here is the most vicious joker of all in the proposed Covenant of Human Rights: It would supersede all State and Federal laws on the subject, and would evade the constitutional safeguards. The Constitution says: "Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of the press." This is the catch—the Covenant, with its abridgments of the freedom of the press, would not be a law made by Congress. Instead of a law, it would be a treaty ratified only by the Senate. Yet, as Senator BRICKER points out, article VI of the Constitution places the Constitution and treaties on an equal plane of supremacy.

On previous occasion we have pointed out the need for the extreme caution in treaty negotiation, since, under our Constitution, a treaty has a far more binding effect upon the United States than most foreign signatories. Senator BRICKER took note of this in saying: "In almost every other country of the world treaties do not become part of domestic law except to the extent that they are implemented by legislation. Other nations, therefore, do not assume the same risks we do in ratifying a treaty. They have the opportunity for a second look. We do not. State Department officials have displayed a callous disregard of this fact in their treaty negotiations."

We doubt if the fancy-sounding Covenant of Human Rights would achieve anything of constructive or practical value to the world. Most certainly it would undermine basic rights which are traditional in the American scheme of government, and therefore in principle it would tend to drag us down to the level of other nations where neither freedom of the press nor freedom of religion is recognized. The most appropriate thing for the Senate to do is, as Senator BRICKER suggests, go on record as not favoring the Covenant and terminate the negotiations looking toward its adoption by the U. N.

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer of July 29, 1951]

BEWARE: ONE-WORLD WELFARE STATE

(By James Ratliff)

William McGrath is the only Cincinnati who has really experienced "one world" in action. And he's been busy scaring his fellow Americans ever since.

The Oakley industrialist (president of the Williamson Heater Co.) has been a member of the American delegation to the International Labor Organization for 3 years. He is just back from his third trip to Geneva,

where this branch of the United Nations still meets.

The ILO consists of delegates from 80 nations who sit down and try to improve working conditions of the world by drafting treaties which Mr. McGrath says would create an international "welfare state." He has looked on in amazement as countries like Liberia gleefully voted to outlaw forced labor, then privately admit that their jungle chieftains draft whole villages to keep their roads open.

William McGrath contends he is as liberal as the next man. He is a Jeffersonian Democrat and "proud of it." He believes in the U. N. and even the ILO. He thinks we should enter into—and respect—international commitments. But he is convinced that no one else in the world appreciates what America has, and even many Americans are so unappreciative that we are in grave danger of losing our liberty by giving it away.

This year at Geneva, Mr. McGrath blasted the drafting of international welfare proposals into treaties. He realizes it is hopeless to get a free-enterprise proposal out of any international conference like the ILO because the world seems determined to choose only between socialism and communism.

Treaties are actual drafts of laws. And they automatically become supreme to any law in America as soon as the United States Senate ratifies them. Our Constitution, almost alone in the world, provides this.

Some U. N. treaties are earth-shaking in their scope. For example, the Covenant of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, now awaiting ratification in the United States Senate, is a virtual world constitution. Other countries can sign it as a showpiece. If we sign it our very basic rights may be endangered.

Senator JOHN W. BRICKER, of Ohio, arose on the floor of the Senate the other day to call this U. N. treaty, "monstrous" and "human slavery" instead of human rights. He then bored into the rotten core of what thousands of fuzzy-minded idealists in this country call "equal rights for all."

Article 14 (3) of the Covenant on Human Rights, dealing with freedom of speech and of the press, declares: "The right to seek, receive and impart information and ideas carries with it special duties and responsibilities and may therefore be subject to certain penalties, liabilities, and restrictions, but these shall be such as are provided by law and are necessary for the protection of national security, public order, safety, health or morals, or of the rights, freedoms, or reputations of others."

This is the end of freedom of speech and the press if the Senate ratifies it, say many experts.

Ironically, our Constitution, which declares simply that "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom . . . of the press . . ." also contains the Trojan horse article VI that makes a treaty supreme in any law of our land. Why? When the Constitution was written 162 years ago, payment of foreign debts was a matter of principal concern. Only debts and allies were settled by treaty then, and we wanted to make them iron-clad. Our forefathers never knew what was to come in the way of treaties.

Senator BRICKER next put his finger on the real reason international conferences, and in truth, potential world governments, ride rough-shod over the American Bill of Rights. We alone in the world consider man's rights to be given to him by God. We are "endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights," Thomas Jefferson put it in the Declaration of Independence.

Why was this great philosophy left out of the U. N. declaration? Because "any reference to God was anathema to the Russians," says Mr. Holman. "In attempting to appease the Russians our State Department ignored our traditional concept of individual rights."

With God shelved as a source of human rights it's not strange that the U. N. Treaty describes freedom of religion as . . . "subject only to such limitations as are pursuant to law . . ." Tito and Stalin already practice this kind of freedom of religion. So we appease them by adjusting our version of freedom to suit theirs.

Was it only the same old appeasement this time? Or are some leading Americans actually tiring of an America based on God-given rights?

There is reason for suspicion when you read the report of famed Robert M. Hutchins' Commission on Freedom of the Press. It says coldly, "The notion of rights, costless, unconditional, conferred by the Creator at birth, was a marvelous fighting principle against arbitrary governments and had its historical work to do. But in the context of an achieved political freedom the need of limitation becomes evident. The unworkable and invalid conception of birthrights, wholly divorced from the condition of duty, has tended to beget an arrogant type of individualism which makes a mockery of every free institution, including the press."

Still the treaties come. The U. N. Genocide Treaty before the Senate—outlawing the horrible crime of race murder—contains a remarkable clause making it a crime to cause "mental harm" to anyone because of his race. Some attorneys believe this could open a Pandora's box of insidious charges, with Americans conceivably dragged before international tribunals for spats in Peoria, Ill. What the Russians could do propagandize if we ever established this law (by treaty) any child can predict.

Being drafted now to promote "freedom of information" is a U. N. treaty which the American delegate bluntly terms, "diabolical." Instead of "freedom of information" this treaty will permit governments to censor news, restrict the movements of newsmen and prohibit "slanders" of government. The simple truth could be "slanders against government" in Russian or Argentinian eyes. William Oatis reached a Czechoslovakian cell without even "needing" this treaty.

What can be done about America's predicament of law by treaty?

Mr. McGrath says that any treaty should be introduced by bills like all laws in both Houses of Congress. This would undoubtedly require amending the Constitution, which many leading attorneys already demand.

The American Bar Association appointed a committee which recommends that a special clause be attached to every treaty to insure that it does not become domestic law.

It can be expected that once they are aroused sufficiently, Congress will do something concrete about halting law by treaty. What America can do about remaining a free enterprise island in a socialistic world, and still mingle with that world in vital security measures like the U. N. and Atlantic Pact, only time, and perhaps a new concept of international relations in Washington, can tell.

The Need for Rent Control in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the need for strong rent-control regulations in Alaska where the housing requirements far exceed the supply is endorsed by the Retail Clerks International Association which met in its twenty-first convention in Washington, D. C., in mid-

July. Because of the tremendous defense-construction program under way in the Territory, areas there can truly be termed critical so far as housing needs are concerned. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution on this subject adopted by the retail clerks in session assembled July 16 to 20, 1951:

RESOLUTION ON RENT CONTROL

Whereas there is an acute shortage of housing units in Alaska; and

Whereas there is an intensified increase in vital defense construction in the Territory of Alaska, demanding a large increase in workers; and

Whereas only a small percentage of rental units are currently under rent control, since the vast majority of units were constructed after 1947; and

Whereas this condition is being exploited by many landlords, who are charging exorbitant rents to the detriment of tenants; and

Whereas this in itself causes many needed workers to leave the Territory resulting in a slackening of the defense construction; and

Whereas the control of all rents in the Territory of Alaska would do much to alleviate the sad conditions now existing: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this convention go on record as requesting Congress to include a universal rent-control law in the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and that copies of this resolution be sent to E. L. BARTLETT, House of Representatives; the Office of Housing Expediter at Washington, D. C., and at Juneau, Alaska; and to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Railroad-Safety Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, score another head-on train collision, with its toll of dead and injured, to the absence of train radio on American railroads. In recent years there has been a series of serious wrecks on our railroads in which hundreds of lives were taken and millions of dollars were lost. This bloodshed and this property loss was needless. It could have been prevented if train radio had been a safety requirement on American railroad systems.

Congress shares the blame with the railroads that have been negligent in adopting train radio as a precaution against such accidents as occurred Friday, August 10, at New Roads, La., and against many similar accidents of the past 3 years. Congress will share the blame for the accidents that will occur in the future for lack of intertrain radio. It is Congress' duty to require the latest and most modern safety devices on our railroads.

A few railroads, too few, indeed, have been progressive and have experimented with train radio. They are showing the way, but the lives of railroad passengers and railroad employees are much too precious to gamble on the convenience of the railroads. Train radio should be required equipment of every system

now—the installation should not be left to the convenience of the companies. We know from past experience how slow they have been in adopting most safety devices. Usually, action was forced by the method I believe to be necessary in the case of the train radio—compulsion by law. Congress should spell out the Interstate Commerce Commission's authority to require train radio.

More than 4 years ago I proposed legislation in the House to do this. It is high time for Congress to act in the interest of safety on our railroads. Time after time I have called to the attention of my colleagues railroad accidents which I am convinced could have been prevented by train radio. I think Congress should absolve itself of the blame for these disasters on our rails by fulfilling its duty without further delay. Legislative action now will prevent another series of wrecks such as we have seen in the past 3 years.

Certainly Congress has had the time to give to this important matter. We might well have produced rail-safety legislation during the many dull days of this session when we were waiting to consider appropriation bills. There can be no logical reason advanced for failure to consider the rail-safety measure. It will require a little financial outlay, so it cannot be attacked as a domestic measure which for economy's sake should be set aside during the present defense emergency.

As a matter of fact rail safety is of great importance to the defense program. It was a troop train, incidentally, which figured in the Louisiana wreck of last Friday. It was not too long ago when another troop train figured in a disastrous Ohio wreck resulting in the loss of many lives.

From another point of view no time could be more opportune than now for passage of rail safety legislation. Railroad earnings are certain to be high during the defense emergency period. A portion of these earnings could be well spent in equipping every system in the United States with train radio. There is an obligation on the part of the railroads to provide this additional safety measure for its passengers and its employees—there is a responsibility on the part of Congress to make certain that the railroads meet this obligation.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to do so, I include herewith an editorial from the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, of Monday, August 12, relating to the Louisiana wreck. The Post-Dispatch has long been an advocate of train radio and has consistently campaigned for legislation requiring its use on our railroads as standard safety equipment. The editorial follows:

GARbled, FORGOTTEN, OR IGNORED

Last Friday's head-on collision of the Kansas City Southern streamliner, Southern Belle, and a troop train on the same railroad, near Baton Rouge, La., was attributed to causes that might have been wholly averted by the use of train radio. A message to the troop train to take a siding and let the Southern Belle by was said to have been garbled, forgotten, or ignored.

Any of these miscarriages of the order would have been a symptom rather than the ill itself—the symptom of a dangerous prac-

tice on the railroads of issuing instructions without an adequate check to determine whether they were properly transmitted, or received, or understood, or obeyed.

In golf, this would be condemned as not keeping one's eye on the ball, and not following through. That is also what it is in railroading. If radio were used, and the recipients of messages were required to confirm that they received and understood and acted upon the instructions, horrors like that on the Kansas City Southern would be things of the past.

Defense Projects Change Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to submit for the RECORD an article written for the North American Newspaper Alliance by Mr. William L. Baker. Mr. Baker, editor and publisher of the Ketchikan (Alaska) Chronicle, recently made an extensive trip through the Territory; and his observations, which appeared in the Evening Star on August 13, are of general interest:

OUR ALASKAN DEFENSES—CIVILIAN AND MILITARY PROJECTS ARE GOING FULL BLAST IN NORTH

(By William L. Baker)

KOTzebue, ALASKA, August 13.—One notable difference in the worker on Alaskan defense bases today is his age and his attitude, when compared with the man who helped fortify the Aleutian Islands or the Alaska rail belt during World War II.

In those days the average defense worker had no thought of remaining in Alaska; he wanted to help get the job done, fulfill the terms of a military deferment and return to his family in the States.

This year's crop of newcomers, however, is largely made up of middle-aged persons from all over the United States, their children grown up or in college (or else brought along for a vacation) and their roots back home less binding. Many of them came here in the family car, with a house trailer behind, and instead of making a nest egg on which to go back to Missouri or Florida and spend the winter, many are staking homesteads or buying suburban lands to develop into resorts or ranches.

MANY LIVING IN TRAILERS

An Anchorage editor estimated that 2,500 families are living in trailer camps or semi-transient housing this summer, most of them working on the expanding Fort Richardson project around Anchorage, whose population seems to grow several thousand each year. Fairbanks may have another 1,000 or 1,500 transient families, most of them in their own trailers. Some of them stuck it out last winter, though that city had more than a week of 50-below weather.

These modern-day pioneers are mostly craftsmen who draw \$3 an hour and better, with lots of overtime. Unskilled labor starts at \$2.70 this year in either defense area. Plumbers in nonurban camps are guaranteed \$220 per week and \$40 weekly for living expenses. Alaska Road Commission crews—and one sees cars from a dozen States in the roadside camps—are guaranteed 9 hours per day, or they wouldn't stay. They're working night shifts in the roadside gravel pits, rushing surfacing on 700 miles of pri-

mary highway in interior Alaska—designated military roads by the Alaska command at Fort Richardson.

NO FAMILY ACCOMMODATIONS

At remote radio, radar, and antiaircraft installations, no family accommodations are available but some of the families are holding down the homesteads or the newly opened ranches in the Matanuska Valley near Palmer, the Tanana River Valley around Fairbanks or on the scenic Kenai Peninsula which is being opened up by new roads.

Lt. Gen. Nathan F. Twining, now assistant chief of staff of the Air Force in Washington and until last year head of the Alaska command, adopted the policy of linking military operations in Alaska to civilian development. Lt. Gen. William E. Kepner, his successor, has followed the same policy.

Transportation, communications and industries needed for the Army have benefited civilians. Thus the Army buys all surplus food from the Matanuska colony. Federally sponsored Dust Bowl refugee experiment—now 16 years old and growing lustily. It buys Alaska salmon and other seafoods. It consumes thousands of tons of Alaskan-mined coal. It has encouraged Alaskans to form construction companies to bid on defense contracts, and stevedoring and barge companies to handle defense cargoes.

TOURIST INFLUX HEAVY

The roads and airports built for defense have proved magnets for pleasure travelers, and the influx of tourists over the war-built Alaska Highway has been heavy. At Anchorage and Fairbanks, the military strongly supported construction of international airports at a cost of nearly \$9,000,000 apiece, and they are being put into operation this year so that commercial airlines using Elmendorf Field at Anchorage and Ladd Field at Fairbanks could move their hangars and shops away from the Air Force's installations.

Many semimilitary operations under way in the north fit into civilian developments or research, too. The Air Force has an Arctic health laboratory at Ladd Field. The Navy has a geophysical laboratory at Barrow on the Arctic, and the University of Alaska has a similar lab at its campus near Fairbanks, probing the mysteries of the cosmic ray, the aurora borealis, and the north magnetic poles.

The turn of events in Iran is expected to force cancellation of the Navy's plan to abandon oil drilling in the vast Barrow oil reserve north of Fairbanks, called by geologists the greatest reserve in the world. While some small oil wells have been brought in, and the Barrow camp of Arctic contractors is being heated by natural gas from the area, the few test sinkings have not yet uncovered the large deposits that are expected to be found. However, the drillers point out that it was 25 years after the first oil well was struck before the Le Duc fields of Alberta, Canada, were really developed and now they rival the West Texas field. Two private companies are drilling in the Katalla-Yakataga region on Prince William Sound this summer.

MINERAL SEARCH PRESSED

The national emergency has boomed the search for strategic minerals in Alaska, and several large companies have men in the field either developing long-held claims or buying ores from the ones that are producing. A \$350,000 defense-plant loan is enabling a tin operator near Teller on the Bering to go into production this year.

Even glaciologists, busy on the icecap back of Juneau are working for the Naval Research Institute. They think that by reading the glacial moraine of each of 32 glaciers in the field, and comparing them with the movements of glaciers in South America and Europe they may chart the pattern of the world's climate back through several centuries and even learn when sun-spot activity was greatest.

Greatest news of nondefense development for Alaska, however, was the decision of Ketchikan Pulp & Paper Co. to begin work in a few weeks on a \$40 million dissolving pulp mill near Ketchikan in southeastern Alaska. It signed a contract with the United States Forest Service for a 50-year timber supply, but it, too, won a defense-plant certificate for partial amortization as a war plant.

Military Order of the Purple Heart Urges Morality and Religion in National Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a resolution adopted by the Department of Illinois, Military Order of the Purple Heart, assembled at their fourteenth annual convention in Chicago, Ill., on June 15, 16, and 17, 1951:

Whereas grave questions of morality in government and in the minds of the citizenry of our country and community have within recent months been suggested by concerned statesmen, citizens, and our great American press; and

Whereas our Nation is now once again in a period of national emergency, which finds brave men of our land again making the supreme sacrifice on foreign battlefields in the service of their country, and

Whereas it is the sense of the convention of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, Department of Illinois, that, in our avowed purpose of defending our Republic and free institutions against the insidious and totalitarian enemy known as communism, we are actually in the role of crusaders for morality, truth, justice, and our great freedoms, while the enemy is the very epitome of the lack of morality and the other of the very basic elements of our way of life; and

Whereas it is the further sense of the convention of this organization that, while we cherish our individual rights to worship as we please, the American people are essentially and historically a religious people; that many of our forebears came to these shores for reasons associated with their religious beliefs; that the enemy of communism is known to be godless and the very antithesis to our most basic beliefs in Deity; and

Whereas it is the further sense of this convention that one of the most potent safeguards which we can employ in combating both the enemy and sabotage of our defense effort is a rededication on the part of leaders of Government and of all of the citizens of this great Republic in general to the ethics, morality, and religious principles of our founding fathers; and

Whereas it is Gen. George Washington, who, in 1782, originated the award of the Purple Heart Medal, also known as the Badge of Military Merit, and it was also the Father of Our Country and our Republic's first President who handed down to American posterity counsel on the very subject aforementioned in his Farewell Address, as published in 1796; and

Whereas it is the sense of this convention that adherence to General Washington's counsel in regard to morality and religion as set forth in the Farewell Address would in itself play a major role in improving our national scene, certainly much more so than any resolution which this body might adopt

bearing upon the pros and cons of any of the many issues and debates now being carried on in many quarters: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Military Order of the Purple Heart, Department of Illinois, and the membership thereof (in convention assembled), That the following excerpt from the Farewell Address of Gen. George Washington be proclaimed and published at the mandate of this body to its representatives and leaders in Government, the same to be adopted by them for their guidance and adherence in the performance of their duties; that the substance of these noble words of counsel be likewise adopted as a code of American living and patriotic performance by our own organizational leaders and membership; that the same practice be recommended for adoption by other veterans' and patriotic groups:

"Of all of the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion, and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of man and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths, which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition, that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure—reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

Be it further resolved, That a copy of this resolution be communicated to the President of the United States, members of the President's Cabinet, to each of the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives who represent the people of the State of Illinois, and to the Governor of the State of Illinois, and members of the Senate and House of the State of Illinois; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the National Convention of the Military Order of the Purple Heart to be held in the year 1951, with the recommendation of this convention body that a similar resolution be adopted by that convention.

Passed by the Department of Illinois, in regular convention assembled, on the 16th day of June 1951.

LESTER J. STEPEK,
Department Commander,
FERDINAND J. BRONZELL,
Department Adjutant.

Choirboy of Capitol Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the ablest and best-liked Members of the House is the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]. In addition, he is one of the hardest-working Members of the House.

I am pleased to include in my remarks a splendid article about our friend and colleague, Mr. RABAUT, appearing in

the issue of August of the fine magazine, the Sign, written by James J. Butler:

CHOIRBOY OF CAPITOL HILL—REPRESENTATIVE LOUIS RABAUT, OF DETROIT, IS ONE OF THE MORE HIGHLY RESPECTED CONGRESSMEN, AND A SINGER

(By James J. Butler)

The choirboy of Capitol Hill is not a cherubic, teen-age page, but is a 14-year Member of the House of Representatives, who, despite his 64 years and the demands of congressional service, still finds time to sing in his home-town church in Michigan and occasionally in Washington and elsewhere.

Father of a priest and of two nuns, Representative LOUIS RABAUT, of Detroit, is one of the highly respected members of the National Legislature, to which he was reelected, for the eighth time, in November. He is, for example, on the Joint Committee on Appropriations, currently engaged in financing the far-flung civilian and military obligations of the Federal Government.

On Capitol Hill it is said that no Member of the House has a wider first-name acquaintance with Members of that branch of Congress than Louis. That may seem of little importance to outsiders. It pays off on Capitol Hill. Under the existing system in the Federal Legislature a Congressman may serve on only one major committee (there are minor committees, and the adjective is truly descriptive); therefore the area of influence on the all-important committee level is constricted. But RABAUT, a born mixer, drops in on other committees, a Representative's prerogative, and avails himself of the right to enter upon the discussions to the degree where some of his colleagues, particularly the first-termers, aren't quite sure whether he's a committeeman or not.

Musical vocalizing has given him stage presence that arrests the attention of colleague and witness alike. So, without slightest trace of bluster, he's Louis to just about everybody in the monumental white masses which make up the cluster of Capitol, House Office Building, and Senate Office Building.

Congressional associates envy RABAUT his election district, his made-to-order specifications to meet the requirements of candidacy for election there. Detroit has a strong leaning toward the Democratic Party, and RABAUT is a Democrat. There are more voters of Belgian extraction in his district than in any other in the country, according to United States Census Bureau records. His grandfather was born in Belgium. Like every other community, there is local pride, interest in promoting a home-town boy. The Congressman's father was born in Detroit; so was Louis. As is the case in most metropolitan centers, the political organization and its lieutenants are importantly of Irish extraction; LOUIS RABAUT's mother was born in Ireland. The Catholic population is large; RABAUT and his family are stalwart Catholic communicants. Veterans are strongly organized in his State, and he has been cited by the Veterans of Foreign Wars for exceptional effort in their behalf. The court room is an ideal preparatory school for congressional work, and Counsellor RABAUT has had wide experience there.

Detroit is so heavily industrialized that ambitious communities elsewhere—even overseas—describe themselves as "the Detroit of so-and-so." Naturally organized labor is a major political element. What is RABAUT's record there? The Congress of Industrial Organizations in a pre-election statement analyzed the voting record of each Member of Congress as a guide to locals in determining who should be endorsed for reelection. The CIO selected 12 key bills as its measure of friend of labor. Picked were the legislative fields of labor, minimum wage, rent control, housing, fair employment prac-

tices bill, social security, natural gas transmission control, Marshall plan, point 4 aid to underdeveloped countries, Korean aid.

RABAUT topped Michigan's 18 Congressmen in the reckoning, was reported to his constituents to be the only Michigander "100 percent right."

RABAUT's political independence has often the despair of more partisan-thinking Members of his party. Elected as a New Deal Democrat, he was "off the reservation" more times than he went down the line in the major votes which preceded entry of the United States into World War II.

"I have no apologies to make to any one for my votes against every measure which I believed was likely to lead this country into war," he said defiantly, as he went before his constituents for reelection. They returned him to the House.

Back in Washington, he became a leader in rushing appropriations bills and legislation to win the conflict when war broke out. With him it was not plain isolationism; it was a conviction, and a hope tenaciously clung to, that our involvement in the world struggle could have been avoided.

There is another typical illustration of his independence. Many Members of Congress lost votes when newspapers disclosed they were indulging nepotism—placing members of the family on the official payroll. A reporter for a hometown newspaper approached RABAUT:

"Is it true that you practice nepotism to the extent that your daughter is employed as your secretary at \$3,200 a year?"

RABAUT wasn't the least bit reticent.

"It's true that she is employed as my secretary. But she receives \$3,900, not \$3,200 a year, and she took a special course at a secretarial school to train for the job.

"You might also say," he volunteered, "that another daughter preceded Mary Jane and she resigned to become a nun."

While a nonprofessional by preference, RABAUT has performed before some of the world's most distinguished audiences. That is to be expected. The novelty of a singing Congressman has placed him in great demand, and he loves to vocalize.

Annually, the House of Representatives conducts a memorial exercise for Members who have passed away during the session. It is not uncommon to find in the membership of Congress former professional entertainers, but they're usually of the hi-de-ho school of music. Ex-Senator Glen Taylor, the cowboy banjo strummer from Idaho, was an example; former Senator "Pass the Biscuits Pappy" O'Daniel of Texas was another; and a favorite for many years was the late Representative Billy Connery of Massachusetts, a former vaudevillian. But the memorial program calls for a more dignified repertoire, and RABAUT fills the bill as none of his colleagues can.

In legislative protocol, the Speaker of the House is regarded second only to the President. He's rated higher than the Vice President, who's normally considered to be only a presiding officer, whereas the Speaker is that plus a policy maker of enormous influence. And when a Speaker dies in office, the ceremonials of funeral service take on great formality. Speaker Joseph Byrnes died shortly after RABAUT came to Congress. The Detroit lawmaker was chosen as funeral soloist. Present in the House Chamber were President Roosevelt, Members of both Senate and House, the entire membership of the Supreme Court of the United States, the Cabinet, Ambassadors representing the major world powers, the military brass.

A stilled Chamber heard Congressman RABAUT sing a program of his own selection: "Ave Maria," "Thy Will Be Done," and "Absent."

The professional skill of his accompanist was taken for granted. Few knew that she was the Congressman's daughter, Joan, now Mrs. John Barrett, of Detroit.

Singing was not an accidental sideline of the national legislator. He made his first public appearance at the age of 4 years, and appropriately it was at a parochial-school show. His parents awakened him from a sound sleep to do his turn at the evening performance. And then he went sound asleep again.

But he went on from there. When he was old enough to button a cassock and adjust a surplice he became an altar boy. His musical inclination turned his ear to the music of the mass, and when he joined the tied choir he needed little coaching in that particular.

Early in his career his voice attracted the attention of the famed Gregory Freitag, European-trained choir director who was associated for almost half a century with Sts. Peter and Paul Church in Detroit. Freitag took the boy under his wing, coached him in solo parts, brought him out. Soon he was appearing as soloist for the huge audiences attracted by the renowned Father McClory, who made history with his missions and Lenten devotions in Detroit and Chicago. Attendance passing the 5,000 mark was common.

It was natural that theatrical producers, always anxious to capitalize on youthful talent, would hear of the boy singer of the Midwest. The Shubert brothers (the "Boys from Syracuse") making inroads on Broadway and destined to establish what was to become a virtual monopoly of show business in the New York and east coast area, sent a scout. He listened to LOUIS RABAUT, arranged for a public appearance audition in the Detroit Opera House. Everything went off according to their fondest expectations.

They talked business with the young vocalist and held out the bait of a professional career that would lead to Broadway. It looked like clear sailing for the youngster. His family wasn't too averse, if he wanted it that way. Louis searched his soul. Was it worth breaking family ties, leaving the things upon which he had placed high appraisal? No.

RABAUT went on to further his education. He applied himself to the University of Detroit curriculum leading to admission to the bar. Meanwhile he continued his interest in music, came up with Hall, Alma Mater—words and music by LOUIS RABAUT, undergraduate, dedicated to his school.

Time marched on. Louis became a magnet to political leaders. He was an able member of the bar, popular, constantly in the public eye as a barrister and a vocalist, a family man. He had married popular and beautiful Stella Petz. Congress? He ran, but didn't make it. Waited 2 years, ran again, and when the votes were counted Detroit lost a lawyer and the Nation gained a legislator.

LOUIS RABAUT was certain from the start that he'd like the job, and he was determined to keep it. He has. He's been in many campaigns since that first ill-fated try and he has applied himself diligently to the interests of his constituency. But he never has been able to resist the urge to write and sing music.

In his avocation he has demonstrated a versatility that is, to put it mildly, surprising. His preference from boyhood has been sacred hymns, the music of the Catholic Church, but he has been a prodigious source of parodies, political songs (the Democrats get all the breaks), and sentimental lyrics.

A decade ago, when the centennial of baseball was being observed, there was a call for a song that would give proper credit to 100 years of the American national pastime. The sports immortal, Walter Johnson, Washington Senator's pitcher, was appointed chairman of a committee to select a composer. He was aided by Judge Edward Curran, of the District of Columbia Federal District Court, and Edward J. Hayes, Detroit native and outstanding Washington attorney. They looked over the field, came up with the man

and the song: "Baseball, the All-American Game"—words and music by LOUIS RABAUT.

The Michigan Congressman was programmed to sing his own composition as the centennial program opened, but he was sent to England on congressional business. A substitute had to be engaged. In London, he sang it for the first time, and isn't sure yet whether "our British cousins" understood what it was all about.

Upon his return he again was asked to sing Baseball, the All-American Game. He agreed. When the night arrived he found himself tied down by essential congressional needs and was obliged to send his regrets.

"Come to think of it," he told this interviewer in his office overlooking the Capitol, "I never have sung this song in the United States, so I will do so now—for you." And, before a one-man audience, he sang while the mills of legislation were being prepared for the morrow's business, involving appropriations and war preparation which, conceivably, could affect the future of every person in the world.

Wherever he goes the "Singing Congressman" is bound to be detected. Embassies in the Philippines, China, Japan, Europe, the republics of South America have echoed his vocalizing. There is an interesting story in connection with his visit to the countries south of the Rio Grande. In promotion of the good-neighbor policy, Sumner Welles, then Undersecretary of State, and Nelson Rockefeller, directing work of cementing inter-American friendship, asked RABAUT to tour the capitals. There was more reason for this selection than RABAUT's eminence in Congress. Advance publicity featured pictures of this Catholic Church choir singer with his family—nine children. A survey by the Rockefeller office, based on clipping services and other sources, estimated that the picture was reproduced in 2,500,000 copies of newspapers circulated in this predominantly Catholic area.

His trips have taken him to many other lands, including Ireland. While there, the famed Irish tenor, John McCormack, learned of his presence, invited him to his home in Dublin. That visit remains one of his most treasured memories. McCormack was in his fatal illness, he had sung his last song. (He died 6 weeks later.) The Congressman sang several of his own compositions, some others. When he made ready to leave, McCormack said:

"I want you to sing one more song in my home. I will play the piano to accompany you. I want you to sing, 'God Bless America.'" With national pride and deep humility, RABAUT obliged.

Not all of the Detroit lawmaker's music is of the semiclassical sort. For example, there is the campaign song, The Kick of the Democratic Mule, and the one the late Franklin D. Roosevelt chuckled over and called for encores in the White House, Prohibition, We've Had Enough of You.

The Congressman's vocalizing, more restricted since the Korean crisis broke than theretofore, includes occasional appearances as a soloist at St. Patrick's Church, downtown Washington edifice, whose congregation includes scores of Senators and Representatives as well as dozens of diplomats and their families. Between sessions of Congress, he returns to Detroit and the choir of Saints Peter and Paul, where his voice has been heard for more than half a century. And he is an active member of the Society for Preservation of Barber Shop Singing in America. Recently he sang over a Nation-wide radio-television hook-up on behalf of the Heart Campaign.

But he isn't the only vocalist in the family. Five of his daughters sing as a group in church, collaborated in composing several World War II songs used to encourage productive effort in the all-important Detroit area plants. A son, Vincent, served as a lieutenant in the United States Navy, now is back in civilian life.

Another son, Rev. Francis Dermott Rabaut, S. J., is on the faculty of Loyola University, Chicago; a daughter, Sister Stella Maris, is in the Motherhouse at Monroe, Mich., and another daughter, Sister Mary Palmyre, is a librarian at Mary Grove College, Detroit.

Congressman RABAUT is an advocate of large families. He preaches that goal to associates, taxi drivers, waitresses—into every available ear. Recently he ate at a restaurant he had not visited in several years. The waitress serving him, whom he didn't recall seeing before, looked furtively around, then whispered to him: "Congressman, I have three children now."

"Must have been someone I gave the usual sermon to once upon a time," he concludes.

Trade Agreements and the Oatis Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article from the New York Journal, by George Rothwell Brown.

This article shows clearly why the Congress, in spite of the efforts of many of its Members, has been powerless to do anything for the relief and liberation of William Oatis.

The truth is that we are in the power of the United Nations. This transpired in the debate on the floor of the House of Representatives. We have relinquished our high powers to protect our citizenry and by so doing we have lost our sacred honor.

The above-mentioned article follows:

THE POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

TRADE AGREEMENTS AND THE OATIS CASE

WASHINGTON, August 15.—Advocates of an immediate denial of tariff preferences to Czechoslovakia, in retaliation for the jailing of an American newspaper correspondent on trumped-up spy charges, are up against a tougher proposition than they realize.

The House approached the Oatis resolution designed to get this American correspondent out of prison, with little understanding of the extent to which the lawmaking body has permitted the New Deal bureaucracy to deprive this Government of its rights as a free agent.

The amendment to the resolution offered by Representative ARMSTRONG, of Missouri, provided that there be an immediate trade break with Czechoslovakia, to be followed in 90 days by a diplomatic rupture if Oatis were not released.

The President could refuse to accept the credentials of the new Czech Ambassador, who has recently arrived in Washington.

But very few Members of Congress realize the extent to which the State Department outsmarted, hookwinked, and tricked the legislative branch of the Government when it surrendered the constitutional tariff-making powers of Congress into the hands of an international creature of the United Nations, the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs, generally known as GATT.

Czechoslovakia is the only one of the iron curtain countries that is a member of GATT,

in which it has the same voice as the United States, one vote.

There are now 30 countries in this organization, in which the United States is heavily outvoted, 29 to 1.

If a majority of these 29 countries, including Czechoslovakia itself, refuses to accede to the American request that special trade preferences enjoyed by the Czech Government be withdrawn, this country will lose its case when the GATT countries meet at Geneva in September.

How did we get this way?

In 1947 a trade conference of 23 nations, under a State Department plan, met at Geneva to draft an international trade organization, known as ITO.

The ITO Charter was perfected at Habana and sent to Congress for ratification.

It was, and is still, a vicious scheme to bypass the American Congress, which alone can enact tariff laws, and to transfer that tariff power over the trade of the world, including that of the United States, to a creature of the United Nations.

In the last Congress no attempt whatever was made to secure ratification of the ITO Charter, upon which the State Department had spent months of time and many thousands of dollars in costly conferences.

In the present Congress the State Department has not peeped about ITO. It has asked for no hearings, and none have been held.

That magnificent project, the International Trade Organization, is dead.

But there's a reason. The cunning State Department bureaucracy found that by establishing GATT it could get everything it would have obtained in ITO—by Executive order without obtaining the consent of Congress. President Truman issued the Executive order in December 1947.

Stripped to its skeleton, GATT is a scheme whereby the United States becomes obligated to maintain full employment in all the member countries.

In short, it imposes on the United States the obligation to import foreign unemployment.

Its deliberate design is to raise the standard of living in foreign countries at the expense of the American standard of living.

Under GATT the United States surrendered its right to decide what countries could share in its own resources.

It is from behind the shelter of this highly secret device of the State Department that Czechoslovakia can thumb its nose at Uncle Sam, while she keeps poor Oatis in a stinking jail.

Immediate Statehood for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the twenty-first convention of the Retail Clerks International Association, which met in Washington, D. C., July 16-20 of this year. That resolution placed the convention strongly on record for the grant of statehood to Alaska and points to the underlying reasons why statehood should be granted now:

Whereas Alaska is a great land, extremely rich in natural resources, presently populated by citizens of the United States, whose

loyalty to, and love for, the United States is unparalleled in this Nation of ours; and

Whereas these citizens are engaged in the prodigious task of developing this grand area in accordance with American ideals under severe hardships, occasioned by nature's forces, far distances, and the emphasized rigors of a new country; and

Whereas these citizens are by nature and the inalienable rights guaranteed under our democratic form of government to the full prerogatives of citizenship, including the right of self-government, enjoyed by all Americans within the boundaries of our Nation; and

Whereas the people of Alaska should not be penalized in their unprecedented effort to mold this land so it will be a credit to our American traditions by the stifling mandates of bureaucratic agencies operating by remote control; and

Whereas the people of Alaska have voted for statehood in a referendum election; and

Whereas the working people of this huge Territory have the greatest stake in forwarding the cause of statehood for their country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this convention go on record as demanding the present Congress of the United States to grant full and complete statehood to Alaska; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Delegate E. L. BARTLETT, of the House of Representatives, and to the President of the United States.

J. A. SUFFRIDGE,
Secretary-Treasurer, RCIA.

Consumers' Advisory Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to establish a Consumers' Advisory Bureau in the Department of Commerce, which will enable purchasers to get best values for the prices paid for food and other commodities.

In these days of constantly soaring living costs, American consumers must be thrown some life line. My bill would provide one means of protecting American consumers who are now helplessly caught in the upward inflationary spiral which has not yet reached its full height. Already the American housewife cannot afford enough nourishing food for her family; the average wage earner's budget cannot provide even the simplest necessities of life. The predictions of further increased prices made when I urged Congress to pass a strong price and rent control bill are now a tragic and accomplished fact. Authentic reports show that the public is being gouged on every hand in the cost of food, due to the weak controls law passed by Congress. Economic Stabilizer Eric A. Johnston recently stated that we could expect living costs to jump 5 to 8 percent during the coming year. The 16,000,000 families in this country who earn under \$2,000 per year, and the 26,000,000 who earn less than \$3,000 face dire hardships, a meager existence, and a lowering of their standard of living.

The American public spends many millions of dollars each year for consumers' goods—food, clothing, and other merchandise. It also overpays millions of dollars in the purchase of commodities because it does not have complete and accurate information concerning the relative quality, utility, and abundance of the commodities available on the retail market.

Trade and brand names, which are constantly called to the attention of the buying public by producers and manufacturers who can afford to spend millions of dollars in advertising, result in those products being requested by purchasers almost automatically. Yet, the best-advertised product does not necessarily make it the best buy. We read and hear of marks of approval bestowed upon certain commodities by groups or associations, yet we know that they do not have the facilities or finances to make a true comparison of the relative quality of all commodities in that same category. Also, it is possible that such private sponsors or organizations could be swayed by other considerations than recommending the best product for the money, and that their verdicts can harm, rather than help, the consumer.

The American consumer has no way of determining for himself how other makes or brands actually compare with the products expertly advertised by press, radio, television, and other mediums. He is practically forced to believe that the well-advertised product is the best value for his money because that story is given to him repeatedly. The truth is, the consumer more often than not pays a higher price than necessary, as the little-known product can in fact be of higher grade and cheaper. Remember, the millions paid for advertising are eventually tacked on to the cost of the product and the consumer pays for it.

I believe that it should be a function of the United States Government to procure and make such information available to the consumer, so that he may receive full value for every dollar he spends, as no other facilities or organizations can accomplish the desired result.

The Consumers' Advisory Bureau provided for in my bill would establish categories of consumers' goods based upon the various uses and functions thereof; it would investigate, analyze, test, and evaluate consumers' goods within each category for the purpose of determining their relative quality, utility, and abundance, and would make available to the consuming public, by periodic publications and by such other means as the director may deem appropriate, full, complete, and accurate information—based upon the results of such investigations, analyses, tests, and evaluation, and upon such other statistics and data as may be collected and compiled by the director—with respect to the relative quality, utility, and abundance of the consumers' goods within each category.

The Defense Production Act of 1951 was a rank betrayal of the American people in that it paved the way for price increases of all commodities in general, assured still higher food prices, prevented roll-backs, provided for rent

boosts, all of which are increasing the hardships of the already overburdened and harassed wage earner. I maintain that the Federal Government must now give all possible assistance to the citizens of this country. We must do all we can to offset the economic evils which now prevail, and which the new controls law encourages instead of corrects.

The Consumers' Advisory Bureau I propose would render invaluable service to the public; it would save our people millions of dollars yearly and would give them some protection, at least, in these days of tremendous living costs, when every penny counts.

Legal Loophole for Murder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the bizarre story of the wartime murder of an American Army major in Italy by two subordinates, just disclosed by the Department of Defense, focuses attention on a legal loophole which existed in the wartime military code. The loophole amounts to a statute of limitations on the crime of murder, since the accused are immune from trial and punishment by a military court following their separation from military service. Defense Department officials have been quoted as saying that the new uniform code of military justice, which went into effect last May 31, corrects this situation. I believe the Congress, or the Armed Services Committee, would be well advised to recheck the situation to assure that the loophole is completely plugged.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following article by C. B. Allen, which appeared in the August 16, 1951, New York Herald Tribune:

ARMY REVEALS TALE OF MURDER OF OSS MAJOR—WANTS ITALY TO PROSECUTE TWO AMERICANS ACCUSED OF SLAYING BEHIND NAZI LINES

(By C. B. Allen)

WASHINGTON, August 15—The United States, in effect, invited the Italian Government today to prosecute two American citizens for the wartime murder of a United States Army major in Italy.

The action was taken after a 5-year investigation was reported to have solved the mystery of the crime—only to reveal that the alleged American participants, one of whom signed a full confession, are wholly immune from punishment in this country because of quirks in the military-civil laws prevailing at the time of the murder.

Department of Defense officials released the bizarre story with the announcement that the State Department during the day had called it to the attention of the Italian Government. They explained that two Italian participants in the murder, after a long series of legal wrangles, are about to be tried for the crime in the Italian civilian criminal courts and that this Government would be "happy" if Italy would request extradition of the two Americans to stand trial with them.

MAJOR HOLOHAN VICTIM

Defense officials said the victim of the murder was Maj. William V. Holohan, a graduate of Manhattan College and the Harvard Law School, who served as an attorney for the Securities and Exchange Commission before he was called to active duty as a Reserve officer in World War II with the Office of Strategic Services. They added that Major Holohan and three companions were dropped 100 miles behind the German lines in Northern Italy on September 26, 1944, to assist the guerrilla partisans operating against the invaders and that he disappeared under mysterious circumstances the following December 6.

His disappearance was reported by the party's second in command, Lt. Aldo Icardi, then 23 years old and a first-generation American from Pittsburgh where he had been a law student before entering the Army. Another member of the group was Sgt. Carl G. Lo Dolce, of Rochester, N. Y., who like Lieutenant Icardi was an Italian-American and spoke Italian fluently, while Major Holohan did not. The fourth member of the drop party was an Italian named Tullio Lussl, who had been serving with the Army's OSS forces and went under the resistance name of Captain Landi.

Lieutenant Icardi reported over the radio set the party had taken with them and later more fully by courier, that Major Holohan had vanished without trace when German-Fascist forces had raided their Lake Orta villa headquarters and the group had scattered with the understanding they would reassemble at an emergency hideout that already had been selected. Even at the time, Army officials were not fully satisfied with the explanation—though they made the 50 air-drops of arms requested by Lieutenant Icardi between December and April—and an investigation was conducted after the war which threw no additional light on the case.

MURDER IS CHARGED

The Criminal Investigation Division of the Army resumed the inquiry in July 1946, Defense Department's officials said, and recently reported they had completed the collection of evidence showing that Major Holohan was murdered by his two Army subordinates and two Italian partisans named Giuseppe Mannini and Gualtiero Tozzini, because they wanted to supply arms to Italian Communist guerrillas and he opposed this. The two Italians now are awaiting trial for the murder in their native courts and defense officials said Sergeant Lo Dolce "finally confessed" his part in the crime last summer and implicated the other three.

They explained that no attempt was made to obtain a confession from Lieutenant Icardi, since he was in Peru when the Army's CID men finally broke the case last summer only to discover there were no legal grounds on which either Sergeant Lo Dolce or Lieutenant Icardi could be held. This, they said, was because both men had returned to the United States after the war and had been separated from military service—a fact that rendered them immune from punishment by a military court.

Likewise, both the Department of Justice and Judge Advocate General of the Army held that the two men could not be prosecuted in the civilian criminal courts of the United States because these have no jurisdiction over crimes committed in foreign territory. Consequently, as one defense official said, both these men are free and will continue to be so, no matter how convincing the evidence, unless the Italian Government moves to prosecute them for murder on its soil.

This official pointed out, however, that the legal loophole which gives the immunity from punishment by a military court for a crime committed while they were in uniform has been plugged for keeps under the new uniform code of military justice which

went into effect last May 31. Unlike the wartime military laws, this carries a provision that makes former military personnel continuously liable after their return to civilian life for any offense committed while in military service and punishable by a penalty of 5 years in prison or worse.

(Lo Dolce's wife, when reached by phone yesterday at Rochester, said: "Mr. Lo Dolce has nothing to say. Please don't call us any more." Icardi was not available for comment.)

Department of Defense legal experts said there was no doubt in their minds that the evidence assembled in connection with Major Holohan's murder would have resulted in death sentences for his slayers if the present military code had been in effect during World War II.

The St. Lawrence Story—VII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the seventh of a series of articles entitled "The St. Lawrence Story," which appeared in the August 14 edition of the Minneapolis Star. This article points out that the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is inevitable as democracy moves slowly and surely toward its destiny.

THE ST. LAWRENCE STORY—SEAWAY PROJECT
IS INEVITABLE, SAY VETERAN SUPPORTERS

(By Leo Sonderegger)

(Seventh in a series)

Completion of the St. Lawrence seaway would develop the greatest remaining natural resource in America and give the mid-continental region a major new outlet to the world.

That is the fundamental argument of the men who have fought to get the project under way. They are inclined to regard all other considerations more or less as fringe on the rug.

These men are willing to debate the fragments of controversy one by one, if you insist. But they always come back to what they consider the basic reason for deepening the channel and harnessing the rapids.

Consciously or not, each of them is guided in some measure by the words of Daniel Webster.

"Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also, in our day and generation, may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

One of the most persistent and eloquent spokesmen for this group has been Julius H. Barnes, Duluth industrialist and shipping executive. He speaks with missionary zeal of the seaway's potential benefits to agriculture and industry, to the Midwest generally, and ultimately to the Nation.

His feeling about the reasons for building the seaway is often couched in language that harks back to Webster, as when he said recently:

"We're a new people. We still have a spirit of adventure."

We had better keep that spirit alive if we want to continue as a great Nation,

Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, of the Army Engineers believes. Pick is one of those who considers the seaway vital because of its potential role in supplying us with Labrador ore.

LEADERS BACK SEAWAY

He is one of a distinguished company of men in high places who have testified for the seaway. The national-security argument has elicited ringing support from Gen. George C. Marshall, Secretary of Defense; John D. Small, Chairman of the Munitions Board; Dean Acheson, Secretary of State; Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization, and others.

To the men who have fought for the seaway, the security argument is a Johnny-come-lately. They make use of it, but they think that more fundamental considerations justify the project without it.

"Look at the map," they say. "The seaway is as natural as the Panama Canal or the Suez Canal—why put our heads in the sand?"

That is a hallmark of the veteran seaway champions—an unyielding belief in its inevitability. The United States has become a great nation by developing its unparalleled natural resources, they point out, seeing no reason to suppose that this fundamental practice will be changed.

PROPOSERS HAVE PLENTY OF ANSWERS

A perennial argument against the project is that it would cost too much. The proponents insist that the only valid consideration is this: will the seaway be of great ultimate value to the United States? If the answer is yes, they contend, then cost becomes secondary.

The proponents also have answers for the charges that estimates are unrealistically low, and that the seaway will be a heavy drain on our supplies of manpower and strategic materials.

The opposition claims actual cost of projects undertaken by the Army engineers often has been several hundred percent of the original figures. The engineers counter with statistics showing that the increase in the cost of their entire civil works program since before 1900 was less than the rise in construction price levels.

Defense Mobilizer Wilson carried the ball with regard to manpower and materials. He said the average number of workers required on the project would be only one-hundredth of 1 percent of the civilian labor force.

Materials, he testified, would be used in amounts "so small as to be negligible in the total mobilization framework."

Proponents say the cost won't matter much, anyway, since tolls are expected to pay off the full investment, interest, and amortization in 40 or 50 years.

TEN MILLION DOLLAR REVENUE EXPECTED

Army engineers and the Canadian Government estimate that annual capacity of the seaway as soon as it is built will be 45,000,000 to 50,000,000 tons. On the lower figure, the Department of Commerce estimates a toll revenue of \$30,000,000 annually.

That is substantially more than the estimated \$20,000,000 a year necessary to liquidate the investment. Some Government experts figure that potential traffic actually ranges from 57,000,000 to 84,000,000 tons.

The railroads and other seaway opponents have poked a lot of fun at such estimates. But as Thomas W. Davis, Assistant Commerce Secretary, said in a rebuttal statement, "It is of some significance that in none of this criticism have alternative tonnages been estimated."

The Commerce Department people stand by all their estimates—for iron ore, petroleum, wheat, and other commodities.

As a clincher, they point out that their figures are based on traffic from only 7 States, instead of the 14 which are expected to do seaway business.

The proponents have a short answer for another facet of the cost argument; that the expense of deepening Great Lakes harbors has been ignored in the estimates.

The deepening of harbors will be done gradually as it becomes necessary, they say. They point out that the Nation's great harbors—New York, Boston, Baltimore, San Francisco—have all been improved as the need arose over a long period of years.

FULL LOADS CALLED EXCEPTION, NOT RULE

Another motif in the blues sung by the opposition might be called the nine point five theme. This involves frequent reiteration of the fact that only 9.5 percent of the United States ocean-going fleet could negotiate a 27-foot channel fully loaded.

Those who favor the project admit this; they admit that a 30-foot channel would be a lot better. They insist, however, that ship operations under a full load are the exception rather than the rule.

And they add that three-quarters of our merchant fleet could operate in 27 feet of water with loads 75 to 100 percent of capacity.

The proponents also admit that a larger proportion of foreign-flag vessels could use the 27-foot channel. In the next breath, they point out that the comparison is unfair because more than 60 percent of foreign ships are so small they seldom venture out of home waters.

The seaway people carry the fight to the enemy on the matter of rail capacity. They scorn an Association of American Railroads claim that its members will be able to carry all the iron ore that Labrador will produce.

No present rail lines from Montreal to the Midwest steel centers are equipped to handle bulk commodities in heavy quantity. Seaway proponents claim the lines would have to be greatly improved to haul from ten to thirty million tons of Labrador ore.

Besides, they say, the freight-car shortages would prevent the railroads from doing the job. The National Security Resources Board estimates that it would take 10,000 hopper cars to handle 20,000,000 tons of ore a year.

SHARE SEEN FOR RAILROADS

That many cars, it is pointed out, would require 230,000 tons of steel. That is about half again as much steel as the entire seaway project would use if built as planned.

Friends of the seaway do not agree that it would be a severe blow to railroad business. There would be dislocations at first, they acknowledge, and some loss of traffic. But in the long run, proponents claim, the railroads would share in the increased productivity the seaway would stimulate.

The "iceway" charge is thrown into discussions frequently as a minor irritant. Opponents assert that ice would lock the seaway for 5 months of the year.

The answer is pointed. The mining people have done all right at hauling most of this Nation's iron ore down from Duluth under almost identical conditions.

The controversy takes note of all these matters, but it always gets back to national defense. The security argument was summed up by General Marshall about like this:

Getting badly needed iron ore from Labrador will be harder—and much more dangerous—without the seaway.

Although the seaway would be vulnerable to sabotage, that is already true of the vital Soo locks where, "until the seaway is built, almost the whole of our iron-ore supply is subject to interruptions by a single act of sabotage."

The project will produce "cheap and independent power so necessary, especially in the case of all-out mobilization."

"The seaway will facilitate the transportation of munitions to overseas bases."

"The seaway will afford access to additional shipbuilding and repairing facilities." The seaway "will increase the capabilities of mutual defense between Canada and the United States."

The Permanent Joint Board on Defense maintained by this country and Canada has heavily underlined Marshall's final point. Last February 28 the Board recommended: "That the two Governments take immediate action to implement the 1941 St. Lawrence agreement as a vital measure for their common defense."

Northern Minnesota, the Birthplace of the Mississippi River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the mighty Mississippi has been a vital part of the history and development of this great land of ours. It has inspired awe and wonder since the earliest settlers came to the New World and the Indians, before that, had already called it the Father of Waters. Hundreds of thousands of people have seen the broad reaches of the great river, teeming with commerce and rolling hundreds of miles to the sea, but few know of its source as a tiny stream in northern Minnesota.

The interesting story of the birthplace of the Mississippi is told in an article in the May 1951 *Eagles* magazine published by the Fraternal Order of Eagles. The author is Agnes Harrigan Mueller. Because there is a lesson in the story of this great river with such a humble origin, I commend the article to the attention of the Members of this body:

BIRTHPLACE OF THE MISSISSIPPI

(By Agnes Harrigan Mueller)

At its source the mighty Mississippi is a modest trickle of water which can be cleared in one broad leap. Some tourists take the stepping stones. Others kick off their shoes and wade across.

The infant Mississippi is just one of many lures which drew more than 72,000 tourists to Itasca State Park in northern Minnesota last summer. Here, in one of the Nation's greatest parks, the wind sings through tall pines more than a century old. Near them grow a friendly assortment of aspen, balsam fir, birch, and ash. Some 3,000 deer roam this protected territory. Beavers build dams in the park's streams, and there are porcupines, raccoons, and black bear. Here nature has her own wonderful way, her works unspooled by the ravaging hand of man.

Although Hernando de Soto sailed the Mississippi in the sixteenth century, he remained ignorant of its source. In 1832 Henry Schoolcraft, a United States Indian agent, set out to find the river's birthplace. Yellow Hair, an Indian guide, led Schoolcraft's party to a lake which had been named La Biche by a French fur trader in 1804.

The lake had three curving arms. At the tip of the north arm, Schoolcraft's group found the slender stream which started the mighty Mississippi on its adventurous way, 2,562 miles to the Gulf of Mexico.

In search of a fitting name for the lake, Schoolcraft asked a clergyman in his party

for the Greek words meaning true and source. Unfamiliar with Greek, the minister suggested the Latin *veritas* for true and *caput* for head. Schoolcraft pruned the first syllable of *veritas* and the last one of *caput* and coined *Itasca*.

People come to Itasca Park by bus, plane, and car. The visitor may park his trailer by one of the lakes, rent a cabin or stay at Douglas Lodge, a State-owned log building where food and lodging are provided.

A good way to see the park and learn about its plants and animals is to climb into the station wagon owned by the Audubon Society and take its wildlife tour. Twice a day from June to September, an Audubon representative drives interested persons about identifying points of natural and historical interest.

Or you may join Donald K. Lewis from the staff of the natural history museum of the University of Minnesota, on a nature hike. He will point out differences among the various pines and identify the balsam poplar whose aromatic brownish-green leaves are longer and narrower than those of other poplars. As you start out along the path from Douglas Lodge, he will tell you that the products of Minnesota forests were valued at more than \$128,000,000 in 1947.

Part of your walk will lead you through a peat bog or muskeg swamp. Here the plant growth changes to ferns, tamarack, and evergreen shrubs known as Labrador tea, a plant from which the Indians brewed a bitter beverage.

If you go to Itasca Park after July 4, you will find ripe blueberries and raspberries. In a good season you can scoop the smooth blueberries from their vines by the handfuls.

Wild flowers add color beginning with the pink arbutus of early spring, the May flower, pink, white, and purple violets, columbine, tiger lilies, roses, the graceful meadow rue and—in August—the blue aster and yellow goldenrod. But the queen of them all is the Minnesota State flower, the moccasin. This proud member of the orchid family is fast becoming rare. The law now forbids picking the white and pink, yellow or purple lady slippers.

Lewis will point out a curious plant which is shaped like a pitcher and leads a vampire existence, living partly on insects it traps in its leaves.

As you swing back toward the lodge at the end of a 2-hour hike, you are likely to see a long line-up of cars when you prepare to cross the highway. Bucky, the panhandling deer, is working his beat. From an outstretched hand, he takes a cookie; from another, a juicy apple or a crunchy carrot. When his soft-eyed begging has netted him more than he can eat comfortably, Bucky heads back for the woods. But just before he enters the forest he pauses and faces many watchers. He waits until cameras click and then gracefully leaps away.

Fishing is a popular diversion in Itasca Park. You will find wall-eyes, bass, northern pike, and perch in its clear lakes. Recreational activities also include horseback riding, horseshoes, darts, archery, croquet, and volley ball. In the evenings there are campfire mixers, lectures, movies, dancing, and cards. Launch rides on Lake Itasca are offered, and there are three accredited bathing beaches. A museum is located a few miles from the Mississippi headwaters. A curio shop at Forest Inn offers Indian art work, souvenirs, and photographs.

And always, close at hand, there is the charm of natural wilderness unspooled by factory smoke or the lumberman's ax.

It is fitting indeed that this birthplace of the mighty Father of Waters has been maintained in its natural state—a sample of this continent as we found it.

AMVETS, VFW Favor H. R. 3193

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include herewith a letter from the American Veterans of World War II and a letter from the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

AMVETS,

Washington, D. C., August 15, 1951.

HON. MELVIN PRICE,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRICE: AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II) urge the Congress to pass H. R. 3193 over the President's veto. The bill would increase pensions to certain disabled veterans. All of these men are either helpless or blind or so nearly so that they require the aid of another person.

AMVETS are of the belief that the veterans covered by this bill are by far the most meritorious of the non-service-connected disability class. The suggestion that they should be provided for in other than veterans' legislation is unrealistic when such suggested legislation is not forthcoming. The suggestion that these veterans are dipping their hands in the public till is also unwarranted, since a definite income limitation is placed upon them—veterans covered by this bill cannot have more than \$1,000 annual income, if single, or \$2,500, if with dependents, in order to get the benefits of this proposal.

To deny this increase to these disabled veterans to meet the admitted increase in the cost of living, solely on the wild estimate that this proposal will cost the American taxpayer \$400,000,000 per year by the end of the century is, we submit, to deny public responsibility to these disabled veterans who served their country in time of war and are now so badly incapacitated that they require the aid of another person.

AMVETS urge you to vote for H. R. 3193 over the President's veto.

Very respectfully yours,

CHARLES H. SLAYMAN, JR.,

National Legislative Director.

A PLEA FOR SUPPORT OF THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS TO OVERRIDE THE VETO OF H. R. 3193

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, D. C. August 15, 1951.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: You are respectfully urged, in the name of common decency and justice, to support the recommendation of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs that the House of Representatives override the Presidential veto which was applied to H. R. 3193, a bill to authorize an extra pension allowance for those World War I and II veterans who are so helpless or blind as to need constant aid and attendance and who can otherwise meet the rigid eligibility requirements to receive a non-service-connected disability pension. It is understood this bill, with the report of the House Veterans Committee, will be brought up for action on Friday, August 17, 1951.

The President, in vetoing this bill, outlined three principal objections: First, the question of cost—present and future; second, that the disabilities for which the veteran would receive the extra pension allowance are not directly related to active service; and, third, that the bill would create a further

spread between the treatment of veterans and nonveterans by the Federal Government. In essence, the President indicates that he is opposed to the payment of non-service-connected pensions to veterans and that there should be no distinction between the treatment accorded veterans and nonveterans by the Federal Government. What are the facts?

1. Costs: According to the veto message the President has estimated that the first year's cost of this bill would be approximately \$16,700,000 and that a projection of the cost, on the basis of experience under similar pension legislation for Spanish-American War veterans, would approach \$400,000,000 a year by the end of the century. The Veterans of Foreign Wars vigorously takes issue with the accuracy of this cost estimate. In the first place it is impossible to accurately project the cost of this bill on the basis of Spanish-American War veterans' experience because the eligibility requirements for the Spanish-American War veterans are more liberal than the eligibility requirements for World War I and II veterans. A Spanish-American War veteran needs only to establish proof that he is so helpless or blind as to require aid and attendance, regardless of misconduct or income. The World War I and II veteran, in addition to establishing proof that he is so helpless or blind as to need aid and attendance, also must show that his disabilities are not the result of misconduct and that he does not have an income in excess of \$1,000 per year if no dependents or \$2,500 per year with dependents. It should be pointed out that the income limitation, along with the growth and extension of social security plus growing industrial pension systems, will serve to keep the number of World War I and II veterans eligible for this pension to the barest minimum.

The present average age of Spanish-American War veterans is 73 years plus. Only 8 percent of all Spanish-American War veterans now receiving age and disability service pensions are receiving the special allowance for the helpless or blind. Taking into consideration the income limitation affecting World War I and II veterans, is it not reasonable to believe that the percentage of said veterans eligible to receive this special allowance will be considerably less than the Spanish-American War veterans? Using the Spanish-American War experience and not taking into consideration the income limitation which applies in one case and does not apply in the other case, the Veterans of Foreign Wars has generously estimated that not more than 20,000 World War I and II veterans would be eligible to receive this special pension allowance the first year at a total cost of approximately \$13,680,000. This is substantially less than the President estimated, using somewhat the same formula. It is our considered judgment that the President's projected estimates of costs did not take into consideration the stern requirements and income limitations which will strongly affect World War I and II eligibility to this particular pension.

In speaking of the costs of this special pension allowance it could well be pointed out that 1 week's cost of the current Marshall-aid program (not including military assistance for Europe would pay this pension cost for a period of 4 years, and that the appropriation which the President is now asking from Congress for 1 year's military and rehabilitation aid for Europe would more than pay the total cost of this pension increase throughout the entire life span of all World War I and II veterans, assuming that the pension legislation remained in effect for that period of time.

2. Pensions for disabilities not related to service: Pensions for aged and helpless veterans has been a tradition and policy in the United States beginning with the early Plymouth colony. Special pension allowances for helpless or blind veterans was first authorized for Civil War veterans and later extended to Spanish-American War veterans. On July 30, 1947, President Truman approved Public Law 270, Eightieth Congress, which increased the special pension for helpless or blind Spanish-American War veterans from \$100 to \$120 monthly. H. R. 3193, which was vetoed, is not something new or a departure from the traditional policy of the United States. If these helpless or blind World War I and II veterans are not worthy and deserving of the \$120 monthly pensions because their disabilities are not directly related to their service, are they deserving and worthy of the present \$60 or \$72 monthly pension which they are now receiving under the same circumstances?

3. Discrimination between veterans and nonveterans: If there should be no discrimination between the treatment and care of veterans and nonveterans by the Federal Government, should there be discrimination between servicemen and civilians in time of war or national emergencies? Should the civilians or nonveterans be subjected to the same rates of pay, the same discipline, the same punishment, and the same loss of personal freedom and independent action as apply to servicemen who later become veterans? The whole theory of special assistance to aged and disabled veterans is based upon the measure of sacrifice, economic dislocation, and loss of personal freedom which applies to members of the Armed Forces on active duty in time of war or national emergencies. Please vote to override.

Respectfully yours,
OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Director, National Legislative Service, VFW.

Congress Is Not Economy-Minded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country are demanding economy in Government—make no mistake about that. The following editorial, in a recent issue of the Mitchell County Press, Osage, Iowa, is further evidence that the people of the great Midwest are not being fooled by the spendthrift policies of this administration on one hand and a pretence of economy on the other:

One of the chief reasons that so much of the taxpayer's dollar in this country goes to Washington for the support of Government spending is the fact that there is little tendency toward economy in Congress. In fact, the evidence all points to a rather complete apathy regarding economy in Government.

Last week in a roll-call vote in the House, a question of economy was upheld by only 2 votes—188 to 186. It must be said to the everlasting credit of our Iowa Congressmen that they voted unanimously in favor of the economy program. No other State's Representatives were unanimous in their desire to cut Government spending.

In view of a threat of increased Federal appropriations, there is increasing need for

economy on all fronts. Only by adopting a pay-as-we-go policy can we hope to hold down the amount of new taxes. Courageous expenditure control alone can lighten the tax blow.

The 188 Congressmen, including all 8 of the Iowa House Members, who voted for economy last week are to be commended. The vote came on a motion to send the \$6,800,000,000 independent offices appropriations bill back to the joint conference committee.

One provision in the bill that the economy bloc insists on retaining says in effect that only one out of every four vacancies on the Federal payroll may be filled. It has been well established that such a move will not impair the efficiency of any Government agency. The Federal payroll in May stood at 2,443,076 persons, and was increasing at the rate of 34,000 persons per month.

Resolutions on Flood Control in Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under consent granted me by the House, I am including as a part of my statement a resolution recently adopted by the city commission of Marion, Kans.; also resolutions approved by the city council and by the chamber of commerce of Florence, Kans. These resolutions are in support of appropriation of funds for flood-control projects. They speak for themselves.

Marion and Florence are in Marion County, Kans., and are in what is known as the Cottonwood River Valley. They are both fine progressive towns in a great agricultural area in the Middle West.

The people of these cities and surrounding communities are victims of the unprecedented and terrible flood disaster that recently overtook a great share of the State of Kansas. Suffering of the people and loss of property by reason of these floods is incalculable.

The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF MARION, KANS.

Whereas the governing body of the city of Marion, Kans., has on the 6th day of August 1951 met in regular session; and

Whereas George Miser, one of the duly elected and qualified commissioners, offers the following resolution, to wit:

"Whereas the city of Marion, Kans., and the Cottonwood Valley have suffered enumerable floods over a period of years and recently suffered a disastrous flood; and

"Whereas the United States Corps of Engineers have heretofore conceived a plan for flood control for the afore-mentioned area, encompassed within what is known as the Pick-Sloan flood-control plan, which plan envisions, among others, a dam or dams to be built in Marion County, Kans., at points north of the city of Marion, Kans., for the control of floodwaters: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the governing body of the city of Marion, Kans., That the afore-mentioned plan of the United States Corps of Engineers be immediately authorized by the Congress of the United States, and that the Congress make available to said Corps of Engineers sufficient money for both detailed

engineering plans and construction of said dam or dams envisioned by said afore-mentioned plans, and more specifically that funds be made available by the Congress for the immediate drawing of detailed plans and for money for construction of the afore-mentioned Marion County dam or dams; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be made available to the Members of Congress and the associations and committees organized for the purpose of the flood control of the above area."

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF FLORENCE, KANS.

Whereas the governing body of the city of Florence, Kans., have on the 6th day of August 1951 met in regular session; and

Whereas B. E. Minturn, one of the duly elected and qualified councilmen, offers the following resolution, to wit

"Whereas the city of Florence and the Cottonwood Valley have suffered enumerable floods over a period of years and recently suffered a disastrous flood, and

"Whereas flood relief for the city of Florence and the Cottonwood Valley is desirable and necessary for the well-being of the inhabitants of the area, and

"Whereas the United States Corps of Engineers have heretofore conceived a plan for flood control for afore-mentioned area, encompassed within what is known as the Pick-Sloan flood-control plan, which plan envisions among others a dam or dams to be built in Marion County at points north of the city of Marion, Kans., for the control of floodwaters. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the governing body of the city of Florence, Kans., That the afore-mentioned plan of the United States Corps of Engineers be immediately authorized by the Congress of the United States and that the Congress make available to said Corps of Engineers sufficient money for both detailed engineering plans and construction of said dam or dams envisioned by said afore-mentioned plans and more specifically that funds be made available by the Congress for the immediate drawing of detailed plans and for money for construction of the afore-mentioned Marion County dam or dams; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be made available to the Members of Congress and the associations and committees organized for the purpose of the flood control of the above area."

RESOLUTION OF THE FLORENCE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Whereas the city of Florence and the Cottonwood Valley have suffered three specific floods, June 7, June 30, and July 11, 1951, the last of which was very disastrous;

Whereas flood relief for the city of Florence and the Cottonwood Valley is desirable and necessary for the well-being of the inhabitants of the area;

Whereas the United States Corps of Engineers have heretofore conceived a plan for flood control for afore-mentioned area, encompassed within what is known as the Pick-Sloan flood-control plan, which plan envisions among others a dam or dams to be built in Marion County at points north of the city of Marion, Kans., for the control of floodwaters. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Florence Chamber of Commerce, That the funds be appropriated for the completion of the dam or dams in the afore-mentioned plan of the United States Corps of Engineers; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be made available to the Members of Congress and the associations and committees organized for the purpose of the flood control of the above area."

The Teen-Age Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address entitled "The Teen-Age Outlook," by Charles L. Stevens, headmaster of Wilbraham Academy, Wilbraham, Mass.:

The story goes that a lad of 8 years had been given a beautiful globe in the hope that it would increase his interest in geography. The little fellow became so interested in it the first evening that when the time came for retiring he took it to his room and placed it on the table by the side of his bed. Some time later, in the belief that the youngster was asleep, his father tiptoed in, picked up the globe, and was carrying it out of the room. As he did so the lad sat up and said, "Hey, Dad, what are you doing with my world?"

This is a question every youth in America has a right to ask of the leaders of this generation, "Hey, what are you doing with my world?" Young people growing up today cannot help but recognize the fumbling and uncertainty displayed by their elders in the management of the world's affairs. Teen-age youth have never known anything but war and crisis during all their lives. To live and associate with them is to be acutely aware of their concern about the future. There is a changing, challenging world, so unlike the one faced by us of a generation ago. There are few certainties around which they can build a workable philosophy in this topsy-turvy world.

I don't have to point to the symptoms. In every daily paper we read of some new instance in which some young person, or some group of young people, has broken down under the pressure of living in a disordered, insecure world. We may thank the good Lord that most of our young people are standing up magnificently under unprecedented moral stress. But they need our help and support if they are to build upright lives in a wobbly world.

The America and the world in which we live today is not the same as the America and the world we lived in even a short 10 years ago. The bursts over Hiroshima and Nagasaki did much to effect that change. Faster and faster transportation, television, new weapons for good and for evil, political cross currents growing out of a succession of hot wars and cold wars—all these have added their bit to radical shifts in living habits.

Because we people of the world are used to classifying the various eras through which mankind has lived, we frequently refer to this present cycle as the atomic age. And this term personifies as nothing else does the movement and fluidity—the dread and the promise—of the age in which we play our role.

But just calling this period the atomic age is apt to cause us to lose sight of what lies behind the science that is making possible our mechanical advances. We are likely to forget that behind every new knowledge stand individuals—men and women. Without them, there would be no progress, no change. Thus, like all other eras of man, ours is basically the human age.

Its mechanical attributes are merely a projection of human effort. And while these mechanical advances bring vast physical changes, they bring also social, economic, and political changes that affect the lives

of each individual. As a result, there have developed changes in the condition of society, changes in the way we think, changes in the relation of a person to his neighbor, and, all too frequently, I fear, changes in standards of morality and ethics, in business and government as well as in basketball.

These are human changes. It is for such changes in human relations that we have to prepare our young people. Our boys and girls must be made to recognize the truth of the Jeffersonian dictum that "morality, compassion, and generosity are innate elements of the human constitution." They must be made aware that each individual must embody the degree of wisdom and integrity he or she expects from the society in which he moves and has his being.

What we need are new social inventions that will aid men and women to live together without injustice and without violence, without cruelty and bigotry, without depressions and wars. We have such inventions and devices which enable men to live peacefully and happily within the orbit of a community. Zoning ordinances and stop-and-go signals are inventions of this type. On a complex scale, so are the Bill of Rights, our judicial system, and the United Nations.

Such inventions do not just happen. Like scientific inventions, they spring out of generations of experience and are developed by painful and continuous trial and error. Basically, they grow out of the efforts of the individual.

That is what makes our responsibility as parents and teachers such an overwhelmingly great one. The training and ideals that will build the society of tomorrow rest upon our efforts today. We must accurately evaluate the needs of the future and be certain that we are preparing our charges to fulfill those needs.

Let's take a look at that future. Let's see what kind of a world the teen-ager of today will have to cope with. Some time ago, Kenneth Gould summed it up somewhat like this. He said that it will be a world of constant danger and vast social upheavals and that to face it its citizens would have to have courage and stamina, physical and mental vitality. Also, it will be a world of rapid change, in which its citizens would need good general work habits and the resourcefulness and adaptability to be prepared for unexpected. It will be a world of constantly shrinking communications and ever greater interdependence—a smaller world, growing always more so. Therefore, its citizens must have an increasing awareness of other peoples and their contributions. They must learn to live in harmony, not only with their own kind, but with all. It will be a world where there is more to do—where there will be more leisure in which to do it—and where people will live to increasingly old age. In such a world, inhabitants must develop inner resource of living—must be able to enjoy the many surrounding interests, or give way to crippling boredom. It will be a world in which the conflicts brought on by prejudices will grow more stringent by virtue of world contraction. Yet, if we are to survive, these conflicts must be resolved. This demands the ability to build friendly and cooperative human relations with a variety of peoples. Finally, it will be a world in which democratic living in the family, the community, the Nation, and the entire globe will either come to full fruition or will succumb to some form of totalitarianism.

As parents and teachers, ours is an unprecedented responsibility. The world of the future depends upon how well we do our job of training, on the kind of a life philosophy that we provide for our young people. Knowing generally the type of world in which our children will have to live and work, it is our duty to prepare them for participation in such a world.

To do this effectively, it may be necessary to modify the methods and traditions of the past. Our problem is unique in history. We have to build in our children inner foundations of strength and resiliency—qualities that do not spring from mere book learning. There is no static set of rules. We are compelled to deal with each child as an individual—and to give to each the strength that his particular personality requires in order to cope with the situations he will meet.

Successful education is no longer gaged by how many pounds of history, or English, or mathematics we teach. Our success will be judged, not by how much our young people know, but by how happy the use of that knowledge makes them in the society in which they must live.

In the over-all, what we are trying to do is develop the whole personality of each young person so that while the world continues to shift, he, secure in his inward strength, fortified by a sound philosophy, will go his way, an intelligent, contributing, happy personality. He should have acquired attitudes and ideals that will give him vision and perspective. He should have formed desirable health and character habits so that he may wholesomely contribute to the life of family and community. He should have developed an appreciation of what is finest and best in the past so as better to be able to build for the future. And he should have an open, inquiring, and evaluating mind that will insure him pleasurable intercourse with others and worthy use of his own leisure. Such was the educational ideal of the founders of Wilbraham Academy when they set as their purpose, quote, "to furnish the whole man."

Such an individual need fear no world changes. Such an individual will contribute to those changes and will live within them, drawing security and happiness from a well-spring of inner strength that will never dry.

I am optimistic about the prospects. I believe we have in our younger generation a new hope for the solution of the problems that our own generation has been bungling. No one who has seen the earnestness with which modern young people are studying the problems of the day can doubt that they will ultimately find workable solutions. There are still frontiers for our society. "Voyages of discovery," writes David Lillenthal, "did not cease with Columbus and Magellan, for within the atom are new continents as vast, as full of adventure and of opportunity as any new land ever sighted by the mariners of old. And the modern voyagers are young people, for these are explorations that call for the vaulting imagination, the daring, and the energy of youth." I know from personal contact and observation that our young people are willing to accept responsibility, that they have the inherent physical, mental, social, and spiritual strength which will make for a stronger America and a stronger world.

They understand—more than most of us realize—that the growth of this country has been made possible through that great reservoir of hidden assets within the heart and mind dedicated to worthy ends and made to bear fruit. They know that our society as a whole can be no better than the quality of its individual parts. Our young people, in their own way, possess the same vision, determination, willingness to work, and devotion to high ideals which our forefathers possessed—the same qualities which are the foundation stones on which America was built. They will use those qualities to build for tomorrow. How pertinent is the statement of Robinson Jeffers: "Lend me the stone strength of the past, and I will lend you the wings of the future."

As we look ahead to a better tomorrow, let us not fail to discover and develop the assets to be found in the mental and emo-

tional capacities of our young people today, and guide them into the proper channels for maximum personal development and social usefulness. Above all, in helping our young people develop a strong philosophy of life, let us inculcate in them the idea that there is no substitute for sincere, earnest devotion to the work at hand, that persistence and determination are still the touchstones to success, and that morality and reverence are stepping stones to achievement.

If ever in human history opportunity called to any people to bear the torch of civilization, it calls today to the youth of America. We must stop tampering so heavily-handedly with their world, and help them to grow in understanding, in humility, in courage, in devotion to the public good.

"As long as there are homes where fathers come at close of day,

As long as there are homes where mothers plan and children play,

As long as boys and girls are taught to love the truth, the right—

So long our cities will survive the years, outlast the night.

As long as there are homes where beauty dwells and books are read,

As long as there are homes where kindness reigns and prayers are said,

Although wars fling hatred on the world and nations grope,

With homes like these, and children waiting there, we still can hope.

Our Republic, Bulwark Against the Tyranny of Majorities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert as part of my remarks, an article by United States Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, formerly a Member of this House, which appeared in a recent issue of *Spotlight*. Mrs. SMITH clearly points out that we are not living under a democracy but a republic:

OUR REPUBLIC, BULWARK AGAINST THE TYRANNY OF MAJORITIES

(By United States Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH)

We talk a great deal about our American Government being a democracy. It is said that we fought two world wars within a generation to "make the world safe for democracy."

Yet, do we know what we are talking about?

You may be surprised to know that our Government is not a true democracy. It is a republic. If you doubt this, take a look at the Constitution. Try to find the word "democracy" or "democratic." Then take a look at article IV, section 4, which says, "The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government. . . ."

If you read the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, these amendments being more popularly recognized as the Bill of Rights, you will see that they directly flout the theory of democracy.

Now what is the difference between a democracy and a republic—what are we instead of what some of us think we are? A democracy is a truly representative government in which the supreme power is retained by the

people and exercised by them. So is a republic. But a republic, such as ours, is a restricted and limited democracy.

The basic distinction between democracy and republic is in the degree of majority rule. Majority rule is unrestricted in a democracy while it is restricted in a republic. The Bill of Rights part of our Constitution places definite limitations on the power of the representatives of the people. They are denied the power to abridge our freedom of speech, right of assembly, press, trial by jury, against unreasonable searches and seizures, and other individual rights, regardless of how much the majority might be opposed to such individual rights. Under a pure or true democracy, there is no protection of such individual rights against the rule of the majority.

Democracy actually means unrestricted majority rule that our Constitution so carefully prohibits. We are inclined to think of democracy in the social sense rather than the political sense. We think of it as signifying equality among human beings. This ideal we do find expressed in the Declaration of Independence with the statement that "all men are created equal." But the ideal is even more basic than the Declaration of Independence. It is in reality the Christian concept of the Golden Rule.

So that there is good reason to distinguish between social democracy and political democracy. By the sheer unrestricted rule of the majority of a political democracy, social democracy could be killed without any protection whatsoever to the minorities.

A republic is a truly representative government. It provides representation for the minority as well as the majority. It places individual freedom and rights above majority rule. If we were really a political democracy, instead of the republic we are, the will of the majority would habitually ride roughshod over the will of the minority. A republic creates and develops tolerance that acts as a bulwark against tyranny by the majority.

The United States Senate, in which I have the honor to serve, is striking proof that our Government is not a democracy but a republic. New York with a population of several million people has no more representation in the Senate than my State of Maine which has a population of less than a million people. Both States have two Senators each. This is a check against unlimited majority rule for the protection of the "minority population" States.

In short, a republic rather than a democracy is the American way simply because this country was settled and founded upon the love for liberty and individual freedom. Our Republic protects our very right to our beliefs even though we be in the minority. It protects differences of opinion.

The RFC Helps the Doughboy of American Business as Vigorously as General Bradley Supports the Foot Soldier, His Rifle, and Bayonet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in peace and war, wise-money boys work both sides of the street.

After World War II, they told us that air power was the decisive fighting force

of war. It had replaced the foot soldier, his rifle, and bayonet. Korea knocked that idea on the head.

Today they tell us that banks and the Federal Reserve Board are sufficient to nurse the needs of business. The RFC knocks this idea on the head.

In war the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps build up fire power to defeat the enemy.

Fire power is the key.

In business, credit is fire power.

The RFC, banks, and the Federal Reserve Board provide credit, or fire power, to promote an expanding economy for the United States.

Facts show that the RFC helps the doughboy of American business as vigorously as General Bradley supports the foot soldier, his rifle, and bayonet.

There is need and room for all, in peace and war.

The Recognition of Russia by the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "Moscow's Red Letter Day in American History," by William La Varre, which appeared in the American Legion magazine for August 1951. This article traces the course of our relations with Communist Russia since we extended recognition on November 16, 1933, and shows the disastrous consequences of that action.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the article will make 3¼ pages of the RECORD, at a cost of \$266.50.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOSCOW'S RED LETTER DAY IN AMERICAN HISTORY—SOUTH OF THE RIO GRANDE, OUR PAN-AMERICAN NEIGHBORS REMEMBER THAT IT WAS ON NOVEMBER 16, 1933, THAT THE COLOSSUS OF THE NORTH BECAME "EL LOCO RICO DEL NORTE," AND LOST MORAL LEADERSHIP OF THE WEST

(By William La Varre)

The very special agent from Moscow, commissar of all the Red Square's nefarious international machinations, chief of the Kremlin's schemes for communizing the American hemisphere, sat victoriously at the White House desk at midnight, smiling at the President of the United States.

For 15 deceitful years the corrupt Kremlin had tried to obtain a Communist base, protected by diplomatic immunities, within the United States. Four Presidents—Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover—had refused to countenance Moscow's pagan ideology or its carriers. But here, at last, was a President the Communists could deal with.

Many patriotic, well-informed Americans, in the old Department of State, in the American Legion, and in the American Federation of Labor, had begged Franklin Roosevelt not to use his new leadership of the United States for the aggrandizement of an evil, dangerous,

and pagan guest—but to send him back to Moscow, red with the blood of the commissar's own countrymen, without a handshake.

But Franklin Roosevelt, plucked by the power of his new office, stimulated by his clique of Marxian and Fabian Socialists posing as intellectuals and liberals—and by radicals in labor unions, universities and his own sycophant bureaucracy—had signed his name to the Kremlin's franchise. Without the approval of Congress, he made an actual treaty with the Soviets, giving them the right to establish a communist embassy and consulates in the United States, with full diplomatic hospitalities and immunities to Stalin's agents, the bloody Bolsheviks of Asiatic Europe.

November 16, 1933, at midnight. That is a date in American history our children will long have tragic cause to remember. That was the day Soviet Foreign Commissar Maxim Litvinov, plunderer of Estonia and the Kremlin's first agent for socializing England, sat down with Franklin Roosevelt, after Dean Acheson and Henry Morgenthau had done the spadework of propaganda, and made the deal that has led the American people, and our once vast resources, into a social and economic calamity to the very brink, now, of national and international disaster.

"In the spirit of Thomas Jefferson," the President reported artfully to his countrymen, "Mr. Litvinov and I have believed that through a resumption of normal relations the prospects of peace over all the world are greatly strengthened." To give his words weight he quoted to his fellow Americans an old letter written by Thomas Jefferson to a Russian friend of 1809, setting forth the thesis—then true but in 1933 a provable falsehood—that Russia and the United States were "in character and practice essentially pacific, with a common interest in the rights of peaceful nations."

Thus began our era of lost integrity, lost statesmanship. There was no truth in the statement that the Washington-Moscow deal had been made "in the spirit of Thomas Jefferson." In the White House, 10 days before the signing of the Roosevelt-Litvinov pact, there was abundant evidence to the contrary, in the form of a comprehensive report on Soviet-promoted Communist activities throughout the whole hemisphere, and documentary evidence that the prospects for peace "over all the world" would be greatly damaged, rather than strengthened, by giving the Kremlin an American base in Washington.

It was known in 1933 that Stalin and his Soviet regime was beginning to topple, and only its diplomatic recognition by the President of the United States—and a subsequent vast economic subsidization—would make it possible to continue to control the Russian people and expand the Soviet's treacherous socialistic activities throughout Europe, Asia—and America.

In the White House, some of us knew—at the very moment of Roosevelt's deal with communism—was a highly detailed report and analysis of the Kremlin's real objective: the sabotaging of the Western Hemisphere's social, political, and economic life and the creation of a Pan-American Union of Socialist states.

M Litvinov, of deceitful smiles, was not the first commissar of the Kremlin to come with a Soviet bag of trickery to America. As far back as 15 years in the American hemisphere history he professed to know so well—and in this instance did know in detail—the President had a dossier of Soviet duplicity, not only in Europe but in America. But in spite of pleas, begging him to give the facts to his countrymen, he hid the truth behind a highly organized Washington plethora of pro-Communist propaganda, banquets, and festivities for the Soviet's agent in the United States.

Here—read it now and weep—is the missing chapter of facts hidden from the public in 1933.

In 1917, when the Bolsheviks seized power and more than a billion dollars' worth of American property and assets in Russia was stolen by the Kremlin, all the American republics, at the request of President Wilson, closed the old Russian Embassies and consulates and refused to recognize the regime of Lenin and Trotsky.

The Argentine, however, had a vast amount of war-boomed surplus wheat, corn, meat, and hides; the armistice had left them facing a national crisis. The first Bolshevik agent to be sent from Moscow to tour America as a "commercial agent" was a Communist-trained Japanese named Sen Katsama. He shrewdly saw Argentina's predicament.

Moscow had a storehouse of gold from the plundered Russian industries, estates, homes, and churches, and needed large amounts of food imports until its Communist agricultural program could regiment Russian farms into a slave-trade monopoly of the Soviet state. Sen Katsama saw, and reported to Moscow, that Argentina, with its urgent need for trade and with its largely European immigrant racial stock, was the most likely nation in which to establish a Western Hemisphere Communist base. Woodrow Wilson, in Washington, was a man with whom the Kremlin could make no deal.

Explaining its predicament to the United States and other Pan-American governments, Argentina welcomed the opportunity to load its food surpluses for spot gold into Soviet-bound ships. They also permitted Moscow to send a "purchasing agency" to Buenos Aires.

The Communist who followed Sen Katsama from Moscow to America, with Soviet gold, was named Boris Kraevsky. He arrived in Buenos Aires with a large entourage of "purchasing" assistants for his Iuyuzh Amtorg office. He placed big, profitable orders for Argentine resources, paid for them in gold, and worked constantly to persuade the Argentine Government to recognize the Soviets, officially, and open Argentina's quarantine to a Soviet ambassador.

To the few North Americans who studied him in Argentina, Boris Kraevsky was a very smooth operator, immaculate in the garb of Bond Street, rather than that of Moscow, and speaking a scholar's Spanish and Portuguese. The sole financial agent of the rich-by-plunder Moscow regime, he was able to weigh his suave arguments for diplomatic recognition and immunities with promises to increase, or sly threats to decrease, his purchases. But it was known to the Argentine police that his orders, early in 1919, were to force, in one final and "victorious conference," the Argentine recognition of the U S S R., "in order that we may proceed to operate, send men and paraphernalia back and forth, under diplomatic immunities."

The Argentine police also discovered the fact that Kraevsky's real title in the Kremlin was not merely that of managing director of Iuyuzh Amtorg, Argentina, but "Soviet Commissar for South America." A secret plan for creating revolutions in South America was obtained by a wealthy and influential Argentinean in Paris. Dated in Petrograd, March 5, 1919, and signed by Zinovieff, Lenin's international schemer, this document showed that the Kremlin's real purpose, behind Kraevsky's polite negotiations and promises of friendship, was to organize all the scattered revolutionary groups in South America—and each country had its own native revolutionists—into a Moscow-controlled union of Communist but native political parties; that these American revolutionists were then to be joined to the Socialists, radicals, and anarchists of England, France, Italy, Germany, Spain, and other Communist-infiltrated areas of the world,

to form a world-wide Communist International which would destroy other forms of government and other economic systems.

Moscow's projected steps in changing Argentina and other American Republics into Communist states were detailed in a document of more than 100 pages, but these are the high lights:

"We confiscate and nationalize all factories, industries, private transportation and communication systems, banks, land estates, both private and those belonging to the church; all buildings, machinery, property, agriculture, dairy, livestock, and turn them over to the state. We abolish all inheritances. All industries will be under the management of organized workers, and taken from the capitalists. We establish, by revolution, a dictatorship of workers into a world union of Soviet socialist republics, with a capital in Moscow.

The Argentine Government notified Kraevsky that diplomatic recognition of the Soviet regime would never be granted and that he and his "Iuyuzh" Amtorg organization in Buenos Aires would be deported if found engaging in any noncommercial activities. Kraevsky began traveling frequently to Brazil and Chile, but the Argentineans beat him to those goals by hastily negotiating a treaty under which each of the three nations pledged itself not to recognize the Soviet regime, or allow a Soviet Ambassador to enter the country, unless all three neighboring nations did so jointly.

The record of Commissar Kraevsky's attempts to get a diplomatically protected base for the Kremlin's program in Latin America was available in minute chronological detail to President Roosevelt in 1933. The Argentineans not only continued to quarantine the Communists, diplomatically, but devoted so much time and documentation to a campaign against recognizing the Soviet regime anywhere in the Americas that they won the lasting hatred of all Communists and pro-Communists throughout the Moscow-dominated world. Kraevsky's purchasing and political strategies, throughout Latin America, brought him no diplomatic success until 1924 when, in Mexico City, he negotiated an agreement with Gen. Alvaro Obregon, the Mexican President, which was to sell Mexicans into a Communist and turbulent era very costly to Mexico and the hemisphere.

Mexico in 1924, like Argentina in 1918, was in an economic depression, caused mainly by dishonest Mexicans in high government positions. General Obregon needed money to keep his personal military clique loyal to him and in national power. Calvin Coolidge found good reasons not to subsidize him out of the United States Treasury. Following the transfer of a large amount of gold and gold certificates to Obregon by Kraevsky, and an official loan of \$25,000,000 worth of gold to the Mexican Government, Obregon announced that he was exchanging Ambassadors with Moscow and welcoming the U. S. S. R. "into the Brotherhood of Friendly International Nations."

With a great fanfare of hands-across-the-sea goodwill to a "Brother Republic," Soviet Ambassador Petrovsky arrived in Mexico City with 30 "diplomatic" attachés—and with the gold that was the price of hospitality—and opened a lavish Soviet Embassy, Boris Kraevsky, well praised by the Kremlin returned to Buenos Aires and his "Iuyuzh" Amtorg headquarters.

The Soviet coup in Mexico, Commissar Zinovieff wrote Kraevsky, made Mexico "the brightest vista for the future, the greatest possibilities for international expansion, and source of possible difficulties for the United States. Mexico is the natural connecting link between the Communist movement in North and South America. Latin America must now become the China of the Far West, and Mexico the Canton of Latin America."

Kraevsky, making no headway with the Argentineans for a South American embassy, began capitalizing on the increasing trade jealousies of the Argentines with their neighbors, the Uruguayans, across the Rio de la Plata. Much to the dismay of the Argentineans, the President of Uruguay, on August 23, 1926, announced that Montevideo was extending full diplomatic recognition to Moscow and that a Soviet ambassador was on his way to Uruguay.

To Uruguay—quickly to become the Kremlin's favorite South American nation, and as blatantly praised by Communists and fellow travelers as Argentina was smeared—Moscow sent Soviet Ambassador Alexander Minkin and a group of 47 "diplomatic attachés." Their baggage and freight passed into Uruguay uninspected, but the Argentine police had channels for discovering that it contained a comprehensive file of Communist literature, booklets, school primers, revolutionary engravings, a high-speed printing press, a portable engraving plant, and 20 radio outfits—also portable—powered by gasoline-motored generators.

With Montevideo as its southern and Mexico City as its northern base, the Kremlin now increased its revolutionary campaign throughout all the Latin-American Republics, ready to pick off whichever nation or nations it found weakest—in spite of the Soviet's pledge to both the Mexicans and the Uruguayans not to engage in any activities affecting the internal affairs or inter-American relations of their hosts. Montevideo became the Moscow of South America, visited by a stream of Soviet revolutionists; and from that picturesque city went out a network of secret workers, financed by Soviet gold, and propaganda in many forms, to Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador, Colombia, and Venezuela.

Shrewdly foreseeing that foreigners would not be allowed permanently to operate subversive and propaganda programs in Latin America, the Soviet Ambassador in Montevideo combined with the Soviet Ambassador in Mexico City in organizing "student tours" to Russia; they selected and subsidized native Latin Americans—from all the major Latin-American universities and labor organizations—for education in Moscow. Between 1926 and 1930 many thousands of young natives were transported to the U. S. S. R., trained as Communist organizers and agents, and sent back to their native communities to become secret "citizen workers of the Communist International." These native Communists could not be deported, though at certain times they hastily went into exile in other Latin-American Republics, and especially in the United States.

The Mexican-Soviet Brotherhood of Friendly International Nations lasted only 6 years. President Calles, after the death of Obregon, ordered the Soviet Ambassador, on January 23, 1930, to get out of Mexico—within 48 hours. Mexican police rounded up trainloads of foreign Communists and deported them. Soviet files were seized and we had a complete record of the Third International's blueprints for the conquest not only of Mexico but the entire hemisphere. Mexican railroad riots, university revolts, and strikes in the mines, utilities, and industries were proved to have been financed out of the Soviet Embassy.

With only one diplomatic base in America, the Kremlin, in March 1930, began stepping up its campaigns in South America. Riots and armed revolts broke out simultaneously in Peru and Chile. There was a wave of rioting in the universities of Argentina, Brazil, Ecuador, Colombia and Venezuela. The Western Hemisphere's oldest university, San Marcos of Peru, older than Harvard, was closed by the government; it had become a major base of socialistic and revolutionary plots and propaganda, financed by the Soviet Embassy in

Montevideo. By January 1941, the Argentine police were defending Buenos Aires against hordes of suddenly armed workers and small farmers and the capital was only saved by a hastily formed Legion for Emergency of Buenos Aires citizens. They raided Kraevsky's commercial headquarters and seized his records. Kraevsky fled across the river to Montevideo. Argentina's President Uriburu canceled Iuyuzh Amtorg's Argentine charter, distributed copies of Kraevsky's files to all the other American Republics.

Revolution almost captured Chile and Peru; martial law had to be established in many Latin-American cities. Violent and costly riots damaged native as well as United States-owned mines, utilities, and industries. Hundreds of Soviet documents were intercepted or seized by anti-Communist intelligence agents. One, dated Moscow, February 5, 1932, signed by R. Tomasoff, Moscow Secretary of the Communist International, is here sufficient:

"The examination of reports from our commissars in Latin America during the last 3 months of 1931 leads us to decide to begin a period of concentrated revolutionary action. The lower classes of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Peru, and Uruguay are ready to fight and bring down the established governments."

In Montevideo President Terra went before the Uruguayan congress, obtained special powers, seized guns and ammunition imported and stored by the Soviet Embassy preparatory to smuggling into Argentina. He imprisoned many Communist agents. Claiming that Uruguay by its continued hospitality to the Soviet Ambassador and Iuyuzh Amtorg had created international liabilities, Argentina recalled its Ambassador from Montevideo and closed its ports to Uruguayans and their commerce. The Brazilian Government, tracing a plot for the overthrow of the federal government to revolutionists exiled in Uruguay and organized by the Soviet Embassy and Kraevsky's agents, sent an ultimatum to Montevideo and set aside an off-shore island as a prison barracks for its native Communists.

By the end of 1932 Mexico, though without a Soviet embassy, had put many of the Third International's programs into its national laws—including the Veracruz expropriation decree which seized United States and British-owned property in Mexico. The National Revolutionary Party was declared a legal Mexican political party, and its native Communist leaders promised Moscow a sweeping control over Mexico in the subsequent elections. The Kremlin's success, after only 6 years as a diplomatic guest of the Republic of Mexico, in infiltrating Communists into labor and government offices and in building up a powerful clique in the Mexican legislature, gave Moscow a new idea—the use of ballots rather than bullets. The Kremlin suddenly changed its American program and ordered its agents to hold revolts in abeyance throughout the hemisphere until it could be determined whether Mexico and the other American republics might not be seized by ballots. May Day 1933, for the first time in five costly years, was riot free throughout the American hemisphere. Stalin's agents in America, beginning May 19 of that year, were directed to work behind and from within, specific native political parties, all of them financed from Montevideo, for the nomination and election of pro-Communists for all future electoral offices and important government positions.

In Mexico, for example, the Kremlin's choice of a candidate for the Mexican Presidency was Lazaro Cardenas, "The Indian," and three now powerful native Communists pledged the Kremlin to organize his election—through the new legal National Revolutionary Party.

It was at this critical moment of American history that a South American ambassador to Washington was tipped off to the fact that

President Roosevelt, in office barely 7 months, had sent a personal letter to the Kremlin inviting Stalin to send an emissary to Washington for confidential talks "to end abnormal relations between 125,000,000 people of the United States and the 160,000,000 people of Russia." The South American ambassador gave his information to other Latin American embassies in Washington and soon many of the governments south of the Rio Grande were dispatching reports to Washington, documenting the Soviet danger to America, its record of consistent double-dealing and intrigue.

"A very great misfortune for both the governments and the people of Pan America," one wise Latin American statesman wrote, to a personal as well as official friend in the old State Department, "will be the certain and irrevocable result of a diplomatic recognition by the great United States of North America, the rightful moral and as well as economic leader of Pan America, of the Soviet regime, its criminal masters and agents."

More than 100 Latin-American patriots rushed long letters and evidence to the State Department and the White House, urging the people of the United States to stand firm with them in an adamant bloc against the Kremlin, its ambassadors, and agents. But these documents of October 1933 were hastily stamped "Top Secret" and kept from the citizens of the United States, and from the United States Congress.

Space, in this review of a tragic error in American leadership, is too limited for quoting details of the Washington record of November 1933 but researchers will find that the pro-Communist officials of Washington used the identical propaganda for softening up United States citizens to the reception of the Kremlin's agents that had been used to fool the people of Mexico in 1924, and the people of Uruguay in 1926: great economic benefits would result from welcoming a Soviet Ambassador to the United States. Stalin was said to have promised a billion dollars in new Soviet-United States trade.

Many well-informed citizens thought otherwise and said so, but their warnings were smothered by a wave of bureaucratic counterpublicity. The American Legion's resolution opposing the recognition of the Kremlin was challenged by the President as a philosophy of Tories and doubting Thomases. The American Federation of Labor's warning that we shouldn't, and couldn't, do legitimate business with a regime under which men, women, and children were perpetual state slaves, was buried under the publicity campaigns of radical labor leaders, pro-Communist agitators, of already Communist-infiltrated labor unions.

One of the greatest concentrations of factual information, wise analyses, police records, and military intelligence ever to pile up spontaneously on one subject in Washington, all documenting the liabilities of dealing with the Kremlin, had no effect on Franklin Roosevelt. He had appointed Henry Morgenthau and Dean Acheson, both protégés of Felix Frankfurter, to study trade opportunities between the U. S. S. R. and the United States, and he praised their report of the benefits to come to all United States citizens from Soviet friendship. The President thought acting as his own Secretary of State—he had a deep-rooted prejudice against the members of the American Foreign Service and against the permanent officials of the Department of State—had Cordell Hull and William Bullitt busily at work with the Communist agents in a building in Washington to which the American press could gain no access.

On November 16, 10 minutes before midnight, while most good Americans slept, the President of the United States raised the 15-year quarantine against the disease of communism, which four other Presidents had preserved, and signed the treaties of his own dictation with the Union of Soviet

Socialist Republics; agreed to accept Stalin's Ambassador, A. A. Troyanovsky, his attachés, and consuls with full diplomatic immunities; and appointed William Bullitt the United States Ambassador to Moscow. It was, indeed, a fait accompli over which the Kremlin's Litvinov could smile satanically, as he drank his vodka toast in the White House.

"A courageous leader." Stalin was to acclaim Franklin Roosevelt in the celebrating Kremlin, while the American President's health was copiously drunk in Moscow.

But there was no jubilation among the statesmen and informed citizens of Latin America. Many of them had seen evidence in Europe that Stalin and his Soviet regime were already in trouble, threatened increasingly by two other rising tides of European power, nazism and fascism. Recognition by the United States, in November 1933, was just what Stalin urgently needed to preserve his hold over the Russian people and expand his international prestige and power.

The Soviet government, the White House publicity emphasized, had promised to refrain from engaging in any political, propaganda, or subversive activities. "The conversations which were successfully concluded," President Roosevelt said, "between Russia and the United States were motivated by the desire of both countries for peace and for the strengthening of the peaceful purpose of the civilized world."

The Kremlin, Secretary Hull promised the governments of the other American republics, at the 1933 Pan-American Conference, agreed to refrain from any act "overt, liable in any way whatsoever to injure the tranquility, prosperity, order, or security of the whole or any part of the United States, or any agitation or propaganda having as an aim the violation of the territorial integrity of the United States, or to bring about a change in the political or social order of the United States."

This pledge, the United States Secretary of State promised the Latin American statesmen, also covered the peace and tranquility of all the other American republics. Did President Roosevelt—in spite of the contrary evidence—really believe that Stalin, Litvinov, the Kremlin, and a Soviet ambassador would abide by such an agreement? The people of the United States can join the statesmen of Latin America, now, in skeptical wonder. A promise of the Kremlin had never been kept on any occasion beneficial to others, prior to 1933.

History, in time, may disclose what secret ingredients were hidden in the Litvinov-Roosevelt deal, they have not yet been divulged in any New Deal memoirs. The Soviet pledges were not 1 year old when Stalin's agents, working out of the Soviet embassy in Washington, engineered the "election" and inauguration of Cardenas as President of Mexico, and proceeded to use "the Mexican Indian," as they had planned in early 1933, as a legal front for communizing the Republic of Mexico. There is much evidence to sustain the belief that the Soviet's coup was materially aided by pro-Communists in President Roosevelt's Washington entourage.

The Soviet pledge of 1933 was less than 2 years old when the key Communists of the Western Hemisphere were summoned to Moscow and given the Comintern's new plan for America: "a temporary alliance with moderates, democrats, and liberals, in order to bore from within and be strong enough to control, as we did in Mexico, all future elections." A copy of a secret report of this Moscow conference, the Seventh Communist International Congress, was obtained by a Latin American government and rushed to Washington in the hope we would cancel our hospitality to the Kremlin's agents. It was signed by Secretary General Dimitroff.

The supposedly secret meeting of the Communist congress had agreed on six tech-

niques for its Western Hemisphere agents: (1) a campaign for "greater democratic rights" from each American government; (2) the creation of a Pan-American bloc of nations "opposed to nazism and fascism and their ideologies"; (3) the labeling of "all prominent industrialists and property owners as fascists or fascist sympathizers"; (4) the uniting of all voters into worker, farmer, and professional unions, with political and economic objectives, which are to be obtained when the proper time arrives by means of general strikes"; (5) the organization of "political parties from these elements so as to obtain in coming elections control over government departments and governments; the initiation of a 'People's Front Government' as a step in transition to the Soviet form of government"; (6) by a "coalition of such new 'People's Front Governments' against the United States (and all other non-Communist countries) to bring the entire Western Hemisphere under Soviet control."

The record shows that Cordell Hull, upon the receipt of this authentic document disclosing the Soviet's continuing duplicity, sent a note of protest to Moscow, but President Roosevelt could not be persuaded to withdraw his diplomatic recognition. He began, instead, the "reorganization" of the State Department in Washington and the dispatching to far, isolated posts of its anti-Communist career officers.

In December 1935, however, the Government of Uruguay, after conferences with its South American neighbors—and after waiting in vain for the United States to join its decision—summarily canceled diplomatic recognition and ordered the Soviet Ambassador to leave Montevideo within 24 hours. Uruguay charged the Soviet Ambassador Minkin and Boris Kraevsky with financing and manipulating, in spite of its promises, antigovernment Communist political campaigns in Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Colombia, as well as in Uruguay and Paraguay. The Uruguayan police seized the luyuzh Amtorg Montevideo files and obtained Moscow's complete record of South American propaganda and activities, as well as duplicate records of Central and North American plans, sent to Kraevsky from the Soviet Embassy in Washington.

Again evidence was given President Roosevelt of the Soviet program, dictated from Moscow by the same Stalin that Roosevelt, in 1933, thought he could do business with. This disclosed among other things that Stalin's agent for the sovietization of Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean was Constantine Oumansky, who had accompanied Litvinov to Washington and partaken of White House festivities in 1933.

The Soviet Ambassador to Uruguay, Minkin, went back to Moscow. Boris Kraevsky stopped off in the United States, under a diplomatic passport arranged for him by the Soviet Ambassador in Washington. He was to master-mind the expansion of the Kremlin's Amtorg Trading Co. headquarters in New York City—the agency which was to be used by Moscow for spying out our most valuable defense secrets, including the atomic bomb.

There was no longer a Soviet ambassador anywhere in Latin America. But Stalin could still gloat; he had the diplomatic base he most wanted in the American hemisphere—Washington. And out of that Soviet Embassy and its consulates a horde of secret agents, protected by diplomatic passports, could roam and plot throughout the Americas, assisted, as the record shows, by powerful pro-Communists in the Washington Federal Government. To the list of Stalin's very good friends in Washington could now be added a former impoverished New York social worker, Harry Hopkins.

Thus, quite unrealized by the good people of the United States, our great Nation, once respected by all our neighbors of the Western Hemisphere, lost its philosophical and moral

leadership of Pan America. We no longer stood, in Latin-American eyes, astride 48 States as the great, respected colossus of the north. We became, instead, *El loco rico del norte*—the rich fool of the north.

The Roosevelt-Stalin deal, of November, 1933, has been so costly to us, as a Nation and as a hemisphere, that the full appraisal of our losses and liabilities will not be known for several generations. The Kremlin's gains within the United States and communism's cost to us is only now, in 1951—after 18 years of suffering a Soviet Embassy in our Capital, and its agents to roam the States—coming to public consciousness.

It has truly been a costly era of mysterious friendship for an appeasement of the devil, of un-American compromises with deceit and pagan ideologies. Some of its protagonists are now dead, their graves monuments to our present predicament, but others, again mysteriously, have been allowed to step into their strategic places.

A colossus of the north no longer sits in the well-earned place of honor at Pan-American conferences. We have exchanged our once unchallenged prestige for a mess of suspicions. With one side of their mouths, our politicians and State Department manipulators had preached a beautiful, new good neighbor western hemisphere policy—but out of the other side they welcomed Stalin's Asiatic and European agents into the neighborhood. Our Latin-American policy since 1933 has been in fact no honestly founded program of sincere hemisphere statesmanship, but merely another case of Washington double talk. The meeting of inter-American foreign ministers, in Washington during March and April 1951, found United States and Latin America far apart on big issues, as our newspaper headlines too briefly recorded. The statesmen of our hemisphere neighbor republics listened politely to President Truman, now mired in a fiasco of Soviet international intrigue, read a speech bidding our neighbors gird against a Red blow by Soviet Russia at the Western Hemisphere, listened to us telling them—at this late date—that the aggressive expansion of Soviet power threatens the whole world.

They listened, too, to our Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, warn them, now in 1951, that "this freedom of ours is faced with a mortal threat. The small group of men who rule the Soviet Union and pull the strings of the international Communist movement have a doctrine which is opposed to freedom. . . . There is no free nation anywhere, large or small, whose freedom is secure."

The statesmen of our neighbor republics have very long memories, and massive dossiers. Acheson: their files on him go far back, complete with enlightening details, to the year 1933, the fateful year when they tried to warn us of the dangers ahead. Is it strange that the Latin-American statesmen, in Washington during April 1951, looked realistically at the busy Soviet embassy's blood-red flag, flying over Sixteenth Street just a few paces from the White House and the State Department, and felt exasperated to be told, like children with short memories, that the Soviet's plan was a new imperialism or that its instruments are a formidable machine of war and the international Communist movement; to be told these long evident facts by the man who had worked night and day, in 1933, to give the Soviets their major base in America—who had celebrated the fifteenth anniversary of the Third International and the fourth anniversary of Stalin's supreme dictatorship of the Kremlin, in a White House party honoring Stalin's emissary, Litvinov, on November 7, 1933?

The protocol of diplomacy requires soft words, innuendo rather than exhortation. Consistent protagonists of a Pan American Union adamantly blocking Soviet expansion,

and cooperatively quarantining its ambassadors, consuls, and other agents from the society of honest, God-worshipping mankind, the statesmen of the rest of the hemisphere replied to our Secretary of State with stoical restraint.

At a time when the threat of a third world conflict is knocking at our doors, Brazil's Foreign Minister Jao Neves de Fontoura suggested, the first thing we must do is to correct the mistakes of the past decade. . . . We are undoubtedly faced with a denial of the idea of nation, just as categoric as the denial of God. There exists an ostensive philosophy which, if it came to pass, would consecrate as a hero Ephialtes, the Spartan traitor convicted of crime against his mother country, having delivered to the Persians the very lives of those who stood in defense of the Pass of Thermopylae.

It was not the Washington Monument, or the remodeled White House, or the Capitol, or the modernistic Department of State edifice which the Latin-American statesmen concentrated on photographing during their sightseeing tours of our Nation's capital. It was the big Soviet embassy, behind its iron fence, with its big red bolshevik flag staining the Washington skyline.

Inside that massive, ugly building, of vaults, dungeons, and short-wave radio code instruments, there is the complete record of Soviet duplicity in and cost to America. If a building could scream we would, before it's too late, know the whole story.

Encourage Revolution Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on August 6, Senator PAT McCARRAN made an excellent speech in the Senate strongly urging the institution of a United States foreign policy aimed at the overthrow of the Soviet Communist regime and its satellites. Senator McCARRAN's speech appears on page 9486 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day.

I have heretofore introduced several resolutions for the same purpose, which resolutions appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 3, 1951. Each of the resolutions which I introduced is directed to the peoples of the various countries now enslaved by communism including the Russian and non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Frank Rockwell Barnett, assistant professor of English and history at Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind., has prepared a detailed program whereby America can assist these enslaved people to overthrow their tyrants.

During World War II, Mr. Barnett served in Germany as a Russian interpreter for the military government section of the Sixty-ninth Infantry Division, the first unit of the western allies to make contact with the Red army at the Elbe River. Following VE-day he worked with Red Army repatriation officers in the mass exchange of Soviet displaced persons for American and British airmen

liberated from German prison camps by the Russians.

Transferred to Berlin in the fall of 1945, he was discharged from the Army so that he could accept a civilian job with the War Department as a public relations official on Gen. Lucius D. Clay's military government staff. From January to August of 1946 he attended meetings of the Allied Control Council in Berlin, prepared background material on political and economic aspects of the German problem for the world press, and escorted British and American correspondents into the Soviet zone of Germany.

From 1947 to 1949 he studied in England under a Rhodes scholarship. During this time he had the opportunity to revisit Germany and Berlin during the Russian blockade and the airlift, to attend a 6 weeks' seminar on the postwar problems of Europe at the University of Zurich, and to talk with many of the exiles from the iron-curtain countries who were crowding into London.

He has been teaching at Wabash College for 2 years and is now on leave of absence in an effort to win support for the plan outlined in this paper.

The program of Mr. Barnett follows:

COLD WAR, ATOMIC WAR, OR LEGION OF LIBERATION?

(By Frank Rockwell Barnett)

A PROPOSAL FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A LEGION OF LIBERATION

Throughout the Soviet Empire, there burns an implacable hatred for Communist tyranny. America can arm that hatred and give it purposeful direction.

Everywhere behind the iron curtain, suspicion and fear are cracking the Communist system. Uncompromising psychological warfare can make those tensions intolerable and widen the gulfs between Red army and secret police, commissar and peasant, believer and atheist, bureaucrat and worker.

America can organize the exiles from the slave world, send them back as liberators of their own people, and so save the world from global, atomic war.

The formation of a legion of anti-Communist exile peoples is vital to our campaign to protect America and our European allies from Soviet aggression and to combat, on its own grounds and with its own weapons, the political and military machine of international Communism. A strong Legion of Liberation would fulfill four major purposes:

1. To defend Western Europe without committing too much American military strength to one hemisphere and without rebuilding the German army to a dangerous level of power.

2. To serve as a concrete symbol of freedom which will—

- (a) encourage anti-Communist undergrounds everywhere behind the iron curtain,

- (b) act as a political magnet that will attract such dissident elements in the Soviet Empire as Red Army troops stationed in Germany and Eastern Europe, scientists, businessmen, peasant leaders, technicians, anti-Russian military, political and religious leaders in the satellite nations.

3. To counteract the anti-American propaganda of the Soviets by guaranteeing to the enslaved masses of the Communist world that the United States does not intend to destroy and occupy their countries, but to help them win freedom.

4. To furnish the disciplined leadership, organization, and weapons which a people's revolution in the twentieth century must have in order to succeed.

ASSUMPTIONS

Democracy cannot do business with men whose fundamental beliefs on morals and politics are irreconcilable with our own. Dictators always break contracts when defaulting is to their advantage.

It is both immoral and impractical to negotiate with our real enemies, Communist governments, while we ready ourselves to use atomic bombs against potential friends, the enslaved peoples in the Soviet orbit.

Atomic warfare may unify the Soviet peoples behind their leadership, just as Pearl Harbor unified a seriously divided America. To defeat Soviet Russia in total war and to garrison and feed an impoverished world, America might become so socialized and militarized that she would fail to maintain her own tradition of freedom.

America can avert a global, atomic war only by actively encouraging millions of potential allies to fight and win their war of independence.

PROPAGANDA IS NOT ENOUGH

We must plan, organize, and finance the liberation of enslaved peoples. Anti-Communists in the Soviet empire are ready to risk their lives for freedom if they have outside help and some chance of success. But they need submachine guns as well as slogans, and an unequivocal promise that America will not turn her back on their struggle to regain their land, their national culture, their freedom, and their God.

FACTS

1. There is potential resistance to the Communist regime everywhere behind the iron curtain.

Between 1919 and 1939 there were 30 sizable revolts, rebellions and plots against the Kremlin dictatorship.

At least 12,000,000 Soviet citizens are in Communist prison camps. Most of those people have been accused of political crimes.

In the U. S. S. R. it is necessary for the regime to employ 2,000,000 security police, including special agents to watch the secret police.

In Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Poland, as well as in Russia, frequent purges of the highest ranks of the party, the army, and the bureaucracy are necessary to prevent treason.

Undeclared civil war between peasant and commissar rages continuously in the Ukraine, Russia's richest province. Today, in spite of the secret police and the Red army, the Ukrainian insurgent army (UPA) keeps alive the resistance movement.

There are other underground groups in the U. S. S. R. directed and financed by anti-Communists in exile. The framework of revolution already exists.

2. The Germans, in 1941, almost overthrew the unpopular Soviet government by promising freedom to oppressed nationalities.

At least 3,000,000 Red army troops surrendered to the Germans in the first 8 months of the war, and a Russian general, Vlasov, led three divisions against Stalin.

Three hundred thousand Ukrainian nationalists fought against the Kremlin.

Only Nazi atrocities enabled the Communist Party to regain temporarily the loyalty of the Soviet peoples.

3. The Red army itself is unreliable.

At least 75,000 officers and men have already deserted to the West—with little or no encouragement.

Red army ideology was corrupted by its contact with the luxuries of Europe. To check desertions, Communists have ordered Russian soldiers on occupation duty in Germany behind barbed wire and returned to the U. S. S. R., as hostages, the families of occupation personnel.

Communist leaders do not trust Red army officers. The high command of the army is frequently purged or reshuffled. Military

heroes disappear into the shadows when they grow too popular with the Russian people.

A police state can never answer the question, "Who will guard the guard?" Mutual fear and distrust between political and military leaders, and the hatred of Red army officers for the police spies of the MVD are corroding the Soviet dictatorship, just as the rivalry between the German Wehrmacht and Hitler's SS helped to disintegrate Nazi power.

PROPOSALS

1. Recruit a Legion of Liberation of approximately 10 regiments from among the Ukrainian partisans, Red army rebels, veterans of General Anders' Polish Army Corps, Baltic and Balkan nationalists, and other anti-Communist refugees who are already on this side of the iron curtain. Find suitable jobs with the legion for thousands of Czech and Polish airmen who flew with the RAF against Hitler and would like to fly with the legion against Stalin.

2. Train the legion in north Africa, Europe, or the Middle East and station it in the American zone of Germany as part of General Eisenhower's Western European defense forces.

Insofar as practicable, combat units of the legion should be comprised of separate nationality groups fighting under their own flags.

3. Invite anti-Communist Red army officers and men stationed in Eastern Europe to transfer their allegiance to the legion in ranks commensurate with their abilities and present grade.

(Do not bribe these men with promises of American citizenship. Guarantee them full citizenship in their own countries when the police states have been abolished.)

4. Vest policy-making decisions, intelligence, supply, and strategic command functions in United States (or U. N.) officers, but leave command of guerrilla armies in the field to officers who understand the psychology of their own peoples.

5. Use part of the United States Air Force, if total war is forced upon us, to parachute the legion into the satellite nations, the Ukraine and the vast reaches of Asiatic Russia, where poor lines of communication will make it difficult for the Communists to bring immediate force to bear against the guerrilla armies organized by those units.

6. Maintain the Legion of Liberation with an airlift while it seeks reinforcements from the sympathetic peasantry of its homeland, subverts the reluctant armies of satellite dictators, and liberates the millions of political prisoners in the concentration camps.

The legion will be a rallying point where anti-Communist Red army units can reform for civil war against the commissars and the secret police.

The legion will furnish arms and equipment to the already existing undergrounds. It will arouse all oppressed peoples by speaking to them in their own language, assuring them that the legion stands for liberation, not conquest.

7. Institute positive intelligence operations to prevent the infiltration of the legion by Communist agents. All-out intelligence is less expensive than all-out atomic war. America, with her "melting pot" society, has the human resources to do the job.

8. Withdraw recognition from outlaw governments which do not rule with the consent of the governed. Publicly proclaim that the principles of the American Declaration of Independence are universally valid. Do not apologize for the violation of the "sovereignty" of international kidnapers.

9. Explore the possibility of establishing a temporary asylum in north Africa for the families of men who volunteer for the legion and for all anti-Communist refugees who

are not of military age. These people will eventually be repatriated to their liberated homelands, but, in the meantime, they, too, should be given the opportunity to work for freedom—on farms, on American air bases in Africa and the Middle East, perhaps in factories producing small arms for guerrilla armies.

10. Employ full-scale psychological warfare to prepare the way for liberation by the legion. Guarantee self-determination and the basic human freedoms to all of the oppressed majorities behind the iron curtain. Do not unify the camp of the enemy by talking "unconditional surrender" and "collective guilt." Separate the people from the Communist Party and distinguish between nominal adherents to the party and the Politburo. Do not abandon the anti-Communist majority by discussing "spheres of influence" with their totalitarian rulers.

ANSWERS TO OBJECTIONS

1. That we ought not provoke the Russians.

We have already provoked the Soviet Government with the Marshall plan, the Truman doctrine, the Atlantic Pact, and our stand in Korea. To form a legion is another "calculated risk" well worth taking. It is a less dangerous gamble than to talk peace with our enemies and threaten our friends with hydrogen bombs.

The legion, unlike the use of atomic bombs, will not provoke the Russian people. It will give them hope.

When dictators are not ready to fight, they are not easily provoked. When they want war, they can always find some excuse to begin. Why let the enemy take the initiative and start war at a time of his own choosing? Disable him now with psychological warfare and the threat of the legion, while we still have supremacy in atomic weapons.

2. That to encourage revolution in the U. S. S. R. is impractical.

No one accuses the Communists of being impractical in their efforts to conquer from within. We regard them as dangerously clever opponents who have had terrifying success in waging underground warfare and recruiting fifth columns.

But subversion could be a thousand times more dangerous to Moscow than to Washington, for reasons already outlined. With courage and planning, and the hearts and hands of all the oppressed peoples, America can turn the Kremlin's weapon of world revolution back on itself.

3. That we can coexist peacefully once we are strong.

The Soviets, like other dictators, thrive on permanent crisis, which justifies their repressive measures at home and undermines the political and economic stability of their opponents. It is doubtful that liberal democracy can survive an indefinitely protracted period of cold war, partial mobilization, and increasing centralization.

CONCLUSIONS

1. A relentless campaign of psychological warfare, based on the creation of a Legion of Liberation and the promise of self-determination, will not guarantee victory over communism without total war. But, by opposing America's greatest strength to the U. S. S. R.'s greatest weakness, it is entirely possible that we can paralyze the enemy without losing our young manhood, our free economy, our whole civilization in a prolonged global struggle. Revolution will mean fewer casualties for Soviet and satellite peoples.

2. Throughout most of her history, America has offered hope to the wretched of the earth. America exposed the divine right of kings as a barbarous superstition by proving

that revolution against tyranny was both possible and honorable.

But modern America sometimes seems to be defending privilege and the status quo. To millions of downtrodden, a selfish America appears to be willing to trade other peoples' lives and property to dictators for the leisure to enjoy her own great good fortune.

Soviet communism, with its false but effective propaganda, gains strength by pretending to promote the welfare of all peoples. American democracy must regain its old vitality by proving that the only genuine revolutionary principle is American and worth fighting for—everywhere in the world.

It is time to repudiate the divine right of dictators and to disregard the imaginary rights of totalitarian rulers who hold power by force and unlimited cruelty. It is time to remember that in America, England, and France freedom was wrested from sovereign authority by armed insurrection, not by negotiation.

We are strong enough to afford moral consistency. We need not stoop to set petty tyrants against the greater villain, when we can have all honest men on our side for the asking. When America abandons expediency and stands firmly for the rights of men against their oppressors, armies of brave men will stand by our side overnight.

Governments Rob Man of His Soul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the problem that faces mankind everywhere and especially in those countries where communism dominates is that of oppressive governments. Mr. William Faulkner, Nobel prize winner and outstanding author, in a public appearance at Oxford, Miss., on May 29, made the categorical statement that the world's governments are using fear to rob man of his individuality and of his soul. This is an outstanding pronouncement of the evil that confronts mankind today. It is not limited to other governments but even the Government of the United States is becoming so centralized that it seeks now by virtue of its bigness to control the daily lives of its citizens. As part of my remarks, I am including the news item that appeared in the Washington News on Mr. Faulkner's address:

GOVERNMENTS ROB MAN OF HIS SOUL

OXFORD, MISS., May 29.—Nobel prize winner William Faulkner, in one of his rare public appearances, warned that the world's governments are using fear to rob man of his individuality and of his soul.

He spoke last night to 1,200 towns-people and to his 17-year-old daughter Jill's high school graduating class.

"What threatens us today is fear," the author said. "Not the atom bomb, nor the fear of it, because if the bomb fell on Oxford tonight, all it could do would be to kill us, which is nothing, since in doing that it will have robbed itself of its only power over us: which is fear of it, the being afraid of it."

"Our danger is not that. Our danger is the forces in the world today which are trying to use man's fear to rob him of his

individuality, his soul, trying to reduce him to an unthinking mass by fear and bribery—giving him free food which he has not earned, easy and valueless money which he has not worked for.

"The economies or ideologies or political systems, Communist or Socialist or Democratic, whatever they wish to call themselves; the tyrants and the politicians, American or European or Asiatic, whatever they call themselves, who would reduce man to one obedient mass for their own aggrandizement and power, or because they themselves are baffled and afraid, afraid of, or incapable of, believing in man's capacity for courage and endurance and sacrifice.

"That is what we must resist if we are to change the world for man's peace and security."

A Doctor Reports on Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Ernest M. Lippa traveled and worked for 7 months in Communist Red China. Dr. Lippa was born in Vienna, graduated from the University of Vienna, and trained as a surgeon in Paris and Berlin. In 1938, after he was driven out of Austria by the Nazis, he went to China where he practiced medicine until recently. He was working as a surgeon in the Catholic Mission Hospital in Kalfeng, which lies about 300 miles from the coast on the Yellow River, when this area was captured by the Communists. Dr. Lippa tried to continue his medical work in Communist China but soon found that medical practice as required of him by the Chinese Reds more resembled butchery than surgery and so he finally managed to get out of Red China.

He is now in New Zealand practicing medicine. Because he could speak many of the dialects of the nation Dr. Lippa was much better able to discover the feelings of the people in Communist China than most western observers.

Dr. Lippa wrote a series of articles in the Saturday Evening Post issues of April 28, May 5, and May 12, 1951, about his experiences in Red China. I include herewith a few excerpts from these articles which vividly portray conditions behind the bamboo curtain:

COMMUNIST JUSTICE

One of the first things I observed in the old liberated area was that the foreign missions had disappeared. The churches, with sickle and hammer replacing the cross, were being used mostly for political meetings.

In regard to the foreign missions, I had an opportunity to observe the communist technique at the walled town of Weikweifu. This market town had been taken over by the Red army only about 4 months before I arrived. I immediately called on Bishop Civelli, whom I had known previously. He had presided over a once beautiful but now neglected mission. The bishop had long been a well-known figure in China, a towering Italian in his middle sixties with sharply chiseled features, a forest of unruly white hair, a beautifully groomed beard, and a hearty laugh.

But the man who came to meet me was a gaunt, haggard, and bleary-eyed figure. There was a tremor in his voice and his hands shook. The white beard of which he had been so proud was unkempt. My first thought was that he had been mistreated, but it was not that simple. The Communist troops in Weikweifu were from Yen-an and had never before seen a Catholic priest. They asked where his wife was, and when he explained that no priest had a wife, they simply didn't believe him.

That night they came back to the mission and searched everywhere for a wife. They poked around his bedroom, shining torches in his face, looking under the bed and in the wardrobes. The next night they came back and did it all over again. Night after night they came to search. In addition, they forbade the mission to lock its doors at any time and the population was encouraged to enter and make themselves at home. The bishop's study, for instance, was always full of children, and he did not dare tell them to leave. It was understandable that after 4 months the old man appeared to be on the verge of a breakdown.

The campaign to close the churches was still more indirect. The people in the old liberated area told me that in the beginning the Communists had declared they were opposed only to foreign domination and that the Chinese Christians could continue their church work without molestation. This was said publicly, while privately the population was encouraged to make accusations against churchmen just as they were encouraged to denounce the large landowners as "enemies of the people."

PEOPLE'S COURTS

Such accusations usually were made before the so-called people's courts, which were village gatherings at which the accused stood on a platform in the middle of the crowd while anyone who desired spoke against him. Then the crowd, after being harangued by a party official, gave the verdict. Landlords charged with cheating the peasants were the main targets of these trials at first, and harsh punishments were customary. But many persons were tried as enemies of the people merely because they owned a wrist watch or because they ate three meals a day instead of the two that were customary for most persons in the old liberated area.

Sometimes even these charges were trumped up against persons whom the party wished to intimidate or punish for other undisclosed reasons. On one occasion I treated a man whose back had been slashed to ribbons as a result of a flogging ordered by such a court. He was accused of owning too much land, a charge I could hardly accept as the real cause of his trouble because his trial occurred 7 years after all the land in that area supposedly had been "justly" redistributed.

Nothing much happened to many others called before the people's courts, except that they had to stand for hours and listen to the charges against them, and then usually had to apologize for their offenses or alleged offenses. But if a man got off with an apology he was expected to take the hint and get into step with the Communist program. And if he failed to do so, he usually disappeared from the community within a short time. Usually it was said that he had been killed by bandits. If only half of the stories told me were true, hundreds of priests and thousands of Chinese Christians vanished in this manner.

I discussed these trials not only with the peasants but with various party officials during my stay in the liberated area. Communists frequently assured me that many untrue or exaggerated stories had been circulated abroad about the fate of those who appeared before the people's courts. Ordinarily, they repeated the statements of some

of the high party officials, who had declared that, while there may have been occasions in the beginning when the peasants were too harsh on the landlords, the party itself had always done everything possible to protect the landowners from unjust treatment.

A CHINESE LANDLORD'S STORY

On one occasion at the town of Ling-shien I recall that a party functionary gave me a long lecture on this subject. Later I went for a walk with my two dogs along a lonely country road and came upon a man hunched up on a bank at the roadside, resting beside a small pushcart. I spoke to him and, as he seemed willing to talk, I chatted for awhile and then asked him whether he felt the landlords had been treated fairly by the people's courts.

"Perhaps," he said, after a few moments' thought, "those who were quickly tortured to death were the fortunate ones."

"I have heard such stories," I said, "and I have seen some evidence, but I have also been told that the party does its best to protect the landlords from real injustices."

He fell silent again, and then said he would tell me of one case. I cannot reproduce his exact words, but the story was a simple one.

"There was near here a landlord, an elderly man who had never had trouble with his tenants," he began. "This man and his family fled when the Communists arrived, and soon thereafter he died. But his eldest son decided to return and see if he could collect rents due him or, if not, to work the land himself, as it was all he possessed."

"He made inquiries and was assured of just treatment, but when he returned he was arrested and led before a people's court. The witnesses against him were men he had never seen before, but they accused him of mistreating his tenants and of being an enemy of the people. However, something went wrong with the stage managing of the trial. Several of his father's tenants appeared and boldly stood up to defend him, and his father as well. They spoke strongly and the crowd was with them. The local party officials then announced they were happy his innocence had been proved and said he should appear at the magistrate's hall to claim his land."

"He did appear, but there were delays and red tape and, since he had no means of livelihood, they gave him a permit to carry on a hawker's business between his village and Ling-shien until matters were straightened out. A few days later he went to Ling-shien and, as was required, appeared at the police station to get a permit to remain overnight. In the station yard several men rushed up and began shouting accusations at him, calling him an enemy of the people. They were the same men who had falsely accused him in his own village. He was again taken before a people's court, but this time at Ling-shien, where no one knew him."

"His accusers repeated their charges and demanded that the people punish him. One of them pushed him hard against a guard, and the guard shoved him roughly around the platform. The crowd jeered him and a party official urged them on, shouting, 'What kind of punishment does he deserve—this blood-sucking Kuomintang dog.'"

"'Kill him,' the crowd yelled. 'Look at those land-grabbing hands,' one of his accusers yelled. 'They robbed you. But if we cut them off, those hands can't grab any more land.'"

"At that moment he was given a hard push which sent him over the edge of the platform and into the arms of the angry, shouting crowd. He was dragged along the road to a butcher's shop, where his tormentors shoved him up against the chopping block and raised a cleaver. A moment later, half conscious, half crazy, he was turned loose and permitted to stagger away * * *

but not until after he had seen his own severed hands lying in the dust beside the chopping block."

When my companion had finished his story, he sat motionless, his head bowed. I thanked him for answering my questions so vividly. "But," I added, "I'm told that such stories often are exaggerated. It is hard to get proof. Can you be sure of the facts?"

This time he didn't answer. But he looked at me with a terrible expression in his eyes and held up two arms that were handless stumps.

AGRARIAN REFORM IN CHINA

I discussed the farmer's problem with many old-timers in the rural villages. I found most of them highly skeptical of the party's achievements. The Chinese farmer's vocabulary is limited and his language primitive, but he is by no means stupid. Within his limitations he is often a born orator and has a knack of putting his finger on the sensitive spot. I cannot hope to reproduce these conversations exactly, because of our limited ability to communicate, but, in general, the attitude expressed was about as follows:

"I've been told that all landlords are bad men who oppressed the common people and let them starve. But, as it happens, my landlord was a pretty good fellow. Of course, there must have been bad landlords, too, but in the old days even a bad landlord would not have let his tenants starve as long as he himself had something. Otherwise, who would have tilled his fields the next year?"

"Our landlord never told us to work longer hours, because he knew we would do everything to make the crop grow. But now, every day, we must go to meetings where we are told to work harder and raise bigger crops, because China belongs to the common people. That's us. But if everything belongs to us, why am I not allowed to do what I want with my land? Why can't I decide what kind of crop I plant, how much grain I will keep for food and how much I will keep for seed?"

"When my father had a big crop he paid the same rent to his landlord that he paid in years when the crop was small. But now, if my harvest is good, I must donate to so many organizations that nothing is left over for the bad years. When my father wanted to visit his relatives, he asked nobody. If I want to visit my brother, I have to ask the magistrate for a permit. And before I get it he asks whether I am behind in my work and whether the work will be done during the time I am away. Yet they tell me that my father was a slave and that I am a freeman!"

MARRIAGE AND FAMILY LIFE IN RED CHINA

As I moved from town to town in the old liberated area, I was shocked to see how far the government had gone in breaking down the ancient family traditions and ancestor worship which for centuries had been the backbone of Chinese life. Marriage in many ways had become an almost casual relationship. Families were more often separated than not.

If a boy and girl want to marry in China today, they must petition the Government which, in most cases, grants the permit on the understanding that marriage will not interfere with the assigned duties of either of the petitioners. Wedding ceremonies are a mixture of old superstition and the new Communist cult of hero worship. Instead of bowing three times before the shrine of their ancestors, as had long been customary, the couple now bow three times before a picture of Dictator Mao Tse-tung. If the newly married are Government employees, they are permitted to live together for about a week, but thereafter each sleeps at his or

her place of work, except on Saturday nights, when they are permitted to be together.

There are exceptions to these rules among the higher party officials, most of whom have their families with them. But a majority of married couples are fortunate if they can work in the same town and see each other once a week. For many who work in different towns, even though they may be only 20 miles apart, it is so difficult to get permission for a visit that they may not see each other for long periods—even for years.

With only a brief notice, a husband or a wife may be ordered to report at a new working place, sometimes hundreds of miles away. If it is the mother who is sent away, she is not permitted to take her children. She must board small children with a peasant family. But if the children are older, the Government ordinarily puts them in a boarding school. It is rather rare for such families ever to be reunited.

Government employees and party members are taught that family attachments are reactionary sentiments that have no place in the Communist state. Such feelings are tolerated by the Government only when they do not interfere with the interests of the state. Marriage, or at least sexual relationship, is necessary to keep up the birth rate. But beyond that any attachments are regarded as detrimental to the productive capacity of the masses.

The government's methods of enforcing these ideas on the mass of people are normally indirect—that is, by transfers of workers, or by refusal of educational facilities to those who fail to conform, or by various kinds of economic pressure. But rigid rules are enforced for members of the Communist Party. A party member's child usually is taken away from its mother when it is 6 to 8 weeks old and boarded with a peasant family while the mother goes to her job. The mother may see the child once a month until it is 2 or 3. At that time it may be returned to her if there is a government nursery at her working place. But when the child reaches the secondary-school age it is separated from its parents again. Except for occasional chance meetings, it is unlikely ever to see them again.

The separation of families, the transfer of government workers from one end of the country to another and the frequent changes of personnel in party offices are all part of a calculated policy. Communism can succeed in China only if the family unit, as it has been known for centuries, is eliminated. The perpetual reshuffling of government employees is necessary to prevent formulation of friendships, to keep the workers suspicious of one another and to make them willing to spy on one another. In every government office there is at least one official who does nothing but report on the behavior and the Communist fervor of the others.

I had often heard it said before I entered the liberated area that the Communists were licentious. But I regard this as false. Immorality and vice were less evident in Communist territory than in Nationalist China. But in the Communist moral attitude there was something far more terrifying: the procedure of mating, begetting children, and bringing them up has become altogether dehumanized.

This government policy has resulted in more frequent divorces and, as a consequence, many more casual attachments between men and women—the basic intention of the policy makers.

MEDICAL CARE FOR REDS ONLY

Only government employees, members of the Communist Party, and soldiers received free medical care at hospitals in the liberated area. The peasants were required to pay for whatever they got, but in practice there was very little they could get, even when they

had the money to pay. There were not enough medicines, not enough doctors, and not enough hospitals in the liberated area—and the government saw that Communists were served first.

One peasant child, for example, was brought to me suffering from a purulent inflammation of the middle ear. He had been turned away from the government hospital without any kind of treatment because the doctors there said they had no medicine. I gave him medicine from my own stores, but I later discovered that on the same day the hospital had given 50 tablets of sulfadiazine to a Communist official who had a small boil on his neck. Yet when I prescribed sulfa tablets for a woman with childbed fever, she was told that they were not available at the hospital. Several times peasants who took my prescriptions to the hospital to be filled were deliberately given charcoal or antacid tablets instead of the prescribed drugs.

This attitude toward the medical care of the peasants was by no means limited to Ling-shien. Late in March I was permitted to continue my journey to the provincial capital of Mah-pu, a small town up in the mountains to which the government officials had retreated some time earlier in order to avoid bombing by Nationalist warplanes. From there I was able to proceed over steep mountain roads on a little narrow-gauge railroad that follows the bed of what was once a glacial river and, finally, by bus to my destination at Luanfu. On this trip I continued to receive patients and found the problem of medical care much the same.

My observations then and later convinced me that the official attitude was not prompted merely by the shortage of medicine in the liberated area. For instance, at one of the government hospitals I examined a small boy who had a tumor growing from the roof of the pharynx. His parents had paid for an operation, but the Chinese surgeon had merely snipped off the tumor, and of course it soon grew back again. I talked to hospital officials, offering to operate radically.

The hospital superintendent turned down my offer when it was discovered that the family had spent all its money on the first operation and could pay nothing for the second.

"In that case," I said, "I will supply all the necessary materials from my own stores, use my own instruments, and perform the operation without charge."

This was translated by my interpreter to the superintendent, but he again shook his head. The interpreter, who was also a party official and an important figure in the distribution of medical supplies, said, "No, you cannot do that. It is against the policy of the Government to dispense free treatment to the lao-pel-shings (non-Communist peasants)."

These incidents were the rule instead of the exception in Communist territory. And if I had needed further proof of this governmental policy, I received it some 6 months later, when I was leaving the old liberated area, en route to Shanghai. On the train I met Anna Wong, the European-born wife of one of the top Communist officials at Peiping. She had just come from Peiping, where she had taken part in a conference with high officials regarding the future handling of all relief organizations in Red China, since she was one of the officers of China Welfare Fund.

Here, I thought, is the right person to speak to about some of the unhappy things I have seen. I did speak to her and, it seemed to me, she replied candidly in regard to the use of relief supplies.

"We have dispensed with the sloppy humanitarian viewpoint that wastes valuable time and material on useless drags of humanity merely because they are sick," she said. "We have only one interest and one duty: to keep fit those who are of value to our future Communist state. These are the

ones who will get our attention and our best care. We are not interested in the people of China as they are now. They must die anyway before we can build a new China. To help them to prolong their lives by adequate medical care would not only be a waste but it would retard progress."

Proposed Removal of Veterans' Administration Office From Boston to Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following communications relative to removal of the Veterans' Administration office from Boston to Philadelphia:

BOSTON, MASS., August 15, 1951

HON. EDITH N. ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

VA jumps Congress re consolidation of VA district offices. Speeding plans. Original date for Boston transfer was February 1952; 2 weeks ago date stepped up to November 1951. Latest order is for September 10, less than a month. Can anything be done?

RICHARD ABRAMS,
Brookline, Mass.

BOSTON, MASS., July 31, 1951.

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge hold in abeyance question of proposed transfer of death claims from Boston to Philadelphia. Savings immaterial and negligible for this item. Strongly urge action on your part to leave as is.

GEORGE W. GRADER,
Department Commander, American
Legion, Department of Massachusetts.

BOSTON, MASS., August 15, 1951.

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Removal of VA district office from Boston to Philadelphia to take place in September. No consideration given employees with regard to time for settling affairs here.

DOROTHY CADY AND GERTRUDE HURW,
Dorchester, Mass.

BOSTON, MASS., August 15, 1951.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Received verbal instruction today to either resign or go to Philadelphia District Office. Threat that finance could not process our pay and retirement at later date if such decision was not made now. Strongly urge you to do what you can for me and my fellow Boston VA employees. We are desperate.

GEORGE C. HALE,
Belmont, Mass.

WATERTOWN, MASS., August 16, 1951.

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I am veteran's widow 16 years' Government service. Has Veterans' Administration right

to deprive me of reemployment rights under civil service because removal to Philadelphia in September; impossible account recently buying home and minor daughter's attending college here. No employment available with other Government agencies due to freeze.

EMILY M. FLYNN.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION DISTRICT OFFICE.

Boston 8, Mass., August 1, 1951.

You have been informed of the Administrator's plans to consolidate the Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Richmond district offices, to be located in a single district office in Philadelphia.

2. You are requested to indicate in the attached questionnaire whether or not you are interested in transferring at Government expense to Philadelphia in your present grade. Failure to accept offer of transfer to the Philadelphia district office may result in your separation from service. Since this movement is a consolidation of functions within the agency, you will not be entitled to any reassignment rights in the Boston commuting area.

3. This questionnaire must be completed and returned through your supervisor to the personnel office no later than 5 p. m. August 7, 1951.

4. The effective date of this move has not yet been determined. However, the earliest possible advice of individual action will be given to all employees concerned.

GEORGE D. LIEBKE,
Acting Manager.

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TRANSFER TO PHILADELPHIA OFFICE

Date-----

1. Name-----
2. (a) I desire to transfer to the Philadelphia district office.
- (b) I do not desire to transfer to the Philadelphia district office.
3. If you signify your desire to transfer to the Philadelphia office, complete the following:
 - (a) Married----- Single----- Number of dependents-----
 - (b) Give the age and relationship of each dependent who will accompany you to Philadelphia-----
 - (c) What mode of transportation do you expect to use?-----
 - (d) Give the approximate weight of the furniture and/or household effects that you expect to take with you-----

Signature of employee.

JAMAICA PLAIN, MASS.,
August 14, 1951.

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: The people of today are always so willing to criticize and never say thanks for a favor that I wish to take this opportunity to sincerely thank you for the splendid objection you raised against the moving and consolidation of the district offices of the Veterans' Administration.

It is gratifying to know that not only the veteran but the Federal employee has a friend in Washington who is ever ready to defend their rights, privileges, and even positions.

Perhaps this may help to show you what we in Boston are up against in the present plans for moving to Philadelphia.

One of my friends, who just bought a house, has a wife and three children, has been applying for work in private concerns. Being only 33 years of age, he has found that he is too old to be hired as a new employee.

We in the VA were declared as defense workers and have been made to understand

that we cannot transfer to another agency with status but if we are lucky to obtain another position we must resign and then are hired as a temporary employee.

The enclosed notice gives you an idea of what we are up against if we cannot move to Philadelphia for any logical and reasonable cause.

Please note paragraph 2b, which shows that the VA employee is patriotic and believes in his Government to such an extent that he even volunteers to die for it in an emergency.

Relative to the present situation, we have been made to believe that if we do not go to Philadelphia we may lose our rights as permanent Government employees and be severed from the service.

It doesn't seem just that in one instance we should be told that we are defense workers and frozen on our jobs and in another be told that we move or we have no job.

Incidentally, the move will affect close to 1,000 of us, as the departments within the regional office which service the district office are also affected.

I am 43 years of age, have 10 years' Government service (including 2 years' Army service), am a major in the Artillery Reserve, never have been arrested even for as much as a small charge as speeding, have been a good citizen, am a disabled veteran, plan to be married, and am the present chief of staff of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, department of Massachusetts. However, this letter is written not as a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, but rather as an individual employee who wishes to express his gratitude to you.

It is my desire to remain in Massachusetts, but will go to Philadelphia if it becomes necessary. This seems quite possible, since there appears to be a surplus of unemployed in this area, and my disability and age are strictly two strikes against me.

Mrs. Rogers, although I am not in your congressional district, I simply wanted to express my deep appreciation for the action you took in Congress in regard to this plan of the VA, and I am also reflecting the attitude of all the VA employees in the Boston district office.

Sincerely,

CHARLES R. LOVEJOY.

JOINT RO AND DO MEMORANDUM No. 81

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,

Boston, Mass., May 7, 1951.

Subject: Revision of reemployment rights program.

1. The following letter from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., dated April 20, 1951, subject as above, is quoted for your information:

"1. It will be the policy of the VA, except as provided in paragraph 3 below, to deny reemployment rights to VA employees being appointed in other defense agencies. Accordingly, managers of field stations and the Departmental Personnel Officer, Central Office, are delegated authority to deny reemployment rights to VA employees, including physicians, dentists, and nurses in the Department of Medicine and Surgery being appointed in other defense agencies without prior approval of this office.

"2. The adoption of the above-stated policy is in the best interests of the VA and will permit this agency to accomplish its mission. Among the factors considered in establishing this policy were the following:

"(a) The VA has been declared a defense agency in compliance with 38 United States Code 693 and it is essential that the accomplishment of the mission assigned to the VA by the various acts of Congress providing benefits to veterans not be disrupted through the loss of employees especially trained in VA operations and procedures.

"(b) Approximately 30,000 VA employees are reserve members of the various civilian components of the Armed Forces and, as such, are subject to being ordered to active duty if that contingency becomes necessary. A major portion of the employees occupying key positions in the VA are reservists. In the event these employees are mobilized, naturally it is anticipated that their replacements would be selected from trained nonreservist employees. As of the present time and since the beginning of the Korean situation, over 4,500 trained employees have been called or ordered to extended active military service.

"(c) During the same period indicated in (b) above, the VA has experienced the loss of 49,612 employees for all reasons. This turnover very greatly exceeds the turn-over which normally occurs.

"(d) Many VA positions are of a shortage category type for which recruitment has been proven to be difficult in different areas. While locally in certain areas, conditions may exist whereby replacements would be available for employees released, positions of that same type would be in a shortage demand in other areas.

"3. However, it is recognized that there may be instances where VA employees possess various specialized skills not being used in their present position in the VA, and which may be better utilized in the interest of national defense in the work programs of other defense agencies. In such exceptional cases, when a request is received from the appointing officer of another defense agency for the appointment with reemployment rights of such a VA employee possessing special technical, scientific, or professional skills, the following procedure will be used. The request together with complete data with respect to the employee's special skills including the other agency's basis for effecting the appointment to the position in question in the furtherance of the defense program will be forwarded to central office, office of personnel, for agency adjudication. In addition, there will be submitted a statement by the manager as to the availability of a suitable replacement for such employee. Consideration will thereupon be given to (a) the transfer and reassignment of the employee to a position in the VA wherein such special skills can be used, or (b) the denial of release with reemployment rights, or (c) the grant of release with reemployment rights.

"4. Additionally, when a request is received from the appointing officer of another defense agency for the appointment with reemployment rights of a VA employee for whom a qualified replacement is immediately available, the assistant administrator for personnel will be notified of the name, title, grade, and organizational location of such employee. A determination will be made in Central Office whether such position is of a shortage category in other areas in order to ascertain whether an offer of transfer and reassignment within the VA may be made to the employee.

"5. Managers and the Departmental Personnel Officer will be responsible for replying to the appropriate office of the Civil Service Commission when advised by the Commission of an appeal by another defense agency which was based upon VA denial of reemployment rights. Decisions adverse to the VA which are rendered by the Commission will be reported to the Assistant Administrator for Personnel, by the most expeditious means, with complete information relative to the case. The information should set forth the name, grade, position title, organizational location, and the immediate effect on operations which would be caused by the release to another defense agency in order that further appeal to the Central Office of the Civil Service Commission may be considered.

"6. Agency policy as stated in this letter will be disseminated by memorandum to all employees in order that they will be fully cognizant of the VA's position with reference to release with reemployment rights for appointment in another defense agency and to transfer and reassignment to shortage category positions in the VA.

"7. The provisions of paragraph 3 b (1) of letter from this office dated March 5, 1951, subject: 'Revision of Reemployment Rights Program, are hereby rescinded.'

By direction of the RO and DO managers:

ARTHUR T. NOREN,
Assistant Manager.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES.

Kansas City, Mo., August 15, 1951.

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: Just a note to express my grateful appreciation to you for the extension of remarks in the August 14 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD regarding Quintus E. Camp.

I have known Quintus for a great many years. It was always a pleasure to work with him while I was an official of the Federal Government and since I have occupied my present position with the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I know of no man in veterans' work who was more sincerely interested in the welfare of the disabled veterans of this country, and in their dependents, than Quintus Camp, nor do I know anyone who has given more of himself to the cause of our disabled veterans than he did.

Again may I express my grateful appreciation to you for the very kind remarks you made on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

GEORGE E. IJAMS,
Director.

NEWTON, MASS., August 14, 1951.

Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Washington, D. C.:

The 260 delegates of Middlesex County Council, representing 18,500 Legionnaires, unanimously and vehemently protest the transfer of the district office of the Veterans' Administration from Boston.

The so-called economies that are claimed for such a plan fade away under close scrutiny.

The lack of service to the veteran and the hardship imposed upon 800 workers and their families are very real, however.

We of Middlesex call upon you, our representative in the Congress, to militantly and zealously resist the move. Our cause will be aided and your position will be made clear if we may have a public declaration on your part.

JOSEPH L. WALSH,
Commander.

Attest:

LIONELL J. SADLER,
Adjutant.

LOWELL POST, No 87, Inc.,
THE AMERICAN LEGION,
August 13, 1951.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MADAM: No doubt by this time you have received a telegram advising you of the action taken Saturday, August 10, 1951, by Middlesex County Council protesting the consolidation of the 12 insurance services offices into 3 and their endorsement of your bill H. R. 9515.

Every county council of the American Legion has presented a like resolution to be acted upon at our State department convention to be held in Holyoke the 16th,

17th, and 18th of August. The resolutions of the several States and Territories will be acted upon at our National Convention at Miami in September.

Very truly yours,

JAMES E. BARRETT.

DEPARTMENT OF MASSACHUSETTS,
DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Boston, Mass., August 9, 1951.
Congresswoman EDITH N. ROGERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: I arrived home this morning and immediately went out in search of figures which we talked about yesterday. Please note the figures in the rental space of the Boston district office. They are on the enclosed sheet.

I am also enclosing here for your information the cost estimate of moving the district office to Philadelphia. I am sure that you will appreciate these figures. It appears to me that they are congressional material. You use them as you see fit.

Also enclosed are two forms which were handed to me by one of the employees. Many of the members of our organization who are employed in the insurance and death-benefit division here in Boston have signed this form "Yes" but they actually signed the form under protest, because they were told that if they would sign "Yes" their job would be prolonged even though they did not go to Philadelphia. They asked me whether they did right, and my reply to these members was that they should have signed the form "Yes" but with protest, and that the Administrator should permit them to sign "Yes" with protest and to submit a supplementary form showing whereby they signed "Yes" with protest so that they may show their hardship which they would suffer in accepting the position in Philadelphia.

I trust that these figures are of help to you, and I am sure they will offset many of the false figures which were quoted to us in Washington.

Very truly yours,

ANTHONY D. TIESO,
Past Department Commander.

*Estimated rental cost of space occupied by
Boston district office*

Total space used by district office and for district office operations (by regional office) square feet.....	100,800
Total usable space in building (including space occupied by PBS) square feet.....	274,100
Total net space occupied by VA regional office and district office square feet.....	256,600
Percent total VA space occupied by district office.....	40
Percent total space occupied by district office.....	37
Annual rental cost of building (borne by GSA).....	\$100,000
Annual rental cost chargeable to district office.....	\$37,000
<i>Cost (estimated) of moving Boston district office to Philadelphia</i>	
Cost of moving household goods of 950 people (846 district and regional office).....	\$311,385.00
Cost of railroad fare, 950 people (not including dependents).....	15,846.00
1st class.....	14.13
Chair.....	2.55
Total.....	16.68

Cost (estimated) of moving Boston district office to Philadelphia—Continued

Cost of per diem, 950 people, 1 day at \$9 (not including dependents).....	\$8,550.00
Cost of moving district office as now operating, 1,646,775 pounds (estimated); rate, \$3 per hundred pounds.....	49,403.25

Total..... 385,184.25

Approximately 75 percent married, 712; approximately 25 percent single, 238. Married person is allowed 7,000 pounds (maximum). Single person is allowed 2,500 pounds (maximum). \$5.42 per hundred weight is rate. Maximum weight figures.

The Servicemen's Indemnity and Insurance Act of 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, one of the foremost laws pertaining to veterans passed by this first session of the Eighty-second Congress is the Servicemen's Indemnity and Insurance Acts of 1951, which became law on April 25, 1951.

This law provides:

First. A free payment of \$10,000 to a widow or widower, child or children, parent, brother, or sister of a deceased serviceman, who died while serving in the Armed Forces on June 27, 1950, or on any subsequent date, thus achieving for the survivors of our deceased armed services personnel complete coverage, which, try as we might, we were never able to attain in World War II with respect to national service life insurance and United States Government life insurance.

Second. This coverage continues for a period of 120 days following discharge or separation from the service under conditions other than dishonorable.

Third. The discharged serviceman may, by application within 120 days after discharge purchase Government term life insurance up to \$10,000 in amount, without physical examination, at a rate greatly lower than the cost of such term insurance under the provisions of NSLI and USGLI. The lower rate allows the the ex-serviceman to pay only the cost of his term insurance, instead of paying more, as is true under NSLI and USGLI systems, and then receiving the overpayment back as a dividend, at great administrative cost to the Government.

There are many other provisions of the new law, as will be hereinafter set out, and in a matter so complex as insurance, there will undoubtedly develop certain inequities, and certain administrative difficulties, as is the case with all laws of broad coverage, that could not reasonably be foreseen. Attention of the Congress is invited to the new law with

the view to such improvement from time to time, as experience may warrant.

In addition to the universal coverage provided by the law, it has the outstanding feature of cutting administrative costs to the bone, and saving for the Government, not only this year, but throughout the years to come, millions of dollars in administrative costs.

As part of my remarks, I include the following outline of the new law and regulations taken from the Disabled American Veterans' Semimonthly of July 24, 1951:

OUTLINE OF NEW INSURANCE LAWS AND REGULATIONS

1. DATE OF ENACTMENT

The Servicemen's Indemnity and Insurance Acts of 1951, a two-part measure, was signed by the President on April 25, 1951, as Public Law 23, Eighty-second Congress, and became effective on the same date.

2. WHAT THIS LAW DOES

The Indemnity and Insurance Acts of 1951 (a) Limit the granting of new national service life insurance (NSLI) and United States Government life insurance (USGLI).

(b) Give to persons in the active service with the Armed Forces certain options and privileges regarding NSLI or USGLI they may hold.

(c) Provide free indemnity up to \$10,000 for death of persons in the active service with the Armed Forces and certain others.

(d) Provide new types of insurance for those in the service after they are separated or discharged.

(e) Establish basis for computation of premiums for the new types of insurance provided; establish conditions under which indemnity is forfeited and makes several administrative provisions.

3. LIMITATION ON ISSUE OF NEW NSLI AND USGLI

Except under certain conditions—discussed later in this fact sheet—no new insurance under NSLI or USGLI can be granted after April 25, 1951.

A. What this provision does: Since April 25, 1951, veterans who are not and have not been in the active service since June 27, 1950, including National Guard men and reservists not called to temporary service since that date:

a. Who allow their term NSLI or USGLI insurance to expire without converting it to a permanent plan or without renewing it, are no longer eligible for any type of Government insurance;

b. Who were, because of their wartime service, eligible to buy NSLI or USGLI, and did not do so on or before April 25, 1951, are no longer eligible for Government life insurance;

c. Who surrender for cash their entire NSLI or USGLI—even if the amount surrendered is less than \$10,000—have no further rights to Government insurance.

4. PRIVILEGES GRANTED SERVICE PERSONNEL HOLDING NSLI OR USGLI

Any person who is now in the service with the Armed Forces and who holds NSLI or USGLI, has the following options regarding that insurance:

A. Term insurance: If the serviceman holds term NSLI or USGLI, he may apply for a waiver of premiums. The policy will remain in force from the time the waiver is granted until 120 days after the insured is discharged or separated. After discharge, the veteran may keep his insurance in force by payment of premiums falling due after the 120-day period. (See E below.)

B. Permanent insurance in force for less than 1 year: If the insurance held by the serviceman is of this type, he may apply for a waiver of a part of the premium (the part representing the cost of the protection, as distinguished from that part of each premium which goes into the reserve). The policy will remain in force by payment of the reduced premium, for as long as the person is in the service plus 120 days. After discharge or separation, the veteran may keep his insurance in force by resuming payments of full premiums falling due after the 120-day period. (See E below.)

C. Permanent insurance in force for 1 year or longer: The serviceman holding this kind of Government life insurance may:

1. Apply for a waiver or a part of the premiums (see B above), or;

2. Surrender this policy for its cash surrender value and stop paying all premiums. Such a person, within 120 days from discharge or separation, may either apply for new insurance on the same plan and up to the same amount as he surrendered for cash (new premiums will be based on the age of the veteran at the time of application), or within the same period of 120 days from discharge, apply for reinstatement of the policy he formerly surrendered. In this latter case, the premium would be the same as he was paying before surrendering, but he would have to pay back the amount received at the time of surrender, plus that part of the premiums not paid representing reserve, plus interest.

(A serviceman will not be protected by the policy surrendered if he chooses the option described under 4, C, 2. He may be protected by the indemnity provided by the act (see 6), after separation from service, for 120 days, within which period he may apply for reinstatement or new insurance.)

D. Physical examination: No physical examination is required for granting new insurance or reinstatement as described under B and C.

E. Caution: While in applicable cases, it has been said that veterans must resume payments falling due 120 days after discharge, it is strongly recommended that they make suitable arrangements well in advance of the end of this 120-day period, to avoid possible lapse and/or expiration.

F. Waivers—When granted and their effect: Applications for waiver of premiums will not be acceptable until the person has been in the service for 31 days or longer. Waiver will not extend to premiums falling due: (1) prior to application for waiver, (2) before the second day of the second calendar month following entry into the service by the applicant; or (3) before June 2, 1951, whichever is later.

While the policy is in force under a waiver of premiums the policy does not earn any dividends.

G. Expiration of term policies while insured is in service: Any term policy whose term expires after waiver of premiums has been granted, and while the insured is in the service . . . is automatically renewed for an additional 5-year term. If the term policy expires while the insured is in the service (not under waiver) he has the right to new term insurance up to the same amount—if he applies for it within 120 days from discharge, and meets health requirements. Premiums on the new policy will be based on the age of the veteran at the time of application.

5. INDEMNITY PROTECTION

A. What it is: The indemnity granted by this law is an automatic payment made to certain survivors of those granted this protection. This protection is free of charge, and no application is necessary. It is a gratuity, and not an insurance contract.

B. Who is covered by indemnity protection: Persons covered automatically by this indemnity include all those who, on and after June 27, 1950:

(a) Are in active service of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or their reserve components, including the National Guard if called to active duty or active training for 14 days or more;

(b) Are cadets and midshipmen of the Military, Naval, and Coast Guard Academies;

(c) Are commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey while assigned to duty during a period of war or an emergency as proclaimed by the President or the Congress on projects for the Army, Navy, or Air Force in areas outside the continental United States or in Alaska or in coastal areas of the United States determined by the Department of Defense to be of immediate military hazard;

(d) are in the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, including the National Guard, while engaged in aerial flights in Government owned or leased aircraft for any period, with or without pay, as an incident to their military training;

(e) are provisionally accepted for service in the Armed Forces and directed or ordered to report to a place for final acceptance and who die as a result of disabilities incurred while en route to such place and within 120 days of the incurrence of the disability;

(f) are inductees who, in response to an order to report for induction and who, after reporting to a local draft board, die as a result of disabilities incurred while en route from the draft board to a designated induction station, and within 120 days from the incurrence of such disabilities.

C. Period of coverage: Persons ordered for, or in, active service for more than 30 days are covered as long as they are in the service and shall be covered for a period of 120 days after separation or discharge. If service is 30 days or less, the person is covered only while in service. (See also B, e, and f.)

D. Amount of coverage: The amount of the coverage is \$10,000, less the amount of any NSLI or USGLI held in force by the person protected—under waiver or otherwise—at the time of death.

E. To whom payable: The indemnity is payable only to following classes of survivors: (1) widow or widower; (2) child or children; (3) parent, (4) brother or sister. The serviceman may, under the classes specified, choose one or more beneficiaries in any order of preference. If no choice is made, the indemnity will be paid to surviving relatives in the order given. No payments will be made if no one among the classes specified survive.

F. How payable: The indemnity will be paid in 120 equal monthly installments.

6. NEW TYPES OF INSURANCE

A. Term insurance: Anyone entitled to indemnity protection (see 5) and who is ordered to, or has been in, active service for more than 30 days at any time since June 27, 1950, is eligible for Government term life insurance in an amount up to \$10,000, provided he applies for it in writing after April 25, 1951, and within 120 days from discharge or separation. No physical examination will be required.

The new insurance has these characteristics:

It is term insurance: Hence, it will not accumulate cash or loan values.

It is renewable: It can be renewed for additional terms of 5 years, each with premiums based on the age of the veteran at the time of each renewal.

It is nonconvertible: It cannot be converted into any kind of permanent plan of insurance.

It is nonparticipating: In other words, it does not earn any dividends.

Premiums for this insurance are lower than those for NSLI or USGLI term insurance granted before enactment of this law.

It carries the same privileges regarding choice of beneficiaries, waivers, and settlement options as similar contracts issued under NSLI before April 25, 1951.

B. Special insurance for the disabled: A special type of insurance is authorized for certain disabled veterans (see (a) below). This insurance may be granted on any of the plans authorized by the NSLI Act of 1940, as amended. It carries the same rights and privileges regarding choice of beneficiaries, settlement options and conversion as NSLI, but with the following differences:

It is nonparticipating, hence will not earn any dividends.

Premiums are lower than premiums on corresponding plans of NSLI granted before April 25, 1951.

(a) Who is eligible: To be eligible for this insurance, veterans—

1. Must be discharged or separated from service on or after April 25, 1951, under conditions other than dishonorable;

2. Must have a service-connected disability or disabilities, recognized by the VA, and for which compensation would be payable if more than 10 percent in degree;

3. Other than disabilities described under (2) above, must be insurable under the good health requirements of NSLI.

Persons who are granted indemnity protection under this law will be considered as having been in the service, as far as eligibility for this particular type of insurance is concerned.

(b) When to apply: Application for this type of insurance must be made within 1 year from the date that service connection of the disability is determined by the VA. (Persons disabled under conditions described under paragraph 5, subheading "B, e, and f," must apply within 1 year of the incurrence of disability.)

(c) Waivers: The law provides that waivers of premiums on this insurance cannot be denied because the disability became total before the effective date of the insurance.

7. OTHER PROVISIONS

A. Forfeiture of indemnity: The law established that any person guilty of mutiny, treason, spying or desertion, or any person who, because of conscientious objections, refuses to serve in the Armed Forces or refuses to wear the uniform, shall forfeit all rights to indemnity protection. Such rights will be restored, however, if the person is restored to active duty. No indemnity will be paid for death inflicted as a lawful punishment for crime or for military or naval offense, except when inflicted by an enemy of the United States.

B. Tables of mortality: For the new types of insurance described under paragraph 6 the law stipulates that premiums, cash, loan, paid-up and extended values shall be based on the Commissioners 1941 Standard Tables of Mortality and interest at 2¼ percent per year. Annuities under 6 shall be computed under the Annuity Table for 1949.

C. Revolving fund: The act establishes a revolving fund in the Treasury of the United States to which all premiums collected for insurance described under 6, shall be credited and from which any payment shall be made. It also authorizes appropriations to this fund.

D. United States liability: If the insured dies while a waiver of premiums on his NSLI or USGLI is in effect (4, A, B, and C), the United States will be liable for the difference between the reserve of the policy at the time of death of the insured and the value of the benefits under the policy.

Lincoln on Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 17, 1951

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues and of the country a very timely article entitled "Lincoln on Korea," written by a well-known Denver attorney and historian, Wayne C. Williams.

The article received commendation of the President when it was brought to his attention; it has been publicized in the Nation's press by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt in her syndicated column; and the Department of State has seen fit to use it in one of its overseas publications for distribution abroad. It is my further understanding that the Voice of America is considering it for possible use on one of its broadcasts.

I am of the firm conviction that an article such as this one should receive the widest possible distribution because it clearly sets out in a few compact words some of the factors in the United Nations' decision to repulse the Communist aggression in Korea and this is done in the immemorial style of Lincoln's Gettysburg address. What was true then is still true today and will be so tomorrow, for as long as man wishes to enjoy freedom he will be willing to fight for it. It is man's most precious jewel, it must be constantly guarded if benefits and enjoyment are to be derived therefrom.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to include Mr. Williams' article as it appeared in the Denver Democrat of July 7, 1951; Mrs. Roosevelt's column, My Day, and as it appeared in the Denver Rocky Mountain News of July 26, 1951, together with President Truman's letter to Mr. Williams.

[From the Denver Democrat of July 7, 1951]

AN ANSWER TO 'THE GI'S

Numerous GI's write home asking their parents the question, "What are we fighting for?"

Wayne C. Williams, well-known Denver attorney and writer, in the Lincoln way has answered the question in the following article, which appeared in the Washington Post:

"LINCOLN ON KOREA

"What is the cause for which our soldiers are fighting in Korea?

"The issue is historically clear and admits of no doubt

"Let us use the logic of Lincoln and borrow some of his immortal phrases to describe it for this present generation.

"Out of the travail, suffering, and death of two world wars the free nations of the world which had overthrown the aggressors, Hitler and Mussolini and Tojo, assembled at San Francisco, under the flag of America, framed a charter and brought forth a new international organization called the United Nations, and dedicated to the proposition that all nations are free and equal and are entitled to live in peace and freedom from aggression.

"We are now in the throes of a mighty conflict between the aggressors who have defied the United Nations by invading one of its members, to determine whether this international union or whether any international organization, so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure.

"The brave men struggling in Korea against Russian and Chinese communism are fighting in this noblest of causes and have hallowed that sacred ground far above our power to add or detract.

"It is for us the living to sustain the forces of freedom in the United Nations in their struggle to free the world of aggression, of slavery and to end the brutal assault of the aggressor nations against the least and weakest of the free nations.

"If we can prevail now in this conflict we will have established an organization of free nations that can hereafter stop aggression, and enforce the ideals of liberty through law, to the end that the free and peace-loving peoples of the world may now be free to live their lives in peace and freedom so that war may perish from the earth.

"WAYNE C. WILLIAMS.

"DENVER, COLO."

[From the Denver Rocky Mountain News of July 26, 1951]

MY DAY

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

HYDE PARK, July 20.—I hear people so often ask the question, "What are our boys fighting for in Korea?" that I was delighted to be sent a clipping from the Rocky Mountain News.

In this Wayne C. Williams put the reasons for the struggle in Korea so simply and so plainly that I would like to publicize it as widely as possible.

Mr. Williams is a well-known Denver attorney and writer and student of President Lincoln, having recently published a book on our Civil War President. He entitled his newspaper article "Lincoln on Korea." It follows:

"What is the cause for which our soldiers are fighting in Korea?

"Let us use the logic of Lincoln and borrow some of his immortal phrases to describe it for this present generation.

"Out of the travail, suffering and death of two world wars the free nations of the world which had overthrown the aggressors, Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo, assembled at San Francisco, under the flag of America, framed a charter and brought forth a new international organization called the United Nations, and dedicated to the proposition that all nations are free and equal and are entitled to live in peace and freedom from aggression.

"We are now in the throes of a mighty conflict to determine whether this international union or whether any international organization, so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure.

"The brave men struggling in Korea against Russian and Chinese communism are fighting in this noblest of causes and have allowed that sacred ground far above our power to add or detract.

"It is for us the living to sustain the forces of freedom in the United Nations in their struggle to free the world of aggression, of slavery and to end the brutal assault of the aggressor nations against the least and weakest of the free nations."

It is really very important that we get to our soldiers fighting in Korea, and to their mothers here at home, a realization of the greatness of the cause which the United Nations has undertaken.

Perhaps out of the Korean decision to resist aggression there may come a stronger organization within the United Nations,

bound together to oppose aggression and, therefore, to fight for peace.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 30, 1951.

WAYNE C. WILLIAMS, Esq.,

Denver, Colo.

DEAR MR. WILLIAMS: I congratulate you upon the inspiration which brought forth your letter captioned "Lincoln on Korea" and which happily has received widespread publication in the newspapers.

I was particularly pleased that that discerning judge of values, Mrs. Roosevelt, embodied it in a recent column.

The analogy is impressive and the Lincoln-esque touch is masterly. All in all, a very forceful presentation of a great principle.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Investigation of All Hate Mongers Is
NeededEXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House to the following letter which I am filing with the House Committee on Un-American Activities:

AUGUST 16, 1951.

HON. JOHN S. WOOD,

Chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE. I know you agree with me that whatever divides us internally weakens our ability to meet the external threat to our liberties which daily mounts about us. The shield of the Republic, held up to foreign onslaughts, can be no more effective than the strength of the Nation's arm which supports it. Surely there is meaning for us in that solemn injunction of old, a house divided against itself cannot stand.

Holding these views, I am the more sensitive to the divisive programs being espoused by political factions on both left and right. Fortunately we have in the United States a number of agencies devoted to the task of exposing these factions through pitiless publicity. The free press, your committee, and the American Legion's Americanism Commission have been stalwarts in this cause.

In recent years your committee has quite rightly found it exigent to devote the limited funds placed at its disposal to exposing the Communist threat in America. In direct proportion to the increasing danger of the Soviet Union to our security, the threat of domestic Communists has risen. But it is my firm conviction that we are now at such a point of danger in world affairs that any group dedicated to the gospel of hate instead of union constitutes a threat to our security and cannot be overlooked. Whether the effort is to pit class against class, or religion against religion, or race against race, the effect is the same; to destroy that sense of oneness as Americans which is the arm upholding the shield of the Republic.

My attention has been recently directed both by the American Legion and by literature coming to my office to the activities of

one of these hate groups operating in the United States. I refer to the writings of one Robert H. Williams, of Santa Ana, Calif. In addition to his serial publication, the Williams Intelligence Summary, he also has distributed such monographs as *Know Your Enemy* (copyrighted 1950).

I have perused these two publications with care and have found their central theme to be that Jews are a threat to the security of the United States. His entire attack seems to stem from the one scintilla of evidence that a number of Communists happen to be Jews. In the dishonored tradition of all poisoned minds, Williams then proceeds to spawn the most contemptible agglomeration of half-truths, innuendos, and false accusations that I have encountered in a long time.

I offer these examples. Williams refers in his intelligence summary of May 1951 to nine prominent Jews in the United Nations—including United States adviser Ben Cohen—as all evidently Marxists. He makes an outright distortion in saying that "Eban—one of the nine—is the delegate from the Marxist-dominated Zionist state." A few paragraphs later his all evidently Marxists become the nine Marxists. In attacking Gen. Mark Clark because his mother was Jewish—a fact pointed out by Williams—Williams then disparages the use of the six-pointed star of David as the emblem of the Sixth Army. This was, to Williams, another indication of Jewish control over America.

Williams' attack on HERBERT H. LEHMAN, distinguished former Governor of New York and now United States Senator from that State, is typical of his character assassination of other loyal American citizens of Jewish descent:

"LEHMAN is a vice president of the Communist-aiding Anti-Defamation League, the real power behind the Red revolution in the West. Banker-Zionist LEHMAN now is promoting a fantastic movement called Crusade for Freedom, which has enlisted many good men and many old-time Communist liners, such as the Jewish movie producer Walter Wanger—put in charge of the Los Angeles division. A spokesman said the organization had no intention of opposing the Truman-Acheson policies. Drew Pearson is plugging it over the radio. Obviously it is a deceptive move, not really bent on combating communism. What it contemplates is the building of five huge short-wave propaganda stations in Europe and perhaps Asia. In the hands of international banker LEHMAN and associated Reds, this gigantic project can move the masses of Europe and Asia to please its planners * * * " (*Know Your Enemy*, p. 34).

The venom of this poison penster is nowhere better indicated than in the crude mathematical formula he adduces to identify Jews. He refers to the daughter of a gentile father and a Jewish mother as a Jew because, in Williams' formula, a half-Jew is a Jew (*Know Your Enemy*, p. 33).

Does Williams recommend the traditional American way of amalgamating minority groups into our national whole? On the contrary:

"The only solution to the Communist-Zionist revolution is to deport all the activists and any successors who become active. Deport all members of the Communist Party and all Zionists of influence, together with their principal proselytes; deport the Frankfurters and Lehmans, the Achesons and Hisses. * * * Put them on a suitable island where they can be self-supporting and charge the Navy with keeping them there. This may never be possible; it may be too late. But such is the price of survival, if we can accomplish it. History does not indicate any other solution except deterioration, violence, bloodshed, and subversion and grad-

ual disappearance of the whites" (*Know Your Enemy*, p. 54).

The doctrine of racial supremacy is as foreign to our way of life as is the doctrine of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Both are un-American; both are corrosive poisons eating away at our foundations; both need to be counteracted by the scrutiny which your committee can provide.

I find that the charter of the Un-American Activities Committee as set forth in Public Law 601 (sec. 121Q) of the Seventy-ninth Congress is broadly worded to encompass all varieties of subversion:

The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

In view of the clear authority vested in your committee to investigate un-American propaganda activities, and in view of the divisive effect of the anti-Semitic propaganda now being circulated by him, I respectfully urge and request an investigation by your committee of Robert H. Williams, of Santa Ana, Calif.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely,

SAMUEL W. YORTY,
Member of Congress

Extending Point 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 17, 1951

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, consideration of the extension of the Economic Cooperation Administration is necessarily of very deep concern to every Member of Congress. In the past 24 hours, I have wished many times that I could consult with the thinking people in my district and check their opinions against my own.

This morning a copy of my hometown morning paper, the Galveston News, reached my desk. In it I read an editorial on the subject of the extension of point 4. The News is the oldest Texas daily and is a sound and conservative paper. Its favorable endorsement of point 4 and of the Marshall plan in general is refreshing and encouraging. The editorial follows:

EXTENDING POINT 4

It has now been proposed that the point 4 program, which calls for technical assistance to underdeveloped areas of the world, be broadened to include gifts of physical goods such as farm machinery. The proponents of an expanded program believe that countries which are improving their standards of living are less likely prey for the Communists.

The original point 4 program as outlined by President Truman sought to give aid in the form of technical assistance to countries which needed it. In short, we would export

American know-how, and it was felt that we, in turn, might be able to make use of some of the materials produced under improved systems.

If we are to remain allied with countries which intend to resist aggression, it would be desirable to have those nations as self-supporting as possible. If we could stimulate their agriculture and industry to the point where they could produce more of their own food and goods, there might in the long run be less of a drain on our resources. A healthy economy among our allies is important. The chain of our united stand against communism may prove no stronger than its weakest link.

Recent reports show that America can now import some of the steel we need in our defense effort from Europe. The ability of Europe to export steel, after its industrial production had sunk so low, is largely the result of Marshall-plan aid. Perhaps the point 4 plan might bear equally happy fruits.

The Craving for Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 17, 1951

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, on last Sunday morning Albert Joseph McCartney, D. D., LL. D., L. H. D., a former pastor of the National Presbyterian Church in Washington, D. C., was guest minister at the First Congregational Church in Washington.

Dr. McCartney delivered a most interesting and effective sermon. I deem the sermon of sufficient importance to include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that Members of Congress and others may have a chance to read this splendid message.

Dr. McCartney is recognized as one of the outstanding ministers in this country. I commend your reading this sermon:

THE CRAVING FOR SECURITY

Our great American obsession would seem to be the quest for security. Man's chief end is no longer to "glorify God and enjoy Him forever," but his chief concern seems today to be for security—a roof over his head, sufficiency of food and clothing, a guaranteed job, a fireside, an easy chair, and slippers, perhaps, at the end of the day. The great hue and cry on all sides is for security—social security, economic security, health security, old-age security, job security—security from the cradle to the grave.

The prophet Jeremiah was sure that security didn't lie in these directions. He kept warning his people that if things kept on as they were in his day—very much, it would seem, as they are going on in our day, gaining momentum on the downgrade—something irretrievable would happen: the very nation itself might collapse and pass away. His sensitive soul instinctively recoiled from the evil features of the Nation's life, and he was trying to find the answer to the moral and social conditions of his time. What, he asks himself, are the true sources of peace and satisfaction in a people's life? Groping for an answer, he gives us the profound and simple statement of the text—Jeremiah 9: 24—"But let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth Me, that I am the Lord, which exercise loving kindness, judgment, and righteousness

in the earth: for in these things I delight,' saith the Lord."

Let us seek to appraise these proscriptions of Jeremiah on the level of collective society; that is, in the State, the Nation, and in international relations.

I

First of all, he warns us not to count too much upon our accumulated knowledge. Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom. Why not? It is our proud boast that we have built a schoolhouse in every green valley, established a university on every high hill, and opened a library at every crossroads village. Through visual and oral education our children are made familiar with the facts of life both beautiful and ugly, before they are into their teens, and they have second-hand knowledge of the nastiness that is in the world that our grandfathers never acquired in the full reach of their three score years and ten. Our universities and colleges are turning out their product on the assembly line process by the thousands. We have poured out unmeasured billions into our educational hopper, and the cry keeps rising for more. We dedicated nine billion alone, and justly so, for the education of our demobilized soldiers. What is the result of all this vast investment? Ask J. Edgar Hoover and he will tell you the graph for juvenile crime seems to be keeping ever on the upgrade. The headlines in our papers dramatize a harvest of crime and dishonesty in high places that would be a disgrace to the most backward countries on the face of the earth. These crimes are committed by a generation which has been the beneficiary of our most costly and wide-spread education. We mean no disparagement to the place and program of the schools, but if life teaches us anything it teaches that heaven lies beyond the reaches of the mind. Evidently wisdom, knowledge, education are no guarantees for national or social security and satisfaction. This is clearly corroborated when we take the long view of history. Every great empire that has passed away was in the very hour of its passing the wisest, the most knowing, the most technically equipped people on the face of the earth. The fallen columns of Tyre, proudest city of antiquity, exposed by every ebbing tide; the fading paintings on the walls of Petra; the crumbling monoliths of Baalbec, that protrude from the sands of the desert like jagged teeth set in the sunken gums of the ages; these furnish mute testimony to the unreliability of man's wisdom. If the accumulation of sheer knowledge were the open road to peace and security, we should long since have arrived there. If the claims of the school men are valid, that the road to utopia lies through more and better educational processes, certainly by now we should have sighted the domes and minarets of the New Jerusalem. Evidently there has been miserable mismanagement somewhere. Is it in the fact that we have neglected the education of man's spiritual nature, the education of the heart? It is possible that we have nurtured in our national family circle a generation that knows little of God, and cares less for the moral law? Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom.

II

Jeremiah warns us furthermore against relying upon our national defense: "Neither let the mighty man (i. e., the military man) glory in his might." Why not? Our national security would seem to be the absorbing concern of people, press, and politicians. Concerned as we all are for what is happening in other parts of the world to defenseless peoples, we must naturally be on the alert to garrison every possible access to alien philosophies and personalities that threaten our once decent way of life. Yet no matter how complete our defense, it will not guarantee us the security for which the heart

longs. It is not for an embattled peace about which we are concerned, though we may have to endure it for a decade or more. Cannot a people with all the accumulated knowledge that we have, and all the sad experience through which we have so recently passed and are still passing in Korea—can we not learn anything from history? Can we not manage to have our statesmen think more clearly, speak more softly, act more sanely, and set forth a foreign policy on the levels of values that reach out beyond the range of sheer military might? Can we not engage to dedicate our great privileges, our wonderful resources, to the service of mankind by sharing our heritage of ideals and blessings? We must defend the freedom of the world not with guns and dollar diplomacy alone, but quite beyond these by the mobilization of the spirit, of the mind, and of the heart. Our real battle is for the conquest of the souls of men. Neither let the mighty man glory in his might.

III

Jeremiah's third proscription lies in the realm of economics: "Let not the rich man glory in his riches." Why not? In our economically minded age, business prosperity is believed to be the open sesame to the security and the satisfaction of life. It is to the bank account and the ticker tape that we are all inclined to "ascribe majesty and honor, dominion and power, now and forever, amen." But the deeper question is, What are we going to do with our vast riches? We have allowed our economy to become honeycombed with sheer materialism. Dishonesty has been spreading like a plague throughout our country, as witness the disclosures in the academic world, in the field of politics, and on the witness stand before so many courts. The conflicting assizing of the West Point revelation is a sad commentary on how far the moral standards have slipped.

The root of our present moral chaos lies in the fact that men and nations have been seeking the glory of life in money and in things that money can buy. But there is no certain magic in prosperity which will bring about peace and satisfaction and security, as witness our present fears and tensions, for riches are forever taking wings unto themselves and flying away. Jesus told us that long ago in his unforgettable language—"a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth." We are coming to realize that it takes more than commercial prosperity and accumulated wealth to secure a Nation's well-being. Robert Burns summed it all up when he sang in his upland dialect:

"It's no in titles nor in rank;
It's no in wealth like Lon'on bank,
To purchase peace and rest;
It's no in making mickle mair;
It's no in books, it's no in lear,
To make us truly blest;
If happiness hae not her seat
An' centre in the breast,
We may be wise, or rich, or great,
But never can be great;
Nae treasures nae pleasures
Can make us happy, lang;
The heart aye's the part aye
That makes us right or wrang."

Let not the rich man glory in his riches. When we turn back to reread what Jeremiah had to say to the people of his time we realize that it is something worth listening to across the centuries, even though it was said so long ago, and to so small a people. It makes a thinking man sit up and take notice. In substance it is this: That which gives a people or a nation its adhesiveness, its solid character, its dependability, that which assures it a place in history, and evokes respect upon the part of other peo-

ples and gives it power to survive, is in the last analysis not its wisdom, nor its educational system, nor its military preparedness and national defenses, not in its accumulated wealth and business measured in billions, but the thing that really matters is the spirit of a people, that mysterious thing called integrity of character, in short, the soul of a people. Jeremiah is trying to tell us across the centuries that we are putting the accent in the wrong place, and on the wrong things, for it is the soul of a nation that matters. What shall it profit a nation if it gain the whole world and lose its soul? It was Daniel who said "the people that do know their God shall be strong and do exploits."

So all this heads up in an appeal to every individual and his sense of responsibility for saving what we call our American way of life, insofar as it is Christian. It is there that you and I can each stand up and be counted, and take an unequivocal stand in the realm of the spirit. Jeremiah had the only answer: "Let him that glorieth glory in this that he understandeth and knoweth Me, that I am the Lord which exercise loving kindness, judgment, and righteousness in the earth: For in these things I delight, said the Lord." There you have the keys to the kingdom, the exercise of loving kindness, of good will, of justice, good behavior, and these keys to the kingdom are within the reach of every one of us.

I know of no more enduring counsel than to commend to you a personal knowledge of God and all those values in which He would delight and you can gain that through knowing Jesus Christ, who is the express image of the Father, and whom to know aright is life eternal.

So the answer to the quest for security lies just there: "Let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth Me." Do you know Him? How well do you know Him?

Commissioner of Internal Revenue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on August 1, 1951, I was privileged, along with other members of the Texas delegation, to attend the ceremonies in which Gen. John B. Dunlap was sworn in as Commissioner of Internal Revenue. The oath of office was administered by the Honorable Tom C. Clark, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

General Dunlap has a distinguished record of public service, both in the civil government and in the military. The President and the Secretary of the Treasury are to be congratulated upon the appointment of a man of the character and the capacity of General Dunlap to this important office.

I was impressed by the remarks made by General Dunlap just after he had taken the oath of office. I think his remarks show that he will conduct the affairs of the Bureau of Internal Revenue with efficiency and with integrity. I believe all of the Members of Congress will be interested in his statement, and I

am, therefore, including it in these remarks. The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT OF JOHN B. DUNLAP, COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE, UPON TAKING THE OATH OF OFFICE, AUGUST 1, 1951

During the past 10 years an almost unbelievable metamorphosis has taken place in the internal revenue service. In the fiscal year 1940 the service received only about 19,000,000 returns. During the fiscal year 1951 we processed 90,000,000 returns, plus 120,000,000 related documents. In 1940 Internal Revenue collections amounted to \$5,300,000,000, while in 1951 our collections totaled over \$51,000,000,000. Taxpayers' accounts on our books increased from 12½ million in 1940 to over 60 million in 1951. In 1940 there was no tax refund problem. In 1951 the Bureau made 30,000,000 individual refunds. This tremendous growth in the workload of the Bureau of Internal Revenue called for a miracle of cooperation and management.

Solving the many problems, involving everything from space to decentralization of various functions to the field, which arose during that period called for great management ingenuity at all levels of the Service. They could only be solved through the introduction of modern scientific sampling techniques, the utilization of new mechanical devices, establishment of a central management staff, development of new tax return forms, introduction of a comprehensive cost reporting system; and numerous other improvements. They could never have been accomplished without the sympathetic cooperation we received from the Treasury Department under Secretary Snyder's management-improvement program.

We must have failed in our attempt to reach our present high state of efficiency without the wholehearted and loyal support of all of that vast body of employees who make up the Bureau of Internal Revenue and its many field offices. Their integrity and their devotion to duty, without regard for the difficulty of the task ahead, or for the long hours involved, have been the basic factors contributing to the solution of our problems.

Even as fine as our employees have been during this trying period, they would have been helpless without the far-seeing, intelligent, and sympathetic leadership which has been so ably furnished for the past 4 years by my friend and predecessor, the Honorable George J. Schoeneman, who, in my opinion, has furnished us with the finest example of a true public servant throughout his 42 years in the Federal service it has ever been my pleasure to know.

George J. Schoeneman and I have at least two things in common. The first is a deep and abiding interest in, and affection for, the Internal Revenue Service, including our goals of raising the level of tax administration, giving more sympathetic consideration to taxpayers' problems, and rendering better service to the public through adoption of more efficient methods of operation, strengthened supervision, and management controls. The second is that we share a tremendous respect and admiration for the integrity of the people who make up the Internal Revenue Service. They are honest, hard-working and efficient. They are loyal. They are the Bureau. I think the fact that out of a total of over 57,000 members of our official family we have had a mere handful of individuals who have failed to measure up to our traditionally high standards of loyalty, faithfulness, and honesty, bears striking witness to the seriousness with which our people treat the important public trust which is theirs.

I have recently completed a trip around the entire United States during which I discussed many problems with the heads of

all of our various field offices and their assistants. My high opinion of our service and its people has become even higher after these visits.

There may be some few within our service who, even now, do not measure up to our standards, possibly some who may have betrayed their high trust. I assure you and the public that these few will be eliminated from our service quickly whenever and wherever their irregularities are detected. In simple fairness to all of our honest and loyal employees, it is necessary that no one be allowed amongst us who might cause the splendid reputation of our people and our service to be smeared by any faithlessness to his public trust.

During this same period of expansion, we have received splendid cooperation from the Congress. Even now, a subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives is working with us in order to provide the Congress with a complete picture of our operations for the purpose of assisting us in bettering the service through constructive suggestions. I wish to assure the King subcommittee that it will receive my wholehearted and complete cooperation as well as that of every other employee in the service in the accomplishment of its important goal.

The task I am assuming is a heavy one. I will need the help of all of our people in the service. I feel confident I will receive it. In that knowledge, I wish to assure the President of our country, and our Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable John W. Snyder, as well as the Members of our Congress, that the Bureau of Internal Revenue will continue to go forward in its efforts to better its service to our Government and to the people who comprise it.

Celebration of First Year's Existence of Novy Svet, Cleveland Czechoslovak Daily

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it was with great pride that I read in the August 13 issue of the Plain Dealer, one of Cleveland's great metropolitan newspapers, an editorial entitled "It Fights for Freedom." This editorial salutes Cleveland's Czechoslovak daily newspaper, Novy Svet—the New World—which this month ended the first year of its existence—a year dedicated to serving the interests of the Czechs and Slovaks alike, impartially, efficiently, and regardless of creed or nationality.

We Clevelanders are proud of our foreign language newspapers which give expression to the deep love of America felt by the very large part of our cosmopolitan citizenry whose backgrounds reach into practically every country of the world.

Such men as Mr. Kratky, editor of the Novy Svet, are doing a splendid job interpreting the fundamentals of our great free country to the Czechs—and many others—who have come and are still coming to Cleveland. I am happy to

salute him and his staff for the fine courage they have displayed in the year that has passed, and wish them a happy and ever increasingly successful future.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein the editorial which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

The editorial follows:

IT FIGHTS FOR FREEDOM

It is just over a year since Novy Svet (The New World), Cleveland Czechoslovak daily newspaper, was established. In a day when the lot of the foreign language publication is a difficult one Novy Svet, under the able editorship of John F. Kratky, has amply demonstrated its value.

While for years before the war, due to immigration restrictions, the reading public of foreign language newspapers was shrinking, there was an impetus after the war with the influx of DP's and persons fleeing the new dictatorships.

But, whether the audience was large or small, the foreign language press was often the only medium for the conveyance of ideas. In the Czech community in Cleveland, which once boasted two dailies, the situation had become critical. The old Svet American adopted a pro-Communist line and much poison was spread and a great deal of damage done.

The old daily died of repudiation. The Novy Svet was founded on American principles, on a commitment to freedom around the world. As Editor Kratky said: "We want a daily which will serve the interests of all the people, the Czechs and the Slovaks alike, impartially, efficiently and regardless of creed or nationality and which at all times will try to bring them as close as possible."

To this end the first year's existence of Novy Svet has been tirelessly devoted. We have confidence it will continue for many more years to come.

Air Force Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I offer herewith an article by Joseph and Stewart Alsop entitled "Huge AF Demands Seen":

HUGE AF DEMANDS SEEN

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—Before very long, the Air Force issue is going to come out, or perhaps burst out, into the open. The preliminary drumfire has already been heard from the friends of air power on Capitol Hill. Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall, and Under Secretary Robert A. Lovett, now have before them the air staffs' program of requirements for an expanded force of 150 groups.

Even if the plan is accepted by Secretary Marshall and the President (which seems likely) its first disclosure is bound to be a bit explosive, if only because of the immense outlays and grave issues involved.

As a minimum, the cost is estimated at several billions of supplemental appropriations by the present Congress and \$15,000,000,000 additional in the 1953 budget, with

recurring huge appropriations in the subsequent budgets.

The chief issue raised is, of course, the proportion of defense investment between the services. The Navy is considered to be approximately large enough already. The Army is reaching its planned manpower ceiling, although still deficient in many types of vital equipment.

But while the curves of expansion of the brother services are thus leveling off, the Air Force expansion curve is to shoot upwards precipitately, and it is not to level off until annual Air Force expenditure is far above either Army or Navy expenditure. The kind of trouble this can give rise to is only too easy to imagine.

Building the Defense Establishment squarely around the Air Force; increasing the already vast defense budget by such huge further sums—these are serious steps to take. But the reasons why a greatly expanded Air Force is needed at this time are quite unanswerable.

First, the air defense of the continental United States is rapidly becoming a larger and larger job. The existing Soviet strategic air force, of imitation B-29's, is expanding. And at the recent air show in Moscow, the Soviets displayed a truly long-range heavy bomber of B-36 type, which air intelligence credits with a 5,000-mile striking radius.

Since the smaller and less costly standard Soviet heavy bomber can efficiently hit targets anywhere except in this hemisphere, the production of this huge, very long-range bomber can have only one purpose—to attack this country.

TWO JOBS AT ONCE

Second, the threat of the Soviet strategic air force, to our allies and to us, also increases the requirement for the American strategic Air Force.

It was originally designed solely to destroy the industrial vitals of the Russian war machine. Its first priority must now be the destruction of Soviet strategic air. Thus, in effect, the American strategic Air Force must now be built big enough to do two jobs at once.

Third, the importance of tactical air in ground war is now so great that General Eisenhower's staff has evolved a rule of the thumb—"The fewer divisions you have, the more air groups you need."

For the defense of Western Europe, it is necessary for General Eisenhower to have a tactical air force ready at all times for combat, which will be capable of dominating the very large Soviet tactical air force from the moment when the first shot is fired.

NO PROPAGANDA

These requirements, and the Soviet air threat that begets them are not mere dreams of air propagandists. The new Soviet bomber of B-36 type is not the 10-engine jet that has been wildly reported. It is a huge four-engine plane, of fairly conventional design. But it exists, has been photographed, and by the magic of the intelligence analysts has been shown to have approximately the characteristics given above.

Equally, the air force actually has in its hands a MIG-15 engine, and has more than ruefully examined the decidedly superior high-temperature alloys and remarkably skillful welding that make this the best jet engine now in production.

In plain language, the Soviets have now been proven capable of building air power on an all too impressive scale. And if we do not wish to commit national suicide, American air power cannot be allowed to fall behind.

Necessary Defense Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON C. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that it was very wise legislation on the part of the House to include in the passage of Senate bill 349 the provision as set forth in the amendment offered by Congressman DEANE, of North Carolina to give the Federal Housing Administration a one-and-a-half-billion-dollar increase in its authority to insure mortgages especially in those cases where the Government contracts had been let and contractors were ready to proceed with the construction of defense housing which could not proceed until the necessary backing was given by the Government to negotiate the loans with the banks and insurance companies.

Without the passage of this amendment these necessary housing construction programs are at a standstill. For example, in the State of North Carolina, there is a project for the construction of 1,421 housing units at the Marine Corps Air Station at Cherry Point, N. C., which is being absolutely held up because of the difficulty in financing same since the features of the Federal National Mortgage Association have not been reenacted to cover a situation of this character. In addition, there are a number of units to be constructed at Fort Bragg, N. C., of the same character under the same plan with the contracts already let, but whose construction is being held up because the contractor is unable to make financial arrangements because of the absence of the Federal National Mortgage Association provisions.

There is also in the South Carolina area a housing project of 500 housing units at Shaw Field, S. C., the construction of which is being held up for the same reason. These are just some of the housing units that are being necessarily constructed in military facilities in North Carolina and South Carolina and the same is true throughout the country generally where military housing is necessary because of the inability of the contractors to make necessary financial arrangements.

The contractors have reached a dead-end street in the matter unless the amendment offered by Congressman DEANE is passed. They are unable to handle the construction program with either the banks or life insurance companies for the reason that these institutions cannot afford to accept the mortgage bonds unless they are definitely supported by legislation as provided for in Congressman DEANE's amendment.

I understand that some several weeks ago the President by procedure authorized home and housing agencies through the Federal National Mortgage Associa-

tion, to purchase as much as \$350,000,000 of the Wherry bill title VIII military housing mortgages, but the banks on contacting the heads of the agency cannot secure a written commitment to purchase, as they were not authorized to issue written commitments for purchase by law.

Congressman DEANE's amendment would authorize these commitments, would solve the situation, would finance this necessary construction in a practical way and permit all of these necessary defense construction projects to proceed to a satisfactory conclusion.

I sincerely hope that this amendment and its provisions will be included in the conference report and the necessary legal authority be furnished by Congress to complete this necessary construction of housing units in defense areas which is so vitally important to the development of our national defense program.

Inactive Reservist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following newspaper article by Hal Clancy which appeared in a recent issue of the Boston Traveler, Boston, Mass.:

INACTIVE RESERVE GETS DIRTIEST DEAL—MANY OFFICERS STILL IN KOREA ZONE WHILE ACTIVE RESERVISTS NOT CALLED

(By Hal Clancy)

The inactive reservist continues to get the Nation's dirtiest deal—and no one seems in a mood to do anything about it.

These men—who accepted no pay for being in the Reserve, who had their contract with the Government changed after they had signed it—are being victimized for the casual convenience of the services.

Take the case of Lieutenant A; it's typical of many:

Lieutenant A was a combat infantryman in World War II and was commissioned in battle. Upon discharge, he stayed in the inactive reserve with the tacit understanding he would be called only in event of all-out war.

He was 35 years old when his recall came. He told his wife and three children that it was a mistake because he was over age in grade for a combat platoon leader. That's what he thought.

After a brief training period, he was flown to Japan and Korea. At 35, he was assigned to a rifle platoon which he led until he was wounded and hospitalized in Japan.

At home, his wife sold their small house and took a tiny apartment. She protested to her Congressman that it wasn't fair for her husband to be overseas when most of the Nation's paid Active Reservists had not been called.

The Congressman agreed it was a very sad thing. Period.

Lieutenant A was released from the hospital after a few weeks and told to stand by for shipping orders. The shipping orders came all right—back to Korea.

That's where he is now.

Lieutenant B is another case—also typical:

This officer was more than 30 years of age and had served 4 years during the last war, three of them overseas. World War II had forced him to close a small business he had started, but he reopened it when he was discharged.

He did pretty well. It wasn't easy. For 2 years he had to take an extra job—nights—to make up the money he was losing. The third year he broke even. The fourth year he showed a small profit.

It seemed as though 1950 would be his first really successful year. It looked like the opportunity to buy the house he and his wife and two children were renting.

He was recalled and sent to a southern camp. Back home, those of his friends who were accepting regular pay from the services for being in the Reserves, kept their jobs and civilian status.

For the second time, war had forced him to close a business. But the second time was infinitely more tragic than the first—because he seemed on the threshold of success, and he was older.

Lieutenant B is in Korea now.

The Defense Department has admitted that inactive reservists were called up in panic because those charged with our defenses had woefully underestimated the emergency until it was upon us. The Defense Department said it planned to do something about it.

That was several months ago. It's true that the Defense Department did discharge some Inactive Reserve enlisted men—and deferred others because of age or dependents.

But officers were the real sufferers. With them, age didn't seem to matter. Dependents definitely didn't.

College students were deferred. Active Reserves were required to perform certain drills—but were not called except in scattered instances, or when they volunteered.

This, of course, is by no means the fault of the Active Reserves. They have provided, in the present emergency, our greatest hope for security while the services were frantically trying to mobilize.

But there were two definite reasons why the Inactive Reserves received callous and shabby treatment:

One reason—frankly admitted—was because the United States was caught short and the mobilizers just grabbed the cards of men who weren't assigned to organized units.

A more insidious reason—not admitted—is because many of the top brass felt a personal resentment toward men who didn't want to stay in the Active Reserve and—even though these men had served and fought and been wounded and decorated—the feeling too often was.

"Give them the business"

That's an actual quote. Those words were said to be by one Army official in an off-the-record discussion. How typical his attitude is of the service hierarchy, I don't know. There is reason to suspect it is shared by many in authority.

Report on the New England Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Christian

XCVII—App.—329

Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., of Thursday, August 16, 1951:

REPORT ON NEW ENGLAND ECONOMY CITES PROBLEMS OF AREA

(By Everett M. Smith)

BOSTON.—New England, although poorly endowed with natural resources in comparison with many other areas of the country, owes much today to its major attractions of scenery and recreational facilities.

An investigation into certain specific aspects of the area's economic development serves to explain the nature of New England's current problems.

New England's limited natural resources its slower growth of population, its labor and manufacturing prospects, its skilled management, its capital accumulation, and its income payments all are brought into sharp focus in the study of the area's economy—transmitted recently to President Truman by his council of economic advisers.

This detailed study serves to demonstrate that the failure of New England to grow or expand its industries as fast as the Nation as a whole is not a matter of recent origin.

Nor is it a condition peculiar to New England, the report shows. There have been great variations in the economic trends of older regions.

Whereas New England's relative rise in manufacturing was largely concentrated in the first half of the nineteenth century, the Middle West has been advancing for the last 150 years, the study shows.

Finally, it is pointed out that there have been significant differences between the rates of growth of northern New England and southern New England.

WATER RESOURCES CITED

The area's natural resources played an important part during the colonial period—particularly its forests and its fisheries. New England's forests, the survey shows, cover a larger proportion of its land area—77 percent—than in any other region of the country.

Although the ocean fisheries off New England have lost some of their relative importance, a solution of some of their present problems, the report indicates, would increase that industry's contribution to support of the entire region.

Water is seen as another of New England's outstanding natural resources, with average rainfall providing adequate supplies for both industrial and consumer use. Water power also was a major factor in the original location and prosperity of the region's textile and paper industries.

With the development of electrical power, proximity to water power became less important, although about one-fourth of the area's electric power is still generated by its rivers and streams, and there is opportunity for much further development of New England's water power, the report states.

Meanwhile, the rapid development of one of New England's major natural resources—its recreational attractions—continues. New England's vacation industry grossed approximately \$850,000,000 in 1949.

So much for New England's natural resources.

Its population trends are another thing. In 1809, one in every five Americans lived in New England. But, by 1950, this figure had changed to 1 in 16.

"We can easily be misled by these figures," the report emphasizes. "Despite the failure of New England's population to grow as rapidly as the Nation as a whole, there has been and still is continuous growth in absolute terms."

Even the growth of population in New England has been by no means equal among the various States. Southern New England has more nearly maintained its share of the

total population of the country since 1809 than has northern New England.

There are two distinct periods recognizable in the history of New England's population growth during the past 150 years. During the first half of the nineteenth century, the three northern States speeded ahead of those of southern New England. This was due to the agricultural, forestry, and fishery resources available in that section.

COMPLACENCY SEEN

During the past 100 years the situation has been reversed.

Going further, the report turns to the characteristics of New England's labor force, which is significantly large in relation to total population. Also, the report shows that New England's industry benefits to some extent from the higher-than-average education of its labor force.

The average New Englander, the study reveals, has received 8.8 years of schooling, as compared with 8.4 years for the Nation as a whole. However, the proportion of the region's inhabitants who attended college is not as high as it is in some other areas.

Hope is expressed by the compilers of the report that a greater clarification of some of these problems of declining industry may result in aid by private initiative, or by Federal, State, or local governments.

Coming forthrightly to the point, the survey asserts that, to some extent, New England's manufacturing success in the nineteenth century and the early part of the twentieth seems to have bred lethargy and complacency among some New England industrialists.

These factors, it is asserted, have handicapped the region in its competition with newer areas.

The Fights of Bishop Sheil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 17, 1951

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Saul Alinsky from the Catholic Digest:

THE FIGHTS OF BISHOP SHEIL

(By Saul Alinsky)

It was 1939. The CIO was young, bursting with energy, surging with wild dreams. A whole new world was coming around the corner. General Motors, Chrysler, U. S. Steel—they were all going down like tenpins before the bowling drive of the CIO.

Chicago, a really tough town, had shrugged its shoulders and sloughed off the CIO. But the CIO kept coming. In Back-of-the-Yards, Chicago's nationally famous jungle, 25,000 Poles, Slovaks, Negroes, Germans, Irish, Lithuanians, and Mexican-Americans were banded together in the CIO. They were heading for the great showdown with the meat packers. Neither side asked quarter or gave any.

Then it broke, news editors shook their heads unbelievably, and asked for a reckoning on the story. It was true. Chicago's Catholic Bishop Sheil was going to open the packinghouse workers' last-ditch-strike mass meeting. And he would appear on the same platform with CIO chief, John L. Lewis. It would be the first time that a Catholic prelate had publicly appeared with the bulldog-faced labor leader since the beginning of the CIO. The bishop's presence would be taken as a

church blessing of the cause of the workers. It would torpedo the entire publicity campaign of the packers, which said the CIO was a Communist conspiracy.

But the fight was for stakes higher than the man on the street dreams about. All the chips were blue, and they were all down. Everything went. If a Catholic bishop had to go, too, it was just too bad.

Yet, after all, he was a bishop, and entitled to a warning. He was warned not to show. His life was threatened. A bullet shattered the window of a restaurant where he was lunching.

On the night of July 16, 1939, the bishop "showed." He showed, even though Chicago police had to clear eight blocks between his office and the Coliseum, and a personal bodyguard of 50 police had to be assigned for protection. Once there, 20,000 packing-house workers inside the Coliseum, and 10,000 standing outside, took over. They would have torn to bits anyone who as much as looked sideways at their "good Little Bishop."

The Little Bishop made history that night. He did not plead for the peaceful, orderly way of democracy. He demanded it; he fought for it. Alternately praising and scolding the workers, he went on to denounce the meat trust mercilessly. He fought, with all he had, to prevent the strike. He knew the passions of the times and what must happen when thousands of men who earned their living using knives, went to war. And he won. The union won. There was no strike. The democratic process prevailed. The democratic cause went forward.

For days afterward, the packing-house workers kept saying that Shell had pitched another no-hitter. They knew the bishop's background. It went back to 1906, when Bishop Shell, then Benny Shell, pitched for small, unknown St. Viator College against the University of Illinois, Big Ten baseball champions for the year. Shell pitched a no-hit victory against a team from which seven members went on to the major leagues. Benny Shell turned down four major-league offers.

Ever since he has played against the kind of opposition in which he has had to pitch almost constant no-hit ball. On issue after issue Shell has calmly and courageously enunciated and acted in accordance with the most radical doctrine known in the history of mankind: Christianity.

Bernard James Shell was born February 18, 1888, in a small, poor flat over a coal yard on Chicago's shabby west side. The house was shaken alternately by the horse-drawn coal wagons, with their regular dumping of tons of coal, and the elevated trains. Here Bernard grew up, a laughing, tough west-side kid, who never ducked an argument. More important, he never ducked the fight that invariably followed. His gang called him Benny, and Benny it was ever since.

He worshiped his mother, Rosella Shell, and he took it for granted that everyone else did, too. Rosella, or Mother Shell, as she was known to hundreds, kept open house every day and night. That quaking, 5-room flat was security and home for those in hunger and in need. There was always a giant pot of boiling coffee, and a mammoth kettle of stew on the wood-burning stove. People were constantly coming in for a meal, and young Benny Shell never forgot the sight of his hungry visitors.

His father, James B. Shell, was possessed of an incredible thirst for knowledge, for knowledge's sake. He was a graduate of Rush Medical School, yet never practiced medicine. He was a graduate of the Illinois College of Pharmacy, yet never pursued pharmacy. He was a registered certified public accountant, but never professionally audited a single ledger. Why? No one really knew, except that Jim Shell wanted to know about things, and when he knew he went on to other fields.

Jim Shell went into the coal-and-ice business. He was Irish, and that was the business for Irishmen. He prospered and became active in politics. Then one of the Democratic Party chiefs sent down the word that a certain businessman in the neighborhood was to be forced out of business for political reasons. Jim Shell refused to be a party to this action. He told the political bigwig, "You are putting precinct politics above Christian charity." Jim fought ballot stealing. The machine went out to get him. A campaign of political persecution finally succeeded in breaking his heart. Once he turned to young Benny and said, "Power without Christian charity is truly the devil at work." And Benny never forgot.

Young Benny went to St. Columbkille's Parochial School, St. Viator's College, and its seminary. On May 21, 1910, Benny Shell became Father Shell. He was assigned as an assistant to St. Mel Church, and Father Shell again was back on the West Side. Then the First World War broke out, and Father Shell became a chaplain at Great Lakes Naval Training Station.

With the war's end, Father Shell was assigned to Holy Name Cathedral, Chicago. He was given also the additional duties of Catholic chaplain for the Cook County jail. Here he saw human misery at its worst. He walked in many a death march to the gallows. Here he became deeply conscious, not only of criminals but of a society largely responsible for their crimes. And once again Father Shell did not forget.

In 1924 Cardinal Mundelein, of Chicago, named Father Shell chancellor of the Chicago archdiocese. On young Father Shell's shoulders rested the main burden of administration of the affairs of the largest Catholic archdiocese in the world. In 1926 Father Shell led in the planning and was treasurer of the Twenty-eighth International Eucharistic Congress in Chicago. For this he was made a monsignor. Two years later Pope Pius XI named Monsignor Shell auxiliary bishop of Chicago.

In 1930, with the blessing of Cardinal Mundelein, Bishop Shell founded the now-famous Catholic Youth Organization of America, more familiarly known as the CYO.

The movement now extends through the United States, Canada, and Hawaii. Its religious, athletic, educational, vocational, and social-service programs are open to youth of all creeds and colors—thousands of non-Catholics are in it.

The bishop's interests are translated into numerous projects. He began, and now operates, the Lewis School of Science and Technology, the Master-Eye Dog Foundation, two social centers in Chicago, the West Side Community Center, and on the South Side the Shell House, the CYO boys' camp, the Mercy Mission, a special Puerto Rican program, an FM radio station, the Shell School, and extensive city-wide summer supervised recreation programs.

Behind all these projects comes the practical question: Where do the scads of money required come from? I asked Bishop Shell that question. "God provides, as He always does," he replied.

However, there are a goodly number of affluent Americans who report, "Well, maybe the bishop's answer is right, but our checking accounts take a beating when he shows up." One prominent financier told me, "You know, I'm opposed to practically everything that Bishop Shell represents. I don't like his stands on labor, housing, and lots of other things. I'm not even sure that I like his brand of Christianity. Furthermore, whenever he comes to me, I know it's for just one thing—money. Each year I say to myself, 'This time the bishop doesn't get a red cent.' Just like the last time. Well, he didn't get a red cent; he got \$15,000."

The bishop appreciates the fact that the way to a man's heart is through his stomach.

Once a year the Knights of Columbus give their annual barbecue, with the proceeds going to the good little bishop. The take is substantial.

Chicago's corned-beef-and-cabbage dinner is famous. Once a year, in the largest hotel ballroom in Chicago, more than 2,000 dinner guests sit down to a plate of corned beef and cabbage at \$10 a plate. At a long speakers' table sit the city's dignitaries and every sports editor in town. On a platform are the best current entertainers in the stage and screen world, doing their best, for free. As for the audience—well, as Herb Graffis, news columnist, who was acting as master of ceremonies one year, said, "Fellow suckers, now that you are here, the bishop has ordered the doors closed and we will put the gun on you for all you've got."

But ask any newsboy or panhandler who the worst sucker or "softest touch" in Chicago is, and he'll tell you, with an affectionate caress to each word, "The little bishop. He's good for a buck to a sawbuck anytime, anywhere, and place."

Bishops are people, and all work and no play would make them dull, too. But even those who play with the bishop find the going hard, for on a golf course the 63-year-old bishop whacks the ball around in the low eighties. Or, if he is bowling, something is wrong when he bowls under 195.

He loves getting outdoors in sweatshirt, baseball cap, ball, and glove to throw a few. He still throws a "spitter," saying truculently, "According to baseball rules, all those using the spitball before it was outlawed can still use it, and I am one of those." It is not uncommon to see the bishop's priestly assistants nursing split fingers after the boss has tossed a few.

The bishop is a wizard at some of the so-called indoor recreations. Once, disturbed over reports of card playing and dice games among the members of one of his boxing teams, he accompanied them on their next trip. It took the kids a little time to start fading the bishop, but they did. In 2 hours, the bishop had won every nickel they had, and that ended the craps and cards. He returned the money to a chastened group of fighters. The way the bishop can roll sevens and elevens has made some folks say, "You know, if he wasn't a bishop, I'd think—but he is a bishop."

These same fingers are pretty expert on the piano, and he is completely at home with the masters. He loves good music, and his record collection is one of the best.

Driven by a burning passion to help children, Bishop Shell's search for the causes of juvenile delinquency inevitably brought him face to face with the delinquencies of our social order. He uncovered the foul sores of a society filled with the pus of prejudice, racial discrimination, anti-Semitism, economic injustice, poor housing, disease, and inadequate medical care. At first he was appalled, then consumed with anger. His capacity for indignation is as deep as his sense of justice and Christianity.

He has never forgotten the incident that took place some years ago in one of his CYO summer schools. A rugged 6-year-old youngster regularly attended each daily session, rain or shine, and just as regularly disappeared immediately after being given his free half-pint bottle of milk. One day a curious priest trailed the youngster to a crumbling shack and found the child carefully dividing the milk into three portions for his 4-year-old sister, 2-year-old brother, and a 6-month-old infant. For himself he kept none. When the bishop tells the story, his emotions are mixed between tears and anger. He says, "That boy will always haunt me; and I will stop at nothing to wipe out conditions like that."

The bishop does not pull his punches on any issue, including the dynamite-laden subject of labor and capital. He is for the guaranteed annual wage, for adequate—and he

means really adequate—unemployment compensation, and even more. "The labor union, as a recognized social and economic force, must have a voice, along with capital, in the management of industry. The time has long since passed when labor will be satisfied with what is left over."

On discrimination the bishop really swings from the floor: "The Negro has not received a square deal, an honest deal, nor a new deal from white America. Times without number, he has been denied a job simply because he was black. He is not accepted on an equal plane in the drawing rooms of the white group. In some parts of the country his vote is sidetracked by legal tricks. The Negro is denied entrance to many of our educational institutions. Some of these, unhappily, are Catholic. Even where separate educational facilities are provided, the Negro receives second-rate equipment and teaching. He is pushed into undesirable living quarters, frequently indescribably filthy and unfit for human habitation. How long are we going to continue to give second-class privileges to first-class citizens?"

On anti-Semitism, the bishop has curtly commented, "The only Jew the gentile need fear is the imaginary one he has created in his own mind."

However, it is not so much what the bishop says as what he does. Just before Pearl Harbor, the bishop, overriding the protests of associates, went unannounced and uninvited to a mass meeting sponsored by a number of groups, such as the Christian Front. Here, in a hall full of hate, Bishop Bernard Shell for 15 tense minutes denounced anti-Semitism, white supremacy, and every vile lie that had been bellowed by a demagogue on the platform. The audience listened restlessly, glaring, seething with hostility.

Finally, he ended, turned, and slowly began to walk out down the center aisle. Suddenly the silence was shattered by a scream of anger. It came from a fanatical old woman who stepped out and blocked the bishop's way just as he was passing her row. She shrieked, "I'm a Catholic, but you, you—you're not a Catholic bishop. G—— you! Nigger lover! Jew lover! A bishop! Ha, ha! Rabbi Shell!"

Now completely hysterical, she deliberately cleared her throat, and with all her strength spat over one side of the bishop's face. The bishop did not raise his hand to wipe it off. By this time, most of the people were standing on their chairs. A mad roar began and suddenly died. The bishop, with the dignity of immortality, had turned the other cheek! He waited. The old woman froze, as did hundreds about her. Then, as though a sudden chill had gripped her, she began to shake violently. What an instant before had been a mob of snarling faces became hundreds of lowered heads.

The bishop waited another moment, then spoke softly. "Rabbi? That is what they called our Lord." He walked out in silence.

Let Us Eliminate the Annual Appropriations Snarl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 17, 1951

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include an elucidating article on the annual congressional appropriations problem which appeared in the August

16, 1951, issue of the Wall Street Journal.

This editorial is a common-sense explanation of the reasons why the appropriations procedure becomes snarled and, by implication, urges Members of Congress to recognize and correct the repeated confusion that surrounds us each time this vitally important legislative responsibility comes up.

Without question the way to a sensible solution lies in the appointment of an adequate technical staff to solely engage in the preparation of information, not only for the Appropriations Committee members, but for every individual Member of Congress, as the basis for intelligent, economical action.

I urge my colleagues to read this article and join with those of us who are earnestly trying to promote the corrective remedy outlined. This article follows:

THE APPROPRIATIONS SNARL

Congress meets in January of each year. The Federal Government's fiscal year opens the following July 1. So to legislate the appropriation measures necessary to keep the Government functioning Congress has about 6 months.

Until recently this was considered ample time for the committees to frame the bills and for the House and Senate to pass them. As a matter of fact, in the days when each alternate session of Congress ended automatically on March 4, there was no great difficulty about passing the money bills before adjournment.

But for the last several sessions of Congress the beginning of the fiscal year has seen some of the money measures not finally passed, and to keep the various departments functioning Congress has had to resort to a make-shift device known as a continuing resolution. The present Congress has the record for a log-jam of appropriation measures.

This condition occurs not because recent Congresses are inferior to preceding Congresses. The various Members work just as long and hard as did their predecessors and they are no less conscientious.

What has happened is that the whole structure of Federal Government has become larger and more complex. In a day when a Federal budget of \$4,000,000,000 was considered large and when the activities of Government were comparatively simple, it was not a hard job for the committees concerned to hold hearings on requests for funds, frame a dozen pieces of legislation and get them through two Houses of Congress. It was not difficult for the committee members and their few technical assistants to have a good working knowledge of what was going on in the various Government departments.

The Government has grown to a size where all this is no longer possible.

When Congress comes into session it is confronted by what is known as the budget. The document is not a budget in any proper sense. It is merely the executive department's proposals for amounts of money to be spent. It contains literally tens of thousands of items, some of them small and some very large. Obviously no group of men meeting that imposing, telephone-book-size document for the first time can hope in a short period of months to investigate a fraction of the proposals it contains.

If Congress and its Appropriation Committees wished to take the executive proposals with only casual examination, they could do away with the delay in passing appropriation bills. It is because the committees of House and Senate insist on doing more than progress of the money bills seems so slow.

The difficulty is that the congressional system of investigating and passing appropriation bills no longer is adequate to the job entailed. It is as though General Motors was trying to get along on an accounting system which might be wholly adequate for a good size retail store.

What Congress needs is an expert staff which will familiarize itself with the so-called executive budget while it is in the process of creation. The staff itself need have no authority either to deny or encourage a proposed request for funds. But it could be given authority to assemble the information on which the request was based and this information would be ready for Congress when it assembled.

Before the request for an appropriation comes before Congress it must be approved by the Director of the Budget, an officer of the executive department. The Bureau of the Budget spends 12 months on the exclusive job of getting together the appropriation proposals. In half that time individual Congressmen who have a multiplicity of calls on their time are expected to investigate single handed what an organization of many people has produced.

Senator McCLELLAN, of Arkansas, has proposed a reform whereby Congress would have a trained staff of full-time technicians to assist it on appropriations. Such a measure is past due.

What Foreign Aid Is Costing the Taxpayers in the Ninth District of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, as we debate the ever-constant issue of where are we going to save the taxpayers' money, we ought to get the figures down to where the average taxpayers can understand them.

We sit here and toss off talk about billions and there are those closely connected with these debates who fail to realize just what those billions mean to the man on the street and on the farm. How, then, can we expect the people back home to get a clear picture of what Government spending does to them unless we get the talk down to figures we can easily grasp?

We are making a great show of saving money by putting the bite on Federal employees, by perhaps giving them a small salary increase, by increasing their hours of work, and by other methods without regard to the loyal, efficient service that is being rendered by thousands of these Government workers. I think we ought to go slow in holding up to ridicule all Government employees or we may find it hard to recruit capable, honest, and efficient workers in the future.

All the time I have been a Member of Congress, I have fought against Government waste, useless spending, inefficiency, all the things that run up the tax bill and are paid for by the men and women who toil in America.

I would like to point out where many billions of dollars of our taxes are going

and what it means to the people of my district.

The administration now has proposed a new budget for foreign aid of \$8,500,000,000. The people of Minnesota will pay \$153,850,000 of that sum.

In a further breakdown, I present the following figures which show how much the taxpayers in each of the 15 counties in the ninth district of Minnesota will pay toward that \$8,500,000,000. Red Lake County, with a population of only 6,805, will pay \$338,470. The largest county in my district, Ottertail, with a population of 51,094, will pay \$2,615,450 toward this new foreign-aid program. This means that every man, woman, and child in that county will pay more than \$50 toward this one particular expenditure and this is only one of many large expenditures in recent years.

When we get that \$8,500,000,000 broken down so that we can see what it means to the people we represent, maybe we should begin to study that item very carefully to see what can be done to reduce it. It may be found that it is not necessary.

The complete schedule of what the people in each of the 15 counties in my district will pay is as follows:

Ninth Congressional District (Minnesota's share of the \$8,500,000,000 foreign-aid cost is \$153,850,000)

County	Population	Percent of total State population	Estimated cost to county
Norman	12,851	0.0042	\$646,170
Mahnomen	6,998	.0023	353,850
Clay	30,202	.01	1,538,500
Becker	24,691	.0082	1,261,570
Pennington	12,953	.0043	601,550
Red Lake	6,805	.0022	338,470
Polk	35,863	.0119	1,830,810
Clearwater	10,158	.0033	507,700
Kittson	9,622	.0032	492,320
Roseau	14,491	.0048	738,480
Lake of the Woods	4,904	.0016	246,160
Marshall	16,208	.0054	830,790
Beltrami	24,850	.0082	1,261,570
Wilkin	10,542	.0035	538,470
Ottertail	51,094	.017	2,615,450
Total			13,861,860

Inflation Unlimited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, despite all of the administration claims as to the efficacy of price control and of the necessity of the heavily staffed OPS, a report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report acknowledges, perhaps unwittingly, that it expects a steady continuation of inflation and a steadily continued decrease in the purchasing power of the dollar for at least the next 3 years.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include the comments of Mr. Paul O. Peters, well-known student and writer on economics and governmental

expenditures, made in a bulletin issued today. In this statement Mr. Peters calls attention to the anticipated Federal expenditures for the next 5 years and to the anticipated inflationary effect of these projected expenditures. In addition, he reduces to terms of the purchasing power of the dollar the inflation forecasts made in the committee report. Mr. Peters' bulletin is as follows:

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE CONFUSED AND UNINFORMED ABOUT THE ECONOMIC CRISIS WHICH MAY OCCUR IN THE NEXT 5 YEARS

(By Paul O. Peters)

The Joint Committee on the Economic Report, so-called, in a recent committee print of materials prepared by the committee staff and entitled "National Defense and the Economic Outlook," brings out certain forecasts which are worth serious consideration by all American citizens.

The forecast reveals the confidence of the committee's staff that the present administration is sufficiently entrenched in office that the spending at an accelerated rate will go on well into the fiscal year 1956. This is illustrated by table 1, on page 36 of the committee print, which indicates that funds totaling \$445,000,000,000 will be available for expenditure to June 30, 1956. This table, which can be interpreted in more ways than one, is as follows:

TABLE 1.—Authorizations, total funds available, and administrative budget expenditures for Defense Department military functions, actual fiscal year 1951, estimated 1952-56

[Billions of dollars]					
Fiscal year	Brought forward, prior years	Net new authority	Total funds available	Budget expenditures	Carry over to next year
1951	9.4	47.6	57.0	19.2	37.8
1952	37.8	60.7	98.5	40.0	58.5
1953	58.5	45.0	103.5	55.5	48.0
1954	48.0	35.0	83.0	50.0	33.0
1955	33.0	35.0	68.0	40.0	28.0
1956	28.0	35.0	63.0	35.0	28.0

The total new spending authority estimated for the five fiscal years 1952 through 1956, plus the carry-over of \$9,400,000,000 from 1951, less the carry-over to fiscal 1957 of \$28,000,000,000 indicates military expenditures estimated at \$192,100,000,000 for the 5-year period.

Total budgetary expenditures of the Federal Government for the same 5 years are estimated to be as follows: 1952, \$68,400,000,000; 1953, \$87,300,000,000; 1954, \$84,000,000,000; 1955, \$72,000,000,000; 1956, \$60,000,000,000; the total for 5 years being \$371,700,000,000.

The estimated expenditures of all governments, Federal, State, and local, for 1952, are put at \$77,000,000,000; for 1953 at \$92,500,000,000; and for 1954 at \$90,500,000,000.

At page 39 of the committee print another table projects the Federal administrative budget expenditures and receipts for the fiscal years 1952 through 1954. This table, No. 7, is summarized as follows:

[Billions of dollars]		
Fiscal year	Expenditures (estimated)	Receipts, estimated (including House increases to tax)
1952	61.4	68.4
1953	87.3	66.0
1954	84.0	70.0
Total	232.7	204.4

This would result in an estimated deficit of \$28,300,000,000 in the 3-year period.

The inflationary effect of the Federal spending is reflected in table 3, at page 37, where the index reflecting the purchasing power of the dollar at 1950 levels is shown as follows:

1950	100.0
1951	110.6
1952	119.3
1953	124.6
1954	128.1

In practical terms, this report indicates that the purchasing power of the dollar will decline from the 1950 level as follows:

1950	\$1.0000
1951	.9041
1952	.8382
1953	.8025
1954	.7806

The estimated depreciation in the purchasing power of the dollar shown by this table is at a rate faster than interest accumulates on investments in Federal savings bonds, or almost any current security.

It is an indicator that the progress of inflation, spurred by Federal spending also encourages people to spend in order to beat off the losses to savings caused by inflation.

This situation poses new problems for both public and private fiscal and budgetary management. The huge appropriations made by the Congress during the present session are indicative of a growing tendency to appropriate faster than the bureaucrats can spend or obligate the appropriated funds. For example, on August 10, 1951, the daily Treasury statement reports the amount to the credit of disbursing officers and certain agencies of the Government was \$59,177,428.485. The funds in the Treasury amounted to \$5,510,712,863. Before the balance of the funds credited to the disbursing officers can be spent it must either be collected as revenues or borrowed from the banks and the public.

We are in a period of "frenzied finance," with no one able to say what the dollar will buy in 1956.

Let Us Stay on Guard Against Inflation Dangers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 17, 1951

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include a very pertinent editorial entitled "Weak Defense Bill" which appeared in the August 11, 1951, issue of the magazine America.

As one who vainly fought for a stronger Defense Production Act, particularly with respect to sensible temporary control of price rises and protection for our average consumers, against the disastrous consequences of inflation, I commend this succinct presentation of the essential deficiencies of the current act.

I earnestly hope that, with the first evidences of unbridled and unrestrained profit gouging by unpatriotic operators, which will destroy the general economic stability of this country, the Congress will take the necessary corrective action.

The editorial follows:

WEAK DEFENSE BILL

About the best that can be said of the 1951 Defense Production Act is that it could have been worse. For a time it appeared that Congress might send a bill to the White House which would positively invite inflation. The new law, while weaker than the one it replaces, will at least enable the administration to fight a rear-guard action against further price rises and, with luck, slow them down to a trot.

So far as we can see now, the chief weaknesses in the law are these:

1. It prohibits the rollbacks of beef prices scheduled for August and October.
2. It continues to give the green light to farm prices.
3. It renders extremely difficult the job of rolling back prices of manufactured goods which have gotten out of line, or even of keeping industrial prices at their present level.
4. It denies authority to maintain slaughtering quotas, without which OPS will find it difficult to halt black markets in meat.
5. It does not permit the administration to control commercial rents.
6. It weakens the Federal Reserve Board's tight controls over installment buying.
7. It leaves the control agencies inadequately equipped to enforce their regulations.
8. It denies to the administration power to curb speculation in the commodity markets.

Some of the Congressmen responsible for this flabby bill have argued that indirect controls (taxes, savings, credit controls) are a much more effective answer to inflation than direct controls (ceilings on wages and prices). The sincerity of this argument may be judged by the reaction of these same gentlemen to the President's request for an additional \$10,000,000,000 in taxes and to the Federal Reserve Board's recent plea that Congress do nothing to weaken its curbs over consumer credit. In the new defense bill, they gravely undermined FRB's controls over installment buying of automobiles and other durables, and now they are talking of giving the President not much more than half the taxes he wants. Yet they profess to be staunch proponents of "indirect" controls.

The fact is that the southern Democrat-Republican coalition is gambling that present consumer apathy to the threat of inflation will endure until after the next election. Meanwhile they have earned the gratitude and support of almost all the major pressure groups in the country. Politically, the gamble may pay off. If it does not, however, if prices, following the present lull, blow upward again, the coalition will have badly served the Nation's welfare.

In this connection, a passage from the June 3 pastoral of the Spanish archbishops is very apropos. Describing the duty of the state to assure the basic needs of the masses in a period of inflation, they write:

"In normal times prices are regulated by market transactions. However, in periods of production shortages, inflation, and high living costs, a legal ceiling price is advisable which assures the producer a fair profit but, at the same time, prevents any abuses by his taking advantages of shortages to extort prices which are higher than the just maximum and which make goods inaccessible to the masses."

To the extent that the new law does not permit the administration to fix and hold fair prices, Congress has failed in its duty to the country. It has violated that justice which dictates that the burdens of society be equitably apportioned, and which moralists call "distributive." In these days when a Senate subcommittee is studying the problem of morality, as distinguished from legality, in Government, this ethical observation may be of some interest.

Penny-Wise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 17, 1951

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the whole Nation is awakened to an apparent lack of morals. Pointed up by several recent events the people are alarmed over the circumstances. Mr. D. A. Huley, president, United States Chamber of Commerce, recently stated:

There is need for a code of ethics in government. The science of government has become a profession. It should have markers warning all who enter such a profession against betraying the public trust.

The evidence of loose morals in all walks of life and in various enterprises brings to my mind this thought: Do the people of America, who are shocked and aroused by any impropriety or misdemeanor on the part of West Point cadets or Government officials, ever bother to look at their own actions, and see where the trouble really lies?

Does the purchasing agent who wrote to me, berating the general who allowed someone to pick up the bill for his 2-day stay in a hotel, ever bother to think about those dinners and drinks which the various salesmen bought for him? And the executive who is shocked at "Government corruption," does he ever look at his own expense account and be able to say in all truthfulness that he has not padded it, even a little bit? And the controller of a small business firm, who wrote to me condemning the RFC, did he remember how many times he had contacted a Senator or a Congressman asking them to exert pressure in behalf of his firm's application for accelerated amortization certificate? And the parents, who are shocked by the spreading use of narcotics by our youth, did they ever stop to think whether they have conscientiously performed their duty in giving their children the home they should have and in bringing them up in moral principles? And the businessman, the preacher, the man on the street—do they look at their own actions before they start condemning others?

The ethics and the morality of the entire country, not only of a few persons in the public limelight, are lower today than ever before. Just pick up any newspaper, and you will see that it is so. If we want to remain a strong nation, we cannot allow our strength to be sapped and rotted from within.

Ethics in public officials must always be above reproach. It is a sorry state when those entrusted with public faith and good, desecrate their trust and abuse their positions for personal gains. I hope that the congressional committees on ethics in Government may restore a high level of ethics in our national politics, and show the way for similar reform on State and local levels.

And I also hope that the people of this country—the people who elect their own officials and expect them to be above re-

proach—will choose their representatives with care and, having chosen them, give them a like measure in return. For unless we clean house in our private affairs and regain that strength which comes from abiding by principles, we cannot very well expect our officials not to be tainted by our own weaknesses. After all, the public official is only a human being, and he will always have a tendency to act the way those around him do.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article, Penny-Wise, by Maurice R. Franks, editor of Partners, the magazine of labor and management.

I recommend his message to the Members of Congress:

PENNY-WISE—IF WE WOULD WIN BETTER MEN AS GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS, EDUCATORS, AND LABOR LEADERS, WE'LL HAVE TO DROP REAL CASH IN THE KITTY

We Americans have managed pretty well throughout our history to avoid pitfalls of false economy. We discovered fairly early in the game the futility of pinching mere pennies when such meant pinching off future dollars. We have learned well the basic rule of investment. The Scriptural statement, "As ye sow so shall ye reap," has made a lot of sense to the business minds of our Nation. Dollars, not pennies, were sown by American enterprise; hence the harvest has been in gold rather than in copper.

Americans, in a word, have been dollar-wise—not penny-wise. The result of our economic wisdom has been our exalted standard of living—a standard which is the envy of the entire world.

To appreciate the scope of our bright and continuing harvest, we need only pause long enough to realize that our dollars, even while financing the reconstruction of most of the civilized world, are still numerous enough to provide the vast majority of our own people with every essential, along with an incredible inventory of pure luxuries.

No; surely we Americans have no reason to hang our heads when less successful people point fingers of scorn at our coffers and taunt us for our dollar wisdom. If anything there be for which we should be ashamed, it is that our dollar wisdom is not as yet complete—that in a shocking number of vital instances we are still penny-wise and dollar foolish.

The situation is all the more shameful because of who and what we are—and because it is we, more than any other nation, who have come up with the right economic answers.

THE CASE OF THE UNDERPAID

Two streams of poison afflict our American way of life. The one is mediocrity. The other is crookedness.

Both, unfortunately, descend from the high places and dribble their paralyzing potions down across the entire face of our national life and into the deepest reservoirs of our future security.

We suffer from mediocrity and corruption in Government. We suffer from both poisons in the field of education. The dual affliction is obvious in many social services—particularly in the profession of labor leadership.

In each instance, the reason for this deadly condition is the same—insufficient investment—penny wisdom and dollar foolishness. And in each instance the remedy, tested and true, is already written in gold in the book of American accomplishment.

PENNY ANTE FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Have mediocrity and corruption made of government in the United States a top-heavy and inefficient machine—one which is

completely out of step with the powerful and efficient machine represented by our industry? All right, we are getting precisely what we pay for. In hiring governments to represent us, we offer each officeholder comparatively speaking—a pittance. And that goes for all Government officials, from the small ward politician to the highest officeholders in Washington.

By offering small change for running the largest and most complex Government machinery in the world, we attract mostly small change in terms of human capacity and integrity. By setting up a scale of remuneration we otherwise pay to average men, we get exactly what we pay for: mostly average men, with their modest store of experience and their limited ability in the handling of out-size problems. By playing penny ante for Government service, we staff our public offices for the most part with men whose horizons are circumscribed and whose spirit of enterprise does not go beyond an unenlightened willingness to indulge in a bit of a killing whenever and however they can.

If our halls of Government swarm with two-for-a-cent characters—when billion-dollar decisions are confided to their inadequate care—we have only ourselves to blame for the obvious results of penny wisdom.

Until we rise to the occasion and make a proper investment in good government, we are doomed to witness a continuance in office of just such a squander trust as is losing billions of our good dollars today. Worse, we shall be progressively afflicted by armies of petty government job holders morally and temperamentally prepared to sell out. Already the boys in the Kremlin are licking their chops over the prospect, based on current symptoms.

Here again, penny wisdom on our part can turn out to be the open sesame to Moscow's dearest hopes for this country. Here again, dollar wisdom—sound and lavish investment—is immediately called for.

Labor leadership is a fast-moving and responsible profession. No other profession, it is safe to say, comes closer to holding the keys to our future as a nation. All right, with what kind of material are we going to people this profession. With rats and racketeers? With stumblebums and ignorant? With short-sighted contractors for socialism? Or with men of superior intelligence, moral fiber and social vision? We'll get what we pay for—make no mistake about that. The choice is up to us.

NOT A HOPELESS PICTURE

The picture is not a pleasant one, most of us will admit. Government, education, labor leadership—three powerful machines manned by individuals who, in character and capacity, but slightly resemble the men in better-paid walks of life who through the years have created American industry and commerce and enabled all of us to realize a fabulous return on their investment. The picture is not a pleasant one because of the damage our long neglect has piled up in our midst. But the picture is not a hopeless one.

With the book of the past open on our knee, the answer to our dilemma is clearly defined. In exploration, industry, commerce, finance, etc.—in all that is wrapped up in our American business world—we have invested heavily in the excellence which resides in our people, and have reaped a mighty harvest. In government, education and labor as a profession, the field is still fertile. As we sow, so shall we reap. This we know from experience. Here, as elsewhere, the dollar must be our trusted servant. We cannot afford to be penny-wise.

Joe E. Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 17, 1951

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, one of God's great noblemen will receive a well-deserved honor of recognition from his country tomorrow, August 18, 1951.

Joe E. Brown, a native of Ohio, actor and public servant, will receive a certificate of appreciation from the Department of the Army for outstanding and conspicuous patriotic service.

I know of no American who has given more unselfishly of his time and energy to the Armed Forces of his country than has Joe E. Brown.

It was my honor to serve as a war correspondent during World War II in the South Pacific. Much of my service was with Ohio's Thirty-seventh Division. In June of 1945 Joe E. Brown came to that division on Luzon in the Philippines while the division was committed to combat. He brought to those war-weary veterans of 3 years of jungle warfare great inspiration as well as entertainment.

Mr. Speaker, I saw Joe E. Brown with troops in the front lines; he visited with them; he brought them messages of encouragement and stories from home. I saw him entertain, on an improvised platform, a group of the One Hundred and Forty-fifth Infantry Regiment while under fire—interrupted by small-arms fire and the operations of tanks. He was the first American to enter the town of Baombong at the time of its liberation. It was "Hi, Joe," every time a GI saw him. They were all his "kids" and he loved them as they loved him.

He made 11 trips during World War II. He went to every theater of operation: Alaska, southwestern Pacific and Pacific itself, China, India, North Africa, Sicily, Italy, France, Germany, and so forth.

He will receive three awards: First, certificate of appreciation; second, citation; third, lapel button.

The Honorable Frank C. Pace, Jr., will personally present the awards. This is the highest recognition the Army can give a civilian.

The Army will be well represented by members of the higher staff, including Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Gen. John E. Hull, Vice Chief of Staff, United States Army, who have all volunteered to show respect to Joe E. Brown for his valiant service.

The certificate of appreciation will read as follows:

CITATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPRECIATION

Joe E. Brown, actor and public servant, for outstanding and conspicuous patriotic service to the Department of the Army. During war years and in peacetime, Joe E. Brown has generously and untiringly given of his time and talents to bring happiness and entertainment to the soldiers of the United States

Army wherever they were stationed. At no time has he refused the call to serve his fellow Americans under arms and has willingly traveled to remote places to entertain and talk with soldier personnel. He was the lone personality to volunteer to welcome the first Army personnel returning from Korea. His gracious personality and wholesome entertainment have won him an enduring place in the hearts of Army personnel and his patriotic service to his Nation merits the recognition of all his fellow Americans and the thanks and appreciation of the Department of the Army.

Federal Affairs Forum Celebrates First Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 17, 1951

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on August 19, 1951, television station WATV in Newark, N. J., will celebrate 1 year of programming the popular Federal Affairs Forum.

During these times, when there are so many threats to democracy and our way of life, accurate and reliable information is more than ever necessary. WATV has been televising Members of both the House and Senate from New York and New Jersey, as well as chiefs of various bureaus and departments of the Federal Government. They are interviewed by top-ranking students from colleges throughout the metropolitan area.

I have had the pleasure of appearing on Federal Affairs several times. It has not only been an enjoyable experience, since WATV is in my own congressional district, but also a duty, because I have felt that this was one of the most effective ways of reaching my constituents quickly and with first-hand information about the latest happenings here in Washington.

It has been heartening to have this contact with our college students. They are an alert and intelligent group, who are keenly aware of the problems facing America today. Their searching questions and their interest have benefited me since I have an additional insight into the intelligent grasp of domestic and foreign affairs shown by these future leaders of our Nation.

At the present time we are hearing a great deal about educational television and the fact that so few television programs have a serious informational content. It is indeed gratifying to know that in my home district, and in the State of New Jersey, WATV has taken the lead in producing educational programs. In addition to Federal Affairs, WATV is also producing a program of particular interest to the residents of New Jersey, Know Your State. Both of these continuing series of programs are, I feel, important civic functions that fulfill a great need on the part of our citi-

zens. Only with leadership like this in our radio and television stations can we here in the Congress be assured that our citizens are being fully informed through all modern media of communication.

I am happy to have this opportunity of congratulating WATV on the occasion of the first anniversary of Federal Affairs.

United States Air Force Must Match Red Air Power, Say Alsop Brothers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 17, 1951

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks a constantly rising tide of discussion and comment has been poured out about an expansion in the size of our Air Force. Personally, I am gratified that at long last this Nation and this Congress is beginning to realize that the might of our strategic Air Force and its atomic bomb have been the sole things which have kept Russia from making all-out war. Public opinion is now crystallizing on the fact that United States air supremacy is and will continue to be the greatest single element of defense and that our air power must remain dominant.

Mr. Speaker, were it not for the consistent and persistent battle conducted by farsighted lay leaders and those of the Air Force to achieve what they in conscience deem essential to the security of the Nation, the United States—with its vacillating, short-sighted, conventional armed-service concept of air power—could have brought this Nation to complete vulnerability. Now, however, the press as well as the public have come to a belated realization of the part the Air Force has played and will in the far future play in insuring peace and security to our country.

Mr. Speaker, I have just come upon an article written by Joseph and Stewart Alsop entitled "Dimensions of an Air Force":

Building the defense establishment—

Write the Brothers Alsop—

squarely around the Air Force * * * are serious steps to take. On any realistic appraisal of the world situation, however, there is no alternative to taking these steps * * * except to take unforgivable risks with the American future.

Mr. Speaker, for the past 4 years, ever since the services were unified, we have heard many elaborate incantations about what is termed a balanced military program. As the Alsops imply, this, in actuality, has come to mean that equal apportionment of the total military appropriations is to be made among the services, regardless of need. A moment's reflection, will I believe, fully demonstrate the fallacy of this pernicious creed.

I submit that our thinking must take us to the heart of the matter—that, to assure our survival as a Nation, the United States Air Force must be made ready to meet its obvious challenger, the Russian Air Force. National security demands that we build an Air Force that can do the job that has to be done. If we are to seek balance, it is balance against our potential enemy that is required.

Our worry must be about the power of the nation we may have to fight, and it is stark truth that the real objective of the great effort now being made for national defense is to stand off Russia. Instead of blindly believing that all will be well if we match appropriations among the armed services, we must be greatly concerned with matching our Air Force against the air force of the Red world.

Mr. Speaker, the article entitled "Dimensions of an Air Force," carried in the Washington Post, expressing the studied findings of these analysts are so cogent and compelling that, under unanimous consent of my colleagues, I place the same in this day's record of our proceedings.

That article reads as follows:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

DIMENSIONS OF AN AIR FORCE

Before very long, the Air Force issue is going to come out, or perhaps burst out, into the open. The preliminary drumfire has already been heard from the friends of air power on Capitol Hill. Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall and Under Secretary Robert A. Lovett now have before them the Air Staff's program of requirements for an expanded force of 150 groups.

Even if the plan is accepted by Secretary Marshall and the President (which seems likely) its first disclosure is bound to be a bit explosive, if only because of the immense outlays and grave issues involved. As a minimum, the cost is estimated at several billions of supplemental appropriations by the present Congress and \$15,000,000,000 additional in the 1953 budget, with recurring huge appropriations in the subsequent budgets.

The chief issue raised is, of course, the proportion of defense investment between the services. The Navy is considered to be approximately large enough already. The Army is reaching its planned manpower ceiling, although still deficient in many types of vital equipment. But while the curves of expansion of the brother services are thus leveling off, the Air Force expansion curve is to shoot upward precipitately; and it is not to level off until annual Air Force expenditure is far above either Army or Navy expenditure. The kind of trouble this can give rise to is only too easy to imagine.

Building the defense establishment squarely around the Air Force; increasing the already vast defense budget by such huge further sums—these are serious steps to take. On any realistic appraisal of the world situation, however, there is no alternative to taking these steps, except to take unforgivable risks with the American future. The reasons why a greatly expanded Air Force is needed at this time are, in fact, quite unanswerable.

First, the air defense of the continental United States is rapidly becoming a larger and larger job. The Soviet atomic-bomb stock is increasing continually, which means that the Kremlin is getting nearer and nearer

to the point where the war planners in Moscow can hope to deliver a crippling blow against this country. The existing Soviet strategic air force, of imitation B-29's, is expanding. And at the recent air show in Moscow, the Soviets displayed a truly long-range heavy bomber of B-36 type, which air intelligence credits with a 5,000-mile striking radius.

Since the smaller and less costly standard Soviet heavy bomber can efficiently hit targets anywhere except in this hemisphere, the production of this huge, very-long-range bomber can have only one purpose—to attack this country. Moreover, it is the Soviet practice never to display new aircraft types until they are ready for actual production, which means that this new Soviet very-long-range bomber is already going to combat units.

Second, the threat of the Soviet strategic air force to our allies and to us also increases the requirement for the American Strategic Air Force. It was originally designed solely to destroy the industrial vitals of the Russian war machine. Its first priority must now be the destruction of Soviet strategic air. This is an immense task in itself. Furthermore, it is essential for the destruction of the Soviet industrial vitals to go forward concurrently; otherwise the defense will learn from experience to take the measure of the offense. Thus, in effect, the American Strategic Air Force must now be built big enough to do two jobs at once.

Third, the importance of tactical air in ground war is now so great that Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower's staff has evolved a rule of thumb—"the fewer divisions you have, the more air groups you need." For the defense of Western Europe, it is necessary for General Eisenhower to have a tactical air force ready at all times for combat, which will be capable of dominating the very large Soviet tactical air force from the moment when the first shot is fired. For this purpose alone, it may be necessary to double the present requirement for American tactical air power.

Nor are these requirements and the Soviet air threat that begets them mere dreams of air propagandists. The new Soviet bomber of B-36 type is not the 10-engine jet that has been wildly reported. It is a huge, four-engine plane of fairly conventional design. But it exists, has been photographed, and by the magic of intelligence analysts has been shown to have approximately the characteristics given above. Equally, the Air Force actually has in its hands an MIG-15 engine and has more than ruefully examined the decidedly superior high-temperature alloys and remarkably skillful welding that make this the best jet engine now in production.

In plain language, the Soviets have now been proven capable of building air power on an all-too-impressive scale, and if we do not wish to commit national suicide, American air power cannot be allowed to fall behind.

Reviving Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 17, 1951

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted me in the House today, I include herewith the following editorial from the Washington Post of Sunday, August 12, 1951, on the subject of the

work of the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency:

REVIVING KOREA

This newspaper does not go along with the idea that no funds can be cut from the foreign aid bill without dire results. It questions, however, whether the decision of the House Foreign Affairs Committee to pare \$100,000,000 from the \$162,500,000 requested for operations of the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency is a wise one.

There is considerable doubt, to be sure, that UNKRA could usefully spend its full budget of \$250,000,000 within the current fiscal year even if large-scale reconstruction were to start in Korea immediately. It is also true that the United States pledge of \$162,500,000 is a promise by the executive department which is not binding on Congress. Nevertheless, the spectacle of the United States slicing this particular contribution by more than half would be a demoralizing one to the other nations which are expected to support UNKRA. It is largely because of United States initiative that some \$230,000,000 of the \$250,000,000 goal has been pledged, and other nations would not understand what they would consider a default by this country. UNKRA, incidentally, is currently embarrassed for cash, for only about \$7,000,000, mostly from Canada, has been paid in.

A congressional decision to vote the whole American quota of \$162,500,000 would not mean that the money would be wasted. Funds that could not be productively spent this year would be carried over, just as \$50,000,000 of the \$162,500,000 American quota represents unexpended ECA funds transferred to UNKRA. The important thing now is to give UNKRA stature enough to induce more nations to assume a larger share in its activities. This in turn would enable UNKRA to be more insistent in its representations to the Army, which so far has kept a tight hold on relief and reconstruction in Korea without doing much of either. Surely there are large areas in South Korea where UNKRA could safely assume responsibility in the near future—for the longer a start on reconstruction is delayed, the more difficult it will become.

A Few Kind Words for Harry Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 17, 1951

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Henry Steele Commager, now professor of history at Columbia University, has taught at Harvard, the University of Chicago, and at Cambridge University in England. He is the author of several historical works and numerous magazine articles, which established for him a prominent place in the ranks of outstanding American historians.

Recently Dr. Commager wrote an interesting article entitled "A Few Kind Words for Harry Truman," which appears in the August 28, 1951, issue of *Look* magazine.

I do not believe that a man of Dr. Commager's stature would have anything to gain by risking his reputation through a departure from the principles which guide the works of historians for the

sake of pleasing any one person or group. For that reason, I sincerely hope that his thought-provoking article, which was inserted in the *Record* of Wednesday, August 15, 1951, by Hon. ERNEST W. McFARLAND, Senator from Arizona, received the careful and impartial consideration of the membership.

Needed: Freeway From the Holland Tunnel to the Bayonne Naval Base

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 17, 1951

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, for the *Record*, I should like to list below the full text of a telegram received from the Honorable Edward F. Clark, mayor of Bayonne, N. J. It concerns the desperate need of a freeway from the Holland Tunnel to the Bayonne naval base:

BAYONNE, N. J., August 15, 1951.

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,

House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

The Board of Commissioners of the City of Bayonne and the citizens of both parties which we represent heartily endorse and sincerely commend your stand on the very vital importance to our national defense of the proposed freeway from the New Jersey entrance of the Holland Tunnel to the Bayonne Naval Base.

Your representation of the Thirteenth Congressional District has been outstanding, but you can win no finer victory for our Nation, for the rapid implementation of the handling of aid to the western Democratic bulwark against communism, for speedy and safe transport of necessary supplies and ammunition to our Armed Forces, and incidentally for the people of your district, to have this ingress and egress road built with all possible speed.

As you know, our children's lives are constantly endangered by the present heavy trucking on our city streets. I do not have to call your attention to several recent tragedies.

In addition, our streets, particularly Avenue E, have been all but ruined by heavy Federal Government traffic during and since World War II.

The people of Bayonne, never lacking in patriotic endeavor, who sent more than 1,100 of their sons into combat in World War II, and who are presently sharing the sacrifice of the Korean war, stand ready to aid our Nation with every resource.

But the wear and tear on our streets and the danger to our people involved through defense traffic is rapidly becoming too heavy for our taxpayers to bear.

The Congress is appropriating a very large amount of money dedicated to building up our defense installations. We do not feel that we are asking aims when we most emphatically insist that the Congress consider our problem in the light of the tremendous importance of the Bayonne Naval Base which we are proud to have located on our shores.

As mayor of the city of Bayonne, I can assure you that our chamber of commerce and our many local civic groups, as well as my colleagues (one of whom is a Republican) are behind your fight for Bayonne 100 percent; please feel free to call upon us for any aid we can give you.

We would be glad to have an opportunity to present our case before any congressional hearings that may be held on this matter. You may rest assured that the citizens of Bayonne will never permit the Department of Defense to have to resort to a "Bayonne airlift."

With kindest personal regards and every good wish I am in behalf of your constituents.

Sincerely,

EDWARD F. CLARK,
Mayor, Bayonne, N. J.

Personal Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 17, 1951

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, at the time the bells rang announcing a vote on the President's veto message on H. R. 3193, the veterans' pension measure, I was in my office talking to my family doctor in San Francisco who was informing me that my mother was in the hospital, the victim of a stroke, and advising me that I had better return home to San Francisco as soon as possible. By the time I completed my conversation and got to the floor of the House, I was too late to qualify for the vote. If I had been present to vote, I would have voted "aye" to override the veto.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I have arranged to leave for San Francisco by plane at 11 p. m. Eastern daylight time this evening. In the event the final vote on the economic and military assistance bill, H. R. 5113, is not taken by that time, I take this means of saying I certainly would have voted for the bill, and state that it is only such unfortunate circumstances as afore-mentioned that would keep me from doing my duty on such an important measure as this.

Water Resources: A Key to Agricultural Progress—Part 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, at the halfway point of the twentieth century, we are confronted with new emphasis, new realization, new understanding of what the scholar Pliny meant 2,000 years ago when he said: "Of all things, water is best."

As our population increases, as the arm of our industry extends itself yearly as a horn of plenty to bring a new array of its productions within the reach of the average person of this world, we use more and more of our basic resource—water.

In the scientific age in which we live, our scientists through research and experiment are unlocking nature's box of secrets pertaining to water and causing us to realize that conservation and proper use of our water resources provides a keystone for the arch of expanding development of our agricultural and industrial resources.

As a part of my remarks I enclose the first half of an address styled *Water Resources: A Key to Agricultural Progress*, by Dr. Paul W. Chapman, associate dean, College of Agriculture, the University of Georgia, delivered by him on February 6, 1951, at Memphis, Tenn.:

WATER RESOURCES: A KEY TO AGRICULTURAL PROGRESS

(By Paul W. Chapman, associate dean, College of Agriculture, the University of Georgia, Athens)

Two thousand years ago, Pliny—a recognized scholar and leader of the period in which he lived—said: "Of all things, water is best."

The passing of 20 centuries, and in the meantime, the development of science, technology, and engineering, have in no way detracted from the soundness or importance of the conclusion reached by the great naturalist and philosopher of the Roman Empire.

In fact, the words of Pliny mean more to-day in relation to human welfare than ever before in the entire history of civilization.

May we undertake to list a few of the fundamental reasons why water resources are increasing in importance? Here are seven—with brief explanations and comments concerning each:

WE USE MORE WATER

1. Increasing populations

There are constantly, day after day, year after year, more and more people in the world who must drink, otherwise consume, and use water.

The world's population has increased fourfold within the past 200 years.

Today there are 60,000 more people in the world to drink and use water than there were yesterday. There will be 60,000 more tomorrow than there are today. In the opinion of experts on the subject of population, this average rate of increase will continue throughout the second half of the twentieth century.

Consider the United States.

During the past 10 years, the population of our country has increased more than 19 million.

This number, perhaps, means little. But it may mean more to say that in terms of water requirements our increased population during the past 10 years is exactly like adding the personal water requirements of all the people who, in 1940, lived in the following 21 States: Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Idaho, Kansas, Maine, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Washington, and Wyoming.

Yes, the water requirements of the United States are increasing very rapidly.

2. City supplies inadequate

It is common knowledge that the water supplies of most American cities are inadequate.

Of this fact, the recent experience of New York City is the most glaring and dramatic example. Many others might be cited.

This item, incidentally, is extremely important in the South—the region in which the largest number of cities are growing most rapidly.

3. Higher per capita use

No people in any country on earth at any time in history have used so much water as do Americans today.

Our increasing usage is due to factors related to our improving living standards. For example, consider plumbing including bathtubs with running hot and cold water—these are but one of many water-using developments that have come for the first time with the current century.

Average water requirements of the typical American citizen—for direct personal use—are now in excess of 125 gallons per day. Ten years ago, they were 100 gallons per day.

Many cities in the United States now use, without waste, an average per capita consumption of 500 or more gallons each day.

4. Industrial uses increasing

Manufacturing, which contributes so much to the prosperity and world-wide leadership of America, and which makes possible the highly diversified occupational pattern of the Nation—more than 40,000 kinds of jobs with an ever-increasing production per worker—is a major user of water.

It is said that American industry uses 70,000,000,000 gallons of water per day (Source: *A Water Policy for the American People*, vol. 1, p. 177.)

But because it is so big such a figure may mean little. It may be more impressive to say that it requires 65,000 gallons of water to finish a ton of steel, that steel mills in the Nation have operated at or near capacity for years—and no doubt will continue to do so, and that there will be an enormous increase in steel mills' plant capacity during the years immediately ahead.

For some persons, the water needs of industry may be better visualized by saying that it takes 30 gallons of water to make a pound of paper or 770 gallons to refine a barrel of gasoline.

Again, it is desirable to call attention to the fact that the industrial water requirements of the South are increasing at a more rapid rate than those of other regions in the Nation.

5. Ever-increasing output of electric energy

For years the electric output of the Nation has increased, it will continue to do so throughout the remainder of the current decade, and probably throughout the remainder of the century.

In the South the output has doubled since 1940, it will double again before 1960.

For the South and the Nation this means increasing water demands.

Some persons may be of the opinion that the above statement applies only to hydroelectric plants—those operated by the force of running water. This, however, is not the case. Every increased output of electric energy requires more water. Even in the so-called steam plants—in which coal, gas, or other fuel may be used—the weight of the water used is 1,000 times the weight of the fuel consumed.

6. Larger food-production demands

Obviously, more people—especially more people employed at higher wages and salaries than ever before—means increased food demands.

Increased food demands per person, always in direct relation to income, will be up not less than 3 percent in 1951.

Everyday, throughout the past 10 years, there has been added to the Nation's total number of buyers of food and fiber an average net increase of 5,555 persons.

Increased water requirements to produce these additional foods and fibers are positively gigantic.

Some agricultural engineer, who has the time and curiosity, should calculate the added national water requirements daily just to provide the increased foods and fibers for our new consumers for each new day.

Agricultural production and human nutrition are such exact sciences that these added water requirements in food could be calculated with a fair degree of accuracy.

7. Water needs of animals multiplying

In calculating ever-increasing water needs, the requirements of livestock must be taken into account. On a unit basis these water requirements are, of course, far greater than actual human consumption.

A high-producing dairy cow may, for example, drink about 200 pounds of water each day. And, after all, milk is something like 87 percent water.

Increasing water requirements for livestock are a major concern to the South—a region in which every State has a farm program designed, primarily, to balance animal production with crop production—a region where, due primarily to recent increases in livestock population, the farm income of five States—Kentucky, Oklahoma, Tennessee, West Virginia, and Virginia—on the bases of preliminary figures, indicates that in 1950 a larger income was earned from animals than from crops.

WATER—SUPPLY AND DEMAND

The previous seven items listed indicate some of the Nation's newer, more urgent, and increasing demands for water resources. But they do not, by any means, exhaust the total needs of human beings for water.

Fortunately, water is not a one-crop resource, like, for example, fuel oil.

Regarding distribution for any given year, our information about the amount of water to be provided for use is a trifle indefinite, but we are confident that there will be no substantial reduction in the total supply available in any given locality over a period of years.

It is because of this knowledge that scientists and engineers may work in implicit confidence with respect to the possibilities for materially increasing economic gains in the future, so far as these relate to water and other renewable resources.

But bear in mind that the law of inertia operates with respect to the rate at which new knowledge is applied. In a democracy there must always be infinitely more followers than leaders. Please do not forget this fact, upon the rapid multiplication of followers or applicators of scientific and technical knowledge depends the solution of the water-resource problems on American farms at the present time.

FARMERS DEFINED

It may be noted, also, that of the seven newer and increasing demands for water, five are concerned primarily with urban needs (but not exclusively urban needs by any means) and two with what may be called segments of farm needs. All seven, in some measure, compete for the total available supply of water.

Now, let us analyze or examine the specific problem: Water—a key to agricultural progress.

First, it is essential to understand what a farmer is, the following definition may help.

A farmer is an individual who works with such natural resources as soil, water, sunshine, and plant food for the purpose of converting these resources into commodities having a higher value than the raw materials he uses.

Some such definition is essential to any real understanding of the nature and objectives of the occupation of farming.

THE LAW OF GROSS FARM INCOME

There is also a law—a fixed law—of economics which indicates how much money a farmer will earn in relation to other farmers, as well as the comparative living standard that he will be able to attain and support. The law may be stated as follows:

The income of any farmer for any given year, in relation to all farmers, will be

affected directly by the volume of natural resources converted into commodities. This law may be more important than all other income factors combined.

PROCESSES OF PLANT GROWTH

The definition of farmers and the so-called law of gross farm income are given as desirable foundation or background information.

There are countless other laws of science and principles of engineering involved in a consideration of the subject—Water: A Key to Agricultural Progress. Of course, we cannot deal with all of them, but the definition of a plant—plants (farm crops) are the basis of all farming—seems to be another minimum essential. The definition follows:

A plant is a foundation through which water passes from the soil into the air. And, since a plant extracts most of its food from the water that passes through it, growth is normally in direct ratio to the constant and total supply of water available.

THE LAW OF FARM PROGRESS

Before considering specific localities, it might be well also to present another law that has a direct bearing upon the subject, namely, the law of farm progress, which may be stated as follows:

The relative rate of progress in farming for any locality, State, or region is in direct proportion to the application of known technology and science in terms of the percentage of total potential applicants, and varies with the speed and volume of the applications.

PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS

Applying this subject and these principles to the South, which is, of course, the primary interest of those who suggested the topic, it is possible to state the primary principles involved in three questions, as follows:

- 1 What are the relative quantities of natural resources (raw materials) available to the typical southern farmer?
- 2 What are the relative results obtained?
- 3 What are the simplest and most practical ways to insure change or progress that will result in economic gains?

SIZE OF FARMS

A allable natural resources for farming can best be measured by acres of land; at least that is one universal measure commonly accepted in the United States.

Forty-five percent of the farms in the South are less than 50 acres in size; 86 percent are less than 180 acres in size. The average for all farms in the Nation is approximately 200 acres, or was in 1945.

America's typical commercial farm has increased in size throughout this century and will probably continue to do so. This trend applies to commercial farms throughout the South.

Selecting more or less typical States, the farms of Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi average, for example, 71 acres in size; those of Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin average, for example, 149 acres—or almost exactly twice the size of the average for those of the Southern States selected.

If one wishes to compare the relative farm incomes of the six States, it will be found that the law of gross farm income applies.

That this should be true is inevitable. Because, if all the farmers in all the six States produced the same crops (and animals), and made the same yields per acre (and per animal unit), and sold the commodities for the same price, the incomes of one region would be twice as large as the other.

While not an integral part of the subject under consideration, it seems somewhat related and certainly is of major importance. And, after all, it is one and the same thing because it involves the relative quantities of natural resources (raw materials) handled, including—as the No. 1 item—water

in terms of the total percent and quantity (by weight) of the total raw materials sold.

YIELDS—PER ACRE AND PER UNIT

Average crop yields per acre in the South are relatively low. Consider, for example, the following typical field crops:

Corn (10-year period): Average production per acre for the Nation, 31.4 bushels; for the South, 17.9 bushels. During recent years, corn yields per acre in many Southern States have increased greatly, but, for the region as a whole, no more than the national average increase.

Sweetpotatoes (10-year period): Of 13 Southern States, 11 were below the national average of 90 bushels per acre. Two—North Carolina and Virginia—were above the national average. With an average production of 154 bushels per acre, Maryland topped the list of States growing sweetpotatoes commercially.

These examples are typical. To add other commodities would not change the relative position of the region with respect to crop yields per acre.

The same relative position is held with respect to production per animal unit. Consider milk production per cow.

For the first time in the Nation's history, the average, annual production per cow went above 5,000 pounds in 1948. During the most recent 5-year period, average, annual milk production per cow in the South Atlantic States was 4,128, as compared with a national average for the period of 4,992 pounds. This was a gain for these Southern States of 510 pounds per cow over a 25-year period, as compared with a national gain of 413 pounds. For the South Central States, an average production of 3,322 pounds per cow was made during the most recent 5-year period; for this section of the South, there has been a gain of 94 pounds per cow in 25 years.

Animal-production records are always correlated with crop-production records. This is true because feed is such an important factor in animal production. Or, to say the same thing in another way—all flesh is grass.

That these unit yields are relatively low—as applied to crops and animals—is extremely unfortunate, since Southern farms are also smaller than the national average. The result is inevitable—low relative average incomes on a per farm per worker, and per farm family basis for the region. And, most important of all, there can be no change in the relative income position of the region—regardless of whatever else may be done—until these conditions are changed and the relative handicaps in one or both removed.

To make a worth-while contribution to increasing average production per unit—per acre and per animal unit (and also per worker) should be the major goal of all workers in public agricultural agencies and all others who are primarily interested in the welfare of the region. Have you accepted this challenge? Are you willing to do so? These are questions that every individual may ask himself; he will not be expected to give an answer to anyone but himself.

What Progress Have We Made Toward Peace Since VJ-Day?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. DEANE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I participated with my esteemed

colleague, Representative WALTER H. Judd, of Minnesota, in Columbia's television program, Peoples' Platform, with Mr. Charles Collingwood, CBS White House correspondent, acting as chairman of the program. This was a special program commemorating the anniversary of VJ-day, August 14, 1945. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I insert my remarks prepared for this program:

HAVE WE MADE ANY PROGRESS TOWARD REAL PEACE IN THE PAST 6 YEARS?

On a world-wide front we have, Mr. Collingwood, despite tremendous obstacles I consider that today we are nearer a lasting peace, especially in view of the fact that within 3 weeks forty-odd nations will sit down together in San Francisco and sign a peace of reconciliation with Japan.

John Foster Dulles is to be commended for pointing up that phrase, "peace of reconciliation." This San Francisco conference is being thought out in terms of a Christian peace without vindictiveness and it is without precedent in the history of peace treaties.

Furthermore, we have made real progress in many areas of the world—through the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall plan, the point 4 program of technical assistance to underdeveloped areas, and the mutual aid under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Last Friday, around midnight, the House approved legislation which wrapped all of these programs up in one package to be known as the Mutual Security Administration. And, incidentally, my colleague here this evening, WALTER Judd, played an important role in the passage of this legislation by the House.

Further evidence of progress toward peace can be found in the very fact that we have such an instrument as the United Nations. For the first time in history 60 nations are banded together in an international organization for the purpose of resolving their differences in a peaceful way.

HAS OUR FOREIGN POLICY BEEN EFFECTIVE?—IS IT A WORKING POLICY?—WHAT SHOULD BE THE POLICY FOR THE FUTURE?

I would say our foreign policy has been effective in three fields:

Economically, in stabilizing Greece and Turkey and other areas of Europe through the Truman doctrine and the Marshall plan.

Politically, in the results of the Italian elections of 1948, in the various international agreements, such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and in the approaching Japanese Peace Treaty.

Militarily, in the tremendous accomplishments of the Berlin airlift and in courageous response to aggression in Korea.

Yet, I sense a basic weakness in a fourth field which may, in the long run, prove to be the most decisive of all—the ideological field. We as a nation have not yet fully grasped the fact that we are in an ideological war—a war of ideas.

Our opponents for 30 years have woven into their military, economic, and political strategy principles and ideas based on the ideology of Karl Marx. Communism has pioneered a new type of war strategy by winning the minds, hearts, and loyalty of millions of people without firing a shot.

This line of thinking has been convincingly expressed by an outstanding newspaperman I met here in Washington recently, namely, Mr. Peter Howard. Incidentally, the press will soon carry the announcement of his new book, *The World Rebuilt*, which will be in the bookstores early in September. I just received this advance copy and I found it most informative. It's an answer to Washington Confidential.

Our future foreign policy besides economic, political, and military programs must include a more thought-through and worked-out

program of ideological warfare. The Voice of America program has done a certain amount. The formation of the psychological strategy board under the leadership of Dr. Gordon Gray, president of the University of North Carolina, is a step in the right direction.

It is not propaganda we need but a great national rededication to the basic ideas of democracy. What we need is a return to absolute honesty and the simple principles stamped on every coin, "E Pluribus Unum" or teamwork, and "In God We Trust." Our national policy must embrace not only military rearmament but moral rearmament.

OUR RELATIONS WITH OUR ALLIES HAVE THE INTERVENING YEARS SINCE THE END OF HOSTILITIES WEAKENED OR STRENGTHENED THEIR FRIENDSHIP OR SUPPORT?

To me, that's the key to our discussion this evening. Mr. Collingswood. Properly developed relations with our allies is the most important aspect of our foreign policy.

Early in January, I attended a public meeting at Washington's Shocham Hotel and heard a former Communist from the German Ruhr say, "True unity in the West would be like an atom bomb on the Kremlin." About this same time I witnessed a marvelous musical stage production, "Jotham Valley." I understand this show is now playing in Hollywood at the Carthay Circle Theater and is booked for San Francisco during the Japanese Peace Conference. A cowboy quartet in Jotham Valley sings a catchy little song. It goes like this: "When I point my finger at my neighbor, there are three more pointing back at me." That's it. Teamwork is a lot more likely to happen if we deal with our own faults instead of spotlighting the other fellow's.

That's certainly true in the family. I know in my own case when I stopped telling the kids what was wrong all the time and began to study these three points, things changed and the kids straightened up on their own. Maybe what's good for one family is good for a family of nations.

We Americans have to face the uncomfortable fact that we do not enjoy the complete trust and confidence of many of the peoples of the world. They may like us but do not love us.

I found this to be true when as a member of a congressional committee in 1949, I had the opportunity of meeting key leaders in 10 far-eastern nations. Conversations with U. N. leaders here in America this year have confirmed my conclusion.

This situation must be remedied and I feel that it can be—and quickly.

Confidence can be restored if we are willing to do two things:

First, admit mistakes when we make them. There is nothing more disarming than an honest apology.

I remember how deeply moved I was to hear a member of the Japanese Diet, Mr. Kitamura, just over a year ago speak to the House of Representatives. With sincere emotions he expressed our "deepest regret for the tragic trouble that we have caused to the people of the United States."

This honest apology from a leading Japanese—which, incidentally, was carried by the newspapers from coast to coast—was encouraging evidence that there are forces at work in Japan which will insure that that great nation will become a democratic and peace-loving country.

We have created the ideal paper plans for a sound Japan—first, by helping them with their democratic constitution, and second, by giving them a peace of reconciliation.

But we also need to help them build up the spirit of democracy within the hearts of the people if the paper plans are to be a success.

Second, we must export the basic ideas of democracy on which our country was originally built. The House of Representatives Friday authorized an additional \$7,500,000,000 for material and military aid for mutual defense. If we only send this type of aid, without at the same time giving these people our hearts, we will incur not their gratitude, but their resentment.

IS THE UNITED NATIONS WORKING?

Mr. Collingswood, the U. N. is like democracy—"Democracy works if you do." Like democracy, the U. N. has shown remarkable strength and remarkable weakness. Yet, surely the credit side far outweighs the debit side.

1. U. N. intervention, by forcing Soviet troops out of Iran in 1946, preserved the independence of that vital middle-eastern country.

2. The 1949 accomplishments in Palestine by United Nations representative Dr. Ralph Bunche were magnificent.

3. I am reminded of the U. N. mission to Indonesia in 1949, which provided the basis for the transfer of sovereignty to the Indonesian people.

4. Prompt action by the United Nations in stopping aggression in Korea, to my thinking, strengthened this international body and certainly enhanced its prestige.

5. Presently, as a United Nations representative, Dr. Frank Graham of North Carolina sojourns in India, attempting to mediate by peaceful settlement the serious differences between India and Pakistan over Kashmir.

At the same time there is plenty of room for improvement in the United Nations. As one of the U. N. delegates stated recently, whenever a U. N. committee meets, there are two sets of problems—the problems that are on the table and the problems that are around the table. He meant the problems of human nature among the delegates themselves.

It is like this handkerchief I hold in each hand. When I pull to the right and insist on my way and you pull to the left and insist on your way—there is tension. When I stop wanting my way and you stop wanting your way and both want the right way—there is no tension and there is unity.

That is the sort of spirit needed in the U. N.

OUR POLICY IN THE FAR EAST

The problems of the Far East, as my colleague WALTER JUDD so well knows, are more complicated than in any other place in the world. It is in Asia, in my opinion, where the great events of the future will take place.

Lenin has said that the road to London and Washington lies through Peiping and Calcutta.

I am thinking of the fact that there are more people in the Far East than all the rest of the world put together. These millions of people are undergoing a revolutionary ferment.

What will be the answer?

Which ideas will win the minds and hearts of the millions of Asia?

It is going to be the revolution of materialism fostered by the Kremlin or will it be the kind of revolution based on absolute moral standards and the guidance of God?

It is largely up to you and me—America, and the lead that we give.

SUMMARY

To summarize my position, Mr. Collingswood, on the challenging theme we have been discussing I will say we can eliminate friction in our homes, within political parties, and furthermore we can as a great nation win the peace if we are willing to make our decisions on the basis of what's right

instead of who is right, remembering that it's no good to point our finger at our neighbor—without first dealing with the three pointing back at ourselves.

To win the peace—we need to know what peace really is. I like the definition of Frank Buchman, who has been nominated for this year's Nobel Peace Prize when he says, "Peace is not just an idea, it is people becoming different." And, that's where every man, woman and child has a part. It is from the little private wars that big wars grow. The small boy's remark is correct: "If you want to stop war in the world, stop war in the home."

It is the wars between husband and wife, between labor and management and between races, that make possible wars between nations.

And everybody, whether he has a television set and can have the benefit of all this wisdom that Walter and I have been putting out tonight—or not—everybody can do something about ending their little private wars and start to do things differently tonight.

With all the international treaties, aid programs and United Nations in the world—they will all succeed or fail according to the way you and I live.

Postal Union Expert on Retiree Deficit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the following article, written by Mr. Jerome Keating, executive secretary of the National Association of Letter Carriers, is an excellent explanation of the present condition of the retirement fund for Government employees. Mr. Keating presents a strong argument in support of the contention that retirement benefits for Government employees can be increased without impairing the solvency of the retirement fund.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of August 17, 1951]

POSTAL UNION EXPERT ON RETIREE DEFICIT

Early in this congressional session, it appeared that legislation to improve the present civil service retirement act and to provide an increased annuity for retired people now on the rolls stood an excellent chance for early enactment. The picture has changed considerably and now prospects do not look so favorable. The difficulty confronting this legislation hinges on the old controversy as to how a government retirement system should be financed. Civil service employees are keenly aware that, despite the fact they contribute 6 percent of their salary to the civil service retirement fund—compared to 1½ percent under social security—survivorship benefits under social security are much more liberal than those under civil service retirement. S. 995, now before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, if enacted, will go a long way toward eliminating this discrimination. S. 995 will also help materially in mitigating the hardships to retired civil service employees who now find their present annuity pathetically inadequate in the face of today's high cost of living.

The hope for early enactment of S. 995 bumped up against the rock of "actuarial solvency." Social security is not concerned with actuarial solvency—it is practically on a pay-as-you-go basis. Despite the fact that on May 31, 1951, there was \$4,236,696,470.33 in the civil service retirement fund, chairman Robert Ramspeck of the Civil Service Commission has made the statement that the fund is deficient to the extent of \$5,000,000. To the lay mind, this is confusing and contradictory.

It is confusing even to actuaries and we find that many of them actively dispute the necessity of having an actuarially funded Government retirement system. To have a fund completely actuarially solvent, it would be necessary to have on hand sufficient money to not only pay the present and future claims of all those now on retirement, but to pay the future claims of all active employees until the time of their death and, if the employee should leave a widow with survivorship rights, long after their death. In addition, it would provide the fund with sufficient administrative funds to operate the system until all such benefits had been completely paid. It is difficult to compute the amounts required for an actuarially funded plan. It is extremely difficult even for insurance companies whose benefit provisions are exact and precise. In the case of a Government retirement system it is impossible—one might also add, unnecessary.

On the subject of estimating pension costs, I think it well to quote from a statement made by Murray W. Latimer, an expert in the pension field, in a report to the trustees of the United Mine Workers. The statement was carried in a bulletin put out by the University of Illinois under the title, "Pension Plans in Collective Bargaining." Mr. Latimer's statement reads as follows:

"Data relating to the ages, lengths of service, and number of miners are, of course, desirable. But these factors, without more, will not give an accurate indication as to what the pension load of the miners' welfare fund would be initially or in the years to come. That load would be the result of individual decisions made by tens of thousands of individuals having a wide variety of conditions to face and a host of considerations to take into account. If every remote relevant fact were collected about every miner who has worked in an American coal mine since 1776 and all the actuaries now alive were to do nothing for the next 10 years but make estimates of what the proposed pension plan would cost, they would still not know the answer. All their data would not tell them what the miners themselves would think, and that, in the final analysis, would be controlling.

"The shortest, quickest, cheapest, and, in fact, the only way to find out what a pension plan costs is to try it out—and for several years. The collection and analysis of data for the railroad retirement system cost many millions, and none of the estimates were borne out. Some were too high, some were too low—and if the life of the system depended upon the infallibility of prognosticators, it would never have left the ground. And so it is with all pension systems."

I believe this, in a brief way, pretty well sums up exactly what you are up against when you attempt to estimate what retirement benefits and survivorship benefits are going to cost. The only factor that you can absolutely rely upon is the factor of experience, and the experience of the civil-service retirement fund has shown the fund increasing rapidly from \$1,876,227,651.70 in 1945 to \$4,236,696,470.33 in May 1951.

The funded system usually results in excessive accumulation of reserves.

Since the civil-service retirement fund was first established in 1821 down through the

present day, the board of actuaries of the civil-service retirement fund have been consistently conservative in their cost estimates.

In their third annual report, submitted on January 19, 1924, the board of actuaries declared: "Experience of other systems promises that the annual payments required of the Government may be expected to increase ultimately to over 20 percent of the payroll if they are not met as they accrue."

For the first 9 years of its operation, Congress did not appropriate a single cent for the operation of the fund. Since that time they have appropriated amounts far less than what has been recommended by the actuaries. Yet in no single year has the Government's share, according to the actuaries' own figures, including normal and deficiency costs, equaled as much as 12 percent. For the year ending June 30, 1945, the Government's share was placed at 6.50 percent—a far cry from the 20 percent prophesied in 1924.

When the Langer - Chavez - Stevenson amendments were before Congress in 1947 and 1948, the board of actuaries was requested to submit a report. The report was submitted to Chairman EDWARD H. REES under date of May 21, 1947, and predicted that the amended bill would cost 12.82 percent of the payroll. This figure applied to normal costs only and did not include deficiency costs. The report for the year ending June 30, 1949, which is the last one published, placed the normal cost at 8.60 percent of the payroll.

Much could be said on how a Government retirement fund should be financed. Without delving too deeply into the intricacies of the matter, let us listen to another qualified witness—this time the witness is Mr. A. A. Weinberg, consulting actuary, of Chicago, who in the second annual statement of the board of trustees of the retirement system of Illinois on June 30, 1945, stated:

"Some variations to the funding method of financing retirement provisions have been adopted by various government agencies. A number of these agencies provide for the financing of the retirement benefits strictly upon the basis of cash requirements, meeting the cost of the benefits as they mature, and making no advance provision for these obligations. Other agencies have modified the accepted method by providing for the accumulation of a moderate reserve, which in some instances represents a substantial proportion of the reserves required under a funding plan.

"The State employees' retirement system of Illinois provides for the latter method of financing. Current contributions by the State are substantially above cash requirements for the matured benefits. These contributions to a fiscal year are equal to an amount representing the anticipated average annual expenditures of the system for that part of the benefits for which the State is obligated, covering a period of 10 years next following that for which a contribution is made. This method of financing is considered appropriate and practicable in cases in which the State is the employer, on the theory that the State is a perpetual entity having unlimited taxing authority and can always raise the funds necessary to meet the revenue requirement of its various agencies and departments."

We hope that the Senate and House Post Office and Civil Service Committees will look past the recommendations and estimates of the board of actuaries and the Civil Service Commission and pass this legislation that is so sorely needed. We hope that the practical side of cost and needed reform will not be smothered in a theoretical projection of imagined costs of the future.

The People Will Drive Out of Washington All of the Minks, the Pinks, and the Stinks Who Are Destroying the Moral Fiber, the Very Warp and Woof of Good Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address I delivered at a Republican rally and clambake, Newport, R. I., August 19, 1951:

We meet today in this beautiful and historic city of Newport, R. I., to renew our fealty to a great political party and to dedicate our services to making it a stronger and more useful instrument of government—veritably, the only instrument available through which the principle of liberty, individual opportunity, and our system of enterprise of free labor and free management can be saved.

Rhode Island was once a banner Republican State. Today it is widely recognized as one of the strongest Democratic States in the Union. This transformation has come to pass notwithstanding the fact that no State in the Union has been more handicapped by New Deal maladministration than your own State.

True, you get some Federal hand-outs. These have been made to appear most alluring. Yet, for every dollar you get from the Federal Government, the State of Rhode Island has to send 10 in tax money to Washington. A citizen who would arise and protest this as bad business would, of course, at once be labeled as a reactionary and one who is living in the past.

But worse still, along with your purchases of Federal grants with your own money comes Federal dictation, regimentation, and a loss of your personal freedom. We travel the old merry-go-round—Federal pap to purchase support at elections, higher taxes to pay for Government spending, higher prices because of the higher cost of Government; and some day—the collapse.

It is hard to believe that the sound-thinking people of Rhode Island really believe in such policies. Your presence here indicates that all the sparks of freedom have not been extinguished. Here is the nucleus for the organization of a fight that can restore good government and sound government to the people of Rhode Island and the Nation.

Effective and intensive efforts at the precinct level will constitute the difference between victory and defeat not alone in Rhode Island but in many other States at the 1952 election. A revitalized and an aggressive Republican Party will be a tremendous factor in the future progress and prosperity of this State. As in the country itself, Rhode Island needs a strong, two-party system to achieve and to maintain good government.

It is a simple fact of history that any administration—be it Federal, State, or local—will soon subordinate the best interests of the people to its own interests unless there is a vigorous, intelligent opposition party, devoted to a fearless, relentless appraisal of the actions of the majority party.

A party too long in control becomes callous and indifferent. In its ambition to perpetuate itself, it seeks more and more power over the people it claims to represent. It finds

that power feeds upon bigger appropriations and heavier taxes. A little corruption here and there begets more and greater corruption, and finally the people discover they have been sold into a bondage of debt and taxes which will be a burden upon their families as long as they live. Lenin, just before his death, made his great prediction when he said, "England will expand herself into destruction, Germany will arm herself into destruction, and the United States will spend herself into destruction." The first two have come true and we are rapidly approaching for the very reason Lenin gave.

There is a particular cause today to organize to fight this battle for America.

We are faced with crises never equaled before in our national life. We hysterically shower money abroad to build up defenses against communism. We are obliged to regiment and fetter American life that we can prepare for the big day they tell us is ahead.

How did this all come to pass in six short years? Who is responsible for the decline of our national prestige abroad and our national defenses at home?

When the awful agony of World War II came to an end, America was the one great star in the world. We had the mightiest armaments and we had the power that comes from an apparently inexhaustible treasury. We stood at the pinnacle of history. All nations were looking to us for support, guidance, and inspiration. We could have laid down the terms and insisted upon a just peace, a peace that would give us the opportunity of realizing the ageless ambitions of man.

But we frittered away that opportunity. We listened to the subtle voice of the man whom President Truman once called "good old Joe Stalin." At Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam, we appeased the "Red brothers," and literally gave away our security. We sat silently by and let the Communists absorb Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, East Germany, Manchuria, Outer Mongolia, Port Arthur, and the Kuriles. One by one they fell. And we hoped each would be the last. Could you imagine such a tragedy happening if your distinguished townsman, Henry P. Fletcher, had been Secretary of State?

We sold out our faithful ally, Nationalist China, at Yalta and Potsdam, even at a time when the Chinese were fighting side by side with our troops against the Japanese. Instead of cementing a friendship with the Chinese people which would have given us a free and peaceful Asia, we tried to force the Red government down the throat of Chiang Kai-shek. These architects of disaster and defeat were foolish enough to believe you can make a lasting deal with the Communists.

By now I hope these fuzzy thinkers realize the only time a coalition with a tiger can succeed is when you are inside the tiger.

I hope we learn the bitter lesson before it is too late. Communism thrives on weakness. Fear, vacillation, and hesitancy are an invitation to the Communists to walk in. In dealing with Communists we should lead from strength and not from fear.

The only thing that will ever stop the Kremlin is a show of strength, a display of will and incisive leadership. Milquetoast leadership is the Kremlin's dish. And that is the kind of faltering, blundering leadership the American people have had in this critical period.

It is the kind of leadership that makes the future uncertain.

That is the kind of leadership that enabled Soviet Russia to gobble up nation after nation and spread its domination from 170,000,000 to 400,000,000 people in 5 years.

That is the kind of leadership that in five short years reduced us from the high posi-

tion we held at the close of World War II to a position where we are literally cringing before Russia and its satellites.

I tell you we cannot expect these same architects of our misfortune, the same designers of our disasters, to provide the solution that will save America. After a crew had carelessly wrecked a ship, no sane person would employ that same crew to salvage it.

The real problem which faces America now is how to prevent these disciples of socialism, these suborners of our Constitution and our liberty, from wrecking our country beyond repair.

Of course, there is no escape now from the tremendous cost of war armaments. It is the price we must pay for the blunders of this administration. We must spend billions to make ourselves secure from our former comrades; those whom we rescued from the bloody hands of Hitler. We must build our Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines to such proportions that we will be safe from attack.

And we should not forget the great record which that Republican Eightieth Congress made in providing for an adequate national defense. That Congress knew exactly what it was doing. And if President Truman had followed the direction and properly administered the defense legislation sent to him by that Republican Eightieth Congress we would not now be authorizing an armed-services budget in excess of \$75,000,000,000 for this fiscal year—and I might go even further in saying that in all probability we would not now be engaged in a war in Korea. The Eightieth Congress fixed the size of our Armed Forces at 2,040,000 men, and provided ample funds to support those forces. But President Truman decided that only about 1,000,000 men were needed in the armed services at that time. That same Eightieth Congress authorized an Air Force of 70 groups and provided funds for those 70 groups, only to hear the President say a 48-group Air Force was enough, and then refuse to enlarge the Air Force or to use the money we had provided for that purpose.

The Eightieth Congress authorized and expanded the naval air program, including a super-aircraft carrier upon which work was begun and then ordered stopped by the President, at a dead loss of \$20,000,000.

The Eightieth Congress also blocked the attempt to put the Marine Corps completely out of business.

This great record was being made while President Truman was running up and down the country denouncing the Eightieth Congress.

We now have 3,500,000 men in our Armed Forces. We have an 89-group Air Force. And, believe it or not, we are now building that new superaircraft carrier, after more than 2 years of precious time has been lost, and at a great increase in cost.

The Republican Eightieth Congress was so far ahead of the President in preparing our national defense for these troublesome days that only last week the Democratic chairman of the Armed Services Committee admitted that the Republican Eightieth Congress had actually done more to build a strong national defense than any peacetime Congress in history.

And that Republican Eightieth Congress not only provided funds for strong national defense, but it balanced our national budget and created a surplus for the first time in nearly 20 years, made payments on the national debt, and in addition to all this, Federal taxes were reduced for the first time in a generation—reduced by more than \$5,500,000,000 a year, and more than 7,000,000 low-income Americans were taken entirely off the tax rolls.

But equally important, this Republican Congress tried in every way to get the President and his Secretary of State to change

their policies concerning China which have proven so disastrous to us and the world.

And I might add all this was done in the House under the leadership of your neighbor and friend, Speaker JOSEPH W. MARTIN, and in the Senate under the leadership of that able statesman, ROBERT A. TAFT.

We must help the countries of Europe to realize the threat they face from communism.

This fight against communism is not confined to the European front. We face danger in a dozen sectors. Each is important; each is vital.

If the restraint of communism is our goal, we cannot fail to give support to Nationalist China, Turkey, Spain, and every country which can be enlisted in this fight.

Old passions and old prejudices must be cast aside. In this struggle against communism, we need all the military support we can possibly secure.

Faced with these tremendous expenses abroad, we might expect a little reason in our spending at home. But this is apparently a futile hope. Spending for politics-as-usual goes on without interruption at the same old stand. To the spenders, what happens to the country is of no great importance, if it will win the next election.

"After all," as a top New Dealer once said, "we owe it to ourselves." Again, we should remember Lenin once said, "If I can control the currency of a country I don't care who may control its army."

The sad consequences of that type of thinking are now revealed in high prices and high taxes. One chases the other.

The household budget of every family in the land feels the daily pinch of inflation—sky-high prices which leave the workingman's family with a reduced standard of living—and the trouble with the new controls bill is it controls everything except inflation.

We all recognize that Washington pay-rollers are doing more to stoke the fires of inflation than any other force in the whole national economy.

Runaway Federal spending, waste, and extravagance which shocks even the most calloused observer, is the one great impulse to runaway prices today.

The President himself recently warned us, "Buy only what you need and cannot do without. . . ." He told us we must forego some of the luxuries and conveniences of life. That was reassuring. We had hoped for a few hours that the administration was going to reform.

But the news came out a few days later that the Army had purchased 68,000,000 can openers, or about 22 for every man and woman in the military service.

And the Army recently purchased 6,000,000 gallons of paint, estimated to be enough for a full year's requirements. But the Army demanded delivery in 60 days. You can realize what that meant to paint prices.

A little while later the Quartermaster called for bids on about 12,000,000 pairs of boots and shoes, although actual needs for a year were stated to be less than 5,000,000 pairs. That didn't make shoe prices slow down.

Last January the Quartermaster Service purchased 5,000,000 pounds of oleo at 25½ cents a pound. And at the very same time the Department of Agriculture was selling 5,000,000 pounds of surplus butter abroad for 15 cents a pound. The record production this year will do more to keep prices down than a dozen Government agencies.

In the current budget the State Department asked Congress for \$25,000 for lunches to entertain visiting officials and scholars from abroad. The Appropriations Committee of the House found that each of the lunches figured out to \$8.73 per person. That's very fancy eating at the expense of the American taxpayers. Well, Congress

knocked that item out of the bill. And we shall knock out many like extravagances before the session is over.

On the appropriation bills for 1952 the Republicans in the House have cut more than \$3,000,000,000.

The President says we must "make the most efficient use of the Nation's manpower." But we find the Government agencies expanding at the rate of almost 2,000 workers every day.

It was revealed recently before the House Appropriations Committee that one of the so-called new emergency agencies was hiring many more stenographers than were authorized in its budget. The answer? Well, it was "stockpiling stenographers" against possible future needs—hiring people and carrying them on the payroll until they might be needed.

These shocking examples give you a picture of the tone and tenor of spendthrift Washington today—spend and spend, tax and tax. You all know that immoral slogan—the battle cry of spenders bent on making America over in the image of socialism and the police state.

But to a man, America says: "They shall not pass."

America is desperate for clear and consistent policies and for truthful presentation of facts by their leaders.

How can our people avoid confusion when the administration itself is apparently so confused that Secretary of Defense Marshall told the House Appropriations Committee the United States knows very little about Russia's military strength, while Secretary of State Acheson tells us the Russians have 4,000,000 troops, 200 divisions, and the world's largest jet air force with 20,000 front line planes, including excellent jet fighters. Whom are we supposed to believe?

And how do we reconcile the statement of Army Secretary Pace that we are ready for war with Russia with the testimony of General Vandenberg that we have only a "shoe-string airforce"?

The Congress has appropriated billions upon billions to build up our armaments. Since World War II we have appropriated for defense nearly \$200,000,000,000. If we are not now better prepared than some of our administrators say we are, it is high time the American people demanded some new administrators.

There is abundant evidence of waste and extravagance in some of our military expenditures. We must continue to spend billions for defense, but the strain of this burden is so great we cannot continue to support waste in any way, shape, or form. The Congress should create a Joint Committee of the House and Senate to carefully scrutinize military expenditures. Such a committee would exercise a restraining hand over bureaucratic excesses and would provide some assurance that the people who pay these vast bills are getting a dollar's worth of value for the dollars they pay in taxes.

Ten years ago, the cost of government—Federal, State, and local—took approximately 14 percent of the national income. When the war ended in 1945, taxation was taking 27 percent of all our income. This year the best available figures indicate that taxation will take approximately 29 percent of the people's income.

A study committee for the Foundation for Economic Education under Dr. Leonard Reed recently reported that when taxes went beyond 25 percent of a nation's income dictatorship was near.

And next year, on the basis of the administration tax bill which recently passed the House over the opposition of myself, and most of our Republican colleagues, taxes would

take 32 percent of all our income. Remember Lenin's great prediction that the United States would destroy itself by spending.

It should be crystal clear that when government confiscates a third of what the people earn—when people work 1 day in 3 for the government—they can no longer be free and independent. They must look to government for help. They have become exactly what the Socialists dream of—incipient wards of the state.

Just as 14 percent became 29 percent, and 29 percent became 32 percent, unless the people bring this wicked trend to an abrupt halt and fire the spenders, the 32 percent will soon become 40 percent as it is today in Socialist Britain, and eventually 60 percent as it is today in Communist Russia. When that happens, you can be sure our great American concept of freedom, opportunity, our system of enterprise, and a better way of life will have vanished forever. When that happens the last bulwark of free government, here and abroad, will have been destroyed.

Our forefathers founded this Republic upon the principle of liberty and individual opportunity, and the Communist concept that the people belong to the government is repugnant to every provision of our Constitution and to every instinct of the American people. The American people do not belong to the Government; the American Government belongs to the people—and the people belong only to God.

The people of the Nation are turning to the Republican Party as the instrument to restore integrity, decency, and morality to their Government. They recognize in our party the instrument through which they can regain confidence in the competence, the honesty, and the good faith of their administrators. They are hungry for leadership whose own example of ethical conduct will establish a pattern of moral standards that will command the respect of our own country and the world.

The vast majority of our people are disgusted with mink-coat and deep-freeze scandals, RFC loans to political favorites, influence peddlers, and 5 percenters—they are disgusted with all the minks, the pinks, and the stinks in Washington who are destroying the moral fiber, the very warp and woof of good government. They know that the only way the mess can be cleaned up is by a new, crusading leadership, dedicated to reviving the moral health of the United States Government.

Yes, the voters of America have a job cut out for them. Our workers, our businessmen, our farmers, and our housewives have a job cut out for them. In all history, the responsibility of citizenship never rested so heavily upon the people—it rests upon each of us just as heavily as if we were on the firing line in Korea.

The task cannot be mistaken. We must run every last one of these appeasers, these blunderers, these corrupters of power, these disciples of alien philosophies out of Washington.

If we don't do it, America is gone.

Once again, we must place lights in the belfry of the Old North Church.

Once again, not one Paul Revere, but thousands like him must ride forth.

American liberty was born in New England. Let New England be true to its heritage and give American liberty the rebirth that will save our country.

The task is not for the few, but for the many. Every single one of us must join in the crusade. We cannot run the risk that if one fails, all fail. Each must do his job.

We must dedicate ourselves to restoring faith in freedom, in individual liberty, and in God. We are joined in a battle that we cannot and must not lose.

Hub of the Trouble for Our Machine-Tool Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in the long study made by the Committee on Foreign Affairs much interesting testimony was brought before us relative to the whole program of production for the security and defense of this country and of the free world in which we must play a leading part. It interested me to have civilians and defense witnesses alike echo the words of the National Machine Tool Builders Association relative to one of the key production problems with which we are faced.

At various times I have laid before you some of the problems of this essential industry, essential both in war and in peace. Unable to amortize their machines in a reasonable length of time, the industry has had to slow down production until it reached a point of something like one-third of its capacity at the beginning of World War II. A ruling of the early thirties stood in the way, and foreign factories leaped into the field. Nor were orders forthcoming from the services which might have stepped up the renewals, due apparently to lack of programs and plans.

At the same time the new type airplanes, guns, and weapons of all sorts require a pretty complete retooling. If our military needs are actual and emergent—and we have no reason to believe them otherwise—then certainly the machine-tool makers have been curtailed beyond both reason and wisdom in the materials and the freedom to move which they require.

On Thursday of last week, Mr. Speaker, August 16, the Cleveland Plain Dealer ran an editorial pointing up one side of the problem which I include in my remarks:

WHERE BOTTLENECKS BEGIN

After all the hurrah it now appears that the mobilization program is in trouble. June deliveries of military aircraft are reported to have dropped below those of a month before, and the entire program was reported running about 20 percent behind schedule.

The big trouble has been the shortness of machine tools, particularly those used in building jet aircraft.

One is impressed with the reply of the machine-tool makers, who offer no apologies, and whose remarks make sense, which appeared in the August 6 edition of Newsweek, as follows:

"We've been predicting this for more than a year," an official of the National Machine Tool Builders Association said last week, "and our committee has been in Washington every week trying to get something done. * * * We repeatedly begged and urged help from Washington."

Newsweek quoted a Warney & Swasey official as having said:

"The airplane boys and Washington brass are looking for a whipping boy," he said, "and

we're it for the time being, as we were in the last war, but we produced then, and will do it again when and if it's necessary and when and if Washington tells us how much it wants, and when and if they give us the materials to do it with."

The machine-tool bottleneck may properly trace its existence to Washington's inability to make up its mind in time and to give the necessary orders and cooperation.

Water Resources: A Key to Agricultural Progress—Part 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, our scientists in the field of agriculture have demonstrated that crops can be produced in water alone, provided the water contains plant food in solution. A shortage of water is usually the direct cause of low crop yields. The crux of the problem in the South where we have the largest rainfall in the United States, is the conservation and proper use of our water resources. In other words, as Dr. Chapman so ably points out in his illuminating address styled "Water Resources: A Key to Agricultural Progress" every farmer must learn how to increase the water-holding capacity of his land.

The second half of Dr. Chapman's address follows.

WATER RESOURCES A KEY TO AGRICULTURAL PROGRESS

(By Paul W. Chapman, associate dean, College of Agriculture, the University of Georgia, Athens)

WHY ARE SOUTHERN PRODUCTION AVERAGES LOW?

Have you thought about this question; that is, low unit production on southern farms? Do you realize how serious and important it is? Can you answer it? What is the answer?

Is it poor soil or impoverished land? Is it an unfavorable climate? Is it due to unschooled masses of people, from the standpoints of science, technology, and engineering?

In some measure, it is, of course, all of these things and perhaps other factors as well.

But simply to say "poor soil" is not saying anything—because as everyone knows, crops can be produced in a water culture containing plant food in solution; that is, plants can be grown successfully without any soil at all.

Neither can conditions be blamed entirely upon climate, because it, too, is a general term. Furthermore, under favorable conditions, the tonnage of vegetation produced per acre tends to increase as one moves toward the equator. And, good farmers in the South usually make high yields. In fact, some of the Nation's all-time crop production records were made in the South.

Specifically, an inadequate water supply is more often than not the direct cause of low crop yields in the South.

THE MIRACLE OF IRRIGATION

Has it been proved that adding water at the proper time increases crop yields?

Yes. Countless times.

In one recent year, more than 30 cents out of every dollar earned from crop production in Texas came from 10 percent of the cropland that was irrigated.

Naturally, water made the difference.

Results obtained in Texas are rather typical; they apply, in general, to all crops everywhere, including, for example, the so-called supplementary irrigation program increasing so rapidly in popularity throughout the Southeast. For example:

Irrigation of truck crops normally pays large dividends. In east Tennessee, a section of normally high rainfall, yields of beans and cabbage are increased by irrigation from 50 to 300 percent. In a recent year, when rainfall was above average (1949) yields of beans and turnip greens were increased, in many instances, more than 75 percent.

The same relative increases apply to all crops.

In the case of an experimental test with alfalfa hay, the yield was increased more than 1 ton per acre by applying 3 inches of water.

Such results are universal.

In Virginia, for instance—the Southern State with the highest corn yields per acre—corn yields, even in a very wet year, were increased 50 percent by the application of water at the critical period in the growth and production period.

In South Carolina, here are some typical results expressed in terms of net dollars of profit per acre resulting from irrigation:

Corn: Net increased returns per acre, \$36.9

Alfalfa: Irrigation increased net profits \$40.05 per acre

These facts were reported by the State experiment station, the research work was done in cooperation with the Soil Conservation Service. Remember these are increased returns over and above the average production on check plots and are expressed in terms of added net profits per acre resulting from using more water than nature and the previous treatment and use of the soil provided.

In relation to southern farming it is conservative to refer to the miracles wrought by irrigation.

In numerous cases in the South, the increased profits resulting from irrigation have been, during recent years, enough per acre in 1 year to buy the land irrigated at the prevailing per-acre price.

WATER-HOLDING CAPACITY OF LAND

Do higher income and increased production results from irrigation mean that all agricultural-agency workers should concentrate their efforts upon extending irrigation farming, including supplementary irrigation in the Southeast?

No. They do not. But if agencies make known the results achieved by farmers using irrigation water, tens of thousands of farmers will install irrigation systems themselves, because it is an infallible way to increase yields per acre and net profits per worker.

Then, what do these results mean?

First of all, they mean that every farmer and all who work with farmers must learn how to increase the water-holding capacity of land. This may well be called the first lesson in successful farming.

MORE WATER—KEY TO GREATER FARM PROFITS

Among all raw materials or natural resources with which farmers work, water comes first. More often than not, it is the limiting factor in crop yields per acre.

That water is the key to agricultural progress and profits is certainly indicated in the following seven concise statements:

1. Thirty percent of a productive soil is water.

2. Seventy-five percent of a typical growing plant is water.

3. It requires 710 pounds of water to produce 1 pound of rice—a southern crop.

4. It takes 2 barrels—100 gallons—of water to grow one ear of corn.

5. To produce a bushel of oats, 146 barrels of water must be available for use.

6. Crop yields are most frequently limited by water. It takes enough water to cover an acre to a depth of 21 inches to make 100 bushels of corn per acre—something thousands of southern farmers are now doing every year.

7. Water and air furnish 95 percent of the ingredients of crops, only 5 percent comes from the soil.

The importance of water in relation to farming and life is understood in the West, where every flake of snow that falls upon the mountain tops in winter is treasured and held for use the following summer.

It is understood in the Southwest, where the total, average annual rainfall, in some sections, is 20 inches or less per year.

But water, like other precious gifts, is not appreciated in localities that seem to have an overabundance. Of this truth as it applies to water, the Southeast is the ideal example.

For generations the farm people of the Southeast have been told that they have the best (optimum) rainfall of the Nation.

This may be true.

But it is seldom, if ever, so distributed that it serves in an efficient manner all the diversified crops produced in all the seasons—fall, winter, spring, and summer—in which farming is done in the Southeast.

And another thing. How much is left for use after run-off, evaporation, and leaching each takes a heavy toll.

Run-off alone accounts for an average total loss of 20 percent of all the water that falls upon the farm lands of the Southeast. In the mild, salubrious climate of the Southeast, where, with the exception of unusual short periods, it is warm and comfortable throughout the year, and where the sun shines so many days out of each 365, evaporation takes a heavy toll—of course, this water is returned in most cases to the general locality from which it came, but there is no guarantee that it will go back to the same farm, or that it will be returned at the time it is needed most.

Then, there is leaching which not only takes out the water useful for farm production but the plant food as well. And, unless a crop is growing on the land 365 days a year, it, with the exception of short intervals in winter, goes on continuously year after year, and has gone on for generation after generation.

Countless things might be said about intermittent rains (short periods of drought) and leaching. Here are two:

Farmers have always known that there were intermittent periods of drought in the over-all annual supply of rainfall in the Southeast. About this, they have said many things. For instance:

"Cotton is a crop well adapted to our conditions. When it rains, it grows. When it stops raining, it stands still and waits for the next rain. Then, it picks up and goes to growing again. It is one of the best crops we can grow to meet our conditions."

This seemed, years ago, to be good logic. But we live now in an age in which logic has been replaced by science. And in light of the average cotton yields now being made in California and west Texas under irrigation, every thoughtful and well-informed person has already compared, in his own mind, the relative values of logic and research.

Any study of fundamental production problems always comes back to a consideration of water. Please consider the following:

In the Southeast, the best relative yields per acre, as compared with the nation as a whole, are most often made in such crops

as oats that are fall-sown. The same applies to winter pastures—perennial grasses and legumes. Why? Could it be that water losses in the fall, winter, and early spring are so much less than those during the growing season of summer? (This is a question directed to scientists and engineers, not to logicians and philosophers.)

CLIMATE-WATER IN SOIL EDUCATION

With good farmers, water is always the most reliable index to probable production.

In the Corn Belt, for example, the annual corn crop can be forecast annually on the basis of the July rainfall. This is not possible for the South, because of variable climatic conditions and wide range in planting dates.

Recently, there has been a South-wide campaign to increase corn yields per acre. Since corn occupies our greatest cropland acreage, such a campaign is most desirable. But no substantial, permanent gains will be made—in this or any other crop-production campaign—that are not associated with establishing a system of farming that increases the water-holding capacity of the soil.

Our farming system in the past, built too largely upon row crops, was undesirable for many reasons. Perhaps the most important reason of all has not been discussed by the public, because the public in the past was not trained or schooled in the sciences. (And is, in the field of conservation, trained very little even today; that is, if one realizes that mass knowledge and reaction are essential to progress in all technical occupations, including farming.)

Row-crop farming, with plowing, land turning, and cultivation, "burns up" organic matter in soils—the only substance that can increase the water-holding capacity of the land.

Thus the primary climatic land-management problem of the South is aggravated; namely, the normal and continuous burning up of organic matter—that is inherent in all mild-temperature localities where soils are seldom, if ever, frozen solid.

Have you realized that while opportunities are greater in a mild climate, so also are problems? Have you considered seriously the fact that it requires more knowledge—that is, education—to manage land efficiently in the South than in the North? This is true because southern farmers have personal responsibility for conserving soil and water 12 months in every year, where in the North God locks up these natural resources several months each year, so they cannot escape and man, even if he wished to do so, could not use or move them.

But in the South the resources of soil and water may, and should, be used 12 months during every year, in most localities.

Water and plant food may be held and used to a greater extent by the simple process of using the land throughout the year—that is, planting crops that will conserve it and increase cash returns. Crops, for instance, like a winter pasture of fescue grass and ladino clover; and other water-holding covers as parts of rotation systems. Of course, every available and known mechanical means for holding and increasing the water supply must be used, too.

By practicing a wiser system of farming than now is universal, the water-holding capacity of land will be increased. For example, At the Southern Piedmont Conservation Experiment Station, Watkinsville, Ga., the infiltration of water was increased 2.5 inches simply by planting cotton after lespedeza. As a result, crop yields per acre are much higher.

We live in an age of science. Education becomes increasingly important daily. Knowledge becomes essential at an ever-accelerating rate of speed.

Years ago, Thomas Jefferson said: The success of a democracy depends upon the education of all the people.

Jefferson was right. But he lived before the day of science. He lived, too, before the division of work that has so increased our dependence upon each other. As progressive as he was, he could not visualize the rapidity with which one man would, in reality, become his brother's keeper.

MASTER KEYS TO FUTURE ACHIEVEMENTS

The broad highways that will lead to more efficient use of natural and human resources in the South, as they relate to more effective utilization of water, seem fairly clear. Three are now obvious. They are:

1. Research: Our technical leaders including, of course, agricultural engineers, must study and present the facts that must guide us in the wisest possible use of water resources. Knowledge is power.

2. Leadership training: Our leaders who are associated intimately with our people, including agency workers, teachers—at all levels—and technicians, must be well trained in science, technology, and some of the broad principles of engineering, they must keep up to date relative to the practical and useful findings of research.

3. Mass education. But this so-called leadership effort will be of no avail unless the results are understood and accepted and in a large measure applied by all the people. Some, perhaps many, individuals in high places should realize that unless there are followers, there can be no leaders. And all should realize, too, the present-day division of labor—more than 40,000 kinds of jobs—cut up as it is into tiny little bits, makes us more dependent today upon each other than ever before. Recently, this thought has been on my mind very much in connection with the book, *Conserving Soil Resources*,¹ from which the following thoughts, if not the exact words, are taken:

In the use of water resources, as in all other aspects of conservation, every man is his brother's keeper. When any person charged with the management of resources fails to use them wisely, he lowers the living standards of his neighbors and his nation.

You are your brother's keeper and he is yours.

What can you do for your brother? You can help give him understanding. That is all.

We cannot control the amount of rain that falls. We cannot alter the climate in which we live. We cannot change, materially, the topography of the land. But, through the processes of education, we can change the attitude and actions of human beings, therein lies the hope of the future—the promise that every tomorrow can be a better day.

Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the prompt enactment of the defense housing and community facilities bill—S. 349—

is essential. I come from a thickly populated industrial area in New Jersey. My district is facing all the problems which come from the expansion of defense activities by industry. In addition, we have all the problems which come with the expansion of military installations in that area.

One of the Newark newspapers has published a series of stories on the housing conditions around these military installations. The story of Fort Dix is almost unbelievable. How can we expect our servicemen to go out and fight for a way of life if their own families are forced to live in squalor and filth.

There were pictures of shanty towns in which the servicemen rent shacks and pay exorbitant rents for them. In many cases their families have access only to community sanitary facilities. Many of the wives are forced to carry water. In some of the houses they sleep with some of the lights turned on to keep the rats from biting the children.

Private enterprise is slow to build housing around military installations. There is always a question as to how long such housing will be needed and whether it is a good investment. Builders and bankers have to be sure that their investment is safe.

The defense housing bill contains a continuation of the Wherry Act FHA housing program. This program is designed especially to encourage and assist private enterprise to furnish housing around military installations. In addition, the bill contains other special FHA mortgage insurance aids to help attract private financing of homes in critical defense areas. Even with these aids it may not be possible for private enterprise to provide the housing needed to correct situations like those at Fort Dix. The bill would authorize the Federal Government to build housing where private enterprise has shown plainly that it will not provide the housing which is necessary for the defense effort in a critical defense area. The bill contains provisions, however, which would assure the prompt disposal of such housing to private investors when such disposition is feasible.

I hope the builders and bankers in New Jersey are as ashamed as I am of the housing conditions around Fort Dix and all the other camps about which we have been hearing the same stories. I am sure they are and that they will be quick to take advantage of the assistance which will be provided by this bill and go in there and provide the necessary housing. If they do not, the Federal Government must do it. This bill would authorize the provision of housing which is essential to the national defense only where private enterprise has demonstrated that it will not do so. It is a good bill. It should have been enacted months ago. We must not delay longer. Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to act favorably on this bill and to defeat the amendments which would cripple action under the bill.

¹ *Conserving Soil Resources*. 1950. Turner E. Smith & Co., 441 West Peachtree St., Atlanta, Ga.

Congress Seen on Right Track in Plan for Reservists' Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the Brooks subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee has been working for weeks in an effort to perfect what may be called the Reserves' bill of rights.

On August 14, 1951, the New York Herald Tribune carried the following article by Gill Robb Wilson, which outlines the study being made of the Reserve program.

Our colleague, Hon. OVERTON BROOKS, chairman of the subcommittee is entitled to a lot of credit. He has handled the hearings in a very able manner and when the job is done the Reserves of the country will realize that it was under his leadership that the Reserves' bill of rights was perfected.

The article in the New York Herald Tribune, August 14, 1951, by Mr. Gill Robb Wilson, follows:

THE AIR WORLD—CONGRESS SEEN ON RIGHT TRACK IN PLAN FOR RESERVISTS' LAW
(By Gill Robb Wilson)

Since July 30, Congress has been exploring the merits of a proposed law—Armed Forces of United States Reserve Act of 1951—which might serve as a Magna Carta for armed civil components.

Hearings by the Brooks subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee show a congressional trend to resolve the unstable status of the week end warriors. The disposition of the committee to seek the guidance of the Reserves themselves is notable.

Hitherto the legal status of armed civil components, with the exception of National Guard and Naval Reserve, has been of permissive character. The act under discussion proposes to give all civil components a legally required status. Furthermore the law proposes to establish categories of reserves whereby the individual can know exactly his status as to liability of active service, responsibility for training, and other basic details.

Testimony to date reveals complete unanimity among various civil component organizations as to the need for the reserve act. The National Guard showed up to testify with 36 of 48 State adjutant generals present as witnesses. The Reserve Officers Association, the Marine Officers Reserve Association, and the Air Reserve all have endorsed the proposed law.

HOW FAR SHOULD LAW GO?

Chief point of contention between regulars and reserves involves the question of how far Congress should go in spelling out provisions of the 1951 act. Reserves want Congress to legislate in considerable detail. Regulars want Congress to legitimize the Reserves but leave details up to the secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Under merely permissive existence the reserves traditionally have been the victims of expediency. Long-range policy has been impossible. A state of irritation between Regular and Reserves has been fostered. Each year has brought the Reserves a fresh set of circumstances. Incentive to volunteer has been lacking. Individuals have been left in

doubt and confusion. Shuttling uncertainly between military and civilian responsibilities has worked hardship on reservists, their families and civilian employers.

But the national defense has suffered equally. For example, in this time of crisis the Air Force already has practically exhausted its reserve. Some 12,000 reservists have returned to active duty since the outbreak of war in Korea, where up to 80 percent of combat crews have been reservists. All Organized Reserve wings and their corollary units have gone back to uniform. Autumn will see the last 15 of the National Guard squadrons in the field.

VOLUNTEER LIST REMAINS

All that remains to the Air Force is a sifting of lists of some 120,000 officers and 60,000 airmen in the Volunteer Air Reserve. These constitute a mass of names and addresses of persons whose physical fitness, availability, or willingness to reenter service is wholly unknown to the Air Force. Not even an educated guess as to what may be salvaged is possible.

When the Volunteer Air Reserve is culled, the Air Force Reserve will be totally exhausted. If 140 groups are activated this year, the big problem will be manpower rather than airplanes.

The Air Force is making an attempt to rebuild its Reserve ranks by an increase in the number of universities and colleges offering Air ROTC training. During last year 63,000 ROTC air cadets were enrolled in 120 different institutions. The number of institutions is now being increased to 187 and by 1955 the output of graduates will have somewhat fortified the Air Reserve. But 1955 is a long way off in view of current world conditions.

In the meantime, it seems evident that the Reserve can be built back sooner and better if legislation gives it legally required status. Congress is on the right track and listening to the right advisers.

Disappearance of Report Relating to the Katyn Massacre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a resolution introduced by me in the House on July 31, 1951, creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the disappearance of the report, relating to the Katyn massacre, dictated by Lt. Col. John H. Van Vliet, Jr., on May 22, 1945:

Whereas the report on the massacre of more than 4,000 Polish prisoners of war at Katyn, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, dictated by Lt. Col. John H. Van Vliet, Jr., on May 22, 1945, in the private offices of Maj. Gen. Clayton Bissell, then Assistant Chief of Staff, G-2, of the Department of War, disappeared in the Department of the Army; and

Whereas the Department of the Army has been unable to produce the report or to discover who was responsible for its disappearance; and

Whereas this report would be of tremendous importance in establishing the guilt of the persons (1) who committed the mass murder of more than 4,000 Polish prisoners of war in the Union of Soviet Socialist Re-

publics, and (2) who caused the disappearance of an additional 11,000 Polish officers on Soviet Russian soil: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the disappearance of the report, relating to the Katyn massacre, dictated by Lt. Col. John H. Van Vliet, Jr., on May 22, 1945, in the private offices of Maj. Gen. Clayton Bissell, then Assistant Chief of Staff, G-2, Department of War.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Americans of Japanese Ancestry in Hawaii Under Attack by Foe of Statehood From Denver—Allegations Disproved by Record—Statehood for Hawaii Still Supported by Denver Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I present for publication in the RECORD, correspondence on the subject of statehood for Hawaii that will be unusually illuminating. It illustrates the tactics that have been employed for many years by foes of statehood for Hawaii. I am indebted to Representative WAYNE N. ASPINALL, of Colorado, for bringing to my attention the letter on this subject addressed to him and other members of the Colorado delegation by E. W. Fishburn, of Denver. His letter contains many serious misstatements.

The comment on this letter of Benjamin O. Wist, a member of the Hawaii Statehood Commission, and for many years, dean of the college of education of the University of Hawaii, is an eloquent reply to these allegations and is deserving of the attention of all Members of Congress.

The correspondence follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 5, 1951.

Hon. JOSEPH FARRINGTON,
Delegate from Hawaii, House Office
Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Attached hereto is a letter which I have received today from the director of the public relations department of the Denver Chamber of Commerce. It is self-explanatory.

Before I reply to Mr. Fishburn's letter, I should appreciate having your reaction to the thoughts which he has expressed and any comments you may care to make.

With kindest personal wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Member of Congress.

DENVER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Denver, Colo., July 2, 1951.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPINALL: Mrs. Fishburn and I have just returned from a 6 weeks' tour of the Hawaiian Islands—we had a glorious time and visited all the islands, spending considerable time on each of them. While there we were apprised of the widespread concern among the people there on the subject of statehood.

As you probably know, the Japanese hold the preponderance of voting strength throughout all the islands and they are naturally very anxious to see statehood for the island accomplished—the contrary is the consensus of everybody else that I came in contact with.

The Japanese are united to bring about their objective, are behind Wilfred Tsukiyama for governor, Tom Okino and Tommy Sakakihara for Senators, or other men who are equally Japanese champions. If statehood goes through, such men would undoubtedly be elected by the Japanese vote. It would give the Japanese positive domination politically over the entire area, resulting in appointments being made favorable to Japanese interests to the detriment of all other interests, American included.

Deep in the heart of every Japanese is an inherent regard for the mother country. There are many loyal Japanese among the younger generation—this is not true of the middle-aged and old Japanese, many of whom forsook their status on the islands to serve in the Japanese Army. To my personal knowledge many are back in business again on the islands and still hold commissions in the Japanese Army.

No one knows the possible eventualities of the future years. It is my firm belief irreparable damage to our Nation could very logically result by the passage of House bills 49 and 1646, now referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

I strongly urge your opposition in every way possible to Hawaiian statehood, and should be happy to have your thought on the matter.

Cordially yours,

E. W. FISHBURN,
Director, Public Relations Department.

JULY 30, 1951.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WAYNE: I appreciate very sincerely your thoughtfulness in bringing to my attention the letter that you received, under date of July 2, from E. W. Fishburn, director of the public relations department of the Denver Chamber of Commerce.

The letter from Mr. Fishburn contains many misstatements and grossly misrepresents the situation in the Territory.

The question of statehood for Hawaii has been under active consideration in the Territory itself and Congress for a period of close to 20 years.

Every poll of public sentiment, public or private, and every vote has shown an overwhelming majority of Hawaii's people in favor of immediate statehood for Hawaii. It shows the opposition is confined to an extremely small, although active minority.

The statement that "the Japanese hold the preponderance of voting strength throughout all the islands" is false. The position of the Japanese politically, economically, and socially, both with respect to the past, present, and future, has been the object of the most searching investigations through a period of more than 30 years. The results of these investigations are readily available to anyone who desires to study them. They completely disprove this allegation. They show not only that the Japanese do not dominate the islands, but that the implication that they are not good citizens is completely false.

The fact is that all of the statistics covering the political, social, and economic position of the Americans of Japanese ancestry reflect great credit upon them. They are industrious, thrifty, and law abiding. They make excellent citizens. Their sacrifices during World War II can leave no doubt of their patriotism. To accuse them now of anything else is to ignore the record and to do them and the people of Hawaii, who have trained them for the responsibilities of citizenship, a very great injustice.

The charge that "the Japanese are united to bring about their objective" apparently intends to give the impression that they desire as a racial unit to take control of the islands politically as well as economically. The record of many years shows that the Americans of Japanese ancestry are divided along economic, political, and social lines as are people of every other racial group. It proves that they have been assimilated into the citizenry of this country as have people of many other racial origins.

The author of this letter shows his ignorance of our situation when he refers to Wilfred Tsukiyama, who is now President of our Senate, as Wilfred "Stukiyama." Senator Tsukiyama is an outstanding American. He would do credit to any community. He was elected to the Senate from the Island of Oahu, where the votes of the Caucasians are predominant. Most of them supported him. He was opposed by a very considerable number of Americans of Japanese ancestry.

Senator Tsukiyama is a graduate of Coe College, Iowa, which recently gave him an honorary degree, and of the University of Chicago Law School. He is a veteran of World War I and was denied service in World War II only because of his age. His son is at present fighting with American forces in Korea.

It is interesting to note that the election of Senator Tsukiyama as president of the senate was opposed by Tom Okino, who is a Japanese-American senator from the island of Hawaii and a Democrat. Senator Okino is a graduate of Oberlin College in Ohio and a good American.

Representative Thomas Sakakihara from the island of Hawaii is on the other hand a Republican.

The allegation that they all work in union is disproved by the record of every election and by the record of the legislature itself.

The so-called Japanese vote does not predominate the islands. In some areas where the Americans of Japanese ancestry are particularly strong, as in the Kona area on the island of Hawaii, all four of the representatives are of races other than Japanese.

I could cite an unending series of incidents to prove the untruth of the state-

ments made by Mr. Fishburn. They are in the character of charges that have been made for a period of 30 years and completely disproved in the minds of fair and impartial persons.

He challenges the loyalty of Americans of Japanese ancestry. I can't imagine any charge that is less justified and more shameful in light of the record that was made in World War II and is now being made in Korea. I am sure that those who see Japan in the future as our most important ally in the Pacific would deplore the circulation of falsehoods of this character.

Among the men who testified in support of statehood in 1947 was Admiral Chester W. Nimitz. He fought most of the Pacific war from his headquarters at Pearl Harbor. Probably no one is in a better position to measure the attitude of the Americans of Japanese ancestry than was Admiral Nimitz. On the basis of his vast information and his devotion to the interests of national defense, he declared that he was confident that these people were as loyal as other Americans.

I suggest that you send Mr. Fishburn the record of the hearings before the House Committee on Public Lands in 1947 containing this statement and others from military leaders who are fully informed on this problem.

Mr. Fishburn addressed his letter to you as director of the public-relations department of the Denver Chamber of Commerce. Is he speaking for the Denver Chamber of Commerce in this letter and, if so, to what extent has his letter been circulated? If the answer is in the affirmative, then I should like to request that this letter be sent to the same persons who have received Mr. Fishburn's letter. If he is speaking for himself, I would like to have you bring this letter to the attention of the president and the board of directors of the Denver Chamber of Commerce.

Yours truly,

J. R. FARRINGTON,
Delegate from Hawaii

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C., July 31, 1951.

Mr. E. W. FISHBURN,
Director, Public-Relations Department,
Denver Chamber of Commerce,
Denver, Colo.

DEAR MR. FISHBURN: Immediately upon receipt of your letter of July 2, in which you, in your capacity as director of the public-relations department of the Denver Chamber of Commerce, set forth your opposition to the legislation providing statehood for Hawaii, I forwarded such letter to the Honorable JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, Delegate from Hawaii. I followed such procedure—

First, because your letter differed so materially from the evidence which we had taken during the hearings on this legislation held in 1949 and 1950—as I remember such hearings, there was no evidence whatsoever to substantiate your position;

Second, because I have come to know my colleague and personal friend, JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, to be one of the finest and most loyal Americans we have in Congress—one for whose integrity and honesty I hold the greatest respect;

Third, because I personally doubt if any person, American or otherwise, can go into another part of the world, even a State or Territory of his own Nation, and correctly analyze political and social situations, and

Fourth, because in your letter you speak not as an individual but rather in an official capacity for an organization to which I personally belong and for which I have high respect, and for my fellow members for whom I desire that information received by them be presented in a factual rather than an emotional manner.

We, all of us, differ in our thinking and naturally we arrive at different conclusions. This, of course, is as it should be in a freedom loving land such as ours. Nevertheless, we should seek to present our position in a rational manner at all times. The people of Hawaii are fellow citizens of ours and have a right to all the considerations and respect which any fellow citizen enjoys—this, until they are proved individually to be disloyal to our country and its institutions.

You are more fortunate than I, in that I have not yet had the pleasure of visiting Hawaii. However, I have met many of its citizens of the various races represented and of the different political parties present in its citizenry. I have found them to be equally loyal and patriotic as the continental Americans themselves.

I am enclosing a copy of Delegate FARRINGTON's answer to your letter. I am sure that you will receive it in the spirit of an understanding citizen just as it was sent to me by a loyal and understanding citizen.

Under separate cover, I am forwarding to you a record of the hearings held before the House Committee on Public Lands in 1947, when it was taking evidence on the statehood for Hawaii bill. I refer you especially to the testimony given by Admiral Chester W. Nimitz.

This matter has been treated by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs (formerly Committee on Public Lands) almost wholly as a non-partisan matter. We look at it presently as such. Delegate FARRINGTON happens to be a member of the Republican Party. I belong to the Democratic Party. Partisan politics should have no place in the consideration of such legislation.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Member of Congress

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 31, 1951.

Mr. GEORGE COLLISON,
Secretary-Manager, Denver Chamber of Commerce,
Denver, Colo.

DEAR MR. COLLISON: Soon after the first of the month I received a letter from Mr. E. W. Fishburn, copy of which is enclosed herewith. Because of the implications conveyed in his letter I immediately got in touch with my colleague, Delegate JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, from Hawaii, requesting him to give to me his reaction to the charges made by Mr. Fishburn. Today I am in receipt of Delegate FARRINGTON's reply, and I am enclosing a copy herewith for your study.

I would be pleased if you would write to me at your earliest convenience and advise me as to whether or not Mr. Fishburn wrote as the official representative of the Denver Chamber of Commerce and as to whether or not his thought is the prevailing thinking, in your opinion, of the members of our chamber.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Member of Congress

P. S.—Copy of my reply to Mr. Fishburn also is enclosed.

DENVER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Denver, Colo., August 6, 1951.
Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Congress of the United States,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ASPINALL: I have just returned to my desk following an absence of 3 weeks, and find your letter to me of July 31 on the subject of statehood for Hawaii.

I was not previously aware of Mr. Fishburn's letter to you, and am unable to reach him today, because he is at home ill. Rather than delay a reply, I am writing immediately. Any expressions by Mr. Fishburn on this

subject are strictly his own, and such should have been made clear in his letter to you.

The Denver Chamber of Commerce, by formal action of its very sizable board of directors, favors statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska. I am enclosing marked copies of our membership magazine, in which announcement is made of the chamber's position.

It should be explained that the board of directors of the chamber consists of 27 members elected from the chamber's general membership, and, in addition, some 25 directors, known as honorary directors, named by and from the governing boards of that number of other Denver organizations, including the leading service clubs, trade associations, and civic bodies. These latter directors participate in all discussions and actual voting on matters considered by the board.

I am grateful to you for the opportunity of clarifying our position on a matter of such extraordinary importance.

With kindest regards to you and yours,
I am

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE COLLISON,
Secretary-Manager.

HAWAII STATEHOOD COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., August 6, 1951.
Hon. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON,
Delegate to Congress, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOE: I have just received your letter of July 30, together with copies of (1) a letter from E. W. Fishburn, director, public relations department, Denver Chamber of Commerce, addressed to Congressman ASPINALL, and (2) your own forceful reply to Mr. Fishburn's undocumented charges in a letter to Congressman ASPINALL.

I can sympathize with your indignation at the charges made by Mr. Fishburn—indignation I share. His position focuses attention upon what you and I know to be the basic reason for the failure of Hawaii to have been granted equality with the States of the Union—an American racial prejudice. It emphasizes anew the fact that all other arguments, such as noncontiguity and communism, are specious rationalizations.

Yesterday the one millionth American to give his life for his country in the wars fought by the United States died on the battlefields of Korea. His name has not as yet been released, but the probabilities are three to one that it will not be Smith, or Brown. In all likelihood, it will be Hashimoto, Sakai, or Toshiyama. It could well be Tsukiyama; for the son of Senator Tsukiyama, and who is so unjustly maligned by Mr. Fishburn, is in Korea fighting for the American way of life—if indeed he has not already made the supreme sacrifice that you and I and other Americans may continue to enjoy the freedoms granted by the greatest document penned by the hand of man—the Constitution of the United States of America.

Apparently, Joe, there are still those among us who have "eyes that see not"; apparently, too, there are persons who have souls so dead that they never to themselves have said, "This is my own, my native land." How can a man, after even 6 weeks' visitation, have failed so completely to understand Hawaii's most conspicuous characteristic—its deep-rooted faith in the American ideal? Blind, indeed, and lacking in soul must be he who has so little faith in the efficacy of the principles which made us a Nation—who believes that these principles have not, and cannot be, implemented in the minds and hearts of those of different ethnic strain from his own.

As you know, Joe, I too am of immigrant parentage. This country of mine made it possible for my immigrant father to assist creatively in the Americanization of his kind. This country of mine has given me the privilege of training some 80 percent of Hawaii's public-school teachers—Americans all. Some

30 percent of these American teachers are of Japanese ancestry. I challenge the imputation that they are other than American. I challenge the imputation that I have lived my life in vain. I challenge the Americanism of the one who dares to imply that the Nisei of Hawaii, born under the aegis of the American flag and educated in America's most cherished social institution—the public school—have "deep in their hearts . . . an inherent regard for the mother country." I know whereof I speak; I believe I have the right to speak; I question the right of a 6 weeks' tourist to his undocumented opinion. And no man, Joe, is entitled to an opinion until he has examined the evidence. Nothing in the evidence supports a single allegation made by Mr. Fishburn.

1 "While we were there (Hawaii)," asserts Mr. Fishburn, "we were apprised of the widespread concern among people there on the subject of statehood."

Concerned? Yes. But not concerned over the possibility of such political status, concerned rather with the long-drawn-out delay in the attainment of this objective.

2 "As you probably know," continues Mr. Fishburn, "the Japanese hold the preponderance of voting strength throughout all the islands." This categorical statement is not borne out statistically. The last available figures indicated that this ethnological group in 1943 represented approximately 32 percent of the electorate. The same statistics—and they are of congressional origin—show that only 9 percent of elected officials were of Japanese ancestry.

There is, furthermore, the inference that voters of Japanese ancestry vote en bloc—and for those of their own ethnic group. What is the evidence? I refer here to the vote for delegates to our State constitutional convention. Surely, if it were the intention of the group to dominate politically it would be reflected in that vote. Of the 63 elected delegates, 19 were of Japanese ancestry. On the other hand, 38 were of Caucasian or part-Hawaiian ancestry. To delineate even more clearly: I was personally one of 31 candidates in the fourth representative district, from which 6 were elected. Racially, these six represented three Caucasians, two part-Hawaiians, and one Chinese. Defeated was one of the best-loved and highly respected Nisei veterans of World War II—largely on the score of his youth and inexperience.

3 "They (Japanese) are naturally very anxious to see statehood for the island(s) accomplished—the contrary is the consensus of everybody else that I came in contact with," says Mr. Fishburn.

Of course, Americans of Japanese ancestry are anxious for statehood. It would indeed be an admission of the futility of the American plan of government and ineffectiveness of its social institutions were this not to be true. What American does not cherish the privileges as well as the obligations of his citizenship?

I can only wonder how a man can spend a day in Hawaii, to say nothing of 6 weeks, and meet none but persons of Japanese ancestry who favor statehood. How can this be reconciled with the 2 to 1 favorable vote in the plebiscite of 1940—before the days of World War II? How reconciled with a 3-to-1 favorable vote in ratification of the State Constitution?

I wonder, too, at a man trained in public relations who accepts without question the misstatement of the relatively few persons he met during 6 weeks of visitation in Hawaii. Who failed to ascertain whether there is another side to the story in view of his apparent interest. He certainly could not have sought information or opinion from the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu—as one might assume he would.

4. Says Mr. Fishburn, "The Japanese are united to bring about this objective: Are behind Wilfred Tsukiyama (Tsukiyama), Tom

Okino and Tommie Sakakihara for Senators. . . . If statehood goes through, such men would undoubtedly be elected by the Japanese vote."

Again, there is the implication of bloc voting—a practice not borne out by any survey or study made by any agency, institution, or individual in the entire history of the Territory. You have ably answered this charge in your own rebuttal. I voted for Senator Tsukiyama; I hope to have the privilege of doing so again. I also voted for Senator Heen (Chinese-Hawaiian ancestry) and for one Joseph Rider Farrington. None of the three I have referred to could have been elected without a majority of the votes of Americans of non-Japanese ancestry—or without those of Japanese ancestry, for that matter.

5. "It (the election of persons of Japanese ancestry), would give the Japanese positive domination politically over the entire area, resulting in appointments being made favorable to Japanese interests to the detriment of all other interests, American included." So says Mr. Fishburn.

What, I ask, are the interests that are peculiarly Japanese and detrimental to other interests? Is not our democracy predicated on the thesis that "what is good, is good for all"?

But there is something far more insidious in this apparently naive statement. There is the implication that Americans of Japanese ancestry are Japanese, not Americans. Does Mr. Fishburn not know that Japanese aliens residing in Hawaii represent less than 25 percent of that ethnic group, that less than 1 percent of the youth enrolled under compulsory education in our public schools are foreign-born?

6. "Deep in the heart of every Japanese," says Mr. Fishburn, "is an inherent regard for the mother country."

Not only does he contradict himself in his very next statement—"there are many loyal Japanese among the younger generation"—but he fails to credit the findings of anthropological and sociological studies which, without exception to my knowledge, prove that attitudes and habits are the results of social environment—not of biological heritage.

7. Continues Mr. Fishburn, "this is not true of the middle-aged and older Japanese, many of whom forsook their status on the islands to serve in the Japanese Army. To my personal knowledge" he adds, "many are back in business again on the islands and still hold commissions in the Japanese Army."

Of all the misstatements in Mr. Fishburn's letter, this is perhaps the most offensive. Whom are we to believe—Mr. Fishburn or the FBI and the Army and Naval Intelligence Services? Mr. Fishburn should be made to name one—just one, not many—persons of Japanese ancestry, back in business in Hawaii while still holding a commission in the Japanese Army, who forsook his status in Hawaii to serve in that army during the recent war.

Mr. Fishburn has made one single statement with which I can heartily concur: "No one knows the possible eventualities of the future years." And in this one sentence he refutes his entire thesis; for elsewhere in his letter he has had the temerity to predict the future—and that on the basis of a 6 weeks' vacation in Hawaii.

I am grateful for the well-established fact that a majority of Americans are better posted on Hawaii and more objective in their reasoning than Mr. Fishburn appears to be.

Please feel free to use this letter in any way you see fit in the enhancement of the American way of life through the granting of statehood to Hawaii.

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN O. WIST,

Member Hawaii Statehood Commission.

Meat Eaters and "Beefers"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 17, 1951

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Patrick E. Gorman, secretary-treasurer of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, A. F. of L., in the following article, reveals in a practical and unique manner, some of the facts and problems concerning the high cost of living:

The United States is both a country of meat eaters and a nation of "beefers." The high price of steak seems to be our chief topic of conversation. In times like these, anyone in the meat business who doesn't have a tough hide feels practically isolated from the rest of society. A meat market owner in Chicago recently became tired of his customers complaining that he was a "robber." He decided to do something about it. The first customer the following morning noticed that the meat cutter was wearing a mask and toted a pistol at his side. "What's the mask and gun for?" asked the customer. The owner then stepped up and said, "Don't blame it on the meat cutter. I set the prices here, but everyone calls me a robber, so I thought I would make my meat cutters look like gunmen. You can't blame the high price of meat on the man who works for me, and you can't blame me either, because my margin of profit is very small. Honestly, I am hardly able to make a decent living."

Who then is to blame for the high cost of meat? Certainly not the worker—he only works for a living. Competition among market owners is keen and, with many people not buying meat, some operators are knocking down prices for the sole purpose of keeping up volume. If we ask the meat packers who is responsible, they only say, "Certainly not us, why don't you take a look at what we are compelled to pay for livestock!" This brings us down through the commission men, the operators of railroads and trucks, and the livestock raiser himself. Far be it from us to cast a suspicious glance at agriculture, except to say that until recently this group alone seemed to have no particular "beef" to make about the whole meat situation.

Our present per capita consumption of around 150 pounds of meat—all meats—ranks us about fifth in the world. Argentina, New Zealand, Australia, and Uruguay are ahead of us. However, when it comes to "beefing" and griping we take the cake. We are the winners with no challengers even in sight.

On the other hand, the picture is not really as dark and dismal as it may seem to be. There have been changes—substantial changes—during the past 70 years in the methods of producing and supplying the Nation's meat needs. Thanks to the widespread use of scientific methods and careful handling, the loss of meat animals by injury and disease has been drastically reduced.

Wages and working conditions of packinghouse workers and retail meat cutters have been materially improved through the years and will continue to be improved in the days ahead by every legitimate means available to the locals and the international union. However, in spite of these improvements it is generally agreed that the cost of the labor factor in the production of meat has remained relatively stable over a long period of years.

This "eating your cake and having it, too," so to speak, is due in no small measure to

the tremendous volume and increased efficiency in the packing industry, including the almost complete utilization of every part of the livestock meat animal, resulting in a constantly expanding list of byproducts. In part, it is also due to the increasing productivity of the workers in the industry. The finger of suspicion must thus cease to point to labor cost as a major factor in the high price of meat.

Nutritionists call attention to the fact that probably the biggest culprit in the meat price muddle or puzzle is the consumer himself. Insistent demands for high-priced cuts that aren't there must share the blame for rising prices in normal times. Add to these the demands of the increasing number of customers regularly entering the market for high-priced cuts, and the problem staggers the imagination.

The housewife and other shoppers who frequently fume about the high cost of meat would do well to remember a few additional meat facts: (1) That the high-priced, quick-cooking steaks and roasts make up only about 26 percent of the side of a beef; (2) that the remainder which comprises almost three-fourths of the side is made up of the more economical, slower cooking, but just as nutritious cuts such as shanks, short ribs, brisket, round steak, chuck, flank, stew meat, and the like. The best advice on how to cook these economical cuts is slow and low—cook slowly on low heat.

Here on the home front we have given a miserable demonstration of patriotism and devotion. We have lost all sense of unity. We seem to have no direction and but little leadership. We have stumbled and bungled our way from one series of gripes and bickering to another. Business "as usual" continues to be the order of the day. Every group advocates sacrifice—but for the other fellow. We constantly violate regulations and defy controls.

The job we face is one for the whole Nation to tackle. In this struggle no proxies are allowed. Every single member of the crew must stand in his place wherever he is and shoulder his load, whether it be simple inconveniences or supreme sacrifice, high meat prices or lowered standard of living.

Polish Rebels Declare Reds Prepare War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the Washington Post of August 17, 1951:

POLISH REBELS DECLARE REDS PREPARE WAR

STOCKHOLM, August 16.—Two young Polish sailors said today they fled to Sweden because they did not want "to fight the West on Russia's side."

"There are more like us in Poland," they said. "Our feelings are shared by most enlisted men and by many officers. We will not carry arms against the West."

The two seamen, Ignacy Hazel, 21, and Henrik Skorupka, 22, acted as spokesmen for a dozen crew members of the Polish minesweeper who locked up their officers 2 weeks ago and guided the ship to political asylum in Sweden.

Poland asked Sweden formally yesterday to return the mutineers but the demand apparently will have little effect.

The sailors said the Poles are preparing for war under Russian direction.

"Russia has turned the whole country into a gigantic slave camp where life is unbearable for anybody but Communists," they said.

The sailors said Moscow has Russians in "every key position."

Their minesweeper, the sailors said, had been busy preparing to lay new mine fields in the Baltic.

Their hopes of escaping, they said, were boosted along by broadcasts of the Voice of America. Everybody listens, they said, even at the risk of "5 years in jail if you pass on what you have heard."

Budget for Foreign Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the action taken by the House last Friday reducing the mutual security bill by \$350,000,000 may prove penny wise and pound foolish. No doubt, many Members were and perhaps still are of the opinion that cuts were anticipated and that the requests for foreign aid were padded to allow in advance for appropriation reductions.

No prudent individual would intentionally risk the security of our Nation and the peace of the world. Since no one will deny that the present and immediate future hold great responsibility and threat to our security and peace, it follows that the sooner we are prepared to meet and avert the danger, not only by building our defense but by aiding our friends toward an identical end, the better and greater our assurances are for peace in our time and for all time.

To the extent we put off the preparedness of the free world, to that extent we are inviting and tempting the Soviets to initiate aggression and perhaps global war.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter of the Honorable Thomas D. Cabot, Director of the International Security Affairs Committee of the State Department, written to the editors of the Washington Post, calling attention to misstatements of fact by the Alsop brothers' column of August 17. I believe Mr. Cabot's reply is a sincere, frank, and conscientious attempt to correct misunderstanding regarding the budget for foreign-aid program.

I recommend his letter to the Members of Congress for it may aid in correcting misapprehensions, perhaps even aid in correcting our errors in judgment on the much needed authorization and appropriations for our security through cooperative world effort.

BUDGET FOR FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

The column by Messrs. Joseph and Stewart Alsop appearing in the August 17 issue of the Washington Post contains a misstatement of fact about the foreign aid program which I want to call to your attention. After reporting that "no more than routine

cuts of from \$700,000,000 to \$1,000,000,000 are now expected," the writers go on to say that these cuts "were, of course, allowed for in advance when the appropriation requests were compiled."

I found this statement surprising in view of the consistent and intelligent support which the writers have given the foreign aid program and the entire national defense effort, and especially in view of the fact that the remainder of their column clearly recognizes the dangers which would result from a substantial cut in foreign aid. It would appear that the statement was based primarily upon the popular notion that governmental budget requests are regularly "padded" to allow for congressional reductions, a reflection upon the state of public morals which I find it extremely difficult to accept.

In any event, I have personal knowledge that the foreign aid request now under consideration by the Congress was not padded. It represents an honest estimate of the minimum requirements for our own national security interests, developed jointly by the State Department, the Defense Department, the Economic Cooperation Administration, and the Bureau of the Budget. These estimates were carefully screened, and in fact sliced to the bone, before presentation to the Congress.

Obviously, no estimate of this kind can pretend to be accurate to the last penny. There is always some margin of error. In this instance, however, the margin of error will beyond question be on the low side. Knowledge of how the estimates were developed will make this fact clear.

The bulk of the funds requested, whether labeled military or economic, are designed to build military strength to resist Soviet aggression, either by providing free nations directly with the guns, tanks, etc., needed by their armed forces or by providing raw materials, machine tools and the like in order to permit them to expand their own military efforts. Everyone knows that, at present, the armed strength of our allies is below the minimum requirements for effective defense. Even assuming a maximum effort on their part, which we have assumed in developing the aid estimates, the remaining gap between existing strength and required strength is still very large.

Our own national security demands that this gap be closed as rapidly as possible. Every year of delay increases the danger period in which we are vulnerable to attack. Obviously, this task is so great that fully adequate defenses can be built only over a period of 3 or 4 years. However, it is equally obvious that the utmost speed is vital and that orders placed now will produce the required military equipment none too soon. In other words, we must do as much as possible as quickly as possible.

The governmental agencies concerned with this program estimated that about \$10,000,000,000 could be used effectively during the coming fiscal year. However, a new factor had to be considered. An interagency study revealed that the American industrial plant currently lacks capacity to turn out tanks, guns, and so forth, for ourselves and our allies fast enough to use effectively the larger sum. Therefore, the original estimate was slashed approximately \$1,500,000,000 before it was presented to the Congress.

I want to emphasize the fact that, if productive facilities had been adequate, the foreign aid request for this year would have been substantially greater than it is, in order to shorten the danger period.

There is another factor which shows the foreign aid estimates are, if anything, too low. These estimates did not allow for the rising prices of equipment here and abroad,

simply because such price increases cannot be reliably predicted at this time. However, the present inflationary trend leaves little doubt that the foreign aid funds, when authorized, will buy considerably less than was originally planned.

In view of the shrinkage that has already taken place, any further reduction in the aid program is both perilous and pointless. A cut in this year's appropriation, however great or small, means that the gap next year and the following year will be just that much larger. It means delay and every day of delay lengthens the period within which the Soviet Union may be tempted to try its luck in the dangerous adventure of global war.

THOMAS D. CABOT.

Balloons Give Clue to Way Into Redland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article by Drew Pearson, from the Washington Post of August 17, 1951:

AN EXPERIMENT—BALLOONS GIVE CLUE TO WAY INTO REDLAND

(By Drew Pearson)

(Drew Pearson is on another tour of Europe, studying conditions there. Herewith is another of his dispatches from close to the Czech border.)

NEAR THE CZECHOSLOVAK BORDER.—The current experiment in penetrating the iron curtain by balloons may be a great success or it may fail. It is too early yet to say. But the important thing is that it's an attempt by private individuals under the free-enterprise system to try out certain methods of psychological propaganda—or call it psychological warfare if you will—which governments will not and perhaps cannot tackle.

Today the State Department's propaganda effort is seriously hamstrung by congressional penny pinching, while the American military men who now dominate our foreign policy believe that the only way to stop Russia is to have more and bigger guns. They have little faith in psychological warfare. Accordingly, the National Security Council has ruled out any strong appeals to the people in the iron-curtain countries to revolt, sabotage, or disrupt their Cominform governments.

Yet psychological warfare to be successful must offer something—a change for freedom, for peace, more food or an end of oppression. American propaganda frequently fails because it offers nothing.

The citizen of Czechoslovakia is not interested in hearing foreign radio broadcasts tell him the Soviet system is evil. He knows the Soviet system is evil; what he wants to hear from the Voice of America are ways by which he can throw off the yoke of oppression. Such advice under the National Security Council's present policy cannot be given officially. Meanwhile, Soviet psychological warfare offers excitement, intrigue, revolt against colonial oppressors, and nose thumbing at bourgeois masters.

STALIN'S ACHILLES' HEEL

These are some of the reasons why private individuals tackled this experiment of trying

to make the iron curtain a lace curtain. Personally I am convinced from my last winter's study of the iron-curtain countries and from other information that it's not the atomic bomb but contact with free peoples that the Soviet fears most. The unrest of Soviet peoples is Stalin's real Achilles' heel. He's not worried over American air power—great as it is—or even over new atomic weapons, but he is worried over the general dislike of the satellite and Russian peoples for Moscow's unpopular regime.

Therefore, if we are to win the subjugated nations over to our side, we must inspire them, encourage them and above all, keep in contact with them. It was because Stalin mortally feared such contact that he erected the iron curtain and it is to hit this Achilles' heel that a group of private individuals and organizations, has now launched messages of hope, friendship, and encouragement by balloon into Czechoslovakia.

The people who had the courage to sponsor this project are the American Crusade for Freedom organization, the Inter-American Federation of Free Trade Unions which has been fighting communism throughout Latin America, veterans or prisoners of war chiefly from Belgium, France, Holland, and Italy, the General Federation of Women's Clubs with 5,500,000 members in 32 countries plus another 5,500,000 in the United States, the AFL Trades and Labor Congress of Canada, the CIO Canadian Congress of Labor, and the International Federation of Free Journalists, comprising about 1,000 newsmen exiled from Soviet countries.

The chief dynamo in this intricate operation has been Abbott Washburn, loaned by General Mills of Minneapolis to the Committee for Free Europe which has done such an important job of beaming broadcasts into Czechoslovakia and placed the freedom bell in Berlin last year. Harold Stassen, who heads the Crusade for Freedom, has also helped to mastermind the operation. At the initial balloon launching from Munich, Germany, were Boleslaw Wierzbianski of Poland, George Jonescu of the Rumanian Federation of Free Journalists, Frau Lotte Stoehr of Germany and Mrs. Robert Taylor, both of the Federation of Women's Clubs.

It is considered especially significant in Europe that these balloons are being aimed at Czechoslovakia after the imprisonment of William Oatis and that among their sponsors are the Federation of Free Journalists. Hitherto the United States official policy has leaned toward paying virtual ransom money when its citizens have been seized by the Cominform. Thus, important concessions were given to Hungary to obtain Robert Vogeler's release from jail.

However, it is now realized that the more you pay out in concessions to the Soviet the more Moscow demands in ransom money and the more it is inclined to maltreat American citizens and to increase the blackmail demands. America's cracking down on Czech trade is an indication of this new stiffening of policy by the United States and the current balloon operation supplements it. This may help to show the Cominform that, instead of taking the abuse of our citizens lying down, we intend to retaliate.

STORY OF FRIENDSHIP

Around Europe Germans crowd around the balloon truck convoy when it sets up operations at night like kids watching circus wagons unload at home. One trouble is to keep the crowds from smoking when near the hydrogen tanks. Radio Free Europe, operated partly by Czech refugees in Munich and financed by the Crusade for Freedom, has poured a daily barrage of messages to the Czech people giving them the story of friendship balloons. It suggests plastic pillow

balloons be used for food containers. Leaflets are found inside the pillow balloons after they settle on the ground. The large rubber balloons burst at 30,000 feet altitude and the leaflets inside them are scattered gradually to the earth.

National Democratic Chairman William M. Boyle, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Three Questions," published in the August 13, 1951, issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THREE QUESTIONS

If the Hoey subcommittee wants to get at the facts on National Democratic Chairman William M. Boyle, Jr., it will set itself three basic questions to answer:

Question No. 1: Why did the RFC, after turning down the American Lithotoid Corp. loan three times, reverse itself and grant the loan?

Mr. Boyle's defense, accepted by President Truman, is that he had nothing to do with the loan. Yet it is a fact that the loan was granted only after Mr. Boyle went on the company's payroll. It is a fact that E. Merl Young, an associate of Mr. Boyle, told the St. Louis RFC office that national Democratic headquarters was interested in the loan. It is a fact that James P. Flinnegan, another associate of Mr. Boyle, pleaded the company's case in St. Louis.

If the RFC did not change its mind because of influence emanating from Mr. Boyle, then why did it change its mind?

Question No. 2: What services did Mr. Boyle perform for the company to warrant a monthly fee of \$500?

Mr. Boyle's defense, accepted by President Truman, is that he was retained as general counsel. Yet it is a fact that the president of the firm has said he performed no service. It is a fact that the company's books originally listed the payments to him as commissions and not legal fees. Commissions for what? Why was the No. 2 man in national Democratic headquarters worth \$500 a month to the company in 1949 and why has his former law partner continued to be worth that much ever since?

Question No. 3: Exactly what are the relations between Mr. Boyle and his former law partner, Max Siskind?

Mr. Boyle's defense, accepted by President Truman, is that he gave up his law practice altogether when he became executive vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee at \$30,000 a year. But this defense rests entirely on Mr. Boyle's unsupported word. If the Hoey subcommittee insists that the statement be proved, it will ask Mr. Boyle to document the exact nature of the agreement which he claims liquidated his law practice. And it will ask Mr. Boyle and Mr. Siskind to show their bank accounts to prove that the partnership actually ended when Mr. Boyle said it did.

If Mr. Boyle is as pure as he says, and as President Truman assumes, he should not object to giving this kind of testimony to prove his statements. Certainly the Hoey subcommittee cannot claim to have made a thorough investigation unless it seeks such testimony.

Pending Requests for Withdrawals of Land in Alaska, Etc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, for some time I have been interested in trying to bring into use the farm lands and mineral resources of Alaska. During the course of the hearings on Alaska statehood last year, we discovered that a vast area of the most valuable resources in the Territory had been withdrawn from use by various Government agencies. It is my feeling that the development of the Territory has been hampered by this policy of reserving these resources from development by private enterprise.

At that time the Secretary of the Interior informed the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that he had set up a committee to survey the problem and to attempt to restore some of these resources to the public domain so that the potentialities could be developed. On June 9 of this year I wrote the Secretary reminding him of my interest in the matter of revoking some of the unnecessary reservations. After some exchange of correspondence, I received a list of all the withdrawals and revocations in Alaska over the period of the last year, together with a list of pending requests for withdrawals and of pending suggestions for revocations. I ask unanimous consent to insert these lists in the Appendix of the Record.

With particular reference to the first table, which shows revocations and withdrawals which have actually been put into effect through June 30 of this year, it is interesting to note that existing reservations being revoked were about 2,094,000 acres of land during the 14-month period. Now reservations aggregate 284,000 acres. On the surface it would appear that reservations revoked are far greater in area than the new ones estimated; however, a careful examination of the table shows that the biggest part of the acreage in the column entitled "Acreage revoked" is made up of the two native reserves at the bottom of this list. Revocation of these two reserves represents a change in policy in handling the native question in Alaska which is highly commendable. Aside from these two native reserves above the total area revoked amounts to only 45,883.

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

A5249

Additional requests for withdrawals that were pending on a recent date amounted to the tremendous area of 11,-

816,000 acres, while pending suggestions for revocation of previous withdrawals amounted to only 1,388,000.

There being no objection, the lists were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Pending requests for withdrawals in Alaska, July 20, 1951 (areas estimated in part)

Reference	Type of reserve	General location	Acreage	Reference	Type of reserve	General location	Acreage
07634	Town site	Anchorage	140	1624728	Military	Fairbanks	240
013015	Industrial sites	do	23	1655904	do	Ladd Field	457,500
014064	Air navigation sites	Yakutat	266	1761619	do	Fort Richardson	(¹)
014960	Railroad	Seward	(¹)	1796532	do	Kodiak	144
015008	do	Birchwood	125	1796532	Coast Guard	Spruce Cape	181
015088	do	Anchorage	(¹)	1836362	Town site	McGrath	76
016768	Air navigation site	Birchwood	241	1896254	Naval	Hog Island	9,153
010942	do	Kenai	160	1906251	Military	Fort Ray	11
017031	Research center	Anchorage	(¹)	1935558	Air navigation site	Naknek	622
017472	Railroad	do	(¹)	1953015	do	Point Barrow	9
017473	do	do	30	1963073	Military	Fort Richardson	8,388
018564	Gravel pit	do	15	1980566	do	Kotzebue	30
18779	Administrative site	do	3	2002643	do	Ladd Field	240
32307	Military	Whittier	(¹)	2060671	Aid of legislation	Cook Inlet	300
36256	do	Big Delta; Northway	14	012233	Administrative site	Bomei Spit	2
50185	Power reserve	Eklutna	1,280	012396	Air navigation site	Borka Island	159
52185	Navy	Baranof Island	4	012857	do	Homer	(¹)
52799	Military	Kotzebue	1,156	015239	do	Haines	170
53591	do	Galeana	1,850	015997	Gravel pit	Glenn Highway	20
53593	do	Bethel	2,150	016389	do	Homer	20
54288	do	Naknek	20	016844	Air navigation site	Naknek	70
54685	do	Lake Louise	7	016910	Gravel pit	Glenn Highway	43
56449	do	Seward	(¹)	016912	Gravel pit, camp site	Homer-Russell River Highway	193
57328	Administrative site	Eagle	12	017032	Powder magazine site	Valdez	40
57592	Timber management	Haines Highway	146	017320	Gravel pit	Richardson Highway	49
57594	Town site	Buffalo Center	1,800	017330	do	T 5 N., R 11 W., Seward meridian	(¹)
58115	Military	Ladd Field	6,720	017330	do	Anchorage	(¹)
58236	Recreation	Various	195	017450	Administrative site	do	(¹)
58366	Military	Cape Prince of Wales	3,770	017459	do	Kenai	1
58370	do	Cape Romanof	15,265	017520	do	Fairbanks	805
58384	do	Cape Lisburne	13,600	07357	Air navigation site	Bethel	1
58446	do	Kenai	4,280	08376	Administrative site	Bethel	141
58630	Gravel pit	Eklutna	205	08522	Air navigation site	Contwell	59
58714	Military	Eielson	7,840	08595	Maintenance depot	Katla	46
59218	do	Skilak; Naknek	39	08606	Air navigation site	Farewell	810
59458	do	Tok Junction	10	08649	do	Bethel	265
59975	School reserve	Tununak	10	08657	Administrative site	Big Delta	2
60059	Military	St. Lawrence Island	21,013	01050	Air navigation site	Unalakleet	143
60075	do	Anchorage	(¹)	18779	Administrative site	Anchorage	1
60122	do	Bethel	2	45395	Forest sites	Southeastern Alaska	664
60154	School reserve	Solomon	3	50470	Town site	Kenai	80
60312	do	Napaskiak	7	51236	Administrative site	Homer	20
60381	Railroad	Anchorage	(¹)	55273	do	Anchorage	(¹)
60373	Military	Gulkana	772,000	58111	Coast Guard	Borka Island	1,474
60446	Military and naval	Alutian and Kodiak Islands	600,000	58155	Town site	Nimchik	40
60462	School reserve	Kalskag	4	59678	Airport	Willow	246
60463	do	Kiana	8	59679	do	Goose Bay	352
60464	do	Nondalton	2	60170	Administrative site	Whittier	(¹)
60473	Administrative site	Tongass National Forest	38	62158	Power site classification	Sheep Creek	(¹)
60507	School reserve	Rampart	5	114637	Administrative site	Kodiak	(¹)
60540	do	Savonuga	5	1782963	Air navigation site	Ruby	1
60613	Gravel pits	Various	1,133	1875139	do	Northway	1,024
60634	School reserve	Stevens Village	1	1917065	Military	Cathedral Bluffs	3
61532	Recreation	Long Lake	38	1925592	Wildlife management area	Cold Bay	407,000
62148	Military	Harding Lake	3	2017855	do	Naknek	6
200264	do	Ladd Field	5,760	213439	Wildlife management area	Kuskokwim	8,960,000
806435	do	Petersburg	7	2138021	Administrative site	Anchorage	3
984553	do	Anchorage	(¹)	2139140	Power site classification	Susitna River	503,360
1030461	School reserve	Kodiak	5	2139759	Wildlife refuge	Simeonof Island	(¹)
1184078	Administrative site	Anchorage	(¹)				
1255727	do	do	2				
1360883	Air navigation site	Yakutat; Port Graham	266				
					Total		11,815,890

¹ Town lots.

² Not determined.

³ Not available.

Withdrawals and revocations in Alaska, May 1, 1950, to June 30, 1951 (areas estimated in part)

Order No.	Date	Type of reserve	General location	Acreage withdrawn	Acreage revoked
PLO 640	May 3, 1950	Air Force	Middleton Island	1,350	
PLO 644	May 9, 1950	Air navigation site	do		1,350
PLO 647	May 31, 1950	Alaska Road Commission	T 12 N., R 3 W., SM	10	
PLO 653	June 26, 1950	National forests	Southeastern Alaska		34
PLO 654	July 28, 1950	Classification	Dunbar		32,437
PLO 657	Aug. 15, 1950	National forests	Southeastern Alaska		90
		Military	Juneau	11	
PLO 659	Aug. 24, 1950	Air navigation site	T 12 and 13 N., R 4 W., SM	1,377	
		Seaplane base	T 13 N., R 4 W., SM	17	
		Air navigation site	Anchorage		97
		Townsite and military	do		1,400
PLO 660	Aug. 24, 1950	National Guard	Kotzebue	1	
PLO 664	Aug. 28, 1950	Aid of legislation	Sitkinak Island	300	
PLO 666	do	Native reservation	Dillingham		10
PLO 668	do	Alaska Railroad	Whittier	3	
PLO 669	Sept. 1, 1950	do	Susitna River	8,490	
PLO 670	do	do	Anchorage	12	
PLO 671	Sept. 11, 1950	Air Force	St. Lawrence Island	1,700	
PLO 677	Oct. 13, 1950	do	Kuskokwim Bay	14,285	
PLO 684	Nov. 9, 1950	do	T 2 and 3 S., R 3 and 4 E.	21,560	
PLO 686	do	Air navigation site	Portage	20	
		Townsite	do		18
PLO 689	Nov. 20, 1950	Alaska Railroad	T 15 N., R 2 W	1,440	
		Military	do		1,440
		Alaska Railroad	T 15 N., R 1 W		1,399
PLO 690	Nov. 22, 1950	Air Force	T 1 N., and 1 S., R 1 E., F. M	1,469	
		Military	do		1,469
PLO 693	Dec. 12, 1950	Air Force	Fairbanks	3,827	
PLO 696	Jan. 16, 1951	National forests	Southeastern Alaska		50
PLO 697	Feb. 2, 1951	Aid of legislation	Mount McKinley		6,040
		National defense	do	118,840	
PLO 700	Feb. 16, 1951	National forests	Southeastern Alaska		31

Withdrawals and revocations in Alaska, May 1, 1950, to June 30, 1951 (areas estimated in part)—Continued

Order No	Date	Type of reserve	General location	Acreage withdrawn	Acreage revoked
PLO 708	Mar. 27, 1951	National forests	Southeastern Alaska	1	
PLO 713	Apr. 16, 1951	Military	do		1
PLO 715	Apr. 25, 1951	Classification	T. 28 S., R. 55 E., CRM	240	
PLO 716	May 1, 1951	Air Force	Kaktovik Island	88,980	
PLO 718	May 4, 1951	Alaska Road Commission	Anchorage		3
PLO 720	May 15, 1951	Naval Reserve	Seward		5
PLO 721	May 24, 1951	Military	do	6	
PLO 724	do	Wildlife refuge	T. 18 N., R. 3 W., etc., SM		4,160
PLO 725	June 4, 1951	Federal Communications Commission	Favorite Channel		105
PLO 731	June 25, 1951	Military	do	105	
PSC 409	July 10, 1950	Administrative sites	T. 13 N., R. 3 W., SM	80	
PSC 412	Nov. 9, 1950	Air Force	National forests	4,232	
SS 441-462	May 15, 1950	Power site classification	Tatalina River	6,400	
FPA 1239	June 30, 1950	do	Kona River	1,700	
FPA 1297	Sept. 7, 1950	do	T. 17 N., R. 1 W., SM	2,086	
FPA 1299	Feb. 7, 1951	Shore space	Various		31,054
ANS 169	June 19, 1950	Power-site reserve	Baronof Island		1
ANS 262	Aug. 9, 1950	do	T. 12 N., R. 3 W., SM		2,360
ANS 182	Oct. 13, 1950	Air navigation site	Various		248
ANS 267	Apr. 25, 1951	do	Naknek River	3,845	1,661
ANS 268	May 2, 1951	do	Lake Kahoonla	300	
SO	Mar. 12, 1951	do	Popof Island		200
SO	do	do	T. 4 S., R. 8 W., FM	520	
		Native reserve	Kovukuk River	1,195	
		do	Barrow		480,000
		do	Shungnak and Kobuk		1,528,320
Total				284,461	2,093,992

Pending suggestions for revocations in Alaska, July 20, 1951 (areas estimated in part)

Reference	Type of reserve	General location	Acreage	Reference	Type of reserve	General location	Acreage
08693	Flood control	Fairbanks	60	1899254	Military	Kodiak Island	520
011631	Railroad	Chickaloon	22	1899254	do	Umlaska Island	2,885
017520	Wildlife refuge	Kenai	1	1899254	do	Hog Island	9,153
07195	Air navigation site	Galena	64	1902651	do	Fort Ray	1,820
22506	Highways	Various	(1)	1907822	do	Campbell Creek	80
33307	Railroad	Whittier	(2)	1927050	do	Fort Richardson	1,614
51700	Military	Kotzebue	1	1929592	do	Alaska Peninsula	469,930
56538	National forests	Southeastern Alaska	1,140	1933313	Naval	Chirikof Island, Caton Island	157
57300	do	do	80	1934630	Military	Lazy Bay	7,650
57328	Air navigation site	Eagle	5	1934630	do	Kwigik	19,500
57689	National forests	Southeastern Alaska	76,000	1934630	do	Nushagak	46,000
60033	School reserves	Various	(2)	1938795	Military	Fort Richardson	6,400
60146	Military and naval	Alutian and Kodiak Islands	600,000	1956230	Native reservation	White Mountain	1,200
60584	School reserve	Umlaska	40	1958231	do	Shishmaref	3,000
104743	Administrative site	Valdez	(3)	1958373	Military	Fort Richardson	950
185872	Military	Nulato	31	1966031	Classification	Buch Lake	1,223
426235	School reserve	Bayview	40	1972234	Military	Nome	241
888266	Administrative sites	Various	(1)	2141244	School reserve	Kanakanak	40
917971	Military	Seward	1	DA 46	Power site reserve	Lake Clark	80
103046	do	Kodiak	1	DA 57	do	Kenai River	5
1181078	Administrative site	Anchorage	(2)	DA 58	do	Rabbit and Campbell Creeks	(1)
1255727	do	Fairbanks	2	07679	National forests	Southeastern Alaska	(1)
1279115	School reserve	Eklutna	2,333	1273539	Air navigation site	Aniak	26
1360883	Naval	Yakutat Bay, Fort Graham	34,240	1378156	National forest	Southeastern Alaska	(1)
1300883	do	Yakutat	10,240	1271600	Reindeer station	Fairbanks	4,306
1806599	Military	Saleha	203	1412078	Coal	Matanuska	17,280
1655904	do	Ladd Field	320	1571080	Archaeological investigation	Kodiak	40
1757173	Naval	Admiral Island	185	1580463	Administrative site	Dillingham	7
1751619	Military	Fort Richardson	190	1627279	Native reserve	Nemana	(1)
1751619	do	do	(1)	1807528	Air navigation site	Nimchik	22
1751619	do	do	2,500	1841730	Wildlife reserve	Cook Inlet	(1)
1796532	do	Kalsin Bay	3,450	1847469	do	Forewell and Stillman Lakes	247
1796532	do	Cape Winslow	1,625	1847501	Air navigation site	Cordova	(1)
1796532	do	Esquire Point	782	1905338	Right-of-way	Brun Bay	12
1796532	do	Constantine Point	547	1937980	Air navigation sites	Forrester Island	1
1796532	do	Fort Brumbach	1,520	1967997	do	Humma Lake	165
1796532	do	Fort Leonard	2,460	2139881	do	Southeastern Alaska	49,093
1796532	do	Ugadaga Bay	793	60101	National forest		
1796532	do	Spruce Cape	845				
1796326	Town site	Turnagain Arm	5,000				
1836362	Military and air navigation site	McGrath	76				
				Total			1,388,428

¹ Indeterminate.

² Town lots.

³ Not determined.

⁴ 18 tracts.

⁵ Not available.

Coal Still King

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader, the Evening News, on

August 14, 1951, entitled "Coal Still King":

COAL STILL KING

It is reassuring to hear from Coal Age that approximately half of the Nation's dwelling units with central heating are kept warm with coal. Centrally heated homes, using coal, total 9,430,000 while 5,127,000 dwelling units, not centrally heated, also use this fuel. Gas and oil running neck and neck for second place, are far behind coal. The emphasis that has been placed on the progress coal's principal competitors have made in recent years had given many the impression coal was out of the picture entirely. This is far from the facts in the case, as these figures so forcibly demonstrate.

Newspapers Support Opposition to Hand-out for Grandview, Mo., Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, support for my defeated amendment to eliminate from the \$5,800,000,000 military construction bill a \$19,019,000 hand-out to

the virtual cowpasture airport at Grandview, Mo., seemed to come from almost everywhere except Congress.

Letters and telegrams urging adoption of the amendment reached my office in considerable volume from Iowa and elsewhere in the Nation, including New York, New Jersey, Ohio, Indiana, and the District of Columbia.

One of the heartiest letters of support came from a citizen of Grandview, Mo.

Newspapers of the country, in the rural as well as the metropolitan areas, have likewise joined in opposition to this misuse of tax money. Here are some of the editorials that have come to my attention:

[From the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier]
PORK BARREL DEFENSE PROJECTS

Representative H. R. Gross will probably be defeated in his attempt to remove a pork-barrel item from the \$5,767,000,000 military construction bill, but he demonstrated that those seeking economy in government should not overlook defense expenditures.

The Waterloo Congressman noted that included in the military construction bill was a \$19,000,000 item for an air base at Grandview, Mo., where President Truman lands on trips to his home at Independence, Mo.

He pointed out that there is an expensive and largely unused air base at Ottumwa, Iowa, which could be used for the same purpose as that proposed for the Grandview base. The Ottumwa base, constructed for the Navy during World War II, has an excellent landing field and brick administration and operations buildings.

Chairman CARL VINSON, of the House Armed Services Committee, said that the use of the Grandview base was "classified," meaning "secret," information; but he indicated it would be headquarters for the Central Air Defense Force of the Continental Air Command. Thus the requirements cannot be ascertained, but it is likely that facilities at Ottumwa or the former B-29 base at Sioux City and other bases constructed during World War II could be used.

Military planners apparently have no thought, during a time of military expansion, of adapting existing facilities. Or, if the military planners have any such thought, their plans are soon revised by Congressmen who want lush construction plums for their home communities. The scale of defense activity today is less than it was during World War II, yet enormous new construction projects are being authorized.

These go through Congress, moreover, with only nominal examination. Gross pointed out that, when his amendment to strike out the Grandview base was defeated, "less than 75 Congressmen" were present to vote on a bill to spend nearly \$6,000,000,000. While at least some consideration is given to the possibilities of economy on nondefense appropriations, military proposals go through with less than one-fifth of the representatives present to vote. In times like the present, military men get exactly what they want and anyone who criticizes their demands or suggests economies is accused of hampering the defense effort.

A \$19,000,000 air base for the President's home county is the kind of thing that is hidden in these defense appropriation bills if anyone takes the trouble to examine them. Congressmen who go home for the week end and allow \$6,000,000,000 defense bills to pass with only a handful of Representatives present are not fulfilling their duty. The voters should require them to pay more attention to business.

[From the Cedar Rapids (Iowa) Gazette]
HOORAY FOR MR. GROSS

With a Democratic administration in the saddle and with little help from some of his pussy-footing Republican colleagues it was too much to expect that Congressman GROSS, of Iowa, would get far in his attempt to remove some of the pork from the \$5,767,000,000 military construction bill.

But he gave it one whale of a try and, in so doing, brought the attention of the Nation to the fact that more careful scrutiny on the part of Congress would result in considerable economy in defense expenditures.

What specifically aroused the ire of Mr. Gross was the little matter of a \$19,000,000 appropriation to construct a "super-airport" at—of all places—Grandview, Mo., where the President lands when he goes home to Independence.

Mr. Gross had good reason for his position. He maintained that an airport at Grandview would duplicate a \$22,000,000 airport at nearby Sedalia. He said, further, that the former Army air base at Sioux City and the former Navy base at Ottumwa would be ideally suited for the same purpose as that for which the Grandview airport is proposed. These could be renovated and ready for use in a few weeks time and at little expense in comparison with the proposed expenditure at Grandview.

We have a hunch that what is true in Iowa is pretty generally true throughout the United States; that by using former military installations the Government could save billions of dollars for the taxpayers. But not until other Congressmen rise above sectional interests will the poor taxpayer ever have his day in court. Don't hold your breath until that happens.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star]
"MISSOURI-ISM" ON THE POTOMAC

A Republican Congressman, Representative H. R. Gross, of Iowa, blocked action Friday on the \$5,767,000,000 House military construction bill when he sought to knock out an item providing for a new \$19,000,000 Air Force installation in President Truman's home bailiwick of Jackson County, Mo. As a result the House delayed further consideration of the measure until today.

We don't know whether Congressman Gross is right in his argument that the expenditure of millions to expand a tiny airport at Grandview, Mo., would be a "glorified WPA project." Nor do we know that there is any lack of merit in reported plans to move headquarters of the Continental Air Command from Mitchel Field, Long Island, to Grandview.

But we do understand the suspicions which must grip Mr. Gross and many other lawmakers as a consequence of the excessive "Missouri-ism" practiced in Washington by the Trumanites. Is it any wonder that plans and appointments which may be wholly good in themselves are sometimes subjected to question when Mr. Truman's home State is involved?

Not since the days of Warren G. Harding and the "Ohio gang" has a President indulged in narrow regionalism to the extent that Mr. Truman has. It has been Missouri, Missouri, Missouri ever since he entered the White House.

The President has surrounded himself with a band of Missouri cronies who exercise vast powers in American Government. A disproportionate number of his key appointments has gone to Missourians. True, a few of them have been excellent ones. (We're thinking right now of Stuart Symington.) But does the Show-Me State have a corner on administrative ability?

Mr. Truman has not been one to disguise his extreme partiality for all things Missourian. Indeed, Missouri is a great State and a reasonable loyalty to one's origin is a

fine thing. But Mr. Truman has been an extremist in the matter. He seems to have overlooked the fact that he also is the President of 47 other sovereign States.

Maybe Congressman Gross is off base on that airport issue. But we well understand what has prompted him to sniff suspiciously.

[From the Mitchell County (Iowa) Press]
CONGRESSMAN GROSS OPPOSES WASTEFUL AIR SPENDING

Iowa's third district Congressman, H. R. GROSS, of Waterloo, is to be commended for his courageous opposition to some of the waste and extravagance involved in the Federal Government's proposed multi-billion-dollar expansion program for the Air Force. The Press-News is ready and willing to lead a loud cheer for Gross' efforts to point out examples of waste, even in matters of national security.

Some of the new air-base installations proposed in the expansion program are virtual duplications of existing facilities which have been abandoned by the Army and Navy since World War II. These old bases could be reactivated at a fraction of the cost of building new bases.

Gross has particularly leveled a barrage of opposition to construction of a \$19,000,000 military air base in President Truman's home county near Kansas City, Mo. There are two abandoned air bases in Iowa which could be utilized at much lower cost, the Congressman points out.

Perhaps the largest air base ever constructed in Iowa is at Sioux City. The Sioux City base is one of the finest equipped in the entire Northwest. The Army spent over \$7,000,000 on it and it served as a bomber instruction school during the war. The field is capable of handling the huge B-29 bombers with three runways well over a mile in length.

There are 204 buildings on the huge Sioux City field, which now serves as a municipal airport. All of these facilities have been abandoned by the Army, which now seeks to build a similar base near Truman's home at a cost of \$19,000,000.

Surely, from a standpoint of defense, the Sioux City location would be just as valuable as the Missouri location for an air base. The flying time between the two can be measured in minutes.

It doesn't take a mathematical genius to see that reactivation of the Sioux City base could be accomplished at a fraction of the cost of building the new base at Grandview, Mo. Congressman Gross is on the right track when he takes a stand against such waste and extravagance. It's about time that our Congress quit throwing money away under the excuse that it is for defense.

[From the Sioux City (Iowa) Journal]
AN IOWAN'S PROTEST

Representative H. R. GROSS, of the Third Iowa District, is to be commended for his attack upon a proposed Air Force installation in President Truman's home county in Missouri. For Mr. Gross has put his finger on one of the many ways the administration is wasting the taxpayers' money under the guise of defense spending.

Here is the situation Congressman Gross finds objectionable: The administration seeks \$19,019,000 to expand the Grandview, Mo., airport in Jackson County, near the Truman family home at Independence. This project would permit the transfer of the Continental Air Command from Mitchel Field, Long Island, to Grandview.

The Iowa Congressman does not object to transferring the Continental Air Command to central United States. Instead, he contends, and wisely so, that the proposed expansion at Grandview needlessly duplicates

facilities at a nearby Air Force base at Sedalia, Mo., which is due for a \$22,000,000 expansion.

After bitter debate, the Gross proposal was defeated by voice vote, whereupon the Iowan demanded a roll-call vote where Members are recorded on the issue. This was put over until Tuesday. Indications are that his new motion, to send the bill back to the House Armed Services Committee with instructions that it eliminate the Grandview item, will be defeated and President Truman will get millions for both Sedalia and Grandview.

Iowa, it is recalled, is one of four States receiving no military construction under the \$5,768,000,000 bill containing the Grandview and Sedalia projects. It is not pure chance which finds Missouri receiving a lion's share of the funds. More than that, Harry Truman's own balliwick, Grandview, is in on the Federal gravy to the tune of more than \$19,000,000 which might as well have been spent at Sedalia, thus saving about \$22,000,000 of the Treasury's funds.

President Truman's administration is seeing to it that Missouri is being taken care of when the money is distributed from Washington. But at least Congressman Gross brought the issue of Presidential favoritism to public attention.

[From the Chicago Tribune]

TRUMAN'S "AIRPORT"

Tucked away in an appropriation bill calling for \$5,750,000,000 in military construction is an item of \$19,000,000 to expand the airport at Grandview, in Jackson County, Mo. Grandview was the home of Mr. Truman's mother; Jackson County is his balliwick, and the small field at the town is used principally to receive the Presidential airplane on flying visits to the old stamping ground.

Grandview has not the slightest strategic importance, but the continental air command, which has the Air National Guard under its direction, has announced plans to remove its headquarters from Mitchel Field, Long Island, to this community. If Grandview weren't associated with Truman, nobody would ever have heard of the place or considered it.

If a hayseed Congressman succeeded in dragging down \$19,000,000 for the old home town, he would feel justified in taking a few bows around the cracker barrel. But, somehow, dulled as the sensitivity of the American people may be to spoils politics, they don't quite expect this sort of thing from a President. They ought to know their man better. Truman's favorite dish is pork.

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register]

MUCH FUROR BUT NO ANSWER TO MR. GROSS

It strikes us that Representative KILDAY, of Texas, as a spokesman for the administration, was a little too indignant about the revelation by Iowa Representative H. R. Gross that a \$19,000,000 air base is proposed for President Truman's home county in Missouri. Was the publicity which Mr. Gross gave this matter a trifle embarrassing?

The Iowa Congressman was arguing that probably it was unnecessarily wasteful to build a spanking new air base at Grandview, Mo., when not far away the wartime Navy base at Ottumwa, Iowa, was lying idle, and still other bases nearby at Sioux City and Sedalia were available for reactivation.

Mr. KILDAY arose on his haunches to express horror that Representative Gross would reveal this classified (or secret) information about the Grandview proposal. But the fact is that Chairman Vinson, of the House Armed Services Committee had already described the Grandview base's purpose in general terms, and Congressman Gross had merely asked whether it was, then, to be a fighter base.

The location of air bases is no secret to anybody. Even the general purposes to which they are put is no secret. Any 8-year-old youngster these days knows jets when he sees them, and knows the difference between bombers and fighters.

In any case, Congressman Gross revealed nothing at all, and Representative KILDAY's indignation appears to have been aimed mostly at discouraging further comment about why we need a new base at Grandview, Mo., which is precisely what Mr. Gross was trying to find out.

The answer, we note, remains unclear, even though the House approved the bill enthusiastically.

[From the Creston (Iowa) News-Advertiser]

GROSS CALLS THE SPENDERS' HAND

Quite a little stir is being aroused over the building of airports. Congressman H. R. Gross, of Iowa, has raised a pretty sharp point on the matter. Wonders why spend a lot of money for a new airport near Kansas City while a very good airport at Sioux City and another at Ottumwa lies idle.

There is additional interest hereabouts in the matter since Mr. Gross, who now lives at Waterloo, is a native of these parts. He was born and reared at Arispe. Has folks living in Creston.

Naturally a layman is not familiar with all the why's and wherefore's of airport planning. But we think Mr. Gross has made a very excellent point in asking for a review of the situation. It seems silly to build a big expensive new port at Kansas City when one is already available at Sioux City, also at Ottumwa. The variance in distance is very little, where airplanes are involved.

And if Sioux City seems too far north, then Ottumwa is closer. So there you are, idle ports all around and the Army and Government wanting to build another—at the additional cost of millions of dollars. More power to Congressman Gross.

[From the Northwood (Iowa) Anchor]

GROSS ON THE BALL

We're glad to see our Representative, H. R. Gross, "right on the ball" in questioning the Air Force appropriation bill.

Mr. Gross doesn't see why a big air base should be built down in western Missouri when there are a couple of unused similar bases, at Ottumwa and Sioux City, already built and available. And most folks will agree with him.

The defense program is costing enough without wasting facilities we already have just to hand out a few more millions to some contractor and to give some Missouri town a new free airport.

Investigation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "They Mustn't Be Silenced," published in the August 16, 1951, edition of the Journal-Every Evening, of Wilmington, Del.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY MUSTN'T BE SILENCED

In refusing to let the Republican minority make a report to the Senate, the Democratic majority of the RFC investigating committee is guilty of a high-handed piece of business. It is a performance which at least smacks of totalitarianistic practices and as such has no place in a country where freedom of expression is still supposed to be the rule.

No less than the majority, the minority members have a right to state their opinion of the testimony which both sides heard during hearings which dragged through 18 months. It is likewise their privilege to draw their own interpretations of the evidence which was presented and which, as everybody knows, revealed some exceedingly shady goings-on in the Federal lending agency.

Fortunately the Republicans on the committee cannot be silenced. Even though the majority can keep their report from going directly to the Senate they can still use newspaper and radio channels to make it public. So the Senators will be able to read it anyway—at least the parts of it which the administration would like to suppress.

The Intermountain Indian School at Brigham City, Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, today the Senate approved the conference report on the annual appropriation bill for the Interior Department. This bill, H. R. 3790, contains an item for Indian education which includes a sum sufficient to operate to full capacity, of 2,150 students, the Intermountain Indian School at Brigham City, Utah.

I offered an amendment to the bill to increase the item for Indian education to such an amount as to make possible the full use of the capacity of the Indian school. The amendment was adopted and the conference report retained the amendment.

Mr. President, I am glad to note that preparations are under way for the school's opening this September with 2,150 students in attendance.

The story is told in a recent issue of the Box Elder News Journal. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD this news story under date of August 15, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FULL QUOTA OF 2,150 NAVAJOS TO ARRIVE AT INTERMOUNTAIN—WILL COME IN GROUPS OF 500 STARTING TUESDAY—STAFF JUMPS TO 400 TO OPERATE SCHOOL

With the principle of off-reservation boarding schools on which the Intermountain Indian School, Brigham City, was founded now a proven success, the institution will reach its maximum enrollment of

County	Number of allotments	Total acreage allotted	Number of bales grown	Total value of cotton	Average acreage per allotment	Average number of bales per allotment	Average value per allotment	County	Number of allotments	Total acreage allotted	Number of bales grown	Total value of cotton	Average acreage per allotment	Average number of bales per allotment	Average value per allotment
Georgia	114,092	1,399,537 3	490,363	\$88,265,340	12 267	4,298	\$773 63	Grady	723	3,274 4	1,196	\$215,280	4 529	1 654	\$297 76
Appling	1,050	6,497 7	2,408	433,440	6 188	2 293	412 80	Greene	776	8,174 6	1,757	316,260	10 535	2 264	407 55
Atkinson	280	1,166 0	293	30,540	4 021	.075	126 00	Gwinnett	2,007	17,788 6	2,593	466,740	3 885	1 292	232 55
Bacon	672	3,207 1	1,080	106,020	4 906	1 621	251 70	Wheeler	411	2,066 4	56	10,080	5 028	1 136	24 53
Baker	351	3,556 4	1,367	245,260	10 132	3 723	670 26	Hall	1,555	11,256 5	883	158,940	7 239	5 68	102 21
Baldwin	414	4,404 9	1,712	308,160	10 857	4 135	741 35	Hancock	961	13,359 8	3,972	714,960	13 881	4 133	713 98
Banks	949	7,449 5	2,612	470,160	7 850	2 752	405 43	Haralson	1,231	8,376 0	1,159	305,020	6 804	1 942	169 47
Barrow	1,045	12,412 6	3,877	697,800	11 878	3 710	667 81	Harris	491	4,113 4	1,702	270,360	8 477	3 079	550 63
Bartow	1,218	24,789 1	10,035	1,806,300	19 863	8 041	1,417 36	Hart	1,613	22,281 6	8,732	1,571,760	13 562	5 315	936 61
Ben Hill	549	6,075 8	1,811	325,980	11 067	3 299	593 77	Heard	727	8,000 0	1,924	316,120	11 010	2 646	476 37
Berrien	711	3,341 0	1,316	240,480	4 699	1 879	338 23	Henry	1,245	20,303 4	7,867	1,416,060	16 308	6 319	1,137 40
Bibb	187	1,444 4	656	118,080	7 769	3 508	631 44	Houston	565	8,940 6	3,257	586,260	15 825	5 765	1,037 63
Bleckley	583	10,301 4	5,827	1,018,860	17 033	9 995	1,789 07	Irwin	855	11,167 8	5,602	1,008,360	13 062	6 552	1,179 37
Brantley	32	50 0	5	900	1 563	.176	28 13	Jackson	1,506	21,619 7	8,128	1,463,010	14 556	5 397	971 47
Brooks	1,272	8,284 3	3,613	650,310	6 512	2 840	511 27	Jasper	121	8,255 3	3,321	597,780	19 515	7 851	1,113 19
Bryan	99	433 1	26	4,680	4 375	263	47 27	Jeff Davis	557	2,672 1	898	161,640	4 797	1 612	290 20
Bulloch	1,770	22,607 6	9,640	1,735,200	12 773	5 446	980 34	Jefferson	1,149	28,713 6	10,158	1,828,440	24 960	8 841	1,501 33
Buie	1,414	49,753 4	17,843	3,211,740	35 196	12 619	2,271 39	Jenkins	694	16,621 9	6,669	1,200,120	21 951	9 610	1,729 71
Butts	483	8,982 9	3,531	635,580	18 598	7 311	1,315 90	Johnson	248	21,421 4	9,004	1,620,720	25 261	10 618	1,911 23
Calhoun	353	5,526 1	2,650	477,000	15 651	7 507	1,351 27	Jones	588	1,498 5	316	56,880	5 808	1 225	229 47
Camden	4	1 7	1	180	.425	.230	45 00	Lamar	513	5,559 5	1,715	314,100	10 769	3 102	612 28
Candler	595	8,543 2	4,334	780,120	14 768	7 284	1,311 13	Landrum	149	618 2	167	30,060	4 149	1 121	201 74
Carroll	2,605	25,759 3	5,689	1,021,020	9 888	2 184	383 10	Laurens	2,170	39,054 2	17,880	3,218,400	17 967	8 429	1,483 13
Catoosa	574	3,546 7	749	134											

Cotton: Number of allotments, acres allotted, and bales produced, by counties for Georgia, 1950—Continued

County	Number of allotments	Total acreage allotted	Number of bales grown	Total value of cotton	Average acreage per allotment	Average number of bales per allotment	Average value per allotment	County	Number of allotments	Total acreage allotted	Number of bales grown	Total value of cotton	Average acreage per allotment	Average number of bales per allotment	Average value per allotment
Talbot	429	2,979.6	747	\$134,460	6.945	1.741	\$313.43	Walker	1,350	8,316.9	885	\$159,300	6.161	0.656	\$118.00
Tallapoosa	387	4,455.7	1,028	185,040	11.514	2.556	478.14	Walton	1,387	30,324.7	14,451	2,601,180	21.863	10.419	1,875.40
Tallapoosa	980	7,593.4	2,259	406,620	7.748	2.305	414.92	Ware	323	1,000.8	174	31,320	3.068	539	96.97
Taylor	568	10,241.9	4,083	736,740	18.032	7.206	1,297.08	Warren	598	17,040.9	6,142	1,105,560	28.467	10.271	1,848.76
Telfair	859	7,085.7	2,145	386,100	8.261	2.497	449.48	Washington	1,226	23,308.0	8,000	1,440,000	19.011	6.525	1,174.55
Terrill	555	13,022.8	7,506	1,351,080	24.546	13.524	2,434.38	Wayne	521	3,812.4	1,022	183,960	7.317	1.962	353.09
Thomas	824	5,005.0	1,796	323,280	6.187	2.180	392.33	Webster	278	2,339.4	773	67,140	8.415	1.342	241.51
Tift	858	7,549.4	3,510	631,800	8.798	4.091	736.30	Wheeler	540	5,711.1	2,038	366,840	10.576	3.774	679.33
Toombs	973	10,629.4	4,396	791,280	10.924	4.518	813.24	White	445	2,627.3	89	16,020	5.650	1.91	34.45
Treutlen	422	5,717.9	2,272	408,960	13.550	5.384	969.10	Whitfield	1,379	7,231.3	80	160,020	5.244	645	116.04
Troup	645	5,583.9	1,064	196,920	8.673	1.096	305.30	Wilcox	951	15,396.0	6,111	1,009,980	16.158	6.426	1,156.66
Turner	670	7,320.9	3,006	541,040	10.927	4.487	807.57	Wilkes	1,016	10,960.1	2,700	486,000	10.787	2.657	478.35
Twiggs	530	5,381.5	925	166,500	10.154	1.745	314.15	Wilkinson	595	4,938.5	693	124,740	8.301	1.165	209.65
Upson	433	3,118.3	909	163,620	7.202	2.099	377.88	Worth	1,368	16,647.3	8,656	1,558,080	12.169	6.327	1,138.95

The President's Indignation at Character Assassins and Scandal mongers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Where There's Fire There's Fire," published in the Washington Times-Herald of August 19, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE THERE'S FIRE THERE'S FIRE

Mr. Truman mustered a quantity of phony indignation to denounce what he chose to term "character assassins" and "scandal-mongers" who not so oddly, are concerned about the character of his administration and the scandals associated with it. He said they had "rotten motives"—namely, to divide and confuse. He said they sought to create an atmosphere of intimidation, so that no one would have the courage to talk back, for fear of being made one of their victims.

It takes no great perspicacity to discover that the methods and techniques he attributes to others are the very ones which Mr. Truman employs. He bawls like a fishwife in the hope that he can scare into silence those who honestly and soberly appraise the character of himself and his associates. He pretends to talk about name callers, but calls names himself with a violence and vindictiveness which none of his critics thinks necessary to invoke.

There is a saying that where there's smoke there's fire. The corruption and Communist inclinations of those sheltered by Truman are not clouded by smoke. They are as plain to see as a fire burning brightly. It is not for nothing that, for the first time in the history of the Republic, the proposal is made to establish a Commission on Ethics in Government, in the hope of restoring respect for common honesty and loyalty to country—qualities now lost in the general degradation.

The critics of the Truman administration are able to catalog and document the offenses for which this cynically immoral outfit stands convicted. They do not have to emulate Truman and tear a passion to a tatters.

They can begin with Truman himself, the creature of the Pendergast gang of Kansas City, the peddler of fraudulent oil stock in a nonexistent refinery at Rollin, Kans., the man

who first went to the Senate on the strength of 116,000 votes stolen for him by the Kansas City mob, the man who left the White House to fly to old Tom Pendergast's funeral when his boss had done a stretch in the penitentiary as No. 55,295. In his apprenticeship under Old Tom, Truman did some funny things with road contracts and school board money. When he became President it was not surprising that those around him expected a tolerant attitude when it came to doing funny things.

Thus we had the incident of General Vaughan and the gift of home freezers, one of which wound up in the Truman home in Independence, Mo. We had the circle of 5-percenters that assembled around General Vaughan, the case of Johnny Maragon, the one-time Kansas City bootblack who had entree to the White House, and who wound up in the penitentiary. We had the fixing activities of Truman's old acquaintance, Merl Young, who rose from the post of messenger, in which he made barely more than \$1,000 a year, until he was a big shot in Truman's Washington. We had the celebrated incident of the mink coat that draped Mrs. Young's shoulders when she reported at the White House to do her typing.

We had the RFC loan of more than half a million dollars that was conferred on a St. Louis firm after William J. Boyle, shortly to become Democratic national chairman through Truman's agency, had gone on its payroll at a fat monthly retainer for doing nothing. It was also undoubtedly coincidental that Truman's St. Louis collector of internal revenue was on the firm's payroll while still supposedly serving the public.

Again, there was the murder of two Kansas City mobsters, Binaggio and Gargotta, bosses of the river wards, who were bumped off under a more-than-life-sized portrait of Truman. On the floor of the House it was charged that they stood in the way of Truman's candidate for Senator.

There was also the theft of the Democratic nomination for Congressman in 1946 when Truman had flown to Kansas City to insure the defeat of Representative Roger Laughter. A grand jury said the election was stolen and indicted 71 of the Truman-Pendergast crooks. Before they could be brought to trial the fraudulent ballots representing the evidence against them were stolen one night when the courthouse safe was blown. Truman was sleeping that night a few blocks away in the Muehlebach Hotel in Kansas City.

There was the nolsome parole of the four Capone extortionists, Ricca, Campagna, Gloe, and D'Andrea, after a Dallas attorney, Maury Hughes, crony of Truman's attorney general, Tom Clark, who now adorns the Supreme Court, had handled a lot of mob money, and after Truman's former St. Louis campaign manager, Paul Dillon, had called at the White

House. Clark conveniently dismissed another pending charge that would have blocked the paroles.

This is only a sketchy outline. Truman also, by implication, contends that there are no Communists or Soviet sympathizers anywhere around the administration, no matter what Senator McCARTHY, Senator McCARRAN, or the House Committee on Un-American Activities may produce for the record. The case of the traitor, Alger Hiss, is, it seems, still the "red herring" Truman originally termed it, although Hiss, strangely, is doing 5 years. We are to forget William Remington, cleared by Truman's "loyalty" board, but also somehow convicted for denying he was a Communist. We can forget Harry Dexter White, Owen Lattimore, Lauchlin Currie, Lee Pressman, Judith Coplon, and dozens more. Moscow sympathizers. Slander, Harry tells us.

The record of treachery, graft, conniving, and corruption is unending. It is sickening. It revolts the moral sense. How can a country not lost to all honor tolerate this man, his associates, and their works?

McCarthy Has the Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN WELKER

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an editorial entitled "McCarthy Has the Answer," which appeared on August 16, 1951, in Idaho's oldest and largest newspaper, the Idaho Daily Statesman. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

McCarthy HAS THE ANSWER

President Truman Tuesday said "irresponsible slander-mongers—including some in Congress itself—are engaged in a campaign of character assassination that has curbed free speech and is threatening all our other freedoms." The President, one of his aides admitted, was referring to Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY, the man who has done more than any individual in the Nation to expose Communists in Government.

Mr. Truman would be on firm ground were it not for two indisputable circumstances:

1. He defended Alger Hiss, who was proven a Communist.

2. Mr. Truman warns, with all his vigor, that the Communists are a threat to a free world and that we must spend to arm for the power to defeat them.

Why, then, does the President protest the efforts to expose Communists in Washington?

Perhaps Senator McCARTHY (who is to speak in Boise August 29) has the answer in an article in the current issue of National Republic magazine:

Says the Senator:

"As a matter of fact, I do not think we need fear too much the prospect of the Communists dropping atomic bombs on Washington. They would kill too many of their friends."

In the meantime, the President should stop the double talk. Assuming he is sincere in his belief that we must oppose communism all over the world, he then must start opposing communism here at home.

Much More Than Cribbing in Mess at West Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted, I include as part of these remarks a pertinent editorial from the August 10, 1951, issue of the Portland Oregonian entitled "Much More Than Cribbing in Mess at West Point." The editorial follows:

MUCH MORE THAN CRIBBING IN MESS AT WEST POINT

The disgraceful affair at West Point grows worse with each day's disclosure. It was shocking that 90 cadets should be involved in violation of the military academy's academic code of honor. But the implications of some statements made in their defense are even more to be abhorred. Coach Earl H. Blaik has conceded that West Point regularly recruits its football players, who, with their tutors, apparently make up the bulk of the cadet cheaters. The father of one athlete in last year's "recruit" crop told newsmen his boy also had been proselyted by the United States naval academy at Annapolis. Thus, it seems clear that appointments to both of the Nation's top service schools have been bartered for brawn.

Such revelation, of course involves Congressmen as well as Pentagon brass and the administrations of the military and naval academies. Red Blaik told newsmen 24 boys attended this year's recruiting session at West Point. He called it a "cram course" to assist in preparation for stiff West Point examinations. But one of the participants interpreted it as a "6-weeks expense-paid vacation." Each of the 24, Blaik said, already had received or had been assured of the required congressional appointment. That testifies to a rank breach of trust by a good number of Congressmen and also to dereliction on the part of West Point officials who must have been well aware of the whole system. It is little in mitigation to explain that expenses of the recruiting were met by interested civilian alumni. The central and damning fact is that the men were recruited as football players, not as potential Army officers.

If 25 of the Academy's 2,500 vacancies were for sale to football stars, how many more

must be involved in recruiting for West Point's very respectable contenders in other intercollegiate sports?

There would be some excuse for such a system if it could be shown that excellence at football is tantamount to top performance on the battlefield. There can be no such assurance. Quite the contrary, cadets whose main interest has been football may have little relish for the soldier's job. Glenn Davis, probably the greatest of West Point grid-ders, performed his pigskin duties during the war years and hence escaped the shooting Army. Immediately upon his graduation in 1947, he sought release from his 8-years' service pledge to capitalize on his football talents with a professional eleven. He first met rebuff but kept trying, and finally, in 1950, the Army accepted his resignation. Now he plays for the Los Angeles Rams at a figure that would make a second lieutenant's salary look pretty sick. Hindsight argues that the Nation would have been better served if the place he occupied at West Point could have gone to an applicant with more sincere intentions if less speed.

There is a revealing sentence in Blaik's statement. "In order for high-school boys such as Duncan (one of this year's recruits) to have a fair chance of passing the Academy's stiff entrance examination," he explained, "it is necessary for them to take at least a short cram course prior to the date of examination." And Harold J. Loehlein, one of the honor-code violators and captain-elect of the Army football team, said something we thought was clear to almost everybody: "Studies and exams are easier for some fellows than for others." Both Blaik and Loehlein apparently meant to convey that the football recruits were not in the highest intelligence categories. We think most American soldiers would rather have their officers brainy than brawny. And, until a few days ago, that is the theory we had felt prevailed at West Point and Annapolis.

The exposé that began with the announcement of the cheating at West Point involves much more than the reputations of the cribbing cadets. There should be a full and searching investigation of the extent to which the overemphasis of athletics has undermined the selection and training of American military leaders.

Housewarming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial entitled "Housewarming," which appeared in the Washington Daily News for August 14, 1951:

HOUSEWARMING

At 6 o'clock, President Truman will dedicate the American Legion's handsome new 7-story limestone building at Sixteenth and K Streets.

It's a sign of the times.

For years, John Thomas Taylor, the old brigadier himself, effectively bullied and threatened the entire American Congress without benefit of limestone facades enclosing trained economists, statisticians, and mimeograph machines.

His own bemustacheed facade, sometimes stately, sometimes threatening, but always noble and soldierly, was sufficient for

the Legion's Washington sector. The books and files stayed at headquarters in Indianapolis.

But it's a poor lobby indeed that runs that way nowadays. And the American Legion is not a poor lobby. There are about 4,000,000 American men and women signed up.

Headquarters are still Indianapolis, but it is a tribute to Brigadier Taylor's extraordinary elocutionary and forensic powers that it now takes a seven-story, air-conditioned building to fill the breach he blasted, over the years, in the lobby front.

We haven't always agreed with the Legion's policies. Sometimes it has seemed to us its enormous potential influence has gotten bogged down in power politics played for the sake of the players, rather than for the sake of the Legion's membership or for the country's broader good. We think, for instance, that it has meddled, to an outrageous degree at certain times in the past, in the management of the Veterans' Administration.

But this is a good day to recall, as the Legion's announcement of today's dedication ceremony does, that the Legion was trying to get universal military training in 1919. Certainly, on that issue, the Legion was a lot more farsighted than the politicians from that day on. Also, the Legion fought against cutting the country's military appropriations when the dictators were on the march in the early '30's. It warned, and cried for preparedness. It fought for a two-ocean Navy, and the air forces. Yet it has been a powerful influence for the security of the country and for the welfare of those who have fought for their country.

The new building will house 89 persons who will continue to try to make the Legion's position felt in a whole gamut of legislation from national defense, rehabilitation of veterans, Americanism, anti-Communist activities, all the way to programs for needy children and junior baseball.

As long as the Legion faithfully and democratically represents the patriotic convictions of 4,000,000 Americans who have proved their devotion by serving in its uniform, it cannot fail to be an effective force for good, not only here in Washington, but throughout the land.

Rebuilding in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of Friday, August 10, 1951, concerning the problem of Korean relief. Provision for this vastly important work is included in the mutual security bill. The actual operation will be conducted by the U. N. Korean Reconstruction Agency, which is headed by a distinguished American, J. Donald Kingsley, who had a notable career in the United States Government before taking his assignment for the United Nations.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REBUILDING IN KOREA

One of the reasons why the United Nations has been eager to find a formula for stopping

warfare in Korea is the realization of the magnitude of the task of rebuilding. The sooner we can get on with this tremendous job the better. It is unlikely that under present or probable conditions the United Nations will be permitted to give help to those in Northern Korea. The United Nations, however, is already going forward with its plans for the rehabilitation of those parts of the peninsula to which it can have access.

As a matter of fact, some of the help to Koreans from the north will be given in the south. As J. Donald Kingsley, the agent general of the United Nations Reconstruction Agency, has just reported to the United Nations, approximately half of the pre-war population of Northern Korea is now in the south. The population was estimated at about 9,000,000. Of these 1,000,000 are presumed to be dead, while the prisoners and refugees account for something between 3,500,000 and 4,500,000.

This increase in a homeless population is naturally a much larger burden than the Republic of Korea can possibly bear. Outside aid on a large scale is imperative. The Republic, moreover, is itself in desperate straits because of war's devastation. In Seoul, for example, Mr. Kingsley estimated that 85 percent of the industrial facilities had been destroyed. The Republic has its own refugees and homeless who have been obliged to flee from the battlefields.

So far as promises go, there has been a generous response to this need in many member states of the United Nations. It is disconcerting, however, to learn that collections have not been as prompt and easy as the obtaining of pledges. Thus far something like \$230,000,000 has been subscribed for the rehabilitation work in Korea, but the agency has only about \$7,000,000 on hand, chiefly the contribution of Canada. The United States House of Representatives, meanwhile, has voted to reduce the American contribution from \$162,000,000 to \$62,000,000. This hardly seems consistent with a recognition of the gravity of the Korean plight.

The latest exchange of notes on the matter of conditions for negotiations offers little to encourage a belief in a quick settlement of outstanding issues. There is certainly no meeting of minds and no atmosphere of mutual trust. It is obvious that the Communists are trying to make propaganda capital out of each United Nations position or action. This is doubtless the proper explanation of the truculent tone of the Communist reply to General Ridgway. There seems no real Communist desire to end the negotiation and the talks will go forward, but in the meantime we shall continue to be subjected to a campaign of distortion that will try our patience to the utmost.

This should not cause us to lose sight of one of the really central problems involved. That problem is the fate and the welfare of the Koreans. We have taken a firm position on the issue of the thirty-eighth parallel precisely because we were aware of the disaster to the Koreans of anything that could be construed as a quasi-legal recognition of the permanent partition of their country. We have helped to defend them against enslavement by an invader bent on destroying their liberties. We shall continue by every means in our power to try to set up the bulwarks of those liberties.

This cause, we believe, has the support of the vast majority of the peoples represented in the United Nations. It has, we believe, the warm support of the vast majority of the people of the United States. But with that group of praiseworthy objectives there must go the realization that the needs of the Korean people are immediate and

urgent. They must be helped in the struggle against hunger and cold. They must have shelter and occupation. We are faced with the necessity of helping to save their lives as well as their liberties.

So, while we follow the vicissitudes of negotiation with grave and continuing concern, we cannot be unaware of the human side of the picture. The plans for rebuilding must be accelerated, and we must do our share to put them into action on a broader scale without further delay.

First Lt. Herbert Lee Jordan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, First Lt. Herbert Lee Jordan, United States Army, was killed in action on September 18, 1950, in Korea. His brother, Harvey D. Jordan, who is also serving in the Army, shortly thereafter wrote a poem in his honor. Because this poem so eloquently expresses the sentiments of thousands of families who have lost loved ones in the Korean conflict, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

What manner is the dead—
These whose still faces and closed eyes
Shield memories and springtime,
And childlike cries,
And tomorrows they could not know?
How oft' have I gazed and said
That these once lived as a boy,
Felt sorrow and joy, heard music from within
Swelling 'ever outward
In gay rhythmic flow.

What words and phrases dwell
In our hearts to measure the features
Of these, these so eternally silent,
Far over the seas,
In the haze of a slow fading day?
I somehow know each one so well,
So worn now and weary;
Each one I know with my loneliness,
As he was a part of me,
Though I did not know until he ebbed away.

What but silence could mean
What my words could never mean—
All the things I have not said,
But oh so much would wish to have said,
Yet never will?
Here is a heart still green
With youth, still to taste living
And feel the crisp morning air,
Still to smell the fragrance of tomorrow's
Flowers and harvest hay—still.

What manner is the dead—
The newly fallen battle-dead
Who knew not why, they among the living
Were called upon to die,
And leave to life a simple cross instead?
Oh hearts, still hearts of this September,
That fell 'neath the blanket of autumn's
First falling leaves, forgive me when I stand,
Solemn and still, wondering and wordless,
And moved—to remember.

England Not a Nation of "Conquest"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY MCGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing an article from the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, by Harry S. Lybarger, entitled "England Not a Nation of 'Conquest.'" Mr. Lybarger is a personal friend of mine.

An instructor in the high school at Coshocton, Ohio, Mr. Lybarger is a noted student and teacher of world history and I submit his article to you because I feel the thoughts set forth merit our serious consideration:

ENGLAND NOT A NATION OF "CONQUEST"

(By Harry S. Lybarger)

On August 10 there appeared in the Plain Dealer the last installment of a series entitled: "Eisenhower—The Man and His Destiny," by Roy Rutherford. In my opinion, it was a correct appraisal of the character of our great soldier-organizer, and a fine contribution to our national appreciation of his abilities. Mr. Rutherford deals with one of the major troubles the general must face in forming an effective, cohesive military force in Western Europe out of the French, Germans, and Italians. But, in my opinion, he ruined the whole effect by the last part of one most unfortunate sentence. Referring to the British, he states:

"They make good allies, but have never been able, on their own, to do any conquering, except in such cases as the horrible Opium War in China, the conquest of semi-civilized India, and after a long while, the defeat of a handful of Boers in South Africa."

DENIAL

It is not my purpose to debate the controversial questions of national political morals of the British in these three minor conflicts. I would attack the statement as ridiculously false and therefore to attack the false propaganda it engenders by such words and phrases as horrible, on their own, conquering.

England has been spoken of as "In Europe but not of it." So close is she to the shores of the continent, that since the political emergence of Europe out of the feudal anarchy of the Middle Ages into large national states ruled by despotic monarchs, she has had to keep watch and ward constantly for her own safety. Her geographical isolation, the character of her people, and other elements, caused her love of liberty to grow apace. One method of protecting it has been to keep intact on the continent the "balance of power." Her diplomatic technique was perfected through four centuries of turmoil. Her sagacious statesmen recognized that her size and position made her a purely defensive power. In no time, since the growth of the great national despotisms, has she waged any way for conquest in Europe.

However, as all European nations joined in a mad scramble for colonies, England seized the opportunity to increase trade and keep abreast of her contemporaries. "Conquests" implies offensive war. England's conquests were limited to colonial wars.

FOR FREEDOM

But, what is of supreme importance, is that five times England has played not only a major but a necessary role in the saving of that part of western civilization devoted

to freedom. In each instance the crux of the whole action became to save her own little island from invasion and conquest by megalomaniac despots. Mr. Rutherford's statement insidiously implies that England has been a military failure in all but the three minor colonial wars he mentions.

In all five cases the outcome was in large measure determined at sea; in three of them, England was largely "on her own." For her own security, it is true she formed alliances and coalitions wherever possible.

But most of the time her allies became broken reeds, and she was compelled to stand "on her own." When she caused the destruction of Phillip's invincible armada; when she checked Louis the Fourteenth at La Hogue; Napoleon at Trafalgar; the Kaiser at Jutland; and the "blitz" of Hitler, her conquest was the shattering of those forces of evil, which threatened to destroy forever those basic concepts of freedom contained in the Magna Carta, the Bill of Rights, Responsible Parliaments, habeas corpus, freedom of speech, the Monroe Doctrine. It would be difficult to prove indeed that in any one of the five cases England was not absolutely necessary to win those victories, all of which were her tremendous and purely defensive conquests. The word "horrible" would have more proper significance had Mr. Rutherford applied the word to conditions which would have followed a Hitlerian victory, rather than to the fiasco of that century-old opium war.

TURNING THE TABLES

What a storm would be raised were someone to write: "The Americans make good allies, but have never been able on their own to do any conquering, except in such cases as the horrible Mexican War, the conquest of semicivilized Indian tribes, and after a long while the defeat of a handful of Filipinos."

This, like Mr. Rutherford's fallacious sentence would be eminently unfair, because it would ignore the fact that our help from 1917 to 1918 and from 1941 to 1945 was essential to victory. No one would like to think of our facing the Kaiser or Hitler or Stalin "on our own." We are not ashamed to build alliances just as England did for four centuries and for the same reasons. Neither her efforts nor ours should be ignored or sneered at, directly or by implication.

Let us look away beyond one little phrase, which is false, and which packs a wallop only because its author has bound together in a small package some words which could carry delight and comfort to ignorant enemies of freedom, be they here or elsewhere. Rather, let us look back, over the last four centuries, and view with respect the long list of English contributions to the cause of freedom, the finest heritage of our race. Let us pause at June of that long dreary year of 1940 when really England was "on her own," and repeat Churchill's inspired, immortal phrase: "It was England's finest hour," and then let us look forward in the hope that England, as well as ourselves, may live to enjoy the fruition of that hope for freedom, which we both have cherished.

International Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, an outstanding citizen of Clovis, N. Mex., in my

State, Mr. Cash Ramey, through the medium of the press, has asked certain questions pertaining to our international policy.

Believing in the right of petition and expression, without in any way passing on the merits of Mr. Ramey's questions, but for the benefit of those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that the entire question propounded by Mr. Ramey be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the questions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEN DOES A DEMOCRACY CEASE TO BE A DEMOCRACY? WHEN FREEDOM LEAVES A DEMOCRACY, WHAT BECOMES OF A GOVERNMENT CALLED A DEMOCRACY?

DENNIS CHAVEZ,

United States Senator,

Care of Senate, Washington, D. C.

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,

Care of Senate, Washington, D. C.

A. M. FERNANDEZ,

Care of House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

JOHN J. DEMPSEY,

Care of House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

When a house and lot, owned by an individual, is taken over by the Government, and a Government official says what rent he will allow the owners to charge for his property—then whose property is it? Does it still belong to the person who paid for it, and pays taxes on it? Or does the property become that of the Government?

When a democracy joins with 57 other nations, and supplies the cash to carry on a war, is that Government still a democracy? Or has it become a nation ruled by a group of Senators and Congressmen who voted that democracy into a United Nations—without the consent of the people who own, and pay taxes on that democracy.

These self-same Senators and Congressmen say, almost daily, to the owners of this democracy (as the United States is called): "You, and each of you, must pay—and pay not millions, but billions of taxes—and you must furnish men by the thousands."

Thousands of men, for what? To keep a war going on in Europe and Asia.

Would it be too much for the taxpayers, and the owners, of the United States to ask our high-and-mighty Senators and Congressmen to please call an election, and let the persons who pay the bills, and who furnish the men and women to carry on this war in Europe and Asia, say whether or not they wish to continue this war?

It will be remembered that in 1945 the Congress of the United States voted our people into the United Nations, and that all but two United States Senators voted for our democracy to join the U. N. After six long years of war, strife, and turbulence, is it not time for our people—before they are taxed out of their very existence—to ask for an election, and let the people say whether or not our Government shall continue this state of war that threatens the very existence of our people and loss of our people's tax money?

If a man living under a real democracy owned, for instance, some furniture, it was his merchandise; he could sell to whom he wanted. But now, under this same democracy, the Government says: "This merchandise shall be sold for not less than 15-percent-cash down payment."

Since when did any man living in and under a democracy have this freedom taken from him?

When does a democracy cease to be a democracy?

The billions that our United States now owes will be a burden for years to come.

Yet, day after day, Congress—both Republicans and Democrats—says that we must have another seven or eight billions.

Money has always been the backbone, shield, and protector of the United States, and a man's property has always been his to do with as he wished. But now you hear: "Government controls this and Government controls that."

Working people pay from 10 to 40 percent of their earnings in taxes, and much of this money goes to further the United Nations war.

What do the other 57 nations in the war with us do and say? Well, some of them sell supplies to Communist China, our opponent, some send a few token troops to aid us, and nearly all say: "Send us money, a lot of it, and send it now."

What do you think, folks?

Would a Republican President and a Republican Congress serve us better? What shall we do to be saved? Shall we continue to pour billions into foreign nations, until our poor tax-paying people have their United States dollar reduced to the value of a dime? Or shall we pull out of the United Nations—come home to our own United States and tend to our own business?

Or shall we continue in the United Nations and fight every other country's war—pour our money and arms over there, which, in the event they broke relations with us, would be used by them to make war against us?

This line of reasoning does not suit a great many of our prominent office-holders (both Republicans and Democrats). I know this, because I have talked with them on the subject.

Some people say: "Well, to be frank about the matter, it is either the United States or Russia that will rule the world."

Here and now, let me state my opinion, for what it may be worth. Neither the United States nor Russia will rule the whole world.

If the United States were out of the Asiatic war today, within 2 years China and Russia would be fighting each other.

Mind you, now, readers, I do not say that when we get out of the United Nations, we should give up one single foot of territory we have occupied. We should keep Japan and all of the islands that we now have, and protect them to the limit. We need no 57 nations hanging on to the United States, to be fed, armed, and fattened.

We are well able to tend to our own business.

Our people should certainly have the full right to vote, and say by their own voices and votes, whether or not we should remain allied with a group of nations who are bleeding us white.

And suppose, folks, that we did win the war? What on earth would we do with China? Simply tell them that we don't want them to be communistic? No, sir. We would want controls—and the Chinese would have to be controlled and cannot be Communists. The United States does not need China, and does not want control of any other foreign country.

So, then, why should we change democracy as a freedom government? Why should we take the lead, and furnish the money and men to continue this conflict, until our dollar is not worth the paper it is printed on? Just why? Where is the sense in it?

Suppose Communist China surrendered today, and said that they surrendered all. What would we do? We don't want their country. We don't want to rule them. Or do we?

Who is behind this war, and why?

If communism is like we, of the United Nations, say, then as communistic nations, will they exist for long? Are we, the United States, the keepers of 57 other nations?

Should we, the people, elect an Army man for President, and give him a concurring

Congress? And if we did elect an Army man, and he, or the United Nations (it would be the U. N., if we won) defeated everyone in Europe and Asia, (of course, if we lost, it would be only the United States) then, after the United States was victorious over all countries and owed another four or five hundred billion dollars, where would we be? We, who furnished the men and money.

No nation, or set of nations, in the world can defeat the United States, unless we let the powers that are in control continue to lead the people further into the quagmire of utter destruction.

In the August 3, 1951, issue of the *Amarillo (Tex.) News*, it states that Mr. RALPH GWINN, Congressman from New York, says that every fourth person in the United States during 1950 was wholly, or partially, dependent upon the American taxpayer.

He states in this article that 34,653,328 checks were issued to Government employees, pensioners, war veterans, unemployed workers, farmers, and many other persons. One item, he says, was unemployment insurance paid to 7,364,000 people in 1950, all amounting to over \$30,000,000,000.

We know that no nation can survive for long on these billions of expenditures, year in, and year out.

This spending has been going on for years—no longer do our Senators and Congressmen speak of retrenchment—no longer do they say that spending must cease.

The Senators and Congressmen talk election in 1952; they talk controls.

Their ideas of controls with Wilson and DiSalle have now been released, and higher prices are now being requested (or permitted) by the Government. All of this control matter is only to misguide and befuddle the people.

Dissipation of our economy is the rule; why, no one seems to know.

It is not a pleasure to write this article about our own Government, but unless someone in the very near future starts some action to save this democracy, it is doomed to complete frustration.

If, after you have read this article, you desire, you may sign the space below; stating your name and address, and mail it to either or all of our governmental representatives.

Will you, Mr. Senator—Mr. Congressman, of the State of New Mexico, try to get a bill passed by the Congress asking that we, the people, have a right to vote on this matter, within 6 months from the date of September 1, 1951?

The subject to be voted on: Shall we, the people, of the United States, remain in the United Nations?

CASH RAMEY.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix to the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

Colossal fraud is about the kindest way to describe the Stalin brand of communism—and the black-and-white proof is in the much-vaunted Soviet constitution of 1936.

In a sort of preamble this constitution states:

"The principle applied in the U. S. S. R. is that of socialism: 'From each according to his ability; to each according to his work.'"

Now, the doctrine preached by Karl Marx—which is supposed to be so revolutionary—substitutes the word "need" for the word "work," and there is a great deal of difference.

As a matter of fact, the principal of "to each according to his work" has long been a guiding principle of the so-called capitalistic nations. It is generally agreed that under the free-enterprise system those who work hard and use just ordinary prudence will enjoy a good standard of living.

This principle was modified long ago to take care of hardship cases by pensions to the blind and aged, aid to dependents, unemployment insurance, as well as numerous private and collective charities. Inheritance and graduated income taxes are taken "from each according to his ability."

Undoubtedly Lenin was a true revolutionist, subscribing to the Marxian doctrine. There is every evidence to believe that Trotsky was the true disciple of Lenin and that his split with Stalin was over Marxism.

"Good old Joe" solved that argument by having Trotsky murdered.

Many of us have always maintained that Stalin's communism was nothing more than another breed of Hitler's nazism. Both are based on state socialism and backed by police force.

The similarity grows with the parades of German Communist youth—this time in blue shirts instead of brown. Even the persecution of Jews is being practiced by the Stalinists.

Of course, the final and conclusive proof that the communism practiced in Russia is a complete failure is the iron curtain itself.

After more than 30 years under this supposedly wonderful and revolutionary system, the U. S. S. R. should need only to open wide the door and let the world see for itself the joy of living under communism as practiced in Stalin's Russia.

When it came to preaching the doctrine of universal military training to the boys of this country, he had no superior because of the story that is told in an editorial published in the *Lexington (Ky.) Herald*, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

SGT. SAMUEL WOODFILL

Sgt. Samuel Woodfill was one of the great heroes of the United States. Although he was retired as a major after World War I, he was always known as Sergeant Woodfill. That was the title he liked and it was the name by which he was called by many of the soldiers. He was, to borrow the term so frequently used for General Bradley, "a soldier's soldier."

General Pershing gave him the name of "the greatest hero of World War I" and selected him as a pallbearer at the funeral of the Unknown Soldier. Later when General Pershing died and his body was laid to rest under a marker similar to those of the enlisted men but set apart upon a hillside at Arlington, the general had chosen his old Kentucky friend, Sam Woodfill, as a pallbearer.

Sergeant Woodfill won the Medal of Honor and 10 other decorations from various allied governments for heroism on the battlefield near Cunel, France, where singlehanded he shot three Germans who were manning a machinegun nest and killed an officer with his fist in a hand-to-hand encounter. Woodfill then killed 15 other machine gunners who were holding up the American advance and when his pistol jammed killed three of the enemy with a pickax.

A native of Belleville, Ind., Woodfill came to Louisville and enlisted in the Regular Army in 1901. He was a sergeant at the outbreak of World War I, was commissioned a first lieutenant and sent to France. He was retired in 1923 as a sergeant major. When World War II started, Woodfill was commissioned a major and assigned to training duty. From 1929 to 1937, he was stationed in Louisville as assistant executive secretary for the Kentucky Disabled Ex-Servicemen's Board.

Woodfill was one of the greatest advocates of a preparedness program and was a modest, true, and patriotic American who braved death, but survived two world wars in which he defended his country well.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, much of the information in this editorial was obtained from C. N. Florence, former executive secretary of the Kentucky Disabled Ex-Servicemen's Board, and now assistant chief of claims for the American Legion in the Washington, D. C., office.

The Stalin Brand of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the *Bellevue American*, of Bellevue, Wash., is a friendly, constructive newspaper which is dedicated to the development of the fertile and promising area which lies to the east of Seattle. Its publisher, Mr. A. J. Whitney, is an able and patriotic American. I was impressed by his front-page editorial of August 16. It covers a subject which is of continuing concern and interest to every one of us.

Sgt. Samuel Woodfill, Hero of World War I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS R. UNDERWOOD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, Sgt. Samuel Woodfill, a Kentuckian by adoption, though born in Indiana, was called by General Pershing "the greatest hero of World War I." Sergeant Woodfill's recent death distressed many of those who had served with him in either World War I or World War II, or had known him in carrying forward the preparedness program of the American Legion.

Treaty of Peace With Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN E. LYLE, JR.

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. A. N. Dahl, of Pettus, Tex., has written me about the National Seminar of Methodist Women, held recently in Nashville, Tenn.

I quote a portion of her letter as introduction to a resolution adopted by the group:

I have just returned home from attending a national seminar of Methodist women from across the Nation, held at Nashville, Tenn.

The theme for the seminar was Christian Foundations for World Order and we studied many of the issues for world peace. Among these was land reform as it has been worked out in Japan under the occupation forces. We believe this is a very good thing for the people of Japan, but we found that no provision has been made in the present peace treaty to protect this. Knowing the background of the Japanese people as we do we fear if some provision is not made in the treaty to safeguard this that in a few years all the land will be back in the hands of a few landlords.

It was voted at the seminar that I ask you to have accompanying resolution inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We will appreciate this very much as we feel it might help to focus the attention of other key people in this issue.

RESOLUTION

The National Seminar of Methodist Women in session at Nashville, Tenn., July 31 to August 9, 1951, have had their attention focused on land reform as one of the major issues of peace in the world today.

One illustration of this is the current program in Japan whereby 78 percent of the soil is owned by those who till it. It is our belief that this achievement is in accord with Christian and democratic principles, and that its value must be preserved for the welfare of the people. We would, therefore, urge our Representatives to safeguard this land reform in the final draft of the treaty for Japan.

Boston Herald Says Central Arizona Project Is Planned Extravagance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, opposition to the proposed central Arizona project has become Nation-wide. In every section of this country, newspapers and organizations of all types have raised their voices against this extravagant, fantastic, and infeasible project.

I have placed many of these protests in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that Congress may be informed of the attitude of the people about this proposed wastefulness.

One of the best editorials on the subject which has come to my attention was printed July 12, 1951, in the eminent Boston Herald.

The editorial follows:

PLANNED EXTRAVAGANCE

Economy in Government is a matter of careful planning. So, it seems, is extravagance. Witness the central Arizona project.

This is a scheme to pump water out of the Colorado River to irrigate 152,500 acres of Arizona farmland now running dry, plus 73,500 acres not now being farmed. A dam would also supply power.

It sounds good, this great plan to bring the blessings of adequate water to 226,000 acres, with a little incidental cheap power,

until the other side of the ledger is examined.

The cost of the whole project was last estimated at \$788,000,000. Of this, \$450,000,000 is for irrigation. This figures to about \$2,000 per acre for construction cost alone. The average market value of that land today is less than \$300 an acre.

Last December the Water Resources Commission reported that the cost per acre of reclamation projects has been tending upward, those now under construction averaging just under \$350 an acre, and those planned averaging \$450 an acre.

But the Arizona irrigation would jump suddenly to \$2,000 an acre.

The taxpayers stand to pay all this cost but a mere \$1,700,000 that the landowners would pay over 75 years. But this is by no means all the taxpayers would be stuck for.

The interest for 75 years on construction costs comes to \$2,075,729,000, which will come out of all the people. It happens also that dams will silt up unless reservoirs and other works are constructed upstream, which will add to the cost. It also happens that every reclamation project so far has cost substantially more than the Department of Interior estimated.

It is entirely conservative to assume that the taxpayers will eventually have to foot a bill of \$3,000,000,000. Three billions to help the farmers on 226,000 acres in Arizona. Even figured at \$2,075,729,000, Secretary Chapman's estimate, Massachusetts taxpayers would be assessed \$70,575,000.

Yet President Truman has energetically pressed for the project, and the Senate passed it (with Senators LODGE and SALTONSTALL voting against it).

This is a measure of how much economy means to Mr. Truman.

To oppose the central Arizona project is not to oppose all reclamation and power projects. It is only to demand a sound regard for prudence. Hoover Dam is required by law to pay, and is paying, 3 percent interest to the Treasury every year for its repayment period. It has not cost and will not cost the taxpayers a cent.

But we are now on a water development spree which refuses to calculate costs against benefits. We are trying planned extravagance.

The New Controls Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article from Newsweek of August 13, 1951, entitled, "Why the New Controls Act is Bad," by Henry Hazlitt. This article emphasizes very strongly that it is useless to talk about price controls unless we are willing to deal with the basic cause of inflation, which is the increase in the volume of money and credit and the increased spending of the Federal Government.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY THE NEW CONTROLS ACT IS BAD

(By Henry Hazlitt)

After his outburst at Detroit, denouncing all criticisms of his policies as smears, slan-

der, and lies from doubters and defeatists, neither the tone nor content of Mr. Truman's statement on signing the new economic controls legislation came as any surprise. It was a purely political document designed to throw the entire blame for any further inflation onto the Republicans in Congress.

Take, for example, his comment on the Capehart amendment. "This complicated amendment will force price ceilings up on thousands of commodities clear across the board. It is like a bulldozer, crashing aimlessly through existing pricing formulas, leaving havoc in its wake." This violent simile was apparently considered a complete substitute for bothering to tell the American people what the Capehart amendment actually provides. It is simply intended to prevent the OPS from fixing price ceilings that would deprive retailers and wholesalers of at least their customary percentage margin of profit in the month before the Korean war.

If we accept the premises of price control, it might be argued that this amendment is inflationary in the sense that it permits a customary percentage mark-up rather than merely a customary dollars-and-cents mark-up. But this argument is not consistently open to those who, like the President, have supported the cost-of-living escalator clauses in wage contracts.

The new Defense Production Act is really a very bad law, as Mr. Truman insists. But it is bad, in the main, for precisely the opposite reasons from the ones he gives. It is bad not because it has failed to impose price and wage controls that are sufficiently "strong" or "tough," but because it continues the flagrant fraud of price and wage control. It cannot be repeated too often that price control is not a cure for inflation. It regiments the economy and ties it in red tape. It inevitably has consequences which provoke demands for more and more controls and lead toward economic totalitarianism. It actually prolongs and intensifies inflation because it unbalances production and causes shortages—and above all because it diverts public attention away from the only real cause of inflation, which is the increase of money and credit.

In the whole course of the debate on the new law the only genuine anti-inflation amendment that got to a vote, was that offered by Representative JESSE P. WILCOTT, of Michigan. This declared: "It is the further intention of the Congress that none of the powers contained in this act . . . with respect to the stabilization of prices and wages, shall be used unless other indirect means of effectuating such controls and stabilization presently provided in other acts for use by the Secretary of Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board have been utilized. This merely expressed the intention of Congress that in addition to using the fraudulent anti-inflation measure of price control, government agencies should also use the genuine anti-inflation measures involved in raising discount rates, tightening bank reserves, and in ceasing to monetize the Government debt.

But this amendment, the only test of sincere and intelligent anti-inflation sentiment in Congress, was turned down, on almost straight party lines, by a vote of 169 to 149.

And yet there is not an economist worthy of the name who does not know that the basic cause of inflation always and everywhere is an increase in the volume of money and credit. Every Congressman, not to speak of Messrs. Truman, DiSalle, and Johnston, would do well to read the Federal Reserve Bulletin for July. "Monetary expansion," it begins, "which had been at a very rapid rate in the last half of 1950, was interrupted in the first half of 1951." It is this change, and not any miracle of price control, which slowed down the previous violent rise of wholesale prices. Where these had gone from

an index number of 157.3 in June of 1950 to 180.1 in January of this year, they had actually dropped back to 177.9 by the week ended July 31 last.

**Statement by David Sarnoff on His Return
From a Visit to Europe**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, last week I read with a great deal of interest a statement made by Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the Radio Corporation of America, upon his return from an extended visit in Europe. This distinguished American businessman has a wide acquaintance in Europe; he visited with leading statesmen and businessmen; in my judgment, his views and reactions to what is going on in Europe are sound, and provide food for thought. I think Members of the Senate will find General Sarnoff's estimate of the European economic and political situation of particular interest as we begin consideration of both the Defense Department appropriation bill and the ECA authorization bill. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, Mr. President, that General Sarnoff's statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mrs. Sarnoff and I were abroad 2 months and visited England, France, Italy, and Switzerland.

While there, I met and discussed current problems with Mr. Winston Churchill, General Eisenhower, and with leaders in government, finance, and industry as well as with wage earners, farmers, housewives, shopkeepers, and others.

In general, my impressions are that, with the help of the Marshall plan, the free countries of Europe have made much progress with their problems of rehabilitation. But they have not yet achieved political, financial, economic, and social stability.

When I visited Mr. Winston Churchill at his home in London, I found him quite well and at work, writing the fifth volume of his great history of World War II. This, in addition to his activities as leader of the opposition. No one abroad has a greater understanding and appreciation than Mr. Churchill has of the meaning and extent of our aid to Europe and of America's constructive position in world affairs.

I had several long and frank discussions with General Eisenhower, whom I visited at his new SHAPE headquarters near Paris. He looked fit physically, alert mentally, and, as always, hopeful and inspiring. General Eisenhower is doing a superb job under the most difficult conditions. In some respects, his present task is a harder one than he had during the late war. It is one thing to obtain unity during war; it is another thing to achieve it when guns are silent and bombs are not falling.

But under General Eisenhower's wise, persuasive and able leadership, visible progress is being made in strengthening the

military defenses of Western Europe against further possible aggressions by Communist Russia.

While there is an awareness in Europe of the Russian menace, nevertheless there is an apparent lethargy about rearmament and a good deal of fatalistic thinking about the future.

In some countries, the domestic problems of higher costs of living, low wages, inadequate housing and the poor living standards of the masses combine to distract the attention of the people from the greater danger of losing their freedom and their future, through Communist aggression from the outside or its infiltration from the inside.

America can help, but it cannot solve the major domestic problems of the European countries. This is a long-term job they must do for themselves. But we must continue our substantial aid in men, money, and materials—at least during the next two critical years—while the rearmament program is under way. To attain our objective, this program must be made effective in Europe as well as at home.

If we leave the Western European countries to their own initiative and resources only, I believe that their defense and rearmament efforts would not be enough to deter Russia from attacking and overrunning them. And this would be fatal for Europe and disastrous for America.

On the other hand, I believe that with the progress being made at home on our program of armament production and military preparedness, and with American aid supplied to our allies in the Atlantic Pact, such aggression and domination by Russia can be successfully prevented. Such tangible evidence of our determination to preserve peace will greatly increase the confidence of our European allies in their own ability to deter Communist aggression and to resist it effectively, if it comes.

In other words, I do not believe that a third world war is inevitable, if all of us do what we are able to do to prevent it. This must be our immediate objective.

Beyond this, there must be a long-term objective of a free, strong, and self-sustaining Europe. In my view, this objective will be achieved only through a federated or united states of Europe. Thus far, traditions, habits, fears, and prejudices have prevented realization of this ideal. But where logic and reason fail, events and realities often impose solutions. For example, today, the project for a European army to serve the common defense is nearing achievement. Only a few years ago, this would have seemed impossible.

I am aware of what adequate aid to our European friends—even during the next 2 years—involves in the way of sacrifices for all of us in America. But I see no practical alternative, if we are determined, as I am certain we are determined, to preserve our own freedom, strengthen our own security, and protect our own way of life.

**Air Force Flyer in Japan Reports Air
Force Ground Support Planes Are
Inferior to Those of Navy and Marines**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include portions

of a letter recently received from a friend in the Air Force in Japan. What he reports about some of our aircraft is disturbing and I call it to the attention of the appropriate officials:

DEAR DR. JUDD: I have been in Japan for the past several months flying interception-patrol missions.

If the people in the United States would realize what an excellent job General MacArthur has done here in Japan they would fully appreciate him as not only one of the few military geniuses our country has produced, but also as one of the political geniuses in our country. From what I have observed, the Japanese people have no bitter feelings against the occupation forces; and being an industrious lot, they have gone ahead to rebuild their country. I think we have no fear of granting them a just peace with the gamble that communism might take control.

As yet have not been to Korea, but the men in my squadron are predominantly combat returnees. I have discussed this matter with hundreds of pilots and I want to set down their first-hand opinions. Perhaps you are fully aware of the situation. The general consensus of opinion is that we do not have a good ground-support aircraft. If anything, the F-51 is far superior to the F-80 and F-84 because it carries more of a load, can stay over the target longer, has greater range, can bomb and strafe more accurately—and yet something as simple as one 30 caliber bullet can knock down an F-51 if that bullet puts a hole in the large underslung radiator and drains the coolant. It seems that the Navy and Marine pilots, by virtue of the fact that their Corsairs and AD's are excellent ground-support aircraft have far outshone the Air Force. Being ex-Navy, I would grant the Navy no compliments unless they deserved them, and this time they do. Please don't misunderstand me though as I believe the quality of pilots in all branches of the service are superior type to the enemy, it's just that the Air Force doesn't have as good an aircraft as the Navy to do the job.

I keep hoping that more F-86's would be sent here for our interceptor squadrons, yet we still fly the obsolete F-80. I keep hoping that maybe the F-90 or F-91 would be mass produced, yet Lockheed is still turning out obsolete F-94's—an all-weather type F-80. I know that because the B-36 program was top priority, we had to skimp on fighter research, but we're getting behind in jets and I hope the wheels in Washington are doing something about it.

With best wishes,

First Lieutenant, Air Force.

**Statement by O. Roy Chalk at Reception
in Honor of Korean Ambassador**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by O. Roy Chalk, delivered at the reception to honor the Korean Ambassador and the Korean airlift at the Carlton Hotel, Washington, D. C., on August 9, 1951.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY O. ROY CHALK DELIVERED AT THE RECEPTION TO HONOR THE KOREAN AMBASSADOR AND THE KOREAN AIRLIFT, CARLTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., AUGUST 9, 1951

Thank you, Dr. Yang. I am sure that all of us, particularly Maj. Gen. William Tunner, chief in charge of the Korean airlift of the Military Air Transport Service, and the representatives of the commercial airlines, who are with us today, are most appreciative of your tribute.

I am especially stimulated by your thought that the airlift might be converted to the peaceful mission of transporting the relief supplies that are so desperately needed by your ravished peoples.

I cannot, of course, speak for the entire aviation industry, but I can make recommendations to the airlines that are members of the Independent Military Air Transport Association. I would like our group to fulfill your hopes.

I shall therefore urge each of our individual members to offer to carry gratis, bona fide Korean relief cargo on a space-available basis in all planes as our contribution to peace. Although it would be impractical to fly low-cost cargo to Korea, it would be feasible to fly gifts of the people of America to ships awaiting at west coast ports.

In the past year the Korean airlift has been flying war supplies to Korea. Let us pray for a speedy and honorable truce, consistent with the tenets of the United Nations—so that instead of war supply planes, we can send over peace relief planes.

I would like to suggest, in this connection, that an airlift program be instituted which would highlight the urgent need for speedy transportation of drugs, food, clothing and supplies to the unfortunates of Korea. Thousands of airports throughout our great country could be collection depots for medicines, food and other non-bulk items. Relief supplies of this character could be picked up by our airplanes and those who would join us.

I am sure that for such a worthy cause most of the airlines of our Nation would be happy to take part in Operation Peace Planes.

To start the ball rolling, Mr. Ambassador, I shall recommend to the Independent Military Air Transport Association that we file a special tariff with the Civil Aeronautics Board wherein we ask permission to transport on a space-available basis all such supplies without charge.

And now, I propose that we all drink a toast to peace in Korea, to Dr. and Madame Yang, to Maj. Gen. William Tunner, to the members of the Korean airlift and to speedy relief for Korea.

TEXT OF A STATEMENT DELIVERED AT THE RECEPTION IN HONOR OF THE KOREAN AIRLIFT AND THE KOREAN AMBASSADOR, BY THE INDEPENDENT MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION, CARLTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., AUGUST 9, 1951

Mr. Chalk, I want to express my deep appreciation to you and to the Independent Military Air Transport Association for honoring me by asking me to share the spotlight with the Korean airlift. I am grateful for having the opportunity to publicly express my appreciation for the magnificent work done by every member of the Korean airlift.

I salute the traffic arm of the Department of Defense, the Military Air Transport Service, and I likewise salute the traffic arm of private industry, the commercial airlines of the United Nations. If it were not for your speedy response and gallant efforts, just a year ago, I shudder to think of what the consequences would have been.

Hundreds of your planes, manned by thousands of your men, have been ferrying

personnel and equipment to the west coast and across the vast Pacific to us every day. Our need has been great, and our plight desperate. You answered the call. I cannot give the exact figures, but thousands of tons have been carried to us each week on your bridge of planes. Freedom flew on your wings from the broad stretches of America to us in the Pacific.

You literally gave us life, hope, and strength.

The Military Air Transport Service is known throughout the world for its illustrious leadership and for its great spirit of service. It has a record for which it can well be proud. The job it has been doing in Korea is but another pearl in the strand of its achievements.

We will never forget the valiant response of the Military Air Transport Service and of such commercial airlines as the Flying Tigers, the Trans Ocean, the Seaboard and Western, the Overseas National—airlines that carried the largest part of the load during those terrible first 90 days.

During this last year, when we suffered so greatly, the United States and the United Nations proved they were our friends. The Korean airlift proved it was our friend indeed.

Today, we are all praying for a new kind of era, and for a new kind of airlift. We desperately need food, clothing, medical supplies, and equipment to help us rebuild our war torn people and our war torn land.

In Korea, truce will mean the end of a terrible experience, and the beginning of a new period, one that will call for the most careful planning, great ingenuity, and coordination.

We cannot correct the devastation by ourselves. We will need help from you who have helped us in the past. We want our people to take their place as useful citizens in the world, but they need the most fundamental of necessities. Many have no homes and are clothed in rags. Many don't know where the next meal is coming from.

We are looking to you for help, and I have confidence that in the difficult days ahead, we can count on the United States, the United Nations, and the Korean airlift for the much needed relief to Korea.

United States and Mexico Work To Dam Rio Grande

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix to the RECORD, I wish to submit an article from the New York Times of Sunday, August 19, 1951, in connection with the building of a dam on the United States-Mexico border, which information should be of interest to the Members of Congress and the Nation as well.

The article follows:

UNITED STATES AND MEXICO WORK TO DAM RIO GRANDE—5-MILE BARRIER HALF COMPLETE IN LONG-RANGE POWER AND IRRIGATION PROJECT

FALCON, TEX., August 18.—The United States and Mexico are working together to control the waters of the Rio Grande.

The first big project in a long-range program is the Falcon Dam, 75 miles downstream from Laredo and 110 from the Gulf of Mexico. This \$48,000,000 barrier is now

half complete. Other dams, backing up huge reservoirs behind them, will be built upstream.

The 5-mile-long Falcon Dam will be among the longest dams in the United States.

The division of costs was determined on the basis of what percentages of Rio Grande flow came from tributaries on each side of the border. The United States is paying 58.6 percent of the cost. Mexico is paying 41.4 percent.

Irrigation water, essential to the citrus orchards and year-round vegetable fields of the lower Rio Grande Valley, will be measured out on the same percentage basis. There will be a power plant on each side of the Falcon Dam. One will serve the United States, the other will serve Mexico.

AN 80,000-ACRE LAKE

The dam will irrigate almost a million acres in an area where irrigation already has created a wealthy orange, grapefruit, cotton, and table-vegetable industry. Holding 3,300,000 acre-feet of water, it will control flood waters that periodically have destroyed river-bottom farmlands. These floods often are reflected in a few days in rising prices for groceries.

It will create an 80,000-acre lake, 50 miles long—a hunter's and angler's mecca.

An Iowa firm, C. F. Lytle & Co. of Sioux City, has the multi-million-dollar contract. Falcon is scheduled for completion in 1953. Already men and machines, ahead of schedule, have:

1. Completed 2 miles of earthen dam on the United States side.

2. Passed the halfway mark toward completing the 3-mile earthen fill for the Mexican side. (Three miles of the dam face will be in Mexico, two in the United States. The dam is unusually long because hills against which it must be buttressed are a long way from the river bed.)

3. Built a huge concrete plant to mix the materials for the spillway and for the structures to house two giant generators.

4. Warned thousands of residents on both sides of the river that they must leave their homes. The 80,000-acre reservoir will put countless farms, and a least 4 towns, under water.

Some of those who must move are pioneer families whose ancestors settled there, 3, 4, and 5 generations ago—8 or 9 generations on the Mexican side.

AMONG LONGEST RIVERS

Much of the time hardly bigger than a good-sized creek, the Rio Grande is nevertheless one of the longest rivers in the world—1,800 miles long. Almost from its origin in Colorado, its waters are used over and over again for irrigation.

But there is a disheartening fluctuation. During periods of heavy irrigation upstream and little rainfall, lower-valley irrigators find the stream almost dry. Then come heavy rains, more than the stream or its smaller present reservoirs can handle. Thousands of acre-feet of water then flow unused into the Gulf or smash across farmlands.

The Falcon is one of three dams on the Rio Grande planned in the 1945 water treaty between the United States and Mexico.

Puerto Rico's Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I think it is generally known that I have a very high

regard for the people of Puerto Rico. They have done an excellent job of becoming fine American citizens. Their present government is a credit to our Nation.

Dr. A. FERNÓS-ISERN, the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, is constantly vigilant on behalf of the people he represents. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD a copy of the letter which he wrote to the editor of the Washington Evening Star and which appeared in that paper on Sunday, August 19, 1951:

PUERTO RICO'S POSITION

Edward Tomlinson seems to misinterpret Puerto Rico's political picture in his article, Puerto Rico on the Threshold, in the Sunday Star of August 5.

Under Public Law 600, Eighty-first Congress, accepted by the people of Puerto Rico in a popular referendum in June, Puerto Rico is organizing a constitutional government. But also, within Public Law 600, the Puerto Rico Statute of Federal Relations, a compact between the island's people and the United States, continues in effect.

United States citizenship as extended to Puerto Ricans in 1917 and Puerto Rican citizenship as extended to United States citizens with 1 year's residence in the island continues. The privileges and immunities clause of the Constitution extends to Puerto Rico. Except for internal revenue laws, Federal laws extend automatically to Puerto Rico unless locally inapplicable. Foreign imports are subject to the same tariff rates as in the continent. The authority of the Puerto Rican Legislature is limited to purely local matters. The Government of Puerto Rico is locally financed. A Federal District Court sits in Puerto Rico as in any State. Federal immigration laws apply to Puerto Rico. Some joint Federal and insular programs, where expenses are shared by both governments, operate in Puerto Rico (grant-in-aid laws).

Accordingly, Mr. Tomlinson is in error when he says that: (1) The island is not self-supporting, (2) political ties with the mainland are hardly perceptible, (3) the island makes its own laws (the island does not participate in Federal legislation which applies to Puerto Rico); (4) every official is elected (Federal officials are appointed—insular officials are elected); (5) appeals from Puerto Rico's supreme court are seldom taken. (The situation is no different than appeals from a State supreme court, except that in the latter case appeals go directly to the Federal Supreme Court, whereas in the former appeals go to the First Circuit Court.)

With its new constitutional government, Puerto Rico will occupy a position similar to that of a State, except.

1 A statute of Federal relations, bilaterally adopted, will join the island to the United States instead of that union being effected by the Federal Constitution. This union with the Federal Government will be parallel to that of a State.

2 Although Federal laws apply generally to Puerto Rico as to a State, Puerto Rico will have no voice in the election of Federal lawmakers or the Chief Executive, and

3 Thus Puerto Rico will not be subject to Federal internal revenue taxes, except on Federal salaries and income derived from sources outside the island.

The ties between Puerto Rico and the United States are no more tenuous than the ties among the States are tenuous. If anything, Public Law 600 strengthens Puerto Rico's union with the United States while granting full self-government along State lines to a people capable of handling the trust.

English is compulsory in Puerto Rico from the first grade. At university level classes are in English or Spanish, depending upon

the professor's choice. College students are bilingual upon entering the university.

Ended now in Puerto Rico is Federal interference in purely local matters. Congress has discarded this suggestion of colonialism.

Full democracy is offered to Puerto Rico. Whenever it is thus offered it strengthens the union of free peoples owing allegiance to the same flag. Union based on equality is tenfold stronger than union based on subordination.

A FERNÓS-ISERN,
Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico.

A Jewish Historian's Tribute to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most beautiful odes and tributes to America recently came to my attention. It is written by the noted Jewish historian Mrs. Anita Libman Lebeson, who is the author of several important works dealing with the history of the Jews in the United States.

Mrs. Lebeson's brief article, America to Me, is written very interestingly and in poetic language. It depicts her feelings and her great love for our country, for its way of life and the freedom of its people. It is a song of joy and great pride in the role played by American Jewry since the very beginnings of civilization on this continent and the vast contributions which Jews have made toward making this country the greatest and most flourishing center of modern civilization in our day.

Very few people are able to put down their thoughts and express their views in the patriotic manner in which Mrs. Lebeson does. She is not only a great scholar, but an artist in her chosen field. The huge and overwhelming majority of Jews in this country feel as Mrs. Lebeson does toward this great land, they appreciate its kindness and its freedom, its sense of justice and opportunities—but they cannot state it as well as she has done.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to read this brief but beautiful article by Mrs. Lebeson which appeared in Congress Weekly, published by the American Jewish Congress, in the issue of May 28, 1951:

AMERICA TO ME

(By Anita Libman Lebeson)

Long before America was discovered and located on a map it was a place etched on the hearts of Jewish wanderers. For every Jew knew the boundaries of Utopia—a place where men could live in dignity and security. It was a sanctuary of refuge and safety, a land no one had yet found, whose existence few doubted. So early map makers drew maps, and philosophers speculated, and astrologers predicted, and mothers described it in their lullabies.

America began as a dream and ended as a reality. Breathlessly the news was spread through the underground of that day. Discovery displaced fantasy surpassing imagination.

The two vast continents linked by a thin thread of land were green and beautiful to

behold. The green forests were dense with ancient trees waiting to be felled and made into dwellings. Swift were the waters that traversed the land. Green pastures beckoned them. Green mansions sheltered them. Who could list its treasures? Who could describe the prodigal land? Who could foretell the sweet future? Hope stirred in the hearts of the oppressed, the unwanted, and the persecuted of all faiths.

So they took to their boats. Sails puffed and swelled in the wind. The endless rhythm of the Atlantic beat a sturdy march. Winds hissed and storms broke over their heads and the pilgrims turned their thoughts to God. And the prayers that arose overcame the storms of nature. So they landed and gave thanks.

In 1500, secret Jews led by Fernando de Loronha headed for the New World. Of the five barcos owned by him, one was named the Judea and of the new settlements established in 1501 by these early settlers, one was called Cananea.

Trackless forests were traversed. Rivers were forded and mountains were climbed. Sugar mills were established, fields were planted, parrots and other exotic creatures were caught for export. Best of all, the painful and humiliating disguises which had been forced upon the Jews were thrown off.

America was a place where men could be free.

America is people.

America is composed of strong men and weak, of bold visionaries and frightened immigrants. Of men who till fields and those who work in factories. Of peddlers hawking their wares and merchant princes in sound-proof buildings. Pilgrims—pioneers—patriots. Of scholars like Rabbi del Prado who helped build the synagogue in Surinam in 1685. Of soldiers like Samuel Nassy who distinguished himself in the defense of Surinam. Of a battling butcher named Asser Levy who fought for the right to do guard duty along with other early settlers of New Amsterdam. Of men like Mordecai Campanal who was one of the first settlers of Newport and who brought with two other Jews the secrets of the Masonic Order to the new land. Of women who, like Mrs. Lunah Burgos of Barbados, sent money to build a fence around the first synagogue in New York. Of scholars like Isaac Pinto who in 1765 translated the Sephardic Prayer Book into English. Of benefactors to higher education like Israel Joseph, Michael Lazarus, and Moses Lindo, who were among the earliest supporters of Brown University. Of shipowners like Aaron Lopez whose ships transported commodities to and from the colonies and whose support of the cause of the American Revolution was incalculable. Of Indian traders like Joseph Simon who dared traverse the wilderness establishing commerce with the Indians and opening vast stretches of land through trade and purchase to countless other settlers. Of householders like the Harts of Easton, Pa., who were among the first 10 settlers of that city and who entertained George Washington in their home.

Of le Juif Elias Stultheus who headed a vast colonization project in Louisiana while it was still under the French flag. Of the Gratz brothers whose vast trading interests opened up the Illinois country and of the Sheftalls who pioneered in Georgia and fought in the War of Independence. And of Francis Salvador of Charlestown, S. C., who when he heard the British were coming, mounted a horse and rode through the countryside alerting the settlers—only to die at the hands of the Indians—thus becoming the first Jew to die for his country—a free America. Of men like Benjamin Levy who could boast of his home that "George Washington slept here." Of men like Hayin Salomon who helped finance the Revolution, and men like Reuben Etting who fell in its defense.

There were people who demanded their rights and wrote letters to editors insisting that they gloried in their heritage. Such a letter was written by a soldier of the Revolution in 1800. It was addressed to the Printer of the Gazette of the United States and reads: "I am accused of being a Jew, of being a Republican and of being poor. . . . I am a Jew. I glory in belonging to that persuasion . . . I am a Republican. Thank God . . . I have fought as an American throughout the whole of the revolutionary war."

America is the sage of noble women. Rebecca Gratz—beautiful, gentle, compassionate, rejecting marriage to cling to her faith. Emma Lazarus at the docks of New York harbor staring with tear-welled eyes at the depressed and dejected immigrants who had fled the terror of pogrom and persecution. Lillian Wald climbing tenement stairs, imperiling her life to nurse the sick and aged through raging epidemics. Henrietta Szold, gentle scholar leading a new crusade to the Promised Land. Louise Wise, the essence of compassion and humility, boldly championing the cause of democratic equality for all people. Tamar Pool, bag in hand, flying to Cyprus to spend Passover with refugees confined in barbed-wire cages like animals in a zoo. An immigrant woman Anna Rosenberg, rising through sheer ability and indomitable loyalty, to be Assistant Secretary for Defense.

America is people—with hearts and minds and vision mobilized for America and for humanity.

It is a vast area peopled first by Asiatic migrants now known to us as American Indians, and next by displaced persons from Europe like the Puritans who went from England to Holland to the New World seeking a place where their Mosaic Christianity might be practiced in peace. Peopled also by Negroes from Africa stolen from their native homes and shipped like cattle into slavery, and freed in a struggle in which Lincoln was sacrificed and was mourned by the Jews of America as a father is mourned.

America is a holy experiment of many peoples who came from many places all working out their plural cultural destinies, all ready to die for the land they love and for its free institutions.

America is a state of mind. It is democracy in action. It is a spiritual adventure. It is the affirmation of the brotherhood of man. America is a place where labor is dignified and self-respecting. Led by a Talmudic scholar like Gompers into strong, cohesive unions. Headed by Torah-nourished men like Sidney Hillman and David Dubinsky, who translated the ideals of Amos into the everyday vocabulary of the workman of every faith and every color so that the worker of America is the envy and model of workers in all other lands.

America is a state of mind—of growth and idealism and of renaissance, of hope and altruism and brotherhood, of dreams of human dignity and of peace and of security and moral grandeur. It is a well of life-giving waters from which all may drink and be renewed. A land of faith, of vision, a becoming.

Europe's Lack of Unity More Serious Than Lack of Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

include the following article by William Henry Chamberlin, from Human Events:

FROM MARSHALL PLAN TO MARTIAL PLAN (By William Henry Chamberlin)

The Marshall plan is becoming a martial plan. This is one of the strongest impressions which one brings back from a trip in Western Europe at the present time. It is symbolized by the administration proposal to Congress to appropriate over \$6,000,000,000 in arms aid and over \$2,000,000,000 for economic aid to foreign countries during the next fiscal year.

Whether or not this will be the amount, it seems likely that a 3-to-1 proportion in favor of military aid, as distinguished from civilian, will be maintained. In the American Embassies and ECA missions in West European capitals, the emphasis today is on the strategic importance of future aid projects. (ECA missions have become almost second embassies in power and influence.)

In the main European headquarters of the ECA, on the rue St. Florentin, in Paris, there is a tendency among officials to speak of the nonmilitary side of their work as finished. This seems a little overoptimistic. While Britain, its dollar reserves temporarily swelled by large receipts from the rubber, tin, wool and other primary products of the Commonwealth area, recently felt able to dispense with what Winston Churchill once bluntly called the American dole, most of the continental European countries are still running dollar deficits. There has, however, been improvement in this field. The "dollar gap," the spread between what European countries considered their minimum needs from the dollar area and what they could pay, was at the fantastic figure of \$7,500,000,000 in 1947. It is now about \$1,500,000,000.

Apart from special weak spots, such as Greece and Austria, Europe might have stood entirely on its own feet economically within another year or two—provided its governments had practiced self-denial and sound fiscal policies and cut out some of the extravagances of the welfare state. Now the picture has changed and it is more difficult to set a time limit for the subsidization of Europe's armies than it was to set a term for financial aid to the European national economies.

During the first 3 years of its existence the ECA pumped about \$11,000,000,000 of American assistance into the anemic postwar European economic structure. The principal recipients were Great Britain, \$2,706,000,000, France \$2,278,000,000; Italy, \$1,228,000,000, West Germany, \$1,192,000,000; the Netherlands, \$958,000,000.

II

ECA aid has been a two-way help to European countries. It has paid many of their bills for raw materials and, to a smaller extent, for foodstuffs. It has contributed a good deal the reequipment for their industries. At the same time it has provided an additional source of revenue in the form of what are called counterpart funds.

While much the greatest part of the ECA shipments has been in the form of free grants to governments, the users of these shipments have been required to pay in their national currencies. Proceeds of these sales are counterpart funds and have been used for various purposes approved by the ECA missions, to help stabilize currencies, finance housing and public improvements, etc.

Whether one trusts the evidence of one's senses as a traveler or delves into volumes of statistics, the evidence seems overwhelming that the economic health of Western Europe is much better today than it was in 1947 or 1948. People are better fed and better dressed; goods move more freely across frontiers; one begins to notice now, even in Germany, not only how much has been destroyed but how much has been built.

Part of the credit for this improvement belongs to the ECA, part to the return to sounder methods of finance and economics, part to the irrepressible impulse of human beings to rebuild, to start up farms and factories and stores again. Two things, however, the ECA failed to accomplish. It alleviated, but did not and could not cure the consequences of some of the worst social and economic dislocations of the war. And it did not create in Europe a more perfect economic union.

One of the reasons why the Netherlands, one of the most prosperous countries in Europe before the war, has felt obliged to draw so heavily on American aid, and is constantly in the red in its account with its neighbor, Belgium, is the loss of the rich Dutch empire in Indonesia. An important cause of France's inability to achieve budgetary stability is the endless, no-decision war in Indochina. Germany's economic recovery, really brilliant in many ways, is clouded by the perpetual problem of how to absorb 9,000,000 expellees, driven destitute from their homes in East Germany, Poland, the Sudetenland, and the Balkans. And ECA has furnished no solution for Italy's chronic overpopulation.

Progress toward closer economic unit has been slow and halting. The EPU, or European Payments Union, a scheme sponsored and financed by the ECA, has smoothed the way for a resumption of multilateral trading. This has eased the pressure on European countries to conclude the constricting barter deals which were a feature of inter-European trade immediately after the war. But, despite much exhortation and some pressure from the American side, Europe has hardly achieved the goal of the free movement of men, goods, and capital. The consequences were vividly described in General Eisenhower's recent speech in London:

"Progress has been and is hobbled by a web of customs barriers interlaced with bilateral agreements, multilateral cartels, local shortages, and economic monstrosities . . . Europe . . . is divided by patchwork territorial fences. They pyramid every cost, with middlemen, tariffs, taxes, and overheads. Barred, absolutely, are the efficient division of labor and resources and the easy flow of trade."

III

In the present shift from Marshall plan to martial plan the emphasis changes; but some of the old problems remain. One hears less complaint about dollar shortages in European countries now, but more about the inflationary pressures of the Korean war and the European rearmament program, which threaten the relative currency stability that has been achieved during recent years.

During the first phase of the European recovery program, ECA representatives were constantly trying to strike a balance between what the European governments were inclined to ask and what Congress might be expected to approve. This same tug of war goes on, under different circumstances. The main issue is the division of the rearmament bill between the United States and its associates in the North Atlantic Pact.

Soon after I arrived in Rome an Italian Cabinet Minister was explaining to me that Italy was in full sympathy with the rearmament program—but on condition that the United States would supply not only the raw materials necessary for munitions, but also consumption goods, so that the workers would have something to buy with their earnings.

An official of the Bank of France suggested to me that the Communist threat was social and economic, rather than military. He then developed the argument that it would be a good idea if the United States would go on subsidizing the French economy full blast and forget about this awkward

and burdensome business of French rearmament. And on my first day in Bonn a German official developed the thesis that Germany's high rate of compulsory social expenditures on behalf of refugees and war victims should count as a contribution to European defense.

The resignation of Aneurin Bevan and Harold Wilson from the British Cabinet was based on the contention that Britain was being pressed by America to rearm beyond its economic strength. There will be some open and more secret pulling and hauling on this matter of paying the bills for the European armament effort, unless all signs fall.

IV

It is hard to see any realistic alternative to the United States policy of promoting the build-up of a unified European defense force. But the many nationalist and ideological divisions among the countries outside the Iron curtain are a formidable obstacle to the effective realization of this project.

From a talk with the French War Minister, Jules Moch, one gets the impression that he regards Germany much more as an enemy than as a prospective ally. For personal reasons (Moch's son was killed by the Gestapo) Moch is probably more intransigent than the average non-Communist Frenchman. But, at a time when the Adenauer government needs all the foreign encouragement it can get to overcome the internal German resistance to rearmament, it has not, as yet, received much help from Paris.

A high point of unreality is touched by the vocal British and French protests against such a common-sense arrangement as an American military agreement with Spain. Taken in connection with the absence of protests against military aid to Tito's Yugoslavia, this development shows that fellow-traveler prejudices are by no means dead in London and Paris.

Two of the qualitatively best European armies, the Swiss and the Swedish, are outside the European defense scheme because of the neutrality traditions of these countries. (The Swiss Army, incidentally, is larger than the number of troops France possesses in Europe.) Two of the largest European military forces, the Spanish and the Yugoslav, are excluded for other reasons.

The Marshall plan failed of complete success because it did not become the basis of a true European economic union. The fate of the martial plan hangs in the balance for the same reason. Since American lives are at stake in the latter case, as against dollars in the former, it would seem that there is a challenge to American leadership to press strongly and consistently for such elementary necessities as the speediest possible rearming of Germany, the establishment of air and naval bases in Spain, and, in general, the subordination of left-wing crochets and prejudices to national security needs.

Contracted Mexican Agricultural Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, there has been considerable misunderstanding of the charge of \$15 a worker for the contracted Mexican agricultural workers brought into this country under the terms of the international agreement with Mexico pursuant to the recent act

of Congress pertaining to the immigration of Mexican agricultural workers. Specific complaint has been made at the requirement of this charge each time the worker is recontracted.

The Secretary of Labor has furnished me a letter explaining this charge. I believe the information contained therein will be of interest and help to a great many citizens who are participating in this program. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be reprinted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Washington, August 17, 1951
The Honorable TOM CONNALLY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CONNALLY: At your request I have prepared a brief explanation of the charge of \$15 a worker for the contracted Mexican agricultural workers brought into this country under the terms of the international agreement with Mexico.

In the international agreement, migration or recruiting centers will be set up in the interior of Mexico at Guadalajara, Aguas Calientes, Irapuato, Chihuahua, and Monterrey. The workers will be recruited at these points and transported to reception or contracting centers in the United States at Harlingen, Laredo, and El Paso, in Texas; Nogales, Ariz., and Calexico, Calif. This expense will be borne by the United States Government and recovered from the employer contracting for the workers at an amount not to exceed \$15 a worker, as provided for in Public Law 78.

The budget for the Farm Placement Service was set up on the basis of a revolving fund to cover this operation. It is the plan to make this revolving fund break even at the end of the year, by collecting from the employer all money spent by us for the transportation and subsistence of these workers in Mexico. This fund is to be reimbursed by the employers for transportation and subsistence expenses incurred by the United States in obtaining Mexican workers.

Our best estimates on the cost of this program indicate that \$15 a worker will not cover the cost of transportation and subsistence when the worker is contracted only once. This means that the United States Government would have to subsidize the farmer for costs over \$15 per worker. This subsidy was not provided for in our budget, nor in our interpretation of Public Law 78. The debate on the bill in Congress shows clearly that it was not the intent of Congress to subsidize the farmer through this program.

Because the \$15 charge per worker will not be sufficient to meet the cost of transportation and subsistence of all of the Mexican workers obtained under the program when Mexican workers are transferred to succeeding employers, we are requiring the succeeding employer to comply with the provision of Public Law 78 which requires all employers to sign an indemnity agreement and an agreement to reimburse the United States for transportation and subsistence costs not to exceed \$15 per worker.

This \$15 figure is an average figure based on the operation of the entire program, and not just one segment such as the Monterrey portion. It is contemplated that this amount will cover only the bare cost of transportation and subsistence.

Those employers who have been contracting at Monterrey for the past few days will be charged the \$15, less the cost of transportation and subsistence to the border. This has been estimated to be \$3.50 per worker.

We plan to keep adequate records, which will be made available to you, to show ex-

actly how many workers are recruited, the average cost per worker for transportation and subsistence, and the amount received from the farmers. None of the funds collected for transportation and subsistence will be used for administrative expenses. It is not our desire to collect from the farmer more than the actual average cost of transportation and subsistence.

Yours very truly,

MAURICE J. TOBIN,
Secretary of Labor.

What Nebraska's Leading Papers Think About Colossal Military Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including editorial passages from two Nebraska newspapers.

The first excerpt is from the Omaha World-Herald of August 11. The World-Herald, Nebraska's largest paper, is politically independent.

MR. BUFFETT STICKS BY HIS GUNS

This week the House passed the \$56,000,000 military appropriations measure with only two votes cast against it. One of them was by Omaha's stoutly honest and individualistic Congressman, HOWARD BUFFETT.

Voting against a military appropriation is one of the things a politically minded Congressman doesn't do. But Mr. BUFFETT doesn't give a hoot for the politically correct thing. He votes 'em the way he sees 'em, and he sees this monstrous spending measure as an inflationary move that will guarantee ultimate victory for communism in America.

It does not promise genuine national defense, and is leading the United States toward national socialism and suicide, says Mr. BUFFETT. He says the most imminent threat to the national security is from within, and he warns that excessive military spending operates to provide full-scale war and ends in catastrophe.

TAKE YOUR CHOICE

Whether they agree with HOWARD BUFFETT or disagree, fair-minded Americans will note that he makes a cogent case for his point of view—and that it is in total opposition to the Truman philosophy and Acheson logic.

Mr. BUFFETT says excessive spending does not create security, but will destroy the economic and social system. The administration says that money will buy a stable world, and it has spent more than one hundred billions in this endeavor.

Look about you and decide who is right.

The second excerpt is from the August 14 Lincoln Star, Nebraska's leading Democratic daily.

The pertinent passages are as follows:

Representative HOWARD BUFFETT, an unconstructed Republican conservative of the old school, was one of two Members of the lower House to cast a vote against this \$56,000,000,000 appropriation for military purposes.

HOWARD BUFFETT lacks a lot in what a great many Nebraskans might desire in a Congressman. Much of the time he eats and sleeps in a world that was 50 years ago. But damned if he wasn't somewhat magnificent

late last week when he got to his feet to cast a vote to tell his colleagues how he felt and where he stood. In part, he said this:

"The military spending plans which H. R. 5054 embraces do not constitute genuine national defense. Instead, they take us toward national socialism and suicide." After launching into an attack on the Truman administration, Mr. BUFFETT concluded with these words: "Of course, military appropriations that have for their sole purposes the defense of our country alone will have my support. But I will not vote for global military spending that seems to guarantee ultimate victory for communism in America by inflation. We have been on that road too long already. Moreover, all history records that such gigantic peacetime military spending does not create security. Instead, it operates to provoke full-scale war and ends in catastrophe."

Representative BUFFETT may be wrong, as wrong as any man can be, but at least he has the intestinal fortitude to lay it down on the line as he sees it and to cast a vote that squares 100 percent with what must be deeply rooted convictions of his own. * * *

The Second District of Nebraska Representative only nibbled on the fringes of a question that can turn out to be the biggest challenge of our times. We are committing ourselves to a long-range spirited armament race which will tax the resources and the spirit of the American people brutally. Whether we can offset Russia's advantages of slave labor, cheap materials, and low living standards by a superior industrial plant and American competence with the machine is anybody's guess. But we, the American people, before too many years will have to decide how much of each day's dollar is to be poured out for arms, whether those arms actually safeguard American security, or whether inevitably they pave the road for a third global conflict of catastrophic proportions. * * *

Representative BUFFETT, however, offered a real challenge to sober thought on the part of his colleagues and 150,000,000 Americans

Spanish-speaking Texans and the 4,500,000 who speak English.

Their ultimate goal is to get the "No Mexicans Allowed" signs down from the restaurants in Texas and, even more important, from the mental thinking of the Anglo citizens.

The groups are the Texas Good Neighbor Commission, a State agency financed by State funds, and the Council on Human Relations, which is appointed by the Governor but which operates on private donations.

A number of other groups have been born in this reform movement: The American GI Forum, composed of Latin veterans; the Lulacs (League of United Latin-American Citizens), and the newly formed National Association of Spanish-Speaking People.

The original barrier breaker was King Cotton. During World War II, when cotton pickers were scarce, migratory Mexican laborers had the opportunity to be choosy. They didn't want to pick cotton in towns where they were thrown out of restaurants. The loss of the labor was costly. It didn't take long for the farmers to realize it was cheaper to be nice to the migrants and see that their towns were nice, too.

Another big barrier breaker is the vote. Texas' Latin citizens are coming of age politically. In many Texas counties support by the Mexican bloc is the decisive factor at the polls.

Still another factor in Texas' awakening toward good neighborliness is the coming of age of Texas millionaires. Some of them desire to use their new wealth for some good purpose.

"I'm in the human-relations business for keeps," is the way R. E. Smith, of Houston, one of the State's wealthiest oil operators, puts it.

Smith, who is chairman of the Council of Human Relations, digs deep into his own pocket to help finance that group. A former baseball player, a dynamic Methodist layman, he tackles the problem of human relations with unrelenting energy.

It is Smith's belief that the best way to settle discriminatory problems is on the local level. The year-old Council on Human Relations has already given birth to 31 local councils, loosely organized as luncheon groups, which try to settle differences between the Anglo and Latin townspeople on an amicable basis.

To guide the local leaders, the council has just put out a handbook which sets forth in ABC language why successful human relations are necessary to the community. It draws a moral between two Texas towns called X-ville and Y-ville.

"X-ville is full of good folks. But somehow it has fallen into an attitude of separation and standoffishness toward Spanish-speaking people. Its business houses display a good sprinkling of 'No Mexicans Allowed' signs. In civic affairs it draws a line—and spends a great deal of time and sweat keeping people on the 'proper' side of that line.

"Y-ville, just across the river, is practically identical except that its people simply don't go to a lot of trouble drawing and redrawing that line. When a man comes in and says he wants to buy a hat, the Y-ville merchant sells him a hat; and when a man comes in and says he wants to buy a sombrero, the Y-ville merchant goes right ahead and sells him a hat. The only difference is maybe the instant it takes him to do a double-take over the Spanish word.

"And the civic result? Come cotton-picking time, when hands are scarce, the Mexican migrant pickers go first where it is easiest to get along, naturally—to the Y-ville side of the river. If there are enough to pick X-ville side cotton, too, they charge 50 cents to \$1 a hundred more to pick it—enough to pay their way back to Y-ville every night or on the week end so they can spend their money without fighting about it.

"The result is that Y-ville, for being willing to sell a man a hat, or whatever he needs, even if he asks for it in Spanish, is richer by about \$100,000 a year."

The council is working to get the Mexican Government's approval of Texas areas which do not discriminate, and to limit its blacklisting to the counties which do. In this way, the pressure is on the areas where there is a labor shortage to take down their unfriendly signs.

Today, only 52 of the 254 Texas counties are blacklisted for Mexican labor by that Government.

Tom Sutherland, executive secretary of the council, who heads its office at the University of Texas in Austin, reports that several blacklisted counties have appealed to the council for advice on how to get off the list. They are told to organize a local council on human relations and begin a local good-neighbor program.

The virtues of good neighborliness are being translated to Texans in terms of dollars and sense, as the council puts it. It is the hope of the council that Texas will take care of its minority problems in such a way that it will never be necessary for the Federal Government to step in.

"In treating human relations in Texas, we don't claim to be skilled physicians yet," Sutherland says. "But we have learned to be pretty good nurses. What we are most suspicious of is diagnosis by telephone."

A Tourist's Viewpoint of Europe and the Result of ECA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting that portion of a personal letter from a successful builder in Los Angeles, Ivan Wells, giving his reaction to the result of ECA spending. This is one of many similar letters I have received and stories given to me personally by others who have visited Europe in the past year:

AMSTERDAM, July 31, 1951.

DEAR NORRIS AND ERNA: Needless to say, we have been having a very enjoyable and interesting trip. We have taken about 300 colored picture slides, many of them showing the results of our Marshall plan and ECA spending. We have built new railway stations and hotels of the very finest construction all the way up through central Italy where war damage had been done. Rome boasts of the finest in the world, even the ceilings of all the enormous waiting rooms and stores inside the stations, and extending out under all the train sheds, are tiled solid with 3/4-inch square glazed tile. This same tile is also used in many other city stations. This labor costs twice as much as the same tile used in the walls. Plaster walls and ceilings like used at home where private capital pays the bill is plenty good enough. If they have lost their shirt it isn't necessary to replace it with a silk one. We had lunch in a Milan hotel completely veneered with the finest of white marble outside and the finest polished marble walls and floors inside, mirrored walls and plate-glass fronts of the finest modern architecture possible. This is only one of many in Italy that have been given the finest ECA and Marshall plan treatment. One educated

Texas Is Solving Its Own Minority Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article entitled "Texas Is Solving Its Own Minority Problem," written by Mrs. Elizabeth Carpenter, a distinguished newspaper correspondent who serves in the Senate and House Press Galleries.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXAS IS SOLVING ITS OWN MINORITY PROBLEM
(By Elizabeth Carpenter)

The fashionable Yankee sociologists' attitude that the South never does anything about its minority problems, is being disproved by the Lone Star State.

Two groups of Texas citizens are operating—with no help from the Federal Government—to foster friendly relations, not only between Texas and its border neighbor, Mexico, but principally between the 1,500,000

Italian said the American man is just "A big little boy, and doesn't know how to take care of his money, while the Englishman hangs on to his money and doesn't give it away." Mr Mackay's and my observations are these—we have given enough aid to these countries, they are on their feet, they have a full crop everywhere, the people are well fed and clothed, there are almost no beggars at all. There is plenty of merchandise in the stores. We were told they fear we are ruining our economy the same as England has ruined hers.

As for Germany—they have a bumper crop, everyone is working hard and they are coming back fast. The people are well fed and having carnivals everywhere, they like us, they don't want our soldiers to go home as they fear Russia, there are very few Communists and they want nothing to do with East Russian Germany, as one man said "they are a different people." They think of themselves as western people. Mr. Mackay and I think we should arm them to gradually help them to police or protect themselves from Russia and take the load off of us. In other words, we believe we should stop all spending except what is necessary to supply our Armed Forces. We found out that the German people pay 4 percent sales tax and income taxes of 15 percent minimum to 40 percent maximum. From these taxes 30 percent of their budget goes to the support of the army of occupation. And as winners of the war we are privileged to pay about the same in sales tax with a 25 to 80 percent income tax. If our Congressmen and Senators (and advisers) could talk to the common man as we have done, in the place of the politicians that meet them at the boat, and cry on their shoulders, our nonmilitary spending would have stopped before this. They don't have a chance to get a true picture of conditions. Europe is full of history of wars and recovery from wars for 2,000 years. We had better stay home and look after our own economy. I was surprised to find almost all of Europe has double track fully electrified railroads extending from Paris, the full length of Italy, and all of Switzerland and part of Germany. We can't boast of that at home. Germany has many 150-foot passenger ships going up and down the Rhine for 250 miles. It is a beautiful trip. We came down the river from Wiesbaden to Cologne, a 10-hour ride, last Sunday. On account of it being a holiday, we had difficulty even getting a seat. It was full to standing room (and folding seats everywhere) of people out for a holiday. That doesn't show hardship among the people.

Best wishes,

IVAN AND NOLA.

Twelve Charges Are Rebutted by Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am submitting the contents of a newspaper report appearing in the Washington Post, August 20, 1951.

It specifically relates to certain charges made by Lt. Gov. Goodwin J. Knight, of my native State of California, together with an important communication to the Secretary of State by a distinguished

citizen of Los Angeles County, Calif., to wit: Mr. John B. Elliott. As the subject matter of this newspaper comment is frequently discussed hereabouts, I believe this report will be of interest to all persons.

It follows:

TWELVE CHARGES ARE REBUTTED BY ACHESON

Secretary of State Acheson has denounced as "either entirely incorrect or distortions of the truth" 12 accusations made against him by Lt. Gov. Goodwin J. Knight, of California.

The criticisms range from his handling of Formosa policy through State Department security questions to the Alger Hiss case.

They were formulated by Knight, a Republican, after he had been challenged by John B. Elliott, Los Angeles civic leader and a Democrat, to back up criticisms of Acheson in a speech Knight made on April 17.

Knight's complaints were sent to the State Department by Elliott with a request that they be answered in detail. Acheson forwarded replies from his staff.

At one point in the exchange the State Department said approximately \$90,000,000 in arms and ordnance had been given Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist Chinese forces on Formosa, and \$300,000,000 more was scheduled for this year.

In addition, the Department mentioned a 600-man United States military mission on Formosa assisting in the reorganization of Chiang's forces.

On June 24, Maj. Gen. William C. Chase, head of the mission, said in Formosa the United States group had 1,250 members.

Last night, in answer to a request for clarification, the Defense Department said it has announced that 500 to 600 men may be sent to Formosa—but only half that number, 250 to 300 men are there now. There was no explanation of the variations.

Here is a summary of the charges and replies as released by Elliott:

1 Charge: "On December 23 Acheson sent out instructions to diplomatic and consular personnel in Asia that Formosa was doomed and expendable."

The reply is that what the Department sent out was a propaganda directive designed to minimize the unfavorable reaction in case Formosa should fall.

ABOUT LOAN TO POLAND

Knight also charged that Acheson had written President Truman that no amount of aid could have saved Chiang, but Acheson said what he wrote was that only full-scale intervention by the United States might have produced a different result in China and such action would have been in support of a government repudiated by its own people.

2. Charge: Acheson approved a \$90,000,000 loan to Communist Poland in 1946 against the advice of United States Ambassador Arthur Bliss Lane. Counsel in the deal was Donald Hiss, a brother of Alger Hiss and a member of Acheson's law firm, and the firm got a \$50,000 fee.

The State Department said the inferences of this charge were false and based upon a distortion of the public record.

Acheson, the State Department said, severed all connections with his law firm in 1941. The Polish loan negotiations began in 1945 and no member of the firm approached Secretary Acheson in any way while the loan was under study. As acting Secretary of State, on instructions of Secretary Byrnes, Acheson approved the loan after it had been favorably considered by responsible State Department officials. The loan finally was cut off in 1948 after Poland failed to produce the coal for Western Europe which was one of the goals of the deal, and after the Communists' grip on the country tightened.

3. Charge: Acheson said July 20 there were no Communists in the State Department, and

"this statement has since proved to be completely false and untrue."

The State Department replied Acheson said only that he "knew of no Communists" in the State Department. Furthermore, the Department said a security-investigation staff of 100 persons, which has operated with the FBI, also does not know of any Reds in the Department.

4. Charge: Acheson "has never repudiated his support of Alger Hiss."

The State Department said Acheson's answers to questions about Hiss, now in prison on a perjury conviction, had been "widely misinterpreted."

"He has never in any way condoned the offense of which Alger Hiss has been found guilty. As far as he is concerned, the decision of the (Supreme) Court disposes of the matter."

5. Charge: Acheson "recommended the abandonment of Formosa" after the Chinese Nationalist government had fled there.

The State Department said that charge "is entirely false."

6. Charge: Acheson joined with friends, "including Owen Lattimore," to encourage a Communist rebellion in China and they referred to the Communists as "agrarian reformers."

The State Department reviewed American aid to Chiang Kai-shek from the end of World War II. It said Acheson has testified he does not remember even ever meeting Owen Lattimore; also that a check of his speeches shows he does not refer to the Chinese Reds as agrarian reformers.

7. Charge: Acheson acted as counsel to Lauchlin Currie when Currie appeared before a congressional committee looking into Communist espionage charges.

The State Department said Acheson was retained by Currie in connection with a volunteer appearance Currie made before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in August 1948 to discuss statements made about him by Elizabeth Bentley. The Department added: "The committee unanimously observed that no charge of Communist Party affiliation was made against Mr. Currie. * * * It is a fact that since Mr. Currie's testimony * * * no further action has been taken" on the Bentley charges.

8. Charge: Acheson told a Senate committee before he was confirmed as Under Secretary of State that Russia should share in the administration of Japan.

The State Department answered that the records showed no such statement by Acheson. It said he had testified in September 1945 that the United States was trying to "go forward with the job" in Japan and had "no disposition * * * to exclude anybody."

The Department added that the fact is the machinery for administration of Japan "completely recognized the major role of the United States."

9. Charge: Acheson insisted on a veto in UNRRA organization to please Russia and supported all Soviet demands "thus leaving the United States impotent to control UNRRA although the United States put up all the money."

The State Department replied that "this allegation is false." They said there was no veto in UNRRA decision-making except for a few specific matters such as amending the charter and nominating a director general.

10. Charge: Acheson obtained appointment of Alger Hiss "to Dumbarton Oaks and Yalta."

Asserting that Acheson never recommended Hiss for either of these missions to international conferences, the Department said "this statement is false."

11. Charge: On December 16, 1945, Acheson "received Juan Negrin, head of the

Spanish Communists, while he refused at the same time to meet Fernando de Los Rios, head of the anti-Communist group in Spain."

The State Department said Acheson did receive De Los Rios on December 21, and both the opposing Spanish leaders talked to him "in a private capacity."

12. Charge: Acheson gave an interview to "Milton Wolff, commander of subversive Abraham Lincoln Brigade and pro-Communist Vito Marcantonio, promising them to intervene with Franco on behalf of two condemned Communists in Spain."

To this the State Department said that Acheson had received a delegation of three House Members—Healy, of California; Savage, of Washington; and Marcantonio, of New York—and five other persons including Wolff but that he "made no special promises of intervention to the group."

The State Department said Acheson explained that the two men were Argentine and Cuban nationals and any action by the State Department would have to be limited "to expressions of interest on humanitarian grounds."

Sugarcane Bagasse Used to Make Newsprint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under authority to extend my remarks in the Appendix to the Record, I wish to submit an article from the Washington Post of August 18, 1951, in regard to an important discovery in connection with the utilization of sugarcane bagasse in making newsprint, as follows:

CANE BAGASSE USED TO MAKE NEWSPRINT

MADISON, Wis., August 17—Tests at the United States Forest Products Laboratory this week showed that newsprint stronger and whiter than the ordinary variety can be made from sugarcane waste, a laboratory official said last night.

G. H. Chidester, Chief of the Pulp and Paper Division, said newsprint made in the tests "had physical properties approaching closely those of standard newsprint made from wood."

The newsprint was made from sugarcane bagasse, a fibrous material left after juice is extracted from cane stalks. Sugar mills in the United States, Cuba, and other countries produce millions of tons of bagasse each year.

Chidester said that while the bagasse newsprint is considerably stronger and much whiter than the wood variety, it let a little more light through. He said that could be corrected by minor adjustments in the processing.

Joaquin de la Roza, New York discoverer of the bagasse process, said he plans to build a \$15,000,000 plant at Clewiston, Fla., to make newsprint. The laboratory tests here were made to get data for his request for a Government certificate of necessity to build the plant.

De la Roza said it would produce 45,000 tons of newsprint annually, and the paper would cost no more than newsprint made from wood.

De la Roza, a graduate engineer from Cornell University, has been working on the idea of making paper from bagasse for nearly 25 years.

Russia at the Peace Parley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, it sometimes happens in the case of both politics and one's own domestic life that the advice or suggestions from people who are located not too close to the scene of action is many times more efficacious than the advice of the people who are closest to the problem.

From the enclosed editorial of the Chicago Sunday Tribune of August 19, 1951, some midwestern ideas on dealing with the Russians at the peace table would certainly be welcomed by the entire Nation. These suggestions from the Chicago Sunday Tribune editorial are as follows:

RUSSIA AT THE PEACE PARLEY

Russia's acceptance of an invitation to attend the San Francisco conference at which a peace treaty is to be signed with Japan next month is interpreted as a move to make propaganda capital. No one expects Russia to sign the treaty drafted by the State Department. Everyone expects Russia to use the occasion to denounce American imperialist aims and to exploit the grievances of other countries which have already expressed dissatisfaction with the draft treaty.

The State Department is undoubtedly quite as much aware of Soviet intentions as anyone else. What does it propose to do to turn the tables on Andrei Gromyko, the churlish orator of the Moscow Foreign Commissariat?

In anticipation of the San Francisco assault, we are offering a few suggestions, free of charge, to the State Department.

After Gromyko sits down, following the customary 2-hour tirade, Secretary of State Acheson may arise in rebuttal. Mr. Acheson might accept as a point of departure the treaty of April 13, 1941, by which Russia and Japan pledged themselves for a 5-year period to neutrality in any war involving the other. Mr. Stalin had been most anxious to get this undertaking for, when he signed it, he knew that a German attack on Russia would not be long in coming.

Mr. Acheson might then recount that, at the Moscow conference of foreign ministers in October 1943, Mr. Stalin assured the Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, that he intended to disregard his sworn commitment to Japan at an appropriate time and to join in the war against Nippon. Mr. Acheson might stress this as an instance of Soviet bad faith.

Mr. Acheson's argument might be weakened if objection were made that Mr. Roosevelt himself had abetted these treaty-breaking intentions by encouraging Comrade Stalin to contemplate military action against Japan at the Yalta Conference of February 1945. At that meeting, sad to relate, Mr. Roosevelt made territorial and strategic concessions at the expense of his ally, Nationalist China, in order to show Mr. Stalin that there would be tangible benefits in breaking Stalin's treaty with Japan. China was not represented at Yalta and knew nothing about this deal at the time.

Mr. Acheson would be under the further difficulty of explaining why Mr. Roosevelt also offered, as an inducement to Stalin, possession of the south, or Japanese, half of

Sakhalin Island and the entire Kurile Islands chain, also a Japanese territory. The proposed peace treaty requires Japan to assent to the relinquishment of these former possessions, which are now firmly in Russian hands.

Some Republican Members of the Senate, who will be called upon to ratify any peace treaty with Japan, have taken the position that to ratify the Japanese surrender of Sakhalin and the Kuriles would not constitute an endorsement of all of Mr. Roosevelt's acts at Yalta. The Yalta deal was never approved by the Senate in the form of a treaty and is therefore without any standing in law.

Mr. Acheson might spurn the timid approach of these Republican Senators and come out with the forthright declaration that the United States Government regards the Yalta agreements as entirely lacking in any binding effect. Mr. Acheson would follow up by saying that they were clearly illegal, that they were immoral, and that there is a reasonable doubt concerning Mr. Roosevelt's mental competence at the time of making them.

Mr. Acheson would then advert to the fact that, on the strength of these inducements, in defiance of its pledged word, Russia declared war against Japan on August 8, 1945, while the Russo-Japanese neutrality treaty had still a year and a half to run. Mr. Acheson would round out his brief by saying that Russia, obviously, does not come to the peace conference with clean hands, that the Soviet Government is a treaty breaker which, far from having any right to sit in judgment upon Japan, is properly answerable to Japan's charges of bad faith and aggression, and that, in consequence, it has no standing at the conference, no right even to discuss the peace, and no valid claim upon Sakhalin and the Kurile Islands.

Mr. Acheson's admirers never tire of proclaiming he is a truthful and courageous fellow who always lets the wrongdoer have it straight from the shoulder. If this were a correct appraisal of the man, he would make the speech we have outlined, and, of course, he will not do anything of the sort.

Studies for a Code of Ethics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal which, in my humble opinion, contains a feasible approach to a bothersome and serious problem:

A BASIC STUDY OF CORRUPTION

Why is corruption so widespread in this country? What can be done to root it out? Here are two of the most pressing questions before the American people today.

It should not be necessary to document the statement that corruption has seldom before eaten so deeply into the national fabric. The evidence has appeared daily in the newspapers. The Kefauver committee has unraveled the tangled skein of crime and politics. The Fulbright committee has spotlighted the business practice of buying political influence to obtain governmental aids. New revelations of bribe giving and bribe taking in Washington cause hardly a ripple.

On top of the string of sordid basketball scandals, involving colleges and their athletes, has piled the disquieting story of the West Point cadets who violated their code of honor by cheating in examinations. The state of political morality is attested to by the part which "fear, ignorance, bigotry, and smear"—termed "the four horsemen of calumny" by Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH—have come to play in political campaigning.

In a recent article in the Nation magazine, Prof. H. H. Wilson of Princeton university says that emotional fervor and moral uplift will not remedy this demoralizing situation. He makes the challenging statement "that graft, crime, corruption, the 'fix' are embedded in the very fabric of our highly competitive society." Involved, he says, are such things as social disorganization, the disintegration of a traditional culture, the absence of common individual or social ends and a widespread cynicism that enables the "best people" to stoop to corruption to gain their ends.

Professor Wilson believes that what is most needed today is a searching study of American social morale—of "the basic premises, institutions and sacred idols" of our culture. He proposes that one of the foundations—Ford, Rockefeller, or Carnegie—might best do the job.

Both Senators KEFAUVER and FULBRIGHT—in letters to the Nation—have approved Professor Wilson's suggestion. Mr. FULBRIGHT supported his proposal that a commission of eminent private citizens do the study. Mr. KEFAUVER said that he favored an inquiry conducted by either the foundations or by one or more of the universities.

To the suggestion that Congress do this job, Professor Wilson answered that it might be too big or too delicate a task for Congress. Senator KEFAUVER said frankly that he didn't think Congress had any place in the picture. Both men seem right. In this proposed inquiry, Congress needs investigation as much as any other group in our society. It has often been said that Congress largely sets the tone of American political morality—a truth evident these last months. There would be no gain in having Congress investigating Congress—history has repeatedly shown that this just doesn't work.

It is doubtful whether the universities are equipped to take on a job of this size or whether they are prepared, as Professor Wilson says, to do it without stepping on the toes of the righteous and the wielders of power. The same objection applies to a committee of citizens.

For the kind of thorough, impartial job that needs doing, the foundations seem the best choice. We hope they will consider the idea. Is there any way they could better serve their country?

People Praying for Economy in Federal Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter dated July 30, 1951, from one of our leading citizens in Oklahoma City, Okla., who says that the people are praying for economy in Federal expenditures.

Without further comment, I am glad to insert the entire message of the letter from this worthy citizen of our State:

There seems to be no limit on spending, starting with our cities, schools, counties,

State, and the Federal Government. There is a big demand for more, and more, and more money, to be spent for countless purposes—some good and some unnecessary. Our Federal Government is a very big spender, and it seems that once money is appropriated it must be spent, regardless of the need. There is only one source for public revenue, and that is taxation. Maybe there is no limit to taxation, but I think there is, and I think we have already exceeded that limit for a normal, healthy condition in our Nation.

With the Federal Government assuming the power to control prices and to levy taxes, totalitarianism is surely taking over. Incentive is being stifled. Inflation is growing by leaps and bounds, although price controls are supposed to control that wild maniac—inflation.

Higher normal tax, higher excess profits tax, higher estate tax, higher gift tax, etc., certainly are discouraging to young business as well as old business; young men as well as old men. There is only one control and one stopping barrier, both controlled by the Federal Government. If wasteful spending were to stop, the need for increased taxes would not exist. There must be a housecleaning, and the sooner the better, for it is apparent that there will be no reduction in Government agencies and bureaus, and no curb on spending until the people rise up and overthrow the socialistic state that has moved in on them unawares.

We have a few Representatives in Congress from the various States throughout the Nation who are making a very drastic effort to stop this runaway team before it destroys themselves and its cargo. They have our prayer for divine guidance and assistance.

Discovery of New Drugs for Cure of Malaria and Hog Cholera

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to submit an article from the Washington Star of Sunday, August 19, 1951, in connection with the discovery of a new drug for the cure of malaria, and also an article from the Washington Star in regard to the discovery of a new drug for the cure and prevention of hog cholera, as follows:

ARMY IS TESTING NEW DRUG BELIEVED BEST YET FOR MALARIA

The Army announced yesterday it is conducting tests with a new drug which may be far more effective treatment for malaria than any now being used. It is called primaquine.

Maj. Gen. George E. Armstrong, Army Surgeon General, emphasized that further research is necessary to determine whether primaquine would be effective against the strain of malaria found in Korea as it has against experimental strains.

Malaria is a disease caused by minute parasites which destroy human blood cells. Korea is a highly malarious country.

The work of combating the Anopheles mosquito in Korea has been complicated both by the innumerable breeding grounds provided in rice paddies and by the frequently harassing tactical situation, the Army said. However, it added that, with the use of chloroquine, which became available throughout the combat area late in the summer of 1950,

the incidence of malaria there has been kept low compared with World War II rates.

"If field tests of the drug prove satisfactory, its use should greatly accelerate the recovery of military personnel returning from Korea who have contacted malaria in that country," General Armstrong said.

However, the successful standardization of primaquine will have no effect on the importance of chloroquine as malaria suppressant. Chloroquine will continue to be given the troops in Korea until they are transferred to some nonmalarious area.

If primaquine proves successful it will be administered routinely to all persons returning from malarious regions.

General Armstrong said several hundred men returning from Korea with no previous history of malaria attacks would be given primaquine next week.

"If this trial is successful, it may be possible to cure malaria, which has been suppressed by chloroquine, without the individual concerned being aware that he had contracted the disease," he said.

Initial tests were conducted with prisoner volunteers at Statesville Penitentiary, Joliet, Ill., in cooperation with the University of Chicago.

END OF HOG CHOLERA HELD POSSIBLE WITH TWO NEW VACCINES

PHILADELPHIA, August 18.—Two new vaccines against hog cholera may mark the beginning of the end of that serious disease in the United States, the magazine Farm Journal said today.

One was developed by the Fort Dodge Laboratories, Inc., Fort Dodge, Iowa, and now is being made available to veterinarians.

It uses a live cholera virus, weakened by passing it through rabbits. The virus still is strong enough to develop immunity in the hogs, but the vaccine doesn't cause active disease, as can happen with a present form of virus treatment.

The vaccine is used with hog-cholera serum, which gives immediate protection until the vaccine takes effect. How long the immunity lasts is not yet known, but it may be for a lifetime, the Journal said.

The second rabbit-produced vaccine will be marketed soon by Lederle Laboratories, Pearl River, N. Y. It is a one-shot treatment, not used with serum, the Journal said. Lederle reports it gives rapid, lasting immunity, based on tests with 10,000 hogs.

The new vaccines are perhaps the biggest news about hog cholera in 43 years, the magazine said.

The new rabbit-produced vaccine development could be the beginning of the end for hog cholera in this country, if the vaccines give lifelong immunity. Areas might be vaccinated with these safe vaccines, and hog cholera eliminated area by area, and State by State, until we back it off the United States.

A Good Christian Is a Good Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, in the international Sunday school lesson for August 19, 1951, which was entitled by many commentators as "The Christian's Respect for Law," there is a great lesson to be learned by the Members of Congress and by our citizens as a whole. The golden text of the lesson appearing in the Gospel according to St. Luke, in

chapter 20 at verse 29, familiar to us all, reads:

Render therefore unto Caesar the things which be Caesar's and unto God the things that be God's.

One of the great citizens of this country, a faithful and efficient public servant, has contributed his views on this important subject. I have reference to Mr. John Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice. The article is entitled "A Good Christian is a Good Citizen," and it appears in the August 12, 1951, issue of the *Lookout*.

In the concluding paragraph of the article, Mr. Hoover says:

The teachings of God, if followed, will prevent criminality. The stabilizing force of religion is needed today more than ever before. A child who has been taught to respect the laws of God will have little difficulty respecting the laws of man.

I am happy to quote the entire article by Mr. Hoover, which I believe should be read by everyone who has an opportunity to read it:

A GOOD CHRISTIAN IS A GOOD CITIZEN

Our American system is based on the premise that each citizen has certain rights and liberties—such as the right to assemble in public gatherings, to speak his mind, to publish the truth, and to worship God in his own personal way. We call these our inherent rights; privileges which were envisioned by the founding fathers of this Nation and fused into the very fabric of our democracy. They have been preserved through the years and handed down to us by preceding generations.

As society by its very nature is complex, it was necessary to establish certain laws to assure that these and our other rights would not be jeopardized, that part of our people would not be disenfranchised, and that the welfare of one individual would not be endangered by the actions of others. This is the reason we have laws. They are the rules by which we govern ourselves. Respect for law is a fundamental requirement for democratic citizenship.

Government and society are closely allied. Actually, government is a product of society, and the type of government we have depends in a large measure on the type of society we have.

While the United States is fundamentally a Christian nation, we have other religious groups which compose important segments of society. Under the American concept of democracy, all races, creeds, and religions are accepted on an equal basis. Every man is afforded the right to worship God according to the dictates of his own convictions.

Democracy takes cognizance of the worth and dignity of man and the desire to eliminate evil from the social order and to replace it with goodness and justice. These concepts have their roots in the same fundamentals as do the teachings of Christianity. The essential elements of democracy are very vividly summed up for us in the Ten Commandments. Thus, we return to the premise that Christianity and democracy have many things in common. A good Christian is a good citizen.

Equality under the law is a principle of American democracy. The various faiths represented in our society find this same equality before God and the law. Since each person has been created with personal and immortal destinies, all can accept democracy, as Christians accept it, and find that it does not violate any of their fundamental religious beliefs.

Lawlessness and political corruption in our Government and society do not prove that the system itself is wrong. They are the fruits of our failure to make democracy work.

It is within the power of the citizens to purge these corrosive influences from the daily routine of our national life. They represent the same type of evils against which Christ so often spoke and against which He warned His followers. They are arrayed against the progress of our society and the advancement of Christianity.

As Christians, we have a double duty to perform. We have a duty as good citizens to support and preserve our form of government against the forces which would destroy and weaken it. We have the duty as Christians to serve God and work for the righteousness of ourselves and our fellow man.

I am convinced that these two duties are not contrary courses because the progress we make in one will contribute to the advancement of the other.

MR. HOOVER HAS SAID

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—In addition to the foregoing, we have Mr. Hoover's permission to quote the following from his statement, *Crime and Delinquency*, dated April 19, 1951.)

The problem of crime and the struggle between law observance and antisocial behavior are as old as man. Our Nation has suffered from criminal activity, and we are constantly faced with the challenge of seeking an answer to the problem of crime.

Criminal activity may involve the child, the adolescent, or the adult. Crime involves human beings possessed of a free will and living in a society which is becoming increasingly complex. Any success in the war against crime depends to a large degree upon an intelligent approach to this problem by all of our citizens.

It is generally accepted that criminal behavior cannot be explained by any one element. The make-up of man is so complicated, the changes of environment so intricate, that it is impossible to focus the spotlight of understanding on any one factor as the cause of crime.

A study of crime causation necessarily must involve the development of a nation and the economic, social, and political factors which go hand in hand with its advancement. Our young people are being brought up in the midst of new notions of happiness and new ideas of values. Too many children and adolescents have absorbed false attitudes and notions of law and order. The important periods of childhood and adolescence have suffered greatly from the lack of sufficient character training and parental leadership, guidance, and example.

Through indifference and neglect we are paving the way for an increase of adult criminals in the future. This is the challenge which must be met by every American—the challenge which must be faced by every village, town, and city throughout the Nation, if we are to insure the continuance of peace and security in our country.

There was an estimated total of 1,790,030 major crimes in this country in 1950. Crime was up 1.5 percent across the Nation during 1950 compared with the previous year, with all offenses on the rise except robbery, where a 10 percent decline was shown. The increase was 0.4 percent in the urban communities, and 4.4 percent in the rural districts.

The rise in crime during 1950 revealed that we are still faced with an abnormally high rate of juvenile misbehavior. During 1950 males and females under 21 years of age arrested and fingerprinted numbered 118,428, constituting 14.9 percent of the total arrests.

The stresses and strains which influence a youngster during the period of his growth

are important considerations which must be analyzed on a purely individual basis. Those who have had the opportunity of studying delinquency among youngsters invariably agree that the home is a major factor in this regard.

The family is the first great training school in behavior or misbehavior. Children develop a sense of right and wrong. The home becomes for them their first classroom and the parents serve as the first teachers.

Although the home is recognized as the most effective bulwark against delinquency, it must be closely supported by the church, the school, the neighborhood, law-enforcement agencies, and recreational groups.

Seldom, if ever, is a youngster inspired to waywardness by any one factor. In almost every case the delinquency is a result of a combination of forces. Neither can it be said that any one of the causes of crime will inevitably produce crime. During the course of investigation of delinquencies committed by youngsters it has been found that a number of causes appear with regularity.

One of these is:

Lack of religion. The teachings of God, if followed, will prevent criminality. The stabilizing force of religion is needed today more than ever before. A child who has been taught to respect the laws of God will have little difficulty respecting the laws of man.

Shasta Project Now Serving California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

MR. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under my unanimous-consent request to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the *RECORD*, I wish to submit an interesting article from the *Washington Post* of August 19, 1951, entitled "Shasta Project Now Serving California," as follows:

SHASTA PROJECT NOW SERVING CALIFORNIA

WASHINGTON.—The new California Central Valley reclamation project has gone into full-scale operation, with 10 days of civic celebrations in California.

The Central Valley project is one of the greatest engineering enterprises ever undertaken by the United States Government. It will move large quantities of irrigation water virtually the 500-mile length of the Central Valley, the longest distance man has ever attempted. Immense hydroelectric power will be developed.

Engineers told the United Press that the Central Valley project will have an economic significance at least four times greater than the Tennessee Valley development, which amazed the world by its demonstration of the multipurpose utilization of a complete river system.

UNIQUE PROJECT

It is unique among reclamation systems in the fact that it combines the Sacramento and San Joaquin watersheds into a single system, with the surplus water from the south-flowing Sacramento River made available to the insufficiently supplied north-flowing San Joaquin. Eventually, all of the important tributary streams will be harnessed for irrigation water and electrical power.

Because California climate and crops are substantially similar to those of the Mediterranean area, the Central Valley already has

attracted many settlers from southern European countries. The migration is likely to continue. The agricultural program is expected also to create a large additional demand for Mexican farm workers.

The Central Valley is about 500 miles long, 50 miles wide, covers 18 counties with 83 cities, and now supports 1,500,000 people. Its ranches, orchards, vineyards, and dairies already turn out products worth about \$640,000,000 annually.

BOOM EXPECTED

The program now being developed ultimately will provide water for 3,040,000 acres of land not now irrigated, and will produce 8,000,000 kilowatt hours of power a year. Low-cost power is expected to lead to an industrial boom in the valley, which economically complements the San Francisco Bay cities.

The key engineering structure in the vast project is the giant Shasta Dam across the Sacramento River. The dam was rushed to virtual completion during World War II to serve the abnormal demand for hydroelectric power in that region.

Shasta Dam, second highest in the world, is 602 feet high. It is topped only by the Hoover Dam, 726 feet. Shasta has a crest two-thirds of a mile long and contains 6,000,000 cubic yards of concrete.

Before the Central Valley program was started, a large part of the area was menaced by water famine, as the underground water table was steadily sinking. Some ranches had drilled wells as deep as 2,000 feet, at an almost prohibitive cost. A menaced area of 800,000 acres will be saved by the new irrigation facilities.

How the American Legion Feels About the St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a resolution adopted by the American Legion, Department of Michigan, at its thirty-third annual department convention held in Detroit, August 2-5, 1951:

Whereas due to the excessive demands of industry and national defense in the areas producing high-grade iron ore, such as the Mesabi Range in Minnesota, this country's known source of high-grade iron ore is quickly being depleted, and

Whereas in view of the above known fact, high-grade iron ore in the amount of forty to fifty million tons per year will have to be imported if we, as a Nation, are going to continue as leaders in the field as producers of iron and steel, and

Whereas alternate sources of open-pit high-grade iron ore must be developed which are easily accessible to our steel industry in the Great Lakes area, if our steel industry is to be permitted to carry out our long-range mobilization program economically; and

Whereas over 70 percent of the steel-producing capacity of the United States is located within the Great Lakes area, with an investment of many millions of dollars; and

Whereas the new known sources of high-grade iron ore are located in Venezuela and Labrador; and

Whereas Labrador has the added advantage economically, because that source is located within the continental limits of North America, which may be transported by inland water routes without exposing a vital supply line to submarine warfare; and

Whereas the continuance of vital steel production in the areas in which they are located are dependent on high-grade iron ore, and the approval of the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway, which in addition to its undoubted general contribution to our transportation system, is essential to steel production, and our entire mobilization effort; and

Whereas unless our steel-producing capacity is augmented, we as a nation will become more and more vulnerable, and will decrease our capabilities for mutual defense between Canada and the United States; and

Whereas the St. Lawrence waterway, once constructed, will have the added attractive feature as a producer of added revenues to the United States in connection with power and navigation investments which will be returned with interest to the Treasury; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Legion, Department of Michigan, in convention assembled in Detroit, Mich., this 5th day of August 1951, go on record as approving the authorization and appropriations for the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway as being vital to the national security and economic stability of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copy of this resolution be forwarded to the national convention for final action

Whereas the national security is largely dependent upon the manpower, industrial, and agricultural production of the Midwest; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to our Representatives in Washington and to such other officials as are responsible for the good and welfare of our Nation.

General Ridgway Now Following Procedures for Which MacArthur Was Fired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, from the Washington Evening Star:

TRUTH BREAKS THROUGH DOUBLE TALK—GENERAL RIDGWAY HAS CLEARED UP THE U. N. POSITION IN KOREA WITH A FATEFUL WARNING TO THE COMMUNISTS

(By David Lawrence)

Candor and a wholesome respect for truth somehow have a way of breaking through the artifices of political double talk and the ambiguity of so-called diplomacy.

For General Ridgway's Supreme Allied Headquarters has finally cleared up in dramatic and unequivocal words the American as well as the U. N. position in Korea with a fateful warning to the Communists as follows.

"If the Communists again raise the standards of war, their soldiers will be met by the fury of the weapons of the United Nations forces. * * *

"The U. N. command, if necessary, will continue to execute its mission of destroying or driving out of Korea those forces which now

seek to deny the Korean people their right of self-determination."

Here is an admission at last of something the Senate Armed Services Committee was unable to elicit from the top military staff here or from the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson—namely, just what the U. N. forces in Korea had and still have as their mission in Korea. It now is stated to be a "mission of destroying or driving out of Korea those forces which now seek to deny the Korean people their right of self-determination."

Here is a statement to the whole world that the U. N., including the American Government, means to continue to use military force to achieve its objectives in securing peace for all Korea.

Here is a declaration which supersedes what was said last June by the Secretary of State and by U. N. spokesmen, namely, that the U. N. never intended to seek the liberation of all Korea by military means and sought only to repeal aggression somewhere around the thirty-eighth parallel.

Here is a warning—or some may call it a threat—directed to the Communists telling them what is in store for them if they don't agree to a cease-fire now.

Obviously, General Ridgway's headquarters spoke with the knowledge and concurrence of the authorities in Washington.

Just 5 months ago—March 24 to be exact—the same kind of statement was issued by General MacArthur urging a cease-fire agreement by military commanders in the field. He, too, used a threat. He said if the enemy didn't agree to a cease-fire, the United Nations might have to depart from its tolerant effort to contain the war to the area of Korea through expansion of our military operations to his coastal areas and interior bases.

The MacArthur message was broadcast in the Voice of the U. N. Command radio program at that time, just as was General Ridgway's in the last 48 hours. General MacArthur based his action on two previous authorizations from Washington to arrange an armistice.

The purpose was then and is now to threaten the Communists with a hotter war if they do not agree to a cease-fire.

General Ridgway does not explicitly define what area he might fight in if the cease-fire fails, but he pointedly mentions the fury of the weapons of the U. N. command, which could mean the use of anything from conventional bombs to new types of atom bombs and artillery shells.

For threatening the enemy with military punishment, and for endeavoring to arrange a cease fire in the field instead of through diplomatic channels, General MacArthur is alleged to have been dismissed—at least, that was one of the reasons stated after the inquiry was begun.

But what has just happened shows that it could not have been any such reason. This is because what the U. N. command in Korea is doing today is along the same lines as General MacArthur pursued. Hence the record of the U. N. command as such is fortunately shown to be consistent throughout, and the Washington administration is to be congratulated for having endorsed 5 months late what it seemed to be repudiating last June.

The most significant revelation, however, is not just the use of a military threat against the Communists but the open avowal of the U. N. command's mission—that it is the liberation by military means of all Korea, and that, if the cease-fire parleys fail, the mission will continue as before.

This undoubtedly means that, even after a cease fire, there will be insistence on a liberation of all Korea or fighting will be resumed by the U. N. Such a result may not materialize soon, as negotiations could go on for a long, long time, but the record, in effect, establishes now the proposition that the armistice will not be accepted as a final

settlement and that threats of a continuance of hostilities will be the U. N. position right along hereafter unless and until Korea, is freed of hostile military forces and peace is established for the people of all Korea. It is a great step forward.

Gill Robb Wilson, Noted War Correspondent, Aviation Authority, Consultant to the Congressional Aviation Policy Board, Declares That "Continuous Research in Air Is Way To Overhaul Reds"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, there are few writers or columnists whose work and writings have intrigued me more than do those of Gill Robb Wilson. Several days each week, Mr. Wilson contributes a column to the New York Herald Tribune—and, to my mind, there are few men who bring to the subject of aviation more than does he.

Mr. Wilson was himself an airplane pilot back in the days of the old pusher planes when our fighting pilots fought enemy pilots with revolvers and rifles and threw hand bombs, rocks, and even beer bottles out of their planes down on the Germany Army troops in order to afford greater tactical support to the ground forces of our own armies.

The works and the writings of this noted war correspondent, lecturer, and author, are well known to a vast number of the men here on Capitol Hill. Many got to know him well when he served as a consultant on the Congressional Aviation Policy Board—to which he brought not alone the wisdom that comes with maturity of years, but specific knowledge of military aviation almost from the time that we thought an airplane was armored if there was a bit of steel under the seat upon which the pilot sat and a few more pieces of thin steel screwed on the side of the ship beside his seat.

It is only because in part of the foregoing that I read and reread the article recently published in the New York Herald Tribune of July 17, in which article Mr. Wilson declared:

Superior American airmanship has been the chief factor in carrying the day against the flashy Soviet MIG-15 in air-to-air combat over Korea. * * *

The Red MIG has outperformed all antagonists in certain important respects, notably speed and climb due to higher engine output. * * * American aviation was not technically ready for World War I—our pilots carried the burden of air victory flying inferior equipment. We were not ready for World War II. Again, our pilots went out with obsolescent equipment to meet the enemy. * * *

It is certainly not the intention of the American people continuously to throw their sons up against such conditions. Yet this has been done successively and the responsibility rests squarely at the door of the fickleness

of public opinion. Each time the tiger steps behind a bush, the American people throw down their guns.

The main reason for this is official failure to explain to the people that national defense, especially air defense, has become a continuous scientific and industrial process. When a gap in that process is created by cut-back of research, development, and procurement of aircraft, the lost ground cannot be regained by any sudden spurt to meet a crisis.

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we have done in the past—once victory was achieved, we in Congress, or the President, reduced appropriations for advanced scientific research and development—and each time have been compelled to pay many times what it would have cost us to have continued the work.

It becomes more evident every day—that without a steady flow of new scientific information resulting from original exploratory research studies, aircraft designers would absolutely be working in the dark—and no progress whatever would be made in military aviation except by the old method of trial and error.

If we are to keep abreast of the great scientific development now taking place behind the iron curtain at the point of a gun by the enslaved German scientists held in bondage in Russia, we must have a constant flow of new ideas which can only be advanced as part of a research program.

I have heard it asserted scores of times on many occasions by Members of this body that the one thing that has thus far contained the Russians and prevented all-out global warfare has been the might and power of the United States Air Force, and of the strategic command of that service, in particular.

We would have no such defense of our Nation today if it had not been for the splendid work that was done by an institution, very seldom ever spoken of, and the work of which is little understood by most Members of this House. I refer to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

I need not tell you that the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is not a new, high-flown, fandangled, bureaucratic committee, currently set up to hold meetings and hearings and print reports, and then disappear tomorrow. The fact of the matter is there is no agency of Government which did more to win both World Wars I and II than did this very committee.

Established during the administration of Woodrow Wilson, 36 years ago, it was ardently supported by this Congress through the Harding, the Coolidge, and the Hoover, as well as the Roosevelt and the Truman administrations. Continuously associated with it, certainly, have been and are the greatest authorities and the most disinterested men, skilled in aviation, that we have in these United States. It was set up and still remains an independent agency of this Government, charged with the supervision and the direction of the basic scientific study in problems pertaining to aeronautics. This committee has done more for military and civil aeronautics than will ever be told.

There has never been any political or partisan patronage policies made applicable to NACA. I doubt if they have such a thing as a public relations division—or even a public information officer.

The Board that runs the NACA prefers to let the work that is done by our advisory committee speak for itself—and it certainly has spoken volumes in behalf of the peace, the security, and the welfare of this country in these last 36 years.

I do not purport to have any particular aeronautical engineering knowledge. Like most of my colleagues in this House, I still wonder what it is that enables the aviation industry to take a pile of metals—steel, iron, brass, copper, zinc, tin, lead, aluminum, magnesium, canvas, and a hundred or more other organic or inorganic products—and fabricate them into a shape which, when loaded, weighs as much as 300,000 pounds—and then give power to that shape, causing it to rise off the ground and fly through space at a speed of hundreds of miles an hour—above any speed that was ever reached by man in his travels on the surface of the earth.

The technical and scientific information of flying will be a mystery to me until my dying day, and so it will be with many others. I am happy to realize, however, that it is not necessary that we understand the know-how of flying as long as we have in our country men who have the skill, the knowledge, the abilities, the material, and the will to make the United States Air Force the greatest military air force on the face of the earth.

I once heard it stated that every military airplane in the United States Air Force, every naval plane, every United States Army airplane, every airplane in the Marine and the Coast Guard Air Forces, as well as the thousands of airplanes engaged in private and civilian and other miscellaneous uses—evolve, in a large measure, from the splendid research work that has been done in the laboratory studies and developments made by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

Of course, as a layman, I find it difficult to take one of their technical reports and understand the scientific language in which the work of NACA is told. However, no one could fail to have confidence in the great work that they have accomplished through the long, long years that they have pioneered in the research work necessary to develop the aviation industry.

Our Nation is extremely fortunate in having on this committee a group of men whose sole aim in life is to plunge deeper and deeper into the unsolved mysteries of the natural laws that seemingly place a limitation upon flight. Such men are few in our country and one could not fail to have other than the highest respect for them, even though we have little comprehension of other than the end product of their work.

This House has learned that for 36 long years past the limited sums which we have appropriated for the work done

by the NACA have always been earnestly and ably spent—producing results that have placed the United States in the front line of aeronautic developments.

We hear from time to time of airplanes that raise themselves to unprecedented altitudes—that fly at unprecedented speeds—of some new gadget which will render it more safe to ascend—or to fly or land—in either civilian aeronautics or in our Armed Forces. Maybe we wonder at the accomplishments of our aircraft engineers and plane manufacturers who brought about the improvement in safety, efficiency, and economy in the performance of our aircraft.

I do not need to point out to this House that airplanes do not just get that way because some manufacturer thought up a good idea. It seems needless to say that no one particular business house is going to risk the expenditure of thousands upon thousands of its own dollars by taking a chance that an airplane of this shape, or with that kind of a wing or this kind of a tail, is going to gain a contract with some one of the armed service forces which acquire planes.

My personal observations indicate that it is safe to say that somewhere back along the line the credit goes to the research agency of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. When a problem presents itself, they either have the answer ready from their previous studies or they set about to get it. From that angle the airplane manufacturers themselves keenly appreciate this service so essential to the design of the modern aircraft.

Soon after the opening of hostilities in Korea, America's greatest living fighter ace—with thirty-seven and a half "plane knock-downs" to his record in World War II—led his unit to the Far East. That splendid young man and officer has already knocked two Russian MIG-15's out of the air over Korea.

Nothing could indicate the greater need of research in aerial dynamics and at the same time disclose the wonderful work that has been done in airplane development to date—more than the statement made by Col. Johnny Meyer when presented to the American people by Dr. John R. Steelman on that great NBC teledocumentary, *Battle Report*, Washington, seen every Friday night over the National Broadcasting Co.'s television network and its coaxials.

When questioned with respect to the value of the Russian MIG-15 as compared to our own Sabre jets—Colonel Meyer, then commander of the Fourth Fighter Interceptor Group which he took to Korea and led against the enemy in its first combat mission, declared:

The Sabre jets of the Fourth Fighter Group were primarily engaged in holding Communist jets at bay in "MIG Alley," a narrow corridor running 30 to 40 miles south along the Korean border in order to keep them off the backs of our tactical fighters operating along the battle front in close support to our ground forces. During this period we had about 1,000 individual encounters with the Russian-built 15's. Like our own F-86 Sabre, it is a high-speed swept-wing jet fighter.

From these dog fights 9 miles high over "MIG Alley" we learned some important

technical and tactical facts about modern aerial warfare. These lessons are:

1. All air-to-air combat is taking place near or at the speed of sound.

2. The Russian-built MIG-15 is at least as good, performancewise, as our own F-86 Sabre jet.

3. The jet airplane is a tough airplane to shoot down.

To go back, the combat maneuvers of aircraft at and close to the speed of sound places challenging requirements on the aviation industry and the Air Force to engineer, develop, and produce aircraft of continually improving aerodynamic design.

That the Russians already recognize this fact is brought out by the performance of their MIG-15 in combat against our F-86. These Russian-built aircraft were tough. They were tough to fight, tough to lick, and tough to destroy. Someone may ask why, if these, the enemy airplanes were so good, were we able during the period of our encounters, to destroy 31 Russian MIG's while losing only 1 F-86? This is explained by an understanding of what I call the fighter aircraft complex; that is, the airplane itself, and its performance, the armament and firing control system, which is the mechanical feature of the shooting performance in which the MIG holds its own with the F-86. In comparing the whole weapon, that is, the MIG and its guns and its pilot, the whole American weapon whipped the whole Communist weapon. Most significantly the pilots of the Fourth Fighter Group are the most experienced air fighters in the world.

The toughness of the MIG is not purely an attribute of that airplane, but rather a general characteristic of all jets. This is being borne out by the fact that our conventional fighters in the tactical support phase of the Korean war alone are suffering losses considerably higher than that of our jets so engaged. If we should become engaged in a global conflict where enemy air power would be encountered in large force, it is my opinion that other than jet fighters used for close support of our ground forces would not survive.

I believe that the most important single lesson to all Americans from this action of ours in Korea is that the Russian world power can produce an airplane equal in performance to America's best. Any nation which can do this has the potential for a first-rate air power qualitatively as well as quantitatively.

Therefore, we must in all fields of research and development in fact, in our total national effort, continuously work toward insuring our security against any rising international gangster.

Mr. Speaker, as I have heretofore stated, it was the clear, concise, factual manner in which the article on aviation research was written by the noted authority, Gill Robb Wilson, that caused me to read it.

The article, *Continuous Research in Air Called Way To Overhaul Reds*, contains so much information of deep and vital interest to the Members of this House concerned with the economic, efficient, and ever-improved development of our military as well as civilian aircraft, that I am appending to this talk that article by Mr. Gill Robb Wilson:

THE AIR WORLD—CONTINUOUS RESEARCH IN AIR CALLED WAY TO OVERHAUL REDS

(By Gill Robb Wilson)

Superior American airmanship has been the chief factor in carrying the day against the flashy Soviet MIG-15 in air-to-air combat over Korea.

Other contributing factors to the score against the MIG have been an exceptionally fine gunsight, excellent armament and the designed ability of American jets to absorb combat damage. Nevertheless, the Red MIG has outperformed all antagonists in certain important respects, notably speed and climb due to higher engine output. Red pilots have been able to break off combat at will or to force combat under conditions of their own choosing.

This is the third time in American aviation history that the airmen of the United States have had to enter a war with victory depending upon the human factor. American aviation was not technically ready for World War I. The pilots carried the burden of air victory flying inferior equipment. We were not ready for World War II. Again the pilots went out with obsolescent equipment to meet the enemy. And now in the Korean war, Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg, Chief of the Air Staff, points out that the MIG-15 tops the performance of the best we have thrown against them.

FICKLENESS BLAMED

It is certainly not the intention of the American people continuously to throw their sons up against such conditions. Yet this has been done successively and the responsibility rests squarely at the door of the fickleness of public opinion. Each time the tiger steps behind a bush, the American people throw down their guns.

The main reason for this is official failure to explain to the people that national defense, especially air defense, has become a continuous scientific and industrial process. When a gap in that process is created by cut-back of research, development, and procurement of aircraft, the lost ground cannot be regained by any sudden spurt to meet a crisis.

Three results always accrue. One of these results is that American technical power loses its deterrent force in preventing war. The second result is that America pays high in loss of life and early defeats until she can spur her scientific and industrial process. The third result is that rearmament is always achieved at the highest possible cost and at the greatest waste of natural resources.

The superiority of the MIG-15 over our fighters in Korea is due to the cut-back of Air Force procurement and development between 1946 and 1949. In those years American air power lost a minimum of three experimental models, each model representing a vital step in aircraft performance. The aircraft industry possessed the technical knowledge to make those advances which have to be made step by step, but it had no market for its knowledge in procurement orders.

Therefore, American pilots entered the Korean war with obsolescent planes and had to produce superior personal qualifications to make up for the difference against the MIG-15, which was a product of Russia's continuous and undiminished research and industrial program.

In view of the rearmament program, the American processes again have been set in motion and within several years American pilots will have something better than obsolescent airplanes, unless armistice in Korea again creates an emotional situation and stops the process.

In the field of atomic energy the authority of the Atomic Energy Commission is accepted and the process of research, development, and production is undiminished. In some manner our people must be made to understand that this same sort of philosophy is essential to the creation of air power, and those responsible for it must concentrate on explaining the how and why of its character to our people.

Tourist in Spain**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following column by Danton Walker from the New York Daily News. Mr. Walker offers an interesting panorama of Spanish life in this article.

THE SPANISH STORY
BROADWAY

(By Danton Walker)

VACATION NOTEBOOK: THE SPANISH STORY

MADRID, SPAIN—Spain, or España, as they call it here, is hotter than a pistol just now. Not because of the weather, but because of that sixty-two millions that Uncle Sam is handing over to his new Mediterranean ally. If signs and symbols mean anything, Spain's stars are on the ascendant. Right after the news that Tio Samuel had given the back of his hand to France and Britain and decided to be practical, rain fell on Iberia for the first time in 7 years. And if there is anything that Spain needs worse than Yankee dollars, it is water. If some of that folding money could be spared for hydroelectric plants to bring aqua from the snow-capped mountains to the sun-baked plains, it would be the greatest boon since Isabella hocked her jewels to back Columbus. A more immediate need, to the Yankee tourist at any rate, is interpreters who can both speak and understand English—not necessarily the same thing—to bridge the awful gap between those who speak no Spanish at all, like us, and those who speak and understand nothing else. "It will take us 3 years to get ready for the American tourists," one harassed hotel proprietor observed, "and by that time they will have decided to go somewhere else." The managements of the Ritz and Palace, two of Europe's finest hotels, have already started daily classes in foreign languages for employees.

Madrid is the place where ladies wave fans instead of cigarettes in public, where everything stops cold at 1 o'clock and does not resume until 4 p. m. (another custom that the Americans cannot understand), where the cocktail hour is around 9 and you do not get around to dining until an hour before midnight, and even the kids are still playing in the streets around 1 a. m.; where Americans squeal at the first sight of blood in the bull ring, but remain to shout "ole" at the toreros, who combine the grace of a ballet dancer with the skill of a surgeon in dispatching the bull—a noble animal which, being Spanish, would probably prefer thus dying in a blaze of glory to being bumped on the head ignominiously by a butcher; where the Spanish not only have their bulls but eat them, too, in a soup that includes everything from head to tail, but there are also to be had hamburguesas con tostado (y con mucho garllico).

If the Americans continue to pile up, they'll soon be calling the country Occupied Spain. From San Sebastian to Gibraltar, you'll find 'em. Judging by the movies currently on display, it may be well for Hollywood that Spain has been isolated these many years—Little Lord Fauntleroy (whatever it is in Spanish) with Freddy Bartholomew and Mickey Rooney; Les Hermanos Marx (Groucho, Chico, Harpo) in something starring Wendy Barrie (1). This "tipico" Spanish cafes—El Chicote's cellar museum with

its \$250,000 collection of liquors of all nations; La Taberna Gitana, with a floor show suggesting El Chico in Greenwich Village. The flamenco songs which come straight down from the Moors and the native dances—jotas, malagueñas, sevillanas, alegrías, bulerías, etc.—with their never-varying routines, of which the Spanish never tire. The gorgeous Gloria Romero, "maxima estrella de la canción andaluz" at the Teatro Zarzuela, a natural for any Spanish floor show in New York and Spain's No. 1 movie star, a blonde named Mery (not Mary) Martin.

Barcelona's Paralelo, where the sounds of gypsy music and the click of the castanets go on all through the night from the sidewalk cafes. Madrid's pride, the Prado Museum, with its priceless collection of Spanish art, including Goya's famous striptease—Maja Dressed and Maja Undressed—for which a duchess posed, and Goya's etchings depicting the horrors of war dating from the time of Napoleon (wonder how many people who have lived in Pensacola, Fla., know that its main street was named for Don Jose Palafox, defender of Zaragoza, in those same Napoleonic wars—so named by the British as a propaganda gesture to keep the Spanish on their side), the little government-sponsored "albergues" scattered throughout the countryside—immaculately clean and more comfortable than our own motels. Toledo, center of Spain's military life, and the Alcazar, the Spanish West Point, bombed to rubble during the civil war, which will be maintained in ruin as a memorial to those who died there.

Sights of interest include the northern province of Galicia, where the majority of the inhabitants are blonde, blue-eyed Spaniards who play bagpipes and dance jigs. The German volkswagen has made its appearance on the Iberian peninsula and made a big hit. It's a small, low-price car that utilizes very little gas. Ford is partly responsible, having invested in the enterprise. And all the other sights and sounds and wonders make Spain and Portugal a new vacation paradise for the American tourist.

The Narcotics Menace**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

WASHINGTON, D. C., August 20, 1951.

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,

House Office Building.

The American Legion is dedicated to the preservation, the welfare, the integrity, and the safekeeping of the way of life that is the United States and for which we, as veterans, served and fought. The narcotics menace threatens the families of this country. There are 27,000,000 children in this Nation who are the sons and daughters of veterans, and they represent more than half of the teen-age population. We spearheaded a narcotics-problem conference in New York City last June which was held to devise ways and means to combat this deplorable menace and its threat to our children. We are, therefore, amazed to learn that the proposed \$400,000 supplemental budget for the Bureau of Narcotics has been cut in committee by 40 percent. In view of the findings of the Senate Crime Committee it is inconceivable that such cut is

in the best interest of national welfare or in accord with public opinion. The full appropriation would provide a narcotics police force only slightly larger than that obtaining in 1930. We strongly urge you and your colleagues to restore the full fund which has been recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. Even that may be insufficient.

ERLE COCKE, JR.,
National Commander.

**A Citizen Nails Some Lies About the State
Department**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the affable and personable Lieutenant Governor of California, the Honorable Goodwin J. Knight, is one of the most indefatigable and entertaining public speakers in California. On April 18, he made one of his typical speeches, reiterating some charges against the Secretary of State which were not unusual except for the fact that Mr. John B. Elliott, of Los Angeles, challenged him to prove them. His attempts to do so are set forth in some correspondence between Mr. Elliott and Mr. Knight and Mr. Elliott and Mr. Acheson, which correspondence I should like to insert in our RECORD. The correspondence plainly shows the predicament in which some of the more partisan critics of the administration would find themselves if called upon to prove the serious charges which they casually make before audiences denied the opportunity to hear both sides and to analyze such charges in the light of the facts. Mr. John B. Elliott is one of the leading citizens of California. He has spared neither time nor expense in proving how irresponsible some partisan attacks can be, while at the same time serving notice on partisan orators that they cannot always escape the duty and obligation of proving their assertions. The full text of this most singular and interesting material, as released to the press, follows:

Editors:

The following material is for release in full or in part. The correspondence contained herein comprises an official answer to miscellaneous charges made from many investigated sources against United States Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

The correspondence here is either addressed to or signed by Mr. John B. Elliott, Los Angeles civic leader, who acted in establishing the facts concerned in certain typical charges made by Lt. Gov. Goodwin Knight of California, and the answers made by Secretary of State Acheson.

All letters and correspondence reproduced herein are full quotations with no additions or deletions from originals.

For purposes of clarity, Lieutenant Governor Knight's charges and Secretary of State Acheson's replies appear together in numerical order, separate from the correspondence.

LOS ANGELES, August 20.—Secretary of State Dean Acheson has specifically refuted 12 charges made publicly against him by

Lt. Gov Goodwin J. Knight, of California, in an exchange of correspondence released today.

Mr. John B. Elliott, Los Angeles civic leader, in making public the documentary story of the Acheson "smear," said, "These vicious charges to which Lieutenant Governor Knight has lent his name are but a repetition, in part, of irresponsible accusations that have frequently been made by various partisan political sources against an admittedly able and conscientious public official."

"They have no foundation in fact," Elliott said, "but are made with intent to destroy the good name and public reputation of Secretary Acheson."

In his statement, Secretary Acheson specifically answered all of Knight's charges, citing documentary evidence.

Elliott pointed out that quotations attributed to Acheson were never made by him, and some detractors have repeatedly confused the record in attempting to identify Acheson with others who were charged with Communist affiliation.

Searching the record for alleged statements of Acheson pertaining to Japan, Formosa, Chiang Kai-shek, the Chinese Nationalist Government, and Russian participation in Japanese administration, State Department officials found that quotations used by Knight in his 12 charges were neither accurate, nor in many cases in existence in any records, interviews, or correspondence.

In attempting to identify Secretary Acheson with Alger Hiss and the conferences at Dumbarton Oaks and Yalta, Knight charged the Secretary of State with having appointed Hiss to the American delegation.

"This statement is false, and Secretary Acheson has so testified under oath, before the Joint Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committee, the State Department official record showed.

"In response to a direct question from Senator KNOWLAND, he (Acheson) stated that he made no recommendations of any kind that Hiss be sent on either of these missions."

Elliott cited the 12 charges and 12 complete answers as evidence that smear tactics can be countered by revelations of the true record.

"Every American who has witnessed the most reckless campaign of vilification against a public official ever seen in this country should read the complete text of Secretary Acheson's answers to the charges.

"Attempts to tie Acheson to Communists, fellow travelers, and traitors have failed because the record reveals nothing of the kind, and on the contrary, Secretary of State Acheson is proved to be a great and patriotic public servant.

"Attempts to damage the national administration by attacking Secretary Acheson have resulted in injuring the United States in the eyes of the world and have demonstrated the weakness of opponents of the administration in having nothing to offer except untrue, unjust, vicious criticisms."

The text of the correspondence follows:

STATEMENT OF JOHN B. ELLIOTT IN RELEASING ACHESON-KNIGHT CORRESPONDENCE

Herewith is made public the original correspondence regarding the activities of the United States State Department, between Secretary of State Dean Acheson, Lt. Gov. Goodwin J. Knight of California and myself.

This correspondence followed a public address by Lieutenant Governor Knight at Chico, Calif., April 17th last, in which Mr. Knight charged Secretary Acheson with being "an American Neville Chamberlain," who is "more distrusted and despised than any man in modern American history"; who had "no friends and no defenders," and demanded that "Acheson should get out." I challenged the integrity of Mr. Knight's charges, and asked Mr. Knight for details. Mr. Knight

replied by making twelve specific charges against Secretary Acheson, to which Mr. Acheson duly replied. Secretary Acheson denounced Governor Knight's charges, one by one, as either completely "false" or "misleading."

These vicious charges to which Governor Knight has lent his name, are but a repetition, in part, of irresponsible accusations that have frequently been made by various partisan political sources against an admittedly able and conscientious public official. They have no foundation, in fact, but are made with intent to destroy the good name and public reputation of Secretary Acheson. This campaign of vilification has been carried on for 2 years. It follows, the Nazi technique of the "The Big Lie," originated by Goebbels, of Hitler's propaganda ministry. The theory of the success of "The Big Lie" is, if the lie is big enough, and repeated frequently enough, people finally will believe it.

These accusations against Secretary Acheson have been repeated in various forms, by various people, throughout the country, from time to time, along the line of "The Big Lie." So far, they have not succeeded in their object, but their vicious propaganda continues. I am glad to be able to assist in bringing to the light of day some phases of this venal conspiracy.

Governor Knight has, I am sure, been misled into giving currency to these malicious inventions. Those who are really back of these calculated slanders have been intent upon destroying the good name and official reputation of the American Secretary of State, regardless of the disastrous effect upon our country's vital interests throughout the world. Thus, communism is served as well as Stalin himself could do it.

J. B. ELLIOTT.

[Associated Press Story published in the Los Angeles Times, of Wednesday, April 18, 1951]

ACHESON BLAMED FOR FIRING BY LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR KNIGHT

CHICO, April 17—Lieutenant Governor Knight tonight blamed Dean Acheson for the firing of General MacArthur and said "no man in modern American history has been so distrusted and despised" as the Secretary of State.

Said Knight, a Republican, in an address before the Chico Kiwanis Club

"The discharge of Gen Douglas MacArthur was not any sudden explosive act of the President. It had been planned and hoped for over a period of many months. The architect of the blueprint of 'exit MacArthur' was Dean Acheson."

"NO FRIENDS"

Knight declared Acheson has "no friends and no defenders. He stays only because of the stubborn will of the President."

He accused Acheson of fashioning a Far East policy of "dumping Chiang Kai-shek and destroying the democratic Republic of China."

Knight asserted "the danger of Acheson is now so real that we must view him as the American Neville Chamberlain." Stalin, he said, would be encouraged by "the Acheson-British Socialist Lowtowing to communism," just as Hitler was made strong by appeasement.

"Acheson should get out and America should get tough," Knight said.

LETTER FROM JOHN B. ELLIOTT TO LT. GOV. GOODWIN J. KNIGHT REQUESTING SPECIFIC DETAILS IN LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR KNIGHT'S CHARGES AGAINST SECRETARY ACHESON, APRIL 20, 1951

APRIL 20, 1951.

Hon. GOODWIN J. KNIGHT,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR FRIEND GOODIE: As a personal friend and a long-time admirer of yours, I am aston-

ished at the intemperate attack on Secretary of State Dean Acheson, recently accredited to you in the daily press from Chico. You are generally regarded as impartial and judicial. I have seen, as has nearly everybody else, over past months, the vicious and unrestrained attacks upon Secretary Acheson steadily increasing in violence and tempo. Very recently these attacks have about ceased, due, probably, to the physical and factual exhaustion of the assailants.

Your reported statements, however, seem to revive the most extreme and venomous assertions of these lately abandoned scurrilous attacks. These expressions will, I am sure, have no good effect. They likely will serve only further to help divide America into discordant camps, violently denouncing each other, and giving aid and comfort to our Communist enemies.

This campaign of unprecedented personal attacks on Secretary Acheson have actually contained scarcely a vestige of truth, and no real aim, excepting, perhaps, a vain hope of gaining some unworthy political advantage.

Secretary of State Dean Acheson is not what has been so intemperately charged. On the exact contrary, he is, without doubt, one of the ablest, most honorable, most persuasive secretaries of state that the United States has had in its entire history. He is so regarded among the nations of the democratic world, and would, I am sure, be so held in his own country were it not for the prejudice kindled by the torrent of slander and vilification that has been poured upon him.

Of course, Secretary of State Acheson has made mistakes. Who has not? Have not we all? We should not forget, either that he holds probably the most difficult public office in the world today, with the United States in the very forefront of international storms that are violent, complex and dangerous beyond anything the world has known before. In almost every corner of the globe, there are situations so desperate and of many and varied kinds, demanding immediate solution, and they are practically all up to the United States of America—up to Dean Acheson, United States Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

Surely, we should all at least try to have the maximum degree of calmness, compassion, patience, and whatever personal humility may be attained.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN B. ELLIOTT

P. S.—The New York Herald Tribune, one of the leading Republican newspapers of this country said editorially yesterday:

"There are no real issues of underlying policy or patriotism; in this debate there are no traitors or devils, but only sincere men who may have different views as to method but are at one in their loyalty to the great ideal of freedom."

J. B. E.

LETTER FROM LT. GOV. GOODWIN J. KNIGHT TO JOHN B. ELLIOTT MAKING SPECIFIC CHARGES AGAINST SECRETARY ACHESON, APRIL 24, 1951

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,

April 24, 1951.

Mr. JOHN B. ELLIOTT,

Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR JOHN: This is in reply to your letter of April 20. I assure you that I was sorry to say anything in the public press that would distress or annoy you. I hasten to reassure you that my statements concerning Dean Acheson were not because he is a Democrat nor because I feel that an attack upon him will help the Republicans. As a matter of fact, that is a very doubtful premise.

You state that the Secretary has made mistakes and who hasn't? Of course, we all have, but, John, this subject is one which is very close to my heart and has nothing

to do with politics. As a veteran of the First World War, I have always been interested in military matters. My nephew was shot down five times over Europe as a pilot in the Second World War. He is now a captain in a B-29. His mother is a widow and has no other children and so I look at Dean Acheson out of different eyes than many other people and what do I see? I do not just see mistakes of judgment or of timing. I see alliances which are violently unpatriotic and I protest against such connections in the high office you describe. We do not differ with Dean Acheson on a matter of policy or judgment. We differ with him on strict grounds of patriotism and honor and now I stop expressing opinions and go to facts.

If you will examine the first four paragraphs of your letter you will see there is not one fact stated. They are all opinions. Your fifth paragraph is about Acheson's responsibilities and mistakes. Your sixth paragraph is one of appeal for confidence, good will, and so forth. I mention this to you so that there can be no doubt about my reply. Should my reply be a defense setting up my opinions against yours it would not justify my position and would not be of any value. Because a man's opinion on any subject is no better than the information which supports it, I now proceed to give you information and facts. These facts are documented and can be supported by the record.

It is natural for you, John, to read the good things your political party says about Dean Acheson, but you will be interested to know that you are the first Democrat who has risen in his defense. No single Democrat in Sacramento has a kind word to say for him. Every veterans group in the United States has condemned him and demanded his impeachment. I don't believe that you have one who is near and dear to your blood risking his life on the decisions made by Mr. Acheson and his staff. If you have, you have more faith in partisan politics than I have.

I have long admired your strenuous efforts in behalf of good government and on many issues I have stood shoulder to shoulder with you but on this one I must differ, based on the foregoing facts. If you have any defense for Dean Acheson on these facts, I eagerly await your factual presentation. If they are but denials they must be accompanied by proof by Mr. Acheson to you and to me.

I join with you that this is a period of patience, humility, and good judgment but patience can become a fault in the face of a record like this and it must be remembered that this is but a partial record of Dean Acheson's faults and failings.

In conclusion, let me say, John, if these were the mistakes of a stupid but sincere man they might be overlooked but here is a brilliantly educated man in nefarious and secret collusion with violent enemies of my country. Place him alongside of George Washington, Alexander Hamilton, U. S. Grant, Robert E. Lee and the act answers the question.

I shall be interested in your reactions to these facts. Please accept my remarks as a devoted American and not an ardent Republican.

Cordially yours,

GOODWIN KNIGHT,
Lieutenant Governor.

LETTER FROM JOHN B. ELLIOTT TO SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN ACHESON, REQUESTING ANSWER TO LT. GOV. GOODWIN J. KNIGHT'S ACCUSATIONS, APRIL 26, 1951

APRIL 26, 1951.

HON. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I hope you may be able to note the enclosed correspondence and newspaper clipping which I have had,

concerning you as Secretary of State, with my personal friend, Hon. Goodwin J. Knight, Lieutenant Governor of the State of California. You will see from Governor Knight's letter that he makes some 12 specific charges against you. On account of the Governor's prominence in the State of California, I would like to have the correct answers to the charges he makes.

Could you pass this correspondence along to one of your assistants who would give me the information I wish in replying to Governor Knight's accusations?

I hope you do not mind my being a self-appointed, and doubtless altogether inadequate, defender of yours.

Very truly yours,

JOHN B. ELLIOTT

LETTER FROM JOHN B. ELLIOTT REPLYING TO LT. GOV. GOODWIN J. KNIGHT'S LETTER AND INFORMING MR. KNIGHT THAT HE HAS FORMALLY REQUESTED ANSWER FROM SECRETARY ACHESON

MAY 1, 1951.

HON. GOODWIN J. KNIGHT,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR FRIEND GOODWIN: I have been pleased to receive your letter of April 24 in reply to my letter of April 20, regarding Hon. Dean Acheson, United States Secretary of State, and would have replied sooner, but for being confined to my home for the past few days with a slight illness.

I will write you further, in detail, when I have had time to secure necessary information, regarding the specific charges you make against the American Secretary of State. Incidentally, would you care to give me your sources of information on which your 12 charges against Secretary Acheson are based? That would help me more quickly to check the facts in the matter.

Like yourself, I have no interest in the political partisanship phase of the subject, but I am deeply interested in what I consider a dastardly political plot to destroy an honest and able public official, such as I have never seen before in my many years of experience in public affairs. Of course, I acquit you of any part in this plot.

Secretary Acheson will not destroy America. But such wild, unrestrained cabals and "smears," as we see using every agency, no matter how vicious or unfair, to harm a man in public esteem, can destroy America.

You point out that my letter to you was one largely of personal opinion. I intended it to be so. I was merely writing you, regarding your own opinions, as expressed in the daily press, which I submit, contained strong language and few facts. Quoting a few samples of "opinion" from your speech at Chico, as published:

"No man in modern American history has been so distrusted and despised as the Secretary of State . . . The architect of the blueprint of 'exit MacArthur' was Dean Acheson . . . Acheson has no friends and no defenders . . . the danger of Acheson is now so real that we must view him as the American Neville Chamberlain . . . Stalin, he said, would be encouraged by 'the Acheson-British Socialist kowtowing to communism'."

Also, in your letter to me, next to the closing paragraph, regarding Secretary Acheson, you say:

"Here is a brilliantly educated man in nefarious and secret collusion with the enemies of my country."

Of course, if that single statement of yours were, in any sense, true, Dean Acheson would be guilty of treason, and would be put on trial on that charge, the penalty for which, on conviction, could be death. It is such extreme and violent statements that I denounce. The only effect of such statements is to do harm to the United States of America. Such charges, which I believe

utterly baseless, serve to supply ammunition to those you call the enemies of my country, rather than does any supposed secret collusion by a Federal official.

If you really believe such statement as this one you make about Secretary Acheson, I venture the suggestion that you should have put in your full time, when you were recently at the National Capital, in bringing quickly such a terrible traitor as you describe, promptly to the bar of justice. Did you do anything like that? As the patriotic American you assert (and I believe you are, but misguided) I believe you should not rest one moment until every real traitor, such as you allege, is behind bars. One should act, in such circumstances, and not continue hurling wild and scurrilous accusations.

I think too, no one can successfully assert his superiority over others in patriotic endeavor. Members of my family, my only son, and many dear friends, were in the late war, Atlantic and Pacific, and some of them never returned. But my concern for all of those whose lives are endangered in the defense of our country is not at all lessened because they happen not to be blood relatives of mine, and may be, to me, unknown. I have the same feeling for the safety of all. It should not be difficult to encompass the thought that human sympathy and compassion can pass beyond the bounds of blood relatives and personal attachments, and include all who are risking their lives in our defense. Doubtless, the lives of those who do not happen to be relatives of ours, are, to them, equally precious.

It is such thoughts, my dear Goodwin, that give me much apprehension when I see men of intelligence and high position, like yourself, give utterance to reckless calumny against those occupying positions of authority and great responsibility in our Government in times of national emergency, the result of which is certain adversely to affect the welfare and safety of the very ones about whom a real concern is professed. Rash charges and intemperate language give aid and comfort to our Communist enemies, and serve only to increase the danger to all, including those already in imminent peril in our defense.

I think your statement that the local sentiment at Sacramento is unanimously adverse to Secretary Acheson, is not impressive. The American public has had little or no opportunity to read, for months past, anything regarding Secretary Acheson except the reckless and violent outbursts of those behind the partisan plot to "get Acheson," regardless.

It might help if you would suggest to those whom you contact at Sacramento that they read the 40-odd pages in Robert S. Allen's "The Truman Merry-Go-Round" (Vanguard, 1950) devoted to Secretary Acheson and the United States State Department, in which Mr. Allen concluded with this sentence:

"Dean Acheson is the greatest Secretary of State since Henry L. Stimson."

Mr. Robert Allen, the author of that book, is a very able, experienced and concededly reliable Washington correspondent, and certainly one not prejudiced in favor of the present national administration. Incidentally, Mr. Allen is, with you, a fellow United States veteran of the World War, having been wounded, and lost an arm in the service.

Also your acquaintances, who are so opposed to the Secretary, might read Mr. Elmer Davis' article in Harpers Magazine for March, 1951, entitled: "The Crusade Against Acheson." Elmer Davis is one of the best known and most reliable journalists in Washington, D. C., 10 years on the staff of the New York Times, a national newscaster, and during World War II, head of the Office of War Information, and so forth.

To save you the trouble of looking up Elmer Davis' able article, herewith are a few quotations of fact and opinion from it:

"For months past Republican orators had been denouncing him (Acheson) with a virulence seldom equaled, and a shameless mendacity quite unequaled in my recollection."

"There has been nothing quite like that in American history. Not merely because they were denouncing as a Communist (or a protector of Communists; they could never quite agree on their story) the man who had done more to check the advance of Russian aggression than any other public official we have ever had."

"The demand for Acheson's removal was overwhelmingly supported in the House caucus; but only 23 of the 42 Republican Senators voted for it. Five voted against it—AIKEN, LANGER, MORSE, and the two SMITHS; 14 others had at least the courage not to vote at all."

"But why this vicious and sustained attack on a man of whom the President said, correctly, that 'no official in our Government has been more alive to communism's threat to freedom, or more forceful in resisting it.'"

"The first of his great achievements, the North Atlantic Treaty, had been largely prepared by Marshall and Lovett, but Acheson finished the work of concluding it, and led the way in the more difficult task of persuading the Senate to approve it."

"The result was the greatest of Acheson's achievements—the persuading of the United Nations Assembly to declare its own competence to act when the Security Council is paralyzed by the veto. As Vishinsky correctly (and furiously) declared, this was a complete change in the character of the United Nations. For the first time it became an organization which could really do something, even if a great power wanted it to do nothing. This was the most brilliant American diplomatic victory of many decades, and the best kind of diplomatic victory, won not by pressure but by persuasion, by convincing other nations that their interest was identical with ours."

"Sometimes it seems that some of the performances of this past year have divulged the secret of the Republic—that while you may not be able to fool all of the people all of the time, you can fool enough of them enough of the time to gain your end."

I will write you further in relation to your charges against Secretary Acheson as soon as I am in possession of the full facts in relation thereto

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN B. ELLIOTT.

REPLY OF SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN ACHESON TO JOHN B. ELLIOTT, PROMISING SPECIFIC AND DOCUMENTED REPLIES TO CHARGES, MAY 14, 1951

MAY 14, 1951.

JOHN B. ELLIOTT,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. ELLIOTT: Thank you very much for your letters of April 26 and May 7 and your telegram of May 1 concerning the criticism of me by Lieutenant Governor Knight. The statements which Mr. Knight made are either entirely incorrect or distortions of the true situation, and I have asked that you be sent a careful, factual reply to these assertions. I hope to make this information available to you in the near future.

I very much appreciate your writing me in the spirit that you did, and I am deeply grateful for your support.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON

During the interim, awaiting the reply to Lt. Gov. Goodwin J. Knight's specific charges, Secretary Acheson and the United States State Department were concerned with affairs of the greatest international importance.

Following will be found the 12 charges made by Lieutenant Governor Knight in

numerical order, followed by the specific answers by Secretary Acheson.

JOHN B. ELLIOTT.

TO JOHN B. ELLIOTT, TO WHICH STATE DEPARTMENT OFFICIAL REPLIES WERE APPENDED, JUNE 28, 1951

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, June 28, 1951.

JOHN B. ELLIOTT,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. ELLIOTT: As I wrote you in May, I asked my staff to prepare a factual reply to the assertions made by Lieutenant Governor Knight concerning my role in the conduct of our foreign policy. Shortly after that all of us were swamped with the work involved in preparing for the hearings of the Joint Senate Committee on United States Policy in the Far East. Only within the last few days have we been able again to turn our attention to certain of the questions which were pending before these hearings began. I greatly regret the resulting delay in answering your letter, but I am sure that you understand the position in which I found myself.

I am glad to repeat the statement I made in my previous letter to you that the assertions contained in Mr. Knight's letter are either entirely incorrect or distortions of the truth. In order to assist you in answering these assertions, I am enclosing a memorandum which deals with them point by point.

I am grateful for this opportunity to set the record straight.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON

OFFICIAL ANSWERS BY SECRETARY DEAN ACHESON

Charge 1 (a) "On December 23, 1949, Mr. Acheson sent out instructions to diplomatic and consular personnel in Asia that Formosa was doomed and expendable."

Answer. The communication of December 23, 1949, on Formosa referred to was in no sense an instruction. It was a guide in the psychological warfare being waged against the Communists in the Far East. Common-sense tactics in psychological warfare call for maximizing gains and minimizing losses. At this time, the intelligence branches of the various agencies of the Government agreed that the Nationalist garrison on Formosa was incapable of holding the island against a determined Communist assault which was then being readied. They further stated that the only way the island could be held was by reinforcing its defenses with American troops.

While acknowledging the strategic importance of Formosa, the Joint Chiefs of Staff had advised the Government that it was not sufficiently important to warrant sending enough ground elements of an American army that was already spread dangerously thin to insure a successful defense of the island.

In the light of these facts, Gen. Albert Wedemeyer sent a memorandum on the matter to George V. Allen, then Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. It is quoted here as read by General Wedemeyer when he was a witness at the MacArthur hearings.

"In a memorandum for the executive secretary of the National Security Council, the Secretary of State . . . stated that under present circumstances the passage of Formosa under Communist control by external or internal action appears probable . . . since there appears no certain assurance that Formosa can be denied to Communist control by political and economic measures alone.

"Further, the Joint Chiefs of Staff at their meeting of August 16 reaffirmed their previous view that overt United States military

action to deny Communist domination of Formosa would not be justified. However, I also note that the Joint Chiefs of Staff believe that the probabilities of the Formosa situation make it more than ever necessary that every effort be made to forestall any weakening of the over-all United States position with respect to the Philippines, the Ryukyus, and Japan. In Department of the Army consideration of this matter, it appears to be particularly desirable that, should Formosa be lost, this event should have a minimum of ill effects of the governments and peoples of western-oriented nations and particularly those of the Far East. Accordingly, it occurs to me that, if not already instituted, you may desire to consider information measures designed to accomplish this end."

Consequently, the directive was sent to personnel in United States missions to try to minimize the damage to American prestige in the Far East if Formosa should fall. The directive advised the people of the Foreign Service of the details of the situation and urged that in their daily contacts they play down rather than emphasize the strategic importance of Formosa in case the island fell to the Chinese Reds.

The directive related solely to psychological warfare and in no way related to administration policy or intentions toward the island.

The policy of the American Government has unwaveringly maintained that the United States must do everything within its capacities to prevent seizure of Formosa by a hostile force. A variant on the same theme is the allegation which is numbered (5) in Lieutenant Governor Knight's letter of April 24, 1951 "Dean Acheson recommended the abandonment of Formosa after the legitimate Government of China had been forced to flee to the island." In this form the allegation appears to be a distorted construction of the speech made by the Secretary of State at the National Press Club in February 1950. In the Press Club talk, the Secretary referred to the American line that was vitally strategic to our Pacific position—which ran (and runs) from Japan through the Ryukyus to the Philippines. The defense of these positions he presented as basically an American responsibility. They must be held at all costs. Inferentially, an attack on them would be regarded as an overt act of war.

It is noteworthy that the full text of this section of the speech is rarely quoted by those making the above allegation, because the Secretary goes on to say that Formosa is important to the security of the United States and that we must use every means at our disposal to deny it to a hostile force.

For a time the means at our disposal were confined to political and economic. Now, with an increase of our military forces and in our production of weapons and equipment, we are able to provide the Nationalist garrison on Formosa with material assistance and needed training. Approximately \$90,000,000 worth of arms and ordnance has been given the Nationalists and another \$300,000,000 is scheduled for this year. In addition, a 600-man military mission is on the island assisting in the reorganization of Chiang's forces.

Charge 1 (b) "On June 19, 1947, before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. Acheson testified there was no danger of a Communist defeat of Chiang Kai-shek."

Answer. The record has been checked, and Mr. Acheson did not testify before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on June 19, 1947, on China or on any other matters. This allegation would appear to be a distorted version of testimony which Mr. Acheson gave to the same House committee a year earlier. Mr. Acheson's 1946 testimony was in support of a bill, endorsed also by General Marshall, Secretary of War Patterson, and Admiral Ramsey, of the Navy Department, to provide military advice and assistance to the Republic of China.

A careful examination of the record of the 1946 hearings discloses no indication of any testimony to the effect of the above-quoted allegation.

Charge: 1. (c) "On July 30, 1949, he wrote a letter to the President of the United States stating that no amount of aid could have saved Chiang."

Answer: In the letter of July 30, 1949, which transmitted the State Department's compilation on United States relations with China to the President, there is no such statement as that attributed to him, namely, "no amount of aid could have saved Chiang." The full text of the letter has, of course, been a matter of record for some time. This assertion is apparently a twisted construction of the paragraph appearing on the page numbered XV in the volume United States Relations With China. This reads:

"A realistic appraisal of conditions in China past and present, leads to the conclusion that the only alternative open to the United States was full-scale intervention in behalf of a government which had lost the confidence of its own troops and its own people. Such intervention would have required the expenditure of even greater sums than had been fruitlessly spent thus far, the command of national armies by American officers, and the probable participation of American Armed Forces—land, sea and air—in the resulting war. Intervention of such a scope and magnitude would have been resented by the mass of the Chinese people, would have diametrically reversed our historic policy, and would have been condemned by the American people

"* * * Nothing that this country did, or could have done within the reasonable limits of its capabilities, could have changed that result; nothing that was left undone by this country has contributed to it"

Charge: 2 "In 1946 against the advice of United States Ambassador Arthur Bliss Lane, Mr. Acheson approved a loan of \$90,000,000 to Communist Poland. The counsel in this transaction was Donald Hiss, brother of Alger Hiss, and for this loan Dean Acheson's law firm, of which Donald Hiss is a member, received a \$50,000 fee"

Answer: The inferences of this charge are false and are based upon a distortion of the public record. The Polish loan and Mr. Acheson's connection therewith was thoroughly explored by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on January 13, 1949, when Mr. Acheson was up for confirmation as Secretary of State. When Mr. Acheson became Assistant Secretary of State on February 1, 1941, he severed all connections with the law firm of which he had been a partner. The interest which Mr. Acheson had in the firm was computed and paid to him before he entered the Department of State. The loan negotiations with Poland did not begin until more than 4 years later and were completed in 1946.

The firm functioned purely in a legal capacity and handled the contracts and the drawing of the instruments necessary to apply for a loan and to operations under the loan. No member of the firm approached Secretary Acheson in any way during the period that the loan was under consideration.

As Acting Secretary of State and on the instructions of Secretary Byrnes, Mr. Acheson approved the loan after it had been favorably considered by the responsible officers of the Department who were interested in it. These included the responsible officers in the economic offices under Mr. Clayton and in the political offices under Mr. Dunn. The late Senator Vandenberg was informed of the proposed credit and his suggestion was followed that full publicity be given to the commitments made by the Polish provisional government of national unity in connection with the loan. Secretary Acheson subsequently suspended the loan because these commitments were not being met. The loan

was reinstated when these objections were satisfied. Subsequently, when the Communist grip on Poland tightened, the unused part of the credit was cut off effective January 31, 1948.

As you know, at the time the loan was made, the Polish Government still included democratic elements, and it was hoped that the loan would assist these elements in fending off full Soviet control. A strong appeal for United States credits to Poland was made by Mr. Mikolajczyk, Vice Premier of the Polish Government and leader of the anti-Communists forces in Poland, when he called on Mr. Truman on December 5, 1945.

Another important reason for making the loan then was the fact that the democratic countries of Western Europe were suffering a severe coal shortage, while Poland had a large surplus of coal which could not be moved for lack of transportation at the Polish mines. The major portion of the loan was intended for the purchase of transportation equipment. Equipment purchased under the loan was subsequently used by the Poles in making heavy shipments of coal to western European countries. This was a substantial factor in the revival of the economies of Western Europe.

Charge: 3 "On July 20, 1949, Mr. Acheson stated that there were no Communists in the State Department. This statement has since proved to be completely false and untrue."

Answer: Mr. Acheson stated at that time that he knew of no Communists in the State Department. This statement has never been proved false. He can reiterate now that he knows of no Communists, Communist sympathizers, or security risks in the Department of State. Moreover, an experienced, capable, and vigilant Security Division of more than 100 trained investigators, whose job is everlastingly to check and recheck the loyalty and dependability of the staff of the Department, doesn't know of any. We have had the benefit of operating with the FBI and either the FBI or the Department has run full field investigations on all our people in sensitive jobs. It can be guaranteed further that if the security and loyalty machinery does turn up a Communist, a sympathizer, or a security risk, or a person of whose loyalty and dependability there is a reasonable doubt, their connection with the Department will be brought to an abrupt end.

Charge: 4. "Dean Acheson has never repudiated his support of Alger Hiss. Previous to this time Dean Acheson sponsored the Hiss brothers to Assistant Secretary of State Adolf Berle, although Whittaker Chambers had denounced them as Soviet agents. Alger Hiss, of course, is in the penitentiary as a perjurer and traitor."

Answer: The several statements about Alger Hill that Secretary Acheson has made in response to questions have been widely misinterpreted.

He has never in any way condoned the offense of which Alger Hiss has been found guilty. The Supreme Court is the highest court of justice in the Nation. It has acted. As far as he is concerned, the decision of the court disposes of the matter.

The allegation with respect to sponsoring the Hiss brothers apparently is an interpretation of Mr. Berle's testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee when he declared:

"I checked on the two Hiss boys. Specifically, I checked with Dean Acheson, and later I checked when Acheson became Assistant Secretary of State and Alger Hiss became his executive assistant. * * *

"Acheson said that he had known the family and these two boys from childhood and he could vouch for them absolutely."

Mr. Berle's memory is faulty. Mr. Acheson saw Mr. Berle on this matter only once, in March 1941, 2 years after Mr. Berle says Chambers came to see him.

The facts are that Alger Hiss was never Mr. Acheson's assistant nor employed in his office in any capacity whatever, except when Mr. Acheson became Acting Secretary or Under Secretary of State when it could be said that everyone in the Department was under his direction.

When Mr. Acheson became Assistant Secretary of State in 1941, he needed an assistant and arranged for the transfer of Donald Hiss to that position. At the time, Donald Hiss was working for Mr. Blackwell Smith in the Office of Production Management. In March of 1941, Mr. Berle came to Mr. Acheson and said that he had information about one of the Hiss brothers which would make his presence embarrassing to Mr. Acheson and to the Department. Mr. Acheson asked him which brother it was and Mr. Berle replied that he could not tell him.

Mr. Acheson thereupon checked with Donald Hiss and satisfied himself that there was no reason why Donald Hiss was not completely fit to act as his assistant. That is still the Secretary's opinion.

When Mr. Berle states that Mr. Acheson told him he had known these boys from childhood and could vouch for them absolutely, his memory plays him false. The Secretary told him that his former senior partner, Judge Covington, had known them since childhood, and that Mr. Acheson had seen Donald and his wife at social gatherings and respected and liked them both.

The foregoing information was provided under oath in his testimony on the hearings on his nomination as Secretary of State before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, on January 13, 1949. The page numbers are 6, 7, and 8.

Charge: 5. "Dean Acheson recommended the abandonment of Formosa after the legitimate government of China had been forced to flee to the island."

Answer: The position of Mr. Acheson and the policy of our Government toward Formosa had been stated in reply to assertion No. 1. This statement shows that the above charge is entirely false.

Charge: 6. "Dean Acheson and his friends, including Owen Lattimore, encouraged a Communist rebellion in China, and they referred in public addresses to the Communists as 'agrarian reformers.' These agrarian reformers are now murdering and torturing American boys in Korea."

Answer. This statement is false—keel to keelson.

United States policy as executed by Secretary Acheson and his predecessors gave Chiang generous and consistent backing—military, monetary, and political. At VJ-day a United States program to organize and equip 39 Chinese Nationalist divisions was half completed and a similar program to provide Chiang with 8½ air groups, somewhat less. Both these programs were completed in the postwar period.

Fifty thousand United States marines were moved into North China to insure a smooth Nationalist take-over. An American sea and airlift shifted nearly a half million Nationalist troops into sensitive areas of North China to enable the Nationalists to take control of the area. These moves made it possible for China's forces to accept the surrender of hundreds of thousands of troops of the Japanese Army which would otherwise have been completely impossible and thereby came into possession of huge quantities of Japanese arms. Moreover, China alone, of all the nations of the globe, continued to receive military lend-lease after VJ-day.

After the foregoing, the United States continued to help Chiang in his struggle with the Communists with grants of economic and military assistance and maintained a military mission with the Nationalist regime to provide military advice. The flow of this aid was interrupted only by the

Marshall mission and for good reason. As early as 1937, Chiang is on record as believing that the differences between the Kuomintang and the Chinese Reds could not be settled by military means—but only by political means. He initiated negotiations with the Communists—with Ambassador Hurley as mediator. General Marshall went to China to replace Hurley at Chiang's invitation to assist in the effort to unite China politically (under Chiang's control) and to demobilize all but 10 divisions of the Red army—ending its existence as a separate military force. The 10 divisions were to become a part of a 60-division Republic of China Army—with the remaining 50 divisions Nationalist troops.

General Marshall strove to arrange a truce—believing that negotiations and civil war could not be conducted simultaneously. He temporarily shut off arms aid because truce efforts had no chance of success if the Nation he represented continued to supply munitions to one of the parties to the truce. When General Marshall gave up his attempt to reconcile the contending parties, the supply of aid to Chiang was resumed. A complete breakdown of that aid appears in the appendix of the MacArthur hearings. Since 1941, the United States has provided the Nationalists with \$1,800,000,000 worth of military assistance and \$1,700,000,000 worth of economic aid.

Secretary Acheson has declared on several occasions that he does not remember ever having met Owen Lattimore—which hardly qualifies the latter as a friend. Four Secretaries of State, including Mr. Acheson, have stated in writing for the official record that Mr. Lattimore exerted no influence on the United States policy—a fact completely obvious to anyone who takes the trouble to compare United States action in the Far East with Lattimore's recommendations. Lattimore was on the rolls of the Department of State for 4 months as a consultant on the Pauley mission on Japanese reparations. He is not in the employ of the Department. He is neither an adviser nor a consultant.

The phrase "agrarian reformer" was not originated by the Secretary of State and as comprehensive a check as was possible of his talks shows that he does not so refer to the Chinese Communists. The record does show that former Ambassador Patrick Hurley in a speech before the National Press Club on November 27, 1945, described the Chinese Reds as reformers. He also declared that "the only difference between Chinese Communists and Oklahoma Republicans is that the Oklahoma Republicans are not armed."

The phrase "agrarian reformer" was also used in 1939 and 1940 by Freda Utey, a reformed Communist writer (she declares she recanted in 1931) allegedly an expert on the Far East. Miss Utey's most recent book *The China Story* has been employed as a source by Senator BREWSTER and Senator MCCARTHY.

Charge 7 "Dean Acheson acted as counsel to Lauchlin Currie when Currie appeared before a committee of Congress to defend himself against proven charges of aiding the Communists in the espionage network."

Answer Mr. Acheson was retained by Lauchlin Currie in connection with his appearance before the House Committee on Un-American Activities on the 15th of August 1948. Mr. Currie appeared before the committee at his own request to testify concerning statements made about him by Miss Elizabeth Bentley. The committee unanimously observed that no charge of Communist Party affiliation was made against Mr. Currie. In contrast to the "proven charges" referred to in the allegation, it is a fact that since Mr. Currie's testimony regarding them no further action has ever been taken.

As for the committee's reaction to Mr. Currie's appearance and as to the Secretary's professional function as a legal adviser, your

attention is directed to a statement by Representative MUNDT, which appears on page 875 of the hearings of the committee of the Eightieth Congress, second session. Representative MUNDT stated: "I think that is all, Mr. Chairman, although I would like to have the record show that Mr. Currie, in addition to having answered questions in a forthright manner, came here without benefit of counsel to whisper in his ear the answer he should give to the committee. I think that is very commendable."

Charge 8. "Dean Acheson stated under oath before a Senate committee before his confirmation as Under Secretary of State that Russia should share in the administration of Japan. It is no defense to now say that that was a long time ago and Russia was our ally. Even the man on the street knew at that time that Russia had been in the war only a few days and had already proven herself a doubtful and dangerous ally."

Answer: At the request of the Department, the staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has searched the committee's records for the period immediately prior to and following the confirmation of Mr. Acheson as Under Secretary of State August-September 1945, and has been unable to find any statement such as the one referred to. A similar search of the records of the Department shows that on September 26, 1945, Acting Secretary Acheson was asked at press conference:

"Can you tell us when and where the Russians accepted the thesis that the United States would be the deciding voice in Japanese policy? Was that at Potsdam or Crimea?"

Answer. I don't think I can comment about that. Of course, as you know, all the allies have accepted the Supreme Allied Commander who is General MacArthur. He must go forward and do things. It is inherent in that decision. Of course, there is no disposition whatever on the part of the American Government to exclude anybody. What we are trying to do is to go forward with the job and work out the best methods of solution that we can.

The foregoing is the only segment that could be found in a voluminous record which could possibly, by any stretch or twist, be construed as placing Secretary Acheson in the position of advocating a Soviet part in the administration of Japan. The extent to which this allegation is an outright misrepresentation is shown by the facts.

The facts are that the machinery for the administration of Japan completely recognized the major role of the United States in the defeat of that country and the dominant United States interest therein, while at the same time recognizing the interests of other countries who shared in the burdens of the war and obtaining their cooperation and support in the administration.

At the time of the surrender, the agreement of the United Kingdom, China, and the Soviet Union was obtained to the appointment by the United States of the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers who had sole executive responsibility for the conduct of the occupation. This was confirmed by the Moscow Agreement of December 1945, which also established the Far Eastern Commission, consisting of the 11 nations who had participated in the war against Japan, and the Allied Council for Japan, consisting of the United States, British Commonwealth, the Soviet Union, and China. While the FEC was given the task of formulating policy for the occupation, the position of the United States was fully protected by provisions for the use of the veto and the issuance by the United States of interim directives where the agreement of the Commission could not be obtained. The Allied Council for Japan had an advisory capacity only.

During the period that the basic policies for the occupation were being formulated, a

remarkable degree of unanimity and support for the United States policy toward Japan was achieved in the Far Eastern Commission, virtually all of the major decisions being approved by all of the other countries included on the Commission, including the Soviet Union.

Thus, without in any way impinging upon United States responsibilities for Japan, a wide and important degree of international support was obtained for our policies toward that country. The record of the Far Eastern Commission is a bright and all-too-little noticed chapter in post-war cooperation and one in which we and the other participating countries can rightfully take pride.

Charge 9. "Mr. Acheson while heading the American delegation in the formation of UNRRA insisted on the veto to please the Soviet Union and supported all Soviet demands, thus leaving the United States impotent to control UNRRA although the United States put up all the money."

Answer. This allegation is false. Mr. Acheson did not support all Soviet demands and did not insist on the veto to please the Soviet Union or leave the United States impotent to control UNRRA. It is a fact that the Soviet Union on drafting the UNRRA agreement sought to require four-power unity of all matters in the central committee of UNRRA. As Assistant Secretary of State and responsible for the Department's work on this agreement, with the firm help of British and Chinese representatives, he was successful in resisting this Soviet move. The UNRRA agreement which was signed November 9, 1943, is a matter of record. It does not require unanimity of great powers generally on substantive matters either in its policy-determining council, on which all members were represented, or in any of its committees. Save for a few exceptions, such as amendment, nomination of the Director General, UNRRA was governed by majority decisions in fields related to its major function.

This has long been a matter of public knowledge. It can be verified in the testimony before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, December 7, 1943.

Charge 10. "Secretary Acheson secured the appointment of Alger Hiss to Dumbarton Oaks and Yalta."

Answer. This statement is false and Secretary Acheson has so testified, under oath, before the Joint Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committee.

In response to a direct question from Senator KNOWLAND, he stated that he made no recommendations of any kind to anyone that Hiss be sent on either of these missions. As a routine official duty, Mr. Acheson signed the travel orders for the State Department personnel assigned to go to the Yalta conference just as he would sign routine orders for any delegation. Mr. Hiss was among the group and received his validation for travel in the same manner as the other members.

Charge 11. "On December 16, 1945, Under Secretary Dean Acheson received Juan Negrin, head of the Spanish Communists while he refused at the same time to meet Fernando de los Rios, head of the anti-Communist group in Spain."

Answer: Secretary Acheson did receive de los Rios who called at the Department, December 21, 1945, on what amounted to an invitation resulting from the answer to a question in a press conference. A newsman asked the Secretary whether or not he would receive de los Rios and the Secretary said he "would be glad to receive him." Both Negrin and de los Rios called in a private capacity. De los Rios saw Secretary Acheson after he had already had a lengthy talk with the Chief of the Bureau of Western European Affairs the previous September.

Charge 12. "On December 20, 1945, Dean Acheson granted an interview to Milton Wolff, commander of subversive Abraham Lincoln Brigade, and pro-Communist Vito

Marcantonio, promising them to intervene with Franco on behalf of two condemned Communists in Spain."

Answer: The records of the Department establish that the then Acting Secretary Acheson received a delegation of three Members of the House of Representatives, Ned Healy, of California, Charles R. Savage, of Washington; and Vito Marcantonio, of New York; and five others, including Mr. Wolff. He made no special promises of intervention to the group. The alleged "condemned Communists," Santiago Alvarez and Sebastian Zaparain, had been seized by the Franco military police and were being held on charges for trial. Secretary Acheson explained that the two men were Argentine and Cuban nationals and that any action to be taken by the Department would necessarily be limited to expressions of interest on humanitarian grounds. During this period, Members of the Congress and many private individuals had written the Department to appeal for action. The Secretary's explanation described the carefully worked out official position taken by the Department with respect to all such appeals.

Incidentally, this assertion not only indicates the way in which information becomes distorted and, in effect, false, but also bears close resemblance to other similar assertions which admit their source of information is the Daily Worker.

TELEGRAM FROM JOHN B. ELLIOTT TO SECRETARY OF STATE ACHESON REQUESTING PERMISSION TO MAKE PUBLIC THIS CORRESPONDENCE, JULY 9, 1951

HON. DEAN ACHESON,

Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

Thank you for your letter of June 28 enclosing your replies to charges of Lieutenant Governor Knight of California. I would greatly appreciate permission to make public this correspondence.

Sincerely,

JOHN B. ELLIOTT.

LETTER FROM JOHN B. ELLIOTT TO LT. GOV. GOODWIN J. KNIGHT TRANSMITTING REPLIES OF SECRETARY OF STATE ACHESON TO MR. KNIGHT'S CHARGES, JULY 12, 1951

JULY 12, 1951.

HON. GOODWIN J. KNIGHT,

Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR GOODWIN: I am in receipt of a lengthy letter from Hon. Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, replying in detail to the 12 specific charges you make against him in your letter to me of April 24. I enclose herewith copy of Secretary Acheson's letter. You will note that the Secretary, who must be one of the very busiest men in the entire world, is gracious and considerate enough to answer, fully and explicitly, each of the charges contained in your letter. Many of these charges he describes as wholly or partly false. His reply to the others, which he characterizes as distortions, is open and straightforward.

I must now conclude, friend Goodwin, knowing you as I do, that you have been imposed upon by your source or sources of alleged information. Like many others, it would seem you have been "taken in" by this giant, vicious hoax, unscrupulously invented, and intended to destroy the public reputation of the American Secretary of State. All this in the midst of a great world crisis, of unprecedented portent, with complete disregard to the resultant damage to vital interests of the Republic. I asked you, in my letter of May 1, if you cared to give me the sources of the information contained in your charges against Mr. Acheson. To this you did not reply.

You will note that Secretary Acheson accounts for the delay in answering your accusations, by referring to his present extraordinarily heavy public duties. Everyone must

recognize that, I am sure, as reasonably within the facts.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN B. ELLIOTT.

P. S.—I also enclose your copy of Secretary Acheson's letter to me of May 14, which I find I had not hitherto sent you.

J. B. E.

TELEGRAM FROM SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN ACHESON TO JOHN B. ELLIOTT AUTHORIZING PUBLICATION OF CORRESPONDENCE

From Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

To John B. Elliott, Los Angeles, Calif.:

Appreciate your message. No objection to making the correspondence public.

JULY 12, 1951.

HON. DEAN ACHESON,

Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Herewith is copy of my letter to Lieutenant Governor Knight, of date of July 12, enclosing copy of your detailed answer to his charges.

I am in receipt of your permission to make public this correspondence. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

JOHN B. ELLIOTT.

The St. Lawrence Story—VIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the eighth of a series of articles entitled "The St. Lawrence Story" which appeared in the August 15 edition of the Minneapolis Star. This article deals with widespread public support for the St. Lawrence seaway and power project found throughout Canada today.

THE ST. LAWRENCE STORY—CANADA ANXIOUS TO BUILD SEAWAY AS UNITED STATES DELAYS ACTION

(By Leo Sonderegger)

(Eighth in a series)

The Canadians have a blind spot. They can't see why the United States balks at going ahead with the St. Lawrence seaway project that the executive branch of our Government endorsed 20 years ago.

"They can't understand," a man in our State Department said, "how two or three interests can hold up the thing."

The Canadian viewpoint is summed up in two deceptively mild statements made to this reporter:

"We have entered into an agreement and want to fulfill that agreement."

"It's very appealing to us to go ahead alone."

A free-hand translation of the first of these diplomatic remarks would go about like this: "We're ready to keep our part of the bargain; how about you?"

The second statement may be translated thus:

"If you don't do something about it pretty soon, we'll finish the job on our own."

The Canadians have been polite for a long time; now they are becoming firm.

Top officials have publicly edged very close to saying: "If you don't, we will." Influential newspapers have asserted more or less bluntly that it's about time this country

makes up its mind. Some of them have predicted that if this session of Congress drops the ball again Canada will run it alone.

Our neighbor to the north has several excellent reasons for doing just that. She also has a number of good reasons for continuing to hold off. There is evidence that the first set of reasons is beginning to outweigh the second.

SEAWAY OUTLET NEEDED

Canada needs the seaway. She needs an outlet for her midcontinent grain and oil. She needs power to turn her industrial wheels. She needs these things more urgently than the United States needs them.

The Great Plains area that will be served by the seaway does not end with the northern border of the United States. It is a geographical region extending over thousands of square miles of Canada, also.

The Dominion share of this region is more rigidly landlocked than our share. We have the Mississippi and its tributaries linking the Midwest with the busy Gulf ports. In Canada the land mass is not split by any comparable river system for cheap transportation.

Excepting the rail lines that stretch across thinly populated areas from mid-Canada to the east and west coasts, the St. Lawrence seaway is the only outlet for the produce of a broad and fruitful region.

Those are wheatlands up there—Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba. Even now, much of the harvest moves down the lakes and the river to Montreal. It is carried along the system of 14-foot canals that Canada built 50 years ago for that purpose.

A substantial tonnage also moves west by rail to coast ports. From there a lot of it goes down the west coast, through the Panama Canal and on across to Europe. The deep seaway channel would absorb that tonnage, cut the sailing distance by half, get the wheat to England many days sooner, many dollars cheaper.

Oil from the newly exploited fields of Alberta is another reason the Canadians yearn for the seaway. They foresee the time when a heavy flow of it will go by pipeline to Superior, Wis., and thence by tanker as far down the channel as it is needed. The tankers are stymied now by the shallow canals.

The Canadians also would use the seaway for shipment of manufactured goods from the heavily industrialized Toronto area.

More than all these things, Canada wants the St. Lawrence power that now pours uselessly into the sea. For Ontario, this is the last undeveloped source of power available.

PROVINCE WANTS MORE ELECTRICITY

The province is desperately in need of it. In Ottawa the electricity is sometimes turned off a few hours a day to conserve the supply. The demands of industry are rising sharply.

The power development, of course, is one phase of the project that Canada could not complete alone. To harness a river, you have to dam it; you can't stop at a boundary line in the middle.

Ontario has already entered into an agreement with the State of New York, and they would be constructing the Barnhart Island powerhouse now if this country's Federal Power Commission had not turned down the application.

If nothing is done by Congress, the application almost certainly will be renewed.

It is often said that Canada will not go ahead with the seaway on her own because it would cost too much. On paper, putting channels in on the northern side of the St. Lawrence would cost some \$30,000,000 more than present estimates.

CANADA COULD DO IT CHEAPER

The truth is, however, that Canadian engineers figure they could really do the job for considerably less than the total arrived at jointly.

We would do it a little more economically than the United States, a spokesman said.

He summed it up this way. Canada figures the seaway could be done for something like \$400,000,000. Over a 5-year period that would be about \$80,000,000 annually, a relatively small amount against the present capital investment of about \$3,400,000,000 a year.

Thirty-five years ago, the Canadians say, the idea of spending \$80,000,000 a year on a project would have been startling. Now, it is said, the seaway would be "just another project, a big project, true, but not beyond reason."

There would be a material and manpower problem if Canada decided to proceed. The several thousand men who would be required on the scene are also needed elsewhere. Probably our own supplies of steel and other materials would be tapped.

If Canada did it alone, would she levy tolls to pay the bill? Probably not. The Canadian Government traditionally has regarded transportation as a necessary economic lubricant. And by treaty, Canada cannot impose discriminatory tolls on United States shipping.

The Canadians have another particular interest in the seaway—Labrador ore. They look at it from two angles, as pointed up in this remark:

"We have a direct and dependent interest in your steel production. It is not just a matter of selling the ore; we want to be able to buy the steel."

SEAWAY CALLED MUTUAL BOND

The Canadians rightly consider the seaway a natural international development. It seems a little silly to them that there should have been so much talk, over so many years, about a project that would benefit both countries so markedly. There has been close cooperation in the past; they can't see why it should stop now.

One aspect of this close cooperation is trade. Secretary of State Acheson underlined this in his testimony before the House Public Works Committee.

"Each country," he said, "exported to the other more than \$2,000,000,000 worth of goods in 1950, the largest commercial interchange that has ever occurred between two nations."

The friendly relations coin, unfortunately, has a reverse side. People in our State Department consider the seaway impasse the most serious irritant in our present direct relations with Canada. The Canadians have a vital interest in the project, but no way of getting their case across to Congress.

The jackpot question, naturally, is whether, with all these considerations in mind, Canada will in fact go ahead with the seaway on her own.

This is the informed, if somewhat hesitant, guess of an observer in our Government.

"Barring all-out war, the Canadians will go ahead and build it within 4 years."

Lionel Chevrier, Canadian Minister of Transport, is high among those who think Canada ought to go ahead on her own.

The best evidence nevertheless indicates that Ottawa has made no firm decision as to whether to proceed if Congress fails to act. The Canadian Government is watching us. When it sees what we do—or, more likely, what we don't do—it will make up its mind.

Meanwhile the Canadians may be forgiven if they remind us of what Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of United States Army engineers, said in a talk at Duluth last June:

"We've got to pick out the things that will help to make this Nation great. We've got to stop this dilatory stuff. If we stop building the United States, in 10 years we'll start becoming a decadent Nation. Let's build."

Am I My Brother's Keeper?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, this is the subject of a very timely editorial which recently appeared in the *Tulsa Daily World*, published at Tulsa, Okla.

This worthy article speaks for itself and should challenge the attention of all who cherish the desire to preserve our great country and its institutions.

AM I MY BROTHER'S KEEPER?

Can the United States support the rest of the world?

Is this Nation bankrupting itself with an astronomical foreign-aid program?

Will our official munificence bring us the ultimate hatred of the beneficiaries of this largess?

These questions are pertinent and with substance since Senator TOM CONNALLY, Democrat and Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, charges the Truman administration with attempting to cover the globe with its program of economic, military, and political aid.

"The United States cannot subsist itself, cannot preserve its own economy and its own freedoms, if we have got to take care of the whole world," the Senator said in probing the administration's request for an \$8,500,000,000 foreign-aid program for the current fiscal year. Although a strong partisan in politics, Senator CONNALLY's remarks regarding this internationalized WPA carries impact because heretofore the Truman administration has been virtually immune from criticism and control within party ranks.

Hopes that the United States might soon be able to taper off its foreign-aid program, repeatedly disappointed since the end of World War II, vanished when the Korean aggression produced a new and long-lasting emergency. The effect of this emergency has been to shift the emphasis in foreign aid from economic to military assistance. The European recovery program, which has absorbed the major portion of aid funds in the postwar world, is now becoming a defense-support program, and the mutual defense assistance program is rapidly moving into top place.

That the administration program betrays a great want of prudence and discernment is obvious. Currently there are 23 Federal agencies conducting some sort of foreign economic operations. The combined dictates of reason and experience call for a slow-down in foreign aid. The United States Department of Commerce reveals that the United States of America spent \$81,905,000,000 in foreign aid throughout the world from July 1, 1940, to March 31 of this year. Here is the breakdown:

Lend-lease	\$49,092,000,000
European recovery	9,585,000,000
Civilian supplies	5,623,000,000
UNRRA and interim aid	3,526,000,000
Philippine rehabilitation	623,000,000
Korean and far-eastern aid	290,000,000
Mutual-defense assistance	837,000,000
Greek-Turkish aid	654,000,000
China stabilization, military aid	625,000,000
Inter-American aid	196,000,000
Special British loan	3,750,000,000
Export-Import Bank	3,141,000,000
Direct loans	2,883,000,000
Loans through agent banks	258,000,000

Credit agreement offsets to

grant	\$1,256,000,000
Surplus property	1,334,000,000
Other	1,374,000,000

This \$81,000,000,000 does not include any direct cost of World War II or the Korean police action—all paid for by the United States.

Further analysis shows the United States of America generosity was all-inclusive. Great Britain received \$35,857,000,000 and, believe it or not, Russia got \$11,241,000,000. France came next with \$6,847,000,000 and China follows with more than \$3,000,000,000. Also given aid were Austria, Belgium, Luxembourg, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Trieste, Turkey, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Poland, Yugoslavia, American Republics, Israel, Australia, Canada, India, Indonesia, Japan and Ryukyu Islands, Korea, New Zealand, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, and Union of South Africa. In addition were anonymous others receiving a total of \$16,400,000,000.

As a people we have an intense sensitivity to injustice and other countries are well aware of it. Our helping hand stretched out after World War I, and it has now atrophied in that position. With the exception of little Finland the countries we then aided have cynically repudiated their obligations. Following World War II the pleas for aid multiplied and magnified. None of these nations have our immense capacity for ceaseless progress—that's admitted. And they have obstacles that are difficult—but not insuperable.

No matter whether this foreign aid is labeled grants, loans, or what have you, there is small likelihood of repayment to American taxpayers. In the foreign press we daily see the taint of fretful ingratitude. With strength and constancy we have aided the world. We are confident to await the sentence of impartial posterity and gain the applause of future ages.

In the meantime—how long will this go on?

Is Korea in Vain?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from *Life* magazine, containing an eloquent letter from a housewife, sizing up the situation in Korea in a most logical way:

SO MUCH GOOD, NOBLY SPENT

President Truman and Secretary of State Dean Acheson have every reason to believe that their efforts to end the Korean war suits most Americans. General Ridgway, taking the firmest position possible in the circumstances, is entitled to the same belief. But the men who make and carry out United States and U. N. policy in Korea ought to be aware that the support for their course is neither unanimous nor wholehearted. Make no mistake—many Americans are troubled by this business of compromise without victory.

Below is the story of a troubled American who is also a remarkable young woman. She is Mrs. Katharine Tabor, 27, of Dallas. The interesting story tells how Katharine Tabor came to be a serious student of United States

foreign policy. It is enough to say here that she is the widow of one of the first American casualties in Korea—Lt. Stanley E. Tabor, of the Army, who vanished at Taejon in July 1950 and was officially reported dead last May. Mrs. Tabor did not like a recent Life editorial "What's the Use of Korea?" (Aug. 6) and has written a letter telling us so. In the editorial we said, among other things, that the Korean war was part of the price paid for the education of President Truman and Secretary Acheson. Arguing that the war can be made worth while if our leaders do their duty, we also said that the least result to be expected is firm notice to the Communist alliance that any further armed aggression in Asia will be met and defeated without compromise. Mrs. Tabor's letter of dissent is so eloquent and so much to the point that we share it with our readers in the remainder of this space:

DALLAS, TEX., August 2, 1951.

SIRS: To a war widow, you seem unduly complacent.

Our men did not die in order to educate Truman and Acheson. Such education should have been unnecessary, and any price paid in blood for it is too high. And anyway, we still have no assurance that they now fully understand the nature and purposes of the Communists, are determined to defeat them, and are sufficiently and effectively mobilizing us—that they are really buying time.

If the war has proved to the Communists that we are capable of fighting them, it has also demonstrated that we lack determination to win, that we are willing to compromise and appease. Our men did not die to show they were capable of fighting the Chinese Communist to a stalemate.

And if the fact that our forces won the battle has any meaning, then why can we not at least regain the territory in North Korea that was ours until the Chinese captured it and pushed us back and held us there? Why can we not at least liberate all Korea? Our battle successes and the war training that those who lived have received do not justify our casualties.

Nor is the least that you ask for enough to right the injustice and make it worth the fighting. They did not die in order that we should still have to give notice to the Chinese Communists that further aggression would mean war. Such notice should not at the conclusion of the war be necessary. They died, indeed, to make it unnecessary, to destroy the enemy's will to fight, to effect by their actions what you would have us do by words. They died believing their actions to be a contribution to the bold uncompromising stand that would destroy the Communists' will to fight and thereby prevent a world war, or at least by strengthening the free world's courage and determination insure ultimate victory. They died believing that those who lived after them would fight on till the enemy was defeated. We have broken faith with those men. We have not made such a stand. That alone would justify their dying. Our forces have not won what they were fighting for, and that is what matters.

The display of moral weakness which we have made in Korea can only encourage the Communists to try again, can only assure them that they have nothing to lose and everything to gain by aggression, that next time they may hope for at least a similar compromise. Even if such words as you call for were spoken, what reason is there to expect the enemy to be warned that any future aggression will be punished and defeated when we do not punish or defeat the present aggression? No words that we now speak can erase the effect of our actions.

We have prevented them from taking South Korea, but the Koreans themselves have paid too high a price for such freedom

and security as we can now guarantee them. We have not prevented the Communists from doing what all they set out to do—from retaining power in North Korea, from demonstrating our weakness and their strength, from humiliating us, demoralizing the anti-Communists, and enhancing their own prestige throughout Asia. In fighting such a power as the United States to a stalemate, the Chinese Communists have won a moral victory that will make further conquests that much easier, that much more difficult to prevent.

Considering the plus factors which you enumerate, it is true that we are not very much worse off than when we started. That is small comfort. It does not allay the feeling of horror, the tragic qualm that the compromise raises in us. So much good has been nobly spent to expulse the evil, and still the evil is not expulsed but remains prosperous. They had no right to send men to die without intending to win. If they had wanted to, they could have defeated the Chinese Communists. They have not used every means available to do so. It is not right. It is intolerably unjust.

Sincerely yours,

KATHERINE C TABOR
(Mrs Stanley E Tabor).

THE EDUCATION OF AN AMERICAN

Like so many others of their generation, Katharine and Stanley Tabor thought of themselves as liberals when they got married in Dallas in January 1950. They were Republicans, but not so you'd notice it. "We both had sort of liberal ideas," Mrs. Tabor has since said, "and for a long time we believed the anti-Chiang line." She had studied at Stephens College and Syracuse University, and her husband had taken an engineering degree at Texas A. & M. after he came home from World War II. Before they married he went back into the Army, with a regular commission as first lieutenant. He was ordered to Japan, and Mrs. Tabor was all set to follow him when the Korean war started and Lt. Stanley Tabor was lost at Taejon.

When that happened Katherine Tabor determined to find out what led to Korea. At her parents' home in Dallas, she began to read all she could get her hands on about United States foreign policy. She also read Marx's Communist Manifesto, and she studied up on the differences between socialism and capitalism. By last November, when Mrs. Tabor first told us about her self-education, she had made up her own mind on a fundamental point. She had concluded that the makers of United States foreign policy since World War II had never been determined to defeat world communism—their purpose, as it seemed to her, was always something else.

Get Bill Oatis Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Muncie (Ind.) Star of August 16, 1951:

GET BILL OATIS OUT

At long last the House of Representatives has passed Representative BEAMER'S resolu-

tion demanding an immediate rupture of trade relations with Czechoslovakia. Its purpose is to force the Czech Communist Government to release Bill Oatis, who was railroaded into a Communist jail on false charges of espionage.

It has taken the House long enough to act to protect the rights of an American citizen abroad. It has taken the Senate even longer. But the worst aspect of this whole case is the fact that congressional action should have to be taken at all.

The State Department had full authority to act forcefully and quickly to secure Oatis' release. It has done virtually nothing but protest, send polite notes, and plead inability to do anything else.

The overwhelming vote in the House for action against the Czechs reflects the anger, humiliation, concern, and resentment of the American people over the way in which an American citizen has been mistreated by a foreign government. The obvious purpose of the Czech Communist action is to discredit the United States in the eyes of the world. Because our State Department has resorted to hand-wringing and innocuous protest, that is exactly what has happened. The tough action demanded by the House, if put into practice by our ill-handled State Department might, however, reverse that impression.

When the Senate concurs in the House resolution, as is certain, all trade should be suspended immediately without any legal quibbling. The past acts of the Czech Government restricting freedom, ignoring treaties, and violating agreements should be laid before the world. At the same time the border of Czechoslovakia in Western Germany should be closed tight by United States troops to prevent any movement of trade to and from that country through that area. All nondiplomatic Czechs in business or other professions in the United States should be sent home.

Until Bill Oatis is set free the United States should consider the Czech Communist Government an outlaw to be shunned by all free societies. The most valuable possession in the world is American citizenship. Nothing should be left undone by our Government to protect the rights of all Americans everywhere in the world.

A Decalog for Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article by the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] which appeared in the August 12, 1951, issue of the New York Times Magazine under the title "A Decalogue for Members of Congress."

This challenging statement of principles should stimulate us all to a more thoughtful consideration of the obligations and opportunities of a Member of Congress, and will, I hope, be helpful in encouraging the self-analysis which must be at the root of all efforts to lift the standards of conduct of public officials.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**A DECALOGUE FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS—
SENATOR BENTON OFFERS TEN PRINCIPLES
OF CONDUCT TO COUNTER THE "MORAL CRISIS"
IN OUR POLITICAL LIFE**

(By United States Senator WILLIAM BENTON)

Congress needs a code of ethics. It needs a code of conduct to parallel its powers, its rules, and its customs. Good government—a fundamental social expression of a civilized society—can exist only where men formulate standards of decent behavior and attempt conscientiously to abide by them. These standards should be based not upon "I want" or "I fear" but upon "I ought."

Professor Toynbee has traced the decline and fall of many ancient civilizations to the undermining of their moral fiber. The more successful they became, the more certain that their power and wealth would corrupt and thus destroy. Constitutional democracy, on the other hand, has steadily progressed through the ages. In constitutional democracy moral restraints have tempered political power.

Today the challenge to good government blankets the world. In the current battle for the minds and hearts and loyalties of peoples everywhere, our greatest weapons are moral ideas. Modern Communist leaders reserve their bitterest scorn for what they call "bourgeois morality." They know that the real chasm which separates us from them is not our stockpile of atom bombs or our industrial genius, but our reverence for a few great ideas—ideas which reach back more than three thousand years.

Every public-office holder, in every level of government, shares this heritage. But since it is the legislative process which is the heartbeat of democracy, it is the Congress which largely sets the tone of American political morality.

We in the Senate and the House need a constant reminder that, as Senator Fulbright recently said, "legal behavior is not necessarily ethical behavior." I have made an attempt—a quick, rough attempt—at drafting an ethical code, a kind of Congressional Ten Commandments or Decalogue. I presented this code to Senator Douglass' subcommittee, which has been holding hearings on the Fulbright resolution to establish a Federal Commission on Ethics. I presented it as a basis for discussion in and out of the Congress. My hope is that my background in business, education, and the executive branch of the Government, coupled with relative newness in the Senate, may give me fresh perspective on this old problem.

I welcome any additions or qualifications. My goal is the adoption of a code as a part of the swearing-in procedure in the Congress. Ethical codes, like conscience, do not make men perfect, but, at least, in the word of an old New Englander, they make us "durn uncomfortable when we're being bad."

Here is my suggested Decalogue:

As a Member of the Congress of the United States, I do solemnly subscribe to the following code and do pledge my strength and honor to its fulfillment:

I

In the same sense in which a judge debars himself from decisions in which he has a direct personal financial stake, so I shall debar myself from legislative decisions, or, if I take action or choose to vote, I shall fully disclose the nature of my interest.

This First Commandment is, in essence, a basic ethical principle which runs through our entire legal system. A few years ago a Representative used his tremendous power as chairman of a House committee to arrange

for war contracts which would bring large profits to a company in which he had a financial interest. He was convicted and imprisoned. This was right and just.

Unfortunately, the proper formulation of an ethical standard in this area is not easy. Carried to its logical absurdity, this Commandment would make it impossible for any legislator to vote on a tax bill. Furthermore, most Members of Congress have financial interests which are directly or indirectly affected by much general legislation. The dividing line cannot be exactly defined, but it can and should be sought—and sensed.

For example, I publish the Encyclopedia Britannica. I wouldn't hesitate to vote for measures to increase world trade, but my ethical indicator should certainly register "danger" on a bill to subsidize the export of reference works.

II

I shall never use my office to exert extra-legal pressures over the decisions of executive or administrative agencies.

Some Members of Congress who would not dream of advancing an issue in which they have a private stake will not hesitate to bring pressure on executive officials in behalf of an important constituent or campaign contributor. Commandment II is aimed at just this type of persistent and improper congressional behavior. There are few more demoralizing experiences for a conscientious Federal official than to be subjected to such nagging.

The staff of every congressional office understands that it has an obligation to facilitate communication between constituents and Government offices. But each should be made to understand that it does not have the right to demand favors that might be termed extra-legal. Nothing else in our political system wreaks more moral havoc than the assumption that the best way to get what one wants is by political "pull."

III

I shall treat witnesses who testify before committees on which I sit with courtesy and fairness, following self-imposed limitations which for centuries have been the hallmark of the judicial process.

Personal abuse has more than once been a feature of congressional hearings. Congressional hearings are, as we all recognize, one of the most important parts of the legislative process. Fortunately the overwhelming majority of Members of Congress do treat witnesses with fairness and courtesy. But when witnesses are beaten with a psychological rubber hose, when conscientious public servants and distinguished private citizens are made to serve as targets for irresponsible publicity seekers, the result becomes a travesty of the democratic system.

When I served as Assistant Secretary of State there was one occasion, in my attempts to preserve the Voice of America program before the Appropriations Committee, when I wished that the honorable conventions of dueling had not become outmoded. I know businessmen who have left Government service because of their fear of possible indignities in congressional cross-examinations.

IV

I shall not abuse my privilege of congressional immunity; I shall not say things on the floor of Congress that I am not prepared to say outside, nor shall I betray the official confidence of the Congress or of any committee thereof.

Congressional immunity exonerates Members on the floor from the ordinary laws of libel and slander. There are good reasons for such immunity, but its abuse has been monstrous in recent years. A way must be found to encourage the most careful restraint. In my opinion, Senator McCarthy

has lowered the respect of decent people for representative government by his attacks upon the character of respectable citizens from the sanctuary of the Senate floor.

Almost as reprehensible is the "leaking" of specific confidential information by legislators, sometimes to gain the support of powerful commentators or favored reporters. The Congressman who leaked to the press the number of B-36's in our Air Force is hardly in position to hurl accusations about security risks among civil servants.

The problem, however, is far larger than military secrets. The convention of having certain kinds of remarks made off the record is partly designed to protect the reputation of individuals before all the facts are known and sorted and weighed. If allegations are leaked to the press, an innocent man may find his reputation destroyed.

V

I shall not indulge in personal vilification of any kind, but I shall not hesitate to criticize public figures and public policies with determination and courage whenever facts of a public nature justify such criticism.

Commandments III, IV, and V of my decalogue all revolve mainly around abuse of the congressional privilege to talk—in committee and on the floor.

At the same time it must be emphasized that the investigative and deliberative functions of the legislator require him to speak out courageously, to root out crime or correct error.

VI

I shall not vote on any issue without an attempt to consider the voiceless interest of the unorganized in our society.

No one who sat, as I did in May and June, through six weeks of hearings before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on the question of extending and strengthening the Defense Production Act, can ever again doubt the effectiveness of organized pressure groups in getting the votes they want—or the importance of the ethical issues involved in the crude favoritism shown to such groups. The committee heard from scores of witnesses—from meat producers, wool growers, real-estate operators, small business and big business, small agriculture and big agriculture, the NAM, the AFL, and the CIO. Most witnesses wanted controls for the other fellow first, or wanted no controls at all.

What about, one wonders, the little fellow who wasn't there? The annuitant, the pensioner, the housewife—the unorganized millions of consumers? Inflation may annoy the strong, but it destroys the defenseless. The general welfare is far more than the sum of the demand of particular interest groups.

Commandment VI pledges each member of Congress to heed that voiceless interest, the general welfare. In all committee hearings one empty chair should be set aside for Banquo's ghost—for the welfare of the tens of millions of unorganized. Special-interest groups are a natural part of democracy, but their demands must be measured in terms of a public interest which transcends the conflicting goals of organized lobbies.

VII

I shall strive constantly to interpret the interests of my constituents in the perspective of the total national interest.

This Commandment is directed to the most difficult special-interest group with which any Congressman must deal: the voters who elected him. The members of his district or State roughly correspond to stockholders in a corporation. The voters feel he is their man, that he works for them. His dilemma is to win their understanding when he puts the national interest, often a long-range interest, above their local, and often short-range, benefits.

Representative government sees to it that the various local and group interests are considered in the making of national policy. Representative government does not, however, necessarily insure that the national interest shall be considered. Witness, for example, the depredations of the silver bloc and the beef lobby.

The guiding principle to be established for every Member of the Congress should be—to paraphrase an old business slogan—that “what is good for America is good for my Congressional district.” This requires a high degree of statesmanship. Many profess it. Few attain it.

Let us take one phase of the record on the Defense Production Act as an example. The Nation owes a debt of gratitude to Senators MORSE and ANDERSON, who courageously opposed the beef interests in their own States. Charles Wilson and Eric Johnston merit public acclaim and support for their moral courage in putting national interest above the pressure of the big business lobbies which some mistaken people thought they represented.

VIII

I shall try to be loyal to the promises of my political party, and thus strengthen party teamwork and party responsibility in the Congress.

In my opinion the examples of statesmanship just cited can be sustained and extended by strengthening party teamwork on the floor. Hence Commandment VIII.

The Lone Ranger is an attractive figure on the mesa, but in politics and in football he makes less sense. The quarterback who plays to the grandstand is rarely as useful as the quarterback who works with the team. The two major parties in America formulate platforms every four years and party policy at intermediate intervals. The American people have a right to expect that party steering committees can rise above the indictment that they seldom meet and never steer.

Furthermore, the strengthening of party teamwork in the legislative process can mean progress toward correcting the vast diffusion of effort which constitutes perhaps the most serious practical problem facing Congress today. The atomization of power in the Congress leads to irresponsible action and to a dispersal of energies which America can no longer afford. Teamwork does not mean blind obedience; it merely means the cooperative relationship of courageous individuals.

IX

I shall not waste my own or my colleagues' time with irrelevant and inconsequential talk in committee or on the floor.

During the days of gas rationing in World War II, patriotic signs went up everywhere: “Is this trip really necessary?” A few signs should be hung around Capitol Hill asking, “Is this talk really necessary?”

The word “bunk” comes from the long-winded oration of a Congressman from Buncombe County, N. C., back in 1820; when his colleagues complained, he admitted he was just “speaking for Buncombe.” Buncombe became bunkum and finally bunk. The accumulation of Congressional irrelevances, or bunk, occupies hundreds of pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and adds up to months of time of the Senate and House.

It is true that what is irrelevant to one legislator may have top priority to another, but Senate procedure can become a shambles when debate on one measure may be interrupted for days or weeks by talk on other subjects. At the least, the Senate should adopt and enforce a rule requiring debate to be germane to the pending business, a rule which has operated effectively in the House and in most parliaments of the free world.

X

Whether as a member of the majority or the minority, I shall attempt in all my actions and words to educate and clarify, never to obscure or confuse.

The target of this last commandment is the public. In doing his full part, each individual Congressman has a duty to educate and clarify public opinion, in the Nation's interest. President Roosevelt once said that the statesman's first job is to educate. Modern legislation is so complex in much of its substance that citizens (and legislators) suffer from an almost perpetual intellectual frustration. Most of us in Congress are not experts, and it would be a national calamity if we became experts. Our job is to interpret the talk of the experts so that complex issues are reduced to understandable terms.

When legislators fail to do this, or when they deliberately obfuscate, they are contributing to the downfall of constitutional democracy.

By presenting my Decalogue at this time I do not remotely imply any special reflection on the membership of the present Congress. Most of the problems I am discussing are as old as organized government. Few recall today some of the gross abuses on behalf of personal and group interests in the first Congress under our first President.

While I condemn those ethical transgressions which have occurred in recent years, such misdeeds should not be allowed to obscure the many good things in the current record of public administration. To cite one of many examples, billions in postwar foreign aid have been administered by ECA without a breath of scandal. To cite another, billions were dispersed under two great public servants, Secretary of Commerce Jesse Jones and Assistant Secretary Will Clayton, and two thousand plants were built during the war, and no charge of wrongdoing has yet developed from any source. Tens of thousands of people participated in this operation. I shall go further and attest to the fact that I have seen more moral courage displayed on many issues by many on Capitol Hill than I have seen in thirty years of experience in and around the business community.

Nevertheless, the combination of money, influence, and power will always tempt the weak and the guileless in public office. Our salvation is that human behavior is, in part, socially conditioned. The code I have suggested would go a long way toward helping to create an atmosphere at the Capitol in which ethical standards and moral courage would flourish.

Secretary Chapman Calls for Mobilization of Nation's Mineral Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mr. D'EWART. The United States Bureau of Mines issued a press release last Sunday, August 19, entitled “Chapman Urges Mobilization of Mineral Resources.” The Secretary of the Interior calls for “intensified exploration of mineral deposits and expanded mining of known reserves as the answer to an alarming decline in this Nation's level of self-sufficiency in many strategic and

critical minerals and metals.” Secretary Chapman also stated that “This country's trend toward greater dependence on foreign sources for some of our most essential metals and nonmetallics must be reversed.” The release also called attention to the fact that “in the 6 years since the end of World War II, the ratio of domestic mine production to consumption of primary material in 38 important industrial minerals has been decreasing.”

I heartily endorse Secretary Chapman's statements as to the need for the mobilization of our Nation's mineral resources. No phase of the national security has been more neglected. However, I wish to bring attention to the fact that the Congress, in passing the Defense Production Act of 1950, authorized the President, through delegated agencies, to expand the domestic production of essential minerals and metals by assisting in the exploration, development, and mining of domestic mineral deposits by private enterprise by means of Government loans, advances against production, Government participation in the cost of exploration and development, contracts and guaranties, incentive payments or overmarket prices for marginal production, and other forms of assistance.

I also wish to call attention to the fact that although responsibility for the mobilization of domestic mineral resources under the Defense Production Act has resided in the Secretary for the past 10 or 11 months he has neither taken nor proposed specific programs which would accomplish the end result he now calls for—apparently from the new Defense Materials Procurement Agency being created by the President, to which he expects to nominate Jess Larson as Administrator.

The record of the Secretary's Defense Minerals Administration stands in evidence of his utter failure to mobilize this Nation's mineral resources during the period he was charged with such responsibility. However, I urge that the Secretary and his Department extend all possible assistance and cooperation to the Defense Materials Procurement Agency and its Administrator; they will need such help if they are to mobilize the Nation's mineral resources as now called for by the Secretary of the Interior and which our national security demands.

The Bureau of Mines press release follows:

CHAPMAN URGES MOBILIZATION OF MINERAL RESOURCES

Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman today called for intensified exploration of mineral deposits and expanded mining of known reserves as the answer to an alarming decline in this Nation's level of self-sufficiency in many strategic and critical minerals and metals.

This country's trend toward greater dependence on foreign sources for some of our most essential metals and nonmetallics must be reversed, said Secretary Chapman.

While he pointed out that the domestic minerals industries have been doing a good job to supply the ever-increasing demands of the civilian and military economy, further expansion of sound projects is possible under the Government-assistance programs

authorized by the amended Defense Production Act.

Secretary Chapman said he was convinced that, within this framework, the American minerals industry can meet demand with respect to several important raw materials. He said, however, the industry must plan not only for the present defense emergencies, but also for the long pull in the years to come when domestic supplies of certain minerals may become more scarce.

Accelerated exploration and development of additional ore reserves, improvement in present mining and metallurgical practices, utilization of marginal deposits, elimination of all possible waste, and the development of alternate materials, particularly those from more abundant sources, are some of the remedies proposed by the Secretary.

A chart prepared by the Bureau of Mines reveals that in the 6 years since the end of World War II, the ratio of domestic mine production to consumption of primary material in 38 important industrial minerals has been decreasing. Estimates for 1951, compared with figures for the 1940-44 period, show that the United States has a lowered self-sufficiency in 25 commodities, including such metals as copper, lead, zinc, and iron ore; an improved position in only 7; and an unchanged situation in 6.

Comparing 1951 estimates with the prewar period of 1935-39, the Bureau of Mines reports that there is a lowered self-sufficiency in 21 commodities, improving self-sufficiency in 12 commodities, and an unchanged situation in 5.

These estimates, the Bureau of Mines pointed out, illustrate that while there has been a general lowering of the self-sufficiency for a generation or more, the most noticeable drop occurred after World War II. This war itself exacted a tremendous toll in mineral resources, but the ever-expanding demands of the postwar years are claiming an even greater stock of our irreplaceable natural resources.

The chart entitled "United States Self-Sufficiency in Principal Industrial Minerals," which contains the data of the Bureau's survey, covers 38 minerals and mineral fuels. Three periods are shown—the prewar era of 1935-39, the World War II period of 1940-44, and current 1951. Self-sufficiency is shown as a percentage, representing the ratio of domestic mine production to United States consumption of primary materials. For instance, in 1951 the Bureau estimates that United States mines will produce 65 percent of the country's requirements of primary copper and import most of the remaining 35 percent. Thus the copper self-sufficiency is described as 65 percent. Similar percentages are given for all of the 38 commodities.

Bureau estimates for 1951 reveal that there are only nine commodities which the United States will produce this year in sufficient quantities to meet or exceed consumption demands for primary materials. They are sulfur, molybdenum, anthracite, bituminous coal and lignite, phosphate rock, salt, natural gas, helium, and magnesium.

In the 90-100 percent self-sufficiency range this year are nitrates, iron ore, and petroleum. Ilmenite and potash are in the 80-90 percent bracket, while the self-sufficiency range is 60-80 percent for copper, zinc, rutile, and fluorspar.

There are seven strategic commodities for which this Nation is virtually dependent upon foreign sources this year. They are industrial diamonds, quartz crystals, tin, chromite, nickel, strategic mica, and long-fiber asbestos. The United States will produce a minute percentage of its tantalum requirements this year, 8 percent of the manganese needed in making steel; 9 percent of its mercury; 10 percent of its cobalt; 20 percent of flake graphite, 38 percent of baux-

ite; 55 percent of lead; and 26 percent of its antimony needs. The difference in this mine production and consumption of primary materials has to be filled in from other sources, largely by imports and some by the recovery of scrap materials.

In evaluating the mineral position of 1951 with that of the World War II period, the Bureau's estimates reveal the following:

Declining self-sufficiency in 25 commodities: Nitrates, iron ore, petroleum, potash, zinc, copper, fluorspar, bismuth, lead, tungsten, cadmium, arsenic, bauxite, flake graphite, mercury, manganese, platinum metals, tantalum, long-fiber asbestos, strategic mica, chromite, molybdenum, phosphate rock, magnesium, and nickel.

Improved self-sufficiency: Sulfur, anthracite, bituminous coal and lignite, salt, ilmenite, rutile, and antimony.

Situation unchanged: Natural gas, helium, cobalt, tin, quartz crystals, and industrial diamonds. (Note that three of these, tin, quartz, and diamonds, represent a continued virtual dependence on foreign sources.)

Airborne Operations in National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted at a recent convention of the Eighty-second Airborne Division Association in Chicago.

This resolution came to me from Father George B. Wood, rector of the Trinity Episcopal Church in Fort Wayne, Ind., the former division chaplain, who has been for 2 years president of the association. It reflects the concern of these veterans as to an important aspect of our defense program.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the veterans of the Eighty-second Airborne Division, world famous for its spectacular and successful operations in Sicily, Italy, Normandy, and Holland, have, for the fifth time, foregathered in annual convention to renew the esprit d'corps for which that group of 58,000 veterans is justly proud, to consider problems of national defense, and to join again in tribute to its honored dead, now numbering 3,228; and

Whereas it is the consensus of this convention that airborne operations provide one of the greatest military weapons of modern times, wherein speed, mobility, and freedom from cumbersome concentrations of troops and equipment is essential; and

Whereas it has come to the attention of this convention that airborne potentialities are not receiving the emphasis required for the maximum efficiency of our Military Establishment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by this convention, That the President and Congress of the United States and the proper military authorities are hereby urged, in the interest of national defense, to place greater emphasis on the value of airborne operations, to increase the number of such airborne troops, to provide in greater quantities the modern and effective troop-carrying planes which have been developed for such purpose and generally to maintain

airborne operations in the high position which, through repeated tests in major battles, they justly deserve; and further

Resolved, That in the interest of national defense and for the love of the country for which the veterans of the Eighty-second Airborne Division have bled and died, we, the surviving veterans of that division hereby pledge ourselves to work individually and jointly until the objectives of this resolution are fully attained.

Admission to Army and Naval Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, on August 16, I introduced H. R. 5202, which provides that all cadets appointed to West Point and all midshipmen appointed to the Naval Academy would be selected from the enlisted ranks of the various services, provided that no man will be appointed until he has served a minimum of 1 year in the enlisted ranks and proves his qualification through a service-wide competitive examination.

I believe that the system set forth in this bill would serve a number of purposes, all aimed at attaining the highest standard of officer in the Armed Forces of the United States.

An officer who has served a term as an enlisted man in one of the Armed Forces would, because of that service, be better able to understand the duties expected of an officer, and, moreover, what an officer can expect from the personnel subordinated to him. This officer would be endowed by his enlisted service with a much wider scope of the working mechanism of the service.

The present system of congressional appointment, while taken as a serious and important matter by Congressmen and Senators, is faulty in itself. Various means are used by Members in selecting the young men to whom they give appointments. I, myself, use the system of a competitive civil-service examination. Others employ other ways of judging scholastic abilities.

These methods, however good for judging scholastic ability, do not supply an indication of the leadership qualities of the appointee. Leadership ability is the prime factor in a good officer, and the only way to discover and develop this factor is by observing the actions of prospective officers in working with other personnel. If an enlisted man in any of the services shows definite signs of being able to cooperate with and lead his fellow servicemen, it is a very good indication that he is good officer material.

The system which I propose in this bill would also, during peacetime, be an incentive for enlistments in the Armed Forces and in the various civilian components. In addition it would assure the

services of getting men who seriously intend to make a life work and a career of service to their country. No longer would young men seek appointments to the service Academies with the only purpose in mind being the attainment of an education and release from the service after serving the minimum time.

This system would relieve the very serious situation of high-powered pressure on athletes and on Members of Congress to appoint these athletes. It would not abolish football in the Academies, but it would place it in its proper perspective, in subordination to the more important job of training the highest caliber of officers for the Armed Forces of the United States.

In my estimation, this is the only completely democratic way in which these appointments can be made. Appointees to the Academies would be there by reason of their sole grace of ability and for no other reason. Those who were appointed would be so by their own merits alone and not because of family or background. And, more important, they would be there with one purpose in mind; to gain in wisdom and ability in order to better serve their country and the people who trust in them for defense against enemies of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks, I include the following editorial from the *Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer* of Saturday, August 18, 1951:

RAMSAY BILL HAS MERIT

Congressman ROBERT L. RAMSAY has introduced a bill relating to appointments to the service academies which merits the serious consideration of every Member of the House of Representatives.

His bill, introduced in the House this past Thursday, provides that all appointments to the service academies shall be made from the enlisted ranks of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force. Appointments to the various reserve officer college training programs would be made from enlisted ranks of civilian components of the different Armed Forces.

In support of his proposal, Mr. RAMSAY said:

"I have long felt that our system for selecting officers for our Armed Forces should be changed. I have felt that all officer candidates should have served in the ranks. I believe we will have better leaders.

"Cadets who have earned the right to seek commissions as officers, and who intend to make the military service a career, would more fully appreciate the obligations of a future officer and gentleman and would be less likely to violate any code.

"Finally, my proposal would, during peacetime, be an incentive for enlistments in the regular services and in their reserve components."

It has been our own observation in the past that military officers who had served in the ranks or who came up through the ranks made better-than-average leaders. Few officers can fully appreciate their duties and their position without having served in the ranks first.

Mr. RAMSAY's bill would not discourage young men who are sincerely interested in a military career. Too many of the young men now in West Point and Annapolis do not intend to become professional soldiers. These less serious officer candidates range all the way from professional football players to sons of people of influence. The former

play football and the latter play soldier, and after they complete their schooling they generally resign their commissions. Forever after they bask in the distinction of having been a West Point man.

Such a bill would surely encourage enlistments in peacetime. By restricting academy appointments to enlisted men the services could encourage every man to put forth his best efforts. Before any officer can become truly outstanding he must establish himself as a man's man and a soldier's soldier. There is no better place to establish such a reputation than in the enlisted ranks.

Ten Rules for Peace of Mind in Time of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following, which appeared recently in the bulletin of the Trinity Methodist Church of Alexandria, Va., which my family and I attend. This very inspirational article is taken from the *Virginia Methodist Advocate* and will be helpful, I am sure, to all who have an opportunity to read it:

TEN RULES FOR PEACE OF MIND IN TIME OF WAR

1. Keep wholesomely busy. The idle mind may become the breeding mind. An empty head will not be empty long.

2. Live one day at a time. Our Creator has not endowed us with the ability to carry tomorrow's burdens today.

3. Hear what the centuries say to the hours. Take the long look. Along with the latest news flashes put the eternal messages of God. With the daily newspapers in one hand keep the New Testament in the other.

4. Do not worry about an atom bomb attack. People have survived even such an attack and methods of safeguard are being devised. An emotional explosion within your own life may do more harm.

5. Avoid focusing your mind on what is wrong with the world. You will live longer and happier if you will think of what is right with the world.

6. Express aggressive good will daily by acts of kindness and love. Ill will and hatred are poison to the human system. Deep satisfactions come in doing good to others.

7. Keep yourself mentally plastic, pliable, flexible. Be willing to face life's changing scenes. Don't be rigid, fixed, unbending. Be prepared to make adjustments.

8. Exercise faith in yourself, your daily comrades, and your Creator. Faith is healing and energizing. It can remove insurmountable barriers.

9. Avoid undue fatigue. When we work on our nerve we often lose what we cannot easily replace. Sometimes to rest, relax, be quiet is more important than to keep on going. Peace of mind is less likely when we are tired.

10. Walk daily with your God, hand in hand, as a child walks with his father. He will give light on your path, guard you from evil, relieve tensions, and speak peace to your soul.

Guilty Consciences About Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I am including an article by William Henry Chamberlin that appears in the *New Leader* for August 20, 1951.

Apologists for Yalta assert that it was a good contract except that Stalin failed to keep his part of it. It is a legal truism that any contract is only as good as the parties who enter into it. The United States was on notice that the Soviet never kept an agreement. The instances are too numerous to mention, except one and that was executed between Hitler-Stalin in 1939. To say now "that the real point about Yalta is that it was a pretty good deal, if the other parties to the bargain had only kept it," as the Alsops have written, is to be simple to the extreme. Apologists for Yalta should admit that it was a very bad agreement and the American people are paying a fancy price for the contractual blunders contained in it. It is the blackest day in American history.

The article follows:

GUILTY CONSCIENCES ABOUT YALTA

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

Conscience, according to Shakespeare, makes cowards of us all. However that may be, there is nothing like an international shady deal to produce a crop of apologists.

The Yalta agreement of February 1945 has been the subject of many labored apologies, from Roosevelt's speech in Congress after his return from signing it to Acheson's recent statement before the joint Senate committee on the MacArthur dismissal.

One champion of Yalta was the late Edward Stettinius, who hit on the quaint argument that it was a great victory to induce the Soviet leaders to sign certain pledges, regardless of whether they were carried out. This is like praising as a financial genius a man who accepted large sums in worthless checks.

Now the Alsop team of columnists has leaped into the Yalta breach. Writing in the *New York Herald Tribune* of July 22, they blithely assure their readers that "the real point about Yalta is that it was a pretty good deal, if the other parties to the bargain had only kept it."

Now this by no means original assertion leads logically and inescapably to certain other questions. Was it "a pretty good deal" to sanction the complete scrapping of the Atlantic Charter while hypocritically professing respect for its principles? The acceptance of the so-called Curzon line eastern frontier for Poland, the detachment of large unspecified chunks of ethnically German territory for cession to the Soviet Union and Poland were decisions in flagrant violation of the self-determination clauses of the Atlantic Charter.

Was it a "pretty good deal" to recognize the legitimacy of human slavery by authorizing the use of the labor of German war prisoners as "reparations"? This was another feature of the Yalta agreement which its apologists are fond of forgetting.

Was it a "pretty good deal" to make ourselves partners in an infamous fugitive-slave

contract, consenting to hand back to Soviet executioners all escaped Soviet citizens found in the western zones? There were scenes of indescribable human misery, including many suicides, when this feature of the pact was carried out. One can hardly imagine a greater handicap to the success of our present belated policy of seeking to organize a resistance movement among the peoples of the U. S. S. R.

Was it a "pretty good deal" to turn over to Stalin the economic control of Manchuria, strategic key to China? Here the Alsops, who, like most apologists for Yalta, simply pass over in silence many of its most objectionable features, counting on public ignorance and forgetfulness, become more articulate. They repeat the familiar argument that Roosevelt's military advisers wanted to buy Russian aid in the conquest of Japan, "which was officially estimated likely to cost 2 years and half a million American lives."

This is merely an indictment of the appallingly bad intelligence accepted by these military advisers. Japan's air and naval power had been knocked out by the time of Yalta. There had been a number of Japanese peace feelers. Had the United States had the wisdom to offer Japan in 1945 the reasonable, nonvindictive peace worked out in 1951, is it not almost certain that Japan would have concluded a quick peace and permitted American troops to replace Japanese in Manchuria? Then the Russian invasion would probably never have occurred.

And if the Chinese Communists had not received large quantities of Japanese arms from the Red army, at a time when General Marshall, pursuing the will-o'-the-wisp of a coalition government with the Communists, imposed a complete embargo on United States arms shipments to the Nationalists, there is a better than even chance that the Communists would never have conquered China. Was it a "pretty good deal" to have facilitated that?

The Alsops offer some extremely dubious speculations of Yugoslav Communists as evidence that Stalin tried to carry out the Yalta agreement regarding China and Yugoslavia, until our precipitate demobilization convinced him there was no power behind United States diplomacy. This demobilization was a great mistake.

But it is a matter of record that the ink on the Yalta agreement was hardly dry when the Soviet Union violated it by imposing a puppet government on Rumania and by carrying out a reign of terror in Poland, calculated to make the pledged "free and unfettered elections" impossible.

Is there any reason in logic or common sense why Stalin should have earnestly tried to fulfill in China and Yugoslavia an agreement which he treated as a scrap of paper in Poland and Rumania?

It is a great pity that the Yalta issue has never been thrashed out in some public forum. It is one of my own still-unrealized dreams to get some defender of Yalta into a debating ring where it would be possible to demand straightforward answers to questions which are customarily passed over in silence or glossed over in misrepresentation.

The Public Should Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my re-

marks in the Appendix, I include editorial comment by Mr. John S. Knight, editor-publisher, which appeared in the August 5, 1951, issue of the Detroit Free Press.

The bill H. R. 3341, introduced by me, is intended to restore to the States their discretion in the publication of details of public-assistance programs.

The Free Press editorial follows:

THE PUBLIC SHOULD KNOW

Federal Social Security Administrator Oscar R. Ewing has cut off the State of Indiana from Federal welfare aid because of a new Indiana law, opening the names on welfare rolls to public inspection.

The bill was aimed at discouraging welfare chiselers after a series of articles in the Chicago Daily News revealed shocking relief frauds in Indiana and other sections of the country.

Administrator Ewing points out that the Indiana statute is in conflict with a congressional requirement that States receiving Federal social-security aid must keep their relief rolls secret.

There can be no quarrel with Ewing's legal position, but he would be on better moral ground if he had argued congressional support of proposals removing the secrecy requirement.

The secrecy repealer has been passed by the Senate but is presently bottled up in a House committee.

The State of Indiana is to be congratulated for insisting that the public is entitled to know how and where its tax money is being spent.

A similar law was passed by the Illinois Legislature and signed by Gov. Adlai Stevenson, except that the Illinois action will not go into effect until Congress has repealed the secrecy section of the Social Security Act.

Alabama, Georgia, and Oklahoma are among other States backing the antisecrecy campaign.

WHAT THE FREE PRESS EXPOSED

Exponents of what the Detroit Free Press calls social workerism will go into a tearful tempest over this long overdue move to separate the cheaters from the needy.

But Free Press exposures of relief money being advanced to play the races and finance vacation trips to Florida should be enough to convince the taxpayer that he has been played for a sucker with Uncle Sam's help.

The United States House of Representatives should get in step with the Senate and lift social security's lace curtain.

There is no justification for concealment in the spending of public funds.

The General Trade Agreements Handcuffs; for Example, Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the following address by O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the National Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy, over radio station WOL on August 19 is especially timely in view of the pending outcry against the treatment received behind the iron curtain by William Oatis. This example well illustrates a point in which Congress ought to find a

keen interest in the hope these handicaps may be eliminated from our foreign trade agreements. The address follows:

Mr. William Oatis, Associated Press correspondent, is still in jail in Czechoslovakia. The recent announcement by the State Department that the United States has decided to abrogate our trade agreement with Czechoslovakia was gratifying news. This action, however, was already required under the Trade Agreements Extension Act, which became law in the middle of June or 2 months ago.

The announcement gave notice that this country was taking steps in accordance with the provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to abrogate our agreement with Czechoslovakia. The actual outcome therefore awaits the meeting in mid-September of all the countries, some 30 in number, that are members of the general agreement. The decision rests, not with us, but with the signatory countries. We could be outvoted but will probably be sustained. The delay involved in this procedure and the dependence of the outcome upon the vote by many nations throws a revealing light on the degree to which the general agreement has impaired our national sovereignty.

How many people know that we entered into an agreement of this character in Geneva, Switzerland, on October 30, 1947?

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, or GATT, as that pact is more generally called, was not submitted to the Senate for ratification as a treaty, although its provisions in important respects conflict with some of our existing laws. Nor was it submitted to the two Houses of Congress for ratification by majority vote. It was put into force as an Executive agreement, provisionally. Under this general agreement two additional multilateral trade agreements have been made, one in 1949, known as the Annecy agreement, and the other in 1951, known as the Torquay agreement.

After more than 3½ years and two international conferences, i. e., Annecy and Torquay, just mentioned, the general agreement is still labeled "provisional."

Why?

Because Congress has not yet modified those of our existing laws that run counter to some of the provisions of the agreement, to bring them into conformity with it. Has Congress then overlooked the agreement?

Not exactly. When the trade-agreements law was extended for two more years last June special words of caution were written into it that enactment of the bill did not indicate approval or disapproval of GATT.

It may be recalled by those who keep abreast of international commercial and economic relations that beginning in 1945 the State Department proposed and promoted what was to be the International Trade Organization, between known by its initials, as ITO. After four or five international conferences, the charter for such an organization was signed in Havana, Cuba, March 24, 1948. Nearly all the general provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, already referred to, were contained in the charter for an International Trade Organization. The principal difference was that the ITO charter was even broader and more ambitious in its expressed purpose and its implications than the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Another difference was that under the general agreement sweeping tariff reductions were made, whereas ITO only proposed the rules by which further reductions were to be made in the future.

Now, the Department of State did agree to submit the ITO charter to both Houses of Congress for ratification by majority vote, rather than submitting it to the Senate as

a treaty, under a constitutional provision that requires two-thirds vote for approval.

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs held public hearings on the charter in April and May, 1950. Heavy opposition developed and the committee pigeonholed the bill, i. e., did not report it to the House. In December 1950, or about 6 months later, the State Department gave up its campaign and the decision was reached to withdraw the ratification resolution from Congress entirely. In other words, the charter had not prospered in Congress and rather than face overt defeat in a vote, the State Department abandoned its painstakingly nurtured child.

Where did this retreat leave the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which is sometimes referred to as the little ITO because of its similarity to its ill-fated forerunner?

The first question arises why, if the ITO charter was submitted to Congress for ratification, has the general agreement been withheld? Was it because the ITO, having been used as a stalking horse, was shot down and its was thought that the general agreement would meet the same fate?

The second question is, if the ITO charter could not become effective without congressional ratification, on what authority has the general agreement been carried into effect to the advanced degree that it has?

If you have followed this background sketch thus far you will perhaps be interested in knowing that the State Department is now seeking modification of our laws to conform them to the general agreement. How? Has the Department prepared a bill labeled so that it would be recognized as ratification of that agreement? Has it asked Congress outright for such a ratification?

No. The State Department has found what appears to be a convenient and suitable vehicle to gain its end without exposing the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to the fate of the ITO charter. It seeks to utilize a bill that recommends itself by its very title, namely, "The Customs Simplification Bill," hearings on which have been held before the House Ways and Means Committee during the past 2 weeks.

The customs simplifications bill is sponsored by the Treasury Department and is based principally upon recommendations made by an outside management engineering firm after a detailed study. Its purpose is to bring our customs administration up to date, to simplify it, and to reduce the time and cost of passing imports through our ports. These objectives are, of course, very laudable, and the bill provides an admirable vehicle for State Department purposes.

In 1950 the Treasury Department issued an analysis of the bill. In this analysis it is stated that "some of the provisions contained in this bill parallel certain customs administrative provisions of the International Trade Organization." That is the Organization, remember, that was not accepted by Congress.

The analysis adds that "In general, passage of these same amendments would enable this Government to make fully effective the administrative provisions of the general agreement on tariffs and trade, which is now being applied in the United States on a provisional basis."

In other words, (1) the frontal approach having failed when the ITO Charter was submitted to Congress; (2) the general Agreement on Tariffs and Trade remaining provisional in character until our own laws are amended to conform them to it; (3) the State Department being apprehensive of the fate of a bill designed and put forward frankly as a measure to modify our laws in order to conform them to the agreement; and (4) a handy vehicle with a popular inscription appearing on the legislative

scene in the name of the customs simplification bill, the State Department seeks thus indirectly to gain its end where it fears defeat in a frank and open approach, under a full display of its purpose.

The question now arises whether this is a matter of importance or wholly trivial in character. Is it wise for our State Department to seek its ends by offering legislation in a form that is not easily recognized for what it is when that Department fears defeat should it offer the same legislation without disguise? In other words, should the Department seek to gain legislative approval on a controversial issue when, so to speak, the people are not looking?

There is another question at issue. This is whether the executive branch of the Government should make international agreements in a field of delegated authority, some of the provisions of which conflict with existing laws, and then confront Congress with the choice of ratifying what the State Department wishes or placing itself in a position of running out on our international agreements. Should this procedure be countenanced the executive arm could soon coerce Congress into compliance even if Congress should disagree.

Are these matters important? Ask Mr. Oatis in his jail cell. Why and how have we lost freedom to act as a sovereign nation? Have the American people said that we should tie our hands as we have done in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, or has the State Department, proceeding out of disregard of the legislative branch, placed us in this position without the knowledge and consent of the people?

A close reading of the State Department's maneuvers as reflected in its efforts to legitimize the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, as just described, will supply the answer. The action of the House of Representatives this week, when it passed a concurrent resolution by a vote of 363 to 1, declaring that the United States should break off all commercial relations with Czechoslovakia until Mr. Oatis is freed, clearly reveals how far the State Department has bypassed Congress in recent years.

If we value our freedom of action as a nation, not only here, but abroad, we will put the State Department back on its own track and in its proper perspective.

The St. Lawrence Story—IX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the last of a series of articles entitled "The St. Lawrence Story" which appeared in the August 16 edition of the Minneapolis Star. This article summarizes the direct benefits that will accrue to the people of central United States, and the indirect benefits to the whole Nation, from the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project:

THE ST. LAWRENCE STORY—BENEFITS FOR 50 MILLIONS SEEN IN SEAWAY

(By Leo Sonderegger)

(Last in a series)

The deep-throated bellow of the *Queen Mary* will never tremble the aspens on the

hills of Duluth. The *Ile de France* will never drop anchor in Superior bay.

This is a dismal thing to face, but there it is.

Even with the St. Lawrence seaway, the folks out on the prairie are going to have to content themselves with smaller ships when they head for a vacation in the old country.

But once the seaway is pushed through, they will be able to do that—board a good-sized blue-water vessel at Duluth or Milwaukee or Chicago and sail out through half this continent to the ocean and on to the ports of the world.

And the area's farmers will be able to send their dairy products and grain directly—without a long rail haul, without rehandling—to the east coast or ports overseas.

Manufacturers will be able, with one short rail haul to a lake port, to put their goods on ships that will take them straight through to destination.

And the 50,000,000 people who live in the Great Lakes area will reap benefits that always follow creation of a major new channel of contact with the world.

And as those 50,000,000 benefit, the entire Nation will be strengthened, because the United States is a network of peoples with a common fate.

MIDWEST CALLED SELFISH

So it seems to the men who champion the seaway. And so it seems to one who has examined, without bias, the arguments for and against completing it.

Carroll B. Huntress, chairman of the national St. Lawrence project conference, reacts sharply when his group is accused of being a spearhead of selfish interests that don't want the seaway.

"It's really ridiculous to think of selfish interests blocking this," he said when this view was mentioned. "They're no more selfish than the interests of Detroit or Minneapolis. That's just a catch phrase of the demagogues."

Huntress thought a moment and added, "The Middle West is brutally selfish in trying to take away from the East that which the East has built up over the years."

In a sense, Huntress is quite right. The land-locked Midwest does stand to benefit greatly by having a new inlet and outlet, and to that extent its interest is selfish.

The competitive advantage to the Midwest is something that seaway proponents dwell upon in language ranging from lofty idealism to the blunt terms of economic warfare.

A topflight mines geologist who declined use of his name summed up the matter:

"Anything that will cheapen the cost of transportation from the Atlantic seaboard into the heart of the continent is good."

Representative WIER of Minnesota's Third District regards the seaway in somewhat the same broad light. He calls it "a great natural resource that goes right into the middle of the continent in its crude state . . . an outlet and inlet to the great Middle West."

But WIER also sharpens his words to prod at the competitive situation. In his Washington office, he reminded his listener of the boxcar shortage that periodically harries the Midwest.

"The railroads now hold a club over us. They can keep cars out of our area if they want to. If we can't get boxcars let's get some boats. Let's not be hog-tied up in our country and take what we can get."

Senator THYE believes the seaway would help relieve the shortage of cars.

And he thinks the deep channel would ease the pressure on Midwest farmers and exporters in another way.

Rail-freight rates are steadily increasing, THYE points out, "and the cost is charged directly to the Midwest, both in finished goods coming to us and harvest products and products of dairy herds moving out."

LOWER SHIPPING RATES PREDICTED

Oceangoing vessels in head-of-the-Lakes ports would help to modify this trend, THYE believes. They would bring lower freight rates, and handling charges would be reduced.

Julius H. Barnes, of Duluth, who has grown white haired in the battle for the seaway, speaks most often of its benefits to midwestern farmers.

"I believe the value to American agriculture is the chief value of all," he said when asked to sum up his belief.

"Look at the global situation. India is begging millions of bushels of wheat. China, we know, is underfed.

"We can grow the food. The question is how to get it there so cheaply that it will enlarge the market of itself."

Precise figures on how cheaply grain will move via the seaway are not available. The Department of Commerce estimates, however, that savings over rail rates will range from 5 to 10 cents a bushel. The exact amount depends on a number of factors, including the grain's point of origin.

Hard information on package-freight savings is impossible to come by. The variables in that kind of trade are even greater. It is fair to point out, however, that for almost all commodities water is the cheapest form of transportation.

PRESENT FOREIGN SHIPPING CITED

Barnes, who has had a hand in shipping for most of his life, feels that the seaway would be a great stimulant to the Midwest in two ways—by reducing charges on standard articles of commerce and by providing cheap and ready access to both export and import contact with other nations.

Lewis G. Castle, a Duluth banker who has been associated with Barnes for several years in the seaway fight, points to the 74 foreign sailings from Chicago and Milwaukee last year.

These were little ships that clawed their way up the shallow canals and returned with Midwest produce in their holds. If shipping firms consider it worth while to send vessels of that size, Castle believes it follows that they will send big ships when the deep channel is cut through.

Seaway opponents warn that it would be a damaging blow to Minnesota's iron-ore industry. Their line of argument is beguiling but erroneous.

Anything that makes it easier to get high-quality ore from Labrador, they say, will hurt Minnesota. Then they throw in the clincher—easy access to Labrador reserves will slow taconite development to a walk, and Minnesota will never be able to catch up with other areas.

The fact is that, during the foreseeable future, every source of iron will have to be exploited. Taconite, underground expansion, foreign reserves—the rising capacity of American steel mills can absorb them all and demand more.

A high official of one of the companies developing taconite said his firm will not slow down its drive toward production in commercial quantity.

MIDWEST MAY LOSE STEEL PLANTS

Actually, failure to develop the seaway would strike a long-range but effective blow at Minnesota ore, including taconite.

As expensible reserves on the Iron Range dwindle, there will be an increasing demand for Labrador and Venezulean ore. Without the seaway, both areas would, of course, ship to Baltimore, Md., and Philadelphia, Pa.

It is not much of a trick to predict that, with a growing percentage of available ore on the coast, any new steel plants erected would go up there rather than 500 miles away in the Midwest. Inevitably, then, the center of the steel production would shift to the east

and Minnesota ores would have an increasing handicap.

This is important, the effect of the seaway on iron ore. But its biggest influence will nevertheless be felt by agriculture.

In the mind of Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of Army Engineers, the project will be a magnet to stimulate new productivity in a spacious region, including the upper Midwest.

"If you open up the St. Lawrence waterway," he said last June in Duluth, "Minnesota becomes a seaport area. North Dakota and South Dakota will be within a few hundred miles of a seaport."

Pick and other men of like mind believe that grain from Minnesota and the Dakotas, perhaps from as far south as Kansas, will flow in a rising stream over the seaway route to the east coast and overseas ports.

"The best indication of what it will mean," he said, "was visible when we came down the hill into Duluth this evening and saw those tremendous grain elevators."

He was not talking about grain alone. The grain is a symbol. It is a symbol of the produce of a fruitful region gathered at the lake ports for shipment to the world.

Riddled With Corruption

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is an old adage that counsels people not to throw stones if they live in glass houses. One week ago the President, during the ceremonies dedicating the new American Legion building referred to certain people as slander-mongers. He should have been the last man to utter such a remark, when as Felix Morley says, "That this administration is demonstrably riddled with corruption."

Mr. Speaker, the remarks made by the President last Tuesday were obviously so intemperate that Erle Coker, national commander of the American Legion has publicly expressed disagreement with Mr. Truman.

As part of my remarks, I am including a feature article by Mr. Felix Morley, which appears in Barron's for August 20, 1951. I commend it to the attention of every Republican. It carries an important challenge:

THE SLANDERMONGERS—WILL THE GOP TAKE ISSUE WITH TRUMAN'S DEFENSE OF CORRUPTION?

(By Felix Morley)

President Truman's speech to the American Legion last week has come like a flash of lightning in the muggy, mid-August atmosphere of Washington. At least momentarily, it has thrown a lurid illumination on the political scene.

All the politicians of both parties, noted the way in which the President linked communism and corruption as issues on which he says his administration is being simultaneously condemned by "irresponsible slander-mongers." At the Republican National Committee this conjunction was immediately spotted as the heart of a speech

designed to set the stage for the 1952 campaign.

And, as so often happens, Mr. Truman caught the opposition off guard. Because of vacation absences, and the let-down of the dog days, no Republican leader was ready with an immediate answer to the President's undeniably shrewd attack. It is more than possible that Senator Taft will pick up the gauntlet when he makes his important speech to the Maine State Bar Association at Belgrade Lakes this Thursday. But that will be 9 days after Mr. Truman set off his mine in Washington.

There had been a good deal of speculation as to what the President would say when he came to dedicate the new million-dollar national headquarters of the American Legion, located only 3 blocks from the White House.

The political importance of the occasion was obvious, since the Legion is a strong and well-knit organization, which has now successfully merged veterans of both the older and younger generations. One could name at least half a dozen States in which it clearly holds the balance of political power.

Among the scribes and forecasters the consensus of opinion beforehand was that the President on this occasion would avoid the subject of Communist infiltration. The Legion has shown its anxiety about this matter in many ways. With Alger Hiss behind the bars, Mr. Truman would scarcely mention "red herrings" at this time and place.

Therefore the reporters anticipated either a conventional plea for preparedness against Soviet machinations, or a request for Legion backing of the NATO effort, or a charge that the GOP will be responsible if the cost of living mounts further. A majority privately predicted the latter line, for there is no doubt that the administration intends to place the blame for any further inflation on the refusal of Congress to let it regiment the economy completely.

But again, as in 1948, Mr. Truman proved himself a first-class politician. Courageous in attack, as well as unscrupulous, he told the Legionnaires that many who "claim to be against communism . . . are chipping away our basic freedoms just as insidiously and far more effectively than the Communists have ever been able to do."

And this appeal to the sense of "fair play," which seldom leaves an American audience unmoved, was immediately followed by the attack on "irresponsible accusations . . . that our Government is riddled with communism and corruption." That was a clever coupling.

It tucked blatant Senator McCarthy and chivalrous Senator Byrd under a single inviolable blanket. It also nurtured the curiously spreading belief that "our Government" is limited to officeholders under Mr. Truman. Indeed, by a general indictment of the Legislature, the Chief Executive further emphasized the totalitarian idea that elected spokesmen of the people are outside of the "Government."

"You have no way of telling," Mr. Truman said, "When some unfounded accusation may be hurled at you, perhaps straight from the halls of Congress." Among the Legionnaires present, that didn't go down so well. But there was a wider audience.

There is no question that by this speech last week Mr. Truman kicked out the ball for the 1952 campaign in which, also without a shadow of doubt, he hopes to repeat his triumph of 1948.

The attack on Communist infiltration may in some cases have been overdone. Some officials who were no more than stupid, misguided or incompetent have been pilloried as subversives when they could more accurately have been described as unwitting dupes. Mr. Truman does well to remind us that: "Real Americanism means . . ."

a man who is accused of a crime shall be considered innocent until he has been proved guilty."

By the same token, when an official is proved guilty of venality he must no longer be considered innocent. When the Comptroller General names a Federal bureau where "every single employee" accepted bribes, it has to be taken seriously. The same applies when it is demonstrated that "5-percenters" have access to the President's key advisers and when some of his personal appointees, not excluding our representatives abroad, are shown to have been the intimates of racketeers and gangsters.

In the light of exposures by the Kefauver crime committee, by the Fulbright RFC investigation, by the Douglas inquiry into "moral standards" in Government, it is all too apparent that this administration is demonstrably "riddled with corruption." And that situation is not remedied by denying that it is "riddled with communism."

Mr. Truman, perhaps a little too shrewdly, attempts to merge the two separate indictments. Because the charges of serving the Reds will not stick in some cases, he suggests that none of the evidence of moral decay in his entourage is convincing. During the coming campaign, it appears, he will build on this specious argument, saying that all who demand a cleaning of the Augean stables are guilty of "slander or character assassination."

In his notable biography of Hamilton Fish, telling the inside story of President Grant's unsavory administration, the historian, Allan Nevins, made an observation that is very timely today. "The American people," he said (p. 641), "always derives much of its tone from its President." Grant "was upright according to his lights. But the lights were murky, and the tone of his administration delighted knaves and discouraged honest men."

The lights of the Truman administration are also murky and pleasing to knaves. The disclosures of wholesale cheating at West Point, of athletic racketeering at many other once-respected schools, are only the latest specialized instances of a "creeping moral deterioration" that is actually defended and condoned by President Truman: "All my appointees are honorable men."

"To err is human; to forgive divine." But forgiveness must be contingent on repentance. The executive agreement at Yalta, in effect turning China over to Communist control, was a dreadful error. It passed beyond the realm of forgiveness when Secretary Acheson, during the Senate inquiry on General MacArthur, defended it as seeming to be clever at the time.

Now, Mr. Truman makes clear that defense and extenuation of administration corruption is also regarded as smart politics. That line will be a part of his campaign for reelection to the Presidency. The question is whether the GOP will, for its part, visualize this issue of integrity as fundamental, and take its stand thereon.

Weichel Holds Worker Dispersal Plan Is Not Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 17, 1951

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I include the following article from the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

WASHINGTON, July 21.—Administration proposals to disperse industry could, if successful, raise havoc with the lives of thousands of people in northern Ohio, Representative ALVIN F. WEICHEL, Republican, Sandusky, declared today.

Although President Truman's industry-dispersal plan was defeated when administration leaders sought to tie it in with the Defense Production Act, WEICHEL insisted that it is "not yet a dead issue."

He understood, he said, that administration leaders are intent on pressing the plan.

"It would open the door to move industry and workers of industry from the established present locations to those selected by bureaucrats in Washington appointed by the President," WEICHEL said.

The Congressman added that the President could stop the expansion of the steel and other industries in the Great Lakes area, forcing workers to move elsewhere, uprooting their homes and their families who have built and lived with these industries since the beginning.

"This grant of authority asked for by the President would jeopardize industry, the workers and the agricultural areas, especially of northern Ohio and become the back door to socializing men and industries in America," WEICHEL held.

Where Are We Going?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, a young woman in my home State of Maine, Miss Shirley Putnam, of Thomaston, has written a very refreshing editorial entitled "Where Are We Going?" which I commend to the attention of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE ARE WE GOING?

(By Shirley Putnam)

Teachers tell us that we study the history of the past so that we may better prepare ourselves for the future. If this is true it might be profitable to focus our attention on wars, since they are of concern to all world citizens of our age.

Wars are caused by disputes between nations, but they seem to be wanting as a permanent peace, since history reveals a rotating cycle of conflict, each of which is more deadly than the previous one.

Perhaps, there is another solution. If we are to profit by the lessons of history, it would be worth while to search for one.

Until we are ready to face the true causes of war, we shall not know how to weed out the germs which spread it. War doesn't begin when armies open fire on one another or end when the guns are silenced. It begins in the hearts and minds of men and women long before the bugles sound and the drums play. It continues long after the last of the heroic dead have been buried or returning armies have been demobilized.

In order to understand war between nations, we must understand what causes arguments among individuals. All the anger which the individual feels when he considers himself the victim of an injustice is multiplied many times in the anger of a nation composed of many people. When we engage in petty arguments with our schoolmates, we are engaging in an individual war. When we try to push ourselves ahead at the expense of others, we are guilty of causing an individual war. When we allow ourselves to support racial, religious, or social prejudice by one class of human society against another, we are engaging in war, and we plant a seed of bitterness and hate in the hearts of those who are victims of our prejudice.

As individuals, we can determine the causes of war between individuals. But most of us would find it unpleasant, inconvenient, and perhaps expensive in pride and money, if we were to admit our shortcomings, so, we loudly boast about the other fellow's being at fault.

The same things are true about nations. We know as much as we will ever know about the causes of war.

We will find the solution only when we, either as individuals, or as a nation, can admit our faults and do something to remedy them. It is not enough to believe in the expression "do unto others as you would have them do unto you"—you must practice it.

If we expect to knock at the door of the United Nations and enter into a realm of peace, each of us must pattern our daily lives after "The Golden Rule." We often boast of our representative form of government. It is up to us to lead the life that we hope to have represented.

Good Administration by the Economic Cooperation Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, there has recently come to my notice an example of good business practice and efficiency on the part of an agency of the United States Government.

Over the past 2 years some sections of the American press have been highly critical of the informational media guaranty program of the Economic Cooperation Administration. This program was approved by the Congress as a means for encouraging the circulation of American periodicals, books and motion pictures in those European countries where currencies could not be readily converted into dollars. The intent was that our American publications should be made as widely available as possible.

The plan was attacked in some quarters as a "give-away," as a subsidy to favorable publishers. The charge was even made that publishers who took the lead in extolling the benefits of the Marshall plan and used their magazines to propagandize for its adoption, were granted subsidies paid by the taxpayers. Some of these charges found

their way into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—see Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 18, page 7204.

The truth is, of course, that many of the principal American publishers and motion-picture producers doing business overseas have made use of this ECA program. A list of users includes members of the Motion Picture Association, Curtis Publishing Co., Reader's Digest, Crowell-Collier Publishing Co., New York Herald Tribune, and so forth.

As a result of this program it is estimated by the ECA that an audience of some 30,000,000 European people is currently reading some of our best American periodicals; that some 2,000,000 tickets have been sold to Germans in order to see American films they would not otherwise see, and that some 2,250,000 copies of books, including thousands of technical and scientific volumes, have been read by those who, without this program, would not have been able to be exposed to them.

Motion pictures shown under this guaranty program have been screened by a citizens' committee appointed by ECA which have included, over the past 2 years, such eminent persons as Thomas K. Finletter, now Secretary of the Air Force; Dr. George N. Shuster, now United States commissioner to Bavaria; and Mrs. Louise Leonard Wright, director of the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations. The periodicals have been limited generally to the list approved by the American Library Association; the books have been carefully screened.

Mr. President, I judge this to have been a most successful dissemination of some of the best materials depicting our way of life to overseas people. The ECA is successfully achieving many of the goals for which I fought as Assistant Secretary of State.

And now comes a most interesting disclosure from ECA, that this program has not cost the American taxpayer one dollar. Indeed, it is actually showing a profit. This interesting fact is even conceded by the Chicago Daily Tribune, which has been one of the most severe critics of the program. In its issue of August 9, the Tribune reported that ECA had to date signed contracts for the conversion of \$10,700,000 worth of European currencies into dollars:

As a service charge the ECA required the publishers and the movie makers to pay in American cash 1 percent of the face value of any contract for each year of its existence. To date, ECA has collected \$140,000 in service fees.

Of course, what ECA does is to sell such francs, marks, lira, and other currencies collected by American publishers and motion-picture producers to other agencies of the United States Government requiring those currencies for operating purposes in the respective Marshall-plan countries. Thus, ECA points out, it has converted the currencies without loss and ECA has retained the aforementioned \$140,000—to defray the relatively small cost of administering the program.

At the present time this very useful and very constructive program is carried forward by only three professional employees and one clerical.

Here we have a heartening example of what the ingenuity and enterprise of my old friends, Paul Hoffman and William Foster, have been able to establish and carry forward in their ECA organization.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Chicago Daily Tribune which, in a fine manifestation of fairness, acknowledges this accomplishment.

Mr. President, just the other evening the Washington Evening Star reported how ECA had renovated formerly useless space in an old office building and by the use of paint and up-to-date designs had been able to greatly reduce its rental costs; also, the Star reported how, instead of buying new office equipment, ECA had painted and renovated old desks and exhibited wisdom and economy in making some formerly undesirable quarters a good place to work.

I also ask consent to have this informative and encouraging article from the Star printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune of August 9, 1951]

PRESS SUBSIDY SHOWS PROFIT, ECA MAINTAINS—EXPLAINS HOW BRITISH UNDERSELL UNITED STATES

(By Philip Warden)

WASHINGTON, August 8—The Economic Cooperation Administration today reported a \$140,000 gross profit on its Marshall plan press subsidy operations in Europe.

Since late 1948, the ECA has been supplying Marshall plan dollars to American movie makers and book, magazine, and newspaper publishers in exchange for European currencies collected overseas.

The exchanges have been made under contracts between the publishers and the ECA. The European currencies were practically worthless except in the countries of their origin, and the movie magnates and publishers were unable to exchange them for dollars in the open market through regular channels.

WHY ECA MAKES EXCHANGE

ECA was willing to make this exchange to get the movies, books, magazines, and newspapers circulated in Europe "to spread the American way of life." Robert R. Mullen, ECA director of information, reported today.

"American books and publications cannot be sold in many areas of the world because of currency restrictions and because, so far as English texts are concerned, the British are able to undersell American publishers by as much as 50 percent. American scientific and cultural relationships have been severely damaged as a consequence.

"The situation has to some degree been relieved, however, by a provision of the economic cooperation act of 1948 which has permitted the United States Government to convert the currencies acquired by American publishers in certain Marshall plan countries.

"Netherlanders, Norwegians, Germans, Austrians, Frenchmen, and Swedes who take an active interest in American affairs are thus able to purchase American texts which with-

out the information media guaranties written by ECA would not be available to them."

ECA COLLECTS \$140,000

The ECA reported that to date it has signed contracts to convert up to \$10,700,000 in European currencies into dollars to facilitate the circulation of the American books and magazines overseas.

As a service charge, the ECA required the publishers and the movie makers to pay in American cash 1 percent of the face value of the contract for each year of its existence. To date, it has collected \$140,000 in service fees.

The ECA has paid out \$3,383,651 through July 1 in exchange for the foreign currencies. Mullen reported that every cent of these foreign currencies in turn had been exchanged by the ECA for dollars from the State and Defense Departments. The State and Defense Departments used the foreign currencies to pay operating expenses in Europe. Mullen said these agencies saved exchange fees by getting the funds from the ECA.

SAYS COSTS ARE SMALL

Mullen said the administrative costs of the operation have been small. Currently three professionals and one clerical assistant are handling the program.

Internationalist publications which have supported the multibillion dollar Marshall plan hold some of the largest ECA contracts. These include the publications of Henry Luce of Time, Inc., the Pocket Books of Marshall Field III, and the Paris edition of the New York Herald Tribune.

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 21, 1951]

UNITED STATES SCRAPES BARREL TO FIND OFFICE SPACE FOR 30,000 IN YEAR—\$29,000 SQUARE FEET CONVERTED FOR OFFICE USE WAREHOUSES, DORMITORIES BEING UTILIZED

(By Robert J. Lewis)

Since Korea, the Government had been scratching around the bottom of the barrel for office space. So far, it has come up with enough additional to house about 30,000 more workers, mostly in defense agencies.

But a great deal of the space is, as one Government spokesman phrased it, "a little lousier" than before. Beggars can't be choosers, and all that. When you don't have any choice, you have to be satisfied with what you can get.

"I wouldn't say that what we have acquired is office slums—but it can't be described as ideal, either," one official said. Some of it is in converted warehouses, run-down buildings, abandoned dormitories. Some of it is stifling in the summer, cold and drafty in the winter.

Notwithstanding a disinclination to be discouraged about the less-than-ideal office-space situation, Government officials admit that good working environment is often a big factor in personnel morale, turn-over, and efficiency.

One agency that has been concerned with the problem is the Economic Cooperation Administration. Some of its people are in modern offices—others are in older buildings converted to office use.

Workers in one outdated building, in particular, had to work with poor light, little or no ventilation, dark walls, plus mice and vermin.

So—as an experiment—the agency determined to do something about it. Today all you need to do is talk to the surprised people in the renovated offices to see what a change a few improvements have wrought in their working spirit.

Besides improvement in morale and a reduction in turn-over, ECA believes it has saved money not only by using the available

space more efficiently and intensively, but by capturing space which has never been used before and putting it to work.

For example, the old Rochambeau Apartment Building at 815 Connecticut Avenue NW.—scene of the experimental renovation—had a number of wide hallways containing much wasted space.

To take that space out of the "lost" column and put it in the "found" category, ECA tore out partitions and combined the wide hall with cubby-hole office space on either side of it—thus increasing the usable space considerably and getting a better deal for the rent paid.

Everett Bellows, special assistant to the ECA Administrator, obtained the advice of a management consultant, and under his direction the agency tore out a few light fixtures which cast a dim glow in the gloomy offices, and substituted fluorescent lighting designed to provide adequate diffused light throughout the rooms.

It painted the offices in light tones, re-covered the tops of the desks with a light, nonglare surface, placed rubber mats on the aisles and rearranged desks to conserve space. Important, also, was installation of window-type fans to pull out overheated, stagnant air.

Officials and workers, themselves, said the changes resulted in a big improvement in office conditions.

"A good working environment invites an employee to do good work, whereas bad working environment fosters a tired, don't care attitude," said A. H. Stricker, who handled the ECA office-improvement job.

"Even if an employee wants to do a good job under poor working conditions, he can't accomplish as much as if conditions were better. If lighting conditions are bad, for instance, the employee simply cannot avoid the bodily fatigue that eyestrain creates."

A key part of the limited experimental job at the Rochambeau was the attention given to preventing ocular fatigue, officials said.

To do this, an effort was made to avoid having extreme contrasts in lighting—a primary cause of eyestrain.

"In an office, the brightness ratio should be kept to about 1 to 5, certainly not more than 1 to 8," Mr. Stricker said. "In other words, papers (which usually are the lightest reflective item) should not be any more than about five times as light as anything else in the room," he said.

"Thus, a table top should be light, so that the eye is not forced to readjust itself in a wide range, from dark to light. Balanced lighting and balanced tones in office furniture and equipment pay off in less fatigue, less eyestrain, and in more work done more accurately."

Since the stepped-up defense began about a year ago, the Public Building Service of the General Services Administration has been obliged to reduce the amount of space per employee to an average of 100 square feet, in contrast to about 109 or 110 previously.

Of the approximately 3,128,000 square feet of office space added to the Government's supply in the last year, more than 1,120,000 has been obtained through "better utilization" of existing space—including reducing the amount of space per person.

A total of 629,000 square feet were obtained by conversion of existing Government-owned buildings, such as dormitories and storage buildings.

Potomac Park dormitories and the Langston residence halls near the District National Guard Armory provided a considerable amount of converted space. The Pentagon basement also yielded a good deal of additional offices.

Up to now, the new GAO Building has provided almost 700,000 square feet of mod-

ern office space, with about 300,000 square feet more to come in this building.

In addition to the 629,000 square feet converted in existing Government-owned buildings, PBS arranged for conversion of 200,000 square feet of the 676,000 square feet leased from private owners this year. The remainder was usable without conversion.

PBS said the cost of the conversion job was relatively low in this space, and that most money spent went to change and improve Government-owned buildings.

The conversion job cost about \$2,150,000, of which \$1,850,000 went into Government-owned buildings, and \$300,000 into leased buildings. Most went to tear out or build partitions, provide lighting, toilet rooms and exit facilities, to paint the offices and to improve the floors, a spokesman said.

Foundation Teaches Wise Use of Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mr. PRIEST Mr. Speaker, Earl Godwin is one of our outstanding radio commentators. His fairness and accuracy are known to millions. He loves his country and he wants those who follow him to share in the good things produced by our business genius, our resourceful workers, and our mass-production methods. He knows that we have the highest standard of living in all history and he wants this protected.

Our secret weapon against the Russians is not the atomic bomb. Our secret weapon is our high standard of living. The Russians may have an answer to the atomic bomb. They have no answer to our standard of living and they never will have.

There have been abuses of installment credit and a group of public-spirited businessmen recognized this fact when they recently set up the National Foundation for Consumer Credit. This is a nonprofit research and education organization financed by private industry and headed by William J. Cheyney, a former college professor of economics. Through high school and college channels and through labor unions, civic clubs, and women's organizations, the foundation is educating the public in the wise use of consumer credit. In 400 high schools, they are teaching the youth of our Nation not to buy things they cannot afford.

This is the full text of Mr. Godwin's broadcast over an NBC network relating to installment credit:

I come around now to another phase of today's turbulent news when I take up the matter of buying the household appliances and the family car on the installment plan—that is credit; and the higher brackets of wisdom in the Government say that credit expands an already inflated situation, but to the average American this installment matter means getting something you need or not getting it. No matter what they call it, it's still the installment buying plan, budget plan, easy credit system, or any other sweet-

selling label—it means putting some money on the line and taking out a piece of your pay check at stated intervals and laying it on the line again. How many billions of dollars have been sent roaring into the vast river of American enterprise by this matter of credit to scores of millions of families. Listen, critic: If it had not been for the idea of a dollar down and a dollar a week, I doubt that there ever would have been a sewing-machine business; and in my youth one of my jobs was selling \$25 talking machines for \$5 down and a dollar a week, and in those days we never used the courts for collection agencies. If the guy didn't come across we grabbed the machine. So I have that much knowledge. Not recent, I admit, but a memory.

But they tell me that some of the extremists in economics or what have you around Washington are set on abolishing all installment buying by means of more and more drastic regulations. If that ever happens, the automobile business will shut up overnight, and so many other industries that it would be as destructive as if the whole industrial picture had been gassed overnight by an enemy. This method of buying and selling and financing is responsible for the success of mass production in the United States of America. There is a vast credit power involved in this method of doing business, and, like any other power in the hands of men, there is a good side and a bad side to it. That's the story of humanity from the time of Adam and Eve and their discovery that there was good and bad in the same world. It's not credit that started the flood of inflation, not the wise and well-advised and well-handled credit of the old-timers who know thrift and prudence, but it is the misuse of the credit power by the modern-day shaper. The slick city fellow who rams a carload of goods into the home of a man who couldn't pay for it under any circumstances, and who is jerked to the courts to be made to pay, who thereupon starves or steals—shucks, that is no part of American finance, that's crime, and should be so treated. Now the question arises what to do about this bit of dynamite, this vast power of credit that the Government uses to a fare-ve-well, never restrains any of its own outlets, and wants to put regulation W into a policeman's uniform to tell you what you can and cannot do when you buy your next car or vacuum cleaner.

If it were left to some of the bankers I know they would handle it just the way the bankers handled it in the days this country was growing up into strength. They didn't have to have and would not have tolerated an army of snoopers let loose on the community to find out about the household accounts. They managed credit; they knew who was worthy and who was not; and there never was any such a fuss and muss as there is today. The status quo is more like a basket of eels than anything else.

Now something is being done about this installment-buying matter and it is along the line of common sense. There has been established a National Foundation for Consumer Credit, Inc. Offices are in this city of Washington. It has a president whom you may not know but he is well known in his business line. Prof. William J. Cheyney, formerly of Rider College at Trenton, N. J., and I noted that the board of directors has bankers and big and medium and small business represented. The purpose is to take the hysteria out of the air, to educate one and all about the use of installment credit, and the importance of consumer credit to the Nation's economy. I hope to goodness they can do what they propose, because it is just as wrong to dot the landscape with governmental credit cops who add one more

irritation and payroll burden to an already overpoliced Nation of so-called free people as it is to stretch the credit structure until it weakens and tears.

I never in my life realized that the very sacrosanct and able Federal Reserve Board had been made into a minor gestapo until I heard the alarm sounded by Representative TACKETT, of Arkansas, in the debate on the so-called controls bill recently. He will probably be termed extreme, but in these days you cannot make a point without a steam shovel or a trip hammer. So it was that Brother TACKETT got me to thinking. He may go a little further than some others, but he certainly pinned the Federal Reserve Board's credit regulations to the barn door.

Here is what he said: "The Reserve Board is following a pattern outlined in Italy, Germany, Russia . . . where government, bit by bit, took away personal liberties on the pretext that certain economic reforms were necessary."

(You know, that reminds me of a man who takes away the small change his children earn selling papers or shoveling off the snow and tells them "papa knows best.")

"The technique is to scare the people into the belief that an emergency exists. People grab for the reforms forgetting the cost to their personal liberties.

"For example, under terms of regulation W, the customer must go to the retailer and sign a pauper's oath, in cases where he cannot meet the monthly payments agreed upon. The Federal Reserve Board demands these oaths as proof that the private citizen had no intention of violating the law.

"The statement must include purely personal information, such as the sickness of a child or the change of a job. Federal Reserve Board house dicks can read them any time. These records are public property. The penalty for white lies in these statements is 1 year in jail."

TACKETT said he had seen hundreds of such statements, and reminded one and all of the embarrassment such stuff could spread in a small town. For instance, where illness hits into a family and the wage earner has to go and spread his inside story on the record as to why he cannot meet his bills at the moment. He may have to reveal something that will work against him in his work or in his efforts to get another job.

Congress did not wipe out regulation W, but it did make itself into another regulatory body by liberalizing the rules—you have more time to pay for a car, you have less to pay down on household appliances and also more time to pay for them.

Congress realizes what too severe a credit restriction will do. Congressmen heard from home and that is another indication of why Congress votes as it does vote. It votes generally the way the grass roots whispers tells them to vote. Congress represents people, the House of Representatives is truly representative. You hear folks declaim that Congress is bought by the interests and such stuff as that. It frequently is bought by the doubtful coin of party politics, but never bought by so-called Wall Street, which has not a chance when it is up against the folks on Main Street. Right or wrong, the men and women on Main Street, who form the bulk of our citizenry, told their Congressmen they wanted lighter credit regulations. They got them—right or wrong—they got them. Now the question is, Shall we keep on being regulated in purely personal matters like buying a rug or a roadster? If we can manage our business, with the aid of wise counselors, this group of businessmen I spoke of, I believe we would be better off with the credit cops put back into mothballs.

Dispersal Should Be Combined With Barter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, the President issued a statement last week again urging dispersal. This time it was for new industries, a somewhat milder suggestion than the previous ones, which recommended dispersing Government bureaus and agencies.

This reminds me that I have been curious from the start about an inconsistency. The first time was about a year ago. It came to the attention of the appropriations subcommittee, on which I serve, when Jess Larson, the very able and often sorely tried head of the then new General Services Administration, was asked by the administration to bring down a request for \$139,800,000 to disperse some of the more important Washington agencies.

Overlooking the fact that the decision regarding relative importance was to be left to the White House, which, under present occupancy, has not established a very good record on such decisions—as, for example, on the importance of commanding generals—this idea seemed to me to be a bureaucratic natural.

You first build up at tremendous cost the necessary quarters for debatably necessary bureaus and agencies, and then you hatch out one of our recurring emergencies, which, somewhat like the sun in its passage around the Arctic Circle, rise and fall like the tide, but which since 1933 have never quite disappeared.

You then propose, on the basis of this latest emergency, to move certain self-selected agencies, departments, or bureaus to a periphery of perhaps 20 miles from the District of Columbia. This requires a lot of new buildings, the preparation of which offers jobs to numerous deserving members of one of the major political parties, and quite incident to it, and completely unexpected by the administration, it leaves in the District the equivalent space, to be filled by an equal number of men and women, who would also be members, undoubtedly, of one of the major political parties, and old enough to vote in 1952. It was, as I said, a natural, and only a man in the White House completely disinterested in politics, and in the results of the next election, could have thought that one up.

To my surprise, and satisfaction, the idea fell with a dull thud. It did not even bounce. The subcommittee, after one brief look, filed the request with business to be taken up on or about Thursday 1951. The reaction of the public was clear. It was opposed. Letters opposed the idea; news items treated it slightly, and editorials derided it. There was even some question, on the part of Government employees, in the

District of Columbia, concerning the criteria for the choice of agencies to be entitled to the little trip.

The idea was revived again in the present session. The results were the same. I again express surprise. Here was a marvelous opportunity to spend a lot of money. Why was it turned down? Being of an analytical frame of mind, I think I have discovered the answer:

First, we are not dispersing the bureaus and agencies far enough; second, we should combine the idea of barter with the proposal to disperse them.

Looking back over the history of this Nation, as of other peoples, you will realize that the practice of bartering usually preceded, but sometimes followed, the use of money. The farm woman who took the eggs to the Pennsylvania store, to trade for "boughten" goods, was a cousin, in economic history, to the tribesman who traded four cows to the chief for a particularly desirable wife. Barter was the ancestor of the cooperative movement. Money is a token, back of which there must be firm standards of value, established in local communities, in nations, or on the international level. It is historic that when money runs out, or begins to slip, in its buying power, the system of bartering automatically reasserts itself.

I do not need tell you that the American dollar has dropped severely, and dangerously, in buying power during the 18 years since Mr. Roosevelt first took office on a platform of economy, and a pledge to reduce Government spending 25 percent. Are we about to face the necessity of barter? Then why not combine the theory of barter with the administration's evident desire for dispersal?

Instead of moving the State Department to Olney, or Fairfax, or Frederick, why not move it to Russia? Some of its employees will be as much at home there as here. If that seems extreme, why not move it to London? More of its employees will be at home there, even to the accent. But here is the nice part of my proposal. Let us not do this for free. Let us barter with them. If we give them the State Department, it must be understood that this is in lieu of any more of the American taxpayers' hard-earned dollars, of which we have sent Russia and her satellites \$1,060,000,000 since the end of World War II, or about \$15,000,000,000, if wartime lend-lease is included; and England \$6,088,000,000.

We can offer to disperse the National Art Gallery to France. This is one of our greatest treasures. Tourists, who probably would not come the distance of Baltimore to Washington, while it remains here, will then flock by the boatloads to Paris. This will help pay off the French debt, and in turn the barter deal will be no more cash, in addition to the \$3,994,000,000 already spent there since 1945.

Mrs. Phillips and I have been driving around Washington, looking for ideas for barter deals like the ones just mentioned. I have been looking particularly for a statue with a plow. I want to offer that to India. I cannot find one, not even in the Department of Agricul-

ture. Maybe we could offer them the Great Seal of that Department. It shows a plow. India does not need money nearly as much as she needs to take a good look at a modern American plow, and then duplicate it. That will save us more money to apply on our deficits, and it will prevent famine in India. In addition to this constructive knowledge, India could not use the money from America to mobilize her army against Pakistan, another good friend of the United States.

How about bartering the new gold statues at the Memorial Bridge back to Italy? We have already paid for the gold and the bronze, and since I last wrote about them, I find that we also paid for the work of casting them. The "gift" on the part of our Italian friends, I discover, was the "unexcelled workmanship and know-how" in casting them. On that definition, the next time I pay my friend Mr. Battista, in the Hill Building, who has plenty of know-how, for a suit, I should put it on my accounts as a "gift." I still contend that the big, gold, muscle-bound men, and the Amazons who accompany them, are a bit out of place where they now stand, in the shadow of the unbelievable beauty and grandeur of the Lincoln Memorial. Gold yet!

It will be understood that if we give back the statues, then Italy will build her own reclamation projects, without the \$117,000,000 of American money, in the form of counterpart funds, now allocated to this purpose. We could use some of that money to complete reclamation projects in the western part of the United States including the Kansas area, where the farmers will be required, and would be willing, to pay back the money, with interest. Repayment would not be required of Italy. Under this deal, we might even get the Coachella laterals finished, which have already taken 5 years to build, and threaten a cost to the water users of \$16,100,000 as compared to the original estimate of 2 years, and about \$13,500,000.

Of course, we would not need to limit this dispersal and barter to foreign nations. In fiscal 1950 we subvented the New England States \$277,800,000. We will offer them the Smithsonian. That will supply the antique shops of New England for a generation, and we can apply the money saved on the national debt. We can offer the Pentagon Building to Chicago. My friend, and fellow subcommittee member, SYD YATES, has convinced me that there is a severe housing problem in that city. The Pentagon alone should solve it.

The Imperial Valley could put in a bid for the Department of Agriculture. Not only is the valley a wonderful farming area, but the Department now has 81,062 employees, as compared with 27,350 in 1932. We could put them out to harvest the crops, in substitution for the Mexican nationals, if the Secretary of Labor should again be asked to decide that a "labor dispute" is created by one or two men leaving a harvesting crew of a hundred or more.

In fact, the Government might get a flat bid from the State of California. In

fiscal 1950 we subvented the State \$376,150,531. Under this barter idea, we would apply that on the debt, and then we would "disperse" whatever the State would like to have in kind. I know the city of Banning would like to have the very fine statue of Bishop Francis Asbury to stand in front of the Community Methodist Church. My friend, Ben Reddick, of the Newport Balboa Press and News-Times, has already put in a request for the statue of Neptune, which now stands in front of the Library of Congress. He wants it to stand in front of the publishing house. Well, what have you to offer in exchange? Will Newport and Balboa and Balboa Island and Costa Mesa and Corona del Mar discontinue the un-Democratic idea of trying to combine the five or six post offices, now situated in a radius of about 5 miles, into one modern, effective, centrally located post office? We cannot let these ideas of economy and efficiency get started; there is no telling how far they might spread. They might even reach Washington. The Neptune statue could be a good, preventive barter. Besides, old Neptune would be more at home nearer the ocean; down here they do not even turn the water on him and his family all the time.

The State of Texas, which got \$338,714,187 back from the Federal Government in fiscal 1950, might be interested in some trades, and not only the tidelands. How about the statue to General Grant at the foot of the Capitol campus? Texas could rename it for Sam Houston, or SAM RAYBURN, and people would stand all day just looking at the marvelous sculpture of the galloping artillery horses. We could even have them painted to look like Palominos.

You can send in your suggestions and bids. There is one thing I want distinctly understood, however, there are limits to this dispersal-barter idea. I would not want the city of Riverside to try and trade us in return the statue of De Anza.

Small Corporations and Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, one of the most thoughtful letters on the subject of taxation which I have received comes from Clarence M. Barksdale, a distinguished member of the St. Louis bar for some 28 years.

So that all of the Members of Congress may have the benefit of Mr. Barksdale's views, I am including it in my remarks:

BARKSDALE, ABBOTT & THIES,
St. Louis, Mo., August 9, 1951.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR TOM: I have been following with interest, through the various tax services which I read, the proposed Revenue Act of

1951, H. R. 4473, and particularly section 123. You, undoubtedly, are familiar with this section and I have no doubt that you have received numerous other letters concerning it. I wanted to take this occasion to add my small voice to what should be a great chorus of outcries against the inclusion of that particular section in the proposed new tax bill. It is, in my opinion, a most flagrant illustration of duplicity and taxation not for revenue by a Government now noted as an expert in both fields.

The 1950 Revenue Act was heralded as a long-overdue measure for the relief of small corporations in its granting a surtax exemption of \$25,000 to each corporation. Following on the heels of that bill came the excess-profits tax law which only tended to magnify the importance of such relief to new small corporations. As a result of such exemptions, many new small companies legitimately were organized, which otherwise never would have come into being. Lawyers throughout the country advised their clients with respect to these advantages and, as a result, many new businesses were created and many companies expanded, all of which undoubtedly have contributed to our high production, high employment, and high tax revenues. Nevertheless, these small corporations, with slightly more than a year's experience, are now confronted with the Treasury Department asking Congress to take away all these exemptions if such companies have similar stockholders controlling other companies.

The estimated revenue which will be produced by such legislation, if passed, is insignificant in contrast to the total revenue sought by the bill, but the damage to small business, if such section is left in the bill, will be incalculable, and I imagine will result in a loss of revenue to the Treasury much greater than it proposes to obtain. On the other hand, the inclusion of such provision in the Revenue Act would have little, if any, effect on large corporations, who are able to do their financing and controlling of multiple corporations in a much more subtle fashion than small local companies. Thus, again, the Fair Deal government, which is supposed to be the Patron Saint of all things small, would be playing in the hands of big business, as it consistently has done for almost 20 years.

Moreover, it is high time that the lawyers in Congress are taking steps to prevent, wherever necessary, the contradictions and constant changes in the law which cause clients to lose confidence in their lawyers and lose faith in the laws. Of all places in this present maelstrom of Federal legislation, Congress should at long last have the intelligence to create a rather permanent framework for the revenue act. It is bad enough for the taxpayer and his lawyer to have the rates forever changing, but to have Congress constantly changing the substance of the law in order to do what the tax courts and the appellate courts have said the Commissioner cannot do, is making a mockery of our courts, a joke of lawyers, and many premature graves for members of our profession.

I may sound overexercised on this subject, but I assure you I am speaking from the heart. It so happens that I believe I know the subject about which I am concerned. It is only such instances as this that cause me to write my Congressman. I assure you it is far from being a habit. I only recall having written a Congressman about pending legislation on one other occasion in the 28 years I have been practicing. I sincerely hope that you are in sympathy with my views and that you will lend the full strength of your office to oppose and defeat the inclusion of section 123 in the proposed Revenue Act of 1951.

Sincerely,

CLARENCE M. BARKSDALE.

Government Planning Comes High**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, much interest has been manifested in the Arizona irrigation project, and I should like to bring to the attention of the Congress a release from Dr. George S. Benson, president of Harding College, Searcy, Ark., dealing with this particular subject. The title of Dr. Benson's discussion is "Government Planning Comes High." It is believed that his comments should be helpful to those who may not be too well acquainted with the problems involved in the plan to spend a large sum of money on the Arizona irrigation project. The article of Dr. Benson follows:

GOVERNMENT PLANNING COMES HIGH

When the economic planners of England's Labor-Socialist Government blithely wasted \$100,000,000 of hard-pressed Britain's money on a scheme for growing peanuts in British East Africa, and were obliged last January to publicly admit utter failure, the limit seemed to have been reached on the high cost of bureaucratic bungling. But the facts regarding our own Interior Department's plan for irrigating a small section of Arizona desert land would suggest that the English Socialists are, after all, only small-time spenders.

The construction cost of our own economic planners' Arizona irrigation project, together with its so-called multipurpose trimmings, is to be \$708,780,000. But that's just the beginning of what the American taxpayers would have to pay. The Interior Department itself admits that actual cost to the taxpayers, counting interest on the borrowed money necessary to build it, would be \$2,784,509,000. That's almost 10 times the total value of all farm lands and buildings in the whole State of Arizona as recorded by the United States Census Bureau.

A FANTASTIC PROPOSAL

The astonishing facts about the Interior Department's Central Arizona projects are disclosed in an article by Towner Phelan, distinguished economist, in the July 16 issue of the Freeman magazine. "From the standpoint of costs in relation to expected benefits," he writes, "possibly nothing more fantastic than the central Arizona project has ever been proposed."

Mr. Phelan points out that the \$2,784,509,000 figure is the Economic Planners' own estimate of the ultimate cost, with interest, and that actually the cost probably would be two or three times this amount—or from \$6,000,000,000 to \$10,000,000,000. "History shows," he says, "that in most cases the initial cost estimate of a Government project is very low, later estimates much higher, and the final cost higher still. The Hoover Commission gives many examples such as the Hungry Horse project in Montana. It was originally estimated to cost \$6,500,000 but actually cost \$93,500,000."

PASSED SENATE

Since the bill to authorize the central Arizona irrigation project is now before Congress, and has passed the Senate, it is well that citizens know the facts. They constitute an example of what makes our taxes so high. The project affects every citizen's income, for it must be financed with funds borrowed by the Government on the strength

of the taxpayers' ability to pay. It provides direct benefits for 6,000 Arizona land owners, but only speculative or intangible benefits—if any—for the remainder of the Nation's 150,000,000 people.

According to Mr. Phelan's well-documented article, the object is this: Water is to be diverted from the Colorado River to provide irrigation for 152,500 acres of land now being irrigated by a dwindling supply of ground water pumped by private means, and an additional 73,500 acres of desert wasteland. To reach the land to be rescued, the Colorado's water must first be raised nearly 1,000 feet by pumping, and then transported some 300 miles by canals and pipelines.

HALF A TRILLION

More than half the land to be watered by the Government's engineering colossus is owned by 420 landowners with 500 acres or more—thus more than half the multi-billion-dollar cost would actually be expended for the direct benefit of only 420 farmers. Mr. Phelan estimates that the cost allocated solely to the irrigation phase of the multipurpose project calls for \$7,159 of taxpayers' money to be spent for each acre of land to be irrigated—on the basis of the Government's own estimates. On past performances, this figure likely would be closer to \$25,000 per acre.

The writer shows that on a pro rata basis the economic planners are proposing to bring water to the 420 larger farms at an average cost to the taxpayers, counting interest, of \$2,118,000 per farm. His article also states significantly that the central Arizona project is only one of a batch of such projects that have been officially planned by the planners at an estimated cost of \$57,506,200,000 and which would probably cost \$500,000,000,000—half a trillion dollars.

Yes, planning by Government economic planners comes high. It is bankrupting England and pulling the citizen down to socialized poverty. Must we too become its victims?

**New Orleans Port Remains Second
in Nation****EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to submit an article from the New Orleans Times-Picayune, of date August 19, 1951, entitled "New Orleans Port Remains Second in Nation," as follows:

**NEW ORLEANS PORT REMAINS SECOND IN
NATION—EXPORT CARLOADS FOR HALF OF 1951
REACH 41,418**

The port of New Orleans, during the first 6 months of 1951, maintained its position as the Nation's second busiest port in the number of export carloads, not including grain or coal.

Figures compiled by the American Association of Railroads show 41,418 carloads unloaded at the port during this period, an increase of 34 percent over the same period last year.

E. H. Lockenberg, general manager of the port, said this was more than a third of the New York total of 113,239 and about twice as much as the combined total of Houston (10,895) and Galveston (12,181).

In spite of an upsurge of 255 percent over last year at San Francisco's port due to the Korean war, New Orleans' export car unloadings are still 6,000 more than that port, according to the association's figures.

"It is interesting," said Lockenberg, "that New Orleans handled more than 10 percent of the national total of these export car unloadings."

He added:

"In spite of the hesitancy of some persons to claim the port of New Orleans as No. 2 port on the basis of dollar volume, it should be remembered that the best measure of a port's activity is in the number of car unloadings.

"This, combined with the dollar volume of its commerce, proves that New Orleans is indeed second only to New York."

Lockenberg said that plans are now under way for an expansion program which will double ability to unload bulk grain from storage by an extra marine leg to be included in proposed new additions to the elevator.

At the same time, figures submitted by C. J. Winters, superintendent of the Public Grain Elevator, showed that grain unloadings from barges for the first 7 months of 1951—16,147,951 bushels—compare to the highest postwar year of 15,543,095 bushels for the total year of 1948.

Winters pointed out that while this does not comprise by any means all of the grain receipts at the elevator it is a "good indication," not only of bulk grain unloadings but also of the increase in barge activity.

**Bureau of Reclamation Deceives Congress
More Than Army Engineers****EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. NORRIS POULSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I find it of great interest that the House Appropriations Committee has seen fit to issue an excoriating report on the deficiencies and deceptions of the Army engineers, with regard to project cost estimates.

The House Appropriations Committee recently passed out the Interior Department appropriations bill, which included the expenditures for the coming fiscal year of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The Army engineers have not deceived Congress any more, if as much, than the Bureau of Reclamation. Both these branches of the Federal Government are guilty of deceiving the Congress, when it comes to estimates for projects.

The discovery of the underestimates of the Army engineers is nothing new. Nor is the fact that the Bureau of Reclamation has been hoodwinking the Congress about appropriations in the years gone by a new revelation.

Perhaps, if the record were examined it would be seen that the Bureau of Reclamation has been a far greater deceiver than the Army engineers.

Comparisons in this case mean nothing, for if either one of these bodies are deceiving the Congress, they should be exposed and punished. But it is strange

that the Bureau of Reclamation was not exposed, and did not draw the wrath of the Congress long ago. For they are old offenders, and we members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee have long been faced with gross misrepresentation and deception on the part of Bureau of Reclamation witnesses, when it comes to the actual cost of a proposed project.

The Appropriation Committee rightly has exposed the deception of the Army engineers, but the underestimates of the engineers are insignificant compared to the underestimates and the deception which the Bureau of Reclamation has inflicted on the Congress.

Let us look at the Bureau of Reclamation record.

It will be found that the estimates for projects given Congress by the Bureau of Reclamation run from 100 to several hundred percent low.

Let me cite a few examples:

Project	Original estimate	Present estimate
Boulder Canyon.....	\$126,500,000	\$173,900,000
Davis Dam.....	41,200,000	114,438,000
Central Valley.....	170,000,000	581,886,000
Colorado-Thompson.....	44,000,000	150,503,000
Fort Peck.....	5,732,554	16,250,000
Hunley House.....	36,648,000	108,800,000
Columbia Basin.....	393,000,000	774,339,000
Kendrick.....	20,000,000	25,000,000
Riverton.....	9,500,000	21,813,404
Shoshone.....	8,851,360	16,851,705
Missouri River Basin.....	529,152,800	2,834,427,848

It will be seen that these examples include both small and large projects. Of course, numerous other examples could be cited. The Bureau of Reclamation has given consistently low estimates to Congress, with the result that the taxpayers of the Nation have suffered excessive burdens.

One of the most dishonest estimates given Congress recently by the Bureau of Reclamation has to do with the proposed central Arizona project.

The Bureau estimates the construction cost of this project roughly at \$788,000,000. But nowhere in the Bureau's report on this project are there estimates of the additional features that would have to be constructed to make the central Arizona project workable. I do not say feasible, but workable.

For instance, the main dam of the Arizona project would be filled with silt within 25 to 29 years without the building of other dams and reservoirs upstream. The Bureau does not include these additional works in its estimate, yet they would add at least half a billion dollars to the estimated cost of the project.

Now, I wish to inform the House Appropriation Committee, and the Senate, as well, that in the project bills as they are presented to the Congress, the Bureau of Reclamation has inserted a paragraph, or section, which is the most dangerous and iniquitous section that could be placed in any bill having to do with appropriations.

This section gives the Secretary of the Interior carte blanche when it comes to spending money on a project.

This section is in the central Arizona project bills—H. R. 1500 and S. 75.

During the recent hearings on S. 75 in the House Committee on Interior Affairs, I questioned at length Mr. E. G. Neilson, assistant regional director of the Bureau of Reclamation.

I shall not reprint here the entire testimony, but I shall refer my readers to pages 273 to 307 of the hearings on H. R. 1500, part 1, March 7, 1951, before the House Interior Committee.

Even a cursory examination of this testimony will reveal to the Congress the gross misrepresentations which the Bureau of Reclamation attempts to inflict upon the Members of Congress.

This testimony will show that such a bill has in it a section which makes the Secretary of the Interior a greater power than the Congress. I remarked to Mr. Neilson that H. R. 1500 was an open-end bill, and he replied:

Mr. NEILSON May I explain what I think those parts of the act are? I think, in almost each authorization that the Bureau or the Corps of Engineers or other agencies get, there is inserted in those bills a catch-all element of this kind so that the secretaries will not be bound by the specific element so that he may make changes in the interest of a more economical project.

Any one who is interested in revealing the deception of the Bureau of Reclamation can read this testimony, and if one will read it through, I am sure eyes will be opened.

There has been some talk about placing the civil functions of the Army engineers under the Department of Interior.

God, forbid.

When it comes to deceiving the Congress about project costs, the Bureau of Reclamation is by far the greater offender.

Is this exposure of the Army engineers the first step to take away their civil functions and give them to the Department of Interior?

If it is, the Congress should stop such a wicked move right now. The Bureau of Reclamation probably wastes more money than any other Bureau, and its propaganda machine is the greatest in the Federal Government. This is a socialistic bureau, if there is one in our Government.

For years, the Bureau of Reclamation has been absorbing more power over the economy of many States, and unless it is stopped, we are headed for bankruptcy or communism, and they are the same things in this case.

For years the Bureau of Reclamation has consistently deceived the Congress, both individual Members and the entire body, and if any of the members of the Appropriations Committees wish to take the time, they can issue a report that will greatly overshadow the deficiencies of the Army engineers.

Let us not excoriate the Army engineers alone. Let us look at the record of the Bureau of Reclamation, which is far more iniquitous. Let us expose and punish the Bureau of Reclamation, and not select one offender without regard for another.

The McCarran Internal Security Subcommittee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has been conducting its investigation in accordance with the highest principles of American jurisprudence. This fact is daily becoming more and more apparent and the committee is now beginning to receive the public acclaim which it deserves.

Mr. President, I request permission to insert into the RECORD at this point an article written by Harold B. Hinton, which appeared in the New York Times of August 19, 1951. It accurately describes the methods and procedures being followed by the Internal Security Subcommittee, often referred to as the McCarran committee. I am proud to be a member of that committee.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

McCARRAN SHIES AWAY FROM MCCARTHY LABEL—HIS COMMITTEE OPERATES LIKE COURT, SHIELDS WITNESSES FROM PUBLICITY
(By Harold B. Hinton)

WASHINGTON, August 18.—The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, after several months of preparatory work, is now embarked upon the public and open phase of its mission, which is "to make a complete and continuing study and investigation of the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950," as well as the operation of other laws against espionage and sabotage.

Since that particular law called for the exclusion or deportation of any alien whose entry or presence would endanger the public safety, many of the subcommittee's inquiries have had to do with Communists and their activities. Its members, however, decline to number themselves among the "scaremongers and hatemongers" whom President Truman castigated so roundly earlier in the week nor do they like to be told they are "carrying McCarthy's load."

The parent body of the Internal Security Subcommittee is the Judiciary Committee, and Senator PAT MCCARRAN, Democrat of Nevada, is chairman of both the full committee and the subcommittee. The other six members also are distinguished lawyers.

EMPHASIS ON FAR EAST

They are Senators JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi, HERBERT R. O'CONOR, of Maryland, and WILLIS SMITH, of North Carolina, Democrats; and HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan, WILLIAM E. JENNER, of Indiana, and ARTHUR V. WATKINS, of Utah, Republicans.

At present, the subcommittee is looking into the extent, if any, to which subversive forces have influenced, or sought to influence, the far-eastern policy of the United States. In this inquiry, it is directing its attention to the membership and activities of the Institute of Pacific Relations.

Unlike many congressional public hearings, the atmosphere of the subcommittee's open sessions closely resembles that of a courtroom. Senator MCCARRAN insists that

evidence submitted by the subcommittee's own staff be fully identified for the record, and treats its counsel, Robert Morris, as formally as he would any strange lawyer who appeared before him

"The committee's staff was instructed to maintain, and the committee has sought to maintain, a high standard of evidence, and to proceed with a truly objective approach," Mr. McCARRAN said of its procedure.

NO RADIO OR VIDEO

Before it began its public hearings the subcommittee considered the advisability of permitting television and radio broadcasting of its open sessions.

"The ruling of the committee is that none of the proceedings of the committee will be televised, and that no direct radio coverage of the proceedings of the committee will be permitted," Mr. McCARRAN announced. "News pictures may be permitted before and after the actual hearing sessions of the committee, but the taking of news pictures during the actual conduct of the hearings will not be allowed."

"Neither will the committee permit the photographing of witnesses with members of the committee in the hearing room, nor the photographing of witnesses in the hearing room without the permission of the witnesses."

"The committee has made these decisions because we are seeking facts, not publicity. We want to make a record, not to make headlines. Furthermore we want to make it clear that no witness who is called here will be subjected to undue publicity against his will."

IF SHOE FITS

If the chairmen of other committees desire to interpret these rulings as an implied criticism of their own proceedings, they apparently are welcome to do so by Senator McCARRAN.

The Nevada Senator is in a good position not to care. He has been in the Senate since 1933, and has been almost continuously at odds with his party. He does not come up for election again until 1956.

An irascible, persistent debater and a hard worker, he has followed the path of rugged individualism in the Senate during his entire service. He opposed many of the New Deal measures President Roosevelt proposed to Congress, and has been equally independent of President Truman's recommendations.

The chairman declines to use the large, marble-walled caucus room where most of the public hearings of Senate committees are held when it is apparent that large audiences will be attracted. His hearings are held in the Judiciary Committee's own small, cluttered meeting room.

Despite Mr. McCARRAN's modest objectives, his subcommittee has been getting its share of headlines, dating from its exploit in raiding the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations in a Massachusetts barn.

RELEVANT QUESTIONS

Witnesses are directed to limit their replies to the things about which they are asked, and Mr. Morris is under strict orders to keep his questions pertinent to the matter in hand. Thus, during the recent parade of former Communists—including Dr. Karl A. Wittfogel, Mrs. Hede Massing, Alexander Gregory Barmine, Whittaker Chambers, and Miss Elizabeth Bentley—the witnesses were asked to testify only about individuals the committee believed to be connected with the Institute of Pacific Relations.

Inevitably, other names were brought into the record, but the committee gave the impression it was making every effort to avoid the "character assassination" about which President Truman has complained.

However, the subcommittee has been exposed to some criticism because of the incidental mention of other individuals, even though resulting from questions from mem-

bers other than the chairman, and the reiteration by some of the witnesses of hearsay charges they have previously made before other investigating bodies. There are those who contend it is merely extending the work of wholesale denunciations started by Senator McCARTHY on the Senate floor.

The subcommittee was established by direction of a Senate resolution adopted last December, and started to work soon after the first of the year. The Senate has thus far authorized it to spend up to \$175,000 for staff salaries and other expenses of investigation.

Its members are not yet certain what they will do in further discharge of their instructions to act as watchdogs over the execution of the laws guarding the internal security of the Nation against subversive activities. The group has already recommended legislation to bar from certification as a collective bargaining agent any organization found to be controlled by Communists and it has called on Attorney General J. Howard McGrath to deport all diplomatic and consular agents of foreign governments whose activities endanger the public safety.

CHECK ON UNION

The first recommendation followed an investigation of the American Communications Association of New York City, certified by the National Labor Relations Board as bargaining agent for employees of the Western Union Co. and those of other communications firms. It received testimony that a number of the union's officials were Communists.

The dig at foreign subversives masked under diplomatic or consular status was prompted by a series of hearings at which State Department spokesmen testified there were 85 current cases where aliens in a diplomatic or semidiplomatic status had been admitted to the United States before adverse security information against them had been received.

The current hearings on the Institute of Pacific Relations were doubtless prompted by the charges and countercharges that came out of the hearings over the dismissal of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. Several of the figures in that controversy were persons who had been charged previously by Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY, Republican of Wisconsin, as being Communists or Communist sympathizers.

The Voice of America Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, before I retired from the advertising business in 1935, I was a reader of the weekly *Advertising Age*. I admired it for its realism in the field in which I then worked. I assume it still adheres to its tradition of factual reporting. Thus I think those of us in the Congress who must soon pass upon the 1952 budget for the Voice of America will welcome a realistic appraisal of this program by the reporter for *Advertising Age*. I ask unanimous consent that the article, *How Good Is the Voice Program?* from the issue of August 13, be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW GOOD IS THE VOICE PROGRAM?—ADMEN COME IN, GIVING IT NEW LIFE—NO SALES CURVE EXISTS TO BOLSTER BUDGET PLEAS; RADIO FUNDS UNDER P. & G.'s

(By Stanley Cohen)

WASHINGTON, August 8.—How good is America's overseas information campaign?

Is it true that this sales-minded Nation falls flat on its face when it tries to put together a campaign explaining its motives and objectives to other nations?

Are talented individuals utilized? Or are they ignored, or buried under a heap of bureaucratic red tape?

Though it has handled the program for more than 5 years, the Department of State faces these questions each time it goes to Congress for appropriations.

Presumably, the questions persist because the Department has never been able to provide convincing answers.

Currently, the prevailing feeling among informed Members of Congress is that the information program is reasonably effective on the operating level—and that it is improving.

There is no sales curve to prove the point. But the Czech who slips across the border, or the Polish sailor who escapes to Sweden, demonstrates that something is getting through to remind the peoples of Eastern Europe of a better life on the other side of the iron curtain.

And there are ouches from the enemy camp which are far more tangible evidence. Experts estimate that Russia has more than 1,000 radio transmitters—a plant equal to nearly half this Nation's whole AM service—devoted exclusively to jamming Voice of America broadcasts.

Moreover, the very fact that Russia is busy blocking and denouncing the Voice is taken here as evidence that the Politburo believes there is danger that the American story is spreading—one way or another—among the captive peoples.

Despite this information, there is an uncomfortable feeling that the information program accomplishes less than it should, considering the amount of money available. Even the program's most loyal supporters on the Hill concede that IIEE (International Information and Education Exchange) is stifled by an unreasonable amount of administrative red tape.

The House Appropriations Committee, which keeps a sharp eye on IIEE, recently used experienced investigators from the FBI and Treasury Department to check the administrative efficiency of the program.

Like all such investigations, the results are contested. There were reassuring testimonials on the effectiveness of Voice broadcasts in France and Italy. But there were chilling illustrations of lost time and motion which convinced most Appropriations Committee members that a house cleaning was in order.

Happily this house cleaning is under way.

To put zip into IIEE operations, Assistant Secretary of State Ed Barrett recently brought in Thurman Barnard, vice president of Compton Advertising, as general manager of the information service.

With his arrival, the office of the general manager has begun tightening its supervision of the enterprise. One of the first steps was to set up a programming and evaluation unit in the general manager's office, under Orville C. Anderson, veteran IIEE executive and former adman and publisher. For chief of evaluation, Mr. Barnard brought in Ben Gedalecia, who has directed radio and TV research for American Broadcasting Co. for the past 5 years.

There have been structural changes, too. Formerly, all media, including the Voice of America, were clustered in the Office of In-

ternational Information, and all education programs in the Office of Educational Exchange.

To strengthen the Voice, which is the State Department's most important medium, Voice has been taken out of the Office of International Information. It has been given coequal status, reporting directly to Mr. Barnard.

Office of International Information, too, is getting fresh leadership. For this operation, which includes press, films, publications, and other media, State Department has brought in Robert C. LaBlonde, vice president for public relations of Foote, Cone & Belding International.

Representative JOHN J. ROONEY, Democrat, New York, chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee handling State Department funds, is hopeful that these new housekeepers will sweep away the red tape which has hampered operations.

In a floor fight over IIEE funds for 1952, he waged a determined fight against an organized Republican campaign to clip \$15,000,000 off the \$85,000,000 proposed by the Appropriations Committee. He pointed out there had been a \$30,000,000 cut in committee. "Any further cut," he warned, "would go below the fat into the meat."

It is nothing new for United States overseas information units to have congressional troubles. Throughout World War II Congress was constantly on the verge of putting the overseas branch of the Office of War Information out of business. Several times it was saved only by the magic name of General Eisenhower, and convincing endorsements from personalities who could not be taken lightly.

Frequently, OWI Chief Elmer Davis was on the Hill, explaining away one or another allegedly unpardonable sin.

From time to time there are crusades to "improve" the information service one way or another. Shortly after the war, Congress demanded that Voice programing be handled by private broadcasters under contract. The results pleased no one.

Currently there are plans for an "Independent" information organization, to gather overseas activities of ECA and other agencies under one roof, away from "old line" bureaucrats.

Probably, this consolidation would eliminate overlapping which is inevitable while ECA operates its own \$17,000,000 information program in 17 countries. Whether an independent IIEE would be any better than the old OWI is a matter of conjecture.

Men close to IIEE believe overseas information will always be in danger of bureaucracy's most serious ailment—procrastination. The development of information "lines" inevitably involves so many "clearances" that there are innumerable opportunities for a project to get completely enmeshed.

For example, the information service recently decided to make a two-reel film on Korea. Before the script for this film got a necessary O. K. from various policy making agencies, it was rewritten several times and bounced back and forth between New York and Washington for more than 6 months.

It is not always this bad, but IIEE gets into fields where there are many cooks.

During the postwar period, IIEE budgets went as low as \$21,000,000 (in 1948). At times the atmosphere was frigid. Big news services refused to sell their reports to the Voice. Voice reporters were—and are—excluded from the regular Press Galleries of Congress, though their iron-curtain competitors were—and are—accorded all the many privileges of honest newspapermen.

Since the arrival of Mr. Barrett from Newsweek about a year ago to take top policy responsibility for IIEE, there has been a noticeable improvement in the climate. Under Foy Kohler, a career expert on Russia

and former chargé d'affaires in Moscow, the Voice has gone on the offensive, raising embarrassing questions for the Politburo to answer to its own people.

Arrival of Mr. Barnard convinced more than one congressional skeptic that a heroic effort to get an effective overseas information program is in the cards.

On the journeyman level, State Department feels its IIEE personnel is a remarkably effective group. But it isn't easy to draw topnotchers for the executive slots.

In a situation short of war, the emotional appeal is lacking. And for topnotchers, the opportunities outside Government are unparalleled at this time.

"We could use more consultants," officials say, "but the problem of security clearance is tough."

"Start FBI clearance of an adman," Mr. Barnard points out, "and he has a headache. His client immediately suspects he is getting ready to go into Government service. Naturally, the client isn't happy about that."

Nevertheless, quite a number of well-known marketing and media experts are putting their shoulder to the wheel. Ed Mayer, president of James Gray, Inc., one of the Nation's top experts on direct mail, recently returned from an assignment in southeast Asia. As consultants, State Department uses men like Sigurd Larmont, James W. Young, William Paley and Ed Noble. Its public relations panel is headed by William G. Werner, public relations chief of Procter & Gamble Co. Its new press and publications advisory committee, under Ben Hibbs, editor of the Saturday Evening Post, includes Ted Repplier, president of the Advertising Council, Edwin S. Friendly, vice president of the New York World-Telegram and Sun; A. L. Cole, manager, Reader's Digest; Arthur H. Motley, publisher of Parade, and others.

Recently a task force from Young & Rubicam was called in to appraise a portion of the IIEE operation. Another task force, from McCann-Erickson, is in the process of drawing up a suggested advertising campaign, as part of IIEE's program for a particular friendly nation. The Advertising Council has a campaign to get IIEE messages into overseas programs of United States industry. The \$104,000,000 budget which IIEE had during the past year may give a false sense of proportion.

For radio, its most important medium, the State Department had roughly \$16,000,000 in dollars and foreign currency. That compares with \$18,357,000 which Procter & Gamble Co. spent for network radio alone in 1950.

Voice of America broadcasts 54 hours of programing daily in 37 languages, and is in the process of stepping up its schedule. For the current fiscal year, it is asking Congress for \$25,000,000.

IIEE's press service produces a 10,000-word report daily for foreign newspapers and radio. Together with publications, it has an annual budget of \$6,800,000. Other budget items: Motion pictures, \$11,800,000; libraries and institutions, \$3,600,000, exchange of persons, \$6,000,000. The bulk of the IIEE budget is capital-equipment construction of new radio stations, \$67,000,000.

I include the following news article written by a lovely West Virginian, Mary Eloise Turner:

MRS. KEE FIRST WEST VIRGINIA WOMAN REPRESENTATIVE—GRANDDAUGHTER SEES GRACIOUS LADY TAKE HER SEAT IN CONGRESS

(By Mary Eloise Turner)

WASHINGTON, July 28.—With a yellow-haired granddaughter watching from the gallery a gracious lady from West Virginia took her seat in the halls of Congress this week, thus becoming the State's first woman Representative. She is ELIZABETH KEE, of Bluefield, W. Va., who was elected July 17 in a special election to fill the unexpired term of her late husband, the beloved John Kee of the Fifth Congressional District.

The Congress was called to order by the Speaker, Mr. SAM RAYBURN, of Texas. The invocation was given by the Reverend William Eckman, of Christ Episcopal Church, of Philadelphia, who came down for the occasion. Mrs. KEE was accompanied to the rostrum to swear allegiance to her new job by Dr. T. H. HEDRICK, of the Sixth West Virginia District, who is the dean of the West Virginia representatives. Seated in the front to view the ceremony and to welcome their new colleague, were ROBERT L. RAMSAY, of the First District, HARLEY O. STAGGERS, of the Second District, CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, of the Third District; and M. G. BURNSIDE, of the Fourth District.

What kind of woman has had this signal honor? First, one would say that ELIZABETH KEE does not look like a politician. She is unhurried, calm, and soft-spoken, a rather large woman with a sweet smile and expressive eyes. She has a keen sense of humor and enjoys a joke on herself. She is no stranger to the job of the congressional office as she has been her husband's secretary for 16 years. As a freshman Congresswoman, however, she will take her place at the foot of the ladder with none of the prerogatives won by her husband in his long years in Washington. Mr. Kee was chairman of the powerful and important Foreign Affairs Committee which gave him and his wife a high place in the official and social life of Washington.

Mrs. KEE has worked hard as a congressional secretary but has kept a vital interest in other things as well. She has a large collection of miniature dogs. To this might be added Pepl, a Mexican chihuahua, a more animated but scarcely larger member who guards his mistress' apartment. Mrs. KEE loves music and flowers and is interested in flower arrangement. Chinese art is another of her varied interests. Her chief hobby, if one can be singled out, is the library at Woodrow Wilson Rehabilitation Center at Fishersville, Va. She has collected 10,000 volumes for this library and had many of them autographed by famous men of our time.

Mrs. KEE is the mother of two children, Frances and Jimmy. Her three granddaughters with the alliterative names of Kirsten, Kathleen, and Karen are the pride of their grandmother as her face shows when she speaks of them.

Mrs. Kee First West Virginia Woman Representative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks,

Should the Government Pay?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the problems arising from the recent Kaw River flood are manifold. The St.

Louis Post-Dispatch on August 15, 1951, published the following editorial entitled "Should the Government Pay?" which asked a searching question:

SHOULD THE GOVERNMENT PAY?

Relief must unquestionably be provided for the flood sufferers in Missouri, Kansas, and Oklahoma. Financial aid must be given to those who cannot get back on their feet without it. Whether this should be done in the way Representative BOLLING, of Kansas City, and Senator THOMAS HENNING, of St. Louis, propose, however, is a question. They would have the United States Government pay for a substantial part of the losses of home owners and small-business men.

The Bolling-Henning proposal would set a precedent in American disaster relief and reconstruction, for hitherto the Red Cross has taken care of these tasks. Once the principle of Federal reimbursement for capital losses in natural disasters was established, how far would it go? Would it mean Federal contributions after every flood, tornado, or other disaster everywhere in the country? What would be the likely cost to the Treasury?

The Red Cross has indicated it expects to be able to cope with the Midwestern flood disaster as it has coped with other disasters in the past. Federal funds are available, as they should be, for emergency relief. For long-range rehabilitation, the Red Cross stands ready to help individuals who cannot help themselves, and the RFC is available for loans to business concerns that cannot get credit through ordinary commercial channels.

But Federal grants to make good losses to private property are essentially different from these forms of relief. While it is unquestionably a Federal responsibility to develop water resources so the floods are brought under control, is it a Federal responsibility to pay the losses resulting from its past neglect of flood control? Are there convincing reasons why means of relief and rehabilitation used in the past are no longer adequate? We raise these questions to indicate some of the considerations which facts and debate should be expected to settle before final action is taken in Congress.

Soldier—Statesman—Friend

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. F. ERTEL CARLYLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 1951

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. Alfred Lee Bulwinkle, late a Representative from the State of North Carolina.

Mr. CARLYLE. Mr. Speaker, for many centuries, thoughtful men have known that the guiding star of their lives must be seen in the early years of life. Hon. Alfred Lee Bulwinkle was a thoughtful man, and in his early years he firmly decided that the guiding star of his life would be determination and faithfulness. He pointed these splendid attributes in the right direction. This fact is ably stated in the following well-considered editorial which appeared in the Charlotte News, one of the leading newspapers of the Southern States, and published at Charlotte, N. C.:

THE MAJOR GOT THINGS DONE

When Maj. A. L. Bulwinkle's discharge papers passed through the office of the Ad-

jutant General of the Army after World War I they were endorsed: "He gets things done."

This endorsement aptly described the career of the veteran Congressman who had represented the Tenth and then the Eleventh North Carolina Districts for 28 years. Major Bulwinkle got things done.

He got things done as an officer of artillery on the battle fronts of France in World War I, and he got things done in his 28 years of service in the National House of Representatives. At the same time his manner was quiet and unobtrusive and his accomplishments were without fanfare and ballyhoo.

Although his chief accomplishments are recorded in national policy, he made many real contributions to Mecklenburg County and the city of Charlotte. He was instrumental in securing the present fine post-office building and gave material assistance in obtaining Federal aid in the construction of such worth-while projects as the American Legion Memorial Stadium, the Douglas Municipal Airport, and Memorial Hospital.

Major Bulwinkle devoted most of his life to public service, as a school teacher, Army officer and legislator. He ran for Congress fifteen times and was defeated only once, in 1928, when Democrats fell right and left in the Al Smith debacle.

Much of the established legislation relating to transportation (land and air) and public health was enacted under his guidance. He was a ranking member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House and was particularly interested in matters pertaining to air transportation. He developed legislation providing for coordination of civil aeronautics and sponsored the National Airport Act which resulted in the establishment of a Nation-wide network of civilian airports.

He was instrumental in securing legislation establishing the National Cancer Institute, the wartime cadet nurses' program and tuberculosis control, as well as the national campaign against venereal disease. He served, too, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Pure Food and Drugs that drafted measures safeguarding food, drugs, and cosmetics.

One of the major's foremost personal and official interests was the welfare of the veterans. He was instrumental in the organization of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and in addition to his official activities he was ready to help any veteran.

When Major Bulwinkle was elected to Congress in 1920 from the Tenth District, Mecklenburg was a part of the district. He served this county well until the redistricting after the 1940 census when North Carolina was given an additional district. Gaston County was in the Eleventh District and Major Bulwinkle had served that district since that time. Because of ill health he did not seek renomination this spring and had planned to retire at the end of his term.

A man of firm convictions and stout courage, the major represented North Carolina well in Congress and his illness and death have removed one of the State's conscientious and capable leaders.

Mr. Speaker, being a member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I have had many opportunities to observe the useful service which Congressman Bulwinkle rendered during the many years that he served as a ranking member of this committee, and important and far-reaching legislation which he sponsored clearly discloses that he was possessed of a clear and trained mind, high purposes, and the determination to render beneficial and permanent service to his State and country. No one has ever doubted his loyalty and sincerity of purpose because his outstanding record in Congress is one of action, achievement, and fidelity.

It was my pleasure to have known Congressman Bulwinkle for more than 25 years and I know he loved people and he loved life. He carefully studied and diligently worked with legislation that had for its purpose to protect life and to promote health and happiness for all mankind. In this particular field of legislation he was a recognized authority. His great mind followed in the vein of the poet:

The world is filled with flowers,
The flowers are filled with dew,
The dew is filled with heavenly love
That drips for me and you.

Of Congressman Bulwinkle it must be said that his life proves that he acted wisely when he selected as his guiding star the attributes of determination and faithfulness, because these splendid characteristics combined with his superb ability and innate honesty enabled him to serve well his constituents, his State, and humanity. His passing has occasioned great loss but he was extremely interested in being of service until the end. In fact, the Death Angel almost called him from his desk.

Being a brave soldier, true statesman, and devoted public servant, he will always be remembered as one of the great sons of North Carolina and one who fully understood and appreciated:

What builds the nation's pillars high
And its foundations strong,
What makes it mighty to defy
The foes that round it throng?
Not gold, but only men can make
A people great and strong;
Men who, for truth, and honor's sake,
Stand fast and suffer long.
Brave men who work while others sleep
Who dare while others fly—
They build a nation's pillars deep
And lift them to the sky.

Newburyport, Mass., Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, the city of Newburyport, Mass., is this year observing in quiet fashion the one hundredth anniversary of its incorporation as a city, and I am proud to call the attention of the Nation to this important event.

Newburyport holds a prominent place historically, and its contributions to State and Nation have been outstanding. Its people have long cherished the meaning of our way of life and have demonstrated their high sense of patriotism at every call to serve the cause of freedom.

Newburyport has long boasted of its fine community spirit, and its churches, schools, hospitals, newspapers, as well as patriotic and fraternal organizations, bespeak of a people working and striving together in order to make their city a better place in which to live.

Steeped in rich traditions and proud of its past, Newburyport looks forward to greater progress.

Proposed Synthetic Oil Plant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the executive session of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee Wednesday afternoon at 2 o'clock on the subject of synthetic liquid fuels, there appeared recently in Platt's Oilgram News Service three articles with reference to the reported plan for the immediate construction of two commercial-size liquid fuel plants. I want to make these articles readily available to the members of the committee and to my other colleagues who may be interested in the subject. The articles follow:

[From Platt's Oilgram, Cleveland edition, of August 8, 1951]

CHAPMAN ASKS NEARLY HALF BILLION FOR SYNTHETICS, WANTS PLANTS STARTED NOW BEFORE OIL RUNS OUT

WASHINGTON—Authority to borrow \$455,000,000 from the Federal Treasury with the object of underwriting the immediate construction of two commercial-size synthetic liquid-fuel plants is being sought by Interior Secretary Chapman, it was learned today by Oilgram on the best of authority.

If permission is granted, Chapman intends to—

1 Use \$400,000,000 of the total to guarantee Government purchase of the output, and thus the profits, on the proposed investment by a private group in a 30,000 b/d hydrogenation plant, to be located probably in southern Illinois.

2 Underwrite in similar fashion the construction of a \$55,000,000 shale oil plant of a "few thousand" barrels daily capacity.

Chapman's request is pending before the Defense Production Administration and seeks to invoke authority for such deals set out in the recently amended Defense Production Act (Sections 302 and 303). That law, as amended, makes a total of \$2,100,000,000 available to Government departments and agencies to encourage expansion of productive capacity and supply.

The Secretary, in going to DPA, is believed to have acted without the advice or even the knowledge of the Petroleum Administration for Defense.

This would mean that he had ignored the fact his own order setting up PAD gives that agency responsibility for all liquid fuels, including any which might be produced synthetically.

Also, patently, he moved without waiting for National Petroleum Council to complete and file report he requested on cost estimates his own synthetic fuels chief, Dr. W. C. Schroeder, claims show synthetics now to be competitive with petroleum.

The Schroeder claim has been vigorously challenged by many in industry, but principal results of NPC's review of his cost figures won't be forthcoming probably until October. NPC study is to be most comprehensive ever made into subject of synthetic liquid fuels, involving work of dozens of industry experts and a cost of their companies well over \$500,000.

However, Chapman apparently decided to wait on nobody and so filed his formal application for borrowing authority with DPA on July 28.

He is understood to have sought to justify the request on grounds that the United

States must immediately take out "insurance" against the day when the petroleum industry can no longer keep pace with mounting demand. In this respect, he thus flew in the face of the short-term (5-year) availability report of NPC's McCollum committee, filed just 4 days previously, and also of PAD reports to him which have scouted the possibility of the United States running out of oil in the foreseeable future.

The "insurance" line is one, however, that the Secretary has been strongly plugging in recent speeches around the country. At Asheville, N. C., on May 19, for example, he said:

"The oil industry has done and is doing prodigious things to increase our supply, yet we must provide the best insurance we can against the possibility that the demand for liquid fuels may ultimately exceed our capacity to find and tap new reserves of oil. In other words, we must begin to provide ourselves with synthetic liquid fuels."

If he gets the requested borrowing authority—and provided nothing intervenes in the meantime to cause him to change his mind—Chapman and his top program planners, including Schroeder, intend entering immediately into active negotiations with a private group looking to construction of the 30,000 b/d coal hydrogenation plant.

Similar negotiations involving shale oil plant presumably would lag not far behind.

The one private group known to be interested in building a coal hydrogenation plant, provided Government guarantees against loss, is represented by Ferdinand Eberstadt, of New York. It has estimated \$400,000,000 as cost of a 30,000 b/d plant, including \$50,000,000 for necessary power-generating facilities.

A crude petroleum refinery of like capacity now costs approximately \$45,000,000, or about \$1,500 per b/d of crude input capacity.

In August 1949 the Bureau of Mines, in its Report of Investigations No. 4564, estimated that a 30,000 b/d hydrogenation plant using Illinois bituminous coal, which is what the Eberstadt group proposes, would require 175,148 tons of steel to build. That tonnage covers only the requirements for actual hydrogenation section, the gas-production section, and general and auxiliary plants facilities such as tankage, utilities, railroads, etc. It does not include indispensable accessory facilities, such as water supply, roads and railroad connections, opening of the mines, and housing accommodations.

The same steel requirements figure probably still holds good, at least, it is the one being used by NPC committee in its study. By way of comparison with 175,148 tons estimate, total third quarter allocation of steel to the refining branch of the oil industry is only 82,000 tons.

In dealing with the Eberstadt group Interior Department officials reportedly are insisting on a cancellation clause in the contract under which, if the deal doesn't work out too well, the Government may take over and operate the plant itself after payment of certain costs.

Any purchase arrangement entered into would have an automatic termination date of June 30, 1962, as provided in the amended Defense Production Act.

Word of the Chapman request to OPA also brought with it today further information as to the internal difficulties at the Interior Department which have been seen Dr. Schroeder taking over from James Boyd as head of the Defense Minerals Administration, with the latter being relegated to his old job of Director of the Bureau of Mines (see August 6 Oilgram).

Insiders said the DMA shake-up has been long in the works for a variety of reasons; also that it had been expected to lead to Boyd's prompt resignation from the Bureau, making it possible for Schroeder to take over as Director. It was said to be in anticipation of this that, at the same time he appointed

him acting DMA chief, Chapman also made Schroeder Assistant Director for programs in the Mines Bureau.

However, Boyd did not resign, so, rather than have Schroeder taking orders from Boyd, Chapman now has issued orders under which Schroeder is responsible only to the Secretary, Oilgram was told. This leaves Boyd in the untenable position of having an assistant over whom he has no control and could have the result of now actually forcing his resignation.

Boyd is understood to have incurred high disfavor of Chapman and those about him primarily because, doubting Schroeder's claims as to synthetic fuel production costs, he called in a private consultant to go over the latter's figures and had those doubts confirmed.

[From Platt's Oilgram, New York edition, of August 10, 1951]

PAD'S BROWN PICTURED AS STILL OPPOSED TO PLAN FOR COMMERCIAL-SCALE OUTPUT OF SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS

WASHINGTON—While he has refused to comment on Secretary Chapman's effort to underwrite a synthetic liquid fuels program (see Aug. 8 Oilgram), it is fair to assume, Oilgram was told today, that Deputy PAD Bruce K. Brown is as opposed now to building of commercial-size coal hydrogenation plants as he was when he so testified before a congressional committee in January 1948.

Brown informed House Armed Services (Short) Committee at that time that, in his opinion, it just didn't make sense to burn 4.5 tons of a solid fuel—coal—to make 3 tons of synthetic liquid fuel.

Meantime, it was positively established today that PAD was not consulted by Chapman in advance of his request to Defense Production Administration for authority to borrow \$455,000,000 from the Treasury to guarantee private promoters against loss in constructing and operating a hydrogenation plant and a smaller shale oil plant.

However, agency subsequently is understood to have communicated to Chapman in writing its view that encouragement of commercial size synthetic plants cannot be justified under present conditions. Presumably its argument followed much the same line as did Brown in his 1948 testimony.

In pushing for construction of plants, Chapman and other departmental officials have been seeking, in part, to economically justify coal hydrogenation process by crediting value of chemicals or aromatics yielded to production costs of liquid fuels output. On this score, PAD may have torn some of ground out from under them in a report sent this week to the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, headed by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Democrat, Texas.

PAD reported to the subcommittee that approval of eight pending necessity certificate applications from industry will "place the oil industry in the position of exceeding by a slight margin" a National Production Authority program under which industry is called upon to produce 131,000,000 gallons of benzene annually.

Total potential benzene from already certified facilities amounts to 81,000,000 gallons per year, while applications pending provide for another 54,000,000 gallons—a total of 135,000,000.

Chapman's move to launch a synthetics program is beginning to get widespread notice.

The Christian Science Monitor reported today that the proposed hydrogenation plant in southern Illinois would be constructed and operated for the so-called Eberstadt group by the Koppers Co. The newspaper also said:

"One Government expert on mobilization contracts estimates that the project as endorsed by Secretary Chapman would insure

to the private promoters of the project profits up to 1,100 percent on the 250,000 shares of \$1 common stock in 12 years. Under the prospectus, this \$250,000 worth of voting stock would control the enterprise."

The Monitor said, too, that Dr. H. H. Storch, director of Bureau of Mines experiment station at Bruceton, Pa., had advised against the Eberstadt deal in a memorandum dated July 3—25 days before the Chapman request was forwarded to DPA. It quoted Dr. Storch as writing,

"It is apparent that even a 30,000-barrels-per-day plant is a 'poor risk' for private capital. It is, therefore, not surprising that the sponsors of this project plan to request guarantees from the Government for capital, interest, and product disposal at a satisfactory price. Because the sponsors refuse to take any risks whatever, it would seem undesirable for the Government to agree to their proposal."

[From Platt's Oilgram, New York edition, of August 13, 1951]

INTERIOR DENIES DISPUTE ON SYNTHETICS RESULTED IN BOYD OUSTER—SAYS NO "OUTSIDER" DID COST CHECKING

WASHINGTON.—An Interior Department spokesman today denied that a difference of opinion between Secretary Chapman and Bureau of Mines Director Boyd over synthetic fuels led to the latter's replacement as head of Defense Minerals Administration.

He referred to replacement of Boyd by Dr. W. C. Schroeder, Chief of Department's Office of Synthetic Liquid Fuels (see August 8 and 10 Oilgrams).

"Synthetic fuels had not the slightest thing to do with it," said this Department official, adding that Boyd's departure from DMA "probably was in the cards" when the President recently created a new separate agency to handle stockpiling of strategic minerals.

This new agency, it was said, will cut across the jurisdictional lines formerly held by DMA.

The Interior spokesman also took occasion to proclaim that Boyd did not have "an outsider" brought in to check cost figures compiled by Schroeder's office on creation of a commercial synthetic fuels industry. Such a check, however, he added, was made by Dr. H. H. Storch, director of the Bureau of Mines' experiment station at Bruceton, Pa.

"There has been an honest difference of opinion within the bureau on synthetics," the spokesman concluded.

Meantime, it was pointed out that Oilgram in its August 10 issue inadvertently quoted Deputy PAD Bruce K. Brown as testifying in 1948 before a House Armed Services (Short) Oil Subcommittee that it would take 45 tons of coal to make 3 tons of synthetic liquid fuel. The story should have said, as Brown testified at that time, that it would require 45 tons of coal to make 1 ton of synthetic liquid fuel.

cently written a very interesting article under the caption "Dangers in congressional immunity." The article was published in a recent issue of the New York Times Magazine, and because of its appropriateness at this time and the attention it has attracted, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DANGERS IN CONGRESSIONAL IMMUNITY—SENATOR HUNT, CITING ABUSES OF THE PRIVILEGE, PROPOSES THAT IT BE ABOLISHED OR CURTAILED

(By LESTER C. HUNT)

WASHINGTON.—If I declared falsely at a public meeting that some person I disliked was a Communist, I might be sued for slander and exposed to the penalties provided by law. But if I, addressing the Senate as a Member, should falsely charge that this person was a Communist, or guilty of any crime, even that of treason to the Nation, I could not be made to pay for the destruction of my enemy's character nor suffer any other penalty. This is a protection accorded Members of Congress by the Constitution of the United States.

The injustice of the effects of such a law, as exemplified by a number of recent cases, has awakened all fair-minded people to the need for subjecting this constitutional provision to the closest scrutiny. There is a growing feeling either that the courts should give the law a very limited construction or else that Congress should abolish the immunity it affords in situations in which it was not meant to be applied.

The latter remedy is the intent of a joint resolution which I have offered in the Congress for repeal of that part of section 6, article I, of the Constitution which grants the immunity privilege for all statements uttered in the conduct of congressional business and which reads: "... and for any speech or debate in either House they [the Members of Congress] shall not be questioned in any other place [e. g., the courts]."

This unusual prerogative of immunity, conferring protection against arrest or civil suit, is one of the most jealously guarded of Congress' rights and privileges. It was lifted from the English law and placed by the founding fathers in our Constitution with, apparently, little debate. Its purpose as conceived by them is plain. The members of the Constitutional Convention were only shortly removed from English rule and they were alert to the dangers which lay in control of legislative bodies by the executive. It was not entirely clear in their minds what form the executive of the United States would assume. Many thought that our President would function as a king and have the kingly prerogatives. So the immunity afforded Members of Congress was designed to allow criticism of the executive without fear of retaliation. It was plainly their intention that the Congress be protected not from its constituents but from the executive branch of the Government.

It was also part of the intention of the Constitutional Convention that the doctrine of privilege should be valid only within the halls of Congress. The framers of the Constitution would be surprised and appalled if they knew that, as construed today, it is applicable to speeches which are never made before Congress but which are written or adapted by Members as extensions of imaginary remarks and circulated throughout the country in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They would also be shocked to learn that it has been extended to committee reports and to testimony in committee hearings.

Such broad interpretation of the term "immunity" has led to three flagrant and, in my view, intolerable abuses. The first of these is that, under the aegis of the immunity privilege, unscrupulous Congressmen can impute unworthy or unpatriotic motives to any department of Government or any member of an administration, by innuendo or as an outright accusation, without offering any evidence in support of such charges. An apparent error of judgment on the part of a public figure may be attributed to motives of treason. The accusation may be utterly without foundation and the accused's purposes may be of the highest, but the doubt which is cast on the Government departments concerned not only lowers public confidence in those departments but also in time undermines the people's faith in our form of government.

Still another abuse of the immunity principle is that practiced by the Congressman who uses it in building up his own political personality. When a Member of Congress, either with or without intent to injure, makes an accusation against another person, the tactic pays off in three ways. It makes of him, as a Member of Congress, a man to be feared. It disgraces his opponent. And it gives him publicity that he does not deserve but which is of paramount usefulness in furthering his personal ambition. This is done at the expense of a person who has no direct recourse against the defamer.

Thus we come to the third abuse of the immunity privilege, that involving a basic violation of the accused party's constitutional rights. This works in two ways, for not only is the ordinary citizen usually denied the right to defend himself against his more privileged accuser, but he is in fact placed in double jeopardy. He is tried in committee and subcommittee, in the newspapers and over the radio. Then, if an iota of evidence against him is found, he is again tried in a court of law, a manifest violation of the due-process clause of our Constitution.

"Trial by press," it should be noted, is by no means an idle or academic concept. During the days of the Constitutional Convention, the power of the press was feeble as compared with its power now, and other means of discrimination were nonexistent. Today, however, we have the world-wide circulation of daily papers and magazines and in addition, the radio and television. Accusations, whether true or false, are constantly battered into the minds of the people, particularly by the radio with its news reports and news analysis.

Take, for example, the recent hearings on the appointment of Mrs. Anna Rosenberg to the post of Assistant Secretary of Defense. Charges without a semblance of truth were made against Mrs. Rosenberg at a Senate committee hearing by persons claiming to be ex-Communists—charges that she was a party member or that her philosophy was Marxist. All these charges were repudiated by reliable witnesses. Nevertheless, the accusations were flaunted on the radio by certain unprincipled broadcasters, whereas the repudiations were lightly passed over—indeed in some cases skipped entirely.

This type of news coverage, spreading the effects of any misuse of the immunity privilege at congressional hearings, plays into the hands of the Communists because it builds distrust, prejudice, and fear.

In the specific case no harm was done to the Government or to the Department of Defense because thinking American people protested and let their anger be known to their Representatives by letter, telegram, and telephone. They refused to tolerate such persecution of a loyal citizen. But a different result might have been reached if

Dangers in Congressional Immunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, our distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] has re-

Mrs. Rosenberg had not been a person of such high character and standing, and if so many persons had not sprung to her defense.

If situations confront the Congress in which it can no longer control its Members by the rules of society, justice, and fair play, then Congress has, I feel, a moral obligation to take drastic steps to remedy those situations. Nevertheless, there are plenty of Congressmen to be found who question the wisdom of lifting this congressional shield and of thereby making themselves responsible and liable for their words and actions.

Some of my colleagues base their opposition to repeal the immunity principle on the ground that immunity is central to Congress' authority to investigate individuals and departments and that such authority is not merely a privilege but a duty. With them I would agree—so long as the investigation remains within the bounds of good conscience. They argue further that, without regard for those who may be unjustly injured by it, the immunity principle must be maintained for the protection of the people at large. With that I cannot agree.

These members contend that to repeal the provision would place a Congressman in the position where he could not expose corruption and crime unless he had irrefutable evidence, thus hampering many commendable congressional inquiries. This may be true, but I am certain that if the privilege were removed every Member would look more closely at the facts before submitting evidence to a committee.

At the same time removal of the privilege would constitute a deterrent to publicity-seeking Members, while little affecting Members who conscientiously study and understand the facts before presenting them on the floor.

However, if the Members of Congress do not see the wisdom of removing this special privilege, another method may be devised to deal with the misuse of the privilege. I have introduced a bill to parallel the Government liability to suit in cases involving contracts and for torts. Originally the Government could not be sued upon any grounds without its consent, but it was recognized that this was unjust, and by an act of Congress the Government is now open to suits of these types.

The proposed remedy would be for Congress to pass an act permitting a person defamed by a Member of Congress to sue the Government for damages.

The great advantage of such an act would be the financial reparation made to the libeled individual. An unjust charge of communistic leanings, for example, or even one involving the more remote guilt-by-association theory, can cause a person great financial harm. It may mean loss of job and job opportunities. The extension of governmental liabilities to cover these losses is based upon the sound principle that where the conduct of a governmental business involves an unjust loss to a citizen, the citizen should have recompense.

A sum of money, of course, can never completely compensate a person for a lost reputation. But the very fact of winning a judgment would help to restore an injured person's reputation. Moreover, the embarrassment of being proved wrong might supply the restraint now lacking for those few Members of Congress who willfully promulgate libel.

The time to correct this unfair, unjust privilege given to Members of Congress is long past due. The suggestions I have made will never compensate for the injuries already suffered by many citizens, but they should help to prevent the recurrence of such unhappy, unnecessary, and cruel situations.

Congress Gets a Pat on the Back for a Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Fallbrook (Calif.) Enterprise on August 17. Our subcommittee referred to in the editorial found the people of Fallbrook to be a fine group of hospitable, hardworking citizens. The unjust attack on water rights made by the Federal Government should be stopped forthwith. The editorial follows:

IT WAS WONDERFUL

Something wonderful happened in Fallbrook this week.

Over one thousand citizens of the United States of America walked into the Fallbrook Union High School auditorium on Monday morning questioning in their minds the veracity, the morality, and possibly the sanity of the vested leaders of this Nation.

Reconvening the next day until 10 minutes to 1 Tuesday afternoon those people, after hours of listening, walked out of the Fallbrook Union High School auditorium thrilled to the depths of their souls. They were thrilled that in the Congress of the United States are sincere, human, down-to-earth individuals of the caliber of Representative CLAIR ENGLE, chairman of the House Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee, and his equally sincere, human and down-to-earth committee members, SAM YORTY, NORRIS FOULSON, JOHN SAYLOR and WALTER BARING.

Torn by confusion, resentment, expense, and summons-servers claiming rights for the United States that seemed based rather on disuniting them, the citizens of Fallbrook and other nearby communities involved in the abortion called No. 1247-civil entered the high school auditorium in quandary. Almost all had never attended a congressional hearing. Would this clarify . . . or mystify?

The congressional subcommittee had not cast their voices 5 minutes over the amplifiers before a sense of assurance permeated the auditorium, despite the visitation of two employees of the Department of Justice and the United States Navy in the auditorium. Eventually, listening to these Congressmen, vituperative as they were at times, even the presence of William H. Veeder and David Agnew could not submerge the inherent faith Americans have in America. Those two men were conceded not the whole of their Departments but the hole. That was the consensus of the audience as faith grew through the proceedings, and the Congressmen evidenced the George Washington spirit instead of the present Washington hocus apparent in the suit.

When these representatives of the people, the Congressmen of the United States unanimously and enthusiastically resolved to "implement into legislation the memorandum of agreement allotting Fallbrook 7,500 acre-feet a year from a dam to be built on the Santa Margarita River," a cheer flooded the high-school auditorium that was as significant as a resurrection. The ideal of government which has sustained democracy was suddenly a living entity, right here in the small confines of Fallbrook, Calif.

But that was not the only wonderful thing that happened Monday and Tuesday in this community's midst. Something else so in-

spiring it will etch its glory in the memory of all arose from the testimonies. Called on in rote from an agenda of Fallbrook's own citizens, the so-called little people of a country village impressed each other and the Congressmen of the United States that here were people so big their names will be legend wherever controversy and the triumph of "right" exists.

It was a proud 2 days for Fallbrook. Proud of its own ability to stand up and face an issue. Proud of its companions in Congress who were champions of a just cause. Proud of a nation that could hold a free hearing and arrive at a moral decision without fear, pressure, or dictation. It was wonderful.

Alaska's Untapped Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 16, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following editorial which appeared in the Belleville (Ill.) News-Democrat on August 18, 1951, entitled "Untapped Resources":

UNTAPPED RESOURCES

Alaska is in the same latitude as Norway and Sweden. If it had a population density equal to the average of those Scandinavian nations, its inhabitants would soar from about 100,000 to more than 12,000,000. Alaska's resources, a bulky report released by the Department of Interior indicates, could support a population up to 10,000,000.

Alaska's remoteness had caused many Americans—including Congressmen—to be apathetic regarding the vast region's development. And Alaska's far northern position has caused numerous misconceptions about its present and future value to the Nation.

Prepared for the information of Congress, the Interior report contains facts that deserve attention of the whole American public. Here are some things you may not know about our northern territory.

Alaska is one-fifth as large as the United States, and it extends one-sixth of the way around the world at that latitude. It has an estimated 180,000,000,000 feet of merchantable timber, in some of the finest forests in the world, yet a substantial part of its lumber is imported from the United States.

Alaska possesses undeveloped potential oil wells and yet it imports \$10,000,000 of petroleum each year. Freight rates of Alaska are so high they cause all commodity prices to skyrocket because manufacturing has not yet been developed in Alaska and many ships have to return empty.

Alaska is estimated to have 17,000,000 acres of land suitable for farm crops and grassland for livestock, and yet it imports much of its food. Alaska's vast river system, offering 3,000 miles of navigable channels, is capable of producing 50,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy each year.

Alaska lies only 56 miles across Bering Strait from Soviet Russia's Siberia, and its 33,000 miles of fiord-notched coast line create a major problem of coastal defense.

Gold has always been the chief center of mining activity in Alaska, but numerous other metals and strategic minerals badly needed in today's defense efforts lie locked in numerous deposits awaiting the key of human ingenuity and enterprise. Alaska's

topsy-turvy economy is again illustrated by its coal. With resources believed to exceed 110,000,000,000 tons, Alaska in 1945 imported coal valued at \$464,000.

Long-range planners in Alaska look upon northwestern America as an economic unit, including Canada's northwest, particularly northern British Columbia and the Yukon, which border Alaska.

Canadian studies of future potentials of their part of this region indicate that natural resources there could support 6,000,000 persons. Combine this 6,000,000 with Alaska's potential 10,000,000 and you have a population 2,000,000 greater than Canada's present total population.

United States and Canadian cooperation in developing this northwest corner of the continent is highly important.

Mineral resources in Canada's northwest, compilers of the report suggest, might best be shipped to Alaskan tidewater plants for smelting, processing, manufacturing, and marketing Canada's northwest, furthermore, when populated, would be a nearby market for Alaskan products.

Some time when Moscow replaces the present Kremlin conspirators with statesmen desirous of cooperating to develop the world's potential for the good of mankind, it will be possible to establish a Bering Strait link between the highway and railway systems of the Americas with those of Asia, Europe, and Africa. This is a geographic and scientific possibility as soon as men decide to use their resources for constructive purposes instead of frittering them away in the waste of warfare.

Meanwhile, we need to face today's facts and strengthen Alaska's defenses to assure that Russia shall not make an invasion springboard of this sparse and undeveloped region which Congress has been too apathetic even to convert into a State.

A Good American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members to the following editorial that appeared in the Springfield (Mass.) Sunday Republican. I think it tells the story that everyone in the country should know.

A GOOD AMERICAN

There is a good lesson for all Americans in the career of Mathew Matulevics of Chicopee Falls, a popular guard at the Fisk branch of the United States Rubber Corp., who soon will retire after 41 years of service with the company.

Mr. Matulevics came to this country from Lithuania as a youth and started work for the rubber concern soon afterward. Throughout his long service he has always been faithful to his duty and at the same time, through his ever-cheerful personality, has made thousands of friends among the personnel at the Chicopee plant.

He was married, soon after arrival in this country, to the former Monica Lakouskas, and they reared a family of four girls and two boys, both of the latter serving as officers in the United States Armed Forces during the war and one of them, John, losing his life in the Pacific area.

The significant point of Mr. Matulevics' career is that, while never attaining a lofty position in the business world, he has always done his work well and faithfully, has lived

a good and honest life and, in his own way, has served America as well as many who can trace their ancestry to the Mayflower.

Mr. Matulevics is typical of the millions of ordinary people who, in the aggregate, have been the main force in building up this Nation to its present position of world-wide leadership, and who also are its principal defense and support in the years ahead.

States Should Win Tidelands Oil Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in our RECORD the following editorial by the eminent editor and publisher of the Los Angeles Daily News, Mr. Manchester Boddy:

STATES SHOULD WIN TIDELANDS OIL FIGHT (By Manchester Boddy)

The United States—one of the world's greatest oil countries—has been forced to import more than 1,000,000 barrels of oil a day. Domestic production is about 6,000,000 barrels a day.

In event of a major war, according to a statement to Congress in January by Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman, this country could boost production by 700,000 barrels but would still be 500,000 short of wartime needs.

The Middle East, which supplies oil to the free world is now rocked by political and social turmoil. If Middle East wells should be cut off or diverted to iron-curtain countries, the rest of the free world would look to the Americas for oil.

Nevertheless and despite repeated warnings that the United States and the Western World face a critical oil shortage, Congress and the Truman administration are still deadlocked over control of the tidelands oil fields, and exploitation of fields in the oil-rich Gulf of Mexico is at a standstill. Almost every State has entered the fight.

DISPUTE HOLDS UP NEW LEASES

No new leases for oil hunting or drillings in the Gulf have been granted since 1948. No new leases are in prospect until Congress and the administration settle these questions:

Who shall control the offshore oil lands—the Federal Government or the coastal States? How shall royalty payments from the oil companies be divided?

The dispute has been thrown into the lap of Congress.

States' rights spokesmen from 38 States are backing bills to quitclaim all rights to the rich under-water oil fields which were awarded to the Federal Government in a series of controversial Supreme Court decisions.

But administration supporters are fighting to nail down Federal control over the lands. They warn that President Truman will veto any quitclaim bill and claim a veto cannot be overridden by Congress.

Both sides have offered compromises. The administration is willing to accept temporary control just to get the oil flowing and has offered to use the oil money for aid to the Nation's schools. The States say they, too, would accept temporary control pending a final solution.

STATES BASE CLAIMS ON HISTORY

The coastal States base their claims to the lands on history. They say that States have

owned the offshore areas since colonial times. The Federal Government claim hinges on the Supreme Court decisions, which in turn were based mainly on considerations of international law.

The States say there is ample evidence the original 13 colonies owned at least a 3-mile strip of water off their coasts, and no transfer of this area was made when the colonies voluntarily came together into a Federal union; nowhere in the Constitution does it specify the Federal Government owns the adjacent seas, and what isn't given the Federal Government by the Constitution automatically goes to the States.

The only way out of the costly stalemate, it seems to us, is for Congress to overrule the Supreme Court decisions. Administration bills, dealing with phases of the issue, have included specific disclaimers to inland waterways, to harbors, to piers and to other improvements built into the sea. One more step is in order: a disclaimer to the tidelands.

When the issue first came up, sponsors of Federal over State ownership attempted to rationalize their position with the argument that the Federal Government needed ownership of the oil lands in order to maintain adequate oil reserves for future use.

Experience through World War II and subsequent years has demonstrated that the major oil producers of the United States have cooperated with the Federal Government to the fullest possible extent and maintained a self-policing policy that went far beyond the system of controls imposed by government over many other major industries. The oil industry in the United States has long since come of age. It is no longer an irresponsible collection of freebooters out to pillage for today and to hell with tomorrow.

But Congress is not faced with a public against private ownership issue. It is at question of Federal against State Governments. Whichever side wins, private industry will produce the oil.

If State ownership prevails, as we think it should, the people of California will benefit from the production of California oil. If the Federal ownership side wins, you may be sure the politicians of 47 other States will have a grand time appropriating the take from California tidelands production.

Proposed Removal of VA Office from New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, shortly after Mr. Carl H. Gray, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, announced the decision to transfer the VA district office from New York to Philadelphia, I introduced a bill in this House to provide that a VA district office shall be maintained in New York. In a statement explaining the purposes of my bill I pointed to the false economy contained in such a move, to the general confusion it will cause, to the dislocation it will bring about, and to the hardship that will result to the many employees and the hundreds of thousands of veterans and their dependents who use the facilities of this office in New York.

I am very much disturbed by the fact that removal of this office from New

York will result in tremendous dissatisfaction and lead to great difficulties for all those concerned. Already we find large segments of our population protesting this removal order, including all major veterans' organizations. In Kings County alone, which takes in the Borough of Brooklyn, we have 400,000 veterans. They require personal assistance and constant contact with the VA district office, and these services will be denied them if the office is moved out of New York.

Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD at this time the text of a resolution adopted by the Joint Council War Veterans Organization of Kings County, comprised of our largest veterans' groups, protesting the proposed removal of the VA office. I am also inserting into the RECORD an article from the New York Post, What the VA Firings Mean, indicating how this removal order is affecting the employees, many of whom are disabled veterans. The resolution and the article are as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE JOINT COUNCIL WAR VETERANS ORGANIZATION OF KINGS COUNTY, COMPRISING THE UNITED SPANISH WAR VETERANS, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, AMERICAN LEGION, DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, JEWISH WAR VETERANS, CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS, ARMY AND NAVY UNION UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, AT ITS SPECIAL MEETING HELD IN BOROUGH HALL, BROOKLYN, N. Y., ON AUGUST 18, 1951

Whereas—

1 The Veterans' Administration district office at 346 Broadway, New York City, handles insurance and death claims for all of New York State and Puerto Rico, the veteran population of which is 1,750,000—400,000 in Kings County alone.

2 The Veterans' Administration intends to abolish the New York office and set up a central office in Philadelphia to handle the business now conducted by the (1) New York, (2) Boston (New England business), (3) Richmond, Va. (North Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, District of Columbia business), (4) Philadelphia (Pennsylvania, Delaware, New Jersey business).

3 The Veterans' Administration claims that the closing of New York office will result in a \$1,000,000 annual saving, \$478,000 in salaries, \$488,000 in rent, and the balance in communications, tabulating, and kindred activities.

4 The Veterans' Administration states "Those employed in the Boston, New York, and Richmond offices will be given an opportunity to move to Philadelphia to work in the new office."

5. Continuing the employment of all present employees will not affect any saving in salaries.

6 The Veterans' Administration claims that no hardship will result to veterans who will simply mail insurance premiums to Philadelphia instead of New York.

7. The rent at 346 Broadway, New York City (\$230,000 actually or the Veterans Administration's statement of \$488,000) can be saved by operating the district office in the Veterans' Administration's own building at 252 Seventh Avenue, New York City, where ample space is now available.

8. The Veterans' Administration was created to serve the veterans and their beneficiaries.

9. The district office also handles death and disability claims which are better serviced when decentralized at district level, and enables disabled veterans and beneficiaries of deceased veterans to receive personal face to face service with its concomitant expedition and understanding.

10 It clearly appears that the removal of the New York office (a) will not effect any money saving, and (b) it will deprive a veteran population of 1 1/4 million of a good decentralized service intended by Congress and a grateful nation.

We unanimously resolve that—

1 We are in accord with the announced purpose of the Veterans Administrator to save the Government's money and at the same time maintain service to veterans,

2 His plan defeats his purpose,

3. Our plan effectuates his purpose,

4. We, therefore, protest the proposal to abolish the New York district office because such action would not result in a money saving to the Government and because it would deprive many veterans and their beneficiaries of a valuable personal service now rendered by the New York office and which cannot be rendered them by a centralized Philadelphia office

5 We recommend that the New York City district office at 346 Broadway be consolidated with the regional office at 252 Seventh Avenue, New York City, which will result in (a) a saving of rental expenses and (b) maintenance of present service to veterans which is the announced purpose of the Veterans' Administrator.

[From the New York Post]

WHAT THE VA FIRINGS MEAN

(By Ted Poston)

Robert J. Esposito, 33, lives with his wife, Geraldine, and 2-year-old daughter, Carol, in a neat five-room brick house at 93 Wood Street, Lynbrook, L. I.

"It cost us \$11,500," Esposito said, "and I had to borrow and rake and scrape together every cent I could get to make the down payment. But it was worth it, or so I thought until this came along—"

The veteran of 4 years of Army service was discussing Veterans' Administrator Gray's economy order.

BENEFITS USED UP

"At least 300 other vets in the district office here are caught in the same jam as I am," said Esposito. "We used up our GI benefits to get a real start in life. We thought we had good permanent jobs here, so we tried to settle down and be good citizens."

"Now, with no warning and no assistance from the VA itself, we're ordered to uproot our lives, sell out at whatever price we can get and start all over again from scratch—in a strange city.

"But what can I do?" he asked. "I've got to go. At least 70 percent of us will have to move to Philly also. We have no choice. With another child coming in November, I can't afford to go out and look for another job right now.

WILL LOSE ON HOUSE

"I only have a \$4,000 mortgage on my house and my payments are down to \$58 a month, excluding heat. But the real estate people know my predicament, and I know I'll never be able to get out of a sale what I've put into this house.

"I can't even talk about it much to my wife, Geraldine, in her present condition. But how can I hope to find a set-up like this in Philadelphia? And I surely can't afford to live there myself and try to keep my family here."

The VA Employees Association, which has been fighting the proposed transfer, with the aid of Mayor Impellitteri, the city council and New York's congressional delegation, pointed out that nearly 400 other career VA employees here are in Esposito's position.

Most of them are committed to GI mortgage payments for 20 to 30 years. Others have bought into cooperative apartments at considerable expense. And still others have survived the veterans housing crisis of 1945-

47 to find fairly comfortable apartments in the metropolitan area.

In this group is Isidore Hechtman, 42, a 100 percent disabled veteran whose pension helps him live on his \$2,450 VA salary with his wife, Dorothy, and daughter, Barbara, 16.

Older than the average man who defended his country in World War II, Hechtman spent 26 months in the Army and three full years in a hospital after a mortar explosion nearly ripped him to pieces in the invasion of the Rhineland.

Because of his disability, he was able to get a neat, \$41-a-month apartment in the veterans project at 515 Jaffrey Court, Brooklyn.

"I can just keep my family together on what I get now," he said. "What will I do the months in Philadelphia while I'm looking for a place, feeding, and lodging myself there and hoping that we can finally be united again?"

MAY TAKE MONTHS

Hechtman, and others similarly situated, may find that it may be more than months before suitable accommodations are found in Philadelphia, for the VA—so far—has offered no relocation or house-hunting service to the affected workers.

A spokesman for the Philadelphia Housing Authority told the Post the vacancy rate for private apartments or homes in that area is almost nonexistent.

"There is supposed to be a 1 percent vacancy rate," he said, "but that is strictly fictional. And even that 1 percent is composed of single rented rooms in converted apartment units. There are few accommodations for family units at all and often the few available have restrictions against families with children."

But even were more apartments available, they would not be held for New Yorkers alone. The nine-hundred-odd New York VA families who are expected to make the Philadelphia move must also compete with an estimated eight-hundred-odd VA families from Boston and seven-hundred-odd from Richmond who have also been ordered to move to Philadelphia.

A survey conducted by the VA Employees Association here revealed at least 20 percent of the affected New Yorkers are purchasing their homes here on GI mortgages, and that the average family has three dependents outside the VA breadwinner.

They estimate that a move to Philadelphia will break up the family units of at least 25 percent of the 1,465 employees because some family members who have other jobs here will be unable to move.

The survey indicated that at least 35 percent of the affected persons are attending New York schools under the GI bill of rights and that their education will be interrupted, if not disrupted, by the change.

Most of the VA employees are proud of the war service which helped them hold their jobs in the VA here. But more than one echoed the question Hechtman, the disabled veteran, asked:

"How many times can a man be called on to sacrifice?"

Now the Water Grab Can Be Halted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, this editorial tells an unbelievable story. I found these facts to exist as a member

of the committee investigating this case. The Los Angeles Times was the first to expose this attempted confiscation of personal property rights. It proves the need of a free press.

NOW THE WATER GRAB CAN BE HALTED

A sudden and devastating blow was dealt at Fallbrook this week to the Federal attempt to seize private water rights in California without compensation.

The congressional investigating committee, headed by Democratic Representative CLAIR ENGLE, acted to start an immediate and practical remedying of the situation created by the United States Attorney General's confiscation suit against some 14,000 farmers on the Santa Margarita River.

NATIONAL OVERTONES

This action represents much more than correction of a local injustice; it is of far-reaching national significance.

The five-man committee, on hearing the testimony and learning the truth, discerned at once that the suit was not, as the United States Attorney General had tried so hard to insist, merely a proper local action to quiet title to contested water rights. It immediately became aware that the suit in the guise of national defense, and under a doctrine of paramount and sovereign rights, is another in the growing chain of dangerous efforts toward Federal centralization and seizure of rights traditionally vested in the States.

Chairman ENGLE's denunciation of the Federal legal sadists who seek by extreme interpretation of obscure legalistic points to appropriate fundamental rights of the people and the States was an indictment well deserved.

This Fallbrook case is a warning signal for the Nation.

If its purpose of seizure of water rights here were to succeed, the same doctrine could be applied immediately to the coal of Pennsylvania, the ore of Michigan, the oil wells of Oklahoma, all in the name of national defense. Such seizures would be the certain symptoms of national socialism gripping the Nation.

ABSENCE OF POLITICS

It is particularly gratifying that no political element entered into the Fallbrook investigation. Three of the five members of the House Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee taking part in the inquiry are Democrats, the other two Republicans. All united without reference to party in the strongest condemnation of United States Attorney General J. Howard McGrath, Assistant United States Attorney General A. DeVitt Vanech, and Special Assistant William H. Veeder who have sought to carry through the water-rights seizure suit.

The Fallbrook hearing was a heartening example of simple truth from plain people coming into violent collision with a legal scheme of Federal bureaucratic lawyers—and the truth emerging triumphant.

The small farmers who testified, the small property owners, the retired teachers, the little merchants all united in trusting honest facts rather than tortured legal principles.

In essence the story was a simple one.

Here were men and women who with their forebears had enjoyed undisputed water rights on the Santa Margarita for up to 100 years, under every recognized principle of law, under every safeguard of the State. In conformity with these laws and as good patriotic Americans these people agreed to go in with the Marines at Camp Pendleton, who had bought part of a big ranch for their camp, to build a dam and share the water on a fair basis.

It was a square deal. The Navy and the Marines were satisfied. The farmers were satisfied.

GREATEST LAWSUIT

Then the United States Attorney General's men came in and blocked the arrangement and, in addition, started the greatest lawsuit in California history against every farmer in the entire watershed. And the lawsuit was no proper action in condemnation, as the Government always has proceeded before. Instead, it was on a new doctrine of "national defense" and "paramount rights," as in the tidelands seizure case. This means that the farmers would be deprived by seizure of their water rights without any payment whatever, in defiance of all past custom, law, and the Constitution.

It was this situation when brought out in irrefutable testimony that resulted in the committee's immediate move to forbid by congressional legislation the Attorney General to seize the water and to provide for future safeguards against such encroachments.

This program must be carried through, even though the time before adjournment of Congress is so short as to constitute a grave barrier.

No promises of the Attorney General must be allowed to divert Congress from making the safeguards airtight at this session.

TESTIMONY CHANGED

Once before in Washington on June 25 an aide of the Attorney General officially testified before a congressional committee that the little defendants would be taken out of this suit to do away with the hardships. Then, as was disclosed at this hearing, he changed his testimony in the record before it was printed and negated the promise.

The Fallbrook case, which had its inception in an exposure by the Times, has assumed tremendous national importance.

It is a symbol of every evil Federal encroachment.

Its specific injustices must be rectified as soon as possible by Congress.

And it must be kept constantly in mind to prevent future wrongful treatment of the people and the States by the Federal bureaucracy.

Russia's Handling of Minorities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have directed attention to the Soviet technique of attracting minorities to its cause by pretending to aid them, only to swallow them up and suppress all individuality once they have allied themselves with the Communists' unholy cause.

Further proof thereof is offered by the following article, Russia's Handling of Minorities, by Morroe Berger, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of August 18, 1951, as follows:

RUSSIA'S HANDLING OF MINORITIES—RECORD OF EXPLOITATION AND SUPPRESSION GOES BACK TO EARLIEST DAYS OF RED REGIME

(By Morroe Berger)

Back in the days before World War II, when there were still plenty of liberal intellectuals who would rise to defend the progressive record of the Soviet Union, their chief stock in trade was the argument that, no matter what else the Russian Communists have done, at least they had eliminated discrimination against minority groups,

ended anti-Semitism and granted autonomy to the non-Russian national minorities.

During the last few years, however, evidence has accumulated indicating that even this last refuge of the Soviet apologist offers little protection against the hard facts of life in the U. S. S. R. and in its sphere of influence. In three respects—its treatment of the national minorities, anti-Semitism and relations with the European satellites—the Communist regime has shown little more tolerance than it grants to political opposition or to economic class enemies. This has been Soviet policy, in fact, for decades but it has become obvious only in recent years. The Soviets used to preach autonomy for national minorities within Russia, but today the Russians have gone so far as to control the satellites outside the U. S. S. R.'s borders in preparation for a possible war against the west.

To doctrinaire Socialists, especially the Leninist variety, minorities have posed a dilemma. On the one hand the Leninists preached national self-determination within the Russian empire, while on the other hand they always stood for a totalitarian centralization of power in the Communist Party. They believed minority differences to be merely the result of a divide-and-rule policy of the ruling class, and although they never really understood why minorities insisted upon retaining their own distinctive traits, the Bolsheviks did promise them cultural and political freedom.

Under Lenin and Stalin the Russian Communists have solved this problem in typical fashion. They are and have been in favor of self-determination for minorities under non-Communist regimes but they argue that under socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat the right of self-determination becomes meaningless because harmony prevails. In non-Communist terms, this has meant that Communists try to use national or equalitarian aspirations of minority groups in capitalist countries but immediately suppress these same aspirations when they appear in Communist regimes or in the people's democracies under Communist control. They use the same technique, of course, with regard to other western institutions such as the free trade union movement and the free press. In capitalist countries the Communists defend these institutions but when they come to power they destroy them.

As the rulers of the Soviet Union early chipped away at the doctrine of political self-determination, they replaced it with a purely cultural form of autonomy in language, literature, and art, upon which they had previously frowned. It was during this period, up to the mid-1930's that the U. S. S. R. found many western admirers of its solution of the minority problem. Then came further consolidation of the dictatorship, suppression of differences and sources of potential separatism, and the extreme Russian nationalism, which are now such familiar features of Soviet policy.

In the course of this tightening up of the dictatorship (precisely at a time when the new Stalin constitution of 1936 proclaimed a liberalization of the regime) the previous cultural growth of the non-Russian minorities was halted and their leadership, because it believed in some degree of democracy and federalism, was purged in accordance with the Stalinist policy of eliminating persons identified with an outmoded line.

World War II exposed grave weaknesses in the allegiance of the national minority peoples to great Russia. The result was an intensification of Russian nationalism, further purges and, as Solomon M. Schwarz points out in *The Jews in the Soviet Union* (Syracuse University Press), the unexplained disappearance of several autonomous republics. All that is now left of the vaunted cultural autonomy, according to Schwarz, is the right to praise Stalin in any language.

This increasingly intolerant treatment of the national minorities has been accompanied by similar treatment of Jews. Anti-Jewish acts in the U. S. S. R. have become so widespread and so pervasive that only a few object Soviet propagandists are still able to point with pride to communism's solution of the Jewish problem. As Schwarz shows in his definitive critical study of Soviet policy toward the Jews and other minorities, over the decades the Bolsheviks destroyed Jewish religious and cultural institutions, harried and exiled individual Jews as cosmopolitans or lackeys of the West, and in general have apparently decided to put an end to everything that in any way could stimulate or keep alive the national consciousness of Soviet Jews, so that they might ultimately disappear as a separate national group.

With regard to relations with the people's democracies of Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union seems to be following the pattern of its treatment of the national minorities. The early relatively gentle methods of sovietization have yielded to more direct and brutal suppression of every possible source of resistance to Russian policy. As Soviet exploitation of the satellites' more advanced economies continued and as the East-West crisis became sharper, the Russians not only stepped up war preparations in Eastern Europe but also intensified their reign of terror over all elements of the population, the friendly local Communist leaders as well as the middle classes, the clergy and the political dissidents.

The turning point in Russian satellite policy was not the initial failure of the Communist invasion of South Korea last year but the defection of Tito in 1948. Up to that time the Russians obviously tried to win satellite acceptance of Soviet leadership by a judicious application of threats of force and some actual violence, together with unceasing propaganda. As the Yugoslav heresy hardened into permanence and took the form of closer relations with the West, the satellites, at the instigation of their Russian masters, speeded the movement toward socialism. In non-Communist terms this meant the more rapid liquidation of actual and potential opponents of the new regimes on the ground of either nationalism or hostility toward the new economic order. The elimination of nationalism was made the first order of business in all the satellites. The process was further accelerated when it became clear that the Communist invasion of South Korea would not succeed.

As might be expected, Russian control over the satellites has been most direct in military, economic, and internal-security affairs. For about 2 years sovietization of the satellite armies has progressed steadily. At first these armies were run by local Communists, but they were soon replaced by Russian officers. According to several reports that have recently reached the West, sovietization is furthest along in Poland and Bulgaria, nearly completed in Hungary, and less advanced in Czechoslovakia and Rumania.

In Poland, of course, Russian Marshal Rokossovsky holds several posts. He is Minister of National Defense, Marshal of Poland, and is a member of the Politburo of Polish Communist Party. Russian officers are in the high command of the Polish Army and, according to British sources, Polish soldiers wear Russian uniforms and insignia, and take an oath of allegiance to Russia. In Hungary the army likewise has Russian uniforms, as well as Russian procedures and military law. High command posts are held by Soviet-trained Hungarian officers.

While Russian uniforms and military law and regulations prevail in Czechoslovakia, the local high command has not yet been fully displaced by Russians. The Rumanian Army is still commanded by local Communists but Russian officers are gradually taking over. In Bulgaria, most sovietized of the satellites in this respect, former Rus-

sian officers head the military establishment, holding both army and civilian posts.

The Russian Communist record of exploitation and suppression of minorities, both within and outside the Russian Empire, goes back to the very earliest days of the regime and, doctrinally, was clear in the Bolshevik line even before the party seized power in 1917. It should stand as a warning to those countries which lie in the path of Soviet expansion, yet there are political leaders in Asia and the Arab world who make unsubtle threats to "seek friends elsewhere" when some western policy irks them. The violent history of Russian treatment of its minorities and its satellites makes it clear that these politicians would be among the first to feel the sharp edge of the Soviet ax.

Offices Move to Suburbs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article reprinted in the Westchester Realtor which originally appeared in the March 17, 1951, issue of Business Week, titled "Offices Move to Suburbs":

OFFICES MOVE TO SUBURBS

North of Manhattan, suburban Westchester County is bringing into sharp focus a new twist in business decentralization—garden-type office buildings.

Migration, it's the latest trend in Suburbia, United States of America. More and more companies are moving all or part of their white-collar workers out where there is plenty of room to expand. Desertion of central office districts has become common enough to worry downtown office building owners in many parts of the country.

A couple of months ago Time, Inc., and General Foods—two big companies headquartered in New York's jungle of skyscrapers—purchased large hunks of Westchester real estate. They plan to build garden-type office buildings to house major portions of their headquarters staff.

Time has set no date for its migration, but General Foods says it will wait at least 2 years before it makes its move.

More space. Both give the same reason for moving out country. Lack of space to expand where they want to in Manhattan. General Foods leases offices in the Postum Building on Park Avenue, but has had to move some of its staff into other buildings. Time occupies the Time-Life Building at 9 Rockefeller Plaza. It has already signed up for two more floors there. But president Roy Larsen told employees "When all of these two floors are in use, we are fairly certain we will not be able to get any more major space here."

Swelling the stream: Many companies in New York besides these two are interested in getting out of town. Some have already made the jump, a good many of them from the crowded insurance district of lower Manhattan. American Mutual Liability Insurance Co. of Boston has moved its New York City branch office to White Plains; Associated Reciprocal Exchanges, another insurance company, now has its headquarters at Port Chester; Improved Risk Mutuals is at nearby White Plains. Besides these, a small company, Christiana General Insurance Co., is committed to move to Tarrytown (also in Westchester County).

Insurance companies aren't the only ones with itching feet. Esso Standard Oil Co. is building two-story offices at Pelham, N. Y., to house its New York State sales division. Citizens Utilities Co. leased space at Greenwich, Conn., a couple of years ago. Now it plans to put up a one-story building near the Time site.

To this list you can add at least a dozen or more companies that are scouting around Westchester's woods for a likely spot to build. Among them is a big downtown insurance company. Its architects are already in the field.

Pioneer: Years ago Reader's Digest proved you could run a huge operation far off the beaten path. It was born and grew up in the Pleasantville area of Westchester County.

Now other companies just as big are studying the Reader's Digest operation to see how a business organization functions out in the woods.

Why move? In almost every case you run across these reasons for moving to the outskirts: (1) There's just not enough downtown space in the right places, and it doesn't look like there will be; (2) rents and real estate prices in good locations look prohibitive, especially to smaller companies; (3) the commutation problem is getting worse; (4) it's getting harder to hire first-class personnel to work in some of the more unsightly, congested New York areas; (5) management thinks workers will be happier looking at trees instead of grimy buildings and listening to birds instead of honking taxis.

For business, Westchester's big attractions are its nearness to New York, plenty of open country, and an unusually large number of people who commute to work outside the county. It should be easy for companies to lure them away from downtown offices into jobs nearer their homes.

Natives of Westchester are happy about the whole thing. If the trend continues, it will help solve a threatening problem that most of the county's towns now face. Large estates that used to pay the big tax bills are being split up into smaller residential sections. Residential areas don't pay their own way unless average valuations run high.

The answer is business property. But Westchester doesn't want a lot of little business districts or factories. Office buildings look like a heaven-sent answer. They carry a big share of the tax load, but don't clutter up the countryside. To make sure they don't Westchester sets minimum acreage, will allow buildings to cover only a minor part of it.

Some warnings: The Urban Land Institute, of Washington, D. C., calls this business exodus a challenge the central city must meet. And the magazine Buildings, published in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, not long ago put out a special brochure called Gullible's Travels. It paints a gloomy picture for companies with wanderlust, warning executives to shy away from the suburbs. A lot of workers will have longer trips to work, the brochure warns. Sales contacts will be lost; you'll probably need to issue maps so people can find your office, hotel accommodations most likely will be poor; the president will find it harder to attend important business meetings held downtown.

There are other problems, too. Feeding has to be at least partly subsidized, most likely in a company-run cafeteria—traditionally a money-loser. Upkeep is another headache that management buys when it takes over its own building. There's a way around that. You can form another company to operate the building, lease it back to yourself.

In addition, if a building is located away from a railroad station a company probably will have to provide partly subsidized transportation. Charges by a private bus operator have to be high to start a new route just to one out-of-the-way spot.

Outweighed; Lumped together, these disadvantages make a good argument for some companies to stay put. But in lots of cases the advantages of cheaper space, room for growth, and top-grade workers available will outweigh the drawbacks. That's especially true for companies that don't have to worry about close contact with buyers and sellers and have few purchasing problems.

Case in point: It applies, for instance, to a company like Associated Reciprocal Exchanges, a fire and casualty insurance group. Most of its staff are women—about 200—doing stenographic and clerical work. It has practically no salesmen. Last December it moved lock, stock, and president to a new three-story brick building it built at Port Chester, N. Y.

A couple of years ago Associated Reciprocal found it didn't have enough room in its Manhattan offices. It needed at least 25,000 square feet more. It also wanted to move into a swankier area because of a mounting employment problem. Top-notch stenographers and clerks were turning up their noses at the company because of its grubby location in New York.

If the move had been made inside the city, says President Ernest B. Brown, rent would have jumped to about \$4.50 per square foot. That's \$120,000 a year. Then, too, the expansion problem probably would have cropped up again in a few more years. Brown didn't want to tie his expanding company to long-term leases.

Settled: So Associated began looking around Westchester County. It finally bought 20 acres between Port Chester and White Plains, put up a building with 37,000 square feet, and left only a two-man office in New York City.

"It's working fine," says Brown. He estimates that the company will have lost only 15 percent of its staff due to the move. About 15 percent already lived in the area, 25 percent moved there, 25 percent plan to commute from the city, a few are still looking for places to live.

Money saver: In dollars and cents the company believes it will wind up ahead. That's despite skyrocketing building costs that threw original estimates way off. It also takes into account maintenance, cafeteria expenses, and a few dollars a week to help pay workers' bus fares from the Port Chester railroad station.

Hotel accommodations are no serious problem. Visitors either commute from New York or are put up in rooms at the Westchester County Country Club—which is glad to have the extra business in off seasons.

Adjustment: There is one problem that came up early: Women missed being able to go around the corner for a noonday shopping tour. "They get over it," Brown says. He adds: "We figure we were smart, especially since Time-Life will move next door. That ought to make our address, Port Chester, N. Y., pretty impressive."

Mr. K. A. Swanstrom Teams Up With RCA for National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a full-page advertisement appeared in the Washington Post today, issued by the Radio Corp. of America, to which I wish to call to the attention of Members of the

Senate very briefly. It appears under the heading, "Mr. K. A. Swanstrom, of Doylestown, Pa., teams up with RCA for national defense." The advertisement calls attention to a very important fact in the economy of this country; that is, that the very lives of so-called big businesses or big corporations depend upon hundreds and thousands, and in some instances, tens of thousands of small businesses. Mr. Frank Folsom, who is president of the Radio Corp. of America, served with distinction during World War II in field procurement for the Government, both for the Navy and for the War Production Board. As a result of his experiences there, he undoubtedly came to know the significance of the small-business structure of the United States, including his own business.

Mr. President, I simply wanted to call attention to the advertisement, and recommend its careful reading by Members of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. K. A. SWANSTROM, OF DOYLESTOWN, PA.,
TEAMS UP WITH RCA FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

The job of providing our Armed Forces with all the things they need to keep this country strong and safe is a big one.

To do this job well, our country needs the scientific research, engineering know-how and mass production facilities of great companies like RCA.

But we also need the skilled performance of thousands of small companies, like that headed by Mr. Kenneth A. Swanstrom, of Doylestown, Pa.

Mr. Swanstrom could not be considered big business by any stretch of the imagination. The Penn Engineering and Manufacturing Co., which he heads, has exactly 26 employees. The leaders of our defense effort in Washington may never have heard of him.

But because American industry—big and little—is working as a team in our defense effort, Mr. Swanstrom and his 26 employees are able to make a real contribution to the production of an important military instrument—the new portable walkie-talkie.

TOGETHER WE MADE WALKIE-TALKIES

Back in 1949, the Army came to RCA and asked us to produce a walkie-talkie that would be smaller, more compact, more efficient, and would have only half the weight of the walkie-talkie used in World War II.

The research scientists in RCA Laboratories at Princeton, N. J., went to work on the development of such an instrument, with smaller parts and new circuits.

The engineers of the RCA Victor division figured out the specifications and blueprinted the parts for production.

We then took these specifications to Mr. Swanstrom and 118 other suppliers of precision parts—87 of whom are classified by the Government as "small business" firms—and worked out with them the details of production.

As a result, the Penn Engineering & Manufacturing Co. was able to make a contribution to the defense effort; we were able to begin delivery 2 months ahead of schedule, and the Army had the lightweight walkie-talkie it wanted when the hour of need came.

TOGETHER WE SERVE AMERICA

This is only one example of the way in which big business and little business team up for defense. The armed services have

long realized the value of such teamwork and are always encouraging the participation of little business in our defense program.

We at RCA are constantly calling on literally thousands of small companies to help with our military contracts. For instance, on just three of the contracts we are working on now for the Air Force, we need, and are using, the skills and facilities of 560 different suppliers—76 percent of whom are classified by the Government as "small business."

This same kind of teamwork in peacetime has made more and better television and radio sets, records and transmitting equipment. It has contributed materially to our standard of living—the highest the world has ever known.

We are proud to tip our hat to our 5,000 suppliers in all parts of the country. Some are large, some are medium sized, many are small, and still others, like Penn Engineering, are very small. As a matter of fact, 49 percent of all our suppliers employ less than 100 men and women.

Together, in peace and in war, we serve America.

RADIO CORP. OF AMERICA.

The Kings River Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALLAN OAKLEY HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Charles L. Kaupke, chief engineer and water master of the Kings River Water Association. This article appeared in the August 16, 1951, issue of Public Utilities Fortnightly. It tells clearly and forcefully of the fight of the water users along the Kings River (Calif.) to protect their water rights. Since 1939, the Bureau of Reclamation has been attempting by every means at its command to bring about the integration of the Kings River with the Central Valley project. The Kings River water users are strongly opposed to being absorbed in the Central Valley project. Here is why:

THE KINGS RIVER CONTROVERSY

(By Charles L. Kaupke)

Since 1939 the Bureau of Reclamation has been attempting by every means at its command to bring about the integration of the Kings River with the Central Valley project of California. The Bureau has made this effort despite evidence that the Kings River water users are strongly opposed to being absorbed in the CVP.

The Kings River section is the largest and most prosperous single irrigated area in the United States. Here is what William E. Warne, at that time assistant commissioner of reclamation, told a House subcommittee in 1947:

"The strategic position of the Kings River . . . makes it extremely important that satisfactory repayments be obtained on the Kings River project to protect the whole financial structure of the Central Valley project."

In this instance Warne has been quite frank. Let us examine briefly the strategic position of the Kings River. Over the last 50 years the river's average annual runoff has amounted to 1,700,000 acre-feet. The

area served is 1,100,000 acres, of which 900,000 at present are under irrigation.

Irrigation began in the Kings River area before the Civil War. At the present time there are 31 irrigation districts, mutual water companies, and other agencies engaged in diverting and distributing Kings River water. The system of wells, head gates, canals, ditches, gauges, and other structures required to effect this diversion and distribution was completed long ago and is all paid for. It cost the farmers of the service area about \$70,000,000 of their own money and not a dime of Federal money. The current average cost of water to the farmers is about \$1 an acre-foot.

Most of the land to be served by the CVP is in different category. The Kings River farmers own rights to the entire normal flow of the river; the various districts which have signed or are signing contracts for water with the Bureau of Reclamation either have no water rights or they have an insufficient supply. As we have seen, the Kings River farmers have a large, efficient distribution system; most of the CVP districts have no systems at all, and are being compelled to sign separate contracts with the Bureau for the construction of such works. It is no secret that some of these CVP districts never will be able to pay off on the basis of the Bureau's charge of \$3.50 an acre-foot for class I (or firm) water, plus the cost of their distributing systems. The latter cost runs as high in some cases as \$180 an acre on land that may be worth little more than that even if it should receive an adequate supply of water.

From this it should be clear what Warne meant in his statement concerning the necessary protection of the CVP's financial structure. The truth is that some of the units of the CVP, strictly speaking, are economically infeasible. It might be possible, however, by setting up a "basin account," integrating highly profitable areas now outside the CVP, and carrying on a complex operation with power revenues, to keep the over-all operation out of the red. But the Kings River water users are naturally indisposed to have their resources tossed into a common pool; the favorable position they occupy today is the result of the foresight, courage, prudence, and hard work of themselves and their predecessors. They do not care for the socialistic doctrine, "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

But the CVP not only is short on feasibility; it also is in need of more water than is available from present sources. The project is supposed to furnish supplemental water to lands in Tulare and Kern Counties from the Friant Reservoir on the San Joaquin River. The water thus diverted through the Friant-Kern canal is to be replaced with Sacramento River water lifted 200 feet by the Tracy pumping plant and then brought up the valley to the Mendota pool some 30 miles west of Fresno.

The San Joaquin River has an average annual runoff of about 1,800,000 acre-feet. But the Bureau already has contracts signed or in prospect for 1,859,700 acre-feet of Friant water. The Bureau also is compelled to let a certain amount of water flow down the San Joaquin to take care of riparian rights between Friant and Mendota, which probably amounts to at least 50 acre-feet a day, or 18,250 acre-feet a year.

Both the San Joaquin and the Kings show many more years of less than average runoff than of over average. Occasional floods serve to raise the average but do not mean much in terms of water. For example, the season 1950-51 is the sixth in succession of less than average runoff, and this year the San Joaquin probably will not yield more than half the Bureau's commitment on Friant water. Consequently, if the Bureau can work out some way to get a little Kings River water for its oversize canal to Kern

County it will be in a less embarrassing position.

This brings us to the Pine Flat Dam, now being built on the Kings River by the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army. This 1,000,000-acre-foot storage reservoir was authorized as a flood-control project with incidental irrigation benefits in the Flood Control Act of 1944. The act was approved unanimously by both Houses of Congress after 4 years of hearings and argument as to whether the project should be built by the Bureau of Reclamation or the Corps of Engineers. It provides that "the Secretary of War shall make arrangements for payment to the United States by the State or other responsible agency * * * for conservation storage when used."

The act was signed by President Roosevelt on December 22, 1944, and this looked to the Kings River water users like the end of the long road. They had begun working for a Pine Flat project as early as 1909. They had been represented at all the congressional hearings between the years 1940 and 1944. They had urged the immediate need for flood control on the river, but also had expressed their willingness to pay a fair price for whatever incidental irrigation benefits might accrue from Pine Flat. The Secretary of War had reported (H. Doc. 630, 76th Cong., 3d sess.) that the project was feasible for flood control alone. Congress, after 4 years of listening to Bureau arguments in opposition, had agreed unanimously with the findings of House Document 630. The Kings River people began preparing to negotiate and sign a contract with the Secretary of War.

But in September 1946, a letter signed by Reclamation Commissioner Michael W. Straus came to light, and the Kings River people were astonished to read, "The President has directed that I, as Commissioner of Reclamation, proceed forthwith to make the necessary repayment arrangements (for Pine Flat irrigation benefits)."

The Presidential directive here referred to is supposed to have been dated May 2, 1946, and signed by Harry S. Truman. But this is hearsay, the directive itself appears never to have been published—at any rate, the Kings River people have not been able to obtain a copy of it. However, since the Straus letter the Pine Flat repayment situation has been magnificently confused.

The confusion goes deeper; the question of who contracts with whom; it involves the whole problem of what becomes of local water rights under reclamation law, and what happens to the self-governing functions of irrigation districts and other agencies when they are subjected to the arbitrary decisions of appointed bureaucrats.

In California, water rights are based on beneficial use. The Kings River people have used all the normal flow of the river beneficially for many years, in some cases for three-quarters of a century. In 1927 and again in 1949, they agreed on their respective rights as among themselves and set up the Kings River Water Association to administer the diversion schedule in which those rights were embodied. This accounted for all the water in the river and all the agencies engaged in diverting it.

The water users, therefore, were in a completely satisfactory position before the Bureau reentered the picture on the strength of a reputed Presidential directive. Their own house was in order; they felt complete security when it came to dealing with the Secretary of the Army and the Corps of Engineers, since the Corps is concerned only with flood control and has no record of claiming or of interfering with local water rights outside the requirements of flood-control operations. But when the Bureau announced that a contract would have to be negotiated in conformity with reclamation law, all feeling of security vanished.

The Bureau repeatedly contends that it is bound by law to respect local water rights, and it is true that section 8 of the Reclamation Act requires it to do so. It also is true that the Flood Control Act of 1944 contains a provision intended to protect rights to the consumptive use of water on all projects west of the ninety-eighth meridian of longitude. But despite these statutory limitations the Bureau has a long record of interference with local water rights.

One citation from this record will be sufficient to illustrate the way the Bureau operates.

In 1949 some 1,100 farmers along the banks of the San Joaquin River went into court asking for an injunction to prevent certain bureau officials from taking their water without compensation by diversions at the Friant Dam. A preliminary hearing was held in Los Angeles before Federal Judge Pierson M. Hall. The United States contended that since the lower reaches of the San Joaquin are navigable the United States had complete jurisdiction under the commerce clause and that no private water rights could exist on the river. Judge Hall denied the injunction on technical grounds having to do with submission of insufficient engineering data by the plaintiffs. But in a memorandum of opinion dated April 12, 1950, he said of defendants' contention:

"The extension of such doctrine would put every water right in California, if not in the United States, in noncompensable jeopardy if somewhere some portion of the river system, upon which that right depended, was navigable or caused floods. * * * The mere statement of the contention is sufficient to refute it.

Judge Hall excoriated the defendant bureau officials for having acted in bad faith in the matter. He also said of the defendants' contention that the farmers had slept on their rights—those nonexistent rights, you will remember—that

"no extended discussion is necessary at this point * * *. The defendants and their predecessors have made repeated statements to them (the farmers) and to the public at large, and in public places, that their rights would not be taken and would be respected, and by means of threats and other coercive tactics have lulled them into a position of security * * *."

until the bureau suddenly notified these farmers that they had no rights and that their water would be taken without compensation.

So much for Bureau procedure in a case which is not unique or even unusual in its general outlines. The matter of public morality, like the defense contention in the quotation next above, probably needs no extended discussion. It should be as easily apparent why the Kings River water users want as little as possible to do with an agency that operates in this fashion.

The association takes the position, on advice of counsel, that Pine Flat is not a reclamation project and that the Bureau has no jurisdiction over it until given such jurisdiction by specific act of Congress.

The Kings River people are perfectly willing to pay a fair price for conservation storage at Pine Flat, and have said so many times. Let us see what such conservation storage would be worth. On long-term average about 10 percent of the river's mean annual flow is lost to the area through floods. That amounts to 170,000 acre-feet a year, and this is the water which actually will be conserved by the Pine Flat project, though 10 years may pass with no water behind the dam at all.

The State engineer of California and a board of engineers employed by the KRWA, taking these and other factors into consideration, arrived independently at \$10,000,000 as a fair price for the water users to repay as their share of Pine Flat construction costs.

The Bureau, however, first said \$14,250,000, and lately has been talking of reallocations based on higher construction costs, with repayment of \$20,000,000 to \$25,000,000 as its apparent objective.

The water users will not bind themselves to surrender the local-controlled administrative system which they and their predecessors have built up over the years. About 80 percent of the Kings River service area consists of irrigation districts, which are political subdivisions of the State, and whose directors are elected by the people. These directors have a trusteeship under which they hold the farmers' water rights—aside from what the law permitted them to do. The directors and officers of the other agencies, semipublic and private, which cover the remaining 20 percent of the service area are in a similar position.

The controversy over the Kings River has been further complicated by the fact that there are valuable hydroelectric-power sites above Pine Flat. The water users are primarily concerned to protect their water rights, but they have a secondary interest in power and have had such an interest for many years.

However, until the Pine Flat project was authorized in 1944 it never was possible for the Kings River farmers to do anything practical about power. Upstream hydroelectric development without subsequent reregulation of water stored and released for power would interfere with the natural regimen of the stream on which all water rights are based.

Having spent some \$70,000,000 on their irrigation system, the water users were in no position to finance two or three powerhouses and a regulatory facility as well. But when Congress authorized Pine Flat in 1944 they promptly applied to the Federal Power Commission for preliminary permits to make power-feasibility studies on the upper river and at Pine Flat.

The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. also applied to the FPC for licenses covering approximately the same up-river development.

This was in 1945. In 1948 extensive hearings on these applications were held in Fresno, with the Bureau of Reclamation appearing as a protestant. In the next year oral arguments were heard in Washington. On November 10, 1949, the Federal Power Commission issued a finding and order which granted licenses for upstream power development to the P. G. & E. and a preliminary permit for Pine Flat studies to the water users.

Shortly thereafter the new Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman requested permission from the FPC to become an intervener in the matter, and also filed a long argument urging the Commission to vacate its order and reserve the Kings River power sites to the United States. Oral arguments again were heard in Washington during March 1950. They were somewhat enlivened by the personal presence of the Secretary, but no new evidence was offered by him or the other applicants. The Commission did vacate its order of November 10, 1949, and took the entire matter under advisement. That is where, as far as the FPC is concerned, it now rests.

Two recent happenings may have influence upon the final outcome of this power argument. One is the enactment by the California Legislature of an act creating a single public agency which includes the entire Kings River service area and is known as the Kings River Conservation District. The California assembly approved the act by a vote of 57 to 14, and the Senate by one of 25 to 3. Gov. Earl Warren signed the act on June 8. The district is authorized, among other things, to issue revenue bonds and to develop, transport, sell, and use Kings River power.

The other happening is the issuance of a "preliminary draft of a proposed report" by the Bureau of Reclamation. Since this draft is stamped "confidential—not for public release," and since it also is quite remarkable for the engineering data it fails to contain, no extended comment on it is possible here. It may be said, however, that the report calls for far more extensive power developments by the Bureau on the upper reaches of the Kings River than the agency proposed to the Federal Power Commission. There also are foreshadowed in it many highly ingenious ways of getting control of the river and regulating its flow in accordance with what the Bureau may consider "reasonable" at any time.

It also should be noted that the Bureau's various proposals to develop power on the Kings River really amount to one "single-purpose project." The agency no longer is primarily interested in reclamation, and it hardly bothers to disguise the fact. As things stand today, the Bureau cannot legally construct single-purpose projects; but by integrating Kings River with the CVP, a multiple-purpose project, it might obtain for its North Fork Kings River plan sufficient protective coloration to enable it to survive congressional scrutiny.

There are three ways out of what today seems an impasse. First, the Bureau may offer the water users an acceptable contract for conservation storage in the Pine Flat Reservoir. Such a contract would have to be a straight repayment contract, based on a reasonable concept of benefits actually derivable from the project, and free from the administrative restrictions of reclamation law.

A second way out would be for Congress to enact legislation clearly defining the rights of the Kings River water users and the status of the Pine Flat project as outside the scope of reclamation law. As a last resort, the water users may attempt to have such legislation introduced and passed. But this would require a long, hard, and costly fight with, it must be admitted, not much chance of success.

The third method of bringing the matter to settlement is the one that has been pursued by the Bureau since the spring of 1949 when former Congressman White introduced his bill to integrate Kings River with the Central Valley project. If the Bureau can obtain legislation giving it control of the Pine Flat project, that will be the end of the controversy.

In that case, there will be no more negotiating. The Kings River people will be placed in approximately the position now occupied by reservation Indians. Their rights will be whittled away by administrative decision and action; their water will be at the disposal of an agency which cannot be reached by the voters. They will have come to the end of the cooperative endeavor they have followed so long and with, up to now, such productive results both socially and economically.

How can the Bureau accomplish all this? That will be easy. It is a truism that the man who controls the head gate is master of the water supply. Pine Flat dam will be a head gate; if the Bureau succeeds in its further plans for power development on the upper Kings River it will have control of half a dozen head gates. Meanwhile, all water rights on the river are based on its mean daily flow as measured by the United States Geological Survey gage at Piedra, so any interference with the natural regimen of the river will impair somebody's water rights. In this connection the Bureau has said it will not operate the dam so as to cause any unreasonable interference, but it will reserve the right to say what is unreasonable.

The Bureau also has numerous plans for laying its hands on Kings River water. There is space to mention only one, the device for creating what is called project water, which will in effect belong to the United States.

Commissioner Straus has defined "project water" as "all water developed by Pine Flat storage and water regulated at the request of the holder of a right, with the result that this regulation alters or adjusts the natural enjoyment of the right."

On this basis the water users could not possibly keep control of the river, for if they attempted to use the storage space they are supposed to pay for they would lose their water by the mere act of storing it. On the other hand, by the commissioner's definition they would lose all water stored—that is developed—behind the dam in the course of conservation or flood-control operations.

The documentation of this Kings River case would fill a large book, and all of it would support the simple thesis here advanced: that the Bureau of Reclamation is determined to get control of the "land and water resources" of the Kings River area in order to strengthen its socializing grip upon the Central Valley. Perhaps enough has been said in this brief account to suggest that local rights, moral principles, and a long history of constructive achievement may not be sufficient defense against the ambition of this Federal agency.

The Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, when we look back upon the actions of the Eighty-second Congress, I am sure one of its high lights will be the passage of the amendments to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. As the original House cosponsor of this bill, I first submitted this amendment in the very sincere belief that it was urgently needed by the farmers of my district, and the whole country.

As finally passed, the new amendment to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act increases the amount which can be loaned to an individual farmer at one time from \$3,500 to \$7,000 for farm and home-operating needs. It permits that farmer to have a total indebtedness at any one time of \$10,000. It increases from 5 to 7 years the time he has to repay the loan.

For the farmer I believe you will all agree that this is a good bill. By today's prices, \$3,500 was all too little if a new farmer was to be allowed to make a start. If one of my constituents, say in Jackson County, wanted to change over from cotton farming to a combination of cotton and dairying, for example, it would take more than \$3,500 to buy the cows he needed, develop his pastures, and fix his barns so they would allow him to sell grade A milk. But he could make a good start if he were allowed to borrow \$7,000.

On the other hand this same farmer who wanted to change over to a cotton-dairy combination would need at least a year or two to get his pasture developed, and it takes three more years to grow a calf into an income-producing milk cow. In other words, this farmer who started from scratch would not really be making any income from those cows until the

fifth year. If he has to pay back the loan during those 5 years, he probably has to sell off some of his base livestock to make the payments. The extra 2 years for repayments allows him to pay from the milk checks he receives after the cows come into production.

As I said, then, this new law should help the farmer. But have you ever stopped to think how it helps the other people in the community, too?

Let us continue using that same farmer who converts from cotton to a cotton-dairy form of agriculture as our example. If he uses the Farmers Home Administration as his ladder up which he climbs to farming success, he starts by receiving a loan. Under the old law this loan might be for a maximum of \$3,500. Now it can be \$7,000. And where does he spend that \$7,000? Almost all of it is spent right in his own community.

Maybe he spends a thousand dollars of it to buy a tractor. If he obtained the loan in Jackson County, it was probably spent with an equipment dealer right there in Scottsboro, Ala.

Part of the money will be spent for fuel for that tractor. It would be bought in Jackson County, too.

He would probably need some feed for those new cows he has purchased, at least until he had developed his pasture. And some seed to plant that pasture. That is where our Scottsboro feed and seed dealers share in the loan check. Somebody right in the county probably sold him the new cows, too.

Because all Farmers Home Administration loans are made after a sound plan for operating both the borrower's farm and home is worked out, the \$7,000 loan probably included some money for a new refrigerator, washing machine, or other household equipment. Those items would be bought right in Jackson County, from local furniture or appliance dealers.

Those changes in his dairy barn, made so he could sell grade-A milk, required lumber—and labor—which made sales for local dealers or work for local carpenters.

Other items purchased with that \$7,000 loan check would be bought from local dealers; but I am sure I have made my point. The \$7,000 was new money coming into the community. There is an old saying that every dollar which comes into a community is spent 10 times before it leaves, so that would mean a total turn-over of about \$70,000 right in Scottsboro from that one loan. The Farmers Home Administration officials in Washington tell me they have allotted \$3,200,000 for loans this year under this program in Alabama, so it would mean that a \$30,000,000 turn-over within the State will be possible by June 1952.

Actually that is only one—but a very important—way that this new amendment will help both farmers and non-farmers. I would like to list a few of the others.

There will be more essential food and fiber produced on our farms. The farmer who could only borrow \$3,500 under the old law might end up with a dairy herd of about 6 cows. The milk from one of them would be used by his family, and he would be able to sell milk from about five. If they are average cows, his farm might produce 30,000 pounds of milk

during the year. That is about 4,000 gallons, roughly.

But if he had \$7,000 with which to start his farming operations, he could end up with about 20 cows, and his farm would produce about 15,000 gallons of milk per year. That means a lot more milk for the city people who depend on these farmers for their dairy products.

And of course it means more income for the farmer—and that income is spent right in the home community, too. Because the farmer earns more, he can spend more, and he spends it with the home-town merchants.

The amendment will make for better schools and churches in our rural areas and small towns. The church is always just as prosperous as the persons who attend it; and so if we improve the economic status of our farmers, we help the churches, too. Similarly, the children of these farmers will be able to attend school longer when their parents are more prosperous; and the parents will take a more active part in community affairs. They will become better citizens of their community.

The local banks will be helped, too. These loans are made to persons who cannot qualify for bank credit at the time the loan is made; but by the time the borrower has repaid his loan he has assembled the necessary chattels and has learned money management to the point where he becomes a good customer of the bank. I recently saw a report where a local banker was asked to look over a list of paid-up Farmers Home Administration borrowers who farmed near his bank. Of the 32 names on the list he identified 26 of them as persons who were then depositors or borrowers of his bank; and he said that none of the 26 would have been made a loan by him at the time they first came to FHA for credit. The same list shown to the implement dealer of the community showed some equally interesting facts. This dealer recognized twelve of the thirty-two as persons who had bought heavy farm equipment from him that year—and all 12 of them were ones he had personally financed because he considered them good credit risks. He, too, said that he would not have done so a few years earlier for the same families.

In a Mississippi county which adjoins my district and where the situation is very similar, a few years ago a carload of milk was brought into the county every day to supply local needs of the county-seat town. Today there are 19 farmers in the county who produce grade-A milk as compared to only one when this county was importing its milk. Today those 19 farms provide almost all the milk used in the county-seat town, and 18 of the 19 obtained their start in dairying through loans such as are now possible under this amendment. It took those 18 farmers several years to get started because they could borrow only \$3,500 to make that start, and had to build from that point. Today they could borrow \$7,000 if necessary, and with this larger loan could have started providing local milk much earlier. Their community would have prospered more, because it would have been buying local milk and the money would be spent over and over again in their home com-

munity. We have a lot of communities in my district which are sending their county dollars to Wisconsin or other dairy States and this new loan program will help them develop a local industry which will continue to be local. It is what my district—and the South—needs. I believe the recently enacted Magnuson amendment will go a long way toward doing the job.

I thought so when, during the Eighty-first Congress, I cosponsored this bill with Congressman Pace of Georgia. When that earlier bill was passed by the House of Representatives but was still in Senate committee when the Eighty-first Congress adjourned, I continued to believe it was necessary for my constituents, and was glad to have an opportunity to again cosponsor it in the eighty-second Congress. Like the Farm Housing Act of 1949, for which I fought for more than 3 years before it finally became law, this amendment represents a long, but a very worth-while struggle. I am, and I am sure all of my colleagues are, proud that the fight has been successful, and that our people—both farmers and those who live in the cities—can now benefit by its provisions.

States Should Win Tidelands Oil Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mr. DOYLE Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent previously granted me, I present for the consideration of all my distinguished colleagues in this great legislative body, an editorial which appears in the *Daily News*, Los Angeles, Calif., August 3, 1951.

My record on this matter, beginning in the Seventy-ninth Congress, shows that I have vigorously supported the premise taken in this editorial by Manchester Boddy, the distinguished editor of this great metropolitan American newspaper.

The editorial follows:

STATES SHOULD WIN TIDELANDS OIL FIGHT

The United States—one of the world's greatest oil countries—has been forced to import more than 1,000,000 barrels of oil a day. Domestic production is about 6,000,000 barrels a day.

In event of a major war, according to a statement to Congress in January by Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman, this country could boost production by 700,000 barrels but would still be 500,000 short of wartime needs.

The Middle East, which supplies oil to the free world is now rocked by political and social turmoil. If Middle East wells should be cut off or diverted to iron-curtain countries, the rest of the free world would look to the Americas for oil.

Nevertheless and despite repeated warnings that the United States and the Western World face a critical oil shortage, Congress and the Truman administration are still deadlocked over control of the tidelands oil fields; and exploitation of fields in the oil-rich Gulf of Mexico is at a standstill. Almost every State has entered the fight.

DISPUTE HOLDS UP NEW LEASES

No new leases for oil hunting or drillings in the Gulf have been granted since 1948. No new leases are in prospect until Congress and the administration settle these questions:

Who shall control the offshore oil lands—the Federal Government or the coastal States? How shall royalty payments from the oil companies be divided?

The dispute has been thrown into the lap of Congress.

States' rights spokesmen from 38 States are backing bills to quitclaim all rights to the rich underwater oil fields which were awarded to the Federal Government in a series of controversial Supreme Court decisions.

But administration supporters are fighting to nail down Federal control over the lands. They warn that President Truman will veto any quitclaim bill and claim a veto cannot be overridden by Congress.

Both sides have offered compromises. The administration is willing to accept temporary control just to get the oil flowing and has offered to use the oil money for aid to the Nation's schools. The States say they, too, would accept temporary control pending a final solution.

STATES BASE CLAIMS ON HISTORY

The coastal States base their claims to the lands on history. They say that States have owned the offshore areas since colonial times. The Federal Government claim hinges on the Supreme Court decisions, which in turn were based mainly on considerations of international law.

The States say there is ample evidence the original 13 colonies owned at least a 3-mile strip of water off their coasts, and no transfer of this area was made when the colonies voluntarily came together into a Federal union; nowhere in the Constitution does it specify the Federal Government owns the adjacent seas, and what isn't given the Federal Government by the Constitution automatically goes to the States.

The only way out of the costly stalemate, it seems to us, is for Congress to overrule the Supreme Court decisions. Administration bills, dealing with phases of the issue, have included specific disclaimers to inland waterways, to harbors, to piers and to other improvements built into the sea. One more step is in order; a disclaimer to the tidelands.

When the issue first came up, sponsors of Federal over State ownership attempted to rationalize their position with the argument that the Federal Government needed ownership of the oil lands in order to maintain adequate oil reserves for future use.

Experience through World War II and subsequent years has demonstrated that the major oil producers of the United States have cooperated with the Federal Government to the fullest possible extent and maintained a self-policing policy that went far beyond the system of controls imposed by Government over many other major industries. The oil industry in the United States has long since come of age. It is no longer an irresponsible collection of freebooters out to pillage for today and to hell with tomorrow.

But Congress is not faced with a public versus private ownership issue. It is a question of Federal versus State governments. Whichever side wins, private industry will produce the oil.

If State ownership prevails, as we think it should, the people of California will benefit from the production of California oil. If the Federal ownership side wins, you may be sure the politicians of 47 other States will have a grand time appropriating the take from California tidelands production.

MANCHESTER BODDY.

Judges Should Not Be Character Witnesses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, widespread interest has been demonstrated in the bill to bar Supreme Court Justices from acting as character witnesses in the Federal courts. Typical editorial reaction is represented by the comments from the Danbury (Conn.) News-Times, Ansonia (Conn.) Sentinel, Atlantic City (N. J.) Press, Long Beach (Calif.) Press-Telegram, and Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette, which I include below, under leave to extend my remarks:

[From the Danbury (Conn.) News-Times of July 11, 1951]

SUPREME COURT TESTIMONY

Probably Justices Frankfurter and Reed, of the Supreme Court, would be very happy to forget, and to have the country forget, that they both appeared as character witnesses for Alger Hiss. But a good many Americans still have a bad taste in their mouths as they recall this.

If the Keating bill should pass, no Justice of the Supreme Court will ever again be called as a witness in any Federal court proceeding. The bill has the approval of a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee. It should have popular support, and be enacted into law.

The Supreme Court, for many reasons, is not held in the greatest respect these days, either by the legal profession or by the public. And certainly the showing made by Justices Frankfurter and Reed in their defense of the unspeakable Hiss has not helped restore to the High Court any of its lost prestige.

[From the Ansonia (Conn.) Sentinel of July 13, 1951]

JUDGES AS WITNESSES

Justices of the United States Supreme Court would be barred from testifying as character witnesses, or on matters of opinion, under a bill soon to be considered by the House Judiciary Committee and endorsed this week by a subcommittee. Representative KEATING, Republican, of New York, who introduced the bill, has declared that he was motivated by the appearances of Justices Frankfurter and Reed as character witnesses for Alger Hiss in his first trial.

Justice Reed had been subpoenaed by the Hiss defense; Justice Frankfurter was a volunteer witness. Chief Judge Magruder of the United States Court of Appeals in the first district was also a character witness for Hiss.

An alternative bill, introduced by Representative SMITH, Republican, of Wisconsin, would provide simply that no Federal judge could be compelled to testify as to character or to appear as a witness if similar testimony could be obtained from other witnesses.

Representative KEATING points to the possibility of some smart lawyer subpoenaing most or all members of the Supreme Court as witnesses in a lower court trial. Then the Court would be unable to pass on an appeal in the case. Reed and Frankfurter both disqualified themselves in the Hiss appeal.

An earlier case of 1905 has been unearthed in which two Supreme Court Justices appeared on the list of witnesses but

there is no indication that they were ever actually called to the witness stand.

Prior to making its favorable report on the Keating bill the House subcommittee had received a letter from Chief Justice Vinson, declining comment on the measure. Vinson said he and the other Justices felt that they should not go on record. Deputy Attorney General Ford had advised the subcommittee that the Justice Department also preferred to make no recommendation.

Representative KEATING certainly has a point. Had there been such a law the Nation might not have been treated to the spectacle of a Justice of the Supreme Court of the land rushing down to give character testimony while the presiding judge bowed and scraped as if the Beatific Vision had entered the courtroom and the country wondered what effect such a rare scene might have upon the minds of the jury.

[From the Atlantic City (N. J.) Press of July 15, 1951]

WOULD BAR JUSTICES AS WITNESSES

Justices of the United States Supreme Court would be barred from testifying as character witnesses, or on matters of opinion, under a bill soon to be considered by the House Judiciary Committee and endorsed on July 9 by a subcommittee. Representative KEATING, Republican of New York, who introduced the bill, has declared that he was motivated by the appearances of Justices Frankfurter and Reed as character witnesses for Alger Hiss (in his first trial).

Justice Reed had been subpoenaed by the Hiss defense, Justice Frankfurter was a volunteer witness. Chief Judge Magruder of the United States Court of Appeals in the first district was also a character witness for Hiss.

An alternative bill, introduced by Representative SMITH, Republican of Wisconsin, would provide simply that no Federal judge could be compelled to testify as to character or to appear as a witness if similar testimony could be obtained from other witnesses.

Representative KEATING points to the possibility of some "smart lawyer" subpoenaing most or all members of the Supreme Court as witnesses in a lower court trial. Then the Court would be unable to pass on an appeal in the case. Reed and Frankfurter both disqualified themselves in the Hiss appeal.

An earlier case, of 1905, has been unearthed in which two Supreme Court Justices appeared on the list of witnesses. There is no indication that they were actually called to the witness stand.

Prior to making its favorable report on the Keating bill the House subcommittee had received a letter from Chief Justice Vinson, declining comment on the measure. Vinson said he and the other Justices felt that they should not go on record. Deputy Attorney General Ford had advised the subcommittee that the Justice Department also preferred to make no recommendation.

Under normal conditions there might not be so much objection to the calling of jurists as witnesses—particularly as "character witnesses"—for defendants, who until their trial had to all effects and outward appearances been good citizens. But these are critical times. Moreover, as Representative KEATING warns, the tribunals upon which the jurists sit may be called upon to act upon appeals for convictions of the very persons for whom the judges testified. Many citizens will believe the bill should be passed, and made law.

[From the Long Beach (Calif.) Press-Telegram of July 24, 1951]

CHARACTER WITNESSES

The Keating bill which would forbid the appearance of United States Supreme Court Justices as character witnesses in Federal

trials has won the unanimous approval of a House Judiciary Subcommittee.

The bill, sponsored by Representative **KENNETH B. KEATING**, of New York, was a result of public shock when Supreme Court Justices Felix Frankfurter and Stanley B. Reed took the stand as character witnesses in the first trial of Alger Hiss, who was later convicted as a perjurer.

The impairment of judicial prestige and dignity was involved. When the Hiss case went to the Supreme Court on appeal, both these Justices were plainly disqualified.

Many citizens, after what they saw in the Hiss case, will heartily approve the purpose of the Keating bill.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette of July 31, 1951]

SHADES OF THE HISS TRIAL

Admittedly with the famous Alger Hiss case in mind, Congressman **KENNETH B. KEATING** of New York is backing a bill that would ban Supreme Court Justices from testifying as character witnesses or on matters of opinion. It will be recalled that Justices Stanley F. Reed and Felix Frankfurter testified to the good character of Mr. Hiss in his first Federal trial for perjury. Subsequently, Mr. Hiss was convicted and both Justices disqualified themselves from his appeal to the high court.

Perhaps it is going too far to call, as does Mr. **KEATING**, the appearance of the two Justices "unseemly conduct." But their action certainly was not prudent from the standpoint of our court system. By appearing in behalf of the defendant they, in effect, removed themselves from having any part in deciding an appeal. Under such practice, the work of the high court could be seriously handicapped.

More importantly, as Mr. **KEATING** emphasizes, the appearance of a Supreme Court Justice could unduly influence a lower court. For example, the judge of that court could be expected to give wide latitude to so distinguished and illustrious a witness.

In the Hiss case, Justice Frankfurter appeared voluntarily while Justice Reed had been subpoenaed. But there is some question as to whether a subpoena in such an instance alters the circumstance, since it is not likely that a character witness would be called against his own will.

It would be just as well if Congress were to dispose of the problem once and for all. That it can do by passing a law along the lines recommended by Mr. **KEATING**—which, be it noted, would not affect the right and duty of Supreme Court Justices to testify, like anyone else, on matters of fact.

Proposed Synthetic Oil Plant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. **HESELTON**. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday afternoon at 2 o'clock the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will hold an executive session to hear officials of the Department of the Interior on the subject of synthetic liquid fuels. In connection with that hearing I want to make readily available to the members of the committee, and to my other colleagues who may be interested in the matter, four articles which ap-

peared recently in the Christian Science Monitor. They are as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of August 9, 1951]

CONGRESS FIGHT LOOMS OVER \$400,000,000 SYNTHETIC FUEL PLANT

(By Harlan Trott)

WASHINGTON.—Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman may be headed for another round of trouble with Congress over a plan of his to put \$400,000,000 of the taxpayers' money into America's first big synthetic fuel plant to be located in southern Illinois.

The project has caused almost a civil war inside the Bureau of Mines and finally obtained the approval of the Interior Department only after Bureau Director James Boyd was fired as Defense Minerals Administrator and replaced by W. C. Schroeder.

UNFAVORABLE REPORT

The difficulty arises not so much out of the idea of entering the synthetic fuel field as over selection of the particular process to be employed in the first big investment in this field.

Experts disagree over the merits of various synthetic fuel processes. Mr. Chapman has picked an old German patent process which some experts in the field believe is bound to fail.

Acting on the advice of Government coal-oil technologists and economists in the Bureau's experimental stations, Dr. Boyd had reported unfavorably on the project in Illinois on the ground that the process selected could not operate successfully with Illinois coal.

In spite of this unfavorable report by his own Department's experts, Mr. Chapman gave a green light to the Illinois project. He requested the Defense Production Administration to provide the necessary \$400,000,000. The request was made in a letter of July 28, 1951, addressed to Edwin T. Gibson, acting director. The letter stated that the project had the vigorous support of the Defense Department.

The Chapman project calls for construction and operation of the plant by the Koppers Co. of Pittsburgh. Financial promotion is being arranged by the New York banking house of F. Eberstadt & Co., Inc.

According to critics the project is so unsound and uncertain technically that Koppers and Eberstadt refused to accept any financial risks. The contract is so drawn that the Government will guarantee cost of production to the company under various conditions including "failure of the plant to operate at designed capacity."

CAUSE OF DISMISSAL?

Dr. Boyd's opposition to the project is believed by his friends to be the cause of his dismissal from the post of Defense Minerals Administrator on August 3, just a week after Mr. Chapman had requested defense production funds for construction of the Illinois plant.

Several Members of Congress have been interested in the matter and there is talk of a congressional investigation. Republicans think they might be able to show that Mr. Chapman picked the southern Illinois project in the hope of retrieving the damaged fortunes of the party in Illinois where Scott W. Lucas, former Democratic Party leader in the Senate, was defeated in 1948.

Dr. A. J. Abrams, manager of the chemicals department of the engineering and construction division of Koppers, said he had been authorized by his superiors to state that the company doesn't wish to comment at this time on the Illinois project.

One Government expert on mobilization contracts estimates that the project as endorsed by Secretary Chapman would insure to the private promoters of the project profits up to 2,100 percent on the 250,000 shares

of \$1 common stock in 12 years. Under the prospectus this \$250,000 worth of voting stock would control the enterprise.

EXPERIMENTS MADE

Experiments with the coal hydrogenation process have been conducted at the Bruce-ton experiment station of the United States Bureau of Mines near Pittsburgh. As a result of these experiments, Dr. H. H. Storch, director of the Bruce-ton station, reported to the Department of the Interior as follows:

"It is apparent that even a 30,000-barrel-day plant is a poor risk for private capital. It is therefore not surprising that the sponsors of this project plan to request guarantees from the Government for capital, interest, and product disposal at a satisfactory price. Because the sponsors refuse to take any risks whatever, it would seem undesirable for the Government to agree to their proposal."

Dr. Storch's memorandum was dated July 3, 1951.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of August 11, 1951]

CHAPMAN PLAN FOR FUEL PLANT STIRS ANXIETY

CHICAGO.—Spokesmen of the oil industry in Chicago have expressed alarm that the plan favored by Oscar L. Chapman, United States Secretary of the Interior, to finance the construction of a \$400,000,000 synthetic fuel plant in southern Illinois might go through.

Commenting on the Chapman project quoted in the Chicago papers by the Associated Press from the Christian Science Monitor, oil company representatives said that the building of the synthetic plant would (1) result in great waste of steel and money when both are scarce and (2) take the country another step down the road toward socialism.

Spokesmen look upon the proposed project, they say, as being similar to the Canol enterprise in Alaska during World War II in which an attempt to operate a refinery was tremendously costly and was a "great bust."

The building of the synthetic plant in southern Illinois, according to the oil company representatives, would be twice as costly as would be the methods to get petroleum in the usual manner from present sources. In their opinion, present techniques and supply are sufficient for normal consumption and defense demands.

PROJECT SEEN PREMATURE

As oil operators here see it, the building of a synthetic fuel plant in Illinois or elsewhere would be premature. They believe that pilot plants for deriving petroleum from coal such as the one in Louisiana, Mo., are sufficient in the present stage of development and that the attempt for production on a commercial scale would be unwise at this time. When the time for commercial production comes, they say they want to be in on helping provide it on a "sound private enterprise basis."

Oil industry spokesman had no comment on the probable political aspects of the proposed synthetic fuel plant in southern Illinois, but they affirmed that the industry is carrying on its own research in synthetic fuel production and will build needed plants when economically sound regardless of political considerations.

They point to an editorial in Platt's Oilgram, oilmen's publication put out by the National Petroleum News of Cleveland, as expressing their general views on the situation dated August 8, 1951.

It criticizes Mr. Chapman for going to the Defense Production Administration for permission to build the Illinois plant without

the advice or even the knowledge of the Petroleum Administration for Defense.

This would mean, said the editorial, that he had ignored the fact that his own order setting up PAD gives that agency responsibility for all liquid fuels, including any which might be produced synthetically.

ACTION IN FACE OF REPORT

"Also, patently, he moved without waiting for the National Petroleum Council to complete and file the report he requested on cost estimates his own synthetic fuels chief, Dr. W. C. Schroeder, claims show synthetics now to be competitive with petroleum. * * * He is understood to have sought to justify his request (for borrowing authority) on the grounds that the United States must immediately take out 'insurance' against the day when the petroleum industry can no longer keep pace with mounting demand."

"In this respect," says the editorial, "he flew in the face of the short-term (5-year) availability report * * * filed just 4 days previously and also of PAD's reports to him which have scouted the possibility of the United States running out of oil in the foreseeable future."

The editorial continues:

"If [Secretary Chapman] gets the borrowing authority, [he] and his top planners, including Schroeder, intend entering immediately into active negotiations with a private group looking to construction of the 30,000 barrel-a-day coal hydrogenation plant * * *. The one private group known to be interested in building a coal hydrogenation plant—provided the Government guarantees against loss—is represented by Ferdinand Eberstadt of New York. It has estimated \$400,000,000 as the cost of the * * * plant including \$50,000,000 for necessary power generating facilities.

INTERNAL DIFFICULTIES

"In dealing with the Eberstadt group, Interior Department officials reportedly are insisting on a cancellation clause in the contract under which, if the deal doesn't work out too well, the Government may take over and operate the plant itself after payment of certain costs."

The editorial pointed to "internal difficulties at the Interior Department which have seen Dr. Schroeder taking over from James Boyd as head of the Defense Minerals Administration with the latter being relegated to his old job of director of the Bureau of Mines."

The Secretary, the Oil Gram has been told, had issued orders under which Dr. Schroeder was responsible only to the Secretary, leaving Mr. Boyd "in the untenable position of having an assistant over whom he has no control and could have the result of actually forcing his resignation."

Chicago Oil Co. spokesman believe that if governmental assistance is given to the proposed Illinois project, it will result in Government ownership of the plant. They say that financing of a privately owned plant through Government sales contracts or subsidies was found to be unsound for the Government when examined in connection with the synthetic-rubber industry.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of August 11, 1951]

FUEL PLANT "INDEFINITE," INTERIOR SPOKESMAN SAYS

WASHINGTON—The Interior Department says plans for establishing a synthetic fuels industry are still in the indefinite stage.

A department spokesman described as incorrect a story in The Christian Science Monitor that is plans to finance construction of a \$400,000,000 synthetic fuel plant in Southern Illinois.

"We are still negotiating an agreement with private industry and we have not yet selected a site," W. C. Schroeder, chief of the synthetic liquid fuels branch of the Bureau of Mines, told a reporter.

"We are still testing coals that might be used, and Illinois is only one of several States from which coal is being tested at our Louisiana, Mo., demonstration plant."

NEWSPAPER ACCOUNT DENIED

The Monitor said that opposition to the project by Dr. James Boyd, director of the Bureau of Mines, led to Mr. Boyd's dismissal August 3 as chief of the Defense Minerals Administration. An Interior Department spokesman denied this and also denied reports that Mr. Boyd might be ousted as director of the Bureau.

Mr. Boyd has been on leave from the Bureau to serve as DMA administrator since last December. Last Friday, Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman relieved Mr. Boyd of the DMA post and appointed Mr. Schroeder to head DMA. At the same time Mr. Chapman promoted Mr. Schroeder within the Bureau of Mines, making him assistant director for programs.

It was learned that the commercial-scale project which Mr. Chapman and Mr. Schroeder want to get started would employ the coal hydrogenation process. This is more expensive than another method known as the gasification process, but there are contentions it is better.

Mr. Boyd is reported to have recommended that the choice of process be delayed a few months, pending completion of two studies now under way.

\$275,000 SPENT ON STUDY

The National Petroleum Council has spent \$275,000 on a study requested by Mr. Chapman, of comparative costs of various forms of synthetic fuel production. This report is due for completion October 1.

In addition, the Army Engineers expect to complete in about 2 months a study of several years on the synthetic fuel potential of United States coal fields.

Mr. Boyd also had proposed that Detlev W. Bronk, president of Johns Hopkins University, who is also president of the National Academy of Science, head a non-government technical group from the academy in a study of synthetic fuels, and advise on national policy in this regard.

In view of Mr. Chapman's plans to proceed along the lines of the coal hydrogenation process, however, this study proposal has been dropped.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of August 13, 1951]

FUEL PLANT PLAN HOW STORY WAS BARED

WASHINGTON—A Government clerk's mistake brought to light the fact that the Interior Department is advocating construction of a coal-to-oil plant that would cost approximately \$400,000,000 and already is a subject of intense controversy.

A carbon copy of a letter from Oscar L. Chapman, Secretary of the Interior, stating that it is "essential" for the Defense Production Administration to set up the \$400,000,000 plant was routed accidentally to a department official who should have been consulted on the undertaking and was not.

This was the first the official knew that the proposal requesting a guaranty of plant production had been approved and forwarded to DPA by the Secretary's office.

James Boyd, director, "surnamed" this letter from Mr. Chapman to DPA, but the related financial prospectus was never shown to him, according to an informed

source. Dr. Boyd thought he was signing a general endorsement, and not approving a specific commercial scale synthetic fuel project. The facts subsequently became known.

PLANT CONSIDERED POOR RISK

The routing list on the documents originating in the Secretary's office included the name of W. C. Schroeder, but not the names of his superiors in the fuels section of the Bureau of Mines.

Informed sources say it is not unusual for the Government to assume all the financial risk in an emergency undertaking, but they challenge propriety of the Secretary's office in negotiating through a subordinate official without letting his superiors know about it, particularly where technical advisers opposed the project as unsound.

While it is understandable that in this case perhaps the Government should assume all the financial risks, they question the wisdom of going \$400,000,000 worth on what many regard as a doubtful undertaking.

The proposed Illinois coal hydrogenation plant is considered such a poor risk by Koppers Co. and F. Eberstadt Co. that this condition of Government assistance was included in Mr. Chapman's letter to DPA.

"A purchase contract good for the starting up period and 12 operating years thereafter from the General Services Administration for all products guaranteeing a 'floor' at present market prices with escalator clauses covering increased cost of production due to (A) increases in the cost of labor, materials, power, (B) shut-downs and the idle time due to strikes, accidents, and other causes beyond our control * * * orders of the Government, hazards of war, and failure of the plan to operate at designed capacity."

The private promoters requested Mr. Chapman to "kindly treat this proposal as confidential, not for publication. The Koppers Co. have asked that their report, which has entailed much time and effort, be restricted to authorize Government personnel."

SKINNER MEMO

The Chapman endorsement was sent to DPA despite adverse reports to the Department's coal hydrogenation technologists.

Included in these negative reports was a review of Koppers' report on the Illinois project signed by L. C. Skinner, a Government economist at the Department's Louisiana, Mo., experimental station.

Mr. Skinner's memorandum to his superiors has this to say of the Illinois project:

"The financial plan outlined looks very good for someone, but if they are able to get the Government to guarantee everything as requested, with the operators assuming no risk for anything, I cannot see why the equity capital cannot be increased."

"The need for Government assistance is clearly shown. However, the guaranty asked for would relieve the operator of any incentive for efficient operation. I would like, also, to ask the question, 'should the Government guarantee everything, including a profit of sizable proportions, to the equity stockholders?'"

The Interior Department's economist also challenged the arrangements for a management fee. The report states that while such arrangements have been used with some success in industry, it is doubtful whether such a plan of operations offers the "incentive for good management" as would a share of the profits.

The memorandum was dated July 17, 1951, 11 days before Mr. Chapman requested DPA to set up the \$400,000,000 for a coal hydrogenation plant which the Department's technologists warn will not work using Illinois coal.

Industrial Dispersion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 22, 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial in regard to industrial dispersion, entitled "A Matter of Common Sense," which was published in the Washington Evening Star of August 13, 1951.

Some of the most significant warnings of our time, Mr. President, can be given in terms of old sayings that have been familiar for generations; for example, "Don't put all your eggs in one basket." That is the essence of the single idea behind the program for industrial dispersion developed by the National Security Resources Board, and announced by the President on August 10, 1951. It is a fundamental plan for national self-preservation.

The President's program is not one of moving essential industries from their traditional locations to parts of the country that, presumably, are safer from attack. Actually, a determined enemy can reach any part of the United States. The object of this program is to avoid creation of any new concentrations of industry anywhere in the country which are large enough to form attractive targets for intercontinental bombing. This can be done as well by careful spacing of new plants within an established industrial region as by moving them to a less industrialized part of the country.

The NSRB program is based on this premise. Its purpose is to show that an area can grow industrially without increasing the concentration of factories and population in any central city. The local chamber of commerce and the planning commission of a city and its county can collaborate in locating a series of potential factory sites dispersed 10 to 20 miles from the center of the city, or less distance in rugged terrain, yet well within its acknowledged trade territory. In fact, the local areas are asked to take the leadership in this program. The program suggests that the surrounding potential industrial areas should be surveyed and listed, each having the characteristics needed for the establishment of new manufacturing operations. These dispersed sites should be in each respective local marketing area, but outside the congested industrial centers which might be affected by any possible bombing of the central area—must not add to the expansion of that area and, therefore, make it a far less attractive target.

At the same time, the dispersed industries and all of the activities associated with them would be part of the greater central city and its economic complex. Their financing would be handled through the same channels as though they were located in the central city.

Shipping would be handled by the same railway, steamship, and trucking lines. Labor would be drawn from the same labor market, expanded by the inclusion of a number of outlying suburban communities. Payrolls would continue to be spent in the central city area, strengthening retail trade in the outlying suburbs and also flowing into the central city through the normal processes by which an active city serves its region. No city or area need lose business. All areas should grow and expand.

Such a survey would put the central city in a position of readiness for industrial expansion to take care of mobilization requirements. If one of their established industries, now somewhat cramped for space, needed to double or triple its floor area, it would not have to move away to do it. It could find ample space for a supplemental plant within easy driving distance of the home office. The same top management could supervise both plants, experienced personnel could shift over temporarily or permanently to help get the new plant going and the central city, not a competing city, would reap the benefit of the expanded activity.

The same readiness would help attract other plants, too, perhaps producers of new products looking for an ample site well separated from likely target areas or new service firms or suppliers set up by central city businessmen to help meet the mounting requirements of the region.

The conclusion reached by business and governmental leaders is that industrial dispersion carried out on such a local basis would hold no threat to their economy, but, on the contrary, would provide an opportunity to greatly expand and improve it. Dispersion offers a way for the area not only to grow industrially without increasing the risk of enemy attack but at the same time to improve economically and socially, solving the age-old problem of mounting in-town congestion and satisfying the American urge for more spacious and attractive home surroundings.

The protection and development of United States productive capacity is the key to strength for the free world and ultimately to peace. The late Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, in commenting on the reasons which might make the Soviet hesitate to start a war against the United States, said in a recent hearing:

The deterrent to war with us is the realization of our technical and industrial potential, the forces we have, our ability to expand them. * * * There is the realization on the other side that if a general war comes, they will be defeated.

Therefore we must do everything possible to decrease the vulnerability of our congested production areas by the use of space.

It is obvious that this appraisal is shared by the U. S. S. R. Everyone recalls Stalin's oft-quoted statement at the Churchill-sponsored dinner in Tehran in 1943 where the Soviet leader said that without American production the war would have been lost.

The NSRB has expended the best thinking at its command in outlining its industrial dispersion program to insure the safety of the Nation. In order to prove the practicality of its ideas, Mr. Jack Gorrie, Acting Chairman of NSRB, called upon Mr. Allen Peyser and the Seattle Chamber of Commerce to undertake the program as a pilot experiment in the Seattle, Wash., area before it was approved. Under Mr. Peyser's leadership a group of industrial and community leaders joined in planning for the practical protection of Seattle's production in case of atomic bombing. Their program is available now for other communities to follow. Their experience has been integrated into the final program.

The NSRB program challenges community leadership to initiate a task force to plan for its own protection. The title of the NSRB brochure "Is Your Plant a Target?" is pointed to local initiative and local leadership. Realizing this, the United States Chamber of Commerce has immediately cooperated by sending out thousands of copies of the brochure to its representatives.

In order to accelerate industrial dispersion the President has ordered all Federal agencies handling loans, tax amortization, and certificates of necessity to be guided by the program of the NSRB and has specifically stated:

I shall look to the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board to keep me advised on the progress of this program

Mr. Gorrie, Acting Chairman of the NSRB, in his foreword in the brochure describing the NSRB program, says:

The risk of an all-out atomic attack on the United States grows greater each day, since we are no longer the sole possessor of the secret of the atomic bomb. This means that no industrial area in the Nation can be considered safe from attack.

The protection of industrial production is essential to survival in case of war. Increased and sustained production is the backbone of national security.

This productive capacity must be protected. The dispersion (or deployment in space) of new plant development for war-supporting industries can make American production less vulnerable to attack.

Mr. Charles E. Wilson, defense mobilization director, has pledged his support for implementation of the NSRB program. In commenting on it he said on August 16:

Industry has much to gain and nothing to fear as a consequence of the industrial dispersion policy announced by President Truman last Friday.

It is a great program for the good of the country, for many years to come, in peace and war * * * and we are going ahead with it. It holds possibilities for every section of the Nation, including those already built up with industry. * * *

The present plan is different from any plan heretofore proposed because it is local in concept, and even encourages continued growth of present industrial areas—out from the edges.

We are relying upon private industry everywhere to see that new plants are dispersed, and effective dispersal can be accomplished within local marketing areas.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MATTER OF COMMON SENSE

There is little justification for the cries of indignation raised by a number of Congressmen—notably from New England—over the President's order directing all Federal departments and agencies to give active support to the administration's policy on industrial dispersion.

The policy—as worked out by the National Security Resources Board, the Office of Defense Mobilization, and the Munitions Board—has only one objective, which is simply this: To do everything that can be done now, within the limits of hard-headed practicality, to minimize what could happen to our gigantic productive capacity should the day ever come—as it may—when an all-out atomic attack is launched against us.

It is because of that very real possibility that the dispersal policy has been formulated. What the policy envisions is the use of special tax write-offs, priority allocation of materials, and other incentives designed to encourage new industries and expanding old industries to build their plant facilities as far from the heart of our cities as is feasible in terms of cost and operating efficiency. As matters stand, our country is peculiarly vulnerable to atomic attack because our great producing areas are concentrated in a relatively compact geographical complex. From the standpoint of practicality, we cannot break up and scatter this complex, or put it underground. But what we can do—and what we certainly ought to do—is take sensible action to keep it from increasing its present density wherever such an increase can be avoided.

Thus, by way of example, if an old industry in Pittsburgh or Detroit undertakes to expand itself, or if an investing group decides to establish a new industry in either of those cities, why should the plant facilities be erected right next door to facilities already existing? If they can be built farther out without seriously impairing efficiency or adding unreasonably to costs, why not build them farther out? By means of such decentralization—limited to the location and construction of factories and mills still in the planning or blueprint stage—a good part of our productive capacity would be given an excellent chance to survive an atomic attack. That is what the President's dispersal order is all about. It adds up to nothing more or less than simple common sense in an age when our Nation must think of itself as a highly concentrated and inviting target.

The congressional opposition to the order apparently is based on the fear that it would take industries out of regions like New England and shift them to desert spots or isolated wheat fields. But this is a misconception. For the dispersion policy—which at best can be regarded merely as a palliating preparedness measure—is aimed chiefly at promoting the construction of new plant facilities at points only 20, 10 or even fewer miles from present concentrations. There is certainly nothing spectacular or revolutionary about that.

In the event of an atomic attack, however, these relatively short decentralizing distances could spell the difference between full and partial stoppage of the productive capacity of any target city. We ought to act accordingly. To argue otherwise is to take a shortsighted view of the nature of the dangers confronting us in this epoch of Red aggression, intercontinental bombers, supersonic flight, A-weapons and kindred instruments of mass destruction.

Appropriation for the National Science Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 22, 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of August 22 entitled "Foreclosing Science," and also a letter to the editor of the Post, published in the same edition, both of which comment on the proposed reduction in the appropriation for the National Science Foundation.

In this critical period, when our survival is largely dependent upon our technical superiority, it seems very shortsighted to reduce the appropriation for the organization which has only recently been established for research in basic science. I believe that it is generally recognized that our security at the moment rests largely on our proficiency in the field of nuclear fission. The fact that the west has remained free is, I believe, due to the scientific contributions which were made by the great scientists of the western world in the development of the atomic bomb.

Although we are a great nation and have excelled in the application of scientific discoveries to modern living, I firmly believe that the United States must concentrate on basic research if the superiority of the west is to be maintained. It simply does not make sense to spend billions for rearmament in conventional weapons and at the same time virtually wipe out a small but important effort to support basic research.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

FORECLOSING SCIENCE

It is astonishing in this day of \$56,000,000,000 defense budgets that the House Appropriations Committee should boggle over a \$14,000,000-fund designed to replenish the armory of scientific ideas from which defense draws its strength. In cutting the request for the national science foundation by 98 percent—from \$14,000,000 to \$300,000—the House committee has virtually shut the door on any effort to stimulate more basic scientific research. The \$14,000,000 asked was below the 15-million annual authorization set by Congress when it established the foundation last year. In view of the many difficulties which preceded the establishment of the foundation, this new blow is profoundly disheartening.

The foundation, under direction of Dr. Alan T. Waterman, had proposed to spend \$8,000,000 in support of basic research and \$5,000,000 for 2,100 graduate fellowships in the sciences and engineering. Some basic research is being done—by universities, by the Atomic Energy Commission, Public Health Service, Department of Agriculture and to a limited extent by the Armed Forces themselves. But there is no coordination, no effort to survey the field and plug the gaps. Likewise, the demands of the military are

constantly increasing the need for scientists, but the supply is diminishing.

In these circumstances \$14,000,000 for the science foundation is not a luxury, but a remarkably small and prudent investment. The United States has been a Nation of applied science; Americans have been geniuses at developing the basic ideas borrowed from others—as, for example, on the atom bomb. But Dr. James B. Conant, who heads the foundation's advisory board, has repeatedly pointed to the need to concentrate more effort on the fundamental research of which applied science is made. The science foundation needs help in its job of promoting the raw material of scientific ideas without which technology alone would soon falter.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION BUDGET

While debates and action proceed in Congress on appropriations of billions of dollars for immediate defense needs, inadequate attention has been attracted to the action of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives a few days ago in recommending the complete denial of the 13-million-dollar appropriation request by the National Science Foundation to initiate its scientific research and scientific fellowship programs. This action is short-sighted penny wisdom and it is hoped that it will be reversed before final passage of the appropriation bill.

The National Science Foundation was created by the Congress as an outgrowth of the experience of World War II in demonstrating the vital importance of science and scientists to the national defense. Under a distinguished board and an exceptionally well qualified director, the foundation's organization and plans began to take shape early this year.

The functions of the foundation may be described broadly as (1) to support and encourage basic scientific studies and (2) to increase the supply, over the years to come, of trained scientists. The former is to be accomplished through contracts with existing scientific institutions, principally universities; the latter is to be accomplished through a program of fellowships at universities in scientific and engineering fields, to be awarded on a merit basis and in amounts sufficient merely to defray on a modest scale the actual educational costs of advanced study by distinguished young scientists and engineers.

These functions are important in peacetime, vital for wartime. It is true that their significance is relatively long term. These programs would have no appreciable value in a war that may be fought this year or next year, but they may have a decisive effect on a war which may be fought 5 years or more in the future—or in preventing a war which might otherwise be fought at such a future time.

Basic scientific studies, as distinguished from applied science and engineering, have never been popular in this country and we have relied heavily on the basic research of foreign scientists. Both for peace and for war, basic scientific studies must be fostered; they are the foundation upon which applied scientific and technological developments may be built.

Both for peace and for war we must have a major increase in our national resources of advanced scientists and engineers. The existing shortage is well known and readily demonstrable. A fellowship program by the National Science Foundation, if based on practical, long-term planning and if well integrated with existing privately financed fellowships, can be a major element in strengthening the national defense and increasing the national standard of living over the years to come.

In properly expending our principal energies in defense against the immediate danger, we should not forget that the danger is a long-term one as well. We are expending our resources of scientific knowledge and of scientists on this immediate mobilization effort, just as we are expanding our resources of metals and other critical raw materials. We cannot stockpile scientists or scientific knowledge but we can and should replace and increase the seed corn we are now consuming. This is a matter for judgment and sense of proportion.

The National Science Foundation's request for less than \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year 1952 is self-evidently modest in relation to the national need and the national budget, the House Appropriations Committee's recommendation of \$300,000 is patently shortsighted. It is not yet too late to remedy this lapse of judgment and it is hoped that the Congress will do so.

WILLIAM T. GOLDEN

NEW YORK.

The Central Arizona Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Harry A. Lawson, editor of the Eagle Rock Sentinel in my district has written a succinct article on the importance of protecting Colorado River water due to southern California and the necessity of defeating the fantastic central Arizona project. I wish to include this article in the RECORD.

TOWN TALKS

(By H. A. Lawson)

Nothing is dearer to the people of Eagle Rock, Los Angeles, and all southern California than just plain and unadulterated water. Without it, it might be said, they would perish. Water tables are dropping drastically everywhere. While floodwater goes to extravagant waste in territories tributary to the great waterways of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, all southern California literally finds itself with its tongue hanging out from thirst for its great agricultural and horticultural areas that need it so drastically. Lack of sufficient snows on the mountains that form our watersheds, years of light rainfalls, make water just about the most important item on southern California's agenda. Yet there are agencies that would rob us of the little supply that is available to us. They would divert it from the heavily populated and productive lands of southern California to the sparsely occupied desert lands of Arizona, known as the central Arizona project. This project is located near Phoenix, comprises but 226,000 acres, and if authorized by measures now before the lower house of Congress, would cost our Government \$1,838 an acre for irrigation alone, or 1,100 percent greater than the average for all other western reclamation projects to date.

The central Arizona project is nothing more or less than a speculator's dream. It is fantastically expensive. Only 420 land-owners would benefit. These favored few would receive benefits averaging half a million dollars each. It would cost a minimum of \$708,000,000 where 17 of our reclamation States have received slightly over

\$993,000,000. It calls for the almost impossible lifting of water 985 feet to irrigate lands at that level. Such a proposal for the irrigation of field crops is economically fantastic.

The Colorado River water that Arizona wants would serve more than 5,000,000 people in California who need it badly to augment their dwindling water supply. And our people own this water by virtue of long-standing contracts with our Federal Government. Two measures—S. 75 and H. R. 1500—pending before Congress would rob us of our water. Write your Senators and Congressmen demanding the defeat of both. Do it now.

Saving Asia for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer, noted foreign correspondent:

[From the New Leader of August 15, 1951]

SAVING ASIA FOR FREEDOM

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

I believe that Asia can be saved from communism without a third world war. It can, in my judgment, be saved by the immediate creation of local anti-Communist forces roughly equal in strength to the local Communist forces.

Most Americans can surely agree on one point. The weakness of the free world in Asia is that it is forced to use its chief armies—American, British, and French—against satellite Asians—North Koreans, Chinese, Indochinese and Malaysians—while the U. S. S. R. preserves its forces intact.

This is the U. N. and United States position in Korea. And, with apologies to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, it was not our position in Greece. In fact, to save Greece we equipped, mobilized, and assisted Greek forces to do the job without any direct military contributions from us. Just this should be our aim in Asia.

Now quite obviously, because of a number of historical errors, chief of which were imagining that the U. S. S. R. could become a peace-loving democracy and that Chinese Communists would be Chinese first and Communists afterward, the western democracies got caught off base. When the Communists attacked in Korea, Indochina, and Malaya, they had to be stopped by the United States, France, and Britain, or by nobody. For, in Asia, we had never created strong local anti-Communist forces. Until such forces exist, the United States, Britain, and France cannot withdraw their forces from the Far East without exposing that vital area to new attacks.

Secretary of State Acheson may find it convenient to say that "if aggression [in Korea] would end and you had reliable assurances that it would not be resumed . . . I think that you have a real possibility of working out a stable situation." The point is that there can be no reliable assurances that North Korean and Chinese forces, having achieved a partial victory, would not embark upon a new aggression somewhere else in Asia, say, against helpless Burma, whenever it seemed convenient. Against such utterly untrustworthy enemies, there can be but one reliable assur-

ance, namely, enough opposing forces to defeat them.

If this reasoning is correct—and during a recent trip through the Far East I met literally no westerner who even sought to refute it—then the \$64 question is: Are there available in the Far East enough local forces to stop Communist expansion?

I am sure that such forces exist potentially. The reason we do not all see them is that the Reds got the jump on us, not only militarily but propagandistically. They not only almost took Asia away from us by force, but "sold" a lot of us a number of phony stories which it was in their interest to have us believe. One of these was that we could not find adequate local forces to checkmate the Communists.

This is fundamentally false. I am convinced. There is, however, just one speck of truth in it. We cannot organize local Asians for freedom until we have first done a number of things that we should have done before the Communists launched their attacks; such as:

1. Hold on in Korea until the French and Vietnamese have smashed the Communist rebels in Indochina, the British have crushed them in Malaya, and the Filipinos have eliminated them from their islands.

2. Settle the Kashmir dispute on any reasonable basis, thus freeing Pakistan's great energy and influence for use elsewhere and giving Indian opponents of neutralism a chance to assert themselves.

3. Bring Burma, Siam, and free Vietnam into a Southeast Asian alliance to include India and Pakistan as soon as either is ready to join.

4. Extend the new Pacific pact among the United States, New Zealand, and Australia to include the Philippines and a rearmed Japan. At the appropriate time, link it with the Southeast Asian alliance.

5. Instead of recognizing Red China, create all possible difficulties for that regime. This means supporting Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa and encouraging any other anti-Communist forces that emerge.

6. Urge the Japanese, once they again become independent, to create a sizable military force.

I believe that carrying out these six undertakings would save Asia, and that nothing less will.

Two obstacles have, I think, prevented this blunt fact from being recognized by everybody. One has been the inconsistency of American policy—first in favor of, then against, now again in favor of, military intervention in Asia. The second obstacle is the absence of a common attitude toward Asia on the part of the United States, Britain, and France. So long as these countries do not agree upon a common policy of over-all defense, the Communists will continue to progress despite our disunited efforts to stop them. Until recently, it has presumably been impossible to achieve such a common policy. Now, in my judgment, the moment has come when agreement on a common line can and should be reached.

Death of Col. Karel Lukas in Prison in Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 22, 1951

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the *REROD*, an article entitled "Refugees Recall Torture Death of Colonel Lukas in Czech Prison," which appeared in the *Washington Evening Star* today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

REFUGEES RECALL TORTURE DEATH OF COLONEL LUKAS IN CZECH PRISON

Warnings voiced in Congress that Associated Press Correspondent William N. Oatis may be killed within "a matter of weeks" from tortures in a Czech prison have recalled to Czechoslovakia refugees here and others the tragic story of Col. Karel Lukas.

Colonel Lucas, former Czech military attaché here, was arrested after the Communists came into power in Czechoslovakia, despite the fact that he was a patriot and hero of both World Wars I and II.

Before his death in prison, he reiterated an account of the brutal beatings and tortures to which he had been submitted to a cellmate. That cellmate, one of the few to escape, eventually brought the story to Colonel Lukas' friends in America. They disclosed it in connection with the Oatis case.

OATIS SERVING 10-YEAR TERM

Mr. Oatis, 37-year-old chief of the Associated Press bureau in Prague, is serving a 10-year sentence on trumped-up spying charges. He is said to be confined in the notorious Pankrac prison in Prague, where Colonel Lukas met his death.

Those who know the Lukas story have been wondering if Mr. Oatis, a former Indiana newspaperman, may not be occupying the same cell that once held Colonel Lukas, along with other political prisoners.

It is, according to the Lukas story, a cell in which there are no beds. Prisoners are forced to lie on the stone floor. Often, it is said, the cell is deliberately flooded to prevent prisoners from resting, even after being beaten and tortured during their interrogations by the KVSTB (state security organs).

That was the fate of Colonel Lukas. He managed to escape from Czechoslovakia after Hitler seized the country, and he joined the Czech Army in France at the beginning of World War II. Toward the end of the war, after being wounded in Africa, he came to Washington as military attaché. In April 1947 he was recalled to Czechoslovakia and placed in command of an armored division.

SEIZED AFTER RED COUP

Then came the Communist coup in February 1948. All those who had served with western armies during the war became "unreliable." One of these was Colonel Lukas. It was charged that, as a recruiting officer in France, he had not accepted into the newly formed Czech Army some Communist Czechs from the loyalist forces in the war in Spain, and these Communists had been executed later by the Germans. So he was arrested and sent to Pankrac.

This is in essence the story that was later related to Czech refugees here:

On May 4, 1949, at 4 p. m., the door of cell 334 was opened, admitting the most hated executioner of the prison, the SNB Sgt. Frantisek Vinlsky. With him were three members of the SNB, carrying the limp body of a seemingly old and wrecked man.

This man wore a disarranged civilian suit. Apparently he had been dressed in haste. His stockings feet left traces of blood on the cell floor. The shoes were carried by one of the SNB men, who threw them on the floor.

HUMAN WRECK AT 52

The prisoner's suit was clean and bore no traces of blood. But on his skull was a gap-

ing wound. His face was covered with black and bleeding blotches. His graying hair hung in blood-stained wisps over his face. This human wreck was Colonel Lukas, the 52-year-old veteran of two wars.

Other men, the story relates, brought a straw mattress into the cell and dropped the body on this meager bed. Sergeant Vinlsky, the story continues, bellowed to others in the cell: "Here you have one of your colleagues who has not been cautious enough and met with an accident. Try not to let him die."

When Colonel Lukas was undressed his cellmates were appalled by the sight they saw. His feet and legs were shapeless and bleeding, and no ankles and knees were discernible. It was evident to the cellmates that he had been beaten with rubber clubs all over the feet and legs. The soles of his feet showed traces of systematic beating, and the old wound from the war was opened.

CLUBBED IN STOMACH

The whole body, it was said, was covered with bruises. The stomach bore signs of recent proddings with clubs. The prisoner's face had, it seemed, been battered with closed fists. The lips and eye were bleeding, and an extended trace of cudgeling marked his right cheek. There was an open wound on the forehead, and the arms, too, showed marks of severe beating.

Despite his battered condition, Colonel Lukas was conscious. When he was left alone with his cellmates he said his interrogation had started at 8 a. m. in the STB headquarters in Bartolomejska Street No. 6, in the office of Dr. Dolek-Belecky, the chief of the section. When he refused to disclose any information he was systematically tortured.

Before the interrogation began Colonel Lukas was blindfolded, and when he refused to answer questions the torture began.

First was what was called the "bear game." Members of the STB formed a circle, with Colonel Lukas in the middle. He had to walk around, and the men beat him whenever they could reach his body. Then he had to walk on his toes to strain the muscles and was beaten across them.

BEATEN ON BARE FEET

Another method resorted to after a 5-minute break to give him time to consider "confessing" was the so-called "bastonade." He had been made to kneel on a wooden chair and lean over with his hands on the back. His bare feet were closely tied to it, and the soles were hit alongside and across until all the nails were torn off.

During this part of the torture, Colonel Lukas told his cellmates he had lost consciousness and did not remember what treatment followed. He was revived with buckets of water and remembered later being beaten over the head and stomach.

The whole torture lasted 4 hours, with a few 5-minute breaks devoted to interrogation. When being taken from the room, he was warned that so-called electric method of interrogation would be used. When the bandage was removed from his eyes, according to the story, Dr. Dolek remarked, "These soldiers did a thorough job on you."

NO MEDICAL AID FOR DAYS

For some days, while Colonel Lukas tossed feverishly and helplessly on his mattress, he received no medical attention. On May 8, a doctor came to see him with another SNB sergeant, whose name, from his cruelties, was Deadhead or Deathshead.

The doctor asked for details of his injuries, and Colonel Lukas said he fell down a stairs after his interrogation. When the doctor pressed for details, the sergeant kicked him and indicated he was to ask no further questions. "Ah, so," the doctor said understandingly.

Colonel Lukas was left without medical aid until May 15 or 16, when his condition became even worse and he was transferred to a hospital. There he died shortly afterward and his last words were said to have been: "They gave it to me. What a shame that they call themselves Czechs."

A Birthday Tribute to Bernard M. Baruch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following well-deserved tribute to that very distinguished elder statesman, Bernard M. Baruch, written by Harry H. Schlacht, appeared in the *New York Journal American* of August 19, 1951, and in other newspapers throughout the country:

A BIRTHDAY TRIBUTE TO BERNARD M. BARUCH

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

America, he has honored thy name. Add him to the roll of thy children whose names and deeds bid the world to demand justice and freedom.

America will observe on Sunday the eighty-first birthday anniversary of Bernard M. Baruch.

We place a crown of laurel upon his head. We invest him with the noble character of an apostle of Americanism.

America honors his ever-growing fame as one of its noblest treasures.

The story of his life makes us proud of our country. It brings to us renewed faith and renewed hope. It strengthens our love for the Republic.

He is a friend of humanity. He is a foe of tyranny.

A virile Americanism is the characteristic of his soul. It is the philosophy of his life. It is the mentor of his actions. It is the touchstone of his thoughts.

In every act and utterance his only motto is "My Country."

His towering integrity, his mighty heart, his greatness of soul exercise far-reaching influence on world affairs.

He was born without an iota of prejudice. He lives without an evil thought.

Wherever truth needs an advocate, wherever right needs a defender, wherever suffering needs a healer, there you will find Bernard M. Baruch.

He is a great and good man. He is a rare and reverent man.

He walks humbly and justly with his God. A magnetic individuality, coupled with a magnetic personality, endears him to all.

His generosity knows no bounds.

He ranks among the foremost leaders of the common good of the Nation.

Mr. Baruch's superb courage is never halted by the magnitude of the task before him, or by the criticisms of those who differ with him.

He is a man of unique stature in American life.

He has never held public office, but he is one of the head coaches of his country.

He has never held any title, and no title could ennoble him.

Mr. Baruch is known as a President-maker, as a humanitarian, statesman, and patriot.

All who believe in honor and morality, in virtue, and in fine public service, must say today: "There walks Bernard M. Baruch,

an illustrious American, a fine American gentleman."

We join with all Americans in wishing him many happy returns of the day, many more years of fruitful service to God, to country, to humanity.

Investigation of Crime in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 22, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was glad to see an editorial in this morning's Washington Post endorsing the stand which I have taken on behalf of a thorough probe into crime in the District of Columbia. This editorial clearly and briefly points out the reasons why it is so important that the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, after September 1, make a thorough exploration of the material which we of the Crime Committee have partially analyzed, relating to vice and corruption in our Nation's Capital.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the text of the Post editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACTS ON CRIME

Senator WILEY's call for a full airing of crime and corruption in the District ought not to go unheeded. The Wisconsin Senator again makes a point that events have amply demonstrated—that the Senate Crime Investigating Committee barely scratched the surface. The same may be said for the earlier probes of crime in Washington, as evidenced by the fact that the large-scale numbers operations of Mr. Charles E. Nelson were apparently unknown or disregarded by those in authority until 2 weeks ago.

A further investigation by the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, which will take over the Crime Committee's powers, is important for two reasons. First, it would serve as an independent check upon the work of the District grand jury, which is hampered by the fact that it must rely upon police as investigators even though police may be involved in the situation it is considering. Second, a Senate investigation would serve to tie together the pieces of evidence as they affect nearby Maryland and Virginia as well as the District.

Such an investigation would not, of course, be a substitute for local action, and in this respect the continuing indifference of Prince Georges County officials to the need for immediate grand jury action there, not to mention the complete lack of observable action in Arlington and Alexandria, is mystifying. Nonetheless, it has become apparent that local crime is part of an integrated pattern which does not stop at State or city lines, and it needs to be approached on this basis. We hope Senator WILEY is successful in persuading his colleagues to make a broad search for the facts of organized crime in and around the Nation's Capital—without politics or punch-pulling.

Investigation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 22, 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in this morning's Washington Post with regard to the final report of the subcommittee which has just completed a study of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The editorial is, I believe, a very fair one in view of the position which the Washington Post has taken in urging the abolition of the RFC.

I also ask to have printed an editorial entitled "Report No. 2," published in the Dayton Daily News of August 21, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of August 22, 1951]

RESCUING RFC

The raucous criticism by Senators CAPEHART and BRICKER should not obscure the fundamentally good work of the Fulbright subcommittee in its investigation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. In no sense can the final report of the Fulbright group to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee be considered a gloss. It refers only briefly, to be sure, to the specific charges of favoritism and influence in the RFC—for the reason that these charges have been copiously aired in four interim reports. As is proper under its mandate, the Fulbright subcommittee directs its attention at specific reforms embodied in a bill before the Senate.

Some of these reforms already have been made by RFC Administrator Symington, as for example, the provisos for full publicity and a showing of public interest in the granting of every RFC loan. Two other proposed correctives seem to us eminently sensible. One would remove the requirement that the Civil Aeronautics Board and Interstate Commerce Commission must pass upon RFC loans to air carriers and railroads, respectively. This has been a deterrent to objectivity, especially in the case of the CAB, for obviously after approving a loan the CAB has been under pressure to grant enough subsidy to insure repayment. The other corrective is a prohibition against the employment by borrowers of any RFC personnel within 2 years of the time they have received a loan. This would be protection against such improprieties as disclosed in the cases of E. Merl Young, John Haggerty, and Allen Freeze, who went at substantially higher salaries directly from the RFC to borrowing firms whose loan applications they had processed.

The Republican minority, in its separate report, starts off with the premise that the RFC should be abolished—a question beyond the subcommittee's province. From there it proceeds to develop a political campaign document lambasting President Truman. The reasons that this is possible, of course, are that the administration is extremely vulnerable, and that the President's attitude toward indiscretions by his subordinates has hardly invited confidence. Nevertheless, the minority goes pretty far afield from the purpose of the investigation when it observes

of Mr. Truman and Democratic Chairman Boyle: "Both are graduates of one of the most corrupt political machines in the history of any State. They have transferred Pendergast politics to the national level." Nor does the minority serve any constructive purpose by dwelling repetitiously upon cases already thoroughly exposed. Significantly enough, as Senators FULBRIGHT and BENTON pointed out, the minority report completely fails to mention an instance of impropriety on the part of a Republican—Senator MCCARTHY's acceptance of a \$10,000 fee from the Lustron Corp., an RFC borrower, for the use of his name on a pamphlet.

Despite the bad taste left by the negative carping of Senators CAPEHART and BRICKER, the work of the Fulbright subcommittee stands up as a balanced, thorough job. It ought to be a warning against lapses of morality on the part of public officials and against complacency in the White House.

[From the Dayton (Ohio) Daily News of August 21, 1951]

REPORT NO. 2

The same motives that inspired the report of the eight minority Senators on the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committee clearly inspired Senators BRICKER and CAPEHART as they wrote their minority report on the RFC hearings before the Fulbright committee.

Again it can be said that their records remove the element of surprise from this blast which is characterized by Senator FULBRIGHT as a scurrilous indictment and a political diatribe, by Democratic Senate Leader McFARLAND as an exercise in smirking plety and demagogic political inference and innuendo, and by the ruggedly independent Democratic Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, as a prosecutor's brief against the Democratic Party.

But the significant fact was this. The Fulbright committee as a whole, as reflected in its majority report, had conducted a rigorous and fair investigation and had denounced specific unethical practices of Donald Dawson, F. Merl Young, and other men with close White House connections. A committee with a majority of Democrats had been, in short, unsparing in its criticism of a Democratic administration. This was a remarkable example of an unpolitical approach to a problem seething with political implications.

It would have been good enough for any Republican Senator of a mentality less blindly political than that of CAPEHART and BRICKER. But it wasn't good enough for them. And so, in order to fry political fish of their own, they have launched out with extravagant and unverifiable charges the only result of which can be to increase acrimony and to depreciate the value of the truly splendid job that was done by the Fulbright committee.

Beyond the Call of Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, last week, a subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee went to Fallbrook, Calif., for a hearing. The purpose of this hearing was to get the facts concerning the attempt of the Department

of Justice to confiscate all water rights on the Santa Margarita River. This sermon of the Fallbrook minister, Rev. Marshal Ketchum, truly summed up some of the issues involved. I commend it for your reading.

BEYOND THE CALL OF DUTY

(A sermon by Rev. Marshal Ketchum)

Sometimes a military man is given special recognition by his country for service beyond the call of duty. The award is given to the man who does more than is expected of him—who goes beyond the usual requirements.

While going beyond the call of duty is usually considered to be exceptional and unusual, according to Jesus, going beyond the call of duty should be the normative and established practice. He says to us, in effect, "Here are the publicans and the pharisees who do what is expected of them. But you who would follow me: you must go beyond the bare minimum requirements. What do ye more than others?"

He spoke of going the second mile. The first mile is your duty; the second mile is because you are a Christian. He said if someone would borrow your coat, give it to him, but don't stop with that—give him your cloak as well. He severely criticized the Pharisees who very carefully followed the letter of the law but didn't go a whit further than just what the law required.

NECESSARY IN MARRIAGE

Going beyond the call of duty is certainly necessary in marriage. No marriage would last long if it were based only on the mere performance of the minimum cordialities out of a sense of duty. Marriage, to be sure, is a legal contract, but it is infinitely more than that. It must include doing things without being asked, performing little acts of kindness that are not expected. A marriage that is just a business arrangement cannot last for long.

This principle is also true in the realm of our daily work. There are certain standards which we are required to meet in our work. But too often we are satisfied with just meeting the minimum standards. Would Michelangelo's name be remembered if he had been content to do just what was barely required? He went far beyond the minimum. As Adam Bede said "I hate to see a man's arm drop as if he had been shot the instant the clock strikes six."

There is another application of this principle. God expects us to also live above and beyond the minimum moral and ethical requirements of law. Many things we do may be absolutely legal, but very immoral. Passing a law doesn't create morality. Laws are simply reflections of the judgment of humanity upon universal truths.

SUIT IMMORAL

This matter of morality being greater than law has a direct application to the suit being filed against people of Fallbrook for water rights. The suit is being filed in a very legal manner. It may be that the Government will win its case—if it does it will be a very legal decision handed down by a very legal court. But let me ask, "Does the fact that it may be proven legal thereby mean that it is moral?"

The Fallbrook Methodist Church has been accused by the United States Government of stealing. According to the suit, all of us, because we have put water in our flower baskets and washed dishes in our new sink, and watered our lawns, have been stealing water from the Government. We, according to the suit, have broken the eighth commandment. We are put in the same class as the man who breaks into a bank and opens the safe and steals the money. It may be legal for the Government to do this, but is it moral?

1. Is it moral for the Government to confiscate our water which, in Fallbrook, amounts to the same thing as confiscating land without payment. The fifth amendment to the Constitution clearly states: "Nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation."

2. Is it moral for Government to deny our right of water which has been recognized for almost 100 years and in doing so, destroy our farms and homes and churches and futures and invested savings?

3. Is it moral for Government to say it needs water for Camp Pendleton when the commanding general at the camp and high Navy officials have stated in writing that they didn't need it because future needs would be met from water through the metropolitan water district from the Colorado?

TESTIMONY CHANGED

4. Is it moral for an Assistant Attorney General to say before a House Judiciary Subcommittee that most water users would not be required to answer the suit, and then, after pencilling in changes in his testimony, send letters saying they would have to answer, causing inestimable confusion and expense and trouble?

As I say, it may be legal. But is it moral? Government as well as individuals should not consider itself to be beyond morality. Certainly the overwhelming majority of Government officials are thoroughly upstanding, fine, and morally conscientious. And yet there are evidently some who have lost their sensitivity to moral requirements—who believe you can do whatever you want to do, providing you make it legal, and who have substituted minimum legality for morality to the extent that 16,000 small landowners have their property, their homes, their savings, and their futures put in jeopardy.

LIKENED TO PHARISEES

Thus we have a vivid illustration of what happens when the principle is lost. That God asks of us more than just the minimum legal requirements—that the Pharisees in all their goodness, were still in danger of Hell because their righteousness stopped with the minimum requirements. To anyone who would make a contribution to society and be a follower of the way called Christianity, these words have tremendous significance: "Except your righteousness exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the Kingdom of Heaven."

The Eighty-second Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 22, 1951

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, an editorial in the Washington Star of yesterday appears under the headline "Congress: Worse and worse." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record, and I might say that I concur in the sentiments expressed in the editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CONGRESS: WORSE AND WORSE

If, as the New York Times reports, the President is keeping a box score on the Eighty-second Congress, it will be interesting to see what use he makes of the statistics.

The Eightieth Congress, which the Republicans controlled, was the "do-nothing" Congress, according to Mr. Truman in 1948. He went all around the country amplifying that dismal theme. It was, he said, one of the worst Congresses in history. That seems to have made a great hit with the people, because Mr. Truman, and a Democratic Congress, won the election.

But the Eighty-second Congress, with Democratic majorities in control, is getting worse and worse, according to the statistics. By this time in the session of the Eightieth Congress, 388 public laws had been approved. The Eighty-second has approved only 110. By this time the Eightieth Congress had approved all the big appropriation bills. But the Eighty-second Congress, to date this year, has sent the President only one big Federal appropriation and all the rest are bottled up while the Government is operating by authority of stop-gap resolutions making it temporarily legal to pay Government obligations. The Eighty-second Congress did pass a controls bill. But the President said it was "the worst" bill he had ever had to sign.

If the Eightieth Congress was the worst, and the Eighty-second Congress is worse than that, just what is the President going to say about it if he decides to take to the hustings and spread these grim facts before the people? The moral of the story well might be that under the Truman administration the functioning of Congress is becoming progressively worse. Mr. Truman might offset that deduction with the explanation that the Eighty-second Congress was the victim of an unholy alliance between the Republicans and the Southern Democrats. But with numerous Truman Democrats, as distinguished from Southern Democrats, already under indictment in Mississippi, who is the President going to ask southern voters to send to Congress?

But that is probably an unimportant detail. The President may simply say that while the Eightieth was the worst, the Eighty-second is worse, and let it go at that. If it worked once, it could work again. There seems to be votes, in them thar worst Congresses.

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, whom will the Dixiecrats support in 1952? And whatever happened to Henry Wallace?

Americanism: A Definition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members a stirring address delivered in Des Moines, Iowa, on August 5 by Rabbi David Lefkowitz, national chaplain of the American Legion. Speaking to the Legion De-

partment of Iowa, Rabbi Lefkowitz gave a sound, forthright speech on down-to-earth Americanism.

The address follows:

How Do You Define Americanism?

Comrade Commander, comrades of the Legion, ladies and gentlemen, my fellow Americans, it is particularly appropriate, in this critical and crucial hour of our country's history, that we reevaluate the meaning of the word and the ideal of Americanism, about which so much has been said but precious little understood. It is appropriate, first, because your great State has contributed more than its share of patriotic Americans and national leaders. But, my comrades and friends, it is appropriate, too, because we need a rebirth of that Americanism, that old-fashioned patriotism that sent our forebears into battle whenever freedom and dignity and justice were threatened—either on our home soil or abroad—where men looked to America to uphold or to restore their precious liberty.

But you know, my comrades, my task at this hour is not an easy one. For what can I say about Americanism that has not already been said by far more eloquent men? Then too, Americanism has been defined in countless ways—from the heroic example of Nathan Hale who regretted that he had but one life to give for his country—to the clarion call of Patrick Henry who fanned alive the flickering spark of our national freedom. The immortal Lincoln made Americanism into a thing of the spirit—even as the rugged Teddy did in his robust way. True, the marine sergeant put it into different words at Belleau Woods when he cried out his undying challenge: "Come on, you so-and-so's, do you want to live forever?" and General McAuliffe, the hero of Bastogne, would undoubtedly blush when we call his answer to the German surrender team a definition of Americanism—but his one word reply of "Nuts" will forever stand as the typical and proper American answer to any demand for surrender or appeasement.

But, comrades, let us reflect for a moment. Must Americanism always be measured in terms of sacrifice or bloodshed? Can it not be exemplified in a more peaceful way? Somehow, it seems to me, that whenever we speak of Americanism and cite deeds that are representative of it—we ignore so many of those who make up America, and whose daily lives compose the Americanism we hold so dear.

For it seems to me that Americanism cannot and must not be the restricted possession of heroes. It belongs to the millions of people whose everyday lives constitute the America we live in—the America for which so many of our contemporaries and forebears have died. In our periodic tributes to those who died in defense of America, we often say that they died so that liberty and Americanism might live. Let us, then, measure Americanism not in the light of the honored few, but in the way of life of the millions for whom the few have died.

Now then, comrades, what is Americanism? It's not just a parcel of land, or a mountain, or rivers or woods. Rather, as I see it, it is a principle—it is the eternal spirit of the chainless mind—it is the liberty you can't have unless you give it to others. You may well say to me: "That's all well and good, chaplain; but these are only abstract terms and definitions"—and I'd have to admit that you were right. But let us see if we can't translate them into our everyday lives—not for us alone, but in the lives of our neighbors, our children, and even those we today regard as less than friends.

For example, when the parade comes down the street, the stirring sight of Old Glory prompts most men to remove their hats and to stand firmly until the flag passes by. In all too many cases, however, they await the

marchers, the floats, the pretty drum majorettes; and in a sense, the act of doffing one's hat is as automatic as the same gesture when meeting a lady on the street. It is the result of training rather than real tribute.

And then, when the national anthem is played at a sports event, men uncover and they and the women stand; and then as the last strains fade away, they noisily call for the main event or whatever the sports feature is. When we salute the flag and pledge allegiance we mumble the words we learned as children, and we join in a gesture that has become as automatic as the repetitive words. The point I am trying to make, comrades, is that there are certain symbols which we have adopted as a display of Americanism, and that these symbols have largely become automatic.

I'm sure that you realize that I could very easily criticize the fact that these symbolic gestures are rendered without meaning; and ask that people give more thought to the significance and the true meaning of these gestures. You'd probably expect that from a chaplain, wouldn't you? But again, let us reflect—is this truly the basis for criticism? We all know that many people pray automatically, without sensing the true and immediate meaning of the words in the prayer service or prayerbook—and yet they both can be (and are) truly God-fearing men and women.

In the same sense, those who doff their hats or rise purely because of habit, these people are not (because of this habitual tribute) any the less American. God forbid. Because Americanism is a way of life, a way of life for millions of people; and if a man or a woman lives as a true American, then automatic participation of the ritual salutes is not to be criticized, by me or by anyone else.

You see, comrades, Americanism is a collective thing—it requires two or more people. For example, if I lived alone, without neighbors or family, isolated in some manner by hundreds of miles from another human being, could I live Americanism? The answer, of course, is "No," because one of the basic concepts of Americanism is the manner in which one lives with others. As an isolated individual I have no need of Americanism or liberty; because, being alone, I am unfettered and truly free. I can do anything I please; and in my selfish acts I affect no one.

But Americanism, comrades, has a meaning if I live so that my acts can affect others. Then, the true measurement of Americanism can begin. The regard for my neighbor, his rights, my rights as they affect his rights—those are the things that require Americanism; and I say that without such a situation, without these factors being present, Americanism is but a hollow and an empty sound. It is for this reason that I feel that we must measure Americanism in the daily doings of the millions—not alone in the hallowed sacrifice of the few. Why—from the time I get up in the morning until I have finished my day and go to bed at night, I carry the banner of Americanism with me—along, of course, with the millions of people who live about me.

Let us understand something, comrades. The liberty that I cherish is not liberty for me—it is liberty for my neighbor. He, in turn, does not have liberty for himself—but liberty only as he accords it to me. If I go to the church or the synagogue—and my choice is not his—he might, if he were stronger physically, stand in my path and bar my way; saying that, since I do not go to his church, then by his sheer physical strength, he will stop me from going to mine. But—because he doesn't do so, because he doesn't interfere with me even though he doesn't

agree with me—he grants me liberty—no, not liberty for himself, but liberty for me to do as I please.

And then, in turn, if we lived in a city where there were two newspapers—both opposite in political belief—and he takes one while I take the other, it would be very simple for me to steal his paper after the boy delivers it, so that he couldn't read it. I know that the editorial in his paper will be in conflict with my belief; but by my act of not interfering with his right to read what he pleases, I grant him liberty. So you see, comrades, liberty and Americanism are not what one has for one's self, but rather what one has for another—a friend, an enemy, a stranger, any person—even a non-American.

Let us go back for a moment to the thought of the heroes who fought and died that Americanism might live. It is easy to see why our daily lives, our living of Americanism every moment of the hour and every hour of the day—should constitute the Americanism for which our comrades have died. However, in almost every case, these men and women gave their lives because of the threat from without—from a force outside our own country. Yes, they most certainly died in line of duty. And, comrades, it is equally our duty, as Legionnaires and as patriotic Americans, to fight against the destructive and subversive forces from within.

True, an act of enemy sabotage can be most destructive; but even at the point of greatest destruction it does little more than impede. If a factory is destroyed, an assembly line disorganized, a ship blown up—these are all mechanical destructions that can ultimately be replaced. To be sure, they are damaging acts; but their effect is only temporary. You see, the mineral wealth of our country combined with our technical know-how and ingenuity can fast replace that which has been demolished.

But, my comrades, what about an act against liberty—an un-American act? Let us compare this with enemy sabotage. When I infringe on a man's liberty I have done irreparable damage. True, I may insist that a man refrain from doing something, and then a few minutes later make reparations by permitting him to act as I should have at the beginning, but the loss is as the loss of time. It can never be replaced. I have destroyed a man's liberty and the destruction, even for a second, is a threat to Americanism, because, being one of millions, I must multiply my weakness by millions to truly measure the potential damage.

And so, as I see it (and of course, I may be wrong, though in this case I doubt it), the greatest threat to Americanism is not from enemy shores but from those who live under the very flag for which we once risked our lives. Because each man who lives in this country bears a trust—he has in his way of life the means to destroy Americanism, and if he betrays that trust (and his is but one of many)—then Americanism has fallen. But if each one of us, as Legionnaires and as thoroughgoing Americans bears well our trust—if we live daily as the doctrines of Americanism dictate—then our very lives strengthen and preserve the bastion of freedom for which so many have died, that same bulwark of freedom which today must combat the most ruthless, the most unprincipled dictatorship the world has ever known.

Now, my comrades of the Legion, you and I and the millions we represent have a peculiar (and I feel an enviable) position. We once served our country in time of war, and in our own way and day echoed the spirit of Nathan Hale as we dared death in defense of freedom. Now, however, we belong to that growing body of Americans who, though civilians, feel a close kinship with those who have answered their country's call. In fact, a great many of us may well be called again. We know the feeling of men going into battle, be it on land, afloat, or in the air. We

know what it takes to insure victory, whether it be superior equipment or superior morale.

I said that each one of us bears a sacred trust, and, comrades, it's truer today than ever before. As I see it, we must bear our privileged burden of labor and taxation to pay for the equipment through which our Armed Forces are guaranteeing our lives. We must sacrifice many of the luxuries which Americans have so long taken for granted—so that those who fight won't have to serve as bait until we here make up our minds that, regardless of terminology and diplomatic amenities, we are at war. We must endure both priorities and controls, distasteful though they may be to the rugged individual American, in order that our fighting men may be spared the shame of another Bataan or the humiliation of another Korean retreat. The world today abounds in trouble spots, and our gallant men must be given the tools from which the ultimate victory is to be forged. Freedom has never come cheap to real Americans. Our forebears paid for it in full with their means and by their lives. We must be ready and willing to do no less.

I mentioned the need for morale and, of all people, this group should know how vital that is. But, comrades, morale comes not only from fine equipment or letters and packages from home—important though we know them to be. No—the morale about which I speak comes from the faith of a fighting man that his people back home are behind him every inch of the way. It comes from knowing that the freedoms he is defending are being held sacred at home—that whether he returns alive or dead—his children and dear ones can still worship God as they choose, can still read whatever they please, can still gather wherever and whenever they so desire. This morale comes from knowing that he is not being made the "fall guy" for those at home who cry loudly for "business as usual"—who seem to care more for ballots than for the bullets that might be coming the soldier's way. And finally, this morale comes from knowing that while he is standing up to godless communism abroad, his people are burning out the nests of the fellow travelers back home.

I realize, my comrades, that I risk your impatience and displeasure by waving the flag. But, by all that's holy, I am getting weary of the smugness and complacency of those who are perfectly willing to sit back and wait for others to carry their load, or if I may be permitted, to shoulder their cross. I served in the last war and soon will be serving in another. You might say that I represent the younger generation. Yet, as God is my witness, if we don't revive some of the old, unblushing, unsophisticated patriotism that wasn't ashamed to stand up for American ideals—if we don't quickly and decisively rid ourselves of the pseudo-liberal termites of a foreign regime—then I warn you—never again may we meet as Legionnaires and free Americans—never again will Americanism so stir the hearts and minds of men. My comrades, we have a sacred trust. Let us, under God, keep that faith—and by so doing and with the Almighty's help, keep our beloved America strong, and just—and forever free.

submitted in January; in the second column, the budget estimates submitted for action by the Appropriations Committee; in the third column, the figures that passed the House; in the fourth column, the figures as they passed the Senate, on the bills that have so far passed; in the fifth column, the public law or the result of the conference.

As soon as the first appropriation bill was reported out, a concerted effort was made to reduce the appropriations on the floor of the House.

This effort had the effect of stiffening the back of the Appropriations Committee and helping it to make substantial reductions and, in addition, it had the effect of reducing the estimates that the President submitted for expenditure in his final requests to the House of Representatives, which were acted upon in almost every instance.

The total reductions below the President's estimates, in the bills that have passed the House, amount to \$3,549,000,000.

I feel that the Republicans can claim a very considerable share in that because of the efforts that we have consistently made to save money.

With the single exception of the Labor-Federal Security appropriation, the Senate figure is way above the figure passed by the House. The House figure was reduced, on the floor of the House, by very substantial items, and the total reductions on the House floor amounted to \$160,687,585, exclusive of what has resulted and will result because of the Jensen amendments on personnel. Those figures may run as high as \$250,000,000.

The figures finally submitted by the President in the January budget upon different items exceeded the final submission by \$6,015,785,131. There are still pending before the Congress the estimates of approximately \$4,500,000,000 for military construction, and approximately \$7,500,000,000 for foreign aid of one type or another, a total of at least \$12,000,000,000.

The actual net receipts from taxes going into the Treasury for 1951 were \$48,142,000,000. The expenditures were \$44,632,000,000. Of these items, foreign relief and military assistance amounted to \$3,700,000,000. The military operations aggregated \$19,200,000,000, a total of \$22,900,000,000. These three items next year will probably run \$45,000,000,000 and the other expenditures of the Government will probably run at least \$22,000,000,000, a total of about \$67,000,000,000.

More war activities than are presently envisaged or have yet been presented to the Congress might increase this figure. On the other hand, if conditions drift along about as they are, the \$40,000,000,000 expenditures estimated for the Defense Department by the President, which I have taken, probably will be less because of slower completion of projects than the rates on which the \$40,000,000,000 was estimated.

The revenue, allowing \$5,000,000,000 increase in the miscellaneous tax and the income tax because of inflation, and \$5,000,000,000 additional tax because of the tax bill, would probably produce a total of receipts of about \$58,000,000,000, which is not very far from what the result must be expected to be.

Appropriation comparisons of items acted on as of Aug 22, 1951

	As per original budget document	Request to House	Passed House	Passed Senate	Public law
1951 items combined.....	\$10,951,581,848	\$7,317,195,131	\$6,932,218,274	\$6,864,605,382	\$6,798,410,382
1952 items:					
Disaster relief.....	2,956,425,000	15,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
Treasury-Post Office.....	2,776,801,000	2,958,125,000	2,918,827,000	2,921,518,344	2,928,798,000
Labor-Federal Security.....	564,717,000	2,732,253,760	2,611,206,361	2,527,844,386	2,512,004,270
Interior.....	6,640,444,465	559,286,000	496,764,500	518,065,354	511,841,816
Independent offices.....	808,161,638	6,837,677,465	6,144,540,355	6,212,199,063	6,162,825,175
Agriculture.....	12,000,000	820,005,546	717,235,233	826,578,130	802,988,626
District of Columbia.....	611,950,000	12,000,000	10,800,000	12,000,000	11,400,000
Civil functions.....	74,334,906	610,637,843	511,427,400	678,578,213
Legislative.....	1,404,562,611	68,953,320	60,435,370
State-Justice-Commerce.....	62,512,609,000	1,258,206,141	1,045,040,115
National Defense.....	3,345,000,000	57,605,014,360	56,062,405,890
First Supplemental, 1952.....	6,068,835,175	2,402,871,114	1,586,587,316
Permanent net.....	6,068,835,175	6,068,835,175
Total, 1952.....	87,894,740,885	81,878,935,754	78,292,964,715
Not acted on.....	10,249,476,271
Total.....	98,144,217,156

* Includes military construction not yet acted on.

Appropriation Comparisons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith a table indicating, in the first column, the original budget estimates

The Mutual Security Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it was quite late last Friday night when the decision was made to take an additional

\$350,000,000 from the committee report on the foreign-aid bill. I must confess that I felt it was not a wise decision at that time, and in the intervening days the enormity of the decision has increasingly bothered me. Moreover, I read in the press threats of even more serious cuts.

The chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], in opposing the Friday night cut, emphasized what I believe to be a most valid reason. If

we want to get out from under the heavy load in Europe in 2 or 3 years, we have got to build up Europe's defense potential to the point where they can carry their own burden.

The gentleman from South Carolina also noted that for every dollar of economic aid we extend in Europe, General Eisenhower will have in support of his efforts \$2 worth of European production. I have with me some case examples adding to that point.

In Denmark they can make \$1,125,000 worth of .30 caliber ammunition if we will supply 25 percent of the cost, which is to say \$285,000, in special carbon steel, copper alloy, and powder. In other words, \$1 worth of contribution of special materials will get the North Atlantic Treaty forces \$4 worth of .30 caliber ammunition. If we supply certain machine tools and materials, costing us \$81,000, Denmark can produce \$452,000 worth of 9 millimeter submachine guns.

If we can supply France with certain quantities of copper, nickel, zinc and machine tools, costing us \$312,102, France will produce \$8,000,000 worth of 12-ton tank destroyers. Our contribution, the cost of those tank destroyers, will, thus, run just under 4 percent.

You can carry this argument out to its ultimate extension. We are proposing to spend in this country upwards of \$60,000,000,000 to convert a part of our production and to do the other things which will make effective more than 3,000,000 soldiers. We propose to spend in the mutual security program in Western Europe around \$7,000,000,000 to supply the tanks and guns and the marginal assistance required so that Europeans can build their own arms, and convert their economies and take the other steps which will have the end result of making effective about the same number of soldiers—3,000,000.

Obviously, without what is perhaps rather inaccurately called economic aid, Denmark cannot make the ammunition and machine guns, and France cannot make the tank destroyers. Without our marginal assistance it is entirely possible that a substantial portion of the 3,000,000 soldiers cannot be mobilized and, if they are mobilized, they will lack essential arms and support.

Just what so-called economic aid means has been projected for two of the larger NATO countries. We had proposed to give these two countries \$565,000,000 in so-called economic aid. With this aid they expected to make military expenditures of \$3,905,000,000. Without our aid their defense expenditures would run more than \$1,000,000,000 less—\$2,825,000,000. What this means in more specific detail is revealed in the fact that if we give these two countries economic aid, they can make \$226,000,000 worth of ammunition and explosives. Without our aid they can make only \$53,000,000 worth. It is the difference between having armies well supplied with ammunition or inadequately supplied. Without our aid it is estimated they can make \$167,000,000 worth of aircraft. Without our aid—and aid does not mean just dollars, it means the materials and tools represented by those

dollars—they can make only \$82,000,000 worth of airplanes.

The same story applies to electronics, ships, combat vehicles, and other major matériel.

Surely no more false economy was ever devised by man than the proposal that we should cut off the help which will make the difference between Europe having a truly effective defense and a defense lacking in matériel. For that reason I feel it has been quite wrong for us to call this measure the foreign-aid bill. The true fact is that this mutual security bill is not a measure to aid foreigners. It is a carefully contrived plan to improve the defenses of the United States, for our borders are not on the Atlantic and Pacific. The true border is that intangible line in the minds of men where the totalitarianism of the East meets Western civilization. We must not for a single minute forget that Europe and all it stands for is important to us. In my opinion it is the balancing power in the world today. Spiritually, Western civilization represents all we hold dear. Materially, if we have the skills and resources of the people of Europe with us, the free world is safe. If those skills and resources are lost, we are in great jeopardy.

Western Europe has almost 50,000,000 tons in annual steel production. Russia and her satellites have an estimated 28,000,000 tons. If you add those 50,000,000 tons to our American 90,000,000, you get a total of 140,000,000 tons. But if you add those 50,000,000 tons to the production of Russia and her satellites, you find 78,000,000 tons ranged against our 90,000,000 tons. That is an oversimplification of the problem, of course, but it does reflect the basic facts, and the urgency, of the situation.

What will be the consequences of the heavy slash in economic aid funds which this House approved last Friday night?

It will mean less defense of our allies and of ourselves. It will postpone the day when we will have power in Europe sufficient to deter the Russians.

It will mean that they will provide less military end items for themselves; and we will be left with the alternative of giving them more equipment or leaving them defenseless.

It will mean less men under arms in Western Europe.

It will mean fewer modern airbases from which fighters can fly in defense of American and European boys.

If, for example, most of this cut were applied to economic aid for France we would face the French with the alternatives of sharply curtailing the forces they have promised General Eisenhower or abandoning all or part of the defense of Indochina—a defense which is costing her hundreds of millions and several thousand lives a year. If the cut were applied proportionately to Italy we would have to plan against the day when the valiant government might be taken over by the Communist rising in protest against less food, less housing and more unemployment.

This deep cut in economic aid also has serious consequences for our plans to deny the Soviet Union things produced in Western Europe. How can we tell our

allies on one hand that they should not trade with the east for such things as wheat and coal and lumber, yet on the other hand refuse to supply them with these needs?

We all know that armies march on their economies, and unless we provide the economic aid to build up a much stronger economic base in Europe, the armies will not be ready to march in the defense of the American frontiers which General Bradley has told us now lie in the heart of Europe.

Finally, gentlemen, I ask you to lay aside for a moment the reluctance many of us feel to face up to America's new responsibilities for leadership. We have sent one of our most illustrious soldiers and one of our most popular leaders to command the forces of freedom in Europe as a symbol of American leadership and energy and optimism. He is there on the ground, and every one of us must support him wholeheartedly. If at this crucial moment in the build-up of the forces which are designed to prevent a third world war we falter the whole cause would fail. If at the very moment when he has started building momentum for defense we cut off the economic aid which fuels his defense forces we may stop him before he starts on his second crusade for peace through strength.

I ask you to face frankly the dangers which confront us. I ask you to search your hearts and then quietly to consider again whether this House is serving the United States by cutting the mutual security bill—by cutting it to a point where a sound, highly useful, and acutely needed mission cannot be performed. In this situation our best military leaders, our most highly respected economic thinkers have developed a program tailored to the minimum needs of ourselves and our European allies. The program is to be carried out by men who have shown they can be trusted to do an economical and businesslike job.

I urge you with all the power at my command to reconsider our tired, despairing action of last Friday night. I urge that this House be ready to come forward and agree to an amount of economic aid which does not strike despair in the hearts of our allies, which does not cause great joy in the Kremlin, but which demonstrates again that America stands at the lead of her allies in the free world.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point in my remarks certain statistical tables which the Congress should find of interest in its consideration of the mutual-security bill.

Projected European military expenditures, fiscal 1952, with and without United States economic aid for two NATO countries

(Millions of dollars)

Category	Without United States economic aid	With United States economic aid	Increase
Military personnel expenditures.....	1, 175	1, 323	148
Maintenance and operation	900	1, 139	239
Military and other construction.....	125	182	57
All other operating costs.....	330	360	30

Projected European military expenditures, fiscal 1952, with and without United States economic aid for two NATO countries—Continued

(Millions of dollars)

Category	Without United States economic aid	With United States economic aid	Increase
Major matériel procurement..	295	892	597
Ammunition and explosives.....	53	226	173
Aircraft.....	82	167	85
Transport and noncombat vehicles.....	24	139	115
Combat vehicles.....	60	135	75
Ship and harbor craft.....	36	89	53
Electronics and communications.....	18	52	34
All other major matériel.....	22	85	63
Total.....	2,825	3,905	1,080

Projected United States economic aid, \$565.

Projections of internal accounts with and without United States economic assistance for 2 NATO countries—fiscal year 1951-52

(Millions of dollars)

	No United States economic aid	\$565,000,000 economic aid	Difference
Gross national product.....	42,910	44,601	1,691
Index of GNP per man-year (1951=100).....	100.8	103.6	2.8
Total availabilities.....	43,172	45,307	2,135
Consumption.....	31,751	32,345	594
Per capita civilian consumption (dollars).....	363	367	4
Investment (gross).....	4,945	5,371	426
Unemployed (thousands).....	2,100	1,617	483
Total revenue.....	8,375	8,865	490
Total expenditures.....	10,451	11,506	1,145
Budget deficit (before counterpart).....	2,076	2,731	655
Counterpart applied to deficit.....		565	565
Budget deficit (after counterpart).....	2,076	2,166	90
Revenues, as percent of GNP.....	19.5	19.9	0.4
Nonmilitary expenditures.....	7,626	7,691	65
Military expenditures.....	2,825	3,905	1,080
Military expenditures as percent of GNP.....	6.6	8.8	2.2

United States Wasting Russian Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Drew Pearson, from the Washington Post of August 22, 1951:

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

UNITED STATES WASTING RUSSIAN REFUGEES

EN ROUTE THROUGH EUROPE.—Here are some spot observations gathered in various parts of Germany regarding one of the most important problems we face either in preventing war or winning a war after it gets started:

Frankfort: High Commissioner Jack McCloy, who is performing a remarkably fine job, is supposed to be the top man in Germany. He can and does set aside German court decrees. He can give or withhold American money, the life blood of Europe.

He can order the American Army to get out of this area or into that.

But when it comes to Russians escaped from behind the iron curtain, McCloy has no influence with the American Army. It flouts his orders.

Perhaps because of this, the amateur detectives in counterintelligence do such a successful job of alienating these Russian escapees that a lot of them decide that Russia is better than the much-vaunted West and return home.

Just outside Frankfort is a Russian refugee camp. Its name, its exact location, the number of Russians in it are supposed to be top secret. Not even McCloy knows how many Russians are in it, nor has he ever visited it. If the Army is ordered by McCloy to let anyone into this camp, the Army says "No."

In this camp at one time were about 2,000 Russian officers who, disgusted with the Red army, had fled to the American zone of Germany, anxious to help the United States. But for months they simply sat, ate, and were interviewed by young counter-intelligence agents—ate, sat, and were interviewed; ate, slept, and were interviewed.

Some were flown to the United States amid a flurry of excitement to report on conditions inside Russia to higher-ups in the Pentagon. Some were promised haven in the United States. In the end, all were reduced to sitting, waiting, and going to seed—thanks to the sterility, inefficiency and lack of imagination of the Army.

Restless Red Army

Berlin: Beyond the invisible iron curtain in the east zone of Germany are about 300,000 members of the Red army. Living in Germany, a country with which they all too recently fought a bitter war, these troops long had to camp behind barbed wire.

This was not to keep the German population away from them, but to keep the Russians from deserting. Even so, many of them did desert—and more would desert if given encouragement or any kind of favorable treatment after their arrival in the west.

Obviously, Moscow knows that these troops, living near the west and with no tight border control between east and west, constitute one of the potential weaknesses of the Red army. It also knows that the same thing is true in Austria where Russian troops also live near the west and temptation is strong to drift over and sample western glamour.

Undoubtedly, Moscow also remembers what many Americans have forgotten—that it was not the Kaiser's army that defeated the Czar in 1917, but the shrewdness of the German general staff in sending Trotsky and Lenin in a sealed train from Switzerland into Russia. Moscow certainly should remember it, for that was what started the Bolshevik revolution and put Stalin where he is today.

And, remembering it, Stalin certainly doesn't want it to happen—in reverse—again.

Kerensky unites

Munich: Dining in Munich the other night, I discussed some of these things with gnarled, spritely Alexander Kerensky, father of the first Russian revolution, who, if not upset by Lenin, Trotsky, and the German general staff, might have saved Russia and the world the scourge of communism.

Kerensky had come to Munich to do a job that has needed doing for years—wrapping all the diverse Russian exile groups into one close-knit body in order to do to Stalin what Lenin and Trotsky once did to Kerensky.

In Munich with Kerensky were three other top Russians from the United States—Vladimir Zenzinov, Prof. I. Kurganov, and Boris Nikolayevsky; also, the League of Struggle for National Freedom, the National Labor Alliance, the Russian National Movement, the Union of Soldiers of the Liberation Movement, and the Union for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia.

These groups and leaders are about as diverse as and difficult to get along with as some of the groups within heterogeneous Russia; and some, such as the Ukrainians, want to solve all "New Russia's" problems even before the New Russia is created.

However, it seemed to me that this meeting of Russian factions in Munich was the most encouraging thing that has happened for a long time. For if and when they get together, they can do two things:

1. Beam propaganda into Russia that comes from Russians, not from Americans who have an ax to grind.

2. Work out a system for screening recent Russian escapees.

Let We Forget the Anniversary of Hitler's Attack on Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, it is said that human memory is short. I therefore believe it fitting and proper to remind ourselves and our Nation that September 1, 1951, will mark the twelfth anniversary of a dark day in the annals of world history.

On September 1, 1939, the world was shocked by Hitler's brutal and completely unjustified attack on Poland, an innocent and peace-seeking republic. At the time, the world little realized what would be the tragic effects of that attack. There were some here who thought it was no concern of ours and could not affect us, seemingly safe and secure, thousands of miles away from the attack.

The fallacy of their thinking was soon evident and we should be reminded of it today, as it seems to have been forgotten by some who again would like to return to the policy of American isolationism. The attack on Poland brought about and directly caused World War II, the bloodiest holocaust ever recorded in human history, bringing tragedy and suffering on all the freedom-loving world, including the United States.

While we think and plan for a new Europe with a free German people participating in it, let us not forget the Nazi gas chambers, their human incinerators and their dastardly inhuman plot to completely extinguished the Polish nation. Let us make sure that in the new free Germany the ugly steel glove of Nazism will not be able to get its grip again.

It would also be worth while in our actions today to remember that without a promise of support from Stalin, Hitler would not dare to launch his attack on Poland, that Hitler's Nazism was the associate and accomplice of Stalin's communism.

At the very first opportunity, Stalin joined Hitler in dividing Poland between them and in the barbaric plot to torture and exterminate its people, a plot which is continuing today just as it did then. Concentration camps, executions and deportations to Siberian camps continue without abatement.

The end of World War II brought no liberation to Poland. Its people today suffer as much as or more than they did under Nazi slavery. But let us remember, too, that the Polish people have not accepted defeat and enslavement. The underground movement of rebellion in Poland continues stronger than ever.

Let us on this 1st day of September 1951, rededicate ourselves to vigilance and preparedness and pledge ourselves never to relax until the international conspiracy, hatched out simultaneously in Berlin and Moscow, has been completely wiped off the face of God's earth.

The people of Poland reject the role of satellite of Russian communism and demand to be restored to their well-earned place among the people of the free world. Justice and our own national security require that we do everything possible to wipe out the dark spot on the history of the world which appears under date of September 1, 1939.

"Winds" Penetrating Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Drew Pearson, from the Washington Post of August 21, 1951:

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

"WINDS" PENETRATING IRON CURTAIN

(Drew Pearson is again on a tour of Europe, studying conditions there. His column today takes the form of a letter to his wife.)

MUNICH, Germany.

DEAR L. W.: Driving up toward the Czech border the other night, about dusk, I noticed a big van lumbering along with a little car behind it. The van looked like it was lost from our convoy, and we stopped it to inquire.

In the little car behind was your son. He was pushing the driver of that big van like a terrier biting the heels of a recalcitrant bull, because that van contained the most important part of our "Winds of Freedom" operation—the messages we were sending that night to the people of Czechoslovakia.

I left the car full of VIP's where I was riding and joined your son, not only because I enjoy his company, but to see what it was all about. What happened was that the friendship messages to the Czech people had been late arriving in Munich from Cincinnati, and we had to get new messages printed in Germany. The latter also were too late to join the main truck convoy which had left Munich at noon, so Tyler was commissioned to remain behind to see that the most important part of our operation got to the border on time.

An eerie spectacle

The trucks were parked on a narrow road on the Bavarian hillside almost on a straight line toward Pilsen and Prague, the two largest cities of Czechoslovakia.

Arranging a convoy is a complicated operation, somewhat like loading a circus train, and it reminded me of my old tent-wreck-

ing days. Electric generators are at one end of the convoy, though far enough away so that no sparks can reach the hydrogen tanks used to fill the balloons. These are filled inside the truck and launched from its rear end. Next come four side-gate trucks for rubber balloons. The latter are so big that they cannot be filled inside the trucks, so the hydrogen tanks are laid sideways with a hose extending to the balloon-launching tables on the side of the road.

Tyler operated the valve on the hydrogen tank, supervising a crew of three Germans. The balloon is inflated with hydrogen until it touches two inverted table legs about 4 feet apart. When it reaches this diameter, it is tied at the bottom and sent on its way across the iron curtain. I autographed one of these balloons for Gottwald and Stalin.

The long line of trucks parked alongside a Bavarian wheat stubblefield made a fascinating, eerie spectacle in the night—the guttural German voices, the swish-swish of the flowing hydrogen, and the steady, silent launching of the big bags as they slipped off into the darkness.

The boys were getting off their missives to Prague pretty regularly—about 1,300, all told—when it started to drizzle. We kept going for a while, since rain does not impede the balloons. They rise above the clouds in no time, but it does get the men wet. So at 2 a. m. we finally laid off; everyone was pretty well soaked.

I sat in the car for a while waiting for the rain to stop, but when it didn't I used the excuse that I had to get to the cable office, and at 3 a. m. headed back for Munich. I am getting old, I guess, and cannot take it.

Before I left, however, I went down the line of murky trucks, trying to find your son. I finally located him sitting inside a truck, listening to German veterans and former prisoners swapping war experiences with American GI students—men who had once been fighting each other but who now worked together launching friendship messages to another people whom they hoped they wouldn't have to fight.

Pacifist youth

Germans, incidentally, supposed to be the military master race, seem to me completely pacifist. German youngsters are just as unenthusiastic about raising an army as your son and other American youngsters are about the draft. Sometimes I think it's chiefly the old dodos who are complacent about the prospect of war.

However, I'm convinced that Moscow wants to wait a considerable time before it plunges the world into war. Its satellite peoples are too restless and would turn against the Kremlin in case of war. That's why I think this balloon deal, coming at this particular time, may help. It's only a drop in the bucket, of course, and lots of people will pooh-pooh it, but you have to make a start some way or other in penetrating the iron curtain. We've taken the first step.

I am very lonesome and anxious to get home. It's rained a lot here and I hope you've had some of it at home. When I left, the pastures were just about burned up. See you soon.

DREW.

West Virginia Veterans' Bonus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD,

I should like to insert the following letter from His Excellency the Governor of the State of West Virginia:

AUGUST 18, 1951.

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am indeed pleased to learn that you have introduced a concurrent resolution concerning the granting of permission to West Virginia to pay the veterans' bonus.

Of course, as you know, we have been working very hard on this matter, and it is my sincere hope that the voluntary restraint committee will permit us to sell these bonds. I heartily commend you and our other Representatives for your efforts in behalf of obtaining permission to sell these bonds. We all appreciate anything you can do to aid us in the matter.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

OKEY L. PATTERSON,
Governor.

The Fraternal Order of Eagles Fights the Drug Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to call to the attention of my colleagues an article by Hon. A. A. Scott which appeared in the Eagle, the official publication of the FOE, for September 1951.

Once again the FOE is in the forefront of the fight to help our youth in the current campaign against the drug menace. My congratulations to this great fraternity and to Judge Scott for the great work they are doing and my best wishes for their success. They can be assured of the full support of the Congress in this worth-while endeavor.

The article follows:

YOUTH AND THE DRUG MENACE—EAGLES EVERYWHERE CAN PLAY AN IMPORTANT ROLE IN THE CAMPAIGN TO SAVE AMERICA'S YOUNG PEOPLE FROM THE EVILS OF THE SPREADING NARCOTIC TRAFFIC

(By A. A. Scott)

Every day we see in our local papers some story featuring juveniles, and now, the latest phase of that problem, juveniles involved in narcotics. Just how serious is it, and what can we, as Eagles, as good American citizens and as parents, do to help solve this problem? The question is a real challenge to each of us.

How many really know how serious a situation the country is facing today with those unfortunate people who are addicted to narcotics? Very few realize what effects drugs actually have on individuals when not properly prescribed by a physician and know less about what the drugs really are.

Years ago we were concerned principally with opium, cocaine, morphine, and heroin—all dangerous and habit-forming. Today we are faced with a new drug evil—marijuana. In some ways it is the worst we have met.

Prior to Pearl Harbor, most illicit opium was smuggled into this country from ships arriving from the Orient. Opium is consumed by its addicts chiefly by way of the

pipe, and as it burns, it gives off a sickly sweet odor. Opium smokers say they experience pleasant dreams and hallucinations. These effects are responsible to a great degree for the continued use of the drug.

The cocaine habit is not only one of the most seductive but one of the most injurious of all drug habits. Cocaine is definitely habit-forming, but the habit is in no way comparable to that produced by the overindulgence in any of the opiates—like opium, morphine, and heroin—and may be broken without great physical discomfort.

Morphine, like opium, the drug from which it is derived, has a tolerance which builds up very fast. The average addict, turning from the opium pipe to the salts of morphine, will dissolve the drug in a small amount of water, usually in a spoon. That solution is slightly heated over the flame of a match or a candle and then drawn into a hypodermic syringe through the needle.

Then there is heroin. Tolerance for this drug builds up very rapidly and its dangers for addicts are definitely greater than those of the other opiates. For this reason, the Government has prohibited the further importation of opium for the manufacture of heroin. There is at this time a very limited amount of heroin in this country for legitimate medicinal purposes.

The traffic in illicit heroin has been extensive throughout the world. In the United States it has been the prevailing drug on the eastern seaboard, morphine over the years having been the prevailing drug on the west coast. In recent years—particularly since Pearl Harbor—Mexican heroin seems to have gained a foothold in Canada and the Western States.

Heroin is used by the addict in much the same way as is morphine—usually by means of the hypodermic needle.

Juveniles, like adults, have their varying likes and dislikes, and cycles are apparent in crimes and drug practices. First, we had careless parents, leaving their nembuto or sodium amytal pills lying around for youngsters to find. These are often referred to by teen-agers as "goof balls" or "yellow jackets." Then we had the benzedrine inhalers which kids would break open and soak in Cokes. All of these fads or fancies were experimented with to make the youngster "feel high" or "get a kick out of life," as the kids put it.

Now, we are confronted with the most popular type of dangerous narcotic—marijuana. I definitely feel that public enemy No. 1 is no snarling human criminal, but the marijuana traffic that is growing rapidly in this Nation and throughout the world. This drug disrupts and destroys the power of the brain and produces visions of grandeur and ruthless power that result in crime and degeneracy.

In recent years the peddlers of this drug have been trying to give marijuana to school children, knowing that once the habit is formed they will have a new victim and a steady customer. In my opinion, this is a crime worse than murder because, deliberately and for profit, it breeds degenerates and murderers.

There was a time when law-enforcement officers felt that the best way to deal with the increasing popularity of marijuana was to say little or nothing about it. They felt that to discuss this product would only lead to increased curiosity about it and cause adventurous young people to experiment with it.

I feel that the time for silence is now long past. During recent years this menace has spread like wildfire throughout the United States. It seems to have started in the South and it has spread throughout the Nation and to Canada as well.

By way of contrast, opium, morphine, and heroin are hypnotic drugs. Their effects are sedative. All the opium user wants is his opium and to be left alone. From opium,

however, he usually goes on to the use of morphine, which is about 10 times as strong as opium, or to heroin, several times more potent than morphine.

At first the result of his addiction is a mere stupor. Then his appetite for food disappears, resulting in a pallor and an emaciated appearance. He loses his sense of cleanliness and the power to differentiate between right and wrong. These effects become more and more pronounced until finally the result is complete physical and mental deterioration.

Almost from the beginning he is lost to society and his dear ones. All sense of obligation vanishes and he becomes incapable of working or obtaining a livelihood in a legitimate manner. The plight of his family, even its suffering or starvation, does not touch him, and he is completely immune to the tears and pleadings of his dependents.

Almost all such addicts eventually become criminals, and their crimes represent the direct results of their addiction and the direct results being their mental deterioration, together with the uncontrolled craving for the drug which must be satisfied at all costs.

Unlike the opiates, marijuana is an excitant drug. It attacks the central nervous system and violently affects sensory perceptions. Singularly enough, there is no way of knowing what effect it will have in a particular case, as it may affect one person in one way and another in the opposite manner.

A person under the influence of marijuana may believe himself so small that he is afraid to step off a curbstone into the street. Or he may feel himself of enormous size and of superhuman strength and passion, and in that condition he is likely to commit crimes foreign to his normal personality. Time and space are obliterated or perceived in fantastic fashions.

The user of this drug may not feel the restraints of gravitation. He may suddenly get the idea that his best friends or his own family are about to take his life, under this delusion he may kill them. Passions may become uncontrollable, resulting in revolting crimes. In fact, no act is too bizarre or horrible for the crazed user of marijuana. And because of its peculiar effects, this drug, unlike opium, morphine, and heroin, is the immediate and direct cause of the crimes committed.

Marijuana is obtained from a weed commonly known as Indian hemp. It is used in cigarettes. These are, in the language of the street and the underworld, referred to as reefers, muggies, weeds, hot hay, or Indian hay. In recent years the habit has been taken up by young people—sometimes by mere children who would not have occasion to encounter other forms of narcotics.

Fortunately, marijuana is not habit-forming to the extent that most other drugs are. A person addicted to other narcotics will experience actual physical pain—sometimes excruciating torture—when deprived of his drug, while the marijuana user will at most feel a mere craving much like the user of tobacco or alcohol.

Until 5 years ago my own State—California—experienced few, if any, problems relating to the use of narcotics by juveniles. However, an alarming percentage of our cases in the past few years have involved persons under 21 years of age. This is generally in the use of marijuana, but it has been noted that many of these youngsters have graduated from that drug to the use of heroin, which is recognized as the most dangerous of all narcotics to use.

So far as narcotic drugs are concerned, there appear to be three definite steps in the juvenile problem—alcohol, then marijuana, and then the third and final step, one of the opiates, usually heroin.

It may be interesting to note that in Los Angeles County during the year 1950, 615

cases involving marijuana were handled by our superior court, as compared to 414 cases involving heroin, opiates, cocaine, and others. This gives the reader some indication as to the prevalence of marijuana.

As compared to this large number of cases in the adult court, 55 boys and 7 girls under the age of 18 figured in cases handled in the Los Angeles Juvenile Court over the same period.

This brings me to a point that I think should be stressed: We should not glamorize cases of youngsters involved with dope—and particularly we should not emphasize the statements of unfortunate juveniles who try to justify their use of the drug by telling of the thrill that they obtain by its use. After all, we must not forget that they are kids, anxious to try something new, and if we are going to remind them constantly of the unfortunate experiences of other children who have fallen into this habit, we should, at the same time warn them of the terrible effects these drugs have on their bodies and minds.

I think the challenge which we must face is that of full cooperation with law-enforcement agencies to see to it that all peddlers are brought to the attention of the law and prosecuted to the utmost. Most enforcement officers are always happy to receive help from interested citizens.

In our national youth-guidance program we have emphasized the need for close cooperation with law enforcement on the part of all subordinate agencies. What better way can we serve our community, and particularly our children, than by sitting down with our chief of police or juvenile officers to ascertain if such a problem exists in our community, and offer our assistance in destroying this drug cancer that endangers our future citizens?

The Coming Betrayal of Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following communication I have from Ex-Naval Lt. W. H. Evans, Jr., because of his comments upon the proposed Japanese peace treaty:

EDGEWATER, MD., August 23, 1951

The Honorable B. CARROLL REECE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REECE: In spite of the fact that the Trumanites have revoked my commission as a naval officer, they cannot revoke my oath of allegiance to my country.

Consequently, I feel that it is my duty to send you the enclosed article on the Coming Betrayal of Japan, which I have written in an attempt to arouse our countrymen to the impending disaster.

My answer to the Acheson Democrats and Truman Republicans is God bless Gen. Douglas MacArthur. He is for the United States first, last, and always.

Most respectfully,

W. H. EVANS, Jr.,
Ex-Naval Lieutenant.

THE COMING BETRAYAL OF JAPAN

The proposed Japanese Peace Treaty that is to be signed in San Francisco is a clever plan designed for the purpose of enabling communism to triumph in Japan. As a

quick glance, this peace treaty may strike the unsuspecting reader as being a fair and generous offer. However, upon careful examination and consideration of all the possible implications of the various articles, it becomes clearly evident that the State Department once again is placing the interests of Communist Russia above those of the United States.

There are four major betrayals in this treaty which should be pointed out to the American people before it is too late:

1. ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF ROOSEVELT'S YALTA BETRAYAL

Section (c) of article 2 of the impending treaty states:

"Japan renounces all right, title, and claim to the Kurile Islands, and to that portion of Sakhalin and the islands adjacent to it over which Japan acquired sovereignty as a consequence of the Treaty of Portsmouth of September 5, 1905."

According to this cleverly worded statement, the secret agreement of the Yalta betrayal whereby Communist Russia was given the Kurile Islands and southern Sakhalin is acknowledged as binding. So secret was this protocol that it was not released until 1 year after Roosevelt's sell-out at Yalta in February 1945 when Japan already was beaten and sung for peace.

Naturally, the Acheson Democrats and Truman Republicans will deny that this article acknowledges the Yalta betrayal but they cannot whitewash the facts.

If this article does not acknowledge Communist Russia's claim to the Kurile Islands and southern Sakhalin then why is Japan being stripped of these two pieces of her territory which are so essential to her defense and important to her economy? The whole world knows that no other nation could conceivably get the Kurile Islands and southern Sakhalin except Communist Russia. It is a subtle way of legally giving the territories to the U. S. S. R. without directly admitting it.

Everyone who reads this section should immediately get a map of the Far East and spread it before them. It can plainly be seen that the Kurile Islands and southern Sakhalin are two daggers pointing at the Japanese home island of Hokkaido. Kunashiri, the southernmost Kurile Island is only about 10 miles from Hokkaido, southern Sakhalin is separated from Hokkaido by the narrow Soya Strait which is only 25 miles wide.

The Treaty of Portsmouth of September 5, 1905, ending the Russo-Japanese War awarded southern Sakhalin to Japan because President Theodore Roosevelt clearly saw that it was essential for Japan's defense against the surging tide of Tsarist imperialism. Moreover, Japan had and has just as much claim, if not more, to territory in this region because Russia looted all of it from China in the first place.

Moreover, there are important fishing grounds in the Sea of Okhotsk that were an important part of the Japanese economy. The Japanese are now barred from these areas since the Kurile Islands and Southern Sakhalin are in the possession of the Communist enemy.

This territorial provision of the peace treaty with Japan is keeping in line with the Roosevelt-Truman-Acheson policy of making the world safe for communism.

2. TROOP WITHDRAWAL

Section (a) of article 6 reads:

"All occupation forces of the Allied Powers shall be withdrawn from Japan as soon as possible after the coming into force of the present treaty, and in any case not later than 90 days thereafter. Nothing in this provision shall, however, prevent the stationing or retention of foreign armed forces in Japanese territory under or in consequence of

any bilateral or multilateral agreements which have been or may be made between one or more of the Allied Powers, on the one hand, and Japan on the other."

The possible implications of this proposal present the most immediate danger to the retention of Japan as a member of the anti-Communist nations. It could readily force Japan into going Communist. A careful analysis of the above quotation shows that events could be made to follow this pattern.

All American troops could be withdrawn after 90 days at the request of a Japanese Government that felt unable to accept certain intolerable conditions of a bilateral agreement intentionally forced upon it by the American pro-Communist State Department. The Japanese would have to reject such conditions or else lose a vote of confidence. Without American bases and troops in Japan, the Japanese would be an easy prey to communism from within or without. Remember how close southern Sakhalin and the Kuriles are to Japan and the Communist Japanese army, reported to be training in Sakhalin.

Another fact to bear in mind is that it would be possible for the U. S. S. R. to offer to return the Kurile Islands and Southern Sakhalin to Japan under a bilateral agreement in exchange for the withdrawal of all foreign troops and bases from Japan. The Communists are willing to execute a minor strategic retreat now in order to be able to cleverly bring Japan into the Communist orbit. The Soviet Union has nothing to lose and everything to gain by such an arrangement.

Perhaps this speculation may sound fantastic but it must be remembered that the same thing was said about China when the inevitable conclusions of Yalta, the Marshall mission to China, and the effects of the embargo upon supplies to Nationalist China were pointed out.

The pro-Communist tactics of the State Department are repeating themselves again in Asia.

3. IMPOSSIBLE REPARATIONS

The first two paragraphs of article 14 state: "It is recognized that, although Japan should in principle pay reparation for the damage and suffering caused by it during the war, nevertheless Japan lacks the capacity, if it is to maintain a viable economy, to make adequate reparation to the Allied Powers and at the same time meet its other obligations."

"However, (1) Japan will promptly enter into negotiations with Allied Powers so desiring, whose present territories were occupied by Japanese forces and damaged by Japan, with a view to assisting to compensate those countries for the cost of repairing the damage done, by making available, the skills and industry of the Japanese people in manufacturing, salvaging, and other services to be rendered to the Allied Powers in question. Such arrangements shall avoid the imposition of additional liabilities on other Allied Powers, and, where the manufacturing of raw materials is called for, they shall be supplied by the Allied Powers in question, so as not to throw any foreign exchange burden upon Japan."

Section (a) clearly admits that it is utterly impossible, from an economic viewpoint, for Japan to pay any reparations whatsoever for the simple and realistic reason that the Japanese economy cannot stand the added burden of reparations.

Nevertheless, the very next paragraph demands that the Japanese process raw materials into finished products, do salvage work, and "other services" (the joker covering a wide field which perhaps is another type of reparation or loot). In plain language, the Japanese economy must pay reparations in the form of using their industrial plants, labor, salvaging facilities, and other services without receiving any compensation.

Not only would these services be profitless for Japan and actually wear down her economy without compensation, but also a tremendous portion of her industrial facilities would have to be diverted from engaging in profitable trade to sustain the nation.

In one paragraph, the State Department views the situation from a realistic and pro-American viewpoint, but follows it up immediately in the very next paragraph with a plan designed to wreck Japan economically in order to force her into the Communist orbit more rapidly.

4. SIGNERS OF THE PEACE TREATY

The last major proof that the peace treaty favors communism is the provision allowing Japan to sign either with Nationalist or Communist China or neither one.

Now, it is time to remember that the Pacific war began in 1937 when Japan invaded China, and ended in September 2, 1945, with the surrender aboard the U. S. S. *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay. The Nationalist Chinese fought the Japanese for eight long and bitter years while the United States sold war materials to the Japanese invaders and gave no effective help until after Pearl Harbor.

After Roosevelt and his clique had baited the Japanese into fighting the United States, Great Britain, and the Netherlands in order that he could save Britain and Communist Russia, Nationalist China still was neglected even though it detained Japanese troops that otherwise would have conquered India and Australia thereby prolonging the war and perhaps making the Japanese Empire impregnable.

Chiang Kai-shek could have had peace with Japan any time after 1941 on honorable terms and he would have been much better off than he is today after being betrayed by the Roosevelt-Truman-Churchill-Acheson-Marshall combination. In spite of the tempting offers proposed by Japan, Nationalist China remained a faithful and important ally in the war against Japan.

China's reward was Yalta, the Marshall mission to China, embargo, and now exclusion from the Japanese peace treaty. The next step will be the expulsion of Nationalist China from the UN and the loss of Formosa.

The record of the Pacific war proves that only the following should be eligible to sign the Japanese peace treaty in the following order:

Nationalist China, for being the nation that fought Japan for the longest period of time even when her future allies sold war materials to Japan and who never thought of betraying her allies.

The United States, for saving Asia from Japanese conquest and defeating Japan almost singlehanded.

Great Britain, for fighting an important delaying action and later returning to the offensive against the Japanese.

Australia, its fine record speaks for itself. Canada, same as Australia.

New Zealand, same as Australia.

The Philippines, loyalty to the United States, defense of Bataan, fought bravely as a free nation, for its independence was already promised, extremely effective underground, fought as free men and not colonial subjects.

The Netherlands, heroic although hopeless defense against the Japanese.

No other nation should sign the treaty as they did not give any assistance noteworthy of rendering them eligible to determine the treaty provisions or sign it.

These nations should not have the privilege of signing the treaty for the stated reasons.

Burma, never at war with Japan as a nation and part of the British Empire until after VJ-day.

Ceylon, same as Burma.

India, same as Burma.

Indonesia, never at war with Japan as a nation and part of the Dutch Empire until after VJ-day.

Pakistan, same as Burma.

Soviet Union, 6-day looting of an already defeated Japan. Communist Russia has no right whatsoever to sign the treaty.

It is a complete farce to allow the above nations to sign while not allowing Nationalist China to do likewise.

In reference to Communist China, that government is merely a satellite of the U. S. S. R. so she can be included under the Soviet Union.

The "joker" in the treaty signing is the statement that Japan can refuse to sign with either Nationalist China or Communist China, the province of the U. S. S. R. As Japan wants to trade with the mainland, she must have relations with the controlling power there.

If and when Japan signs with Red China, then the clamor for admission of Red China to the pro-Communist United Nations will increase. The plan to recognize Red China and abandon Nationalist China takes another step near completion.

The administration is already pro-Communist with particular emphasis upon the State Department. If the Senate ratifies this treaty, then it also falls into this same classification.

This is an appeal to all Americans to protest this treaty designed to force Japan to go Communist and, with Japan, all of Asia will inevitably follow.

With her Asiatic flank secure, the U. S. S. R. will no longer have the threat of a two-front war thereby enabling her to concentrate against Europe.

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I am including two editorials, one from the Philadelphia Inquirer and one from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette. One day last week news came to me that the president of a bank in one of the towns in my district had taken illicitly from his bank over a period of years more than \$600,000, double the amount of its capital and surplus.

In years gone by, this news would have resulted in panic throughout the community, in individual inconvenience or suffering while affairs of the bank were investigated and liquidated, and even in harmful repercussions in banks there or in other communities where there existed no need for alarm.

In the present case, no depositor need fear any loss nor will there be any disruption of the economic life of the community. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation as soon as it heard of the situation, stepped in promptly, pledged its resources to prevent loss to depositors of the bank and arranged that all deposits be taken over by another insured bank in the community.

The legislation creating the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was sponsored and passed in 1933 during the

Democratic administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Not enough can be said about the splendid record of FDIC in protecting depositors in insured banks during the past 17½ years. When you consider that no depositor of an insured bank has suffered a penny's loss since May 1944, and that depositors' losses during the preceding 10 years were infinitesimal—when you realize that Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has repaid to the Treasury its initial Government capital of \$289,000,000 plus more than \$80,000,000 in interest, all in addition to carrying for deposit insurance losses and administrative expenses while accumulating a deposit insurance fund that today exceeds \$1,250,000,000.

As evidence that mine is not an isolated opinion, I should like to insert in the RECORD editorials from representative newspapers in Pennsylvania which reflect the esteem in which FDIC is held by the people of that State:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of August 17, 1951]

NEW KENSINGTON AND THE FDIC

Embezzlement of \$600,000—one-fifth of its resources—from the Parnassus National Bank, of New Kensington, Pa., is a grim personal tragedy to the accused bank president, his family, his friends and associates.

Twenty years ago, this affair would have been a tragedy as well to thousands of depositors, for it would have meant closing of the bank. Today the bank remains open, checks of depositors are honored, and not one, it is announced, will lose a penny.

This is due to one of the most sensible reforms of our times, the insurance of bank deposits, through the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. This agency, created in 1933, is supported by payments of member banks. In an emergency, it can borrow from the Treasury but never has done so.

Before 1933 the closing of a bank was a disaster of the first magnitude, often to a whole community. Beginning in 1933, depositors of insured banks were protected up to \$5,000 of deposits, and more recently up to \$10,000. In many cases, the FDIC also saved the bank, by reorganization.

A few comparative figures are interesting. United States bank failures ran from 500 to 900 a year from 1925 to 1929. In 1930 there were 1,352, in 1932, 1,456, in 1933, 4,004. By 1941 there were only eight, in 1944 only one, in 1945 and 1946 none, in 1947 one, in 1948 none, and so on. What a difference the FDIC made.

New Kensington knows that, gratefully, today.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of August 18, 1951]

PROGRESS IN BANKING

There was a time not long ago when a \$600,000 bank embezzlement would have caused more dismay than astonishment. Now, happily, the situation is reversed. Thanks to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, depositors in the Parnassus National Bank of New Kensington will lose nothing as a result of the bank president's incredible defalcations.

The FDIC was organized under authority of the Banking Act of 1933. All banks which are members of the Federal Reserve System are, under the law, insured under the permanent insurance plan and are subject to periodic checks by Federal examiners. That being the case, depositors must wonder how the president of the Parnassus Bank could get away with his manipulations over a period of 16 years. They must conclude that the examiners were woefully inept or

that the bank official was a wizard at covering his thefts.

Actually, banks probably never will reach a point at which their funds are theft-proof. Periodically, we must learn to our amazement that some trusted pillar of the business community has hit upon a scheme by which he can, for a time, rob his customers.

There is satisfaction, however, in the knowledge that insured banks are closely supervised and that techniques for detecting thefts are constantly being improved. It is becoming increasingly difficult to loot a bank from within and, in those rare instances where it is done, the depositor is not ruined. That represents considerable progress in banking.

Use of Anthracite Coal in the Northeastern Part of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent of August 19, 1951:

ANTHRACITE IS USED TO HEAT MILLIONS OF HOMES IN NORTHEASTERN PART OF UNITED STATES—WYOMING VALLEY OUTSTANDING PRODUCTION CENTER IN FIVE-COUNTY REGION OF STATE

All but an insignificant amount of the anthracite produced in the United States—something over 99 percent—is mined in a small section of Pennsylvania.

You could put all the mines of this anthracite-producing area in a circle with only a 12¼-mile radius—but that little circle has enriched the United States so far with \$10,000,000,000 worth of hard coal.

Also, there are 150 years of mining still left in the five-county region of northeastern Pennsylvania at current production rates.

Anthracite is one of two principal types of coal. There are four distinct, rather narrow, canoe-shaped anthracite fields of northeastern Pennsylvania in which are located many cities and towns, including this city, Scranton, Pottsville, Shamokin, Hazleton, and Mahanoy City.

VARIETY OF USES

Anthracite's place in American history ever since hard coal began to be mined in considerable quantities early in the nineteenth century has been of the greatest importance. It has heated millions of homes, powered scores of industries in war and peace, and has contributed to the well-being of the whole country.

Coal is used in prodigious quantities because, directly or indirectly, it heats a large percentage of all buildings, drives a large portion of all factory engines, railroad trains, streetcars, and steamships, and must be used in about the same quantity to make steel as iron ore itself.

Over half of all the electricity and most of the manufactured gas are made from coal. Electricity provides much of our artificial light and power and makes possible our movies, radios, and countless appliances. Coal, gas, and electricity together cook the food of city folks and of many more in towns and in the countryside.

NEW DISCOVERIES FROM COAL

In addition, many of the newest discoveries of science stem from a lump of coal.

Modern chemistry has employed coal for such useful things as sulfa drugs, vitamins, fibers, rubber, fertilizers, dyes, perfumes, disinfectants, insecticides, and paints.

In 1930, 32 producing companies in the anthracite field formed the Anthracite Institute for the purpose of protecting and increasing the market for the product through research, equipment development, trade and consumer education.

Located in this city, Anthracite Institute obtains technical information on all uses of anthracite, develops new methods of burning hard coal with greater convenience at lower cost, and tests equipment designed to help manufacturers maintain high performance and improve their products.

All but 10 percent of the anthracite mined in northeastern Pennsylvania is sold in the northeastern section of the United States, a 12-State area including the District of Columbia. The rest goes to Canada, which takes 7 percent of production, and other States.

More than half of the people engaged in commodity production through the anthracite region are employed in the hard coal industry. A high level of employment in anthracite invariably means a high level of prosperity throughout the entire Nation.

The immediate outlook for anthracite is encouraging, primarily because of the large over-all demand for all fuels. Most people who burn anthracite are in the lower middle and low income groups, equal to 70 percent of the population. Although these people do not have as much money per family unit as those in the higher brackets, there are a great many more of them and, consequently, they burn more coal.

Anthracite's fortunes have risen and fallen with the tides of national prosperity. It has been shown that the annual output of all our gold, silver, lead and zinc mines is worth less than two-thirds of the value of anthracite production.

By the time anthracite has heated 5,000,000 homes in a dozen States, these black lumps of coal have added to the economic well-being of the railroads which carry it, the dealers who sell it, all the employees involved in its mining and distribution, and the benefit of mankind.

Socialism Is Not for Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Socialism Is Not for Us," written by Ralph S. Yohe and published in the August 18, 1951, issue of the *Prairie Farmer*.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SOCIALISM IS NOT FOR US (By Ralph S. Yohe)

When I sailed for America recently, after several months' study of European agriculture, our ship put in at Bergen, Norway, at 4 o'clock in the afternoon. It was loaded with American tourists.

People streamed off the ship to make their last purchases before leaving Europe. But all the stores were closed. Norway needed those American dollars.

Why were all the stores closed at 4 o'clock? Because that's the time the Government says stores must close. The stores might have remained open late under special permit from the police. But they would also have needed a permit from the labor department to work their people overtime.

And it is doubtful if the clerks would have worked overtime anyway, because the Government would take that much more of their pay in taxes.

A man making \$2,500 in Norway, a very good wage there, must pay nearly \$1,000 income tax. Fifty-nine percent of Norway's national income goes for taxes. "What can I do with my money?" the clerk would say. "I can't buy an automobile or any of the other things I would like to have. The prices are just completely out of reach. Then I probably could not get a permit. Really the only luxury that I can afford is time off. The Government can't tax that."

And so the Norwegian workman has one of the most liberal vacation systems in the world. He just doesn't see any sense in working overtime. So he takes time off.

Yet, this is the one national luxury Norway cannot afford just now.

"Sure, I'm against socialism," you say. "The people will never vote in socialism in this country." But hold on. Let's see what is happening right here at home.

Congress has just passed a controls bill. Many politicians scream that it is not enough. We need stronger and tighter controls to cure inflation, they say. Even so, the bill will control the price you pay for a new suit of clothes, a new dress, a can of tomatoes, or a new automobile. Indirectly it will control the price you can get for a bushel of wheat, a veal calf, or a dozen eggs.

Many economists have urged that it would be far better to control inflation by curbs on credit and money supply, thrift in Government spending, and pay-as-you-go taxes.

But instead of using these, we are galloping into price fixing, rationing, and subsidies. Anyone who puts up a voice in opposition finds himself labeled a tool of vested interest.

Before you buy this pig-in-a-poke, let's look at what the so-called planners have done in other parts of the world. Let's see where we are headed.

Here is what happened in Britain.

All prices and wages were fixed by government during the first part of the war, at about 1939 levels. British troops were being pushed off the French coast at Dunkerque. Frowning packs of submarines were sinking supply ships. One could hardly argue that Britain did not need controls.

The war was won, controls stayed on. And this could happen here.

If we in America accept a controlled economy for the duration of world tension, we may never be able to shake it off. We've set the stage for the economic planners in Washington.

Let's see how these controls have worked out in Britain.

Allan Bridger works in a steel mill in Wales. His wage is stabilized according to the cost-of-living index. His wife goes down to the grocery and buys their food at what the government says she can afford to pay.

Nearby the government buys Farmer Fraser's wheat and milk at "cost of production" prices. The difference, a big difference, comes out of taxes.

But both Steel Worker Bridger and Farmer Fraser are taxpayers and their taxes are not a part of the cost-of-living index.

Businessman Smith has a drug store on the corner in the village. He doesn't have to worry about someone putting a drug store on the opposite corner. To start a new business, the other fellow would have to have a permit.

And so long as Smith is on this corner, the other fellow would have a pretty hard time getting a permit. With such lack of competition, small wonder Druggist Smith

carries few lines of merchandise and the customer waits to be served.

The operator of a moderately sized filling station in Scotland told me he kept one person busy merely filling out forms, checking rations and dealing with Government control officers. For the Government has set up bureaus which check and countercheck all permits and rations.

Taxpayers Bridger and Fraser find more of their tax money going to support a growing staff of Government employees. And what is equally bad, when they buy a gallon of gasoline, a suit of clothes, or a new house, the manufacturer, the retail store, and the contractor has added to the price the salaries of almost an equal number of people who do nothing but negotiate with the people in the Government.

Socialism supplies its own opiate. Actually, steel worker Bridger is afraid to see controls lifted. It might upset his world and make him work harder. Farmer Fraser doesn't want the Government to step out of agriculture.

It would mean that he would have to become more efficient and stop farming on a cost plus basis. Businessman Smith without his permits to limit competition would find he would have to get down and dig to stay in business. He shudders at the thought.

And in the end everyone is worse off, for there are fewer bushels of wheat and less meat, fewer suits of new clothes, fewer new schools, and not only that, they cost more.

An act of the British or Norwegian Parliament cannot make more eggs, more meat, more milk, or more houses for its people. There is only what has been produced. Parliaments may divide, but this doesn't create more. The only way the British or Norwegians can have more meat or more milk is through productive work.

These countries can guarantee security to their people only to the extent of their total production. The road to abundance lies through greater production.

Nor will controls, regulations, price ceilings and rationing cure inflation in these countries or in our country.

When production is stifled, these socialistic devices are at best only dams that must be built higher and higher to hold back a mounting flood of excess money.

GOVERNMENT RUNS THINGS

In most European socialistic countries the government runs the coal mines, the power companies, the railroads, the bus companies, along with other public utilities. They run them just as we do our post-office system here, and, like our own post office, they have their hands deep in the taxpayer's pocket.

For it is much easier to subsidize these industries than put in efficient methods that will make them pay.

It can't happen in America? Have you noticed Washington's recent promotion campaign for Government-owned electric-power plants?

The European Socialist Party member can give long reasons why their planned economy is far better than a haphazard free economy.

But, more often than not, the economy is not planned on hard, cold economics. It is just plain politics.

Some formula adopted on the spur of the moment becomes a religion. Government is afraid to change it.

CAUSES OF SOCIALISM

Bad practices by business, labor, and agriculture can make the time ripe for socialism. When businessmen resort to monopolies, when labor does the same by slow-down techniques and padded jobs, and agriculture demands special government protection, socialism gets ready to move in. This is a lesson we should remember in America.

The greatest bulwark against socialism is an active industry, highly competitive, that brings more good things to more people.

In my travels from country to country, I ran into large numbers of young people who wanted to come to America. When I asked them why, they would answer, "There is opportunity there." I never heard anyone say he wanted to go to Great Britain or Norway because "there is security there."

You see, though clothed in the garb of liberalism, the Socialist is actually a conservative at heart. He is afraid of the future; he fears a dynamic, expanding economy because it involves risk, he is afraid of risks; he will settle for freezing the present pattern of things and he buys a kind of security for today with the opportunity of tomorrow.

Socialism is an aspirin economy. For a time it makes the country's faltering economy feel better. What at first seems to be a stabilization of the economy turns out to be the first symptoms of rigor mortis, and business continues to lie in bed, afraid to exercise its weakened muscles, taking larger and larger doses of economic aspirin.

Let's not let it happen here.

Investigation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Unethical Conduct Is Still the Big Issue," which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer, Philadelphia, Pa., on Wednesday, August 22, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNETHICAL CONDUCT IS STILL THE BIG ISSUE

In objecting to the gloves-off, hard-hitting report by two Republican members of the subcommittee which probed the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Democratic majority of that group appears to be laboring under the misapprehension that ethics and morality in Government constitute a strictly partisan issue.

It is nothing of the sort. Unethical or corrupt conduct by Government officials can—and should—become a campaign issue if one side is guilty, and does nothing about it.

But falling standards of ethics in Government involve much more than partisan considerations. They involve a tolerance of wrong which any political party seeking support of the voters should combat vigorously as an evil that can do untold harm to our system of government.

For this reason, the anguished cries of "politics" coming from the three Democratic RFC probers sound hollow. Their intimation that Senators CAPEHART and BRICKER nailed down instances of favoritism and shabby ethics in connection with RFC loans only to embarrass a Democratic administration scarcely does justice to the record.

The same record was available to both groups of probers. It was the basis for both majority and minority reports. But where the majority employed gentle remonstrances and general language urging a better system for making RFC loans, the two minority members struck out at individual cases of unethical conduct, and at the administration's disgraceful failure to condemn such conduct.

It is significant to recall that the interim report on the RFC issued by the subcommittee last February was denounced as asinine by President Truman, although it cited numerous cases of improprieties, and urged that the five-man board of directors be abolished in favor of a single administrator. Mr. Truman at first refused, and then later made the changes urged by the committee.

It is also significant that Donald Dawson, a White House aide who admitted before investigators that he accepted free hotel accommodations at a Florida hotel which got a big RFC loan, is still at the White House. Yet Dawson's remark that he saw nothing wrong with this, but wouldn't do it again, stands as a deflection of ethical standards most Americans don't share.

There hasn't been any dispute over the activities of E. Merle Young, a former RFC examiner who achieved remarkable success later as an employee of an RFC borrower, or over the fact that his wife, then a White House secretary, received a \$9,540 "royal pastel blue" mink coat from an outfit interested in an RFC loan.

These facts on the present are not altered by Senate majority leader McFARLAND's digging back to the Teapot Dome scandals of the Harding administration and the more ancient malpractices in the post-Civil War administration of Ulysses S. Grant. Nor is their meaning lessened by McFARLAND's stalwart defense of President Truman's honesty.

Nobody has charged the President with dishonesty. What has been charged and demonstrated by the RFC investigation is that other administration officials have peddled real or fake influence, that they have shown favoritism, that they have departed from the rigid code of ethics which should guide all Government officials. And whether because of misplaced loyalty, anger at criticism, or some other reason, Mr. Truman hasn't cracked down on them as he should.

Adherence to high standards of ethics and morality is absolutely essential if Americans are to have confidence in their Government. It is something that must be required on an individual basis of each official, not something that can be achieved by juggling agencies as has been done with the RFC.

We won't get it by indulgent, tap-on-the-wrist reproofs for those who fail to measure up. The Nation will get proper ethical standards in Washington only when both parties and the administration make it plain that nothing else will be tolerated.

Pioneers of Western North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Pioneers in Western North Dakota Carved a Living From the Wilderness," written by Nellie B. Noyce and published in the Hettinger County Herald, of New England, N. Dak., on July 26, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PIONEERS IN WESTERN NORTH DAKOTA CARVED A LIVING FROM THE WILDERNESS

(By Nellie B. Noyce)

The Missouri Slope area of western North Dakota is not an old, settled country. In

fact, it is still very young as far as we pale faces are concerned. Our extension of home building in the Missouri Slope area can be attributed almost entirely to the last 80 years.

In the late nineteenth century when the fear of Sitting Bull's warriors subsided the first white settlers came to establish homes on the prairie sweep west of the big Missouri River. The country was indeed a wilderness. The several Indian tribes who had lived here found it difficult to make a living although buffalo, deer, and antelope roamed the hills and prairies in herds. Wild meat and berries were plentiful and herbs for food and medicine were obtained from the buttes and mountains such as Killdeer and Tracy Mountains and Rainy, Block, and Sentinel Buttes. It was to such a wilderness that our pioneers came from the north, east, and south. Ranching was in their blood so they brought not a bushel of grain or a single plow to turn the grassy sod. They came in covered wagons driven by horses or oxen, buckboards, buggies, bicycles, horseback, and on foot. Men, women, and children looked hopefully upon miles of sweeping prairies and hills. They knew they would have to work, save, and sacrifice to make a success of this new venture in a wilderness. Log cabins were erected by some while others made dug-out houses or built houses of stone.

Very soon cattle and horses were roaming the free, open ranges. In the 1880's towns began to spring up along the Northern Pacific Railroad track. In 1881 the railroad reached the Montana line. The towns that were growing consisted of business places such as grocery stores, livery stables, hardware stores, blacksmith shops, saloons, and banks. Grocery-store operators sold big wagon loads of supplies to ranchers who paid cash or arranged to pay in the fall when grass-fed range cattle were shipped to eastern markets. Livery stables provided shelter, feed, and water for horses belonging to ranchers, drifting cowboys, and new home seekers who stayed in town overnight.

Hardware stores sold buffalo guns, rifles, revolvers, ammunition, horseshoes, nails, rope, stovepipe, wood and coal stoves, kerosene lamps and lanterns, hay forks, repairs for buckboards, wagons, haymowers and rakes. Blacksmith shops were restricted mostly to horseshoeing or repairing buckboards, wagons, and haymowers. Saloons were patronized by men and were usually small in structure with hitching racks outside for horses.

Banks were the last of the group to appear in the western towns but the larger towns also had saddle shops and barber shops. As far as saloons were concerned in the eighties and nineties and later, it is well to paint a clear picture. Ranchers shipped beef cattle only once a year and received only \$25 or \$35 a head for 3- or 4-year-olds. First they would pay their debts and get a load of supplies. This left very little money in their pockets. Saloonkeepers did not get wealthy and many were forced to close their doors because of lack of customers. Cowboys' salaries were \$25 or \$35 a month and much of that was spent for fancy riding paraphernalia or put into savings so they could start a herd of cattle of their own.

Women and children fulfilled their homemaking duties where life was of a rugged nature. Furniture was plain and often homemade. Women were prepared to cook meals and supply sleeping quarters for cowboys who might drop in any time and stay for a night, a week, or a month. During range round-ups a dozen or more extra men would stay at the rancher's home and enjoy his wife's cooking unless the men had a regular chuck wagon along. Indians often asked for food but they rarely ate a meal in a ranch house. They would go to the ranch house and ask for chunks of meat so they could combine it with buffalo or June berries and cook it over their campfires. Often the ranchers would go to fight sweeping

prairie fires that swiftly engulfed the range grass. Rattlesnakes were numerous and children were cautioned about gray wolves that might come prowling. In winter terrible blizzards swept the unprotected prairie space and women were faced with the responsibility of keeping the coal fires burning but under control so they would not cause a fire that would destroy the only shelter the family had against the elements.

These courageous pioneers were thoughtful of one another. No man would speak disrespectfully of a lady and marriages were permanent and usually happy. Schools lasted 4 or 5 months and the family often had to hire and pay its own teacher. Religion was taught in the home and a few men, of various faiths, preached the gospel.

In 1905 a new group of people began to migrate into this region. Farmers from the South, East, and North established homes where the soil was suited to agriculture. Even people who had come from across the ocean made their homes here because at this time America, as a land of opportunity, was attracting a large number of foreign immigrants.

The new settlers laid valid claim to homesteads and with the law on their side forced the ranchers to do the same. The ranchers also had to purchase much of their range land in order to keep it. In a short time farming, especially the growing of hard spring wheat, became as great an industry as cattle raising in the area. Even the ranchers began raising some tame feed to compensate for the loss of prairie hay. The farmers had to work just as hard as the early ranchers had done to make a living. There were a few wealthy people in the West, among them Theodore Roosevelt. He often rode the range when he lived in this area and he was well liked by the pioneers who knew him.

As early as 1901 our pioneers began to observe the new conveniences that were being introduced and gradually they began to recognize their worth. A good example of this new development occurred one day in the summer of 1901. Two cowboys, George Clark and Bill Taylor, were standing in downtown Dickinson. An automobile came plugging along and came to a sudden stop. Cowboys flocked around to inspect the strange new vehicle and remarks like the following were heard:

"Beats a horse."

"Needs no range to run on."

"Won't buck you off on a cold morning."

"I wonder how much it cost."

Bill Taylor turned to his friend and asked, "What do you think of it, George?"

George was slow to comment because he stuttered. "Why this thing might be pulling people's houses all over the United States some day," he said. Perhaps he envisioned the trailer houses that are so common today.

These men who shaped our country never had a great amount of money on their hands. One early rancher sent a letter to a Dickinson banker in 1918 asking for a loan of \$200 to tide him over the spring. He received a check for \$100 and a brief note that read: "Dollars are as big as wagon wheels this spring, so try and make ends meet with 100 of them."

Today, 1951, we are living in a world of machines and atoms where the push of a button does work that once required a great deal of human labor. But it is also a world of war and insecurity, of tension and mental strain that often tax man's endurance far more than physical strain ever could. As we move forward it is wise to look back and try to revive those pioneer characteristics that have proven to be good in society. There will never be a button to push that will rear children. Rearing children in pioneer days was a minor duty, because the children knew hardship and appreciated even small pleasures.

So if we combine all the problems that face the people of today, we find that they outnumber the problems that our pioneers experienced.

Wages and prices for our produce have more than tripled themselves since 1900, but prices for food, clothing, and shelter have also tripled. The man who makes \$200 or \$300 a month today is no wealthier or not as wealthy as the cowboy whose monthly salary was \$35 and board a half-century ago because the modern worker must also meet the modern cost of living. In these times we must also pay and give generously in order to protect our country and preserve the democracy that our forefathers founded for us. Perhaps things have not changed so drastically after all in our Missouri slope area. The following story will help show that the past is not so remote from the present as we may sometimes think. Recently a housewife, thinking she heard a strange noise in the night, aroused her husband. "That's probably just an old cow looking around the house for a bone," he mumbled sleepily.

"There aren't any cows in the city," she said impatiently.

The husband sat up in bed and remarked, "Of course, there are cows in the city. I ought to know, when I saw 1,200 head go through the sales ring today."

Address of Capt. P. D. Gold, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address made by Capt. P. D. Gold, Jr., commander of the Boston Naval Shipyard, Boston, Mass., at the installation of officers of Boston Naval Shipyard Chapter of the Disabled American Veterans, held at the Parker House in Boston on Friday, May 25, 1951.

The speech is an excellent one, and stresses the need for, and desirability of the utilization of the services of the physically handicapped.

The address follows:

REMARKS BY CAPT. P. D. GOLD, JR., USN, AT INSTALLATION OF OFFICERS OF BOSTON NAVAL SHIPYARD CHAPTER OF DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, AT THE PARKER HOUSE ON FRIDAY, MAY 25, 1951

Mr. Toastmaster, Commander Sullivan, national officers, State department officers, officers-elect, distinguished guests, and friends of the Disabled American Veterans, it is a great honor and real privilege for me to be here tonight at this installation of officers of the Boston Naval Shipyard Chapter of the Disabled American Veterans. My pleasure in being with you tonight is greatly increased by the fact that you and I stand shoulder to shoulder in striving to preserve our Christian and democratic way of life. You, the Disabled American Veterans, know and value highly the traditions, customs, and freedom of this country and its ideals, and you have shown your loyalty and devotion to those liberties that are our priceless heritage.

I am happy to have had the good fortune of knowing many of your people, who by their superior performance of duty, have made and are making a significant contribution to the welfare of our Nation.

May I congratulate the Disabled American Veterans for their excellent achievements in advancing the interests of all disabled veterans, and for the untiring efforts of your organization in stimulating a feeling of mutual devotion, helpfulness, and comradeship among all veterans.

You, the members of the Boston Naval Shipyard Chapter of this great organization, have reasons to be boastful of your superior accomplishments in the sponsoring of State and Federal legislation so necessary in the proper rehabilitation of the disabled veteran. By your zealous endeavors in making possible the enactment of these laws, you have instilled in these men that will to win. They, themselves, have proved that they possess that will to fight; having both, your and their success is assured.

It was gratifying to learn that the high office of State commander of the Disabled American Veterans has been held on three occasions by Boston naval shipyard personnel. First was Mr. Edward J. Walsh, who was one of the charter members and organizers of your present chapter. Mr. Albert F. Sears, who left employment as supervisor at the shipyard to assume duties in the Veterans' Administration as training officer in order that he may be able to better assist disabled comrades. The third, Mr. Anthony D. Tieso, who is presently a key member of our shipyard team, I am happy to say, and who was a national officer under your past national commander, General Wainwright. I understand that our toastmaster here this evening is the possessor of the Distinguished Service Cross.

The Boston naval shipyard also boasts that among its former employees we can count Mr. Paul J. Sullivan, your present chapter commander, and Mr. James J. Sayre. Both of these gentlemen left the shipyard in 1946 to become members of the Disabled American Veterans' staff at the Veterans' Administration, where they are presently rendering professional services to disabled veterans.

At a time like this it is essential that our country use all its productive resources. Our national strength is the chief reliance of the world in its effort to overcome the forces of tyranny and aggression. For that reason this Nation of ours needs the contribution that each of its citizens is capable of making. Your association was among the first to realize that those who have physical handicaps can work as effectively as those who have no handicaps, provided they have jobs fitted to their capabilities. Those persons are needed today in the great productive efforts of our Nation. Our country is strong. It is loved by its citizens. We love our country not as an abstraction or a theory, not because it is ours, but because it offers us the opportunity to lead useful lives and to do what we can to assist those around us. It offers us security yet independence. Those who are physically handicapped are sometimes unable to make their own independent contribution and are therefore dependent upon others. In many instances this is entirely unnecessary. I understand that out of 30,000 ways of making a living, there isn't a single job that requires all the bodily functions or all five senses. Usually the physically handicapped can do as much and earn as much as the unhandicapped if they are guided to the right job. It is in this way, and this way only, they can share in the greatest satisfaction of life—to be independent and self-supporting.

Federal, State, and local government agencies have set good examples in the employment of the handicapped. A program for selective placement for physically impaired persons in Federal civil service positions has been in effect approximately 9 years. It has resulted in the placing of more than 100,000 persons with serious, permanent physical disabilities. This program is sponsored by the United States Civil Service Commission, and is now an integral part of the Commission's recruiting and examining functions.

To the question, "Can this physically handicapped person perform the duties of the job without injury to himself or to others?" the United States Civil Service Commission, by using methods of selective placement, has answered "Yes" more than 100,000 times in the last 9 years. Experience from operating this program has firmly convinced the Commission that physically handicapped persons, selectively placed, are excellent employees, and that it is good business to employ them.

The Navy Department at Washington periodically issues directives to all naval and Marine Corps activities concerned reemphasizing its desires to employ physically handicapped personnel, particularly veterans, and inviting the attention of all activities to the procedures that have been developed by the Navy Department for determining the physical demands of jobs and matching these demands with the physical capacities of workers.

I make it my business to follow the yard's program for the utilization of physically handicapped personnel. On March 30 of this year, approximately 62 percent of the total employment of the shipyard were veterans. Of that percentage, 1,589 have service-connected disability, 283 of these are from World War I and 1,306 from World War II. In addition, we had a total of 61 wives and widows of disabled veterans, and, last, we have 70 nonveterans on our rolls with serious permanent physical handicaps—not including many others with lesser disabilities.

Physically handicapped workers are employed in almost every activity of the shipyard. We know them to be efficient and dependable. In one particular shop alone, we have two amputees and one crippled by polio. In another activity, we have three amputees. All performing excellent work. The employee who has fallen prey to polio performs his day's work in a wheelchair. His efficiency rates among the highest of the personnel employed in his activity. He, like all the other physically handicapped employed at the yard, has refused to let his handicap throw him for a loss.

Recently, I have had the handwriting of an employee brought to my attention. This particular employee lost his right arm in the performance of his duties at the shipyard compelling him to learn to write with his left hand. Through perseverance and patience, he now has mastered this difficult task by being able to write and print equally as well as previously.

In one of our offices, among the personnel, we have two physically handicapped employees; one of whom has lost the use of both of her legs and the other the use of one. They too, do exceptionally well at their jobs and are definite assets to the office.

In our Apprentice Training School, we have at present 74 disabled veterans, including 32 severely handicapped. The majority of these men are standing well up in their class.

I was more than delighted to hear recently the favorable reports from the various supervisors in the shipyard regarding the general aptitude and efficiency of our handicapped personnel. I have found that in my discussions with these supervisors that no instance of lowered efficiency nor morale was reported as a result of employing the physically handicapped worker, and several specific examples were given where the morale of the group, as a whole, has been raised. It is inspiring to realize not only that we are able to assist our fellowman, but that we are letting those persons realize that they are suitable and fit for the jobs they are performing and contributing their full share.

I am proud to state that the physically handicapped workers of the Boston Naval Shipyard in their work habits and attendance records have proved themselves equal to or above the average of the nonhandicapped in production and dependability. They should take pride in their important contribution to the economic and military strength of our country.

Your organization is responsible to a large degree for the success of the campaign for the employment of the physically handicapped. Nothing is more important in the rehabilitation of a disabled person than the final step—the acceptance of employment as normal members of a productive society. I know this is your goal. The altruistic efforts of the Disabled American Veterans has resulted in the gainful employment of many.

In our society, human life is precious. It is the purpose of our society to enable the individual to attain the highest achievement of which he is capable.

Your organization has been successful. People such as yourselves who give so generously of time and effort in this noble philanthropic work deserve such success.

Rehabilitation of the disabled into employment is an indispensable service to your fellowman and to your country. You have replaced sympathy with realistic human understanding and intelligent support.

You have put life into the slogan that it is the ability not the disability that counts.

A Bill To Prohibit Imports of Furs From Soviet Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced, today, a bill amending the Reciprocal Trade Act of 1951 in order that all fur imports from Soviet Russia and Communist China may be prohibited.

The need for enactment of my amendment is this:

The President, on August 3, 1951, signed an Executive order prohibiting the importation of furs from Russia. The President's order contained a "joker." The order does not say that "the importation of all furs from Russia is prohibited." It says that the importation of certain furs, listing them by name, is prohibited.

Oddly, the names of two furs, Persian lamb and squirrel, are strangely absent from the list of banned furs, despite the fact that these two furs, the names of which are omitted from the prohibited list, constitute more than one-half of all Russia's fur sales in the United States.

Fur imports from Russian in 1950 totaled \$20,936,126, of which \$10,675,128, or more than one-half, were Persian lamb and squirrel skins, importation of which are not banned.

Unless my amendment is adopted, Russia can continue shipping Persian lamb and squirrel furs into the United States, thereby retaining more than one-

half of her fur business, despite the President's order, and thereby get more than \$10,000,000 a year in American dollars with which to buy war goods in other nations.

The omission of Persian lamb and squirrel pelts which in money value head the list of all furs shipped into the United States by Soviet Russia came about in this manner. The House and the Senate both passed reciprocal trade bills. The two bills went to conference. The clauses in the two bills seeking to ban fur imports from Russia were different. To compromise this difference in the two bills a new clause was written to cover the subject. Whoever wrote this clause and recommended it to the conference committee proposed listing the banned furs by name. This was accepted. When the clause was written, somewhere along the line the names of the two furs, Persian lamb and squirrel, which comprise the bulk of Russia's fur business with us, were omitted. The bill was approved by the conferees and adopted by both Houses of Congress without the omission of Persian lamb and squirrel being detected. It was signed by the President without the omission being discovered by him or his staff.

Later, on August 3, 1951, someone wrote an Executive order for the President banning the importation of the furs from Soviet Russia listed in the Reciprocal Trade Act, without the omission of Persian lamb and squirrel being discovered.

It was, I am sure, the intention of Congress and of the President to prohibit all fur imports from Soviet Russia. If so, it is necessary that my amendment to the Reciprocal Trade Act be adopted to accomplish that purpose. Unless this amendment is adopted, Soviet Russia can continue shipping Persian lamb and squirrel skins into the United States and thereby obtain large numbers of American dollars for these luxuries to spend in acquiring war materials essential to Russia's military effort.

Here is a list of fur imports from Russia for 1950 and for the first 4 months of 1951 showing that Persian lamb and squirrel furs topped the list of all furs exported from Russia into the United States:

United States fur imports from U. S. S. R.

	1950	January to April 1951
Persian lamb.....	\$5,462,382	\$1,568,181
Squirrel.....	5,213,746	917,693
Fox (except silver and black).....	437,187	155,058
Kolinsky.....	1,455,862	473,298
Marmot.....	1,720,640	1,335,676
Marten.....	1,142,275	292,714
Muskkrat.....	1,940,625	678,549
Sable.....	1,559,270	273,457
Other furs.....	2,004,139	295,839
Total.....	20,936,126	5,694,626

In addition to adopting my amendment in order to correct the mistake which has been made, the conferees on the Reciprocal Trade Act should investigate the circumstances of how Persian lamb and squirrel came to be

omitted from the clause in the bill that proposed to ban fur shipments into the United States. The person or persons responsible for the omission of these two important fur items from the banned list of furs, whether the omission was due to carelessness or done by design, should be fired.

Are We All Hypocrites?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of Congress a very thoughtful editorial entitled "Are We All Hypocrites?" which appeared in the Bordentown Register on August 17, 1951. Bordentown Register is published in Bordentown, N. J., which is located in my congressional district. Its editor, James McGee, Jr., has a reputation for writing very excellent editorials of which the following is one:

ARE WE ALL HYPOCRITES?

America is becoming very conscious of crime in high places. Communists in Government, and the general disregard of the law of the land. We are conscious of the crimes that others commit but we have not yet grown self-conscious of the crimes which we, the public, are guilty.

We have had our Kefauver investigation and shown our concern because of the known hook-up between big-time gamblers and local, State, and National political and law-enforcement officials. We are against sin. However, in the State of New Jersey our State government makes a report weekly on the amount of money taken in by the State from its four legal race tracks. This money is a rake-off from the horse-race bets, which run into millions of dollars, yet it is admitted that the race tracks are the source of most of the big gamblers' activities.

Just how hypocritical can we be? In a Philadelphia newspaper on Tuesday Westbrook Pegler attacks the Government, the social-security system, and the financial responsibility of the United States Treasury. (Incidentally, this ulcerated individual has been opposed to social security for the past year or two.) He makes the very rash and unproved statement that "the Roosevelt-Truman administration have squandered every dime (of social-security funds)." This great patriot (?) and spokesman for the privileged classes also urges the women of the country to refuse to collect social-security payments from their domestic help. He also urges businessmen to refuse to make the collections from their employees.

We are disturbed because the Communists flout our laws and would wreck the country, but Pegler speaks for another breed of cats who would just as surely wreck our Government and throw the working people back on the bread lines and jump for joy to see them squirm.

Social security is working for the oldsters. In Bordentown, every day more men and women are retiring from jobs in industry. With their social-security checks, their small

pensions, and their meager savings of other years they are independent, not rich, just independent.

The Constitution of the United States has served us well for the past 175 years, but during this period the majority of the American people were God-fearing. Today, there are generations who know no God and who know no moral laws.

We, the people, must preserve our own democracy. There is no use passing the buck.

Frank Kirkpatrick: Hard-Hitting Milwaukee News Commentator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the crying need in America today is real leadership. A few short years ago the United States was the strongest country in the world. Now many of our leaders who were in power then and are still in power now are cringing with fear and saying that we must be cautious on how we tread because we are now unprepared to properly defend ourselves.

How did all this come about? Perhaps some of it is due to the strange outlook of a President of the United States who could say of the atomic bomb that had been dropped on Hiroshima, "this is the greatest thing in history."

I include herewith the talk given by a Milwaukee radio commentator, Mr. Frank Kirkpatrick, on August 6, 1951:

AS I SEE IT

(By Frank Kirkpatrick)

It is good to be back with you. And, I know many of you are curious as to why I have been off the air. That's a long story, with many chapters. Some of it probably need never be told, and part of it you can readily guess by the new manner in which I am introduced. Anyway, so many of you have stopped trying to tune me in, that it will be better if we let explanations go for a later date when more of us are back together.

For tonight let's just be old friends who have been separated, who have come together again—and who postpone explanations until calmer moments.

I do want to say, however, that I've missed our little visits each evening. And, the hundreds of telephone calls and letters and cards asking what happened to me would indicate that maybe you missed me, too. I haven't been able to take all the calls or even begin to answer your letters and cards—but I've been glad to have them. And, someday, I hope to get around to answering you.

In the meanwhile, pass the word to your friends and fellow listeners. Tell them I'm back on the air, at the same time, same station. If you don't do this, I don't know how I'll get the message to everybody.

Now, let's get to the news. The very latest item at 5:54 is a bulletin from the United Press stating that the President of the Russian Soviets, Nikolai Shvernik, has

proposed to President Truman that the Big Five powers sign an antiwar treaty to end the cold war. This will be huge headlines tomorrow, but—tonight and tomorrow—I suggest that it is about as important as the man who sent the message. His name is Shvernik, and he is the President of Russia, but I doubt many of you ever heard of him. But, I suppose the top news has to do with this business of the off-again-on-again truce talks in Korea. Right now they are off temporarily. It would be hard to prove, however, that this is the top news from the reactions of the average man in the street. As I see it, most of us are apathetically indifferent to what is going on at Kaesong—and it's my guess that this stems from a conviction that whatever happens we are going to lose. At least, we will lose face, lose prestige, and probably lose the little toe-hold we still have on our Pacific defense line.

When I was writing this script I first said at this point that we would lose all that we fought Japan to gain, but I had to stop and cross out that statement because we long ago lost the free China for which we fought Japan. And because this is the anniversary of the dropping of the first atomic bomb, it is appropriate that we think of the present in terms of the past.

TEN YEARS AGO AMERICAN PRESTIGE HIGH

So, let's look back 10 years to August 1941. Ten years ago today, Hitler's armies were sweeping across Russia faster than any enemy force ever moved across another country in all history. Roosevelt and Churchill had met and were about to issue a statement which came to be known as the Atlantic Charter. President Roosevelt had pledged all possible aid to Russia.

Nationalist Chinese forces were fighting Japanese invaders as they had been for 4 years. The Chinese Communists, in turn, were betraying their homeland by forcing Chiang Kai-shek to fight them instead of the Japanese, just as the French Communists had betrayed their nation to Hitler.

Rudolph Hess had flown to Britain in his quixotic attempt to convince the British that Hitler's aims were against Russia, not Europe.

The moderate Cabinet of Prince Konoye was in power in Japan, and was considered friendly to America. It was soon to be replaced by Tojo's Cabinet, however.

Throughout the world we were respected as a potentially powerful nation. We had great prestige in the Far East and China, particularly. American marines were stationed in China, and American gunboats sailed in China seas and on Chinese rivers. When Japanese guns fired on an American gunboat and American sailors were killed, the Japanese promptly apologized and paid millions of dollars indemnity.

That was August 1941.

SIX YEARS AGO AMERICAN POWER GREATEST IN HISTORY

Now, let's come to August 1945. That's only 6 years ago. Between August of 1941 and August of 1945 we had become the greatest military power the world had ever known. And, because we, and we alone, had the atomic bomb at that time—we were the most powerful single nation the world will ever know.

We had fought a great global war on two fronts and had won it almost single handed. For it was our industrial might which had enabled Russia to make a stand at Stalin-grad. It was our production which had given both Russia and Britain the food and planes and ships and guns and tanks that had enabled them to halt the Axis armies in Europe. And, it was our troops as well as our armed might which had finally diverted

those armies and forced Hitler's withdrawal from Russia.

In the Pacific and in Asia we, and we alone—under the inspiring leadership of MacArthur—had made our island hopping return to the Philippines and had brought Japan under direct attack. And the Nipponese were begging for permission to surrender.

This power, this prestige, of a great people (the American people) was ours, just six short years ago today.

This was not six centuries ago. Not six decades ago, but just 6 years ago. So short a time, in fact, that everybody old enough to clearly understand what I am saying, has this recollection as part of his memory. I repeat, that was 6 years ago today.

Six years ago today, literally, August 6, 1945, the men to whom leadership of this great and powerful Nation was entrusted were speeding back to America. They were on the American Cruiser *Augusta*, returning from Potsdam. Just before noon, the Chief of that leadership, Harry S. Truman, was handed the message that an atomic bomb had been dropped on Hiroshima. And, according to Admiral Leahy, Mr. Truman then said: "This is the greatest thing in history." Yes, conscious of the power this bomb gave to the great Nation he led; Truman said, "This is the greatest thing in history."

SAME LEADERS STILL IN CONTROL

Among the principal personalities who shared with Mr. Truman the control of our destinies 6 years ago were the most important of the men who share that control with him today. At Potsdam and presumably on the *Augusta* were Truman, Marshall, Eisenhower, Averell Harriman, and Omar Bradley and, holding down the fort at the State Department, as Under Secretary, was Dean Acheson.

These were the men to who were entrusted this great power that we had built with our natural resources, with our sweat, with the blood of our young men, with the tears of their families, and with the sacrifices of all of us.

WHAT HAPPENED TO AMERICAN PRESTIGE AND POWER?

And, these are the men, Mr. Truman and his assistants, who for the past 6 years have had control of that power. The power entrusted to them for use in protecting the men and women whose sacrifice created it.

So, today on the anniversary of Hiroshima it is proper to ask: What of their leadership? What of their stewardship?

And, the answer, as I see it, is to be found at Kaesong in Korea; at Kaesong behind the Communist lines, where our unarmed delegates are surrounded by armed Communist guards. There under the first white flag ever carried by a United States field commander, excepting only at tragic Corregidor, there at the direction of Truman and Marshall and Acheson and Harriman and Bradley, there in Communist-held Kaesong, there under a white flag lies the power, the dignity, and the sacred honor of the American people; and that means you and me.

Address of Donald R. Burgess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I wish to include the following address made by Mr. Donald R. Burgess, Director, Office of Publications, Department of Commerce, at a panel discussion at the annual convention of the American Society of Newspaper Editors at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., on April 19, 1951:

I greatly appreciate the privilege of being on this panel and of meeting with you.

There are many things I should like to bring under discussion, but I have decided to concentrate on the one I consider to have the most far-reaching significance. This subject is the importance of creating an attitude toward Government information work which, while deploring actions not in the public interest, will encourage development of, and give support to, a career information service with solid traditions of objectivity and integrity.

The significance of this proposition is far-reaching because misdirected criticism of the Federal information services is tending to create exactly the conditions I hope they are intended to prevent.

I believe that few things besides the integrity and public responsibility of the press itself are more vital to the support of democratic government than is the presence of those qualities in the Government information service.

Obviously, scrutiny of those services must be close and continuous, but unless criticism is sound and constructive it will turn good men from the information field and open the way for the very type of person who should not be trusted with its responsibilities. It will also tend to drive the information services into a defensive anonymity that would make their ramifications unfortunately difficult to trace.

Twelve years ago in his excellent book on Government Publicity, James L. McCamy indicated that a start had been made on building a career group of specialists. I think information workers are tending more and more to professionalize themselves and their work and that codes of ethics, quality standards, and practices are becoming fairly well defined.

In the face of this development, and greatly tending to reverse it, there has been a series of attacks on what is referred to as "the administration's army of press agents" or the "Government's horde of propagandists." This sort of charge, usually linked with charges of huge waste in printing, lump up to 45,000 persons and leave the impression that the Government information services are filled with ward heelers grinding out tons of political propaganda.

I hope you will take it from one who never paid a nickel to any political party or any political candidate and who never obtained or held a Federal job through influence that such attacks do not help the morale of men who believe that the title of Information Specialist carries with it an obligation to ethical and professional standards as high as those attached to the title of Managing Editor.

Now I have no intention of whitewashing the Government or Government information. I do not want or advise forbearance when criticism is due. What I do want is to take you on a few minutes' tour on the information man's side of the fence and show you where I think much of the criticism has been misapplied:

First, propaganda. Let us stipulate that the word propaganda covers improper attempts to influence action or opinion. I think it is highly probable that most of the propaganda that has been criticized was carried out over the protest or without the knowledge of the information services. Certainly my office is expected to stop every bit

of propaganda on the part of well-intentioned operating people that it finds.

It is true that you and we might differ to some extent on the definition of legitimate areas of public education. However, I see little danger in public education on any of the so-called common-consent programs or even in certain more controversial areas provided it is carried on largely through the press, radio, and magazines, which are well able to sift the material.

So I suggest that observers might well consider first whether the thing they are examining is propaganda in the worst sense or whether, broadly speaking, it really is legitimate education concerning a program that is in the national interest. Then they should find out who is responsible for it rather than assume that it is an information office. Finally—if propaganda is found—their vigilance should extend to how far the Government is using techniques designed to carry the propaganda around and over the heads of the great public information media such as you represent. It must be recognized at this point, however, that expecting the Government to reach and serve the people largely through private media creates a special obligation to public service without political bias on the part of those media.

Next, staffing: Paul Leach, of the Detroit Free Press, apparently investigating reports that there are more than 45,000 propagandists on the Federal payroll, wrote that he could find only about 2,000 information workers in Washington and in the field—including stenographers. The last official count that I know of was made by the Civil Service Commission in 1947 and showed 2,357 persons on the Government payroll in what was known as the "1230" information and editorial classification. This covered all specialists in press, radio and magazine work and all editorial clerks in all grade classifications from CAF-5 through CAF-15. Because editorial clerks are low-salaried employees whose work is mostly statistical or clerical, they should be excluded from the figure we are considering. This makes Mr. Leach's estimate very close to today's actual employment if the information staffs of new defense agencies are not counted. I think his figure is about right. At the ratio of professional to clerical workers existing in my group, Mr. Leach's count of 2,000 would mean 1,200 professional workers to gather, report, edit, distribute, legitimately promote, and answer questions on the full report, service, and research output of the entire United States Government.

The larger figures, which show up in political debate, are arrived at by including the large foreign propaganda staffs and adding statistical specialists and technicians who don't know the difference between a deadline and a release date.

This brings us to publications. Almost all Government publications are the physical embodiment of operating programs approved in some detail by congressional Appropriations Committees. They are not written by information staffs. People who think their titles sound trivial should first read them and find out what the books are intended to do. Then, if they still don't think them proper, they should criticize the operating program of which they are a part. I have criticized a number of operating programs myself and my office, for example, last year suspended or prevented publication of material with a printing cost of \$176,500 and put limiting conditions on 30 other publication projects.

A Budget Bureau study in 1947 indicated that fewer than 10 percent of Government Printing Office orders that year were for public-use publications and that the cost of these was only \$4,000,000, or about 7 percent of total printing and binding obligations of the executive departments. To this must be added the cost of publications reproduced

by offset—a cost which is lumped with administrative printing and cannot easily be ascertained. In any case, the amount is not excessive when considered as the cost of converting the entire Government's operating programs into usable form.

Waste in distribution is becoming less and less of a factor in distribution as more publications are distributed through sale. The Superintendent of Documents last year took in \$3,809,000. Sales of Commerce Department publications have averaged more than \$1,000,000 a year for 3 years, or almost \$1,500,000 if sales of Coast and Geodetic Survey charts are included.

You may have gathered from what I have already said that information offices perform a multitude of functions. The charter of my own office says that it is to exercise functional supervision over all information activities of the Department's 15 bureaus and offices and provide service for those bureaus without information units, analyze the market for and usefulness of the Department's publications and services, provide a good distribution system, operate the departmental pressroom and clear all news releases, exercise general control over the preparation and issuance of all publications and establish for them standards of policy, style, content, format, and essentiality; maintain relations with the press and radio, conduct or approve all promotional campaigns, clear speeches, and supervise information work in the field.

Most information offices perform all or most of these functions. The degree to which they emphasize one or another of them and to which they influence top policy decisions varies with the administrator and with the director of information. It must always be recognized that the information office is never autonomous and is, as it should be, subject to the final decisions of the agency administrator.

I well realize that I have skimmed over topics which could occupy several panels. However, I want to speed us to the discussion period.

I have tried to show that the Government's information staffs are very, very small in relation to their duties, that they probably are not responsible for improper promotional actions and propaganda but in general act as a guard against them, and that in most cases legitimate criticism of publications should be diverted from the information staffs to the operating programs which produce the material.

I believe your Government information services do a conscientious job for you and the public. I repeat that they deserve your support and that with it there will be a continued professionalization of information work.

I thank you.

Karamu House in Cleveland . . . Where All Races and Creeds Contribute to a Program of Meaningful Life . . . Fulfilling the American Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, we li- cosmopolitan Cleveland take great pride in the many creative and constructive activities built because of the vision and

the courage of individuals and groups that make up our population.

One of those which has taken on both national and international stature is Karamu House, recently celebrating the thirty-fifth anniversary of the first meeting of its board of trustees.

What is Karamu House? Begun on less than a shoestring, it is today recognized as "one of the greatest democratizing forces in our America."

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Karamu and to the two gentle, indomitably hope-filled people who conceived it, who lived it, who have guided it down the years until it is recognized throughout the world as a demonstration of the fact that all men and women are equally children of a loving Father who is indeed a universal and living God.

"Karamu," in the Swahili language of Africa, means "a place of recreation," and "the center of the community"—Karamu House in Cleveland has come to mean all of that and more. It is a center directed toward the creative growth and development of human beings, a center fostering successful human relationships, demonstrating democratic understanding between peoples and reaching out toward the far horizons of human relationships. Our Karamu is a living proof of the realization that members of all races and all creeds have a meaningful life in our country and can offer much to the American heritage. We are both proud and humble in its accomplishments.

Karamu House was conceived in the hearts and minds of Rowena and Russell Jelliffe. It was brought into being through their efforts. Bit by bit their inspiration found answering chords in the great heart of Cleveland. Little by little their devotion to an ideal bore fruit. A year ago a beautiful new theater, built of solid bricks and mortar, took the place of the ramshackle makeshifts of the past. The opening night was one of the most moving experiences Clevelanders have ever had. To me it was unforgettable. To the Jelliffes it was proof of the validity of their faith and a challenge to future achievement.

Thirty-five years and now a little more ago these two native Ohioans came quite alone to the most poverty-stricken area of the city to open a recreational and athletic center in an old funeral parlor. Their funds, given by the Second Presbyterian Church, were very modest. The people of the neighborhood received them coldly and with suspicion. But gradually the poor and repressed people came to the center, growing in numbers until the Jelliffes were forced to expand to a few dilapidated neighboring buildings.

Soon the founders noticed unmistakable signs of creative talent: shy efforts to help decorate the barren walls with a charcoal painting; a self-conscious attempt to compose music; the persistent rhythm of a dance; and an almost hidden sense of make-believe and fantasy. Inhibited attempts to brighten an otherwise dull and drab life, they were nonetheless real and vital in spirit. From these crude origins came the artistic genius that is Karamu today.

It was 30 years ago that the late Charles Gilpin came to Karamu to attend one of the first theatrical presentations. To the small number of eager Negro actors who crowded around him, he said:

Learn to see the drama in your own lives, and some day the world will come to see you.

And today the world has come to see them not only to esteem the renowned dramatic productions, but also to applaud the rhythmic, skilled, Karamu dancers, to listen to the Karaleers, the nationally famous men's quartet on CBS, and to appreciate the Karamu art shows.

But between the lines of favorable press notices and behind the glare of the amber-tinted footlights is the real heart of Karamu—the meaning it has for the thousands who come from all parts of the city to become members of the Karamu family. The intrinsic contribution of Karamu is encompassed within its many clubs, organized crafts, and group activities.

The Karamu Children's Theater and the Junior Theater give the youngsters of the neighborhood and beyond a unique opportunity for youthful expression. Choral groups and instrumentalists, while supplying the music for many of the theatrical productions, also form an interest group in themselves.

Small children are cared for in the Karamu nursery school, while their working mothers maintain their jobs away from home. The nursery school program also offers evening discussion groups and a series of topics and projects to broaden the understanding of the parents of their responsibilities.

The activities in the arts and crafts building include printing, ceramics, sculpture, and wood cutting. The first Negroes to have their paintings displayed in the International Print Show received their original inspiration as members of the Karamu art classes.

It is activities such as these, serving the needs of all from the preschool age through all the stages of life, that enable Karamu House to give hope to those who have lived in despair. It is also the spirit of such activities that inspired others to come to the Karamu staff as faithful teachers and directors.

While the Jelliffes have been the guiding light, loyal members of the board of trustees, civic-minded people, have also given their constant and willing service. The many names of illustrious national sponsors are further proof of Karamu's fame and meaning.

An integral part of the Cleveland community, Karamu works actively with the Cleveland Museum of Art, the Museum of Natural History, Western Reserve University, the fine arts division of the Cleveland Public Library, and the Cleveland Playhouse.

But Karamu no longer belongs to Cleveland alone. The Karamu idea is rapidly spreading to all of the leading industrial centers of the Nation. And even our State Department, recognizing and appreciating Karamu House as one of our greatest examples of a working democracy, has sent foreign students to Karamu from all parts of the world.

They will carry the Karamu message to all nations.

Thus our Cleveland Karamu House has become not only a thrilling art center in a great cosmopolitan industrial city, but also the symbol of what life in a free country has in store for all its people as bit by bit the barriers are dissolved by a better understanding of the meaning of beauty in the universe of God.

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Before Convention of National Association of County Officials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Friday, July 6, it was my pleasure to address the National Association of County Officials who were gathered in convention in Milwaukee, Wis. The following day I left for Europe for a 2 weeks' trip as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

In the course of the speech in Milwaukee that night, I mentioned the Kaesong peace talks—the negotiations which have now apparently broken down because of the bad faith of the Communist aggressor.

At this time I ask unanimous consent that the text of my talk be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHONY OR REAL ARMISTICE

The Nation and the world follow with bated breath the latest developments in the arranging for a cease-fire in Korea. The American people, like all the peace-loving peoples of the world, trust that there will come out of the negotiations a successful cease-fire order which will banish bloodshed once and for all from that ravaged peninsula. Even with such a cease-fire, however, there must be no slackening of the home-front production effort.

THERE MUST BE NO PHONY ARMISTICE

In our zeal to see the bloody fighting end and to see the lives of servicemen and civilians saved, we should not forget that a Korean cease-fire or armistice would be phony if certain conditions were not attained in the subsequent settlement. Remember that the cease-fire would be negotiated between

- (a) General Ridgway, the UN Commander,
- (b) The North Korean commander; and
- (c) The commander of the Chinese Red so-called volunteers.

On the other hand, the subsequent peace talks would have to be between the main parties at interest, namely, Russia (which is pulling the puppet's strings), Red China, and the UN. Such subsequent conditions would have to be—

1. A commitment as binding as could possibly be made, to the effect that at no time would there be a resumption on some flimsy pretense of the Chinese Red-North Korean invasion of South Korea.

Now, of course, the question arises as to whether any agreement signed by a Communist or Communist satellite state will ever be worth the paper that it is written upon. A binding contract in times past according to the Anglo-Saxon concept, meant just that. But in this day and age, a binding commitment is held as long as it pleases the Communists to do so.

ARE WORSE KOREANS IN THE MAKING?

2. An understanding as binding as could possibly be obtained in Korea, Moscow, and Lake Success, that Chinese Red forces would not use the opportunity "after a breather" to send their forces into French Indochina, into the Malayan Peninsula or other lands in southeast Asia.

I want to point out that this question of possible invasion of those lands is of course, independent in a certain sense from the more immediate question of peace in Korea as such. And yet it seems to me that we cannot simply close up the Korean chapter, ignore other parts of the chessboard and merely permit the Chinese Reds to start a new and bloodier Korea in the southeast portion of Asia.

SACRIFICES OF HEROES MUST NOT BE IN VAIN

The American people are, I believe, firmly determined that there shall be no appeasement of the Chinese Reds. The American people are determined that the Korean cease-fire shall not be a Munich. As much as they shudder at the thought of continued bloodshed, they rebel even more the thought that after 12 solid months and 150,000 battle and nonbattle casualties, the sacrifices of our heroes might be rendered in vain by an ignoble agreement.

WATER SHOULD BE SQUEEZED OUT OF FOREIGN AID

As I have indicated, we are all aware that the Korean settlement is but one element on the world chessboard. In the Foreign Relations Committee, there is now pending an \$8,500,000,000 foreign-aid bill, most of which is for military aid. We of the committee are going to go over that bill with a "fine tooth comb" in order to make sure that every dollar to be authorized is necessary and justified.

At the present time, I for one, say that no figure requested of us by the administration or anyone else is sacred and untouchable. If we can squeeze water out of that \$8,500,000,000 figure, then I say it is essential that we do so, just as we can squeeze water out of our domestic budget.

OPPRESSIVE TAXES CAN RUIN AMERICA

The American people cannot stand indefinitely mammoth governmental expenditures and governmental taxes at the rate they have experienced them for so many years. Sooner or later, there is a point beyond which "the goose that lays the golden egg", namely, the businessman, the laboring man, the white-collar worker, the farmer, whose taxes have been raised to the highest point in history—will cease to function in the free enterprise system because of the oppressive tax burden.

ATTITUDE OF SELFLESSNESS NEEDED AT HOME

And while I am on this subject may I say that hand in hand with our foreign program goes the question of anti-inflation action here at home. You all have read about the tremendous debate in the Senate and House of Representatives on the issue of extending price and wage controls. I, for one, voted for temporarily extending controls because it is obvious that Uncle Sam cannot continue to pump out \$60,000,000,000 of war orders without having severe consequences on our economy—on our life insurance, bank deposits, and so forth. I want to point out, however, that if stabilization action is to be successful, it will take the united cooperation of every group in American society. There must be less of an atti-

tude of "how much can our own group profit from the present situation," less of an attitude of "Let the other fellow take price cuts or wage cuts" and more of an attitude of "What can I do," "What sacrifices can I make to do my share?"

Naturally the sacrifices must be fair and equitable. It is completely understandable that any individual in our society would feel that it is wrong for him to suffer a compulsory cut in his standard of living while other individuals or other groups are profiteering. That is why I say it will take unified, selfless cooperation on the part of all of us.

FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE TRIP

Now, on the foreign-aid issue, which I had previously mentioned, tomorrow morning I am flying back to Washington in order to join with my colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee on a brief official trip to Europe. We have been designated to make a first-hand study of military, economic, and political conditions of Western Europe so that in turn we might be able to report back to the Senate. This, I assure you, is no pleasure lark. We will be busily conferring with top officials every single available minute, working in the interest of the American people as much, if not more so, as when we are in Washington laboring in your behalf. Out of the official, on-the-spot surveys such as this, hundreds of millions of dollars have been saved for the American people. Why? Because it is next to impossible for a Congressman sitting in Washington, D. C., to know accurately how the ECA or State Department is spending our money, 3,000 or 6,000 miles away. A good business sends its field agents out to explore what is going on, and that is what your Congress is doing in sending this delegation to see how your money is being spent abroad.

TRIBUTE TO YOUR GROUP

Now, my friends, I should like to pass to other matters. I am sure that it would be difficult indeed to assemble a more representative collection of grass-roots leaders of our country than can be found in this splendid association. I am glad indeed that there is such an organization as yours because through it, you can accomplish collectively what would be very difficult to accomplish individually.

Within the last two decades America and the world have witnessed a major phenomenon, the gathering together into central governments of increasing power, authority, prestige, taxes, and appropriations.

SOURCES FROM WHICH UNCLE SAM TOOK AUTHORITY

In our country, such power was taken over from various other sources. It was taken over from the following:

(a) From the State governments, which found the Federal Government increasingly depriving the States of regular sources of State tax revenue. Then, because the States found themselves financially unable to handle various types of aid programs, they had to come hat in hand to Uncle Sam and beg him, so to speak, for the very aid which he alone could give, because he had gobbled up the State's tax sources.

(b) A second source from which powers were taken were the major municipalities of our country. With constantly increasing populations and ever higher costs for public services, more and more they found themselves sending their representatives to Washington in order to appeal for this or that appropriation, this or that power to be exercised by Uncle Sam in their jurisdiction.

(c) A third source from which the power was taken was from the counties of America which found themselves becoming increasingly the servants or at best, co-partners of

Federal officials in dispensation of funds and power.

(d) A fourth source of authority was the American people themselves. In other words, more and more, the Federal Government took over powers from the people—powers which had never been exercised by Government at all.

FACTORS WHICH LED TO CENTRALIZATION

Now, we might well ask ourselves: What are the principal factors which have contributed to this increase in Federal power? They are the following:

1. Of course, the greatest single factor was the Second World War, and in fact, the whole national emergency between the years 1939 and 1945. Everyone recognized that during that emergency, Uncle Sam had to exercise increased powers and spend vastly increased sums.

2. A second factor was the depression, which began with the stock-market crash in October 1929, and which continued right on into the national emergency of September 1939, when we still had some 10,000,000 unemployed.

3. A third factor was, of course, the crisis with the Soviet Union which existed from practically the end of the Second World War right on through the start of the Korean conflict and up to the present time—1945 through 1951.

Because of each of these factors, the Federal Government has taken increasing power and jurisdiction.

POWER HAS BEEN HISTORICALLY DIVIDED

Now this whole phenomenon must be understood in terms of the background of the American system of constitutional government. We all recognize that power in the American scheme of things is divided three ways among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Federal level. But power is also divided among the Federal, State, and local levels, and just as important, the residuum of power was left by the wise founding fathers of our country in the American people themselves. Down through the years, the area of those residual powers has been increasingly narrowed, while the area of Federal power has more and more been increased.

WE SHOULD TRY TO CHECK CENTRALIZATION TREND

It would be unwise indeed if one were to assume that, merely by passing a resolution, we in the Congress or anyone else could easily reverse the historic trend, particularly amidst a grave national emergency. But while one cannot end this centralization trend, one can certainly slow the trend, keep it in check, and indeed attempt to balance it by securing a return of certain powers to the States, cities, and counties which they once had but which they now no longer possess.

WE SHOULD HAVE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON INTER-GOVERNMENT RELATIONS

In order to do so, one must basically return certain fiscal powers—tax-collecting powers—to the people at the grass roots. So long as Uncle Sam continues to take such a tremendous proportion of certain types of taxes, so long as he continues to “dry up” sources of local tax revenue, just so long will the financial position of the localities be dangerous indeed. That is why for many years I have sponsored legislation to establish a National Commission on Inter-Governmental Relations. This Commission (on which county leaders would serve with others) would be along the lines of the famed Hoover Commission on Governmental Reorganization. Its purpose would be not only to analyze the duplication of authority between the Federal Government, States, and localities but to recommend what pow-

ers could be returned to the States and communities. Moreover, it would analyze which level of the Government should collect which type of taxes. In other words, there are certain taxes which should be best handled practically exclusively at the local level.

On the other hand, other taxes are such that they can best be collected exclusively by Uncle Sam. No one has ever suggested, for example, that the Federal Government should get into local property taxes. It is obvious that the property tax is peculiarly suited to local revenue raising. However, such things as gasoline taxes and other levies were long held to be within the domain of the States and localities, but have now been increasingly preempted by Uncle Sam.

I am indeed hoping that this National Commission on Inter-Governmental Relations might be activated during the Eighty-second Congress, and that it might make a report to us sometime during the Eighty-third Congress. I think that it could become a major means by which the continued integrity of county government in the United States might be assured.

ATTITUDE OF “LET UNCLE SAM DO IT”

Although we have described various phenomena which have accounted for the centralization of authority in America, perhaps the greatest single factor has been a changed attitude on the part of the American people. I refer to the attitude which has developed during the last two decades by which the old phrase “Let George do it” has turned into a new phrase “Let Uncle Sam do it.”

Somehow, the American people have gotten the curious notion that Uncle Sam can do things better, more economically, more accurately, more carefully than can be done either by themselves or by other levels of the Government. Nothing could be further from the truth.

As a matter of fact, we have usually found out that when Uncle Sam does something, he does it with more extravagance, with more overhead, more recklessly, more dangerously, than if it were performed by the American people themselves or by other levels of government.

DANGER OF POTOMAC FEVER

This is not because Federal Government servants are by and large unworthy. On the contrary, the great mass of Federal workers are honest, hard-working, sensible and they try to do a faithful job in accordance with their responsibility. But there is a bureaucratic disease known as Potomac fever which serves to distort performances of Federal functions when they are directed exclusively from Washington, D. C.

I say that it is practically impossible for some seat warmer in Washington to know varying conditions in Door County, Wis., or in Alameda County, Calif., etc. I say that officials at the county level are in an infinitely better position to know the character of their own people, the background of their people, the local economic, political and social conditions, needs, etc.

UNCLE SAM MUST TAKE FROM PEOPLE TO GIVE TO PEOPLE

Of course, if you have unlimited billions of dollars to spend, as Uncle Sam is supposed to have, then this shower of Federal gold can accomplish a good deal. However, let not the American people kid themselves that Uncle Sam possesses a single cent except for the money which he takes from out of the pockets of the American people themselves, either in the present or future generations. Government itself can only spend what it collects, or what it mortgages from the future.

DECENTRALIZATION OF INDUSTRY NECESSARY

Now, my friends, I have spoken to you about one of the serious problems that is

confronting America, and that is the problem of centralization of power in the Federal Government. Of course for years, some of us have talked about the need of decentralization—decentralization, for example, of our industries, so that in this atomic age we might find ourselves adequate to meet whatever challenge arises. If our heavy industries are all centralized, as they are at present, we may find that we will not be able to meet the challenges of a possible world war III as we should, if, Heaven forbid, war comes.

But this subject that we have been reviewing today is the matter of the centralizing of power. History demonstrates that power in the hands of a few, corrupts them and injures the rights of the common man. As we all appreciate, the big challenge to the Federal Government in this period is that of defense, and so, the Federal Government should return, as I stated heretofore, to the States and the communities—those functions that the States and communities can more adequately look after than the Federal Government can.

TRAINING OUR YOUTH RIGHTLY

Let us look now at another of the challenges of our day. Recently, I heard President Plaza of Ecuador tell how before the second World War, Germany had at Quito built a propaganda school there, where the Ecuadorian children attended and were impacted by the doctrines of Nazism. President Plaza said to antidote that (and I might mention at this point that President Plaza was born in the United States and educated here), he built an American school so that the Ecuadorian leaders of tomorrow would understand the American way of life. This brought to my attention the need for all of us to see to it that our youth are well trained in the American concept and ideas, that they understand our governmental mechanism of checks and balances, our American economic system of free enterprise, and above all, that we recognize the need for high moral standards in the home, in the State, and in the Nation.

THE FOUR ABSOLUTES

Recently, it was my privilege to attend a meeting of Moral Rearmament at Mackinac Island where representatives of various nations attended. There were some very dramatic and inspiring incidents reported there. There was the incident in our own country where a president of a great business organization and a leader of a labor union both told the story of how they had gotten together. How did they do it? They recognized what has been called the four absolutes—honesty, purity, unselfishness, and love. All religions teach these great moralities; but these two men showed how when they applied them in the management-labor relationship, they found a solution that worked so well that the efficiency rating went up from 60 to 120 percent. But more than that, harmony prevailed and life became worth while.

HOW RIGHT IDEAS HAVE BEGUN TO WORK IN GERMANY

An incident was told, too, as regards Germany where the Communists had taken over great labor unions. There, when these four absolutes of honesty, purity, unselfishness, and love became vital in the minds of the labor leaders and management, not only was the strike situation improved and industrial production raised, but the impact of Communist ideas was to a considerable extent antidoted. These incidents could be multiplied many times. They indicate how all of us can make a contribution to the safety, the efficiency, and the worth whiteness of our own American life.

WHAT TRUE LEADERSHIP CONSISTS OF

According to my "book," this kind of higher thinking and acting which has been demonstrated between labor and management here in America and in Europe—clearly indicates the type of higher leadership that is needed so much here and elsewhere. After all, I am speaking to leaders—to men and women, respected in your communities, men and women to whom other officials and private citizens look for guidance. Remember, too, a leader is one who in a crisis can keep his head clear and who when a problem arises, can arrive at the solution of that problem—getting at the solution promptly. We do have problems in this wonderful America of ours, as you so well know. In many of our communities, as indicated by the recent crime exposé, there is need for this morality rebirth to which I have referred. Yes, on every level of our society, there is a call for rededication to these principles.

I should like now to quote from Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT of Arkansas. He had been commenting on the corruption in some of our sports, and he had reported that the inquiry into the RFC had revealed conditions that were terribly unwholesome. Senator FULBRIGHT said:

"It is not unreasonable to ask of men in public office that high standards of conduct be required. It is not too much to ask of them that they do not use a Government lending agency as a dumping ground for their own mistakes in judgment. Is it too much to ask of them that they behave with simple honesty?"

Then he continued with this significant statement:

"The vast majority of great civilizations which have been destroyed was not as the result of external aggression, but as the consequence of domestic corruption. A democracy can recover quickly from physical or economic disaster, but when its moral convictions weaken, it becomes easy prey for the demagog and the charlatan. Tyranny and oppression then become the order of the day."

And so, my friends, you and I know that callousness, smugness, yes, moral blindness, never point toward economic and political health. You and I must therefore become alerted to these dangers. The remedy is to be found in the individual accepting the fact, that his is a position of leadership. I repeat that there is no one here but what in time of crisis, folks will look to you and see what you think, and how you act. We are facing just such a crisis now. I am not in this particular instance talking about the international situation. I am talking, for example, about the danger to our youth, resulting from the impact of the drug peddler—he who would have our youngsters use marijuana, heroin, and morphine. I am talking about our condoning and accepting as inevitable immoralities in our communities and our condoning of looseness and corruption in public officials.

WE NEED MEN OF STRONG CONVICTIONS

Let us return to the days when men had strong convictions. "Convictions on what?" you ask. Convictions about the worth-while-ness of the Republic. Convictions about the worth-while-ness of our economic system. Our economic and political systems are, after all, the best that have ever been evolved by the human race. But the best systems or the best mechanisms do not operate smoothly if they are operated by poor mechanics.

THREE WAYS OF BECOMING AND REMAINING A LEADER

I was talking not long ago to a group, and after I had concluded someone said, "But how does a leader really become a leader?" I told how Lincoln and how thousands of others who had never been known publicly (like these young men that brought about

improvements in labor relations in Germany and elsewhere), how in the midst of critical challenges, they would tell a funny story and get release for their tense nerves and muscles. They understood the value of humor. They were men, too, who didn't hesitate to pray for guidance. They knew that God is available. Remember, Lincoln once said, "When I have no other place to go, I go to my knees." They were men who selflessly, not selfishly, had a great purpose. They were men who dealt honestly with themselves and with others.

We need but look about us today to note this imperative challenge of leadership.

FOILING THE KREMLIN'S PURPOSES

As we view the international situation, we recognize of course that there is a continuing evil attempt on the behalf of the leaders in the Kremlin to take possession and to tyrannically rule the peoples of the earth. The eyes of all of us should by now have been opened as to Politburo's diabolic methods. Americans, some with doctor's degrees and masters degrees, have fallen for their evil line, and have become traitors to their native land. Now, it is our job, yours and mine, to see to it that this America of ours grows in strength—physical, economic, and spiritual—so that the Kremlin's evil purposes will not be accomplished. There is indeed a great goal—a great challenge for each of us. To do that we must become adequate personally, and if we follow these four absolutes or directives—honesty, purity, unselfishness, and love—we can't help but become better citizens. And if we become better citizens, we can't in turn help but become more adequate in our day-to-day relations. If this happens to you and me, then opportunities open up to us to serve God and country. This Nation has been called to a position of high leadership. Whether we will be competent in that leadership depends upon whether 154,000,000 people will raise not only their economic standards, but their moral and their spiritual standards. If those standards are raised, then direction will be given us and we will maintain our leadership and our freedoms. If we fail to grow in grace, then that which happened to other nations that were called unto leadership—but which were not adequate—may happen to us.

I HAVE FAITH IN AMERICAN PEOPLE

I have faith that just as when we are challenged to war, we center our energies and our all to fight the aggressor, so too, I have faith that the American people are becoming alerted to this challenge. They recognize the need of not only rededicating their physical energies to make America adequate, but of rededicating themselves to a spiritual rebirth so that true leadership will be ours.

Speech by Hon. Harold H. Velde, of Illinois, on Communism in UE and FE Labor Unions in Chicagoland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to set forth the speech of my colleague, Representative HAROLD VELDE, of Illinois:

Mr. Speaker, the Un-American Activities Committee has, during the past 2 years, con-

ducted many hearings on the subject of the Communist infiltration into labor unions. These investigations and hearings have in the past been greatly concerned with the United Electrical Workers Union, formerly of the CIO. The testimony of Matt Cvetic, of the Pittsburgh area, along with several other reliable witnesses, proved definitely to the committee that the leadership of the UEW was almost entirely composed of members of the Communist Party. In spite of the fact that extensive publicity was given to this Communist conspiracy, the UEW union still flourishes in many sections of the country. One of its strongholds is in the Chicago area, where big industry flourishes, and there are a great number of farm machinery and electrical industries.

Our committee has previously studied the influence of this Communist-infested union in the New England States, Pennsylvania, and New York, but has not at this time made any extensive investigations into the union's manipulations in the Chicago area. I am happy to report that such investigation will shortly be under way. I hope that the investigations carried on will be followed by public hearings of the Un-American Activities Committee. Our committee investigators will also look into the manner in which elections for union representation are held and methods used by the United Electrical Workers Union in campaigning for these plant elections. It is interesting to note that both the UEW Union and the Farm Equipment Workers Union were, on November 2, 1949, expelled from the CIO by its executive board as Communist-infested unions, but neither this action nor the action of the Un-American Activities Committee has effectively stopped the actions of the Communist Party in seizing control of the labor movement. In addition to the widespread publicity given to these hearings, Congress cited for contempt several of the leaders of the UEW Union. It is difficult for me to understand, in view of all the evidence of subversive activity in these unions, why they are so successful in winning plant elections in the Chicago area.

One of the most effective workers in carrying on the Communist Party doctrine in labor unions in Chicago has been Grant Oakes, former president of the Farm Equipment Workers Union which has merged with the United Electrical Workers Union. The special Committee on Un-American Activities in 1944 published the following report on Mr. Oakes:

"Sidney Hillman has enlisted the aid of Grant Oakes, president of the United Farm Equipment and Metal Workers of America, in support of the CIO Political Action Committee. Oakes was among those who addressed the national conference of the CIO Political Action Committee on January 14, 1944, at the Park Central Hotel in New York City, which was organized by Hillman and at which he was the keynote speaker.

"From his experience as Associate Director General in the Office of Production Management, when Grant Oakes led the disastrous strike in the International Harvester Co., handling millions of dollars worth of war contracts, and from his experience as one of the founders and leaders of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, Hillman must be fully aware that Grant Oakes has consistently carried out the biddings of the Communist Party.

"Grant Oakes was elected to the national council of the American Peace Mobilization in Chicago in September 1940 on a program which called for 'repeal of the Conscription Act,' 'repeal of the Alien Registration Act,' 'defeat of legislation to outlaw strikes,' 'keeping the United States out of war,' and 'withdrawal of all aid to Great Britain. The Communist Party of the United States launched this organization in accordance with the

pact of 1939 between Stalin and Hitler. Oakes and his associates incited the strike at the International Harvester Corp plant which produced tractors for the United States Army in order to cripple the national defense program which was in keeping with the policies of the American Peace Mobilization and the Communist Party during that period.

"Describing the strike at the huge tractor plant at 2600 West Thirty-first Street, employing 6,500 men, the Chicago Daily News of January 29, 1941, page 1, declared: 'The walk-out began when the Farm Equipment Workers Organizing Committee (CIO) broke off negotiations * * * No formal strike call accompanied the walk-out, but pickets with placards and flags began a march in front of the plant's gates as the men walked out.'

"Grant Oakes, the leader of the International Harvester strike, was following a carefully prepared plan to stop production in the plant. When the company sought to continue negotiations, Oakes scornfully rejected 'endless conferences.' He issued the following warning to Government officials who sought to end the strike: 'It should be clearly understood that the strikers will strongly resent any repetition of the one-sided mediation such as occurred in the Vultee strike * * * (Daily Worker, February 7, 1941, p. 1).'

"He even went so far as to warn President Roosevelt of violent consequences if the plant was opened, holding out the possibility that these workers will 'line the morgue tomorrow, with their blood on Chicago streets,' and held out the gruesome prospect of 'mass murder' (Daily Worker, March 22, 1941, p. 5).

"The Daily Worker spoke in glowing terms of the strike led by Grant Oakes. In an editorial on February 1, 1941, page 6, the Communist organ declared: 'In the snowy winter morning pickets parade before the strike-bound Chicago Tractor Works of the International Harvester Co. * * * This pageant of the militant labor movement is a reply to the prevalent war economy.'

"Grant Oakes and his fellow strikers, who formed a delegation to the meeting of the American Peace Mobilization, which took place on April 5, 1941, in New York City, were hailed as veritable heroes by the thousands of Communists there assembled (Daily Worker, March 29, 1941, p. 2).

"Almost simultaneously with the German-American Bund, the McCormick local of the Farm Equipment Workers Organizing Committee 'adopted a scorching resolution against the Roosevelt war-dictatorship bill (H. R. 1776), which declared that the measure would give the President more power than Benito Mussolini' (Daily Worker, February 7, 1941, p. 3).

"The Daily Worker of March 9, 1941, page 3, reported an interview with Oakes in which he 'hinted that strikes may be called in other Harvester plants,' with the added explanation that 'leaders of the Farm Equipment Workers Organizing Committee were inclined to think that the strike will be won on the picket line and called for mass mobilizations * * *'

"The American Youth Congress was outstandingly active in the American Peace Mobilization against conscription and the national defense program. The executive board and the shop stewards of local 101 of the Farm Equipment Workers Organizing Committee expressed 'both sympathy and support for the program of the American Youth Congress' (Daily Worker, January 25, 1941, p. 5).

"The Communist Party has organized a number of May Day parades in Chicago during which it mobilizes its full support behind its current programs and slogans. Grant Oakes was a member of the provisional May day committee in 1929 and a speaker during the parade and the demonstration which

followed (Daily Record, April 15, 1939, p. 3; April 29, 1938, p. 1).

"Grant Oakes endorsed the Daily Worker in its most recent drive for readers (Worker, January 9, 1944, p. 6). From the exceptionally large number of Hillman's CIO Political Action Committee associates who have recently joined the drive to spread the Daily Worker, it is apparent that they look upon this Communist newspaper as one of the CIO Political Action Committee's house organs.

"Oakes was a delegate to the 1943 CIO convention in Philadelphia."

Following this report I am reminded that in the spring of 1948 Grant Oakes, acting as president of the Farm Equipment Workers Union was busily engaged in my home district of Peoria, Ill., managing a strike at the huge Caterpillar Tractor Co. there. Working in connection with local Communist Party members who were likewise officials in the FEW local, which was then the bargaining representative at the Caterpillar plant, he was able to tie up operations of this plant for a considerable period of time. An investigation into the manipulations of Grant Oakes and his cohorts will certainly lead to the uncovering of several Reds and subversives in the Peoria area.

An investigation into the Communist activities in labor unions in the Chicago area cannot help but lead up to an investigation into communism in education and other fields in that area. The Communist Party of Illinois has, for a long time, been attempting to extend its operations into State government and many of the Federal agencies located in Chicago as well. In this connection I am reminded of a speech I made here on the floor of the House in December 1950 in which I advised the Members that Communist propaganda was being issued and distributed by the Communist Party of Illinois with headquarters at 208 North Wells Street, Chicago. This literature was being distributed to young men of draft age, chiefly among college and university students. The literature was designed to leave the impression with all readers that our entry into the Korean conflict was a mistake, and advocated that our Government desist from its imperialistic act of aggression. In that speech I asked that an objective study and report of the extent of communism in the State of Illinois be made. Shortly thereafter I received a communication from my good friend Illinois State Senator Paul Broyles, stating that he was contemplating introducing several bills of anti-Communist nature in the State legislature upon its convening in January of 1951. Among these bills was one to establish an antiseeditious investigating committee, the purpose of which would be to investigate communism and other subversive activities in the Illinois colleges and universities, as well as other institutions in the State of Illinois. Senator Broyles did introduce such a bill and it was passed by both branches of the Illinois State Legislature, only to be vetoed later by Gov. Adlai Stevenson.

Although I had received many requests from citizens in the State of Illinois asking that an objective investigation of communism be made by the Un-American Activities Committee, I felt that this was a matter which could properly be handled by the investigating committee which was to be set up under Illinois law, had such legislation been approved by Governor Stevenson. Now, the Governor having seen fit to stymie such an investigation by his veto of the Broyles bill, it becomes incumbent upon our congressional committee to make the much-desired investigation.

Chicago has long been recognized as the midwestern headquarters of the Communist Party, and a great many nefarious operations of that party have been promoted by those in charge at the Communist Party

headquarters at 208 Wells Street in Chicago. I had the opportunity to witness the manipulations of the Communist Party of Illinois when I was assigned to the Chicago field office of the FBI as a special agent in 1945. While I played only a small part in counter-espionage and sabotage activities there, I learned that much of the investigative work carried on by the Chicago field division under the very able direction of J. Edgar Hoover was directed toward countering the activities of the Communist Party. A good many agents were assigned at that time to investigate the activities of Soviet espionage agents working to obtain secrets from scientists at the University of Chicago.

Chicago is a great industrial center. Chicago is also a great educational center, containing more than half of the student population of the State of Illinois. The University of Chicago was designated by the Manhattan Engineering Project as a center for research on the atomic bomb during World War II. It was here that the now-famous espionage agent, Arthur Adams, concentrated a great many of his espionage activities on behalf of the Soviet Government. It was at the University of Chicago where Clarence Hiskey was employed under the supervision of Dr. Harold Urey, an atomic scientist working there. A great deal of information is already in the records and files of the Un-American Activities Committee regarding the case of Clarence Hiskey. There is also a great deal of information concerning the Communist-front organizations of Dr. Harold Urey. Then, too, we note that in the famous Canadian and English espionage case involving Dr. Allan Nunn May that the University of Chicago was frequently mentioned. It is believed by many that the pure uranium which was stolen by Dr. May came from the University of Chicago laboratories.

In speaking of communistic influences at the University of Chicago, I want to make it clear that it is not the only major American university which has been a subject of the vicious schemes of the Soviet and American Communist Party. We know that the Communist Party made attempts to obtain secrets from the University of California which was also designated as a center of atomic research by the Manhattan Engineering Project. Practically every college and university in the country has felt the impact of Communist manipulations. The Communists have been especially adept at infiltrating into educational centers where the policy has been to allow the utmost latitude and liberality in teaching and learning. Officials of the University of Chicago have, in the past, brought out the fact very plainly that the policy of the university is to allow such latitude and liberalism. The officials have sought to bring the broadest interpretation of the freedom-of-speech clause of our Constitution to bear in its educational processes. No one can blame any college official, instructor, or student for furthering such a policy. It occurs to me, however, that ever since the famous Alonzo Stagg left the University of Chicago as its head coach, and the athletic program was relegated to a practical nullity, that left-wing and pseudo-liberal teaching and thinking has flourished. The Communist Party of America and the Soviet representatives in this country have used this so-called liberal and free-thinking policy of the University of Chicago, as well as other famous American universities such as Harvard, to further their plans for political and economic revolution in America. I do not mean to indicate by my remarks that the general run of students at the University of Chicago are at all disloyal. I do feel certain 99 percent of the faculty, students and alumni of the University are sincere, patriotic Americans. We have in the past, however, witnessed the sad spectacle of an extremely small and a parently harmless element of Soviet-inspired citizens taking

control of whole segments of our American society. I want to make sure that it doesn't happen again, and especially to one of the greatest American educational institutions in existence.

In 1949 the Illinois Seditious Activities Investigation Commission made an attempt to investigate and study the influence of the Communist Party at the University of Chicago and Roosevelt College. This commission held hearings from March 9, 1949 until May of that year. During this time the following persons were called to testify: Dr. Robert Maynard Hutchins, chancellor of the University of Chicago; John Madison, Jr., a newspaperman, Paul Lerman, a student at the University of Chicago; Elias Snitzer, president at that time of the Communist Club at the University of Chicago; Dr. Edward J. Sparling, president of Roosevelt College in Chicago; Dean John B. Thompson, dean of Rockefeller Chapel at the University of Chicago, Representative G. W. Horsley of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois; Howard Rushmore, magazine and newspaper writer; Mr. Laird Bell, chairman of the board of trustees of the University of Chicago; Prof. Ernest W. Burgess, Prof. Robert J. Havighurst, Prof. Malcolm Sharp, Prof. R. G. Tugwell, and Prof. Harold C. Urey, all of the University of Chicago.

Time will not permit me to go into all of the testimony that was adduced by this commission; however I should like to briefly comment on the testimony of Dr. Hutchins, who in his very first statement says: "The subpoena which I have received summons me to testify concerning subversive activities at the University of Chicago. This is a leading question and the answer is assumed in the question. I cannot testify concerning subversive activities at the University of Chicago because there are none." Subsequently this once-famous educator admitted that there had been chartered by the university what was known as the Communist Club. Later, relative to this Communist Club, Dr. Hutchins states: "The real purpose of the Communist Club is to subvert the Government of the United States and it is inconsistent with the purposes of the university. Then too, the purpose of the Communist Club is to come together and study and discuss communism and the university believes in free discussion and study of all important subjects." It is interesting to note that during the Illinois commission hearings Senator Broyles received a telegram from the then president of the Communist Club, dated March 10, 1949, which reads as follows:

"In a Communist club meeting of over 40 students of University of Chicago a unanimous vote was taken to protest both the Broyles bills and the investigation of our university. The members of the Communist club along with hundreds of students on our campus cannot accept the idiotic definition of communism stated in the bill. We wish to emphatically state that no commission will ever 'wipe the Communist club off the campus of the university.' We will continue to fight for students' rights as laid down in the National Students Association Bill of Rights and continue to bring Marxism, Leninism to the campus. Your intended smear campaign will only make us fight harder and more consistently toward the fulfillment of our goal. We further realize that you are not coming to our campus merely to destroy the Communists club but also to destroy all overprogressive elements on our campus. This fact is fully realized by most of Chicago's students who have formed a campus-wide coalition at a meeting of over 1,500 students to protest the Broyles bills and the activities of your commission

"ELIAS SNITZER,
"President of the Communist Club."

Now, I ask you, was Chancellor Hutchins' statement that he knew of no subversive activities on the University of Chicago campus correct? In all credit to Dr. Hutchins, who shortly after these hearings resigned his position, I must say that every attempt was made to disenfranchise the Communist club at the University of Chicago. I hope that if an investigation is made by our Un-American Activities Committee, our committee will be able to issue a report saying that Communist and other subversive activities at the University of Chicago are on the decline or have been totally suppressed.

The great majority of loyal students and alumni of the University of Chicago desire that their Alma Mater be again looked upon as one of the great American universities. They feel, I am sure, that the true facts of Communist infiltration should be brought out into the open in a manner consistent with the right of free speech, and the freedom of academic thought and teaching being fully protected. While I received a great number of letters requesting such an investigation, I believe that the following excerpt from a letter of a student at the University of Chicago illustrates the attitude of most students there. I cannot reveal the name of this student as he asked that it be kept confidential, but here is an excerpt from his letter.

"Let me say that as a student in the university I think that such an investigation is long overdue and a surprising number of students agree with me. It is not so much the fact that there are a lot of Communists on the campus, for in reality I think that there are very few; but rather, that the entire campus is geared to a socialistic atmosphere. This permeates the faculty and is forced upon the students at every turn. It is especially dangerous because of the fact that we have a great many very young students (14 to 18 years) in the undergraduate school. I could supply you with reams of material bearing out what I have said should you desire it; however, in the meantime I am enclosing under separate cover, a copy of the Maroon, the university student newspaper. I will leave it to your discretion to determine of what 'rainbow-omic' view this publication is. I am only writing this letter because I can see that the seeds which are being sown here at the university, if permitted to go unchecked, could grow and undermine the very foundation of this Nation."

I sincerely hope that the proposed investigation by the Un-American Activities Committee of communism in Illinois will have the support of the patriotic citizens of that State who have knowledge of subversive operations. I am particularly anxious to secure the cooperation of the board of trustees of the University of Chicago, Roosevelt College, and all the other educational institutions in the State of Illinois. I feel certain that such cooperation will be forthcoming as it is certainly to the best interest of all citizens that such an investigation be made.

Condemned to Perpetual Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, according to reports, eight members of the joint committee of the Senate have issued a

statement concerning the long-drawn-out hearings on foreign policy, emphasizing some of the very important issues and particularly with reference to far-eastern policy.

Many of us have watched with great interest the developments and the discussions that have occurred as a result of the hearings.

There have been many issues pointed up as a beacon light because of their importance to our future welfare, as well as the differences of opinion that apparently exists. That this whole discussion has been brought before the American people as a forum seems to me to be invaluable. It is obviously the best way to bring these various issues into the open and before the people.

An appropriate and pertinent discussion of some of these issues in this eight-man document occurred in an editorial of the Washington Post today. In that it discusses so clearly the facts, I ask unanimous consent to include it in the RECORD:

EIGHT REPUBLICANS

A few of the outstanding points in the eight-man Republican document on the MacArthur hearings which call for correction are:

1. That the failure of the United States promptly to deliver arms and munitions to Chiang Kai-shek was responsible for his downfall. This is a travesty of the history which is now part of the record. Much American material was left to pile up in Shanghai, and much of the remainder was bartered to the Communists in return for safe surrender. In other words, Chiang became the "supply sergeant" for the Communists, as he was called in China. Even General Wedemeyer said the Communists could have been stopped at the Yangtze "with broomsticks" if there had been any will to fight on the part of Chiang's Nationalists.

The point is extremely important in connection with future policy. On analogy the fresh supplies that are being sent to Chiang Kai-shek are likely as not to have much the same fate as the old supplies. This would be inevitable if there were an invasion of the mainland. And that is what Chiang wants—as a Chiang-American operation. Our policy does not yet envisage this, yet—again on analogy—the possibility exists of such a development in our Formosa policy. Policy on Formosa started out as neutralization and shaded quickly into defense, and, before we know it, the defense policy may shade into support of a Chiang landing.

It will be a sad day when our country helps peoples or governments who, as has been proved by Chiang's government, cannot or will not help themselves. The United States will wind up with "old men of the sea" on its back crushing the life out of its taxpayers.

2. That there is authoritative evidence of Russian domination of Communist China as far back as 1945.

Nothing of the sort. Everything that Gen. Patrick Hurley said contradicted this thesis. The authoritative evidence all jibes with Col. Robert R. McCormick's testimony on his visit to China in 1947. The rebellion against Chiang Kai-shek, he said, "is falsely called a Communist insurrection. Although Communist backed, it is still a bona fide insurrection against a government which is little more than an agency of the Soong family."

Nobody can be positive about the present tie between Moscow and Peking, but a tenable theory on the part of the officials in close touch with the negotiations at Kaesong is that there are the beginnings of a rift.

General Ridgway furthermore has gone so far as to say, in a talk with Bert Andrews of the New York Herald Tribune, that our national destiny depends upon our driving a wedge between Peking and Moscow. It would be the height of folly on the part of our policymakers, at any rate, to go on the assumption that Moscow and Peking will always be one and indivisible.

3 Any settlement south of the Yalu would constitute a Communist victory.

Nonsense. The purpose of the military action taken under the aegis of the United Nations was to defeat aggression—to push the aggressor back where he came from. When that is accomplished, and a satisfactory agreement on such a basis achieved, the aims of the UN action will have been accomplished. General Ridgway has said that that would be a tremendous victory, and those who are not suffering from a partisan myopia will agree with him.

The reverse side of this eight-man comment—namely, that victory is the end of this or any other war action—is equally fallacious. By this is meant that only unconditional surrender can mark the end of hostilities. Battles are fought to victory, but a war should be fought to a settlement if we are going to have a world fit to live in. It was the cardinal mistake in the First and Second World Wars that we forgot this golden rule. Under such a contrary policy as the GOP members advocate, the world would be condemned to perpetual warfare.

The Plight of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a resolution which was unanimously adopted at a mass meeting held at the Municipal Building in South Boston, Mass., by the Boston Chapter of the American-Lithuanian Council, on June 16, 1951.

The resolution follows:

Resolution unanimously adopted at a mass meeting held at the Municipal Building, South Boston, Mass., on June 16, 1951, under the auspices of the American-Lithuanian Council, Boston Chapter, in protest and commemoration of the following tragedies which have befallen Lithuania and its people: (1) Eleventh anniversary of the re-subjugation of Lithuania; and (2) decennial of the first horrible deportations from Lithuania, when, during one night, the bolshevik secret police—NKVD—arrested and carried off to the frigid wastes of Siberia 40,000 innocent Lithuanians:

"Whereas the Soviet Union, relying upon the spurious Ribbentrop-Molotov pact of August 23, 1939, and in disregard of all treaties and agreements with Lithuania, including the peace treaty of 1920, the non-aggression pact of 1926, and the Mutual Assistance Pact of 1939, did occupy Lithuania by most brutal means and did subject Lithuania to a most cruel oppression; and

"Whereas the Soviet Union, in furtherance of its designs to implant communism in Lithuania and throughout the world, and being unable to bend the resistance of Lith-

uania to its will, has embarked upon a relentless and unprecedented policy to eradicate the Lithuanian Nation, as attested by the fact that it has already deported or annihilated over 800,000 Lithuanians, which constitutes over 30 percent of the entire Lithuanian people: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That said re-subjugation and genocide being practiced in Lithuania is sorely protested, decried, and deplored; and further be it

"Resolved, That the attention of the United Nations, and of the whole cultured world be directed to the plight of blood-soaked Lithuania, and all effective means be solicited to block the ravisher of Lithuania and to expose him to the nations of the world; and further be it

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to all Congressmen and Senators of the United States, to the representatives in Washington, D. C., of the Governments of Great Britain, France, Italy, Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Finland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Spain, Portugal, Belgium, and to the press."

AMERICAN-LITHUANIAN COUNCIL,
BOSTON CHAPTER.

ALEXANDER CHAPLIK, *Chairman*.
J. JANUNIN, *Secretary*.

Farm Management Aspect of Variety Selection in Rice Production in Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, in the August issue of the Louisiana Rural Economist, published by the department of agricultural economics, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, there appears an article by Mr. Troy Mullins, which will be of much interest to the rice industry in which my congressional district in Louisiana has a major role. The article follows:

FARM MANAGEMENT ASPECT OF VARIETY SELECTION IN RICE PRODUCTION IN LOUISIANA

(By Troy Mullins)

The choice of varieties of rice to plant is an annually recurring question confronting rice farmers. As is true of other management problems the amount of consideration given this question varies widely among operators. Force of habit and personal likes are the principal determinants for some operators, whereas other operators closely observe the results of experimental tests and of farmers' experience with new varieties or strains and take immediate advantage of those which have superior qualities. Fortunately, the trends in the production of various varieties during recent years as well as information obtained from farmers indicate that the latter is more common among rice farmers in Louisiana.

In the selection of rice varieties consideration must be given to such factors as relative yields, insect and disease resistance, milling quality, consumer preference, prospective prices, comparative costs of production, and to timeliness in the performance of key operations such as seeding, watering, and harvesting.

An analysis of the more important aspects of this problem, and an appraisal of the effects of different varieties on incomes, under varying situations relative to source of water and tenure status of the operator, are presented in this report. Data obtained for the 1949 crop season for 208 rice farms of various sizes throughout the rice area of Louisiana provide the basis for this analysis.

VARIETY CHARACTERISTICS RELATED TO MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

From the standpoint of management practices the important variety characteristics are related to: (1) time of maturity, (2) type of grain, and (3) adaptability to harvesting with a combine.

MATURITY DATES

The length of time required from seeding to maturity is largely an inherent characteristic which varies considerably by varieties. However, the date of seeding a given variety will have some effect on the date of maturity. Varieties of rice may be grouped into three major classes in regard to the usual time of maturity—early, intermediate, and late. In Louisiana, Zenith, which requires an average of 125 to 130 days between seeding and maturity, is the most popular early variety. Fortuna, Bluebonnet, and Blue Rose, which require about 140–155 days, are the main intermediate varieties. Rexoro, which requires about 170 days to mature, accounts for practically all production of late rice in Louisiana.

During recent years the proportion of acreage devoted to early- and late-maturing rice has increased, while the midseason varieties have declined in importance. During the 1935–39 period only 11 percent of the Louisiana crop was seeded to early varieties, whereas in 1950 these varieties accounted for 52 percent. The proportion of the acreage seeded to late varieties for these respective periods was 8 and 25 percent.

The usual relation of planting and harvesting date for the different varieties is presented in figure 1, which shows the period during which a large proportion of the acreage of each group of varieties was planted and harvested in 1949. This chart was compiled from the reported planting and harvesting dates for the acreage of the different varieties grown on the farms surveyed. The planting dates for a particular group of varieties were spread over a somewhat longer period than were the harvesting dates for the same group of varieties. This is because early seedings require a slightly longer growing period than do late seedings. For example, experiments at the Rice Experiment Station, Crowley, La., in which seedings were made at approximately 15-day intervals between March 17 and June 15 during the 6-year period 1933–38, show that Early Prolific rice reached maturity within an average of 119 days when seeded on June 15 compared with 143 days for March 17 seedings, or an average difference of 24 days. Other varieties showed similar variations in length of growing periods. Therefore, special attention must be given to selection of varieties, time allowed between seedings, and order in which the early, midseason, and late maturing varieties are seeded so as to spread the harvest season and yet permit timely harvest. This problem applies primarily to medium-sized and large farms.

GRAIN TYPES

Practically all of the rice produced in Louisiana is of the medium- and long-grain types. This has been the situation since rice production was started in the State. Zenith is the major medium-length grain variety, and Rexoro is the principal long-grain variety.

During recent years a marked shift has occurred in the relative importance of the

medium- and long-grain types. During the 1935-39 period 87 percent of the Louisiana crop was of the medium grain types, whereas in 1950 they made up only 54 percent of the acreage. The proportion of the acreage devoted to the long-grain varieties increased from 13 percent during the 1935-39 period to 46 percent in 1950.

Several factors have contributed to these shifts in production. Price differentials, which vary because of changes in market conditions, frequently are relatively favorable for certain varieties. For example, during the 1948 marketing season the price of rough rice for Rexoro averaged about 50 percent above the respective price for Zenith. In 1949 prices for Rexoro averaged about 32 percent above prices for Zenith, which is considered more nearly the normal relationship between the prices of these varieties. Distribution of the acreage of rice in 1949 by varieties on the farms surveyed is shown in table 1. About 80 percent of the farmers interviewed planted part or all of their acreage of rice to Zenith and about 30 percent planted Rexoro. Approximately 55 percent of the rice acreage on these farms was in early-maturing varieties, 23 percent in mid-season varieties, and 22 percent in late varieties. A large proportion of farmers, especially operators of medium-sized and large farms, seeded more than one variety.

RELATION OF VARIETIES TO METHOD OF HARVEST

During recent years the adaptability of varieties to combine harvesting and artificial drying has been of increasing importance in the farmers' choice of varieties. For example, the experience in drying Blue Rose has not been entirely satisfactory and the recent decline in acreage seeded to it is largely attributable to this fact.

The relation of harvesting method to the distribution of varieties according to time of maturity is shown in table 2. Farmers who have shifted to the combine method of harvesting apparently have increased the proportion of their acreage seeded to the late-maturing varieties primarily at the expense of midseason varieties.

New varieties are being introduced after they have proved satisfactory in the intensive breeding program carried on at the Rice Experiment Station located at Croyley, La., and at similar stations located in other rice-producing States. For example, the Zenith variety was introduced about 12 years ago and because of its earliness, its adaptability to artificial drying, its milling qualities, and favorable per-acre yields, it has practically displaced the early prolific variety throughout the southern rice-producing areas.

ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF VARIETY SELECTION

The previous discussion was concerned mainly with varietal characteristics as they relate to management problems. Other factors are important, however, particularly the prospective market outlook for rough rice of the different varieties as reflected in prices received, the average yield relationships; and the relative costs of production. The effects of any one of these factors alone cannot be determined, but in a general way the approximate combined effect of all of the factors may be estimated. The difference in income from different varieties will depend upon the tenure status of the operator both from the standpoint of ownership of the land and the water used for irrigation. Approximately 70 percent of the rice acreage surveyed was grown by operators who paid a fifth of the crop as land rent. About two-thirds of the rice acreage was operated under contracts requiring a fifth of the crop in payment for water.

The estimated returns from a representative medium-grain early-maturing variety

(Zenith) and a long-grain variety (Rexoro) for operators having different tenure status with respect to both land and water are presented in table 3. This summary is applicable to the 1949 season and is based on the information obtained from 208 farmers. It takes into account yields, prices received, labor costs, and pumping costs (for operators who own their water supply).

Production for each variety is based on average yields, at the Rice Experiment Station during the 8-year period (1941-48), of 13 barrels for Zenith and 11 barrels for Rexoro. In addition to land and water rent, the direct operating expenses—which include costs of materials, services, and labor—were included in these calculations (see table 3, footnote 2). Overhead costs such as depreciation on buildings and machinery, interest on capital invested, taxes, management services, and miscellaneous items have not been accounted for. However, the cost of these items would not vary by varieties.

After deducting the land and water rent and the materials and labor costs, the estimated per acre returns to share tenants for management and overhead, based on 1949 price-cost relationships, is \$16.80 for Zenith rice and \$18.98 for Rexoro, or a difference of slightly over \$2 an acre. The value of the shares going to the land and to the water also is increased by about 10 percent. If the operator owns the land he farms and pays a fifth of his rice for water his estimated returns to land, management, and overhead would be slightly over \$32 per acre for Zenith and about \$36 for Rexoro.

If the operator pumps his irrigation water from a well on his farm he receives an additional one-fifth of the crop but the advantage to growing late-season rice is slightly less than \$3 per acre compared with \$3.63 per acre when the operator pays a fifth of the rice for water. This difference results from the fact that it is necessary to keep the late-maturing varieties flooded about 130 days, compared with 85 days for early maturing varieties. The estimates of operating costs for maintaining water on the rice are based on the use of fuel-burning engines. This type of power unit is used on a major portion of the wells in the area.

This analysis relates to relative prices of Zenith and Rexoro for the 1949 crop. The differences would vary by season. Farmers can use this analysis to determine the most profitable variety by adjusting these estimates to fit their individual situations.

TABLE 1.—Distribution of farms and acreage of rice, by varieties, classified by time of maturity¹

Varieties by length of growing season	Farms reporting		Acres of rice	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Early—125 days				
Zenith	171	82	16,155	46
Magnolia	38	18	3,146	9
Other	8	3	222	0
Subtotal	217		19,523	55
Mid-Season—140 to 155 days				
Blue Rose ²	39	19	2,698	8
Fortuna	34	16	2,681	8
Bluebonnet	24	12	1,781	5
Other	10	4	621	2
Subtotal	107		7,784	23
Late—170 days Rexoro	64	30	7,506	22
Total			34,849	100

¹ Based on data obtained for the 1949 crop from 208 farmers in Louisiana.

² Blue Rose matures in approximately 155 days. All other varieties in this group mature in about 140 days.

TABLE 2.—Relation of method of harvest to varieties classified by time of maturity

Method of harvest	Proportion of acreage by variety [Percent]			
	Early	Mid season	Late	Total
Binder	60	35	5	100
Combine	55	19	26	100

TABLE 3.—Estimated relative returns per acre for an early and a late maturing variety of rice

Item	Variety of rice		Difference Rexoro over Zenith
	Zenith	Rexoro	
Income			
Gross value of production ¹	78.00	85.25	7.25
Costs			
Land rent (one-fifth of crop)	15.60	17.05	1.45
Water rent (one-fifth of crop)	15.60	17.05	1.45
Materials, services, and labor costs ²	30.00	32.17	2.17
Estimated returns to—			
Tenant operator renting land and water ³	16.80	18.98	2.18
Owner operator renting water only ⁴	32.40	36.03	3.63
Owner operator renting neither land nor water ⁵	43.53	46.39	2.86

¹ Based on average yields during 8 years (1941-48) at rice experiment station of 13 barrels for Zenith and 11 barrels for Rexoro (see table 2, Louisiana Experiment Station Bulletin 436) and average prices received for these varieties by 208 farms during 1949 season (\$6 per barrel for Zenith and \$7.75 per barrel for Rexoro).

² Includes materials such as seed, fertilizer, herbicide, fuel, oil, grease, service fees (drying seed treatment, etc.) and labor valued at prevailing wage rates but does not include a charge for interest and depreciation on machinery, other overhead items and management. Harvesting performed by operator owned combine.

³ Return to tenant for management and overhead.

⁴ Return to operator for land, management and overhead.

⁵ Return to operator for land, water, management and overhead. Estimated operating cost for pumping and spreading water (does not include depreciation or interest on investment in well and pumping equipment) \$4.47 per acre for early rice and \$6.69 per acre for late rice.

Flags Aid Russian Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Drew Pearson, from today's Washington Post:

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

FLAGS AID RUSSIAN PROPAGANDA

EN ROUTE THROUGH EUROPE.—Europe today is a study in contrasts—contrasts between east and west, contrasts between this continent and the United States of America. Here are some scenes which, though I have left them, remain vividly etched on my mind.

Scene I—East Berlin: As you walk behind the Iron Curtain through the bomb-ridden city of East Berlin you are struck with the way Moscow has played up the thing that appeals most to men's hearts.

Flags are everywhere. Between every German, Chinese, Czech, Korean, Hungarian

flag is the blue and white flag of peace. Atop every pillar also squats the dove of peace—a plump, dumpy dove, a little too smug and self-satisfied to sit surveying the stark remnants of what was once Berlin—but nevertheless, a constant reminder that the Soviet Union supposedly craves peace.

And at the base of every pillar are featured the international words for peace—"paz—mir—paix—beke—peace."

Over and over again are repeated these words, the words every soldier loves, the words every nationality can read and understand—peace.

In telling contrast are featured the words of President Truman, Secretary Marshall, Dean Acheson, warning of the danger of war, warning that we must prepare for war.

It was international propaganda at its most effective, most deceptive best. And despite the State Department's valiant though limited counterpropaganda, hundreds of thousands of the two million youngsters who attended the Berlin youth rally must have gone home with the impression that the United States of America was the big bad ogre of the world today, with the U. S. S. R. their only hope for peace.

Scene II—The United States Senate. Senator McKELLAR, Democrat of Tennessee, aged 88, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, is listening sleepily to State Department testimony regarding its budget. George W. Perkins, aged 56, son of a J. P. Morgan partner, Chief of European Affairs, and not exactly the Communist-type McCarthy alleges runs the State Department, is testifying regarding the need for more funds to run the United States Embassy in Communist Poland.

The Senators want to know why it will cost more next year than last. Perkins explains that the battle against communism has become more intense, also that the Embassy lost money last year through the depreciation of the Polish zloty.

"Young man," glowered Senator McKELLAR, "will you tell me under what article of the United States Constitution or by what law of Congress you have the right to go out and tamper with another nation's currency?"

It is this same Senator McKELLAR, using his deep insight into international affairs, who influences how much money the State Department can have to combat communism.

Scene III—Also the United States Senate: Senator McCARRAN, Democrat, Nevada, aged 75, is listening to Assistant Secretary of State Barrett testify regarding the Voice of America and the importance of selling the United States to the rest of the world. McCARRAN keeps wider awake than his colleague from Tennessee. He even admits that Barrett puts up a plausible argument. Finally, however, he concludes:

"I would hate to answer for the spending of all this money to prevent war, when I feel sure war is inevitable."

Scene IV—Back in Berlin: The studio of radio station RIAS, operated by the State Department in the western sector:

A group of East German youngsters have crowded into the RIAS studio. Supposedly Communists, and attending the Communist youth rally, they want to see the radio station they have been listening to across the iron curtain in East Germany.

Before the microphone come various RIAS radio performers—first a singer. She gets a terrific round of applause. Then comes a political commentator who every night takes gibes at Soviet operations in East Germany. He too is gleefully recognized by the youthful audience.

They know their RIAS radio performers as an American audience knows its Jack Benny or Milton Berle. It's a recognition that can come only from listening.

These youngsters are the future generation of Germany—the kids who will really decide whether communism stays or goes, who will fight or fraternize with American boys in the war that Senator McCARRAN says is inevitable.

Yet Senator McCARRAN, an old man of 75, who won't have to fight, and Senator McKELLAR, now 88, say the State Department's radio program is wasted money, poured out on empty ether.

1876 Diamond Jubilee—1951 What You Should Know About Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, if majestic splendor alone would strike music from rock and rill, Colorado, in its lofty grandeur up near the clouds, would have no need for the feeble voice of man. However, not even the peerless vistas of the mother of mountains has voice to sing, so antlike man, awed and inspired by the green carpeted uplift of snow-capped mountain and white water rushing to the plain beneath, must give vent to praise.

Man stands at first spellbound amid Colorado crag and dale, hushed by the bounty and beauty of God's handiwork which dwarfs all the stone piled upon stone by which man has measured his advancement from the garden of nature. Yet, the matchless pattern before his eyes moves his voice to songs of praise. One such song, inspired by Colorado's beauty, from the pen of the late Carrie Jacobs Bond, comes to mind:

Oh beautiful, for spacious skies,
For amber waves of grain,
For purple mountains majesty above the
fringed plain

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Middle Park Times, of Kremmling, Colo., and I call it to the attention of the Members as an accounting of that which is Colorado as the Centennial State celebrates 75 years of statehood:

WHAT DO YOU KNOW ABOUT COLORADO?

1. Colorado Territory was formed in 1861 and Lincoln appointed William Gilpin as first Territorial Governor. The population then was 25,331. In the Civil War Colorado Territory supported the Union cause.

2. On August 1, 1878, Colorado became the thirty-eighth State to be admitted to the Union and John L. Routt, last Territorial Governor, became first Governor of the State. Because it was admitted on the one hundredth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence in 1776, Colorado was called the Centennial State.

3. The famous Four Corners meeting point is at the southwestern corner of Colorado where Colorado, Utah, Arizona, and New Mexico join corners.

4. The northern boundary of Colorado is about 560 miles from Canada; the eastern boundary about 1,450 miles from the Atlantic Ocean; the southern boundary about 430 miles from Mexico; and the western boundary about 780 miles from the Pacific Ocean.

5. Colorado is the seventh largest State in the Union with an area of 104,247 square miles. It is 387 miles from east to west, and 276 miles from north to south.

6. The six States larger in area than Colorado are Texas, California, Montana, New Mexico, Nevada, and Arizona.

7. Colorado is seventh from the last State in water area, having only 280 square miles of inland water.

8. Colorado is larger than Illinois and Indiana combined, 12 times as large as Massachusetts, 9 times as large as either Holland or Belgium, 6 times the size of Denmark or Switzerland, and it lacks only nineteen one-hundredths of being as large as the total British Isles.

9. The largest county in Colorado is Las Animas, with an area of 4,794 square miles; the smallest is Denver County, with 58 square miles; and Grand County has an area of 1,867 square miles.

10. Colorado is divided into three great natural regions: the Great Plains or Eastern Slope; the Rocky Mountain region that straddles the Continental Divide and includes North Park, Middle Park, South Park, and San Luis Park; and the plateau region of the western slope.

11. Fossil remains of sea animals in Colorado (also found here in Grand County) indicate that this region was once covered by the sea, and that ice sheets crept down from the north and then retreated.

12. The basic mountain structure of Colorado is now believed to have been formed about 80,000,000 years ago near the close of the Mesozoic Era.

13. Skeletons of prehistoric monsters, dinosaurs, huge turtles, rhinoceros, giant pig, mammoth, and the sabre-toothed tiger have been found in various parts of Colorado.

14. Colorado has 54 mountain peaks 14,000 or more feet in elevation out of the 80 highest in North America. There are 583 other peaks more than 12,000 feet high in Colorado.

15. The highest mountain peaks are Mt. Elbert, 14,431 feet, and Mt. Massive, 14,418 feet, both in Lake County near Leadville. Mt. Harvard is 14,399 feet in Chaffee County. Pikes Peak, in El Paso County, near Colorado Springs, perhaps the best known, is twenty-ninth in rank at 14,110 feet.

16. The lowest point in Colorado is near Holly, 3,385 feet.

17. There are 26 important State and Federal highway passes in Colorado, the two highest being Trail Ridge between Grand Lake and Estes Park at 12,183 feet on U S 34, and Independence Pass at 12,095 feet on Colorado 82 between Leadville and Aspen.

18. There are 14 national forests in Colorado with a total area of 13,697,257 acres, or 20 percent of the State's area; 2 national parks—Mesa Verde and Rock Mountain, and 8 national monuments.

19. Colorado is famous for its clear skies and brilliant sunshine. The yearly average for sunny days is 304, with an average yearly rainfall of 16.5 inches. The sunshine, the very low humidity, and the light air pressure make the climate most beneficial for persons with lung diseases.

20. Colorado is known as the mother of rivers since more large rivers rise in the State because of our heavy snowfall on the Continental Divide than in any other State. The largest is the Colorado (first called the Grand, meaning large in French) which rises in Grand Lake in Grand County and goes on down to form the Grand Canyon. Other large ones are the Rio Grande, San Juan, Arkansas, Cimarron, North Platte, South Platte.

21. Colorado has about 3,000,000 acres of irrigated land, but already two-thirds of the water which originates in Colorado has been given to other States.

22. Gold was first discovered in 1858 near Denver by Green Russell, but the large silver

mines in the State caused it to be called the Silver State.

23. The State flower is the lavender and white columbine (adopted 1889); the State bird is the lark bunting (1931); the State tree is the Colorado blue spruce (1939).

24. The Colorado flag has three equal stripes—two blue and 1 white for the blue of the skies and the white of the snows; at left is a large C in red for the name of Colorado, meaning "colored red"; and within the C a golden disk for the golden sunshine. The flag was adopted in 1911.

25. The State song was written by Dr. A. J. Flynn, of Denver (1915), and is called *Where the Columbines Grow*. The State motto on the great seal is "Nil Sine Numine", meaning "Nothing Without the Deity."

Synthetic Liquid Fuels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the executive session of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on Wednesday afternoon to hear officials of the Department of the Interior on the subject of synthetic liquid fuels, I want to make available three articles from the *National Petroleum News* of August 15. The articles follow:

CHAPMAN IGNORES PAD, NPC ADVISERS IN DEMAND FOR SYNTHETIC FUEL PLANTS

WASHINGTON—Without regard for the Petroleum Administration for Defense or the National Petroleum Council, Interior Secretary Chapman has launched a drive to borrow \$455,000,000 from the Federal Treasury to underwrite the creation of a commercial synthetic liquid fuels industry.

Mr. Chapman made his move in a letter to the Defense Production Administration, asking for the money to guarantee private promoters against loss in the construction and operation of a 30,000 barrels per day coal-to-oil plant and a somewhat smaller shale-to-oil facility.

PAD was not consulted by the Secretary prior to his request to the DPA, it was said here. Neither did Mr. Chapman confer with NPC, which, like PAD, is under his immediate jurisdiction.

Although not consulted, PAD is understood to have communicated to Mr. Chapman, subsequent to his letter to DPA, its view that encouragement of commercial size synthetic plants cannot be justified at this time. NPC has under way a detailed study of synthetics, but its report probably won't be forthcoming until this fall.

Brown won't comment: The Secretary's top assistant in PAD, Deputy Administrator Bruce K. Brown, has refused to comment on the \$455,000,000 proposal, but NPN was told that it would be fair to assume that he is as opposed now to building commercial size plants as he was when he so testified before a congressional committee in 1948.

At that time, Mr. Brown told the committee it just didn't add up to burn 45 tons of solid fuel—coal—to make 1 ton of synthetic liquid fuels.

What Chapman wants: If DPA goes along with his idea, Mr. Chapman intends to—

1. Use \$400,000,000 of the total to guarantee Government purchases of the output, and thus the profits, on the proposed investment by a private group in a 30,000

barrel-per-day coal hydrogenation plant, to be located probably in southern Illinois; and 2. Underwrite in similar fashion the construction of a \$55,000,000 shale oil plant of a "few thousand" barrels daily capacity.

His request seeks to invoke authority for such deals set out in the recently amended Defense Production Act. That law, as amended, makes a total of \$2,100,000,000 available to Government departments and agencies to encourage expansion of productive capacity and supply to aid the mobilization program.

Mr. Chapman is understood to have sought to justify his request on the grounds that the United States must immediately take out "insurance" against the day when the petroleum industry can no longer keep pace with mounting demands.

Opposite view: This view has opposition within his own bureaus and agencies. For instance, some officials in the Bureau of Mines believe, and have so reported, that the current costs of producing synthetic liquid fuels are too high to make a start at this time.

And in PAD there is the unshakable opinion that far from running out of oil, this country is still a long way from reaching its productive peak of crude petroleum. In fact, it is said that if the 1951 drilling rate is continued in future years the crude productive capacity of the United States should increase by around 250,000 barrels per day annually for years to come.

The agency is also said to have the opinion that it would be much less expensive and wasteful of heat to hydrogenate residual fuel oil into lighter products than it would be to produce liquids from coal by the same process. Methods of hydrogenating residual oil have been developed by the oil industry, but these are reportedly not now economical.

The forthcoming NPC study on synthetics will analyze the cost estimates for synthetics which Mr. Chapman's own synthetics chief, Dr. W. C. Schroeder, claims now show commercial synthetics production to be competitive with petroleum.

Known to be interested in building a coal hydrogenation plant is a group represented by Ferdinand Eberstadt, New York investment banker and formerly a vice chairman of the War Production Board of World War II. It has estimated \$400,000,000 as the cost of a 30,000-barrel-per-day plant.

A crude petroleum refinery of like capacity now costs about \$45,000,000.

Word of the Chapman request to DPA also brought with it reports of internal dissension at Interior, with Dr. Schroeder taking over from Dr. James Boyd as head of the Defense Minerals Administration. The latter now goes back to his old job as Director of the Bureau of Mines.

The dissension was said to have revolved around Dr. Boyd's opposition to the synthetics-now policy. However, an Interior spokesman denied this, declaring Mr. Chapman and Mr. Boyd were not arguing over this subject.

Mr. Boyd's confirmation by the Senate was held up for more than a year by the opposition of John L. Lewis. During that time Mr. Boyd worked without pay, but when finally confirmed by the Senate collected back pay. Dr. Schroeder undoubtedly will have the support of John L. Lewis and coal operators, in view of his synthetics-now stand.

This Interior spokesman also denied another report that Dr. Boyd called in an outsider to check Dr. Schroeder's cost estimates on synthetics.

However, the departmental official conceded there were differences of opinion within the Bureau of Mines on synthetics. For example, an official of the Bureau's experimental station at Bruceton, Pa., sent a memorandum to Washington recently recommending strongly against starting commercial production at this time.

BUREAUCRATS SNEAK ANOTHER GRAB FOR OIL

It is truly incredible and terrifying to American citizens who believe in Government by the people and for the people, the lengths to which the Truman bureaucrats, nationalizationists and other extremists go to impose complete Government control on American industry.

Let NPN say that this is not just a "squawk" by NPN—which has been fighting nationalization of industry by government for years—because the day that this editorial was first planned, and to be concerned solely with the Trumanites attack on the oil industry, John L. Collyer, president of the B. F. Goodrich Co., of Akron, issued a statement saying flatly that the Federal Government has succeeded in nationalizing the rubber industry. He said the Government now controls the industry, buying crude rubber for it, deciding how that rubber will be gathered or manufactured, and how it can be used. The rubber industry, he said, is now completely under Government control, and where is it and other American industry going under these totalitarian plans?

It was a coincidence that Mr. Collyer's statement came the day it leaked out that Interior Secretary Chapman and head of PAD, sneaked—and we emphasize the word "sneaked"—a recommendation to the Defense Production Administration for \$455,000,000 out of a \$2,100,000,000 fund just released to this agency by government to permit the Government, at Truman's approval, to go into any kind of a business he wants to in the name of producing defense materials against war.

The money Chapman asked for is to be spent, if he gets it, in building a 30,000 b/d coal-to-gasoline plant, something that he and at least one member of his Bureau of Mines, has long been wanting to do. This amount is a bit of a come-down for Chapman who in 1948 campaigned loudly for a 2,000,000 b/d gasoline-from-coal plant even though that amount would take at least two-thirds of the maximum amount of coal that this country ever produced in a year, to say nothing of an amount of steel that would have shut down a large percentage of the then development of the rest of the country. This current Chapman request would also hog a large amount of steel, more than twice the allocation to the oil industry for refining for this last quarter of 1951.

That Chapman and his nationalization cohorts would put their own political growth ahead of the country's good is further shown by the fact that converting coal or shale to engine fuel is still in a development stage so far as reasonable costs go and also even as to some features of the processes. This then is still an experiment both as to supply and quality of materials as against the sure thing of getting more crude oil and converting by well-established techniques into the products the country most direly needs, and at relatively low cost.

But for the details of this back-stairs manipulation see pages 11 and 27 of this issue as supplied by our Washington news bureau, and we here return to the indictment of Chapman and the nationalizationist crowd.

The Interior Department has long been a hothouse for socialization of American industry using natural resources. Ickes during the last war tried to hold up American oil companies and force them to sell their Middle East interests to the United States Government. He and Roosevelt tried to grab control of all oil and gas in this country under an utterly socialistic conservation law and this with downright falsehoods by Ickes and others. Krug, his successor, took up the fight—after speaking kind words about how he loved private enterprise—for the 2,000,000 b/d synthetic gas venture. Chapman continued it when he succeeded Krug.

The industry found after Chapman took charge that he was not a very good keeper of his word. There were some stormy battles to get him to abide by his word that oil men would run the present war mobilization effort. Then the industry got his word that he would not put the Government in this synthetic business, at least not until after Chapman's National Petroleum Council and others had made a thorough study which may be finished in a week or two or by October.

After thus giving his word that he would await reports from his own selected advisers, Chapman rushes this recommendation for this big venture of the Government into the synthetic-fuel business and he does it in secret. Neither the Interior Department nor the Defense Production Administration issued any publicity release. From all indications they had no intention of so doing until the money had been given Chapman. When Oilgram broke the story last week there was much muttering by the nationalizationists at Washington. The inside conspirators belligerently inquired of the Oilgram where did it find out Oilgram of course told them it was none of their business, that this is a public matter, with public money, that it is not enveloped in any war security secrecy and that no public official had any right to try and slip it over in secret.

So far as can be learned neither Chapman nor any of his people spoke to the National Petroleum Council nor his oil advisory associates who have been appointed from the oil industry about this new effort to get money to build a Government synthetic-fuels plant which would be the Government's big entry into the oil business as an owner and competitor to privately owned oil companies.

Chapman has done a good job on some things in standing up against some of his associates and the totalitarians in the administration. He has done a good job in fighting the unconstitutional and totalitarian efforts of the Department of Justice to make it the last judge of what an industry can or cannot do in conjunction with Government, but he still shows that he is either afraid of this totalitarian and anti-private-ownership crowd in Government or he has no idea what they are up to. This last is unbelievable in regard to this big synthetic plant and in view of what Chapman has recently said for it and in view of the fact that he had to make the application for the money.

Smelling to high heaven is the row now on in the Bureau of Mines, wherein Chapman is obviously trying to force the resignation of the present head because, although Chapman fought tooth and nail to get him there some years ago, the Director of the Bureau could not go along with Chapman's present favorite on this big synthetic fuel plant. Present Director Boyd, of the Bureau, has challenged the cost figures of the chief promoter of this Government synthetic business, Dr. Schroeder. Schroeder evidently has the inside track, because he is getting Chapman's backing and Boyd is not.

Not only Boyd but everyone in the oil industry we have heard from says that Schroeder's figures as to costs are entirely wrong. As some companies in the oil industry are spending upward of \$10,000,000 a year of their own money trying to develop better synthetic processes, and all told the oil industry is and has been spending a few times more money on this subject than Bureau of Mines, the oil industry ought to be entitled to have some opinion on the cost feasibility of synthetic processes.

Some readers may ask why print this inside Government row, what good does it do? Is NPN seeing ghosts under the bed?

The answer is that official Washington wants to operate in secrecy until it has a victory or a success to announce, and then

no publication should question the terms of the announcement of the success.

In other words, despite all the press agents in Washington, the officials do not want the public to know any more than those officials wish it to know. Hence the Interior Department wants this half a billion dollars in hand, and probably would like to get it all spent before the public or Congress knows about it. This has been the policy of nearly all administrations, but it has been especially the policy of the planners since they got such a hold on Government starting with the New Deal.

Further, if the public was not told of these sneaks to put over nationalization, the country would wake up some day and find it completely nationalized just as President Collier, of Goodrich, says is the case with rubber, all done by many little moves before any number, even in the rubber industry, woke up to what was going on.

And once a thing is accomplished in government control it is never undone.

The oil industry has not done a good job in fighting this threat of government entering the oil business under the guise of doing a research job and needing a fair-sized research plant. The threat has been with the industry ever since the early days of the Roosevelt administration. But the oil associations have pretty much ignored it.

In February 1948, when a bill to give former Secretary of the Interior and Chairman of the Petroleum Board Krug the millions to build a 2,000,000 b/d synthetic plant was before Congress, some of the industry got much exercised and some top oil men including Bruce Brown, then with Standard of Indiana and now Deputy Administrator for PAD, Chairman Wilson, of the Indiana Co., Dr. Murphree, of the Jersey's Development Co., and several others, gave strong testimony against it before a congressional committee. Then, when the subject came up this spring, the National Petroleum Council took up the fight through a special committee. But in the main it can fairly be said that the industry has slept on its rights, that the industry should have recognized years ago that the bureaucrats were working all the time to get into the oil business, and that properly to contend with them the industry should have had a group also at work all the time if necessary with a full-time paid expert.

There has been too much regard for dignity and a high-level approach to these politicians by the oil industry as well as by other big industries. It is to be hoped that this synthetic plant threat and other experiences will now cause our industry leaders to realize that force exemplified through a vigorous and public licking is all that those seeking to impose socialism, nationalism, and communism on this country have any respect for and there are times when that force has to be exercised in a real knock-down and drag-out fight right out in the middle of the road.

The sooner the oil industry gets out into the road and gives that kind of a fight with all the vigor that so many of its top executives used in their younger days out in the oil fields, the better for the industry and for all the freedoms of the American people.

CHAPMAN SYNTHETICS PROGRAM COULD BE LOOKING MORE FOR VOTES THAN FOR OIL

(By Herbert A. Yocom)

Secretary Chapman's attempt to foist a synthetic liquid fuels production program onto the country at this critical juncture smacks more of politics than of good judgment.

He says the country must take out insurance against the day when the supply of oil may ultimately drop behind in the race with demand. He hasn't the slightest notion

when. It's just something that's bound to happen—eventually.

Hence, the Secretary is insisting on having the authority to spend \$455,000,000 of the public's money—plus the Lord only knows how much later on—to launch a commercial-size plant building program here and now.

The petroleum industry does not quarrel with the idea that it may some day be necessary to turn to synthetics.

It, in fact, endorses the idea, has spent literally hundreds of millions in furtherance of its own research in that field and rather generally supported governmental efforts along the same line.

But it disagrees vehemently that commercial production can be justified now, economically or otherwise.

Nor does it see any probability or even a possibility, over the near future, certainly, of a dearth of supply occurring that can be attributed to failure of the industry to find and develop crude oil in expanding quantities.

Least of all can it see the wisdom now, when steel is so scarce that the Secretary himself has to beg and plead for an increase in oil's restricted allotment, of expending great tonnages of that same material in a venture that is economically so palpably unsound that no private persons will have anything to do with it unless Government guarantees them against any and all loss.

Why then, knowing the valid, contrary views of the oil industry and of his own expert and supposedly respected advisers in both PAD and even the Bureau of Mines, does Chapman choose to go galloping forth on his shiny white charger at this particular time?

Of course, his answer no doubt will be that someone has always to take the first step; that, while he may seem to others to be stepping out way too soon, he nevertheless, as a public official, has a responsibility for protecting the national security which he does not intend to shirk.

No one would quarrel with him in that if it could be shown that security of our country actually is endangered because we are about to run out of oil.

Obviously, however, the Secretary cannot so contend.

So, after all, is the national security really Chapman's primary reason for seeking to launch now a Government-subsidized synthetic liquid fuels program?

There is a very strong feeling here that it is not, that the main motivation is political and that the Fair Dealers mean to dangle synthetics before the coal and oil-shale States as a lure for votes in 1952.

They are not above it, certainly. Nor is Secretary Chapman, who is first and foremost a politician. As a matter of fact, we seem to recall him going out to Columbus, Ohio, last June 7 and addressing a Jefferson-Jackson day dinner.

That was an occasion on which the Secretary indicated as plain as could be an awareness of the vote-getting possibilities in synthetics. Because he rather went out of his way, we thought, in relating—at this political shindig—how Ohio has "12 suitable general areas for synthetic liquid fuels plants," plus a supply of coal which represents "a liquid fuel" reserve of 12,200,000,000 barrels of finished products, chiefly "gasoline" and which could be produced "at any rate up to 834,000 barrels per day with 40 years' coal supply for each plant." Also, that Ohio's "potential" of 12,200,000,000 barrels of "conversion products" is only a little under half the total proved United States crude-oil reserves, thus adequately demonstrating "Ohio's potentiality in this new industry."

This is the sort of stuff calculated to make the voters go bug-eyed—and the same sort of stuff can be dished out elsewhere than just Ohio to make votes for the Fair Deal, they hope.

Even down South, maybe, where on last May 19, Chapman could be heard telling the Junior Chamber of Commerce at Asheville, that development of synthetic fuels capacity is a very striking and important example of the sort of thing which needs to be done—an example which will ultimately have an immediate, practical effect here in North Carolina.

World Assembly of Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the problems of our time are so difficult that the ideas and outlook of our young people are of the most critical importance to the future. Almost at the same time there took place a world youth assembly at Cornell University at Ithaca, N. Y., of the youth Communist Youth Festival of enslaved youth in East Berlin. The comparison between these two events is so striking in terms of its implications to the future of our world that I believe the Members will be interested in the appended newspaper articles. The report in the New York Times so well refers to the Communist youth festival as this organized mass madness which mocks the Soviet peace professions and says of the World Assembly of Youth that it is pledging itself to peace without hate and misunderstanding. The dignity and the informed character of the reports from the World Youth Assembly at Cornell are to be compared with the mass frenzy and hate preachments at the Communist youth festival. The articles follow:

[From the New York Times of August 7, 1951]

THREE YOUTH RALLIES

The struggle for the minds of the younger generation of this world destined to shape the future is being symbolized this week by three international youth rallies. Of these, the most elaborate and most costly but also most ominous is the Communist youth festival in East Berlin, where a quarter of a million boys and girls from Soviet-occupied Germany and more than 10,000 delegates from 38 countries are being regimented in a Hitler-like demonstration to pledge in the name of peace undying loyalty to Stalin and undying hatred for the United States and the whole free world. Once again uniforms and parades, waving banners, and the contagion of mass contact are being utilized by a totalitarian regime to raise robots ready to immolate themselves at their master's bidding in a cause that spells slavery and death. The frenzied enthusiasm of a large part of the demonstrators too young and too ignorant of the rest of the world to know what it is all about shows that this educational method is not without success.

In happy contrast to this organized mass madness, which mocks the Soviet peace professions, are the two other rallies—the first World Assembly of Youth meeting on the Cornell University campus at Ithaca, N. Y., and the World Boy Scout Jamboree at Bad Ischl, Austria. The first, consisting of 500 delegates from voluntary youth organiza-

tions in threescore countries, is dedicating itself primarily to search for ways and means of making the United Nations declaration of human rights a living reality throughout the world. The second, consisting of more than 15,000 delegates representing millions of free youths, is pledging itself to peace without hate or misunderstanding. The keynote of both gatherings is liberty.

Judged by mere size, the Communist rally dwarfs the others, and the significance of its mass aspect, which the Communists spent millions of dollars to create and which gives the youngsters a flattering sense of participation and self-importance, must not be underestimated. It provides an impressive captive audience for the pronouncements of the Communist chieftains who seek to inflame it against the defense preparations of the west.

But it is significant that once mass contagion and mass discipline are broken the participants appear more than apathetic, and that thousands defy punishment to slip into free Berlin, some to seek refuge there, most merely to view its wonders, which, despite the remaining ruins, form such a welcome contrast to the Communist slums. Therein lies hope that Communist propaganda is overreaching itself—that a good part of the participating youths are not quite so gullible as the Communists would have them, and that the Germans in particular, having marched in so many bad causes, have learned to march with tongues in their cheeks.

[From the New York Times of August 14, 1951]

YOUTH, 1951

It is discouraging to see another generation of youth repeating the tragic folly of their fathers. What does it matter that the million youngsters who walked shrieking through the streets of East Berlin on Sunday wore blue shirts instead of the brown of the Hitler Jugend or the black of the Italian Fascists? It is history repeating itself, but a mad and vicious history. It was the youth of the twenties and thirties that carried the world into the holocaust of 1939 and we who were young then—or at least younger than we are now—are, no doubt, open to the jibe that we could do no better. Perhaps today we deserve the reproach that we have failed to catch the imagination and the ideals of youth the way the Chinese and German Communists have done. That, however, depends on who has the boys and girls to educate, to indoctrinate, to fill with high ideals or with the hate and militancy of totalitarianism. It stands to reason that if Hitler could train and win over a generation of youth to Nazi doctrines, the German stooges of Stalin could do the same to a new generation of boys and girls.

These are bitter thoughts, but the bitterness is not directed at the youth. The young Americans who are fighting in Korea, the young Frenchmen who die in a charge across an Indochinese paddy field, the young of all lands who are now meeting at the World Assembly of Youth in Ithaca, N. Y., are proof enough that the fault is not and never could be in youth itself. The criminals are those who inspire the young to serve their wicked purposes. They create a militant mass that knows not what it does, because its individual parts lack the experience and the judgment to make a decision that has moral validity. The mass then becomes a force going on its own momentum. Both Mussolini and Hitler were like Phaetons trying to drive the chariot of the sun, they could not control the forces they set in motion and so they were carried to disaster. The Russian Communists, to be sure, have proved that they can mold, indoctrinate, and control their own youth. But we have yet to see an ability to hold in check the youth of a newly Communist country such as China, or of a people

with the bitterness and shame of defeat in their hearts such as the Germans and Japanese. In such countries youth is an electric, explosive force that can be directed toward good or evil and that will go toward one or the other with the inexorability of a juggernaut.

That is why the Communist demonstration in Berlin was frightening. The Reds are unleashing the impulsive power of youth and directing it toward their evil ends. We can pity the young men and women who are so misled. If only we could teach them the lesson contained in Secretary Acheson's message to the Ithaca assembly yesterday: "The path of regimentation can lead only backward—to tyranny, to servitude, to the degradation of man."

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of August 9, 1951]

THE WFYSP VERSUS THE WAY

The World Festival of Youth and Students for Peace and the World Assembly of Youth, meeting simultaneously on opposite sides of the iron curtain, present a striking contrast.

The Commie-led WFYSP sessions in the Soviet sector of Berlin are beating the drum for Uncle Joe Stalin. They are distinguished chiefly by the parroting of party-line propaganda. So long as he stays on that line, any Tom, Dick or Harry can mount the rostrum and spout to his heart's content in the name of any youth group he elects to represent.

Participants in the WAY conference, being held at Cornell University, are in a different boat. They come as accredited representatives of specific groups whose seriousness in support of democracy has won them official membership in this world body. They may speak only for the groups whose credentials they bear.

The WAY delegates move about as they please, see this country as it is, and have samples of American hospitality pressed upon them from all sides.

The WFYSP youths must get their sample surreptitiously. Many of them, venturing into West Berlin for a taste of the democratic life, found it so palatable that they wouldn't go back. As a result the Commies clamped down on such visits.

It is easy to see what the results of these contrasting procedurs will be. Youths of the Communist world will return home with nothing but a richer store of vituperatives to hurl at the free world. Those at Cornell will carry to all corners of the democratic world the realization that only from a free exchange of ideas and knowledge can come the real understanding on which peace must depend.

[From the Brooklyn Eagle of August 7, 1951]

LESSON OF EAST BERLIN YOUTH RALLY IS DEMOCRACY MUST FIGHT TO LIVE

It is a sobering experience to read about the East Berlin Youth Rally, where more than 100,000 young men and women from all parts of the world are being inflamed by Communist oratory and join in singing the praises of Josef Stalin and proclaiming their open dislike for the United States. Some might say that after all only six Americans participated in the parade, so why get upset? But it is frightening to know that any citizens of this Nation marched under such auspices.

The lesson of the meeting is plain and no phase of it is beyond the understanding of anyone anywhere who prefers freedom to serfdom. This spurious demonstration is indeed an effective means of bringing home to people the grim necessity of accepting the true nature of Russian intentions and of making plans to combat it intelligently and without thought of small capitulations to gain time. The truth is time has run out, in spite of recent Russian gestures of desiring to be friendly with America and the

democratic world. The latter are obviously phony. The crisis is here, and the broad question of survival is revealed with stark realism.

These misguided young people who have been converted into unthinking talking machines to parrot the Red lies can do great damage when they return to their respective countries. Each will be a disciple of a doctrine that says the Soviet conception of peace and her foreign policies must prevail. To be caught unawares will be to swell their ranks with new recruits. The youth meeting should heighten our determination to create an effective defense of Europe and conclude the Korean truce talks on a note that makes it plain that Communist aggression has been defeated. Anything less could have tragic results.

Meanwhile, there is some comfort to be had from the first World Assembly of Youth at Ithaca, where 500 representatives of 63 nations are studying the problem of attempting to make human rights universal. There no frenzied oratory is present, no concentration on promoting hate. It is a sharp contrast to its Kremlin counterpart in East Berlin and living proof that regard for democratic processes is a potent force if we see that it receives proper emphasis.

[From the Brooklyn Eagle of August 10, 1951]

BERLIN YOUTH RALLY FED RED SLOGAN DIET
Youth of the free world are meeting in Ithaca, N. Y. Youth following the Communist line are meeting in East Berlin. Geographically, the two groups are about 4,500 miles apart. In ideas they are worlds away. The United Press carries the following dispatches from Berlin and Ithaca to illustrate differences.

"BERLIN, August 10—Thousands of East German Communist youths poured into Berlin today to reinforce 500,000 youth delegates already assembled here for a gigantic peace parade Sunday.

"The Communists estimate 1,000,000 youths from 70 nations will march down the Unter den Linden in the high spot of the world festival of youth and students for peace.

"Sunday's parade—complete with shouted slogans against the American warmongers, banners, flags, blaring bands, and uniformed youths packed into solid masses—follows the pattern already set.

"The delegates—some as young as 10 years old—have been demonstrating for peace for almost a week. They have shouted and sung propaganda slogans taught them by Communist teachers.

"The main object of the mass rally is propaganda—in favor of communism and against the west.

"Sunday's parade may see the unveiling of a sideshow allegedly planned by the Communists—a group of 50 American prisoners captured in Korea.

"But parades and rallies have not been able to fill the stomachs of the young delegates nor make them comfortable sleeping on straw in tents or crowded East Berlin homes.

"Approximately 40,000 of the delegates are living in youth camps or tent cities erected in the parks of the city. The largest is the Ernst Thaelmann camp where 20,000 delegates from 10 to 20 years old are quartered. The camp is surrounded by a thatched fence and a heavy police guard.

"Hunger has been a major problem for the rally organizers. Leading Communist youth officials have been fired and arrested for the breakdown in the food supply at the camps, according to press reports in West Berlin."

"ITHACA, August 10.—Four hundred young lawyers, doctors, economists, and students from 63 non-Communist nations met today

in a scholastic atmosphere in this quiet university town to discuss the problems of youth in the free world and how they can be solved.

"A Junior United Nations, the youths, ranging from 18-year-olds to those in their early thirties, sit solemnly in a dozen workshops at Cornell University and discuss youth and human rights.

"Delegates from Pakistan, Sweden, Great Britain, France, Italy, the African Continent and Japan, among other nations, are preparing resolutions for a general assembly which will meet August 14 and 15.

"SUBJECTS COVER WIDE RANGE

"Their subjects cover a wide range: Discrimination, juvenile delinquency, family life, freedom of movement, freedom of youth organizations, world citizenship, social security, conditions of work, leisure time, education and the duties and responsibilities of youth.

"Solemn and serious as the assembly's work may be they live well.

"They sleep in the dormitories of Cornell, on a campus considered one of the most beautiful in the United States.

"FOOD GOOD, CHEAP

"Food, always an important item in the life of a youth—even if the weight of the world's problems rest on their shoulders—is good and cheap. A complete dinner served in the university's cafeteria costs about \$1.06.

"After the assembly winds up many of the delegates will make tours throughout the United States visiting some 40 cities.

"Maurice Sauve, 28-year-old Canadian lawyer, president of the group, said, 'we don't need bands and noise to stir up this group. The people here are national youth leaders * * * not a bunch of kids picked up off the street.'"

Robert Gardiner Wilson, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, on July 12 of this year Robert Gardiner Wilson, Jr., was elected imperial potentate of the Shriners of North America.

A great and deserved honor was thus paid to a man of whom Massachusetts is justly proud.

Descendant of an illustrious American family line, Judge Wilson's background, training, and record are linked and interwoven with the finest traditions of New England.

After graduating in 1910 from the oldest public school in America, the Boston Public Latin School, he received his degree with distinction from Harvard College in 1914. Then followed 3 years at Harvard Law School.

In the autumn of 1917 he entered the practice of law, but before long his attention turned to politics. In 1925 he was elected city councilor of the city of Boston, and served six terms, a total of 12 years, under four successive mayors, until his voluntary retirement in 1939.

In December of 1940 his legal training and deep understanding of the problems of his fellow man were recognized by the then Governor of Massachusetts, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, now senior United States Senator from Massachusetts, who

honored him with a life appointment as judge of probate.

The Shriners of North America, who have contributed so much toward helping the crippled and the sick, and who have brightened the lives of so many unfortunate children, can be indeed proud of their new leader.

The first imperial potentate in the 75-year history of the Shrine to come from Massachusetts, Robert Wilson has earned for himself a high place in the history of his home State.

New Global Commitments Enmesh United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a timely article by Mr. David Lawrence which appeared in the Washington Star on August 22. The critical situation described by this outstanding writer is little understood by the people in the country and it can be rightly said that too few Members of Congress understand the situation.

The article follows:

A NEW MILESTONE IN HISTORY—UNITED STATES TIED UP IN NEW COMMITMENTS AROUND THE GLOBE AS BRITAIN IS UNABLE TO HOLD UP HER INTERESTS

(By David Lawrence)

Slowly but surely the United States is finding herself tied up in new commitments and new obligations around the globe.

Latest dispatches from London by the United Press indicates the understanding there that the United States has recognized the importance of the Suez Canal area in Western defense and has agreed to share with Britain the burden of middle-eastern security.

The statement is further made that the United States has accepted the British contention that the Suez Canal zone is a vital bridge between Asia and Africa and the best site for bases to defend the oil-rich Middle East against possible aggression.

This means that, just as Great Britain in 1947 abdicated full responsibility for Turkey and Greece and the eastern Mediterranean and persuaded America to take over, so today the area of American interest has been extended to include the Suez Canal.

This is a new milestone in world history. For it shows either that the British Empire is no longer capable alone of holding up her interests in the Middle East or that she would rather spend her money for the socialistic pursuits of a labor government.

In any event, the United States is about to provide \$415,000,000 worth of military aid and \$125,000,000 of economic aid to the Middle East out of the Mutual Security Act fund.

The United States is to be a part of the Middle East defense council, soon to be established, which includes Britain, France, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, and Turkey.

Not long ago, when the late Admiral Sherman proposed that an American naval officer become the commander in chief of Allied naval forces in the Mediterranean, there was

a protest in the House of Commons. But, subsequently, when it was pointed out that the heavily preponderant number of naval vessels now in the Mediterranean were those of the United States Navy, there was a tapering off of the criticism. For the truth is, Great Britain is not spending anywhere near the sums she used to spend on her navy and is relying to a large extent on the American Navy to protect her dominions and colonies.

There is no doubt that, if American funds and American military forces are to be furnished in larger quantity than those of any other nation or combination of nations, then it is logical for American officers to be in command. But there's another and much more vital question. It is to what extent the policies of the United States must go along with the Imperialistic programs of the British in the Middle East.

The Iranian dispute is a case in point. Iran not only wants to nationalize her oil properties but she wants to reserve the right to operate them. The United States, through W. Averell Harriman, has been trying to mediate in the dispute. But it looks now as if the prolonged negotiations have been forced to a crisis point by the refusal of the British to give up an indirect hold on the Iranian oil fields. While there is an apparent desire on the part of the London government to accept the principle of nationalization, the way it works out Iran feels it will not have freedom of action in managing the property it now owns. Britain may soon withdraw her technicians. Does this mean American technicians must keep out?

Another question is: Will the United States become involved in supporting British policies in the Near East where the tales of exploitation of the impoverished peoples have long caused concern here and have added fuel to the Communist inflammatory attacks?

American oil companies in the Near East have pursued a far better policy than the British and have been willing to share on a 50-50 basis their revenues with the native owners. There are ways, of course, to resolve these oil crises but, if the United States is to put large forces in the Middle East, it will correspondingly introduce the query as to whether America should not have something to say about the British policies that are provoking discord now in Iran and may lead to Communist invasions later on.

It is doubtful whether the full meaning of the casual way the United States is being eased into more and more global responsibilities is fully realized by the American people—or by Congress.

News Columns Distorted To Serve Administration Propaganda Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, a recent distortion of news in the Washington Star, a paper with an historical reputation for fairness, indicates the alarming tactics of the attempt to shackle America with economic regimentation.

On August 11, a Star headline at the top of page 1 proclaimed, "Prices Turn up as Pressure on Controls Mounts." Following was an 8-inch news story to

the effect that the wholesale prices were turning up. The obvious effect of the story was to give people the impression that the new OPS law had promptly started prices up.

The next day, on page 18, section E, a small-type news item in the Star told a different story. That inconspicuous item on the financial pages recorded that the Associated Press weighted wholesale price index of 35 commodities had declined that week for the fifteenth week in a row. The following Tuesday a new 1951 low mark was reported.

COMMODITY PRICES

NEW YORK, August 14.—The Associated Press weighted wholesale price index of 35 commodities today declined to 191.72, new 1951 low. Previous day, 192.43; week ago, 192.25; month ago, 195.53; year ago, 184.61, based on 1926 as 100.

The contrast of emphasis in this second instance is also amazing. When the BLS wholesale index went up one-tenth of 1 percent in the week ended August 7, a headline on page 1 resulted. When a similar index made a new 1951 low mark 3 days later, the news was buried in small type on page 11.

Ill-conceived "scare stories" on page 1 may sooner or later cause another frantic scramble to turn money into goods. Such an hysterical rush now would serve well the collectivists, who want it so they can blame the rise on the price law passed by Congress—a non sequitur of the first order.

It is disturbing to find the Washington Star collaborating, undoubtedly innocently, in this evil strategy.

Unless sound money is restored, prices are going much higher. But the cause will not be the absence of allegedly strong controls, it will be the long-continued cruel and dishonest financial policy that generates unending inflation.

Help Liberate the Peoples of the Soviet Union—Peoples of the Soviet Union Back Move for a New and Positive Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on April 3, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 89, and on April 17, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 94, to assist in the liberation of the Russian and non-Russian peoples, respectively, of the Soviet Union from their present Communist enslavement and for the early restoration of their basic human rights and freedoms.

I wish to set forth herein excerpts from some of the many responses I have received to these resolutions:

CHICAGO, ILL., August 5, 1951.

Please accept our most heartfelt congratulations for submitting House Concurrent Resolution 94.

Your resolution, if acted upon, can be more powerful than a hydrogen bomb, 200 military divisions, or a 200-group Air Force.

PROKOP MATIJICW,

President, Organization for the Defense of the Four Freedoms for the Ukraine, Inc.

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 20, 1951.

Please accept our best thanks for sending us your concurrent resolution and for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and our sincere congratulations for the most excellent Resolution No. 89.

SERGE BELOSSELSKY,

President, Russian Anti-Communist Center.

CHICAGO, ILL., July 4, 1951.

This resolution is a great step toward helping the Byelo-Russians obtain their independence. The White Russian American National Council most heartily thanks you.

The name of CHARLES J. KERSTEN shall never leave the hearts of the Byelo-Russian people.

T. LOBATCH,

Secretary, White Russian American National Council.

CAMP ATTERBURY, IND., July 9, 1951.

From very good friend of mine in Detroit I got your address and had chance to read your very interesting and valuable CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

You are really well informed about the life and condition behind the iron curtain. It makes me very happy that the people in Washington know the truth.

I am one of the non-Russian nationalities—Ukrainian. I was born there and I know all about Communist terrorism in Ukraine, therefore I would like to repeat again—your CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is very important and valuable bulletin.

In the service, in the colleges, and some other organizations I always have speeches about communism and the life in the best country in the world—Russia.

I would like to ask you kindly, if you can, to send to me some copies of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I will use it for my anti-Communist propaganda activity and to give to read for my friends in the service.

Pfc POTIENKO JURIJ.

MUNICH, GERMANY, June 8, 1951.

From the great public assembly of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN) on June 3, 1951, in Munich we, the representatives of our oppressed nations and 2,000 participants of the assembly, send you our warmest thanks for the understanding and sympathy you have shown our hard struggle for freedom and the national rights of our nations.

FURST N. NAKOESCHIDN,

Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations Central Committee.

EDINBURGH, SCOTLAND, July 16, 1951

We read with very great satisfaction your remarks on May 9 on Non-Russian People in U. S. S. R. Our Potent Ally in Defeat of Soviet Imperialism.

In June last year we called a Congress in Edinburgh of those who we knew were the actual delegates outside the iron curtain of the actual fighting men and women in the underground forces on the other side of the curtain. It did not obtain much support at the time, but it was the first time that any opportunity was given to these delegates to put their views before an English-speaking audience, and since then understanding and support have grown very largely and our views are now taken up in highly responsible quarters.

JOHN F. STEWART,

Chairman, Scottish League for European Freedom.

LACHEMONT, N. Y., April 23, 1951.

The Ukrainian officers and soldiers present you expressions cordial gratitude for your resolution.

Lieutenant General SHANDRUK.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, July 24, 1951.

A copy of your resolution of May 9 has been received and I want to commend you on it.

This is a fundamental step that is no doubt one of many that your Department of State should have been taking in order to assure world peace.

WILLIAM E. WARNER,
Executive Director for Civil Defense.

CHICAGO, ILL., July 15, 1951.

I thank you with all my heart for your the Kersten resolution, which I will always remember as the finest and most pleasant surprise I have met at my arrival to the United States of America.

Being deeply convinced in undeniable correctness of your resolution and of that the very greatness of our country is due in no small measure to its variety of the help to the subjugated nations by Russia especially to the Ukrainian.

JURIJ ARTIUSZENKO.

CAMBRIDGE SPRINGS, PA., May 1, 1951.

Please accept the profound thanks of all true friends of America for your Concurrent Resolution No 94 introduced into the House of Representatives on April 17, 1951.

By now it is obvious to most of us that we cannot win a global war with our own manpower. We must have the help of our friends in satellite countries and most of all in the Soviet Union itself. Your historic resolution, if carried into the field of American foreign policy would save many American lives and would win for us the victory.

ARTHUR P. COLEMAN,
President, Alliance College.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 28, 1951.

Accept expressions deepest gratitude on behalf North Caucasian nationalities.

TAMERLAN SALATY.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 26, 1951.

The executive board and members of Byelo-Russian-American Association, in U. S. A., Inc., extend their spontaneous and whole-hearted congratulations to you on your Concurrent Resolution 94, submitted to the House of Representatives on April 17, 1951.

Unquestionable principles for which you stand have strengthened our hopes of early liberation of our people. We assure you that Byelo-Russian people will never forget your magnificent deed on its account.

NICHOLAS HOROSHKO,
Chairman, Byelo-Russian-American Assn., Inc.

MUNICH, GERMANY, July 11, 1951.

We would like to express our deep gratitude for your aid to the non-Russian nationalities of the Soviet Union, especially for your moral support.

Our people was the first of the non-Russian nationalities who initiated to fight against the bolshevism already in 1917 and they fought continuously for more than 3 years. This was not just the fight against the bolshevism but also against the power, which tried to destroy the young Cossack Republics of Don Kuban and Terek, established by the expressed wish of the Cossack people in December 1917. These three Cossack Republics unified on January 5, 1920, into a "Federation of Don Kuban, Terek, Steppe and Mountain peoples," called now by all Cossack patriots—Cossackia. But the Bolsheviks had overpowered our armies which have been forced to retreat to the Crimea

Peninsula and then as final result had no alternative left but to flee from the homeland and emigrate to Constantinople.

If there would be an all-out conflict against the Bolshevik, the Cossack nationalist fighters would be a powerful factor from out of all the other non-Russian nationalities of Soviet Union in the struggle against a common enemy and the free world must not overlook such an ally.

WASSILY G. GLASKOW,
President, Cossack Supreme Representative.

ANKARA, TURKEY, June 5, 1951.

I have brought the text of House Concurrent Resolution 94 to the attention of my compatriots with whom I am in contact. This resolution which emphasized that the Red Russian imperialism is a force that respects neither human rights nor liberties, and which proposed courageously and with understanding the measures necessary to save the civilized world, has evoked in each of us a profound sentiment of gratitude toward the author.

With all the nations slaves of Russia and in the name of the members of the National Movement of Azerbaijan, who for more than 30 years have been struggling against bloody communism threatening the whole world, and against Bolshevik genocide, for national independence, for the defense and revitalization of human rights, and the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations and for the high ideals of the western democracies I thank you very cordially and hope that your proposals may be accepted by the authorities of the United States.

MEHMET EMIN RESULZADE,
President, National Assembly of Azerbaijan.

LONDON, ENGLAND, May 29, 1951.

We have a copy of the concurrent resolution which you presented in the House on April 17, 1951, and which we understand referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

May we take this opportunity to congratulate you most sincerely on the excellent presentation of policy which is concrete, to the point and very proper.

G. B. R. PANCHUK,
Ukrainian Canadian Committee.

PASSAIC, N. J., May 8, 1951.

I appreciate your Concurrent Resolution No 94 and wish for it the fulfillment.

Rev. NICHOLAS LEFETZKI,
Chairman, Byelo Russian-American Relief Committee.

SOUTH RIVER, N. J., May 7, 1951.

Byelo Russian Congress Committee of America presents our cordial expression for your resolution.

Dr. NICHOLAS SCORS,
President, Byelo Russian Congress Committee of America.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 24, 1951.

On behalf of Russian scholars accept our heartfelt thanks for your resolution.

Professor STANKIEVICH,
President, Byelo Russian Scientific Society.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 16, 1951.

We wish to thank you for a copy of your resolution. We fully agree with you that a free union of the American people and the peoples of the U. S. S. R. is a prerequisite for the successful outcome of the struggle against communism.

N. IRGIZOV,
Chairman, Association of Former Political Prisoners of Soviet Labor Camps.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.

The Wisconsin branch of the American-Ukrainian Congress Committee presents you our most sincere thanks for your excellent resolution regarding the oppressed nationalities of the Soviet Union.

G. K. PAWLATZ,
President, Wisconsin Branch, UCCA.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee, San Francisco branch, extends you its heartfelt greetings and pledges support of your House Concurrent Resolution 94.

M. MELNIK,
President, San Francisco Branch, UCCA.

KANSAS CITY, MO., April 30, 1951

I am impressed with the text of your resolution (H. Con. Res. 89) and it would seem that you have well pointed up the real issues between the United States and Soviet Russia, together with a definite approach which should be made in solving these problems.

OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Director, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

MEXICO CITY, MEXICO, May 11, 1951.

May I, by these lines, extend to you my deep appreciation of and my gratitude for your interest and your effort for those who are suffering under the oppression of the Russian giant which, I am afraid, will be the same whatever the political system in Moscow.

H. J. PROCOPE,
Former Finnish Minister of Foreign Affairs and Envoy to Washington.

[From the weekly Posev (newspaper) of April 15, 1951, printed in Germany, circulated behind the Iron curtain]

Congressman KERSTEN submitted the House of Representatives of the United States a resolution requesting Congress to declare the friendship of the American people for the Russian people and to lend assistance to the Russian people in its fight against the Bolshevik enslavers.

As yet not the whole democratic world comprehends the problem in the same manner as does the author of the draft of the resolution concerning friendship for and assistance to our Nation. Not all see clearly as yet that only in this friendship and assistance lies the salvation of the world from the threat of Communist slavery, from the horrors of a new war. It is not yet generally understood that one cannot light-heartedly enjoy freedom and well-being as long as hundreds of millions of men live in misery and slavery.

It is up to us to promote in every possible way the victory of the only true outlook on the future of mankind. Freedom and peace cannot exist only for a portion of mankind.

One conclusion only can be drawn from what we have said before. The nations under the yoke of communism must be given every possible help in their struggle for liberation. Such help must come as soon as possible, fully and with the time when complete victory of freedom will be forthcoming. One cannot stop half way.

If KERSTEN's resolution will be passed communism will be dealt one of the severest blows ever suffered.

Yet this is not enough. The Russian people must know not only that friendship is being expressed but also that it is given factual assistance. The assistance the Russian people need most is the help to the revolutionary forces which are engaged in the struggle against the Bolshevik dictatorship. The American Nation has the duty to lend assistance to these forces because their struggle is the concern of the entire world.

Every free and freedom-loving nation is under the obligation to support our Nation in its struggle. Words of friendship and of recognition must be endorsed by deeds.

The Halogeton Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, recently Senate bill 1041 was passed by the Senate, after being reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with reference to the poisonous weed known as halogeton, which is spreading through the eastern part of Nevada and parts of Utah, Idaho, and other States. A certain amount of money was appropriated to eradicate this weed.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a joint statement by the Nevada State Farm Bureau and the Nevada State Cattle Association with reference to this subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HALOGETON MENACE—JOINT STATEMENT,
NEVADA STATE FARM BUREAU, NEVADA STATE
CATTLE ASSOCIATION

RENO, NEV., August 1, 1951

The poisonous weed Halogeton is spreading throughout the State of Nevada and surrounding States at an alarming rate. In 15 years of reported history it has been discovered in ever larger stands in widely divergent areas.

Along the highways, byways, roads, and wherever disturbed earth furnishes a receptive bed to the wandering seed this poisonous weed flourishes to threaten the livestock of the area.

We the farmers and ranchers of Nevada are aware of our responsibility to warn the Nation of this creeping danger. We do not wish to cause undue alarm as losses from Halogeton poisoning to date have not yet assumed the proportions of a disaster, although they have been severe in certain localities. However, if geometric expansion is allowed to continue and changing conditions such as drought or unforeseen circumstances in varying regions may multiply its threat to our national meat and wool supply.

It is our considered opinion that now is the time to halt the spread of this dangerous weed. A program for the eradication of Halogeton now may do the job that one 10 times its size would fail to accomplish in a few short years.

Our recommendation does not include the establishment of new agencies or bureaus to be supported by tax moneys or to expand into various projects of a continuing nature. We believe that existing agencies are fully qualified to do the job on a short-term basis with additional funds earmarked for the specific purpose of Halogeton control.

RUDOLPH H. SCHWARTZ,
President, Nevada State Farm Bureau.

FRED H. DRESSLER,
President, Nevada State Cattle Association.

Lustron-Commercial Home Equipment Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, on April 19, 1950, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation formally submitted to the Department of Justice evidence of a \$500,000 mail fraud and asked for prosecution. The RFC said the fraud took place in the execution of a contract between the Lustron Corp. and the Commercial Home Equipment Corp. of Chicago.

I can find no evidence of any action on this request by the Department of Justice.

On August 11, 1950, the Fulbright committee of the Senate filed a report recommending that the Department of Justice investigate the Lustron-Commercial Home Equipment deal.

Again, I can find no indication of any action by the Justice Department.

On June 28, 1951, interested in the matter because I was formerly counsel for the Fulbright committee, I wrote the Justice Department and asked for a report on any action "taken or contemplated by the Department of Justice with respect to the recommendation" of the Fulbright committee.

On July 11, the Justice Department finally answered my letter. Deputy Attorney General Peyton Ford said an investigation had recently been completed and an examination of the voluminous investigative reports is now under way.

I believe that the handling of the Lustron-Commercial Home Equipment investigation should be probed by Congress. In an effort to initiate such a probe, I have written to the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the Senate Judiciary Committee, and the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. In these letters I have attempted to bare the record of 17 months of procrastination by the Justice Department. I have called attention to unusual pressures which were brought to bear on the members of the Fulbright committee on behalf of the individuals involved in the Commercial Home Equipment Corp. and said:

I do not believe that I am merely engaging in wild speculation when I say that I suspect similar efforts have been made with respect to the investigation and action by the Department of Justice.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that all Members of the House should know the facts connected with the Lustron-Commercial Home Equipment Corp. mail-fraud case and so that they may have an opportunity to learn of them, I would like to include as a part of remarks, my letter to the Attorney General of June 28, the Justice Department reply of July 11, and

the letter to the four congressional committees dated August 21:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, July 11, 1951.

HON. GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is to acknowledge your letter of June 28, 1951, asking to be informed of the action taken by this Department with respect to the recommendations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency as contained in its preliminary report of April 19, 1950, a copy of which was made available to this Department. As you state, the mentioned report of the committee called attention to the half-million dollar mail fraud alleged to have been perpetrated on the Lustron Corp., growing out of the transportation contract that company had with the Commercial Home Equipment Corp.

Based on the information supplied in the committee's report, as well as that obtained through other sources, an investigation was requested to be made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. That investigation has recently been completed and an examination of the voluminous investigative reports is now under way. When that review is completed and the evidence evaluated, a decision will be made regarding criminal prosecution. You will be informed of the Department's decision in this matter.

Yours sincerely,

PEYTON FORD,
Deputy Attorney General.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 28, 1951.

HON. J. HOWARD MCGRATH,
Attorney General of the United States,
United States Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCGRATH: On August 11, 1950, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency filed its report on the Lustron Corp. transportation contract. This report was based upon public hearings held June 26 to 30, 1950, subsequent to executive hearings and staff investigations. This matter was first brought to the attention of the committee by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Investigation Division. On April 19, 1950, a preliminary report was furnished to that committee. This report, in effect, charged that a half-million dollar mail fraud had been perpetrated in connection with the Lustron Corp. transportation contract.

The same report was furnished at the same time to the Department of Justice.

The committee's report referred to above recommended as follows:

"1 The subcommittee does not undertake to pass upon the legal consequences of the evidence. That task is one for the Department of Justice. The Department of Justice should therefore promptly investigate the circumstances surrounding the transportation arrangement between Commercial Home Equipment Corp. and the Lustron Corp. for the purpose of ascertaining whether there is probable cause to believe that an offense has been committed against the laws of the United States."

As you probably know, I served as counsel for the Fulbright committee at the time of the hearings and the report referred to above.

I would appreciate your informing me of the action taken or contemplated by the Department of Justice with respect to the recommendation of the committee quoted above.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEADER.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 21, 1951.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, House Judiciary Committee,
Hon. WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, House Committee on Ex-
penditures in the Executive Depart-
ments,

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Commit-
tee,

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Ex-
penditures in the Executive Depart-
ments

MY DEAR COLLEAGUES: I wish to bring to your attention a situation in the Department of Justice which I believe merits exploration by the Congress. I am addressing this letter to the Judiciary Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate and the Expenditures Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate because, in my judgment, all of those committees have jurisdiction over the subject matter, and it is my hope that at least one of the committees will take sufficient interest to pursue this investigation.

April 19, 1950, the Investigations Division of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation formally referred to the Department of Justice for prosecution an instance of a half-million-dollar mail fraud. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation charged this fraud had been perpetrated in connection with the Lustron Corp. transportation contract with the Commercial Home Equipment Corp., of Chicago, Ill.

The alleged fraud consisted in false representations by Commercial that it had furnished 200 tractors to Lustron whereas, in fact, it had furnished only 160. Rental payments of minimum monthly amounts were based on the number of truck-tractors furnished.

This matter subsequently was investigated by the Fulbright committee of the Senate through preliminary staff investigation, executive hearings, and public hearings. August 11, 1950, the Fulbright committee filed a report recommending that the Department of Justice investigate this case for the purpose of determining whether or not an offense had been committed against the laws of the United States.

It was my privilege to serve as counsel for the Fulbright committee at the time of this investigation of the Lustron Corp.-Commercial Home Equipment Corp. transportation contract. I continued to follow the matter informally from time to time to ascertain what progress was being made by the Department of Justice. Finally, on June 28, 1951, I addressed a formal inquiry to the Attorney General of the United States, a copy of which is attached hereto. On July 11, 1951, Peyton Ford, Deputy Attorney General, acknowledged my inquiry. A copy of his letter likewise is attached hereto.

I am not one to minimize the difficulty of examining the facts in preparation for a criminal prosecution. I favor careful and thorough investigation before a case is presented to a grand jury. However, it would seem on the surface that 16 months would be adequate time within which the Department of Justice could complete its investigation, and either proceed to present the matter to a grand jury or else determine that there was no probable cause to believe that a criminal offense had been committed.

This is particularly true when it is considered that the Department of Justice has had the advantage of outside investigative work. The Investigations Division of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation employed the talents of at least three able investigators over some period of time. The Fulbright committee staff developed additional facts.

Further documentary evidence and testimony was accumulated in the executive hearings and public hearings of the Fulbright committee. All of this material was made available to the Department of Justice. I would doubt that there are very many cases before the Department of Justice which have been so completely documented by outside sources as the instant matter.

There are additional circumstances which seem to me to indicate that what appears to be delay and procrastination on the part of the Department of Justice is not wholly ascribable to the difficulty of the case. I believe these matters should be called to the attention of your committee.

1. Although the Reconstruction Finance Corporation formally urged the investigation by the Department of Justice on April 19, 1950, no action was taken on that request until the Fulbright committee announced its intention of holding public hearings on the Lustron Corp.-Commercial Home Equipment Corp. transportation contract on Friday, June 23, 1950. On this date, the Department of Justice, through Mr. Peyton Ford, Deputy Attorney General, advised the Fulbright committee informally that the alleged mail fraud in the Lustron Corp. transportation contract was being referred to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for investigation. At the same time, he requested the Fulbright committee to suspend its public hearings on this subject. The Fulbright committee arranged to hear the representative of the Department of Justice in executive session but refused to call off its hearings. Monday, June 26, 1950, Mr. Raymond Whearty appeared before the Fulbright committee in executive session and advanced his reasons on behalf of the Department of Justice why public hearings on this matter should not be held. The committee decided to proceed with its hearings, which were held during the entire week commencing June 26, 1950.

2. During the preparation and consideration of the report, unusual pressures were brought to bear upon the members of the Fulbright committee and the members of the Fulbright committee staff by and on behalf of the individuals involved in the Commercial Home Equipment Corp. and their attorney, Mr. Joseph E. Casey. These pressures, I am proud to say, did not succeed in suppressing the committee's report, nor in softening the language of that report, although the report was somewhat delayed and the members of the committee and the staff leaned over backward to avoid any reflection upon the individuals or upon the Commercial Home Equipment Corp. not fully substantiated by the facts in the committee's record.

Having witnessed these efforts, through political influence, to affect the action of the Fulbright committee, I do not believe that I am merely engaging in wild speculation when I say that I suspect similar efforts have been made with respect to the investigation and action by the Department of Justice. It is this aspect of the matter which, in my judgment, warrants the attention of the Congress.

One of the foundations of any social organization is confidence in the integrity of its rules of conduct and the agency responsible for enforcing observance of those rules of conduct. The Department of Justice holds this responsibility with respect to the Federal Government. It is idle to talk of establishing a code of ethics for the conduct of Government officials if the criminal laws of the United States are permitted to be flouted with impunity. It is essential that the Department of Justice act vigorously, forthrightly, and promptly in the prosecution of offenses against the United States.

I sincerely hope that any congressional investigation will disclose that the Depart-

ment of Justice is meeting these responsibilities. However, from the facts and circumstances I have recited, and from the public record and the report of the Fulbright committee on this subject, it seems to me that sufficient doubt is raised to warrant congressional exploration.

The Department of Justice may be able to satisfy any thorough, impartial congressional inquiry that its handling of this matter has been exemplary. If that is so, a public service will have been done by dispelling the doubt in the minds of the American people which naturally arises when the Department of Justice permits 16 months to elapse without taking action after responsible Government agencies have formally and solemnly urged investigation with a view to prosecution.

I wish to assure any committee undertaking this matter of my full cooperation in assembling all facts pertinent to the inquiry. A copy of the Fulbright committee hearings and report are enclosed herewith.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEADER.

Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest jobs being done in American journalism today is being done by two great New Orleans newspapers, the Times-Picayune and the New Orleans States.

These two newspapers are in the forefront of the fight to prevent the theft of the tidelands of this country by the Federal Government. From time to time the ace reporters of these great newspapers have been assigned to write stories about the machinations and chicanery behind the proposed tidelands grab. From time to time I have brought these pieces to your attention.

Today I direct your attention to two editorials which have appeared in these newspapers. From the editorial side they present undisputable logic and inevitable conclusions as a result of a recent story on the tidelands grab, which appears elsewhere in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of today.

The editorial from the New Orleans States is entitled "The Case of the Cooperatives," and the editorial from the Times-Picayune is entitled "Tideland Grabbers Multiply."

I commend both of them to you for your study:

[From the New Orleans States]

THE CASE OF THE COOPERATIVES

In the mind of the average person, a cooperative is a nonprofit enterprise entered into by a small group of farmers, say, to pool their resources and market their goods. Or an arrangement whereby they purchase together machinery none would be able to purchase alone. A co-op can buy seed in bulk, or feed or tools or fertilizers.

Generally speaking, co-ops are nonprofit making and they pay no taxes. Still generally speaking, the money they make is paid

out to members as dividends on shares. That makes them nonprofit.

That is what people think of when they hear of co-ops.

But there are co-ops and co-ops.

The Sunday paper, in a story by Mr. David Kleck, oil editor of the Times-Picayune New Orleans States, told us the story of a co-operative, headed by Mr. Howard A. Cowden, of Kansas City, Mo., which is doing its best to grab off large portions of the tidelands of Louisiana if the rape of States' rights plotted by the Fair Deal centralized Government proponents is not stopped by the Congress. This cooperative is named the Co-operative Refinery Association.

Mr. Cowden is also president of the Consumers Cooperative Association, domiciled in Kansas City.

This cooperative operates in Missouri, Kansas, Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Colorado, and Wyoming.

It owns in the neighborhood of 1,000 oil wells.

It owns around 1,000 miles of pipeline.

It operates four oil refineries and has an interest in a fifth.

And it doesn't pay taxes.

Oil, however, is not the only interest of this giant tax-free enterprise. It also mills lumber. It manufactures fertilizer. And it is in the wholesale business, selling to its local member co-ops groceries, farm machinery, motor-car tires and accessories.

This behemoth business, composed of 1,500 local cooperatives in 9 States, is only 1 of 18 farmer cooperatives which are laying siege to Louisiana's tidelands as well as those of Texas. These cooperatives claim a fair and equitable portion on the marginal seas in order—as Representative Charles LaFollette of Indiana said on the floor of the House—not to “deprive the farmers of Indiana and of the 32 other States involved . . . of their share in that wealth and of their right to join together cooperatively in its development.” Their idea of a fair share was 1,800 square miles.

This legal tax dodger is connected with other interlocking co-ops. Their webs stretch from Canada to the Mexican border, from ocean to ocean, dodging taxes all the way. They exist, legally, without paying taxes. Their share of the costs of Government, costs of defense, costs of European aid, costs of welfare, are paid by other businesses, large and small, and individuals who cannot escape through the cooperative dodge.

Cooperatives are big business. As an example Mr. Cowden's Kansas City Consumers Cooperative did \$62,428,460 business last year, expected to have done \$75,000,000 as of the end of its fiscal year August 1.

How much business can you do without paying taxes?

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune]
TIDELANDS GRABBERS MULTIPLY

The attempted Federal grab of the tidelands to which the coastal States have held constitutional and judicially confirmed title for more than a century, has generated an army of civilian grabbers for leases to these areas. Their activities, described in yesterday's Times-Picayune New Orleans States, supply a fantastic sequel to the all-but-incredible adventure launched by Interior Department bureaucrats. Private applications for leases on the oil-bearing offshore areas are being filed by individuals, organized groups, and even by “farmers' cooperatives” whose lawyers claim the Federal Government must hand them out to speculators lured by dreams of easy profits running high into the millions.

It is stated that the coastal areas of California, Louisiana, and Texas have been blanketed by these claims. Filings cover, for

example, the entire 811 miles of water front of Long Beach, Calif., and likewise all of that municipality's harbor facilities and recreation and park improvements, constructed by the city at a cost exceeding \$25,000,000. Oil developments on which hundreds of millions have been invested under State leases are demanded by the private grabbers from the Federal grabbers, under an act permitting leases at 50 cents per acre.

It is noted further that former Secretary of the Interior Ickes, who helped engineer the Federal tidelands grab, now supports the lease claims of private speculators. Other former Federal officials, including an ex-United States Senator, are connected with this greedy scramble which might, if successful, dwarf in its easy-profits killings that earlier product of Federal maladministration, the Teapot Dome scandal.

Whether child or parent of the Federal grab, this huge private-grab project obviously is violative of sound public policy and destructive of the public interest. Its exposure should insure prompt enactment of the measure already passed by the House to restore the tidelands to the States whose titles and rights to them were constitutionally established and steadily maintained by the land's highest Court from the Republic's beginning until a few years ago.

Common Sense Ideas for Flood Prevention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, we have had so many recipes, prescriptions, and theories handed to us on the subject of flood control during recent years, that I fear we have almost lost sight of what is really involved. Sometimes we can listen to the scientists and the experts so much that we fail to see the fundamental concepts to be considered. We may not be able to see the woods for the trees.

I am not so much interested in flood control as I am in flood prevention. If we are to conserve the precious soil up on the watershed on the uplands and the slopes, we must take those steps which will result in contour farming, terracing, gulley plugging, and the damming of the branches, creeks, and small streams, tributary to the larger streams. The trouble has been that apparently we have begun at the wrong end of the stream. We have constructed large dams, which inundate and put out of production forever so much of the best land and the most highly productive lands of the country.

If we begin up on the watershed and conserve both the precious soil and the moisture, we can prevent to a remarkable extent the occurrence of floods downstream, and we can almost assuredly prevent flood disasters on a large scale. It does look like poor judgment to take out of production the best land in order to put some of the marginal and submarginal lands into production, when we know that we can depend upon a reasonable return and in most instances

a bountiful return from the fertile bottom lands along the larger streams, if we prevent floods from above. But the marginal and submarginal lands must constantly be treated, petted, pampered, and then we cannot count upon bountiful yields such as we can obtain from the rich bottom fields downstream.

Hence I say we should use common sense ideas for flood prevention. I realize that this will not result in the construction of large dams downstream which may serve as monuments to the memory of dead engineers or politicians. But it will surely be to the best interests of the people as a whole and will insure the expenditure of the taxpayers' dollars in places and in the manner that will produce the best results in the long run.

The following is a very interesting, illuminating and convincing letter which I received from the Konawa Lions Club of Konawa, Okla. It shows that this group has the proper understanding and conception of what should be done. They compare the results of constructive thinking and efforts where flood prevention has been begun and installed on the watershed, with the improper method of constructing large dams downstream, resulting in such serious mistakes, and they point out vivid instances and illustrations in our own State of Oklahoma. I trust that this letter will be read with much interest and edification by all who are interested in the problem of genuine flood prevention:

KONAWA, OKLA., July 31, 1951.

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE,

Member of Congress,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCHWABE: You are familiar with the tremendous losses in northern Oklahoma and eastern Kansas resulting from the recent rains. Newspapers in Oklahoma recently quoted the Corps of Army Engineers as stating such losses could have been avoided had the Congress provided sufficient funds, to the amount of hundreds of millions of dollars, to construct necessary big dams for flood control. You will likely be called upon in the near future to use your influence and cast your vote toward appropriating huge sums of money for such a needless expenditure. The experience of Miami, Okla., proved that construction of big dams did not avert flood damage. Release of the floodwaters from Canton Dam in the North Canadian River has resulted in more crop damage and damage to highways than was experienced before the dam was constructed for flood-control purposes.

Before you cast your vote to spend a lot more of the taxpayers' money for something that will be only a mud flat in 20 years, as one Army engineer described the proposed Eufaula Dam, we urge you to give serious thought to the real flood-control program as established on Cloud Creek in Washita County, Mill Creek in Johnston and Murray Counties, East Owl Creek in McClain County, Sandstone Creek in Beckham and Roger Mills Counties, and Barnitz Creek in Custer County. All of these watersheds received more than twice the rainfall as watersheds where extensive engineering structures failed to control floods and still none of these watersheds suffered any flood damage. Also, adjacent untreated watershed, with similar slope, erosion, soil, and farming conditions, were severely damaged by flood conditions. Further, large structures result in inundations of some of the most fertile farm lands in the world, while the agricultural flood-control program that is being established on

the Washita River watershed protects the fertile bottom soils for continued production at a much less cost of taxpayers' money for each acre protected. Some would have us believe that time is too short for watershed treatment for flood control and that big dams are the only alternative. We believe if you will compare time used in the two treatments that you will find very little difference in total time necessary to establish control.

We urge that you use your influence to appropriate the taxpayers' money for flood control by treating the watersheds where the floods originate and not wait until the uncontrolled waters are in the major streams.

Sincerely,

KONAWA LIONS CLUB,
JACK DAVIS, *President*.
BURWELL M. BATES,
Secretary

Truman's Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a recent issue of the Wall Street Journal:

TRUMAN'S WAY

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

In recent months we have heard a lot of criticism of the Congress for not letting Truman have his way. In the words of the "Happy Warrior," let us look at the record and see what would have happened to our country if Congress had given Truman everything he asked for.

If Truman had had his way, every farm in America today would be operating under the Brannan plan—socialized agriculture. If Truman had had his way, the country would today be saddled with socialized medicine under that great medical genius, lawyer, Oscar Ewing.

If Truman had had his way, under his four point program, every nation in the world would today have a direct call on the United States treasurer for technical assistance and economic development loans.

If Truman had had his way, there would today be no Taft-Hartley provision requiring official registration of Communists and labor unions.

If Truman had his way, every major river in America today would be a part of some TVA with State and local government submerged by Federal bureaucrats.

If Truman had his way, every school in America would today be under direct supervision of the Washington bureaucracy—socialized education.

If Truman had his way, there would have been no investigation of communism in the State Department and other Federal agencies. His red herring statement of August 1948 would have ended the Alger Hiss case.

If Truman had his way, total Federal spending since 1946 would have been about \$75,000,000,000 more than it has been to date. That is the accumulated cost of all the new programs Truman proposed which were turned down by a resolute and wise Congress.

Had it not been for the defenders of constitutional government in the House and the Senate Truman would have had his way in all these things. He urged each of these programs at least once; some several times.

GEORGE E. STRINGFELLOW.

WEST ORANGE, N. J.

Division of Water Between the United States and Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I think I should call to the attention of the Congress a development that has come to my attention in our negotiations concerning division of water between the United States and Canada along the border north of Montana.

The government of the Province of British Columbia in a statement: "In the matter of the application of the Government of the United States to the International Joint Commission dated January 12, 1951, for approval of the construction and operation of the Libby Dam and Reservoir on the Kootenay River near Libby, Mont., March 8, 1951," requests that any order of approval should include certain conditions, one of which is:

(c) That in recognition of the physical contribution of British Columbia to the project, there shall be delivered from the power developed as the result of the proposed works to a point on the British Columbia border for use in British Columbia such amount of electrical energy as the Commission shall deem appropriate.

I have information that the Province of British Columbia, in recognition of its physical contribution to the Libby Dam and Reservoir, expects to demand under this provision one-third of the electric power generated at the Libby project. Such a grant of power to Canada would be contrary to the best interests of the State of Montana, the United States which is making such a huge investment, and contrary to existing law.

I would further like to call the attention of the Congress to an extract from the Calgary-Albertan entitled "Across the Divide," dated July 25, 1951.

Three power projects have been considered above the Grand Coulee. One, on the Kootenai at Libby in the extreme northwest corner of Montana, has already been approved by engineers and only a few political considerations stand in the way of actual construction. The Libby Dam would form a lake reaching far up the Kootenai River and extending 42 miles into British Columbia to a point near Cranbrook. More than a quarter of a million horsepower would be developed, a third of it earmarked for British Columbia. Fifteen thousand would be a gift, another 73,000 at a very cheap rate. Final terms are now being negotiated.

Mr. Speaker, let me especially call your attention to the above article. You will note it says:

Final terms are now being negotiated.

I would like to call attention to certain facts that have been brought to light in these negotiations which are exceedingly disturbing.

First, the Province of British Columbia has asked to be paid in power rather than in money as recompense for the

utilization of her natural resources. Heretofore, it has been the policy to make settlement in such cases by cash payments—never by the allocation of a block of power.

Second, section 5 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, reads, in part, as follows:

Electric power and energy generated at reservoir projects under the control of the War Department and in the opinion of the Secretary of War not required in the operation of such projects shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, the rate schedules to become effective upon confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission. Rate schedules shall be drawn having regard to the recovery (upon the basis of the application of such rate schedules to the capacity of the electric facilities of the projects) of the cost of producing and transmitting such electric energy, including the amortization of the capital investment allocated to power over a reasonable period of years. Preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives.

Granting a third of the power generated at Libby Dam to Canada as indemnity would be contrary to this provision of law.

Further, Public Law 329, Seventy-fifth Congress, chapter 720, first session, section 4, reads as follows:

In order to insure that the facilities for the generation of electric energy at the Bonneville project shall be operated for the benefit of the general public, and particularly of domestic and rural consumers, the Administrator shall at all times, in disposing of electric energy generated at said project, give preference and priority to public bodies and cooperatives.

Again, in this section, in the Bonneville Act, there is a definite mandate that the project shall be operated for the benefit of the general public, and particularly of domestic and rural consumers. That the Administrator shall at all times, in disposing of electric energy generated at said project, give preference and priority to public bodies and cooperatives.

This section of the law would be violated in the granting of one-third of the power of Libby Dam to the government of the Province of British Columbia.

Article VIII of the treaty between the United States and Great Britain relating to boundary waters and questions arising between the United States and Canada states, in part:

In cases involving the elevation of the natural level of waters on either side of the line as a result of the construction and maintenance on the other side of remedial or protective works or dams or other obstructions in boundary waters or in waters flowing therefrom or in waters below the boundary in rivers flowing across the boundary, the Commission shall require, as a condition of its approval thereof, that suitable and adequate provision, approved by it, be made for the protection and indemnity of all interests on the other side of the line which may be injured thereby.

It is not contemplated that in carrying out this provision of the treaty there should be a violation of either the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, or Public Law 329, Seventy-fifth Congress.

The Department of the Army, Office of the Chief of Engineers, under date of December 1, 1950, submitted to the Secretary of State a report on the proposal for construction of the Libby project. On page 6 of this report, the Libby project is described as follows:

The Libby Dam site is located about 11 miles upstream from Libby, Mont., at river mile 213. At this site and for a great proportion of the length of the proposed reservoir, Kootenai River flows in a deep U-shaped rock-walled canyon.

A project at this site, as constructed to the forebay elevation of 2,459, as recommended by the International Columbia River Engineering Board, would create a reservoir approximately 100 miles long and from one-half to one and one-half miles wide. The reservoir would extend 42 miles into Canada, to the tailwater of the Bull River Dam site, which is about 5 miles upstream from Wardner, British Columbia. With a full Libby Reservoir, the depth of water at the international boundary would be 150 feet. The reservoir will occupy approximately 51,500 acres, of which 17,700 acres are in Canada. Improvements in the United States portion of the reservoir are a transcontinental railroad, a State highway, a few logging communities, and a few farms. In the Canadian portion the reservoir would flood a few small communities and farms, and some secondary roads. In addition, it would necessitate the raising of the Canadian Pacific Railway Crows Nest line and No. 3 Highway for short distances. The reservoir would have a gross storage capacity of 6,730,000 acre-feet, of which approximately 1,000,000 acre-feet would be in Canada. The usable storage capacity at 35-percent draw-down (128 feet) would be 4,620,000 acre-feet, of which 980,000 acre-feet would be in Canada.

The report goes on to say that there will be a power installation of 10 units of 103,000 kilowatts each, or a total installation of 1,030,000 kilowatts. The estimated cost of the construction is \$242,000,000, of which approximately \$5,500,000 is the estimated cost of providing the portion of the reservoir in Canada, and approximately \$236,500,000 is the cost of the dam and the portion of the reservoir in the United States.

With regard to flood controls, the report says that flood-control benefits from the project are estimated at \$1,165,000 annually in the United States and \$30,000 annually in Canada. The estimate of the flood-control benefits in Canada is confined to estimated reduction in pumping and maintenance costs in existing diked areas, and is based on an assumption, by Canadian authorities, that the existing dikes give essentially complete flood protection.

Page 8 of the report states:

In summary, the effects of the Libby project in Canada which are particularly pertinent to consideration of this application are that the water surface at the international boundary would be raised approximately 150 feet and the reservoir pool would extend into Canada some 42 miles, inundating 17,700 acres of Canadian land, displacing the population of a few small communities and farms, and requiring short lengths of a main railway line and highway to be raised. The project would provide benefits in Canada by almost entirely eliminating flood damages along the Kootenay upstream from Kootenay Lake and by making possible an increase in power output along the lower Kootenay of 172,000 kilowatts. The estimated annual monetary benefits in Canada are \$4,502,000. In addition, the regulation and stabilization of stream flows should

provide substantial intangible and unevaluated benefits throughout the affected area.

In other words, the benefits to Canada because of the construction of this dam are very material. The demand of the Province of British Columbia of one-third of the power generated at Libby Dam would be in addition to the benefits mentioned in the Army engineer's report.

This grant of power, in addition to other benefits, is unjustified.

Mr. Speaker, the granting of any such terms by the United States to Canada, as I have indicated, is contrary to the best interests of the United States, contrary to precedent, and I feel very strongly should be opposed by the American section of the Joint International Commission representing the United States. It will, I am sure, be opposed by the citizens of Montana.

It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that this whole matter should be examined carefully before it proceeds further and that it should be made clear to our friends across the border that such terms as they demand would be unlawful and that our Government, under existing law, does not have the authority to concur in such terms.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope the Secretary of State will take note of these negotiations and adequately protect the best interests of the United States, by supporting Senator Stanley and the American section of the International Joint Commission in their efforts to protect the interests of our country.

MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested by one of my constituents, William H. McMasters, of Cambridge, Mass., who is a former newspaperman and presently an instructor in journalism at Mount Ida, in Newton, Mass., to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following lines which he has written, and which were published in the Boston Evening Globe on July 25, 1951:

MACARTHUR

Serene and dignified, he stands erect
Amid vast throngs who wildly cheer his name.

Like some sequoia, calm and proudly decked,
He wears his silver stars that but proclaim
The fulgent service of a soldier, brave
And unafraid to speak the truth for all
His countrymen to hear While critics rave,
He smiles, unmoved, his back against the wall.

Deep planted in his patriotic soul,
He knows that blood-cemented wall is strong,
Built stone on stone, a bulwark and a goal
That holds the line where right shall challenge wrong.

God grant his strength that he do well his part

To flood the life-tide of our Nation's heart.

—William H. McMasters.

Supreme Court's Problem With Relation to the Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to unanimous consent granted, I insert an article by Hon. Durwood T. Pye, a member of the Atlanta bar, entitled "The Supreme Court of the United States Problem With Relation to the Public Schools."

Mr. Pye is a prominent member of the Atlanta, Ga., bar, where he has practiced law since his admission to the bar in 1929. He has served as assistant solicitor general of the Atlanta judicial circuit, and as assistant county attorney for Fulton County.

Mr. Pye has also served in the capacity of law school lecturer and is the author of papers dealing with the Georgia law of negotiable instruments and the Georgia law of corporations.

The article above referred to is as follows:

THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PROBLEM WITH RELATION TO THE PUBLIC
SCHOOLS

(By Durwood T. Pye, of the Atlanta bar)

In the recent book by Prof. Mitchell Wendall (Columbia University Press, 1949) entitled "Relations Between the Federal and State Courts," attention is called to the neglect heretofore given the governmental significance of the Federal court system.

This neglect is now being rapidly dissipated in the South. The recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States upon the subject of public schools and colleges focused attention upon the governmental significance of the Supreme Court of the United States. This tribunal has become public problem No. 1.

The decisions referred to are those in the cases of Sweatt against Painter et al and McLaurin against Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education et al, both decided June 5, 1950.

In the Sweatt against Painter case Negroes were ordered admitted to the University of Texas Law School (established for white students) although the Court of Appeals of Texas and the Supreme Court of Texas had adjudicated that the privileges, advantages, and opportunities for the study of law afforded white students at the University of Texas Law School were substantially equaled by those afforded Negro students at Texas State University for Negroes.

In the McLaurin case the Negro student there involved received the same instruction, from the same professors and the same books and at the same time and place, as the white students. He was merely required to observe separate seating and eating arrangements.

These decisions make plain the purpose of the Supreme Court of the United States: to require that there be no separate education of the white and colored races in public schools and colleges; to require that the two races be integrated in such institutions; that only mixed schools of the white and colored races may be maintained and supported by the States. Or to put it more concretely, separation of the races by law is forbidden, there must be a forcible amalgamation of the races, and we will begin at the most effective point.

This construction of these decisions is that adopted by the Democratic Party of Georgia in its resolution of August 9, 1950, refusing to abide by the same, in which it was stated: "Under the doctrine of these decisions the races must be educated together in the public schools beginning with the first grade."

This is the same construction as that of the Harvard Law Review (vol. 64, No. 1, p. 130) in which it is stated: "If the approach adopted by the Court is consistently followed, it would seem unlikely that equality will be found to exist under any system of mandatory segregation."

And this is precisely the construction placed by the Supreme Court of the United States upon its own decisions in these cases, for in the *McLaurin* case it says: "We hold that under these circumstances the fourteenth amendment precludes differences in treatment based upon race."

This is an extraordinary statement. It is extraordinary not only because of its construction of the fourteenth amendment, but because of the conciseness of treatment in reference to such construction. The amendment is not quoted. None of its language is referred to. No language thereof sustaining the position taken is substantially stated.

If the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States sustained the proposition that Georgia could not have separate schools for the white and colored races it would not be morally binding upon the people of Georgia.

The fourteenth amendment was submitted for ratification to the Southern States after the War Between the States upon the theory that they had no right to leave the Union and had been at all times members of the Union. It could not have been ratified without the concurrence of the States of the South. These States (except Tennessee) refused to ratify. Then, at the point of the bayonet, with the respectable white people disfranchised, they were forced to ratify. Such ratification is contrary to law, and if the Supreme Court of the United States were to pass upon this question of ratification in an impartial manner, it would so hold, but it refuses to say whether this amendment was or was not ratified, and construes the United States Constitution as though ratification were not in question.

But the fourteenth amendment does not in any way support the proposition that Georgia may not have separate schools and colleges for the white and colored races.

That amendment merely provides so far as is here relevant: "No State shall . . . deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

The entire claim to Federal interference in the schools of Georgia is based upon this provision.

Is a white student denied equal protection of the laws when he is required to attend a white school? Is a colored student denied equal protection of the laws when he is required to attend a colored school? If there be no colored school within the graduate class which the colored student desires to attend, is he denied equal protection of the laws if his expenses in a school without the State be paid in lieu of providing a school within the State?

In short, may the State have separate white and colored schools? Is equal protection of the laws denied because the races are separated in the schools?

There is no such language in the fourteenth amendment. Deliberate consideration of this amendment by the Supreme Court of the United States in former years reached no such construction. On the contrary, that Court then determined that this amendment did not prevent separate school systems for the two races in those States which desired such systems.

However plain it may be from its language that the fourteenth amendment gives the Federal Government no jurisdiction over the separation of the races in public schools and colleges, it is equally plain from the *Sweatt* and *McLaurin* cases that the Federal Government proposes to integrate the races in the schools and destroy separation of the races therein.

In *Plessey v. Ferguson* (163 U. S. 537), decided October term, 1895, the Supreme Court of the United States distinctly ruled that the fourteenth amendment did not prevent the individual States from recognizing that there are differences between the white and colored races, and that the States might lawfully and in full keeping with all provisions of the Constitution of the United States, provide for the two races separate and substantially equal public schools.

Why the different rulings in the *Sweatt* and *McLaurin* cases? The Constitution of the United States has not been changed. Congress has passed no laws on the question. Indeed Congress has time and time again refused to enact such laws.

The different rulings result from a different Court and a different national administration. The refusal of the people to change the Constitution of the United States, and the refusal of Congress to pass laws on the subject, have brought about a determination on the part of the present personnel of the Supreme Court of the United States and a determination on the part of President Truman to take the law into their own hands—to do illegally and unlawfully what they may not legally and lawfully do. That is, to depart from the rule of law and resort to the rule of force—the last resort of tyrants—as the kings of France knew when they carved those words upon their cannon.

Apologists for the President and his Court claim that they merely desire good schools for the colored race. That equality of opportunity is all that is wanted. The Supreme Court makes no such claim. It indulges in no such hypocrisy. It uses no such weasel words. It frankly states its fiat: "We hold that under these circumstances the fourteenth amendment precludes differences in treatment based upon race." Those circumstances were that the colored student received the same instruction, from the same professors and same books, and at the same time and place, and he and the white students observed separate seating and eating arrangements.

President Truman and his Court well know that the South is the great obstacle to national socialism in America. While Georgia and the other States of the South have no monopoly on the love of liberty and freedom, they know from hard experience that liberty and freedom require vigilance, and they are cold to the idea of the control of all life from Washington. They are too close to ancestors who carved this land from out the wilderness.

To break this hard core of opposition to a central state it is necessary to break the South. And the purpose is to break it. To break it at its heart. The body will then be pliable. When pride of ancestry and hope of posterity are gone from the white people of the South, there will be no resistance to the tide of national socialism, and the central state may engulf for good or ill the economic and social life of the Nation.

While the Court does not have absolute power, the Court and President Truman together, acting in concert, do have power approaching the absolute. The decrees of the Court enforced by a President willing to use military force to that end approximate the absolute power referred to by Lord Acton.

This combination of President Truman and his Court is more dangerous to Georgia and the South than John Brown and his

band. John Brown plotted to slit throats of individuals. What he could hope to do was limited by small numbers. The President and his Court aim at the jugular vein of a great section of the Nation. What they hope to accomplish is without limit. John Brown was a traitor and an outlaw, and he swung from the gibbet for his treason. The President and the Court represent the majesty of the Nation, and their decrees are taken as "the law."

This is not to be understood as making any invidious comparison. But it does point up the greater opportunity for evil, without risk to themselves, of those who hold in their hands the instruments of public power and are willing to make unrestrained use of them.

Mr. Conrad Richter, in his essay entitled "That Early American Quality" (the Atlantic, September 1950), in lamenting the decline of that quality says: "So the later Romans, looking back on the days of Caesar and Pompey must have spoken longingly and tragically to each other at some steep and dangerous dip in their decline. Our fault has not been so much the betrayal of our forefathers as the short-sighted abandonment of a vital thing that might have kept us on the track. Some of the bounties of those early Americans we try to keep alive today . . . But the most precious thing, the temper of the men who produced and established these bounties and privileges, has been ignored."

Mr. Truman and his Court think this is true of the South. They will find it is not true of Georgia. The temper of freedom and the will to maintain it still live in Georgia. Georgia is determined to resist the destruction of her laws and institutions.

President Truman and his Court are detected in their plans. Their purposes are understood. The educational leaders of the State are aroused. Important sections of the clergy are aroused. The anger of the people rises in every section of the State.

Article VII, section II, paragraph I, of the constitution of Georgia expressly limits the taxing power of the General Assembly to nine stated purposes, the second of which is "For educational purposes." "The General Assembly has only those powers of taxation over the State which it is permitted to exercise under the grant of power contained in the constitution. . . . (In the above parts of) the constitution of the State are specified the purposes for which the power of taxation may be exercised by the General Assembly, and it can be exercised by that body only for the purposes specified." (*Brown v. Martin* (162 Ga. 172, 175).)

The words "For educational purposes" are limited and defined in article VIII, section I, paragraph I. "The provision of an adequate education for the citizens shall be a primary obligation of the State of Georgia, the expense of which shall be provided for by taxation. Separate schools shall be provided for the white and colored races."

The provision for adequate education and the provision for separate schools are not distinct and separable parts of the constitution so that one may stand while the other falls. On the contrary, these provisions are inseparable parts of one distinct and entire constitutional law providing for adequate education in separate schools. If one part fails the other fails likewise in the common disaster *Reynolds v. State* (181 Ga. 547, 551).

It is true beyond cavil that if the separation of the white and colored races in the schools of the State be destroyed, the same blow will destroy all taxing power of the General Assembly for educational purposes.

This is not to say that a decision or decree of the Supreme Court of the United States striking down the separation of the races in the public schools of the State will destroy

all taxing power of the General Assembly for educational purposes. But when a colored student enters any white school, or a white student enters any colored school, then such taxing power will terminate.

The above states the plain law of the State not only as respects the taxing power of the General Assembly for the support of the common schools, but likewise the university system. Article VIII, section I, paragraph I, is not confined to "common schools for the education of children," as was its predecessor section in the constitution of 1877, but in terms relates to "adequate education" for "the citizens." It covers the whole field of public education.

Thus upon the entry of a colored student into any white college of the university system, professional, graduate, or otherwise, all officials of the State are immediately prohibited by the constitution from expending any tax funds of the State for the support of any public school or college of any grade or class.

Nor may the counties under such circumstances levy taxes or expend county tax funds for school purposes.

The taxing power which the general assembly may delegate to counties is expressly limited to the 16 purposes stated in article VII, section IV, paragraph I, the third of which is "for educational purposes upon property located outside of independent school systems, as provided in article VIII of this constitution." The words "for educational purposes" as here used have the same meaning as those same words in article VII, section II, paragraph I, relating to the taxing power of the general assembly. "The provisions for establishing and maintaining public schools and allowing taxation by counties for educational purposes are not distinct and independent constitutional provisions. They bear upon and have relation to the same subject" *Brown v. Martin* (supra, at p 177). In addition, the power of counties to tax for educational purposes is only "as provided in article VIII of this constitution," which is the article authorizing taxation only for schools which are separate.

Nor may municipal corporations, cities or towns, independent school districts, local school districts, or trustees under such circumstances levy taxes or expend tax funds for school purposes.

All such school systems derive their existence and authority from article VIII of the constitution, and are created by it or as to those antedating it are thereby continued. Article VIII authorizes but one system of schools within the entire State, and that is a system in which the white and colored races are separately educated. No act of the general assembly could authorize these local school systems to levy or expend tax funds for mixed schools. The general assembly cannot authorize a local subdivision of the State to exercise an authority which the general assembly itself could not exercise.

Efforts to force mixed schools will therefore fail in Georgia. Persistence in such efforts will result in no public schools in which to mix.

There can be no public schools without public school funds. Neither the President of the United States nor the Supreme Court of the United States may levy taxes. The Constitution of the United States forbids. If this does not deter, the lack of tax machinery does. Only Congress can provide tax collectors. Those who would force mixed schools are thus effectively deterred—they are stopped in their tracks.

The general assembly of the State has authority to save many of the schools against foreseeable contingency. Two simple laws are required. One dealing with all public schools outside the university system; and the other dealing with the schools,

colleges, and departments of that system. The first would provide that when separate schools came to an end in any school system, the schools of that system would simultaneously cease to be a part of the public school system; that the Governor shall make proclamation of the fact and assume charge of the facilities of the system for the purpose of care and preservation of the school property. The second of such laws would make like provision respecting any school, college, or department of the university system.

These laws are required to preserve the existence of the remaining schools, colleges, and departments. Without them the entire structure of public education falls with the collapse of any part, for all are parts of one component whole under article VIII of the constitution of the State. With these laws the educational structure must be assaulted system by system, college by college; for each school system and each school, college and department is a citadel which must be separately assailed.

With these laws on the statute books any mandamus, injunction or like order of the Supreme Court of the United States would be fruitless. It is settled law that such writs will not issue in cases in which the plaintiff would not be aided thereby. It is not suggested that the Supreme Court of the United States would follow this law. But it is suggested that with the enactment of the two mentioned statutes, there would be little incentive to litigation.

Once again the system of Government set up by our forebears is our protection. Once again the Constitution of the United States deserves the veneration which Georgians have always given it. That Constitution may be twisted and distorted by those who would have it serve their ends—its plain terms and provisions may be violated—but so long as that Constitution stands the States have their internal governments. The internal governments of the States are their defense against Washington dictation.

Doylestown, Pa., Small-Business Firm Teams Up for National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT C. VAUGHN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. VAUGHN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, August 21, there appeared in the Washington, New York, Philadelphia, and Camden newspapers an RCA full-page advertisement outlining the major role played by small business in our national defense program. This advertisement particularly called to the attention of the readers of these newspapers the contribution Mr. K. A. Swanstrom, owner of the Penn Engineering & Manufacturing Co., of Doylestown, Pa., and its 26 employees are making to the production of an important military instrument—the new portable walkie-talkie. Our leaders of national defense may never have heard of Mr. Swanstrom's small company or of many other small companies which are contributing so much toward the defense effort.

The job of providing our Armed Forces with all the things they need to keep this country strong and safe is a big one.

To do this job well, our country needs the scientific research, engineering know-how and mass production facilities of great companies like RCA, but we also need the skilled performance of thousands of small companies like the Doylestown company. As a result of this type of cooperation between big and little business, the Army was able to obtain the lightweight walkie-talkie it wanted when the hour of need came.

RCA is to be commended not only for the large part it plays in our defense program but also for calling attention to the public of the magnificent role that thousands of small concerns like the Penn Engineering & Manufacturing Co. are playing in making America strong.

Hard-Core Revolt Wins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News for August 21:

HARD-CORE REVOLT WINS

(By John Cramer)

While we've been dozing, Government personnel practice has been going through a major revolution—perhaps the biggest and most important in the history of the civil-service system.

It's a revolution which most of us have failed to recognize, even those who urged it.

But it's here just the same, or 90 percent here, and it seems almost certain to stay, and remake the whole face of the Federal civil service as we've known it.

It's a revolution in the direction of what is called the hard-core system.

Under the hard-core system, the number of permanent employees in all agencies, and in Government as a whole, would be severely limited.

But permanent employees would be really permanent—instead of permanent in name only, as was the case with so many career workers during the immediate postwar years.

They would be untouchable or almost so, when Government went through a period of lay-offs.

When an agency expanded, it would do so by hiring new temporary employees.

When it was forced to trim its staff, it would do so by firing temporary employees.

I first heard about the hard-core system about a year ago from the Navy's Charles Plozet, a veteran Government personnel officer. I've rarely heard it discussed since. There has been no particular campaign behind the idea.

Yet it's a fact that Government right now is operating under rules which need only minor polishing to become a bona fide hard-core system.

It's a further fact that the Civil Service Commission soon will send Congress proposed legislation which will accomplish the greater part of this polishing.

BY ONE MAN

And it's a good guess that this legislation, though submitted originally as only temporary legislation, eventually will become permanent.

All this has come about, or is destined to come about, mainly by the efforts of one man—Representative JAMIE L. WHITTEN (Democrat, Mississippi).

I doubt if even Mr. WHITTEN realizes the full significance of the revolution he has set in motion.

Nevertheless, as a result of his so-called Whitten rider, Government, for all practical purposes, is under a hard-core system right now.

We're told it's a temporary system, that it will go out the window when the national emergency ends.

But as of now, the odds are heavy it will become a permanent system. The odds are heavy, because:

1. Congress finds much to praise in the personnel controls laid down in the Whitten rider.

2. Many Government administrators, especially those whose agencies went through the rapid expansions and contractions of the '940's, find the hard-core system attractive.

3. Because Civil Service Commission and Budget Bureau officials, who have such a big voice in making personnel rules, are known to be leaning increasingly toward the hard-core concept.

ON TEMPORARY BASIS

Under the original Whitten rider, most Government job appointments and all promotions and transfers were put on a temporary basis for the duration of the emergency. The idea was to prevent any increase in the permanent staff of Government, and prevent, too, any repetition of the excessive promotions which occurred in World War II.

The revised Whitten rider, as approved Friday by the House Appropriations Committee, makes sweeping changes in the original:

There still could be no increase in the permanent staff of Government.

But permanent employees could be given permanent transfers—provided the transfer does not involve a promotion.

And any permanent employee who transferred, regardless of whether the transfer is permanent or temporary, would be given reemployment rights in his original agency.

MACHINERY NEEDED

The one thing needed to convert this revised Whitten rider into a bona fide hard-core system is machinery for giving qualified temporary employees a chance to become permanent members of the hard core as vacancies occur.

In this connection, I'm told:

1. That Civil Service Commission already has ample power to set up such machinery.

2. That it will send Congress soon its own proposals for a new revision of the Whitten rider.

3. That these proposals probably will include a formula for feeding temporary employees into the hard core as vacancies occur.

4. That Representative WHITTEN has told Commission officials he will not object to a revision of his rider—provided the revision incorporates his basic concepts of holding down Government's permanent staff, and preventing excessive promotions.

Along with making it easier for Government to expand and contract its staff in periods of emergency, the hard-core idea has one other big advantage.

Over the years it would immeasurably raise the quality of Government's permanent staff.

Employees would have to take the customary civil service exams before they could get even temporary Government jobs.

But to advance into the hard core, they would have to meet the tests of experience, of careful screening, and, very possibly, even new exams.

Thus, only the most outstanding employees could become members of the hard core.

The big disadvantage of the hard-core system is that it would help crystallize what already is a growing caste system in Government.

On the one hand there would be the elite—the fortunate ones with permanent appointments in the hard core.

On the other would be the unfortunates—those with mere temporary appointments.

The British have used a hard-core system for years. And the British civil service is supposed to be a model.

The Ultimate Defeatism Is To Deny That Two Opposed Systems Can Exist in Same World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal of August 17 carries an excellent article by Joseph E. Evans denying the inevitability of war.

One of the most significant aspects of the great address made by the gentleman from South Carolina, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, in opening the debate on the mutual-security bill, was his forthright and convincing rejection of the theory of an inevitable war, which unfortunately had found expression on the floor of this House.

I was gratified to read about the same time the thoughtful statement of the Wall Street Journal which underlined again the danger of defeatism in this respect. We cannot responsibly give up the hope that the great powers of the world will exist peacefully on the same planet.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Evans' article as follows:

As part of their current peace offensive, the Soviets are once again professing their belief in the peaceful "coexistence" of Communist and capitalist states. It is natural that this should be greeted with sniffs of suspicion in the United States and the west, but there is some danger that suspicion of the source may lead to rejection of the principle.

The principle of coexistence has been pounded by Stalin at various times before. It stands in glaring contradiction to many of his actions as well as in contradiction to the theories of other Communist dialecticians. Hence the suspicion. But it should be noted that coexistence not only was the basis of United States policy during and after World War II, but presumably still is. What is more important, it is the only possible basis of a reasonable policy.

The danger is that by dint of constant demonstration of Soviet perfidy the United States may gradually—and perhaps subconsciously—be abandoning belief in the possibility of coexistence. While continuing to pay it lip service, the United States may in fact be constructing effective policy on other and contrary bases. More and more, attacks are being made on the very concept of coexistence.

One such appeared in a recent issue of the New York Times magazine. In this case the absorption of Czechoslovakia into the Soviet

sphere is taken as evidence par excellence of the unworability of coexistence.

BETRAYAL AND ENSLAVEMENT

The democratic Czech politicians, it is correctly related, sincerely tried to practice coexistence and were cupped, betrayed, and finally enslaved by the Communists. The clear implication is that the same fate awaits the United States and the west in general if it operates on the theory of coexistence. The analogy is superficially impressive, but it is highly doubtful that it will bear examination.

In terms of its relations with the Soviet Union, perhaps the most important facts about Czechoslovakia are that it adjoins the Soviet Union and that it is relatively small. In addition, it emerged from the war militarily weak, unprotected by the United States and in the shadow of the Red Army. Its statesmen at that time could not honestly see how they could ignore, economically or politically, the new colossus the war had created to the east. But being western by tradition and ideals, they hoped to effect, insofar as their own country was concerned, a compromise between east and west.

It is easy enough to say that they should have known better—and it is true that in the show-down many of them proved weak. But it is not so easy to see how they could have done much else than they did even had they known better. They were doomed to be swallowed up as soon as the Soviet realized it had come out of the war the most powerful nation outside the United States; the Czech politicians' short-lived experiment in coexistence merely facilitated the process.

The connection between this kind of situation and the United States, together with the potentially massive military coalition it heads is tenuous at best. The United States is obviously not condemned to Soviet absorption by geography or military weakness. Neither are its western European allies so long as they remain under the great shield of United States protection which is the Atlantic Pact.

Furthermore, coexistence as between the Soviet empire and the west does not mean, as it did in the case of Czechoslovakia, any acceptance by the west of Soviet-type political and economic institutions. It does not mean giving local Communists toe-holds in governments. It does not imply that the west has to assume the Soviet is activated by good will.

THE PRINCIPLE IS NOT DISPROVED

What the principle of coexistence does require the west to accept is the premise that the Soviet empire and the free nations can continue to occupy the same planet without being irresistibly impelled to mutual annihilation. Neither the specific case of Czechoslovakia nor the degeneration of east-west relations generally disproves the principle. But for it to work, it is necessary in the first instance that both east and west accept it.

Now it is admittedly impossible to know whether or not the Soviet actually does accept coexistence as a practicable modus operandi. It usually appears not to, but it is conceivable it does. That its ultimate ambition is world domination does not necessarily prove that it intends to plunge the world into total war to achieve it—especially since that course is becoming increasingly risky and since the Soviet has accomplished so much in the way of territorial aggrandizement without it. It still has fertile fields to work in by means short of total war.

For it goes without saying that if the Soviet does in fact accept the principle it would continue—indeed, more actively than if it were preparing total war—its attempts to subvert or otherwise annex non-Communist countries. Such countries would always

have to be on their guard. But then, that is a proper and reasonable position for a free country to be in anyway.

As long as there is room for doubt about Soviet intentions, however, it would be risky—and it could be fatal—for the United States and the west to reject the principle of coexistence either directly or indirectly. A direct repudiation would of course leave only one alternative for the United States—to go to war with the Soviet Union. For if the two systems cannot coexist, then obviously they must clash, and the sooner, it would seem, the better.

UNINTENDED CONCLUSION

Stating the matter thus at least reveals the logical conclusion inherent in any contention that coexistence is necessarily and automatically unworkable. The United States is hardly likely to put itself in that position as a matter of official policy. But it might nonetheless do so unintentionally. The almost exclusive emphasis its policy now puts on military might and the danger of war could all too easily lead both policymakers and people generally to the conviction that war is inevitable.

That would be not only to repudiate coexistence, it would be to deny the validity of the western way of life. It would be to assume that that way of life can triumph over Soviet totalitarianism only by force of arms and not by virtue of its intrinsic superiority. In short, the denial of the principle of coexistence is the ultimate in defeatism.

Socialism Blights England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an article by Sir Ernest Benn which appeared in the current issue of *Freeman* entitled "Killing With Kindness." The results of our support of a bankrupt Socialist government in England are now becoming apparent to all who want to see

KILLING WITH KINDNESS

(By Sir Ernest Benn)

The road to hell was never so well paved as with the good intentions of Uncle Sam toward John Bull. Loans, gifts, and Marshall aid have all, unwittingly, robbed the English nation of the need to pull itself together and justify the victory so arduously and gloriously won. The very idea of self-help, the basis of John Bull's philosophy, has gone for the time being, and in its proud place we have "full employment," "social security," "fair shares" and other political deceptions. These fictions have, for five full years, successfully masqueraded as facts, until the recollection of such disagreeable things as individual duty and responsibility have almost ceased to trouble us.

In broad outline the story of the economics of the last 10 years can be put into a few sentences. When the fall of Norway made desperate measures needful, the Trade Union Congress blackmailed its way into the Government, in return for a promise to allow the workers to work. Mr. Churchill handed over the key offices, other than war, to the Socialists. Men who a few months previously had opposed every effort at arma-

ment, assumed effective control of the country's domestic affairs. Then, while the Tories were busy with the war, there began a stream of reports drafted by the Socialists, but issued in the name of national government.

The Beveridge plan was only one of many proposals to destroy personal responsibility and private enterprise. Our daily war news was interlarded with the most tempting and detailed particulars of what each member of every family would receive when the war against nazism and fascism was won; and Cabinet Ministers did not scruple to make clear their view that capitalism and nazism were one and the same thing.

When in May 1945 the American armies got to Leipzig, and Montgomery was on the Baltic, a weary, bombed, and undernourished people were caught in the mood to sit back and let Beveridge and all the other planners implement their fantastic promises.

Since then we have lived in a veritable fool's paradise. No penalty for failure and no adequate reward for success; wages for everybody measured not by the value of the work but by the need of the worker; no competition, no market, no choice. As a safeguard against the machinations of those who do not believe in these Utopian absurdities, the system of wartime control has been perpetuated and private enterprise, insofar as it is possible at all, must work in chains made of red tape.

In this respect Britain suffers a handicap from which the rest of Europe is happily free. Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, and France were all "controlled" by the occupying Germans, who were never able to put a foot on British soil. In consequence, resistance to the very idea of control is ingrained in the hearts and minds of all these peoples as a positive patriotic duty, while the British are still afflicted with the degrading notion that control is for their good. American visitors to Europe who compare the drab shabbiness of English cities with the smarter appearance of continental places must notice the striking difference in the workings of the two points of view.

Americans should spare no pains to inform themselves of the results of nationalization, the outstanding achievement of the believers in socialistic dogma; for a goodly proportion of all American aid is balanced by the losses on British Government trading. The Bank of England has become a mere part of the machinery of official monetary manipulation and has lost its world position as the central repository of credit and confidence.

Mines, railways, aviation, and other industries, all of which made substantial contributions to the national tax revenues, now have heavy losses and are thus a double debit upon the taxpayer. In every one of these industries the charge to the consumer has been substantially increased, and there is no pretense of giving to the public such good service as private enterprise was expected to provide. The last justification for all this madness is now disappearing, for the comfort and content which the workers thought to obtain has so disappointed them as to justify demands for still higher wages, without regard to the source from which the money is to come.

The framework of this dismal picture is made of 60 years of Fabian theory and 50 years of an organized Labor Party, preaching damnation to private enterprise and capitalism. All the ills to which flesh is heir were laid to the charge of private property and the profit motive, and the cure was the ownership and control of the instruments and means of production and exchange. That ownership and control has at long last been achieved, but the dupes of this false doctrine have yet to learn that utopia is not a sort of improved convalescent home. Meanwhile they go merrily along, many of them doing less and less work for more and more money,

the deficit coming from the charity of the United States and the Empire. To stifle doubt and suppress criticism, there is an army of boosters styled public relations officers, costing £15,000,000 a year, who fill the air and the newspapers with the joyful news of the next plan to undo the trouble caused by the last.

One must go back to Uncle Sam and John Bull to get the measure of the tragedy of a lapse in mind and morals which must end quickly, or end us. The vast expenditure of the United States to keep this sort of thing going may prove a good investment if it saves America from a similar experience.

It is not fair to put the whole of the blame on the Socialists; they have built a great edifice of error upon a foundation of falsehood laid by Lloyd George and "Ninepence for Fourpence." Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal, unless England's warning is heeded, may well serve the same sordid purpose.

Some 20 years ago I paid a visit to a small Communist settlement run by Russian Jews a few miles from Jerusalem. There were up-to-date farm buildings half finished, land ploughed but not sown, and everything begun and halted. The Russian Commissar was in despair, because the financial crisis had cut off the flow of American capital. Something of the same kind, on a much bigger scale, is about to happen to the British utopia unless John Bull awakens and, having lost six good years, starts again on the hard but worthy road of work and duty.

Consumers' Research, a Long-Time Crusader for Low Prices, Points Out Administration Determination Not To Halt Inflation, But Just To Talk That Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including this excerpt from the August issue of *Consumers' Research*:

OFF THE EDITOR'S CHEST

Although there has been vociferous propaganda emanating from Washington, D. C., that make out the chief enemy on the economic front to be inflation or high prices, there is a growing recognition in informal economic circles that lower prices or deflation is the last thing Washington officialdom wants.

Hardly had the New York City price war made headlines throughout the country when Senator JOHN SPARKMAN of Alabama announced that his Committee on Small Business would immediately institute hearings on the effects of this "cross-fire of a vicious price-cutting war." That doesn't sound like administration enthusiasm for the lowering of prices to consumers or a belief in the wisdom of the Supreme Court's decision.

The price war also came at a most inopportune time for those officials who have been pushing actively for more stringent price controls and the power to set ceiling prices on nearly all essential consumer commodities. What various dealers in many lines of goods sold to consumers wanted was not ceiling but floor prices, to prevent spectacular below-cost sales that threatened them with insolvency if the tendency should continue or extend.

To reverse suddenly their position of ostensibly favoring the lowering of rental prices would make ridiculous the pronouncements of those in Washington officialdom and sympathetic economists in recent months, who had loudly cried that "inflation is coming."

The recently announced OPS ceiling prices on clothing and textiles, for example, simply gave the clothing trade an expensive job of paper work to do.

It is no secret that the textile trade has been in the doldrums for many a month. Women who had been counted on to buy anything put on the clothing racks—as they did in the scarcity days of World War II—have stayed away from dress departments in droves and nobody has yet been able, in print at least, to figure out why; ignoring, of course, the obvious conclusion that prices were too high for the quality and style offered. Some attempt has been made to explain away the lack of clothing sales by blaming consumers' constant attention to their television receivers.

Television, however, is also having its troubles. One informed observer reports that there are enough television sets now in warehouses to provide all the sets consumers are likely to buy during the coming Christmas season and even to carry stocks over into next spring. Appliances also are plentiful.

The chief shortage is in the wool field where the world supply does not equal the demand and prices are still very high. Synthetic fibers, however, are making great strides in their development and may be expected to supplant wool in the low- and moderate-price ranges in many cases.

The well-known preference of most men for wearing their old clothes will undoubtedly be a factor in easing the buying pressure in this field. In short, it looks as if, barring the major outbreak of an armed conflict over a wide area, consumers will not need to worry too much about shortages.

Whether prices come down will depend on a wide variety of economic factors including reduction of taxes, refusal of public officials to lend political support to influential labor groups in their efforts to force wage increases at the expense of others less strategically situated with respect to the seats of power, and the institution of a rigorous program of governmental economy which Congress can require and enforce whenever it receives the necessary backing of public opinion.

These factors all involve political hazards, and no party will undertake to advocate any of them unless forced to do so by informed public demand.

The smaller dealer far from New York City without Macy's and Gimbels' tremendous resources cannot afford to match their price cuts even if he needs to raise money to carry his inventory. Prices are determined by many factors in which taxes, wages, pensions, transportation costs, subsidies to producers of raw materials, elaborate bookkeeping and accounting practices, such as are required by the Office of Price Stabilization and other Government bureaus, are important factors.

The consumer who looks at the retail price of a product he wishes to purchase and complains that it is high simply because the retailer is making a large profit will be applying his pressure at the wrong point.

Our economic system of mass production is capable of turning out tremendous quantities of consumer products at very reasonable cost, but when one or more groups, strategically placed with respect to the assembly line, and in respect to Government policies or officials, takes advantage of the need for smooth meshing of each operation to hold up the process by demanding a larger cut, the final cost to the consumer is bound to reflect the shake-down.

The expansion of American industry in the last war was so great that unless a monkey

wrench is thrown in the works, it shows every evidence of being able to provide all the products that the consumer can absorb at the prices now being charged and still produce all the war material that can be used by our forces or given away abroad to countries that are presumed to be our allies in case of world conflict.

To take a common-sense approach to preparedness is to incur the unpleasant accusation of giving aid and comfort to the enemy.

On the other hand, the suspicion has already been voiced in several circles that the Washington-induced war economy is looked upon with favor by those who prefer a high-price scarcity economy to one in which consumer goods are abundantly available at lower prices and competition among manufacturers and merchants for the consumer's favor is keen.

Unthinking consumers who have supported measures for price control in the belief that price control is synonymous with or makes for lower prices will do well to look beyond the claims made for such measures and examine carefully their actual working out in operation.

They should especially consider the quick reaction of the Senate committee, already referred to, that price cutting is a bad thing and must be discouraged. It is well to remember that one of the most marked effects of governmental price fixing in World War II was that the process of trying to hold down the price to an uneconomic level resulted in many cases in the elimination of the product from the market, since farmers, manufacturers, and dealers simply would not produce or distribute a item on which they could not make a living or receive customary returns.

As with many advertising claims, the benefits to be derived from such promised protection are almost certain to be greatly exaggerated. (Consumers' Research Bulletin, August 1951.)

Government by Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Wakefield (Mass.) Daily Item of August 16, 1951, is included herewith under leave to extend these remarks:

GOVERNMENT BY CRISIS

Bruce Barton asserts the late Franklin Roosevelt during his first 5 years in the White House declared no less than 49 emergencies. Every time a new law was drafted, says Barton, there was a demand to hurry up and legislate it to avoid a national peril.

Mr. Truman has tried to follow in his predecessor's footsteps. "Emergency" bureaus are never abolished. Taxes, which the Democrats told the American people long ago would be reduced as soon as the emergency was over and prosperity established, have risen higher and higher. The Government payroll, which the Democrats promised to cut, is now astronomical, and every day sees additional thousands recruited. Controls that include programs for Government buying and building, and socialistic schemes not only for agriculture but now for business, medicine and industry, are demanded.

All this in the name of "emergency"—with an eye cocked to the 1952 election.

Only by a complete change in administrations can the American people, after 20 years, hope to rediscover peace in the world, at home, and of the mind.

Administration Might Follow Army Example in Handling Ethics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Humboldt Star, of Winnemucca, Nev., entitled "Administration Might Follow Army Example in Handling Ethics." It explains the various machinations and manipulations that have gone on from the White House, the RFC, and other important Government organizations.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADMINISTRATION MIGHT FOLLOW ARMY EXAMPLE IN HANDLING ETHICS

The fabulous era of the mink coat, 5-percenters and the deep freeze now has a slogan which can be inscribed, heraldic fashion, above the symbol of an outstretched hand.

"I did nothing that anyone else wouldn't have done," it reads. "Only someone caught me at it."

Those frank words came from Brig. Gen. David J. Crawford. What he was caught at was accepting gifts and hotel entertainment from defense contractors, using Government lumber to build himself a couple of sailboats, and hauling some trees for his front lawn halfway across the country in an Army truck.

Having been caught at it, the general was relieved of his command at the Army's Detroit tank arsenal and publicly reprimanded, a penalty just short of court martial.

This prompt action by the Secretary of the Army is highly refreshing. It is also somewhat surprising when you consider the current attitude of the administration in Washington toward similar cases that have come up, they have been brushed off as if such things were no more serious than catching junior's hand in the cookie jar.

Another general, name of Harry Vaughan, is still at the White House, for instance, his bemedalled chest untarnished by the taint of a couple of remarkable moral lapses regarding frozen food lockers and five percent influence peddlers. The State Department is keeping one or two of Vaughan's foreign medals in escrow, but same seems to be all that's happened.

A fellow fixture at the White House is Donald Dawson, a Presidential adviser. He's the one who got free hospitality from a plush Miami hotel which had obtained an RFC loan. The congressional committee which found out about the hotel said Dawson apparently exerted considerable influence over certain directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Along with the famous pastel mink coat and the imported Wedgwood china, all these things have been looked into. And in the atmosphere of an easy-going code of ethics that seems to prevail, they have been shrugged off.

General Crawford, who not only was caught but punished, had been doing an outstanding job at the Detroit arsenal. But it was a job

of important public trust, and the crackdown was commendable.

We suspect it would be more than difficult at the moment for a contractor to pass off so much as a cigar on any other Army officers engaged in spending the taxpayers' money.

But it may be too much to hope that the administration will follow the Army's example and give the Nation a change in the loose moral and ethical atmosphere that is clouding Washington.

Dehydration of Sweetpotatoes in Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, my congressional district in Louisiana is the sweetpotato capital of the United States and in this connection the dehydration of sweetpotatoes has grown into a very important industry.

I desire to call attention to the following very interesting article on dehydration of sweetpotatoes in Louisiana, 1946-51, by Mr. Randall Stelly, which appears in the August issue of the Louisiana Rural Economist, published by the Department of Agricultural Economics, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge:

The dehydration of sweetpotatoes on a commercial scale in Louisiana began during World War II when several canning plants contracted with the Army to supply dehydrated sweetpotatoes for food purposes. The program met with considerable success and dehydrated sweetpotatoes were considered by military personnel to be one of the more palatable and desirable dehydrated foods. As demobilization took place and Army food needs declined, the demand for dehydrated sweetpotatoes for food purposes largely disappeared. But the experience gained with dehydration during the war, combined with the development and adaptation of satisfactory dehydration machinery, a growing demand for carbohydrate feeds in Louisiana, and the availability of nonmarketable sweetpotatoes together formed a favorable setting for the development of commercial dehydration of sweetpotatoes for livestock feed. The value of dehydrated sweetpotatoes already had been proven in experimental feeding tests.

NUMBER AND LOCATION OF PLANTS

By the end of the 1946-47 season, 54 dehydrating plants were in operation in the State. These plants provided a market for sweetpotatoes not suitable for shipping or canning, aided materially in weevil and disease control, and made available consider-

able quantities of good feed for the State's growing dairy and livestock industries.

Many of the sweetpotato dehydrating plants established during 1946, 1947, and 1948 did not remain long in active operation. The number operating has decreased from a total of 54 in the 1946-47 season to 22 in 1950-51. There were 39 dehydrators in the State during the 1950-51 season, but only 22 were active.

About half of the plants established from 1946 to 1948 were concentrated in the South Louisiana commercial sweetpotato area of St. Landry, Lafayette, and adjoining parishes. The remainder were fairly well distributed throughout the State. Many of these latter plants were on the fringes of commercial sweetpotato producing areas, or in those areas where production had expanded during the war or where expansion was anticipated.

In some areas sweetpotatoes replaced part of the cotton on many farms because they appeared to be more profitable. More recently, however, the comparative advantage has again shifted to cotton in many of these areas, with the result that the acreage and production of sweetpotatoes has declined. Year-to-year changes from cotton to sweetpotatoes, or vice versa, are possible in those sections adapted to both crops because both require approximately the same amount of labor for their production and can be grown with the same type of cultivation equipment.

VOLUME AND VALUE OF PRODUCTION

Louisiana dehydrators processed 9 percent of the 1946 Louisiana sweetpotato crop, 10 percent of the 1947 crop, close to 11 percent of the 1948 crop, slightly over 7 percent of the 1949 crop, and approximately 8 percent of the 1950 crop (table 1). The volume of sweetpotatoes dehydrated has ranged from 974,000 bushels in 1946-47 to 636,460 in the 1949-50 season. From the 1950 crop 779,350 bushels were processed, the largest amount since 1946. The output of dehydrated material has varied from 170,000 hundredweight in 1946-47 to 111,075 in 1949-50, and amounted to 136,010 in 1950-51.

While volume has undergone moderate changes from year to year, the number of active plants has decreased sharply. Therefore, volume per plant has increased, nearly doubling from 1946-47 to 1950-51. In the latter year the average per plant was 6,182 hundredweight. This change has resulted from the discontinuance of a large number of plants located outside the major commercial sweetpotato producing areas. These small plants could not obtain raw materials for processing economically, and did not have sufficient volume to operate profitably.

CAPITAL INVESTMENT

The original investment in dehydrating plants averaged about \$10,000 each. The largest item of cost is the drying unit which alone accounts for approximately 90 percent of the cost of all plant equipment. Since the life of the unit is usually estimated to be 7 to 10 years, depreciation costs are appreciable. Therefore, costs of operation per unit of output are determined to a great extent by volume of production.

OPERATING PRACTICES

Dehydrating plants obtain from two-thirds to four-fifths of their raw sweetpotatoes from growers on a custom basis. Under such an arrangement the plant processes the product for a specified charge per hundredweight, or retains half of the dry material. Other sources of raw sweetpotatoes are purchases from farmers, packing shed and cannery culls and waste, and those grown by the dehydrator operator for processing.

Farmers have retained about two-thirds of the dry material produced by dehydrators in most years. This material is mainly used for feed on the farms where the sweetpotatoes were grown. Of the dry material kept by the plant operators, a half to two-thirds is sold directly to dairymen and other farmers. The remainder goes to feed dealers and manufacturers, industrial plants, and other less important outlets.

COSTS OF OPERATION

The total cost involved in the operation of sweet potato dehydrators averaged \$6,924 per plant in 1946-47, \$6,783 in 1947-48, \$6,842 in 1948-49, and \$7,490 in 1950-51. Items of cost were divided into general overhead, operating costs, interest, sweetpotatoes purchased for dehydration, and purchases of sacks. The largest overhead cost for all the seasons studied was depreciation which averaged more than \$1,100 per plant annually.

The largest single item of operating cost was labor, amounting to an average of \$1,449 per plant in 1948-49 and \$2,001 in 1950-51. Fuel for furnace heat was the second largest operating item. Other costs of substantial size included the cost of sweetpotatoes purchased for dehydrating and sacks for bagging the dry material.

Costs of repairs to equipment and buildings were negligible during the 4 years studied. Most repair costs reported were incurred for maintenance of the dehydrating unit and to keep other equipment in proper operating condition. Those plants operating a longer period of time and having a larger volume of output per season, required a greater amount of upkeep and repair.

The direct effect of volume on cost per unit of output is shown in table 2. Plants producing 6,000 or more hundredweight in 1950-51 had an average total dehydrating cost of about 89 cents per hundredweight, while plants producing an average of from 2,500 to 5,999 hundredweight had an average total cost of \$1.68 and those plants processing less than 2,500 hundredweight reported an average total cost of \$2.54. The total overhead and operating cost for all plants averaged approximately 71 cents per hundredweight of dry material processed during 1950-51, compared with total costs of 99 cents in 1946-47, \$1.01 in 1947-48, and 82 cents in 1948-49. Most items of cost decreased as volume of output increased, and substantial reductions in per unit costs occurred in depreciation and other overhead, labor, and fuel. The volume of production is the greatest single factor affecting the per unit cost of dehydrating sweetpotatoes. Other factors include: (1) Efficiency in the use of labor and equipment, irrespective of volume; (2) the type of fuel used for furnace heat; (3) the length of life of the dehydrating unit, and (4) the condition of the raw sweetpotatoes processed.

FINANCIAL RETURNS

Gross returns from dehydration operations averaged \$9.172 per plant in 1948-49 and \$10,724 in 1950-51. Returns to dehydrating plant operators accrue from sales of dehydrated sweetpotatoes, cash charges for custom work, and value of the dry material used by the operators in feeding their own livestock. In most years sales have made up more than half of their income, and cash charges have accounted for slightly more than a third.

TABLE 1—Sweetpotato dehydration in Louisiana, 1946-50

	Unit	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950
Total production.....	Bushel....	10,800,000	7,470,000	7,315,000	8,700,000	10,200,000
Sweetpotatoes dehydrated.....	do.....	974,000	745,000	775,000	636,460	779,350
Portion of total crop dehydrated.....	Percent.....	9.02	9.97	10.57	7.32	7.57
Dry material obtained.....	Hundredweight.....	170,000	130,000	135,000	111,075	136,010
Estimated value per hundredweight (dry material).....	Dollars.....	2.74	3.40	2.91	2.61	2.64
Estimated gross value of output.....	do.....	466,000	442,000	392,850	290,160	358,020
Plants operating.....	Number.....	54	47	37	22	22
Average per plant.....	Hundredweight.....	3,148	2,706	3,649	5,049	6,182

TABLE 2.—Relation of volume dehydrated to costs and returns, Louisiana sweetpotato dehydrating plants, 1948-49 and 1950-51 seasons

[Per hundredweight]

Cost item	1948-49, volume dehydrated				1950-51, volume dehydrated			
	All plants	Less than 2,500 hundred-weight	2,500 to 5,999 hundred-weight	6,000 hundred-weight and over	All plants	Less than 2,500 hundred-weight	2,500 to 5,999 hundred-weight	6,000 hundred-weight and over
Returns.....	\$1.50	\$1.41	\$1.69	\$1.48	\$1.48	\$1.47	\$1.59	\$1.46
Costs:								
General overhead.....								
Depreciation.....	.199	.745	.284	.122	.154	.693	.330	.083
Other.....	.116	.306	.148	.096	.087	.410	.192	.047
Total.....	.315	1.111	.432	.218	.241	1.103	.522	.130
Operating:								
Labor.....	.251	.251	.271	.243	.275	.410	.255	.255
Fuel for heat.....	.123	.380	.138	.096	.105	.389	.112	.091
Power.....	.022	.063	.034	.011	.015	.083	.015	.009
Repairs.....	.048	.101	.056	.036	.031	.049	.023	.028
Other.....	.005	.022	.003	.005	.006	.006	.006	.000
Total.....	.449	.817	.502	.394	.432	.937	.411	.383
Other:								
Sacks.....	.064	.030	.068	.064	.082	.078	.069	.081
Interest.....	.062	.242	.090	.028	.035	.137	.070	.022
Sweetpotatoes purchased.....	.209	.160	.385	.209	.249	.283	.606	.273
Total.....	.425	.432	.543	.361	.366	.498	.745	.379
Total costs.....	1.19	2.36	1.47	.97	1.04	2.54	1.68	.89
Net gain or loss.....	.40	-.95	.22	.51	.44	-1.07	-.09	.57

Net income varied directly with volume of production in each of the 4 years studied. In 1948-49, plants processing 6,000 or more hundredweight of dry material had an average net income of \$5,248, while the average net income of plants processing from 2,500 to 5,999 hundredweight was \$918, compared with a loss of \$1,141 per plant processing less than 2,500 hundredweight. In the 1950-51 season plants processing less than 2,500 hundredweight suffered losses amounting to \$1,322, while plants processing 6,000 hundredweight or more realized average net profits of \$8,656 each.

The effect of securing adequate supplies of raw sweetpotatoes to permit a full operating season upon net returns per unit of output is shown clearly in table 2. Plants processing less than 2,500 hundredweight of dry material suffered an average loss of 95 cents per hundredweight in 1948-49 and \$1.07 in 1950-51, while plants processing 6,000 hundredweight or more realized net profits of 50 and 57 cents per hundredweight in the two seasons. In general, those plants not located near the concentrated areas of production were the first to cease operating during the period 1948 to 1950. Those plants located at the fringes of producing areas generally are forced to operate at only fractional capacity, and even with a decline in the number of plants operating in the State from 1948-49 to 1950-51, some plants were unable to secure adequate supplies of raw material for efficient and economical operation and operated at a loss.

Conditions necessary for economical operation of sweetpotato dehydrating plants and favorable net returns include: (1) a large volume of sweetpotatoes for processing to permit near-capacity production; (2) the use of natural gas for furnace fuel; (3) clean, dry sweetpotatoes, free from decay; and (4) efficient use of labor and equipment. Efficiency is improved when labor can be used full time by continuous operation of the dehydrator or in other work, such as in a storage house or packing shed.

Honesty in Government Is the Only Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence in the August 17 issue of United States News and World Report has written a telling editorial which points out that the only issue before the American people is honesty in Government:

HONESTY THE ONLY ISSUE

(By David Lawrence)

The subject before the House is "honesty." The origin of the debate is the scandal at West Point, where cheating in examinations was exposed and the guilty cadets were promptly punished.

But what did Members of Congress say—that is, the few who were articulate?

Some said the guilty deserved the punishment.

Some said it was just too bad and that the punishment should have been much lighter.

Some said honesty is a difficult standard to maintain anyhow and that there ought to be something done about it.

Some said the thing to do is to abolish sports.

Some said the thing to do is to abolish the Military Academy itself, along with the Naval Academy at Annapolis.

Some said the idea of putting a man on his honor not to cheat is a terrific strain, that the students ought not to be subjected to it, and that monitoring the students during exams is the better system.

Some said it is all due to the lack of morality in this age—and they mentioned mink coats, deep freezes, and other violations of the code of ethics recently noted

in the headlines in connection with RFC scandals and the like.

Some thought the occasion opportune to take a swipe at everything and everyone they didn't like—from legislators to lobbyists.

Some thought the cadets should have been given another chance—and that there ought to be a law or something.

Some said there should be a congressional investigation—but just how, after you investigate dishonesty, you legislate honesty in its place was not explained. Hardly a word was said about the failure of the home environment to teach honesty to the boys in the first instance.

What is beginning to be significant is not merely the guilt of the cadets at West Point—deplorable though that is—but the amazing comments by persons on the outside generally who, because they feel sorry for the dismissed cadets, allow pity to sway their judgment.

It seems incredible that a simple issue of dishonesty should evoke such diverse reactions.

Who will arise in Congress to point to the remarkable work being done by character-building agencies among our youth, like the Boy Scouts—and who will note the indignation of the more than 2,400 cadets at West Point who didn't cheat and who seem to be forgotten in the melee? Who will point to the success of the honor system at Princeton, at the University of Virginia, and a host of other schools and colleges?

The problem is not complex. Dishonesty arises every day on the competitive front in business, in the professions, in public life. It isn't to be excused because it is prevalent. But it will not be solved by abolishing the stakes in such competition—or by denying to youth the chance to engage in intercollegiate sports.

What of the colleges which have winning teams whose members get top scholastic honors despite the long hours of football practice? The cases are legion.

What shall we say of the overenthusiastic alumni who, in violation of intercollegiate rules and agreements, help to recruit football talent by mercenary methods? Will alumni dishonesty be cured simply by abolishing football?

Back in prohibition days there were conscientious people who thought the way to cure drinking was to prohibit the manufacture and sale of all liquor. This only created a worse evil—the bootlegger and vice rings.

The fight against temptation is won not by removing the liquor bottles from the shelf but by being able to be temperate in habit even though the shelf is full.

The fight is won when the individual learns the oldest lesson of experience—there are no compensations which dishonesty can possibly give that are worth the tortures of conscience coming afterward.

The fight cannot be won by Army regulation—or by legislation.

The fight can be won when the individual discovers some day, as so many of us do, even belatedly in the twilight years, that the defeats in life, no matter how large they loom in lost pride or treasure, are more than offset by victories won over self in obeying the code of the Master.

The churches of all creeds open the doors to the peace the human mind strives for—the doors which only the changed individual with an instinctive or acquired sense of moral values can bring himself to enter.

The honor system is the honesty system. The Secretary of the Army and the Military Academy authorities did their duty in dismissing those who failed to put honesty above all else. There can be no compromise with dishonesty. That was and is the only issue at West Point.

Cutting Iron Curtain Not Hard**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, more convincing proof comes from abroad that we must encourage and not cripple our State Department program of reaching the people within the iron curtain through the Voice of America program. This time this proof comes from a first-hand report from one of our foremost columnists who is touring Europe, and who managed to get behind the iron curtain.

Berlin today seems to be the stage for all kinds of propaganda. We cannot afford to let the Communist get the jump on us there.

Opportunity presents itself for the coordination of the activities of our Central Intelligence Unit, the State Department, and our occupational forces in Berlin to penetrate the iron curtain with American ideals and principles, and stir up the youth within the iron curtain to overthrow communism. Our hope to save the world lies in our youth of today.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the Washington Post on Monday, August 20, 1951, entitled "Cutting Iron Curtain Not Hard":

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

CUTTING IRON CURTAIN NOT HARD

I have just spent an evening behind the iron curtain. It's not hard to do here in Berlin where no guards patrol the line between the Russian and American sectors and where, if you flash a White House press card and look reasonably important, you can attend even the most exclusive of the Communist youth shows.

Berlin tonight is a city of vivid dramatic contrast—miles of bunting and flags everywhere, flags of every nation but particularly and ironically the flags of peace. Sandwiched in between almost every national flag is the blue and white emblem of peace. Standing out against the gaunt bomb-gutted ruins of Berlin, they made a genuine appeal to the tired population which never wants to see war again.

Across from the Kaiser's once ornate palace which the Russians tore down and removed piece by piece, a great platform stood in front of the bomb-battered museum. The inside was an empty shell but outside a Russian ballet, a girl in Georgian costume, and Finnish folk dancers all performed. It was Russia's youth exhibition and you had to admit it was good.

Red's youth rally no flop

Reading the headlines in American newspapers you got the impression that the Berlin youth rally was a flop. It wasn't. No rally which brings 2,000,000 youngsters together from all parts of the world is a flop and it's no use kidding ourselves.

The State Department, with a meager budget, did a miraculous job of attracting a quarter of a million German youths into the western sector, giving them food, literature, and a sight of the vastly better living standards on our side of the iron curtain.

But when the rally was only half over, orders came to close up certain youth

depots. The food was costing \$12 per day at one center and the State Department's budget was exhausted. Congressman TABER, Republican, of New York, CLEVENGER, Republican, of Ohio, and other economizers had pinched too many pennies and a great opportunity was thus snuffed out.

"Ami, go home"

If you arrived early enough and flashed a White House press card, a United States military pass or even a District of Columbia police pass, an American could get into the most popular and packed performance of all—the North Korean. Seeing the Korean show gave some idea of the propaganda barrage this youth congress was subjected to.

The highlight of their performance was a dance operetta in which a Korean mother, her child killed by Americans, is the heroine. The scene which really brought down the house was that in which she throws three grenades into an American camp. Three Americans then tear her clothes half off and take turns beating her while she takes from her blouse the flag of the Peoples Republic. Then, just as the Americans tie her to a tree preparing to shoot her, a shot rings out and Korean guerrillas come to her rescue. The heroine then shoots an American officer at point-blank range.

At this point, the audience goes wild; there is 20 minutes of applause; the Korean actors get curtain call after curtain call and Russian ladies rush up to embrace the embarrassed but happy Korean orchestra leader. The audience then leaves, chanting "Ami, go home," the slogan of derision for Americans thrown at us from the Adriatic to the Baltic.

This is a sample of the propaganda drilled in on the youths at the rally and there's no use in kidding ourselves about its effect.

What we could do very easily and where we have been missing the boat is to sell both an idea and bread—the idea of uniting Europe and preventing war.

The Cost of Truman's War**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from a recent issue of the Wakefield (Mass.) Daily Item:

THE COST OF TRUMAN'S WAR

The war in Korea—or do we still regard it as a minor police action?—has cost \$5,000,000,000 to date, Congress has been officially told, and may cost as much more in the next fiscal year, ending June 30, 1952.

And, of course, this takes no account of the cost of American men killed, wounded, or missing in action.

All this is without victory, because, no matter how the negotiations turn out (if they result in anything but resumption of war) we have definitely failed to stop communism, we have been unable to win anything approaching a decision, and we have laid waste the south province of Korea.

And, of course, we will be expected to restore the property we and our enemies have destroyed.

All this because Mr. Truman and his advisers went into the wrong war, at the wrong time, at the wrong place.

If Mr. Truman thinks he can get elected on this record, the American people are crazier than we think they are.

**Address of Lt. Gen. Graves B. Erskine,
USMC****EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Lt. Gen. Graves B. Erskine before the annual meeting of the President's Committee on NEPH Week in the Departmental Auditorium, Washington, D. C., August 17, 1951.

As Director of Retraining and Reemployment Administration, General Erskine had "general supervision and direction of the activities of all existing executive agencies—except the Veterans' Administration—in the fields of retraining, reemployment, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation for the purpose of coordinating such activities and eliminating overlapping functions of such agencies." RRA was also authorized to "confer with existing State and local agencies and officials in charge of existing programs relating to retraining, reemployment, vocational training, and vocational rehabilitation for the purpose of coordinating the activities of existing Federal agencies with the activities of such State and local agencies."

In accepting General Erskine's resignation from the position as Administrator of the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, President Truman wrote:

You have met the difficult responsibilities of your post with a singleness of purpose and a devotion to the interests of our returning veterans which will command the respect and grateful appreciation of the American people. No task was ever more important than that of assisting our veterans to resume civilian life and the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, under your direction, has played a significant part in the combined efforts of the Federal Government, the States, and the local communities toward this end.

The address follows:

REMARKS OF LT. GEN. GRAVES B. ERSKINE, USMC, BEFORE THE ANNUAL MEETING, THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL EMPLOY THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED WEEK

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is good to be back among so many friends. It is an honor to address this gathering of the President's committee. During the past 4 years, I have watched with interest as my many friends and associates of Retraining and Reemployment Administration days worked so successfully to improve employment opportunities for the handicapped.

Wherever my Marine Corps duties have taken me, I have followed with interest your plans and programs. It has been a source of real personal satisfaction to watch the growth of this truly important organization from the cooperating committee we formed back in 1946 when National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week was scarcely 1 year old to its present status.

It was a distinct privilege this morning to hear the President of the United States lend the dignity of his high office and the strength of his personal efforts to this great program

of helping the handicapped to help themselves. I heard with interest the words of the Secretary of Labor and the Federal Security Administrator as they outlined for us the plans and projects of the Federal and State governments in employment and rehabilitation. I enjoyed Admiral McIntire's fine review of what has been done and what lies ahead. It is left for me, therefore, to speak briefly to you this afternoon as a military man.

Like Admiral McIntire, I have been interested in people with disabilities ever since World War I. A man cannot command troops and not be interested in the wounded he has led into battle. During the days of peace between our two world wars, we of the military have known first hand of injuries, accidents, and disabilities. During the last great war in the Pacific, one of the first responsibilities of a field commander was to make every prudent effort to assure his troops the best medical attention in the shortest possible period of time. The record of the Navy's doctors, corpsmen, and nurses under Admiral McIntire during World War II leaves little doubt that almost superhuman effort was made to assure those who suffered wounds a fighting chance to survive.

The lessons we learned from Guadalcanal to Okinawa are paying off daily in Korea. And, today, Admiral McIntire is again making a great contribution to his country and the century in which he lives by assuring a steady supply of whole blood and blood plasma to Korea via Red Cross collection centers across our country.

The First Marine Division which today is fighting in Korea is made up of many of my friends and comrades of many years. Some are today among our Nation's hero dead. Others are among our handicapped veterans. I had the honor to command and train the First Marine Division until shortly before Korea, so I have a more than casual interest in today's wounded and disabled veterans of Korea.

Actually, however, I am not too concerned about the future of the disabled veterans of Korea. I believe that they will give just as good an account of themselves on the home front as they did on the battle front. You cannot train and work and plan and prepare for battle for weeks and months on end without establishing certain patterns of behavior and character which will carry over into whatever you do later on.

Once a man learns his job, whether it is firing a bazooka or driving an ammunition carrier, he has established confidence in his ability to perform efficiently under almost any possible condition. That is one of the most valuable assets a man can have, confidence in his ability to perform a given task despite obstacles.

I realize that there are a few jobs in our civilian economy calling for bazooka experts or ammo carrier drivers, however, the important point which I wish to emphasize is that today's disabled veteran entering the labor market after bullet or bomb has cut short his Korean fighting has a great potentiality of becoming just as valuable on the home front as he was on the battle front.

Therefore, while reminding you that there are many things that the people back home can do to make employment easier for the disabled veteran as he leaves his hospital or special training, I should like to emphasize to our employers that they will be doing themselves a great service by making places in their firms and businesses for today's wounded who are going to be tomorrow's workers.

Before I close, I would like to review with you something that I said many times during 1946 and 1947 when I was Administrator of the Retraining and Reemployment Administration. I pointed out that the battlefield casualties of the Normandy invasion beachhead were less than our violent highway deaths during a similar period of time at

home. I also mentioned that civilian amputations during the entire period of the war were 10 times greater than service amputations.

These figures which I used in 1946 and 1947 to illustrate yesterday's problem are just as important today. They serve to focus our eyes upon today's real problem, the civilian handicapped. As a man in uniform, it may seem strange for me to be emphasizing the civilian handicapped. However, we who wear our country's uniform are first of all Americans and rightfully concerned with the welfare of all our people. Aside from this, however, the civilian handicapped are vitally important to any military man who understands even the basic essentials of supply.

It takes men and women to provide our armed forces with the tools of war and the replacements for sustaining a victorious campaign. A man would be a fool to focus all his attention upon 10 percent of the available manpower while overlooking or slighting the other 90 percent. So, since the civilian handicapped outnumber the disabled veterans by some 10 to 1, they are of prime importance to our country and to her fighting forces whether in peace or war.

We of the Armed Forces appreciate everything that has been done and will be done for our wounded comrades who have returned to civilian society. But we most respectfully ask for the sake of national security and the war effort that you give the civilian handicapped their chance to help us win this struggle.

Wanted: A Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial published in the Reading (Mass.) Chronicle August 9, 1951:

WANTED: A LEADER

I suppose it is permissible for a dyed-in-the-wool Republican to admit to himself at least that he is a bit fed up with the Republican Party, but it is probably rank heresy for him to admit it to others.

But it is difficult to find that the elephantine party has had an original idea, at least nationally, in the past 20 years. About all we get is "whatever the Democrats can do we can do better and cheaper" but during that period of time there has been no opportunity to prove the assertion.

As a matter of fact politics from any angle is sort of a mixed up mess at present what with Dixiecrats, Democrats, Stand-patters and progressive Republicans.

Congress is spending more time investigating than legislating, witness the MacArthur hearings, the crime hearings, the proposed investigation of cribbing at West Point and the investigation of this and that, all of which appear to be designed to promote publicity for Congressmen rather than to promote the good of the country.

The control measure recently passed by Congress is a case in point. Instead of getting down to brass tacks it appears that the lobbies are dictating what legislation shall be passed. The farm lobby, the meat lobby, the manufacturers lobby, organized labor, the cotton lobby and all the rest don't want their particular commodities touched and lo and behold they aren't.

The demand for economy lops a few percent off security measures but little is done to stop the bureaucracy which is growing to gigantic proportions in Washington and nothing at all to the pork barrel where every Congressman wants to get all he can for his own district.

The necessity of raising new taxes which is still under discussion so far has failed to hit the sources which are the cause of inflation but attempts to get more out of those sources of revenue which are already being taxed to the point of saturation.

Maybe the Republicans wouldn't do any better but they couldn't very well do worse.

What is really needed is a leader such as this country has had in the past who, by the force of his personality, knowledge and leadership, could show the way to a sane and sensible economy. But have we such a man?

There is one and it will be a grievous blow to the Republicans if he turns out to be a Democrat.

President George Willis Diemer, of Central Missouri State College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted me, I include a tribute to President George Willis Diemer, of Central Missouri State College, Warrensburg, Mo.:

ALWAYS A LEADER

(By George S. Reuter, Jr., former superintendent of schools, R. VIII, Henry County, Mo., and Laura E. Reuter)

President George Willis Diemer, of Central Missouri State College, is in Frankfurt, Germany, conducting an extensive one-man education mission. Not only is he studying the German teacher-education system, but he is organizing a 1952 workshop dealing with guidance and evaluation in German education.

Mr. Diemer is the only Missourian to serve on three United States education missions abroad since World War II. In 1946 and 1950, he served on missions to Japan. Dr. W. W. Carpenter, professor of education, of the University of Missouri, who spent 2½ years in Japan, was a leader in developing the new system between the two missions.

This is another example of our outstanding bipartisan foreign policy in action. Mr. Diemer is an independent Republican, much like Missouri's late Congressman, T. J. Halsey, of Holden. In these missions, he is working closely with Secretary Acheson and Secretary Marshall—two of the greatest Cabinet officers in American history.

President Diemer, who was born in Arkansas City, Kans., December 11, 1885, was the son of the late John Perdue and Amelia L. Sylviem Diemer. He married Miss Myrtle S. Caselboit on June 15, 1916. Their children are: Dorothy Elizabeth (now the wife of a Tennessee educator), George Willis, Jr. (killed in action in World War II), John Irving (a music educator in Illinois), and Emma Lou (organist for the Wornall Road Baptist Church in Kansas City, Mo.).

He was president of the Kansas City Teachers College from 1923 to 1937, and he has been president of Central Missouri State College at Warrensburg since 1937. Mr. Diemer has the following degrees: Bachelor of pedagogy, Northeast Missouri State College, Kirksville, 1911; bachelor of science, Central

Missouri State College, Warrensburg, 1917; and master of arts, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1925. He also studied at the University of Missouri.

Mr. Diemer has also found time to write two books, serve as a deacon in the Disciples of Christ Church, be a governor in the Rotary, and hold membership in: Kappa Delta Pi, Phi Sigma Pi, Phi Delta Kappa, the Masons, and the Knights Templar, the Shriners, and the Eastern Star. Yes, he is always a leader. All Missouri salutes him.

Statement of John Geoffrey Will on H. R. 5102

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I believe it was Mark Twain who once commented that those who bypassed the truth needed a wonderful memory so that they could recall what story they had used for what purpose. Today, under leave to extend my remarks, I am happy to insert a statement given by John Geoffrey Will, secretary and general counsel for the Upper Colorado River Compact Commission, before the Armed Services Committee of the House in support of H. R. 5102 to authorize the Navy to improve the water-supply facilities for the San Diego, Calif., area. As he mentioned very pointedly in his statement, it is a soundly conceived and badly needed project and one which he, and the organization of which he is the official representative, is glad to support fully in demonstration of the friendship both he and the organization have for the great State of California, which would be somewhat less great without Colorado River water—practically all of which water arises within the jurisdiction of the upper Colorado River Basin.

Now, going back to this matter of consistency in what one says or the need for a terrific memory, I could refer the Members to two articles in the Appendix of the RECORD inserted by two of my distinguished colleagues from California in which Mr. Will is unmercifully panned and his ability and purpose questioned and found wanting, and, where careful phrase making and sly digs leave the impression that possibly he should be hung by the neck until dead for having ventured to say a kind word for another project in another great State needing Colorado River water in order to become still greater.

Since it has never been my policy to engage in puerile and useless controversy which merely allows the parties to give fullest vent to their silver tongues and Thesaurus-aided pens, I shall not name these colleagues, but I am quite sure they shall be aware of what I mean and the articles to which I refer. I also trust that charity will jog their memory if the exigencies of the moment again make it seem politic to use people, who

after all are merely carefully filling out their jobs, as whipping boys to reach some goal which they see as being more desirable than accuracy itself.

STATEMENT OF JOHN GEOFFREY WILL, SECRETARY AND GENERAL COUNSEL, UPPER COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION, BEFORE THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, REGARDING H. R. 5102, A BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY TO ENLARGE EXISTING WATER SUPPLY FACILITIES FOR THE SAN DIEGO, CALIF., AREA IN ORDER TO INSURE THE EXISTENCE OF AN ADEQUATE WATER SUPPLY FOR NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS INSTALLATIONS AND DEFENSE PRODUCTION PLANTS IN SUCH AREA

I am deeply grateful for this opportunity to appear in support of legislation to authorize the construction of works to enable the city of San Diego, and its environs in the State of California, to receive an additional water supply for municipal and agricultural purposes. I am grateful also for this opportunity to demonstrate by act and deed, both officially and personally, that long standing friendship which the Upper Colorado River Commission and I feel toward the great State of California, one of the community of States in the Colorado River Basin—a feeling of friendship that has endured notwithstanding those occasions that have found us at times not seeing eye to eye with our friends. In that connection, Mr. Chairman, I venture to express the hope that the time is not too distant when some means will be found whereby all of the Colorado River Basin States can once more gather together under one banner to discuss their several plans and long range objectives and find those respects in which agreement lies. I am confident that, had those means existed before the introduction of H. R. 234, the original bill to authorize these works, much of the regrettable delay that has since occurred could have been obviated.

Preceding bills to authorize construction of the works that would be authorized by the enactment of H. R. 5102 have been viewed by the Upper Colorado River Commission with some lack of enthusiasm. H. R. 5102, however, goes far toward meeting those objections to which preceding bills gave rise. I congratulate Congressman McKINNON on the inclusion in H. R. 5102 of section 6 which provides, in effect, that all works constructed thereunder shall be subject to and controlled by the Colorado River Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, and the California Limitation Act and that no right or claim of right to the use of the waters of the Colorado River shall be aided or prejudiced thereby. Some such assurance is needed in the light of the statement contained in the 1948 report of the San Diego County Water Authority on the "need and feasibility of increasing the capacity of the San Diego aqueduct" that "in the meanwhile, the metropolitan water district's water rights can either be strengthened by a policy of diverting and using increasing amounts of Colorado River water in communities where the need exists, or such rights may be weakened by pursuing a policy of restricting further use of Colorado River water until the decision of the (Supreme) Court has been received." I understand that the foregoing statement from the 1948 report of the San Diego County Water Authority no longer represents the official position of that body. Nevertheless, the fears engendered by that statement remained. Section 6 of H. R. 5102 will tend to dispel them. A few additional amendments upon which, I understand, agreement has been reached will complete the job.

The project proposed to be authorized by H. R. 5102 is soundly conceived and badly

needed. It would make a good project for authorization and construction under the Federal reclamation laws. In purpose, for instance, it is similar to a little project in Colorado, known as the Colbrann project, upon which hearings were recently held before the Irrigation Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Procedures called for in connection with the authorization of flood control and Federal reclamation projects are admittedly somewhat burdensome. Reports on such projects are required to be circularized among affected States for 90 days, and the comments of such States, received within that time, must be transmitted to the Congress along with the report on the project. In the case of the Colbrann project that procedure was adhered to strictly, notwithstanding the fact that one of the principal purposes of the project is to provide an additional municipal water supply to a city which is becoming known as the uranium capital of the world and in which vital national defense activities are centered. That procedure has not been followed in the case of the project proposed to be authorized by H. R. 5102. In view of the need of San Diego and San Diego County and their environs, and in view of the lapse of time, it has been concluded that, so far as the Upper Colorado River Commission is concerned, there will be no insistence upon that procedure in this case. I point to this conclusion as another bit of evidence of friendship for our California neighbors. The policy represented by existing statutory procedures in connection with the authorization of water resource projects is wise. The present departure therefrom in H. R. 5102 ought not, therefore, to be deemed a precedent.

I am constrained to advise that there is disagreement as to the legal availability of water from the Colorado River system for the city of San Diego and its environs. I do not for one moment suggest that, because such disagreement exists, the project to transport water to the San Diego area should not be authorized. I do think, however, that this committee and the Congress ought to be fully advised in the premises. The disagreement to which I refer is one in which two States, Arizona and California, are generally considered to be primarily concerned. It involves construction of the documents and statutes described in section 6 of H. R. 5102 as well, perhaps, as the Mexican Water Treaty. If one view should prevail in all or virtually all respects and if the present California priority agreement should remain unamended, then it seems doubtful that Colorado River water will be available for transportation to San Diego. Should another view prevail in all or virtually all respects, there will probably be sufficient water legally available for transportation to San Diego.

The question here is similar in a sense to questions posed other committees of the Congress in connection with the proposed authorization of the central Arizona project. In that case, the Senate has twice resolved to authorize the project notwithstanding disagreement on the legal availability of a water supply therefor. The House, on the other hand, has not finally taken a position. Action taken by this committee and by the House on H. R. 5102 may, therefore, constitute an interesting precedent in that respect.

I have deliberately left untouched the question whether the existing priority agreement among California agencies, regarding their use of waters of the Colorado River system, should be amended. Just as the States represented on the Upper Colorado River Commission might resent suggestions from outside regarding their purely internal affairs, so might California properly object to any suggestions from me in that regard.

I refer to that priority agreement only for the purpose of pointing out to this committee that it could be so amended as to foreclose any doubts regarding the legal availability of water for San Diego and her environs whatever view may finally be taken on larger questions.

As I said a moment ago, the project proposed to be authorized by H. R. 5102 is soundly conceived and badly needed. I would be happy to see it authorized, subject only to such minor amendments as will fully protect the interests of the States concerned.

Why Should We Be Fighting in Korea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. JUDD Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a letter which in graphic and inspiring language reveals what has happened in the mind and heart of one high-grade American youth as he struggled with the question: Why should he be fighting in little, relatively unimportant Korea?

A first lieutenant in the United States cavalry division fighting Communists in Korea, he wrote the following letter to his parents. It does two things which the President and Secretary of State have failed to do adequately.

It states clearly the reasons for American participation in the struggle in Korea, and defines specifically the objectives which we hope to gain through the fighting there.

Mr. Acheson had opportunity to clarify these issues recently when he wrote, for publication, his reply to a young marine's suggestion that our foreign policy was more than a little mixed up. The marine's chief objection to our involvement in Korea was because he doubted that America had a just cause there.

However, the first lieutenant sees what is at stake, and clearly states what we stand for as well as what we are against. He wrote his letter while hospitalized in Tokyo following an emergency operation in a tent just behind the front lines in Korea. He was awarded the Bronze Star medal for heroism displayed last November when during an attack by superior enemy forces he organized flank and rear-guard security, heedless of heavy enemy mortar, automatic weapon, and small arms fire, and inspired his men to beat off the enemy and hold their position.

Here is this young American's letter:

TACHIKAWA, JAPAN.

DEAR FOLKS: Quite often in Korea I used to become very depressed, and had all but convinced myself that it was wrong (strategically, not morally) for us to tie up so much of our Army in so remote and untenable a spot when the decisive portion of the earth seemed to be the Western European-North African sector. I could not help but feel

that we were doing little more than bringing the misery, poverty, and carnage of war upon the Korean people, who after all seemed to care little about the processes of legislation and government. All their principal cities—Seoul, Pyongyang, Inchon, Chungju—have been gutted, pillaged, burned, destroyed—crops went unharvested in the fields; homes by the thousands were burned, women and children, clinging desperately to their pitiful possessions clogged the roads and fields as our forces met, and were killed and maimed by shells and bombs from both our own and the enemy's weapons.

I could not see how all the devastation visited upon them could possibly be justified by any amount of political independence which might be the end result of it all. But, because I was so close to the scene of this havoc, I suppose I was blinded to everything else taking place in Korea. I lost sight of the fact that the fight is for not only political freedom, but freedom of mind, and freedom of soul, for the people of Korea. Are there not hundreds of thousands of ROK's fighting beside us, and fighting valiantly when equipped? No one will ever know how many of them have died in battle and lie in unmarked graves—and many more thousands will die before their soil is free of Red troops. So, if these sons of the Korean land find liberty worth fighting for, and if need be, dying for, then surely we cannot be wrong in helping them. I have only seen the harder phases of the struggle, and the struggle is a hard and vicious one. But throughout the history of mankind, liberty has never been bought cheaply. We paid for our own at Valley Forge and at Yorktown, not in silver and gold, but in blood.

But, whereas there are unspeakably painful aspects in the contest, there are also those which make it worth while and wholly justifiable. Free elections are being held; schools are opened again, and the children are taught the humanities instead of communist ideology; churches are rebuilt and there is freedom of worship once more. And not unimportant, there is freedom of enterprise, which means freedom from poverty and economic enslavement.

Now that I have been out of the midst of the turmoil for a few weeks, my mind has been cleared and I have been enabled to view objectively the whole of the struggle, untainted by difficult and unpleasant conditions which of necessity must exist before the goal is reached. I have been able to analyze and reason out and determine to my own satisfaction why we must fight communism—not only in Korea, but wherever it exists and challenges us. To achieve liberty we had to fight, and now that we have it, we must keep it at all costs, keep it though we must fight and die to possess it.

A poet once wrote these lines—

"Yet still am I a slave

When banners flaunt and bugles blow,

Content to fill a soldier's grave,

For reasons I shall never know"

But we do know why we must fight, and we know what will happen if we do not. We know now what we are for and what we are against.

We, and in this case we are the great majority of men—are against the domination of the world by a gang of self-maddened technicians of power. We are against enslavement of nations and peoples, counter to their will, by corruption, lies, and conquest. We are against the reduction of society to the uniform pattern of a spy-ridden slave camp. We are against the strait-jacketing of science and art and invention in the rigid bindings of a banal and degrading dogma. We are against the torture and sacrifice of human beings on the bloody altars of these faceless

gods of communism, historical necessity, and the revolution of society. We are against the sapping and mining and smashing of every institution and human relation which men have so long and so painfully fitted together in their never-ending contest against the mysteries of nature. We are against power which is legitimized only by power.

And in knowing what we are against we are also defining almost directly what we are for. We are for the restraint of power by custom, moral principle, and by law. We believe individual human beings to be of an infinitely higher moral worth than any secular end or goal. We believe in an open, not a closed society, in the right of men and nations to be different, and we believe in the right of man to explore varied routes to earthly and eternal heavenly salvation. We are for, specifically, the liberty of those nations that have been subjected to the Communist tyranny, and for the removal of the threat to the freedom of all other nations. We are for a world order, based on law and Christian principles, which will permit men to advance creatively without the threat or existence of war, and the paralyzing weight of fear and systematic terror. We are for freedom—freedom of mind, freedom of body, freedom of soul, and freedom to determine the restrictions to be placed upon that freedom, lest it destroy itself.

And so I have determined why in my own mind I know that we must conduct our campaign in Korea, and any place else on earth where the need of militant resistance arises. May God grant to our statesmen and soldiers and people the foresight and wisdom which they so sorely need to meet the crises which will come.

Give us more guns, more ammunition, more troops, and more of your prayers, and with God in close support, freedom again shall rise up from the dust.

Love to all

In Memory of Hersey Egginton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD W. HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me I include the following poem by James Patrick McGovern in memory of the late Hersey Egginton, formerly a district attorney of Kings County and leader of the bar in the State of New York:

IN MEMORY OF HERSEY EGGINTON

Broken is our sacred friendship,
Fifty years of brotherhood,
Which time had always turned more mellow,
Which death alone had not withstood.

Gone our bond transcending selfhood,
Happy in each chance to give,
Consecrated by each service
With which the pulse would beat and live.

Brother quick to help all suffering
Of sick and poor wherever known,
Feeling for the hearts of others
By Christian spirit in your own.

Death? Your friendship is undying
In myriad lives your deeds still shine;
In them your memory is immortal,
To me, our love must be divine.

—James Patrick McGovern.

Address of Hon. Edward J. Reagan,
Member of the California State Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Edward J. Reagan, a member of the Senate of the State of California, representing the fifth senatorial district, delivered a stirring address at the California State convention of the CIO on July 28 last.

It has been my privilege to know the senator for many years and I am very happy to have the privilege of including in my remarks his splendid speech.

We are nearing the end of the sixth year since the Empire of Japan sued for peace in the Pacific and the victorious United Nations Allies entered upon what we confidently hoped would be an era of lasting world peace.

Objectives of any people in international relations are determined by their desire to carry out the principles and purposes to which they are supremely devoted.

Americans have a rich heritage of moral and political principles which we have always conceived as applying equally to all the people of the world. This tradition is rooted in the belief in the dignity and supreme worth of every individual human being. States and governments have to us never been ends in themselves but only the means through which men could secure their individual liberties and carry out their moral purposes.

Americans possess a fundamental love of freedom which we believe is common to all the people of the world. We believe that every man should be free to think for himself, to worship his God in his own way, to express his convictions and to act either alone or in association with others in accordance with what he believes to be the highest good.

Americans believe that everyone in the world has a right to a sufficient quantity of material goods to enable him to live in a way that is consistent with his dignity as a human being. Americans believe that everyone in the world should be enabled to live in peace, secure from the threat of war and violence which always deprive men of their dignity, life, and well-being. The kind of world in which every human being can live in peace and can think and act with the dignity which befits a man is the kind we seek to achieve, and cooperation with all men—everywhere—in the creation of such a world constitutes the highest ultimate objective of our efforts in international affairs.

Beset by fear—angered by the tactics of the Soviet Union—and impatient in the failure of peace to emerge from the wreckage of World War II—the United States has embarked upon a vast rearmament program designed to protect the freedom and our own security. But America needs to try to formulate her policy with the wisdom of maturity, the temperance of perspective, the humanity of greatness.

America must reassess her objectives and examine the impact of her policies on the rest of the world. Are they moving us toward our objectives or away from them? We approach the world problem with confidence, with a hope for peace and security.

That confident hope has been sobered in 6 years. We are today sadder, perhaps, but rather considerably wiser and more realistic

in recognizing that peace is not a thing cheaply to be purchased, nor easily to be maintained. We have learned that preservation of peace requires much the same kind of effort we have already learned to put into raising the living standards of our people. Success is not automatic—efforts cannot be relaxed—and the results we achieve are in more or less direct proportion to the work and thought which we collectively contribute to the whole.

Perhaps it will help if I put this in concrete terms familiar to all of you. It has often occurred to me that the development of organized labor provides a striking parallel to the efforts by nations to develop an organization capable of bargaining collectively for peace.

The individual employee is, for the most part, in a poor bargaining position. To succeed in the short run for himself he frequently finds that he is bargaining with his employer against the interest of his fellow employees. Under a system of individual bargaining, the employer is almost certain winner in each case—at least to the extent that anyone may be the winner in a situation in which the result is a continually depressed living standard.

The emergence of effective organization within the labor force has brought with it victory for everyone concerned. The steady rise in living standard which has accompanied the maturing system of labor-management relations under collective bargaining has confirmed what the early theorists of the labor movement predicted. There has been more of everything for everyone—employers and employees alike—and ever less of hardship, misery, and strife.

I trust you will forgive my reminder of these familiar things which you already know so well, but as I remarked earlier, I believe there is a close parallel between organization for a better living standard and organization for the preservation of peace.

So, with these thoughts in mind, let us take a look at what we are trying to do in making this a peaceful and decent world. I take it to be the objective of the United States that we should assist in creating, within the family of nations, an organization which will work collectively to keep the peace. Such an organization of individual nations should be governed by an understandable, understood, and agreed upon system of law and order.

Within our own communities, our States, and our Nation we have achieved a system of law and order recognized and enforced throughout the country. While we must concede that even our own national system does not produce perfect justice, it does have perfection as its goal. And I believe the history of the United States demonstrates that we have steadily approached a closer approximation of absolute justice between citizen and citizen, and the citizen and his government.

But this is a slow and difficult process into which constant effort must be poured.

I think it is perfectly clear that the task of instituting a system of law and order to control conflicts between sovereign nations is a much more difficult one. It is complicated by long-standing jealousies and antagonisms: of the Irishman against the Englishman—of the Frenchman against the German—the Pole against the Russian. Religious differences intervene. So do racial differences. So do political theories, and social theories, and economic theories.

Yet overriding all these differences, jealousies, suspicions and antagonisms is the still larger concern of all men to work out means for peaceable solutions to their conflicts.

So great in fact is this demand for peace that we grow impetuous for immediate re-

sults. We forget all the differences and the difficulties. We grow impatient, and seek after some magic way to peace that would be quick and cheap and easy.

Naturally, where there is such a great demand for instantaneous results bought at bargain-counter prices, there are those who pretend to offer us an easy way out. The Kremlin, for example, tries to market the thought that if the nations of the world will appease the ravenous Soviet appetite for conquest, there will be no war. In the Communist view, there would be one world—a Soviet world—in which no possible force could arise to begin another war. What the Communist omits from his argument is any reference to the price we would pay for such appeasement. Down the drain would go all our cherished freedoms, our standard of living and all the other great things which we presently have and for which we continue to strive.

But the Communists aren't the only ones who offer what is supposed to be an easy way out. We have what might be called the go-it-alone plan, perhaps more accurately, a whole group of plans that operate more or less on the go-it-alone theory.

Basic to all of these go-it-alone schemes are most of the familiar arguments against joining a union. Why spend money on union dues to help somebody else? Why aren't you good enough to take care of yourself without calling on others to help? What difference does it make to you what happens to the other fellow? Why get in an organization where the other fellow gets to vote on what happens to you?

Well, you know the answers to all those questions—and those answers pretty well apply in the field of foreign policy. Perhaps the worst feature of go-it-alone is its rejection of the whole idea that we will try to build a system of law and order among nations. Instead, we would try to protect ourselves under go-it-alone on the idea that might makes right, and that it doesn't matter what happens to the other fellow.

Well, what happens to the other fellow does matter in this world. Quite apart from the complete immorality of the might-makes-right idea, and quite apart from the rejection of trying to create a family of nations that can settle its differences by collective bargaining, we need the other fellow just as much as he needs us.

I don't think it's necessary to argue the immorality of might-makes-right, or that it's necessary to develop the advantages of a system of law and order among nations. But I would like to discuss briefly why it is that we can't go it alone, why it is that we do need the other fellow.

Take industrial production, since it is an all-important factor in modern war. There are four great industrial areas in the world. The largest, of course, is here in North America. Next is the area of free Europe, then the area in Russia and her Eastern European satellites. Last on the list in size, and considerably smaller now than it was before the war, is in Japan.

Steel capacity is a good illustration of the relative size of these industrial areas. For every 10 tons of steel that we can produce in the United States, free Europe can produce a bit more than 6 tons—and the Soviets can produce almost four. Now the mathematics of this 10-to-6-to-4 ratio of steel capacity is of utmost importance. Add the 3 tons from free Europe to our 10, and the result is 16 tons on our side to 4 tons on the Soviet side—a 4 to 1 advantage for us.

Now add these up another way. Add free Europe's 6 tons to the Soviet 4, and the result is 10, which is then equal to our capacity.

Is there any doubt in your minds, then, as to why the Kremlin has sought, through every kind of sabotage, infiltration, and threat, short of war itself, to take over five

Europe? With that single stroke, world communism could acquire a total steel capacity equal to our own—and with this newly acquired Soviet might, Japan, separated from us by the width of the Pacific, would find itself constantly under the Soviet gun—either neutralized, or taken over altogether.

Now without attempting to overburden you with argument here, I would like also to point out that if Europe were lost to the Communists, we would actually be in worse shape than the approximate equality in steel capacity would indicate. There are a dozen or more critical, strategic materials which the United States must import from outside the Western Hemisphere in order to keep this giant industrial machine of ours running at anything like its present levels. Perhaps 15 pounds of manganese go into every ton of steel—and for this manganese we depend overwhelmingly upon supplies in India and Africa.

To maintain, and for that matter, to increase as we would have to do, our industrial output in the event Europe fell to the Communists, we would necessarily have to keep India and Africa out of Communist hands. And this task, accomplished without allies, would be an enormously difficult one for us.

Now in developing this industrial picture to show a practical reason for our need of allies, I am perfectly well aware that former President Hoover reminded us last winter, during the great debate over troops for Europe, that the United States could, "with proper safeguards," as he put it, be self-sufficient and independent of imports from places such as India and Africa. As an engineer and former Secretary of the Interior, as well as a former President, he should know. What he did not point out, however, was that our industrial output would be seriously curbed if we were compelled to depend exclusively on the Western Hemisphere.

With this review of some of the essential facts which must be considered in discussing our foreign policy, the course of action followed by the United States in the past 6 years becomes more readily understandable.

We have invested heavily in building the machinery for international collective bargaining in the interests of peace. The "union dues," as it were, that we have contributed to this collective effort have been high. But the stakes involved are incomparably higher. We hope to achieve out of it a union of nations dedicated to peaceful and lawful settlement of disputes. To be effective, this union of nations must resolutely act collectively to assist any nation threatened by aggression. This union must be strong enough—militarily and economically—that its collective action can prevent an aggressor from achieving his objective. This union of nations must make it forever impossible for any aggressor to get away with the old Hitler trick of picking off free countries while other nations stood helplessly by until the Nazis had amassed such power that only a world war could halt their conquest.

Thus it is that the United States has stood by the United Nations through Soviet veto after Soviet veto of proposals aimed at making world peace more secure. We have put billions of dollars into Europe in the form of economic assistance needed to restore the vitality of its industrial and agricultural productivity. From the levels of starvation and hopelessness that existed in postwar Europe, production is now well above prewar levels.

The European people themselves have created from their war-decimated population a new generation of democratic leaders in whom they have faith. They have discarded the old leadership which in the 1930's had counseled appeasement and led them into war and an occupation from which they have had to be liberated. The local Communist movements in the free countries of Europe, who hoped to parlay the postwar

misery and despair into a rejection of democracy and the institution of a Soviet Europe, have been steadily beaten back at the polls, losing more ground in each election. The danger of internal overthrow of Europe's democracies by communism has now largely passed.

The steady build-up in Communist military strength which began even before Europe's economic recovery was well under way has, of course, opened the new danger of outright Communist aggression, for we must conclude that the Kremlin still sees the necessity for taking over free Europe's industrial capacity if it is to succeed in world conquest.

Military conquest, as part of Communist strategy, had made its first postwar appearance in Europe when the Kremlin directed and supplied guerrilla warfare broke out in Greece in 1946. We poured military and economic aid into Greece, and into Turkey and Iran as well, beginning in 1947. The result was the survival of the elected government of Greece and the stamping out of the guerrilla movement. It also resulted in a greatly strengthened Turkey and in the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the northern province of Iran.

In 1949, the broad blueprints for the collective military defense of Europe were laid down in the form of the North Atlantic Treaty under which 12 nations of the Atlantic community agreed to work together in their common defense. Also in 1949, the program of supplying our free allies with military equipment and with machinery for the production of military supplies was also put into operation. The result, in terms of Europe, has been the creation of an international army under the command of General Eisenhower. Free Europe already has more than 2,000,000 men under arms, and has a large and growing supply of trained reserves. Her defense budgets have mounted steadily, and we are looking forward to the day when this force is sufficiently strong that no aggressor will dare launch an attack against it.

The full significance of the North Atlantic defense force strikes us when we realize that the bulk of Western Europe's armed forces are committed to General Eisenhower's command. When we consider the extent to which this has required the free European countries to submerge their long-standing national rivalries in order to work together for a common purpose, we can be heartened to see ourselves moving toward the desired goal of a united and peaceful family of nations.

Turning away from Europe now to Korea and the Far East, everything I have said about the establishment of collective action to preserve peace applies with equal force. As a question of principle, aggression is aggression wherever it occurs. If the union of free nations is to be dedicated to the proposition that no aggressor shall succeed in depriving an independent country of its freedom, this principle must be applied whenever and wherever an aggressor seeks to violate it.

On June 25, 1950, the North Korean Reds set out to conquer Korea south of the thirty-eighth parallel. If this conquest had succeeded it would have resulted in the destruction of the free and independent Republic of Korea which the United Nations itself had helped to create.

Thus, the military objective of the United Nations in Korea has been to prevent the Red aggressor from succeeding in this conquest and thereby forcing him to abandon his attack. With the Korean war now into its second year, it is perfectly apparent—and this should now be clear to the Communists, too—that the U. N. forces will not permit the conquest of South Korea.

So far as the Communists are concerned, the question in Korea is whether they have

had enough. Physically, they are further from the conquest of South Korea than they were on June 25 of last year. The whole purpose of the Red aggression—conquest—has been thwarted. Worse still from the Communist view, they have suffered staggering casualties in terms of trained troops. For those who point out that China has a seemingly endless supply of manpower, it is important to recall that there is a vast difference between unskilled and illiterate coolie and the soldier trained in the techniques of modern warfare. And the best armies of Red China have been plowed under by superior fire power and almost unchallenged air supremacy over the Communist lines which the U. N. forces have possessed.

Perhaps the Reds have not yet had enough. Or perhaps events of the next few weeks will prove that they have. Whatever may be the short-run result in Korea, we may be absolutely certain that the free world cannot drop its guard.

We must never lose sight of our basic objective: peace. We must continue to work at this in a hard-headed and realistic fashion. There is no cheap, easy, or quick way to achieve it.

I believe we are at a point where we can see that our global efforts are beginning to pay off. Military conquest by an aggressor is being stopped, and stopped very effectively, in Korea by a group of nations convinced that peace is everybody's business. You may be sure that this denial of conquest in Korea is not being lost upon Soviet satellites. If Red conquest had succeeded in Korea, satellite enthusiasm for similar adventures might be considerably higher than it is today. U. N. action in Korea has made aggression a somewhat unattractive proposition.

Our global efforts are paying off in another sense as well. The union of free nations is now greatly stronger than it has ever been in the past. This is true in a military sense and in an economic sense. But most important of all, this free world union is constantly broadening its foundation of understanding and agreement. We are making real progress in resolving the jealousies and differences which in the past have wrecked efforts at cooperation between nations.

In short, a system of law and order—agreed upon and understood—is emerging. We are building a basis of enforcement for that system by a community of nations learning to bargain collectively in keeping the peace. The union dues are high. The amount of effort involved is immense. But the stakes are higher still. We need the other fellow. He needs us. And we all need peace.

In closing, I would ask. Is our present policy winning for us the friendship and confidence of other peoples and nations around the world? Is our policy advancing the cause of human freedom and welfare? Does our policy give promise of providing us and other nations with a measure of security? Have we exploited to the fullest extent the essential role of the United Nations, namely the strengthening of the peace-making functions of that body? Have we explored to the fullest extent those conditions under which the nations of the world can work together to help themselves in the struggle for food, for freedom, for justice, for security? Have we given the world the benefit of a great demonstration through our deeds of the effectiveness of the democratic process?

An international program embodying these concepts requires intergovernmental action. We must—as the first and most effective step—unite American opinion behind a coherent program of private and public action—national and international—motivated by a concern for the general welfare.

America now finds herself in an unusual position. She was brought into being as a nation by men who had a deep awareness of the value of the individual and deep and pervading confidence in the Supreme Being.

America is no longer an infant republic but a powerful nation. We must meet the test of world opinion which seeks to determine whether our physical strength will tempt us to depend on it alone rather than have it tempered with moral and spiritual values.

We should be sensitive to the needs of the other peoples of the world and we then become in a much surer position as a powerful nation to be trusted. May we bring a vigor, a resoluteness and all-pervading sense of the spiritual values into our dealings with the world about us. Then perhaps we will justify the faith in America as set forth by Prime Minister Nehru of India in April 1940: "India is far from America, but more and more our thoughts go to this great democratic country which seems, almost alone, to keep the torch of democratic freedom alive in a world given over to imperialism and fascism, violence and aggression and opportunism of the worst type."

The world about us would like to reach toward us with high expectation. Do we, will we, meet the challenge?

Undercover Communist Agents in Government—Reply of Senator McCarthy to President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, recently the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCarthy] replied to President Truman on a Nation-wide network over the facilities of the American Broadcasting Co., with reference to undercover Communist agents in government. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, my deepest thanks to the four radio networks for giving me time to speak for those of us who are engaging in the difficult and unpleasant task of digging out the dangerous and undercover Communist agents in government. If we are to succeed, we must first break through and destroy the smoke screen of smear which is the Communist method of discrediting those who are willing to do this task.

The occasion of the four networks so generously giving me this time is that the President himself the other night joined in this smear and shouted all of the same names that have been coined by the Daily Worker and the left-wing elements of the press and radio. The terms are familiar—"character assassins," "unproved charges," "slander monger," "hate monger," "irresponsible accusations," "destroying unity," "tearing up the Bill of Rights," "the big lie," etc. The President also added his voice to the left-wing chorus: "No proof, no proof, no proof."

Well, the 15 minutes I have tonight will not allow me to give you even a fraction of the proof we have begged the State Department and Mr. Truman to take. But I shall give you the evidence tonight in one or two typical cases and then you decide whether those people should be doing our planning and handling top-secret material. You decide whether enough evidence was given against them.

But before I do that I would like to discuss briefly with you why it is so difficult to produce evidence against Communists and fellow-travelers. For example, I have in my hand testimony given before Senator PAT MCCARRAN's committee. General MacArthur's chief intelligence officer, General Willoughby, was testifying. On page 744, he was asked to give information which he had about some State Department employees from the Far East who were suspected of Communist activities. Listen to his answer. Here is what he said:

"Mr. Chairman, as a citizen, I am naturally most desirous to assist this important committee. However, as an Army officer, I am expected to observe Army orders and Presidential directives.

"No information of any sort relating to an employee's loyalty shall be submitted to a congressional committee.

"Any individual who may appear or be a witness before a congressional committee will respectfully decline to testify concerning the loyalty of any person and will state that he is forbidden to answer such questions by pertinent directives of the Army."

This same order prevented Maj. Leslie Groves from giving the Un-American Activities Committee the facts which he knew about atomic spies.

Can any one of you think of one reason on God's earth why Mr. Truman has issued this order making it an offense against the Government to give Congress the truth about Communists who are in our Government? Is not this order an admission that they know about and are trying to protect the Communists in government? Otherwise, why forbid the 2,000,000 Government employees to tell what they know about Communists?

Let us see when that incredibly fantastic order quoted by General Willoughby was first put into effect. It was issued to Army officers on August 21, 1948—just 17 days after the Hiss case broke. President Truman had just made his famous statement that the Hiss case was a "red herring" and that those who uncovered Hiss were seeking publicity and "endangering unity."

The President then says, "But why doesn't McCarthy produce the evidence which I, the President, have ordered withheld?"

Now on this question of proof, we might well spend a minute on the ill-famed Tydings committee which was appointed to investigate the men I had named. I hold in my hand the hearings of that committee which shows that Tydings was offered the names of a large number of witnesses who would give the evidence on the Communists and fellow travelers whom I named and what happened? The answer was No. Tydings with the administration blessing said, "Oh, no. We will not hear these witnesses. We will close the case and report that McCarthy produced no proof."

To give you a better idea of how phony and dishonest is this claim of no proof, let me read from the Tydings hearings:

On page 2521, the minority counsel, Robert Morris, said:

"I have gone and gotten some witnesses together who will testify that he (former State Department employee at that time employed in another Government office) was a member of the same Communist Party unit as they were, and I think that we would be delinquent if in the face of this evidence that is now on the record—"

Senator Tydings interrupted and said, "Turn it over to the FBI or do something else with it. I would like to get a decision here. We don't want to waste this afternoon."

That is from pages 2521 and 2522 of the hearings.

In view of the fact the Truman-Acheson axis shouts that there is no evidence against any of the people who McCarthy considers

so bad for this Nation and that McCarthy is afraid to give the evidence off the Senate floor outside of congressional immunity, let's take the evidence in a typical case of a high State Department planner tonight, a planner who has been so often found where disaster hits America and success comes to Soviet Russia. Let's take the case of the President's Ambassador at Large, Philip C. Jessup.

Now as I give you this evidence, remember that every left wing writer and radio commentator has been screaming that McCarthy has been naming these people under congressional immunity. Well, there is no congressional immunity on this radio program tonight. I am sure you will agree with me that if what I tell you is untrue, then this man Jessup is being grossly libeled and should at once start one of those lawsuits that they threaten so often. If, on the other hand, what I say is true, then I am sure you will agree that this man is not good for America and should be taken out of Government.

As I give this evidence, I ask the President what more evidence does he want on this man—what more must I prove on Philip Jessup before he will get rid of him—or is this Truman's and Acheson's idea of no evidence? If this is not evidence, then there is no such thing as evidence.

And remember that we have given equally convincing evidence on a vast number of State Department employees.

But let us get down to the evidence. Any of you can have a copy of this evidence if you want it—by merely dropping me a line.

I hold in my hand the photograph of a document showing that Mr. Jessup had editorial control of the official publication of an organization named as the front for and doing the work of the Communist Party. I have in my hand the pictures of checks representing thousands of dollars of Communist money which were accepted and cashed by Jessup's organization. I have the photostats showing that Jessup was affiliated with not one, not two, not three, not four, but five organizations that were officially named as fronts for and doing the work of the Communist party—not named as Communist fronts by McCarthy, you understand, but named by the attorney general or legislative committees. I have in my hand a copy of a petition—and listen to this if you will—a petition signed by Jessup urging that we destroy all atomic bomb material—and I quote—by appropriate means such as dumping it into the ocean. This was at a time when undercover Communists were stealing our atomic bomb secrets and sending them to Russia.

I have in my hand also the court record of Hiss' second trial in which Jessup swore that Hiss had a high moral character and high integrity and a great reputation for truth and veracity—a man who was convicted as being a Communist perjurer.

While Jessup was chairman of the Pacific Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations, which is being investigated by the McCarran committee, he had for 4 years as his staff, 23 individuals. Ten of them have been named under oath as Communists; three of them named as espionage agents, and three have been named as probable Communists.

I ask the President to stand up and tell you what part of this evidence is untrue. Let him tell you that Jessup was not in editorial control of a Communist front publication. Let him tell you that Jessup's publication was not supported by Communist money. Let him tell you that this publication did not follow the Communist Party line in Asia. Let him tell you that it did not hire well-known Communist writers. Let him tell you that Jessup was not affiliated with five organizations which were officially named as fronts for and doing the work of the Communist Party. Let him tell you that

Jessup did not petition that we destroy atomic bomb material by dumping it into the ocean. Let him tell you that Jessup, as chairman of the Pacific Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations did not employ on his staff of 23, 10 people who were not named as Communists, 3 as espionage agents, and 3 as probable Communists. Let him tell you that Jessup did not come to Hiss' defense and did not testify to Hiss' reputation for loyalty, truth, and veracity.

Incidentally, when I first gave this evidence to the President, what do you think he did? He gave this man top secret clearance to all atomic and hydrogen bomb information. Of all the stupidly stubborn and stubbornly stupid playing with the lives of American boys that I have ever seen, this tops the pinnacle of them all.

I see my time is up. I will continue this on another network, Friday night.

What Communists Call "Spying" Is Routine Work for Russians Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article appearing in the August 24, 1951, issue of United States News and World Report entitled "Communists Get Free News Here":

COMMUNISTS GET FREE NEWS HERE—UNITED STATES PRESS IN SOVIET AREAS: HAND-OUTS OR JAIL

(United States is wide open to Moscow newsmen. What Communists call "spying" by Americans is routine work for Russians here. Stalin's reporters attend all press conferences, have access to all agencies, have rights Voice of America men can't get. Little that they write appears in print. But they keep a detailed account of United States affairs moving out—direct to the Kremlin.)

In Prague, an American newspaperman is in jail for doing the everyday, routine work of a reporter. He was charged with spying and sent to prison for 10 years. In Washington and New York, reporters for Communist newspapers in Russia and other countries behind the iron curtain do their jobs with all the privileges and rights enjoyed by Americans.

When George C. Marshall, the United States Secretary of Defense, holds a press conference to tell of military plans, Communist reporters are present. Within a few hours a report of what he said is on the desk of Joseph Stalin. President Truman's ideas, outlined to American correspondents, are in Moscow about as soon as they are on the streets of American cities. These reports often are more detailed than those printed in America. They tell how the President looked, what he meant, give background interpretations of what he said.

The situation is the same all through the Government. Communist reporters for Russian newspapers have full freedom. They carry the same press cards as do American reporters. The Voice of America, a Government agency, is barred from membership in congressional press galleries. But correspondents for foreign Communist newspapers are admitted.

Reporters for the Soviet news agencies have cards that admit them to the White House offices. They have working space in the State Department pressrooms, lunch with State

Department officials, and listen in on press conferences of Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

All around Washington the Soviet reporters rub shoulders with American newsmen. They move in and out of newsrooms, pick up the same hand-outs, attend press conferences with officials of the Defense Department, the Atomic Energy Commission, and other agencies. They are members of the National Press Club and attend its social gatherings. And they may travel freely about the country and talk to anyone.

If American reporters are spies—as William Oatis, the Associated Press reporter, was accused of being in Czechoslovakia—then Communist correspondents are able to do a full job of spying in the United States with the aid of United States officials and long-standing policies.

Seven employees do the work for Tass, the Russian news agency, in the United States. Three of them are in New York, four in Washington. Of them, only two are Russians. The others are American citizens. There are no reporters from the satellite countries in the United States except for two Polish newsmen who are accredited to the U. N. and whose activities are confined to the New York area.

Like the 2 Poles, the 16 Russian reporters accredited to the United Nations are restricted to work in the New York City area, including Flushing and Lake Success. If one of them should go to Albany to cover a session of the legislature, or to Philadelphia for a Communist meeting, he might be deported. But in New York City they travel freely and talk with whomever they wish, ask all sorts of questions. Many of them spend much of their time in Wall Street and on local assignments for the Soviet agency.

The seven Tass reporters assigned to general work in the New York and Washington offices, and accredited as correspondents, may travel where they wish and write what they will. Those in Washington are free to range through the Government departments. There is no censorship over their activities or what they send out of the United States.

From the New York office, Ivan Beglov and his two American aides send Russia far more material than ever appears in Russian and satellite newspapers. They send the texts of speeches, governmental announcements, business and technical reports, all kinds of useful information. In Moscow, this is passed around among trusted officials. The dribbles that get into the newspapers are distorted versions of American happenings.

Much of this material comes from Washington where the bureau is operated by Mikhail Fedorov and his three American helpers. Fedorov, 30, was an aeronautical engineer before the Soviet Government decided to convert him into a newspaperman.

Fedorov's three helpers are Laurence Todd, Miss Jean Montgomery, and Miss Euphemia K. Virden. Miss Montgomery is the daughter of a Pittsburgh architect. Miss Virden's father is a Cleveland industrialist, once an official in the Department of Commerce.

Todd, 68, preceded Fedorov as chief of the Tass bureau. He is an old hand in Washington. A New Englander, Todd has an ancestor who fought in the Revolution. Another helped to start the Republican Party. Todd has many news sources in Washington. In the past, the Russian Embassy has relied heavily on his advice.

Instructions from New York and Moscow flow into the Washington office of Tass without question. But one of the points raised against William Oatis was that he worked under orders from his New York office.

The congressional press galleries, whose rules are administered by newspapermen, refused to grant membership to reporters for the Voice of America because it was a Government agency. Tass reporters were held to be representatives of a press service and admitted.

But, among satellite countries, one Government put Tass in a different light. An American correspondent in that country protested to Foreign Office officials that he was being compelled to submit his dispatches for censorship but that Tass men did not have to do so. He got back a formal letter telling him that Tass reporters had diplomatic rank but that he did not.

Adoption of the same point of view in Washington would ban Tass men from congressional press galleries on the same ground as that on which membership was refused to the Voice of America.

Few reporters from the United States remain in either Russia or the satellite countries. There are only four American reporters in Russia. No others are being admitted.

One American correspondent, recalled to the United States recently, was kept waiting 7 months before the Soviet Government would permit him to go back to Moscow. He had worked in Russia almost 10 years, was married to a Russian woman and had left his wife and two children in Moscow.

Another American newspaperman, seeking admission to a satellite country, was told over the telephone that if he would call at the Embassy in Washington, he could get an entry permit. At the Embassy, he saw men inside, but no one would answer the doorbell. For several days, he got more assurances by telephone that he could get an entry permit; but no one would come to the door at the Embassy. He is still waiting.

In Russia and most of the satellite countries, a reporter can make no move that is not reported to the police. There are no governmental news sources, no press conferences, no uncensored newspapers from which to pick up news. And many of the citizens are afraid to talk with reporters. They, too, are being spied upon. The only news source is newspapers that print officially approved news. Often dispatches themselves are censored before being sent; they may be held up at any time.

The general disposition is to treat newspaper reporters as spies. And, around Washington, since the Oatis incident, the suggestion is being raised that Russian reporters be treated the same way.

The Case of the Confused Cougar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I bring to the attention of the House The Case of the Confused Cougar.

This interesting story comes from the Tennessee Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report, of Nashville, Tenn.:

THE CASE OF THE CONFUSED COUGAR

The bureaucrat and the taxpayer are not alone in their confusion over duplication and overlapping among Federal agencies.

Even the animals in the forest lands owned by Uncle Sam are slightly puzzled—or should be, anyway. Take the case of the cougar (or mountain lion). If a cougar is killed on Park Service land, the hunter is held under Park Service regulations to have destroyed wildlife in a national park. He is liable to a fine and imprisonment or both.

However, if the cougar passes up the Park Service land for a better hunting preserve in the Forest Service land, the hunter who kills him is treated from an entirely different standpoint—but also by Federal standards.

The Forest Service rules contain no provision for punishing a cougar killer. Rather, he is rewarded, for the State in which the Forest Service preserve lies will pay the hunter a \$75 bounty for having destroyed a predatory animal.

In this fashion, under Federal laws, one bureau hails the hunter as a benefactor of mankind and he is rewarded accordingly, while another agency of the same Government holds that the hunter is a criminal and can send him to jail.

It is confusing, to say the least—confusing to the hunter and maybe even to the cougar. If the cougar is not confused, then the taxpayer, at least, should be freed from the confusion and duplication of overlapping Federal agencies.

Rational Adjustments to Uncertainty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address entitled "Rational Adjustments to Uncertainty," delivered by Dr. William A. Neiswanger, professor of economics at the University of Illinois, to the 1951 graduating class of Washburn University, on June 3, last.

Dr. Neiswanger, a graduate of Washburn University, has not only had a distinguished career as university professor, but has spent considerable time in the Government service as an adviser on important problems involving monetary and economic questions. At these commencement exercises he was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of laws.

While directed particularly to college graduates about to face the realities of life in these trying and uncertain times, the address of Dr. Neiswanger contains so much that is wise, thoughtful, and constructive that it might well be read and heeded by every American. For that reason, I have felt that it should be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

RATIONAL ADJUSTMENTS TO UNCERTAINTY

President Stoffer, members of the boards of regents and trustees, faculty, members of the graduating class, distinguished guests and ladies and gentlemen, as you must know, I am very pleased to return to my alma mater for the purpose of greeting this graduating class, congratulating each of you on the successful completion of a course of study and wishing you well.

As a faculty man myself, I should like also to congratulate the faculty of Washburn on the graduation of this class. I know something of what you, the faculty, have been through in bringing these students so far. For if they are like those I meet in class, it is quite a task seeing them to graduation. Some it is possible to inspire—these, of course, run the risk of becoming professors themselves some day. Others yield only to cajolery—athletes are occasionally like that. A few it is necessary to intimidate—these usually have a convertible parked outside.

Then there are those who come to class to be entertained. These last are a great frustration to us professors—they respond so nicely to our every humorous sally, yet they often show an acute allergy to learning. To avoid this frustration, I sometimes pass them on general good nature and then advise them to follow another curriculum.

It must have been much the same when I was a student in Washburn, and I must say I, when a student, had but little conception of the role the faculty plays in higher education. Now, however, I have a real sense of gratitude to the inspiring teachers of my day at Washburn. I know now, also with what benign tolerance they observed our immature attempts at self-expression and with what restraint they refused to interfere with those occasional atavistic displays of youthful exuberance such as hobo day celebrations and sack scraps. I have no doubt such exhibitions have long since been renounced by more sophisticated generations.

And so to the faculty, for their continued skill in conveying learning to reluctant generations of youth, I say, for myself and this class—thank you very much. And to you, the students, without whom we professors would be truly sad—felicitations! I am sure President Stoffer, your faculty, parents and friends are very proud.

But I did not come here solely to eulogize the faculty and graduating class. I came also to discuss some problems of adjustment to the unusual uncertainties which face us in our day. To be confronted by uncertainty is surely nothing new in human experience, but the extent and source of our present insecurity seem to come to us with novel impact and leave us in some doubt as to a proper course of behavior.

The cause of the unique uncertainty of our day is an essentially false philosophy, which after some 100 years of incubation and restless stirrings has accumulated a violent force and this force has been turned outward on the world. It is the philosophy of class conflict, based on an economic interpretation of history and a mistaken materialistic dialectic. According to the Marxists, the history of civilization is the history of exploitation, of the many by the few, and the culture of a people is but part of the apparatus of enslavement of those who toil. Religion, art and literature are to them but the servants of politics and must be made to serve the state. The state, in turn, is viewed as an instrument of organized violence administered by the ruling classes as a means of oppression. The Communist dictatorships ironically referred to as people's democracies, use this power ruthlessly to suppress individualism and freedom in their political, cultural and economic manifestations. The Marxian doctrine and its new testament, by Lenin and Stalin, make of our ideals a sham, our defense of freedom a hypocrisy, and love of country an emotion stirred and diverted by tricksters for their selfish interest.

Small wonder we are assailed by uncertainties, a new sense of insecurity and resulting anxiety when such perverse ideas are combined with military power and loosened in the world. No single group of our citizens is more apprehensive or filled with foreboding than the quarter of a million young persons who are receiving their baccalaureate degrees this month from American universities. Abroad there is even more misgiving and concern in the minds of young people, for they live closer to the danger, in societies which are more divided on fundamental issues; their professors are widely separated on basic questions of social philosophy and organized minorities are vocal in sponsoring the most radical sort of ideas.

Americans, least of all Kansans, have never been impeded nor awed by a feeling of uncertainty or insecurity. Indeed, we have thrived in the midst of uncertainty. Perhaps

this is partly because we are still close to the pioneer days and have been weaned on stories of Indian raids and the struggle to make Kansas free. The Beecher Bible and rifle-men who left the security of Boston to settle in nearby Wabaunsee County and take their chances in bloody Kansas are a symbol of resolute faith and purpose in the midst of uncertainty. True, motives may have been mixed, as one settler on Pony Creek wrote to his relatives back home in New England: "We came to make Kansas free and, incidentally, get a quarter section of land."

The real danger in the uncertainty which confronts us in our era is that we may become weakened by doubts, that our emotions may become so aroused as to lead us to foolish actions and we may be led to emphasize the wrong things in trying to work out the solutions to the perils of our own day.

What adjustments can the intelligent person make which will preserve his sense of balance, dispel in measure the anxiety of fear, and enable him to stand as his pioneer ancestors did with calm surety and steadfast purpose?

The adjustments I wish to suggest take the form of recommendations for action and for certain points of view. What actions we should take in view of the present uncertainties, what points of view we should develop in the interest of our common welfare depend, of course, on the nature of the problems with which we are confronted. I would very briefly characterize the program of those who oppose us as follows:

1. They are attempting to weaken the western democracies by using every tool of propaganda and design to widen each fissure and crevice in the social structure of the democracies. If our enemies are successful in this, they will have gained two important ends—(a) we will be divided and (b) we will be led to doubt the enduring quality of our institutions.

2. They stimulate national movements in the colonial areas of the world and contribute by force to the success of these movements. Then, in these backward areas, they stimulate agrarian revolt and finally organize the proletariat uprising of the urban workers as the climax of the three-stage Communist revolution in colonial areas.

3. The economies of the major industrial nations of the west, they contend, contain the seeds of their own destruction. Without going into the economic basis for this Communist point of view, let me say merely they argue that the collapse of western civilizations is to be expected as a consequence of the breakdown in the economic system as revealed to us in periodic business depressions.

And so the Communists have a program which would weaken us internally by exploiting any weaknesses which may be found in our social and economic structure, which will harass us at the fringes of the earth as colonial peoples are stimulated to revolt and will, it is contended, destroy us at last through a breakdown of economic organization.

If this is the program of our foe, and he like Hitler has written out his philosophy and program of action in detail for us to read, then the question arises: What are the adjustments which a rational person might well make during this period of uncertainty?

I would suggest first, that we should observe with great care the points at which the Communists direct their divisive propaganda. We should then consider in a rational way whether the faults truly exist in our social structure. If so, we should do what we can as soon as we can to strengthen our democracy by remedying these faults. One does not travel abroad for long before the propaganda reaches his ears, sometimes from friendly sources—What about your lynchings? What about the share croppers? What

about the Okies? What about the gangsters who rule your great cities? "Why," the concierge of a Swiss hotel asked me, "do you keep your Indians in concentration camps?"

With such cunning, attempts are made to belittle us in the eyes of world opinion and cause doubts among us. Some of the faults which are exploited so craftily run deep and are surrounded by intense emotion. One cannot heal them overnight nor cure them with single acts of well-intended legislation, nor do I advocate a Carrie Nation-like approach to their solution by members of this class, for example. It does seem, however, that one rational adjustment to the uncertainties which confront us is to re-evaluate the importance of issues raised in the broad area of ideological conflict and to see that we use our influence right here at home to develop a more perfect democracy and so strengthen ourselves at home and abroad.

Members of organizations working toward these ends, whether women's clubs, service clubs, trade unions, student societies or Senate crime investigating committees surely serve their country's cause.

Not only, it seems to me, should we take a positive position to remedy, as we can, the faults in our society, but I would suggest also that, as individuals, we should impose restraints on ourselves when under the emotional tensions of our new insecurity. This to me is another useful adjustment to uncertainty. For there is real danger that our anxieties will stir such emotions within us that we will seek an outlet near at hand—that we will turn on our neighbors; that we will assail the universities and attempt to restrict intellectual inquiry there; that we will join with those whose fears overcome their faith and deprive ourselves of those fundamental rights of freedom which are the glory of our society.

As you may remember, the New York Times conducted a study last month in 72 major colleges in this country and reported "a subtle, creeping paralysis of freedom of thought and speech is attacking the college campuses, in many parts of the country, limiting both students and faculty in the area traditionally reserved for the free exploration of knowledge and truth." This, I think you will agree, must be stopped by men and women who make a rational adjustment to uncertainty and refuse to be stampeded by fear.

But if a rational adjustment to uncertainty is a refusal to be panicked into a destruction of our traditional freedom of expression and thought, then it seems to me there is a collateral adjustment which all responsible persons, especially professors, should make. We all know professors who like to use the shock technique to stimulate interest, and I fear we must renounce it and take special care that what we say in the classroom and public forum reflects our sober judgment. I do not mean that we should gag ourselves, to do this would destroy our integrity, but I do mean that what we say we must intend to say in all sobriety and objectivity, and that we willingly align the prestige society accords us behind our views. Only in this way do we merit the special privileges given us, and only in this way do we maintain our influence.

The second point in the general program of the Communists to which I have made brief reference has to do with their attempts to bring colonial areas of the world under proletarian dictatorships. Clearly, we see these programs in partial fulfillment in China, Indochina, and Korea—each in its own stage of the three-stage revolutionary program for such areas. This activity contributes much to our sense of uncertainty just now, and much could be said and should be said concerning our adjustments to this new element of uncertainty in our lives. I

will make but one comment, however. It is this: As a people we must make the intellectual and emotional adjustments to the fact that we are a great world power. In 1914 we were one of five or six great powers; in 1941 again we were one of five or six great powers, but now we are one of two great world powers which have the technical capacity, the industrial resources, the manpower, and the geographical position to qualify. We are so regarded by other peoples everywhere. True, we have strong allies, but in the end we emerge as the custodians of the English common law, of eighteenth century liberalism, of the rights of man, and no immature desire to escape by hiding behind the oceans or retreating to the security of the open country can change this fact, in my opinion.

If this is faced without evasion, many new complexities arise, but one at least has the inner peace of a mature person who has located himself in his environment and understands, in measure, his relationship to it.

It seems to me we are wearing our great power very well—without swagger or truculence, and I hope none of us mistakes for weakness the repose which only great strength makes possible. For another rational adjustment which should be made in time of uncertainty is a proper appraisal of one's own strength and the enjoyment of a quiet satisfaction in it.

These same Communists who assail us on so many fronts today, also hold the belief, as I have said, that every form of society—ancient, medieval and modern—breeds within itself the seeds of its own destruction. The force to which they look to destroy the great industrial nations at last is the business depression which in its recurring cycle, they say, forces more and more persons into the proletariat, centralizes control more and more in the hands of the few, whom they call the monopoly capitalists, and finally leads to the overturn of the entire structure by the mass uprising of the proletariat.

I will not now explain the fallacy of this argument as it applies to American society; its fallacies are probably evident to you. It may be, however, that a great depression in America will induce such recessions abroad in societies less stable than our own and bring such spreading unemployment and distress as to enable the native Communists to score great victories without the firing of a Russian shot.

Equally important with military preparedness in America, I would say, is the preparedness to forestall, if possible, and certainly to reduce the violence of, any major business recession which may come upon us. Faced with armed aggression, our leaders usually under-emphasize the importance of this.

Why do I mention this to the members of a class who have seen nothing but prosperity in America since their early childhood? My reason is that you should not have to learn by hard experience what we have learned and that your generation must understand that a business depression in America may be hard for us to weather, but a truly severe one might well bring real disaster to our neighbors overseas. Fear of this has been one of the great stumbling blocks in Anglo-American relations in the postwar years.

A rational adjustment to our present uncertainties is required here, too, for the concept of the Kansas pioneer who shaped his own destiny on a quarter section of good Kansas soil and regarded government as a necessary evil, is of eternal merit as it emphasizes the individual's responsibility for his own welfare. However, the magnitude of the economic forces which influence our economy, and the wide range of their effects on many people in many lands and the critical role they play for good or evil in the battle of ideologies, requires that our most

powerful and concentrated forces be mustered when collapse seems imminent and this means the Federal Government must act. This indicates, it seems to me, that when we no longer are sustained by huge military expenditures and a period of transition is before us, that the Federal Government must face its responsibility and direct its fiscal policies to the goal of economic stabilization. To the prospect of such action I believe we must adjust ourselves in this time of uncertainty.

Finally, I think we may need to make a rational adjustment to the very concept of uncertainty itself. When my class of 1922 graduated, World War I had but recently ended; we were entering the "two chickens in every pot" era and the outlook, apparently, was quite serene. However, those of us who went to graduate school had but received our higher degrees, and those who entered business had but become established when the great depression came. Our sense of economic security was rudely destroyed and our economic status, which had seemed secure and certain, became most uncertain. As we emerged from this, the Hitler tyranny appeared and all those uncertainties of personal fortune which confront men at such times assailed us. So the period of security enjoyed by the class of 1922 was short and our lives have been full of uncertainty, little dreamed of on our commencement day.

Today, your commencement day, the prospect in 1951 seems quite as uncertain as ours appeared certain in 1922. But in the fullness of time it is likely that you, too, will know years of reasonable quiet and enjoy that sense of security known too rarely by men of any era. Surely, however, the only certainty is change, and as mature persons we can scarcely feel abused or that fate is against us if our years have their lot of uncertainty which has been and will be the experience of man.

Ours is the task of making rational adjustments to the perils of our period; adjustments of the kind I have been speaking lead to action, and positive action programs dispel, in measure, the anxieties of fear. In such times as this human greatness can emerge, and I express the hope, in closing, that the members of this class may come to know the deep and satisfying experience of personal achievement in the midst of great uncertainty. "Ad astra per aspera."

Philippines Enact Minimum-Wage Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, one of the surest ways to fight communism is to eliminate some of the conditions on which it thrives. In the Philippines it thrives on unequal distribution of the land and a low standard of living for the majority of the people. Therefore it is encouraging to know that the Philippine Government has taken a big constructive step in enacting the first minimum-wage law for the islands.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article, taken from the August issue of the Monthly Labor Bulletin, a United States Department of Labor publication:

On April 6, 1951, the Congress of the Philippines enacted the first minimum-wage law

of general application to be adopted for the islands.

The law was devised to improve the economic conditions of workers, and, thereby, the economy as a whole, not only by establishing more adequate wage rates but also by preventing certain practices through which many workers in the Philippines are deprived of a portion of their meager wages. The impetus for this law came from one of the recommendations in the report of the United States Economic Mission to the Philippines (the so-called Bell report) made to President Truman in October 1950.

By reason of conditions peculiar to the Philippines, the minimum wage specified in the new law has three different levels. A single rate of 4 pesos a day is required to be paid in nonagricultural employment in Manila or its environs. A rate of 3 pesos a day is provided for nonagricultural employment outside of Manila or its environs for 1 year, and thereafter a rate of 4 pesos a day. The rate provided for agricultural work applicable on farms comprising more than 12 hectares (approximately 30 acres) is graduated over a 3-year period, with annual increases, from 1.75 pesos a day to 2.50 pesos a day. The Philippine Secretary of Labor is empowered under the act, in certain circumstances, to appoint tripartite wage boards to recommend wage rates in excess of the specified minimum.

DIRECT PAYMENT PROVIDED

To insure that wages are received by the workers who have earned them, the law provides for the direct payment of wages to workers. It requires the payment of wages directly to the wage earner in legal tender at intervals not exceeding 16 days. Furthermore, it is designed to forestall present kick-back and extortion practices, such as the so-called capataz system in the stevedoring industry in Manila, whereby foremen extort money from workers as tribute for retaining their jobs. Other such instances involve forced purchasing from company stores and the charging of exorbitant fees for representation in wage-collection matters.

Effective enforcement of the new minimum-wage law is expected to prove a useful step in helping to stimulate the Philippine economy through an increase, however modest, in the purchasing power and standard of living for a large portion of the islands' workers.

Considerable work in the drafting of this legislation was performed in the Office of the Solicitor of the United States Department of Labor. Members of the Solicitor's staff who performed outstanding service in such work and who have recently received special recognition by the Department's Efficiency Awards Committee for their contributions to the project are Leonard Appel, who received an honor award for meritorious service, and Miss Carol Cox, who received a superior accomplishment award. Experts from the United States Department of Labor who performed on-the-spot work in the Philippines in the effectuation of this program were Henry G. Gomperts, Ealton L. Nelson, and Harry S. Kantor.

How Should Cadets Be Picked?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Ap-

pendix of the RECORD an article by my colleague, JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts. This article appeared in The New York Times Magazine of August 19, 1951, under the title "How Should Cadets Be Picked?"

Congressman KENNEDY has made a special study of congressional methods of selecting nominees for West Point and Annapolis. He has a distinguished record of service in World War II for which he received the Navy and Marine Corps Medal as a PT boat commander.

HOW SHOULD CADETS BE PICKED?—THE WEST POINT SCANDAL CALLS ATTENTION TO THE WEAKNESSES OF AN OUTMODED SYSTEM FOR MAKING SERVICE-SCHOOL APPOINTMENTS

(By Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY)

The recent disclosure that 90 West Point cadets have been involved in "cribbing" on examinations has shocked the Nation. While this unfortunate scandal is a cause for concern it serves to call attention to the graver issue of the selection methods used in choosing our future military and naval leaders. Young men are finding their way into the service Academies by political favoritism, inadequate screening, and misplaced emphasis on qualities that are of little importance in military leaders.

Public attention has focused on the number of football players involved in the scandal at West Point. It is quite apparent that the first impulse toward moral breakdown came when these young men were approached by Academy officials and athletic scouts who offered them appointments to West Point. It is, of course, imperative that immediate steps be taken to stop such professional recruiting of athletes. But there is more to it than that; special preference for football players is only one of numerous faults in the entire system of selecting entrants for West Point and Annapolis.

Our present system, developed to insure the supremacy of the civilian over the military, makes the majority of appointments to West Point and Annapolis a personal prerogative of Senators and Representatives. That system is far from a success, especially when our safety may hinge on our ability to draw into the service Academies young men who are best fitted to meet the vast responsibilities that will later be placed upon them in our Armed Forces.

The broad facts as I have gathered them after some months of study with the assistance of Army and Navy officials, who recognized the deficiencies of the present system, disclose a situation so serious that we cannot afford to ignore it. These facts will show that the service Academies are unfilled; that the best men are not being attracted to them; and that an undesirably high number of graduates, upon whom the Government has spent large sums of money, fail to stay with the armed services.

Congressmen are not required by law to use any particular standard in making their appointments. In response to an inquiry I find that while half of them employ some type of competitive test, mostly the so-called civil service designating examination, the marks made by the candidates are not usually considered to be the controlling factor. Congressmen frequently make their choice on grounds of "first come, first served," or on grounds of political obligation, or perhaps because of reasons of friendship.

The weakness in our present system of selection can be pointed up by the results that the Coast Guard has obtained through its system of recruiting its students by open competition. As contrasted with West Point and Annapolis, it has eight or nine times as many applicants as vacancies—men who in many cases might have gone to the other Academies but who felt they did not have the political influence to get an appointment.

Moreover, statistics from the Educational Testing Service, an affiliate of the College Entrance Examination Board, reveal that in 1945, 1946, and 1947 (years in which this agency prepared examinations for both the Coast Guard Academy and the Naval Academy) the Coast Guard candidates achieved a higher score than the Annapolis candidates.

Further evidence of the deficiencies of our present system of selection was provided by the study made for the War Department in 1944 by Maj. Oscar K. Buross, Jr. Comparing the records of cadets who were appointed by Congressmen with those appointed in special categories as a result of a competitive examination, it was found that over a 10-year period the cadets who were not congressional appointees performed academically, year after year, better than congressional appointees.

The present system of congressional appointments is, in addition to being unfair, obviously not producing the best men for the service Academies. Evidence of this is to be found in the "attrition studies" made of the classes of 1915, 1925, and 1935 at both West Point and Annapolis.

"Undesirable attrition" is the term employed in these studies to represent those men who have been accepted for admission who later become lost to the armed services for reasons of lack of suitable temperament, want of proficiency, or absence of emotional stability. The figures on undesirable attrition are truly startling. In the Navy class of 1915 it has been 48.7 percent, in the class of 1925 it has been 52.5 percent, and in the class of 1935 it has already grown to 27.9 percent. The figures for West Point are somewhat less. For the classes of 1915, 1925, and 1935, undesirable attrition stands at 27.2 percent, 22.3 percent, and 14.8 percent, respectively. But both illustrate how the services of a vast number of officers are lost to the Nation before they have repaid the investment made in their education and training. These losses are in large part avoidable.

Of particular interest in this time of emergency are statistics on attrition in the Academies at the end of World War II. From 1945 to 1947 there were 306 resignations from undergraduates from Annapolis and 380 from West Point. Among the graduates of the Academies the attrition is even more noteworthy. About 30 percent of the Annapolis Academy graduates of classes 1943-46 have resigned their Navy commissions, and it is reasonable to estimate that the country has today less than 50 percent of all men entering the Naval Academy from 1940 to 1943.

The resignation figures of the Military Academy were a great deal less but it is evident that in troubled years too great a percentage of young men consider the Academies as a place of refuge rather than as the foundation of a life's career in the service of their country.

The entrance tests for appointees to the Academies compound in many cases the original errors made in congressional selection, although recently they have been substantially improved by being administered by the Educational Testing Service, with its experience in the field of giving college entrance examinations.

One deficiency that seems to characterize them is that they fail to equalize the opportunities of all candidates to meet the academic requirements for admission. The candidate who has private tutoring or who has attended a preparatory school with instruction oriented toward entering one of the Academies will, as a rule, achieve higher marks on the entrance examinations of the Academy than will a candidate who has equal or greater native intelligence and academic aptitude but who has the benefit only of a high-school education.

According to a survey made of the class of 1942, 97.3 percent of the 298 members of the class who qualified by passing the regular entrance examination had preparation supplementary to their high school courses. That survey substantially confirms four previous studies which have shown that more than 95 percent of the candidates who passed the regular examination had extra instruction in addition to their regular high school work. This has led to the development of "cram schools" and this trend has handicapped the boy without funds.

A second deficiency that seems to characterize these tests is that in doing the job they purport to do they do it very imperfectly. Some 15 to 20 percent of the young men entering Annapolis and West Point, despite having passed these tests, fail to graduate because of academic deficiencies—a percentage that represents pure educational waste and that is substantially higher than that which characterizes other comparable institutions.

Furthermore, the entrance requirements of the Academies consist of mental and physical qualifications and make little attempt usually to determine a candidate's personality, character, and leadership potential, but rather rely on the judgment of the Members of Congress, who themselves have no effective means, beyond personal knowledge, of determining the presence of these attributes.

Evidence of the importance of qualities other than mere academic proficiency in achieving success in the armed services is the result of a study of more than 1,000 naval line officers on full duty at the time of Pearl Harbor, drawn from the classes of 1912 to 1922 at the Naval Academy. The purpose of that study was to discover what correlation existed between academic success at Annapolis and officer career success.

Taking a correlation coefficient of 1 to mean that a candidate's success at the academy would mirror exactly his success in his later career, a result of 0 would indicate that there was no connection between the two. The correlation coefficient turned up by the study was only 0.16, which demonstrated that there is very little connection between academic success at the Academy and later success in the Navy, where personality and character begin to count heavily.

The obvious method of improving the quality of men applying for entrance to Annapolis and West Point is to pursue some such method of recruitment and selection as that practiced by the Coast Guard Academy. I doubt today whether this is a practical method. Our goal must be to develop as effective a system as possible within the framework of congressional responsibility for the selection of applicants. But there are ways, however, for immense improvements in the framework of the existing system—ways which I have attempted since 1947 to adapt to the selection of candidates from the Eleventh Massachusetts District for the service Academies.

Each year I have announced that open examinations would be held for the appointments that I was entitled to make to the two Academies. All applicants are subjected to a physical examination based on standards applied by the Army and Navy, an obvious necessity, as between 12 percent and 30 percent of those appointed by their Congressmen fail to pass the physical examination given at the Academies.

Those who are physically acceptable are then given aptitude and achievement tests, especially developed by the training division of the Civil Service Commission, which measure their ability to learn and their proficiency in academic subjects. Their scholastic records in high school and preparatory school are carefully compiled and evaluated.

Objective reference questionnaires devised to bring out all the relevant data relating to the candidate's character and personality

are sent to former teachers, supervisors, and others who have personally observed the candidate over a period of time. These questionnaires are drawn in such fashion that it is difficult to give any candidate high marks. This was done in order to get a more accurate report on an individual than the usual letter of recommendation provides.

The candidates are finally interviewed by a selection board composed of three members, consisting of a clergyman who formerly was an Army combat chaplain, a psychologist and doctor of medicine at Harvard University, and a former Army doctor with long experience in conducting interviews while in the service. The selection board, after these interviews, finally evaluates the competitive rank of each candidate and notifies, by wire, the candidates it has selected for appointment.

Some system such as this, obviously much improved, can easily be made available to all Congressmen. The Civil Service Commission, or the College Entrance Examination Board, or some similar organization, could undoubtedly devise better and more comprehensive tests which could be made available to any Congressman who might want to employ them. Local citizens of responsibility and experience could be prevailed upon to conduct the necessary personal interviews, and thus real merit would become the basis for appointment.

The cost for the introduction and operation of such a system would be negligible. It would not be compulsory, but a simple request by a Congressman would set the entire system in operation.

In addition, the admission tests given by the Academies themselves must be improved because they fail sufficiently to emphasize the qualities which, in addition to academic proficiency, make for good officers.

We all know that although two individuals may have identical intelligence levels and mechanical aptitudes, one may succeed at a given job and the other fail because of the difference in personality, attitude, and motivation. This field of character evaluation is developing rapidly. Industry and other educational institutions are availing themselves of its already demonstrated results to pretest both executives and promising college material.

What scientific advancement in this field has proven is that, although tests and evaluations of character traits are not too accurate as applied to the individual, they are highly dependable in analyzing the average characteristics of a group as a whole. In other words, while one cannot be sure of selecting a particular future leader, one can pick a group of several hundred from which future leaders can be developed with far greater frequency than from an unselected group of the same size.

During the war the psychologists and the educators achieved marked success with these techniques at the Coast Guard Academy. In evaluating Reserve officer cadets they were able to predict, with an error of two to four cases, how many individuals out of a class of 200 to 300 Reserve officer cadets would actually receive commissions. The same general sort of techniques were applied by the Army and Navy air arms in selecting candidates to become pilots, bombardiers and navigators, with startling success in reducing to almost negligible proportions the number who would eventually fail to qualify.

I believe that it is essential that some system similar to the one that I have discussed be placed into operation as quickly as possible. Common justice requires that all boys in this country of ours have an equal opportunity to attend a service academy, and the needs of the country require that the best boys be chosen.

We dare not continue to pick the men who may direct another war with new weap-

ons and new techniques by methods developed almost a century ago and shown to be wanting. There is no better place to begin than with the improvement of the process of selecting candidates for the two academies, for it is from these that the generals and admirals of tomorrow will be made. The Congress, I am certain, given the facts, would recognize its responsibilities to do a better job. To do so it must provide itself with the tools that are needed. They can easily be created, and at a negligible cost. And since the world rumbles of war and unfortunately is not likely to be soon at peace, the Congress dare no longer delay the discharge of its responsibilities as wisely and as best it may.

Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, once again David Kleck, the oil editor of the Times-Picayune and New Orleans States, has pulled the rug from under the real culprits in the attempted wanton theft of the rich tidelands of the States of California, Louisiana, and Texas.

The chicanery and base machinations of the schemers has been exposed in another illuminating article which Mr. Kleck recently wrote for the Times-Picayune and the New Orleans States and which I now direct to your attention.

Just what is behind this attempted tideland grab by the Department of the Interior becomes more and more apparent with the passing of each day and the continued ventilating of the historical facts behind the scheme.

The Times-Picayune and the New Orleans States are rendering an invaluable service to the people of this Nation in exposing this unhealthy situation. These two great newspapers are doing a service in the finest tradition of American journalism and Mr. Kleck is demonstrating his great talent as a reporter who knows how to get the facts and how to present them.

This story of the story behind the tideland grab would be almost unbelievable if it was really not so fantastically true.

Read it for yourself:

APPLICANTS AFTER TIDELANDS AS PRIVATE WEALTH SOURCE—EIGHTEEN HUNDRED SQUARE MILES ASKED BY UNTAXED CO-OPS
(By David Kleck)

Nation-wide scheming to legally loot the rich coastal resources of Louisiana, Texas, and California will come to an end only with the enactment of proper legislation by Congress.

Thousands of American citizens desiring Federal control of the offshore areas for their own purposes, have been trying for years to plunder the States' oil reserves by devious use of the Federal Mineral Leasing Act.

Private citizens have asked the Government to give them mineral leases on the submerged lands and have blanketed the coasts of these three States with their claims.

In these ranks are counted Federal officials, former Senators, farmer cooperative associations, stock promoters, speculators, and individuals who figured they knew a good thing when they saw it.

By admission of a former Secretary of the Interior, Harold L. Ickes, it was pressure from the early members of this group that touched off the whole tidelands controversy, not the question of oil for national defense.

The coasts of Louisiana and Texas were singled out in 1946 by 18 cooperatives that filed claims with the Interior Department for a "fair and equitable portion" of the submerged areas, that is, 1,800 square miles. One of these applicants was a multi-million-dollar Kansas City, Mo., cooperative oil refinery.

CLAIMS STARTED IN 1934

All these were people who believed, or were told, that title to the vast undersea wealth would eventually rest with the Federal Government. On that basis, as early as 1934, individuals applied to the United States Interior Department to give them notoriously cheap leases on California's offshore areas where the prospects of oil were known.

The Federal Mineral Leasing Act provides that leases may be issued for 50 cents an acre (it used to be 25 cents) on a noncompetitive basis if the lease is not within the area of a geological structure producing oil or gas.

The reasoning was simple. Applicants plastered the offshore areas with claims that they expected to be realized when title went to the Federal Government. Under the guidance of Ickes, the Interior Department accepted the applications and issued serial numbers.

"BEGAN TO HAVE DOUBTS"

The influence these applicants and their attorneys played on Ickes was described by him before a congressional committee.

"Until 1937 these applications were denied by the Commissioner of the General Land Office and, in those areas where appeals were taken to the Department, his decisions were affirmed.

"But applicants and their lawyers continued to insist that the United States does own the land and the oil and that the Department does have the power to grant them oil and gas leases.

"So we began to have doubts"

In the interval between the time these applications began to roll in and the United States Supreme Court decisions taking the tidelands from the States, the offshore area leases skyrocketed in value. Oil companies, operating under expensive State leases, explored the submerged lands at tremendous costs and established numerous oil fields. Municipal improvements, such as harbor facilities, recreation beaches, and other structures, were erected on State bottoms that these Federal applicants claimed.

The applicants figured that when the Court decisions were final, this tremendous wealth would roll into their hands at the ridiculous figure of a few cents an acre. Their claim had precedent, they said, over all and they demanded their rights.

Stock companies were formed by applicants and stock was sold in many parts of the United States on the basis of these applications with the Interior Department. The Nation was on its way to one of the biggest land grabs in its history, and the path was paved by Ickes.

This was indicated by a letter a Federal postmaster wrote to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in September 1949. The postmaster, I. A. Smoot of Salt Lake City, had claimed his share of the California tidelands and he wrote:

"These applicants (many from Utah) were the first to initiate claims that the Federal Government owned and controlled

the marginal sea belt and induced Secretary Ickes back in 1935 to establish Government claim by court action."

HALTED BY SOLICITOR'S OPINION

"Sixteen years ago the Interior Department opened the marginal sea areas to American citizens to file oil and gas lease applications. The Interior Department accepted money, gave serial numbers and treated lands as being subject to the Mineral Leasing Act.

"The Department used these applicants to bring the problem to a head and finally secured a Supreme Court decision. Ickes stated clearly and definitely that leases should have been issued after the Supreme Court decision."

What prevented the national spectacle of millions of acres of oil-bearing land going to private citizens for a song was an opinion rendered by the Solicitor of the Interior Department, Mastin G. White. White decided that the Mineral Leasing Act could not apply to the submerged areas and recommended that all applications be denied. The main gist of his reasoning was that the law applied to lands in the public domain and that the submerged areas were not actually in the public domain.

Numerous applicants immediately brought suit in Federal court to force the Interior Department to hand over these leases. What makes this vast number of frustrated applicants important today is the fact that a group, headed by former Senator Burton K. Wheeler, has a suit in a District of Columbia court for this purpose. The judge has suspended action on the suit because the case of the California boundary is before the Supreme Court, but Wheeler's action is viewed as a test case by interested parties all over the country.

But these were not the only people who hoped to make a killing in the rich offshore areas. A former Assistant Attorney General of the United States, a man who helped prepare the tideland suits, also made his try.

Norman M. Littell, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Lands Division of the Department of Justice, and in charge of all litigation the country was engaged in with respect to the public domain, headed a committee to study the ownership question of the tidelands.

FILES CLAIM FOR INDIANS

After he left the Justice Department in 1944, he filed a petition 4 years later in the Supreme Court, asking to intervene. Littell said that since California did not own the submerged areas and the Court decision did not say the United States owned it, it therefore belonged to California Indians. Therefore, he was representing 21 bands of Indians and their claims to a substantial portion of the oil-bearing bottoms.

A recent story from Washington showed how another individual, E. L. Cord, had collected Federal land script entitling the bearer to 160 acres of public land, and had therefore filed a claim for all the oil wells in the Gulf of Mexico by demanding the land around each producer.

One of the first intimations of the monster grab attempt shaping up came in 1946 when Senator CAPEHART, of Indiana, rose in the Senate to express himself as "amazed, shocked and sick" over the facts he had learned.

CAPEHART had introduced resolutions supporting the United States suit against California and immediately withdrew them. He said he had introduced the resolutions ("without understanding their significance") at the request of former Senator James E. Watson, of Indiana.

Watson was head of the Washington law firm representing the Pacific Undersea Oil Co and a registered holder of 75,000 shares of its stock. This oil company was founded out of thin air and would be in business only

if its claims on the rich coastal areas were approved, which it expected when the Federal Government took title through the Supreme Court action.

At that time Congress was passing a bill quitclaiming the coastal lands back to the States. President Truman, who had previously proclaimed that the submerged lands belonged to the States, vetoed the quitclaim legislation on August 1, 1946.

But 4 months before the veto, a curious combine focused its eyes on the Louisiana and Texas shore. Alfred A. Kiltz, a lawyer and also of Indiana, went to Oscar Chapman, then Under Secretary of the Interior, and personally delivered the claims of 15 farmer cooperatives.

FARMER COOPERATIVE CLAIMS

Shortly after, Representative Charles LaFollette, of Indiana, rose in the House and announced the claim. He said the participants covered 33 States and had a membership of 4,750,000 farmers. He asked the governors and attorneys general of all the States to reconsider their actions "in contesting the right and title of the Federal Government to the great wealth which is involved in the oil under the continental shelf and the tidelands of the United States."

He also asked them to reconsider their action in supporting the quitclaim resolution "and thereby deprive the farmers of the State of Indiana and of the 32 other States involved * * * and the people of those States of their share in that wealth and of their right to join together cooperatively in its development."

Subsequently, the list of tax-free farmer cooperative claims on file with the Interior Department increased to 18. Although domiciled all over the country, their applications were distinct in character, were written exactly alike, and all cited the President's proclamation.

The claims were made by Cooperative Refinery Association, Kansas City, Mo.; Tennessee Farmers Cooperative, Columbia, Tenn.; Indiana Farm Bureau Cooperative Association, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind.; Farmers Cooperative Exchange, Inc., Raleigh, N. C.; Southern States Cooperative, Inc., Richmond, Va.; Farm Bureau Services, Inc., Lansing, Mich.; Farm Bureau Cooperative Association, Inc., of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio; Pacific Supply Cooperative, Walla Walla, Wash.; Pennsylvania Farm Bureau Cooperative Association, Harrisburg, Pa.; Cooperative Oil Association, Inc., Caldwell, Idaho; Farmers Union State Exchange, Omaha, Neb.; Central Cooperative Wholesale, Superior, Wis.; Farmers Union Central Exchange, Inc., St. Paul, Minn.; MFA Oil Co., Columbia, Mo.; Midland Cooperative Wholesale, Minneapolis, Minn.; the Cotton Producers Association, Atlanta, Ga.; Iowa Farm Service Co., Des Moines, Iowa; and Consumers Cooperative Refining Association, Levelland, Tex.

In asking for 100 square miles each, the claims all written alike, said, in part:

"Whereas the applicant desires to explore said area in order to obtain a fair and equitable portion of the same for purposes of its own drilling and production of crude oil; and agrees that all information obtained on the area so explored and not granted to claimant shall be turned to the Government of the United States for the general welfare."

The claim presented by the Cooperative Refinery Association, Kansas City, Mo., is signed by Howard A. Cowden as president. Cowden is also president of the Consumers Cooperative Association of Kansas City, which operates in Missouri, Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Colorado and Wyoming.

OPERATES REFINERIES, PIPELINES

Operating in the stronghold of the old Pendergast political gang, this cooperative last year did a \$62,428,460 volume of business. This year it expects to do about \$75,000,000.

As a manufacturer and wholesaler, this tax-free cooperative operates refiners at Coffeyville and Phillipsburg, Kans., and Scotts Bluff, Nebr., and Newcastle, Wyo. The association also owns a part interest in a refinery at McPherson, Kans., and owns about 1,000 miles of pipeline.

Owned by 1,500 local cooperatives in nine states the association markets petroleum products, mills lumber, and manufactures fertilizer and paint. It wholesales to the local co-ops farm machinery, groceries, motor car tires, and accessories.

Although Cowden is not regarded as taking part in politics in Kansas City, the record of Congressional hearings in 1948 shows that Benjamin C. Marsh, secretary of Peoples Lobby, Inc., read a Cowden editorial into the Record. The editorial was entitled "Oil Companies Making Foreign Policy," and warned that it was time to substitute international control under the United Nations for what amounts to oil imperialism that can and may lead to war.

PEOPLES LOBBY, INC., FOLDS

The Peoples Lobby, Inc., which was all for Federal control of the off-shore areas, folded and did not appear in later hearings. Marsh had reassured the Senators that our editorials are fresh every hearing and we do not repeat them.

The claims of the co-ops further stated, in part:

"Whereas applicant has made research upon the possibilities of the existence of structures within the hereinafter described area and has already done research as to mechanical methods of drilling for and producing petroleum under waters of the Continental Shelf."

The Louisiana geological survey, a branch of the department of conservation, reported that no permits for geophysical work had been granted to anyone in the cooperative associations. However, officials of the survey pointed out, some independent geophysical company could have done the geophysical work for the cooperatives.

These officials have in their office a map prepared by a branch of the Interior department showing the gravity variations in this same area. This is gained from geophysical work.

The map was prepared by the United States Geological Survey in cooperation with the Navy Department and noted as a preliminary map of geophysical investigation. It is dated July-October 1947.

LOUISIANA OFFSHORE STUDY

The map indicates that its objective was "to obtain information on regional geologic structures, on bottom sediments and on salinity and thermal structure of the water, especially in offshore areas and at depths beyond those where exploration is at present considered economically feasible.

The scope of the Federal Government's investigation of the Louisiana offshore area is cited as "an area extending seaward 70 to 75 miles from the shore of the Gulf of Mexico between Sabine Pass, Tex., and Grand Chenier, La."

It is in this area that a year previous the cooperatives filed their claims. These claims were denied by virtue of the Mastin White opinion, the rendering of which has been contested by Burton K. Wheeler, among others, and disputed by Ickes. Although the cooperatives have never been in bad standing with the present Federal Government, the Interior Department has no knowledge of any more to force them to issue the leases.

The question apparently rests on the Wheeler suit in Federal court and the passage of legislation by Congress.

CLAIMS BY THOUSANDS

The picture of the multiple claims by thousands of people over the Nation pre-

sents one of chaos should the leases ever be granted. As Irving Smith, city attorney for Long Beach, Calif., testified before a congressional committee:

"Application * * * cover parcels of tide and submerged lands and reclaimed tide and submerged lands. These filings are located upon the entire 8.11 miles of water front of the city of Long Beach and extend seaward several miles, and likewise cover all of the municipalities' harbor facilities and recreation and park improvements * * * constructed by the city at a cost of \$25,000,000."

The magnitude of this claim is further pointed out when it is considered that the claims on the three States rest upon a \$250,000,000 investment the oil industry has made in the coastal areas. As a result, many oil companies hastened to apply to the Federal Government for leases on the very areas they had leased from the State.

But Ickes, who early in the thirties, encouraged the filing of these applications to support his move against the States, believes that the Government owes the speculators and promoters these leases.

ICKES REAFFIRMS OPINION

In a statement in a Washington newspaper in 1947 he said:

"Recently, the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, Mastin G. White, also of Texas, and the Attorney General agreed that the Federal Leasing Act did not extend to the California tidelands."

"I challenge this finding."

"I charge that this opinion has all the earmarks of a collusive opinion to defeat the legitimate interests of the people of the United States. One last act that should be performed as gracefully as possible by the Attorney General and Secretary of the Interior is to reverse this opinion and say what I believe the courts ultimately will say—that the Federal Leasing Act does apply to the tidelands."

Ickes reaffirmed this opinion in his last appearance before a congressional committee considering a tidelands bill.

The vast move is not dead, even though Congress appears sufficiently informed to snuff out the scheme of legal looting of rich and developed resources. Even as recently as last month, when the House passed the tidelands quitclaim bill, an amendment was offered that would validate all these claims. The amendment was defeated amid cries of "Burton Wheeler's boys."

Considering the strong fight made by these applicants and their relentless efforts to seek a hasty consummation of the profit motive involved, it appears that the basic opinion of the Supreme Court has been largely ignored. The Court emphasized the need of dominion only when danger arises to threaten our domestic security. Combined with the efforts of the applicants have been the efforts of those who insist upon placing incalculable power in the hands of one United States official.

John L. Madden, assistant attorney general of Louisiana, emphasized these thoughts in an article in the July-August 1949 issue of the Louisiana Municipal Review. He said: "We have cause to wonder, as well, why the Federal Government should need control now, or during any other tranquil period in our history."

Behind the scene are the tremendous furor of the lease applicants, plans for the Federal Government to imitate the State's system of leasing that is so lucrative and the prospect of money coming into the Federal Treasury. Legal authorities question whether the Supreme Court considered any of these things in their decision.

But the grabbers have not given up yet. If an amendment which they sponsored had been tacked on the House tidelands bill, the Nation would have been on its way to the

spectacle of one of the greatest land grabs on record. As it stands, the House bill passed on July 30 could effectively kill this dream of plunder. This bill awaits action by the Senate.

Here Is America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to have my own remarks inserted in the Record, I include therein a speech made by Hon. Theodore R. McKeldin, Governor of the State of Maryland, at the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of Thurmont, Md. I think this is a splendid address and exemplifies the American spirit and principles to which most of us subscribe:

HERE IS AMERICA

There are very few people in this troubled world of ours, very few in these United States and, I dare say, very few in our own State of Maryland who know that we are gathered here today to dedicate Thurmont's new firemen's hall.

In Paris, France, where the citizens are observing the two thousandth birthday of that great and beautiful city, the celebration of Thurmont's two hundredth anniversary, which we also are launching here today, hardly would be considered an event of world shaking moment.

And yet, these events are important—important to you and to me—important to America—yes, and important to the world.

Here is not just a new firemen's hall.

Here is not just a little Maryland town that is older than the Nation itself.

Here is America

Yes, here, symbolically, in brick and mortar is the United States of America

Here in Thurmont is a part of our great and powerful Nation—part of the bulwark of freedom and liberty in a world where powerful forces seek to enslave the bodies and souls of men

In Thurmont, Md., there are smiling faces and well-nourished bodies—so different from the melancholy that has become habitual, and the near starvation that has become the way of life in many areas of the earth.

In Thurmont, as in thousands of American communities, there is calmness in our determination to retain our freedoms.

Here we find sane confidence in the future in contrast to the psychopathic hysteria of despair which is the curse of the burdened lands where the dictators have crushed the souls and minds of humanity.

Even while keeping eternal that vigilance which is the price of liberty, we must keep Thurmont's smiling faces and well-nourished bodies on all the main streets—on all the highways and byways of America.

We can, and we must, retain our calmness and our confidence, without becoming lax in our determination to remain free, in the face of wars and threats of wars—in spite of the socialistic trends that creep into our own National Government and in spite of the fakery that is peddled by our false prophets and our Utopian dreamers.

That is the lesson of history and of history's repetition in our times.

The rational became the irrational and the psychotic became the rule as a preliminary to the downfall of nations throughout the annals of time. Reason gave way to

superstition, and fraud and charlatany replaced honesty and decency among the people who followed mad leaders in their selfish ambitions down the road to national ruin.

Slaves and consuls alike aped those groping, crumbling Caesars who, in their greed and in their fear, decreed themselves gods or swore their descendants to delity them after death by executive action—as preliminaries to the fall of the Roman Empire.

Adolph Hitler and his breast-thumping band of maniacs crouched at the feet of star gazers, palm readers, skull feelers, tea-leaf artists, numerologists, and seance conductors while they shouted their defiance at the true God and at man, and twisted their traitorous knives in the back of the Welmar Republic; and the aping, confused, and hysterical German populace joined the mad rush of the leaders to the scented rooms of the astrologers and other practitioners of the occult in a neurotic effort to tear the veil from the fate that they knew was about to engulf their land.

In Russia, today, the frightened keepers of a false idealism that got too big for them to handle, have sought to drive God from the churches and from the hearts of the people and to force the population to kneel in supplication before the hammer and sickle and to doff their hats in the presence of Stalin's picture in the public places.

And great masses of the people, not only in Russia but in other nations that have succumbed to her power, have become part of the international neurosis and madness.

Yes, there are fire stations in Russia, too—but not firemen's halls. They don't belong to Ivan, Serge, and the ladies of the auxiliary. They belong to the Kremlin—to Joe Stalin.

Vladimir and Igor may belong to the fire company—but they are not volunteers. They are assigned there by the commissars.

Anton and Bogdan do not drop into the fire station for a social evening with the boys. They may go there under orders for a party meeting. They may go there to be told their production is too low, or to be questioned about some remark they were heard to make.

But Thurmont, Md., thank God, is not the Russia of today. This new firemen's hall is as American as the seventh-inning stretch. This is yours. It is the club, the gathering place of the men—the volunteers—who are organized to extinguish fires in Thurmont and the surrounding territory—not start world conflagrations.

John and Pete, and Joe and Jack can come and go as they like. The auxiliary can use the rooms for a sewing bee or a bridge party. There is no one in Washington—no one in high station—who can tell them when to come or when to go. There is no one in the Nation's Capital or in any other place of power who can say who must belong to the fire company. If anyone in Washington wants to hold a town meeting in this firemen's hall for some good purpose, he must get your permission. If the purpose is not good, you can deny the use of the premises, whether the request comes from the Governor of the State or even from the President of the United States, because—

Here is America.

Thurmont, by American reckoning of historical time, is old, but to the ancient towns of Europe it is a babe in swaddling clothes—but you and your homes are far more mature than the oldest household in Communist-dominated areas of Europe.

There is no secret police watching your door, checking on your comings and goings, spying to see whose picture hangs in your living room, prying to learn the identity of your guests, delving into the lives of your associates.

There was no one this morning to bar you from your places of worship.

You are, indeed, more mature today than the people of socialized England. You

choose your own doctor at your own time. The industry for which you work is not the property of the State or of the Nation.

In spite of your youth as a town and our youth as a Nation, we are more mature than the people of the ancient races of Asia, because we of the 48 American States have learned to live together. We have no tribal warfare. We have no leaders taking arms against other leaders. We have found what their wisest men so long have sought—a true Republic—"the last, best hope of Earth," because here is America. Again, I say, keep it that way.

Just as all of us, as Americans, are calmly determined to keep America free from foreign domination, you as citizens of Thurmont be calmly determined to keep control of your local affairs and institutions—your schools, your park sites, your recreation activities, your police, and all of those things that belong to you as a community—including your new firemen's hall. Cooperate with your Federal Government in the things in which we, the people, have charged the Federal Government with responsibility, such as national defense, interstate commerce, and, when necessary, the waging of war. Cooperate with your State government in the sphere of the State's responsibility, such as the building and maintenance of primary roads, the upkeep of hospitals for the mentally ill and the tuberculosis sufferers, the educating of teachers for your local public schools, the operation of a State university, the coordination of public welfare, and, among other things, the maintenance of a State military department.

But be alert against Federal and State infringements on those things which are traditionally yours.

Beware of the Federal and State handouts of money, which may appear to be a windfall, but which actually may be the wedge in the door to give the higher levels of government control over your institutions.

So as we dedicate this new firemen's hall here today, and as we start the observance of Thurmont's bicentennial, let us also dedicate ourselves to the maintenance of all our freedoms—our freedom as a nation, our freedom as a State, our freedom as a county, and our freedom as a town.

Let us rededicate ourselves to that principle that the power shall rise from the people through the local levels of government, not loom over them like a cloud—a cloud that protects them from the glare of responsibility's sunlight, but threatens them with the dictatorial downpour of super-control.

Let us resolve in the shadow of this symbol of the people's power to help themselves to drive from the seats of government those who sell the favors of their offices, and who trade for illicit and unwarranted profits in the needs of a nation at war.

Let us dedicate ourselves to a moral reawakening—a renaissance of thinking as well as of behavior—to a public demand for honesty among our public officials—not merely the skin-deep honesty of the clever manipulator who avoids conviction—but the deeper, sincere, and genuine honesty of the man and woman who think honestly as well as behave with apparent honesty.

We must never—as did the followers of the decadent Caesars, the bullies of the Third Reich, and, presently, the sadists of the Soviet—accept as normal the recurrent waves of crime in the Nation. We must, on the contrary, dedicate and rededicate ourselves to living as God—the real Giver of all our freedoms—would have us live.

We must keep Thurmont, and all the Thurmonts, strong in their own rights—so that we as a Nation will have our greatest strength, because—

Here is America.

The St. Lawrence Seaway: A Water Highway From Vast New Iron-Ore Fields to the Industrial Middle West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Record a very absorbing article from the magazine Inside Michigan which recently began publication. The magazine is dedicated to providing enlightenment on public affairs, and it is fitting that in this first issue there should be included an article of vital interest not only to the people of Michigan but also to every person in America.

The article tells the story of the St. Lawrence seaway. It is concise and to the point. I call it to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY: A WATER HIGHWAY FROM VAST NEW IRON-ORE FIELDS TO THE INDUSTRIAL MIDDLE WEST

(By William M. Trevarrow)

Fifty-six years ago, in 1895, a joint commission was established by the United States and Canada to investigate the need for a deep-water route between the Atlantic Ocean and the Great Lakes. The Commission reported favorably, taking the first step in the long, and thus far, unsuccessful fight to establish the St. Lawrence Seaway.

In 1909, the International Joint Commission was established under the conditions of the Boundary Waters Treaty. This Commission accomplished nothing until the end of World War I. It then surveyed the seaway and power situation, filling the 60 volumes with the testimony of hearings held in cities across the United States and Canada. Its findings were favorable enough for President Coolidge to appoint, in 1924, a United States Commission, headed by Secretary of Commerce Herbert Hoover. Complete plans for the project were also drawn by a joint board of engineers.

Eight years later, today's legislation began when representatives of the United States and Canada signed a treaty providing for the construction of the seaway. Unfortunately, the treaty needed a two-thirds majority in the Senate before it could be ratified. The vote was 46 in favor of ratification, 42 opposed. The treaty was rejected.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt established an agreement with Canada in 1941, which differs from a treaty in that it requires only a simple majority for approval. Hearings on the agreement are now being conducted in both the House and the Senate and it is expected that the matter will reach a decisive vote during the present session of Congress. Estimates are that the vote will be called during the early fall months of the term.

An extremely close vote is expected and, while the bill is in committee, lobbyists for both sides of the issue are working to gain a few ballots. Should the agreement be defeated, supporters of the seaway project will have one last chance, in the national campaign next year, to gain their end. If they can bring about the election of a sufficient number of supporters of the bill, it will be passed early in the next congressional session.

To do this, the story must be brought to the people—something that has not been done to date. That so important a matter

has not been brought before the public seems strange, but throughout its 56 year history, the battle for the seaway has been fought at the legislative level and in Washington cocktail parties.

Michigan proponents of the seaway admit that the story has not been brought to the people. In a brief on the St. Lawrence seaway project prepared by Bert Robb, director of the Michigan State Waterways Commission, two objectives are established. The first and most important of these is to insure the passage of the present legislation, or, failing this, to establish such a strong position and grass-roots support that the next session will see success.

The first step in securing the necessary grass-roots support was taken when Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan, and Gov. Val Peterson, of Nebraska, called for a Midwest conference of the governors of 15 States on June 18, 1951, in Omaha, Nebr. The text of their message read in part:

"A present and future problem for the people of the Great Lakes area and the States of the Middle West is to determine interregional value of the St. Lawrence seaway project, hydroelectric, and other resource developments in connection with national and regional security.

The objective of the conference is to develop facts and information for ourselves and others through recognized expert sources. Defense officials of the Federal establishment and the Canadian Government are being invited to officially participate. Representatives of agriculture, commerce, labor, transportation, and others will be invited. Panel discussions and reports will be scheduled concerning problems of transportation, power, and connected interregional production. Sincerely urge that you join us in first interregional conference of governors on inland America's problems."

The facts to be presented before the conference of governors, although far reaching in scope, are simple. They may be roughly classified under four headings—the need for ore; foreign trade and economic stability; hydroelectric power, and national security.

Estimates by competent geologists indicate that the present supply of iron ore in the Lake Superior region will last only about 15 years. Present experiments with low-grade beneficiation processes may extend this span for a time, but will not provide a sufficient supply to keep the many mills in this area operating indefinitely. Unless the seaway is built, there is a good chance the steel and other heavy industries must relocate nearer the Atlantic coast and the new fields of foreign ore.

A few plants have already been relocated in the East in anticipation of the coming ore shortage. If this trend continues, the industrial Midwest would face a condition of economic and social upheaval.

On the other hand, if the 100-mile-long rapids west of Montreal are made suitable for navigation, the newly discovered ore deposits in Labrador and Quebec, Venezuela, and Liberia would be within easy reach of Michigan and other inland steel centers. Norman W. Foy, general manager of sales for the Republic Steel Corp., stated before the House Public Works Committee that—

"For the sake of our national welfare and security, the necessary legislation to construct the seaway must not be delayed. The seaway can be built without loss of time because approximately 5 years will be required to develop the mines and to build a railroad from the mines to Seven Islands (Labrador). During the same period the seaway can also be built. If we are to stop a possible economic catastrophe before it begins, we must have the St. Lawrence seaway not a probability, not a possibility, but an actual accomplishment."

Taking Detroit as an example, the need for the seaway as a direct route to foreign markets is easily demonstrable. Detroit is

the largest producer of export freight in the country. One out of every seven sales made in Detroit is to a foreign country. Last year, its exports and imports exceeded \$1,500,000,000. Today, Detroit is on a side road of world trade and all goods must be transferred through coastal ports with the exception of those moving by air. The completion of the seaway will place Detroit on a direct route to the Western World with resultant increases in its business. The increased market area made available by the seaway will contribute to Michigan's economic stability and permit industrial expansion.

The States of the industrial Midwest are not the only ones to benefit from the proposed seaway project. Power supplies in the Northeast are so low that defense demands during the last war caused a "brown-out" of the entire area. It is estimated that power development planned as a part of the seaway project would produce an almost unlimited amount of electricity. The resulting stabilization of industry would benefit the entire Nation.

The seaway has been attacked by its opponents as a wartime liability. An impressive group of responsible leaders, however, state that it is an urgent defense need. Leading this bloc are such men as Mobilization Director C. E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall, Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They state that among the advantages resulting from the project are

1. The establishment of an easily defended, new and vital line of water communication directly into the heart of the continent.

2. Provision for the construction and repair of ocean going vessels in a relatively secure area of the Great Lakes.

3. The over-all economic and industrial advantage accruing from the development of the waterway. The most important phase of this last point being the availability of open pit ore deposits which would permit rapid expansion of steel production during time of national emergency.

Opposition to the project is centralized in the National St. Lawrence Project Conference. Carroll B. Huntress, chairman of the organization, is a vice president of the Republic Coal & Coke Co. of New York. Approximately half the members are the chambers of commerce in cities on the east and Gulf coasts. Chief financial support of the program to defeat the project has come from the Association of American Railroads. Other anti-seaway blocs are found in the local transportation and power interests. In almost every case opposition has formed to protect personal interests.

The supporters of the program are, for the most part, Government representatives in this country. The Canadian Government and people are most emphatic in their insistence that the seaway be built immediately and, as has been stated before, have expressed their determination to go ahead with the project either with or without the cooperation of the United States. The greatest weakness in the past has been the lack of industrial backers. Recently many Midwest steel and iron companies have come to the program's assistance. But, with the exception of the Ford Motor Co. and the Nash-Kelvinator Corp., few Michigan industries have appeared as contributors to the seaway fight. Michigan labor and farm interests are vitally concerned with the success of the program and are taking an active part in the campaign.

These are the facts that will be brought forth at the Midwest Conference of Governors. Here, the first step will be taken in carrying the fight to the people. It is time for the proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway to let the public know what stake it has in this project.

Today the man on the street knows nothing of the St. Lawrence seaway problems; tomorrow he may well curse the legislators and press for keeping him uninformed.

Did Rain Makers Change the Weather?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. SMITH or Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following article by Paul Friggens from the Farm Journal for September.

This article again points up the necessity for a thorough congressional study to make recommendations for legislation in this field which have so much effect upon the economic destiny of our country.

DID RAIN MAKERS CHANGE THE WEATHER?

(By Paul Friggens)

This year goes down as man's biggest attempt to fool Nature into raining—and so change the weather—over one-third of the United States.

Drought-plagued western ranchers and farmers have gambled upwards of \$3,000,000 in 1951 to try to get rain on 350,000,000 acres. The result, cloud-seeding looks about as experimental as the first airplane at Kitty Hawk.

"But don't laugh it off," General Electric Scientist Vincent J. Schafer warned the Great Plains Agricultural Council in August. "I think we know enough that eventually we can do anything we want to with the weather."

This year a rash of rain increasers—they use silver iodide to milk extra moisture—signed up the West. Farm Journal has just completed an on-the-spot check of their operations.

More than 50 associations of farmers and ranchers, who have contacted for rain and snow, report, about two to one, that they believe they got their money's worth.

What about those droughts, then?

"They can't break a drought," declares Rod J. McMullin, general manager of the Arizona Salt River Valley Water Users. Desperate Arizonans have been seeding 4 years to stem one of the worst droughts on record. "Our experiments show that there's not much you can do in a dry cycle but just sweat it out."

The United States Weather Bureau at Phoenix jabs. "While the rain makers seed the clouds the droughts get worse."

Does rain-increasing really work, then? It will take years to find out conclusively, but from laboratory and field tests, five things stand out.

1. Scientists—including the United States Weather Bureau—now agree that it's possible under proper conditions to increase moisture. Meteorologists also see hopes both for hail and rain suppression.

2. Rainmakers don't always hit the target. "That's our biggest weakness," admits a team of "precipitation engineers" operating over 2,000,000 acres of Montana wheatlands. Rainfall is often increased where it is not intended. A lot of dry Montana farmers wonder if some rain maker stole their wheat rains.

3. No one knows for sure what he's getting for his money. Either Uncle Sam or the States must devise some system of control and evaluation. "We're not going to get very far unless everybody does it in the right way," Scientist Schafer told the Great Plains Council.

4. We don't yet know whether rainmaking is important economically. "Could be worth more than hybrid corn or the atom bomb," scientists declare. If farmers got only a 1 percent boost in average rainfall they would

get back double the cost of a year's cloud-seeding, a Nebraska study shows. Dr. Charles L. Hosler of Pennsylvania State College doubts that artificial rain "of any importance will be possible in the near future."

5. Rainmakers don't know about effects downwind—whether Colorado cloud-seeding might have caused Kansas floods. Leading scientists, including the United States Weather Bureau, believe not. A few wonder.

Well then, did the rain makers change this year's weather, or didn't they?

"There is very little evidence and no present scientific basis for the belief that we now possess the ability to modify or control the weather and climate of a major portion of the country." That's the last-minute official word of the American Meteorological Society.

Irving P. Krick, whose work we described in *Farm Journal's* March 1951 issue, has made rain making into a multimillion-dollar affair. He does more than 90 percent of the West's grand-scale seeding, and declares: "Half of America is my laboratory." He's also cloud-seeding in Mexico and Salvador.

Farmers and ranchers report absolutely opposite results.

"Bumper crops" and "grass never better" are the reports to *Farm Journal* from many parts of South Dakota, Kansas, Nebraska, Washington, and Oregon. "Results here in reverse—target area one of the driest in Montana," goes another report.

"Some bone-dry farmers are of the opinion that rain increasers are doing more harm than good," asserts Montana's commissioner of agriculture. "No rain . . . we're stuck with the costs . . . doubt anybody could ever sell us again," says a Nevada group.

Whether it's nature's water or "Krick" water, Krick can point to a second wet year on his original three contracts in Washington, Colorado, and northeast New Mexico. The rest of powder-dry New Mexico is not so sure.

At all events, the West is filled with talk of rain making. From Montana to Mexico I heard about a new kind of summer storm, and a rain that falls after the clouds go by.

"Never saw anything like it in my life," declares Floyd Lee of the famous San Fernandez ranch, New Mexico. "It actually drizzled over my place for half an hour after the clouds disappeared." Meteorologists explain that this is the effect of silver iodide seeding.

Elmer Allen, a cattleman of Miles City, Mont., told me about another unnatural rain—almost 4 inches of "heavy mist" in June. "I was born and raised here, and never saw a rain like it," Allen declares.

Wyoming cattlemen report "Grass still growing in August." In western South Dakota there's another curiosity—crops are above average while rainfall is below normal, and some waterholes low. "It's due to gentle rains, with slight runoff," the rain makers claim.

All over the West I heard the same story: "No runoff. Grass rains instead of gully washers." Some say that the seeded rain, instead of the usual violent thunderstorms, could be the greatest soil-erosion and flood-control discovery we've ever made.

The Weather Bureau takes a dim view: "Misty rains could be dissipating clouds. We know that seeding dissipates energy and moisture."

Hail suppression might be big news. Dr. Bernard Vonnegut, the General Electric genius who developed the silver iodide technique, told Congress:

"Wise use of cloud-seeding can achieve reduction of hail and its great damage to agriculture." A team of Oregon cloud-seeders claim to have had 3 years' phenomenal results in knocking off hail thunderheads.

The spectacular new science has the West in a whirlwind.

There's the \$1,000,000,000 Kansas flood. Although top meteorologists doubt that

there's any scientific evidence to link it with rain making, you should tell that to some Kansans.

Washington dry-land wheat farmers scored a second year's record crop, while hay, bean, and cherry growers again took it on the chin. A Yakima Indian chief sued the wheat men for ruining his hay crop.

It was up there in Washington that I met my first "rain-stopper." Ed Garrick, a bean farmer, is the organizer of Sunshine Unlimited. It's well known that overseeding actually retards rainfall, so Sunshine Unlimited plans to spot duplicate generators everywhere the wheat men operate next season, and stop any rain. "We'll do it up brown," swears Garrick.

High in Colorado, with a 250-percent snow pack after last winter's seeding for irrigation farmers, Summit County folks appealed to the Governor for relief from blocked roads, snow slides, and mine cave-ins. Just the reverse, Colorado's San Luis Valley farmers paid \$10,000 for a snow pack, but at the end of the contract felt that they had failed to get enough snow.

A western concern is doing a flourishing business selling kits.

In Washington, Benton County's harvest is so bountiful that commissioners are talking about reclassifying 600,000 acres of dry wheat lands—if rain making really works.

Uncle Sam, several Western States, and citizens, are all vying for water rights in the skies.

The Bonneville Power Administration is considering rain making to fill its big power dams. It would stake out the skies, of course. Wyoming and Colorado laws already assert sovereignty in the clouds, while in Custer County, Mont., I found probably the first document of its kind. There the Tonn brothers, big ranchers, have filed "legal notice to all the world" that they are appropriating all moisture above their ranch and claim prior right to increase same.

"Going to need policemen in the skies to see that some State doesn't steal another's weather," quips Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, authoring one of several Federal weather-control bills.

Four Federal agencies—Commerce, Agriculture, Interior, and the military—are scrambling to take over.

The Weather Bureau, which has ridiculed cloud seeding, now climbs on the band wagon to an extent. "The Weather Bureau finds reasonable evidence that some cloud modification is possible, and we admit the possibility that rainfall may be locally influenced in some degree by artificial means." So it is seeking millions to fence off the country for its own exclusive experiment.

The Bureau of Reclamation—never slow to grab an opportunity or an appropriation—asks \$25,000,000 to investigate rain-increasing. Reclamation boss Michael Straus wants to see if the world's costliest dams will have to be raised, and spillways and canals enlarged, to accommodate the extra water. The same Bureau wants to experiment with stopping natural rain in wet areas.

Most westerners fear that rain making will be another excuse to fasten further Federal controls on the country, and create another batch of fat jobholders. It is agreed that rain makers should be required to register, be financially responsible, and report on their operations. Colorado, Wyoming, and Arizona now require this.

Westerners, however, do not see why the States cannot control and evaluate the new science, by getting together.

Several things seem clear from this year's grand-scale experiment:

Ambitious operators raced to control fat cloud contracts, and may have stretched themselves too thin.

"There is a feeling among our subscribers," says a well-known New Mexico rancher, Albert Mitchell, "that Dr. Krick possibly

overstretched himself, and that we did not get enough generators and personnel to serve our territory properly this year." Krick denies this.

Like the first airplane at Kitty Hawk, rain-increasing may be putting us on the threshold of a new era in which no man can guess the end.

"We have got to think of the upper atmosphere as a reservoir from which we are tapping only a small portion (perhaps 1 percent)," says Scientist Bernard Vonnegut. "I feel with almost 100 percent certainty that cloud-seeding can be of enormous value to our country."

As Montana Sheepman Earl Davis sizes it up:

"Just rained enough here this year to wet a man's shirt. It is about time that somebody tapped that waterhole in the sky."

Nobody can be sure yet whether the rain-increasers are really doing it, but, as mentioned, two-thirds of the farmers and ranchmen who laid out money this year feel they probably got their money's worth.

Help Liberate Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and Bulgaria—The Poles, the Czechs, the Slovaks, the Rumanians, and the Bulgarians Back Move for a New and Positive Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on June 7 last, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 120, pertaining to Poland, and on the same date I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 121, pertaining to Bulgaria. On June 15, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 123, pertaining to Rumania, and on July 4, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 139, pertaining to Czechoslovakia.

The purpose of these resolutions is to assist the Polish people, the Bulgarian people, the Rumanian people, and the peoples of Czechoslovakia in attaining liberation from their present Communist enslavement and for the early restoration of their basic human rights and freedoms.

I wish to set forth herein excerpts from some of the many responses I have received to these resolutions:

POLAND

Oil City, Pa., July 20, 1951.

Please accept my sincere thanks for your plea in behalf of Poland. I already began to doubt whether anyone in Washington will have the courage to speak up against communism.

Dear sir, I have attended Russian schools and know Russia. It is a giant of clay.

Once again many thanks to you, Mr. Congressman; millions of Poles here in the United States will be grateful to you.

HIERONIM KLOS.

CHICAGO, ILL., June 18, 1951.

We of the Polish American Congress, uniting 6,000,000 Americans of Polish descent, are most grateful to you for having submitted House Concurrent Resolution 120 in the House of Representatives on June 7, 1951,

In this respect the voice you have raised on behalf of Poland and Communist-dominated countries has also heartened a wide section of America which is now seeing the folly of the Yalta Pact.

It is our fervent hope that your resolution will bring about hearings and eventual repudiation by the United States Congress of that shameful agreement.

CHARLES ROSMAREK,
President, Polish American Congress, Inc.

MANLY, AUSTRALIA, July 17, 1951.

I understand that a few weeks ago you introduced into the House a resolution in regard to the Yalta agreement and Russian aggression against Poland.

This is a matter on which I, myself, feel strongly, as I believe that our action at Yalta was wrong and that our conduct toward Poland consisted of a downright betrayal. There is no doubt whatsoever in my mind that Russia has been guilty of outright aggression against Poland and other states of Eastern Europe.

W. C. WENTWORTH,
Member of Parliament, the Parliament
of the Commonwealth.

[From Milwaukee (Wis.) Kurier Polski of
July 17, 1951]

The energetic Congressman from the Fifth District of Wisconsin, CHARLES J. KERSTEN, recently submitted a well-founded resolution pleading very courageously in defense of tortured Poland which was sold out in Yalta.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Even should the resolution get stuck in the committee, it has at any rate achieved the desired result in the Polish cause. KERSTEN in his resolution brought to light the injury inflicted upon an Allied nation which is suffering a terrible injustice. He submitted his resolution before the House of Representatives, unafraid to run the risk of falling out of favor with the administration and the State Department, which up to now stubbornly defended the shameful Yalta agreement.

Americans of Polish descent have expected for a long time the submission of such or similar resolutions to the Congress of the United States, and lived to see that a resolution was submitted by a Congressman who is not of Polish descent—Congressman KERSTEN.

BUFFALO, N. Y., July 6, 1951.

We are thankful that we have leaders in Congress such as you, who recognize the tremendous injustice done to Poland. Certainly proves beyond any question of a doubt that any time and every time we sacrifice basic principles of justice, regardless in what part of the world they occur, sooner or later they back up to our doorstep.

F. B. ROGGER,
General Manager, Everybody's Daily.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

HILLSIDE, N. J., August 11, 1951.

It is gratifying to know that men like you are attempting to free peace-loving peoples from other nations from the clutch of that terrifying menace, communism. Keep up the fight.

MICHAEL HVASTA.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, August 9, 1951.

Thanks very much for the insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in behalf of the Slovak people to win freedom, and on behalf of our organization of over 96,000 members, I want to sincerely thank you for your interest in our people.

N. J. WARGOVICH,
President, Jednota, First
Catholic Slovak Union.

WASHINGTON, N. J., August 3, 1951.

You deserve our sincere thanks and appreciation for the splendid work you did in behalf of the Slovak people. I know that all appreciate your kindness and good judgment.

JOHN C. SCHRANKA,
Chairman, Board of Governors,
American Friends of Slovak Freedom.

MIDDLETOWN, PA., July 11, 1951.

Thank you for a copy of House Concurrent Resolution 139 pertaining to the liberation of the peoples of Czechoslovakia. It does interest me, indeed. I am happy that you have set forth something that will undoubtedly be acceptable to Americans of Slovak descent and to the Slovaks over there and in exile.

With respect to the future, the resolution is very good. The peoples of Czechoslovakia should have a chance to choose freely whether they want to continue under Czechoslovakia. I know that expresses the will of at least 99.8 percent of the Slovaks anywhere.

In referring to the past, however, several items need clarification.

P. A. HROBAK,
President, the Slovak League of America.

NEW YORK, N. Y., July 13, 1951.

The attention of the National Committee of Free Czechoslovakia has been drawn to your proposed resolution in the House of Representatives of July 4, 1951, to have the Congress of the United States express the conviction that the people of Czechoslovakia have the right to basic human freedoms and freedom from Communist enslavement and have the Congress direct the United States representatives in the United Nations to demand that the United Nations charge the Communist regime with violating charter and principles of the United Nations for robbing Czechoslovakia of its freedom, independence, and territorial integrity and demand the withdrawal of Soviet Communist rule.

We are deeply grateful for your understanding of the hard struggle of the Czechoslovakian people for liberty and freedom, for your interest in the fate of Czechoslovakia and for your desire to help our suffering people.

We wish to call your attention, however, to certain statements in your resolution which unchanged would be misleading and might as a consequence bring results opposite to those you wish to attain—the restoration of a strong democratic Czechoslovakia.

PETER ZENKL,
National Committee of Free
Czechoslovakia
(And others).

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 10, 1951.

I studied the resolution with a special interest and am glad, dear Congressman, to state that on the whole it gives a true picture of the life in my enslaved fatherland—Czechoslovakia—and partly indicates the right ways to be followed in our common fight against communism in order to liberate subjugated nations behind the iron curtain from the Bolshevik yoke.

I am very grateful for your interest and efforts in this case. However, I cannot agree with some of the statements contained in the resolution which must be due, as I presume, to some incorrect information.

DR. MATEJ JOSKO.

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 17, 1951.

The Council of Free Czechoslovakia appreciates with sincere thanks your endeavor to strengthen the traditional friendship of the great American Nation to the Czech and Slovak (Czechoslovak) people, as well as to the

other peoples behind the iron curtain remembered in a number of similar resolutions. We are grateful to you for having described in so eloquent a manner the unbearable conditions created in our countries by the Soviets and their satellites, the different Communist regimes, and for having pointed to effective methods to be applied in the opposition to the attempts at full enslavement and decimation of also the Czech and Slovak people pursued by world communism.

We take, however, in the best of faith the liberty to draw your attention to the fact that—apparently due to incorrect information received—certain mistakes and erroneous conceptions found their way into your resolution concerning Czechoslovakia. We deem it our duty as Czechoslovak patriots to point out to you these errors.

We leave it entirely to your objective judgment to determine the way in which you will modify the suggested passages of your resolution, the tendency of which, we again assure you, is welcome by all of us with great appreciation.

DR. JURAJ SLAVIK,
Acting Member of the Executive
Board, Council of Free
Czechoslovakia.

CHICAGO, ILL., July 24, 1951.

As duly authorized representative of the White Legion, Slovak underground organization, I hereby thank you for your courageous resolution which strengthens our anti-Communist activities very much. You rendered with it an immense service to the cause of freedom in Slovakia and certainly rendered the same service to your great country.

OTO CACKO.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.

The Slovak people of Milwaukee, Wis., and environs, being gathered at the Twenty-first Slovak Day picnic in Milwaukee, sponsored by the Federated Slovak Societies, in due recognition of previous deliberations concerning your efforts on behalf of the Slovak people held under the Communist yoke in Czechoslovakia, do hereby thank you for your interest in our cause and humanitarianism the world over.

Please accept the undying gratitude of the oppressed Slovak people and of those who cherish and respect the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

STEPHEN RASSEK,
President, Federated Slovak Societies
(And others)

RUMANIA

COMPTON, CALIF., July 27, 1951.

We Rumanian-Americans who are suffering great anxiety because of the turbulent times our country of origin is going through are deeply appreciative for your remarks made in the House of Representatives and for the House Concurrent Resolution 123.

As Rumanians, our fervent wish is to see Rumania free again.

JOHN T. RANCU.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, August 14, 1951.

The Rumanian American National Committee Ladies Association met in convention in Youngstown, Ohio, wishes to congratulate you for your humanitarian House Resolution 123 in defense of Rumanians' liberty and independence.

ESTER STANCULESCU,
President, Rumanian American
National Committee Ladies
Association.

COMPTON, CALIF., July 30, 1951.

Words cannot express my sentiments. I have read the text of House Concurrent Resolution 123, and am most deeply impressed by your understanding of the true situation and of the true feelings of the Rumanian people, as shown by your remarks.

Today when most of the world is menaced by chaos, your voice is raised prophetically, and the 18,000,000 oppressed Rumanians will respect your name for generations to come, as their Messiah.

May God grant that you are successful in upholding the cause of subjugated peoples thereby indirectly serving this great United States.

D. DRAGHICEANU.

BALTIMORE, MD., August 3, 1951.

I am an American citizen of Rumanian descent and proud of my American citizenship, loyal and devoted to our United States of America and proud of my Rumanian ancestry.

My family and I subscribe to the Foala Poporului (People's News), published in Cleveland, and we read an article regarding the Resolution 123 you proposed in defense of the Rumanian people as well as the other little nations who are today suffering under the cruel heel of the tyrannical Godless Communists.

We, as good loyal Americans congratulate you for this noble gesture and may God bless you, everyone near and dear to you. May God bless our America and all freedom-loving and God-loving people.

NICHOLAS MAGINA AND FAMILY.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, July 27, 1951

As President and on behalf of the Union and League of Rumanian Societies of America, the largest fraternal insurance company for Americans of Rumanian descent with over 74 branch lodges throughout the United States and Canada, it gives me pleasure to thank you for your presentation of the resolution "Rumanian People Our Natural Ally Against Communism."

It is gratifying to all of us that as busy as you are, you could find the time to investigate and present the problem of the Rumanian people as ably as you have done.

Your resolution has given our younger generation of Americans of Rumanian descent that extra punch needed to make us want to sacrifice all to aid and fight for America, the land of freedom, which through the blessings of God our parents adopted as their homeland and to which they have and will forever be loyal and ready to help against all aggressors who wish to disrupt or change the American way of life.

The success of your resolution has been in that people from all over the world are awakened to the fact that America is made up of all the nations of the world and that through the united efforts of all nationalities in America, can we as Americans bring about freedom to all the world as we Americans know it.

JOSEPH J. CRACIUM,
President, the Union and League of
Rumanian Societies of America,
Inc.

LA CANADA, CALIF., August 2, 1951.

Thank God for people like you and we all pray for God's wisdom and guidance to free the world of communism.

We get letters from Rumania from my kinsfolk, my sister, which they are all sick from lack of food, and constantly arrested and tortured, and took their homes away from them, throwing out of the home the children.

I have a letter recently which they stated frankly that they all waiting for America to come, then they all will be on our side. Every man, woman, and child will fight Communist Russia in case of war with the United States of America.

Mr. and Mrs. JOSEPH J. BREZEAN.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, August 4, 1951.

Many thanks for your House Resolution 123 in behalf of Rumania. Its contents are

a mark of your enlightened statesmanship and a credit to America's spirit of fairness and justice.

GEORGE STANCULESCU,
President, Rumanian American
National Committee.

NEW YORK, N. Y., July 16, 1951.

Our executive committee has asked me to thank you for your activities in favor of the liberation of Rumania from the Communist occupation.

With all our forces we are joining you in your fight, which is the fight of all freemen.

We are convinced that you are one who has understood the troubles of a nation caught between the devastating winds of communism.

I. GLICKMAN,
Executive Secretary,
United Rumanian Jews of America, Inc.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., August 13, 1951.

The Americans of Rumanian origin from Los Angeles, Calif., extend their thanks and appreciation for your resolution presented by you in the House of Representatives to liberate the people of Rumania from communism.

GEORGE POPESCU,
President, The Holy Trinity
Rumanian Orthodox Church
(And others).

CLEVELAND, OHIO, July 26, 1951

The Association of Rumanian Catholics of America (an organization of American Catholics of Rumanian descent), at a meeting of its executive committee held in Alliance, Ohio, July 22, has instructed me to convey to you the deepest gratitude of the Rumanian Catholics of America for the inspiring initiative taken by you through Resolution 123, introduced on June 15 into the House of Representatives, to the end that the fundamental freedoms of the Rumanian Nation be reestablished.

Sooner or later the Rumanian people, as well as all other subjugated nations, must be free from the tyrannical yoke of Communist slavery if peace and understanding among nations are to prevail.

Your timely endeavors in the cause of God-given liberty for all nations will be a source of inspiration for all those who strive for justice in the whole world.

Permit us to count you among the great friends of the Rumanian Nation.

MSGR. BASIL MARCHIS,
President, Association of
Rumanian Catholics of America

BULGARIA

ISTANBUL, TURKEY, June 21, 1951.

We, the members of the parliamentary group of Nicola Petkov who died in the struggle for democracy and, as members of the Bulgarian National Committee in Washington presided by Dr. G. M. Dimitrov in the name of the Bulgarian people, in the name of the Bulgarian emigration in Turkey and in our own name, present to you our most sincere thanks for your historical statement made in the House of Representatives of the United States of America in defense of human rights and liberty of the Bulgarian people.

Your statement is a new demonstration of friendship of the great American Nation for the Bulgarian and it strengthens our faith for liberation from the bloodthirsty communism in the near future.

STRATIA SKERLEV,
Supreme Council of the Bulgarian
National Agrarian Union.

PARIS, FRANCE, July 19, 1951.

It is with the keenest pleasure that we have taken notice—in the newspaper, *Libre et Indépendante* (Free and Independent Bulgaria) of your remarks in the Congress relative to the liberation of the Bulgarian people from the Communist yoke.

This gesture will never be forgotten by our people, and we—their free representatives—want to confirm this to you; for your trend of thought will reach the last rural cottage and all the prisoners in the concentration camps and forced labor camps, to whom your voice will mean encouragement and hope.

The acting board of directors of the Union Agrarienne Nationale Bulgare a l'Etranger (National Agrarian Association of Bulgarians Abroad) will do everything in its power in order that your appeal to fight slavery be heard by all those who suffer and fight for freedom.

TSENKO BAREV (and others),
Acting Board of Directors of the
Union Agrarienne (Nationale)
Bulgare a l'Etranger.

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 3, 1951.

It gives me great pleasure to express to you the gratitude of the Bulgarian National Committee and the Bulgarian people of whose overwhelming majority it is a representative.

The noble act which you, the freedom-loving son of the great American Republic, instituted by introducing Resolution No. 121 concerning the liberation of the Bulgarian people along with the rest of the Eastern European nations, shall forever be a golden page in the history of our nations presently enslaved by communism, in the history of great America, and in the history of the humankind.

Your attention, invaluable help, and still more invaluable encouragement in their great struggle are, I can assure you, widely appreciated and cherished for they come in a very dark hour.

Dr. G. M. DIMITROV,
President, Bulgarian National Committee.

Nevada Civil-Work Status Reported

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Nevada Civil-Work Status Reported," published in the Reno (Nev.) Evening Gazette of August 18, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEVADA CIVIL-WORK STATUS REPORTED—ARMY ENGINEERS MAKE SUMMARY AT REQUEST OF SENATOR MALONE

Status of civil works in Nevada has been summarized by the Army engineers at the request of Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, his office announced today.

The report gives details of work on the Humboldt River and Mathews and Pine Canyon flood-control and irrigation projects, both provided for in Malone-sponsored legislation.

Also summarized are surveys and investigations made in Truckee River, Carson River,

Walker River, Martin Creek, Cleason, Robinson and Murray Creeks at Ely, and the Virginia River area. Not included is the Las Vegas Wash project survey which is provided in another Malone bill the Senate passed recently.

The report lists emergency flood-control work done since MALONE came to the Senate, as follows: Humboldt Lake, clearing, snagging, and levee repairs, \$90,000; Lovelock slough, clearing and snagging, \$18,600; similar work plus emergency flood fighting on Humboldt River at Elko, \$55,000; at Murray Canyon and Robinson Basin, \$25,000; on Humboldt River at Beowawe, \$5,000; building revetments and cleaning and straightening channel on Clover Creek and Meadow Valley Wash at Caliente, \$8,100; clearing and snagging, recent flood, Truckee River at Reno, \$50,000; and on East Fork Carson River near Minden, \$25,000.

The Humboldt River project consists of three reservoirs: at the Hylton site on the south fork of Humboldt, 120,000 acre-feet storage capacity, \$3,320,000 cost; at the Devils Gate site on the north fork, 80,000 acre-feet, \$2,530,000 cost; at the Vista site on Marys River, 50,000 acre-feet, \$3,358,000 cost. The project also includes channel improvement work along the most critical reaches of the river, cost \$200,000, and drainage improvements for the Lovelock area, cost \$1,991,000.

Total cost of the Humboldt projects is \$11,399,000; the Federal share is estimated at \$7,679,000. This project will produce estimated annual benefits as follows: flood-control benefits, \$207,000 annually; irrigation benefits, \$207,400; drainage benefits, \$309,000; total benefits \$723,500 annually. The project should be complete in 4 or 5 years.

The project in Mathews Canyon and Pine Canyon consist of two flood-control reservoirs to be constructed concurrently. Mathews Canyon flood-control basin will be formed by construction of an earth-fill dam about 717 feet long and 68 feet high above the stream bed on a tributary to Clover Creek, a tributary of Meadow Valley Wash. The reservoir will have a maximum water-surface area of 299 acres and a capacity of 6,260 acre-feet. The estimated construction cost of Mathews Canyon Dam is \$700,000. Mathews Canyon Dam will prevent flood damages to residential, business, public, and agricultural properties; to irrigation and drainage works, to existing flood-control improvements, to highways, roads, railroads, and utilities. Combined with the damages estimated to be prevented by construction of Pine Canyon Dam, the total average annual damages that will be prevented by the project are estimated at about \$110,000. The damages that would be prevented by Pine Canyon Dam and Mathew Canyon Dam from a single very large flood are estimated at \$2,000,000.

Pine Canyon flood-control basin will be formed by construction of an earth-fill dam about 2,003 feet long and 97 feet high above stream bed on a tributary of Clover Creek. The reservoir will have a maximum water-surface of 255 acres and a capacity of 7,840 acre-feet. The estimated cost of Pine Canyon Dam is \$1,356,000. All costs of entire project will be borne by the Federal Government.

Surveys under way:

Truckee River: An investigation of the Truckee River drainage basin in California and Nevada is under way, to develop a program of work that would (1) stabilize the levels of Lake Tahoe to prevent flood damages during wet years and detrimental effect on recreation during dry years; (2) prevent flood damages, especially to the city of Reno and to the agricultural area in Truckee meadows; (3) generate or make possible the future generation of hydroelectric power (4) make available an additional water supply for irrigation purposes.

Carson River: An investigation of the Carson River drainage basin in California and Nevada is under way, to develop a plan that would (1) eliminate damages caused by the floodwaters, (2) provide additional water for irrigation purposes, and (3) possibly permit generation of hydroelectric power. Studies indicate that a multiple-purpose reservoir on East Carson River at Horseshoe Bend or at the Watasheamu site, or possibly on West Carson River at the Hope Valley site may be feasible. Local channel-improvement works will be included.

Walker River: Investigation is under way for the development of the Walker River drainage basin in California and Nevada, for the same three purposes. Studies indicate that a multiple-purpose reservoir at the Pickel Meadows site will be economically justified. This project would be predominantly a power project, with flood control and irrigation of relatively smaller significance.

Martin Creek, Humboldt County: An investigation of Martin Creek, a tributary of Little Humboldt River, is being undertaken. The creek drains 170 square miles along the east slope of Santa Rosa Mountains and debouches onto the floor of Paradise Valley. The average flow into Paradise Valley is about 30 cubic feet per second, but flood flows of 9,000 cubic feet per second have been recorded which cause considerable damage to farm lands and structures on its alluvial cone. It is believed that flood damage may be prevented by channel improvements supplemented by small detention storage reservoirs.

Gleason, Robinson, and Murray Creeks provide drainage for about 100 square miles of mountainous areas above the city of Ely. These streams generally carry little or no water but occasionally considerable flow occurs during heavy snow-melt run-off or intense rainstorms, which have resulted in flow down the streets and flooding of basements of business establishments and residences. An investigation of these creeks is under way.

Virgin River: A dam is proposed at the White Narrows site on Muddy River above the mouth of Meadow Valley Wash. The reservoir would impound the winter flow of Muddy River for release during the irrigating season. The town of Overton along lower Muddy River is subject to damage from floods from Overton Wash.

Let's Deal With Basic Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JARMAN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently a friend sent to the Honorable Brooks Hays of Arkansas, and to me, a copy of the sermon delivered by Dr. John Peters on April 22, 1951, at the St. Luke's Methodist Church, Oklahoma City, Okla., entitled "Let's Deal With Basic Issues." Dr. Peters is associate professor of religion at Oklahoma City University and former chaplain of the Fortieth Infantry Division of the United States Army.

It is an arresting document, and with the thought that it might be helpful to Members of the House, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, on behalf of the Honorable Brooks Hays and myself, I include it in my remarks.

It is an impressive presentation of strong Christian convictions by a man who has shared the hardships and dangers of modern war. Its emphasis is upon moral and social issues but it is closely related to many governmental policies with which Members of Congress are concerned. It contains excellent advice and inspirational material and I commend it to the membership.

LET'S DEAL WITH BASIC ISSUES

(By Dr. John L. Peters)

One of the difficulties in dealing with the basic problem of our day is the lack of agreement as to what that problem really is. Ask the next man you meet for instance, what he considers the real obstacle to world peace, and he is likely to tell you that it is the Russians, or the Democrats, or the Republicans, or his wife's relatives. The answer will differ with the man and with his mood.

It is said that during World War I, one of the outstanding ministers of America solemnly assured a vast audience that peace would come to the world only when all persons of German extraction were rendered sterile. There was, the eminent gentleman was certain, some carnal content in German blood which constituted the primary threat to the peace of the world. Some years later, in World War II, a member of the British Parliament came forward with a somewhat more provocative suggestion. Said he, "The world will be happy again only when Franco's widow tells Stalin on his death-bed that Hitler has been assassinated at Mussolini's funeral."

The passing of time has demonstrated that the minister was obviously ridiculous and the member of Parliament patently naive. It takes more than genocide or the removal of the current crop of dictators to effect world peace. Such peace can be had only when basic issues are equitably settled.

What are those basic issues?

If our religion gives us any insight into the nature of reality—and this is a primary function of religion—we have the answer indicated in the records of our own faith. Let's assume that God knew what he was doing when he sent Jesus Christ into the world. Let's go further and suppose that there was some actual significance to the song which the angels sang when Jesus was born—"Peace on earth, good will to men." What then was the purpose of this coming? What was the program by which peace was to become more than a fading celestial song? The answer is not difficult. For Jesus presents that program in his keynote message to his neighbors in the synagogue at Nazareth. There, on the threshold of his amazing ministry, he stood and asked for the scroll of the prophet Isaiah. The account is found in Luke 4:17-19—

"And when he had opened the book, he found the place where it was written. The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; He hath sent me to heal the brokenhearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord."

What was his mission? Why did he come? Let theologians clothe the answer in what terms they choose. Here Jesus simply and explicitly declares that he came to explore and to answer the needs of the disinherited, the exploited, the poverty-stricken of soul and body.

These were the basic issues with which the Prince of Peace himself proposed to deal. These are the basic issues with which any seeker after peace today must deal. Let's examine them further.

I presume that each of you who could be was at a radio Thursday and heard General

MacArthur's moving address to the joint Houses of Congress. The general's defense of certain of his policies has, of course, gained the spotlight of attention and is now the center of wide and furious debate. I wonder, however, if in the midst of all this strife and confusion we have not tended to ignore some areas of his message which are more deeply significant. Do we remember, for instance, his opening remarks in which he described the underlying reason for Asian unrest, the surging tide of which the present conflict is but the bitter froth? Here, according to General MacArthur, are facts which must be taken into consideration before any realistic policy can be enunciated or before any permanent solution can be had:

"Long exploited by the so-called colonial powers, with little opportunity to achieve any degree of social justice, individual dignity, or a higher standard of life, . . . the people of Asia found their opportunity in the war just past to throw off the shackles of colonialism and now see the dawn of new opportunity, a heretofore unfelt dignity, and the self-respect of political freedom

"Mustering half the earth's population and 60 percent of its natural resources, these people are rapidly consolidating a new force, both moral and material, with which to raise the living standard and erect adaptation of the design of modern progress to their own distinct cultural environments.

"Whether one adheres to the concept of colonialism or not, this is the direction of Asian progress and it may not be stopped.

"What they seek now is friendly guidance, understanding and support, not imperious direction; the dignity of equality and not the shame of subjugation

"Their prewar standard of life, pitifully low, is infinitely lower now in the devastation left in war's wake. World ideologies play little part in Asian thinking and are little understood

"What the people strive for is the opportunity for a little more food in their stomachs, a little better clothing on their backs, and a little firmer roof over their heads, and the realization of the normal nationalities' urge for political freedom."

There has been none to challenge these assertions, for the facts overwhelmingly support them

Are we fully aware, for instance, that while here in America the per capita annual income is around \$1,450, in Indonesia it is around \$25, in Thailand and Burma, \$35, in China, \$27? True enough, most of these people do not live under a cash economy like ours. But around the world there are many things—necessary things—which cannot be had except as they are bought, bought with that which they simply do not have.

Occasionally it is argued that, despite this fact, these people are probably happy and any attempt to assist them is simply a foolish meddling with an already satisfactory situation. Those who subscribe to such an idea must take seriously romantic novels, Hollywood extravaganzas, and the seductive brochures of travel agencies. But engineers, economists, health authorities, and soldiers have had an opportunity to observe the unrelieved misery that is characteristic of most areas of the world—including many of those lands which we still hope to preserve as a bulwark against encroaching communism

These people, it is true, usually make the most of what little they have. And they neither want nor could use that multiplicity of things which we consider necessary to our standard of living. But that they are happy amid their hunger and disease and illiteracy is a ludicrous assumption. I never shall be able to forget the mothers who brought their emaciated and fever-ridden babies to our aid stations, begging for medicine to check their suffering. And who that saw them could for-

get the long lines that waited patiently under the blazing sun or in the driving rain—for what? For the privilege of dipping into our garbage cans and relieving their constant, gnawing hunger. The trouble with most of us is that we have never known the hunger which is the constant corrosive companion of millions of these people.

I thank my God now, as I did not then, that I have known what it is to be really hungry. In hot pursuit of an education, I came to a period when I was forced for a week or so to live on 15 cents a day. Each day I would buy one Coca-Cola and two packages of "Nibs." It wasn't enough. And during that time, as I watched others eat steaks, salads, and pork chops I came to dislike them intensely. They had done nothing to me. Most of them did not know that I existed—but I just didn't like them. Hunger has its own peculiar logic.

The masses of the world are hungry. And when, through our magazines and movies, we tell them of our overabundance, they do not respond with respect and love—they only pull their belts a little tighter and hate us a little more.

It is assumed by some that any attempts to improve these conditions will only aggravate the problem of overpopulation which prevails in some of these areas. And that is a very real problem. But is the answer to be found in deepening malnutrition? In virulent disease? In weapons of mass destruction? This will, of course, have to be the answer unless some sufficient alternative is forthcoming.

Are we so spiritually and intellectually bankrupt that we can offer none?

There is another alternative. And men like Frank Laubach have dedicated themselves to it. For these miserable masses are not merely animals. They, too, aspire and dream and love and hope. They are God's children and potentially his sons in as full a measure as any of us are or ever could be. But they are illiterate, ignorant—lacking that basic prerequisite to self-help, the ability to read. Three out of every five persons on this globe, a billion two hundred million people, spend their lives in poverty, hunger, and superstition, primarily because they are illiterate. The knowledge of how to care for themselves, how to plan for and to rear their children, how to improve personal and community sanitation, how to cultivate their soil and to develop their natural resources—all this is to them a closed book because simple manuals of instruction are as indecipherable to them as Egyptian hieroglyphics are to most of us. The saving alternative begins with the impartation of the precious gift of literacy. As yet, the world's masses are without it—and dwell in consequent misery.

What makes their deep tragedy our dire threat is that now they are aware of their plight. We have sent movies, and tourists, and GI's and missionaries into these areas. And while once these people knew merely that they were miserable, now they know too that they need not remain so. To make sure they do, the agents provocateurs of communism are fiercely at work among them, fanning the coals of their tortured resentment into the flames of open rebellion—and Africa, India, Asia, and the Philippines are at work with this ferment of peril and protest. A vast, dumb, suffering multitude is determined to rise—a movement which General MacArthur has said "may not be stopped." We have the choice of giving it guidance or being destroyed by it.

We are, of course, living in that day when the prophetic words of Edwin Markham are being fulfilled. You remember his 'Man With the Hoe,' that brutish symbol of "humanity betrayed, plundered, profaned, and disinherited." And you will recall Markham's piercing question:

"O Masters, lords and rulers in all lands,
How will the future reckon with this Man?
How answer his brute question in that hour

When whirlwinds of rebellion shake all shores?

How will it be with kingdoms and with kings—

With those who shaped him to the thing he is—

When this dumb Terror shall rise to judge the world,

After the silence of the centuries?"

Around the world, multitudes once dumb are rising to ask questions—questions which once we asked: "Is colonial status right? Is exploitation just? Is deprivation necessary?

They ask, too, "Who will help us?" And far too often the only voice they hear and the only hand they see is the voice and hand of communism. From our high vantage point it seems obvious that they should know that the Communist's offer of help is but an invitation to deeper enslavement. But from their depth of need—and hearing no other voice—these masses seize this offer as a way of life itself. Unless we have shared their wretchedness, we simply cannot understand the impact which the Internationale makes upon them as it thunders.

"Arise ye prisoners of starvation,
Arise ye wretches of the earth,
For justice thunders condemnation,
A better world's in birth."

And to the submerged millions, these words are far more meaningful than all our political ideologies

It is true that a militant and ruthless Russian imperialism is using international communism as a front behind which to conceal its real designs and as a tool through which to effect its real purposes. This must be clearly recognized and intelligently dealt with. But it is also true as Stringfellow Barr, erstwhile president of St. John's College, has recently reminded us:

" . . . that if all the Russians in the world obligingly died this evening, and that if all the Communists of whatever race were so kind as to commit suicide tomorrow at noon sharp, the world revolution for equality would not stop . . . the backward peoples . . . are in motion . . . Neither containment nor appeasement will bring us peace. Our only chance is to do something about the real problem "

But the real problem may be even deeper than already has been indicated. For it is as true today as it was when Jesus declared it, that "Man shall not live by bread alone "

If we ignore man's physical needs while we hand him pious platitudes, we justify the Communist's contemptuous characterization of religion as "the opiate of the people," promising little but "pie in the sky by and by." But if we conclude that the problem is simply and only economic, then we join the Communists in their crass dialectical materialism. An attempt at a global program of "bread and circuses" is not likely to serve us any better than it served imperial Rome—and she lies today in the dust. History is full of the truth that mere material prosperity has brought neither real happiness nor continuing peace to individuals or to nations. Today's juvenile delinquent is recruited mainly from families whose economic resources are more than ample. It must be recognized that man is a unit, whose physical and spiritual needs are concomitant and interrelated. Neither can be adequately dealt with if the other is casually ignored.

Nevertheless, there is widespread agreement that today's real problem is theological. Men need not only food, they need God. Their hearts as well as their stomachs cry out for satisfaction. And many an ex-GI is serving his Lord today in the Philippines, Japan, and Asia because he glimpsed the vast

hunger for God when he served in those areas. I could tell you of the deep appreciation for Testaments and Bibles—and the plea for more of them—on the part of these peoples of the East.

It is reported that before World War II, Toyohiko Kagawa, observing the rising power and spreading ambition of the Japanese military, wrote to American Christians saying, "Send us thousands of your sons as missionaries now or you will send tens of thousands of them as soldiers later." We would not do the first. We were forced to do the second. MacArthur, shortly after assuming his responsibilities in Japan, invited the churches to send a thousand missionaries to that country. There was an immense spiritual vacuum in Japan with the collapse of Shinto. It was an open door and a golden opportunity. After 5 years had passed, that quota requested from the churches by the military remained about as follows: The Roman Catholic Church, to its credit, has fulfilled its portion; the quota of the Protestant churches was substantially unfulfilled. By way of comparison, it is instructive to note that Russia, upon the conclusion of her treaty with Red China, is said to have sent 45,000 "specialists" into that country. Large numbers of these went, of course, to the armed forces, but thousands were assigned to posts of educational, agricultural, and technical assistance—"missionaries" in the full sense of the word.

The irony of it is that while the followers of Christ are preaching the precepts of the Master, and while the Voice of America is proclaiming to the nations our good intentions, the Communists move in among the masses who never saw a missionary nor heard a radio, and appear to be practicing what we preach. Practice always has been more eloquent than preaching. Actually, America is far more able and better prepared to do, and do honestly, what the Communists do on a limited scale and for a limited time. But we have been short-sighted and reluctant. "It is time," as Frank Laubach has said, "for us to take the initiative and call the plays."

It is not too late to win the battle for men's minds and for the peace of the world. I trust, as all of us do, that we shall win any war into which we might blunder or be plunged. But our goal is not merely to win the war. It is to win the world for all that is ultimately right and good. And this second goal will not be accomplished by the weapons of the first. For war solves no basic problems.

On this there is unanimity among our thoughtful military leaders. General Bradley recently has decried the fact that we know more about killing than about living, more about waging war than about making peace. In 1946, at the reception of an honorary degree from Boston University, General Eisenhower said to his assembled auditors, "I have been classed as a rather risky chance-taking person, and I venture to make a suggestion. Why doesn't Dr. Marsh, and the president of every great university in the world, teach his people to put people in my profession permanently out of a job?" More recently General MacArthur has asserted, "I know war as few other men now living do and to me nothing is more revolting. I have long advocated its complete abolition, as its very destructiveness on both friend and foe has rendered it useless as a means of settling international disputes. . . . If we will not devise some greater and more equitable system, our Armageddon will be at our door."

Can we devise this greater and more equitable system? We can. But it will not be easy. It will call for considerably more than the pushing of a button or the dropping of a bomb. It will be long and costly—but not so long nor as costly as the unprofitable road which heretofore we have trod. It will be beset with false starts and disappointments.

But if we undertake it, we shall win out for we shall be moving in the right direction and we shall be doing what God through Christ has told us we must.

What kind of a program shall it be? I hesitate to suggest its outline. And if there be a man among you who has a better plan or can improve upon this one, I adjure him, in humanity's name, to stand and declare it. Until then, let me suggest these characteristics:

1. First of all, it must meet real needs with real solutions.

Some of our sporadic efforts along this line have smacked much of these radio quiz shows which have a habit of showering fantastic and utterly useless prizes on the luckless winner. Some mild and humble soul answers his phone and foolhardily comes up with the right answer. He is thereupon flung into the ruthless machinery of publicity, given 2 weeks in the bridal suite at the Waldorf Astoria with paid admissions to all the bright night spots—when all the poor man wanted and needed was a new pair of pants and some repairs to his upper plate. This program we envisage, therefore, must be international in its support and administration. America, while undoubtedly she must take the initiative, cannot and must not assume the role of the world's Santa Claus—and the cloak of economic dictatorship which inevitably would follow. Powerful and well-intentioned though we may be, we have neither the resources nor the insight to administer this program alone. We must appeal to and gladly accept the assistance and instruction of men of good will everywhere.

Only so can we devise a program which will allow men to keep their dignity and self-respect. For this can be no universal dole, no global boondoggle. This program must be designed to help men help themselves; to become men in the only way such a process is possible, by their own participating efforts, guided and assisted wherever that is necessary and possible.

2. Secondly, it must be extensive and aggressive enough to constitute a real counter-offensive to the Communist program.

Unless we embark upon it in this measure, we shall sink like a row boat in a heavy sea. But a vigorous program is certain of success. In France today, the Roman Catholic Church is having a revival primarily because its younger priests are acting upon the conviction that the only way to defeat communism is to outlive, outlove, outserve, and outdie it. So far our efforts have been marked and marred by timidity. We have set up a point 4 program and Dr. Henry G. Bennett, president of Oklahoma A & M. College, has been placed at its head—a program nobly conceived and ably headed. The Congress, with some reluctance, voted an appropriation of 38,000,000 to put it into effect. Immediately the plan was condemned as contributing dangerously to inflation.

What is it that really brings about inflation? I have here a chart prepared by the National Bank of Commerce of Chicago. It is their 1950 chart of business booms and depressions since the beginning of our national history. One fact is made unquestionably clear. The cheapening of the dollar—which is, of course, inflation—has come in connection with and as a direct result of war, in particular World Wars I and II. Starting its subnormal trend in mid-1917, the dollar had plunged to 69 cents by 1920. After regaining its strength through the thirties, the downgrade began again in 1941 and by 1949 had a comparative value of 59 cents. It is our expenditure for war that is bleeding us economically white. Yet this year our appropriations for defense have risen at the last report I noted, to the sum of \$71,000,000,000. That's a little over a million dollars every 7½ minutes, day and night, for 1 year. That means that in 1 hour we spend more for arms than the entire world spends in a whole year for

meeting the problems of hunger through the Food and Agriculture Organization, or in combating disease through the World Health Organization. Yet these are the only world-wide organizations set up to cope with the issues which are the breeders of war and the spawning ground of communism.

In the light of all this, to denounce expenditures for point 4 as unwarranted and foolish is much as though we planned a malarial control program with the slogan, "Billions for swatting mosquitoes, but not one cent for draining swamps." Yet it is the swamps that breed the mosquitoes. And point 4, not yet adequate, is nevertheless a step in the right direction and deserving of our earnest prayers and substantial support. We need a technical assistance program aggressive and vigorous enough to make a real impact on today's need.

3. In the third place, and of central importance, this program must be shot through with the spirit of Christ.

We can send the wrong people to do the right job—and fail completely. That is why I should like to see this program taken in hand, sponsored and underwritten in a large part by the churches. The church is an international institution, wedded to no one culture and subservient only to the high demands of Almighty God. Where the church is vital she exercises a bond of unity which transcends all other lives. She has the commission to undertake this task and the organization to effect it. And she can, if she will, do it better than any or all governments. The question is: Does she have the passion and the will to do it?

If she does attempt it, she will need vastly to expand her missionary program and to give a new definition to the term "missionary." The Christian evangel would have to be carried by teachers, engineers, mechanics, nurses, writers, and technicians. The saving "good news" would be presented by teaching men to read, helping them build dams, showing them how better to cultivate their soil, care for their health—in short, how to rise out of their ignorance, disease, and misery. It would be the imposition of no particular culture. It would be the unfolding of a way of life, as Laubach has said, in a spirit of Christian love and democratic friendliness—and it would stop communism cold.

It would call for a greatly increased support of the missionary program. If we send 100,000 such workers into these fields, it probably will cost the average church member around \$50 annually—as compared to the \$1.25 he now pays. Let us not forget, however, that we will each spend this year between \$450 and \$500 for arms. Perhaps it will be argued that this is all the more reason why we cannot be expected to make an increased outlay in any other direction. But the point is that somewhere, somehow, we must break through this vicious circle of recurrent wars. Somehow we must interrupt the process that requires us to send our sons and our sons' sons to stain the world's battlefields with their blood. Suppose, for such a purpose, we do have to pay more. Surely sacrifice and heroism is not to be required merely of the young. Actually, if we choose to put a dime for constructive ends along side every dollar we spend for destructive ends, the day will come when the dollars now spent for death will buy more abundant living for us all. But we've got to begin. We've got to sacrifice. We've got to match heroism with heroism.

There are men of means and intelligence listening to me this morning. They have proved what they can do for themselves, for their families, and for their communities. This is the hour when, under God, they need to rise and show what they can do for their world. And there are able and talented young people hearing me who ought now to dedicate their talents to this high, holy, and absolutely necessary task. It is a sad and

sobering fact that, in the last 30 years since communism began its militant march, the missionary enterprise has dwindled and retreated. In more than one major denomination of protestantism there actually are fewer full-time missionaries today than there were 30 years ago. Shall we not pick up that faltering banner and justify our very own reason for existence?

Perhaps you wonder why I feel this so deeply. Let me tell you one of the reasons. A group of us were moving up a hill in the Philippines one day through the driving rain. Suddenly a mortar shell burst squarely on top of us. The lad directly behind me was mortally wounded with a piece of shrapnel directly through his heart. As I held him in my arms and tried unsuccessfully to staunch the spurting blood, the whole cruel waste of it all swept over me. Here was this lad, a farm boy from Tennessee. He had joined our outfit only 2 weeks earlier and the night before we went into this sector his mail had caught up with him. Amid all the wonderful words from his loved ones was a letter from his draft board. He showed it to me ruefully. It informed him that after due deliberation, the board had decided to classify him as IV-F. He was the only able-bodied man on the farm of his parents and so he was exempt. But the boy had tired of waiting, and stung by the taunts of some of his neighbors, had enlisted. After basic training he had been sent out to us as an infantry replacement. And now he lay dying in my arms. That night, as I lay in my muddy fox hole, I asked God why that boy had been taken and I had been spared. Perhaps it was a foolish question. But split seconds before he was hit I stood exactly where he had stood. Why was I spared? I don't know. But I was, and I vowed I would do all I could to keep this thing from happening again. Perhaps I've failed. Surely somebody has. As I go my way in safety and comfort I feel now and then the lash of this adaptation of Eleanor Breed's bitter poem:

"The young men die in battle,
The old men sleep in bed.
The tortured earth of Asia
Is furrowed deep with red.

The old men sat conferring
With smile and scheme and lie.
The old men made the blunders,
Today the young men die."

Must this go on? I have a kid brother and a fine nephew in the Air Corps. Another nephew is entering the marines. My son is approaching draft age. And many of your sons and nephews and husbands are even now in Korea and on the high seas. Is this all and always the answer? Has Jesus failed in that high mission He undertook? Is it not, in fact, we who have failed and are failing?

Suppose the road out should prove costly. Is there any price higher than He paid? Is there any price higher than our sons are paying today?

Let us go to our knees and find our answers and rise to our feet determined by God's grace to make them effective.

What We're Up Against

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the national magazine of one of the great fraternal organizations of America, the Fraternal

Order of Eagles, is deserving of the attention of not only Members of Congress but of every patriotic citizen of our Nation. As a member of that order, I am pleased to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHAT WE'RE UP AGAINST

"An elephant is like unto a rope," observed the blind man, his hands grasping the animal's tail.

Communism is an economic system, say some, pointing to Kremlin nationalization of industry and collectivization of farming. "I perceive an elephant to be a great tree," said the second blind man, his arms locked about one of the animal's legs.

Communism is a political tyranny, some tell us, directing our attention to its one-party state and elimination of opposition.

"But I find an elephant to be a wall without doorway or windows," commented the third blind one, his palms pressed against the huge body.

Communism is a military menace, experts tell us, analyzing the armed forces and strategic position of Soviet Russia and its satellites.

"Thrice blind you must be," said the fourth of the blind men, as the elephant's trunk rested on his shoulder, "for an elephant is nothing but a large serpent."

Communism is a spiritual challenge, wise ones tell us, pointing out its assault upon religions and its denial of the freedom and dignity of the individual.

The Arab tale of the four blind beggars from the land of Ind does not let us know whether or not the four pooled their observations to come closer to the truth of what an elephant is. We had better, for our lives and freedom depend upon it, combine the opinions of the experts to learn what we are up against in the world today.

For communism is a military organization, a political tyranny, an economic system, and a spiritual challenge to the rest of the world. No adequate defense can be constructed to its pattern for world-wide conquest and domination until the free peoples recognize the fronts on which communism fights and the weapons that Communists use. Until you, and people like you, are convinced that communism is all of these things, the deluders who are its leaders and the deluded who are its followers, may lull you to sleep while they contrive to seize a world by force.

This total organization of a party and a series of nations to seize and hold political, economic, military, and thought control makes Communists in our midst the equivalent of air-borne troops dropped behind the line of battle by the enemy. Above ground or underground, they are participants in a world-wide conspiracy to effect our defeat and destruction.

Every Communist leader is an officer in the Kremlin's shock troops. Every Communist Party member is a soldier in that army. Eagles join other patriotic groups in smashing their organization and destroying their influence, not because they are Communists but because they are traitors.

Help Liberate Hungary—Hungarians Back Move for a New and Positive Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on June 7 last, I introduced

House Concurrent Resolution 119, expressing the hopes of the American people for the early liberation of the Hungarian people from their present enslavement and for the early restoration of their basic human rights and freedoms.

I wish to set forth herein excerpts from some of the many responses I have received to this resolution:

[From the Catholic Review of June 29, 1951]

The Kersten resolution, which the conviction of Archbishop Groesz now calls to public attention, is a long and thoughtful condemnation of communism.

CHICAGO, ILL., July 9, 1951

As a displaced person who recently arrived from Europe's camps to this, my adopted country, to express my humble appreciation to you as the champion of the oppressed and enslaved Magyar people of that 1,000-year-old defender of Christianity and western civilization—Hungary. You have expressed in your resolution the truth regarding the depraved and degrading acts of the Communist-controlled clique who retain power in Budapest and control Hungary with Russian bayonets.

Dr. JOHN BOKOR.

BOYS TOWN, NEBR., July 15, 1951.

The introduction and publication of your resolution is veritably a grand event, long ago expected by all Hungarians who within or beyond the boundaries of their country yearn for liberation and hope it comes true by the initiative and efficient assistance of the United States.

Principles and aims of the Kersten resolution are classic expressions of these great expectations and I may say that by returning my deep esteem and grateful obligation for their promotion I just give a true voice to all Hungarian souls of good intentions.

JOSEPH BODY.

MIAMI, FLA., July 24, 1951.

Let me assure you that everyone who came from Hungary and retained the loyalty that their mother taught them are grateful to you. I have read your resolution to the citizens of Miami over the WFEC Radio Station.

STEPHEN SZABO.

ELYRIA, OHIO, July 14, 1951.

Your Resolution 119, on the subject of Hungarian people, our natural allies against communism, was read and presented to the above church board at its regular monthly meeting held July 7.

We consider the Kersten resolution one of the most pronounced and informative presentations of the injustices being suffered by the peace- and freedom-loving people of present-day Hungary.

Rev. L. C. NOVAK.

Magyar Evangelical and Reformed Church.

TORONTO, ONTARIO, July 12, 1951.

I am one of the many who had to leave my country, Hungary, because I could not believe in or stand the barbaristic Communist ideas and form of government.

I thank you very much again and again for the interest and admirable work on behalf of my people. I know this is hard work, but please don't forget many people need your help, and many bless you for it.

ANNA ALBRECHT,
Imperial Bank of Canada.

CHICAGO, ILL., July 16, 1951.

As secretary of the Hungarian (Magyar) Club of Chicago, I have the honor of expressing to you the gratitude, approbation, and support of the entire membership for

the firm stand you have taken in the House of Representatives in behalf of the benighted Hungarian people.

You may understand, we believe, how greatly we applaud your high-minded action in presenting Resolution 119 to the representatives of the American people—not only because of our emotions with respect to a suffering people, but, indeed, principally because the dictates of reason demand such a stand as a notice to the world that the people of this country adhere to the principles of freedom, believe them to be universal, and have the moral courage to offer aid and support for their furtherance.

THEODORE BUSH,
Secretary, Hungarian
(Magyar) Club of Chicago.

MASCOUTAH, ILL., July 18, 1951.

SIR: I beg you not to stop, and please do everything you possibly can for the sake of the Hungarian people and for the sake of people over here like I am; great souls like you are our only and last hope. Of course, I am convinced, that with great men behind us, like you are, the time must and will come when the Hungarian people will be free again. Let us hope it shall happen real, real soon.

Mrs. LESTER W. MUELLER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., July 29, 1951.

Please pardon me for writing to you in the Hungarian language. However, having arrived in the United States only 4 months ago as a Hungarian refugee, I have not been able to learn the English language so far.

I read in the paper *Amerikai Magyar Nepszava* about your interview with Mr. Stephen E. Balogh, secretary general of the American-Hungarian Federation.

Your statement made in the course of this interview will raise hope and confidence in the hearts of many thousands of Hungarian refugees who have come to America that our unfortunate Hungarian homeland will finally be freed from the heaviest yoke of slavery known in the history of mankind, namely, the Slav-Bolshevik domination. Sir, already since many a decade we Hungarians realized and recognized clearly that bolshevism represents a danger threatening to engulf the whole world.

JENO SORBAN.

CHICAGO, ILL., July 11, 1951.

I have received the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with your remarks and resolution on the Hungarian people. It is simply wonderful. Every sentence of your speech is right, and I hope those who heard it accepted it.

GEZA ZOLTANI.

CHICAGO, ILL., June 29, 1951.

We, the undersigned Committee of Three, representing 60 Chicagoans who were until recently displaced persons in Europe, and who are ever grateful to this, our adopted country, for an opportunity to enjoy livelihood and freedom under the American flag, do hereby desire to express our gratitude to you for your Concurrent Resolution No. 119, expressing the hopes of this country for an early liberation of Hungary from their present enslavement and for the early restoration of the Magyar people's basic human rights and freedoms.

ELMER L. OSABA
(And two others).

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 28, 1951.

As an American citizen whose brothers, sisters, and mother are behind the iron curtain, I am very grateful for your active support of and warm interest in the oppressed peoples behind the east-west border. Your statement to Mr. Balogh shows that you realize the problem is more than persecution of thousands, that it concerns the American foreign policy itself.

B. TALBOT KARDOS.

ATHERTON, CALIF., July 10, 1951.

I heard and read that you are a very good friend of the Hungarian people and you fight against the communistic tyranny.

I read you are making an effort to prevent the cruelty, which happen now in Hungary. Many, many thanks for it. God bless you.

DR. GEORGE DEMETER.

KULPMONT, PA., July 4, 1951.

Your indictment against the communistic, Russia-sponsored regime in Hungary is so forceful that I could not refrain from congratulating you. It presents the clearest and truest exposé of the countless grievances of that nation that I have ever read. The deeds of brutality to which the henchmen of Russia stoop in that land are, indeed, an intolerable stench in the nostrils of every respectable man.

In the communistic philosophy of life the words are always wedded to action. Hence the secret of their success. I fear that until we furnish a positive physical evidence of our deep indignation we remain just sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal. I hope, however, that your noble-minded endeavor will bear some fruit.

REV. JOS. J. C. PETROVITS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., July 8, 1951.

Your resolution recalls to our minds Hungary's present sad plight under Russia. Hungary will ever serve as an example of what happens when the great powers lack the common sense necessary to deal with the Soviet as she really is, a scheming and anti-religious power bent on destroying democracy and freedom for her own political and material advantage. I believe that your resolution makes a big step in the right direction; that is why we Americans of Hungarian origin are and will ever be grateful to you.

DESZO DE A. BALOGH

NEW BRUNSWICK, N. J., June 1951.

I read in the *Amerikai Magyar Nepszava*, of June 22, 1951, about the interview which you have granted to Mr. Stephen Balogh and which concerned itself with the terrible tragedy that befell the innocent and helpless Hungarian people who suffer in Russian prisons.

We look with confidence to the American people and through them to the civilized world that they will give help by all means at their disposal to the children and hundreds of thousands of adults who are drowning in the Russian swamp. May God bless all of you; expressing my grateful thanks in the name of every Hungarian, I remain with patriotic greetings.

J. T. SZIRAKY.

CHICAGO, ILL., July 7, 1951.

I am sure that 90 percent of the Hungarian people will bow their heads in gratitude for your sympathy and good will toward them. God bless you.

FRANK SCHMIDT.

NEW YORK, N. Y., July 5, 1951.

This is to acknowledge your memorandum about Hungary. Indeed you have used the right words—what else can I say? Please keep up the good will toward my poor birthplace. If I ever come to Washington, I hope that I will have the privilege to call on you and thank you personally.

EDMUND J. HORWATH.

President, American Hungarian
Chamber of Commerce.

ST. LOUIS, MO., July 10, 1951.

Allow me to take this opportunity to express our sincere thanks, in the name of our fellow members of the United American Hungarians of St. Louis, Mo., for your kindness. You raise your powerful voice to call

attention on that unfortunate, liberty-loving Hungarian innocent people, who are against their will forced and terrorized by Red Communists to slavery.

NICHOLAS LABANICS,
Secretary, United American-Hungarian Societies of St. Louis.

CHICAGO, ILL., June 28, 1951.

The South Side division of the American Hungarian Federation representing over 15,000 Americans of Hungarian origin wishes to express its humble thanks to you for Concurrent Resolution No. 119 with respect to the reaffirmation of the faith of the fathers of our country and also for your championing of the cause of downtrodden Hungary where thousands of its people are taken into forced enslavement, exile, and torture chambers.

JOHN MATANYI,

President, South Side Division, American Hungarian Federation.

YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO.

Our organization composed of 18 societies, churches, and lodges in this community at a mass meeting of its members, went on record in thanking you for your interest shown to the people of Hungarian ancestry.

By resolution duly affirmed at the meeting, sincere thanks have been extended to you, as it is very seldom we have an able man such as yourself acknowledge the problems and magnificent history of our mother country which has always been composed of liberty-loving people even though at the present time it is under communistic domination.

AMERICAN HUNGARIAN FEDERATION
OF CHURCHES AND SOCIETIES OF
YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO

By JOHN GOBER, Secretary.

COLUMBUS, OHIO.

The officers and members of branch 59, of the American Hungarian Federation, read and studied with great interest House Concurrent Resolutions 116 and 119. The special meeting, held on June 29, at Columbus, Ohio, unanimously resolved to express our gratitude for the noble work you are doing. We respectfully urge you to continue your fight for the restoration of freedom and human rights in Hungary and in the other Soviet satellite countries.

JOSEPH FODOR,
President.

CHICAGO, ILL., June 28, 1951.

Chicago North Side division of the American Hungarian Federation, representing over 6,000 Chicagoans of Hungarian descent, desire to express its deep appreciation to you, Congressman KERSTEN, for your noble reaffirmation of the faith of our founding fathers, and for expressing the hopes of the American people for the early liberation of the Magyar people from their present forced enslavement and the restoration of their basic human rights and freedom. What the Moscow-controlled government in Budapest is doing is in direct violation of the treaty concluded in 1946, and therefore your Concurrent Resolution No. 119 gives us Americans of Hungarian origin renewed courage that something will be done to alleviate the sufferings of Hungary. Your noble services to humanity will long be remembered and cherished in the hearts of all freedom-loving Hungarians.

JOHN BLASZ,
President, Chicago North Side Division, American Hungarian Federation.

TOLEDO, OHIO, June 26, 1951.

The pastors and lay leaders of the Hungarian community of Toledo, Ohio, at a mass meeting held June 25, 1951, express to you their gratitude for the wholehearted support

In your effort to defend the rights of the Hungarian people against the oppression and inhuman treatment to which they are subjected by the Communists. We heartily endorse House Concurrent Resolutions 116 and 119.

MSGR ELMER G EORDOGH.

WASHINGTON, D. C. July 6, 1951.

The supreme council, the national executive officers, the district and local branch leaders of the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America, representing an over-all membership of 30,000 citizens, wish me to express our heartfelt gratitude for House Concurrent Resolutions 116 and 119, and urge you to continue the good fight for the peace of the United States of America and for the liberation of Communist-dominated Hungary. We are very proud of your good efforts.

THE HUNGARIAN REFORMED FEDERATION
OF AMERICA

Rev. GEORGE E K BORSHY.

SEATTLE, WASH., July 9, 1951.

I am very grateful for the copy of the Kersten resolution which I recently received. It is the finest and the best informed paper I ever read on the subject since I master the English. My American friends ask me very often questions about Hungary. The best way to give them the most competent information would be to hand a copy of the resolution. Is it possible to get at least 50 prints?

Dr. D. VASARHELYI.

EAST CHICAGO, IND., July 9, 1951.

Your resolution in behalf of the down-trodden Hungarian people deserves the precise and everlasting gratitude for a real American who has the courage and ability to speak for the truth. If we only had more men of distinction who could see the light, maybe we would have real peace in this world. Justice is the foundation of everything. External disturbances shall not bring us peace or settled conditions. Preaching false theories will lead us to disruption and upheavals. May God preserve America from this scourge. God may preserve those who have the courage and blessings for telling the truth.

Most respectfully yours,

JOS S KOVACH.

HAWLEY, PA.

We read in the Amerikal Magyar Nepszava, American Hungarian people, of your activity, for Hungary and for the Hungarian people who are in the Red Diktatute. God may lead you in your activities.

Dr. ANDREW BALLA.

NEW KENSINGTON, PA.

If the Congressman will continue to stand for the truth and to fight for justice in the interest of the oppressed Hungarians, God will reward his efforts with material and spiritual gifts in this world as well as in Heaven.

The time is approaching, and also the elder ones among us will live to see it, when the Hungarian nation will again be able to give a helping hand to the nations of the world in reaching the goal that everybody might enjoy his due share of a happy, peaceful life.

PETER HADIKFALVI.

CHICAGO, ILL., July 29, 1951.

Your clear-headed, courageous, and energetic efforts to enlighten the American people about the abhorrence and wanton disregard of every principle of right and decency by the Red usurpers in Hungary constitutes a highly valuable patriotic public service in

behalf of our American people because, as you have done in your splendid speech, you illustrate by living examples, existing in Hungary, the true and horrid nature of a Yalta-created "government by broad representation" in reality the true and horrid nature of communism.

JOSEPH C. CANADY.

BRIDGEPORT, CONN.

The John Calvin Church and Sick Benefit Society of Bridgeport, Conn., is taking this opportunity to express its most sincere gratitude to you for that noble Christian-like speech and resolution which you delivered in the House of Representatives on June 20, 1951, in behalf of the oppressed Hungarian people in Hungary.

Please be assured that your continued efforts merit the admiration of every American of Hungarian descent.

May God bless you in your noble work here and abroad for liberty and peace.

LOUIS KARDOS,

Secretary, Hungarian Evangelical and Reformed Church of Bridgeport, Conn.

TORONTO, CANADA, July 5, 1951.

I was deeply touched to learn that you take interest in the Hungarian affairs and that you feel and understand this nation's hardships and struggles.

It is such a good feeling that we are no more alone and forgotten, there is somebody who cares for this little, but heroic nation.

Thank you very much for your understanding and I know you will do your utmost to help Hungary in their struggles. God bless you.

VALERIA LOMDL.

STURTEVANT, WIS., July 31, 1951.

As an American-born Hungarian I want to express the hope of helping the Hungarian people from their present enslavement and for the early restoration of their human rights and their freedom from communism and all the cruelty that is going on there. Please do all you can for those poor Hungarians over there in Europe. Thank you.

JOHN D KOVACH, Jr.

FRANKSVILLE, WIS., August 1951.

I am expressing myself as thousands are doing and thousands have done already. I am writing to liberate the Hungarian people from their present enslavement and for the early restoration of their basic human rights and freedoms. To wipe out the communism from Hungary.

JOE KLAUS.

CHICAGO, ILL.

As national president of the American Hungarian Federation permit me to express the appreciation and gratitude of the Federation on your Concurrent Resolution 119. * * * The inhuman practices committed in Budapest in enslavement of thousands of Hungarians is in direct violation of the treaty of 1946, and we urge your endeavors in behalf of the humanity of Hungary and in the interests of the democratic ideals upon which this, our Nation, was founded.

DANIEL SZANTAY,

National President, American Hungarian Federation.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Please accept my deepest and sincerely heartfelt thanks for your magnificent attempt to help that unfortunate people.

Only yesterday I received a letter from my only sister, living now in Hungary, who is now the wife of a retired colonel of the army. She wrote the few lines weeping and says farewell to us, who for some years were able

to help them from here, writing as one who goes to the death cell or gallows. It seems certain that they will be driven away from their modest home and taken to some concentration camp, not being allowed to take with them anything.

REV EDMUND VASVARY,
The Hungarian Reformed Federation
of America.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

Your resolution and extension of remarks were received with greatest interest and deepfelt gratitude not only by all Hungarians living on free soil but by free members of every nation now languishing under Soviet yoke.

MSGR JOSEPH KOZI HORVATH,
Executive Committee of the Hun-
garian National Council.

To Explore Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I should like to include the following editorial from the Providence Journal of Friday, August 3, 1951:

TO EXPLORE UNION

As supreme commander of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization forces in Europe, General Eisenhower occupies a position which is unique in the military history of the world. He was chosen by the common consent of a dozen governments. But because the NATO countries are bound together only in an alliance of sovereign states, Eisenhower is a military commander with no effective civil authority above him.

A less sensitive democratic and more ambitious man might relish this circumstance and seek to take advantage of it. General Eisenhower on the contrary, earnestly desires improvements in the NATO machinery which will place his own military command in proper subordination to centralized civil authority effectively representing the nations he is serving.

This arresting picture of the problems behind the NATO command and of General Eisenhower's personal reaction to them was painted recently before a congressional committee by the long-time American prophet of Atlantic union, Clarence Streit, portions of whose statements are reprinted elsewhere on this page. Mr. Streit, who testified in support of the pending mutual-security bill, was newly returned from Europe, where he had talked at length with General Eisenhower.

The MacArthur controversy, Mr. Streit reported, struck Europeans as "a sharp object lesson in the difficulty of keeping the military subordinate to the civil by diplomacy." No one was more sensitive to this reaction than General Eisenhower, who thereafter "leaned backward to confine himself to the purely military side of his office."

But this wise and necessary reaction on the part of the NATO commander aggravated the practical difficulties inherent in his position as the military agent of 12 sovereign governments. Responsible to a council on which each nation has an equal voice and which has power only to recommend action, General Eisenhower is like a man in a boat in the Atlantic Ocean without oars and without any helm.

What the NATO commander needs, obviously, is a more cohesive and effective political authority above him. Progress is being made in that direction. The recent tentative agreement of five NATO countries to form a common army with centralized ministries of defense and finance is a long step forward.

The question is whether such plans go far enough. Great Britain and the Scandinavian countries would not participate in the common army plan. Neither would the United States. Yet Eisenhower serves them all.

Mr. Streit's answer is Atlantic Union—organic consolidation of all of the NATO countries along federal lines. But he recognizes that no such revolutionary move can come overnight. All he asks is that Congress pass the long-pending resolution for an international conference to explore the possibilities of union.

This would commit no one to anything. The sole object would be to examine the possibilities, the advantages—and the limitations—of federal union. We agree with Mr. Streit that the time is ripe for such a study.

Contribution of Labor to American Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 24, 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the text of the address which I delivered before the annual convention of the West Virginia State Federation of Labor at Huntington, W. Va., on August 23, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It always gives me a great deal of pleasure to speak to the American Federation of Labor. We are old friends, and it is always good to be with old friends.

You are old friends of whom I am very proud. I know of no group of people in this land of ours, either collectively or individually, who are stronger backers of our Nation, our Government, and our way of life than American trade-unionists.

You have proven your devotion over the years. You have proven it in good times and you have proven it in times of strife. You have been the backbone of democracy in the United States.

I know you have. You know you have. A grateful Nation knows you have.

You have proven your belief in this land of ours and its institutions many times. You have proven it especially in your never-ceasing fight against communism and nazism and every form of dictatorship over the minds and the bodies of men.

It was the production of American labor which made it possible for us to throw back and defeat the aggressive hordes of Hitler.

It is the production of American labor which is making it possible for us to hold and strengthen the free world against communism.

American labor has been in the fight against communism for a long time.

You know the causes of communism and the cures. You know that the way to fight it is not by undermining American institutions and freedoms. You know that the way

to fight it is not by making wild and irresponsible charges.

You, who have been in the fight a long time, know that communism breeds in the slums of cities. It breeds in the bitterness of approaching hunger. It grows like a mushroom on the dunghill of cheap labor, in the neglect of basic human rights.

The causes of communism have long been well known to organized labor, and organized labor has long known how to act effectively against the dangers of communism.

Labor is fighting communism at the ground level, and it is slugging communism where it hurts.

Organized labor has led in the fight for better working conditions, better housing, health insurance, social security, and other benefits for all citizens.

It is my firm belief that organized labor in the United States has done more than any other single group to defeat communism in this country and throughout the free world. The trade-unions of the United States have been active in bolstering the struggling anti-Communist unions in Europe. Representatives of your great federation have gone into Western Europe and have beaten the Communists at every turn.

The A. F. of L. is actively engaged in protecting the freedom of workers everywhere, in strengthening their bargaining power, in helping workers win a higher standard of living and a place of dignity in the community—in other words, in helping workers of the free world withstand the blandishments of communism.

As part of our fight against this menace to world freedom, your Government and many private groups are bringing to this country workers from other lands in the free world. Each of you can do a great deal to make these visitors to our land feel at home and to show them why we prize democracy so highly. By helping these visitors see the real America and the American way of life as you live it, each of you can take a more active part in the fight for survival. You can teach freedom. You can teach democracy.

Take these visitors into your homes and into your union meetings. Arrange for them to sit in on your grievance and collective-bargaining sessions. Take them to civic functions such as PTA meetings. Show them local government and politics in action. That is the way to teach freedom. That is the way to teach democracy. Teach it by helping our foreign guests live it as you do, day by day.

We all know that there is also the material side of our fight for peace. On this front American labor has made its greatest contribution to protect this land we love. Labor has fought incessantly for peace but when the chips have been down and our national integrity and security has been threatened the laboring man and woman have stood shoulder to shoulder with our soldiers in the field.

Hitler misjudged you on this score. Even while Fortress Europe crumbled around his head he considered democracy weak and those of us who believed in its principles soft. Democracy is not weak. The American people are not soft. American labor proved this in World War II.

While our Army, Navy, Marines, and Air Force chalked up victory after victory over the "supermen" American labor won battle after battle on the production line. American workers are the unsung and unbemedaled heroes of our victory over the Axis Powers, and no one should forget it.

I could tell many stories of the sacrifices made by the men and women who kept the supplies rolling to our men in the front lines, but time is limited. There is, however, one little-known incident—one battle of production—which stands out as a shining example

of what free labor in a free land can and will do to protect their freedom. It is a story of a battle in a far-away land that was won primarily by the hands of American workmen. It is the story of a job that "couldn't be done."

In early 1942 the wily fox of the desert, German Field Marshal Rommel, chopped the British African armored forces to bits. When the dust of battle had settled only 70 tanks remained out of an original force of 300. Tobruk had fallen and the Afrika Korps stood before El Alamein. Hitler was elated. "Cairo will be ours within a month," he declared. But he failed to comprehend what American labor could do.

Franklin Roosevelt, however, knew the working man and woman. He knew what industry in our country could produce; he knew that it would produce "Hold on. Fight for time. Count on us," was his solemn pledge.

In early 1942, if you will remember, our own war production was in its infancy. It was barely beginning to roll. But this did not lessen President Roosevelt's belief in the abilities of America's labor force. He put the problem in the hands of American industry—labor and management.

Local union and management leaders in the principal Sherman tank plant were called in and the situation explained. This was a fight for existence. For the next 9 days and nights, through holiday and weekend without a let-up, the battle against time went on. Every worker spent at least 14 hours a day on the job—many of them worked 20 hours straight without rest. Naturally, fatigue became terrific. The injury rate rose above the normal percent of casualties suffered in battle. But not one worker asked to be relieved. Not one worker let his country down. The original plan had called for 250 tanks, the quota was doubled. Along with this, extra guns, howitzers, tank destroyers, and ammunition were produced. These were speeded to the weary soldiers of the British Eighth Army in North Africa.

For six long weeks of bitter desert fighting the tanks, produced by American labor on that job that couldn't be done, spearheaded the attack. The guns produced by the men and women in our factories stopped the Germans in their tracks. And for the first time turned a German victory into defeat; making the beginning of the end of Hitler's Third Reich.

This was only one job. This is only one example of the ability and productivity of American labor. It is only one example of the great debt that is owed by this Nation to its vast labor force. It is only one example of how labor won the battle of production during the last war. But it is a vivid example, and one that will long be remembered.

Again today the American worker is being called upon to help protect our freedom. And again today they have accepted the challenge. They are accomplishing the undreamed-of task of producing for a dual economy; one for the needs of the civilian population, to keep their standard of living high and raise it still further, and the other to keep our defenses strong and to further strengthen them. This is a tough job but a job labor can do.

Since we have drawn the line in Korea against Communist aggression, our defense activity has grown by leaps and bounds. It is going to grow still further. We are going to have a three-and-a-half-million-man standing army.

We are going to produce 50,000 airplanes, 35,000 tanks and over 200,000 jet engines a year. And we are going to do this without seriously disrupting our civilian economy. It will be hard work. It will mean sacrifices. But we will do it.

To keep our defense machinery supplied and to meet civilian demands our steel production is being raised. Within 18 months

we are going to produce 118,000,000 tons of steel a year. Russian slave labor, of greater number than our own work force, has been able to produce the staggering total of 27,000,000 tons of this vital defense material per year.

We are going to raise our electrical output 30 percent and double our production of aluminum. We are going to step up our production in all other fields.

We are serving notice now to all would-be world conquerors that America is ready, her people are ready, and her industry is ready. We are ready to sacrifice if we must, to fight if need be, and to give of our material wealth and our very lives to keep freedom alive. The Hitlers of the past have disbelieved us and they have perished along with their ideologies. Let the Hitlers of the present take notice that we are a united people and the world's most powerful nation. Let them take note that we seek peace at all times. But let them fully understand that we will never give up one iota of freedom to maintain this peace.

Now our dual economy is going to produce many problems but problems that we can and must solve.

One of these problems is manpower. To maintain our national security and to continue our economic stability we are going to have to use our human resources to a maximum extent. This involves providing manpower for the Armed Forces in sufficient numbers and with the mental, physical, and occupational qualifications necessary to maintain a strong fighting machine. It also means providing manpower for producing the materials and services necessary to support the Armed Forces, to meet our commitments of aid to other free nations, and to support the civilian economy.

To meet these requirements there are certain definite things that we all are going to have to do; certain things that organized labor can do.

We are going to have to constantly increase our manpower potential through the further training of workers. We can do that through increased apprenticeship programs and additional training and education of workers already on the job and those who will enter industry for the first time.

American labor and management have done a marvelous job in the mutual operation of apprenticeship programs to provide more skilled workers for the job ahead. The results are easy to see. These programs have produced the best craftsmen in the world. Craftsmen of the type we need to keep strong. We can all do more though to promote this type of training. We need all the skilled workers we can get and if we are to have them when we need them we have to start training them now—not when it may be too late. I know that labor will keep up its support of apprenticeship and will increase this support as our defense effort swings into higher gear.

To meet our manpower requirements we not only are going to have to train new workers and improve the skills of those presently employed, we are going to have to protect the workers while they are on the job. It doesn't do much good to train a man or woman and then have them injured or killed on the job. That is just plain waste. Waste we can ill afford.

For years, organized labor has taken the lead in the development of safety devices and standards. It has worked unceasingly for more safety legislation and has encouraged the growth of safety-mindedness on the part of employers. As time goes on and production increases, safety will become even more important. It is up to each of us, not the other guy, to practice safety.

When you speak of safety it always brings up the problem of those who have been injured on the job and are now physically

handicapped. In these unfortunate persons lies a vast source of manpower—manpower we need desperately to meet our defense production demands. We are going to have to make every effort to make room at the Nation's work benches for those persons who are capable of good work in spite of their physical impairments.

Of all the groups interested in employment of physically handicapped workers, none should have a more valid interest than those who labor in our plants and factories.

As has been proved many times, the laboring man has a great human compassion for all those in our vast army of physically handicapped people. But he has an even greater compassion for those men and women who must fight for a place in our labor force, despite their handicaps.

Because he works with his hands as well as his brains, the laboring man has a deep understanding of the fight of the physically handicapped to make and to hold for themselves a place in the productive and economic scheme of things.

The President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, a part of the United States Department of Labor, conducts, in cooperation with labor, management, and public and private agencies, educational and informational programs designed to bring about greater equality of opportunity in employment for the physically handicapped.

The program of the President's committee has the full support of the A. F. of L. President William Green has said

"The physically handicapped should be encouraged to serve where opportunity presents itself for them to do so, and labor and management should cooperate in helping to create work opportunities for handicapped individuals.

"It is the purpose and policy of the American Federation of Labor to cooperate in as full a measure as possible in the promotion and achievement of these worthy objectives."

Yes, to get the manpower we are going to need to keep our defense and economy strong, we are going to have to train workers and we are going to have to look to every source of workers.

We are going to build our defenses so strong that no one will dare threaten us. We are doing it now and will continue to do so. But we must realize that there are dangers to our welfare at home as well as abroad. We must guard against losing our standard of living even while we protect it.

In a dual economy that we are planning the needs of the military naturally must come first. That means that we are going to have fewer new automobiles, refrigerators, washing machines, television sets, and other civilian goods than we might have in normal times. It means that all of us are going to have money to spend but fewer things to buy. This condition is the first step to inflation.

To win against our enemies we are going to have to stabilize our economy as well as build our defenses. We are going to have to win on the home front before we can hope to win elsewhere. American labor knows as all citizens know that the home front fight is a bitter one. The forces of the special interests are well organized. They are attempting, and have been somewhat successful, to lull the American people to sleep with their cry of the "voluntary way being the American way." By this I suppose they mean that you and I should voluntarily accept an inflationary condition so that they can profit. Well, we won't do it.

We have seen how this voluntary way works. We have seen how the special interests have voluntarily helped themselves at the expense of the rest of the Nation. We have seen what voluntary means when we

try to buy meat for our families. It means we can voluntarily do without or pay the outrageous prices set by the special interests.

Have any of you ever received anything voluntarily from these special interests; either fairer wages, shorter hours, better working conditions, or anything? Of course you haven't and you won't. These special interests, and all of you know who I mean, are going to have to be controlled now as in the past.

The new National Production Act shows what happens when special interests are at work. Oh, they helped pass an act all right. But it was an act designed to help them and not you. The President tried to strengthen the old defense production law, and I tried to strengthen it, to give some measure of protection to all the people, to stop inflation, and to see that everyone received a fair share of the national production.

The reactionary spokesmen for the special interests that are in Congress ignored the advice of the President, his top economic advisors, and even the clear thinking members of their own group, and wrote a bill which protects no one but themselves.

It is a bill that eventually will wreck price and wage controls. It will raise ceiling prices for the manufacturer, the wholesaler, and the retailer. It prohibits the Government from reducing the price of beef to a point where we can all have a steak now and then, and it makes effective roll-backs of other commodities practically impossible.

This bill heralds the return of black markets, meatless meals, high prices, lagging wages, and the terrible deprivation and frightful damage of a renewed inflation.

None of us will have protection against the exploitation of the special interests unless Congress repairs the damage done by the new Defense Act. I fought its passage and will fight for its revision. The President fought for a strong controls bill, one that would protect us and our families. He signed the present one reluctantly.

The special interests in their "voluntary" way are willing to let the whole defense program fall apart to achieve their ends. They held up the emasculated defense production bill until the last minute and then presented the President with the choice of accepting it, for the time being, as it was, or letting the old law expire with resulting chaos and confusion.

The President had no choice, he signed this special-interest-conceived bill, but he urged the Congress to revise and strengthen the new law, point by point, to give our Government the tools it needs to fight inflation and build our defenses.

I am going to continue to fight for a law that will protect all of the people of this Nation from exploitation. I am going to continue to fight for a law that will protect you and your families from the dangers at home as well as those abroad.

I ask you to join me in this fight.

American Foreign Policy in the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 24, 1951

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject American Foreign Policy in the Far East, delivered by me on August 17, 1951, at Chautauqua, N. Y.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it is a privilege to come here once again and to discuss the subject, American Foreign Policy in the Far East. If this same topic had been assigned prior to the outbreak of hostilities in Korea in June of last year, I would have suggested that a question mark would have been necessary at the end of the speaking assignment. I doubt if there were any persons in the executive branch of the Government who could have given a clear cut and satisfactory explanation of what our foreign policy in the Far East was at that time. Certainly a Member of the minority party could hardly have been expected to accept such a speaking assignment.

For a period of more than 50 years our foreign policy with relation to China had been fairly clear and consistent through both Republican and Democratic administrations. Its basic conception was to maintain an independent China and to resist, by all diplomatic means available, various efforts to encroach upon or destroy the sovereignty of the people of China over their own land.

Despite the efforts of some to paint us as having imperialistic ambitions in Asia, the facts speak for themselves and clearly show that the contrary is true.

As a result of the Spanish-American War, we had rather unexpectedly and reluctantly come into a position of responsibility in the Philippines. Our efforts during the next four decades were directed toward preparing the people of those islands to take over the responsibility of government for themselves, looking toward the creation of the Philippine Republic which has now taken its place among the free nations of the world. Our Nation had played a part in the opening of Japan to trade and commerce with the west and the average American viewed with a mixture of interest, admiration, and alarm the great military and economic progress that nation made in a relatively short time.

In 1904-5 it came as a surprise to many people that the Japanese naval and military forces could win such notable victories over imperial Russia. Through the good offices of President Theodore Roosevelt the Treaty of Portsmouth was negotiated and signed in 1905. To prevent an aggressive Japan from extending its domination from Manchuria southward, the United States in 1941 risked and ultimately became involved in World War II.

The rapid advance of the Japanese forces for a time isolated us from our historic friend and ally, China, and forced our withdrawal from the Philippines, to whose defense we had pledged ourselves and from other island bases in the far Pacific. During the entire period of the war, and up until the time of the Yalta Conference in February of 1945, we had a policy in the Far East, which was generally understood and, I believe, generally approved.

That policy was to resist overt aggression, to win a victory over the aggressor, to restore to the Republic of China and to the Republic of the Philippines the territory which had been taken from them by the aggressor and to restore peace to that important area of the world.

The sacrifices made by many people in many lands was certainly not for the purpose of substituting a Communist aggressor in place of a Japanese one. Yet, the record is clear that the agreement made at Yalta played an important part in the extension of Soviet power in Asia and the ability of international communism to win a great victory in continental China. History will have a hard time justifying an agreement made without the knowledge or consent of the American people or of the American Con-

gress, which at the expense and without the knowledge of our historic friend and ally China, gave rights and areas which belonged to them, to the Soviet Union.

From that time until the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, it was most difficult to know just what our far eastern policy was and what was motivating the action and inaction which has had such a catastrophic impact.

Our diplomats lost what our fighting men had won. A friend who had fought the aggression of Japan for 6 years was sacrificed to one which engaged in the war in the Far East for 6 days.

In the Philippines we set out to help rehabilitate their war-torn economy and to enable their government to once again take its place among the free nations of the world.

In Japan, thanks to the leadership, vision and capacity of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, a nation whose inhabitants had been our enemies, were being reconstituted into our friends. While this was going on in two important far eastern island nations, China the key to the future of all of Asia was going down the drain of communism.

Exactly contrary to the position we were taking in Europe, where we suggested that governments not form a coalition with the Communists, we were urging the Republic of China to take Communists into their government. The Chinese have a saying that "you can't have coalition with a tiger unless you are inside the tiger." For this reason they resisted both our suggestions and our pressures to form a coalition with the Communists. When they refused, our Government placed an embargo for a period of about 8 months against any arms and ammunition to the legally constituted Government of the Republic of China. During that same period of time the Soviet Union in Manchuria, as a part of the Yalta agreement, turned over captured Japanese arms and equipment to the Chinese Communists in large quantities. This, I believe, was the turning point in the Chinese civil war.

The Soviet Union openly and loyally gave moral and military support to the Communist forces of Mao-tse Tung.

Our Government followed a vacillating policy of giving aid but refusing to give the type of supervision and support to the legal Government of China which they quite willingly gave to the legal Government of Greece. Our policy seemed to have been one of "scuttle and run" as far as China was concerned. This tragic phase reached its culmination in a series of acts by the executive branch of our Government. The Chinese white paper issued on August 1, 1949, was a devastating blow aimed at a prostrate friend and was meant, I fully believe, to pave the way for a recognition of the Chinese Communist regime after the ice had been broken by India and Great Britain. On January 5, 1950, the President of the United States in a public declaration made it clear that the Government of the Republic of China, which by then had withdrawn to the island of Formosa, could no longer expect to receive any military aid from this country and on January 12, 1950, in his speech before the National Press Club, Secretary Acheson made it clear that while we would fight to defend Japan or the Philippines against aggression, that both the Republic of Korea and the island of Formosa were outside our line of defense or responsibility.

The men in the Kremlin and in Peking must have interpreted these signs as reasonable assurances that they could consolidate their victory in China and win a cheap victory in Korea without too great a risk.

Fortunately under our form of government neither the opposition party nor the press is under government control.

The issuance of the China White Paper being such a one-sided presentation was challenge in and out of Congress. The

scuttle and run policy met resistance throughout the Nation, in Congress, in the press, and in the Defense Establishment.

On December 28, 1949, in order to stem the growing criticism the State Department issued one of the most remarkable confidential documents ever issued by a responsible agency of the Government of the United States. With the technics one would expect of a totalitarian nation, they set forth a line of propaganda which was contrary to the advice of the responsible defense authorities of this Nation and misrepresented the facts as to the importance of Formosa to the strategic defense of this Nation.

When they were caught at this deception, they resisted for a period of 18 months the full facts from being revealed to the Congress or the country and it was not until the Joint Committee on Armed Services and Foreign Relations, by a vote of 15 to 9 in June of this year insisted on the memorandum being published, that the full facts and the extension of the deception was known to the Congress and the country.

Despite warnings from responsible officials in the Far East and from those who had been there and returned, the administration continued its fatal Chinese policy until overt aggression broke out in Korea on June 25 of last year.

As a result of the bitter experiences of the Korean war, the criticism of the opposition party and the clear-cut testimony of the responsible defense chiefs of this Nation at the hearings growing out of the MacArthur removal, steps have been taken which may salvage to some extent the damage done in that area of the world.

As a result of the Japanese Peace Treaty Conference in San Francisco, we should have despite the prospects of a Soviet filibuster, a Japanese peace treaty sometime during the month of September of this year.

We have embarked upon a clear policy of giving both economic and military aid to the Republic of China on Formosa for the purpose of keeping that important strategic island out of unfriendly hands and its 8,500,000 free people from being enslaved by communism.

We are giving arms aid to the non-Communist forces of southeast Asia in an effort to try to prevent that important area from falling to Communist domination.

Additional assistance is being given to the Government of the Philippines so that they may maintain law and order and improve their economic position. Technical assistance and economic aid is being given to other nations of Asia so that they may have an opportunity of helping themselves to improve their agriculture and industrial production for the benefit of their respective peoples.

But this program is at best a holding operation. It is part of the over-all global containment program which has its counterpart in Europe and the Middle East.

I believe that it will be most difficult to bring the operations against the Communists to a successful conclusion in Indochina as long as the Communists there have a common frontier with Communist China. It must be remembered that the civil war in Greece was not brought to a successful conclusion until access to Yugoslavia was denied to the Greek Communists. When they could no longer get supplies and reinforcements from across the border and retire there when necessary to strike again at some other part of the frontier, the forces of the Greek Government with the equipment and advice from the United States were able to successfully conclude the operation.

As long as all of continental China is in the hands of Communists allied with the Kremlin the ultimate odds of saving Asia are stacked against the free nations of the world.

Given a little more time to liquidate non-Communist elements and to consolidate their position on the mainland of China, the economic and military power of the Soviet Union plus China will ultimately be able to dominate all of Asia on the continent and perhaps the island nations of Japan, the Philippines, and Indonesia as well. This fact, as unwelcome as it may be to face, is one which no realistic person dare ignore when the challenge to human freedom is so great.

One only needs to look at the map in the light of world events to realize how different the world picture would be today if that area labeled "China" were under the control of a free and friendly government outside of the Communist orbit.

Many competent observers believe that the risk of Soviet aggression in Europe has grown in direct ratio to her success in protecting her Asiatic flank through a Communist China and a Communist North Korea.

There are indications that in our lifetime, Manchuria and North China may remain in the Soviet sphere. If indeed they are not ultimately incorporated in the Soviet Union. There is hope, however, that in South and Central China there may still be an opportunity for the non-Communist Chinese to throw off the yoke which binds them and to restore to a part of their country at least the dignity and freedom which only a free China can have.

There is a growing realization throughout the country, as well as in the legislative and executive branches of the Government, that the menace of aggressive communism is global in character and that it does not make sense to close the door to communism in Europe. If it is to be left wide open in Asia.

Unfortunately, up until the Communist aggression from North Korea against the Republic of Korea on June 25, 1950, there were too many of our people in and out of official life, who were either apathetic to the problems of Asia or who followed a deliberate policy discounting its importance despite a full realization of what was going on there.

Even after fighting between the North Korean aggressors and the United Nations' forces resisting aggression had taken place, with the obvious material and moral support of both Communist China and the Soviet Union, there was not a full appreciation of the nature of the conflict and of the Communist objectives. When the participation of the Chinese Communists became an established fact in October of last year, a fear psychosis seemed to grip many of our United Nations' associates, who demanded a "peace at any price" formula in order to bring the conflict to a halt.

Those who then and now favor a far eastern Munich, are willing to purchase a temporary respite by admitting Communist China to the United Nations and to turn Formosa over to the Communist regime.

They lose sight of the fact that if such proposals could be accomplished it would be a tremendous victory for aggressive Communists in Asia and throughout the world and would, I believe, assure the passage of most of the rest of Asia into the Communist orbit within 2 or 3 years at the most.

These short-sighted ones fail to recognize the Communist approach to the problem which is that the "road to Paris is through Peking."

The recent Soviet acceptance of the invitation to attend the San Francisco Japanese Peace Treaty Conference may be for the several purposes of disrupting the work of the conference, using it as a sounding board for Communist propaganda and to advance the cause of Communist China for United Nations membership and the possession of the strategic island of Formosa. I believe

that this pattern will be clearly revealed between now and the final signing of the treaty some weeks hence.

The American people are entitled to the full facts regarding the contributions made or offered in the collective security action to resist aggression in Korea.

Four days after the aggression started, the Government of the Republic of China, now on Formosa, offered the United Nations 33,000 troops.

This is the approximate number contributed by all of our United Nations' allies a year after the outbreak of hostilities.

Up to the present time, out of a United Nations' membership of 60, only 19 nations have sent or offered to send combat forces to Korea. The United States has supplied approximately 350,000 troops and the other nations who have troops in Korea have supplied approximately 10 percent of that number. This is, I submit, not a fair contribution of the burden of collective security.

There are some people who are under the impression that time is on the side of the free world. This is not necessarily so.

On VJ-day in 1945 there were less than 200,000,000 people behind the iron curtain. Today there are over 700,000,000 in the Soviet orbit.

When World War II ended, the United States had an Army in being of great strength and battle tested. Our Air Force was preeminent and had no equal in numbers or quality. Our Navy was the most powerful in the world. This Nation alone possessed the atomic weapon and the atomic production capacity.

Had we not been incumbered and compromised by the secret agreements of Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam, we had the opportunity to insist that human freedom would be reestablished in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, and all of Korea and that a nation which had been our ally such as China would be reestablished in full authority over all of its territory including Manchuria.

Now, less than 6 years later, this Nation is negotiating terms of a settlement at Kaesong with North Koreans and Chinese Communist volunteers, which leaves the North Koreans in possession of most of the territory they had before their aggression and leaves the Chinese Communist aggressor free to move elsewhere when he thinks the time is right.

Still outside of the Communist orbit in Asia are approximately another one-half billion people. These will remain under a constant threat of aggression, which if successful will destroy their rights and liberties, but with the precedent now established that if the aggressor tries and fails, he will be secure in his own territory to rehabilitate himself and try again at the time of his choice. It is a dangerous doctrine and one which may be costly to free men everywhere.

There is real doubt as to whether this Nation can for a period of 5 or 10 years carry the unprecedented burdens of its own Defense Establishment and assume a large part of the defense burdens of the rest of the free world without wrecking our economy and destroying the initiative and productivity which has made this Nation a great world power. Our present policies have made us almost the captive of Soviet strategy. They test us out with the Berlin blockade and we go to great expense and effort to offset. They engage in civil war in Greece and we move to the support of the Greek Government. They threaten in Turkey and in the Middle East and we send military and economic supplies to bolster the defenses of those countries. We become so preoccupied with Europe that China with her 450,000,000 people passes into the Soviet orbit and by so doing jeopardizes a

billion one hundred million people and the vast resources of all Asia.

Leaving the initiative to the Communists may, in the end, either bring them or their satellites military victory or destroy our economic system in the cold-war process. We must find an alternative that is workable and will have the support of our own people and those of the free world. It must be a means of enlisting the support of those who want freedom but find themselves temporarily behind the iron curtain.

I am convinced that if we rally the force of freedom throughout the world, we can find the means of gaining millions of allies who now are deep in Communist territory. Instead of international communism being able to disrupt the free nations of the world we should find the means of keeping the Communists so busy in their own backyard in Asia, Europe, and the Middle East, that strains and stresses will develop and will crack the fabric of communism and bring it crashing to the ground. In our own Nation Abraham Lincoln recognized that this Nation could not continue half slave and half free. In this age of the airplane and the atomic weapon it is doubtful if the world can remain half slave and half free.

It was Lincoln who said: "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history—the fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation. We, even we here have the power and bear the responsibility—in giving freedom to the slave we assure freedom to the free. We shall nobly save or we shall meanly lose this last best hope of earth."

If we use the same courage and common sense that motivated the men who sat in the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia, there is no domestic problem we cannot solve and there is no foreign foe we need fear.

Dispersion of Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 24, 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on industrial dispersion, by Jack Jonas, a member of the staff of the Washington Star, which was published in the Washington Sunday Star of August 19.

As I pointed out several days ago, Mr. President, the object of the industrial dispersion program is to avoid the creation of any new concentrations of industry anywhere in the country which would be so large as to form inviting targets for bombing attacks. I desire to emphasize that the program is not one of moving industries from their traditional locations to parts of the country which would presumably be safer from attack. Any part of the United States could be reached by a determined and resourceful enemy. Industrial dispersion can be accomplished by the careful spacing of new plants within an established industrial region just as it can be by moving them to less industrialized areas of the Nation. But it is a matter of plain common sense that great new concentrations of industry should be avoided.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNCLE SAM FINALLY IS GETTING SERIOUS ABOUT PROTECTING INDUSTRY

(By Jack Jonas)

For a long time now, everybody has agreed that if war brings enemy bombers over America, there should be some way to keep the bombs from destroying the Nation's industrial might, and that the best way to do this is to make the factories harder to hit.

Military men have stressed—and civil defense officials agree—that the application of the simple military tactic of spreading the targets over a broader area is the best solution. They call it "industrial dispersion."

Briefly, it amounts to this—build new factories on the outskirts of a city instead of close to downtown, where other busy plants are located. Spread the plants, as the population has spread in recent years, into the suburbs and beyond.

Properly executed, such a plan could even cut the A-bomb down to size as a military weapon.

But the military and civil defense people have bitten their fingernails in bitter frustration as they watched new plants being built next door to already-established industries, both of them ripe for the same bomb. This situation arose because, for an equally long time, nobody did much about putting the industrial dispersion policy into effect.

The military has warned again and again that it will be unable to keep the majority of enemy bombers from getting over their targets. They shouted the warning, and everybody yawned.

TEACHER'S PET

Now the Government finally intends to do more than just talk about spreading the country's industrial power over wider areas. The core of the National Security Resources Board's new policy is this—the industrialists who build new plants away from places where they are likely to be bombed are going to become, literally, "teacher's pet" when it comes to favors from the Government.

They will get the bulging defense contracts, the defense loans, the strategic raw materials, and the right to pay less in income taxes by writing off their factories over a period of 5 years instead of 20 or 25 years.

But the program goes much deeper than that. It includes a concentrated effort to get local businessmen and city and State officials in each area interested in handling the problem themselves with a minimum of Government interference. The Government has promised to set an example by building future Federal projects out of target areas.

The plan does not mean a gigantic reshuffling of industries already located in busy areas. Established industry is to stay put—nobody is going to pick up the sprawling automobile factories in the Detroit area and scatter them over Texas. Disruption of the present plants might weaken the very structure that is to be protected—the structure that makes this a mighty industrial Nation.

LONG MOVES NOT NECESSARY

Nor does it mean that future additions to basic centers of industry will be shifted to other areas of the country. The plants can locate in the same general market areas, where labor and the proper utilities are readily available. They would merely move from 10 to 20 miles away from the center of the target.

The key word in the program is "space"—space between the plants themselves, space between the congested areas which would naturally rise up around the new factories, space to make an enemy bombardier confused about where to drop his eggs.

To bring all this about, the Government will stress formation of local committees—the NSRB likens them to task forces—to make a thorough study of the problem in each community and decide what particular program of industrial dispersion would best suit that community.

When the study is completed, a survey, again under local direction would be made to find out what factory sites are available in the desired areas. Laws of the communities will be studied to see if any changes need to be made to facilitate the spreading of industry.

When all of these things have been done, the Government suggests a comprehensive report be made available to industry in the area, showing the plant owners and prospective plant owners where planned new plants can be built in keeping with national security.

But the Government recognizes that reports and studies are not enough. That is why the program of incentives has been drawn up to make new industries, and adjuncts to present industries, want to move into the country where they will be safe from atomic attack.

DISTANCE ISN'T EVERYTHING

The Government also has a warning—be sure that the sites selected follow the pattern of sound industrial location. They should be close to transportation, near the water supply and other utilities, out of flood areas—all of the basic considerations of plant location should be observed.

Although the Government says that, as a general policy, it isn't going to pick up an already established industry and set it down again hundreds of miles across the country, it was just such a move that led to the pattern which is to be followed in the future.

The military was instrumental in moving the Boeing Aircraft Corp B 47 plant from Seattle, Wash., to Wichita, Kans., because it was deemed to be vulnerable to air attack where it was located at Seattle.

The startled Seattle Chamber of Commerce set about to do something that would keep such things from happening in the future. They drew up a plan of industrial dispersion designating areas outside the city, but still near enough to be readily available to workers and utilities, at sites where factories would be relatively safe from attack.

When the Government began formulating its present industrial dispersal policy, it leaned heavily on the Seattle experience, and Seattle Chamber of Commerce experts helped write the fancy red, black, and green brochure which the Government has issued to explain its program.

PLENTY OF DIFFICULTIES

Putting the program over will not be a simple task. Opposition will come from the cities themselves, which will see a great loss in taxes if the big industries are located outside the city limits.

In many cities the plan will be difficult to implement. Utility routes—gas, electricity, and water—have followed the pattern of the centralized city. Few lines, particularly water, have extended much past the suburbs because they were not profitable investments.

Workers will grumble about traveling extra distances to work until housing developments can be constructed in the areas of the new plants. With defense production taking much of the critical materials, housing around the new plants will be slow in coming.

The larger plants will attract smaller industries to locate nearby, and this, coupled with the expected housing developments, might eventually cause them to evolve into a major bombing target. To counteract any such tendency the Government's program suggests plenty of space between the expected

new communities, perhaps developed as parks or recreation areas or kept as farm land.

NO MORE UNDERGROUND

The only alternative to dispersion seems to be building underground factories. This, of course, is a tremendously costly operation. Besides, areas away from the centralized industrial areas would have to be chosen as spots for underground factories, and, the experts say, if the sites are far from the central areas anyway, why not go ahead and build the plants on the surface?

Congress recognizes the importance of industrial dispersion. It has been critical of the failure so far to get along with the job. But Congress, at the same time, has bypassed proposed legislation for building five new major Government buildings on the fringe of Washington—indicating a lack of real interest in the program of dispersion as it applies to its own particular business.

Last week the Office of Defense Mobilization, to which the task of issuing certificates of necessity was transferred recently from the NSRB, announced a 60-day moratorium on their issuance, stating that a survey is needed of all the applications. Perhaps the survey will pursue the President's policy on industrial dispersion.

Some industries have been following the plan on their own, but they have been few and relatively small. Major department stores in the big cities, for instance, have followed with branch stores the move of the residents to the suburbs. It was good business. Now, the industries must follow, not because it will be particularly good for business but because it may save their lives.

Can We Organize Revolution Behind the Iron Curtain?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from New Leader for August 13, 1951:

CONVERSATION WITH AN MVD AGENT

(By Melvin J. Lasky)

BERLIN—I was not surprised, but still immensely pleased, to note on the day of my return here from New York a small item in the local press that another Communist bigwig had jumped off and was now a refugee in the free western sectors of Berlin. We met the next afternoon in a cool corner of a sidewalk cafe on the Kurfürstendamm. The face and figure were vaguely familiar from the dozens of blurred butcher-paper photographs in the Soviet and Communist press. A tall, powerfully built man, with pale, hollow cheeks and ceaselessly narrowing and burning eyes. A formidable fellow. He had only returned from Soviet Russia 2 years ago, a political confidant of the MVD, a protégé of General Gomez-Zalser (with Ulbricht the most seasoned of the Cominform chieftains in Germany), a whip of the Stalinist propaganda machine in the East. Such was Prof. Dr. Eduard Schulz, erstwhile head of the Soviet German School of Journalism in Leipzig, now another ex-Communist, but of the late class of 1951.

"Why make any pretense?" he said (with characteristic toughness). "One doesn't jump off for ideological reasons, because one

has become converted to the free way of life. Of course, there is hardly anybody who doesn't at one time or another play with the idea. Ah, the Golden West! But sooner or later, it becomes a matter of life and death. Last Friday night, I was faced with the decision. My bank account had been closed on higher orders. I suddenly couldn't get a car, several mysterious phone calls came through. It would be a day or so before they would close in. Why? Who knows? Factional intrigue among our German Communists, maybe—a mysterious order from Moscow—some crazy Jesuitical reaction to some unorthodoxy which somehow slipped across my lips. . . . Anyway, I had to take my chances—a year or two in an American hoosegow for being a big bad subversive, or a hell of a lifetime in Siberia. So here I am. . . .

Yes, there he was, sipping fine Löwenbrau, for the moment a little helpless and forlorn, without papers, money, or any notion of what would be done with him; but his "Bolshevik ingenuity" would carry him forward, and I didn't doubt it. I was only grateful that there weren't a thousand of these resourceful, cynical agitprop commissars in East Germany's service. Or perhaps there were.

"I can see that you're troubled," he observed perceptively. "You're still caught up in those old petty-bourgeois categories of sincerity and the like. Everybody is sincere and isn't sincere, everybody believes and doesn't believe, can't you comprehend that? There wasn't a man among us who wasn't insecure. Right up to the top of the German Politburo. Eisler is shaky. Paul Merker has been broken. Lex Ende, for some mysterious connection with Noel Field in West Berlin (which was supposed to run back to Rajk and Kostov), was sent to die in the uranium mines of Aue. Albert Norden, whom you must know from his Protestant magazine days in the United States, toys dully with the notion of taking off for somewhere. And do you think Ulbricht or even Zaisser are ever really at ease?"

"Everybody is suspect, and most everybody is spying on everybody else. The so-called operational section of the MVD has asked me a dozen times for information on the top boys themselves. Of course I told them. But sometimes, in the case of my good friends, we worked out a pretty smooth story beforehand to appease the Moscow inquisitors. There was always the risk that one of those good friends would tip off the MVD that everything wasn't on the up-and-up. Maybe that's what happened to me. Who knows?"

We sat and talked in the cafe for long hours until the sun had moved around and caught us in our corner. The man had much to tell. I had much to learn. I thought suddenly of that Washington narcotics commissioner who had pooh-poohed the polite antimarijuana and heroin educational campaign undertaken by good-willed doctors and nurses. "The only people of any value," he said, "were the former addicts themselves: They know the disease, they understand its lures, they can talk the language." The same goes for the Schulzes.

Only a week before, he had been part of the apparatus. Through little slips of the tongue, he still indicated his newness at being a victim and not an executioner. He spoke of the so-called concentration camps. He occasionally spoke of "we," meaning, of course, "they." Only a month ago, he had done a devilishly clever job of sucking in an American foreign correspondent, Al Cappon of the Associated Press staff in Berlin, to do a propaganda job for them. Cappon fell for a visit to Schulz' Institute in Leipzig. He came and, in good American fashion, saw for himself: "I was there." Of course, he did not know that the nice young student in short pants who came to act as

a guide was a secret-police agent shipped down from Berlin. Of course, he did not know that the western literature he saw in the hands of students in the library had been removed just a few minutes before from a locked closet and placed in the hands of three reliable party members. How could he know that every word he said was turned and twisted to make it appear that an American was telling the truth about the American imperialist invasion in Korea, the American plot to rearm Nazi Germany, the American blindness to the true progressive character of the people's democracies? The clever Schulz had done an expert job. Poor Cappon was yanked back to the States by the home office. . . .

"I'll concede this much to you people in the West," Schultz continued. "You've learned something about propaganda. You have almost caught up with Marx and Engels. But with propaganda alone, mein lieber, it can't be done. Organization is what counts, political organization. And there you've got a long way to go before you even catch up with Lenin. Around these parts, only somebody like Rainer Hildebrandt makes a dent on the top Russo-German leadership. Zaisser himself once spoke to me of that 'dangerous fellow Hildebrandt, who is trying to organize a Résistance again us. . . .'" Zaisser had organized the International Brigades in Spain; he knew the meaning of the word. All the rest is piddling, petty-bourgeois nonsense.

"And it just amazes me. What kind of a political show do you people run? Here in the East, you have every opportunity you could possibly wish for. A political party afraid of its own shadow. An economic system that doesn't work. An atmosphere loaded with tension, suspicion and instability. National conflicts that are explosive. And is it taken advantage of? Why, any of my 150 kids in the Leipzig Seminar could produce genuine revolutionary situations out of this stuff. Don't you people have any money? Or don't you care enough?"

We argued a little. I tried to explain the slow course of Western politics, the nature of democratic decisions. I pointed to the Presidential message to the peoples of Russia over the heads of the Kremlin leaders as evidence of the possibility that the Western world could muster the clan and the dynamism which goes with an historic movement of liberation.

"Yes, yes," he said, "but there is so little time, or so our friends in Moscow always used to remind us. You are all busy arming, and military strength naturally will impress Stalin. But they still have the political initiative, and I know of no leading Stalinist who has ever thought for even a single minute of anything but ultimate Soviet victory in all of Europe. And how easily they could be terrified into thinking of defeat. How? Well, if the party structure here and elsewhere in the east begins to crack under the load of factionalism, insecurity, and heresy. If the economic system, with a little careful and systematic prodding from our side, teeters on the verge of break-down. If resistance movements, agitating under the slogan of all-European liberation, begin to make themselves felt. If the eastern military force, including the Red army itself, becomes (once again with more than a little help from your side) shot through with discontent, subversion, and desertion.

"No, have no fear, I am not trying to convert you to Marxism-Leninism. But if Marx turned Hegel upside down, maybe it would pay you to turn Lenin on his head. I tell you that a revolution is going to be made in this world of ours in our time. Either they will make it, or you will have to make it. You are rich and prosperous, and they are poor. You are open-minded and even intelligent, and they are fanatical and very

often blind. But they are serious, my friend, and you are asleep. They want to change the world and you only want to cling to it. They will continue to think in terms of moving forward, until you force them to think in terms of moving back. . . ."

I played with the prospects for a moment—"the democratic uprising against Soviet totalitarianism"—"the liberation of Europe"—"the disintegration and overthrow of the MVD Empire." I paid for the beers, and we walked together a bit toward the Bahnhof Zoo. I disliked the man's arrogance. Wasn't he still a professional fanatic? I had long ago stopped making notes and was busy with furious mental resistance. How delusive was this rhetoric of the "masses in motion"? What could this pseudo-putschist tell us, we who had known the sans-culottes and Thomas Jefferson?

We said goodbye, this man Schulz and I. He said, with a characteristic scowl and squint (which I take to be standard Bolshevik equipment), that we would probably meet again—in a Siberian prisoner-of-war camp. . . .

"Or," were his parting words (which I suppose I will never forget), "or can you make a revolution?"

Senate Crime Investigating Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 24, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the days are running out on the life of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee. On August 31 this special committee, which began to function in May of 1950, will have retired into history with the filing of its final report.

Much has been accomplished by it, but a great deal more must still be done. It is for that reason that I have made numerous statements urging the Senate Commerce Committee to carry on our crime probe.

I have pointed out the tremendous numbers of areas in which the crime investigation could be carried on with great public benefits resulting. Among such areas deserving investigations are: crime in the District of Columbia; crime on the water front; crime resulting from gangster attempts to muscle into Chicago labor unions. There are numerous other fields for investigation, moreover.

At this time I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the Record the text of a statement along this line which I released to the press last Sunday. I also ask that an article I wrote for the current issue of Lookout magazine, published in Cincinnati, Ohio, be printed in the Appendix.

This particular article stresses the need for a higher standard of morality in Government and in private life. One of the ways by which to help achieve such higher standards is by intensification of our efforts against wrongdoers. Their continued immunity from prosecution serves to lower the morale of our Nation, particularly the morale of our Nation's youth.

I trust that the crusade against crime will not end on the mistaken assumption that all that possibly could be done has been done; on the contrary, a tremendous amount of work that could be done and should be done remains to be done in order to wipe out "the shame of our cities."

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY URGES COMMERCE COMMITTEE START LAYING PLANS TO CARRY CRIME PROBE ON AFTER SEPTEMBER 1

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, Wisconsin, member of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee, made public a letter delivered on Friday by messenger to Senator ED JOHNSON, chairman of the Commerce Committee, urging a continuation of the anticrime crusade.

"Speaking as an individual citizen and Senator," WILEY said in commenting on this letter, "I hope that not a single day will be lost between the ending of our Special Crime Committee on September 1 and the opening of a continuing probe by a Senate Interstate Commerce Subcommittee thereafter."

"The criminals and alleged criminals of America, particularly those who are right now in hiding, flagrantly violating our subpoenas or our attempt to serve subpoenas, should not be given so much as one moment's satisfaction in the mistaken belief that Congress' interest in crime has ended. New subpoenas by the Commerce Committee, or duly authorized subcommittee, should be issued."

The full text of WILEY's letter to Chairman JOHNSON reads as follows.

"RESOLUTION AUTHORIZED COMMERCE COMMITTEE TO CARRY ON"

"I am writing to you as an individual Senator to convey by most respectful suggestion that you and your associates on the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee kindly begin to consider as soon as your tremendously busy schedule will allow, your future procedure insofar as taking over the work of our Special Senate Crime Investigating Committee is concerned. As you know, the special committee goes out of business as of September 1, when we file our final report. Under the provisions of Senate Resolution 129, as amended and passed on April 24, 1951, our Crime Committee records are to be turned over to your committee which 'shall, under and by virtue of the authority of section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1936, continue the study and surveillance of the subject matter of this resolution'."

"I am sure that we will comment on this matter in our final report and that our distinguished chairman, Senator O'CONNOR, has been and will be in further touch with you along this line; but I thought that I might at this time submit some individual views for your kind review. I ask if you will please bear with me through these extended comments."

"I believe that the following facts might be considered by you and your colleagues:

"1. The Special Crime Committee has always been operating within a drastic time limitation, considering the vastness of its jurisdiction. We have attempted to do in the period since May 3, 1950, a job which State and local investigative agencies in the various States have had many years to do, but which many of them have not done adequately during all of that time. During the present 4-month extension of the Crime Committee, there has barely been sufficient time and resources to do more than try to liquidate the outstanding work of the previous year of the Crime Committee. We have not been able to initiate many new assignments which might very well be considered

by your standing committee nor to complete all of the liquidation of old assignments.

"DISTRICT, CHICAGO, WATER FRONT CRIME SHOULD BE FURTHER STUDIED"

"2. Among the assignments which I might possibly be taken by your committees are the following:

"(a) A complete probe of interstate angles of crime in the District of Columbia. I realize that the Senate and House District Committees have jurisdiction in this field, but I do think that in view of the fact that the District of Columbia does not have national representation nor even local government, the Congress has an especially heavy responsibility to it. I was against the Crime Committee attempting to look into District crime, because I knew that within the available period, we could not possibly have analyzed Chicago interstate crime, New York interstate crime, and crime all over the country, and also handle the District assignment. We have, however, showed some facts with regard to District numbers operations, and I do not feel that this probe should be dropped at this point. I do not feel, moreover, that the Congress should scatter its shots by a wide number of crime probes. I do think that if your Interstate Commerce Committee develops a trained investigative corps, it can avoid duplication with the Senate District Committee whose request for an independent probe is still pending, I understand, before the Rules Committee, which request might thereafter be shelved.

"(b) A second major phase worthy of investigation, it seems to me, is the incredibly odorous situation along the New York-New Jersey waterfront. We have never really gotten into the guts of that situation—where organized piracy exists on a scale that would make Captain Kidd green with envy, where all of the evils of narcotics traffic, labor-union violence, policy rackets, and other crimes abound.

"(c) A third situation worthy of investigation is the current gangster effort being made to invade the Teamsters Union in Chicago. I had hoped that our Senate Crime Committee might look into that situation because in recent times, there have been a series of outrageous bombings, beatings, and murders in Chicago teamster circles which have indicated that there is being attempted a repetition of the Capone mob muscling into unions of the 1920's.

"These are but a few phases which might well be explored. The crusade against crime has only begun; it cannot be allowed to die.

"FURTHER PROBE NOT NEEDED IN GAMBLING FIELD"

"I do not feel, of course (and I'm sure you would concur), that the Interstate Commerce Committee should continue piling evidence upon evidence in fields which we have already explored. Some of our recent work has been of a rather cumulative nature. I think that we have already made our point insofar as exposing organized gambling is concerned. This matter (except in the District) should now be left to the States and localities to handle.

"3. I realize what a tremendous jurisdiction your committee has, what a great variety of subjects come under your study. However, I do feel that under your very competent over-all chairmanship, a standing subcommittee might be appointed by your full committee. That subcommittee need only meet comparatively rarely, but it would have a trained body of investigators and could do a splendid job. For the small amount of money which it would cost, it could save untold millions for Uncle Sam in additional income-tax returns alone. Such a subcommittee should, of course, be given the same subpoena power and the same right (by Presidential direction) to secure income-tax returns, as we had.

"I particularly invite your attention—and I know you will agree, based upon your many years of able Senate service—on the necessity of the carefully trained corps of investigators which I have mentioned—men with seasoned judgment who would use with great discretion and care the tremendous powers which they would possess—so that the innocent (whether it be an innocent community, an innocent individual, an innocent corporation, or innocent associates), might not be harmed, while the guilty would not be spared.

"MEMBERS OF PRESENT COMMITTEE WOULD COOPERATE"

"4. It is indeed fortunate that three of the members of the Senate Crime Committee also serve on the Interstate Commerce Committee—our industrious chairman, Senator O'CONNOR, and my colleagues, Senators HUNT and TOBEY. All three of these splendid legislators have, I am sure, tremendously crowded workdays and numerous other assignments. But they would, I feel sure, be happy to constitute the nucleus for your future work. I am sure that insofar as my worthy colleague and former chairman, Senator KEFAUVER, and I are concerned, we two who serve on the Judiciary Committee, should be happy to cooperate to the greatest extent possible with your committee in the event you would like to call upon our services and perhaps the services of those members of our staffs who have assisted us on the probe.

"5. I realize that Members of the Senate are legislators, rather than crime investigators; but in these instances of crime, which I have cited above, and in others which might be mentioned, we have a paramount responsibility which I feel we must discharge.

"6. I want to point out further that the files of the Senate Crime Committee constitute literally treasures of information which can be used down through the years in supplementing the work of Federal, State, and local law-enforcement officers. It would be a pity if those files were simply to gather dust in some Senate attic.

"NATION'S TOP CRIMINALS STILL NOT REALLY HIT"

"7. We have seen that in the instances of the largest syndicates, the topmost individuals have generally remained immune from prosecution. We have still barely cracked these topmost individuals, men of the character of Frank Costello, Joe Adonis, etc. I do not feel that convicting any such top individuals of contempt of the Senate is enough (even if we should be successful in the contempt cases). On the contrary, I think that we ought to help lay the basis for conviction of these individuals of the substantive crimes of which we feel they are guilty.

"Speaking generally and without any specific individual in mind, I think that it is basically wrong for any American to feel complacent that top criminals are put away for, say, a year in prison, rather than the 20 or 30 years which they undoubtedly should get for the wide variety of crimes of which they are really guilty. We legislators cannot, of course, prosecute, but we can certainly help pave the way for prosecution.

"Our aim has never been to 'get' any individuals as such, because we are interested in legislation. But, if in the process, the criminal master minds can be exposed, it should certainly be done.

"We have learned that the threat of a Federal investigation has been enough to really worry the Nation's top criminals who invariably have been unafraid of State and local probes.

"I would not want, of course, a congressional committee or subcommittee to ever assume that it can take the place of any duly constituted Federal investigative agency, such as the great FBI, or the Secret Service,

or the Narcotics Bureau. I do think, however, that for some time to come, a subcommittee such as I am suggesting, could supplement the work of these and other investigative agencies.

"During the year and a half of our crime committee's work, we have operated without partisan politics and in virtually unbroken harmony. I am sure that that record could be duplicated on your own committee."

"TOP CRIMINALS ARE STARTING TO RESUME THEIR ACTIVITIES"

"Congress' job is definitely not done in this field, as I see it. Already, the pendulum of crime is starting in the swing back against the reform wave. There must be no let-up in our moral crusade, as I see it. You, with your profound spiritual sense can, I am sure, appreciate what I am saying."

"I realize, too, that this whole matter is something that you will want to take up with the full committee, but I do hope that this can be done at an early date. If there is a hiatus between the expiration of the special committee and the start of a later probe, I am afraid it would be most unfortunate and uneconomical, and so I am indeed hoping that there can be an unbroken continuity."

[From the Lookout of August 19, 1951]

UNITED STATES SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY, FROM WISCONSIN, A MEMBER OF THE SENATE CRIME INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE, VIEWS THE STAGGERING AMOUNT OF EVIDENCE THAT HAS BEEN UNEARTHED AND GIVES HIS OPINION OF THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CHRISTIAN IN PUBLIC LIFE¹

"Ultimately, success in the war against crime depends on the uplifting of standards of public and private morality, a rededication to basic spiritual values, which will entail righteous indignation over crime and corruption. To this end, the committee looks with confidence to the great force of religion and morality as applied in all phases of life and to sound education of the generations which follow."

These words are found on page 188 of a committee print of the third report of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee. For over 1 year, we members of the committee (popularly known as the Kefauver committee) have visited the length and breadth of this Nation, seeking out instances of crime and corruption. I personally have investigated in Washington, Kansas City, Las Vegas, Los Angeles, and some other cities. Following each of our disclosures, following all our legislative suggestions for reforms, the committee has come back to the basic point that it is upon religion that the ultimate solution of crime and corruption depends.

This is no new conclusion. As a matter of fact, this solution—man's return to God—ever has been available to us poor mortals. What miracles we could achieve if we but realized it and made use of the dynamic force for human happiness, for peace and prosperity, that is inherent in Christianity, if we but applied spiritual principles in every phase of our daily lives.

"Sound education," such as the Crime Committee recommended, means obviously more than teaching the ABC's to the Nation's young—more than stuffing heads with geography, chemistry, grammar, etc. Sound education involves basically the inculcation of moral principles on the minds of our Nation's youth.

Now, there can be few greater satisfactions than the joy of helping to mold the minds of youngsters along creative, constructive lines. My own dear wife for many years taught in Sunday school, as did other members of our family. Every moment devoted

to this task was in itself a blessing, a joy, a measure of personal fulfillment, a measure of service to God and to one's country. In Acts 5. 28, as my readers so well know, are related the words of Peter to the council: "We ought to obey God rather than men."

And so I salute the tens of thousands of Sunday-school teachers throughout the Nation for their obedience to our Lord, for their inspiring contribution to the service of God, and, yes, indeed, the service of their fellow men.

The more I have worked with the Crime Committee the more I have been convinced that if we did a better job of teaching our youngsters at mother's knee, in Sunday school, in grade school, high school, and institutions of higher learning, the dreadful problems that we face today would present themselves rarely. Problems of gambling as a \$20,000,000,000 industry, of criminals infiltrating into legitimate business, of wild teenage youngsters arrested on narcotics jags, of scandalous basketball sell-outs, of bloody gangland slayings, of corruption of public officials, of casinos running wide open, of thousands of homes broken because the breadwinners' pay envelopes have been used to put money down on horse races, could have been kept from developing had more emphasis been placed on the right kind of teaching.

You and I and all like-minded Americans must recognize that the best way to smash crime is to stop it before it starts. How? By spiritual education of the highest order.

But this conclusion on our part need not be based solely on revelations of the Senate Crime Committee. You and I know from the revelations of other Federal, State, and local investigating groups that the problem of public morality is one of the most challenging problems of our age, if not the most challenging.

You have read the stores of shady practices in connection with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. You have read of the mink-coat gifts, the deep-freezer gifts. You have read of other disclosures that indicate there has been a decay of men's spiritual core.

Well, then, I repeat, how are we to solve the problem? By a rededication to spiritual values, a personal and mass moral reinvigoration on the basic principles of the Gospel.

It is not enough for the Christian to worship his Creator in his church. There falls upon him the obligation to put his creed into his deed 7 days of the week, to let his light so shine before men that they may see his good works, and that they may emulate his example.

The Christian has an obligation, particularly in relation to his elective officials, to secure the finest and most honest public-spirited citizens available. Let him reject those individuals who, unlike Caesar's wife, are not above suspicion. Let him turn out from office those individuals who have associated with gamblers and racketeers. Let him turn out those lax law-enforcement officers—sheriffs, police chiefs, district attorneys—who have winked at instances of gambling and racketeering in their midst.

Are these tasks easy? Of course not. They are difficult. They take time, energy, often financial contributions for the cause of good government. But these things must be done if you and I are to be worthy of the description "Christian" in its broadest, most ethical, most spiritual meaning.

In the face of this challenge, I am not one of those who are discouraged or disheartened. To be sure, I cannot rejoice over the appalling conditions that we of the Crime Committee have found. But I can rejoice in the certain and sure knowledge that our people will be adequate to the task of solving this problem, and that the forces of God in our country will be in the van-

guard of those bent upon cleaning up that which we have exposed.

SENATOR WILEY STRESSES—

"It is upon religion that the ultimate solution of crime and corruption depends."

"Sound education involves, basically, the inculcation of more principles on the minds of our Nation's youth."

"If we did a better job of teaching our youngsters . . . the dreadful problems that we face today would present themselves rarely."

"You and I must recognize that the best way to smash crime is to stop it before it starts. How? By spiritual education of the highest order."

"The Christian has an obligation, particularly in relation to his elective officials, to secure the finest and most honest public-spirited citizens available."

"What miracles we could achieve if we but . . . made use of the dynamic force for human happiness, for peace, and prosperity that is inherent in Christianity."

Arrival in the United States of Greek Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 24, 1951

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on July 16, 32 men, women, and children from Greece reminded Americans of their precious freedom, which at times we take for granted. This freedom is a God-given right. But it must be constantly protected and fought for, or ruthless men, hungry for power, will destroy the democratic and free institutions that are the product of man's eternal desire for justice and decency.

The ancient Greeks were the first to affirm the essential dignity and worth of the individual. They established the philosophy of personal and intellectual freedom on which the great city-states were patterned. Indeed, it was Socrates who drank the hemlock poison and sacrificed his life for this principle. Then, under the statesmanship of such men as Themistocles and Pericles, these states led in the development of an artistic and intellectual flowering that has not been surpassed. The modern world is even yet drawing from ideas and accomplishments of the Greeks. The roots of contemporary science, mathematics, architecture, philosophy, sculpture, and literature are all buried deep in the history of Greece.

Since the beginning of the Second World War, the lot of Greece has been hard. In 1941 her small and determined army turned back the Italian invasion. Then with equal courage they fought the Nazis of Germany when they took up where Mussolini had failed. But the overwhelming numbers of the German armies were too much. For 3 years after that, the Nazis carried out one of the cruelest and most inhuman of all programs of national extermination against the people of Greece. Thousands were starved to death, other thousands were

¹ This article is for reading in connection with the Bible-school lesson for August 26, the Christian's Responsibility in Public Life.

executed, and many more died of the diseases which flourish on hunger and misery.

But despite these years of incredible hardship, the Greeks were ready to fight for liberty once more. In 2 years of unofficial but very real warfare against the Communists, they proved their mettle. And in Korea the Greek troops are proving themselves brave and efficient fighters once more.

Since 1948 over 2,600 Greeks have entered this country under the Displaced Persons Act. The American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, or AHEPA, has done splendid work in financing the transportation of many of these displaced persons and has helped them to find homes, jobs and happiness in this country.

On July 16, 32 of these displaced persons landed in America. But they did not land at Ellis Island. During their voyage, they expressed a desire to visit the Statue of Liberty—the symbol of freedom to all Americans and to millions throughout the world—before setting foot on American soil. A moving account of the gratitude and sincerity of these Greek immigrants appeared in the New York Times for Tuesday, July 17, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREEK DP'S BOW TO MISS LIBERTY—THIRTY-TWO WHO ASKED ARE PERMITTED TO FIRST SET FOOT ON UNITED STATES SOIL ON BEDLOES ISLAND

Two symbols of the American way of life were introduced yesterday to 32 Greek immigrants. One was the Statue of Liberty. The other was a hot dog.

Arriving at a Hoboken pier aboard the Greek liner *Nea Hellas*, the 26 men, 5 women, and a little girl made an unusual request. They remained aboard the vessel and asked that the first American soil they set foot on be Bedloes Island, on which stands the Statue of Liberty.

The American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, under whose sponsorship the displaced persons were brought here, checked with the Department of Immigration. The way was cleared and the immigrants were taken from the *Nea Hellas* onto a tugboat.

The tug's first stop was Bedloes Island. As the tug neared the island and the Great Lady became visible through the haze, a 22-year-old girl suddenly jumped up from the valise on which she was sitting.

CLASPS HANDS AS IF IN PRAYER

Her hands clasped together as if in prayer, the girl, Ourania Zaphiropoulou, whispered in Greek "Bless God. Be with us all the time."

Following the girl's lead, the others leaped to their feet and began waving and shouting. Then, giving way to an urge to make some noise to express their happiness, a group of the younger men began a gay and cheerful song whose title in English was "Sea, Wild Sea."

The first step on American soil was a solemn moment for each immigrant. They walked slowly, eyes staring, toward the steps leading to the statue. Then under Miss Liberty's shadow they knelt to receive a blessing from the Reverend Demetrios Makris, chancellor of the Greek Archdiocese of North and South America.

After an inspection of the statue, the immigrants met the second American symbol—the hot dog with mustard.

TAKES A BITE, AND SMILES

Stamatios Greveas, a former prisoner of the Nazis, took his first bite of a frankfurter, and a great smile broke across his face.

Among those who arrived were women whose husbands had been killed in the war and men whose homes had been burned down. Each was ready to tell a story of hardship and tragedy. Rather than that, though, they wanted to talk about their future in America.

The association has brought 650 displaced persons of Greek origin to the United States during the last 4 months. The immigrants' request to go to the Statue of Liberty before any place else was made to the association through Capt. Stamatios Polemis, skipper of the *Nea Hellas*.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this incident may at first seem small. But it is a tribute to the inherent strength of the free world. These displaced persons, who have kept alive the spirit of liberty through countless hardships, were brought to this country with the help of a group of public-spirited and unselfish Greek-Americans. The Displaced Persons Act, under which they were admitted, is a reaffirmation of America's willingness to provide a haven for the homeless tempest-tossed peoples of the Old World. And finally, contrary to all regulations, they were permitted to visit the Statue of Liberty without going first to Ellis Island. This fierce love of freedom, unselfish generosity, and understanding by the authorities of the desire and dignity of the individual combine to form an American story at its best.

AFL President Says Our Freedom is a Trust We Must Defend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Our Heritage. Freedom," written by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor for the August 1951 issue of the American Federationist, the official periodical of the American Federation of Labor:

OUR HERITAGE: FREEDOM

Members of the American Federation of Labor have every reason to be proud that they are citizens of a great Nation whose institutions are based on sound principles of human freedom, giving each and all the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. These rights are buttressed by constitutional guarantees of freedom—freedom to worship in accord with one's conscience, the right of association, the right to work or not to work, protection against arbitrary arrest and the right to trial jury.

Just how important these rights are we know as we learn the tragic facts of what happens to our citizens and the citizens of other free nations when they are unfortunate enough to incur the displeasure of the U. S. S. R. or its satellites. A human being

has no sacredness in their eyes, for to them a person has no higher purpose than to obey the orders of the appointed representatives of the Communist Party. Those who do not obey orders are sent to corrective work camps or liquidated. Citizens live in dread of the early morning knock on the door as a summons to answer prejudged charges. The more important persons are subjected to Communist procedures—drugs, et cetera—so that they sign confessions and declare their "guilt." In addition to those in political prisons, the numbers in the Kremlin's compulsory labor camps have been estimated as high as 15,000,000.

We have a free press which publishes the views of many groups so that we can get some kind of hearings, whereas in Communist states no one is free to disagree with party policy. One must follow the party line without deviation. In this country apprehension is roused should an individual be penalized for differing with official policy. Here we have freedom to express differing political views, to join political parties of our own choosing, and the right to secret ballot to assure real freedom in voting for representatives of our own choosing.

We have the right to organize in unions for the purpose of negotiating contracts determining the terms and conditions under which we work and we have that most precious right which distinguishes free men from slaves—the right to refuse to work under conditions which we believe to be unfair. Because this right is so basic, we use it with a feeling of deep responsibility for consequences to workers and to the community.

Such a way of life emphasizes the dignity of every human being by giving him the opportunity of determining his own life with responsibility for his decisions. This way of life resolves on the ability of each individual to distinguish right from wrong and to be aware of the effects of his acts and decisions on the rights of others.

Those who have had the privilege of living in a free country and enjoying a free way of life can never be content in any other environment. Freedom stimulates initiative and provides an opportunity for development of moral and spiritual forces which are the bulwark of our liberties.

Our freedom is a sacred heritage—a trust which we must defend against all who would take it from us.

In this hour of national peril to a strong nation, we need, as during the period of this country's birth, to echo the challenge of one of its founders: "Give me liberty or give me death." With a totalitarian enemy that discredits all that we believe there can be no compromise. Aggressive, atheistic materialism cannot coexist with Christian civilization.

What Is the Matter With Some of Our Preachers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN T. WOOD

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to append an article appearing in the Chicago Tribune of August 20, 1951, quoting the Rev. Carl D. Soule, a member of the peace commission of the Methodist Church, as urging the surrender of United States sovereignty to a world

government in which we will be hopelessly outnumbered and outvoted just as we are now in the United Nations.

If the Reverend Soule is correctly quoted, he is advocating the worst type of world despotism—the domination of the world by the have-not nations that have made a mess of their own governments—a world despotism that will be ruled by Stalin and his Asiatic stooges, which would proceed to drain away our wealth and drag our standard of living down to the world level.

None will deny that one of the principal objectives of the Kremlin is to discredit and destroy the Christian religion, and those who advocate the policies accredited to Reverend Soule are doing more to discredit the Christian religion than any other force in America, and are playing right into the hands of the Communists.

Internationalism, communism, and fascism are all forms of absolutism which can lead only to despotism. Show me an internationalist who would surrender the sovereignty of the United States to a world super-government and reduce the United States to the status of a mere world province, and I will show you a potential traitor to the United States. You will know them because they are the type who smear loyal Americans with such terms as "isolationism" and "McCarthyism." The article from the Tribune follows:

PASTOR URGES UNITED STATES SURRENDER OF SOVEREIGNTY—FAVORS WORLD STATE STRONGER THAN UN

Surrender of United States sovereignty to a world government was urged yesterday by the Rev. Carl D. Soule, a member of the world peace commission of the Methodist church. He spoke in the Evergreen Park Methodist Church, Ninety-fourth and Homan Avenue.

Observing that the Methodist church had helped to get the United States into the United Nations by a widespread letter-writing campaign, he added that "in our church there is strong support for the United Nations, and there are many who would like to go beyond the United Nations to something stronger."

CITES CONFERENCE STATEMENT

He then noted that the church's last general conference, in Boston in 1948, adopted a statement reaffirming its faith in the United Nations, but recognizing the necessity for a stronger form of organization—some type of world government whereby nations would surrender more of their sovereignty than they have yet done.

Taking for his subject, Three Pillars of Peace, the Reverend Mr. Soule said the spirit of nationalism is the great obstacle to those seeking international control.

"A Christian is not primarily an American," he said. "He is first of all a Christian. We should give greater attention to pronouncements made by international bodies, especially Christian bodies such as the World Council of Churches."

LAUDS AMSTERDAM DECLARATION

He mentioned with approval the action of the World Council of Churches at Amsterdam in 1948 in condemning both communism and capitalism with the statement that neither was capable of insuring justice and freedom in the world. The pronouncement said that capitalism had failed to meet human needs, and had concentrated on materialism. Later this was modified to condemn only "laissez faire" capitalism.

The Reverend Mr. Soule assailed the House Committee which reduced the size of the appropriation recommended by President Truman for the United Nations, and said that church leaders had bombarded the Senate with letters of protest, urging that the cut be restored.

The church is concerned, he said, that the Nation live up to all of its commitments. He praised the activities of the United Nations economic and social council and, particularly, its program of technical assistance to foreign nations.

Intensify Defense Program, William Green, AFL President, Urges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial written by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, which appeared in the August 1951 issue of the American Federationist, the official publication of the AFL.

DEFENSE IS IMPERATIVE

The men in the Kremlin are realists when they propose an end to loss of human lives and waste of quantities of munitions in fighting up and down the territory of Korea with no possibility of victory. They directed their representatives in the United Nations to propose a truce. This he did at the conclusion of a vicious diatribe against the member nations fighting in Korea to maintain the principles of the United Nations. Such a truce determines military adjustment. At the beginning of truce parleys the Communists tried to assume the position of hosts dealing with representatives of a conquered army. Clear conditions of equality were laid down by the United Nations negotiators as the basis for continuing negotiations. American citizens are grateful to Vice Admiral Joy and his associates for the way they have conducted business in our behalf.

We want an end to the stalemate in Korea in order to prepare for a show-down with the real enemy of human freedom. Unless Stalin's aggression is ended, there can be no peace for the world.

Our defense program should be expanded and defense production intensified regardless of what happens in Korea, for the security of our Nation is at stake. We need to go back over our experience in 1945, after VE- and VJ-days, when the slogan was raised to "get our boys home" and return to normal conditions. Hard-won victories of our armies were imperiled by hasty demobilization. Our diplomats—weakened by the crumbling of our armies and the Air Force, and our Navy put away in mothballs—made concession after concession until the fruits of victory earned by the sacrifice of human lives were quite dissipated.

Just as surely as a change in the Korean situation takes place, enemy agents within our borders will raise the slogan: "Stop building for defense." We must be unperturbed and ready to defeat their strategy and move steadily on to preparedness for any emergency.

Preparedness is the only policy the Kremlin will respect. Unless sure of conquest, the U. S. S. R. does not attack. But prepared-

ness is much more than the availability of troops amply equipped with fire-power and means of transportation and supplies to maintain them in action. It involves spiritual and moral preparedness—stamina to take the risks necessary to maintain our ideals. It requires clear thinking and decisive action by all citizens to keep themselves informed of their own interests and welfare so as to be able to detect and defeat the propaganda of enemy agents.

Congress has a major responsibility to legislate for defense purposes promptly and wisely. Defense is not a partisan issue and hence is not a proper field for maneuvering for party advantage. In non-Government fields organizations of employers and employees also have heavy responsibility, both for promoting defense work and for the detection and frustration of sabotage in defense production as well as in those relations where data and experience are available which would enable the enemy to benefit by our successes and be informed of our plans. Likewise, responsibility rests on those professions which contribute research and information to defense production and where treason is particularly fateful. High-ranking scientists and Communist spies and informers have stolen information and blueprints to enable Kremlin engineers to make the designs and patterns of guns and atom bombs, so that they lack only the know-how of production. Our own citizens should be alert to detect such spies and be on guard against sabotage of workers on the job.

Soviet timetables indicate their military will be ready for a test about 1953. Their transportation facilities are not complete in East Germany and Siberia, although integration into through lines has been effected in the satellite states. Transportation is essential to a show-down. Nor have long-distance, two-way bombers reached the production stage in the U. S. S. R. Even with respect to mobilized units ready for action, the balance is beginning to turn against the Kremlin. The Soviets intend to try to speed plans in the coming months. Time necessary to get patterns from drafting boards and into continuous supply for Soviet use require a much longer time for Soviet workers than for workers in the United States. This country has nothing to fear, provided we put all our energy into expediting defense production. Keep your mind free of the fear psychology that some writers promote.

American Navy Should Not Be Without a Cruiser "Brooklyn"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, with the sale of the cruiser *Brooklyn* by our Government to the Government of Chile our Navy no longer has a fighting ship honoring the great borough of Brooklyn. Our ever-alert borough president, the Honorable John Cashmore, has started a movement to correct this omission. As he so ably points out the patriotism of Brooklynites should be symbolized by giving the name "Brooklyn" to one of our fighting ships. He proudly points out the heroic services of Brooklynites in all our wars and particularly the fact that in World War II more than 320,000

Brooklyn men and women fought in defense of freedom and democracy.

I join with him and other members of the Brooklyn delegation in this worthy project.

The following editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of August 16, 1951, is most appropos:

AMERICAN NAVY SHOULD NOT BE WITHOUT A CRUISER "BROOKLYN"

Announcement that the Navy Department is planning to present the ship's bell of the United States cruiser *Brooklyn* to Brooklyn College recalls the fact that it was sold to Chile several months ago and no longer carries the American flag under which it distinguished itself in World War II.

It was a happy thought on the Navy's part to arrange to have this bell find a home in the community for which the stout old cruiser was named and at a public institution which bears the name "Brooklyn" and in which the borough takes just pride.

The incident, however, brings home to us the fact that there is now no American fighting ship that bears the name of this community. This should be remedied at the earliest possible moment. We suggest to the nine-man delegation in Congress from this borough that they act as a unit in urging that one of the next cruisers to be built be given the name "Brooklyn." According to naval custom, it is the cruisers that are named for cities and the battle-ships for States.

The name "Brooklyn" is a proud one in the American Navy. It was first borne by a 3,000-ton sloop of war, which saw active service throughout the Civil War, notably at New Orleans in 1862 when it was a part of the attacking fleet under Admiral Farragut. It was finally put out of commission in 1889. The second to bear the name was the light cruiser *Brooklyn* which was launched on December 2, 1896. She had a wonderful record in the Spanish-American War. At the Battle of Santiago she served as the flagship of Commodore, later Admiral, Schley, was hit 26 times, yet lost only one man killed, and two wounded. That was the engagement in which the Spanish fleet under Admiral Cervera was destroyed.

It was Schley's maneuvering of the *Brooklyn* on that occasion that brought about the famous controversy between Admirals Schley and Sampson. The *Brooklyn* was put out of commission in 1906, then sent to Boston as a receiving ship in 1914. Shortly afterward it was made the flagship of the Asiatic Fleet, largely, it was said, because of its comfortable living quarters for both the men and officers. During World War I it was sent on various diplomatic missions in the Far East and from her were directed the movements of our cruisers hunting German raiders in that part of the world. In 1917 she was on duty at Vladivostok. Finally in 1921 she was sold for junk.

The second cruiser *Brooklyn*, which is now in Chilean waters, was launched in the Brooklyn Navy Yard in 1936. From early 1942 until December 1944 she was in almost continuous active service, starting with the invasion of north Africa, where her guns destroyed a part of the French fleet at Dakar. She played a prominent part in the landings in Sicily, was in the Salerno invasion, was flagship of the first support group at Anzio and Nettuno. For 6 days, starting May 12, 1943, she pounded Italy from Cassino to Gaeta. Her 6-inch guns were also felt during the invasion of southern France. She was finally put in moth-ball storage at Philadelphia Navy Yard in 1946, where she remained until her sale.

Brooklynites will always regret that she is passing her later years under a foreign flag and with a different name. We feel sure that the sentiment for another American ship of war bearing the honored name will be general throughout the borough.

Cooperatives and the Income Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 24, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, there appeared in the August 1951 issue of the American Bar Association Journal an article entitled "Cooperatives and the Income Tax." It was written by Mr. Israel Packel, of Philadelphia.

The article throws timely and much-needed light on a subject into which entirely too much heat and confusion have been injected to permit its ready solution on the basis of the welfare of the country and the interests of agricultural cooperatives.

The editors of the American Bar Association Journal commented as follows in presenting the article:

Mr. Packel says that our income tax laws levy taxes not on the cost of doing business, but on the cost of doing business profitably. This raises a peculiar problem when the business enterprise upon which the tax is imposed is a cooperative, since the cooperative is often said to be a nonprofit organization. If the tax is levied only upon profits, the cooperative escapes the tax. The form of the enterprise should not result in different tax results, he argues. On the other hand, as the Government's need for money for defense increases, the exemptions which now are granted cooperatives are being reexamined and narrowed by the Congress. There is a danger, however, he says, that the effort to obtain equity might lead to an attempt to hit cooperative transactions with patrons of the enterprise—transactions that result in no profit to the cooperative, thus falling outside the traditional concept of income.

As an aid to a better understanding of the subject, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Bar Association Journal be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COOPERATIVES AND THE INCOME TAX: A PROBLEM OF ACHIEVING EQUALITY

(By Israel Packel, of the Pennsylvania bar (Philadelphia))

The increased cost of Government resulting from the clouds of all-out war is borne by individuals or by their economic enterprises. An increase in the rate of the income tax is one way of meeting the rising cost of the Federal Government. The elimination of exemptions is another way of coping with the problem and, therefore, Congress is appropriately reexamining the Topsy-like growth of exemption provisions relating to various types of cooperatives. A decade ago the writer urged such a legislative study.¹

The same demand for equality which calls for the elimination of unjustifiable exemptions, dictates that a tax which is imposed on profits should not tax cooperatives or any other organizations for that matter, on that which does not constitute profits. Thus, wholly aside from any question of the elimination of exemptions, it is important to determine the extent to which equality calls

for the application of income taxes to the economic activities of cooperatives.

The syllogism—Income tax is a cost of doing business, cooperatives are engaged in business and therefore cooperatives must pay income taxes—starts with a false premise. The income tax is not a cost of doing business; it is a cost of doing business profitably. The company which does \$100,000,000 worth of business pays no income tax if it has no profits. It may well be that under a sound system of taxation, the cost of government should be borne by economic enterprises on some basis in addition to that of profit. Until such a change is made in our tax system, however, it is not fair to single out cooperatives, assuming it could be done constitutionally, to make them pay an income tax on anything other than profits within the normal meaning of that word.

The in terrorem argument has been made some 18 years ago in England² and here in the past few months, that discrimination in favor of cooperatives "is bound to tend to drive the taxed organizations out of existence, leaving the state with no support from the organizations which are conducting much of the business activities in the state."³ This ignores the fact that if our economy ever approaches such a situation, there can always be a change in the system of taxation.

It does not truly help the analysis to pick on decisions⁴ or authorities⁵ referring to cooperative activity as nonprofit or to multiply decisions calling cooperatives merely agents or instrumentalities for their members.⁶ There is no gainsaying that the word "nonprofit" must be examined in the light of the purpose for which the word is used.⁷ Likewise equality of taxation is not to be escaped by getting courts to disregard corporate entities, which people set up for their economic advantage.

COOPERATIVE PROFITS ARE LIMITED IN NATURE

The real crux of the matter lies in the dual relationship of (1) cooperative and member and (2) cooperative and patron. They are not to be confused with each other, even though cooperatives generally deal with their own members. The cooperative and member relationship is comparable to that of the ordinary relationship between corporation and shareholder or between unincorporated association and owner except for (1) the democracy in control, whereby each member of a cooperative generally has one vote no matter what his capital interest may be and (2) the limitation on capital return, whereby each member of a cooperative gets at most a fixed maximum return which excludes what the economist calls entrepreneur profit. This limited return must be earned before it can be paid to members. Therefore, to the extent that the cooperative has receipts which it can use to pay such limited returns, it has profits within the meaning of the income tax law.

¹ 175 L. T. 427 (1933); c. Crichton, *Cooperative Societies and Income Tax*, vol. 38, *Law Quarterly Review*, p. 48 (1922).

² Magill & Merrill, *The Taxable Income of Cooperatives*, vol. 49, *Michigan Law Review*, pp. 167, 183 (1950).

³ E. g., the holding that the cooperative came within the definition of nonprofit operation under an exemption provision of the Interstate Commerce Commission Act, *United States v. Pacific Coast Wholesalers' Ass'n.* (338 U. S. 689 (1950)).

⁴ "The profit incentive is the mainspring of commerce, but is the antithesis of cooperation," Henderson, *Cooperative Marketing Associations*, vol. 23, *Columbia Law Review*, p. 91 (1923).

⁵ *Infra*, note 9.

⁶ For a variety of situations in which the courts have considered the nonprofit or profit character of cooperative enterprises, see Packel, *Law Cooperatives* (2d ed., 1947), p. 28.

⁷ Packel, *Cooperatives and the Income Tax*, vol. 90, *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, pp. 137, 155 (1949).

The limited return on capital of members refers to distribution to members. It in no way refers to increases in the growth of cooperative capital. The history of almost all successful cooperatives shows great increases in capital. Such growth, however, is by no means to be ascribed necessarily to income. Additional investments of capital or even contributed capital, whether it be a cooperative or any other association is not profit subject to income tax. Sometimes increases of capital are evidenced by the issue of share certificates or participation interests in capital, surplus or reserves and sometimes the increases are purely by way of contribution. Yet, in any event, the rule is clear that such capital increases do not constitute income.¹

This analysis of the cooperative and member relationship shows then that cooperatives do have taxable profits to the extent that their receipts can be used to pay a return on capital to the members. Conversely, capital received from members for which interests in capital or reserves are issued or for that matter capital contributed to the cooperative, does not constitute taxable income.

COOPERATIVE-PATRON RELATIONSHIP IS SIGNIFICANT FACTOR

The cooperative and patron relationship is the most significant factor in determining whether the bulk of the receipts of cooperatives is subject to income tax. A good number of lawyers, many of them representing cooperatives, seem to feel it necessary to say that the problem must be approached from the standpoint that the relationship is one of agency rather than of buyer and seller.² That seems unnecessary because, as the Supreme Court of the United States has pointed out, ownership and control "can have no different tax consequences when clothed in the garb of agency than when worn as a removable corporate veil."³ The Sales Act and traditional concepts of the common law in the light of all the facts as to the method of operation used by a particular cooperative would furnish the answer as to how the relationship is to be categorized. Then again, the underlying reason for labeling the category would have significance.

On careful analysis it would appear to make no difference as far as the income-tax question is concerned whether the transaction between the cooperative and the patron is called a sale or not. The relationship between the parties because of the very nature of cooperative dealing is that the transaction by means of patronage refunds is to be handled without entrepreneur or risk profit. "The patronage-dividend device has been woven into the warp and woof of the cooperative system."⁴ It makes no difference as to the true relationship, taxwise, whether A says to B, "I make you my agent to sell my wheat, you to receive your expenses and 5 percent of the selling price," or if he says, "I sell you my wheat for \$1,000 with the understanding that you will proceed to sell it and refund to me everything you receive over \$1,000, less your expenses and 5 percent of the selling price." Surely, there may be differences between the two situations as to the passage of title, risk of loss, rights of credi-

tors, and other legal consequences. But so far as profits when B sells, how can it be said that B's status is any different in these two situations?

It has been argued that the cooperative-and-patron relationship is one of self-dealing, and for that reason no agreement can be effective to allocate the economic benefit so as to mitigate the tax burden.⁵ It is true in cases of self-dealing, of which the parent-subsidiary and the family partnership are only a few examples, that mere agreements for the division of future profits are ineffective taxwise. These illustrations, however, are a far cry from the situation where the agreement is made with the very persons whose transactions purportedly produce the profits. Agreements between A and B as to the distribution of profits resulting from transactions with third persons are entirely different from agreements between A and B or A and all its customers with respect to the very transactions between them.

CONFUSION RESULTS FROM IGNORANCE OF TRUE NATURE OF COOPERATIVES

The confusion results from the failure to recognize the true nature of cooperative transactions with patrons. The charges made by a consumer of purchasing cooperative and the original payments made by a marketing cooperative are subject to the understanding that there will be patronage refunds in the form of cash, credits, or capital interests. That understanding by virtue of the nature of a cooperative is an essential part of the cooperative and patron relationship. It is to be distinguished from the cooperative and member relationship. The point was made effectively and briefly by Lord MacMillan, in the House of Lords, in *Inland Revenue Commissioners v. Ayrshire Association, Ltd.*⁶ which held that the English Finance Act of 1933 aimed to tax undistributed receipts of cooperatives had missed fire:

"It is not membership or nonmembership which determines immunity from or liability to tax, it is the nature of the transactions. If the transactions are of the nature of mutual insurance, the resultant surplus is not taxable whether the transactions are with members or nonmembers."

The patronage refund is an incident of carrying out the arrangement between the cooperative and the patron that the transaction should be conducted without entrepreneur profit. The farmer could receive for his products \$1,000 at time of delivery and \$200 in the form of a patronage refund, or \$800 followed by \$400, or \$1,200 with no patronage refund. In each one of the situations the net position of the cooperative or the farmer is the same. Likewise, the consumer cooperative which sells or orders for a patron a washing machine, is in no different situation so far as profits are concerned, whether it receives \$200 and refunds \$40, or receives \$180 and refunds \$20 or makes an initial charge of \$160.⁷

²Supra, note 3. Other writers have taken the position that the patronage refund system is effective so that the cooperatives are not subject to income tax thereon, O'Meara, *The Federal Income Tax in Relation to Consumer Cooperatives*, vol. 36, *Illinois Law Review*, p. 60 (1941); Paul, *The Justifiability of the Policy of Exempting Farmers' Marketing and Purchasing Cooperative Organizations from Federal Income Taxes*, vol. 29, *Minnesota Law Review*, p. 343 (1945).

³(1946) vol. 1, *AELR*, p. 637.

⁴For an interesting recent opinion of Judge Goodrich which indicates properly that there may be a difference in the method of operation so far as the fair trade laws are concerned, see *Sunbeam Corp. v. Civil Service Employees Coop. Assn.* (19 L. W. 2437 (3d Cir. 1951)).

An interesting English case decided in 1948,⁸ which apparently has received no attention on this side of the Atlantic, raises a very serious question. English and Scottish consumer cooperatives had joined together in the formation of an organization to raise tea in India. The Privy Council held that there could be profits because the nature of the transactions differed from cooperative insurance where the funds are received from, and paid out to, patrons. The case seems to be wrong, historically and analytically, because there is no justification for discrimination solely on a functional basis. What difference does it make whether the cooperative is dealing in insurance policies, spices, wheat, rural electrification, housing, or washing machines? The important thing is the nature of the transaction under which it furnishes the economic product or service. The weakness of the English case is made manifest by this response to the point that the actual distribution of patronage refunds would mean that there are no profits.

"Their Lordships are not concerned to discuss that suggestion in this appeal and express no opinion favorable or unfavorable on it."

It has been succinctly pointed out: "The patronage dividend is as much a part of the transaction as the price itself."⁹ If the patronage refund is an inherent part of the transaction, then whether or not paid in cash, it cannot be entrepreneur profit for the cooperative. Of course, the benefits received by the patron, unless he be a non-business consumer, must be reflected in the income tax returns of the patron.

MUTUAL AND NONMUTUAL DEALINGS MUST BE DISTINGUISHED

Some cooperatives for diverse reasons discriminate between members and nonmembers in their transactions. Manifestly, if the dealing with a nonmember is not on a mutual basis, the benefits of the transaction go to someone other than the patron. It might be contended that nonmutual dealings are part of a general understanding to reduce the costs of mutual dealings. Here, however, it is a valid contention that the arrangement is ineffective taxwise since it is an agreement to share profits in dealings with third persons. It is necessary, therefore, in such situations, to differentiate mutual and nonmutual dealings, and the income received from the latter transactions would be taxable.

Cooperatives are in nonmutual transactions at times with persons other than patrons. Thus, for example, in order to go into larger quarters a cooperative may sell its building and realize a large profit. Then again, marketing or purchasing cooperatives with large reserves may make temporary investments in bonds or other securities. Certainly the returns on such investments representing nonmutual transactions constitute taxable income. These instances, though, are rare and should not be used to draw general conclusions as to the taxability or non-taxability of cooperative receipts.

Under present law, nonexempt cooperatives are liable for income tax to the extent that their receipts are sufficient to permit the payment of a return on capital and to the extent that they have income from nonmutual dealings. Aside from the foregoing, they have no receipts which constitute income because their normal dealings with patrons are on a cooperative basis under which patronage refunds are made in the form of cash, evidences of indebtedness, or capital credits.

⁸*English & Scottish Joint Coop. Wholesale Society, Ltd. v. Assam Agricultural Income Tax Com'r* (1948) (2 *AELR* 395).

⁹*Midland Coop. Wholesale v. Ickes* (125 F. (2d) 618 (8th Cir. 1942)).

¹ *Garden Homes Co. v. Com'r.* (64 F. (2d) 593 (7th Cir. 1933)).

² See Report of the Committee on Classification and Terminology of the Division of Cooperative Corporations (1950) Proceedings of the Section of Corporation, Banking, and Business Law, p. 156 et seq. Also see Hanna, book review, vol. 3, *Journal of Legal Education*, p. 502 (1951).

³ *National Carbide Corp. v. Com'r* (336 U. S. 422, 430 (1949)).

⁴ *Bowles v. Inland Empire Dairy Assn.* (53 F. Supp. 210 (E. D. Wash. 1943)).

Congress, undoubtedly, will and should change the existing provisions of the law by clarifying and narrowing the scope of exemptions to cooperatives. Congress, however, should not depart from traditional concepts of income so as to attempt to hit cooperative transactions with patrons which are conducted without entrepreneur profit.

What Goes on During a War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD this article by George H. Todt published in the Highland Park News-Herald, of Los Angeles. A question he has raised has been one many people have wondered about, and that is, Just what goes on during a war? The military should answer such questions.

The article follows:

IN MY OPINION

(By George H. Todt)

One of the greatest—and most shocking—stories concerning World War II has never been fully told.

It relates to 47 massive Allied air raids sent against Frankfurt, Germany, from 1942 until 1945.

Over 50,000 heavy bombers dropped in excess of 100,000 tons of high explosives to turn the great city into a shambles almost as bad as Kassel.

Nearly everything of military significance was thoroughly clobbered and either badly damaged or destroyed.

I repeat "nearly everything."

But there was a fantastic exception made in the case of the much-bombed city of Frankfurt. You deserve to know what it was.

It was the vast I. G. Farben chemical works located at Höchst, a suburb of sizable proportions at the very edge of the city.

In addition to the mile-square factory area at Höchst, the I. G. Farben administrative buildings in the center of the town were left carefully untouched by bombs.

Not one was ever dropped on these two prime military targets, perhaps two of the most vital to the whole war effort of the entire Third Reich.

Why?

I talked to many people on the scene in 1945 and 1946, and this is what they told me:

"Destruction of the huge I. G. Farben chemical works at Höchst would have hastened German collapse by at least several months.

If this is true, then all the American boys—as well as those of other countries, too—who were slain the last few months of the war died unnecessarily.

Their people can today thank the genius for their deaths who decided it was more valuable to bomb the I. G. Farben workers' homes—thereby making them a few minutes late to work at the factory—instead of destroying the prime outlet of much-needed German chemicals at their production source.

Was this indeed simply madness?

Or was it something worse?

Were there certain parties or interests—here or abroad—who were so involved in I. G.

Farben financial manipulations that they did not desire the destruction of one of the greatest sources of Nazi power? A power used up until the last moment to bring death to sons of American mothers sent abroad to win a war as quickly as possible?

Our people deserve to know the answer to this now.

It cannot bring back any of the dead who were sacrificed needlessly. But it might prevent another tragedy of this sort happening to us again in the future.

Other important factory areas were smashed ruthlessly and with precision pinpoint efficiency by our bombers. On the very first try in most instances.

So why not the I. G. Farben works in Frankfurt—a town struck by 47 major raids involving a thousand or more bombers apiece in each attack?

The plants would have been easy enough to hit. They were out in the open of a vast square mile of concentrated industrial buildings.

They were plainly marked for all to see by 8 or 10 huge red brick chimneys which rose hundreds of feet into the air. They could be seen 50 miles away. It would have been impossible to miss them, except on purpose.

Our failure to bomb such targets would be comparable to an enemy air fleet smashing residential Grosse Point in Detroit, but forgetting about Willow Run and the Ford plant.

Or to devastate Beverly Hills and Hollywood in the Los Angeles area, thereby passing up the Lockheed, Douglas, Hughes, North American, and Northrop aviation factories located nearby.

Such an action would seem unthinkable to a reasoning person.

It is hard to see where it could make any sense to those who might have some honest questions to ask about this matter.

Perhaps some may ask at this point of our discussion: "How is it possible that some intrepid young pilot did not take it upon himself to break formation and bomb the I. G. Farben works anyway?"

In defense of all our airmen who took part in the Frankfurt actions, let me tell you of their predicament in regards to this very situation.

They are always under orders when on bombing missions.

When they start out, they are ordered to bomb primary target A. If they are unable to do so because of weather or other legitimate reasons, they may bomb alternate targets B or C. Usually there are not more than that.

Indiscriminate bombing is not allowed.

If unable to bomb his primary or alternate targets, a pilot has no further choice except to lug his bombs home.

He may be court-martialed if he does otherwise.

The airman who bombed the Krupp works on his own in World War I received such fare for his courageous and timely action.

So that is the reason why I believe none of our crews took it upon themselves to bomb the I. G. Farben works.

They were simply not ordered to do so.

Falling to receive such orders, it would have been illegal for them to even try—and with perhaps some dire results for their pains if they had succeeded.

Here is another queer angle to this I. G. Farben business.

Many other junior officers in Frankfurt became curious, as I did, as to why these installations were so miraculously spared by British and American airpower.

It became a great topic for conversation in the mess.

Lots of folks got quite upset about the whole thing. Many said they intended to write their Congressmen about it. Perhaps some really did. For a strange thing came to pass.

One day we learned that a new batch of Johnny-Come-Latelys had arrived in Frankfurt from Washington, D. C. It was said that they were a Treasury investigation team. The rumor spread that they were on hand to look into the stinkeroo concerning I. G. Farben.

This crowd had a lot of cute girl typists and clerks. They became frequent visitors at the Casino officers' mess in the evening. We did our level best to pump them for all we could learn.

They were frank enough to admit that our suspicions were really founded on some facts. In the words of one young lady I heard exclaim:

"This is the biggest scandal the country has ever had. When the report is made public, it will blow the lid off Washington."

However, the girls also indicated that they had been sworn to secrecy for the time being. Therefore, no detailed descriptions, if you please.

After this we all went back to sleep. The war was over, and we went home to mother. We scattered over the United States. Many of us waited patiently for the great report to come out. We were still curious to know who had worked this one.

However, a strange thing happened. The report has never been made public—if there was ever a report really made out in the first place.

Perhaps it was only a smoke screen set up to allay the outcry which was commencing to come out of Frankfurt in 1945-46.

I am not sure what we would find in any investigation of this matter if one were ever made.

I do not know the individuals, parties, interests, or countries which might become involved in a scandal of this type. That is, if there is really a scandal to be uncovered.

I do not care about these things, for the reason that I am a reporter, not a politician or a diplomat.

I believe in uncovering the truth and reporting it. Then let the chips fall where they may.

We are about 6 years late with a much-needed investigation of the I. G. Farben matter.

The American people deserve to know the answers. The blood of many fallen sons has earned for them the right to know why this German cartel was preserved at the price of additional and unnecessary American dead.

To whom was their filthy money more precious than the lives of Yankee soldiers, sailors, and airmen?

Let us try to learn the answer.

A Prayer by the Distinguished Chaplain for the Long Beach Navy Shipyard Employees Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent heretofore granted me, I am honored to bring to the attention of you and all my colleagues a prayer written by the chaplain of the Long Beach Navy Shipyard Employees Association, Max Horowitz, who is employed by the navy shipyard as a rigger. He is a veteran of World War I, is very

active in veterans' affairs, and is always anxious to help fellow members of the VFW. He is widely noted for his untiring services in behalf of the veterans being hospitalized in the military or veterans hospitals.

The prayer follows:

Almighty God, our Father, we seek Thy blessing and guidance on the deliberations of the Long Beach Naval Shipyard Employees Association. Grant that any actions taken be for the best interests of our employees and the Long Beach Naval Shipyard.

Bless those that are in authority over us that they may supervise in fairness to all.

Watch over our beloved America, O Lord, that she might always be the land of the free and the friend of the downtrodden.

Guide our President and his advisers and our legislators that, whatever they do, it might be for the good of all America.

May Thy protecting eye watch over our Armed Forces and that the enemies of our way of life be destroyed.

Finally, O God of Mercy, be with those of our number who suffer from bodily injuries and disease. May Thy healing power restore their bodies and release them from pain and suffering.

We ask this in Thy holy name. Amen.

PRAYER OF ADJOURNMENT

Our Father, as we are about to adjourn, we ask Thy blessing on each one till we meet again. Amen.

Mulhern Aims To Enforce Fair-Pay Act by Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, another of my constituents has been signally honored by being chosen Brooklyn's Man of the Week.

The article with reference to Thomas F. Mulhern, which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle Sunday, August 12, 1951, follows:

BROOKLYN'S MAN OF THE WEEK—MULHERN AIMS TO ENFORCE FAIR-PAY ACT BY EDUCATION

(By Victor Timoner)

With the United States Department of Labor appointment last week of Thomas F. Mulhern as a top administrator of the Fair Labor Standards Act in the New York-New Jersey region, the firm hand of an able executive took over the task of helping keep a floor under wages and a ceiling over hours in the biggest precinct of the Nation's labor market. And the added job of keeping tabs on ballooning post-thirty-eighth parallel pay envelopes for the Wage Stabilization Board holds no terrors for this placid, bespectacled Jack-of-all-trades.

A career Government employee and an avid reader of "heavy stuff," particularly tracts on economics, Mr. Mulhern sizes up his view on getting the world's work done with a single homely phrase, "I never believed in feeling sorry for myself."

Son of Irish immigrants and heir to his father's views on labor organization, acquired during 30 years as president of Local 59 of the Brewery Workers of America, one of the first employee groups to be formed in the

New York area, Mr. Mulhern was born in Brooklyn in 1893.

It was during his student days at St. Francis Prep that he first formulated what today he considers a foolproof design for success in working out a problem. And he is eternally grateful for having chanced upon the formula at so early an age.

"When the decks are cleared for action," he explains today, "the critical first step that's taken decides whether the job will be done crisply or whether it will be done into a hash. Set your goal or objective clearly in mind with razor-sharp detail, plan every step of the way in advance, and take the steps firmly. Most folks make a hash of things because they are vague about the first steps."

Mr. Mulhern fondly recalls that he achieved enviable success with his formula when at a youngish 25 he landed a job as classified advertising manager of the Brooklyn Eagle. He started his career with the paper as a delivery boy while attending St. Francis Prep, and worked his way up the rungs, as a reporter, as a helper in the circulation department and as an assistant manager in the classified section, finally reaching the top position in the last-named department at an age which put him in the way of being the youngest to hold such a job on any of the big city dailies of that day.

His newspaper career took him then to the New York Telegram, the Herald Tribune, and the New York Journal, and before he left the field for Government work he attained the position of publisher of the Suffolk County edition of the Island News. And throughout he picked up a keen insight into the relations of management and labor which proved invaluable for his present detail with the Labor Department's Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division.

The strong interest he has in the written word is also due in part to the fact that upon graduating from St. Francis College he spent several semesters as a teacher. Subjects he taught were Latin, Greek, and English.

But there is nothing of the pedagogue in Mr. Mulhern. He says that his reputation for seeing an objective and going toward it is due mostly to an understanding of how to work cheerfully with others. "I have a vast sympathy for people, vast numbers of 'em," he confesses, "and that's why I find my present job so rewarding."

His calling today finds him in direct charge of a staff of 114 investigators, who chalk up a total of about 65,000 field studies a year throughout New York and New Jersey. In the 12 years that the wage-hour law has been in effect—the graying executive has been in the program from the very beginning—a total of \$15,000,000 has been found due workers in metropolitan New York and Long Island for violations of the Federal act. From January 25 to September 30, 1950, the New York City office alone found violations in 1,032 firms and determined that 11,195 workers were owed \$483,575.

An analysis of the investigations in the metropolitan area has shown Mr. Mulhern that a high percentage of those who receive back wages are young workers in their first jobs, elderly people who take any wage offered because of the difficulty they have in finding work, members of minority groups and some displaced persons, whose lack of English and ignorance of labor laws put them at a disadvantage.

But Mr. Mulhern says he is convinced that an enforcement officer can do more by trying to prevent violations through education rather than by catching people after they have unwittingly broken the law.

In 1922 Mr. Mulhern cemented a summer romance with Miss Josephine Dybinska, a school teacher, and moved from the Park Slope area to 1594 East Seventh Street,

where two daughters, Jo-Ann and Jean, and a son, Thomas F., Jr., were born.

Summing up views of his job as assistant regional director of the New York-New Jersey office, which has quarters at 341 Ninth Avenue, Manhattan, Mr. Mulhern says that making democracy work by seeing to it that the Nation's wage earners are well paid and properly paid is "the best antidote we have today for the poison of Communist doctrine."

Mr. Mulhern is a former president of the New York City Classified Advertising Managers Association, former president of the St. Francis College Alumni Association, and is affiliated with Delta Sigma Pi, International business fraternity, and the St. Patrick's Society of Brooklyn.

Dispersal of Industries in Atomic Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, if Hiroshima and Nagasaki taught the world anything about atomic warfare, it should have been the vital necessity of dispersing industries to make the widest possible bomb target. Too much of our most vital productive capacity is already crowded together in areas easily subject to enemy attack, yet new industrial expansion is continually concentrated into these same vulnerable areas.

Purely from a defense standpoint there are many other potent arguments against the continued concentration and crowding of defense industries in the same congested sites. When workers far beyond the normal population of a community must be brought in to furnish the labor force for these industries, there are additional costs to our economy, either private or governmental. Additional housing must be built. If it is not immediately forthcoming through private sources, there is demand for the Government to build it. In addition, the community facilities which local and State governments normally supply are suddenly overtaxed, and these services can only be supplied through assistance from the Federal Government. All of these extra items require the use of more critical materials, and make the cost of defense even more burdensome to the taxpayer.

When the Defense Production Act was before Congress for extension a few weeks ago a strong effort was made to write into the law a provision to encourage dispersal of industrial plants established for the future. Despite the overwhelming logic of the dispersal argument, it was voted down by a sectional division.

The National Security Resources Board, with an eye more to national security than narrow sectional interests, has since that time announced a dispersal program which is to become official policy for all defense agencies. This policy is a step in the right direction, as evidenced by the bitter denunciations it has received from politicians of the

North and East. At best, however, it is still very timid and very technical.

The need for dispersal is evident in the recent report of prime defense contracts made by the Department of Defense. New York got 18.3 percent of these contracts, and California 13.4. Tiny Connecticut, with a population approximately the same as Mississippi, got 5.8, while Mississippi received 0.2. Other State figures include Arizona, 0.2; Arkansas, 0.1; Colorado, 0.3; Florida, 0.2; Kentucky, 0.2; Maine, 0.3; Nebraska, 0.3; New Hampshire, 0.3; New Mexico, 0.1; Oklahoma, 0.3; Utah, 0.1; Vermont, 0.1; West Virginia, 0.1; Wyoming, 0.1. Tennessee and Alabama, two Southern States with a relatively high degree of industrialization, received only 0.7 and 0.6, respectively.

To narrow the range down to two industries which have figured prominently in defense industrial expansion, during the first 8 months of defense activity, 11 Northeastern States have been authorized to build 81 percent of the new iron and steel capacity and 76 percent of all new aircraft plants.

We must have a fundamental reversal of policy as an elementary step toward national self-defense.

As a supplement to my remarks, I submit the statement on industrial dispersion issued by Defense Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson, and an article on industrial dispersion by Ralph E. Lapp, which appeared in a recent issue of the magazine Reporter:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., August 16, 1951.

Defense Mobilization Director Charles E. Wilson issued today the following statement in connection with the industrial-dispersion policy:

"Industry has much to gain and nothing to fear as a consequence of the industrial-dispersion policy announced by President Truman last Friday.

"It is a great program for the good of the country—for many years to come, in peace and in war—and we are going ahead with it. It holds possibilities for every section of the Nation, including those already built up with industry.

"I should like to emphasize the local character of this program for greater national security. Existing industrial areas can apply the dispersal idea—space—in terms of a few miles rather than hundreds. We are not asking vital industries to move their factories but only to locate new factories a few miles away from existing ones.

"In our expanding production we must take every possible step to protect our people, and our military experts tell us that one of the best ways to protect people and industries is to spread them out.

"By spreading them out we make it that much harder for an enemy to hit them. The greater the number of likely targets, the greater the chances of each one to survive an attack. And the possible damage from each bomb is thereby limited rather than increased.

"The present plan is different from any plan heretofore proposed because it is local in concept, and even encourages continued growth of present industrial areas—out from the edges.

"We are relying upon private industry everywhere to see that new plants are dispersed, and effective dispersal can be accomplished within local marketing areas.

"What we suggest, above all, is simply the judicious use of space—one of the best defenses against the atomic bomb—in the planning and construction of new plants still to be built."

[From the Reporter of August 21, 1951]

OUR CROWDED TARGET AREAS—GOVERNMENT AND INDUSTRY, IGNORING THE LESSON OF NAGASAKI, HAVE NEGLECTED OUR BEST DEFENSE AGAINST THE A-BOMB: DISPERSION

(By Ralph E. Lapp)

American industry, greatly expanded during the Second World War and further enlarged in the postwar years, is now being fortified to the extent of over \$20,000,000,000 to meet the urgent demands of our present mobilization. Despite our industry's already dangerously high vulnerability to atomic attack, new war plants are still being located in critical target areas.

Last fall the National Security Resources Board was assigned responsibility for approving pieces of paper called certificates of necessity, which permit a company to write off, for purposes of tax saving, the cost of new plant construction over a period of 5 years rather than the usual 20 to 25. Subsequently, the Defense Production Administration was made the certifying authority, and up to the present date more than \$8,000,000,000 worth of certificates have been approved. Roughly, 40 percent of the dollar value of this new construction has been slated for metropolitan areas. The enormity of this defiance of the simple rules of atomic common sense is only slightly lessened by the fact that some of the plants are not to be built right in the center of metropolitan areas—presumably because such areas are too heavily populated or have too high tax structures.

A House subcommittee investigating the granting of certificates of necessity has reported: "Under the present policy [of granting certificates of necessity] no effort is made by the Government to control the location of new facilities through certificates; the selection of the site is left entirely to the applicant." The report concludes: "... after studying all aspects of this matter * * * the failure on the part of administrators of the program to make any effort whatever to locate new industrial facilities with regard to military security is most illogical and unreasonable."

PREATOMIC MOBILIZATION

It is especially paradoxical that NSRB should rubber-stamp certificates of necessity without considering the national security, because that very agency has shown in its brochure, National Security Factors in Industrial Location, that it understands dispersion of plants to be basic defense against A-bombs. This reads: "The whole problem of industrial dispersion boils down to a common-sense application of the old adage about not putting all of one's eggs in one basket * * *. The job of dispersion is one that industry must assume, both for its own protection and that of national security."

The Office of Defense Mobilization has dodged the industrial dispersion issue, apparently because it considers it politically infeasible and because it prefers to concentrate on "getting the job done." Our present mobilization effort has thus become in this respect a postscript to the Second World War program. Industry, with ODM's blessing, is following the well-traveled but now dangerous road of preatomic mobilization. With but minor exceptions this road has been followed in our entire industrial development since VJ-day. Five years of unprecedented construction have witnessed an annual expenditure of about \$18,000,000,000, the bulk of which has been funneled into our largest metropolitan areas.

HOW FAR IS ENOUGH?

Data compiled for 35 prime target areas, almost all of which are metropolitan, reveal that 56 percent of the Nation's industrial product by dollar value originates in these manufacturing centers. Chicago alone accounts for 7 percent of the total. Anyone who has looked down upon a large city from an airplane knows how plants are usually crowded within city limits. To be sure, some industry has moved out to the country, but not far enough out, and open space around the plant is soon filled with the outspread from the city.

Dispersing manufacturing facilities beyond city limits can be an effective defense measure if the dispersion distance is considerable and if permanent open space is maintained between the city and the plants. Just what is meant by a considerable distance? In some cases the dispersal distance should be as high as 20 miles, for example in the case of huge plants which necessarily attract other smaller industries. In other instances a few miles may be sufficient.

Since our industrial plants represent fixed investments of long duration in the sense of national security, their defense must be planned not just for the weapons of today but for those still below the technical horizon. In this connection, a New York industrialist told his colleagues: "Don't try to protect your plants. If you locate in the suburbs, 5 years from now the A-bomb will be so much bigger it will get you anyway." Such pessimism is not warranted, since every weapon, even the H-bomb, can be combated with the proper use of space. In fact, unless industry goes underground—and this is generally regarded as impractical—our only defense weapon is space.

The combination of official secrecy and unrestrained guessing has discouraged many industrialists from any kind of action. When the Atomic Energy Commission detonated A-bombs near Las Vegas early this year, light flashes were visible from points 400 miles distant. These tests convinced many laymen that the H-bomb had been ushered into the world, even though the AEC later denied it. Tersely worded official statements from Eniwetok about weapons several times more powerful than the Hiroshima-Nagasaki type compounded the confusion.

Industry cannot be expected to erect defenses against unknown weapons. Nor can it safely proceed in its planning on the basis of information passed out over Washington dinner tables. The facts about the power of new weapons already have been brought out in testimony before a congressional committee considering the dispersal of Federal agencies. Top AEC officials were called upon to advise what would be judged to be a safe distance for establishing six new agency sites close to Washington, D. C. They stated that 12 miles would be adequate from the standpoint of the probable power of new atomic weapons and 20 miles for other possible weapons.

As long as the Government keeps data essential for sound industrial development secret and until ODM changes its short-sighted policy of giving industry free rein in plant location there will be further concentration of war plants in prime target areas.

THE PENTAGON'S ALOOFNESS

One might expect the military services to exert influence in safeguarding their future tanks, planes, and ships. The late Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, testifying before the Senate inquiry into the MacArthur ouster, commented on the reasons for Soviet hesitancy in plunging into a third world war: "... the deterrent to war with us is the realization of our technical and industrial potential, the forces we have, our ability

to expand them; that there is the realization on the other side that if a general war comes they will be defeated." Yet the Military Establishment has never announced any policy on the security of the Nation's war plants. On the other hand, it seems to have gone out of its way to emphasize our vulnerability to air attack.

An exceptional instance in which the military intervened in plant location was the transfer of the Boeing Aircraft Corp's B-47 production from Seattle, Wash., to Wichita, Kans. W. Stuart Symington, as Secretary of the Air Force, personally strong-armed this relocation. The case is worth discussing because Seattle reacted vigorously and constructively. Its chamber of commerce realized that the Boeing incident could well condemn the city as a site for future industrial growth. To counter this threat the chamber of commerce announced an approach to industrial mobilization in which dispersion of key industries plays an essential role. Certain areas judged to be out of bomb range have been designated for new manufacturing facilities. Time must elapse before the effectiveness of the Seattle plan can be assessed, but certainly the basic philosophy behind the scheme is heartening. Milwaukee is likewise adopting a progressive attitude toward industrialization, not because it suffered a Boeing incident, but because it has an enlightened mayor, Frank P. Zeldner.

Any sane program of dispersal must begin with a critical evaluation of the present vulnerability of existing war plants. In the language of the war planners this means that there must be a target analysis of United States industry by men who look at our industrial concentrations through the eyes of Soviet strategists. Target analyses have already been made by the Air Force and by the National Security Resources Board, and only recently two new groups have set to work on the task—the Industry Evaluation Board in the Department of Commerce and the Facilities Protection Board of the National Security Council. NSRB itself has started a new attack upon the over-all problem and is currently formulating a national policy for industrial dispersion. Announcement of this policy is expected from the White House some time this summer.

BROODING YANKEES

Anticipating President Truman's policy statement, Representative JAMES T. PATTERSON, Republican, of Connecticut, has taken issue with dispersion by quoting the Bridgeport Post, "a scheme to fill up the empty spaces of the South and Southwest, not by enterprise, not by the long process of building up a place in industry through merit and competition, but simply by deliberate brutal Government action transferring established industry from one section of the country and planting it somewhere else through the manipulation of Government contracts." A group of Congressmen, for whom Representative PATTERSON is a spokesman, have been increasingly worried about the loss of industry from New England ever since the much-publicized uprooting of the Chance Vought Aircraft Co. from Stratford, Conn., near Bridgeport. The long-distance move, in this case to Texas, paralleled the Boeing case. Together they form the two big exceptions to the rule of nondispersion.

New England need have little fear that the administration plans to parcel northeastern industry out to the rest of the country. But if the policies now being developed are put into effect, New England along with the rest of the Nation will find that it is no longer at liberty to select new plant sites without first considering national security. The Government has a number of

powerful tools that can be used to persuade industry if the latter should disregard atomic vulnerability. One, already mentioned, is the certificate of necessity. Others are loan guarantees, direct loans, direct supply of equipment, allocation of critical materials, and preference in the awarding of military contracts. No new mechanisms have to be invented to put the pressure on industry; they exist but have not been put into effect.

Certain critical industries, evaluated as absolutely essential to war production, may have to be shifted to new locations. This does not mean they will be lifted bodily out of New England and set down in Kansas. More likely the Government's policy will be to recommend the relocation of plants somewhere within the same market area but well outside of bomb range. Such drastic action will be limited to relatively few plants, but as plants become obsolete the companies concerned will be encouraged to build elsewhere if the old location is vulnerable to attack. Many plants, especially those in the chemical field or where technological advancement is very rapid, go out of date in as little as 5 years.

THE PRICE

An argument frequently advanced to block dispersion is that it will cost too much. Although it is absurd to think of dispersing all industry, even this colossal task is not nearly so unattainable as it might seem. A rough estimate of the replacement cost for American plants, arrived at by adding up (in terms of 1950 dollars) the prewar United States industrial plant cost, the amount of wartime construction, and the very considerable additions to the total since the war, puts the replacement cost at slightly more than \$300,000,000,000. Since we are spending an average of about \$18,000,000,000 per year on new construction and equipment, simple mathematics would indicate that we could replace our total industry in about two decades. The actual process is, of course, more involved than simple arithmetic, and the time required would be longer, but no one proposes that we demolish our present economy and completely replace it.

If we subtract plants that are not essential to war production, we eliminate about 60 percent of the total. Furthermore, since some of these plants are peripherally dispersed, are in small towns, or are not even in target areas, the amount of industry for hypothetical relocation would be further reduced. The dollar total thus involved would probably become about \$90,000,000,000.

This figure drops further when one considers that equipment could be reinstalled in relocated plants. Since equipment costs usually outweigh direct plant-construction costs by a factor of between two and three, it may be deduced that with our present outlays for new construction we can replace our most vulnerable essential plants in about 10 years. It must be emphasized that this is selective dispersion, applied only to critical plants which are judged to be in target areas. Selective relocation obviously should not and cannot take in such installations as breweries, soft-drink bottlers, department stores, or dry cleaners.

Six years ago in Nagasaki the Mitsubishi Steel Works and a score of other factories were, much like United States plants today, turning out war goods. Then came the fateful day when the atomic bomb was introduced to Japanese industry. Yet, judged by six postwar years of unrivaled construction and concentration of plants, United States industry has apparently not learned the lesson of the twisted girders and crumbled walls of factories built too close together.

THE UNWARY EAGLE

Businessmen point out in their own defense that they have not been encouraged to disperse and that the Government has announced no program for industrial relocation. They are, of course, correct, for it is a case of multiple negligence. The Pentagon says dispersion is not its responsibility. Put to the test, NSRB and ODM have both refused to come to grips with the problem until now. Only at this late date, with defense construction well under way, is NSRB valiantly trying to put teeth into a sound dispersion policy. Meanwhile the steady agglomeration of defense plants in overcrowded target areas keeps on adding to the country's vulnerability.

A Libyan fable chronicled by Aeschylus may well be pertinent to American industry. An eagle stricken with a dart said, when he saw the fashion of the shaft, "With our own feathers, not by others' hands, are we now smitten." Perhaps the moral of the fable, the omen of Nagasaki, and the new drive within the NSRB may yet jog the lagging memory of United States industry.

American Appropriations to Foreign Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 27, 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Charity Begins Elsewhere" from the Bismarck Tribune of August 23, 1951. This is one of the finest editorials I have read dealing with the fact that we are sending money all over the world and permitting our own people, including American Indians, to starve.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CHARITY BEGINS ELSEWHERE

How the United States is pouring out billions to help unfortunate peoples all over the world while it neglects some of its own equally unfortunate citizens was told by a Member of the United States House of Representatives recently.

The Congressman, FRANK T. BOW, Republican of Ohio, had reference to what he described as "gross neglect of duty in our treatment of our American Indians." His interest is somewhat remarkable in that the so-called Indian problem does not exist in his district.

Since the inception of the American ECA program, Bow told the House, the total direct cost in ECA dollars for agricultural production, reclamation, irrigation, transportation, communications, power, waterways, and harbors has been \$294,349,400. In addition, beneficiary countries have had available \$3,961,700,000 in other funds provided by the United States to develop their resources.

Thus the United States has been most liberal with the American taxpayer's dollar when it comes to helping out people in the British colony of Kenya with a road-building program, or the people in French Morocco with their municipal water supplies, or the people in Indonesia with their public health

projects, or the people of the Belgian Congo with their power projects.

It is a different story, however, when funds are asked to correct the admittedly sorry conditions of American Indians on their inadequate reservations, where they live in stunting poverty without prospect of self-improvement.

Before the present Congress there are Indian rehabilitation measures which would authorize expenditures totaling \$90,650,000. But Congress shows little disposition to act favorably upon them. It will go all the way on a \$4,000,000,000 program to help strangers on other continents. But it gets mighty miserly when it comes to spending a fraction of that amount to help some of its own people.

As outlined by Bow, the rehabilitation programs now proposed are intended to give Indians financial assistance so that they can become self-supporting. They would raise the Indians' economic, social, education, and health standards so as to bring about final termination of Federal supervision and control over the Indians.

Part of this would be accomplished by reimbursable loans for land acquisition, equipment buying, farm improvement and aid in the consolidation of fractionated heirship interests, which are an intolerable mess now. In addition, some money would be spent outright to put the Indian on his feet.

Among the authorizations asked are these for North Dakota Indians: \$15,000,000 for the Turtle Mountain Chippewa, \$10,000,000 for the Standing Rock Sioux and \$2,000,000 for the Fort Totten Sioux. Bow's report, incidentally, shows that the average annual income per family on these reservations in North Dakota is \$745 at Turtle Mountain, \$765 at Standing Rock, \$949 at Fort Totten. For the country as a whole, over half of the American Indians have less than \$500 annual income per family.

Most American Indians are crowded onto reservations comprised of the poorest available land, go without even the minimum schooling because school facilities aren't available to them, live under deplorable health conditions, are shut off from normal credit sources and have their inherited lands all tied up by the bungle of fractionated heirship interests.

The tragic part of it is that as long as Congress and the country fails to take the problem by its figurative horns and do something about it, it will keep on costing the country money.

Money spent now to help the Indian solve his own difficulties would be money saved many times over later.

But Congress in its myopic economy can't seem to see this.

It's willing to spend billions for people in Asia and Africa, but virtually nothing for these Americans who need the help, in many instances, much worse than the foreigners do.

Assuredly, American charity does not begin at home.

Dispersal of Industry in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 27, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD program No. 48 in my series of broadcasts to the people of Pennsylvania in the series "Happenings in Washington." This broadcast pertains to the matter of dispersal of industry in the United States.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 48)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital and bringing you another discussion of Happenings in Washington.

In this broadcast I want to tell you about an Executive order issued by President Truman which strikes a severe blow at Pennsylvania and every other industrial State.

It is a threat to the growth and expansion of every productive enterprise in Pennsylvania.

It holds over thousands of workingmen and their families the danger that they may be forced to break up the homes where they have been established for years and seek new jobs and new homes wherever the Government directs industry to go.

The order, issued by the President on August 10, gives the administration bureaucrats the power of life and death over all industrial expansion.

It places in the hands of the Defense Mobilization Director autocratic power to dictate where industrial plants necessary for defense production are to be located.

To enforce this unprecedented authority, the Director of Defense Mobilization is ordered to use his unlimited power to grant or withhold allocations of critical materials.

Every other department and agency of the Federal Government that has to do with defense production is directed to deny certificates of necessity for accelerated tax amortization, Government loans, defense contracts, and all other Federal aids to industries which refuse to submit to this new form of bureaucratic tyranny.

President Truman's advisers, who drafted the order, call it an industrial dispersal policy. They justify it as designed to minimize the effects of any atomic bombing attack on the United States.

But the real purpose is to force, in the name of national defense, the industrialization of areas where industry has been unable or unwilling to go because of conditions unfavorable to efficient or profitable operation.

Here are the rules laid down by which it is planned to force industry into line. They are contained in a public statement issued by the National Security Resources Board, an agency of the Executive Office of the President. I quote:

1. To the greatest extent practicable, certificates of necessity, allocation of critical material for construction purposes, and emergency loans growing out of defense production will be confined to facilities which meet satisfactory standards of dispersal.

"2. Primary consideration to dispersal factors will be given in locating facilities built by the Federal Government.

"3. Defense contracts will be awarded and planning under Defense Department production-allocation programs will be conducted in such a manner as to make maximum use of facilities located in dispersal sites."

That is the end of the quotation and I say to you, my fellow Pennsylvanians, that these measures are absolute proof that the administration leaders do not understand and have no appreciation of the free-enterprise system which gave America the highest industrial development in the world, and cre-

ated the miracle of America's unparalleled productive capacity.

Concentration of industry in areas such as the great steel-producing district of western Pennsylvania is all wrong, the bureaucrats would have us believe.

Furthermore, they say, it is dangerous, even though as they themselves point out, some \$18,000,000,000 were invested each year in the last 4 years in new plants and equipment, largely in areas already highly industrialized.

In other words, those who operate under the system of free enterprise and the public which invests its savings in American industry, just don't know what's good for them—the Government will have to lead them into safety and security.

And to make the scheme more attractive, the statement to which I have referred has this to say, and I quote:

"With the necessary technical guidance as well as the positive inducements which we will give, much can be accomplished."

There is the old familiar promise of the Government medicine man—that a kindly, paternalistic government has something to give—positive inducements—that will make everybody safe, secure, and happy.

That promise is false. It means the end of free enterprise as we have known it in the United States. It is the essence of state socialism.

At this point it would be natural for you to ask: "Where has Congress been all this time?" "What is Congress doing about it?"

I'll tell you. When the President issued that order on August 10, he defied the will of Congress which a few weeks earlier refused to give him the power to order the dispersal of industry.

Twice in the House and again in the Senate the attempt was made to include that provision in the defense production bill and each time it was overwhelmingly defeated.

The first time the dispersal proposition appeared in the House it came as an amendment inserted in the defense production bill by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

This amendment was ruled out of order because it was drawn with such broad provisions that it went far beyond the intent and purposes of the defense production bill. In effect, it would have amended the Internal Revenue Code with respect to tax amortization. It was ruled that this should be handled as a tax matter and that the attempt to make it a part of the defense production bill was an invasion of the jurisdiction of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Immediately another amendment was offered omitting the reference to tax amortization, but retaining all the power to direct where new or expended industry must be located.

I am pleased to report to you the whole Pennsylvania delegation, Republicans and Democrats alike, was in the forefront of the battle to save Pennsylvania industry and Pennsylvania jobs from the disruption threatened by this New Deal scheme.

Not a Pennsylvania voice was raised in its favor, and the amendment was rejected by the decisive vote of 134 to 79.

In the Senate the dispersal plan was defeated by even a greater margin, the vote being 56 against the amendment and 25 in favor.

When the vote was taken in the Senate, I was hospitalized following an operation. Otherwise there would have been another emphatic vote against the proposal.

My colleague, Senator DUFF, voiced the opposition of Pennsylvania, stating that it would be a fatal mistake to adopt any measure which would seriously interfere with the successful pattern of production. Of course, he voted to defeat the amendment.

Thus, Congress clearly expressed and recorded its opposition to the scheme. By its

vote in both Houses. Congress supported the traditional American freedom of choice, freedom of initiative, and freedom of enterprise. It recognized the right of industry to establish factories in locations where we have the skilled manpower and the know-how to do the job, where there are adequate shipping facilities and economical access to raw materials and normal markets.

It took into consideration the many billions of dollars that would be added to defense costs by the expense of building new communities, full-scale public housing, new schools, new recreational facilities, and other essentials to meet the needs of the dispersed workers and their families.

It rejected the proposal as a dangerous attempt to revolutionize the industries of the United States and to distribute them on a political basis.

But President Truman, in flagrant violation of the clear and unmistakable will and intent of Congress, grabbed the powers which the elected Representatives of the people refused to give him and which it never intended for him to have.

His Executive order of August 10 was a usurpation of power which must be regarded as an attempt to fasten bureaucratic control upon industry which can become tighter and tighter as new and more stringent Executive orders are issued.

The assumption of this power by the President virtually places a noose around the neck of American industry that can be tightened at his will.

No President in our history has ever asked for or assumed such dictatorial power.

It is an outrageous attempt to undermine and destroy the free enterprise system and to substitute a planned and regimented economy, directed and controlled from Washington.

Under the plan put into effect by the President, a manufacturer, planning to locate a branch plant in the Pittsburgh district, or near Philadelphia, or in any other industrialized area of Pennsylvania, could be summoned to Washington and ordered to locate in an undeveloped region of the South or West.

Otherwise he could get no certificate of necessity, no defense contracts, no allocation of critical materials and, of course, he would be barred from any Government loan, if he needed it.

Or even if he wanted to build an addition to an existing plant in order to increase production he would be told he could not do so.

Just think of it—some politically appointed bureaucrat, sitting at a desk in Washington, without experience in business or industry, would be in a position to dictate to the industrial brains of America where plant expansion must be placed.

JOE MARTIN, the minority leader of the House, was absolutely right when he called the Truman order "the first step toward one-man Government in this country."

"The Congress might as well shut up shop and go home," he added.

Ours is a government of law—not of men. The Congress of the United States must in no uncertain terms say to the President that it will not tolerate such a brazen attempt to defy its clear mandate.

It must be made clear that Congress will not tolerate the usurpation by the Executive of the duties and responsibilities entrusted by the Constitution to the legislative branch of the Federal Government.

In order to prevent the President from exercising such unwarranted authority, I have introduced a bill in the Senate, the effect of which will be to rescind the President's order.

The bill provides that "in granting certificates of necessity under the Internal Revenue Code, in allocating critical materials for construction purposes, and in making emergency loans growing out of defense production,

preference shall not be given to facilities which meet any specified standards of dispersal; and defense contracts shall be awarded and planning under Department of Defense Production allocation programs shall be conducted without regard to maximum use of facilities located in dispersed sites."

It further provides that "any order, regulation, or instruction issued or promulgated by any officer or agency of the Federal Government inconsistent with this amendatory act is hereby rescinded."

In conclusion, let me say to you, my fellow Pennsylvanians, that I shall do everything within my power to obtain speedy and favorable action on this bill.

This is Ed MARTIN speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

The Law of Supply and Demand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 27, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer of August 24, 1951, entitled "The Old Law Works." The old law referred to is the law of supply and demand, and the editorial points out very succinctly how prices of grains and many other items have slumped off during recent weeks, not because of the activities of the OPS, but simply because demand for these commodities has fallen off.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OLD LAW WORKS

On the same day this week that President Truman indicated he will renew his fight for stronger price-control powers, the newspaper wire services carried reports showing that the old law of supply and demand hasn't been voided. It continues to operate, whenever it is unfettered from the economic manipulations, to bring prices into line.

Anyone who recently has been following what's happening to corn, wheat, cotton, and other commodities knows that the decline in prices is not due to any efforts of the Federal Government, but rather in spite of them.

The Dow-Jones commodity future index shows that between February and June of this year the price barometer fell from 215 to 180. And the primary reason the index hasn't shown a further decline since June is the Government's price floor (support prices) which is designed to prevent food and wearing apparel from becoming too inexpensive.

Wheat, however, sold in Kansas City this week for \$2.36 a bushel, approximately 9 cents under the support price. And corn sold in Chicago at \$1.64 a bushel, 10 cents under the expected support level. Cotton, selling in the neighborhood of 34 cents a pound for December delivery, is about 2 cents above the price floor.

The price of a leading grade of cotton print cloth recently fell 9 cents a yard under the price of last March, and the price of flour under the New York market fell from \$6.50 a hundred pounds (the February price) to \$6.05.

Price declines also cover such items as gasoline, electric appliances, frozen foods, and fruit juices. Lard is 2 cents a pound under the price of last February and the year's tremendous hog output is expected to bring the price down further. Lard for December delivery is selling under 15 cents.

The irresistible force under all of this, of course, is something the economic planners haven't yet been able to control completely, though they have moved far in that direction. That force is production.

Nature has smiled during 1951 not only on the crop and grass lands of the United States but upon those of much of the free world. The cotton crop now nearing harvest is the third largest in the Nation's history, and it follows on the heels of another bumper crop of wheat and precedes an upcoming bumper corn harvest.

An Associated Press dispatch from London says that Europe's pantry this year will be better stocked with home-grown items than at any time since the end of World War II. No country west of the iron curtain has had a bad growing season, and in Spain farmers are gathering the best harvest in 50 years.

The effect of all this on food prices was illustrated last week by Dun & Bradstreet's index of wholesale prices. Its index, representing the wholesale cost of 1 pound each of 31 food items, stood at \$6.94. Last February on the same items it stood at \$7.31.

A wartime economy, of course, could quickly change the picture, and it may be that the Truman administration is seeking stronger price controls for use in the event the big war really comes. And the President may know of something down the road ahead which he chooses not to reveal to the public.

But certainly the current operation of the time-proved law of supply and demand doesn't suggest the need of stronger price controls now.

Thanks Expressed by Richard J. Rossbach for Veteran Benefits Received

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 27, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Richard J. Rossbach, apartment 19, 1137 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., transmitted to me by letter. The statement marks Mr. Rossbach as a patriot.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the People of the United States of America.

I owe you a debt of gratitude which I shall herein try to express. I am a veteran of three campaigns in Europe during World War II. For having thus participated in this conflict I was privileged to complete my education at your expense and to borrow money with which to buy a house. As if this were not enough, you have hospitalized me for 16 months for the treatment of a wartime, service-connected disability which I sustained; you have provided me with compensation and you are now paying my national life insurance premiums. It is for all of these helps you have afforded my wife and me that I now wish to express my deepest gratitude.

I know, however, that you the people of the United States of America, can be most completely repaid for these helps, most graciously given me, by my being a good, useful, and loyal citizen of our country. I shall try to be such a citizen by employing my profession to the general good of our country and by good moral conduct in both public and private life.

Yours sincerely,

RICHARD J. ROSSBACH.

Financial Plight of Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 27, 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have received from Mr. James H. Rademacher, Jr., president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, of Detroit, Mich., together with an article enclosed in his letter entitled "Post Office Workers' Plight Is Cited," which appeared in the Detroit News.

I call particular attention to the fact that the postal employees of Detroit alone have borrowed over a million dollars from their credit union in order to keep from starving to death.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
LETTER CARRIERS, BRANCH No 1,
Detroit, Mich., August 23, 1951.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I am sending you an article from the Detroit News of this date which I would appreciate having you use for the RECORD and/or on the floor.

You have been so truly effective in the past for our just cause I probably am taking advantage of your generosity.

It is most sincerely hoped that retroactive features will be contained in the final legislation and perhaps the fact that over a million dollars in debts have piled up on Detroit postal workers alone may be enough to convince the Senate of our critical plight.

With sincere gratitude for your wonderful treatment of our legislation and with kindest personal regards, I remain

Appreciatively,

JAMES H. RADEMACHER, Jr.,
President.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News of August 23, 1951]

POST OFFICE WORKERS' PLIGHT IS SIGHTED—
GET NO RAISE, GO DEEP IN DEBT, UNIONIST
SAYS

Detroit's post office employees, rebuffed by Congress in attempts to get a pay raise, today are in debt to their credit union for more than \$1,000,000.

James J. Rademacher, Jr., president of the Detroit branch of the Letter Carriers Union (AFL), said the economic situation of postal employees here is critical.

"Pay-raise bills have been before Congress since last December," Rademacher said. "Little action seems possible before mid-September.

"Meanwhile, the public, with lessening service daily, seems to think post-office people already have received a pay raise.

"DEBTS PILING UP

"No raise has yet come to a vote in Congress, much less anything sufficient to take up the enormous debts which are piling up against loyal workers."

Rademacher said that 1,300 temporary, non-civil service employees are working in Detroit post offices to supplant men and women of experience who were forced to quit to support families. He said jobs in industry have called 1,200 from the service since July 1950.

"More than 50 post-office employees resigned in the last month," he said.

ASKS ESCALATOR PLAN

Rademacher declared there is no reason why the Post Office Department cannot set up an escalator pay plan.

"A 37 per cent turn-over of employees occurs when spiraling prices overtake wage levels," he said. "This results in a tremendous loss to the Government. Training of new employees is costly.

"It all could be prevented by an elastic pay formula, not subject to whims or obstructions. It is a shame to see the postal service destroyed, especially when it could be saved for less than its destruction is costing."

Treatment of Patients in Providence, R. I., Veterans' Administration Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 27, 1951

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to the editor of the Providence Journal, Providence, R. I., and published on last Wednesday, August 22. This letter from a veteran, a patient at the United States Veterans' Administration Hospital, Providence, R. I., is an excellent commendation of the service extended to veterans at this veteran facility in my home city. Certainly, the manager of the hospital, Dr. William A. Sullivan, the attending physicians, the nurses, and, for that matter, the whole staff at the hospital, are to be congratulated on the excellent service given the veterans in Rhode Island.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS PATIENTS SEE IT

EDITOR:

I wish you would write a story for the paper and let the public know what a wonderful job this hospital is doing for the veterans.

My fellow patient, Julius Greenstein, spoke out of a full heart as he sat beside me in the comfortable day room of ward 6B of the Davis Park Veterans' Hospital in Providence, on his way to recovery from an operation. Four weeks earlier, desperate with pain, he had tried a number of hospitals, only to find that there were no beds available. Then, knowing of the long waiting list and somewhat fearful of being lost in red tape, he had applied to the veterans' hospital and found himself immediately admitted to an emergency bed.

"You know," he said, "I have been figuring that the treatment I have received here would have cost me at least a thousand dollars in a private hospital. I wonder how many eligible veterans realize and appreciate what the Government is prepared to do for them."

The Veterans' Administration contact man who calls on all patients immediately after their admission, had explained to me that the actual cost to the Government was much lower because its medical services were rendered on a wholesale basis.

No doubt that term "wholesale" had something to do with the financial administration of the institution, which I am not competent to discuss, but I soon saw that it also had something to do with the actual conduct of hospital affairs. Being of the nature of a military institution, routines could be introduced which, while not cutting down on the quality or quantity of service required in each individual case, nevertheless made it possible to operate efficiently with a minimum staff of attendants.

Patients in serious condition could have half a dozen special nurses if they needed them, but patients who were not confined to their beds and who were perfectly able to look after themselves were required to do so. They were required to keep their rooms tidy, make their own beds, change their own bed linen at least twice a week, and take their meals in a central cafeteria. They received every attention that they needed and none that they did not need, and it was good for them.

Another of the military features making for efficiency was the rigid restriction of visiting hours to one a day and two on Sundays. This seemed a hardship in some instances where people came a considerable distance to see their friends, but the visiting hours meant an interruption in the busy routine of medications and treatments, and had they been of longer duration they would have materially lengthened the average time required for recovery. Again, the rule was tempered in accordance with individual circumstances.

Still another factor which contributed enormously to the economic efficiency of the hospital and at the same time to the health, welfare, and high morale of the patients was the volunteer service which is rendered on a large scale by the patriotic people of the vicinity. Volunteer nurses' aides devote regular hours of service in the wards ministering comforts and attentions which the busy nurses would not have time to render.

Gray Ladies make daily rounds to make sure that there is no shortage of toilet articles, smoking materials, or reading matter. Various organized groups on regular schedule take over the administration of the daily visiting hours, operating the information desk, running the elevators and distributing packages brought by the visitors. Last, but not least, are the volunteer services of those who provide stage shows several times a week in the hospital theater.

The hospital constitutes an interesting sort of melting pot. There can be few other situations where people of such diverse color, religion, national origin, and condition in life live together in intimate daily contact with every outward sign of complete harmony.

Of course the most important consideration about any hospital is the professional qualification and skill of the medical staff. I found that all the patients with whom I talked at Davis Park shared a very high degree of confidence in the doctors and in the medical establishments as a whole, including the nurses, orderlies and technicians. They could not, as laymen, judge professional qualifications in the medical field. They had to accept that on the authority of the Veterans' Administration. Their faith, however, was founded on the evidences of their own observation. The

quiet, efficient, ceaseless industry with which doctors and nurses went about their work was that of people who knew what they were about.

Even as I was being wheeled into the hospital on a stretcher, I was beginning to be impressed with the fact that all of the resources of the United States Government were being drawn on in the battle to restore me to health and strength. It was an awesome feeling which grew with the passage of the days. Here was more than a hospital. This was a living monument to the patriotism of the American people. Every time I looked out and saw the flag waving from the top of the pole on the level of our sixth floor windows, a lump came in my throat and I felt an impulse to salute!

JOHN D. KETTELLE.

BARRINGTON.

Koch Treatment for Mastitis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 27, 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "London Milk Producers Study Koch Treatment for Mastitis," published in the Ontario Milk Producer for July 1951. I call this particularly to the attention of the farmers of this Nation who have cattle.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LONDON MILK PRODUCERS STUDY KOCH TREATMENT FOR MASTITIS

The frank, enthusiastic, and sincere testimony to the efficacy of the Koch treatment for mastitis, sterility and acetonaemia, given to a group of Middlesex County dairymen, a few days ago, by a dozen or so Michigan dairy farmers, left the Canadian group somewhat stunned. The evident control that has been gained over mastitis particularly, seemed almost unbelievable to the Middlesex men who, heretofore, in the majority of cases have been able only to secure temporary relief from this scourge of the dairy farmer.

The London Whole Milk Producers Assn., interested in the reported success of the Koch treatment in British Columbia, under the authority of the British Columbia Department of Agriculture, decided to send a committee to Imlay City, Mich., where extensive work had been progressing in the application of the treatment. Duncan Fletcher, Beverly Chappel, John Byers, and Ivan Parkinson representing the association, made the trip. They were accompanied by Dr. D. H. Arnott, of London, Canadian associate of Dr. Koch, who arranged the tour, and by Douglas Cozens, Woodstock, of the Ontario Whole Milk Producers' League Field Service, and the editor of the Milk Producer.

The Imlay City enterprise was the result of action taken by the chamber of commerce. Mastitis was rampant in Lapeer County. Members of the chamber had read of the Koch treatment and the work being done in British Columbia. A meeting was called at which Dr. Arnott was invited to speak and tell of the results in the British Columbia project. After this meeting, which was attended by some 250 dairy farmers, the chamber of commerce decided that some action should be taken but that the veterinary department of the State college should

be requested to cooperate and render some financial assistance.

A committee went to Lansing. The result, as reported, was that the committee was told, first that it would require \$2,000 to finance the project in its initial stages; that sufficient experts on the specified diseases were not on the staff, and that the time was not available. Dr. Bryan, the chief veterinarian, is reported to finally have offered to make tests required but only providing no representative of Dr. Koch was present. Refusal to permit Dr. G. F. R. Barton, one of the veterinarians named by the British Columbia Government to work on the investigations in that Province, to assist or even be present is said to have been made.

The Imlay City committee believed that, for reasons best known to themselves, the State officials wanted no part in the work. It went home disappointed, but not dismayed. It was decided that the work should go ahead. Finances were found and Koch Cattle Shots, Inc., was founded. Its president is Lawrence Thatcher, a member of the Christian Medical Research League, of Detroit, the organization that produces the Koch treatment, and its manager is Lyle Watkins, long-time prominent citizen and farm-implement dealer of Imlay City.

Two herd-demonstration tests were arranged. Dr. Lewis T. Dawe, veterinarian of Capac, Mich., agreed to supervise the tests. The herds chosen were badly infected with mastitis, consisted of 23 Holsteins in the herd of Max Graybiel, and a 35-Jersey herd owned by Richard Konig, both in Lapeer County. Control groups were not treated.

The results of these tests were so successful that the green light was given the new organization. Dr. Dawe reported that he was much encouraged. Dr. William Mackay, of Lapeer, said he had found the medicine more effective than any other he had used in chronic mastitis cases. Dr. David Ellis, of Memphis, said that out of 40 or 50 doses he had observed favorable results.

This, briefly was the background of the Imlay City enterprise, which was told to the Canadian group and shown to them by well-documented evidence.

For 2 days the party toured Lapeer, St. Clair, and Sanilac Counties, covering nearly 300 miles in the trip. Some 15 or more dairy farmers were interviewed by the party in addition to druggists who retail the treatments, State agricultural instructors, and others have had some contact with the work that is being done.

One of the first farms visited was that of Harlan Greenwald. A number of cows in his Holstein herd had developed sterility. Bulls and feeds were changed in the belief that one or the other or both was responsible for this condition. However, there was no effect. Cows did not conceive. The Dr. Koch treatment was suggested and Mr. Greenwald consented without much hope and as a last resort. The cows and heifers were injected and no other treatment was used. Mr. Greenwald says the condition has entirely cleared up and he has had no more trouble. This was the story told by Mr. Greenwald.

At the Fergus-Lea farms, where, by the way, the committee saw one of the finest herds of Guernseys this writer has run across for many a day, Harold Walton, herd manager and part owner, told an amazing story. Mastitis, acetonaemia, and sterility in a prize bull were part of his troubles and were conspiring to reduce the number and the effectiveness of his herd to a very unprofitable position. The natural increase could not be maintained. After other treatment, the condition remained substantially unchanged. Then the Koch treatment was used. Following the treatment conditions began to improve, in some cases in a matter of hours. Today the herd is clean. Milk production has increased as has butterfat. Mr. Wal-

ton's records show an increase in butterfat from 3.84 to 4.21. One of his cows had a condition diagnosed as acetonaemia further complicated with pneumonia. The cow was down and appeared a fit subject for the wagon. Mr. Walton said that at 11 o'clock at night it was injected with the Koch treatment and the following day the cow was on its feet. It made rapid recovery from both the acetonaemic condition and from the pneumonia. In the case of the bull, which was a pedigree prize-winning champion, it developed an apparent sterility. It could not get a calf. The bull was treated with a Koch injection. It regained its potency and can now successfully withstand heavy service.

At the farm of Elmer Perkin, he told that he had several times attempted to bring a herd into profitable producing condition. On each occasion, as he believed he had reached his goal, mastitis infected the herd and they finished in the slaughterhouse. He was in debt, veterinary bills and medicine was costing him \$200 upward per year, and was on the verge of quitting and getting out of the dairy business. He was induced to use the Koch treatment and, he said, from the day his herd was treated, his troubles began to decrease. He told the committee his herd was cleaned up. In a couple of cases there had been a recurrence and these cows were subjected to a second injection which cleared up the flare-ups. Today, he said, "I am almost out of debt, my milk checks have increased in amount, and pretty soon those milk checks are going to be all mine."

William Thorman, a dairy farmer with a herd of fine Holsteins, had similar troubles. He told the committee he treated 30 cows and had 100-percent success with 29 head.

The committee visited several farmers who had been shut off from the dairies. One such case was that of the postmaster of Deckerville, Mich., Mancel Wintermute. This man was not actually shut off, but had been warned on several occasions that he would be shut off. He said he was about to sell, when he decided to try the Koch treatment. Everything else he had used had given only indifferent results. After the herd had been treated, beneficial effects became apparent. The herd is now producing steadily without trouble. Quality and quantity have substantially increased. Asked if he had any intentions of selling out now, Mr. Wintermute said, "No, not any more."

One farmer, a Mr. Shreiber, of Imlay City, told the committee that after his herd was treated, he not only had his mastitis trouble cleared up, but that his milk check increased from \$421 to around \$755 per month.

The product is sold by some 42 druggists in the counties visited and in Deckerville, the druggist there, Mr. Vannattar, produced his books for the inspection of the committee. These showed the accounts of some of the dairy farmers in the area. They showed in the case of one man, that in a period of approximately a year he had purchased such drugs as penicillin, aureomycin, streptomycin, sulphamethazine, and sulph-anilimide to the extent of nearly \$200 but after purchasing the Koch treatments for his herd, the sales of the drugs dropped to practically nothing. Other accounts showed similar trends. Mr. Vannattar's records showed that he had distributed 340 treatments during the past 4 months, or an average of better than three for every week-day.

Wherever the committee went, or whoever they interviewed, they heard the same enthusiastic story. The writer, seeking some independent information, sought an interview with the editor of the Imlay City Times. Mr. Cross had had considerable contact with farmers who had used the Koch treatment and he said he had heard nothing but praise for the treatment. The closest he had come to anything that might be construed as

lacking in recommendation was a couple of farmers who had said they were undecided whether the treatment was doing their herd any benefit. In these cases, Mr. Cross said, "they were using other treatments at the same time."

A number of the agricultural representatives in the areas are also staunch supporters of the treatment. One, to whom the committee talked, was outspoken in his regard for the "shots."

Not only in that area, but in other areas in United States the same situation is to be found. The committee had the privilege of studying the case histories sent in by veterinarians from many parts of the United States. The results were practically all the same—a complete clearing up of the trouble.

It was not suggested that the treatment was 100 percent effective in all cases. Both Mr. Thatcher and Mr. Watkins say they have reason to believe the treatment, over-all, is nearly 80 percent effective.

Space here does not permit us to report on the many other interviews and the documents that were studied by the committee. In no case was there any derogatory evidence either oral or documentary, other than that referred to near the beginning of this report, which originated at the State College at Lansing. The committee was so impressed with the evidence they had seen and heard that they will recommend to the London Association that herd tests be made in that area. We understand that an attempt will be made to have this done as speedily as possible.

In this report, we have referred to this therapy as treatments. While this definition is accurate within limitations, the liquid substance used is known as glyoxilide. It comes in small glass ampoules containing either 5 or 10 cubic centigrams. Five cubic centigrams is the amount usually employed at each treatment. It is administered with a hypodermic needle into the muscular section of the neck of the cow—sometimes in the rump. Each shot is considered a treatment. The herds visited by the committee had in the majority of cases only one treatment per cow. In some cases, two treatments were administered, and on rare occasion, three. The glyoxilide frequently produces reactions that manifest themselves in cycles of 21 days, gradually becoming lesser in intensity until they disappear entirely. It is only in extremely stubborn cases that two or more treatments are indicated. The beneficial effects of one treatment have been known to exist for up to 3 years. A year to 2 years is common. At most of the farms visited by the committee, there is a prevalent practice of retreating about every 18 months as a form of insurance. One result that was pointed out to the committee repeatedly is the generally lower bacteria count that follows the use of the glyoxilide. Counts of 8 to 10 thousand was mentioned on more than one occasion.

The action and work of the London Milk Producers Association will undoubtedly be followed with much interest, and this journal will endeavor to keep you up to date with the progress of the experiment if it is undertaken.

A Water Policy for the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 17, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include

the following address I shall deliver over radio station WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Monday, August 27, 1951:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, water is not free.

Man's misuse of it to meet his growing needs is proving costly to him.

To a man sitting on his cottage porch by the sea, or overlooking a great mountain lake, this statement might appear ridiculous.

To the residents of the big and fast-growing city of Los Angeles, who could not live for long if an earthquake or enemy action or other disaster should break the aqueduct that brings water over a long distance to supply their wants, this so-called common element is precious.

When water was rationed not so long ago to the inhabitants of New York City, it came as a surprise and warning to most of us.

Again, the recent floods in Kansas and Missouri, among the most destructive and expensive in our history, told us that we were not paying enough attention to the problem of water.

Coming closer to home, the capital city of Concord, N. H., in the foothills of the White Mountain watershed, was plagued by a water-contamination threat endangering the health of its people a few weeks ago.

Life magazine, in a recent issue, devoted its first picture story to a graphic account of the diminishing water supply in Arizona, and the resulting emergency that imperils the people and the economy of that area.

Without water, industry cannot operate, homes could not function, crops would not grow, forests would disappear, fish and game would become extinct, earth would become a desert, and the human race would perish.

On the other hand, the misuse or neglect of water leads to floods, erosion, and bacteria-breeding pollution.

In primitive times, our ancestors, caught between droughts and floods, offered sacrifices to the "god of water," seeking to placate the whims of this unpredictable "deity," who either gave them too much or too little.

Slowly, with the help of intelligence and experience, man is learning to control the extremes of nature. As the population of this world grows and its needs increase, a water policy program becomes imperative.

A good many years have passed since the first Americans called upon the medicine man to appease the moods of nature.

He was dismissed as we came to realize that he was bluffing it all the time.

However, the over-all problem of water is still with us, and it is getting worse.

So, instead of the medicine man, we now put our faith in the modern rainmaker, who sprinkles pellets into a cloud from his airplane so that the water-bearing cloud will dissolve in rain to nourish the parched earth.

We pride ourselves on the great cities—the millions of cars, television sets, and miscellaneous gadgets that we manufacture. In that process, we tend to ignore fundamentals. Next to air and food, there is always the basic necessity of water. In fact, it is present in what we breathe and in what we eat. The human body itself is largely composed of this element.

When water becomes so scarce that it is worth its weight in gold, when it floods the rich topsoil from our farmlands and deposits it on the floors of rivers and oceans, when it becomes so polluted that fish actually drown in it, we begin to understand that it is very important on many counts.

We cannot ignore it or abuse it.

The President's Water Resources Policy Commission, in its 445-page report, with more to come later, faces up to the challenge. We must control and conserve these resources, not in a hit-and-miss fashion but in multi-purpose river basin developments.

This is a big subject, a many-sided subject, and we have just begun to apply ourselves to it. In the few minutes at my disposal, I can only hope to make you aware of its urgency.

As the report states: "Water has unique characteristics. Time does not change it. It is the same today as it was 10,000 years ago. Water is active and affects all other things. It has molded our mountains, carved our great valleys, nourished our forests, created our alluvial plains, played a major part in creating the fertility of our land, and carried off our topsoil."

Changes in its quality are only temporary; it does not change in quantity but only in its location and form as it pursues nature's eternal cycle from the raindrop to the land, thence to the sea, and back again to the clouds. Throughout history, water has dominated human life. The earliest civilizations appeared in the great river basins of Mesopotamia and Egypt. Settlements were limited to coast lines and river banks; trading centers arose at the confluences of navigable streams. Rainfall and drought have set the stage for the drama of human existence. Rivers, with their life-giving waters, changing at times to swollen monsters bent on destruction, have been principal actors in that drama.

Until recent times, man has not attempted to control water, except in a limited measure for water supply and irrigation. He has, for the most part, been forced to adjust his ways to its moods as nature gave or withheld rain for his crops or overwhelmed him with raging floods. Prayer, magic, and sacrifices marked his early gropings for control.

The attempt to use science and technical skill to force water from the clouds is symbolic of the modern determination to control and use water rather than submit to it.

It is an expression of the same scientific determination to use the forces of nature to serve man's purposes as is embodied in such great river basin programs as that for the Columbia, which will ultimately provide 50,000,000 horsepower and bring millions of new acres under cultivation in the Pacific Northwest.

Midway in the twentieth century, two facts have become compellingly clear. The first is that water is limited in relation to the many and varied needs for its use. These needs will intensify as the population grows and as industry develops. New industrial techniques, such as those originated in the chemical industries, synthetic fuel production, and the harnessing of atomic power, bring with them increasing demands for water.

The second fact we can now see clearly is that the management, conservation, and use of our water resources is bound up with the use of our land, and that both are essential to our expansion as a Nation. Floods cannot be controlled by building higher and higher levees, or permanently by building dams, if other things are neglected. The big streams are fed by small streams, and water control inevitably leads us back to the proper conservation of forests and agricultural land.

In short if we do not manage and conserve water, we suffer losses, some of them beyond recovery, in our natural resources. If we do not manage and conserve these other resources, we shall lose the usefulness of our water; it will rush to the sea, robbing instead of enriching us.

In the West the crucial value of water has long been recognized.

The East is now waking up to its prime importance.

The faucets in millions of homes and factories could run dry through waste of this essential liquid.

The tendency of commercial and industrial centers to push their structures, and the location of railroad tracks which join

them, down into the natural flood plains of rivers, tended to create a major problem of protection every time a river swollen by melting snow or torrential rains, overflowed its banks. The need for flood control appeared critical.

Meanwhile, the expanding cities and industrial plants begin to overload the streams with their sewage, thus causing pollution which gradually rendered them unfit for beast, bird, fish, or man. Water treatment and pollution control, with part of the cost defrayed by the fertilizer reclaimed, became necessary as a measure to protect public health.

In New England the waters of the Merrimack have been so fouled for many years by sewage and factory discharges that some of the commercial clambers at its mouth must rinse the clams in salt water or possibly chlorinated water before selling them.

More than 100 bills dealing with the problem of pollution have been introduced in Congress during the past 50 years, culminating in the passage of the Water Pollution Act of 1948.

In New England, electric power rates are among the highest in the Nation because, in part, we have failed to develop the total hydroelectric resources of this region or resist any move for the development of such power in neighboring areas.

We are worried by the migration of our textile industry. Now there are many reasons for this movement, including high taxes, the attitudes of management and labor, old and inefficient machinery, equipment, and plants, etc. Let us say that, in addition to these and other competitive disadvantages, the high cost of power is no inducement for them to remain here.

One hundred years ago when the textile industry settled in New England this area had a monopoly on all the factors necessary for the production of cotton and woolen goods. Most of the craft skills, the few key energy resources to power the machines, the availability of investment capital, cheap transportation, the limited number of raw materials without effective substitutes, resulted in a specialization. New England was the unchallenged center of textile manufacturing.

New England became the victim of habit and inertia, overlooking the fact that urban civilization was spreading across the whole continent.

Technical knowledge, manual skills, and dynamic enterprise began to lure textile manufacturers to the South. New England preferred to ignore the challenge, while more and more mills moved away. Belatedly, this area is recognizing that the challenge has become a threat that can no longer be brushed off as of little consequence. New England must get up on its competitive toes, become alert and up to date, if the textile industry is not to be lost by default.

I mention this in connection with the subject of A Water Policy for the American People only to contrast the stand-pat attitude with the handwriting on the wall seen and learned by those who believe in the economic betterment that follows from full development of an area's resources.

The manifold problem of water, its control and conservation, is not the all-in-one answer for New England, but it must be reckoned with squarely and honestly.

It is one of our few natural resources.

With precedent and ample warnings before us, the extent to which we learn how to use and control this life-supporting element for health, recreation, power, and economic progress will determine our capacity to meet modern problems with modern solutions.

I say again that we cannot afford to abuse our waterways or take them for granted.

During the Eighty-first Congress, various bills were introduced which, severally, would extend the Tennessee Valley Authority to

include the Cumberland River basin; create separate valley authorities for the Columbia River, the Merrimack River, the Missouri River, the Connecticut River, and the Savannah River; and create a comprehensive system of valley authorities covering the entire country.

These have been temporarily sidetracked by a threat to our security from without.

But, in time, we shall learn or fail to learn the lesson that "every human enterprise is the mixture of a little bit of humanity, a little bit of soil, and a little bit of water."

The China Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following review by Edna Lonigan of the best-seller book, *The China Story*, by Freda Utley, published by Henry Regnery Co., Chicago:

In her new book Freda Utley reviews the China story from the close of the Second World War to the entrance of Communist China into the Korean war. Her book cannot be read, even by those who have followed every twist and turn in our China policy, without a mounting sense of fury at the betrayal of both China and America.

The material falls into two parts, American policy in China, and the making of that policy in this country.

The China phase of the story is extremely well done. Miss Utley saw much of it with her own eyes, and for the rest has gone to the original sources, especially the hearings in Congress. For the story of what happened in this country, Miss Utley is dependent on the general level of writing and thinking about our present political issues, and that is extremely low. We do not have any such analysis of American political life today as has been made of our policies in China.

Miss Utley describes very well the conspiracy to sabotage our policy in China, but she is not yet willing to believe the extent of the conspiracy. She tries to explain the military loss of our right flank, and the political loss of 400,000,000 allies, as due to "misunderstanding" of China. She still hopes for a change through better "understanding" of Russian communism, without seeing that the problem for Americans is understanding of how communism operates through American agents in the American Government, Congress, and the press. Hers is the position taken by nearly all our writers today.

Perhaps the best chapter in the book is that on American "aid" to Chiang, entitled "Too Little and Too Late." Miss Utley disposes completely of the padded figures used by the administration and its adherents to suggest that we gave vast amounts of assistance to China, and Chiang was too corrupt or inefficient to use it.

Mr. Acheson's bloated figures of our postwar aid include postwar lend-lease, military aid, and UNRRA. Postwar lend-lease includes the cost of repatriating Japanese soldiers and moving Chinese Nationalist troops into the areas recovered from Japan. These are clearly war costs. As Dr. Judd pointed out, we actually saved money by transporting Chinese troops instead of sending American forces to take over from Japan.

Another item in Chinese lend-lease is the estimated value of supplies left in the China-Burma-India theater, and destroyed promptly at the end of the war in Asia. These items are still charged to Chinese lend-lease aid though many of them are at the bottom of the sea.

A third financial item is UNRRA. As Miss Utley says, as fast as UNRRA rebuilt roads and bridges, railroads and flood-control dams, the Chinese Communists destroyed them. For that the Communists were given a large share of UNRRA aid—which is charged to Nationalist China.

It is easy to see how much material help all this gave to Chiang in his postwar struggle with the Communist armies. But in these financial reports only figures were murdered. Far more terrible is the story of what happened to the bullets the Chinese soldiers needed to protect their country against hostile invasion.

The Chinese did not need the more elaborate types of war equipment—heavy artillery, antiaircraft, radar. They needed, as General Stilwell said, "Bullets, damn it, just bullets." What happened to those bullets for the guns of China is a story that every American should know in exact detail because it explains why 250,000 of our countrymen are fighting in Korea.

The Chinese needed rifle ammunition of the same caliber as the German 7.92 millimeter. After VE-day, captured stocks of such German ammunition were ordered shipped to China, with the approval of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. But the very first consignment was stopped in midpassage by an order from Lauchlin Currie of the White House Secretariat, who had been named by Elizabeth Bentley as among her contacts when she was a courier for the Soviet espionage network. As Miss Utley says, this ammunition would have given the Nationalists critically needed help at no cost whatever to us.

After VJ-day the same sudden mysterious orders went out to destroy all ammunition, planes, jeeps, and the rest in the Pacific, instead of sending them to China. We know what vast quantities of goods were in the pipelines leading from our American factories to the fighting fronts. We know what tons of equipment would have piled up for Chiang's armies. But someone in our Government knew, and did not want Chiang to have them. He issued an order to help the Soviet war plans by throwing the stuff into the sea. Congress has never given this chapter in our postwar debacle the attention it deserves.

We can only list the many forms in which our military aid to Chiang was sabotaged. General Marshall ordered an embargo of war matériel into China that lasted a year, while the Communists were being rearmed by the U. S. S. R.

War surpluses were sold to China, but the Armed Forces were ordered not to declare anything surplus if it was of military value. (Instead of letting the Nationalist Chinese use our equipment against the Communists, we waited and let our men use it against the same Communists in Korea.) Only a small part of the ammunition the administration did sell was of the type the Chinese could use in their equipment. The Chinese bought the rest to use the explosives in mining, or to make new ammunition—while time was running out.

When Congress finally rebelled, and voted military aid to Free China, the State Department, and other Federal agencies, held up the purchases, set arbitrary standards, made studies, refused shipping permits, and used every possible tactic of delay. The first substantial shipment of the arms Congress ordered left Seattle just after the Communists had conquered most of China.

Finally our Government ingeniously cut the value of congressional appropriations for China by rigging the prices charged for

equipment. Prices were set 10 to 30 times as high as prices the Government charged Greece and Turkey for the same matériel. Thus the effective value of congressional appropriations could be cut 90 percent.

Even Mr. Acheson admits the Chinese did not surrender ammunition to the Communists. They surrendered their guns when they could no longer fire them. We do not know how many of those Chinese fighters, some of them trained in Burma by American officers, have been shot or sent to Siberian slave camps because they did not want to join the Communist armies we are fighting today.

As Miss Utley makes clear, the story in Korea is an exact parallel to that in China. We were twice bitten but now twice shy. The blockade of the China coast by our Navy after the outbreak in Korea enabled the Chinese Communists to rearm, by stopping Formosa's blockade of Shanghai and Tientsin. This is Marshall's 1946 blockade of our friends, and rearming of our enemies all over again. Again the peace settlement proposed by the administration in Korea is, like Marshall's peace in China, pure appeasement of the Communist enemy. Miss Utley probably would have added that the Soviet peace terms on the front pages today are underneath the double-talk, exactly the same as the Acheson-Marshall-Lattimore solution in China, withdrawal of our Armed Forces, mock withdrawal of the Communists, while the native Communists are rearmed by the U. S. S. R.

Miss Utley then attempts to account for diplomatic and military policies in Asia designed perfectly to help the U. S. S. R. by analyzing what happenings in our Government made this possible. She gives a fine account of how the Communists captured the diplomats in the China field, how John Davies, John Stewart Service, and others were won over to the Communist side, and then, while still remaining as American public servants, did everything their positions permitted to aid the victory of Communist arms. Miss Utley also tells how these servants of communism, when they returned home, were always promoted to higher echelons in the policy-making bodies of the State Department and our Armed Forces. John Davies is in charge of our Far Eastern policy in the State Department's Policy Planning Committee. John Service is about to come up for Senate approval for another promotion.

In her excellent discussion of the way writers were won over, the author mentions Francis McCracken Fisher, who served with the United Press Bureau in Hankow, then went to OWI, and became policy information officer for the Far Eastern Division of the State Department "where he was in a position to decide what news and views should be passed on to the higher-ups." In 1949, she adds, "When congressional pressure forced a minor house-cleaning job in the Far Eastern Division . . . Mac Fisher was quietly moved over to the War College." Miss Utley believes Mr. Fisher is not a Communist, but if somebody powerful did not love him, when he was criticized by Congress, he would not have been promoted to the War College, but led to the nearest exit.

One of the best ways to test whether officials have the support of the Communist bloc in our Government is to notice whether, when they are criticized, they invariably come out with higher rank, ever nearer to a more sensitive area. Miss Utley is concerned to distinguish between those who are Communist by conviction, those who follow the Communist line out of ambition, and those who are innocent dupes. These are important distinctions when judging an individual but we must be careful to remember that they are of no importance whatever when judging the political power of the Communist bloc in our Government.

Miss Utley puts together correctly important pieces of the pattern by which American Government and military officials aided a hostile power and sabotaged our own country and our most loyal allies. But still she does not believe the pattern is there. She believes minor officials of the Foreign Service in one geographical area were powerful enough to overturn the hundred-year-old American policy in Asia, and to do it without anyone's knowing or effectively protesting. That is underestimating the solid structure of the American executive establishment, the Congress, the press, and public opinion. Many protested and protested bravely and clearly. Our problem is to find what force could have been strong enough to overcome all those solid American institutions and the people who had been educated in the American creed in foreign policy.

Miss Utley reports that career-minded men in the Foreign Service thought it necessary to support the Communist side, if they hoped to get promotion, but she does not ask who was strong enough to make it certain that pro-Communists in the State Department would go up, and pro-Americans would go down—or out, like Grew and Hornbeck. No career men believe such claims unless they are supported by proof of power. She reports that pro-Communists rose steadily to positions of increasing importance in the writing field, but she does not wonder why the law of averages failed so signally after being so dependable for a long, long time.

Miss Utley says, "Since this was the period when the influence of the Friends of the Soviet Union and the champions of the Chinese Communists was at its height, it was hardly surprising that many well-known columnists and commentators, and editors followed the IPR-State Department line." Well, it was very surprising, one of the most surprising things that has ever happened in this country, where the free press has had greater influence and greater professional pride than in any other country.

Miss Utley fails to explain—or even to ask—why the same curious design for secret support of the Soviet Union's intricate moves for power appeared at the same critical moment in our State Department in China, the State Department in Washington, the top military, the White House, the administration supporters in Congress, the press, the colleges, and even the churches. It appeared in our European policy as well as in Asia, though Miss Utley does not see—from a distance—how the Marshall plan blunted our opposition to communism in Europe, as Marshall did in Asia. Even Turkey seems at the moment to be getting the China treatment.

All the different parts of our postwar foreign policy were designed to fit together, and the level from which the parts were coordinated was evidently far above the State Department and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The locus of the conspiracy within our Government to let Asia fall, but not let it look as if we pushed her, must have been in the White House circle, or in the top levels of the party in power, or, in practice, both.

Miss Utley thinks the American people are deluded about the nature of the Communists in Russia. That is not the problem. American publicists are still deluded about the nature of communism in the American Government, American parties, and the American press. It is because the Communists now have roots deep in American political life that we shall find no easy way to dislodge them.

Mr. Acheson "believes that the Soviet Government's ambitions are not the result of any lust for power, but merely the consequence of a false philosophy," says Miss Utley. Perhaps. And perhaps not. Mr. Acheson's behavior at the hearings before the Armed Forces and the Foreign Relations

Committees of the Senate was hardly that of a simple-minded idealist. It suggested the behavior of a very able lawyer defending a client who was guilty as charged.

Like so many commentators, Miss Utley is misled by the belief that Americans were fooled by the Communists because they are indifferent to foreign affairs, ignorant of countries other than their own. That ignores the fact that the United States has till now had a great foreign policy. The British had a more difficult problem than we had in their nearness to Europe, but no nation has ever had a greater foreign policy than we, especially in Asia. It does not take an extensive knowledge of foreign geography and customs and culture, to make a good foreign policy. That the British lacked also. It takes clear political understanding of the relations between nations, and a clear understanding of the basis of free political institutions at home. Both of those we possessed in full measure.

The Communist General Staff which in 1942 decided to sabotage our policy in Asia did not underestimate us. They did not send a man on a boy's errand. They thoroughly understood every phase of American governmental, political, and cultural life, and they devised a military campaign to overcome our total strength.

If we wish to cut out the conspiracy which wrecked our China policy, and, as Miss Utley says, now keeps us fighting in Korea with one hand tied behind our backs, in preparation for an appeasement peace, then we dare not underestimate it.

Miss Utley hopes we can change our China policy by a change of heart, but she herself gives us the answer in her last chapter. She quotes there the terms of the Russo-Chinese Treaty which the Communists have signed, and which makes the 400,000,000 people of China into slaves of the Soviet Leviathan.

Americans cannot overcome the political skill which has parlayed postwar Russian poverty and desolation into an empire of 800,000,000 slaves unless we recognize that the problem is power, and regain the understanding of power and the skill in dealing with it, which are the American political heritage. (The China Story, by Freda Utley, Henry Regnery Co., Chicago, Ill., price \$3.50.)

Employment of the Physically Handicapped—Address by the Secretary of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 27, 1951

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the address by Secretary of Labor Maurice J. Tobin at the annual meeting of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, in the Departmental Auditorium, Washington, D. C., August 17, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY FOR HANDICAPPED

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am happy to welcome you today, just as I was happy to welcome you from this same platform a year ago. I am also

glad to report much progress by your Government and by the Department of Labor during these last 12 months of defense mobilization.

A year ago, in talking with you, I said:

"Today, employment is high and going higher. We meet in the grim shadow of a tense world situation. Our troops are fighting in Korea. To meet the growing demands for manpower and supplies this Nation is speeding defense production and rapidly expanding its armed might. Here in the Department of Labor, we are throwing all the resources of every bureau and agency into the task of drawing up plans to meet the current civilian manpower situation, as it is affected by the President's program."

I could repeat the same statement almost in its entirety, except that today the plans have not only been drawn but are in operation. I shall discuss with you some of the completed plans and some of the action taken since our last annual meeting on August 9, 1950.

During the last fiscal year, ending June 30, 1951, some 277,000 job placements were made of physically handicapped workers through the joint efforts of the Federal-State public employment service system. This figure compares with 177,000 for the previous year, exactly a 100,000 increase. Included in this remarkable figure of more than one quarter of a million placements of handicapped workers in a 12-month period, were 132,000 disabled veterans.

Only 1945, the last year of the war, with its 297,000 handicapped placement exceeded the record total of 277,000 during fiscal 1951. Of course, 1951 was a record year for all placements, with more than 14,000,000 workers placed.

You can gather some idea of the magnitude of handicapped placements by comparing them with the increase of 47 percent in placement of male workers and a 22-percent rise in total placements of women over the previous year. The increase in the placement of handicapped workers during 1951 as compared with 1950 was 56 percent.

I believe that Robert Goodwin, Director of the Bureau of Employment Security, and his coworkers, including Perry Faulkner, Chief of the Veterans' Employment Service, are entitled to a real vote of gratitude from the Nation for this record. The State Employment Security Administrators, many of whom are with us today in their capacities as chairman of governors' committees, can take particular pride in the work done during the past 12 months for they have actually done the major job.

However, the job has only just begun. We have completed the comparatively easy part of the task. The real challenge and the real goal lie ahead. During the next 12 months we must not only continue our placement of qualified handicapped workers, but we must increase our national efforts to rehabilitate and train other workers, particularly the severely disabled, so that they can enter our labor market with credit to themselves and profit to their country.

In my remarks last year I referred to Korea. You have all read the casualty figures in your local papers. I need not repeat them here. However, I can assure you that the Department of Labor is doing everything possible to assure job opportunity for today's Korean disabled veterans.

Military and naval hospitals are being visited by representatives of the Veterans Employment Service or the State employment services.

Where the discharge rate of disabled veterans from service hospitals has warranted establishment of itinerant service in the hospital itself, such a service has been arranged.

Today, procedures are established so that the local office of the employment service

near the service hospital is called at any time there is a need for services or counseling. We are trying to provide expeditious and detailed services to the disabled veteran, not only while he is in a service hospital, but after he has returned home to his own community and is either looking for work or seeking further training.

The disabled veterans in active employment service files are fewer in number today than at any time since the end of World War II. Less than 31,000 disabled veterans are actually registered and seeking employment.

The disabled veteran of Korea is much younger than his older brother who suffered injuries during World War II. Some 80 percent of today's disabled veterans from Korea are under 20 years of age. Naturally, this means that we must work closely with the Veterans' Administration in finding training opportunities for many of these young men who are now entering the labor market with no previous work experience.

However, I would not have you think that we are overlooking the civilian handicapped. The Department has been working closely with the Federal Security Agency, the Department of Defense and the Office of Defense Mobilization, as well as with other agencies of Government, to assure our country of the greatest possible utilization of its available manpower.

As you all know, the Office of Defense Mobilization, headed by our friend Mr. Charles E. Wilson, who is on the platform today, has over-all responsibility for manpower policy and coordination. Mr. Wilson has a special interagency committee on manpower policy. It advises him on manpower problems, including the allocation of available manpower to meet military and civilian requirements. This advisory group also reviews policies, plans and programs relating to manpower and studies proposed executive orders and legislation in this important field.

Another committee, a labor-management manpower policy committee, advises both the ODM and the Department of Labor, which has responsibility for almost all of the civilian manpower mobilization. The various programs of the Labor Department today and since the onset of Korean hostilities, are coordinated and directed by the Defense Manpower Administration, headed by former Senator Frank Graham, now on leave of absence, who chaired the mobilization panel at your spring meeting in May.

Under the Department's Defense Manpower Administrator, plans are developed and placed into operation by the Bureau of Employment Security, the Bureau of Labor Standards, which services the President's committee, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Bureau of Apprenticeship, the Women's Bureau, and the Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights.

The plans that I referred to in my remarks here last August have been placed in action. In each of 13 regions, area directors of DMA have been set up. In each of these regions, labor-management committees on defense manpower and interagency mobilization committees of Federal agencies concerned with manpower problems have been established and are operating.

To provide our communities with readily functioning local representatives of DMA, I have designated the local managers of the Public Employment Service offices as responsible for manpower problems, including the increased placement and proper utilization of the handicapped. Locally, citizens' committees advise and work with these appointed officials. Local NEPH committees are no doubt assisting these local office managers in solving pressing manpower problems.

I have recited this chain of command for manpower utilization for two reasons. First, that you may have a better understanding of wherein lie opportunities for you and your

respective organizations to assist in the national manpower program, and, secondly, to draw a comparison between our attack upon the problem and the similar voluntary administrative operation of the President's committee, which works somewhat less formally through Governor's committees and thence through them to local committees.

Within a week I will release a new publication to the field, titled "The Job at Home." It is subtitled "Labor and Management Mobilize." Aimed at responsible community and State leaders who will be serving on our area manpower committees, the booklet emphasizes the vital importance of the current defense program. It points out that the success of our efforts depends on all of us, that a large part of the defense manpower job must be done on the local level.

Our objective today is to insure that national manpower resources are developed and used in such a way as to make the maximum contribution in safeguarding our national security.

Many of you may find this pamphlet upon your desks when you return to your States and communities next week. Others will become familiar with it in the months ahead. In a way, it is similar to your Committee's Program Guide, which Admiral McIntire tells me is being released today, a program guide for coordinated, cooperative community action in behalf of the handicapped. "The Job at Home" includes the handicapped, but also takes into consideration the older worker, women, young workers, and certain minority groups.

In all this planning and special work, I am constantly reminded of the need for better and more accurate statistics, particularly in the field of the handicapped. The Department has previously endorsed special legislation aimed at providing us with more documented figures regarding the number of handicapped, types of disabilities, and incidence of the handicapped in the population. I am still convinced that a survey or census, even of a pilot variety in one community, would be a distinct help. Those of you who represent communities or who are connected with foundations having funds for such a worthy project in this period of defense mobilization might explore with your associates the possibilities of such a census or survey.

I realize that the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and the Bureau of the Census conducted a national sample survey last September. They estimated that some 3,000,000 persons in the age group 14 to 64 were unable to work or could work only occasionally because of a disability that had lasted 7 months or longer. I am happy to agree with the Census people who conservatively estimate that more than 2,000,000 handicapped people in America can be added to our labor force if provided with selective placement and rehabilitation. However, this estimate, excellent as it is and useful as it undoubtedly will be, is still not the definitive and definite figure we would like to have.

As reported by Selective Service Director Lewis B. Hershey, a considerable number of the handicapped are included in those rejected for military service for physical reasons. They should be given every possible opportunity to serve their country on the defense line since they have been denied the opportunity to help out on the firing line. I am personally very much interested in any plan whereby many of these young men could serve in uniform on a limited-duty basis. I know that this has been under serious consideration for some time, and I feel that perhaps the Government might undertake a pilot program with great profit.

Another suggestion relating to this whole field of the proper use of manpower in the defense effort has been made recently. It is simply that special effort be made by the

Government and by defense contractors to place subcontracts with firms having as a cardinal policy the employment of handicapped workers.

I am familiar with many establishments that employ handicapped workers almost exclusively. I would presume that many of these firms would be excellent places for subcontract work connected with national defense. It may well be worth while for the Office of Defense Mobilization and the Department of Defense to consider some method of alerting their purchasing officials to the possibilities of placing orders with shops and plants specializing in the employment of qualified handicapped workers. I can offer the services of the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions of the Department of Labor in making known to the proper authorities places of employment where the handicapped, particularly the seriously disabled, are given an opportunity to make good that is so frequently denied them.

This idea certainly blends well with something else that I said at your meeting a year ago. I said:

"Our goal this year cannot be confined merely to obtaining job equality for the physically handicapped. It must be enlarged by a vigorous campaign to bring to the attention of employers, as dramatically as we can, the very real manpower asset we have in our handicapped population. As the demand for manpower expands, employment of handicapped workers must be maximized to the extent needed in defense production."

This maximum use of the handicapped would certainly be furthered if they could be brought more and more into the defense effort through such means as I have just suggested.

Our efforts to bring about maximum utilization of the handicapped have taken many forms, several of which I have mentioned already. I should not like to omit mention of a recent joint statement prepared by the Department and the Federal Security Agency for the Office of Defense Mobilization. This 5-page document, titled "Mobilization of the Handicapped for National Defense," emphasizes the importance of community action. In addition, the Department has cooperated with the Federal Security Agency, Civil Service Commission, and the Veterans' Administration in preparing a proposed plan for the maximum utilization of the physically handicapped. This resulted from the pioneer work of your own mobilization committee which set out a year ago to draw up usable plans for today's emergency. We are presently working out the details for use of this plan in a few selected areas where there are labor shortages. We hope that through the lessons learned in this and in other pilot projects, to have available a tried and tested plan in the event general mobilization is forced upon us by our enemies.

America's free workers, who have proved beyond question their ability to outproduce the slave laborers of dictator countries, stand ready to do their important tasks in the great defense effort that confronts us.

We must, however, use our manpower wisely; we cannot afford to squander our human resources.

As the demand for manpower expands, the great potentialities for labor expansion that lie in the huge reservoir of unused skills represented by unemployed handicapped workers must not be overlooked. Properly placed, handicapped workers will meet the test, whether in the shop, the office, the laboratory, or on the farm. Those who are not employed should be given the right to take their places in the common effort to build up the strength of the Nation. Those not trained should be trained.

We ask no special preference for the handicapped; simply equality of employment op-

portunity. Employers who do not now employ physically handicapped workers are urged to consider them for available jobs, as new manpower is required in the defense effort. America needs all of us.

The President's Industrial Dispersal Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 27, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, this afternoon I issued a statement relative to the President's statement on the dispersal of industry, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. EDWARD MARTIN,
OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. President, in his statement defending his industrial dispersal order President Truman complains that it has been misrepresented by its critics.

His program, the President asserts, and I quote his words, "merely encourages the spacing of new defense and defense supporting industries a few miles apart."

The program, the President continues in his statement, "merely suggests that in building a new plant . . . the site of the new plant shall be located a few miles away from other defense plants in the same locality."

But I insist, Mr. President, that when a policy, presented as one of "encouragement" and "suggestion," has within it the power of compulsion and the threat of severe punishment, it violates the principles of free competitive enterprise and becomes dictatorship.

The President's order of August 10 states that the Director of Defense Mobilization shall establish general standards with respect to dispersal which shall be followed in the granting of certificates of necessity, in the allocation of critical material for construction purposes, and in the making of loans growing out of defense production.

But when we turn to the National Industrial Dispersion Policy, as promulgated by the President, we find that it goes beyond the President's order by including further and more drastic measures to be taken against industries which do not meet satisfactory standards of dispersal.

It announces that "defense contracts will be awarded, and planning under Department of Defense production allocation programs will be conducted, in such a manner as to make maximum use of facilities located in dispersed sites."

Is it improper to ask for a clear and more explicit definition of satisfactory standards?

Is it improper to question the wisdom of giving the Government unlimited power to dictate where new or expanded defense industry is to be located?

In the booklet issued by the National Security Resources Board, it is suggested that dispersed areas be selected 10 to 20 miles away from densely populated or highly industrialized sections and the same distance from major military installations.

But the plan itself places no 10- or 20-mile limitation.

If the program contemplates dispersal of only a few miles Congress should write it into the law in language so clear that there could be no possibility of misunderstanding or misinterpretation.

Otherwise, the "satisfactory standards of dispersal" to which industry may be required to conform, could be so framed that they would hold the power of life or death over any industry or industrial community.

I am firm in the belief that the President's order is dangerous and harmful to the defense effort. It should be revoked, and I shall do everything in my power to have Congress enact my bill to prohibit the administration from carrying out the program.

Employment of the Physically Handicapped—Address by the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 27, 1951

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, it was my privilege recently to attend the full meeting of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. The opening speech at that meeting was by President Truman.

Mr. President, the millions of physically handicapped persons in this country deserve every encouragement. The President in his speech pointed out the progress that has been made in the employment and utilization of physically handicapped persons. I commend the reading of the address by the President, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am glad to welcome you to this annual meeting. It's good to be with you again.

This year of 1951 will be the seventh year that we have observed National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. In those 7 years, we have made a lot of progress. The needs of the physically handicapped are much better understood throughout the country than they have ever been before. Many of the old prejudices against employing handicapped workers are disappearing. It is now well recognized that employment of the physically handicapped is a natural and very valuable part of our economic life.

The figures show that this is true. Secretary Tobin and Administrator Ewing will give you all the details. But it's very impressive to me that during this past year, the public employment services were able to find 100,000 more jobs for handicapped people than during the year before. That's a gain of more than 50 percent.

This kind of progress shows the value of the work of this committee, which has brought private citizens and private organizations and State and Federal agencies together in one great effort.

Much good has been done in these last years, but there is a great deal more that we must do. Our goal should be to see that every physically handicapped person who wants to work and who is able to work gets a chance at a job he can do.

I say this, not only because we ought to do it as a matter of decency, but also because

there is so much our handicapped citizens can do for us, if we help them to gain employment.

We need these people in our labor force. We need them badly. We need to use their skills and energies in our great program of defense production, to help us win the struggle for a just and lasting peace.

The production job ahead of us calls for the fullest and wisest use of all our resources and especially of our manpower.

We are now employing more than 62,500,000 people in this country. As defense production expands, there are going to be more and more jobs and it will be harder and harder to find enough people to fill them.

A great proportion of the able-bodied young people who in earlier years would have been starting work for the first time, are being drawn instead into the armed services. These conditions are bound to continue.

This means that in our national interest it is urgent for us to make full use of the skills and abilities of all our handicapped citizens. Those who have been trained should be employed at their highest level of skill. Those who have not yet been trained should be given rehabilitation and vocational training. Your 1951 poster puts the problem very clearly when it says, "America needs all of us."

I think that you should hammer this point over and over again. Giving the physically handicapped a job is not a charity. It is not just a gratuitous kindness. These people need jobs, it's true. But the more important fact is that the country needs their help. If they are given the right jobs—jobs fitted to their capabilities—they can do just as much as anyone else to increase the production of the Nation.

The polio victim, the spastic, the blind, the deaf, and the amputee, as well as those suffering from heart disease and other disabilities can all do their part. All they need is a reasonable chance and good old American fair play. Once on the right job they ask no favors of anyone.

I hope that this Committee will make every employer in the country aware of the fact that hiring the physically handicapped is not simply a humanitarian obligation, but a real business opportunity. These people include some of the best workers we have. They are people who have suffered the shock of being disabled, and have gone through the physical and mental suffering of being crippled or blinded or otherwise injured. And, in spite of all that, they have picked themselves up again, mastered their handicap and fitted themselves, sometimes through years of rigorous training, for jobs which they can do. It takes a lot of character to go through an experience like that, and in any kind of employment—I don't care what it is—character counts.

I am going to have the pleasure this morning of presenting a trophy on behalf of this Committee. This award is to be given annually to a handicapped individual selected by the Committee for the best performance of the year in behalf of the physically handicapped.

The trophy was designed and made by four severely handicapped persons. The young man who has been selected to receive it this year is also a severely handicapped person. He is an employer in Chicago. He is in business for himself. He is successful in that business. Today, he employs 80 persons and 60 of them—three-fourths of them—are handicapped. Some of them are blind, some are deaf, some have lost an arm or leg. But that plant of his, during World War II, outproduced larger concerns that employed more workers. It did such fine work that it received the Army and Navy "E" award.

I am very proud of that young man—George Barr. He has made this country a better place to live in—and he has shown

what men can do if they have the courage and the will.

There is a lesson for all of us in this story. That lesson is that you never know what you can do until the going gets rough. The true measure of a man's ability—the true measure of the character and ability of a nation—comes out only in a struggle against difficulties.

A lot of people are saying these days that the people of our country are soft. They are saying that we haven't had things easy for too long, and that we do not have the strength of character to impose restrictions on ourselves and to undergo hardships in this time of crisis.

I simply don't believe this. I just don't think it's true. When I look at the record of our physically handicapped, and what they have done and are doing in American industry, I know it is not true. And if any further proof is needed we can find it in the record of our soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen in Korea. There's nothing soft about the job our fighting men have been doing over there, and there's nothing soft about the way our physically handicapped workers have been doing their jobs here at home.

If these among us who have been disabled can pick up their lives again, and fit themselves for jobs in spite of their handicaps, I am sure that the rest of us can do what we are called upon to do in this period of national defense.

This Nation is not soft. I believe we have the same kind of character we have always had. I believe we have the will and strength and know-how to carry on through these difficult times.

I know we can face up to any problems that lie ahead, both at home and abroad.

And I am confident that we can reach our goal of a just and lasting peace.

Flying Leathernecks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 27, 1951

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared regarding a motion picture entitled "Flying Leathernecks," which it was my privilege recently to witness at an advance showing here in Washington, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. RICHARD NIXON, OF CALIFORNIA

This film is the Edmund Grainger production, Flying Leathernecks, portraying the immortal achievements of our Marine Corps air arm in the early days of the Pacific war. It is a splendid combination of documented World War II history and an original story.

With the passage of time, too many of us are prone to forget the very important part played in the ultimate victory by those few brave Americans who were on the battle scene at the war's outset, and during the trying days and weeks immediately afterward. Ill-equipped as they were, they held the line and even accomplished strategic advances which, it later developed, were of the utmost importance to final success.

It is the story of this critical stage of the war and the part played in it by our fight-

ing marine flyers which is portrayed in excellent fashion in Flying Leathernecks. Mr. Grainger is to be highly commended for this production of great historic and patriotic significance which is at the same time good entertainment.

Our Wartime Relations With the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 27, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on August 17 the Honorable W. Averell Harriman made a statement regarding our wartime relations with the Soviet Union, particularly as they concern the agreements reached at Yalta. This statement is so informative and so useful for reference by Members of the Congress and others interested, that I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD at a cost estimated by the Public Printer to be \$512.50.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF W. AVERELL HARRIMAN, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT, REGARDING OUR WARTIME RELATIONS WITH THE SOVIET UNION, PARTICULARLY AS THEY CONCERN THE AGREEMENTS REACHED AT YALTA

I am submitting this statement for use in connection with the hearings on the far-eastern situation. My objective is to clarify the confusion that has arisen regarding the understandings reached at Yalta by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill with Premier Stalin.

Much has been said and written about Yalta and its effect on the postwar course of events. Some people have shown a lack of understanding of our objectives in the conduct of the war and our efforts during the war to lay a foundation for a peaceful postwar world. Others appear to have profited from hindsight. Still others—for reasons best known to themselves—have distorted and perverted the facts to a point where their statements have little or no basis in reality. As a result, a myth has grown up that what President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill did at Yalta has led to our postwar difficulties with the Soviet Union. This myth is without foundation in fact.

The discussions at Yalta and the understandings reached there were an integral part of our negotiations with the Soviet Union throughout the war to bring the desperate struggle to a victorious and early conclusion and to find a way in which the United States, Great Britain, and the U. S. S. R. could live together in peace. The postwar problems have resulted not from the understandings reached at Yalta but from the fact that Stalin failed to carry out those understandings and from aggressive actions by the Kremlin.

In this statement I have attempted to set forth the manner in which President Roosevelt sought to achieve his objectives. In doing so I have drawn heavily on my personal experiences. After being involved in our rearmament program beginning June 1940, I was sent by President Roosevelt to London in March of 1941 as his special representative for assistance to Great Britain.

From October 1943 until January 1946, I was Ambassador to the Soviet Union. Prior to this appointment President Roosevelt had sent me on several special missions. The first was in September of 1941, when I went to Moscow with Lord Beaverbrook as chairman of the President's special mission to the Soviet Union. In August 1942, I represented President Roosevelt at the first meeting of Prime Minister Churchill and Premier Stalin in Moscow. I was with Secretary of State Hull at the Moscow conference in October 1943. I attended all but one of the conferences between President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, and all of the conferences between the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union—Tehran in November 1943, Yalta in February 1945, and Potsdam in July 1945. I also attended the meeting between Churchill and Stalin in Moscow in October 1944. I was in San Francisco for a few weeks during the United Nations conference in April and May 1945. Throughout the war I had innumerable personal talks with Churchill and many discussions with Stalin.

The primary objective of the American and British Governments in our relations with the Soviet Union during the war was to keep the Soviet Army as an effective fighting force against Hitler. We sought to do this through the shipment of essential supplies and through the coordination of our military strategy. Supplies began to flow shortly after the discussions Lord Beaverbrook and I had with Stalin in Moscow in September 1941. The principal strategic talks took place when Churchill visited Moscow in August 1942 and at Tehran in November 1943. At this latter conference, Stalin was informed of our plans to land in France, and he undertook to attack shortly after we got ashore in order to prevent the Germans from diverting divisions from the eastern front to the west.

There are those who now contend that we should not have supported the Soviet armies. They contend that we should have let Germany and the Soviet Union kill each other off. These people forget the real danger was that Hitler would knock Russia out of the war. The Germans were only a few miles from Moscow when I was there in October 1941. That year the winter saved the city. I was in Moscow again in August 1942 when the Russians were again facing disaster. The supplies from the British and ourselves may have been decisive in helping the Russians to hold Leningrad, to prevent the encirclement of Moscow, and to stop the onslaught on Stalingrad and the oil fields of the Caucasus. With the increased flow of our supplies, by the spring of 1944 the Russians had been able to throw the Germans back on all fronts.

These people forget that on June 6, 1944, when the Allies landed on the Normandy beaches, there were about 60 German Divisions in France and the Low Countries, whereas there were 199 German divisions and 50 satellite divisions engaged on the eastern front. In accordance with Stalin's agreement at Tehran, the Russian armies launched a major offensive on June 22 and tied down and broke through this formidable Nazi force.

If we had failed to come to the support of the Soviet Union the Germans would have rendered the Russian armies ineffective and would have been able to throw their full power against an Allied invasion of the Continent. In this case it is doubtful whether such an invasion could have been attempted, and no one can now tell how long the war with Hitler might have lasted.

These tremendous and courageous operations by the Soviet Army and the fact that Stalin had honored such a vital military commitment influenced the attitude of British and American representatives in subsequent negotiations with the Soviet Union—

and built up favorable opinion for the Soviet Union among the people of the United States and the other western allies.

In addition to maintaining the Soviet Union as an effective fighting ally against Hitler, it was our objective to encourage the Soviet Union to join in the war against Japan at the earliest possible date. Because of their ambitions in the east, there was never any doubt in my mind that the Soviets would attack the Japanese in Manchuria in their own due time. The question was whether they could come in early enough to be of any help to us and to save American lives. I raised the subject with Stalin as early as August 1942. He told me then that it was his intention to come into the Pacific war when he was in a position to do so. Stalin was gravely concerned by the possibility of a premature attack by the Japanese. He had weakened his Siberian forces for the defense of Stalingrad. Furthermore, the Japanese Navy alone could have cut off the vital line of our supplies coming through Vladivostok.

The question of Soviet participation in the Pacific war was discussed in some detail at Tehran. Roosevelt proposed to Stalin the basing of American heavy bombers in the maritime provinces north of Vladivostok. This was deemed a necessary requirement by our Air Force in order to cover the Japanese islands. In addition, Roosevelt suggested the possible use of Soviet ports for our naval forces and requested the immediate exchange of military intelligence concerning Japan. Stalin agreed that these matters should be studied. Shortly thereafter we established exchange of combat intelligence. The other matters continued to be the subject of discussion on my part with Stalin in Moscow during the ensuing year.

Concurrently with our negotiations for the conduct of the war, President Roosevelt sought to come to an understanding regarding postwar problems with the Soviet Union. It was clear that unless these problems were settled we would have difficulties once the war was ended. President Roosevelt attempted to use our relationship as allies to develop a basis on which world peace could be maintained, and to settle in advance differences which we were likely to have over the treatment of territories occupied by the Red Army.

In August 1941, before Pearl Harbor, Roosevelt and Churchill had met at sea and proclaimed the Atlantic Charter, a statement of the fundamental principles to which nations must adhere if they are to live together in peace and freedom. In January 1942, at our request, the Soviet Union subscribed to the Atlantic Charter in the Declaration by United Nations. In October 1943 a further step was taken in the Moscow Declaration, which laid the foundation for the United Nations. This declaration was signed by Molotov, Eden, and Hull, and the Chinese Ambassador in Moscow. It was only after Hull's vigorous insistence that Molotov agreed to the inclusion of the signature of the Chinese. This was in line with Roosevelt's consistent attempts to strengthen the position of the Chinese National Government and to obtain the support of that Government by the Soviet Union.

At Tehran, in addition to the military matters, President Roosevelt attempted to develop further a basis for reaching political understandings with the Soviet Union. Plans for the organization of the United Nations were discussed, and also such matters as the postwar treatment of Germany, the future of Poland, and the independence of Iran. Further negotiations about these matters took place in Moscow on frequent occasions during the ensuing year and, with respect to the United Nations Organization, at Dumbarton Oaks.

Russian objectives in the Far East were also explored at Tehran particularly with

reference to the need of the Soviet Union for the use of warm water ports. I understand that Roosevelt had talked about this latter point with Chiang Kai-shek at the Cairo Conference, and that Chiang had indicated his agreement with the idea that the Port of Dairen should be internationalized.

In my talks with Roosevelt in 1943 and 1944, he told me of his concern over the historic conflicts between the Soviet Union and China, and the need for finding a basis for the settlement of the underlying causes of these difficulties.

On Roosevelt's instructions, I discussed with Stalin on a number of occasions throughout 1944 Soviet participation in the war against Japan, the concerting of our military actions in the Pacific, including operations by American bombers from the Maritime Provinces, and the basis of an understanding between the Soviet Union and the Chinese National Government. In one of these talks, which took place in June, Stalin minimized the Chinese Communists, and stated that Chiang was the only man who could hold China together and that he should be supported.

Molotov reiterated this position when Mr. Donald M. Nelson and Maj. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley stopped at Moscow in August en route to Chungking.¹

Although Stalin had on several occasions mentioned Soviet political objectives in the East, it was not until December 1944 that he outlined these objectives to me in detail. He said that Russia's position in the East should be generally reestablished as it existed before the Russo-Japanese War of 1905. The lower half of Sakhalin should be returned to the Russians, as well as the Kurile Islands, in order to protect Soviet outlets to the Pacific. The Russians wished again to lease the ports of Dairen and Port Arthur and to obtain a lease on those railroads in Manchuria built by the Russians under contract with the Chinese, specifically, the Chinese Eastern Railway, which was the direct line from the Trans-Siberian Railroad through to Vladivostok, and the South Manchurian Railroad making a connection to Dairen. He stated that the Soviet Union would not interfere with the sovereignty of China over Manchuria. In addition Stalin asked for the recognition of the status quo in Outer Mongolia. I pointed out to Stalin that the talks at Tehran had envisaged internationalization of the port of Dairen, rather than a lease. Stalin replied that this could be discussed. I immediately reported Stalin's proposals to President Roosevelt, and they became the basis of the discussions at Yalta.

It was against this background, which I have briefly sketched, that President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill met with Stalin at Yalta in early February 1945. The question of Roosevelt's physical condition at the time of Yalta has been the subject of considerable discussion. Unquestionably, he was not in good health and the long conferences tired him. Nevertheless, for many months he had given much thought to the matters to be discussed and, in consultation with many officials of the Government, he had blocked out definite objectives which he had clearly in mind. He came to Yalta determined to do his utmost to achieve these objectives and he carried on the negotiations to this end with his usual skill and perception.

The discussions at Yalta covered a wide range of topics, including final plans for the defeat of Hitler, the occupation and control of Germany, reparations, the United Nations Conference to meet at San Francisco on April 25, the restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to the liberated peoples of Europe, and the establishment of a free, independent and democratic Poland through the holding of free

¹ See United States Relations With China, pp. 71-72.

and unfettered elections. By the declaration on liberated Europe, Roosevelt and Churchill obtained the pledge of Stalin for joint action to secure the fundamental freedoms for the people in territories overrun by the Red Army.

The text of the declaration is as follows:

"The Premier of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, and the President of the United States of America have consulted with each other in the common interests of the peoples of their countries and those of liberated Europe. They jointly declare their mutual agreement to concert during the temporary period of instability in liberated Europe the policies of their three Governments in assisting the peoples liberated from the domination of Nazi Germany and the peoples of the former Axis satellite states of Europe to solve by democratic means their pressing political and economic problems.

"The establishment of order in Europe and the rebuilding of national economic life must be achieved by processes which will enable the liberated peoples to destroy the last vestiges of nazism and fascism and to create democratic institutions of their own choice. This is a principle of the Atlantic Charter—the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live—the restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to those peoples who have been forcibly deprived of them by the aggressor nations

"To foster the conditions in which the liberated peoples may exercise these rights, the three Governments will jointly assist the peoples in any European liberated state or former Axis satellite state in Europe where in their judgment conditions require (a) to establish conditions of internal peace; (b) to carry out emergency measures for the relief of distressed peoples; (c) to form interim governmental authorities broadly representative of all democratic elements in the population and pledged to the earliest possible establishment through free elections of governments responsive to the will of the people, and (d) to facilitate where necessary the holding of such elections

"The three Governments will consult the other United Nations and provisional authorities or other governments in Europe when matters of direct interest to them are under consideration.

"When, in the opinion of the three Governments, conditions in any European liberated state or any former Axis satellite state in Europe make such action necessary, they will immediately consult together on the measures necessary to discharge the joint responsibilities set forth in this declaration.

"By this declaration we reaffirm our faith in the principles of the Atlantic Charter, our pledge in the declaration by the United Nations, and our determination to build in cooperation with other peace-loving nations world order under law, dedicated to peace, security, freedom, and general well-being of all mankind.

"In issuing this declaration the three powers express the hope that the Provisional Government of the French Republic may be associated with them in the procedure suggested"

It was agreed that there should be continued collaboration between the three governments through periodic meetings of the Foreign Secretaries, and the concluding paragraphs of the Yalta communique, quoted below, expressed the determination of the three governments to have "unity for peace as for war":

"Our meeting here in the Crimea has reaffirmed our common determination to maintain and strengthen in the peace to come that unity of purpose and of action which has made victory possible and certain for the United Nations in this war. We believe that

this is a sacred obligation which our governments owe to our peoples and to all the peoples of the world.

"Only with the continuing and growing cooperation and understanding among our three countries and among all the peace-loving nations can the highest aspiration of humanity be realized—a secure and lasting peace which will, in the words of the Atlantic Charter, 'afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.'

"Victory in this war and establishment of the proposed international organization will provide the greatest opportunity in all history to create in the years to come the essential conditions of such a peace"

Had Stalin honored these commitments taken at Yalta, Eastern Europe would be free today and the United Nations would be a truly effective organization for world security.

The last understanding to be reached was that relating to the Far East. The crucial issue was not whether the Soviet Union would enter the Pacific War, but whether it would do so in time to be of help in the carrying out of the plans of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for an invasion of the Japanese home islands. The great danger existed that the Soviet Union would stand by until we had brought Japan to her knees at great cost in American lives, and then the Red Army could march into Manchuria and large areas of northern China. It would then have been a simple matter for the Soviets to give expression to popular demand by establishing People's Republics of Manchuria and Inner Mongolia. President Roosevelt sought to reduce the general assurances which Stalin had previously given to specific undertakings for the early entry of Russia in the Pacific War, to limit Soviet expansion in the East and to gain Soviet support for the Nationalist Government of China.

It should be recalled that it was only on the second day of the Yalta Conference that General MacArthur entered Manila. The bloody battles of Iwo Jima and Okinawa still lay ahead. It was not until more than 5 months later that the first and only experimental explosion of the atomic bomb was successfully concluded at Alamogordo. The military authorities estimated that it would take 18 months after the surrender of Germany to defeat Japan, and that Soviet participation would greatly reduce the heavy American casualties which could otherwise be expected. The Joint Chiefs of Staff were planning an invasion of the Japanese home islands, and were anxious for the early entry of Russia in the war to defeat the Japanese Kwantung army in Manchuria and in order that our bombers could operate from bases in Eastern Siberia.

These plans were outlined in two memoranda which were before the President at Yalta.

In a memorandum for the President, dated January 23, 1945, the Joint Chiefs of Staff stated:

"The Joint Chiefs of Staff have been guided by the following basic principles in working toward U. S. S. R. entry into the war against Japan:

"Russia's entry at as early a date as possible consistent with her ability to engage in offensive operations is necessary to provide maximum assistance to our Pacific operations. The United States will provide maximum support possible without interfering with our main effort against Japan.

"The objective of Russia's military effort against Japan in the Far East should be the defeat of the Japanese forces in Manchuria, air operations against Japan proper in collaboration with United States Air Forces based in eastern Siberia, and maximum interference with Japanese sea traffic between Japan and the mainland of Asia."

In a memorandum dated January 22, 1945, the Joint Chiefs of Staff stated:

"1. The agreed over-all objective in the war against Japan has been expressed as follows:

"To force the unconditional surrender of Japan by—

"(1) Lowering Japanese ability and will to resist by establishing sea and air blockades, conducting intensive air bombardment, and destroying Japanese air and naval strength.

"(2) Invading and seizing objectives in the industrial heart of Japan.

"2. The United States Chiefs of Staff have adopted the following as a basis for planning in the war against Japan:

"The concept of operations for the main effort in the Pacific Islands:

"(a) Following the Okinawa operation to seize additional positions to intensify the blockade and air bombardment of Japan in order to create a situation favorable to:

"(b) An assault on Kyushu for the purpose of further reducing Japanese capabilities by containing and destroying major enemy forces and further intensifying the blockade and air bombardment in order to establish a tactical condition favorable to.

"(c) The decisive invasion of the industrial heart of Japan through the Tokyo Plain

"3 The following sequence and timing of operations have been directed by the United States Chiefs of Staff and plans prepared by theater commanders

"OBJECTIVES AND TARGET DATE

"Continuation of operations in the Philippines (Luzon, Mindoro, Leyte). ———.

"Iwo Jima, February 19, 1945

"Okinawa and extension therefrom in the Ryukyus, April 1–August 1945

"4 Until a firm date can be established when redeployment from Europe can begin planning will be continued for an operation to seize a position in the Chusan-Ningpo area and for invasion of Kyushu-Honshu in the winter of 1945–46.

"5 Examination is being conducted of the necessity for and cost of operations to maintain and defend a sea route to the Sea of Okhotsk when the entry of Russia into the war against Japan becomes imminent. Examination so far has shown that the possibility of seizing a position in the Kuriles for that purpose during the favorable weather period of 1945 is remote due to lack of sufficient resources. The possibility of maintaining and defending such a sea route from bases in Kamchatka alone is being further examined

"6 The United States Chiefs of Staff have also directed examination and preparation of a plan of campaign against Japan in the event that prolongation of the European war requires postponement of the invasion of Japan until well into 1946"

These military considerations had been the subject of careful study by Roosevelt for a long time and they were uppermost in his mind at Yalta. President Roosevelt personally carried on with Stalin the negotiations leading up to the understanding on the Far East. I was present at the meetings when these matters were discussed and, under President Roosevelt's direction, I took up certain details with Stalin and with Molotov. Neither Secretary of State Stettinius nor any of his advisers, except for Charles E. Bohlen, who acted as the President's interpreter, had anything to do with these negotiations. Any suggestion to the contrary is utterly without foundation in fact.

The first conversations took place on February 8, at which Stalin brought up with Roosevelt the proposals which he had presented to me the previous December in Moscow. Stalin contended that these proposals should be accepted. Roosevelt said that he believed there would be no difficulty in regard

to the Kurile Islands and the return to Russia of the southern half of Sakhalin. He said that, although he could not speak for Chiang Kai-shek, he believed that Dairen might be made a free port under an international commission, and that the Manchurian railroads might be operated jointly. The President and Stalin also discussed internal conditions in China. Stalin reiterated his recognition of the need for a united China under Chiang Kai-shek's leadership.

Stalin suggested that the proposals be put in writing and be agreed to before the conference ended.

Two days later, on February 10, Molotov took up with me the details of the understanding to be reached. I reemphasized President Roosevelt's views that the ports should be free ports and not leased to the Soviet Union, that the Manchurian railroads should not be leased but jointly operated, and that in any event, the understanding should specify that the concurrence of Chiang Kai-shek was required.

I reported this conversation to Roosevelt, and he instructed me to explain his views again to Molotov, which I did.

Later on in the same day, February 10, Roosevelt and Stalin met again. Stalin agreed to the modification as proposed by Roosevelt, except that he maintained that a lease on Port Arthur would be required, as it was to be used for a naval base. Stalin accepted the requirement for Chiang Kai-shek's concurrence and said that he wanted his concurrence also to the status quo in Outer Mongolia. President Roosevelt and Stalin concluded that the matter should be discussed with Chiang when Stalin was prepared to have this done, having in mind the need for secrecy and lack of security in Chungking.

On the following day, the text was shown to Churchill, and after his agreement, it was signed on that day, February 11, 1945, by Stalin, Roosevelt, and Churchill. The full text is as follows:

"The leaders of the three great powers—the Soviet Union, the United States of America, and Great Britain—have agreed that in 2 or 3 months after Germany has surrendered and the war in Europe has terminated, the Soviet Union shall enter into the war against Japan on the side of the Allies on condition that:

"1. The status quo in Outer Mongolia (the Mongolian People's Republic) shall be preserved;

"2. The former rights of Russia violated by the treacherous attack of Japan in 1904 shall be restored, viz:

"(a) the southern part of Sakhalin, as well as all the islands adjacent to it, shall be returned to the Soviet Union;

"(b) the commercial port of Dairen shall be internationalized, the preeminent interests of the Soviet Union in this port being safeguarded and the lease of Port Arthur as a naval base of the U. S. S. R. restored;

"(c) the Chinese-Eastern Railroad and the South-Manchurian Railroad which provides an outlet to Dairen shall be jointly operated by the establishment of a joint Soviet-Chinese company, it being understood that the preeminent interests of the Soviet Union shall be safeguarded and that China shall retain full sovereignty in Manchuria.

"3 The Kurile Islands shall be handed over to the Soviet Union.

"It is understood that the agreement concerning Outer Mongolia and the ports and railroads referred to above will require concurrence of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. The President will take measures in order to obtain this concurrence on advice from Marshal Stalin.

"The heads of the three great powers have agreed that these claims of the Soviet Union shall be unquestionably fulfilled after Japan has been defeated.

"For its part the Soviet Union expresses its readiness to conclude with the National Government of China a pact of friendship and alliance between the U. S. S. R. and China in order to render assistance to China with its armed forces for the purpose of liberating China from the Japanese yoke."

Stalin also agreed to joint planning for military operations in the Pacific and to the use by the United States Army Air Force of bases in the Maritime Provinces at Komsomolsk and Nikolaevsk.

President Roosevelt felt that he had achieved his principal objectives. He had obtained the agreement of the Soviet Union to enter the war against Japan within 3 months after the defeat of Germany. This was the period required to move Soviet troops from the European front to Siberia. It was considered to be in good time, and conformed to the plans of the Joint Chiefs of Staff which involved the redeployment of our forces from Europe to the Pacific. Roosevelt had also obtained Stalin's pledge of support for Chiang Kai-shek and recognition of the sovereignty of the Chinese National Government over Manchuria.

In recent years several objections have been leveled at the terms of the Yalta understanding on the Far East and the circumstances under which it was concluded.

It has been asserted that the understanding was a mistake because, as it turned out, Russian participation had no influence on the defeat of Japan. To President Roosevelt at Yalta, the lives of America's fighting men were at stake. He had been advised by the Joint Chiefs of Staff that the defeat of Japan would take many months after VE-day and that if the Soviet Union came in soon enough countless American lives would be saved. Furthermore, up to that time, Stalin had carried out vital military undertakings. Roosevelt, therefore, considered that a definite commitment from Stalin was of supreme importance and would be of great value.

Another criticism is that Chiang Kai-shek was not consulted before the understanding was signed and that the understanding was kept secret. The question of consulting Chiang was a difficult one. Secrecy was a military necessity. Experience had shown that whatever was known in Chungking got to the Japanese. Stalin was unwilling to risk Japanese knowledge of his plans until he had been able to strengthen his forces in Siberia. At Roosevelt's insistence, however, the understanding specified that Chiang's concurrence was required where China's direct interests were affected and that Chiang should be notified at the appropriate time.

I am sure that Roosevelt would have much preferred to have consulted Chiang in advance, if he had thought it was feasible for him to do so. On the other hand, he had had certain general talks with Chiang on some of the points involved, and knew of Chiang's desire to come to a permanent understanding with the Soviet Union. For these reasons, and also because of the strong support that he had given Chiang in the past, Roosevelt felt that he could work things out with Chiang when the time came.

Because of the prior conversations with Stalin, Roosevelt was convinced that the requirement for Chiang's concurrence qualified the provision that the claims of the Soviet Union shall be unquestionably fulfilled, and that Stalin so understood. Events proved that Roosevelt was correct. The Yalta understanding provided a framework for negotiations between the Soviet Union and the Chinese National Government in the summer of 1945, looking toward a settlement of the long-standing difficulties between the two countries. These negotiations which I will discuss in greater detail later in this statement were voluntarily negotiated between the two governments and culminated in the Sino-Soviet agreements

of August 1945. In these agreements, although the Soviet Union obtained certain privileges in the railroads and the ports, it fully recognized the sovereignty of the National Government over both China and Manchuria and agreed to support that government and no other. When the Sino-Soviet agreements were made public in August they were welcomed both in China and in the United States. These agreements dispose of the claim that the concessions made at Yalta regarding Manchuria undermined Chiang Kai-shek and ultimately caused him to lose control of the mainland of China. The loss of control over the mainland by the National Government was due not to the Yalta understanding but to the fact that the Soviet Union broke the Sino-Soviet agreements and to the factors which have been discussed in detail before these committees.

Subsequent to the Yalta Conference certain events took place during the late winter and spring of 1945.

At the end of February, Ambassador Hurley, who was then United States Ambassador to China, returned to Washington for consultation. He has testified that he saw President Roosevelt on two occasions in March and that Roosevelt instructed him to go to London and attempt to ameliorate the Yalta understanding. (Printed record, pt. 4, p. 2885.) It does not appear that Ambassador Hurley correctly recalls the facts.

I am convinced that President Roosevelt's concern after Yalta was to see to it that friendly relations were developed between the Soviet Union and the National Government of China.

Ambassador Hurley came through Moscow on his way to Chungking in April. He stayed with me during his visit. At no time did he indicate to me that President Roosevelt was disturbed about the understanding reached at Yalta or that he desired that this understanding be ameliorated. On the contrary, the purpose of Ambassador Hurley's visit to Moscow, as he stated it to me and to Stalin, was to find out from Stalin when Chiang could be told about the Yalta understanding and to help further cement the relations between the Soviet Union and the Chinese National Government.

This is revealed by the report which Ambassador Hurley sent to the Secretary of State on the meeting which he and I had with Stalin and Molotov on the night of April 15. The full paraphrased text of this report, dated April 17, is as follows:

"Conference concluded by me and Harriman on April 15 with Molotov and Stalin. My analysis of former statement by Molotov on attitude of Soviet toward National Government of China and Chinese Armed Communist Party given to Stalin and Molotov. My analysis was briefly as follows: 'Molotov said at the former conference that the Chinese Communists are not in fact Communists at all. Their objective is to obtain what they look upon as necessary and just reformations in China. The Soviet Union is not supporting the Chinese Communist Party. The Soviet Union does not desire internal dissension or civil war in China. The Government of the Soviet Union wants closer and more harmonious relations in China. The Soviet Union is intensely interested in what is happening in Sinkiang and other places and will insist that the Chinese Government prevent discriminations against Soviet nationals.' Molotov agreed to this analysis. I then outlined for Stalin and Molotov existing relations between the Chinese Government and the Chinese Communist Party. I stated with frankness that I had been instrumental in instituting conferences and negotiations between the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese Government. I then presented in brief form an outline of the negotiations, of the progress which

had been made, and of the present status. I informed Stalin that both the Chinese Government and the Chinese Communist Party claimed to follow the principles of Sun Yat-sen for the establishment of a government of the people, by the people, and for the people in China. I continued that the National Government and the Chinese Communist Party are both strongly anti-Japanese and that the purpose of both is to drive the Japanese from China. Beyond question there are issues between the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese Government, but both are pursuing the same principal objective, namely, the defeat of Japan and the creating of a free, democratic, and united government in China. Because of past conflicts there are many differences on details existing between the two parties. I made clear American insistence that China supply its own leadership, arrive at its own decisions, and be responsible for its own policies. With this in mind, the United States had endorsed China's aspirations to establish a free, united government and supported all efforts for the unification of the armed forces of China. I informed him that President Roosevelt had authorized me to discuss this subject with Prime Minister Churchill and that the complete concurrence of Prime Minister Churchill and Foreign Secretary Eden had been obtained in the policy of endorsement of Chinese aspirations to establish for herself a united, free, and democratic government and for the unification of all armed forces in China in order to bring about the defeat of Japan.

"To promote the foregoing program it had been decided to support the national Government of China under the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek. Stalin stated frankly that the Soviet Government would support the policy. He added that he would be glad to cooperate with the United States and Britain in achieving unification of the military forces in China. He spoke favorably of Chiang Kai-shek and said that while there had been corruption among certain officials of the national Government of China, he knew that Chiang Kai-shek was selfless, a patriot, and that the Soviet in times past had befriended him. I then related to Stalin and Molotov the request made by the Chinese Communists for representation at the San Francisco Conference. I told them that before leaving China I had advised the Chinese Communists that the conference at San Francisco was to be a conference of governments and not of political parties and that I had advised the Communists to request representation at San Francisco through the national Government of the Republic of China. I told him that this decision had been upheld by President Roosevelt and that the President had advised Chiang Kai-shek of the advisability of the national Government's permitting the Chinese Communist Party to be represented on the Chinese national Government's delegation to the conference at San Francisco. I told them that it was a very hopeful sign when Chiang Kai-shek offered a place on the delegation to San Francisco to a Chinese Communist and that the appointment had been accepted. I told Stalin that I thought it was very hopeful that a leading member of the Chinese Communist Party would be a delegate of the Chinese national Government at San Francisco. Stalin agreed that this development was very significant and he approved. I told him that President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill had indicated their approval of the policy outlined. The marshal was pleased and expressed his concurrence and said in view of the over-all situation, he wished us to know that we would have his complete support in immediate action for the unification of the armed forces of China with full recognition of the national Government under the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek. In short, Stalin agreed

unqualifiedly to America's policy in China as outlined to him during the conversation.

"Also instructed by Roosevelt to discuss another subject with Stalin. Asked by Stalin if I was acquainted with subject. I stated "Yes." Stalin then inquired if I had advised Chiang Kai-shek. I said, "No." Stalin then said that he and Roosevelt had agreed that when it was time for discussions with Chiang, I was to institute such discussions. There followed a full talk on this subject as to which Harriman, who is now on his way to Washington, can give you the details. Harriman's general helpfulness and cooperation in the meeting with Molotov and Stalin and in all other matters were of great value."

With regard to the last paragraph of the telegram, Stalin said he preferred to delay discussion of the Yalta understanding with Chiang for about 2 months longer and Hurley agreed.

I returned to the United States to report to President Truman immediately after the conversation with Stalin and before Ambassador Hurley's report was prepared and dispatched. On April 19, I discussed Ambassador Hurley's report with Mr. E. F. Stanton, of the Far Eastern Affairs Division of the Department of State. Mr. Stanton's memorandum of that conversation is summarized as follows, on pages 97-98 of the volume United States Relations With China:

"Mr. Harriman felt that General Hurley's report, while factually accurate, gave a too optimistic impression of Marshal Stalin's reactions. Mr. Harriman was certain that Marshal Stalin would not cooperate indefinitely with Chiang Kai-shek and that if and when Russia entered the conflict in the Far East he would make full use of, and would support, the Chinese Communists even to the extent of setting up a puppet government in Manchuria and possibly in north China, if Kuomintang-Communist differences had not been resolved by that time. He indicated that he had impressed on General Hurley the fact that statements made by Stalin endorsing our efforts in China did not necessarily mean that the Russians would not pursue whatever course of action seemed to them best to serve their interests. Mr. Harriman feared that ambassador Hurley might give Chiang Kai-shek an over-optimistic account of his conversations with Stalin and he thought it might be advisable to suggest to General Hurley that he should be careful not to arouse unfounded expectations."

As a result of this conversation, the Secretary of State on April 23 instructed Ambassador Hurley in Chungking not to present his talk with Stalin in too optimistic a light to Chiang Kai-shek.

In a cable to President Truman from Chungking on May 10, 1945, Ambassador Hurley outlined in some detail his conception of the mission which he had been given by President Roosevelt in March. There is nothing in this cable which indicates that Roosevelt had instructed Ambassador Hurley to attempt to ameliorate the Yalta understanding. The paraphrased text of the cable is as follows:

"Knowing the great strain under which you must be working I have hesitated to burden you with problems by which we are confronted here. In my last conference with President Roosevelt he entrusted me with two specific missions in addition to my duties as Ambassador to China. The first mission was to bring Churchill and Stalin to an agreement on the policy that the United States has been pursuing in China. Namely (1) to take all necessary action to bring about unification under the National Government of all anti-Japanese armed forces in China. (2) To endorse the aspirations of the Chinese people for the establishment of a free united democratic Chinese Government. (3) To continue to insist that China furnish her own leadership, make her own

decisions and be responsible for her own policies and thus work out her own destiny in her own way. As you have no doubt been advised by the Secretary of State I obtained concurrence of Churchill and Stalin on the plan outlined. The British claim that the policy to which they now agree has always been British policy. This statement is incorrect. Roosevelt knew it was incorrect and that is why he sent me to London. We have conclusive evidence on this point which it now seems unnecessary to resubmit since agreement has been reached. The policy of all the southeast Asia imperialist governments was to keep China divided against herself. This policy would seem to have been altered now that the British and the Soviet have agreed to the Roosevelt policy in China.

"The second mission entrusted to me by President Roosevelt in my last conference with him pertains to a decision affecting China reached at the Yalta conference. Before my last visit to Washington and before I had been informed by the President of the Yalta decision pertaining to China including particularly the all-important prelude, the Generalissimo had discussed with me China's position on the same problems decided upon at Yalta and had given me his attitude relating to them. He gave me, at that time, an aide memoire summarizing his position on some of the problems. Of course, the subject discussed in the prelude to the Yalta decision was not known to him and so far as I am concerned the matter has not yet been presented to him. Since my return we have continued to discuss the problems that would be involved in promoting future friendship and peace with Russia, without referring to the Yalta decision as such. All of the problems decided, except No. 1 in the prelude, have been raised by the Generalissimo and discussed fully with me. I am convinced that he will agree to every one of the requirements but will take exceptions to the use of two words "preeminent" and "lease." These two words have had connotations in Chinese. They have been involved in the controversies over extra-territoriality. These two words seem to impinge on the principles of the territorial integrity and independent sovereignty of China. Both Roosevelt and Stalin advised me that it was agreed between them that I would not open the subject of the Yalta decision with Chiang Kai-shek until the signal was given me by Stalin. Stalin said he would give me carte blanche and let me use my own judgment as to when and how to present the subject. However, both Harriman and I were of the opinion that it would be best to delay the presentation because of the possibility of leakage which in turn might bring undesirable results. I explained this to Stalin and it was finally decided that I am not to present the subject to Chiang Kai-shek until we have advised Stalin that, in our opinion, the time is opportune and until we have received the signal from him. I want to emphasize to you that prior to my recent visit to Washington I had discussed with Chiang Kai-shek all phases of the Chinese-Russian problem before we knew what was contained in the Yalta agreement, and since coming back to Chungking we have again thoroughly covered the same subjects without alluding to the primary subject. We are therefore in a position to proceed with dispatch on the Yalta Agreement when we are authorized to submit the particulars thereof to the Generalissimo. My purpose in wiring you this report is to give you the foregoing brief and somewhat cryptic outline of the situation and at the same time advise you that the Generalissimo has received telegrams from the Chinese Ambassador at Washington summarizing all of the items decided at Yalta except the primary one.

"The Chinese Ambassador's recitations of the various items are not all correct although he states that he got the various points in

conversation with President Roosevelt. The Chinese Ambassador has indicated that the United States will join as a third party in the agreement between Russia and China on the various instrumentalities described. No such participation is indicated in the Yalta decision. In addition to this the Chinese Government yesterday received a cable from a Chinese representative in Switzerland which reports movements of troops that we know are taking place and which indicate Russia's intent. The Chinese Government also has other information of movements and plans from which they have concluded that the object referred to in the prelude of the Yalta decision is definitely expected to happen. From the reports the Chinese are now receiving and with what they already know it is reasonable to expect them to reach approximately correct conclusions on this subject. It is of utmost importance that the Generalissimo as head of a state vitally concerned should be informed officially and in an appropriate straightforward manner becoming the character of the United States when the time is propitious. This information could and probably would have been given to him some time ago were it not for the lack of security associated with China. It now appears desirable that you discuss this situation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of State to determine when you should direct me to ask Stalin for his approval of the time when I am to officially inform Chiang Kai-shek. Telling Chiang Kai-shek and asking him to clamp down secrecy which no doubt he would do to the best of his ability would I believe keep the secret from the enemy longer than it will be kept by letting the Chinese continue to conjecture publicly on the facts that come to their knowledge from other sources. The American theater commander is familiar with the contents of this message."

With regard to Ambassador Hurley's comments on the words "preeminent" and "lease" in the Yalta understanding, I can personally state that neither Roosevelt nor Stalin intended that the phrase "preeminent interests" should go beyond Soviet interests in the free transit of exports to and imports from the Soviet Union. President Roosevelt had told me at Yalta that this was his interpretation and, when I took this position with Stalin in August 1945, he agreed. As to the lease on Port Arthur, Roosevelt looked upon this as an arrangement similar to privileges which the United States had negotiated with other countries for the mutual security of two friendly nations.

The problem of China and the Soviet intentions in the Far East was also discussed during Mr. Hopkins' special mission to Moscow in May 1945. During a conversation which he and I had with Stalin on May 28 I brought the matter up and Stalin reaffirmed his support of a unified and stable China which would control all of Manchuria. Stalin reiterated that the Soviet Union had no territorial claims against China and stated that he would support the open-door policy. He said he would also welcome representatives of Chiang to be with his troops when they entered Manchuria in order to facilitate the establishment there of administration by the Chinese National Government.

Soviet participation in the war against Japan was again discussed at the Potsdam Conference which took place from July 17 to August 2, 1945. It will be recalled that although the first and only atomic bomb experimental explosion had been successfully concluded on July 16, the bomb had not yet been used against Japan. During the conference, Stalin informed President Truman of peace feelers which he had received from the Japanese Government. These were of such a character as to be unacceptable.

At Potsdam, more than 5 months after Yalta, the Joint Chiefs of Staff were still planning an invasion of the Japanese home

islands and still considered Soviet participation in the Pacific war essential. On July 24, 1945, the Combined Chiefs of Staff reported to the President and the Prime Minister that their over-all strategic concept for the prosecution of the war in the Pacific was as follows:

"In cooperation with other allies to bring about at the earliest possible date the defeat of Japan by: lowering Japanese ability and will to resist by establishing sea and air blockades, conducting intensive air bombardment, and destroying Japanese air and naval strength, invading and seizing objectives in the Japanese home islands as the main effort; conducting such operations against objectives in other than the Japanese home islands as will contribute to the main effort; establishing absolute military control of Japan; and liberating Japanese-occupied territory if required."

The Combined Chiefs of Staff also stated: "The invasion of Japan and operations directly connected therewith are the supreme operations in the war against Japan; forces and resources will be allocated on the required scale to assure that invasion can be accomplished at the earliest practicable date. No other operations will be undertaken which hazard the success of, or delay, these main operations."

They went on to say that our policy should be to:

"Encourage Russian entry into the war against Japan. Provide such aid to her war-making capacity as may be necessary and practicable in connection therewith."

On the basis of this over-all plan, extensive discussions were carried on with the Soviet Chiefs of Staff for the attack on Manchuria by the Soviet forces about 2 months prior to landings by United States forces on the Japanese home islands.

In the meantime the Chinese Government had been informed of the Yalta understanding. In Washington on June 9, President Truman had discussed with T. V. Soong, Premier of the Chinese National Government, the provisions of the understanding, including the promise of Stalin to conclude a treaty of friendship with the National Government of China. On June 14, President Truman saw Soong again and told him of the renewed assurances Stalin had given Hopkins and myself in Moscow to support the National Government of China under Chiang Soong expressed his gratification. On June 15, Ambassador Hurley informed Chiang of the Yalta understanding and also communicated to him Stalin's renewal of his assurances regarding China's sovereignty in Manchuria and his support of a unified and stable China and of the open-door policy.

By this time it had been agreed that negotiations would start promptly in Moscow between China and the Soviet Union regarding the matters dealt with in the Yalta understanding. T. V. Soong arrived in Moscow at the end of June 1945. Negotiations were conducted between Stalin and Molotov, on the one hand, and Soong, on the other. They were interrupted by the Potsdam conference, but were resumed early in August, at which time Soong was joined by Wang Shi-chieh, the Foreign Minister of the Chinese National Government.

Stalin, at the outset, made demands that went substantially beyond the Yalta understanding. While Soong was not prepared to accede to all of these demands, he made it clear to me that his Government was anxious to reach an agreement with the Soviet Union, and to this end he was prepared to make concessions which we considered went beyond the Yalta understanding.

At no time did Soong give me any indication that he felt the Yalta understanding was a handicap in his negotiations. I repeatedly urged him not to give in to Stalin's demands. At the same time, during this

period, I had several talks with Stalin and Molotov in which I insisted that the Soviet position was not justified. This action I took on instructions from Washington. Also, on instructions, I informed Soong that the United States would consider that any concessions which went beyond our interpretation of the Yalta understanding, would be made because Soong believed they would be of value in obtaining Soviet support in other directions. Soong told me that he thoroughly understood and accepted the correctness of this position. The fact is that, in spite of the position I took, Soong gave in on several points in order to achieve his objectives.

Events moved swiftly during the early days of August. On August 6, the first atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima and on August 9 another on Nagasaki. On August 8, the Soviet Union entered the war against Japan. On August 10, Japan sued for peace through the Swiss Government and on August 14 an armistice was arranged. On that day a series of agreements between the Soviet Union and China, including a Treaty of Friendship and Alliance, were concluded. They were ratified by the Chinese Government on August 24, 1945, and were made public at that time. The texts of these agreements are set forth on pages 585-596 of the volume entitled "United States Relations with China" and are summarized as follows on page 117:

"The treaty pledged mutual respect for their respective sovereignties and mutual noninterference in their respective internal affairs. In the exchange of notes the Soviet Union promised to give moral support and military aid entirely to the National Government as the central government of China and recognized Chinese sovereignty in Manchuria; and China agreed to recognize the independence of Outer Mongolia if a plebiscite after the defeat of Japan confirmed that that was the desire of the Outer Mongolian people. The agreement on Dairen committed China to declare Dairen a free port 'open to the commerce and shipping of all nations' and provided for Chinese administration of the port; but it exceeded Yalta by granting the Soviet Union a lease of half of the port facilities, free of charge. This agreement has not been put into effect, since Nationalist military and civil officials have been prevented from functioning in the Kwantung Peninsula area because of the attitude of the Russians and the Chinese Communists. The agreement on Port Arthur provided for the joint use of the area as a naval base by the two powers and extended the boundary of that area farther than the United States expected, though not to the pre-1904 boundary which the U. S. S. R. would have preferred. The railway agreement provided for joint ownership and operation of the Chinese eastern and south Manchurian railways. The treaty and the agreements regarding Dairen, Port Arthur, and the railroads were to run for 30 years."

Of prime importance is article V of the Treaty of Friendship which reads as follows:

"The high contracting parties, having regard to the interests of the security and economic development of each of them, agree to work together in close and friendly collaboration after the coming of peace and to act according to the principles of mutual respect for their sovereignty and territorial integrity and of noninterference in the internal affairs of the other contracting party."

Supplementing this provision, an exchange of notes between Molotov and Wang specified:

"In accordance with the spirit of the aforementioned treaty, and in order to put into effect its aims and purposes, the Government of the U. S. S. R. agrees to render to China moral support and aid in military supplies and other material resources, such support and aid to be entirely given to the National

Government as the Central Government of China."

Soong told me in Moscow he was gratified at the results obtained and expressed his gratitude for the active support the United States had given him in his negotiations. Ambassador Hurley informed the Secretary of State on August 16 from Chungking that Chiang Kai-shek was "generally satisfied with the treaty." Ambassador Hurley went on to state that at his suggestion Chiang had invited Mao Tse-tung, chairman of the Chinese Communist Party, to a conference in Chungking. His cable concluded by stating that "Chiang Kai-shek will now have an opportunity to show realistic and generous leadership." On September 6 Ambassador Hurley cabled the Department of State that—

"The publication of these documents has demonstrated conclusively that the Soviet Government supports the National Government of China and also that the two Governments are in agreement regarding Manchuria."

The Sino-Soviet agreements were welcomed by the American press. As a sample, I quote below portions of an editorial which appeared in *Life* magazine on September 10, 1945:

"Twelve days after Japan gave up there was announced in Moscow and Chungking an agreement which was as great a victory for common sense as the defeat of Japan was for armed might. The Soong-Stalin treaties contain less ammunition for pessimists than any diplomatic event of the last 20 years. The signatures of two men have done as much to assure peace as all our flying fortresses.

"Two strong and subtle men, both revolutionaries since youth, sat down in Moscow and discovered that each needed and wanted a long peace to complete his particular revolution. So they negotiated out every major issue between Russia and China.

"In Chungking, Mao and Chiang are now laying the basis for that (China's) future. It is extremely bright.

"Certainly Americans have cause to call it bright. For the present prospects of China are a vindication of American policy in Asia for almost 50 years.

"Peace, lively but genuine peace, is therefore the outlook."

Nothing that was done at Yalta contributed to the loss of control over China by Chiang Kai-shek. The Yalta understanding was implemented by the Sino-Soviet agreements, which had they been carried out by Stalin, might have saved the Chinese National Government. The inability of the Chinese National Government to maintain control over China was due to the fact that the Sino-Soviet agreements were not honored by Stalin, and to other factors which have been dealt with before these commitments in great detail.

I do not believe that it would serve a useful purpose for me to discuss the subsequent course of events in China, as they have been testified to at length in these hearings by others who had direct contact with these matters.

In conclusion, I want to reemphasize the objectives that President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill sought to achieve in their relations with the Soviet Union during the war.

Their primary objective was to maintain Russia as an effective fighting ally. This problem in itself gave grave concern, not only as to the military capabilities of the Soviet forces, but also as to whether the Kremlin would make separate arrangements with Hitler and leave the Western Allies stranded. The building of mutual confidence in the conduct of the war was not an easy task. But the fact remains that Russia was an effective fighting ally, and carried

out vital military undertakings against Hitler.

In addition, Roosevelt and Churchill sought to lay a foundation during the war for cooperation to maintain world peace by all nations, including the Soviet Union, and to find solutions to specific problems which would result from the war, particularly with regard to the treatment of those countries which would be occupied by the Red Army. No one was under any illusions about the difficulties that we would encounter. Nevertheless, step by step, Soviet leaders subscribed to principles which culminated in the formation of the United Nations. They entered into agreements designed to dispose of many specific problems. The carrying out of these commitments would have gone a long way toward achieving Roosevelt's objective of a peaceful world. The postwar difficulties stem from the fact that Stalin did not carry out his commitments and from the fact that the Soviet Union has failed to live up to the Charter of the United Nations.

Some people claim that we sold out to the Soviet Union at Yalta. If this were true, it is difficult to understand why the Soviet Union has gone to such lengths to violate the Yalta understandings. The fact is that these violations have been the basis of our protests against Soviet actions since the end of the war. There would have been a sell-out if Roosevelt and Churchill had failed to bend every effort to come to an understanding with the Soviet Union and had permitted the Red Army to occupy vast areas, without attempting to protect the interests of people in those areas.

Only by keeping our military forces in being after Germany and Japan surrendered could we have attempted to compel the Soviet Union to withdraw from the territory which it controlled and to live up to its commitments. The people of the United States and the war-weary people of Europe were in no mood to support such an undertaking. This country certainly erred in its rapid demobilization in 1945, but this is an error for which the entire American people must share the responsibility. I cannot believe that anyone seriously thinks that the move to bring the boys home could have been stopped. I still recall my grave concern when I was in Moscow at the cold reception the Congress gave to President Truman's recommendation for universal military training in the fall of 1945.

The most difficult question to answer is why Stalin took so many commitments which he subsequently failed to honor. There can be no clear answer to this question. I believe that the Kremlin had two approaches to their postwar policies, and in my many talks with Stalin I felt that he himself was of two minds. One approach emphasized reconstruction and development of Russia, and the other external expansion.

On the one hand, they were discussing possible understandings with us which would lead to peaceful relations and result in increased trade and loans from the west for the reconstruction of the terrible devastation left in the wake of the war. If they had carried out this program, they would have had to soft pedal for the time at least the Communist designs for world domination—much along the lines of the policies they had pursued between the two wars.

On the other hand, we had constant difficulties with them throughout the war and they treated us with great suspicion. Moreover, there were indications that they would take advantage of the Red Army occupation of neighboring countries to maintain control, and they were supporting Communist Parties in other countries to be in a position to seize control in the postwar turmoil.

The Kremlin chose the second course. It is my belief that Stalin was influenced by the hostile attitude of the peoples of Eastern Europe toward the Red Army, and that he recognized that governments established

by free elections would not be "friendly" to the Soviet Union. In addition, I believe he became increasingly aware of the great opportunities for Soviet expansion in the postwar economic chaos. After our rapid demobilization, I do not think that he conceived that the United States would take the firm stand against Soviet aggression that we have taken in the past 5 years.

The one great thing accomplished by our constant efforts during and since the war to reach a settlement with the Soviet Union is that we have firmly established our moral position before the world. Had these efforts not been made, many people of the free world would still be wondering whether we and not the Kremlin were to blame for the tensions that have developed. The fact that the Soviet Union did not live up to its undertakings made clear the duplicity and the aggressive designs of the Kremlin. This fact has provided the rallying point for the free world in their collective effort to build their defenses and to unite against aggression.

W. A. HARRIMAN.

Subscribed and sworn to this 13th day of July 1951.

PERCY E. NELSON,
Notary Public.

Employment of the Physically Handicapped—Address by Oscar R. Ewing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 27, 1951

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address by Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, at the fall meeting of the President's Committee on National Employment of the Physically Handicapped Week, August 17, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

As an associate member of this Committee, I am honored to share with you in work which the condition of our times has made even more important than ever before. As administrator of the Federal agency concerned with the health, education, and economic security of all Americans, I am happy to be a part of this continuing effort to increase employment opportunities for the handicapped. And as an individual, I find it heartwarming to aid in this humanitarian program.

To help our handicapped citizens toward the independence of self-support is to help them share fully in the bounties of our way of life. This is not merely a matter of common humanity. It is a patriotic service that contributes to the enduring strength of our Nation. Our strength is founded on the rights, the dignity, and the worth of the individual. One of its greatest concepts is that every man and every woman should have a fair and equal chance for useful work.

At the meeting of this Committee last year, President Truman emphasized that the free world relies on our strength in the effort to overcome the forces of tyranny and aggression. All that has happened during the past year adds urgency to what the President said then. We cannot realistically hope to achieve a just and lasting peace unless we are strong—and we cannot be strong unless we use all our human resources.

Many months ago the American people embarked upon a gigantic mobilization program for national security and world peace. This program calls for something beyond blueprints and raw materials. It calls for manpower at the very time when manpower is short in America. Manpower can be developed but it cannot be stockpiled.

The handicapped, the housewives and mothers, the older people and the retired, and the young people—these make up a reservoir of potential manpower that offers possibility of development. In the last war we learned that it was possible to carry the employment of homemakers too far. Our mobilization program today may go on for many years; and we cannot afford to take the risks of broken homes, family separations, and childhood insecurities that the unlimited employment of married women might bring about. That is one reason why we must place greater emphasis upon the use of handicapped citizens. Their numbers are considerable, and their capacity for work is enormous. If they are put to work they will not create new social problems; on the contrary, they will be solving the very social problems which so often arise out of their disablement.

These are the simple facts that every American ought to know. This committee has the job of making sure that every American gets to know these facts. We must break down apathy, overcome prejudice, and spread the truth about the capabilities of handicapped men and women.

In the Federal Government, as you well know the value of handicapped citizens to the defense team is widely recognized. The Manpower Policy Committee of the Office of Defense Mobilization has recently established a task force to survey the problems relating to utilization of the handicapped in the defense effort. This task force, under the able leadership of Dr. Theodore G. Klumpp, its chairman, is already working on the best methods to channel the handicapped into defense production.

We in the Federal Security Agency have revised our programs to the requirements of national defense. We have speeded up the whole process of vocational rehabilitation, the only complete public program of this type for disabled civilians.

In cooperation with organized labor and the American College of Surgeons, we are now reducing the length of time required for injured workers to return to the job. With the voluntary agencies, we have inaugurated special programs for the rehabilitation of persons with epilepsy, mental illness, tuberculosis, and certain other serious conditions. In response to our recommendations, many public vocational schools have opened their doors to blind students, thus expanding opportunities for employment of the blind.

Through a more intensive use of rehabilitation centers in our program, increasing number of seriously disabled persons, who for years have been confined to their homes or beds, are being returned to our labor force. In this connection I would like to cite particularly the splendid cooperation extended by the United Mine Workers of America in the physical restoration and retraining of injured coal miners for employment in other occupations. Finally, we have strengthened the ties between the State vocational rehabilitation agencies and the State employment services in the interest of better service to the handicapped.

With the added impetus of our defense needs, we have also stepped up other major programs of the Federal Security Agency. At my request the Surgeon General has established a committee on rehabilitation to help us draw more heavily upon medical services in rehabilitating the substantially disabled. Greater efforts to insure the adequacy of health and medical care to meet

both immediate and long-range needs are being made by the Public Health Service. The Office of Education is assisting our public schools in providing training to develop to the maximum the potential skills of American workers.

Through the public-assistance program we try to reduce the financial distress which some among us suffer even in times of prosperity. Indeed, many of the people who receive such aid are in distress because of disablement. Our Children's Bureau is working to help maintain the American family as a unit even under the congested conditions often associated with defense production. And, for older people, I have recently proposed that the benefits of old-age and survivors' insurance be broadened to include hospitalization insurance for up to 60 days a year.

One striking example of the need for a continuing campaign against disablement lies in the growing amount of disability due to chronic disease. The war against chronic illness is a ceaseless struggle—a struggle on two fronts. On one front we fight disease itself—in the research laboratory and in the hospital or clinic. On the other front we fight the effects of today's major crippling diseases with physical restoration and other processes of rehabilitation.

We have, then, a problem for which employment is only part of the solution—the part that comes last, after the whole complicated job of medical rehabilitation and retraining has been done. Advancements of medicine have added years to the span of human life. In so doing, they have imposed upon society the obligation to make these added years healthy, productive, and happy.

That is one of the very purposes of the Federal Security Agency, including the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. The Public Health Service, with its broad program of research, is constantly uncovering new methods to preserve life. Many who would have died but for the development of the antibiotics, improved methods of surgery, and other advances of medicine are now enabled to live to old age. With our broad programs of social security, we have the means of insuring minimum economic security and helping to maintain family life. Through training and vocational rehabilitation, we have achieved the means of adding productivity to the life thus extended.

Rehabilitation has made tremendous strides since enactment of the Barden-Lafollette Act of 1943. In the past 8 years, the Federal-State partnership has transformed more than 400,000 disabled men and women from dependency and despair to the self-respect and economic independence that a steady job affords. To many this program has meant a new lease on life.

These heartening gains show what can be done, and what should be done on a bigger scale. We still have far to go. There are still at least 2,000,000 persons throughout the country so handicapped by physical or mental disability that, without rehabilitation, they are either unable to work in jobs which use their best talents, or unable to work at all.

Each year about 250,000 Americans are disabled by disease, accidents, or congenital causes. Service to all of these people must be given if we are to meet fully our obligations to the handicapped and to the Nation.

In a time of national emergency, there is always the danger that our permanent programs may be overshadowed by the dramatic appeal of immediate defense needs. We must realize ourselves, and emphasize to others, that the rehabilitation of handicapped men and women is vitally important to the defense effort. Rehabilitation means more hands, more skills, and more brains

added to the productive effort which supports military security.

Each year more disabled persons have been rehabilitated, but the number who still need rehabilitation continues to mount. Advancements in medicine and other sciences are giving us new techniques and know-how with which the job can be done better than before. But we need more money to fulfill these exciting possibilities. For 3 years there has been no increase at all in the amount of Federal funds available for this vital job.

Every American must come to understand how important our handicapped citizens are—or could be—to the national interest. We can no longer afford to overlook their productive potentialities. We can no longer allow ourselves the doubtful and lazy luxury of ignoring the possibilities of increasing our manpower supply through rehabilitation.

This committee has a great educational responsibility—a responsibility which we have assumed because of our interest in the handicapped and the Nation's welfare.

It is not enough that many industrial employers take an enlightened view toward hiring handicapped men and women. It is not enough that our Government hires handicapped workers for jobs that they can fill.

We must carry the message further, to the small-business men whose payrolls account for most of our employment and most of our job opportunities. This message must reach the corner grocer, the farmer, the filling-station owner. It must reach into every section and every community in America. When it does, opportunity will flourish where prejudice may once have barred a handicapped person from the chance to make a living.

I know that all of us here feel this very strongly. I ask that you give your attention, not only to the employment aspect of the problem, but also to the rehabilitation aspect. We must open employment opportunities for the handicapped, and we must also extend the services of rehabilitation to equip more of our substantially handicapped to share the fruitfulness, the self-respect, and the ever-broadening possibilities of American opportunity.

Migrant Workers Find Better World in Minnesota Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 27, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Migrant Workers Find Better World in Minnesota Town." This article appeared in the Labor Information Bulletin, dated August 1951, which is published by the United States Department of Labor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the Record, as follows:

MIGRANT WORKERS FIND BETTER WORLD IN MINNESOTA TOWN—HOLLANDALE CITIZENS JOIN TO AID CHILDREN AND PARENTS

Things are looking up this year for the 800 migrant farm-worker families who annually

help gather the crops around Hollandale, Minn.

All groups in the community of 355 persons—school officials, church leaders, growers, farm worker recruiters, and other citizens—have joined together to see that school-age children of the migrant workers are not employed during school hours, as required under regulations of the Federal Wage and Hour law, and that they actually attend school.

In May of this year, the State Department of Health sent a mobile X-ray unit to Hollandale and examined both migrant and local children and adults.

NEW STATE BILL

Under a bill introduced in the Minnesota State Legislature by State Senator Earl L. Engbritson, who resides in Hollandale, the State Board of Health is authorized to regulate the construction and maintenance of equipment insofar as they concern sanitary conditions in the migrant labor camps. The bill was approved in April of this year by the Governor.

Hollandale is surrounded by an extensive area of intensive farming. Potatoes, cabbage, onions, and asparagus are the major crops. Sugar beets and spinach are also grown. During the agricultural season—which extends from June to early November—the 800 migrant families more than double Hollandale's population. Most of them come from Texas and are of Mexican origin.

Few of the children in these families attended school. They worked in the fields instead. Housing was poor and sanitary facilities in many cases nonexistent.

During the 1950 season investigators of the Department of Labor's Wage and Hour Division, with the help of Minnesota State labor law inspectors, launched an educational program to get the cooperation of school officials, church groups, growers, and those who recruited labor for the growers in providing school facilities for the migrant children—and seeing that they attended school. The Fair Labor Standards (Wage-Hour) Act provides that no one under 16 years of age may be employed at agricultural jobs during school hours by a producer who ships directly or indirectly in interstate commerce.

GROWING INTEREST

At first the community was resistant to the idea of taking the migrant children into school, but increasing insight into the many problems that beset the migrants has resulted in a growing interest in these families and a local action program to help work out answers to their problems. School officials made plans for them. One minister urged more than 100 growers in his congregation to tell the migratory workers that their children should be in school. In another church attended by many of the migrants, the priest gave his congregation the same information.

REMAINED THROUGH WINTER

During last winter several families from Texas, whose earnings had been very low because of poor crops, stayed on in Hollandale. The 25 children in these families continued to attend school. The small amounts charged for school lunches were provided by donations from churches, the parent-teacher association, and other groups. The families were supported by public funds.

Then, this spring, one local grower, who recruits in Texas for himself as well as for other growers, prepared contracts in Spanish for the workers to sign. These contracts included a clause informing the workers of the Minnesota school-attendance law. Another clause explained the Federal minimum-age provision.

Copies of these contracts were left with the Texas State Employment Service offices. Families migrating to Hollandale were told

to bring birth certificates and school records of their school-age children.

Early in May, representatives of the Department of Labor's Wage and Hour Division and the Bureau of Labor Standards, as well as representatives of the Minnesota State Industrial Commission, visited Hollandale. They found 65 migrant-family children in the Hollandale elementary and high school that day, though the influx of workers from Texas had just begun. They expected an enrollment of not less than 120 before the end of the school year. The principal of another school was preparing to take in children from other districts where space was lacking.

The investigators were agreed that things were looking up, particularly for the migrant children, and they believe that what Hollandale is doing, and what its citizens plan to do, can be adopted to thousands of like communities throughout the Nation.

Light Plane Pilot Sets Speed Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 27, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a news story entitled "Light Plane Pilot Sets Speed Record," which appeared in the Washington Daily News of August 7, 1951, be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point. The article concerns the speed record set by a Minnesota citizen in a recent plane flight to Mexico City. I believe the story has significance, since it is my firm conviction that this is but another means of cementing friendly relations between the nations of the world.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIGHT-PLANE PILOT SETS SPEED RECORD

MEXICO CITY, August 7.—Pilot Max Conrad held a new light plane speed record today after landing his little Piper Pacer to end an 18-hour, 44-minute flight from Winona, Minn.

He averaged 100 miles per hour during his 2,200-mile flight. He said he encountered some thunderstorms soon after taking off, but later everything was easy.

ROOM FOR GAS

When he arrived yesterday, the plane had enough gas for five more hours of flying. His Piper Pacer had three of the four seats removed to make room for 165 gallons of gas, enough for about 26 hours of flying.

Nonstop flights for long distances in light planes have been a hobby for Mr. Conrad. A few weeks ago, he set an official record with a 23-hour flight from Los Angeles to Teterboro, N. J. Last fall he flew to Europe in the same plane to visit his vacationing family.

Mr. Conrad said he tired on the flight, but the best way to stay awake is to keep hungry.

HIS FORMULA

"I take along a box of Graham crackers," he said. "And every hour I eat several, chewing them about three times as long as usual. I do not drink anything, not even water."

"The crackers keep me going and alert. After a while, they even taste good."

Mr. Conrad said he would stay in Mexico 5 days and will fly back, taking it easy and seeking no record.

Government Development of Power Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 28, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at the dedication of the new Flambeau hydroelectric station 6 miles north of Ladysmith, Wis., on Sunday, August 26, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPANDING AMERICA'S POWER FRONTIERS

(Address by HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin)

I am delighted to be here today to join with the members and friends of the Dairyland Power Cooperative in the dedication of this splendid hydro power plant.

I should like to welcome here the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, and the former Secretary and now REA Administrator, Mr. Wickard. I welcome them not only to my State but to my own home area—an area in which I was born and raised and have lived virtually all my years, with the exception of my service in Washington. Welcome, gentlemen, to God's country.

I am particularly glad to be here today for a good many reasons:

MORE ELECTRICITY CRUCIAL TO SOUND FARMING

1 First, I am glad because this new plant will clearly mean good things to Midwest agriculture and indeed to all the folks in our communities whose prosperity depends directly upon a prosperous, healthy agriculture.

I speak as a member of the REA myself—my farm in Barron County being served by the Barron County Electric Cooperative. And so I rejoice that the miracle of expanded electricity will be assured for all of the farmers served by this vast Dairyland Power Cooperative. The kilowatts will truly help relieve the back-breaking burdens of farmers, their families, their kin, and their help.

WISCONSIN MUST KEEP STEP IN ELECTRICITY OUTPUT

2 For another thing, this dedication means that my State—Wisconsin—is keeping step with the national increase in power potential. Electricity, we all know, is a key to success in future healthy competition in agriculture and industry.

Just consider the northeastern section of our country, for example. The whole area there will, many experts believe, soon be starving for electric "juice"—"juice" which could and should be generated by the St. Lawrence seaway power project—power for which we have mutually battled for so long. Last thing I did in Washington was in committee to speak on behalf of an amendment for the St. Lawrence seaway. The Northeast

will consequently lose step with the rest of the Nation because it simply won't have the electricity to meet expanding needs. I don't want that ever to happen to Wisconsin. We want to keep in step and indeed to stay ahead of step.

FLOODS ON THE MISSOURI COMPARED WITH CAREFUL HARNESSING ON FLAMBEAU

3. There is a third reason for our mutual joy today. As we view this wonderful project, there comes to mind the marked contrast between what we are dedicating here (by the use of our God-given ingenuity, initiative, and cooperation) and what was not done in the valleys of the Missouri and Kaw Rivers, and, yes, in southwest Wisconsin. In those areas, terrible floods have inflicted ghastly damage upon the people, upon industry and upon farms. The mountains of mud piled high today throughout the whole flood region stand in marked contrast to this mountainous dam today. The one the symbol of the destructiveness of nature, unchecked and uncontrolled by man. The other—the symbol of farmer-citizen owned, farmer-controlled creativeness and constructiveness.

THE MIRACLES OF THIS NEW STATION

As we know, this station alone is capable of producing sufficient electrical energy to fill the entire present needs of approximately 18,000 farms. According to the most conservative estimates, the annual production of electricity by this plant will average 60,000,000 kilowatt hours. As a matter of fact, there is a chance that the total energy output will pass the 70,000,000 mark before the year's end. If you base your estimate on an annual production of 60,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy, the Flambeau hydroelectric station will be producing energy at the rate of 5½ mills per kilowatt-hour, which is, of course, a very low rate indeed.

But the story of this dam cannot be told alone in the statistics about it. Yes, the concrete portion of the dam itself is more than 90 feet in height from bedrock, with an operating head of around 65 feet. The earth filled portion is 5,200 feet in length. The project, as you know, went into service in January of this year after 3 years of construction. It cost \$6,125,000.

One of the finest features of the station is the multiple purposes which it serves, in that, for example, it has created a lake of 2,000 acres with a shore line of 23½ miles. This beautiful lake carefully cleared and cleaned by Dairyland at a cost of \$180,000 before it was flooded is a tremendously valuable addition to Wisconsin's recreational resources. It will help contribute to making Wisconsin—for its own people and for out-of-State visitors still more of a paradise for boating, fishing, swimming, and other forms of summer recreation.

There, my friends, is more of the contrast between sound planning on the Flambeau and floods on the Missouri.

Now, let us go on and review further reasons for our pride and satisfaction today.

WHETHER PRIVATELY OR PUBLICLY, FARMERS MUST BE SERVED

One of the reasons why I personally am happy to be here today is because not so many weeks ago, it was my pleasure to assist in another dedication ceremony when the Petenwell and Castle Rock projects on the Wisconsin River were formally opened.

Those particular projects had been built by private electric companies working in cooperation with one another.

And so, within the space of but a short period of time, it has been my pleasure to join with men of good will in dedicating two great additions to the electric potential of Wisconsin; the one developed exclusively by private capital; the other developed by REA and its patrons.

This simultaneous development aimed at fulfilling the needs of the people of Wisconsin holds a great lesson for all of us. I, for one, believe that the one most important thing is indeed that the consumers of electricity be served and be served adequately, efficiently, and economically.

Down through the years, I have spoken on many occasions of the need for cooperation between REA and the private electrical companies. After all, the job of each is to serve the public interest. I realize the considerable differences which prevail now and which have prevailed between them, but I do think to the extent that it is possible, such differences should be reduced by men of good will and understanding on both sides, rather than having the differences needlessly increased and antagonisms prolonged.

As you know, the REA was set up to do a certain specific job. It is in effect a creature of the various statutes which originally set it up and which have added to its authority in subsequent Congresses (such as its relatively new authority for rural telephone service). Under the basic statute, REA's administrator was authorized and empowered "to make loans for rural electrification . . . for the purpose of furnishing electrical energy in rural areas who are not receiving central station service." In another part of the act, "rural area" was defined to exclude persons within the boundaries of any city, village or borough having a population in excess of 1,500 inhabitants.

PRIVATE UTILITIES SHOULD HAVE BROUGHT "JUICE" TO FARMERS YEARS AGO

Years ago, I pointed out to certain leaders in private utilities that the farmers of my State were hungry for electricity. The private utilities had not strung up sufficient poles to serve our farms. They had said it was too costly. I prophesied that the farmers of Wisconsin were not going to stand idle and simply hope that some day they might be served.

I said that the farmers were entitled to the electricity, and that they were going to get it one way or the other. I pointed out that our farmers were not going to be serfs. They were not going to be chained to manual labor. They insisted that the great miracle of electricity be harnessed and brought to them and to their wives.

My prophecy and the prophecy of others was fulfilled. Because of the dire need, there developed the great rural electrification movement. That movement has seen a tremendous and necessary increase in the percentage of Wisconsin farms served by electricity.

DAIRYLAND POWER CO-OP'S VAST ACTIVITIES

I have been most interested in personally learning more and more about the vast activities of Dairyland Power Cooperative and its 25 member distribution co-ops. I have read its business statements, learned more about its 2,000 miles of transmission lines, to 80,000 members in Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, and Illinois, about its transmission substations, its plant substations, distribution substations. I have read about its over 400 employees, its investments, its hydro power, its steam generation, internal combustion generation, its kilowatt-hour sales, the amount of coal it burns, oil it burns, and so forth right down the line.

Reading and learning ever more about REA confirmed anew the fact, as mentioned in your literature, that the whole development of rural electrification cooperatives in Wisconsin proves the ability of farmers working together to organize, build, and maintain their own electric-power systems. This has been democracy at work and you

can certainly feel proud of your accomplishments.

What a tremendous amount of water has gone over the dams, since early 1937 when representatives of 10 rural electric distribution cooperatives met in the first discussions that ultimately led to the creation of Dairyland Power Cooperative. I will not review with you, my friends, all of the tremendous battles and controversies which have raged during these 14 years. I do want to look right now however at the present Dairyland Power Cooperative story.

DAIRYLAND POWER'S ENCOURAGING FINANCIAL OPERATIONS

Right at the end of 1950, as you know, Dairyland Powers' plant investment was over \$24,500,000. Dairyland's tax bill was in excess that year of \$178,000. To date, Dairyland has been approved REA loans in the amount of \$47,750,000 and its investment in generation and transmission facilities total over \$36,500,000. This is the amount which REA advanced the cooperative.

As of June 30, 1951, Dairyland was current in the payment of its loans. It has paid almost \$1,200,000 in principal and over \$1,000,000 in interest on those loans. As you know, the REA system is founded upon 2 percent loans to qualified borrowers with preference to nonprofit and cooperative organizations, payable back over a maximum period of 35 years.

REA'S SERVICES THROUGHOUT AMERICA

Throughout this Nation as a whole, by July 1, 1951, the REA system had approved almost \$2,500,000,000 in loans to over 1,000 borrowers, most of which were cooperatives but some of which were public power districts, other public bodies and including 25 commercial power companies. Over 80 percent of the REA loans have been for electric distribution facilities. As you know, REA makes generation and transmission loans only when borrowers are unable to purchase an adequate supply of power or a saving would result. Around 18 percent of the REA loans have thus been for the construction of generating plants and transmission lines. By July of this year, borrowers had returned to the Government almost \$300,000,000 in principal and interest payments on their REA loans. Over \$33,000,000 of that amount constituted payments on principal ahead of schedule. There has only been one REA loan foreclosure to date on an operating power system.

I have said that the REA was democracy in action, and I know that all of my listeners today would agree to that fact, based on their recognition that the consumer members do indeed control each REA Cooperative through Boards of Directors which they elect annually by and from their own membership.

As of July of this year, Wisconsin REA's had paid over \$10,000,000 in principal and interest on their Government loans. Almost one-half million dollars was paid on principal in advance of the date due. Seventeen borrowers were ahead on their payments and only two were slightly behind.

WHAT GOVERNMENT SHOULD AND SHOULD NOT DO

And so the REA story is truly an American story, proving how the American people can adapt to changing needs.

We all know that there has been considerable debate over the years over the question of public and private power, and no doubt there will be far more debate in the future. In the Congress we are always confronted with a great deal of amendments affecting electricity generation and transmission. Before each of these votes we legislators must carefully weigh the equities, the pros and cons, in trying to determine whether Government should step in or not step into

a given picture. I can think of no better rule for us to use than that expounded by Abraham Lincoln when he stated the purpose of the Federal Government:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do it all, or cannot do so well in their separate or individual capacities. In all that people can individually do for themselves the Government ought not to interfere."

I personally have always believed in trying to maximize the area where individual citizens could act in their purely private and individual capacities. However, it is my firm belief that where, as in Lincoln's formula, it has been clearly shown that individual citizens and individual business companies are unable to fulfill a public need, the Government must step in to lend a helping hand.

TOO MUCH GOVERNMENT—TOO LITTLE GOVERNMENT—TWIN DANGERS

You and I reject the old days when America and the world suffered from the two extremes of too much Government or too little government action. On the one hand, we do not want government to reject its responsibilities to the people—to allow them to suffer from a low standard of living when the means for improvement of such standard are at hand. On the other hand, we do not want to have government-itis spread—the disease of government poking its nose into everything—reaching out its hand for all sorts of power, whether or not such power is really justified.

We are trying, as the Scandinavian countries in particular have tried, to find the middle way—a middle way between too much government and too little government.

WISCONSIN FARMING IS CHANGING

This great hydro station comes at a time when Wisconsin farming is dynamically changing. Science has come to the farm and it has come to stay. The modern farm has become not only a scientific laboratory, but it has become a complex business where the assets must be carefully conserved and increased. Assets such as our precious soil, assets like our farm people themselves, who constitute the greatest assets of all.

The Wisconsin farmer today is confronted by a great many challenges. His costs are rising—the costs of feed and fertilizer, the cost of farm labor and farm machinery. He is facing renewed competition from foreign competitive agricultural products. He is facing competition for the consumer's dollar, from other food industries, which have tremendous advertising and public relations budgets. One of his most difficult problems is that of facing a general lack of understanding among many city folks as to the farmer's problems, the farmer's cost, the farmer's needs.

The farmer is increasingly turning his interest to public affairs. He knows that our State legislature in Madison and our national legislature in Washington can help improve his lot or can harm him; can, for example, take actions mistakenly which would serve to reduce his standard of living, cut his profit below his cost of production. The farmer therefore has a right to expect his Representatives and Senators at Madison and Washington to do their part in assuring justice for him.

WE SHOULD BUILD PROJECTS LIKE ST. LAWRENCE

When I return to Washington, I will be debating and voting on legislation to provide great sums of money abroad in defense of this Nation against communism. Included among those sums will be millions of dollars designed to increase the generation of

electric power in Europe. By such power, the western European countries will be better able to sustain their industry and rearmament program. In that way, they will be in a better position to combat communism—internally and externally.

We are going to try, of course, to squeeze the water out of the foreign-aid program, to cut out unnecessary items. But a considerable amount of appropriations will remain and will be voted for.

Being with you today and seeing how Wisconsin is increasing its hydro capacity makes me very glad and proud, because it shows that we are looking after our own, just as we are trying to help others to help themselves abroad. Our greatest responsibility is, of course, to our own people.

It is unfortunate therefore that while we are indeed spending millions abroad to develop transportation arteries and electricity generation, there is right to the north of us the greatest uncompleted transportation channel in the world today, and the greatest single untapped source of power—the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway power project. Here is a project delayed for 3 decades by the unfortunate selfishness and blindness of a few special interests and biased and provincial minds.

It is my hope and prayer, that just as today we are dedicating this great new project on the Flambeau, so, some day in the not too distant future, we or other men and women who follow us will dedicate the completion of a Great Lakes seaway. It will come, my friends, as assuredly as the dawn follows the night—it will come. The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway is based upon self-defense necessity, on economic necessity, on the necessity of further good relations between our good neighbor, Canada, to the north, and ourselves. It will come. It must come. The hands of progress cannot be stayed by the blindness and selfishness of a few men. History proves, as the poet said, that—

"Truth proclaims this lesson,
In letters of living light.
No question is ever settled
Until it is settled right."

The seaway must and will be settled right, just as the electric needs of Wisconsin must and are being settled right.

CONCLUSION

I want to thank you for the opportunity of being with you today, and I want to congratulate all those officers and patrons of Dairyland whose dreams and hopes and days

and years of labor have now come to fruition in this splendid project.

Good luck and carry on.

Economic Power of the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPP

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 28, 1951

Mr. SCHOEPP. Mr. President, I recently came across an interesting economic analysis of the Soviet Union, prepared by Paul O. Peters, Washington analyst. It furnishes important information regarding the Soviet Republic, which I am sure is not generally possessed. I ask unanimous consent that the analysis be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. It presents Mr. Peters' view of the situation, which is most interesting.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC POWER OF THE SOVIET UNION SMALL WHEN COMPARED TO THAT OF THE UNITED STATES ALONE

Studies of the economic power of the Soviet Union reveal many weaknesses which for years will probably keep her from any new direct wars of aggression and conquest against her European neighbors.

The basic weakness of the Soviet Union lies in her inability to produce agricultural commodities in the abundance necessary for all-out war against any sizable foe.

As a matter of fact without American agricultural commodities shipped under lend-lease during World War II, and through United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration after the war, it is doubtful if the Soviet forces could have defeated Hitler's eastern armies, which had been reduced to almost skeleton proportions by the allied invasion of the European Continent in 1944.

The shipments of the principal agricultural commodities to the Soviet Union between 1941 and 1946 are shown by the table following:

Item	Shipped under lend-lease	Distributed by UNRRA	Total agricultural aid
	<i>Pounds</i>	<i>Pounds</i>	<i>Pounds</i>
Meats and meat products	2,152,881,000	204,889,000	2,417,770,000
Fats and oils, including butter	1,884,506,000	53,760,000	1,938,266,000
Milk, processed	218,769,000	89,856,000	308,625,000
Eggs and egg products (dried)	242,458,000	—	242,458,000
Rice and rice flour	135,808,000	3,983,000	139,791,000
Vegetables and products	53,970,000	33,150,000	87,120,000
Pulses	567,186,000	30,415,000	597,601,000
Wheat and flour	1,502,820,000	—	1,502,820,000
Cheese	69,814,000	12,063,000	81,877,000
Other foods	315,782,000	8,585,000	324,367,000
Total pounds of food supplied			7,636,714,000

THE LAND OF THE SOVIETS

Much of the Soviet Union is either ill-suited or ill-adapted for farming. This is due to several causes, namely the severity of the winters in certain areas and the lack of rainfall in others.

Over the entire area the rainfall averages less than 20 inches a year. Large parts of the country, especially in the north, are covered by tundra wastes and marshes and des-

erts in the east and south. Out of the entire area in the Soviet Union there still remains 570,000,000 acres of tillable land, comparable to 530,131,000 acres in the United States.

Russian productivity is low according to American agricultural standards, partly due to the indifference of the collectivist farmers, and partly due to the lack of mechanization. For example in 1940 there were 523,000 tractors on Russian farms compared with 1,447,000 in the United States.

The average Russian farmer harvests the crops from about 8 acres of land while the American farmer harvests 27 acres.

The production figures tell the story better than words. In the table following there is shown comparative crop productions for grains and other agricultural products:

Item and year	American production	Soviet Union production
Wheat, 1949 bushels	1, 146, 463, 000	1, 100, 000, 000
Winter rye, 1949 . . . do	18, 697, 000	950, 000, 000
Oats, 1949 do	1, 322, 924, 000	775, 000, 000
Barley, 1948 do	315, 891, 000	315, 000, 000
Corn, 1948 do	3, 681, 793, 000	110, 000, 000
Rice, 1948 do	85, 055, 000	15, 555, 500
Potatoes, 1949 . . . do	401, 962, 000	2, 800, 000, 000
Cotton, 1949 bales	16, 634, 000	2, 070, 000
Flaxseed, 1948 . . . bushel	51, 529, 000	19, 300, 000
Tobacco, 1948 pound	1, 960, 000, 000	380, 000, 000
Beet sugar, 1949 . . . do	2, 876, 139, 000	—
Cane sugar, 1949 . . . do	2, 074, 000, 000	—
Domestic only . . . do	1, 950, 139, 000	1, 961, 000, 000
Livestock, head, 1949		
Cattle	78, 298, 000	54, 000, 000
Hogs	57, 128, 000	15, 000, 000
Sheep and goats . .	27, 051, 000	187, 000, 000
Horses	5, 808, 000	10, 800, 000

¹ The United States has only about 4,000,000 goats on the farms and western ranges. The goat is a common farm animal in Russia.

RUSSIA SMALL PRODUCER OF PETROLEUM AND ITS PRODUCTS

The war potential of a country can well be measured by its access and capacity to produce petroleum and its products, gasoline and the like, in order to successfully prosecute motorized and mechanized war.

In 1947 the refinery capacity of the U S S R was known to be 575,000 barrels per day, compared with United States refinery capacity of 5,400,000 barrels a day.

In 1946 crude production in the Soviet Union totaled 166,827,000 barrels, compared with United States production of 1,731,889,000 barrels.

Just why the American people do not know all of the economic facts about the Russian war-making potential is one of the mysteries of the hour.

With a population of 211,000,000, compared to the 150,000,000 in the United States (154,000,000 in 1951) the Russians are in no position to wage a successful war against the United States or Western Europe, for that matter, under the present defense set-up of the Atlantic Pact.

It seems advisable, then, that there should be great caution exercised by the Congress in appropriating funds for the economic and military security of Europe, for materials and equipment furnished now may become the incentive to the Russians for a quick strike, hoping to enrich and strengthen their own military power.

PAUL O. PETERS.

Freedom of the Individual in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 28, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered at the annual picnic of the

Independent Order of Odd Fellows at Kingwood, Somerset County, Pa., on August 25, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am happy to be here today because your organization and your membership truly represents the spirit of patriotic Americanism—faith in God and loyal devotion to our Republic and our flag.

Throughout its history the Independent Order of Odd Fellows has been a powerful influence in the moral and spiritual progress of our State and Nation. In every city and town your order has exemplified the real meaning of brotherhood by teaching and practicing good will, tolerance, and mutual helpfulness.

You have prospered in good works, in charity, and in moral uplift. You have recognized your responsibility to those in need of a helping hand—the unfortunate, the aged, the widow, and the orphan.

May the Supreme Ruler of all mankind bless the work of the Odd Fellows and strengthen the fraternal bonds which have their inspiration in the Holy Bible for greater service to God and their fellowman.

It is always a pleasure to come to Somerset County. Here nature has spread incomparable beauty with a lavish hand. In these beautiful surroundings and in the presence of this splendid assembly, it is appropriate to consider the elements of American greatness. It is fitting on occasions such as this that we express our profound gratitude for the blessings we enjoy as citizens of a nation founded on the sincere belief that the independence of the individual is God's greatest gift to mankind.

The early settlers of America differed in their form of worship, but they met on common ground in their love of liberty and independence.

They sought in the New World a haven where they could live in freedom, where they could walk upright in dignity, obedient to the will of God, without fear of tyranny or persecution.

They braved the hazards of the ocean and the perils of an untracked wilderness in order that they might enjoy civil and religious liberty.

The trappers and traders who crossed the mountains and began the migration toward the westward plains carried rifles and axes—but they turned to their Bibles for spiritual comfort and guidance.

From those early beginnings every advance in the progress and development of our country can be traced by the golden thread of deep religious conviction.

Our own Commonwealth of Pennsylvania was established by William Penn as a holy experiment in government based on the spirit of tolerance and freedom of religion.

"If we are not ruled by God," William Penn asserted, "we will be ruled by tyrants."

The founding fathers in drafting the great charter of our liberty, the Declaration of Independence, made four explicit references to the Almighty.

In the first eloquent sentence of that immortal document they proclaimed the right of the American Colonies "to assume among the powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitled them."

In the second sentence "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" are set forth as inalienable rights with which all men are endowed by their Creator.

In next to the last sentence appeal is made to the Supreme Judge of the World and finally there are those inspiring words of faith "with firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence."

Eleven years later, when the Constitution of the United States was being written in Philadelphia and little progress was being made, Benjamin Franklin reminded his colleagues that "God governs in the affairs of men." He proposed that daily prayers be held "imploping the assistance of Heaven and its blessings upon our deliberations." That practice continues today in our legislative halls.

Our own Constitution of Pennsylvania, in its preamble states:

"We the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, grateful to Almighty God for the blessings of civil and religious liberty, and humbly invoking His guidance, do ordain and establish this constitution."

Supporting all this background of religious faith—of devotion to the teachings of the Holy Bible—we have the great legal pronouncement of the Supreme Court of the United States in which it was stated:

"This is a religious Nation."

These words express the eternal truth that the American Republic was founded on the principles of religion. They were spoken by Mr. Justice Brewer, when he delivered the opinion of the Supreme Court in the case of the Church of the Holy Trinity versus the United States.

I repeat the words of Justice Brewer: "This is a religious Nation."

That opinion marks a great milestone in the judicial and religious history of the United States. It should be read during this critical time by all true Americans.

More than anything else, it points out one of the great elements of American strength—the spirit of tolerance and good will under which many faiths and creeds live together in peace and harmony, respecting the right of every individual to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience.

Referring once more to the Declaration of Independence, let me recall those rights which the founding fathers described as inalienable—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

You will notice that they put particular stress on the pursuit of happiness. They knew that no government since the world began has been able to guarantee happiness.

They knew that real happiness is the result of individual effort. It is the reward of righteous conduct toward each other, work, thrift, courage, and the love of God. Happiness is a goal toward which every free man and woman can strive by hard work, by living a clean and decent life, and by taking an honest part in the work of our churches, civic affairs, and in our Government. Success in life can be measured by our contribution to those activities which raise the spiritual and cultural level of our communities.

The courageous men and women who built the foundation of American freedom believed that each human being was created in the image and likeness of God.

In accordance with the plan of the Almighty, some men gain leadership in industry, science, education, government, or religion. Others became outstanding in the development of our natural resources. Others have superior skill as craftsmen in the production of articles of beauty and utility.

Our Heavenly Father, in His infinite goodness, expected the more fortunate to aid the less fortunate. For 150 years this plan served our people well through organizations such as yours and through individuals and families who have acquired wealth.

One of the most important of human rights is the right to acquire property by all honest means, but it brings with it an obligation to society. Billions of dollars, dedicated by great American foundations to promote health, welfare, education, good government, and to advance the cause of religion are carrying out that obligation.

But during recent years so-called intellectuals and other false prophets of a philosophy which knows no God have been gradually undermining all that is fundamental in the American way of life.

They proclaim that God's plan has failed—that security is preferable to liberty. They teach that freedom of the individual should be surrendered to a planned and regimented economy directed by an all-powerful central government. They declare that progress and prosperity can be achieved without the incentives which created the greatness of America.

That is the philosophy of communism. It hopes to cause the downfall of our country when our people turn away from religion and abandon decency in government and private conduct.

In every country where the people have followed false leaders into a planned economy and the so-called welfare state religion has been destroyed, the self-respect of the individual has vanished.

When the people forget that all human rights come from God and not from the state they begin to decay.

From the days of ancient civilizations, like Rome, to the present day, corruption in public life has preceded the downfall of nations. Men failed in religion. They failed in loyalty to their country. They became selfish. They became corrupt.

The evil influence spreads to the youth. Recently we have had some shocking examples of that influence in school and college athletics.

We have just had an appalling example of it at West Point, where the highest standards of honor have been maintained for 150 years. In all its history West Point has been the pride of the soldier and the civilian.

We have reason to be alarmed at recent disclosures that indicate a widespread breakdown of morality and decency.

We have been shocked by evidence of corruption, bribery, graft, and political favoritism in government.

We have racketeering, organized crime, and corrupt partnerships between the criminal underworld and some officials sworn to enforce the law.

The reason for this trend toward moral decay is not hard to find.

In recent years too many Americans have been careless of spiritual values. They have become negligent of their civic duties and responsibilities. They have forgotten that there is a definite relationship between religion and good government.

The religious training of our youth has been inadequate. We have failed to impress upon the minds of our young people that religion is the foundation of American strength.

We have neglected to implant appreciation of American patriotism and sacrifice by failing to make American history a basic course of study in all our schools and colleges. So many of our public schools do not teach American history and two-thirds of the Nation's colleges do not insist upon the study of our history as a requisite for graduation. We have remedied that situation as far as the public schools in Pennsylvania are concerned. The study of American history is now required by law.

We must have a moral and spiritual awakening. We must strengthen the religious life of America. Our churches must be filled with God-fearing men and women who will fight, regardless of consequences, for decency and honesty in Government.

We must defend America against greed, selfishness, and grasping ambition for personal advantage. With the spirit of God in our hearts we can clean up all immoral practices in politics, in business, and in national and international affairs.

While the threat of the Communist aggression endangers the peace of the world, we must build American strength to its highest peak.

But if we are to survive as a free nation, we need more than armies, more than guns, bombs, and planes. Above all, we need the strength and courage that come from God.

We cannot defeat communism by force alone. Even though we gain military victory, the ultimate and final defeat of communism will not be achieved until we set before the world an example of righteousness and obedience to the laws of God and man.

We will strengthen the cause of freedom when we make known to all the world that the American system of Government means freedom of the individual to plan his own destiny according to his own ability. But first we must put our own house in order. We must so live that we can be an example of patriotism, religion, and high moral standards.

We are so fortunate in America that we produce so many of the things which are helping to solve the chaotic condition of the world. We have the steel, oil, machine tools, electrical apparatus, chemical production, textiles, and countless other products of our mines and factories. We have the know-how of our skilled craftsmen, and the superior ability of management.

All of these are important, of course, but the basic industry of America is agriculture. The American farmer is the backbone of the Nation. We must maintain our great crops. We must produce the finest livestock in the world. We must keep our broad and fertile field well tilled with an abundance of grain, vegetables, fruit, cattle, sheep, hogs, and poultry.

We must continue to expand agriculture and adhere to the free economy of plenty. We must not be lured into the dangers of a planned economy of scarcity.

But we must keep in mind always that the real strength of America is not in our great industrial plants, our mines, mills or factories. It is not in our agricultural production nor in our wealth of natural resources.

Our national strength is firmly established on the freedom of the individual. Upon that principle the United States attained leadership among the nations of the world and gave its people the highest living standards in all history.

But, I am forced to say with deep regret, that this great strength of our Republic is now in danger.

Government has become too cumbersome and too costly. We are continually asking for Government handouts. States, counties, cities, all go to the higher levels of Government with hat in hand, asking that grants be made for many purposes. Chambers of commerce and other organizations join in pressure groups to demand special advantages for their own localities.

We are all leaning too much on Government rather than depending upon our own efforts.

When the iron hand of Government takes hold, the people are regimented. They are told what to do. Self-reliance is weakened. Initiative is lost. Know-how is forgotten.

Demands upon the Government are multiplied and the cost of Government climbs higher and higher.

We should not forget the lessons of history. Human rights have always been lost when a nation, burdened with debt, increases that debt through waste and extravagance. Crushing taxes are laid upon the people.

Over and over again this has ended in financial collapse and the fall of the government. Germany under Hitler and Italy under Mussolini were tragic examples. Time after time freedom died when totalitarian government seized control over the lives of

the people. It has always brought tyranny, moral degeneration and death of the body and the soul.

There are elements now in this country whose purpose is to spread confusion, dissension and hate. They are the spearheads in the drive to destroy free government.

We can defeat their evil objective if we return to the spirit of our forefathers.

They worked hard. They practiced tolerance and lived humbly in the way of the Lord. They poured out their sweat and shed their blood to build for us a land of liberty and independence.

In our industry, our culture, our spiritual life and in the betterment of government there are vast opportunities. Let us take courage. Let us live the lives of Americans.

Let us avoid hate and fear, passion and prejudice. Let us beware of empty promises of false leaders who pretend government can give something for nothing.

In real humility we should dedicate ourselves to the principles of our religious faith, because good laws are based upon religion and righteousness. Honest measures, decency and statesmanship should take the place of craftiness, deceit and political trickery. Nothing that is morally wrong can be politically right.

Men and women of the church can help strengthen America by taking an intelligent and militant part in the battle for good government.

They can take leadership in the fight against the centralization of government, the high cost of government and deficit financing which leads to bigger debt, higher taxes and inflation.

They can organize the moral forces in each community to fight against corruption and vice of all kinds.

The United States will survive as a free Nation if we all do our duty to God and our Republic.

The West Point Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 28, 1951

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I wrote to the Secretary of the Navy on August 6, 1951, together with his reply dated August 20, 1951, referring to the recent dismissal of cadets at the United States Military Academy.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER TO SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

UNITED STATES SENATE,

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,

August 6, 1951.

The Honorable DAN A. KIMBALL,
Secretary of the Navy, Department of
Defense, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In connection with the reported dismissal of cadets at the Military Academy, I should like to ask for the following information:

1. Has it been customary to have an academic coach for the football team at Annapolis?
2. If so, what have been his duties?
3. What methods has he employed in carrying out those duties?

4. More specifically, how has he endeavored to coach the members of the football squad in their studies?

5. Has he proceeded:

- (a) By individual instruction;
- (b) By extra hour classes;
- (c) By use of special textbooks;
- (d) By special instruction of cadets either individually or in groups on selective projects or problems; or
- (e) By any other method.

6. How does the academic coach determine the subject material to be used?

7. How are the academic coaches and members of their staffs selected?

8. Are there academic "coaches" for any other competitive athletic groups—or any other groups?

9. If so, would the answers to the foregoing questions also apply to their methods?

10. How long has the practice of academic coaching been carried on as covered by the above questions?

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS CASE.

REPLY FROM THE NAVY

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, August 20, 1951.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CASE: I have obtained information from the Naval Academy which I consider supplies the data you requested in your letter of August 6, 1951. Since no academic coach is assigned to the football or any other team at the Naval Academy specific answers to your questions are not furnished.

The following pertinent portions of article 4206, United States Naval Academy Regulations, are quoted.

"(a) Extra instruction will be given by the various departments as indicated in the academic calendar.

"(b) The object of this instruction is to afford midshipmen every opportunity to supplement, and to clear up any doubtful points in their current work. Instructors are regularly detailed for this purpose, and all midshipmen are urged to avail themselves of this privilege. Midshipmen who have a mark of 2.6 or lower in one or more subjects may, upon written request approved by the commandant of midshipmen, have extra instruction assigned priority over extra duty 'sub,' 'weak,' and posture squads. The officer of the watch is authorized to grant this privilege in those cases where the interference with extra instruction was unforeseen.

"(c) * * * All midshipmen who wish to attend extra instruction, both regular and night, must sign up for it in advance in the department concerned.

"(d) No extra instruction shall be given by any officer or civilian instructor at any other times than shown in the academic calendar unless authorized by the head of his department. Notice of such extra instruction shall be given to the entire class and shall be open to all."

The program of extra instruction, academic year 1950-51, referred to in the United States Naval Academy Regulations is enclosed. A similar program is prescribed in this year's calendar not yet printed.

The amount of academic time lost by the football team is recognized and calculated for each of the three upper classes at the Naval Academy. For example, members of the football squad from the third class will lose six recitations in the department of mathematics this fall. Members of the varsity football squad at the beginning of the academic year in early September are sectioned by classes therefore, and continue in these section until the end of their athletic season at which time they are returned

to their regular sections. The lesson plans for these football sections are worked out so that they cover the same amount of textbook material as do the regular lesson plans for the other midshipmen of the respective class. This divergence from the normal has been proved satisfactory by experience and permits all midshipmen to be on an equal scholastic footing by the date of the term examinations which come in January.

You will note that the night extra instruction schedule is conducted during the football season. This is done in recognition of the essential, long-practice sessions required of football men. By regulation, the program is available to all who could not attend the extra-instruction classes scheduled in the afternoon and, it is utilized by other varsity fall sports squads—soccer, cross country, basketball—and by members of the corresponding teams competing in the intramural program.

As to the selection of instructors to conduct scheduled extra instruction this matter is handled at the time by the heads of the academic departments. Since all midshipmen sign up for the extra instruction they propose to attend, the numbers to be instructed govern the numbers of instructors assigned.

The Naval Academy also conducts extra instruction, again for all midshipmen who indicate they desire it, during the Christmas-leave period. Midshipmen are free, of course, to assist other midshipmen with their studies and visiting for such purpose during prescribed study periods is permitted.

We recognize that many midshipmen have difficulty with certain subjects. Heads of each department, therefore, keep close check on all whose daily averages are below passing or close to that line. An additional check on members of all athletic squads is kept by the officer representative of each sport. By personal interview individuals in academic difficulty are advised and counseled to take advantage of extra instruction. Records of marks are posted each week for the information and guidance of midshipmen.

I trust that this information is satisfactory.

Sincerely yours,

DAN A. KIMBALL,
Secretary of the Navy.

The Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 27, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, in the Baltimore Sun of August 27, 1951, there appeared a very timely and instructive article by Mr. C. P. Ives, a man of high learning and great insight, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERIL TO THE BILL OF RIGHTS?

(By C. P. Ives)

Over and over again the Truman people tell us that red-baiting and anti-Communist witch-hunting endanger the Bill of Rights. Is that so? The Bill of Rights is strictly and solely a series of curbs on the powers of the Federal Government. Take article I:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the

free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government. * * *

Now, then, can Mr. Truman point to a single bill in Congress by which a Red-baiter seeks to set up an "establishment of religion"? Of course, he cannot. On the contrary, within a few years the Supreme Court, in the McCollum case, has given the church-state separation clause new force.

Well, then, are the Red-baiters pushing for laws to limit the exercise of religion? Everyone knows they are not. Are there anti-Communists in Congress advocating a law to suspend freedom of speech or of press? No. Are the rights of assembly and of petition about to be repealed? No.

Article II of the Bill of Rights says the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed. No Red-baiter is urging a repeal of that rule in Congress. Article III promises that soldiers shall not be quartered on private persons. No threat of that.

Article IV of the Bill of Rights guarantees that the people shall be secure in their papers and houses against unwarranted search and seizure. Some very competent scholars think this guaranty has indeed been impaired in late years. But it was done by majority decision of the Supreme Court and no complaint has been heard from Mr. Truman.

Article V is the one that protects criminals, that is, people charged with crime. Mr. Truman will search the record in vain for any victim of the witch-hunt who has been made to answer for crime in illegal ways and without relief—look at the Remington reversal just now. He cannot name a single "liberal" who has been punished for the same crime twice.

Far from the privilege against self-incrimination being in danger, it is stronger than ever, is used every day by "liberals," pro-Communists, and Communists in court and before the congressional committees and has just been given renewed force by a decision of the Supreme Court. If the property protections in article V are threatened, it is surely not by the anti-Communists.

Article VI of the Bill of Rights guarantees a speedy trial, and no Red-baiter in Congress is advocating any repeal of that. Article VIII provides the right of trial by jury, and the major threat here comes from antijury articles in the law journals by slicker professors, most of whom are on the President's side politically.

Article VIII prohibits excessive bail and cruel and unusual punishment. Having seen what Judge Chesnut has just done in cutting bail imposed under the Smith Act in one case from \$75,000 to \$5,000, can Mr. Truman honestly say that this provision is in danger?

Articles IX and X are catch-all defenses of the residual rights and powers of the States and the people against all unspecified Federal usurpation. Here many of us non-Truman people feel there is, indeed, grave danger. But Mr. Truman would hardly agree since the abuse we fear comes from him and his power-happy colleagues in the post-1933 administrations.

If it is thus absolutely and teetotally false to say that the current drive against communism threatens the Bill of Rights, why does Mr. Truman keep saying that it does? The answer is painfully clear.

We have here one more symptom of the pandemic "liberal" error—an almost indescribable confusion and imprecision in the use of words and concepts. Mr. Truman has actually read into a curb on government abridgement of freedom a guarantee against social disapprobation.

For it is quite true that a man who will not turn his back on Alger Hiss today faces sharp social disapprobation may range from cuts on the street or hard words at cocktail parties through economic pressure to the

most offensive forms of scandal mongering and character assassination. And it is true that timid men valuing their comfort more than their convictions may in the face of social disapprobation swallow their dissents.

But—and this is the all-important point—dissenters retain every constitutional right to dissent. Social pressure will quite possibly be turned against them, but they will not be silenced physically by the force majeure of government. They will not be silenced because the Bill of Rights stands.

It is a gross delusion to suppose that the Bill of Rights, besides protecting dissenters against physical silencing by the Government, also cuddles cowards from the threat of social unpopularity. The Bill of Rights did not repeal courage as a basic equipment for participation in affairs.

It follows that a time when dissent may indeed require more courage, can be a time when the Bill of Rights is stronger than ever. This, indeed, all the 1933-type orators to the contrary notwithstanding, is such a time.

Need for Tuna Research Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 27, 1951

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Dr. R. Van Cleve, director, University of Washington School of Fisheries, on the need for tuna research funds.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON,

SCHOOL OF FISHERIES,

Seattle, Wash., July 31, 1951

The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Member of Congress,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: For some time I have been concerned over the lack of progress on the new Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, which has been due entirely to the lack of funds during the past year. I was astounded to learn, on my return from a 3-month trip to Japan, that a movement is on foot in the Congress to eliminate appropriations for this commission for the coming year. I hope that such a grave error can be avoided, and I wish to call your attention to several facts regarding this commission.

While the center of the United States tuna industry is in California, in recent years the fishermen of Washington have profited greatly from the tuna fisheries off our coast. In spite of the tremendous investment in our tuna fisheries and the heavy production of food resulting from this industry, the only money spent to obtain information that will lead to sound conservation practices has come through minute appropriations made by the States of California, Oregon, and Washington. The United States has spent considerable sums for the investigation of the tuna industry off Hawaii by the Pacific Oceanic Fishery Investigations of the Fish and Wildlife Service, but the lack of research in the area exploited by the American tuna fleet, especially off the coast of Mexico and Central America, leaves this major producing area almost completely unexplored scientifically. The Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, established by treaty between the United States and Costa Rica in order to

fill this void and to lay a foundation for the protection of this natural resource, has been adopted and put into effect by both countries. This treaty is of great importance to the United States in many respects. It furnished a basis of active cooperation with at least one Central American country in an area in which all of these countries are vitally interested. It also provides a means of avoiding friction which has been increasing in recent years due to the policy followed by Mexico and other Central American countries of using our tuna fleet as a source of income through exorbitant license fees charged for obtaining bait, and exacted of our boats even to enter port to secure supplies. If properly administered by the United States, the treaty should also furnish a basis for closer cooperation with all the Latin-American countries and lead to a solution of the difficult problem of territorial limits and fisheries conservation off the Central American coast.

I understand that one of the facetious remarks being made in the Congress in opposition to the appropriation for this commission is that money is to be spent "to investigate the love-life of the tuna." This attitude is not new. In the 25 years I have been connected with fisheries biological work, I have heard it expressed many times by those who are completely ignorant of or uninterested in the potentialities of conservation of our natural resources. You are already aware, I am sure, of the excellent results stemming from the efforts of the International Fisheries Commission, which has rehabilitated the halibut fisheries of the Northeast Pacific. The International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission has accomplished equally fine results in rebuilding the sockeye fishery of the Fraser River. In the case of the former commission and its work on the halibut fishery, this is the first, and to my knowledge, the only marine fishery that has been successfully regulated and rehabilitated. The only salmon fishery of which I have knowledge that has been successfully regulated is that of the Fraser River under the jurisdiction of the International Pacific Salmon Commission. The primary reason for the success of both of these commissions has been their effort toward conservation based upon a thorough scientific knowledge of the biology of the species involved. Most of the failures in efforts to conserve other fisheries are due to lack of just such knowledge. I can assure you that without a careful and thorough study of the tuna fisheries of the west coast of the United States, Mexico, and Central America, we are deliberately taking a chance of losing the largest and most valuable fisheries of this region. In addition, we are risking the loss of a major source of protein food. We are also demonstrating to our Latin American neighbors that we are not interested in conservation. This is certainly a poor example for us to set for these countries where for the most part conservation is an almost totally unexplored field.

In view of the importance of the tuna fisheries to the United States, and in the interest of protecting our fishermen from exorbitant tribute to Mexico and Central American countries in the future, as well as to provide a sound basis for maintaining future relations with our Latin American neighbors looking forward toward the conservation of our resources, it is my firm belief that the Congress should appropriate the full amount requested for the operations of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission. I am sure that support of this commission by our Government will result in benefits comparable with those derived from the other two international commissions mentioned above.

Respectfully,

R. VAN CLEVE,
Director.

Montana Indian Affairs Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 28, 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on June 22 and 23, 1951, a Montana State Conference on Indian Affairs was held at the call of the Governor of Montana, Hon. John W. Bonner. Requests are coming from many States for copies of the proceedings of this conference, which are of widespread interest to Western States. At the request of Mr. K. W. Bergan, Coordinator of Indian Affairs, I ask that these proceedings may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the proceedings of the conference are estimated to make 8½ pages of the RECORD, at a cost of \$683.34.

There being no objection, the proceedings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCEEDINGS OF THE FIRST MONTANA INDIAN AFFAIRS CONFERENCE HELD IN STATE CAPITOL, HELENA, MONT., JUNE 22-23, 1951

The registration of all delegates and visitors to the conference took place from 8 to 10 a. m., June 22, 1951.

The first session of the Montana Indian Affairs Conference was called to order by Miss Mary M. Condon, State superintendent of public instruction, at 9:30 a. m., June 22, in the house chamber of the State capitol.

Opening remarks by Miss Condon:

"It is my very great pleasure to officially call the first all Montana Indian Conference to order. The idea for the conference was born, I believe, in the mind of our Indian leader in the State and our very fine Governor of the State of Montana. The purpose of this meeting is to get together and talk Indian problems and learn from each other the solutions to problems. This is the most democratic way and effective way of getting concrete and lasting results. We are very grateful to you for the time and expense and the energy which has brought you to this meeting."

Miss Condon read two communications:

Telegram from Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY, Senator from Montana.

"DEAR GOVERNOR BONNER: My congratulations and sincere best wishes to you and the delegates of the tribes of Montana attending the State Indian Conference which you have had the wisdom and foresight to convoke. I am very conscious of the many significant contributions the Indian has made to our American culture and have every confidence that this outstanding record will be continued and enhanced in years to come. I hope that my legislative effort of the past and those I shall continue to make in the future in behalf of the Indians will in some measure hasten the approach of the day when the Indians will completely control their own social, educational and economic affairs and will assume those responsibilities and obligations now borne for them by the Federal Government. The paternalistic protection now afforded the Indian by the Government cannot be considered a permanent measure. I feel that the Federal Government must eventually step out of the Indian picture as the progress of the Indian places him in a position of equality in his community. With assurance of my continued interest and effort in behalf of the Indians of Mon-

tana and with kind personal regards to you all, I am,

"Sincerely yours,

"JAMES E. MURRAY."

Miss Condon read a letter from Mr. Jarle Leirfallom, chairman, Governors' Interstate Indian Council, St. Paul, Minn. Mr. Leirfallom congratulated Montana Indians upon the progress that has been made in bringing problems of Indian people to a focus and the hope that an early solution could be found:

"Hon JOHN W. BONNER,

"Governor, State of Montana,

"Helena, Mont.

"DEAR GOVERNOR BONNER: It will be impossible for me to return to Helena for your Indian conference on Friday, but I want to send this letter as a special message and greeting, hoping that you will find opportunity to read it to the persons attending the conference.

"It was very pleasant to see you briefly last week, and to find that you are putting forth such a great effort to assist the Indians, and to know that you are planning so many fine things for your State.

"The Governors' Interstate Council on Indian Affairs, which you helped organize in St. Paul last year, is making real progress. In my recent trip among a number of States, discussing the future of this organization with the governors of the States, I find great enthusiasm for the work of the council, and a real desire on the part of the States to continue working together for the solution of the Indian problem. Over the past year I have also found that Indians from all over the country have great hopes that the organization will benefit them. I am satisfied that neither the Federal Government, nor the individual States, nor local communities working alone, can solve the Indian problem. The cooperative efforts of all levels of the government, and the efforts of Indians themselves are necessary in finding a happy solution to their desperate situation. To develop this cooperation is one of the functions of the Governors' Interstate Council; to bring together all kinds of people, particularly from State and local communities, who have an interest in doing something for Indians, including Indians, who see the necessity of trying to help themselves, and by studying the many phases of the Indian problem, find out what needs to be done and then go ahead and do it.

"The Governors' Interstate Council is a meeting place where these ideas can be threshed out and progress can be made by pulling in one direction, rather than by pulling in all directions. Already, in the 1 year's time during which the Governors' Interstate Council has been active, much progress has been made. There are many things that States and local communities can do by themselves on behalf of Indians, and it is chiefly in this respect that the progress has taken place. Many State meetings and discussions have been had. Indians have been consulted about their problems. Persons interested in the Indian problems have begun to know one another, and have begun to exchange their ideas. State and local officials have begun to negotiate with the Federal Indian Bureau, expressing clear-cut ideas on what should be done and how improvements can be made, and a program is being placed before Congress. In other words, the Indian situation has been brought into the consciousness of the people of the State in such a way that there is a beehive of activity going in most States over the problem. The conference which you have called in Helena is certainly a very important undertaking on behalf of Montana Indians.

"Therefore, I want to say again that Indians in Montana and the rest of the country are greatly indebted to you, Governor, for having helped to start the Governors' In-

terstate Council, for having supported it this past year, and for carrying on the work within your State, all of which will lead to the eventual solution of the Indian problem, if we can submerge our differences to work together in a cooperative effort, rather than pulling away in different directions.

"Best wishes for a very successful conference, and thanks again for your ever-present interest in Indian matters.

"Sincerely yours,

"JARLE LEIRFALLOM,

"Chairman, Governors' Interstate Indian Council"

Miss Condon recognized and introduced Mr. Tom Main from the Fort Belknap Reservation.

"Mr. MAIN Before this conference of Montana Indians that has been called by our good Governor of Montana commences, I suggest that the chairman request that the Blackfeet Indians formally open this meeting in the good old traditional Indian way by singing a song. I can assure the chairman that under the Indian rules of order in his natural state, that I am in order. Thank you."

Motion seconded and carried

Song by Iron Pipe, Buffalo Hide, and Last Star from the Blackfeet Reservation, expressed the feeling that the Indians of the State of Montana are here today to try to iron out their problems. The above ceremony was carried out in a traditional and beautiful manner.

Hon. John W. Bonner, Governor for the State of Montana, was introduced by Miss Condon.

Brief summary of the address by Governor John W. Bonner:

"Judge Johnson, member of the Supreme Court, State of Oklahoma, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Archdale, Senator Phillips, Dave Higgins, our distinguished guests, members of Indian Tribal Councils of the State of Montana, and friends, this is a historic meeting as far as the Indians of the State of Montana are concerned. It is the first time in the history of Montana that a meeting of this type has been called in this State. I welcome all of you on behalf of the great State of Montana.

"I have had the good fortune to live on the Flathead Indian Reservation and perhaps know the Indians and their problems as well as any man.

"As attorney general I again faced the problems of the Indians of this State. It is my conclusion that more time has been given investigating these problems than solving them. Frankly speaking we have had enough investigation and the time has come to solve these Indian problems. Our real problem is to give to the Indians the same status as all other citizens of the United States of America, which means giving them the same rights, privileges, and obligations which are borne by every citizen. The obligation should be recognized as soon as possible. One of the important problems will then have been solved, and the Indians will then face the problems which are faced by all other citizens from time to time. The landless Indians are men, women, and children without a country, because our Congress has not legally recognized them. We must have the Congress of the United States give them legal recognition. Do not let anyone forget that there are many Indian gold star mothers in Montana. Indian servicemen have made outstanding records, and whether they are tribal Indians or landless Indians they are denied the rights given to other veterans. We should see to it that every Indian is given the right to serve the United States of America. Our Indians as a whole face problems of discrimination and face more severe economic hardship than most people."

Governor Bonner stated that he helped call the Governors' Conference of Indian Problems in St. Paul. If all Indian States

would support the program it would give the Indians greater opportunities to have their problems heard and place them on an equal status. Seventeen States, including Montana, have joined in an Interstate Council on Indian Affairs. Out of the suggestions made at this meeting, five proposals have been drafted and passed on to Congress:

1. Repeal of the Federal law prohibiting sale of liquor to the Indians.

2. Authorization for housing program which will accommodate Indians.

3. Extension for 2 years of the time for settling Indian claims which is due to expire August 13, 1951.

4. Provision for a vocational education program that will enable Indians to take suitable jobs.

5. Scholarship program which will enable Indian students without the necessary funds to obtain a higher education.

Governor Bonner added the foregoing proposals to the above:

1. To permit rehabilitation loans with a reasonable rate of interest from various sources.

2. A program of public works on the reservation to provide roads, etc.

3. Abandonment of racial discrimination and all discrimination against the Indians.

4. Veteran program to help Indian veterans, so that there will be no doubt that they will have the same rights as other veterans.

5. Give the Indians the same status as other citizens

6. Recognition by Congress of landless Indians, and a program of rehabilitation for them

"Of course there are many other needs which will benefit Indians. Many problems have not been solved because they have not reached the proper authorities. We have sincerely tried to do everything possible to solve our Indian problems." Governor Bonner concluded his address with an analysis of the work to be done in solving the problems of Indians in Montana and the big job of solving these problems. He closed his address with an optimistic statement that he is willing to work for such a program and asked the united support of all tribal councils in the State in a united effort to achieve this program.

The laws of 1951, established the Office of Coordinator of Indian Affairs. This makes it possible for the Indians to help solve their own problems. Montana is the only State that has such an act enabling its people to aid in solving problems confronting Indians. Governor Bonner paid tribute to those who started this bill and were successful in getting it passed.

Response. Mr. James Archdale, Poplar, Mont

Chief Black Owl, an Assinibolne Indian from Poplar, who has frequently gone to Washington to fight for the Indians, gave the response to Governor Bonner's address. In his response he gave many historical facts of the American Indian and the difficulties the Indian encountered and the new problems that are facing him every day. He stated that the Indians still love this country and are still loyal to this country, but it is necessary that they band together to gain the rights that belong to them, such as getting their water rights and mineral rights which have been taken from them. Also the Indians must be able to sell their cattle, and should also receive decent wages for the work they do in order to raise their standard of living to the level of other citizens of this country. They wish to cooperate with Governor Bonner and Miss Condon in making this conference a success. Indian people are rich in resources but have none of the other necessities of life. This conference should also do something about the prejudices against the Indians.

Mary M. Condon introduced Mr. Felix Cohen, an attorney from Washington, D. C.,

who took the place of Mr. Lierfallom on the program. Mr. Cohen is a practicing attorney from Washington, D. C., who has for years studied Indian law, and fought for Indian rights.

Mr. Cohen expressed his gratitude for the privilege of speaking at this conference, and paid tribute to Governor Bonner and to Justice Adair.

He told of the wealth that the Indians have lost in the last 100 years, and stated that today most Indians faced great poverty. He stated that for years their enemies have been trying to divide the Indians and that if they wanted to ever accomplish anything, the Indians must stick together. He paid tribute to Governor Bonner because he had all tribes represented at once, instead of having one tribe at a time.

There are on record over 500 official studies of Indian problems. These studies have never been put into effect and the problems solved. He stated that the policies of the Federal Government have gone through the following stages of philosophy:

1. Extinction.
2. Transmigration.
3. Isolation.
4. Paternalism.

He stated that in the last 100 years the appropriations made to Indians have been reduced by 80 percent; however, the appropriations to the Indian Bureau have been raised 535 times. Indians must be allowed to solve their own problems without the Indian Bureau ruling over every decision they make. The Indian Bureau has blocked every effort that has been made to give the Indians the rights they deserve. The Indian is learning from the white man not to be so trusting, but to be as shrewd as the white man. He must also learn to take over the white man's methods of going to court and going to Congress. God helps those who help themselves, and you will have God's blessing in your struggle.

Miss Condon introduced Chief Justice Hugh Adair, of the Montana supreme court, who introduced Hon. N. B. Johnson, justice of the supreme court of Oklahoma, and president of the National Congress of American Indians.

Judge Johnson expressed his gratitude at being invited to Montana for the conference. He said it was very gratifying to see the high officials of Montana taking such interest in the Indians and their problems. He expressed the hope that other governors of other States will follow Governor Bonner's example and take such an active interest in the Indian people of their States.

He extended greetings from Governor Murray, of Oklahoma, who is a Chickasaw Indian. He is the first Indian to be elected Governor of Oklahoma. In Oklahoma many county and State offices are filled by Indians. This shows that in Oklahoma they recognize Indians in their true light as American citizens and not as a segregated group. He stated that the Government has failed in fair dealings with the Indians, and the Indians must accept the white man's ways or methods or he shall be forever lost. There are now 400,000 Indians in the United States and Alaska living on some 50 different reservations. Few men in Congress have the time to make a study of Indian needs, thus they do not get the support they need to solve these problems. The Indians have bad lands, bad health, and much poverty in return for the many contributions they have given to white civilization. Groups must organize and make themselves heard by Congress, and the Congress and the people of this country must work together for a common understanding if the Indians are not to be seriously exploited. Governors of all States must unite and recommend to Congress that the States take over much of the work that the Office of Indian Affairs is now doing toward health, agriculture, and other services as they can do a much better job since they under-

stand the problems in their own areas and are closer to the people.

In both World Wars the Indians have contributed both in manpower and in the purchase of bonds, and yet they do not have the rights of other veterans and other citizens. Every Indian should go to the polls and vote, as they have a reservoir of power if they would only use it. The eventual solution of Indian problems will come through the education of our future generation.

At the conclusion of Judge Johnson's remarks the meeting adjourned for lunch.

AFTERNOON SESSION, JUNE 22, 1951, STATE CAPITOL, HOUSE CHAMBER, 1 P. M., MISS MARY M. CONDON PRESIDING

The afternoon session dealt with reports from each reservation.

Blackfeet problems, Mr. Joe Brown, of Browning reporting

In 1890 there were 18,000 Indians on the Blackfeet Reservation, mostly full-bloods. Today on the Blackfeet Reservation, out of 5,700 there are only approximately 400 full-blood Indian families. This indicates the pace of assimilation among Indians. He told about the early-day problems of providing education and getting the children to go to school, and now the problem of keeping them in school. The serious problem is that educational facilities are limited.

He believes that the Indians should have the right to build up their businesses, and handle such businesses themselves. They have partially won out in this. The Blackfeet are starting a policy committee at Browning, and believe with the backing of the results of this meeting that they are going places. This committee would be in a position and have the power to consult with the coordinator, if there is one, the Governor, and inform the State officials of reservation needs and wants. The problem is to get all tribal councils to unite on a program.

Crow Reservation problems, Mr. George Hogan reporting

One of the most serious problems of the Crow Reservation is the educational problem. The Crows paid dearly for their education by giving land for public schools to be built. Each year Congress appropriates enough money for the noonday lunches, and the tribe gives several head of buffalo for each school district in every public school in the various districts. Out of 2,800 children, 546 are enrolled in Indian schools. Those enrolled in other schools number 756, those not enrolled in any school number 70.

Irregular attendance: Parents should bear responsibility of forcing children to attend school regularly. They should be encouraged to make good, and night pastimes and tribal customs take too much of the children's time and should be lessened. Parents and teachers should hold meetings in order to understand one another and children as well. Most children need tribal assistance in order to receive the proper education.

Hon. Sam Mitchell, secretary of state for Montana, was introduced by Miss Condon. Mr. Mitchell expressed his gratitude for being able to live in this State, and how he has enjoyed serving the people of this State. He stated that the office of the secretary of state would be very happy to assist the Indians with any problems in every way possible.

Crow Agency problems, Mrs. Minnie Williams reporting

She stated that the mothers needed education in order to help their children. She told of the early days when children were stolen from their mothers and put into boarding schools, and of the hardships and insecurity they felt at being treated in this manner. This is the basis for the feeling of rebellion which still exists among Indian people today. She told of the discrimination problems, and of the need for getting together with the teachers and their desire to

cooperate with schools. She stated that the women of her tribe professionally had taken more advantage of their education than the men.

Flathead Reservation problems, Mr. Walter Marigeau reporting

One of the problems on our reservation is the migratory worker, those who do seasonal work in different communities where there is work in fruit orchards, sugar-beet fields, and potato fields. As a result there are children who should have graduated from high school, who are just commencing high school because of these periods they have missed attending school while working.

He brought up the question of what this new organization and this conference could do for the Indians. He wondered if they should support the Federal program, the State program, or have two programs. As it is they already carry about 90 percent of the administration on their reservation.

He raised the question of who is responsible for financing the education of the children who are less than one-quarter Indian blood.

He stated that the Flatheads do not have a hospital either on the reservation or in their town to care for their sick.

The tribe must pay hospitalization for its people, and \$40,000 last year was approximately the cost out of tribal funds for this purpose. They carry their own law and order, and this is also paid from tribal funds. They pay all expenses except the wages of one or two persons who work for the Indian Service.

There is a 10-percent charge against the sale of timber. Last year this amounted to about \$40,000. One-half of the Indian welfare cost is also paid by the tribe, and the other half by the county.

Chief Charlo, interpreted by Bob Adams

Chief Charlo expressed his desire that they should band together to solve their problems and needs. He told of his personal problem of paying for irrigation water twice which he has never used. He wanted to know what he could do to have the bill removed that the Bureau of Reclamation has against his property.

In answer to this problem Governor Bonner said that he would write to the Bureau of Reclamation to see if some adjustment cannot be made.

Fort Belknap Reservation problems, Mr. Tom Mann reporting

He said that they have many educated Indians on their reservation, some with college degrees and others with at least a high-school education. These men are in a position to take care of their own affairs if given the chance. The criticism is brought out that the Indian cannot make his own leases, and by going through the Indian Office there is so much red tape that it takes a week to a month to get any action. The Indian cannot develop his business ability because his rights to transact his own business are taken from him by the Indian Office. The Indian Office is so strong that there is no way to fight it. He expresses the strong feeling against the Indian Office, and he thinks that there should be some way to overcome having to have all of their business conducted through the area office. There is a tremendous need for rehabilitation on the Fort Peck Reservation. There are 500 families of Indian blood on the reservation and over one-half of them need better homes. He spoke highly of the education program on his reservation and the employee situation.

Fort Peck Reservation problems—James Archdale reporting

The land on the Fort Peck Reservation is considered as the bread basket of Montana. They ship out millions of bushels of wheat each year.

One of our problems is the question of irrigation. The Indians are selling too much

of their land to the white man. There is a false economic background back of every one of these people. We have some 1,400 Indian children that are landless. Out of 3,200 people we have some 500 Indian families and about 50 percent of them need livable homes. Out of these 500 Indian families we have a small percentage of them who are crippled people, orphaned children, blind, incapable of taking care of their own business. He believes that the liquor law should be repealed because there are only about 3 percent of the Indians who are addicted to the use of liquor. He feels that the Indian people are displaced persons because they have had all of the water and mineral rights taken away from them, and they do not have the opportunity to lease their own land or do their own business.

Northern Cheyenne Reservation problems, Rufus Wallowing reporting

In the summer of 1947 the Indian Bureau closed the Northern Cheyenne Hospital. This hospital cost the Government \$121,000. They must take their people to the Crow Agency Hospital. It is 42 miles to the nearest hospital and 80 miles for some people on the reservation. The ambulance often takes patients in to the hospital, and they must be returned to make the best of their illness because the hospital is filled. He thinks that the area office in Billings should recommend the reopening of their hospital. They have written to their Congressman, and also to the central office and they get no cooperation but are merely told to go to their area office. The area office feels that rather than reopen this hospital they can take their patients to the Crow Agency Hospital. Our Government, who sends millions of dollars to foreign countries to rearm them, could just as well spend some of that money to maintain that hospital. There is a clinic that is held there, once or twice a week. He believed that this money could just as well be spent to reopen the hospital and handle the health problem in the proper way. He also stated that the northern Cheyennes have a controversy with the Federal Government over the repayment for relief cattle issued in 1934 and 1935. These cattle came from drought-stricken areas during the depression.

Northern Cheyenne Reservation problems, Mr. Standing reporting

The Northern Cheyenne Tribe some time ago borrowed \$500,000 from the Government, and they in turn loaned this to individual Indians to purchase cattle. The difficulty was that they could not get started because the loans were so small that they could not sufficiently increase their herds. This year the Indian Bureau is now collecting what the tribe owes to the Government. "We tried to ask for an extension many times before the money came due, but we were always refused." They must now have their money or take back the stock. At least 1,800 head of cattle will be taken back in the next 6 years, which works a hardship on the tribe as they will not be able to build up the herd in time to save some for their own use. Many Indian boys are fighting in Korea for their land and for their freedom. We will fight here shoulder to shoulder until we get what we want. We must fight for our freedom or we shall forever be wards of the Government."

Rocky Boy Reservation problems, Joe Cochrane reporting

The Landless Indians have such poor land that it is impossible for the people there to make a living. As a result they have people all over the State of Montana who are doing odd jobs in order to make a living. They have some boys who should be graduated from high school and who are still in the seventh and eighth grades. This is a white man's problem as it cannot be handled by the reservation.

Landless Indian problems, Mr. Belgrad reporting

He expressed the desire to get together and thresh out the problems and arrive at some definite decisions.

He thanked Governor Bonner and Miss Condon and the rest of the non-Indian people who have given their time and effort to help the Indians to find a better way of life.

Summary of afternoon discussions, Robert Yellowtail, Crow Reservation

Mr. Robert Yellowtail summarized the afternoon discussions in a very able manner. His remarks centered around the following ideas:

Indian affairs come within the jurisdiction of Congress to handle in a legislative manner, but Congress is restricted in abrogating rights which belong to the Indians. These statements were quoted from decisions of the Supreme Court. The Indian Service has had 36 commissioners all of them selected on the basis of political patronage. The Bureau of Indian Affairs is not subjected to court review so the problem of the Indian becomes entirely political. The rights of the Indian are based upon our "Magna Carta," as expressed in: (1) Declaration of Independence; (2) Constitution; (3) Bill of Rights; (4) Atlantic Charter; (5) "four freedoms." The Indian was here before the white man and is included in the phrase "all persons" as expressed in the fourteenth amendment.

DINNER MEETING, 7 P. M., BANQUET ROOM, PLACER HOTEL, JUNE 22, 1951

The dinner was served by the Placer Hotel at a charge of \$2 per plate. There were 89 people present at the banquet. Miss Mary M. Condon presided very graciously as toastmistress at this first Indian affairs banquet. The music was furnished by Mrs. Sig Berg of Helena, and the principal addresses were given by Hon. John W. Bonner and Justice N. B. Johnson. Chiefs Iron Pipe, Last Star, Buffalo Hide, all dressed in full Indian costumes sang the Blackfeet Welcome Song. Several impromptu speakers expressed the feeling of the group in words of praise to Miss Condon and Governor Bonner for their interest and support of this first Indian affairs conference. Justice Johnson spoke very eloquently of how the Indian must proceed to accomplish the solution of his problems. He offered the services of the National Congress of American Indians in support of their program.

SATURDAY, JUNE 23, 1951, 9 A. M.

The conference and delegates met in groups for making recommendations for a program of procedures in the solution of the problems confronting the Montana Indians. Each section had a leader, a recorder, and a summarizer:

The groups met as follows:

Education. Miss Mary M. Condon, leader, room 84, Mitchell Building.

Employment: Mr. M. Joe Miller, leader, first floor, Mitchell Building.

Health: Mrs. Henrietta Crockett, leader, room 168, third floor, Mitchell Building.

Welfare problems: Mrs. Dorothy Cassutt, leader, senate chamber, Capitol Building.

Veteran problems: Mr. Forrest Gerard, leader, committee room 325A.

Federal relations, treaties, claims, land: Mr. Felix Cohen, leader, Governor's reception room.

Public works, economic, and business problems: Mr. Dave Higgins, leader, house chamber.

Landless Indians: Senator Phillips, leader, committee room 325B.

THIRD GENERAL SESSION, 1 P. M., JUNE 23, 1951, HOUSE CHAMBERS

House chamber, third floor, State Capitol Building, Miss Mary M. Condon, presiding.

Education, employment, health, welfare, veterans' problems, Federal relations, treaties, claims, land, public works, economic and

business problems, landless Indians, section reports were on the agenda.

Mr. Pamburn made a motion that all nominations be made from the floor, it was seconded by Mr. Higgins, no discussion followed, the motion was carried.

Judge Johnson was introduced. He said that there would be a meeting of the National Congress of the American Indians at St. Paul, Minn., in the Lowry Hotel on July 24-27, 1951. He said that there would be a Governors' Interstate Council meeting at the same time. In case anyone wants to go, he should write, 202 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C., Ruth Bronson, secretary, Congress of American Indians.

The landless Indians

The landless Indians report was given by Mr. Belgrad, of Helena. Mr. Joe Dusone had wired his regrets that he could not be present to give the report on the landless Indians. Some of the problems that confront them are:

Rehabilitation of landless Indians heads the list. If this program were carried out it would mean a great deal in helping landless Indians be better taxpayers in Montana. Many landless Indians that are on relief rolls and receiving aid in various ways would become self-sufficient. Another problem is education. We feel that the program of rehabilitation and education must be considered together. There is much improvement to be made in education. These children must have the highest quality of education in order to compete in our way of life. Mr. Belgrad said that he hoped that the landless Indians can establish themselves so that they can take a place in society and become useful taxpayers like everyone else.

Mr. Belgrad read his resolutions and made a motion that the resolutions of the landless Indians be accepted; the motion was seconded by Mr. Pamburn; no discussion followed, and the motion carried.

The landless Indians presented a charter that showed that they were organized as a legal unit.

Mrs. B. M. Phillips, senator from Phillips County, told of her long experiences with the landless Indians and urged rehabilitation so that they could become contributing citizens.

Montana Landless Indians' Resolution

"Be it resolved, That there be conveyed to the Congress of the United States, through the Montana Representatives in Congress, that it is the feeling of this conference that Senate bill 743, now pending before Congress for the rehabilitation of the landless Indians of Montana, be enacted into law, and that this resolution be accompanied by Montana Senate Joint Memorial No. 1, setting forth the conditions and circumstances of the Montana landless Indians, introduced by Senator Mrs. B. M. Phillips, and adopted by the Thirty-second Legislative Assembly of Montana."

Resolution of Protest

"Whereas that certain strip of land bought in the vicinity of Great Falls, described as follows, blocks 14, 15, 22, Sun River Park addition in the N½ of section 9, T. 20N., R. 3E, p. m. Montana, containing some 40 acres or more purchased for the purpose and use of landless Indians residing in Great Falls, and such land would be utilized by said Indians for subsistence, gardening, and building homes: be it

"Resolved, That we, known as the landless Indians, protest any action to be taken for the sale of said land; and be it further

"Resolved, That the land in question be utilized for the purpose for which it was bought."

Montana Landless Indians Resolution of Thanks

"Whereas our great and humane governor, the Honorable John W. Bonner, has expressed deep interest in us and has encouraged us to

organize, to study our problems, and to take action, and

"Whereas Senator (Mrs.) B. M. Phillips has worked tirelessly and voluntarily without compensation in our behalf, and

"Whereas we recognized Miss Mary M. Condon, State superintendent of public instruction, and her wonderful assistants, as having played a great part in making this conference a success. Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Montana landless Indians are deeply appreciative and tender this expression of their most sincere thanks and gratitude."

Mr. Henry Little Dog, spoke briefly that he and his friends Bert Ear Rings opposed the Higgins resolutions.

Public works, economic and business problems, Mr. Dave Higgins, leader and summarizer

Mr. Higgins read his resolutions regarding public works, economic and business problems. He made a motion that his resolutions be accepted. It was seconded by Mr. Sharpe, no discussion followed and the motion was carried.

"Whereas there are vast amounts of lands on the reservations that may be in agriculture status by improving and extending existing road facilities, and

"Whereas existing reservation roads are used primarily as farm to market roads; and

"Whereas the existing roads programs on Indian reservations have been receiving insufficient funds to properly maintain and improve such roads; and

"Whereas roads, trails, and bridges into forest areas have long been neglected by reason of lack of funds, thus creating serious conditions with respect to fire hazards, dry rot and bug kill, with such timber products being critically needed for defense purposes; and

"Whereas the improving and expanding of roads, trails, and bridges to promote employment being a critical factor on the Montana reservations. Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we hereby respectfully request immediate attention and increased Federal appropriations on respective Montana Indian reservations through appropriate State channels in order to alleviate the condition above mentioned, be it further

"Resolved, That Federal appropriations be increased for soil conservation on the reservations through the proper State channels to take care of flood control and drainage falling in the category of soil conservation."

The matter of the present credit regulations governing revolving credit funds on the reservations, and the securing of loans from existing loan agencies without the necessity of following the credit manual was discussed by the committee. The committee unanimously decided in favor of presenting this in the general session.

Committee report on Federal relations, treaties, claims, lands, Mr. Felix Cohen, leader

Mr. Felix Cohen, leader of the Federal relations, treaties, claims, and land, said that there were so many resolutions that they had been divided into sections. Mr. Jim Archdale read his resolutions and made a motion that they be accepted. This was seconded by Mr. Higgins, there was no discussion and the motion was carried. In the same section Mr. McDonald read his resolutions, one dealing with irrigation problems, and the other dealing with the repayment of cattle. He made a motion that his resolutions be accepted. This motion was seconded by Mrs. Schultz, no discussion followed and the motion was carried. Eneas Grandjo read his resolutions and made a motion that his resolutions be accepted. This motion was seconded by Mr. Main, no discussion followed and the motion carried.

Mr. Felix Cohen read a resolution which was presented to him by Mrs. Burgess, he made a motion that this resolution be accepted, no discussion followed and the motion carried

There were more problems that had been given to Mr. Cohen, but were not quite ready to be voted on, so he made a motion that the rest of these problems be given to the advisory committee and the coordinator. This motion was seconded by Meade Swingley, no discussion followed and the motion carried

Resolution To Permit Indian Tribes of Montana To Have Final Control Over the Spending of Their Own Incomes, James Archdale, Summarizer

"Whereas Indians are now prevented from spending their own income without the approval of various Government officials and cumbersome red tape under section 221 4 and 221 5 of title 25 of the Code of Federal Regulations, promulgated by Secretary of the Interior many decades ago, and other similar regulations applicable both to individual and to tribal income; and

"Whereas this denial of the right of Indians to spend their own money, destroys Indian initiative and prevents Indians from learning through experience how to handle their economic problems and is contrary to American principles; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of Montana in House Memorial No 5 has requested the Secretary of the Interior and Congress of the United States to abolish all such controls over the right of Indians to spend their own money; and

"Whereas the Commissioner of Indian Affairs advised the Governor's Interstate Indian Conference in 1950 that these controls had been abolished with respect to individual funds; and

"Whereas the Indian Bureau in 1948, 1949, and 1950 agreed to support legislation giving tribes the right to spend their own tribal income without bureau supervision; and

"Whereas Senators MURRAY and ECTON have introduced a bill to grant the tribes of Montana the right to spend their own tribal income without bureau supervision (S. 745), and similar bills have been introduced by Congressman MANSFIELD (H R 2124) and by Congressman D'EWART (H. R. 1936); and

"Whereas we have been advised that the Indian Bureau is opposing this legislation despite their previous pledges and promises: Now, therefore be it

"Resolved, That we respectfully urge the Secretary of the Interior to eliminate all controls which restrict the right of Indians to spend their own funds, and that the Secretary of the Interior overrule the Indian Bureau and give his support to the legislation sponsored by Senators MURRAY and ECTON and Congressmen D'EWART and MANSFIELD, giving the tribes of Montana final control over the spending of their own income."

Resolution on Leasing Land, James Archdale, Summarizer

"Whereas the Commissioner of Indian Affairs reported to the governor's interstate Indian conference in 1950 that the Indian Bureau was abolishing its paternalistic control over Indian leasing and was allowing Indians to lease their own lands and receive their own rentals; and

"Whereas notwithstanding this statement, the Indians of Montana are still being denied the right to lease their own lands and receive their own rentals and are being threatened that unless they sign over powers of attorney to the superintendents they will be denied all rights to get any income from their own property; and

"Whereas the result of Indian Bureau control over leases is to inject delays and obstacles that drastically reduce Indian income and destroy Indian initiative and gives

opportunity for corruption and influence to Bureau employees; and

"Whereas the so-called conservation purposes cited by the Indian Bureau to justify perpetuating its controls could be much better cared for by Montana State or county conservation officials; and

"Whereas the Montana Legislature has protested against the interference by the Indian Bureau with the right of Indians to lease their own lands: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we appeal to the Secretary of the Interior to rescind all regulations which prevent Indians from leasing their own land, individual or tribal, and receiving the rentals from this land, subject to any obligations which the Indians may owe by reason of having pledged rentals in payment of any debt."

Resolution on Irrigation, Cattle Repayment, Mr. Walter McDonald, Summarizer

"Whereas the Indians on several reservations in Montana are not permitted to use their own water for irrigation purposes unless the O. and M. charge is paid in advance; and

"Whereas the Billings area office has refused to follow the act of Congress (25 U. S. Code, Sec. 385) providing for reimbursement of O and M bills that have been assessed against Indian land where water has never been used, and

"Further, individual Indians who own land have been unjustly charged for bills that the Indian Bureau should have collected from the lessee, now, therefore, we urge:

"1 The Secretary of Interior to cancel charges on lands that cannot be irrigated.

"2. To cancel charges that the Indian Bureau should have collected from the lessee, and

"3 Instruct the Billings area office to abide by the act of Congress that gives Indians the right to water delivery free of charge where the Indians do not have adequate funds to pay for such delivery."

Resolution on Cattle Repayment, Mr. Walter McDonald, Summarizer

"Whereas in the early thirties the United States Government transferred drought-stricken cattle known as ERA cattle and ID cattle to several reservations in Montana; and

"Whereas these cattle were purchased on an emergency recovery act at a price ranging from about \$12 to \$22; and

"Whereas these cattle were meant for the use and benefit of the Indians of Montana; and

"Whereas the Department of Interior has recalled these cattle in kind or money on the reservations of Montana at the prices set by appraisers at \$130 on the Flathead and \$110 on the Blackfeet and various prices on different reservations: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we urge the Department of Interior to accept the same purchase price on the cattle that was used when the cattle were bought in the early thirties; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Department of Interior give such extensions of time for repayment as may be necessary and justified by the circumstances on the various reservations."

Resolution on Area Office, Eneas Grandjo, Summarizer

"Whereas Federal appropriation for the benefit of the Indian tribes of Montana and other adjacent areas are being diverted by the Indian Bureau to pay for the expenses of the Billings Indian Bureau area office; and

"Whereas the Billings area office has not done any work during the time of its existence in any noticeable amount for the benefit of the Indians living on the various Indian reservations in Montana, but has either

duplicated or interfered with the necessary activities on the various reservations of Montana and its surrounding areas; and

"Whereas the Billings area office has taken away powers from the superintendents of the various reservations, which superintendents are unable or not empowered to make decisions which were formerly within the province of the superintendent of the particular reservation but such matters are sent with the recommendations of the superintendent to the Billings area office where decisions are delayed to the detriment of the Indians living on such reservations, and such Billings area office acts, in most instances, as a road block and a time waster in getting matters from the superintendent of the particular reservation to the proper officials in Washington, D. C., and such area director and area office does not assume any responsibilities of officials in Washington, D. C., so as to decentralize powers as originally intended: Now therefore, be it

"Resolved, That representatives of the Montana tribes of Indians in conference assembled in Helena, Mont., at the first all-Indian conference respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to abolish the Billings area office and to abolish the useless jobs maintained by that office and that the personnel employed in such useless jobs be separated from the Federal payroll, and that the savings resulting from such action be used for the beneficial purposes intended by the Congress of the United States to aid the Indians in reaching economic self-sufficiency, be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the congressional delegates from the State of Montana and to the proper congressional committees dealing with the Indian affairs and appropriations therefor, and to the proper Federal bureaus and departments"

Veterans Committee—Forrest Gerard, leader; Steve DeMers, summarizer, Meade Swingley, recorder

The following recommendations have been approved and passed upon in this section:

1. That this committee endorse the bill now in Congress for the repeal of the Indian liquor law.
2. That we recommend an amendment to the present trust patent laws on the Indian land which will permit Indian veteran wards to submit their land as security for a GI loan by an approved lender under guaranty loans for veterans.
3. That we strike out that portion of the Wheeler-Howard Act which states, "at the discretion of the Superintendent," and change that part of the sentence to read, "to appear before a Federal Judge and leave it to his decision as to the competency of the Indian ward involved."
4. That Korean war veterans have the same benefits and privileges as veterans of World War II
5. That the United States Government recognize the landless Indian veterans as legal citizens of the United States, to enjoy all other privileges as all other Indian veterans as to loans, education, etc.
6. That the Congress of the United States be urged to enact appropriate legislation to permit veterans who did not themselves take advantage of the GI bill of rights because of family responsibilities, business reasons, or because they had already acquired their education prior to entry into the Armed Forces, to pass on such benefits in the same amounts as such veteran would have been entitled to himself, to one or more of his children in such prorated amounts as he or his widow might choose.

Mr. DeMers moved the adoption of his report of the veterans committee, which was seconded by Mr. McDonald. There was no discussion and the motion carried.

Governor Bonner had to leave, and before he left he thanked the people for attending. Governor Bonner felt that a lot of work had been accomplished and a great deal of interest was shown at the conference. He said he would take these resolutions to the Governors' interstate council.

There are no funds to hire a coordinator; we must get the legislature to appropriate money for a salary. We need someone to help the Indians. We are just starting to move along in this work. Gov. John W. Bonner asked Mr. Bergan to take on this extra work. He thought an Indian would take the job, but at the present time he could see no one that could qualify better for this job than Mr. Bergan. Mr. Archdale felt that Mr. Bergan was well qualified. Mr. Meade Swingley spoke highly of Mr. Bergan and felt sure that Mr. Bergan could do a fine job.

Nominations were open for an Indian coordinator. A motion was made by Mr. Archdale and seconded by Mr. Swingley that Mr. Bergan be appointed as a coordinator of Indian affairs for a year and a half. There being no further nominations, the motion was carried.

Mr. Pambrum made a motion that all the various reservations and the landless Indians choose two delegates to be on the advisory board to assist the coordinator and help make resolutions. These two people can be elected in any manner the tribal council desires. At the advisory meetings there would be only one voting delegate from each reservation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Couture. There was no further discussion and the motion carried.

Governor Bonner left the conference to attend another meeting.

Welfare committee, Mrs. Dorothy Cassutt, leader

Mrs. Irgens read the recommendations concerning welfare problems; she made a motion that these resolutions be accepted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Barrett; no discussion followed and the motion carried.

- Federal level:
1. To provide Federal funds for rehabilitation loans at a reasonable rate of interest and sufficient amounts to meet the needs of the family.
 2. Authorization for a housing program that will encourage integration of our Indian citizens
 3. To support a vocational education program that will equip Indian youth to take suitable jobs
 4. Establishment of a scholarship program to provide higher education for promising Indians.
 5. To accord Indians equal opportunity for responsible positions in the Indian Service.
 6. To establish the policy of placing Indian children in public schools in the direction of normal transition, thereby ultimately reducing and eliminating boarding schools particularly for younger children.
 7. To urge the Indian Service to make increasing use of the machinery of the Johnson-O'Malley Act so that agreements may be made for services of health, education, law and order, agriculture, and relief to be dispensed by one State agency so that Indians will cease to feel that they are a minority group but are a part of the body politic with all the rights, privileges, and responsibilities of that citizenship.
 8. Extension for 2 years of that time for filing Indian claims which expires August 13, 1951.
 9. Repeal of discriminatory liquor laws.
- State level:
1. Cooperate and support the State coordinator plan.
 2. Educate the public toward a better understanding of Indian affairs through the facilities of the press, radio, clubs, and other organizations interested in Indian welfare,

and to promote more community interest to break down existing barriers that may be found.

3. Set up public works programs.
4. Encourage education in the broadest sense: (a) adult education; (b) educate children for useful citizenship; (c) make known to Indian youth opportunities for higher education, such as scholarships.
5. To promote health services with special attention to mental health.
6. To repeal discriminatory laws.
7. To actively seek services to which Indians are eligible.
8. To make known to Indians their right to appeal with regard to social-security benefits.

Health committee, Mrs. Henrietta Crockett, leader; Mrs. Vina Chattin, summarizer

Fort Belknap Indian Reservation, Mrs. Julia Schultz: "Inasmuch as there is only one doctor to provide medical service to both Fort Belknap and Rocky Boy Indian Reservations, a distance of 100 miles between, that the salary of the doctor is inadequate, that the hospital has only 30 beds, that there is no home for the aged; it is therefore requested that an additional doctor be placed on the hospital staff at Fort Belknap, and an additional appropriation be granted by the Government to increase the salaries of the doctors and for other hospital facilities and that other provisions be made for medical care of the landless Indians, since the Fort Belknap Hospital does not have the facilities to care for them, and that a home be provided for the aged, with adequate staff for same."

Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, Mr. Rufus Wallowing: "Inasmuch as the hospital on the Cheyenne Indian Reservation has been closed for some time, there is a dire need that there be hospital facilities for the Cheyenne Indians since the Crow Hospital is inadequate to care for the Cheyennes too. It is requested that the Cheyenne Hospital be reopened and a staff provided to operate the hospital, also that a home be provided for the aged. A resolution to the effect that the hospital be reopened is presented herewith."

Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mr. Dave Johnson: "Inasmuch as there is evidence of lack of proper medical attention provided by the medical staff of the Fort Peck Hospital, and the hospital facilities are inadequate, it is requested that a complete investigation be made of the present medical service provided by the Fort Peck Hospital, that the need for another hospital be investigated, that additional appropriation be granted for better hospital care and facilities be granted and that a home for the aged be provided."

Flathead Indian Reservation, Mr. Jess Couture: "Inasmuch as the tribe has been paying for all hospitalization costs and transportation costs to other hospitals, which the tribe cannot continue to do and remain self-supporting and inasmuch as the present doctor is unqualified or inadequate to fill the position, it is requested that the Government assume the cost of hospitalization, transportation to other hospitals, that one doctor now employed at the Holy Family Hospital in St. Ignace, Mont., be replaced by a new, better-qualified doctor, that Dr. Mathews be replaced, and that a home for the aged be provided by using the old hospital at the Dixon Agency, with a field nurse to keep in contact with the old people for medical attention."

Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mrs. Vina Chattin: "Inasmuch as there are many old people on the reservation without children to care for them and without adequate funds to take care of their living expenses and medical care, and inasmuch as the Blackfeet Hospital is not equipped to care for old people for indefinite periods of time, it is requested that a home be provided to care for the aged

Blackfeet Indians, with a staff nurse, that the home be placed in Browning, in town where it will be easily accessible. This request is urgent and requires immediate attention."

Resolution Providing for a Home for the Aged on Every Indian Reservation in Montana

"Whereas at the present time, there are no facilities on any Indian reservation in Montana for care of old people; and

"Whereas inadequate care of the aged creates a health problem because of inadequate funds and lack of hospital facilities to provide this care in hospitals, and

"Whereas the income to these old Indian people is insufficient to care for their living expenses and medical needs; and

"Whereas the same condition exists on each Indian reservation in Montana Be it

Resolved by the Montana Indians in conference assembled at Helena on this 23d day of June 1951, That they hereby petition and urge the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Office of the Secretary of the Interior and the Congress to forthwith appropriate and set aside the money necessary to provide necessary homes for the aged with necessary staff on each Indian reservation in Montana, in order that the health and welfare of the said aged Indian people on the reservations in Montana may be taken care of and that these people may be spared the unnecessary risks of life now forced upon them by the Government through the Bureau of Indian Affairs without these facilities for care of the aged Indian people on the Montana reservations."

Resolution Providing for the Staffing and Operation of the Cheyenne Indian Hospital at Lame Deer, Mont

"Whereas there is at the Cheyenne Indian Agency at Lame Deer, Mont., a complete Government-built hospital unit which has been abandoned; and

"Whereas the Cheyenne Indians are in dire need for the opening and immediate use of this hospital; and

"Whereas they are now and have been since abandonment forced to take their sick to the Crow Indian Agency Hospital which is 80 miles distant from the eastern end of the Cheyenne Indian Reservation; and

"Whereas the said Cheyenne tribe from every moral consideration should no longer be allowed to continue to go along without this most urgent and necessary health protection activity; and

"Whereas the Crow Agency Hospital is and has always been overcrowded in caring for the health needs of the Crows, and is in no position to take on the extra burden of caring for the patients from the Cheyenne Indian Agency, and

"Whereas on account of this great distance several Cheyenne Indians have died enroute to the said Crow Hospital in emergency cases, and

"Whereas in the winter months when the temperature is down below the 20 degree level such trips are most hard on sick patients, and in labor cases several cases of near births enroute have happened; and

"Whereas the Government by treaty and other obligations both moral and legal is committed to perform this kind of duty toward the Cheyenne Tribe: So, now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Montana Indians in conference assembled at Helena on this 22d day of June 1951, That they hereby petition and urge the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Office of the Secretary of the Interior, and the Congress to forthwith appropriate and set aside the money necessary to again reopen the said Lame Deer Indian Hospital in order that the health demands of the said Cheyenne Indians may be met and their people be spared the unnecessary risks of life now forced upon them by the Government

through the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the removal of personnel of their hospital."

Mrs. Vina Chattin read the resolutions dealing with health, and she made a motion that these resolutions be accepted, the motion was seconded by Mr. Dave Higgins, no discussion followed and the motion carried.

Mr. William Smith read the report which was drawn up by the group that attended the employment section. He made a motion that this report be accepted, it was seconded by Mr. Couture, no discussion followed and the motion carried.

Recommendations on the panel on employment. Mr. Joe Miller, leader, Mr. William Smith, summarizer

The panel on employment unanimously agrees that—

1 Indian tribal councils must be urged to establish employment committees on each of the Indian reservations in the State of Montana.

2. Such employment committees should be designed to work with the younger generation of the Indian population of the State of Montana in training such young people in the industrial trades and crafts.

3. Such committees should work in close cooperation and harmony with the Montana Employment Service, a department of the Unemployment Compensation Commission of Montana, to effect the registration of all available workers, both male and female, with the employment service, so that the Indian population of this State may achieve full employment and the State and Nation be thereby enriched in all ways.

4 Whenever work of either a public or private nature is to be performed under contract or otherwise on an Indian reservation, preference should be given by public or private employers to qualified Indian workers living on that reservation.

5. Tribal councils and individual council leaders throughout Montana must be urged to contact workers with the objective of maintaining and developing further high standards of performance, punctuality, efficiency, and dependability among Indian workers.

Education. Miss Mary M Condon, chairman; Mr. Walter Morigeau, summarizer

Mr. Morigeau read the report concerning education. He made a motion that this report be accepted. It was seconded by Mrs. Burgess and the motion carried.

The committee on education submits the following report of its deliberation the morning of June 23, 1951, in the form of five recommendations

1 The United States Indian Service give special financial support to vocational training in high schools to encourage this type of training for children of Indian blood.

2. More emphasis be given to the enforcement of compulsory education laws on Indian reservations.

3 Indian education reimbursement should be given for all children of Indian blood without restriction to the one-fourth degree of blood that is used at present.

4 Indian children should be admitted to public schools on the same basis as other children without discrimination of any kind.

5. The United States Indian Service should make the education of Indian children a long-term project with more emphasis on higher education than at present. This will give the young children of Indian blood better opportunities to fit into the American stream of life

The following is a slogan Thomas Main of Fort Belknap, Mont., offered as a statement of Indian position on Federal and State relations:

"TETHERED TO FEDERAL LAW, NOT TURNED LOOSE AND NOT CHOKED DOWN

"In the word tether we can spell out something positive that we stand for:

"T is for time that each tribe needs to figure out its program of change.

"E is for education for our young people who will have to live the new way.

"T is for Tribal Council Rights guaranteed by Federal law.

"H is for home base—a guaranty that our reservation homes will always be ours.

"E is for economic planning by Indians which will guarantee our tribal assets and our own administration.

"R is for reform needed by both Indians and whites. We will improve in our responsibility toward each other as we keep in mind our responsibility to God and His laws.

Mr. Dave Higgins read a resolution dealing with the Governors' Conference and the Inter-Council on Indian Affairs. Mrs. Burgess made a motion that this resolution be adopted, it was seconded by Mrs. Schultz, the motion carried.

"Whereas the Governors' Conference at White Sulphur Springs, Va., in 1950 adopted a resolution to the effect that the problems of the Indians of the United States were also problems of the Governors' Conference; and

"Whereas and also at the Governors' Conference at St. Paul, Minn., 17 States including Montana joined in the formation of an Inter-Council on Indian Affairs which engaged in the discussions of the administration of the affairs of the Indians and finally reached agreement on five proposals presented to the Congress which proposals are as follows to wit

"1 Repeal of the Federal law prohibiting sale of liquor to Indians

"2 Authorization for a housing program that will encourage integration of our Indian citizens.

"3 Extension for 2 years of the time for filing Indian claims, which is due to expire August 13, 1951

"4 Provisions for a vocational education program that will equip Indians to take suitable jobs.

"5. Establishment of a scholarship program that will enable promising Indian students, without the necessary funds to obtain higher education

"Whereas the representatives of 22,000 Indians of the State of Montana being met in conference at Helena, Mont., on the 22d and 23d day of June, 1951, in a review of the administration of their affairs by Washington, and other matters in relation thereto by the State of Montana do hereby adopt proposals numbers 1 to 5 adopted at the St Paul Conference of 17 States, together with the following proposals, numbers 6 to 11, to wit:

"6 To permit rehabilitation loans with a reasonable rate of interest from various sources for the purpose of enabling deserving Indians to become self-sufficient.

"7. A program of public works such as roads on Indian reservations to provide improvements and employment on these reservations.

"8 Abolishment of discriminations

"9. A vigorous program to help the Indian veteran so that there will be no doubt that he has the same rights and privileges as other veterans

"10 Coordinated effort to give the Indians the same rights as other citizens.

"11. Recognition by Congress of landless Indians and a program of rehabilitation

"Whereas the Indians of Montana in conference at the State Capital of Montana these 22d and 23d days of June 1951, do hereby officially adopt the St Paul Conference proposals, numbers 1 to 5 as herein set forth, together with the proposals above recommended, numbers 6 to 11; and do further hereby recommend to His Excellency, the Governor of Montana, that he do everything in his power to see to it that the wishes of the Indians of Montana be conveyed to the National Organization of the Governors' Conference of the United States and the Congress of the United States to do all with-

in their respective powers to write into law the said 11 proposals herein above set forth. "Done at a State-wide convention of the Indians of Montana at Helena, Mont., these 22d and 23d days of June 1951."

Hon. N. B. Johnson was thanked once more for attending the conference on Indian affairs and speaking so effectively on Indian problems and lending his prestige to the conference.

Miss Condon introduced Mr. Bergan, the coordinator for Indian Affairs.

There being no further business, Mr. Couture made a motion that the meeting be adjourned, it was seconded by Mr. Higgins, the motion was carried.

JULY 20, 1951.

GOV JOHN W. BONNER,
Helena, Mont

DEAR GOVERNOR: I want to again express my appreciation for the many courtesies extended to me while in Helena. It was a pleasure to meet you and to meet with your State officials, especially the chief justice of your supreme court.

The result of the Indian conference was most heartening and gratifying. The response of the Indians and the cooperation they gave you in working out the purposes of the conference was remarkable. It was a milestone in the progress of the Indians of Montana, and I hope that they will take advantage of the good graces tendered them by the non-Indian citizens of Montana through you as Governor.

However, I believe it will be necessary to conduct some meetings on the reservations among the full-blood Indians to educate them and acquaint them with the aims and purposes back of this movement. While there was absolute harmony among those Indians present, there were a few who had some misgivings and entertained the idea that the State was endeavoring to take over all the functions of the Federal Government, but through a series of meetings held on the reservations, the real purposes of the conference can be explained. Once the full-bloods understand thoroughly what the State is trying to do, I feel that they will be wholeheartedly behind you in the great work you have started.

I do hope that other States with a major Indian population will follow your example by calling like conferences with a view toward adopting a similar course. I talked to the head of the welfare department yesterday to get his views on the advisability of requesting our Governor to call a conference of the Indians of this State. I learned from him that certain services in regard to welfare now handled by the Federal Government could well be handled by this department.

I have also learned from the area director of the Five Civilized Tribes that the Indian Bureau has entered into contracts with the State whereby the State will take over all the health services heretofore rendered by the Indian Bureau and will administer those services to the Indians except, of course, the three Indian hospitals we have in Oklahoma.

I want to take this opportunity to extend to you an official invitation to attend the eighth annual convention of the National Congress of American Indians which will be held in St. Paul, Minn., July 24-27, inclusively. I would be very happy to have you appear on our program and speak on any subject which you think will be of interest to the convention. I will be glad to arrange a date on the program suitable for your convenience, and hope that your business is so that you can be with us.

With all good wishes, I am

Sincerely,

N. B. JOHNSON,
President, National Congress
of American Indians.

Senate Joint Memorial 1 (Introduced by Phillips)

A joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the Congress of the United States and to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and ZALES N. ECTON, United States Senators from Montana, and to the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD and WESLEY A. D'EWART, Representatives in Congress from Montana, requesting that Congress continue and enhance its program of rehabilitation of the landless Indians in Montana, known as nonwards.

Whereas before World War II the Government of the United States has undertaken a program of rehabilitating the landless Indians in Montana, which program was interrupted by the outbreak of the war and has not since been resumed; and

Whereas many Montana Indians, who for the most part reside on the outskirts of various cities and towns in the State, are ill-fed, ill-clothed, and their living conditions are deplorable, in that said Indians do not receive the common necessities of life. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Thirty-second Legislative Assembly of Montana of 1951 now in session (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring) That we do most earnestly pray that the Congress of the United States resume and continue an adequate program of relief for the nonward Indians, commonly known as the landless Indians, of Montana, to the end that said Indians may ultimately become self-supporting, and may in the meantime not be denied the common necessities of life; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted by the secretary of state of Montana to the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana

House Joint Memorial 5 (Introduced by Higgins)

A memorial to the Congress of the United States of America, to the Honorable United States Senators Zales N. Ecton and James E. Murray, and to the Honorable Representatives in Congress Wesley A. D'Ewart and Mike Mansfield, and to the Honorable Oscar L. Chapman, Secretary of the Interior, requesting that the Eighty-second Congress introduce and pass an act eliminating all present discriminatory laws pertaining to Indians, transfer to the State of Montana and its subdivisions certain enumerated activities and transfer fund for the purposes of expediting these activities

Whereas the American Indians of Montana are now subjected to various discriminatory laws and practices administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, under which our first Americans are denied rights enjoyed by their fellow-citizens of other races; and

Whereas the continuance of such discriminations is inconsistent with American ideals of democracy, freedom, and equality; and

Whereas the Indians of Montana have pleaded in vain with the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the ending of such discriminations. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana (the Senate concurring), That we respectfully urge that the Congress of the United States eliminate, at least with respect to the Indians of this State, all existing Federal laws which discriminate against such Indians, and we specifically recommend as a step in the right direction, the prompt enactment of the House Resolution No. 1936 of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-second Congress of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior is respectfully urged to see that promises made by the past four Commissioners of Indian Affairs are actually carried out and that controls which hinder the right of Indian citizens to spend their own money, to lease their own lands, to hire their own attorneys, and to run their own businesses should be promptly eliminated, be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Congress and the Secretary of the Interior, in their respective fields of jurisdiction, to turn over to the State of Montana and its subdivisions any of the following activities which, in the opinion of the Indian tribes concerned, can best be handled under agreements with the appropriate State authorities:

- (1) Education;
- (2) The administration of law and order (without prejudice to existing Indian rights);
- (3) The management of reservation hospitals and health services;
- (4) The maintenance of reservation roads;
- (5) Resource management and agricultural extension work; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress is respectfully requested to authorize the transfer to the appropriate State, local, or tribal authorities of funds for any of the foregoing purposes, not in excess of the average funds appropriated for such purposes during the past 5 years, whenever agreements satisfactory to the tribes concerned and to the appropriate State agencies have been concluded; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the Congress of the United States; the Honorable Oscar L. Chapman, Secretary of the Interior; the Honorable Senators Zales N. Ecton and James E. Murray, Senators from the State of Montana; the Honorable Wesley D'Ewart, Congressman from the Second Congressional District; and the Honorable Mike Mansfield, Congressman from the First Congressional District; and to each of the Indian tribes of the State of Montana.

INDIAN AFFAIRS CONFERENCE, JUNE 22-23, 1951

A list of the people attending the convention: Forrest Gerard, Helena, Mont., Blackfeet Reservation; K. W. Bergan, Helena, Mont., guest; Mary M. Condon, Helena, Mont., guest; Mrs. B. M. Phillips, Landusky, Mont., landless Indian; Frank Bellmore, Plains, Mont., Flathead Reservation; Arthur L. Swan, Arlee, Mont., Flathead Reservation; Joseph Ironpipe, Browning, Mont., Blackfeet Reservation. Theodore Last Starr, Browning, Mont., Blackfeet Reservation; Bill Buffalo Hides, Browning, Mont., Blackfeet Reservation, Sister Pipe Woman, Hays, Mont., guest; Sister Clare, Hays, Mont., guest; George Cochran, Harlem, Mont., Fort Belknap Reservation, David Johnson, Poplar, Mont., Fort Peck Reservation; Mrs. David Johnson, Poplar, Mont., Fort Peck Reservation; Gwendlyn Mail, Helena, Mont., guest; George J. Fox, Hays, Mont., Fort Belknap Reservation; Andrew Gray, Lodge Pole, Mont., Fort Belknap Reservation; Thomas Main, Harlem, Mont., Fort Belknap Reservation; Lorena Burgess, Perma, Mont., Flathead Reservation; William C. Knorr, Wolf Point, Mont., Fort Peck Reservation; Mrs. Dolly Akers, Wolf Point, Mont., Fort Peck Reservation; William R. Smith, Oswego, Mont., Assiniboine; Mrs. Henrietta Crockett, Helena, Mont., guest; Mrs. Julia Schulz, Dodson, Mont., Fort Belknap Reservation, Mrs. Vina Chattin, Browning, Mont., Blackfeet Reservation; Joe Jackson, Oswego, Mont., Assiniboine; Edward Belgard, Helena, Mont., landless Indians; Violet Belgard, Helena, Mont., landless Indians; Jerry Thumm, Great Falls, Tenth Avenue SW., landless Indians; Helen Thumm, Great Falls, Mont., landless Indians; Henry Archdale, Oswego, Mont., Assiniboine; Ralph Wing, Poplar, Mont., Fort Peck Reservation;

Elnora Bangs, Helena, Mont., landless Indians; Joseph Brown, Browning, Mont., Blackfeet Reservation; Ray Doore, Browning, Mont., Blackfeet Reservation; Sam Newbreast, Browning, Mont., Blackfeet Reservation; Henry Little Dog, Browning, Mont., Blackfeet Reservation; Bird Ear Rings, Browning, Mont., Blackfeet Reservation; George Pambrum, Browning, Mont., Blackfeet Reservation; Cora Ingens, Browning, Mont., Blackfeet Reservation; Eneas Granjo, Arlee, Mont., Flathead Reservation; George W Hogan Crow Agency, Mont., Crow Reservation; Minnie Williams, Crow Agency, Mont., Crow Reservation; Olive Venne, Crow Agency, Mont., Crow Reservation; B. Adams, Arlee, Mont., Flathead Reservation; Rufus Wallowing, Lame Deer, Mont., Northern Cheyenne; Clay Powell, Lame Deer, Mont., Northern Cheyenne; John S. Timber, Lame Deer, Mont., Northern Cheyenne; Frances Roberts, Lame Deer, Mont., Northern Cheyenne; Theresa DeLore, Harlem, Mont., Fort Belknap Reservation; Elva DeCelles, Harlem, Mont., Fort Belknap Reservation; John Adams, Arlee, Mont., Flathead Reservation; Paul Charla, Arlee, Mont., Flathead Reservation; Peter Fisher, Arlee, Mont., Flathead Reservation; John Sharp, Browning, Mont., Blackfeet Reservation; Irene Knarr, Poplar, Mont., Fort Peck Reservation; Susan Jacobs, Poplar, Mont., Fort Peck Reservation; Jim Archdale, Poplar, Mont., Fort Peck Reservation; Mrs. Robert Yellowtail, Lodge Grass, Mont., Crow Reservation; Kate Stewart, Crow Agency, Mont., Crow Reservation; Mrs Vera Lansing, Montana Tuberculosis Association, Helena, guest; Alvin Stewart, Crow Agency, Mont., Crow Reservation; John Casebolt, Helena, Mont., guest; Robert Yellowtail, Lodge Grass, Mont., Crow Reservation; Stephen DeMers, Polson, Mont., Flathead Reservation; Walter Morigeau, Arlee, Mont., Flathead Reservation; Jess Couture, Arlee, Mont., Flathead Reservation; Walt McDonald, St. Ignatius, Mont., Flathead Reservation; Jess Fletcher, Mitchell Building, guest; Joe Miller, Mitchell Building, guest; G T Barrett, Billings, Mont., Indian Service; Mrs G T Barrett, Billings, Mont., guest; Mr P C Crump, Ronan, Mont., guest; Earl J Summers, Ronan, Mont., guest; J B Kira-cofe, Ronan, Mont., guest; Dave Higgins, Cut Bank, Mont., Flathead Reservation; Alice Higgins, Cut Bank, Mont., Flathead Reservation; Harry Cloke, Browning, Mont., guest; Elva Williamson, Crow Agency, Mont., Crow Reservation; Isabella Miller, Missoula, Mont., Landless Indians; Isabella Ellsworth, Missoula, Mont., Landless Indians; Dr W F. Kimmell, State board of health, guest; Cedor B Aranow, Shelby, Mont., Mrs. Cassutt, department of public welfare, guest; Morla Stanford, department of public welfare, guest; Mrs Peter Plouffe, Dixon, Mont., Flathead Reservation; Nancy Sluman, Plains, Mont., Flathead Reservation; Peter Plouffe, Dixon, Mont., Flathead Reservation; Frieda Fligelman, 320 North Warren, Helena, guest; Joe Corcoran, Box Elder, Mont., Rock Boy Reservation; Meade Swingley, Helena, Mont., Blackfeet Reservation; Mrs. Justice Sharpe, Browning, Mont., Blackfeet Reservation; Mr. Justice Sharpe, Browning, Mont., Blackfeet Reservation; Mr John Willard, Helena, Mont., guest; Mr Luke Wright, Helena, Mont., guest; Emma M Koliha, Great Falls, Mont., Landless Indians; Felix Cohen, Washington, D. C., guest; Orville Good, Great Falls, Mont., Landless Indians; Oliver Lien, Roosevelt County, State representative; W Guy Bamister, Butte, Mont., FBI; Mrs Lyle Roeseler, Womans Club, Helena, Mont., guest; Marvin J. Sonosky, 810 Eighteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C.; Harold A. Wilkes, Helena, Mont., guest.

REGISTRATION BY RESERVATION

Summary

Blackfeet Reservation.....	18
Crow Reservation.....	8
Flathead Reservation.....	16
Fort Belknap Reservation.....	7

Fort Peck Reservation.....	11
Northern Cheyenne Reservation.....	4
Rock Boy Reservation.....	2
Landless Indians.....	10
Guests.....	28

**ROCKY BOY'S AGENCY,
Box Elder, Mont., April 15, 1950.**

We, the undersigned, original enrolled members of the Rocky Boy's Indian Reservation, have passed around a petition, herewith attached, among the so-called full-bloods and among others of the enrolled members of the above-mentioned reservation, for the purposes of voting, or voicing our opposition against the bills, known as S. 1690, and H. R. 4318, and also H. R. 5570.

The reasons for our opposition to the above-mentioned bills are, because, the sum mentioned in the bills is entirely out of proportion, compared to the size of our reservation. First of all, we have not anything to put up as security for the amount of \$3,510,000, when we only have a 100,000-acre reservation.

Since we adopted the Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934, we have borrowed funds from the Government and we still would like to borrow funds, in the amount of \$100,000, but not any more than that amount.

We have tribal funds roughly, \$10,000, which our tribal council has earmarked for the purpose of purchasing heifers to be used as a revolving herd to be issued among our full-blood members. We have many homeless members among our young people, who have a desire to become stockmen.

Governor Bonner has called a convention to be held at Great Falls and has requested attendance of Indians of all reservations in the State of Montana. The chairman of our tribal council has appointed a member of the tribal council and a member of the full-blood group to represent the Cree Tribe. The half-breeds have appointed a member of the tribe to represent them at this convention.

We, the so-called full-blood or minority group hereby appoint another member of our group to represent us at this convention, namely, Pete Favel, a full-blooded member of the Chippewa Cree Tribe.

This petition was brought before the tribal council in the early part of March to see what attitude they would take and the majority of the council members were against the bills now in Congress.

**India's Objection to Japanese Peace
Treaty**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 28, 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three editorials: Nehru's Gift to the Kremlin, published in the Washington Evening Star of August 27, 1951; Scratch One Yogi, published in the Washington Daily News of August 28, 1951; and India's "No," published in the Washington Post of August 28, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEHRU'S GIFT TO THE KREMLIN

Prime Minister Nehru and his government, whether wittingly or not, have given aid and

comfort to the Kremlin in deciding that India will not take part in next week's San Francisco conference on the Japanese peace treaty. Andrei Gromyko and his monkey-wrench Soviet delegation could hardly have asked for a nicer gift. Propagandistically and otherwise, it should be of considerable help to them in their expected effort to play hob with the meeting and divide its participants as much as possible.

Mr. Nehru's decision, of course, does not come as a complete surprise, though that fact does not make it any the less discouraging or irritating. The possibility of his boycotting the conference was intimated some weeks ago in notes expressing to our Government his strong dissatisfaction with a number of the projected treaty's provisions, and he has now made clear that that dissatisfaction still stands. Our attempt to dissuade him from it has failed, and India will therefore hold itself entirely aloof from the San Francisco proceedings.

The chief of Mr. Nehru's objections may be summed up as follows: First, he is against the fact that the treaty does not specifically provide for Formosa's return to China, and the transfer of South Sakhalin and the Kuriles to Russia; second, he holds that the Ryukyus and Bonin Islands, instead of being placed under an American-administered United Nations trusteeship, should be restored to the Japanese; third, although not ruling out the idea of separate mutual security agreements, he is opposed to having the peace settlement include the article calling for the continued presence of foreign armed defensive forces—meaning particularly United States forces—in and about Japan after the formal occupation ends; and finally, fourth, he considers it wrong that the Chinese Communist regime at Peking has not been invited to participate in the San Francisco conference.

All of these objections coincide with those raised by the Kremlin. Mr. Nehru prides himself on following a policy that he regards as absolutely imperative for India. The policy, besides emphasizing the doctrine of Asia for the Asians, is supposed to be one of strict neutrality—a kind of tightrope act—in the power contest between the Soviet Empire, on one hand, and the United States and most of the rest of the free world, on the other. But somehow, as he tries to do his fence-sitting, Mr. Nehru—again perhaps unwittingly—seems to lean rather noticeably toward the Russian position. At any rate, even though his government has voted—with certain reservations—against the Red aggression in Korea, he has appeared quite anxious to be pleasing to Moscow and Peking.

Maybe India's geographical location and its domestic political situation make Mr. Nehru feel that he can follow no other course. Still, his actions—climaxing now by the decision to stay away from San Francisco—have tended to be less than realistic or even-handed. Why, for example, if he insists that the Ryukyus and the Bonins should be restored to Japan, does he not also insist that Japan get back southern Sakhalin from Russia? And how can he seriously suggest that the Peking aggressors ought to have been invited to next week's conference? And on what common-sense basis, even the dangerous world we have, can he justify his objection to special Japanese-American defensive arrangements against the Red threat in Asia?

These questions speak pretty much for themselves. In all probability—despite Mr. Nehru's arguments and Soviet propaganda barrages—the overwhelming majority of governments represented at San Francisco will sign the Japanese Treaty. Nevertheless, because it is a country of special significance in Asia, India will be sorely missed at the conference. Its absence will cast a shadow on all the proceedings—the kind of shadow

that the Kremlin wants. Mr. Nehru may have felt compelled to make the decision he has made, but in doing so he has definitely hurt himself in the United States and other free nations. More than that, to the world at large, where his mental and leadership qualities have been highly regarded, he has demonstrated a surprising degree of muddle-headedness.

SCRATCH ONE YOGI

Prime Minister Nehru's unmitigated gall is equaled only by his capacity to picture himself as an anguished martyr dedicated to the cause of world peace—Nehru version.

By his timing and uncompromising stand, he has delivered a master stroke of sabotage to the Japanese treaty conference which opens next week in San Francisco.

It is sabotage because his boycott of the conference opens the way for Russia to make the maximum use of India's expressed opposition to the best settlement that could be devised. Thus the Yogi from the upper Ganges runs interference for the big Moscow bruisers who will carry the ball of obstructionism to San Francisco.

Nehru's abounding gall comes in his presumption to tell the United States exactly how we should settle a war with which India had little to do, a war won largely by American blood and resources. His Government was not even in existence during World War II, and India fought the Japanese only briefly as a reluctant auxiliary of the British Empire.

In reaching the long-delayed settlement, we asked nothing from India but approval of a common policy for Japan. It is a policy which a huge majority of the free nations believe will help establish a friendly community in the Pacific. And it is a settlement Japan wants, so Nehru can't pretend he is working for Japan's good.

No elaborate analysis is needed to show that in rebuffing us Nehru has lined up with the Communist camp and that the peace he seeks would be red tinted. At various times Nehru has admitted that he is friendly to communism and that he has found Marxism very helpful. However much he has sought to perpetuate the myth of a middle way, his stated objections to the peace plan go right down the line of Russia's arguments to date.

What, for example, is more transparent than his inconsistency on Japan's former island possession? He objects to a United States trusteeship over the Ryukyus and Bonin Islands, but he favors outright Russian possession of the Kuriles and South Sakhalin. Evidently in Nehru's eyes only the democratic western nations—not Russia—can be guilty of the sin of imperialism.

And, of course, he wants the peace treaty to turn over Formosa to Communist China which his country recognizes, trades with and morally supports—while giving lip service to the United Nations.

We've said before, repeatedly, as the threat of international communism is laid bare, it's high time that our allies and neutral hangers-on stood up to be counted. India has.

When Nehru, the would-be mystic, went before his Parliament yesterday to put the seal on his decision, he wore a bright red rose on his tunic.

Very appropriate, we should say.

INDIA'S "NO"

What bothers the State Department about the Indian objections to the draft Peace Treaty on Japan and its boycott of the San Francisco Conference is Premier Nehru's obvious partiality toward Soviet Russia. It will bother a good many Americans. Never has Mr. Nehru's neutralism shown such a bias—a bias in the Russian direction. The Indians feel that the territories of which

Japan is being deprived under authority of the surrender instruments should be formally ceded to the contemplated beneficiaries. For various reasons the draft treaty merely provides for renunciation by the Japanese. The Indians would give title to China over Formosa, to Soviet Russia over the Kuriles and southern Sakhalin, and they add that the Ryukyus and the Bonins should be returned to Japan.

This last issue brings in the United States, which, according to the draft treaty, will administer the Ryukyus (including Okinawa) and the Bonins, pending a proposal to the United Nations for a trusteeship. Sovereignty would still be Japanese. It should be quite clear from this provision that the door is not closed to a future transfer of these islands to the Japanese. But at present Japan is defenseless. More, it is next door to Soviet Russia, which, since the war, has had such a record of aggression that all countries, let alone neighbors, are living in fear of Soviet expansion at their expense. It is only for this reason that American troops will remain in Japan after the signature of the treaty. They will be posted at bases, including the Bonins and Okinawa, so as to protect Japan while she is getting back on her feet.

The Japanese themselves want these safeguards. To them the country needs to be relieved of the fear under which it would live of a Russian attack if it were left without protection. This is borne out in Japan's statements. Premier Yoshida is quoted in the State Department reply to New Delhi as saying, "The treaty, as it stands, reflects abundantly American fairness, magnanimity, and idealism." How then is Mr. Nehru justified in saying that this clause is a "source of dissatisfaction to large sections of the Japanese people and must carry the seed of future dispute and possible conflict in the Far East"?

Mr. Nehru's comment should more truthfully be made about the Kuriles. It isn't, on the contrary, Mr. Nehru wants Russia's claims to the Kuriles to be formalized in the treaty. This newspaper is glad that this has not been done. Cession of the Kuriles to the Russians was provided for in the compact of Yalta, on the grounds that they were once Russian property. Such was not the case. Only the northern Kuriles—which are part of the causeway between Russia's Kamchatka and Japan's Hokkaido—were formerly Russian. The four islands of the southern Kuriles, known as the Habomais, are an integral part of the Japanese mainland, and had always been in the jurisdiction of the Hokkaido authority. Yet the Russians, taking advantage of the general ignorance exhibited at Yalta, took possession of the southern Kuriles, whence they supervise Japan's vital fisheries in the Sea of Okhotsk. If there is one thing that has caused dissatisfaction in Japan and will promote trouble in the future, it is the Kuriles situation. But Mr. Nehru blithely ignores it.

It is not clear exactly what Mr. Nehru wants in respect of Formosa. Mr. Nehru pleads that the Formosan status should not be left undetermined. Inferentially, therefore, he wants Formosa, in conformity with the Cairo declaration, to be declared the property of China. But what is present-day China, juridically? It is focused on Peking to much of the world, on Taipei to the United States. Clearly, in this matter, the signatories could only provide for Japanese renunciation of title. With Red China an aggressor in the eyes of the United Nations, moreover, it would have been fantastic to have made such a formal disposition of the Japanese island as Mr. Nehru suggests. India has certainly stated a case against the treaty which undermines her own asseveration of neutralism—whether from fright of the Russians or from sympathy with them, we do not presume to say.

Who's Trying To Ruin Our Schools?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 28, 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on August 6, 1951, I called the attention of the Senate to the efforts of certain groups who are seeking to destroy the confidence of the people in our public education system. At that time I also made some remarks concerning the need to protect American public schools from the danger of exploitation by those who would restrict the freedom of teachers and impose thought control on them.

Since then McCall's magazine for September 1951, has published an article, *Who's Trying To Ruin Our Schools?* by Arthur D. Morse. This carefully prepared article shows clearly the sinister and dangerous character, background, and tactics of the persons who head organizations which are trying to undermine our free public educational system in America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. Every Member of Congress will thus have an opportunity to read it and be forewarned and forearmed against those who seek to undermine and destroy our public-school system.

I am informed by the Public Printer that this article is estimated to make three pages of the RECORD at a cost of \$246.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO'S TRYING TO RUIN OUR SCHOOLS?

(By Arthur D. Morse)

Public education in America is under the heaviest attack in its history. This attack is not aimed at the improvement of free education. It is aimed at its destruction. So far it has struck at school systems from Port Washington, N. Y., to Pasadena, Calif.

"We place the greatest importance upon this attack," Dr. Willard E. Givens, executive secretary of the National Education Association, whose membership consists of 850,000 teachers, said recently. "In recent months campaigns against our schools have been intensified in number and effectiveness. Since they strike at the very roots of our system of free public education, they are a very real menace to democracy."

The most notorious success yet achieved by the forces that are undermining our schools was made at Pasadena.

Early in 1948 Pasadena's school board invited Willard Goslin, one of the country's most able and respected educators, to become superintendent of its public schools. Less than 3 years later the board that had hired Goslin asked for, and received, his resignation.

The shoddy developments that led to Goslin's ousting had nothing to do with his talents as an educator. His removal—as David Hulburd makes clear in his book *This Happened in Pasadena*—was the result of shadowy fears generated in the community with the aid of individuals and organizations as far away as New York City.

The shame of Pasadena cannot be undone. Nobody knows what community will be next.

"You say this hasn't happened to my school, to me." Dr. Richard B. Kennan, a well-known educator, told the 1951 convention of the American Association of School Administrators "Maybe not. But it has happened in California, in New Jersey, in Louisiana, in Massachusetts—and your school may be next, particularly if you are in a large school system where new buildings and increased school tax support are needed."

To see how these attacks begin, who is behind them and how the assault is waged, let us look at the case of Englewood, N. J., an attractive, prosperous community of approximately 25,000, situated across the Hudson River from New York City.

Englewood has long been properly proud of its school system, brought to a new peak of achievement under its present superintendent, Dr. Harry L. Stearns. Dr. Stearns, who admits to being politically somewhat conservative, has made many sound improvements in the Englewood school system. One of the most successful was the installation of a child study department, staffed by two psychologists and a nurse. He is firm in the belief that "if public education fails it will spell the end of a free society in America." Until October 7, 1950, Dr. Stearns had no reason to believe that this opinion was not shared by every citizen of Englewood.

Then came the bombshell.

The Englewood branch of the American Association for the United Nations was celebrating official U. N. week with an open meeting at the Roosevelt School. As the principal speaker was being introduced, an Englewood resident named Frederick G. Cartwright rose in the audience and demanded to be heard with regard to the speaker who originally had been scheduled to deliver the principal address—not the man being introduced. Cartwright claimed the originally scheduled speaker was a "suspected Russian agent" who had been denied re-entry into the United States.

The next 20 minutes were chaotic. While the chairman, together with a minister and a rabbi who were on the speaker's platform, attempted to restore order, Cartwright walked to the stage and began reading a prepared speech, cheered on by followers in the audience who had been alerted for this demonstration.

Eventually Cartwright sat down again. Meanwhile the police had been called. Cartwright was arrested and charged with disorderly conduct. As he was being removed from the auditorium a firecracker exploded in a corridor. A young girl in the audience became hysterical.

So U. N. week was thoroughly spoiled, although the speaker went on to trace the North Korean aggression and to discuss the guilt of Soviet Russia in the current situation.

Shortly after the meeting, but before his trial, Cartwright publicly demanded an investigation "into the activities and possible communistic ties of some of the teachers in the Englewood public schools." At the same time the commander and the past commander of the local post of the Catholic War Veterans announced that their organization had decided to support Cartwright (who is an Episcopalian) in this proposal.

The attack was under way.

At Cartwright's trial for disorderly conduct the pattern of the attack began to emerge. It was a pattern familiar to anyone acquainted with the attacks in Pasadena and in other cities, where the anti-public-school elements have, almost without exception, been allied with an organization that is impostingly and misleadingly called the National Council for American Education (not to be

confused with the highly reputable National Education Association or the American Council on Education).

The so-called National Council for American Education is run by Allen A. Zoll, who bears the title of executive vice president. Because Zoll and his organization have figured so prominently in the Nation-wide campaign against the public schools, we will examine them more closely later on. It was to be expected that they would show up in Englewood.

Cartwright said at his trial that he had donated \$200 to the National Council for American Education. In addition, Cartwright, who is in the investment business in Wall Street, said that he was acquainted with Zoll and that his information about the original speaker had come from Zoll.

The judge found Cartwright not guilty of disorderly conduct, though deploring and disapproving of his actions. But the trouble in Englewood did not end there. By that time Cartwright had founded an organization which he called the Englewood Anti-Communist League, and tremendous tension began building in the community.

As the poison of recrimination began to spread through Englewood, Cartwright and two of his Anti-Communist League associates went before the board of education and recited instances in which (they alleged) teachers had displayed pro-Communist sympathies. The board ordered Superintendent Stearns to make a full investigation.

In March of this year Stearns opened an inquiry into subversive activities in his schools. Under his questioning, the evidence presented by Cartwright and the two other complainants turned out to be an assortment of hearsay, gossip, and rumor.

For example, Frederick H. Grein, the past commander of the Catholic War Veterans, said several students had complained of objectionable remarks made by teachers at the Dwight Morrow School. But he admitted that he had got this information second-hand and that one of his informants was not even a pupil of the school.

A mother, who happened to be Cartwright's secretary, charged that her daughter had been reprimanded by a teacher for making an anti-Communist classroom report. But it developed that the teacher, surprised by the peculiar material in the child's report, had merely asked the source of the information. It turned out to be a book titled "Communism Unmasked," by Maj. Gen. Amos A. Fries, retired, whom we shall meet later. It fit the pattern that his name should also turn up in Englewood.

As a witness Cartwright was not impressive. He rambled on disjointedly about a variety of matters not connected with the suspected subversion in the schools, and it required all of Dr. Stearns' patience to keep him on the subject. Eventually Cartwright did attack the textbook American Democracy Today and Tomorrow, though he admitted that he had not read it.

After Cartwright had attacked another textbook that he had not read, the following exchange took place, according to the official transcript:

"MR. CARTWRIGHT. It is possible, I mean very highly probable, in a majority of cases that the teachers can be teaching subversively without being aware of the fact that they are teaching subversion.

"DR. STEARNS. In other words, you are saying that without the teacher knowing it she is teaching subversive activity?

"MR. CARTWRIGHT. I would say in the majority of cases.

"DR. STEARNS. In this particular case? You have not read the book, and you don't know what the teacher is actually teaching in the course?

"MR. CARTWRIGHT. No, I do not."

At the conclusion of the hearing the board of education announced that the charges had been found to be based on hearsay, and it exonerated the teachers of any implications of subversive activity.

Though Cartwright's charges against the schools and his subsequent veiled accusations had not been substantiated, a subtle and distressing change was creeping over Englewood. The teachers were jittery. They were afraid the healthy, open discussion that had previously characterized their classes would somehow be misconstrued. Several teachers told Dr. Stearns they were sure that some students, under instructions from their parents, were trying to trap them into making incriminating statements.

This atmosphere of uneasiness was not confined to the schools.

"There is a community menace that is growing here like a cancer," the Englewood Press-Journal said in an editorial, and went on to observe: "It is arousing religious hatreds—Catholic against Protestant against Jewish. His [Cartwright's] methods are similar to those of Allen Zoll, to whose campaigns against our schools Mr. Cartwright has contributed funds. When he sets group against group, he is endangering our community life and our Americanism itself."

The attack on the Englewood school is still being waged. The Anti-Communist League is holding frequent meetings and distributing literature attacking the schools. Allen Zoll has made several appearances in Englewood. "He is advising us, and we think he is a swell fellow," a leading member of the Anti-Communist League recently remarked.

Frederick Cartwright and Frederick Grein have appeared on a television program emanating from Newark, N. J., during which they repeated substantially the same accusations made during the Board of Education inquiry. Cartwright has become more and more blatant. He now claims to be in contact with the FBI. Innocent Englewood citizens who do not share the Cartwright-Zoll viewpoint are increasingly familiar with rumored threats to report them to the Government for subversive activity.

To counteract the activities of the Anti-Communist League, a number of prominent Englewood residents have recently formed an organization which they named the Englewood Citizens Union. A representative group composed of both the conservative and liberal elements in the community, it is coming to the rescue of Englewood's beleaguered school system. In Pasadena some citizens finally organized to fight the attack on their schools, but only after it was too late. Everyone who is for good education and against government by intimidation must hope that the Englewood Citizens Union will get the widest community support and that its work has been started in time.

Though the nature of the attack on the school varies somewhat from place to place, the general pattern is identical. The attackers use the same techniques, the same literature and the same sweeping charges. They accuse teachers and textbooks of being subversive, they link modern educational practices with communism; and they attempt to stampede parents into believing that our public schools are the breeding grounds of totalitarianism.

Chief among the groups that are exploiting the widespread misunderstanding of modern education and the consuming fear of communism is Allen Zoll's National Council for American Education.

Many well-intentioned people, lured by the dual prospect of fighting communism and reducing school taxes, have joined local groups which, like the Englewood Anti-Communist League are linked to Zoll's organization. Anyone who is a member of, or has been invited to join, one of these groups, should be interested in learning something

about Zoll whose career is not without interest.

Educators are usually cooperative in arranging interviews with reporters, but I found that in this respect as well as in others, Zoll is not in the tradition. When I phoned his office, which is in New York, he was reluctant to grant an interview, until I pretended that I was in sympathy with his aims and wanted to gather material to further the cause. Then he agreed to see me.

This will be the first interview I've granted since I've been in this thing," Zoll remarked, and concluded by saying, "If you smear me, I'll cut your throat." (This is not, of course, the kind of remark that one often hears in educational circles.)

Before seeing Zoll I looked into his background and found, among other things, that he was the founder and national commander of an organization called American Patriots, Inc., which appears on the Attorney General's list as a Fascist organization. The Patriots (now defunct) had their biggest fling during the years immediately preceding World War II, when Zoll, who cannot be accused of lacking a talent for opportunism, exploited the division of sentiment in this country toward the war.

At meetings of American Patriots, Inc., National Commander Zoll presented such speakers as Elizabeth Dilling, who was indicted for sedition three times during the war and was a defendant in the mass sedition trial of 1944 (which was declared a mistrial when the presiding judge died). Other patriots who addressed the group included John Eoghan Kelly, later convicted as an unregistered agent of Franco; Joseph McWilliams, also a defendant in the sedition trial, who once boasted, "I'm 100 percent for Hitler", and the notoriously anti-Semitic Gerald L. K. Smith. Zoll introduced Smith as "without doubt the most dynamic and inspiring speaker on Americanism today."

Zoll had a pretty good year in 1939. In January he appeared at a Senate hearing to oppose the nomination of Felix Frankfurter as a Justice of the Supreme Court. Zoll said he didn't like Frankfurter's record or his religion. Senator Borah was moved to remark, "So far as I am concerned, I do not propose to listen to an argument against a man because of his religion. You are raising the same question that is drenching Europe in blood."

A while later Zoll was in the news again. For months the New York radio station WMCA had been picketed by Christian Front followers of Father Coughlin in protest against the refusal of the station to broadcast the priest's inflammatory speeches. In July, Zoll, who was one of Coughlin's most vocal supporters and one of the originators of the picket line, was arrested on an indictment, charging that he had attempted to extort \$7,500 from WMCA's president, Donald Flamm. In return Zoll had allegedly offered to call off the pickets. Zoll was never brought to trial, and the indictment was dismissed.

The publicity that Zoll received as a result of this untidy affair was not flattering. He accordingly drifted off into the shadows, where he worked for a few years as a salesman (he sometimes refers to himself in print as an internationally known sales consultant) for such professional anti-Semites as Merwin K. Hart and Joseph P. Kamp.

In 1948 the internationally known sales consultant, sensing a new market for a somewhat different brand of goods, organized his National Council for American Education. Ex-National Commander Allen Alderson Zoll now appeared as Allen A. Zoll, Ph. D.

The office of the National Council for American Education occupies a large room on the tenth floor of a shabby building at

1 Malden Lane, in downtown New York. It has a staff of three: a receptionist, a typist and Zoll's secretary. The room is cheerless, sparsely furnished and undecorated except for numerous pictures depicting scenes in the life of George Washington. In the rear, partially blocked off by storage cabinets and stacks of old newspapers, is the small cubicle occupied by Zoll, from which he emerged to greet me.

At the age of 55 Zoll is a man of average height, weighs about 200 pounds and is growing bald. His eyes, which are his most distinctive feature, are narrow and glinting. His manner is restless.

At the outset I told Zoll that I was familiar with his main arguments against the schools; that progressive education is a menace, that most teachers and textbooks are subversive and that children are not learning the three R's, which should be taught to the exclusion of virtually everything else.

"That's about it," Zoll said. "Most teaching and textbooks are socialistic, and the teachers' colleges are implanted with socialism. These Socialist plotters are deliberate saboteurs, and we're in serious danger from them—just as much as from the Communists. There are plenty of bad people who haven't joined the Communist Party, and we're out for them too." Zoll leaned back in his chair. "You're either for individualism or collectivism. The middle is a barbed-wire fence. I tell kids that in my talks to them."

I asked just how he was attempting to improve this situation.

"Well," he began, "neither the FBI nor the Un-American Activities Committee knows what's being taught or what's in the heart of a teacher. The only person who knows that is the person right on the ground. I help these local outfits. Like in Punxsutawney it might be called the School Development Council [in Pasadena the antischool faction was called the School Development Council]. I've also formed a pro-American underground for teachers."

After Zoll had exhausted himself on the subject of disloyal teachers I asked what he was doing about subversive textbooks.

"We have an office in Wisconsin," he replied. "Their job is to review about 60 books a year. It's under the direction of our vice president in charge of research, Verne Kaub."

I had run across Kaub before and knew that he, like Zoll, is a Johnny-come-lately to education. Until recently Kaub was working the religious side of the street, writing articles for the anti-Jewish publication the Individualist, as well as distributing a pamphlet titled "How Red Is the Federal Council of Churches?"

Zoll said that Kaub's job of ferreting out un-American propaganda in the children's books is sometimes pretty difficult. "Once," he said with a straight face, "we had to have a book reviewed eight times before we got a good analysis."

I asked Zoll what he believed the proper aims of education should be.

"That's a good question," he said. "I just sent a memo to our board asking them to give me their ideas on that matter."

That didn't seem like a very good answer, but Zoll was indicating that he wished to wind up the interview.

"Any other questions?" he asked.

"Well," I said, "can you tell me what's right with the schools?"

He did not dignify that query with an answer.

I remarked that nearly all educational authorities agree that approximately 500,000 new classrooms need to be built within the next 10 years, and asked Zoll if he also considered this a vital problem.

"That's a lot of fuddydud, about new buildings, when the old ones are just as good," he replied. "The factor of age has nothing to do with the efficacy of school buildings."

There seemed time for only one more question. Since Zoll now signs his writing "Allen A. Zoll, Ph. D." and prefers to be addressed as "Dr. Zoll," I ask him about the degree.

"I got that from Temple Hall," he said quickly, and then seemed embarrassed by his hasty remark. He rose, and the interview was over.

After leaving "Dr." Zoll I learned that Temple Hall College and Seminary (now defunct) was a one-man diploma mill operated by a man named D. Scott Swain. Swain's qualifications as an educator included the serving of a 6-year prison term on 6 charges, including running a confidence game, obtaining property under false pretenses and passing bad checks. While running his college Swain conferred upon himself the title "Archbishop Primate." Probably the high point of his career was reached at a meeting in New York City, when the "Bishop" got roaring drunk and in a burst of expansiveness passed out Temple Hall Ph. D.'s to his entire audience. The exact moment when Zoll was awarded his doctorate is unknown.

Zoll would be funny, if his aims were not so deadly. He cannot be dismissed as a harmless crackpot, for, though his statement to me that his organization has 10,000 members and is linked to some 400 local groups is an obvious exaggeration, it is nevertheless true that he has been a potent influence in every city whose schools have come under attack.

Zoll's influence is widely exerted through the pamphlets that he publishes and distributes. At the height of the school controversy in Pasadena, citizens picking up their morning newspapers found copies of Zoll's pamphlet *Progressive Education Increases Delinquency* on their doorsteps.

"So-called progressive education," the pamphlet said, "shot through as it is with the blight of pragmatism, has had a very deleterious effect upon the original character of American education. The public-school system in hundreds of cities and towns throughout the land is fatally committed to these subversive principles of 'progressive' education." Zoll goes on to explain that modern education does not permit absolute truth, hence those who believe in it cannot be true Christians. And he makes the further observation that "currently it is popular to plug hard for the democratic equality of all men."

This pamphlet made such a vivid impression on the president of the School Development Council in Pasadena that he recited passages from it almost verbatim in his speeches attacking the school administration.

In Denver the forces attempting to oust Superintendent Kenneth Oberholtzer (who is also president of the American Association of School Administrators—the highest honor his profession accords) presented copies of *Progressive Education Increases Delinquency* to each member of the board of education and to members of many other civic groups.

Other Zoll literature includes pamphlets bearing such titles as "They Want Your Child (the Communists, that is), 'Private Schools: The Solution to America's Educational Problem,'" and "How Red Are the Schools?"

The philosophy in these pamphlets is being advocated by the Parents' Council for Education in Eugene, Ore.; the Citizens' School Committee in Los Angeles; the Parents' Council in Minneapolis; the Three R Parents Committee in Columbus, Ohio; and by similar groups in many other communities.

Zoll's satisfaction in the wide distribution of his literature is not altogether spiritual.

His most popular item, *Progressive Education Increases Delinquency*, sells for 20 cents a single copy; 6 copies for \$1; 1,000 copies for \$60; and customers are offered a special price on larger quantities. In all of his pamphlets Zoll makes a strong pitch for contributions. People who join his council are rewarded with various titles, the rank conferred depending on the amount of cash they send in. They can become an associate for \$5, a patron for \$150, or a benefactor for \$1,000.

By the end of 1949, when Zoll was just swinging into action, his pamphlet sales and contributions had netted him an estimated \$45,000. With the way his business is booming at present, there is no reason to believe that his efforts are not now being even more respectably rewarded.

Though Zoll's organization is the most important rallying point and serves as general headquarters for the enemies of education, other operators are busy turning out weapons for waging the attack.

One of the most destructive of these—a kind of secret weapon—is a quarterly publication called the *Educational Reviewer*. Edited by Lucille Cardin Crain, and financed by a lobbying organization with headquarters in Washington, D. C., the *Reviewer* has been used effectively in Englewood and in other widely scattered cities across the country. Its sole function is to try to discover subversive material in textbooks.

The methods used by the *Educational Reviewer* can be illustrated by its treatment of Dr. Frank Magruder's textbook, *American Government*. This text, which is on the recommended list of all 48 States, has been a classic in its field for a quarter of a century. It was appropriately selected for review in the first issue of the *Reviewer*, which appeared in July 1949. The writer of the review was a woman named Edna Lonigan. How she made her point that the textbook is subversive can perhaps best be shown by comparing excerpts with which she purported to express Magruder's views with actual passages from his text:

Magruder, according to Lonigan:

"Italy and Germany were dictatorships but not the Soviet Union.

"The United States and the Soviet Union are equals fighting for 'world leadership.'

"By democracy we mean that form of government in which the sovereign power is in the hands of the people collectively."

Magruder's actual text:

"Russia is leader of the dictatorial nations, most of which are communistic.

"The United States and the Soviet Union, the most powerful of the allies in the Second World War, now find themselves as the two only powerful contenders for world leadership

"By democracy we mean that form of government in which the sovereign power is in the hands of the people collectively, and is expressed by them either directly or indirectly through elected representatives."

In the last instance above, by deleting half of the sentence, Miss Lonigan was able to prove to her satisfaction that Magruder was an advocate of the collectivist state.

Unfortunately she proved it to a number of others, including Radio Commentator Fulton Lewis, Jr., who, a few months after the review appeared, read considerable portions of it on one of his broadcasts.

The response was big and prompt. The State Textbook Commission of Georgia immediately banned the book, as did the Houston, Tex., school board. Parents in Portland, Oreg., demanded that similar action be taken there. A newspaper in southern California quoted Lewis, attacked Magruder, and concluded that the public schools are bound to destroy this country. In places like Council Bluffs, Iowa, and Trumbull County, Ohio, where the broadcast also caused a stir, some people took the trouble to read

the textbook and so avoided taking precipitate and foolish steps.

Referring to the *Educational Reviewer*, a report recently issued by a committee of the House of Representatives, observed that the review of textbooks by self-appointed experts smacks too much of the book-burning orgies of Nuremberg to be accepted by thoughtful Americans without foreboding and alarm.

That kind of talk infuriates the editor of the *Educational Reviewer*, Lucille Cardin Crain, who is convinced that any critic of her publication is a Communist.

Allen Zoll described Mrs. Crain to me as a charming woman, very lovely, and I found upon meeting her in her office, which is in a brownstone house on East Thirty-sixth Street in New York City, that she does possess the most attractive figure in the anti-school movement. She is 50, has cool blue eyes, a cameo face, and a fondness for using rather fancy words. To indicate her personal interest in children Mrs. Crain sometimes says exuberantly: "I'm a grandmother seven times." This reference is to the children of her husband—who is 71—by his first wife. Mrs. Crain is childless.

Like Allen Zoll, Mrs. Crain joined the educational ranks recently. Her scholastic background consists of the equivalent of a high-school education which she received at a convent in Minnesota. She is suspicious of most recognized educators who hold degrees, and she has expressed strong disapproval of what she calls our compulsory State-operated educational system. What she is in favor of is a mystery.

When I asked Mrs. Crain what she thought the proper aims of education should be, she seemed to be pushed as far out to sea as Allen Zoll had been when I asked the question of him. After remaining silent for a spell Mrs. Crain, moved by a sudden inspiration, said brightly, "I like our little slogan on the *Educational Reviewer*." This reads: "In the light of truth, objectivity and established American ideals, to examine the publications used in instructing American youth." There seemed little point in pressing that subject further.

In other respects my interview with Mrs. Crain was not unusually rewarding, partly because she consumed most of it by delivering a diatribe against the National Education Association, which she thinks is subversive. Her reasons are not monuments of persuasion. Reading from an NEA pamphlet, she remarked, "They say here they're committed to the democratic ideal," adding, as she tossed the pamphlet aside, "whatever that is."

The *Educational Reviewer* has been specific in explaining what it thinks democracy is. "Democracy," the *Reviewer* said in October 15, 1949 issue, "is a government by demagogues leading to the tyranny of the majority over the minority."

A few steps behind Mrs. Crain is another foe of modern education—78-year-old Maj. Gen. Amos A. Fries, retired. The aged general is editor of a widely distributed monthly publication ironically titled *Friends of the Public Schools*. "Anyone who calls our Government a democracy," this publication has pointed out, "is either completely un-American or a moron."

The general stands four-square against nurseries and kindergartens, health, welfare, and recreational activities, services for handicapped pupils and vocational guidance, among other things. "Where one child is overworked," he says, "a thousand aren't worked enough."

The general's educational program, if such it can be called, stems from his apparent belief that things were better in the good old days when fewer children went to school.

These three—Allen Zoll, Lucille Crain, General Fries—by themselves would, of course, be ineffective. What enables them to carry on their programs is the support

of well-meaning but misinformed people in communities across the country, who are frequently prompted to join a local, innocent-sounding school group because its main interest seems to be controlling school taxes or carrying out some other aim that appeals to the pocketbook or the emotions.

To provide facts enabling friends of education to improve our schools and defend them against unjustified attacks, there was founded in 1949 an outstanding organization called the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools. President James B. Conant of Harvard was instrumental in its establishment. Roy E. Larsen, president of Time, Inc., is its chairman, and its membership includes many other leading American citizens. A nonprofit group, the Commission is financed by the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corp., and it works closely with all organizations devoted to better education, including the National Congress of Parents and Teachers and the United States Office of Education.

The National Citizens Commission stimulates and assists in the formation of local committees representing a cross-section of the community—business, labor, church, civic, women's and veterans' interests—devoted to improving the schools. The Commission furnishes its local committees, free of charge, a wealth of material that explains how to organize, what to look for in evaluating the schools, how to work with local educators, and how to carry through a program of action. The Commission acts as a national clearing house of community experiences. One of its most valuable services is the distribution of case histories of school improvement in every part of the country.

All of this material and aid can be obtained without cost simply by addressing the National Citizens Commission, 2 West Forty-fifth Street, New York 18, N. Y.

Our public schools are the firm underpinning of our democracy. Like democracy itself, they are in deadly danger.

"We are threatened from without," Willard Goslin said upon tendering his resignation as superintendent in Pasadena. "I think we are threatened even more from within. I know of no better way to wreck everything that we think is good in America than to begin to destroy ourselves one by one, institution by institution, community by community, throughout the land."

Tidelands Oil Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 28, 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the *RECORD* an editorial entitled "Clever Oil Grabbers," which appeared in the *Denver Post* and was reprinted in the magazine *Frontier* for September 1951. It discusses the tidelands oil question.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

CLEVER OIL GRABBERS

Oil interests and extreme champions of States' rights are beating the drums again for legislation to surrender Federal ownership of lands and minerals under the offshore seas to the coastal States.

This may prove to be the big drive which has been in the making ever since the United States Supreme Court in June 1947 held that the tidelands belong to the entire Nation, not merely to the States which border them.

Many oil companies are anxious to have the tidelands turned over to the States. They would rather lease from the States than from the Federal Government, which usually imposes more restrictions on the activities of its lessees than do the State agencies entrusted with such matters.

Texas and California Congressmen will be in the forefront of the battle. Texas has been receiving \$7,000,000 a year or more from tidelands oil leases for its school fund. State profits from California oil leases amount to several million dollars annually.

Oil production from the tidelands now amounts to only a drop in the bucket when considered on the basis of potential production, many experts believe. Texas officials, for example, have estimated that their State may reasonably anticipate a total income over the years of a billion dollars from offshore leases if Congress can be talked into surrendering Federal tidelands rights.

In an effort to enlist the aid of inland Congressmen, which the coastal States must have if they are to pass the tidelands bill, a campaign of fear and alarm has been under way for some time.

If Congress does not give up Federal ownership of tidelands, the Federal Government may next claim the ownership of iron deposits located under inland lakes, oil under navigable streams, and even docks on bays and rivers, it is argued.

Senator O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming, is among those who have not been taken in by the scare campaign. He points out that at the time of the Supreme Court decision the Attorney General made it plain that the Government's case involved tidelands only.

The Supreme Court decision itself was based largely on the traditional responsibility of the Federal Government to protect the Nation's shores from other countries, a responsibility which could not by any stretch of the imagination be extended to take in the lands under inland streams and lakes.

Liberal legislation to allow the coastal States the lion's share of oil royalties and rentals from tidelands has been proposed, but men like Senator CONNALLY, of Texas, and other States' righters will be satisfied with nothing less than complete surrender by the Federal Government as represented by Congress.

The big drive seems to be under way. But the principle of Federal jurisdiction over tidelands is sound. It is essential to national welfare and security.

Profligate Spending by the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 28, 1951

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, the Emporia Gazette, made famous by the late William Allen White, of my home State of Kansas, recently editorialized under the caption "Why not reward thrift?"

Warnings against the profligate spending indulged in by our Government in past years are increasingly numerous from our alarmed constituents.

The Gazette editorial, reprinted in the Rooks County Record in Stockton, Kans., is short and to the point and worthy of careful attention, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY NOT REWARD THRIFT?

Only the strongest kind of public pressure can force the Government to economize. That is the theme of a recent article by Stanley High in the Reader's Digest called "In Washington It's Waste as Usual."

Stanley High shows how our money is being dissipated on unnecessary projects of a thousand and one kinds, and says: "Lately there has been a notable increase in mail from constituents—making sharp demands for economy on the part of Congress. These demands already have strengthened the efforts of Congressmen who believe with Senator BYRD that 'our strength and preparedness in all respects depend upon reduction in nonessential spending'."

"But there will be no adequate reductions unless pressure from the people is greatly increased. To add to that pressure without delay is, I believe, an obligation upon every patriotic American."

From every source we are told that the increase in Government spending which has no connection with our military preparedness has been incredible. For example, the Commerce Department's 1950 budget showed a 1,049-percent increase over its 1940 budget. Department of Labor spent 1,283 percent more in 1950 than in 1940. The State Department spent 1,634 percent more—although due to present world conditions, considerable of this increase could be justified. But so it goes, down the line, with Government costing us more and more. Isn't it time to reward thrift?

"Soon" Mr. High writes, "the army of United States Government employees will be nearly as big as the combined total of all the men in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines as of last spring."

As voters, citizens, and taxpayers the people of this country should do something about this. Americans should forsake their false belief in "something for nothing" government. Instead of flocking to the banners of candidates who promise everything, voters should rally to the men who offer some guaranty of reducing Government spending. The Congressman or Government official who can save the Treasury the most money should be the one who gets the most votes. We have rewarded the spendthrifts too long and they've got us nothing but the highest public debt in our history, and still higher taxes.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 28, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of last Saturday, August 25, 1951, entitled "Price Control." It is interesting to note that even the most ardent supporters of the New Deal are a little skeptical of the

President's latest request for more controls and regulations as a means of controlling prices.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRICE CONTROL

President Truman has urged Congress to repeal three amendments that, as he rightly says, are the "worst provisions" of the new control law. They are: (1) the Capehart amendment which permits manufacturers and processors to add all costs, direct and indirect, to their pre-Korean price levels up to July 26; (2) the Herlong amendment guaranteeing pre-Korean percentage mark-ups for distributors, and (3) the Butler-Hope amendment prohibiting slaughtering quotas. Without doubt these amendments will result in needless price increases, hamper enforcement of price regulations, and create an enormous amount of administrative work for stabilization agencies.

Nevertheless, we doubt the wisdom of an attempt to persuade Congress to repeal these amendments only a few weeks after passage of new controls legislation. There is a bare possibility, of course, that Congress may take action now that Republican Senators have introduced a repeal bill—a repeal bill which is obviously designed to deprive the President of the political advantages that he might gain by blaming Republicans for the higher prices expected to result from retention of the amendments. But the chance is slim, since a large number of Democrats joined the Republicans in putting through these amendments. Moreover, the chairman of both the House and Senate Banking Committees have shown a conspicuous lack of enthusiasm for proposals to change the law this year.

More time is needed to test the effects of the amendments; they should be given a fair trial to determine whether they are worse than useless as a means of stabilizing the price structure. That is a somewhat dangerous proceeding, to be sure, since if prices rise, as expected, it would probably be impossible to roll them back to present levels. However, the surest way to secure corrective action from Congress is to try to enforce objectionable laws and show their actual, not their predicted, effects. Another reason for concluding that the President's efforts are ill-timed is that his warning of future inflation comes at a time when inventories are excessively high and scare buying no longer in evidence. The Department of Commerce reports that consumer expenditures for the second quarter of this year (the latest available estimates) were lower than during the preceding 3 months while consumer savings had increased.

The President himself pointed out in his message to Congress that since the imposition of controls the rise in the cost of living has been less than 1 percent and wholesale prices are below the level of last January. It looks as if the buying lull brought about by removal of fears of imminent shortages, rather than price controls, has been the chief cause of the subsidence of inflationary pressure. But we agree with the President that unless controls are strengthened, prices will begin to rise sharply as defense production expands, incomes from defense work increases, and inventories of consumer goods dwindle. There is always danger, moreover, that another wave of consumer buying will be spurred by fears of or actual shortages.

Another item on the President's repeal agenda, however—removal of the restrictions imposed on imports of fats, oils, and dairy products—might well be made the subject of separate repeal legislation, since not only will it tend to raise prices of competing domestic products, but it also conflicts with our reciprocal trade policy.

Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I offer for inclusion in the RECORD the following timely address by the Honorable Vincent R. Impellitteri at the formal joint opening session of the fifty-second national encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in New York, August 27:

Commander in Chief Ralls, Madam President of the Ladies Auxiliary, Mrs. Ilg, fellow veterans of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, ladies, and gentlemen, as a member of the VFW it is a particular privilege for me as mayor of the city of New York to extend official greetings and words of welcome to you at this opening session of your national encampment. I know that I need not tell you or your encampment directors that for many weeks now all preparations have been made for your convenience and comfort, and to insure that your week-long meeting in our city will be the most profitable and enjoyable one in your long history of service to our country.

All municipal departments and agencies have been alerted, and the city's vast resources are at your disposal.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, founded just before the turn of the century in 1899 as a national, non-partisan, nonsectarian, overseas organization, has been a potent force for good in war and peace for more than a half century now. Its current membership of nearly 1,200,000, affiliated through 10,000 posts or local units, has left an indelible mark of service since the days of its organization immediately after the Spanish-American War.

The VFW still includes veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Chinese Boxer Rebellion, the Philippine Insurrection, the Cuban Pacification, World War I, and various armed campaigns and expeditions, such as the Haitian campaign of 1919-20, the Yangtze River campaigns of 1926-27 and 1930-32, the Nicaraguan campaign of 1933; and soldiers, sailors, marines, and coast guardsmen with campaign-ribbon service in World War II, and, more recently, veterans of the Korean war.

As we pick up our newspapers today, the headlines become more ominous, with truce talks stalled and called off, and certain segments of the world intent on destroying the freeman's way of life. It is, therefore, particularly appropriate that your fifty-second national encampment is dedicated to the ideals and principles that found immortal expression in the Declaration of Independence, whose one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary our country is celebrating this year. In this connection I should like to quote from the encampment message of Commander in Chief Ralls, which tersely sums this up:

"In commemoration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence this year, I am happy to dedicate our fifty-second national encampment to the spirit of that sacred charter. We call upon all loyal Americans to join with us in pledging ourselves to a redeclaration of independence from the forces of evil and a new dependence on a kind and bountiful God. * * *

"Today our way of life is being threatened by the global menace of communism. We

are engaged in a struggle that is demanding tremendous sacrifices from those who are serving in the Armed Forces and from every loyal American on the civilian front. * * *

"In our debates and discussions, let us be guided solely by what we truly believe in our hearts is the best for America."

Those last words of your commander in chief have been the keystone of the more than 50 years of service of the VFW to its countrymen. There is no truer guide to honest action than that we "be guided solely by what we truly believe in our hearts is the best for America."

The limited time allotted to me will not even permit a recitation of the many services for veterans, their families, and for their communities in which the VFW is engaged. Your legislative bureau in Washington sponsors and keeps abreast of legislation for the benefit of all war veterans and repeatedly has urged Congress to enact laws dealing with veterans' employment, education, medical care, pensions, and benefits for widows and orphans of veterans.

Your legislative service sponsored and sought enactment of laws affecting national security, universal military training, immigration, taxation, social security, Armed Forces unification, atomic-energy policies, foreign affairs, and countless other matters of general public interest.

Your rehabilitation service has gone on, uninterrupted, throughout your long history. For instance, during the first 4 years after World War II approximately 1,000,000 veterans' claims were filed with the VFW Rehabilitation Service, and almost a half billion dollars was recovered for veterans through 750,000 appearances of your experts before governmental agencies—all without cost to individual veterans.

Your work for dependents has justly won national acclaim. Since 1925 your national home at Eaton Rapids, Mich., has been a safe refuge for children whose veteran fathers are deceased or totally disabled.

Throughout its existence, the Veterans of Foreign Wars has consistently advocated preparedness against war. The VFW has ever stressed the high price and futility of warfare, but it eternally dedicated to the principle that it will fight, if necessary, to safeguard our democratic way of life.

Last, but not least, the VFW plays a vital role in every community where its maltese cross is emblazoned, through its grass roots community services.

In one of the recent issues of your national magazine, Commander Ralls, in his monthly letter, stresses that your community service programs have given life to VFW activities by doing something.

He very properly emphasized that a post that exists only on paper is doomed to the fate that awaits old soldiers. Says your chief:

"The VFW post that is fading away is just as useless to itself and the VFW as the post afflicted with an acute case of rigor mortis * * * If all of our 10,000 posts can be persuaded to act on the simple formula of doing something, I honestly believe the VFW can become the largest and most powerful veterans' organization in the country."

It is in your community service work that your auxiliary plays such a prominent role, and I feel the good women of the auxiliary are to be commended for this undertaking.

In this connection, I should like also to say just a word of tribute to our city's own Ketchum-Hennessey Post of Coney Island, Brooklyn, which was selected as the leading VFW post in the State of New York in the field of community activities.

In closing may I say that I know the 8,000,000 people of our city are grateful to the VFW for its staunch role on their behalf these past 50 years. I know that I can say

for each and every one of them that they are proud to be your hosts.

I have taken liberties with Commander in Chief Ralls' convention statement, and now I should like to quote briefly the national president of your auxiliary, Mrs. Sue Ilg, of Edgewood, R. I., who states:

"We are meeting in a period of national stress, when loyalty to ideals, faith in our Nation, concern for our fellow citizens and service to those who fight in defense of this Nation and its principles are of major importance."

It is to these principles that the VFW is dedicated.

May your encampment in our city be a most fruitful one so as to help safeguard for all of us the ideals and principles that have made our Nation the beacon light of freemen everywhere.

Missouri Basin Survey Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 28, 1951

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, last week, together with 14 other Senators, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 93, to establish a Missouri Basin Survey Commission. In introducing the joint resolution, I pointed out that I believe the time has come to put an end to jurisdictional disputes and misunderstanding and emotional arguments and to get down to business in formulating a workable, comprehensive, long-range program for effectively harnessing the water resources of the Missouri Valley.

A recent editorial in the Washington Post, discussing the various conflicting approaches to this problem, asks:

Should there not be created a national commission, with no doctrinaire axe to grind, to study the Missouri Valley and make recommendations as to what over-all objectives should be?

Just such a study would be the duty of the Commission proposed in our joint resolution.

The editorial further speaks of the necessity for local participation and states:

Popular participation is basic in any satisfactory program, the people in the areas concerned should have an active voice in deciding what the program should be.

Mr. President, I should like to stress again that this, too, is a basic concept of our proposed resolution. This feature was, I believe, made clear in my remarks on introducing the measure, when I said:

After long study of this problem, I have become convinced that no single plan will succeed in the area unless it has a large measure of local acceptance and support. My resolution, I believe, offers a new approach from this standpoint. It encourages local participation by requesting the governors of the Missouri Basin States to appoint representatives to an advisory committee to the Commission. The members of the advisory committee are invited to attend the meetings of the Commission and present

the desires and views of the individual States. Moreover, the Commission is directed to go into the area and conduct on-the-site surveys and appraisals of resources-development programs. Of prime importance, however, is the provision that the Commission would hold hearings throughout the area. It would go into the valley with an open mind. It would listen to the people who live and work in the region and would learn their sentiments and their thinking on all of the many water problems. I believe this is a healthy approach and I believe that through it the various divergent groups, representing differences in thought, understanding, and judgment on the problem, would find themselves in substantially greater agreement than disagreement on many of the issues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the editorial from the Washington Post of August 25, entitled Patchwork Valley, which is both constructive and thought-provoking.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PATCHWORK VALLEY

Now that public interest in the Missouri Valley is aroused as a result of the recent floods, there is an admirable opportunity to develop a fresh approach toward valley development. What has taken place along the Missouri River so far is a patchwork—or rather, a series of patchworks—principally because there is no guiding over-all plan. With the clamor for more flood-control measures in the wake of what happened in Kansas and Missouri, the danger is that there will be a stampede for new dams and reservoirs with no thought of how they can best be fitted into the interests and resources of the Missouri Valley as a whole.

The Federal Government has invested large amounts of money in the loosely-knit Pick-Sloan plan and, in lieu of something better, vast new expenditures are contemplated. The trouble with the Pick-Sloan plan is that it attempts to marry irreconcilables, such as irrigation and navigation, and that by failing to include all the components of water-resource control it leaves the interagency fight unappeased. Some persons feel that the great dams and reservoirs now being demanded in Kansas will be purchased only at the expense of flooding great areas of farm land which would be perfectly usable under a more comprehensive plan. Is it not time for a stock taking before more money is spent? Should there not be created a national commission, with no doctrinaire ax to grind, to study the Missouri Valley and make recommendations as to what over-all objectives should be?

This does not mean that any program of valley development should be imposed from the top. That is the trouble with the proposed Missouri Valley authority, and to a lesser extent with the present plans for flood control. Popular participation is basic in any satisfactory program; the people in the areas concerned should have an active voice in deciding what the program should be.

Perhaps the Missouri Valley is too big an area to tackle all at once. Possibly the most effective plan for the Missouri Valley would be in the integration of smaller programs for individual watersheds, such as the Kaw, the Big Blue, and the Platte Rivers. Although the Federal Government properly ought to have a say where Federal money is concerned, perhaps the most useful role of the Government at this stage would be in serving as a catalyst to get local groups interested in "community watersheds" and in the development of comprehensive regional programs.

In any event, a study by representative citizens of the Missouri Valley as a whole could be of invaluable assistance in promoting broad thinking and in shedding light where there now seems to be largely confusion.

Rural Electrification Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Allen Shivers, Governor of Texas, has set aside a week as Rural Electrification Week in recognition of the outstanding work which has been done by Texas REA cooperatives. The development of REA has brought a new way of life to the farm families in my district and has opened opportunities for new industry and greater comfort throughout the district. The city of Bryan is unique in that it owns and operates a REA cooperative which has achieved outstanding success in providing service to most of the farm families of Brazos County.

The following editorial, which appeared in the Bryan Daily Eagle, gives recognition where recognition is due to the progress made by Texas REA co-ops:

REA WEEK

The week has been set aside, through the medium of a proclamation by Gov. Allen Shivers, as Rural Electrification Week. As a result many of the REA cooperatives that have been organized in Texas, as well as in other States, will take time out to do some celebrating.

The city of Bryan and its citizenship, as well as thousands of men, women, and children in the immediate trade territory, should be interested in this proclamation. Bryan occupies a unique position in the development of rural electric service and in the whole REA development, since it is the only city in Texas that owns and operates an REA system and, from all accounts, now is the only city in the United States engaged in such an enterprise. Today there are 77 REA co-ops in Texas—and Bryan.

The establishment of the Rural Electrification Administration as an agency of the Department of Agriculture does not reach back into history. In fact the rural electrification movement is only about 30 years old and in that period electric current has been made possible to about 4,900,000 of the 5,200,000 occupied farms of the Nation and to about 15,000,000 of the 15,500,000 occupied rural dwellings.

The growth that has been recorded throughout the country has been matched by the progress in this community. The energizing of the Bryan system's first line was in December, 1937, less than 14 years ago. Since that time approximately 3,000 rural families in Brazos County and in sections of Burleson and Robertson Counties have tied into the Bryan REA system. This not only has brought more comfort, as well as light, into rural homes but has made possible such developments as the dairy industry, today an important agricultural activity of this section. It also will be a factor in the development of the broiler

industry, now in swaddling clothes in this county but struggling to get out of them.

The approximately 3,000 consumers which include not only rural homes but churches and schools, and dairies and gins and rural stores—in fact all rural activity has been aided by the availability of electric current—are served by something more than 650 miles of line. The power is produced at the Bryan power plant.

The development of the Bryan REA system is expected to make possible, within the comparatively near future, the development of a rural telephone system for the area served by the REA system. This matter already has been discussed with USDA officials connected with the REA and since this city already has the right-of-way and the poles and line the development of a rural telephone system would be comparatively simple and a survey now being made shows a satisfactory interest despite unfavorable crop conditions.

The REA system and the probability of a rural telephone system which would be made possible by Bryan, are highly important as good-will builders and as community developers. The REA is paying its way and there is no reason to doubt the proposed telephone system would also pay out. This community has every reason to join in the observation of Rural Electrification Week, since making electric light and power available to the rural areas adjacent to Bryan has been of high value to both those served and the people of the city.

Tribute to the AMVETS by Hon. Brian McMahon, of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 29, 1951

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement prepared by me in tribute to the AMVETS as they assemble this week in Boston at their seventh national annual convention.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

As the seventh annual national convention of the AMVETS convenes this week in Boston, I wish to say a few words of tribute to that young organization.

It is fitting that such tribute should be paid at this time because of the outstanding work which AMVETS have done in civil defense during the year now ending. They have long been recognized for the solid and constructive programs in foreign affairs, veterans' rehabilitation, and military preparedness which have emanated from each of their annual conventions. But a year ago, at the convention in Cleveland in September 1950 they added new laurels as a result of the sound measures which they adopted regarding civil defense.

By unanimous resolution, AMVETS pledged their full cooperation to civil-defense authorities throughout the country. They directed that civil-defense committees be established in every post and department and that these committees give their active and wholehearted support to the civil-defense programs in their home communities. This

has been done throughout the country in a way that is indeed gratifying.

In addition to these measures, the AMVETS advocated that a national blood-typing program be made a part of the civil-defense preparations in each city and State in order to increase the registers of potential blood donors at hospitals and blood banks, thereby making possible the collection of great quantities of whole blood in an emergency, whether the result of war or civil disaster.

The importance of such a program is underlined by these basic facts.

First, it has been estimated that several million pints of whole blood might be needed within the first few weeks of an attack on our civilian population. In one city alone, hit by a single atom bomb, more than 250,000 pints of whole blood will be needed in the first 3 weeks.

Second, whole blood can be preserved for only 3 or 4 weeks. It would be extremely wasteful and probably impossible to maintain a 3-week stockpile of several million pints. It would mean bleeding several million donors every 3 weeks to maintain such a stockpile.

Blood plasma will be used, of course, because it can be stored for several years and, therefore, can be stockpiled. It is useful in many ways, but it is by no means a complete substitute for whole blood. It lacks the red blood cells necessary to carry food and oxygen to injured areas of the body.

Whole blood, therefore, will be needed immediately, and needed in large quantities. Extensive blood-typing programs in advance of an enemy attack upon this country will greatly simplify the collection of blood when that attack comes.

Advance blood typing does not eliminate the need for retying at the time blood is collected, but it will save valuable time and countless lives. And it will achieve two other vitally important results.

First, it will help train the highly efficient organization that must be ready to stage mass blood collections from persons outside the attacked areas. As one civil defense authority has said: "To activate an adequate and safe wartime blood program without previous, extensive, actual experience in peacetime would be virtually impossible."

Second, extensive peacetime blood-typing programs will bring about immediate expansion in the production of critically short blood typing serum. Today there is only enough serum on hand to blood-type but a few hundred thousand of the several million donors who will be called on to give blood in the first few weeks after a bombing attack.

In conjunction with the blood-typing program, AMVETS urged that there be issued to each civilian an identification tag bearing his name, address, blood group, and Rh type. They entered upon their own program of research to determine the best materials and design for the tag and the basic information that should be included on it. Later, when the Federal Civil Defense Administration began studies of this subject, AMVETS made available the vast amount of information which they had assembled.

Months ahead of others, the AMVETS carried out a blood-typing campaign on a city-wide basis in order to show its practicability and to determine the best methods of operation. With community-wide support of the people of Allentown, Pa., an extensive blood-typing program was launched in that city last December 4. The program there won the support of municipal and civil defense officials, medical authorities, civic groups, business and industrial organizations, and the public generally.

In late December 1950 these pioneering efforts began winning through, for as the

year ended the new Federal Civil Defense Administration announced its approval of extensive blood-typing programs in critical target areas and declared further that "a peacetime, widespread blood-grouping program, not confined to target areas, would be of great help in making large numbers of group O donors available in an emergency."

In complete accord with the ideas which AMVETS had expressed earlier, the Federal Civil Defense Administration pointed out that the process of collecting blood in an emergency would be "greatly expedited and simplified" by a previous blood-typing program.

Early this year the AMVETS undertook to acquaint State and municipal authorities with the progress and results of their long study. This informational campaign is largely responsible for bringing about the widespread discussions now being held in towns and cities throughout the country on blood-typing programs. Today there is hardly a community of any size that is not now turning its attention to detailed consideration of extensive blood typing of its citizens. The impetus for these discussions has come from the AMVETS. Their work has brought nearer the day when such projects will be undertaken everywhere in the country.

The task is far from completed. The real work of putting such programs into operation remains to be done. But AMVETS' past record of achievement is convincing proof that they will be in the forefront in carrying out this work in the communities throughout America.

But more than that, their counsel and help will be sought from many quarters. In the months that they have devoted to research and study, AMVETS have become perhaps the leading nongovernmental lay authority in the Nation on the methods and procedures for large-scale operation of blood typing and blood tagging programs. Their understanding of both the technical and organizational aspects of the problem has prepared them to aid our States and cities in this work.

They have assembled operational data on the problems of organization, financing, enlistment of volunteer workers, and public education through every media of publicity. This vast information would be invaluable as a guide to any community undertaking a blood typing program.

One cannot conclude this story of foresight and courage without paying respect to the two men whose leadership made it possible. Harold Russell, the National Commander of AMVETS, and Gen A. A. Vandegrift, former Commandant of the Marine Corps, now serving as the AMVETS chief of civil defense.

Notable among the others who have played a leading part in this work are Caryl Warner, of Los Angeles, who was chairman of the Civil Defense Committee at the AMVETS 1950 convention and who was instrumental in first developing the program; Paul H. Kern, civil defense director of Allentown, Pa., who directed the blood-typing program in that city; Harold A. Keats, finance administrator of the AMVETS National Service Foundation, who was conspicuous in the early development of the program; Joseph M. Gelman, Ford Forsythe, and James Laverty, who directed the program in Pittsburgh; John G. Hundley, the civil defense coordinator for AMVETS; and John C. Palmer, the deputy civil defense coordinator.

In times like these, we can draw renewed confidence in the strength and well being of this Nation from the noble example of the AMVETS. These young men and women have given us an eloquent demonstration of their great principle—in war a mighty shield, in peace a tower of strength.

Why All This War Scare Talk?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN T. WOOD

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, while there is not a particle of evidence to prove that Communist Russia has a single atom bomb—although traitors have tried desperately to furnish Russia all atomic secrets—the President has gone on the radio to picture the havoc to American cities by an atomic attack from Russia. Not only has the atom bomb been overexploited, but the war potential of Russia has been overexploited and greatly exaggerated, as is shown by the reliable and accurate Washington News Bulletin No. 171 of August 27, 1951, hereto appended.

Why then the feverish activity to pour billions into defense armaments not only for the United States but for all countries outside the iron curtain? There are just two reasons: First, the pseudo economists of the 'New Deal-Fair Deal' have made such a mess of our economy that they must promote wars and rumors of wars to keep our economy going; and, second, international conspirators see in this an opportunity to drain away our wealth, destroy our domestic economy, and gain control of the strategic materials of the world and thereby dominate and control American industry and commerce.

Our most dangerous enemies are not in Korea, China, or Russia, but right here in the United States. The United Nations, the International Bank and Fund, and a debauched, manipulated, irredeemable currency supply the tools with which these subversives work and the vehicles on which they are riding to power, and until we strip them of these tools, all the present frenzied efforts for world peace, economic stability, and national security are just so much sound and fury signifying nothing.

Fear of Russia is merely one of the instruments used by these conspirators to attain their objectives.

Communist Russia is the greatest economic hoax in all history; ready to fall apart from her own internal weaknesses when our enemies within and without withdraw their support. Russia dare not start world war III, even if she were economically able, because the Balkans are seething with revolt and ready to rise against their oppressors at the first opportunity, and Russia knows that.

There is no war talk in Europe such as we hear in the United States. But for the two reasons mentioned above the administration is piling crisis on crisis, emergency on emergency; and the beating of the war drums and the barking of the dogs of war have so unhinged our reason and detracted our attention that we seem totally oblivious of the fact that we are being rushed headlong into a

situation many times worse than war—total economic collapse—which means unbridled anarchy throughout the world, the break-down of civilization, and a throw-back to the Dark Ages.

The Senate got us into this mess by ratifying the United Nations, the Bretton Woods monetary agreements, and the Atlantic Pact, and it is up to the Senate to get us out of them.

Common sense dictates that the way to prevent wars and depressions is to eliminate the causes. Every war is, in essence, and economic war; and the underlying causes of wars and depressions, booms and busts, inflation and deflation are unsound monetary and fiscal policies of governments. These causes can be eliminated in 90 days without cost to the American taxpayers, without economic disturbances of any kind, and without sacrificing the life of a single American boy in foreign wars, merely by carrying out a legislative mandate that has been on our statute books for 57 years—section 311, United States Code, Annotated, chapter 8, 28 Statutes 4.

World peace, economic stability, national security, and the survival of constitutional government are predicated on a sound monetary system because money is the measure of the value of all goods and services; and unless that measure is honest, constant, and invariable, millions of people will be cheated in the sale of their goods and services while others will profit unjustly, and chaos, confusion, and war will be inevitable.

A sound, honest, dependable monetary system which maintains and protects the solvency and integrity of the people's money, and guarantees the redemption of currency at face value, on demand, will do more to prevent war, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, and promote peace and harmony among nations than all the United Nations, Bretton Woods Agreements, Marshall plans, Atlantic Pacts, or point 4 programs ever devised.

Those who ignore facts and realities and permit themselves to be stampeded into voting away billions and billions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money for global boondoggling and arming European nations that do not want to be armed, at the risk of bankrupting the United States, will probably live to see even the school children point them out as Benedict Arnolds.

Washington News Bulletin, No. 171, follows:

SOVIET UNION TOO WEAK LOGISTICALLY TO FIGHT A WAR AGAINST WESTERN EUROPE AND THE ALLIES AT THE PRESENT TIME

The immediate possibility of a third world war should be considered from a logistic standpoint.

A brief survey indicates that the Soviet Union has several inherent weaknesses, which by all military experience should deter her from an attack on Western Europe and the Allied Nations constituting the present North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

In order to successfully prosecute a war of aggression, certain basic elements are necessary. Among these are men and materials. The Soviet Union has the manpower beyond question. However, when it comes to material, the scales are tipped heavily in favor of the Allies.

There is an old saying that armies travel on their stomachs.

This brings into focus the ability of the Soviet Union to feed and support expeditionary forces for aggression in Europe.

Without giving consideration to the agricultural production of Europe, which might for the time being fall before a quick advance of an aggressor, the agricultural potential of the United States alone is far greater than that of the Soviet Union. Although the Soviet Union has slightly more tillable land than the United States, the rainfall and climate limit the production to no inconsiderable degree. A comparison of the principal agricultural crops of the United States and the Soviet Union is shown by the table following:

Item and year	American production	Soviet Union production
Wheat, 1949.....bushels..	1,146,463,000	1,100,000,000
Winter rye, 1949.....do.....	18,697,000	950,000,000
Oats, 1949.....do.....	1,322,924,000	775,000,000
Barley, 1948.....do.....	315,894,000	315,000,000
Corn, 1948.....do.....	3,681,793,000	140,000,000
Rice, 1948.....do.....	85,056,000	15,555,500
Cotton, 1949.....bales..	16,034,000	2,070,000
Sugar (domestic).....pounds..	3,950,130,000	3,964,000,000
Tobacco, 1948.....do.....	1,980,000,000	380,000,000
Livestock, head, 1949 ¹		
Cattle.....	78,298,000	54,000,000
Hogs.....	57,128,000	15,000,000
Sheep and goats.....	127,651,000	87,000,000
Horses.....	5,898,000	10,800,000

¹ Goats numbered 4,000,000 in 1949. In Russia goats are commonly owned by many families too poor to keep milk cattle.

AGRICULTURAL AID TO RUSSIA IN WORLD WAR II

After the United States entered World War II, lend-lease was made available to the Soviet Union. Eligibility was declared on November 7, 1941, and a lend-lease agreement executed June 11, 1942.

Of the more than \$11,500,000,000 in aid to the Soviet Union, largest single item was agricultural products. The total shipments to the end of 1946 in pounds are shown by the table following:

Item	Shipped under lend lease	Distributed by UNRRA	Total agricultural aid
	Pounds	Pounds	Pounds
Meats and meat products.....	2,152,881,000	264,889,000	2,417,770,000
Fats and oils, butter.....	1,884,806,000	53,760,000	1,938,566,000
Milk processed.....	218,769,000	89,856,000	308,625,000
Eggs and products (dried).....	242,458,000	242,458,000
Rice and rice flour.....	135,808,000	3,983,000	135,791,000
Vegetables.....	53,970,000	33,159,000	87,129,000
Pulses.....	567,186,000	30,415,000	597,601,000
Wheat and flour.....	1,502,820,000	1,502,820,000
Cheese.....	69,814,000	12,063,000	81,877,000
Other foods.....	315,782,000	8,585,000	324,367,000
Total pounds of food supplied.....			7,636,714,000

The farmers in the Soviet Union do not have the advantage of mechanization to the extent enjoyed by American farmers. For example, in 1940, there were 523,000 tractors in the Soviet Union compared with 1,447,000 in the United States. Much of the work done on farms in Russia proper is with draft animals, and the average Russian harvests the crops from about 8 acres of land compared with the average harvest in the United States of more than 27 acres.

It is apparent, therefore, in case of a war with the Soviet Union, the agricultural production of the United States, coupled with that of Canada and other Western Hemisphere nations, gives the Allies a big advantage when it comes to feeding the forces who will do the fighting.

We now move to the consideration of the potentials in steel and petroleum products without which wars cannot be fought along the present strategic plans.

STEEL CAPACITY OF THE SOVIET UNION AND SATELLITES

Steel is a vital necessity in war. Without it in abundance, no nation can long fight a war of aggression. So it is pertinent to compare the quantities of ingots and castings the United States can turn out compared with the capacities of the Soviet Union and her satellites, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Austria, and Hungary.

The American Iron and Steel Institute, in a background memo of February 1951, quotes the following:

"By turning out almost 97,000,000 tons of ingots and castings in 1950, steel companies in the United States of America produced approximately the same amount of steel as all other countries of the world.

"Retaining its position for the fourth consecutive year as second largest steel-producing country in the world, Russia turned out an estimated 26,500,000 tons of steel, or 13 percent of global output. Combined production for the Soviet satellite countries of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Austria, and Hungary was estimated at 7,500,000 tons in 1950. This tonnage, coupled with Russian output, brought to approximately 34,000,000 tons the steel production for Communist-dominated countries of the world."

CRUDE PETROLEUM AND REFINERY CAPACITIES

In 1949, the production of crude petroleum in the United States reached a total of 1,840,307,000 barrels of 42 United States gallons.

By way of comparison the production of the Soviet Union and all of Europe was but 291,726,000 barrels.

Refinery capacities reported by the American Petroleum Institute, as of January 1, 1950, were as follows:

United States: Three hundred and sixty-seven refineries with daily capacity of 6,696,300 barrels.

Soviet Union: Twenty-five refineries with daily capacity 650,000 barrels.

Yugoslavia: Five refineries with daily capacity 8,300 barrels.

Poland: Six refineries with daily capacity 7,100 barrels.

Hungary: Eight refineries with daily capacity 19,700 barrels.

Austria: Nine refineries with daily capacity 26,100 barrels.

Rumania: Sixteen refineries with daily capacity 181,500 barrels.

The table shows that Russia and all her satellites have a combined refining capacity of 892,000 barrels a day compared with the United States total of 6,696,300 barrels a day.

The transport of crude and refined petroleum products is very important in time of war. This brings up the question of pipelines and tankers. The United States had 578 tankers in 1949, with 5,439,000 gross tons

capacity, compared with 16 of the Soviet Union, with a capacity of 106,126 gross tons.

As far as this story goes, we wonder just how scared our military men really are of the big red bear?

PAUL O. PETERS.

Consolidation of Veterans' Administration District Offices in Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 29, 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD a statement I have issued with respect to consolidation by the Veterans' Administration of their Richmond, Philadelphia, New York, and Boston district offices, at Philadelphia.

Although this consolidation affects my States and removes the district office from Richmond, Va., with 800 employees, I favor it, as I am convinced it is a proper move in the interest of retrenchment, simplification and efficiency. The time has come when all of us must recognize that retrenchment in Federal public spending, which is so necessary, means sacrifices in our own localities. This consolidation will save, I am convinced, approximately \$1,300,000, and, for this reason, I favor it and save so announced.

This consolidation will permit the elimination of 372 supervisory positions. There are now 4 division chiefs, and, as a result of the consolidation, there will be only 1. There are more than 12 units in each of the 4 divisions, making 48 chiefs of units, and, under the consolidation, there will be only 1. Carrying this down throughout the managerial operation will mean, I am convinced, that the minimum of savings I have just stated, as estimated by the Veterans' Administration will be realized.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Veterans' Administration, as an economy move, has ordered consolidation of its Richmond, Philadelphia, New York, and Boston district offices at Philadelphia.

Naturally I have received numerous oral and written requests to oppose removal of the district office from Richmond, and in response to these requests I have endeavored to establish the facts in the case.

As a result of my investigation I am assured that there is no basis for fear that service to veterans or their dependents will be impaired by this consolidation.

The savings resulting from the consolidation of these four district offices are real, and I believe they will total more than \$1,300,000 per year.

As chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I know from my own investigation that the Veterans' Administration has been overstaffed and overorganized, and I have frequently called upon it to reduce its nonessential expenditures. I believe that this

can be done without impairment of its legitimate services to deserving veterans. As of July the Veterans' Administration was employing more than 182,000 persons with a payroll of more than a half billion dollars a year. This is an employee for every 100 veterans of all wars whether they are participating in veterans' programs or not.

We are faced with the possibility of confiscatory taxation which would destroy the free enterprise system and bleed white those of us paying individual income taxes even in the lower- and middle-income brackets.

If we are to survive we must change this course. We must submit to economies in nonessentials, both at Washington and at the State levels of Federal agency operation.

Under the circumstances I cannot oppose a sincere effort for economy through consolidation in a Federal agency when I am assured that the economy is real and that essential services will not be impaired. On the contrary, it is incumbent upon the Veterans' Administration to institute such efficiency whenever and wherever it is possible.

Naturally I regret that I am unable to accede to the wishes of those who requested me to oppose this consolidation, but I do not feel that I can sincerely talk economy in Washington and oppose economy in Federal operations in Virginia.

Washington Merry-Go-Round

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 29, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the column entitled "Washington Merry-Go-Round," published in the Washington Post on Monday, August 27, 1951, which I wrote, substituting for Drew Pearson.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, substituting for Drew Pearson)

Sometimes the actual Washington Merry-Go-Round whirls so fast and reverses directions so often that observers get pretty dizzy and confused just trying to follow it. In fact, the contradictions of certain high-up folks in Washington can really make even an expert's head spin. These contradictions remind you of a lot of Alices in a fantastic blunderland.

Do you think, for example, that the present Democratic administration is liberal and that its Republican opposition is reactionary. If so, consider these items which tell a revealing story:

GAS GOUGE

You, the consumer, are soon going to have to pay still more for natural-gas fuel. How come? Well, you can thank the great liberal Democratic Party for those high rates. A Democratic President, Harry Truman, had soundly vetoed a bill (backed by leading Democrats) which would have indirectly resulted in increasing natural-gas rates. Many Republicans like myself supported and applauded the Democratic President's veto.

Later, however, as reported by Drew Pearson and others, the Federal Power Commission (appointed by the same President)

completely reversed the President's action and a Democratic-appointed Supreme Court by exempting independent gas producers from Federal rate control. But do you suppose that the President criticized the Federal Power Commission for its dangerous action? No, definitely not. The President said the FPC decision had no connection with his previous veto (even though it completely reversed the veto).

So here we have a good Democrat, Harry Truman, patting on the back by implication other good Democrats who have completely stabbed one of his own policies in the back. Dose that make sense? Of course not. Moreover, the Republicans whom the President has repeatedly attacked as allegedly not being interested in you, the consumer, have been the principal ones who have fought to protect the consumer from these gas-rate increases.

SEAWAY SABOTAGE

Take another instance. In his recent speech in Detroit, President Truman rightly praised the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway as the most important single project facing this country. Yet, this very same project which would incidentally be self-paying and which has been endorsed by Herbert Hoover, Franklin Roosevelt, George Marshall, and so forth, has been blocked by some of the President's best friends in the Democratic-controlled Senate and House of Representatives. On the other hand, many of the leading advocates of the seaway are Republicans. So, here again we have Republicans supporting the President, while Democrats—with some notable and praiseworthy exceptions—are trying to sabotage the President and are working hand-in-glove with selfish, backward-looking railroad and port lobbies.

Had enough inconsistencies? Here are some more. The merry-go-round spins faster.

SOUTHWEST STEAL

The President says he opposes favors for special privilege groups. Yet, some of his leading supporters in the Senate have succeeded once again in passing—over Republican and some Democratic votes—a fantastic bill, the central Arizona project, which would pour three-quarters of a billion dollars down the rat-hole for the benefit of a few Arizona landowners. Some monkey business.

TIDAL TILL

In another interesting issue, the President rightly says he will veto any bill which quitclaims Federal title to the oil-rich marginal sea. Many Republicans like myself will support the President in such a veto. Why? Because we think—although a good many Republicans disagree—that all Americans are entitled to ownership of the tideland treasures. But who do you suppose is spearheading the effort to destroy Federal title? Why, principally, the very same Democratic leadership in the Senate and House which is usually, amazingly enough, trying not to decrease but to increase and expand Federal power. Is that contradictory? It certainly is. But, as the old saying goes, "It all depends on whose ox is gored."

CODDLING CRIME

Take another example. Back in April, one of the most difficult fights I ever had was to try to extend the life of our Senate Crime Investigating Committee. Who do you suppose fought against the extension? Some of the leading Democrats in the Senate (although they were afraid to do it openly). Now, the Special Crime Committee is coming to an untimely end as of September 1. There will be rejoicing then throughout the underworld. But do you suppose that the Senate Democrats will en-

courage the standing Interstate Commerce Committee to carry on where the special crime group's efforts left off? That remains to be seen. Judging from the past, the anti-crime crusade may now be put to sleep by probe-shy Democratic leaders. Yet conscientious Democratic members of the Crime Committee led the superb fight against crime in a nonpartisan way and worked in complete harmony with us Republicans against crooks and corruption. But that hasn't prevented some other Democrats from trying to hamstring our committee's work. Perhaps, the Democrats are afraid of exposing more shenanigans in the big-city machines (Bronx County, Cook County, etc.) which furnish the hard core of Democratic voting strength. Does that sound likely? Could be.

CONCLUSIONS

What do these examples prove? Just this: 1. Beware of ready-made labels for any political party. Neither party, be it Republican or Democratic, has a monopoly on virtue. But, certainly the Republican Party (and not just its so-called liberal wing) has a lot more virtue than its critics have attributed to it.

2. The term "liberal" itself is often a misnomer. It's easy for many Democrats to be liberal in spending other people's money and taking other people's rights away. I am against such liberalism, just as I would be against a conservatism or reaction which would try to turn the hands of the clock backward or which would attempt to deny certain progressive steps which the American people insist on in this modern age.

O. K., Drew, thanks for the ride on the Merry-Go-Round. You might call it the Carousel of Contradictions.

Political Conditions in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 29, 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address regarding political conditions delivered by Col. Robert R. McCormick, and broadcast over the Mutual Broadcasting System on August 11, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOPE FOR OUR FUTURE

(By Col. Robert R. McCormick)

During my recent 2 weeks' absence a considerable number of letters have accumulated, many of which despair the future of our country.

Much of this despair is attributable to petty men rattling around in positions of vast power in the executive branch of the Government and not a little of this despair is attributable to the failure of the legislative branch to throw off subservience to the White House and to assume the vital role contemplated by the founding fathers.

While it is true that a majority of the Democrats and a minority of Republicans are lacking in patriotism, it is fortunate for the country they do not always constitute a majority of the Congress. From time to time the true patriots in Congress have band-

ed together with determination and resolution to resist tyranny, and socialism, and treason, and boodling.

Despair is common in periods of crisis. Each generation is fond of looking at its problems as more difficult than those of the generations that have passed this way before us. The unsolved problem of today appears to be insurmountable by comparison with the solved problem of yesterday, although the latter loomed no less formidable when first it loomed against the horizon of history.

When unsolved problems rear to terrifying heights above us, progress seems slow. It is when we look back over the years that we can truly measure the progress that we have made and take heart in the future.

Almost 20 years ago, Franklin D. Roosevelt was a hero to the majority of the people. He strode the national scene, acclaiming himself as a paragon of moral virtue, a model of political propriety, and a colossus among statesmen. Hundreds of millions of dollars were expended by Federal propaganda mills to create and keep alive the fiction that Roosevelt was an all-wise, all-seeing, and all-honorable philanthropist, political philosopher, and great commander.

Today Roosevelt's stature is dwindling below the heroic and even below the human. He and most of his family stand revealed as having a careless regard for the commonest rules of morality as regards honesty and truth. And Roosevelt stands revealed as a short-sighted dupe, first of Britain and then of Russia, rather than the far-seeing statesman of the profiteering fictioneers.

The personal honesty of the Roosevelts must be measured against the story of John Hartford, head of the Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. At a time when the company was under the New Deal attack Roosevelt helped Elliott, one of his four sons, borrow \$200,000 from Hartford with some radio stock as collateral. The President clinched the loan for his son by addressing Hartford, a man he had never seen, as "John" over the telephone and inviting him to visit the White House.

But this was not all. The loan was made in 1939. For 3 years Hartford heard nothing from Elliott in the way of payment of principal or interest on the \$200,000 loan. In the meantime, the radio stock left with Hartford rose in value to over \$500,000. President Roosevelt sent his Secretary of Commerce, Jesse H. Jones, to Hartford to represent the stock as worthless and return it on settling the \$200,000 loan for \$4,000, or 2 cents on the dollar.

Jones turned the stock over to the President, who turned it over to Elliott, who in turn turned it over to his divorced second wife and their children as a divorce settlement.

Under no stretch of the circumstances can these transactions be characterized as honest. To be blunt they smack of the operations of confidence men, the most amiable of the crooks. Other devious financial operations have revealed the Roosevelts as something less than nice where money is concerned.

As a statesman Roosevelt was neither truthful nor honest with the American people. In the days before Pearl Harbor it has been disclosed Roosevelt deliberately kept the people and Congress uninformed. He operated by stealth to bring the Nation into war while cloaking his actions in trappings of defense and peace. Roosevelt made the destiny of the Nation the private concern of himself and a small coterie of fellow travelers.

As he did not consult the people in the making of war, Roosevelt did not consult the people, or their representatives in Congress, in the making of the peace.

In the crazy quilt of personal war and personal peace, Roosevelt betrayed allies and the American people to Soviet Russia. Pub-

lication of the secret agreements entered into at Tehran and Yalta demonstrate that Roosevelt betrayed Eastern Europe and China to communism and betrayed the United States to the Soviets even to the extent of furnishing Russia with bases from which to launch a military attack upon this country. I refer to the Kurile Islands, which lie between Japan and the Aleutians and which Moscow radio tells us have been transformed into a bastion of iron.

Rule by coterie under Roosevelt has become rule by crony under Harry S. Truman. Once again the American people are being kept uninformed and Congress is not being asked to advise, in fact, it is more frequently than not even being consulted. At Potsdam Truman ratified and augmented the betrayals of Yalta and Tehran. The conspiracy of communism was encouraged as Josef Stalin, the bloody murderer and bank robber, became "Good Old Joe," and the Communist traitors became nothing more than red herrings, even though their stench rose to high heaven in the nostrils of the body politic.

A little more than a year ago Truman wrapped Roosevelt's mantle of secret power politics and secret diplomacy about himself and declared a personal war in Korea. He defied constitutional war-making provisions, ignored Congress and the people, and embarked on a military operation for which even he himself has encountered difficulty in finding a name. His first choice was police action and his second limited war.

Whatever the name, his personal war has cost more than 60,000 casualties, which is a ghastly total for what is being represented as preventive war.

In recent months intimates of the President have been revealed as personally corrupt and, to say the least, careless of his honor. In fact, the history of the Truman administration is pockmarked with scandal upon scandal. We have a sordid parade in and out of the White House of vote fraudsters, 5 percenters, pardoned gangsters, influence peddlers, RFC favoritism, mink coats, home freezers, surplus profiteers, ship stealers, and assorted chiselers.

Truman's prestige has dwindled to so low an ebb that it is recognized that his only hope is to control the next Republican convention as he controlled the last through Thomas E. Dewey and the New York mesalliance of financiers, internationalists, and Communists. This strange combination has been pretty well exposed by the actions of Dewey and his chief lieutenant, John Foster Dulles. Dewey and Dulles have become synonymous for damaged goods since the revelation of Dewey's corrupt bargaining contained in the now infamous Joe Hanley letter and the disclosure of Dulles' part in the election of Alger Hiss, the Communist perjurer-spy, to the head of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

The Carnegie Foundation is linked by financial and ideological ties in an interlacing of directorate which comprises a solid phalanx of international do-gooders. There is an interlocking directorate in the Carnegie group with the Rockefeller Foundation, the Council on Foreign Relations, the Foreign Policy Association, the English Speaking Union, the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, and the World Peace Foundation. There organizations activated by men of common financial interests in internationalism, have been pouring out tax-exempt funds to promote globalism. Exposure of their activities will doubtless project their dissolution as un-American organizations as an issue in the forthcoming presidential campaign.

Looking backward over the last 20 years, there is no reason to despair of the future. We have made progress in recognizing deceit and trickery. In spite of the many billions

and vast powers at the command of the administration, brave men in Congress have so exposed communism that a score of Communists have been convicted by juries and a number, including Vanderbilt Field, that curious financial angel of destruction, have been jailed for contempt of court or contempt of Congress.

I represent these brave men in alphabetical order by branch of Congress so as not to make any comparisons between their patriotism. In the House, we had former Congressman Dies and Congressmen Busbey, Dondero, Hoffman, Vall, and Velde. In the Senate, we have had Senators Bridges, Ferguson, McCarran, McCarthy, Mundt, and Nixon. These men, with the help of high-minded colleagues, have made communism so unpopular that Harry Bridges is the only conspicuous Communist to hold this high place.

The decriers of McCarthyism and Operation Truth are fully discredited. The quasi-respectables, who go along with them, are beginning to see their peril. The truth is being recognized from the lie repeated a thousandfold. Truth is triumphing over calculated fiction. Fact is replacing myth. In the sense, BRICKER, BYRD, CAPEHART, DIRKSEN, GEORGE, JENNER, KEM, TAFT, and WELKER with those previously named are furnishing the desired patriotic leadership. The return of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur has brought all of his great genius to the aid of the patriots. He has brought the power of truth and military genius to bear on the world crisis.

William Fulton, the Tribune's New York correspondent, has exposed the conspiracy of the Rhodes scholars to subordinate this country to Socialist England. He has traced the indoctrination of these scholars in British ideals and their initiation into the secret society envisioned by Cecil Rhodes—into a secret society aimed at returning 48 States and two great Territories to Britain for the 13 colonies lost almost two centuries ago.

Drawing their inspiration from the decay of monarchy in Europe to socialism, these cabalists would overthrow the sublime concept of our founding fathers, who threw off the yoke of the tyranny state and erected the mighty structure of sovereignty of the people.

Frank Hughes of the Tribune staff has rendered no less yeoman service in exposing the Communist tinged gang that is working to destroy the freedom of the press and poison the foundations of education in order to subject this country to an autocratic world government. These enemies have been drawing their inspiration from all that is abhorrent in Europe to create an all-powerful world state, which would at once be our political master and our spiritual god. Fortunately, the exposures have come at a time when it is still possible to reverse the course of the despots and crackpots.

No, my friends, there is no reason for despair. The tide is turning with the brightening of a new dawn.

If our Congress is slow it is because its Members are largely submerged in the Capital throng of alien diplomats and alien-minded office holders and do not appreciate the public opinion at home. Even the tremendous mail in the wake of the MacArthur dismissal does not seem to have awakened some segments of Congress.

Only after a number of the laggards in patriotism have been defeated for renomination or reelection can we expect America to come to Washington. Then we will get a patriotic Congress to support a patriotic President.

Threat to a Free Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 29, 1951

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Threat to a Free Press," published in the Columbus Evening Dispatch of August 22, 1951. The Columbus Dispatch is one of the outstanding metropolitan newspapers of my State. The editorial deals with the covenant on human rights, and is one of the best discussions I have found of this matter which I have been bringing to the attention of the people of the United States on the floor of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THREAT TO A FREE PRESS

Members of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights (including Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt) have produced a draft on "freedom" of the press which comes straight out of the Fascist notebook.

The Commission hopes that the United States Senate will ratify this covenant. If it does, it will become the law of the land and it will supplant, as far as practice is concerned, the provision in the United States Constitution that Congress shall make no law which abridges the freedom of the press.

But here is what Mrs. Roosevelt and her foreign colleagues have proposed to restrict the press and which they hope the United States Senate will swallow and ratify.

"The right to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas carries with it special duties and responsibilities and may therefore be subject to certain penalties, liabilities, and restrictions, but these shall be such only as are provided by law and are necessary for the protection of national security, public order, safety, health or morals, or the right, freedom, or reputation of others."

It ought to be obvious that any political administration in Washington could use a law like this to stifle the press in the United States or to jail members of the press if they wrote anything displeasing to it. This law is precisely what Hitler or Stalin ordered.

Who is to say what is a transgression on the rights, freedoms, or reputations of others and then assess penalties, liabilities, and restrictions except the rulers of the nation?

With this law they would have the wedge to get the laws passed or issue the edicts imposing the "special duties and responsibilities" on the press they happen to desire, and to assess the "penalties, liabilities, and restrictions" to give their wishes teeth.

Argentina's Dictator Peron operated on precisely such a basis as this in his unlawful, unblushing suppression and seizure of La Prensa.

It ought to be obvious now a national political administration would consider editorial criticism of its foreign policy as contrary to national security which means, in such a case, the administration's personal, political security.

It should be plain how a national political administration would consider editorial criticism of traitors, bribe-takers, ballot-thieves, and the like in its ranks as being an attack on their reputations, however unsavory.

Actually the covenant, by limiting press restrictions only to those provided by law and necessary for the protection of national security, public order, safety, health, or morals or the rights, freedoms or reputations of others, covers everything. What couldn't one suppress under at least some provision of this broad restriction?

The covenant is quite applicable to conditions existing in almost all countries of the world save those of the west, and there are exceptions in that. Certainly the covenant is alien to all that freedom of the press connotes to Americans. It is a restrictive, totalitarian measure from top to bottom.

Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt betrayed the traditions of her country and the heritage that is hers, along with all her countrymen, when she allowed herself to be a party to this monstrous proposal.

As an alleged and self-styled "liberal," she falls into a characteristic liberal pattern which seldom visualizes a reform except that it be arbitrarily imposed and governed from a ruling elite. This always has meant the death of individual freedom.

But in view of the record and in view of what they propose, and how they propose it, the liberals are among the least concerned of all in genuine individual freedom, of which freedom of the press is a vital element.

Research Unlimited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ZALES N. ECTON

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 29, 1951

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a sermon on the subject Research Unlimited, by Dr. Peter Marshall, the late Chaplain of the Senate, whose daily prayers in the Senate were such an inspiration to all the Members of this body. I ask that the foreword also be printed.

There being no objection, the foreword and sermon were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

[From the Washington Post of February 24, 1950]

MANKIND NOW MUST MAKE MORAL PROGRESS FOR WORLD'S SAKE

FOREWORD

There are no other sermons like Peter Marshall's. For there was no other man like Peter Marshall.

The beloved Chaplain of the United States Senate, Peter Marshall, passed away recently at the age of 46. He had attained a national reputation at an age when most clergymen are still unknown.

The Washington Post during the early Lenten season is publishing the richest passages from Peter Marshall's most vigorous sermons. They were preached in Washington's historic New York Avenue Presbyterian Church. They were addressed to the man he called "Mr. Jones," to the multitude of clerks and taxi drivers, butchers and housewives, motemen and the lonely girl in the hospital ward.

Taken from the book, Mr. Jones, Meet the Master, the sermons preserve the emphasis of his words, by a special typographical style. The manuscripts are presented exactly as Peter Marshall prepared them.

RESEARCH UNLIMITED

(By Dr. Peter Marshall)

During the lifetime of most of us, science and invention has made its greatest strides.

Everybody over 40 can remember the mood of optimism that marked the first decade of the twentieth century.

People then were living in the days of the first telephones perfected for general use; the first express trains; the first uses of electricity; the first internal combustion engine.

Great things were in prospect.

The airplane no longer amazes, but whisks us across the continent from breakfast to supper.

Motion pictures have become a weekly diet.

Electric eyes open doors at our approach, and radio enables us to see in the dark.

Penicillin and sulfa drugs have conquered many a germ, and atomic energy has opened a vast new world.

All of this since most of us were born.

These latest inventions and discoveries have made war more terrible, and while they have given us many conveniences and comforts, they have made life more complicated, peace more difficult, and the human heart more troubled.

Undoubtedly we have improved means—but unfortunately we have not improved ends.

We have better ways of getting there, but we have no better places to go.

We can save more time, but we are not making any better use of the time we save.

Everyone agrees that we have made far more advances in the scientific world than we have made in the world of morals and ethics.

Spiritually, we have not kept pace with our progress in the realm of science and invention.

If great advances have been made in the realm of the spirit, then either they have not been reported or publicized, or we have chosen to ignore them, else we are forced to the conclusion that they have not been made at all.

Why is it that we have so little interest in spiritual discoveries—new discoveries of God, of God's working in His world, of God's dealing with His people?

The scientists have forged far ahead.

What they have invented and provided for us has outstripped our moral character, our spiritual quality, and our religious faith. Scientific discovery has gone far ahead of man's progress in the moral realm.

That is the trouble.

Some people have thought that the more science we have, the more religion can be discarded.

But that is not so.

Rather, the fact is that the more science we have, the more we need character-building religion.

We are now at the place where we see that progress simply must be made in the realm of morals and ethics and character, if civilization is to be saved.

The time has come when we must face the solving of the world's true problems—the human problems.

The problem of lying—which is called propaganda; the problem of selfishness, which is called nationalism or self-interest; the problem of greed, which is often called profit or good business; the problem of license disguised as liberty; the problem of just masquerading as love; the challenge of materialism—the hook that is baited with security.

These are the problems that confront us now.

Science has its foundation in research.

Its discoveries all rest upon the patience, willingness, and open-minded seeking of

thousands of men and women who have taken one single proposition and sat down humbly before it to explore and to test it, a great number of times, under varying conditions, and then to report the results.

Suppose that in this way, there were a comparable number of young men and women setting out to get their master's degree, or to write their Ph. D. thesis on their findings, after months of careful experiment with such propositions as these:

"Therefore take no thought, saying What shall we eat? or What shall we drink? or Wherewithal shall we be clothed? for your Heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things.

"But seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness and all these things shall be added unto you." (Matthew 6:31-33)

Or this one:

"Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you" (Matthew 7:7)

This sort of research could advance much faster than physical science, which requires special laboratories, perfect conditions, and expensive equipment.

For it's the sort of research that anyone can pursue.

You say you have no time?

Anyone of us could delve into it where we are as we are in our present jobs, and it would make our jobs new and exciting, humdrum no longer.

No time?

A tired-out rail splitter, crouched over his tattered books by candlelight at the day's end, preparing for his future, instead of snoring or sky-larking like his collaborators.

Lincoln cut out his path to later immortality in his spare time.

An underpaid and overworked telegraph clerk stole hours from sleep, or from play, at night, trying to crystallize into realities certain fantastic dreams in which he had faith.

Today, the whole world is benefiting by what Edison did—in his spare time.

You, too, have spare time.

Why not use it in this kind of research which pays wonderful dividends in this life and the next?

Suppose, for example, that a group of Christians decided to experiment with the Lord's exhortations to tithe for 1 year.

What do you suppose the results would be?

The tithe is the form of giving advocated in the Bible.

All through the Old Testament, the principle of dedicating the tenth to God is taught and observed.

So much was it a part of the habits and customs of men of that day that in New Testament times it was taken for granted—something that simply was expected of men of integrity.

Jesus expected it of men of God.

He felt it was only when a man began to give above his tenth that he was showing real generosity.

What if we were challenged to try it out for a year?

If you are a skeptic, would it not be worth your while to investigate in those cases where doctors can do nothing?

For you see, there are still miracles being performed.

I have seen them happen.

Still, in these latter days, there are clear evidences of God's power working in human affairs.

That we must admit.

God has not withdrawn any power that was available in the days of the first disciples.

There is certainly no indication in the Bible that the power given to them was for a certain period only, or to work in a certain location.

It was not like a free trial offer advertised "good only for 30 days."

If the other elements in the Gospel message were to have universal application, and to hold true until Christ returned, why not this element of healing, that has always had such a strong appeal to human hearts and is so wistfully remembered by those in trouble?

Everywhere He went, Christ was confronted with sickness and disease, and everywhere He did something about it.

Yet, there were times when He could do no mighty works, as Mark puts it, because of unbelief.

Where there was no faith, He was powerless.

And there were many cases of sickness where no healing was sought. "But," someone will say, "that was all very well for Christ to do these things, for after all, He was the Son of God.

He had powers unique as He Himself was unique.

True—but He promised the same powers to His disciples.

Christ said:

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on Me, the works that I do shall he do also, and greater works than these shall he do, because I go unto My Father."

Now, for some reason or other, we are inclined to skip over that promise, or to spiritualize it as though by the passing of the centuries the words have lost the meaning they apparently had to the first disciples.

The truth is that the church has permitted this breath-taking part of the Gospel to fall out of it.

Is the "good news" only for the soul?

Is it simply for the life to come, with no application to the life that now is?

The answer lies in a lack of researchers.

Men have been willing to let mosquitoes bite them in the interests of science and human welfare.

How many are willing to give themselves away to take risks in spiritual research?

No one yet has ever set out to test God's promises fairly, thoroughly, and humbly, and had to report that God's promises don't work.

On the contrary, given a fair opportunity, God always surprises and overwhelms those who truly seek with His bounty and His power.

We have neglected spiritual food.

Without spiritual exercise, our souls are soft and flabby.

The temptation is powerful to become so obsessed with the urgent, brutal facts of the immediate world that faith in Christ and His way of living becomes like a lovely impractical dream, a pious hope, a frail illusion.

The challenge today, pointed and heated by the atomic bomb, is still what it always was—a challenge to spiritual research.

Selling the United States Out to a Communist-Controlled World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN T. WOOD

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I want to present documented evidence to show that those who are so desperately trying to reduce the United States to the status of a mere province in a world government have

no hesitancy in deliberately and willfully evading the Charter of the United Nations as well as the Constitution of the United States when it serves their purpose.

Article 43 of the United Nations Charter provides, in plain terms, that member nations of the United Nations shall furnish armed forces, assistance, and facilities "for the maintenance of international peace and security" under agreements between such member nations and the United Nations Security Council, such agreements to be "subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes."

On April 27, 1951, in a speech before the American Society of International Law, Mr. Harding F. Bancroft, Deputy United States Representative on Collective Measures Committee of the United Nations, said that failure to provide armed forces and assistance when the shooting started in Korea created an "impasse" which "broke the ground for an alternate way around" the situation; that it called for "improvising;" and that troops were furnished for, and were fighting in, Korea pursuant to a "uniting for peace" resolution passed by the General Assembly of the United Nations. Bancroft thus admitted an evasion not only of the United Nations Charter, but an evasion and circumvention of the Constitution of the United States as well.

State Department Publication 3922, United States Policy in Korea, released in July 1950, shows that a Security Council resolution of July 7, 1950, recommended that member nations providing military and other assistance in Korea under United Nations resolutions of June 25 and 27, 1950, make such forces and assistance available to a "unified command under the United States," under the United Nations flag and under a commander designated by the United States. So, it seems, the United Nations started a war in Korea, and delegated its conduct to the United States, without compliance with article 43 of the United Nations Charter or with our Constitution.

In a letter of July 26, 1951, transmitting the 1950 annual report on United States participation in the United Nations, President Truman told Congress that—

The aggression against the United Nations—

In Korea—

brought home to all peoples the imperative need for developing more efficient means to deal with aggression within the framework of the United Nations. The Korean case has demonstrated that the United Nations can act effectively against aggression through recommendations of the Security Council, or the General Assembly, if the Security Council is paralyzed by the veto. But in Korea the participating nations had to improvise their measures from the ground up.

The statement is untrue, for the improvised action was not "within the framework of the United Nations," but it was a willful evasion of the United Nations Charter.

In the 1950 annual report to Congress, Secretary of State Acheson said:

The United Nations had to meet aggression—

In Korea—

without the means which had originally been expected to be available.

And after blaming Russia for member nations not having furnished troops, Secretary Acheson further told Congress:

No United Nations forces existed when on June 25, 1950, the North Korean Communists launched an armed attack upon the Republic of Korea. The United States and many other members carried out their Charter obligations loyally and courageously. However, as will be seen, their entire collective action had to be improvised.

More cold-blooded admissions of evasions and circumventions of both the United Nations Charter and the Constitution of the United States cannot be found, even in the files and reports of our arrogant bureaucracy.

Now, according to the Right Honorable Warren R. Austin, United States representative to the United Nations, these improvisations and evasions are to be made permanent; seemingly without even a belated consultation of Congress.

On August 27, 1951, Mr. Austin told the Veterans of Foreign Wars that "organization of a permanent United Nations peace force is underway at this very hour," under the guidance and direction of a United Nations committee on collective measures, seemingly the same one for which Mr. Bancroft spoke on April 27, 1951.

According to State Department Publication 3580, Postwar Foreign Policy Preparation, released in February 1950, Mr. Austin actively participated in the work of the Advisory Committee on Postwar Foreign Policy, which operated within the State Department from February 1942 in great secrecy to bring about the kind of world that the United States desired after the war. This last-mentioned publication shows, too, that forty-odd Members of Congress actively participated in the work of that committee, the existence and work of which were kept secret.

How much longer will Congress stand by and see the Constitution evaded and its provisions set at naught? It is time to call a halt on the internationalists who seek to destroy this Republic.

Comparison of the United States and Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 30, 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a condensa-

tion of a booklet entitled "At the Crossroads of Destiny," which pertains to a comparison of the geographical, political, and social aspects of the United States and Russia.

This booklet was prepared by Mr. Francis H. Buffum, of Concord, N. H., after exhaustive research into many aspects of the two countries. At my request Mr. Buffum, who is an outstanding citizen of the State of New Hampshire and a prominent writer on historical subjects, prepared this condensation so that I could commend it to my colleagues in the Senate for their study.

There being no objection, the condensation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TWO NATIONS COMPARED

In the course of their national development, Russia and America have now arrived at the point where their respective ideas regarding the individual and his relation to government have come into conflict on a world-wide front. Back of these ideas, and giving them practical effect, are the material resources and other factors that constitute national strength.

In area, population, and natural resources, Russia has a considerable advantage over the United States. It extends over one-sixth of the land area of the earth, and is almost three times as large as this country. Its population is about 196,000,000, and is increasing much faster than the population here, which is now 150,000,000. As a result of extensive surveys, it is believed to contain more of the basic minerals than any other country in the world. It is strategically located for defense against invasion and for the extension of its power on the continents of Europe and Asia.

The United States offers a striking contrast to Russia. With only 6 percent of the area of the world, and 7 percent of its population, this country has so far developed its natural resources and productive capacity that it produces 50 percent of the basic commodities of the entire world and, at present, four times as much of these as Russia.

It may well be asked why Russia, with its larger population and vast resources, lags so far behind the United States; or why, on the other hand, the United States, with a smaller population and probably less natural resources, has now four times the productive capacity of Russia and half that of the whole world.

The answer to these questions lies in the histories of the two countries which, when placed side by side for comparison, form one of the most interesting and instructive chapters in the record of human development and the rise of nations.

What concerns us here, however, is not Russian and American history, except insofar as the past of these two countries indicates what their future is likely to be. What does concern us, and concerns us vitally, is that the Russian bear has been awakened from his long sleep by the evil genius of communism, and for 31 years has been gaining in strength and sharpening his claws.

If the reawakening of Russia meant only the peaceful progress of a great people, there would need be no anxiety concerning its growing strength. But such is not the case. Under the ruthless dictatorship of its present masters, Russia's productive machine is being built for political power and geared to a war economy. This is the fact that makes the strength of Russia, in comparison with that of our own country, of such urgent importance to us all. That is why a comparison of Russian communism and American democracy is drawn in the following pages, for the relative strength of the two countries in days to come, as well as the course of

civilization itself, will depend upon which philosophy of life and system of government predominantly wins the allegiance of men and stimulates their productive efforts.

TWO PRINCIPLES OF GOVERNMENT

In looking for an answer to the question as to why the United States has so far outstripped Russia, we will find an answer at the same time to the question as to how the United States can continue to lead Russia and, indeed, the rest of the world—at least, until other countries learn and apply the principle upon which our greatness rests, or until we, in blindness, forsake it.

The answer is simple; so simple that many overlook it. But it is so important that no one can afford to ignore it. It is to be found in the difference that exists between two opposite and conflicting principles of government. These principles are based upon the state on the one hand, and upon the individual on the other.

The individual

The Individualist believes that he has been endowed by his Creator with certain inalienable rights—rights which may be summed up in the term "self-government." He believes that no other man or group of men has any right, divine or otherwise, to claim his involuntary allegiance. He has seen that men the world over, from time immemorial, and almost without exception, have governed in their own interest rather than in the interest of their subjects; and he is thereby confirmed in the determination to govern himself. He looks upon government as his servant, not his master, and joins with other men, equally free, in establishing where possible such a form of government as is necessary to preserve the rights which are naturally his, and to obtain mutual services that can better be obtained by collective action than by individual effort. Believing that he can grow to full mental, moral, and spiritual maturity as a man, only by an untrammelled and undictated exercise of his powers in every field of human endeavor, he strives in this sense to remain the master of his fate, the captain of his soul.

In the assertion of his personal rights as prior to the rights of government over him, he agrees with Thomas Paine who, in writing on the subject, had this to say:

"It has been thought a considerable advance toward establishing the principles of freedom, to say, that government is a compact between those who govern and those who are governed; but this cannot be true, because it is putting the effect before the cause; for as a man must have existed before governments existed, there necessarily was a time when governments did not exist, and consequently there could originally have been no governors to form such a compact with.

"The fact, therefore, must be, that the individuals themselves, each in his own personal and sovereign right, entered into a compact with each other to produce a government; and this is the only mode in which governments have a right to arise, the only principle on which they have a right to exist."

The state

The man who advocates the authority of the state over the individual holds a philosophy diametrically opposed to that of the individualist. He believes that tribal chiefs, monarchs, and other governors by whatever name, rule legitimately by the authority of Heaven or the rightful assumption of power by themselves. He assumes that it is natural and right for one man or group of men to govern another man or group of men, either with or without the consent of those governed. He believes in the divine right of kings and dictators.

According to this political creed, the government has the right to give and the cor-

responding right to take away. The individual is either the recipient of its favors or the victim of its displeasure. It may either rule him with cruelty or give him broad powers that border on self-government. The point here is not whether a government is benevolent or despotic at any given time: it is the fact that it has the power to misuse its authority at any time and to any extent.

In writing on the Bill of Rights, Dean Russell made the following statement on this point. "They (the founders of our Government) knew that without exception every government in recorded history had at one time or another turned its power—its coercive power as the police force—against its own citizens—confiscated their property, imprisoned them, enslaved them, and made a mockery of personal dignity."

Such is the danger inherent in any government which is master of its individual citizens, rather than their servant. In the United States, under constitutional guarantees, the people have established a government subservient to them—one that has given such scope to their creative and inventive energy—to the free enterprise of the individual—that they lead the world in freedom as well as in productive capacity.

THE ALTERNATIVES

The purposes of this work—or, more accurately, of this message—is to focus the attention of every intelligent American who may be induced to read it upon the stark necessity of a new and deeper sense of civic responsibility on the part of every citizen of this country, in the face of impending danger.

The leaders of Russia have embarked upon a campaign to communize the world. They have already imposed their rule upon their own people and are now driving relentlessly westward across Europe and southward from Manchuria through China to bring the continents of Europe and Asia under the domination of Moscow. In the accomplishment of their purpose, they have not hesitated to intimidate, enslave, torture or murder those who oppose them. They have sought to undermine governments not yet under their political control and military power, by posing as the champions of democracy, and at the same time using every form of deceit, propaganda, intrigue, economic disruption and violence short of war known to masters of the black art.

Since Russian communism first raised its ugly head and revealed its evil purpose, hardly a day has gone by without some warning of its threat to our freedom going out from practically every radio station in America. Almost every American newspaper has clearly and amply recorded its sinister activities. Books on the subject by Americans who have lived in Russia, and by Russians who have escaped from its tyranny, line the shelves of our libraries. Congressmen and churchmen, public officials, and private citizens have used the platforms of America to warn us of its dangers.

There are indications that these warnings are taking temporary effect, but equal reason to believe that their effect will be only temporary unless we are willing and able to go all the way in doing what is necessary to put and keep ourselves on guard against the enemies that threaten us from without and those that are already beginning to undermine us from within.

If we have learned so little from two world wars and the threat of a third that we are still blind to the necessity for complete preparedness, and still persist in making appropriations for national defense on the basis of emotion rather than upon a reasoned calculation of what is necessary for national security, we shall have proved our unfitness to survive in a world where nations still resort to arms.

Our contest with Russia goes deeper than military opposition and preparedness against attack, vital as that is. Even though we could withstand all military assaults of the Soviet Union, we should still have to prove that American democracy offers to men more than Russian communism has to offer, if our system is to commend itself to other peoples and to future generations. In its magnitude and political import to the world, and in its spiritual implications as well, the struggle between democracy and communism is an Armageddon of universal scope.

Nature will not long tolerate those who persist in breaking her laws and who refuse to set themselves to the task of fulfilling the purpose for them. If she has decreed that men should climb, however slowly, from the cave and jungle toward the spiritual heights envisioned by seers and prophets, let them be assured that their success lies along that path and no other. But when men refuse to take the line of progress ordained for them, and turn from the light that once shone from Sinai and later from one greater mount, and again invoke the law of the jungle, let them beware, for destiny will already have marked them for oblivion.

The Russian Communists are committed to this latter course. In their vain hope to communize the world they have invoked the law of the jungle and placed their reliance upon coercion and force. In their hope to make Moscow a third and greater Rome, they have forgotten what made Rome great and what led to its ultimate fall. No matter how much temporary power they may exercise, sooner or later they will go the way of all who oppose the primary rights of the individual and the democratic evolution of man.

Let it not be so with Washington. In its rise to a supreme position among the nations of the earth, the United States has proved the case for democracy, at least to date. However, no system of government, least of all democracy, can be once established and left to automatic operation, for democracy is particularly susceptible to decay. Its success depends upon the eternal vigilance and the participation in public affairs of the people who compose it.

The past is secure. In spite of costly delays in preparing to meet attack, we have managed to escape defeat in two world wars. Except for brief periods of economic depression, we have been more prosperous in days of peace than any other people on earth. We have even kept the cancerous growth of greed and corruption from spreading with fatal effect throughout the body politic.

But in common with the rest of the world, we have suffered from an intellectual, moral and spiritual depression that no material success can offset. Crime and delinquency have flourished on our indifference. We have been intent on "getting ours while the getting is good," and in our shortsightedness have not hesitated to kill the economic goose that lays the golden egg. We are suffering from the delusion that we can get more and more by doing less and less. We have squandered our natural resources. We have spent an increasingly large proportion of our spare time and money on amusement, and a correspondingly small part of both on self-improvement and those activities that make the individual a competent member of society. We suffer from confusion and uncertainty, and lack the deep religious convictions and purpose of our fathers.

In Government we have steadily—and in the last 16 years rapidly—drifted toward State socialism. We have lost something of that personal independence that goes with hardihood. We seek security rather than achievement and want all of the privileges of American citizenship without having to meet its obligations.

Let this be bluntly said: That although the past is secure, the future is not. To

make that future secure, to vindicate our faith in democracy, and to stem the Red tide of communism, we can do no less—we dare not do less—than reorient ourselves to those principles by which we have achieved our present greatness and by which alone we can maintain and augment it.

The alternatives and their consequences are as plainly visible as the handwriting upon the wall of Nebuchadnezzar's palace. Either America will lead the world into a new era of freedom, peace, and prosperity, or Russia will plunge it into a new dark age of tyranny and slavery. Today the choice is ours. Tomorrow, if we allow the hour of our opportunity to pass, the decision will go to Russia.

Which is it to be? You and I will have to answer that question and stand responsible for our answer to future generations. As we pause to make our decision it will be well for us to listen again to the prophetic voice of Lincoln. He spoke to our fathers in 1862, and they gave heed to his warning. He speaks again, this time to us in the hour of an even greater crisis. He declared in words that spell either the ultimate doom of American democracy or its ultimate triumph that "we shall nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope of earth."

The Niagara Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 30, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an opening statement I made before the Senate Public Works Committee recently on the Niagara power project. This subject is of widespread interest in my State, and should be to the entire Nation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE SENATE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE, IN CONNECTION WITH HEARINGS ON THE NIAGARA FALLS POWER DEVELOPMENT, AUGUST 21, 1951

The hearings starting today on the several bills dealing with the preservation of the Niagara Falls and the development of water power at the Falls are of the highest importance to the northeastern section of the United States, and, as I hope to show, to the entire Nation.

When these hearings were originally scheduled—and I am extremely grateful to Senator CHAVEZ and to Senator McCLELLAN, chairman of this subcommittee, for setting these hearings at my request—S. 517, my bill, was the only one before this committee. Lately two others on this same subject have been introduced and are also pending before this committee, and are also, I understand, to be considered in these hearings. I am glad for the committee to have this opportunity to study this mighty project, the Niagara project, from the several different approaches represented by the three pending bills.

In the course of my testimony today I shall try to answer four questions which must arise in connection with these hearings:

1. What is the history and background of the Niagara project and of the pending legislation?

2. Why is legislation authorizing the power project at Niagara Falls desirable, necessary, and economically sound?

3. Why should Congress make this authorization now, at this time?

4. Why should Congress approve S. 517, my bill, in preference to the others on the same subject now pending before this committee?

I hope the committee will bear with me during the reading of my statement, which is of some length, but which, I think the committee will find, is factual and highly pertinent to the questions raised by this tremendous undertaking.

As the committee may recall, I introduced a bill similar to S. 517 last year. No hearings were held in the Senate, but brief hearings were held before the House Public Works Committee on a companion bill introduced by Representative FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, Jr. This year Representative ROOSEVELT has again introduced a companion bill to S. 517, H. R. 2536, which is now pending before the House Public Works Committee. That committee, as you may know, has been preoccupied with the St. Lawrence power and seaway bill.

I am very pleased that the Senate committee is now proceeding to take up the Niagara bill. It goes without saying that I hope that you will see your way clear to making a favorable report on S. 517. As I shall indicate later in my testimony, prompt action is called for in the public interest.

S. 517 is very similar to the bill I introduced last year and to its companion measure in the House. No committee action was taken on that bill by the House Public Works Committee because it was so late in the year. This year I have made a few changes in it—and Representative ROOSEVELT made the same changes in the companion bill, H. R. 2536, as a result of comments by some of the Federal agencies and by interested groups and agencies and individuals in New York State.

I originally introduced my bill last year immediately after the President had submitted to the Senate the treaty negotiated with Canada providing for the preservation of Niagara Falls and the diversion of great amounts of additional water for power purposes. That was in May of 1950.

I drafted that bill in consultation with the then trustees of the New York Power Authority and with experts of the Federal agencies interested in power. I hasten to add that the Federal agencies were not committed to the details of this bill last year and reserved their official judgment at that time, although they did indicate in their formal reports to the House committee that "the objective of the bill . . . is wholly in accord with the program of the President." I am quoting from the report of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, filed with the House Public Works Committee under date of June 2, 1950.

The Bureau of the Budget advised the committee that there were some "basic issues of Federal water-resources policy which demand careful consideration by all interested agencies, as well as by the staff of the Bureau of the Budget. As yet there has not been sufficient time to enable the interested agencies to complete their study of these issues." I am quoting from last year's report by the Bureau of the Budget.

By this time the Federal agencies have completed their study of my bill and of the public-power policy issues involved, and I think they are ready to testify on them. This committee has received formal reports from these agencies, I believe, and representatives of some of the agencies involved will come before you to testify.

Because of this it will be unnecessary for me to go into great detail on the technical and expert phases of the Niagara project, on which these Federal experts are better qualified to speak than I.

The Corps of Engineers, especially, has already started on a detailed study of the Niagara project, under the authorization of a resolution adopted by this committee on June 5 of last year, as well as under the authorization of the United States-Canadian Treaty, itself. Funds were voted in the third supplemental appropriation bill this year for that purpose, and additional funds were voted by the Senate in the civil functions appropriation bill only last week. The chairman of this subcommittee was most helpful in the debate which led to the approval of that item, and I want to take this occasion to thank him.

I should like to offer for the record at this point the resolution adopted on June 5 last year by the Public Works Committee on the survey of the Niagara project.

UNITED STATES SENATE, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

Resolved by the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate. That the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, created under section 3 of the River and Harbor Act, approved June 13, 1902, be, and is hereby, requested to review the reports on Niagara River, N. Y., Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, New York; and Buffalo Harbor, New York; published respectively as House Document No. 253, Seventieth Congress, first session, House Document No. 92, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, and House Document No. 352, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, and other reports, with a view to determining the most feasible general plans for utilization of the waters apportioned to the United States for power development at this locality consistent with the provisions of the treaty between the United States and Canada, effective October 10, 1950, and the effect of such developments upon the Federal navigation projects at this locality.

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman.

Adopted June 5, 1951.

Thus, the Corps of Engineers will be in a position to give this committee some very current data concerning this project, based on studies already made, although the survey has been under way only a relatively short time.

The Army engineers have been surveying not only the power phases of the Niagara project but also the remedial works called for under the terms of the treaty, under the general direction of the International Joint Commission, an official body representing the Governments of both the United States and Canada. These remedial works are required not only to preserve the beauty of the Falls, which have been eroding steadily over the years, but also to preserve that magnificent spectacle in connection with the projected diversion of additional water for power purposes.

The diversion of water for power has an inevitable effect on the Falls, and the study of the power project is thus inseparable from the study of the remedial works. The construction of the power projects is likewise inseparable from the construction of the necessary remedial works. This is a vitally important point, as I hope to bring out a little later in my testimony. The Corps of Engineers will, I expect, go into the technical phases of this question, and I presume will be prepared to answer any questions on this point which members of this subcommittee may have.

Since I introduced S. 517, I have received a great many comments and suggestions from interested groups and individuals, and have, myself, carefully reviewed the bill in the light of these comments and suggestions. As a result I have worked out several proposed changes which I shall submit to the committee for its consideration. None of these changes have been studied by the Federal agencies, but none of them affects the essential outlines, purposes, or provisions of S. 517. I will list these amendments at the end of my testimony.

On August 9, 1950, when the Senate ratified the treaty with Canada which makes the Niagara power project possible, the Senate also unanimously approved a reservation to that treaty.

That reservation reads:

"The United States on its part expressly reserves the right to provide by act of Congress, for redevelopment, for the public use and benefit, of the United States share of the waters of the Niagara River made available by the provisions of the treaty, and no project for redevelopment of the United States share of such waters shall be undertaken until it be specifically authorized by act of Congress."

That reservation is the reason why Congress must act before any of the power potential made available under the terms of the treaty can be developed. If the Senate had not attached that reservation, it would have been perfectly proper, once the treaty had been effectuated—as it was in October 1950—for any private company or individual to submit an application to the Federal Power Commission for a license to construct and develop the power from all or any part of the waters made available to the United States under the terms of the treaty.

But the Senate unanimously declared that this should not be the case. The Senate declared that this power should be developed "for the public use and benefit." The Senate declared that Congress should legislate on how these waters from this international waterway should be redeveloped for power purposes "for the public use and benefit."

I submit that this reservation, unanimously adopted, affirms the national power policy—that the waters of the Niagara should be publicly developed for the public benefit—for the benefit of the consumers, of the national defense, of rural consumers, of co-operatives, of public bodies, and of all the people of this country.

I submit that S. 2021, introduced only yesterday by Senator CAPEHART, which is a companion bill to H. R. 3146, introduced by Representative MILLER of New York in the House, flies directly in the face of this policy and seeks to undo what the Senate did when the reservation I have described was attached to the treaty. If the Senate had wished to do what S. 2021 proposes, the Senate would not have adopted the reservation which, along with the treaty, is now part of the supreme law of the land. If that reservation had not been adopted, no further legislation along the lines of S. 2021 would be necessary. Private utilities could have made their applications to the Federal Power Commission and licenses could have been granted for the construction and redevelopment of these waters for power purposes.

This is not a question of public versus private power. Private utilities should be encouraged to expand their facilities to the maximum. All the steam power they can generate can be used in New York State and in the neighboring States. We are counting on the expansion of privately generated steam-power facilities in the years immediately ahead.

We must have that power, and the publicly developed water power, too. The water power, however, must be publicly developed.

This water is a public resource. It has been so recognized for years. This water is not only from a navigable waterway, but from an international waterway, made available for water power purposes by the exercise of the sovereign power of all the people of this country, through their Federal Government.

The Niagara Falls have been a concern of the Federal Government ever since 1906, when Congress passed the Burton Act, which asserted the jurisdiction of the Federal Government over this waterway and over diversions for power purposes.

The State of New York has asserted on numerous occasions—in its constitution—that these waters are the inalienable possession of the people. The major part of the present diversions now being utilized by private companies was preempted before 1906, before the Burton Act. Some additional diversions were made available, under temporary licenses, by executive agreement with Canada between 1940 and 1948, because of the power shortage resulting from the defense and war efforts.

I want to make clear at this point that S. 517 expressly exempts from the applicability of its provisions any valid existing rights under licenses granted by the Federal Power Commission for the use of waters now being diverted from the Niagara River. Thus, the Niagara Mohawk Co. is assured of its valid existing rights under its present licenses. This exemption is provided for in subparagraph (1) of paragraph (b), section 3 of S. 517—page 5 of the bill as printed.

Now we have this new treaty, making available great new diversions of water, sufficient to develop more than a million additional kilowatts of power—around 18,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power annually—and this should and must be developed for the public benefit, for the benefit of all the people. This can be done only by a public development.

Practically all the power on the Canadian side has been developed publicly. The Ontario Hydro Commission which owns and operates almost all the power facilities on the Canadian side is an instrumentality of the Province of Ontario, which is authorized by the Government of the Dominion of Canada to develop this waterpower for the benefit of all the people of Canada. The result in Canada is low-cost electric water power at rates which make the rates for electricity in New York State seem astronomical by comparison.

The development of this waterpower is a Government responsibility, along with the preservation of the beauty of the falls. We could not pass on the responsibility for preserving these falls to a private company; neither can we pass on the right to divert this water for power purposes. As I have said, the redevelopment of this water is inseparable from the preservation of the beauty of the falls.

There is need for every kilowatt of power which can be developed in this area, both by steam and water power. In 1949, the bureau of power estimated that by 1960, there would be a need of 1,500,000,000 kilowatts of additional capacity in the New York area in the vicinity of the Niagara project, and 1,600,000,000 kilowatts of additional capacity in the Ohio-Pennsylvania area within economic transmission distance of the Niagara project.

The Niagara project can furnish roughly 1,000,000 kilowatts of new capacity. The balance will need to be made up by privately owned steam power. The private power companies have their work mapped out for them to meet this demand.

The Niagara project—and the St. Lawrence project, too—are vitally needed, and should be started immediately, as Government-owned projects, to help meet, along with the needed expansion in privately owned steam-

plant capacity, the power shortage which faces us in the Northeast.

I want to emphasize that the estimate I have just cited of power needs was made in 1948 and 1949—before Korea and before we launched our great program of industrial expansion, which even today is only getting under way. New expert estimates made today would, I am sure, greatly raise the figures I have cited.

Before the start of World War II, there was actually a power surplus in the Niagara frontier area. During the war, power facilities were expanded. Increased diversions of water from the Niagara were authorized on an emergency basis. New steam plants were built and old ones were expanded. Power in considerable quantities was imported from Canada.

That did not meet the need. Dim-outs were ordered. Power had to be brought in from the New York City area to meet the requirements of aluminum and other vital defense plants in this area. In 1942, the War Production Board said the Niagara frontier area had the most critical power shortage in the country, and directed that no new plants be established in that area.

Since the war, demand for power in this area has not decreased but expanded. In 1947, the assured capacity was 13 percent less than the peak load. And today Canada, which has been exporting power to this country, can no longer continue to do so.

Reserve capacity in this New York area has been pressed into service. In case of breakdowns there is no reserve. Overage plants cannot be retired, as they should be.

This area is one of the most vital of all areas in the Nation for our defense requirements. Airplanes, steel, abrasives, radar equipment, chemicals, ordnance, parachutes, and, above all, aluminum are produced in this region. During the recent war, this area produced \$5,250,000,000 worth of war supplies.

The Aluminum Co. of America has two plants at Massena, N. Y. There was an aluminum reduction plant at Niagara, but it was forced to move during the war because of the power shortage. Insofar as these defense plants must use high cost steam power—in some cases power brought in from great distances—the taxpayers of this country must foot the bill for any delay in building the projects at Niagara and at the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence.

In the case of Niagara, there is no controversial seaway or other navigational feature. It is a simple power development. The power development project would, in fact, affect navigation, but that is a matter which can be solved by the engineers.

Under the terms of the United States-Canadian Treaty of 1950, the two countries are authorized to divert for power purposes all the water that is not needed to insure the beauty of the Falls. A minimum of 100,000 cubic feet per second is to be permitted to flow over the Falls for scenic purposes during daylight hours and during the tourist season. At other times this flow may be reduced to 50,000 cubic feet per second. All the rest of the flow can be diverted for power.

This means, according to the studies that have been made, that an annual daily average of 130,000 cubic feet per second of water can be used for power purposes, an increase of approximately 45,000 cubic feet per second over the amount now being diverted for power.

Of this 45,000 cubic feet per second, the United States share will be 32,500; the Canadian share, 12,500. This will bring the total diversions for both United States and Canada to 65,000 cubic feet per second each on an annual daily average. Thus for the first time, the United States and Canada will be on a par in these diversions.

Under the terms of the treaty of 1909, Canada was granted the right to divert 36,000 cubic feet per second; the United States, 20,000 cubic feet per second. Under the terms of this treaty of 1909, plus the wartime executive agreements, these diversions were increased to 32,500 cubic feet per second for the United States and 52,500 for Canada.

Thus, under the terms of the 1950 treaty, the United States is allocated twice what it now uses, and more than three times what it had under the treaty of 1909.

In terms of electric-power capacity, the installed dependable capacity on the American side is now about 445,000 kilowatts. According to the survey of the Bureau of Power of the Federal Power Commission, this amount can be increased to 1,572,000 kilowatts—an increase of 1,127,000 kilowatts of capacity.

These figures, of course, are the result of a tentative plan for redevelopment worked out by the Bureau of Power and are in the process of being reviewed by the Army engineers. There may be some modification up or down as a result of these detailed studies.

In any event, this development is certain, on the American side alone, to be one of the biggest power developments in the United States. It will produce annually an estimated 11,600,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, compared to the present figure of 3,700,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power now being developed by the Niagara Mohawk Power Co. with its present diversion of 32,500 cubic feet per second.

The larger increase in electric-energy output compared to the increase in water diversion results from the plan worked out by the Bureau of Power for the use of the maximum possible head of water in the new installations. The drop in water level is 300 feet. One of the installations—the old Adams plant, which uses 8,000 cubic feet per second—operates under a net head of only 135 feet. The Schoellkopf plant, which uses the rest of the 32,500 cubic feet per second now being diverted on the United States side, operates under the head of 215 feet.

A major part of the power on the Canadian side is developed at a net head, under maximum load, of 294 feet, although Canada, too, has some older plants which use a lower head, and hence are less efficient.

The greater the head, the more power, and the more efficient the operations. Canada's Queenston plant develops 219 kilowatts of capacity for each cubic foot per second of water. The Adams plant on the American side develops less than 10 kilowatts per cubic foot per second.

Canada is now at work building new plants, not only to use the new water made available under the 1950 treaty, but also to retire those plants which use less than the maximum head of water.

When both the Canadian and the American construction are completed, the Niagara power sites will have a capacity of 3,000,000 kilowatts, by far the largest water-power development on the North American Continent and perhaps in the world.

As I said a moment ago, Canada is already at work on her new plants and power installations. When construction on the Canadian side is completed, Canada will have capacity to utilize 90,000 cubic feet per second, including the older, less efficient plants scheduled for retirement. If the United States does not proceed promptly to build the necessary works to utilize our half of the water, Canada is permitted, under article VIII of the treaty to use such portion of our share as we are not using. Canada will be able to do just that, and we will be losing power whose value is roughly estimated at almost \$100,000,000 per year.

This Niagara power can be developed as cheaply, if not more cheaply, than any other

water power in the United States. The estimated cost of construction, under public financing—and this was the 1949 estimate of the Bureau of Power—is about \$300,000,000. This figure undoubtedly needs to be brought up to date. The cost of producing the power was estimated at about 2 mills per kilowatt-hour at the dam site, compared to a cost of about 8 mills per kilowatt-hour for equivalent steam-generated power, under private financing. This does not include the cost of transmission or distribution.

This figure includes provision for repayment of the cost of construction, at public rates of financing.

This is a self-liquidating project—so obviously so, that private interests would jump at the opportunity of developing this power. They have so expressed themselves, and undoubtedly will do so in the course of these hearings.

I say this in emphasizing that this project is completely self-liquidating and will not cost the taxpayers anything but will, instead, benefit both the country at large and the consumers. The Nation's taxpayers will benefit directly in the lower cost of defense items such as aluminum, the largest cost component of which is, of course, power.

This low-cost power will inevitably force down the cost of power generally, even in areas which are not physically reached by this specific power. This has been the experience everywhere in the country. It will be the experience in New York.

New York has the sixth highest power cost in the entire Nation. At last count, there were 20,000 farm families in New York State which did not have central station power. Rural cooperatives have had a difficult time in New York because of the high cost of power. Yet New York farmers, especially that vast number engaged in dairying, vitally need electric power for refrigerators, separators, and other modern dairy equipment.

I have tried to show briefly the need and the possibilities of this development. Now I should like to speak in some detail about S 517, my bill for authorizing the construction and disposition of this project.

S 517 is designed basically to assure the benefits of this natural resource to the general public and to the consumers. It takes cognizance of national public power policy, developed over the past two decades, aimed at promoting the use of electric power through lower costs, and at providing special preferences for rural consumers, rural consumer cooperatives, and public bodies.

S 517 insures preferences for Government agencies. It insures an equitable distribution of the power among the States within economic transmission distance, accepting the fact that although the power site is in New York State, the waters come from many States, and the benefits must be made available to the people without interstate prejudice.

S 517 is designed to implement the purposes of the United States-Canadian treaty for the preservation of the natural beauty of the Falls, and provides for the remedial works which will be necessary both because of the natural forces of erosion which have been eating away at the Falls and the additional works required to preserve the spectacle at the Falls while diverting additional waters from the river for power purposes.

All this is proposed to be accomplished under terms of an agreement to be entered into between the State of New York and the Federal Government. This agreement would be subject to approval by both the Congress and the State Legislature of New York.

Under the terms of this agreement, New York State would undertake to repay the Federal Government in full for the cost of construction of this project. New York State would, in turn, assume the ownership of

the project facilities and the operation of the project, subject to the conditions and safeguards of the Federal and public interest set forth in this bill and required to be included in the Federal-State agreement.

These safeguards are the heart of this bill. They carry the burden of public-power policy, as worked out in New York State and in the Nation over a period of three decades.

I want to point out here and now that New York State has played a pioneer role in developing this national public power policy. Under Govs. Al Smith and Franklin D. Roosevelt, and during my four administrations as Governor, New York State contributed the major ideas and many of the leaders in the development of the policy of promotional power rates, of preferences for rural consumers and public bodies, and of the primary right of ownership and benefit for all the people in regard to water resources.

Moreover, New York State contributed the primary engineering genius which resulted in the plan for the use of additional waters from the Niagara without interfering with the beauty of the falls.

While I was Governor in 1936, the New York Power Authority launched a comprehensive engineering study of the Niagara River power possibilities. That study resulted in the power authority's report of 1938 which set forth for the first time the plan for redeveloping additional waters, by nighttime and off-season diversion, by storing these waters in reservoirs and pools on week ends and holidays, and for the utilization of these vast waters through an ingenious system of canals, at maximum head, for the vast power projects which are here proposed, and which are actually under development today in Canada.

I submit that all these factors give New York a special right in regard to this project, beyond the fact that the power site is actually in New York, and the consumers of the power must be, for the most part, New Yorkers and New York enterprises.

The New York Power Authority, the agency that New York would designate to handle this project has a long history. It was established by law in 1930, under the leadership of the then Gov. Franklin D. Roosevelt. I was Lieutenant Governor at the time and helped guide this legislation through the State senate.

Since that time, the New York Power Authority has spent millions of dollars in engineering studies, plans, promotion, and organizational preparations to handle the power from the St. Lawrence and more recently from the Niagara. I have already described how the New York Power Authority made the basic engineering studies for the Niagara project. The people of New York have come to expect that this agency would develop this power, in the public interest, in the interest of the people of New York and of the entire Nation.

Unfortunately, the New York Power Authority has never had an opportunity to amass any experience in actual construction. This agency, more than 20 years old, has contributed much to national public power policy and to our sum of knowledge of power development. But New York State has been denied the right to develop the mighty waters along its borders. Power projects have been built in a score of States. Many public waterpower projects are today under construction. The St. Lawrence project and now the Niagara project are still in the blueprint stage. The people of New York feel that they have not gotten a fair shake in this matter, whatever the reasons.

My bill provides that the Army engineers will build this project. The Corps of Engineers has the necessary experience and background. I need not dwell on this fact.

The corps has built, is building and is scheduled to build power facilities of a total capacity of 7,262,400 kilowatts. It is the agency which should build this project. The United States Government will, of course, be reimbursed for the cost of construction. It will not cost the Government a single cent.

Now I want to refer briefly to S. 1963, introduced by my colleague, Senator Ives. I understand that this bill has the support of the present New York Power Authority.

On the surface, there is not a great amount of difference between S. 1963 and my bill, S. 517. Indeed last year, before the House Public Works Committee, Chairman Burton, of the New York Power Authority, said he supported the principles of the Lehman-Roosevelt bill, although he did suggest some amendments. S. 1963 however, departs much, much further from the principles and purposes of my bill than did the amendments Mr. Burton proposed last year.

Mr. Burton stated, last year that what he wanted was additional safeguards to safeguard New York—I am quoting from his statement before the House committee last year. S. 1963 proposes to safeguard New York by handing over, outright, these great water resources to the New York Power Authority, with vague and completely inadequate safeguards for the people of New York and the consumers of New York. There are no safeguards to speak of for the national interests.

I am sure the drafters of this bill did not deliberately set out with this in mind, but the effect of this bill is really to safeguard and enhance the authority and power of the New York Power Authority, while leaving the rights and interests of the people of New York, among others, largely unprotected.

Moreover, I must submit that S. 1963 is, in important aspects, entirely unrealistic if our objective is to obtain legislative authorization for this project. That is what I wholeheartedly desire to accomplish.

The provision for the New York Power Authority to build the power project and the remedial works is unwise and impractical if not impossible.

The New York Power Authority has no construction experience whatever. The Army Engineers have a vast construction experience.

The United States Government cannot be expected to pass on to a State instrumentality the responsibility for building the remedial works. These remedial works are a treaty responsibility of the United States Government. These works are required by treaty to be constructed under the supervision of the International Joint Commission. No reference is even made in S. 1963 to this circumstance.

A major part of the remedial works will be required as a consequence of the power diversions. The Army engineers are now making engineering studies of this extremely complex problem of remedial works. I have been told by the Corps of Engineers that its studies have showed that the diversion of the water for power purposes can, unless proper and extensive countermeasures are taken, completely destroy the beauty of the Falls, both on the American and the Canadian side.

The remedial works and the power works should be undertaken together. They should be undertaken by an agency with the maximum amount of experience in this type of undertaking. This is necessary to protect the interest of the people of New York as well as the national interest. This is a matter of practical engineering, and not of political policy.

Officials of New York State should be consulted concerning the over-all aspects of the projects, and my bill, S. 517, provides exactly that. The public interest—of New York

State and of the United States—requires that the agency best qualified, regardless of whether it is a State or Federal agency, undertake this job. That agency is, I believe, the United States Corps of Engineers.

Moreover, there are highly important defense implications. This project is vital to the defense of the Nation. Its construction must take these defense aspects—vulnerability to enemy attack, among others—into consideration. The Army engineers are qualified to supervise these vitally important aspects. S. 1963 makes no mention of preference in the sale of power to Defense Agencies.

S. 1963 vests in the New York Power Authority final and complete jurisdiction, for the implementation of the rather vague commitments set forth in section 4. The power authority is directed to carry out these commitments in its contracts for sale of power, but there is no provision for supervision of how these commitments are actually being carried out and no provision for review or penalty for failing to carry them out.

S. 1963 makes no mention of rural cooperatives or of public bodies such as municipally owned utilities and does not grant outright preferences even to States, counties and municipalities or to defense industries. S. 1963 merely directs that the Authority should assure the resale of power to domestic and rural consumers at the lowest possible price. If that is not done, no review or penalty is provided.

S. 1963 does not provide for the outright allocation of power from the Niagara project to other States. It provides for an exchange of power between New York State and the other States, by interstate compact, or, in the absence of such a compact, by ruling of the Federal Power Commission. While, as a New Yorker, I might prefer to see my State keep all the power from the Niagara, and not share it with any other State, except on an exchange basis, I do not think this would be fair to the other States. If any comparable public water power projects are authorized for Ohio or Pennsylvania, within economic transmission of New York State, I shall insist on an equitable allocation of some of that power to New York State. But I would not withhold an equitable share of Niagara project power from those States, just because they presently have no comparable development. Yet the language of S. 1963 might very well be so interpreted. It is, at best, confusing and misleading.

S. 517, on the other hand, achieves the objective of safeguarding the interests of New York, without sacrificing the safeguards of the public interest and of a progressive public power policy.

S. 517 lays down, in very specific terms, the safeguards which are to go into the agreement between New York State and the Federal Government. Spokesmen for the New York Power Authority have been quoted as saying that it might be impossible to reach an agreement with the Federal Government, and that consequently, under the terms of S. 517, the power facilities would remain under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government and never be turned over to New York.

I would like to invite the spokesman of the New York Power Authority at these hearings to state exactly what provisions of the proposed agreement as spelled out in S. 517 would prove the stumbling block to the consummation of an agreement. I believe the spokesmen of the Federal agencies will testify that they support all the safeguarding provisions for the public interest which are spelled out in S. 517. To which of these provisions does the New York Power Authority object?

I have spoken with great earnestness because I want this project to be approved, and the power to be developed, in the public interest. I am willing for this bill to be

amended in any constructive way, on the basis of the considerations which members of this committee will give to this legislation, providing that the safeguards of the public interest are retained.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have completed my formal statement on the legislation now pending, except for the amendments I am, myself, suggesting to my own bill.

I summarize them as follows:

1. Amendments to affirm the national defense interest in the proposed project.

2. Amendments specifically to authorize the inclusion in the Federal-State agreement of provision for the preservation and enhancement of the scenic beauty of the Falls, including the accessibility of the river shore lines.

3. Amendments to grant preferences in the disposition of project power at cost to all defense agencies, and, on fair and reasonable terms to other Federal agencies and to defense industries requiring the power to fulfill defense contracts.

4. Amendments to provide that negotiations for the Federal-State agreement shall commence immediately upon the enactment of the act, rather than after the appropriation of the first funds, and dating the report which the President is called upon to make to the Congress on the status of the negotiations from the time of the enactment of this act rather than from the time of the start of construction.

5. Amendment to insure that even if negotiation and approval of the Federal-State agreement is not completed by the time the first power is available from the project, the project can be turned over to the New York State by subsequent agreement and approval by Congress and the Legislature of New York, or the Congress may make other disposition.

6. Amendment authorizing the making of payments to State and local authorities in lieu of taxes, on the model of TVA.

AMENDMENTS SUGGESTED TO S. 517 BY THE SPONSOR

In line 3 of the title, page 1 after "and other purposes", insert "to promote the "national defense".

In line 7, page 1, section 1, after "floods", insert "and to promote the national defense."

In line 5, page 1, section 1, after "River", insert "including the accessibility of the river shore line."

In line 1, page 5, section 3 (b) after "distance", insert "and provisions for the maintenance and enhancement of the scenic beauty of the Falls, including the accessibility of the river shore line."

Beginning in line 25, page 3, section 3 (a) (1) delete all after "agreement" to the end of the sentence and insert "upon the passage and approval of this act."

In line 7, page 6, section 3 (b) (3) (A) after "Defense" insert "and other Defense Agencies, and on fair and reasonable terms to other Federal Agencies and to private enterprises requiring power to fulfill defense contracts."

In line 17, page 6, section 3 (b) (4) after "Federal Government", insert "rural consumers."

Beginning in line 12, page 8, section 3 (c) delete "beginning of construction of the project" and insert in place thereof "enactment of this act."

In line 8, page 9, section 4 before the period, insert ", pending the negotiation and approval of the agreement provided for in subsections (a) and (b) of Section 3 of this act or pending further disposition by Congress."

On page 8 after line 11 add the following: "(9) (a) In order to render financial assistance to those States and counties in which the Agency carries on its operations and acquires properties previously subject

to State and local taxes, the agency of the State of New York shall pay to such States and counties for each calendar year such amount as the agency deems fair and equitable, taking into account the State and local taxes which would be payable if such operations were carried on by private corporations, but in no event more than — percent or less than — percent of the gross proceeds derived from the sale of power by the agency for the preceding calendar year, except as hereinafter provided.

"(b) The payment for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among such States and counties in the following manner: One-half of such payment shall be apportioned by paying to each State (including payments to counties therein) the percentage thereof which the gross proceeds of the power sales by the Agency within such State during the preceding calendar year bears to the total gross proceeds from all power sales by the Agency during the preceding calendar year; the remaining one-half of such payment shall be apportioned by paying to each State (including payments to counties therein) the percentage thereof which the book value of the power property held by the Agency within such State at the end of the preceding calendar year bears to the total book value of all such property held by the Agency on the same date. The book value of power property shall include that portion of the investment allocated or established to be allocable to power. *Provided*, That the minimum annual payment to each State (including payments to counties therein) shall not be less than an amount equal to the 2-year average of the State and local ad valorem property taxes levied against power property purchased and operated by the Agency in such State. Such 2-year average shall be calculated for the last two tax years during which such property was privately owned and operated or such land was privately owned. The Agency shall pay directly to the respective counties the 2-year average of county ad valorem property taxes (including taxes levied by taxing districts within the respective counties) upon power property and reservoir lands allocable to power, determined as above provided, and all payments to any such county within a State shall be deducted from the payment otherwise due to such State under the provisions of this section. The determination of the Agency of the amounts due hereunder to the respective States and counties shall be final."

Mr. Chairman, I have one additional point to make in regard to this legislation. I have been thinking for some time about one aspect of our public power legislation in general and about my Niagara bill in particular involving the right of collective bargaining for workers engaged in construction work on these projects and for the workers engaged in operating them.

I have been trying to figure out some formula whereby these workers on Government projects can be protected and given the same rights that other workers engaged in the same work under private ownership and construction have.

I do not have legislative language worked out on this point, but I want very much to submit my ideas on this for the RECORD. As soon as I do have legislative language worked out I would be glad to submit it for the committee's consideration. I would suppose that many of you have been thinking about the same subject and may have ideas on this point.

I think the workers on these projects and operating these projects should have not only the protection of the Walsh-Healey Act but also the protection of collective bargaining and unionization if they desire it.

Appropriations for Aid of Countries in the Near East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 30, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, because I am leaving this afternoon for the San Francisco treaty conference, it will unfortunately not be possible for me to be present for some of the vital debate and votes which will occur during the next several days.

There are a great many features in this legislation in which I am deeply interested. One particular feature relates to the matter of aid appropriations for the Near East. It is obvious that this area is one of the most critical points in the entire world scene—a point which the Soviet masters of the Kremlin are eyeing with the deepest of craving, in view of its strategic position, in view of its proximity to the rich oil field area, and so forth.

I have received a considerable number of communications from inside and outside my State which have pointed up our people's sound recognition of the importance of that area, and I wish that I might have the time to comment upon this issue in detail in the Senate.

Because time is lacking, however, I am going to ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several of these materials. The first is an excellent memorandum prepared by the American Zionist Council on United States aid to Israel and for Arab nations. This memo analyzes the differences between the House of Representatives version and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee version. I particularly invite attention to its comments on the crucial military importance to the west of the brave new Republic of Israel.

The second is a communication from distinguished Americans associated with the American Christian Palestine Committee; and I ask unanimous consent that it, too, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. It represents the views of a great many Americans of non-Jewish faith who are deeply sympathetic with the needs and aspirations of our good, democratic friend, Israel.

There being no objection, the memorandum and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM—UNITED STATES AID TO THE NEAR EAST

1. We respectfully submit that the growing crisis in the strategic Near East—an exposed and vulnerable area on the very frontier of potential Communist expansion—justifies raising the authorization for economic assistance up to the totals voted by the House.

2. The action of the House: The House cut \$1,001,000,000 from the administration's mutual security program, but made most of its reductions in title I (Europe)—\$955,000,000. Taking note of the needs and dangers

in the Near East, the House increased the authorization for that area from \$125,000,000 to \$175,000,000.

3. The Senate Proposal: The Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees, effecting a total cut of \$964,000,000, took a different course. They voted a flat, across-the-board, 30-percent reduction in the economic aid program requested by the administration. This brought the Near East allocation down to \$87,500,000. Fortunately, the Senate committees then took into account the House figures on the Near East and voted to use them as a base before applying the 30-percent slash. This brought the Near East to \$122,500,000.

4. The differences between the two proposals: Thus, the Senate and House bill authorizations for the Near East vary as follows:

	Senate	House
Economic aid to Iran, Arab States, Israel, Libya, Liberia and Ethiopia.....	\$42,500,000	\$75,000,000
Resettlement of Arab refugees.....	40,000,000	50,000,000
Resettlement of Jewish refugees in Israel.....	40,000,000	50,000,000
Total.....	122,500,000	175,000,000

We urge the adoption of the House proposals for the following reasons:

5. The relative needs of the Near East and Europe: We agree that every effort must be made to trim unnecessary expenditures. However, we question the advisability of drastic cuts in title II, the Near East. Since the end of the war most European countries have received generous assistance from the United States and are today well on their way to complete recovery. In contrast the Near East has not yet been included in the foreign-aid programs. Living standards of its people are depressed—far below those of Europe. Governments are unstable. Lacking the will and capacity, the region is ill-prepared to resist aggression or Communist subversion. It is evident that to spend large sums on Europe and to ignore the Near East, which lies directly in the path of Soviet invasion, is to build a high wall on one side of that path. Accordingly the announcement that the United States planned for the first time to extend its aid program to the Near East reassured those concerned for the strategy of our over-all defenses and at the same time kindled hope among the peoples of the area. But the amount envisaged, in relation to the total proposed in the security program and measured by the critical needs of the area, evoked keen disappointment.

6. The growing crisis in the Near East: Events following the presentation of the President's program underline the urgency of a comprehensive assistance and development program commensurate with needs and opportunities. There is a persistent drive to expel western influence from the Near East. It is stimulated by jingoistic nationalism. It is exploited by Communist propagandists who brand the United Kingdom and the United States as imperialists bent on colonial domination and conquest.

7. Iran: In Iran, the assassination of Prime Minister Ali Razmara and the nationalization of the great oil refineries at Abadan were followed, just last week, by the collapse of negotiations between Iran and the United Kingdom. Our Government attempted—but in vain—to achieve a reconciliation. The free world is in imminent danger of losing an enormous supply of refined petroleum products.

8. Jordan: In Jordan, the one Arab country considered friendly to the West, King Abdullah, symbol and spokesman of that

friendship, was assassinated in a conspiracy organized by followers of the ex-Mufti of Jerusalem, one-time collaborator of Adolf Hitler.

9. Lebanon: A few days before the murder of Ab'ullah, Riad el-Solh, former Prime Minister of Lebanon, and a moderate, was assassinated by Syrian nationalists.

10. Egypt. The Egyptian Government proclaimed its neutrality between East and West and reiterated its determination to abrogate the Anglo-Egyptian treaty and to compel the United Kingdom to withdraw its troops from the Suez and from the Sudan. And, in defiance of the United Nations, Egypt continues its interference with international shipping, including American shipping, through the Suez Canal.

11. Friend of the West: In contrast to the Moslem trend of withdrawal from and rejection of the West, recent developments confirm and strengthen the mutuality of friendship between the United States and Israel. Last week, Israel and the United States entered into a treaty of friendship—the first comprehensive treaty that Israel has signed with any power. Last month, at their second national elections, the people of Israel rejected extremism of right and left and increased the strength of centrist and pro-Western elements which now predominate in the national legislature by large majorities. The Communist Party, largely Arab, received only 4 percent of the vote—an insignificant fraction when compared to its strength in European countries.

12. Israel's consolidation and American defense. The economic consolidation of Israel will strengthen American defenses. The Israel Army grows as new immigrants enter the country, for there is compulsory national service for men and women alike. Israel Army officers are now studying in American military colleges. Israel is the one country in the Near East with the mechanics and facilities to repair and maintain essential military equipment. It has steel fabricating, precision engineering and casting plants, foundries and machine shops and rapidly growing construction, fertilizer, chemical and pharmaceutical industries. In World War II, with half the present population and half the present plant, it was manufacturing for the allied forces land mines, machine gun parts, cable, batteries, wire and many other essential items. The total war production was estimated at more than \$100,000,000. Today Israel is producing much of its own armaments. The influx of labor and capital together stimulate agriculture and industry, and the country has become the potential industrial workshop for the free world—the guarantor of our logistics and supply in the Near East in the event of another conflict. The blunt truth is that the West has only two secure ports of anchorage in the turbulent Near East—Turkey and Israel.

13. Israel's refugee problem: Since Israel was established, in May 1948, it has received almost 700,000 refugees, many of whom are still in tents and only partly employed. They come at the rate of 200,000 a year and they are still coming, driven by the pressures of disaster—from Moslem countries, from Africa and Asia, from Europe. Never before in history did a people double its population in 3 years and propose to triple it in six. The cost of the resettlement program for 1951 is estimated at \$500,000,000. This will be financed by taxation, austerity and savings, investments, loans and private philanthropy. The grant of \$50,000,000 as proposed in the House bill is about 10 percent of the total cost. Israel and its people, assisted by the philanthropy of the Jewish people of the United States, have strained every resource before turning to the United

States Government for aid. These considerations are offered in support of the plea that the Senate raise the allocation for the Jewish refugees from \$40,000,000 to \$50,000,000, the amount voted by the House.

14. The Arab refugees: The resettlement of the Arab refugees is essential to economic health and the attainment of peace in the Near East. Displaced by the war of the Arab States against the 1947 United Nations partition decision, the Arab refugees can be resettled in Arab countries which have the necessary fertile land but lack the people needed to work it. A partnership fusing the imagination of western engineering, the co-operation of Arab States and the contribution of the United States and other members of the United Nations can effectively solve this tragic problem. Hopes that a real beginning on the resettlement program could now be made were raised when the United Nations approved this policy last winter and the Arab States finally indicated their readiness to cooperate and participate. The administration proposed \$50,000,000 as America's contribution to the United Nations reintegration fund for Arab refugees. It is feared that the proposal to cut this amount to \$40,000,000 may retard the resettlement program. It may result in a proportionate reduction in the amount to be contributed by other nations. This would lead to a prolongation and intensification of the suffering of innocent people who are not responsible for their present plight. It is therefore urged that the Senate approve the \$50,000,000 authorization for the Arab refugees voted in the House.

15. The restoration of United States-Arab confidence. Deterioration of relations between the West and the Arab States should not be permitted to continue. Recent developments argue for an increase—not for reduction—in American economic and technical assistance. It is sometimes claimed by those who regret the establishment of the State of Israel that the threatened estrangement between the Arab world and the West is a consequence of American support of Israel at the U. N. This dubious argument is generally advanced to immobilize and neutralize our own Government and to stultify its policy. It is not an objective evaluation of the forces at play. The fact is that Arab hostility is directed primarily against the United Kingdom, which supported the Arabs—not Israel—at the U. N. Arab attitudes to the west are determined by other factors. The Moslem world won political freedom within the last quarter of a century. But it did not achieve economic liberation for its people. They are told that they are dominated and exploited by the colonial powers—a propaganda myth sedulously circulated by those who would maintain their own feudal place and privilege. They stir up agitation to rid the Near East of British influence. They preach distrust of the United States, charging that our own country stands with and for and seeks to restore the vanishing imperialism of the nineteenth century. It is imperative that we overcome this suspicion and distrust. The Near East needs our help. And we need its friendship. The entire area deserves greater consideration—in the interest of the United States. We regret that the Senate bill would drastically cut down the amount of economic assistance envisaged for the Near East in the House bill. We urge reconsideration and acceptance by the Senate of the \$175,000,000 authorization approved by the House.

16. Conclusion: In submitting these observations we acknowledge with appreciation the fact that the two Senate committees took action to insure substantial aid to Israel, despite the general percentage reductions. We who have been advocates of the

establishment of the State of Israel for a generation are gratified by this renewed expression of good will, the welcome affirmation of the friendly relations between Israel and the United States that grow increasingly significant to the progress and defense of the free world.

But in this memorandum we speak for more than Israel. Israel cannot live by itself—isolated from its neighbors with whom it would be at peace. We speak for the entire Near East, which is so vital to American interests. Today it is a weak spot in our democratic armor. Rich in resources and strategic in location, the Near East cannot be defended unless its standards are raised, its economies are stabilized, its people are lifted to new levels of opportunity and fulfillment.

This we deem crucial to the promotion of our defenses in the Near East, to the security and welfare of our own people.

(This document is submitted by the American Zionist Council, 305 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.)

AUGUST 27, 1951.

NEW YORK, N. Y., August 29, 1951.
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

May we urgently remind you of the critical importance of the Near East. Our way of life has not yet won its spurs in this area except in Israel. Unresolved problems such as those of the Jewish and Arab refugees may yet overwhelm incipient democratic developments unless we, the representatives of the western way of life, step in with the help necessary to bring order and a measure of prosperity to these oppressed peoples. We therefore plead with you to use your good offices in the Senate to restore \$50,000,000 for Arab refugees and \$50,000,000 for Jewish refugees, bringing the Near East allocation into conformity with the \$175,000,000 authorization voted by the House of Representatives, which will substantially help to resolve this tremendous and tragic human problem.

Respectfully,

DANIEL A. POLING,
SAMUEL GUY INMAN,
HENRY A. ATKINSON,
CARL HERMANN VOSS,
KARL BAEHR,
American Christian Palestine Committee, 41 East Forty-second Street.

Fundamental Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Fundamental Government, delivered by a fellow Vermonter, former Representative Charles Plumley.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Vermonters, I did not choose the subject on which I am to talk to you this afternoon, though confessedly I am glad it

was selected for me. My text is *Fundamental Government*.

On the 30th day of April 1789 was consummated a work commenced years before but not accomplished till that day, when the people of what we now know as the United States, those fearless colonists, acting under the deepest sense of responsibility, achieved and completed the most transcendent act of power that social man in his mortal condition can perform.

The Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States are parts of one consistent whole, founded upon one and the same theory of government, then new in practice, though not as a theory, for it had been working itself into the mind of man for many ages, and had been especially expounded in the writings of Locke, though it had never before been adopted by a great nation in practice.

There are yet, even at this day, many speculative objections to this theory. Even in our own country there are still philosophers who deny the principles asserted in the Declaration, as self-evident truths—who deny the natural equality and inalienable rights of man—who deny that all just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed. . . . I speak to matters of fact. There is the Declaration of Independence, and there is the Constitution of the United States—let them speak for themselves. The grossly immoral and dishonest doctrine of despotic State sovereignty, the exclusive judge of its own obligations, and responsible to no power on earth or in heaven, for the violation of them, is not there. The Declaration says, it is not in me. The Constitution says, it is not in me.

So said John Quincy Adams on the 30th of April 1839. . . .

When Thomas Jefferson . . . was first inaugurated he delivered an oration which contained the best definition of democracy ever propounded. Let me quote briefly:

"It is proper you should understand what I deem the essential principles of our Government, and consequently those which ought to shape its administration. I will compress them within the narrowest compass they will bear, stating the general principle, but not all its limitations. Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none; the support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns, and the surest bulwarks against anti-republican tendencies; the preservation of the general government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet-anchor of election by the people; a mild and safe corrective of abuses which are unprovided, absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority, the vital principle of republics, from which is no appeal but to force, the vital principle and immediate parent of despotism; a well-disciplined militia, our best reliance in peace and for the first moments of war, till regulars may relieve them, the supremacy of the civil over the military authority, economy in the public expense, that labor may be lightly burdened; the honest payment of our debts, and sacred preservation of the public faith; encouragement of agriculture, and of commerce as its handmaid, the diffusion of information and arraignment of all abuses at the bar of the public reason, freedom of religion, freedom of the press, and freedom of person, under the protection of the habeas corpus; and trial by juries impartially selected. These principles form the bright constellation which has gone before us, and guided our steps through an age of revolution and reformation. The wisdom of our sages and blood of our heroes have been devoted to their attainment; they should be the creed

of our political faith; the text of civic instruction; the touchstone by which to try the services of those we trust; and should we wander from them in moments of error or of alarm, let us hasten to retrace our steps and to regain the road which alone leads to peace, liberty, and safety."

So much for some of the fundamentals of government.

At a time when this country faces the greatest crisis in its total history; when we are suffering the humiliation of the most ignominious defeat at arms ever experienced by any Christian nation since Christianity fell to the Turks at Byzantium, it is a supererogation of my duty and my obligation to suggest that when and if this war continues for 10 years it is picaresque to complain about the possible rise in the price of gasoline, or of rubber, or of automobiles, or of a lot of things, when the fact is, we are at war.

If we are at war, as we are at war, without a declaration I admit, but nevertheless involved in it up to our necks, if what they tell me from Washington is true. It is my opinion that nobody should be concerned about paying an additional gasoline tax, and nobody should be troubled about paying more for tires, and nobody should over-exert themselves to save money to buy an automobile, for it is my honest opinion you won't even get gasoline, or tires, or an automobile if this thing clamps down. . . .

Every sensible man must know that it means that he will have to pay more taxes out of his jeans. I mean out of his pockets. I mean out of what he saved. . . .

No appropriation for anything in excess of that which has heretofore been made . . . should be made at this time by Congress or by the legislature of any State.

It was 55 years ago the 10th of April, that upon my return from Bellows Falls where I had, as a cadet, represented Norwich University at a Young Men's Christian Association convention, I was met by Prof. C. C. Brill, then superintendent of Norwich, to be told that I had been selected to be a commencement-day speaker, and that I could choose between "The Future of Heaven Than Air Machines," and "The Future of Arbitration as a Substitute for War," as the subject of my oration. . . .

So I went to New York to the Public Library and found there a compendium of scientific treatises prepared by the then leading physicists who absolutely, scientifically, mathematically demonstrated that no heavier than air machine would ever be able to lift and transport a load. It might lift itself off the ground for a short distance, but fly—never. So I decided to select arbitration as a substitute for war. I made some speech that commencement day. I convinced myself at least, that I had solved the problem of the ages. My peroration was as follows:

"Down the dark future
Through long generations
The echoing sounds grow fainter and then
cease
And like a bell with solemn sweet vibrations
I hear once more the voice of Christ say,
"Peace."

"Peace! and no longer from its brazen portals
The blast of war's great organ shakes the
skies
But beautiful and sweet as songs of the
immortals
The holy melodies of love arise."

And almost before I could take my seat some Spaniard blew up the *Maine* in Habana Harbor. And there has been either hot or cold world war and no peace ever since I spoke in June 1896.

The pacifist policies of refraining from adequately preparing ourselves militarily for defense have led us into two world wars and threaten us with a third. * * *

In every Republic the due cultivation of a proper military spirit and a general diffusion of military information are indispensably necessary for the preservation of liberty.

I have lived long enough to find out * * * that there is no peaceful diplomatic solution to these problems. So far as this war in which we are involved is concerned, we forfeited any solution when we sold Poland and China down the river, meaning the Volga, when we eliminated the war potential of Germany and Japan, which were the only natural dams or obstacles in the way of the Bolshevik tides, and when so foolishly and unwisely, on top of all our diplomatic adventures, we financed and promoted the total disarmament of Europe. What a catastrophe! * * * We have done too much erroneously and have done too little right, too late.

Our national existence is at stake. I am one of those who believe that we should use any and all means within our power to put a stop to this war right now, and we have the means and we have the power, and there is no reason under God why American boys should be slaughtered longer in Korea, so long as at our hands and in our possession are the means wherewith, and by the use thereof, we could and can put a stop to it. Some say it is unethical to wage a bomb war against an aggressor. I am one of those who believe that any method which we can use to put a stop to the sacrifice of the best blood of America is justified by the circumstances which confront us, in an attempt made to go outside our boundaries to establish the ideals in which we believe, or do we? If we do not * * * believe in the use of the bomb as a means to an end, then we are nothing more or less than conscientious objectors, and we should surrender and quit, and we should roll ourselves up into an America self-contained. In this policy I do not believe. . . .

We are at war although we have not concluded the Second World War. * * * Just how long will we feed our boys and our girls for slaughter, so long as we have the means with which in 48 hours to put an end to all this? I am free to admit I do not understand why we do not act in the premises, and at once, to end all war by putting an end to it, for it is high time for a showdown too long delayed.

Our destiny requires that we should have made and should use the power to accomplish the salvation of civilization. To wait much longer is to inherit a place with the other buried civilizations, some five in number, which never had the intestinal fortitude to sustain and to maintain the principles for which they stood.

Remember Pearl Harbor, and threatened by the situation in Korea and elsewhere, with Rudyard Kipling we may truthfully say:

"Far called our navies melt away
On dune and headland sinks the fire,
Lo, all our pomp of yesterday
Gone with Nineveh and Tyre.
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget; lest we forget."

The road to universal peace is a tortuous path which leads down the dark future through long generations, involving the Christianization of the world—an end devoutly to be sought, eventually to be obtained—but obviously ages hence.

The sober realization of a people who fail to allow their idealism to divorce them from stark reality and a clear conception of the foibles and idiosyncracies of human nature impresses the fact upon them that just so long as racial hatred and discrimination, economic rivalry between nations for world

markets, and arrogant nationalism remain, disarmament and a pacific world cannot be. * * *

I would like to believe that there would never again be another world war. I would like to feel that the dawn of everlasting peace was near at hand. * * *

I would like to believe that human nature has changed, but the hard cold facts are that no plan has been promulgated in our day or generation, or ever will be, that will change human nature or bring about the millenium by contract. No covenant, as such alone, which has ever been made or will be entered into in this day of grace between and among nations can or will prove a perfect panacea for or perfect preventative of war. The truth is that neither you nor I, our children or great-grandchildren will live long enough to see the day when it will be unnecessary to maintain a sufficient force to guarantee safety and to keep the peace.

We all agree that war is evil. We agree that war is the prolific mother of every other evil known to men; disease, want, cruelty, destruction, hatred of man for man, dictatorships of every kind. We agree that whatever values may come out of war are far offset by the brood of evils it invariably spawns. We agree that the eradication of war is the prime business of both ethical religion and modern civilization. We simply refuse to accept the inference or assertion that war is natural and unavoidable. When Cordell Hull said: "War is not an act of God; it is a crime of man," the religious conscience said: "Amen."

My private opinion is that unless we are prepared to back not only with dollars but with the necessary force the edicts issued by the United Nations we stand helpless. * * *

Whether we shall come through standing up to survive or lying down to lose all our liberty, to find ourselves in the limbo of those who do not appreciate what they have until they have it not, is something we must decide. It is later than you think.

Our country is losing its soul.

It has taken me some time, fellow Vermonters, to realize that as individuals we do not appreciate our opportunities nor do we discharge our responsibilities. I am not going to preach at you, I am going to tell you that we are responsible for the situation that obtains, and nobody else.

Because we have assumed the attitude, "let George do it." We have presumed that someone else would take care of us and everything else while we undertook to take good care of ourselves.

The self-seekers, the weaklings, the so-called and would-be liberals, the wild-eyed progressives, the crack-pot fellow travelers who follow or are followed by the Commies or affiliated with them, the parlor pinks, in short, the opportunists in every field dedicated to subversion and perversion have swarmed into all activities in which we should have indulged, and taken over our responsibilities everywhere right before our face and eyes. With ears to hear and eyes with which to see, we have neither heard nor seen. * * *

Our country has come a long way in 176 years, and yet at the peak of a material greatness with which no other nation has ever been blessed, there is a feeling of inner insecurity spreading over the length and breadth of the land among all classes of people, affording exactly the opportunity sought to be obtained by those who would destroy us. This threat has reached a point where it very seriously threatens our existence as a nation. * * *

The house cleaning which is needed everywhere might well commence in Vermont, the summer home of Alger Hiss, and a place where are to be found too many of his friends and admirers. We can get along without

them, and the fact that we tolerate them and undertake to alibi the reason for their being here is no credit to the State of Vermont in the eyes of those who look at us from outside the State. For years our schools and colleges, Nation-wide, have neglected to bring into the lives of millions of young Americans the basic spiritual truth which is the root of American strength. * * *

There is very little religious teaching, but instead it has become popular to claim to believe that man is nothing more than a superior animal. It is trite, but it is true, that ordinary honesty and loyalty are being disregarded on all sides. * * * Men and women in important positions in Government have acted as traitors and have given away precious secrets to those who would destroy our country, and nobody knows how many like them have not been caught. While communism of the registered variety may to some extent be controlled by law, the problem which confronts us is not subscribed by our fight with communism nor to be treated with complacency.

Men of great force and persuasion, gifted with many attractive qualities, extremely disarming, ranking today among the famous men of our time have probably shaped the trend to godlessness in America more than all other forces combined. In my opinion, not only have they rejected the fundamental idea on which our Republic is founded, but have been the means of causing millions of others to follow in the same godless path.

So far as the future is concerned, I wonder if there will be a future for my grandchildren, or if they will ever enjoy the privileges and opportunities which have been accorded me and you, if such a standard of living as we have enjoyed shall be maintained, or is it worth the price? So I wonder, and have wondered, and one night, believe it or not, I wrote what I call a poem. I called it I Wonder, and this is what I said:

"As once I wandered at eventide alone
In rain-drenched garden paths through
flowers and weeds,

I wondered if any day and sun would ever
follow to atone

For all the wind and dark had done; to
which no heed in world at large

Is paid by those who idly pass to waste
both lives and time and money never
earned,

Lightly burdened by thought or care of
whence these came or what a burden
some must bear

To save us from the catastrophic flair
For reckless, wicked waste of things they
claim do make men great!

"Still stand I wondering what will be their
fate—

The fate of those who measure not nor
calculate

The depth to which by ill-considered reck-
lessness with lives of other people's
son, and dollars, not their own,

They have condemned those generations
yet unborn

To travail such as other age has never
known."

But that which my friend, Hurd, said in answer put me in my place poetically and otherwise when he wrote:

"The scythe that severs life lays waste the
world;

The hate which cumulates to wrath is
hurled

Against the peace which trembled like a
flower

Upon the stalk of hope. The fatal hour
Has struck. * * * Is this the end

Of Hope? The ultimate for which men
spend

Their years in never-ending toil and sweat?
Is this the doom to which our days curvet

Like moths unable to resist the light
Whose flame is death?

"Thus fell the boasted might
Of Nineveh and Troy * * * thus
Carthage fell * * *

And Babylon. Shall future centuries tell
A similar story of our rise and fall
To depths too deep for resurrection? Call
The roll of systems grown obese and weak
From glutton; apply the pure critique
Of reason to historic facts and know
The ageless truth that nations cannot sow
The retroactive earth with hate and reap
The fruits of love. Oblivion lies deep
Upon the names of tyrant men and states.
Be not deceived, for time reiterates
The unlearned lessons of the fruitless past.

"The slashing scythe cannot destroy the vast
insistence within the root. The ground
Grows quick with promise; without audible
sound

Or visible motion, life thrusts toward the
light

Like secretive grass that grows despite
The devastation of the scythe. Madmen
sow

The soil with steel, indifferent to woe
Implanted! Ignorant of Nemesis.
Tomorrow is a deep and dark abyss
Into which the cruel and unjust
Will slide and vanish. Empires fall to
dust—

Democracies will follow if they dare
To break eternal faith with man—despair
Is fertile soil for change. Lay waste the
earth—

Apply the blade to beauty and to mirth—
Reduce each city to a cluttered grave—
Destruction is not final if we save
A single fibered root of freedom. Now
Is not forever! Wait! Somewhere, some-
how

The severed stalk of liberty shall rise,
Grow green, and flower under friendlier
skies."

God alone knows how late the hour is for
our civilization. It may be later than we
think. But, until the hour of midnight strikes
and all hope vanishes, we must work at our
task of trying to do our duty as God gives
it to us to see it, seeking peace without
fear or alarm, but ready and prepared to
defend ourselves as we save civilization.
More than this we cannot do; to do less
than this would be quite useless.

"God bless our native land!
Firm may she ever stand,
Through storm and night;
When the wild tempests rave,
Ruler of wind and wave,
Do Thou our country save
By Thy great might.

"For her our prayer shall rise
To God, above the skies;
On Him we wait;
Thou who art ever nigh,
Guarding with watchful eye,
To Thee aloud we cry,
God save the state!"

The Anticrime Crusade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 30, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am tremendously gratified that there is apparently an excellent chance that the Senate Commerce Committee will carry on the anticrime crusade which we of the

Special Crime Investigating Committee have been conducting since May of 1950.

I have previously placed in the RECORD—on August 22 on page A5317 and on August 24 on page A5390—various materials which I have issued, or which have been published, on the need for the continuation of the investigation, particularly in connection with the need for a probe of crime and corruption within the District of Columbia area.

The newspapers in the District are to be congratulated for their tremendous interest in seeing such a probe conducted. In addition to editorial comments, there has been a very wide news coverage of this whole matter, and I am sure it has served to stimulate the thinking of Members of the Senate.

I should like to place in the RECORD at this time various additional materials pertinent to this general theme.

First, I should like to include the text of the release which I sent out last Sunday on the subject.

Second, I should like to include the text of an editorial which was carried in the Evening Star on Tuesday, August 28. This editorial was entitled "In Fairness to Police," and I agree thoroughly with the sentiments which it expresses. It rightly pointed out that in all fairness to the police of the District of Columbia they should be given the opportunity to clear their collective name.

During the last several days I have had to cite various anonymous letters which have come to me—letters with a ring of authenticity, letters which have cast a reflection on District law enforcement. I have had no alternative in doing this, because these anonymous tips are the only thing that can be presented at this stage in lieu of complete investigative findings. I have very carefully refrained, of course, from citing any names mentioned in those anonymous tips, because I realize more than anyone that the whole procedure of honoring anonymous letters is extremely dangerous, and can do irreparable harm to innocent people.

I would infinitely prefer that the senders of anonymous letters have the courage to write their names and addresses so that they might be fully questioned. However, they often fear retribution and so are careful to avoid specific reference to themselves. I feel that it is my public duty to at least mention the subject matter of which they wrote as an indication of the type of material that could be uncovered if we had a complete investigation.

The third item is a very fine letter which I recently received from Mr. William F. Hadler, Jr., chairman of the home rule committee of the Democratic Club of the District of Columbia. Mr. Hadler points out the relation between the home-rule fight and the fight to clean up crime. It is not very often that I receive such splendid letters from a Democratic club, but seriously speaking, I am grateful to have received it, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, preceded by the listing of the officers, directors, and honorary vice presidents of the club—all very good Democrats, and

including many folks whom I have the honor of considering fine personal friends.

Finally, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal, of August 14, entitled "Public Apathy to Crime."

There being no objection the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

ANONYMOUS LETTERS REPORT PAY-OFFS TO POLICE IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AREA RACKETS: WILEY RENEWS PLEA THAT COMMERCE COMMITTEE CARRY ON CRIME PROBE

Time is running out in our Senate Crime Committee's probe and the Commerce Committee has but a few days to decide whether or not it will carry on after September 1st the job which we have initiated. If the Crime Committee dies at the end of this month and the Commerce Committee delays its decision (because of its preoccupation with other affairs), then our expert staff, assembled over a period of many months will disperse and the whole momentum of the investigation (which already has been somewhat lost) will be completely dissipated.

A great many messages have come to me endorsing my effort to try to get a thorough probe made into District of Columbia vice affairs. Included among such messages have been numerous anonymous letters (many with a clear ring of authenticity) reporting

(a) A considerable amount of pay-offs to law enforcement officers up and down the line so that they would ignore numbers and horse race betting operations being carried on in their areas in both the District and in adjacent Maryland and Virginia counties.

(b) A consequent vast increase in the wealth of certain law enforcement officers—wealth which even on its very face is completely disproportionate to the amount of income which they would have from their regular duties.

Organized crime cannot exist without police protection

The Senate Crime Committee has proved that no major organized crime, whether it be the policy racket, horse race betting, or other forms of gambling can possibly exist under the noses of the police without police connivance and protection in any American city. This is as true in the District of Columbia as it is everywhere else. The Crime Committee has also proved that there is probably no city in the country where organized rackets cannot be smashed practically over night if the wraps are taken off and if policemen honestly and fearlessly set out to do the job which they are supposed to do. Organized rackets exist in the District of Columbia, and it is obvious that there have been pay-offs all along the line. It is a very unhealthy situation where the seat of a national government is partially poisoned by the existence of crime and corruption, particularly amidst a grave national emergency while men are giving their lives for decency and freedom overseas. It is discouraging to the morals and morale of the Nation's youth in particular.

Home-rule legislation can be partial remedy

Part of the answer will come when District home-rule legislation—which I have previously supported and which I still support—is passed so that there can be more local responsibility in administration of local problems. The present home-rule legislation, while it is far from perfect, at least holds out the possibility of citizen participa-

tion in Government here. I think it is unfair to inform the people of the District of Columbia that crime exists in their midst and yet to deny them the opportunity to help eradicate such crime by their own judicious use of the ballot.

Suspicion should, of course, not be cast at the overwhelming bulk of District area law-enforcement officers, who comprise probably as fine a body of policemen as any American area enjoys; but it is clear to everyone concerned that the big shots in organized crime in the Capital area have been immune from prosecution for far too long, and it is up to us to find out why. Immunity does not happen accidentally.

Anticrime flurries tend to die down

The public should not be fooled into thinking that a flurry of local investigations and headlines are going to solve District crime. Flurries like this tend often to pass over with comparatively little permanent good accomplished, and that is why it is essential that the Senate investigation dig deeper and help strike at the taproots of crime here and elsewhere throughout the country.

Criminal establishments will open up on September 1

Criminals all over the United States are marking the days off on the calendar until Friday night, August 31, when the Crime Committee expires. They will breathe a lot easier when our special committee dies. It is reported that in a great many American major city areas, like the parishes outside New Orleans, organized gambling—now under the lid—expects the green light to be flashed on September 1, and expects to open up its establishments bigger, wider, and more profitably than ever.

A great many missing criminals and alleged criminals will also suddenly turn up out of hiding after September 1, having successfully defied the United States Government, unless new subpoenas are issued for them by the Senate Commerce Committee. At this stage of the game, it looks as though the top criminals of America may have the last laugh.

I do not discount all of the many excellent investigations by grand juries, local prosecutors, and other officials now under way, nor the progress which has been made in many other respects as a result of our Senate Crime Committee probe; but I do think that there is an unfortunate false sense of security being built up in the American people, a great delusion to the effect that the Senate Crime Committee, by the waving of some magic wand, has dealt a permanent blow to crime. There has been a considerable public awakening and much progress has been made, but a great deal more must still be done, and done by a United States Senate committee itself.

From the Washington Evening Star of August 28, 1951]

IN FAIRNESS TO THE POLICE

District Commissioner Donohue says the people of Washington have a right to know whether there is a close and unholy alliance between mobsters and officials of the District government. He is right in requesting a thorough investigation of flying rumors and anonymous charges that something is rotten with the Washington Police Department.

The District grand jury already has begun an inquiry into phases of the testimony given to the Senate Crime Committee by Charles E. Nelson, Maryland horse breeder who netted profits from a business he said might have been the numbers racket. Some of the information obtained by Senate investigators is reported to date back to gambling operations in this area beyond the statute

of limitations. Because the grand jury's investigation will be limited in scope by that statute, Mr. Donohue suggests a congressional inquiry. The Davis subcommittee of the House District Committee already has made an extended investigation of District crime conditions, is it true, but recent developments indicate that further probing by some congressional group might be productive.

Some of the anonymous communications to Senators are said to name names and describe incidents reflecting on the integrity of certain local police officers. Senator WILEY says the letters assert that a considerable amount of pay-offs to law-enforcement officers up and down the line has been made to protect numbers and race-betting racketeers. The Senator's public disclosure of these anonymous charges tends to raise questions in the mind of the public which ought to be settled one way or another without delay. If the grand jury cannot get at the truth, due to statutory limitations, Congress should direct one of its committees to conduct an investigation. It is only fair to the officers accused and to the police department as a whole that the allegations be checked for fact or falsity.

DEMOCRATIC CLUB OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D. C., August 21, 1951.
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: It was good to hear your statement advocating the development of Washington into a model American city, one of which all of us can be justly proud.

As you so knowingly pointed out there is a need for a clean-up of the gambling and narcotics rings that have infested the District of Columbia for some time and this vital work must begin at once.

In all American cities, through our cherished democratic processes the local citizenry can prevent such a menace from taking root by electing officials who will be diligent in their duty of discharging their public trust. These officials must serve the best interest of their people because they must answer to them directly—not indirectly.

All American cities, Senator, except one, the one that you and others have pointed out, where crime conditions are the worst in America today, our own voteless, voiceless National Capital.

The burdening and time-consuming duties of the congressional "city fathers" often cause the local problems to be slighted, and this is such a case brought to light.

The gambling rackets and narcotics trade are not new to the people of Washington, they have suffered with these things for years, but have been helpless to take direct democratic action to correct this evil condition.

The hearings of the Senate Crime Committee have clearly brought out before the public that any city government can stamp out the rackets, flourishing therein, within 24 hours if it is of the disposition.

At this time the people of Washington have taken renewed hope in the compromise home rule bill now passed by the Senate District of Columbia Committee to provide a good American city government which can clean its own house and give the Nation a model American city for its capital.

You may surely have the appreciation of all the people of Washington for your leadership in bettering the Nation's Capital.

With every good wish, I have the honor to remain,

Most respectfully yours,
WILLIAM F. FADLER, JR.,
Chairman, Home Rule Committee.

Officers: Arthur Clarendon Smith, Sr., president, William F. Fader, Jr., executive vice president, John K. Evans, vice president;

Mrs. Estelle Whiting, vice president; Capt. Edward Everett, treasurer; Miss Utha Gray Smith, assistant treasurer; Mrs. Vivian House, recording secretary; Mrs. Gertrude Jay Scott, corresponding secretary.

Publicity chairman: Paul A. Thels.

Board of directors: Arthur Clarendon Smith, Sr., chairman; Mrs. Estherlene Bell; Reidar D. Claffy; Maynard DeWitt; Capt. Edward Everett; William F. Fader, Jr.; Mrs. Anne T. Kelly; Herbert Leeman; Robert Mars; George Moriarity; Mrs. Arthur Clarendon Smith, Sr.

Honorary vice presidents: Hon. Charles F. Brannan, Mrs. Charles F. Brannan, Mrs. Oscar Chapman, Hon. George Neese Clark, Hon. Jesse M. Donaldson, Mrs. Jesse M. Donaldson, Mrs. Julien N. Friant, Senator Clyde R. Hoey, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Senator Estes Kefauver, Hon. J. Howard McGrath, Hon. Burnita S. Matthews, Senator Matthew M. Neely, Senator Claude Pepper, Brig. Gen. Louis H. Renfrow, Mrs. Louis H. Renfrow, Senator John J. Sparkman, Maj. Gen. Harry H. Vaughan.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of August 14, 1951]

PUBLIC APATHY TO CRIME

The district attorneys of the country are in better position than most men to appraise our current moral atmosphere. They are also among the least likely to exaggerate our shortcomings.

So when the National Association of County and Prosecuting Attorneys at its national convention expresses "deep concern over the evidence of a breakdown in the moral and spiritual life of our citizenry," the Nation can well believe that there is indeed "an alarming indifference to moral standards and basic ideals."

The keynote of the convention was a demand for a return to high concepts of morality by the people generally. The prosecutor, it was pointed out again and again, cannot enforce the laws against such evils as gambling and dope "unless the psychology of our people is affected with an abhorrence of the kind of crime they promote." In a climate of "public apathy" on many phases of crime, the prosecutor is in difficulty at the outset. He is lucky if he can get the courts to assess even a small fine against evildoers—a fine which will be looked upon merely as "an expense of doing business."

The district attorneys, are, of course, right in what they say. Any law can be enforced if the people are solidly behind it, no law can be a complete success in the face of public indifference. And there are today many indications that indifference has become widespread.

The astonishing reaction of many of those caught cheating at West Point is one evidence of how low some of us hold the fundamental virtue of common honesty. The "influence" selling and buying, revealed in the RFC and other investigations, is another proof of low standards.

In a truly moral society, such aberrations would bring forth high and general indignation. Today they seem merely to encourage others to go and do likewise. The general feeling seems to be: "If he got by with it, so can I."

To remedy such a situation, we must have an entering wedge. The police, the district attorneys, and the courts can here do their part. They can give better enforcement of the law than the people demand. If they themselves are convinced of the vital importance of getting their necks out. The educators and the church people can also do a better job than they have so far done, measured by results.

The decent forces of our country must still be a big majority. If they will band together, apathy will end. So long as they timidly "mind their own business," crime and "getting by with murder" will flourish.

United Nations Council's Action on Covenant on Freedom of Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 30, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Freedom Unadulterated," reprinted from the Akron Beacon-Journal, which refers to an address by the distinguished and able junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] on the floor of the Senate a few days ago relative to the proposed covenant on freedom of information.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM UNADULTERATED

Senator JOHN W. BRICKER, of Ohio, does not make a habit of presenting bouquets to the State Department, but he had a moderately kind word to say for the Department the other day. Taking note of the fact that the American delegate to the United Nations Economic and Social Council had denounced a proposed covenant on freedom of information, the Ohio Republican said it appeared that the State Department had finally become aware of the impossibility of drafting a universally acceptable definition of fundamental freedoms.

The sort of freedom of information described in the UN covenant was no freedom at all, judged by American standards. As BRICKER said, it would legalize a host of restrictions on the liberty of the press.

Perhaps naively, the United States took the lead, 5 or 6 years ago, in the attempt to establish through the UN a world-wide acceptance of the American concept of freedom of information. It soon became apparent, however, that many foreign governments were determined to hedge freedom with restrictions and penalties. The covenant finally drafted guaranteed no gains anywhere and as far as the United States was concerned, it represented an unthinkable retreat from the Constitution.

BRICKER stated an unpleasant fact, but a fact nevertheless, when he said:

"Most of the members of the United Nations subordinate the rights of the individual to the power of the state under some form of communism, fascism, or socialism. It was fantastic to expect that these countries would enter into any agreement recognizing the principles of economic and political freedom embodied in the Constitution of the United States and the Declaration of Independence."

The Senator believes that its experience in the futile effort to spread freedom of information should be a lesson to the State Department. He wants the Department to serve notice that "the basic liberties of the American people will not be compromised for the sake of obtaining agreement on an international bill of rights."

A declaration of this kind might put an end to the effort to achieve such a bill of rights. But if additional liberties can be gained for foreign peoples only by sacrificing freedoms which are traditional here, the subject may as well be dropped at once. The State Department would only be dealing frankly with the U. N. if it were to make the announcement urged by BRICKER.

The Yalta Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 30, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Yalta Agreement Was Great Tragedy," which appeared recently in the Washington (Pa.) Observer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YALTA AGREEMENT WAS GREAT TRAGEDY

The eight Republican MacArthur investigators who term Yalta a great tragedy are right. The secret protocol on China is an ugly chapter in American diplomatic history. It was at Yalta that the United States sacrificed principle for expediency, and this shameful fact should not be overlooked in the controversy over whether (or by whom) the United States was betrayed.

In the Atlantic Charter, later adhered to in principle by Russia, the signators agreed to seek no territorial aggrandizement from the war. Yalta violated that by giving Russia the other half of Sakhalin Island and the Kuriles. A promise publicly made to the people of the world was secretly violated.

In the Cairo declaration, moreover, Roosevelt and Churchill had proposed complete restoration of Chinese sovereignty over Manchuria. But at Yalta they also dishonored that promise by giving Russia special privileges in Manchuria, including what amounted to half ownership of two railroads. This act was also a betrayal of America's traditional open-door policy.

That this deal gave away the territorial rights of this country's ally China, without China's knowledge or consent is another of its shocking aspects. The Yalta protocol stated that Roosevelt would undertake to make Chiang give Russia what FDR promised. This is not the sort of role in the world that is consistent either with American principles or the national interest.

The world picture might be no less dark today if Roosevelt had made no such deal at Yalta, but American hands would be cleaner.

Dispersal of Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 30, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "How Not To Prepare," which appeared in the Bridgeport Post of August 28, 1951. It refers to the President's dispersal-of-industry policy.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW NOT TO PREPARE

It is about time that the Nation as a whole and the industrial East in particular woke up to the true inwardness of President Truman's dispersal-of-industry policy. He does

not want future contracts for war supplies awarded in industrial communities like Bridgeport or industrial States like Connecticut. He wants new factories to be built out in the prairies, the woods, and the deserts so they can't be hit with atom bombs.

That's what the man says.

As a matter of fact, assuming that the Russians have the atom bomb and assuming that they might want to drop it on us some fine day, there is only one real defense against it, and that is to have such a network of radar and interceptor planes as to make it virtually impossible for any Russian plane to get over us.

Otherwise the Russians would be quite content to drop their bombs on New York City, Chicago, Washington, or other targets which they couldn't possibly miss, without bothering to hunt up industry in the woods. They could strangle our whole transportation system by knocking out the important rail centers, unless President Truman also intends to move the railroads into the woods where there aren't any people, as a matter of safety.

But let's consider the practical aspects of the President's program. If the word "practical" can be applied to any such monstrosity

1 It means that the present factories which have the men, the machinery, and the know-how to produce what the Army, Navy, and Air Force need in the minimum possible time, are to be neglected.

2 It means that new factories are to be built and that the job of equipping these factories with the necessary tools and machinery will constitute a terrific drain on our materials and manpower, all of which must be subtracted from our actual production of materials needed for war use.

3 It means an enormous increase in the cost of the whole preparedness program plus a long delay in making the program effective.

Aside from that it's a good idea. It comes pretty near to being tops among the dam-fool ideas which emanate from Washington these days.

The Morgan Horse Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 30, 1951

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Morgan Horse Farm," which appeared in the Washington Star today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MORGAN HORSE FARM

People interested in equine affairs will be glad to hear that the famous United States Morgan Horse Farm in Weybridge Township, 2 miles north of Middlebury, Vt., is not to be closed. The Department of Agriculture, in charge of the place since 1908, has released it to the University of Vermont, and the breeding of noble Morgans will continue. Back of this news lies a fascinating mystery story which probably never will be solved.

Nobody knows where the first Morgan horse came from or what his ancestry was. His owner at the moment when his career as a historic steed began in 1795 was an obscure New England school teacher, Justin Morgan by name. How the animal was acquired by Morgan never has been settled. Tradition

tells that he accepted the horse in part payment of a debt owed by an acquaintance in Springfield, Mass. Morgan called the little critter—he was only 14 hands high—a "Dutch horse," but why he applied that designation to the forefather of all the Morgan stock is a question.

What matters is that the school teacher's steed was strong, docile, obedient, quick in response, intensely energetic, capable of out-pulling much larger horses. His contemporaries named him "Figure," but later he was entered in the books as "Justin Morgan" in memory of his owner. The teacher died in 1798, his "Dutch horse" lived until 1821. Meanwhile, the valiant little stallion had proved his power "to project his own characteristics through successive generations to remote descendants." Among his progeny were the celebrated General Gates, Bennington, Mansfield, Magellan, Ulysses, Canfield, Niles, Goldfield, Nadir, and Mentor—all magnificent creatures. The tribe now runs into thousands of members.

Much of the credit is due to Col. Joseph Battell, the founder of the official register of the breed. He established the farm at Middlebury in 1907 and gave it to the United States Government the following year. The Department of Agriculture made the place a center of the science of hippology—the practical art of producing and raising fine horses. Statistics compiled there are used by breeders throughout the world. The Bureau of the Budget recommended discontinuance of Federal supervision when the Army ceased to be interested in Morgans, but a way has been found for carrying on the stock under Vermont State management. Such direction should be and undoubtedly will be appreciated by all human friends of horses.

Freedom of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 30, 1951

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "This Press Freedom," which appeared in the Columbus Evening Dispatch on August 28, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS PRESS FREEDOM

It is axiomatic in a frightened and confused world that control and repression and restriction should suggest themselves as guarantors and protectors of freedom.

But they are, in fact, betrayers of freedom. And it has happened in our own times that they have been the executioners of freedom.

It is easy enough, for instance, to say that the guarantee of freedom of the press in the United States—or anywhere—carries with it an obligation on the part of the press to present accurate, factual information, or, as Mrs. Utterback in a letter on this page today quotes the New York Times as saying, that freedom of the press and of information is so complicated that the U. N. decided to handle the subject under a special and separate commission.

What this commission might do better than the experience of mankind has done in hundreds of years of difficult and painful effort toward defining and establishing

freedom of the press may, however, be questioned. And it has been questioned by the United States representative on the commission who has opposed the U. N. convention on press freedom as too restrictive; as, in fact, constituting control of the press rather than freedom of the press.

It was 140 years from the time of John Milton's defiance of the press licensing laws of Great Britain when, in 1644 the great poet and pamphleteer printed his "Areopagitica, a speech for the liberty of unlicensed printing to the parliament of England" (and got away with it) to Lord Mansfield's definition of press freedom.

Mansfield finally summed up the whole and complete idea of freedom of the press in 1734 when he said, simply, that "the liberty of the press consists in printing without any previous license, subject to the consequences of the law."

And that is the basis for the prohibition on Congress in the first amendment to our Constitution forbidding it to pass any law abridging freedom of the press.

The "responsibility" of the press to present accurate, factual, or any other kind of information is wholly irrelevant to the basic and all-pervading importance of freedom. To raise the question at all is to drag a very red and very odorous herring into the discussion.

The responsibility of the press is to be free to print anything it decides is worth printing. Then, if it has offended by injuring the reputation of an individual, the moral sensibilities of a people, the financial integrity of a corporation, it may be called to account by the courts.

Any attempt to define the responsibility of the press is an attempt to restrict and suppress it. Any attempt to restrict it as the U. N. convention has attempted to do—to make it responsible for the feelings of foreign monarchs or other foreign governmental agencies—is to deny freedom of the press the very soul of its being.

Genuine responsibility is self-imposed. The press of America naturally knows what is decent and what is truthful and factual. It naturally knows the fate of those publishing ventures which mislead, which lie, which print lascivious and obscene material, and which libel individuals or maliciously and wrongfully attack corporate structures. The press itself is one in opposing these practices. Its sense of responsibility is unusually high.

Responsibility imposed by law—or, as in the case of the U. N. Convention, by treaty—is not responsibility at all.

It is merely a tightening and a lessening of the field in which a free press naturally and normally performs.

In such restrictions lies the evil of even greater misrepresentations and misunderstanding among nations, for unless the full light is permitted to play on what is happening in the world the destruction which could (and perhaps would) be devised in the great areas of darkness arbitrarily imposed by a legal definition of responsibility could well bring ultimate ruin, with desolation and death for us all.

Future International Manpower Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 30, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during the years of consideration of the im-

portant displaced persons, expelled persons and related problems, it has been my pleasure to have had numerous contacts with Msgr. Edward Swanstrom, director of war relief services of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and with his able associates, including Rev. Aloysius J. Wycislo.

Monsignor Swanstrom serves also as chairman of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies, Displaced Persons and Refugee Committee, and in that capacity, as in others, he has been a source of invaluable suggestions for those of us who have been interested in America's fulfillment of her humanitarian responsibilities down through the years.

Because I am leaving for the Japanese Treaty Conference in San Francisco this afternoon, it will not be possible for me to comment in a Senate address regarding the subject matter of Monsignor Swanstrom's telegram, namely, provisions of our mutual aid bill dealing with movement of surplus manpower. I do however, ask unanimous consent that its text be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I earnestly invite the attention of my colleagues to it because I feel that it represents not only the seasoned judgment of church and lay leaders who have been working with might and main on Europe's manpower problems, but it represents a clear voice of America's own conscience in dealing with this issue.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., August 29, 1951.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

As chairman of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies' displaced persons and refugee committee composed of the major voluntary immigration agencies in the United States, among whom are American Friends Service Committee, American Jewish Distribution Committee, Church World Service, Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society, Lutheran Resettlement Service, United Service for New Americans, United States Committee for the Care of European Children, War Relief Services—National Catholic Welfare Conference, and others, I urge your fullest support of H. R. 5113 and am particularly concerned that there be clearly established during the debate that it is the intent of the Congress to provide that the use of ECA funds for the movement of surplus manpower from Western Europe will be withheld from any international organization, institute, or office which has among its membership nations which are Communist or Communist-dominated. The provision that a specialized temporary operational organization which has as its sole purpose the movement of surplus manpower from Western Europe to areas of the world where manpower is needed for economic development is the soundest approach in meeting this gravest of human problems confronting the Western World in its efforts to establish common security. This is the position of the agencies I have the honor to represent and has been clearly indicated by us to Assistant Secretary of State Hickerson and members of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Msgr. EDWARD E. SWANSTROM,
War Relief Services—National Catholic Welfare Conference.

The Veto Power in the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 30, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a guest editorial written by A. D. Quaintance, which appeared recently in the Denver Post. Mr. Quaintance is a profound student of the United Nations Organization, and is anxious to get rid of the veto.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET THREE-FOURTHS VOTE REPLACE DEADLY VETO POWER—AMERICA'S PATTERN COULD MAKE REAL U. N.

(By A. D. Quaintance)

The great Professor Barr tells us that the whole world is in a condition of chaos and revolution and instead of being in for one more war we will be in for perpetual war until everyone joins the human race and studies the bold new program series.

Rather, what we need, I believe, is to go back to the bold old program of our forefathers and Independence Hall in Philadelphia where we can learn the history of the founding of the greatest Nation in the world.

The immediate past President of the United States thought so little of our form of government that he spent billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to propagandize the word "democracy" in order to perpetuate the Democratic Party, a trick which was quite simple and effective.

Our own children and most of our citizens do not even now know that we are not a democracy but that we have a constitution, or fundamental law, which is the rock foundation upon which this, the greatest Government of liberty and freedom and individual initiative and incentive in the world, is founded, and that this constitution provides that we are a republic and have a republican, or representative, form of government.

In the face of the confusion at home we have a world begging us to give them the kind of liberty and freedom that we have always enjoyed and to give them a fundamental law and constitution similar to our own and which will work for them as successfully as it has for us. They ask for bread and we give them a stone. They want something—the something that has enabled the class- and caste-ridden peoples of the earth to come to our shores and be freed from.

Instead of our amending the Charter of the United Nations by doing away with the veto power and making a three-fourths majority the controlling factor, the same as it was under the Articles of Confederation of the United States of America, we have permitted Russia, by abuse of the veto power, to block the United Nations and to make it absolutely ineffective and helpless.

I had the temerity to offer in the Bok peace contest after the First World War, the plan or pattern of our own government of the world. I was not ashamed of this simple plan of republican, representative government as an ideal pattern for the world, but this plan, which acknowledged God Almighty has been derailed and the world, in its search for false gods, is falling into chaos, anarchy, and revolution. There is no venture capital and no incentive for honest labor and the fires of liberty and freedom are dying.

How shall we rekindle these fires of liberty and freedom and cause them to burn brightly throughout the whole world? I say by amending the Charter of the United Nations, first to recognize God, the Supreme Being. Second, to do away with the veto power, which has enabled Russia to block all progress, and to adopt in place of the veto power, a three-fourths vote of the nations belonging to the United Nations, which was the method adopted by our forefathers under the Articles of Confederation of the United States of America.

With these changes the fires of liberty and freedom will be relighted and burn brightly, for we can then have law and order in the world and a new sense of security, peace, and safety that will enable us, with the use of atomic energy in peaceful pursuits, as suggested and sponsored by the University of Michigan in its Phoenix project, suggested by its great ex-president, Alexander G. Ruthven, to make great progress in the art of peaceful living, and a return to the idea that every man should work and earn an honest living.

It is fitting that the United Nations Organization is located in this country where we can influence it as an instrument of law and order and peace in the world. It may take 100 years or more to make it work completely but in the meantime we can maintain peace and law and order by a representative body of the whole world rather than having any one country seeking to master and control and dominate.

We have truly in our own United States of America, the pattern for a genuine United Nations of the World.

Department of What's This

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, Army engineers figure 182 projects would cost \$2,500,000,000 when they asked Congress to approve them. They now say the cost will be almost six billions. Eight hundred million dollars of this comes from poor engineering. Do we need new engineers or not?

Tidelands Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 31, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by me as guest columnist for Drew Pearson, published in the Montgomery Advertiser of August 26, 1951. In the article I discussed the question of tidelands oils.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(With Hon. LISTER HILL, of Alabama, as guest columnist)

(SYNDICATE NOTE.—While Drew Pearson is on a brief vacation, the Washington Merry-go-Round is being written by several distinguished guest columnists, today's being by Hon. LISTER HILL, United States Senator from Alabama. Senator HILL is the author of the Hill-Burton Hospital Act, the rural telephone act, and co-author of the TVA Act and the Vocational Education Act.)

WASHINGTON.—The life of a Senator is not always a happy one. In these days when the problems are so complex, so grave, and so global every Senator imagines himself an Atlas with the world on his shoulders.

But every once in awhile he is abundantly rewarded for all his pains by the finding of a sound solution to a problem of large proportions. He knows that if he is able to win application of his solution he will have rendered a service to the American people. That becomes his new challenge.

Today I want to tell you about my new challenge. I call it oil for education. You may wonder what oil has to do with educating the children of this Nation.

Let me tell you about the oil. Off the coasts of Texas, California, and Louisiana are billions of barrels of oil under the sea. The geologists of the United States Department of the Interior and of private oil companies estimate there is at least \$40,000,000,000 worth at present prices. There may also be fabulous quantities of gas. The Supreme Court of the United States in two famous lawsuits has said this oil does not belong to the three States alone but to all the people of this country—the United States of America.

But with no better claim to the oil than that they are closest to it, these States with the help of big oil companies have introduced a bill to overrule the Supreme Court and have Congress make them an outright gift of the oil. They recently got their bill through the House of Representatives and it is now in the Senate. It is exactly the same kind of give-away bill that the President vetoed about 5 years ago before the two lawsuits were decided.

Every teacher, every parent knows the desperate financial condition of education all over the United States—of grammar schools, high schools, and colleges.

Meanwhile the Federal Government is up to its neck in debt, unable because of mounting military requirements to foresee a balanced budget. The American taxpayer is already carrying a heavy tax burden and sees a still heavier one ahead. If he is a parent or teacher he says to himself that he knows our schools are in serious condition, but he doesn't for the life of him see where he is going to get the money to put them in the shape they should be.

But if we put these three things together—oil, education, and the tax burden—you get a result, a solution that will work. My new challenge is put all three together.

That is what is proposed in the "oil for education" amendment sponsored by myself and Senators DOUGLAS, of Illinois; KEFAUVER, of Tennessee; MORSE, of Oregon; NEELY, of West Virginia; TORY, of New Hampshire; HENNING, of Missouri; BENTON, of Connecticut; HUMPHREY, of Minnesota; CHAVEZ, of New Mexico; LEHMAN, of New York; my colleague, Senator SPARKMAN; and Congressman MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana.

The amendment provides that the royalties from this public undersea oil resource shall be paid into the United States treasury

and used for education. This is the policy that Congress adopted in the Morrill Act, providing grants of public land for the establishment of our magnificent system of land-grant colleges. Applying the same policy to this great new land resource at the bottom of the sea would be like placing an oil well in the back yard of every grammar school, high school, and college in America.

This oil offers education's big chance—the means given by providence without taxes for meeting a large part of education's pressing needs. It is America's big chance to turn the trend away from illiteracy and educational deficiency that has caused the rejection of over 300,000 young men by the armed services since Korea—the equivalent of over seventeen infantry divisions. Our potential enemies outnumber us many times in manpower. Our industrial and military superiority rest upon the education and scientific training of our people.

As the Atlanta Journal recently pointed out in a splendid editorial, this vast store of undersea oil is one of our greatest potential sources of oil. The late secretary of national defense, Mr. James Forrestal, defending Federal ownership, called it one of our most priceless weapons. For all our atom bombs, we could not carry them to the enemy without oil. Forty-two percent of the total world supply lies in Russia's back yard in the Middle East. The oil tremors in Iran at this hour point up the importance of keeping the withdrawal of our oil under the conservation supervision of the United States Department of the Interior, in cooperation with the Department of National Defense.

The oil must be used in the interest of national security. The royalties should be used for the education of the children of the entire nation.

The oil-for-education amendment should have the active support of every parent, every teacher, every educator.

Fumbling in Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BLAIR MOODY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 31, 1951

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column published in the Washington Post of today, written by Millard Caldwell, the distinguished former Governor of Florida, who is now the Federal Civil Defense Administrator, on a subject which in my judgment should have the serious consideration of every American.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Millard Caldwell)

CALDWELL HITS FUMBLING IN CIVIL DEFENSE

(While Drew Pearson is on vacation, the Washington Merry-go-Round is being written by several guest columnists, today's being by Millard Caldwell, Federal Civil Defense Administrator.)

While time is running out, the cracker-box strategists fumble civil defense.

Some of them know that air power at its best can stop only 30 out of 100 attacking enemy bombers. Yet they insist that more

air power is the sole answer to protecting the home front.

Others blow hot and cold. One day they think the situation is so hopeless that civil defense could do no good. The next day, the world situation looks brighter, so civil defense is not needed.

Still others insist that retaliation is the answer. What we can do to the enemy blinds them to what the enemy can do to us. They forget the trigger for our retaliation will be a mass atomic attack on our own cities.

Then, another group, the ostrich thinkers, insist that no nation would dare attack this country, because nobody ever has, and besides we're too strong.

Some, bored with crisis after crisis, wake up now and then, say "it can't happen here," and doze off again.

The timid pin their hope on Russian backwardness and say, "that atomic explosion in Russia wasn't really the bomb."

While the pseudo-strategists grope in a smog of truth, half-truth and fantasy, time is running out. We stand in danger of war.

We can lose a war

Too many seem unable to grasp the fact that we can lose a war. Their stock answers are: If it takes production, we'll out-produce the enemy. If it takes atomic bombs, we'll build bigger and better atomic bombs. If they hit us, we'll hit 'em harder.

These prevalent American beliefs are ingrained, basic, but unfortunately, stop short of an adequate answer to the sharp question sired by reality. They were incomplete by three things—Red imperialism, the global bomber, and the atomic bomb.

This trio has forced on Americans a whole new concept of war. Today or any day, America itself can become a battleground. Civilians are the first targets in this new kind of war. If the enemy first smashes the home front, the military may have little left to fight for and less to fight with.

The Kremlin knows that our American home front must be knocked out quickly, if it is to be knocked out at all. For this reason the first attack must be a grand slam using all the modern terror weapons.

Those who doubt the likelihood of war on the home front should heed what Representative CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, had to say on the floor April 9. He said "If war comes—which God forbid—it will be fought in this country as well as abroad."

Vandenberg's warning

General Vandenberg (speaking for the Air Force) said that "in spite of all our radar fences, our walls of shipping, our networks of communication, and our clouds of interceptor planes, 70 percent of the enemy planes carrying atomic bombs would get through. We might as well face that fact. Every center of production, every center of wealth and population, and civilization would be devastated. We have only to look at the cities in Germany to see how the cities of America would look within 1 week after war started."

W Stuart Symington, while chairman of NSRB, said "who can be a bigger fool than the fool who continues to fool himself, especially when his own existence is at stake." Those who will read the record must see where the 30-year pattern of Russian imperialism leads.

The retaliationists have an empty answer. To devastate Russian cities would not restore our own.

Unrealistic thinking has sapped our strength and robbed us of precious time. No American city is prepared to cope with an enemy attack. We must use our time wisely and well. There is no time for fatalism or fantasy.

Our Vindictive Little Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 31, 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Vindictive Little Man," published in the Chattanooga (Tenn.) News-Free Press of July 30, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR VINDICTIVE LITTLE MAN

In his speech, or tirade, at Detroit Saturday, Harry Truman demonstrated anew the magnitude of the tragedy which has befallen the United States in having Harry Truman as President at this critical time in the history of this Nation and the world.

The President gave a realistic summary of evidence that Communist Russia is preparing for a new war—even while the present negotiations for "peace" are proceeding in Korea. He cited warlike moves in Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, the Russian provinces, and in North Korea, and warned the people of America must be ready for "any emergency."

The people know that, in fact have known it for a long time. They have long been ready for any emergency.

They backed Mr. Truman with surprising unanimity when he decided to intervene with American armed force to block Communist aggression in Korea. They backed him strongly until the Truman-Acheson administration turned the war in Korea into a war of appeasement—after Red China became the enemy instead of Red Korea.

Mr. Truman used strong language in his denunciation of the Russian war plans. His strongest language was reserved, however, for his attack on Americans who disagree with him.

Though he did not mention any names, Mr. Truman accused men who are fighting patriotically for what they are convinced is the best interest of their country of "using the smear and the big lie for personal publicity and partisan advantages, heedless of the damage they do to their country."

Since his speech came immediately after the Boston address by Gen. Douglas MacArthur, in which the general criticized policies of the administration, it is reasonable to assume the President's remarks were directed in part at General MacArthur.

But if Harry Truman, the Pendegast machine President, whose administration has been shown by its own supporters to be shot through and through with the vilest corruption, thinks he can impugn the honor, integrity, and patriotism of a man of General MacArthur's stature, then the power and the glamor of his office have indeed gone to his head.

Mr. Truman charged his critics with "trying to stir up trouble and suspicion between the people and their Government."

As a matter of fact, the critics to whom the President referred have been trying hard to remove from the Government causes of the people's suspicions—and causes of suspicions which are justified.

There is no doubt that Republicans have sought partisan advantage of the faults of the administration. But the outstanding critics of the administration, both Republicans and Democrats, have sought the adop-

tion of policies and measures which they, along with millions of good American citizens, sincerely believe necessary for the safety and welfare of the Nation.

These people are denounced by Mr. Truman as liars and self-seekers.

There could be no more impressive evidence of the fact that Harry Truman is too small to be President—at this time or at any other.

The stubborn intolerance of this little man is the cause of much, if not most, of our country's present trouble.

Infiltration of Communists in Democratic Party in Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 31, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a short article from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of August 28, 1951, entitled "No Party Members Among Suspects, Democrats Report." As long ago as the 1949 report, and again in my minority reports on Hawaiian statehood in 1950 and in 1951, I called attention to the infiltration of the Democratic Party in Hawaii by the Communists. The newspaper article I have referred to states that none of the seven Communists seized by the FBI are any longer members of the Democratic Party. It makes it very clear that at least three of the seven were members of the Democratic Party until about a year or so ago. In short, this article sustains completely the charges I have made regarding Communist infiltration of the Democratic Party. Furthermore, there is nothing in the article to indicate that this Communist influence has been removed, since the great majority of Communist top-liners in Hawaii are still at large.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO PARTY MEMBERS AMONG SUSPECTS, DEMOCRATS REPORT

Democratic Party leaders were quick to point out today that not one of the seven persons arrested by the FBI as Communists is a registered Democrat.

Edward P. Toner, former member of the Standpat Democratic Territorial Central Committee, says he checked the party records early today.

He found that four of those arrested are not Democrats, and three resigned more than a year ago.

Here's the way Mr. Toner tabulated the score:

Jack Wayne Hall, regional director of the ILWU: A former Democrat who resigned from the party 18 months ago.

Jack D. Kimoto: Resigned from the party in 1950 after charges were filed against him by Mr. Toner.

Dwight James Freeman: Not a Democrat. Charles K. Fujimoto, chairman of the Communist Party in Hawaii: Not a Democrat.

Mrs. Charles K. Fujimoto: Not a Democrat.

John E. Reinecke: Resigned from the party in 1950 after charges were filed by Mr. Toner

Koji Ariyoshi, editor of the Honolulu Record: Not a Democrat.

The Return of Gromyko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 31, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Gromyko's Back," which appeared in the Patriot, published in Harrisburg, Pa., on August 29.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GROMYKO'S BACK

Andrei Gromyko arrived in this country the other day

He and a large staff will represent Soviet Russia at the Japanese Peace Conference in San Francisco.

There is no reason for Russia to have anything to say about the Japanese Peace Conference. Russia contributed nothing to the defeat of Japan. She jumped into the Japanese war after Japan was beaten and the world knew it. She just got in in time to fulfill the technical condition of having declared war. If it had not been for the frightened men of Washington who made needless concessions to Russia in order to get her into the war, she might never have got into the Japanese war at all. It would have been over too soon for her to do so.

The man who did so much to defeat Japan and who was almost entirely responsible for the rehabilitation of the Japanese people to date, General MacArthur, will not be at the peace conference. But Gromyko will. That such a weird condition could come about must be attributed to the sheer genius with which this administration has messed our foreign affairs in the Orient.

Gromyko will be on hand to throw monkey wrenches into the peace conference if he can. Failing that, he will make the whole business an organ of Red propaganda for the Far East.

Too bad the Asiatics could not see the picket signs which greeted Gromyko when he landed in New York. They were carried by a delegation of Americans of Hungarian origin. Their story in slogans went this way:

"Gromyko in luxury, Hungarians in slavery"

"Gromyko—Slave labor paid for your luxurious trip"

"Gromyko—You and your bosses talk peace but make war"

"Gromyko—Back again to confuse the issues"

You see, Hungary has had communism; Hungarians have really had it.

Yes, Gromyko is here again to carry on the Red sabotage of western institutions. While we talk about peace in our above-board, fair-play, give-and-take way, Gromyko will be making Red propaganda and scuttling the fine relationship built up by MacArthur between the Americans and their vanquished foes who can and should be valuable allies against the spread of Communist aggression.

Gromyko is back and facing a splendid opportunity to hurt us again, thanks to the fact that we have lost MacArthur's firm hand on Japan.

We will continue for a long time to collect dividends of trouble from President Truman's ill-advised and hasty and utterly wrong and petty action in dismissing MacArthur.

Communist Penetration of the Hawaiian Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 31, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the lead article from an extra edition of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of August 28, 1951, entitled "FBI Seizes Seven Isle Reds." It is very interesting to note that of the seven Communists who were taken into custody in Hawaii several days ago, six were named by me as leading Communists in the Territory as long ago as 1949 in my report, entitled "Communist Penetration of the Hawaiian Islands," based on my personal investigation there of the question of Hawaii statehood. At the time I made that report, my charges of the Communist menace there were sneered at, and I was told that I was imagining dangers where none existed. It is very gratifying to see that the FBI feels exactly the same as I do regarding this threat to our American institutions.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FBI SEIZES SEVEN ISLE REDS—BAIL IS SET AT \$75,000 EACH; ALL SEVEN ARE SENT TO JAIL

Bail was set at \$75,000 each—a total of \$525,000—this morning for seven alleged leaders of Hawaii's Communist Party.

Unable to raise the sum immediately, all seven were committed to the Honolulu city-county jail.

They are scheduled for a preliminary hearing at 9 a. m. Thursday before United States Commissioner Harry Steiner, the official who signed their arrest warrants and set their bail today.

After their dawn arrests, the seven first were taken to the FBI offices in the Dillingham Building on Bishop Street.

NONE HANDCUFFED

It was about 8:45 before they arrived at the United States commissioner's office on the third floor of the Honolulu police department building.

Each was accompanied by an FBI agent, but none was handcuffed.

Jack W. Hall was the first to come up in the elevator to the hearing room. The others followed in a next elevator.

The FBI agents had a tight hold on Denichi Jack Kimoto but simply walked alongside the others.

Harriet Bouslog and Myer C. Symonds, the two attorneys who defended the hostile witnesses in the 1950 un-American activities hearings, appeared as attorneys for the seven.

ATTORNEY PROTESTS

They had not been allowed to see the seven at the Dillingham Building and Mrs. Bouslog protested they were being held virtually "incommunicado."

Commissioner Steiner spoke first to Jack Hall, and asked if he was aware of the charge against him.

Hall said, "Yes, I know."

The commissioner then told him that he is entitled to a hearing and asked if he wanted one immediately.

"I'll have to wait for advice of my counsel," Hall said. He then turned to Mrs. Bouslog to ask her advice.

The commissioner called each of the seven to ask them to identify their counsel and all named Bouslog & Symonds.

TWO-WAY ARGUMENT

The attorneys for the seven and Howard K. Hoddick, United States attorney, then argued over two points—bail and a hearing time.

Mr. Symonds asked for the hearing at 2 p. m. today. Mr. Hoddick asked for a week's delay.

Commissioner Steiner finally set 9 a. m. Thursday.

On bail, Mr. Hoddick said the United States Attorney General requested that the figure be set at from \$75,000 to \$100,000.

(This is comparable to the figures set in the mainland arrests, although some were later reduced.)

HIT HIGH FIGURE

Mrs. Bouslog and Mr. Symonds, speaking for the defendants, said the high figure would be tantamount to denying bail.

"You have to take the charges into consideration," Commissioner Steiner said, and set the \$75,000 figure.

He then asked Mr. Symonds if his clients could make the bond—a total of \$525,000.

Sarcastically, the attorney replied, "You'll have to give us time to make arrangements to rob a bank, Judge."

TWENTY-FIVE ATTEND HEARING

The seven were officially in custody of Emmanuel Moses, Deputy United States Marshal.

About 25 people were in the hearing room—the seven, their attorneys, the commissioners, about five newspaper and press association reporters, and the rest FBI men.

Mr. Symonds asked for a larger hearing room.

"I want to consult my clients without a lot of FBI agents around," he said.

Poland and Her Tragic History Since September 1, 1939

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address commemorating the twelfth anniversary of Adolf Hitler's wanton attack on Poland:

POLAND AND HER TRAGIC HISTORY SINCE SEPTEMBER 1, 1939

The beginning of World War II, September 1, 1939, is a tragic landmark in Poland's history. On August 23 of that year, when the Nazi-Soviet nonaggression pact was signed, then it seemed probable that Poland might become the first victim of that pact. The

subsequent train of events unfortunately proved that the first objective of that pact was the destruction of Poland as an independent and sovereign nation, the largest nation in northeastern Europe. Molotov had cynically described Poland as "the ugly offspring of the Versailles Treaty," but the Poland created at the end of World War I was infinitely better governed and a far better place to live in than the dismembered Poland created after World War II. It is now little more than a concentration camp for some 24,000,000 unhappy Poles.

On September 1, 1939, Nazi hordes swooped down upon Poland without a declaration of war, and in a few weeks they were able to eliminate most of Poland's organized forces from battle areas. On September 17, Stalin's Red hordes began to move into Poland on pretext that the nation had ceased to exist. On September 28 almost all of Poland lay prostrate under the occupation of her two neighbors, and on that day Poland was partitioned between the two conquerors. This fact itself proved to the world that in the destruction of Poland's independence Communist Russia was as guilty as Nazi Germany. Whether the invaders were Russians or Germans, the impact upon Polish citizens was the same—the destruction of their liberties. Stalin's henchmen literally drove out millions of Poles from eastern Poland to the Soviet Union, to the far-off corners in northern Russia and Siberia where many of them are still toiling under abominable conditions. The Nazi leaders planned the extermination of many Polish citizens in concentration camps and in gas chambers. It is impossible to say how many innocent and helpless Poles lost their lives in the hands of their cruel conquerors.

No country in Europe was more tragically and fundamentally affected by World War II than was Poland. After its legal government fled the country, after its regular fighting forces were destroyed by the invaders, and after millions of Poles had been uprooted from their native homes, millions of others carried on their underground fight against the enemy within Poland. For more than 4 years these valiant souls, undaunted by the terrible punishment imposed upon them, kept the fire of freedom and independence going in the hearts of their unfortunate countrymen. Dispersed and refugee Poles were able to reorganize themselves under General Anders and fight aggression side by side with the Western Allies.

It is a strange commentary on modern diplomacy that since the first shot was fired on September 1, 1939, the fate of the Poles, and the destiny of Poland have not been in Polish hands. That, one might say, is the curse of our days—that the fate of small and weak nations is in the hands of statesmen from large powers. During the last war the conferees at Yalta decided upon several provisions regarding Poland's future, and these were later confirmed at Potsdam. The disastrous course of political events in Poland was set in motion during these conferences, yet no qualified Polish leaders were consulted. They were not told of fateful arrangements which ultimately resulted in Soviet occupation.

Today, Poland, the largest of the Soviet Union's European satellites, is a vast concentration camp behind the iron curtain. There some 24,000,000 souls are being ordered and schooled in Soviet ideology. All the ways of liberty and freedom are proscribed. The ways of life must conform to communism as practiced in the Soviet Union. These helpless millions have only one hope, that of gaining their lost freedom through the aid of all free people, and especially with the constant help and encouragement which they hope to receive from this country. We Americans cannot be deaf to their appeals and entreaties. The homeland of Kosciusko and Pulaski, of Chopin and Paderewski, of Pilsudski and Anders, certainly deserves our help in its fight for freedom and independence.

Our Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 31, 1951

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject *Our Country*, by Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, president and general manager of Eastern Airlines, Inc., following a pageant staged by Karem Temple, AAONMS, in Tyler, Tex., on June 29, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am grateful indeed for the privilege and the opportunity to join with you this evening and to witness this beautiful ceremony portraying Shrinedom and Masonry in all its glory and significance.

Particularly is this true for that portion dedicated to the crippled children's hospitals, so dear to the hearts of all Shriners. Let us remember that this work was made possible through the vision and leadership of the Honorable W. Freeland Kendrick, former imperial potentate of our fraternity, and now carried on under the inspired leadership of Hon. Galloway Calhoun, 33°, past imperial potentate and chairman of the board of the hospitals, one of your fellow townsmen and one of God's noblemen. No man in America more nearly represents the conscience of the Shriners who are doing this great work than Noble Calhoun, whom I am delighted to call my friend.

Let us remember that it costs more than \$3,500,000 per year to operate these hospitals, and that we have failed to do our share toward meeting this obligation.

Let us Shriners never forget this worthy cause when budgeting our yearly contributions, so that some of the pleasures and happiness enjoyed by our own children may be shared by these less fortunate kiddies.

And, as Texans, I trust you will always remember the plentitude of rewards bestowed upon your great State, God must have in mind some special destiny for a community, almost a race apart, which in the span of two generations has created, deep in the heart of America, wealth and productivity

on a scale that dwarfs the much publicized state developments of the Soviet Urals.

A great shearing movement is going on among the American people tearing many away from the fundamental beliefs and aims upon which this Nation was erected. False doctrines are undermining the old faiths that made for unity, and we stand in great danger.

If you want an example of how fast a powerful nation can disintegrate once it deserts its ancient principles, I suggest you take a look at Great Britain.

About 67 years ago, the Fabian Society, composed principally of intellectuals, was founded for the main purpose of reconstructing society in accordance with the highest moral possibilities. At that time the labor movement was in its infancy, but eventually labor captured its program.

In contrast with Marxism which advocated the overthrow of society by force, the Fabians regarded the state—in other words the government as a social machine to be captured and used for the promotion of social welfare.

They coined a remarkable phrase to explain their seemingly mild but adroit policy, "The inevitability of gradualism."

And slowly, but surely, as the Fabians have accomplished their purpose, the living standards of the English people have been lowered until today British power has sunk to its lowest ebb in three centuries, and the Promised Paradise of the common people has failed to materialize. Their taxes are higher than at any time in the history of their country; their freedoms are gradually being taken away from them.

Let us heed the lesson implicit in the dismal outcome of this British experiment in "The inevitability of gradualism." Slowly and surely we ourselves have begun to succumb to the same dreary philosophy of drift.

Can the process be stopped? It can if we who loathe all that statism implies take full and constant advantage of our right to speak out—if we register our convictions whenever the issues are raised in elections.

Speaking about elections, do you know that in the last Presidential election only 48,836,680 citizens voted out of an estimated 87,000,000 who were eligible?

The victories, along with the sacrifices, which have accrued to this Nation during the two great world wars that I have witnessed in my lifetime prove that the sense of duty has not yet been dulled by the softness that some cynics profess to see in our "creature comfort" civilization, unapproached by and unknown to the rest of the world.

The time is past when wars were decided by armies alone. Wars now engage the entire energies of whole peoples. The struggle reaches into every resource at a nation's command—human, intellectual, industrial, political, and moral.

The name we give it is total war. It had not even been invented when I first went off to war in 1917. The old-fashioned idea prevailed that business as usual would continue at home, but that comfortable illusion was quickly dashed along with many another.

When nations clash the idea is to pile up more and more resources for the fighting forces until one side or the other collapses. That goes for manpower. It goes for weapons. It goes for anything that might affect the balance of power.

But now we find ourselves faced with an entirely different kind of situation—war that is not yet completely war. We have large forces on the Korean peninsula engaged in a shooting war with a nation of 400,000,000 people controlled by the men in the Kremlin that has not bothered to declare war.

We have stationed substantial air units in Great Britain. We are sending additional divisions into Germany. We are rearming Europe. We are building air bases in North Africa and negotiating for others in

the Middle East. Meanwhile we are rearming ourselves at home.

Yet, no war has been declared. And nobody in our Government or the military can tell us when we shall be involved in an all-out war, or whether, for that matter, war will ever be declared.

It is a terrible thing to lose the power of decision over one's destiny. The dilemma in which young men now find themselves was unknown to other generations of Americans. Nevertheless, let me assure you, all is not chaos.

Frankly, we have been too successful for our own good. Too many of us have believed that we alone are responsible for the welfare of this land, that we alone have made it the greatest Nation in the world. Again, frankly, I say to you, that we had nothing to do with it.

We simply took advantage of God's gifts—nature's gifts—and capitalized them, but we have too often failed to appreciate our blessings. We have failed to the degree that America has lost much of its spirit in the hearts of its people within the boundaries of our land. We have failed to remember that liberty is not license; that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance.

And I know of no greater hazard to our leadership than to continue on the path that we have been following in the past decade or two. Because if we intend to retain our leadership in the world we can only do so by being strong—spiritually, physically, and materially.

If you think back, if you study our history, if you recognize what our forefathers have handed down to us, you will be eternally grateful as I have been.

I think that I can speak with some authority on the subject of citizenship and the obligation that goes with it, because I am a first-generation American.

My parents migrated from Switzerland. They taught me and six other members of our family to enjoy and appreciate the freedom of this country. They taught us how to work. They taught us that we could never expect something for nothing, nor more for less. They taught us to be frugal. They taught us, above all, to love America.

And I say to you, frankly, there is nothing in the world, nothing that I love more—not even life—that compares with my love for America.

Let us, therefore, remember to be grateful. Let us recognize that the men and women who migrated to this country and pioneered came here for the freedom of speech, for the freedom of religion, and for every other fundamental freedom they craved. They hewed a great nation out of the wilderness. They had no automobiles or radios. They had no technocracies or great industries. But they used their hands and coordinated them with their heads. And they were people of stout hearts.

They were brilliant. They had to be because they left to the world two of the greatest instruments that God ever let man create. And I specifically think in terms of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of this great land of ours that have withstood the onslaughts of dictators and peoples who would destroy them if they only could.

Yes; they believed in the freedom of worship. They were Christians at heart—something the peoples of this country have lost to a great degree through the capitalization of the opportunities that they helped to create and handed down to us. We have been selfish to the extent that we felt we needed more and more of the material things of life, and forgot the need for more and more of the spiritual side of life.

With the events that have taken place in the past few months every thinking American must realize how close we are to World War III, and what that will mean America, as we know it, will be gone forever. The

American way of life will be gone forever, because no one can win world war III, morally and financially.

But world war III can be prevented. How? By unity of purpose, through faith and prayer, and recreating the true, fighting American spirit into the heart of every man and woman who claims citizenship in this land of ours, no matter what color or creed.

If that can be jelled and solidified, America will always be strong enough, morally and physically, to withstand any type of attack that may be made.

Stripped to its bare fundamentals, American strength is built upon its power to produce. And this power is the result of our system of shared free enterprise and open opportunity—two blessings that have given us the highest standard of living ever achieved by any people in the world.

And yet, strange as it seems, this very system still must be sold to some of our own people. Certain types of minds, usually self-styled intellectuals, enlarge on the imperfections and shortcomings of a system which, obviously, is not fully developed even now to its greatest good. Why? Because we do not remember all that we know. Therefore, we are destroying or helping to destroy that spirit which has made America the greatest land in the world.

If that trend is not reversed, it will eventually destroy this land, as other lands have been destroyed.

It is the responsibility of every one of us, individually and collectively, as members of such a group as this, to prevent it.

Surely, you will not confess or admit that there isn't sufficient spiritual strength in this group, to go out and influence thousands of others in your community—your neighbors, no matter what their color or creed, to inspire them to become good Americans again?

This country must have men of character and statesmen instead of politicians at the helm, the same as you in your own group here must have statesmen instead of politicians at the head of it in order to get the quality of leadership that will carry Shrinedom and Masonry on to greater heights.

For I believe that you and I as brothers in Shrinedom have a greater opportunity today than ever before in our history to prove to the world what unity of purpose and faith in God can do toward putting the world on an even keel.

Therein lies our great opportunity to be prepared to carry the torch of liberty to the generations of tomorrow, and inspire in others the interest, obligations and the responsibilities they owe to this great land.

Then, and then only, will we be able to look back when the candle of life burns low and say, "Thank God I have contributed my best to the land that contributed so much to me."

(P. S.—Captain Rickenbacker, thirty-third degree Mason, is a member of Moslem Temple, Detroit, Mich., and is an honorary member of Salaam Temple, Newark, N. J. and Karem Temple, Waco, Tex.)

The Kem Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 31, 1951

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] has conducted a long and valiant fight to prohibit United States military, eco-

nomic, and financial assistance to nations which send arms, ammunition, and strategic materials to iron-curtain countries.

It seemed for a while that the Senator from Missouri had won his fight when the Congress adopted the Kem amendment to the third supplemental appropriation bill. Now, however, the administration has forced through a bill which nullifies the Kem amendment.

The passage of H. R. 4550, the so-called Battle bill, repeals the Kem amendment, which made it mandatory for the administration to shut off American assistance to nations which trade in war materials with Russia and her satellites. Under the Battle bill, the administration may continue to send assistance to countries which trade in war materials with the Soviet and other iron-curtain countries.

The passage of H. R. 4550 is hailed by the administration and its friends and supporters as a great victory. That victory, if it can be called a victory, is not a victory for America.

The people of Missouri have reason to be proud of their Republican Senator, JAMES P. KEM. The Kem amendment was a product of his courage and persistence. He fought for enactment of the amendment with the conviction which comes to men when they know their cause is just. He fought to prevent its repeal with the kind of patriotic devotion which marks the difference between an ordinary American and a great American.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Washington (D. C.) Daily News of August 29, 1951. The article points out some of the probable consequences of the repeal of the Kem amendment.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IFFY SOVIET TRADE BAN IS VICTORY FOR TRUMAN

(By Earl Richert)

The Truman administration has won a major victory in getting Congress to vote to permit free nations to do some trading in strategic materials with the Soviet bloc and still receive United States aid.

And Republicans, who wanted a mandatory end to United States aid if such trading went on, now have what party leaders think is an important campaign issue.

The Senate approved with minor changes a House-passed bill which sets up a somewhat flexible system of rules governing United States aid to nations doing business with Russia and her satellites.

The bill provides that no United States aid shall be given to a country that permits the shipments of arms, ammunition, implements of war, and atomic energy materials to the Soviet bloc countries. No discretionary authority is given to the administration to continue aid if such trading goes on; the cut-off is automatic.

The bill also lays down the general rule that the countries receiving United States aid should embargo shipments of petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and items of primary use in the production of armament to the Soviet bloc countries.

CAN TRADE IF

But on trading in goods of this type, discretionary authority is given to the President to continue aid if he finds that the goods which our allies are receiving from the Soviet

bloc are of even greater strategic value to them than the goods which the Soviets are getting.

Presumably, this would sanction for aid purposes such trade deals as the one now existing between Britain and Russia whereby Russia sends timber to Britain and gets rubber in return.

Republicans thought they had won on this issue in June when Congress adopted a rider, authored by Senator JAMES KEM, Republican, Missouri, to an appropriations bill. This ordered United States aid cut off whenever a recipient country traded in strategic materials with Russia. But it left one loophole. Discretion was given to the National Security Council, a group composed of the President, Vice President, Defense Secretary, and other top officials.

The council set the whole Kem amendment aside for 90 days, declaring it was unworkable.

TRIED AGAIN

A House subcommittee headed by Representative LAURIE BATTLE, (Democrat, Alabama), was working on the problem and proposed the discretionary bill. The State Department supported the Battle bill wholeheartedly. The Senate adopted it with a surprising show of Democratic unanimity. Senator HARRY BYRD (Democrat, Virginia) being the only Democrat to vote with the Republicans on the key test vote.

Democrats headed by Senator JOHN SPARKMAN (Democrat, Alabama), argued that it was almost impossible for the European countries to shut off all trade with the Soviet bloc and that such a shutoff would immeasurably increase our costs of supporting Western Germany.

Senator SPARKMAN said that Western Europe received, and had to have, 11,000,000 tons of coal from the Soviet bloc countries last year. This, he said, was just barely sufficient to keep the homes heated and the average home then was allowed only 1 ton to supply all its household needs that year. If the 11,000,000 tons had come from the United States it would have required a fleet of 100 vessels in continuous operation to haul it. Cost would have been about \$250,000,000 more.

"CAVIAR FOR BLOOD"

Senator KEM argued that this was a question of human rights versus property rights—that regardless of all the arguments about the necessity of trade, etc., Russia was being strengthened by the trading. He called it an exchange of Russian caviar for American blood, and said it was identical with sending scrap iron to Japan before World War II.

Senator KEM predicted that the people would speak on the issue at the next election and the next Congress would vote differently. Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN (Republican, Illinois) also predicted that United States aid to countries trading with Russia would be a major campaign issue, to the benefit of the Republicans.

The Parents and Wives of Soldiers in Korea Are Entitled To Know That Their Loneliness, or Their Losses, Have Not Been Futile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, out of the maze of confusion, name calling,

backbiting, and disunity which has to a much too great a degree characterized the United States during the past year there emerges certain facts which I believe to be worthy of the attention of all of us:

The aggressions of North Korea, and the aggressions of Red China have been turned back. Formosa has been saved from invasion. UN armies have expanded a little beachhead at Pusan into firm control of South Korea.

Our intervention in Korea has blunted the Communist threat on Japan.

The pinch of circumstances has been felt by the Red Government of China to the extent that it has postponed or abandoned many of the social and economic reforms promised to the Chinese people, thereby undermining the confidence of the Chinese Reds in their government.

Today, the Japanese people stand reassured of our integrity and good faith, and they march forward to assume their role of responsibility in the Far East.

The Chinese Dictator Mao, at the urgings of Moscow has poured his troops into Korea in an unending stream. Though greatly outnumbered, the American soldier has sent his message to Mao and Moscow in the form of staggering casualty lists, and disastrous defeats. In the meantime our war has been held to narrow geographical limits, and we again have had time to prepare.

Our sacrifices in Korea have not been in vain. They will live on as a great epic in the history of our times.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article entitled "Losses in Korea Are Not In Vain" from the Disabled American Veterans semimonthly, July 24, 1951:

LOSSES IN KOREA ARE NOT IN VAIN, COLUMNIST SAYS

I see by the papers that one evaluator of the Nation's policy in Korea believes we have sacrificed our boys for nothing and we have been humiliated by a lot of barefoot Chinese. This is perhaps the most compact summary of a year of intervention in Korea; but it is not the wisest. It begins with the false assumption that the only valid object of war is total and decisive military victory. It ignores the many constructive and valuable results of our Korean operations. And it does gross injustice to American and other UN troops by implying that the barefoot Chinese, being an inferior race, have humiliated us by not collapsing entirely.

It might be well to recall some of the real accomplishments of our intervention in Korea. The parents and wives of soldiers in Korea are entitled to know that their loneliness or their losses have not been futile. And American judgments of our war policy would be wiser if account were taken of what has been achieved.

In the first place, the North Korean aggression of 1 year ago was the first outright military aggression by a Communist country since shortly after World War II. It has been repulsed and the territory of the victim country, the Korean Republic, has been recovered. A second aggression, that of Red China, also has been repulsed, and the Korean Republic again cleared of invaders.

It is worth something to America and to the world to have turned back two aggressor armies in 1 year. It is worth something because much of the world lives in fear of other such aggressions and has a new confidence in the capacity and the will-

ingness of the United States and the UN to deal with Red aggression.

In the second place, it seems fairly certain that Formosa would have been invaded before now, probably with success, except for the Korean intervention. An island of some strategic importance has been denied to the Communists. That is well worth while, from the standpoint of American security alone.

In the third place, the heat has been taken off of Indochina, where the French and their native allies were in a fair way to lose everything a year ago. Helped by the drain on China's resources caused by the Korean conflict and also by the aircraft we have supplied, the French are doing very much better against the Communist forces they have been battling for years. A gain for France, in this case, is a gain for all the non-Communist world.

Fourth, the war and accompanying economic warfare have so punished Red China as to have forced Mao's government to postpone or abandon many domestic reforms and projects he had promised the Chinese people. This has greatly augmented the unpopularity of the Chinese Communist Government, and possibly has laid the basis for new cleavages and additional resistance. Added to outright losses in battle, these setbacks may be at the bottom of the recent peace overtures—overtures born of China's wish to end the war, passed on by Russia to save Mao's face and advance Russia's "peace offensive."

Fifth, and very important, our intervention in Korea has greatly reduced the Communist threat to Japan and has given us a far better chance to hold the Japanese to a pro-American, anti-Communist policy. And this is vital if we are to maintain a long-term defensive system in the island chain off eastern Asia.

To apprehend the immense value of this accomplishment, one needs only to imagine how Japanese leaders would feel today if, 1 year ago, the United States had allowed the Communists to take all Korea—or how they would feel if UN forces had been driven out of the Korean Peninsula.

In either case, realistic Japanese would have been compelled to write off American protection of Japan as a myth and to prepare for a policy of conciliation and compromise vis-a-vis Red China. Japan is today an anchor for our far-eastern defensive system only because we have proved our willingness and capacity to meet a Communist challenge in Korea.

Finally, our intervention in Korea, always within the framework of UN policy, has made possible the build-up of the UN itself as a means of combating aggression by the use of collective force. For the first time in history, an international armed force of various nations, under the authority of an international organization, has undertaken punitive action in the field against an aggressor—two aggressors, in fact.

The techniques of using the collective strength of the world community have been developed. Precedents for such collective intervention have been set. And during this year the machinery of the UN has been considerably strengthened, at the urging of the American State Department.

In the face of such a record of accomplishment, which could be extended, I do not see how anybody wishing to be fair in his appraisal can say that "we have sacrificed our boys for nothing." It is unjust to the men who have made and are making great sacrifices in Korea to pretend their sacrifice is futile. It is injurious to their morale and to that of their families at home. And it is misleading for Americans who sincerely want to form a balanced judgment of our Korean War policy.

As for our being "humiliated by a lot of barefoot Chinese," it seems to me the reverse is the fact. Whether they wear shoes or not, the Chinese are not a contemptible foe.

China had able generals before this country was settled. The Chinese soldier has great courage, whenever he has confidence in his leaders. The Chinese Reds have outnumbered our forces at all stages of the war since last December, and yet they have been defeated in a succession of battles and driven from the territory of the Korean Republic.

If anybody has been humiliated it is Mao Tse-tung, who has had great numerical superiority at all times and supply lines only a tiny fraction the length of ours, and still has been unable to push the imperialist aggressors into the sea as he promised to do. Mao has been further humiliated, for he was maneuvered by his good friends the Russians into taking on the United States and then was denied the Russian support that might have saved him from a series of disastrous defeats. The greatest humiliation is to be made a sucker, and that was Mao's fate.

Admittedly, our Korean intervention is a disheartening and frustrating kind of campaign. That is likely to be true of any war of limited objective, fought with only a fraction of one's total resources. But we have accomplished very important things by our Korean effort, and we have done so (1) without allowing it to draw us into a massive conflict in China and (2) without slackening our build-up of defensive and offensive strength in more important theaters and at home.

To me this is reason for pride, not humiliation. I believe the sacrifices made by Americans in Korea have contributed to the security of our own land, and to that of the whole world of free men.

The Moral Weakness of United States Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 31, 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Moral Weakness of United States Leadership," published in the Daily Plainsman, Huron, S. Dak., of August 20, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MORAL WEAKNESS OF UNITED STATES LEADERSHIP

"They had no right to send men to die without intending to win."

That is a sentence which should be cast in bronze and affixed to the entrance to "Foggy Bottom," Washington's name for the new State Department building, and affixed also to the White House entrance.

It is a sentence written by Mrs. Katharine Tabor, of Dallas, Tex., whose Army lieutenant husband was killed at Taejon, Korea, in 1950, when she quarreled with an editorial by Life magazine. Her argument, graciously reprinted in full by Life magazine in its current issue, gets to the heart of the matter much more clearly and logically and accurately, in this newspaper's opinion, than Life magazine's original editorial.

The Life editorial had said that the Korean war was part of the price paid for the education of President Truman and Secretary of State Acheson, and the Korean effort would serve as firm notice that the United

States would oppose any further Communist aggression.

Mrs. Tabor's argument in her letter is reprinted on this editorial page and a thorough reading is urged.

It is impressive that after her husband was killed she got down to work and read all she could about United States foreign policy and Communist policy. She finally reached the conclusion—and this is highly significant—that the makers of United States foreign policy since World War II had never been determined to defeat world communism.

This is the conclusion which many other observers reached during the formation of that policy. The United States attitude toward China was the best indication of a leadership that was willing to let communism spread and take over the Western World bit by bit. The Yalta and Potsdam Treaties, all the Nation knows now, were to the advantage of Communist Russia and the disadvantage of the United States. We reversed our attitude on Korea several times. That is, Acheson and Truman reversed it.

But the worst crime of all was sending American men into the toughest, bloodiest war in United States history with no intention of winning it.

It may well be, as Dorothy Thompson writes in the current Ladies' Home Journal, that "the greatest experience of the twentieth century that requires digestion is that war no longer serves any ends—ideological, material, or spiritual."

But it is certainly true that every war up to Korea was fought with the intent of winning it. Even no professional soldier ever envisioned a time when he would be asked to fight without some ultimate objective of victory. Senseless as war already was, it had only one vestige of sense and that was that out of it one side would be victor and one the loser.

But now in Korea we are talking of an armistice and a buffer zone that puts the situation back exactly where it was in June 1950. It is, as Mrs. Tabor says, "compromise with evil" and it adds up to appeasement.

It is worse than that. It is equivalent to cheating the purpose for which more than 100,000 American men have been battle casualties (the Army says 80,000 but does not count those who lost arms and legs from being frozen in the December and January fighting).

The concern over the violation of the honor code at West Point has been out of proportion to its significance to the Nation. It was an index to the moral depreciation in the United States but it drew the attention of everyone.

But where is everyone's concern about the violation of the honor code of American leadership holding in stewardship the welfare of the American people? Where is the honor in sending men to war for a country that uses their deaths only as bargaining power?

The manner in which the Korean War has been handled since its birth in postwar foreign policy to the talks now going on at Kaesong spell moral weakness in United States leadership.

There is one other point to make in reference to Mrs. Tabor's letter.

That is the fact that General MacArthur said, in effect, the same thing. For it he was relieved of command by the President and attacked bitterly by the President's partisan supporters.

Mrs. Tabor can be relieved of nothing.

The MacArthur-Truman affair had no effect upon her. If the reader will note Life's story on Mrs. Tabor, he will see that Life said she reached her conclusions last November about the purpose of United States foreign policy.

Her personal tragedy broadened her concern into a study that gave her greater insight into United States leadership. Tragedy

does not need to be a prelude to insight, but understanding of tragedy does. Every American with close friends and relatives can understand it and should have the insight into the obvious moral weakness of United States leadership that cannot be brushed away by Harvard legalisms nor by earthy Missourian epithets.

When an infantry battalion commander has to order a company to attack and a company commander has to order his close friends to do what looks like certain death to attempt, the soul-searing is deep beyond words. Such orders can never be given unless there are directives to take a certain hill or ridge. No one close to the carnage can bring himself to say, "O. K., men, get out there and fight just for the hell of it."

What, then, is to be said of the leadership that sends men into battle by the hundreds of thousands with no specific objective of winning?

This newspaper agrees with Mrs. Tabor and the hundreds of thousands who must believe as she does that.

"It is not right. It is intolerably unjust." It is a display of "moral weakness."

Wanted: More Faith and Less Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 31, 1951

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Wanted: More Faith and Less Fear," published in the Portland Press Herald of August 15, 1951. It deals with the necessity for counsel from wise leaders of America.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WANTED: MORE FAITH AND LESS FEAR

We would do well to listen to the big men of America who counsel us against acting like neurotic jack rabbits.

General MacArthur has said frequently that a nation as strong as America need have no fear of absorption by communism if we will only pull ourselves together and use latent energies in a bold defense, here and abroad. A living symbol of our strength, MacArthur urged in his Boston speech that we abandon the policy of fear, face our enemies with more courage and less panic.

General Eisenhower preaches the same sermon: "The material, intellectual, spiritual, technical, and professional resources available to the free world are so overwhelming as compared to what the iron-curtain and satellite countries have, that it is almost ridiculous for us to be talking in terms of fright and hysteria, which we often do."

Another great American, Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, put it this way in a recent speech: "World war III can be prevented. How? By unity of purpose, through faith and prayer, and re-creating the true, fighting American spirit into the heart of every man and woman who claims citizenship in this land of ours, no matter what color or creed. "If that can be jelled and solidified, America will always be strong enough, morally and physically, to withstand any type of attack that may be made."

"Stripped of its bare fundamentals, American strength is built upon its power to produce. And this power is the result of our system of shared free enterprise and

open opportunity—two blessings that have given us the highest standard of living ever achieved by any people in the world.

"And yet, strange as it seems, this very system still must be sold to some of our own people."

This distinguished trio is not complacent in the face of Communist power. Far from it. They understand the threat as keenly as anyone. Their approach is different in that they will have no truck with appeasement. They wish to substitute a patriotic faith in America for cowardly fear. They want us to stop whimpering and use our material and spiritual resources in a bold fight to maintain freedom.

Faint heart never won fair lady. A faint America, an America lacking in self-confidence and courage, an America that is afraid, cannot successfully champion liberty. It's time we ditched fear and developed a more vocal faith in democracy. It's a faith that can make us strong and protect us forever.

Freedom of the Press—Case of Lake Charles American Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 31, 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared regarding the case involving the Lake Charles American Press and its representatives.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From the founding days of our Republic, our people have held the principle of freedom of the press to be inviolate. We have believed—and rightly so—that fearless, alert newspapers, uncoerced by any source, are essential to the workings of a democracy.

That principle has been challenged many times during our history. It has been challenged by the forces of corruption, brutality, and "home-grown" dictatorship. But each time, the challenge has been repelled successfully and the press has emerged the victor.

It was with a sense of shock and a feeling of shame that I read about the latest challenge a few days ago. By this time, I assume that every Senator is familiar with the facts. The case involves the Lake Charles American Press and its representatives.

The facts are simple. This newspaper launched a crusade to rid Calcasieu Parish of the criminals who had become so heavily entrenched in that area. In the classic tradition of American journalism, its reporters went out and got facts. They named names; they printed truths; and what is most important, they got results.

I am familiar with conditions in Calcasieu Parish—familiar with them because of the information given to the Senate Crime Committee. It has not been too long since crime in its most blatant and violent form was fastened upon the good residents of that community.

After investigation of the Senate Crime Committee in New Orleans a group of determined citizens got together in Lake Charles and decided to do something about conditions there. They set out to clean up their parish, and they were backed solidly by the

Lake Charles American Press. As I said before, they got results—at least partial results. Indictments were returned and crime in that area went underground.

Then came the reprisals. A grand jury, formed to hand down indictments against the criminals, suddenly indicted the newspapermen. And they indicted them for defaming three convicted gamblers and some local officials.

Mr. President, if this outrage is allowed to stand it will be to the shame of all Americans. Are we to tell the world that this is a country where we prosecute not the law-breakers but those who seek to have the law enforced? Are we to proclaim openly that the lords of crime have become so powerful that we have turned our judicial processes to protecting them from defamation of character? Are we to permit this mockery of justice to go unchallenged?

This is more than a minor criminal court case. This is a direct challenge to a foundation stone of our form of government. I believe the people of the Nation and of Louisiana will give an affirmative answer upholding the high principles for which these good people of the Lake Charles American Press stand.

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, what happened to the Kefauver investigation? Answer. Nothing.

Private Bills in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 5, 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, as a member of the Judiciary Committee I have been very much concerned with the problem of private bills. In the present session of Congress there have been referred to the Judiciary Committee a total of some 1,500 bills, of which more than 1,250 are private bills. There has been a good deal of criticism of the whole system of private bills, with suggestions that they be further curtailed or abolished. To those who know the time and energy which the consideration of private bills requires, these proposals often appear to have much to recommend them. In the August 1951 issue of the magazine *Nations Business*, published by the Chamber of Commerce, there is an interesting article on private bills which presents a different view—it is a discussion which has a good word to say for private bills. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEN TO USE YOUR RIGHT OF PETITION

(By Alfred Steinberg)

Not many of us realize that the Congress of the United States has a judicial function that stretches from here to there. Yet every time Congress makes a private bill award, it sits as a court of last resort for some poor fellow who has a gripe against the Government but doesn't have the legal right to take his claim to a regular court.

Matter of fact, in sheer output, the judicial function of Congress is generally more impressive than its legislative work. Three of the last four Congresses passed more private bills for individuals than they did public bills, which affected at least a broad class of us. The last Congress—the Eighty-first—passed 1,081 private bills and only 905 public bills. And stacked side by side, the private bills probably were crammed with as much emotion as the public ones.

Take the recent private bills, for example. A baby was blinded at birth in an Army hospital in Germany by an Army doctor who used a wrongly labeled medicine. A business firm found its costs had skyrocketed because it struck rock unexpectedly while operating under a rigidly priced Government contract. If it could not recoup \$500,000 in extra costs, it would be in serious financial trouble. An American was unable to bring his Indonesian bride home because of the Oriental Exclusion Act. A homesteader discovered that his house and barns were not on his property because of a slipshod Government surveyor. A boy left his keepsake camera with a guard in the Capitol and when he completed his tour of Congress, the camera was missing. An Indian named Abe Lincoln was charged money by the Department of the Interior for living on Government property when he actually lived in a private home.

The common theme running throughout these private bills is that in not a single case did the petitioners have a legal claim against the Government which would have permitted the courts to grant them a hearing. If they hadn't been able to appeal to Congress, they would have been finished.

But fortunately for them, the Constitution guaranteed them the right to petition Congress for a private bill. The first amendment permits anyone to ask Congress for a redress of grievances against the Government. How well even our earliest Congressmen knew this. From 1789 to 1793, while our fledgling legislators were organizing such monumental institutions as Federal departments, tariffs, and currency, they had to take the time to consider more than 1,000 petitions from private citizens.

Often, the only thing private about a private bill is its name. Some have packed a terrific wallop and have resulted in Cabinet crises, Senate filibusters, and a falling out among party regulars.

George Washington found them handy in promoting foreign trade. In his first term as President, the British had blockaded France and American merchants hesitated to send their wares abroad. Trade dipped ominously. Finally, Secretary of State Thomas Jefferson promised the merchants that Congress would consider their petitions for redress of injuries suffered on the high seas. Only after this assurance that private bills would be made available did trade rise again.

Nevertheless, "private bill" historically has been one of those bad-sounding terms linked with logrolling. Until the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, one great form of national sport was to petition Congress for a pension, for a change in military records, or for the construction of a bridge over a local

stream. The Fifty-ninth Congress, in 1905-07, hit the jackpot with 6,248 private bills, which came to 90 percent of all the bills it passed. And most of the private bills were of these logrolling varieties.

More than one Congressman complained there were so many pensioned widows of soldiers from our earlier wars still in circulation that perhaps medical science should investigate their remarkable longevity. And even the private bills Washington's administration promised foreign traders—called the French spoliation claims—still were being dropped into the hopper as late as 1945.

But times are different now.

The only private bills Congress will consider today are those dealing with money claims against the Government, land claims, and immigration and naturalization claims. French spoliation claims have been tossed out the window and Congress has assigned pensions, military records, and bridge building to administrative agencies. Claims more than 15 years old will not be entertained because of the difficulty of determining the true facts. And a private bill once rejected will not be reintroduced unless overwhelming new evidence is produced.

On petitions dealing with money claims against the Government, Congress will hear no claim from anyone injured by a Government employee who was acting "within the scope of his employment." If a Government messenger delivering six volumes of the 1950 census dropped them accidentally on your head, your petition would be handled by the Federal agency involved if you wanted less than \$1,000, or by a Federal district court if you claimed greater damage. Congress would say he beamed you within the scope of his employment.

However, should that same messenger wallop you with a baseball bat while delivering those six volumes, no Federal agency or court will hear your case. They would say he was not acting within the scope of his employment. To get any satisfaction, you could let the State try him for attempted murder, which the State would anyway, or you could petition Congress for a private bill.

Government agencies and the courts operate under the strictest possible interpretation of the term "within the scope of his employment." There is actually a 1943 case on record where Pentagon officials held that the Government was not liable for damages involving one of its motorcycle messengers because his accident occurred as a result of his returning to the Pentagon from an errand via the Key Bridge and not over the Highway Bridge, the route they had blue-penciled for him.

During the last war the commander at a southern training center forbade pilots to fly farther away than a radius of 50 miles from the airfield. Two young pilots residing only a few miles beyond limits buzzed their home town one day. They flew too low and crashed into some houses. The Government took the view that it had no liability to the townspeople because the boys had not acted within the scope of their duties. Since no court would award damages, it took a private bill to settle the claims.

As a court of last resort, Congress pays little attention to cold legal precedents. Its chief consideration seems to be whether justice is being trampled underfoot. It is the only court extant which publicly acknowledges that it often arrives at a decision simply because it feels sorry for the party involved.

A typical action of this sort involved a mailman of Oakland, Calif. While on the way to his post office to drop off a registered letter containing \$681.33 in bills and currency, he found a man lying on the ground bleeding profusely. Without hesitation, he stuck the letter in his hip pocket and gave the man first aid, saving his life.

But after the ambulance arrived he discovered the registered letter was gone. Someone in the crowd had filched it while he was bent over the injured man.

The Postmaster General said that the carrier's failure to follow instructions forbidding mailmen to carry mail in their pockets apparently caused the loss. The Comptroller General pointed out, however, that the Federal Tort Claims Act specifically excludes claims based on lost mail. The carrier had to make good the loss.

After making small monthly payments on the missing letter for more than 2 years, the mailman decided he, too, would write a letter. He wrote his to his Congressman. Shortly afterward a private bill was introduced, his claim was examined and passed by Congress. The President signed it, ordering the Treasury to pay for his loss.

In reporting out the bill, the House Judiciary Committee told Congress that while there was no legal basis for the mailman's claim, "the humanities are such as to justify the reimbursement of the claimant for the loss sustained by the Government."

Despite Congress' fondness for petitions that cry out for justice, don't think it is lenient with the Treasury's gold pile. A person with a claim against the Government ordinarily will fare better in court than he will before Congress. Back in 1945, an Army plane crashed into the Empire State Building and killed a man working on the seventy-ninth floor.

His widow petitioned Congress for a private bill and was in line for a \$10,000 award. In the midst of these proceedings, Congress passed the Federal Tort Claims Act, permitting her to transfer her case to Federal court. She did and won an award of \$47,000.

In making awards, Congress has no fixed standards, but utilizes rule-of-thumb methods. These are chiefly the handiwork of Walter R. Lee, long-serving staff member of the House Claims Subcommittee, whose determinations dollarwise generally are heeded by Congress.

He graduates death claim awards according to the age of the deceased. They run from \$2,000 for children up to 8 years of age, to a maximum of \$10,000 for adults. Before the current inflation descended, Lee's maximum death claim proposal was \$5,000.

Injury claims often are puzzlers. Each by necessity is decided on its merits. A farmer who loses a leg as a result of a Government action can expect a higher award than a clerk who loses a leg. During World War II, a soldier on a troop train threw a hardboiled egg at a railroad fireman on a passing train, and managed to destroy an eye. The Army ruled that the soldier had not acted within the scope of his duties and that the injured fireman could not bring action against the Government.

But Congress passed a private bill awarding him \$4,300. Lee computed this figure by determining what his future earnings might have been as a railroad engineer, a job requiring two good eyes, and deducting from this sum a fireman's salary for the same length of time.

What looks like logrolling today unquestionably is the strongest point in favor of private bills. They take up little time on the floors of Congress. Last fall a tourist walked into the House galleries and sat down to watch the proceedings. The Clerk was calling the Private Calendar.

Thirty minutes later, when Mr. Tourist rose to leave, 75 private bills had been passed without a single dissent. No doubt he went home less certain than before about the honesty and earnestness of Congress. Of course, what he did not see was the long-drawn-out scrutiny each of those private bills got before coming to a vote.

The average private bill takes 9 months to get through Congress. After Representative Doe drops the bill in the hopper he has

to file the evidence for the petitioner with the hearing committee. The Government agency involved gets 60 to 90 days to make its report on the case. Then the bill has to clear the rungs of the subcommittee and the full committee, and only if they approve it unanimously will it be placed on the Private Calendar of the House. And even here, before the vote, the majority and minority leaders appoint six official objectors to screen the bills and weed out ones they feel are unworthy. When the vote finally is taken, if any Member present objects to a private bill, it is passed over, and if two Members object, it is recommitted to the committee for further consideration.

Then, of course, there is the Senate, where the process must be repeated, and here again action must be unanimous. If a private bill fails in one House, the other will not consider it.

Even after a private bill clears Congress, it still needs the President's signature. Few Presidents have sloughed off private bills as an inconsequential duty. Last August, during a low ebb in the Korean fighting, President Truman spent most of a White House staff meeting arguing the merits of a single private bill. This bill would have permitted a dead soldier's insurance money to go to his adopted sister. The Veterans' Administration was objecting because the law specifically restricted such payments to blood relatives. At the end of the staff meeting, the President signed the private bill.

Only once since the Cleveland administration has Congress overridden a veto of a private bill. This happened in 1949, after a Tennessee tobacco factory had burned down and \$8,337.98 worth of internal revenue stamps were lost in the fire.

Congress examined the claim and passed a private bill reimbursing the firm for the stamps. But President Truman vetoed the bill on the grounds that a refund could be legally made only if the stamps had been returned to the Treasury in a recognizable condition or if they had been destroyed under the supervision of a deputy collector. In a wrathful mood, Congress overrode his veto.

There are many ways private bills can be improved. Most Congressmen feel obliged to introduce any private bill a constituent may petition him for. Take such private bills as frequently are introduced which would order the Treasury to return money paid as fines for violating Government regulations. Once they are introduced, committee staffs and Government agencies involved must spend time and money investigating them. Yet their chances of getting by are nil.

Other private bills have been introduced which would return money to designated individuals who used the wrong tax form. One such bill, which cleared Congress only to be slapped down by a Presidential veto, would have returned \$32 to a taxpayer in North Dakota. Think of the actual cost in promoting a bill of this nature.

More uniform decisions would also help. Today there is no certainty that identical cases will get identical treatment. Recently, one Senator objected to the private bill award for a constituent and held the Senate floor for 2 hours until his colleagues agreed to raise the amount by an additional \$10,000.

Still another improvement would be to lower the voting requirements so that a private bill can be passed without a unanimous decision. Of course, unanimity is one deterrent to logrolling. Yet there has been times when a single Congressman, irked by one matter, has objected to every bill on the Private Calendar.

With the development of the mobilization program, two types of private bills will grow in number. One will pertain to injuries and damages caused by the growing ranks of the Armed Forces who will not be acting within the scope of their duties,

The other will deal with contract claims. Some will come about because of unexpected cost increases above those computed in signed Government contracts. Others will result from relying on well intentioned Government officials who lack authority.

During the last war, several boatbuilders signed contracts to construct small speed-boats for the Government for \$8,500. Shortly afterward, Navy supervisory engineers made the rounds and told them to add various improvements which would make the boats sturdier and faster. "The Government will take care of the extra costs," they assured the builders.

By the time the boats were built, some cost as much as \$15,000. The Comptroller General's office ruled that as long as the improvements were not specifically listed in the contract, the builders would have to stand the loss.

As a result, the firms were stuck; the Government would not settle and, because of legal technicalities, it was determined that the courts could not enter a judgment against the Government. All the firms wanted was compensation for out-of-pocket losses. A private bill was the only recourse.

A petition to Congress in behalf of these builders came next and another successful private bill was born.

By the law of averages, there will be many similar experiences this time. And private bills will continue to be the last hope for those who have nowhere else to take their complaints about the Government.

Attacks on the Public School System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 5, 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks of Elmo Roper over the CBS radio network, Sunday evening, August 19, 1951. This article has reference to the barrage of attacks being leveled at the American school system in recent months. Mr. Roper dwells particularly on the book entitled "This Happened in Pasadena," by David Hulburd.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE THE PEOPLE STAND

It is becoming more evident all the time that many parts of our day-to-day lives are suffering as a result of living in the same world with the Russians. The constant war of nerves, the uncertainties of war or peace, the recurring waves of imminent battle and of overtures of peace, all take their toll on American public opinion and patience. These stresses show themselves in many different ways. One man was recently recorded as saying that his back begins to ache whenever he picks up his morning newspaper. Another claims that his tooth aches him every time the truce negotiations in Korea are about to bog down. Several people have blamed a virus infection on the atomic bomb tests out in Nevada and even in the Pacific. We are establishing a close relationship with the events of the world about us in personal and intimate fashion. Maybe you can chalk it all up to the external pressures generated by the world-wide guerrilla warfare we are waging against communism.

But there are signs that even some of our oldest and best established free institutions are also being afflicted with the tensions. Not the least of these is our educational system. And if we are embarked on a 30-year war of nerves with the Communists, as many say we are, then what happens to the education of our young can be pretty important. If, indeed, education ever needed a crisis to justify its long-range importance.

Education trouble will almost always break out on a local basis here in this country, because each town or city as a rule runs its own public-school system. The place where education takes hold or fails to work is right back in the home towns of the Nation. There have been a number of reports lately of unrest over education in many towns and communities. Part of the problem is the fact that we are laboring with a bumper crop of children these past few years, and the schools are vastly overcrowded. And the prospects are that things will get a good deal worse before getting better. But in the past year or so, there are signs of strains of still another variety. These newer strains were recently summed up in one local experience in a well-documented little book of 163 pages by David Hulburd, called *This Happened in Pasadena*. The Hulburd book tells what to many has been a terrifying story.

It is a tale of battle which took place in the latter part of last year and the early part of this year in the city of Pasadena in southern California. This is what happened in Pasadena, as told by David Hulburd: In early 1948 Willard Goslin, then superintendent of schools in Minneapolis, was asked by the Pasadena School Board to come to that city to head up its growing school system. Goslin had reached the high point of a distinguished career that year when he was elected national president of the American Association of School Administrators, the organization of all the superintendents of schools in this country. Yet hardly more than 2 years later Goslin was forced to resign his job in Pasadena. He had been ousted by substantially the same school board that asked him to come there in the first place. But a lot of water had gone under the dam in those 2 years.

Willard Goslin instituted a good many changes in the Pasadena schools. He brought in some new people, began new teacher-training programs, summer workshops, brought in visiting lecturers on education; fundamentally he introduced methods which have grown over the past 10 years to be accepted by most educators as sound techniques of teaching. But, beginning with a new school-tax program, followed by a delicate redistricting of school zones which brought children of different races and income levels into the same school, Goslin ran into increasing difficulty. A series of groups sprung up to fight each of his proposals. His school-tax program was beaten. The opposition to the school administrator took on more and more the appearance of a frontal assault on the entire concept of education as Superintendent Goslin saw it. When visiting lecturers came from Columbia Teachers College they were branded as dangerous radicals. Literature and advice were received from superpatriotic organizations as far away as New York who saw in Goslin's every effort an attempt to communize Pasadena's school children. Even members of the Pasadena School Board began to be beset by personality clashes amongst themselves. They grew increasingly suspicious of Goslin. Many of the people who were in opposition to the school administration were of the honest belief that modern education methods were synonymous with teaching socialism and immorality. Others were cranks and crackpots who had special purposes and designs in their opposition.

Finally, in the fall of 1950, the whole issue came to a head, and while Willard Goslin was in the East at an education meeting, he received a telegram from the school board asking that he resign. The main body of criticism against him was that he was trying to head the schools toward socialism; that he was encouraging sexual immorality by teaching sex education in the classrooms; that he was trying to undermine the patriotism of Pasadena's children; that he was being extravagant in his requests for more taxes for the schools; that he belonged to such organizations as the United Nations Educational, Social, and Cultural Organization and the National Conference of Christians and Jews, which many strongly hinted were subversive; that he had too many visiting lecturers, especially radical visitors from the East. The opposition finally succeeded in getting Goslin out. But after his resignation the citizenry of Pasadena became outraged. After his resignation, Goslin addressed an overflow crowd in an auditorium in Pasadena at which people demanded that he come back. Too late and futilely, the people of Pasadena rose up to claim that they had unwittingly been tricked into scuttling a modern education leader and an enlightened school system for their children. Goslin could not come back. The damage had been done.

As Hulburd describes Goslin's final appearance before the school board in Pasadena, he describes what happened this way: "Mr. Goslin said he wished to make his position clear—how he felt about education as it stands in the United States. 'We are,' he said, 'in an exceedingly difficult position. Each of us feels that our freedom is in jeopardy. We are threatened from without. I think we are threatened even more from within. I know of no better way to wreck everything that we think is good in America than to begin to destroy ourselves, one by one, institution by institution, community by community, throughout the land.' With that, Mr. Goslin bowed out. His final words were: 'I shall take away no ill feelings when I leave Pasadena—rather, a deep regret that I was unable to lead this community to a level which would have produced the best school system in America.' As the people slowly left the conference room that November afternoon, some of them were crying," Hulburd concludes.

The Pasadena story is a moving one, and one which has aroused the interest of a good many other people in other communities. But from reports of the National Education Association, the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools, and other education groups, the Pasadena pattern is not entirely an isolated case. Reports from such widely scattered places as White Plains, N. Y., Englewood, N. J., Los Angeles, Chicago, Minneapolis, and Denver indicate that many of the same charges are being made as were made in Pasadena. Many of the same sort of organizations are springing up.

We have some recent evidence from Denver, one of the reportedly embattled cities, which might cast at least part of this controversy in quite a different light. Over the past 2 years, groups in Denver have charged that the schools are bent on teaching socialism to the children, are destroying the patriotism of our future citizens, are engaged in such subversive activities as holding special teacher training programs, and having visiting lecturers from such so-called radical places as Teachers College. The pattern, while not as pronounced as Pasadena in its latter stages, appears to Mr. Richard Kennan and other educators to be much the same. Well, just about the time that Pasadena was in the process of asking for Willard Goslin's resignation, Denver was just getting the results of a special public opinion survey of the citizens of that Colorado city on what they thought of the way the education system

was working. Some of the results shed some interesting light on some of the more vociferous charges which have been made in Denver and elsewhere.

The people of Denver were asked what they liked most about the school system in their city. Three out of the top five things cited as being most satisfactory to the people hit right at the heart of the issue. The fifth most popular phase of public-school education in Denver are health subjects, especially sex education. The issue of sex education is one which in many cities has been fraught with a good deal of emotion. We found in a Nation-wide survey last year that a majority of the parents of this country are in favor of sex education. But it has been attacked as introducing immoral subjects into the classroom. In Denver, as in the Nation, most people are satisfied with the fact that courses in sex education and other health subjects are taught. Another source of controversy is the teacher-training programs. Superintendents like Willard Goslin believe that teachers should have more opportunity to swap their experiences in the classroom, that they should have special training courses and workshops which will allow teachers during the summer months and just before school opens to learn the latest, up-to-date developments in education. All sorts of tales have been told about these out-of-school sessions, ranging from secret Communist or Socialist briefing sessions to immoral behavior. Yet, in Denver, one of the cities where it is said the Pasadena pattern is emerging, the fourth most popular part of the school system is the training the teachers receive, the manner in which they are indeed brought up to date on educational techniques.

Perhaps at the root of the controversy is the explosive atmosphere which surrounds any mention of modern or progressive education in these cities I've just mentioned. This is apparently also true of Denver. Yet, Denver's citizens say that they are more pleased with the modern, progressive teaching techniques used in their schools than almost any other phase of their public-school system. Progressive education methods are outranked only by people's satisfaction with the modern new school buildings and equipment. Rounding out the first five is the feeling that children in Denver's schools are well trained to get along with other people, in what the educators call in a fancily turned phrase, "social-psychological skills." Significantly, on three of the most controversial issues in Denver, the people take a progressive approach. Progressive education, methods of training teachers, and the teaching of health subjects, particularly sex education, apparently strike a responsive chord among a large number of the city's citizens.

But let's take a look at the negative side of the ledger for a moment and see what the people of Denver don't like so well about their schools. Interestingly enough, the most disliked part of the school system is what many parents think is not enough emphasis on fundamental English. Not enough reading, spelling, grammar, and pronunciation, say the parents. Next most unpopular is the amount of homework the children are given. Apparently, the parents have grown tired of helping junior with that "math" problem and they feel that their children's complaints about homework are justified. Down in third place on this unfavorable list is a complaint about the overcrowded condition of the schools, a perennial problem now abundant throughout the Nation. Going down the list, in fourth place comes the feeling on the part of many that not enough mathematics are taught. Many parents **no** doubt feel that they could have used more. But the next most frequently mentioned dislike is a curious one. People say that they object to too much emphasis on fundamentals, especially the attention

that is paid to getting young boys and girls ready for college.

Well, let's go back for a moment and take a look at the top five likes and five dislikes which the people of Denver have for their school system. Among the first five most liked things were three points which the so-called modern educators have especially emphasized, progressive educational approach, teacher training, and sex education. And on the list of the five things most disliked were none of the common complaints which were so successful in ousting Willard Goslin in Pasadena and which have in the past placed Superintendent Kenneth Oberholtzer under attack in Denver. In fact, you have to go further down the list of things people don't like about Denver's public schools to find those people who agree with the organized opposition. Some 7 percent of the people in Denver say that they believe the schools don't teach enough religion, Americanism, and other patriotic subjects. And then, 8 percent say they are opposed to the progressive education methods, the platoon system, the additive method of subtraction, and other techniques.

And finally, some 9 percent say they think not enough discipline is taught the children. Interestingly enough, too, there was no significant opposition to the teaching of sex in the schools, with hardly more than 1 percent of the people mentioning it in a negative way. Of course, some will say that the desire for more teaching of math and English is a criticism of progressive education, too. But that's debatable. In Denver, then, it appears that no more than 15 percent of the people go along with the vocal charges of subversion in the classroom, of spreading socialism in the schools, or dark and diabolical plots being hatched by teachers and school officials, according to the results of the survey which was conducted by Research Services of Denver.

One might naturally ask how in the world could the Pasadena pattern be emerging in Denver when so few people actually believe what the organized critics have to say. The answer which was evident in Pasadena was that the citizens became awakened to the dangers too late, after the damage had been done. Groups such as the Parent-Teachers Associations and others did not effectively organize to defend those who were vested with the responsibility for running the school system. Everyone has a vital stake in the future of public education in the United States. But do people generally recognize their obligations? Do they help make the school system strong? Do they understand that the independence of the American public-school system constitutes its greatest strength? Good evening.

Did Our State Department Plan It This Way?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the identity of the State Department official who conceived the grand strategy, if it can be called strategy, behind the San Francisco Japanese Treaty Conference will probably remain anonymous for reasons of both state and health. Apparently, our diplomats believed that the Soviet Union would choose to absent itself from

these proceedings. Such a theory was seemingly based upon the projected agenda for the meeting which contemplated a few pleasant platitudes, limited speech-making, and a good time for the visitors at fascinating San Francisco, with the treaty signed and no questions raised.

Nothing could be more absurd, and nothing so short-sighted should ever have been permitted to emanate from our State Department, short-sighted as it has proved itself to be on repeated occasions. Mr. Andrei Gromyko is very much on the scene, with no less than 31 aides and fellow delegates, prepared to offer him aid and comfort in blasting our Secretary of State's formula for a happy treaty party.

With the whole fate of Asia at stake, with the discussions in Korea still wavering from day to day between a resumption of hostilities and the drafting of a buffer zone line, the San Francisco affair has offered Russia one more vehicle for the airing of its propaganda lines for European and oriental transmission. Tell us, Mr. Acheson, did somebody in your office plan it this way, or is this just another fiasco like Formosa?

The Japanese Peace Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 5, 1951

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a statement I released to the newspapers yesterday regarding the Japanese peace treaty.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER, Republican, Indiana, issued the following statement today from his Washington office, in relation to the Japanese Peace Treaty. His statement follows.

"In the Washington Times-Herald of August 30, Walter Trohan reported that the State Department has assured a group of Senators Japan will sign a peace treaty with Nationalist, not Red, China, but the Senators must not say so publicly because release of the plan to bypass Communist China would disrupt the ceremonies at San Francisco.

"What a shameful spectacle. How low our country has fallen when an anonymous State Department official whispers behind his hand what our policy is going to be, and a few Senators are allowed to learn of that policy if they will be good and not tell anybody how the fate of our country is going to be settled.

"Senator McCARRAN, of Nevada, in a brilliant review of the many Soviet victories over us on the Japanese issue, points out that 24 governments have recognized Red China, and of the remaining 25 nations or so, only a dozen, perhaps only 4, are determined to support Free China.

"Why are we afraid to stand alone? If it is both morally right and essential to our national interest, to support Free China, what choice do we have but to take our

stand? How can secrecy and double-dealing help us?

"Whom are we afraid of? Red China? The Soviet Union? The Soviet fifth column in Britain and France? What country makes the State Department tremble with fear? What kind of allies are we trying to win, if we cannot hold them if they know the truth? Why should our allies trust us if our State Department itself says we have a plan to bypass Communist China, but are hiding it from them?

"This is only one aspect of the threat to our security still hidden in this draft treaty. Immediately after the signing of the peace treaty, we are to sign a treaty of mutual aid with Japan. All our defenses in Asia hang on this treaty. Our troops will have no legal right to stay in Japan after the first of the year. We will have no legal right to the bases we are building. Those rights will be created de novo in the Mutual Aid Treaty. But the text of that treaty is not available to members of the United States Senate.

"It is 'classified' material, for the eyes of the State Department personnel and their satellite columnists but it is not available to Members of the Senate, to members of our free press or to the American people. The State Department has about 28,000 employees, but it cannot find time to complete the draft so the Senate can study it for a whole week before it is signed.

"I want to know one thing about that treaty. Are we negotiating for American troops and American bases in Japan? Or, is there an escape clause by which we will soon find we have only U. N. troops and U. N. bases there?

"Mr. Truman transformed the United States Armed Forces in Korea into U. N. forces by the stroke of a pen. We entered Korea as an American police action. The next day by Executive fiat, obediently ratified by the U. N., we were part of a U. N. police action. The Senate was never consulted about the change, as it was never consulted about the war in the first place.

"Every military move and every political move in Korea has been twisted, confused, and blocked in the maze of U. N. control, but Congress has been helpless.

"Will Mr. Truman, a few months after the treaty signing, change our American troops and our great military installations into U. N. forces and U. N. installations by a stroke of the pen, as he did in Korea? Does anyone think the Senate will be consulted over the second breach of the Constitution, if it was not consulted over the first?

"Will we find next spring that we cannot stop Soviet moves on the Asian chess-board because we are bound by U. N., and 25 (or 45) members of U. N. favor Red China and a specious neutrality? Will we have another flood of State Department press releases about peace-loving nations and defense against aggression, while our men are fighting and dying, trapped in the coils wound about them by U. N. diplomacy?

"So far, the Members of the Senate have seen these problems rolling in, and have waited to speak their minds until the never-never time when the administration would put them before Congress.

"It is time to stop this newest impending catastrophe before it starts, and not after we have 150,000 or perhaps 500,000 casualties, among the innocent youth now in our high schools and colleges.

"It is time for the Members of Congress to use their wits, to trust their own judgment, to admit what they cannot deny, that this 'peace' in Japan bears all the earmarks of a repetition of the Acheson-Marshall-Lattimore 'peace' in China in December 1945. It is time for us to set up total safeguards against another such 'solution in Asia.'

"We must insist that Free China be invited to this conference at once. If she wishes to appoint one of her representatives now

in this country, he can be in San Francisco in 24 hours.

"The Mutual Aid Treaty with Japan must not be signed until 30 days after its final publication. It must contain unequivocal promises for American troops and American bases in Japan.

"Congress must make sure that no American funds go into Japan if she signs a trade treaty with Red China.

"Then we must make sure that never again can our President transform American troops or American installations into U. N. forces by fiat.

"It is time for each of us in conscience to recall our oath of office to preserve the Republic against any danger from without or from within."

VFW: Defenders of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 5, 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an article entitled "VFW: Defenders of Freedom," written by Harry H. Schlacht, and published in the New York Journal-American of August 30, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VFW: DEFENDERS OF FREEDOM

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

"In the name of our God we will set up our banners."—Psalms 20:5

Today we salute the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States on their fifty-second annual encampment in New York. We hail them. We honor them.

The VFW is composed of overseas veterans. It was born at the close of the Spanish-American War. It was headed in the early stages by Gen. Arthur MacArthur, father of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

They are the defenders of democracy.

They are the heroes of humanity.

Their deeds unite to light the fire on the shrine of human glory which shall spread its illuminations throughout all nations.

They are the priceless legacy of the centuries. They are the spirit of America sweeping onward under the star of destiny.

Loyalty to our American institutions and their ideals, eagerness to defend them against all our enemies, undivided allegiance to our flag, and a desire to secure its blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity are the purposes of the VFW of the United States of America.

We must all believe in these ideals, or we are not worthy to enjoy the God-given blessed privileges of our heritage bought with their sacrifice.

An evil tyranny is abroad. Aggression stalks rampant and the jungle law prevails as the strong devour the weak.

Communism challenges democracy. Communism and democracy cannot survive side by side.

Our immortal heroes have fought and died on a thousand blazing battlefields and crimsoned the seven seas to destroy the roots of the insatiable ambitions of fiendish tyrants who sought to enslave humanity. In the world of communism force reigns supreme.

We shall not permit the sacrifices of our heroes to be in vain. We shall not permit

the adventurous derelicts to weave a crown of thorns for our brow.

We shall not permit the Red devils to spin the wheel of fortune which shall determine the future destiny of our country.

Hear ye—VFW: You are the warriors of liberty. You are the sinews of our Nation. You are the guardians of our security. We need you on the firing line of democracy.

Hear ye—the still voice of our martyred buddies. They challenge you to beware of freedom's foes. They challenge you to preserve our ideals for which they died. They challenge you to preserve our American way of life.

Let us today at the VFW convention rededicate ourselves to the preservation of liberty which is the very heart of our country.

Let us lift our heads as high as our flag. Let us march forward into the future, for we are the future. May the glorious banner of the VFW march onward behind the Stars and Stripes toward new glory for Old Glory.

We commend Charles C. Ralls, of Seattle, Wash., retiring VFW commander in chief, on his splendid achievements.

We congratulate Frank C. Hilton, of Reading, Pa., on his election as commander in chief.

Europe the Battleground

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 5, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article entitled "Europe the Battleground," written by Mr. Michael Straight and published in the current issue of the New Republic. It merits careful study and thought.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EUROPE THE BATTLEGROUND

I. THE NATURE OF THE BATTLE

(By Michael Straight)

"Europe is a battleground," said Milton Katz in his final speech as European head of the Economic Cooperation Administration. In the continuing battle, recovery from the devastation of war is only one short phase, and rearmament, another. The United States and Western Europe are bound together. We are part of a long-range, vital effort to transform feudalism into capitalism in Europe, class rule into democracy, continental anarchy into European union.

That effort includes the creation, through armaments, of an earned confidence in Europe's ability to defend against Soviet aggression the new life it is creating. But while fear of Russia may be the greatest spur to common action, it is not and cannot be the central binding force. "For that," Katz maintained, "you must add an affirmative element." He added: "We can find the key in the historical process of moving West in the United States. . . . As we moved West . . . it was necessary to be ready at all times to fight Indians. . . . If the people had not been prepared to fight . . . they would not have moved West. On the other hand, if the sole purpose of moving West were to kill Indians, we likewise would not have moved West. It was

the job of building a new world and realizing the great American dream that kept people moving. * * * It was a creative movement, with a deeply felt sense of purpose."

The goals are still obscure in our new Westering. But the emergence of clear goals is the outstanding experience of Europe today. Our ideas are often archaic and our supposed allies are our worst enemies. Yet, on balance, we stand as the true revolutionaries. It is we who hold the initiative. It is we who press for needed change.

At each stage our effort may be overthrown in free elections. So the struggle resembles a continuing election campaign. In this campaign the basic contest is for the loyalty of the European worker, described by Dan Goldy of the ECA as one "who lives largely on bread because its price is controlled, who lives in substandard quarters which he can afford because its rent is strictly controlled but is seldom able to heat, due to the high price of fuel, who must defer marriage sometimes for years because of the scarcity of suitable dwellings, who owns one pair of overalls and one suit and who must constantly choose between food or clothing for his family because he can't afford both."

The faith of this man in the future of democracy is all we have to build on. The reason why so many appeals for action necessary for survival meet with a disappointing response stems from two inner convictions on this man's part. The first is that nothing he does in a divided Europe can make much difference. The second is that he has little to lose if democracy should go down. His stake is minor. His outlook is forlorn. His return for harder effort is unjustly small. His incentives to work harder are consequently weak. He looks with suspicion on all political leaders. He casts his protest vote for a party which intends to destroy his right to protest. He asks with skepticism of all new programs: *Chi me lo fare?*—What's in it for me?

A program which could clearly lead to new schools, low-cost housing, shoes, at prices European workers can afford, would generate great enthusiasm. The Marshall plan has prepared the way for these gains by expanding basic capacity. Yet, thanks to continuing low productivity and poor distribution of wealth, the workers' living standards have not risen above prewar levels and now are falling.

These trends can be reversed but only by drastic change. Paradoxically the European worker stands as a champion of revolution and an opponent of change. One reason is the conservation induced by a century of stable population. In addition, progress in material conditions has seemed so far beyond the reach of the European worker that his demand for change has shifted from the realities that surround him to sterile and false abstractions.

The Communist Parties of Europe, of course, exploit the duality in the working class with great skill. They formulate and press the illegitimate abstractions. They organize the resistance to change and for their own good reasons band together with conservatives to prop up an indefensible status quo.

The battle with the Communists is the open battle, fought on the surface of Europe. Every large wall in Europe has "peace" or a hammer and sickle painted on it. Every lamppost has its notice: Americans, go home. Between January and June 1951 the Communist Party distributed 3,000,000 posters, 18,000,000 leaflets, and 2,000,000 booklets in Paris and its suburbs alone.

To speak of communism as an idea in Europe is absurd. Communism is the Communist Party, a heavily financed, carefully trained, superbly organized paramilitary force. It has broken Europe down, region by region, profession by profession, prejudice by prejudice, age group by age group, city block by city block. There is nothing sur-

prising about the votes it polls on election day. All summer long the children of city workers go to Communist camps where indoctrination accompanies fun. All winter long the party's block captain is the man who knows where coal can be bought cheap. The trade union, controlled by the party, is the one a worker must join to get a job. The party is the group which offers specialized training and rapid advancement for young men with organizing skill. Communism may have started as an idea in Europe. Today Stalinism is an organization, not an idea.

In France and Italy, Communist Party publishers own the finest job printing presses, print the biggest comic books, farmers' papers, and radio, screen, and fashion magazines. The Communist Party owns huge chains of theaters. It controls farm cooperatives and draws from them a large part of the income from food distribution. Communist bankers handle all trade with Russia, China, and the satellites and draw their commissions of 5 and 10 percent. Direct subsidies are transferred through Soviet- and Communist-controlled banks such as the Banque Commerciale pour l'Europe du Nord. In international solidarity funds alone the Communist-controlled CGT acknowledged receipts of \$2,000,000 from Prague, Moscow, Sofia, and Budapest between November 1948 and January 1949. In turn, the Communist Party spent \$2,000,000 in 5 months on the Paris elections, and in Italy budgets one billion lire a month for propaganda alone.

To speak of communism as a movement which seeks to gain its ends in Europe by social and economic pressure is equally absurd. Every strike and demonstration staged by the Communist Parties is organized under military formations as a rehearsal for a general uprising. The factory workers are trained in sabotage, and sabotage occurs every day across Europe. Luigi Longo, in Italy, and Laurent Casanova, in France, command large armed forces, well-trained and well-equipped with weapons stolen from factories and constabularies and smuggled in from abroad. In January, in Rome alone, the police haul of hidden Communist armaments included 4 mortars, 21 machine guns, 49 submachine guns, 180 automatic rifles, 655 rifles, 314 pistols, 3,431 mortar shells, 3,160 artillery shells, 8,462 hand grenades and 198 tons of explosives.

Behind these armed forces stand the 80 Soviet divisions that ring Europe. At first, Western European Communists carried out door-to-door campaigns, taking money from charwomen and concierges and giving them chips in return reading "present this for protection purposes when the Red army arrives." The threat of invasion still glares through every Communist leaflet and poster. Alexander Werth and his friends may insist that Stalin is a loveable old pacifist. But Aldo Cuccini and Valdo Magnani, when they toured Russia in September 1950 as loyal Communists, were shocked first by the frightful impression of more cannon than trees. They saw, as they later reported, divisions on the march, divisions at garrison posts and high military officials prominent in every public meeting. It was the new emphasis placed by Communist leaders in the conquest of power in Europe through Soviet invasion that led to their break with the party. Magnani's first criticism, voiced at the Emilia Congress of the Italian Communist Party, was that—

"There is an opinion, fairly widespread amongst party members, that revolution can advance only by means of war. The peace campaign is regarded merely as a kind of camouflage. It is thought that at the present stage of the world struggle, revolution can triumph only thanks to the bayonets of an army invading our country. The comrades holding this opinion regard the Red army * * * as the only force capable * * * of freeing the colonial peo-

ples and the working classes of the world at present subjected by capitalism."

In France and Italy, until recently, the Communist Parties have operated as a state within a state, directing their work of espionage, sabotage, violence, and intimidation almost independently of governments. As masters of propaganda they went almost unchallenged. Now that, at least, has changed.

For every poster calling for peace in Europe there is today one published by Europeans calling for peace with liberty. For every Communist propaganda unit, there is an ECA sound truck pushing its way into Communist suburbs throughout France and Italy with films on reconstruction. Against the experts of the Communist agitprop departments with their 30 years of training, and with a fraction of their budgets, ECA information officials are doing a tremendous job. Forty-five radio programs each week dramatize Marshall-plan goals to Europeans. One in three Europeans have seen the ECA's five series of documentary films entitled "The Grand Design," treating housing, health, power, transportation, and food on a European-wide basis. Twenty-six million Europeans have passed through Marshall-plan exhibits set up at fairs and in market places. "Italy is not alone" proclaims the first section of the ECA exhibit which has toured every major Italian city. Italy is a part of western civilization, it continues, drawing on reproductions of art and literature. Italy will rebuild and defend this civilization through unity with her partners, it goes on, and, it concludes, here is what you can do to help. This exhibit drew 1,500,000 Italians in Milan alone.

ECA in Italy, under the brilliant direction of Frank Gervasi, has told its story in spectacular and convincing ways. An ECA art contest for children drew 7,000 entrants in 3 weeks from all over Italy, a motor-scooter rally, held this month in Bari, is drawing entrants from every town in Italy who, with a tractor for first prize, must visit and report on every ECA-sponsored project in the region of Apulia.

And there are many projects worth dramatizing. In Milan, Genoa, Naples, Bari, Palermo, and Rome, ECA funds have been used to build low-cost cooperative housing.

On balance, our record is good. In contrast, the Communist record is terrible. Their slogans are discredited. The major strikes and attempted insurrections they have launched have all been broken. Yet they remain a major force.

One reason is that there are two battles on Europe's battleground. The first is the open, surface battle against the Communists. In that battle we have done well. The second is the silent, undercover battle against an enemy, unidentified, unheard of, and unknown in America—the European right. By the right, I do not mean a political group tagged with the archaic labels of the past. If liberalism implies a responsiveness to new ideas, then the civil servants and military leaders who are developing the Schuman plan and the European army without regard for labels are far better liberals than the band that is gathered around Aneurin Bevan to buttress the relics of irrationality and romanticism that cling to the British Labor Party. By the right, I mean simply the forces massed in Europe to perpetuate class division, low productivity and barren nationalism. They do not cover the walls with posters or hand out leaflets in the streets. Instead they control legislatures and set the policies of governments.

In the secret battle against these groups we have done badly. We have been hesitant, fearful, half-hearted. We have been restricted by the uncreative alliance of American and European industrialists, the outworn doctrine of nonintervention, and the foolish illusion that we must not criticize capitalism in Europe because capitalism is our own way of life. In these ways we have

been disarmed in the secret battle. We have barely begun to recognize the necessity for battle. Yet as long as reaction dominates in Europe and resists all efforts to create a better life for Europeans the Communists will be strong.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 5, 1951

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a number of editorials from Indiana newspapers commenting on the investigation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune of August 22, 1951]

TRUMAN'S "BABY"

Shakespeare's "he doth protest too much" comes to mind as Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Arkansas Democrat, speaking for the Senate RFC investigating committee majority, and Senator ERNEST W. McFARLAND, Arizona Democrat, majority leader in the Senate, denounce the committee minority report. The authors of the latter, Senators HOMER E. CAPEHART, of Indiana, and JOHN W. BRICKER, of Ohio, have merely amplified the committee majority charge of last February that "an influence ring with White House connections" was involved in RFC irregularities. In the final report the majority reiterates that charge in slightly different phraseology.

In their report, described by Chairman FULBRIGHT as "scurrilous," Senators CAPEHART and BRICKER refuse to draw a sharp distinction between the White House and President Truman himself. Mr. Truman, it must be remembered, tried to nullify the RFC investigation from the very beginning. His patronage dispenser, Donald S. Dawson, has not been discharged or even obliquely rebuked by Mr. Truman although the Dawson involvement in the RFC mess is a matter of official record. Senators CAPEHART and BRICKER also refuse to collaborate in President Truman's rather airy dismissal of the charge that William S. Boyle, Jr., now the Democrats' National Chairman, was a member of the influence ring.

Those two Republican Senators actually have not emphasized anything in the RFC mess that could not have been emphasized, in equal detail, with full propriety by the Senate investigating committee majority. As has been remarked the majority cannot be fairly accused of perpetrating an outright whitewash but it was overly polite in its refusal to go into more detail where White House connections were concerned. The RFC scandal is definitely President Truman's "baby." Democrats denunciations of Senators CAPEHART and BRICKER cannot obliterate that fact.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star of August 21, 1951]

BUT YOU SAID, MR. FULBRIGHT—

Democratic Senator FULBRIGHT charges that the minority report on the RFC scandal prepared by GOP Senators CAPEHART and BRICKER is partisan and scurrilous. How-

ever, it is clear from Mr. FULBRIGHT's own comments that he does not dispute the facts presented by CAPEHART and BRICKER. He only objects to the strong language attacking the Truman administration for corruption and stating that morality in government has declined to the lowest ebb in the Nation's history.

The facts that Senators CAPEHART and BRICKER presented in their sharply worded report are fully supported by the Democratic majority report and previous reports already on the record. They reveal nothing new, nothing that Senator FULBRIGHT can claim has not happened.

It is strange that Senator FULBRIGHT, of all people, should attack Senators CAPEHART and BRICKER for denouncing immorality and corruption in the administration. Last March 28 Mr. FULBRIGHT made a resounding speech on the Senate floor that was fully as strong in its denunciation of the scandals exposed by his committee. Said Senator FULBRIGHT, "What seems to be new about these scandals is the moral blindness or callousness which allows those in responsible positions to accept the practices which the facts reveal."

What happened to Mr. FULBRIGHT's righteous indignation? When Senators CAPEHART and BRICKER say much the same thing as he said about the influence peddlers and the White House mink coat episode he says they are partisan and that what they charge is scurrilous. Has the nearness of election caused the Democratic Senator temporarily to succumb to the moral blindness or callousness which allows those in responsible positions to accept the practices which the facts reveal?

Senator FULBRIGHT was roundly applauded throughout the Nation when he attacked the low state of morals in the Truman administration. And he was quite right when he said, "Democracy . . . is more likely to be destroyed by the perversion of or abandonment of its true moral principles than by armed attack from Russia." But when Republicans say the same thing he calls them partisan. How come?

[From the Richmond (Ind.) Palladium-Item of August 23, 1951]

INFLUENCE DOMINATES RFC

Both Democrats and Republicans agree that politics had a part in loan grants by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (RFC).

The Democratic members of the committee which probed operation of the RFC did not like the language used by the Republican minority. But in substance they, too, condemned the manner in which politicians had used the RFC.

So the big difference actually is one of tone rather than of guilt.

Republican Senators CAPEHART, of Indiana, and BRICKER, of Ohio, traced the racket to the doorstep of President Truman. They saw in it the effects of his early political schooling under the wing of the crooked Pendergast machine of Kansas City.

Democratic National Chairman William Boyle was linked with Truman as having been a party to transferring corrupt Pendergast politics to a national level.

Senator FULBRIGHT, Democratic chairman of the subcommittee which investigated, regretted the partisan nature of the Republican minority, but he did not dispute the fact that the RFC had become a tool of administration politicians.

President Truman, early in the investigation, had termed as asinine the original charges that the RFC was influenced by political figures with White House connections.

But the Fulbright committee said in its report that its original charges had been proved by their inquiry.

The Democratic majority report declared that the committee had proved charges the RFC fell prey to a political influence ring "with White House contacts."

That is only the soft way of saying that the President had permitted members of his official family to influence the granting of loans. It is the nice way of admitting that the RFC had been used for political purposes by those who rub elbows with the President in and out of the White House.

It is splitting hairs to condemn the Republican minority report because it calls a spade a spade.

Crookedness is still reprehensible by any name. The fact that the RFC has been an instrument of political influence under Truman's administration is confirmed. That, alone, indicts Mr. Truman, and he cannot attribute it to "red herrings."

[From the Bedford (Ind.) Times-Mail of August 24, 1951]

BUT WHY AN RFC?

Republican Senators BRICKER and CAPEHART, reporting as minority members of Senator FULBRIGHT's subcommittee which investigated the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, called a spade a spade, and said that President Truman and Democratic National Chairman Boyle have "transferred Pendergast politics to the highest level." No, no, said FULBRIGHT in the majority report. Such a statement is "scurrilous." Put it this way, said FULBRIGHT: RFC fell prey to "an influence ring with White House contacts."

So that's the way the majority report will read, instead of being specific about Pendergastism and Kansas City ward politics played on a national stage.

The wording of the report is actually unimportant. What is important is the fact that the committee investigation "fully sustained" charges that it was accepted practice for those who wanted to borrow from RFC to get Democratic politicians to let them in on the ground floor—and that those politicians had White House contacts.

These charges of influence were, earlier, called asinine by Mr. Truman. They now are buttressed by testimony and evidence. RFC made some sound loans. But mixed in with the good were many which would not have been made if there had not been White House contacts. And the taxpayers hold the bag on loans which go sour.

RFC is now presumably in good hands, under Stuart Symington's direction. Symington's "goldfish bowl" methods have cut down RFC lending appreciably. The very publicity surrounding a loan has scared off those with dubious pleas; and the political side entrance has been barred by Symington, who is making an excellent record.

The falling-off of RFC business indicates that Symington may be working himself out of a job. If good risks are properly referred to private lenders, if bad risks are refused; if political influence can no longer sway RFC decisions, there is no real reason why RFC should exist. True, RFC has made some disaster loans and some military loans; but such loans should be handled by agencies specifically limited to lending for disaster relief and military purposes.

We have proved in practice that a Government lending organization like RFC affords a continual temptation to use the people's money and credit for political purposes. The best that RFC can now prove, under model management, is that it wasn't necessary for RFC to be misused. But why go on with RFC to prove that point, when it has not been satisfactorily explained why there is an RFC at all in times of ample credit for any who have a venture worth selling?

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star of August 17, 1951]

NO MORE WHITEWASHES

The Democratic majority in the RFC investigating subcommittee has decided to soft pedal charges of influence peddling and favoritism against members of the Truman

administration. Another whitewash seems to be in the works. The majority also seems to be getting ready to attempt to suppress a minority report containing these charges prepared by Senators CAPEHART and BRICKER.

If the committee majority tries to refuse approval of this minority report the Senators should release its contents to the press anyway.

The Fulbright committee has only scratched the surface of corruption and political favoritism in the RFC. The disclosures already out, however, make it clear that the RFC has been an evil influence, has been used to further the political fortunes of the party in power and has even approved some loans that have all the earmarks of fraud.

Both ex-President Hoover, who set up the RFC, and Jesse Jones, who administered it for so long under Roosevelt, have demanded that the RFC be abolished for good. No matter how often it is cleaned up the very nature of this agency makes inevitable that its tremendous powers will be used to punish administration enemies and aid administration friends. Its original purpose, to combat depression, has long since been fulfilled.

The RFC is also an engine of inflation. It makes to businesses loans that the Government itself will not permit banks to make. The administration insists that banks cut back their loans to private business to combat inflation. But the RFC goes merrily on inflating the currency by making loans the banks will not or cannot make.

The RFC should be abolished. If the Senate has a chance to see the minority report of Senators CAPEHART and BRICKER its Members will know how far the agency has gone toward becoming a political weapon and how evil its past activities have been. The people want no more whitewashes of corruption from their Congressmen. The RFC scandal should get a thorough and complete airing.

[From the Richmond (Ind.) Palladium-Item of August 19, 1951]

WANT RFC REPORT SOFTENED

The Democratic majority on the committee probing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (RFC) is critical of the pending minority report.

Republican members have a report ready which is too harsh for the thin-skinned Fair Dealers of the Truman administration.

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, of Indiana, and Senator JOHN W. BRICKER, of Ohio, wrote most of the minority criticism.

But whatever may be the results of the attempt of the Democrats to tone down the minority report, Senator CAPEHART says he is going to release it Monday.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has become an instrument of political privilege. Evidence of the past year has shown how millions of dollars have gone to concerns that enjoyed official influence.

Even Senator FULBRIGHT, Democratic chairman of the subcommittee making the probe, was named among others as having sought favor.

The mess into which the RFC got itself brought about a revamping of the direction, with a five-man Board being replaced by a single head, named by President Truman.

Hundreds of millions of dollars have been thrown around by the RFC as a form of political sugar for those who knew their way around Washington.

It has become an agency for huge grants which in many cases would not be considered for a moment by any soundly operated private banking institution.

When the RFC was set up under President Herbert Hoover it was designed to help finance the worthy enterprises which needed working capital. It should have been liquidated after serving its purpose.

The New York Times, often champion of the Truman administration, states the case well editorially when it says:

"Are we to go on forever trying to run down charges against every individual who takes advantage of the morally insidious dual character of the RFC to use the institution as an instrument for financial or political aggrandizement, as the case might be?"

"Or are we to do the intelligent thing and rid ourselves once and for all of the corrupting influence of this agency, which was erected 20 years ago to deal with a temporary emergency and has perpetuated itself as a potential paradise for political shysters and chiseling businessmen?"

[From the Marion (Ind.) Chronicle of August 21, 1951]

IT'S NOT WHAT YOU SAY—

It is not what you say but how you say it that counts in Washington today. Senators CAPEHART and BRICKER filed a sharply worded minority report on the Senate's RFC investigation. The report charged President Truman and William M. Boyle, Jr., Democratic national chairman, "have transferred Pendergast politics to the national level."

Senator FULBRIGHT, committee chairman, asserted the minority report was politically motivated but he wrote, and other Democrats on the investigating group joined, in a majority report which itself renewed charges made by the committee last February that the big Government lending agency had fallen prey to "an influence ring with White House contacts." The new report from the Democrats, adopted by the full Banking Committee and sent along to the Senate, said those charges were fully substantiated in a new series of public hearings held after Mr. Truman had called the preliminary report asinine.

The minority report has been substantiated by the conviction of several of the Missouri gang in court. Others have been involved in the reports of influence peddling but have not been convicted. The public needs little additional evidence, however, on this score.

The Democrat national chairman was the latest to be involved in the RFC scandals. A St. Louis newspaper charged, and submitted proof when he attempted to deny, that he had received fees from a printing firm which succeeded in obtaining an RFC loan. The loan was not granted until after Boyle had been retained. Mr. Truman asserted, however, he would stand by his longtime friend and national chairman, because he was honest. When one irate Marion citizen heard what the President had said, he declared that none of the Missouri gang has the slightest idea of what honesty is.

It is a sad state of affairs when an administration sinks so low in public esteem that the average citizen questions the honesty of the highest officials. The cheating scandal at West Point was simply the latest in a series of shocking developments within and without the Government. There has been corruption, graft, bribery, cheating, and dubious practices in former administrations. But rarely, if ever, have they been on so wide a scale as in very recent times.

The Capehart-Bricker report may serve to awaken the public to what is happening in the Nation's Capital. To date, there is a tendency to regard graft and sharp practices in and out of Government as inevitable and of relatively small importance. It is a dangerous feeling.

[From the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune of August 21, 1951]

RFC REPORTS

The final report of the Senate investigating committee majority does not mod-

erate the RFC procedures criticism made in a preliminary report last February. The gist of it, in the majority members' words, is that the RFC was used by an influence ring with White House contacts. On behalf of the committee majority, however, Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Arkansas Democrat, denounces as scurrilous the Republican minority report in which President Truman and National Chairman William M. Boyle, Jr., are described as graduates of one of the most corrupt political machines in the history of any State.

The committee majority effort to minimize the Truman-Boyle political background while admitting existence of an influence ring with White House contacts is essentially incongruous. The minority report authors Senators HOMER E. CAPEHART, of Indiana, and JOHN W. BRICKER, of Ohio, have really gone to the root of the matter. President Truman tried to sneer the Senate RFC investigation out of existence. When he was unable to do that he failed to speak and act in a manner indicative of regret that the RFC had been misused by an influence ring with White House contacts. The majority report is not, strictly speaking, a whitewash but the minority report is more realistic.

[From the Evansville (Ind.) Courier of August 21, 1951]

THEY SAY THE SAME THINGS

Senator McFARLAND, Democratic Senate leader, says the RFC minority report issued by Senators CAPEHART and BRICKER is "political poppycock" and filled with "demagogic political inference and innuendo."

It seems to be all a matter of language.

The majority report, written by Senator FULBRIGHT who pushed the investigation against Mr. Truman's wishes, said:

"It became accepted practice in many instances for loan applicants to seek introduction to the Directors of the RFC, or to some of them, through officials of the Democratic National Committee."

"It became apparent that the [RFC] Board of Directors, as then constituted, tacitly acknowledged its responsiveness to external influence."

This is pretty tangible support, it seems to us, for the Capehart-Bricker statement that some Democratic leaders have moved "Pendergast politics to the national level."

Isn't that about as good a definition of this kind of business as you can get?

[From the Goshen (Ind.) News-Democrat of August 23, 1951]

WHAT OTHERS SAY

BUT YOU SAID, MR. FULBRIGHT—

(The Indianapolis Star)

Democratic Senator FULBRIGHT charges that the minority report on the RFC scandal prepared by GOP Senators CAPEHART and BRICKER is partisan and scurrilous. However, it is clear from Mr. FULBRIGHT's own comments that he does not dispute the facts presented by Senators CAPEHART and BRICKER. He only objects to the strong language attacking the Truman administration for corruption and stating that "morality in government has declined to the lowest ebb in the Nation's history."

The facts that Senators CAPEHART and BRICKER presented in their sharply worded report are fully supported by the Democratic majority report and previous reports already on the record. They reveal nothing new, nothing that Senator FULBRIGHT can claim has not happened.

It is strange that Senator FULBRIGHT, of all people, should attack Senators CAPEHART and BRICKER for denouncing immorality and corruption in the administration. Last March 28, Mr. FULBRIGHT made a resounding speech on the Senate floor that was fully

as strong in its denunciation of the scandals exposed by his committee. Said Senator FULBRIGHT: "What seem to be new about these scandals is the moral blindness or callousness which allows those in responsible positions to accept the practice which the facts reveal."

What happened to Mr. FULBRIGHT's righteous indignation? When Senators CAPEHART and BRICKER say much the same thing as he said about the influence peddlers and the White House mink coat episode he says they are partisan and that what they charge is scurrilous. Has the nearness of election caused the Democratic Senator temporarily to succumb to "the moral blindness or callousness which allows those in responsible positions to accept the practices which the facts reveal?"

Senator FULBRIGHT was roundly applauded throughout the Nation when he attacked the low state of morals in the Truman administration. And he was quite right when he said, "Democracy . . . is more likely to be destroyed by the perversion of, or abandonment of, its true moral principles than by armed attack from Russia." But when Republicans say the same thing he calls them partisan. How come?

National Vegetable Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 5, 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, it was my pleasure to introduce the bill designating the week beginning with the first Sunday of August of each year as National Vegetable Week, because I was convinced that Nation-wide observance should be given to this worth-while cause.

In this connection I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate an editorial which appeared in the Packer, the national fresh fruit and vegetable industry newspaper, on the success of National Vegetable Week, which was observed this year August 5-11, and I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL VEGETABLE WEEK

It strikes us that National Vegetable Week (observed this year August 5-11), the big promotion of the Vegetable Growers Association of America, is definitely coming of age.

This year's event was in the big-time class beyond a doubt—28 governors proclaimed the August 5-11 period officially as National Vegetable Week in their States, and trade press, daily press, radio, TV, and the various other mass media backed the event with wonderful and virtually priceless publicity for vegetables—and nothing could be finer for all concerned because, who benefits from increased consumption of fresh vegetables? Everybody.

And we say everybody advisedly. That includes all segments of the industry—the producer first, then on through the distributive factors. And finally, the consumer, for what better food than fresh vegetables—and fruits—in the daily diet. Here are all the required vitamins, and in a form that ap-

peals to all the senses—health-giving foods with taste appeal and eye appeal. Dream products for the high-powered promotion man.

We congratulate the enterprise of the Vegetable Growers Association of America—and their astute and wide-awake publicity director, Max Chambers, on a job well done. The Packer is pleased that it could have a part in such a universally worth-while cause, and we promise VGA our full and complete cooperation in making next year's National Vegetable Week truly bigger and better than ever. Let's have the other 20 governors on the bandwagon in 1952, and the President of the United States as well.

As we said above, the Packer is proud to have had a part in the success of the big week for vegetables, and, if we may be pardoned for doing so, we are quoting below excerpt from a letter of thanks received from VGA's Max Chambers.

"I know all vegetable growers throughout the Nation will appreciate the full recognition you gave National Vegetable Week on the front page of the August 4 Packer.

"VGAA is growing just as is National Vegetable Week and the queen program. Much of our progress is due to the splendid support we have received from our friends and papers, especially the Packer and related interests. Would you please convey to your editor our sincere appreciation."

"Tis done, Max, for all the world to see. And we thank you.

Attacks on Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 5, 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news article from the New York Times dated August 25, 1951, dealing with attacks on public schools and appeals to bias. This article tells of a number of tax exempt organizations which have sprung up in various localities, carrying on scurrilous attacks against teachers in public schools in many parts of the country. The article indicates that these baseless attacks are being made by local tax savings and superpatriotic groups supported by wealthy reactionaries and powerful national organizations. It warns the country that public education is under a barrage of attacks expressed in irrational appeals to prejudice, undermining the stability of our American school system.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AFL TEACHERS ASK EDUCATION DEFENSE—VITUPERATIVE ATTACKS ON PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND APPEALS TO BIAS ARE CHARGED BY UNION—MEMBERS URGED TO FIGHT—CONVENTION, IN CLOSING SESSION, ALSO SEEKS EXTRA PAY FOR EXTRACURRICULAR DUTIES

(By Murray Ilson)

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., August 24.—Warning that public education was under a barrage of vituperative attack expressed in irrational appeals to prejudice, the American Federation of Teachers, AFL, called upon its entire membership tonight to fight for the defense of the Nation's schools.

The federation's action came in the closing session of its thirty-fourth annual convention and was based on a unanimously adopted report of its committee on national educational trends and policies. The report said that federation members welcomed all genuinely constructive criticism of the public schools and that no group of citizens was more aware of present educational deficiencies or of the need for continual improvement. Referring to the campaign against the schools, however, the committee said:

"The stated purpose of these attacks is to reduce the funds spent on education in a period of rapidly rising school population and of increased needs of youth, and to destroy the very processes by which youth learns how to accept his moral and civic responsibilities.

"Special interests demand that tests and curriculum be distorted to their advantage. Guidance, counseling, and the development of wholesome relationships in the classroom are denounced and penal discipline based on submission, not on creative participation, is demanded. The right of teachers and administrators to the normal use of their privileges as participating citizens is denied and individual teachers are publicly attacked without chance for answer or defense."

THREE GROUPS NAMED

The report declared that the attacks were being made by local tax savings and superpatriotic groups that were stimulated and supported by powerful national organizations. It said that federation members should be made aware of the local activities of such groups as the Friends of Public Education, the National Council for American Education, and the American Education Association, whose misleading names entrap the unwary.

Also by unanimous action, the delegates adopted a resolution declaring that if extra-curricular school activities could not be incorporated into the regular school program, teachers taking part in them should be compensated for the extra time and work. The resolution was based on a report dealing with the recent stoppage of voluntary after-school activities by New York City's public-school teachers in their campaign to win higher salaries.

The report said that "in no other occupation is a worker employed to perform exacting and highly technical duties of one sort and later forced to render, on his own time, service often unrelated to the job he is supposed to do."

It went on to say that "just as the carpenter or the plumber is compensated for all additional time spent on his job—and not at the expense of his fellow workers, either—so every teacher should be compensated fairly for his additional labor."

SAYS TAKE-HOME PAY DROPPED

A report of the federation's standing committee on taxation said that, although revenues for public education had continued to increase last year, the rise was nullified by soaring costs.

The committee put the Nation-wide average of teachers' salaries at \$3,080, compared with \$1,580 in 1938-39. In terms of purchasing power in 1938-39, however, the current average is worth \$1,657, it was said. The committee added: "Taking into account the considerable increase in the rates and amounts of taxation at the local, State, and Federal levels that has taken place since 1938-39, it is obvious that teachers' take-home pay is actually less in 1950-51 than it was in 1938-39."

At least 520,000 additional classrooms will be needed during the next 10 years to provide necessary replacements and new facilities for children now in school and for prospective pupils in all grades, the committee

reported. It observed that these new facilities would require an investment of about \$14,000,000,000 and that this would involve "average annual expenditures of considerably more than three times what we are now spending for school-building purposes."

Alabama's Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the forests of Alabama are one of her greatest natural resources. More than one-half of the total land area of Alabama is in forests.

Alabama forests contributed more than their share to the Nation's needs for forest products during World War II. They likewise contributed heavily to the need for housing and industrial building in the postwar period.

Now, again, as our country finds itself in a great national emergency, when the war drums of Korea beat in our ears, and we, from day to day, do not know when we will be called upon to fight a bigger war to preserve our national freedom, Alabama's forests are again being called upon to furnish the sinews of war.

These unprecedented demands on our forests, which are indicated by the fact that more than 9,000,000,000 board feet of lumber were cut in Alabama during the 5-year period 1944 to 1948, inclusive, imposed a drain on our timber resources greatly in excess of replacements by natural growth.

PROSPERITY OF SEVENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF ALABAMA DEPENDENT ON ITS FOREST RESOURCES

The prosperity of Alabama and, to even a much greater degree, the prosperity of its Seventh Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent in the Congress, is dependent on its forests.

The forests of the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama—Blount, Cullman, Fayette, Franklin, Lamar, Marion, Pickens, Walker, and Winston Counties—furnish a major source of employment and income for our people. That pillar of our well-being must be preserved. Wise planning and prudent efforts to restore and improve this base of our wealth are called for.

Happily we are so situated geographically, our mild climate and heavy rainfall are such, that our timber grows rapidly. We have thousands of acres of vacant land, not needed, or too poor and eroded, for the growth of annual farm crops. Our forest resources can be restored. They must be restored.

ALABAMA HAS THREE NATIONAL FORESTS

As a part of its total forest resources, Alabama is fortunate to have three great national forests. They are:

First. The William B. Bankhead National Forest, situated in Winston, Franklin, and Lawrence Counties in

Northern Alabama. Within the boundaries of this forest are 560,604 acres—876 square miles. Eighty percent of this forest area—448,841 acres or 701 square miles—is in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, in Winston and Franklin Counties. The Government actually owns 178,184 of these forest acres—278 square miles—88,921 acres—139 square miles—of which lie in Winston and Franklin Counties in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama.

Second. The Talladega National Forest in central Alabama.

Third. The Conecuh National Forest in the southern or flatwoods section of Alabama.

ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION OF ALABAMA'S NATIONAL FORESTS

These national forests are under the jurisdiction of the United States Forest Service, presently headed by the Honorable Lyle F. Watts, Washington, D. C., as Chief. The United States Forest Service divides its operations into 10 regions. Region 8 is made up of 11 Southern States, of which Alabama is one. Mr. Charles A. Connaughton, with headquarters in Atlanta, Ga., is the regional forester for region 8.

The three Alabama national forests have a forest supervisor, Mr. C. F. Burnham, who has offices in Montgomery, Ala.

A district forest ranger is in charge of the William B. Bankhead National Forest, with headquarters at Haleyville, Ala. The Conecuh National Forest also has a district forest ranger in charge, and the Talladega National Forest, because of its larger size, is divided into three ranger districts.

PURPOSE OF UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE

The purpose of the United States Forest Service is to develop and demonstrate the best methods of managing forest lands. On these national forests owners and managers of timberlands can oftentimes find the answers to the problems which confront them in growing a crop of trees.

RECREATIONAL VALUE OF FORESTS

The national forests have another value which cannot be measured in dollars and cents. I refer to their facilities for hunting, fishing, swimming, hiking, and other types of healthful outdoor recreation. These facilities have been developed for public use. They belong to all the people.

THE FUTURE OF FORESTRY

There are great undeveloped possibilities in the field of making a more valuable use of our forests. Less than one-half of the total tree is converted into lumber. The other half is usually waste. We do not know how to use it. This opens up a wonderful field for scientific research for new methods of using that part of the tree that we now throw away. Think what it would mean to Alabama if we discovered profitable ways to use that part of the tree that we now throw away.

A few years from now our scientists may lead us to make motor fuels, food, clothing, and explosives from the odds and ends of the sawmilling process. We

already know that a ton of dry sawdust or chips, when carried through the proper chemical processes, will yield 1,000 pounds, or half its weight, in wood sugar, and another 500 pounds of a brown powder known as lignin residue. Before and during World War II German scientists carried their experiments in the use of wood waste to what were for them very practical results.

LET US PUT OUR VACANT LAND TO WORK

In most sections of this country we take our forests for granted. Their depletion, however, in recent years brings us face to face with the fact that if we are going to continue to enjoy their benefits we must do something about it.

We can at least do these things:

First. Plant seedlings to replace the trees cut and otherwise destroyed in the lumbering process.

Second. Apply the latest principles of conservation, fire, and insect control, worked out by our State departments of conservation and by the United States Forest Service.

Third. Plant our vacant lands to forests and accomplish the practical purpose of growing an income on land not now producing, and at the same time saving our topsoil together with the life-sustaining minerals it contains for the generations that will come after us.

Planting trees is perhaps the cheapest and most effective soil conservation we can do on lands that are unused, and whose fertility has been impaired by erosion.

Will Controls Be Permanent?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, our Director of Defense Mobilization is a man who has always fought regimentation in industry. He is, in fact, one of the Nation's biggest businessmen. In his role as head of our defense set-up he has often been called upon to explain his advocacy of controls, and his answer is invariable. He says, "Controls are necessary now, because we are in an emergency."

But the disquieting fact is that there is every evidence from the administration that it regards this emergency as a continuous process. Almost daily some official spokesman predicts that the era of tension may last for a generation. Some say that this is another One Hundred Years' War. All of which means that to this group of planners of the Nation's economy the need for controlling production, prices, wages, and through tax devices, profits and investments as well, will probably go on for an unforeseeable future. This is what some of us fear—the possibility that we are witnessing the end of the free-enterprise system—without the approval of Defense Mobilizer Wilson at all.

Salaries of Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to file with the House of Representatives the report of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee on H. R. 244, a bill to increase the salaries of postal workers. The bill, H. R. 244, was introduced by me on January 3, 1951, the day the Eighty-second session of the Congress convened.

As recommended for passage by the committee the bill differs from that originally proposed. The bill does not completely bridge the ever widening gap between the salaries of postal workers and the ever rising cost of living. It goes a long way in this, however, and is the best bill we can get at this time.

A brief analysis of it follows:

Salary increase: (a) Grants to 500,000 postal employees salary increases of \$400 for all such employees paid on an annual basis, except fourth-class postmasters who will receive a 20-percent increase. Hourly employees will receive a 20-cent-an-hour increase.

Raises entrance salary: (b) Eliminates the first three grades for all employees and rennumbers the remaining grades in sequence beginning with No. 1. This increases the entrance salary by \$300. When combined with the provisions of (a) above, it raises the entrance salary for clerks, carriers, and motor-vehicle employees from an annual rate of \$2,670—\$1.31½ per hour—the present rate, to an annual rate of \$3,370—\$1.66½ per hour. Rural carriers presently receive permanent appointments and are appointed in grade 3. Their entrance salary will be increased by one grade.

Grade increases:

(c) Grants two grade increases to those employees who have entered the postal service since July 1, 1945, and have not received any grade increase by operation of law counting increases under this bill. Grants one grade increase to those employees who have received only one such grade increase. Employees advanced in grade under this section will still retain their time in grade toward their next promotion.

Other provisions:

(d) Provides that increases under this act shall not be counted as equivalent increases in compensation within the meaning of the Classification Act of 1949, so that employees who might be transferred to the Classification Act, such as transfer of buildings to GSA, will not be denied within-grade increases when due.

(e) Is retroactive to July 1, 1951, but shall not apply in the case of employees who have been separated from the rolls on the date of enactment, with the exception of those who are in the Armed Forces or who have retired since July 1, 1951.

Salaries of Government employees, including postal workers, have continu-

ously lagged behind the cost of living as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor.

The tendency of the Congress has been to let the cost of living run away from Federal salaries, then to adjust them to meet the minimum difference. This policy has always been repugnant to me. It means that we require our employees to progressively work for less and less.

This unhealthful policy and the current tendency of carping criticism of those who work for Government has had a serious effect upon the esprit and morale of the workers. It has driven good men and women out of Government and made it increasingly hard to attract the same type to Government.

In discussing the salary situation with representatives of the Postal Central Council of Alameda County, Calif., some time ago, I suggested that they gather certain data in support of their plea for an increase in salary. This very efficient group has undertaken this study and I submit their findings for the consideration of my colleagues. Here is the report:

COST OF LIVING POLL COMPILED AUGUST 13, 1951

To secure a true and accurate picture of what the postal employee in this area is confronted in his fight to maintain his family and home in a decent manner under present conditions and to secure conclusive evidence that the postal employee is in need of an immediate increase in salary, a questionnaire with many important questions was submitted to all the postal employees in the East Bay area. Over a thousand replies were returned.

We believe that the results of this poll depicts an honest and fair cross-sectional check on this grave problem. We also feel that these results or averages would be similar in any California community.

Category	Percentage	Average
Single.....	10.0	-----
Married.....	90.0	-----
Number of dependents.....	-----	3.1
Years of service.....	-----	6½
Average take-home pay (monthly).....	-----	\$244.90
Wife working.....	25.3	-----
Doing outside work.....	24.6	-----
Other income.....	12.0	-----
Used cash reserves.....	70.0	-----
Cashed savings bonds.....	70.0	-----
Had to borrow money.....	70.0	-----
Debts increased in past year.....	83.0	-----
Average cost per month for essentials ¹	-----	\$54.00
Rent.....	-----	19.62
Utilities.....	-----	121.50
Food.....	-----	6.00
Entertainment.....	-----	16.32
Insurance.....	-----	14.40
Clothing.....	-----	11.20
Medical expense.....	-----	13.65
Transportation.....	-----	-----

¹ It is obvious that the figures used in this category are not sufficient to maintain a family of 4 properly. They indicate only what the employee has to spend, not what is needed to maintain his family.

Question: Will you be forced to resign from the postal service if an increase in salary is not forthcoming?

Answer: Forty-three percent of those answering this question said "Yes."

Study and analyze these figures. The average man has 6½ years of service and has 3.1 dependents. His average take-home pay of \$244.90 is insufficient to support his family in our proud American tradition with round steak at over \$1 a pound and milk 22 cents a quart.

Over 61 percent must seek outside work, get a job for his wife, or supplement his income from other sources. These are American postal workers in this the year of our Lord 1951 of whom we speak.

The \$64 question is the one that directly affects the efficiency of the postal service and the great investment we have in it.

Here is the answer: Forty-three percent of the employees interviewed said that they would be forced to leave the postal service and seek work elsewhere if a salary increase was not forthcoming.

What will this turn-over of manpower mean in cold cash? What will it mean in lower morale among those who remain? What will it mean in service to the public? One thing it does mean, and there is no gainsaying the fact, that Uncle Sam will pay more for less efficient service. The continuous introduction of new untrained men, the great majority of which look upon the postal service as stopgap employment, can be directly translated in higher costs.

We in Congress have a high moral responsibility toward those who work for Government. They are entitled to more than just a subsistence wage; they are entitled to the same standard of living that others enjoy.

Study the figures set forth above. They are typical of those found in all of our larger communities.

Government workers should be secure with a fair living wage and only when we accept this thesis can we hope to build back loyalty and pride in the job they do. These are requisites in any smooth-working, efficient organization.

Dividends From Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 5, 1951

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Farm Credit Agency Earns One Hundredth Million," published in the Washington Star of August 25, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM CREDIT AGENCY EARNS ONE HUNDREDTH MILLION

A Federal Government activity that has been a consistent money maker for 16 years paid another million into the United States Treasury today.

When a check for \$1,000,000 was handed to Treasury Secretary Snyder by Gov. I. W. Duggan, of the Farm Credit Administration, it raised to \$100,000,000 the sum the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, a subsidiary, has earned in dividends since it was set up in 1934 to meet a need for farm-mortgage credit.

The Government earlier had been repaid for its original \$200,000,000 investment in

the project, which was created as a depression aid.

The money was turned over to the Treasury at the White House, and President Truman issued a statement saying that the FCA has always been self-supporting and will probably be able to pay off \$30,000,000 more in dividends.

Thought Control: United States Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 5, 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Thought Control: United States Style," by Dr. Alonzo F. Myers, chairman of the department of higher education at New York University. This article deals with certain organizations and pressure groups seeking to force boards of education to establish little gestapos within each school system, the members of which must spy and report on their colleagues. They adopt the principle of indictment by association and cause much confusion among the teaching profession in our American schools.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOUGHT CONTROL: UNITED STATES STYLE

(By Alonzo F. Myers)

Today, fear of Russia, or of communism, dominates our national life. "Stop Russia" comes very close to being our national policy. Negative policies and negative actions possess greater vitality and popular appeal today than do positive actions and policies. It almost appears to be true today that nobody is interested in strengthening or preserving our traditional democratic liberties. It is feared that to preserve them will leave us vulnerable to further Communist infiltration.

We are engaged in a futile effort to defend democracy by abandoning its principles. This attitude indicates a shocking lack of faith in the efficacy and strength of democratic processes. It suggests a fear that if the American people were given all the facts and the right of free choice they might choose Communist totalitarianism in preference to our great democratic liberties and traditions.

We used to ridicule "thought control" in Japan. Yet the Japanese were only doing then what we are doing now, trying to protect their system against dangerous thoughts infiltrating into the minds of their people. The Japanese had an understandable reason for doing this, just as have the dictators in the Kremlin today. They did not dare permit their people to become informed about our great democratic freedoms, our living standards, and our system of private enterprise. We in America today, with no such justification, can think of no better way of protecting our system than that of aping the totalitarian practices of our adversaries.

We first castigated Hitlerian Germany, and then Communist Russia, for the ridiculous practice of condemnation by association. We ridicule Russia for not permitting her people to associate freely with American citizens in Russia. Just how safe is it for

non-Communists to associate with Communists in America today? We are up to our ears in this business of thought control and condemnation by association here in America right now.

We condemn the Russians for their refusal to permit free cultural interchange with the democracies. If there is anything certain, it is that an essential condition for a secure and lasting peace must be the resumption of the free flow of goods, services, people, and ideas throughout the world. Suppose the Russians were to take us up on that proposition. Specifically, suppose the Russians should suggest the exchange of teachers between their colleges and ours, and suppose they should suggest that 100,000 Russian youth should come to America to study in our colleges and universities in exchange with 100,000 of our students who would study in Russian colleges and universities.

Nothing that could be done at this time would hold greater promise for long-time peaceful relations between the United States and Russia. Is that not what we want? But what would we do if the Russians were to make that offer? How safe would it be for an American boy or girl to become one of the participants in such a program? How safe would it be for an American teacher to participate? Would we permit the Russian professor, who unquestionably would be a Communist, to teach in one of our State universities? Are we, in fact, any more ready to lift the iron curtain than are the Russians?

It is in this setting that academic freedom is making its feeble struggle for survival in our American schools and colleges. Its prospects do not appear to be too good. Teachers are being discharged because they hold, or are alleged to hold, unpopular political and economic views. A number of the States appear to be engaged in competition with each other to see which can devise the most obnoxious and repressive kind of special loyalty oath for teachers.

II

Perhaps the most vicious and dangerous legislation ever enacted against the teaching profession is the Feinberg law, introduced in the New York Legislature about 2 years ago by a legislative lieutenant of Governor Dewey and rushed through to passage in the closing days of the legislative session without an opportunity for the educational forces of the State to appear in opposition to it.

It forces boards of education to establish little gestapos within each school system, the members of which must spy and report on their colleagues. It frankly adopts the principle of indictment by association, one of the most vicious of all totalitarian practices.

The Texas Legislature at the last session enacted legislation requiring that staff members in all State-supported colleges and universities take a particularly objectionable kind of special loyalty oath in which they must swear that they are not Communists, never have been Communists, and are not and have not been members of any organization that has been declared to be subversive. It is freely predicted in Texas that presently all public-school teachers also will be required to take this loyalty oath.

Such legislation accomplishes no good purpose. It undermines confidence in public education and in teachers. It singles out teaching as a profession and says in effect that the teaching profession is subversive and is not to be trusted. It uncovers no Communists. It intimidates and terrorizes honest teachers. It causes independent and courageous young people to avoid teaching as a career. Perhaps these are the things such legislation aims to do.

Businessmen and other responsible community leaders are being propagandized to the effect that there is a great Red menace

in the schools. Students and student organizations are being subjected to inquisitorial investigation designed to suppress liberal thought and to enforce unquestioning conformity. Increasingly, colleges are building up permanent dossiers on students which go far beyond official needs. Students are afraid to join respectable organizations such as international relations clubs for fear that at a later date the organization may be labeled as subversive. In school and college classrooms today there are just too many things we don't dare talk about and too many questions that it is inappropriate for our students to ask.

III

In Springfield, Mo., I sat beside a banker at a luncheon. There were many teachers there. I observed that the banker was well acquainted with many of them; he appeared to like them, and they him. Toward the end of the luncheon, after the banker and I had discussed a good many subjects, he said to me "I am troubled about something that I am sure you know much more about than I do. Just how much communism is there among members of the teaching profession?"

I thought about that question for awhile before making a reply. I realized that it was a serious question asked by an honest man. Finally I said: "I think communism is just about as common among teachers as embezzlement is among bankers."

The banker thought about that for a bit and said: "I suppose you're right." He admitted that he was being propagandized with printed material to the effect that there is a great Communist menace in the schools.

I asked the banker about teachers that both he and I knew who were employed in the local public schools and in the State college located in Springfield. In each case he assured me of what I already knew, that these teachers could by no stretch of the imagination be considered Reds. He said he was not worried about the Springfield teachers, he knew they were all right. It was teachers elsewhere in the United States that he was worried about. I assured him that the teachers he knew were no different in their economic, political, and social views from the vast majority of teachers all over this country.

I told him that there are some Communists in the teaching profession, but only a small number, probably a smaller number than in almost any other profession or occupation. On the basis of his experience with Springfield teachers, he agreed that this must almost surely be true. We then discussed embezzlement among bankers, how rare it is, how unfair it would be to the banking profession, and how destructive of public confidence it would be if there were to be a persistent propaganda campaign designed to convince the public that bankers are embezzlers.

Our teaching profession has permitted itself to be placed on the defensive in this matter of defending itself against unjust attack, primarily because most of us are so timid, and because our profession is not strongly enough organized to combat such attacks. There is evidence that even a reasonable amount of intestinal fortitude coupled with effective organization could help greatly.

A few years ago a professional speech maker, apparently in order to compensate for a declining popularity, began making the most violent attacks against the teaching profession in his speeches. In an address before a convention of hardware dealers in Toledo, Ohio, he was particularly bitter in his attack, referring to teachers as Reds and loafers.

Dr. Bowsher, superintendent of schools in Toledo, initiated correspondence with the speaker, asking for his evidence. Unable to get any satisfactory reply, Dr. Bowsher re-

ferred the matter to the National Education Association's Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education, of which I was then chairman.

Dr. Donald DuShane, then executive secretary of the Commission, tried to make an appointment with the lecturer. The lecturer replied that he was too busy with his lectures to see Dr. DuShane. Repeated efforts brought the same response. Finally we decided on another approach to the problem. In an address before the Oklahoma Education Association I reported on the gentleman's activities, recounted Dr. DuShane's successful efforts to secure a conference with him, and said that I thought the lecturer was too busy with his speech making, and that something should be done about it.

Teacher members on the committee of a civic lecture series in Tulsa persuaded the committee to inform the lecturer's booking agency that the lecturer would not be re-engaged in Tulsa until he was at least willing to confer with official representatives of the organized teaching profession regarding his reckless attacks upon teachers.

Presently, Arthur Garfield Hays, the civil liberties lawyer, informed me that he had been retained by the lecturer and the speakers' bureau to bring suit against me and against the Commission. Mr. Hays was good enough to invite me to give him our side of the controversy. I did, with the result that he evidently advised his clients against bringing suit. Soon we had a communication from the lecturer stating that he was willing to discontinue his attacks on teachers and asking that we inform the teaching profession that he was discontinuing these attacks. This we were happy to do.

The teaching profession must give positive indication of a determination to preserve academic freedom. Further, we must recognize that the teaching profession alone cannot preserve academic freedom. There can be no greater degree of academic freedom than public opinion will support. We must recognize that academic freedom cannot stand alone, and that destruction of civil liberties inevitably means destruction of academic freedom. Academic freedom is merely freedom of speech operating in the classroom. It is part of the same piece as freedom of the press, freedom of radio, freedom in the pulpit. We must make common cause with those who would preserve civil liberty in all its applications, and we must invite them to make common cause with us.

IV

Fundamentally, it is the task of the teaching profession to make it clear to the American people that safety lies, not in repression and suppression, but in enlightenment and education. I am confident that this can be done. But to do it we must approach the task with clean hands. We must be clear as to what it is we stand for, and we must have nothing up our sleeves. We must not demand the right to indoctrinate for communism, nor for any other ism, under the cloak of academic freedom.

We, the organized teaching profession, must be prepared to expose and discredit all such attempts. Unless the teaching profession has the courage and the forthrightness to expose and discredit those few subversive members of our profession who would pervert academic freedom in order to propagandize for totalitarianism, the task will be handled by those who would destroy all liberalism and all academic freedom.

On one particular issue directly affecting academic freedom I am convinced that we must take a positive stand. There is a growing tendency to dismiss teachers on the allegation that they are members of subversive groups or that they associate with persons who are members of subversive groups. We should insist that no person should be fired for what he thinks or is

alleged to think. If he is to be dismissed it should be for what he does or fails to do. Admittedly it is more difficult to prove overt acts than it is to accumulate evidence in support of dangerous thoughts. But the threats to civil liberties and to academic freedom in the policy of indictment by association and of dismissing people because of what they believe or are alleged to believe, are so great that we must take a strong stand at that point.

There is a growing tendency to restrict the freedom of students as well as that of teachers. We seem to be moving in the direction of requiring young men and women to pass a loyalty examination as one of the requirements for admission to college. Unless we have completely lost faith in the strength and validity of our great democratic principles and traditions, we need not fear the effects of having a few young people on our campuses who have decided that communism looks more attractive to them than does our American brand of democracy and private enterprise. I would say that such young people particularly need the benefits of a good college education.

Recently, in New York City, the superintendent of schools suspended eight public-school teachers, charging them with being Communists. Certain student organizations in one of the municipal colleges requested permission to have one of these suspended teachers present his side of the matter at a meeting on the campus. A faculty committee denied the request. The board of presidents of the four municipal colleges supported the faculty committee's action.

This is symptomatic of what is happening all over the country. We have become so jittery over the Communist menace that we are afraid to have our students listen to anybody who has not been tested for complete orthodoxy. We seem to have lost faith in the ability of American college students to think for themselves, to distinguish between true and false, and to detect a phony when they see and hear one in action.

V

I do not advocate hiring Communist teachers. I would not knowingly hire one. But neither would I become unduly alarmed over the presence of a Communist teacher on a college campus. I think if he behaved the way a Communist is supposed to behave he would be spotted as a propagandist and as an intellectually dishonest person by the students whom he sought to indoctrinate.

I have enough confidence in the great body of intellectually honest college teachers to have no fear that the lone Communist would capture the minds of the students in spite of their efforts. Any possible damage that a Communist teacher could do is small indeed as compared to the damage that already has been done by the witch hunters who have succeeded in intimidating and demoralizing college teachers and administrators to such an extent that, unless we get over our hysteria, perhaps it will be true that one Communist might be more effective than a hundred scared rabbits masquerading as teachers.

Back to College, United States Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, All over America, millions of youngsters are

going back to school. In larger numbers than anywhere else in the world, many of them are enrolling at the Nation's colleges. Poor or rich, there are few boys and girls in our country who cannot afford to attend a college somewhere. For those of special talent, opportunities virtually unlimited beckon encouragement.

This is no new phenomenon, but the freedom which the colleges display in these times of international tension merits more than passing notice. At Long Island University, for example, a course will consider the effects of the Russian Revolution on the people of Asia. Another will analyze the history of the Soviet power in Europe and present it in objective relationship to the rest of the world. Nowhere are there restraints upon what may be taught in this land—only in the Western World can this be said. The Communists who prate so loud and long of human freedom do not permit it to be discussed or studied.

When Joe Stalin can say of his country that it welcomes American professors to choose and discuss any topic of their own choosing, he will be able to talk to us as a champion of free honest education. Until then, he belongs with the bigots.

Before Congress Adjourns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. GAMBLE. Under leave granted by the House, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Daily Times, of Mamaroneck, N. Y., entitled "Before Congress Adjourns":

BEFORE CONGRESS ADJOURNS

If the Senate can catch up with the bills already passed by the House of Representatives, while Members of the latter take a 2-week vacation, and if Members of both Houses buckle down to the job instead of junketing around the world, there is a possibility Congress may adjourn around the first of October. In such event, they might not be called back into session before the regularly scheduled meeting time in January.

We have an idea the adjournment might be in the public interest. After all, the people can digest only so many new laws at a time. And since a large proportion of these laws affect the earnings of individuals, it might be wise to allow the sheep to graze quietly and fatten up before they are called up again at shearing time.

But before Congress can adjourn, there must be specific legislation passed. At the present time, for example, only 1 of 13 regular appropriation bills has been signed by President Truman and a large share of our Government is running on a series of stopgap appropriations.

The record shows that as of the start of this week the Eighty-second Congress has enacted into law only one-third the legislation passed by the Eightieth, which Mr. Truman characterized in his 1948 campaign as the "Do-nothing Congress."

In the list of "must" legislation faced by Congress, it is significant that a large proportion of the bill pledged in both 1948 and 1950 by the administration are missing. The Truman pledge included enactment of the Fair Deal civil-rights bills, repeal of the Taft-Hartley labor reform law, a compulsory health insurance program, and the Brannan farm subsidies. None of these can be found on the "must" list of today.

Also missing is the proposal by President Truman at the time of signing for revision of the control laws, statutes on which he found himself deserted even by his own Senate leader as well as many others of his own party. Neither is universal military training on the calendar of requisite legislation. The framework for UMT has been legislated but necessary laws for implementation are still lacking.

The "big three" on the "must" list, which may be about all of the major legislation which can be anticipated before October adjournment, are: (1) appropriation bills; (2) foreign aid, and (3) the 1951 tax bill.

Even with prompt passage of these three groups of bills, the Eighty-second's record will still be far behind that of the Eightieth. It was on his exhortation of the latter that Mr. Truman rode back into the White House. It may be he plans a similar campaign next year on the record of the Eighty-second.

But how is he going to get around the fact that while the Eightieth was Republican, the Eighty-second is strongly Democratic?

California State Admission Anniversary, September 8, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent and authority heretofore granted me, I am pleased to call to the attention of yourself and my other distinguished colleagues the fact that California's one hundred and first birthday will be fittingly observed in the city of Oakland, Calif., on September 8, 1951. When this memorable occasion, known as Admission Day, comes around in my native State, it is historical that the appropriate observation of California's birthday is more particularly noted and emphasized and observed by the Native Sons and Daughters of the Golden West. These two organizations, devoted to high ideals, including the preservation of the history of California, have rendered great and enduring service to the preservation of historical landmarks and events in this far western outpost of our great Nation.

I have always been proud that my own parents were very early settlers in the Golden State and that I, therefore, am a native son thereof.

Native sons and native daughters of California from every corner of this Golden State will participate in the one hundred and first birthday observation in Oakland. Other streamline events are also planned to make California's 1951 State celebration a notable one.

A word about the metropolitan city of Oakland in the early days is related in

the magazine, *Grizzly Bear*, and I am pleased to relate it here from that magazine as I am sure it will be of certain interest to all who read it.

The relative and strategic importance of the State of California in these latter days is indicated by the fact that up to July 1, 1951, more than 13 percent of all the prime contracts awarded the prime contractors of our Nation in connection with the current program of national defense and security have been awarded to producers, manufacturers, and contractors in appropriate plants in the industrial manufacturing world within the border of the State of California.

The quotations from the History of California by the noted western historian, H. H. Bancroft, follow:

H. H. Bancroft, *History of California*, volume VI, page 475, states: "In 1850-53 the greater portion of the Peralta grant, from Point Isabel to San Leandro Bay, was bought by different speculators, yet not until the most desirable section of Oakland had been occupied by squatters, who were mainly instrumental in giving a start to the place and procuring town and city charters. The rush of the squatters, which in 1850 set in for Oakland, was headed by the lawyers A. J. Moon and Horace W. Carpenter, and E. Adams."

A. J. Moon laid out the town of Oakland, so named from the many oak trees which grew in the open plain bordering the bay. The city was incorporated in 1852.

Carpenter was elected the first mayor of the city. The original site of the city was located on one side of the San Antonio slough while on the opposite side were two small settlements. Clinton, among whose first settlers was Moses Chase, then there was the small settlement of San Antonio. These places constituted the town of Brooklyn in 1856. In 1870 Brooklyn was incorporated with the city of Oakland.

Bancroft, volume VI, page 476 "In early times large numbers of wild cattle roamed here, which led to the establishment of tanneries and regular slaughter yards for the San Francisco market. An occasional steamboat service was soon replaced by a ferry, the *Hector*, followed by the *E. Corning*, of the Contra Costa Ferry Co. The first public school was organized in 1853, at the corner of Market and Seventh Streets, about the same time that H. Durant opened the Oakland College School preparatory to the College of California, which was incorporated in 1855 and organized in 1860, to merge before the end of the decade into the University of California." Oakland continued to grow; its water front was developing, which gave impetus to its steady growth.

The first train over the newly completed railroad across the country arrived in Oakland on November 8, 1869.

By 1870 states Bancroft's *History of California*, volume VI, page 477 "By 1870 the population had risen to 10,500, strong enough to begin the struggle in earnest for the county seat, which was won in 1874, by 1880 the census showed more than 34,500 inhabitants, including Brooklyn, with all its appurtenances of a well regulated city, and with certain harbor advantages, procured by deepening the outlet of San Antonio Creek through the mud flats.

"Brooklyn which in 1872 was annexed to Oakland, as its east suburb, was a landing place in 1849 for lumber cutters in the redwoods 5 miles inward. The dwelling of the Peralta brothers stood nearby, and a Frenchman kept a dairy about Clinton Point for a time."

According to Historic Spots in California Counties of the Coast Range by Mildred Brooke Hoover: "Lake Merritt, containing 160

acres of water, is unique in that it is a wild-fowl sanctuary in the midst of a populous city. It was named in honor of Samuel B. Merritt, a graduate from the medical department of Bowdoin College, who died in 1890. Dr. Merritt served as councilman and was chosen mayor in 1868. He furthered many projects favorable to the development of the young city."

Many well-known personages in early California days lived in Oakland, among them being Ina Coolbrith, later California poet laureate, and Oakland's first librarian; Bret Harte, Joaquin Miller, and Jack London.

The port of Oakland developed from its early days into a waterfront covering many miles. The first airplane flight from the United States to the Hawaiian Islands started from the Oakland airport June 28, 1927, when Lts. Lester J. Maitland and Albert F. Hagenberger, took off, this was one of Oakland's historic events.

Oakland, which is named for the sturdy California oak tree, grew from the days of the gold rush to be one of the largest cities in California.

Anything To Win

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I requested and received permission of the House to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the *Daily Times*, published in Mamaroneck, N. Y., entitled "Anything To Win."

I wish also to insert an interview which I gave to newspapers in Westchester County at the time of the disclosure of the tragic situation at West Point.

[From the Mamaroneck (N. Y.) *Daily Times*]

ANYTHING TO WIN

The revelations subsequent to the West Point announcement that 90 cadets would be dismissed for cheating on examinations now make it evident that Representative RALPH A. GAMBLE, of Larchmont, put his finger squarely on the spot where the disease germinated—the recruitment of football stars by the Academy's athletic committee.

Earlier this week Congressman GAMBLE, a one-time Princeton track star himself, who has officiated at West Point athletic meets, pointed to the policy which began at the Point before World War II when Army's football team first started to put together long victory strings.

Under this procedure, the athletic committee, through alumni and scouts, located promising high-school material or even stars in colleges.

Requests were then made of Congressmen in such districts by the West Point Academic Board that the youths in question be appointed to the Academy.

Recent revelations, including frank admissions from Army Coach Earl Blaik, show that such applicants were carefully tutored in order to pass entrance examinations. Once entered, they were assigned to the football training table, and it was there, it now appears, the cheating formula was evolved. Gradually, this spread to roommates and close friends of members of the football squad.

That is a capsule history of the developments over recent years. The genesis of the scandal was obviously in the desire to win

regardless of what methods were used. And this spirit was not confined wholly to the cadets. When Gen. Robert L. Eichelberger reorganized Army football with the hiring of Coach Blaik he flatly stated:

"It is important in these times that people should think of West Point as a place that can win."

We have no argument with that philosophy provided General Eichelberger inserts the word "honorably." For it is much better to lose honestly than to win dishonestly. That is what we are now finding out, but only after shame and disgrace have been brought upon 90 cadets and their families.

There is the tragedy of it all—we have learned that the policy of anything to win can have disastrous effects on the spirit of our youths and can prove saddening to a nation which is based upon the principle of fair play.

GAMBLE SEES ATHLETIC TAIN IN WEST POINT CADET OUSTER

WHITE PLAINS, N. Y.—West Point's present difficulties stemming from dismissal of 90 cadets for cheating on examinations—in the opinion of Representative RALPH A. GAMBLE, of Larchmont—may be traceable to the World War II law by which Congress gave the academic board authority to fill vacancies in the Military Academy.

"In many cases, according to the grapevine," said Congressman GAMBLE today, "these vacancies have been filled with appointments of young men recommended to the board by the athletic committee at West Point. And many of these recommendations were of star athletes in high schools and colleges."

Representative GAMBLE, a former trackman at Princeton who has officiated in track and field meets in Madison Square Garden and at West Point, explained that the law was passed to keep the Military Academy at full personnel strength of 2,520 cadets. The law gave authority to the board to fill vacancies, including those where cadets had been dropped for failure to keep up with classes or for other reasons.

SOLONS NAME APPLICANTS

"Each Congressman has the privilege of naming one applicant each year to West Point," said Mr. GAMBLE. "They may be selected by competitive examination, as I do in my Westchester district, or by certification based on high-school credits or after the applicant's having spent 1 year in college."

"Each Congressman has the privilege of naming a principal and three alternates. Now, it may be that there is a vacancy at West Point. Some cadet has failed, or for some other reason has had to drop out. Accordingly, the academic board may go to some Congressman, point out that there is in his district an outstanding athlete recommended by the West Point Athletic Committee, and ask that the Congressman list this athlete as an alternate. Then the academic board can name him to the vacancy."

Address by Hon. Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico, to the People of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 6, 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered before the American GI Forum of Texas, at Austin, Tex., on August 25, last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My good friend and fellow American, Dr. Garcia, delegates to the GI Forum of Texas, and friends, viva Texas.

We shall start from there.

Texas of the glorious past and of the more glorious future. Texas, of Indian lore and life—first seized in 1538 by Cabeza de Vaca and actually discovered by Pineda in 1539. Texas originally settled in part by the Spaniards of the sixteenth century. Texas, later explored by that brave Frenchman, La Salle, some 100 years after the Spaniards first saw Texas. Incidentally, La Salle died in Texas and his remains are in Texas soil. Texas, the beneficiary of the philosophy of government of Benjamin Franklin, George Washington, John Adams, and Thomas Jefferson.

Texas, which through the fortunes of the god of nations had to take its part in trying to obtain the freedom and the liberties which the followers and descendants of the peoples of the Thirteen Colonies made. Texas, who through the efforts of Moses Austin, Sam Houston, Stephen Austin, and Lorenzo de Zavala, and many others tried to work with the free peoples of Mexico for life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness, but because of the greed of the dictators of the moment in the Republic of Mexico, Texans could not succeed, and had to take up arms and fight for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. [Alamo]

Texas—the empire—large enough to be a country within a country, with its wonderful progress in a few short years, its beautiful cities, its farms, its forests, its mines, its ranches. But more than all—a State of grand people who believe in life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Texas, populated by Americans and when I say Americans, I mean just that.

As you boys know, it was this idea of fighting for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness which gave birth in the original 13 colonies to the Declaration of Independence. The Declaration of Independence—to the moment the greatest expression of freedom ever voiced. As a result of that Declaration of Independence, the forefathers of America built a government based upon a constitution, or the law of the land.

The Constitution of the United States defines an American citizen. There is not one word in the Constitution which says that in order to be an American citizen and be the beneficiary of this Constitution, you have to be of any particular race, of any particular religion, of any one chain of ancestry or background.

Now, Dr. Garcia and your associates have done a grand job, you and the people who have helped you in forming this organization, whose purposes are so noble, deserve the gratitude not only of the people whom you are trying to help, but also that of all liberal and progressive people who know that the cause of democracy and freedom can only be served by according rights, social, and economic advancement among all people, without regard to race, color, national origin or religion.

When I see this assemblage, I think back to my youth, when penance, low wages, poverty, illiteracy, disease, and political bossism prevailed in New Mexico. We have not quite overcome our problems there but the enthusiasm which you and this young group of GI's are showing here today brings to mind how a few of us felt some 40 years ago in New Mexico when we set out to change what existed there then, and which to a great extent we have succeeded in doing.

What Dr. Garcia, the delegates to this convention, our good friends, Gus Garcia in San Antonio, Bill Maldonado of the American Federation of Labor, George Garza, Judge Canales, R. A. Cortez, and countless others have done has been the work of heroes. Texas and the Spanish-speaking people your great State and our country owe you and the countless others a debt of gratitude. In your youth, enthusiasm, vision, and guts, I see a future for our people in Texas.

May I pause for a moment to pay special compliment to Dr. George Sanchez of the University of Texas. He has for years, championed the poor and the downtrodden. A tower of strength, unmindful of his own welfare, Dr. Sanchez has led the way patiently and tirelessly for many years. I am happy and proud to call him a friend, and to be a coworker with him in the cause.

Texas is blessed with natural resources exceeded by no other State. It is blessed with a further resource in its tremendous manpower potential, but if 20 percent of the manpower is poor, illiterate, diseased, badly housed, burdened with crime and delinquency, how can the remaining 80 percent ever hope to progress and not be concerned?

I need not dwell on the problems which grow out of the poverty of our people. I think I need only say that the prejudices and discriminations which arise out of these conditions are not the exclusive properties of our Spanish-speaking people. They are attributes of the poor white tenants in the southern regions of the United States. They are certainly characteristic of the Negroes of our country. The slums of New York, Baltimore, Philadelphia and Chicago have their same problems.

The problem is one which primarily, you yourselves should face, but it affects all segments of the population as well. The cotton grower, the citrus fruit grower, the industrialists and other business concerns in Texas may hold some citizens in disdain, but crime and disease respect no boundary. Polio, diphtheria, tuberculosis, and whooping cough spawned out of poverty do not hesitate to cross from the poor barrios in San Antonio to the homes of the wealthy and the more secure. The problems must be faced by all.

I fail to see how I can counsel you. I am sure that you know what you have to do, and I am equally confident that you are going to do it. Your presence here is evidence of that. These problems are a challenge to the Anglos of Texas, because in the long run they probably will suffer the most. As long as a part of the people remain in a perpetual state of poverty Texas can never attain the position which she deserves because of the vastness of its territory and resources until all the people are raised from their present conditions of poverty and enjoy the benefits of their American heritage.

I should be not advising but complimenting you. You have done a great job in bringing the problems to light and in correcting them, in many instances.

I suggest that you encourage organizations such as yours, the American GI Forum of Texas, the Lulac, the Texas Pro-Human Relations Committee, the Pan-American Progressive Association who are developing in Texas something which our people have never had before and that is a community spirit. You have to help yourselves and after that you can seek and without question obtain the help of others, but it is your primary responsibility. I am happy to note you have assumed that responsibility.

With community service organizations in localities in which the Spanish-speaking population exists, you can obtain for the relatives of the six Texas heroes of Mexican descent who won the Congressional Medal of Honor in the Second World War, the rights, privileges and opportunities which, as loyal and patriotic American citizens, they deserve.

Many Texans of Spanish or Mexican descent are suffering the agonies of the damned in Korea, fighting for freedom, democracy and against Communist aggression, yet, the most powerful argument of communism is food and future for the hungry and social justice for all men. A person who is hungry and whose children are starving, ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed, must necessarily find the arguments of communism appealing on account of their hunger and poverty. I am of the opinion we can never beat communism with guns alone. Guns plus ideas will do the work. Thank goodness the ideals and ideas of democracy as envisioned by the founders of this country are sound and they must be applied all over the United States.

Basic rights have been denied too long. The cause has been the greed and ignorance and prejudice of ignorant people. Now is the time to fight back. The very safety of our country and the security and peace of American families is at stake.

I know that you good people are not here for the purpose of showing resentment, nor for the purpose of indicating anger or arrogance or for getting even for so-called bad treatment at the hands of individuals carrying on as good citizens. The law will prevail, Texas will do what is right by its citizens and its people. I know of individuals who have a right to resent, and I do not blame you, but do not blame the whole State and millions of fine people for the work perpetrated by some individuals who through ignorance behave not like an American but rather like an uncivilized person.

Great progress has been made in Texas in the matter of human relations, in the matter of good will and understanding. I congratulate the people of Texas. Through the efforts of your governors, through the efforts of your local officials, of your businessmen, civic groups, but mainly through the efforts of the University of Texas, Texas is putting democracy into effect.

Carry on. Do your duty. Participate as citizens in all the endeavors of good citizenship. Express your opinion—not rancor or malice, always remember that while citizenship carries benefits, and that as citizens you are beneficiaries of all the laws and good that comes from those laws. Remember also that citizenship carries with it an obligation and duty. Obey those laws.

Here in Texas there are probably 1,500,000 Americans of either Spanish or Mexican ancestry. I want you to listen to the words of wisdom expressed many years ago—some 100 years ago by a German immigrant who went to the State of Wisconsin. His name was Carl Schurz. He became a great American, a patriot, a hero, as a United States Senator from the State of Wisconsin, addressing German immigrants in that State he told them, in effect: "You as Germans did not come to this country to put into effect the ideas of the Old World or your former home, but you came to this country to contribute in brains, in mental attitudes, physical work, what you could to carry out the philosophy of government of this country."

Proceeding from there, remember that you, as descendants of former Spanish or former Mexican ancestors, did not come to Texas to impose upon the people of this State what you may think is good in any other country. You are here to contribute with your spirit, with your help, with your brains, with your labor to carry on as American citizens and other help.

Before closing, a word of appreciation for Archbishop Lucey and Bishop Gariga, of Corpus Christi, and the heads of other religious bodies in Texas, who rendered noble service in seeking to ameliorate the condition of millions of people that deserve their never-ending thanks. When the question of Bra-

ceros came before the Congress these holy men, and among them Archbishop Byrnes, of Santa Fe, came to the defense of the native Spanish-American population which has been displaced as a result of the illegal and discriminatory introduction of wage-depressing Mexican nationals into our agricultural regions.

My quarrel was not with the poor Mexican who wanted to help himself and his family, but with the greedy and selfish flaunters of the law who would like our Spanish-speaking American or Mexican-American people to remain in bondage and slavery as long as they could make a larger profit than those who paid the farm worker fair salaries and afforded them decent American standards of living.

We must insist on the protection of decent wage standards, working conditions; if greed and avarice prevail against justice and human decency, then it is time that you should fight for your rights just as your forefathers and you fought to protect and preserve the very institutions that guarantee us those rights.

For political advancement I would advise you to take full advantage of your right of franchise. Support those candidates who will help you irrespective of names, religion, ancestry—support them if they are good people. Ask for no special privileges, ask for no special rights—ask only that you be accorded that which you are entitled to, the rights, privileges, opportunities of American citizens.

Urge your people to register, to find the necessary money to pay your poll tax, and be in position to express an opinion on the primary or election date.

I have been in the Congress of the United States for 20 years. I have sought to champion and uphold every liberal cause which came before the Congress and the Senate during that time. I hope to continue serving my State and my people, not only in New Mexico but throughout the country in every way I can. I am willing to fight, I am willing to help, but I know that the future rests elsewhere. As far as you are concerned, the future is in your hands and in the State of Texas, you have to carry the ball—you will have to go ahead. What remaining years the Lord grants me will be dedicated to the same cause, because I am with you, heart and soul in this struggle, for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Again, viva Tejas!

God bless you all, and good night

The Japanese Treaty and Point 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 6, 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject The Japanese Treaty and Point 4, delivered by me on September 1, 1951, and broadcast over the facilities of the National Broadcasting Co.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JAPANESE TREATY AND POINT 4

In 4 days delegates from the four corners of the world will meet with representatives

of the Japanese people for the purpose of signing a treaty of peace.

The treaty draft is the result of months of study and negotiations. There has been giving and taking by all parties. It is a good treaty in most respects, and it certainly gives lie to the scurrilous charges of the Communists that our aims are imperialistic. It doesn't give the Japanese everything they ask for, but from all reports from Tokyo they are most anxious to sign. Unlike the Treaty of Versailles, this treaty can be described as no less than magnanimous, benevolent, and humanitarian.

The proposed treaty will assuredly be signed, despite delays and obstacles which the visit of the Soviet delegation headed by Gromyko presages. That is the one sour note in connection with the San Francisco conference. Russia has decided at the last minute to send a delegation headed by Gromyko, the icy-faced, hatchet man of the Kremlin, whose tirades and harangues so often delay and obstructed otherwise peaceful and harmonious sessions of the United Nations. We know what to expect from Mr. Gromyko.

Further, well-known Communist official newspapers, such as *Izvestia* and *Pravda*, have attacked the treaty on the ground that it is not acceptable to the Asiatics, that it makes an American colony out of Japan, and is a move to further American imperialism.

So we can expect Mr. Gromyko to show up at San Francisco with his usual paraphernalia of parliamentary tricks, lies, and rantings. He doesn't want a fair and just treaty. He wants to use the occasion of the conference as a sounding board to disseminate Communist propaganda throughout the world.

I suspect that he will use as bait the stalled Korean cease-fire negotiations as a means to introduce into the sessions of the conference the wholly irrelevant subjects of Formosa and the admission of Red China to the United Nations.

But there is one sure way of stopping Mr. Gromyko and his gang, and that is by beating him at his own game. Let Mr. Gromyko know at the conference that although we cherish peace, we are prepared physically and spiritually to uphold our rights and defend our way of life, and that neither threats nor aggression can intimidate us.

Let Mr. Gromyko and his master in the Kremlin be shown at the conference that America is truly the arsenal of freedom, that this Nation is arming to the teeth, that we have the guns, the ships, and the planes ready if they move against us.

Further, let Mr. Gromyko and his master in the Kremlin know that we not only can beat them with guns but we can beat them with ideas. Guns never decide issues. Ideas do.

It is with ideas that we must lick the Communists and at the San Francisco conference we must keep in mind the fact that communism flourishes best where there is ignorance, poverty, and unrest. We must acknowledge the fact that a large part of the world lives in such abject misery that the people can hardly be described as human. But these people are human, they have souls, and the individuality of the most miserable of the lot should and must be respected.

Communism has exploited the misery of these masses to further its global expansion. In order to counteract and defeat communism the free world must offer something better than communism.

I contend that we have something better. We have the know-how to teach them to help themselves. While helping themselves they can also enjoy that precious commodity known as freedom. Communism can never offer as much.

The signing of the treaty is most important. The Japanese people must join the family of free nations. But if we are to achieve the goal of world peace, that treaty must be strengthened by actions on our part to raise the standard of living of the unfortunate and backward peoples of the world. We are doing just this in our point 4 program. The program is not a vast and gigantic world WPA project. It is a program of humanitarianism and brotherly love by which our materials and our know-how are placed at the disposal of backward peoples, and through them they are being taught to help themselves, to improve their lot and thus make it possible for them to become the good neighbors we want them to be.

Our system, which Messrs. Stalin and Gromyko call imperialistic, is not only furnishing arms to the free world, but it is furnishing the material and technical knowledge needed to restore it to economic and political self-sufficiency.

We are in a life or death struggle with communism. It is ridiculous to hope that we can live in harmony with a nation whose government is based on godlessness, slavery, oppression, and aggression. The Communists have never deviated from their goal of world domination. Their prophets, Marx, Lenin, and Stalin, told the world what they intended to do and unless we act boldly, they are apt to reach their goal.

Since the end of World War II without firing a shot, Stalin has become the lord and master of more territory and more peoples than any conqueror in the history of the world—Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Albania, and Czechoslovakia have been gobbed up, and their peoples willingly or not are behind the iron curtain and its terror.

Stalin's puppet Mao is master of China and another puppet, the President of North Korea, is responsible for the order to cross the thirty-eighth parallel more than a year ago and he is the cause of the misery and suffering that resulted, including our own 80,000 casualties.

It is time we told Mr. Stalin and his stooge, Gromyko, and the San Francisco Conference would be a good time to start, that we have adopted the rattlesnake slogan of South Carolina's State flag "Don't Tread on Me." Force is the only argument that Communists understand.

To the rest of the world and especially that part which lives in poverty and whose standard of living needs improvement, we extend the firm grasp of friendship and aid. We are doing this by the point 4 program and other forms of economic assistance. Point 4 agreements have been negotiated with 32 countries, including such Far Eastern Asiatic countries as India, Ceylon, Pakistan, and Indonesia.

Communism holds promises of food and a better life, but promises are not enough when the world is fully aware that by any standards the condition of the common man in Russia is that of the poorest man in any third rate country. The world also knows that the poor unfortunates behind the iron curtain fail to enjoy life's greatest treasure—freedom and respect for the individual.

It is significant that the Western Hemisphere, the inner citadel of freedom and democracy, is united in approving the signing of the Japanese Treaty. It is significant because here the point 4 program is working with tremendous success. Its guideposts have been the programs initiated 10 years ago by the Institute of Inter-American Affairs.

In this hemisphere 300,000,000 people are striving together to elevate their standard of living. Assistance comes from the strong but with complete cooperation from the weak. Thus the nations of the New World have improved their lot through the gener-

ous hand of Uncle Sam and these mutual assistance programs. We live in peace in the Western Hemisphere. There is no iron curtain, and we would like the rest of the world to enjoy similar blessings.

Every nation on the American Continent will sign the Japanese Treaty. This is not because we have a gun pointed at our heads or because we have troops on our territory. We are signing because we are good neighbors and we shall continue to be good neighbors.

The Japanese Treaty will be signed, but if it is to be a success, it must be implemented by mutual-defense pacts. The accord entered into by our Nation and the Philippines is an example of what must be done, but, still further, and more important, the treaty must be strengthened by spiritual and economic forces.

Our materials, our machine tools, and our technical know-how must be placed at the disposal of the unfortunate peoples of the East in order that they can help themselves to achieve a better way of life. The point 4 program must be augmented.

We will all enjoy the benefits of the peace that will derive from this. This is what I mean by beating the Communists at their own game. Beating them with ideas. We can and will beat them.

Thank you.

Rebuilding Strength in the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 6, 1951

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address by Secretary of Agriculture Brannan entitled "Rebuilding Strength in the Land," delivered at the awards ceremony of Piedmont communities soil conservation contest, Spartanburg, S. C., Wednesday, September 5, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REBUILDING STRENGTH IN THE LAND

It is a privilege to have the opportunity of being here with you today. You are celebrating a most important event. You are making real progress in rebuilding strength in your land.

This occasion officially brings to a close 2½ years of intensified effort directed toward the betterment of your soil—the lifeblood of your communities.

It is most inspiring to see such a large number of farmers receiving prizes for accomplishments in soil conservation—prizes for both individual accomplishments and for group action. Nearly 1,500 farmers have participated from the six counties in the contest. That is a highly impressive number. I salute you each and every one for your interest and effort in getting better soil conservation on your farms.

Also, the 214 merchants, business firms, and industries who contributed prizes for this contest are to be congratulated. I understand that in total your prizes have a cash value of more than \$25,000. You most certainly have expressed your interest in soil conservation in a dramatic manner. Your contributions have provided a potent incentive for stimulating more soil and water

conservation in these farming communities. You have vividly demonstrated your understanding that productive soil is essential to general prosperity.

I also want to congratulate the supervisors of the five soil-conservation districts who sponsored this Piedmont communities soil-conservation contest. You have put into action the program for greater service being recommended by the National Association and State Associations of Soil-Conservation Districts. You have demonstrated that such programs are effective when a majority of the people get behind them.

I especially want to compliment Mr. J. A. Bridwell, chairman of the contest committee, for his part in this affair. He gave willingly and freely of his time and energy in the community interest to help make the contest such a big success. Your effort—and the efforts of those who helped you, Mr. Bridwell, have redemonstrated that local leadership plays a key role in getting more conservation practices applied to the land, as it does in any other worth while agricultural undertaking.

Today we are celebrating much more than the closing of this 2½-year contest. We are celebrating a new high point in the march of conservation progress. You have reached a new high in applying conservation farming to your land. Complete farm-soil and water-conservation programs are now in effect on about 750,000 acres of land operated by more than 6,000 farm families in these five districts.

Since your districts were organized, you have put more than 77,000 acres in soil-building grasses and legumes. You have started rotating crops on 27,000 acres. You have terraced nearly 20,000 acres. You are strip cropping 10,500 acres. You are farming 37,000 acres on the contour. You have planted trees on 4,500 acres. And, you are practicing better woodland management on a much larger area.

You have built farm ponds, waterways, and made plantings for wildlife. You have limed, fertilized, and planted cover crops. And you have applied many other soil-conserving practices.

You should be proud—and I am sure you are proud of your progress. But, I know you don't want it to stop with the closing of this contest. Never before has the need for conservation farming been so great—or so urgent. Now, more than ever, we need renewed strength in the land.

That's what I want to talk over with you today. First, I want to say a few words about why we need new strength in the land. Then, we'll talk about ways of getting it.

Free men are in grave danger. The threat is more serious than many want to admit. Millions of people in foreign lands have already lost their freedom. Millions more are threatened—including ourselves—because communist aggression is on the march. Our Nation has taken a firm stand to bring that aggression to a halt.

Our mobilization program has created a new and sudden demand for greatly increased quantities of agricultural commodities. Agriculture faces the immediate challenge of producing enough to supply the Nation's growing military forces with food and clothing, the growing defense industries with raw materials, and a rapidly growing civilian population with food, clothing, and shelter.

Farmers must produce enough to supply this demand, and enough more to carry at the same time a safe margin in strategic reserves. For example, we need to maintain a substantial reserve of cotton.

On top of all this agriculture must produce enough to back up the Nation's foreign policy by continuing to share our abundance to the fullest possible extent under sound arrangements with friendly countries in need of help.

The need for greater production is immediate. And it will be enduring.

Military mobilization, in itself, stimulates the rate of consumption of agricultural commodities. Also, special military needs must be met. The Nation's huge industrial machine is leaning more and more on agriculture as a source of raw materials. As industry further mobilizes and expands, that demand will increase.

Our population is increasing at the most rapid rate in this century. The latest census report shows that we already number more than 154,000,000. We are growing at the rate of a little more than 2,000,000 persons a year, or about 6,000 every day. In another 10 years at this rate we will have 20,000,000 more mouths to feed and backs to clothe. By 1975 our numbers may swell to 200,000,000.

There can be no question about it: the future requirements from agriculture will greatly exceed our current rate of production.

Already, American agriculture is producing at a record level. Farmers are maintaining in production just about every acre of the land now available to economic crop production.

The situation means that American agriculture cannot look to new land and expanded farm acreages to satisfy the Nation's growing needs for food and fiber. It means that, Nation over, farmers must concentrate largely on making existing acreages produce more abundantly—not only next year and the year after, but on a continuing basis so that the increased demand can be met 5 years from now, 10 years from now, 25 years from now, and so on through the years.

The problem is to increase production immediately and—while doing it—to build renewed strength in the land so as to be able to meet future demands. Failure to meet demands could threaten this Nation's ability to meet world responsibilities. This in turn could endanger our democratic way of life and bring about a drastic lowering in American standards of living.

To help prevent this is really what soil conservation is all about. That's why town folks have as much at stake as country folks in soil conservation. That's why we have national programs to aid with the adoption of conservation farming. That's why today we are celebrating the progress you are making with conservation farming in the five soil-conservation districts represented here.

I want to take a few moments to trace the history—the evolution—of the problem we face. It's a well-known story. But, we need to review it to bring our problem into focus.

The American pioneers were farmers. When they came to America in search of freedom, they found a new land of opportunity. They found their new land so productive that one man could grow more than enough for himself and his family.

Not all were needed to grow food. Some could be spared to make tools and provide services for the rest.

As more and more land was put to production, more and more people could be spared from the farms. Towns and cities sprang up across the country. Railroads were built. The fertile soils fed the growing industries. And, the country expanded.

In the Midwest, corn grew in abundance. In the Great Plains, wheat was supreme. Here in the South, cotton was king.

And the soils' capacity to produce was taken for granted. If a farm wore out, the family moved west. "Go west, young man," was the motto for progress.

Then, we ran out of new land. Still, the demand for agricultural products continued to rise. More farm products were needed to feed the blood stream of our fast-growing

Nation. So, agriculture concentrated more on exploiting the available soil resources.

During World War I we plowed the plains to meet the heavy demand for wheat. In the depression years that followed, economic pressures forced farmers to continue mining their soil to eke out a bare existence.

Erosion had set in on much land. On some fields water erosion had washed away much of the topsoil. Other fields were being depleted by wind erosion.

Dr. Hugh H. Bennett deserves the Nation's thanks for focusing public attention on the erosion problem. He recognized in the early 1900's what was happening to our soils. And, he told the Nation about it over and over again.

Finally, his warnings were heeded. By 1933 the Congress of the United States established the Soil Erosion Service, with Dr. Bennett in charge. It was then that the Nation's first organized effort in soil conservation was set into action.

I will say more about that action in a moment. Right now I want to go ahead with the evolution of our current soils problems.

World War II brought with it unprecedented demands on agriculture. Farmers were called on to produce enough to feed and clothe million-man armies and, at the same time, to food the working force and supply raw materials for enormously expanded industrial production.

To meet this new demand, agriculture was forced to further exploit our soil resources. We won the war, but in the process we drew heavily on the Nation's reserves of soil fertility.

When the fighting stopped, the demand on agriculture did not let up. Huge quantities of our agricultural commodities were needed to rebuild war-torn countries, and to maintain the peace.

By 1950 postwar demands on agriculture were becoming less pressing. But Red aggression was actively on the march. And our Nation took a firm stand to protect freedom.

Again, agriculture is confronted with a new high in demand. And all prospects for the future point toward continuing increases for an indefinite period.

I have taken considerable time in reviewing this history. And I have done it for a specific reason—to underscore the key part that soil fertility has played in the growth and development of our great Nation.

There is no doubt about it, strength in the land always has been the foundation for building strength in our Nation.

Also, it is true that over the years we have drained off, or lost through neglect, much of the original natural strength in our land. We have dissipated much of the inherent productivity of our soils. Consequently, some people have jumped to the conclusion that we have about reached our pinnacle in national strength—that our soil resources cannot long support the United States in a position of world leadership.

I cannot agree. I am more optimistic. Events such as the one we are celebrating here today are convincing cause for encouragement. You are moving forward in rebuilding strength in your land. Your progress, and similar progress in other parts of the country, demonstrate what can be done through conservation farming, along with the various other advancements in modern agricultural techniques.

During the last 18 years we have seen numerous significant advances in soil and water conservation. We've come a long way from where we were in 1933 when the original Soil Erosion Service was established.

In the middle 1930's dust from wind erosion in the Great Plains darkened the skies all the way to our eastern shores.

In 1935 the Congress promptly passed the first broad national Soil Conservation Act adopted by any country. The renamed Soil Conservation Service became a permanent agency in the Department of Agriculture. In 1936, the President, at the suggestion of a number of States to the Secretary of Agriculture, recommended the framework which made possible the establishment of local soil conservation districts, by vote of the landowners under State enabling laws. This program, now in operation in every State, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, makes available, at Government expense, the services of trained technicians to help farmers plan and put into effect complete soil conservation programs for their farms.

Complete farm plans have now been worked up for about 275,000,000 acres of land on approximately a million farms. You have made good use of these services here in the Piedmont in developing complete soil conservation programs for your farms.

In 1936 the Congress augmented its earlier action by establishing the agricultural conservation program. The objective here was to help farmers to finance the cost of applying soil conserving practices. Each year since 1936 a major portion of the Nation's farmers have received conservation assistance through the agricultural conservation program. This assistance has had an important impact on the ability of the land to produce.

You know the help that agricultural conservation program assistance has been to you. I'm sure you have also found that agricultural conservation program assistance was most effective after your farm was planned completely for soil and water conservation. Farmers generally find that maximum benefits can be obtained when the services from both programs are brought to bear simultaneously.

Of course, soil conservation has not been limited to governmental action programs. In 1937 the first farmer-organized and farmer-managed soil conservation district in the United States was established in Anson County, N. C. Since then, more than 2,360 soil conservation districts have been organized—an outstanding achievement from democracy in action. The districts include more than three-fourths of all of the land on farms in the United States. South Carolina is 100 percent covered with soil conservation districts and North Carolina's farm land is 95 percent covered.

Also, during recent years at the colleges and universities, at the State agricultural experiment stations, and in the research agencies of the United States Department of Agriculture, research scientists have given intensive study to our soil problems. They have continued to make important progress in determining causes of soil deterioration and developing methods for combating it.

They have found, for example, that some soils, although naturally infertile, can be made highly productive. Many fields once considered worn out can be made to yield abundantly. You are finding that out here in the Piedmont. Farmers elsewhere, with similar soil problems, are finding it out, too.

Soil research has also revealed that naturally fertile soils that have lost productivity through use and abuse often can be rejuvenated. Already, productivity is on the comeback on many farms where yields were falling off because of declining soil fertility.

As a result of these findings over the years there has gradually evolved a changing concept of soil conservation. No longer do we consider soil conservation as limited to controlling erosion. We now know that soil deterioration through cropping also may be extremely serious. For soils subject to erosion it is often necessary to check cropping

losses and increase fertility along with application of erosion control measures.

We have also come to understand that conservation farming can seldom be achieved by a single practice. Instead, a combination of practices is usually needed, a combination fitted to the specific soil characteristics and needs. The basic physical objective of soil-conservation activities by Department agencies is the use of each acre of agricultural land within its capabilities and the treatment of each acre of agricultural land in accordance with its needs for protection and improvement.

The modern concept of conservation farming has come to mean applying the necessary practices on a farm to increase production and to build up soil productivity, both at the same time. It means making soils yield abundantly year in and year out for an indefinite period. It means rebuilding strength in the land.

Many modern measures for soil conservation serve triple duty. They increase production. They lessen the effect of soil deterioration from cropping. And they reduce the erosion hazard. All at the same time.

Improved winter legumes, for example, fall into this category. First—they produce winter forage, which permits increased livestock production. And they act as a nitrogen factory gathering nitrogen from the air and depositing it into the soil. The added nitrogen helps to increase yields on crops following in a rotation.

Secondly, when plowed under, legumes add to soil organic matter, helping to offset the loss of organic matter from cropping.

Thirdly, while growing, legumes provide a cover to protect the soil against erosion and, when plowed under, continue to help the soil resist erosion.

Today, improved grasses and legumes are available for many areas. Here in the Piedmont, for example, you are growing Ladino clover, crimson clover, sericea, and kudzu, Kentucky fescue, and others. In the early years of conservation these crops were available to you in only limited amounts, if at all. The fertility needs and management practices for growing them successfully or extensively have been perfected only recently. Their development has given you new opportunities for rebuilding strength in your land.

I have mentioned improved legumes and grasses merely as an example of the modern conservation measures that farmers now have at hand. I could name many more. But, you know better than I about those that fit your farms best. You have been about the business of putting them to use. After all, that's why we are celebrating here today.

I sincerely hope that you will continue to increase your effort in applying conservation measures to your land, and that you will encourage your neighbors to do so. Now, more than ever, we need to concentrate on applying those practices that increase production and improve conservation both at the same time. Not only here in the Piedmont, but all over the country.

While agriculture has made much progress in soil conservation during the past 18 years, we still have not done enough. Gains from conservation have not completely offset losses from soil erosion and deterioration. On many farms the soils have been improved. But hardly enough to offset soil deterioration on other farms.

Reversing the general downward trend in soil productivity offers one of our greatest opportunities for expanding the capacity of American agriculture to produce. It offers tangible means for meeting the increasing demand for agricultural products currently,

and for continuing to meet those demands over the long pull.

Opportunities here in the South are at least as great as anywhere in the country. In fact, I believe the possibilities for agricultural advances have been, and still are, larger in the South than for the Nation as a whole.

Already you have brought about spectacular increases in per-acre crop yields. Your cotton yields have gone up substantially during the past decade. Grain yields are on the increase. Corn yields in the South generally have been increased 75 percent during the past 5 years. Your increases in pasture production have been phenomenal.

Increasing yields are making it possible for you to grow your row crops on the less erosive soils. Thus, you can devote more of your rolling lands to hay and pasture.

You are increasing farm mechanization.

You are diversifying your crops.

You are expanding livestock production.

Ten years ago there was a great deal of doubt in many minds as to whether the South could feed a profitable livestock industry. Feed crop yields were low, and there was a popular belief that the South had poor soils.

Now we know that although some of the soils of the South were low in plant nutrients to begin with, most of them are very responsive to fertilization, use of the right kind of crops, and other good management practices. They can be made highly productive. In fact, the productivity of soils in the South can be raised to, and maintained at, levels that compare favorably with the soils of other major agricultural areas. Many of you are demonstrating that for yourself on your own fields.

Climatic conditions that have made your soils what they are also offer unusual opportunities for increasing levels of productivity. So far you have made only a good beginning in cashing in on these opportunities.

Department of Agriculture scientists believe that progress in research with feed crops on a scale comparable with that now in effect for cotton and tobacco would probably make it possible for southern farmers to grow enough feed to support three times your present livestock numbers.

Is that goal too high to shoot at? I think not. But, it will take much doing to reach it. In fact, it will take much doing by farmers in all parts of the country to meet current and future demands for agricultural products.

American farmers generally face the job of bringing most of the land now in use to a high level of economic production on a sustained basis. The job is so big that it calls for full cooperation from everyone—farmers, businessmen, consumers, church and civic organizations, State institutions, and Federal agencies. Throughout the Nation we need the kind of cooperation that you have had here in the Piedmont in conducting your soil conservation contest.

We in the Department of Agriculture are doing everything we can to help. We are marshaling our forces to bring them into sharp focus on the production job. We are doing whatever we can wherever we can, to get widespread adoption of farming practices that will increase production as needed. We are continuing intensive research to develop improved practices.

Last winter we set in motion a reorganization of soil conservation and agricultural research activities to enable the Department to do its work more efficiently and economically. We are making progress toward the objective of a single county headquarters for the Department agencies directly serving farm people. We are trying

to give the Nation more and better soil conservation per tax dollar and at the same time make for a stronger and more successful defense mobilization.

In every State and county, agricultural mobilization committees have been organized to help farmers get the information and working tools they need. Production guides are being worked up for 1952 production. Guides for winter grain crops have already been announced.

We are insisting as forcefully as possible that adequate machinery, fertilizers, and pesticides—your tools of production—be kept available.

We are working to help farmers retain enough skilled manpower on farms.

And, we are working to provide reasonable price assurances to agriculture so that you can go ahead with the business of expanding production with some assurance that your markets will not come crashing down about you.

We are reviewing all of our agricultural programs to make sure that they are serving family farms as effectively as possible. I consider this review to be highly important, because the family farm is the very foundation of American agriculture. We want to be sure that the services we offer to help increase production and achieve conservation will also help to provide farm families with a high standard of living.

Those are the policies under which your Department of Agriculture is functioning.

In conclusion, I again want to congratulate all of you who have taken part in this five-district soil conservation contest. Your accomplishments are especially encouraging at this time when increased agricultural production can mean so much in the free world's struggle for peace and security.

It is wonderful to see what can be done by a resolute, determined free people, using the services of their democratic government, to rebuild strength in the land.

The True Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 6, 1951

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address by Secretary of Agriculture Brannan entitled "The True Dedication," delivered in Anderson, S. C., Tuesday, September 4, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRUE DEDICATION

(Address by Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan at dedication of county agricultural building in Anderson, S. C., Tuesday, September 4, 1951)

Any person who takes pleasure in the productivity of agriculture, anybody who likes good farms and modern living on family farms, would envy me the invitation you people have so kindly extended. I consider it not only a privilege but a genuine personal pleasure to have this occasion to visit Anderson County and your attractive city which is its county seat.

It is especially appropriate, it seems to me, that we are meeting to dedicate a building

which houses your center of agricultural service. I might better say that this building houses one of your centers of agricultural service, for in a very real sense your progressive merchants, your banks, your farmer cooperatives, your radio stations, and your newspaper are all centers of agricultural service. It is appropriate to dedicate such a building in Anderson County because, as you know, there are almost a quarter of a million acres of good cropland in this county, and for about every 10 of those acres there is a citizen of Anderson County living on a farm. In short, this is a county in which agriculture is tremendously important.

In getting acquainted with your county, I have been happy to see how productive your farms are and what a variety of things they produce: Beef, poultry, many kinds of vegetable, lumber and its products, lespedeza seed, cotton, tobacco, corn, and small grains, and many other things.

How highly you value this agriculture is indicated in the magnificent building we are here to dedicate. I can tell you that very few counties in the Nation have facilities as good as you have. We in the Department of Agriculture are much interested in county agricultural buildings, and while many counties are doing a good job in spite of less attractive, less modern, less desirable facilities, it is fair to say that you are to be congratulated in having the fine building you have erected here.

The Department of Agriculture is interested in county buildings because, as you know, we are constantly trying to make our service more efficient, more effective. We have, for one thing, been trying to bring all county agricultural services together throughout the Nation, as you have here. We wish they could be brought together in a single building in each county. With such varied histories as the different agricultural agencies have had, is it not surprising that in many places they have been scattered all over a county. In our efforts to bring them together, we have not tried to sit in judgment of that history. On the other hand, we believe that it should now become possible for farm people to go to one place in each county, to make one stop, park the family car or truck once, and be able to contact all the different agencies they need to. Not only that, but by so doing it should be possible for these various agencies all to be together in a spirit of teamwork, together in their use of such facilities as auditoriums, like the fine auditorium you have here, and together in the interests of economy—for example, being housed together should reduce expense for heating, storage space, office rental, and so on. Practically all our experience points up the importance of the very kind of thing you folks have done here. That is why I am hoping that all county offices of Department of Agriculture agencies and of the cooperating agricultural services can be brought together in a single building in each county for greater service to farmers and to the Nation.

We have taken steps, also, to bring together the different agencies of the Department of Agriculture not only at the county level, but at the State level and the national level. You probably know that we are bringing into closer working relationship the agricultural conservation program of the Production and Marketing Administration and the Soil Conservation Service. Moves as far-reaching as these take time to accomplish in the 3,000 and some counties of the United States; but progress so far has been very gratifying, and we expect further progress in the future.

Nor can we stop there. In fact, I cannot see that we shall ever be able to say we

have finished in the job of bringing about better organization and integration in the Department of Agriculture, or in any Department of Government. Every single division, agency, and bureau of the Department of Agriculture came into being because it had a job to do. No doubt others will come into being in the future, as new jobs arise. Older agencies have been consolidated or abandoned as need for them has changed. Certainly it is in the interest of the Nation that there shall be enough flexibility in our administrative organization that we can accomplish with efficiency anything the Nation requires of us.

Some people seem to believe that an agency such as the Department of Agriculture can be cast into one mold for all time—that you can organize it and then fit all activities into a rigid organization pattern. But the truth is that no rigid mold is desirable. The organization must be adapted to the job that the people want done. I expect we will have to keep on adapting our organization as long as the Department of Agriculture is working on real problems of live people. It is true of any person or any group working on real problems that it must keep on improving, changing with the times.

Certainly farmers know about that.

The shift of your own agriculture from essentially one-crop farming, with cotton as your primary product, to your present diversification into grasslands, livestock, tobacco, poultry of several kinds, hogs, grain, lespedeza seed, and cotton indicates how much your agriculture has changed with the times.

The fact that you have been able to change, and change wisely, to increase your own prosperity and to produce more agricultural output for the Nation is due primarily to your own efforts, your own ingenuity and hard work. Without them, you would never make any progress.

But your progress is due partly to the very things for which this building stands. You have come to rely heavily upon your county extension workers, your soil conservationist, your farm loan association and your production credit association, your home demonstration work, your 4-H work—and the others. They are here, some of them as your own cooperative agencies, some of them selected by you to help run national farm programs, some as channels through which you can get the results of the latest scientific work done at Clemson, in your very fine State college of agriculture, and the latest work of the Department of Agriculture. As markets change, as old opportunities pass by and new ones arise, the folks in this building are constantly bringing such matters to practical terms for Anderson County. The people in this building represent one of your most dependable resources. They are here to serve you—all of you.

They are part of a great team that has been formed to serve agriculture because agriculture is of basic importance to our Nation, because agriculture must be strong if our Nation is to be strong.

Those of us who are employed to serve you must be thoroughly aware at all times of our responsibility to provide not only good but economical service. The tax money that pays for our service to agriculture comes from all taxpayers and must promote the welfare of the whole Nation.

In these times when so many things are going higher in price, you will be interested to hear that expenditures of the Department of Agriculture have gone down. The actual number of dollars we have been authorized to spend for the coming year is about 25 percent less than it was in 1940, the last year before World War II. Not only that, but dollars will buy less now, and if

you take into account the buying power of these dollars, the expenditures of the Department of Agriculture have gone down 60 percent.

That situation didn't just happen. As some of you know, we have made a real effort, and it has been effective, to keep down the costs of agricultural service; to avoid overlapping wherever possible; to close any little loopholes and in every way to be good custodians and stewards of the public's money.

To be perfectly honest, I wish that we had the means to do a number of important jobs we cannot now do. A good deal of the reduction in cost I have mentioned has been legitimate economy that we have learned how to bring about through experience. But we have lost some good people because they could not be paid as much for public service as they could get from private industry. We are not able to go ahead as fast as we should with the job of soil conservation. Farmers do not yet have as much protection against low prices as they are entitled to on the basis of their contribution to the strength and welfare of the Nation. Some farmers do not have enough credit to produce at peak efficiency. Farmer cooperatives are not receiving adequate service. More scientific research would repay the cost many times over.

On the other hand, we all recognize there are limits to the amount of money that can be used in any particular year. The Congress decides what those limits are, and the Department of Agriculture will do its best within those limits. What really counts is the over-all strength of America. But let us never forget that agriculture has a great part to play in making America strong.

Agriculture faces a bigger job in the future than we have ever faced in the past. There was a time when people who lived on farms needed to produce only enough for themselves and a little bit more. They bought very few manufactured goods, so they didn't need much cash; and cities were small compared to farm population, so the cities didn't need to buy very much. In colonial days perhaps 5 percent of the national farm production moved from farm to city. And in the years when these colonies became the United States the population of our whole country was just about twice the population of South Carolina now. It was no trouble feeding that few people from this great land. Hunting alone could play a large part.

But we have grown. Our standard of living has risen. Our way of life has changed drastically. It is more important today that a man be able to use a telephone than he be able to stalk a deer. It is more important that he know how to use fertilizer and modern farm equipment than that he know which wild roots and berries are edible.

Now a very small proportion of our people grow their own food. Most of the people are absolutely dependent upon others—upon farmers—for their food and much else. This trend is continuing and nobody can tell how far it will go. Our national population is rising. I am sure that we can well take care of our people for many years ahead, but to provide them with food and a good standard of living will require that farmers be very productive.

Although from time to time we may have what looks like surpluses, in the longer pull we will need just about all the production we can get. We may from time to time need to cut down on some item to produce more of another; but the job of feeding this mighty Nation will require our best efforts. With allowances for short-time disturbances, basically it means that the farmer's market is assured for a long way ahead.

Today our population is between 150,000-000 and 155,000,000 people. I am told that in 25 years it could well be 200,000,000 people. Nobody knows exactly what it will be.

But this is sure: The farmer, who used to be in the majority because almost everybody had to be a farmer, is now in the minority.

He is a specialist; and his industry is the only great industry in the Nation that is organized on family lines. It is the only great industry in the Nation in which the worker and his family live amidst the means of production and, in most cases, own those means of production. It is a way of life that is famous as a seedbed for the finest kind of citizenship.

In a very real way the changes that have come to your agriculture in Anderson County are the changes that have come to agriculture everywhere.

The new agriculture has not sprung spontaneously from the soil, full-grown. It has been built. It has been built by farmers out of their own intelligence and hard work and by the whole people of this Nation, who have provided the services needed by agriculture.

That service is exemplified in Anderson County by this splendid building that we are now dedicating.

Does it seem a little strange, to you, that today we dedicate this building which has been finished and in use for 2 years? Does it seem strange to you that the ceremony of dedication should come now, after the building has been in use for hundreds of busy days, by thousands of busy people?

I think it is altogether appropriate that we should take part in this ceremony now—that we should gather here for the ceremony.

We might cut a ribbon stretched across the open door of this building, symbolizing its opening to the public, but it has been open for a long time.

We might go through any ceremony, regarding this building and its service to your county, but that is not essential to the true situation.

In a sense, as it seems to me, a building cannot be dedicated. By itself, this building is no more than an aggregation of minerals and wood and other materials. For itself alone, the building would never be worth building.

What you people of Anderson County built, when you made this agricultural center, was not just a building, but an instrument of human purpose; you made it easier for people to work together better.

It is not the roof, but the people it shelters, not the floor, but the people who walk on that floor; not the telephones, but the people who call and those who answer the telephones; not this fine architecture, but the people of the county for whom it stands.

So, as we come to dedicate this building, we come rather to dedicate something that is renewed each morning with the rising of the sun; something that is greater than any building. We have come to dedicate the strength that can build buildings, and will in time outgrow them, however big and fine they are. We have come to dedicate ourselves.

The human purposes of proud men standing upright in the light of day, of strong men who will defend the things they hold dear, of freemen for whom freedom is a way of living dearer than life itself—these are the purposes we have come to dedicate.

Nothing we might say or do here could deepen the dedication this building has already received, for it has had the dedication of daily use, the dedication of life itself.

For the dedication of men and women living upright lives, to the noble purposes of all mankind, is the true dedication of this building, and of this Nation.

The Genocide Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 5, 1951

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the United Nations Assembly at its Paris meeting in December 1948 adopted the Genocide Convention. On June 16, 1949, the Genocide Convention was submitted by the President of the United States to the Senate for ratification, and was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee.

In the August 1951 issue of the *Rotarian*, I read an article by Mr. Frank E. Holman on the subject: Should the United States Ratify the Genocide Treaty? Because the Genocide Treaty may be reported by the Foreign Relations Committee to the Senate at some future date, I believe that the written observations by Mr. Holman will be of real interest to every Member of the Senate and to every reader of the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*.

Mr. Frank E. Holman is a past president of the American Bar Association, and is presently a member of the Commission for Peace and Law Through United Nations. Mr. Holman is a respected and prominent resident in Seattle, Wash. He is an outstanding American. I am deeply pleased to offer his views on an important question to my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Holman be printed in the Appendix of the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

SHOULD THE UNITED STATES RATIFY THE GENOCIDE TREATY?—No; It Is A Legal Bramble, Says Frank E. Holman

In 1946 a Human Rights Commission was appointed as a subagency of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt was made its Chairman. Early in 1947 this Commission announced that it proposed to draft a Declaration of Human Rights and a Covenant on Human Rights. A little later it took up the matter of formulating a genocide convention.

What is "genocide"? The word was coined by a Yale professor, a Polish refugee. Translated into simple Anglo-Saxon, it means "race killing." It goes without saying that all decent men and women are opposed to any program, official or otherwise, which contemplates the destruction of a racial group in whole or in part. But out of this generality of the term "genocide" a whole new class of individual crimes is to be created. Acts are made punishable which are not only purely domestic in character, but public officials as well as private citizens are to be made amenable to international tribunals for a variety of ill-defined and ambiguous so-called acts of genocide—to the extent that the causing of mental harm to a member of a group, or complicity in so doing, is an act of genocide.

The United Nations Assembly at its Paris meeting in December 1948 adopted a Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In the

dying hours of the same session of the Assembly, at which the declaration was passed, the Genocide Convention was hurriedly adopted. At the time little or no publicity was given the matter by the United States Department of State. On June 16, 1949, the Genocide Convention was submitted by the President to the United States Senate for ratification and referred to the Foreign Relations Committee.

At a hearing in January 1950 before a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee members of the American Bar Association committee on peace and law through United Nations appeared and submitted reasons and arguments against its ratification, pointing out the serious loopholes in its content, the failure of its language to include "genocide" committed by governments—as, for example, the liquidation of political groups in Russia and Russian satellite countries—and the dangerous effect of the document on basic American rights if ratified by the United States as a treaty.

It should be kept in mind that in nearly all nations except the United States, even after the ratification of a treaty, each particular government may decide when and to what extent, if at all, it is ready to implement the treaty by the passage of national legislation, even though the signatories have agreed generally to enact such legislation. The United States is the only important country (except France and Mexico to some extent) that faces the peculiar legal situation that when a treaty is ratified by our constitutional process (to wit, by the Senate) its provisions become a part of the supreme law of the land without either State or national legislation.

Article VI of the United States Constitution provides that a treaty when ratified becomes "the supreme law of the land"—"anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." In this very fundamental respect the American Constitution is unique.

Unfortunately, those in charge of attempting to "sell" the United Nations human-rights program, including the Genocide Convention, to the American people have chosen to disregard this distinction. They persist in discussing treaty obligations as though the effect of a treaty were the same in America as in other countries.

They undertake to clinch their position by pointing out that certain proposed treaties, like the Genocide Convention, contain a provision binding the parties "to enact in accordance with their respective constitutions necessary legislation to give effect to the treaty," and they argue that this leaves each signatory country free to put the treaty provisions in effect or not, as each country may determine. Such a clause does not and cannot operate that way in the United States. The position taken by certain lawyers in the State Department with respect to this matter is legally fallacious, because no such treaty provision can unwrite the self-executing effect of article VI of our Constitution, under which no legislation is necessary to put a treaty into effect.

Hence, if an international agreement like the Genocide Convention is ratified as a treaty, it will supersede every city ordinance, every county ordinance, every State law, and every State constitution, as well as every Federal statute on the same subject. This has been specifically decided in such a recent case as the California alien land case *Jaff v. State of California* (217 Pac. 2d 481). See also *Perez v. Lippold* (198 Pac. 2d 17), in which case the Supreme Court of California overruled the long-established law in that

State against mixed marriages. Of course, no decent person can quarrel with the announced objective of the Genocide Convention—to wit, the outlawing of mass murder of groups of people—but the present document is so drawn that it does not apply to liquidating political groups as “enemies of the state.” Hence, it does not apply to genocide as practiced by Stalin in Russia or in the Russian satellite countries. In drafting article II of the convention and in order to appease the Russians, genocide was limited to “national, ethnical, racial, or religious groups.” The political group was omitted. Under the Russian technique of attacking political groups as “enemies of the state” genocide occurs and will continue to occur on the theory that such liquidation is not for the purpose of destroying “national, ethnical, racial, or religious groups.”

Hence, dictators can sign the Genocide Convention with complete immunity. All they need to do is to classify a particular group as “enemies of the state.” George A. Finch, of Washington, a member of the Committee on Peace and Law through United Nations of the American Bar Association and editor in chief of the *American Journal of International Law*, testified before the Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee in January 1950.

“The Genocide Convention is an outstanding example of an international agreement upon which the public has been and is being misinformed. As genocide is defined in the convention, it does not apply to the mass killings and destruction of peoples by totalitarian governments, but appeases such governments by making it possible for them to continue, as they are doing today behind the iron curtain, the monstrous treatment of thousands of human beings whom those governments regard as enemies of the Communist states. . . . There is not a word in the convention which denounces as genocide the mass killing and destruction of peoples by governments.”

Article I of the Convention commits all signatory nations “to prevent and to punish” genocide “committed in time of peace or in time of war.” Therefore, if the United States ratifies the Convention, it will be committed to go to war to prevent genocide in some distant country, as, for example, India, Iran, Russia, Argentina, or elsewhere. The definite obligation is to prevent and punish genocide wherever it appears in the world—whether in civil, racial, and religious wars, or in national and ideological struggles. This would require a procedure of interference in the internal affairs of other nations, and in the case of countries able to defend themselves, such as Russia, would mean war.

The Convention invades the field of domestic law and changes and nullifies domestic law. In his letter of transmittal to President Truman, James E. Webb, Acting Secretary of State, quoted the United States representative on the United Nations Legal Committee as agreeing that—

“If an individual is murdered by another individual, or by a group, whether composed of private citizens or Government officials, as part of a plan or with the intent to destroy one of the groups enumerated in article II, the international legal crime of genocide is committed as well as the municipal-law crime of homicide.”

What does “intent to destroy” mean? Was it absent from the race riots in Detroit and Harlem? In lynchings in Georgia? Was it absent in the civil war in China? In border conflicts between India and Pakistan? Are we to be committed to stop genocide wherever it occurs in the world and have a series of experiences like that in Korea?

Again, George A. Finch testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee in January on “intent to destroy” and “mental harm” as follows:

“Can it be successfully denied that segregation laws are susceptible of being denounced as causing mental harm to all members of the group against which such laws discriminate? Minority groups in this country are vigorously seeking to have such discrimination abolished by Federal legislation. Can there be any reasonable doubt that if Congress fails to enact the civil-rights laws now being urged upon it and if this Convention is ratified as submitted, members of the affected groups will be in a position to seek legal relief on the ground that this so-called Genocide Convention has superseded all State legislation?”

When is “mental harm” serious, when is it harmful, and when is it only mental? No American judge or jury will be the last arbiter of that question. It will be answered finally by the International Court of Justice if the United States Senate ratifies this convention as a treaty. Thus, the International Court of Justice is in a position to determine when an American citizen should be punished—a prerogative up till now reserved exclusively to our own laws and our own courts.

The Genocide Convention, if ratified, constitutes a threat to freedom of speech in the United States, for article III sets forth “that incitement to genocide” and “complicity in genocide” is punishable as genocide. As to this, the American Bar Association committee on peace and law, through United Nations, made the following observation:

“This was adopted in spite of repeated objections of the United States representative that it was a plain infringement of freedom of speech and freedom of the press. Who shall judge if political speeches are incitement to genocide? [An international court.]

“Who shall judge as to freedom of the press? As a prevention of genocide, shall censures be provided by the State? Representatives of many countries insisted that as between genocide and freedom of speech and freedom of the press, the latter must give way. The position of our representatives seemed to be incomprehensible to many of them. The representative of the United States boldly said that genocide should stop where freedom of speech begins. He warned the other nations more than once that inclusion of incitement to genocide would present an obstacle to the ratification of the convention by his country. [Nevertheless, this provision was retained to appease the views of other countries.]

“If the effort to promote human rights in the world is to mean anything, it would seem to be essential that freedom of speech and freedom of the press be preserved, and that no treaty, no matter what its purpose, which seeks to deny those rights, should be considered by the Senate of the United States.”

Under article VI a specific provision is made for the trial of American citizens in courts in other countries, and under article VII for extradition to a foreign jurisdiction. If the United States ratifies this treaty, it will mean that we have agreed to set up the machinery for extraditing Americans charged with genocide and for shipping them overseas to be tried for acts committed in their own home towns, and this, it has been pointed out, may be for as little as having been charged with inflicting “mental harm” on a “national, ethnical, racial, or religious group.” It may even mean that the telling of a story reflecting on the characteristics of a particular racial group may be treated as inflicting “mental harm” or as “incitement to genocide.”

The Genocide Convention may be briefly characterized as follows:

First, it falls as to its primary purpose of preventing genocide committed by Government and hence is a document of appeasement as far as Russia and other dictator nations are concerned.

Second, it commits the United States to go to war, if necessary, to prevent genocide

in any distant part of the world where the members of any “national, ethnical, racial, or religious group” are being killed.

Third, it invades, changes, and nullifies American law as heretofore exclusively determined by our own Congress, our own State legislatures, and our own courts.

Fourth, it threatens the American concept of freedom of speech and of press as guaranteed by our Bill of Rights.

Fifth, it denies Americans the right to be tried in their own courts and the right to invoke such safeguards as trial by jury and presumption of innocence until proved guilty.

Because of the foregoing considerations, the Genocide Convention is an outstanding example of emotional internationalism and loose and hurried draftsmanship. As pointed out by the American Bar Association, it should certainly not be ratified by the United States Senate.

Concerning Honor in Public Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 6, 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address delivered by former President Herbert Hoover in Des Moines, Iowa, on Thursday, August 30, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

I am indebted to the Governor, the legislature, and the people of my native State for a most distinguished honor at this celebration of Iowa's centennial.

In view of our serious national situation I would like on this occasion to review a few things for you to think about. They are mainly related to honor in public life. Let me say at once that honor is not the exclusive property of any political party.

I may start with the idea that all things in government which bear the prefix “new” are not necessarily new. They may not all of them even be good. Truly every generation discovers the world all new again and knows it can improve it. It is a good thing that they do—or our race would shrink in vitality and grown senile.

Each generation also wants to find out for itself that the stove is hot. A renewal of that sort of information is valuable.

But we have overworked this word “new” in trying to get out of this age of misery from our 37 years of hot and cold wars, with intervals of hot and cold peace.

In this period we have either been cured or made over new about 14 times. We have had the New Order, the New Freedom, the New Day, the New Era, the New Outlook, the New Epoch, the New Economy, the New Dawn, the New Deal, the New Religion, the New Liberalism, the New War, and several new foreign policies. None of these were really new discoveries.

And the New Testament is too often omitted. After each “new” we have a relapse and take another pill, labeled “new.”

Some of these somethings “new” have value. Too many have been false signposts on the road of national progress. Some point to will-o'-wispes of security not to be had on this earth. Some lead the Nation over the precipice of inflation and socialism. Some just lead to the land of make-believe.

Certainly some of them are tainted with untruth and a diluted intellectual honesty.

The word "new" applies better to physical things than to human forces. Indeed when the sun rises in the morning we had it as a new day. We cheer the passing of the night. But it is a false analogy in the march of civilization.

Most of our chores for the new day were assigned the night before. Our abilities to perform them were formed not only last year but over centuries or even geologic time. If the new day has no link with yesterday we would be without know-how and morals today. The loss of that link can bring chaos to the whole economic, the moral and the spiritual world.

AN ADJOURNMENT FOR A WHILE

As an aside, I suggest at least we adjourn trying to make America over into some other shape until we get out of this cold or hot war. Our present crisis is dangerous enough to require one concentrated undeviating purpose in Washington.

Many of our so-called social and economic gains will go by the board, anyway, if this hot and cold war keeps up. After all, the great social gains of the last century were a mixture of liberty, compassion, unlimited meat, automobiles, and washing machines. These are at least getting scarcer.

There will be plenty of time to exercise our muscles on "new" experiments after these violent changes in international temperature are survived. And these programs of making America over add an especially destructive new—that is new taxes.

Think about it.

LET US USE THE WORD "OLD" ONCE IN A WHILE

The practical thing we can do if we really want to make the world over again is to try out the word "old" for a while. There are some old things that made this country.

There is the old virtue of religious faith.

There are the old virtues of integrity and the whole truth.

There is the old virtue of incorruptible service and honor in public office.

There are the old virtues of economy in government, of self-reliance, thrift, and individual liberty.

There are the old virtues of patriotism, real love of country, and willingness to sacrifice for it.

These old ideas are very inexpensive. They even would help win hot and cold wars.

I realize that such suggestions will raise that cuss word "reactionary." But some of these old things are slipping badly in American life. And if they slip too far, the lights will go out of America, even if we win these cold and hot wars.

Think about it.

THE FLIGHT FROM HONOR

We might explore some of the things that have happened to the old virtues of integrity, truth, and honor in public life. During the recent past we have had a flood of exposures by congressional committees, by State legislatures, by grand juries in scores of cities, and the press.

A few days more than 175 years ago, the 56 Members of the Continental Congress of the United States unanimously declared a program of action and certain principles of American life. The concluding words of the declaration are a pledge of our sacred honor.

I sometimes wonder what the 56 founding fathers, from their invisible presence in our congressional Halls, would say about the procession of men in responsible position who have come before its committees of this day. What would they have thought of the "sacred honor" of the 5-percenters, mink coats, deep freezers, and free hotel bills? Or favoritism in Government loans and Government contracts? Or failures to prosecute evildoers who spread cancerous rackets and gambling rings with their train of bribed officials?

But I am less concerned at stealing public money than with the far more destructive forms of dishonor. What would the founding fathers have thought of those who coquette with traitorship? Or of secret and disastrous commitments of our Nation which were denied at the time? Or high officials under oath contradicting each other as to facts? Or the failure to keep promises to the people? Our civilization moves forward on promises that are kept.

We thus have a cancerous growth of intellectual dishonesty in public life which is mostly beyond the law. One of its chief instruments is corrupt propaganda. There has been such propaganda by foreign governments and our own designed to get us into war. Then we have the propaganda to keep up our pep. Then the habit continues in peacetime. And some pressure groups have learned this trick to get something they ought not to have.

The mildest form of corrupt propaganda is a process of persuasive part truths. At times it even rises to the high moral levels of selling snake oil.

But the malignant form of propaganda spreads deadly poisons. Its process is to create suspicion, hate, and fear. Its purpose is less to persuade than to conceal truth and to crush opposition.

The machinery of propaganda is made of standardized gadgets by which you can detect it.

One of these standard gadgets is slogans. They freeze the real process of thought.

If you will examine the two-score loud slogans created during this last third of a century, you will find most of them, like the "apples of Sodom," have turned to bitter ashes in our national mouth. Most of them became ripe in a year or two, some lasted a little longer. Some very new ones are already turning moldy.

One of these gadgets is to create fear by describing the horrors of invasion of the United States by foreign armies. This one always arises to its maximum decibel when pressuring legislation and elections. While aircraft can come our way no armies on earth can land on our shores.

Another gadget is to give new meaning to old, simple and well-understood expressions until the integrity of our language is polluted. The term "liberalism" has turned pink inside. The term "welfare" never before meant the "welfare state" with its red or pink colors. The Chinese Communists were not "agrarian liberals." From that perversion of truth alone, we suffered a gigantic defeat of freemen in China.

You can test malignant propaganda from another of its gadgets. That is the smear. This gadget has wide potency. When Mr. X presents an inconvenient fact or argument, the propagandists can simplify matters by pointing out that he was once a banker or was fined for speeding. With this gadget you can get your opponent either way in the international field by just suggesting he is an appeaser, or a warmonger, or an isolationist. On the issue of Government spending, he can be flattened out by calling him an inflationist or he is against the underdog. If he comments on either side of ideological matters, you can defeat him going or coming by calling him a Fascist, or a reactionary, or a fellow traveler, or just a red herring.

There is still another of these propaganda gadgets. That is to squelch debate by cries for unity. Unity. The implication is that the citizen is disloyal to his country if he disagrees with the powers that be.

I suggest that these are not operations of rugged intellectual honesty. They are attempts to coerce men into the intellectual concentration camp named "Fear." These gadgets have been very handy tools for making America over into these 14 new varieties and getting us into hot and cold wars.

Think about it.

UNVEILING TRUTH BY DEBATE

It is difficult enough to debate against the gadgets of propaganda. But there is something worse. That is the concealment of truth and commitments. I am not here discussing our foreign policies. But may I ask you a question?

Does anybody believe that the propaganda-promoted foreign policies over the past dozen years have always been right? Or that there has always been a disclosure of the whole truth?

For example, certain secret commitments were entered into at Tehran and Yalta which sold the freedom of half a billion people down the river. They were not disclosed to the Congress or to the American people. Does anyone believe that, had they been submitted to the American people for debate and to the Congress for decision, that they would ever have been approved? That is where we lost the peace and wandered into the land of hot and cold wars.

Debate founded on the full disclosure of the whole truth and free of these gadgets is the stuff that can save freemen.

Think about it.

OUR SACRED HONOR

I would like to explore this old virtue of truth, integrity, and honor in public life a little further.

Congress can well widen the laws so as to clutch the new kinds of bribes and benefits they have discovered. But Congress cannot reach intellectual dishonors.

Part truth, concealment of public commitments, propaganda and its gadgets and failure to enforce the laws are but part of them, and there are group pressures "to get theirs" which smell from both the decay of integrity and the rotting of patriotism, and some persons arrive at their morals with a divining rod that measures morals in terms of votes.

The Congress, from its own inquiries, is confronted with the fact that sacred honor cannot always be tested by legality or enforced by law. In its frustration, the Congress is groping for some sort of code of ethics, which with a prefix "new" might protect the citizen from his own officials.

Might I suggest that there are already some old and tested codes of ethics? There are the Ten Commandments, the Sermon on the Mount, and the rules of the game which we learned at our mother's knee.

Can a nation live if these are not the guides of public life?

Think it over.

OUR RIGHT TO COMPLAIN

The American people have a right to bitter complaint over these disclosures of dishonor in high places. The duty of public men in this Republic is to lead in standards of integrity—both in mind and money.

Dishonor in public life has a double poison. When people are dishonorable in private business, they injure only those with whom they deal or their own chances in the next world. But when there is a lack of honor in Government the morals of the whole people are poisoned.

The drip of such poisons may have nothing to do with dishonor in some college athletics or the occasional policeman on the beat. But the rules of the game have been loosened somewhere.

Some folks seem to think these are necessary evils in a free government, or that it is smart politics. Those are deadly sleeping pills. No public man can be just a little crooked. There is no such thing as a no-man's-land between honesty and dishonesty. Our strength is not in politics, prices, or production, or price controls. Our strength lies in spiritual concepts. It lies in public sensitiveness to evil.

Much as the Congress has my good wishes, something stronger than a new code of ethics is needed by America. The issue is decency in public life against indecency.

Our greatest danger is not from invasion by foreign armies. Our dangers are that we may commit suicide from within by complaisance with evil. Or by public tolerance of scandalous behavior. Or by cynical acceptance of dishonor. These evils have defeated nations many times in human history.

The redemption of mankind by America will depend upon our ability to cope with these evils right here at home.

Think about it.

CONCLUSION

But I do not wish to leave you, the neighbors of my childhood, with any implication of pessimism. I speak to you of some of our weaknesses, not because of frustration or despair, but to urge remedy. The fact that we are vigorously washing our dirty linen in the open is a sign that moral stamina still survives.

Without bitterness in our hearts, we are raising our eyes to the Creator of man who assured us that in American soil we can find the moral and spiritual forces which make free men and women. In His guidance we shall find the fortitude to correct our errors, to straighten our courses, to resurrect the spirit that made our America so free and bountiful a nation.

For reassurance in the future I need only to turn my thoughts to my grandparents who came to this State in the covered wagon. Here they and my parents toiled that their children might have greater opportunities than had been theirs. Here they worshipped God. Here they lived out their lives in the faith and hope of Americans. They lie buried on an Iowa hillside.

Therefore, here in this State where I was nurtured, I cannot but feel a strength that comes up from the deep roots in the very soil on which we stand. That strength is in character and truth and decent living. And it will triumph.

It will triumph because I know America is turning its face away from the maudlin leftisms and the spread of untruth of the past two decades. We sense the frauds on men's minds and morals. Moral indignation is on the march again.

Death of Abraham Cahan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 6, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Friday, August 31, Mr. Abraham Cahan, long one of the leading citizens of New York City, entered into his eternal rest at the age of 91.

Mr. Cahan, an old and dear friend of mine, had an extraordinarily useful life. For half a century he was an outstanding leader in the fields of journalism, labor, philanthropy, and in the fight against communism. He was a man of unusual courage, vision, and energy.

I ask leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the New York Times this morning entitled "Ten Thousand Five Hundred Pay Tribute to Abraham Cahan," as well as a telegram which I sent on September 1 to Mr. Alexander Kahn, manager of the Jewish Daily Forward. This message reflects my high estimate of the character and leadership of this great American.

There being no objection, the article and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of September 6, 1951]

TEN THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED PAY TRIBUTE TO ABRAHAM CAHAN—MAYOR, SECRETARY TOBIN AMONG THOSE AT FUNERAL SERVICE FOR EDITOR OF FORWARD

A funeral service for Abraham Cahan, retired editor of the Jewish Daily Forward, was held yesterday at 175 East Broadway, the home of the newspaper he had headed for more than 40 years.

Five hundred persons filled a second-floor auditorium while 10,000 others jammed the surrounding streets to pay a final tribute to the Socialist leader and the lower East Side's first citizen.

The simple, non-religious, 80-minute service for Mr. Cahan, who died Friday night in Beth Israel Hospital at the age of 91, was conducted by Alexander Kahn, general manager of the newspaper.

Long before the service was scheduled to begin at 1 p. m., thousands queued up in front of the 11-story newspaper building from which Mr. Cahan warred vigorously against communism, on behalf of labor and social reform and the transition of large masses of Jewish immigrants to a new way of life.

When the doors were closed on the 500 inside the building, Deputy Chief Inspector John Ferretti, in charge of a detail of 30 policemen, said 10,000 persons filled Strauss Square and Seward Park. They and others who took up points of vantage in tenement windows and on fire escapes heard the service through loudspeakers.

ALL WALKS OF LIFE

Taken together they were representative of every stratum of official life, of other faiths and every economic station. The stillness both inside and outside the building was broken by the rumble of nearby traffic and the muted strains of organ melodies, but the people were silently unanimous in their reverence for the man whose name was a byword among his own people.

His oak coffin, blanketed with gladioli, lilies, smilax and red roses, stood in the center of Forward hall just in front of a small stage crowded with floral displays. At 1 p. m., Lazarre Weiner, the organist, tread softly on his pedals and opened the service with Chopin's Funeral March. Ase's Death, from the Peer Gynt Suite by Grieg followed. Alexander Kahn then arose and spoke of his former colleague.

"He was of the first to fight Communists," Mr. Kahn said. "He was of the first to relegate party tradition and support Roosevelt. His idealism was always guided by a sense of the real and when the interests of the people and his country came into conflict with any tradition or dogma he resolved in favor of the interests of the people."

Mayor Impellitteri said it was his privilege as mayor to pay tribute to "the late, great Abe Cahan" on behalf of the city's 8,000,000 people.

"His was a powerful voice for justice and equal opportunity for all men," the mayor said. "Our troubled era will surely miss the greatness that was Abe Cahan, but his works and his writings will sustain us in the job of building a better world for everyone."

Maurice Tobin, Secretary of Labor, eulogized the founder of the Forward as "a great fighter for free trade-unions." He said not only Americans, but workingmen throughout the world "suffered a great loss" in Mr. Cahan's death.

LAUDED FOR AID TO LABOR

Praising Mr. Cahan for his contributions to improved living standards, Mr. Tobin said the former editor "lived to see the American worker getting the best minimum wage of the entire world." He paid warm tribute to

Mr. Cahan for his leadership of the Jewish daily, which he held played "a great part in the elimination of sweatshops and tenement slums."

"We should as Americans say 'Thank God' for the day Abe Cahan arrived in the United States," he continued.

David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, recalled the role played by Mr. Cahan in staving off Communist control of his union. Were it not for the courage of the Socialist leader, Mr. Dubinsky asked, "how many unions would have been captured and how many workers would have been enslaved?"

Abba Eban, Israeli Ambassador to the United States, brought tributes from the Government and people of Israel. Alluding to Mr. Cahan's roles in furthering social progress and in Yiddish journalism, Ambassador Eban said he preserved Jewish consciousness and culture against the tide of assimilation.

Others who spoke were Justice Jacob Panken of the Domestic Relations Court, Alex Rose, president of the United Hatters, Cap and Millinery Workers Union; Harry Rogoff, editor of the Forward; Nathan Chavin, educational director of the Workmen's Circle; Joseph Baskin, general secretary of the Workmen's Circle; Raphael Abrahamovitch, for the International Socialist movement, and Reuben Guskin, president of United Hebrew Trades.

Five cars, heavily banked with flowers, led a 50-car procession to the cemetery. Burial was in Mount Carmel Cemetery, Queens.

WASHINGTON, D. C., September 1, 1951.

MR. ALEXANDER KAHN,
Jewish Daily Forward,
Brooklyn, N. Y.:

Word of the passing of my old friend, Abraham Cahan, has filled me with the deepest sorrow. I hope you and members of his immediate family can be comforted in the knowledge that your loss was the loss of the countless legion of friends Abraham Cahan has throughout New York, the Nation, and the world. You must be further comforted in the knowledge that he had lived a long life studded with accomplishments such as fall to the credit of few men. He was known and loved as a great American as well as a leader of thought among those of our faith in this country. He was a man of courage, of integrity, of vision, and of learning.

He was the spokesman for ideas which were bold in his time but which came to be accepted by most of his fellow citizens. He fought the good fight when the battle was hard. His reward was in the impression his work left on his community, on his State, and on his country. That work will never die. Like the newspaper he built to greatness Abe Cahan's work will long survive him. He was my friend and my coworker in many a good cause through the years. I mourn him but know that my feelings are shared by thousands.

HERBERT H. LEHMAN.

Price Control and the Capehart Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 6, 1951

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, last week when Mr. Charles E. Wilson was testifying before our Banking and Cur-

rency Committee concerning the amendments to the Defense Production Act which he was recommending, I asked him if he wanted a price-control bill or profit-control bill. He promptly replied that he wanted a price-control bill. I then pointed out the language of the conferees which I had proposed, and which the conferees adopted, which declared the legislative intent of the so-called Capehart amendment. Mr. Wilson replied that OPS could not carry out that legislative intent unless the language of the Capehart amendment was modified. I suggested that he prepare appropriate language which in his opinion would make the Capehart amendment workable. He did so, and his suggestions were embodied in an amendment offered last week by the chairman of the committee, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. It is my purpose to support that amendment, or appropriate language to the same effect.

In explanation of the position I have taken that the Capehart amendment should be modified but not completely repealed. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an analysis of what is involved by the well-known New York economist, Harold Fleming, published in the September 4 issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SQUEEZE PLAY SEEN TRIED ON BUSINESS
(By Harold Fleming)

NEW YORK—Some people here are inclined to feel that the administration, in its continued opposition to the so-called Capehart and Herlong amendments in the new Defense Production Act, is trying to use the defense program for a new type of squeeze play on American business.

The gist of their reasoning is that farmers have escalators, labor has escalators, but the administration doesn't want business to have escalators. An escalator, in economic and political slang, is something on which one can stand still yet ride upward—that is, have his own prices lifted whenever other prices are lifted. The farm escalator is parity price support, which rides up with the farmer's living costs; labor's escalator is the cost-of-living clause. The nearest thing to an escalator for business is the "pass through" of costs permitted the manufacturer in the Capehart amendment and the inclusion of "historic" percentage markups in distributors' ceiling prices.

SQUEEZE BETWEEN OFFICIAL PRICE FLOORS, CEILINGS

Were the Congress to accede to the President's astonishing request for the elimination of these two clauses, the effect would be to put business in the grip of a more effective vise than it has yet been put in during the last 20 years. Whichever way the course of prices were to move, business would be squeezed between official price floors and official price ceilings.

For were prices to continue downward, the prices received by distributors and manufacturers would drop freely, while farm prices and labor's wages would be held up at officially supported levels. But were inflation to return, the prices received by businessmen would soon, despite the Capehart and Herlong amendments, be bumping against semi-rigid ceilings, while farmers and wage earners would merely stand still and ride up their

escalators. Heart of the businessman's problem is that under price control as now preached by the administration, his prices would have ceilings but no floors, while farm prices and wages have floors but (in practice) no ceilings.

For even with the Capehart amendment the pincers of this vise are clearly in evidence for the manufacturer. In a falling market his prices have no floor, like those received by farmers and wage earners; but in a rising market he cannot add any costs to his ceiling beyond those he paid up to July 26, 1951. The amendment merely releases him from the squeeze he was already in. Were such a drastic inflation to develop as the President keeps warning of, rising costs, including particularly wages and farm prices, would soon rise about him like flood waters round a man locked in a basement.

HOW THREE GROUPS HAVE FARED

How these three broad general groups—farmers, labor, and business—fared under the post-Korea inflation may be seen roughly from the following figures:

	1950	1951	Percent increase
Consumers' price index, June	170.2	185.2	10.9
Average weekly earnings, June			
All manufacturing industries	\$58.65	\$65.44	11.0
Average hourly earnings, June			
All manufacturing industries	\$1.453	\$1.604	10.4
Prices received, all farm products, June	247	301	21.9
Parity ratio (prices received by farmers versus prices paid by them) June	97	107	10.3
Corporate profits after tax (annual rate, billions) second quarter	\$20.6	22.0	7.0
Wage and salary receipts (annual rate, billions)	\$141.1	166.1	17.7

Not all these figures can be fairly compared. It is not entirely fair, for instance, to compare corporate profits after taxes with wage and salary receipts, which are before taxes. On the other hand the comparison is fair in the sense that any persons receiving dividends out of these corporate profits have to pay taxes on these dividends.

From the other angle, however, it is not fair to compare corporate profits with average weekly or hourly earnings. The fair comparison is with total wage and salary receipts; for while the latter reflect an increase in the number of people working, the corporate profits come from an increase in the number of jobs done.

In any case the above comparisons indicate that (1) Farmers and wage earners improved their position compared to corporations; (2) the purchasing power of average wages stayed approximately abreast of living costs while (3) that of farm products gained substantially but (4) that of corporate earnings declined substantially.

TRFND S EEN CONTINUED THIS SUMMER

These trends probably still continue this summer since (1) prices received by corporations are lower generally than in the second quarter, (2) wages continue upward; (3) farm prices are down near support levels; and (4) more corporations are shifting to defense work, where the profit-margin is smaller.

In view of these trends, the President seems to have indulged in a slight exaggeration in his recent message to Congress when he said that "the fact that (the Capehart) amendment was not needed is amply demonstrated by the remarkable level of business profits during the last few months."

But perhaps the heart of the President's attack was expressed in his statement that "All along the line, under the Capehart amendment, business is protected. Business is told that it need not absorb rising

costs. But no such assurance is extended to the consumer, the wage earner, and the people living on pensions and other fixed incomes. They stand at the end of the line."

This statement so confuses matters that fact needs to be disentangled from fancy. To begin with, there is no line with an end to it. There is a circle, in which money circulates. Everybody is at both the beginning and the end of this circulation. Many businessmen are inclined to feel they are at the short end.

Second, the bunching of wage earners with people living on fixed incomes is very confusing. Only a few days before the President's speech the Wage Stabilization Board had agreed that labor was entitled to upward adjustments for future cost-of-living increases—that is, that it need not absorb rising costs. And only a few weeks earlier than that new 1951 support rates for leading farm crops were announced, higher than last year, on the parity-price philosophy that the farmer need not absorb rising costs.

Visit of Governor Dewey to Ketchikan, Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 6, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a newspaper story from the Ketchikan Daily News, of Ketchikan, Alaska, for August 23, entitled "Thomas E. Dewey Entertained in Ketchikan." In this story, Governor Dewey is quoted as wanting to know more about the Alaska statehood question before definitely making up his mind about the statehood proposal. Previously, Governor Dewey has been somewhat of a supporter of statehood. Apparently, as a result of his trip to Alaska, he has had more of an opportunity to see both sides of the question, and has begun to have doubts about the advisability of taking that step at this time.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOMAS E. DEWEY ENTERTAINED IN KETCHIKAN—IS IMPRESSED WITH BIGNESS OF TERRITORY—WANTS TO LEARN MORE ON ALASKA STATEHOOD QUESTION

Exhibiting the dynamic personality which has twice made him a candidate for the highest office in the land, and placed him in the driver's seat of his home State for the second term, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, took over the city of Ketchikan last night while making a brief stop here on a grass roots tour of the Territory.

The Governor appeared before a representative group of Ketchikan residents at the Elks' Temple last night and after being presented with a basket of seafood, especially prepared for him at the Fishery Products Laboratory, admitted to be tremendously impressed by the elegant and fabulous land of our last great frontier and the wonderful hospitality and friendship of its people.

"This trip to Alaska," the Governor said, "has been one of the most amazing and revealing experiences of my entire life and I am glad I came. No one," he continued,

"who has not been to Alaska could possibly appreciate the tremendous size, the impressive ruggedness, and the grandeur of this great land and I find it clean and refreshing after the oppressive lands of the Orient."

The Governor entertained his listeners for a period with anecdotes of incidents which happened on his 40,000-mile swing through Asia and Australia and then turned his attention for a moment to one of the major problems of Alaska.

"Before I came to Alaska," he said, "I was of the opinion that everybody favored statehood for this country. I am now beginning to realize how wrong I was, for the more people I meet the more the argument over statehood seems to grow and I admit I am now definitely confused over the issue, but perhaps that is a good thing, for they say the knowledge of ignorance is the beginning of wisdom, and I now feel in a position to begin to learn the true facts."

Governor Dewey had previously told a reporter in Juneau that he always favored statehood but in response to a question from a reporter here last night, he stated, "I would certainly not favor statehood for Alaska unless the admission bill contained adequate assurances the new State would receive sufficient finances to make it self-supporting. I have been led to believe the statehood bill was well drafted but if it does not provide adequate protection for the new State I would never support it."

The Governor was entertained at the Elks Temple with a buffet dinner, and following his brief talk took a stand near the center of the floor and shook hands with all of the 200 people in attendance.

Upon his arrival at the Coast Guard Base at 5:30 p. m. the Governor was met by a welcoming committee of the Chamber of Commerce, composed of Mayor George Beck, Chamber President Herb Hetherington, Secretary Bill Boardman, W. A. Bates, Howard Stevens, Pete DeBoer, Mel Roe, and attorney Lester O. Gore, and he and his party were escorted to the Ingersoll Hotel.

Arriving with Governor Dewey were Governor Gruening, his military aide, Capt. Donald Morrison, USCG, Paul Lockwood, formerly Dewey's secretary, now a member of the Public Service Commission of the State of New York, Ray Borst, veteran newspaperman of the Buffalo Evening News, and Tom Galvin of the New York State police.

En route from Juneau the party stopped at Waterfall where Governor Dewey was impressed with the modern salmon cannery and the high speed lines there.

During the early part of the evening the welcoming committee took the visiting Governor and his party through the cold storage plant where Al Whitmarsh of Polar Fisheries explained the complex operations of the plant, and a drive was taken to the site of the pulp mill at Ward Cove.

Upon their return, the party stopped at the home of Mayor Beck, where over an hour was spent in general discussion. The group then left for the buffet dinner at the Elks Temple.

This morning Governor Dewey and party were taken aboard the yacht *Manana II* for a salmon fishing trip to Vallenar Point, and they will be picked up there by plane this afternoon and flown to Tracy Arm, where they will spend the night aboard the Fish and Wildlife Service vessel *Brant* before returning to Juneau.

Salmon Derby, chairman, and District Forest Supervisor C. M. Archbold, and Chamber of Commerce, President Hetherington were in charge of arrangements for the fishing trip.

Governor Dewey admitted to his audience last night that he is not a fisherman at heart but consented to the trip in deference to Lockwood and Borst, who have been stricken with the strange form of insanity which afflicts fishermen the world over.

"I accompany them," Dewey said, "because I would lose a million constituents in my home State who would not consider me worthy of office if I visited Alaska and failed to take part in your wonderful fishing."

Aid to Free China and Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 6, 1951

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, the American people are determined to cooperate with Spain and Free China, two of the most stalwart opponents of communism, but we must not be misled by the statistics. Military aid to Formosa and to Spain are both subject to control of the State Department. I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD two excerpts from an article by Frank C. Hanighen which appeared in Human Events, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACHESON STILL OVER SPAIN

When the military finally overrode the State Department opposition and achieved a deal with Spain, the general opinion here was that State would swallow its disappointment and collaborate in making Spain a real military bastion of defense. Like many other general opinions, this one has now proved faulty, although the real news has not yet reached the public prints.

Dean Acheson—who in 1946, together with the Red Dean of Canterbury, led a Communist-inspired rally against Franco Spain in Madison Square Garden—is not so readily converted. We learn from unimpeachable sources that, on the morrow of Admiral Sherman's agreement with Franco, Acheson sent his aides to the Defense Department. Their line ran, as follows:

"Yes, we must make Spain a bastion of our defense. But military aid cannot prove successful without economic aid—to raise the standards of living of the people. That's our province. We propose that a State and ECA mission go to Madrid to examine and supervise thoroughly all economic aid expended in Spain."

This proposal, we hear, has aroused angry opposition and apprehension in the Pentagon. The Pentagon people fear that the State Department would utilize such a mission to create confusion, if not chaos, in Spain, by withholding funds from one faction and tendering them to a rival, thus playing one against another. State Department agents, still trying to overthrow Franco, would upset all the Defense Department's plans for a stable Spain, certainly a prime necessity for construction and operation of our bases there.

It might be added that these Pentagon fears are seeping into committees on Capitol Hill which are examining requests for foreign aid. The reaction of Congressmen is, "Let the generals and admirals supervise any money for Spain."

FORMOSA

The announcement that some \$300,000,000 of proposed foreign military and economic

aid funds will be allocated to Formosa has given the dubious impression that the State Department has changed its spots. Last spring, the Acheson team reversed itself on the Formosa problem, verbally admitting that the island is a bastion of our strategic defenses. Actually, the State Department language was tricky, and this column warned that Acheson's boys had not abandoned the idea of ousting Chiang Kai-shek, who rules the island. In reality, State no more wants Chiang on our side than it does Franco—and is attempting to lay the groundwork for a policy to undermine the Generalissimo's power in Formosa.

Last week, we revealed how State now seeks to infiltrate Spain with its agents, under the guise of administering economic aid, and how the United States military fear that State will thus cause much trouble, if not confusion damaging to military plans. This week, the same pattern of Acheson activity is seen in the announcement that \$300,000,000 will be allocated to Formosa. The proposed grant is contained (according to the Washington Post, August 9) in the mutual security program now before congressional committees. While the Post news story speaks of arms to modernize Chiang's army on Formosa, it also mentions that almost half of the appropriation would be for economic help.

It is through this back door of economic aid that, just as in the case of plans for Spain, State Department agents would enter the Formosan situation and exert influence not of a kind to strengthen the Chiang regime on the island. It is noted that Assistant Secretary of State Dean Rusk's name is associated with the aid project. Rusk is the Acheson aide who used the "tricky" language last spring to give the impression that the Department supports the Nationalist Government. More and more it is feared that Acheson's men have not changed their long-term plan to get rid of Chiang Kai-shek.

Proposed Establishment of National Citizens Advisory Board on Radio and Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 6, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, this morning the Subcommittee on Radio, Television, and Telecommunication, of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, presided over by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. McFARLAND], heard a series of very remarkable and extremely interesting witnesses. Their testimony dealt with the problems involved in the future of television, and with the joint resolution and bill introduced by the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and myself.

Three of the statements are brief, but they are very interesting and illuminating. They bear directly on the questions which are being asked of many of us by our constituents. I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF DR. EDGAR FULLER, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS, ON S. 1579, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE, SEPTEMBER 6, 1951

Mr Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to testify concerning Senate bill 1579, which would establish a National Citizens Advisory Board on Radio and Television as an adjunct of the Federal Communications Commission to evaluate radio and television programs and to report thereon to the Federal Communications Commission and to Congress.

This testimony is presented in a dual capacity. My regular work is as executive secretary for the superintendents and commissioners of education of the 48 States and the Territories and Island dependencies. These chief State school officers, as important State officials and heads of the State school systems, are especially concerned about what the effects of television may be on elementary and secondary school pupils. They are also interested in the quality of programs offered to the general public. The second capacity in which I testify is as chairman of the Joint Committee on Educational Television, which is composed of seven organizations, as follows. American Council on Education, Association for Education by Radio, Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, National Association of Educational Broadcasters, National Association of State Universities, National Council of Chief State School Officers, National Education Association of the United States. The membership of these organizations constitutes the vast majority of educators in the United States, and the committee attempts to be of service to more than 30,000,000 elementary, secondary and college teachers and students throughout the country. The proposed National Citizens Advisory Board on Radio and Television should be an excellent influence on behalf of these millions of teachers and students as well as on behalf of the general public.

Mr Chairman, it is unthinkable that the limited number of television channels may be allowed to become monopolized for selling goods. Television is expensive and its monetary value for selling is great. The history and present status of radio has demonstrated that the rituals of the sellers demand monotonous repetition of the trade-mark and the trite cliché. Such repetition, carried to excess, spoils programs and stultifies thinking. Television is a more powerful medium than radio, and the public interest demands even more insistently that it diversify its offerings to maintain entertainment of good quality and public information programs beneficial to good citizenship.

There is reason to believe that governmental censorship of mass communications media can become dangerous to freedom, and we are opposed to official censorship for that reason. Thus we have a peculiar situation in which it seems best that the Government which represents the public should refrain from official action on behalf of the public. Assuming such governmental restraint, the problem is how to insure that there shall be a variety of programs, that the television medium shall not be commercially monopolized and that there shall be an impartial, authentic, and noncommercial avenue for public expression concerning the kind and quality of radio and television programs. This is long overdue, and will be done one way or another.

It is reasonable to suppose that the National Government, while refusing to evaluate radio and television programs itself

through administrative action by the Federal Communications Commission or through direct legislation, should cooperate to assist the public to express itself, and a less offensive or less dangerous way than that proposed by S. 1579 could scarcely be devised. We are especially pleased that the distinguished Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission is supporting this legislation.

It is difficult for us to understand why commercial broadcasters should oppose such a National Citizens Advisory Board as S. 1579 proposes. The Board would be entirely unofficial and advisory, and it would have no powers of censorship. It would be legal for both the Federal Communications Commission and Congress to ignore every suggestion it might make. Do the broadcasters suppose that there will be no organized groups of any kind whatever to suggest to them what the public opinion is concerning their presentations on television? Are the commercial broadcasters going to refuse to cooperate with any such groups of citizens? If they take an attitude that all the television channels belong to them, to use as they please to bombard the people in any way that will earn them the most dollars, the alternatives of the general public may be limited to less desirable types of action to protect itself. The groups I work with very much prefer the route of cooperation.

Mr Chairman, I would like to include here some of the officially approved statements made by these groups. The National Council of Chief State School Officers in its annual meeting about 2 months ago unanimously approved the following resolution:

"Inasmuch as the available television channels are limited in number and are in danger of being monopolized by commercial interests in ways which will not protect the high general educational level upon which our way of life depends, the council requests that the Federal Communications Commission take action to

"A Reserve permanently at least one very high frequency channel for educational broadcasting in every metropolitan area and major educational center.

"B Require that noncommercial broadcasts be given priority and be produced regardless of commercial interests on all channels for a reasonable length of time each day at hours convenient for public listening

"C Reserve permanently a number of ultra high frequency channels for future educational broadcasting adequate to provide such service to all the people of the United States wherever they live

"We commend the Federal Communications Commission for the beginnings of such reservations for noncommercial educational television as exemplified in its third tentative allocation of March 22, 1951. We also commend the Ford Foundation for its generous support of educational objectives in television."

Mr Chairman, we sincerely hope the self-regulation of the broadcasting industry will make it unnecessary to press for reservation of time for noncommercial broadcasts at good listening hours on all stations, either before the Federal Communications Commission or in the Congress.

I also quote a paragraph from the official policy of the Joint Committee on Educational Television:

"The general policy of the Joint Committee on Educational Television shall be to concern itself with education as it does or does not appear on television screens of the United States from whatever source. Its attitude shall be one of realistic cooperation and of realistic appraisal with respect to performance by both educational or commercial television stations and/or networks. It shall conduct its activities in terms of long-range objectives based on the belief that democracy requires a well informed public,

It will represent the special needs and duties of education in this newest and most potent of the mass media, with the understanding and belief that the principles and objectives it seeks must be measured in terms of several generations."

Here, once again, there is an expressed interest in the general quality of all television programs. That interest is expressed not only on behalf of the millions of students and teachers at all educational levels which constitute some 20 percent of the entire public, but also on behalf of adults generally. All television has an educational effect one way or another, and in a free nation all adults are or should be students in a general sense, in order to be good citizens.

Mr Chairman, commercial broadcasters will be very unwise if they oppose any and all efforts to make the citizens' voice heard in the field of radio and television in the manner assured by Senate bill 1579. It may be said that the industry can regulate itself and that the broadcasters have already taken steps to form such internal regulatory bodies. This is all right as far as it goes, but it doesn't go very far. Senate bill 1579 is entirely in accord with all the commercial broadcasters may do toward self-regulation, but there is no reason to suppose they can shake off the powerful commercial pressures unaided. If the commercial broadcasters are really sincere in their desire to maintain good-quality programs on television screens in the interests of the general public, as we believe most of them are, they should welcome such aid as the proposed National Citizens Advisory Board on Radio and Television will be able to extend to them.

They should also welcome similar groups in the States and perhaps in the local communities as well. The commercial broadcasters need the cooperation of such groups. The laudable objectives of freedom under self-regulation and the prevention of additional official regulation will come to commercial broadcasting only as it takes the people into its confidence and demonstrates capacity to regulate itself. If broadcasters resist any effort of the public to express itself, such as through the proposed National Citizens Advisory Board, their motives at once are suspect. Many people may come to believe that they do not really want to regulate themselves in a manner generally acceptable, that they do not want suggestions from the public, and that what they really want is license to follow the dollar sign wherever that dollar sign may lead.

These are the principal reasons, Mr. Chairman, why I have appeared here to support Senate bill 1579 today, and I would like to express again my appreciation for the privilege of doing so.

Thank you.

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON RADIO, TELEVISION, AND TELECOMMUNICATION OF THE SENATE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE, PRESENTED BY STANLEY H. RUTTENBERG, DIRECTOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND RESEARCH, CIO, SEPTEMBER 6, 1951

I wish to express my great appreciation for the opportunity to appear before this committee and indicate the complete support of the Congress of Industrial Organizations for S. 1579, the proposal to establish a National Citizens Advisory Board on Radio and Television.

The interest of the Congress of Industrial Organizations in the future of television is based upon two extremely important factors. In the first place, our organization represents the overwhelming majority of the men and women employed in the manufacture of television sets. The degree to which television programs are responsive to the needs and wishes of the American people and thus assure a healthy future for the industry

plays an important part in the future well-being of these thousands of workers in the industry.

In the second place, the membership of the CIO represents one of the largest organized consumer groups in America. The degree to which television programing not only entertains the public but also elevates its cultural standards, provides useful educational and informational services, and generally advances the cause of good citizenship is of tremendous importance to our 6,000,000 members and their families.

While we are all particularly concerned with the presently inadequate educational service which television is rendering our children, I do not wish in the brief moments available to speak to that very important aspect of the problem before us. In the millions of CIO families, there are millions of children who should now be served with more educational programs and better entertainment programs than are now being provided by our program sponsors. Our concern is identical with that of all other parents and educators. But I am sure that this problem has been adequately discussed by competent educational authorities during the course of these hearings.

Of equal importance to the problem of child listeners is the question of the values which can be obtained for adult listeners by the proper utilization of the great potential inherent in television broadcasting.

More than 100 years ago the leaders of organized labor of that period were actively participating with other groups in the effort to establish a free public-school system. The expansion of education at all levels both for children and adults, has been a constant objective of organized labor during the years. American democracy, with its dedication to the concept of equality of opportunity, is dependent upon expanding mediums for education and information for all of the people.

If the great problems of our age are to be understood by all of the people, and information, reason, and logic are to be the tools with which the people are to understand and solve them, no educational medium—least of all television—can be left solely in private hands for the purpose of profits based primarily on the provision of entertainment. The Congress of Industrial Organizations does not seek to deprecate those entertainment programs provided by private sponsors which meet acceptable standards. Certainly our members want to continue to see, hear, and enjoy the Jack Bennys and Bob Hopes, the quiz shows, and athletic events. The basic question, however, is simply whether the great educational potential of television shall be stultified and this important medium only used for purposes of entertainment. Will this dangerous trend, which has already been set in motion in television programing, be allowed to continue unchecked and follow the unfortunate pattern already established by commercial radio broadcasting? There are evils in the pattern which must be opposed in the interest of the American people and this is even more true in the case of television because its educational possibilities are many times greater than that of radio. Certainly most educators agree that what is seen has more impact on the mind than words that are heard or read.

It is our belief that working people desire the best in television entertainment. But they want much more. The millions of wage and salary earners of America who have been deprived of higher education and who have been forced to pursue their own educational advancement through correspondence short courses and night schools are a group whose educational needs can be tremendously enhanced by effective educational television programing. Why should not television now bring to the homes of all American workers the opportunity to

receive information and knowledge which circumstances beyond their control have prevented workers from enjoying as students in the classrooms of our universities and colleges? In addition to television instruction in home economics, in mechanics, and in the arts, millions of adult Americans seek an opportunity to learn more about good books, about American history, about the operation of their Government and the laws under which they live. Even more important, since we live in an age of controversy, the American adult seeks to understand the issues which he must face in order to be an intelligent voter and citizen. Therefore, there is an increasing need for the type of television programs which present responsible discussion of public issues and which help the listener to understand them.

Certainly it is not to condemn the advertisers of soaps and automobiles if the type of programs which we have discussed do not interest them. With few exceptions, commercial sponsors avoid "public interest" programs that involve controversial discussion because they fear so-called unfavorable reactions. Or they avoid the so-called educational programs because they presume that they are dull and that the American people do not want them and will not listen to them and therefore will not buy their products. Or, perhaps, the commercial advertisers avoid these programs for the reason that they believe they had best be left to those who are professionally trained in the field of educational broadcasting.

Whatever the reason, it should be apparent to all that the public interest in the development of our fast growing television broadcasting industry must be protected. A large part of television time should rightly belong to the entertainment field and continue to be sponsored commercially as long as standards of diversity and good taste are elevated. But much of television time must be reserved for more serious purposes and it is the responsibility of Congress which represents the interests of all the American people to see that this is made possible. Not only must educational agencies be protected and encouraged in their desire to provide educational and public service programs through television but there is also a related responsibility to see that these types of programs—no matter who sponsors them—are allotted portions of the broadcasting day and night when those who desire to enjoy them are free to listen.

In television it is not true that the air is free. Because of the limitation on the number of stations which can transmit television programs through the air at any one place, monopolies inevitably are established. It is the view of the Congress of Industrial Organizations that the United States Congress must safeguard the public interest now before it is too late by establishing the National Citizens Advisory Board, called for by the bill which is before us. Through this objective body, divorced from any personal financial interest, the American people can hope that American television will serve in the future the great potential entertainment, cultural, educational and public service which the people so badly need and want.

TESTIMONY OF WALLACE J. CAMPBELL, DIRECTOR, WASHINGTON OFFICE, COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE IN BEHALF OF S. 1579, SEPTEMBER 6, 1951

My name is Wallace J. Campbell. I am director of the Washington office of the Cooperative League of the United States of America, a national federation of consumer, purchasing, and service cooperatives. The league's membership is made up of local and regional cooperative organizations whose total membership is nearly 2,000,000 families. I am also president of a small FM radio

station, WCFM, owned by our member organizations, the Cooperative Broadcasting Association here in Washington.

Our organization is happy to support S. 1579, introduced by Senator BENTON for himself and Senators HUNT, BRICKER, and SALTONSTALL, to establish a National Citizens Advisory Board on Radio and Television.

The Cooperative League has long been interested in the mass media of communication and in the practical job of adult education which, in our view, must continue long after formal schooling is completed if we are to build an educated and effective democratic movement.

Because of this keen interest, our cooperative associations have taken the leadership in the development of various techniques of adult education. Perhaps the most effective are the advisory council work in the State of Ohio and the study group movement in Nova Scotia, Canada, which together combine the best elements of an all-round program of adult education. Thousands of farmers in Ohio meet in their neighbors' homes once each month throughout the year in groups of a dozen families to discuss the practical problems that face them. These advisory councils are interested not only in the problems of the operation of their cooperatives, but in general education, economic, and civic problems on a community, State, and National basis.

Let me give you some examples of the importance of radio to our adult education and information program.

In Nova Scotia the cooperatives have had the active support and assistance of St. Francis Xavier University, a small Catholic college which pioneered in adult education. When their study-club movement reached such proportions that it was difficult to keep up with it with available manpower, friends of the college applied for a license for a broadcasting station and established station CJFX in Antigonish, Nova Scotia. Although it supports itself by commercial advertising during parts of the day, its main function is providing a channel for continuous adult education. For example, the university adult-education staff conducts its own discussion groups around the microphone at stated times. The local groups meet around their radios and listen to that discussion and then continue their own discussions in their own homes. The Canadian Broadcasting Corp. has a similar program, the Farm Forum, which serves as the nucleus for discussion groups across Canada.

In the State of Ohio, the farm-bureau cooperatives took the initiative in establishing the People's Broadcasting Corp. which now owns stations WRFD in Worthington, Ohio, and WOL in Washington, D. C. Farm groups in Nebraska have just started a similar station in Lexington. The Ohio station has created a new pattern for farm radio. It is a day-time AM-only station devoted specifically to the service of farmers of Ohio. It is noted for its complete weather coverage designed to be of assistance to farmers. It provides extensive market and crop reports, news coverage every hour on the hour, and good music aimed at the farm family. Too much of American radio is city oriented and is troubled with "urbanitis." Apparently no regular commercial station was interested in doing this kind of job. The result is that WRFD already has the second largest radio audience in the State of Ohio.

Here in Washington a group of listeners—or rather at that time prospective listeners—formed the Cooperative Broadcasting Association. They were granted the first FM license in the city of Washington and are just completing 3 years of FM broadcasting. WCFM is establishing new patterns in radio, primarily because it is listener-owned and listener-oriented. It is owned by 2,700 individuals and 10 consumer associations serving this area.

Because it is listener-owned, it crowds more news coverage into its broadcasting time than does any other Washington station. It has a series of outstanding commentators, many of whom serve without compensation because they are interested in the station.

Its Capital Events coverage of Washington conferences and important meetings is unique in this Capital City; and because it is the Capital City the talent available is abundant.

WCFM's programs include the National Gallery of Art Symphony Orchestra concerts which are broadcast every Sunday evening. A new feature, sponsored by the listeners themselves, is a 3-hour program of fine music and drama produced by the British Broadcasting Co. and available only on a noncommercial basis. In cooperation with the Library of Congress we conduct our own poetry program.

With this background you can see why our cooperative associations are keenly interested in radio and in the prospects for enlarging television broadcasting as well.

These illustrations are not given to advertise the station or to boast of their accomplishments. As a matter of fact, the accomplishments are very small compared to the opportunities in the field. What accomplishments have been made have been made the hard way. Our people are amateurs in this field. But they felt there were important services which were not being rendered or were being performed inadequately or being shoved aside to poor times by more profitable accounts.

We try to be a yardstick in the industry, but there are many things of a civic, educational, and cultural nature which we cannot do but which the major networks and other independents could do if given the encouragement of a citizens advisory board.

We would like very much, as a part of our program of public service, to put the Senate of the United States on the air every day it is in session. There are a great number of people who would like to follow these sessions carefully who could do so most effectively through radio. There would not be the continuing huge following of the Kefauver hearings. And perhaps the Senate would not pull as large an audience as John's Other Wife. But seriously, we would like very much to give the public the opportunity to hear these sessions. As a small non-profit station, we could make time available which a commercial station or network might find difficult to remove from advertising commitments. We do not believe the Senate of the United States should be sponsored by Carter's Little Liver Pills.

We feel that the Government, which owns the wave lengths upon which both radio and television depend, should have a responsibility for helping to shape the general direction in which this programming should go in order to provide the greatest possible public service. We feel that the Government should encourage experimental stations and those which will provide a yardstick for public service broadcasting. We feel that it also should encourage nonprofit organizations engaging in radio and television broadcasting and should give particular encouragement to consumer-owned and listener-owned radio stations.

We do not wish or request subsidy of any kind from the Government. The National Citizens Advisory Board should bring the spotlight of attention and approval to those things which are in the public interest and report to the FCC and the Congress programming and practices which tend to degrade this important public instrument.

A board of highly competent and well-known citizens devoted to the public interest could do much through the voluntary

recommendations of the committee to help shape the policy for the radio and television industry which would move it away from the present trend which at times seems to be to seek the lowest common denominator in the radio audience and direct all of the programming toward that lowest common denominator. Only when the public interest becomes the predominant interest in radio and television will these media achieve the stature which they deserve.

The Japanese Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 6, 1951

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excellent editorial by Frederic Nelson entitled "Japan's Treaty Delegates Must Be Slightly Puzzled," which appeared in a recent number of the Saturday Evening Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAPAN'S TREATY DELEGATES MUST BE SLIGHTLY PUZZLED

The treaty which the Japanese are being asked to sign in San Francisco this week is more than generous. In contrast to the Treaty of Versailles and in defiance of all the Morgenthauism that was being thrown about at the end of the war, this treaty offers a defeated nation political integrity, considerable economic freedom, and a fresh start in the family of nations. It speaks well for the wisdom and skill of Mr. John Foster Dulles, who had an important part in drawing up the treaty, and for the Administration which let him do it. What kind of treaty Japan would have got if we were not working like beavers to line up allies in the cold war is another matter.

Nevertheless, there is considerable doubt as to whether we shall get full value for this commendable, if shotgun type, generosity. The doubt is based on what orientals must think of our over-all performance in the Far East. The Japanese delegates arrive here, knowing that, contrary to the advice of General MacArthur, we pulled our punches in the Korean War, and were then trapped into armistice negotiations which were dragged out beyond all reason. The Communists desired the respite in order to build up their strength, while we were supposed to relax. A Japanese, reading Admiral Joy's charge that the Communist delegates had come to the conference to state your political price, must have been amazed at our innocence. Communists invariably regard negotiation as a step in the master plan. Will the country which exhibits such naiveté assure the Japanese that, even with our protection, they are safe all alone in the new Red Asia?

If it isn't to be a Red Asia, the Japanese delegates must be saying to each other: Why was the United States so reluctant to list Nationalist China among the signatories to the peace treaty? Soviet Russia, which fought the Japanese for 5 days, is represented at San Francisco—much to the embarrassment of the geniuses who bribed Stalin to come in. China, which fought Japan for 15 years, was not invited, although Nationalist China is still recognized by the United States.

The Japanese may well wonder whether we left Nationalist China off the roster because we secretly expected the Chinese Communists eventually to be recognized, after an appropriate amount of pressure from Messrs. Nehru and Morrison. Or did we leave her off in an effort to appease communism throughout Asia?

Neither question is calculated to reassure the Japanese gentlemen that we are the most sapient allies one could have. The Japanese are under tremendous pressure from communism in Asia. Their livelihood depends on their ability to trade on some terms with the Asiatic mainland. To see us unwilling to take a stand behind the anti-Communist Chinese, while being chivvied into an unprofitable talkathon at Kaesong, could make the Japanese wonder just how smart we are. However, since the immediate power is on our side, and the treaty is a generous one, they will presumably sign—if they haven't when you read this. It is a pity, though, that the circumstances create so many doubts.

The Merit System and the Whitten Rider

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 6, 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, in justice to the great number of conscientious, hardworking Government employees, whose services to the people of this country are of the highest order, it is urgent that fullest consideration be given to any legislative proposals which might work to the detriment of this great body of loyal citizens.

I make this observation as a result of reading the article in The Federal Diary by Jerry Kluttz in the Washington Post of September 4 concerning certain alleged discriminations which would be caused by the Whitten rider which was affixed in the House of Representatives to H. R. 5215, the supplemental appropriations bill for 1952. Because of the unusual nature of the proposals of this rider, and because also of the very detailed criticism of the proposals by the writer, who is recognized as one of the most authoritative commentators upon Federal employment proposals, I ask unanimous consent that pertinent excerpts from the article by Mr. Kluttz be reprinted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FEDERAL DIARY

(By Jerry Kluttz)

BASIC MERIT PRINCIPLE OF UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT CORRUPTED BY RIDER

You, the Federal employee, would be the victim of rank discrimination and the basic merit principle of filling a Federal job with the best qualified person available would be corrupted by the Whitten rider which has been voted by the House.

Worst of all, you would be penalized because of the simple fact that you are working for Uncle Sam. Outsiders would be free to

come in and take over the better Government jobs without restriction. Your incentive to work for and be promoted to a better job for which you could qualify would be shattered by the far-reaching rider. To be blunt about it, the rider would lead the way toward mediocrity in Government.

That is a sweeping indictment against the personnel rider guided through the House without a single protest by Representative JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Democrat, of Mississippi, whose sincerity in doing it is not being questioned. This is the bill of particulars to support the indictment:

The rider would require employees to wait at least a year between each grade promotion; promotions of two or more grades would be outlawed.

In Government are thousands of youngsters who enter at low grades. They go to night school and they take training courses to equip themselves to qualify to be lawyers, scientists, technicians, accountants, FBI agents, and so forth. They are then free to take Civil Service or agency competitive tests for the better-paying jobs. Those who qualify are then eligible for appointments under the present sound career service principle.

The Whitten rider would hamper this practice of self-training and promotion for the qualified. A grade 4 clerk, for example, who sweats and slaves to put himself through law school and who qualifies for a grade 7 legal job through a competitive test, couldn't be appointed to it under the Whitten rider. He could only be given a grade 5 job; he'd have to wait several years before he could get a grade 7.

The grade 4 clerk, who has had valuable Government experience and who may be the very best man for the legal job, would have an anchor around his neck. But an outsider, one with no Government experience whatsoever, who qualified at a lower grade for the grade 7 legal job could be appointed to it without restriction.

There isn't an agency of any size in the Government that doesn't encourage its lower-grade people to train themselves to qualify for its better jobs. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, for example, carefully screens youngsters it appoints to its grade 5 accounting jobs. Those who get the jobs must undergo agency training, take college courses in banking, and pass agency competitive tests to get trainee bank examiner jobs at grade 7 and later examiner jobs at grade 9. The FDIC system has proved to be most successful.

Thousands of young college graduates are in Government today who are hired at trainee jobs; those who successfully complete their training assignments have been promised promotions to so-called journeyman jobs, promotions that usually carry a two-grade jump from grade 5 to grade 7. The Whitten rider would disrupt these programs which have paid big dividends to Uncle Sam. It would destroy the incentive of these people to work for better jobs and, without doubt, drive many of them out of Government.

The civil service rule is to have a two-grade spread between that of a bureau chief and his assistants. Let's assume we have a grade 15 bureau chief who retires and the department desires to follow the well-established career principle and appoint to it a grade 13 assistant who is eminently qualified for it. Under the Whitten rider, it couldn't be done, but the grade 15 job could go to an outsider.

The above are just a few of the terrible injustices that could, and would, happen under the Whitten rider. It would be the good and able people and with something to offer the Government who would be hurt by the rider. The inefficient and the drones, the target, apparently, of Representative WHITTEN, would be unaffected by it.

Some Uncensored Footnotes to the Forrester Diaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 6, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a very excellent article entitled "Some Uncensored Footnotes to the Forrester Diaries," written by William Bradford Huie. It is interesting in that it shows the extent to which the Communist Party line will go to smear a really great American.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME UNCENSORED FOOTNOTES TO THE FORRESTER DIARIES

(By William Bradford Huie)

With the publication this month of the Forrester diaries, thoughtful Americans can reflect further on the story of James Forrester, America's first Secretary of Defense, whose brilliant career ended in the predawn hours of May 22, 1949, when his body came hurtling 16 floors to the pavement at Bethesda Naval Hospital.

Those who expect to study the published diaries should do so with these reservations in mind:

1. The diaries have been censored. The two men who suffer most in comparison with Forrester, and who possess none of his vision, are President Truman and Defense Secretary George C. Marshall. Yet, after Forrester was discharged, his papers for many months were in secret custody at the White House, and it is admitted that the Defense Department, under General Marshall, withheld some of the papers "in the national interest."

2. The papers were purchased and prepared for publication by a newspaper that supported many of the policies Forrester so courageously—and so futilely—opposed.

With these reservations, the diaries should be examined for the many evidences of Forrester's remarkable foresight, of which these are the finest examples:

In 1943, while most other men in our Government thought otherwise, Forrester repeatedly warned that Russia was not an ally but a treacherous enemy. He urged President Roosevelt to impose stern terms on Russia before our invasion of Normandy, and his first advice to President Truman was that Russia be dealt with as a dangerous probable enemy.

In 1945, while Alger Hiss, Dean Acheson, and others were urging President Roosevelt at Yalta to yield to the Russian's concessions that would lead inevitably to such disasters as the Korean war, Forrester pleaded with the President not to make those concessions.

In 1946, while Marshall, Acheson, Hiss, Philip Jessup, John Carter Vincent, and Owen Lattimore were favoring the Chinese Reds by trying to enforce a coalition government in China, Forrester opposed the coalition policy and warned General Marshall of its consequences. Forrester went further: Supported by the Secretary of War, he addressed a note to the State Department demanding to know if it was the policy of the United States to desert the Nationalist Government of China.

From the time of the inauguration of the Manhattan project, which developed the atomic bomb, Forrester was deeply concerned over the protection of our secrets. He warned President Roosevelt that security was

being violated, and in 1945 he battled to have the bomb's further development kept within the custody of the military.

In 1947, when traitors prepared to hand over additional atomic secrets to scientists who were shuttling our secrets directly to the Russians, it was Forrester alone who came to the aid of Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, chairman of the congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, and prevented the transfer of the secrets.

In 1949, while Forrester was battling to prepare the country's armed forces for such eventualities as the Korean attack, Truman fired him and brought in Louis Johnson as Defense Secretary to implement the politically expedient policy of retrenchment.

Despite the handicaps of censorship, however, the published version of the diaries should convey an inspiring portrait of a type of American who may fast be disappearing—a patriotic public servant with wisdom. And between the lines, perhaps, there will be new clues to the individual himself—a complex personality beset by all the dilemmas of his time.

Jim Forrester—his mother always called him Vincent—was reared at Beacon, N. Y., on the Hudson River. His father, a modestly successful contractor, was a devout Catholic born in Ireland, and a Cleveland Democrat. Because he was the bantam in a family of 6-footers, Jim Forrester developed the pug-nacious drive that sent him bounding through life with an energy that dismayed his friends as well as his competitors. His broken nose, suffered in an early boxing match, gave him his scarred-bulldog look. At Princeton, he was the sort of student who not only works his way through school, but accumulates money and influential friends in the process.

Before he was 50, Forrester had reached the traditional goals of the ambitious American boy: he had made a million dollars in Wall Street; he had traveled extensively and attained a confident, world viewpoint; he had married and reared two sons; he was the \$180,000-a-year president of Dillon, Read & Co.; and he was ready to quit business and serve his country when it needed him in a crisis.

When Roosevelt made him Assistant Secretary of the Navy, he quickly attracted attention; he had the fiercest energy ever seen in Washington. He'd dictate letters while riding to the golf course; then he'd go charging around the course, often alone and in the rain, determined to keep physically fit.

He was capable, on occasion, of being quiet and warm, as when he sometimes sat over luncheon and talked with a close friend like Navy chaplain Msgr. Maurice S. Sheehy, of Catholic University.

What made Forrester appear most unusual in Washington was that when World War II ended, everybody but him relaxed to celebrate the peace. Indeed, he seemed to gain momentum with the peace; he refused to accept peace as a reality, and instead went charging along as though the war had reached a deadlier stage.

In December 1947, when France was paralyzed by a general transportation strike, Forrester summoned his most trusted friends to Washington and told them that necessity demanded the use of dollars in Europe for bribes. He explained that he had spent all the Defense Department's "nonvoucherable funds" as well as much of his own money and that more was needed. His friends produced \$50,000 immediately; the money was carried that night to Paris by a Naval intelligence officer and paid the next day to a prominent Communist leader. The strike ended within 12 hours.

In the spring of 1948, during the Italian elections, Forrester acted in the same forthright manner. He summoned his friends and told them that the election would be lost unless dollars were used to overmatch Red

payments to Italian propagandists. His friends produced what is believed to be in excess of a million dollars, and this money was carried in cash to Italy and paid out in the most effective manner.

Before he permitted large dollar contributions to the De Gasperi campaign fund, Forrestal received a promise that never, under any circumstances, would De Gasperi allow Communists in his government. This was at a time when representatives of our State Department were still advocating the formation of coalitions with Communists.

In addition to private money, Forrestal employed deception in Italy. He had no authority to give American tanks to the Italians, but he was, with authority, shipping tanks to Greece. He arranged for freighters loaded with Greece-bound tanks to refuel at Naples, and while the ships were refueling, American troops in civilian clothes "broke in" the tanks by driving them down Italian streets in parades with Italian soldiers, thus giving the impression that the tanks had been delivered to Italy.

After the election, an Italian cardinal declared: "The Communists blame Mr. Forrestal for this defeat. They have marked him as their No. 1 enemy. He understands them too well."

It was during the Italian elections that the pro-Communists in America began plotting Forrestal's destruction. Forrestal made his most powerful enemies, however, when he declined to take an active role in trying to reelect Truman. This enraged the political gang around the White House, and immediately after Truman's inauguration in 1949, they launched the scurrilous get-Forrestal campaign that resulted in his discharge, his crack-up, and his death.

The country has never witnessed a more dishonest smear campaign. Forrestal was accused of having defrauded the Government in a tax case. He was a Fascist, a warmonger, a racist, a bedfellow of I. G. Farbenindustrie, a dealer in near eastern oil. As a climax, Drew Pearson screamed that Forrestal was a personal coward, that he had once run out of his house and abandoned his wife to burglars.

The smear effort raged through January, February, and March, and by March Forrestal appeared dazed and depressed. On April 1, Forrestal attended the swearing-in ceremony for his successor. He wept openly. The President insisted on decorating him—and Forrestal wept while the President was pinning on the medal, for he considered the gesture an insult. He walked back with Admiral Louis Denfeld, and told the admiral he was going to Florida to play some golf.

On April 5, Ferdinand Eberstadt in Washington phoned Robert A. Lovett in Hobe Sound, Fla. Mr. Eberstadt reported that Forrestal was ill.

Four hours later, just at dusk, a big Air Force Constellation, the *Dew Drop*, circled and landed at a small, deserted field near Hobe Sound. Waiting was a single automobile in which were Mr. and Mrs. Lovett and Mrs. Forrestal. The door of the airplane opened, and a small ladder was dropped.

"I looked up and saw him standing in the door," Mr. Lovett recalls, "and he looked so pitiful. He was alone. And he didn't look like the man I had known at all. He looked like a little, old Irishman. His eyes were sunk, and I couldn't see his upper lip. As he came stumbling down that ladder, I reached up and caught him under the arms."

After he had greeted the two women, Forrestal stood under the tail of the airplane and told Mr. Lovett that "they" had got him, that he was being followed, that his telephones were tapped, and he broke into tears as he said: "They're going to catch us unprepared, Bob; American soldiers will be dying in a year."

During the evening he was quiet, but the following day he was worse. Mr. Lovett telephoned Washington and next day

Forrestal's personal attorney, John Cahill, of New York, arrived with Dr. William Menninger and Dr. George Raines. The illness was diagnosed as occupational fatigue, and Forrestal was returned to the Naval Hospital.

Perhaps the diaries will shed some light on what happened during the 7 weeks Forrestal was at Bethesda.

Forrestal, in his sixteenth-floor suite, spent most of his time entirely alone. Mrs. Forrestal sailed for Europe on April 12. Two of the people who visited the hospital were his older brother, Henry Forrestal, and Monsignor Sheehy.

Early in 1949, Forrestal had asked Father Sheehy, along with his brother, to help him return to the Catholic Church. To facilitate this return, some investigation had been made into Mrs. Forrestal's previous divorce.

Forrestal was admitted to the hospital by Capt. B. W. Hogan, and Captain Hogan noted that Forrestal insisted on being listed as a Catholic. His first request was to see Father Sheehy. This request was noted by Captain Hogan, but for reasons not yet explained, Captain Raines, the psychiatrist in charge, kept delaying a meeting between Forrestal and Father Sheehy.

On April 12, Henry Forrestal visited the hospital and talked with his brother as well as with Captains Hogan and Raines.

"Jim looked better than I expected," Henry Forrestal recalls. "His eyes seemed clear; he was sharp and incisive. He said, 'I'll be all right. We'll pull out of this.'"

What worried Henry Forrestal was the confinement in Bethesda. He told Captains Hogan and Raines: "What my brother needs is not to be cooped up there on the sixteenth floor. He needs to be on an estate somewhere, among friends, where he can walk around in the sun. He has been an exceedingly active man."

Mr. Forrestal asked Captain Raines, "Is my brother fundamentally okay?" Captain Raines said, "Yes."

Henry Forrestal also told the doctors that his brother wished to talk with Father Sheehy. Captain Hogan replied, according to Mr. Forrestal: "Yes, he has asked to see the father several times. And, of course, he will."

On May 10, 11, and 12 Henry Forrestal again visited the hospital. Meanwhile Father Sheehy had visited the hospital six times, each time asking to be allowed to see Forrestal and each time being denied permission.

Father Sheehy got the impression that the doctors were under orders in the case, so he sought the aid of John L. Sullivan, Secretary of the Navy. Mr. Sullivan called Dr. Raines and was assured that Father Sheehy could see the patient in time. But the time never came.

Henry Forrestal had a travel reservation to Washington for Sunday, May 22. He was going to make another effort to obtain his brother's release. But this effort, too, was too late.

Around midnight on Saturday, May 21, high up in the white monolith of the hospital, Forrestal sat reading Greek poetry and thinking back over his life. As he reflected, with his frustrations welling up inside him, he apparently concluded that he had lost his reasons for being.

He slowly read and pondered the chorus from Sophocles' *Ajax*:

"Oh, when pride of Gracia's noblest race,
Wanders, as now, in darkness and disgrace,
When Reason's day
Sets rayless, joyless, quenched in cold decay,
Better to die, and sleep
The never-waking sleep, than linger on,
And dare to live, when the soul's life is gone."

Forrestal then laid aside his book, pulled his robe around him, peeped cautiously into

the hall, then dashed into a pantry, shoved out a screen, and plunged to his death.

The greatness of men is determined by what happens after they die. If events disclose that they were possessed of vision, then they were great and valuable; if only trouble comes as the result of their decisions, then they were less than great. By this rule, Forrestal will probably be acclaimed a great American long after the lesser men who contributed to his destruction have been forgotten.

Aid for Nationalist China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 6, 1951

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, we are constantly told of the billions we gave to help Nationalist China. I ask unanimous consent to reprint in the *Record* an article by Ching-fan Chen which appeared in the *China Monthly* for November 1949. It will help put us on guard against rosy figures of aid to the Chinese Government on Formosa.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

MONEY DOWN THE DRAIN?

(By Ching-fan Chen)

Many newspapers and columnists have complained that the United States has poured billions of dollars down the drain in China during the last decade. But was this money wasted? Or has it been used for the purposes intended?

Financial transactions are officially estimated by the American Government at three billions and a half, but many debatable items are included. For example, nearly all the loans made before Pearl Harbor, or prewar loans, were repaid. There is a difference of \$600,000,000 in the Chinese and the American estimates of the postwar lend-lease. Part of the money was used to repatriate the Japanese in the China-Burma-India theater and part of lend-lease supplies sent for Chinese account to India was diverted to British and Indian forces, chargeable against Allies other than China. Finally, nearly half of the amount listed as surplus property to China was repayment due China for wartime maintenance of American Armed Forces. The final total is about two billions, of which only one billion went to China during the period of American-Japanese fighting.

Beginning in 1938, American financial advances to China have fallen into three classes. Prewar loans were commodity credits, most of which have been repaid, sometimes well ahead of schedule. Financial advances in the war period included lend-lease and inter-Treasury credit. Financial transactions in the postwar period included surplus property arrangement plus Export-Import Bank credits, relief grants, and the China-aid program which is still going on.

All these advances were motivated by commercial, military, and diplomatic calculations. Prewar loans were made to strengthen the American domestic economy in the depression of 1937 and 1938 and to help China in its war against Japan. After Pearl Harbor, financial advances were made because, China, worn out from four-and-a-half years of single-handed fighting against the Japanese, was needed as an ally in the war against Japan. Postwar advances, among other reasons, were made to bolster the

reconversion of the United States from a war to a peace economy, to repatriate the Japanese in China, and to prevent the growth of anarchy along the China coast, the traditional center of Chinese trade with the Western World and of western business with China.

Pre-Pearl Harbor advances, amounting to \$120,000,000, bore interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum. They included four barter credits; that is, the tung oil loan of \$25,000,000 was made to support the Chinese fighting spirit; the tin loan of \$20,000,000 to champion the National Government of China and to denounce the puppet government of Ching-wei Wang in March 1940; the tungsten loan of \$25,000,000 to react against the Japanese occupied northern Indochina in September, after the fall of France; and the metals loan of \$50,000,000 to negate the Japanese formal recognition of the Ching-wei Wang puppet regime at the end of 1940. These credits were for purchase of American trucks, gasoline, chemicals, and construction materials for China's war needs. They were repaid in commodities; that is, America swapped her credits for China's tung oil, and strategic materials, such as tin, tungsten, and antimony, all of them considered vital to America's national defense.

The tung oil loan was authorized in December 1938, after the Japanese had occupied the key commercial cities, Canton and Hankow along the Yangtze River. With Japan already in control of nearly all the southeastern part of China, American commercial rights and interests in China were jeopardized. The provisions attached to the tung oil loan agreement are typical of American prewar advances. First of all, it was a "tied loan." Every dollar lent had to be spent in the United States. China could buy only American agricultural and manufactured products. Even China's receipts from the sale of tung oil after paying the loan had to be spent in the United States. Under this arrangement, each dollar advance by the American Government would lead to the sale of \$3 worth of American products. In addition, all shipments had to be made in American vessels. Finally, insurance had to be placed with American underwriters, and insurance premiums were collected by their firms.

After the battle of Britain had forestalled a quick Axis victory, the lend-lease bill of March 1941, "An act to promote the defense of the United States," was designed to trade material aid to Britain and Greece for time, so that the United States could prepare its own defense. Lend-lease was not extended to China until 2 months later, that is in May 1941.

Pearl Harbor shortened the time of preparation, and the military posture of the Allies was poor. On December 13, Guam, and on December 24, 1941, Wake fell to the Japanese. The Japanese quickly overran the Philippines. Hong Kong was taken by the Japanese on December 25, 1941, and the mainland of the Malay Peninsula was abandoned by British forces at the end of the year. In February 1942, Singapore was taken by the Japanese with the capture of something over 60,000 British troops, and much equipment. This was one of the greatest single British defeats of the war.

In order to help China fight the common foe, she had to be strengthened and encouraged. Assistance during the war years was mostly granted under lend-lease. Lend-lease aid to China from 1941 to the most recent date available is officially listed as \$1,627,000,000, although actual aid received by China was less. Wartime lend-lease allotments to China were at most \$846,000,000, or 1 percent of the total. This compares with eleven billion to Russia, where transportation difficulties were almost as great. Lend-lease to China, during 1941 through 1944, ranged between \$90,000,000 and \$40,-

000,000 a year. If a curve were to be plotted with the figures for these years of Allied warfare in the Far East, it would be a curve of descending order, starting with \$88,000,000 for the lend-lease period of March 1942, whereas China's resistance to Japanese aggression was an up-hill fight, getting more and more bitter and costly.

Comparing lend-lease aid to various countries, the United Kingdom had the lion's share, thirty-one billion, or 63 percent. Soviet Russia stood next to the United Kingdom with eleven billion, or 22 percent. France and its possessions received three billion. China, the first and most populous country to resist the Axis early in 1931, having received 1 percent of wartime lend-lease, got, according to the highest estimates, including postwar lend-lease, \$1,627,000,000, that is, 3 percent of total lend-lease aid.

Unfortunately, lend-lease to China disturbed Allied relations during China's darkest hours. In the summer of 1944, when the Japanese were making a last attempt to knock China out of the war, Winston Churchill, in a speech in September, emphasized that though China had received lavish American help, she suffered severe military reverses. Statistics refute the charges of lavish aid, and the severe military reverses were in part due to the heavy losses China suffered when the United Kingdom closed the Burma Road and abandoned Hong Kong and Singapore.

After VE-day lend-lease to China was increased. It amounted to a billion—war and postwar—in 1945. This amount was partly used to evacuate the Japanese in the China-Burma-India theater; to that extent, it should not have been considered a proper charge to the Chinese account only.

Before the war ended, the Yalta "trade of China's territory" was made by Roosevelt and Stalin. Russia's claim to the restitution of her 1904 "sphere of influence" was granted, and China had to give up lands, rights, and interests vital to her national defense and security. After the Soviet Army had occupied Manchuria, it took war booty estimated by American officials at around two to three billion dollars. These industrial plants and equipment were essential to China's postwar reconstruction. Their loss more than cancels all American war and postwar aids to China.

Regarded as the "financial counterpart of lend-leasing war materials," an inter-Treasury credit of \$500,000,000 was granted to China in February 1942. Two-fifths of this credit was used as backing for dollar certificates and victory dollar bonds issued to the public in China. The purpose was to check inflation. Another \$220,000,000 was used to purchase gold in the United States for free market sale, an unsuccessful attempt to halt inflation. Of the balance, \$55,000,000 was spent for printing Chinese bank notes in the United States, and \$25,000,000 for importing textiles into China.

Postwar financial transactions included sale of surplus property, the Export-Import Bank credits, the foreign relief program, and the China aid program of 1948. Surplus properties summarized the various fixed installations and movable properties transferred to China from the United States Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission. They included the bulk sale agreement of 1946 amounting to \$175,000,000, the United States Navy vessels transfer estimated at procurement cost of \$141,000,000 and other items. These properties were stored on Pacific islands and in the China-Burma-India theater. They were scattered, often left in the open and not well guarded. Due to the deterioration of these supplies, their value dropped and though they could not be considered as merely scrap, they were not in good shape. It would have been more expensive to ship these materials back to the United States than to sell them where they were

stored. Furthermore, disposal of these supplies facilitated the repatriation of American personnel.

Total surplus property transactions amounted to \$381,000,000 at the highest estimate. Of this, \$205,000,000 was payment to China for outlay she had made, including the 1946 bulk sale agreement for nonmilitary supplies valued at \$175,000,000. The actual negotiations on that agreement were complex. An item of \$150,000,000 was due China from the United States for wartime supplies to the American Armed Forces. Another \$35,000,000 was due from the American Government for the expense of, and the purchase of properties for the embassy and consulates, and \$20,000,000 was made available for the Sino-American cultural and educational program. The balance of \$30,000,000 covered American payments for cost of shipping and technical services arising out of the United States surplus property transfer. In other words, of \$381,000,000 charged as surplus property under aid to China, not more than half were gratuitous.

Referring to the prices charged to the surplus property transaction, a comparative study shows sales to India at 7 cents on the dollar, and to the United Kingdom, Greece, and Turkey at 10 cents on the dollar. China paid 20 cents on the dollar.

After the war, loans of \$82,000,000 were extended by the Export-Import Bank for seven different projects involving the purchase of industrial and transportation equipment and of textiles. At the end of 1948, \$65,000,000 was drawn and \$12,000,000 repaid.

Since 1947 the American Government has granted \$46,000,000 for relief work in China. Eighty percent was spent on food, and the remainder for shipping cost, medical supplies, seeds and pesticides. Food was rationed and sold at low prices, and food sales were to be spent for relief work in China.

The China aid program of 1948 had a fund of \$400,000,000. Of this, \$275,000,000 was for use by the Economic Cooperation Administration for economic aid, and \$125,000,000 was additional assistance for military supplies. The purpose of this program was to help retard economic deterioration and to provide a breathing space in which the National Government could stabilize her economic and military situation. In the field of economic aid, both rural and industrial, plans have been projected.

Of the total \$275,000,000, the following three major programs were under consideration: Namely, \$204,000,000 for commodity purchase, such as cotton, food, petroleum, fertilizer, and coal; \$67,500,000 for industrial replacement and reconstruction; and \$2,500,000 for rural projects. Less than \$200,000,000 has been spent of this \$275,000,000, and more than \$80,000,000 is still undisbursed. Of \$125,000,000 military grants, the American Government has allocated the total sum, but the latest figures for the end of 1948 show that only half the amount of materials sold has been shipped to China.

Of American financial advances to China in the last decade, the four prewar commodity credits have been almost fully repaid. Lend-lease included some items not properly charged to the Chinese account. Of the postwar financial transactions, surplus property barely balanced the American debts due China; \$12,000,000 has been repaid; and \$100,000,000 has not been disbursed to China. This factual presentation suggests that the money did not go down the drain; if any did, it was peanuts.

Certainly, \$2,000,000,000 of financial advances to China for the last 12 years looks like a large sum of money. Even one billion, i. e., what China really received since Pearl Harbor, is a great deal, though only equal to the yearly United States postwar expense on Japan.

Yet, the Chinese people have made a substantial contribution to the defeat of our

common enemy. In the Second World War, the fighting in China held down 2,000,000 Japanese soldiers who might have been deployed elsewhere to the discomfiture of China's allies. Victory in Europe was possible, because China held down the Axis forces in the Pacific and the China-Burma-India theater. One should not forget how close the German armies in the Caucasus came to combining forces with the Japanese who were attacking India. If the Japanese had attacked Russia with their forces at the time of Stalingrad, how far would the German armies have penetrated into Russia?

Chinese direct war casualties were conservatively estimated at more than 10,000,000, of which 4,000,000 soldiers were dead, wounded, and missing, and 6,000,000 civilians were killed. The number of civilians who were wounded or who died from starvation is estimated at many times these figures. The Chinese people think that they have paid a heavy price to help save Europe which is nearer and closer to the United States. After all the factors are considered, can we still claim that the United States dollars spent on China were totally wasted?

Voting "No" on Ruinous Military Outlays Strikes a Responsive Chord

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial from the Council Bluffs Nonpareil, one of the leading dailies in the State of Iowa:

AN UNUSUAL CONGRESSMAN

Congressman HOWARD BUFFETT, of Nebraska, was one of two members of the House of Representatives who voted against the \$56,000,000,000 military appropriation.

In his report to the voters of his district this week, he tells why he did it.

Britain, France, Canada, Italy, Belgium, Holland, our principal allies are spending only about \$9,000,000,000 this year on defense. Part of that they get in free gifts from the United States.

The \$56,000,000,000 is not all the United States is spending for military purposes. It doesn't include the costs of the Korean war, billions for defense housing, and other billions for air bases all over the world, etc., etc.

Of course it doesn't include the billions we are giving other countries for economic rehabilitation.

Congressman BUFFETT voted against the \$56,000,000,000 military appropriation bill because he believed we are overcommitting our economic strength and jeopardizing our economic system.

He suggests we are making the same mistake the French made between 1918 and 1939. They voted so much to the military that the civilian economy of France came apart at the seams. The result was their national defense became a hollow shell.

BUFFETT believes a vote that overloads America is a blow against America, a victory for communism.

He finds no evidence that we can carry on current military spending without ruining our economic system, so he votes against reckless spending.

National security, as he sees it, depends upon the integrity of the dollar and a free

economic system, just as much as it does on radar, jet planes, and the atom bomb.

He is well aware that his stand isn't popular with a lot of people. Many Members of Congress, he observes, believe a "No" vote on any appropriation label "military" is like taking carboic acid. They regard such a vote as political suicide.

"Maybe it is," he says. "That factor is not important, except as the Member regards his own reelection as important to the Nation."

An unusual Congressman, HOWARD BUFFETT. When he believes anything he stands foursquare and votes accordingly.

The future of our country would be a lot brighter if there were more Congressmen like HOWARD BUFFETT.

Communists in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 6, 1951

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Our New Privileged Class" by Eugene Lyons, published in the September 1951 issue of the American Legion magazine. It deals with Communists in the United States.

I have been informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make three and one-fourth pages in the RECORD, at a cost of \$266.50.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR NEW PRIVILEGED CLASS

(By Eugene Lyons)

Late and slowly, a shocked America is becoming conscious of the nature and size of the Red conspiracy in its midst. It is natural, under the circumstances, that Communists and their fellow-travelers should find the going tougher; that the pink past of a few actors, public officials, scientists, and teachers should catch up with them.

Here and there some dabbler in treason, or outright Communist, is dislodged from a spot where he worked Red mischief with impunity. Here and there an institution long infested by Kremlin termites takes measures, in simple self-defense, to smoke them out. Because the problem is new for America, because the very survival of our Republic is at stake, the process is not always free of error and excess.

But the notion that merely to be accused of Communist affiliations brings down the lightning of society's wrath is just untrue. It is a propaganda myth, cunningly promoted for the purpose of shielding the conspirators.

For every crimson professor flushed out, a hundred of his ilk continue to mold the mind of our youth. Scientists clearly implicated in the Soviet atomic thefts remain free to ply their trade. Men and women publicly identified as habitual Red-fronters still write and perform for radio and television. The spectacle of known Communists brazenly defying congressional committees remains standard on Capitol Hill.

The truth of the espionage revelations by Whittaker Chambers and Elizabeth Bentley has been confirmed by jury trial in every

instance when it was thus tested; yet nearly all those whom they named carry on unmolested. Virtually all the organizations identified as subversive by the Department of Justice are doing a brisk business at the old stands; and the Supreme Court in a recent decision has made their official tagging a lot more difficult. Although Alex Bittelman and a batch of other top-shelf alien Communists were picked up for deportation over 3 years ago, most of them are still here and free to exploit the opportunity. It appears that Uncle Sam, who has no trouble deporting hundreds of thousands of ordinary alien criminals and others illegally in the country, is always stymied when Stalin's criminal agents are in question.

On the rare occasion when a Kremlin "plant" is exposed and expelled from some sensitive spot, cries of anguish rend the air. We are warned that the whole structure of American freedom is about to cave in. The average American, deeply concerned by any threat to personal rights, is alarmed by such warnings. Before his common sense is drowned out by the choral caterwauling, let us therefore look at the whole picture.

We may begin with a true—and what's worse, a typical—story. It is about two Hollywood people who lost their jobs, in both cases because of the Communist problem. One was a writer who had battled the Reds, the other an actress who played footsie with the Reds. Now you would expect, in ordinary logic, that the plight of the jobless anti-Communist would stir up at least a gust of indignation, while the discomfiture of the woman accused of procommunism would be applauded, or she would be ignored.

But amazingly—and that's the point of the story—exactly the reverse happened. The punishment meted out to the patriot made no dent on the public conscience, the chances are you've never heard of Jack Moffitt. But the dismissal of the lady in red raised a hurricane of protest and touched off an orgy of soul-searching. Overnight it lifted Jean Muir, until then relatively unknown, to the status of public martyr No. 1.

The contrast is worth pondering, as a symptom of these Alice-in-Wonderland times. Certainly two wrongs don't make a right, and no one in his senses condones unfairness. Yet it seems to me humanly understandable that Americans charged with being anti-American should meet with robust hostility in America. But that Americans known to be pro-American and anti-Soviet should be maligned and boycotted adds up to suicidal lunacy.

Mr. Moffitt for years had fought the Communist gang then in control of the Screen Writers Guild, and Muscovite monkeyshines in the movie industry generally. His ability assured him steady work notwithstanding, besides which he served brilliantly as film critic for Esquire. In the fall of 1947, however, he went too far. As a witness before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, he dared denounce Stalin's Hollywood playmates.

On returning to the cinema capital he found himself, like others among the so-called friendly or pro-American witnesses, a target for foul insults, a pariah—and without work. He was sacked by Esquire and no more assignments came to him from the studios. Nobody seemed to notice, let alone protest, this injustice and the victim retired to lick his wounds in obscurity. Fortunately he has begun to emerge from that obscurity through his anti-Communist column, the Cracker Barrel, in the Los Angeles Herald and Express.

The Jean Muir side of the story is all too celebrated. To people in show business, fighting party-line influences in actors' guilds, she was known chiefly as a bitter and fervid adversary. Last year a documented compilation of radio and TV people

mixed up in Red-front enterprises, Red Channels, was published by Counterattack, a weekly newsletter dedicated to exposing Communist skulduggery. Miss Muir appeared in the line-up, along with a few items from her political biography.

When she was assigned, soon thereafter, to a role in the television version of the Aldrich Family show—displacing Lois Wilson, a forthright foe of the Communists who had carried the role competently on the radio—a number of irate citizens protested to the sponsors. The latter proceeded, maybe too hastily, to cancel the assignment, paying her off in full, reputedly to the tune of \$10,000.

Instantly the incident was seized upon by the left-wing howling squads in the press and on the air. Their carrying power again proved awe-inspiring, drawing impassioned echoes not merely in the southpaw press but in papers like the New York Times. In record speed the affair was belloyed into a cause célèbre. The Muir name became a banner, a slogan, and a club with which to beat "Red baiters."

In the floodtide of angry editorials, resolutions, forum arguments, sermons, everyone overlooked the minor fact that the Red Channels information was substantially correct, that Miss Muir had indeed figured as vice president of the subversive Congress of American Women, and sponsored and supported other Stalinoid outfits. Counterattack, driven by the furor to dig more deeply into the lady's career, dredged up and published a dozen or so additional samples of her fellow-traveling—which the press did not deign to report. Nor did the people who were doing the protesting notice that the actress, having threatened to file libel suits, discreetly refrained from doing so, although her spouse is a lawyer.

The Muir uproar, we may be sure, sounded ironical to the anti-Communist Mofitts—to the throng of writers, artists, educators, and just Americans who had been abused and penalized for attacking the Kremlin and its obscene works. They could not help recalling that there had been no hollering about justice and jobs, no storms of sympathy, when they were being pushed around by Stalinists entrenched in the publishing and entertainment fields, on the campuses, in Government agencies.

The villain of the piece, of course, was Counterattack, put out by ex-FBI men who specialize in the underworld of Red subversion. And here we must consider another Alice-in-Wonderland contrast.

Exposure—by private groups—of people considered dangerous to the community is hardly a new phenomenon. The Better Business Bureaus have been doing that for the past 30 years, with the support of the courts and public opinion. They have warned against swindlers of every variety, naming names. But no one has screamed "private vigilantes" at them—that smear was reserved for Counterattack, which has exposed ideological swindlers and confidence men whose political rackets are infinitely more dangerous to American society.

At the political end, a good many private organizations—Friends of Democracy, for instance, and the Antidefamation League—have long been exposing alleged subversives of the non-Communist brands. In 1944, to cite a specific case, Friends of Democracy filed with the Civil Service Commission a list of several thousand persons it accused of being Fascist, among them eminent Americans who were outraged by the charge.

We need not enter here into the pros and cons of such exposures. The significant fact is this: The papers and people who ganged up on Red Channels were strangely silent about similar and far more reckless listings of non-Communist types of subversives by other private groups. Even in the war years, when the label of Fascist was far more damaging than the Red label today, they somehow for-

got to lambast outfits doing the Red Channels type of job on a larger scale.

Not until the exposures hit the Stalinist gentry, apparently, were the alarms about the Bill of Rights, due process and job tenure sounded. Can we be blamed for surmising that some of the howlers, at any rate, are more concerned with protecting the Communists than protecting personal freedoms?

Consider yet another contrast, this one in the area of religion. Two men of the cloth, Rabbi Benjamin Schultz and Rev. John Howard Melish, both lost their pulpits in recent years—the rabbi for attacking the Communists, the rector for defending them. Whatever the rights and wrongs of these cases, we might expect normal Americans to rally around the patriotic rabbi and to denounce the clerical fellow traveler. But once more precisely the reverse came to pass.

Dr. Melish was removed as rector of a Brooklyn church by his Protestant Episcopal bishop. The conflict revolved around the frankly pro-Soviet activities of the clergyman's son and assistant, Rev. William Howard Melish, then head of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship and a familiar figure in other pro-Soviet undertakings.

Quickly the Melish episode was inflated by liberal publicity into a burning challenge to freedom of faith. There was a spate of sympathetic editorials. Thousands of clergymen were mobilized to support the rector's legal battle for reinstatement. Though he lost in the courts, he was victor all the same: at this writing it appears that part of the congregation is trying to install the Red-fronting son as successor to the father.

Benjamin Schultz, rabbi of Temple Emanuel in Yonkers, N. Y., for over 12 years, had long been troubled by the progress of Communist corrosion in religious life, Jewish and Christian alike. In October 1947, he therefore wrote three articles in the New York World-Telegram documenting and warning against this danger. It was a sober, balanced, irrefutable presentment.

Punishment followed swiftly. The Yonkers temple fired the rabbi within a month after the articles appeared, and he has been without a permanent pulpit since. The Leftist press, reinforced by a vile whispering campaign, impugned his character and branded him a "Fascist." In effect his pulpit career was wrecked.

Neither the civil libertarians nor the press, neither the commentators so sensitive on issues of thought control nor the clergy came to his defense. Rabbi Schultz had shown the articles on the Jewish phase of the subject in advance to the Anti-Defamation League, and made the few minor corrections it suggested. Yet when the rabbi became director of a newly formed American Jewish League Against Communism, the Anti-Defamation League released a vicious attack on him; befuddled little men in other Jewish organizations picked up the cue and to this day continue to take swipes at Rabbi Schultz.

How does it happen that public opinion is always aroused in behalf of the Melishes and Muirs, rarely on behalf of victimized foes of communism? The answer is that this is no accident. It is the result of careful party-line strategy, organized and staffed by experts. There is an array of Commie-front pressure groups, their agents spread through the land, trigger-ready to defend the fellow-traveler or outright Communist who gets into hot water. Because these groups fly the flags of civil rights and justice, they can always round up the support of people honestly concerned with such values.

But the decent American who suffers at the hands of Sovieteering enemies stands almost alone. There are no patriotic counterparts of the Civil Rights Congress, the

Lawyers' Guild, the Committee for the First Amendment, to mention a few of the party-line "defense" groups. There is no one whose task it is to publicize interference with the livelihoods and personal freedoms of anti-Communists. The American Civil Liberties Union, which rushes into action to defend the lowliest Communist in trouble in the backwoods of Arkansas, remains as calm as a Buddha when anti-Communists are in difficulties.

When Mrs. Mester McCullough faced ruinous libel suits—her reward for protesting against pinko entertainers in her own community—there was no society geared to share her burden. Had she been a Muscovite fellow traveler, there would have been a great "National Committee To Defend Mrs. McCullough," you may be sure, with hundreds of ministers, professors, artists, and other "prominent Americans" on its letterheads and its fund-raising activities. Neither did anyone give a helping hand to Mrs. Lela Rogers, mother of Ginger Rogers, when her attack on Red marauders netted her a libel suit.

The late James McGuinness was the boldest fighter against movie-land Reds; he compounded this "crime" by testifying against them in Washington. Soon thereafter he was eased out by M-G-M. His friends insist that this expulsion hastened McGuinness' untimely death. Be that as it may, the fact is that there was no outcry such as accompanies the loss of a job by prominent pro-Communists.

Belatedly the country begins to take the measure of the ersatz revolution that came to Hollywood. Those de luxe proletarians and three-car peasants, paying the Union Square racketeers for the fun of playing at cocktail communism, may seem comical to normal minds. The stuff of a great farce awaits the hand of a Morrie Ryskind. But it has been no joke to actors, writers, directors who refused to conform.

Only those close to the scene know how the disciplined, ruthless Red minority ruled the roost for a dozen years and more; how they beat down newcomers unwilling to toe the party line; how they logrolled one another into jobs and power. Ten years ago, in *The Red Decade*, I wrote of Hollywood:

"Under the tomfoolery there was plenty of tough self-interest. For the younger members of the colony, avid for the fatter fleshpots, Stalinism became the short cut to success. At 'cause parties' they rubbed shoulders and bosoms with big shots they could not have met otherwise. Those who tried to detour the revolution, unless they were stars well fixed in the firmament, found themselves slipping from favor. It was at once a movement and a lobby, a religion and a racket."

Little changed in the years that followed. Not until they were kicked in the box office by congressional hearings did the movie industry leaders even bother to recognize the existence of the problem. Their attitude toward the handful of picture people who dared tell the unpleasant truth—Mofitt, McGuinness, Adolph Menjou, Fred Niblo, Jr., John Lee Mahin, Rupert Hughes, Ryskind, and the rest—was especially shabby. A local author and college instructor who knows the score, Oliver Carlson, in an article in *Plain Talk* (August 1949), explained with respect to the friendly witnesses:

"They have suffered long enough for being good Americans. . . . The movie moguls did nothing to protect them from the insults, slanders, and character assassinations of the pro-Communist stooges within the industry. On the contrary, aid and comfort was always forthcoming to the host of Stalin-lovers."

During the war, Patsy Ruth Miller, former star and successful writer, was assigned to do a movie script. Suddenly she was in-

formed that the deal was off. Under her insistence, the director finally blurted out the reason. "A lot of people around town," he explained, had warned him that she was a notorious Fascist and reactionary—the standard accolades she had won for fighting the crimson locusts. Postscript: there was no Miller case to match the future Muir case.

Bert Kalmer, song writer and lyricist, joined the one daring anti-Communist group in Hollywood, the Motion Picture Alliance. Immediately he found himself under furious attack as a Jewish anti-Semite. There followed a campaign of threats, both against himself and his son, then trying to get started as an actor, and Kalmer was forced to resign. Had it been just a matter of his own livelihood, he explained, he would not have yielded, but he felt he should not jeopardize his son's chances.

Referring to the activities of a couple of commissars in the movie city, labor columnist Victor Riesel wrote recently: "They conspired to kill jobs and reputations of good Americans so well that one patriotic specialist is now working as a machinist in Lockhead to keep from starving." The familiar pattern.

Even so firmly rooted a Hollywood figure as Hedda Hopper is not immune to the rawest kind of threats. Having mentioned in her column that she knew the names of Communists in the industry, she was subpoenaed by the House committee. Instantly, a piece of unsavory intimidation appeared in Variety.

Miss Hopper, the article generously conceded, has "a perfect right" to say what she wishes—but, "She is largely dependent on studio press aid for news, and there's some questioning as to whether such cooperation should be continued." The industry, Variety reminded her, doesn't like exposure of Communists "and there's no reason for a supposedly proindustry columnist to force a prolonging of the agony." In other words, her news sources would be shut off unless she held her tongue.

The article then followed up with a remark which, against the background of the Korean casualty lists, deserves some sort of Oscar for profit cynicism: "It's a long-range dollars-and-cents proposition to the studios, who have in the can valuable properties of some of those already mentioned and others on whom Miss Hopper's testimony might throw doubt." Luckily, Miss Hopper, who has been consistent in her Americanism, is not one to be scared silent.

The rest of the entertainment fields are no less polluted. Show people who stuck out their necks in defying Red cliques in the guilds knew they were staking their professional heads. When Eddie Wragge came to the fore against the comrades at an AFRA meeting in Boston, he was aware of the risks. Sure enough, when his radio show ended there were no others; he took a job in a department store.

As an index to the extent of communism among radio and TV scripters, here is what amounts to a public boast. The National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions is Moscow's leading cultural front in this country. Among other things, it runs a school for writing and advertising craftsmen, and the school advertises in the Communist Party press: "Writing taught by top radio-television script writers." Could anything be cozier?

About a year ago the ABC network produced a notable series of anti-Communist documentaries. They proved sensational and brought orchids to the brilliant young script writer, Morton Wishengrad. But he, too, apparently had to pay the price of patriotism. He had negotiated a big television contract which was about to be signed. As soon as his anti-Communist show went on the air, the contract was mysteriously called off.

Let us turn to the academic world. If there were a roster of living patriots, Prof. Arthur P. Coleman would merit an honorable place on it. Had he been a fellow traveler fired for party-line shenanigans, you would surely know the story; the howling squads would have seen to that. But it happens that he gave up his university post, after two decades of teaching, in protest against Communist shenanigans—so he got only the Moffitt-type silent treatment.

Professor Coleman's field is Polish language and literature. In 1949 the Red puppet regime of Poland offered to endow a chair at Columbia—a brazen piece of Red infiltration. The university saw fit to accept the gift. The first installment was paid by the Red Ambassador at a cocktail party in the home of Prof. Ernest J. Simmons, an ornament of the Sovietsteering crowd in those precincts.

All anti-Communist faculty members were shocked by the episode. Professor Coleman decided to do something about it. He offered his resignation, specifying the reason. It was accepted. Professor Coleman was out in the cold, and worst of all, his sacrifice went unnoticed. The same public that is driven to near-apoplexy when some Stalinist teacher is ousted blissfully ignored the whole affair.

In any inventory of Red-front supporters, professors always make up the largest single group. Names like Harlow Shapley, Ralph Barton Perry, Corliss Lamont, Dorothy Brewster are typical of hundreds; no great university is without its quota of Kremlin enthusiasts. Thus Communists are being mass-produced on our campuses, thus young minds are being softened for the Red virus.

The biographies of Alger Hiss, William Remington, Judy Coplon, Lee Pressman, Whittaker Chambers, and Miss Bentley provide case studies of the malignity; each of them was first twisted toward Moscow in college years. In the whole tongue-tied crew brought before the House committee in 1947 in connection with Soviet espionage and infiltration, there was no farmer or workman or so-called common man. Without exception they were college graduates, doctors of philosophy, summa cum laudes, and Phi Beta Kappas from Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and other great colleges.

The public indifference to this menace to its children, once more, can be explained only in Alice-in-Wonderland terms. The occasional half-hearted effort to deal with the problem churns up cyclones of synthetic anger. Physicists who figure in the atomic espionage charges for which two culprits await death in the electric chair still teach in our halls of learning; one of them, Clarence Hiskay, was recently rehired by a Brooklyn institution after he was cleared, on a technicality, of contempt for refusing to answer congressional questions about his Communist connections. Aaron Copland, a composer whose fellow-traveling record fills two full pages in Red Channels, has just been appointed to the Charles Elliot Norton Chair of Poetry, one of the most coveted professorships in Harvard. Small wonder that the bolder anti-Communists on the faculties have found the going as difficult, the abuse as vicious, as their equivalents in Hollywood.

For years the appointment of the late Benjamin Stolberg to a teaching post in Columbia was mysteriously stymied. Shortly before his death he told me in detail how Stalinoid professors had managed this boycott.

Dr. J. B. Matthews, a professor who was sidetracked into fellow-traveling, had been in terrific demand as a university lecturer as long as he toed the Moscow line. He gave 250 talks in 48 States during 17 years. But since he broke with the comrades and turned crusader against them, he has not been honored by a single invitation from any of those universities. For counterpoint,

let it be noted that Gerhart Eisler, Moscow's cocky little emissary, spoke several times on university campuses while awaiting deportation.

This strange design holds true in the Federal Government, which is still crawling with people known to have been mixed up in Red activities. Some have been technically cleared, others are shielded by statutes of limitation, but everyone in Washington—and the FBI in particular—knows they are there. The attempt to dislodge one of them is fought every inch of the way, to the drumbeat of national publicity.

Yet scores of big and little anti-Communist officials and diplomats, including eminent personalities like William C. Bullitt, Joseph C. Grew, Gen. Patrick J. Hurley, Adolf A. Berle, Jr., Arthur Bliss Lane, have been hounded out of public life without the American people seeming to be aware of it. Men directly responsible for steering American policy into the tragic cul de sac of a Sovietized China and war in Korea—Acheson, Philip Jessup, John Stewart Service, John Carter Vincent, et al.—have been retained or promoted. But Angus Ward, one of the few who stood up to the Chinese Reds, has been sentenced to the obscurity of a minor job in Africa (For the whole sad tale, see the new book by Freda Uteley, *The China Story*).

I come finally to the area with which I am most familiar, journalism and literature. Here something close to an intellectual Red terror reigned in the heyday of Communist influence. We faced a GPU of the mind that succeeded—through intrigue, calumny, and job pressures—in directing cultural opinion into totalitarian ditches.

For a great many years famous and able journalists—John T. Flynn, Stolberg, Freda Uteley, Irene Kuhn, Charles Yale Harrison, to mention a few—were virtually barred from magazines which had previously welcomed them. Their sin, of course, was that they had been rough on Stalin and his entourage. Such writers soon became aware of strange pressures against them even in the more conservative publications.

William Henry Chamberlin, long a contributor to the Atlantic, found its pages closed to him after that monthly abruptly turned left. Stolberg, long a contributor to the Saturday Evening Post, was no longer welcomed on Independence Square after a fellow traveler objected to being called a fellow traveler. The man whose job it was to promote one of my own books was overheard telling book critics, on the eve of publication, to just ignore it.

No one denies the right of editors to choose writers to their own taste. But let us keep the record straight now that sentiment at long last is veering against the Muscovite fraternity. They were pitiless and utterly cynical in persecuting anti-Communists when it was still smart—and lucrative—to be Red.

Recently I received a letter from Alice Leone-Moats, an American journalist residing in Mexico. Miss Moats was stationed in the Soviet Union in the earlier period of the Russo-German war. It was a time, let us recall, of hyperbolic adulation of everything Soviet, with Mission to Moscow setting the pitch and the OWI press-agenting the Kremlin's democracy. It called for real courage to write a sharply anti-Soviet book, which Miss Moats had the temerity to do in *Blind Date With Mars*.

"At this time," she writes me, "when there is so much talk about witch hunting and Red baiting, it might be salubrious for the American public to learn about the witch hunts and baiting to which anti-Communists have been subjected. . . . I was smeared as a Fascist, a dangerous woman, a troublemaker. My career as a political reporter was ruined as effectively as the career of some Government official dismissed

for being a commie. But I could do much less about it, and nobody sprang to my defense."

Miss Moats speaks for any number of Americans who were smeared and economically punished for forthright support of American ideals. Any one of a thousand anti-Communists could recount an Ordeal by Slander to make Owen Lattimore's whimpering lament under that title look like a picnic. The gang-up on W. L. White (Journey for Margaret, They Were Expendable, etc.) after he wrote his Report on the Russians is now a familiar classic of the comradely technique.

The commie smeared followed some writers beyond the grave, as witness the case of the late Jan Valtin. His *Out of the Night* was one of the worst blows suffered by world communism. So, in the words of a recent Saturday Evening Post editorial, "through their fellow travelers in the press and in the Government of the United States, the commies set to work." Their work paid off. It produced, among other things, an order for Valtin's deportation. Fortunately the Government could not find a judge heartless enough to ship him back to the Nazi butchers of his native land.

The main item in the smear on Valtin was the lying claim that he was an "admitted Gestapo agent." The mendacity of it was obvious to anyone who read his book. After years in Hitler's torture chambers and with the consent of his then-Communist comrades, Valtin pretended to enlist in the Gestapo; a trick enabling him to escape abroad, where he soon blasted both the red and brown afflictions. Yet when Valtin died last January, some obituaries—among them one in the New York Times—repeated the Commie calumny as if it were a fact. The long arm of Red vengeance reached into editorial offices to befoul the memory of a dead man.

The story of Angela Calomiris is well known through her book, *Red Masquerade*. Here was a girl, a photographer by trade, enlisted by the FBI to infiltrate the Communist movement in New York. This she did as a wartime duty, at considerable risk and without pay. Her role was disclosed when she appeared dramatically as a witness against the 11 top Communists.

Except in Alice's Wonderland, she would have been treated as a heroine. Through long years she had carried the hated Communist stigma as a patriotic chore. But strangely, many of those who had done business with her when she was known as a party stalwart now boycotted her. She was bitterly assailed, for instance, by the photo editor of the *Ladies' Home Journal*, one John Morris, a fellow who had lectured at the Stallhold Photo League. Never again, he informed Miss Calomiris when she came for an assignment, could he look upon her as a photographer, but only as "a spy." On the same theory he would presumably have refused to deal with Nathan Hale.

The plain fact, savored to the full only by its victims, is that until quite recently outspoken opponents of Red fascism risked their reputations, their livelihood, their peace of mind. I have alluded to typical episodes almost at random. The full story of their ordeal is too long, and to the uninformed must seem too incredible, to be recounted in an article.

Moreover, of necessity I have dealt with victims whose names mean something. But there are thousands of nameless ones, workers in Red-controlled trade-unions, "little guys" in Government agencies and school systems and private offices, whose refusal to play along with the Communists cost them their bread and butter. Anyone close to the merchant marine was aware of men with families to support who were kicked off ships for opposing the Communist clique in the maritime and communications unions. Ditto for the electrical and upholstery and office

workers unions during their period of Red control.

Today public opinion is swinging against the Communist conspirers. More and more of the shocking facts are being revealed. In the slow surge of popular resentment, a few dim-witted henchmen of treason and even innocent bystanders may be hurt. We must do our utmost to prevent this. Each time an innocent is punished, the guilty have cause for jubilation.

At the same time, however, we need to distinguish between honest champions of personal freedoms and the civil libertines interested only in shielding the conspirators, as evidenced by their failure to speak up when the shoe was on the other foot. They do not come into the court of public opinion with clean hands unless they also rallied to the defense of Mrs. McCullough, Rabbi Schultz, Ben Stolberg, Flynn, Moffitt and their kind. Sudden zeal for the Bill of Rights is suspect in persons who have not given unequivocal evidence of awareness that the greatest threat to all American values—and to civil liberties in particular—is represented by communism.

Moreover, we need to refute the exaggerations, as I said at the outset. The loudest wall of all was set up by Owen Lattimore. His case is far from closed. But already no margin for doubt remains that he played the game on the Kremlin's side, with dire consequences to his own country. Yet he is in greater demand than ever as a lecturer; according to his own account he is treated as a hero by the Johns Hopkins faculty. The only economic sanctions he could cite as a result of his "ordeal" was the cancellation of an order for some of his books by a small college.

Even Alger Hiss, after 8 out of 12 jurors in his first trial voted to jail him and the facts that ultimately convicted him were spread on the record, continued to lecture at a Quaker seminar and elsewhere. He remained on the Carnegie Foundation payroll until the day he was indicted, which was long after the famous "pumpkin papers" and his own tangled testimony had pointed to his guilt. Meanwhile Chambers had lost his job on *Time*—which was not restored to him despite his full vindication.

A few of the denizens of Red Channels have been removed from the airwaves. But the overwhelming majority of those listed continue to function as usual. One cannot switch on a radio or TV set, indeed, without hearing or seeing Philip Loeb, Leon Janney, Will Geer, and the rest.

I trust I have made clear that this is not a plea for indiscriminate boycott. On the contrary, I believe we should bend backward to avoid punishment of innocents and to help former Reds honestly desirous of living down their blunders. But we need balanced judgment and perspective.

If there are people too ready to assume the guilt of anyone accused, even more automatically do other people assume innocence and rush to smear accusers of Reds. Recall, as an example, how the New Yorker hastened to defend Hiss, then Remington, and to attack Chambers and Miss Bentley respectively. Few accused or even proven Stalin agents have suffered a tithe of the putrid abuse that has been the lot of people like Louis Budenz, Miss Bentley, Chambers, Joe Zack, Benjamin Gitlow, Paul Crouch—men and women whose Communist past is being atoned for by subsequent services to their country.

We must give no quarter to excess. But the greater danger is that the organized wailing and howling may put brakes on—or even paralyze—the effort to unmask the Red conspiracy. For this, let it be remembered, is the objective of the howlers and wallers. They are frightened by the fact that the old apathy and indifference of the American people seem to be breaking down at long last.

It was that apathy which made it possible for a small but energetic and disciplined minority to undermine American thinking and infiltrate American institutions. The urgent need today is for countermeasures on the part of the decent, patriotic majority. Our civic, religious, business, labor, fraternal and professional organizations, though many of them give lip service to the fight against communism, are still dragging their feet. They are content to applaud others, while doing nothing themselves.

The American Legion has a great historic opportunity to provide leadership and inspiration to the rest of our country. In helping to expose and neutralize the Communist threat it can safeguard the human values for which generations of Americans have been ready, and are still ready, to stake their lives.

We Need Immigrants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the appended article from the Catholic Digest—under the distinguished Managing Editor Father Paul Bussard—of September 1951 has been condensed from the article in the New York Times Sunday magazine of July 8, 1951. It reflects again the vital interests of Americans in the revision of our immigration policy to modernize it in order to meet the requirements of our national interest. We are engaged in a great program of self-help and mutual co-operation with practically the whole free world. This means not only defense, finance, and the movement of goods, but the free movement of peoples, as well, where they will do the most good for the development of family life, for freedom, and for human brotherhood.

WE NEED IMMIGRANTS—AMERICA GREW GREAT WHEN THE GATES WERE OPEN

(By JACOB K. JAVITS)

(Condensed from the New York Times)

The wealth of America is its people. We are a conglomerate Nation, drawn from every race of men. Out of diverse talents and traditions we have distilled something unique and priceless, the American character. That character has made us the strongest, freest Nation in history.

But by our immigration policy of the last two decades we have reduced infusions of foreign blood that have vitalized our life stream. We have adopted a policy of exclusion.

That policy was temporarily broadened in 1948 by the Displaced Persons Act, admitting an average of 205,000 immigrants a year. But when that program is completed this year we will revert to the outmoded restrictions of the past. The moment has arrived for the question: Why must this great democratic Nation, with its record of compassion for the oppressed of the world, once more slam shut the gates of hope and opportunity?

My proposal, which I will offer as Representative in Congress for the Twenty-first District (Manhattan) of New York, is a goal of not fewer than 10,000,000 new immigrants during the next 20 years at the rate of 500,000 a year. No preferential arrangements

should favor one nationality over another. We should guard against infiltrating enemies. We should guard against admitting the chronically ill and incompetent or irresponsible who might become public charges. But otherwise our gates should be open to the oppressed and uprooted peoples of the world who are willing to work and sacrifice to make a home in America.

I know that the scope of these numbers will shock many people. But I believe we have the need and capacity to absorb 10,000,000 new residents from foreign lands during the next 20 years. We should do this not only in the name of humanity but in our own enlightened self-interest.

Additions to our population by means of immigration have always produced new jobs, new consumers, and new forms of industrial expansion. Immigration brought us the wealth and talents of every race on the globe. Alexander Graham Bell and Emile Berliner immigrated here to pioneer the telephone; John Philip Holland, the submarine; John Ericsson, the ironclad steamship; David Lindquist, the electric elevator; Mathias Schwalback, the typewriter; Ottmar Mergenthaler, the linotype machine; Carl Hestrom, the motorcycle. Conrad Huber, the flashlight; Victor Bendix, the self-starter for automobiles, and Octave Chanute, the glider.

Andrew Carnegie developed our great steel industry; Herman Frasch, chemist, discovered the initial process for refining petroleum. Charles Steinmetz and Michael Pupin were the twin geniuses of electricity; Bellanca, Seversky, and Sikorsky contributed much to American preeminence in aviation. Einstein and Meitner were distinguished in atomic development, and William Knudsen was the mass-production genius of the automobile industry—to cite only a few.

States with the largest proportion of first- and second-generation immigrant families, like Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware, have shown up best in terms of per capita wealth and income and in education and social betterment. This cannot be attributed to natural resources (Rhode Island, for example, is near the top of the list but its natural resources are small).

In the face of all this we are operating under restrictions clamped down during the great antiforeign hysteria that engulfed the country after the First World War. At that time we had been frightened by the success of the revolution in Russia and were in the first great wave of isolationism.

The Immigration Act of 1924, still the law of the land, established a quota system for immigration based on national origin. The quota for each country is determined by the number of persons born in that country who were living here in 1920. Theoretically, admission of 153,174 immigrants a year is possible under the act. Actually, only about half the quota has been used or the average. The reason is that in countries with large quotas, like Great Britain, there is only a small demand for immigration. In other countries with relatively small quotas, like Poland, Italy, and Greece, there is a huge demand. This law discriminates against southern and eastern Europeans on the basis of prejudice. It is more in keeping with Nazi race theories than with our Constitution.

It was adopted in the first place as an ill-conceived defense against a nonexistent danger; we feared subversive activities from the persons thus excluded. And the law has worked immeasurable hardship and misery to millions abroad, meanwhile depriving us of the brains, skill, and productive wealth which substantial and continuing immigration would have brought.

The Displaced Persons Act, expiring next December 31, provides only temporary and inadequate relief. It represented American leadership in resettling about 1,110,000 people found in Germany, Austria, and Italy by

General Eisenhower's forces. They had been transplanted by oppressors from their native Poland, the Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and the Balkan and Baltic states. Of the 1,100,000, this country is taking in not more than 341,000, and probably only 305,000 DP's.

One of the most urgent arguments for opening our doors is the fact that our population cycle is slowing down while our age level is rising. Those now over 65 represent 7½ percent of the total population. The ratio is likely to double by 1975, although the gross increase in population will not exceed 10 to 15 percent.

That confronts us with an ominous dilemma; our declining population curve is in stark contrast to an upswing in population in most other parts of the world. Experts tell us that in another 20 years, assuming no change in our present situation, the United States with its aging population will face youthful, vigorous peoples on both sides of the ocean.

But the experts warn us, the period of alert in which we are now involved is to persist for 10, and possibly even 20 years. Our industries and farms simply have to have more workers than are promised by the currently visible supply.

We now have a leeway in our civilian labor force of only about 1,600,000 persons. The total available workers number 62,800,000. Of these 61,200,000 already have jobs. That leaves 1,600,000 unemployed—many by choice, since they normally are housewives, students, or retired persons—from whom the rapidly expanding needs of the defense program are to be met. Those needed in the next couple of years are expected to total between 3 and 4 million workers. Under the law we can meet that demand in two ways. One is to pull into the labor market the housewives, students, retired persons and physically handicapped much as we did during the Second World War. This has many obvious social disadvantages, particularly its effect on home life. It also lowers the general level of industrial efficiency and output of our country.

The second way is to increase the work week above the present average of 41 hours. It is estimated that each hour of overtime, applied throughout industry generally, is the equivalent of adding 350,000 new workers. But this is costly both in dollars and efficiency; it turns back the clock of social progress; and would be unnecessary if we followed a sensible immigration policy.

Serious labor shortages already are showing up in some areas. Demand exceeds supply, for example, for engineers and draftsmen, for machinists, metal workers, and pattern makers. In some areas there is even a shortage of semiskilled workers. Shortages in domestic help are as acute as they ever have been, and are an added deterrent to building up the work force with mothers and housewives.

Farm labor represents another critical shortage. There are 300,000 fewer farm families this year than in 1950, and the number of hired farm hands is also down. Congress has been fumbling with adjustments, but they are unrealistic and inadequate. No one seems willing to attempt a quota excluding the limit of 153,714 immigrants in any 1 year.

Against this rather negligible figure are the International Refugee Organization estimates. There are at present from three to four million workers and members of their families in Europe anxious and ready to emigrate. Some eight hundred thousand to a million can be moved for immigration in a year. This includes about two hundred and twenty-five thousand remaining DP's, perhaps one million Volksdeutschen who have been expelled from Eastern Europe by the Communists, and possibly two million surplus workers from Italy, Austria, Greece, and

the Netherlands for whom there is little prospect of full employment. The IRO has found that the cost of resettlement is only \$301.50 per person.

What stands in the way of substantial, effective reform? I find that the arguments boil down essentially to two: prejudice and economic competition.

With respect to the first of these, many of the objections are implied rather than stated. Racial and religious intolerance are involved. There is also an element of bigotry; a contempt for and distrust of all foreigners. Another quite powerful factor, one that is freely stated, is the fear that many present-day immigrants from Europe are imbued with socialist and even Communist views. They might turn out to be subversive.

On the economic side, the fear seems to be that large-scale immigration will create a future unemployment problem. The newcomers might become public charges and a drain on our social services. Another argument is that they would intensify the pressure for housing and other basic facilities already in short supply.

To the arguments, intolerance, and bigotry, there is, of course, no use of answering rationally. Such views are so contrary to our American tradition and heritage as to represent only a small minority. As to subversive or other criminal tendencies, it is highly significant that of 220,630 displaced persons admitted between July 1, 1948, and January 31, 1951, only three have been deported for cause.

The economic arguments, it seems to me, are practically self-defeating. We have always proceeded in this country on the basis that we have an economy which flourishes on increased production. As of today, we are approaching the \$300,000,000,000 level of national income, our problems of defense mobilization and civilian supply can be solved only by more production; and a deficit of manpower to run the machines and till the farms is already visible. Unless we adopt a defeatist attitude and say that a depression and mass unemployment are inevitable, there are no grounds for fearing that immigration will depress the job market in the United States, now or soon.

There is much more reason to believe that we will need these additional hands and skills and brains to keep our productive mechanism going full blast in the decades ahead.

Nor is there any problem of geographical capacity to absorb 10,000,000 immigrants over the next 20 years. Most population experts (including Lotthrop Stoddard, who helped write the present restrictive immigration law) agree that there is ample room in the United States for 200,000,000 as long as we maintain our high standard of living. But it would take us until the year 2000 to achieve that level at our present ratio of births to deaths and our present level of immigration accepted by this country.

The time has come to reform our immigration policy not according to fears but according to needs, resources, and hopes.

British Meat Ration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 6, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a

very short clipping from the Washington Post, for September 4, 1951, entitled, "British Meat Ration Boosted; Bacon Cut." The clipping states that British consumers will now be permitted to buy the magnificent quantity of 28 cents worth of meat per week. Until this week, British consumers were permitted only 25 cents worth of meat per week, so this order represents an increase in the ration. For purposes of comparison, I have learned from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics that in America the average consumer bought \$1.43 worth of meat per week in 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITISH MEAT RATION BOOSTED; BACON CUT

LONDON, September 3.—The British weekly meat ration was increased to 2 shillings' (28 cents) worth for each ration book tonight, effective September 9. The old ration was 1 shilling 10 pence (25 cents).

The Ministry of Food ordered the bacon ration cut from 4 to 3 ounces weekly.

Korea: As Seen From a Fox Hole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1951

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, having served as an Infantry battalion commander during World War II, I have maintained a soft spot in my heart and a very warm feeling for the combat infantryman. To my way of thinking, he has carried the brunt of the war, and no one knows better than he, why he is fighting. We need the other services, but when the chips are down, and it reaches the point where actual occupation of the area settles the question of whose territory it is, ours or the enemy, it is up to the infantryman to move in against the unknown.

I have read many articles covering the war in Korea written by correspondents and military writers, but when it comes to getting the true picture, you should consult the combat infantryman, the man who is part of the thin black line in the newspaper map known as the front line. For that reason, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to insert an article written by a Corp. Charles Francisco, a machine gunner on the Korean front which appeared in a nationally syndicated column. Further, many articles appear from time to time stating that our soldiers do not know why they are fighting. It is interesting to note in Corporal Francisco's article, he makes the flat statement that he and his buddies know why they are fighting.

KOREA: AS SEEN FROM A FOX HOLE

(By Corp. Charles Francisco)

IN KOREA.—What is it like in Korea? What is it like to the men who are here? I think of three things around me—mountains, loneliness, and death. I think of rotation and home and the future. And I know that

those things are in the minds and bones of most infantrymen in Korea.

As a soldier lies in his fox hole and tries to peer through the mist that covers the top of a mountain he thinks of many things. This is the war in Korea as I see it.

It seems to me that civilian writers covering the war have not made enough mention of the hills. At any rate, the hills have a major bearing on the job of the individual soldier and the entire tactical situation.

Put yourself in the place of any man here. You're no military superman. You're just an average guy carrying around 50 or 60 pounds of equipment on your back. Your job is to climb, sometimes 2,000 and 3,000 feet almost straight up, find the enemy, and either kill him or drive him off. There are no paths or footholds so you usually are forced to walk the ridge lines. That puts you right in the enemy sights. It's just a matter of when he decides to open up.

It seems to me that the fighting in Korea is much like the island warfare in the Pacific. Here each hill is an island fortress. Artillery and air soften them up, and then the infantry must go it alone.

Mountains and weather—enemies which have proved as effective against the U. N. forces as the Reds themselves. Last winter it was cold and snow. You've heard about that. So far this summer the temperature has averaged in the humid eighties. When it isn't hot, it's raining. Steady downpours for 2 and 3 days straight.

It's a strange war here in Korea. It's a strange soldier we fight. Reports from intelligence speak of such things as "the Chinese may be waiting for a full moon" or "expect an attack if we get three straight days of rain." The Chinese are superstitious. They frighten easily and they fight fanatically.

Every soldier dreads nightfall. The Reds love to infiltrate at night and launch wild whistle-blowing banzai attacks. The enemy uses his artillery most at night. Unlike most wars there are no clear-cut front lines in Korea. The enemy can be any place at any time.

A combat infantryman doesn't have much time to think about the grand philosophy of war. But the American soldier is no machine. He walks hand-in-hand with death. No matter how brave or patriotic or religious he might be he can't forget that each minute could well be his last.

I remember the first man I saw killed. We had been joking about how easy we had it. Then the artillery came in. He was dead. The same shell was close enough to have gotten me but it didn't. Incidents like these encourage the foxhole faith you read about in civilian life.

Then there's the matter of heroes. Before I entered combat I thought heroism was a rare and individual thing. Long ago that was true. But today any man who performs his duties well under fire is a hero for my money. A knight of old may have single-handedly slain dragons but a modern soldier cannot do hand-to-hand battle with shrapnel.

At least one good thing comes of war—teamwork. I don't mean the military teamwork of infantry, artillery, air, etc. Even more significant is the comradeship of men in battle. In my own regiment (Seventeenth Infantry) racial or religious prejudice is unheard of. A man soon learns to appraise the guy beside him by his courage under fire. That's where men are made.

I sometimes wonder if war isn't more of a personal fight than it seems. A man seldom has time to consider world ideals. It usually narrows down to kill or be killed. There is no pretense among men in battle. The will to live tears away the protective veil we sometimes wear in civilization. Everyone is afraid at times. But most men fight fears as they fight the enemy.

Many men now in the front lines were only recently removed from civilian life by the draft. They dream about getting back to the work they love. They worry about the long delay in their chosen careers. They wonder how it will affect their future.

Soldiers, as always, have their gripes. Rotation is wonderful, but sometimes it seems awfully slow in coming around. When they see stateside papers with Korean news mentioned briefly on page 3 they wonder if the people back home know or care why this war is being fought.

The men here know why they're fighting. I was amazed when I first arrived in Korea at the difference in attitude about the war. Sure you hear, "Why not give them the place; it isn't fit to live in anyway." But when you talk seriously with these same men, most of them will admit they were only letting off steam.

After the last big Allied offensive we discovered we can defeat the Communists no matter how many men they have. We threw back everything the Reds had to offer and we had them running when the cease-fire talks opened. We, as no one else, pray for peace. But if it doesn't come, we can still whip them.

One thing is certain. Every man here has learned the horror and waste of war. We're happy it's happening to us instead of those we love. Our only hope is that in waging this isolated war we have proved to our potential enemies that it will not pay to test our strength in our own backyard.

Diversion of Cattle and Beef

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 6, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Cattle Disappearance," from the Omaha Daily Journal-Stockman for August 30, 1951. This editorial points out how severely present OPS regulations are disrupting the normal operations of the meat packing industry.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CATTLE DISAPPEARANCE

Continuing its reports on the diversion of cattle and beef, the American Meat Institute says this week:

"For the 12th week the country's normal beef business registered severe dislocation. Last week 95 leading beef-producing plants were able to buy only 68 percent of the number of cattle they bought during the corresponding week of a year ago. In other words, their purchases were down 32 percent. At the same time during last week the receipts of cattle on 12 leading markets were down only 2 percent from the corresponding week of a year earlier. During last week the 95 plants were able to buy under OPS ceiling compliance regulations 104,479 cattle; against 153,202 they bought a year ago. Receipts at the 12 leading markets last week totaled 195,231; a year ago the receipts totaled 199,113."

Mr. DiSalle finally admits that something of the kind may be going on, and has his scouts out to detect and correct. He could

correct this deplorable situation overnight if he really wanted to, by simply getting out of the picture, which of course, he won't do so long as the law permits his monkeyshines. And as for detecting, that will prove to be for the most part wasted time and money.

National Science Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 7, 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the appropriations bill passed by the House provides for 2-percent support for basic scientific research. The modest \$14,000,000 appropriation requested for the National Science Foundation has been slashed to less than one-third of one million. This is a cut of 98 percent.

Two-percent support for basic scientific research as we move into the second half of the twentieth century, an ever increasingly scientific age, when it is imperative that we maintain our pre-eminence in science, is false economy in its most dangerous form.

I have had a part in the legislative beginnings of the foundation. The National Science Foundation idea has developed and grown over a period of nearly a decade. After the most thorough study, the foundation was established in the Eighty-first Congress.

Dr. Alan T. Waterman, an outstanding physical scientist and former chief scientist of the Office of Naval Research, was appointed director of the foundation. The foundation's 24-man board, with James Bryant Conant, president of Harvard, as chairman, includes some of the most able and distinguished men in America.

A statutory limit of \$15,000,000 was set for the current budget. An appropriation of \$14,000,000—a million dollars less than the statutory limit set by Congress—was requested. It is this amount which has been slashed by 98 percent.

Basic research, which the National Science Foundation is designed to encourage, is imperative if our store of basic knowledge, from which come all our developments in applied science for peace and war, is to be constantly built up and increased.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I shall vigorously urge the restoration of the full \$14,000,000 for the National Science Foundation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on the subject from the New York Times and one from the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times]

KILLING THE SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The House has cut by 98 percent the \$14,000,000 appropriation which was requested by the National Science Foundation. This fund was set by the foundation for the fiscal year

1952 as a modest Federal investment, but a vital one, in the scientific future of the Nation. The slash by the House is absurd. Practice of the most stringent economies in the face of a frightening military budget cannot ignore the value of science and the almost unanimously voiced appeal of the Nation's leading scientists.

The foundation, though a newcomer among Federal agencies, has been in the paper-planning stage since 1941. All the kinks have been ironed out. Last year Congress passed enacting legislation, after 9 years of study, and provided a first-year fund of \$225,000 for administrative purposes. The foundation's distinguished 24-man board, with James Bryant Conant, president of Harvard, as chairman, met six times during the winter to figure out where to put its limited funds in order to accomplish the most good. Since the Nation annually spends over \$2,000,000,000 for research in the physical sciences, a \$14,000,000 fund could not change things overnight. But the National Science Foundation was set up to provide a few dollars here and a few dollars there for "seed" money. It would support projects that just don't sound money-making to the average Federal, industrial, university, or philanthropic investor. From such unpromising-sounding ideas have come nuclear weapons and radar, as well as the sulfa drugs, penicillin, and cortisone.

In the House hearings, scientists never pressed their case in the usual way. Their request was for only \$14,000,000. This drop in the bucket drew only magnificent public indifference. The \$300,000 appropriation which was finally approved by the House is worse than useless. It will relegate the foundation's scientific staff of 30 persons to another dreary year of shuffling papers in Washington in the vague hope that something will eventually be done, but without assurance that it will be done in time.

The Senate has still to consider the scientists' request. The American Association for the Advancement of Science, among other senior scientific societies, alarmed by the House action, has taken the unprecedented step of advising its members to write their Senators. The influence of science on Congress has been proved to be negligible; perhaps the rest of us can assure the Senate Appropriations Committee that the foundation's \$14,000,000 is a sound investment.

[From the Washington Post]

FORECLOSING SCIENCE

It is astonishing in this day of \$56,000,000,000 defense budgets that the House Appropriations Committee should boggle over a \$14,000,000 fund designed to replenish the armory of scientific ideas from which defense draws its strength. In cutting the request for the National Science Foundation by 98 percent—from \$14,000,000 to \$300,000—the House committee has virtually shut the door on any effort to stimulate more basic scientific research. The \$14,000,000 asked was below the \$15,000,000 annual authorization set by Congress when it established the foundation last year. In view of the many difficulties which preceded the establishment of the foundation, this new blow is profoundly disheartening.

The foundation, under direction of Dr. Alan T. Waterman, had proposed to spend \$8,000,000 in support of basic research and \$5,000,000 for 2,100 graduate fellowships in the sciences and engineering. Some basic research is being done—by universities, by the Atomic Energy Commission, Public Health Service, Department of Agriculture and to a limited extent by the armed forces themselves. But there is no coordination, no effort to survey the field and plug the gaps. Likewise, the demands of the military are constantly increasing the need for scientists, but the supply is diminishing.

In these circumstances \$14,000,000 for the Science Foundation is not a luxury, but a remarkably small and prudent investment. The United States has been a Nation of applied science; Americans have been geniuses at developing the basic ideas borrowed from others—as, for example, on the atom bomb. But Dr. James B. Conant, who heads the foundation's advisory board, has repeatedly pointed to the need to concentrate more effort on the fundamental research of which applied science is made. The Science Foundation needs help in its job of promoting the raw material of scientific ideas without which technology alone would soon falter.

Proposed Steel Mill in New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 7, 1951

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed by my colleague, the junior Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BENTON), to the editor of the New Haven (Conn.) Register, and published in that newspaper under the headline "Senator BENTON defends support of steel mill."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR BENTON DEFENDS SUPPORT OF STEEL MILL

(A letter to the editor of the New Haven (Conn.) Register)

TO THE EDITOR OF THE REGISTER:

The Register recently reprinted an editorial from the Lakeville Journal vigorously attacking the proposed New England steel mill. In reprinting, the Register complained that I had failed to answer the Journal's questions and it also implied that the Journal's criticism was unanswerable.

I know that you are anxious to open your columns to a fair and factual discussion of the steel-mill project; the biggest and most vital industrial project ever proposed for New England, and I am only too glad to send you my views.

There is now taking place in the United States perhaps the greatest expansion in steel-making facilities this Nation has ever known. This expansion is due to the stepped-up demands of the rearmament program and also to the discovery of vast deposits of iron ore at several points along the rim of the Atlantic Ocean—notably in Labrador, Venezuela, and Africa.

These new ore deposits are bringing about a radical shift of the American steel industry, with the new mills being located closer to the Atlantic Ocean. The United States Steel Corp. is now starting construction on one of the biggest mills in the world in eastern (not western) Pennsylvania.

Some years ago, an organization of far-sighted businessmen foresaw a coming industrial shift and started laying plans to make sure that New England not only protected what it had, but also got its share of the new industrial expansion. I refer to the New England Council, one of the most representative business and industrial groups in the whole New England area. The council knew that New England had been losing its shoe and textile industries at an alarming rate and that if it lost its metal workers, because of cheaper steel available elsewhere,

the result would be little short of disastrous.

The council put up its own money to make an exhaustive study of the probable effects of Labrador ore upon the New England economy. The study made by the council was nonpartisan and nonpolitical. It was designed for one purpose only—to assemble and interpret the economic facts. The council's investigation disclosed that a ready market exists for the output of a steel mill in New England and that its construction is highly desirable to insure the economic growth of the New England area.

In its editorial, the Lakeville Journal makes the ugly sneer that the steel mill project is simply a slick scheme of my colleague and myself "to swing the State into the Jackass Camp for the good and all." Naturally the Journal had to invent this in order to tag the word "political" on the steel mill project. The Journal would not dare make this unjust accusation against the honorable and highly respected members of the New England Council. The Journal would not dare make the absurd charge that in sponsoring a steel mill for New England, the Council had nothing more in mind than to advance the fortune of the Democratic Party.

Isn't it true that the man who has a bad case usually finds a false premise on which to base it?

MAINTAINS POSITION

I readily confess my keen disappointment at the fact that the big steel companies have failed to cooperate with the New England Council and New England industry by contracting to build the New England mill. But I don't for a moment concede that this means the project is economically unsound.

The big steel companies have, of course, actively opposed the construction of a mill in New England. The fact is that these companies do not compete against each other in the traditional American sense. If you doubt this, I suggest you consult the nearest steel buyer. The result of this is a terrible economic handicap for the whole New England region.

In the last few years, steel mills have been built in California, in the sparsely settled State of Idaho, and one is now being constructed in Texas, a State industrially relatively undeveloped in contrast to Connecticut. Despite dire predictions of economic failure, the record shows that the California and Idaho mills have been highly successful and I predict the Texas mill will be so also.

New England is the oldest industrial area of the United States. Its life blood depends upon securing sufficient steel at reasonable costs to keep its shops and mills and factories in operation. The man who says Texas can support a steel mill, and Idaho and California, but New England can't, is something more than a pessimist. In my opinion, his judgment and his motives should be subjected to the sharpest scrutiny.

A thoroughgoing study of New England steel products has recently been made by H. A. Brassert & Co., admitted experts in this field, and that company found there was ample market here for a good-sized mill. It is admitted everywhere that few men in the country have had more experience than Mr. Brassert in the steel industry and on just this kind of problem.

The Lakeville editorial writer brings into the steel mill discussion a host of extraneous subjects, a custom not unusual among those not too well acquainted with the primary subject. He demands to know why he has not heard a word from me about the effect of Federal spending on the New England economy.

I shall answer that question even though the answer depresses me. The truth is that New England is booming with war orders. The \$70,000,000,000 which the Federal Government is pouring into armaments this year

has brought a kind of prosperity to our area just as it has every other section of the country.

Three or four weeks ago, as a member of the Senate Small Business Committee, I sent two investigators into New England. I was prepared to arrange hearings by a subcommittee into hardship cases. In 10 days or so they could not find enough to justify hearings. The hearings, already announced, were called off. With all our complaints, we are in a war boom.

FALSE PROSPERITY

Naturally I want New England to have its share of rearmament orders. But this is false prosperity—it is prosperity based on something fundamentally alien to the peaceful purposes of our people, and there isn't a fair-minded person in New England who thinks it can go on indefinitely.

Some day, please God, this dreadful armaments race must stop and when it does—I want New England to be in a position to compete for the peacetime markets of the world. To be in this position, we must have our steel mill. It may prove to be the steel mill—or growing concentration and reliance on insurance, education, and tourists as sources of out-of-State money. I am not prepared to surrender those great qualities of ours which, given an even break, can insure our continued industrial vitality.

The Bethlehem plant at Sparrows Point attracted more than 400 metal-fabricating plants to that immediate area. If history repeats itself in Pennsylvania, where only 200 miles away, United States Steel is now building, from where will these plants move? From New England, as seems likely for a high percentage. The public man who tries to gloss over this danger to New England's future is doing an immense disservice to his State and to his region. Many in our business community who gloss it over have no real familiarity with the problem—or have made their pile, or inherited it, and are not accustomed to thinking of the welfare of Connecticut and its people.

For New England, a steel mill is something more than a luxury: It is essential to New England's industrial future. Anyone who opposes the mill must answer this question: Is he prepared to throw in the towel on New England's industrial future?

If other sections of the United States win the right to process Labrador ore, and not New England, then we shall be compelled to reconcile ourselves to the most bitter setback in the region's economic history.

Very sincerely yours,

WILLIAM BENTON,
United States Senate.

Address by Gen. Douglas MacArthur in Cleveland, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ZALES N. ECTON

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 7, 1951

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered last night in Cleveland, Ohio, by Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is gratifying indeed to have this opportunity to address the citizens of Cleveland and of the State of Ohio—a State which

has contributed so abundantly to America's leadership both past and contemporary. Indeed, indications multiply that this leadership may even increase in the not-too-distant future.

No section of our country symbolizes more forcefully the pattern of our national progress than does this great Midwest, whose fertile fields and thriving industry combine to reflect the constructive energy of our people. You have molded a standard and pattern of life known to no other nation of the world, and I pray that we will have the vision and courage and statesmanship to keep it that way—that we will preserve an America which will provide increasing, not diminishing, opportunities for human advancement.

We have just passed another anniversary of the end of the war with Japan. Six years ago, with a few strokes of the pen, a calm descended upon the battlefields of the world and the guns grew silent.

Military victory had been achieved for our cause and men turned their thoughts from the task of mass killing to the higher duty of international restoration, from destroying to rebuilding, from destruction to construction. Everywhere in the free world they lifted up their heads and hearts in thanksgiving for the advent of a peace in which ethics and morality based upon truth and justice would thereafter fashion the universal code.

THE WORLD WAS LEFT EXPOSED

Then, more than ever in the history of the modern world, a materially strong and spiritually vibrant leadership was needed to consolidate the victory into a truly enduring peace for all of the human race. America, at the very apex of her military power, was the logical Nation to which the world turned for such leadership. It was a crucial moment—one of the greatest opportunities ever known.

But our political and military leaders failed to comprehend it. Sensitive only to the expediencies of the hour, they dissipated with reckless haste that predominant military power which was the key to the situation. Our forces were rapidly and completely demobilized and the great stores of war material which had been accumulated were disposed of with irresponsible waste and abandon.

The world was thus left exposed and vulnerable to an international communism whose long-publicized plan had been to await just such a favorable opportunity to establish dominion over the free nations. The stage had perhaps been unwittingly set in secret and most unfortunate war conferences.

The events which followed will cast their shadow upon history for all time. Peoples with long traditions of human freedom progressively fell victims to a type of international brigandage and blackmail and the so-called iron curtain descended rapidly upon large parts of Europe and Asia. As events have unfolded, the truth has become clear. Our great military victory has been offset largely because of military unpreparedness, by the political successes of the Kremlin.

Our diplomatic blunders increased as our senseless disarmament became a reality. And now the disastrous cycle is completed as those same leaders who lost to the world the one great chance it has had for enduring universal peace, frantically endeavor, by arousing a frenzy of fear throughout the land, to gear anew our energies and resources, to rebuild our dissipated strength, and to face again a future of total war.

Our need for adequate military defense, with world tensions as they were and are, is and should have been completely evident even before the end of the war. By what faith, then, can we find hope in those whose past judgments so grievously erred—who deliberately disarmed in the face of threaten-

ing communism? Can they now be blindly trusted as they so vehemently demand to set an unerring course to our future well-being and security? There are those of us who, from neither partisan affiliation nor with political purpose, think not.

INHERENT WEAKNESSES IN U. N.

At war's end the main agency for maintaining the peace became the United Nations. The organization was conceived in a common desire that the scourge of war should not again be visited upon the earth. It was dedicated to the principle that all mankind of inalienable right should live in justice and liberty and peace. It represents perhaps the noblest effort man has yet made to evolve a universal code based upon the highest of moral precepts. It became the keystone to an arch of universal hope.

Yet, in practice its efforts become increasingly doubtful of ultimate success. Its organization is inherently weak, legislatively, judicially, and executively.

It lacks legislative strength because its members, not being elected but merely appointed, are not answerable directly to their people. It lacks judicial strength because there is no accepted international code of sufficient moral authority or purpose to mould and guide its decisions. It lacks executive strength because it controls no agencies of sufficient power to enforce its mandates.

It threatens to fail, if the innate selfishness of its members does not yield to universal needs; if the mechanics of its operations are not corrected to prevent the will of one nation from counterbalancing the collective will of the others; if it does not obtain acceptance by member nations of its lawful decisions; if it does not stop obstructionist tactics, even by expulsion if necessary, of its own unruly members; if regional military alliances must be organized within its membership to undertake collective security measures against threat from other members; if it allows itself to be reduced to a mere forum for meaningless and acrimonious debate, and a springboard for propaganda.

Unless a strong and dynamic sense of responsibility emerges within its ranks capable of rallying the forces of good throughout the world; of establishing a higher moral tone of its deliberations and activities; of correcting its existing institutional and mechanical weaknesses, the United Nations may well go the way of its predecessor League of Nations and perish as a force to guide civilization.

But the great moral and spiritual purpose which animated its formation—the abolition of war from the face of the earth—will always live and a way must be found to achieve that purpose. This way cannot be found, however, if nations are so blind as not to see their own weaknesses—so weak as not to correct them.

JAPAN'S RECOVERY

In this post-war period of general failure to attain real peace one of the bright spots has been conquered Japan.

That nation and its people, long boasting of many centuries of unbroken military successes—a self-sufficient warrior race with a history of almost complete isolation from the rest of the world—at war's end was reduced largely to rubble, with its people impoverished and broken in mind, body, and spirit. The sudden and general destruction of Japanese institutions brought about by complete defeat left a spiritual vacuum in Japanese life, to be filled either by a philosophy of good, or a philosophy of evil.

Fortunately for Japan and for the free world, the country was spared the dreadful consequences of a Soviet military occupation and was brought instead within the benign guidance of the American people. Under this beneficent influence, the Japanese gradually lifted themselves from the ashes of

defeat and started to build a new nation—a nation dedicated to the pursuit of new concepts and new ideals, fashioned from a blend between the best of their own ancient and those high precepts of ethics and morals which have been the great pillars supporting America's origin and growth.

This oriental nation under the shadow of a continent plagued by the cruel misery of unending wars, pillage, and natural disasters, proved willing and adept under the guiding hand of an occupation not conceived in a spirit of vengeance or mastery of victor over vanquished, but committed to the Christian purpose of helping a defeated, bewildered, and despairing people recreate in the East a nation largely designed in the image of the West.

New Japan was thus erected upon free institutions, somewhat similar to our own, which permitted the development of a moral base which cannot fail to favorably influence the course of events in Asia for generations to come. Discarded is the traditional intolerance of human rights, the restrictions upon human liberties, the callousness to human life, and in their place have been accepted and fused into the Japanese heart many of the Christian virtues so predominantly embodied in the American character.

LAND SYSTEM HAS BEEN REFORMED

An enlightened constitution has become the great charter of Japanese liberty, with enabling laws which give full effect to its immutable precepts. The Government has become truly representative of the popular will, deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed. The principle of local autonomy has been established. This permits the balance of political power to rest with the citizen at the community level and thus serves as a constant check against the excesses of centralized authority.

The hated system of land tenure, so contributory to general unrest in Asia, has been abolished. Every farmer is now accorded the right and dignity of ownership of the land he long has tilled. He thus reaps the full fruits which result from his toil and labors with the incentive of free enterprise to maximize his effort to achieve increasing production.

Representing over a half of Japan's total population, the agriculture workers have become an invincible barrier against the advance of socialistic ideas which would relegate all to the indignity of state servitude.

Labor, through the protection of modern laws, has come into a new and heretofore unknown dignity and is making rapid strides along the course of a sound and healthful movement. The schools have been rid of the strictures upon academic freedom and public education is provided to all of the youth of the land.

Universal suffrage has been established and the women of Japan have assumed their rightful role in the political life of the nation. With dignity and resolution they have brought to bear upon public affairs the morality which centers in the home and are progressively asserting a strong and healthful influence upon the course of Japan's political destiny.

The courts are proceeding in their administrative and judicial roles with universally accepted principles of justice firmly implanted in the norm of their procedure. The police have ceased to be masters and have become, instead, servants of the people, with a decentralization in organization which permits exercise of their functions at the community, rather than national, level of government.

A POLICY OF ECONOMY

The economy of Japan has made rapid and effective advances toward the full restoration of stability and self-sufficiency and has achieved a sound basis for a frugal public administration. For the past 3 years, the

national budget has been in complete balance, with savings to permit substantial reductions in the tax load upon the people and corresponding raises in their living standard.

Japan's present course in the economy of public administration follows closely the pattern sagely advised by Thomas Jefferson when he warned in speaking of our own Government:

"I place economy among the first and most important virtues and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. To preserve our independence, we must not let our leaders load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude. The same prudence which in private life would forbid our paying our money for unexplained projects, forbids it in the disposition of public money. We are endeavoring to reduce the Government to the practice of rigid economy to avoid burdening the people and arming the magistrate with a patronage of money which might be used to corrupt the principle of government."

If Japan continues to heed this farsighted warning and our own leaders who pretend to be disciples of the Jeffersonian teachings continue to ignore it, the time may well come when the Japanese people will be firmly established within the protective folds of our own cherished liberties, while we ourselves shall have lost them because of the assumption by our leaders of that patronage of money with its consequent corruption of government against which Jefferson so clearly warned.

In such a tragic eventuality, we would be hard put to it indeed to answer the charge of our children and our children's children that we had recklessly squandered their rightful heritage of liberty, resource, and opportunity.

JAPAN'S POWER OF DEFENSE

This is but a brief outline of the new Japan which is about to be restored to a position of international dignity and equality under a peace treaty, which, as presently proposed, while far from flawless, embodies much of human justice and enlightenment.

It is a Japan which may now assume the burden of preparing its own ground defense against predatory attack and thus in short time release our own beloved divisions for return home. With our air and naval support, Japan can with no great difficulty defend its own homeland which forms so vital a sector of the island defense system buttressing freedom and peace on the Pacific. It is a Japan in which we of the free world may find an alliance which shall merit our full faith.

I realize well that there are nations who fought with us to victory while suffering grievous hurt from Japanese depredation who understandably disagree in whole or in part. It is hard for them to accept the realistic but tragic fact that in modern war the victor is also the loser. He suffers materially with the vanquished—oftimes more than does the vanquished. Indeed our own country, in the aftermath of victory, pays with a burden of accumulated debt such as to place a mortgage upon the energy and resource of many future generations.

May we not hope that eventually through wise statesmanship and Christian tolerance the scars still left in war's wake may be finally healed and that victor and vanquished, as befits the sacred cause of human freedom, will be invincibly bound together in mutual preservation.

Since my return from service I have enjoyed the privilege, the freedom, and the opportunities of private citizenship. I have seen many new and wonderful things but some which to me create a disturbing outlook for the future. Possibly one of the most pernicious is our steady drift toward totalitarian rule with the suppression of those personal liberties which have formed

the foundation stones to our political, economic, and social advance to national greatness.

Our Government now differs substantially from the design of our forefathers as laid down in the Constitution. They envisaged a federation of sovereign States with only such limited power resting in the Federal authority as became necessary to serve the common interests of all.

But under the stress of national emergencies during the past two decades, there has been a persistent and progressive centralization of power in the Federal Government, with only superficial restoration to the States and the people as emergencies subsided. This drift has resulted in an increasingly dangerous paternalistic relationship between Federal Government and private citizen with the mushrooming of agency after agency designed to control the individual. Authority specifically reserved to the States by constitutional mandate has been ignored in the ravenous effort to further centralize the political power.

ROLE OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Within the Federal Government itself has been a further and dangerous centralization. For example, the Department of State, originally established for the sole purpose of the conduct of foreign diplomacy, has become in effect a general operation agency of Government, exercising authority and influence over many facets of executive administration formerly reserved to the President or the heads of other departments. The Department of State indeed is rapidly assuming the character of a prime ministry, notwithstanding that its Secretary is an appointed official, neither chosen by nor answerable directly to the people.

This drift toward totalitarian rule is reflected not only in this shift toward centralized power, but as well in the violent manner in which exception is taken to the citizen's voice when raised in criticism of those who exercise the political power. There seems to be a determination to suppress individual voice and opinion which can only be regarded as symptomatic of the beginning of a general trend toward mass thought control.

Abusive language and arbitrary action, rather than calm, dispassionate, and just argument, ill becomes the leadership of a great nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to a course of morality and justice. It challenges the concept of free speech and is an attempt at direct suppression through intimidation of that most vital check against the abuse of political power—public criticism. If long countenanced by freemen, it can but lead to those controls upon conviction and conscience which traditionally have formed stepping stones to dictatorial power.

ISSUES "CLEARLY DEFINED"

The issues which today confront the Nation are clearly defined and so fundamental as to directly involve the very survival of the Republic.

Are we going to preserve the worth-while heritage in that of our progeny?

Are we going to continue to yield to personal liberties and community autonomy to the steady and inexorable centralization of all political power or restore the Republic to constitutional direction, regain our personal liberties and reassume the individual State's primary responsibility and authority in the conduct of local affairs?

Are we going to permit a continuing decline in public and private morality or reestablish high ethical standards as the means of regaining and diminishing faith in the integrity of our public and private institutions?

Are we going to continue to permit the pressure of alien doctrines to strongly influence the orientation of foreign and do-

mestic policy or regain trust in our own traditions, experience and free institutions and the wisdom of our own people?

ENCOURAGED FOR THE FUTURE

In short, is American life of the future to be characterized by freedom or by servitude, strength or weakness? The answer must be clear and unequivocal if we are to avoid the pitfalls toward which we are now heading with such certainty. In many respects it is not to be found in any dogma of political philosophy but in those immutable precepts which underlie the Ten Commandments.

During the 5 months since my return, I have been encouraged to believe that our citizens will not complacently tolerate further incursions against their cherished liberties and will move to correct this drift away from truly religious base to our origin, our growth, and our progress, or yield to the devious assaults of atheistic or other anti-religious forces.

Are we going to maintain our present course toward state socialism, with communism just beyond, or reverse the present trend and regain our hold upon our heritage of liberty and freedom?

Are we going to squander our limited resources to the point of our own inevitable exhaustion or adopt common-sense policies of frugality which will insure financial stability in our time and a representative government? I have found this encouragement in the rare opportunity to search the faces of millions of my fellow countrymen.

Therein I have been given understanding of the meaning of Abraham Lincoln when he said: "To the salvation of the Union there needs but one single thing—the hearts of a people like yours. When the people rise in a mass in behalf of the liberties of the country, truly it may be said that (nothing can) prevail against them."

I have seen in the faces of the American people that to which Mr. Lincoln prophetically referred. I have clearly seen that the soul of liberty is still living and vibrant in the American heart. It is neither Democratic nor Republican, but American. It will assert itself by constitutional process and with invincible force in the battle to save the Republic. The people will still rule.

Fiscal Policies of the Truman Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 7, 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of August 14, 1951, in which very deserved credit is given to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'Connor] for his efforts to preserve the fiscal solvency of our Government.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR O'CONNOR POINTS OUT SOME ECONOMIC FUNDAMENTALS

In a statement marked by unusual economic insight, Senator O'Connor has launched what amounts to a head-on attack on the fiscal policies of the Truman administration. From a number of striking truths in the

statement, consider for a moment the passage which reads:

"The effects of taxes in restraining inflation have been overestimated by the administration."

It is necessary to note that Senator O'Connor does not argue against increased taxes in these times of stress. But he has the wit to see and the courage to state that there is a limit to the effectiveness of taxes as an anti-inflationary weapon.

The reason taxes are not the whole answer is obvious to thoughtful people. The Government taxes in order to spend. The money collected in taxes is immediately pumped back into circulation, chiefly in the form of wages and salaries. The higher the taxes, the more the Government is able to put back into circulation. The more money in circulation, the more severe the pressure on prices, the more danger of inflation.

Of course, if the money collected in taxes were used to reduce the Federal debt the effect would be deflationary, rather than inflationary. Thus the real problem is one of balancing the forces at work, so as to hold the economy steady. But to do this is to run counter to the pressures constantly exerted by the numerous pressure groups—organized labor, the farmers, the do-gooders who want the Government to finance their favorite projects, and so on.

All these things Senator O'Connor has discerned, and it is good to be able to give him credit for having the courage to point out how the pressure groups are being carefully cultivated by an administration with its eye on the elections of 1952. The great word now is defense, and one of Senator O'Connor's objects is to point out the kind of projects which today are being impudently marshaled under that banner.

For instance, that hoary project of the political pedagogs, Federal aid to education, is now being put forward on the ground that fundamental education is essential to national service whether in the Armed Forces, in industry, or on the farm. The unwarranted assumption here, of course, is that to provide fundamental education the Federal Government must muscle in.

Also under the defense label are proposals for a dozen or more expensive Federal projects—one of them is the St. Lawrence River scheme—which couldn't possibly be finished in time for any war to be fought in this generation. This alone would be sufficient to justify Senator O'Connor's charge that under the guise of preparing for war, the administration is really proposing to alter the bases of our economy.

For those who feel the need for additional evidence on the way the minds of the administration's henchmen are working, we commend the hand-out of the Federal Trade Commission which was published over the country yesterday. The general purpose of this hand-out was to prove that the country's basic industries are garnering in profits at, presumably, a wicked rate.

We hold no brief for industries which are in fact profiteering, assuming that they can be found in this competitive economy. But it is certainly true that to compare the rate of profits in 1950 with that of 1940 is to obscure the true situation for the unwary reader. In that 10 years, the value of the dollar has been cut in half. If a corporation is to maintain its margin of profit today, it must earn at least twice as much, dollarwise, as it earned in 1940. Also, it should be remembered that after the profits are distributed to the stockholders, the Government takes a much larger cut today, in the form of income taxes than it took a decade ago. To argue that profits are higher and then stop there is to ignore some of the basic factors in the situation.

Besides, what is wrong with adequate profits? They are distributed among more

than 10,000,000 Americans, all of whom are consumers and contribute to the upkeep of the economy. At least a part of them are turned back every year for the further expansion of industrial production, to the greater material good of all of us.

Mr. O'Connor might well follow up his disclosure of the hidden evils in the President's budget with an examination of the implications of this hand-out by the FTC. In it he will surely find confirmation of his growing doubts of the fiscal responsibility of the Truman administration.

They Are Gouging Soldiers Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 6, 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Booton Herndon, which appeared in the February 1951 issue of Redbook magazine, which relates the poor conditions around our military camps. This revealing article confirms and emphasizes the facts about these conditions as recently reported by the Johnson Armed Forces Subcommittee.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY'RE GOUGING SOLDIERS AGAIN

(By Booton Herndon)

What are your strongest memories of World War II? Do you thrill when you remember the Army's smashing invasion of Normandy? The marines on Guadalcanal? The great naval battle of Midway? Or the daring raid on Tokyo?

Or is your strongest memory of World War II a bitter one? Do you remember the greed of the civilians more than the heroism of the fighting men? The callous gouging by the local landlords?

If not, you're lucky, but there are such people with such memories. A young lieutenant colonel talked to me dispassionately of being captured in the Battle of the Bulge, but his hands trembled when he told me of the contempt and rudeness to which fellow Americans subjected his wife and children.

An Air Force major talked about the one-room children's playhouse his wife rented in Tampa, Fla. They couldn't stand up straight in it, but the rent was \$150 a month.

Those, too frequently, are the memories of World War II. What kind of memories are we storing up today? Has anyone done anything about housing around Army camps? Is any effort being made to keep prices down—whether of milk or of beer? These are the questions to which I have, in a cross-country tour of military establishments, tried to find the answers. On my tour, however, I was amazed at the bitterness still ranking in the souls of men and women all over America.

Take Master Sgt. William F. Vining at Camp Pickett, near Blackstone, Va. He and his wife live on the post, rarely go to town. Even today, 9 years after their first time in town, they remember it too well. They had skimped for months on Bill's \$34 private-first-class salary, so she could come to see him. They couldn't find a place to be together and had spent the night in camp—

she in a dormitory, he in his Army barracks.

Sunday morning they went to church in Blackstone. A member of the congregation welcomed them, heard of their plight, and invited them to his home. They had little privacy because members of the family kept charging through their room during the 2 nights they spent there. They were, nevertheless, deeply grateful to their host. As they were leaving, they tried to tell him so. He waved away their thanks.

"That'll be \$13," he said, "\$6.50 a night."

People remember everything about Leesville, La., near Camp Polk—the heatless pigsty sheds, each big enough for only a double bed and with 50 families of soldiers sharing one filthy toilet, which the landlady kept locked most of the time to conserve water.

"Leesville," said a reporter for the Washington Post in 1943, "was the most unsavory, chaotic, and humiliating picture that I have ever had of our American civilization."

Even babies weren't safe in Leesville. Their mothers were sold inferior, unpasteurized milk—more than one child remained there forever.

Yes; that was our America of the camp communities 8 years ago. What is it like today? Once more husbands and fathers are entering our Armed Forces to protect this country and this country's way of life. Has anyone done anything to protect their wives and children from greed, misery, and squalor?

The answer, I have found through visits to communities all the way across America, and through conferences with the few people interested in the problem is yes—and no. For once, we are not caught completely flat-footed.

On the other hand, whatever steps that have been taken have been hesitant and hamstrung.

Tighe E. Woods, Federal Housing Expediter, found rent gouging ranging from 100 to 500 percent in small communities around recently reopened Camp Atterbury, Ind.

Woods says he hasn't the staff to check conditions in other camp areas.

Last summer, after the invasion of South Korea, the Armed Forces hastily gathered up fighting men from all over the country and sent them to repel the invaders.

And this time, the landlords in the towns about the camps discovered one in every four soldiers was married, and most of them had children. The kids of World War II had become husbands and fathers, and the wives and children of those husbands and fathers did not intend to sit at home and wait for them to come back.

They followed them to training camps, and they followed them to staging areas. Early in the Korean war, when men were piling into west coast camps to wait for transport, their wives and children piled right into the communities after them.

When first I began my research for this article, I was advised to go to California. At Pittsburg, serving the Army staging area of Camp Stoneman, and at Oceanside, near the Marine staging area of Camp Pendleton, I was told by welfare agencies, the deplorable conditions of World War II were repeating themselves. I went there, and while I by no means found another Leesville on the west coast, I, too, found, "a humiliating picture of our American civilization."

I also found men and women of good will, doing their best to ameliorate that picture.

But I found no one, no one except me, interested in these west coast communities as a preview of what was to happen as dozens of other camps went into full capacity.

The men went by troop train, and the wives and children followed by train, by bus, by car. Some wives sold their furniture in order to be with their husbands those last few days. After they got to California they

spent the money they'd kept for the return trip on housing and food, and many became dependent on charity to be sent back where they came from.

Even the charities bogged down in confusion and lack of funds. At Camp Stoneman, a Red Cross representative said his own opinion was that the wives had no business being there.

At Oceanside, however, the Red Cross stepped right in and within a few weeks was spending \$10,000 a month in that one little area. Nearly all of it went to dependent wives of servicemen.

The Army Emergency Relief took over in many cases.

Before I left Oceanside, I made one more visit. I talked to Zandra Outain. I think every American ought to know the story of Zandra Outain.

When Sgt. Benjamin F. Outain was sent to Korea, his wife, Zandra, with 3-year-old Wanda and 18-month-old Steven, set out to find quarters off the post.

Lost, bewildered, confused, Zandra scoured the area by bus and by foot. Once she found a place she could afford—a dirty shed with no toilet and no heat—in the hills back of town, but the thought of living there with her children until her husband got back, if he got back, revolted her. She would have taken a place only slightly better, for \$50 a month and extra for electricity and water, but the landlady backed out at the last minute. If Zandra would get rid of one of her children.

Finally Zandra found a nice unfurnished apartment, rent \$60 a month. The lady next door said she'd take care of the children for 75 cents a day so Zandra could get a job to augment the \$75 she'd eventually get from her husband. But what about furniture? Nobody, of course, would sell furniture on time to the wife of a marine.

Zandra's husband had a friend in the furniture business, though, and he said he'd help her—for friendship's sake.

Then the lady next door moved, and Zandra could find no one to take care of her children for less than \$5 a day. She couldn't earn that much. Her allotments had still not come in, and the Red Cross was advancing her money for food. She missed a payment, and the good friend came to take the furniture away.

Finally, the Marines got her into the project at San Diego. With Wanda and Steven, she started out early one morning, made the hour's bus ride to San Diego, and signed the necessary papers. Then it was necessary to travel by bus another 15 miles to make a deposit. Then back to San Diego, where, as the three of them got off the bus, Wanda fell and hit her head. Already tired, the little girl broke down and sobbed. Finally, late in the day, they got back to Oceanside.

That was the evening I dropped in on Zandra. She had cooked supper, fed the children and bathed them, and washed out a few clothes. Her face was drawn with fatigue, and there were deep circles under her eyes. But she smiled as she told me about her new apartment.

"Today's my birthday," she said. "Wasn't that a wonderful birthday present?" Zandra sighed, like an old, old woman. "I'm 20 years old today," she said.

The President's Committee on Religion and Welfare in the Armed Forces had been in existence for 2 years when the cold war turned hot. I've had long talks with both Mr. Well, a New York attorney and its chairman, and Charles K. Brightbill, the executive secretary at the Washington offices, and they're both fine men.

This committee was set up to encourage and promote the religious, moral, and recreational welfare and character guidance of persons in the Armed Forces and thereby to enhance the military preparedness and security of the Nation, and at first, housing of dependents was pretty far down its itemized program. At that time, the great proportion of servicemen were teen-agers, without need of civilian housing. Nevertheless, it soon became obvious that the housing shortage was affecting even their morale.

So, in 1949, the President's Committee called together representatives from all three services to discuss housing. It was the first time such a meeting had been called, although the housing shortage had been acute for years. Since then the Wherry bill providing for housing near permanent installations has become law.

The Committee has a budget of only \$100,000 and only four field men to cover the entire country. It has been active primarily in the intangible fields of recreation, welfare, and religion. Still, it was one agency more, in the summer of 1950, than we had at the time of Pearl Harbor.

After Pearl Harbor, camps sprang up all over the country, accompanied by, in too many cases, terrifying conditions of greed, venality, corruption, and downright cruelty. One of these camps was Camp Pickett, near Blackstone, Va. It was better than some, worse than many.

After Korea, Camp Pickett once again became an active camp, home of the Forty-third Division, a New England National Guard outfit, and other units which brought the total strength up to over 30,000. I'd heard a couple of stories about the town of Blackstone, and I visited it, shortly before the vanguard of the division arrived.

I found a town of about 3,000 people, over 50 percent colored, with precious little housing of any kind. Every decent place in town was rented when I got there, and almost every other kind of place. The camp's commanding officer, Col. Leslie E. Babcock, a slim little man with a deep bass voice and sympathetic blue eyes, was deeply concerned with the problems of the wives and children of the men who would come to his camp. Already he had heard of price increases in restaurants and grocery stores. Already dependents of soldiers had been treated unfairly by persons hungry for money. One of them was the wife of Warrent Officer Robert A. Hanna.

Mr. Hanna had been flown from Camp Pickett to Korea, leaving his wife in a comparatively pleasant little apartment near the camp. In the inevitable Army red tape, his allotment of pay did not get to her by the first of the month, and she was late paying her \$75 rent.

Three days later she received a letter from the owners, telling her, A, that she had broken her lease by being late in her rent, B, that the owners wanted the apartment and she should get out, and C, that in case she wanted to stay, the rent was \$150.

As Mrs. Hanna looked at the note, the thought came to her that her husband had been in the combat zone less than a month. She went to Colonel Babcock, who made it possible for her to stay on a few days while she straightened out her affairs. She then left Blackstone with no great regret.

In the meantime, a representative of the President's committee visited the camp. A committee on housing was formed. I was at one meeting which was attended by civic-minded people from the entire area. They seemed sincere in their desire to help, but they stated plainly that they were not, and did not intend to become, a policing agency against their own people.

I was blandly told that one Army complaint had been investigated and found to

be groundless. The case so whitewashed was the get-out-or-pay-more ultimatum with which I was familiar.

Just as at Oceanside, I found a vast difference in attitude between the people who had a place to sleep and those who hadn't. While I was listening to the platitudes of the housing committee, my wife, representing herself as the wife of an incoming officer (not because we're snooty, but because everybody knows enlisted men can't afford apartments anyway) and the mother of two children, was looking for a place to live. Even though it was play-acting, she was actually cross and tired and bitter when we met later that evening.

At one place she was shown a room in which the floor was patched with old license plates. Generally she was shown fairly decent furnished rooms, nearly all at \$10 a week. However, they were purely academic. When the landladies heard about the two children, the discussion was ended.

The only home she found was in a big, old building which had once been a boys' military school. A local man had bought it and made an apartment building out of it. Out of 70 apartments, there was only one four-room apartment left.

A congressional committee has begun an investigation into many varied charges against both camp and community, and a Senator has introduced a special bill to take care of what he described as a desperate need for homes. Since then, also, the President's committee has worked closely with the camp and with civic leaders. Just a day ago I got a special-delivery letter from Charles Brightbill saying that they are "really beginning to get results in holding rents down." The President's committee, incidentally, is also proud of the communities of Mount Clemens, Mich., near Selfridge Field, and Ogden, Utah, near the Hill Air Force base. In these two towns the citizenry has worked most wholeheartedly with the committee to make the soldiers welcome.

When Camp Polk was reactivated, the present clean-government mayor and council went contrary to legal provisions in refusing to accept fees and issue licenses for new saloons in the town. Even after they were forced by the State to permit new gin mills to open, the council grimly promised to padlock the doors of any bar that stepped over the bounds of decency. In Leesville, La., that was tantamount to social revolution.

The clamor of commerce set about finding rooms and inspecting them for cleanliness and price, and the camp was made eligible for Wherry bill housing which was restricted to permanent Army installations. There was a change in attitude—Leesville just felt better to be in. However, it was still a matter of pure comparison, for with 25,000 men in the camp, 6,000 of them married—with a total estimate of 13,000 dependents—there could not possibly be enough housing for all, let alone decent housing.

And another problem for which there is apparently no answer whatsoever—the dependent of Negro troops. At El Paso, Tex., where segregation is practiced far more rigorously than in the paternalistic South, the Negro population is about 2,600. Double that number of troops were ordered into near-by Fort Bliss, with, of course, the average number of dependents. Every garret, every basement in the colored section was instantly filled, and when they were gone, everything was gone.

Even in El Paso, however, the town did something that no one even thought of last time. It collected \$3,000, enough to open and maintain for a few months a little center

in the colored section where a Negro soldier in town could at least go to the toilet.

Yes, it isn't so bad, for the young man. But if you're the wife of a soldier, if you're the mother of his children, and if you love them both and want to be with them both whenever and wherever and as long as you can, you're going to have a tough time.

One answer is, of course, that you stay where you are and keep the home fires burning until his return. It would certainly be more practical, and the military advises it. The commanding officer of the Forty-third Division, Maj. Gen. Kenneth F. Kramer, as a matter of fact, ordered the wives of the soldiers in his command not to come to Blackstone. That solution to the problem, however, was quickly eliminated, for, the general discovered with some discomfiture, few of them had paid any attention to him. It may not be wise to follow your man, in short, but no one can stop you.

If you do, as thousands have done before you, there are one or two rays of hope. It is true that now there are people, influential people, who have realized that your problem exists, and have taken steps to help you. Houses are being built, in certain communities. Committees are trying to hold down rents in certain communities. There is hope for you in the future.

But right now, even after the example of the greedy, hideous, shameful nightmare of World War II, you might as well accept this for a fact:

There are not enough people in this country for which your husband is ready to lay down his life tomorrow who care where you or your children sleep tonight.

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, whatever happened to local civil defense?

The Benton Amendment to the Mutual Security Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BLAIR MOODY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 7, 1951

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Still Fighting the Last War?" written by the distinguished columnist Thomas L. Stokes. His is the first report I have seen in the press commenting on the Benton amendment to the mutual security bill. This amendment came up in the Senate late in the evening, after most morning news stories had been written, and secured but little press coverage. It is, in my judgment, one of the most important declarations of policy made by the Senate in connection with United States leadership

of the free world, and I hope it will receive the serious consideration and approval of the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STILL FIGHTING THE LAST WAR?—THE CONTEST FOR MEN'S LOYALTIES ALL OVER THE WORLD MAY BE WON OR LOST WITHOUT ROCKET OR ATOM BOMBS

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

A hard-boiled Regular Army colonel who was in Europe toward the end of the Second World War came here, after the war, for a refresher course at the Army War College. During his student days here he remarked rather cynically:

"They are still fighting the last war over there at the college, just as we were fighting the First World War when the Second came along."

That all seems to be rectified now, what with rockets, atom bombs, radar, and even talk about space ships and whether we or Russia will get to the moon first and liberate that mild-mannered planet in the name of democratic capitalism or Communist imperialism, quite an ambitious venture since we haven't found out yet how to run this planet. War has been taken out of the classroom on tactics into the scientist's laboratory. In the laboratory we seem to be fighting tomorrow's war or day after tomorrow's war—so we are at least up to date.

That war possibly could be made more likely by an attitude that might be expressed by paraphrasing the colonel and saying that we are still haunted by the First World War in making delayed peace for the Second.

This is dramatized by current developments—in the Japanese Peace Treaty up for signing at San Francisco and in some pertinent facts about what is happening in Europe brought out in recent Senate debate over the ECA bill.

Anybody who has had any contact with John Foster Dulles, the architect of the Japanese Peace Treaty, knows his deep concern that it should not repeat the mistake of the Versailles Treaty after World War I by imposing upon the Japanese people impossible burdens, as were laid on Germany after the First World War. Some historians hold those burdens responsible for the eventual rise of Hitlerism, which seems oversimplified.

The Japanese Treaty is, indeed, liberal and generous, to the extent that the Japanese Government is given the right to abandon reforms carried out in our occupation under Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur's administration.

Our aim was to "democratize" Japan by various changes, including wider distribution of land among her people and, perhaps more important, breaking up the great monopolistic combinations of finance and industry known as cartels. These were all-powerful. They dominated the government through a few families and inspired Japanese conquest in the Pacific—for trade and business sake—just as the same sort of cartels used Adolf Hitler as a pawn in Germany for the conquest of Europe.

After the war we sent teams into both Japan and Germany to conduct what we known familiarly as "antitrust" operations. In seeking to avoid one mistake of Versailles, we may be stretching our generosity to the point of nullifying their work—one of our chief World War II aims. That was, simply stated, to get government into the hands of the people in Germany and Japan so they could live decently in a free, competitive society and not be led off to aggressive wars to despoil other nations.

How much had been achieved by our Japanese reform program is a matter of dispute—but even that now apparently is to be forfeited. We already have learned how the German program fell far short of its aims

and we know also that cartelization—giant monopoly control—still exists all over Europe among our Atlantic Pact allies as well as getting a new lease of life in Germany.

How this is hamstringing the real purposes of our ECA program of recovery was forcefully presented during Senate debate by Senator BENTON, Democrat, of Connecticut, himself a businessman. He showed how recovery has not extended down to the people, declaring the unhappy truth about Europe in recent years is that the rich have been getting richer while the masses of people are no better off than before the war, and, in many cases, worse off. This is through the nice and pleasant and orderly way of the monopolists who, by reducing competition, guarantee a nice fat profit at a nice fat price. He also cited tax favoritism for the big industrialists. These conditions invite Communist exploitation and, beyond that, some of the industrialists prefer to deal with Communist unions, thus strengthening the latter and contributing to the disruption of a stable order, which is the Communist aim rather than helping the workers.

Senator BENTON got the Senate to include in the ECA bill an amendment stating that it is the policy of Congress in ECA to discourage cartel and monopolistic practices in European business and to encourage and strengthen the free labor movement of Europe.

That was something.

It is possible that this contest for men's loyalties all over the world may be won or lost without the firing of any of those rockets or atom bombs or the maneuvering of space ships, but by simpler weapons that reach down to human needs.

Ambassador Harriman and Dictator Tito

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 7, 1951

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an open letter dated Wednesday, August 29, 1951, addressed to Ambassador Harriman by Il Progresso Italo-Americano.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO AMBASSADOR HARRIMAN

You are in a unique position to render a great and indispensable service to the cause of world peace and freedom. At Tehran, you have been able to make even the stubborn and short-sighted British show some slight readiness to come to a just and amicable arrangement with the Iranian Government. Your sterling services in Iran have won for you enhanced admiration and confidence of the American people. We now look forward to your aiding the cause of peace at Belgrade.

At this grave juncture of world affairs, your visit to Belgrade is an event of major import. You have a real opportunity to raise the hopes of those who sincerely believe in a united democratic Europe as a foundation for world peace. We firmly believe that the idea of furthering this great goal inspired your trip to Yugoslavia. With the prestige and prowess of the United States behind you, we have every reason to hope that you shall have been able to register at Belgrade real successes toward this end.

In this light, we place before you the burning urgency of utilizing the occasion of your visit to Yugoslavia for the purpose of improving the relations between Italy and that country through expediting the prompt return of Trieste to Italian sovereignty where it rightfully belongs. You will, of course, have discussed with Dictator Tito the problem of further American military aid to his regime. We do not object to our Government providing such assistance as long as Yugoslavia co-operates loyally with America and the other democratic nations in resisting Russian imperialist expansion and aggression. What we do emphasize is the need for correlating such aid to Tito with the fundamental objectives of our Nation's foreign policy and with the basic aims and interests of the members of the Atlantic alliance. Obviously, the mere granting of aid to Tito is in itself no source of strength to every member to this alliance and to world peace. What has to be done is to enable Yugoslavia to take her place—to the fullest extent of her capacities—in the ramparts of resistance to Russian aggression.

But this cannot be done unless Yugoslavia is able to live fully at peace with her democratic neighbor Italy, which is a member of the Atlantic alliance. We are sure that you realize that such peaceful relations between the two countries will be impossible as long as Tito stands in the way of the restoration of Trieste to Italy. You certainly can appreciate that the Italian people can never fully trust the Yugoslav Government's peaceful and honorable intentions as long as it holds by force even an inch of Italian soil—soil filched from our Atlantic alliance partner by a so-called peace treaty despicable in its intentions and destructive in its consequences.

Moreover, as a skilled statesman devoted to the cause of international justice, you also realize that Italy likewise cannot make her full contribution to the cause of world peace as long as she is kept weak and her people feel the sting of the abominable injustice inflicted on them by tearing Trieste out of their homeland. That is why we hope that you have made clear to Tito that he must get off his high horse and stop trampling on Italian aims and interests. It is highest time that he cooperate with America, Britain, and France in helping them make good on their repeated promises to return Trieste to the Italian people.

We simply refuse to believe that an experienced and astute diplomat like you could go to see Tito merely to arrange for more American help without any services in return, without any reciprocal action on his part in the cause of world peace. Being so deeply involved in the cause of international harmony and the molding of American foreign policy, you have been fully aware of the acuteness of the Trieste issue as a source of friction and conflict between Rome and Belgrade. As an ally of Italy, our country can hardly feel justified in continuing to aid the Tito regime unless and until it stops hurting the prestige and interests of Rome—that is, unless and until Trieste is returned to the Italian people.

There can be no sound relations or lasting peace between peoples unless they are based on justice. The first and absolute requirement for such harmonious relations is an application of the principle of reciprocity. If America helps Yugoslavia, the latter should at least not hurt any of America's friends and partners in the cause of peace. Our country would be really asking very little from Yugoslavia, if you were to insist that Tito demonstrate at least a minimum of good faith, an appreciation of our life-saving aid to him by having his regime remove the obstacles and end its opposition to the immediate return of Trieste to Italian sovereignty. Surely, now that Tito is no longer

a member of the Cominform, he has no further interest in promoting chaos and demoralization in Italy. He should, therefore, gladly desist from doing anything at all which plays into the hands of Russia's agents and subverters inside Italy and which weakens Italy as a loyal and friendly neighbor who might well render him decisive aid in the event of a Moscow assault on his domain and the peace of Europe and the world.

We cannot, therefore, emphasize too strongly that we are counting on you, upon your return to Washington, to urge with all the influence and power at your command that our Government should clearly and forcefully say to Tito: "If you want further help from America, act in a just and peaceful manner toward America's friend and partner, democratic Italy. Join us in restoring Trieste to the Italian people. If you want to help ward off and smash Russian aggression and the destruction of the national independence of Yugoslavia, then stop weakening your friendly neighbor and cooperate sincerely and fully with her in the cause of peace. Demonstrate your new attitude toward democratic Italy in deed—by joining with us in returning Trieste to Italy. There is no better way in which you can earn and hold the full trust and confidence of the members of the Atlantic Alliance whose aid and friendship are essential to your national survival and prosperity."

After your distinguished services in Tehran, your voice and influence will be more weighty than ever in the councils of Washington. We hope that you will leave nothing undone to have our State Department act with fullest vigor and greatest promptness to bring Tito back to his senses and Trieste back to Italy.

IL PROGRESSO ITALO-AMERICANO.

A Plan for Railroad Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 7, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New York Times of Wednesday, September 5, 1951. This editorial describes the impasse now existing between the railway operators and three railway labor brotherhoods—the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, and the Order of Railway Conductors—in connection with their dispute over wages and working rules. The editorial suggests a plan for producing a settlement of this long and bitter dispute, and deserves the most careful consideration by the administration.

It will be recalled that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare made an investigation of this dispute, and reported thereon to the Senate. The investigation revealed the basic causes of the restlessness of railway labor, namely, a deterioration in railway wage rates as compared with other industries, and threats to alter fundamentally working rules which have become traditional in

the industry. The investigation also disclosed that Government seizure and operation of the railroads is a token seizure under which railway management continues to operate the railroads with merely nominal supervision by the Army.

As a result of the dispute, the railroads were seized by the Government on August 25, 1950, and are still operating under Government seizure. It seems to me that this governmental involvement in private industry is unwholesome and ought to be terminated at an early date. It can only be terminated, of course, when the dispute is settled. As the New York Times editorial recommends, the administration ought to take constructive steps to bring about early settlement.

It must be remembered that the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen has reached agreement with the carriers. Two of the other brotherhoods involved in the dispute, namely, the Firemen and Enginemen, have not had the benefits provided by the Railway Labor Act for the mediation of disputes. No fact-finding board has investigated and made recommendations with respect to their dispute. The plan for railroad peace suggested by the New York Times is therefore highly practicable and appropriate. It suggests that the President "name an inquiry board to investigate the dispute in all its ramifications and to make recommendations to the President." As the Times points out, such a board "would have to consist of a team with the highest technical proficiency, experience, and probity, whose members have in no way been entangled in the controversy." The Labor Committee in its report, and I in several statements, have pointed out that the reference of the dispute to a new set of mediators would, in itself, afford a strong hope of settlement, because it would remove the issues from the bitter personal differences which have grown out of the long struggle.

In view of the settlement with the Trainmen, I am sure agreement can be reached between the other brotherhoods and the carriers. I believe that the administration has a splendid opportunity for constructive labor statesmanship. I sincerely hope the administration will act on this opportunity at an early date.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PLAN FOR RAILROAD PEACE

More than a year ago President Truman ordered seizure of the Nation's railroads when trainmen and conductors threatened a strike. The carriers had accepted and the unions had rejected an emergency board's recommendations. The dispute over wages and working rules not only affected the trainmen and conductors but also the engineers' and firemen's brotherhoods. The trainmen and the managements made their peace last May. The other disputes have dragged on interminably, embittering the relations of the carriers and the employees and seriously affecting administration of the Railway Labor Act and its machinery for adjustment of disputes.

The managements would naturally prefer to settle with the three hold-out unions on the basis of the trainmen's contract,

which was predicated on a memorandum of agreement signed by them and the four brotherhood chiefs in the White House last December but later repudiated by the unions' general chairmen.

Meanwhile, conferences by the parties with the National Mediation Board and occasionally with each other have continued, but the deadlock remains unbroken. The unions took their case to Congress and a senatorial committee has completed its long record of public hearings without result so far. If, as has been indicated, a senatorial committee asks President Truman to request or direct the parties to submit the dispute to arbitration the move will probably fail.

But somewhere and somehow a solution must be found. At this late date it would be useless to attempt an assessment of the exact reasons for the prolongation of this tangled controversy. Not the least of its bitter side is the blind resentment of the rank and file against what they term "token" Government seizure, though they perhaps forget that it was their leaders who actually begged for this procedure.

What is the way out? The situation calls for a new and fresh approach. A solution suggests itself. If the President were to name an inquiry board to investigate the dispute in all its ramifications and to make recommendations to him he would fill what is now a vacuum. This step would be a face saver all around and end what is now a merry-go-round of bickering and deepening resentment.

Such a Presidential board would have to consist of a team with the highest technical proficiency, experience, and probity, whose members have in no way been entangled in the controversy. Even if a board so constituted hewed close to the settlement in the trainmen's case the result would probably be accepted by the engineers, firemen, and conductors who are so reluctant to do so now.

The President owes it to the Nation as well as the managements and employees to direct a reexamination of the unfortunate dispute as it exists today. To name a board of the highest caliber for this all-important task would be a deed of the highest statesmanship.

Grayson Keeps the Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 10, 1951

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks I made at the Farmer's Day program, at Felts Park, in Galax, Grayson County, Va., on September 8, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It always gives me pleasure to visit the district of my good friend and able congressional colleague, Tom STANLEY. While the law is valuable training for a legislator, so many problems of government these days are purely business problems that any district is fortunate in being represented in Congress by a practical and successful businessman like Representative STANLEY.

I have personally known all of the Representatives of the Fifth District for the past 50 years and during that first half of the most momentous century of recorded history

no district in Virginia or of the Nation has been more ably represented than the Fifth Virginia District. When I was a boy in Rocky Mount, Claude Swanson was your Representative. He is the only Virginian of the past half century and one of the few of all time who has served in both branches of Congress, as Governor of Virginia, and as a member of the President's Cabinet. In 1906 he was succeeded by Judge Edward W. Saunders, of Rocky Mount, justly rated as one of the most skilled parliamentarians who has ever served in the House. And Judge Saunders was not only a statesman but a great jurist, resigning from the House after 16 years of service to become a member of the Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals. He was succeeded by that splendid businessman from Danville, Rorer A. James, who unfortunately died before the expiration of his first term. Then you had two splendid lawyers in Murray Hooker, of Stuart, and Joseph Whitehead, of Chatham, and then another outstanding businessman in Thomas G. Burch, of Martinsville, who represented the district in an outstanding way for 16 continuous years, retiring from the House to accept appointment as United States Senator. And he, of course, was succeeded by Mr. Stanley.

While those Representatives of the Fifth District were making history in Richmond and in Washington, Grayson County was making some history of her own.

In my youth, Germania, the country home of Gov. Alexander Spotswood, was owned by my mother's father, the two families having intermarried. In 1720, a new county near the historic city of Fredericksburg was formed and named Spotsylvania, in honor of Governor Spotswood. From that county were later formed the counties of Orange, Augusta, Botetourt, Fincastle, Montgomery, and Wythe, and in 1792 Grayson was formed from Wythe. Fifty years later Grayson gave approximately half of its total area to form the county of Carroll, which now has 496 square miles as compared with Grayson's 425.

Two of my direct ancestors, Col. James Gordon, of Lancaster, and his nephew, James Gordon, of Orange, and one collateral ancestor, Benjamin Harrison, of Charles City County, were members of the Virginia Convention which ratified the Philadelphia Constitution. Prince William County was represented by the distinguished William Grayson. He and Richard Henry Lee were Virginia's first two United States Senators. William Grayson served on General Washington's staff and distinguished himself at the Battle of Monmouth. Patriots from the area of what is now Grayson served under him during the Revolutionary War. For him Grayson County was named.

On January 20, 1775, a group of them had assembled at the old lead mines on the edge of Carroll and prepared the famous Fincastle Declaration in which they said:

"We by no means desire to shake off our duty, or our allegiance to our lawful sovereign, but * * * if no pacific measures shall be proposed or adopted by Great Britain and our enemies attempt to dragoon us out of these estimable privileges which we are entitled to as subjects, and to reduce us to a state of slavery, we declare that we are deliberately and resolutely determined never to surrender them to any power on earth but at the expense of our lives."

At these same lead mines 350 militiamen assembled under Col. William Preston on February 10, 1781, and 18 days later participated in the victorious assault on the British at Guilford Courthouse, N. C.

The July 1950 issue of Virginia and the Virginia County was devoted to the remarkable development of the counties of Carroll and Grayson. No one who was not familiar with this part of the State 80 years ago can fully appreciate how remarkable that development has been. And no one who does not know the history of the stout-hearted, fighting patriots who settled this area can

adequately understand how the development could have been achieved. My friend, Lud Lake, of Fauquier County, one of the largest and most successful cattle dealers of that fine horse and cattle country, comes to Grayson to get his feeder stock. Recently, at Senator Byrd's apple picnic, Lud told me that early in the month he had sold his steers, that they averaged 1,350 pounds and they brought him 35½ cents per pound. I said: "Lud, those steers must have graded at least Good," and he promptly replied: "Nearly all graded Choice and the remainder Prime." There is one county in southwest Virginia that produces more cattle than Grayson, but none more purebred cattle. Few counties in the State have more bluegrass pasture land and none a better type of bluegrass. The same type of white-marbled meat which is supposed to be produced only in the feed lots of the Middle West can be shipped straight from the pastures of Grayson County. And no county in the State has as large a milk condenser plant as Grayson and, in fact, there are only four larger in the entire United States.

By taking advantage of the Federal soil conservation program, which has had my active support in Congress, Grayson has been able to triple the productive capacity of its pastures. I do not have the figures on the total gross-farm income in Grayson in 1950 but in 1947 it was \$4,500,000, which was three times what it was 20 years earlier.

The development of the county's resources also indicates that this income has not been squandered but that the people of Grayson have had the same forward-looking attitude as the colored man in Mississippi who contracted to buy a piece of land for \$2,000. When he went into a lawyer's office to sign the papers he said:

"Lawyer, I want to pay cash for that little farm I am going to buy."

"You do?" said the lawyer. "Well wait until I go into my rear office a minute."

The lawyer went into his rear office, called the sheriff on the telephone and said to him, "Sheriff, come to my office quick. A colored man in my office has just opened up a shoe box and has \$2,000 in it, and I think you will need to investigate that situation."

So a few minutes later the sheriff entered the office and said to the colored man, "I understand that you have \$2,000 in that shoe box."

The colored man said, "Yes, boss."

The sheriff said, "I want to know where you got all that money."

The colored man said, "Mr. Sheriff, Mary and me saved that money by doing without the things we had to have."

Everyone who eats beef has a personal interest in the cattle industry. The measure of that interest is indicated by the fact that of the 144 pounds of all meats which the average person in the United States consumed last year, 63 pounds was beef.

The concern of those of you engaged in the cattle industry over the outlook for its future is shared by others, not only because they eat beef but also because of the importance of the cattle industry to our economy. We learned after World War I that when the farmer loses his purchasing power the wheels of industry begin to slow down and the next depression has started.

This is true nationally and it is true locally. I do not have to remind the merchants and other nonfarm residents of Grayson County how dependent they are on the \$4,000,000 to \$5,000,000 of annual gross farm income produced in this county, around three-fourths of which comes from livestock.

Knowing your deep interest in this matter, I asked the Department of Agriculture to give me the latest available information on the outlook for the cattle industry. It advised me that the prospects are generally favorable. There is no expectation of a marked weakness in prices in the near fu-

ture and the tendency toward future declines because of increased production may be offset by increased consumption of beef if, as is expected, employment and consumer incomes are kept high by our defense program, which will soon be at the rate of a billion dollars per week.

I was told that the cattle cycle is on an upward swing, with the number of animals on farms and ranches at or near an all-time peak, while the number slaughtered this year has been smaller than last year. The South Atlantic States have led the Nation in percentage of cattle increases. Slaughter has been smaller because of the large proportion of young stock and a tendency to retain them for addition to breeding herds or for feeding and also because the good condition of pastures and ranges has encouraged holding cattle on grass.

Another factor, of course, was the uncertainty about price controls and other legislation which caused cattle to be held off the market until conditions were less unsettled. When we had the amendments to the Defense Production Act of 1950 under consideration, I predicted that if we let the growers know where they stood and assured them of fair treatment, there would be no shortage of beef. The proposal of Mr. DiSalle to roll back the price of beef an additional 9 percent was a political gesture to consumers that would have resulted in curtailed production, black-market operations, and ultimately higher prices. Therefore, I opposed it.

During the first 6 months of this year 9 percent fewer cattle and 18 percent fewer calves were commercially slaughtered than during the same period in 1950 but in August, after we had acted on the defense production bill, slaughterers reported for the first time that they had gone above the level for the same date last year and that they expected this condition to continue for the remainder of this year.

We all recognize the danger of excessive prices that will reverse the trend toward greater consumption of beef from which the cattle industry has profited. That happened after World War I when the price of cattle in 1920 dropped 50 percent and broke many cattle dealers. However, the Department of Agriculture reports that although the average retail price of beef was up 10 percent this summer, as compared with the summer of 1950, there was a corresponding increase of around 10 percent in the disposable income of consumers and demand for meat traditionally has closely followed changes in income. All beef consumers think the present price of beef is too high and maybe it is. But the fact remains that the per capita consumption of beef is higher than in the depression years while the percentage of the average family income that goes for the purchase of beef is lower.

Grayson farmers were among the first in the State to learn that it does not pay to plow a hillside that will produce bluegrass. But on a limited area not subject to erosion 279 Grayson farmers have been supplementing their farm income through the production of a fine type of burley tobacco that has averaged better than a thousand dollars per acre. Last year 114 farmers grew 36 acres of Turkish tobacco, an aromatic and free burning but very expensive type of tobacco that goes into the manufacture of all cigarettes.

In an area that is to a large extent a plateau, containing the two highest mountains in the State, and which 50 years ago had neither a railroad nor improved highways, one would not expect to find a splendid industrial development. Yet, Grayson has large furniture plants, textile mills, a large Carnation Milk plant, to which I have previously referred, and a Grayson man, operating five plants, is one of the largest producers of mirrors in the country.

All of which goes to prove how right the Reverend Benjamin Floyd Nuckolls was when

he said in his book, *Pioneer Settlers of Grayson County*, published in 1914:

"The times, opportunities, and surroundings have changed so much since the early settlement of this country that the people of the present generation do not realize what were the labors, privations, cares, and anxieties of their ancestors. They were such as to try the nerve, strength, and fortitude of mankind.

"History proves to us beyond a doubt that our noble ancestors, by strenuous labors and perseverance, changed the face of this country, which they found wild and uncultivated, and that we now enjoy the fruits of their labor, while they 'Rest from their labors and their works do follow them'."

Europe had great universities, great manufacturing plants, artistic and technical skills and accumulated wealth when the early settlers of this country were building their simple log cabins with one hand and fighting the savages with the other. It was no accident that the Grayson settlers changed the face of Grayson County. It was no accident that the United States of America became the richest and the most powerful nation in the world. It was strenuous labor and perseverance that changed the face of our wilderness and gave us the highest standard of living in the world. The mainspring of that personal effort was our private enterprise system under which those of superior brains, character and perseverance could expect a superior reward. I have visited the countries of Europe and observed the creeping paralysis of socialism and of communism which deny to a man the fruits of his own labor and kills his incentive to produce. I have watched with deep concern the trend in our own country to statism and a gradual reversal of the Grover Cleveland philosophy that it is the duty of the citizen to support the state. Turning down offers of private employment far more lucrative than my public service, I have dedicated the best years of my life to the preservation of those priceless principles of political and economic freedom that were born of the brain and purchased by the blood of our founding fathers.

Both here and abroad those principles are being seriously threatened. At home they are threatened by the same type of demagogue who threatened the great Athenian philosopher Isocrates 353 years before the birth of Christ and of whom he said

"When I was a boy, wealth was regarded as a thing so secure as well as admirable that almost everyone affected to own more property than he actually possessed, because he wanted to enjoy the standing which it gave. Now, on the other hand, a man has to be ready to defend himself against being rich as if it were the worst of crimes, and to keep on the alert if he is to avoid disaster; for it has become far more dangerous to be suspected of being well off than to be detected in crime."

The American system of private enterprise to which we in Virginia have always subscribed was aptly expressed by Abraham Lincoln, when he said:

"No man living is more worthy to be trusted than those who toil up from poverty. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him labor diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

In all ages a share-the-wealth program has ended in a share-the-poverty program.

Our democratic institutions are likewise threatened at home by unnecessary and extravagant public spending, the end-product of which is printing press money and ruinous inflation. Our political and economic freedom is threatened from abroad by the ruthless leaders of the Soviet Politburo who re-

alize that if men know the truth it will make them free. Therefore, they keep their subjects in ignorance behind an iron curtain while massing a vast military force on land, on sea and in the air to crush by superior force the truth of democracy.

Until the danger of a physical attack from enemies abroad is past, it will be necessary for us to maintain for the defense of our country a military establishment comparable to the police force we maintain to protect our homes from thieves and robbers. For several years such a program will be so costly that real financial sacrifice will have to be made. So I hope there will be no Grayson farmer like the farmer I heard about who was attending a Methodist revival meeting when the minister was preaching about hell, saying:

"Hell is a lake of brimstone and fire and sinners will be plunged into that seething caldron and there they will simmer and boil throughout all eternity."

After the meeting the freedom-loving farmer approached the preacher and said:

"Parson, did you say that hell was a lake of brimstone and fire?"

"Yes, brother, that's what the Good Book says, and that sinners will be plunged into that seething caldron and there they will simmer and boil throughout all eternity. Yes, brother."

"Well, Parson, I just want to tell you—the people won't stand for it."

I am happy to be privileged today to visit a county where the fundamental principles of our forebears still are cherished and where the people will stand for whatever sacrifices are necessary to preserve our constitutional liberty. I wish I had it in my power to make the Galax Leaf a national and international symbol, not only of honor and distinction but likewise a symbol of the perpetuity of those fundamental democratic principles which Thomas Jefferson gave to the Nation and to the world.

Attitude of Russia in International Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. DUFF

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 10, 1951

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an address I delivered at the national convention of AMVETS in Boston, Mass., on September 1, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Horrible as the prospect is, the world is on the verge of another appalling conflict. Russian imperialistic communism, of all the powers in the world, is alone responsible for our being on the edge of this frightening precipice.

At the end of World War II the United States and the other free nations liquidated their armed might in the sincere belief that it was the intention of all people to move into an era of peace. But Russia, determined on a course of grasping aggression, went in the opposite direction and continuously prepared for more war.

As the result of the enormous growth of Russian military power, while the power of the free nations was declining in a military way, the Communists developed a tremendous temporary military advantage and have continuously used that advantage to gobble

up their neighbors and to menace the whole world.

Here in America nobody but a fool wants war today, knowing how terrible the present instruments of destruction are and how vast our living advantages are in America. Every condition of self-interest in America points towards peace.

The American people enjoy the highest standards of well-being of any people in the world. To sacrifice this advantage to engage in another war of our own choosing would be the action of madmen. But nobody but a fool would imagine that we can prevent war if we permit the Russians to escape unchallenged with the false propaganda that the United States is for war and that they are for peace when every informed person knows that the exact opposite is the fact.

Russia alone is responsible for the current world turmoil. The Communists scheme to prevent peace. Every time the United States makes a move in the direction of peace, the Soviet press and the Soviet stooges world-wide come out with charges of warmongering against us.

Before the North Atlantic Pact was signed the hysteria and hate vomited over the world by the Russians was without parallel. The Communists are beginning to subject the world to the same routine prior to the San Francisco Conference on the Japanese Peace Treaty.

Terrible as the prospect of war is, the time has come when we can no longer permit ourselves to be bully-rugged and bamboozled and lied about by the fakels in the Kremlin and their stooges.

With fakery and deception the Russians talk peace but they constantly manipulate in the direction of war.

Fearful that the San Francisco Conference will be successful, the swindlers of the peace from the Kremlin have already made their arrangements to try to sabotage what goes on in San Francisco.

This week the leading newspapers of Russia joined in a terrific and vicious propaganda attack against the United States. They accused us of aiming at war with China and with Russia. Yet these same warmongers, are in San Francisco right now for the sole purpose of endeavoring to sabotage the peace and to spread further unrest in the world.

Gromyko, with his fellow travelers in the Kremlin, are the swindlers of the peace of today's world. And they ought to be so charged every day around the world.

Everybody knows except the Russian people, from whom the truth has been concealed, that if it had not been for American military might and American productive capacity and American generosity, Russia would have been destroyed by Hitler in World War II. For our aid in actually saving the life of the Russian nation we have been repaid by Russia with hate, with vituperation, with misrepresentation, and with trickery.

Our supposed friend has proven to be not only our greatest enemy but the greatest menace to freedom that has ever existed in the modern world.

The Russian Communists are a false and ungrateful people. The complete falsity of everything that the Communists say and everything they stand for and everything they do can be nailed down with hard facts.

The Communist record is one of repudiation of agreements, of stabbing friends in the back, and of violating every precept of humanity and decency recognized by the civilized people of the world. It is a record of tyranny and treachery and death without parallel in history.

To prevent these very same people from being destroyed by Hitler during World War II, the American people, out of unexampled generosity, advanced to Russia in lend-lease \$10,776,176,000.

And now these fantastic swindlers offer to settle with the United States for the comparatively puny sum of \$240,000,000—one forty-fifth of our loans.

In reverse lend-lease we received from Russia the mere pittance of less than \$2,250,000.

During the war the United States transferred to Russia 710 ships with the agreement that at the end of the war they would all be returned to the United States. Did Russia keep that agreement? Of course not.

The Communists faked that agreement the way they fake every agreement with everybody everywhere.

Of the 710 ships that they solemnly promised to return and which we lent them for the purpose of saving their country and their lives, they have only returned 37. And the miracle of it is, in view of their complete repudiation of everything, that they gave us back a single one.

This is proof that an agreement with the evil men in the Communist government today is not worth the paper it is written on. They have no more hesitation about violating their agreements than they do about eating a meal. They seem to enjoy breaking every agreement they make.

In World War II the United States furnished Russia with 14,795 airplanes, 7,056 tanks, 51,503 jeeps, 375,883 trucks, 35,170 motorcycles, 8,071 tractors, 1,981 locomotives, 11,155 freight cars, 105 submarine chasers, and 197 torpedo boats. These are a mere sample of the things that we did for the Russians to save their lives. In repayment the Communists are trying to set up a conspiracy world-wide to destroy the United States and the American people.

The present government in Russia has no conception of an obligation. No obligation has any binding force with them.

Between 1925 and 1941 Russia signed a number of nonaggression and neutrality pacts. Eleven of them were violated directly by Russia.

Between 1935 and 1950 the present government in Russia signed 18 military alliances. Fifteen were broken or violated by these same notorious breakers of pledges.

Between 1928 and last year the Soviet Union participated in seven important international peace moves, with the ostensible purpose of trying to promote peace, but in each case they actually worked for their destruction.

The continued fakery of the Reds in Korea with reference to the cease-fire agreement is merely another proof that no dependence can be put upon what they say.

Let us examine their attitude in other fields.

The Russians joined the United Nations. Once joined it was soon evident that their only purpose in joining was to wreck it.

The Russian Communists make a pretense of being interested in the underprivileged. Let us examine their performance as compared with their pretensions, as a member of the United Nations, in endeavoring to aid unfortunates in the world.

The Soviet Union contributed not 1 cent to the International Children's Emergency Fund; not one cent to the Palestine Refugee Organization; not one cent to the International Refugee Organization; not one cent to help finance the International Bank, formed to aid downtrodden people; not one cent to the suffering people in Korea, a million of whom have already died. And every death is directly chargeable to Russia, because without Russia that war of aggression would not have started.

While Russia has faked and falsified its interest in other people, the generous American people have given more than \$80,000,000,000 in foreign aid during and since World War II.

And yet the representatives of the swindling group in the Kremlin have the audacity

to send Gromyko, one of their chief swindlers, to the United States to again perpetrate falsity, and perfidy, and crookedness.

In Czechoslovakia—one of Stalin's Red satellites—Bill Oatis, an American newspaperman was arrested and thrown into jail for 10 years. Oatis, in the eyes of the Communists, committed the crime of reporting facts in news stories.

And yet this Gromyko, representing these same evil men in the Kremlin, is here to defame the United States right in the face of our people.

It ought to be made clear to this swindler and all those who sent him here that by their conduct in the treatment of American citizens they are an offense to the nostrils of the American people.

For Gromyko to have the audacity to come to America and insult our people, when an American citizen is in jail in one of Stalin's stooge countries merely because he was telling the truth, is the kind of thing that ought to awaken the American people to the fact that they are dealing with the biggest group of fakers and bandits ever organized for the purpose of international crime.

And when Gromyko goes back to Russia with his minions, after spewing his venom here in the United States, he ought to take back with him the faker the Communists sent here the other day from Czechoslovakia to represent them as an ambassador.

And then let us remember this. The Soviet Russian Communists in the guerrilla warfare in Greece kidnaped 28,000 children and are making slaves out of them in Russian satellite countries.

Also remember that 250,000 Japanese prisoners of war, in violation of all the rules of war and of humane conduct, have been kept as work slaves, hidden somewhere in Russia, building up the power to try to destroy the rest of the world.

Millions of displaced people have disappeared into Siberia, into concentration camps, removed from their families, from their friends and from the society in which they lived, as part of the Red purpose of again building up this vicious and terrible power that is represented by Gromyko here in San Francisco.

These are the things these swindlers and fakers are doing everywhere in the world. And they have the crudity and the vulgarity and the audacity to send their agents to America to say to us that we are warmongers when we are helping people world-wide and they are trying to destroy free people by every engine and ingenuity of wickedness that diabolical scheming can devise.

Here at home let us not forget that these same Communist conspirators have penetrated into important places in America. They have succeeded in fooling some American citizens into giving up the greatest birthright in the universe and to contribute with them to the enslavement of the world.

If we are going to get tough with the Communists from over there, let's get tough, too, here at home with the fakers among our own people who prefer what the Communists stand for to what the American birthright should mean to them.

But above all else let us in America realize—

No. 1: The only thing in the world that the Russian Communists respect is brute force—the kind of force strong enough to win when it gets in a fight.

No. 2: This being so, despite our tremendous desire for peace, we must permit nothing to stand in the way of the advancement of the power of the United States and the other free peoples in the world. We must be strong enough to move in on these people the first time they make another aggressive move anywhere.

That means complete military preparation—not preparation for war but preparation for peace. We will never be safe from

continuous and outrageous attacks from the men in the Kremlin until they know that we are so strong that if they do make a sneak attack our retaliation will be so great that we will destroy them.

General Ridgway has pointed out and significantly summed the world situation in a paragraph.

"The real issues are whether or not the power of western civilization, as God has permitted it to flower in our beloved lands, shall defy and defeat communism; whether the rule of men who shoot their prisoners, enslave their citizens, and deride the dignity of man, shall displace the rule of those to whom the individual and his individual right are sacred; whether we are to survive with God's hand to guide and lead us, or to perish in the dead existence of a Godless world."

Government and Financing of the City of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 10, 1951

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I have never personally met Mr. Robert Moses, construction coordinator of the city of New York, but I have recently had reason to correspond with him. In answer to an inquiry, he provided me with a copy of a letter he had written under date of August 9, 1951, to Mr. Lazarus Joseph, New York comptroller, on the question of the work of New York City's Management Committee. In my view, the Moses letter is an extraordinary and remarkable document. It includes observations which will be of interest to every reader of the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF NEW YORK,
OFFICE OF CITY

CONSTRUCTION COORDINATOR,
New York, N. Y., August 9, 1951.

Hon. LAZARUS JOSEPH,
Comptroller of the City of New York,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: The management committee of which you are chairman and of which I am a member has now been in existence for almost 2 years. The city has approved an expenditure of more than \$2,000,000 for the surveys thus far authorized, not including overhead contributions of city agencies. It seems high time to clarify the committee's objectives as a step toward measuring progress.

I accepted membership on this committee reluctantly at the insistence of Mayor O'Dwyer. At one of its early meetings, I strongly urged that its activities be confined to a few definite, specific subjects where technical advice from outside would bring about genuine improvements in administration and actual economies. I suggested several such subjects. Some were adopted but, generally speaking, the scope of staff work has been greatly expanded and, as I feared, extravagant expectations have been aroused as to anticipated achievements. The public is beginning to believe that sufficient savings can be made in various departments to meet the increased cost of salaries and services.

The time has now come to take stock, to inform the public as to what we are actually driving at, whether or not there will be any substantial savings, to correct misapprehensions and to fix attention on the basic problems of the city.

I have had considerable personal experience with the improvement of forms of government and have for some years followed efficiency and economy studies, in the Federal field from Mr. Taft to Mr. Hoover, in the State from Governor Smith to Governor Dewey, and in the city from John Purroy Mitchel to the present mayor. I was responsible for the staff which prepared the plan of State reorganization for Governor Smith, and was recently identified with Mr. Hoover's commission.

I have also had responsibility over the years for administration on a fairly large scale and for the expenditure of considerable sums of public and quasi-public money, and have even drawn from ultraconservatives the grudging comment: "What you build costs a lot, but we get something for our money." Bearing in mind that some of our wealthier citizens regard all government as an organized conspiracy against the taxpayer, this comes as close to praise as anyone who tolls in the vineyards of Uncle Sam, mother Empire State, or Father Knickerbocker can get.

This experience has taught me to be wary of salvation by new organization charts and efficiency installations and extremely suspicious of extravagant claims of net dollar savings in government. Men, not charts and measures, make good government. The ideal thing, of course, is to have first-class men operating first-class machines, but first-class men can operate any machine and third-rate people can't make the best and most modern gadgets work. Budget, efficiency, and planning surveys usually avoid the big immediate problems in favor of small economies or propose long-range revolutionary plans not realizable in our lifetime.

I have learned that government is not just another business with the profit motive left out—a business which, once divorced from politics, can readily be improved by itinerant experts armed with the lingo of efficiency. The electorate is not exactly like a group of stockholders who choose directors to run a corporation, and the mayor is expected to have qualities, loyalties, and compulsions quite different from those of a bank or business president. It has even been suggested that the mayor is the conscience of the community as well as its housekeeper.

Capitalism, whose practices government is asked to imitate, has not always been internally healthy and without sin, and it has even been whispered among the unregenerate that great corporations have their own diseases paralleling those of government, including politics, deadheads, nepotism, illusions of grandeur, hardening of the arteries, gout, and the Chinese rot.

My hunch is that Mr. Waterman, the fountain-pen manufacturer, who ran against the Honorable James J. Walker for mayor in 1925, and is the only honest-to-God businessman in my memory who actually took the plunge, would, if he had won, have been the greatest flop in the history of city hall. I am supported in this cynical observation by practically every reporter, taxi driver, bartender, and other trained observer, philosopher, and pundit in a fairly wide acquaintance.

With these generalizations, let me turn to the big problems of New York City's administration and financing. We must keep in mind that the city is still growing in population, that it has 8,000,000 people today, that the population in 5 years will be 8,225,000 and in 10 years 8,555,000. Recent metropolitan increases have been accompanied by

tremendous geographical shifts from the city to the suburbs, from central areas in the city to outlying areas, from one borough to another, and public and quasi-public housing have brought about complete changes in entire neighborhoods. With these shifts, enormous problems involving old and new schools, recreation facilities, hospitals, roads, transportation, health, sanitary, and other services have arisen.

It should be noted in passing that the city has plans and specifications, some preliminary but many detailed and final, for well over a billion dollars in capital and assessable improvements, none of them extravagant or frivolous, and that civilian defense will require additional capital and expense appropriations. Increased appropriations are also required to pay for the installation and upkeep of new facilities. Debts must be amortized and interest must be paid on them in the expense budget, and personnel and maintenance must be provided for. Recently high prices and inflation, for which the city certainly is not responsible, have raised costs, and Federal controls have made orderly city planning difficult.

Meanwhile, the demands of the people have increased. Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness have acquired new meanings in terms of municipal expenditures. People are no longer satisfied to live in slums. They properly demand a fair share of the good things of life and look to government, and particularly to municipal government, to provide them. There are more old people than there used to be, and there is more leisure time for recreation. No administration can be elected, and certainly none can survive, which does not recognize these facts. This is the democratic process as we practice it.

New York had a disgracefully inadequate borough park system when Mayor LaGuardia took office in 1934. Since then we have doubled its acreage, raised the number of playgrounds from 117 to 550 and quadrupled other recreation facilities, but we have had no proportionate increase in our budget. The same legislators—State and National—who write urging us to keep on temporary summer employees throughout the winter, scream for cuts in our budget and prompt laying off of superfluous employees. Apparently these statesmen see nothing inconsistent in these two positions. We have so few attendants and police that vandalism and violence are rampant and cannot be checked. The rank and file of our men are scandalously underpaid and are hardly able to pay for their overalls. Our receipts have risen from \$373,773 24 to \$1,855,747.

What would the people of the city do? Reduce these facilities? Stop the growth of the system? Leave the old, neglected, and newly populated neighborhoods as they are? Would they raise the entrance charges at swimming pools and cut out the free periods? Would they put turnstiles and meters on beaches such as Coney Island where we have 10,000 people to the acre on good summer days? We can indeed raise our revenues and in the process freeze out a third of our children and adults. Shall we feed sawdust to the animals in our zoos? Is that what the city wants? Will itinerant management experts from Oshkosh, who never operated a peanut stand, tell us how to run one of the greatest municipal recreation systems in the world?

We are in the midst of a \$150,000,000 hospital expansion program. The new beds must have doctors, nurses, equipment, bandages, food, fire, and current. New parks and playgrounds must have attendants. New schools require teachers, janitors, and supplies. New streets must be swept and lighted. Expressways must be policed. Slums, parking, traffic congestion, smoke, dirt, pollution, disease, gambling, ignorance, dope, organized crime,

rackets, vandalism, the law's delay—everyone demands a sustained drive against them, but nobody wants to pay the bill.

Business and industry also make demands on the government for the many improvements which require the power of eminent domain and the expenditure of public funds to furnish the framework in which private enterprise can flourish, and to enable local business to compete successfully with business in other progressive and ambitious communities. A good example of this is our waterfront, which is so important to the economy of the city that it must be subsidized.

All these factors contribute to a steadily mounting municipal budget, and no management survey by this committee or any other, by the present staff of outside experts or any which can be recruited, will change this situation. The city budget is bound to go up. An honest effort should be made to anticipate and publicly explain the curve of increase, to keep it within reasonable bounds, and to get a dollar's worth for each dollar spent.

Economy is, of course, indispensable, but the notion which has been assiduously cultivated by various civic agencies and the press that enforced efficiency and economy will actually result in tremendous net cuts in the city's expense budget and make it possible to meet inescapable demands for increases in pay and services within the present total and without new taxes, is just so much moonshine.

I recommended and voted for the present director of the management survey. I am for genuine economy, for cutting out waste, for the smallest practical number of competent, decently paid and well-treated employees, and for savings which do not cut services, but I ask that the experts on whom we are spending \$2,000,000 concentrate on the big problems of financing and refrain from making mountains out of molehills. We are attempting to balance the budget of what we hope will continue to be the world's first city. We are not rewriting Poor Richard's Almanac, or reestablishing the economic and civic standards of the nineteenth century.

There is undoubtedly waste in our municipal government, and it should be mercilessly exposed and rooted out, but not at the expense of morale and service. There are too many professional employees on the permanent payrolls preparing specifications and inspecting contract work which could be done faster, cheaper, more smoothly, with less overhead, stalling and clockwatching, if it were farmed out on a contract basis to the best firms in private business, firms which have to meet payrolls, rent, and light bills to live. The costs of plans and inspection in some departments are astounding. Instead of a maximum of 4 percent for design and a similar amount for supervision, charged by private firms, the costs rise to 8 and 12 percent and even higher for each. Here is room for savings in both capital and expense budgets. But it is one not welcomed by some of our organized civil-service groups.

Better executives in all departments will get long-term economies, but they are not easy to find. The incentives become less rather than greater when investigating committees from Washington dominated by men like Senator Tamm, by clear implication, characterize the entire city service as corrupt and incompetent, and imply that men like Costello and Erickson, whom most of us never saw until the Kefauver committee televised them, run the city's entire business. I personally never laid eyes on or even remotely heard of these characters in the course of 17 years in major city work. It is senseless to foul our municipal personnel

with unproven charges of general corruption and then demand that better people hurry into government service.

That the standards of government, the levels of public morality and the ambitions of the young will be permanently elevated by the appearance and sworn testimony of such ineffectual characters as Virginia Hill—whose performance my ribald friends unanimously hold to have been the high point of the greatest minstrel show on earth—is a proposition which only professional believers in good clean fun will advance. Miss Hill was no more relevant in the Kefauver investigation than Morgan's midjet at the stock-market investigation.

To paraphrase the sapient words of the immortal bard, there will be cakes and ale, wagering and other sports after Senators KEFAUVER and TONEY have returned to the hills of Tennessee and New Hampshire from whence, as the Bible says, "cometh our help." Wise reformers don't give too many cathartics. A few more doses of Senator TONEY, and the town will be thirsty for another Jimmie Walker.

Spasms of reform and efficiency get us nowhere. We need firm objectives. These are orderly growth, wider horizons, decent standards. Toward their realization we require steady, reliable sources of income.

There has been a deal of loose talk about patronage in the city service. There are, to be sure, political jobs in every government but the possible savings claimed by eliminating them have been fantastically inflated. There are in all 532 exempt positions in our municipality, including elected officials, commissioners, etc., controlled by the city. The salaries attached to these positions aggregate \$3,151,492 out of a total personal service appropriation of \$693,000,000. If half of all these exempt places could be dropped, the net saving would be less than \$2,000,000, or two-tenths of 1 percent of the total.

We must not forget that in the total current annual expense budget of \$1,322,181,423.09, mandatory items amount to \$402,000,000. Anyone who believes that these mandatory appropriations can actually be substantially reduced with legislative and public approval must have the mentality of a particularly glib child.

It is an undeniable fact that the same individuals and groups who demand drastic economies are equally vociferous in shouting for additional expenditures for their pet projects, groups, and causes. Among the economy minded are found those who insist that the city increase the salary of huge numbers of employees. Some are particularly interested in police, others in teachers, still others in transportation workers or nurses. Some are trustees of private hospitals, and in this capacity demand that the city pay these hospitals full cost of maintaining city charges in private institutions. Some are trustees of semipublic educational institutions, museums, foundations, theaters, concerts, and what not, and in this guise urge greatly increased city appropriations for these excellent causes. They point out that we cannot live by bread alone, that culture, too, counts, and claim with considerable truth that the city is not living up to its moral and contractual obligations to the arts and sciences. Often the same critics demand lower assessments on real estate on one day, and on the next claim payments or awards in condemnation far in excess of assessed values. It all depends upon whose blocks are gored. Ambitious parents of small means look to the board of higher education to make the gates of our city colleges wide enough for every qualified applicant, but what does "qualified" mean? In theory we might restrict the professions to a small number of the most brilliant students, but that is not the way democracy looks at it. It means more buildings, more teachers, more

upkeep. It's very expensive, but we are committed to it.

Vociferous shouters for economy include prominent figures who for years in the LaGuardia administration supported the 5-cent fare on the ground that the social implications of a higher rate would be terrible. They prevented the building of new subways when prices were low and materials available. They created our worst budgetary problems, and blame subsequent administrations for them.

When the sales tax increase was debated earlier this year, Mr. Walter Hoving charged that receipts from this tax for the current tax year were deliberately and maliciously underestimated by the city finance department to the extent of \$31,000,000 and that an increment therefore was unnecessary. When the chips were down, however, the able chief accountant of the comptroller's office, Mr. Julius Wolff, proved to be within 2 percent of perfect in his February 9, 1951, estimate and Mr. Hoving was shown to be wholly wrong. It is fortunate that Mr. Hoving was not an official estimator, for if he had been, the city would have been in real trouble.

Let us consider inevitable increases in the salaries of underpaid city employees.

The total number of city employees is about 217,000.

Here is a table of conservative increases:

Police	\$16,000,000
Firemen	9,000,000
Sanitation workers	2,500,000
Teachers	40,000,000
Board of transportation employees	25,000,000
Park employees	1,500,000
Water supply, gas, and electricity	500,000
Clerical and stenographic forces	3,500,000
Nurses and doctors	5,150,000
Other professional and technical forces	500,000
Welfare and court workers	4,350,000

If we add these together we see that we require, beginning in 1952, not less than \$100,000,000 for increases in wages alone.

Now to this total must be added the cost of additional police, teachers, and other employees which will bring the total required for expansion of forces to \$10,000,000. To these figures must be added the costs of amortization, interest charges and upkeep arising out of a considerable amount of additional capital construction, totaling another \$20,000,000. The grand total of inescapable additions seems, therefore, to be about \$130,000,000.

How can any sane and honest person claim that any such sum can be saved by efficiency studies and relatively small economies. For example, improved business methods in the police department will not save more than a small fraction of the cost of more officers to make life safe, and sufficient pay to enable the average policeman to keep his family decently and to resist the temptations to which underpaid men are subject. An adjustment in the age of retirement is certainly in order, but this can't be made retroactive, may be applied only to newcomers and therefore means little for many years in terms of savings. Let us anticipate also that at the first public hearing in this matter there will be critics now screaming for economy, who will question whether vigorous young thugs can be caught by worn-out, middle-aged policemen.

Let me give another example. We have just been forced, because of largely unavoidable delays in the building of new incinerators, to extend the dumping of garbage, refuse, and ashes. In the process we prudently reclaim meadow marsh and lowlands and lands under water for parks, roads, and other future public improvements. This reclamation program means ultimate economy, but

the immediate effect is an increase in the budget to furnish better barges, trucks and machinery, dikes, water gates, hydraulic fill, more men and supervisors, etc. No immediate savings in the sanitation department by efficiency installations will offset these increases, and only tricky minds can make such a claim.

The net reductions in the 1952 expense budget, through real economies brought about by this management survey cannot possibly exceed \$10,000,000. I am all for saving this \$10,000,000, but am not for ignoring the \$130,000,000 which can be reduced only by injustice to underpaid employees and by curtailing vitally needed services.

The question arises how these bills are to be met and this should be answered by the committee, its director, and his staff. The establishment of full, true value of real estate will permit an increase in the budget and in borrowing power without imposing new forms of taxation. Do the director and staff recommend an additional Federal and State aid? Do they recommend attracting more private capital into quasi-public enterprises such as slum clearance? Do they recommend increased fares and other changes? All these are matters which require study and honest presentation, and it is unfortunate that the management committee has been pictured as an agency which can meet these problems simply by improved efficiency and small savings. I want to see something more substantial come out of all this than slogans for the next municipal campaign.

In conclusion, let me suggest that the management committee ask the director and his staff and consultants to furnish the following important information:

1. How much more money is required in the expense budget for personal service, including net increase in the number and pay of employees? When will we have this estimate?

2. What will the budget increase be to meet the amortization and interest for needed public improvements?

3. What will the budget increase have to be to meet increased cost of food, drugs, equipment, and other materials which the city must buy?

4. How long will it take and how much will it cost to put the reclassification of personnel into effect?

5. In what departments can substantial immediate net savings be made, and what is the total of such savings?

6. What does the aggregate of all anticipated dollar savings due to efficiency and economy amount to?

7. How shall the net increase reached by deducting No. 6 above from the sum of Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4 be provided for?

8. What legislation, State or local, is required to carry out the committee's recommendations and when will it be ready for introduction?

Sincerely,

ROBERT MOSES,
Construction Coordinator.

Inharmonious Harmony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 10, 1951

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address entitled "Inharmonious Harmony," by

Adrien J. Falk, president of the California State Chamber of Commerce, at the host breakfast in Sacramento on September 1, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

In his epistles, Horace, the immortal Latin poet, coined the phrase "concordia discors," which, literally translated, means "inharmonious harmony." He was referring to the underlying principle of the philosophy of Empedocles, who held that the life of the world is due to the perpetual conflict of love and hate.

Today we reject that narrow concept, but most of us do recognize that life and growth and human relations are largely shaped through a conflict of opposing forces and that the most peaceful and purposeful progress or harmony results when such forces are brought into reasonable balance or concordance.

Certainly that is the fundamental that governs our free way of life, which is founded on agreement out of disagreement. It excludes appeasement, but admits compromise when such is for the common good, though never at the sacrifice of principle.

This great Republic was born in an atmosphere of travail and contention. The Declaration of Independence was proclaimed on July 4, 1776; the Constitution adopted on September 17, 1787, after 4 months of debate and negotiation that often seemed hopeless; it was established by ratification of the ninth State on June 21, 1788. Rhode Island, the thirteenth and last of the Original States to fall in line, acted on May 29, 1790. Thus, for more than 10 long years the very existence of the Republic wavered in the balance. But finally "inharmonious harmony" prevailed and brought about a meeting of minds in a compromise of conflicting interests.

Compare the difficulties faced by the founding fathers in securing the unity essential to the drafting of the Constitution and the molding of the Republic into a nation with those with which the Union is confronted today. Then there were 13 disunited States, a population of about three and one-half million, no national government, no army or navy, no established system of education. The loose federation known as the United States was bankrupt. There was not enough money in the Treasury to pay the interest, let alone the redemption charges, upon the loans that France, Spain, and Holland had advanced to the cause of the American Revolution. Tariff barriers existed between the States; there were rival monetary schemes and disputes over navigation rights. A large part of the population was unemployed and poverty-stricken. Agricultural prices had descended to their lowest levels. There was a welter of social disorder, religious disturbance, and insurrection, culminating in Shay's rebellion. There was no sense of security and had been none since Washington disbanded the Continental Army 4 years earlier.

When we consider the magnitude of the task essayed by the founding fathers and the success they finally achieved in conciliating differences among themselves and between the States, thereby establishing a sound, effective national government, dedicated to liberty, tolerance, and human rights, of which we are the fortunate heirs, we must pull up with misgiving when we contemplate the uncertainty and often the inadequacy, with which this great and powerful Republic meets the crisis of today.

Now we are a Nation of more than 154,000,000, possessing limitless resources of mind and material, a form of government proved and entrenched by tradition and experience. We have maintained our basic freedoms and still chart our own course. Our economic system has provided the highest

standards of living known to man. Inherent in our very way of life are moral and spiritual values that restrain and channel for human welfare our unparalleled economic accomplishments.

If the founding fathers succeeded in doing so much with so little—of what, then, need we be afraid? What did those 55 men who sat in Constitutional Convention 184 years ago this very day have that this generation hasn't got?

Historians agree they were an exceptionally gifted body of men—each a predominant figure in his community or in his State—each an expert in the field of government. Wisdom, devotion to duty, and integrity—such as they possessed would stand us in good stead today. They realized that unbridled democracy would trample liberty to death, just as surely as absolutism would crush it, and so they wisely shaped a middle course.

Franklin expressed their attitude when it came his turn to sign the Constitution. He said he did not entirely approve the document, but he was not sure he would always entertain such doubts. He had often been moved by better information to change his opinion, and he hoped that other members who had objections would, with him "doubt a little of their own infallibility" and to manifest unanimity, sign the instrument.

This exemplified the spirit of compromise in which our free institutions were evolved; the willingness to accept less than the full measure of our personal desires; concession of part in order that the whole structure may be somewhat advanced.

If it is true that a free society rests on agreement out of disagreement then, it follows, that disagreement itself is an essential of liberty. Lord Balfour said that our whole political machinery presupposes a people so fundamentally at one that they can safely afford to bicker. It is impossible to conceive freemen holding collectively to one opinion on all issues; such is the very antithesis of free thought; it is also the essential yet unattainable objective of despotism, and inevitably brings about its downfall. John Stuart Mill said "If all mankind, minus one, were of one opinion, and only one person were of contrary opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person, than he, if he had the power, would be justified in silencing mankind." Voltaire, in his famous quotation, put it more tersely "I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it."

The liberties we enjoy carry with them definite obligations. The obligation of the right to disagree is that disagreement shall be founded in fact, framed with integrity, and be devoted—not to self-service—but to the common welfare.

Our free way of life is a voluntary way and it exists on free trade in ideas. Its very being rests on moderation and tolerance and recognition of the dignity of the individual, for it is only where these prevail that liberty of thought and word and act can long endure. Its authority stems from the people. Its processes cannot be frozen but must ever be open to change at the will of the people. Article I of the Constitution of the State of California describes it thus: "All political power is inherent in the people. Government is instituted for the protection, security and benefit of the people, and they have the right to alter or reform the same whenever the public good may require it."

The will of the people can no longer be determined in town meetings, but must be the result of a studied and guarded process. Otherwise, liberty can swiftly degenerate into license, for people in the mass are often moved by impulse and emotion rather than by reason. That calls for government strong and pliant enough to preserve, as Madison put it "the rights of the minority in all cases where a majority are united by a common interest or passion."

So the founding fathers, in their great understanding of human nature, created a representative government of checks and balances; a federal republic of limited power, dedicated to personal liberty.

Our Nation has undergone many changes since the drafting of the Constitution. Then the population numbered about 3,500,000; the economy was basically agricultural. Seventy percent of the people lived from the soil. How different today. Now 16 percent of our population produce almost all the food and fiber consumed by our 154,000,000 people, plus vast surpluses to meet the needs of other nations. With the development of the industrial era, our population has largely centered in and about great cities. Standards of living have increased immeasurably. Our whole fabric of life is complicated by the swift and ever-increasing tempo of transportation and communication, and by the constant shuffling of a highly keyed and sensitive economy, with its concomitant social, economic, and political fluctuations.

Jefferson's axiom that the best-governed people are the least governed still holds true, but it takes a lot more government to meet the pressing issues of today than it did in his time. And because government inevitably feeds on itself, and most office holders, with human appetite that can be understood but not always condoned, seek to retain and even extend their power and authority, it is up to those who love liberty and believe that the State was created to serve man—and not man the State—to be sure they don't get more local government in their personal affairs, more State government in their local affairs, and above all, more National Government in all their affairs, than is absolutely necessary to maintain "a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

In our zeal to maintain human rights and protect minorities, we must not lose sight of the fact that majorities have rights, too, and strange as it may seem, sometimes they are in need of safeguards. Lincoln gave this warning: "In giving freedom to the slave, we assume freedom to the free." This paradoxical situation arises out of the very immensity of our country, our constant growth, our great prosperity, the diversity of our origins, cultures, pursuits, and interests, and to other factors. As individuals our influence on legislation is nil; therefore, groupwise, we organize to protect and advance what each conceives to be its welfare. "Organized cooperation is the mightiest engine in the universe when men lay hold of its power," says an anonymous author, and politically, pressure groups certainly know how to throw their weight around in these United States.

No question but that it is proper and sometimes necessary for agriculture, business, labor, racial, and other groups to act collectively in order to obtain equality of treatment and to prevent discrimination, but when they push beyond such legitimate objectives and use their combined strength to reach for special privileges that tend to throw our social mechanism out of balance, they undermine the very processes that assure their liberties. Eternal vigilance is not the only price of liberty. We must pay for that precious boon in many ways—in our daily doings, in services performed for the common good, in concessions made to bring harmony out of inharmonious, and thus maintain a balanced and free society.

The conflict between self-interest and the common good—between freedom and force—between the voluntary and the regimented way of life—is as old as relations among men and goes back to the first instance when some stronger or craftier cave man sold his weaker or less alert neighbor, by force or by persuasion, the idea that he would be better off if he exchanged his labor and his sub-

servience for food and shelter. When time came to give this relationship a name it was called slavery. The present-day slickers refer to it by the more enticing term "security."

We search vainly through recorded history for a single instance wherein government, in any form, has ever achieved absolute or lasting security for its people. Our personal experiences—our common sense—tell us that security must be built from within—security buttressed by self-reliance, morality and faith and recognition of the obligations we owe our fellow men. Every man born of woman knows or comes to know both happiness and trouble, sickness and health, success and failure and all the other conditions that comprise the gamut of human experience. And none will ever come to know security from cradle to grave—or freedom from want and fear.

Most of us think that catching phrase "freedom from want and fear" was first used to describe the "four freedoms," when in fact it predated that fervid speech. I quote: "We shall banish want. We shall banish fear. The essence of national socialism is human welfare. There must be cheap volkswagen (automobiles) for the workers to ride in, and broad autobahns (highways) for the volkswagen. National socialism is the revolution of the common man. Rooted in the fuller life for every German from childhood to old age, national socialism means a new day of abundance at home, and a better world abroad." Who uttered those noble words? An inspired National Socialist—Adolf Hitler, of course, whose distorted philosophy and ambitions brought Germany and half the world to waste.

What makes people fall for such high-sounding, sophistical, cheap slogans? Let us analyze a couple. Karl Marx said, "To each according to his need; from each according to his ability." That simply means that government will put its finger on every individual and decide just how much he must contribute to society and just how much he will receive in return.

Regard the proclamation of the British Labor Party. "Fair shares for all." What fair shares? What all-wise power will evaluate them? Or will it elect to disregard individual contributions, requirements, tastes, and capacities and feed us all at the same public trough?

Clement Attlee, the British Prime Minister, said within the past 2 months, "Our socialist movement is not merely out to change things—it is out to change people." Now Government is going to shape individual character. That rings of omnipotence—and as soon as it succeeds there will be no further need for God, for then man will be made in the image of his government.

Isn't it about time for the American people to take stock of themselves—to evaluate their accomplishments, their problems, and their purposes realistically, in the light of experience and of the proven verities? Saint Paul said: "Prove all things—hold fast that which is good."

Today the lines of battle are clearly drawn. The world is divided into opposing ideological camps—one committed to the free way of life—the other, the compulsory way. It is a conflict between a totally materialistic philosophy and one predicated on the principle that materialism must be guided and controlled by moral law. It is a test to determine whether free men are fitted to govern themselves or whether a despot, a clique or a relatively insignificant minority shall direct the destinies of mankind. It is not a new conflict, though it has assumed many different forms throughout the ages.

Those who think the clash of ideas and interests between free government and communism is of recent origin, should read the prophetic words of Alexis de Tocqueville, a French liberal politician and author, who wrote over 120 years ago when America was

an adolescent, sprawling agricultural nation, and Russia a mighty semi-barbarous despotism:

"There are at the present time two great nations in the world, which started from different points, but seem to tend towards the same end. I allude to the Russians and the Americans. Both of them have grown up unnoticed; and while the attention of mankind was directed elsewhere, they have suddenly placed themselves in the front rank among the nations. . . ."

"All other nations seem to have nearly reached their natural limits, and they have only to maintain their power; but these are still in the act of growth. All the others have stopped, or continue to advance with extreme difficulty; these alone are proceeding with ease and celerity along a path to which no limit can be perceived. The American struggles against the obstacles that nature opposes to him; the adversaries of the Russian are men. The former combats the wilderness and savage life; the latter, civilization with all its arms. The conquests of the American are therefore gained by the plowshare; those of the Russian by the sword. The Anglo-American relies upon personal interest to accomplish his ends and gives free scope to the unguided strength and common sense of the people; the Russian centers all the authority of society in a single arm. The principal instrument of the former is liberty; of the latter servitude. Their starting point is different and their courses are not the same; yet each of them seems marked out by the will of Heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe."

It was the same de Tocqueville who said, "Despotism may govern without faith, but liberty cannot."

Truer words were never spoken. America must have faith—faith in the divine providence that shapes our ends, faith in our free way of life, faith in our destiny, faith in ourselves.

Let us free ourselves of all cheap slogans and foreign isms, and returning to our American tradition be guided by those fundamental principles which have been for our country, through all the years, even when in the wilderness of war and of depression, a pillar of cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night.

Let us seek leaders in whom we can have faith—leaders with everyday probity and with intellectual integrity, with vision tempered by knowledge and common sense, with burning patriotism that rises above political considerations, with conviction that holds fast to principle yet recognized the essentiality of concordia discors—agreement out of disagreement—in a free society. Such potential leadership exists, for in this great land, the spirit of Washington and of Lincoln persists in the hearts of the people.

He leads us still. O'er chasms yet unspanned Our pathway lies; the work is but begun; But we shall do our part and leave our land The mightier for noble battles won.

Here truth must triumph, honor must prevail;

The Nation Lincoln died for cannot fail!

Suspension of Deliveries of Fresh Beef

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 10, 1951

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a memorandum from Earl C. Gibbs, of Cleve-

land, Ohio, a large independent meat packer, and also a press release issued by him, in regard to the suspension by his firm of deliveries of fresh beef, and thus the cessation by his firm of the meat-packing business, because of the OPS regulations. The memorandum to which I refer is a notice which that firm has sent to all its customers in its territory.

The Gibbs firm is the oldest meat-packing establishment in Cleveland. Its normal distribution amounts to from 400,000 to 500,000 pounds of fresh beef a week.

The memorandum and the press release bring very forcibly to the attention of the Senate some of the confusion which is resulting because of impractical rules and regulations issued by the Office of Price Stabilization.

There being no objection, the memorandum and press release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 8, 1951.

To Our Customers:

Effective Monday, September 10, 1951, deliveries of fresh beef will be terminated until some relief is granted by OPS for beef slaughterers. We have very reluctantly taken this step and this is the first time in the 40 years of our company's existence that our customers will not be able to get normal deliveries of beef but after careful consideration of all the facts we find that this step is necessary because it is impossible for us to continue to serve our customers' beef requirements in anywhere near a normal manner. We have worked diligently and at considerable expense to attempt to find a way to continue and have been told that some price relief was to be forthcoming from OPS for a number of weeks. Until some relief is granted it will be impossible for us to operate.

Sincerely,

EARL C. GIBBS,
President, Earl C. Gibbs, Inc., 3378
West Sixty-fifth Street, Cleveland,
Ohio.

PRESS RELEASE FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE FOR
SEPTEMBER 10, 1951, BY EARL C. GIBBS, INC.,
3378 WEST SIXTY-FIFTH STREET, CLEVELAND,
OHIO

Earl C. Gibbs, Inc., today suspended deliveries of fresh beef for the first time in its 40 years of existence to all of its customers. This includes about 600 retail stores in greater Cleveland.

We normally distribute four to five hundred thousand pounds of fresh beef each week to retail stores in greater Cleveland. We have reluctantly taken this step because of the inconvenience that it will cause to our customers and in turn the inconvenience to the consuming public served by our customers.

But after careful consideration of all the facts we find it impossible to continue our operation until some workable program is set forth by OPS. OPS has acknowledged the fact that relief is necessary for these beef slaughterers to operate and has promised relief for a number of weeks. This relief has not been forthcoming and we do not find it possible to continue unless we engage in some manner of Federal price evasion. This we will not do.

The reason that the price squeeze has developed for beef slaughterers is: The price of fresh beef was established at a fixed level by OPS and in establishing the level of beef prices a ceiling price was also established on hides and tallow which is a slaughtering byproduct. Hides and tallow are now selling below the prices fixed by OPS. This reduction in these items amounts to more than the profit allowed by OPS for the slaughter of a beef animal.

Government Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 10, 1951

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Controls Confusion Confounded," written by Royce Brier, and published in the column entitled "This World Today," in the San Francisco Chronicle of August 25, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS WORLD TODAY

(By Royce Brier)

CONTROLS CONFUSION CONFOUNDED

One of the melancholy aspects of the controls issue in the United States is that we, the consumers, are compelled to listen to such arrant nonsense about it from the control boys in Washington.

It isn't, and never has been, an intelligent device for regulating the American economy during an inflationary trend. It is a device for accumulating what political capital may be lying around, and for re-summing, behind the mask of an emergency, those demolitions of a free economy which were the natural recourse of a nation at war, but were rejected by the people as a nuisance and a freedom-destroying impertinence when the war was ended.

All controls which go beyond simple regulation designed to protect the public welfare from economic abuses, are steps to a socialist collectivism, and those who advocate them outside warfare are quite aware of this and are intrinsically collectivists, though they plausibly deny it and conceal their true aims with learned talk of technology, change, and necessity. The controls people swarm Washington and the regional offices like excited bees, and they multiply by the thousands when the season is on, and there isn't a rookie stenographer among them but will give you the technology-change-necessity lingo if the subject is brought up.

Not all those resigned to controls, as many Congressmen and businessmen are, are collectivists, but they are confused by distortions of the price structure, and stampeded by the job-holding collectivist horde which orders them controls as an oplate guaranteed to kill their pain.

The most casual comparative study, however, of controls as practiced and advocated in the United States reveals them as an early stage of what has now been reached by British socialism, bringing on a pattern of economic activity so sluggish and so creaking with bureaucratic burdens as virtually to paralyze the British people historically.

Any difference is quantitative, not qualitative. Present American controls are a first step, openly advocated controls are halfway, and barely concealed purposes of the Washington controllers are all the way to the British system. And the British system has nowhere to go but back to a reasonably free economy, or forward to more controls until it resembles for all practical purposes the economic determinism practiced in the so-called Marxist societies.

To get back to the nonsense (and the news), the Washington people, with Mr. Truman as inevitable spokesman, but many bees far busier than the President can be, have a story. You've been bombarded with it for

several years, and it never changes. Prices are high. Give them controls and they'll stop the inflation.

So they got some controls. Then they got an anxiety neurosis as to how we'd take them. So they resorted to expediency in applying them. When they did apply them, as in the case of meat, nothing special happened. Some meat went up and some down, the average went up a trifle. Then they said meat would have gone up far more without controls, so give us more controls and we'll bring it down. But the housewife, who is no idiot, saw that this was sweet talk, and the Congress, which doesn't go in for trying to fool the housewife, wouldn't give them more controls. This was a horrible set-back, and Mr. Truman and Mr. Disalle were both indignant, and everybody scattered around to make speeches, saying: "You'll be sorry, you'll be sorry."

Another part of the story is that the controls people know infallibly what's going to happen in the American economic future if the people and the Congress don't grant them whatever control powers they ask right now—today. It's runaway inflation. And they say, if you don't do it, why, Pilate-like, we wash our hands.

This is nonsense because infallible prediction is always nonsense. An intelligent economy, a going society, cannot be predicated on infallible prediction, especially the infallible prediction of some deputy administrator of something addressing a luncheon club.

All this is just collectivist beehive work, and it's using your economy for a political football, too. Mr. Truman and his party are not alone responsible. Many harvesters see hay in controls. The President has been mulling over how to get more controls than the modified law already gave him, calling the boys in for sessions. So he came up Thursday with a special message seeking repeal of three sections of the control law he doesn't like.

In what the dispatch called a surprise move, Republican Senators FERGUSON, NIXON, and WELKER introduced a bill to grant the President's request. They explained they believed the President was playing politics with controls, so they would give him what he wants, and thus the administration will have to take the blame if controls fail.

It is submitted here that this dubiously plays politics to counter dubious political playing, and it is further submitted that your economy, which means what you eat, wear, own, and earn deserves more responsible treatment than a frantic endeavor to prefix blame for some economic disaster which has not yet occurred.

The Flood in Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 10, 1951

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, in July of this year my State of Kansas and the States of Missouri and Oklahoma suffered what is the most devastating flood in their history. The loss in money will mount to the billion mark.

The loss to those who have lost their homes and possessions, accumulated often over the period of a lifetime, cannot be calculated.

On August 31 I voted, with four of my colleagues, against the tremendous Eu-

ropean-aid bill. My reasons for so doing could not have been better summarized than in the resolution adopted by the Fredonia chapter of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARL GILL POST, No. 3018,

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,

Fredonia, Kans.

Be it resolved by Carl L. Gill Post, No. 3018, Veterans of Foreign Wars of Fredonia, Kans., That Kansas and her neighboring States have just suffered the most devastating floods that have been recorded in any section of this Nation at any time; and

That this flood damage is still beyond comprehension in the destruction of highways, bridges, business buildings, railways, utilities and personal effects of the flood victims but that this damage can be easily assessed at this time as equal to or greater than the war damage to the European areas during World War II; and

That this Government has been dealing out billions of dollars in grants to war stricken areas of Europe and has under proposal now, additional billions for this same purpose; now

Carl L. Gill Post of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, United States of America, calls upon the congressional delegation of the State of Kansas to demand from their colleagues in the House and Senate, that no more aid to Europe be voted except that an amount equal to such proposed aid shall be automatically appropriated in money and goods to the flood stricken areas of the Middle West

Carl L. Gill Post, No. 3018, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Fredonia, Kans., is not condemning aid to sufferers in Europe but believing that charity begins at home and that these flood sufferers of this area of the Middle West have supported the aid to Europe in years past with their tax dollars, have now the right to expect first call from a spendthrift administration in this, their hour of need, and Carl L. Gill Post, No. 3018, Veterans of Foreign Wars, United States of America, Fredonia, Kans., tenders this resolution to each member of the congressional delegation from Kansas with the request for their serious consideration of the action requested.

CARL L. GILL POST, No. 3018,

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

Lincoln's Handling of Peace Conference Offers Lesson for Korean Negotiations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, mention has recently been made of the fact that while the Korean truce talks had lasted 60 days when they were suspended by the Communists, it took only 5 days to secure a cease-fire ending World War I and only 2 and 4 days, respectively, to gain a cease-fire in the European and Pacific phases of World War II.

Much more* to the point, it seems to me, is the fact that it required only 4 hours to determine that peace negotiations designed to end the American Civil War were premature and nonproductive.

These historic negotiations, in which President Lincoln personally participated, were held aboard a Union transport at Hampton Roads, Va., February 3, 1865. Any comparison of these negotiations with those at Kaesong must, of course, take into account one important difference. Both sides in the Hampton Roads Conference were represented by reasonable men, by men of honor, sincerity, and integrity. Even so, I believe the present administration could have profited—and might still profit—by the example set by President Lincoln in those proceedings 86 years ago.

The meeting at Hampton Roads was attended by President Lincoln and Secretary of State Seward, for the Union, and by Vice President Alexander Stephens and two other representatives of the Confederacy. It was the result of a volunteer peace move initiated by the venerable Francis P. Blair, of Maryland. Blair, in January 1865, secured Lincoln's permission to visit President Jefferson Davis. Blair had the dream that the North and South might agree to suspend their war to launch a joint expeditionary force to drive the French Emperor Louis Napoleon's stooge, Maximilian, off the Mexican throne. This project did not have Lincoln's endorsement, but he had no objection to Blair's meeting the Confederate President.

Blair brought back a letter from Davis stating that he—Davis—was willing to send commissioners to discuss restoration of peace "between the two countries." Lincoln then gave Blair a letter saying he was willing to receive southern representatives to confer informally "with a view of securing peace to the people of our one common country." The issue of the supremacy of the Union reflected in the wording of those two letters became the point on which the negotiations collapsed. Nevertheless, Lincoln and Seward did meet with the southern representatives in a historic 4-hour conference, details of which Lincoln later reported, with full documentation, to the Congress—in itself a precedent which the present administration would do well to note.

Here are a few of the features of this conference which, I believe, offer a timely lesson for present or future American negotiations in Korea:

First. The Hampton Roads conference was held at a location designated by President Lincoln, within Union territory.

Second. Lincoln, in advance of the conference, wired General Grant, top Union commander:

Let nothing which is transpiring change, hinder, or delay your military movements or plans.

There was no let-up on the enemy.

Third. Lincoln dramatically proved his desire for peace by his personal participation in the conference—but there was no display of overcagerne's which would weaken his position or suggest a

willingness to compromise or appease for the sake of peace. At the outset, Lincoln made it clear that "restoration of the national authority throughout all of the States" and abolition of slavery were absolute requirements for peace and were matters not subject to discussion, debate, negotiation, or compromise.

Fourth. Finally, Lincoln flatly rejected any proposal for a truce of ceasefire prior to acceptance of these basic terms. He spurned the idea of the Mexican undertaking as the basis for a possible future agreement to reunite. Agreement to reunite, he insisted, must come before peace or anything else.

The conference itself was conducted by both sides in an amicable, reasonable, and courteous atmosphere. Lincoln's firmness permitted no misunderstanding. He stopped every shrewd effort to get a foot in the door so far as compromise was concerned. He made it clear that so far as basic principles were concerned there was, in MacArthur's recent phrase, "no substitute for victory." It took only 4 hours to agree that there was not and could not be agreement. The victory came less than 3 months later—by force of arms.

How desperately the United States needs the same Lincoln clarity, firmness and hard-headed good sense in dealing with today's ruthless and unscrupulous enemies.

Cocke Defends Legion's Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. MCFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 11, 1951

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Cocke Defends Legion's Activities," written by Erle Cocke, Jr., national commander of the American Legion, substituting for Drew Pearson in writing the column entitled "The Washington Merry-Go-Round," published in the Washington Post this morning.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND COCKE DEFENDS LEGION'S ACTIVITIES

(While Drew Pearson is on a brief vacation, the Washington Merry-Go-Round is being written by distinguished guest columnists. Today's is Erle Cocke, Jr., national commander of the American Legion.)

It's very seldom the American Legion gets the chance to tell its side of the story—the side some folks don't bother to determine.

PRESSURE GROUP, WARMONGERS, TREASURY RAIDERS, HOODLUMS

We've been called all those names in our 33 years. But, as Al Smith used to say, "Let's look at the record."

Pressure group? To this one we plead guilty—all 4,000,000 legionnaires and auxiliarians. We pressured into being the spending of \$87,165,759.18, raised by our own efforts, to help the Nation's needy children.

We organized more than 16,500 junior baseball teams—teams that gave supervised

recreation with citizenship training for more than a million teen-age boys every summer. We sponsored nearly 4,000 Boy Scout troops.

We created a Boys' State program through 18,000 selected high-school students who learn by doing the way our Government operates.

We conduct an annual national oratorical contest in which 350,000 high-school students write essays on the Constitution and Bill of Rights.

PRESSURE FOR DEFENSE

Sure, we're a pressure group. Pressure against juvenile delinquency.

The vacationing Drew Pearson will know what it means to be called a pressure group. Throughout the years his pressure has caused fear and consternation in Fascist and Communist circles, and today his friendship balloons are piercing the iron curtain in Czechoslovakia, into the very heart of communism.

Warmongers?

No, but like our great Secretary of Defense, George C. Marshall, we admit pressurizing for preparedness. We authored the universal military training bill and hope to see a thoroughly integrated program become law before another year has passed. Of course, the Kremlin has its own slant on "warmongering" and we are proud to be No. 1 on their warmonger list.

The American Legion has been a great and constant force, at home and abroad, for Godliness, for Christian philosophies, for moral backbone and for civic virtue. Perhaps some people call that warmongering.

It was the American Legion that brought to attention Communist infiltration into our labor unions and farmer guilds. We exposed the Communist infiltration in our legal profession and in our courts. It was the Legion that exposed the way Communist teachers infiltrated our schools, and we formed neighborhood groups of vigilant parents to defeat the Communist Kiddie-Klubs.

FIGHT COMMUNISM

It was a commander of one of the 17,330 Legion posts who started the longshoremen's refusal to load or unload Communists' ships of supplies bound for Communist troops.

Yes, we have fought communism with every means at our command and we intend to continue fighting it until it no longer menaces the free world we live in.

For that we have been called warmongers.

Treasury raiders? No, but we do demand that wounded and disabled service men and women get fair treatment. We were the authors of the GI bill of rights, which has provided higher education and vocational training for 7,500,000 veterans of World War II, the greatest stimulus to education in history.

Fair compensation for war wounds has always been our demand. Hospitalization and domiciliary care, yes. But in all fairness, is that Treasury raiding?

Hoodlums? There never has been a city that housed our national convention that has not asked us back again. Miami, our host city this year, has invited us to make Miami the perennial convention city and according to their editorial writers and those of other cities, American Legionnaires are the best behaved of any national convention.

And why not? After all, the American Legion is America. Certainly no one else has a finer cross-section of citizens as members. We are proud of our membership comprising the President, 25 State Governors, 55 United States Senators, and 237 Representatives. Along with them we have members in about every category known to our country.

THE CASE RESTS

Thrice we have been called upon to defend our country in war. Thrice we have given America victory. Thrice more shall we do the same if necessary.

We are proud that in the past 2 years we have collected and distributed more than 10,000,000 toys—distributed them to the underprivileged children of Europe and the Pacific.

We are proud that it was Legionnaire Pearson who aided the American Legion in getting this program under way. We are proud that it was he and our past national commander, George Craig, who originated this program.

That's the American Legion many do not know. That's the American Legion that has been called all those epithets over the years.

Pressure group? Treasury raiders? Warmongers? Hoodlums?

We rest our case.

Horse Sense and Honesty in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 11, 1951

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Horse Sense and Honesty in Government, delivered by me in Rockland, Maine, on August 22, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is always a pleasure for me to come to Maine. I do find the summer here somewhat more pleasant than the winter, however, because the last time I visited your State we had to come down in the snow on the Kennebec River when the State airplane decided it could no longer continue to fly.

I was glad to accept an invitation to make a Republican speech in Maine at this time, because what we need more than anything else in Government in Washington is a return to those virtues of thrift and honesty and truth and horse sense which have characterized the residents of Maine since the earliest days of the Republic. There never was a time when those virtues were more neglected or more needed in Government.

It is always a pleasure to be associated with my old friend and classmate, OWEN BREWSTER, who has battled for sound principles in Washington now for a great many years. I have enjoyed my association with your junior Senator, MARGARET CHASE SMITH. She has well represented the people of Maine in her consistent votes for economy in Government, and against those pressure blocs—whether in the field of labor or business or agriculture—who sometimes seek more for their own special interest than they are entitled to in an economy based on equality and justice. I particularly appreciated her votes against the attempt to repeal the Taft-Hartley law.

Congress is in session today, and OWEN BREWSTER and I have to explain our absence from Washington by pointing out that we had every reason to expect that the Congress should and would be adjourned by this date in August. And we would have adjourned except for the breakdown of the Democratic Party as a party, and the complete absence of a legislative plan. There is a good deal of loose talk about differences among the Republicans. I can only say that I feel confident that the Republicans in 1952 will present a united front. They can be easily reconciled because they agree on certain fundamental principles of government—on honest administration, on progress through

more individual and local liberty, and not by more and more power in a control government and not by more and more spending and taxation. But the real split in Washington is in the Democratic Party because half of them are left-wing socialists who dominate the executive administration, but can't control the Democratic Congress. The failure of this Congress to do anything promptly, or to accomplish anything substantial at all is due to that determined split which has prevented any kind of a planned program from being considered by this Eighty-second Congress.

Certain measures, of course, are forced upon us by the threats of Soviet Russia. The regular appropriations, the necessity of extending the Draft Act to provide the necessary armed forces to meet the present emergency, the new military program and the incidental aid to foreign governments for military purposes, the new taxes to meet the vast expansion of public spending, the defense controls to prevent the inflation produced by that spending, are all bipartisan measures based on the general agreement of all that we must meet the Russian menace. But even this program has been long delayed. The administration's proposal for foreign aid was not even presented to Congress until May 24. The huge defense appropriation bills did not even reach the House of Representatives until May 1. In the Senate, at least, we did not receive the tax bill until nearly July 1.

The people can well compare the record of this Eighty-second Democratic Congress with the comprehensive and efficient record of the Eightieth Republican Congress. We adjourned in 1947 on August 1, and in 1948 before the first of July. In those periods, we enacted every appropriation and a long series of additional programs, carefully planned, including the repeal of war controls and the return to a free economy, the unification of the armed services, and a 70-group Air Force, later cut down by President Truman, the Taft-Hartley law, the Aiken agricultural policy and price-support law, the Marshall plan to combat communism abroad, the only tax reduction bill we have seen in many a New Deal year, a constructive reclamation program, the first revelations of communism in the Government, and many other substantive laws. These laws, even those passed over the President's political vetoes, have been the basis of all government policy since, because they were based on horse sense and sound principle. The Eightieth Congress also initiated the studies which resulted in bipartisan social-security amendments, and also the Atlantic Pact.

In that Congress we Republicans had only two more than a majority, but we retained our majority on every important vote. Today, of course, we are the opposition party without control of the Congress or its committees, but only a Republican victory in 1952 can restore harmony between the executive and Congress, and a constructive program of legislation.

In its foreign, as in its domestic program, the administration is wavering and uncertain. The most important of all the proposals before us today is that of the size and strength of the Armed Forces. On a definite plan for such Armed Forces depend the need for drafting all boys in this country for 2 years' service in the Armed Forces, the size of appropriations, the extent of the additional taxes to be levied, the character of the price and wage control and Government regulation essential to prevent the inflation which naturally results from such a tremendous Government-spending program. But this administration's defense program is characterized by the same wavering uncertainty and lack of planning which has characterized its foreign program. After the last war they assumed that no military threat remained in the world and they utterly failed to realize the character of the com-

munist of Soviet Russia, or its aggressive intentions. I certainly assumed, relying on the advice of the military, that the expenditure of \$13,000,000,000 or \$14,000,000,000 a year on the Armed Forces, 10 times what we were spending before the war, would be amply sufficient to provide adequate armed forces and defense for the United States. No one yet has been able to tell us just what did happen to the \$50,000,000,000 appropriated in the 3 years after the war. We know that President Truman refused to use about \$750,000,000 appropriated for a 70-group Air Force. It was as late as March 1950, only 18 months ago, that General Bradley testified that in his opinion \$13,000,000,000 was approximately enough to provide a completely adequate defense for the United States. He stated that the Joint Chiefs of Staff might like a little more, but that they never went along with the big figure of \$20,000,000,000 and that if he should recommend \$30,000,000,000 a year, he probably ought to be removed as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. You will remember that at the time General Eisenhower criticized the budget.

Today the Joint Chiefs of Staff are not satisfied with a total expenditure approaching \$60,000,000,000 a year. Of course, the Korean attack occurred in between, but we are told correctly that the end of the Korean war will make no difference in our military program. We are arming to meet the power of Soviet Russia, just as well known before Korea as since Korea. The administration was still fooling itself and the Nation, as it did at Tehran, and Yalta and Potsdam, because of its sympathy for communism, and its failure to understand its true nature.

At the time of Korea, we had about a million and a half men in the Armed Forces. In July we were asked to raise the number to 2,100,000 men. By the time we reached Washington in December, the Joint Chiefs were asking for 2,270,000. Thirty days later, in January, they were up to 3,325,000. The April 30 budget asks for 3,339,000 and now they want 3,500,000. All of our plans have been made on the basis of about 3,500,000 men, but now within the past 2 weeks the President suddenly suggests that the Joint Chiefs of Staff are preparing a much larger program with more men and more money. The question at least suggests itself whether we are not under military influence now overdoing the job as much as under military influence we underdid the job in 1950.

In my opinion there is a definite economic limit to what the United States and the people of the United States can do in time of peace without wrecking the whole economy of the country. It is not possible to impose the same sacrifices or the same controls on people in peacetime as in wartime. It is not wise to impose the same limitations on civilian economy for a 10- or a 20-year period as it is possible and wise to impose for a war period whose end is within sight in 2 or 3 years. At the present time we are raising about \$60,000,000,000 in taxes at the highest tax rates this country has ever seen, except at the very peak of the last war, and they will soon be higher than that. We are proposing to spend \$70,000,000,000 this year, requiring \$10,000,000,000 more in taxes, and about \$90,000,000,000 next year, which would require an additional \$20,000,000,000 in taxes. The President's last suggestions seem to indicate a total expenditure of at least \$100,000,000,000 a year, and in my opinion it is utterly impossible to raise the taxes necessary to meet this tremendous spending without doing more harm to the people than good. If the enlarged program is adopted, I am afraid the Government will be borrowing \$25,000,000,000 a year for 2 years, which would destroy all confidence in the value of Government bonds and make inflation almost certain, with all of the social consequences and the labor disturbances and the interference with production which such inflation

must bring. Perhaps it is necessary, but I don't believe it is, and certainly that necessity must be clearly proved. Furthermore, it is not possible to put more than 3,500,000 men in the Army without requiring our young men to serve probably 3 years in the Army instead of 2, a serious interference with the life of every boy and a sacrifice which certainly must not be imposed unless it is absolutely essential.

What seems clear is that there has been no intelligent program worked out and that the plans change from day to day. While each department of the Government and of the Armed Forces may be making intelligent plans in its own field, there is no overall brain operating with the horse sense to assure that the whole program is efficient for its purpose, and not as destructive as war to the liberty of the people. We certainly do not have the kind of intelligent leadership which the people of the United States deserve.

Apart from the lack of intelligence, I have repeatedly pointed out that there is no truth or sincerity in the programs which are presented, assuming that there is any thinking behind them at all. Each program is presented as a solution of the entire problem, although it is certain that the administration knows it is coming in next year with something much larger. They frankly have no confidence in the intelligence of the people. They feel that in order to put over their programs they have to fool the people by making them think that it is much smaller and requires much less sacrifice than it actually does. Just consider the history of gifts and loans to foreign nations. Before the war was over, we had presented to us the two Bretton Woods plans—the International Bank and the International Fund. According to Mr. Morgenthau and the officials of the Treasury, these two programs were going to stabilize the world and represented the total contribution that America would have to make. It was claimed by some at the time that this plan was insufficient and ineffective and that a loan would have to be made to the British, but this was vigorously denied by the Treasury officials. No sooner was Bretton Woods adopted, however, than we were asked for \$4,000,000,000 for a direct loan to the British. This was to solve the entire economic problem of the world. It was to be paid back by the British in due time at a low rate of interest. The British loan lasted about 1 year instead of 3 years, and thereupon we faced the \$17,000,000,000 of the Marshall plan. That plan was to be the final weapon against communism and to prevent the further spread of communism throughout the world, and to be definitely completed in 4 years. But as soon as the Marshall plan showed signs of completion, we had point 4 to encourage economic aid to all the countries in the world.

We had been considering the Atlantic Pact as a joint agreement to stand against aggression in Europe as we had already signed the Inter-American Pact to stand against aggression in South and Central America, but in 1949 we had added to a simple defense treaty the demand that we provide arms for the other members of the pact. Senator Vandenberg succeeded in limiting this proposal to approximately half-a-billion dollars a year, and it was adopted largely on the basis that that was the contemplated expense. Now we are asked to provide more than \$6,000,000,000 a year for arms to European countries. Not only that, it is now said that it is essential that we provide American soldiers as well to be stationed in Europe, although this intention was absolutely denied by the administration when the Atlantic Pact was being considered. Either the administration had no plan, or it was deliberately deceiving the American people as to its real intentions, for fear they might be rejected.

If there is any uniform philosophy underlying the administration's foreign and domestic policy, it is more and more spending by the Federal Government and more and more power for the Federal Government. Just when the people indicated in 1950 they were opposed to this philosophy in domestic policy, the administration was able to find in foreign policy the justification for engaging in an even vaster spending program. And there is no end to it. Two weeks ago the President hinted that 3,500,000 men in the Army was only an interim goal and we hear of additional appropriations which may add ten to twenty billion dollars a year to Armed Force spending. Secretary Acheson sends word to the Foreign Relations Committee that \$25,000,000,000 in 3 years is a substantial underestimate of foreign aid. But these additions as usual are being held in reserve until Congress approves the present program.

A large expenditure is undoubtedly necessary, but that necessity must be proved. It must not be spending for the sake of spending and power. No matter what the administration may say about a reduction of this spending within 2 years, the record shows that there will never be a reduction in spending until the present administration is removed from office. This vast expansion of the power of government can only be brought to an end by the election of those who really believe in thrift and in telling the people the truth and letting the people decide.

Last week the President angrily attacked slander-mongers and scare-mongers and hate-mongers because he said, "They are trying to get us to believe that our Government is riddled with communism and corruption—when the fact is we have the finest and most loyal body of civil servants in the world." In short, everyone who has said that there is Communist influence in the Government, and not only that, but everyone who says there has been corruption in Washington, is a liar. The fact that the President of the United States can so blithely dismiss the proved charges, in many cases brought out and substantiated by Democratic committees, is evidence of the low standard he accepts himself and hopes will be accepted by the people. He fails to answer any specific charge, or to point out any specific falsehood. Is it a lie to say that General Vaughan received a deepfreeze for using his influence in behalf of perfumery importers and their representative Maragon, and that Maragon is now in jail and that Vaughan is still in the White House? Is it a lie to say that one of the President's secretaries received free hotel accommodations for influence used with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or that a White House stenographer received a \$9,500 mink coat in connection with another RFC loan? These facts have all been publicly printed, and no one has even replied to these statements. Is it a lie to say that the Department of Justice neglected to make any real investigation of the vote frauds and stealing of ballots in Kansas City until the statute of limitations expired? Is there any doubt about the sordid story of influence peddling detailed in the minority report just published on the RFC investigation leading to the doors of the White House? The President condoned this kind of immorality by calling Senator Fulbright's criticism, in his interim report, asinine. If anyone doubts the low state of public morals I urge him to read this report, as well as the Look article entitled "The Scandalous Years." I suggest the President point out the lies instead of shouting "liar." The President evidently hopes that some of the charges of communism against members of the administration have been successfully repudiated, and so for the first time he ties charges of corruption in with charges of communism. But what about the charges in the field of communism? Is it a lie to say that Alger

Hiss was convicted of perjury in denying his Communist connection, after the President himself said that the investigation was just a red herring? Isn't it a fact that Marzani was convicted of perjury because he was a Communist? Didn't Wadleigh, in the State Department, admit that he passed out documents to the Soviet conspiracy? Isn't it a fact that only recently Remington has been convicted of lying about his Communist experience? Isn't it a fact that the Institute of Pacific Relations tied right in with the State Department and was dominated by Communists? Isn't it a fact that hundreds of top-secret documents were found in the office of Amerasia, the Institute's magazine, stolen or obtained from traitors in different departments of the Government?

The President's outburst must be based on the assumption that the people have forgotten all the facts and have lost all the standards of honesty and Americanism which are basic to the success of any democratic people. His attitude is shown by the fact that no one of those men whose conduct is condemned by honest men, whether immoral or illegal, has been dismissed from his Government post. It is a contrast indeed to the honesty of Calvin Coolidge. When the Teapot Dome scandals broke, he called in outside prosecutors. The crooks were promptly removed from the Government and convicted where they had violated the law. Standards of honesty were returned to Washington. These standards can never be returned to Washington under this administration, or until the administration itself is removed from office.

This Nation can be destroyed by dishonesty and immorality, by unlimited and uncritical spending, by lack of intelligence. Those are the qualities which seem to dominate the present scene in Washington. So Republicans offer to America a return to the New England virtues—the virtues of a rugged country, the virtues of a people who had to conquer the wilderness to establish the right of their children to freedom—the virtues of horse sense in dealing with the fundamental problems of foreign and domestic policy, the virtues of thrift and honesty and truth.

New Floods in Kansas-Missouri Valley Emphasize Extent of Relief Job and Necessity of Immediate Action To Make This Area Floodproof

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix to the Record, I wish to include an article by W. H. Lawrence, of Kansas City, Mo., published in the New York Times of Sunday, September 9, 1951, as follows:

**NEW FLOODS EMPHASIZE EXTENT OF RELIEF
JOB—KANSAS RIVER VALLEY WANTS FEDERAL
FUNDS AND AN INSURANCE SYSTEM**

(By W. H. Lawrence)

KANSAS CITY, Mo., September 8.—The agriculturally rich and industrially important Kansas River Valley missed another major flood by inches this week, at a time when the area barely had started climbing up the ladder of economic recovery after mid-July's inundation—the most costly natural disaster in American history.

President Truman himself was on the scene for a personal look-see on Thursday as the battered, partially repaired dikes contained the boiling dirty-brown waters.

The new flood threat, which had been serious enough to cause precautionary evacuation of three major industrial sections in both Kansas Citys, underlined both the high cost of the first flood and the necessity for prompt governmental action at local, State, and national levels to repair the damage and take what steps are possible to avert similar disasters in the future.

LOST IN THE FLOOD

Rated as five times more damaging than the great Ohio-Mississippi River flood of 1937, the rampage of the Kansas River in July displaced 350,000 persons and destroyed property worth \$2,500,000,000, while ravaging an estimated 5,500,000 acres of the most fertile farm land in America.

Eight weeks after that July black Friday the 13th not even the surface damage has been removed and, while the railroads and some of the bigger industries are getting back into production, thousands of small businesses have made no start at all toward reopening. Hundreds of persons working with the most elementary tools are trying to clean out the mud and slime from homes that were damaged but still are rated structurally safe; but no start has been made at all toward replacing the thousands of structures which have been condemned.

In brief, it has been estimated that perhaps 10 percent of the rehabilitation job has been done, thus far.

Not even the dikes have been repaired sufficiently to afford as much protection as they did in June, and they won't be in such condition for another 6 or 7 months—at a cost of approximately \$11,000,000. To make the valley more or less floodproof would cost an estimated \$300,000,000 and take 3 to 5 years to complete under the best of conditions.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE URGED

This has been a disaster of such magnitude that there is general agreement among Republicans as well as Democrats, out here at least, that it is absolutely essential for the Federal Government to intervene both with money and a coordinated recovery plan. So far, the Federal Government has committed itself to spending \$25,000,000 and private agencies have spent approximately \$7,500,000 in emergency relief work.

One probable result of this week's flood threat will be to bring new pressure upon the Congress for action upon Mr. Truman's proposed \$400,000,000 rehabilitation program.

Mr. Truman's plan addresses itself to several difficult aspects of long-term recovery affecting both agriculture and industry.

Of the 5,500,000 acres of damaged farm land it has been estimated that farmers can, with their own efforts, get approximately 2,000,000 acres back into shape for seeding this fall. Extensive State and Federal assistance to restore regular drainage facilities and other anti-erosion measures will be necessary to bring back into production another 2,500,000 acres, and the time is running short for getting ahead with this job if there is to be a wheat crop next year.

There are major credit problems now slowing the rebuilding both of industry and of homes, and two of the most controversial features of Mr. Truman's new program are aimed at relaxing if not removing these barriers.

The individual home owner and the small-business man have to a large extent found themselves with their assets gone and their debts remaining now that the flood is over. It is difficult to borrow money to build a new home or store if there are still long-term mortgages to pay off on property that was destroyed in July. There is not now available any general system of flood insurance,

and only a very few of those suffering damage had insurance upon movable equipment.

TRUMAN'S PROGRAM

Mr. Truman has proposed, therefore, both a partial indemnification program to take care of part of the recent loss, and establishment of a broad system of flood-disaster insurance similar to the war-damage insurance system offered during World War II. It is these two features which are likely to cause the most controversy in Congress.

The need for a flood-insurance program was argued by Mr. Truman in his August 20 message, pointing out that lack of such a system is a "major gap in the means by which a man can make his home, his farm, or his business secure against events beyond his control."

"It is a basic requisite to the reopening of plants in the flood region, where dikes cannot be rebuilt for some months, and companies are unwilling, in some cases, to undertake the risk of being inundated in the meantime," Mr. Truman said. "Once such a system of flood insurance is in effect there should be no need in the future for a program of partial indemnities such as is now proposed for Midwest flood victims. As a permanent national policy, insurance is far superior to direct payments."

The insurance plan calls for purchase of policies from private insurance companies with reinsurance provided by the Federal Government. It would be similar to the war-risk insurance in effect from 1942 through 1945, on which, by the way, the Federal Government made a considerable profit.

Both Kansas and Missouri are expected to summon special legislative sessions as soon as Congress enacts the new bill and the requirements of State action become more clear. Until now the States have had little money to spend on flood relief and repairs.

Report to the People of Pennsylvania by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 11, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the Record the text of a broadcast by me to the people of Pennsylvania in the series entitled "Happenings in Washington," this broadcast being program No. 49.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 49)

(Text of broadcast by United States Senator Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania)

This is Ed MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capitol and bringing you another discussion of Happenings in Washington.

In this broadcast I want to talk about the kind of government the American people are receiving from Washington—government by defiance of Congress; government by defiance of the Constitution.

For many years we have heard repeated warnings against the growing centralization of power in the executive department of the Federal Government.

We have seen the rise of a socialistic trend which would concentrate all political and

economic control in a giant bureaucracy at Washington.

We have seen the administration ignore the constitutional limitations and usurp legislative functions vested by the Constitution in the Congress of the United States.

All of this reflects the growing tendency on the part of the White House and the executive department to go their own way, no matter what Congress does in the exercise of its rightful function as the law-making branch of our Government.

If the average citizen of our country should so conduct himself, in blunt defiance of the law, he would soon find himself in jail. But this administration seems to regard itself as above and beyond the law. Its flagrant disregard for the will of Congress has led it into countless blunders which have seriously hurt our Nation, but government by defiance of Congress continues, nevertheless.

Let me give you a few examples.

In my last report to the people of Pennsylvania I told you of the President's industrial dispersal order. That is the most recent major example. Before the order was issued, administration supporters tried to have the Defense Production Act amended so that it could force new and expanded industries to locate in areas dictated by the Government. In the House this proposal was defeated by nearly 2 to 1. In the Senate it was beaten by better than 2 to 1.

In other words, Congress made it overwhelmingly clear that it opposed any program which would let the bureaucrats tell a man where he must build his factory. It refused to give the administration the right to take industry from Pennsylvania and other industrial States and give it to undeveloped areas in the South and West.

But within a few weeks President Truman defied the express will of Congress. He issued an Executive order putting into effect a national dispersal policy which could place all defense production under a virtual dictatorship.

Under this order an industry can be denied materials for new construction or expansion unless it builds where the bureaucrats say it must build.

But that's not all. Unless industry submits to this new form of control it can be denied defense contracts, emergency Government loans, accelerated tax benefits, and allocation of critical defense materials.

Now let me remind you that the President did not ask Congress to enact legislation to carry out his dispersal program. He did not ask Congress to place a limit upon the distance that industry might be required to go in order to minimize the danger of atomic attack.

Oh, no—he simply ignored Congress and resorted to legislation by Executive order.

That is government by defiance of Congress.

Now let me give you a few other examples.

Congress, upon the recommendation of the Navy Department, decided that the Nation should have a giant aircraft carrier, a super-carrier, for whatever might lie ahead. The law was passed, the money was voted, and the keel was laid.

Then, after \$20,000,000 had been spent, President Truman stepped in and ordered construction stopped. He decided that the project should be abandoned. That was in defiance of a law which had been voted by the House and the Senate and signed by President Truman himself.

Now, here is the unusual part of it. The administration has ordered work resumed on the same aircraft carrier. But the price of materials and wages have gone up, and the cost of the vessel will be at least \$50,000,000 greater than if it had been built in the first instance.

If the President had not defied Congress, the great carrier would be completed, commissioned, and in the fleet today. It would

be a warning to all aggressors that we can deliver the atom bomb by planes launched from the deck of an aircraft carrier, appropriately named *United States*.

Here's another example.

The Eightieth Congress was deeply interested in the problem of a strong and powerful Air Force to protect us against the growing threat of Communist aggression.

You may remember that we voted funds to provide a 70-group Air Force. President Truman, governing by defiance of Congress and the law, directed the Secretary of Defense to place the money in reserve. He refused to let us have a 70-group Air Force.

Since then, Russia has built a larger and more powerful air force than ours, and Mr. Truman, who blocked the 70-group Air Force, now puts out messages frantically demanding an Air Force much larger than the 70-group strength he had overruled.

That was defiance of the Congress and the law.

The greatest defeat this Nation has ever suffered—anywhere—at any time—has been in China, where the friendly government of Chiang Kai-shek gave way to the Red Communist forces, armed and equipped by Soviet Russia. There we lost 400,000,000 people to the iron curtain—a really crushing defeat.

Congress tried to block this tragic development. It sought to aid the Chinese Nationalists and to prevent all of China from going under Communist domination. There are many examples of how the President and the State Department defied Congress and helped to turn China into a Communist state. Let me remind you of just one of them.

The Eightieth Congress voted \$125,000,000 to provide arms and munitions for the Chinese Government to fight the Reds. Again the President defied the will of Congress.

He held up the program for 3 months and, as a consequence, the first shipment did not reach China until 9 months after the money was appropriated.

That was government by defiance of Congress—and the tragic price was paid in the lives of American boys who died fighting in defense of human freedom in Korea.

Back in 1946 the Seventy-ninth Congress—a Democratic Congress, by the way—voted substantial funds for flood control, particularly in the Midwest. On the day that Congress adjourned, the President issued an Executive order curtailing the program by about \$300,000,000.

That was government by defiance of Congress. Had the work gotten under way, much of this year's terrible flood conditions in Kansas and the President's home State of Missouri might have been averted.

Now, let me tell you about lend-lease, under which we gave Red Russia more than \$11,000,000,000 in military goods during World War II.

We gave them ships, tanks, aircraft, ordnance, and supplies of all kinds. We gave them \$4,000,000,000 worth of farm machinery and industrial items.

By act of Congress lend-lease was terminated on December 1, 1946. At that time, most Americans realized that all freedom in the world was threatened by the advance of Communist domination over free people in Europe and Asia.

The termination date of lend-lease found many millions of dollars' worth of goods still in this country but allocated for delivery to the Communists.

The act of Congress said they should not go abroad as lend-lease. The Comptroller General of the United States ruled that it would be illegal to give them to Russia.

But the President and his Secretary of State ignored the will of Congress. They ignored the ruling of the Comptroller General. They found a way to benefit Russia at the expense of the American taxpayer.

They acted on the theory that the Communists already had title to these goods and therefore were entitled to receive them.

Through this fantastic interpretation millions and millions of dollars' worth of American supplies went behind the iron curtain as a gift to help build Communist strength for aggression and conquest.

That brings me to another chapter in the development of government in defiance of Congress.

An act passed by Congress and approved by President Truman on September 27 of last year provided that no economic or financial assistance was to be given to any country whose trade with Russia or its satellites was found by the National Security Council to be contrary to the security of the United States.

But the National Security Council did nothing—nothing at all—and Marshall plan countries, receiving millions of dollars in aid from the United States, continued to sell strategic war materials to Communist countries, including Red China and North Korea.

Then, on May 10, of this year the third supplemental appropriation bill was amended. The amendment—and it was signed into law by President Truman—provided that economic and financial assistance should be shut off automatically to any country which continued to sell war materials to the Communists. It was passed with a clause which permitted the administration to make an exception where it was in the national interest.

The language of the act was plain. It means that Congress, reflecting the desires of the American people, wanted to stop the flow of war goods to the Communist countries which we are now fighting and those which we may have to fight in the future.

Now, what did President Truman's National Security Council do? With his approval it suspended the entire war-goods amendment for 90 days.

Congress said that it might make certain exceptions in the national interest. But the Security Council, a direct arm of the White House, made everything an exception. It suspended everything in the amendment that Congress had adopted.

That was government by defiance of Congress and defiance of the law.

My fellow Pennsylvanians, many other examples could be given of government by defiance of Congress and the law.

They all point to the great need in Washington for a return to constitutional government. If we are to survive as a free nation we must return to the fundamental American principle of government by law and not by men.

When the President ignores the express will of the representatives of the people, the chances are that the national interest will suffer, just as it has suffered in each example I have given you.

The United States will never be conquered by invading armies, but if constitutional government is allowed to break down we will face a far greater danger—self-destruction.

That is why government by defiance of Congress and defiance of the law must stop.

This is Ed MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

Brig. Gen. David J. Crawford

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 11, 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a letter I wrote on September 7, 1951, to Hon. Frank C. Pace, Secretary of the Army, respecting my request for the court-martial of Gen. David J. Crawford.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following is the text of a letter sent today by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, to Secretary of the Army Frank C. Pace, Jr., in connection with the case of Brig. Gen. David J. Crawford who recently was removed from his position as commanding general of the Detroit Ordnance Tank Automotive Center:

SEPTEMBER 7, 1951.

HON. FRANK C. PACE,
Secretary of the Army,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have received and noted your letter of August 31 replying to my letters of August 8 and 29 in which I requested a full report of the Inspector General's investigation into the improper conduct of Gen. David J. Crawford as commanding general of the Detroit Ordnance Tank Automotive Center.

In my letter of August 8, I protested against transferring General Crawford to a position in Heidelberg of responsibility, dignity, rank, and compensation equivalent to the one he previously held. I note that this assignment has been canceled and that General Crawford has now been assigned a position of special assistant to the commanding general at Aberdeen Proving Ground, where he will enjoy at least the same rank and compensation.

Your letter emphasizes, however, that General Crawford will be entrusted with no procurement responsibilities at Aberdeen. Is this to be interpreted that you no longer have confidence in General Crawford's integrity and that for this reason he has not been assigned to duties involving Government procurement which has been his customary work?

You state that—

1. General Crawford, commanding general, Ordnance Tank Automotive Center, Detroit, Mich., accepted free hotel accommodations, on certain dates mentioned, from a representative of business firms performing and negotiating for contracts with the Ordnance Tank Automotive Center. (I understand that General Crawford, while accepting these free accommodations, drew his traveling and subsistence allowance.)

2. General Crawford accepted a keel for his personal sail boat from an official of a company which was performing and negotiating for contracts with the Ordnance Tank Automotive Center.

3. General Crawford converted Government material to his own use in the construction of pleasure boats at Wayne, Mich.

4. General Crawford transported personal property in a Government vehicle from Detroit, Mich., to his home in Maryland.

In my judgment, such acts constitute malfeasance in office; and no mention is made in your letter of the fact that General Crawford was quoted publicly as saying everybody was doing it, and that he was "just one who got caught." If he was quoted accurately, it is a reflection upon the integrity of every other officer in the Army which, of course, should not be allowed to stand unchallenged. He should be compelled to give the names of those who committed such dishonest acts.

All of this combined shows a lack of conception of public duty and a breach of public trust which, unless severely punished, will tend to lower the moral standards of the Army and the Government in general.

The facts you have presented would indicate that General Crawford does not merit assignment to any important position. The

fact that you have removed him completely from all procurement responsibilities would suggest that you, also, to some extent at least, hold this opinion.

The armed services shortly will be spending at the rate of \$60,000,000,000 a year. Most of the contracts for purchases, as you know, will be awarded on the basis of negotiation, and not necessarily to the lowest bidder to be determined through the public advertising procedure. This will place a great responsibility upon the moral integrity of those in high position in the Military Establishment, civilian and military.

After full consideration of the facts I have, including those you have submitted, and from my general knowledge as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I respectfully suggest and request that General Crawford be court-martialed in the interest of discipline and as a warning to others that unethical and dishonest acts will be summarily punished. We must keep our Government clean.

Cordially yours,

HARRY F. BYRD.

The Tragedy of the Hungarian Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 11, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD remarks made by Hon. Edward M. O'Connor, Commissioner of the Displaced Persons Commission, on the Tragedy of the Hungarian Nation.

This address was delivered at a celebration of the nine hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the crowning of St. Stephen in Staten Island, N. Y. It is noteworthy that at this celebration resolutions of gratitude to President Truman and Secretary Acheson for their efforts in behalf of the Hungarian people were adopted.

We Americans are gathered here today to commemorate the nine hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the crowning of St. Stephen, the first Hungarian King. This anniversary has been given significance in America for a great many years because our Nation has been blessed by the talents, the skills, the hopes, and the dreams of several hundred thousand immigrants from Hungary. These immigrants came to our shores in generations past, in the period of the building of our great democracy, and their contributions, with those of their children and their children's children, form a most significant part of the history of our beloved country. But today this anniversary has more important meaning than ever before. The sad and tragic events which have taken place in Hungary since 1945 are a matter of grave concern to all of us.

The glorious history of the Hungarian people begins with the reign of King Stephen. At the age of 20 years, Stephen, son of Geza and great-great-grandson of Arpad, became King of Hungary. This was in the year 997. He was the first leader of the Hungarians to accept, with full heart and mind, Christianity and western culture. The first 3 years of his reign were devoted to the establishment of a Christian state. In the year

1000 he appealed to Pope Sylvester II for his investiture as a Christian king and for his crown—symbol of the ruler of an independent country.

A special envoy of Pope Sylvester II brought to him the crown which comprises the upper part of the present-day holy crown of Hungary. This same crown was used for more than 900 years in crowning all Hungarian Kings, and is even today recognized as the traditional and supreme symbol of State authority. The Hungarian people, in keeping with this centuries-long tradition, rightfully associate their liberties and freedoms with the holy crown.

Stephen was a firm and consistent advocate of a peaceful state and sought the cooperation of all other peaceful rulers in his goal for a universal peace. His deeds were always governed by Christian ethics. Stephen outlined his principles in his admonitions to his son Prince Imre. There is a very beautiful and timely excerpt from these admonitions which I would like to quote here:

"If you wish the honor of kingship, be peace loving. Rule over all without anger, pride, or hatred, but with love, tenderness, and humanity. Remember always that each one of us has the same standing; nothing exalts a man but humility; nothing humiliates more than haughtiness and hatred—peace-loving monarchs rule; the rest only tyrannize. Be patient toward all, influential and destitute alike."

King Stephen was the founder of a new principle—that of peaceful evolution of a nation. His achievements in this respect had a profound effect upon the entire civilized world. Peaceful evolution in matters of state is today a keystone of western civilization. The strong foundations built by King Stephen prepared the Hungarian people for their heroic role.

The Valley of Karpath down through the centuries has been the outpost of western culture and civilization. The Hungarian people, in arms with all other people in this territory, withstood wave after wave of invasion. Thus, Western Europe on many occasions was saved by the tenacity of the Hungarian people. One such epic is even now remembered daily by millions of Europeans through the Angelus. Soon after the fall of Constantinople, in 1453, Hunyadi began a campaign to drive the Turks from Belgrade (Nandorfehervar)—then a Hungarian fortress. Church bells throughout all of Christendom were tolled at noon each day, reminding the people to pray for the success of Hunyadi's campaign.

With the rise of the twentieth-century tyrants in Europe and their struggle for world domination, western civilization was ill-prepared to defend itself. For a time the tyrants Hitler and Stalin were locked together as comrades, thus joining their evil purposes. This development upset the traditional balance of power and in the end prevented those nations with western culture and traditions from forming an alliance to defend themselves against these evil forces. When the tyrants fell out, each one seeking to be sole ruler of the world, many nations who detested both these forms of pagan life were caught between them. There was no neutrality for any nation on the Continent, they had to choose one side or the other, or else be completely overrun and absorbed. Hungary was one of the nations caught in these powerful pincers, and thus became an unwilling participant. During the war years the Hungarian people had to struggle against becoming a subject state of the Nazis and at the same time to struggle against the penetrations of world communism. How obvious it now is that no matter which of the tyrant powers were victorious the Hungarian people would be the losers.

This conclusion is borne out by a study of events which took place during, and immediately following, the war. The first signs of brutal revenge became apparent as the Soviet armed forces entered Hungary. Rape and pillage was the order of the day. Chaos reigned until the political commissars of Moscow came upon the scene, headed by Marshal Vorosilov. Then the pattern changed; a handful of Hungarian Communists headed by one Rakosi began laying the groundwork for the political take-over of power. The first tactics were to show favor for democracy—create slogans to catch the imagination of the people, and to make alliances with splinter political parties. The Social Democrats were deceived by this maneuver, and in joining hands soon found themselves being liquidated from within.

People's courts were set up, and, of course, mostly "workers" were called to sit on these courts. It turned out that "workers" meant only those who worked in certain factories and carried the Communist Party card. The secret political police were organized under the direction of Marshal Vorosilov, and their job was to take into custody all dissident elements. Those who were brought to trial had their fate determined by the loaded and Communist-controlled people's courts.

Organized religion fell under attack, but only by skillful diversion rather than outward violence. By skillful though misleading maneuver, the groundwork was laid for the destruction of all religion.

In November of 1945, the national parliamentary elections were held. These elections were held largely because of the demands of the western nations. With over 600,000 Soviet troops quartered in Hungary, and with open pressure from Marshal Vorosilov, the Communist Party was only able to secure 17 percent of the popular vote. The Smallholders Party received 57 percent of the vote, and thus won a clear majority. Nevertheless, and contrary to the expressed will of the people, the Soviets forced the Smallholders Party to form a coalition government.

Soon the Smallholders Party received demands for the removal of certain alleged non-democratic-minded members of the Parliament. Again under pressure, they yielded to these demands. There followed additional demands of this character, which were backed up by Soviet military power and action committees formed by the Communist Party. This maneuver had for its purpose the destruction of the majority political party, and this purpose was accomplished. After the Smallholders Party was destroyed, the Communists demanded new elections in the summer of 1947. In this so-called election, the Communists set up a coalition of subservient parties, and through this means took over total power in Hungary.

It was after this that direct and open efforts were started to destroy the Catholic Church. Soon thereafter, the persecution of the Protestant churches began. All leaders of religion and of the national spirit were singled out as enemies of the state. All business and enterprise was nationalized, the school systems put under rigid control, land which was distributed to the people by the first coalition government was nationalized through the Kolchoz system of collective farming.

When the people had lost all hope in the remaining political parties of Hungary, they all turned to Cardinal Mindszenty for leadership in preservation of their basic rights and freedoms. He was the national hero of the people regardless of any differences in religious belief. It was apparent to the Communists that he was the rallying point for all patriotic Hungarians—this then made him the special target of their destroying

tactics. He was arrested on trumped-up charges and tried by a kangaroo court under a scheme planned and directed by the masters of the Kremlin. Events which have happened since his desecration make it more clear why they persecuted him. They knew he stood firmly by the teachings of St. Stephen as defender of the dignity of man, that he would fight for the rights of the people, and that he would shelter and protect the persecuted, just as he did under the yoke of the Nazis. All of Hungary knew what he had done to save persecuted people during those dark days. Christians and Jews alike were his concern when their dignity as human beings was in danger.

A similar fate has befallen thousands of other freedom-loving Hungarians. Time and space do not permit me to list all the martyrs who stood in defense of freedom and religion.

The civilized world has been shocked again by the most recent atrocities taking place in Hungary under the Communist reign. The mass deportations which are again under way demonstrate clearly that a plan has been set in motion to exterminate the Hungarians as a race of people. Leaders in all walks of life are being arrested in the dead of night and carried off to parts unknown. Their families are left destitute or moved to distant areas of Hungary where there is no housing for them, and where there is little or no chance for them to survive. Just how many thousands have been, and are being, deported to the Arctic areas of Siberia is not known, as yet. No one is safe from the terror of the Communists—fear is the means being used to hold these people in subjugation. The vicious cycle that has been established is explained by the Communist Government as "the removal of the internal enemy."

The internal enemy is, of course, anyone who refuses to adopt the ideologies of communism and who does not cooperate with the regime. If the Communists are to hold power, they must continue this vicious cycle because the great masses of the Hungarian people will not adopt the pagan teachings of Moscow. Thus, the present regime in Hungary is proving to the freedom-loving nations of the world that they knowingly and willingly are engaged in the international crime of genocide. With each passing day they are providing ample evidence which one day will confront them as they stand before a bar of justice made up of representatives of the free world.

It would be a grave mistake for anyone to assume that these crimes are just receiving passing notice. These mass deportations are a matter of official concern to the Government of the United States. President Truman, on July 27, 1951, made the following pronouncement:

"The Government of the United States is giving the closest attention to the deportations in Hungary with a view to taking such steps as may appropriately expose this situation to public view and judgment and render the Hungarian government accountable before the world for its infamous conduct."

Secretary of State Dean Acheson, in reaffirming the statement of President Truman, had this to say on the matter:

"The United States Government is also taking careful note of the identity of individual Hungarian officials, including the highest authorities, who have participated in any way in carrying out these mass deportations in order that their responsibility may be made fully known and their acts publicly stigmatized."

The fate of the Hungarian nation is very much like that of all other people under the oppressive and bloody yoke of the Kremlin. From the Baltic to the Adriatic, and eastward to the Pacific Ocean, there is a huge

concentration camp wherein 700,000,000 people suffer a somewhat similar fate. And behind all this sits a handful of men in the Soviet Politburo. These same men would seek to completely conquer the world by the process of deterioration from within, followed by military invasion when the time is ripe.

But, please God, the free nations of the world have awakened in time, and having grouped themselves into mutual security arrangements, are preparing themselves for the defense of freedom-loving people everywhere. These free nations do not recognize the theory of peace at any price, because this would be no peace at all. It would be nothing more than an armistice with peace. Peace is indivisible—peace is a quality of life which may not apply to some and be denied to others. Peace throughout the world can be attained only when all men and all nations are free to choose and elect their own peaceful destinies.

As we review the tragic fate of the Hungarian people, brought about by a new type of invasion, one that seeks to turn back the pages of history 950 years by imposing a pagan and primitive way of life among the people, it is necessary that we arrive at some conclusions from these historic facts. The following conclusions and their logic in these events, and must serve as a warning to freedom-loving people everywhere and, I sincerely hope, added encouragement for those who suffer under the new tyranny:

I. That the spirit of the heroic Hungarian people, forged in the centuries of struggle against the barbaric hordes of the east, and tempered through the wise teachings of their great leaders, beginning with St. Stephen, will never be broken by the evil leaders who now seek to destroy their rich culture, religion, and traditions, and to make of them an uncultured and uncouth serfdom. The courage, faith, and love-of-country which has preserved them in the past will keep them strong until their day of liberation, when the holy crown of Hungary will be restored to their safe keeping;

II. That just as surely as history records the heroic defenses of western civilization by the sturdy Hungarian people against the barbaric invasions from the east—so it will record the liberation of the Hungarian people from their present yoke of tyranny by the freedom-loving peoples of the Western World;

III. That the leaders of the present illegal regime in Hungary, and those who voluntarily assist in carrying out their evil plans, are guilty of a long list of crimes against humanity—more specifically, they stand guilty of the international crime of genocide—and the day is inevitable when they will be punished accordingly by a world tribunal of justice. The time has come to forewarn them that it will not be possible for them to plead their case as unwilling or unwitting stooges of the Kremlin, because the masters of the Kremlin will continue as their full partners—before this same world tribunal of justice;

IV. That a new day will soon dawn for all the nations under the tyrannical yoke of the Kremlin, and in the glorious sunshine of that new day the people of Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Byelorussia, Ukraine, Slovakia, Czech, Georgia, Armenia, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Albania will once again with their Hungarian brothers breathe the free air of liberty and individual freedom. By the full exercise of the principle of self-determination the people of these nations will work out their own peaceful destinies, and will form such unions or federations as they, the people, freely decide are to their liking.

May God speed the happy day when all men are at peace with one another under a system of justice which guarantees freedom and individual liberties for all.

Drift Toward Totalitarian Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 11, 1951

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "General MacArthur Sees Drift," published in the Washington Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL MACARTHUR SEES DRIFT—THREAT OF TOTALITARIANISM REVEALED BY TENDENCY TO CRITICIZE CRITICS SUCH, FOR EXAMPLE, AS HIMSELF

(By Lowell Mellett)

Take a few weeks' vacation and you are apt to be surprised by what happens during your absence from the seat of Government. For one thing, a drift toward totalitarian rule can set in. Other people may not have observed it, but it already has happened, according to Gen. Douglas MacArthur. It is revealed, he told an audience in Cleveland, by "the violent manner in which exception is taken to the citizen's voice when raised in criticism of those who exercise political power. There seems to be a determination to suppress individual voice and opinion, which can be regarded only a symptomatic of a general trend toward thought control."

Totalitarianism is bad business. We know what it meant in Hitler's Germany and Mussolini's Italy and what it means in Franco's Spain and Stalin's Russia. In the last-named country it means not only suppression of the voice but banishment of the person to Siberia or some other sort of liquidation. It isn't quite that bad in Truman's America yet. But the general, who, understandably, was thinking of his own experience, has plenty to complain about.

He has been banished to New York City, a locale of his own selection. He has been provided with comfortable offices in a Government building, which he preferred to the Pentagon in Washington. He has been given a staff of military aides, also of his own selection. He is comfortably housed in one of those Waldorf Tower suites you've read about, and he has passes to all the ball games. His travel is restricted, however, to the United States—unless he wishes to go abroad. He can make speeches whenever and wherever he pleases and he is not required to know what he is talking about.

But he has a real complaint. It is that some people criticize him. He has only to open his mouth and give tongue to any or all of the loose charges that accumulated against the present administration during his 17 years in the Pacific, when somebody ups and criticizes him. Now that shouldn't happen, if we are to preserve our cherished freedoms. As the retired general himself said, "It challenges the concept of free speech and is an attempt at direct suppression through intimidation of that most vital check against the abuse of political power—public criticism."

If you find that a little difficult to follow, read it again. It means that anybody who criticizes General MacArthur is against public criticism. Simple as that. And the next thing you know, we got totalitarianism.

The drift is in that direction. Another bit of evidence could have been used by the general had his native modesty permitted. President Truman, in his speech opening the

peacemaking in San Francisco, devoted only one paragraph to praise of MacArthur's accomplishments in Japan, instead of making that the whole theme of his address.

This drift will have to be stopped and the general is moving into position to stop it. A private organization called the National Republican Roundup Committee has published a poll of 3,000 Republican leaders—delegates to the last two national conventions, county chairmen, and such. It reports that Senator Taft is now first choice for the Republican nomination, but the second is not General Eisenhower, as you would have guessed, but General MacArthur. Senator Taft has been at it for years; General MacArthur only a matter of months. Give him another year and—well, his critics had better be thinking that over.

Congress, the Hope of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 11, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Congress Is Our Hope," published in the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of Tuesday, September 4, 1951, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS IS OUR HOPE

President Truman's blast against a Senate cut of \$964,250,000 in the administration's \$8,500,000,000 program for foreign economic and military aid was not unexpected. It's been his forte right along to severely criticize and abuse Congress in every effort to hold down Government spending.

Where the President is not, Congress of necessity must be realistic of the fact that a nation which continually and incessantly spends more than it has cannot forever endure. Government waste and extravagance, reflected in continued deficit spending, eventually could so diminish the economic resources of the Nation as to destroy it from within.

The little man in the big job has sought to use the world emergency as an excuse for spending endless billions on all kinds of wasteful schemes in the name of defense and security. In defiance of the warnings of fiscal experts, he has loaded his budget with a bevy of socialistic measures that would add needless billions to the Nation's tax bill; he has used the emergency to pad the Government payroll to a point greater than at the height of World War II; and he has prodded Congress continually for more and more billions to subsidize countries which to date have shown neither the will nor the inclination to carry their share of the burden in the fight against communism.

Since the beginning of World War II, nearly \$100,000,000,000 has been authorized by this Nation for foreign economic assistance and joint military security. This is equivalent to \$650 for every man, woman, and child in the United States; it is almost twice the total of all Federal taxes collected last year.

Is it any wonder Congress is moving to curtail these gigantic expenditures which are eating away at the heart of this Nation's strength? Is it any wonder that Senator TOM CONNALLY, an administration stalwart, recently accused the chief of the Economic Cooperation Administration with "trying to

cover the earth with money squeezed from the American taxpayers?"

America always has and will continue in every way possible to assist the free nations of the world in the struggle against the common Communist enemy. At the same time it must be realized that the source of that aid is not endless and there is a point beyond which the Nation cannot go without so diminishing our economic resources as to make an adequate military defense impossible.

Congress is the sole hope of the Nation against economic bankruptcy and socialism. Nothing but grief can be expected from the administration headed by the Pendergast politician from Missouri.

The Japanese Peace Treaty and the Kurile Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 11, 1951

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to the editor of the New York Times by Stephan C. Y. Pan, a member of the Legislative Yuan of China.

As Mr. Pan states, the Japanese peace treaty, by letting Russia take the Kuriles, is giving the Russians a beachhead for further aggression against Japan. Alger Hiss at Yalta was a good and faithful servant but not of his own country.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of August 4, 1951]

ACCORD ON FORMOSA QUERIED—ISSUE TAKEN WITH INDIA'S POSITION ON GRANTING COMMUNISTS ISLANDS

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In the New York Times of July 30 it was reported that the Nehru government has insisted that in accordance with the Yalta agreement the island of Formosa be given to China in the future. If the reported Indian attitude toward the Japanese Peace Treaty and the Yalta agreement is correct, it is amazing that the Indian Government could link Formosa with the once top-secret document—the agreement regarding Japan.

Having studied practically all the available sources on the far-eastern agreement, I find nothing mentioned about Formosa or Taiwan. Perhaps another part of this document is still unknown to the Chinese National Government but is familiar to the Indian Government. If this is so, then I would not attempt to contradict the Indian argument on the Yalta accord with regard to Formosa.

It is interesting to note that while the Yalta agreement did not mention a word about Formosa, India still desires to deliver Formosa to Red China, basing her argument on a Yalta provision which does not exist.

It is equally interesting to note that when the draft treaty of peace with Japan gives to Soviet Russia more than the Yalta agreement intended, India's silence seems to indicate her approval. For instance, section (c) of article II of chapter II of the draft peace treaty with Japan stated:

"Japan renounces all right, title, and claim to the Kurile Islands and to that portion of Sakhalin and the islands adjacent

to it over which Japan acquired sovereignty as a consequence of the Treaty of Portsmouth of September 5, 1905."

While section (3) of article II of the Yalta agreement only stated: "the Kurile Islands shall be handed over to the Soviet Union," the draft provision seems to give the impression that Japan acquired all these islands only as a consequence of the Portsmouth Treaty. This is in contradiction of the late Secretary of State Edward Stettinius' views about these islands. Stettinius wrote:

"The Kurile Islands, of course, were Japanese territory before the Russo-Japanese War of 1904. During the nineteenth century both Russia and Japan had laid claim to the Kuriles and Japanese ownership was recognized near the close of the century."

Aside from legal considerations, it should be understood that by conferring extra-legal titles of the Kurile and Sakhalin Islands to Soviet Russia, it would mean placing the Kremlin in a convenient beachhead for further aggression in Japan.

If certain politicians wish to reward Soviet Russia or Soviet China in such a manner they should not arbitrarily change the facts of history and geography in advancing their own falsified interpretation of a treaty or an agreement.

STEPHEN C. Y. PAN.

WASHINGTON, July 31, 1951.

(The writer of the above letter is a member of the Legislative Yuan of China and the author of American Diplomacy Concerning China.)

The Brannan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 11, 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch and communications I have received from farmers in Virginia giving their opinion of an effort that is being made by Secretary Brannan which they construe as being preliminary to adoption of the Brannan plan.

I desire to say, Mr. President, that I do not believe anything would be more destructive to the farming industry than the Brannan plan. It would destroy the initiative of the individual farmers and would mean nothing less than socialized farming.

There being no objection, the editorial and communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Richmond, (Va.) Times-Dispatch of September 11, 1951]

GROWING REVOLT AGAINST BRANNAN'S MANIFESTO

In 1943 when Eric Johnston, now reportedly about to retire as Director of Economic Stabilization, was making a name for himself as president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, he published an article in Reader's Digest entitled "We're Not Washed Up," from which we quote:

"Our economic system is not dying of old age, it is dying from its chains—the restraints, the restrictions and exactions fastened on it by some trade associations, some labor unions and some governmental units * * * Our system suffers because of the

bureaucrat and the tax collector. There is one salvation for our crippled giant: Unbind him, strip the chains from his limbs, and behold him labor."

What Mr. Johnston wrote then is even more true today, for in the interim the tax collector has taken a huge share of the American citizen's earnings in order to support a vast and steadily growing army of bureaucrats.

Part of that bureaucratic army has become solidly entrenched in the United States Department of Agriculture. Of its more than 80,000 employees many do little more than clutter the mails with an avalanche of booklets, pamphlets, mimeographed gobbledegook and outright political propaganda, designed to glorify Secretary Brannan and the man who locks to him to capture the agricultural vote for the Fair Deal in 1952.

A particularly flagrant piece of propaganda, disguised as a plebiscite of farm families, was recently submitted for endorsement to the Nation's farm families actually to nominally autonomous county meetings dominated by Brannan's political proconsuls who operate under the leadership of State committees, each consisting of farmers appointed by Brannan.

It was largely the campaign propaganda disseminated by such toilers in the Truman vineyard that swung the 1948 election to the Fair Deal.

But during the last 3 years the farmers of Virginia have learned a thing or two. They have awakened to the fact that 2 minus 2 equals nothing; that their support (in 1948) of a reckless and profligate administration resulted in inflationary Federal spending which has more than offset whatever economic advantage they might have gained from special privileges and paternalistic largess.

To be brutally frank about it, the farmer has at last realized that his own dollars have been used to buy his own vote.

When the rank and file of organized labor, still bewildered by its sleight-of-hand economists, arrives at the same conclusion, and realizes that taxes and Fair Deal promoted inflation have progressively lessened the purchasing power of the pay-envelope dollar, union labor will be similarly disillusioned.

As for the Brannan manifesto, Virginia farmers who have attended county meetings in Greene, Culpeper, Dinwiddie, Fauquier, and Madison have minced no words in expressing their rejection of this latest attempt to pull the wool over their eyes and lead them to the slaughter in 1952.

Their expressions of contempt and disapproval at those meetings have an old-fashioned ring of down-to-earth common sense that indicates a revival of the spirit of 1776, when their forefathers revolted against oppressive taxation and arrogant bureaucracy also imposed by remote control.

To read the stenographic reports of those meetings is a heartening experience. These farmers are sick of being tied to the apron strings of the Federal Government. They are not unmindful of the benefits gained from scientific research in animal husbandry, soil conservation, and the like—but in the counties referred to farmers stood up on their hind legs and spoke up in open meeting to tell off the socialistic planner in Washington, who now has the gall to suggest more millions for an even greater army of USDA bureaucrats to carry the torch for the late Mr. Pendergast's protégé.

They demanded that Department of Agriculture expenses be cut instead of expanded, and like "the village Hampden who with dauntless breast the * * * tyrant of his fields withstood," they demand a return to genuine State autonomy, with a minimum of political and economic meddling from the north bank of the Potomac.

They spurned the mouth-filling phrases and fulsome clichés of the 121-page Farm Family Survey booklet—published at heaven knows how high a cost—with which Mr.

Brannan is trying to bewilder them into open-mouthed expectation—the time-honored technique of the sideshow spieler at a county fair.

C. D. Jordan, chairman of the Virginia State Agricultural Mobilization Committee, was quoted as saying that he welcomed criticism of this Nation-wide survey. He has been getting plenty to date.

We hope that this revolt of Virginia's farmers will spread to every county of the Old Dominion, and spark a rebirth of independence, among the farm families of the Nation.

CULPEPER, VA., August 31, 1951.

HARRY F. BYRD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Your attention and appropriate action is requested in opposing hasty current activity by USDA in forcing a questionable and apparently socialistic program on the farmers of America.

A GROUP OF 25 CULPEPER
COUNTY FARMERS,
FRANK J. TOURAND,
Chairman,
L. E. MCNEMAR,
Cochairman.

Seventy farmers and the agricultural workers of the county, met in the Madison County War Memorial Building on August 31, 1951, at 8 p. m., to discuss the survey conducted by the USDA as set forth in the booklet entitled "Family Farm Policy Review," and generally purported to be a survey of grass-root thinking. The farmers were greatly disturbed by the lack of information on the subject resulting from a planned scarcity of the above said booklet and an insufficient amount of information offered by the professional agricultural workers. It was generally conceded by the farmers that the professional workers labored under the pressure of the nature of their employment.

Mr. Giles Miller, immediate past president of the Virginia Bankers Association, spoke before the group. His talk was on the general background of the Family Farm Policy and was well received by the farmers. The farmers drew up and passed the following resolutions unanimously:

(For further information please contact Col. George Ashworth, Orange, R. F. D., Va.)

"Whereas the farmers of Madison County have been requested to express approval or disapproval of changes in the United States Department of Agriculture programs; and

"Whereas they object to the use of appropriated funds by paid employees of the Department in attempting to instill into the minds of our farm people official thinking of the Department of Agriculture, then to have this echoed back through these same paid employees as grass-roots thinking; and

"Whereas we believe that many of the services now being made available by the Federal Government can better be made available by State and county agencies; and

"Whereas we believe that the present emergency situation in which the Nation now finds itself calls for the strictest economy in expenditures by all nondefense agencies of the Federal Government, and we in agriculture are willing to take our proportionate share of necessary cuts; and

"Whereas we believe that proposed United States Department of Agriculture policies and present trends endanger the farmers' status held by us to be fundamental rights as freeholders founded upon the Constitution: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the farmers of Madison County, Va., represented at this meeting, oppose the methods of the Department of Agriculture in presenting the Family Farm Policy Review, oppose any expansion of the activities of the Department and recommend a curtailment of its activities as proposed in this review."

Fright Treatment Toward Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ZALES N. ECTON

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 11, 1951

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Fright Talk by United States Aids Kremlin" by David Lawrence, published yesterday in the Washington Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRIGHT TALK BY UNITED STATES AIDS KREMLIN—RUSSIAN OFFICIALS LEAD NATION TO BELIEVE THAT AMERICA IS PRODUCING FANTASTIC WEAPONS FOR AGGRESSIVE WAR

(By David Lawrence)

No more striking illustration of the ineptitude of the American Government's psychological policies in the cold war could be given than in the start during the last few days of the so-called fright treatment toward Russia.

Beginning with the President's remarks at San Francisco about the fantastic weapons that are being fashioned, and continuing with the comments coming out of Congress about a hitherto unmentioned appropriation of \$5,000,000,000 for new weapons, the obvious objective has been to terrorize Russia.

The idea itself—to manifest military prowess—is logical in a situation where physical force is supposed to be the only language the enemy can understand but it is plain that the fright campaign is not being directed where it ought to be, that is, at the Kremlin alone and not toward the Russian people.

This results from a fundamental failure in American policy to declare the Kremlin the real enemy and to separate it from the Russian people very much after the fashion of the late President Wilson in the psychological warfare that was carried on by the White House and Department of State during World War I. It was made plain first when diplomatic relations were broken with the militaristic government of the Kaiser, and later, even when war broke out, that the fight was against the Imperial German Government and not the German people. This helped to shorten the war after America entered.

Today the mistakes of the Government here in failing to break off diplomatic relations with the Russian Government and to concentrate all propaganda against the Kremlin rather than the Russian people are readily appraised the moment one imagines oneself as a resident of Russia reading the American press dispatches. A Russian family is told in effect that the United States is preparing terrible weapons to destroy the Russian people. Every time the mention of weapons is made the Russian papers naturally reprint references to it with an accompanying propaganda accusing the United States of seeking war.

The Russian citizen is not informed that these weapons are intended solely for protection and reprisal in the event that the Kremlin starts a war. The Russian people are not told that while it is the intention of the United States to avoid war, this purpose can be accomplished more readily by the Russian people themselves in eliminating the evil men in the Kremlin. No word is going to the Russian people that the same billions now spent for armament will be spent in an extension of the Marshall plan

and mutual assistance pact to aid the Russian people in liberating themselves from the yoke of the tyrants in Moscow.

For reasons that have never seemed persuasive the American Government carries on an anti-Russian and anti-Communist campaign through the press and through Voice of America broadcasts but allows the impression to prevail through other official statements that it will negotiate and do business with that same group in the Kremlin at any time in the future. This is usually described as holding the door open for peace. Yet it is plain that nobody in the American Government—in Congress or in the executive departments—has the slightest faith in any agreement or treaty the Kremlin might negotiate.

The vague statement is often made here that someday the Kremlin will learn the error of its way or be frightened completely by the knowledge that fantastic American weapons are about to be produced and that an agreement with Moscow then will be made. That kind of argument is transparently illogical because it gives the Kremlin a chance to build up meanwhile among the Russian people a bitter sentiment against the United States and its allies. The Kremlin can point to American military preparations as aimed wholly at the Russian people, and until the people of the iron-curtain countries are told directly that no such purpose is in the minds of the democracies they will believe the Russian rulers.

If diplomatic relations were broken off, the Russian people would know that the price of reestablishing relations would be the elimination of the totalitarian government which has become a menace to world peace.

The principle that no government which is a threat to world peace should be permitted to remain in the United Nations is so sound that it could be the most impressive way to start the movement for a change in government in Moscow. The theory that the Kremlin would thereupon declare war as a reprisal is unrealistic, for, when the Russian people learn about the destructiveness of the new weapons, they will overthrow the Moscow regime rather than go to war. They would do so particularly if psychological preparation has been made in advance for that climax. That's why valuable time is being lost now talking about new weapons without drawing a distinction between the Kremlin and the Russian people.

DiSalle Might as Well Have Spent the Time in Fijis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 11, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in this day when there is so much discussion about price control and the failure of Congress to enact a proper price-control measure, it was most enlightening for me to pick up the Minneapolis Star of yesterday afternoon and read in it an article by Arthur R. Upgren. Mr. Upgren is a very able economist. This article gives a thorough explanation of prices, or what has brought about a change in prices. He does not give Mr. DiSalle as much credit for controlling the inflationary trends as might be done, but I think the article is a very enlightening one, and I ask unanimous

consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DiSalle Might as Well Have Spent the Time in Fijis

(To give you some idea of how much we need stabilizers, our economic consultant shows what forces kept prices on even keel, despite DiSalle and his crew.)

Washington price "stabilizers" have taken a great deal of credit in the last few months for holding prices on a fairly even keel since controls were instituted last winter.

What are the facts of the matter?

The plain fact is that Price Director Michael V. DiSalle could have taken his oath of office in Washington, then departed for the Fijis with his entire staff, and prices would have been just about where they are today.

There have been at work in the country since last March three powerful deflationary forces which have had much more to do with keeping prices where they are than any activities of the political price "stabilizers." For example:

In the second quarter of 1951 consumers lowered their rate of purchase of consumer goods by \$5,000,000,000. This was despite the fact that their personal incomes were increased by \$5,000,000,000.

Result: Ten billion dollars less spending upon what was proving to be an enlarged supply of available goods, and an increase of \$10,000,000,000 in our personal savings.

TAX DAMPER, TOO

Then the first quarter of 1951 saw a huge cash budget surplus. That increase in the "tax take" dampened spending too.

Finally, about 1st of February came another powerful force. That force was the restoration of independent control of the uses of bank credit by the Federal Reserve authorities.

As a result, longer term Government bonds were allowed to decline in price, and the yields on shorter term bonds were increased.

In addition, because bonds were no longer supported by the Federal Reserve System, Federal Reserve credit was not issued unstintingly at 100 or better for every Government bond.

When the Federal Reserve "paid par," that payment was made in that kind of high-powered money we call bank reserves. For every \$1,000,000,000 of bank reserves so created by the mere act of the purchase of Government bonds by Federal Reserve banks, the member banks, on the basis of this \$1,000,000,000 increase in their reserves, are able to lend \$6,000,000,000 more and yet maintain required reserves.

Thus we see the powerful forces of budget surplus, prospective inventory liquidation, and credit control have brought about deflationary trends in the economy.

Of these three forces, credit control has been important, and, it is to be hoped, will continue without further interference by Congress or the Treasury. The deflationary force of increased taxes appears to be reasonably certain in an amount of five to seven billion dollars.

These are the forces that have operated on the deflationary side of our economy. This year they have operated in such force that the index of wholesale prices, at an all-time peak of 184 last March, has been reduced to 176.4 at the present time.

The cost of living has now stabilized. It has actually gone up less in the last 6 months than in the same months of the last 11 years.

DO WE NEED THEM?

Against the case of Mike DiSalle (a genial and likable politician) is the fact that we

stopped inflation by credit control and tax policy. We did that in an especially difficult economic situation last winter.

If we can do it, with those instruments under the conditions that prevailed 9 months ago, we can do it again. We have learned how.

The great gain to all in not having DiSalle and the stabilizers is that we operate much more efficiently under the price and profit system than we do under bureaucratic ukase. We get more goods produced and we get them produced more economically.

As far as any need for the stabilizers is concerned, it can be said flatly we haven't needed them at all.

Prices would have leveled out anyway.

ARTHUR R. UPGREN.

Necessity for America Being on Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 11, 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Three Times in the Nation's History," by Bishop Fulton J. Sheen.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THREE TIMES IN A NATION'S HISTORY

(By Fulton J. Sheen)

In the lives of nations, as in the lives of individuals, there are three times: a time of grace, a time of blindness, and a time of judgment. Often, at the close of World War II, many statesmen said: "This is our last chance; we will not be given another." It will be recalled that at the time of the San Francisco conference, when the United Nations was formed, a great statesman of a foreign country arose to give a 7-minute speech. As everyone seemed proud that a charter of peace was drafted, this gentleman said:

"There is something in this charter which has been put in, but it should have been left out; there is something which has been left out which should have been put in. What was put in was the right of veto, which gives to any world power the right to cancel out all ethical considerations. What was left out is God, who is the Rock upon which the peace of all nations is founded. Our house is not built on a rock, and the winds and the seas shall come and batter it, and beat it to the ground. This is our last chance, we will not be given another."

Nations as individuals can fling away opportunities for peace as individuals can trample on the visitations of grace. Once more we see the gospel picture fulfilled: "And as He drew near and caught sight of the city, He wept over it and said: 'Ah if thou too couldst understand above all in the day and that is granted thee, the ways that can bring thee peace.'" As it is, they are hidden from sight. The tears of the Savior are for a lost opportunity of free men. Insensibility is the forerunner of destruction.

At the close of World War II we were lulled to sleep in the false belief that we had destroyed dictatorships, but there were a few who were not deceived. We now have to pay the penalty for that lapse of caution. But we are still not free from further deception, and there is a need for another warning.

Soviet Russia has three Trojan horses. Two have already been wheeled into the ramparts of western civilization. The first was antifascism, in which it doped the world into believing that it was opposed to totalitarian systems. Then suddenly communism entered into a union with nazism, as Molotov said to Ribbentrop: "Our friendship has been sealed in blood." But it was the blood of noble Poland as World War II was launched.

The second Trojan horse was democracy. Communism made itself appear as the "great defender of the democratic force of the world." That lie has now been punctured and it is believed only in two quarters, by a few intelligentsia who have been educated beyond their intelligence, and by a few who have no intelligence to be educated.

The third Trojan horse has not yet been taken out of Moscow's stables, but its snortings can already be heard. This new one is called peace and is the most dangerous of all. As antifascism ended in an alliance with fascism; as defender of democracy ended in the trampling underfoot of 36 out of every 100 people in the world, so peace will eventually mean war in the double talk of communism.

Russia has seen that its antidemocratic moves have been matched by our military preparedness. Its wars made us prepare for war. There is only one way left to deceive us, and that is to talk peace to put to sleep the free peoples of the world. This method will undoubtedly be successful, as the other two were successful. Being a naturally and truly peaceful Nation, we will begin beating swords into plowshares, university professors will talk Communist peace in their classrooms, and the whole Nation will let down its guard.

America be warned. "Three times in a nation's history." The third could be our ruin. Peace is not in words, but in the tranquillity of order—and order means giving to each freeman his due under God, who is also entitled to His due, which is our adoration, our service, and our love.

Proposed Telecasting of Three Navy Football Games

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER C. HUNT

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 11, 1951

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Naval Academy has seen fit to enter into a contract with private industry to televise three football games, instead of making the programs available to the public, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD this morning a letter from Mr. Edward Sullivan, adjutant, Robert S. Garrison Post, No. 3350, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, with reference to ticket arrangements at the Naval Academy.

In the same connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a protest from the Fair Television Practices Committee with reference to the contract which the Naval Academy has entered into with private industry to televise the three Navy football games by box-office television interests.

There being no objection, the letter and protest were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROBERT F. GARRISON
Post, 3350, VETERANS OF FOREIGN
WARS OF THE UNITED STATES,
East Rockaway, N. Y., September 6, 1951.
Hon. LESTER C. HUNT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUNT: I should like to applaud your stand on the televising of football games played by the Naval Academy. And I believe it is high time for someone in authority to look into the manner in which this and other public institutions conduct themselves toward the public that support them.

You know for many many years it has been the custom for small groups of our organization to make reservation for various Navy games played in the vicinity of New York City. I'd like to tell you of my last such attempt. I believe it was 3 years ago, when in August I mailed in a reservation card with the proper amount of money to reserve four seats for a Navy-Penn game to be played in October in Philadelphia.

You may recall 3 years ago tickets were quite difficult to obtain and we were quite prepared for a rebuff. We were quite content to acknowledge preference be given people closer to the Academy than were we. However we heard nothing and as the weeks went by we felt our application for tickets had been accepted; and we made arrangements for the trip to Philly. On the Monday previous to the game, I received a refund of the money I had sent in with the reservation card, nothing else. No "I'm sorry, or we regret," just no nothing.

Naturally we were somewhat nettled and I wrote the Academy protesting such treatment, although acknowledging the prior rights of others to the tickets. In return some Captain (I forgot his name), suggested I read the back of the reservation card; and although I had been receiving reservation cards for 20 years, my name was dropped from the mailing list and I no longer receive these reservation blanks. Incidentally this is quite in contrast with the treatment accorded us by the various universities who treat every request with politeness, tact, and courtesy.

There isn't the slightest iota of consideration given by either Academy to the general public. And as a matter of fact you ride steerage strictly if you want to go along with them. And at quite a neat price for tickets if you compare them with other schools who require private funds for what the public pays for at Annapolis and the Point. I am by no means a reformer but if ever a situation required investigation, athletics in public military school does.

Thanks for listening, and congratulations on your fine work in the Crime Investigating Committee.

Sincerely,

EDMUND SULLIVAN.

FTPC PROTESTS NAVAL ACADEMY BO-TV CONTRACT

Jerome W. Marks, chairman of the Fair Television Practices Committee, has written to the Superintendent of the Naval Academy, Vice Adm. Harry W. Hill, protesting the contract entered into by the Academy which would permit exclusive telecasting of three Navy football games by box-office television interests.

Mr. Marks' letter follows:

"DEAR SIR: The Fair Television Practices Committee has learned with regret that the Naval Academy has assigned to a privately financed theater television network the rights to exclusively telecast three of Navy's football games during the coming season.

"Theater television is a commercial operation designed solely to obtain box-office receipts. It offers no public service features. The Academy, on the other hand, is entirely supported by public funds and presumably should be operated solely in the public interest.

"The FTPC believes that all Navy football matches should be freely available for telecasts for the general public benefit. It wishes to point out to you that among these who will be deprived of the opportunity to witness telecasts of Navy football games will be thousands of hospitalized veterans, soldiers and sailors, who obtain a sense of active participation in life through the medium of television. It appears to us that to these the Navy owes a primary debt.

"Furthermore the FTPC believes that in view of the present criticism of increasing professionalism and commercialism in college football, the Academy's arrangement with box-office television interests is an example of bad policy."

ANTITRUST INVESTIGATION OF COLLEGE TV PLAN REQUESTED

The Fair Television Practices Committee, a private group organized to represent the interests of television set owners, has requested Attorney General Howard McGrath to order an investigation of the plan of the National Collegiate Athletic Association which will severely limit telecasts of college football games during the coming season.

A letter to the Attorney General from Jerome W. Marks, New York attorney and chairman of the FTPC, requesting the investigation follows:

"MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: The National Collegiate Athletic Association has adopted, and is enforcing, a plan to severely limit the number of college football games which may be televised during the season which will begin in September.

"The plan will result in the telecasting of a single intercollegiate football match a week. These telecasts will be carried by a single network under the sponsorship of a single advertiser.

"Not all member institutions of the NCAA have been agreeable to this plan but the association has forced compliance through threats by other members, actual or implied, to cancel games with the offending institution or institutions.

"This plan, according to reports in the press, has been arrived at in an effort to stimulate attendance at football games on the part of persons who have previously had the opportunity of watching football games on their television sets at home.

"Regardless of the sympathy with which one would regard efforts to solve the economic problems in which college athletics are at present involved, it appears to the Fair Television Practices Committee that the plan being enforced this year by the National Collegiate Athletic Association is a violation of the antitrust laws of the United States.

"This committee respectfully requests you to instruct the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice to investigate thoroughly the plan of the NCAA and its operations.

"It is the belief of this committee that the failure of the Department of Justice to take action in this case will open the door to similar agreements on the part of others affecting other sports.

"This committee regards the plan of the NCAA both as illegal and the result of an error in judgment. The availability of telecasts of football matches may possibly have affected the attendance at college and high school football matches. But other important factors doubtless have played a part in declining attendance.

"We have witnessed in the last 25 years an enormous growth in football. Almost

every college and university—there are some notable exceptions—schedules games during the season which, itself, has been substantially lengthened. High-school football has had a similar growth. Professional football has developed entirely during this period.

"Stadiums have become more numerous and of vastly increased capacity. Coaching staffs have become larger and more highly paid; the costs of recruiting and maintaining players have risen, as well as the general expense of football operations.

"It is thus quite possible that football has grown more rapidly than its audience. It seems obvious that what in show business is called the 'nut'—that is the total expense which must be met before profits can be taken—has grown so great that a slight drop in attendance can cause financial embarrassment.

"It appears more likely that economic inflation and higher tax rates have done more to reduce attendance at football games than television. It seems reasonable to believe that the public is being offered more football than it can absorb at current admission prices. Yet television has been singled out by the NCAA as the sole culprit guilty of football box-office woes and as an answer the association has developed this plan of which we complain.

"We do not, of course, expect the Department of Justice to engage in an investigation of the woes of college football, but we do request a thorough investigation into the legality of the NCAA plan to force limitation of telecasts of games of its member institutions.

"Respectfully yours,
"JEROME W. MARKS."

The Position of India on the Japanese Peace Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 11, 1951

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to the editor of the New York Times by Taraknath Das, a Hindu scholar, who is professor of international relations at Columbia University.

Though I do not share Mr. Das' confidence that the Japanese-American security agreement leaves to us the defense of Japan, I am glad to put into the RECORD this excellent analysis of the position of India on the Japanese Peace Treaty.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of September 4, 1951]

NEHRU'S STAND QUESTIONED—REASONS ADVANCED FOR OPPOSITION TO JAPANESE TREATY DISCUSSED

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

As one who for more than half a century has worked and hoped for Indian and Asian freedom, I feel morally obliged to comment on Prime Minister Nehru's opposition to the peace treaty with Japan proposed by the United States.

Mr. Nehru advocates the return of Formosa to Communist China. But Communist China is today carrying on an aggressive war against the United Nations and in particular

the United States. Communist China and Soviet Russia have concluded a 30-year treaty of alliance which will serve to combat Japan and any nation aiding Japan. As the Government of the United States is committed to helping Japan protect her sovereignty, the Soviet-Chinese alliance is virtually directed against the United States.

The Communist Chinese Government and Soviet Russia by not signing a peace treaty with Japan will continue to be in a state of war with that country. Since the United States has agreed to protect disarmed Japan from any attack, it can hardly be expected that the Government of the United States should agree to turn over Formosa to Red China. For in that event Soviet Russia and Communist China would be able to use the island as a submarine and air base against Japan and the United States.

IMPORTANCE OF ISLANDS

Mr. Nehru wants the United States to give up control over Bonin and Ryukyu Islands. If there were a Japanese Navy intact to tackle Soviet Russian-Communist Chinese naval forces stationed in various bases and islands from the Kurile Isles to the southern part of the China Sea, then Japan might now be given possession of these islands. As things stand today, however, to return Bonin and Ryukyu Islands to Japan would mean that Soviet Russia and Communist China would control a vital portion of the Pacific.

Surely, the United States of America did not fight Japan to her defeat in order to insure Soviet Russian control of the Pacific. America, under the present circumstances in world politics, will cooperate with Japan to arm her so that she may be able to assume full responsibility for her own national defense and check any further expansion of Soviet Russia and Communist China in east Asia. I am afraid Mr. Nehru does not realize that American-Japanese cooperation, leading to an alliance to counter the Soviet-Chinese pact, has already become a major factor in world politics.

The proposed Japanese Treaty gives Japan full sovereignty in matters of her own defense. However, by a Japanese-American agreement, American forces are to remain in Japan to defend Japan. As long as Japan agrees to an understanding with the United States for her own security, India should not oppose any such understanding. India cannot logically do so unless she is aligned with Soviet Russia and Communist China and against Japan. Will India fight to protect Japan from Soviet Russian and Communist Chinese aggression?

JAPAN'S FUTURE

Mr. Nehru suggests that Sakhalin and the Kurile Isles be given to Soviet Russia. Whatever happened at the Yalta Conference is in no way binding on Japan, and it is quite understandable that Japan may not agree to give up those islands which are so essential for her own security. Within 5 years, Japan with her more than eighty millions of virile and disciplined people will again become the most important power, economically, politically, and militarily in Asia, as Germany again will play the most vital role in rejuvenated Europe.

Mr. Nehru sincerely desires to lead a third force for peace, but in refusing to be a party to the Japanese Peace Treaty he actually aligns India with Soviet Russia and Communist China and against Japan and the United States. Indian freedom and peace and independence throughout Asia can be secured only by the closest possible collaboration between India, Japan, the United States, and a China which is not the tool of imperialist Soviet Russia.

TARAKNATH DAS.

(A Hindu scholar, author, and professor of International Relations at Columbia University. He knew Nehru when the latter was a young boy.)

New York, August 31, 1951.

Economic Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 11, 1951

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Defense Production Act was amended and extended by Public Law 96, signed by the President on July 31. That law was enacted as the result of long and conscientious study and debate by the Banking and Currency Committees of both bodies of the Congress, and by the individual Members in both bodies. It represented the best evidence of what the Congress considered to be the appropriate governmental policy on economic controls in this country. However, the President has seen fit to challenge the law on a political basis, and now continues what some have called the crusade for controls. I ask unanimous consent to reprint in the RECORD an editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle of September 3, an editorial which clearly traces and discusses some of the more important issues involved.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CRUSADE FOR CONTROLS

President Truman has sent a new message to Congress, asking more extensive economic control authority than was given him in the bill he reluctantly signed on July 31. He describes such authority as imperative to the waging of a successful struggle against mounting inflation. It is a highly appealing argument to use at a time when every American is feeling the pinch of mounting prices, and wondering where it will all end.

A healthily critical public, however, will want to raise a number of questions before it goes along with the President. It will want to know whether the President's program actually has the prospect of doing a more effective job on inflation than the program now in effect. It will want to know, as far as possible, what the long-range effects of the President's program are likely to be. And it will want to know something about the motives prompting the administration's program.

The answers, it seems to us, spring clearly and indisputably out of the evidence.

In the original Defense Production Act Congress, reacting to the rather violent stimulus of the newly joined Korean war, enacted a system of controls that were farther-reaching than even President Truman had dared ask for at that time. It authorized Government controls over wages and prices. It authorized the Federal Reserve Board to set up stern limits for consumer credit. It set up a system of allocations and priorities of strategic defense materials; stockpiling of strategic materials; authority for necessary loans to facilitate defense construction; import controls; payments of subsidies to encourage critical enterprise.

This was a stiff, but on the face of it, equitable program for coping with an emergency.

It had, however, all the usual encumbrances of any control system, including the fact that how well it would work would be dependent upon what wit and integrity it was administered.

FIRST VISIBLE DEFECT WAS COLLAPSE OF WAGE LINE

The first and most glaring defect was that the wage line gave way. While pegging prices at existing levels, the administration set the now famous 10-percent-increase formula for wages, ruling wages might be raised 10 percent above January 1950. With the lid unscrewed to that extent, really vigorous unions had no trouble in blasting it even higher.

Then came Mike DiSalle's pronouncement on beef-price rollbacks, which was heralded as a kind of pilot operation for rollbacks of many kinds. This had a fine, pleasant sound to it, consumerwise, but a conspicuous fault. As prices were rolled back, production began to drop off; the shrinkage of profits tended to discourage stockmen from growing beef. And housewives began to face the same old disgruntling situation as under OPA—beef prices were reasonable, but they couldn't buy beef.

There were various other matters in connection with the bill that seemed to Congress to demand righting. And there were phases of that same law that President Truman considered too mild and in need of tightening. So the debate waxed hot and heavy through the spring and early summer, and finally the President found himself facing the choice between signing a bill he didn't like, or letting the whole control program expire on July 31. He signed, verbally reserving the right to continue his fight at a later date.

The new measure continues the system of allocations and priorities, stockpiling of strategic materials, loans for defense construction, import controls, and subsidies for nonagricultural enterprises. It extends rent controls under a system providing for maximum 20-percent increases over 1947 levels, which keeps a fairly tight lid on rents generally. Small business is given a powerful assist by the creation of a Small Defense Plants Administration to make sure that organizations in this category get a fair share in the awarding of defense contracts.

CONSUMER CREDIT CONTROLS SHOULD HAVE BEEN KEPT

It does make certain modifications in the price-control set-up, and it refrains from doing certain new things that President Truman felt were important, which we shall discuss in a moment.

But the main error it commits, in our judgment, is the relaxing of consumer credit controls. By making it possible to buy goods in many categories with lower down payments it opens the way for far more extensive incurrence of debt and thereby contributes a direct inflationary pressure. Congress, by relaxing the credit controls, opened itself to the charge of reacting to cynical and dangerous private pressure.

President Truman did not, however, attack Congress on this point in his new message. And his failure to do so opens the way for legitimate speculation that his primary objective had nothing to do with curbing inflation.

His actual, voiced criticisms—some of them incorporated in the new message and some of them made earlier—offer additional justification for that suspicion.

For example, in the message to Congress he listed as No. 1 among the worst features of the new bill an amendment permitting manufacturers to pass on to consumers all direct and indirect cost increases since the Korean war. This was in keeping with an earlier Presidential expression of indignation that took this form: "We cannot ask the working people of the country to reduce their standard of living just to pay for the higher profits this act provides." What he overlooked, of course, was that the wage line had long since been shot full of holes. We're not taking a position against those increases. We simply believe, as Congress obviously did,

that when a company found its operating costs hiked by wage and other increases, it had a right to demand relief in the form of price increases.

WHAT'S HARD TO CATCH IS A DECENT CUT OF MEAT

The President also lashed out against the ban on livestock slaughtering quotas, saying this would mean black marketeering and higher meat prices and make the black marketeer harder to catch. We doubt it will work out that way. On the contrary, we have seen time and again where such orders as the one telling slaughterers how many cattle they could kill result, finally, in the failure of the ultimate producer to produce. The only thing that's been hard to catch under the existing set-up of quotas and frozen prices has been a decent cut of meat.

The President in his message was also indignant because Congress declined to give him blanket authority to build defense plants. Here is perhaps the boldest attempt yet by the administration to set the Government up in business in competition with private enterprise, and it was properly spikied. There is no reason to suppose private industry can't go on doing the industrial job better than Government—the best evidence of this is that it has done the job up to now a dozen times better than any foreign government is doing it. Existing measures afford the Government the means of aiding private enterprise in the performance of this vital job, but Congress rightly balked at giving the Government carte blanche to take the job over.

The President asked these more stringent measures on the broad plea that they were all essential to the control of inflation: "The greatest danger of high prices is ahead—and we need stronger, not weaker, laws to control it."

Undoubtedly fresh inflationary forces are gathering, but there is no shred of evidence to prompt the assumption that the way to cope with it is to give Government—already possessed of a vast array of emergency controls—even more dictatorial authority over this traditionally free economic system.

During the latter half of 1950, before the President invoked the controls Congress had voted him, the cost of living went up 7 percent.

After the invocation of controls, prices continued to rise steadily, though at a reduced rate. The increase during the first 4 months of controls was 2 percent. The main controls (except credit controls) that held the rate down to that figure are still in effect.

PRODUCTION IS WHAT WILL SIPHON OFF INFLATION

It may be that those basic controls are, for the moment, essential to maintain the equilibrium of a Nation in the grip of an emergency.

But if so, the bulk of the President's effort should be to step up production by private industry with the view of meeting the stepped-up demand and thereby dissolving the inflationary pressure at the earliest possible moment.

The method he is using is a sure-fire method of depressing production and driving goods of any price off the market. It is, besides, a fairly effective way of leading the Nation toward that condition of complete Government domination that is so well favored by a host of economic-control boys and bureaucrats and power-hungry social planners around Washington.

There are two solid reasons, therefore, why the American people ought to come powerfully to the support of Congress in turning back this effort.

One is because it is impractical. It neither restrains inflation, except superficially and temporarily, nor produces the goods-in-plenty that its advocates always preach.

You can prove this out by any fair comparison with the productive levels and living standards in Russia, where the experiment has gone the whole way, or in England, where they're only well into it.

The other is because it involves the sacrifice of the right of self-determination, the surrender of freedom. To hand over to Government the total control of the economy is to give Government the means of ordering, completely, the life of the Nation, right down to a determination of what you wear and eat, where you live, and what kind of work you shall do. If freedom is going to survive in the world it will be because the American people have the common sense and the will to defend it, not only against threats from abroad and from subversives within but against the economic do-gooders and long-haired planners in Washington who peddle collectivism under a false face.

The Public Debt of the United States**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 11, 1951

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, under date of September 15 the News Bulletin, in a special edition, publishes a most informative and interesting statement. It shows that the public debt of the United States Government exceeds that of all other responsible governments in the world, excluding the Soviet Union, by more than \$100,000,000,000, with added borrowing due. It is a very interesting and informational news item, and I invite the attention of Senators to it. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the News Bulletin was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PUBLIC DEBT OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT EXCEEDS THAT OF ALL OTHER RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENTS IN THE WORLD EXCLUDING THE SOVIET UNION BY MORE THAN \$100,000,000,000 WITH ADDED BORROWING DUE

The daily Treasury statement for August 31, 1951, lists the gross public debt and guaranteed obligations of the United States Treasury at \$256,676,566,707.15 and the amount to the credit of disbursing officers and certain agencies of the Government on that date as \$56,765,037,920.45.

Although net budget receipts for the first 2 months of the fiscal year 1952 exceeded receipts for the same period in fiscal 1951 by \$1,424,599,209.79 the spending in the same comparative periods was greater by \$4,297,694,021 and the net result was to wipe out the accumulated budgetary surplus of \$3,509,782,624.25 reported by the Treasury for fiscal 1951.

With signs of stagnation appearing in various fields of endeavor outside of the national defense effort, and indications that the economic trend line is still pressing downward, in spite of a rise in disposable personal income during 1951 of more than \$2,500,700,000, there appears to be developing a buyer's market in many lines.

The big unanswered question in the minds of many Americans is how long can our economy stand the drain of new and heavier taxation to support our international adventures in almost every part of the world.

To present a comparative picture of our own financial position with that of the other responsible governments of the world, with the exception of the Soviet Union there is presented a summary of the public debts of countries in Europe, Asia, and Africa which make up the bulk of the responsible nations of the world.

**Population and public debt
of the United States:**

Public debt..... \$256, 676, 566, 707
Population..... 154, 000, 000

Other countries:

Canada:

Public debt..... \$16, 950, 000, 000
Population..... 13, 300, 000

In the table which follows, the debts of the respective nations have been converted to United States dollars at the rates of exchange reported in July by the International Monetary Fund which fund is closely allied with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development in which 49 nations presently hold memberships on the Board of Governors, including Czechoslovakia, Finland, and Yugoslavia. Poland, a former member, withdrew March 14, 1950, and the Soviet Union never joined either the fund or the bank.

**TABLE 1.—Public debt of European nations
compiled from latest reliable statistical reports**

Country	Reported population	Public debt in United States dollars
Austria.....	6, 755, 000	\$1, 714, 700, 000
Belgium.....	8, 421, 000	4, 863, 000, 000
Denmark.....	4, 190, 000	1, 413, 000, 000
France.....	41, 500, 000	11, 808, 700, 000
Greece.....	7, 780, 000	199, 000, 000
Ireland (Eire).....	2, 997, 000	171, 360, 000
Italy.....	45, 373, 000	5, 812, 719, 000
Luxembourg.....	289, 000	97, 270, 246
Netherlands.....	9, 629, 000	5, 167, 843, 600
Norway.....	3, 181, 000	1, 233, 239, 854
Portugal.....	8, 402, 000	360, 000, 000
Sweden.....	6, 883, 000	2, 406, 180, 000
United Kingdom.....	50, 300, 000	73, 963, 000, 000
Total 13 countries.....	195, 700, 000	109, 240, 602, 700

¹ The French debt formerly reported at around \$21 billion was reduced by the devaluation of the French franc to a rate of .350 to 1 United States dollar.

² The Swedish kronor is currently valued at 5.180 to the United States dollar, which reduced the Swedish debt of 12,464,000,000 kronor to \$2,406,180,000 in United States dollars.

DEBTS OF IRON CURTAIN AND OTHER EUROPEAN NATIONS

The latest available report on the public debt of the Soviet Union as of 1947 shows that the external debt was \$26,208,000,000. The population of the Soviet Union at that time was 193,000,000.

In the table following there is shown the public debt of the so-called iron-curtain countries, the marginal country, Finland, and Spain and Switzerland.

TABLE 2.—Debts of iron curtain and other European countries

Country	Reported population	Reported public debt in United States dollars
Bulgaria.....	6, 993, 000	\$389, 082, 293
Czechoslovakia.....	12, 916, 000	1, 703, 428, 340
Hungary.....	9, 400, 000	549, 575, 000
Poland.....	23, 781, 000	3, 512, 479, 000
Rumania.....	10, 530, 000	295, 598, 634
Yugoslavia.....	15, 700, 000	703, 402, 000
Finland.....	3, 835, 000	628, 725, 020
Spain.....	27, 503, 000	4, 395, 304, 820
Switzerland.....	4, 547, 000	2, 016, 416, 650
Total.....	122, 325, 000	14, 194, 612, 357

PRINCIPAL AND OUTSTANDING FOREIGN DOLLAR BONDS OF 11 LATIN AMERICA COUNTRIES AS OF DEC. 31, 1948

Bolivia: Principal plus interest in default.....	\$59, 422, 000
Brazil: Principal plus interest in default.....	182, 246, 000
Chile: Principal plus interest in default.....	135, 402, 000
Colombia: Principal plus interest in default.....	138, 488, 000
Costa Rica: Principal plus interest in default.....	8, 102, 000
Cuba: Principal plus interest in default.....	81, 205, 000
El Salvador: Principal plus interest in default.....	7, 920, 000
Mexico: Principal plus interest in default.....	273, 582, 000
Panama: Principal plus interest in default.....	15, 083, 000
Peru: Principal plus interest in default.....	80, 444, 000
Uruguay: Principal plus interest in default.....	46, 033, 000

Total for 11 countries..... 1, 028, 017, 000

TABLE 3.—Debts of foreign governments reported by the International Monetary Fund as of December 1950

Country:	
Australia (Australian pound debt).....	\$3, 918, 656, 000
Egypt (combined foreign currency and pound debt).....	238, 342, 800
Iceland (krona debt).....	29, 891, 610
Japan (yen debt, Dec. 31, 1950).....	762, 360, 000
Union of South Africa (pound debt, 1951).....	2, 178, 960, 000
Venezuela (Bolivar debt, 1950).....	447, 000, 000
Total for 6 countries.....	7, 575, 209, 410

SUMMARY

TABLE 4.—Debts of listed countries combined

Country:	Public debt
Canada.....	\$16, 950, 000, 000
13 European countries.....	109, 240, 602, 700
9 other European countries.....	14, 194, 612, 357
11 Latin American countries.....	1, 028, 017, 000
6 countries in various parts.....	7, 575, 209, 410
Total debt 40 countries.....	148, 988, 441, 467
Estimate for all other countries:	
Germany.....	663, 367, 000
China.....	6, 522, 000
All others.....	2, 500, 000, 000

Total compiled and estimated world debts as of Dec. 31, 1950..... 152, 158, 330, 467

Industry and Government Should Give Continuing Consideration to Protection Against Bombing in the Location of New Industrial Enterprises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 21, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, whether we like it or not, it is, as I see it, definitely in the interest of the Nation's safety that our industry disperse itself so as to minimize the effects of bombing in the event of war. This is, of course, true regardless of whether the bombs used be atomic, hydrogen, or conventional.

Little can be done about factories already built where large sums of money

have been invested, and the labor to man the factories has been trained. In these areas, apparently the practical solution is to perfect and carry out the latest and best plans for the protection of the people of the area in the event of attack—all of which, of course, offers little protection against the destructiveness of falling bombs on the industry itself.

Even though established industries cannot be moved, continuing consideration should be given by industry itself to locations which present the greatest safety advantages against future bombing. Certainly our Government should abide by these common sense considerations in the location of the defense factories which it builds, in whole or in part, and in the granting of highly valuable amortization certificates to new industrial developments.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a new problem. It has been before us, at least since our atomic bombs were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945.

I include an article dealing with the subject, entitled "Relocating Plants for Safety" from the August 13, 1948, issue of United States News and World Report:

RELOCATING PLANTS FOR SAFETY

VALUE OF SMALL-TOWN SITES IF WAR COMES

Owners of factories in big industrial areas are getting official advice to decentralize if they want to be safe in wartime. Small towns, not big cities, offer the best sites for firms in any future war. Underground factories are impractical on a large scale. Bombing, if war comes, is to be selective, is unlikely to hit isolated plants, suburban areas.

A guide is being offered to owners of industry who want to be as secure as possible in the event of future war. This guide calls for dispersal of plants in time of peace so as to be prepared for war.

Official advice to businessmen on how best to meet the threat of world war III is given by the National Security Resources Board. This Board, headed by Arthur M. Hill, is charged with planning to coordinate military, industrial, and civilian defense. Its advice, given in a report just made, is this:

Decentralization should be seriously considered by industry in its long-range planning, with a shift of new plants away from centers of industry.

Small towns offer the best opportunity for industries seeking safety in the event of war. Plants in these areas are least likely to be the object of bombing attacks.

Caves, deserts, other bizarre locations for industry need not enter calculations of businessmen. A shift of a few miles away from strategic areas is likely to be just as effective. Even remote locations will not be wholly immune.

Underground factories are not recommended. They would be too expensive, are considered impractical except for a few highly strategic plants. War, in spite of previous military reports, apparently is not to drive people underground even in the atomic age.

Businessmen, in this guide, are given the story of what to expect if war does come. The story is not quite what many expected in the light of tales about atomic weapons that might destroy entire States. Destruction in any foreseeable war is to be selective, the area of destruction not very widespread. But realization of what war is to be like must underlie planning of business and industry if that planning is to provide for the possibility of war.

War, as the official report sees it, is likely to involve these factors:

Attack, when it comes, will aim at a few key industrial centers. Warning may not be given. No location in the United States will be out of range of enemy bombers or enemy sabotage. Destructive effects may be many times those of Pearl Harbor. Attempt will be made to knock out key war industry with the first surprise blow.

Atomic bombs probably will be used. Those bombs, in the past, have been able to destroy nearly everything within a radius of half a mile from their center of detonation. They have caused moderate damage to all structures within another 1½ miles of that area. Allowing for future developments, the atom bomb is not expected to cause heavy damage beyond a distance of 3 miles from its point of detonation. Area destroyed by each bomb, thus, will be small.

Number of bombs used will be relatively small. They are highly difficult to make, will remain very expensive. Being scarce, they must be used on concentrated targets of great strategic importance. An enemy in the foreseeable future, thus, cannot bomb every big factory, even every big city.

What this means to the businessman is that his factory will be in danger of destruction in wartime if it is in an area that forms a strategic target, but the same factory will be relatively safe if it is away from such a strategic area.

Safest wartime sites for factories, as indicated in the chart on page 25, are to be areas with these qualifications:

Away from other plants: Sites should be at least 3 miles from other war industry which could become an atomic target, and well out of any industrial area larger than five square miles.

Away from big cities: Cities of 50,000 or more people could become targets for enemy bombs. Safe factory sites should be at least 5 square miles.

In hilly country: Hilly terrain is preferred over flat country, as possible atomic explosions nearby might be blocked off by intervening hills. Many factories were thus shielded from the Nagasaki bomb, second of those dropped on Japan in World War II, while nearly all were destroyed in the earlier blast on the flat area of Hiroshima.

Away from military installations: Atomic factory sites should be more than 3 miles from major air bases, air-supply depots, Army or Air Force posts, naval installations.

Away from dams, power plants: These power installations, too, might become prime targets in a surprise attack, should be avoided by several miles.

Where factories should be relocated for safety, thus, may be in any part of the country, just so the new sites are several miles from possible target areas. Decentralization alone may not be enough—each plant could still be subject to bombing if located too close to war installations. Idea is to plan future expansion so that new plants are located near, yet out of big cities, industrial areas, away from military and power installations.

In terms of cities, meaning of the relocation plan is this:

Detroit is probably the most dangerous area for factories in wartime. Here industry is concentrated, land is flat, population is large.

Pittsburgh, in contrast, is described as relatively safe. Industrial plants are spread out over a large area, terrain is hilly, no concentrated target is presented in spite of the large size of the city. Further decentralization, however, still is advised for such an area.

Chicago is between these two extremes. Land is flat, the lake front is dangerous in case of atomic attack, population is large. Yet industry is fairly well spread out, not concentrated.

Northeastern cities, as a group, are the most dangerous in case of war. Here, in 9 percent of the Nation's area, is concentrated about 65 percent of all United States manufacturing. This includes centers such as New York, Baltimore, Boston, Philadelphia, smaller manufacturing cities in New England.

Southern cities, over-all, are better off. Aside from a few areas such as Birmingham, there are no large concentrations of industry that would attract an atomic assault.

Western cities, in most cases, are in the most favored position. Grouping of industry is small, much of the land is hilly, power installations mostly are well away from factory areas, populations are smaller than in the East. With 61 percent of the Nation's area, the West now has only 11 percent of all United States manufacturing, plenty of room for new plants.

In terms of industries, the relocation plan means this:

Aircraft firms, especially susceptible to attack in wartime, must be further spread out for safety. These now are concentrated in half a dozen large areas, even though a few have begun relocation programs to get away from industrial areas.

Steel plants, those making ingots, are centered in too small an area for security. About 70 percent of total ingot capacity is located in western Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. This endangers the steel industry even though 27 States now have steel-making facilities, 29 States have steel-finishing plants.

Oil firms, in many cases, have their refineries much too concentrated for safety in wartime. The recent Texas City explosion shows what may happen to such facilities in case of enemy attack.

Machine-tool industry, basic in wartime, is in a far better position now, is spread out in relatively safe areas for the most part.

Other firms, less directly connected with war industry, may be just as vulnerable to attack if they are located in areas that could become strategic targets. As a result, they may be just as concerned with relocation plans. Moreover, secondary war industries, such as Germany's ball-bearing factories, may be considered key plants for bombing if they present a concentrated target.

To relocate plants for increased safety in wartime, however, owners still must base their choice of location on available power, transportation, markets, and labor, may not count on Federal money to overcome any increased costs.

Subsidies for decentralizing are not in sight. Even such strictly war industries as ordinance and aircraft firms may not expect financial aid from the Government in moving out of congested areas.

Policies may be shaped by Government to encourage such relocation, nevertheless. Defense planners are much disturbed, for example, about recent court rulings concerning f. o. b. prices, which they fear will result in centralization of industry around supply points. Military pressure probably will be on the side of efforts to get a change in that situation through action by Congress.

Self-Interest, in the long run, is expected to bring about the gradual relocation of United States factories. Location of new plants and equipment, now being built at the rate of about \$13,000,000,000 a year, could be a big element in the financial risk involved if war is in the offing. Pressure for safe locations, thus, may come from agencies lending money for long-range capital investments. The recent trend in decentralizing of firms is expected to continue in some industries and be guided by these new rules for choosing safe sites.

Official advice on relocating plants for security in the atomic age, as a result, is to apply to a large number of United States firms, is likely to be followed in many cases where new and expanded factories now are being planned.

Public Housing in St. Joseph, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 11, 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement which appeared in the St. Joseph Gazette of August 22, 1951, showing the decisive defeat of Federal public housing in that city.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Federal public housing was rejected by St. Joseph voters yesterday by a decisive vote which was almost 2 to 1 against the proposal.

Unofficial totals of the referendum election showed that 4,987 persons voted for housing and 9,288 voted against the ordinance which would have permitted construction of the project.

The increased interest in the issue during the past weeks was reflected in the 14,275 votes cast as the opponents rolled up a majority of 4,301 votes.

CARRIED ONLY FOUR PRECINCTS

The housing ordinance was doomed from the start of the balloting yesterday, as it ran consistently behind in almost all precincts. When the unofficial tallying was completed, the proposal was found to have carried in only 4 of the city's 63 precincts.

Party lines were ignored as the opponents of public housing rolled up their big majority. The seventh ward, for instance, always a Democratic stronghold, rejected the housing plan by a vote of 465 to 212. Almost all sections of the city, including areas which had been classified as slums and exclusive residential sections, voted against the proposal.

WOULD FORGET BITTERNESS

Mayor Stanley I. Dale, who led the fight to repeal the public housing ordinance which had been passed over his veto by the city council, said, "I am very pleased with the outcome of the election. I believe the votes cast have indicated in a truly democratic way that the people of St. Joseph are against socialistic trends and spendthrift programs.

"I believe this is a very encouraging sign for all America to follow. I think this was a very important issue to the citizens of St. Joseph and I want to thank very gratefully those who cast their ballots, whether for or against the ordinance, because their active participation is a sure guaranty of the survival of democracy.

"Let us forget all bitterness arising from this campaign and go forward to build a better St. Joseph in a democratic method."

Oil for Education Is Theft Slogan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, we have seen many articles and editorials recently regarding the tidelands question. Under leave to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in August 28 issue of the Dallas Morning News which warns of the danger of turning our school systems over to a highly centralized government, should the tidelands be held by the Federal Government, and the revenue derived therefrom restricted to educational use. This would be the initial step of Federal aid to education.

OIL FOR EDUCATION IS THEFT SLOGAN

Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, and some other advocates of turning everything over to the Federal Government are pushing a bill that would give tidelands oil to the Federal Government, restricting it to educational use. It is a crafty move aimed at appealing to teachers and school patrons throughout the Nation other than those of the three States most directly affected—Texas, Louisiana, and California. In their arguments, they make no mention of the moral issues involved. They make no mention of the danger of turning the schools over to a highly centralized Federal Government—a Government that may be highly militarized over a long period to come.

While these advocates of the tidelands steal for the Federal Government are using the billions of dollars of anticipated revenue in their appeal to the people, their design far transcends the mere theft of the oil. They want a precedent, based on the paramount-rights theory, for further grabs and extension of Federal power.

It is very significant that Senator HILL, in a recent release arguing for his proposal, tries to make it appear that, if the States succeed in retaining their tidelands, the United States will lose all of the oil of the submerged continental shelf. The States are claiming only 3 miles, except Texas, which claims 10.5 miles under its annexation agreement. The claim of the Federal Government to the edge of the continental shelf extends more than a hundred miles. And the chances are that, even if the States win their fight, the Federal Government will get most of the oil from the submerged area—in fact, 90 percent or more of the oil.

But the fanatics for Federal power want the precedent established because they want progressively to grab the river beds and thereafter any other natural resources that might be claimed under paramount rights.

This is not merely a battle for oil money. It is an ideological battle. And on the side of those advocating the tidelands steal is the grandest piece of strategy for the advancement of socialistic government that has ever been concocted.

Celebration of Port of Baltimore Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 12, 1951

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address now being delivered by the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] at a luncheon sponsored by the Propeller Club in celebration of the Port of Baltimore Day be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am proud to be here today to join in the celebration of Port of Baltimore Day. No one could live all his life in his native city with-

out feeling pride in its traditions and its institutions. The port of Baltimore has played a magnificent part in the history of the State of Maryland and the country.

From the docks and wharves of this great port, in time of peace, ships carry to the far-flung shores of every country in the globe a tremendous flow of commerce. In time of war, the facilities of this great port are turned to shipping munitions and other war materials to equip our fighting men.

Since I have been in the Senate, I have given close attention to every problem brought to me concerning the port. I will continue to keep a vigilant eye upon its progress. I had some small success recently in keeping the clinic in the Customs House open. I hope to see it expanded and will bend every effort to that end.

On Tuesday, August 21, the merchant marine bill was before the Senate and, realizing how important this measure is to our great port, I gave it my full support. I voted against several crippling amendments and was exceedingly pleased when the Senate finally passed the bill.

I consider the port doubly important today. There is a big fight going on in this country between communism and Americanism. It is a part of a greater battle between Godlessness and Christianity which is spreading all over the world. Now I have been drawn into that battle. As a matter of fact, I plunged into the senatorial campaign which resulted in my election with the avowed purpose of keeping the free State of Maryland clear of subversive influences and to fight for American liberty.

No doubt you have been hearing and reading about an investigation of my election by a subcommittee of the United States Senate. You have not heard the whole story, but that is no fault of yours.

During the public and secret sessions of this subcommittee more than 20 volumes of transcript were taken covering many thousands of words of testimony. Of course, the newspapers could not carry all of this complex story. Therefore, they picked out parts of it according to their individual judgment as to what makes news, because that is what sells newspapers. Newspapers are in the business to sell their product, and, therefore, you can't blame them for making it as attractive as possible.

Unfortunately, this practice failed in many instances to cover all of the facts. It also resulted in undue emphasis being given to parts of the testimony and the stating of conclusions wholly unfounded.

I therefore decided that after the furore and the tempest had subsided in Washington, and everyone had his say who wanted to, I would come back to my home town and tell my friends my side of the story. It's very simple, and I know you will understand it better this way than if I took the floor of the United States Senate and engaged in name calling and vituperative debate.

Here is where I was born. Here is where I grew up as a boy selling newspapers and doing odd jobs in the neighborhood.

Some of you are aware of the fact that when World War I broke out I enlisted immediately and served my country in France. After 26 months of service, I returned and worked my way through college, finally to obtain a law degree from the University of Maryland. I was 53 years old when I filed for the United States Senate, and for 23 years I had practiced law in my home town. I am married and have two fine boys and a lovely girl.

Many of you have been intimately connected with my private life, either through contact with my family or my profession. I know that if I were the kind of man some have been trying to paint with smears and insinuations, I would not be here today. If there were any doubt about my honesty and integrity, 326,291 voters in the State would

not have picked me over my opponent, Millard Tydings. I defeated Millard Tydings by a majority of 43,111.

Since then he has originated and directed a campaign against this overwhelming expression of public opinion which has been centered in an attempt to smear the voters of Maryland and my personal character. I can understand how he would be disturbed and upset over his defeat after serving so long in the Senate, but I have been dismayed and amazed at the extent of personal bitterness which he has expressed to mutual friends of ours.

I ask you to compare his attitude with my campaign against him. To this day, I have never made any personal reference to this man but have merely held up to the people of Maryland the oft-repeated criticism of his public record. You all know that I fight fair be it on the gridiron, in the courts, or in this field of politics which is brand new to me.

I told you at the opening that the investigation in Washington was a long-drawn-out affair. Besides the thousands of words of transcript, the pages after pages of exhibits and the investigators' reports, there has been considerable debate on the floor of the United States Senate. The report on this affair was 39 pages long.

Since it would be impossible for you to go into the matter in its entirety, I am going to sketch some points that I believe are important from the standpoint of a lawyer and a native Marylander.

First of all, the admitted crux of the whole situation lies in this paragraph of the Senate report on page 2. It says:

"Our answer, as respects JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, is that the facts developed from the evidence before this subcommittee are not sufficient in our judgment to recommend the unseating of Senator BUTLER."

If this language seems to say to you that the Senate subcommittee which wrote it was sorry they couldn't find enough to unseat me, you can blame it on the fact that the Senate Rules and Administration Committee that adopted the report was controlled by the Truman administration—that the subcommittee which approved the report contained three Democrats and two Republicans. In that respect, I want to point out to you something about the statement that this was a nonpartisan report drawn up by two Democrats and two Republicans.

I know of no better way to explain this situation than to quote you what one of these Republicans who signed the report said about it on the floor of the Senate on Monday, August 20, when the report was officially submitted.

Senator HENDRICKSON, a Republican from New Jersey who served on the subcommittee, said (and it is carried on p. 10332 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Monday, August 20):

"Mr. President, the subcommittee found very clearly that the distinguished Senator from Maryland had not in any manner conducted himself so that he would disqualify himself for membership in this great body."

I am very proud to have been a member of a committee which has been able to do justice to an honest and fearless and courageous citizen, who was elected by the people of Maryland after an intensive and exhaustive campaign; and I commend the people of Maryland today for the judgment which they displayed in that campaign.

Now maybe you are puzzled as to why, if Senator HENDRICKSON feels that way about the people of Maryland in selecting me for the United States Senate, he signed a report which contained unfair criticism about my campaign and my conduct in it. Maybe some other things Senator HENDRICKSON said on the floor of the Senate will enlighten you. At one time he said:

"The Senator from New Jersey would like to go one step further with relation to the part Jon Jonkel played in the Maryland campaign. If Jon Jonkel had followed the law, this matter would not be before the Senate today.

"I freely confess on the floor of the Senate this afternoon that there are contained in the report words and phrases and even paragraphs with which I could have taken issue. However, in order to get the basic issue settled and in order to do justice to a man who was held in the balance so to speak for a long time, I refused to quibble over a word here or a phrase there. All too long did JOHN MARSHALL EUTLER stand in a position in which he must have wondered what his neighbors and friends were thinking of him. I felt, as did the junior Senator from Maine, that we had to get down to business and dispose of the whole question and to dispose of it with a spirit of justice which would make the people who love justice completely satisfied that the committee had been conscientious in its labors."

And if this is not a clear answer, I want to tell you that shortly after Senator HENDRICKSON made this public declaration on the floor of the Senate the other Republican member of the subcommittee, Senator SMITH of Maine, told me that she concurred in the views of the Senator from New Jersey.

Now as to the criticism in the report. Let me read to you another short paragraph in the report which may have escaped your attention. It is on page 6 of the report and is the opening paragraph of what the subcommittee called their observations, conclusions, and recommendations. It says:

"Much of the 1950 Maryland senatorial campaign was in the regular and traditional American political pattern. And like any vigorously fought election, it had good and bad features that stand out."

Thereupon the report set down all the bad features they could find or that Tydings charged were present. They had nothing to say about the good features. They didn't mention the many men and women of high character who supported my candidacy. They never mentioned anything good about me personally, except that I had a right to my seat in the United States Senate.

I don't blame them because as new as I am to politics I've found out that a committee directed to find out if there is something wrong doesn't look at the good side.

After reading these criticisms of my campaign carefully I began to question whether the things complained of had any dominant effect on the result of the election. I don't think they did.

I call your attention to the widely published and universally accepted analysis of the campaign made by Millard Tydings on November 17, 1950, a few short days after the people of Maryland had duly and legally expressed themselves at the polls. I want to read you this interview with Mr. Tydings. It was published in the United States News of November 17, 1950. I quote:

"What do you think was the basic reason for the outcome in your case, Senator?"

"The basic reason, in my judgment, was that the primary campaign for the governorship was so bitter that it demoralized the Democratic Party and brought on a situation that has no parallel in Maryland politics, where the party was split completely down the middle.

"The fact that I ran about 50,000 votes better than the Governor did is indicative of what I am trying to say, but the demoralization over the whole State was due to the gubernatorial primary, and that couldn't have been healed. I think that was the principal factor. Everybody was the victim of it, because even the attorney general, who would normally win by 100,000 or more, won by only about 20,000, and there was no real fight on that office in the sense that there was on the others. It affected everybody."

"To what extent was the result influenced by the fact that Senator McCARTHY jumped into your campaign?"

"I don't think that McCARTHY as a person did any damage, but I think the issue raised and the propaganda about it had some effect, but it would be secondary to what I have already told you."

"What about foreign policy and military policy?"

"That was too obscure to pass any sound seasoned judgment on it. It was in and out, but never a major issue. The worst thing of all was the demoralization of the party by the gubernatorial primary, where they fought each other so hard that both sides were exhausted and there was a lot of terrible bitterness."

Now, that interview was given when every detail of the campaign was fresh in the minds of all of us. In that interview it was readily admitted that the defeat of the Democratic Party in Maryland was due to a split in that party and that it extended to the gubernatorial race, the race for attorney general, and right down the line to the county officers.

You know the registered Democrats outnumber the Republicans in Maryland by at least 3 or 4 to 1 so there has to be a reason for a novice Republican candidate for the United States Senate to defeat a Democrat of long service and entrenched position by a majority of 43,000. The Republican victory of November 1950 was not confined alone to the senatorial race nor is there yet any charge made that any particular phase of the senatorial campaign had any effect on the miserable showing the Democratic Party made in the other races. On the contrary, the defeated senatorial candidate, in the interview above quoted blames his plight on forces outside his case and on the general record of his own party.

There was also another analysis made of this senatorial campaign by a person who cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be said to be prejudiced in favor of the Republican Party or its candidates. It came from the pen of C. P. Ives, an editorial writer for the Baltimore Sun. Need I remind you of the unswerving political leanings of the Sun—the publicity bulwark of the Democratic Party? The article by Mr. Ives was printed in that newspaper November 13, 1950. I shall read it to you.

"Our own Millard Tydings is a very special case with a good deal of the flavor of pathos about him. No one who cheered his bravery (as this voter did) in the 1937 court-pack fight can believe any version of the grotesque yarns about a rush of leftism to the head in his latter years.

"What a very high percentage of the 285,000 Marylanders who went for Mr. BUTLER seem to have concluded about Mr. Tydings was that in a single, but determinative, episode he served the President, as Wolsey served Henry VIII, not wisely, and in the end not well. From that first historic television show of the Lattimore hearing, tens of thousands of these people seem to have had a dimming sense of levity and lack of inquisitiveness in the chairman."

These analyses are but two that were written along similar lines on or about that time. I will not weary you with the others because I believe these two coming from the mouth of the defeated candidate and a newspaper that champions his every move may be taken as the defeated man's own best explanation.

Therefore, I ask why this later attempt to put another face on the facts?

It may be argued that campaign matters now complained of were not known at the time these statements by Tydings and the Baltimore Sun were made. Do you believe that is true? Let's take a look at the facts.

First of all the most bitterly complained of piece of literature in the campaign was

a four-page circular entitled "From the Record."

How can anyone complain that this piece of literature was unknown to the defeated candidate or his personal mouthpiece, the Baltimore Sun, when they made their analyses of the election? The defeated candidate spoke long and lustily on the radio and television and issued statement after statement every day from the date of distribution of this circular to the date of the election. As for the Baltimore Sun, I venture to say that From the Record received more public attention from that newspaper and others than any other piece of literature used in any national campaign of the year 1950.

I wonder if the defeated candidate and Mr. Ives of the Sun discounted the effect this circular had on the voters because they knew every charge made in it—every piece of material—had been used before over and over again on the radio, in the newspapers, in speeches, or on the floor of Congress.

The whole tenor of this piece of literature was that the defeated candidate had been charged with whitewashing the investigation of communism in the State Department. Is there any doubt in the minds of anyone that the charge was made? Is there any doubt that it was repeated and repeated the length and breadth of this Nation? Is there any doubt that it is still being made now?

What is so strange about including it in campaign literature?

Can there be anything wrong in bringing out during a campaign that the public record of your opponent has been criticized day in and day out?

Obviously, the defeated candidate did not shy away from using current issues as material for his campaign. He charged the Republican Party with being responsible for the Korean war. Here's what he said about it time and time again.

"If we had done what the Republicans wanted in Korea there would not have been a gun out there."

Now, here you have the chairman of the Senate's Armed Services Committee, who is by rank and title bearing responsibility along with the President of the United States and the Secretary of State, for the policy of our country in relation to our armed intervention on foreign shores, charging the flops and failures of policy to the Republican minority in a Congress controlled by the Democrats.

When the people of Maryland put the responsibility where it belonged, this defeated candidate shouted "Foul." Everybody—in and out of Maryland—knows the truth of the matter and I am not going to dwell on that point any further.

So, I move on to the great composite-picture issue.

I don't know what difference it makes, at this late date, but just for the official record I tell you here and now that I did not know anything about this picture until I saw a printed copy of the circular From the Record.

The only previous knowledge of the circular I had was a brief notice that someone, somewhere, was planning to distribute a four-page newspaper containing direct quotations from the records of the United States Senate concerning the failure of the Tydings subcommittee to do its job of investigating communism in the State Department. When I saw it, my judgment was and still is, "let the people evaluate it."

But to resume, as to the Browder-Tydings picture, I never knew the whole pamphlet was even out of the planning stage until a copy of the completed product was put in my hands.

However, I have been informed and have every reason to believe that the composite picture was merely designed to illustrate the attitude displayed by Tydings toward Communist Earl Browder when the latter appeared before the Tydings subcommittee

and was questioned by the defeated candidate who was then chairman of the subcommittee investigating communism in the State Department.

If you are not familiar with this record, I urge you to read that testimony by Mr. Browder and then you can decide for yourself whether the composite picture, which was in reality a poor excuse for a cartoon, did accurately portray that incident.

Now, here are the facts. Browder did appear before the subcommittee. The defeated candidate, as chairman, did question Browder and did thank him most warmly for his testimony. Whatever else you read into that picture is a matter of imagination.

However, no mention of this picture, well advertised as it was, was made in the defeated candidate's own explanation of his failure, until long after the campaign was over. Again, I ask you why? What changed his mind, if in sober judgment it has been changed? What happened between the time he first spoke and his later utterances?

I can understand you could be puzzled, for, as close as I am to the matter, I have been shocked and amazed at this turn of events.

Now, we have heard a great deal about the manner in which funds were handled in the campaign. First of all, let it be clearly understood by those who are not aware of such things that I did not personally disburse any funds.

It was not my job. I was the candidate. I had a treasurer.

I can truthfully say, for my own campaign, that I endorsed some checks. I don't know how many or in what amount. I was confident at the time that they were being carefully handled through the treasurer in full accordance with the election laws. I know that no check I endorsed was handled otherwise.

Secondly, I was involved involuntarily in the matter of the \$18,000 bill owed William Fedder for printing. I did not know until I was told by Mr. Fedder in a telephone conversation at 2 o'clock in the morning of November 2, that any such bill existed. I did not know that a Mr. William Fedder existed before that time, much less that I owed him money. I was distraught at the thought that such a bill had been run up.

However, I told Mr. Fedder that, if it was true that others using my name had induced him to do work for which he now thought he was not going to be paid, I would personally guarantee him against loss. I pay my debts. I never seek a way out.

I felt that although I had not made or authorized any such advance commitment to Mr. Fedder, it was up to me to see that he did not suffer even if it took my last cent. I told him so and I followed it up with a letter.

And, I want to tell you that as a lawyer I know there was no violation of any law involved. I had a perfect right to make such an offer under the very language of the Corrupt Practices Act which exempts such printing bills.

And, I think that if a man's effort to be honest is to be twisted around to look as if he was violating a United States statute, the statute ought to be changed or we ought to get rid of the people who are interpreting it in such a manner.

Now it has been established that one closely associated with my campaign committee was guilty of violations of the Maryland Corrupt Practices Act in the handling of certain funds used in the campaign. In this regard, I want to make you this assertion:

Every cent of the money involved was used for the legitimate purposes of buying radio time, printing circulars, and running the office. Not one scintilla of evidence has been produced that it was used otherwise. I am

confident nobody can produce any such, because I am confident there is no such.

The only charge was that the rules on reporting campaign funds were not carried out. In other words, the charges on which Jon M. Jonkel was convicted and fined in no way changed the course of the campaign or the result of the election and in no wise involved moral turpitude.

If receipt of the money have been otherwise recorded, it still would have been used for the same purpose and the result would not have been changed one iota.

Let us pass on to another phase of the Maryland campaign, the matter of outside influences.

After considerable study of the subject, I am of the opinion that it is really not so much a question of whether it is proper for persons from outside a State to contribute funds in a national election, or for persons from outside a State to come in to make speeches.

It is rather a question of who gets the money and who does the speech making.

I have heard of bitter denunciation because a Republican Senator came into Maryland and made two speeches for me. I don't recall that anything was said about the fact that President Truman came to Maryland before the party primaries got under way and spoke up for the candidate I defeated. I don't recall any mention of the fact that the Democratic National Committee contributed \$5,000 to the defeated candidate's campaign and that \$2,500 was contributed by the Democratic Senatorial Committee.

If these so-called outside influences are to be stopped, are we to do away with the two-party system? Are we to abolish both national committees?

Are we to stop the President of the United States from making swings around the country to speak for local candidates at whistle stops or metropolitan areas?

Of course, such steps would be ridiculous, but I believe some definite effort should be made to stop hand-picked Truman Democrats from selling Federal jobs in Mississippi, stealing ballots, and peddling RFC loans.

One other point I would like to clear up before I close. During the long months while my right to a seat in the United States Senate has been under fire I refrained from entering into name calling or mud slinging. I do not intend to lower myself to that level today. However, because I did not answer the jibes of some columnists, radio commentators, and others who wish to prolong this fight, it has been charged even in the United States Senate report that I have never made any answer to the charges. This is not true.

I was the first person to appear before the Senate subcommittee when it opened its public hearings February 20. I asked the subcommittee to allow me the right of every accused American. I asked that I might be given a specification of the charges against me and counsel so that I could defend myself. I was denied these rights. In that appeal to the subcommittee I did give a full accounting of my campaign. Here is what I said:

"I have no personal knowledge of any violation of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act. I fled, and my treasurer has fled, complete statements which I believe were a full compliance with that statute. I have never run for an elective office before, and I do not claim to be an expert in political procedures. In my campaign there were many citizens who volunteered to assist me, a large number of whom had had no prior experience in politics. Since my victory I have learned that many people unknown to me at the time of the campaign were working independently to assist me.

"It is thus impossible for me to state that the investigators of this committee may not

have found some technical violations, as indeed I suspect could be found in a 3 months' investigation of any political campaign. But I can state wholeheartedly and without any qualification whatsoever that I never knowingly have violated a single provision of any statute, and that if any of my supporters have done so, any such violations were technical in character and relatively trivial, and due to inexperience and not to intention.

"There is no suggestion that the total amount of my expenditures was excessive compared to expenditures in other senatorial campaigns. It will also be found that they were well within the limits of either State or Federal statutes."

I don't know how I could have been more plain.

I hope I have given you all the information that you desired about the election. The report of the Senate committee should mark the end of unjustified and unreasonable attacks on me by Tydings or others on his behalf.

There can, however, be no assurance on this point, but with a better understanding of the facts, you will better appreciate the nature and the motive behind any such attempts. Perhaps it was only natural for a poor loser to seek an alibi.

I call your attention to this thought which I am going to leave with you in closing. I am, as you know, a freshman Senator, new in politics, but I have been advised by veteran Members of the Senate and many persons in Maryland, that if Mr. Millard Tydings had conducted a full and satisfactory investigation of communism in the State Department, he would still be the senior Senator from Maryland today. In that case, I would be practicing law and perhaps a lot happier individual.

I am inclined to agree with that theory. The fact that clinched the argument for me is that the same investigation that Tydings was supposed to conduct but didn't, is now being done over by another Senate committee. It is a Subcommittee on Internal Security. It is headed by Senator Pat McCarran, a Democrat from Nevada, who is also chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. The decision to have the job done over was made by a Democratic-controlled Senate. The progress reports from this new Senate committee put an entirely new light on some of the conclusions of the subcommittee headed by Mr. Tydings.

This country, like every other country attacked by communism, will stand or fall on its internal security. I am certain this is one of the most important issues of the day and I intend to use every effort at my command to wipe out any weaknesses in our Government this committee reveals.

I thank you for this opportunity to tell the people in my home town what I stand for. I am ready, as always, to meet the issue anywhere, but I am doubly proud that I can safely place my fate in the hands of the people of my own State.

Dedication of New General Accounting Office Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIS SMITH

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 12, 1951

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, yesterday at the laying of the cornerstone of the new General Account-

ing Office Building, the Comptroller General of the United States, Hon. Lindsay C. Warren, a distinguished North Carolinian, with many years of service in the Congress, made an address with respect to the General Accounting Office and its part in the governmental functions of the Nation's activities.

In this address, among other things, he pointed out some very interesting facts as to personnel employment, and how he had reduced the number of employees from a peak in April 1946 of 14,904 to 6,899 on July 31, 1951, a reduction of 8,005 employees in the last 5 years.

This is such a refreshing statement by a man who believes in efficiency in Government that I think it should be published in the RECORD for all to read, and many, I hope, to emulate. I therefore ask consent that the statement be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen, the General Accounting Office and its employees are deeply grateful for this splendid new building. It is the product of a great engineer, Mr. W. E. Reynolds, and his able staff; and a master builder, Mr. John McShain, and his workmen. Its dignified exterior and public reaches leave an impression of strength and soundness. Its functional work areas incorporate the advances of modern science. Ample provision has been made for the convenience and physical comfort of our people. While its construction entailed considerable cost, it is reassuring to know that the collections of the General Accounting Office during any 5 months would pay that cost. We are all expecting great dividends in terms of better management and morale from this first gathering under one roof of all of our Washington activities.

It was 30 years ago this summer that the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 was passed. The title "General Accounting Office" was assigned to the office then created, but the genealogy of the Office is clearly traceable back to the very beginning of our Government. The story of its development is an interesting and important part of Federal financial history.

From the days of our early colonists up to the year 1921, the function of auditing Government expenditures took many forms and was administered in many different ways. But with the enactment of the Budget and Accounting Act there was brought into existence an audit and investigative agency in the legislative branch of the Government with real enforcement powers. Legislative control over financial matters was greatly strengthened. For the first time Congress had the means to secure necessary information concerning the financial transactions of our Government from a completely nonpolitical agent, independently of the executive branch.

As could be expected, that independence has not gone unchallenged. In the 30 years since 1921, there have been several abortive efforts to destroy the Office. They have come not only from within the Government, but from the outside. Even some of your predecessors, Mr. President, have made the attempt. Their plans were rejected by the Congress. As late as last year, an ill-conceived attack was launched from outside the Government. The action of the Congress in repelling this last assault speaks for itself, for not a single vote, nor a single voice, was mustered in support of the proposal in either the Senate or the House of Representatives.

The General Accounting Office has emerged from this experience with new stature and increased importance as an agent of the Congress. Yet, neither the Congress nor the Office can afford to relax its vigilance. The controls placed by Congress on the expenditure of funds in the exercise of its constitutional power over the purse and the enforcement of those controls by the General Accounting Office are integral parts of our system of checks and balances. It would be naive to think that there will never be another attempt, motivated by dislike of restraint or adherence to discarded theories, to water down legislative control of public funds or weaken the General Accounting Office. Both the Congress and the Office must keep ever alert to guard against any such eventualities with all the strength at our command.

I would not paint the picture too dark. The Congress has displayed most heartening confidence in us over the years. But we in the General Accounting Office must always bear foremost in our minds that the support and backing of the Congress and of the citizens of our country must be earned and deserved. Our job, as in the case of any organization, whether in private business or the Government, is a continuing one. Let us never forget that no organization exists for long at a standstill or as a matter of right. The General Accounting Office was established to meet particular needs of our democratic form of government and we must serve those needs with constant vigor and with continual awareness of ever-changing conditions.

The very nature of the duties of the General Accounting Office and its status in Government as an agent of the Congress, independent of the executive branch, make it of paramount importance that we do our job with unassailable integrity. Our actions must be based on fact and fact alone. Our conclusions must be fair. We must execute our duties in a forthright manner without consideration of partisan factors and without fear of recrimination from any source whatsoever. Should the work of the General Accounting Office ever fail to follow any one of those principles, then the value of the Office will be lost.

It is essential that the General Accounting Office not only cooperate with the executive branch in its field of operations, but also lead the way to achieve those improvements that will result in better government. There are some of you from the executive branch here today who not too many years ago would have said, "That is not possible." I think you will now agree with me that it is not only possible, but has been done and is continuing to be done with increasing tempo.

A prime example is the joint accounting program which was inaugurated in December 1947 by the Secretary of the Treasury; the then Director, Bureau of the Budget, James E. Webb, and myself. This program has had the undeviating support of the President from its very inception. It is a partnership with the three partners cooperating 100 percent and having one common goal—the improvement of accounting, budgeting, financial reporting, and auditing in the Government. I gladly pay public tribute to Secretary of the Treasury Snyder and Director of the Budget Lawton. As a result of this program and of legislation enacted by the Congress, culminating in the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950 and the Post Office Department Financial Control Act of 1950, accounting improvements are going forward with rapid acceleration on a Government-wide basis. The primary objective of this great program is full disclosure of public funds—full disclosure for the benefit of the President, for the benefit of the Congress, and full disclosure, if you

please, for the benefit and information of the American taxpayer.

The General Accounting Office which takes up its quarters in this building is a far cry from the office which I first knew as Comptroller General in November 1940. With all modesty, I want to say that I think the Office has done an outstanding job over the years. There was the audit of billions of dollars in expenditures during the emergency and war years, as well as the many other related duties such as the settlement of several millions of claims, the rendering of thousands of decisions on the legality of expenditures, the continuous investigations and inspections, and the rendering of assistance to Congress and its committees on legislative and investigative matters and to the agencies on fiscal and accounting problems.

Since the termination of hostilities of World War II, new duties have been given to us by the Congress and new activities and approaches have been inaugurated to enable us better to perform our primary functions. The Government Corporation Control Act, enacted in 1945, requires the General Accounting Office to audit annually all Government corporations. This means an annual audit of about 65 Government corporations, whose financial transactions run into billions of dollars. The Federal Property Act of 1949 requires the GAO to audit all types of property accounts and transactions and to prescribe principles and assist in developing systems of accounting for property. Our part in the joint accounting program, which I mentioned a few moments ago, is a tremendous task. We are successfully developing comprehensive, on-the-site audits which bring about broader coverage, more effective results, less paper work, and reduced flow of documents into Washington. All are major undertakings and are of real importance to the Congress and the taxpayer. Our country is now in the throes of another defense effort. The resultant expansion of Government organization and expenditures has placed a direct and serious responsibility on the Office.

Work done can only be measured by results. On this score, I think the record of the General Accounting Office measures up. In the last 10 years, we have not only paid our way, but we have made a substantial contribution each year to the Treasury. Collections from 1941 through June 30 of this year total over \$740,000,000. This money had been illegally or otherwise improperly paid out, and it is a fair statement to say that little of it would have ever been recovered except for the General Accounting Office. We have found it possible to reduce employees. In April 1946 the number of employees reached a peak of 14,904. There were 6,899 employees on July 31 of this year, a reduction of 8,005 in the last 5 years, of whom 779 were transferred to the Post Office Department. This has been accomplished through constant surveys of our work and the elimination of procedures which serve no useful purpose under present conditions. The revised procedures which we have placed in effect are enabling the General Accounting Office and the Government as a whole to do a more competent job at less cost.

I would like to tell you my conception of the mission of the General Accounting Office and the way in which that mission should be performed. I believe the Office must see to it that the will of Congress is given effect in the Government's financial transactions. I believe it must make full use of the resources at its command, growing out of its audit, accounting, and investigative activities, to fearlessly expose the facts, not as a carping critic, but in a constructive spirit. I believe it must constantly strive to bring to light waste and extravagance in the Government's operations and insist that those who spend the Government's money be

guided by the principle that it is not their money, but money taken involuntarily for public purposes and impressed with a public trust. I believe the Office must continue to cooperate wholeheartedly with both the Congress and the executive branch toward improved and informed governmental administration. I believe we must remain young in our outlook, adaptable in our methods, and firm in our objectives. If we faithfully adhere to this pattern, I have no doubt as to our place in the great structure of our Government.

Effect on School-Construction Program of Limitations on Steel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 12, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, on last Friday, September 7, there was some discussion on the floor of the Senate regarding the proposal to ship 3,000,000 tons of steel to England during the coming year, and regarding the effect of present limitations on the use of steel on road-construction and school-building programs.

I have been very much concerned about this problem for sometime. On the day before the discussion occurred on the floor, I addressed a letter to Mr. Manly Fleischmann, Administrator of the National Production Authority, calling his attention to the disastrous effect on the school-construction program of present limitations on steel. Although I have not yet received a reply to my letter, I believe it may be of interest to other Members of the Senate, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND
INSULAR AFFAIRS,
September 6, 1951.

MR. MANLY FLEISCHMANN,
Administrator, National Production
Authority.

My DEAR MR. FLEISCHMANN: During the last few months, I have become more and more concerned about the disastrous limitations on new school construction which will apparently result from restrictions planned by the Federal Government on the use of steel for that purpose.

Preliminary indications are that we shall have a record number of children in elementary and secondary schools this fall—about 800,000 more than last year. Next year, it is estimated the number will rise by another 800,000, and there is no reason to think that this steady increase will stop for some years to come.

There are some of us who think that education is at least as important as military preparedness in the long-time preservation of our way of life.

These additional children will have to be educated somewhere. Existing schools are already bulging. We cannot double-deck the children. The only solution is to build more schools.

I have received any number of questions and complaints from various school districts

in Nebraska, regarding the serious situation they will face if they are not allowed to proceed with their plans, because of the rigid quota on the use of steel for school construction. It is my understanding that a total of only 196,000 tons of steel of all types is needed each quarter for this purpose, but the allocation of steel to schools, colleges, and libraries for the coming fourth quarter of this year has been restricted to approximately 104,000 tons. That is another way of saying that nearly one-half of the schools which should be built will not be built.

I further understand that this extreme shortage in the supply of steel available for civilian purposes is expected to continue for at least 1 year. If that occurs, it will throw the whole school construction program so far behind schedule that I don't know whether we will ever catch up, particularly since there is no guaranty that ample steel will be available at the end of the year.

The additional steel needed for the coming quarter would represent about four-tenths of 1 percent of the estimated supply. I realize that the steel shortage is unusually acute with respect to certain particular types of steel, such as structural steel. However, most school construction plans have been revised so as to hold the use of structural steel to a minimum.

We have been told that the cold war might last 5 or 10 years. It is not pleasant to think of the possibility that our educational system might have to labor under greater and greater difficulties year after year. The children are growing up and their education cannot wait. Very frankly, I believe that education should have a priority right next to military needs. It is hard for me to believe that we are in such a crisis that we cannot educate the children properly. When we speak of necessary sacrifices, I had supposed we were thinking in terms of sacrificing luxuries and comforts, not the educational, cultural, and moral training of the coming generation.

I would appreciate learning from you how you feel this situation can be handled. I have no desire to make your task more difficult, and I realize what a job you have in allocating the available steel supply among the various requirements. Not all needs, however, are equally essential, and I believe there is a time when first things must be put first.

Sincerely yours,

HUGH BUTLER,
United States Senator, Nebraska.

Value of Soil Conservation Districts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 12, 1951

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Mr. T. W. Thornhill, a trustee of Clemson College, in connection with the recent visit of the Secretary of Agriculture to inspect the soil conservation districts of certain sections of North Carolina and South Carolina.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There are times when we may feel that democracy is losing ground in the United States, when we may think that bureaucra-

cy and big government are supplanting local leadership and initiative.

A sure cure for that gloomy feeling is to study the work being done by our farmers through their locally organized and locally controlled soil conservation districts. It will reassure you that democracy, individual initiative, and individual freedom and acceptance of responsibility are alive and—yes—thriving. I believe I can say without successful challenge that our farm people, as a whole, have been throughout our history our most independent and our most vigilant group in maintaining the freedom and rights of individuals. I believe that this is true also today.

I would cite you to my own State, South Carolina, which is solidly covered by farmer-organized soil conservation districts, and has been since 1943. My friend, T. W. Thornhill, Charleston businessman, civic leader, farmer, district supervisor, and a leader in the South Carolina Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors, helped me to gather this information.

In these districts, created under authority of State law, farmers develop and carry out their own programs to solve their soil and water conservation problems. Of course, they use the facilities and services available from local, State, and Federal agencies, but this help is channeled through a program designed by the farmers themselves. For example, full-time technical help is provided through the districts to farmers by the United States Soil Conservation Service. PMA-ACP funds are used to help defray the cost of conservation work, and, through a recent order by the Secretary of Agriculture, soil conservation district supervisors will have an even greater share in the responsibility for shaping and carrying out a unified soil and water conservation program. The Clemson College Extension Service and vocational agriculture teachers help with the conservation education program. The State Forest Commission supplies much of the tree planting material used to return to forests those lands which should never have been cleared. The Farmers Home Administration urges all its clients to work out whole-farm conservation plans with the districts. Those are only a few examples of the types of help made available through the districts.

All of this, please remember, is under the local leadership of the farmers who serve as district supervisors. And, I understand, that the farmers are accepting an even greater responsibility for the operation and management of their districts. Our South Carolina General Assembly recently passed, and Governor Byrnes signed, an amendment to the State Soil Conservation District Law setting up a State soil conservation committee composed of district supervisors to administer the law. In the past, the committee has been composed of agency heads serving by virtue of other positions held by them. I feel that this change is in no wise a reflection on the agency heads formerly members of the State committee. It is simply another important bit of evidence that farmers are willing to accept full responsibility for the leadership of their soil and water conservation program.

Before we look inside a few of the South Carolina soil conservation districts, to see how local leadership carries out the local program, let's consider some of the area-wide and even interstate activities of district supervisors.

Supervisors in districts within the Savannah River watershed, both in South Carolina and in Georgia, have banded themselves together in an association to see that any watershed development and flood-control program worked out for that river basin is practical and in keeping with the wishes and needs of the local people. Any kind of basin development and watershed flood-con-

trol program worked out for the Savannah will affect the land on every farm in the watershed. Therefore, the district supervisors of both South Carolina and Georgia want to be dead certain that any program planned will be the kind of program the landowners need. And, here, I should like to emphasize that flood, erosion, and drainage problems cross boundary lines of farms, counties, and even States.

Within South Carolina, another group of district supervisors banded themselves together to help solve the land use and water management problems along the coast. With the help of supervisors of coastal districts in North Carolina, Georgia, and Florida, they sponsored the location of a Soil Conservation Service Experiment Station at Fleming, Ga., for the scientific study of those problems. It was my privilege to help the district supervisors get what Chief H. H. Bennett, of the Soil Conservation Service, has called the world's first drainage experiment station.

Along the coast, from Virginia to Florida, lies an area of land with enormous potentialities for development. Under the guidance of soil conservation districts, manned as they are by local people who know the situation best, great sums of money will not be spent unwisely in premature development, or in efforts to develop land not suited for agricultural purposes. You can be assured that this orderly development will provide for our great wildlife resources, and perhaps supply even greater quantities of desirable foods for waterfowl and other game. Management of land and water for waterfowl is one of the problems which I understand will be studied at Fleming, Ga.

And I feel that the time is ripe for the orderly, scientific development of these idle or little used coastal lands. Aside from our needs for food and other crops during the present emergency, we have a growing industrial population in South Carolina and adjoining States that will benefit from new and nearby sources of foods. Further, dependable sources of electric power and raw materials will encourage location of new industrial processing and manufacturing plants.

For example, the Santee-Cooper development and the proposed further expansion of this development to divert water from the Cooper to Back River will provide an increased market for agricultural products and put an increased demand on our crop and pasture lands to meet the needs for people employed in industry. Likewise, great quantities of quality foods will be required by people working at the atomic energy project on the Savannah River near Aiken.

Wise land use, sound water management methods, and development of idle and little used lands are vital, therefore, to the owners, to industrial workers, to industry itself, and to business and transportation—extremely vital, in fact, to our Nation and to the cause of freedom-loving people everywhere.

How is this responsibility being met within the individual districts?

District supervisors, elected or chosen by their neighbors and serving without pay except the satisfaction of performing well a service to all people, look to community and neighborhood leaders to spark the soil- and water-conservation program, and to the individual farmers to do the work voluntarily when provided the necessary technical help. When farm people are given correct information about land use and treatment, they will make wise decisions—and take appropriate action.

We all know that every farm community has its own leaders—men and women in whom the others have confidence and whose advice and guidance they seek. We also recognize that people accomplish most when they work together, whether the goal is better schools, better churches, better roads, or better farming methods. Working together

is an especially cherished rural tradition. It is a tradition handed down by our forefathers who worked together in log rollings, corn huskings, and barn raisings.

For those reasons, district supervisors encourage what they call "group action in conservation." That saves much time and travel expense for the Soil Conservation Service technicians. Conservation education and preliminary farm-planning work can be done as effectively with a group as with an individual. On the other hand, the final job of helping a farmer plan a complete farm soil- and water-conservation program must, of course, be done right on the land with each owner.

Group work is especially desirable and essential in solving drainage problems. Frequently the water drained from one farm must cross several other farms to reach a good outlet. Neighbors working together make this possible.

Mrs. O. M. Dotson and J. B. Mims, of the Lower Edisto Soil Conservation District near Harleyville worked together on such a project. Trained technicians of the Soil Conservation Service assigned to the district made preliminary surveys of the job and gave the landowners a cost estimate. Water from Mrs. Dotson's farm had to cross Mr. Mims' farm to find a good outlet. The landowners reached a financial agreement, and obtained help from the PMA-ACP at the rate of 12 cents per cubic yard of dirt moved.

Equipment owned and operated by the district dug a total of 3 miles of canals at a reasonable cost. The canals benefit 724 acres, including some very poorly drained land then idle. All the land drained is now ready for application of other soil and water conservation measures provided for in whole-farm plans with the district.

In order to encourage other landowners in the district to work together, the district supervisors sponsored a field day on the farms of Mrs. Dotson and Mr. Mims. Veterans' class members and other local farmers attended. Since that time, six group jobs have been undertaken in the district, and four of them already are completed. Four other group projects, involving 20 farms, are now in various stages of planning.

Perhaps the State's outstanding example of group work in soil conservation is in the Piedmont section, in Midway community of the Cherokee Soil Conservation District. That was the home community of the late E. C. McArthur, a district supervisor who was a founder of the South Carolina Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors and later of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts that now includes more than 2,300 districts through the Nation. He served as the first president of each group.

Group work in the Midway community under the leadership of Mr. McArthur, C. F. Swofford, M. B. Salmon, and others, prompted the Spartanburg Herald-Journal to sponsor a community soil conservation contest in cooperation with the districts.

In this one community, each of 81 farmers have a complete soil and water conservation plan with the district, and a high percentage of the planned measures can be seen on the land.

I'm told that you can drive at a moderate rate of speed for about 3 or 4 hours on the numerous improved roads in the 9 square miles within Midway community and never be out of sight of less than six of the many different soil and water conservation practices coordinated into complete programs. I'm told that you can stand at a county and farm road intersection on the Billie Hatcher farm and see, without moving or turning around, 18 different conservation measures established on the land. Visitors from many States and several foreign countries have seen and praised the cooperative conservation work of the Midway farmers.

The increased yields, reduced cost of production, and other benefits exceed many times the cash and work put out in applying the measures of whole-farm plans, according to C. F. Swofford, local leader and a supervisor of the Cherokee district.

"My own yields have increased from 30 to 35 percent since we started a conservation plan," Mr. Swofford says.

And the Cherokee district has 10 other similar community groups, with a total of 287 farmer members.

I could not complete this report without emphasizing that soil-conservation districts are giving equal assistance to Negro farmers, who also like to work in groups to save and build their land.

Here is an outstanding example of Negroes working together in the Berkeley Soil Conservation District:

The Smithville section of Berkeley County is one of the county's poorest drained farming sections. It lies between two large bays which do not have sufficient outlets. Water accumulating in the bays seeps through the farming area in between. Excess water does not drain off due to lack of outlets; it just evaporates. On 31 farms, covering 1,800 acres in this area, the owners cultivated the few high ridges to grow cotton, corn, sweet potatoes, and a little tobacco. Most of them had to seek employment in logging and pulpwood operations and in other work.

A Negro minister, Rev. W. M. Warley, who also farms in this section, learned about the assistance available through the district. He called a meeting of his neighbor farmers to hear from a Soil Conservation Service technician a full explanation of the help available. The group voted 100 percent to participate putting in a drainage system and using the necessary conservation measures on their lands.

Under the leadership of Reverend Warley, the group agreed to assign all PMA-ACP payments to the construction of a community drainage system. These payments will cover about 60 percent of the total cost, based on preliminary engineering surveys prepared by the SCS. The remaining 40 percent was raised in cash by voluntary assessments (based on benefits) to all 31 farms involved. The final engineering surveys were completed by the SCS, and the farm group was receiving bids for the construction in late April.

This drainage work will greatly benefit all present open land by lowering the water table about 3 feet. It also will open up 1,000 acres of potentially productive land suitable for a wide variety of row crops or pasture—land which has never produced crops. The drainage system will permit diversification and the establishment of conservation practices. The newly available cultivated land will enable each farmer to earn his living from his land. Health conditions as a result of standing water have been poor in this section, with a high rate of malaria. Drainage will largely eliminate this hazard. Road conditions also will be improved.

All these 31 farmers needed was the help given them by the district. They are doing the rest of the job under their own leadership and initiative.

I am told that in many instances, white and colored farmers, working with soil-conservation districts, have done group drainage work. An example is a group-drainage job by five white and two colored farmers in the Williamsburg Soil Conservation District, near Kingstree.

Countless other examples could be cited of the leadership of local farm people in the soil-conservation-district movement of South Carolina. The evidence is clear, convincing, and inspiring. Soil-conservation districts are helping to keep democracy, individual initiative, and local leadership living realities.

The Contest Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 12, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter under date of August 29, 1951, addressed to the President by Maurice Tishman, a member of the American Legion, dealing with the duty of American citizens in the present contest with communism.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 29, 1951.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As a loyal American and an ex-soldier of World War I, having served my country overseas (Company 168, Infantry) of the Forty-second (Rainbow) Division, and having seen front-line action at the Battle of St. Mihiel, from which action I was returned to this country as a war casualty, I believe I have earned the privilege of presenting to you my own interpretation of those constitutional rights you discussed in your address before the American Legion in Washington, on August 15, although as an individual I hesitated answering this address.

I am a past president and present chairman of the board of trustees of the Maiden Lane Historical Society, and I am a member of the American Legion, Victor Murtha Post, No. 972, Long Beach, N. Y., and in your address you quoted parts of the beautiful preamble to our Legion's constitution which pledges its members to "uphold and defend the Constitution, perpetuate a 100 percent Americanism, and to transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy."

For 52 of the 64 years of my life, these are the ideals I have cherished in my heart. For these ideals I have worked and striven and seen countless millions of my fellow Americans sacrifice their lives. During this period America has gone through four wars: The Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, and now we are in the Korean conflict, again sending our boys thousands of miles overseas to keep communism, in one of its open bids for power, away from our democratic shores.

If as it now appears we have contained communism in Korea in its open bid for power, we have done little to protect ourselves from the Communist's hidden bid for power here at home. This is Stalin's main line of attack, his central front along which the Reds never sleep, a perfected and damnable technique by which the Communists, without risking a single Russian soldier, seek by secret and underground methods to undermine and weaken the democratic structure of the West until it collapses of its own internal rottenness. And if the Communists succeed in this hidden bid for power, and a third world war engulfs our already tottering civilization, history will attest that it was not brought on by the Russian armies but by American citizens, by those whom we have placed in the highest positions of trust in this country who sold their birthright and honor to the enemy.

Such was the history of the Russian Empire in the days of the Czar. The latter had the largest standing army in the world. He believed Russia impregnable and dismissed all warnings of Communist influences undermining his regime as slanderous attacks against his trusted advisers and as unworthy of notice. When the Red's underground work had been completed he saw his mighty army disintegrate overnight, his trusted officials go over to the Soviets, and in the end he, his entire family, and the great Russian Empire were destroyed.

This pattern of waging a bloodless conquest from within, not without, has been the method by which every one of the Russian satellite countries have been forced under the Communist yoke. It is the pattern by which they eventually hope to destroy America, the only country in the world which they still fear and which alone has the power to block their dreams of world conquest.

In your address, Mr. President, you spoke of the Bill of Rights, of freedom of religion, of the liberty of the individual, of a man being considered innocent until he is proven guilty, of fair play, and these things are indeed the keystones of our liberty.

But liberty is not license. It does not include the right to destroy the very thing it seeks to uphold. Freedom of religion was never meant to give protection and immunity to those who do not believe in God, and are bent on eradicating religion from the face of the earth. Fair play does not mean foul play and the right to preach violence, hate and revolution.

These are terrible times of national emergency. The Red menace is reaching out to destroy not only our Bill of Rights, but America itself. It is doing this from within by underground, secret, and treacherous methods that cannot be faced and grappled with in the open. It is abusing every one of our constitutional privileges by using them as a cloak in which to hide its nefarious activities. To afford it the protection of these liberties as a safety zone in which to destroy our rights is national madness and suicide.

Our first fundamental liberty as assured us in the Declaration of Independence is the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, yet because of the Red menace and the terrible emergency which is upon us (an emergency which you yourself have proclaimed) millions of our youth are being denied life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and asked to sacrifice their young lives to protect these very rights for future generations.

Is it asking too much of the rest of us, especially those of us who hold positions of public trust and who are responsible for the training and guidance of our youth—to have our own actions and beliefs subject to this same vigilance? How else, except by the full light of publicity, can we cope with this enemy which always acts in secret and strikes in the dark? Should not we, the great civilian army of the home front, consider all such inquiries an honor and be ready at all times to voluntarily give proof of our loyalty in order to protect our loved ones on the firing line from this enemy which is within our gates? If we are true and faithful Americans what have we to fear?

Under the very rights you speak of, Mr. President every American who may be suspect is assured his day in court and is considered innocent until he is proved guilty. We have bent backward to give even those Communists among us who have been caught red-handed in their traitorous acts, an equitable opportunity to defend themselves and a fair and impartial trial.

Americanism, as I see it, and as you defined it in your speech, Mr. President, means and includes the basic right of freedom of

speech, the right of every citizen to say what he thinks. This fundamental right is the keystone of all the others, for without it none of the others can be preserved.

It is this right that Senator McCARTHY has used to such great advantage in uncovering the Red trail in our State Department. Wherever this vigilant and outspoken Senator has seen smoke, he has called for an investigation of fire. And this is what every one of us should do in these perilous times. It may result in the destruction of some of our false prophets, but it will save America.

In conclusion, may I briefly relate a personal experience which is typical of the role that even the most humble among us can play in the present emergency. This is the case of a so-called honorable American who was the founder and respected leader of one of our youth movements. He is one of the most prominent labor attorneys in the United States, has practiced before the United States Supreme Court, and written well-known and authoritative books on constitutional law. His reputation was that of an outstanding American and a brilliant and loyal citizen of his country.

I accused this man of being a Communist, of having been the founder of the Marxist movement in this country, of advocating the abolition of the power of the Supreme Court of the United States, of urging the workers of this country to resort to violence and revolution if they could not obtain their ends by peaceful means.

For having so accused this great man, I was sued by him for libel, called a character assassin, lost many of my friends and my health, but in the end I won out and pulled the mask from his face, and proved him a traitor to his country by his own written words.

To attack those evil ones who are in power and expose them is a heart-breaking experience. One must expect to be ridiculed, maligned, lied about, be called a scandal-monger, and a defamer of character and faith. Such was my humble experience and such to a far greater degree is the continuing experience of that Paul Revere of the twentieth century, Senator McCARTHY. But until the Red menace is wiped from the face of the earth, such work must go on by those who are willing to subjugate their own lives and feelings for the greater good of the country they love.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the rights you speak of were put in the Constitution by our founding fathers to give every American, the rich, the poor; the powerful and the meek; the intelligent and the illiterate; of whatever race, color, or creed, equality before the law and an opportunity to live together in freedom, prosperity, and happiness. These rights were meant to heal the hurts of fate of those who fled here to escape the oppression of foreign lands and who have helped to build here the greatest democracy in the world. But these rights were not put in the Constitution to protect those among us who would abuse and waste the gifts of freedom, nor those from foreign lands who would tear down the flag of democracy. Time and again, through our long history, Americans have risen in their might, and even temporarily laid aside some of these rights, to put down with hand of steel those whose aim it was to destroy all that we were, or hoped to be, and this, in our greatest hour of peril, is no time for softness. We must fight fire with fire and present a united, unbroken and loyal front to the enemy. Only thus can we help free the world and remain free ourselves, a people worthy of our splendid destiny. I am,

Respectfully, your comrade Legionnaire,

MAURICE TISHMAN.

The Schools and the Tidelands Issue**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 12, 1951

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why Drag Schools Into Argument on Tidelands Issue?" which appeared in the August 25, 1951, issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY DRAG SCHOOLS INTO ARGUMENT ON TIDELANDS ISSUE?

The latest device to sell the Federal Government's grab of the traditionally State-owned tidelands is to link it with education. Those who oppose this aggression against the long-accepted property rights of the States are now told off by Fair Deal columnists for "attacking the children of the Nation." It is bad enough to be accused of being a tool of the oil lobby, but it takes a strong Member of Congress to hold out when the antidelands forces march into battle holding helpless kiddies in front of them. Nevertheless in its most recent expression on the subject, Congress seemed indifferent to this dubious appeal.

The way the children got into the tidelands row is interesting. To gain wider support for filching the property of the States, Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, suggested that the money received from oil leases in the newly acquired tidelands be distributed among all the States to support education. Members of Congress were then expected to forget the dangerous principle behind the seizure of the tidelands because so many of their constituents would be hounding them to cast a vote for the kiddies and not for the oil lobby. One thing we do owe Senator HILL, and that is the admission that under Federal control, as under State, the oil companies would still operate. Heretofore the idea of the liberals seems to have been that, with the oil companies out of there, oil would descend (or should we say ascend?) like manna from heaven.

Plainly the decision should be made on the merits of the case and not on what the Federal Government plans to do with the lease money, when, as, and if it gets any. If it is all right to disturb property values of long standing and throw the whole complicated question of land titles into deep confusion, then let Congress sanction the tidelands grab, even if the Interior Department uses the proceeds to support the price of marijuana. But if, as we believe, the tidelands grab is wrong in principle and will be catastrophic in practice, then distribution of the money among worthy and indigent spinsters won't make the deal any sweeter.

Until former Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes raised the issue, there had never been any serious question regarding ownership of submerged land adjoining the coastal States. Justice Gray ruled in 1894 that the "new States admitted into the Union since the adoption of the Constitution have the same rights as the Original States in the tidewaters and the lands under them." In 1912 Chief Justice White observed that "each State owns the beds of all tidewaters within its jurisdiction." Chief Justice Hughes

said in 1935 that the new States had the same rights to tidewater lands as the Original States.

The present Supreme Court, in a series of decisions, reversed the accepted standards of a century and a half. In one of the Court's decisions on this matter Justice Black attempted to show that the claims of the Federal Government "transcended those of a mere property owner." What do they mean, "mere"? If they mean that property ownership—of your house, your car, your savings—is so tenuous that it can be upset whenever the Government decides to change the rules, then we are nearer the Nazi system than most people imagine.

North Dakota Mill and Elevator**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 12, 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "State Mill Shows Good Net Profit," published in the Kildeer Herald of August 23, 1951, showing that the mill and elevator owned by the State of North Dakota reported a gross operating profit for the last fiscal year of \$638,662.89.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE MILL SHOWS GOOD NET PROFITS

The North Dakota Mill and Elevator at Grand Forks reported gross operating profit of \$638,662.89 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1950, ending June 30, 1951, according to Gov. Norman Brunndage, chairman of the State industrial commission.

After deducting \$135,308.57 for depreciation and setting aside \$40,894.50 to reserve, there was a net operating profit for the year of \$462,459.82.

During the year 1,434,156 hundredweights of flour were manufactured and 1,403,438 hundredweights were delivered.

Tass a Department of the Soviet Government**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 12, 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, in connection with my recent statement in the Senate concerning the need for positive measures to bring about the release of Associated Press Correspondent William N. Oatis, now imprisoned in Czechoslovakia for alleged spying for the United States, I urged that representatives of Tass, purported Russian news agency, have their licenses revoked and be denied the privileges of the congressional Press

Galleries, because Tass was not a legitimate news agency within the accepted meaning of the term.

In confirmation of this statement an article which appeared in the Washington Daily News of Saturday, September 8, written by James Daniel, made clear this point. It related how Tass, several years ago, officially declared, in connection with a libel suit in the British courts, that Tass possessed the immunity of the Russian Government itself. As proof of this, a declaration from the Russian Ambassador in London was produced to the effect that Tass was a "department of the Soviet Government."

With this clear evidence that Tass is not a reputable news-gathering agency, but merely a propaganda agency of the Russian Government, it becomes all the more urgent that action be taken to deny its representatives access to the sources of official information traditionally open to reputable newspaper and magazine representation.

The diplomatic rather than news-gathering status of Tass is something that must be kept in mind likewise in any considerations with reference to its representatives in this country. There was no question that Mr. Oatis represented a legitimate, reputable news gathering organization, the Associated Press. There is no question, in view of the facts contained in Mr. Daniel's article, that Tass is not a legitimate, reputable news gathering agency. All the more reason, therefore, why its foreign-born engineer director, here on a diplomatic passport, and its American-born puppets, should be denied the rights and privileges always accorded by this country to honest, decent news representatives.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Washington Daily News by James Daniel be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TASS, CLASSIFIED

(By James Daniel)

The question whether Tass is a news agency or an arm of the Russian Government was decided by that Government itself—it's a department of the Soviet Government.

This admission was made by the Russians in Britain in 1948. The question comes into discussion now because the standing committee of correspondents, which governs the congressional Press Galleries, is considering whether to rescind privileges to Tass employees.

Here's how Russia came to spill the beans on Tass:

When the Communists gained power in Czechoslovakia, Dr. Vladimir Krajina, secretary general of the National Socialist Party and a foe of communism, was a marked man. But Dr. Krajina, a member of Parliament, escaped and made his way to Britain. There he quickly became the leader of Czech refugees, who set out to inform the British public about the real facts regarding Czechoslovakia's Russian-engineered revolution.

The world-wide mechanism of Russian propaganda was set in motion to discredit him. In his homeland, the Communists announced they would try him in absentia for treason. In Britain, Tass attacked Krajina's reputation.

Soviet Monitor, a Tass publication printed in Britain, carried a story that Krajina had some connection with delivering a group of downed British aviators to the Gestapo during World War II.

In the opinion of non-Communists, it was a classic example of the totalitarian use of the big-lie technique.

Dr. Krajina promptly sued for libel. Papers were served on Tass officials in Britain. Then suddenly Tass asked the British courts to set the suit aside on the ground that it possessed the sovereign immunity of the Russian Government itself.

As evidence, Tass presented a declaration from the Russian Ambassador in London that it was a department of the Soviet Government.

Successive British courts ruled that this exempted Tass from any suit in British courts. Lord Vansittart, the British peer, angrily called the Tass bureau in London a nest of guttersnipes and denounced the Labor Government for preposterous and unprecedented extension of immunity to Tass agents at a time when the Reds were putting the screws on legitimate western newsmen throughout their empire.

Another British Member of Parliament pointed out that any foreign press agency claiming such immunity could print any lies it chose about any British subject with impunity. The Government talked for a time of amending the libel laws to prevent a recurrence of the Tass episode. Dr. Krajina later moved to Canada.

The present significance of the Krajina case is that it provides the American Government with solid grounds for stripping Tass employees here of all press privileges.

Hon. Albert C. Vaughn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1951

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include the following article concerning our late colleague, ALBERT C. VAUGHN, of Pennsylvania. The article is from the Evening Chronicle, Allentown, Pa., of Tuesday, September 4, 1951.

IN THE WAKE OF THE NEWS—ANOTHER CONGRESSMAN PASSES

"Life hangs by a slender thread," someone observed. This is all too true as witnessed in the case of Congressman ALBERT C. VAUGHN who less than 1 year ago assumed high political office to become this district's second Representative to Washington to be removed from office by the hand of death in this generation.

A freshman in the halls of Congress, Mr. VAUGHN scarcely had an opportunity to try his wings. Serving as he did as aide to two former Congressmen had its differences from actually holding down the responsible position as the people's representative from the Eighth District.

Mr. VAUGHN's quiet demeanor contrasted noticeably with the vociferous nature so frequently associated with political figures. There was serious work to be done in Washington and Mr. VAUGHN exhibited his desire to take his assignment seriously by attending all sessions of both committees on which he served as well as the legislative deliberations themselves. Probably it was Mr. VAUGHN's persistent application to the work at hand that may have been a contributing factor in

the sudden breakdown leading to his demise. It is no easy task to absorb and weigh the countless number of factors required to bring one to decisions on current problems. Congress has been in continuous session since Mr. VAUGHN took his seat last January.

Hail to Armstrong County, S. Dak.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, some of the tragedies of our present trends can be very impressive if presented in a humorous fashion. Spiritual Mobilization of Los Angeles, Calif., has put out a little leaflet calling our attention to one place in the country where there are no Federal employees. While they have these leaflets available for distribution in large quantities, I am taking the liberty of asking that the contents be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The leaflet is as follows:

HAIL TO ARMSTRONG COUNTY, S. DAK.

(By Peter Steele)

It has become fashionable in recent years to dedicate the passing weeks to worthwhile institutions, persons, and events (and to a few not nearly so worth while as a 7-day salute would indicate). So far, to our knowledge, no one has yet suggested a national salute to Armstrong County, S. Dak., week.

You'll find Armstrong County three counties over and two counties down from the northwest corner of South Dakota. It comprises 518 square miles and has a population of 53. Its principal contribution to the economy of the Nation is livestock from its seven farms.

There you have it. Armstrong County, S. Dak., a small piece of ground much like other small pieces of ground inhabited by a small number of Americans—much like other small numbers of Americans—with one important difference.

You can travel the length and breadth of Armstrong County, you can talk to its 53 inhabitants, individually, one by one, you can search the dark corners of its buildings to your heart's content—and nowhere, but nowhere, will you find a single person occupying a single foot of floor space who makes his living as a civilian employee of the Federal Government.

That's right, there's not a single Federal civilian employee in Armstrong County, S. Dak. And, according to the 1950 Report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-essential Federal Expenditures, Congress of the United States, Armstrong County is the only county left in the entire United States which can make that claim to fame.

HEADS WILL ROLL

You can be relatively certain this is the result of a clerical error for which heads will roll in Washington when the oversight is discovered. Where is the Department of Agriculture for example, with seven farms to administer? Where is the Department of Interior, with livestock panting for sanitary drinking pools built at public expense? And surely social security is being derelict in its duty, with 53 inhabitants to benefit. But until that oversight is discovered, the 53 inhabitants of Armstrong County remain, as

a group, the last vestiges of a fast disappearing race, Americanus Independentus—the rugged individual. To them we doff our hats and sing:

All hail to Armstrong, South Dakota,
Land of the free!
You have yet to fill your quota
With a Federal employee!

No one from Agriculture?
How do you farm?
No one from Justice?
Who keeps you from harm?

No one from Veterans?
By whom are you paid?
No one from Commerce?
How do you trade?

No one from Housing?
Who buildeth your shacks?
No one from Treasury?
Who takes your tax?

No one from Post Office?
Who sells your stamp supply?
No one from Military?
Who keeps your powder dry?

And no one from Security?
How, then, can you be social,
If you have no single bureaucrat
To decide things equivocal?

Even the Department of the Interior
Is from Armstrong's roster missed.
Tell me, Armstrong County,
How do you exist?

All hail to Armstrong County,
Where there's no "share the pelf,"
And despite the welfare staters,
Each does things for himself!

Utah Shows the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 12, 1951

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and thus made a part of the permanent archives of the Government of the United States, an article which appeared in today's issue of the Washington (D. C.) Post. This article is an account of Christianity in action in the modern world. It is a story of mutual understanding and respect as practiced by the people of the State of Utah.

International military alliances and vast financial give-away programs will not bring us world peace. Military force tends to inspire counter force and breeds fear and suspicion. All the money in our National Treasury will not buy international brotherhood and good will. The true road to those goals is in the example which has been set by the people of Utah as described in the article by Mr. Kuhn.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR NEW FRONTIER

(By Ferdinand Kuhn)

IRAN'S BEST NEIGHBOR—UTAH

The geography books say that Iran's neighbors are Iraq and Turkey on the west, the Soviet Union on the north, Afghanistan

and Pakistan on the east. But no geography book has disclosed that Iran's best neighbor of all—believe it or not—is the State of Utah. Partly by accident, partly by intelligent planning, a link of friendship has been forged between an ancient Moslem kingdom and a western American State which, at first glance, have nothing whatever in common. The story is worth telling to show how other American States may yet find neighbors in distant lands, and, in doing so, may help the foreign policy of their country.

The Utah-Iran courtship began in 1912 at an international dry-farming congress at Lethbridge, Alberta. The president of the congress was John Andreas Widsøe, of Salt Lake City, an elder of the Church of Latter-Day Saints and president of the Utah Agricultural College at Logan. One of the delegates was Ali-Kuli Khan Nabil, then the young Chargé d'Affaires of the Persian Legation in Washington, now a veteran diplomat who still lives here at 3618 Newark Street NW.

The Mormon and the Moslem struck up a friendship. Dr. Nabil was invited to lecture at Logan. The Iranian had not expected to feel at home in the Rocky Mountains, yet the very look of Utah suggested home to him. He found, too, that his hosts frowned on smoking and drinking, just as good Moslems do in Iran. And he encountered such hospitality, and such a breadth of view about other religions, that he promptly decided to send his four nephews to Utah to study.

They came, and were known in Logan as the Khan boys. One of them, Mohammed Aneen Khan Sepehri, became president of the agricultural school at Karaj, near Tehran; another, Seyed Jafar Khan, became adviser on animal husbandry to the late Shah Reza Pahlavi. In 1939, when the Shah needed an agricultural adviser, what was more natural for him than to turn to Utah? He chose Dr. Franklin Harris, a former professor at Logan who had become president of Brigham Young University at Provo.

Today Dr. Harris is back in Tehran as Ambassador Henry F. Grady's adviser on the Point Four program. On the Point Four staff are a number of the Utah graduates who followed "the Khan boys" to the Rocky Mountains. Other Utah graduates are serving in the Iranian ministries of agriculture and health.

The flow of students has gone on since 1912—slowly at first, but more swiftly in recent years—until by now there are at least 150 in Iran with Utah degrees.

Some of them did not have an easy time in the early years. Most of the Iranian boys came from wealthy families. They hired chauffeurs and helpers to clean up their test tubes in the laboratories, and they did not know that experimental work in agriculture meant grubbing in the soil with their own hands.

Little by little, the Iranians learned American ways. They dispensed with the drivers, they tidied up for themselves, and bent their backs in the fields like other farmers. Some of them married Utah girls.

And now, to return to compliment, Utah is coming to Iran. Thirty farming and livestock experts from Utah will be among the Point Four technicians who soon will be stationed in 10 regional centers throughout Iran as part of the joint Iranian-American work of village improvement.

The Utah-Iran marriage has not been a complete success up to now. Sometimes Utah graduates were kept out of important posts in the Government because of political jealousy. Sometimes their training in Utah was not closely enough related to the work they would have to do back in Iran.

But the interchange has had this supreme merit—it has put at Iran's disposal the ex-

perience of a State with many comparable problems.

Utah, of course, has no monopoly on the able American technicians now in Iran, who come from many States and often from State and city governments. Nor is Utah the only place where Iranians are studying in this country. But of hundreds of Iranian students here Utah always attracts a large number.

The Utah experiment suggests that other States might well develop similar connections with other foreign peoples who have comparable problems.

The Greeks, for example, can find their soil and climate reproduced in many parts of California. The Arab peoples can learn much from the experience of Arizona and New Mexico. The Turks, farming and grazing on the high plateau of Anatolia, might find the answers to many of their problems in the range country of Montana.

The American exchange-of-persons program can become more effective, more directly related to foreign needs in the future, if the land-grant colleges attract more students from countries with comparable climates and conditions. And the work of technical cooperation abroad can have a greater impact if State and city governments lend more of their experts to work in counterpart countries abroad. Here is a problem the Federal Government might well put before the governors' conference later this month.

Neonazism in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of September 12, 1951:

NEONAZISM IN EUROPE

That an ideology gripping two powerful nations for well over a decade should be extirpated at a blow, leaving no remnant or trace, is altogether unlikely; and observers of the European scene have watched for recurrences of the Nazi poison. There have been reasons for some disquietude. While the main drift of affairs has been measured in terms of the relative strengths of democratic and Communist votes, a sinister theme has been struck with increasing force—the theme of nationalism carried to the point of xenophobia in dissident parties of postwar Italy and Germany. The American Jewish Committee has just issued a detailed report on neonazism in these two countries. Though the names of the scholars who compiled it are not given, the study bears the marks of careful research, and its conclusions are worthy of note.

In Germany, the report points out, the neo-Nazi Socialist Reich Party won 367,000 votes in the Lower Saxony elections last May, or 11 percent of the total vote cast. In Italy the neo-Fascist Italian Social Movement won some 600,000 votes in two groups of municipal elections, or roughly 4 percent of the vote cast. This was double the strength displayed in the same cities 2 years previously. Meanwhile there are signs that a Fascist international is coordinating the movements in the separate countries.

The propaganda of these parties does not correspond in all regards to the outpourings

of the prewar epoch; but there is at the bottom of it the same excessive and narrow nationalism. This manifests itself in anti-communism. It manifests itself in an equally fierce anti-Americanism and a disdain of democracy in all forms. The resulting neutralism sometimes goes so far as to invite a quick Soviet occupation rather than risk a sustained struggle. In this doctrine of despair, in this total negativism which ends by embracing the very communism it disavows, the new Nazi and Fascist movements bear obvious resemblances to the old. The final indecencies of racialism we shall perhaps be spared, at least until the neo-Nazis find conditions more propitious for their evil work.

It would be easy to exaggerate the importance of these movements. A flurry of nationalism is not unnatural in present circumstances, and the fact that the principal parties in Germany and Italy in some measure appeal to it does not mean that they have been infected. Nevertheless the danger needs to be watched. Nazism grows where men are without hope, where they suffer from a sense of mass injustice, where they are frustrated, rootless, and afraid. It is to remove the cause of such conditions, as well as to withstand the more immediate threat of communism, that freemen must dedicate their energies.

The Common Strength of Freemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MERLIN HULL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by the Honorable Charles F. Brannan at the dedication ceremonies in connection with the opening of the Flambeau River station, Ladysmith, Wis., on August 26, 1951. The Flambeau River station is a part of the great Rural Electrification Administration-financed Dairyland Power Cooperative generating system which supplies electrical energy at wholesale rates, and is owned and controlled by 25 REA distribution cooperatives operating in the States of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Illinois, and Iowa.

The address follows:

THE COMMON STRENGTH OF FREEMEN

In accepting your very kind invitation I feel that I am meeting here today with people with whom I have a great deal in common. I am by nature a peace-loving person, but I am sure you know that willingness to fight for the things we think are right, occasionally to be beaten, but to come back and continue to fight hard is one of the essentials for any person in public life today.

I know you are by nature peace-loving people, who would prefer to be able to do quietly the good work you have in hand. But anyone who has acquainted himself with the history of this great Dairyland Power Cooperative knows that you have had a more or less continual uphill struggle against unequal odds to reach the position of strength you now enjoy. You are today the world's largest cooperative power business. You are strong, and as you grow, you become stronger; but you have had to fight for that growth and that strength.

I would not want you to be deceived in that strength. I believe that you face even

greater problems ahead than you have yet solved. The forces which you have been pained and surprised to find arrayed against you have not finished yet. They will shift the conflict, they will join the struggle in new ways, but they will not quit now nor at any time in the future that we can see. Moreover, the very nature of the business in which you are engaged will bring you new problems as you solve old ones. Yet the same vitality that you have shown in the past will carry you forward if you will define accurately the battle you have joined, see clearly the problems you confront, and if you will persevere, as you have in the past.

Let's look at that past.

In the year 1882, on Pearl Street, in New York City, Thomas A. Edison set up the first public electric system. His plant had a generating capacity of less than 900 kilowatts, and it served customers within a distance of 12 city blocks. The electric wires were new and strange things in that day. The power he generated and sold was used almost entirely in arc lamps and carbon filament light bulbs. By modern standards the system was crude, incomplete, and the power he provided was not of the rock-steady dependability we expect. Yet it was such a success that the industry grew. The power industry of the United States has grown from that beginning.

In that same year, 1882, there wasn't any Rusk County; and there was no town called Ladysmith. This was part of Chippewa County, and the pleasant city near us was the town of Warner. This whole region, where now your prosperous and powerful cooperative spreads out as a resource to everyone, was then largely wilderness. Part of the wilderness had been cut over by logging companies who took from the land but returned nothing to it. Part of the land was being cleared for farming, some farms grew grain and hay for the horses of the logging camps. Hardy folks grazed sheep on the cut-over land, and they had difficulty at times in protecting them from the wolves. There were some towns and cities. Here and there farming communities had developed, but it is not stretching the truth to say that the electric power industry and the agriculture of this region have grown up pretty much during the same period of history.

In those early days water power was important for the operation of mills and factories; and as far back as 1877 the report of a Government explorer mentioned that there was an excellent site for a power dam here a little way up from the town that is now Ladysmith. He had no idea that the power it would some day develop, instead of being carried by belts, pulleys, and line-shafts, would be carried by a high line crossing a score of counties in giant steps.

By the middle of the 1930's there was no city, not a town of 5,000 people or more in the entire Nation, which was without electric power line service. In those well-populated areas, the commercial power companies had done a consistent job of making power available. Electric lights had long been taken for granted in city homes. In many industries electric power had gone to work.

At that time—the middle 1930's—there were about 200,000 farms in the State of Wisconsin, and close to a million people lived on them. They were staggering under the depression of the times, but they were continuing to produce their share of the agricultural products the Nation needed. They had begun to recover a little with the aid of Federal emergency programs undertaken in order to get things going again.

Those were the times when the Rural Electrification Administration was organized.

It is safe to say that if anyone in a city or town with a population of 5,000 or more wanted electricity in his house, or in his factory, he could get it. But how was it on the farms of Wisconsin, then? I might speak of the farms of Minnesota, Iowa, Illinois, or any of these great States of the Midwest—although the exact statistics vary, the general situation was the same.

Not even as many as one farm in five, in Wisconsin, had electric power. To tell the true story we have to look further, and notice that the less-than-one-fifth of the farms that did have electric power were mostly those near the major cities.

Up here in Rusk County, and in this whole great Wisconsin-Minnesota-Iowa-Illinois region the percentage of farms which had electricity was very low, indeed.

These farms wanted electricity. How many times did you see farmers, in that period, putting up electric systems operated by a one-cylinder gasoline engine and a bunch of storage batteries? It was better than kerosene lamps, but it wasn't what farms needed.

In those middle thirties, there was a deep sense of futility on the part of many farm young people. Many of our best young people—the kind this Nation needs on its farms—felt that in order to enjoy the many real advantages of modern comfort they must leave the farm and go to the city.

If that had continued, it might have undermined our agriculture at the core of its existence—the people who make it up. But the American people began using their Federal Government to undertake a comprehensive program of wise, original, far-reaching farm policies which have had the most profound effect in the years since, enabling farmers to adjust their entire way of living to meet the challenge of the times. The program of the Rural Electrification Administration was but one of these. Among the others, without which REA would stand alone and weak, have been price support policies, more adequate farm credit, marketing improvements, and aids to soil conservation.

The job of REA has been to make it possible for farmers to bring electricity from the high lines to their own farms and, if need be, to generate their own electricity for those high lines.

Industry spokesmen told us back in the middle thirties, as you remember, that farm electrification had gone about as far as it could go.

Well, in one sense it had. It had gone to a point you folks in Dairyland know very well indeed. When REA was founded, electrification by commercial public utilities had gone right to the cream-line, or what they thought was the cream-line, and there it had stopped. Many farmers urgently requested that their farms be connected to the high lines, but in vain.

Then the President, under emergency powers, established the Rural Electrification Administration, May 11, 1935. The following year Congress passed the Rural Electrification Act of 1936.

Within a year, your leaders began to work for an electric system of your own, and it wasn't long before you had an REA loan and you were able to begin the job.

The history you have written since then is a history of which you can be proud. Many of us have been watching with satisfaction the soundness with which you have organized and managed this business.

When your rural cooperatives banded together to form Dairyland, in 1941, just about half the farms in Wisconsin had electricity, and they were still mostly the farms near to large cities. The rest of the farms were too far out, according to the commercial electric companies. So those farmers would have to do without the convenience and economy of electric lights and power. They would have, except for the fact that by form-

ing your own cooperative electric business, you solved those problems for yourselves.

In many places in the country, REA cooperatives have found it most advantageous to buy their power wholesale from commercial utilities. This has been a very happy arrangement where the commercial utilities have had the vision to see that they could serve their own best interests well through such a connection. In other instances, as you know only too well, power companies have been reluctant to sell electricity to cooperative distribution companies, and have tried to sell it at prices which would severely disadvantage the REA co-ops.

The fact is, the commercial utilities haven't much spare electricity to sell. The electric industry of the Nation now has a total capacity to generate electricity which reflects a very slim margin of reserve. That margin is so slim that if no new generating capacity should be added, there is no assurance that the growing demand for electric power could be met this very winter. The Nation is slipping, in the race to keep up with its own electric power requirements. The margin for growth, has diminished until now it is a matter of a few months. Nor can those who oppose development of our power capacity argue that they have not been able to afford to build new generating plants. During the calendar year 1950, they paid stockholders some of the highest dividends in history.

I, for one, am grateful for the private enterprise, the private initiative, the willingness to take a large commercial risk that you people have shown in building this great dam, and installing this Flambeau Hydro-Electric Station. Its electric output is needed. I am grateful for the life of such a man as your grand, beloved, late president, Mr. E. J. Stoneman. I am grateful for the energy, the devotion, and the clear vision of such men as your present leaders, and you, yourselves who are the source of their strength.

This station—your station, for you are its owners—is evidence of your determination. It shows how important electricity is to you. With a formal power rating of 15,000 kilowatts, I understand that it is already working at 19,000 to 20,000 kilowatts. The mighty power of this 65-foot head of water is working for you, lighting up the night, making your dairy industry more efficient, and supplying power for rural industries that process your products.

It is correct to say that Dairyland grew to its present size out of your need to generate electricity for yourselves after you tried, and tried hard to buy it from power companies who couldn't or wouldn't sell it to you at a fair price.

As far back as 1936, the Wisconsin Power Cooperative, which is now part of Dairyland, began to try to buy electric power from commercial power companies at reasonable wholesale rates. No price the companies offered was within reason, so the Chippewa Falls generating plant was built. The Wisconsin Power Cooperative folks reasoned—correctly, as history has proved—that if they couldn't buy it at a fair price, they could generate it at a fair price. They did just that.

A similar situation with a similar result arose in the southern part of Wisconsin, and another Dairyland predecessor, Tri-State Power Cooperative, began generating electricity. In the beginning of your own electric power business, your managers and boards of directors tried to buy power wholesale from the power companies, and relieve those companies of the expense and hazard of long distribution lines. But it was not possible to reach an understanding.

Unfortunately, the power industry apparently has still not awakened and does not appreciate the job in rural electrification that still needs to be done.

Perhaps you saw, as I did, a copy of the announcement issued in June by the electric industry designating this week as Rural Electrification Week.

This particular announcement said, and I quote: "The electric-power industry announces plans to celebrate the near-completion of the electrification of America's farms. With the expansion of lines to rural areas this year, electricity will be available to 95 percent of the country." I am interested to note that the chairman of the committee supervising celebration of this Rural Electrification Week is also president of a Wisconsin electric company.

It is not surprising that he and other industry leaders believe rural electrification is now about finished. They have been saying the same thing for many years. In July of 1935, 16 years ago when electricity on farms was the exception, not the rule, a committee of the industry issued this statement—and I quote: "There are very few farms requiring electricity for major farm operations that are not now served."

Power company men have frequently tried to squirm out of this unfortunate statement by saying it was taken out of context. But if you will read the whole report you will be struck by the fact that the power company committee had absolutely no faith that farmers could be served with electricity on a sound, business basis.

At any rate this was only one of many statements to the same effect. For example, an industry spokesman told Congress in 1945, "The job of extending lines to farms and nonfarms will be practically over in 1948."

And there are other statements just as shortsighted.

It is clear, then, that the power companies and some of their leaders have been ready to celebrate the near completion of rural electrification for a good many years longer than most farms have had electricity. Even yet, any such celebration is a phony and a fake.

Or, in the words of President Truman, it is a publicity stunt. The President also said, "No doubt some people can be led by deception to believe that the rural-electrification job is now completed. However, I cannot believe that very many will be fooled—certainly the hundreds of thousands of rural families who are still waiting for the blessings of electric light and power will not be."

President Truman also pointed out that "we must be sure that our farms are in a position to use the production efficiencies and labor savings of electric power. This is particularly true now when we need to make our manpower as productive as possible and when food may become a most critical factor in our struggle against the evil forces of world communism."

The job the President is talking about takes power on the farm as well as in the factory. Obviously, connecting farms to high lines is not the whole job. Demand for power increases and has to be supplied. The rural electrification job will not be finished when every farm is hooked up any more than the job of building houses can be finished. If we understand the growing need for power, we see clearly what the power industry has in mind in wanting to give a final eulogy to rural electrification. It wants to keep any other Flambeau dams from happening. It is part of the long-time opposition you and other co-op people have faced in getting your own generation and transmission facilities.

Flambeau is just a chapter in a long story. You well remember how your directors have had to fight for this dam through public hearings, the State legislature, the Rusk County Board, the legislature again, Washington, the Public Service Commission, the

Conservation Commission, and finally the Federal Power Commission. You know that a large part of the opposition certainly the most strenuous part of it, came from the very same power industry that could not or would not sell you electricity at a price that you could pay. Here they tried to keep you from generating it yourself.

Finally Dairyland won. In March 1940, the construction work began. Today we are here to dedicate this plant. It is finished and even as we meet here, it is turning out the power that you need at a price you can pay.

Today the total generating capacity of Dairyland is more than 125,000 kilowatts; you have more than 1,700 miles of high voltage transmission lines, delivering this power to your members. Your interconnections are planned so that almost every point in your system can be served by alternate, emergency power sources if some generating plant should have trouble.

I congratulate you members of Dairyland, you people who own it, when it serves. I congratulate your board of directors, your manager, and your president. I imagine that 20 years ago not one of you ever dreamed you would be in the electric-power business; some of you didn't even have a reasonable hope of electricity on your farms. Yet today this project is finished and at work, and other projects are coming along at a great rate.

I am sure you know your directors are not stopping, nor even slowing down in their forward planning. They have already drawn up a timetable as far ahead as 1960, and some of them are thinking ahead to the days a generation from now when little folks who are babes in arms today will be the grown-ups, out in the early morning doing the milking, and making coffee on the electric range, and running Dairyland.

That is an attractive future, but it is not going to be easy.

For one thing, those who oppose you will try to find more effective ways to work through the Congress. You know, as I do, that the lending authority of the Rural Electrification Administration derives from the Congress. It is almost as if the Congress had its hand on the master switch that controls all the additional electricity you will want to use next year and the years after. You will need to make sure the master switch is in the hands of people who believe in the American future and who face the future with courage rather than timidity.

Upon the Congress also depends the question of keeping taxation fair to cooperatives. So far, the organization bearing the euphemistic name of National Tax Equality Association has spent a lot of money but has not persuaded the Congress to tax cooperatives out of business. This does not mean NTEA will quit trying. It will not be content with anything less than a tax program that completely disregards the fundamental characteristics of cooperative business. NTEA wants the Government and everybody else to think of a cooperative as just a corporation, which is very much like putting all the cows and horses of the country together and calling them all cows. You will not dare to relax your vigilance against unfair taxes or even death taxes on your cooperatives.

Nor can you assume that it will become easier in the future to meet increasing demands for power.

As long as power companies, whose main job is not to make kilowatts but to make dividends, believe they see in you a threat to their future business, they will continue trying to obstruct you. They will try to make it impossible for you to generate your own power. They will try to confuse things by talking about socialism. Incidentally, I want to ask: Do you think you are socialistic because you do for yourself what somebody else wouldn't do for you?

The commercial power companies had their chance and partly lost it, but I believe their chance is not entirely lost. There are three-quarters of a million farms still without service, and farms already connected are using more and more power. It is obvious that there continues to be a great opportunity for the power industry to render a real public service.

If I were a New York City public relations firm I would think about that for a while, before I cooked up a so-called Rural Electrification Week to celebrate the near-completion of rural electrification.

It is the fundamental interest of all of us to help in every way to strengthen this Nation. We are mobilizing the strength of the Nation in support of our freedom, which requires that we lend our strength to freedom everywhere. How long we shall need to remain mobilized, I can not say, but I am not ready to believe that the plans for world conquest the Communists have openly announced for so long, have been abandoned.

It is in the interest of all of us to support the mobilized strength of the United States until such time as freemen can safely lay down their arms and enjoy the freedom they have defended. You can do that by keeping such things as your own Dairyland Power Cooperative strong, and on a sound business basis. You can strengthen the Nation by farming well, as you already do. Agriculture's strength is absolutely vital to our country, and you are part of that agriculture.

I take pleasure in sharing your dedication of this station. As it confines and puts to human use, in regulation of stream flow, in beauty, and in electric power the waters of this picturesque Flambeau River, it is the material embodiment of the firm purpose of free men. For so long as it shall stand, for so long as these waters shall flow, may it be a monument to your cooperative effort, the common strength of freemen.

Release of Inactive Reservists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress have been very vocal in connection with the confused Reserve program. To date most of our suggestions and ideas have been bypassed in the Defense Department.

Last week I talked with Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, Assistant Secretary of Defense, regarding a system to release reservists. After talking with her I am convinced that the inactive reservists involuntarily recalled to active duty must be released through a unified system equitable for all branches of the armed services.

At the present time there are thousands of men classified I-A who could be called immediately. I think it is only fair that every effort possible be made to release the inactive reservists and replace them with men who have not previously served.

Although the system I propose which was introduced today and printed below may not be the most perfect release system, I sincerely believe it is a step in the right direction.

I trust it will be given favorable consideration and that the inactive reservists will be able to go home to their families in the near future.

A bill to provide for the release of certain members of the Inactive and Volunteer Reserve serving on active duty with the Armed Forces of the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) effective November 30, 1951, each member of the Inactive or Volunteer Reserve who has been or shall be involuntarily ordered to active duty with the Armed Forces of the United States, shall, unless sooner released under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned, be released from active duty when he has been credited with 50 points as provided in subsection (b) if he makes application for release to the Secretary of the branch of service in which he is serving. Any member released pursuant to the preceding sentence shall not thereafter be ordered to active duty for periods in excess of 30 days without his consent except in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by Congress.

(b) Each such member shall be credited with one point for each month he shall have actively served with the Armed Forces of the United States after September 30, 1940, and shall be credited with 10 points for (1) his spouse, if any, (2) each of his children, if any, and (3) each of his other dependents, if any

(c) For the purposes of this act (1) the term "children" means legitimate and illegitimate children, legally adopted children, step children, foster children, and any other persons who are supported in good faith by such member in a relationship similar to that of parent and child, but shall not include any person 18 years of age or over unless such person is physically or mentally handicapped, and (2) the term "dependent," when used with respect to any such member, means any person who is a United States citizen or who lives in the United States or its Territories or possessions, and whose support such member has assumed in good faith, but such term shall not include any person 18 years of age or over unless such person is physically or mentally handicapped. In the consideration of a dependency claim, any payments or allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of members of the inactive or volunteer reserve serving on active duty with the Armed Forces of the United States shall be taken into consideration, but the fact that such payments or allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for the dependency claim.

Foreign Relations and the American Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at the convention of the New England Associated Press News Executives Association and the New England Association of Circulation Managers, at Rangeley, Maine, on September 6, 1951. The address was a part of a debate with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] on the subject, Foreign Relations and the American Press.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN RELATIONS AND THE AMERICAN PRESS

Mr. Chairman, I don't mind telling you that I was very pleased to get the invitation to address this group. I was also pleased to find that my fellow speaker was to be my esteemed colleague from the State of Maine.

Now Senator BREWSTER and myself have had occasion to disagree as to what America's foreign policy ought to be. I won't deny that. But frankly, I can think of no one in the Senate with whom I have found disagreement more stimulating.

So I am prepared to take a position today which may well find something less than favor in the eyes of the senior Senator from Maine.

I am told that the great majority of you are editors of New England papers served by the Associated Press. Others are on the staffs of the various Associated Press bureaus in this area.

In short, all of you are direct participants in the molding of public opinion.

Such is your role whether or not you desire it. And the obligations imposed upon you by virtue of that role are indeed considerable.

In a democracy where the people decide who shall be the wielders of governmental power, the press is among the foremost channels through which the average citizen gets the evidence upon which to base that decision. In today's danger-fraught world, the nature of that decision is more intimately related to America's survival than ever before.

There can be little question but that what appears in the news columns and on the editorial pages of our newspapers has a vital bearing upon the policies adopted by our Government. Colonel McCormick may have his doubts about that. But then there are some Americans who read papers other than the Chicago Tribune. They may well read your papers in preference. The papers of one of our largest national chains carry the credo—and I quote—"Give light and the people will find their own way."

I heartily subscribe to that credo. But I am equally firm in my conviction that the type of light shed is a factor of no mean concern in the crystallization of that intangible something we call public opinion.

With your indulgence, I am going to try to do a little light-shedding of my own. I would like to demonstrate that the foreign policy this Nation is currently pursuing is a thoroughly realistic one. I would like to demonstrate that that policy represents our surest hope for peace and survival.

No American in his right mind will deny that Soviet totalitarianism is bent upon world conquest. That is implicit in Marxist-Leninist dogma. And Stalin, for all of his references to the coexistence of capitalism and communism, has not departed from that dogma.

The Kremlin is no respecter of morality. The end justifies the means and that runs the gamut all the way from lying propaganda to subversion and outright aggression.

Are there any among us so naive as to question the premise that Moscow is out to conquer the world for communism? The attempted subversion of Greece, the Berlin blockade, the Korean aggression, were not all of these but threads in the gigantic Soviet web?

If there is one thing that the Kremlin's activities since World War II's end have taught us it is that strength is necessary for the free world's salvation. Furthermore, the only strength which will deter Soviet aggression today is the united strength of all the free peoples.

The basic premise of this Nation's foreign policy, therefore, is and must continue to be: America cannot go it alone.

Our fate is inextricably bound up with that of the entire free world. An anti-Communist Western Europe, a stable Near East, and an economically developed southeast Asia are as essential to American security as our stockpile of atomic weapons. America's defenses cannot stop at her coast lines.

Many of you will undoubtedly recall the statement Gen. Douglas MacArthur made on this very point when he appeared before the joint Senate committee investigating the circumstances of his dismissal—a statement which was widely commented on by many of your papers.

In reply to one of my questions as to his policy in Asia he said: "My hope would be, of course, that the United Nations would see the wisdom and utility of that course, but if they did not, I still believe that the interest of the United States being the predominant one in Korea, would require our action."

I asked: "Alone?"

He replied: "Alone if necessary. If the other nations of the world haven't got enough sense to see where appeasement leads after the appeasement which let to the Second World War in Europe, if they can't see exactly the road that they are following in Asia, why then we had better protect ourselves and go it alone."

You will recall that the general received an excellent press as the result of that statement.

I will not take the time to discuss the hackneyed charge that we are pursuing a policy of appeasement in Asia other than to state that our policy there is anything but appeasement.

I simply invite your attention to MacArthur's basic premise—that this Nation can afford to go it alone.

When the general was asked whether or not he thought that his "Asia first" approach might weaken our over-all global position, he replied that global policy was not his concern.

When those of my sadly misled colleagues in the Senate who take an isolationist or semi-isolationist position are asked why they oppose our European-aid program, they either respond with the MacArthur line or complain that the Europeans are doing virtually nothing to help themselves.

I think that the sooner we expose these and other alleged justifications for destroying the free world's unity for what they really are, the better off all of us will be.

Let's look at the facts—not at the fancies.

The first point that needs to be made is that America is anything but self-sufficient. Pittsburgh, Cleveland, and Detroit would be ciphers on the industrial map if we were suddenly cut off from foreign raw material sources.

Steel is the bellwether of any industrial economy. Of the 13 pounds of manganese that go into every ton of American steel, less than half a pound is produced at home.

Of the 15 basic metals, America has only 6 in any quantity. We must import all of the others.

We import all of our tin, natural rubber, and cordage fibers. A third of our lead, three-quarters of our tungsten, and more than a quarter of our copper come from abroad.

Truly, we are not the self-sufficient Nation so many of our isolationists make us out to be. The sinews of our current great national defense effort are anything but entirely home-grown.

Inasmuch as Europe is the area to which the overwhelming bulk of our foreign aid has gone to date, we ought to take a close look at what Western Europe really means to us.

It should be common knowledge for any alert high-school boy that this country cannot do without Western Europe.

A Western Europe in Soviet hands would see America and her few remaining allies outnumbered, outgunned, and outproduced.

Western Europe's more than 275,000,000 people are among the most highly skilled and productive in the world. Her steel, coal, and electric-power production normally surpasses that of the entire Soviet bloc.

Western Europe's civilization—the cradle of our own in many ways—is no mean barrier to Soviet expansionism. But if we allow our domestic penny pinchers to douse the light of freedom in the hearts and minds of our European friends, that barrier will have ceased to exist.

We will have lost Europe by default.

In terms of America's security, Western Europe's strategic significance is second to none.

Of what earthly good are air power and atomic weapons if we lack the bases with which to use them most effectively in our own defense?

Western Europe gives us ready air access to the heart of the Soviet power potential. Our own continent does not.

Do we prefer to fight a battle for survival amidst our own ruins?

A strong, stable Western Europe represents our best hope for prohibiting that frightening possibility.

I think that the relationship between the free nations of Europe and ourselves was put very well in a recent report issued by a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which investigated our economic- and military-assistance programs for Western Europe. I might add that Senator BREWSTER and I were members of that subcommittee, of which I was chairman.

The report reads—and I quote.

"The United States is not seeking to build strength in Western Europe in order to protect those countries from aggression any more than the countries of Western Europe are building their defenses primarily so that they can help protect the United States. The fact is that the individual and collective self-interests of all free nations coincide."

That, I repeat, is from a report issued by a subcommittee of which both Senator BREWSTER and myself were members. This committee of nine members made a rather unusual record of coming back from a hectic trip all good friends and of making to the Senate a unanimous report.

Now let's look at the charge that the Western Europeans have not been carrying their share of the defense load. Much has been made of this issue.

Shortly before setting out to convince New Englanders that their choice in 1952 lay only between Taft and chaos, the Senator lambasted the Europeans on the floor of the Senate.

He expressed his chagrin that only 13 percent of Europe's population was in uniform while our own percentage was 2.3.

Far be it from me to question the Senator's percentages. He is assuredly an astute mathematician.

But I can and must question what appears to be the basic premise: That the Europeans are falling down on the job.

It is true that, percentage-wise, the Western Europeans now have fewer men in uniform than we do. But it is also true that that situation will very shortly be remedied.

General Gruenther, General Eisenhower's deputy in the North Atlantic Treaty military organization, has testified that—and again I quote—"the European effort as currently projected for the coming year is roughly at the level which it appears to be in the United States interest to propose."

Furthermore, there are some very excellent reasons for those percentages Senator BREWSTER is so fond of.

In the first place, Western Europe was a thoroughly devastated area only 6 years ago. It was she that felt the full impact of war.

Is it any surprise that Western Europe has yet to equal our own efforts in terms of de-

fense production and mobilization of trained manpower? The Western European countries have virtually had to rebuild their economies from scratch.

Secondly, Western Europe suffers from profound equipment shortages. It would be useless to try to mobilize additional manpower until that equipment need is met.

Thirdly, rapid mobilization imposed on a shaky domestic economy might easily throw Western Europe into the sort of economic tailspin which would invite that Communist subversion which can be as dangerous to the free world as outright military attack.

A fourth point is that European armed manpower figures do not accurately reflect the extent of mobilization. According to our own officers at Eisenhower's headquarters, Western Europe has thousands of trained reserves above and beyond those men actually mobilized, but they have not these uniforms, on which so much stress is laid in the percentages quoted.

These reserves have not been mobilized primarily for lack of equipment and facilities. Taking these reserves into account, Western Europe's trained manpower does equal our own.

Much has been made of the fact that estimates for fiscal 1952 show that 15 percent of America's gross national product is going into defense budgets while in Western Europe the percentage is only 8.

But Western Europe has a per capita income of only one-third that of the United States. Yet it is contributing more than one-half as large a proportion of its output for defense.

The Western Europeans are carrying a much more severe tax burden than we are in terms of that burden's impact on individual income.

Figures, my friends, can lie. They lie when not used in their proper context. But the figures on Western Europe—when properly used—show that our allies there are truly doing their share to keep the free world united and strong.

But there are other evidences that American aid to Europe has reaped concrete results. We find them in Europe's industrial production; in the decline of Communist influence; in joint efforts to solve the more pressing economic problems.

Industrial production in the Marshall plan countries is up 44 percent over what it was in 1938. A truly amazing feat.

Agricultural production is up 9 percent above prewar. The notorious dollar gap which has been plaguing virtually every European nation was cut to \$1,000,000,000 in 1950.

I would be the first to admit that free Europe has a long way to go before it can be said that its economy is fully stabilized. Western Europe's standard of living is, at best, considerably below ours.

But American aid has helped the Western Europeans to help themselves. American aid has given the Europeans the tools with which to build an economy sufficiently strong to withstand Communist subversion.

In the political arena, the story is much the same. In every Western European country, Communist Party membership has dropped considerably since 1946.

The membership decline for the Marshall plan countries has been a full 30 percent between 1946 and 1950. In countries like Britain, Belgium, Norway, and Luxembourg, the drop has been 63 percent or more. Even in France and Italy—where Western Europe's largest Communist Parties hold forth—the drop has been some 30 percent.

In every Western European country with the exception of Italy, Communist voting strength has shown an obvious decline since the end of World War II. In France the Communists lost some 80 seats in the Assembly in the most recent elections. In

Britain, all Communist members of Parliament were defeated in the 1950 balloting.

In terms of joint cooperative action in the economic sphere, the Western European countries have shown themselves ready and willing to solve their common problems in the interests of a united front against Communist aggression.

A European Payments Union has been set up to facilitate intra-European trade. The Union operates by making it possible for currencies to flow where they are needed when they are needed.

The Schuman plan is well on its way toward implementation. When placed in operation, it will guarantee a single market for iron, steel, and coal. It will thus add considerably to European unity at a time when such unity is the essence of self-preservation.

Most Marshall plan countries have already entered into agreements with each other whereby customs duties have been dropped on an important segment of their exports to each other. This, in itself, is doing much for the economic health of Western Europe.

Economically, politically, and strategically, free Europe has indeed gone far to meet the threat of communism and to build a better life for its people. These two objectives cannot be segregated in Europe any more than they can be segregated anywhere else in the world.

We have General Eisenhower's word that what we have given Europe we have not given in vain. We have his word to the effect that democratic Europe's morale is the morale of a people willing to defend its way of life against assault, whether from without or within.

American aid—the product of a sound foreign policy—has done much to build America's security even as it has contributed to the unity and security of the entire free world.

But so terribly much remains to be done.

It can and will be done as long as we remember that our own security rests upon the unity and strength of the entire free world.

No one has stated that principle more clearly than Mrs. MARGARET CHASE SMITH, the junior Senator from Maine. Mrs. SMITH has said—and I quote:

"We should give the greatest reassurance that we can to our present allies. We should reassure their protection with a protective wall behind which they can rally their forces, rebuild their morale, and reconstruct their governments. We should convince all nations that the United States is a reliable and desirable partner in alliances."

Mrs. SMITH's thesis is the thesis upon which our current foreign policy is based. It is the thesis that America must continue to accept if our democracy is to survive.

America ought not to go it alone. It is my sincere hope and prayer that America will never be forced to try to go it alone.

Use of All Available Weapons in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "If Size of Conflict Is To Dictate Use of Weapons, the United States Invites Defeat," which

appeared in the Independent, published at Anderson, S. C., on September 11, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IF SIZE OF CONFLICT IS TO DICTATE USE OF WEAPONS, THE UNITED STATES INVITES DEFEAT

He was born twenty-odd years ago in a small city. His father made a living wage, his mother was a Christian woman active in the affairs of her church and neighborhood. He enjoyed the advantages of an average education in the public schools, although the times were confused and the future threatening. His parents had high hopes for him. His father hoped he would "have it better than I did." He was an average, decent, healthy American youth.

But the world did intrude with its evils and he hit the transmission line to a place called Korea. He survived the rigors of spring, and he rejoiced with his companions when the so-called cease-fire talks began more than 2 months ago. He might get to go home.

His hopes faded as the talks dragged out. All along he had been puzzled, because he was an intelligent boy, by the absence of the superweapons his Nation was supposed to have developed. He was angered by failure of policy makers to save lives by using the most devastating weapons in the American arsenal against an enemy which outnumbered him day after day.

The war in Korea was termed by the high brass and the diplomats as a "localized" war. They said that to keep it from spreading they had to pull their punches, to restrict the area in which he and his companions could hit the enemy.

He remembered how a vastly more widespread war had been ended in a matter of days when the first atomic bomb was dropped upon the enemy in Japan.

He recalled reading that the dropping of the bomb enabled the saving upward of 1,000,000 American lives that would have been expended in the storming of the shores of Japan.

Then a few days ago President Truman made a political speech in San Francisco in which he revealed that the United States had developed weapons even more terrible than the bomb. The President said the new weapons were "fantastic."

Last week, in the night, the Reds decided they wanted the hill upon which his company maintained outposts. The hill had been won at the price of scores of new graves. There was a brief, bitter battle for the hill. He was driven off, along with his companions. Next day they went back, under cover of artillery and aviation. He was killed and his name added to the lengthening list of those who have died in this "localized" war.

Already the question is being raised in Washington as to why these "fantastic" new weapons are not being used in Korea to hasten the end of that war and to save American lives.

Senator JOHNSON of Colorado wants to know why men are being forced to fight with bayonets while national leaders brag of possession of Buck Rogers equipment.

The Soviet Russian strategy seems to be the creation of numbers of "small" wars in all parts of the world. The reason is clear: falling to match the United States in atomic weapons, they will fight the kind of wars where these will not be used—until such time as the Reds have the same or superior strength in new weapons.

"Fantastic" new weapons are doing no good so long as a policy allows the size of a conflict to dictate the use of weapons.

Large war or small, the United States should serve notice that in the future everything in the arsenal will be thrown at the enemy. It is nothing short of criminal folly to permit the continued killing of American men when the Nation has bought and paid for means to stop their slaughter.

Investigation of OPS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution asking for a complete investigation and study of personnel and positions in the Office of Price Stabilization in order to determine, first, whether such personnel are qualified to perform the duties of the positions to which they have been appointed and second, to what extent there have been created in the Office of Price Stabilization positions which are unnecessary to the proper performance of the functions of such office.

During the recent recess I had occasion to attend a hearing conducted by the Cleveland office of OPS. The purpose of the hearing was supposedly to discover whether a small butcher was violating OPS regulations. However, the true facts of the situation are that this small meat dealer was being harassed in an effort to uncover information on the Wayne Packing Co., Inc., a slaughterer who the OPS had refused a permit to operate. It was disheartening to witness highly paid special agents of the OPS pick on a little businessman just because he had sold beef under the ceiling price without having the price posted on the beef.

Printed below is the exact subpoena issued in the case. Similar subpoenas were issued to 34 other small butchers.

Price control is one thing and business control is another. In my opinion, the OPS operation is directed primarily at controlling business.

I am aware that most bureaucrats had found a roosting place prior to the start of OPS. Then when OPS came into being those that were left over were apparently dumped on poor Mike DiSalle.

Judging from recent press releases from the OPS office, they based their success on the number of people they are able to keep on the payroll. If the investigators who conducted the hearings in Akron last week are typical, and I have every reason to believe they are, I am certain this Congress will see the fallacy of continuing the OPS in its present form.

Speaking as a small-business man, and one who is familiar with sound business principles and ethics, I would appreciate the opportunity of assisting in the investigation of the OPS.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ECONOMIC STABILIZATION AGENCY, OFFICE OF PRICE STABILIZATION

SUBPENA DUCES TECUM

To Damił Kapusinski, doing business as Buchtel Market, 544 East Buchtel Avenue, Akron, Ohio.

You are hereby commanded to appear in the Municipal Building, at room 102, 166 South High Street, in the city of Akron, State of Ohio, on the fifth day of September 1951, at 1:45 p. m., to give testimony concerning posting of selling prices on meats, selling prices on meat, and the display of meat products in your store and to bring with you and produce for inspection at said time and place, the following books, records, and documents: all purchase invoices and statements, and daybooks or ledgers, into which such purchase invoices or statements are entered, from April 1, 1951, to date.

In testimony whereof, the undersigned, an officer designated by the Director of Price Stabilization, has hereunto set his hand this 29th day of August 1951, at Cleveland, Ohio.

CREIGHTON E. MILLER,

District Enforcement Director, Office of Price Stabilization, Cleveland, Ohio.

Problem of Allied-Iron Curtain Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Trade Dilemma," by Ludwell Denny, which appeared in the Washington Daily News August 30, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRADE DILEMMA

(By Ludwell Denny)

The problem of Allied-Iron curtain trade has not been changed, much less solved, by passage of the Battle bill.

It remains a strain on Allied relations and a domestic political issue in the United States. Unless Washington obtains tighter Allied restrictions on shipments to Russia and the satellite states, the issue can grow until it wrecks the mutual security program.

If the situation is allowed to drift it is only a question of time until American public opinion will force Congress to ban, without discretion, all American aid to any country exporting to Red countries anything which may be used in manufacturing war materials—and that covers almost everything. Rather than submit to such a drastic embargo our major allies would sacrifice American aid and no adequate West European rearmament would be possible.

There is a temptation for the administration and the Allied governments to misunderstand the Senate defeat of the Kem amendment, which would have made a sweeping ban mandatory. The Kem type legislation will be introduced again and again, and its defeat will depend on the East-West trade record in the interim.

Partisan propaganda on both sides is not the only reason for general confusion. The issue is vastly complicated and contradictory because actually it is not one problem but several, and because solutions vary from

country to country and from one period to another.

In theory there is no argument about shutting off strategic or war-usable exports from Allied countries to Red countries. The disagreement begins when you define strategic materials and enforce the ban.

There is a case like Austria, which the United States is keeping alive by subsidies. It is impossible to stop Russia from getting war materials there, because the most important part of the country is under Soviet military occupation and the majority of industries and materials under Soviet control. The country as an economic unit cannot exist without a constant and fairly complete trade flow back and forth between its interdependent parts. Abuses are hard to prevent.

Then there is the bulk of West European exports to Red countries in exchange for eastern grain, meat, timber, and coal. Those essentials must come from Red countries or from America. Even if we had enough to spare, and there was no dollar exchange problem, there are not enough ships available.

It is agreed that the Allies should not export weapons to Red countries; but what about machinery and chemicals, two of the biggest export items? When are machine tools or rubber or oil war materials, and when are they not?

About 10 percent of the American embargo-list items are not banned by other allies.

That is the point at which tighter Allied control is needed, and stricter enforcement.

Retirement of Gen. George C. Marshall as Secretary of Defense and Appointment of Robert A. Lovett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BLAIR MOODY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Thou Good and Faithful Servant," which appeared in the Washington Star today, paying tribute to a great American and his distinguished successor, Robert A. Lovett.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOU GOOD AND FAITHFUL SERVANT

To General Marshall's admirers, and he has won a deep and abiding place in the hearts of his countrymen, the news of his resignation as Secretary of Defense is good news. For he has been called on to do more than it is reasonable to expect of any man. Like everything else he was ever called on to do, he has served with distinction during the year that has elapsed since he was plucked out of retirement and put in charge, once more, of rebuilding the Nation's defenses. And it is well that he leaves office now in good health, conscious of another task discharged with honor and with another fine chapter added to a remarkable record of accomplishment.

In his successor, the President has made a selection that was plainly in the cards when he persuaded another veteran, Robert A. Lovett, to return to Government service in September of 1950 as Under Secretary of De-

fense who is better qualified by experience and outstanding ability. That was what General Marshall and the President were thinking about when they called Mr. Lovett back to Washington last fall and persuaded this No. 1 man to take a No. 2 job for the time being.

One of the things that happened to General Marshall—as it must to all men who serve in high places—was that this past tour of a return to duty brought out, for the first time in his career, a little group of questioners of his good faith who were highly critical, in their own way, of the man selected as a target for their attack. It is a measure of his own stature that nothing made them appear quite so small as attacking General Marshall.

A 10-Year Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the following 10-year tax plan by Samuel J. Foosaner is a plan based upon projecting our national budgetary needs and our anticipated national income. It is a plan worthy of serious consideration by the Ways and Means Committee in connection with our present and proposed confiscatory Federal tax rates, and in connection with any proposal to impose a constitutional limitation upon Federal tax rates. The following is a brief exposition of the Foosaner proposal:

TEN-YEAR TAX PLAN

A plan which would provide a financial blueprint for our Federal Government for the next 10 years, is now under consideration. The 10-year tax plan which was first proposed by Samuel J. Foosaner, Newark, N. J., tax attorney, and former chairman of the Federal Tax Lawyers Committee, to the House Ways and Means Committee on February 16, 1951, seeks to lay a pattern in Federal tax planning and to chart a general course in national fiscal policies.

Citing the fact that with each successive year our population increases and so does our total national income, making more tax dollars available, Mr. Foosaner urges that "each taxable year should be subjected to taxes in accordance with its ability to pay."

TEN-YEAR PLAN DESCRIBED

The essential steps which would be entailed in the proposed 10-year tax program are as follows:

1. Estimate the Federal expenditures for the period from July 1, 1951, to June 30, 1961.
2. Estimate the probable national income for the same period.
3. Equitably apportion the tax load over the period from July 1, 1951, to June 30, 1961.

Within the purview of the above tax plan, the deficit of 1 year would be offset by the surplus revenue collections of another.

Here is how the plan would work. Assume, after full pruning of all expense items except the absolute essentials, our budgetary requirements for the 10-year period from July 1, 1951, to June 30, 1961, were estimated at \$600,000,000,000. If the history of the last 10 years repeats itself the national income will increase from year to year, with the possible exception of small drop-back in 2 or 3 years. With this pattern in mind, let us assume that the national income is

\$280,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and thereafter, there is an average increase of \$20,000,000,000 a year to 1961. Conjecturing a drop-back of \$10,000,000,000 in each of 3 years (say 1955-56 and 1959), the total estimated national income for the 10-year period will amount to three trillion three hundred and ten billion dollars (\$3,310,000,000,000.)

Instead of piling taxes in 1 year to meet the defense costs of other years between now and June 30, 1961, the \$600,000,000,000 required by the Government would be met by taxes in accordance with the taxable year's ability to pay. Illustratively, since the estimated national income for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, is \$300,000,000,000, and this represents approximately 9 percent of the total anticipated national income for the entire 10-year period, the total tax requirement for that year would be 9 percent of \$600,000,000,000 or \$54,000,000,000.

The national income for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, having been conjectured at \$320,000,000,000, or somewhat less than 10 percent of the conjectured total income for the 10-year period, the taxes to be collected for that year would be approximately \$58,000,000,000.

If the above assumption of \$600,000,000,000 is determined to be too low for the 10-year period from July 1, 1951, to June 30, 1961, it can be increased. It is merely necessary to apply the same formula to the higher figure. Thus, if after preliminary study, or upon subsequent modification, it appears that \$700,000,000,000, for example, will be necessary, then, in such event, each taxable year will be required to produce its percentage of taxes on the \$700,000,000,000 figure.

In advocating the 10-year-tax plan, Mr. Foosaner has argued that Congress must decide upon a budgetary program which parallels our defense planning. He contends that those who know, have clearly indicated that the security program which we have cut out for ourselves will cover a period of at least 10 years, and emphasizes that our tax planning must go hand in hand with this security program. He recognizes that there must be some conjecture in endeavoring to anticipate budgetary needs and national income for a 10-year period, and states that, "while, as a practical matter, it will not be expected to enact tax legislation to stand indefinitely without change, modification, or adjustment, nevertheless, Congress is capable of chartering a general course."

In pointing out that the American population will increase to approximately 180,000,000 people in the next 10 years with a corresponding increase in taxpayers, he asks: "Why should five taxpayers today, pay the tax bill which will have to be paid by six taxpayers 10 years from today?"

In stressing the dire necessity for longer range tax planning, Mr. Foosaner cites the fact that the American taxpayer has been subjected to one tax blitz after another, and relates that tax blitzes are most damaging to the nervous system. He adds:

"The Federal tax laws are very complicated. No set pattern is followed, no definite tax planning is pursued. The average businessman has no way of telling in what direction our Government is headed, from the standpoint of Federal taxation. Whether he operates as a sole proprietor, as a partnership, or as a corporation, it is almost impossible for him to make intelligent financial plans in his own business. How can he do so, when he does not know just what portion of his profits, if, in fact, his business earns profits, will have to be paid out in taxes?"

HIGH TAXES NOT COUNTERINFLATIONARY

When he appeared before the Senate Finance Committee on July 10, 1951, regarding the 10-year tax plan, and in opposition to increased taxation at this time, Mr. Foosaner argued that high taxes constituted the greatest stimulus to increasing inflation that Congress could provide. He stated that

in periods of exceedingly high taxation, taxpayers undertake many business expenditures primarily motivated by the knowledge that the net cost to them will only be a fraction of each dollar spent. Businessmen who are subjected to high taxes, whether operating as sole proprietors, members of a partnership, or under the corporate form, spend money which they can deduct for tax purposes which they would not otherwise spend. In this way, they feed the flames of inflation. Our experience in the last war proved this beyond a doubt. There wasn't a corporation in the country in the excess-profits tax bracket which did not spend money which it would not have otherwise spent, except for the fact it was putting out 1 1/4-cent dollars.

TAX CREDITS

In order to get the 10-year tax plan under way and yet at the same time not deprive the Government of needed funds for extraordinary military expenditures for the next 2 to 3 years, Foosaner would resort to tax credits. He would fix tax rates at their present levels without increases, and, to the extent that Congress determines additional revenue must be collected from taxpayers, he would have them make these additional payments. Instead of these levies constituting additional taxes, however, they would in reality be loans to the Government on a non-interest-bearing basis. Credits would be issued to the taxpayer. These credits would then be usable by the taxpayer in any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1953, against any Federal income, estate, or gift taxes which such taxpayer may owe during the ensuing 10-year period.

Foosaner asserts that by using the tax credits the Treasury would be able to collect the extra revenue it will need for the next 2 years. At the same time, inflationary spending would be curbed. Since taxes themselves would not be increased, taxpayers would be less apt to undertake expenditures not otherwise contemplated. They would be spending their own money, and this makes a difference.

Taking cognizance of the fact that the 1951 Revenue Act involves new tax increases, Foosaner contends that this should not prevent adoption of the longer-range tax plan.

"There is nothing to preclude Congress from giving the proposed tax credits for the additional income-tax sums which will be collected under the 1951 revenue law. At the same time the details of the 10-year tax plan can be worked out with a view to its early acceptance. This plan," he added, "will put our country on a cash-paying basis, not for 2 or 3 years, but rather for the full period of our defense preparation and emergency program."

TABLE A.—National income and taxes paid, 1939-50

	National income ¹	Amount of taxes paid ²
	Billions	Billions
1939.....	\$72.5	\$5.5
1940.....	81.3	5.7
1941.....	103.8	7.8
1942.....	137.1	13.5
1943.....	169.7	22.6
1944.....	183.8	42.2
1945.....	182.7	44.4
1946.....	180.3	40.9
1947.....	198.7	40.0
1948.....	223.5	42.5
1949.....	216.8	40.4
1950.....	236.2	39.0

¹ Based on calendar years. (Source: U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.)

² Based on fiscal years ending June 30. (Source: U. S. Treasury Department.)

³ Estimate, based upon incomplete data as submitted by Council of Economic Advisers. National income for fourth quarter reached annual rate of \$24.7 billions.

TABLE B.—Projected 10-year national income and taxes

Fiscal year ending June 30	National income (conjectured)	Approximate percentage of over-all tax to be collected ¹	Approximate amount of taxes to be collected ¹
	Billions	Percent	Billions
1952.....	\$280	8.46	\$50.76
1953.....	300	9.06	54.36
1954.....	320	9.67	58.02
1955.....	340	10.27	61.62
1956.....	330	9.97	59.82
1957.....	320	9.67	58.02
1958.....	340	10.27	61.62
1959.....	360	10.88	65.28
1960.....	350	10.57	63.42
1961.....	370	11.18	67.08
Total.....	3,310	100.00	600.00

¹ Based upon estimated 10-year budget of \$600,000,000,000

The United States Cannot Take Economic Action Against Czechoslovakia

REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the only method we have, short of war, to release an American citizen from the prison in Czechoslovakia is to apply economic measures—cut off trade. But lo and behold, we cannot do it. Are we a sovereign Nation and have we a will of our own? No, sir; we lost that when we joined the United Nations. Now we cannot use any economic power against Czechoslovakia until we get consent from the United Nations. Is not that a nice position for this great country to be in?

There seems no end to the multitude of side organizations of the United Nations. Something new is popping up every day. The President himself has just been met by what one of these branches or subsidiaries did. In time he is bound to meet other actions that have been taken against the sovereignty of the United States. In the present case the President wants to do all the can, short of war, to get Oatis, the American newspaper correspondent, out of the dungeon in Czechoslovakia. He decided that the best way to do it was to shut off all trade with that country. Any sovereign nation has that right if it chooses to exercise it. But the United States cannot do it, and you ask why we cannot exercise our own rights as a Nation. I will tell you why.

In 1947 the United States along with 29 other nations representing the Trade and Commerce Committee of the United Nations, met and entered into an agreement called the general agreement on trade and tariffs, now known as GATT. This outfit is one of the myriad side organizations of the United Nations. In that agreement we bound ourselves to trade with nations, including Czechoslovakia, and we can't get out of this trap unless two-thirds of the nations with

whom we agreed will let us out. The President is stymied on the course of action he would like and ought to pursue. If we take this matter up and attempt to extricate ourselves, we will not be successful, because the majority of the people represented in the United Nations are following the communistic line. Then what is to be done?

When this agreement was made under the authority of the Secretary of State it clearly was an unconstitutional act because control over commerce and tariffs of this Nation is solely controlled by the Congress of the United States. Here we have a case where the Secretary of State and his cohorts have attempted to bypass Congress and set at defiance the laws of the United States. I propose that we get out of this organization immediately, declare the agreement null and void, notify the United Nations of the action, and then go on about our own business. To this end I have introduced a concurrent resolution to accomplish this purpose.

This action in overriding Congress on our trade and tariff laws is just one of the many schemes that this communistic-dominated United Nations is conjuring up day after day.

And what kind of people are represented in the United Nations?

Here is the composition: 488,000,000 people who believe in the capitalistic theory of government, and 560,000,000 who follow the Communist line—and that does not include Red China. If she were admitted we would be outnumbered two to one. India, Poland, Yugoslavia, and Russia are the stumbling blocks in that organization now. Yugoslavia is a Communist country and refrains from voting, but those who are not with us are against us.

Do we want any social programs emanating from that organization? Do we want to train our children to fit into a social group instead of preparing them for lives of individuals, with all the hopes and aspirations of freemen?

Do we want laws offered by that organization? Do we want to practice deceit and falsehood in order to prepare our citizens to accept the United Nations laws?

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights document that has been printed and circulated by the millions among our churches and schools is a dishonest attempt to prepare the people of the United States to accept the Covenant of Human Rights, soon to come before the Senate for ratification.

This Universal Declaration of Human Rights document is not the same document that the Communists of the United Nations want us to adopt. The two sound much alike. One is labeled "The Universal Declaration of Human Rights." The other is the Universal Covenant of Human Rights.

In the first, it would appear the free speech and a free press are protected. But see what the second document says about free speech. Here it is:

Everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression, subject to such restrictions as are provided by law or are necessary for the

protection of national security, public order, safety, health, or morals, or the rights, freedoms, or reputations of others.

In the first, freedom of religion seems to be protected, but see what the second one says about religion. Here it is:

Freedom to manifest one's religion or beliefs shall be subject only to such limitations as are pursuant to law and are reasonable and necessary to protect public safety, order, health, or morals, or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others.

If a question of free speech and a free press comes up, under this definition, with all its exceptions, who is judge of the exceptions? The answer is, "The United Nations Court." Whatever it says will govern a free people in the United States. Who will judge whether a newspaper is guilty of a violation of this definition? The United Nations Court. Is that what the people of this republic want? We have always guarded this clause in our Constitution, and are we to surrender it all to a communistic United Nations?

If a question of religious practice comes up, who is the judge of all the exceptions noted in the definition of religious freedom? The United Nations will do the judging, not us. Is that what the people of the United States want? This country was settled by those who felt the heavy hand of religious intolerance. We grew to greatness, among other things, because of our liberality in religion. Are we to surrender this precious right to a communistic United Nations?

In pointing out some of the results which would follow the adoption of this provision contained in the Universal Covenant of Human Rights, the Committee for Peace and Law through the United Nations of the American Bar Association said in a report last September 20, the effects would be these:

The persecuted brethren of any religious group in any country dominated by the Soviet shall be assured that such persecutions are legal and proper under a covenant on human rights because the public safety and order of their state demand such protective action. Is this the message we shall send to persecuted worshippers in other lands?

Today when an atheistic ideology of great power and proportions confronts the religious groups of the world, an organ of the United Nations presents the doctrine of state regulation of religion, a codification of the right of regulation, and complete destruction of the freedom of religion if laws based on alleged public safety and order of the state shall so provide.

If the Communists in the United Nations and the Communists—or half-Communists—here in the United States can put over this Covenant of Human Rights, there will be no free speech and no free press; there will be no free religion.

I think our representatives in the United Nations should be investigated. I have a suspicion that it is teeming with Communist sympathizers.

Alger Hiss was secretary of the United Nations when it was organized. He spent more time than any other person in framing the charter. The Senate thought everything was all right and the charter was approved. What happened? The very first thing we noticed was that

the United Nations Charter had become the supreme law of the land—and in that Charter there is a provision that came in conflict with a law of the State of California. The case went to the circuit court of appeals and that court held that the Charter of the United Nations is the supreme law of this land, and therefore the California law was set aside.

Do you not think we should look with suspicion on that whole outfit? That same Charter comes up again right now in our controversy with Czechoslovakia. We cannot handle our own business without first asking the august, Communist-dominated United Nations to please give us the authority to act. The greatest nation on earth, kneeling before a Communist-dominated debating club.

I am trying to get a list of all the employees of the United Nations who are citizens of this country. If I can get it, I will ask the Attorney General to put the FBI on the job and see if our own citizens are at work trying to destroy our form of government.

My statement is this—and I ask no congressional immunity—that our representatives in the United Nations are either powerless to cope with the Communist elements or they are deliberately cooperating with Communists to change our form of government, or they are too ignorant to understand what they are doing, and they should be removed.

I am not speaking to snipe at the administration. I am speaking as an American who will make any sacrifice to preserve this Republic.

We have undertaken to stop the Communists in Korea, but we would have made better progress if we had first stopped the Communists in the United Nations. This would be easy to do if we had nerve enough to do it. Throw out the Communists. Or, if that is impossible, get out ourselves. In my judgment this should have been done long ago, and could have been done if our representatives had shown any inclination that way, and had the courage to back it up.

By abjectly bowing to the wishes of the United Nations and having representatives in it who have not stood up for the sovereignty of the United States, we have gone farther along the road to the destruction of this Republic than ever seemed possible. We have surrendered our State laws; we have surrendered our control over tariffs and trade; we are in the process of seeing our jurisdiction over criminal cases surreptitiously slid over to the United Nations.

We have seen our way of education attacked, and are boldly told that the child must be fitted for life in a consolidated social group instead of being schooled as individuals with all the hopes and aspiration of free men; we are witnessing our control over narcotics being transferred to the United Nations.

I hope we are not too late in arousing the people to action. Many millions of our people talk peace, peace. But peace at the price of the destruction of this Republic is not peace. The power of the Russians and the atomic bomb have been purposely exaggerated to scare the

people. Russia could no more land her forces in this country than I could fly to the moon without wings. If Russia has the atomic bomb, let her use it. We are ready. A few people will be killed, but not as many as we shall lose in fighting all over the world at our own expense in men and money.

We have come to the point where we have two enemies to fight—the Communists outside the United Nations and the Communists inside that organization.

After mature reflection, my advice to the people of these United States is—

Prepare our own defenses. Fight for no one who is not willing to fight for himself. It would be much better to have 6 nations lined up for the defense of democracy than to have 60 of them, 44 of which do nothing, contribute nothing, but still demand that we tax our people to make life easy for them. When the British cannot balance what they call the "boojet," they ask us for money—and they get it. Our own budget is never considered. Our tax burden is fast becoming insupportable—confiscatory.

I say to the people of the United States, "Stand up for this country—at least once." There is just one question the people of the United States must settle: Is the Congress of the United States working for the people of this country to preserve our liberties, or are we to sit here like stool pigeons and see this Republic undermined and destroyed? That question can be answered by the people at the next election.

Speech by Mr. J. P. Cullen, Manager, Veterans' Administration Regional Office, Milwaukee, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following speech delivered June 29, 1951, by Mr. J. P. Cullen, manager, Veterans' Administration regional office, Milwaukee, Wis., at the annual encampment of the Department of Wisconsin, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Manitowoc, Wis.:

I appreciate this opportunity of attending the department encampment with members of our staff. To me, your organization and your 51 years of existence exemplify one of the finest of loyal and patriotic traditions, representing as you do those in active service beyond the seas, and foreign service veterans of the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard and the Air Force. And for the past 30 years, during which the Veterans' Bureau was established in 1921 and the Veterans' Administration came into being in 1930, the Veterans of Foreign Wars organization has marched with our own in progress and strength, shoulder to shoulder in a common cause; service to the veteran, to his widow and to his orphan. May I please express here, for our office, my appreciation of

your cooperation always evidenced during the past year by Commander Roang, the close relationship of our business dealings in the person of Col. Les Myers and his staff, and the patience and sociability manifested by all of you.

In recent months we may well have puzzled over the scoops in the daily press and articles in magazine publications obviously designed to startle and surprise us, these having behind them the movement of forces apparently contrary to our common cause. What is happening to the fine traditions which embodied a decent respect for the war veterans of our Nation and for the institutions established to uphold their dignity as citizens, their rights to rehabilitation, and their rights to care for their dependents? These scoops and scarehead articles seem not to be flavored with the traditional and homely aroma formerly to be found in the accounts of the men and women who fought our wars, and how their wounds are to be healed. Here in our grand and fertile State of Wisconsin we have a homeland that has, at all times when our Nation called, given generously, nobly, and unselfishly of her sons and daughters, of the fruits of her soil and of the products of her factories. If we may be historical, may we look back four score and eight years ago, to recall what was taking place just west of a little town in southern Pennsylvania. Here on the morning of July 1, 1863, unfolded the first act of one of the world's most decisive battles. Here the Iron Brigade, including the Second, Sixth, and Seventh Wisconsin Infantry, was coming in on the double to the relief of the gallant Buford, who with his cavalry division and his mounted batteries had held off the invading Confederates since early forenoon. The Iron Brigade outflanked the Confederate right and with the suddenness and determination for which it was famous, surrounded and captured nearly all of Archer's Brigade, including its commander, the first of Lee's general officers captured on a battlefield since he assumed command of the Army of Northern Virginia. The Iron Brigade fought on, through that first day's fight and through the second and third days of the battle and suffered the highest casualties, in proportion to its strength, of any Union brigade in the entire war. Nearly all its officers, including General Meredith, were wounded, killed, or captured. The commanding officer of the Sixth Regiment, Col. Rufus Dawes, of Mauston, in Juneau County, father of the late Gen. Charles G. Dawes, of Chicago, was one of the two or three commissioned officers to come out unscathed. Had it not been for these brave men and their comrades of the First Corps, Gettysburg, which was most strategically located, would have been lost that first morning and Lee's vision of open roads to Harrisburg, Baltimore, and Philadelphia would have become (for the North) a terrifying and tragic reality.

May we not forget that the sons and grandsons of the men of the Iron Brigade carried on the glorious tradition of the Wisconsin fighting man 55 years later at Hill 230, Juvigny and the Argonne, and again in 1942 in the foxholes of Bataan, the blistering sands of Buna Beach, and the choking jungles of New Guinea.

These are but a few, notable as they are, of the valorous phases of Wisconsin's patriotic tradition down through our country's wars. You and we, in the important work we are charged with, must not forget this fine tradition when we know there are now forces abroad which could destroy the memory of all that was good and noble in the past, warp our concept of the present, and cloud our vision of the future.

What must our younger veterans think when they read of, and this is not fiction, I quote: "The scandalous days of the Hines' regime," meaning the period when Gen.

Frank T. Hines was in charge of the Veterans' Administration, the years 1923 to 1945. I wonder if they believe, as such articles baldly state, that our doctors and lawyers were devoid of professional ability or ethics, were broken down quacks and ex-ambulance chasers?

Last week, in Chicago, I saw a physician who has been a consultant with the Veterans' Administration for over 20 years. He is a well-known eye specialist, who, once a week still makes the 15-mile trek from his office in the Loop to Hines Hospital. He has been, in his private practice, treating my 10-year-old son for the past 7 years and successfully performed operations on both eyes. Ten years ago when I was stationed at Hines, many of us went to this doctor with our eye troubles and took our families to him. Why? Because he is a good physician, besides being a fine, unselfish person. He is still Consultant in Ophthalmology at Hines Hospital, which, incidentally, has always been one of our largest hospitals. He has not changed except as productive, unselfish experience further develops a professional man or woman. I could name other physicians on the staff there—I know them all, or knew of their worth and ability, their reputations in the medical profession, and I include the full-time Veterans' Administration physicians stationed at Hines—surgeons, orthopedists, internists, psychiatrists. This fact of good medical care I cite from personal knowledge and experience. It could be attested to with respect to other hospitals and areas by those who were elsewhere.

So take these accounts of the terrible state of Veterans' Administration medicine back there—take them with a grain of the familiar white condiment. It's good on the meat we eat—when we can get meat these days—and it's also good to sprinkle on these articles and reports that profess to tell you what scandalous people we used to be and what a shambles we worked in.

Now the lawyers—I studied law myself—and entered the old Veterans' Bureau direct from college, even before I took the bar, though maybe I leaned on a couple along the way. That will be 29 years ago next month. I can't compare it with the famous Gettysburg date, but sometimes I feel that old. Why does the Veterans' Administration need lawyers anyway? Congress says we have too many Government lawyers and the outside experts say they get too much money; that we should give it back to the taxpayer or better, pay it over as fees to these experts who can save our Nation from bureaucracy. Well anyway, we do have lawyers in our office down in Milwaukee. One thing any lawyer, and especially ours, must know is the value of evidence, and how and where it comes from, and where the veteran or his VFW representative may find it if it isn't there in the case file. A claim has to be supported by good evidence and we are required to support the pay vouchers with facts. We don't have to prove a claim to a mathematical certainty, or rather the veteran and his representative need not, and we must give the veteran the benefit of reasonable doubt. All these things, in our opinion and that of the Federal Civil Service, require education, experience, and background. We seriously believe that a veteran's claim or a widow's claim is an important piece of business, important enough to be handled by experts, by competent doctors and qualified lawyers sitting together on the boards, passing on these claims with mature deliberation.

Suppose we don't have them—that kind of board members—and suppose we go wrong—and that would happen I assure you with the wrong kind of personnel. Well, we go wrong and we turn down the claim of a veteran who deserves, on evidence which is good, favorable action. That decision may very well ruin him, not only thwart his ambition, his

aims, but sink him and his family into depths of despair and frustration from which he may never emerge. We can hardly estimate the extent of such a wrong in dollars and cents. Now let's say we, with this same kind of people making the decision, go wrong the opposite way, on the other kind of claim with its bad evidence, and pay off a gold brick or a malingerer. We don't have many, but rare or not, it takes a smarter man than any old guardhouse lawyer to spot them. So we pay off. We can easily figure 20—30, yes even 40 years of longevity—these fellows often have a long and happy life—and let's say at a thousand a year, that's a fair guess. It adds up to \$40,000—that's a lot of money to pay out on a fraudulent claim. As taxpayers we wouldn't like it because that money comes out of your pockets and mine.

Yet there are those who have been saying for years, "You don't need college-educated, experienced men and women, technical experts to make these decisions. Properly trained clerks can make them and at half the salaries." I suggest you take that one with a grain of salt, too.

May I pose an answer to the question of success and efficiency in any operation or reorganization, any business, whether it be a white-collar job, running a threshing rig, or running a 500-bed hospital. Get a good man to run the job, give him authority as well as responsibility, then leave him alone while he runs it.

Authority and responsibility after you get the right man. That's the key to it. Responsibility without authority is the curse of any important job. Thousands of dollars in reorganization schemes have and are being spent to discover that simple answer. It is not original. Teddy Roosevelt came up with it 40 years ago.

One of your very fine leaders in your national office, Col. George E. Ijams, director of your National Rehabilitation Service, was with the Veterans' Bureau and Veterans' Administration for many years. I know him well and I worked under him in Washington. Then he was in charge of claims and insurance and later he was assistant administrator charged with the responsibility for medical and hospital activities, as well as construction and supplies. He could enlarge on my story here. He has really been there and he knows the answers. He knows what the medical care was during the Hines regime because he was in charge of it and he knows how claims must be handled in order to be fair to all. He had a lot to do with our acquiring our fine building in Milwaukee and one of his last acts was in that connection, a wire calling me to Washington, early in 1946, just before he left the Veterans' Administration. The VFW is fortunate in having George Ijams, a thorough gentleman and one of the most capable administrators, combining as he does long and productive experience in our agency, and possessing a full understanding and experience with the aims and principles of the VFW. If he were here I think he would agree to what I have said about the tradition in respect to physicians and lawyers in the Veterans' Administration, that most of them were doing their job to the best of their talents and ability during his tenure and they are doing it now, together with the vast new group of personnel that has come in since World War II.

This tradition of competent medical care and the fair and impartial consideration of disability claims lives on, among us who know the facts, and we all may well hope it will continue, in spite of adverse press and publicity, along with your fine, loyal tradition of half a century of service, comradeship and patriotic ideals. Let's keep our traditions alive; we have a very fine relationship in our State, working together as we do, and let's not forget our common cause, untiring and unremitting service to

the veteran, to his widow, and to his orphan. With the help of God we can continue to serve them well. There is no nobler cause to which we can devote our energy, our experience, and our sincere sympathy. Thank you.

**Address of Hon. William Jennings Bryan
Dorn, of South Carolina**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address of Hon. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, of South Carolina, to the graduating class of the Page School on June 11, 1951, in the Ways and Means Committee room in the New House Office Building:

Mr. President, members of the graduating class, ladies and gentlemen, I consider it a great honor to have been invited by the members of this class to make the address in this occasion. It is a genuine pleasure to participate in these exercises on this memorable night in the lives of these young men.

Members of the graduating class, this is a serious hour in the history of America, and a critical period in your own lives. I would suggest to you, and to the youth throughout the land, that you set a goal in life—a goal toward which you must constantly strive. The earlier we set for ourselves a goal of accomplishment, the more likely will be our chances of success.

I remember hearing a story about a young boy who was employed as a carpenter in the new building which was to be the meeting place of the Supreme Court of Oklahoma. This young lad was observed by his foreman to put forth special interest in the chair in which was to sit the chief justice of the supreme court. The foreman asked this young boy, still in his teens, why he spent so much time on this particular chair. The lad replied, "Someday I will sit in this chair as the chief justice of this State." Years later this young man did become the chief justice of the supreme court in the great State of Oklahoma. He set for himself, early in life, a high goal and worked toward that end. It is no small wonder that his ambition was crowned with ultimate success.

I hope the youth of America today, seeing the shortcomings of this generation, will set for themselves the goal of rectifying the chaos we find in the world today. I hope you young men, in facing the menace of foreign ideologies and "isms" which would enslave the world, will be bold and aggressive, and that you will have no fear. The foreign policy of our great country tonight seems to be predicted on what Russia might or might not do. Fear hysteria is sweeping the country. Fear cannot solve the problems of this great Nation.

The Bible says the things which we greatly fear will come upon us. As you face the future, with its stupendous task of arriving at lasting peace, I know you will face those tasks with the same type of fortitude that our forefathers had when they founded the early American Republic. They were afraid of nothing, except to do wrong.

The motto of the late Alexander H. Stephens, of Georgia, is found on the monument

at his resting place in Crawfordville, Georgia. This motto reads: "I am afraid of nothing on the earth, under the earth, or above the earth, except to do wrong. In the path of duty I shall ever endeavor to walk, fearing no evil and dreading no consequences." And what a wonderful motto that would be for the youth of America today.

France and England, in the years preceding World War II, contributed to the outbreak of that war by being afraid to stand on principle and back up the little nations who desired freedom. They were, by their policy of fear and appeasement, just as guilty of starting the war as were the aggressor nations. A bold, determined stand by these two nations for righteousness and the sanctities of treaties in 1938 could have prevented World War II. Whenever any nation surrenders principle for a temporary respite or fleeting expedient that nation later will pay a terrible price in blood.

America has reached the coveted position it occupies in the world today because of its belief in God and in freedom of opportunity. Our forefathers were builders. They gave us, on a silver platter, this land as we know it today. We have the highest standard of living any people in world history have ever enjoyed. Our educational systems are comparable to those of any other nation. The masses in America have a far greater opportunity for an education than those of any other nation.

When I was in the Far East in April, I was told that 83 percent of the Chinese people are illiterate, that eighty-plus percent of the people of India are illiterate—they cannot read or write. Our literacy rate, in America, is higher than the illiteracy rate of these two countries.

I enjoy living in America. I am proud of my American citizenship. We should be grateful to God and the founding fathers of our Republic for the great America we see every day. No civilization has ever excelled ours in religious tolerance or freedom from class hatred. Minority races of people have advanced further here than in any other country. Strong moral and spiritual beliefs have always placed our Nation on the side of right and principle as opposed to tyranny and oppression. Our democratic form of government has created an American citizen who is tolerant, self-reliant, intelligent, and conscious of his rights and the rights of others.

The American system of free enterprise has given to the American people more automobiles, television sets, more telephones, more washing machines, more of the luxuries of life than all the rest of the people on this globe combined. Think of it—150,000,000 people have more of these modern conveniences than all the other 2,000,000,000 people in the world. This is a tribute to our democratic way of life, to our free-enterprise system, and to the individualism of the American people. We cannot maintain this great era of accomplishments by tearing down or by socializing the system which has made this era possible. The youth of our Nation must work, in the years ahead, to guarantee the preservation of our system of government with its equal opportunities.

Booker T. Washington was born a slave in Virginia. Never knowing who his father was, he went from that humble beginning to establish Tuskegee Institute, one of America's greatest colleges today. I visited this college, in the "black belt" of Alabama, not long ago. It is a monument to the character and perseverance of Booker T. Washington. He could have accomplished this only in the United States.

Abraham Lincoln was born in a one-room log cabin in the backwoods of Kentucky. With little formal education, he gradually ascended the ladder of fame. He was defeated for Congress and for the United States Senate. He did not become disillusioned

and embittered. Instead he continued onward and became the President of the United States.

Alfred E. Smith was born in the East Side of New York City. He worked in the fish markets and, as he grew up, saw little of the world except the slum sections of that great city. But Al Smith was four times elected Governor of New York State and was the Democratic standard bearer for the Presidency in 1928.

Immorality in government and among the American people is today posing as a great threat to true democracy. This threat is paralleled by complacency and indifference on the part of the American people. If we are to preserve democracy, we must use democracy. If freedom is to grow, we must use that freedom.

In 1948, 93,000,000 Americans were eligible to vote in the Presidential election. Only approximately 47,000,000 voted. Forty-six million did not vote at all. They did not evidence enough interest to exercise the sacred privilege of casting their ballot for whomever they pleased.

How many people today exercise the privilege of publicly stating their views on the state of the Nation? One-half of the American people are members of no church of any denomination whatsoever. Yet, America was founded and has prospered on Christian principles and a belief in God.

I do pay special tribute tonight to the press and radio for exercising the sacred privilege to write and discuss the things which they believe.

If any man, woman, or child in this audience tonight were to go home, get in bed, and lie flat on your back for a year without exercising the limbs, you would lose the use of arms and legs. We maintain the physical limbs of our body by constant use and exercise. So it is with the "four freedoms" and our democratic way of life. If we do not use them, we will surely lose these sacred privileges.

You members of this graduating class, as you face the many problems of today, are probably thinking of the obstacles of seniority. You are probably thinking that you will have to wait many years before you can serve your community, your State, or your Nation. You are probably thinking that youth and lack of experience will be a stumbling block.

Remember the words of Benjamin Franklin. "Fools learn by experience; wise men through the experience of others." In the fourth chapter of First Timothy, the twelfth verse, we find these words: "Let no man despise thy youth." These words are taken from Paul's letter advising the young minister, Timothy, as he went out into the world of men. Youth is your greatest asset. You have all the history of the past centuries to draw from. If in this modern age, with its libraries and great teachers, we have to learn in the bitter school of experience, then we are indeed very foolish. If we must put our hand in the fire to learn, by experience, that we will be burned, then we are what Benjamin Franklin said of those who learn by experience—very foolish indeed. We can turn back through the pages of history, or we can look at our contemporaries in the various fields of endeavor and find that youth has played an important role.

I am thinking tonight of scientific advancements. The men who made the atomic bomb were but little older than you who sit in this graduating class tonight. The average age of the members of the American Association of Atomic Scientists is 29 years.

Let us turn to the field of literature. William Cullen Bryant began writing poetry at an early age and wrote until he was past 80. Yet the greatest poem he ever wrote was *Thanatopsis*, written at the early age of 17. Byron, Keats, and Shelley, of England,

were all young men when they wrote their masterpieces.

In the realm of government and politics, William Pitt was Prime Minister of Great Britain at the age of 24. He is acclaimed by most historians as the greatest Prime Minister Britain ever had, greater even than Winston Churchill. William Pitt saved England in the great Napoleonic era of world conflagration.

In America, Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence when he was 33 years of age. Alexander Hamilton, the father of the American currency and one of the founders of the American Constitution, was adjutant to Gen. George Washington at the age of 20 and helped to plan the campaigns which made this country independent. Madison and Monroe were both young men when they fought for the American Constitution. John C. Calhoun, who once represented the district it is now my honor to represent in Congress, was elected to the House of Representatives at the age of 28 and in a few months was one of the outstanding leaders of the country. Henry Clay was United States Senator at the age of 29. A few years later on the same day he took his oath of office as a Member of the House of Representatives. He was elected Speaker of the House, at the age of 34.

In the field of music, Mozart was playing publicly at the age of 6 and composed his first symphony at the age of 9.

In military science and tactics, the greatest generals the world has ever produced were young men, little older than you. Alexander the Great conquered the world before he was 33 years old. Napoleon Bonaparte was a lieutenant general at the age of 27, and dominated Europe at the age of 31. Hannibal was commander of the Carthaginian Army in Spain when he was 25. Gustavus Adolphus was commander of the Norwegian Army at the age of 19. These four men are credited by most historians as being the greatest military generals of all times. They were at their best when they combined their great intellect with the vigor and imagination of youth.

The members of this graduating class are all young men—but we must not forget the ladies. Joan of Arc was a French leader while in her teens. Florence Nightingale also made great accomplishments early in life.

Jesus Christ hung on Calvary's cross at the age of 33, after He had started a movement which is still growing today and has hundreds of millions in its ranks. And today a young evangelist in America—Billy Graham at the age of 32—has won hundreds of thousands of Americans to the cause of Christianity.

We are never too old nor too young to serve our country. Let no man ridicule you for your youth.

I hope you will pardon this personal reference. I received no encouragement when I ran for the legislature of my State of South Carolina at the age of 22, but the people of my county elected me. Two years later, at the age of 24, I received no encouragement when I ran for the State senate, but I was elected over two opponents. I was advised by many not to run for Congress in 1946 because I was what they termed too young, but still the people elected me to the House of Representatives.

Let us not be discouraged by the cynics and those who would have us wait while America may be passing through its hour of greatest danger. Our country needs us today. Tomorrow may be too late. The past generation has failed to give us, the youth of today, the peace that they promised, the security that was to be ours. Let us not make the same mistake and pass on to the next generation a world of chaos, of war, of fear, and of apprehension. We must act now, before it

is too late, to save our country in this hour of crisis.

A story is told of Napoleon Bonaparte when he was being defeated by the Austrians at the Battle of Austerlitz. He had done his best and defeat was staring him in the face. As his veterans fell back in disorder, he rode up to a little fourteen-year-old drummer boy, and the great general said, "Son, beat a retreat." The little boy looked up at his great commander and said, "Sir, I don't know how. You never taught me how to beat a retreat. But, sir, I can beat a charge on this drum that will wake the dead on this battlefield." Napoleon thought for a moment and then said, "Beat it then." The old guard, seeing the courage of this little boy and hearing his stirring notes on the drum, rallied and won for Bonaparte the greatest victory in French history.

The great minds of America may fail to solve the present-day problems. Just remember the great general Bonaparte and all of his commanders had given up that day in the Battle of Austerlitz, only to see defeat turned into a great victory by a fourteen-year-old lad. The youth of America today, like the little drummer boy, might save this country after our leaders have done their utmost.

I wish you great success in the years ahead. May you serve your community, your State and your Nation as well as yourselves and your families. God bless you, each of you.

Stones for Bread?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, in the course of the investigation of the use of chemicals in food products, carried on by a select committee authorized by this and the previous Congress, I have read, or heard, as chairman, the testimony of many nationally known experts on nutrition. Many of the scientists who testified before the select committee have devoted their lives to finding new methods of preserving the natural values and purity of food. Some of these scientists, experts on nutrition, have developed recipes for baking pure, wholesome bread filled with natural ingredients and free of chemical additives.

In support of this expert testimony I was gratified to note an article on the merits of pure bread ingredients written by Julie Bedier, in *Commonweal* of April 27. The author, while not a professional nutritionist, bears out the statements made before the select committee by scientists of wide repute.

I therefore include this article as part of my remarks.

STONES FOR BREAD

(By Julie Bedier)

When I was a little girl, hearing a story about someone who had lived on bread and water, I decided to try it. I took a bowl of clear cold water, broke up bits of bread in it, and did my best to down the mess. Resolution: no more bread and water. However, saints in their hermit cells and prisoners in their dungeons have lived, sometimes for years, on bread and water. Not only that,

but rigorous fasting was widely and successfully practiced during Lent, in ancient and medieval times.

Lent is still supposed to be a time of fasting, but how many are able to keep it? In my home parish, I remember, there was an old woman, a seamstress, who was said to be a saint; she kept the "black fast" all through Lent. Nobody else that I knew kept it. Workingmen and their families were excused, and most people were in that class. People with desk jobs could not fast, because they grew faint and suffered headaches. The teaching Sisters could not fast while at the same time keeping up classroom work and discipline. Some of the clergy may have fasted; certainly some were too sickly and overworked to do so. And so, who kept the Lenten fast? Only old Mrs. O'Reardon.

After I grew up and spent some years in China as a missionary nun, I began to think the Lenten regulations for China were more sensible than ours. In that country there are only eight fast days in the year—the Fridays of Lent and Christmas Eve. Eight fast days, and every Catholic keeps them. Even the poor coolies pulling rickshaws for a living kept the fast, and kept it more rigorously than we Sisters did. The Chinese Catholics ate nothing at all until noon, whereas we took the usual piece of bread and coffee at breakfast time; the Chinese were able to outdo us, somewhat to our humiliation.

Francis Thompson, in his essay *Health and Holiness*, speaks of the exuberant vitality of his hardy ancestors, compared with the "existing valetudinarianism of our oversoft bodies," of the medieval men clad in iron mail, who fought through the Crusades in the torrid lands of the east, while modern soldiers in khaki fall out by the hundreds during mere maneuvers on an English down.

In this connection it seems apropos to mention the experiences of our soldiers in Korea, brave and hardy youngsters, but needing rest and hot chow at regular intervals, and their own wonder at the Red Chinese, who can fight all day and all night, and all the next day, without rest, while using for food only a few cold cornmeal cakes or millet dumplings which each man carries with him. Here the less modernized Chinese might be compared to Thompson's medieval Crusader. It never occurred to Francis Thompson, nor does it occur to many of us, to lay the blame for our modern lack of stamina where it belongs. Weakness of will? Of piety? Not at all. The faintness, the dizziness, the failure of the body, are not imaginary; they are real and have a real cause. The experiments of a few scientists and investigators, independent and widely scattered, give the clue to those who care enough to think it through.

Man, while being practically omnivorous, is largely a grain-eating creature. Down through the ages bread, or its equivalent, has been his staff of life. Nations have grown great and strong where wheat prospered. "Give us . . . our daily bread" meant just that. However, the bread of ancient and medieval peoples had no relation to the modern bakers' bread which is given us today. I have eaten the "black bread" of the Russian peasant, and it is a meal in itself, dark brown, solid and heavy, "chewy" and moist, and utterly delicious. You can feel and taste its substantial goodness with each bite. After that try a slice of modern white bread, and you might as well be chewing on a nice tender paper towel. Bread and water—peasants' black bread and water—could indeed sustain life. I should hate to try living on white bread and water for any length of time.

Our Food and Drug Administration has recently ordered bakers to stop using chemical "extenders" and "emulsifiers" which take the place of the milk and butter formerly

used in home-made bread. However, the inedible trash added to the flour in bakeries does not make all the difference. It is the flour itself that is devitalized and anemic. Much of our wheat is grown on soil lacking in essential minerals. Year after year, crops are taken off the soil and nothing put back. Nature demands a return of services, and when she is flouted, she cannot be blarneyed or propagandized; she gives what she gets. She is most just. Crops grown on deficient soil are deficient crops.

Next, the wheat, formerly cut and allowed to dry in shocks before threshing, is now combined in the field before the grain is well ripened. Stored at once in huge elevators, it has to be protected from weevils by having cyanide gas blown through it. Then it is milled at a high rate of speed, at high temperatures in our modern mills; the old-fashioned millstones, grinding slowly, did not destroy vitamins so efficiently. The flour is then refined, separated from the bran which contains minerals and vitamins so necessary to life. After refining, it is usually bleached with chemicals, some of which have been proved very injurious to health. Then it may be stored for long periods before it is used for bread.

Whole wheat flour is difficult to keep for any length of time, as weevils breed in it and it is soon discovered to be buggy. The refined white flour does not get buggy, and for a good reason. The insects know which flour is fit to eat; and with their God-given instinct they choose the foods which will sustain life and avoid the worthless ones.

We moderns are so convinced that our diet is the most scientific, our standard of living the highest in history, that it comes as a shock when we are told of the great numbers of young men found to be unfit for our Armed Forces on account of poor health. It is true we eat a great deal of meat, sweets, and out-of-season vegetables and fruits, these latter often of poor quality from long storage and shipping after being half ripe when picked.

If we did not have these additions to our diet we should be badly off indeed, as our bread surely would not sustain life by itself. No amount of our added foodstuffs, however, can take the place of whole grains. Man needs grain in his diet, and he needs plenty of it. The shame is that there is a kind of conspiracy to prevent his getting it. There is "whole wheat" bread on the market, to be sure, but this whole wheat is only a trade name, having no foundation in fact. There are people who, refusing to be pushed around, have developed a mighty wrath and have taken to grinding their own wheat in small kitchen grinders and baking their bread from the grain, fresh ground. These people are few, but the number is growing. Their enthusiastic testimonials and their relish for the plain brown, fragrant wheaten loaf are eloquent.

In the Himalaya Mountains in India, near the border of the U. S. S. R., is the land of Hunza, shut in by towering mountain peaks. It is a dry country, where farming is done by means of irrigation. Farm land is scarce and is made up of little patches on stair-step terraces carved in the mountain sides. Crops are, therefore, scanty, and winters are cold and bleak. The Hunzukuts who live there are a hardy race of mountaineers, light of skin and with handsome features and figures. They are intelligent, cheerful, lovers of dancing, at which they are skilled, and expert polo players. They are peasants and herders, and few of them can read or write.

Hunzukuts sometimes die by falling down mountain peaks, but seldom from disease. They have no doctors or hospitals, take no medicines and seem to need none. Colds, appendicitis, stomach troubles, heart disease, cancer, and "nerves" are unknown

among them. They live to be from 85 to 100 or more, and pass away from old age. The only ailment they seem to know is some eye troubles, caused by smoke from the fires in their little houses. Fuel is scarce; they are like the American Indian, who said, "White man build big fire, sit 'way back; Indian build little fire, sit close to."

Hunzukuts often walk 60 miles at a time, up and down steep mountains, carrying heavy loads. A Hunzukut of 70 plays a fast game of polo, on foot, and is not winded. In the evening, after a day of burden-bearing over mountain trails, perhaps in drenching rain, Hunzukuts often have a gay dance around a fire. One Hunzukut messenger made a 200-mile journey over the mountains, on foot. He returned in 7 days, quite untired and fresh. The people of Hunza are very cleanly. It is a custom among them, in winter, to make two large holes in the ice of a pond, then dive in at one end and come out of the other, over and over again, quite as cheerfully as a polar bear.

Why are the Hunzukuts so hardy? A group of scientists made a study of them and their habits, and their findings are interesting, to say the least.

The Hunzukuts live entirely upon natural food which they raise themselves. No canned, frozen, or preserved food processed in factories ever reaches them. Their bread is made from whole wheat, grown at home, freshly ground in the home and baked there. They use no sugar, no candy, no ice cream or bottled drinks (which contain much sugar). Their food is made up of wheat, barley, millet, and buckwheat, of vegetables, nuts, and butter, of apricots, mulberries, apples, grapes, peaches, and pears, together with a small amount of meat from their herds of goats. They do not peel their vegetables, but eat skin and all. They raise all this food on soil which they keep fertile by nature's means; that is, they put all vegetable, animal and human wastes back into the soil after composting them.

The scientists decided that the food habits of the Hunzukuts might be the cause of their fine health and good dispositions, because other people living nearby in the same climate, but having different food habits, were both unhealthy and quarrelsome. However, the inquirers wanted to be sure. They then experimented with three groups of rats, which were kept in cages in a laboratory. One group was fed upon the food of the Hunzukuts. Another group was fed white rice, vegetables, and spices—the diet of the poor of southern India. The third group got white bread made from factory-milled flour, margarine, tea with sugar, a little boiled milk, cabbage, potatoes, canned meat and jaw. This was the "white man's diet"—the food of many working people of England and of some in America.

The diets were kept up for several years, and the observers were startled by what they saw. The "Hunzukut" rats had no illness, no deaths, were fine, sleek, handsome, tame animals with good tempers. The "Southern Indian" rats were diseased in nose, ears, heart, stomach, lungs—in every organ. They had poor teeth, developed boils, lost their hair, and were quarrelsome and wild. The "English" rats also had most of the same diseases. They were nervous, often tried to bite their caretaker, and killed and ate the weaker rats among them.

While considering the advantages of grain in diet, the following experience of a group of Maryknoll Sisters seems particularly significant. Throughout the war years these women, five in number, lived in a large city of Manchuria where they conducted a school. First under the Japanese, and later under the Russian occupation, food grew daily scarcer. When ordinary meat, fruit and vegetables, dairy products, and canned goods became unobtainable, the Sisters, with considerable

good sense, bethought themselves of the food of the Chinese poor—kaoliang, the seed grain of the Manchurian sorghum plant. This grain is widely raised by the Chinese in the north, as it will thrive where rice cannot be grown. Farmers, laborers, and beasts of burden eat it.

Kaoliang is simply threshed and winnowed, then boiled as a kind of porridge, and eaten with a sauce or vegetables. The Sisters bought bags of this sorghum grain and began to use it in the traditional way. As they took in numbers of destitute refugees, they fed the refugees on the same fare as they themselves used. For 2½ years they lived on kaoliang mush, sometimes adding a little seaweed, some grass or a few leaves of cabbage, and rarely a bit of fish for flavoring. The amount of these other items was negligible. Kaoliang was their "daily bread" indeed. The five Sisters found that their health was excellent, in spite of having to live through two Manchurian winters of sub-zero weather with practically no heat in the house. They contracted no illness of any kind during this period. Their eyes, teeth, nerves and general health improved under the diet.

In time, even the kaoliang became scarce and hard to buy. As the number of refugees increased, the Sisters felt considerable weakness and hunger, since the portions of sorghum porridge had to be much watered to go round for all. The unpalatability, too, was hard to bear, as the boiled grain with salt and grass or seaweed would hardly be listed among the *hors d'oeuvres* at a banquet.

Each missionary had a hard day's work to do, teaching in the classroom, and a mile to walk each way to and from school. Constant fear of raids and brigandage also kept them on edge. In spite of all they came out of the ordeal in good health and spirits. The Sisters learned by experience why the Chinese coolie has such strength and vigor, comparatively speaking in spite of his poverty, lack of sanitation and medical attention, and his crowded living conditions. They had done well on the coolie's daily kaoliang. The wholesome vitamin-rich grain had been practically their only food for 2½ years.

What does all this prove? It seems at least to point the finger at a crime being committed against us all, against our health, our vitality, and against our children. No wonder we cannot keep the Lenten fasts, if the food we do eat has lost its power to sustain health. It is a situation that cries to heaven. However, like the weather, nobody does anything about it.

Katyn Massacre Should Be Investigated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on April 13, 1943, the Berlin radio announced that German authorities had discovered mass graves of thousands of Polish Army officers in the Katyn Forest near Smolensk, U. S. S. R. The Germans placed the blame for this massacre on the Soviets. The Soviets immediately countered by charging the massacre to the Nazis. On April 17 the Polish Government in exile requested the International Red Cross to investigate the

were all young men when they wrote their masterpieces.

In the realm of government and politics, William Pitt was Prime Minister of Great Britain at the age of 24. He is acclaimed by most historians as the greatest Prime Minister Britain ever had, greater even than Winston Churchill. William Pitt saved England in the great Napoleonic era of world conflagration.

In America, Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence when he was 33 years of age. Alexander Hamilton, the father of the American currency and one of the founders of the American Constitution, was adjutant to Gen. George Washington at the age of 20 and helped to plan the campaigns which made this country independent. Madison and Monroe were both young men when they fought for the American Constitution. John C. Calhoun, who once represented the district it is now my honor to represent in Congress, was elected to the House of Representatives at the age of 28 and in a few months was one of the outstanding leaders of the country. Henry Clay was United States Senator at the age of 29. A few years later on the same day he took his oath of office as a Member of the House of Representatives. He was elected Speaker of the House, at the age of 34.

In the field of music, Mozart was playing publicly at the age of 6 and composed his first symphony at the age of 9.

In military science and tactics, the greatest generals the world has ever produced were young men, little older than you. Alexander the Great conquered the world before he was 33 years old. Napoleon Bonaparte was a lieutenant general at the age of 27, and dominated Europe at the age of 31. Hannibal was commander of the Carthaginian Army in Spain when he was 25. Gustavus Adolphus was commander of the Norwegian Army at the age of 19. These four men are credited by most historians as being the greatest military generals of all times. They were at their best when they combined their great intellect with the vigor and imagination of youth.

The members of this graduating class are all young men—but we must not forget the ladies. Joan of Arc was a French leader while in her teens. Florence Nightingale also made great accomplishments early in life.

Jesus Christ hung on Calvary's cross at the age of 33, after He had started a movement which is still growing today and has hundreds of millions in its ranks. And today a young evangelist in America—Billy Graham at the age of 32—has won hundreds of thousands of Americans to the cause of Christianity.

We are never too old nor too young to serve our country. Let no man ridicule you for your youth.

I hope you will pardon this personal reference. I received no encouragement when I ran for the legislature of my State of South Carolina at the age of 22, but the people of my county elected me. Two years later, at the age of 24, I received no encouragement when I ran for the State senate, but I was elected over two opponents. I was advised by many not to run for Congress in 1946 because I was what they termed too young, but still the people elected me to the House of Representatives.

Let us not be discouraged by the cynics and those who would have us wait while America may be passing through its hour of greatest danger. Our country needs us today. Tomorrow may be too late. The past generation has failed to give us, the youth of today, the peace that they promised, the security that was to be ours. Let us not make the same mistake and pass on to the next generation a world of chaos, of war, of fear, and of apprehension. We must act now, before it

is too late, to save our country in this hour of crisis.

A story is told of Napoleon Bonaparte when he was being defeated by the Austrians at the Battle of Austerlitz. He had done his best and defeat was staring him in the face. As his veterans fell back in disorder, he rode up to a little fourteen-year-old drummer boy, and the great general said, "Son, beat a retreat." The little boy looked up at his great commander and said, "Sir, I don't know how. You never taught me how to beat a retreat. But, sir, I can beat a charge on this drum that will wake the dead on this battlefield." Napoleon thought for a moment and then said, "Beat it then." The old guard, seeing the courage of this little boy and hearing his stirring notes on the drum, rallied and won for Bonaparte the greatest victory in French history.

The great minds of America may fail to solve the present-day problems. Just remember the great general Bonaparte and all of his commanders had given up that day in the Battle of Austerlitz, only to see defeat turned into a great victory by a fourteen-year-old lad. The youth of America today, like the little drummer boy, might save this country after our leaders have done their utmost.

I wish you great success in the years ahead. May you serve your community, your State and your Nation as well as yourselves and your families. God bless you, each of you.

Stones for Bread?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, in the course of the investigation of the use of chemicals in food products, carried on by a select committee authorized by this and the previous Congress, I have read, or heard, as chairman, the testimony of many nationally known experts on nutrition. Many of the scientists who testified before the select committee have devoted their lives to finding new methods of preserving the natural values and purity of food. Some of these scientists, experts on nutrition, have developed recipes for baking pure, wholesome bread filled with natural ingredients and free of chemical additives.

In support of this expert testimony I was gratified to note an article on the merits of pure bread ingredients written by Julie Bedier, in *Commonweal* of April 27. The author, while not a professional nutritionist, bears out the statements made before the select committee by scientists of wide repute.

I therefore include this article as part of my remarks.

STONES FOR BREAD

(By Julie Bedier)

When I was a little girl, hearing a story about someone who had lived on bread and water, I decided to try it. I took a bowl of clear cold water, broke up bits of bread in it, and did my best to down the mess. Resolution: no more bread and water. However, saints in their hermit cells and prisoners in their dungeons have lived, sometimes for years, on bread and water. Not only that,

but rigorous fasting was widely and successfully practiced during Lent, in ancient and medieval times.

Lent is still supposed to be a time of fasting, but how many are able to keep it? In my home parish, I remember, there was an old woman, a seamstress, who was said to be a saint; she kept the "black fast" all through Lent. Nobody else that I knew kept it. Workingmen and their families were excused, and most people were in that class. People with desk jobs could not fast, because they grew faint and suffered headaches. The teaching Sisters could not fast while at the same time keeping up classroom work and discipline. Some of the clergy may have fasted; certainly some were too sickly and overworked to do so. And so, who kept the Lenten fast? Only old Mrs. O'Reardon.

After I grew up and spent some years in China as a missionary nun, I began to think the Lenten regulations for China were more sensible than ours. In that country there are only eight fast days in the year—the Fridays of Lent and Christmas Eve. Eight fast days, and every Catholic keeps them. Even the poor coolies pulling rickshaws for a living kept the fast, and kept it more rigorously than we Sisters did. The Chinese Catholics ate nothing at all until noon, whereas we took the usual piece of bread and coffee at breakfast time; the Chinese were able to outdo us, somewhat to our humiliation.

Francis Thompson, in his essay *Health and Holiness*, speaks of the exuberant vitality of his hardy ancestors, compared with the "existing valetudinarianism of our oversoft bodies," of the medieval men clad in iron mail, who fought through the Crusades in the torrid lands of the east, while modern soldiers in khaki fall out by the hundreds during mere maneuvers on an English down.

In this connection it seems apropos to mention the experiences of our soldiers in Korea, brave and hardy youngsters, but needing rest and hot chow at regular intervals, and their own wonder at the Red Chinese, who can fight all day and all night, and all the next day, without rest, while using for food only a few cold cornmeal cakes or millet dumplings which each man carries with him. Here the less modernized Chinese might be compared to Thompson's medieval Crusader. It never occurred to Francis Thompson, nor does it occur to many of us, to lay the blame for our modern lack of stamina where it belongs. Weakness of will? Of piety? Not at all. The faintness, the dizziness, the failure of the body, are not imaginary; they are real and have a real cause. The experiments of a few scientists and investigators, independent and widely scattered, give the clue to those who care enough to think it through.

Man, while being practically omnivorous, is largely a grain-eating creature. Down through the ages bread, or its equivalent, has been his staff of life. Nations have grown great and strong where wheat prospered. "Give us . . . our daily bread" meant just that. However, the bread of ancient and medieval peoples had no relation to the modern bakers' bread which is given us today. I have eaten the "black bread" of the Russian peasant, and it is a meal in itself; dark brown, solid and heavy, "chewy" and moist, and utterly delicious. You can feel and taste its substantial goodness with each bite. After that try a slice of modern white bread, and you might as well be chewing on a nice tender paper towel. Bread and water—peasants' black bread and water—could indeed sustain life. I should hate to try living on white bread and water for any length of time.

Our Food and Drug Administration has recently ordered bakers to stop using chemical "extenders" and "emulsifiers" which take the place of the milk and butter formerly

used in home-made bread. However, the inedible trash added to the flour in bakeries does not make all the difference. It is the flour itself that is devitalized and anemic. Much of our wheat is grown on soil lacking in essential minerals. Year after year, crops are taken off the soil and nothing put back. Nature demands a return of services, and when she is flouted, she cannot be blarneyed or propagandized; she gives what she gets. She is most just. Crops grown on deficient soil are deficient crops.

Next, the wheat, formerly cut and allowed to dry in shocks before threshing, is now combined in the field before the grain is well ripened. Stored at once in huge elevators, it has to be protected from weevils by having cyanide gas blown through it. Then it is milled at a high rate of speed, at high temperatures in our modern mills; the old-fashioned millstones, grinding slowly, did not destroy vitamins so efficiently. The flour is then refined, separated from the bran which contains minerals and vitamins so necessary to life. After refining, it is usually bleached with chemicals, some of which have been proved very injurious to health. Then it may be stored for long periods before it is used for bread.

Whole wheat flour is difficult to keep for any length of time, as weevils breed in it and it is soon discovered to be buggy. The refined white flour does not get buggy, and for a good reason. The insects know which flour is fit to eat; and with their God-given instinct they choose the foods which will sustain life and avoid the worthless ones.

We moderns are so convinced that our diet is the most scientific, our standard of living the highest in history, that it comes as a shock when we are told of the great numbers of young men found to be unfit for our Armed Forces on account of poor health. It is true we eat a great deal of meat, sweets, and out-of-season vegetables and fruits, these latter often of poor quality from long storage and shipping after being half ripe when picked.

If we did not have these additions to our diet, we should be badly off indeed, as our bread surely would not sustain life by itself. No amount of our added foodstuffs, however, can take the place of whole grains. Man needs grain in his diet, and he needs plenty of it. The shame is that there is a kind of conspiracy to prevent his getting it. There is "whole wheat" bread on the market, to be sure, but this whole wheat is only a trade name, having no foundation in fact. There are people who, refusing to be pushed around, have developed a mighty wrath and have taken to grinding their own wheat in small kitchen grinders and baking their bread from the grain, fresh ground. These people are few, but the number is growing. Their enthusiastic testimonials and their relish for the plain brown, fragrant wheaten loaf are eloquent.

In the Himalaya Mountains in India, near the border of the U. S. S. R., is the land of Hunza, shut in by towering mountain peaks. It is a dry country, where farming is done by means of irrigation. Farm land is scarce and is made up of little patches on stairstep terraces carved in the mountain sides. Crops are, therefore, scanty, and winters are cold and bleak. The Hunzukuts who live there are a hardy race of mountaineers, light of skin and with handsome features and figures. They are intelligent, cheerful, lovers of dancing, at which they are skilled, and expert polo players. They are peasants and herders, and few of them can read or write.

Hunzukuts sometimes die by falling down mountain peaks, but seldom from disease. They have no doctors or hospitals, take no medicines and seem to need none. Colds, appendicitis, stomach troubles, heart disease, cancer, and "nerves" are unknown

among them. They live to be from 85 to 100 or more, and pass away from old age. The only ailment they seem to know is some eye troubles, caused by smoke from the fires in their little houses. Fuel is scarce; they are like the American Indian, who said, "White man build big fire, sit 'way back; Indian build little fire, sit close to."

Hunzukuts often walk 60 miles at a time, up and down steep mountains, carrying heavy loads. A Hunzukut of 70 plays a fast game of polo, on foot, and is not winded. In the evening, after a day of burden-bearing over mountain trails, perhaps in drenching rain, Hunzukuts often have a gay dance around a fire. One Hunzukut messenger made a 200-mile journey over the mountains, on foot. He returned in 7 days, quite untired and fresh. The people of Hunza are very cleanly. It is a custom among them, in winter, to make two large holes in the ice of a pond, then dive in at one end and come out of the other, over and over again, quite as cheerfully as a polar bear.

Why are the Hunzukuts so hardy? A group of scientists made a study of them and their habits, and their findings are interesting, to say the least.

The Hunzukuts live entirely upon natural food which they raise themselves. No canned, frozen, or preserved food processed in factories ever reaches them. Their bread is made from whole wheat, grown at home, freshly ground in the home and baked there. They use no sugar, no candy, no ice cream or bottled drinks (which contain much sugar). Their food is made up of wheat, barley, millet, and buckwheat, of vegetables, nuts, and butter, of apricots, mulberries, apples, grapes, peaches, and pears, together with a small amount of meat from their herds of goats. They do not peel their vegetables, but eat skin and all. They raise all this food on soil which they keep fertile by nature's means; that is, they put all vegetable, animal and human wastes back into the soil after composting them.

The scientists decided that the food habits of the Hunzukuts might be the cause of their fine health and good dispositions, because other people living nearby in the same climate, but having different food habits, were both unhealthy and quarrelsome. However, the inquirers wanted to be sure. They then experimented with three groups of rats, which were kept in cages in a laboratory. One group was fed upon the food of the Hunzukuts. Another group was fed white rice, vegetables, and spices—the diet of the poor of southern India. The third group got white bread made from factory-milled flour, margarine, tea with sugar, a little boiled milk, cabbage, potatoes, canned meat and jaw. This was the "white man's diet"—the food of many working people of England and of some in America.

The diets were kept up for several years, and the observers were startled by what they saw. The "Hunzukut" rats had no illness, no deaths, were fine, sleek, handsome, tame animals with good tempers. The "Southern Indian" rats were diseased in nose, ears, heart, stomach, lungs—in every organ. They had poor teeth, developed boils, lost their hair, and were quarrelsome and wild. The "English" rats also had most of the same diseases. They were nervous, often tried to bite their caretaker, and killed and ate the weaker rats among them.

While considering the advantages of grain in diet, the following experience of a group of Maryknoll Sisters seems particularly significant. Throughout the war years these women, five in number, lived in a large city of Manchuria where they conducted a school. First under the Japanese, and later under the Russian occupation, food grew daily scarcer. When ordinary meat, fruit and vegetables, dairy products, and canned goods became unobtainable, the Sisters, with considerable

good sense, bethought themselves of the food of the Chinese poor—kaoliang, the seed grain of the Manchurian sorghum plant. This grain is widely raised by the Chinese in the north, as it will thrive where rice cannot be grown. Farmers, laborers, and beasts of burden eat it.

Kaoliang is simply threshed and winnowed, then boiled as a kind of porridge, and eaten with a sauce or vegetables. The Sisters bought bags of this sorghum grain and began to use it in the traditional way. As they took in numbers of destitute refugees, they fed the refugees on the same fare as they themselves used. For 2½ years they lived on kaoliang mush, sometimes adding a little seaweed, some grass or a few leaves of cabbage, and rarely a bit of fish for flavoring. The amount of these other items was negligible. Kaoliang was their "daily bread" indeed. The five Sisters found that their health was excellent, in spite of having to live through two Manchurian winters of sub-zero weather with practically no heat in the house. They contracted no illness of any kind during this period. Their eyes, teeth, nerves and general health improved under the diet.

In time, even the kaoliang became scarce and hard to buy. As the number of refugees increased, the Sisters felt considerable weakness and hunger, since the portions of sorghum porridge had to be much watered to go round for all. The unpalatability, too, was hard to bear, as the boiled grain with salt and grass or seaweed would hardly be listed among the hors d'oeuvres at a banquet.

Each missionary had a hard day's work to do, teaching in the classroom, and a mile to walk each way to and from school. Constant fear of raids and brigandage also kept them on edge. In spite of all they came out of the ordeal in good health and spirits. The Sisters learned by experience why the Chinese coolie has such strength and vigor, comparatively speaking in spite of his poverty, lack of sanitation and medical attention, and his crowded living conditions. They had done well on the coolie's daily kaoliang. The wholesome vitamin-rich grain had been practically their only food for 2½ years.

What does all this prove? It seems at least to point the finger at a crime being committed against us all, against our health, our vitality, and against our children. No wonder we cannot keep the Lenten fasts, if the food we do eat has lost its power to sustain health. It is a situation that cries to heaven. However, like the weather, nobody does anything about it.

Katyn Massacre Should Be Investigated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on April 13, 1943, the Berlin radio announced that German authorities had discovered mass graves of thousands of Polish Army officers in the Katyn Forest near Smolensk, U. S. S. R. The Germans placed the blame for this massacre on the Soviets. The Soviets immediately countered by charging the massacre to the Nazis. On April 17 the Polish Government in exile requested the International Red Cross to investigate the

true situation. The Red Cross agreed to investigate the massacre if requested by all parties concerned. The Soviet Government refused to give its consent to the investigation and on April 26, 1943, broke off diplomatic relations with the Polish Government.

The German Government then set up an investigating committee composed of representatives of 12 countries. This committee made a report on April 30, 1943, which was printed in *Amtliches Material zum Massenmord von Katyn*, Berlin, 1943, pages 114-118. A translation of this was admitted as Exhibit Goering No. 61 in the Nuremberg trials.

Lt. Col. John Van Vliet, Jr., and Capt. Donald B. Stewart, American prisoners of war in Germany in 1943, were taken to Katyn Forest to investigate for themselves the circumstances of the massacre. Colonel Van Vliet, on May 22, 1945, made a report of this investigation to Maj. Gen. Clayton Bissell. Only one copy of such report was made and it was marked top secret and filed by General Bissell. Apparently this report has never again been seen. It is now lost and no one in the Department of Defense or the State Department knows where Colonel Van Vliet's report is.

In January 1944 the area around Smolensk was recaptured by the Russians. Thereafter, on January 24, 1944, a Soviet-sponsored investigation made its report on the Katyn massacre. According to this report the Germans were responsible for the massacre of the Polish officers. But all of these investigators were Soviets. They were V. I. Prozorovsky, chief medical expert of the People's Commissariat of Public Health of the U. S. S. R.; V. M. Smolyaninov, professor of medical jurisprudence at the Second Moscow State Medical Institute; D. N. Vyropayev, medical sciences professor; P. S. Semenovskiy, senior research worker, State Institute of Medical Jurisprudence of the People's Commissariat of Public Health of the U. S. S. R.; M. D. Shvaikova, senior research worker, State Institute of Medical Jurisprudence of the People's Commissariat of Public Health of the U. S. S. R.

The indictment of the major war criminals before the international military tribunal at Nuremberg contained, among others, the following definite charges against the Nazi leaders:

Murder and ill treatment of prisoners of war and other members of the armed forces of the countries with whom Germany was at war and of persons on the high seas * * *. In September 1941, 11,000 Polish officers who were prisoners of war were killed in the Katyn Forest near Smolensk. (Vol. 1, p. 52-54.)

Evidence relating to this charge was admitted by the tribunal on February 14, 1946—volume XV, page 289 and following pages.

Nonetheless, the final judgment of the Nuremberg tribunal makes no mention of this charge. It neither acquits the Nazis of this charge nor does it find them guilty of it. And there is no record in the Nuremberg hearings of any decision or ruling which caused the prosecution to drop this count.

In view of these facts I have related, I believe it is highly important that a

special House committee be created to investigate the true facts of the Katyn massacre.

The conflicting reports of the Nazis and the Communists, the mysterious disappearance of the Van Vliet Report, the failure of the Nuremberg tribunal to make any decision on the charges relating to the massacre all demand that this Congress make a serious effort to finally determine the responsibility for this horrendous massacre.

I include herewith exhibit Goering No. 61 of the trial of the major war criminals before the international military tribunal, Nuremberg, Germany, November 14, 1945–October 1, 1946, which exhibit is a translation of the report of the International Medical Commission appointed by the German authorities in April 1943:

EXHIBIT GOERING No. 61

[Excerpt from the official documents concerning the mass murder at Katyn, compiled by order of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs based on documentary material of evidence compiled and published by the German Information Office (Berlin 1943) (pp. 114-118)]

17. PROTOCOL OF THE INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL COMMISSION AT THE TIME AT SMOLENSK, APRIL 30, 1943

Protocol drawn up on the occasion of the examination of mass-graves of Polish officers in the forest of Katyn near Smolensk, subject to a thorough scientific examination which was performed by a commission of leading representatives of European colleges for the study of law, medicine, and criminology and other prominent medical college teachers.

The commission was composed of the following persons:

1. Belgium: Dr. Speleers, ord. professor of ophthalmology at the University of Ghent.
2. Bulgaria: Dr. Markov, ord. professor of forensic medicine and criminology at the University of Sofia.
3. Denmark: Dr. Tramsen, demonstrator at the Institute of Forensic Medicine of Copenhagen.
4. Finland: Dr. Saxén, ord. professor of pathological anatomy at the University of Helsinki.
5. Italy: Dr. Palmieri, ord. professor of forensic medicine and criminology at the University of Naples.
6. Croatia: Dr. Miloslavich, ord. professor of forensic medicine and criminology at the University of Agram.
7. Netherlands: Dr. de Burlet, ord. professor of anatomy at the University of Groningen.
8. Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia: Dr. Hajek, ord. professor of forensic medicine and criminology in Prague.
9. Rumania: Dr. Birkle, court doctor attached to the Rumanian Ministry of Justice and first assistant at the Institute of Forensic Medicine and Criminology in Rumania.
10. Switzerland: Dr. Naville, ord. professor of forensic medicine at the University of Geneva.
11. Slovakia: Dr. Subik, ord. professor of pathological anatomy at the University of Pressburg, chief of the state health service in Slovakia.
12. Hungary: Dr. Orsos, ord. professor of forensic medicine and criminology at the university in Budapest.

During the work and conferences of the delegation the following were present:

1. Dr. Buntz, ord. professor of forensic medicine and criminology at the university of Breslau, instructed by the German High Command to direct excavations in Katyn.
2. Medical-Inspector Dr. Costedoat, who was commissioned by the head of the French

Government to be present at the work of the commission.

The discovery of mass graves of Polish officers in the forest of Katyn, near Smolensk, which was brought recently to the notice of the German authorities, has caused the head of the Reich health service, Dr. Conti, to invite the above-mentioned specialists from various European countries to be present at the inspection of the place discovered at Katyn in order to clear up this unique case.

The commission personally invited some native Russian witnesses, who, amongst other things, confirmed that in March and April 1940 large rail transports with Polish officers were unloaded almost daily at Gnesdowa station near Katyn, then transported in prisoners' lorries to the forest Katyn and were never seen again; they further noted the previous findings and identification, and inspected the evidence discovered. According thereto 982 bodies were exhumed up to April 30, 1943. About 70 percent of them were immediately identified, whilst the papers of the others could only be utilized for identification after careful preparation. The bodies exhumed before the arrival of the commission were all inspected, and an inquest held on a considerable number by Professor Buntz and his collaborators. Up to today 7 mass graves were opened, the largest of which contained approximately 2,500 bodies of officers.

Inquests on nine bodies were held personally by the members of the commission, and on numerous specially chosen cases a post mortem was held.

FORENSIC-MEDICAL RESULTS OF THE INSPECTIONS AND EXAMINATIONS CARRIED OUT

A shot in the head was without exception observed as cause of death of all bodies so far exhumed. It was throughout a matter of shots in the head and, predominantly, of a single shot in the neck, in rare cases of double shots in the neck, in a single case of a treble shot in the neck. The bullet hole is usually low in the neck and leads into the bone of the occiput near to the occiput hole, whilst the spot where the bullet left as a rule lies in the vicinity of the beginning of the hair growth, in very rare cases deeper. It is throughout a matter of pistol shots of less than 8 mm. caliber.

From the fracture of the skull and the finding of powder smoke on the occiput bone near the spot where the bullet entered, and also from the similar localization of the points where the bullet entered, it is to be concluded that it was a point-blank shot or from closest range, especially as the direction of the fire-channel is also similar with only a few slight deviations. From the striking similarity of the injuries and the localization of the points where the bullet entered in a very limited region of the occiput, skilled hand may be supposed. On numerous bodies similar handcuffing and in some cases also four-edged bayonet thrusts in clothing and skin could be established. The carrying out of the chaining corresponds to the chaining established on bodies of Russian civilians who were also exhumed in the forest of Katyn and were buried much earlier. It was moreover established also that the shots in the neck on the bodies of Russian civilians had been similarly accurately aimed.

From the establishment of an oblique blow on the head of a Polish officer, killed by a shot in the neck, which had only crashed in the exterior bone, it is to be concluded that another officer was first killed by this bullet and that, on leaving his body, it pierced the body already shot and lying in the trench. From this fact it may be presumed that shootings were obviously carried out in the trenches in order to avoid transport to the place of burial.

The mass graves are in a forest glade. They are completely leveled and planted with young pine trees. From the personal observation of the members of the commis-

sion and the statement of the forestry official von Herff, called in as expert, it is a question of pine trees of at least 5 years old, poorly developed in the shade of big trees, which were planted on this spot 3 years ago.

The mass graves are arranged in the form of steps in the hilly territory, which consists of pure sand. They reach partly down to the surface water.

The corpses are lying almost exclusively on their faces, tightly packed next to one other and above one other; lying orderly along the side but more promiscuously in the middle. The legs are almost always stretched out. Quite obviously they were laid away in a systematic manner. According to the unanimous observation of the Commission the exhumed bodies show on the whole and individually, especially as regards buttons, insignia of military rank, decorations, shape of boots, ink markings in underwear—the unmistakable characteristics of Polish uniforms. We find here winter clothing; frequently there are found furs, leather jackets, knitted vests, officers' boots, officers' caps typically Polish. Only few of the corpses do not seem to be those of officers; in one case it was a priest. The measurement of the clothing correspond to the measurements of the individual bodies. The underwear is properly buttoned; suspenders and belts are in the proper place. This shows the men wore their uniforms until they died when they were buried with them without ceremony and covered with earth.

None of the corpses have watches and rings although notes made in several diaries until the very last days and with exact statement of the time of entry indicate that there must have been watches. Objects of rare metal were discovered only on a very few corpses and in very hidden places. On the other hand the set of teeth of many of the corpses still included gold teeth. Polish bank notes were found in considerable quantities; there were cigarette and match boxes on the corpses, in several instances also tobacco boxes and cigarette holders engraved "Kocielsk" (the name of the last Soviet prisoner-of-war camp of the murdered persons). The documents found on the corpses (diaries, correspondence, newspapers) dated from the time of fall of 1939 to March and April 1940. The last date so far established is that of a Russian newspaper of April 22, 1940.

The degrees and manifestations of decomposition due to storing of the corpses in the pit and stocking them closely together vary. In addition to mummification on the surface and along the edges of the mass of corpses, moist maceration is evident in the medium portions of the piles of corpses. The sticking together and riveting together of adjacent corpses through the solidifying fluids of the corpses, especially the deformations brought about by pressure, point definitely to the fact that the positions are the original ones.

There is a complete absence of insects or insect residues on the corpses possibly dating from the time the corpses were buried. From this it follows that burying and covering took place during a cold season of the year when there were no insects.

A large number of skulls were examined for changes which, according to the experiences of Professor Orsos, are of extreme importance for the determination of the time of death. We have here an incrustation of tufaceous limestone of several layers on the surface of the brain pulp already homogenized in loamlike fashion. These manifestations do not exist for corpses which have been in the grave less than 3 years. That was the condition, among others, which was particularly pronounced for the skull of corpse No. 523 reddened on the surface of a huge mass burial pit.

SYNOPSIS OF SURVEY

The commission examined in the woods of Katyn mass pits of Polish officers of which so far seven were opened. From these, 932 corpses were so far recovered; postmortem examination was made on part of them, about 70 percent being identified.

All the corpses gave proof of shots in the neck as the exclusive cause of death. From statements of witnesses, from letters found on the corpses, from diaries, newspaper, etc., it is evident that shooting took place in the months of March and April 1940. This corroborates perfectly with the findings made on the mass graves and on the individual corpses of the Polish officers and as described in the minutes.

Dr. Speleers (Dr. Speleers); Arno Saxén (Dr. Saxén); M. de Burlet (Dr. De Burlet); Naville (Dr. Naville); Markov (Dr. Markov); V. M. Palmieri (Dr. Palmieri); Hajek (Dr. Hajek); Subik (Dr. Subik); Dr. Tramsen (Dr. Tramsen); Dr. E. L. Miloslavich (Dr. Miloslavich); Dr. Birkle (Dr. Birkle); Dr. F. Orsos (Dr. Orsos).

Mr. Justice Douglas Puts His Foot in It Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Baltimore Sun, Baltimore, Md., of September 2, 1951:

MR. JUSTICE DOUGLAS PUTS HIS FOOT IN IT AGAIN

The United States is engaged in a bloody and costly war with Red China. The Chinese sneaked into Korea by a subterfuge to which they still cling. They have been denounced by the United Nations as aggressors. At this moment they are lying and cheating at Kaesong, up to heaven knows what deviltry.

This is the government which the Honorable William O. Douglas now proposes that our Government should recognize. Senator CONNALLY, a man with a sense of national responsibility, did exactly right when he slapped down Mr. Douglas with the comment that he should stop making fool statements.

The slap, unfortunately, comes too late. The fool statement has been made. There is a Douglas claque in this country. To the members of this claque, Mr. Douglas is the fount of all wisdom. To some extent at least he still shines in the fading glory of the old Roosevelt brain trust. This means that to his claque he is not properly bound by the restrictions which confine other judges. The members of the claque still hope that someday, somehow, Mr. Douglas will be President of the United States and that they will then be rewarded for their unctuous support.

The claque will not allow Mr. Douglas' foolish statement to be forgotten. Nor will the Russians. To the latter it is a God-given opportunity to play upon the idea that the people of the United States are far from unified in their present struggle with Red China. We may be sure that Mr. Gromyko, already well prepared with ammunition to gum the works at the San Francisco meeting, will add Mr. Douglas' mischief-making

statement to his store of monkey-wrenches.

And this man, so indifferent to the delicacies and dangers of the present international situation, is a member of the United States Supreme Court, theoretically the most aloof and self-disciplined group in the country.

Small Business Concerns Being Taxed Out of Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from a relatively small business concern, which says that the Federal Government is taxing small business concerns out of business.

It will be noted that in this letter my constituent shows concretely how the excess-profits tax law catches a new and expanding small enterprise, with no base earnings period and low investment, and militates against their further enlargement and extension of activities, which practically results in taxing such a concern beyond the point it can survive and continue in business.

In this letter it is also vividly shown that the present tax laws are tending to make the large business concerns larger, and to force the smaller ones out of business and prevent risk and venture capital entering into new business engagements. The result, as well stated, is "that the [present] tax laws are causing the very thing which the Justice Department has been fighting—monopoly."

The letter to which I have reference follows:

As we have always understood it, it has been one of the aims of the Democratic Party to care for the little-business man or for the man with incentive to start in business. We fall in that category and the Federal Government is caring for us by coming close to taxing us out of business. No longer do we worry about our competitors but we do have to worry and scheme to keep our present Federal Government from causing liquidation.

To give you a typical example of the effect of our present excess-profits tax on the small and new businessman let us present our experience:

This company started in business in the fall of 1948 in the Rocky Mountain area. For 2 years we struggled against big established competitors and slack-work periods, just managing to survive. In the spring of 1950 (before Korea), due to a reputation we had gained for efficient operations, we were able to secure a series of contracts with a major company giving us steady work. In fact a second rig was requested and was purchased for their operations, requiring an investment of \$200,000. As is customary, a down payment was made and balance is being paid at the rate of \$5,000 per month for 24 months.

Then comes the excess-profits tax law catching us with no base-earning period and low investment because we are a new expanding company.

For our last fiscal year we are paying \$52,300 in Federal taxes, leaving us \$38,300 net profit to meet our rig payment obligations of \$60,000 per year. Due to the hazardous nature of our operations we should be increasing our working capital for insurance against future losses. Actually, with best efficiency, working capital is decreasing due to overtaxation.

Some departments of the Federal Government are calling for expanded oil production with resulting expanded drilling programs. We could purchase and put to work several more rigs, but under the tax laws we couldn't pay for them, and if we could the profit incentive is not worth the risk and work involved.

If we are the only company or business caught in this situation you could forget it. But inquiries teach us that we are only one of thousands. Under the present tax laws which you gentlemen have passed, a new expanding company has odds against it surviving. The end results can only be that a few large old established businesses will control all business, and that there will be no incentive for new businesses to start. You gentlemen know the evils of such an event. It appears to us that the tax laws are causing the very thing which the Justice Department has been fighting—monopoly.

Gentlemen, the situation is a mess and it is hoped that from the above you can get some idea of why we do not appreciate the Government's present help to the little businessmen.

Industry Dispersal Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the President:

I would like to clear up a lot of misinformation about the Government's very important industry dispersal program.

The program has been misrepresented by critics who have mistaken it for something else. The opponents are criticizing supposed efforts to move industry and labor from one part of the country to another. That is not the Government's plan. Our program has no relationship to the Rains amendment, which intended widespread dispersal of plants.

Our program, which was carefully described by the National Security Resources Board recently, does not tell any industry or individual where to locate. It does not propose moving of existing plants, wherever they may be. It merely encourages the spacing of new defense and defense-supporting industries a few miles apart.

Under this program, defense plants and basic industries can, if they wish, find dispersed sites around such existing industrial centers as Detroit, New York, Pittsburgh, or San Francisco. The program merely suggests that in building a new plant in such areas, the site of the new plant should be located a few miles away from other defense plants in the same locality. On the other hand, the program does nothing to interfere with the normal efforts of nonindustrial areas to attract businesses.

This is a common-sense program which serves the national security in the atomic age and is consistent with the American

system of competitive free enterprise. I urge every member of the Congress, every industrialist and every labor representative to take the time to read this program. They will find it economically sound and adaptable to any State or industrial area.

Eight Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in order to keep the RECORD straight and to preserve the expressed views of others it appears to me highly desirable that outside opinions based on the evidence be submitted for consideration. I therefore submit an editorial from the Washington Post of August 23 titled "Eight Republicans" which evaluates and points up some of the gross exaggerations and misstatements contained in the purely partisan report on the MacArthur hearings. Fortunately it is not the official report of the committees which jointly conducted the proceedings and to all appearances it does not even reflect the opinion of all the Republican members of the joint committee but rather a group largely known for their pro-Chiang Kai-shek views and favoritism. The document I hope will not be printed at public expense. I consider the report a slanted partisan expression political in nature and purpose and nothing more.

I believe we have already squandered billions in military supplies and cash to aid China against communism and it has been about as effective as pouring sand into a rat hole and less desirable. The Chiang forces in the first place never had the stomach for combat because they had nothing to fight for that held promise for the future except the perpetuation of the Kung-Soong-Chiang "plunderbund." Vile communism on one hand, corruption, starvation, and misery on the other, with no choice in between. So they swapped their American equipment to the Communists for the chance to surrender and today we are recapturing our own equipment in Korea as our boys lay down their lives to do it. The United States Government gave Nationalist China \$200,000,000 in gold to stabilize its currency system and thus to halt the deadly inflation which in addition to war ravaged the country. This gold, many tons of it, was shipped to Chiang from Fort Knox; whatever became of it no one knows. The gold disappeared in another rat hole operation. Like the abject licking of Madame Chiang's hands it does not appeal to me as worthy of repetition. We were burnt severely in China so many times that we ought to be able to follow the right course without even so much as using our brains, sheer instinct should guide us henceforth. No truck with communism under any circumstances or nationalism of the kind we know in China today

unless it reforms or is replaced with a real democratic movement which we in America can embrace and support. At the present time there is no assurance of success. Chiang, Kung, Soong, et al. have not changed.

The editorial follows:

EIGHT REPUBLICANS

A few of the outstanding points in the eight-man Republican document on the MacArthur hearings which call for correction are:

1. That the failure of the United States promptly to deliver arms and munitions to Chiang Kai-shek was responsible for his downfall. This is a travesty of the history which is now part of the record. Much American material was left to pile up in Shanghai, and much of the remainder was bartered to the Communists in return for safe surrender. In other words, Chiang became the supply sergeant for the Communists, as he was called in China. Even General Wedemeyer said the Communists could have been stopped at the Yangtze with broomsticks if there had been any will-to-fight on the part of Chiang's Nationalists.

The point is extremely important in connection with future policy. On analogy the fresh supplies that are being sent to Chiang Kai-shek are likely as not to have much the same fate as the old supplies. This would be inevitable if there were an invasion of the mainland. And that is what Chiang wants—as a Chiang-American operation. Our policy does not yet envisage this, yet—again on analogy—the possibility exists of such a development in our Formosa policy. Policy on Formosa started out as neutralization and shaded quickly into defense, and, before we know it, the defense policy may shade into support of a Chiang landing.

It will be a sad day when our country helps peoples or governments who, as has been proved by Chiang's government cannot or will not help themselves. The United States will wind up with "old men of the sea" on its back crushing the life out of its taxpayers.

2. That there is authoritative evidence of Russian domination of Communist China as far back as 1945.

Nothing of the sort. Everything that Gen. Patrick Hurley said contradicted this thesis. The "authoritative" evidence all jibes with Col. Robert R. McCormick's testimony on his visit to China in 1947. The rebellion against Chiang Kai-shek, he said, "is falsely called a Communist insurrection. Although Communist backed, it is still a bona fide insurrection against a government which is little more than an agency of the Soong family."

Nobody can be positive about the present tie between Moscow and Peking, but a tenable theory on the part of the officials in close touch with the negotiations at Kaesong is that there are the beginnings of a rift. General Ridgway furthermore has gone so far as to say, in a talk with Bert Andrews of the New York Herald Tribune, that our national destiny depends upon our driving a wedge between Peking and Moscow. It would be the height of folly on the part of our policy makers, at any rate, to go on the assumption that Moscow and Peking will always be one and indivisible.

3. Any settlement "south of the Yalu" would constitute a Communist victory.

Nonsense! The purpose of the military action taken under the aegis of the United Nations was to defeat aggression—to push the aggressor back where he came from. When that is accomplished, and a satisfactory agreement on such a basis achieved, the aims of the U. N. action will have been accomplished. General Ridgway has said that that would be "a tremendous victory," and those who are not suffering from a partisan myopia will agree with him.

The reverse side of this eight-man comment—namely, that “victory” is the end of this or any other war action—is equally fallacious. By this is meant that only unconditional surrender can mark the end of hostilities. Battles are fought to victory, but a war should be fought to a settlement if we are going to have a world fit to live in. It was the cardinal mistake in the First and Second World Wars that we forgot this golden rule. Under such a contrary policy as the GOP members advocate, the world would be condemned to perpetual warfare.

Stump Speaking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of September 8, 1951:

STUMP SPEAKING

The highly charged atmosphere that seems to discharge lightning in the vicinity of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur every time he adds a speech to his public record might be clarified somewhat and the thunderheads dispersed if the general would come right out and announce that he is a candidate for President.

Virtually every utterance made by General MacArthur since he came back from Japan has been that of a man making it plain in stentorian tones that he is available for the nomination and would accept it if offered, despite his disclaimers of political ambition.

The American people know that he is against President Truman and against some of his wartime superiors and colleagues in the Army. He has also made it plain that he considers his administration of conquered Japan the crowning triumph of his admittedly distinguished career, and the American people are inclined to agree with him. But he doesn't say who or what he is for now, today, what he feels may be his due reward for his service, or what he hopes to accomplish in the future. Nor does he throw his strength to any particular Republican candidate. Plainly he is a candidate for President if the Republican Party will give him the nomination.

His Cleveland speech, for example, asserting that the Nation is drifting toward a totalitarian leadership was not a sound analysis of the situation, but it was first-rate political utterance at this juncture. The speech did a great disservice to the American people by employing the technique of spreading fear at a time when a sound, courageous and constructive foreign policy is emerging from the confusion of America's postwar years.

The speech touched all the antiadministration bases, but failed to make generous admission of the truly unselfish sacrifices the American people have made to assist in rebuilding a war-shattered world. His criticism of the United Nations might be valid had he offered something more than an outline of the weaknesses of U. N., which all the world knows. He cited no alternatives.

It might be profitable for General MacArthur, who is so strongly critical of the failure of the United States to seize world leadership, to study another period in world history when Russia had confused and upset the balances of power in Europe—the time of the Congress of Vienna when Britain, which

had laid out treasure for 20 years to defeat Napoleon, was laggard in seizing leadership.

General MacArthur has served his country well, and there isn't the slightest question of his skill as an administrator or commander. Japan is ample proof of his sagacity. Yet, General MacArthur tarnishes his own luster by utterances which have a baldly partisan political complexion.

As a military man he has spent his life in the exercise of command in a totalitarian regime—the Army—where the requirements of discipline must always be totalitarian in character, where regimentation is a natural state and all commands filter down from above. General MacArthur must know that the American people are still participating in politics, issuing the orders at the polls and choosing those to whom they entrust the operation of the Government.

The fiction that he is talking as a soldier and patriot, the private citizen, is unworthy of one who has carved his name so high on monuments that record America's greatness. He should announce his candidacy, or indicate who he supports, for he is stump speaking.

Gen. Charles P. Summerall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, in view of the fact that we have passed the largest appropriation bill on record for the armed services, I think it is entirely appropriate, that I call attention to an article published in the Charleston News and Courier with regard to former Chief of Staff of the Army, Gen. Charles P. Summerall. He has just completed 20 years of work at The Citadel, an institution in my State. He is now 84 years of age.

The General, since his retirement from the Army, has rendered most valuable service in many respects to the people throughout America, particularly the Southeast. He was a former student at Porter Military Academy. He was appointed to West Point from the State of Florida, and his interest in the people of the South has never diminished.

As a graduate of West Point and former Chief of Staff of the United States Army, he has always been an advocate of strong preparedness for America, with an Army, a Navy, and an Air Force sufficient to maintain our world prestige.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMERALL TOOK OVER AS HEAD OF THE CITADEL 20 YEARS AGO

Twenty years ago today Gen. C. P. Summerall began his first year as president of The Citadel.

On September 12, 1931, at 10 a. m., The Citadel began the 1931-32 academic year with a new president.

General Summerall had ended a 4-year term as Chief of Staff of the United States Army in the fall of 1930 and in March 1931, went upon the retired list of the Army.

Following his retirement General Summerall had accepted an invitation of The

Citadel's board of visitors to become president of the military college.

The Citadel on September 12, 1931, was a far cry from what it is today. In that year there were about 500 cadets in the corps, the faculty numbered 41, of whom only 3 held the doctor of philosophy degree, major electives were offered in 8 fields of study, and there were 2 ROTC units, Infantry and Coast Artillery.

Today The Citadel expects 1,400 cadets for the year beginning September 24; there are 121 faculty members, 25 having the doctor of philosophy degree and 7 more to receive it in the near future, major work is offered in 14 fields, and there are 5 ROTC units.

Since 1931 the physical plant of "The Citadel" has been more than tripled.

New buildings which have been completed in the past 20 years include the cadet chapel, the armory, the barracks, the cadet activities building, an annex to Bond Hall, containing the library, the new dining hall, and quarters for 44 faculty families.

Although much has been accomplished in the past 20 years. The Citadel and General Summerall are looking toward the future, not the past.

Another phase of the building program, consisting of an academic building and a 16-family faculty apartment house, is nearing completion, and further development is in the planning stage.

At least 10 faculty members are on leave each year to complete additional graduate work, and the college is aiming for a larger freshman class in 1952 and an ultimate student body of 2,000.

And on General Summerall's immediate agenda is the receipt of the American Legion Distinguished Service Medal at the Legion's national convention in Miami next month.

It is awarded each year to recognize the achievements of men of heroic stature, and it comes to the general at an appropriate time, the twentieth anniversary of his becoming president of South Carolina's military college, The Citadel.

Message for Russian People Seen in United States Terms to Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the New York Herald Tribune of September 7, 1951:

MESSAGE FOR RUSSIAN PEOPLE SEEN IN UNITED STATES TERMS TO JAPAN

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, September 6.—America and the free world can be proud of the statement that a President of the United States was able to make on the occasion of the signing of a treaty of peace between the victor and the defeated.

Nowhere in the technical phrases of the treaty itself, quite naturally, are to be found the phrases of interpretation which a magnificent speech by President Truman bequeathed to all history to read. There are two sentences of that speech which tell the story of an achievement unparalleled in modern times, indeed, of a document unmatched anywhere in the treaties of peace

of the past. Those two memorable sentences read as follows:

"It (the treaty with Japan) does not contain the seeds of another war. It is a treaty of reconciliation, which looks to the future, and not the past."

AMERICA'S MORAL FORCE

To be able to make that statement persuasively, to be able to point to the deeds that actually prove its truth in the records of our Army of Occupation, to be able not only to say that there was no spirit of revenge but to be able to point to acts that corroborate it, is to express the moral force of America in the free world.

This moral force is not the attribute alone of the American Government of today. It springs from a long line of precedents expressed in public pronouncements since World War I began. It is the reflection, moreover, of the viewpoint not of just one political party but of all parties in the United States, not of just the spirit of American ideals but of the ideals that freemen hold everywhere. All this has not come to fruition heretofore in such concrete facts of international relationships as are evidenced in the treaty between the Japanese and those who fought victoriously against them.

The kind of peace outlined in the treaty with Japan is the kind that men of all religions have hoped and prayed for, and particularly the kind of peace urged for Europe, too, by President Wilson after World War I and by President Franklin D. Roosevelt after World War II. It is the kind of peace Pope Pius XII has been petitioning for in his public addresses since 1944.

President Truman in his San Francisco address to the assembled nations rightly pays tribute to the outstanding leadership of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur for the way in which the Allied occupation has been carried out. And the President also points with pride to General Ridgway as MacArthur's able successor and to the splendid work of John Foster Dulles, who worked so patiently and intelligently in negotiating the treaty itself.

Rising above party and domestic controversy, the President recognized that, in writing this speech, he was writing for future history a chapter of accomplishment which can prove an inspiration to those who will be custodians of American world policy in the years to come.

For in a sense the treaty, while not mitigating the evils of war or condoning the aggression which started it, does show that, when peoples put aside misguided leaders and take into their own hands the cause of decent international relations, they will find in the people of the United States ready and willing partners in supporting those aims.

America did not receive a single dollar of governmental indemnity out of World War I or World War II. Nor did America annex a single acre of territory from either war.

Mr. Truman's address at the San Francisco gathering of nations will be read with even more intense interest outside America than inside. It will rank as one of the great state papers of all times—not because of its simple phrases but because it recites eloquently the record of American postwar behavior and challenges the rest of the world to adopt the letter and the spirit of that behavior.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE

The implications as to the future, so far as they relate to an ultimate settlement with the people of Russia and the iron curtain countries—and, indeed, as they may relate to the Chinese people once the Korean aggression can be dealt with in similar fashion—will not, it is hoped, be lost on the people of those countries which are still in the grip of totalitarianism, even as Japan once was. Unfortunately, the Korean war has not gone to the point of defeating on

the battlefield the forces of aggression. There has been no effective contact as yet with the peoples of those countries where troops are being employed against us.

Military force must go hand in hand with moral force in making peace, and the consummation of the Japanese treaty is an excellent example of what can be done once evil governments are removed from power.

Dictatorship Under the United States Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM C. LANTAFF

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a very timely report by TIES, an organization of business and professional men and women in my district. The name is made of the initial letters of the words "technicians, industrialists, economists, scientists." The subject of the report is Puerto Rico, and the facts set forth were obtained through a personal investigation by a member of that organization. I believe that all Members of this body will be interested in this most intelligent analysis.

The report follows:

DICTATORSHIP UNDER THE UNITED STATES FLAG

This report on conditions in Puerto Rico is rendered to the TIES Association and the TIES Research Foundation, pursuant to prior agreement with the officers and according to a decision that a survey of Puerto Rican conditions was not only warranted but was urgent. It is now offered as a public document bearing the approval of the TIES Research Foundation.

During this survey there were conferences with businessmen, bankers, lawyers, ordinary citizens, and persons in many other walks of life. There were studies of official reports and figures, public laws and documents, including the Insular budget.

At the outset there is this flat and unequivocal statement:

Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín operates a complete dictatorship under the American flag.

This dictatorship is made effective in many ways. Economic pressure is a favorite method, but there can be direct political and judicial means applied.

The Muñoz dictatorship is supported chiefly by money derived from the United States.

What few Americans know is that every dollar of revenue tax collected on products (chiefly rum) shipped to the mainland is sent back to the Puerto Rican insular government. This rebate now amounts to about \$4,000,000 annually, but for a considerable period it ran to several times that figure.

On the other hand, Puerto Rico has its own import tax on commodities from the mainland. For example, a standard brand pack of cigarettes costs 30 and 35 cents in Puerto Rico. An American automobile carries a Puerto Rican import tax of 26½ percent. United States electrical goods pay a 26-percent duty to the island—and so on.

ISLAND PAYS NOTHING—RECEIVES PLENTY

The insular government does very well in the matter of revenues that are not available to any State in the Union.

The main point here is that Puerto Rico pays nothing into the United States, but receives very generous bounty from United States taxpayers of many millions per year.

In this report there will be no names used. It is not at all uncommon for a Puerto Rican to say, "We have to live here, you know."

Under those circumstances, this report is a composite, backed by plenty of responsible authority which must remain anonymous. And, too, there is a "gag" law which is so written as to appear aimed at those advocating overthrow of the government by force, but which, like many other laws, can be broadened by official interpretation.

The major exhibit in the Puerto Rican government show window is the Puerto Rican Development Company, an insular government operation, financed by the insular government, but with the highly important help of revenues accruing from the mainland through revenue rebates.

The industrial development undertaking is known as Operation Bootstrap. One writer has called it "operation mouse trap." Another designation might well be "operation fly trap."

The law is written loosely. It provides tax exemption for certain specified new industries for a period of approximately eight more years, tapering down in the final 2 years. Under the law it is possible for the government even to erect a plant for a new industry. It looks like anybody's oyster and too many have construed it in that way, so that United States industries have gone in, lacking skill, lacking market, lacking everything except the desire to get the insular government's largesse, with no chance to lose. It is a lure to the searcher for what is known as cheap labor, and also it is a lure for the operator out to make "a fast buck."

But as a remedy for unemployment and for new employment to a large volume of unskilled population, the whole effort has been ridiculously ineffective. There are industries operating at a profit, there are those still wondering, and there is a list of companies that have given up and gone home.

After careful examination of the situation in Puerto Rico, one may well wonder how careless can Washington get?

The Popular Democratic Party, controlled absolutely by Governor Muñoz, dominates the insular legislature completely. If Muñoz wants a new law quickly he can get it as fast as Huey Long ever did.

I have examples of some quickie laws.

Opposing the Governor's Popular Party there is the Statehood Party, the most important of the opposing groups. The Independence Party is practically no more than a handful. The Socialist Party, once strong, is now weak.

Election of delegates to Puerto Rico's Constitutional Convention was held while we were in the island. It was announced in advance that the Governor's party would elect 70 delegates and that the minorities altogether would elect 28. And that is exactly the way the vote was—70 to 28.

We talked with one of the leading minority men, a highly intelligent man. "We will have a number of good men in the convention and we will fight hard for a good constitution. Then the steam roller will get going and the Governor's Popular Party proposal will go through," he said.

More and more the word "dictator" is being used, aimed at Muñoz. It is beginning to hurt. At first there was silence, but now there are official attempts to explain that after all the Muñoz government isn't a dictatorship.

GOVERNOR CONTROLS COURTS

A part of every dictatorship is control of the judiciary. All local courts now are controlled by Muñoz through his appointees.

The insular supreme court is the next target and 2 years more will do the trick.

Control of all government agencies is another method of building dictatorship. All key department heads are Muñoz appointees. Many of them were small-time young men around the smaller towns before Muñoz gave them good jobs. Muñoz is an astute politician. He has picked men who have proved their ability and, more important, their loyalty to Muñoz. Every governmental department is under tight Muñoz control.

There is also the Insular Police Force. From this force there is a detachment variously put at from 120 to 150 picked men serving as the Governor's guard, operating around the clock. These men get extra compensation in the form of meals and quarters. This tight guard was established after the riots of 1950, when an attempt was made on the Governor's life. Today when he makes a speech he talks from within a four-sided steel barricade speakers' stand.

LITTLE FREEDOM OF PRESS

When dictators do not dare to be too brutal, there are ways of harassment. In San Juan there are three daily newspapers. Of these, *El Imparcial* is an out-and-out opponent of the regime. The Governor wanted the building in which the paper was published. *El Imparcial* was given official notice to vacate in 20 days. That is a short time, indeed, in which to find housing and to move a newspaper plant. Finally an extension was secured and *El Imparcial* had to buy another building.

The Governor then established his own newspaper, *El Diario de Puerto Rico*. It is beautifully housed.

Then came one of the quickie laws. *El Diario* wanted government official advertising, but it didn't have the circulation. The new law offers this advertising to any paper of general circulation of more than 5,000 copies, which lets *El Diario* under the wire, for it carries plenty of what is customarily juicy plum business. The administration also owns a radio broadcasting station which is used for its own educational purposes. Traveling sound trucks also are used to keep in close touch with the voters.

The third newspaper, but surely not the least important, is *El Mundo*, a fine, middle-of-the-road paper. It doesn't come out against the Government because if it did, inspectors would overrun it the next day, an ex-government official told us. However, *El Mundo* does now and then print some brisk criticisms of certain things.

There enters now another factor. Puerto Ricans and Puerto Rican industries pay no United States income tax. They do pay an insular income tax. The insular income tax is slightly less than the Federal tax would be in like incomes.

One of the habits of dictatorships in their more polite moments is harassing by inspectors. One businessman said he had been bothered so constantly by insular income-tax inspectors that his books were 6 months in arrears. The inspectors kept up a constant demand for more and more records. If you really are in bad, another said, "You may have as many as a dozen inspectors of various kinds in your place all at once."

BIG LOCAL TAX BOOST

Within the past few weeks a new and flaming issue has arisen. It was forecast faintly about 2 years ago when the insular government decided that the time had come for a reassessment of all property. The Muñoz government calls it "scientific reassessment." Most islanders now think the quotes should be this way, "scientific" reassessment.

A Chicago firm was called in for the job. Beginning in August, communities began getting their tax notices under the reassessed valuation. Without exception public mass protest meetings have been held in every community where the new notices have been received.

A banker said that without doubt reassessment was due. The mass protests are caused by the tremendous increases in assessed valuations. Even with a reduced mill rate, most taxpayers are due for a terrific jolt and it was predicted freely that many will be confronted with a confiscatory figure.

Many examples were offered. One was the case of a grocery store which had its assessed value fixed at a figure four times the actual value of the stock on its shelves. A farmer found his cattle valued now at eleven times the former assessment.

Whether the reassessment is or is not "scientific" is open to serious question. That the reassessment can be gerrymandered seems without question.

Tax reassessment notices went first to the smaller communities. There is much wonderment as to what will happen when the new valuation notices reach the population of San Juan.

There were two conceded objectives behind the reassessment program.

One, to increase insular government revenue;

Two, to increase the bonded debt limit of the island.

Both of these objectives mean higher taxes for a population much of which is struggling to make even a bare living, or scarcely above that level.

One highly successful San Juan businessman said sadly, "I don't know what it will mean to this business. We may have to close our doors."

Here could be the political issue fatal to Muñoz-Marín. If it fails to become such an issue it will be because the opposition lacks a sufficiently powerful and willing leader.

It is a strange and contradictory thing that purely political opposition is able to operate freely, but opposition to the economic and industrial program of "the party"—and that is its customary designation—is quite something else. It doesn't appear to be healthy.

As for contradictions, the whole atmosphere is filled with them. On the one hand the Government goes to extremes to encourage new industries to create new jobs in an effort to eat into the very large reservoir of unemployed. New businesses must have their plans and their operation approved by the Government bank and by the Planning Board. And there are some mighty bright boys in those two outfits. Approval extends even to the insurance to be carried and to the placement of that insurance.

On the other hand, the Government seems not to want private industry to build low-cost housing. Public housing is preferred, it is generally believed, as a means of controlling those who occupy public housing. Rentals on public housing are graduated according to income. Such housing cannot be sold, but must be rented.

Private housing can be sold. Home owners customarily have an entirely different outlook from renters and this is in Puerto Rico as it is elsewhere.

San Juan municipal and insular housing is a drop in the bucket when compared to FHA and privately built housing. The city of San Juan built a group of low-rental houses on dock-side property, ostensibly so that dock workers would not have to pay bus fare to and from work. Few dock workers now live there, but put to proper use the lots would have a value of about \$10,000 each. So goes dictatorship and so goes bureaucracy.

In 12 years the United States FHA has built 20,400 living units and it has had but 8 actual foreclosures.

AMERICAN BUILDS 10,600 HOMES

No inquirer can be in Puerto Rico more than a few days before beginning to hear of Leonard D. Long, an American from Charleston, S. C.

L. D. Long (the "D" stands for Darlington) is a private builder. He has provided

more jobs for workers than the entire "bootstrap" operation of the island's subsidized industry. His biggest development is Puerto Nuevo—4,428 small concrete homes on the outskirts of San Juan. His houses were built to sell—and all were sold—for \$3,995, with payments of \$30 per month. All told, Long has provided Puerto Rico with 10,642 individual family homes. Most of these are so planned that easy expansion in any of several ways is possible. But the party doesn't care for private housing and so L. D. Long finds many and varied obstacles in his path.

Long has employed as many as 10,000 native workers at a time, and he has paid some \$18,000,000 in wages over the period of his operation. His expenditures for materials bought in Puerto Rico have been enormous.

There is one puzzling factor in the Long operation. His success was so striking that for a time there were indications that "the party" might break down and give him full headway. He was asked by Muñoz Marín to submit a plan for a development of 30,000 more small homes. Long submitted the plan. The governor used it in his campaign, but it has not been heard of since.

If Long were less determined to provide housing for family ownership, he would leave the island. But, viewing the jobs he has created, it may be that "the party" will take a careful last look before putting in his pathway the final obstacle to operations. Long actually has done in construction what Henry Ford did years ago in putting automobiles together. Here is a striking example:

The local government's development company built the luxury hotel, Caribe Hilton, at a cost of at least \$7,500,000. Some say it ran to a million more than that. Long has nearly completed the Darlington Apartment Hotel, a half dozen blocks away, at a cost that will run to about \$3,000,000. The Darlington ground measurements are larger than the Caribe Hilton, and it will be two stories higher.

The excuse for excessive cost of the government hotel is that it had to be rushed to completion, and that, after all, it is a paying tourist attraction, as operated by the Hilton hotel chain. A gambling casino in the Caribe helps to make it pay.

UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTES A BILLION PLUS

The United States has put into Puerto Rico, through one channel or another in the past 8 years, a grand total of one and three-tenths billions of dollars, and more goes in every day. "Operation Bootstrap," up to the beginning of 1951, has created exactly 5,659 new jobs. These figures, forgetting all others, indicate that somewhere there has been some fancy dreaming—and there has been.

Some of the fancy dreaming is a hang-over from the regime of former Governor Rex Tugwell, many of whose luminaries still function. Puerto Rico's 2,300,000 citizens still know a poverty that is primitive and disgusting. New housing has made some slight inroads on the fantastic partially submerged slum lands, where huts stand perilously on stilts along the water's edge. The government owns the fabulous Caribe Hilton Hotel, and it also owns the land on which stand these rickety slum shacks. These slums bear such names as *El Fangito* (the mudhole), *La Perla* (the pearl), and *Hato Rey* (King's farm).

A hotel maid was asked what she earned per week. She said \$12.60. Her husband was able to get work about half the time. They never had meat to eat. They lived in the "Mudhole" slum. Official estimates say there are about 34,000 slum dwellings in the San Juan metropolitan area.

Much is made of free medicine. But hospital facilities are so limited that at best only a pitifully small number can get such care.

In contrast, the New York Hamilton Wright firm, which has publicized Canada

and European countries, is said to get \$125,000 a year for doing likewise for beautiful Puerto Rico whose hill-folk and city workers cannot even dream how much money that might be.

TWO HUNDRED FIFTY-SEVEN THOUSAND CHILDREN WITHOUT SCHOOLS

Puerto Ricans are kindly folks. They are not lazy. The workers do not have backgrounds of modern skills. When they come down out of the hills they do bring with them such rural customs as going home from the job when it rains. But they can be given training and, properly done, training brings results. Industries, wisely run, can make money. Language barriers baffle others. Bureaucratic interference and "the party's" politics baffles and defeats other firms—some of them even before they start. The promise of tax exemption and of low wages is partly something like bait for fish. Many find that low wages do not need to mean low labor costs.

For Puerto Rico there is no quick and easy cure. Land is limited. When one person dies four are born. The crowded island's birthrate is 60,000 a year. For 257,853 children of school age there are no schools at all.

Yet, the Governor has spent millions to sell the United States on his administration, including expensive "red carpet" entertainment for invited United States officials and press. It is said locally, by good authorities, that Governor Muñoz spent something over a million dollars on his inauguration celebration alone.

If there is a crime against Puerto Rico and its people it is the pretense that there are bootstraps by which there can be miraculous extraction from a deep-seated and long-existent sea of economic, political, and social submersion.

Meanwhile, United States taxpayers are paying the bill.

Give Our Troops in Europe a Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, ever since I have been in Congress I have worked and voted for a large and powerful Air Force. Like many others I was dismayed when the sums voted for a 70-group Air Force by the Eightieth Congress were impounded and not used for that purpose and the will of the people through their elected Representatives was flouted.

We are fortunate in having in the House a chairman of the Armed Services Committee who is a patriot and also a man of vision.

Like all such men he is working for a greater and more powerful Air Force. It is my hope that the House will support him in every way in this high purpose. The following article appearing in the September issue of the Reader's Digest gives expert and sound arguments for building for air supremacy. In the words of the author Francis Vivian Drake:

In Poland and France, in the skies above England, in the wheat fields of Normandy and Western Germany, in the jagged hills

of Korea, the lesson has always been the same—air power is essential to survival.

[From the Reader's Digest of September 1951]

GIVE OUR TROOPS IN EUROPE A CHANCE

(By Francis Vivian Drake)

The past 12 months have made it painfully clear that we plunged into Korea without a plan, and with little preparation for safeguarding our men against heavy odds on the ground. That is over the dam, but our soldiers have paid for it with high casualties—one out of every four men in Korea.

Today we are preparing to commit troops in Europe on a much greater scale, but with no realistic plan for safeguarding our soldiers against infinitely heavier odds in the air.

General Eisenhower is trying to raise an army of 50 divisions for the defense of Europe; the United States is to supply at least 6 of these and our men are now being drafted for the purpose. This army is to be ready sometime between 1953 and 1955. Without debating the wisdom of sending our troops to Europe at all, one thing stands out prominently: That we are making no adequate provision for protecting these troops from air attack.

Stalin, who has said that the bravest men are helpless if they lack air protection, is providing his troops with a modern air force of 20,000 planes, of which 10,000 are to work with his ground forces. To protect our soldiers we have only a few hundred planes available and are to have less than 3,000 at the peak, and that not until 1953.

This example of unrealistic planning moved Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., himself an infantryman in the last war, to make a thorough investigation of our program for the defense of Europe. His finding, that in case of war our men will be sent into battle "naked in their underwear," to be slaughtered like animals, just as the Reds have been slaughtered in Korea. This alarming situation is reflected in the statements of our air leaders.

Gen. Carl Spaatz (commander of our Air Forces in Europe in the last war) calls the air odds against us "nothing short of appalling," and warns that Western Europe will become a huge trap for our soldiers.

Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg (present Chief of Staff) says that "we have only a shoestring Air Force today," and that our plan of procurement is "only a stepping stone" toward what is really needed.

John A. McCone (Under Secretary for Air) declares that "the strategic Air Force is not keeping pace with our atomic development . . . the tactical Air Force will not be sufficient to gain the air superiority which our ground forces must have in order to operate with hope of success."

These are only a few of many statements uttered by men who have access to our plans, and some of whom have defied the administration's gag on "uncleared statements" in order to warn their countrymen.

In face of our own deficiency in the air it might be supposed that the administration is relying on Europe to provide the planes necessary to protect General Eisenhower's army. But this cannot be. Here is a comparison of the resources of Europe and the United States.

Plane potential for next 2 years:

Europe	5,000
United States	50,000-75,000
Population:	
Europe	380,000,000
United States	150,000,000

The figures given above represent our potential. But the planes that are so vital for our troops in Europe, that could be produced long before General Eisenhower's army is ready, that could block the Red air force and might prevent the successful invasion of Europe, are not on order.

We continue to ready up divisions which will get there late, instead of planes which could get there early—perhaps early enough to avert war altogether.

We are, in fact, trying to produce too many of the wrong things too soon, trying to conceal the mistakes of past years with cataracts of oratory which explain nothing. The Government has committed over \$60,000,000,000 for defense, yet the essential of air cover for our soldiers has been ignored. What does it take to convince the administration that sending troops to Europe without air cover is an act of suicide?

DOES IT TAKE OBJECT LESSONS?

Object lesson No. 1 has been Korea, where the enemy, without air protection, has suffered over a million casualties. According to Supreme Headquarters in Tokyo, approximately 47 percent of these casualties have been caused by our small Far Eastern Air Force. Using jellied gasoline, single planes have burned to death as many as 800 Chinese in one flight, and although the enemy has the advantage of hilly country and bad weather and is well armed with anti-aircraft guns, machine guns, tanks and artillery, they have lost as many as 10,000 men in a day, without being able to shoot down one of our planes. On our side the infantry has been the first to say that it would have been cut to pieces without air cover. In Korea the lesson is that air power has saved our bacon.

The previous object lesson was in Europe. Before the invasion of Normandy, General Eisenhower insisted on the destruction of the German air force. He declared later that the entire invasion would have been impossible without control of the air. Before the march from Normandy to the Elbe, Gen. Omar Bradley's Twelfth Army Group (almost exactly the same size as General Eisenhower's army now forming) was supplied with 6,000 tactical planes and vast bomber fleets of the Eighth and Fifteenth Air Forces. Bradley had several times the air cover today being planned for Eisenhower, although he had negligible air opposition. And certainly no one ever suggested we had too much air support.

The object lesson before Normandy was provided by Hitler. Using almost the identical combination of armor and air power as that of the Red forces of today—although on a far smaller scale—he swept from Poland to Western Europe and pushed the British into the sea at Dunkirk. But even Hitler underestimated the number of planes he would need to capture control of the British skies. Had he possessed sufficient planes, he would probably have won the war there and then.

All these object lessons point to one thing: The truth of what our air leaders keep trying to tell us. In Poland and France, in the skies above England, in the wheat fields of Normandy and Western Germany, in the jagged hills of Korea, the lesson has always been the same—air power is essential to survival, whether of armies or of nations. What further object lesson does it take? Bombs falling on the homeland? Our newest troops massacred on the plains of Europe?

DOES IT TAKE UNBIASED ADVICE?

President Roosevelt, shortly before his death, set up a large group of eminent civilians to make an independent report on the lessons which the United States might learn from World War II bearing on its own future defense. This group, the United States Strategic Bombing Survey, inspected Germany and Japan at the close of the war and unanimously reported that air power would henceforth have to be outstanding in our national defense. "Even a first-class military power," they reported, "cannot live long without control of the air." The survey, to all intents and purposes, has been ignored.

Another independent survey, the President's Air Policy Commission, formed in 1947, mapped out a detailed blueprint of our air requirements. Our Air Force, it reported, was not only inadequate but "hopelessly wanting in respect of the future." Its recommendation—a minimum Air Force of 130 groups, composed of 20,500 modern planes. The President ignored this report. The existing Air Force was later reduced.

The following year a Congressional Aviation Policy Board made still another survey. It recommended the same 20,500 modern planes. This was also ignored.

For the past 6 years, independent advice has overwhelmingly urged the maintenance of modern air power. In spite of this advice, our invincible 78,000-plane Air Force of 1944 was consistently reduced to a total of under 3,000 modern planes in 1950, and production was dropped from 9,000 planes a month to a trifle over 200. As a result of this obstinate refusal to accept counsel from Congress, the air officers, or the civilian experts, the Korean War caught us with only a handful of modern planes. During the recent MacArthur controversy about bombing enemy bases in China, it was several weeks before politicians got around to asking General Vandenberg whether, in fact, he had enough planes for the job. His answer was "No." He had not enough planes unless he exposed the United States to attack without power of reprisal. Whatever its professed reasons for refusing to approve MacArthur's proposal, the administration had failed to provide enough planes to make such an operation possible. It smoke-screened this negligence by taking the position that it did not wish to carry out such bombing anyway.

DO WE NEED ADDITIONAL CAPACITY?

The stated goal of the administration is an Air Force of 95 groups, of which only 80 will be combat groups, totaling about 5,000 modern shooting planes. This is far below our productive capacity. The following is the production now scheduled by the administration compared with the production offered by the aircraft industry:

Planes ordered:	
Fiscal 1952.....	8,000
Fiscal 1953.....	11,000
Production available:	
Fiscal 1952.....	12,000
Fiscal 1953.....	36,000-50,000

Planes actually on order include all types, combat and noncombat, and are to be divided between the Navy, Army, Military Air Transport service, mutual defense assistance program and the Air Force. After providing planes for our Pacific bases, our allies, our Atlantic bases and our homeland, these orders provide a completely inadequate force of tactical planes for the protection of our troops in Europe.

The Under Secretary for Air states that "production of air power in sufficient quantity to make the United States supreme in the air can be achieved much faster than is popularly supposed and now planned." Admiral De Witt C. Ramsey, head of the Aircraft Industries Association, says that "the aircraft manufacturing industry is presently building airplanes at a rate substantially below its potential. As a matter of fact, the rate of increase of our present production is less than 50 percent of the rate we were able to achieve in World War II." Donald Douglas, perhaps the greatest of our plane builders, says: "We have the technical skill, the industrial capacity, and the national will to do the job if we are not sidetracked or distracted from the task by indecision and uncertainties."

It will be remembered that during the last war President Roosevelt asked for double the production offered by the aircraft industry. Faced with a grave emergency, the maximum production President Truman has ordered—2

years hence—is only 1,000 planes a month compared with the 9,000 a month ordered by President Roosevelt.

It is completely within our power to move up our schedule from 80 to 150 combat groups. If we do so, we shall have created the three greatest deterrents to aggression in our power to produce within the next 2 years:

(a) A real defense force for our homeland—something we do not have today.

(b) A real tactical Air Force of over 5,000 modern planes available for the protection of our troops in Europe, with power to reinforce them rapidly in case of war.

(c) A real strategic air command, strong enough to destroy the Red atom-bomber bases and the sources of Soviet power—oil, chemicals, armament production, and communications without which an army cannot function.

The building of such an Air Force will be no easy task, but fortunately we have immense and well-equipped factories left from the last war. The planes will cost roughly twice as much as if they had been bought when they were originally recommended by the two Air Commissions. But, if we send troops to Europe at all—and we have several divisions there already—we must give them air cover if they are to survive.

We are the only nation capable of providing adequate air protection for the North Atlantic Treaty armies. We have the plants. We have the skilled workmen. It is surely more urgent to produce planes for the minimum protection of our troops than to keep adding to the total of men already "naked" in their underwear in Europe. We can better serve our allies and the cause of freedom by sending over armed planes rather than unarmed men.

WHAT MORE DOES IT TAKE?

The air leaders, the civilian advisers, the producers, the headlines have all failed to move a laggard administration into action. It would seem that only a single force remains untried—the compelling voice of public opinion. It is the public's sons, husbands, brothers who will have to pay the price in the event of war, whose unarmed heads will be exposed to the same pitiless punishment with which air power has mowed down the Reds in Korea. Our young men have to do the fighting for us. The least we can do is to see that they get the best protection our country can produce, even if it means raising such an outcry that it bends in every window in our Capitol. It has become the responsibility of the individual. Tell the President and your Congressman how you feel about it. Nobody else can do it for you.

Civitan International Foresees Socialistic Trends Where Government Operations Compete With Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware that Civitan International is one of the great civic organizations of the world. Its activities are not limited territorially nor circumscribed by any political party or organization. Its motto is "Builders of Good Citizens."

I was an active member of Civitan International for many years, and I cannot imagine how any patriotic Amer-

ican can find fault with the principles of this great organization, the work it has done and the programs it sponsors.

Civitan International held its annual convention in Jacksonville, Fla., June 20, 1951. At that convention it adopted a resolution in which Civitan International foresees socialistic trends where Government operations compete with private enterprise.

This resolution is most timely. In fact, it is long past due, and I congratulate the delegates attending the Jacksonville, Fla., convention of Civitan International for unanimously adopting such resolution. It is American in language and in all its implications. I am delighted to give my colleagues and those who may read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the benefit of the thinking and the warning of this resolution and of the members of Civitan International, which follows:

SEPTEMBER 10, 1951.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The following resolution was adopted by unanimous vote of the delegates in attendance at the annual convention of Civitan International held in Jacksonville, Fla., June 20, 1951.

"Whereas we regard with grave concern the socialistic trend of our governments to enter into competition with private enterprise and the enormous waste which is inevitable in government operations; and

"Whereas the Federal budgets contain appropriations for many projects which would further inject our governments into competition with private enterprise; and

"Whereas the expenditures for such projects come at a time when citizens are being asked to make sacrifices to arm for defense, and they are called upon to pay the highest taxes in the history of our Nations, and

"Whereas we believe that government operation or subsidy of industry or business is socialistic and contrary to the interests and wishes of the people of the United States and Canada and will not only hinder industry, but will eventually destroy the private and free enterprise system through which our countries have grown great: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That Civitan International urge our respective governments to oppose any legislation or the appropriation of any funds for socialistic experiments, the direct or indirect use of which put the government in competition with its own citizens or would further the nationalization of any business or industry; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to (1) all Members of the Congress of the United States, (2) all members of the House of Commons, (3) each club of Civitan International, and (4) the home offices of all other civic and service organizations in the United States and Canada."

Respectfully submitted.

RUDOLPH T. HUBBARD,
Secretary.

Lower Marias Irrigation Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWARD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. D'EWARD. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post contained an article criticizing severely

the Lower Marias irrigation project in Montana and, by inference, the Bureau of Reclamation's plans for development of water resources for irrigation, flood control, and related purposes. The article has created considerable indignation in Montana among people who know the value of irrigation and who have been interested in the development of the Lower Marias area. I include the letter and two editorials dealing with the facts of the case as stated by local citizens in my remarks:

[From the Havre (Mont.) Daily News]

ATTORNEY FOR MARIAS IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION WRITES SATURDAY EVENING POST EDITOR ABOUT ARTICLE

Harry Burns, Chinook attorney, has written Ben Hibbs, editor of the Saturday Evening Post in regard to the article, 'The Big Water Gyp in Montana,' by Edmund Christopherson, appearing in the August 25 issue of that magazine.

Mr. Burns is attorney for the Irrigation district proposed by the Marias Improvement Association which is the subject of the article.

The following is the letter sent Mr. Hibbs by Mr. Burns:

"DEAR MR. HIBBS: The article of Mr. Christopherson entitled 'The Big Water Gyp in Montana' published in your issue of August 25 is evidence of the fact that a half truth or a quarter truth is more damaging and confusing than an outright falsehood. Obviously this article was written and published by the Post with the idea of criticizing the methods of the Reclamation Service. There are few total falsehoods in the article, but the over-all impression it gives is entirely false. If Mr. Christopherson and the Post had wished to be fair in their treatment of this matter, the article would have stated that the Marias project was the brain child of one William Cowan, of Box Elder, Mont., a rancher and stockman of that area who conceived this in 1898 and through whose untiring efforts, coupled with those of many other builders of northern Montana, finally pushed it to a successful climax by the court decree of June 7, 1950, establishing this district. Bill Cowan was fortunate in two particulars, first he lived to see the successful climax of his efforts in the creation of the Marias irrigation district, but died before being accused by one of the leading publications of the country of being a gyp.

"If fair, your article would further have stated that at no time was there any intention on the part of the proponents of the district to force any section of the territory into the district where the majority of the landowners wished to be excluded and the court record affirmatively shows this at the very commencement of the hearing. The record further shows that another group not mentioned in your article, these being the farmers owning land under the proposed Big Sandy canal, were voluntarily excluded without court representation or fight. Furthermore, this court proceeding lasting some 10 or 11 days was not a bitter fight but one held principally for the laying of the foundations to enable the court to establish this district and the final lines decided upon were considered by both the proponents and the objectors to be eminently fair and I am confident that everyone left the courtroom at the end of the hearing feeling that they had been treated fairly. Furthermore, opposing counsel, Mr. Randall Swanberg was entirely fair and unprejudiced in this case and one of the finest gentlemen that I have had to deal with at any time in court, and your article is entirely misleading as to the character of this hearing.

"At no time did the Reclamation Bureau or its attorneys take any direct part in this proceeding and such part as was taken by

them was entirely at the request of the proponents of the district. The president of the Marias Improvement Association is and was the Honorable C. B. Elwell, judge of the district court of this district, and one of the most respected jurists of the State of Montana.

"If fair, the article should further have emphasized the fact that over 80 percent of the residents of the area of the district as finally established by Judge Speer wanted water delivered to their lands at the earliest possible date. It would further have stated the fact that the delivery of water to these lands will mean a stabilized agriculture for all time in the future with the raising of thousands of cattle and other livestock where none are now raised because of uncertainty of feed supplies.

"I have long been a partisan of your magazine and have generally entirely agreed with your editorial policy and have enjoyed most of your special articles. The tragedy of this to me personally is the fact that it has done something to destroy my confidence in your policy, and to wonder how many other articles published by you in the past can be believed as the truth or have in fact been yellow journalism as this article is. In the early twenties you published an article by Gareth Gareth, entitled 'The Pain in the Northwest,' which dealt with this same territory and part of Montana. If you could have published the Gareth article alongside of Christopherson's it would have been a good example of the art of inconsistency in journalism. Is your article further proof of the apparent inability and lack of desire of the East to understand the problems of the States of the West?

"Very truly yours,

"HARRY L. BURNS."

[From the People's Voice of August 31, 1951]

SAT EVE POST CARRIES ON

Honored old Ben Franklin from his very special spot in the celestial heavens these days must be saddened over how far from the narrow path of truth and righteousness has strayed the publication he sired almost 225 years ago.

Ben Franklin would never knowingly have permitted four false or misleading statements to appear in any headline that he might have written. Nor would he have ever stooped to the Hearstian journalistic tactics employed by one Edmund Christopherson in writing his article 'The Big Water Gyp in Montana' (Post, August 25). Such a verbose piece of distortion Franklin would have placed where it rightfully belonged—in his circular file. That would have been the end of it.

Not so, the editors of the Post 225 years later. As with past articles critical of the West and western reclamation, the Post editors of 1951 prefer to mislead millions of Americans into opposing congressional appropriations for developing and utilizing the West's most precious resource—its water.

Let's take a look at that misleading "bank" headline under the title "the Big Water Gyp in Montana." Quote:

"These Montanans, offered what seemed to be a splendid gift—water for 127,000 dry acres—took a second look and found the Reclamation boys wanted to turn them into peasants. Whereupon they hauled the Bureau into court, made it get out of their area and stay out."

Misleading assertion No. 1: "These Montanans, offered what seemed . . ." They weren't offered anything. Residents of the Lower Marias for half a century have been after Reclamation to come in and construct an irrigation system. As early as 1898, William Cowan, father of Lower Marias project, who died just last January, began probing the idea of bringing irrigation to his area. First formal steps toward setting up a

project came in 1904, at the instigation of people of Lower Marias area.

Misleading assertion No. 2: "The Reclamation boys wanted to turn them into peasants." Bunk. The several large operators who did not wish to come under the project because of Reclamation law's 160-acre limitation, and for other reasons, were fully protected by State laws which in so many words say (Ch. 89-1201-4 Rev. Codes 1947): any landowner, up to the time of an irrigation district being formed by a district court, may be excluded from the district if he can show that inclusion will damage him financially, etc., etc., etc. Of course, if such landowner did not desire to be excluded, he would have to abide by the 45-year-old reclamation acreage limitation. Experienced irrigation district attorneys tell us that Reclamation Bureau has meticulously observed Montana State laws safeguarding landowner rights, at all times.

Falsehood No. 1: "Whereupon they hauled the Bureau into court." Tain't so, brother, tain't so. To the point Reclamation was not a party to the court action. The big court fuss that Christopherson went into journalistic ecstasy over was 99 percent figment of his imagination. The truth was in the statement by Harry L. Burns, Havre attorney, in a letter of protest to the Post over the article. Said Burns:

"Furthermore, this court proceeding . . . was not a bitter fight but one held principally for the laying of the foundations to enable the court to establish this district and the final lines decided upon were considered by both proponents and the objectors to be eminently fair . . . At no time did the Reclamation Bureau or its attorneys take any direct part in this proceeding."

Falsehood No. 2: "Made it get out of their area and stay out." Reclamation is going ahead, with the blessing of 80 percent of the landowners of the lower Marias, and is establishing an irrigation system for upwards of 120,000 of the 127,000 dry acres.

There are many other false and misleading statements in the article, but these four should suffice to emphasize the value of the article as so trenchantly put by District Judge C. B. Elwell, president of the Marias Improvement Association: Quote:

"I have read the Saturday Evening Post for years. It is seldom that you find them making three mistakes in one article.

"Their first mistake was in being 'gypped' into buying such an article.

"Their second mistake was in publishing it after they had been 'gypped' into buying it.

"Their third mistake was in listing it in their table of contents at the front of the magazine. It should have been listed under the first heading of 'Short stories' along with the rest of the fiction."

[From the Havre (Mont.) Daily News]

BIG CHIEF PLENTY NONSENSE IS LOOSE AGAIN

Our esteemed colleague Herb Watts has already opened the throttle fairly wide in discussing the "big water gyp," but because of the gravity of the matters involved this writer also feels impelled to have his say.

Not since Gareth Garrett wrote 'The Pain in the Northwest,' likewise in the Saturday Evening Post, has there been such a rumpus. Strangely enough, it was the same "triangle" which drew the Post Blast—the area which extends roughly from Chester to Havre and southward to Great Falls. Gareth Garrett concluded, to the noisy dismay of local patriots, that the region should be turned back forthwith to the nearest Indian silly enough to accept it. Now comes Author Christopherson saying that the Bureau of Reclamation has concocted a foul plot to steal it back from the Indian or from the plutocrat ranchers who apparently inhabit it. What goes on here, anyway? A quarter century has

passed since Garrett flung the first rock at the Triangle and still the game continues. The region seems to be a fairly newsworthy spot, doesn't it?

As one who for many years has been associated with such Marias boosters as the late Bill Cowan, Judge Charlie Elwell, hundreds of water-hungry farmers and the combined pressure of goodness knows how many community fronts, we dislike to see this region torn asunder by another magazine article so openly tinted with malice, but if the boys wish to feud, we'll feud with 'em.

After tempers have cooled there emerge three points which should be clearly understood. First, the reclamation service did not come barging in with a club in 1950 demanding that this region be irrigated; the idea originated locally more than 30 years ago as a combined farm-town project in which far more farmers than town people were involved. Second, instead of rushing in with the glad hand, the reclamation service for decades gave the plan the push-around. Third, as far as we know there is no law compelling any organized community to enter an irrigation district against its will. So in some amazement all we can say as an individual is, "Why all the rumpus?"

In this discussion we are by no means fronting for the reclamation service. Current history proves this outfit well able to fight its own battles. Some of the organization's latter year activities we do not approve, as an individual, yet the 50-year record shows that in spite of all the published difficulties of irrigation farming, crops and families and towns bloom in parts of 11 Western States where cactus, gophers, and similar desolation reigned supreme previously. That is the picture we should keep in mind, isn't it?

Without these reclamation projects a good many of us who now stumble along more or less contentedly in these Western States might even be reduced to living in Philadelphia where the Saturday Evening Post is edited. Which would be the well-known fate worse than death to anyone who has ever lived in Philadelphia.

The Post is a great magazine, partly dedicated in recent years to exposing and exploding the notion that a nation is different from an individual—neither can permanently spend more than it receives without facing ultimate disaster. Lots of us agree with that thought. We also agree that in this instance the Post's drum-beating zeal led it out onto a long limb which is rapidly being sawed off.

It is a human trait for the humble to snicker when the mighty are embarrassed, so let's have our fun, indulge our peevish and get over it. "The triangle" survived Garett and struggled on to new prosperity. It will also survive author Christopherson and the Saturday Evening Post. So let's part on friendly terms with the Lonesome Prairie recessionists, close up the ranks and proceed with the Marias project.—J. R. L.

Tribute to General Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is unusual in these times to greet the retirement of a public servant with the genuine regret which is felt in General

Marshall's leaving his country's service. He is held in the highest esteem by those who have had close contact with him. The general earned universal respect in his devotion to duty through military and civilian service. An excellent soldier in World War II. General Marshall took on civilian tasks in the service of this Nation when he might well have rested on his laurels. Even after retirement as Secretary of State he heeded the call to duty, and returned to active duty as Secretary of Defense.

We on the Armed Services Committee are aware of his intense devotion to country, and his realization that potent forces threatened the peace of the world. Only through General Marshall's insistence has a program of universal military training been authorized by Congress. He can be proud of his accomplishments in this office, and may retire with the accolade of a job well done.

Forces Balanced on the Basis of Top Priority Tasks, the Only Kind of Military Establishment the National Economy Can Afford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most of you have read in the newspaper excerpts from the remarks made by the Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Thomas K. Finletter, at the Los Angeles convention of the Air Force Association. The association is only 5 years old, but it is flourishing. It counts among its members and its leaders some of the most distinguished men in the country. The convention was an important one. Mr. Finletter's speech on Saturday afternoon, August 25, was the high point of the occasion and a clear, frank, and concise report to Air Force veterans on the structure and status of the Air Force.

One thing Mr. Finletter said in his address struck those who heard it, and especially the astute reporters whose job it is to pick up news as a revelation of a possible new use of atomic weapons. Mr. Finletter said:

Here we are entering into new terrain and we shall use all the imagination we possess to see to it that effective use will be made of atomic weapons against profitable targets in the ground battle area. And it is not too much to hope that if we put the proper effort of industry into this operation and if we have sufficient imagination to detach our minds from past conditions of warfare, we may be able to assure our European allies of a much greater striking power on our part than we had hoped for, and even, indeed, make it unlikely that an enemy attack on the NATO forces on the continent of Europe would have a hope of success.

What made headlines in the papers, however, was but preliminary to an

equally important statement by Mr. Finletter on the nature of the defense establishment of the future. Less sensational than statements about atomic weapons, Mr. Finletter's carefully worded, well-reasoned discussion of balanced forces has significance for all thoughtful Americans, and especially for the Members of this Congress. Too often the term "balanced forces" has been used to mean an Army, a Navy, and an Air Force of equal size. As Mr. Finletter pointed out:

This term "balanced forces" is an example of a good phrase that has gone wrong. For it has come to mean in the minds of many the idea that the defense dollar should be divided equally between the three departments which make up the Defense Establishment. This never was the intention of the men who first used the term. Anyone can accept the term "balanced forces" if they interpret it in its right meaning, which is that in these days with a military budget already at \$60,000,000,000, nothing less than a most exacting calculation of forces in relation to the top priority tasks these forces have to perform can be used for the basis for determining the kind of military establishment the country should have.

As a responsible and thoughtful public servant, Mr. Finletter is constantly aware of the effect of mobilization on the national economy, and of the need to use material as well as personnel economically, allocating both on the basis of priority needs. In his address to the AFA convention, Mr. Finletter went on to say:

Perhaps in the past we could afford to have military units which were not strictly necessary on the day war starts or during the period immediately thereafter, or were not calculated to meet the top priority needs of ourselves and our allies. Now we have to calculate the things which are the musts—that is, the tasks which are indispensable to our great purposes of deterring war and of seeing to it that if war comes this country and its vital interests are protected. Then we must calculate how we can use most effectively not only our presently available resources to accomplish these results, but also the resources we will have in the future from 2 to 4 years from now. We must then allocate the planes, tanks, and ships, and the men who man them, to create an integrated force which will be able to accomplish these top priority tasks with the most devastating effect. Only then can we think in terms of secondary tasks, things which we might desire to be able to do but which are not indispensable to our great and primary purposes. And I venture to believe that we will not be able to devote much if any effort to these secondary tasks.

World War II cut heavily into our resources of manpower, raw material, and industrial facilities. From this point on, as Mr. Finletter well understands, we must give increasingly serious thought to the sobering fact that all our resources are limited. Military strategy based on this realization will not produce an army, a navy, and an air force equal in numbers, with closely matched budgets. But a wise strategy, based upon a wise and economical use of our total and limited resources, will produce balanced forces welded into an invincible defense team.

I ask unanimous consent to insert Mr. Finletter's address at the Air Force

Association's Fifth Annual National Convention and Reunion, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The remarks are as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE
THOMAS K. FINLETTER, AT AIR FORCE ASSOCIATION'S FIFTH ANNUAL NATIONAL CONVENTION AND REUNION, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., SATURDAY, AUGUST 25, 1951

It is my privilege to read to you a message to the Air Force Association from the President of the United States:

AUGUST 21, 1951.

MR. ROBERT S. JOHNSON,
President, Air Force Association,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: It is a pleasure to offer congratulations to all members of the Air Force Association on the occasion of this national convention which celebrates their fifth anniversary as an organization.

I recall the day 5 years ago when I greeted several of your leaders at the White House shortly after your association was established. I am delighted with the progress you have made in this relatively short period in banding together Air Force veterans with the common mission of adequate defense for national security and world peace.

I believe that the mission of the Air Force Association is more important today than ever before. While our armed might is greater than it was at the time of your founding, so is the threat to freedom greater. Nothing must permit us to deviate from our mobilization objectives.

If in the year ahead the Air Force Association will continue to help keep our people alert to the dangers we face from militant aggression, and will help prevent any slackening of interest or effort in our military preparedness program, you will be doing the Nation a great service.

Very sincerely yours;

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The Air Force Association on its fifth anniversary is entitled to pride in its accomplishments. Your conviction that an adequate air power is essential to our national security and that the creation and maintenance of this air power is everybody's business led to the formation of this association. You set yourselves the goal of improving the public's understanding and support of a sound air power policy for the Nation. Your contributions to this end are evident in current expressions of opinion by the leadership and the rank and file of the American people on the subject of air power and its relation to the security of the free world.

In paying tribute to the work of your association, I also pay tribute to the members of the Air Reserve and the Air National Guard and the other civilian components that go to make up so large a part of your membership.

Mr. Zuckert has already told you of the high regard and appreciation of the Department of the Air Force for its civilian components. I underscore Mr. Zuckert's remarks of the high importance of the civilian components.

I also endorse the new long-range reserve plan which Mr. Zuckert outlined to you last night. I have great hope that it will be of substantial value not only to the security of our Nation, but also for the members of our Reserve forces.

Even though Mr. Zuckert has dealt fully with this subject, I do want to reemphasize that we are aware of the great burden which is falling upon the Reserves—and when I speak of Reserves, I refer to the Air National Guard and the Air Reserve collectively. This crisis has been particularly hard on the Reserves. They had not expected to be called to serve in this particular kind of situation. They had committed themselves to train in order to be ready for a major

war. They had not expected to have their lives and careers disrupted for anything less than a major war, and yet it has been necessary that they should serve now when the country is not engaged in full-out conflict for survival. Grievous as the war in Korea is, it is not that.

Also, we have not been able to carry out the rotation system that we would have liked. The war in Korea from this point of view must be regarded in two phases. The first phase was that of build-up when we were compelled to keep individuals and units in the battle area longer than a proper rotation system would have called for. This was in the period of build-up. There was nothing else that could be done if the necessary amount of American power were to be made available for the Korean conflict.

However, we are now reaching the stage where a more equitable rotation will be put into effect. By the early part of September we hope that the rotation of combat crews and of other personnel in the Korean area will have reached the proper standard. In the case of combat crews, General Weyland will be able to effect a rotation calculated on the basis of the number of combat missions flown and on other factors which he and we are prepared to say is satisfactory. The same thing is true of the other personnel. The time of service for the personnel other than combat crews will vary with the geographical location. For example, in Korea, it will be 18 months' total service, whereas in certain areas it will be higher than that as conditions are less exacting than in the actual combat area. Then, of course, the provisions of the existing law provide that personnel called to active duty involuntarily from the Organized Reserves will not be retained longer than 24 months, while those called from the Voluntary Reserves may not be retained longer than 17 months.

It may be of interest for you to note here that legislation has been passed by the House in connection with the appropriations bill for the armed services which would reduce the tour of duty for those called from the Voluntary Reserve from 17 months to 12 months. Another interesting sidelight is in the proposed bill before Congress which provides for fixed contractual periods of service for reservists serving with the Armed Forces. These contracts may be from 1 to 5 years' duration. May I emphasize that this is proposed legislation and has not yet become law.

The Reserve components, in short, have been called upon to make heavy sacrifices for their country. Their work has been indispensable to the success of our air effort in Korea. It could not have been done without them.

I will say a few more words about the Korean situation. The success which has been achieved by the United Nations in Korea would have been impossible without air power. Air power has definitely established itself as an important part of collective action for peace. On the other hand, the situation in Korea has been special. There has so far been comparatively little opposition to the supremacy of United Nations air. To be sure, there have been vigorous battles over the northwestern area, but so far the enemy forces have not seriously challenged our supremacy over the battle area. We must therefore be careful in our appraisal of the results in Korea not to reach conclusions which are based on the very special circumstances that the first tactical objective of air power—namely the obtaining of air superiority—has been ours with relatively little effort. We must remember that in any plans that we make for the future that this is the first condition to be attained and that the further operations of isolation of the battle area and close support can be accomplished only if there has been already obtained a condition of air supremacy.

We must, however, be aware of the fact that this air supremacy of ours could have been challenged at any time within recent months by the enemy forces. The enemy has a considerable force of air which it has not used. The Chinese Communist air force has in excess of a thousand planes which they have not committed to the land battle except in the contest in the neighborhood of the Yalu River.

A decision on the part of the Chinese Communists high command to commit this force in a struggle for air superiority over the Korean Peninsula would have very serious consequences indeed.

One more point about Korea. On my recent trip there I was especially impressed with the Joint Operations Center at Fifth Air Force headquarters, where representatives of the ground forces sit side by side with representatives of the Fifth Air Force, and naval and marine aviation and mutually agree upon how the available air effort shall be distributed in support of current operations. Thus at this one central point, the tactical employment of United Nations air power is closely coordinated with the fire and movement of United Nations ground forces in Korea. The operations of this center went without hitch. All of the planes of the United States and of our allies were in a pool, and as far as I could make out, there was no argument about who did what except that assignments were made in accordance with the need of the battle situation and without reference to who was to do it. Unification has been applied not only through the whole of United States air, but through the whole of United Nations air there available. There does seem to be some rule that the closer to the scene of action, the less difficulties there are in achieving a coordinated and harmonious effort. Reports testifying to the effectiveness of our Air Force on the United Nations' land-sea-air team in Korea, have come from all ranks of the United Nations' ground forces. Air Force reservists, of course, have contributed heavily to this fine record.

May I say now some words about the Air Force as it stands today? As you know, our present target is for 95 wings by the middle of 1952. We have 87 wings now.

It is customary to say that the 95 wings will not be modern by the middle of 1952, and this is true provided that one also accepts the proposition that an Air Force is never fully modern in the most literal sense. While the Air Force, is fully alive to the need of having an adequate force in being, it is also our purpose to see to it that there is a constant improvement in the quality of our planes. We will never be satisfied with any existing set-up. However, it must be said that there are some contemplated improvements in the quality of our machines which will come into effect fairly soon. The bomber fleet is still in the main piston-engined. The B-29's and B-50's are still the backbone of the medium bombers. The B-36 has moved partially into the jet field since the B-36D's and F's are now rapidly filling up the units. The B-36D and F are, of course, the B-36 with straight wings, six 4360 piston engines, and the four J-47 turbo-jets.

May I say a word about the B-36? Sometimes the modernity of this plane is challenged. If we are talking about the earlier models, which had only the six 4360 piston engines, then I think it is fair to say that the plane is obsolescent. On the other hand, the B-36, like every airplane, especially bombers, that has ever existed, is in a state of evolution. The latest model can fly very fast and very high and it is the best intercontinental bomber in the world. I realize that there have been some statements recently about a new Russian six-turbo-prop bomber, but we have no indication that this plane already exists.

Moreover, B-36 is evolving into a new model which will fly soon, to which the designation B-60 is given. It is still the basic B-36 design but it will have swept-back wings and will be powered by eight J-57 Pratt and Whitney jet engines. This will be a much improved airplane and will compete with the Boeing B-52 powered by eight Pratt and Whitney J-57 jet engines. The B-52 is expected to fly this year, and I can assure you that neither the swept-back B-36 nor the B-52 are obsolescent airplanes.

Moreover, as you know, the B-47 will move into units in the medium bomber fleet of B-29's and B-50's and gradually will supplant these two planes.

Likewise in interceptors, fighters, cargo carriers, transports and tankers. The North American F-86 is still our best day interceptor, but all weather interceptors such as the Northrop F-89, the Lockheed F-94 are rapidly coming in, all to the end that our air defense fleet will become almost entirely an all-weather operation. And we are planning for a new interceptor which will be superior to any of these. The C-124 is coming in the cargo-carrying and transport field to phase out entirely the C-54. The C-119 is rapidly taking over the bulk of the troop carrier field, and the new Chase C 123 is the latest thing in assault transports. The KC-97, the tanker version of the Boeing Stratocruiser, is supplanting the tanker versions of the B-29 and the B 50. And on the drawing boards, looking ahead to the immediate future and years ahead are improvements on all of these planes and draftings of new and advanced models. In some instances these drafts, both those for the near future and those for the long future take the form of uninhabited aircraft and other devices, the nature of which has not yet been made public.

May I say a word about production? The impression is sometimes put forward that the aircraft production program is subject to serious slippage and we are falling materially behind schedule. It is sometimes also said that we do not have the production potential which, if orders were placed now, would enable us to obtain the planes that we might want within the normal period of time.

Neither of these statements is true.

During fiscal year 1951, our aircraft production schedules underwent several changes. Some adjustments were due to the excessive step-ups in the programs. Other adjustments were made in order to give effect to changes in the actual design of the aircraft. The result has been a variation in the meeting of our scheduled deliveries; but none of these changes was other than temporary. In fact, deliveries during fiscal year 1951 did not fall materially behind schedule. Under the more realistic schedule that governed production during that period, there was actually a deficit of some 50 airplanes.

Nor should there be any appreciable slippage in the future for our production schedules unless we fail to realize some of the things which we think we can realize. For example, the machine-tool bottleneck must be broken. We expect that the controlled materials plan will reduce the lead time in the flow of materials. On the other hand, unforeseen contingencies could interfere with this, as they could interfere with any program. By "unforeseen contingencies" I mean prolonged plant shut-downs such as the ALCOA strike or a national catastrophe such as the Kansas flood.

During fiscal year 1952, we do anticipate a slippage of about 11 percent by February 1952, but we also expect that this deficiency will be fully recovered by June 30, 1952. Moreover, we expect that by December 31, 1952, aircraft deliveries should be about a third ahead of those called for by the production schedule.

Now a word about the mobilization potential.

It is very much to the credit of the then Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Stuart Symington, and to the present Chief of Staff, General Vandenberg, that in the days prior to Korea, the Air Force budget did call for stand-by tooling for the purpose of creating a reserve mobilization potential for the day when the country might need airplanes in a hurry.

As a result of this foresight, the situation today is that with the existing plants, and with merely an increase in subcontracting and shifts, we could, if we want to, 20 months from now start on a great program of aircraft production, greatly in excess of that presently contemplated as our present peak. We could, without any new plants, more than double our monthly production of airplanes. This is a huge capacity and takes no account of what might be done in the event that other new plants were brought into operation.

A word about our personnel policy.

The cost in money terms of the air power which this country will have to maintain will be very great. It will be a great burden on the economy of the country. That the country can stand it is without question. On the other hand, any one who has anything to do with the development of this air power must and does look most attentively at each item of cost in an attempt to hold the burden on the people to the minimum.

On the other hand, there is another element of cost which is sometimes neglected in our thinking. That is the cost in numbers of people. People count more than money, and the Chief of Staff and I have been working very hard to see to it that the requirements of the Air Force for personnel are slashed below any figures which have heretofore been contemplated. In our plans for the Air Force of the future, we have already arrived at a basis for economy of use of men and women, for which the Chief of Staff and the Air Staff deserve high credit. We intend to pursue this very difficult policy rigorously.

I shall now say a word about the Air Force of the future.

First, about this perennial question of lead time. It is usually said that the lead time for the production of aircraft is 20 months on the average. It is, though, more helpful to say that the Air Force must make its immediate commitments and plans with respect to a period of 2 to 3 years after the commitments are made. The reason for this is that it takes this long to get the aircraft into units and the men trained once the program is submitted to the proper channels in the Government. Now, when we do look—at this moment—to the period 2 to 3 years from now, we see that there will be certain important changes in the conditions which the Air Force will have to meet.

It is obvious that in these 2 to 3 years the number of atomic weapons which will be available to our possible enemies and to ourselves will increase. We must, therefore, base our planning not on the figures which presently exist, or on those which will probably exist a year from now, but on those which we can count on from 2 to 3 years hence. A failure to make our calculations in this way would be a breach of trust. For we might then find ourselves in a position where we lacked sufficient air power to deliver the atomic weapons which are available, and this is something we must not allow to happen. The importance of these weapons and the stakes of a war in which they would be used are too high for us to allow any such condition to occur. No man's conscience could permit this to be done.

Moreover, these changes in the situation of the next 2 to 3 years must cause us to think imaginatively of the possibilities of

the future. We must not stay fixed to hide-bound ideas which will no longer be valid once atomic weapons are more plentiful. We must use the new resources we will develop not only to strengthen the strategic operations of the Air Force as we now conceive them but also to find new and novel uses for this vast new resource.

Air power should be made ready to bring atomic power to bear directly on the enemy's ground forces, retarding his advance and rendering him unable to concentrate his forces decisively. Here we are entering into new terrain and we shall use all the imagination we possess to see to it that effective use will be made of atomic weapons against profitable targets in the ground battle area. And it is not too much to hope that if we put the proper effort of industry into this operation and if we have sufficient imagination to detach our minds from past conditions of warfare, we may be able to assure our European allies of a much greater striking power on our part than we had hoped for, and even, indeed, make it unlikely that an enemy attack on the NATO forces on the continent of Europe would have a hope of success.

I do not propose to discuss these matters in any detail because it is not fitting to discuss them while they are in the formative stage. These are matters which must be resolved within the Department of Defense and the executive branch before they can be presented to the Congress and the people for their consideration. I do feel, however, justified in pointing them out in broad general terms.

What I have said I think is enough to dispose of any notion that the Defense Establishment of the future is to be based on balanced forces, at least on balanced forces as that term is sometimes misused. This term "balanced forces" is an example of a good phrase which has gone wrong. For it has come to mean in the minds of many the idea that the defense dollar should be divided equally between the three Departments which make up the Defense Establishment. This never was the intention of the men who first used the term. Anyone can accept the term "balanced forces" if they interpret it in its right meaning, which is that in these days with a military budget already at \$60,000,000,000, nothing less than a most exacting calculation of forces in relation to the top priority tasks these forces have to perform can be used for the basis for determining the kind of Military Establishment the country should have.

Perhaps in the past we could afford to have military units which were not strictly necessary on the day war starts or during the period immediately thereafter, or were not calculated to meet the top priority needs of ourselves and our allies. Now we have to calculate the things which are the musts—that is, the tasks which are indispensable to our great purpose of deterring war and of seeing to it that if war comes this country and its vital interests are protected. Then we must calculate how we can use most effectively not only our presently available resources to accomplish these results, but also the resources we will have in the future from 2 to 4 years from now. We must then allocate the planes, tanks, and ships, and the men who man them, to create an integrated force which will be able to accomplish these top priority tasks with the most devastating effect. Only then can we think in terms of secondary tasks, things which we might desire to be able to do, but which are not indispensable to our great and primary purposes. And I venture to believe that we will not be able to devote much if any effort to these secondary tasks.

I say this because it must be already plain to all of us that the claims upon our resources represented by the top priority tasks

alone will by themselves require a most frugal husbanding of our manpower, our raw material, and our industrial facilities. Already the demands are huge. They fall upon an economy that, in the war just passed, dug deeply into its mines, cut unstintingly into its forests, drained heavily in its oil pools, and made heavy demands on its manpower. From this point on we must give increasingly serious thought to the sobering fact that our resources are limited. Nothing could be more damaging to the future of this country than a blind piling up of armaments. A wise strategy, the only possible strategy for this country, is one based upon a wise and economical use of our total resources.

In these remarks I have touched on a few of the major current and future problems confronting the Air Force. The magnitude and complexity of these problems bears on us. In the aggregate, they are a stupendous challenge to our energies and imagination, and we shall try to meet this challenge as General Arnold and his colleagues did 11 years ago, when the total officer strength of the Air Corps—Regular, National Guard, and Reserve—including those not on active duty, was only 5,500 officers. When we think of the situation that confronted the Air Corps when the Nation began to mobilize in the summer of 1940 and, when we consider how we went on from such small beginnings to create the great Army Air Forces of 2,500,000 officers and airmen—we have an inspiring example of what we can do when we all pull together toward our common objective: The protection of freedom.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter which I wrote to my constituents under this date:

DEAR FRIEND: President Truman has called in his advisers and asked them to see what can be done about changing the weak price control law passed by Congress at the end of July.

We've already seen some of the effects of that law on our grocery store shelves. There's worse to come. I voted against the sections of that bill that are allowing price hikes. I don't think our economy can stand such high prices, and I know the people of my district can't.

I got pretty sick during the debating though, of listening to certain Congressmen blame farmers and workers for the current inflation.

An interesting report was issued recently by a Senate Agriculture Subcommittee headed by Senator GUY M. GILLETTE of Iowa. It spiked the fiction that farmers are to blame for high food prices. Evidence gathered during a long series of hearings last year showed that quite the contrary was true.

For instance, the report shows that in 1949 the prices farmers got for their produce dropped 13 percent, while retail prices went down only 4 percent. Later, when farm prices went up, the food processors quickly raised their prices to reflect not only the rise, but bigger margins for themselves.

The report states that bread sold for 13 cents a loaf in 1947. The wheat farmer got 3 cents of it. In 1949, with bread selling for 14½ cents a loaf, the wheat grower got only 2.4 cents as his share. I think that the same situation is generally true for today.

As for workers, I have heard dozens and dozens of speeches on the floor of the House by men who said workers were making too much money, and hence our country's economic troubles. I always find such speeches hard to listen to. Workers make a good deal less than Congressmen, and I know how inflation has cut into my own standard of living. I get letters from workers in West Virginia who are suffering real hardships with today's high prices.

I think that these stories blaming workers and farmers for high prices are advanced to the public by men who have a definite purpose in mind. They want to cover up their own actions. They know, too, that their position will be stronger if they are able to confuse the public and create wide divisions, especially between workers and farmers. Let's not let them do it.

Sincerely yours,

M. G. BURNSIDE,
Member of Congress

The Crusade for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, for his undaunted patriotism, initiative, and foresight, Drew Pearson, distinguished reporter and columnist, deserves the undying gratitude, commendation, and the wholehearted cooperation of all liberty-loving people everywhere. He is deserving of more than just the moral support of the Crusade for Freedom which he conceived and put into effect. He is in fact entitled to such financial aid as might be given in sums however small by the average citizen to help carry out this original and effective plan which penetrates the iron curtain and reaches the very hearts of the enslaved peoples. While this plan should be universally supported, it is especially commended to those who have personal friends and relatives yoked to slavery by vile hell-bred communism. An energetic and a sustained campaign should be inaugurated and carried on from public forum to pulpit in every part of the Nation. Let us unite to inform and to encourage the suffering people of the satellite nations who through no fault of their own have been consigned and confined to an existence worse than outright imprisonment. This fight on communism, like the unique idea of penetration by the use of balloons, is not the responsibility of Drew Pearson alone. It is the obligation of everyone who believes in God, in freedom and democracy. Remember that the millions of people fenced in behind the iron curtain constitute the biggest asset of the free Western World and they are the greatest liability and weak-

ness of Russia and of communism. To keep alive the spirit of these people we must maintain contact, stimulate their hopes and aspirations, and never charge off or even discount their value when the time and the test is at hand.

To claim an equity in the eventual victory you must underwrite the plan. You should invest now the dollar or more which can and must be spared to carry on the campaign for freedom and peace.

Contributions, Mr. Speaker, may be sent directly to Drew Pearson in Washington or to the Crusade for Freedom headquarters in New York City.

Fiftieth Jubilee of Glos Narodu (Voice of the People)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent of the House of Representatives, it is my personal and distinct pleasure to commemorate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the fiftieth anniversary of the Glos Narodu—Voice of the People—a Polish-American weekly published in the great State of New Jersey by George Otłowski, young, dynamic, imaginative, and fiercely patriotic president of the American Publishing Co. situated in Perth Amboy, N. J.

I say it is my personal and distinct pleasure to salute the Glos Narodu, Mr. Speaker, because as a boy barely able to look over the top of the table in our library in Jersey City, I often heard mother and dad discuss, in Polish, news carried in the Glos published at that time by my uncle, Peter Prazmowski.

Recently, when the House recessed, I went to Florida to visit my parents who live in retirement on the Gulf of Mexico not far from Clearwater in charming Dunedin Isles. I had not seen mother since that morning last fall when I bade her good-by before leaving for service in Korea to join my World War II commander, Lt. Gen. Edward M. Almond, and his now famous Tenth Army Corps. As mother rose to greet me on my safe return from Korea and to congratulate me on being elected to this distinguished Congress of the United States, a newspaper fluttered to the ground. It was the Glos Narodu.

Mr. Speaker, you can multiply this experience of a family and its reading habits by the thousands throughout the United States; especially is it true among families whose parents were born in non-English-speaking lands, and whose task it is to raise their children to be good Americans. Dedicated to help in such a mission, foreign-language media have a distinct place in our community.

With pardonable pride, Mr. Speaker, I should like to list below tributes

tendered the Glos Narodu on the occasion of its golden jubilee:

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,

Jersey City, N. J., July 16, 1951.

DEAR MR. OTLOWSKI: The people of Jersey City and Hudson County have been fortunate these past 50 years in having had access to a publication with the noble ideals of Glos Narodu.

A free and unfettered press is the heritage of America, and newspapers such as yours are essential in the never ending maintenance of that heritage.

Glos Narodu, with its undeniable appeal to the thousands of descendants of Poland whom we are fortunate to have within our community, has been of great assistance in helping to further good citizenship.

As the American citizens of Polish extraction have grown in community stature during the past 50 years, so has Glos Narodu.

Your newspaper is as much an outstanding credit to our community as are the people whom it represents.

On the occasion of its fiftieth anniversary, the City of Jersey City salutes Glos Narodu, and it is my personal, fervent hope that its contributions to our citizens will be continued in the years to come.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN V. KENNY,
Mayor of Jersey City.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, June 11, 1951.

MR. GEORGE OTLOWSKI,
President, The American Publishing Co., Inc., Perth Amboy, N. J.

DEAR MR. OTLOWSKI: I am happy to participate in observing the fiftieth anniversary of the Glos Narodu.

For half a century the Glos Narodu has performed a high public service for its many readers of Polish descent in New Jersey. It is to be congratulated particularly upon its patriotic endeavors in helping thousands of Polish immigrants become good Americans.

During both of the World Wars, it served faithfully in promoting Treasury bond drives, in the letters to Europe, and similar activities.

Today, when it is necessary for free people all over the world to stand together against the menace of aggressive communism, it is particularly important that the strength of all freedom-loving men, regardless of their nationalities or the languages they speak, be combined.

Standing thus together, there can be no doubt of our victory.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY TRUMAN.

UNITED STATES SENATE,

June 6, 1951.

MR. JOHN J. WOLCZANSKI,
Secretary, the American Publishing Co., Inc.,
Perth Amboy, N. J.

DEAR MR. WOLCZANSKI: My greetings and good wishes on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the Glos Narodu. The steady growth of this publication over the past half century is a fitting testimonial to the useful service Glos Narodu has rendered to the community and to Americans of Polish extraction.

A well-informed citizenry is one of the greatest guarantees of the survival of our democratic society and I am confident that the Glos Narodu is living up to its responsibility in giving its readers full access to the important developments of our time.

My congratulations on the golden jubilee of your newspaper.

Yours very sincerely,

HERBERT H. LEHMAN.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,

Trenton, June 27, 1951.

It is with real pleasure that I extend to Glos Narodu, on behalf of the people of New Jersey as well as myself, warm congratulations and sincere good wishes on its fiftieth anniversary.

Your golden jubilee issue marks more than a half century of a successful publication venture. Yours has been the devoted duty of chronicling the progress of three generations of Americans of Polish heritage. To those newly arrived in the early days, Glos Narodu brought not only news of their compatriots, their problems and achievements, but even more important, an interpretation of American life, American hopes, and American ideals. As much as any other institution, your newspaper entered into the important work of raising up a generation of new citizens who had so much to give to our community at the same time that they made its values their own.

The record of five decades is one of progress and achievement in many fields—economic, social, cultural, philanthropic, and political. It is a record of new citizens, their children and their children's children, all enriching the life of our State by their individual and group contributions.

May I wish you many years of service as constructive and rewarding as those that have passed.

Cordially,

A. E. DRISCOLL,
Governor

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D. C., June 27, 1951

DEAR MR. OTLOWSKI: On this the fiftieth anniversary of the Glos Narodu, I wish to compliment and congratulate you and your entire staff and organization for the great and laudatory work you are doing for the American people of Polish extraction. To report the factual news and the views of governments, statesmen, and people, is a service to the community and your readers that cannot be surpassed. To know and discuss is to understand and appreciate.

Glos Narodu represents that segment of the American free press that is devoted to the principles of democracy. My best wishes to you on this midcentury day of service to American people of Polish extraction.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D. C., August 28, 1951.

MR. JOHN J. WOLCZANSKI,
Secretary, the American Publishing Co., Inc., Perth Amboy, N. J.

DEAR MR. WOLCZANSKI: Congratulations on your anniversary. Your half century of outstanding achievements in the field of newspaper publishing prompts me to send you, your staff, and readers most sincere congratulations. I believe Glos Narodu fills a gap which would otherwise deprive the subscribers of many informative and interesting articles and special features which, I feel, is most important to the Polish people. The fact that Glos Narodu is publishing this anniversary edition confirms its excellence, its service, its community appeal and interest. My heartiest wishes for the continued success of Glos Narodu.

Sincerely,

ANTONI N. SADLAK.

ST. ANTHONY'S ROMAN

CATHOLIC CHURCH,
Jersey City, N. J.

GLOS NARODU,
Jersey City, N. J.

DEAR EDITORIAL STAFF: As pastor of St. Anthony's parish, the oldest Polish parish in Jersey City, I wish to convey my sincere wishes to Glos Narodu, the oldest Polish weekly published in the East.

The Polish press deserves great credit for what it has done for the Polish people, especially during the last 50 years. Although hindered by different occurrences, Glos Narodu is carrying on; it brings the mother tongue into our homes, defends our character, and propagates our traditions. A majority of the Polish weeklies have gone from the horizon, but Glos Narodu is celebrating its 50th year. This golden jubilee is the unbeatable proof of the esteem in which it is held by the Polish people.

Therefore, for all your past and future achievements I am sending to the editors and the entire staff my best wishes for success and perseverance in your endeavors: May the Glos Narodu expand and serve the public for many years to come, to reach its one hundredth anniversary and more.

REV. LEON P. HAK,
Pastor, St. Anthony's Parish.

AUGUST 25, 1951.

MR. GEORGE OTLOWSKI,
President, Sons of Poland,
Glos Narodu, Perth Amboy, N. J.

DEAR MR. OTLOWSKI: On the occasion of the golden jubilee of your publication, Glos Narodu, which you will observe this month, I am pleased to congratulate your organization. I wish you continued success in making known the great struggle of the sons and daughters of Poland in the cause of true freedom, and for the preservation of the God-given rights of each individual.

With kind regards, I am

Very sincerely yours,

F. CARDINAL SPELLMAN,
Archbishop of New York.

HUDSON DISPATCH,

Union City, N. J., August 20, 1951.

DEAR MR. OTLOWSKI: I want to congratulate you on completing 50 years of publication. That is a long time in the life of any newspaper, even when you get out only one issue a week.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN MITCHELL,
Editor.

[From the Hudson Dispatch, Union City, N. J., of July 28, 1951]

SIEMINSKI PRAISES POLISH NEWSPAPER—JERSEY WEEKLY PLANS HALF-CENTURY ISSUE

"The cultural heritage of a people is its reservoir of moral courage in troubled times," Congressman ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI last night told a group of radio and newspapermen assembled at Hotel Plaza, Jersey City, to discuss the publication of the jubilee half-century issue of the People's Voice (Glos Narodu), Jersey City's weekly Polish-language newspaper.

SIEMINSKI announced his intent to include a feature of the jubilee edition, a chronicle of 50 years' progress of Americans of Polish heritage in the metropolitan area, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He compared the work of a foreign-language paper with that of the Voice of America. The exchange of our culture, "our hopes and ideals . . . is our best weapon against Russian communism," he declared.

The Voice of America, whose fight for a full \$85,000,000 appropriation he spearheaded to victory in Congress this past week, is keeping alive a spark of hope in the future for millions of Europeans, he said, while the foreign-language newspaper presents the story of Americanism enriched with the living culture of the new American who has found freedom.

SIEMINSKI's thoughts on the American story of the Polish immigrant were drawn upon by the publishers of the People's Voice, John J. Wolczanski and George Otlowski, as well as those of others present from the communications field, for incorporation in the anniversary edition which is scheduled to be printed in the last week of August.

The edition, it was announced, will tell in words and pictures the growth of the immigrant, his problems, and his achievements in the past 50 years as well as the part the paper itself has played in the community life.

[From the Jersey Journal]

GOLDEN JUBILEE OF GLOS NARODU

The forthcoming golden jubilee issue of the Polish weekly newspaper Glos Narodu, which has served in turn the Polish immigrants to New Jersey of 50 years ago and the Polish-American business and professional men of today, will emphasize the fact that America is still the land of opportunity.

Established back in 1901, when most of the Polish-speaking people in New Jersey were recent immigrants working in factories, the Glos Narodu has grown with the fortunes of the people it served. Today it can number among its readers civic, professional, and business leaders of the community.

Today, with their homeland oppressed under a foreign yoke, the people of Polish descent in this country have more reason than ever to rejoice in the freedom and the opportunity that America has offered. They will join most fervently with George Otlowski, president of the company which published Glos Narodu, when he says:

"On this fiftieth anniversary we dedicate this issue with a prayer for freedom and liberty for all."

AUGUST 21, 1951.

JERSEY JOURNAL,

Jersey City, N. J.

(Attention: Editorial department)

GENTLEMEN: The Glos Narodu, the Polish weekly of Jersey City, is the official organ of our association.

We naturally were quite pleased with your editorial which briefly outlined the 50 years that were covered by the Polish weekly in that span of time. The board of directors have asked me, as the general secretary of the organization, to convey our sincere appreciation to the Jersey Journal for the splendid presentation of the Glos Narodu's forthcoming golden jubilee.

Very truly yours,

ALEXANDER SUDNIK, Jr.,
General Secretary, Sons of Poland.

[From the Jersey Journal, Jersey City, N. J.,
of July 28, 1951]

SIEMINSKI LAUDS POLISH NEWSPAPER

Congressman ALFRED SIEMINSKI, speaking at a dinner of members of the Glos Narodu, Polish newspaper published in Jersey City, which is celebrating its fiftieth year of operation, declared he would salute the paper by introducing an article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, describing the progress of Americans of Polish descent for the past half-century.

The Glos Narodu, which in English means the voice of the people has offices at 167 Bay

Street. It was founded in Jersey City August 31, 1901.

SIEMINSKI told Polish radio workers and staff members of the Glos Narodu who attended the dinner at the Hotel Plaza last night that the "Polish newspaper has a definite place in the American community as long as the immigration program is open for non-English speaking countries.

"The Polish newspaper enables the people of Polish descent to keep in touch with the religious festivities of their country. Before the days of the iron curtain it served as a source of information to the Polish people concerning American activities. Even now it is occasionally smuggled into Poland in the wrappings of packages.

SIEMINSKI added the circulation of foreign language papers helps international relations. "Our Ambassadors should be Americans who understand the problems and background of the countries in which they are working," he declared.

WHOM,

ATLANTIC BROADCASTING CO., INC.,

New York, August 7, 1951.

The GLOS NARODU WEEKLY,

Peoples Voice,

Hudson County, N. J.

GENTLEMEN OF GLOS NARODU: In this important matter of the fiftieth year existence of the Polish language paper, let me have the privilege of sending my greetings and the hope for your further expansion and continuance of the promotion of Polish culture in America.

I hope, too, that the Polish language be furthered by the Glos Narodu and that your readers be increased and enriched with Polish tradition.

God bless you

With esteem, I am,

CASIMIR A. OTLOWSKI

Director, Polish Hour, Radio Station

WHOM.

LONG ISLAND BROADCASTING CORP.,

Woodside, N. Y., August 13, 1951

DEAR EDITOR: On the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of your Polish paper Glos Narodu am sending you my best congratulations for additional expansion and best of success.

At the same time I would like to see the young generations of Polish descent to take an interest in the Polish press especially the Glos Narodu which is serving the Polish people the past 50 years.

Once again, best wishes to Glos Narodu for the next 50 years. May it live to 100 years in high esteem and a big success.

EDWARD V. GRONET,

Director of Polish Program, Polka Time.

ASSOCIATION OF THE

SONS OF POLAND, INC.,

Jersey City, N. J.

The GLOS NARODU,

Perth Amboy, N. J.

GENTLEMEN: The Glos Narodu is undoubtedly the most influential Polish language paper in New Jersey. This, of course, is greatly due to the fact that the Glos Narodu is the official organ of the Sons of Poland and serves its 20,000 members.

We of the Sons of Poland are happy to congratulate you on the half century of service to the American of Polish descent.

You have done a magnificent job. We certainly hope that you are able to carry out in the future your many public services as you have in the past.

With sincerest best wishes, I am,

Yours sincerely,

ALBERT M. KLEMP,
Grand Master of the Sons of Poland.

Poland: After 12 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, when the unexpected Nazi-Soviet Nonaggression Pact was signed on August 23, 1939, it became clear that Poland's fate was sealed. The worst fears and suspicions of Poland's friends were realized on September 1 when Hitler's forces invaded Poland without a declaration of war. That was the beginning of World War II, one of the most tragic days in the history of western civilization. It also turned out to be the darkest day in the history of the unhappy Poles.

During the first 2 weeks of war, when the Poles were facing only the Nazis, they fought brilliantly and bravely against heavy odds, but on September 17, when the Red Army began to move against Poland from the east, again without a declaration of war, then it seemed that the end of Poland as an independent sovereign state was approaching and that in a few weeks the nation would be strangled by the evil forces of her two giant neighbors.

War blazed over Poland during the next several weeks, but by the end of October practically all organized resistance was eliminated, all Poland was occupied by Nazi-Soviet invaders, and all of Poland's 35,000,000 inhabitants were caught in a large concentration camp.

The designs of Hitler and Stalin against Poland were thus carried out by their henchmen according to plan. Millions of innocent Poles were uprooted from their native homes and driven eastward, deep into the Soviet Union to the "dark side of the moon," where many of them are still suffering and toiling in slave labor camps. Hitler's henchmen disposed of another several million Poles by means of inhuman gas-chamber murders. Still, in the midst of this holocaust brave and valiant souls continued to fight against Nazi-Communist tyrants. While the Government fled Poland and finally took refuge in London, many brave Poles fought the enemy in towns and in villages, day in and day out, in the open marshes and in hidden forests. They carried on their fight for independence and freedom from 1939 until mid-1945, for almost 5 years. From the information on hand, many of them are still carrying on that fight against their new oppressors.

At the end of World War II Poland lost more than 60,000 square miles of territory and about 10,000,000 inhabitants to her "liberator" the Soviet Union. This enormous loss was partially compensated by allotting some 30,000 square miles of eastern Germany to Poland. But these territorial changes were made against Poland's real wishes and therefore Po-

land actually lost more territory in World War II than Germany.

Since 1945 Poland's "liberators" have imposed a new tyranny upon her helpless people, a ruthless and heartless type of tyranny, even more cruel than the despised Nazi tyranny.

Poland's history is full of national tragedies. This is not the first time that Poland has been partitioned and dismembered among her foes. Her history of the last one-hundred-and-seventy-five-odd years is marked by such partitions. And in the end, through the valor of her fighting sons, she has managed to regain her independence and freedom.

We in the United States, in recalling that fateful September 1, know that the race which gave us, in our Revolutionary War, General Kosciuszko and General Pulaski, shall not overlong suffer under tyranny.

Address of A. H. Ward, of Aiken, S. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a copy of an address delivered by Mr. A. H. Ward, of Aiken, S. C., at the annual tobacco festival held at Mullins, S. C., on August 21, 1951. Mr. Ward is one of our leading citizens and has devoted his entire life to improving farming conditions in the South. He is one of the leading orators in the South and I am certain every Member of Congress will enjoy reading this address:

Mr. Chairman, Congressman John McMILLAN, Mayer Turbeville, other distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, we have gathered today to pay tribute to a great crop, the golden weed of the Pee Dee, we are here to honor the successful producers of this crop, we are here to honor the business interest and others of this town who have made this festival possible, and we are here to do honor to the tobacco queens of this and surrounding towns.

Within the span of a little more than 50 years, we have seen the tobacco industry in this area develop from a small beginning to now when it brings to the producers of this area of South Carolina something like \$70,000,000 annually. It has been responsible for making this one of the highest income per acre areas in the United States. It has made of this a thriving town. The farmers and businessmen of this section are to be congratulated on their foresight, and progress and their ability to work together in building a great and prosperous area with tobacco as one of the principal sources of income. You are blest with a soil that is so well adapted to the growing of this great crop. You farmers have used science, efficiency, and knowledge to produce as fine tobacco as is grown any place on the globe.

It is somewhat strange that prior to 1927 no research or experimental work had been done on tobacco. Up to that time our average yields ran around 600 to 800 pounds

per acre. Then the Department of Agriculture and our State experiment stations began to work on developing new varieties and improved cultural practices. Now yields average 1,100 and 1,200 pounds per acre with some farmers harvesting 1,600 and 1,800 pounds per acre.

What a peace of mind and feeling of satisfaction there comes to one as he smokes a cigarette made from South Carolina-grown tobacco. It doesn't matter whether it is a business deal or whether he is making love to a beautiful tobacco queen, he watches the curling smoke and smells the sweet aroma of South Carolina tobacco, and success is bound to result. Long ago, young ladies were taught to say, "Lips that touch tobacco can never touch mine." My, how times have changed.

You people live in a section that is steeped in history. From pre-Revolutionary War days up to the present time, you have been a peace-loving people. But whenever the call to arms came, people from the Pee Dee were ever ready to shoulder their arms and march into battle until peace was assured. Then you were ready to return home and pursue your peaceful occupations. People who have lived here have wanted to be left alone. They disliked the raids of the Indians, so your forefathers drove them out. They disliked the interference of the British redcoats, so they rose in their might and drove them out. Many of you here, had a distaste for the views and actions of Germans, and Japs, and Italians. You went out to meet them in mortal combat and administered a stinging defeat. You abhor the tactics of the Reds today, and your sons will give a good account of themselves. Many of you have a distaste for too much Government interference, and something needs to be done about it. Your fathers knew how to govern themselves and they got along fairly well. It was people like yourselves, rural people and small-town people, who long ago gave us our freedom and our American way of life. Unless people like you have a greater voice in government today, our freedom will not survive. I would that we had more men in Congress like JOHN McMILLAN, who knows the farmers' problems, who has the farmers' welfare at heart and who put America first.

You the rural and small-town people constitute the last bulwark of democracy in America. You are needed as a balance wheel in our social, political, economic, and religious lives.

Nowadays, we see a trend toward centralized government. When our forefathers wrote the Bill of Rights, they thought they were avoiding just such a thing as we see happening about us. Yet, in spite of all that can be done, our Nation is trending toward socialism. There are millions of people in our country who cry out for socialized medicine, socialized insurance, socialized business, socialized agriculture, socialized this and socialized that. You do not find many socialistic minded people among farmers. They live close to the soil, close to nature and close to God. I do not believe you will find one single Communist on all of the 40,000 farms of South Carolina. There are millions who cry out for guaranteed employment and guaranteed income. This great Nation and its way of life came to us because our fathers were willing to work and toil. Your forefathers in this very area used their axes and grubbing hoes and bent their backs to clear this land of the trees.

A few days ago Admiral Fechteler said, "We Americans need to work until we sweat. If rivers of perspiration can save one drop of blood, it will be very worth while." Well, on a hot day like this we should save many drops of blood.

There is a modern idea abroad in the land that we can get something for nothing. A few days ago we were dismayed and chagrined that 90 young Americans were dismissed from one of our educational institutions for cribbing. They were simply following the modern American idea of getting something for nothing. They are not the only people guilty of cribbing. There are millions who are willing to beg the Government for a livelihood. There are many who will resort to crime, underground government, and gambling in order to keep from earning an honest living. We are witnessing the breakdown of the moral fiber of the Nation. Yes, these 90 young men broke an honor system, a code of ethics. There are too many people in America who are operating without an honor system. We see it in Government circles, we see it in politics, we have seen the gift of material things for political favors and vice versa. Almost every newspaper carries an account of some scandal by some Government official. The crying need of this Nation today is for undiluted honesty in government. There is no substitute for honesty. It is needed in business, in homes, in politics, in basketball, and baseball, and in all our relations with our fellow man.

Every load of tobacco which comes to this market represents honest work and toil on the part of somebody.

There are so many parents nowadays who do not want their children to work. They probably want them to be modern Democrats. This is a different kind of system from that practiced by our forefathers. You tobacco farmers have to work for what you get. I repeat that the last vestige of democracy left in this land is among farm people and small-town people.

Within recent months much ill-feeling toward farmers has been engendered by some of the metropolitan press, some commentators and some columnists. Housewives are told that farmers are responsible for the high cost of living. They are told that the farmer is a gouger and that he is selfish and that he is getting rich. The high cost of living is due to inflation, and the farmer isn't getting his share of the national income.

Factory wages are up 18 percent and farm income is down 15 percent since 1947. Yet we are told the farmer is getting rich. Within the past 60 days the price of cotton has dropped \$50 a bale. Figuring a similar drop in cottonseed that means \$50,000 less than was expected at planting time by South Carolina cotton farmers. Whenever the Government enters the field of production asking for a bumper crop, it has a responsibility to enter the price field in order that cotton producers making normal yields shall not suffer a loss.

Farmers are doing a splendid job. In the last 20 years they have increased per acre yields by 50 percent. Only 6 percent of the population of the world live in these United States. The farmers of America constitute only 1 percent of the population of the world, yet they produce 12 percent of all the food and 33 percent of all the meat in the world.

Sometimes we have surpluses of food and we complain about it. I'd rather live in a land with every storage house bursting out with surpluses than to live where millions of people are hungry and millions of children are starving to death. Yes, we've made progress. It now takes a farmer 1 hour to do a job, which took his forefather 1 week to do a hundred years ago.

Here today is a fine demonstration of cooperation between farmers and businessmen. Every segment of this Nation's activity is so interwoven with every other segment. Long ago McCormick built a reaper and binder, Deere produced the binder twine, Hill built

the railroads and Pillsbury built flour mills. That must happen today. This tobacco industry depends not alone upon you farmers, but upon the warehousemen, the dryers, the big tobacco companies, the highways, the railroads, the telephones, the telegraph, the bankers, and others. There must be a balance between agriculture and industry if there is to be lasting prosperity.

You businessmen of Mullins are interested in selling more tobacco here and in doing more business. That is your right. We love progress and prosperity. If you want this town known far and wide, build it yourselves and then build for quality and build for character. As you build, put character in every brick, every board, and every shingle. Build character into your business, in your organizations, in every load of tobacco, and in every relationship with your fellow man.

America must be strong. It must be strong agriculturally, industrially, militarily, educationally, and of more importance, it must be strong spiritually.

Apparently Federal Government Is Making It Difficult for Small Business To Exist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from one of our leading attorneys of my home city of Tulsa, Okla., in which he says that apparently the Federal Government is doing most everything it can to make it difficult for small business to exist.

My friend explains his statement by showing a comparison of two corporations. One is the corporation that has been in business for several years and the other is a new corporation which has only been in business a year or two. He gives facts and figures showing that the two corporations have the same number of employees, the same amount of equipment and investment, and the same net income. Yet the old corporation has a \$75,000 excess-profits-tax credit and the new corporation has a \$27,000 excess-profits-tax credit. My friend insists that there is no reason that relief is given older corporations and yet cannot be given new corporations. Therefore, I say apparently the Federal Government is making it difficult for small business to exist.

The letter from my friend, a Tulsa attorney, follows:

You will recall, I trust, the occasion that I had the opportunity to speak to you in the Capitol Building about a month back concerning the excess-profits-tax law as its burden hit young and new businesses—essentially small businesses. You asked me to write to you on this matter and personal business affairs have unfortunately delayed me.

While I am not a tax expert, the excess-profits tax uses as a base period the 4-year interval from January 1, 1946, to December 31, 1949. To determine your excess-profit credit, you use the three best years of this base period. A corporation that was in existence during this period of time is thus

able to take an average of its three best years and then 85 percent of that average is, substantially, its excess-profits-tax base. This means income in excess of that excess-profits credit will be subject to the excess-profits tax. For a young corporation that was not in existence throughout that period, say 1 year or less than that period, in the application of the same formula it would be forced to take less than a year's earnings, in effect divide that by three and take 85 percent of the sum remaining as an excess-profits-tax credit. As I indicated to you, a comparison of two competing firms here in Tulsa, of which I am informed, shows that with the same number of employees, same amount of equipment and investment, and the same net income, the old corporation has a \$75,000 excess-profits-tax credit and the new corporation has a \$27,000 excess-profits-tax credit. Frankly, such a thing is monstrous and many people, as well as I, feel that there is no reason that relief is given older corporations and yet cannot be given to new corporations.

I am quite conscious of the so-called provisions for new corporations but the alternate methods given are based on industry average rates of return which are determined in Washington and they do not constitute what we normally think of as relief.

Anything you can do to correct these injustices would certainly be in the best interest of the American citizen. I say this because if there is anything that is in the best interest of the American citizen and industries, whether large or small, it is having a quantity of healthy small businesses. Yet, to this writer, it appears that the Government is doing most everything it can to make it difficult for small business to exist.

Thanking you for your courtesy and attention in this matter, I am.

This Man Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PHIL J. WELCH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press of September 9, 1951:

THIS MAN ACHESON

One dramatic appearance sent William Jennings Bryan to fame. That was his "crown of thorns and cross of gold" speech at the 1896 Democratic National Convention.

The superb conduct of Secretary of State Dean Acheson presiding over the Japanese Peace Conference Friday night at San Francisco, could and may do for the much harassed and beleaguered statesman, what a year of plodding drudgery in foreign affairs never could bring about.

Television and radio audiences Friday night, many unfriendly to Mr. Truman's first minister of state, were in accord that the Secretary came off with high honors against the adept Gromyko. Mr. Acheson presided with fairness, with firmness, and with complete knowledge of parliamentary law. He was master of the situation from the first fall of the gavel until the late adjournment.

It is a strange thing but sometimes isolated happenings change history. It is not beyond the realm of possibility that this

prime minister, long target of the press, the Republicans, and even among many of the administration party, by his statesmanship as presiding officer of the 1951 world peace conference, may rehabilitate himself and confound his critics. Our own belief is that McCarthyism today is at cellar level in Washington senatorial circles.

The Late Roy N. Lotspeich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday night, death came to Mr. Roy N. Lotspeich, president and publisher of the Knoxville Journal. He was a man of wide vision and great courage. With him his country always came first. He regarded the grave national issues confronting our country above and beyond party considerations. With it all, he was a kindly man who liked to help people. As a publisher he imparted his fine qualities of character to his newspaper with the result that it became a great newspaper with but one interest to serve—the public interest. After his death, the Journal carried an editorial written by Mr. Lotspeich's loyal friend, Guy L. Smith, one of the Nation's ablest editors, which I think is of sufficient public interest that I am inserting it in the RECORD where it may be widely available:

ROY N. LOTSPPEICH

Where to begin?

What incidents to choose from 69 years of active, vigorous living?

What words to use to express the devotion and loyalty of a great organization to the man who was its chief not simply by the accident of corporate position, but because of outstanding characteristics of mind and heart?

To speak for the people in his organization, then, the words must be personal. They must need be sorrowful and sentimental, because he whom they have lost in death was not just a name, or a casual acquaintance, but a man of flesh and blood with whom they joined hands to serve an institution.

So the Journal organization, one may begin by saying, mourns the loss of Roy N. Lotspeich, president and publisher of the Knoxville Journal until his death here on Saturday night. The community, as well, in that death lost one of its authentic personalities, the like of which it will not soon see again.

Trying in a moment's space to weigh, compress, and analyze the reason why he was a great human being, perhaps the thought that claims first attention was his friendliness. He liked people, big people, little people, successful people and those who for one reason or another had failed. This friendliness was apparent wherever he was, in his office, on the street, in a railway lounge, or at a party at home. He anticipated a friendly response and for that reason never was reluctant to take the initiative in striking up an acquaintance. Almost invariably the response was there, too.

Because he was a friendly man in, for the most part, a friendly world, he doted on doing things for people, with no thought of self-serving. His associates know that there

never lived a man who got greater or more sincere pleasure from doing nice things for people than did Mr. Lotspeich.

It goes without saying that he was both intelligent and unusually well informed. The success story which he lived is proof enough of that. It was in the free-enterprise tradition which has made this a great nation through the composite achievements over the years of such men as this one we have lost. As a young man and from a standing start he became one of the South's great industrialists before he became a newspaper publisher.

He was loyal, both to friends and to principles. What kind of weather his friends encountered did not make any difference, once his loyalty was engaged. He was willing to fight for his friends, and, under provocation he was just as loyal an opponent as he was a friend. The thing about it was, though, that to a man of such generous instincts forgiveness came easy. A fight concluded, he was always willing to make friends.

What courage he had. Like almost every other man who makes a great success, he knew some dark days in business, not many but still a few. He had a fighting heart if ever a man had. He never envisioned defeat in any undertaking, even though it might appear impossible. He sometimes expected the impossible of his men, and frequently got it.

Courage is the psychological cousin of optimism, and here was a man in whom optimism was invincible. His darkest hours were brightened by a steadfast conviction that they would pass, and pass they did invariably.

And he had a streak of sentiment in him a yard wide. East Tennessee, Greene County as the place of his birth and early years, Knoxville, as the scene of his life career—what but good could come out of any of them? That was the way he saw it and would hear of nothing else.

To serve that sentiment about his section, county, and town, he was a natural and proper prospect in any civic undertaking. From the early beginnings of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, under the leadership of the late David Chapman, down to his most recent civic enterprise, Blount Memorial Park Association, Mr. Lotspeich was a ready and generous planner and giver. He felt he owed his success to his city and section and personally, and through his newspaper, he supported everything he believed to be to their advantage.

A devoted husband and father, he provided an example of affection and solicitude for his family which was as well known as any of his other notable characteristics.

It was said above that Mr. Lotspeich was as loyal to principles as he was to people and the statement is undeniable. His newspaper, this newspaper, was the instrumentality through which was expressed the burning patriotism that every intimate of his knew well. He possessed a remarkable grasp of the end effects of forces which have been put in action in this country mainly in our times. For example, he was denouncing communism at a time when it was fashionable in certain circles to coddle and encourage it, and no less outspoken has been his position on socialism, corruption, and other evils in government. There is no worse plight for any publication than to have a cowardly publisher, and this man's courage to let his paper tell the truth as it saw it and to fight for what it believed to be right, regardless of consequences, was a constant source of inspiration and a basis of loyalty to his people. Not only did Knoxville and east Tennessee lose a great citizen in his death, but the Nation lost a devoted patriot.

So the words have been said, mayhap awkwardly and haltingly, which again may not be unfitting when they, in whose behalf

they are spoken, are under the deepest and most painful consciousness of their loss. Words can suggest, they can indicate the facets of a complex human being, especially one blessed with such unusual powers and abilities as Mr. Lotspeich, but the full-rounded picture of such a man is formed in having known him or having had him as a friend. The picture of a man operating a great institution is one picture; that of the same man choking up and having his eyes brimming with tears when his printers sent flowers to his sickbed is another, yet the man is the same and only for those who really knew him can it be complete.

Fortunately, as Mr. Lotspeich so often said, Nature has a way of carrying on, no matter what happens. His dearest wish, that his newspaper be carried on in the great tradition which he had established, will be regarded by his organization as a sacred trust. The last days of its publisher were made content in the confidence that this would be so.

**With Public Recognition that Southern
Alabama Is a Mighty Fine Place in
Which To Live and Work, the Huge
Alabama Power Co. at Salco Will Prove
an Important Source of Power in De-
veloping Large Chemical Industries
Closely Related to McIntosh Salt and
Its Many Byproducts**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, along with the news of the Alabama Power Co. breaking ground for the new Barry steam generating plant at Salco, comes word of another \$60,000,000 industry to be built there—a rayon textile mill.

Mr. Speaker, more than a half century ago—and when first I learned about a thing called electricity, I queried my father, "Dad, can you really light a house without burning coal oil or kerosene?" "Yes, you can," he said, "with electricity." When I asked him what electricity was, I remember his saying, "Son, I don't think anybody in the world knows exactly what electricity is, and I don't know that it is absolutely necessary that we should know. Some day someone will find out, but whatever it is, I predict that it will do more to improve the lot of mankind than any discovery that has ever been made. Now, son, I told you we don't know just what electricity is, but it is not necessary that we know what things are if we know how to create them and use them for the benefit of man."

My father went on to say, "We know now, my boy, that we can take a mass of iron, cut it into certain shapes, wrap cotton-covered copper wire around the iron so as to form a ring; and we can take another bar of iron wrapped with the same kind of wire, and then by using an engine to turn the bar inside the ring, not alone can we produce elec-

tricity to light the house, but actually use the electricity to drive other machines. Thusly, by reversing the process we can use the power made by an electrical generator so that it will run vehicles"; and out of these applications of electric power came the first streetcar line in all the world.

Mr. Speaker, various men as well as groups have attempted to decide just what invention or the establishment of what principle has added most to the development of civilized man. Some have said the discovery and application of the principle of the wheel and axle. Some say it was the lever. Some there are who claim the printing press was the greatest, inasmuch as that enabled man to acquire knowledge with which to improve his understanding of and his usefulness to his fellows.

I myself hold to an entirely different theory. History has recorded man's doings on this earth for more than 6,000 years, but the existence of the centers of the life of earliest man have either entirely disappeared from the earth or else the inhabitants of those areas are among some of the world's most backward people. The history of European development—easily traceable back several thousand years—reveals, certainly, that some of the most backward areas of the world are to be found on that continent. The discovery of North America, however, was made less than 500 years ago, and the establishment of these United States of America was instituted less than 160 years ago.

I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that I make overstatement in saying that we in this country have built on this continent a more advanced civilization in 160 years than has been developed anywhere else on the planet in the 6,000 years of recorded history.

Much of all that America is today revolves around the fact that it was Benjamin Franklin, an American pioneer, Revolutionary leader, philosopher, writer, statesman, and scientist, who, when as a boy flying a kite, made discovery during a rainstorm that lightning was, in fact, electricity.

There are a dozen or more factors which have contributed to the tremendous developments that we have achieved here in our country. Not the least of these were our great natural resources, our great agriculture, minerals, timber, water, and transportation. They all have contributed much to our development.

The inventive genius of our people—Deere, McCormick, and others—in developing agricultural machinery which began with the plow; the empire builders who staked out the transcontinental railroads; the Schwabs and Carnegies, who brought forth the age of steel and steel products that have been wrought into our skyscrapers, our railroads, and our bridges; the Goulds, the Vanderbilts, the Harrimans, the Morgans, the Chryslers, and the Fords—these were all men whose dreams were fabricated into the realities which make for the high standard of living enjoyed by our peoples—and which the world has come to know as the American way of life.

I did not intend to encompass all of America's great development in this short talk. I wanted to talk to you all about our Southland—of our own great potentialities in the cotton South—and particularly did I want to talk to you about my State of Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, more particularly do I want to talk to you at some length about a great American and Alabama man—Tom Martin, chairman of the board of the Alabama Power Co.

Somewhere I one time read that possibly the greatest invention that had ever been made was that contrivance put together by Eli Whitney. It was an engine-driven gadget designed to remove cottonseed from the staple. Thus, our plantation Negroes learned to call it the cotton gin—a name which has stuck to it until this very day.

There is no doubt but what the cotton gin was an invention that has had much to do with our cotton economy inasmuch as, prior to its development, hundreds of thousands of Negroes spent millions upon millions of man-hours picking the seeds out of cotton by hand. Indeed, it was a Herculean task for a person to hand-pick the seeds from as much as one pound of American-produced cotton in a single day.

In times like these when we hear of fifteen to eighteen billion 500-pound bale crops of cotton, we can well appreciate the enormous value of the cotton gin. I well remember the story of a ship which landed in England with 50 bales of cotton aboard, the captain of which was thrown into jail, for no particular reason, or with any specific charge against him except that he had brought 50 or 60 bales of cotton into port in one cargo. It was reasoned that inasmuch as no mortal on earth could have that much cotton at any one time—he had to be "in league with the devil himself" to have acquired that many bales of cotton. The story tells of the trouble to which the captain was put in his efforts to explain where on earth he could have acquired that many bales of cotton.

As the days of reconstruction turned into years—and unfortunately for our Southern economy—our progress was still hitched to a one-galled planter—and a one-mule farm. Hence, it is not surprising to have it authoritatively stated that our natural resources of timber and water have done more to improve the economy of the cotton South than have all other factors combined.

The great abundance of timber in our southland has enabled us to ship billions upon billions of board feet to northern and world-wide markets, and with the funds obtained therefrom, to build a more solid economy and standard of living than ever before known. Forest products in general, our sawed timber, our plywood, furniture, barrel staves, boxes, ax and pick handles alone, have brought billions of income to the Southern States.

The influence of all of these, however, have been dwarfed into insignificance by the magic of the white power generated by water flowing over dams built in our rivers and coal taken from the bowels of

the earth in our own beloved State of Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, principal among all business concerns to which the unborn generations of southerners will forever be indebted is the Alabama Power Co., its affiliates, its associates, and to those intrepid men whose vision of the economic worth of electrical energy caused them to stake their all to elevate the cotton South from being the prime economic problem of these United States to one of the most fruitful and productive areas on the face of this earth.

Far and above all others to whom this credit is due is my good and long-time friend, Thomas Wesley Martin, born at Scottsboro, Ala., in August of 1881. Mr. Speaker, I would have you know that in the short span of his lifetime Tom Martin has done more to make the South the great country that it is today than any other man that has ever lived.

Mr. Speaker, no more significant honor could be paid any man than the distinction recently given to Tom Martin by the Alabama State Legislature as reported in the news as well as the editorial column of the Birmingham News of August 2.

What follows is an editorial clipped from the Birmingham News as of that date:

WELL-DESERVED SALUTE—LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION HONORS ONE OF OUR FINEST THOMAS W. MARTIN

(By Fred Taylor)

MONTGOMERY, ALA., August 2—Gov. Gordon Persons today signed a house joint resolution honoring one of Alabama's outstanding—many consider him the outstanding—citizens.

He is Thomas W. Martin, Birmingham lawyer, businessman, and chairman of the board of the Alabama Power Co.

But no more need be said. The resolution, introduced by Jefferson Representative J. G. (Jimmy) Adams, Jr., and Dallas Representative Walter C. Givhan, speaks for itself. It was passed unanimously by both the house and senate and it reads.

"House Joint Resolution No. 78

"Whereas Thomas W. Martin, a native son of Alabama, has for many years given of his time and talents for the benefit of the people of Alabama and the South; and

"Whereas Thomas W. Martin has been instrumental in getting many important industries to establish plants in the State of Alabama which are of great benefit to the State and the people of the State, and

"Whereas Thomas W. Martin has been greatly instrumental in organizing and establishing the Southern Research Institute at Birmingham, which institute has been of great service to the manufacturing industry in Alabama and the southeast; and

"Whereas the Legislature of Alabama desires to express its appreciation, and the appreciation of the people of Alabama, for the distinguished achievements of Thomas W. Martin. Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, that the house of representatives (the senate concurring), Takes this opportunity to express its thanks and appreciation to Mr. Martin for his constant, untiring, and unselfish work in the fields of industry, education, research and history, for the benefit of the people of Alabama and the South; be it further

"Resolved, That it is the hope and wish of this body, and of the people of Alabama, that Thomas W. Martin may be spared for many years to come to continue and will be

able to continue the great and beneficial works in which he is engaged.

"A copy of this resolution, when passed by the legislature, is to be sent by the secretary of state to Thomas W. Martin."

Tom Martin, one of the first and foremost of all living southerners, is the son of William and Margaret Martin, the grandson of Thomas and Elizabeth Jane Martin, the great-grandson of Jesse Martin, and the great-great-grandson of Frank Martin, a soldier in the Revolution, who moved from Halifax County, Va., to Alabama in 1808.

Tom Martin's father, a lawyer, was attorney general of Alabama from 1889 to 1894, and was serving as speaker of the Alabama House of Representatives at the very time of his death in 1907.

Receiving his preparatory education at Starke's University School in Montgomery, Tom Martin studied law at the University of Alabama in 1899-1900, and following his admission to the bar in 1901, practiced with his father in Montgomery. He served as assistant attorney general of the State from 1903 to 1911, during which time he was also junior partner in the Montgomery law firm of Martin & Martin until the death of his father in 1907. The firm then became Tyson, Wilson, & Martin, and, in 1912, Tom Martin moved to Birmingham to become general counsel of the Alabama Power Co. In 1915 he took on the added duties of vice president, and, on February 16, 1920, was elected president but still retaining the post of general counsel. In October 1949 he was elected chairman of the board.

Mr. Speaker, the original power program of the company was financed in England and with English capital through the Alabama Traction, Light & Power Co., Ltd., which company acquired the common stock of the Alabama Power Co. That plan of financing was superseded by an American plan—due to the situation brought about by the First World War. Inasmuch as control of the company still rested in England, the directors authorized Tom Martin to go to England to negotiate this program for an American company to succeed the Canadian company. This he did in 1924, and, upon his return, the Southeastern Power & Light Co. was organized under the laws of Maine with Mr. Martin as president.

The latter company then acquired all of the holdings of the Canadian company, including control of the Alabama Power Co., the Mississippi Power Co., the Gulf Power Co., the Georgia Power Co., and the South Carolina Power Co. In 1930, the Southeastern Power & Light Co. was merged into the Commonwealth & Southern Corp., with Mr. Martin as the first president of the Commonwealth & Southern Corp. After serving 2 years, he resigned, but continued as a director and as president of the Alabama Power Co. This company serves directly or at wholesale the greater part of the domestic and commercial electric power business in 840 communities in Alabama. One of its largest hydroelectric developments was named in honor of Tom Martin in 1926, whose name was fast becoming known throughout the country.

Largely responsible for the organization in 1941 of the Alabama Research Institute—the name of which was changed later to Southern Research Institute—this institute is a nonprofit organization supported by business and commerce and provides much needed technological facilities for southern industry. An original founder, Mr. Martin is still chairman of the board of trustees of the institute, which operates in Birmingham with a laboratory, a director, and staff of scientists.

Tom Martin has served in innumerable other community and public efforts, and was largely responsible for the organization in 1937 of the Alabama State Chamber of Commerce, of which he is still a director and member of the executive committee. Chairman, in Alabama, of the Finnish Appeal in 1940, the Order of the White Rose of Finland was conferred on him by the President of the Republic in 1941. Honorary LL. D. degrees were conferred on him by Cumberland University in 1931 and by the University of Alabama in 1943.

In 1937, he acquired a panoramic hand-painted wallpaper made in France circa 1800, depicting, in five panels, French activities in Alabama under the title "The French at Algileville," or "Foundation of the State of Marengo." This settlement is best known in Alabama as Vine and Olive Colony.

This he presented to the Alabama Department of Archives and History in behalf of Mrs. Martin and himself. In recognition of his contribution to arts and to science, he was, in 1940, made an Officer d'Academie by the French Government, and was decorated with the Palmes Academiques, France's highest recognition to men of letters, arts and sciences, in recognition of his writings on early French activities in Alabama and the French settlement at Demopolis, Ala., called The Vine and Olive Colony.

Mr. Speaker, I remember your own great personal elation when Tom Martin was chosen the South's man of the year in 1946, and selected in 1947, in a Nation-wide vote conducted by *Forbes* magazine, one of America's 50 foremost business leaders.

He was principally responsible for presenting, in 1948, the achievements of his long-time friend, Dr. William Crawford Gorgas, of Alabama, in behalf of the Gorgas Hall of Fame Committee, for election to the New York University Hall of Fame for Great Americans, and, in the election in 1950 Dr. Gorgas was elected by the highest vote.

At formal ceremony at New York University, on May 24, 1951, Mr. Martin presented the bust of Dr. Gorgas to the Hall of Fame in behalf of the friends of Dr. Gorgas. On that bust it is worthy of permanent record to note these immortal words of Dr. Gorgas himself, in commenting upon his successful efforts at Panama and Habana in mosquito control:

If there were no other way to control yellow fever and malaria, the hot countries would be left to the inertia of the ages.

Thus you see, Mr. Speaker, the great significance of the work of that great Alabamian Dr. Gorgas, to southern

United States as well as to the hot countries.

Mr. Martin was chairman, from 1944 to 1948, of the Talladega County War Plants Conversion Committee, which was formed to make plans for the conversion of war plants in Talladega County to peacetime uses. These efforts finally resulted in the leasing of practically all of the war-plant facilities of the United States capable of peacetime production.

A director and chairman of the board of directors of the Alabama Power Co., director of the Southern Co., Coosa River Newsprint Co., and the First National Bank of Birmingham, Mr. Martin is a member of, among others, the American, Alabama, and Birmingham bar associations.

Mr. Speaker, I am always glad to avail myself of an opportunity to commend a friend or some great organization. On this occasion, I take opportunity to commend Tom Martin and the Alabama Power Co. which he heads, for the tremendous benefits they have brought to our State through the production of electrical energy and through the great genius of this man inasmuch as there has come to our Southland a happier way of life for every man, woman, and child residing in this area.

Mr. Speaker, the power that Tom Martin and the Alabama Power Co. created was not just a new form of energy. It was a something that gave to us in Alabama a new mode of existence.

In building the Alabama Power Co. to its great strength and position in American life, Tom Martin did more than exploit an invention that made for progress. He opened a way to a new mode of life in our every Southern State.

What I have said heretofore is apropos of the recent ground breaking near Salco, Ala., the starting of one of the greatest powerhouses ever built in southern Alabama, a plant to be known as the Barry steam plant of the Alabama Power Co.

Jim Barry, known, beloved, and respected, has been associated with the Alabama Power Co. since 1918. His appointment as local manager and division superintendent at Anniston in the eastern division was at a time when that division served 4,600 customers out of a total of only 9,600 served by the Alabama Power Co.

Distinguished as a marvelous engineer, he took an active part in the construction of Mitchell Dam, was named southern division manager in 1923 and elected vice president in charge of operations in 1927. He served as vice president and general manager from 1932 until 1949, when he succeeded President Thomas W. Martin, who that year was elected chairman of the board.

Mr. Speaker, it is altogether fitting that the Alabama Power Co.'s new steam plant at Salco should be named in honor of Jim Barry. Jim Barry is universally known as a hard-working, capable engineer, a distinguished southern gentleman and a great executive, respected not alone for his abilities but also for his many fine personal qualities which have endeared him to all who know him.

The concept of the generating plant at Salco is not new. Foreseeing the future of the Mobile area as far back as 1931, studies were instituted by the Alabama Power Co. to disclose the comparative costs of power for large power consumers in various places in the country.

These studies, which I well remember, disclosed that the cost of products requiring big blocks of electric power was cheaper in Mobile for many types of industry than at any other point. It was because of these facts that studies were begun for building a large steam-driven generating plant.

The plant, as it was laid out in 1931, was to contain five 100,000 kilowatt steam driven generators, and was to be located on a large tract owned by the company, with the view of making possible a big industrial center just north of Mobile. The principal reason why construction of the plant did not go ahead in the thirties was due to the long depression followed by World War II.

However, the ever-increasing demands for power over the Alabama Power Co. system during the past year, resulting in considerable part from a revision of national defense plans, together with other unexpected demands, including the demand for power to develop the McIntosh salt dome—caused immediate consideration of plans to provide additional power capacity in the Mobile area.

The new plant will have an immediate capacity of 250,000 kilowatts of power for national defense and essential civilian use. The building of a power plant near Salco therefore had its inception some 20 years ago in the future planning of power for the system, particularly in the vision of the then chief engineer, Oscar Gowen Thurlow. So convinced of the future of the Mobile area was the Alabama Power Co. that they then purchased the lands which now are the site of the proposed new Barry steam plant.

The new Barry steam plant is being designed so that ultimately it could have a capacity of 1,000,000 kilowatts. The initial capacity, as I have said, will be 250,000 kilowatts in two 125,000 kilowatt generating units. The first unit is expected to be in operation late in 1953, and the second in 1954. These generating units will be the largest yet installed on Alabama Power Co.'s system, and will have a capacity more than twice that of the company's Chickasaw steam plant, and almost as great as that of Gorgas No. 2 steam plant.

To prepare the site for the new plant, thousands of cubic yards of soil will have to be removed. The plant building will be supported by approximately 4,000 piles driven to depths varying between 55 and 65 feet. The over-all height of the building will be the equivalent of a 12-story building. The boilers alone will be as high as an 11-story building.

When the plant is in full operation it will use 100 tons of coal per hour. At normal operation the first two units of the Barry steam plant are expected to consume 800,000 tons of coal per year—or enough to heat 150,000 southern

homes of average size during an average winter.

An interesting feature of this plant will be the method by which the steam entering the turbine will be reheated after passing through the high-pressure end and before entering the low-pressure end of the turbine. This feature makes possible increased economy.

After the steam passes through the turbines, it is condensed for return to the boiler. In each of the two condensers to serve the two 125,000-kilowatt generating units there will be approximately 62½ miles of 1-inch tubing through which will pass the cooling water to convert the steam leaving the turbine into water. When the turbines are running at full load each condenser will require approximately 90,000 gallons of water per minute for cooling. This water, which will be pumped from the Mobile River, will discharge back into the river downstream from the plant. It is not to be consumed. The availability of this great amount of water from Mobile River made the plant possible at this location.

In addition to the Barry steam plant, the Alabama Power Co. has other important facilities under construction and on completion of its present program in 1954 it will have generating capacity of 1,384,500 kilowatts compared with 570,600 kilowatts in 1940.

Now that most of the large-scale rural construction program is completed, electric service will be available to practically all of the farms within the service area of the Alabama Power Co. Construction activities and expenditures currently are the greatest in the history of the company.

These expenditures—

Tom Martin declares—

are assurance of the intention of the Alabama Power Co. to serve well the 480,000 customers who get their power supply directly from us, and the 100,000 who receive it indirectly through other distributors.

Mr. Speaker, we in Alabama have great natural beauties, many physical assets, and a vast fund of resources of all kinds which have been untouched for centuries. Among the greatest of all assets within the State of Alabama are its many business concerns and great industries.

Mr. Speaker, I count among the greatest of these, if not the greatest, is the Alabama Power Co. I have no hesitation in saying, whether it be in the cloakrooms, whether in a congressional committee, or on the floor of Congress or elsewhere, that in my opinion, the Alabama Power Co. has done more to foster the industrial and economic development of our State than any other being or agency.

The reason it has been such a great leader in these fields is because of the vision and dynamic qualities of a man who has been at its helm for these many many years. I refer to that fine gentleman and my good friend, Tom Martin.

The Alabama Power Co. also is a leader because of the talent and vision of the men who are and have been associated with Tom Martin in the enterprise—

Eugene A. Yates, formerly a vice president and general manager and now chairman of the board of the Southern Co.; O. G. Thurlow, whose engineering genius is evident in many structures of the Alabama Power Co. Certainly, contributing to the company's farsighted leadership is James M. Barry, the company's president, after whom this latest plant is named. His capacity as an engineering executive is only one among dozens of fine qualities which are his, a deep devotion to the men and women who are the employees of the Alabama Power Co., a generous heart, a high regard for integrity, fidelity to duty.

Mr. Speaker, in my years in and out of public office I have had the privilege of meeting few men and few organizations so completely willing to do everything honorable which might be necessary to lead to the development of our great State. Certainly, since that great power company became established in the Mobile area in 1926 much has been accomplished here, and while the credit for this accomplishment should go to many, mark me as one who knows, the names of Alabama Power Co.'s Tom Martin, Jim Barry, and others, should be names high on the list.

I could spend hours upon hours talking to you of the history of this section, of the glories and the dramas, the joys and sorrows, which that history reveals. I could spend days talking and dreaming of the potentials of the future because who knows what raw material treasures still lie beneath our soils.

Not far from the Barry plant at Salco and close to McIntosh a great chemical plant is being built to utilize a basic resource—salt—from which many diverse chemicals can be produced in quantity for perhaps centuries to come, so large is the body of salt in the area.

Alabama's oil fields are not too far from here—and while not yet a great producing area, who knows but that at some early date all about us in this section will be the towering derricks that characterize the major oil field of our country.

Mr. Speaker, whether or not the earth beneath the soils of south Alabama hold further treasures, that are does offer unbounted treasure in the qualities of its people. They are dependable, honest, industrious, and they hope to apply their talents and intelligence in industries which may—yea—will locate here.

I am at this moment not privileged to disclose in detail the interests which have been shown in this area. There are, however, many diverse industries which are now considering locating among us. Some are related to the defense effort and some are not.

Since the beginning of the Korean war, I have made innumerable trips to New York, Detroit, Cleveland, Chicago, Montreal, and other industrial centers. These were made in an effort to present every possible inducement and benefits that would accrue to new industries suitable for location in the First Congressional District of Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly am gratified with a determination of my friend, Tom Martin, and his associates to build this new great power plant at Salco. Above

all else, it proves that they share with me my unbounded faith in the future of this great section of Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, to me the Alabama Power Co., in every phase of its existence and operation, is the epitome of democracy, rugged individualism, and private capitalism.

Not one single penny of governmental subsidy of any kind has ever gone to enrich the treasury of the Alabama Power Co., whose assets as of today are more than \$250,000,000.

The company employs over 4,000 men and women, and, as a result of its 1950 record, earned not alone the National Safety Council's first place award for the best accident rating among 33 participating electric utility companies of the same class—but it also received three Edison Electric Institute safety awards for having achieved a record of working a million continuous man-hours without a disabling injury accident. Additionally thereto, the company itself issued certificates of merit to 130 district, town, and division crews for completing a calendar year without a disabling injury.

Mr. Speaker, it has been authoritatively estimated that there are now 400 uses for electricity on the farm. Electrical power now grinds food—sends milk flowing through pipes into sterile containers and cures meat in the refrigerators and the lockers. A motor hums and distributes water, a farm wife snaps a switch to start a churn or a washing machine, and, with the arrival of eventide, comes the smooth hum of an electric sewing machine—while young eyes watch a movie in a country school, or perhaps even a television in the home.

There are now electric chick brooders, both fireproof and time-saving, electric curing sheds for the tobacco and sweet potatoes, electric milking machines and separators, electrically powered sprinkler and ditch irrigation, cutters, grinders, saws. These are but a few of the literally hundreds of machines and gadgets for which farmers and farm wives have found use for the low cost electricity generated by the Alabama Power Co. and which save them not alone time but back-breaking labor.

Mr. Speaker, as the Alabama Power Co. has prospered and grown—so has the State of Alabama prospered and developed. Their interests are mutual. To paraphrase a great poet, "As the bow unto the cord is, so are they one to the other—useless both if not in union."

Is the Long-Range Bomber the Only Answer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I find myself increasingly irked by what is apparently a disinclination to question the esti-

mates of our military planners, as well as the alacrity with which certain Members of both bodies rush to the defense of the military high command when their demands are questioned.

There is no one who will question the integrity of those who direct our military policies but the record is replete with so much evidence of bad judgment that Members of Congress would certainly be derelict in their duty were they to fail to question the justification for military expenditures that will run in excess of fifty billion annually for the next several years.

A case in point which seems to justify congressional skepticism is the controversy still raging over the effectiveness of long-range bombing and specifically the use of the B-36 bomber as our primary weapon, a program which will unquestionably take the lion's share of our appropriations for defense.

In my search for expert opinion on this important subject I have had what appears to me to be the sound advice and counsel of one of my constituents, Mr. Louis R. Humpton III, of Parkersburg, Pa., who has drawn on his experience as a naval aviator in World War II. Mr. Humpton has pleaded to some bias because of his naval service but inasmuch as I, as a former marine, am also biased in favor of Navy and Marine Corps aviation, I feel justified in submitting the following which sets forth his impressive conclusions. I invite all those who may have some doubts as to the program as the Air Force to give it their consideration.

AUGUST 13, 1951.

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DAGUE: It was with a great deal of surprise and pleasure that I received your considered answer to my recent correspondence concerning questionable strategic concepts of the Air Force. Feeling that I know you, I believe you would hear me out, but since my feelings are admittedly strong in this issue I had assumed you would be somewhat dubious about the merit of my statements.

You will find enclosed the documents return of which you had requested. In addition, I respectfully submit additional material pertinent to the subject at hand. Unlike the Air Force which has volumes of documents to "prove" the Air Force view—all such proof having been sifted, compiled, published, and distributed by the Air Force—unlike these Air Force officers, I have only an occasional and intermittent influx of informative material from a few varied media—no one of which is trying to sell anybody anything. Then too, I'm unable to draw upon a file of refined data exclusively favorable to my contentions. I can only hope that you'll keep in mind the realization that I do not stand to make one solitary red cent one way or another and that I'm not attempting to persuade you to further strain the national economy in order to finance a paper theory whose pros and cons are far from overwhelmingly favorable.

I repeat: I'm well aware that emotion can cloud judgment. Still I feel that some of the objections which I shall state are valid and reasonable in a cold light of impartiality. My days as an active officer in the United States Navy are over. I speak as an individual only. In a few weeks I shall be at the University of Pennsylvania School of Veterinary Medicine and far more immersed in the viscera of a horse than in the

big bomber hypnosis. My motives in writing are quite simple—perhaps to the point of sounding a bit vapid: First, I wish my country to be sound and strong; not in arms alone, but financially as well. To that end I would see it defended efficiently by methods which will provide not only flexible defense, but which can do so in a manner that promises economic soundness and financial responsibility. Unless I'm very much mistaken, Marxist philosophy and strategy calls for the fall of America by its own lack of vision in economic matters. Like him or not, old Karl was no fool—and neither are his disciples.

I recognize that strategic bombing is a factor in modern war. Yet, it should not, it must not be distorted into the factor by overzealous Air Force advocates. It is becoming—at long last—more and more obvious that the taxpayer cannot buy every general and every admiral every item each deems "absolutely essential." There is evidence of logrolling even within the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Is it therefore boldness to inquire into the usefulness and performance value of any given weapon? Is it not reasonable to question the worth of a multimillion-dollar item when there is a valid contention that one costing less can serve the same purpose as well or better? Evidently Admiral Denfeld was considered "bold." He was certainly not blindly emotional and he did have some valid points. If one wonders why there's still some seething under "unification," that might be a place to start looking.

For your consideration I set forth here several points which seem logical objections to the excessive emphasis on long-range, high-altitude bombing: At present the Air Force plans a heavy bomber which will fly higher and farther than anything of its category now in operation. Initial models will cost \$21,000,000 each. One bomb sight for one of these planes will cost one-quarter of a million dollars. Is it worth it? For the following reasons I think not: First and foremost is the simple fact that it's too much for too little in the way of results. Most of the cost is to provide a bigger plane to fly higher and longer—the ultimate objective of precision bombing, to hit with accuracy, is indeed pushed further from realization. I've had very limited experience in patrol bombers, but enough to realize that no sky-high bomb sight—regardless of cost—can provide the accuracy and pin-point target differentiation that comes with low and medium altitude attack runs. If, for example, you wish to destroy a bridge you can go about it in several ways. From the air you could send over many bombers very high with many bombs and expensive bomb sights. All would rain their bombs in the area of the bridge. If you sent enough planes with enough bombs you will hit the bridge by sheer probability. Your bombers then must get home. They're out of range of fighter support and cost \$21,000,000 each. You'll almost certainly lose some of them. On the other hand you might launch smaller aircraft from a point nearer the target. With fewer bombs to carry, operating over a smaller range and releasing from a lower level the percentage of hits is tremendously greater. If their base is a carrier they'll have fighter support during a majority of their flight to and from—if not over the target itself. For less investment and at less risk you've gotten better results. Now I'm aware that there are targets within the Eurasian land mass which are out of range of carrier bombers—but they're very limited in number and certainly do not require whole fleets of intercontinental bombers to be crushed. Most of the industrial resources and productive potential of the Soviet Union do lie within range of carrier strikes.

The counter to such a statement might be, "Only the intercontinental bomber can be depended upon to answer aggression with a strategic blow." Why this word "only"? That's reminiscent of the "as is well

known—"logic of Russia's Malik. The near-fanatic belief in such retaliatory bombing serving as a deterrent to aggression has some very large holes—not the least of which is the possibility (unmentioned by the Air Force) that the limited and highly specialized ground facilities of strategic behemoths will be devastated with or before a blow against New York, Detroit, Chicago, etc. One doesn't launch these multimillion-dollar babies from the nearest available farm lane or highway. Indeed, they'd sink through a standard runway in much the same manner as an elephant lumbering through a mud-flat. Even the much-vaunted B-36 cannot be handled from the overwhelming majority of military air fields. Special facilities, all quite expensive, are required—and one doesn't patch up the holes in jigtime with a few bags of Portland cement. On page 7 of the Air Force magazine is the statement that General Vandenberg's goal is to get 20-30 percent of attacking aircraft. I'm a poor math student, but that would seem to mean that even should he reach his goal there remain 70-80 percent which get through to drop their loads. If you've never flown over a large Air Force base, I can assure you it presents a beautiful sight—and a lovely, unmissable, unmovable target. While on the line of bases, it is evident that a carrier cannot be permanently located on the Kremlin wall maps. Every American big bomber base in the United States and overseas can be—and doubtless is.

The Air Force maintains that Korea is an unusual and a typical war. Whenever their performance therein is criticized in any manner they hasten to state that one must not judge them thereby. Quite readily they point out that enemy supply and build-up flows from areas which are politically inviolate to their air giants. You and I know that the privileged sanctuary routine is an anomaly and paradox to say the least. Damn foolish would be more descriptive and exact. If a man is loading his gun with the expressed intention of blowing your head off, it seems logical to try and stop him before he begins to take aim. Nevertheless, that's not the way it is in Korea. Furthermore, considered opinion would suggest that the Korean pattern represents a revelation of Communist strategy involving localized and isolated harassments both active and impending. Such conflicts are apparently far more profitable to Moscow than any all-out hot war of major powers. Why then risk economic rupture by building fleets of air giants which, by the Air Force's own concession, are useless in such engagements? Why call skilled and experienced strategists with years of military and naval background by such names as "petulant," "jealous," "short-sighted," and "old fashioned" merely because they suggest that carrier aircraft can serve efficiently in either type of war—restricted or all-out? If, as in Korea, the battle area is limited, strategic bombers with the golden bombsights are seemingly good only as subjects for recruiting posters.

Please keep in mind that I do not say our country should ignore the potentiality of high altitude bombing. I say most emphatically, however, that it is not the only way by which numerical superiority of enemy forces may be offset—it's merely the most expensive.

Economic orientation must be maintained during defense preparations if we're not to defeat our own purposes. One billion dollars represents \$6.80 from every man, woman, child, and infant in America. The Air Force trend is distending the national budget to a point which may eventually approximate \$100,000,000,000—that's 11 zeros, 10 percent of a trillion, and \$666 per head per American with absolutely no assurance it'll be enough—indeed, the inference is definitely to the contrary. Add to this the fact that

no item of war deteriorates and becomes obsolete as rapidly as bombers and related facilities. One doesn't buy a military aircraft, fly it and use it forever. As you know, its obsolescence is initiated the moment its construction begins. The more aircraft in operation the more there must be evolved to maintain the status quo. An increased air appropriation, therefore, is not an end in itself, but by its very nature the beast is a self-perpetuating and expanding organism.

The factors of replacement, new design, modification, and improvement are of prime import should be so obvious that their very mention is superfluous. Yet these same factors of replacement, new design, modification, and improvement loom ominously and prohibitively large when applied not to one type aircraft but to a number in excess of 100 groups (87 now, I think—just give them a little time). Should that be sobering, you need only recall that the more one has the more he wants—at one minute he's rough, tough, and ready for retaliation—later he fears for our Nation's fate because he's operating on a shoestring. Somewhere in the Air Force comments upon my last letter it was implied that I tended to illustrate by exaggeration. If I did so, it was unintentional—but what, pray tell, is General Vandenberg doing with \$20,000,000,000 worth of shoestrings?

Before I conclude I should like to refer to the Air Force letter to Chairman VINSON regarding my letter. They begin by stating that the emotional tone of my comments is typical of the criticism heard in the 1949 hearings regarding the B-36. It would seem that they feel those hearings vindicated their ideas and demonstrated the error of naval viewpoints. As Al Smith used to say, "Let's look at the record." The carrier *United States* was canceled directly or indirectly as a result of this so-called Navy versus Air Force feud. A carrier of this type—over 2 years late, costing nearly twice as much and not quite as large—is now authorized. I believe two may have been recommended. As the Navy suggested in 1949 and as the Korean affair has now demonstrated, the tactical arm of the Air Force is woefully neglected. Although they contend that they're correcting this matter, the proportion of ground support groups remains unchanged under their expansion program. One of their own officers became so disgusted with the tactical neglect that he's leaving the services. We were told in 1949 that unification would save millions and increase efficiency. Under unification as now practiced the Army lacks satisfactory ground support (being corrected with more money), we started with three services and unified them into four and we save by creating an additional bureau with its concomitant employment of thousands of file clerks and stenographic personnel.

A weak tactical air arm is denied—yet all the material is defensive and backed up by profound quotations—mostly by high Air Force officers. One letter from an infantryman is hauled out to glorify tactical support given his unit. Are we to assume that all combat units are so ably aided? They ought to be. The Marine air arm does it as a matter of course every day. I presume the fact that this man is a naval officer's son is meant to illustrate some injustice in naval attitudes on strategic bombing. Either that or it is the one letter they have from a supported outfit.

As to "Mr. Humpton's saying the Air Force called carriers highly vulnerable oceangoing platforms—" it's a direct quote from one of General Spaatz' articles in *Newsweek*. I presume a gentleman of Spaatz' stature is at least capable of accurately reflecting the views of his associates in the Air Force. If naval men are emotional in their arguments,

it may well be due to such impartial news analysis and one-sided criticism.

My data concerning Air Force losses in Korea was from a Defense Department release of this summer. Vandenberg explains by saying that the aircraft supporting troops are at grenade altitudes. So are Navy and Marine Corps aircraft. A comparison of performance and losses here would be interesting. My figures comparing naval and Air Corps performance in World War II are taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of 1949. If they are inaccurate, the gentleman from Congress who presented them was, shall we say, exaggerating. The exact issue I do not recall—if necessary, I could locate it.

In paragraph 7, my figures comparing naval air performance with Air Force crashes are assumed and presented in eloquent language. I appreciate the sarcastic compliment, but derision is hardly a clear rejoinder. Present accident rates are passed over as 50 percent better than before World War II. I would like very much to know what that means in terms of dollars and cents. This percentage comparison reads like a Soviet report on the accomplishments of the latest 5-year plan. Looks good and tells nothing. Incidentally, as I type this the radio is reporting the crash of a B-50 into an apartment building somewhere. Very well timed.

Paragraph 8 refers to the fact that on the night of February 5 the Air Force dropped nails on roads still behind Red lines. Was it or was it not the intention of U. N. forces to use those same roads as soon as possible? Ton for ton, are the U. N. forces more dependent on rubber-tired vehicles than the Reds for supply or are they not? Perhaps on the night of February 5 the Air Force foresaw the present situation. If so I commend them. As it is now the move looks wise. Potentially it was damn foolish.

As to my contention that the Air Force would have Americans believe it can win any war anywhere, I concede my error. I cannot recall any United States Air Force recruiting statement or civilian publicity film in which those exact words are used.

Attached to this letter are some clippings to illustrate several of my points. You may find them interesting. This letter has already grown too long. In closing I wish to repeat that I write only because I desire to see America establish efficient defense while remaining financially solvent. I may well be wrong, but I sincerely believe that excessive spending for current Air Force concepts fails to meet either of these provisions. It will grow worse, not better.

Respectfully,

LOUIS R. HUMPTON III.

PARKESBURG, PA.

Merger of International Monetary Fund and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of September 13, 1951:

FROZEN FUND

The governors of the International Monetary Fund, holding their sixth annual meeting in Washington, have come under attack

from delegates sent by Australia, South Africa, and other member states who claim that the fund's vast loan resources of \$8,000,000,000 are being withheld from nations which could put some of it to good use in stabilizing their balance of payments positions. These critics are correct in holding that the fund has been disappointingly inactive. It has been so since opening for business on March 1, 1947. Yet no criticism of the fund's inactivity is valid that fails to take account of the crucial reason for that inactivity. The fund was designed to operate in a world that existed in the hopes of its founders at Bretton Woods, N. H., in 1944, but a kind of world that has not come into existence up to now. The fund's resources have been virtually frozen because they were not meant to make their contribution until after a period of postwar economic transition to fairly stable international conditions had been achieved.

The fund was not calculated to help reconstruct postwar economies nor to redress fundamental imbalances in the trade among nations. Its sponsors never expected its resources to be used by member nations as a substitute for sweeping internal measures to achieve high employment and price stability, nor did they regard the fund as the sole vehicle for international economic co-operation. The purpose for which the fund's resources were planned to be used was in assisting members to protect the value of their currencies from short-run changes not due to basic shifts or disruptions in their foreign trade.

How should the fund use its resources now, in an international environment for which it was not designed? Should they be dissipated in a vain attempt to correct imbalances for which rearmament, underdevelopment or continuing reconstruction needs are to blame? Should they be used as a bonus to members who will reduce trade barriers? Should they remain frozen until normal conditions are restored by other measures or accidents? Each of these alternatives has its advocates. It would seem that mutually satisfactory compromise is unlikely and that the time has come to re-examine the charter of the fund with an eye to reformulating the functions it might reasonably be expected to perform in the world that confronts us.

Remarks of Secretary of State Acheson at San Francisco, With a Comment by the Cleveland Plain Dealer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, there appears to be universal admiration for the manner in which the Secretary of State presided over the recent history-making meeting in San Francisco climaxing treaty negotiations with Japan. The concluding words of Mr. Acheson are inspiring.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include Mr. Acheson's statement quoted approvingly by the Cleveland Plain Dealer on September 10. The editorial is as follows:

A MAGNIFICENT JOB

Every honest man, whatever his politics, must admit that Dean Acheson rose to great

heights in his skillful handling of the Japanese Peace Treaty conference in San Francisco.

Urbane, unflustered, courteous, polite, he parried the clumsy lunges of the Communists with consummate skill. Yet, behind his quiet voice and his calm deportment there was steel, which even the Reds must have recognized.

It is to be admitted that his task was made easier because of the actions of the Reds. The scowling, snarling Gromyko, Soviet deputy foreign minister, was no match for him. Stefan Wierblowski, the Polish chief delegate, was no match either.

The persistent sallies of Gromyko and the Pole and the occasional interposition of Dr. Gertrude Sekaninova, Czechoslovakian delegate, drew good-humored and occasionally sarcastic responses from Acheson. United States Ambassador John Foster Dulles and others.

Television audiences will well recall how laughter broke out on occasions when the Reds pulled some whopper of a lie, or began talking about an absence of democratic principles, which they, in their own countries, have nailed to the cross.

Acheson was in command of the conference every second. Even when he sat with his head in his hands, listening to obvious flubdub dished up by the Reds, he was a commanding figure. He looked and acted like a Secretary of State. Gromyko, for all his pressed trousers and his polished shoes, looked and acted like an ill-mannered bum.

And when it was all over, and the signatures of the representatives of Japan and 48 other peace-loving, liberty-loving nations had been affixed to the document, Dean Acheson spoke movingly, as follows:

"You have seen an act of greatness of spirit, an act, a true act of reconciliation * * * in accordance with the fundamental moral principles of the great spiritual teachers and leaders of all nations and of all religions.

"And it was for this reason, I think, again as Mr. Dulles suggested to us last night, that we were able to accomplish here what we have accomplished, because all of us, in the words of Benjamin Franklin, all of us doubted something of our infallibility, and all of us worked together, giving up much that was close to our hearts, much that was close to our economic interests, for the purpose of bringing about this peace of reconciliation.

"And we were able to do that, because we were doing something that lifted our spirits, something of which we were proud. There was nothing mean. There was nothing sordid which lurked in any corner of this treaty. There was nothing hidden, nothing that could not bear the broad great light of day. * * *

"And as Mr. Morrison said to us this morning, this is not an ending; this is a beginning. We signed this great treaty this morning, but we must live this treaty from this day on. And it depends upon each nation, each individual represented here, each individual of each nation, to make this treaty be what it is in words. And by no means, last of all, it rests with our Japanese friends to see that this treaty yields its true fruits.

"And I say to them that a great, broad highway to a position of equality, of honor, of friendship in the world lies open to you. All the obstacles on that highway have been cleared away so far as governments can clear them away. * * *

"We regret that there are some who were unable or unwilling to join our meeting, and others, we regret, who came here but were unable or unwilling to join in this great constructive effort. But what we have done here, we have done both for ourselves and for those who did not come here, because we

have laid a great peace for all peoples, not merely those here, but for all peoples throughout the world.

"And those who were unwilling to work with us and those who criticized our efforts, for those people we feel no bitterness, but we urge them now to join in the great effort which lies before all of us.

"And may I close this conference with words which, in many languages, in many forms, in many religions, have brought comfort and strength.

"May the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, be amongst us and remain with us always."

We could hope that Dean Acheson might never descend from the high place he made for himself in the esteem of men at San Francisco.

Know Your Waterways: The Cost to Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article published in the Washington Post under the sponsorship of the Marine News, New York, as follows:

KNOW YOUR WATERWAYS: THE COST TO TAXPAYERS

There is much clamor about the staggering amount which the taxpayer will have to pay for the planned conservation and use of the Nation's land and water—about \$1,500 for the average American family has been given wide publicity. That amount is based on some \$53,000,000,000 as the estimated cost of development projects in the construction and planning stage. From the beginning in 1822 up to and including the 1949 fiscal year, the Corps of Engineers has spent approximately \$3,500,000,000 for waterway improvements and maintenance, including every harbor and channel in the Nation; since 1896, about \$2,275,000,000 for flood control. Beginning in 1902, the Reclamation Service has spent about \$1,800,000,000. The total of about \$7,575,000,000 covers a period of 129 years. But approximately 60 percent of the amount was spent during the past quarter century. Even at that rate, should the full \$53,000,000,000 be spent, some 300 years would be required to do it; if the expenditure was at twice that rate, 150 years would be required.

It is certain that many years, perhaps several generations, will pass before a large part of the proposed work will be completed; much of it may never be done. It is not explained that, in any event, the cost to the average family will probably never exceed more than a few dollars in any one year—not such a staggering amount after all.

The planned conservation and use of the Nation's land and water resources will undoubtedly be carried out as prudently in the future as in the past. Rather than being a threat to the Nation's financial stability as some predict, future development will add tremendously to national wealth and strength as similar development has in the past. And the average American family will be greatly benefited rather than being burdened with staggering taxes.

Outstanding Country Newspaper Opposes \$19,019,000 Hand-Out to Grandview, Mo., Cow-Pasture Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on August 20, I inserted in the RECORD several editorials which had come to my attention from newspapers in Iowa and elsewhere in the Nation in support of my opposition to the authorization for a \$19,019,000 hand-out to a hayfield airport at Grandview, Mo., home territory of President Truman and the late Boss Pendergast.

This gratifying support of my opposition is all the more important in view of the fact that the Grandview authorization, which was passed by the House over my protests, has now been passed by the Senate without a single word of protest being raised on the floor and, as near as I can determine, with only nine Members of the Senate present at the time.

I will ask permission to insert in the RECORD tomorrow additional editorials supporting my position in this matter. Meanwhile, here is an editorial from the Traer (Iowa) Star-Clipper, one of the outstanding country weeklies in this Nation and recipient of many awards over the years for distinguished journalism:

GROSS WAKES 'EM UP

Most of the Republican Congressmen in Washington, including other members of Iowa's delegation in the House of Representatives appear to have missed the boat and have shown themselves out of step with public opinion back home when they failed to get behind Representative H. R. Gross' amendment to eliminate from the \$6,000,000,000 military construction bill the Truman proposal to build a \$19,019,000 airport at Grandview, Mo. Gross, who can be depended upon to speak out against the frequent idiotic proposals by bureaucrats for wasteful and extravagant spending by the Government, declared that the Grandview airport is nothing more than a glorified WPA project for the home territory of the Truman family and the late Tom Pendergast, boss of the Kansas City Democratic machine of which our President is an alumnus.

Our Iowa Third District Representative pointed out that in the same bill was a proposal to spend \$22,462,000 on an air base at Knobnoster, Mo., only about 50 miles east of Grandview, and that during World War II millions of dollars were spent by our armed services in building air bases in Iowa, Missouri, and Kansas which have been inactivated since the war for the reason that they were not needed. Among the many idle airfields is the Air Force base at Sioux City, the Navy base at Ottumwa, and a military airfield at St. Joseph, which is only 60 miles from Grandview.

Gross' opposition to this Truman boondoggling won the commendation of many Iowa newspapers. The Des Moines Register, which has not often served as a cheer leader for Mr. Gross, took his part the other day when, after the discussion in the House over the Grandview airport, a Texas Congressman, Representative KILDAY, charged that Gross had revealed classified (secret) information

about the purposes of the Grandview project which would give aid and comfort to the enemy. The Register properly pointed out that Chairman Vinson, of the House Armed Services Committee, had already described the Grandview base's purpose in general terms; that Gross revealed nothing secret at all, and that KILDAY was apparently trying to discourage any comment by Gross or others on why we need a new base in the region of Truman's ancestors, which was precisely what Gross was trying to find out. Said the Register: "The answer, we note, remains unclear, even though the House approved the bill enthusiastically."

The Cedar Rapids Gazette approved of Gross' suggestion that idle airfields at Ottumwa and Sioux City could be renovated and made ready for use in a few weeks and at little expense in comparison with the proposed expenditure at Grandview, and that by using former military installations the Government could save billions of dollars for the taxpayers. "But," the Gazette added, "not until other Congressmen rise above sectional interests will the poor taxpayer ever have his day in court. Don't hold your breath until that happens."

The Marshalltown Times-Republican said, "Regardless of party, our leaders should be sufficiently cost-conscious to avoid duplication or waste of expenditures to please local constituents. There is so much political finagling and wasteful spending by this administration that taxpayers are beginning to worry about the strain which is bound to come on their take-home pay. They should appreciate the courage shown by Representative Gross."

The Waterloo Courier, the Chicago Tribune, and others expressed similar sentiments, and we noted that even our Fair Deal Senator GILLETTE was willing to state publicly that Gross had performed an important service to the public in this instance.

Gross, in his regular weekly letter to the newspapers of the Third District this week, says he has had many letters and telegrams urging the adoption of his amendment—from Iowa and elsewhere—and that one of the best letters was from a citizen of Grandview.

When the Gross amendment came up on Friday, August 10, it was defeated by a voice vote, whereupon Gross offered a motion to recommit the bill with instructions to the committee to strike out the Grandview pork-barrel project, and demanding a roll-call vote. The Democrat majority leader postponed consideration of the bill until the following Tuesday, as only 72 of the 433 Members of the House were present. Gross explains that every week most of the eastern Congressmen start leaving for their homes about Thursday and do not get back to work in the legislative chamber until Monday or Tuesday. He calls these Congressmen the T and T Club (Thursday to Tuesday). A vote on more important measures can be taken only in the middle of the week, because it is so embarrassing to have so many of the House membership recorded as absent on roll calls.

On the following Tuesday Gross' motion for a roll call received only 44 votes—43 Republicans and 1 Democrat supporting it. This was an insufficient number to compel a roll call. The entire bill, including the Grandview project, was then passed by a vote of 352 to 5. This demonstrates how "sincere" are many of our legislators in Washington who talk economy and curtailment of wasteful spending by the Government. Their speeches and their voting records do not seem to be in proper balance.

Gross says he is not through with them yet. An appropriation for these military construction projects is yet to be approved, and our Congressman warns that if the House Appropriations Committee or the Sen-

ate fails to remove the Grandview item from the bill, "I will certainly offer an amendment on the floor to do so unless the bill is brought in under a gag rule and is unamendable."

We think we can assure him that the large majority of the people of Iowa and in many other States approve his courage in this matter.

Jews in Franco Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of my colleagues to the following article which appeared in the August 31, 1951, issue of the Jewish Mail:

JEWIS IN FRANCO SPAIN—A REPORT BY AN EYEWITNESS

(By Dr. David Diringer)

When some little time ago I was invited by the Spanish authorities to visit Spain and to give a course of lectures on Hebrew subjects at the Institute of Hebrew Studies of the Higher Council for Scientific Research, and at Madrid University, I felt some hesitancy, not only because of the sentiments we Jews generally feel toward Spain on historical grounds, but because of my dislike for all that was understood by fascism. Eventually, however, I accepted the invitation, deciding to use the opportunity to see things for myself.

My first surprise occurred when I filled in the necessary forms. I was not required to state my race, religion, or political creed, as is required for quite a number of "democratic" countries today. In Spain itself—though I must beware of generalizing in view of the comparative shortness of my visit—I was struck by the absence of those manifestations that we have come to associate with a totalitarian State. I could move or travel about with a sense of complete freedom.

I had many conversations with Jews and, of course, with non-Jews, particularly those interested in Hebrew studies, but I never noticed any sign of fear—or any sign of the inferiority complex so often noted in other countries—on the part of Jews, or any anti-Semitism on the part of others. In short, I was not aware of a "Jewish problem."

In Spain before the Second World War there was only one significant Jewish community—that in Barcelona—which, unfortunately, I had no time to visit; it now comprises between 2,000 and 3,000 members. It is recognized by the Government as the Comunidad Israelita de Barcelona. There are two synagogues—one Sefardic and one Ashkenazi.

The second largest community is now that of Madrid. There are also Jews in Valencia, Seville, and elsewhere.

The Madrid community was formed during the war. Previously there were scattered Jews, who held occasional services in private houses. The present synagogue is Mr. Kahn, and the treasurer, Mr. 49; services are held regularly on Friday evenings, Saturday mornings, and during the holy days. The congregation is presided over by Professor Bauer. The vice president is Mr. Kahn, and the treasurer, Mr. Lawend. The committee includes the Marquis Cuby, from Gibraltar, and two other members. A temporary rabbi and

shochet have been appointed. The community is quite active, and a communal seder was held on Passover, to which all members of the community—about 200—were invited. The participants included 35 to 40 university students from Morocco.

During the war many refugees entered Spain from Nazi Germany and its satellite countries, many of them without passports or official papers. No obstacle was placed in the way of their admission, the Government provided them with temporary papers, valid for 3 months, during which period the holders were required to report weekly to the police. The refugees were thus given an opportunity to regularize their position; during this preliminary period the majority of them found work or else the prospect of arranging for a start in business; since then, indeed, quite a number have turned to business and attained wealth.

It will, perhaps, suffice to indicate the possibilities by a brief reference to the career of the leading spirit of the synagogue, Mr. Lawenda. Born in Warsaw, he arrived in Spain from South America over 20 years ago almost penniless; he is now a prominent industrialist. During the war he gave much aid to refugees from Germany, Italy, Poland, Rumania, and other oppressed countries. Today his constructive work includes the building of a new synagogue for the needs of a larger community. This, it is hoped, will be ready by Rosh Hashana.

The present temporary synagogue was inaugurated on January 2, 1949, in the presence of representatives of the Government, and of the Jewish communities of Barcelona and Tangier. Official recognition of the Madrid community, as the "Comunidad Israelita," it is understood, will be forthcoming within the next few weeks.

I was somewhat disappointed to find that the Jews of Madrid show no interest in Hebrew studies as such. Indeed, with the exception of the Moroccan students who are concerned with chemistry, engineering, medicine, etc., hardly any are associated with the academic sphere, certainly none with humanistic studies. The great majority are merchants, a small number industrialists, and nearly all are refugees from Central Europe.

In Spanish academic circles, however, there is a keen interest in Hebrew and in Biblical studies. New and important institutes have been founded by the Higher Council of Scientific Research; among them the Institute of Hebrew and Near Eastern Studies, "Arias Mantano," occupies a prominent place. At Madrid University there are two chairs of Hebrew, one held by Professor Perez Castro.

There is, among scholarly circles in Spain, more than a passing interest in things Jewish. The celebration of the eighth centenary of the birth of Maimonides was remarkable in that it reflected the deep interest of Christian Spain in the research that is proceeding on the medieval Jews of Spain. The efforts being made by the Spanish authorities to preserve Jewish antiquities are also worthy of notice: in a sense, they are unique.

Not many countries are proud of their great Jews who, through their contribution to Jewish culture, contributed to civilization in general, but who had no special share in fostering the national culture of their adopted country. In other words, while Italy may be proud of Luigi Luzzatti, the late great Italian statesman and Prime Minister, or France of Leon Blum, the first French Socialist Premier, or Britain of Benjamin Disraeli; while, indeed, some Germans may consider Heine to be their great poet, or Einstein their great scientist, it is doubtful if, for example, non-Jewish Frenchmen were ever interested in whether Rashi or David Qimhi were born in France or Poland, or anywhere else.

One of the most notable exceptions to this rule is apparently Spain, where ancient synagogues are given the status of national monuments, and where Hebrew books and inscriptions and other relics of Jewish glory in medieval Spain, like the Moorish remains, are part and parcel of the Spanish heritage. Indeed, Spanish culture was derived from all countries lying about the Mediterranean Basin. "The art of Spain is alluvial," said V. Lamperez y Romea with a touch of melancholy, deploring the rapidity with which fresh floods of immigration brought their deposit to overlay the past.

It is true that in every age change fell too soon upon Spain. So on Jewish-Mudejar (Mudejars, an Arabic word, meaning "domesticated," is the terms applied to the Spanish Moslems, who preserved their customs, laws, art, and religion, after the country had been reconquered by the Christians) a wind blew from the north, and chilled the plan; it never came to fruition. Professor Georgiana Goddard King, a great authority on Spanish art, compares it with the veins and grains of gold that are dug out of mountains or washed down among the sands of rivers and upon which each age sets its image and subscription; but always it is gold. The splendidly illuminated Spanish Hebrew manuscripts—of which some are to be seen in the British Museum—the two relatively well-preserved synagogues of Toledo and certain other remains are unique jewels; they are molds of this gold which have been formed by Jewish genius on Spanish soil. The origin and the impact of the Jewish-Mudejar art need a more thorough study than they had hitherto received and there is no doubt that the Spanish authorities would favor such research.

Statehood Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to insert the following editorial which recently appeared in the New York Journal-American pointing out the need for the grant of statehood to Alaska and Hawaii without further delay:

WHILE WE SLEEP, RUSSIA SNARES

The current session of Congress, like so many of its predecessors, has done nothing but talk about the issue of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, and of late it has not even been talking about this vital subject.

This amazing indifference, or abysmal ignorance, about the importance of giving the full status of statehood to Alaska and Hawaii is in sharp contrast to the alert awareness of Soviet Russia in its appraisal of these Pacific outposts as indispensable links in the chain of American national defense.

In the case of Alaska especially, the refusal of statehood is leaving the pathway of Russian invasion wide open and virtually unguarded.

The strategic position of Alaska, actually at the doorstep of Soviet Russia, could make America impregnable in any war with the Communist world.

But instead, with the continued failure of Congress to act on the statehood measures the position of Alaska leaves America dangerously weak.

In this connection, National Commander Erie Cocke of the American Legion returned from his recent tour of Alaska with some information that will interest and should awaken the American people.

The Russian propagandists are filling the radio air in Alaska with their version of world affairs, he noted, and their constant theme is that Alaska is historically and rightfully the territory of Soviet Russia and will eventually be restored to its sovereignty.

In fact, not even the name of Alaska is given recognition by the Russian propaganda, the Territory being always referred to as if it were a part of Russia.

If the people of Alaska listen to the radio at all they can hardly help hearing the Soviet broadcasts beamed to them, and, as Commander Cocke reports:

"The crowning insult in these broadcasts is that they never refer to Alaska as Alaska.

"What they talk about is what they term 'Russian-America.'"

In short, our Communist enemies know perfectly well what Alaska means to them in the formulation of plans to attack and conquer the United States, and they are assiduously laying the groundwork for exploiting Alaska when the ultimate assault is made.

But still Congress fumbles the issue of statehood, and continues to leave not only Alaska but also our great Hawaiian outpost almost totally neglected and to all apparent intents and purposes unwanted.

The best barrier to even the making, let alone the successful outcome, of any future Russian claim to ownership of Alaska is to make this rich and vital territory a sovereign American State, and thus inseparable from the American Union.

Why does Congress persist in a policy of procrastination and avoidance on the issue of Alaska and Hawaiian statehood, when only the interest of our Communist enemies are served by that policy, and our own American interests are so endangered?

The Late Honorable Frank Fellows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an excellent editorial on our late colleague, Frank Fellows, appearing in the Talk of the Towns in September 6. The Talk of the Towns is an admirable weekly published in Yarmouth in my district. The publishers are Mr. and Mrs. Francis W. Tully. Mr. Tully was formerly in the Radio Press Gallery here in the Capitol and is well known to many of our Members. We are glad to have him running a paper in Maine. The editorial follows:

FRANK FELLOWS

It is going to be difficult for the voters in the Third Maine District to replace Congressman Frank Fellows, who died last week. He was a hard-working, positive-minded Member of the House, known to his colleagues and to Washington newsmen as a man who voted according to his beliefs, and never hesitated to state his position on an issue. He seldom addressed the House—when he did, he always had something to say, and held the attention of the Members.

His salty, down-to-earth oratory, mixed with Maine wit, made him in demand in

many States during Republican campaigns. Whenever Frank Fellows spoke in North Carolina, a large attendance at Republican rallies was assured, and the same was true in other parts of the country. Only a few days before his death, he delivered one of his typical speeches at the Republican gathering for Senator TAFT in Rockland. After the speaking, we chatted with him for a while, and he remarked on how glad he was to be back in Maine after the long, hot session in Washington. However, he was in the best of spirits, and it was a shock to learn just 5 days later that he had died. During his 12 years in Congress, he had earned the respect of all who knew him.

Grand Coulee Dam Near Completion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, as per authority granted to extend my remarks in the Appendix to the RECORD, I submit an article from the New York Times, of date September 9, 1951, in regard to the completion of the Grand Coulee Dam. The article follows:

COULEE COMPLETION NEAR—GREATEST POWER PLANT TO REACH TOP CAPACITY THIS WEEK

WASHINGTON, September 8.—The world's largest hydroelectric power plant at the Grand Coulee Dam will be completed this week after 18 years of work on the over-all project—but there is talk of making it still bigger, Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman said today.

The eighteenth and last generator will go on the line next Friday. Its 108,000 kilowatts will give the plant in central Washington a record 1,974,000 kilowatts of generating capacity—enough to light every home and run every plant in a city the size of Chicago.

Yet the Northwest's soaring needs for power have outstripped even this gigantic capacity, and the possibility of adding a third great battery of generators is being discussed, Mr. Chapman said.

Action Demanded From Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, the short recess enjoyed by the Members of the House of Representatives gave them, I hope, an opportunity to get a good view of how the rank and file of our public feel about the achievements, or the lack of achievements, of the Eighty-second Congress.

It must have been obvious to anyone who made any attempt to learn the truth that John Q. Public is quite dissatisfied with the failure of Congress to give any cooperation to the President or to offer any program of its own to combat inflation and the steadily increasing cost of living, which is our public enemy No. 1.

Equally disturbing to the public is Congress' apparent apathy and lack of understanding of the gravity of danger from abroad and the necessity of a more substantial national defense program, including civilian defense.

One of the most striking and glaring deficiencies of this session of Congress, however, is our slowness in making adequate provisions for pay adjustments for the postal employees and other Federal employees.

Everyone recognizes that pay adjustments to these employees are long overdue and that it is nearly impossible for them, under the present pay rates, to meet the steadily increasing cost of living. And yet, after 8 months, the pay-increase legislation is still languishing in the committee. If private industry lagged anywhere near this long in its treatment of the employees, it would have been subjected to attack by Government agencies long ago.

It is not yet too late. Our citizens demand and deserve prompt action from us. Let us put our shoulders to the wheel, give the President adequate legislation to combat inflation, to build up a firm and solid defense from foreign enemies, and lastly, let us, without delay, take care of the crying needs of our own Government employees and adjust the glaring inequities in their pay scales.

They Really Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the State, Raleigh, N. C.:

THEY REALLY WORK

A few days ago we were talking to O. K. LaRoque in Kinston. He has been in Washington, D. C., for about 3 years but has now returned to his former job in Greensboro.

Said Mr. LaRoque: "The one thing that impressed me most about my stay in Washington was the hard work done by our Senators and Representatives. The average citizen, back home, has little knowledge of this. In most instances, our representatives in the Senate and House get to work shortly after 8 o'clock in the morning. They stay on the job until after 6 o'clock, and when they return to their hotels they usually carry with them heavy brief cases, stuffed with work which will be attended to at night."

We agree with Mr. LaRoque in this statement. There may have been a time when a Senator or Representative could take things easy in Washington, but that time vanished long ago. He now has to keep plugging away strenuously every day if he wants to keep up with his work. If he fails to do this, it isn't long before it piles up on him in overwhelming fashion, and he's absolutely sunk.

What is the nature of all this work?

Well, in the first place, there are his duties on the floor of the House and Senate and also in committee rooms. There are dozens

of visitors to see daily in his office. There are scores of letters that must be answered promptly. There are various departments and bureaus that have to be visited frequently, and there are innumerable telephone calls.

When you see your Senator or Representative here in North Carolina attending some kind of a celebration or making a speech at some kind of a meeting, you may get the idea that he has an easy job of it, but such an idea is far from the truth. Chances are that he works harder than most of us ever did in all our lives.

Czechs Isolated by Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from today's Washington Daily News:

CZECHS ISOLATED BY AIR

PARIS, September 14—France and Britain canceled all airliner flights to Communist Czechoslovakia today.

The measure, which completed an aerial quarantine of the Red-ruled country, was a further reprisal for mistreatment by the Czechoslovak Communist regime of Western Allied citizens.

Yesterday the Allied high commissioners in Germany canceled all Czechoslovak plane flights over Western Germany.

The Anglo-French order forbids any flights to Czechoslovakia by the nationalized French and British airlines, Air France and British European Airways, to Prague.

BLOW FOR OATIS

The order banning Czech flights over Western Germany was largely a reprisal for the imprisonment by the Reds of Associated Press Correspondent William N. Oatis, sentenced to 10 years in prison as a "spy."

A French Foreign Office spokesman said today's ban was decided upon, insofar as France was concerned, to safeguard French plane crews against possible reprisals by the Czech Reds for the Allied ban against Czechoslovak flights over the Allied occupation zones of Germany.

TEMPORARY MEASURE

The French measure is temporary, the spokesman said, depending on developments. It was taken on France's own initiative, he said, and not at the request of either the United States or Britain.

The spokesman said France supported the Allied High Commission's ban on Czech flight over Western Germany because of Czech treatment of French nationals in cases very similar to that of imprisoned American Correspondent William N. Oatis.

The spokesman said the ban on French flights to Prague was ordered because "we simply felt it was a prudent measure to take in view of possible reprisals by the Czechs against our own planes and crews."

He said there were at least two or three French nationals held incommunicado in Prague and that French diplomats have not been permitted to communicate with them. The spokesman said there were also British nationals similarly held in Prague.

In the case of William N. Oatis, it was plain that the United States planned a campaign of retaliation without once using the word in public.

Meanwhile, the Czech train which entered the Allied zone of Germany early this week was still there with 87 passengers who wanted to return to their homeland. The engineer and 26 other passengers have asked sanctuary and probably will receive it.

Praise for Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of September 11, 1951:

PRaise FOR ACHESON

Back in Washington from the Japanese Peace Conference and a stopover in Kansas City, President Truman highly praised Secretary of State Acheson for the latter's skillful handling of the peace meeting. He told the reporters that he had personally congratulated Mr. Acheson for the firmness and skill with which he had presided over the conference and blocked the Soviet attempts to delay and disrupt the meeting. In the President's typical man-of-the-street language, he said that the proceedings had demonstrated that his Secretary of State "is smarter than any of the guys who have been attacking him."

This forthright statement of the President is significant at this time, because it evidently indicates that he is standing by his Secretary of State and is not yielding to the pressure from various sources to throw his pilot overboard. For many months now, pundits have been saying that Mr. Acheson is a political liability to the administration and would have to be "given the gate." This fulsome praise now, however, would indicate that, if Mr. Acheson wants to stay on, the President will keep him in office right through for the election next year.

The millions of people who saw and heard Mr. Acheson handle the peace conference will agree with the President that Acheson handled the situation with consummate skill. Firm, but dignified, and with no show of ill-temper at Gromyko's rough tactics, he made a remarkable impression upon the American people. Even photographically, his appearance on television was more pleasing than most of his published photographs.

Any suggestions of alleged Red coloring in Acheson's political philosophy were completely dispelled by the way he handled the opposition from the delegates from behind the iron curtain. As a matter of fact, unbiased observers in other countries have always given Acheson high credit for his capacity as a statesman, and they have derided the silly attempts to make Red capital out of his friendship for Alger Hiss. It is probable that Mr. Acheson could have been more diplomatic with the American people in announcing his continued friendship for Hiss after the latter was convicted of conspiring with the Reds, but standing by a friend who had gone wrong was never considered by the American people to be a bad trait in any man.

Secretary of State Acheson is now going into conference at Washington with the

British and French foreign ministers, to prepare a pact with Western Germany to bring the people of that country into the family of free nations, as has been done with Japan. Mr. Acheson has emerged from the Japanese conference with such added prestige, that he can be depended upon to be the guiding spirit in forming this new alignment with Western Germany.

The William N. Oatis Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, Uncle Sam should bar operations of Soviet press agents here, at least until the U. S. S. R. gives William N. Oatis his freedom.

Every red-blooded American is demanding just and proper retaliation against the Reds, both within and beyond our shore, for the unwarranted arrest of William Oatis.

The Fraternal Order of Eagles of Council Bluffs, Iowa, are to be highly commended for adopting the following resolution.

RESOLUTION ON WILLIAM N. OATIS ADOPTED BY THE EAGLES LODGE OF COUNCIL BLUFFS, IOWA

Whereas William N. Oatis, Associated Press bureau chief in Prague, Czechoslovakia, a free newspaperman who was performing his duties according to the standards and criteria of the free press of the world, was brutally snatched and imprisoned by the Communist Government of Czechoslovakia without explanation, and

Whereas Mr. Oatis was arrested and held in detention without access to friend, Embassy representative or trusted legal counsel; and

Whereas he was brought to trial and accused of "insisting on obtaining accurate, correct, and verified information," which is the definition of the work of a free press; and

Whereas he was forced into admission of espionage because of his reporter's instinct for presenting the factual rather than the fictional, and

Whereas he was convicted and sentenced to 10 years of imprisonment by a trial which was universally condemned by all free nations as an outrageous "kangaroo court," completely bereft of the principles of justice and the dignity of the human being; and

Whereas, by its action, the Communist-dominated Czech Government showed its scorn for the principle of freedom of information and its hatred for our free world; and

Whereas representatives of the Soviet news agency, Tass, have the free run of the United States of America, and are permitted to attend press conferences at our national seat of government, at which often much off-the-record information is discussed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Council Bluffs Aerie, No. 104, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles urges the Federal Government and its agencies to be uncensured in its efforts to secure the freedom of Mr. Oatis by honorable means, and

we also offer our support and the vitality of our membership to the executives of the Associated Press in their campaign to secure the release of Mr. Oatis by the communication of the true facts of the case to the free peoples of the world; and be it further

Resolved, That Aerie, No. 104, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles urges the Federal Government to bar the correspondents from the Soviet news agency, Tass, as well as all satellite nation correspondents from official Government press conferences, where vital information may be revealed, until the release of Mr. Oatis has been secured.

Big Three Show-Down Near on Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article by Constantine Brown which appeared in the Evening Star of September 10, 1951, written in his usual excellent style and which should be of interest to all who are anxious to strengthen the position of the United States in the present difficult world:

BIG THREE SHOW-DOWN NEAR ON SPAIN—FRANCO'S ROLE IN WESTERN DEFENSE TO BE THRASHED OUT AT ALLIED CONFERENCE OPENING HERE WEDNESDAY

(By Constantine Brown)

The foreign ministers of Britain and France will meet next Wednesday here in town with Secretary of State Acheson to discuss informally a number of mutual problems regarding the strengthening of the European defense against possible Soviet attack.

Although the discussions will be informal, the three top diplomats will deal with problems far more vital today than the signature of the Japanese Treaty. The questions of full sovereignty for the West German Republic and America's military and economic assistance to Spain are expected to be the most controversial items.

Top-ranking Senators and military men hope fervently that the "spirit of San Francisco" will linger on for some time and cause the diplomats to weigh these controversial matters more in the light of what is best for the free world than political expediency at home.

Although the Japanese treaty has provisions which are distasteful to some of its signatories, the free nations have presented a solid front which alone prevented the Soviet and satellite representatives at San Francisco from sabotaging the peace treaty. We learned last week that if the non-Communist countries stand together the Red sabotage technique can be defeated.

For the first time in 5 years we have spoken an emphatic "No" to the Kremlin and its stooges. San Francisco has proved for the first time that the Allies and their friends can be as tough as the Muscovites.

The question of American military and economic assistance to Spain ranks among the top questions for discussion next Wednesday. The French and British governments have signified unmistakably that they oppose our "unilateral" policy toward that country.

The French objections are purely political. The Plevin government is hanging by a thin thread, and in order to obtain the support of some Socialist factions in the National Assembly, it must make an impressive display of opposition to any help to Franco's Spain.

The British are in a somewhat different position. The Laborites, who supported Spanish Loyalists during the Civil War actually hate the Franco regime. The Conservatives are concerned over our decision to help Spain, because they fear foreign interference with Britain's Mediterranean line of communications.

This sounds absurd to Americans, yet it is so. For centuries the Iberian Peninsula was considered the exclusive preserve of the British Empire. When we planned operations in North Africa in 1942, it was necessary to obtain naval bases in the Azores from Portugal. The British representatives in the Combined Chiefs of Staff in Washington objected strongly to the United States approaching Portugal directly. They insisted that the bases be obtained by London in accordance with the centuries-old Portuguese-British alliance.

Last week the Labor government, which does not stand very high with Portugal's Premier Salazar, had to accept a direct American-Portuguese agreement on the Azores bases.

All British political parties will continue to look askance at any foreign power obtaining bases in the Iberian Peninsula. They know that we now are negotiating with the Spanish Government for the establishment of American air fields in a number of localities, including the Seville-Malaga and Almeria-Alicante areas in southern Spain and Spanish Morocco, right across from Gibraltar.

The British should know better than anyone else that there is no other motive in our efforts to obtain bases in Spain than the common defense of the West. Yet, they definitely dislike the idea of any alien power getting so close to Gibraltar, which is supposed to guard the western Mediterranean and give Britain a predominant position in that sea.

It is this reason as much as the ideological antipathy of the Labor government which causes London to oppose our assistance to Franco.

In a recent conversation an important British official asked, "How would you like it if we obtained air bases in Colombia and Panama, thus flanking your canal?"

The State Department has had its hand forced by Congress and by the Pentagon to accept closer association with Spain. The strategic arguments in favor of giving that country an opportunity to improve her economy and modernize her armaments were so strong that both President Truman and Secretary of State Acheson could no longer reject them.

But our Government has yet to convince our principal European Allies that what we intend to do for Spain is in the common interest of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and not a selfish move on our part.

Meat Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the latest beef production figures show that meat

packers in Indiana did not get their fair share of cattle during the 4 months slaughtering quotas were in effect from April through July.

In June, for example, when OPS slaughtering quotas were 80 percent of last year's kill, Indianapolis production was down to 63.9 percent, while New York packers were up to 102.3 percent and west-coast slaughtering was running 109.1 percent.

It is apparent that Mr. DiSalle did not even attempt to force the packers in New York and California to observe the quota regulations. Indiana's farmers, packers, and consumers alike suffered because of this situation which resulted from the quota system of the Office of Price Stabilization.

The record indicates that slaughtering quotas did not work, and I feel that Congress should ignore the President's request for authority to reimpose them.

The drain of cattle from Indiana, which would not have happened if slaughtering quotas were effective, is due to the freight forgiveness policy of the Office of Price Stabilization. Packers on the east and west coasts can pay more for cattle because freight forgiveness on their ceilings exceeds actual freight costs.

Packers are permitted to pass freight costs along to consumers, and that means that housewives in Indiana have to pay the freight east on cattle and west again on beef.

International Agreements

REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the conference now going on in Washington between the so-called Big Three—that is, England, France, and the United States—should be all to the good. It is well for nations to sit down together and discuss their many problems, because the world is much smaller today than it was a generation ago.

I do hope that Dean Acheson, our Secretary of State, does not make any secret commitments or alliances. I can remember, that in the past, secret commitments committed the United States to conditions which should have been approved by the Congress of the United States. I am sure my colleagues remember some of the commitments made at Yalta and Tehran. The then President of the United States sat in this very well of the House and told the Congress that no secret commitments had been made. It was months afterward when it was discovered that Mr. Stalin, Roosevelt, and Churchill had made secret agreements which could well cause a third world war. This should never happen again. Certainly the Congress is entitled to know what commitments are to be made.

The Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a very able statement entitled "Handwriting on the Wall," prepared by Mr. H. L. Spencer, of South Pasadena, Calif.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HANDWRITING ON THE WALL

In the last few weeks, with the dismissal and return of Douglas MacArthur, the American people have lived through one of the most profound, disillusioning and emotional experiences in their history. Coming on top of the RFC and Kefauver revelations, confidence in the integrity and good judgment of our national administration has sunk to new low levels. A sudden realization has come to us that there must be grave flaws in the basic concepts by which we have been governed in recent years.

A remarkably clear statement of our present national predicament is contained in a new book, *The Welfare State, a Mortgage on America's Future*, by the brilliant young economist, Jules Abel. A powerful foreword by Raymond Moley points out that our only hope now lies in Congress. In the next few months congressional decisions must be made which will affect our national destiny for generations to come. Constructive results could come from our recent shock treatment if the emotional ferment of recent events produces overpowering public demand that the conditions which so endanger the future of our fine country be corrected and corrected now.

Mr. Abel makes the point that we are all being exhorted and hoodwinked to believe that the more we spend the better off we are and that the greater our debt the greater becomes our prosperity. Based on the misleading statistics of gross national product, so freely used by Washington exhorters, that may appear to be the case. Certainly if we can scatter a few billions of pump-priming seed corn and from that harvest a great crop of increased income, everything will be lovely.

But, as Raymond Moley says, "Everything is fine if you don't look too closely." What the country needs is to throw away its rose-tinted glasses, get out the old bifocals and really take a close look at the fine print. For gross national product and national income are deceptive figures in that no account is taken of the taxes that must be paid to sustain the effort of pulling ourselves up by our bootstraps. Nor is any allowance made for the fact that a large part of gross national product is made up of non-income-producing expenditures such as those for war and so-called foreign investments. For example, in 1939, 1.4 percent of gross national product was for war expenditures. In 1944 this figure was 41.8 percent.

Currently the expenditures for war and foreign investment must be high and going higher. If we continue blindly to leave it to this administration to plant our pump-priming seed corn we need not be surprised if the harvest consists of a large crop of war-producing bayonets rather than income-producing plowshares.

Gross national product less various adjustments and taxes gives the data for disposable personal income. This is the true measure of our prosperity. It is the figure that most of us are interested in as we struggle to keep our heads above the rising tide of inflated living costs. Payroll-tax deductions buy no groceries.

Therefore it would appear that the best test of our national economic health, following a 20-year effort to squander ourselves into prosperity, would come from a comparison of the trend lines of disposable personal income and net public and private debt. These are shown on the chart below and it at once becomes apparent that income has not grown as rapidly as debt. The rather rapid convergence of these trend lines over the last 20 years shows at a glance how serious is the situation in which we have become involved by adoption and long continuation of a reckless fiscal policy motivated in large part by political expediency and sold to the trusting public by continued and deliberate misrepresentation of the true meaning of gross national product and national income.

This administration's apparent conviction is that national welfare depends upon continued spending and expansion of debt. While this may have been true in earlier years, when our rate of true growth was greater and our debt was small, for later years the data shown here does not bear out this assumption. For instance, in 1946 there was a decline of \$8,500,000,000 in debt but an increase of \$8,200,000,000 in income after taxes. On the other hand, in 1949 an increase of \$11,400,000,000 in debt produced an actual decrease in income. These facts, together with the converging trend lines of the chart, may well be interpreted as statistical handwriting on the wall to warn us that we have reached our debt limit or point of no return beyond which further debt increase will do great harm.

Certainly, unless we are willing to embark on a course of full-scale runaway inflation, further increase in debt must be prevented. Only thus can we preserve the value of our money, wages, the hard-won pensions of our workers, and the country's working capital savings that have come from 150 years' development of a rich and virgin land.

With the records of German, French, and other foreign inflations before us, people everywhere are coming to realize that such inflation in the United States would be tragic. Responsible Members of Congress should be aware of this rapidly spreading sentiment. We are beginning to recognize the fact that confidence in the dollar is the basic measure of confidence in our national credit, if not in the country itself. In the world crisis confronting us, maintenance of our national credit is a first order of business if we are ever to rearm ourselves and our friends.

We are involved today in a dangerous international situation complicated by a crisis of long-continued and cumulative fiscal management. Further adventures in the economies of fairyland will serve no purpose. It is time for the American people to call on their elected representatives in Congress to face the facts of our situation resolutely and work out a bipartisan program which will provide realistic solutions. Such a program should include:

1. No further increase in debt.
2. Pay-as-we-go taxation.
3. Sharp reduction in nonrearmament spending at home and abroad.
4. A free hand to Federal Reserve Board in debt management.
5. Modification of the automatic inflation escalator provided by present farm parity, cost-of-living wage relationships.
6. For the time being and in the interest of the country—forget politics.

The Crusade for Freedom**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the New York Times editorial of Tuesday, September 11, headed "The war of words." This editorial pays tribute, so justly earned, to the Crusade for Freedom. This is a most important and vital element in the so-called war of words. Under the leadership of a distinguished board, the Crusade for Freedom is developing programs and taking the kind of initiative which would be difficult for a Government agency.

May I particularly call to the attention of the Senate the most important part played in the development of the Crusade for Freedom by Mr. Frank Altschul, of Greenwich, Conn., who has spark-plugged the most important activity of the crusade, Radio Free Europe? Mr. Altschul has been a moving and a determining spirit in the great development of the crusade, and, I think it is fair to say, the moving spirit of its broadcasting operations beamed to the satellite countries behind the iron curtain.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WAR OF WORDS

The Crusade for Freedom launches here today its campaign to raise funds for the construction of two more radio transmitters which will bring its message of truth to the Soviet satellite nations. At present, the Crusade is operating the most powerful radio station on the Continent, Radio Free Europe in Munich, which now beams broadcasts for more than 11 hours each day to Czechoslovakia. The new transmitters will be equally as powerful and will broadcast to Hungary and Poland. It is expected that similar radio facilities will be established in Asia to bring the voice of the free world to that continent.

What the Crusade for Freedom is doing is vitally necessary. At present the Soviet Union is bombarding those within its orbit with an unceasing humdrum of propaganda vilifying the United States. At every turn our every action is slandered, criticized, and distorted. The Soviet propaganda effort has reached a new intensity and we are threatened with the loss of many friends unless we can bring the true picture back into focus.

The Voice of America is playing an important part in this struggle. But more than an official voice of our Government is needed. The Crusade for Freedom is endeavoring to enlist 25,000,000 Americans to support its program—to bring the message of truth from a broad cross section of a people who are free to a broad cross section of people who long to be free. It is the kind of program with which every thinking American will agree; it is the kind of a program which every thinking American will want to support whole-heartedly. The Crusade's local campaign headquarters is at 5 East Fortieth Street, New York.

Central Arizona Project**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Raymond Moley, not only an eminent national columnist now writing for Newsweek magazine and many newspapers, but also a man whose views on economics and the general affairs of our Nation have been long respected, has written a commendable letter to the Governor of Arizona, disclosing the planned extravagance of the present administration, especially with regard to reclamation projects.

I believe my colleagues would be interested in reading this letter, inasmuch as every State of the Union is interested in the problem of increasing taxation.

Mr. Moley uses the central Arizona project as a potent example to illustrate his point.

His letter to Governor Pyle, of Arizona, follows:

TO THE GOVERNOR OF ARIZONA

(By Raymond Moley)

Hon. HOWARD PYLE,

Phoenix, Ariz.

DEAR GOVERNOR: Your friendly letter, to which I assigned this space last week, raises a number of issues which deserve a considered reply.

My criticism of the central Arizona project was not based on California propaganda, but on the Senate debates, in which your Senators McFARLAND and HAYDEN took a leading part, on the Arizona case as presented to the House committee in March, on the letters and documents of the Interior Department on the subject, and on other pertinent public documents. I have not approached the subject from the standpoint of the dispute between Arizona and California, but from the standpoint of a taxpayer in a wholly remote State.

It is perfectly apparent that Arizona is entitled to a very considerable amount of the water of the Colorado River that now flows to the sea. It is also clear that the needs of Arizona are urgent and critical. It is clear, too, that your predecessors in office and your State legislature were negligent in failing to impose restrictions on the veritable looting of the water table by wells drilled for the raising of quick and highly profitable crops by people who rushed there in war years for that purpose. You are commendably trying now to lock the stable.

I cannot agree that the question submitted to the Secretary of the Interior was "loaded." It was: "How much interest on the national debt occasioned by the project would be borne by the Nation's taxpayers, assuming a 75-year repayment period and a reasonable construction period?" His answer, \$2,075,729,000, is a matter of arithmetic. The immense size of this interest charge is due to the incorporation in the bill of a principle of accounting that has never hitherto been approved by Congress and that is a product of the Interior Department's desire to enlarge its activities, regardless of expense and despite the old principle that irrigation and

power should pay for themselves. In power projects the rate at which power is sold is fixed high enough to pay interest on the money borrowed to build the project. That interest has been paid into the Treasury, as it should be. Under the principle in this bill, this interest money or interest component would be used to pay the costs of irrigation, thus giving a subsidy to farmers-users of the water. Also, the period of repayment is fixed in the bill at 75 years, thus nearly doubling the time which has always been the rule in reclamation projects.

If Arizona is so in need of water and if the return is so favorable as the figures you have presented suggest, it should abide by the traditional rules that have always governed reclamation.

There is also something very strange in the claim of sponsors of this project that the whole thing must be authorized by Congress before the Supreme Court can determine the dispute with California about how much water Arizona is entitled to. I realize that lawyers argue that the Court cannot take jurisdiction of the case unless actual damage can be claimed by California. Other lawyers argue that it can. It would seem that this is a most expensive way to bring a law suit. If the Court should refuse the cheaper way, then it would seem that Congress might set up some temporary body to adjudicate the case.

Finally, the cost of the project can hardly be judged by the Reclamation Bureau estimate of \$788,000,000 for building. If past experience with such reclamation projects is any guide, the cost will be two or three times that. Also, it is admitted that the proposed dam will fill up with silt in 30-odd years unless another dam or dams are built up the river.

It would seem that Congress ought to take a long look at the whole immediate and remote cost of this and all related projects and then measure them against the capacity of American taxpayers to meet such expenses in a period when immense sums must be raised for armament and foreign aid. These, it seems to me, are considerations which must be measured against the recognized needs of your State.

Whom Shall We Trust?**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it is always helpful to have the opinion of the folks back home and with that thought in mind, I want to share the views expressed by Mr. J. E. Holtzinger, publisher of the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror, by inserting the following article that appeared in the September 1 issue of said paper:

WHOM SHALL WE TRUST?

Many prominent men who are in close touch with our international affairs seem to feel that war with Russia is inevitable. While we do not concur with their opinions on all matters, we might weigh very carefully what they have to say. If, as they say,

war is inevitable, then we should carefully reexamine our policy and make sure that we are doing our very best; first, to avoid war, if that is still possible; secondly, to be fully prepared for war should it come.

We also must be very careful into whose hands we place the instruments of destruction which can have a decisive effect on the outcome of any war and upon the amount of damage that may be inflicted upon us if we are involved in that war. We do not believe that it is best to put implements of war into the hands of people who may offer but feeble resistance or no resistance at all to an aggressor and risk having those instruments of death and destruction turned against us by an enemy that prefers to capture its war materials rather than to build them.

It has been argued time and time again that a weakened European economy plays into the hands of international communism. It also might be well to point out that a weak industrial structure in central Europe will be of little use to Russia in the event of all-out warfare.

Germany was a powerful foe because her industries were powerful. When their industrial potential was destroyed by strategic bombing the German field armies were weakened, and eventually they collapsed. The only possible use Russia can make of Germany and other central European powers is to harness their industrial production to the Soviet war machine and make them produce the heavy machinery of destruction that is so essential to modern warfare. We wonder at times if those who are responsible for the administration of Marshall-plan aid to Europe never think of this danger.

At the present moment Congress is debating on legislation that would cut off from American aid those powers that sell or trade to Russia those things that increase the potential military strength of the only power that can threaten our peace. It seems to us that all aid should be stopped immediately when evidence of such trading or selling is uncovered. It also seems to us that if the Republican Party, which is the official watchdog of the tactics of the party now in power had able leadership these things would be brought out into the forefront and made an issue in the campaign that is now shaping up for 1952.

The party of the opposition has a definite duty to perform. It should make itself clear on fundamental issues, and it should quite openly oppose those unsound principles which someday may lead to heavy loss of life and place in jeopardy those things we all hold dear.

Taxes have been raised and raised again until today every American is contributing much more to the Government than he is able to save or to use for his own advancement. Too many of those tax dollars are being sent abroad to help people many of whom have a standard of living much higher than the average American can hope to achieve. Every now and then there is quite a little discussion about the powerful lobbies that operate in Washington to influence legislation for this or that American group. Seldom have we seen it mentioned that other powerful lobbies, the male members of which stay at the best rooms in the best hotels and the female members of which are dressed in silk, satin, and mink coats, also are present in Washington. These are the lobbies of the nations seeking Marshall fund hand-outs.

It would be interesting to know just how much of the money expended on aid to other countries goes to men and women of the millionaire class in those nations, how many members of the nobility and former nobility are getting handsome hand-outs from these funds which are in the long run collected from the working people of this Nation.

How many of this international set will be in the front lines defending democracy against the onslaughts of communism when the chips are down and battle smoke is in the air? It is our guess that most of them will take special planes carrying so-called VIP's to the neutral corners of the world where they can live a life of ease and safety while the sons of the republic fight it out with the hordes of Communists.

We believe that if most of the money now being expended on aid to foreign nations were devoted to getting our own house in order, to building up the world's greatest air force and the world's greatest pile of atomic weapons, war would not be inevitable. If war came it could be one of short duration. There would be no stockpile of American-made goods to be used by the enemy, there would be death and destruction for him if he chose to challenge the mighty nation that was wise enough to put its trust in God and its ammunition and war materials into American hands only.

Robbing Americans of the just fruits of their labor to build up new privileged classes in foreign nations will not strengthen this Nation. It can only weaken it. Taxing our great industrial machine to such an extent that its own progress must be halted is playing into the hands of the enemy.

There are three things that a really great American Congress can do to build up national unity and national strength. First, they can put a limit to the taxing powers of the Nation so that its great industrial and individual initiative is not crippled; second, they can make sure that all money expended by the Federal Government is spent for the essential things which will contribute to national preparedness and, third, they can insist that the money spent abroad is drastically reduced in amount and that it is entrusted only to such products and to such uses as will aid America and not place strategic materials within reach of our potential enemy.

Flood Control in Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MYRON V. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to again call the attention of Congress to the disastrous floods which recurred in Kansas this year. The total actual property and farm damage to our State runs well over \$700,000,000. Every river and every watershed in Kansas, with the exception of those controlled by a flood-control dam, contributed greatly to this damage.

Kansas covers an area 200 miles by 400 miles and is comprised of 105 counties, 97 of which counties were seriously affected by this excessive and uncontrolled rainfall.

I am including an article published in the Chanute (Kans.) Tribune, which gives a detailed report of one of the rivers in Kansas, and the amount of damages, county by county, on the Neosho-Cottonwood Rivers which flow through my district. Since the publication of this article, these rivers have again overflowed and added more damage to our people.

The article follows:

LOSS ON NEOSHO IS \$42,500,000; URGENT ON DAMS—VALLEY ASKS CONGRESS FOR FLOOD CONTROL STEPS AT THIS SESSION

Residents of the Neosho-Cottonwood Valley in Kansas today figured their tangible losses in the July flood at \$42,500,000.

They immediately joined in an urgent plea to Congress for flood protection so they can rebuild.

At Burlington, John Redmond, president of the Neosho-Cottonwood Flood Control Association, prepared a complete report to Congress on the emergency need for reservoirs which were authorized last year.

He emphasized that recovery in the valley depends upon action in this session of Congress to start work on the entire flood-control program, consisting of four dams upstream on the Neosho and Cottonwood.

The Senate Appropriations Committee approved last week a quarter million request for planning Strawn Dam, located north of Burlington and below the junction of the Neosho and Cottonwood Rivers. Redmond said that residents throughout the valley are appealing for additional appropriations for preliminary construction at Strawn and for planning of dams at Marion, Cedar Point, and Council Grove.

The people in these flooded valleys need this start on flood control so that they can rebuild and repair their property in safety, he said.

The estimated cost of the four dams is \$36,220,000, which Redmond pointed out is considerably less than the Kansas damage estimate of \$42,529,573 in the July flood alone. This was 1 of 40 floods recorded in the Neosho Basin in the past 20 years.

In Oklahoma the Neosho flood caused additional millions in damage last month. District Judge William Thomas, of Miami, Okla., who is preparing the damage estimates, is away on business. However, C. M. Bartlett, publisher of the Miami News-Record, said he had heard estimates as high as \$20,000,000 on losses suffered in Oklahoma above the Pensacola Reservoir.

The estimate of losses in Kansas was computed from figures obtained from each of the 11 counties in the Neosho-Cottonwood Basin. Half of the losses were accounted for by farm buildings, crops and equipment.

The figures were compiled by Representatives Howard Emmel, of Iola, Ernest Mabry, of Council Grove, and Ernest Johnson of Chanute, a committee representing the flood-control association.

Their figures showed type of property:

City dwellings.....	\$7,774,746
Industrial, commercial.....	4,605,525
Public property.....	2,551,650
Farms, crops, equipment.....	21,135,452
Railroads, roads, levees.....	6,462,200
Total.....	42,529,573

The committee members said the figures represent only visible losses. Much damage could not be calculated, they said, such as waste of soil, interruptions in essential services, and losses which will become apparent in the future.

The losses by counties in the Neosho-Cottonwood Valley were computed as follows:

Allen.....	\$5,410,423
Chase.....	5,214,150
Cherokee.....	928,500
Coffey.....	6,160,000
Crawford.....	35,750
Labette.....	2,575,000
Lyon.....	5,730,750
Marion.....	5,518,850
Morris.....	5,120,000
Neosho.....	4,624,500
Woodson.....	1,211,650

Total..... 42,529,573

The Late Honorable Frank Fellows**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked when informed of the death of my dear friend, Frank Fellows.

He was a great American—old fashioned in his sturdy type of Americanism—a fine legislator, and one who put the interests of his country first. Of great courage, he never swerved from the path of duty to his constituents and country. To his family I extend my deepest sympathy.

Another Exposé on Tidelands Grab**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, David Kleck, of the New Orleans Times-Picayune and New Orleans States, has come up with another exposé of the shenanigans behind the tidelands grab by the Department of the Interior.

The story grows more unbelievably fantastic with each new exposé brought to light by Mr. Kleck.

It could well be the story of Grimm's Fairy Tales or the Arabian Nights with its Ali Baba and the Forty Thieves. Or it could well be the saga of another Get Rich Quick Wallingford or a present-day Ponzi. Nothing seems to be beyond the realm of those behind this scheme to take away from the sovereign States that which rightfully belongs to them.

But why labor you with my observations and comments when Mr. Kleck is doing such a splendid job and the New Orleans Times-Picayune and New Orleans States are doing such a magnificent job in their own right.

Read this fantastic story for yourself. Here it is:

CORD SERIOUS IN SCRIP GRAB TRY FOR GULF OIL MILLIONS—PLAN HELD ACTIVE AS INTERIOR OFFICIALS FAIL TO HAILE IT

(By David Kleck)

E. L. Cord isn't fooling when he says he wants millions of dollars worth of oil-bearing tidelands off the Louisiana coast.

Cord's plan to grab Louisiana offshore oil wells in exchange for Federal land scrip is a serious plan. It is highly active today because the United States Department of the Interior is reluctant to take any action to halt it.

While the Department acted with speed to deny claims filed by a variety of get-rich-quick operators under the Federal mineral leasing act, it is not acting quickly in the scrip-exchange case of Cord, one-time luminary in the motor car, shipbuilding, and aviation industries.

Cord, who holds a variety of Federal land scrip entitled the owner to certain Federal

lands in the public domain, contends that this scrip applies to the Gulf bottom and has filed a claim on 92 acres containing oil or gas wells.

The claim was filed over 8 months ago. This was about the time a man who identified himself as a Cord associate was trying to sell the scrip "titles" to Louisiana through Gov. Earl K. Long and attorney general Bollivar E. Kemp, Jr.

The price asked of Louisiana was 5 percent of all Gulf production, or about \$68,000 monthly at present rates, and a truly incredible figure in the foreseeable future, depending on exploration.

CORD CITES AUTHORITY

When the Times-Picayune questioned how strongly Cord felt about the validity of his claim based on land scrip, he wired from Beverly Hills, Calif.:

"As to validity of scrip suggest you examine the acts of Congress signed by the several Presidents of the United States under which scrip has been issued.

"They grant the highest and best titles in the land.

"Precedents are too numerous for recital, but include Miami Beach, Sioux City, Iowa, Phoenix, Ariz., and Seal Beach, Calif. The most recent congressional act pertaining to scrip was that of August 3, 1949, authorizing issuance of duplicate certificates of Gerard scrip."

WON'T DISCLOSE TALKS

The Times-Picayune asked Cord if he had received any expression on the scrip validity from any Federal official. He answered:

"At this time we do not feel privileged to disclose conversations between ourselves and governmental officials."

If, by some means, Cord gains title to the areas he claims, the Nation could be staggered by the news of 1 man grabbing off oil wells producing 18,000 barrels daily with the vast potential of the Gulf lying completely in his hands.

Cord's associates first began approaching Attorney General Kemp 2 years ago, mainly through telephone calls, in an effort "to work something out with scrip," but it was not until last February that Roy Maggart, Los Angeles, journeyed to Baton Rouge to lay the cards of the "big deal" on the table. The details of this meeting are vouched for by Kemp.

WOULDN'T REQUIRE ACCOUNTING

Because the United States Supreme Court had ordered Louisiana to give an accounting of offshore revenue from June 3, 1950, Maggart told Kemp he had a "plan" to enable the State to avoid this heavy payment.

Maggart told the legal official that the scrip certificates collected by Cord "at a cost of over \$1,000,000" would be given to the State. This "title" could not be broken, Maggart contended, and Louisiana thereby being the owner of the Gulf production, would not have to account to the Federal Government, despite the Court decision.

The payoff to Cord and associates, Maggart said, would come from "jacking up the big oil companies who would give in without quibbling since they are so anxious to get the thing settled." The plan would not cost the State a cent, Maggart said, as Louisiana could simply make the oil companies increase their royalty payments on Gulf oil.

CORD WOULD GET "CUT"

The increase in royalty payments would cover the State's usual royalty, a cut to the Federal Government, and a cut to Cord and associates, according to the stipulations of Maggart's plan. The idea, in effect, would raise royalty rates from 12½ percent to 25½ percent.

Maggart proposed:

1. The State to continue to receive 12½ percent of production.

2. The Federal Government to receive 12½ percent, but because the lease would be in Louisiana waters, Maggart figured that the Government would return 37 percent of its cut (as is customary when oil is produced on Federal land within a State), leaving an actual payment to the Government of only 8 percent.

3. Cord and associates would get 5 percent.

4. The total would be only 25½ percent which, he said, the oil companies would be glad to settle for.

The plan, according to Maggart, was purposely designed to make everyone happy, but Kemp was not overjoyed and told him it was something he could not and would not handle. He then took Maggart to see Governor Long. At that time Kemp asked Harold Teasdel, president of the California Co., who was in Baton Rouge on other business, to join Long, him, and Maggart for lunch and listen to the proposition.

(Subsequently, the California Co. filed a brief protesting Cord's claims with the Interior Department. The brief cites four grounds which they consider would invalidate his claims.)

LONG SAYS PLAN FANTASTIC

Long listened to Maggart's proposition and later told Kemp it was too fantastic to worry about until a Federal ruling had been made. Maggart has not returned to Baton Rouge.

Five years ago a trace of Maggart appeared in an official brief prepared in the California case by Robert W. Kenny, attorney general of California, and William W. Clary, assistant attorney general, which says: "For a long time one Roy Maggart has been active on behalf of a group of applicants for Federal oil leases. On numerous occasions Maggart has tried to persuade large California oil companies to settle the tidelands controversy by buying out the interests represented by him."

Last December Kemp was contacted in Washington by A. P. Scott, Reno, Nev., who said he was a Cord associate and wanted to talk over a scrip proposition. Scott said, in effect, that "we own the land, the courts say so, the Government will say so, and we'll raise hell if they don't recognize us in a hurry."

Scott then arranged a meeting for Kemp with Oscar Chapman, Secretary of the Interior, and the matter was discussed. The legal significance of the scrip was placed in the hands of Mastin G. White, solicitor for the Interior Department.

ACTION HELD UP

This week, 8 months after Cord's application was filed, the Washington bureau of the Times-Picayune asked White why he had not rendered an opinion on the validity of the scrip.

The reason no action had been taken, he said, was because "we are waiting until the Supreme Court tells us whether they are State lands or Federal lands."

(White was apparently referring to the matter of the line of demarcation. The matter of the California boundary is before the Supreme Court now.)

White maintained that no reason exists for the Interior Department to stick its neck out until Congress finally acts on the quitclaim bill which Washington observers predict will not receive final action this session.

ONCE HEADED AUTO PLANT

The House-passed quitclaim bill gives the States title to the 3-mile limit and the United States title to the Continental Shelf edge. The majority of Cord's claims lie beyond the 3-mile limit.

In addition to Cord's claim on Louisiana, two scrip applications have been filed against

Texas offshore areas for 40 acres each, and eight applications in California, four of these for 40 acres and the others for 900, 79, 734, and 246 acres.

Cord, a one-time auto salesman who rose to the status of a multimillionaire and manufactured the Cord and other automobiles, once fled to England to escape kidnapping threats. In August 1937 he quit as chairman of the Cord Corp. which had resources of \$65,000,000.

Cord quit the post shortly after a Federal judge enjoined him and Morris Markin, then president of Checker Cab Manufacturing Co., from manipulating stocks in that and other Cord affiliates (aviation, ship-building) on the Nation's securities exchanges. The court issued the order at the behest of the Securities and Exchange Commission. Cord and Markin, while consenting, denied violating the market regulations.

LOUISIANA CLAIM INGENIOUS

Cord, then 43, sold out 658,000 shares of stock in Cord Corp. for \$4 a share. His holdings had amounted to 30 percent of the outstanding stock.

The bill of complaint contended that manipulating forced an artificial rise in stock of the cab company from \$7 a share to \$50 a share. Cord now lives on Wilshire Boulevard, in Beverly Hills, Calif., and maintains ranches in California and Nevada.

The scheme Cord applied to the Gulf oil wells has already been used for the basis of applications in California, but off Louisiana his procedure of claiming is ingenious to the point of being fascinating.

Acting for himself and as trustee for the Santa Fe Pacific Railroad Co., he produced scrip which had been issued under five different acts of Congress: Porterfield Warrants Act, 1864; Soldiers' Additional Scrip Act, 1872; Valentine Scrip Act, 1872; Forest Lieu Scrip Act, 1897; and Isaac Crow Scrip Act, 1907.

The Soldiers' Act gave scrip in lieu of a cash bonus to Federal soldiers of the War Between the States. The Forest Lieu Act allows lands in a public forest to be exchanged for public lands elsewhere. The other scrip acts were passed to satisfy various claims against the Government.

BOUGHT UP SCRIP

The Santa Fe Pacific Railroad Co. was the owner of forest lieu scrip amounting to 280 acres. Cord collected an additional 1,690 acres by buying up scrip under the other acts.

But, as United States Representative Edwin E. Willis pointed out in a recent letter of protest to Interior Secretary Chapman, the Forest Lieu, Soldiers' Additional, Valentine and Crow Acts contain the words "not mineral."

The Porterfield warrants say nothing about minerals.

Cord apparently figured that the Porterfield warrants would provide him most substantial claim to the Gulf wells, but he only had collected 120 acres of this type. He solved the problem by splitting this acreage into 92 claims of 1 round acre each.

These round acres he plotted on top of each oil well in the Gulf and included gas and shut-in gas wells.

The majority of Gulf wells are drilled at slants from single platforms. One platform may have as many as 11 wells slanting off at different angles. To achieve the difficult feat of placing these round acres directly over the bottoms of these slanted wells, Cord had to have accurate engineering information. This information can be obtained in a variety of places, including the company itself, the Louisiana Department of Conservation, and the Interior Department, assuming that agency had collected such information.

CLAIM 1,932 ACRES

Cord found the problem of locating his claims on top of the bottom holes, located mainly by subsurface geometry, so difficult that he sometimes went awry and claimed an area above nonproducing sands.

To make his claim complete, Cord then added up the remainder of the acreage under the other scrip acts and applied it around these Porterfield round acres to make squares of 21 acres each. His total claim amounts to 1,932 acres.

Cord's reasoning is apparent. If the other scrip can be shown to be nonapplicable, the Porterfield warrant acres around each well will be the chief talking point. Oil companies who have plotted the curious Cord claims on their holdings consider that his claim represents an engineering work of some ingenuity.

This claim, serial No. 022604, is now on file with the Bureau of Land Management, Interior Department.

Cord first came to attention in the tidelands controversy when he, and other speculators, were denounced on the floor of the House of Representatives by Representative Willis, who had learned of their use of the venerable certificates.

OBJECTIONS LISTED

Of the 1,932 acres claimed by Cord, the California Co. has leases on 756 acres and the majority of the oil wells in the Gulf.

The oil company's protest delivered to the Interior Secretary cites these grounds why the claim should be denied:

1. The offshore areas are not public lands within the meaning of the act which provides for the land scrip certificates.

2. The ocean areas below low-water mark has been reserved and set aside and therefore is not open to entry and selection under these acts.

3. The lands described by Cord are not available because they are known to be mineral lands.

HOME IN GULF NOT INTENT

4. The ocean area below the low-water mark is not subject to selection under the land scrip acts because it has not been surveyed and is not subject to survey by public land surveys of the United States.

But Willis provides another reason why he thinks the application should be denied. In the letter to Chapman, he said:

"Quite aside from law and jurisprudence, everyone would concede, I think, that Congress never intended to say in effect to the original holders of the certificates: 'You have been good soldiers. Unfortunately, we have no funds with which to pay you a cash bonus, but we want you to be good citizens and settle with your families on a tract of the public domain. Here, therefore, is a scrip that entitles you to select and live on a farm at the bottom of the Gulf of Mexico.'"

But the Interior Department has taken no action.

Willis adds, in the same letter.

"I am concerned, however, about the fact that whereas your Department turns down mineral leasing act applications within a matter of days, no action has been taken on the Cord application, filed on February 5, 1951. I would like to know the reason for this delay, and I hope you will agree with me that the Cord application should be immediately denied."

R. D. Searls, Acting Secretary of the Interior, answered Willis' letter, saying that the scrip applications had been receiving the personal attention of Chapman, who was then on the west coast.

That was 3 weeks ago. Chapman has said the Cord application was "fantastic," but no matter how fantastic or what kind of bill passes the Congress, a decision will have to be made.

That hasn't been done yet.

Time Wobbles On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appearing in the September 9, 1951, issue of the Cincinnati Enquirer discusses my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 6, 1951, regarding the unwarranted attack by Time magazine on the National Guard in the August 6, 1951, issue:

TIME WOBBLES ON

In its usual flip style—and evidently about as accurately as usual—Time magazine a month ago ridiculed the National Guard and Reserve, quoting "candid Pentagoners" as saying that the National Guard is wobbly, often clique-ruled, often riddled with politics, and should either be abolished or strictly disciplined.

Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT has given effective answer in a speech in the House of Representatives, asking that the magazine identify the "candid Pentagoners" and explain why they supposedly told Time something very different from what they told the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Military Establishment. Representative VAN ZANDT asserted flatly that the article was a "vicious canard, manufactured out of whole cloth and utterly unwarranted." He added that: "This is not the first time that Time has vented its spleen against the Organized Reserve Corps but more particularly the National Guard."

The Pennsylvania legislator then went on to cite the imposing record of strength build-up which the National Guard has achieved in the various States in recent years, with one-third of the force now in active military service. He recalled that even the old National Guard in World War I was good enough to prove the decisive factor in the defeat of the imperial powers of Central Europe, that it was good enough to account for 18,827 of those killed, for 40 percent of the wounded, and for 38.4 percent of the ground gained. He added, "The same thing held true in World War II, and it will hold true in any war of the future."

Terming the article "a vicious slur on a group of patriotic National Guard men and reservists who take their obligation to their Nation seriously and are willing to do something about it while others play or criticize," Representative VAN ZANDT closed with the assertion that "if Time is bent on helping Russia and her satellites, then I submit Time is using the proper means to do so."

On behalf of the battle-tested Ohio National Guard, we say "Amen" to all the Pennsylvanian's remarks.

Statement by Gen. W. Anders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I

include therein a statement made by Gen. W. Anders relative to one of the most shocking crimes in human history, namely, the unjustified murder of thousands of Polish officers who were prisoners of war and whose bodies were found in a mass grave in the Katyn Forest.

This is a very important statement on the subject and should be read by every Member of Congress. House Resolution 390, to investigate the Katyn Forest massacre, now on the Union Calendar of the House, should be passed without delay.

STATEMENT MADE BY GEN. W. ANDERS ON THE 28TH OF APRIL 1950, AT A PRESS CONFERENCE CALLED ON THE OCCASION OF THE TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KATYN MURDER

Although it is 10 years now since the Katyn crime was committed, the Katyn case as such can by no means be treated as closed. That is why I feel it my duty to raise it again and remind the public opinion of the democratic nations of its existence.

1. THE VICTIMS OF THE CRIME, THE PLACE AND DATE OF THEIR DISAPPEARANCE

The victims of this foul murder were my own countrymen and my comrades-in-arms, most of them officers who, in the same way as I did, having fought in September 1939 against Hitler, found themselves taken prisoners of war by the Red army, the then German ally, who joined Hitler in his assault by stabbing us in the back over the eastern frontiers of Poland.

Two years later, after the outbreak of war between Germany and Russia and after the signing of an agreement between the Polish Government in London and the Soviet Government, I was released from Soviet imprisonment and appointed commander of a Polish Army to be formed in Russia from among the Polish prisoners of war, civilian prisoners, and deportees. Soon after I had set about my task it became apparent that about 14,500 prisoners of war were missing, mostly officers who had been formerly inmates of 3 large prisoner-of-war camps in Kozielsk, Starobielsk, and Ostaszew. It was further established that, ever since the disbandment of these 3 camps which had taken place in April and May 1940, except for some 400 men who had been transported to a camp in Gruzowice, all the others had vanished without a trace and without ever giving a sign of life. Not a clue about what had happened to them could be found in spite of a meticulous search which lasted nearly a year and in spite of several interventions at the highest level in Moscow including two personal interviews with Stalin himself, at one of which General Sikorski was also present. All we ever got was a score of deceitful and vague answers. It was obvious that the Soviet Government was unwilling to explain what had happened with the thousands of missing prisoners of war taken by the Red Army in 1939.

2. THE KATYN GRAVES AND THE INTERNATIONAL CONSEQUENCES OF THEIR DISCOVERING

But when in April 1943 the Germans made their announcement about the discovery of the Katyn graves, the Soviet Government immediately came forth with a ready version about the alleged capturing by the Germans of several thousands of the missing Polish prisoners of war during the summer of 1941, and about the subsequent murdering of them by the Germans in August and September 1941. Furthermore, when the Polish Government, headed by General Sikorski, sent in a request to the International Red Cross asking for an investigation of the whole case, the Soviet Government not only refused its consent to any such investigation

but moreover took this Polish initiative as an excuse for the severing of diplomatic relations with the Polish Government in London.

3. THE KATYN CASE BEFORE THE NUREMBERG TRIBUNAL

The Katyn case came before the Nuremberg tribunal as part of the general trial of the chief German war criminals by an international tribunal. As prosecutor of this point of the indictment appeared the Soviet Union representative and therefore a representative of a government which was a suspect No. 1 in the case of the Katyn crime included in the indictment. Moreover, among the four members of the jury there also sat a representative of this suspect Government. But there was no representative of Poland whose sons and soldiers were involved and who therefore was most entitled if not to accuse at least to plead and give evidence. True enough that delegates of the Warsaw administration were sent to Nuremberg and did appear there although only in a secondary role, but I do believe that there is no longer any doubt as to the real character of the Beirut regime. But even to these agents of Soviet interests in Poland the right to speak in the Katyn case was denied.

Nevertheless and in spite of such a composition of the international tribunal at Nuremberg, the Katyn crime, although included in the indictment, was omitted from the judgment. There is no mention about this atrocity in the long list of inhuman crimes proved to have been committed by the Nazi Germans. The significance of this fact is enormous. It means that—since it was found impossible to prove that the Germans had perpetrated this crime—one of the greatest atrocities committed in this last war has been ignored and its culprit has escaped with impunity. The very principles of justice therefore call for the appointment of a new international tribunal before which the Katyn case should be brought. Neither should it be thought that although this case no longer occupies the official bodies of international justice or that at present nothing is heard about it at Lake Success, that it has been finally settled, that the crime will be forgotten and that the conspiracy of silence hovering over the mass graves of Katyn will last forever. On the contrary, to quote a sentence from an excellent article by Mr. G. F. Hudson in a recent issue of the quarterly International Affairs, "The unquiet dead of Katyn still walk the earth."

4. THE UNEVEN STRUGGLE FOR JUSTICE

We Poles will never forget Katyn. Having lost the right to raise our voice on the international forum after most of the countries had withdrawn their recognition of our government, deprived of the possibility of appealing directly to governments and to the institutions of international justice, we have nevertheless prepared with perseverance our indictment. For years we collected every scrap of documentary evidence, we scrutinized ever detail, and we informed both the governments of democratic countries and the public opinion of the free countries about the result of our work.

Speaking of publications available to all, the most exhaustive material is to be found in the book *The Katyn Crime in the Light of Documents*, to which I have written a foreword and which was published in Polish in London in 1948 and in French in Paris in 1949. An English translation of this book is ready for publication and awaits a publisher. Further to this documentary work there is a whole chapter about Katyn in the book *Stalin and the Poles*, published last autumn by Hollis & Carter, and containing a foreword written by the President of the Polish Republic. Important evidence is also contained in the memoirs of J. Czapski, consisting of two books, *Souvenirs de Starobielsk*

and *La Terre Inhumaine*. I have also related the story of the Katyn crime in my memoirs which were published by Macmillan under the title "An Army in Exile." All these books are lying on this table ready for anyone who would care to look through them.

In our endeavors to make known the truth about Katyn we were by no means alone. Time and again we have found understanding among generous people, not least here in Great Britain. They have never hesitated to stand up in defense of a righteous cause, and have claimed justice for us in defiance of the materialistic considerations and the short-sighted attitude which seemed to dictate to many of the free governments the policy of silence in the matter of Katyn in preference to the risk of irritating the Kremlin. I wish to express here my sincere thanks and appreciation to all those who preferred to put justice and truth before illusory political interests, and especially may I be allowed to express my deep gratitude to those of our proved friends who are present here today.

5. THE AMERICAN COMMITTEE FOR THE INVESTIGATION OF THE KATYN MASSACRE

Voices claiming justice in the Katyn case have been also raised many a time in other countries, especially in the United States of America. I wish to mention here particularly the speeches in Congress of the Honorable GEORGE A. DONDERO on July 7, 1949, and of the Honorable RAY J. MADDEN on September 29, 1949, both of whom courageously and outspokenly demanded the conviction of those guilty of the Katyn crime.

Finally, toward the end of last year, an initiative in the United States of America which calls for our special gratitude has led to the formation of the American Committee for the Investigation of the Katyn Massacre under the chairmanship of Mr. A. Bliss Lane, the former United States of America Ambassador in Poland. We greet the announcement of such an impartial investigation of the Katyn case as an important and positive step toward the vindication of the principle of international justice.

6. POLISH EVIDENCE IS AN INDISPENSABLE ELEMENT IN ANY PROCEEDINGS RELATING TO THE KATYN MURDER

I also hope that in any future proceedings relating to the Katyn case the second essential misfeasance committed at Nuremberg will be avoided, namely, that Polish evidence was not heard by the court. By Polish I understand of course evidence given not by Soviet puppets but by free Poles entitled to demand the truth and to speak in the name of the victims and of the injury suffered in this case by the entire Polish nation. Moreover the hearing of the Polish side in any trial of the Katyn case cannot be dispensed with, not only because the very nature of legal procedure calls for it; it should be heard also because only when the material assembled by the Polish side can the evidence supplied by both the potential culprits be rightly estimated and the actual culprit determined.

7. WE ACCUSE THE GOVERNMENT OF THE U. S. S. R.

I deem we are sufficiently prepared to appear before any tribunal. Not only have we gathered all the available evidence but on the strength of the proof we possess we are positive that the Soviet Government is guilty of having committed the Katyn crime; that the 14,500 Polish prisoners of war in Russian hands were murdered during April and the first half of May 1940, therefore at a time when Soviet Russia was still at peace and on friendly terms with Hitlerite Germany; that, therefore, the Kremlin is guilty of having calmly decided to murder in cold blood practically the whole of the Polish officers' corps together with a few thousand other prisoners, all of whom had fallen into the hands

of the Red army in September 1939, and whose only guilt was of having been the first to fight against totalitarian aggression.

I shall briefly sketch the following main points on which rests our firm conviction about the Soviet guilt and our indictment against the Soviet Government.

(a) It is an uncontested fact that all the murdered Polish prisoners were alive and in Soviet hands earlier in the spring of 1940. All statements brought forth by the Soviet Government that, while still alive, they had found themselves out of reach and no longer in the responsibility of the Soviet authorities and that therefore they must have been murdered by someone else are false and obviously untrue and no proof can be given to support such statements.

(b) Throughout the 10 months from August 1941 till July 1942 while vainly searching for the missing prisoners all over the Soviet Union, we had exchanged notes with the Soviet Government and had held innumerable conferences and interviews in this matter; but we never received any information about the falling of these men into the hands of the Germans in the neighborhood of Smolensk which was the story the Soviet Government put forth immediately after the revealed discovery of the Katyn graves.

(c) Soviet statements which claim that the Polish prisoners in question were alive till August-September 1941, at which time they were murdered by the Germans after having fallen into their hands when the Germans took over the Smolensk district, are absolutely with no foundation and no proof has been ever produced to support such a version. The truth is that ever since the spring of 1940, no sign of life has been given by any of the missing prisoners while every evidence retrieved from their bodies such as thousands of newspapers, letters, and other documents proves irrefutably that the lives of the victims came to an end in spring of 1940.

(d) The Soviet Government never gave its consent for the admittance of international impartial experts to the Katyn graves. It objected against it in April 1943 when the Polish Government requested the International Red Cross to investigate the case, neither did it invite a single international expert to investigate the graves when, 6 months later, the Katyn district was once again in Soviet hands. On the other hand the International Commission of Experts invited by the Germans to Katyn included, further to experts coming from countries occupied at the time by the Germans or allied to them also Dr. Fr. Naville, professor of forensic medicine in Geneva, and therefore from a country which was absolutely neutral. The report of this Commission, dated April 30, 1943, stated the Soviet guilt.

(e) The official Soviet Communiqué about the Katyn massacre, published in January 1944 by a commission composed entirely of Soviet citizens contains so many contradictions, obviously fictitious facts and false statements by feigned witnesses that it only strengthens the conviction about the guilt of the Soviet side.

(f) In spite of the privileged position the Soviet side had in Nuremberg no new arguments in favor of the Soviet version produced at the trial. On the contrary, by failing to prove the guilt of the Germans the trial although indirectly also incriminated the Soviet Government.

8. THE GROUP OF OFFICERS THAT ESCAPED THE MASSACRE

Before I end I should like to assure you that we welcome any inquiries and are willing to supply you with all explanations referring to our attitude in this matter and about the documentary material we possess. We also have among us a few of the former prisoners of war from the three camps which

were liquidated in 1940. They belonged to that group of 400 sent first to the Pawliszczew Bor and later to the Głazowicz camp and which was the only group to be spared from massacre. They can give you evidence particularly about the important circumstances of the evacuation of the camps and can testify about the ceasing of all correspondence with their lost comrades, a fact which they had learned from letters they received from their own families in the country.

9. MY APPEAL TO THE PUBLIC OPINION OF THE FREE NATIONS

I thank you, gentlemen, for having come here today and for your attention throughout my rather lengthy explanations. May I be allowed to appeal through you to the public opinion of the countries you represent as well as to that of other free and democratic countries and ask for their support of our endeavors tending to elucidate the Katyn case and our plea for the appointment of a new international tribunal which would be called upon to investigate this crime and to punish the culprits.

Because, in my opinion, only if all the war criminals of this last war will meet with adequate punishment will this be understood as a warning for the future and will give a guaranty that human principles will be maintained in case we find ourselves involved in a new armed conflict.

Anti-Nationalist Influence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial taken from the September 12, 1951, issue of the Peoria Star, entitled "Anti-Nationalist Influence Is Still Powerful in Washington":

ANTI-NATIONALIST INFLUENCE IS STILL POWERFUL IN WASHINGTON

There are excellent reasons for believing that the Truman-Acheson regime was on its way toward recognition of Communist China a few months ago, that it was reconciled to the loss of Formosa to the Reds, and that it would have permitted the Red China Government to sign the Japanese Peace Treaty. That these things did not happen is due entirely, we think, to the public exposure of improper influences steering our Far East policy, and of dangers to our national safety which were being ignored by the administration. Once the public suspicion was thoroughly aroused, Dean Acheson was forced to change his course in Asia.

But no one is to conclude that the friends of Communist China—who are the foes of Chiang Kai-shek and the Nationalist Government on Formosa—have given up the fight in Washington. Evidence that they are still powerful is seen in new charges of corruption in the Chiang Kai-shek Government. It is being objected that a \$300,000,000 bill to aid the Nationalists should not be approved because of alleged fraud and shady deals in Formosa.

One Washington newspaperman—and he takes himself most seriously—sums it up in this solemn pronouncement:

"The whole troubled relationship of the United States to China involves the appraisal of the strength and integrity of Generalissimo

Chiang's regime, first on the mainland, now on Formosa."

It seems to us that this overlooks a factor fully as important as Chiang's strength and integrity; that is, an appraisal of Harry Truman's strength and integrity.

If the Government of the United States is to consider withholding \$300,000,000 aid from Chiang because it doubts the strength of his Nationalist leadership, and fears that grafters within his own ranks will get some of the money, it is in a comical position. The last 12 months are unprecedented in American history for the amount of fraud and corruption exposed in high places in our Government.

If we withhold aid to Chiang, what is the result? We give aid and comfort to the Red regime. As between the two alternatives, how could there be any doubt of our choice? Assume that there is fraud in the Nationalist Government. It still exists as a power against communism in Asia. It is absurd to think of probing the moral character of a friendly Chinese Government when a hostile Chinese Government is killing American boys.

Friends of Communist China have used the technique before. It is now being probed in detail by a Senate committee. The aid that might have been given to Chiang in time to prevent the Red conquest of China was withheld when doubts of Chiang's strength and integrity were shrewdly planted in strategic places in Washington. Congress should be well acquainted with the technique by this time and should soberly consider the fact that the anti-Nationalist influence is still powerful in Washington.

Congressman Potter Speaks on Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1951

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the Honorable CHARLES POTTER, of Michigan, on Saturday evening, September 8, delivered an address on Americanism to an audience of 2,000 at Aberdeen, Wash., and I offer it for publication in the Appendix of the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks.

The occasion was an "Alert America" observance sponsored by Aberdeen Post No. 5 of the American Legion. All patriotic labor—both AFL and CIO—civic and community organizations united in making the observance a most successful one. The observance did, I am sure, much to stimulate interest in freedom and liberty when these are under such bitter attack from alien forces.

I hope all Members will read Mr. POTTER's address and, knowing of the success of the Alert America Week celebration staged in Aberdeen, that they will endeavor to have patriotic organizations in their own districts undertake similar programs.

Representative POTTER's address follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I am most happy to be here in Aberdeen, Wash. I was fortunate to be in your great

State a few days this spring, and the same as any other visitor, I thoroughly enjoyed my visit. The hardy pioneer stock of the people of our great Northwest makes a Michigander feel much at home because so many of you migrated from my section of the country. When your Congressman, RUSSELL MACK, asked me if I would be your speaker tonight, I was most pleased to accept.

I am particularly pleased to be able to participate in your Alert America campaign. The American Legion Post of Aberdeen receives the thanks of every loyal, patriotic American citizen—not only of this community or the State of Washington, but of the entire country. This is the first program of its kind to my knowledge in the country. It is my hope that the fire of patriotism that has been kindled here today will sweep the country and brand the spirit of Americanism on the heart and conscience of every citizen.

In many segments of our society today, people appear to be afraid to demonstrate any evidence of our American philosophy. If they do, the enemies of our way of life charge them with being superpatriots, reactionary, witch hunters, and other names intended to slander the good American.

Many of you in the audience tonight have in the past actively heeded the alert call. You have assembled at the call of a bugle or mustered at the sound of the bosun's whistle in World War I, II, or in Korea. You fought—and many died—on strange soil and unfamiliar waters: for what? So that your children and your children's children would not have to make life's greatest sacrifice—that of placing their own lives in jeopardy on the field of battle. Yes, but we also fought because of a firm belief and a shining ideal—that being the American way of life; a way of life unexcelled in any civilization. We were convinced that our form of representative government was best. We believed in individual freedom, where a poor immigrant can become a great industrialist—where a poor farm boy can become President of the United States. Yes, we gladly fought to protect our free institutions which have developed under the protection of our Constitution.

Did we fight so that when we returned to our loved ones, our community, and our country we might become cogs in a diabolical, socialistic machine? We did not. Why is it when we have fought so hard and prayed so long for lasting peace, that peace is not with us?

The free people of the world today are challenged as never before. This insidious challenge is international communism. International communism assumes an octopus-termitic character. The octopus characteristics are evident in the aggressive feelers of the Soviet Union utilizing their armed might to suppress and strangle their victims, such as Poland. The termite characteristics have been demonstrated time and time again by the Communists' organized efforts to bore from within a government structure by honeycombing the moral, political, and economic fiber. The government then lacks strength to ward off this internal aggression and becomes easy prey for communism, as for example Czechoslovakia and China.

While both external aggression and internal penetration differ in appearance, they supplement each other and both have the same objective—that of bringing all countries and all people into their web in order to carry out their mission of communizing the world. This has been their objective since the days of Marx and Engle, who conceived this diabolical philosophy.

Most Americans today realize that communism is a false philosophy and shudder to think of ever having to live in a Communist society, but despite this fact the Amer-

ican public knows very little about its operation here in the United States. You have heard it said many times by sound-thinking Americans that there is too much fuss being made over communism, that there are not enough Communists in this country to do any damage, and many say "Let them sound off, no one pays any attention to them any way." Of course, this type of thinking plays right into the hands of the Communists.

It has been my privilege to be a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities. My service on this committee has dramatically brought home to me that the Communist movement in the United States cannot be taken lightly and that it is a real and distinct threat to our form of government and our way of life. I have seen the Communists who have appeared before our committee and noted the hate in their eyes, ungodliness in their hearts, and conspiracy on their lips.

Tonight let us get a good look at the Communist Party in the United States and see how it operates. Much of the information our committee or the FBI receives comes from former members of the party who have come to realize the hypocrisy of communism and are now willing to aid their Government by giving the FBI and our committee all known information concerning the party as they experienced it. They all say as soon as they were recruited into the party, they went through a period of training or indoctrination. The basis for this training, which was not only required reading, but actually serves as a Communist Party member's bible, is the Communist Party—A Manual in Organization, written by J. Peters. J. Peters for many years was the representative of the Cominform or the Communist International Committee in the United States.

Permit me to quote from this manual, which I have had photostated, as to the role and aims of the Communist Party: "As the leader and organizer of the proletariat, the Communist Party of the United States of America leads the working class in the fight for the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism, for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, for the establishment of a Socialist Soviet Republic in the United States, for the complete abolition of classes, for the establishment of socialism, the first stage of the classless Communist society."

Let us analyze again the aim—which I have just read—of the Communist Party of the United States of America. The Communists' own manual states: "The Communist Party is to lead in the fight for the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism." Can that leave any doubt in anyone's mind as to what is the Communist Party's main effort? It is to destroy our republican form of government and supplant it with what? Supplant it, and I quote, "with a Socialist Soviet Republic in the United States."

Many people will claim that revolution does not necessarily have to be violent or forceful, and that the Communist Party would not resort to forceful means. Let me quote to you from another section of their manual. In the section dealing with party discussion and freedom to criticize, we find this paragraph:

"We cannot imagine a discussion, for example, questioning the correctness of the leading role of the proletariat in the revolution, or the necessity for the proletarian dictatorship. We do not question the theory of the necessity for the forceful overthrow of capitalism. We do not question the correctness of the revolutionary theory of the class struggle laid down by Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin."

In other words, the doctrine of forceful overthrow of our Government by the Communist Party is a basic doctrine which Communist Party members cannot even question. Let me repeat again this one salient sentence: "We do not question the theory of

the necessity for the forceful overthrow of capitalism." That says nothing about a nonviolent revolution. It says nothing about overthrowing capitalism by constitutional means. But it does specifically say "forceful overthrow." Analyzing the paragraph further, it is important to note that the Communist Party which claims to be a great advocate of freedom of speech, freedom of discussion, civil rights, individual rights, forbids these same rights within their own organization. The paragraph from the Communist Manual just read forbids the questioning of the basic theory of the Communist Party. Members cannot question the writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, or Stalin. They cannot even question the necessity for forceful revolution.

The Communist Party has a most effective organization held together by the strictest of party discipline. Party discipline is enforced from the top down. Any deviation from the so-called party line, any questioning of party principles or objectives, subjects a member to reprimands or expulsion, and, of course, we know in many cases extinction is the inevitable punishment. We have only to refresh our memory by reviewing the famous purge trials behind the iron curtain and the assassination of Trotsky. If a party member is given an assignment to perform, some duty which has been agreed upon by his superiors, despite any objections he might have to carry out such assignment, it is compulsory he carry it out despite any personal wishes to the contrary.

Until recent date a great many people considered the Communist Party of the United States of America as a minor political party and did not consider its revolutionary aspects. We naively believed that the Communist Party within our own borders was a native organization not under the control of the Soviet Union. Now, however, we are awake to the realization that the ultimate objectives of the Communist Party—whether it be in this country or any other section of the world—are always to overthrow existing governments by revolution and establish the Communist society instead and to receive its orders through its tightly knit organization enforced by the strictest discipline from the Soviet Union itself.

The leader of the Communist Party of today is Joe Stalin. He actually is the brain of the octopus whose tentacles reach into every country of the world and into practically every community. If we need proof that the Communist Party is under the domination of the Soviet Union, we have only to cite the oath which a person takes when he becomes a member of the party. That oath reads:

"I now take my place in the ranks of the Communist Party, the party of the working class. I take this solemn oath to give the best that is in me to the service of my class. I pledge myself to spare no effort in uniting the workers in militant struggle against fascism and war. I pledge myself to work unsparingly in the unions, in the shops, among the unemployed, to lead the struggles for the daily needs of the masses. I solemnly pledge to take my place in the forefront of the struggle for Negro rights. I pledge myself to rally the masses to defend the Soviet Union, the land of victorious socialism. I pledge myself to remain at all times a vigilant and firm defender of the Leninist line of the party, the only line that insures the triumph of Soviet power in the United States."

No American can be a member of the Communist Party and be a loyal American. He is pledged to defend not the United States of America, but the Soviet Union. In case of an all-out war waged by the Soviet Union against the United States, members of the Communist Party are forced to aid the Soviet Union and hamper and sabotage the defense effort of the United States.

The Congress some years ago passed what is known as the Smith Act. This act makes it unlawful for any person to belong to an organization which believes in the overthrow of our Government by force or violence. This year the Supreme Court upheld the constitutional validity of this law in the case where the 11 Communist leaders were convicted. We can see from the very oath of membership that the Supreme Court decision was a correct decision and that members of the Communist Party are traitors to the United States.

I personally am convinced that the Congress has further responsibility in an effort to combat the Communist menace in the United States. First, we should outlaw the party. The courts have established, and it is a known fact, that the Communist Party is not a political party but an agent of a foreign power. Therefore, it has no legal right to disguise itself as a political party and appear on our election ballots. Secondly, our statutes should be revised so as to impose the same penalties on membership in the Communist Party as now provided for treason. There is no doubt in the mind of anyone who has studied the Communist movement that its philosophy, its actions, and its training have welded together a most despicable, dangerous group of revolutionist traitors to free society and to the human race that civilization has ever encountered.

I have endeavored to stress some of the high lights as to the functions and aims of the Communist Party and to show its conspiracy nature. However, much of the work done on behalf of the Communist Party is done not by the closed party itself, but rather through various Communist-front organizations, utilizing great numbers of non-member sympathizers, misguided idealists, and many innocent individuals who fail to realize the Communist Party is controlling their organization. It is not just happenstance that many worth-while organizations have been taken over by the Communist Party. This is a designed effort on the part of the Communist Party to take over large organizations and to use them to carry out their objectives. The Communist Party refers to this effort as "party fractions." I wish to quote again from the Communist Manual: "The fraction is an instrument in the hands of the party through which the policy of the party is brought to the organized masses and through which the party gives leadership to members of mass organizations." The main effort in the establishment of fractions is in labor organizations. The Communist Party has since its inception endeavored to appeal to the working men and women. Quoting from the manual "Fractions are built in all the trade-unions and other mass organizations of the workers. In all unions and in cultural, fraternal, sport, and unemployed organizations of the workers or farmers, in all united front organizations, in all conventions and conferences of such organizations where there are at least three Communists, a Communist fraction must be organized."

Members of the Communist fraction work with a singleness of purpose to get on select committees, to hold a controlling office in the organization which they have infiltrated. If you have an organization of say 300 members and out of that membership there should be 10 party members, one of their group would be selected as the secretary of their fraction. The Communist members of the organization would meet and report to the local Communist Party unit advising that unit of actions that the organization—made up mostly of non-Communists—plans to take. The unit will then instruct its 10 members to carry out a certain policy. The 10 will work in unison in an effort to gain support of the total organization membership. You can readily see that in most mass organizations, it is very easy for a small, well-disciplined minority, working with a

singleness of purpose, to direct and control the policies of the entire organization. This is done without the vast majority of the organization membership realizing what is happening.

Let me to quote you from the Communist Party manual as to what is said about the function of the fraction: "The party fraction in a union or a branch of another mass organization meets regularly before the meeting of this organization. At this meeting, the members of the party fraction discuss and decide how to apply the policy of the party in the organization; how to introduce the party campaigns; how to recruit new party members from the union; how to get new readers for the Daily Worker. No party member has the right to speak or act in the union or other mass organization against the decisions of the fraction. The party members must always act as a solid unit in the union or other mass organization."

During World War II, after the break of the Hitler-Stalin pact, when Russia and the United States were allied in the war against Germany, Communist-front organizations sprang up like mushrooms all over the country. This was a harvest period for the Communist Party. The party utilized the war alliance between the Soviet Union and the United States as a means of setting up hundreds of organizations throughout the country which it controlled and which many unsuspecting persons joined in the belief that they were joining solely patriotic organizations. The Communists have an uncanny ability to name organizations which they wish to use in such a manner as to appeal to the humanitarian or patriotic instincts of unsuspecting Americans.

It is interesting to watch the Communist Party line and see how that line is followed by the party in the United States. We have but to look back to the beginning of World War II when Hitler was rising to great power in Germany and was threatening all of Europe. At that time, the Communist Party was vehement in its attack on nazism. Then with the signing of the Hitler-Stalin pact, the Communist Party overnight ceased all anti-Nazi propaganda and appealed to the American people not to become engaged in the war against Germany. Peace movements were conducted by the Communist Party in the United States. Petitions were circulated and speeches made in an effort to limit our defenses and to remain neutral during this period. Then with the breaking of the Hitler-Stalin pact, the Communist Party of the United States of America again switched overnight and became vehement in its attack against nazism and fascism. Then the clamor was for us to get into the war, open up a second front—and from that time until the end of World War II, the Communist Party aim and effort for the prosecution of the war was the same as ours. Because of that, many people were misguided in believing that the Communist Party was not only a harmless organization, but was working in the interest of America. However, at the conclusion of World War II, the Communist Party in the United States abandoned its role as peaceful cooperators with the American Government, and reverted to its true role of militant conspirators.

When this took place, many individuals who had been naively associated with many of their activities realized the Communist Party for what it was and would have nothing further to do with any organization which Communists controlled, and many organizations endeavored to ferret out Communists from their ranks. This is particularly true of many of our major labor organizations. And then came Korea. The act of aggression by the Communists of North Korea and the position of the Communist Party of the United States of America in upholding that aggression was the final blow to many mis-

guided idealists who still believed the Communist Party was nothing other than a political party. Since Korea it has been much more difficult for the Communist Party to establish its front organizations and the fractions that do exist have to work much more quietly and not as openly as before. You may be sure that today any person who is a member of the Communist Party is a hard-boiled revolutionist; shaken off the fringes of the Communist Party are the misguided idealists, the do gooders, etc.

Despite these facts, the American people are traditionally optimistic. It is most difficult for most Americans to believe that there are people in our country who would carry out the aims and objectives of the Communist Party. Therefore, the American Legion Post of Aberdeen is performing a great patriotic service in setting aside a special day to alert Americans, enunciating the advantages we Americans have and take for granted, and pointing out the real danger which is threatening that which we hold so dearly. It is inconceivable to me, despite an individual's political views, how anyone can conceive of destroying our way of life and our free economic system and supplanting it with dictator government based upon enslavement of the people.

We all admit that there are some imperfections in our own system and are conscious that with the passing of time, changes develop and we must find new methods and new solutions to our problems. This we have been able to do. This we can and will continue to do within the framework of our Constitution in keeping with our economic structure. The United States has by far the highest standard of living in the world today. The critics of the American system of government fail to point out that we have reached this attainment at the same time a great abundance of our natural resources has gone to other countries in order to raise their living standards. Many of these recipient countries are socialistic countries. Countries are no different than individuals. If we as individuals are to copy or imitate someone, we copy a person who has something better than we have. It would be folly to copy an inferior product. The same holds true with philosophies of government. It would be stupidity of the first order for us, who have maintained a high living standard, personal freedoms, a code of high moral ethics, to copy a philosophy of government enjoyed by the Soviet Union which has produced a low standard of living and where the most intimate personal freedoms are denied and moral ethics are ridiculed.

What the country needs today is not a 5-cent cigar or two cars in every garage but a rededication of ourselves to the principles embodied in true Americanism. This program here in Aberdeen is truly significant and I hope that the spirit which prevails here will so engulf the country that every loyal American will become an active participant in an American crusade to root out all forces that would destroy our heritage of freedom and that we would not be cowed and that we work with the same singleness of purpose, with the same determination as do our enemies. Let us pray to God that our children and grandchildren will never look back to our generation with scorn and brand us because of our apathy as being responsible for having squandered our sacred trust. We who believe in God must meet the danger of communism realistically. All religious creeds are ridiculed and debunked by the master minds of the Communist International. The freedom to worship God as our conscience dictates is inherent in our free society. Don't sacrifice this freedom on the atheistic altar of communism. Let's pray—let's work—let's think. A nation that is right, alerted, and prepared will never be conquered.

Five Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Christopher Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is eminently fitting that the five hundredth anniversary of Christopher Columbus, navigator, daring seaman, and discoverer of this great continent, be honored in 1951 with the issuance of a special stamp.

The Encyclopedia Americana lists the year 1451 as the year in which Columbus was born in Genoa, Italy, and in New York State, and in many other States in the Union, October 12 has been set aside as Columbus Day for the purpose of doing honor to the memory of this intrepid Italian explorer.

Columbus, in discovering this new continent, opened up vast new lands which became the haven of millions. He raised the sights of mankind to new fields and valleys extending far across the sea. It is vital, then, that his services to the world and to humanity be commemorated anew in tribute to him as a navigator and benefactor.

American citizens of Italian descent who came to this great land first opened by Columbus, have rendered the Nation most valuable service in its development, in its wars, and in its arts and in the sciences. The United States owes a debt to its Americans of Italian birth and descent, just as we owe a far-reaching debt to Columbus. The Nation has been vastly benefited by arrival here of these many millions of men and women of Italian lineage. There has been a tradition of good citizenship in peace, and valor in war.

Mr. Truman Uses Taft-Hartley Act—Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. BENDER. For "yars and yars," Mr. Truman has been waging war against the Taft-Hartley Act on two alleged grounds: First, it is no good; and second, it is unnecessary. Before the 1952 campaigns get warmed up to even a mild fever, Mr. Truman will have to discover a new reason for his opposition. Or perhaps some new brain truster will have to come up with the reason for him.

It is now at least nine times that the President has used the Taft-Hartley Act to end a work stoppage which imperils the national health and safety. You may be sure that Mr. Truman would never have used this legislation if he could possibly have avoided it. More-

over, if there were no need for the Taft-Hartley Act, you may be sure that the White House would have pointedly called our attention to other methods by which these problems could be met. In meeting the serious challenge to continued production created by the copper strike, the Taft-Hartley machinery will provide for a Federal court injunction which will compel the immediate resumption of work for at least 80 days during which negotiation to settle the issues can proceed.

We do not like to crow—much—but the Taft-Hartley Act has earned a niche in the history of conciliation in labor disputes which Mr. Truman's invective cannot dislodge.

Tactical Use Set for New Atomic Weapons of United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the following article appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Monday, September 10. This article was written by the aviation editor of this great paper. He was a lieutenant colonel in the Eighth Air Force in World War II and has recently returned from the Far East where he was war correspondent in Korea and Japan. Colonel Talbert has contributed much to this Nation by his writings and warnings to our people concerning the future of air war.

I have personal pride in Colonel Talbert's success in New York and elsewhere because many of his people are in the district it is my honor to represent. One of his late kinsmen represented my district in this Congress. The late Col. James Talbert served for 10 years with distinction and honor in this great body.

The article follows:

TACTICAL USE SET FOR NEW ATOMIC WEAPONS OF UNITED STATES—ALLIED PLANNERS COUNT ON THEM TO HALT RUSSIAN ATTACK DEEP IN EUROPE

(By Ansel E. Talbert)

LONDON, September 9.—America's new secret atomic weapons are definitely being counted upon by military planners for future tactical use in stopping any Russian attempt to sweep across Europe, it was learned here today.

Both American and British strategists are in complete agreement that the "Battle of Britain" must never be repeated and that a defensive fight of free nations against Communist aggression must take place deep in Europe. There the new atomic weapons would be employed in disrupting Russian communications and transport and in destroying enemy troop masses before they are set in full motion westward.

Implementation of this plan is receiving the highest priority and the United States Air Force has created a new unit known as the Mutual Defense Material Division, which is an air material command to build up logistical support necessary to accomplish the aeronautical phases of this program.

MUST WIN AIR SUPERIORITY

The primary move of course would be to capture air superiority over Europe so that tactical air and ground units employing the new weapons could carry out their missions successfully. They would be unable to do this if the power of the Soviet Air Force was not destroyed to a very large degree in the first stages of the war.

The chief British worry at present is that the build-up of combat aircraft in the United Kingdom and elsewhere is not taking place rapidly. It was with this in mind that the British recently proposed powering 500 American Sabre F-86 jet fighters with the Rolls-Royce Avon engines built here. The plan is still under consideration.

The production of the Avon, one of Britain's most powerful axial-flow jet engines, rated at a 7,200-pound thrust, is being expanded considerably at present. The Rolls-Royce Co. claims that it will soon be in the largest-scale production of any single jet engine in the world, with the British motor-car industry being called in to do the job.

The parent company is now building the Avon engine at Derby and is about to start production at two other factories in West Scotland. Two other British aircraft engine companies, Bristol and Napier, have agreed to build the powerful axial-flow engine under subcontracts. The latter concern is opening a new Lancashire factory in connection with the project.

CALL THREAT "VERY SEVERE"

The highest ranking man in the Royal Air Force and in the Air Ministry, with whom his correspondent has discussed the matter, say frankly that the air threat to Great Britain and all of free Europe for the moment, is "very severe."

They estimate that the Red air force right now is capable of delivering sustained attacks against London from its present bases, which would be heavier than any delivered throughout World War II by the German Luftwaffe. Should the Soviet Army succeed in moving westward and in capturing new bases, this threat would be even more serious, according to these strategists.

This view, incidentally, is not a personal one of the officers concerned but has the approval and agreement of Arthur Henderson, British Secretary of State for Air.

To counteract this potential Red threat the British are designing new jet fighters and bombers for production in the British aerial rearmament program scheduled to reach its peak early in 1954, and the Americans are shipping an undisclosed number of jet aircraft to the North Atlantic Treaty countries. Many will be in actual service by the end of the year.

CONTROL GROUPS SET UP

Already the Mutual Defense Material Division has begun setting up control groups overseas in friendly countries to supply necessary spare parts and maintenance equipment for the jet aircraft sent to them. By October the first huge overseas control group supply depot will be operating at Chateauroux, France, under the command of Brig. Gen. Joseph H. Hicks, of the United States Air Force. The first of several State-side transport control depots, designed for shipments of good to overseas control groups, is already in action at Newark, N. J.

Meanwhile American ground officers in Europe, assigned to serve under General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower, are giving the closed study to potential use of the new atomic weapons in the field. Some feel that there may be more efficient ways of delivering these weapons than by aircraft, but the value of air superiority under all circumstances is admitted.

Many of the officers studying the problem were in England during World War II and they have not forgotten that, although late

in the war German science developed flying bombs and other V-weapons capable of turning the tide, the value of these weapons was largely nullified by constant allied bombardment of the V-weapon launching sites. This activity would not have been possible without clear-cut allied air superiority.

The Federal Income Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Nebraska Tax Research Institute that covers the subject of the Federal income tax. I commend the reading of this article to my colleagues. It is accurate and thought provoking.

THE FEDERAL INCOME TAX

The one thing taxwise that burns our very soul is the constant propaganda from Washington that Congress must raise the income-tax rate to siphon off surplus profits to stop inflation. It is the screwiest dilly any politician has hatched up to date, and yet we have not seen where any economist has had the courage to take exception to the idea. Actually they siphon the money away from the people who earned it and would use caution and intelligence in spending it, and throw it into a political jackpot where it is spent with the usual abandon of intoxication that so often goes with the uncontrolled spending of the other fellow's money.

Inflation is nearly 100 percent Government created. Let's examine the procedure exactly as it is:

1. Every time the Government gets into the market for services and commodities the price shoots up. The more they are in the market and the longer they stay in the market the higher the price goes.

2. Evidently very little thought is given by our friendly easy spending bureaucrats, who are charged with the responsibility as to the effect of their buying on prices of civilian goods.

3. This Government buying always starts an upward spiral of increases in wages, and thus the cost index on all services and commodities are pushed upward and inflation is turned on in a big way.

There is no better example of the utter disregard or ignorance of the facts in this matter on the part of the Government top brass than a statement made by Gen. George C. Marshall, who is presumed to represent the civilian interests in the Pentagon aggregation known as the Joint Chiefs of Staff. General Marshall, in this statement, said that inflation had cost the war effort over \$7,000,000,000 and was hampering this effort. He must surely realize that in his role as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff he is perhaps responsible for more of our present inflation than any other one man in the United States. He has not said a word about: (1) Careful buying, (2) that we might run out of tax money, (3) that waste of Government funds is in reality a racket for exploiters, (4) that the effect of high taxes is having a deadening effect on the growth of business, especially small business, and (5) that under the new tax rate some of our large corporations will have that part of their earnings

that are in the high bracket almost completely socialized.

INCOME TAX FURNISHES RACKET MONEY

It is well known, of course, by every thinking man in the United States that the Federal income tax is the one main supporter of all this incompetence, this useless spending, this paying two, three, or four times as much as they should for services and commodities, a situation that will surely eventually bring us disaster.

With all this common knowledge and with all the talk there is in and out of Congress about stopping inflation, what does Congress do? They increase the Federal income tax, which is the principal source of the creation of and the support of the inflation they talk about stopping.

Not only does the Federal income tax of itself create the inflation but perhaps one of its worst features is that it creates a taxing complex that is followed by State and local officials over the entire country, and thus these agencies act as an auxiliary promoter of inflation that is almost as serious as the Federal income tax itself.

Time and again we have asked top officials when this foolish Government spending with its resultant inflation is going to stop. None to date have offered a guess. Evidently they assume the inflation must go to the breaking point.

We should all ask our representatives in Congress these questions:

1. Why is it necessary for the Government to pay several times the civilian price for services and commodities?

2. Why is it necessary for the Government to buy as they so often do several times the quantity of goods needed?

3. Why is it that Government can take the manpower of the Nation in any manner they choose, but when it comes to services and supplies the Government appears to be helpless—particularly as to the prices to be paid?

4. Why can't Congress in some manner put an effective penalty on incompetence, crookedness, and waste in Government and stop it before it takes place rather than their usual procedure of a lot of useless investigations after the harm has been done.

In conclusion may we again remind our readers that inflation is never created by business. It is 100 percent a Government institution and a Government monopoly. The Government can stop it any time it wants to. When we hear of curbs for inflation we must keep in mind there is only one. Shut off a sizable percentage of the Federal income tax and don't put any other tax in its place. Get dollar value for government dollar expended and inflation will be past history in a hurry.

Grand Jury Recommends Additional Narcotic Agents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a recommendation of the grand jury for the eastern district of Illinois concerning employment of additional agents in the Narcotic Bureau

of the Treasury Department to help combat traffic in narcotics:

RECOMMENDATION OF THE GRAND JURY FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

Whereas it has come to the attention of the grand jury of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Illinois at the September term, 1951, thereof, that the traffic in narcotics is on the increase throughout the country, particularly in the larger cities, and constitutes a threat to our country; and

Whereas it further appears that although the narcotic agents are now rendering efficient and capable service, nevertheless there are not sufficient agents in the Narcotic Bureau of the Treasury Department to control and eradicate this traffic.

Now, therefore, we, the grand jury, recommend that sufficient appropriations be made by Congress to employ additional agents in the Narcotic Bureau of the Treasury Department so that this traffic in narcotics may be controlled and eliminated;

We further recommend that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Attorney General of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, Commissioner of Narcotics, the Representatives in Congress from the eastern district of Illinois, and the United States Senators from Illinois.

Executed this 11th day of September A. D. 1951, by the aforesaid grand jury, by and through its foreman.

VINNIE MYERS, Foreman.

The Oatis Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I submit three brief articles and letters in regard to the William Oatis case:

ANDERSON, IND., September 13, 1951.
Representative JOHN BEAMER.

United States House of Representatives:
Members and officers of UAW-CIO, Local 663, Guide Lamp, Anderson, Ind., commends you for your resolution which brought about House action of break off trade relations with Czechoslovakia because of that nation's action in regard to the William Oatis case.

GEORGE D. STEWART.

UNION LEADER CORP.,
Manchester, N. H., August 23, 1951.
Congressman JOHN V. BEAMER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BEAMER: You might like to see the editorial entitled "Release Oatis," praising your stand, in today's paper. This is the largest newspaper in New Hampshire, having more circulation than all the other dailies in the State combined.

Keep up the good work!

When I was born in Washington in 1905 my father was secretary to President Theodore Roosevelt, who was my godfather. You will remember T. R.'s famous message to the Sultan of Morocco, "Perdicaris alive or Ralsull dead"! In those days, the American flag was respected!

Best wishes for success.

Very sincerely,

WILLIAM LOEB, President.

[From the Manchester (N. H.) Union Leader
of August 23, 1951]

RELEASE OATIS

Bill Oatis, the American newsmen arrested, imprisoned, and tortured by the Czech Reds on trumped-up charges of espionage, has a stalwart champion in Representative JOHN V. BEAMER, of Indiana. Mr. BEAMER talks bluntly in behalf of doing something quickly to secure Oatis' release. More than that, he backs up his words with demands for action.

The Beamer resolution would suspend commercial relations with Czechoslovakia. This is a most important step, the Congressman feels, since the balance of trade is decidedly in the puppet's favor during the past several years.

That favorable balance has been frequently commented by this newspaper's Victor Riesel. Goods made behind the iron curtain—even in Russia itself—have flooded the American market, so unpatriotic are some American businessmen, who are intent on making a profit even though the imports penalize American labor. To suspend commercial relations is to step upon the Czech pocketbook. Because the balance of trade has been so much in the satellite favor, it stands to lose a great deal. And so, too, Russia will lose the American dollars the Kremlin so eagerly garners.

Representative BEAMER has other constructive thoughts. He wants to know the ideological leanings of Ellis O. Briggs, this country's Ambassador to Czechoslovakia. Is it possible, BEAMER asks, that Ellis, who incidentally, was graduated from Dartmouth in 1921, "may have the same weak attitude that has been displayed by Dean Acheson and the State Department? If so, it would seem very important and very necessary that he either be replaced by an American who believes in America or that he be instructed to really take an active part and demand, instead of beg, to see Oatis. Other requests must be equally firm."

BEAMER then stresses that fundamental principles are involved in the Oatis case. Freedom of the press and speech and the right to a fair trial (which of course was denied the newsmen) are among these principles. Shall the State Department remain cowardly in the face of the truth that Oatis has been martyred only because he was exercising these basic rights?

Another great principle, to quote the Indiana Representative, is the integrity of the United States. It must be restored:

"We must maintain the honor of the United States flag and the sanctity of an American citizen no matter where he may be, and especially if he has done no wrong."

American prestige has suffered. American honor has not been maintained. Brazenly, the Reds thumb their noses at this once proud United States of America. That is the price of the State Department's cringing servility.

[From the Muncie (Ind.) Star of September 11, 1951]

BIG TALK, LITTLE ACTION

In a letter to Indiana Congressman JOHN V. BEAMER, President Truman wrote: "We are doing everything within the authority of the Executive to obtain Mr. Oatis' release." The President is not telling the whole truth.

Everything possible is not being done to release the American newspaperman from false imprisonment in a Czechoslovakian jail. The President has not cut off Czech imports to the United States. He has not ordered United States troops to blockade the Czech-German border, as Russian troops have so often done to us. He has not ordered Czech Communists in the United States to turn in their passports and go home. He has not ordered restrictions on the activities of Com-

munist newspapermen from other nations in the United States comparable to restrictions imposed on United States newspapermen in Communist countries.

Mr. Truman has told Czech Communist Ambassador Prochazka that United States relations with Czechoslovakia will not improve until Oatis is released. The ineffectiveness of this weak talk is indicated by the Ambassador's refusal to do anything about Oatis and his statement that the Oatis case is "closed." The President has not, as he has the power to do, sent Prochazka home as persona non grata, with instructions to the Czech Communists to send no more ambassadors until they send Oatis home free. Nor has he fully complied with the wishes of Congress to end all trade relations with Czechoslovakia.

Until President Truman does do "everything possible" to get Bill Oatis released, Oatis will stay in jail. Instead of trying to fool the American people with evasions and half-truths, the President should be using his immense powers to protect the rights of an American citizen falsely accused, falsely tried, and falsely imprisoned in a Communist police state.

Heart Fag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include the enclosure in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

HEART FAG

Hate, the poison that hurts the hater—not the hated.
Envy, the cancer that eats at heart and mind.
Arrogance, that shuts out friendship and love.
Recrimination, the useless brooding over wasted yesterdays.
Tension of nerves, that destroys personality.
Fear, that makes us cowards instead of "captains of our souls."
Anger, that makes men more like beasts than in "His image."
Greed, that chills charity and blights life's blessings.

HUBERT M. HARRISON.

(With acknowledgment to Dr. Norman Vincent Peale.)

Additional Newspapers Oppose Squandering \$19,019,000 on Grandview, Mo., Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD herewith additional editorial comment supporting my opposition to an authorization to spend \$19,019,000 of the taxpayers' money for a glorified WPA project at the Grand-

view, Mo., Airport, in the vicinity of property owned by the Truman family and political insiders—graduates of the Pendergast school of politics.

This supplements similar material which I made a part of the RECORD on August 20 and yesterday, September 13.

[From the Waverly (Iowa) Democrat]

OUR CONGRESSMAN ON THE JOB

Congressman H. R. GROSS was right in opposing the "Trumanview" airport contained in the military construction appropriation which the House voted last week. How in the world President Truman can ask for price and wage controls to fight inflation and at the same time recommend such extravagance is beyond understanding. It's plain to see that it's the old Pendergast system of getting plenty of money in circulation at election time. There must be some limit to how small our dollars can shrink. Truman seems determined to find out. If we had more men like Congressman GROSS in Washington we'd get at the real causes of inflation—projects like the "Trumanview" airport.

[From the Marshalltown (Iowa) Times-Republican]

H. R. GROSS SHOWED COURAGE

Our Third District Representative, H. R. GROSS, is to be commended for questioning the \$19,000,000 asked to improve an airfield at Grandview, Mo., in Truman's home county.

GROSS claims there are nearby airfields which could be enlarged at far less cost. The Armed Services Committee did not approve a dime, out of \$5,000,000,000, to improve Iowa airfields though Sioux City had its claim on file.

It did authorize 12 projects for Georgia, the home State of Chairman VINSON of the committee.

Probably if the administration were Republican, Iowa's solid Republican delegation in the House would fare better in the location of Government projects.

But, regardless of party, our leaders should be sufficiently cost conscious to avoid duplication or waste on expenditures to please local constituents.

There is so much political flinching and wasteful spending by this administration that taxpayers are beginning to worry about the strain which is bound to come on their take-home pay.

They should appreciate the courage shown by Representative GROSS. The loyal opposition should always be alert to see that our billions are spent with due regard for reasonable economy, and that the defense effort is not used by politicians for handing out favors to any contractor, State, or pressure group.

[From the Charles City (Iowa) Press]

GROSS INNOCENT

Representative H. R. GROSS was accused by a Texas Democrat in Congress of violating security by disclosing that an expanded airfield at Grandview, Mo., was to be used as a fighter plane base. Congressman GROSS didn't reveal anything at all but the furore his remarks caused obscured, unfortunately, the reasons why the expanded base is needed. The American people would still like to know.

[From the Winterset (Iowa) Madisonian]

TIMELY TOPICS

(By Ed. M. Smith)

H. R. GROSS, whom you used to hear over the radio, seems to be using his head, and is not afraid to stand alone, if necessary, against the majority.

Perhaps you read that the bill to build a big military installation at Grandview, Mo.,

was before Congress and the Truman cronies want it built at Grandview, President Truman's home town. This in spite of the fact that we have several unused war installations, including the one at Fort Des Moines.

GROSS asked for a roll call on the nearly \$20,000,000 Grandview project. He says: "My motion to recommit the military construction bill with instructions to strike out the \$19,019,000 Grandview, Mo., airport project received exactly 45 votes when I asked for a roll call. Only 44 of the more than 160 Republicans present, and only 1 Democrat supported it. The total of 45 was an insufficient number to compel a record vote. The entire bill, authorizing some \$6,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money, and including the Grandview pork-barrel item, was then passed by a vote of 352 to 5. The five who voted against the bill consisted of four Republicans, including myself, and one Democrat."

Suppose you write your Congressman for a report on how he voted on the roll call.

[From the Storm Lake (Iowa) Pilot-Tribune]

GROSS WAS RIGHT

H R GROSS, formerly of radio fame and now a Member of Congress from the Third Iowa District, staged a losing battle on the floor of the House the other day. He opposed a \$19,000,000 air base in the home county of President Harry Truman. The proposed location is Grandview, Mo., near Kansas City.

GROSS contended that the expenditure of \$19,000,000 was just plain extravagance. He pointed out that the Air Force could use a nearby base at Sedalla. And that there are unused bases at Ottumwa and Sioux City that were constructed during World War II and are standing idle.

GROSS termed the Grandview expenditure as "just a glorified WPA for the Pendergast crowd." He declared he hadn't received any "satisfactory explanation as to why the bases at Ottumwa and Sioux City are not being utilized."

Well, the newspapers say all that GROSS accomplished was to delay the final vote. When the test roll call was made, he was overwhelmingly defeated.

Nevertheless, northwest Iowa, we are certain, believes he was right. Sioux City has been trying for months to get the Armed Services Committee at Washington to recognize the \$12,000,000 airport at the Woodbury County metropolis as worthy of service.

Congressman CHARLES B. HOEVEN has joined the effort to discover why the Sioux City air base is standing idle while the Air Force is spending millions for new ones. Thus far no one has been able to figure it out.

Usually the alibi is that winters in northwest Iowa make it difficult to keep an air base open during portions of severe weather. But Grandview, Mo., is in the winter belt, too, along with Kansas City. So that explanation explains nothing.

Apparently the idea is that the Air Force wishes to build new airfields regardless of whether present ones should be reactivated. Another dig into the taxpayer's sock.

Speech of Hon. Frank R. Ahlgren at Forrest City, Ark., on August 30, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, it was my distinct pleasure to be present on the

occasion of the dedication of the Hamilton Moses power generating plant at Forrest City, Ark., on August 30, 1951. The most significant high light of the day's program was the masterful address of Hon. Frank R. Ahlgren, of Memphis, Tenn. Mr. Ahlgren, who has served as editor of the South's greatest newspaper, the Commercial Appeal, for the past 14 years, was the principal speaker at the banquet sponsored by the Forrest City Chamber of Commerce. The guest speaker had just returned from an extended trip to many European countries.

Mr. Ahlgren's report on Europe, his tribute to Mr. Hamilton Moses and his learned presentation of the problems with which the South is confronted were excellent and well received by the listening audience. I commend this very fine speech to the membership of the House and the country. The full text of Mr. Ahlgren's remarks follows:

I

As I interpret my assignment tonight it is twofold: To acknowledge the enterprise of the people of Arkansas, and particularly eastern Arkansas, who have demonstrated so magnificently what unity of purpose under our free enterprise system can achieve in material advancement and to pay tribute to a man whose faith and energies have been an inspiration to all of us for so many years.

Your invitation reached me while on a busman's holiday in Europe. It came at a time when I was contemplating with some misgivings the overburdening bureaucracy and state planning with which those countries of the Old World are struggling. It served to underscore the difference between our system and theirs.

We have here a manifestation of bold, confident, self-reliant people working together, looking only to themselves and a benign providence to accomplish something in the tradition that has built this great country in contrast to the drab, timid, mildly imaginative way of life under socialism that depends on the state for virtually everything.

With your indulgence I would like to give you some of my observations on that trip as a means of emphasizing the need to keep abreast of developments. Of course, the usual question asked of anyone lately returned from there is, "Are the Russians going to attack in Europe?" I am not making any predictions. I will say, however, that the chances of Russia sending her armies into an outright offensive against us or our allies in Europe seem less likely at this time than in 1947 when last I toured Europe.

The Berlin airlift showed the Russians we would not be bluffed. Tito has led his Yugoslavs away from the Moscow-dominated Comintern. There are indications of unrest in Hungary and Bulgaria. The Communists, although still strong, have been rebuffed in French and Italian elections.

And General Eisenhower is welding a strong Atlantic pact army that will give even the arrogant Russians pause. As one observer put it, "Ike's forces, even in this formative stage, are strong enough to bloody the nose of any aggressor." The Russians are not noted for taking the initiative if they can get somebody else to stir up a ruckus and at the moment the elements of freedom and liberty are in control in those countries outside the iron curtain.

Recently discussions were held with Generalissimo Franco, the caudillo or leader of Spain, to establish American military bases in that country. Admiral Sherman, late Chief of American Naval Operations, whom I talked with in Madrid a few days before his untimely death, told me negotiations with Franco were proceeding "satisfactorily."

From conversations with others in Spain, I am inclined to the belief that Franco will make a deal with us, thereby affording a second line of defense behind the Pyrenees from which to mount a counteroffensive should the Communists attack in Europe.

Franco's new cabinet is regarded as less isolationist and therefore more friendly to the United States. He has said his selection of a cabinet had nothing to do with the pleasures of another country but the complexion of it could hardly be called inimical to this country. He hates communism. He knows the Red hordes would sweep over his domain if they took Europe. So he is with us, one way or another.

This does not please the Socialist governments of England and France. They make much over the unseemly prospect of our democracy going into a deal with a dictatorship and the effect it would have on other democracies. The real reason, of course, is that we would be spending money on installations behind their first lines of defense. And, also, that we would be spending money elsewhere than in their countries.

I was in the House of Commons in London when Foreign Secretary Morrison made his first speech on foreign policy since assuming that office. In the course of it he explained that, while the United States was not contemplating asking the inclusion of Spain in the Atlantic Defense Pact, nevertheless a treaty between America and Spain would result in advantages that would not outweigh the disadvantages.

When he was finished, the Conservative side of the House tore into him with unexpected vigor and I got the impression that at least a large section of British politics was not going to rebuke the United States or presume to tell us what treaties we could make.

During my visit in London I talked with a number of persons in rather widely diverse walks of life—servants, the inevitable taxi driver, proprietors of one of England's most authentic forums, the "pub", shopkeepers and even men and women of the rather tarnished opulence that remains—and there were very few supporters among them for the Labor government. Bernard Baruch, with whom I talked on the returning *Queen Mary*, reminded me that while the working man and woman, or the low-income group at any rate, did not apparently like the way the government was being run, they voted for it out of a sort of "sullen contentment" in the leveling-off process that is taking place in Great Britain.

Mr. Baruch, one of the few elder statesmen remaining in this country—he was Chairman of the War Industries Board in World War I and one of President Wilson's closest friends and advisors—addressed a dinner of the United Europe Committee in London. In the course of it he told European diplomats that "Unless the peoples of Europe unite and quickly give their full all-out support to General Eisenhower in his efforts to bring about a common defense, you cannot count on America's economic and military aid continuing. We will meet more than generously whatever Europeans do. If you show no hesitation and undertake your full share, we will go the limit. The burden will be less for all concerned. * * *

"We shall do more than match your efforts. But do not let Americans feel that you are not willing to shoulder your fair share of the burdens. Korea has shown that we are lacking neither in leadership nor sacrifice. But if we are to succeed you must do more there and your full share here. * * * There is no price tag on freedom. If we lose that, we lose all."

Mr. Baruch was chairman of the committee that wrote the atomic energy report which, had it been adopted by Russia, would have considerably lessened our pres-

ent difficulties. He spent some time at Versailles with General Eisenhower.

He likened General Eisenhower to Peter the Hermit, who in the eleventh century roused the first great crusade against the infidels threatening to sweep over Europe. At 81, Mr. Baruch has one of the keenest intellects it has been my good fortune to encounter and he is frequently called upon for advice by persons high in national and international affairs. And without apparent drain on his astonishing energy.

Referring to General Eisenhower he said he had never seen a man so completely devoted to his assignment. "He talks, sleeps, and breathes SHAPE (Supreme Headquarters Atlantic Pact in Europe) and is utterly devoid of political ambitions, so far as I could determine. I came away with a feeling that anybody who tried to divert his attentions to matters political was doing this country and Ike a disservice."

Be that as it may, I do not believe he would argue against the theory that if General Eisenhower were to appear at the convention of either American political party that he would get the nomination.

Ike's popularity in Europe is tremendous. Diplomats congenitally are cagey and they try to avoid enthusiastic statements. Yet one official in our Embassy in Paris countered my questions of "Are they rallying behind Ike?" with another: "Who can you name anywhere who could do the job? The people idolize him as the liberator of Europe and the politicians have great affection for him for his ability to consolidate differences. He is the one man for the job."

We were in Paris for Bastille Day—the same as our Fourth of July. France displayed units of artillery and aircraft of modern design, soldiers regaining their proud heritage. Again I called on the estimate of a man in our Embassy who served in both world wars. He had been in France since 1945. We compared notes on my visit in 1947. We were of the opinion that the French, for the first time since the debacle of 1940, were taking a pride in arms. And out of it may come—with Ike's urging—a will to fight again.

For too often in Europe you hear the expression "we don't want to fight again, we want to live."

When a German editor told me that I replied, "Well, we might as well take our people and go home." His response was immediate and characteristic, "Oh, you would not do that. The United States of America would not leave us?"

I don't believe the German editor's attitude reflects the sober thought of the people. There are leaders in most European countries who seek only to perpetuate their regimes and get what they can from us or any other source so long as they remain secure. But with the growing economic strength there comes a desire to protect it, and it is pretty well known what can be expected under the Russian regime.

The governments are selfish, of course, and they are concerned with matters that exert immediate pressure. Indicative of this was the lack of display in London newspapers of any news from the Korean front, Iran, or Persia, where the British are striving to keep their huge oil interests intact, got the greatest display. They do a pretty good job of reporting the news in their 6- and 8-page newspapers but Americans, accustomed as they are to detailed coverage of news, complain.

Europe, or that part which I saw, looked greatly improved over 1947. France and Italy were doing exceptionally well in contrast with 4 years ago. Great Britain was coming out of it in characteristic fashion—slowly but certainly—when the Labor Gov-

ernment announced another 3 years of price and profits controls which set the market off on a downward spiral.

Black markets in the countries visited—especially currency—have been overcome with adequate, if not abundant, supplies. Prices are lower than in this country but considerably advanced over recent years. Most of the best things are shipped here and we found few bargains unless you wished to trust your knowledge of art objects, which I did not.

Aboard the *Queen Mary* we held a Rotary meeting, which included some 15 Rotarians who had spent several months in Europe. They ranged from a chemical engineer from Wisconsin to a coal bunkering executive from Bombay, India, and even a pharmaceutical distributor from Manila, Philippine Islands. Each discussed his reactions. A summary was written at the conclusion which may be of interest. It reads:

"It was very encouraging to hear that, in general, the contrast found in Europe of today to that of a few years ago, showed a tremendous improvement.

"Apart from the difficulties of traveling in Russian-occupied territory, where new laws seemed to be passed overnight to the inconvenience of travelers, and intrigues of the black market in some zones, the reception was good.

"There was distressing lack of money in Spain—not in the cities of course; Madrid, for example, appeared to be building more than any other city in any country. It was gratifying to see the tangible evidence of the constructive way United States dollars were being spent, but the necessity remained that each and every traveler should regard and conduct himself as an ambassador of good will. As such, he could do much to ease the tense situations that so frequently arise.

"There was, too, the overshadowing horror of war, and some felt there were politicians who would rather remain in office than see civilization survive. But facts were more important than impressions, and the group held to the monopoly of setting the right example by introducing clear and unselfish thinking wherever any point of issue might arise."

It is good for us to visit Europe occasionally if only to understand their problems and exchange ideas. And, also, to see the exasperating lengths to which bureaucracy can take them—and us, if we don't watch it.

II

As we dedicate the magnificent utilities system that will mean so much to the future of eastern Arkansas we also honor the man who made it possible, the Honorable Hamilton Moses. I want to remind you of a few things about this remarkable man. Most of you, perhaps all of you, may already know everything that I say about him but I insist that to review the career of such a man as he, can never be superfluous. It is an inspiration to all, an incentive and a challenge to young and old.

Colter Hamilton Moses, whose full-time job seems to be finding more ways to build Arkansas, likes to call himself just a plain country lawyer.

The president of Arkansas Power & Light Co. is neither plain, nor country, nor just a lawyer. He did come from the country, having been born and educated in the little Calhoun County seat of Hampton.

He went to Arkadelphia to enter Henderson-Brown College, a Methodist academy, but found Ouachita College located closer to town. It was 3 weeks before his parents learned that he had enrolled in Ouachita.

His baccalaureate address and graduation speech at the college earned a scholarship to Tulane University. President Edwin

Booth Craighead, of Tulane, was in the audience and offered the scholarship after hearing Moses' oratory.

The master of arts degree he got at Tulane in 1909 was followed by a Bachelor of Laws degree from the University of Arkansas in 1911.

He was senior author of the Crawford and Moses Digest of the Statutes of Arkansas, known familiarly as the Laws of Moses. For long years it was the encyclopedia for lawyers and the courts of this State.

One interesting sidelight to his political career attends his association with the late Senator Joseph T. Robinson.

Mr. Moses was serving as secretary to the incumbent governor at the capitol when Mr. Robinson was elected to that office. Dismissal of Moses was reported to be the late Senator's first official act. However, when Robinson was appointed United States Senator within a short time, Mr. Moses managed the campaign of George W. Hayes and was soon private secretary to another governor. He had served earlier as secretary to Gov. George W. Donaghey, and later held the same office under Gov. Chas. H. Brough. He was assistant attorney general from 1915 to 1917, and attorney for the State corporation commission in 1919.

In 1919, he met the late Harvey C. Couch. That began a career with the power company. Later, in 1936, Senator Robinson invited Mr. Moses to become a law partner.

For 22 years, he was general counsel for the railroad, utility and industrial interests of Mr. Couch. He handled legal affairs for the Kansas City Southern and Louisiana and Arkansas Railroads. He was elected second president of Arkansas Power & Light Co. in 1941. Under his leadership, this company is spending more money for expansion than was required during all the years before 1941. The plant we saw today, significant as it is, represents only a small part of the great expansion program.

Since 1941, Mr. Moses has been the vocal, energetic president of Arkansas Economic Council-State Chamber of Commerce. He has been the central figure in the "Build Your Own Home Town" program, a joint community development effort of business and government. This movement to encourage communities to build themselves rather than rely on Federal and political direction won a gold medal in 1949 from Freedoms Foundation, Valley Forge, Pa.

III

Now, I am sure the man we seek to honor approves of the idea of my attempt to develop the theme of leadership since he has so ably demonstrated the course which that leadership can take.

Our Southland is confronted with a situation that, adequately administered, can bring her to the forefront in our western civilization. If we do not rise to that challenge we can be prepared to resume the role of what amounted to captive province economically and politically.

World War II showed the rest of the Nation—and the world for that matter—how important the South is and can be. Our climate, terrain, and transportation facilities caused the great share of military installations to be established here.

As a result, a large number of servicemen were exposed to the potentialities of this region and the evidence is on every hand that many are returning to make the South their home.

Industry, in the war-imposed decentralization program, found the South magnificently endowed for industrial pursuits. Here are the vast natural resources of oil, minerals, chemicals, wood, and fiber. The casualties among the war babies of industry in the South were surprisingly low, much lower

than in other sections for they were readily converted to peacetime purposes.

Now that we are again girding for war, the plants are here and adaptable.

The South, then, can anticipate industrial expansion. And in that expansion perhaps it can find the solution to a growing problem, the displacement of farm labor through mechanization and the increasing growth of urban populations.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics tells us that there were 4,100,000 farm families in the South last year; that 10 years from now there will be only 2,800,000 families on farms, a drop of 30 percent. That means 1,300,000 families—and farm families are prolific—will have to find other means of livelihood.

Much of that displacement will come in the areas that concern us most, the extensive cotton portions of the South where farms have been least mechanized.

The South is now ripe for a great industrial expansion provided it has an aggressive business leadership. It has the best opportunity of its history to get an economy balanced by agriculture and industry.

Money put into factories increased from \$5,000,000,000 to more than \$10,000,000,000 during the war years, and now our factories can produce more than \$45,000,000,000 worth of goods each year. The Federal Government put more than \$4,000,000,000 into new plants during the war and was offering many of these for sale. Small locally owned companies may be formed by the hundreds to make goods in these new plants in the South.

The South for the first time has trained hands to operate the machines in these plants. Many workers learned skills in trade schools during the early days of the war and later went into factories in many parts of the country to apply their skills. Recent studies show that southern workers are as efficient as those of any other section when they have good tools and equipment with which to work. The long summer or warm period in the South permits the worker to have a garden, chickens, and a cow at little cost. Southern workers can produce as much and fare better than those of any other section. Persons with managerial know-how or who understand assembly-line techniques may also be found in the South now to operate these plants.

In 1948 the banks of the Nation increased their deposits by 6 percent, while those of the South increased theirs by 15 percent. Between 1936 and 1950 the banks of the Nation had increases of more than 181 percent, but those of the South had increases of more than 375 percent. Large businesses may still have to look to other sections for finances, but many small businesses can find adequate capital in the South.

More than three and a third billion dollars worth of minerals were mined in the South in 1948. The South produces half of the coal and electricity, 66 percent of the petroleum, and 70 percent of the natural gas of the Nation. It produces 80 percent of the cotton, more than 92 percent of the tobacco, 40 percent of the lumber, and one-third of the lime and the fruits of the country. It produces a similar proportion of many other raw materials and natural products used here or shipped abroad.

We have enough railway mileage to reach around the world four times. We have the best, coastwise and inland water transportation of any part of the country. We have 23 major airlines, and adequate bus and truck lines crisscrossing through all parts of the South. We do need an adjustment in freight rates, and it is coming soon, to encourage the shipment of finished products out of the South, so we can keep our raw materials at home and make them into goods.

Markets for billions of dollars worth of goods may be found in the South within the next few years. Half the southern population lives at a very low scale. These people need and want better homes, more and better household furnishings, clothing, food, and farm and other tools. Better wages that will come with industry will give them buying power to get the goods they want and need, and thereby will improve their standard of living. Making and distributing goods to satisfy this demand will make possible many southern factories and will give jobs to many middlemen.

Within the next 15 years from one to three million workers will be unable to eke out an existence from the cotton and corn patches of the South. This surplus population will have to migrate to another section or it will pull down farther the standard of living on Southern farms. The program of industrial expansion, though, will give jobs to these people, and will result in doing away with the colonial economy of the South. Such an economy of furnishing raw materials for others and buying back the finished products always results in a low standard of living where the standard should be high.

It was Amiel who said "He who is silent is forgotten, he who abstains is taken at his word, he who does not advance falls back; he who stops is overwhelmed, distanced, crushed; he who ceases to grow greater becomes smaller; he who leaves off, gives up; the stationary condition is the end."

And I am reminded, also, that someone has said there are two kinds of discontent in this world; the discontent that works and the discontent that wrings its hands. The first gets what it wants, and the second loses what it has. There is no cure for the first but success; and there is no cure at all for the second.

I do not wish to burden you with soporifics, but Victor Hugo was so right when he remarked that "People do not lack strength; they lack will."

The people of the South have the will; they must be given the leadership. They must have that leadership now.

We must be about the business of providing outlets for those persons to be displaced by farm mechanization. We must see to it that there are adequate financial resources available to project those enterprises that must be brought South. There must be educational facilities made available to instruct in skills and inculcate reasonableness and awareness of social and economic responsibilities.

It is currently popular to point out that there is a need for something to be worked out to solve the industrial unrest that besets our large centers of population. The strikes, the work stoppages, are a symptom of political agitation, it is true, but they are also a manifestation of the fact that the worker is not content with conditions that industrial concentration has brought.

If the South in planning and shaping the anticipated industrial spread to our area, will keep that lesson in mind I believe we can establish a pattern of small but efficient plants close by moderate-sized communities where agriculture still flourishes and where "living for worker and family can have decency and dignity."

We must guard against trying to assimilate factories on a basis that would amount to exploitation of the workers. Sweatshops are not good in any community, large or small. On the other hand, the opportunities should be there for those who still adhere to the belief of "an honest day's work for an honest day's pay."

Our natural resources should be protected from a ruthless colonial system—our mines,

our forests, and the oil and sulfur from our ground should not be squandered. It is well to create conditions inducing exploration and development but there should be severance taxes and regulations to finance institutions for the people and prevent prodigality.

For all too long, now, the rest of the Nation has looked down their noses at the South's educational facilities. Our teachers are underpaid, by comparison with other sections, and our buildings and equipment, for the most part, are in the lower brackets.

It is not sufficient to recount the economic and racial burdens, to talk of injustice and wish for assistance from other sources. It is time we turned to and reestablished a flourishing educational system second to none. We can do it, and the need is there as never before if we are to fashion the coming era into one of progress and prosperity.

The eminent educator, George Peabody, defined education thus: "A debt due from present to future generations."

I don't regard it as a debt. Education, to me, is an immediate opportunity that must not be permitted to slip by lest we lose the enjoyment of the new experiences it unfolds. We owe it to ourselves, as well as future generations.

Those misguided and not always well-intentioned persons from other sections who seem to be ever ready with a glib answer for the South's problems, arouse our antagonism with their outcries against what they call "white supremacy in the South." Well might we rebuke them with Whittier's lines. "Search thine own heart; what paineth thee in others in thyself may be."

And we know that only when our racial minority has achieved the ability to rationalize, has the awareness of social and economic problems and reasonableness, can leadership be shared. I am not arguing the superiority of one color over another. Undoubtedly the time will come when the majority of our colored brethren will have achieved that status where both races can dwell side by side with equality of opportunity and responsibility, but that time will arrive only when education has made it possible.

The South's economic level can only rise in ratio to the building up of the group at the bottom of the ladder. If but for selfish reasons, then, we must give them the opportunity to raise that level and help them with the doing thereof. One thing our critics, universally, seem to overlook is that increased economic and political advantages should mean increased responsibility for those enjoying them. They must demonstrate a capacity for that responsibility.

Yes, the South must improve its educational system. I am no pedagogue, but I regard education as one of the first problems to which we must turn our efforts. And the South must have courageous, competent leadership.

It is human to extol the giants of another era for they assume increasing stature with the passing years, but the land that produced Thomas Jefferson, the Jacksons—Andrew and Stonewall—John C. Calhoun, Jefferson Davis, Robert E. Lee, Alexander Stephens, Albert Pike, L. Q. C. Lamar, and Hamilton Moses, has sons and daughters to catch the flaming torch.

The time is now for that leadership to assert itself, to regain for the South the place of eminence that is its heritage. If we falter now, in the face of great opportunity and, conversely, the threat that agricultural displacement poses, then well may we be damned by the succeeding generations whose birthright we will have forfeited through lack of courage and vision.

Program of Exchange of Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the editorial from the New York Times of Wednesday, September 5, headed "Defeating our purpose." This editorial tells of our excellent program of exchange of students with other countries, and points up a flaw in that program which is, of course, a flaw in the fabric of our democracy here in the United States. The flaw is our racial prejudice and discrimination. This flaw is a major weapon of the U. S. S. R. in its big propaganda arsenal geared for our destruction. A part of the problem of our own information program overseas is to show that we are making steady and constant progress in this difficult and troublesome area. We in Congress can share the hope of the editorial writer of the Times that these 53 visiting students will have discovered "that segregation is fighting a losing battle" and will realize that that battle has proved a slow and tough one.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFEATING OUR PURPOSE

A group of 53 foreign-exchange students who had been brought to the United States to study during the coming year were about to climax an orientation course at Indiana University with a trip to the TVA. Fifty-one of the students were white and two were dark-skinned Panamanians. When it developed that the two could not stay at the same hotel in Knoxville as the 51 because of racial segregation in the capital of the TVA, the 51 refused to make the trip. Net result, 53 foreign students will fail to see one of this Nation's most impressive achievements; the rigidity of racial segregation in the United States will have been sharply demonstrated to 53 inquiring minds; and 53 youngsters who might even yet be enthusiastic friends of America in the 17 countries to which they will return have been given a bad taste which it will be difficult if not impossible to eradicate.

The student-exchange program can be one of the most effective means of building up permanent good will between the United States and other countries. We think that Congress would make a great mistake if it drastically cut the appropriation for this purpose. Yet it cannot be denied that many dark-skinned students from Asia and Africa have had unpleasant and embittering experiences directly due to the segregation practiced in various parts of the United States. They cannot be expected to know that segregation is fighting a losing battle in this country, or to realize that that battle is necessarily a slow and tough one. While, unfortunately, we cannot wipe out segregation overnight, the responsible agencies could by careful planning and skillful guidance pretty well prevent the opportunity for embarrassing incidents from arising. It is essential that great pains be taken to do so; for every colored student who is humiliated while a guest of our country is all too likely to go home an enemy rather than a friend of the United States.

Not Inviting Nationalist China to Japan
Peace Parley Shows Weakness of
United States StandEXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

NOT INVITING NATIONALIST CHINA TO JAPAN
PEACE PARLEY SHOWS WEAKNESS OF UNITED
STATES STAND

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

At San Francisco, beaten Japan, shorn of the territorial loot acquired in four wars, will be taken back into the family of nations.

The victors will be there. So will the victims. Even peoples like the Pakistani, the Indonesians, the Indochinese, who resisted Japan as nonsovereign parts of other political units, will be present and given a chance to say their say.

Japan's first victim and longest adversary, Nationalist China, will be absent and not by its own choice. On the other hand, India, Burma, and Yugoslavia have decided not to go to San Francisco.

Nationalist China will be absent because, in the interval since the end of World War II, it has lost most of its territory to a rival Chinese faction. It will be absent because the U. S. S. R. strongly supports that rival faction. It will be absent because Prime Minister Attlee of Britain yields to the pan-Asian view of India's Nehru who hates white people more than he hates Asian Communists. But above all, it will be absent because the United States chose to abandon its wartime ally and wait for the dust to settle.

Therefore, since there are two Chinas, neither was invited to San Francisco.

The final choice between these will be made by the very Japanese who lost the war. It is hard to imagine a more humiliating decision by the United States and Great Britain. But there it is.

So the man who first stood up against conquering Japan and for years stood alone, Chiang Kai-shek, will not be present.

CHIANG WILL NOT WEAKEN

Knowing the Generalissimo, I am sure he will not weaken. How could he? He is intensely Chinese. There with him on Formosa is all that remains of Chinese civilization, one of the greatest that ever has been.

Everywhere else, Communists are destroying the old Taoist-Buddhist-Confucian culture and putting in its place a Chinese version of a foreign barbarism.

Yet sometimes Chiang must ask himself just why he stood by a Western World that then so categorically refused to stand by him.

During the war, he could at any time have come to an understanding with the Japanese. They would have become the masters of China. Chiang, and not Wang Ching-wel, would have become their puppet. (Wang accurately predicted just about how the West would recompense China's sacrifice.)

As Japan's gauleiter, Chiang might not have been too happy. But if he had gone over to the Japanese in 1941, Chinese Communist resistance, always half a bluff, would have collapsed like a paper bag. Assisted by National China, the Japanese might well have made themselves invincible to outside

attack. There would have been a different world today.

CHINA WOULD BE BETTER OFF

In many ways such a world would have been unpleasant to Chiang Kai-shek. Yet the people of China would doubtless have been better off than they are now. The Japanese dearly need the Chinese, both as customers and as manpower for future adventures. They would not have destroyed the ancient glories of Chinese civilization. They would hardly have murdered one and one-half million Chinese in cold blood, as the Communists have done. Life under them would not necessarily have been so bad. The Formosans, who lived half a century under Jap rule, prefer it to rule by Chinese Communists.

Had Chiang accepted one of the many Japanese offers to collaborate, China would not have suffered the further destruction of World War II and would altogether have avoided the horrors of the subsequent civil war.

True, such a solution would not have been to the advantage of the democratic world. It might even have brought about Hitler's victory in Europe and the end of the democratic world.

Yet why—somebody at the San Francisco conference should explain—why should the Chinese people care two hoots for a democratic world that was ready to throw them to the Communists in order to appease Soviet barbarians?

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House of Representatives to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am including therein an editorial from the Detroit News of August 22, 1951.

While the loss in the Missouri Valley from floods was tragic and unprecedented, the loss to the people of the Great Lakes, the Middle West States, and the Nation without access to the seven seas is also tragic.

The depletion of the iron ores of this country brings a threat to our economic welfare and even the safety and security of our country.

EQUALLY CRITICAL

By dint of having had a billion-dollar flood, residents of the Missouri River Basin are assured of a beefed-up allotment by Congress for the project to harness the unpredictable waters of that stream.

Maybe it is too bad the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin was so well endowed by nature with control reservoirs, in the shape of the Lakes themselves, that we never have floods here. The St. Lawrence seaway project—needing no more money than the Missouri plains and assured, moreover, of paying back every penny through ship tolls—seems incapable of enlisting Congress' interest.

Yet the losses threatened in the Great Lakes Basin, unless we finally get access via the seaway to Labrador's iron ore, are apt to be on a scale dwarfing the Missouri flood damage. The whole country and the whole world, if war and wartime ore demand

come again, will feel the loss of a major part of our national steel-manufacturing capacity.

This will not happen in a day, nor can anyone name the day when Great Lakes ore reserves at last will be gone. The threat is not so spectacular as that of a great flood. Yet it is actually a more definite threat than the improbable recurrence of a Missouri flood unequaled within 100 years.

Progress Under the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the best estimates available today indicate a need for an additional 830,000 hospital beds in this country. We have 1,100,000 hospital beds. We need nearly 2,000,000. In other words the beds available represent about 54 percent of our needs.

The Hill-Burton program for hospital construction—the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, as amended—is making progress throughout the United States. One thousand six hundred projects have been approved for construction, and when completed they will add a total of 77,000 additional beds to the hospital plant of this country. Four hundred and seventy-five of these 1,600 projects have been completed; 1,000 are now under construction; 125 are still in the planning stage.

This program must go forward. One of the greatest assets of the United States is the health of its people. The construction of hospitals, health centers, and other needed facilities will bring important services to the rural people of this country both in the fields of curative and preventive medicine.

As a part of my remarks I include excerpts from an address of Dr. John W. Cronin, Chief, Division of Hospital Facilities, of the United States Health Service, styled "Planning for Hospital and Health Facilities," and recently delivered by him in Hopkinsville, Ky. I also include excerpts from an article by Dr. Cronin which appeared in a recent issue of Hospitals, the journal of the American Hospital Association:

PLANNING FOR HOSPITAL AND HEALTH FACILITIES

(Address of John W. Cronin, M. D., Chief, Division of Hospital Facilities, Public Health Service, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D. C.)

Each hour, each moment we stand on the threshold of the unknown. This statement holds true for each of us as individuals and also for all of us as a Nation. It is in times such as these that our real worth as freemen becomes manifest.

The foundation upon which all of our great progress as a Nation has been built has been our ability to plan for the future. In isolated instances the planning has been done by a single individual, but in the vast majority of times the planning has been the result of the work of many individuals, com-

petent in many skills, getting together, working together, sharing trials and tribulations, but ever pushing forward to achieve the common goal for the betterment of all. That is democracy in action.

All planning is based on recognition of need. One of the greatest needs in our whole country today is adequate health services for our people. We need to maintain and improve the quality of our health services. Equally as important we must extend the scope of these services so that they will be available to those in need of them. This is true in time of peace, but in time of potential war, hot or cold, it is imperative that the health resources of the Nation be mobilized to meet any catastrophe, great or small. Today atomic, bacteriological, radiological catastrophes are a concern of many of our communities. Those of us who deal with services to our fellow men in time of illness have an even greater duty during the preparation for the defense of our country.

It is well to take stock of some of the important aids available to the Nation in building up our health resources.

In 1946, by the action of the Seventy-ninth Congress and the President, Public Law 725 established the hospital survey and construction program. This program, known popularly as the Hill-Burton program, was designed basically to assist the States to provide needed hospital and health facilities in needy areas. These areas were primarily rural. The mechanics of this act have proven it to be one of the most soundly conceived statutes ever enacted by Congress in providing for local, State, and Federal cooperation in providing hospital services. It is administered on the State level with the local community retaining the incentive for local initiative and local operation of the completed nonprofit, nondiscriminatory, community service type of facility. An inventory and analysis by the State of the existing facilities and definition of the need for additional facilities is required before Federal funds become available on a matching basis for construction purposes.

The State establishes the percentage of Federal funds to be made available annually for each project in its borders. The total amount of Federal funds granted to the respective States is determined by a formula in the law. The controlling factors, however, are population and per capita income of the State.

In 1949 the basic law was amended to include Federal aid for research in the field of hospital services. An appropriation to implement the amendment was under consideration at the outbreak of the hostilities in Korea. With the increased demands on the distribution of our Federal funds there has been no appropriation made available for this type of research.

As of July 31, 1951, a total of \$467,500,000 has been appropriated for hospital and health center construction. This has made possible the approval of 1,600 projects which will provide 77,000 additional hospital beds. An analysis of all the State plans shows that there are in existence today approximately 1,100,000 acceptable hospital beds and a deficit of nearly 830,000. In other words we have only about 54 percent of our needed hospital plant in this country at this time.

Of the 1,600 approved projects, 475 are completed and rendering a community service, 1,000 are under construction and 125 are still in the planning stage. Total construction costs are estimated at slightly more than \$1,200,000,000. The Federal share is about 36 percent of this amount.

Of all the projects approved, nearly three-fourths are for general hospitals. This includes new hospitals as well as additions, alterations, or remodeling of existing hospitals. Next in order are public health centers, about 15 percent; then mental hospital projects, about 5 percent; tuberculosis proj-

ects, 3 percent; with only about 1 percent for chronic disease facilities.

It is apparent that most of the emphasis has been on general hospital facilities. About 55 percent of the general hospital projects are for completely new hospitals. Most of the new hospitals are being built in small towns and in the smaller cities; nearly 61 percent of the new general hospitals are located in towns of less than 5,000 population. Only 7 percent are in cities of more than 50,000 people.

This to me points up the providential nature of the Hill-Burton program at this time. There is a duality of purpose noted. I pose the question, "Cannot these Hill-Burton hospitals be regarded as evacuation destinations for our potential target areas"? I hope we will never be called upon to put this statement to a test, but we may be. It certainly was not our original purpose.

The provision in the Hill-Burton Act for survey and planning has proved to be one of the soundest features of the law. Each community fits into a pattern of service as outlined in the State plan. The community must determine the size of the facility that can be supported and the services to be included. The local community planning features are one of the major reasons why the Public Health Service believes that a program for what we now call defense impacted areas, with increased populations, should follow the Hill-Burton concept. Service at the local level is the objective of the program for war impacted areas. Therefore, advice from the communities where the affected people live is essential. Conversely, State and Federal advice to local planning groups is important if the planning is to be really effective. Those involved at all levels should take part in it, not simply be brought into the program after the plans are made.

In addition to the Hill-Burton program, with its obvious limitations for hospital construction in war impacted areas there are several action programs designed to provide assistance.

The Federal Civil Defense Act does not contemplate the making of grants for hospital construction. It does provide for the incorporation of shelter areas or other construction designed to provide protection of the occupants against enemy attack. Funds, however, are very, very limited.

The bill sponsored by Senator MAYBANK of South Carolina and Representative SPENCE of Kentucky, known as the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act was passed by this Eighty-second Congress and signed by the President. Title III of this act relates to community facilities and resembles in some respects the Lanham Act of World War II. The provisions of this act include hospital facilities and services for the care of the sick, as well as facilities for water, sewage, sanitation and other community facilities. Federal funds in the amount of \$60,000,000 are provided for the construction, maintenance or operation of community facilities. In the case of assistance for hospital construction these funds will be available only if funds are not available under the Hill-Burton Act. This legislation also provides that maintenance and operation payments will not exceed the portion of the maintenance and operation expenses attributable to the national defense activities in the area. The act also specifies that the function, powers and duties with respect to health, refuse disposal, sewage treatment, and water purification shall be exercised by and vested in the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. This latter proviso properly relates the health activities of those existing in regard to the Hill-Burton program. The success of this legislation depends entirely upon local, State and Federal cooperation and coordination of hospital and health services—the kind of cooperation which has proven so eminently effective to date.

[From Hospitals]

INSURANCE AGAINST CATASTROPHE

The Hill-Burton program is now completing its fifth year of operation. The local communities, the States, and the Federal Government, working closely and harmoniously together, have demonstrated that hospitals and health centers can be built in relationship to the need for better patient care. As of January 1, 1951, a total of 1,497 projects had been approved for construction; 382 were completed, and 867 were under construction. As communities which have never heretofore enjoyed adequate hospital and medical services begin to receive these services, and as other communities expand these facilities to meet their needs, the value of the extensive survey and planning carried on by the respective States becomes evident.

At a time when our national security is a matter of grave concern, it can be considered as providential that such a program as the Hill-Burton program has been in existence for even such a short period. Modern, well-equipped hospitals are being built. No better insurance against a catastrophe to the Nation's health can exist than the provision of hospitals to treat the sick and injured, to conserve the health of the worker, and to effectively utilize the time and energy of our limited number of doctors, nurses, and other health workers.

The hospital of today is the center of health for the community. It represents the mobilization depot of modern medical science to be utilized in the interest of the public.—John W. Cronin, M. D., Chief, Division of Hospital Facilities, Public Health Service.

Save the Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Save the Tidelands," written by Harold L. Ickes, and published in the September 1951 issue of *Frontier*.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAVE THE TIDELANDS

(By Harold L. Ickes)

A moral question is involved in the attempt that is once more being made to turn over to the oil interests, via the States, the immensely rich off-shore oil lands that the Supreme Court of the United States, on more than one occasion, has found never belonged to them. The States now affected, in the order of the cases that were decided against them, are California, Texas, and Louisiana. These three States, concededly in entirely good faith, for many years assumed that they had title to the so-called tidelands in which enormous oil pools have been found, and they proceeded to grant leases to explore for and capture oil, subject to a royalty to be paid to the lessor. In total, royalties that have been paid have amounted to great sums of money. Part of these profits to the States have been used for educational purposes and the rest has been expended for other State purposes.

When I became Secretary of the Interior in March of 1933, I found that my predecessors had accepted the theory that title to these off-shore oil lands belonged to the States upon which they abutted. I accepted

this policy without question, as every member of the Cabinet necessarily does with policies established by those who have preceded him, unless some reason arises which calls for a reexamination of any question. It would literally take many years for a new Secretary of the Interior to pass upon, de novo, every decision made by his predecessors.

Applicants for oil leases in these off-shore areas, on the theory that title to them was in the Federal Government, had been pressing for Federal leases in the belief, as a result of opinions rendered by their lawyers, that title in fact was in the Federal Government. Usually these applicants were turned back by the General Land Office which was the agency in Interior in charge of the leasing of oil lands on the public domain, which no one disputes belongs to the Federal Government. Finally one applicant presented his case to me personally. There was no question as to my duty to consider his case, which I did, with the result that doubt arose in my mind as to whether the decision originally made, and subsequently maintained by my predecessors, was a proper finding under the law. My conclusion was that a legal question was involved which should be decided by the courts. I did not change my mind as so many critics are fond of saying, as if for an executive officer to change his mind was an act of malfeasance. Even if I had done so I would only have been acting with due regard for my oath of office, if I had come to the conclusion that the Federal Government did have title to the property in question.

SECRETARY ICKES AND F. D. R. AGREED ON THE ISSUE

However, on the facts and arguments that were presented to me on both sides of this question, I did not feel justified in coming to a final decision. I simply took the position that, as between the United States and the several States affected, I did not know which held title and that this doubt on my part as the Federal officer having the responsibility for a final determination, should be resolved by the Federal courts. I stated the problem to President Roosevelt and he agreed with me that this was a question for the courts. He, too, was a lawyer by profession, as I am. He, too, as the Chief Executive Officer of the Nation, believed that if we had not been following the law we should find out what the law was and amend our course of action accordingly. So far as I knew, he had no interest in any oil property and therefore was without the prejudice that a man interested in gaining profits from such an investment would have. I was in the same situation. It meant absolutely nothing to me whether, so far as oil lands off-shore the coast of California, for instance, belonged to California or to the Federal Government. But it was my concern to see to it that the United States was not carelessly, and in violation of the law which all of us had taken an oath to uphold and defend, permitting any trespass upon the property or in violation of any of the rights of the United States which was precisely what had been happening, according to the three subsequent decisions by the United States Supreme Court.

It was the Supreme Court that held that paramount rights and interests in these off-shore oil lands belong to the United States, and therefore to all of the people of the United States. I never made any such decision, although I have applauded it. I might have made such a decision, subject to a possible overruling by the courts, but it seemed to me that the orderly procedure was, first to find out the answer from the courts and then to abide by that answer as it was my duty to do unless I cared so to conduct myself as properly to be subject to impeachment for misfeasance in office. But to listen to the uninformed, as well as misinformed,

clamor that is being indulged in in the tideland States, and even from inland States that not even remotely have an interest in tidelands, one might suppose that I was a wrongdoer to be vituperated and excoriated, not for violating my oath of office, but for insisting upon living up to it.

The moral question involved in this issue, stated as simply as possible, is: Is California or Louisiana or Texas justified in holding onto property as to which they have been trespassers, even if in good faith, after the Supreme Court has said that the property is not theirs? Another question is involved which is of the highest political importance. It is: To satisfy the greed of gluttonous and obese oil interests shall we encourage, let alone permit, the Congress of the United States, in effect, to overrule a carefully considered opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States, thus doing a grave hurt, not only to the Court itself, but to our institutions, that it will take more than time to heal? Are we to stand before the world, not as a united nation defending our time-honored institutions, of which we so loudly boast, or are we to present an appearance of disunity and factionalism such as we did on the slavery question which required a civil war to settle? Is the law supreme in this country or, after it has been written by the Supreme Court, are we to tear it up and cast the shreds of paper to any fitful wind which may blow? Is there anything to the American political ideal, as we have vaunted, when the dollar, even though it is depreciated, tempts our greed? Just how patriotic are the oil interests of California, Louisiana, and Texas when it comes to accepting gracefully decisions of the Supreme Court that will put them on a basis of equality with other States instead of at an unfair advantage? Here are questions which we must answer now in the field of politics or with which we must trouble our conscience hereafter.

DISTORTION OF THE FACTS IS CHARGED BY ICKES

There has been going on in the halls of Congress, in both branches, one of the dirtiest fights on this tidelands issue that I have ever witnessed and I have been a close observer of Government during an entire adult life which has already stretched into many years. I have followed the arguments indulged in by such men as Senator TOM CONNALLY of Texas, as well as Representatives WALTER of Pennsylvania and BOYKIN of Alabama. If one did not know what the facts actually are, one would be justified in believing, from what these and others have said in and out of Congress, that the real purpose behind the Walter bill (H. R. 4484) is not to get control of the offshore oil lands from the United States "under false pretenses" in order to make them more accessible on more satisfactory terms to the oil interests—no indeed. The patriotic and unselfish motive is to prevent the rapacious Federal Government from absconding with all of the inland waterways, especially those within the boundaries of those States that are without access to the two oceans and the Gulf of Mexico which, with Mexico and Canada, constitute our outer borders.

The incredible Association of State Attorneys General, generously financed, it is believed, by the oil interests, has also thrown itself into this fight for this lofty reason. Moreover, Senator TOM CONNALLY and others are all excited by the thought of Federal ownership of offshore oil lands because this would tend toward socialism. Texas and Louisiana and California may be given title to offshore mineral oil lands to lease to private interests, but there apparently would be no danger of socialism in such cases. Socialism rears its ugly head only when the United States takes possession of property which belongs to it and grants leases to explore for oil or other minerals. It is interesting that, although the United States for many years has been granting oil and other

mineral leases on the public domain, the argument of socialism has never been heard against such a proper exercise of sovereign power, particularly by the oil interests which have obtained many such leases and have grown rich under the generous patronage and protection of the Federal Government.

The argument for raping the tidelands for the advantage of the oil interests is based upon a tissue of lies—no other word is apt enough to describe the situation. The fact is that the Federal Government has frequently and publicly disclaimed any idea of exercising any jurisdiction over the inland waterways, to say nothing of claiming title to any of them. This is a matter of record so clear and explicit that Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY of Wyoming, a short time ago, on the floor of the Senate felt called upon to try again to set the record straight, so far as inland waterways are concerned. But the light-fingered who are out to pick the pockets of Uncle Sam of these off-shore oil lands do not wish to have the record set straight. They persist in their defamatory and untruthful statements to that degree that one is tempted to suggest the revival of the Ananias Club made famous by the late Theodore Roosevelt, so that all of the irresponsible gentry who keep repeating what they must know to be a lie, can become honorary members.

INLAND WATERWAYS ARE NOT IN DANGER OF SEIZURE

There is a conclusive counter to this "Goebbelsism" to the effect that inland waterways are in danger of seizure by the Federal Government under the doctrine of the tidelands decisions. Representative MANSFIELD offered an amendment to assure this when the Walter bill was before the House of Representatives. This amendment was overwhelmingly defeated by Representatives who, at the same time, bitterly complained that the waterways of their states were endangered. Moreover, the administration has caused bills to the same effect to be introduced during the last several Congresses. These have been defeated when they would have been passed overwhelmingly if supported by the Senators and Representatives who are so willing to serve the oil interests. Nor were they supported by the lobbying State attorneys general, who either do not know what the law is or are willing to misrepresent it, for purposes that will not bear the light of day.

The fact is that the oil interests and the lawyer-like State attorneys general, whose unprofessional conduct would have been investigated long ago by the American Bar Association if it had been doing its duty, do not want any bill to pass that would be declaratory of title in the States to their inland waterways. Despite their professional deviation, they must know that such a law is unnecessary, but the dead horse danger to the inland waterways gives them something to flagellate in order to befuddle the people and distract their attention from the real issue which is a conspiratorial attempt to put over the biggest steal in the history of the world for the enrichment of people already too rich and to the unjust deprivation of the people of those States that do not have any off-shore oil lands.

PROFITS SHOULD BE DIVIDED AMONG ALL THE STATES

Those who are opposed to the Walter bill and similar legislation have proposed that the profits from the Federally owned oil lands be apportioned among all the States on a fair pro rata basis for the benefit of education the facilities for which, in almost every part of the United States, have been rapidly deteriorating of late years for lack of money to support them. The schools need money to repair old, and buy new equipment; we need to maintain our school buildings and add substantially to what we now have; we need higher pay to hold onto the teachers

who are leaving the schools by the thousands as well as to attract new teachers. All of these things we need if we are to provide the rapidly growing army of children of school age with education, lacking which we can hardly expect them to qualify for useful citizenship. And yet a disgracefully large number of the Members of Congress would deny the children of America the educational opportunities to which they are entitled by handing over to the Standard Oil and other interests lands that are estimated to be worth literally hundreds of billions of dollars.

This new national domain constitutes the greatest source of possible new national income since the Louisiana Purchase. If wisely and prudently administered it is capable of supplying substantial financial support to the schools for many years to come. We must either allow our schools to deteriorate further, add to our already vexatious burden of taxation, or use the revenues from this oil that belongs to the Nation if we are even to attempt to educate our children for an intelligent citizenship. Yet it is apparently the intention of such men as Representative WALTER and Senator CONNALLY to turn this enormous national wealth over to greedy oil interests while adorning the education that used to be the richest heritage of our children "to go hang." When the story of this brazen betrayal by a Congress that is supposed to represent the people against the avaricious comes to be written, those who would pick the pockets of the people in order to gratify the cupidity of the oil aristocracy will richly earn their page of infamy.

Know Your Waterways—Constructive Tax Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix to the RECORD I wish to include an article by the Marine News, of New York, published recently in the Washington Post, as follows:

KNOW YOUR WATERWAYS—CONSTRUCTIVE TAX DOLLARS

Central government help for certain general-welfare purposes has been in practice since medieval times. It began in America with the birth of the Nation. Taxpayers have contributed, directly and indirectly, to wagon trails, canals, harbors, river and channel improvements, railways and highways. Certain industries are helped through protective tariffs. Aviation for economic and defensive purposes is aided. Science is helped in research and investigation. Magazines, newspapers, and other publications are helped through low mailing costs. The shipping industry is subsidized; how could it operate otherwise with American seamen the highest paid in all the world.

One of the underlying purposes of Government aid is to encourage, protect, and strengthen certain activities essential to national welfare, to guard against national disaster through the collapse of those vital activities.

Nation-wide harbor and channel development and maintenance, wholly unsuited for private capital, is an undeniable and imperative duty of the Federal Government: In

view of the world situation, these transportation facilities and indispensable aids to shipbuilding, both vital to defense, are becoming more and more valuable to the Nation.

Acheson's Triumph Over the Russians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a most interesting column by Thomas L. Stokes, entitled "Danger in Goaded the Russians." Here is a thesis of great importance by a most talented observer and writer, a thesis receiving all too little thought and attention by some of our colleagues in the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DANGER IN GOADING THE RUSSIANS—DICTATORSHIP REGIME, PLAGUED BY FEARS, IS INCLINED TO MOVE QUICKLY INTO WAR TO SAVE ITSELF AND JUSTIFY ITS ACTIONS

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

One can hardly imagine our immaculate Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, in the role of the battered prize fighter in gaudy purple trunks, perspiration streaming down his chest, who breathlessly bawls into the microphone:

"Hello, Mom, I whupped him like I said I would. He never put a glove to me."

Yet, in the huzzas and hosannahs going up now from his former critics for his performance at San Francisco, there is the primitive vengeful note reminiscent of the prize ring. From the tenor of the shouting one might suspect that their changed attitude toward the once much-belabored Secretary is chiefly because he handcuffed—as we say—Andrei Gromyko and his stooges at the recent Japanese peace treaty conference.

In short, he "whupped" the Russians, single-handed—and that makes everything all right now. Come home, sir, all is forgiven.

The Secretary deserves better than that, though he deserves all the plaudits and encomiums for his brilliant success.

At the lower level of practical domestic politics, where he has been so unmercifully mauled, it was a political victory both for Dean Acheson and the Truman administration. The opportunity for him to achieve that, by putting him forward as chairman of the conference, was nicely arranged and with the assistance and cooperation of a Republican, John Foster Dulles, who worked so long and faithfully to bring the Japanese peace treaty to its conclusion. Mr. Acheson fulfilled that opportunity, bringing new prestige to himself and his country, as anybody who knows his ability could have forecast.

His effectiveness is diminished none by the fact that the Russians at this conference turned out to be what is known in prize ring parlance as a "set-up," for they revealed at San Francisco no ingenuity or change of pace, using the old and familiar blocking routines, and very stumbingly. Or, as one diplomat put it, their performance was stereotyped and sterile.

The Secretary's real achievement at the conference, in the higher levels of inter-

national diplomacy, was not in his personal handling of the meeting, but in the solidarity demonstrated in the free world. And that was not something that just happened suddenly at San Francisco, but something that represented long and slow and careful work that he has been directing all the while his now freshly converted critics were condemning him. It was that which had handcuffed the Russians long in advance of the San Francisco meeting.

So the hurrahs of the Johnny-come-late-leys has a hollow ring, and is, too, somewhat disturbing. It puts too much stress merely on beating the Russians, on "One-Round Hogan" type of knock-outs, and what we are trying to do in the world is much more than that, and may take many rounds of diplomatic maneuvering. This is not a prize fight, a bull fight, or a bar-room brawl. Much more is at stake.

It would be too bad, also, if in the exaltation of success at San Francisco the administration and the State Department would accept the rating of the now converted critics. It might prove tempting after so much abuse. Already it has been evident that the previous yammering and hammering by the critics, including the sinister manifestations of McCarthyism, have affected the administration and the State Department to perhaps an overemphasis on anti-Sovietism and an underemphasis on pro-free-wordism, negative rather than positive.

This is pointed up by one intuitive and astute observer of the San Francisco proceedings by a little venture into dialectics—to wit, the more success, the more danger. That is, there is danger in merely goading the Russians; for a dictatorship regime, plagued naturally by fears and uncertainty as it is, is inclined to move quickly into extremes, including war, to save itself and justify itself. By its very nature it can do that, since it lacks the restraints from its people that a free nation has.

We are strong, and we need to keep our heads.

We don't need to ape the tactics of a prize ring bully, which are those of the Kremlin.

Acheson's Triumph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Acheson's Triumph," from the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACHESON'S TRIUMPH

Senator KNOWLAND's tribute to Dean Acheson, and the spontaneous applause with which the Secretary of State was greeted upon his return to Washington, must have echoed what many Americans were thinking about the conduct of the San Francisco Conference. Despite the somewhat sticky situation into which the State Department had maneuvered itself on the procedure for approval of the Japanese peace treaty, Mr. Acheson handled the meeting with great skill and aplomb. His firm and unruffled performance as presiding officer of the conference brought not only the admiration of the non-Communist delegates but also an acknowledgment by his political opponents.

The State Department's pressure upon the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. to complete the coast-to-coast television network in time for the conference may prove to have been one of the smartest moves the Department could have made. Millions of Americans saw the proceedings with their own eyes. They saw in action the man traduced as being "soft" toward the Communists, and what they saw eloquently refuted the accusation. In this newspaper's view, "softness" in dealing with Moscow has never been one of Mr. Acheson's failings. We are happy to join with others in congratulating Secretary Acheson on a job well done.

The Murder of a Candidate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week, my friend Donald R. Richberg, former Administrator of the NRA and presently a member of the law faculty of the University of Virginia, delivered a memorable and prophetic address in New Haven, Conn. In this address Donald Richberg offers a candid and courageous analysis of the American political and economic scene and the issues which lie before the American electorate in 1952.

In addition, Mr. Richberg suggests practical steps which patriotic citizens who place principle above partisanship and country above political creed must take if we are to preserve here a way of life that has made our country great and kept it strong. In my opinion, this is an address which should be read and studied carefully by every citizen desiring to have a part in conserving at home the blessings of individual liberty which we are now sacrificing so much to protect abroad. I am asking that Donald Richberg's entire address appear in the Appendix of the RECORD. It is a clear outline of what we have a right to expect in any Presidential candidate in 1952 whose victory will contribute to standards and concepts which are fundamentally American.

I have been informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make three and one-fourth pages of the RECORD, at a cost of \$273.34.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MURDER OF A CANDIDATE

(Address by Donald R. Richberg at annual meeting of the Manufacturers Association of Connecticut, at New Haven, Conn., September 11, 1951)

It is my happy expectation that this speech will somewhere offend everyone. This is because I propose to discuss the greatest weakness and danger of our democratic form of government. That weakness and danger is shown in our universal habit of murdering all candidates for high public office. This is done, not by the comparatively humane destruction of the body, but by a continual battering of the mind which leaves the candidate apparently alive but actually a mental

ghost devoid of those courageous convictions which would make him capable and worthy of great leadership.

This murderous political custom might be discussed in generalities without offending anyone. But on the eve of a Presidential campaign, I feel impelled to speak plainly and intolerantly about what each and every one of us is going to do to destroy the particular candidate whom he would like to see become President of the United States. Such a brutal, nonpartisan exposé is certain to offend not only all the candidates but all the voters who are sufficiently earnest citizens to have a candidate and to want to see their favorite elected President.

In order, however, to have my candid comments understood as a criticism of ourselves as citizens and not as personal attacks upon the individuals whom we develop and then destroy as our leaders, I shall only identify the candidates as types. There will be for example the governor, the Senator, the general, the socializer, and the economizer. There are so many potential candidates of each type that the discussion of a typical candidate need not be regarded as the criticism of any particular person.

The first demand upon every candidate is that he shall be a miracle worker; and if he is not willing to promise this he might as well not run for office. Of course no one expects him to achieve all his promised miracles, but each voter must be made to feel that the promise in which he is most interested will be fulfilled.

In foreign affairs the President must promise to lead us toward world government with a peaceful sharing of earth's resources by all nations; and yet promise to preserve a free, independent United States with the highest standard of living on earth.

In domestic affairs the President must promise to lead us into social security for everyone regardless of his contribution to social welfare; and yet promise to preserve the freedom of private enterprise and the incentives of self-advancement.

He must promise high prices to the farmers, high wages to industrial workers, and low prices to both as consumers, so that everyone can sell his labor high and buy the products of labor low. A favorite device to accomplish that miracle is to increase taxes so that the Government can pay the high prices that no one else can afford to pay and the private citizen will not have enough money to buy the things he can't afford to buy.

The President must promise to prevent inflation; and yet promise to print and spend more and more Government money, which is the irresistible cause of inflation.

The President must denounce all large-profit makers as selfish exploiters of the workers and consumers; and yet make sure that this profit making continues so that the Government can collect billions of dollars from those taxpayers who are a voting minority.

The President must attack vigorously all business monopolies because they restrain competition and raise prices; and at the same time he must support enthusiastically the labor-union monopolies which are the most powerful organizations to restrain competition and to raise prices that we have ever known.

In a word, the President must be a cynical deceiver of the masses of the voters, or else he must be a self-deceived, wishful thinker who has so little understanding of economic laws that he believes they can be nullified by legislative acts. Strange to say there are thousands of men who laugh at the story of King Canute commanding the ocean tides to recede, who will solemnly advocate the use of an act of Congress to reverse irresistible economic tides. There are even sycophant economists who will tell

President Canute that the way to prosperity lies in spending more than your income.

Many years ago (when I first addressed this association) I was rather notoriously a member of the national administration. You may recall that we were engaged then in a tremendous effort to raise prices. It seemed to be a good thing to do when depression prices and depression wages permeated our industries like a stifling fog. In retrospect I can only explain, as did the man who threw a champagne bottle into the chandelier, that it seemed to be a good thing to do at that time.

But, defensively, let me point out that in the NRA at least we were openly trying to raise prices and wages. With a similar intent, the President increased the price of gold and devalued the dollar. Later when the Government was spending billions in preparing for and then in fighting the Second World War, not even the wooziest economist of the lunatic fringe of that administration was encouraged to announce that by spending more and more money it was fighting inflation. Inflation was inevitable. An honest defense was that inflation could not be avoided. An honest promise had to be that it would be restrained as far as possible.

Likewise today the people should be told that the winning of the undeclared, but desperately dangerous, war in which we are now engaged, with its necessarily vast expenditures, must bring more inflation. They should be told that to ward off disaster there must be an end of luxurious government, a curtailment of political philanthropy, a pause in calf-killing for prodigal sons and daughters, and the actual sacrifice by all Americans of a substantial portion of their previous standard of living.

To promise today to any segment of the American people an advance in their standard of living while proposing to arm the Nation and prepare for the costliest war ever waged, is either supreme folly or sheer hypocrisy. Any intelligent and honest leadership would be forced to tell the American people that the time for austerity has come to us. If we are not to shed more blood, at least there must be more sweat and tears for all of us. In the face of the greatest national insecurity which this generation has ever known, political promises of more social security and an ever rising and spreading prosperity, sound like the chattering of happy imbeciles or the bombast of conscienceless demagogues.

What should the people be told by the candidates for the Presidency in 1952 who have enough brains, enough honesty and enough courage to be worthy of that high office? They should be offered a program that might make sense—not one that is plainly nonsensical.

If the candidate does not believe in the imminence and gravity of the menace of war—he can candidly and courageously advocate a great reduction in military expenditures. If he is also a socializer and Federal spender, he can promise to keep on taxing people to the limit so that the Government can spend all their surplus funds for them. If, on the other hand, he believes in individual liberty and local self-government, he can promise to present something like a pre-world war budget to the next Congress plus only a few billions to service and gradually reduce the national debt.

If a candidate believes that adequate preparation to fight a third world war is the only way, either to prevent the war or to win it if it be forced upon us, then he cannot honestly and courageously offer any program except that of a reduced standard of living and an equality of sacrifice for Americans as long as we must make and maintain our Nation as one impregnable fortress of freedom in a world menaced by tyranny on the march to conquest.

If a candidate believes that we must not only prepare to defend our own land, but

must also aid remote, potential allies to defend themselves, he should honestly and courageously estimate the ultimate cost of that aid in dollars and men dedicated to foreign service. He cannot honorably ease the American people through small initial contributions into an ever rising scale of enormous spending abroad that will mean a steadily falling standard of living at home.

If a candidate believes in world government he should honestly and courageously tell the people that world government means the gradual destruction of self-government in the United States, just as the centralization of government in Washington has meant the gradual destruction of local self-government in the separate States.

These are a few examples of what the people should be told by a candidate. But, what will the governor, the Senator, the general, the socializer, or the economizer actually tell them? Any one of these may start out boldly, seeking to gain a following by showing a masterful will to win nobly by a bold disregard for cautious advice and time-serving tactics. To use a homely metaphor the candidate may stride to the plate swinging a heavy bat and determined to bang out a home run. But his manager will whisper to him: "You can't risk flying out. You're a good bunter and a fast runner, so just bunt and scuttle for first base. Watch for a chance to steal second. With good luck you can be sacrificed to third. Then you can come home on a long fly or a slow grounder. You may not be a hero, but you must get home. That's the way we win this game."

There is the keynote of the campaign: "to win the game." The candidate must play to win the game. The rabid partisans in the bleachers want their team to win the game. There is little glory in defeat and the spoils of office go to the winner. No candidate is free to run his own race for himself—to a deserved victory or a noble defeat. He is running for the party. And what is the party?

The party today is a conglomeration of discordant pressure groups. It is for everything that will bring large blocks of votes and against nothing that is popular. So far as it is possible to straddle the issues, that strategy must be followed, because both major parties are straddling parties. Just take a look at them as they are.

The Democratic Party must gather in the votes of conservative States' righters in the South, radical socializers in the industrial sections of the North and Midwest, individualistic farmers from Maine to the Rockies, and reformers of all varieties from mild to wild-eyed along the Pacific coast. It must use the corrupt big-city alliances between professional criminals and local politicians to raise campaign funds and herd voters to the polls. It must crusade occasionally against some of these odiferous allies, and sacrifice a few of them, in order to reassure a frightened or angry electorate that their Government is still a physical and moral guardian of the countryside and the respectable sections of the cities against overflows of murder, robbery, rape and other crimes from politically protected areas in which they naturally flourish.

The Republican Party must gather in the votes of conservative businessmen, both big and little, and of the members of labor organizations not yet converted to socialism by radical labor bosses. It must seek to revive the faith of individualistic farmers in themselves, and at the same time must assure them that the Government will continue to serve as the guarantor of their prosperity. It must hold itself out as more respectable than the Democratic Party in the big cities, but as sufficiently practical to get support from a lot of unpleasantly rugged characters.

The Republican Party seeks to remain the party "that freed the slaves" and to recapture its historic share of the ever-increasing

votes of the Negroes. But, contrariwise, it must recognize that it desperately needs a large share of the white votes cast in Southern States where fears of political domination by Negro voters are more disturbing today than at any time since the violent overthrow of carpet-bag government.

Is it any wonder that a Presidential candidate of either party faces the prospect of losing his own mind in striving to rally enough party votes behind him to win a national election? Is it any wonder that each party will seek frantically to find and to take the winning side of issues over foreign relations? In this way at least it may be possible to induce the voters to disregard domestic controversies, to keep them usefully confused as to what the candidate and his party intend or will be able to do to solve domestic problems, and to develop a great enthusiasm for that program of national defense and international peace which will have the strongest appeal to millions of voters who have as yet no convictions as to how our bewildering international riddles should be solved.

There is one possible escape from this prospect of unprincipled political parties and futile candidates. It would be found in the one decisive issue which would divide the voters along the line of a political principle which political leaders could honestly and courageously declare and maintain. That would not be any meaningless division into conservatives and liberals. The conservative wants all the progress that the liberal promises to achieve. The liberal wants all the enjoyments that the conservative insists should be retained. Men do not differ politically because of a different ultimate aim, because all except hopeless misanthropes want to see mankind make progress. They do differ fundamentally and always have differed on the basic question as to whether progress is most surely made by human beings in voluntary cooperation or under compulsion. The socializers turn to government as the most powerful means ever devised for compelling men to work together for a common aim. The anti-Socialists turn away from government as the most dangerous means ever devised for destroying the self-developing incentives, freedom and self-reliance, through which individuals advance themselves and humankind.

Long before socialism as we know it today was a political creed the struggle between individualists and master men was carried on in tribes, communities, and nations of slowly maturing human beings. Chiefs and patriarchs, lords and princes, hierarchies, and dynasties of kings claiming divine authority, sought in turn to rule larger and larger domains. The masses of the people were assumed to be the obedient servants of superior classes. Slave revolts, the emergence of free citizens, gave indications that below the glittering surface of society, in dark and muddy depths, were suppressed energies and ambitions struggling for release. Then when a new world was discovered, beyond once forbidding oceans, these long-submerged humans rose from ignominy, broke away from bondage to hereditary ruling classes, and began to create a new world of individualists, each man relying more and more upon himself for his own support in his pursuit of his own happiness.

Gradually came to awakening minds the greatest political discovery of all time which was that self-government is the best government to promote the progress of a people, just as self-control is the best control to insure the progress of an individual. The greatest political invention of all time was the scheme of self-government embodied in the Constitution of the United States. Our Constitution provided self-government, not because the people elected their public officials, but because their public officials were denied the power to rule their lives. They were given only limited powers to establish

and maintain an orderly conduct of citizens in their relations and associations with one another, so that in a peaceful society the people could work together voluntarily, or work separately, for their own advancement and the welfare of their associates. "The best government is the least government" was the animating spirit of the Nation created in 1787.

This Nation grew and prospered beyond all precedent in the political faith of individualism. In this faith, the American people have become the most fortunate people on earth, just because they have been the freest people. Now their faith is challenged by the fanatic revival of an old discredited faith in master men, which is given a new deceptive name: Socialism. In that faith the peoples of nation after nation have become in half a century the most unfortunate people on earth, because they have become enslaved to government monsters of their own creation.

Whether we are to follow other nations down the socialist path to degradation, down which we have been going in recent years, or whether we shall reject the leadership of the socializers and find and follow the leadership of wholehearted individualists, could be and ought to be the great issue of 1952. If that issue were made and honestly fought, 1952 would be the year of a great decision. If the issue is not made and fought we shall continue drifting down the road of degradation.

He would be a wishful thinker who thought that any normal candidate of either of the two major parties is likely to lead or could lead his party into battle on that issue. There is only one faint hope that the great issue may be made and fought. That hope lies in the recent efforts of a few brave men in both parties to bring into the Presidential campaign that coalition of Democratic and Republican anti-Socialists which could force the Democratic and Republican Socialists to make an equally genuine coalition of candid socializers.

The notable coalition which has been operating in the present Congress is, on the surface, an alliance against Trumanism. But it has taken something deeper than mere opposition to the policies and conduct of the President to bring into voting agreement with Republican Congressmen a large number of southern Democrats with their comfortable and valuable chairmanships of influential legislative committees. Nothing less than the double pressure of their own deep convictions and the intense feelings of their constituents could bring these Democrats to join in defeating the programs of a Democratic President.

There is significance also in the fact that so many influential Republicans have been courageous enough to antagonize the fervid socializers in the powerful labor unions, the emotional welfarists and the equalitarian minority lobbies, by flatly announcing that Republicans should fight socialism, which should be recognized as simply communism watered down for popular consumption.

A recent debate between a Republican coalitionist and a Republican anticoalitionist showed how irreconcilable are the two wings of the two major parties. The coalitionist asserted that the conservatives of the North and the South should vote together in the Presidential election as they do now frequently in Congress. The anticoalitionist recoiled in horror from the idea of having either party become a party of principle. If the winning party really tried to carry out its program, he said, the defeated party would not accept the results of the election. There would be a civil war such as came in 1861 because the southern Democrats then expected that the northern Republicans would really try to carry out their program.

Let's not have another civil war, pleaded the anticoalitionist. Let both parties always compromise and dishonor their pledges,

let both promise honest government and neither one try to be too honest, let both promise to support the Constitution and neither one firmly support it, let both promise peace and neither keep us out of war. This anticoalitionist was, of course, a Republican socializer and, being in Congress, he evidently had a lively fear that an anti-Socialist coalition of Republicans and Democrats might beat a Socialist coalition in every part of the country except in the big city centers of industrial and social discontent, and in other localities where dependence upon a centralizing, socializing government has become a degenerative habit like taking morphine. The best hope of survival among the socializers today apparently lies in using pressure groups within both parties to advance socialistic programs gradually, but also by adroit compromising to hold them back so as not to arouse too much resistance until, bit by bit, the political morphine habit has taken hold and a majority of the people no longer care for self-respecting independence but will sell their last threadbare garments of personal freedom for those soothing promises of security.

Compromising is what appeals to all party managers and regular candidates as the ultimate in political wisdom. A halfway reform encourages the reformers and mollifies their opponents. It is more difficult to retain public office after achieving a reform, which is usually disappointing, than after failing because of the alleged opposition of evil men and special interests which the politician can promise to overcome in his next term. With this pessimistic preparation for estimating the probable virtues of the party programs and leaders of 1952, it seems time for a brief review of the typical candidates, one of whom is likely to emerge as your candidate or mine.

First, let us consider the governor, who is always a safe candidate. Having been governor of a populous State, he is well trained in the political art of bold platitudes and cautious commitments. He promises the ultimate achievement, but leaves the timing and methods of performance to the hopeful imaginations of both radicals in a hurry and slow-moving conservatives. He seeks to be the darling of the independent voters who are not violently for or against anything but always looking for a happy compromise between emotional desires and reasonable fears. He will advocate reduced expenses of government and the expansion of social services, with equal fervor. He will preach local self-government and increased Federal aid and control of local projects in the same sermon. Having had no responsibility for our foreign relations, his statesmanlike, although confusing, espousal of both world government and America-first policies will not be embarrassed by any record and will simply indicate an open mind which both nationalists and internationalists can plan to occupy in the future.

The governor will be a safe candidate. He will not force the voters to decide the great issue—which should be decided in the campaign of 1952. He will not be mentally murdered by the pressure groups. He has long since become a mental ghost.

The Senator has most of the advantages of the governor as a safe candidate. He, too, is well trained in the art of appealing to the partisans on both sides of a political issue and to the bewildered voters recorded by the poll takers as having no opinion. But the Senator has had to talk and vote on foreign relations and on laws intended to centralize and socialize our internal government. He has had to reveal on many occasions whether he was still a man of strong convictions and resolute courage or whether he had succumbed to the battering of pressure groups and become a mental ghost. If he is still mentally alive, he may not be a very safe candidate because he might think that it was more important to force a decision

of the great issue of 1952 than to win the election. But nothing is more important to a party than to win the election.

We may assume that if the Senator is nominated by his party it will not be because he is expected to fight to the death for his personal convictions on the great issue, but because the party thinks he can win the election. The party managers must then believe that, under the tremendous pressures upon a candidate who understands that he must win, he will lose control of his own mind and become the sort of mental ghost that it is safe to have in the White House. Party managers do make mistakes. If the Senator is nominated, voters who believe that he thinks with them on the great issue can only hope that his mind will be able to live through the campaign.

The general is not a safe candidate. He has not been trained to adapt his thinking to the supreme need of winning an election. But he has been disciplined throughout his life to carry out the orders of his superior in command. Will he, or can he, assume the responsibility of ultimate leadership, the final determination of a political policy, the organization and direction of a political machine to carry out that policy which has the support of his inner convictions as to the government that will best serve the welfare of his fellow citizens? What are his inner convictions?

These are momentous questions. The general has the life-long habit of precise expression, careful planning and intelligible orders. He may intend to confuse and mislead the enemy but he must make his objectives and his directions clear to those who follow his leadership. The morale of his army, its will to win, must be created and maintained. In a pitched battle on the great issue of 1952 the general might be a great leader. But if the general as a candidate for President were to make himself acceptable to the unprincipled politicians of both major parties, then he should be regarded as just another political log-roller who is not even well trained for that Machiavellian occupation.

The socializer is a candidate who is swimming or floating in a political tide that has been rolling in to our shores for so many years that canny politicians have come to believe that it will never recede—or at least not in the next election, which is always their major concern. The socializer has one political remedy for every economic or social or moral problem. Pass a law to make people prosperous, or happier or more virtuous; and then tax the people and spend their money for them to achieve these desirable ends. "Let the Government do unto you what you won't do unto yourselves," is his political Golden Rule. If prices for farm products or wages for labor are too low, the Government will raise prices and wages. If the cost of living then goes higher and higher, as of course it will, and the Government can't hold it down, even by statistics, then the Government will help the farmers and the workers raise their prices and wages again. All deficits in the pocketbooks of the voters will be made up by the Government through "deficit financing." The perils of inevitable inflation will be averted by more inflation. Fortunately for the socializer, there is now always the excuse of war or the preparation for war to justify high taxes and huge expenditures of public money with which to maintain "full employment." As long as the balloon of Government spending can be kept inflated the people can enjoy "pie in the sky."

The socializer does not appeal only to the material desires of the voters. The virtue of a paternal government expands beyond merely satisfying fleshly hungers. It promises relief to the emotional discontents that have afflicted men and women ever since they were unfortunately created with differing physical and mental abilities. All the

social discontents resulting from these differences are now to be eliminated by government, which will pass laws under which there will be no champions or prize winners in sports or business—no acknowledged and rewarded superiors in any human activity, except possibly in politics. Of course, in politics a man is ostensibly engaged in serving his fellow men and a superior servant can be tolerated. Indeed, he must be tolerated just like a good cook because if you can't cook your own meals you either tolerate a masterful cook or you don't eat.

The socializer is a sure candidate in 1952, because the political problem of having government assure satisfaction of all the material needs of the people, combined with the social, moral program of depressing all human beings to a common level has an irresistible appeal. It appeals not only to all persons of limited ability but also to many fortunate, or nominally superior, persons who hate snobbery and worldly pride and believe that all men should walk humbly in the sight of the Lord.

Finally we come to the economizer. Will he make and fight the great issue? If he is only an opponent of careless spending, graft, and inefficiency the answer is an emphatic "No." The great economy issue is not whether government shall be efficient or wasteful. It is whether government shall protect or destroy a free economy. The great issue is whether government shall protect individualism—the faith of self-respecting freemen, or force upon us socialism—the creed of those who wish to become rulers of an all-powerful state, which is acceptable only to those who are willing to be their servants. The great issue lies between those who have a faith in the God who created them and made each one responsible for his own welfare and salvation, and those who preach worship of a god whom they have themselves created and named the state. This inanimate state is simply a pagan idol, an artifice of jealous, greedy theocrats who demand unending sacrifice and subservience as the price of a miserable livelihood and a worthless salvation.

The economizer may have some understanding of this issue. His hatred of waste and theft will help him to learn quickly that state socialism is simply legalized waste of individual energy and theft of individual gains. If he is more devoted to his country than to any political party he might be a good candidate, if he has the mental stamina to survive the campaign.

What is necessary today, in order to make and fight out the great issue is a frontal, all-out attack upon the whole theory that government is the fit instrument through which a people can make progress. The basic theory of socialism is that men should be compelled to do what governmental planners decide is best and right for them to do to advance themselves and their neighbors. This is the exact opposite of the theory of individual liberty and self-government. It is regrettable but necessary that government should be used to compel some men not to do what is generally accepted as intolerably wrong. But government should never make conduct legally wrong which is not commonly regarded as an intolerable interference with the freedom of others to pursue happiness individually, or in voluntary association with their fellows, in a peaceful and orderly society. To give any ruling class the power to decide what is best and right for individuals to do for the good of society is to assume that some men possess a wisdom beyond the finite power of any man. Only a fool will think that he can play God successfully.

When we permit public officials to decide how we should use our energies and spend our earnings we not only give up our self-respect and make a degrading confession of incompetence to take care of ourselves, but, as the height of folly, we assume that poli-

ticians are born with, or develop, a super-human wisdom for the management of other people's lives. For this there is no justification. National socialism offers us not only a tyrannical but also an incompetent government.

There may be little hope that the great issue will be clearly made and fought to a decision in 1952. Yet, it will underlie every domestic and international issue. We must revive our faith in individualism, not only to save ourselves from increasing dependence on our own Government but also to save ourselves and our Government from increasing dependence upon foreign governments over which our citizens can never exercise any individual control.

We gave a mighty aid to the Communists and to all socialistic governments during and after the Second World War. This they repay by fighting us, as our bitter enemies or our obstructive friends, in the bear pit of the United Nations. There our predestined functions are: To make enormous contributions to the welfare of other nations, to sacrifice for their benefit our men, our wealth, and our freedom, and to submit to all the international laws which our socialist enemies and friends can agree should be enforced against us—but not against themselves. This costly subservience to other nations is what is described in political bombast as accepting world leadership and its responsibilities.

No Presidential candidate can seriously contend that our adventure in world leadership up to date has made us more independent and self-sufficient, or more secure against either international aggression or domestic disasters. Any Presidential candidate worthy of any confidence should be aware, and should warn us, of the imminent danger that, in a reckless combination of extravagant, Quixotic adventures abroad and self-indulgence at home, we may exhaust our resources and lose control of our destiny.

If, through such warnings of his fellow citizens, a candidate should raise clearly and develop the great issue of 1952, I pray that those who see its importance give him a fair chance to fight it out free from their pressure to make himself primarily the champion of their immediate self-interest. I beg them not to take part in the slugging by all the pressure groups that seek to batter the candidate's mind into insensibility. I beg them to realize that the winning of a forthright fight against socialism will mean the winning of scores of minor struggles against socialistic projects to which they are particularly opposed.

If there should emerge in 1952 a candidate who will wholeheartedly support our constitutional form of government, and the individual liberties which are still dear to a majority of Americans, let us pray that his friends will give him a chance to arrive at the White House still mentally alive.

Hoffman Plans Global Air Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a column about one of our great American citizens, Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, written by the eminent journalist, Mr. Marquis Childs.

As the head of the Ford Foundation, I believe Mr. Hoffman has the most im-

portant private job and the greatest opportunity for service to his fellow man of any private citizen in the world.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FORD FOUNDATION HEAD

(By Marquis Childs)

HOFFMAN PLANS GLOBAL AID PROGRAM

PASADENA, CALIF.—In the last 75 years American philanthropists have given away billions of dollars for libraries, hospitals, colleges, laboratories in every part of the world. But the Ford Foundation tops them all, both in scale and in concept.

Here is an accumulation of a half-billion or more that will produce \$30,000,000 to \$40,000,000 a year, and the idea is to spend this income as intelligently as possible so that it will promote peace and freedom in a world torn by war and threatened by totalitarianism. Some of the best brains in the country have been enrolled to make sure that this vast philanthropy contributes to these ends and not, as sometimes has happened in the past, to solve one problem only to create two others.

Still another reason the Ford Foundation is unique is its director. A prescription covering what we usually think of as the highest qualities in American life would add up to someone very like Paul Hoffman.

He is a doer. He has been an important part of the motor car industry, which is the most dynamic sector of America's competitive system. He took a critical and pioneering Government assignment as head of the Economic Cooperation Administration and did a superb job.

Now he has tackled the task of making over the world with the same cheerful yet earnest conviction that has characterized him throughout his career. There is nothing in the least arrogant or presumptuous in this. He believes that mankind through faith and reason and the techniques of modern science can avert the disaster seeming to hover darkly in the air, and move eventually into an era of peace and good will.

You cannot talk with Hoffman long without catching something of this hope and enthusiasm. Recently completing a trip around the world, he talks about some of the projects being worked up for the foundation with full realization of the dire plight of a large part of the human race.

For India the plan is to start a series of demonstration farm plots in various parts of the country showing how by improving methods of cultivation only slightly and by comparatively simple means the yield per acre can be doubled. The yield today is abysmally low. Indians are to be trained to carry out this demonstration on an ever-widening scale. One or two earlier experiments have shown that the demonstration method takes hold quickly with the Indian peasant.

In Pakistan the foundation plans to start a technical high school for young men and a domestic science school for girls. The great need in that new country—the fifth largest in terms of population in the world—is for trained experts to teach thousands of teachers who will in turn help to educate the masses in the rudiments of modern living.

For the Near East, too, one aim is to coordinate the various efforts now being made by a host of experts to raise the level of agriculture. In the first instance, at least, this will be by means of the simplest steps.

On quite another line the foundation is hoping to establish a chair of philosophy at the American University in Beirut to be filled at least part of the time by Charles Malik, Ambassador of Lebanon to the United States. Malik is a distinguished philosopher and it is believed that his lectures will become a focus of understanding between the

Arab world and the West. This would be the beginning of a much-needed bridge between the two so-different societies.

These are only a few of the ideas Hoffman throws out as he talks of the role of the foundation. Of the many programs taking shape in this country, one is a series of radio programs called *The People Act*. To be given on a national network, it will tell how people themselves can solve community problems.

Hoffman has sworn that he will never take another Government job in Washington and when one sees him here on El Mirador Ranch, started by his father in 1911, one can understand why. In the big rambling ranch house with the terrace and the rose garden that looks across a tree-filled arroyo, he and his wife welcome a constant succession of guests from every corner of the globe, to say nothing of the goings and comings of the seven Hoffman children and their families. It is with this satisfying life as a base and a center that Hoffman works so perseveringly and so hopefully to spread understanding and reason. The visitor comes away feeling that the very existence of the man and what he stands for is in itself a portent of hope. It is one of those all too rare instances in which the man and the job have come together.

Experiences of a Watertown (S. Dak.) Man in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Former Watertown Man Tells of Struggle in Early Korean War," by Chuck Griffith, published in the *Watertown (S. Dak.) Public Opinion* of September 10, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FORMER WATERTOWN MAN TELLS OF STRUGGLE IN EARLY KOREAN WAR (By Chuck Griffith)

War correspondents in the second big fracas had a habit of writing that a GI's war was only as big as the few acres of ground that surrounded him.

This was probably because, on the battlefield the most important thing to 99 percent of the men was old No. 1, the GI himself. And in a situation such as that, the GI worries about himself, tries to take care of himself, and seldom takes the "broad view" and puts himself second.

So when it comes to talking to men who have been involved in a war and had these feelings, a different version of a battle comes from every man in the fight just as the thousands of men in the battle react differently in the small sphere that makes up their particular arena of action.

Another Korean veteran told his story in Watertown this week, a story in which he was only a few miles from a marine who had recounted his experiences earlier of the bitter defeat suffered by U. N. troops in North Korea last fall and winter.

PREVIOUS CAMPAIGNS

The Army man is Warrant Officer J. G. Lester O. Lindgren, who is a former resident of the city. Lindgren is a veteran of the Second World War and saw action with the

Thirty-first Infantry Regiment at Attu, Kiska, Kwajalein, Leyte Gulf, and Okinawa. Following his discharge in January 1941, Lindgren returned to Watertown where he was employed by the Cudahy Packing Co. and the post office.

During the 3 years after the war, he helped form the local National Guard unit. In December of 1949, Lindgren reenlisted in the Regular Army with the grade of sergeant first class. He was sent to Hokkaido, one of the northern Japanese islands for occupation duty and was there when the Korean war began.

In September of 1950, Lindgren's unit was sent to make the Inchon landing. Following the attack, the unit was sent back to Pusan where it was regrouped and brought back to combat strength. In November, the unit joined other Army and Marine divisions and made a landing at Iwon, north of Wonsan in North Korea.

SURROUNDED BY CHINESE

From there, the U. N. forces struck north, arriving at the Chosen Reservoir north of Hagaru on the 27th of November. On the morning of the 28th, Lindgren, who was in one of the rear elements of the division's artillery battalions, got word that the Chinese had entered the war and had cut off the forward elements of the division. Within a few hours, the rear elements also found themselves surrounded by hordes of Chinese soldiers.

Attempts were made to send tank-supported ammunition convoys through to the cut-off artillery regiments. The Chinese had thrown up strong road blocks and these attempts were unsuccessful. The unit then fought its way to the Marine units along the reservoir where they gave artillery support with the few field pieces they had left.

Lindgren said the forward elements which had borne the brunt of the initial Chinese assault were decimated and very few men were able to get through to other American units. All weapons except those carried by hand had to be destroyed.

ESCAPE ROUTE BLOCKED

By the 4th of December, the Americans had regrouped and reorganized sufficiently to begin their break-out. The Watertown man said it took 24 hours to make the first 10 miles. The Chinese would occupy the higher ground along the escape route, construct road blocks and pour heavy automatic weapons fire into the convoy. The Americans would have to charge the high positions, drive the Chinese off the hills, and then repair the road before proceeding. Lindgren said he had been caught in several of the fire-fights at these road blocks during the escape.

"One of the worst enemies to us was the bitter cold," Lindgren said. "We were afraid to look at the thermometer many times but it did get down to 30 and 40 degrees below. Frostbite casualties were heavy but we managed to get most of the wounded evacuated."

AIR SUPPORT VITAL

The artilleryman said the Marine air groups gave excellent support during the retreat and would fly continually as long as there was enough light to see their targets. He felt that the escape would have been much more costly if air support had not been there.

Supplies had to be dropped by aircraft to the retreating column, including all gasoline, ammunition, food, clothing, and medical supplies. A few of the wounded were evacuated by air from Hagaru's improvised airstrip but all equipment which could be evacuated by air or driven out under its own power during the initial attack was lost to the enemy.

After leaving North Korea, Lindgren's unit went back into action north of Tanyang in January. The Chinese forward advance had

finally been stopped but they were still throwing heavy attacks against the U. N. line. Gen. Walton Walker was killed in a jeep accident about this time and Gen. Matthew Ridgway took over command of the troops.

ARTILLERY DUELS

"Every time after that when the Chinese hit our line, they paid heavily," Lindgren said. "Our artillery did much to stop them for the whole forward line was under heavy concentration of artillery most of the time. When these concentrations couldn't break up their attacks, mobile units would be moved in quickly to supplement the fire power. The Chinese were slaughtered then."

The warrant officer said the Chinese have fairly good artillery but massed counter-battery fire of the U. N. artillery units would keep them quiet.

Speaking of the fighting caliber of the South Koreans, he said there was only one ROK unit that proved its worth in battle. That, he said, was the ROK Capital Division. In his opinion, the other South Korean units either have too many politically appointed officers or haven't had the battle training to make them effective units. He said there were 7,000 South Koreans with his unit but they wouldn't hold the ground in the face of an attack.

COMMUNIST ATROCITIES

The Chinese, he said, are much better soldiers than the North Koreans. Lindgren remarked that he had never heard of any Chinese troops committing atrocities but it was a common occurrence for North Koreans to torture their captives.

The Korean veteran says the men in the front line believe the war should be taken to the Chinese. He says most of the men agree with General MacArthur's plan to bomb Manchurian bases and make an assault on the Chinese mainland. They feel that the Chinese can pour men into the battle indefinitely in spite of losses.

Although the men with the most service are being returned to the United States under the rotation program, Lindgren feels the United States will have an effective Army in Korea for some time to come. He says the Air Force, Navy, and Marine air attacks are keeping the Chinese from building up too much.

CONVOY SLAUGHTERED

"I saw one convoy caught in a pass during an air strike. The Chinese were slaughtered. Bodies of men and horses were stacked up all over. The Chinese have a healthy fear of our air power."

Lindgren left Korea July 5 and spent 1 month in Japan, where he received his warrant officer's grade. He was on leave for 1 month and has returned to the Sixth Division, a training unit.

Lindgren is married and has a 2½-year-old son. He plans to stay in the Army now, having served more than 8 years.

Some residents of the Belmont addition in Watertown may remember Lindgren as the boy who once delivered their Public Opinions to them. Later he worked in the mailing department of the Public Opinion as a mailing clerk. His term of employment for the newspaper was also 8 years.

America's Richest Resource

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD, an address on the subject America's Richest Resource, delivered by me at the annual meeting of the American Petroleum Association in the Hotel Traymore, Atlantic City, N. J., on Wednesday, September 2, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S RICHEST RESOURCE

I deeply appreciate the high honor of addressing the oldest trade association in the petroleum industry.

It is always an inspiration to meet with an organization of Americans who believe, as you do, in free, competitive, private enterprise as the foundation of American economic strength.

It is a pleasure to recall that your association had its origin among the independent refiners of western Pennsylvania and has always been identified with the State in which the oil industry was born.

Since its inception, 49 years ago, your organization has played an important part in the advancement of American progress. You have been leaders in the never-ending search for better products at lower prices in order to give better service to the public.

You are the rightful inheritors of a great tradition that has come down from the pioneer oil men of western Pennsylvania. They were men of courage and initiative. Their most valuable assets were hard work, self reliance and resourcefulness.

They faced difficulties that would have defeated men who lacked their energy, persistence and determination.

They struggled against hardship and discouragement. They took great risks, financial and personal. But the technical skill—the know-how—which they developed is the basis of one of the greatest and most useful industries in the world today.

The vast contribution of the petroleum industry to the betterment of the human race is one of the brightest chapters in the romance of American achievement.

It is appropriate, in meetings such as this, to consider the elements that have built the strong structure of American greatness.

It is proper that we give thought to the factors that transformed an untamed wilderness into the richest and most powerful Nation on earth.

What gave America outstanding leadership in industrial production?

What gave its workers the highest living standard in world history?

Why were the American people able to attain higher spiritual and cultural levels than any other people on earth?

Why have we accomplished so much in less than 200 years that many other nations look to the United States for assistance and support?

Is it because we had richer natural resources than other countries?

No; that is not the reason. Many other lands have greater natural resources than ours.

There is only one answer.

The unparalleled greatness of America was achieved because we possessed the richest resource bestowed by Almighty God upon mankind—freedom of the individual.

Yes, here in America we had a bountiful storehouse of natural resources—timber, oil, coal, gold, copper, iron, and all the other treasures of our mines, farms, and forests. But more precious and more productive of human progress and prosperity was that priceless resource—individual liberty.

We must remember that the early settlers in the American wilderness came here in search of freedom. They endured cruel hardship because they sought in the New World an opportunity to build a better life

for themselves and their children. They wanted freedom from the tyranny of kings, rulers, and dictators.

They did not look for an easy way of life. They did not ask for security. All they asked was opportunity.

We must remember also that American independence was established by men who loved liberty above life itself.

The Declaration of Independence was a protest against unjust taxation, and political interference with the rights of freemen.

The founders of our Republic did not guarantee the rights we enjoy as Americans. They considered these rights—freedom of religion, freedom of speech and the press, freedom from unlawful search and seizure, and freedom to possess property—as God-given rights.

In framing the Constitution they sought to protect these rights from the one danger that had destroyed freedom in the past.

That one danger was an all-powerful centralized government. They knew that government could become oppressive and could encroach upon the liberties of the people.

They sought to restrict the power of Government, to safeguard individual freedom, and to protect the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

That concept of government—with freedom of the individual as its keystone—made every American the master of his own destiny. It unleashed ambition, initiative, and inventive genius.

It offered equal opportunity for individual enterprise without government directives or regulations designed for political purposes.

It made possible our marvelous industrial development, our great transportation system and our rich agricultural production. It expanded the employment of our workers and encouraged the establishment of many thousands of small businesses.

It built our great cities and beautiful towns. It gave us our great colleges and universities, our centers of art and music, our splendid churches of every denomination.

All this magnificent record gives assurance that the future of the United States looks forward into a vast new world of greater achievement—provided we preserve the freedom of the individual—the opportunities and the incentive that have been America's strength in the past.

In your own industry the wonder workers of science are constantly revealing new miracles for the benefit of mankind. On every frontier of human progress we are searching out the secrets of nature to fulfill the promise of a better world.

But we must take warning from the trend of recent years. The fundamental spirit of Americanism—the driving force that inspired every American generation in the past, is being destroyed.

We must take warning that personal liberty disappears as the Government strengthens its power to control the lives of the people.

We must heed the lesson of history which teaches that every nation which robbed the people of their freedom has gone down to destruction.

What are the dangers confronting America?

Let me outline briefly some conditions that threaten America's richest resource—freedom of the individual—and are undermining the whole structure of the American way of life.

First, Excessive taxation, now taking away from the people more than 30 percent of the total national income.

Taxes are so heavy that very little is left for the expansion of productive industry. This robs our workers of their jobs and destroys the real market for our products.

Human rights have always been lost when a nation, burdened with debt, goes deeper into debt and lays crushing taxes upon its citizens.

Over and over again this has ended in financial collapse and the fall of the government. The result is always misery and suffering under dictatorship and tyranny.

Second, Excessive spending, brought on by waste and extravagance at all levels of government, Federal, State, and local. We have so-called Federal grants, subsidies, and other handouts of the taxpayers' money, all imposing restrictions which take away rights that properly belong to the States or to the people.

In the international field we are pouring out billions of dollars to back up an uncoordinated and unplanned foreign policy.

Third, Concentration of power in a huge political bureaucracy at Washington, working constantly to fasten unwarranted Government controls upon business, industry, agriculture, and labor. It pours out great volumes of propaganda advocating socialized medicine and Federal control of our public school system. Its ultimate objective is a planned and regimented economy patterned after socialistic failures in England and other countries of Europe.

Fourth, Pressure groups, including many well meaning but misguided citizens, who demand the expenditure of public funds for selfish purposes and their own special advantage.

Fifth, Indifference and neglect on the part of so many of our people who take no interest in the affairs of government.

If our form of government is to survive we must have a part in it. It is our Government. The taxes it collects are our money. Its officers are our servants.

We have only ourselves to blame if bad government is the result of failure to accept our share of civic responsibility.

Sixth, The breakdown of moral standards in public and private life. Honest measures, decency, and statesmanship should take the place of craftiness, deceit, and political trickery. In all humility we should dedicate ourselves to the principles of religion, because good laws and good government are based upon religion and righteousness.

We should all work to put men at the head of our Government who will set an example of honesty and morality.

Never before in American history have the leaders of Government concealed, condoned, and protected corruption with the same arrogant disregard for ethical standards as we are witnessing today.

There is something wrong with our system when we contemplate taxing the illicit profits of gambling and other immoral practices in order to balance governmental budgets.

Seventh, Too much dependence upon Government for security. Too many of our people have been misled by unscrupulous politicians, of both parties, into thinking that whatever we get from the Government is free of all cost. That false promise of something for nothing destroys initiative and self-reliance.

Eighth, Communists in our Government and subversive teachings in our schools and colleges. This poisonous influence must be rooted out wherever it is found. There can be no compromise with communism. It is a philosophy that denies God. Its objective is the destruction of all human freedom and to rule the world by terror, tyranny, and bloodshed.

We must fight communism in our midst by preaching and practicing 100-percent Americanism. We must drive out of our educational institutions every teacher who adheres to the communistic doctrine. We must stimulate among our young people a deeper appreciation of American patriotism. We must make American history a basic course of study in every school and college.

Ninth, The increasing tendency toward government by executive directive instead of the constitutional legislative process. This violates the fundamental concept of our Government as one of laws and not of men.

The most recent major example was the directive issued by President Truman on August 10 ordering the dispersal of industry. A few weeks earlier both Houses of Congress had refused, by overwhelming votes, to give the President the power to direct where industrial plants must be located. Nevertheless President Truman, in flagrant violation of the clearly expressed will of Congress, resorted to an executive directive to accomplish what he failed to get through normal legislative channels.

The order gives the administration bureaucrats the power of life and death over all industrial expansion. It is put forward under the pretext that it is a defense measure to minimize the danger of atomic attack. But actually it is another move by the advocates of a planned and controlled economy to disrupt the whole pattern of American industry and place it under a system of socialist control.

No President of the United States has ever been given or has ever assumed such dictatorial power. It is to be enforced by refusing all Government aids for defense production to industries which fail to meet so-called "satisfactory standards of dispersal."

It has been argued that the Government intends only to suggest and encourage the spacing of defense industries a few miles apart. But to my mind the President's order has within it the power to pass a death sentence upon any industry which incurs the displeasure of politically minded bureaucrats. It can curtail defense production. It can destroy the free enterprise system which is the foundation of our industrial greatness.

Tenth. Government competition with private enterprise. The Federal Government owns or is financially interested in about 100 important business enterprises with a direct investment of about \$20,000,000.

The Government is engaged in the business of lending money, guaranteeing loans and deposits, writing life insurance, producing, distributing and selling electric power and fertilizers, operating railways and ships, buying and selling farm products, and smelting and selling metals.

The Government does not belong in any of these business activities. Every dollar that the Government collects in taxes, every dollar that it pours into enterprises that compete with private business or industry, was produced by the free enterprise system. Every dollar that the Government spends was produced because freemen had the courage to risk their savings in ventures that promised a return on their investment.

The thought I would like to leave with you is this:

We will not return to sound, sensible, honest Government unless men like you go out and fight for it.

You have a choice to make.

You can sit back and merely complain about high taxes, excessive spending, socialistic schemes, advancing communism and increasing corruption or you can swing into action.

If you want to win this fight you must come out slugging.

You will have to battle every step of the way against the entrenched power of a bureaucracy with more than 2,500,000 employees on the public payroll.

You will have to struggle against an administration leadership that sees no wrong in lies, deceit, political favoritism, and personal gains from Government loans and contracts.

It will not be easy—but if we go into the fight with the spirit of patriotism and sacrifice, as a great crusade to save America, we can gain a glorious victory.

We can preserve for future generations America's richest resource—freedom of the individual.

Pacific Pacts Tied to Japan Treaty Are United States Reply to Soviet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor of September 1, 1951:

PACIFIC PACTS TIED TO JAPAN TREATY ARE UNITED STATES REPLY TO SOVIET

(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—The Japanese Peace Treaty, scheduled to be signed shortly in San Francisco, is Washington's answer to the Soviet challenge in the Pacific.

But it is not the total answer.

The treaty, believed here not to be in real danger despite Moscow's decision to walk into the conference, and New Delhi's to walk out, is only part of Washington's plan for peace and security in the Pacific.

Its contribution is that it restores Japan to a place of dignity, equality, and opportunity in the Far East; it includes Japan in the family of liberty-loving nations allied against the aggression-minded Soviet bloc; and it puts the greatest industrial workshop in Asia to work for the free world.

Accompanying the treaty will be a series of defense arrangements that are designed to give to the Pacific a sense of security comparable to that given the Atlantic community of nations by the North Atlantic Treaty.

THREE OTHER PACTS

There is the Philippines-American mutual defense pact, being signed here in Washington this week, to be followed by an Australian-New Zealand-American security arrangement for the South Pacific to be signed in San Francisco on the eve of the treaty conference. And, finally, there is a Japanese-American defense pact, designed to assure Japan against Soviet aggression, which allows the stationing of United States forces in the Japanese islands, and which will be signed following the conference.

These three defense pacts aim at covering the Pacific and giving the free nations of that part of the world the assurance of American cooperation in mutual defense against Communist aggression.

Together, the Japanese treaty and these defense pacts constitute Washington's answer to Moscow's imperialist ambitions in the Far East.

DIPLOMATIC CHANNELS

As the delegates gather in San Francisco, the months that have been spent in drafting the treaty text emphasize these facts about the pact:

It is unique in that it has been drawn up entirely through diplomatic channels—not in an assembled conference.

While United States Ambassador John Foster Dulles has done most of the spadework—and footwork—in getting the treaty drafted, other nations have made notable contributions. The British, who are sponsoring the text along with the United States, say that a good half of the final draft is their handiwork.

It is notable, if not unique, in its leniency toward the "enemy." It is nonpunitive, nondiscriminatory. It does not shackle Japan with impossible reparations—in fact, a few nations are saying it does not impose even possible reparations.

JOINT RESPONSIBILITY

It anticipates the future defense of Japan to be a joint responsibility, with the United States and Japan as the original contributors to the islands' security against Soviet aggression, but with other powers possibly entering the picture later.

While the San Francisco Conference, with the Russians attending, is not going to be the perfunctory affair at first envisaged, the prospects of the Soviets disrupting the conference are nil. They and their two satellites attending (Poland and Czechoslovakia) are in a distinct minority, and Moscow possesses no veto it can use for wrecking purposes.

The conference is expected to surmount whatever obstacles Andrei A. Gromyko, Soviet delegate, and his colleagues present, though there are sober second thoughts in the capital that suggest it might have been better to sign—as well as negotiate—the treaty through regular diplomatic channels rather than face the Soviet pyrotechnics at San Francisco.

BILATERAL TREATIES

In anticipation that some nations would not sign the treaty at San Francisco, a novel feature was introduced, authorizing bilateral treaties similar to the main treaty for just such cases. Thus India, which is boycotting the conference, has the opportunity—should it ever have the desire—to negotiate a peace treaty with Japan.

India's action was a greater disappointment to Washington than Russia's decision to attend. For India's presence would have given the conference an extensive Asian flavor.

However, though India and Burma are sitting San Francisco out, the presence of the Philippines, the Indonesians, representatives from the three Indochinese states of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, and delegates from Pakistan, Iran, and Iraq, as well as Liberia and Ethiopia, rob Moscow of its contention that this is a non-Asian treaty and a white-man imposed pact.

But there is no hiding the disappointment, even disillusionment, that fills Washington over Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru's decision to boycott San Francisco. Mr. Nehru is fast becoming in Washington eyes a fallen hero, at a time when his help was much wanted.

General MacArthur's Part in the Japanese Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an Associated Press dispatch entitled "Dulles Congratulation Sent to MacArthur," and an editorial from the Washington (Pa.) Observer entitled "Major Architect of Treaty Not Present," dealing with the part General MacArthur had in the shaping of the Japanese treaty.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DULLES CONGRATULATION SENT TO MACARTHUR

SAN FRANCISCO, September 8 —A telegram of congratulation was dispatched to General MacArthur by John Foster Dulles as the

Japanese Peace Conference came to a close here today.

Mr. Dulles' message, addressed to the general at his hotel in New York, read:

"As we are about to sign the Japanese peace treaty, my thought like the thoughts of other delegates will turn to you.

"You will be present in spirit, for the signing delegates and the witnessing multitudes all know that without your great leadership in war and peace, the results achieved here would not have been obtainable."

General MacArthur, who was removed by President Truman as supreme commander of the United Nations in Japan only last April 10, was not officially invited to the conference.

[From the Washington (Pa.) Observer]
MAJOR ARCHITECT OF TREATY NOT PRESENT

Progress at the conference on the Japanese peace treaty has been most encouraging, but under all rules of sportsmanship and justice it would seem that Gen. Douglas MacArthur should be among those present to at least take a bow.

It is quite true that the shapers of policy are entitled to proper credit for the good and bad results in the Far East, but General MacArthur was the real bulldozer.

Policy is shaped at Washington, but the execution is in the hands of envoys in the field. General MacArthur was made the dominant figure in the Far East and sent to Japan in charge of the occupation of that country.

It was under the leadership of General MacArthur that Japan was transformed from an enemy into a country friendly enough to be restored to its former position among the nations of the world.

The firm hand of General MacArthur halted the Communists in their efforts to gain a foothold in Japan and foiled all their attempts to dominate early diplomatic sessions on the future of Japan.

General MacArthur was given recognition by United States leaders at the conference for the part he played. We believe his presence would have had a fine effect on the representatives of the more than 50 nations present.

General MacArthur may be slighted by those who oppose him, but we believe that history will accord him the honor due him as a warrior and a statesman in the Far East, and Japan in particular. Politicians may have a temporary advantage, but it is seldom that they attain a lasting place in history.

Most Americans know him to be one of our ablest men, and we believe the world recognizes him as such. His deeds and works will stand the test of time and be recorded in full measure in the history of world affairs.

Illegal, or Just Improper?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Illegal, or Just Improper?" which appeared in the August 18 issue of the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post:

ILLEGAL, OR JUST IMPROPER?

Jim Farley, more formally the Honorable James A. Farley, has for many years played

a large part in American affairs, as an adviser to Presidents, as a public official, and now as a head of an important business corporation. No man in American public life has a greater hold on the affections of the American people than Jim Farley.

One reason for this public admiration and respect is the high moral standard he has always maintained. On this point he said something singularly appropriate in an address given at Ithaca College on May 12 this year. He was deploring the cynical attitude which prevails in some high spots both in our own country and others, pretending that a line of conduct which is highly improper is all right provided only that it is not illegal. He said:

"We are told that if the act of a public official is not illegal that it is necessarily proper and always excusable. We are told that there is a fundamental difference between what is illegal and what is improper.

"I do not see this difference because what is illegal is merely one of the improper things that happens to have been the subject of legislative action. We have got to pass judgment against, and so far as we can, eliminate the improper as well as the illegal in our public life.

"Our public servants elected to high office have a duty far greater than that of merely enforcing the law and collecting taxes and spending our money. They have the duty of moral leadership in the country.

"For if they do or condone or permit things that are improper, they are destroying the very fabric of public morals and the poison moves down into all of the ranges of our population. When men in high places make hundreds of thousands of dollars through their improper acts, it is a hard thing to maintain purity and integrity in the sport of boys in college and on the sandlots of the Nation."

When Jim Farley uttered these words in Ithaca no whisper of the impending West Point scandal had reached the Nation. But how prophetic these words were. And how they did hit the West Point nail right on the head.

How the Government Succeeded in Reducing Beef Supplies in the Face of a Record Cattle Population

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Economic Trend Line Studies:

HOW THE GOVERNMENT SUCCEEDED IN REDUCING BEEF SUPPLIES IN THE FACE OF A RECORD CATTLE POPULATION

It is now beginning to be clear that Washington is succeeding in the most difficult and baffling undertaking in all its long and earnest efforts to reduce the food supplies available to the Nation's consumers.

The problem is that of reducing the supply of beef to consumers in the face of the largest beef-cattle population in the history of the country—no less than 46,500,000 cows, calves, and bulls. This achievement now receives the longest horns of all our great national dilemmas.

With sheep it was easy. A bright young man in the Department of Agriculture conceived the brilliant idea of ordering the sheep growers to make their ewes get together and

to pick different times throughout the year to bear their lambs and not have them coming all in a bunch in the spring. The directive was sent out right in the middle of the spring lambing season for maximum effect. The results exceeded everybody's expectation. The sheep population is now the lowest since Civil War days.

When the Government wanted the cotton crop reduced, the Department of Agriculture simply ordered every other row plowed under. With pigs, which expect to be slaughtered eventually anyway, the Department simply ordered a lot of the little squealers exterminated. In reducing the potato supply, the Department had the tubers spread out on fields to rot. They spoil easily anyway.

It wasn't till they came to reducing the egg supply, however, that the agricultural people demonstrated the heights of efficiency and competence of which they are capable. They ordered the egg supply reduced by drying them and then set standards of dryness that taxed the brains and ingenuity of the engineers who designed the dryers. But it was in storing the dried eggs that they showed the touch of imaginative genius and enterprise that identifies Americans throughout the world.

They decided to store dried eggs in a Kansas cave. It was a magnificent idea from a publicity point of view because it exploited the magic of the West which has held the imagination and interest of the American people throughout our history.

With so many brilliant successes behind them it is no wonder that the Washington people decided at last that they were ready to tackle a situation that had defied the efforts of some of the Nation's most practiced bunglers.

It is difficult to exaggerate the formidable character of the problem of reducing the beef supply. All animals multiply at a most alarming rate and cattle are particularly hardy beasts. They graze on the open range or pasture and acquire most tenacious characteristics. On top of this, farmers gorge them with corn after they are taken from the range to give them added weight.

The nature of the bovine is indicated by the fact that it is the adversary in a popular Mexican sport. A bullfighter in disposing of a male bovine faces a difficult and a dangerous task, but afterward the bull is dragged away and heaven knows what becomes of it. In a way a bullfighter can be said to be reducing the beef supply, and certainly in a very courageous way.

At the same time it can be said that the Washington bureaucrats have demonstrated just as much rash courage as a bullfighter in tackling the problem of reducing the beef supply. It should be remembered also that Washington is dealing with the much more difficult female bovine. A cow won't charge like a bull except when protecting her young but when she does she is a much more dangerous animal. You can't distract her by waving a red flag even if she belongs to a Republican.

At any rate there is no denying the enormity of the problem. Here was the cattle population at an all-time high with the imminent prospect of an overabundant supply of beef in the butcher shops. Other Washington administrations might have tried to reduce the beef supply by encouraging people to eat more beef or feed more to their dogs and cats. But the present administration is of a different temper.

Undaunted by the frightening prospect of thick, red steaks piling up in butcher shops until other faces besides the butchers' were red, our great Washington production cutters determinedly sought and found a solution. They found their answers in corn and, like all great discoveries, it turned out to be absurdly simple.

It is well known even in Washington that cattle are fed corn to increase their weight

and thereby enhance the beef supply. Thus with many minds of great energy and competence assailing the problem it was inevitable that one of them should discover that if it were made unprofitable to feed corn to cattle, automatically the increase in beef production would be halted.

Fortunately the Department of Agriculture had already jacked up the prices of corn and other feeds under the farm price parity laws until it wasn't very profitable to put feed into anything but beef cattle and hogs. Thus the only action necessary after the original discovery was made was to reduce the market price of cattle to a point where cattle feeding, too, became unprofitable.

As a matter of fact the most time-consuming decision was encountered in the selection of a name for the action to be taken. It would gain public acceptance much more readily if a name could be found with pleasant and agreeable associations. To call it a price reduction or simply a cut in prices might well offend some sizable block of voters.

After much brain cudgeling and prolonged discussion the word "roll-back" was chosen, first of all because of its association, for example with farm activities. On the farm, there are razorback hogs and farmers often ride horseback. The word "roll-back" has home associations too with our fondly remembered piggy-back rides as children.

From the point of view, roll-back has excellent associations with rolling automobiles and other machines that move on wheels. This is indicated by the popular idiom which describes progress in any effort as getting it rolling. Not to be overlooked either is the words' association with popular songs such as Roll out the Barrel, Roll On, Thou Deep and Mighty Ocean, Roll, and so on. Roll, in fact, suggests ease of movement.

To sum up, the successful outcome of this effort to reduce beef production can be attributed to the discovery that farmers are actuated by the profit motive. Washington had long since learned that businessmen are devoted to making profits to a most unpleasant degree. To find that farmers also want to make money, while a disagreeable discovery in the light of events, it is also a very useful one.

As far as the farmers are concerned, they have simply moved their beef stock from the feed lot to the pasture. Cattle put on very substantially less weight in the pasture. So we have the comforting assurance that the beef supply will diminish throughout the summer. As to the unfed corn, that can be sold to the Government at the prevailing parity prices and we can be sure that the Government will prevent its use to increase anything but rodents and our great Washington bureaucracy.

ECONOMIC TREND STUDIES,
J. H. KELLEGHAN.

McDonough Constitutional Amendment Will Protect Against Loss of Civil Rights by Foreign Treaties

REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, today is the anniversary of the signing of our Constitution which was approved

by the delegates in Philadelphia on September 17, 1787. It is indeed appropriate that on this day legislation should be introduced which will reaffirm our faith in the preservation of our heritage of freedom and rededicate this Nation to the basic rights of the individual through a constitutional amendment which will prevent those rights from abrogation by international treaty or agreement.

The civil rights of the people of the United States may be nullified unless the United States Constitution is amended as I am proposing by the introduction of a House joint resolution today which will have the effect of protecting these rights against the present Supreme Law of the Land clause in the Constitution as it applies to international treaties and agreements.

In view of recent court decisions and the present trend in international treaties, including extraordinary international agreements under the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty, the Rio Treaty with South American Republics, the Mexican Water Treaty and many others, apparently binding upon the United States, but entered into by the President or the Secretary of State on their own authority with or without the consent of the Senate, our civil rights may no longer be secure unless immediate steps are taken to enact the necessary legislation to prevent any treaty or international agreement from nullifying any of the rights guaranteed to citizens of this Nation under the United States Constitution. Many legal experts and the American Bar Association have been studying the need for a constitutional amendment to protect our civil rights and prevent the nullification of these rights by any foreign treaty or international agreement.

Quoting from article VI of the United States Constitution, the provision relating to treaty-making states that "all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land"; and the language of this provision has been subject to controversy among experts on international law almost since the ratification of the Constitution by the Thirteen Original States.

There is today no longer any reason for permitting this provision, which is of vital and personal importance to every United States citizen, to remain vague and subject to varying interpretation in our courts. Our civil rights which guarantee us individual freedom such as no other people in the world enjoy today must be safeguarded from any possible threat.

The amendment to the Constitution which I propose will clearly establish forever the rights of United States citizens under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, and there could be no further question as to any expressed or implied power of a treaty entered into by the United States to have any effect under any circumstances upon these basic rights.

This amendment would not change the treaty-making power or the method of negotiating and ratifying a treaty.

If there are any rights to which individuals should be entitled which could be granted to Americans through international treaty, these rights could still be so established. This amendment only guarantees that no treaty shall ever be permitted to nullify or interfere with any of the rights which are guaranteed to our citizens under the United States Constitution and which we now enjoy. Ratification of this amendment, will forever insure us of a free press, freedom of speech and assembly, freedom of religion, and all other civil rights guaranteed to United States citizens under the Constitution.

House Joint Resolution 325

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the effect of treaties and international agreements upon the civil rights of citizens of the United States

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Treaties made under the authority of the United States and international agreements entered into by the Department of State or by the President shall be void to the extent that they abrogate or interfere with any of the rights guaranteed to citizens of the United States by the Constitution.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission."

Mr. Speaker, the Legislature of the State of California recognized the need for an amendment to the Constitution such as I have proposed when on June 4, 1951, a joint resolution approved by the legislature was submitted to the Senate of the United States which read in part:

Whereas the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and of certain State courts have caused uncertainty in the minds of lawyers and of the public generally concerning the effect of treaties and executive agreements on our Federal and State Constitutions and laws; and

Whereas such uncertainty should immediately be clarified; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby petitioned and urged to immediately submit to the several States an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and the following form of said amendment is hereby suggested, to wit:

1. The representative form of Federal Government, consisting of the Congress, the executive, and the judiciary, the sovereignty of the governments of the several States, the express limitations on the powers of Congress, the guaranties of individual liberties, and the independence of the Federal judiciary, contained and guaranteed in and by this Constitution and in particular the first 10 amendments thereto, shall not be abolished nor altered by any treaty or executive agreement.

Judges as Witnesses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, nick-naming Congresses which terminate during a presidential election year has become a popular and profitable sport in some quarters. It may be that this will be known as the Ethical Eighty-Second. Certainly, the room for improvement in this field become more apparent each day.

One large step forward would be accomplished in my opinion by the passage of a bill to prohibit judges from testifying as character witnesses. Two editorials supporting the proposal and pointing out the need for such legislation appeared recently in the San Francisco News and the Corpus Christi (Tex.) Caller.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include them below:

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) News of July 20, 1951]

TOWARD ETHICAL CONDUCT BY SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

A Senate committee is investigating ethics, or their lack, in the conduct of Government agencies. And some Members of Congress are talking of enacting a code of morals to be applied to officials of the executive departments.

A bill just put before Congress deals with ethics on another high level—the ethics of Supreme Court Justices.

Introduced by Representative KENNETH KEATING, Republican, of New York, and approved unanimously by eight members of a House Judiciary subcommittee, it would prohibit Justices of the Supreme Court from testifying as character witnesses in any court.

This bill is a direct result of testimony as character witnesses by Justices Felix Frankfurter and Stanley Reed in the perjury trial of Alger Hiss, who despite their favorable words in his behalf, was convicted of lying under oath when he denied giving Government secrets to a Communist agent.

The two Justices not only proved themselves poor judges of character, as Mr. KEATING points out, they disqualified themselves from taking part in consideration of the subsequent appeal by Hiss. And they placed other Supreme Court members in the awkward position of being forced to pass on the guilt or innocence of a person whose character their colleagues had endorsed under oath.

It is unfortunate that Congress should feel it necessary to legislate a common-sense standard of ethical conduct for members of the Nation's highest court. But Justices Reed and Frankfurter are responsible for that necessity. The Keating bill should become law.

[From the Corpus Christi (Tex.) Caller of July 17, 1951]

JUDGES AS WITNESSES

In the first trial of Alger Hiss, convicted of lying about his Communist affiliations, three Federal judges testified in his behalf as character witnesses. Two were Justices of the United States Supreme Court. Justice Reed had been subpoenaed by the Hiss de-

fense. Justice Frankfurter was a voluntary witness. Chief Justice Magruder, of the United States court of appeals, was the third.

Now a bill by Representative KEATING, Republican, of New York, has been approved by a House Judiciary subcommittee which would bar Justices of the United States Supreme Court from testifying as character witnesses, or on matters of opinion, and is expected to come before the full committee soon. Mr. KEATING said frankly that he was motivated by the Reed-Frankfurter appearances in behalf of Hiss.

Representative SMITH, Republican, of Wisconsin, proposes an alternative to the Keating bill. The Smith bill would provide simply that no Federal judge could be compelled to testify as to character or to appear as a witness if similar testimony could be obtained from other witnesses.

In behalf of his bill, Representative KEATING suggests the possibility that some smart lawyer might subpoena most or all the members of the Supreme Court in a lower court trial; then the highest Court would be unable to pass on an appeal in the case. Justices Reed and Frankfurter disqualified themselves when the Hiss appeal came before the Court.

Appearance of Supreme Court Judges as witnesses is extremely rare. Somebody has unearthed a case in 1905 in which the names of two Justices appeared on the list of witnesses, but there is no record that they actually testified.

The House subcommittee considering the Keating bill received a letter from Fred Vinson, Chief Justice of the United States, declining to comment on the bill. He said he and his colleagues felt that they should not place themselves on record. The reason is obvious: The high Court might someday have to pass on the constitutionality of the bill.

Amendments to Railroad Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

STATEMENT OF THE RAILWAY LABOR EXECUTIVES' ASSOCIATION WITH RESPECT TO ACTION TAKEN BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE ON AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

On August 23, 1951, a majority of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce adopted a substitute for all of the vital provisions of the original Crosser bill, H. R. 3669, generally referred to as the Railway Labor Executives' Association bill. The substitute adopted by the committee provides a 15-percent increase in benefits for pensioners and annuitants and a 33 1/3-percent increase for survivors.

The Railway Labor Executives' Association is flatly opposed to the enactment by the Congress of the committee bill. The committee bill fails in several important respects to assure the railroad workers, their widows and survivors, adequate protection in the light of present economic conditions and does not accord railroad workers equitable retirement in comparison with workers in other industries, in spite of the much higher taxes paid by railroad employees.

The four glaring deficiencies cited below completely justify our indictment of the substitute adopted by the committee:

1. If the substitute bill is enacted into law, some 60,000 current annuitants and pensioners, and many thousands of future annuitants under the Railroad Retirement Act, would receive less than they would if they were under the social-security system.

2. Practically all widows and all other survivors, including orphans, would receive less than they would receive under the social-security system. The following table clearly demonstrates the inadequate survivor benefits provided by the committee bill when compared with benefits under the present social-security system, and with the provisions of the original Crosser bill, H. R. 3669. This table is based on 7 years taxable service which at present is the average upon which existing survivor benefits have been computed.

Widows only

	Average monthly pay \$100	Average monthly pay \$150	Average monthly pay \$200
Present Railroad Retirement Act	\$26 09	\$30 10	\$34 11
Committee substitute bill	34 78	40 13	45 48
Present Social Security Act	37 50	43 13	48 75
Crosser bill, H. R. 3669	47 00	52 00	57 00

Widow with 1 dependent child

	Average monthly pay \$100	Average monthly pay \$150	Average monthly pay \$200
Present Railroad Retirement Act	\$13 48	\$50 17	\$56 85
Committee substitute bill	57 97	66 88	75 80
Present Social Security Act	75 00	86 26	97 50
Crosser bill, H. R. 3669	91 00	101 00	111 00

A glance at the above table illustrates vividly the shortcomings of the committee bill. In all of these instances, under the provisions of the committee bill, widows and orphans would receive less than they would receive under the Social Security Act. This deficiency on the part of the committee bill is sharply accentuated by the fact that the Crosser bill, H. R. 3669, in every instance provides more for the widows and orphans than is provided for in social security. This is completely justified in view of the higher taxes paid by railroad employees.

3. Based on actuarial estimates, the cost of the committee bill over and above income is 2.21 percent of taxable payroll. This creates a serious condition because the substitute provides for no savings to the fund nor does it provide for any additional revenues to the fund.

4. By increasing the benefits on a straight percentage basis, the committee bill gives the least consideration to the people whose needs are the greatest. The surviving widows of deceased railroad men are now receiving an average of \$29 68 per month. The average dependent child is receiving \$17 18 per month. The need in this category is the most compelling. A percentage increase across the board fails utterly to make the needed adjustments required by present economic conditions.

5. The Crosser bill, H. R. 3669, is superior to the committee bill for the following reasons:

1. Increases of 13.8 percent and 15 percent for annuitants and pensioners is provided along with a guaranty that in no case shall the minimum to which a beneficiary is entitled be less than he would receive if covered by social security. This guarantees

that no one in the railroad system will receive less than he would if covered by social security.

2. Surviving widows, dependent children, orphans, and parents are increased at least 60 percent and in many cases in excess of 80 percent. This restores the survivor benefits under the railroad system to a position better than social security by approximately 25 percent. This relationship between railroad survivors and social-security survivors is fully justified by the higher railroad tax rate and is in conformity with the intent of Congress in the establishment of survivor benefits for railroad employees.

3. The spouse's benefit is provided in H. R. 3669. Persons covered by social security are now entitled to spouse's benefit. It is not possible to justify a substantially greater railroad retirement tax rate without providing benefits equal to that of Social Security. In addition to recognizing the need of aged wives in this inflationary period, this section affords railroad employees the same consideration now being given persons covered by social security. The committee bill ignores the wives.

4. The annuities of persons retiring in the future will be increased substantially by the advancement of the creditable maximum from \$300 per month to \$400 per month.

The Crosser bill, H. R. 3669, can provide the substantially better benefits described above because it contains financing features and makes provisions to pay its own way. This is accomplished in the following manner:

1. The work restriction clause identical to that provided in social security which improves administration and balances Congress' policy in this respect.

2. The elimination of duplicate credit for prior service on which no taxes have been paid.

3. The transfer of casual employees who are not career railroad workers from the railroad retirement system to the social security system. At the same time this section guarantees that the affected employee shall not be made to suffer a financial loss as a result of having paid taxes into the railroad system.

4. Increases the taxable and creditable maximum compensation base from \$300 to \$400 per month.

The Railway Labor Executives' Association will make every effort to restore the original provisions of H. R. 3669. This bill was prepared after more than a year of study and consultation with the best experts in the field and is an integrated proposal with proper checks and balances which will continue our railroad retirement system on a firm and sound financial basis.

G. E. LEIGHTY,
Chairman.

Lower Marias Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD additional editorial comment on the controversy which has arisen as the result of the article on the Lower Marias project, Montana, recently published in the Saturday Evening Post.

I believe this editorial, coming as it does from a newspaper in the Midwest,

far removed from the project itself, is noteworthy as an objective appraisal of the Post article:

[From the Moline (Ill.) Daily Dispatch of September 4, 1951]

POST GOES OUT ON LIMB IN MONTANA WATER ROW

In the Saturday Evening Post of August 25, an article entitled "The Big Water Gyp in Montana" describes how a group of 100 farmers fought the United States Bureau of Reclamation's program of damming the Marias River to irrigate the 37,512 dry acres of land they owned.

The article portrays rather colorfully how the farmers hauled the Bureau into court, made it get out of their area and stay out. The picture painted is one of hardy individualists scorning Federal charity and having to battle the big powers of the Federal Government to a standstill in court.

We are tardy in discussing the Post article because we've been doing some checking. The Dispatch has repeatedly found fault with the Bureau of Reclamation's tendency to squander money, and we felt that the Post article might provide heavy ammunition to fire another round at the Bureau.

But our investigation, which netted a long letter from the Bureau, articles and editorials from three Montana newspapers and statements by various persons involved in the case, indicate that in this instance it was the Post and not the Bureau that was all wet.

Space does not permit a full analysis of the variances between the Post article, written by one Edmund Christopherson, and the facts of the case, but here is a sample of inaccuracies, misstatements and misleading implications in the article:

1. The Post says the Montanans "hauled the Bureau into court." The facts are that the court hearing was on the districting of 127,000 acres for irrigation purposes at the petition of about 425 farmers operating as the Marias Improvement Association. Another 100 farmers, operating as the Lonesome Prairie Protective Association, submitted an accompanying petition that their lands be excluded from the irrigation district. After a hearing, which apparently was not "long and bitter" as the Post says, the court allowed both petitions. The Bureau did not figure in the court case at all, except in an advisory capacity at the judge's request after the arguments were heard.

2. The Post implies that the Bureau originated the "gyp" plan and "intended to shove the project down the ranchers' throats." The Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, which should know, says the lower Marias irrigation project was dreamed up by one William Cowan, of Box Elder, Mont., in 1898 and was promoted by him and a number of small-scale farmers until the dream was realized in 1950.

3. The Post says Bureau Chief W. G. Sloan—a "big gun rolled out just in case"—threatened the farmers with the bureau's power. Sloan made one speech in Big Sandy, Mont., at the request of the Marias Improvement Association, explaining the project. We couldn't find evidence that Sloan had fired any big guns.

4. The Post fails to present arguments in favor of irrigating the lower Marias sector, as offered by the large group of proponents.

We regret to see such a reliable publication as the Post fall for an apparently phony crusade. We regret further that the Bureau of Reclamation was misrepresented as a Federal agency which shuffles people and money around like a Fascist power. There is enough confusion about the Bureau's true merits—and demerits—as it is.

It's all right with us when the Bureau or any other Government agency is criticized, but not when the criticism is not based on the truth.

Brevity at the Expense of Clarity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the September 14 Washington Times-Herald entitled "Bvrvty at the Xpns of Clrty." Translated, I presume, that means "Brevity at the Expense of Clarity."

It is gratifying, Mr. Speaker, to know that someone besides myself is distressed at the gobbledygook with which we here in Washington—and throughout the country, for that matter—have to deal in our everyday relationship with our present administration and its multitudinous agencies.

I have noted long lines of letters and numbers on letters which I receive in my office, with the notation to refer to this identifying mark in making reply. I am not objecting to that necessarily. I understand that some sort of system must be adopted to keep separate the triplicate and more copies of letters, most of which will be filed away and promptly forgotten.

But as our administration's ever-growing patronage list in the guise of necessary agencies expands, the more complex, proportionately, becomes gobbledygook in its various forms.

There is one place, however, that I believe such double-talk should be eliminated: in the budget requests submitted by the several departments and innumerable agencies. Brevity, yes; clarity, by all means. But clarity should not be sacrificed for brevity.

Perhaps the point is labored a bit in this editorial, but it strikes home.

BVRYTY AT THE XPNS OF CLRTY

Commander John R. Howard of the Navy contributes a complaint to the Marine Corps Gazette on the kind of language used in the services to write operations orders or other official papers. He says that if the addiction to abbreviation grows any worse, it will be necessary to provide in the TO [tables of organization] for specialists to follow each commander, like a commissar in the Red Army, for the purpose of translating this military gobbledygook into basic English.

First, says Commander Howard, the writers of military communications eliminated all articles. If you are in uniform, you don't write "The quick brown fox jumped over the lazy dog," but "Quick brown fox jumped over lazy dog." Having accomplished this, the military authors reduced everything to consonants. Commander Howard says that to those long subjected to this jargon an old, obsolete vowel is enough to bring tears of nostalgia to the eyes.

If universally adopted, the commander suggests, the language of love would be expressed as follows: "I lv you drly, my darlg. Lt's hv a kss." Citing an actual example, the commander offers: "Send 3 Os and 12 Trs to this HQ. These prs are needed at once." Translated, this means that headquarters orders that 3 officers and 12 enlisted [troop] personnel be sent to it at once, as they are urgently needed. He says when he reads a dispatch of this kind he is strongly

tempted to put the "u" back in "color" as the British do.

The word aircraft is customarily rendered "ac" in one service, while in another that term is used to mean "accounts receivable."

"Picture an officer expecting several aircraft [acft to him] to arrive with reinforcements," suggests Commander Howard. "He receives a message from an officer of another service which reads, 'Ur ac arvd at 1800 pd Rpt at once.' Thinking his bills have finally caught up with him, the poor fellow leads a banzal charge."

The habits of expression cited by Commander Howard have had a not negligible influence in corrupting the language, already in a sad enough way. When some 18,000,000 persons are exposed to this sort of thing in one of the country's major wars, a force has been unleashed hardly less dangerous to decent English than that of the bureaucratic scribes who draft Federal regulations.

Who Should Do Choosing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the caliber and character of our military leaders is of ever-increasing importance to the future safety of this Nation. It does not take a prophet to see that this state of affairs will continue for years and perhaps generations to come. Rational self-interest, therefore, dictates that our choice of men who will be the top echelon in years to come must be the best possible. It was for this reason that I recently introduced House Resolution 374, authorizing an investigation into the methods of appointing men to West Point and Annapolis.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the *Ithaca (N. Y.) Journal* on this subject:

WHO SHOULD DO CHOOSING?

Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, Rochester Republican, raised a recurrent issue and doubt when he recently declared it is highly questionable whether candidates for the service academies should be selected by Members of Congress.

"What peculiar qualification does a Senator or Representative have which enables him to select young men who are likely to make the best Army, Navy, or Air Force officers?" he asked.

"I am not sure," he continued, "that a higher caliber of youth in both character and ability would not result from selection through a process of screening by an independent board or otherwise."

The charge is often heard, whether justified or not, that "pull" and having political connections is the open sesame to the military academies, and that exclusive criteria of character and ability do not exist. It hardly can be charged against Members of Congress in all instances that they try to make a good choice that will do themselves the most political good. But such suspicions ever will exist under the present system. For good of the Nation and all concerned, it might be best if a system dedicated solely to obtaining only the best qualified youths could be devised.

It is of the mythology of purported American democracy that all should have equal opportunity within limitations of ability and

capacity. To remove ugly suspicion of the existence of an elite from which candidates are taken would be all to the good.

Mr. KEATING has properly introduced a bill calling for a House Armed Services Committee study of present methods of selection and directing the group to report any changes in the procedure it "may deem proper in the public interest."

Missouri-Kansas-Oklahoma Flood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MYRON V. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks to further inform the Members of Congress as to the terrible devastation that has taken place by floods in these States in the Midwest, I wish to call the attention of Members to an article written by RUSSELL V. MACK, Congressman, Third District, of the State of Washington. Congressman MACK accompanied the Public Works Committee on their tour of part of this devastated area.

Mr. MACK describes the damage done in the Missouri-Kansas River Basin as he saw it. I wish to call the attention of the members to the fact that this flooded area included all the river watersheds of Kansas, except those regulated by flood control dams. The total damage to our State will run well over \$700,000,000.

The article follows:

THE KANSAS-MISSOURI FLOOD

(By Congressman RUSSELL V. MACK, of Washington)

I was one of 12 Congressmen who were members of a committee which, over Saturday, Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday spent 4 days inspecting the flood damage done in Kansas and Missouri by the recent floods and in holding hearings in the flooded area on how Congress might cooperate to prevent a recurrence of such a disaster.

The Kansas-Missouri flood was the greatest disaster, outside of a war, that has ever afflicted our country. Damage done by this single flood is estimated at more than \$1,000,000,000. The damage was far greater than that done by the San Francisco earthquake and fire, the Jamestown flood or the Galveston tidal wave.

In Kansas City I saw one area where about 4,000 homes were destroyed or badly damaged by the flood. In this one area alone, 11,600 people were made homeless. The damage in this one area was estimated at \$170,000,000.

In an industrial area of Kansas City, the damage was estimated at \$200,000,000 with many scores of industrial plants being put out of operation by the flood water and hundreds of stores flooded almost to ceiling height by the muddy waters.

In Topeka, Kans., about one-third of this city of 100,000 was flooded to depths up to 20 feet. This city was, at one time, crowded with 29,000 refugees. Four thousand homes were flooded with 8 to 20 feet of water. All of these homes had mud and muck in them 3 to 6 feet deep. When I was there, many of the occupants were engaged in shovelling this muck out of their dwellings.

In Topeka, as in Kansas City, the flood waters and mud had ruined the household furniture in the flooded dwellings. Over-

stuffed davenport and chairs were damaged beyond repair by the mud and water. The residents of hundreds of these homes dumped their overstuffed furniture into the streets to be hauled away by the garbage collectors. Bedroom suits, chairs, and wood furniture were washed clean of varnish and in most cases were warped beyond repair. Even pianos were dumped into the streets, so bad was their condition after the flood had receded.

I saw at least 500 automobiles—there must have been thousands of these, that were caught in the floods. There was mud and muck in them that extended in a solid mass from the floor to above the seats. These cars, including the engine, were filled with silt and sand. Repairmen warned motorists from attempting to move their cars. These cars were being picked up by trucks and hauled into repair shops where they will have to be taken entirely apart, every part cleaned and oiled and then reassembled. In Topeka, one dealer had 450 new cars flooded in this way.

In the vicinity of Topeka more than 10,000 head of livestock were drowned. Several thousand of these animals while still alive swam to the only green things in sight, the tree tops, and settled in crotches of these, where they died of starvation, thirst, and exhaustion. Ten days later, when the floods receded, the United States Engineers went into the territory and dynamited the swollen and rotting carcasses, which was the only way to get them out of the trees.

The floods covered, I was told, 2,100,000 acres, which is the area twice as great as that of the entire State of Rhode Island. I saw hundreds of square miles of this territory with its farm lands covered with a foot to 6 feet of silt and sand. Much of this will have to be scraped from the land before it can be used again. This year's crops in the area are ruined.

In one railroad yard 8,000 railroad cars were flooded, and of these 1,700 were loaded with merchandise, all of which was ruined. Among these cars were many hundreds loaded with grain. When the grain became soaked it bulged, blowing out the cars in great swellings that almost burst them. In Topeka four high bridges, much higher than most of our western ones, extend across the river. The flood waters ran across the floors of these bridges, and two of the bridges were washed away. In an attempt to save one of the railroad bridges heavy railroad locomotives were run out upon it to weight it down. Despite this the center span of this bridge was washed away, and with it four huge railroad locomotives went into the river.

Prior to going to the desolated area I had read much about the damage done by this gigantic flood. However, no writer can tell the story of the magnitude of the great desolation it wrought. One has to see it, as I did as a member of the congressional committee, to have any understanding of the magnitude of this disaster and of the heroic spirit with which its victims have reacted to this overwhelming adversity.

Behold Acheson's Vindication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Behold Acheson's Vindication,"

published in the September 14 edition of the *Montgomery Advertiser* and written by the brilliant young editor of the paper, Capt. Grover C. Hall, Jr.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

BEHOLD ACHESON'S VINDICATION

The *Advertiser* is proud of the fact that it did not join the pack baying for Secretary of State Acheson's resignation last winter and spring.

The *Advertiser* was one of the few American newspapers that stood fast in its support of Acheson.

The *Advertiser's* position was lonely a few months ago. It is less lonely now.

We see on the front pages of papers this week a photograph of Acheson leaving the State Department. The caption says:

"Secretary of State Acheson has suddenly soared into such high public regard that people now wait outside the State Department doors in Washington to cheer him as he emerges. Acheson, who was held low in public favor just a few weeks ago, became a diplomatic idol with his skillful handling of the Japanese Treaty Conference. Here he waves to applauding admirers."

We see on front pages—wonder of wonders—Acheson's tormentor, the foul McCarthy, making grudging concession that Acheson laid the Russians out in great style at San Francisco.

We see Senator Knowland, often a passionate Acheson critic, conceding out of his intellectual honesty that "Acheson was superb" and did an "outstanding job" in lining up the world with Uncle Sam against Russia.

The Republican Dewey praises Acheson for "fine handling."

So recently as last May there was a national clamor to sack Acheson. Even Attorney General J. Howard McGrath, thinking of the 1952 election, shamefully and publicly sought to prod Acheson to walk the plank.

The *Washington Post*, formerly an Acheson supporter, abandoned him, saying, "At home as well as abroad he is a political deadweight. Foreign policy in his regime has become merely a carbon copy of Pentagon strategy without regard to policy or principle."

The *Advertiser* (of May 3) dissented.

"Defending Secretary Acheson is plowing in wet ground, but, nevertheless, here goes a furrow . . . Isn't it a whit paradoxical for newspapers that systematically entreat Mr. Truman to quit 'playing politics' to give Acheson the heave-ho for the reason that he is a 'political deadweight'?"

"It is a singular statement the *Washington Post* makes in asserting that the Secretary is barren of 'principle.' Was the intervention in Korea to defend a tiny state 5,000 miles away against an aggressor anything less than an act of principle of the first magnitude?"

"When Acheson sponsored a hedge of bayonets in Europe through the North Atlantic Pact was that less than an act of principle?"

"When Acheson lent himself to the Marshall plan to revive Europe, was that a lack of 'policy and principle'?"

"The truth is that no man in this Republic has fashioned more methods for resisting Russia than Acheson."

"And, finally, we may view the matter (resignation) from the Secretary's standpoint. It is reported that he has acted with complete propriety in offering his resignation to the President several times. It was not accepted."

"The Secretary has done his duty. He himself believes in his policies and himself. Is any parent in Alabama raising his kid to quit in such circumstances?"

The American people, by insisting upon the stacking of arms in 1945, were responsible for the Korean extremity. But Acheson became the goat.

The national cry for his resignation rose to siren pitch.

It began to subside when Acheson appeared before the MacArthur investigating committee and flattened his Republican tormentors.

They felt his steel and recoiled from it.

Only when in the grip of panic and tantrum could the country lap the dish that Acheson was an appeaser. He was, as should now be plain to the most obstinate among the dull, the worst enemy the Russians have had in America.

He has been the mainspring in the Berlin airlift, the North Atlantic Pact, the Marshall plan, the Korean intervention, and the system of military alliances in the Pacific.

When the Kremlin looks at Acheson it sees the man whose Marshall-plan inspiration kept the Russians from taking France and Italy as they took Czechoslovakia; at the man who has ceaselessly labored to hedge in Russia with bayonets in the east and in the west, at the cold, resolute negotiator who gave them the bum's rush at San Francisco.

It is preposterous—and always has been—to call Acheson an appeaser. He is, contrarily, the world's leading exporter of Russian frustration.

Consider this San Francisco report in *Time* magazine:

"The 49 signers of the Japanese Peace Treaty wrote a resounding diplomatic victory for the world's free nations, the sharpest defeat yet suffered by Communists. San Francisco was the most clean-cut demonstration yet of what bold United States initiative can accomplish. This fact centered particularly on two men, John Foster Dulles, and Acheson."

"Acheson personified United States determination to get on with the job. By contrast, the Russians sounded strangely half-hearted and ineffective. Against the west's new and surprising unity, the Communists had lost the power to paralyze, terrorize, and delay."

"Not even the frank threat from the Peking Radio that the fate of the Kaesong armistice talks might hang on events at San Francisco could crack the unanimity of the non-Communist world."

"Up stood Asians, Buddhists, and Moslems alike. Up stood small nations, which had trembled before at the first hint of Russian displeasure. Up stood those who had their own disputes with each other, but could resolve them in favor of a united front. Iran and Egypt, at Britain's throat in the Middle East, could still sign with her to stabilize the Pacific."

"Nor was the Japanese Treaty the only accomplishment . . . A new network of mutual defense treaties—between the United States and the Philippines, between the United States and Japan, a third among the United States, New Zealand, and Australia—projected United States strength into the Pacific as a stabilizing force against the old rivalries that communism loves to exploit."

This is an extraordinary diplomatic achievement. The *Advertiser* believes it firmly undergirds its oft repeated statement that America is winning the cold war.

From this triumph in the Pacific area Acheson rushed to a conference wherein to defy the Russians by tapping German resources for Eisenhower's growing army.

The arming of Japan and Germany may cause Russia to go to war. The risk has to be borne. But in any event, you can scarcely call the chief sponsor of this defiant, awesomely defiant act an "appeaser."

Thus when the Kremlin glowers at the lean and unflinching Acheson it beholds him who is organizing and arraying the world against Russia.

It is our considered opinion that the Russians would rather hang Acheson than Tito.

Additional Employees for the Senate Committee on Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the *RECORD* an editorial entitled "Needed: Some Devil's Advocates," published in the *Washington Evening Star* of September 17, 1951, dealing with an appropriation for additional employees for the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

NEEDED: SOME DEVIL'S ADVOCATES

In the course of approving the appropriation bill last week which covers the expenses of Congress the Senate adopted an amendment adding \$20,000 for the hire of additional employees of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

The amount of money involved was inconsequential. But the principle under discussion is important. And the unusually strong bipartisan support for the amendment reflected what seems to be an increasing spirit of frustration in Congress after the relatively futile efforts this year to cut down on prodigious Government spending.

The idea behind the amendment, originally proposed in another form by Senator THYE, of Minnesota, is to create in the Senate an expert staff adequate to deal not merely with budget recommendations for new appropriations, but to keep Congress more intimately abreast of how past appropriations are being spent. One logical way to go about this might be to increase the staff of the General Accounting Office, which is an agency of the legislative branch. But as Senator FERGUSON reminded the Senate, that move has been defeated by congressional refusal to appropriate the necessary funds.

The situation as it now is was summed up from two points of view by Senator McCLELLAN and Senator FERGUSON. Senator McCLELLAN said that the appropriations committees of Congress hear a one-sided presentation of budget estimates. The arguments all come from the people who are recommending the money that they want to spend. "We have to act on ex parte testimony," he said, "or we have to act arbitrarily in making reductions without having much information upon which to base reductions."

What this means in practice was described by Senator FERGUSON. For committee staff work on the \$57,000,000,000 military bill, one staff man was assigned. For two other appropriations bills, aggregating \$7,500,000,000, one staff member was assigned. There are not enough staff men on the Senate side to spare more than one for each bill, and in most cases one man must handle two or more bills. A really adequate job of analyzing these measures, said the Senator, would require the services of scores of technicians. All the Senate is planning to do now is to assign three or four men, with clerical help, to the job of analyzing each appropriation bill.

Senator DIRKSEN thought the additional appropriation requested should be a million dollars, instead of \$50,000. There is pending a bill, to which Senator McCLELLAN referred, to create a joint committee whose staff would work for both House and Senate in analyzing all appropriations—for the

House now maintains its own staff for that purpose. If, as President Truman seems to imply, real economy is the work of the devil, then Congress needs to organize a staff of devil's advocates who will spend all their time showing ways and means to reduce estimates sent to Congress from the Budget Bureau and the President.

While the debate over the tiny \$50,000 item was in progress, Senator BYRD's Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-essential Federal Expenditures was hearing some dismal testimony. The upshot of it seemed to be that Congress has practically lost control of the Government's purse strings. The purpose of the hearings now in progress is to develop some plan to regain that control. Such men as Representative DOUGHTON, the veteran chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, said that there is no remaining method that he knows of to increase taxes again without endangering our national economy. Senator GEORGE, who has just finished hearings on the new tax bill, said the same thing. And this opinion is expressed in the light of prospective deficits of ten to fifteen billions a year—if the present rate of expenditure continues—even after the new tax bill goes into effect.

President Truman told an audience of cheering Democrats in San Francisco the other day that our prosperity and strength—"beyond anything the people ever dreamed of"—are the result of the system of free enterprise. The mood of Congress now is that the free enterprise system itself depends on whether new ways to reduce Government spending can be found.

Cuckoo Statistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose the following editorial from the Boston (Mass.) Herald of September 14, 1951:

Cuckoo Statistics

President Truman slings a mean statistic. A casual reader of his budget-defense address Tuesday gets the impression that, considering the defense effort, Government expenditures are quite modest, kept that way by a penny-pinching Chief Executive.

Yet here are record taxes, with at least another \$6,000,000,000 coming up. What's wrong?

It's the way the President uses the statistics. These may not be the kind he calls butterfly statistics, taken out of the air with a net. They are cuckoo statistics, come to lay eggs in the wrong nest.

The President extracts defense expenditures from the budget because we must pay what it costs to be free. He extracts the national debt because we can't repudiate the signed obligations of the United States. He extracts veteran costs because he doesn't believe in economizing at the expense of men who have bared their breasts to save the country. He also extracts grants for the blind, aged, and needy, with the statement that money couldn't be spent for a better purpose. And finally he extracts a little half-billion item for highway grants, which somehow also carries an appearance of inevitability.

So, with \$60,000,000,000 written off as sacrosanct, the \$8,000,000,000 that is left just cov-

ers the bare cost of essential Government operations, like the Coast Guard, the FBI and the Public Health Service. Or so the President says.

It's an old trick, this marking off untouchable budget items. Too old to be convincing. For the chances for economy are everywhere. Even in the interest on the national debt.

Included in the debt item are a bunch of interest payment to Government trust funds and Federal corporations and agencies, and these payments form a concealed subsidy. The national service life insurance fund invests in Government securities and gets 3 percent interest, compared with the 2.2 percent paid to public purchasers of Government bonds. A couple of retirement funds and an Indian trust fund get 4 percent out of the Government. Taxpayers getting refunds from the Government enjoy 6 percent interest.

The Tax Foundation, Inc., computed that \$145,000,000 a year could be saved here, without incurring any of the dishonor Mr. Truman suggests.

If there are not savings also to be made in defense, veterans and grants to the States, then the millennium is here.

The President also has a prize cuckoo statistic in the statement that over the last 5 years "we" have operated the Government with a surplus of nearly \$8,000,000,000. "We" indeed. The despised Republican Eightieth Congress, over Mr. Truman's own vehement objections, effected reductions or rescissions in budget requests amounting to almost \$10,000,000,000. By far the greatest part of "my" 5-year surplus was achieved by the Republicans.

Even the present Democratic Congress has already cut \$2,000,000,000 off what the President calls his tight budget, and it's not finished yet.

But what is going to be hard for the average citizen to take is the President's calm assumption that all the complaint about taxes is really just blowing off steam—half the fun of being a citizen in this country comes from complaining. And he cites the man who goes into a night club and pays \$40 or \$50 but screams about a \$30 tax bill.

Believe us, Mr. President, any man who spends like that has a \$3,000, not a \$30, tax bill.

As against cuckoo statistics, let us have butterfly statistics.

Burial in Arlington of Sgt. John R. Rice, Winnebago Indian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the American press has innumerable writers who express the ideals and philosophies of our Government correctly. Amongst the many who have expressed them is Mr. Thomas L. Stokes. Only lately Mr. Stokes has written a very fine exposition of American ideals. It had to do with the burial of Sgt. John R. Rice, the American Indian boy, at Arlington.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the Record for the benefit of posterity.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINDFUL OF OUR OWN FRAILTIES—BODY OF AMERICAN INDIAN HERO RESTS IN ARLINGTON CEMETERY AFTER REFUSAL OF GRAVE IN LAND WHERE FOREBEARS ROAMED

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

They have buried Sgt. John R. Rice, a native American, with full honors among the immigrants in Arlington National Cemetery.

He had no choice—this Winnebago Indian who, himself, had chosen voluntarily to serve the United States of America in two wars, the Second World War and the Korean War, in which he gave his life exactly 1 year ago. He had reenlisted in January 1946 after serving 4 years previously, and a veritable catalogue of decorations attest to his bravery.

John Rice had no choice as to where he would rest in eternity. His family had arranged, naturally, for his burial back home and had bought a lot in a Sioux City cemetery, which was appropriate in another symbolic way, too, for the Winnebagoes were members of the Sioux confederacy.

But that cemetery was only for "Caucasians," a restriction that applies to so many cemeteries all over this land of exclusive immigrants, and no place, certainly, for a dead Indian, even if a good Indian. So the President of the United States offered the family a place in Arlington National Cemetery, and they brought John Rice here.

For a word from the President of the United States is an order.

John Rice never had any choice. Nor did his family.

But, standing there watching the ceremony over Sergeant Rice, one could imagine that it would suit him well enough. The grave was dug on a hillside, with a young oak a few feet below it that will grow in time to spread its kindly shade over John Rice, two young catalpa trees just above it on the hillside and, across the paved road, another hill rising gently upward. In this green valley, had the road been a stream, you might well think yourself in Iowa about this time of the year, or Wisconsin where John's forefathers lived, or in any of the rolling prairie country, rich and lush, where his ancestors roamed so contentedly for so long—until the immigrants swarmed in hungrily, with a Bible in one hand and a musket in the other.

John Rice lies now among their descendants, men who like himself served their country in the United States Army. The little white slabs rose all around—William J. Weakley from West Virginia and Joseph Shurdan from Ohio and Carl Lowndes from Mississippi and William C. Thurman from New Jersey and Frederick De Sales from Maryland. And across the hill lie Gen. John J. Pershing and Gen. "Hap" Arnold and Gen. Walton Walker, commander of the Eighth Army who also died in Korea.

It's all democratic there, with no salutes required, and no questionnaires with race and color to be filled in.

John Rice became unwittingly a minority problem. His forebears were not the minority when the first immigrants arrived, when De Soto landed in Florida and drove his army of 600 through the swamps and morasses and wilderness of what later became Georgia; when Tonti and La Salle penetrated into John Rice's own native country; when Capt. John Smith unloaded his pallid sojourners at Jamestown; when the self-consciously righteous and forbidding Puritans embarked on New England's equally forbidding shores. Then an Indian could choose the whole continent to bury his dead, and no one to say him nay, and no restricting papers flashed in his face.

It all belonged to him.

The hypocrisy of refusing John Rice a grave anywhere in this country—when who has a better right?—was compounded somehow for an observer of the ceremonies in the showy and unctuous way we seek to absolve ourselves from our crimes against ourselves. As if we could wash it all away by draping our flag—which John Rice followed to his death and which covers so often such a multitude of our own sins—across his coffin and carting it on a caisson, with soldiers tramping along behind, and a band, and officials representing various branches of the Government and the services, and photographers rushing about and us reporters noting every little detail to prove to ourselves by a public record how fine a breed we immigrants are.

Referred to here is the idea, not the execution of it, for it was a simple, beautiful, and moving ceremony, something that John Rice's family and relations who were present can cherish—if they can forgive. So much better, perhaps, if the Government could just have suggested that they take John Rice out quietly somewhere to some virgin hillside in the public domain not privately owned by us immigrants, and lay him to rest in their own way, without benefit of bands and cameras.

But they had no choice. Nor did John Rice.

Very likely they can forgive, and will understand, for they, too, heard the chaplain read from the services:

"While we consign this body to the earth, let us be mindful of our own frailties."

Address of Ben H. Wooten

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Ben H. Wooten, president, First National Bank in Dallas, at dedication of Hamilton Moses Steam Electric Station, near Forrest City, August 30, 1951:

An invitation to speak on this occasion is indeed an honor, and I am deeply appreciative; in fact, I am home again. My heart and affections were lassoed by Arkansas a long time ago.

We are here for a threefold purpose, namely, the launching of the Eastern Arkansas Industrial Expansion Exposition, the dedication of the \$15,000,000 Hamilton Moses power plant, and to honor a great American, Colter Hamilton Moses.

Henry W. Grady, in making a speech in New England some 70 years ago, said: "Far to the south lies the fairest and richest domain on this earth. It is the home of a brave and hospitable people. There is contained all that can please and content mankind." He was thinking of eastern Arkansas.

Nature has done much for Arkansas. It has a climate adaptable to any type of business. It offers plenty of living room. Arkansas is a State where one may round out his desires. It has historic romance and color. It has an abundance of raw materials. Beneath her surface lie oceans of oil, deep reservoirs of gas, and there are treasures stored in her forested hills.

The major problem confronting Arkansas is the changing of the flow of raw materials and manufactured goods. Wealth is generated in the manufacture of raw materials into finished products. High wages are not

paid to the producers of raw materials. Arkansas has the power to turn its rice into crispies, its cotton into cloth. It has the power to convert the hides of its cattle into shoes, and we have finally come to the conclusion that it is sheer nonsense to ship our raw materials away, with the result that many of our people remain poor. It is no disgrace to be poor, but that is all I can say in its favor; I have tried it.

This exposition demonstrates the fact that Arkansas is not waiting for some magic wand to create for her a balanced economy. We have often heard that the wheel of fortune spins—"Round and round she goes, and where she stops, nobody knows." The wheel of fortune is actually very much like a bicycle wheel. It does spin round and round when it is pedaled, but only when it is pedaled, and the rider must do the pedaling.

Eastern Arkansas is more than just another land of promise. From this day on it will shine brighter and brighter in a firmament of a balanced economy. If oratory, newspaper articles, and speeches could industrialize this State, it would have been done long ago, but it takes dollars that can be converted into brick and mortar. It takes money that can be converted into plants and equipment.

There is no curfew on eastern Arkansas's opportunities, unless it be a lack of desire and willingness to work, plan, and finance. This exposition is conclusive proof that the leaders of eastern Arkansas are not lacking in this desire.

The advent of this exposition and the dedication of the Hamilton Moses power plant mark the beginning of closer cooperation between management, capital, and research. We shall coordinate capital, know-how, and raw materials. We shall take hold of scientific research in a more affirmative way, for some day the well of natural resources will run dry, and only through research and courageous action can we have a completely balanced economy. One of these days, in the not too far distant future, we should expect to see in this area a panorama of industries, in the shades of which many happy and prosperous people will be working and building eastern Arkansas.

I know nothing about electric power or its production. I do know that electric power has helped to make 150,000,000 people the best housed, the best fed, and the best-dressed people on earth, all at a cost less than we pay annually for cosmetics and cigarettes.

I do know that this electric age should continue unabated, and I further know that it will do so if not hampered politically.

This new \$15,000,000 power plant is a far cry from Edison's little Pearl Street plant in New York City in 1882 that served 59 customers. Industry, courage, and inventive genius have characterized the American utilities management since that humble beginning, and it behooves all of us to defend it. We should have no patience with those persons who advocate taking the electric industry away from its builders. The Government cannot run electric plants any more efficiently than can private industry. You just cannot talk cost out of operation.

Let us look at the record of electric companies. Electric utilities, privately owned and publicly regulated, supply 93 percent of all electricity produced for public use. For decades they have maintained their establishments at the height of scientific discovery and development, always ready to deliver additional electric energy to industry and the home.

Ninety percent of the power in the Nation is generated from fuel. Arkansas has an abundance of coal, oil, gas, and lignite.

The power plant we are dedicating is actually a great new factory for eastern Arkansas. Too often we do not attach sufficient importance to a power plant as a new industry.

Actually it produces a valuable product just as much as a paper mill or a garment factory. The kilowatt is the lifeblood of modern civilization, and it is the only item in the budget of the people of Arkansas that has not increased in unit price in many years. Economists tell us that the 1951 food dollar is worth only 47 cents, the clothing dollar only 54 cents, and the rent dollar only 85 cents. "The electric dollar is worth 104 cents—the only item worth more today than ever and yet costing less.

The Hamilton Moses kilowatt factory cost \$15,000,000, and every cent of it was supplied by private capital. It is paying taxes that others may use, I trust, not in competition with it. During the 15-month period of its construction it provided jobs for more than 500 men. It will have about 45 regular employees. They, too, will own homes and pay taxes. The building of this plant brought a major collateral benefit to this section of the country, in that the volume it will use makes it possible for natural gas to be brought into the area for the service of all.

This new factory symbolizes the spirit of Arkansas—the spirit of a people who have literally raised themselves by their own bootstraps into national attention through the now famous Arkansas plan. The naming of this plant is a fitting monument to Colter Hamilton Moses, the author of the Arkansas plan.

The science of medicine had its Pasteur; printing had its Franklin; telephone had its Graham Bell; electricity had its Edison; and Arkansas has its Ham Moses—and Ham Moses has his Mrs. Moses. In the life of every strong man there is a good woman of strong character. Someone said a long time ago, "The highway of success is filled with women pushing their men along," and we would have Mrs. Moses know that the honors of this day include her in a major way.

There is something in a name. I am thinking of Hamilton Moses. This name indicates a heritage and tradition of devotion, of worship, of keen business acumen and leadership.

Exodus, the second book of the Bible, tells of a boy who from the beginning was destined to greatness. He was tending the flock of his father-in-law at the foot of the mountain of God. He saw a bush; it was burning, but it was not consumed. It aroused his curiosity, and he went to investigate. God called to him out of the bush and gave him the difficult task of leading 600,000 people out of personal, political, and economic slavery.

There is an analogy. Did it ever occur to you that a light globe gives light but is not consumed? Ham Moses has always stayed close to the mountain of God, as evidenced by the fact of his leadership in Ouachita College and his continuous teaching of the largest men's Bible class in the State. Early in life he learned what to think, what to say, and how to pray. He, too, like Moses of old, has been a spokesman for God and His people.

His parents gave him the name Hamilton, which brings us to another analogy, that of Alexander Hamilton, a genius from birth. Early in life Alexander Hamilton wrote to a friend: "I'll risk my life, though not my character, to exalt my station." Our own Hamilton Moses would never risk his character in exalting his station. Alexander Hamilton was also a great orator. He organized meetings, gave addresses, wrote letters, newspaper articles, and pamphlets urging the people to stand firm against English oppression. He knew the science of government as did no other man in America, and it became common for men to say, "When in doubt ask Hamilton." He preserved the credit of the Nation. Another thing he often said was, "The prosperity of the people is the

prosperity of the Nation." That sounds like Hamilton Moses.

Alexander Hamilton was destined to help fight America's battles, to share in her victory, to help make of her a great nation. He wove his name into the web of her history so that as long as the United States of America shall be remembered, so long shall be the name of Alexander Hamilton. So it is with Hamilton Moses. As long as the State of Arkansas shall be remembered so shall the name of Hamilton Moses.

We have in our honored guest today the keen business acumen of Alexander Hamilton and the sturdy Christian characteristics of Moses of old, a leader of whom there is none greater.

Hamilton Moses possesses great personal charm and magnetism. His achievements are the most effective testimony of how his character, industry, and know-how have worked not only for his company but for his State and Nation.

It has been said, "There is no better test of the character of a people than that afforded by knowing what kind of men they honor." We who are here today are willing for our past, present, and future to be judged by the type man we honor. Someone has said, "Men measure each other the first time they meet and thereafter every time they meet." Under each measurement Hamilton Moses grows in stature, and he will continue to do so.

There are monuments all along the way which he has earnestly, modestly, and efficiently built. Look around in the city in which he lives, a better city because he lives in it. Look at the State in which he resides, a better State for his having chosen it as his home.

We honor him for many reasons. He is a gentleman of the highest ideals, possessed with business and statesman acumen, which makes for leadership. He is a man who knows all the time what to do next. Few men, especially in an emergency, know what to do next and wait for some impulse to direct their movements. By his depth of thought and precision of bearing he has the ability to dominate an assembly and inspire followers. He has the courage befitting a stalwart American citizen who firmly believes in the American way of life and its defense from destructive forces from within and without.

We believe, as he believes, that all the United States Government owes us is to keep this a land of opportunity where we may reap the rewards of our labor. We believe, as does he, that personal economic security cannot be procured through ballots, bayonets, or bullets. Such means are used to assure the continuity of our Government, but when the afternoon of life is well spent and the gold of the sunset meets the gray of the twilight, there will be more safety, comfort, and dignity in living off the security acquired through thrift than there will be in wondering for whom to vote in order to keep a pension of dependence from being cut.

Hamilton Moses' mother and father were his inspiration, and they planned to send their son to Henderson-Brown College, the Methodist school at nearby Arkadelphia. He got to Arkadelphia, all right, but found a better baseball squad at Ouachita College, and the Baptist school was located closer to town. It was 3 weeks before his Methodist family learned their son was enrolled in Baptist Ouachita. He has been pitching and catching for the Baptists ever since.

Those of us who know Hamilton Moses best recognize in him a lovable, warm-hearted fellow, radiating friendship, human kindness, and helpfulness. Even though he is an intellectual and industrial giant, he is still an unspoiled big man. He towers in the forest of big men, and certainly at this period in the history of our State, the Nation, and the world, we find a need for greatness in men. Judged by the principles upon which this Nation was founded, the prin-

ciples under which it has become great, he is a citizen first-class, a delightful friend, whose handiwork will ever be reflected on the pages of history recording the development of Arkansas and the Southwest.

We are here today because we like Hamilton Moses. We like what he has done. We like the way he has done it. We esteem him for having done so many things so well. We honor him because over and over again he has earned our admiration and devotion.

If I were an artist of great talent, having in my possession an inspired brush, with access to immaculate colors representing courage, vision, fairness, justice, industry, and vision, I might be able to correctly portray the likeness of Hamilton Moses.

Colter Hamilton Moses, I would have you know that—

"It isn't the man you hope to be,
If fortune and fate are kind,
The man the eyes of the world will see
In weighing your will and mind;
The decade ahead is a chartless sea,
And next year is a world away;
It isn't the man you would like to be,
But the man you are we honor today."

It is a great joy to me to have a part in this ceremony. We shall never have the opportunity to honor a more distinguished and deserving American, and I know you join me in the prayer that God shall continue to give him health, strength, and happiness—that God shall guide and protect him, not only for himself and his family, but for all the people of this Nation.

A Corporal Finds the Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD, this down-to-earth editorial from the Montreal Gazette in Canada of August 23, 1951.

A common man, Corp. John B. Moullette of Camden, N. J., did some soul-searching while he was stationed in California and before he went to Korea.

He spoke the doubts of many Americans.

He wanted to find his way through the smoke screen of diplomacy and discover the simple answer which is "truth."

He would be able to do his job better if his Government told him the score, but, as it turned out, he had to do this for himself.

Earnestly and honestly he fought a dual battle against the enemy and through the confusion of high policy.

And the decision he came to was this: In Korea you know what you are up against.

The Gazette takes it up from there:

A CORPORAL FINDS THE ANSWER

"In Korea you know what you're up against."

That is the opinion of Corp. John B. Moullette, of Camden, N. J. And the opinion of Corporal Moullette has come to be of particular interest.

For Corporal Moullette has come to be the type of the average soldier, who has gone from his North American home, to fight in a far-away land of which he knew little, and for a cause which has been bewildered by

doubts and questionings. It is a matter of some importance to Corporal Moullette to know why he should go so far to fight. After all it is his life that is at stake.

While still in camp in California he wrote a letter home to his father in New Jersey, saying that he wasn't quite sure what it was all about. His father, without letting him know, sent the letter on to Mr. Dean Acheson, the Secretary of State.

So it was that a corporal who had his own private doubts, found himself, quite unexpectedly, thinking out loud, with his father, and the Secretary of State, and the whole world as an audience.

Under a democratic system it is important what Corporal Moullette thinks. The American people have always been willing to sacrifice themselves generously. But they are not willing to accept sacrifices simply because their Government in its own secretive wisdom, tells them what they must do. And there is no cause to distrust a system in which even a corporal's questionings are not dismissed.

Mr. Acheson took time out from his work in the State Department to write an answer. And he also wrote to the corporal's father. "What is important is that your son should feel," he wrote, "and that all our young people should feel, a strong faith in the validity of the ideals on which this country was founded and on which it now endeavors to guide its actions."

Corporal Moullette appreciated the answer. But he was only mildly impressed. So many words have been written and spoken about Korea that the barrage almost deadens the ears. But Corporal Moullette went on to Korea, and left opinions behind to come face to face with the facts. And the facts he found to be terribly real. They were like a slap in the face.

In Korea there is no doubt about what aggression is. Nor is there much room for doubting who is the aggressor. The enemy is face to face. Says Corporal Moullette today: "Over here I've had a chance to see what I'm fighting for. . . . In Korea I've seen that aggression has got to be stopped, and if it takes guns to stop it, then guns we must use."

But Korea brings not only an awareness of the enemy: it brings awareness also of how real is the comradeship in the struggle. For the first time in his life the words about one world have a real meaning for him. His notebook is crammed with the names of new friends, infantrymen and artillerymen and truck drivers from England, France, Belgium, and half a dozen other countries. And when he gets out of the service and winds up college, his first major project is to make a trip through Europe, and make the calls he has promised to make.

It is not just a matter of one nation fighting another. It is, in actual practice, a union of nations fighting a common aggressor. What Mr. Acheson was writing about no longer seems quite as formal and detached. "That's what Mr. Acheson was trying to tell me," says Corporal Moullette, "but what I didn't really discover until I came out here was that all people are one people, and we must join together if we are to have protection."

Korea is a long way from Camden, N. J. And it is also a long way from Canada, and from England, and from Belgium and from Turkey, and from all the other countries which have their soldiers fighting on Korea's soil. It's quite easy not to face the facts when you don't have to face them, and to debate about things in the abstract when you don't have to look at them as they are, and to deal with generalities when you have no demand to deal with particulars.

But Corporal Moullette knows what deliberate aggression and what collective security mean. Perhaps his questions and his answers may help other people to know what they're up against.

The Student-Exchange Program**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT**

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I received from a professor at the University of Oslo, in Norway, regarding the worth of the student-exchange program to Norway.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., September 11, 1951.

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: May I take this opportunity while I am briefly in Washington to voice a few words of appreciation for what you have done for Norway through the Fulbright exchange program.

We in Norway have the advantages and drawbacks of being far away from everywhere. In the sciences and liberal arts, isolation is our biggest handicap. To me the world is one, and a small nation particularly depends heavily upon what is going on in other parts of the world. Furthermore the only way to mutual understanding is by personal contact whether in private life or in the life of nations.

Fulbright students and scholars have brought a stimulating and understanding into our university life which cannot be evaluated this early in the program, but their influence is already noticeable in our university policy. Within a few years I believe their effects will have become extremely widespread.

With deep appreciation for your pioneering efforts in furthering mutual understanding between nations, I am,

Yours sincerely,

TOM F. W. BARTH,

Professor of Mineralogy, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway, (Board of Directors, United States Educational Foundation in Norway).

Bearing the Free World's Burdens**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. THOMAS J. LANE**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the House I want to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial from the Montreal Gazette dated August 22, 1951.

In our new world role we are apt to brush aside the opinions of other nations as coming from paupers who should have no voice in the matter. We become impatient with criticism. We feel that no matter what we do it will not be appreciated. In too many cases that fear is justified.

It is a welcome change to find one nation—our young and energetic neighbor

to the north whose spirit and progress is so akin to our own—expressing an understanding of the difficult responsibilities we have assumed in order to defend freedom in this world.

The sincerity of this editorial, coming from a true friend and neighbor, Canada, should hearten us in our endeavors.

BEARING THE FREE WORLD'S BURDENS

The United States is spending \$35,000,000,000 a year on defense. Before the end of this year the rate will probably be near to \$50,000,000,000. And what are all the allies of the United States in the North Atlantic Treaty together spending a year on defense? They are spending \$9,000,000,000.

Perhaps these figures show, more plainly than anything else, how true it is that the main hope of defending freedom is centered in the United States. Without the billions it is pouring into armaments, all hope of the Western World to preserve the freedom of independence would be gone.

But money spent upon actual armaments is only part of the contribution the United States is making today. Congress has just approved nearly \$7,500,000,000 for a foreign-aid program. It is true that the sum asked by the President was \$8,500,000,000. Yet even after the reluctant and opposing Members had done their worst in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, this very massive sum remained.

It would seem that such lavish contributions by the United States would arouse admiration and thankfulness in all who are interested in keeping the Western World in freedom. But there are those who insist, with a certain laborious peevishness, in raising two minimizing considerations.

They say, in the first place, that the United States is a great and powerful nation, and is only carrying its rightful burden. And they go on to say, in the second place, that the United States is helping others only to help herself, she is acting only in self-interest; and self-interest is not a particularly exalted motive.

But is the United States such a powerful nation that it can do such incomparable things easily? The actual figures may be strangely unexpected. The United States, huge as it may seem, has only 10 percent of the free world's population. Western Europe—together with Turkey—has a population 80 percent greater.

As for natural resources, the United States has only a fraction. Areas outside the United States not only produce 43 percent of the free world's crude petroleum, but they also produce about 70 to 80 percent of the free world's lead, zinc, tungsten, and rubber, and practically all its cobalt, manganese, nickel, tin, and wool.

It is true that the United States has been spared the actual devastation of war. But it has not been spared an enormous proportion of the cost of war, and of the lend-lease methods by which she supplied her allies as well as herself. With a relatively small population within the non-Communist world, and with many limitations in natural resources, she has so organized her industrial system that she is producing goods and services at a rate 10 percent higher than last year.

The President's Council of Economic Advisers is of the opinion that further increases will take place. It is probable that the United States, within the next 2 years, will be able to increase total output at least twice as fast as it did during the period from 1946 through the first half of 1950.

Then there is the second point raised by the critics—that the United States is only acting in her own interest. But here a pertinent question may be asked. Why should the United States consider herself in such imminent danger from totalitarian communism?

She is in danger just because she is the heart of the non-Communist world's hopes of survival. There is an old saying: "Freedom itself is an offense to tyrants." The United States inevitably assumed great international obligations when it decided to build on freedom. Such a Nation can exist only in a free world. But in assuming an increasing role in keeping the free world free, she is hardly pursuing a narrow interest.

The United States is not huge beyond all comparison, so that she can carry even massive burdens easily. She is comparatively small in relation to the non-Communist world, and carries her burdens mainly by her own vital enterprise.

Nor is the United States simply a selfish Nation, seeking only what is in her own interest. She is a Nation that has identified self-interest with freedom, and for that interest all nations cherishing their independence can feel thankful.

The tasks of the burden-bearer are never easy. Not only is there criticism from without, but there are temptations from within. There are those of the American citizenry who would minimize her obligations, offer ways of retreat from reality, or who would justify the cause of the encroacher.

The free nations of the world should give thanks that, despite all, the faith and resolution of the United States is still strong. And as she goes to her formidable and incalculable tasks, she should not be pricked by depreciation but heartened by an unmitigable cheer.

Increase of Postal Rates**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the legislation calling for an increase of the postage stamps from 3 to 4 cents and the penny postal card from 1 to 2 cents has caused a great deal of criticism throughout the country.

The enclosed letter from Miss Margaret Burosh, 2030 Atchison Avenue, Whiting, Ind., is typical of the thoughts in the minds of a great majority of the American people on this increased tax.

WHITING, IND., September 13, 1951.

DEAR MR. MADDEN: When I picked up the newspapers recently and read about the bill of hiking the 3-cent stamps to 4 cents and the penny postal to 2 cents, my first thought was, "surely this isn't necessary; certainly we can keep the letters going through under a 3-cent stamp and the postals going through at 1 cent."

Many times we have family discussions during which time we talk about prices going up on merchandise, groceries, etc.

But we brought in the fact that—"At least we can still send a letter under a 3-cent stamp and a postal under just a penny."

And now, a bill that might take this little consolation away from us is coming up before the House—the bill that includes a hike of the 3-cent stamp to 4 cents and the penny postal to 2 cents.

As a voter, I voice my opinion hoping that the House of Representatives defeats this bill.

My reasons are, (1) it's unfair; (2) it's extravagant; (3) it's inconsiderate.

When I say inconsiderate, I'm speaking for the many shut-ins in the country who depend on the mails for outside communication through correspondence and hobbies—they can't afford this hike. I know this, because I'm a handicapped arthritic myself, at home with a very difficult case of arthritis and use the mails for correspondence and my hobby of prize contesting.

Of course, I'd rather partake in more active hobbies but my present condition will not let it—even though I'm taking all the latest medicines that medical research has to offer for this crippling disease—but my doctor tells me not to give up hope.

However, in the meantime, as I mentioned previously in my letter, I must turn to some sort of an indoor hobby—thus I've turned to "prize contesting" which requires a lot of postage—both 3-cent stamps and penny postals as my contest entries are sent via mail.

I know that there are many others in my predicament who have turned to this interesting, educational, and profitable hobby to derive pleasure to compensate for the many pleasures they are denied because of their ill health.

Here's hoping the House defeats the bill that calls for a 4-cent stamp to replace the 3-cent stamp and a 2-cent postal to replace the penny postal.

Let's keep our Government out of the hiking-prices parade.

Yours sincerely,

Miss MARGARET BUROSH.

Constitution Day, September 17, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared with reference to Constitution Day, September 17, 1951.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, Constitution Day, September 17, 1951, finds our country at the crossroads. The civil power of government, which the Constitution makes supreme, is in a dangerous decline. There is an ever-growing tendency to look to military men for leadership and to rely on military alliances and superweapons as the guarantors of freedom and liberty.

Constitution Day 1951 finds the United States spending untold billions of dollars in a vast armament program. Many thousands of our men and boys are fighting an undeclared war in Asia. Other thousands are under arms in Europe. Our factories and our farms are engaged in war production. Our economic life is being controlled from Washington and our sons are being drafted into the armed services. All this is being done in time of peace and in the name of liberty and freedom.

In fairness and honesty it must be pointed out that there has been no usurpation of power and authority in America by the military. Our military leaders have not forced themselves into their present place of leadership in national and international affairs. They have not placed their hands on the reins of government by force. The fact is that our military men have merely stepped in to fill a vacuum caused by a serious default in our civil leadership. The decay of

political morality which has fallen upon us has caused some of our people to turn from the civil authority of government to our military leaders in search of leadership and strength and hope in these dangerous times.

Constitution Day, September 17, 1951, finds the United States in open military alliance with 35 nations. When Greece and Turkey are admitted to the North Atlantic Pact the United States will be committed by treaty to the military defense of no less than 37 nations. In addition we are obliged to defend the freedom of Austria, the Free Territory of Trieste, Western Germany, Korea, Okinawa, and many hundreds of Pacific Islands.

It has at times been pointed out that the Constitution makes no specific mention of God. Be that as it may, it cannot be denied that the Constitution is the result of divine inspiration. Aside from the Bible and the recorded words of our prophets, the Constitution undoubtedly is the greatest documentary embodiment of the concept that human life is sacred and that each individual is the concern of God.

To some, the Constitution is a barrier. It stands between them and their political and other ambitions.

To the vast majority, however, the Constitution is a bulwark of liberty. Through many generations it will continue to give pause to those who seek to transgress upon the concept that the life and liberty of the individual are sacred and that the individual has the right to own and enjoy private property.

It seems to me that the time is at hand for us to take seriously the advice of Abraham Lincoln, who once said of the Constitution

"Let it be taught in schools, in seminaries, and in colleges, let it be written in primers, in spelling books and in almanacs, let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in courts of justice. And, in short, let it become the political religion of the Nation and, in particular, a reverence for the Constitution."

The Student-Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from George Vogel to the Columbia Broadcasting System regarding the exchange-of-students program.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRIKE IT RICH,

New York, N. Y., September 10, 1951.

Mr. EARL H. GAMMONS,
Columbia Broadcasting System,
Warner Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GAMMONS: On the 29th of August Strike It Rich experienced one of the most delightful meetings it has ever had during its more than 4 years of being on the air.

Two Lafayette College freshmen, representing the Student Committee for Better International Understanding, visited our office and explained their interest in making it possible for 40 exchange students of more than 17 countries to visit Washington, the heart of our country.

Since these exchange students were going back to their respective countries, the boys

wanted to Strike It Rich so that they could win enough money to help pay for the trip to Washington and incidental expenses incurred during their 2-day stay there.

We are happy that the Colgate-Palmolive-Peet Co., sponsors of Strike It Rich, were able to afford these boys the opportunity; and, as a result, some forty-odd students will have a better idea about America and will be able to report their experiences with our country more fully.

Perhaps Senator FULBRIGHT will be interested in learning that students in Lafayette College, in Easton, Pa., have caught the true meaning of the exchange-student plan and are trying to do something in a practical way on their own to help make this program a successful one.

Anything you can do to pass this information along to Senator FULBRIGHT and other Members of Congress interested in this better international-understanding program will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

GEORGE VOGEL,
Public Relations.

P S—They won \$500.

South Dakota Practices Economy and Abolishes Temporary Taxes

REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, South Dakota is unique, to say the least, in the handling of her fiscal affairs. In South Dakota, in contrast with the Federal Government, we believe in the old-fashioned principles of economy and taxing on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Three years ago the people of our State voted to pay a \$28,000,000 bonus to our war veterans. To retire the bonus debt within the shortest time possible, the 1949 State legislature imposed three special taxes, and inserted an automatic repealer whereby the special taxes would be repealed as soon as sufficient funds were collected to retire the obligation.

Last month the State director of taxation informed the Governor that sufficient money had been collected under the special tax program to pay the last installment of this bonus debt.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government, too, imposes special taxes for special purposes. However, here the similarity between South Dakota and the Federal Government ends. October 1 will see the end of South Dakota's special taxes—a 2-mill State property tax, a 1-percent extra sales tax, and a special 3 percent sales tax on liquor, beer, and cigarettes.

Yes, South Dakota kept faith with her citizens. Instead of finding some new scheme on which to spend the \$8,000,000 obtained by the temporary taxes each year and keeping the taxes on the books, these special taxes were wiped off the books.

In South Dakota we favor a program of paying our debts and bills as they occur. We do not favor the principle of levying taxes on future generations. We believe in paying our own way. We

may be old-fashioned but we are true liberals in the true sense of the word.

For this outstanding achievement, much credit must be given to the 1949 South Dakota Republican Legislature and former Gov. George T. Mickelson, as well as the 1951 legislature and our present Governor, Sigurd Anderson.

I am sure that the following editorial taken from the Wall Street Journal of September 13 will be of interest to every Senator and Representative interested in true economy and taxing on a pay-as-you-go basis. The article reads:

POINTERS FROM PIERRE

It's news enough these days when any government finds itself with too much money, and startling news when the government meets this unwonted situation by abolishing temporary taxes instead of thinking up new ways to spend the surplus. Yet that is what is happening in South Dakota.

A few years back the State was faced with the familiar problem of paying a bonus to its war veterans. The State could have, as many States did, attacked this problem in the modern manner—which, of course, is to borrow the money and let the next generation worry about paying off the debt. Instead, the legislature decided not only to meet the obligation with special taxes, a rare but not totally novel idea, but further decided to make the taxes stiff enough to pay off the \$28,000,000 bonus quickly. The idea seemed to be that the people who had so generously voted the bonus at a special election ought to be the ones to pay for it.

Well, the other day in Pierre, the State's capital, the Governor was informed that all the money to pay the bonus was at hand. This means that in less than 3 years the entire transaction has been completed, a record remarkable enough by itself.

But the wonders didn't stop there. With the bonus bill paid, the State government would have an extra \$8,000,000 plus each year which it could spend if it kept the temporary taxes. No one would have been particularly surprised had the legislature decided to do this. In many places some temporary taxes are as old as some of those "temporary" buildings built in World War I. Governments never have difficulty thinking up very worth-while projects on which to spend any extra money found lying around.

But in South Dakota the temporary taxes are just that. On October 1 there will be repealed a 2-mill State property tax, a 1 percent extra sales tax, and a special 3-percent sales tax on liquor, beer, and cigarettes.

The Daily Argus-Leader of Sioux Falls, commenting with understandable pride on this achievement, remarks that "perhaps we're a bit old-fashioned in South Dakota." Well, if this be old-fashioned, we can't avoid a bit of nostalgia over the news from Pierre as we contemplate the news from Washington of more modern manners.

The Taft-Hartley Act and the Copper Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have embodied in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Friend in Need," published in

the American Metal Market for Saturday, September 8.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FRIEND IN NEED

When President Truman eventually decided to invoke provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act in the copper strike, appropriate steps were taken with commendable speed. The matter was referred to the three-man fact-finding committee on Thursday of last week, and notwithstanding the intervention of the Labor Day week end, the report was delivered at the White House by last Tuesday, on schedule. This was fast work.

On the same day, though by that time he had gone to San Francisco, the President instructed the Attorney General to seek a Federal court injunction which would require the workers to return to their jobs for an 80-day "cooling off" period. A temporary restraining order was issued the next day by the United States court in Denver, and by Thursday the strikers began drifting back to work, as, by that time, they and their leaders knew what was coming. The return movement has since gathered momentum, although, with the week half gone, or more, by the time the legal machinery could operate effectively, it has been evident over the last few days that volume operations could not be resumed before next Monday. This delay could have been—and was—foreseen by observers.

Gratifying as this decisive and productive action has proved to be, it does not in the least detract from the seriousness of the stoppage, the utter lack of justification for it, or the callous indifference to the welfare of the country displayed by those union officials who brought it about. As the fact-finding board reported: "This country needs copper. It needs every pound that can be produced. It needs that copper now—not in a few weeks or a few months, but now." Speaking to the press on Thursday, Defense Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson described the strike as "very serious—a terrible thing to occur when copper already is in short supply. It couldn't have happened at a worse time."

These are harsh words, but they are fully justified. The stringency in copper was as well known to the so-called leaders who brought about this strike as it was to those most intimately concerned with the particulars of our accumulated reserves and our rate of production and consumption, for on the very eve of this reprehensible action, the President had been obliged to authorize the release of as much as 25,000 tons from the strategic stockpile in order to maintain the flow of material in volume sufficient to prevent hampering the defense effort. It is incredible that union leaders should not have known this.

In fairness to the CIO and A. F. of L., it should be acknowledged that they did not actively promote the tie-up. In many instances, their members were absent from their posts because of picketing by other unions, and because of the crippling of essential facilities by the strikers, resulting in the paralysis of other plant activities. But, by the same token, let it be observed that the notorious mine-mill group lived up to the unenviable reputation it has built for itself and that by the brazen insolence of its leadership it has invited the conclusion that its indifference to the consequences of its action was studied and its paralysis of industry motivated by the knowledge of its power plus a readiness to place selfish purposes above national requirements.

Once again the country has been given a graphic illustration of the futility of attempting to deal with left-wing outfits of suspicious background as one would deal with the normal country-loving American

citizen. Once again it has been demonstrated that only the power of force—legal force or military force as the occasion may require—is respected by them, and that the only appropriate course of action when contending with this faction is to hit at once, with both barrels. Had such a procedure been adopted when it first became obvious that no other would serve the interest of the Nation, it is probable that at least one of the precious 2 weeks' production which has been lost, could have been saved.

But even as we look upon the disturbing aspects of this discreditable affair, let us not overlook its brighter side. It is not perversity which suggests that, while we deplore what has taken place, we might the better realize how fortunate we are by contemplating what might have been. Just let us ask ourselves what would be our predicament today if the Wagner Act were still the law of the land? In our disgust with the action taken by the leaders of the mine-mill group, in our impatience with the authorities for their failure sooner to invoke the most appropriate measure which they had at their command for dealing with the situation, let us not undervalue the great service to the public interest which the Taft-Hartley Act performs, at the very hour of the public's greatest need.

One of the very great virtues of the Taft-Hartley Act is the willingness of its sponsors to acknowledge its imperfections. Another of its great attributes is the unreasoning denunciation which has been heaped upon it because it embodies provisions which disinterested third parties have, from the start, recognized as impartial and fair and in the public interest. It has been this popular recognition of the basic even-tempered fairness of the act—despite all imperfections—which has caused the millions to rally to its support when it has been under assault from interested parties, determined at all cost to make the law serve them, rather than the Nation.

Paradoxically, the more bitterly the act has been attacked, the more clearly has its utility, even its indispensability, been repeatedly established by excesses committed by those who condemn it. Once again, in this grave situation, its great value as an instrument for public good has been confirmed by the unpatriotic immobilization of the copper and allied industries at the worst possible time. Once again it has proved itself the invaluable shotgun behind the door, the one weapon we have to prevent paralysis of essential services at critical junctures. To paraphrase the deserved tribute paid that uncompromising exponent of rugged integrity, Grover Cleveland, we love it for the enemies it has made. It has proved, once again, to be the country's and the public's friend in need.

Portland, Oreg., Airport Ready for Largest Planes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, during the short House recess I visited my home district and arrived and took off from the Portland Airport. Recently the city of Portland celebrated the completion of a new runway at the Portland Airport which is longer than any other municipal or commercial airport runway on the west coast except the one at San

Francisco. It was a \$2,000,000 project and will permit direct calls to be made by the largest trans-Pacific and trans-continental planes on routes already established to and from Portland. It is of sufficient length to permit Air Force B-52's and C-124's as well as the Globemasters to operate from this field.

There is now direct service between Portland and Alaska and Portland and the Hawaiian Islands, and the airport is now rightfully known as an international airport. Its location is an excellent one in that it is situated almost within the city limits and the central downtown area may be reached from the airport within 30 minutes or less.

I include as a part of these remarks an editorial which recently appeared in the Portland Oregonian describing this new facility:

READY FOR LARGEST PLANES

Portland does not have anything comparable to the splendid, \$3,000,000 administration building at the Seattle-Tacoma Airport, but the 9,000-foot runway to be dedicated today at the Portland International Airport is 1,500 feet longer than the Seattle-Tacoma runways and only 70 feet shorter than San Francisco's longest. It is longer than any other municipal or commercial airport runway, aside from San Francisco's, on the west coast.

This \$2,000,000 project, completed at last, merely brings the Portland field up to its immediate demands. The largest trans-Pacific and transcontinental planes on routes already established from Portland may now make direct calls. The runway is long enough to accommodate the Air Force's B-52 and the C-124, or Globemaster, which carries 200 combat troops and will be opened to public inspection today, as will be a Northwestern Airlines stratocruiser.

With the addition of Alaska services to its continental and Hawaii lines, Portland moves ahead in long-distance airplane freight and passenger transportation and rightfully adds the word "international" to its airport title. Our port is conveniently situated on the fringe of the city, unlike the new Seattle-Tacoma field. We are envious, however, of the northern port's dazzling and complete facilities for passengers and airlines.

Hawaii's Youth Favors Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to offer for publication essays by Winnet Ho and Walter Pollack, both age 15, and sophomores at McKinley High School, which won for them a visit to Washington in a contest conducted by the Honolulu Junior Chamber of Commerce.

These essays express very convincingly the attitude of Hawaii's youth toward statehood for Hawaii:

HAWAII AS A STATE
(By Winnet Ho)

I think Hawaii should become the forty-ninth State because the people living in Hawaii are just as American as the people living in the 48 States. I believe that all

Americans should have the same rights and opportunities. God created everyone equal. We as Americans should keep that ideal burning with all the goodness in it. We the people of Hawaii, not a State, do not have the same rights and privileges as people in the States. For example, we do not have the right to vote for our President or Governor. We do not have Senators nor Representatives to represent us in Congress. Since the Hawaiian Islands are known for their importance and valuable position as a front line of defense, don't you think we should have the same basic American rights as do the people of the States to form our Government?

Personally speaking, I think we should become a State because of the crisis we are facing today. The world is in need of friendship, brotherhood, love, understanding, and good aloha spirit. We have all that and much more to offer. We here in the islands are a living example of these principles and hence we have much to contribute to the people of the world if we become the forty-ninth State.

Educationally speaking, our young people are all seeking opportunities for education and we make the best of these opportunities to develop ourselves into good American citizens. Our educational standards are equal to those of the schools in some States, and I believe are even better than the standards of schools in many States.

Our youth is a living example of democracy at work. We young people show our influence in leadership, participation in school and civic affairs. We assume our responsibilities and are promoting good in our deeds and action just as are the young people in the present 48 States.

HAWAII SHOULD BE A STATE

(By Walter Pollack)

I firmly believe that Hawaii should become a State. Most of all we want to vote for the President and vote for our own Governor. I think we are ready to take the responsibility of statehood. Hawaii has a growing population and we have contributed much in the way of agricultural products to the 48 States.

In Hawaii everyone looks upon one another as an individual believing in freedom and most of all we are against communism. We must learn to get along with everyone and keep them as our friends. We should not hold a grudge against anyone for his nationality but help him when we can.

We the people of the Hawaiian Islands feel we will prove our equality if given the rights of statehood. We were all created equal and no one is better than the other. We will fight, as we did in World War II for peace and freedom. Each State wants lasting peace and freedom and so do we. For the old saying goes, "United we stand, divided we fall," which is still true to this day.

Hawaii is willing to share in defending against communism, too, for the welfare of the United States. Hawaii is an important link in America's defense. So that is why I think that Hawaii should have statehood.

The First Scandal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, we get the sort of government the people vote for. The last individuals to complain at

what goes on in Washington should be those who fail to express themselves at the ballot box. It seems almost incomprehensible that any citizen genuinely interested in his Government and having the right to vote should not take it to be a part of his responsibility as a good American to make certain that his right of franchise is exercised by him on election day. In this connection under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Medford (Mass.) Mercury of September 9, 1951:

THE FIRST SCANDAL

So much scandal is coming out of Washington these days, it is right that the original sin should be given its proper place and weight. Chancellor Albert C. Jacobs, of the University of Denver, used it as his text at the summer commencement.

"It is, I think, a scandal that so few voters have seen fit to participate in our national elections," the chancellor said. "It is a shameful fact that nonvoting is increasing; that as the number of potential voters rises, the percentage of participation in elections declines."

Yes; the scandals can all be traced to the shameful refusal of citizens to exercise their right to vote or, when voting, of exercising their intelligence to pick men of integrity and honor for public office.

New Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a very much worth-while editorial which appeared in the Sunday, September 9, issue of the Springfield News-Sun entitled "New Postal Rates." This editorial pungently and properly points out the need for greater efficiency and economy in the operation of the Post Office Department.

NEW POSTAL RATES

The Senate has passed and sent to the House a bill which virtually doubles the cost of postal service to the public. Post cards will require 2 cents postage; letters will be 4 cents an ounce, and all other mailing charges will be increased when the House adopts the measure, as it is expected to do.

The Post Office Department has been operating "in the red" and undoubtedly some increases in its revenue are advisable, but one wonders whether the Congress should not insist that the Department operate in the future on a more business-like basis.

The Hoover report made a great many recommendations for increased efficiency in the Department, but few, if any, of these recommendations were ever adopted.

Here in Springfield are a few examples of wasted money insofar as the Post Office Department itself is concerned. Some time ago, a new elevator was installed in the Post Office building. This elevator was paid for and is operated by the Post Office Department. Yet it is not used for post office business but rather for the benefit of the other Federal tenants in the structure—Internal Revenue Department, Social Security, Army and Navy, and other Federal departments who enjoy free rent, heat, and main-

tenance at the expense of the Post Office Department appropriations.

Then there is that new flagpole. Perhaps it did not cost very much—say \$300—but it was so unnecessary in view of the fact that the Springfield Post Office previously had a quite satisfactory flagpole atop of the structure and there was no need whatsoever for installing the new one.

In the lobby of the local post office is a stamp-sales machine. A private business would have installed a precancelling machine for the customers which would have saved time "behind the scenes," but not the Post Office Department. It installed a machine that merely sells stamps and that only to those who happen to have the exact change. Hence it does not relieve the window clerks materially.

These are just a few samples but the Hoover report showed that many, many similar wastes may be found throughout the Nation.

Springfield also wonders whether, the proposed upping of the air-mail rate to 8 cents an ounce, it may expect any improvement in the air-mail (?) service to and from Springfield. At present, such service is a joke so far as any but quite distant points are concerned. So far, any efforts to get any improvement in the service gain the brush-off from higher postal officials.

So it is again suggested that in giving the Post Office Department more money from the public, the Congress take a good and long look at the Department's methods of operation.

News in Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the Record, I am taking the liberty to submit several articles announcing discoveries in the treatment of some of the terrible diseases suffered by our people. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this information should have widespread publicity, and if only a few people read about these scientific discoveries and obtain relief or are cured, I think it will well be worth the cost of printing same in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The articles follow:

[From the New Orleans Item of September 12, 1951]

NEWS IN MEDICINE CANCER

CHICAGO.—A specialist said today a revolutionary method has been devised for detecting hidden cancer as much as 5 to 7 years before it reaches the large tumor stage or causes suspicious symptoms.

When internal cancer advances to the stage of causing distress, only a small percentage of sufferers can be saved from death.

The detection of latent or previsual cancer is done by cytology. This is a method where organs or other areas of the body examined are scraped or swabbed, and the surface cells obtained are examined under a microscope.

Dr. J. Ernest Ayre of Miami, Fla., director of the Cancer Cytology Center of the Dade County Cancer Institute, said the procedure is so simple and painless that every doctor's office can become a cancer detection center.

In a paper to the sixteenth annual assembly of the United States and Canadian chapters of the International College of Surgeons he said:

"Cancer of the uterus, cancer of the lung, cancer of the prostate, cancer of the larynx, and throat, and other forms can be diagnosed with great accuracy by using the cytology test.

"In cancer of the cervix and lungs, cytology offers earlier diagnosis than any other known method.

"Cytology is the only method known to medical science to enable the discovery and location of a cancer before it is visible or causes symptoms."

He said there have been many cases in which cancer cells have been scraped from a cervix that appears completely normal, and that the disease was completely curable at that stage.

It would have required from 5 to 7 years in some of these cases, he added, for the cancer to grow enough to be readily visible or cause symptoms. He said:

"It is now felt that in this type of malignant disease—cancer of the uterus, which up till now has claimed 26,000 lives a year—almost all could be saved if a cervical cytology test each year becomes part of their health examinations."

ARTHRITIS

ST. LOUIS.—A new treatment for the stubborn arthritis of old people—against which even cortisone has had little effect—was announced today by a Brooklyn doctor.

Dr. W. S. Collens told the Second International Gerontological Congress the substance, an extract derived from the liver of pregnant cows, is still experimental and not yet available for general use.

But he declared it appears to be capable of bringing relief of pain and stiffness and restoring normal joint movement in many cases of the ailment known as hypertrophic osteoarthritis.

He said the substance first was developed in his laboratories as a possible material for the control of a painful neuritic condition which sometimes occurs as a complication of diabetes.

It proved more effective against that condition than anything previously tried, he said, adding that by a happy accident, he and his colleagues got a lead on its possible use against osteoarthritis.

The tip developed from the alertness of a woman diabetic who reported that while being treated for the neuritic complication of that disease, she had obtained relief from a long-standing joint limitation in her right hand. The doctors determined that she had been suffering from osteoarthritis.

Osteoarthritis, which affects 6,000,000 of the Nation's estimated 7,000,000 arthritis sufferers, is the degenerative type which occurs principally in elderly people.

It is marked by bony deposits in the joints, producing marked disability.

It is distinguished from rheumatoid arthritis in which there is an actual destruction of the joints.

The rheumatoid type principally affects younger people, but the drug cortisone has demonstrated great promise in its control.

Cortisone, however, has so far shown little effect on osteoarthritis.

DIABETES

BALTIMORE.—Many a doctor has had to leave the delivery room and face a grief-stricken husband with—"I'm sorry, Rh, or diabetes."

Now, perhaps those times are limited. For science is offering a shining ray of hope that many of those infants may be saved through a direct injection of vitamin E.

It hasn't been tried yet—and won't be, except where a baby cannot possibly be saved by other means. But one (unnamed) hospital is said to be ready to try it.

Dr. Karl E. Mason, professor of anatomy at the University of Rochester Medical School, last night explained his research into the subject at the concluding session of a symposium of 150 of the Nation's leading biochemists.

The symposium was presented in honor of Dr. Elmer V. McCollum of Johns Hopkins University, hailed as the "father of nutrition" and discoverer of vitamins A and D. It was sponsored by the Robert Gould Research Foundation of Cincinnati and Johns Hopkins.

Babies dying because of the Rh factor—even after transfusion—and often babies of diabetic mothers show less vitamin E present than in normal babies.

Furthermore, Dr. Mason said, babies dying because of the Rh factor show a "picture similar to death produced in experimental animals through the elimination of vitamin E in the diet."

(The so-called Rh factor results when the properties of the father's and mother's blood differ in such a way that the combination many times causes death to the child. In some instances, transfusions after birth can save its life, but there is no assurance.)

Among other things, vitamin E is found in whole-grain cereals, egg yolks, meat, and milk.

Normal babies, Dr. Mason said, are born with a slight vitamin E deficiency, compared with adults. But mother's milk shows a supply of vitamin E five times as plentiful as the amount found in cow's milk.

This naturally led to the assumption that bottle-fed babies should be given extra supplies of vitamin E. But only under the direction of a doctor, he hastened to add.

[From the New York Times of September 9, 1951]

MAJOR GAINS SHOWN IN FIGHT AGAINST INFANTILE PARALYSIS—WORLD SESSION OF SCIENTISTS IN DENMARK NOTES IMPROVEMENTS IN TREATMENTS

(By Howard A. Rusk, M. D.)

COPENHAGEN.—Scientists and clinicians met here last week at the second International Poliomyelitis Conference to take inventory of the status of the global attack now being waged against infantile paralysis. The conclusions of the 5-day conference, which was arranged by the Danish National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis and the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis of the United States, were that although the long-range objective of a single vaccine that would provide protection from poliomyelitis has not been achieved prospects are becoming increasingly hopeful. It was noted that as a result of improved treatment methods and rehabilitation there is now less physical disability from this disease than ever before.

In the first comprehensive statement made public to date from a huge 3-year research project set up 2 years ago by the national foundation in the United States, Dr. Jonas E. Salk, of the University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, reported that thus far only three distinct types of poliomyelitis virus have been found. The first of these was discovered in 1909, but it was not until 1931 that the existence of more than one type was suggested and it was 1949 before it was proven.

Typing of the various virus is one of the fundamental problems poliomyelitis investigators face, for the number of types and their characteristics must be determined if successful vaccine is to be developed. Because of the necessity for standardizing techniques in virus research so that data developed in one part of the world can be reliably compared with results obtained elsewhere, most scientific papers in the 5-day session that ended Friday dealt with these problems. The magnitude of the research

effort was evident from the fact that 24 papers on these subjects were presented by scientists from 10 nations.

NEW DETECTION TEST ANNOUNCED

One of the most important announcements of the meeting was by Dr. Jordi Casals of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, New York, concerning a new test for the detection of infection with polio virus. The new test, which is on the complement fixation type similar to the Wassermann test for syphilis, still is in the experimental stage but results thus far have raised hopes that a simple test for polio may be developed that can be put into general use by the medical profession. At present the positive and certain detection of polio virus depends upon the inoculation of rhesus monkeys with the suspected material. If it is polio virus, the monkeys develop paralysis.

The importance of a simple test was stressed by Dr. Robert Debre, professor of pediatrics at the Sorbonne in Paris, who told the Sorbonne in Paris, who told the conference that many diseases ranging from arthritis to pneumonia can be mistaken for infantile paralysis. He said that in a series of 509 cases sent to the center for acute poliomyelitis of the Paris hospital for sick children with a diagnosis of polio, the diagnosis proved wrong in 71 cases.

Methods in the care and treatment of polio patients were presented primarily by a series of closed circuit television programs presented by teams of demonstrators from Denmark and the United States three times daily. These teams of physicians, nurses, and physical therapists presented practical demonstrations on nursing care, use of the respirator, muscle testing and re-education, walking, training, and rehabilitation. The television demonstrations, which were made possible by E. R. Squibb & Sons, Inc., and produced with Radio Corporation of America equipment and engineers, attracted great attention as they were the first television programs seen by most of the Danes and many participants from other nations.

PROGRAM VIEWED BY PUBLIC

The programs also were viewed by the public, marking the first time that this technique had been used for general public health education. Equalling the Danes' interest in television was the interest of the visitors in the educational exhibits presented for the public. With their great ingenuity and excellent craftsmanship, the Danes utilized modern abstract art to present scientific material in a dramatic manner, which caused many visitors to term it the most striking health education exhibit they had ever seen.

Concurrently with the poliomyelitis conference, 150 physical therapists from 15 nations met to form a new world confederation for physical therapy. The new professional organization will provide for an international exchange of technical data on physical therapy, encourage standardization of training and certification and develop methods whereby each of the nations may recruit and train more therapists.

Miss Mary E. Switzer, Director of the United States Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, told this group that the present world shortage of physical therapists is the greatest single obstacle to the immediate development of additional rehabilitation services for the handicapped and chronically ill.

Delegates to the meeting in Copenhagen were deeply impressed with both the quality and scope of health and welfare services, particularly in tuberculosis, available to all Danish citizens and by the Danes' love of fun. As one American visitor commented, Denmark proves that social betterment and fun can be combined. This is one of many lessons the world could learn profitably from little Denmark.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of August 27, 1951]

DOCTORS REPORT MENINGITIS AID BY TERRAMYCIN—TWO CHICAGOANS ASSERT 14 CASES, CONSECUTIVELY TREATED, ENDED IN CURES

Successful treatment of 15 consecutive cerebro-spinal meningitis cases with the antibiotic terramycin is reported by two Chicago doctors in the current issue of the Journal of Pediatrics.

Dr. Archibald L. Hoyne and Dr. Emmanuel R. Riff, of the Cook County Contagious Disease Hospital, in Chicago, report in their article that "recovery was complete" in all 14 patients after periods of treatment by terramycin which averaged 3 days less than has been usual with sulfonamide treatment. The doctors conclude that terramycin may prove to be the ideal drug for combating meningococcal and influenzal infections.

The terramycin treatments, they noted, were free of the unpleasant reactions, commonly suffered by victims of the disease—an epidemic form of meningitis—who have been treated with sulfa drugs or other antibiotics.

The doctors reported relative success in using terramycin in the treatment of two other types of meningitis—pneumococcal and influenzal. With the antibiotic the only drug administered, five or six pneumococcal meningitis patients and all of three influenzal meningitis patients recovered. The one death, they said, was due to bilateral pneumonia.

NEW, OLD DRUGS TEAMED UP TO CHASE A COLD—TWO FILIPINO SCIENTISTS REPORT REMEDY

NEW YORK, September 10 —A new common-cold remedy, reported good even for old colds, was announced to the International Congress of Pure and Applied Chemistry today.

This new drug strikes three ways. It hits at the virus which doctors say causes colds, at the histamines which doctors said aggravate colds, and at the germs which usually come swarming in to make the misery worse.

FILIPINO SCIENTISTS

The report was by two Filipino scientists, Eusebio Y. Garcia, a physician, and Ramon Acevedo. Garcia is in the Binan Medical Research Clinic, Laguna. Acevedo is in the Araneta Institute of Agriculture at Malabon, Rizal. Neither came to the congress, but their report is printed in the official abstracts and is part of the day's proceedings.

They said their remedy was 95 percent effective on 200 common colds. Recovery came on the average after 3 days' treatment, except old, or third-stage colds, when treatment sometimes went for 5 days. On second-stage colds, which means after the first day, they said headaches disappeared in 10 to 15 minutes. Stuffed-up nasal passages became easier for breathing after a few minutes.

NEW AND OLD DRUGS

The remedy is a new synthetic drug plus an old sulfa drug. The new one is dimethylguanidine, which they said was synthesized in their laboratories.

It was made as one of a large number of drugs to combat malaria. It was tried on common colds because it had antiviral effects, a mild antihistamine effect, and a mild pain-relieving effect.

The added sulfa drug is sodium sulfathiazole. This sulfa has been used in the United States for many years for common colds on the theory that it kills the germs which usually multiply in colds.

The report said this same three-way drug was tried on the virus colds of chickens. On 700 chickens the remedy gave apparent cures 100 percent. It is given to humans both by mouth and by hypodermic.

United States Chamber Makes Telling Presentation of Our Federal Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article which gives a clear picture of the reckless financial path our country has been following for the past 22 years. The article entitled "United States Chamber Makes Telling Presentation of Our Federal Debt," appeared in the Friday, September 14, Watertown Public Opinion in a Down the Main Drag column by Alex Johnson:

DOWN THE MAIN DRAG—UNITED STATES CHAMBER MAKES TELLING PRESENTATION OF OUR FEDERAL DEBT

(By Alex Johnson)

The United States Chamber of Commerce has put together one of the most effective presentations of the enormity of the Federal debt I've seen. It's a simple bar graph but the tale it tells is tremendous.

It shows that in 1869, after the Civil War, the United States debt was \$2,200,000,000, a mere bag of shells. In 1919, right after the First World War, it was up to \$25,200,000,000, still just pocket money.

By dint of prosperity and smart management, this had been squeezed down to \$16,600,000,000 in 1929. Came the thirties, and the alphabet soup and by 1939 it had leaped to \$39,900,000,000 and you remember how we used to choke whenever anybody mentioned it.

But now it's \$255,000,000,000.

Looking at it another way:

In 1869, the Federal debt measured one-eighth of an inch. In 1939 it measured 2 3/4 inches. Now it stretches out to 1 foot, 5 1/2 inches.

As an average United States family, your share of this is \$5,640.

Nicolai Lenin: "We shall force the United States to spend itself into destruction."

The Chamber also kicks up some interesting dope on the upcoming Federal budget for 1952: seventy-one billion.

Your bill for this is \$1,589. As the Chamber says, "\$71,000,000,000 is a lot of money. Try to picture a pile of a million \$1 bills. Now try to imagine 71 thousand other piles just like it.

"It's hard to imagine that much money, isn't it? Shucks, it's hard to imagine just that \$1,589 that's my share.

"Is this spending necessary?" asks the Chamber.

"A lot of it is. The Government does a great many things that we all think are good. For example, a big chunk of that \$71,000,000,000 is going to build up our national defense."

I'll go along with that, gladly, and so will you. The wolves are howling at every door we have and they're no cream puff enemies.

"But," says the United States Chamber, "there's a lot of Government spending that isn't needed—especially right now in a national emergency."

For instance, it adds, one Government agency is doing research to find out how long a raccoon lives. It could better spend its time trying to find out how long a taxpayer can survive.

Another agency buys corn from the farmer and then lets the farmer buy corn for his

own use on the open market at half what the Government gives him—"lets" him buy it, mind you.

Another agency invested our dough in a rattlesnake farm which went broke.

I'm trying to think up a joke about rattlesnakes but it won't come.

The United States Chamber of Commerce notes that the Hoover commission showed how Government agencies could save as much as \$7,000,000,000 of our money every year just by cutting out waste and adopting a more sensible organization.

But, instead of that, the Federal Government has grown so fast lately that if we only went back to the Government we had in 1948—3 years ago—we could save another \$7,000,000,000.

Who's going to pay the bill? You. Nobody else but.

"You will pay these new taxes and the old ones," says the Chamber, "every time you see a movie or drink a bottle of beer or smoke a cigarette or use the telephone. You will pay pennies here and nickels there. You won't even know most of the time that you are paying taxes because they are included in the prices of the things you buy."

And all these things don't include the March 15 headache. You've paid all year long. Then you pay the rest.

Don't misunderstand. If it's gotta be, it's gotta. If it means preservation and progress and efficient administration in Government, okay.

If it means quality goods for our tax investment, fine. But so much of it is going for junk.

William N. Oatis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I submit a resolution from the Marion, Ind., Aerie, No. 227, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, in behalf of William N. Oatis:

RESOLUTION ON WILLIAM N. OATIS

Whereas William N. Oatis, Associated Press Bureau chief in Prague, Czechoslovakia, a free newspaperman who was performing his duties according to the standards and criteria of the free press of the world, was brutally snatched and imprisoned by the Communist Government of Czechoslovakia without explanation; and

Whereas Mr. Oatis was arrested and held in detention without access to friend, Embassy representatives, or trusted legal counsel; and

Whereas he was brought to trial and accused of "insisting on obtaining accurate, correct, and verified information," which is the definition of the work of a free press; and

Whereas he was forced into admission of espionage because of his reporter's instinct for presenting the factual rather than the fictional; and

Whereas he was convicted and sentenced to 10 years of imprisonment by a trial which was universally condemned by all free nations as an outrageous "kangaroo court," completely bereft of the principles of justice and the dignity of the human being; and

Whereas, by its action, the Communist-dominated Czech government showed its scorn for the principle of freedom of in-

formation and its hatred for our free world; and

Whereas representatives of the Soviet News Agency Tass have the free run of the United States of America, and are permitted to attend press conferences at our national seat of government, at which often much off-the-record information is discussed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Marion Aerie, No. 227, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles urges the Federal Government and its agencies to be unceasing in its efforts to secure the freedom of Mr. Oatis by honorable means, and we also offer our support and the vitality of our membership to the executives of the Associated Press in their campaign to secure the release of Mr. Oatis by the communication of the true facts of the case to the free peoples of the world, and be it further

Resolved, That Aerie, No. 227, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles urges the Federal Government to bar the correspondents from the Soviet News Agency Tass as well as all satellite nation correspondents from official government press conferences where vital information may be revealed until the release of Mr. Oatis has been secured.

Press and Farm Reaction to the Family
Farm Policy Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting various articles from the Virginia press dealing with the family farm policy review.

I particularly desire to call the attention of the House to the resolution adopted by the farmers of Rappahannock County, Va. Rappahannock is a small county and its citizens have always been known for their intelligence, courage, and independence.

The resolution is as follows:

[From the Rappahannock (Va.) News of September 13, 1951]

The full content of the committee's report follows:

"Whereas the farmers of Rappahannock County, Va., have held several meetings in connection with the Family Farm Policy Review sponsored by the United States Department of Agriculture; and

"Whereas at the last county-wide meeting two farmers of each Magisterial District were elected as a committee to bring to another county-wide meeting recommendations concerning this review; and

"Whereas the report of the Committee has been presented to the meeting; and

"Whereas the farmers of Rappahannock County feel that the idea of having the farmers of the United States give their views is good, the method used in conducting this survey was not in accordance with democratic process, in that it was conducted principally by paid Federal employees; and

"Whereas it appears that the recommendations contained in the review in every instance call for increased expenditure, increased personnel and broadening of powers

of the United States Department of Agriculture, and

"Whereas we feel that the concentration of further authority over agriculture in the United States Department of Agriculture is unwise; and

"Whereas in this time of impending war, with an enormous Federal indebtedness and the highest tax in our history, it is felt that any unnecessary increase in non-defense spending is unsound; and

"Whereas we feel that the United States Department of Agriculture should operate as far as is possible through our State extension service, and other State facilities, other than directly with the farmer.

"Now, therefore, we the farmers of Rappahannock County, Va., represented at this meeting do hereby go on record as strenuously objecting to the increasing of the activities of the United States Department of Agriculture and recommended a contraction rather than expansion of its activities, and further that we vigorously record our protest of the method used in this survey, of obtaining reaction to the report and its recommendations; and further be it

Resolved, That we recommend that the United States Department of Agriculture be decentralized, and that during these strenuous times that the Government spend only for necessities and defense spending, further be it

Resolved, That farmers as a rule are landowners, hence interested in the general welfare of the country, and to this is attributed the fact that rural sections have produced a large percentage of our statesmen. We are firm believers in our rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. At the present we, along with the majority of our fellow countrymen have been convinced that life and liberty are both endangered. Hence we have favored our present defense program and are willing to help pay for it. However, since this program will take probably 20 percent of the national income for several years, we are willing to deprive ourselves of other less-necessary things until our defense costs are paid, and until we are annually making a reduction in our national debt. We are willing to be the first group to make sacrifices and urge other groups to unselfishly follow us.

"Therefore, our general answer to these questions pertaining to the family farm is that the Department of Agriculture practice all possible economies until our defense problem is solved. Our recommendations are:

"1. The Agriculture Research Administration:

"I. Research: Present program adequate.

"II. Pest control: Present program adequate, possibly need further work on effect of germ warfare.

"III. Meat Inspection: Adequate.

"2. Bureau of Agricultural Economics:

"I. Agricultural estimates: Continue on present scale.

"II. Economic Investigation: Discontinue.

"3 The Cooperative Extension Service: No expansion recommended.

"4. The Office of Information: No expansion recommended; tie in with 1 and 2 above and economize.

"5. Production and Marketing Administration:

"I. Commodity Credit Corporation: Curtail 50 percent.

"II. ACF: Curtail 10 percent and reduce maximum to a farmer by 10 percent.

"III. Production adjustment program: Abolish for duration of present emergency.

"IV. Price support: Abolish.

"V. Program for stabilization of sugar production and marketing: Curtail 10 percent.

"VI. International commodity agreement program: Curtail 10 percent.

"VII. Surplus removal, export and diversion programs: Curtail 10 percent.

"VIII. Marketing agreement and order programs: Curtail 10 percent.

"IX. Marketing research: Abolish—handle by ARA

"X. Market News: Abolish—handle by BAE

"XI. Standardization, grading and inspection of farm products: Curtail 10 percent.

"XII. Marketing regulatory laws: no expansion.

"XIII. State matched-fund marketing service work: Abolish—let BAE handle it.

"XIV. Transportation rates and services: Curtail 10 percent.

"XV. Defense food program: Abolish—let extension handle necessary information in time of need.

"XVI. Other programs:

"(a) Supply program: Curtail 25 percent in administration cost.

"(b) Foreign purchase program: Curtail 25 percent administration cost.

"6. Soil Conservation Service: Render technical assistance where requested, work closely with county agent. No expansion except to move into new counties if requested by them.

"7. The Forest Service: No. expansion necessary for present emergency.

"8. Farm Credit Administration: Curtailment rather than expansion is recommended, avoid conflict with local banks and look more toward cooperation with them."

Article from the Thursday, August 30, issue of the Richmond Times-Dispatch:

**CULPEPER FARMERS RAP USDA POLICIES—
RESOLUTIONS RECENTLY ADOPTED WITH
ONLY ONE DISSENTING VOTE**

"Whereas the farmers of Culpeper County have been requested, on short notice, to express approval or disapproval of changes in United States Department of Agriculture programs outlined in a 121-page booklet, of which, first, there are very few copies in the county; second, if there had been more copies, few farmers would have had the time to read; third, many, if they had read it, would have been confused by the broad scope of subjects covered. And we strenuously object to the use of funds, appropriated by the Congress for the benefit of agriculture, by paid employees in an attempt to instill into the minds of our farm people official thinking of the Department of Agriculture; and then to have this echoed back through these same paid employees as grass roots thinking.

"Whereas we believe that many of the services now being made available by the Federal Government to farmers are good and worthwhile. Some of these, we believe, have served their purpose and are no longer required. However, we believe any of these kept in operation should be channeled through appropriate, presently constituted State agricultural agencies and county governmental bodies, such as the land-grant college, State department of agriculture, and county board of supervisors. We disapprove of the political potential of the present Department of Agriculture program and believe that the recommendations set forth in the Family Farmer Policy Review are calculated to enhance this potential;

"Whereas the present trend of the United States Department of Agriculture of centralization of authority in Washington and of continual increase in personnel points significantly to patterns followed by other countries whose economic and social status is much lower than ours and could easily lead to socialism and then to communism. This trend also results in overlapping and duplication of effort at the expense of the taxpayers;

"Whereas we believe that the present emergency situation in which the Nation now finds itself calls for the strictest kind

of economy and definite reduction in the expenditures of all nondefense agencies in the Federal Government. And we in agriculture are willing to take our proportionate share of such cuts as may be required in order that the Nation may remain on a sound financial basis: therefore be it

"Resolved, That the farmers and other individuals of Culpeper County, Va., represented at this meeting called by the agricultural mobilization committee, headed by the Production and Marketing Administration in this State do wish to be recorded as opposing the methods of the Department of Agriculture in this procedure, and that they vigorously oppose any expansion of the activities of the United States Department of Agriculture, and recommend a curtailment rather than an enlargement of such activities."

Editorial comment from the Saturday, September 1, issue of the Winchester Evening Star:

CULPEPER FARMERS ARE FIGHTING MAD

Our hat is off to the farmers of Culpeper County.

At a meeting last week they went on record as "strenuously objecting" to the use of public funds for propaganda purposes "to instill into the minds of our farm people official thinking of the Department of Agriculture, and then to have this echoed back through these same paid Agriculture Department employees as 'grass roots' thinking." The farmers further recommended strongly that "the United States Department of Agriculture be decentralized and that the administration of the affairs of agriculture in each State be done by and through any existing appropriate State and county agency."

The immediate cause of the resolution of the Culpeper farmers was a 121-page booklet put out by the Department of Agriculture with the purpose, to quote page 24, "to bring about changes in people, their attitudes, abilities, and in turn their actions."

The Culpeper farmers were asked to endorse the program outlined in the booklet. The farmers replied that, first, there were few booklets available; secondly, if there had been more copies, few farmers would have had time to read it; and thirdly, many if they had read it would have been confused by the broad scope of subjects covered.

This discerning action on the part of the farmers in Culpeper County is refreshing evidence that American farmers have their guard up against Secretary of Agriculture Brannan's program of socialized farming. The Culpeper farmers reminded Mr. Brannan that the centralization of authority in Washington "points significantly to the pattern followed in other countries whose economic and social status is much lower than ours, and which could easily lead to socialism and then communism. This trend also results in overlapping and duplication of effort at the expense of the taxpayers." The resolution was approved by an almost unanimous vote.

In England, under the Socialist Government, a farmer must get a permit from London before he can kill a hog or a steer, even for his own use.

Editorial comment from the Thursday, September 6, issue of the Clarke Courier, Berryville, Va.:

BRANNAN HAS A NEW FARM PLAN

We have always considered farmers intelligent people. We have thought of them as smart and practical, and certainly they are for they have maintained a deeply rooted independence that neither the office worker, businessman, nor the clerk can exhibit. But there is an apparent indication that Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan doesn't have the same idea as to the farmer's intelligence.

Defeated in the passage of his now well-known infamous Brannan's farm plan, the Secretary has come up with another one, and like its predecessor, it is a dilly. He seeks to obtain the endorsement of farmers on a direct payment plan to boost consumption at market prices, and the difference between the prices and adequate returns to the farmer to be met by the taxpayers of which the farmers are many.

Secretary Brannan urges the strengthening of the farm family by strengthening the family farm through self-reliance. The county committee would advise farmers on family life, hobbies, recreation, and sort of take over the job as the head of the farm family, with the result that the family would run the family farm and the Department of Agriculture would run the family. How dumb can you get?

This is all contained in a proposal which was brought out some time ago in a booklet which has only confused the farmers by its vague and difficult Government prose. Clarke County farmers have received these booklets, but it is highly doubtful if many of them have read them, and if they have, it is just as doubtful if any farmer understands what he has read. The farmer is expected to read this report, digest it and then approve or disapprove it. A typical passage reads:

"It seems more desirable to give more attention to development of standards for comparing family farms with regard to (a) economic efficiency in farm production and (b) the levels of living they provide for farm families. In the case of economic efficiency, criteria need to be developed for comparing family farms of different sizes and types in various areas and for comparing family farms with large-scale operations to determine the competitive position of farming units of different sizes. The results of such studies would indicate how the position of family farms may be strengthened. Development of production and income budgets from experience of family farms in different areas will be helpful to public and private credit agencies in their lending operations."

The booklet is filled with drivel such as this, tending to confuse and perplex those who read it. Further, it is Brannan's first step to get the farmers aboard the presidential special in 1952 for Truman.

But as we wrote up above, we consider farmers intelligent people and they value their independence and liberties too much to allow such regimentation as Brannan proposes.

Editorial comment from the Halifax County (Va.) Record-Advertiser:

NO HAND-OUT, SAY FARMERS

We think that it would have done both Houses of Congress a lot of good to have been present at the meeting last Thursday night of Halifax County farmers presided over by J. H. Austin, chairman of the PMA. The sentiments expressed were so clear cut and strong that it would have stiffened the backbone of many a wavering Congressman and convinced them all, we think, that the farmers at least in the United States want to do something about the haphazard, loose spending ways of our present Government.

The farmers took in their stride the fact that they are getting a smaller share of the national income than they did 4 years ago. They perfectly understood that farm income has decreased 12 percent, while nonfarm income has increased 12 percent. They understand that a farm family has to get along on about one-half of what a nonfarm family gets. What was the most significant thing in the whole matter was the attitude that practically everyone present took—that present conditions in farming cannot be cured by Government subsidies. In fact, the farmers present looked askance on subsidies for anyone. Over and over again they stressed the fact that unless our Government got its

house in order and began to run itself on a pay-as-you-go plan, this country is headed for ruin.

A long time ago we heard Senator Burton K. Wheeler make a speech in Virginia. Senator Wheeler praised the efforts of Senator BYRD to curb Federal spending and balance the budget. If we remember correctly he said: "A nation can no more live by spending more than it takes in than an individual. Both will go bankrupt, and it will be necessary then for both to have a receiver. What is a receiver for a bankrupt nation other than a dictator?"

The administration has not sold its program of socialism to the farmers, at least of this country. The farmers of this country are more for national interest than they are for selfish interests for farmers as a class. If Mr. Brannan could have heard the reception given his plan by the farmers of Halifax County, multiplied by the feeling that must exist whenever a group of citizens interested in their Government gather, he would at once abandon any idea of embarking on a wild orgy of spending. The farmers of Halifax County don't want that, and what the farmers want is usually what Halifax County wants.

The Gap Between Congress and Main Street

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, yesterday there was published in the New York Times magazine section an article by the distinguished and eloquent senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] entitled "The Gap Between Congress and Main Street."

Every time I return home to Connecticut—and I must have averaged a trip a week throughout 1951—I am reminded of this gap between Congress and Main Street, and it is often a wide one, at least temporarily.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by the Senator from Illinois be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. President, one final thought on this article. The Senator from Illinois refers to "the marathon legislative session" and I particularly call the attention of the Senate to the many new problems and dangers to us growing from these marathon sessions. Many of the regulations under which we in Congress now operate go back to the days when legislative sessions ran only about 4 months a year. For instance, the allowance given a Senator for railroad fare back and forth to his State only covers one such round trip per year. That regulation manifestly antedates the customary length of the session in recent years, which has spread out to something like 10 months per year. These marathon sessions which have become the regular sessions are a further, most urgent reason, in my judgment, for legislative recommendations for the reform of the Congress; such recommendations are now under consideration by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

I am sure the Senators will agree with Senator DOUGLAS' comment that "all of us are defective human instruments and Senators and Congressmen are no exception." I cite this as a provocative quotation which I hope will persuade my colleagues that this article contains many candid and penetrating observations which make it eminently worth thoughtful reading.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GAP BETWEEN CONGRESS AND MAIN STREET—SENATOR DOUGLAS POINTS TO A DANGER THAT IS CREATED BY THE MARATHON LEGISLATIVE SESSIONS

(By Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois)

WASHINGTON.—In a democratic government there is constant need for a mutual exchange of information and opinion between the people and their elected representatives. Both elements in this exchange are equally important. The elected representatives should make clear to the citizens what the facts about the issues of the day actually are and the reasons why they favor a given course of action. The voters and the citizens should in a reciprocal manner let their representatives know what they think should or should not be done. Out of this intercommunication, if properly conducted, comes a relative consensus of opinion. The democracy makes a decision but preserves its unity in the process and moves on to its next set of choices.

There is a fairly widespread feeling through the country that Congress in many respects has lost the necessary touch with the people and this interconnection has broken down.

There is some truth to the accusation, but there are mitigating circumstances. Most Congressmen, as a group, make prodigious efforts to keep in touch with the home folks. They and their staffs comb local papers, are receiving a constant stream of constituents and are always alert for every scrap of news from the grassroots.

The fact remains, however, that life in Washington tends to be inbred. It is an artificial city where public officials see more of each other than of a more representative cross section of public opinion. Furthermore, the impact of groups who can afford to maintain representation in the capital—as well as the immediate presence of special pleaders within the Government—often confuses or distorts the picture of the country as seen from Capitol Hill. This accounts for many of the occasions when it appears that there is a lag or contradiction between popular thinking and congressional action on important issues.

The fault for this sort of Washington provincialism lies less with the individual Congressman than with the legislative system itself as it has developed in recent times.

All of us are defective human instruments and Congressmen and Senators are no exception. Some may even be considered out of touch with the country because they see a little more clearly than the multitude what the real interests of the Nation and the world actually are and are more concerned about the future than about the passing moment.

But to the degree to which we are "out of touch," it is, I believe, due to the terrific pressure of work under which we labor and to the fact that we are tied up in Washington for such protracted periods of time. For the best way to keep in touch with one's constituents is to mix with them on their own ground, to meet them face to face, and to exchange opinions directly, as do good neighbors.

Up until recently, this process of mutual interaction took place normally and nat-

urally. Congress convened on March 4 and adjourned within 4 months, by the Fourth of July. The Congressmen and Senators then, with some exceptions, went home, lived among their neighbors and resumed their businesses and professions. In their spare time, they would travel in a leisurely fashion over their State or district, making speeches to whoever would listen to them, but also talking privately with people in restaurants, drug stores, and on the street. It is true that all too frequently the returning representatives talked with a too restricted social group and that they did not get in touch adequately with the manual workers who customarily lived "on the other side of the railway tracks." But such a failure was due more to a defect in the sympathies and imagination of the representatives than to any lack of opportunity. And in the crowded districts of the great cities, the Congressmen kept in touch with the humble as well as with the powerful.

It is true that some Senators and Congressmen in supposedly safe districts would fall subject to the attractions of Washington and the East and seldom return home. The story is told, for example, of a celebrated Senator X from one of the Mountain States who, after staying away for years, returned one day to his native city. A small boy spied him on the street and rushing to his father shouted, "Father, I have just seen Senator X." To which the father is alleged to have replied, "Son, you must be mistaken. Senator X is too big a man to visit his home State."

But only nationally known figures from "safe" districts could get by with such absenteeism. In general, the voters tacitly and indeed properly required their representatives to return for consultation upon penalty of defeat. Statesmen who acquired a bad case of "Potomac fever" (which causes a man to swell without growing) were commonly turned out to grass. Generally only those who kept in close contact with their constituents survived.

But this informal give-and-take has largely been swept away in recent years by the prolonged sessions of Congress. In 1949, for example, Congress was continuously in session from January 3 to October 19, while in 1950, though we recessed on September 23, we reconvened on November 27. This is typical of what has been happening throughout the last 15 years. The result is that the job of Congressman or Senator has become virtually a full-time one in itself.

This in effect precludes a representative from actively practicing a supplementary profession or business. It also chains him to Washington for approximately 10 months a year, leaving only 2 months out of which a brief vacation and the inspection of Government agencies, as well as a sojourn back home, must come. The result is that even with the best will in the world a Congressman or a Senator finds it hard to keep in touch personally with his constituents and to carry out the reciprocal interchange of opinions and arguments which is an essential part of the blood stream of democracy.

Our system of representative democracy puts a high premium on intelligent information on the views of the people who send us to Washington. It also attaches a great deal of importance to the public representative's ability to analyze and interpret the effect of pending legislation on the general welfare. The caterwaul of the lobbyists is most dangerous when even the most conscientious legislator has not had the opportunity to sound out the true state of affairs.

The average Senator or Congressman must vote on hundreds of measures concerning which he has no special knowledge of his own. He can often use the advice of constituents to particular advantage. By the same token he owes his constituents the responsibility of making the issues and his own

position on those issues crystal clear. Nothing is more disastrous to a democracy than a gulf between national policy and the people who must live—perhaps even die—according to that policy.

But the political future of the most hard-working representatives is put in jeopardy by enforced absences from home.

The fact that the Senators and Congressmen must be away from home for so long is resented by many of the voters, who feel that their servants should be back with them more and who tend to treat their absence as an indication that they have gone "high hat." Moreover, while the legislator is tied to Washington his rivals, both inside and outside his party, are free to roam through his district making speeches at luncheon clubs and building themselves up as friendly and solicitous tribunes of the people. The Congressmen and Senators therefore come to feel much like the chief of the Alban Tribe, whom Frazer described in his *Golden Bough* as pacing at midnight in the grove by the Lake of Nemi, waiting for the rival who would slay him with the sword and then succeed to his chieftainship.

It is small wonder, therefore, that the average representative, for both personal and general reasons, seeks quite zealously to find additional ways of keeping in touch with his constituents.

The first way is, of course, through correspondence. The volume of mail received in congressional offices has increased greatly ever since Franklin Roosevelt was elected President. In the pre-F D R. days, a Congressman's mail would commonly amount to 15 or 20 letters a day, while even a Senator from a big State would seldom receive more than a hundred. In contrast, when my wife was a Congresswoman from Illinois from 1945 to 1947, she would customarily get from 200 to 300 communications a day and today, as a Senator from the same State, I receive around 1,200. This I believe is fairly typical of the volume received by Senators from large industrial States. I am informed, however, that the mail of the Senators from New York is about three times as heavy as this.

This mail is at once a heavy burden and a fruitful opportunity. The physical labor of handling it promptly is great and makes the secretarial staffs on the Hill the most overburdened of Government employees. The volume is indeed so heavy that most of the letters on legislative issues have to be answered with form letters. Along with others, I try to make my replies informative both about the facts and as to what my position is and why. About 300 of the daily letters receive personal replies from me which I try to make as individualized as possible.

On the whole, one's correspondence is a valuable source of information as to what people are thinking. There are, however, certain inherent biases in its composition of which a representative is always aware. The first is that the "against" letters on matters of general policy always tend to overrepresent that section of opinion. It is curious but nevertheless true that men and women seem to be more ardent in opposition than in advocacy.

A second qualification is that letters come from the more articulate sections of the community, which have both the leisure and the means to write. This means that wage-earners and farmers tend to be underrepresented in the mail and the professional and business groups overrepresented. The third caution which must be followed in analyzing one's mail is that part of it is dictated by pressure groups. This can commonly be detected by the use of stereotyped phrases which monotonously recur. While such mail should not be disregarded, its importance as a free expression of opinion should certainly be discounted.

If letters are then the chief means by which voters communicate to their Representatives, how do the latter try to keep in touch with the voters? The first method is, of course, through replies to one's correspondents, and this I have already discussed.

Nearly every Congressman and Senator, moreover, sends out a periodic newsletter both to friends and to the newspapers of his district to let them know what he is doing and thinking. Most of the Congressmen from the nonurban districts as well as the Senators also make periodic radio broadcasts back to their home districts. Both the House and the Senate are equipped with radio recording rooms where one can cut a record which can then be reproduced in quantity and shipped out to the local radio stations to be played over the air by transcription. The average cost for such a record is approximately \$3, so that a five-station program will cost \$15 and a ten-station program approximately \$30. The stations will play these records in between election times without charge as a public service feature, so that a Congressman can, therefore, get a reasonable radio coverage inside his district for \$300 a year and a Senator for perhaps \$750.

Ex-Senator Arthur Capper, of Kansas, was probably the most effective in his radio talks of any Senator. Through field interviews conducted by the circulation and advertising staffs of his farm papers he knew each week what the people of Kansas were chiefly concerned about and the directions in which they were leaning. With this information at his command he was then able to go to the radio and speak on the condition of the Kansas voters. There are few or none of us today, however, who have the facilities to gather similar information.

Finally there are the trips back home. These, if they can be managed, are the best of all. But while these are easily possible for the Representatives who come from within a radius of 250 miles around Washington, they are almost impossible for those who hail from the Pacific coast and the Mountain States. While the airplane has distinctly lengthened our tether, we of the Middle West still find such trips difficult. In the first place, each trip costs around \$125.

In the second place, bitter experience has taught us that no matter how quiet the legislative schedule may seem, if we return home during the week, a storm is almost certain to blow up and crucial roll calls will be held. Then if we are absent the same constituents who customarily demand our presence as proof that we have not contracted "Potomac fever" will damn us out vehemently for neglecting our posts. Moreover, if a Representative cancels such an engagement at the last minute in order to vote, then the organization before which he was to appear is likely to become his enemy for life. As the saying goes, in such matters "One can't win."

The result is that during sessions it is only safe to make engagement for week ends. I, for example, try to make two such trips back home every month. These are very crowded days and I always return to Washington with the unhappy feeling that while I have talked with my constituents about what I think, I have not been able adequately to find out what they think.

The wise Senator and Congressman will, however, devote at least one month of the two which are left to traveling among his constituents. I try to lay out a schedule some time in advance for this trip and each year try to cover about half the State. This is the most pleasant part of the year. Traveling over the roads and mixing with people are a sure, if temporary, cure for the "butterfly stomach" which is the characteristic of Washington. Like Anteus of old, one feels

the stronger for having touched once more the reality of the good earth.

Except during the 6 months prior to an election, a Senator or Congressman can generally speak at nonpartisan or citizen gatherings and meet with members of the opposing political party as well as with those of his own. Such meetings soften the asperities of the political campaigns which follow, and do much to prevent party strife from becoming too bitter.

In order to widen still further the scope of such contacts, a friend has allowed me to fit up his station wagon for sound and on my tour hold a large number of meetings out of doors in courthouse squares, on the main streets of towns, and at factory gates as shifts start and end. I have been criticized rather strongly for this on the ground that it is said to be undignified for a United States Senator to seek out crowds.

I have never been greatly worried by this criticism, however, for it seems to me that the job of explaining and discussing the issues of the day is so important that one should seek out the people in every possible way. One of my most pleasant experiences nearly every fall is speaking at the noon hour to intelligent and skeptical crowds at the Western Electric plant, where the questioning is always keen and the verbal give-and-take spirited. The engineers and office workers there are always eager for economy and alert on foreign policy. Perhaps I do more speaking than is necessary or even desirable, but I take some pride in the fact that last year I made a total of over 500 speeches in well over a hundred towns in Illinois. And I tried to do a lot of listening too.

I hope it is not immodest to add that a heavy price is exacted for all this. The heaviest is the small amount of time which it leaves for a normal life with one's family. There are numerous Senators besides myself who are not able to take vacations with their families. One has, indeed, the constant doubt whether the whole struggle is worth such deprivation and whether it would not be far better to get out of politics and be able to live a normal life with those one loves. Another deprivation is the lessened amount of reading we can do. I try to read approximately two books a week, divided fairly evenly between current events and the great, glowing classics which live for all time. But I find this pace sometimes difficult to maintain and I must confess that I read far too many newspapers and periodicals which chronicle only the passing moment.

It is similarly difficult to save time for contemplation and to mark out the moments where, in James Martineau's words, "the arc of our lives meets the tangent of eternity." We frequently fail, therefore, to make contact with the eternal as well as with the transient.

There are basic factors built into our present Federal system which influence the extent to which Congress can truly keep in touch with the temper of the country as a whole. In the Senate a small State like Nevada has a voice equal to that of New York; rural-dominated State legislatures have frequently refused to reapportion congressional districts in accordance with changes in population. As a result opinions of city dwellers are minimized and the opinions of those who live in the country and small towns are maximized.

But the most immediate need for improvement, as I see it, is so to arrange the business of Congress as to let all of us have more time with our constituents and for study and reflection.

There are two suggestions which I should like to offer in this direction. The first is that the leadership in Congress should so arrange the legislative schedule that definite and important bills be brought forward for action on the floor during the first 3 months

of the year instead of being postponed until the middle or end of the session. While we are busy in our offices and in committee during the early months of the year there has tended to be a legislative vacuum on the floor. Failure to act in the early months prolongs the session and hence makes it more difficult to consult with the voters. More legislative action at the very outset should shorten the session and make it more possible for us to get back home.

A second improvement, in my judgment, would be for the Senate to adopt a rule of germaneness in debate. We are continually being delayed and interrupted as we are considering a bill by long speeches on an infinite variety of irrelevant subjects. This holds us back and greatly slows up proceedings. It would greatly expedite business if discussions were confined to the bill under consideration. This would shorten the session and the Senate could then set aside, as does the House, a periodic 5-o'clock hour, when Members might address the Senate on any subject.

This would permit colleagues who were not particularly interested in the speech of the Senator in question to return to their offices to get some work done while still retaining the Senate as a useful sounding board for the discussions of topics which are not immediately before the Senate for action. But whether or not these suggestions are the best that could be adopted, some improvement is needed to reestablish the intercommunication between electors and the elected which is so necessary for a democracy.

And so we representatives of the people struggle along, doing our job incompletely and making many errors along the way. But at times to nearly all of us comes the consciousness that we are perhaps part of the divine shuttle which, as it moves back and forth, helps to weave the texture of democracy, and we pray that in spite of our individual faults the pattern which we help to weave may be noble and worthy. In the words of Browning's Rabbi Ben Ezra:

"So, take and use thy work:
Amend what flaws may lurk,
What strain o' the stuff,
What warpings past the aim"

Killing the Goose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include in the Record an editorial in this morning's Washington Post, entitled "Killing the Goose."

The editorial is as follows:

KILLING THE GOOSE

Sound economy embraces the conservation and cultivation of national resources. In the light of this standard, the recent action of the House in slashing the appropriation request of the National Science Foundation must be viewed as a piece of penny-wise foolishness. Congress established the foundation last year and authorized it to spend \$15,000,000 for the purpose of stimulating research in basic science and giving educational opportunities and training to some 2,000 young scientists. Organized under the direction of Dr. Alan T. Waterman, the foundation asked for \$14,000,000. The House cut

this by 98 percent, granting only \$300,000 and in effect nullifying the entire authorized program. This pittance precludes research and training alike, leaving the agency without any real function. This is not economy; it is wreckage—the wreckage of a program vital to national welfare and national defense.

In a letter urging the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee to repair the error of the House, Dr. Lyle B. Borst, chairman of the Federation of American Scientists, pointed out that "we run the risk of greatly distorting and weakening our entire research effort if we do not lay special emphasis on the training of new investigators and the development of new fundamental knowledge." American inventiveness has been strongest in the realm of applied science, but to a large extent American scientists have relied upon their European colleagues for basic research. That reliance is no longer feasible. And at a time when scientific supremacy is the cornerstone of military strength any neglect of this country's scientific potentialities is rank profligacy. Every consideration of national security will support the Senate in restoring the funds requested by the National Science Foundation—and in insisting upon the restoration when the appropriations bill goes to conference.

Separation of Air-Mail Pay From Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record two very interesting editorials bearing on the pending legislation, Senate bill 436, one entitled "The Passenger in the Baggage Compartment," published in the Baltimore Sun of September 16, 1951, and the other entitled "Air Mail and Subsidies," published in the Washington Post of September 11, 1951, which I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of September 16, 1951]

THE PASSENGER IN THE BAGGAGE COMPARTMENT

A young lady boards a trans-Atlantic plane bound from New York to Paris. She holds the stub of a ticket for which she paid \$394.60 one way. Settling back in the comfortable seat, she expects her money's worth. And she gets it. There's good food, champagne on some flights and perhaps even a sample bottle of Parisian perfume.

Riding beneath the young lady is another passenger also bound for Paris. But this passenger rides in a dark cavernous section of the plane, jostled to and fro by other passengers. No comfort, no champagne, and no perfume. And why should there be? After all this passenger is only a humble sack of mail. But there's nothing humble about its fare, \$1,578. And who foots the bill? Uncle Sam.

In other words, the way the airlines figure it passengers go to Europe for about 70 cents

a ton-mile. But letter mail travels the same route at a cost to the Government of \$2.40 per ton-mile.

The Post Office Department is currently running a larger deficit on foreign air mail (\$50,900,000) than on domestic (\$35,500,000). One of the reasons why the international deficit is so large is that at present the cost of hauling international air mail is not based on actual transportation costs but is part of a conglomerate fee paid out by the Post Office Department to the airlines to cover both mail pay and subsidy.

Since VJ-day (according to a recent Comptroller General's report) the Post Office Department has paid the mail-carrying airlines a total of one-half billion dollars. How much of this has been subsidy?

The Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board in a conservative estimate places the figure between \$150,000,000 and \$200,000,000. The vagueness of this estimate by an informed public official is a rough indication of the taxpayer's total ignorance of what is being done with his "air-mail dollar." Clearly the time has come for a clean separation between what is subsidy and what is pay for carrying the mails.

A partial remedy is now under consideration by a Senate committee. This is the Johnson bill, S. 436. Under this bill as amended, the Federal Government would not be relieved of the subsidy burden. But at least the Post Office would be relieved of paying mail pay and subsidy in one lump fee. Under the bill subsidy would be separately determined and paid separately by the Civil Aeronautics Board. Then at least the taxpayer might be able to see what's what.

[From the Washington Post of September 11, 1951]

AIR MAIL AND SUBSIDIES

While Congress is voting on various proposals to raise postal rates, the Senate has a chance to strike a real blow for reduction of the postal deficit. That is to pass, without watering, the Johnson bill to separate sums paid to the airlines for carrying air mail from the sums paid them in governmental subsidy. To be sure, S. 436, as amended, would not relieve the Government of the burden of airline subsidies. But it would remove this millstone from the neck of the Post Office Department, which has been paying a conglomerate fee for mail pay and subsidy. Under the bill, subsidies would be determined separately from mail rates and would be paid separately by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The Senate bill is not ideal, even in the determination of domestic mail rates. For example, it contains a good deal of loose language, such as the provision that mail rates "shall be based upon" (instead of "shall not exceed") cost plus air return. But the bill does give the CAB leeway to modify rates and set standards for compensation without further legislation. It also provides that no new certificates for carrying the mail shall be issued, nor any extensions of present service approved, without the sanction of the Postmaster General. Although the standards for separate subsidy determination are vague, especially in the national defense feature, the bill does provide that the existence of an airline certificate shall not be deemed conclusive justification for subsidy. That should give the CAB a weapon in insisting upon efficient management.

Where the bill falls down, rather badly in our opinion, is in setting up a dual standard for international carriers which completely ignores the cost factor in mail rates. It sets as a floor the amounts paid to foreign carriers for handling the mail, and as a ceiling the Universal Postal Union rate of \$2.86 a ton-mile. The ceiling rate would be approximately three times the rate charged

passengers and nearly seven times that assessed freight and express. In other words, the bill would continue to hide large amounts of subsidy in the guise of mail pay. Yet the bill would authorize still further subsidies. Obviously the concept of subsidy separation has been clouded here, and the bill needs to be amended to relate international mail payments to cost.

None of these objections is a valid reason, however, to delay consideration of a move that has been batted around like a tennis ball for the last 2 years. What the Senate can do is place the principle of subsidy separation on the record and tighten up the loopholes of the present bill to identify subsidies clearly.

Know Your Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, as per authority granted me to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include copy of an article by the Marine News of New York, N. Y., published in the Washington Post, as follows:

KNOW YOUR WATERWAYS—INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY DEVELOPMENT

During World War II, barge transportation of petroleum products along the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, including the Florida and Jersey canals, had they been ready, would have saved many lives and a tremendous material loss from submarine action. While hundreds of millions of dollars were being spent for steel for pipe lines and tank cars—steel badly needed in other directions, relatively fractional amounts for harbor and channel development were condemned by some as extravagance, log rolling or "pork barrel" legislation.

Much intracoastal and inland waterway development remains before these channels can yield the great benefits potential in them. National security will be greater with such additional transportation available which will be a further safeguard in case of disruption of other transportation facilities. Distribution Age said in January, "Capacity production without capacity distribution is futile." Low cost distribution is one of the unsolved problems of our economic system.

New Committee Organized to Explore Political Realignment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release issued by him entitled "Announcement of Formation of Bipartisan Committee to Explore Political Realignment."

The Senator from South Dakota states in that connection:

Due to the growing interest in proposals for finding a political formula in 1952 whereby the effective voting strength of like-minded voters in the North and South can vote for the same candidates for President and Vice President regardless of where they live geographically or how they are registered politically, I think the Senate will be interested in some developments occurring in Washington in that connection during the past week end.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNOUNCEMENT OF FORMATION OF BIPARTISAN COMMITTEE TO EXPLORE POLITICAL REALINE- MENT

Following a meeting of like-minded Americans—Democrats and Republicans—from 17 States who held a 3-day series of informal and unpublicized conferences here in the Mayflower Hotel Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, the formation of a committee to explore political realignment was announced here today. The committee will be headed by co-chairmen with equal authority—a Democrat and a Republican. An executive committee was created which will complete the organization. Edward R. Burke, former Democratic Senator from Nebraska, will serve as temporary chairman of the executive committee.

A partial list of executive committee members was announced as follows:

PARTIAL LIST, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS OF NEWLY ORGANIZED NATIONAL BIPARTISAN COM- MITTEE TO EXPLORE POLITICAL REALINE- MENT

Edward R. Burke, Omaha, Nebr., and Washington, D. C.: Democratic United States Senator from Nebraska 1935-41, and Member of United States House of Representatives in the Seventy-third Congress from Omaha, Nebr., district. Temporary chairman.

Donald J. Cowling, Minneapolis, Minn.: president, Carleton College, Northfield, Minn., 1909-1945; former president, Association American Colleges, member, National Republican Program Committee, 1927-40.

Charles Edison, West Orange, N. J.: Former Democratic Governor of New Jersey, Secretary of the Navy under President Franklin D. Roosevelt, past president of National Municipal League; president, Thomas A. Edison, Inc.

Horace A. Hildreth, Lewisburg, Pa.: Former Republican Governor of Maine, 1945 to 1949; now president, Bucknell College, Lewisburg, Pa.

Albert W. Hawkes, Montclair, N. J.: Former Republican member of the United States Senate, 1943-49; former president of United States Chamber of Commerce; former president, Congoleum-Nairn, Inc. (now retired).

Donald R. Richberg, Charlottesville, Va.: Executive Director, National Emergency Council under President Franklin D. Roosevelt; Chairman, NRA Board (National Recovery Act) under President Franklin D. Roosevelt; now professor of constitutional law, University of Virginia, and member, Washington, D. C., law firm of Davies, Richberg, Beebe, Busick & Richardson.

These six—three Democrats; three Republicans—will expand the executive committee to include others from both political parties, to represent additional areas of the country, economic and professional pursuits, etc. They will select the cochairmen, secretary, treasurer, and other committee officials. Headquarters of the committee is expected to be maintained in Washington, D. C.

The purpose of the Committee to Explore Political Realignment is to conduct studies and hold conferences in both the South and the North, inquiring into the practical possibilities and potentialities of the various methods by which it has been proposed to join the voting strength of like-minded vot-

ers in 1952, regardless of where they live geographically or how they are registered politically. The objective is to create an administration that will reflect the convictions of these Americans to the end that America may be preserved and world peace established; it is believed that this can be done by combining the voting strength of the people in the local voting precincts whose Senators and Representatives in Congress have been crossing party lines for many years to oppose socialistic legislation and to support measures designed to strengthen the doctrine of home rule by States and local communities as against bureaucratic tyranny operated by an all-powerful Federal Government.

It is the feeling of this group that prevailing party designations have become confusing and unrealistic; that they often operate to divide into ineffective voting blocs the votes of those in different geographic areas who agree on the basic political, economic, and social problems of our times. Differences within our two major political parties, they maintain, have frequently become more significant and divisive than the differences between the two parties as reflected in party platforms and political campaigns. When this occurs, the individual voter is frustrated and defeated in his desire to have as effective a part in directing the destiny of his own Government.

The newly formed committee will sponsor no specific candidates—either Republican or Democrat. It is more interested in developing basic American standards for party platforms and in the political procedures by which those who think alike can find a working formula for combining their voting strength to stop the encroachments of socialism and the all-inclusive centralized superstate. Committee spokesmen said its ensuing studies and activities should determine the specific methods by which the proposed combination of alliance of like-minded voters might best manifest their strength in influencing the results of the 1952 election.

Plans for formulation of the new committee have been shaping up for several weeks, but it was decided to select Constitution Day as the date for announcing its organization since strict adherence to the American constitutional concepts of limited government, individual liberty, and private ownership will be a lodestar in guiding the activities of the newly formed group.

The Whisper of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRAZIER REAMS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Toledo Blade of August 23, 1951, entitled "The Whisper of America":

THE WHISPER OF AMERICA

Action of the Senate Appropriations Committee in cutting \$22,000,000 more from the Voice of America funds, which had already been cut \$30,000,000 below the administration's request by the House, indicates that the President and Congress are still at odds over the value of this propaganda weapon in the ideological struggle with the Soviet Union.

It would be interesting to know on what grounds the Senate committee, meeting in executive session, based its heavy reduction.

Do the Senators know of any specific activities of the Voice of America program which could be eliminated without affecting its usefulness? Can they cite any instances of wasted money? Or do they just feel that the whole program is of doubtful value and for that reason should be held down to a minimum scale?

If their policy of curtailment is based on this last reason, it must be admitted that it is extremely difficult to measure the results of any propaganda campaign waged by air in hostile territory. But surely Senators who talk more than any other species of homo sapiens, cannot discount the effectiveness of words on that account. If they can be as effective in political campaigns as they have often proved, why shouldn't they prove extremely useful in the sort of ideological warfare in which we are now engaged?

The men who have been directing this phase of our propaganda campaign think that it has been successful, though they have no way of telling for sure and though they naturally have a personal interest in the matter. So do the Russians, whose only interest is bound to be the opposite of ours and who have done their best to jam all broadcasts directed behind the iron curtain and who have countered with a similar program of their own.

Under these circumstances it is hard to figure out why Congress, whose members can hardly be experts in this field of mass communication, should overrule the judgment of the men who are. This struggle between democracy and communism for men's minds could turn out to be the decisive phrase of the conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union. And why should the Voice of America be reduced to a whisper while it rages?

Eisenhower and European Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Rev. Edward A. Conway, appearing in the September 15 issue of America, national Catholic weekly, entitled "Eisenhower and European Union":

EISENHOWER AND EUROPEAN UNION

(By Edward A. Conway)

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Supreme Commander of the North Atlantic Treaty Army, made two statements early in July which should be required reading for the foreign, defense, and finance ministers of the 12 North Atlantic Treaty nations. Those gentlemen of the North Atlantic Council will meet for a week in Ottawa beginning September 15—the Russians at San Francisco permitting—to prepare for their regular annual conference at Rome in late October. The successful defense of the west will depend on the decisions made at those two meetings. The ideas of the man to whom that defense has been entrusted on what now urgently needs to be done should be welcomed and carefully weighed at both Ottawa and Rome.

Take, for example, this passage from the general's address to the English Speaking Union at London, July 3:

"It would be difficult to overstate the benefits, in these years of stress and tension, that

would accrue to NATO if the free nations of Europe were truly a unit."

Though the general proceeded to deplore "the web of customs barriers interlaced with bilateral agreements, multilateral cartels, local shortages, economic monstrosities, and patchwork territorial fences," it quickly became clear that he was not urging mere economic integration. The unity so necessary for security, he went on to say, is political as well:

"The establishment of a workable European federation would go far to create confidence among people everywhere that Europe was doing its full and vital share in giving this cooperation."

That might be taken as nothing more than benevolent encouragement of European federation as a desirable, however distant, objective, were it not for the intriguingly worded paragraph that followed:

"Any soldier contemplating this problem would be moved to express an opinion that it cannot be attacked successfully by slow infiltration, but only by direct and decisive assault, with all available means. The project faces the deadly danger of procrastination, timid measures, slow steps, and cautious stages."

This is strongly reminiscent of what Pope Pius XII said to the European Union of Federalists 3 years ago:

"If it is intended that this union shall really achieve its purpose, if it is desired to make it serve to advantage the cause of economic and political peace between the continents, it is high time it were established. Some are even asking themselves whether it is not already too late."

During consultations with visiting members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee July 9, General Eisenhower made it clear that he considers federation very relevant to his own immediate defense problems:

"Personally, I am very hopeful that many of our problems would disappear if this whole area of Western Europe were one federal union. I believe it so strongly that I do not believe that real security is going to be felt in the United States, in the British Empire, and other nations of the globe until that comes about."

This statement was set in a context expressing a sense of driving urgency:

"The faster they [Western Europeans] regain their confidence, the faster they will do the job of defending themselves. In my opinion, the one thing that can break the United States and give us nothing in return is to drag this thing out. We must go to the limit of our productive capacity and of the power of Europe to absorb our military assistance, and get it done now."

Two weeks after General Eisenhower put himself on record in favor of the earliest possible European federation, I had a chance to observe the reactions of both Europeans and Americans. Sir Alfred Zimmern of Great Britain, former director of the Geneva School of International Studies, delivered a powerful address on European unity at the Colgate Conference on American Foreign Policy. Disclosing that he had abandoned his opposition to European union since the United States had finally and definitely committed itself to European defense, Sir Alfred discussed the "experiment of European federation which will determine the character of the atomic age":

"Will it mark the inauguration of the rule of law in the world? Or will it usher in a dark epoch of perpetual fear? The issue lies with us Europeans: for you Americans, insofar as it concerns you, have already made up your minds. Are we not justified in regarding General Eisenhower's magnificent speech on Independence day (it was given on the eve thereof)—I had almost said Interdependence day—as expressing your own sentiments?"

But was Sir Alfred justified in saying Americans had already made up their minds in favor of European federation? Formal addresses by two top State Department spokesmen at the same conference moved me to wonder a bit. At the closing session of the conference Philip C. Jessup, United States Ambassador at Large, found time in an hour-long discourse to devote this one sentence to Eisenhower's magnificent speech. "For such European unity," he said, "General Eisenhower made a dramatic plea in London on July 3." The luncheon address on the day Sir Alfred was to speak in the evening was delivered by Thomas D. Cabot, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for International Security Affairs. Mr. Cabot, according to the State Department Bulletin, is directly responsible for work in connection with the United States participation in both the mutual defense assistance program and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. In his discussion of implementing the Atlantic Pact, Mr. Cabot delivered himself of this eminently correct but excruciatingly cautious comment:

"It is perhaps a recognition of this difficulty [that 'neither the North Atlantic Council nor any of its subsidiary bodies possess the power to make binding decisions, and agreements can be reached only through the slow process of negotiating unanimity among the members'] which has recently prompted a renewed interest in the problem of European unity both here and abroad. On this point, I wish to say only that the United States Government has constantly supported all practicable approaches to the achievement of closer European integration and will continue to do so. At the same time, it would be a mistake to believe that this problem can be easily solved or that European unity, even if achieved, would be a panacea for all ills."

Mr. Cabot has, I suspect, one of the old and perhaps envious hands in the Department to thank for putting him in the position of "cooling off" the general, with whom his job demands that he have nothing but the very best relations. It is quite evident that the word among the Department's speech-writers, even after General Eisenhower's eloquent appeal for prompt federation, remains as it long has been: "Support it but don't push it."

The fact seems to be that the general's personal experiences in Europe have put him far in advance of the State Department theorists in knowledge of the basic difficulties which still stand in the way of adequate European rearmament, and especially of the grievous shortcoming of NATO as an operating organization. Diplomatically, yet pointedly, the Supreme Commander alluded to the latter at London, in a passage which also indicates one of his main reasons for wanting early European federation.

"We, the peoples of the British Commonwealth and of the United States, have profited by unity at home. If, with our moral and material assistance, the free European nations could attain a similar integration, our friends would be strengthened, our own economies improved and the laborious NATO machinery of mutual defense vastly simplified."

That was just 2 months after drastic revision of the NATO machinery was announced from London by Charles M. Spofford, deputy United States representative for NATO, in order to simplify and make more effective the executive organization of NATO. The implication is obvious that General Eisenhower is baffled by the number of his bosses. If a European federation were set up they could be reduced to three, representing the federation, the British Commonwealth, and the United States. No wonder he called for a direct and decisive assault, with every available means against continuing European disunity. No wonder

he warned against procrastination, timid measures, slow steps, and cautious stages.

By direct and decisive assault, however, the general does not seem to mean the so-called constitutional approach to federation, such as is embodied in the demands of European federalists like Altiero Spinelli for the immediate convocation of a European constituent assembly. His approach might be termed "semifunctionalist" in the sense that he accepts the necessity of working toward federation through cooperative action on concrete problems. His choice of the specific field in which to start toward federation clearly indicates, however, that he does not hold with Britain's Herbert Morrison that the nations must go no further than intergovernmental cooperation. General Eisenhower wants to move toward federation through the development of a European army. He is giving warm and open encouragement to the so-called Pleven plan, from which the British shied away because it is more federalist than functional. When the French Government proposed the plan last October 24 it frankly declared that the organization of a European army is vital principally because of the political solutions it implies, since the creation of such an army would necessarily further European unity. The general, by his encouragement, shows a willingness to accept that implication. What is more, he welcomes it. In the conversations with the visiting Senators referred to above, he said:

"I realize that a lot of my professional associates are going to think that I am completely crazy, but I will tell you that joining Europe together is the key to the whole thing. And if you can do it with a European army, I am ready to put a lot of work in it."

That, in the colloquial, common-sense language for which he is famous, is proof that our soldier-statesman has grasped the real significance of the Pleven plan. It is more than a device, however important, for incorporating the needed German forces into the European defense scheme. As the French representative, M. Hervé Alphand, said at the conclusion of the Paris Conference on a European army July 24:

"The delegates (of France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, and Luxembourg) believe that this merger, under European political, military, and financial institutions, which will be created simultaneously with, or after, the Schuman plan (for the merging of European steel and coal industries) would constitute an extremely important step in the political and military realm along the road to the achievement of European federation."

The delegates might have added that the step would be just as important in the economic realm, demanding, as it does, economic integration far beyond what ECA has been able to bring about.

The Pleven plan is the military twin of the Schuman plan. Indeed, they might be described as Siamese twins, since they are joined by several common supervisory bodies, and notably by the same European Parliamentary Assembly. This democratic body would supervise Schuman plan operations, and also control the administrative acts of the European Defense Authority.

The experts who submitted their agreed recommendations on a European army were immediately directed to write a draft treaty. So many unresolved problems remain, however, such as the size and command of the German units and the methods of financing, that it is doubtful whether a final draft will be ready for discussion even in Rome, unless negotiations are speeded up. A similar situation obtains in the case of the Schuman plan. The disturbing fact is that no adequate European defense system is possible until both those plans are actually in operation.

General Eisenhower has done his part. It remains for our diplomats on the North Atlantic Council to emulate his leadership, at Ottawa especially. Is it too much to hope that they will manifest a more sympathetic understanding of what the Europeans are trying to accomplish through the Schuman and Pleven plans; the while they insist, more vigorously than they have heretofore, that the remaining differences be settled in time for conclusive action by the Council in its conference at Rome?

Questions of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 10, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, does Mr. Truman remember that the Republican Eightieth Congress was responsible for a surplus of \$9,174,000,000 in the Federal fiscal operations of the last 5 years?

When the Federal budget jumps from its present \$70,000,000,000 a year to \$100,000,000,000 who will stop inflation?

Does anyone know what the \$5,000,000,000 tacked on to the military appropriations for the coming year is really for?

International Adventures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, for the edification of the taxpayers of our country I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following report prepared by Mr. Paul O. Peters:

NEARLY ONE-FOURTH OF FEDERAL EXPENDITURES IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1951 WENT FOR INTERNATIONAL ADVENTURES AND COST OF KOREAN WAR

Total reported expenditures of the Federal Government in the fiscal year 1951 ended June 30 were \$44,632,821,908.37. This amount was previously exceeded only in the four fiscal years 1943 through 1946, when reported Federal expenditures were as follows:

1943	\$79,702,073,074
1944	\$5,572,319,510
1945	100,397,470,126
1946	63,713,798,417

Receipts of the Federal Government in fiscal 1951 were reported at \$48,142,604,532.62, the largest amount ever collected in any single fiscal year since the Republic was established, and exceeding the total revenues of the Federal Government in the 10-year period from 1930 through 1939. Thus has the cost of the Federal Government increased, with the burden falling on the American consumer and taxpayer.

Nearly one-fourth of the expenditures in fiscal 1951 were for international adventures supporting our foreign policies and the estimated cost of the United Nations war in

Korea. The table following shows the details of the expenditures:

Agency expending funds, fiscal year 1951:	Reported total expenditures fiscal year 1951
Agriculture Department..	\$17,272,866.20
Commerce Department..	306,316.71
Army Department.....	59,667,709.24
Navy Department.....	1,379,190.83
Economic Cooperation Administration.....	2,903,280,230.24
Export - Import Bank, loans and guarantees..	219,313,961.00
Federal Security Agency..	316,439.19
General Services Admin- istration.....	29,370,144.02
Korean aid.....	36,902,031.23
Mutual Defense Assist- ance.....	883,733,742.06
State Department.....	21,649,988.03

Total listed ex- penditures.....	4,183,192,462.75
Estimated cost of Ko- rean war for fiscal year 1951 (from Senate hearings).....	7,500,000,000.00

Total cost of in- ternational aid and Korean war, fiscal 1951.....	11,683,192,462.75
---	-------------------

The expenditures for international adventures and the war in Korea exceeded the expenditures of the Federal Government in any one year prior to 1941 with the exception of the fiscal years 1917, 1918, and 1919, the World War I period, when the total for 3 years was \$33,189,264,177. This amount included the loans to foreign governments.

Preserving the Historic Documents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1951

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I was one of a large assemblage at the Library of Congress this morning to witness the sealing against possible physical deterioration of the two great documents in our Nation's history, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. Perhaps I should have said, to witness our renewed efforts under the latest scientific technique to preserve these documents against the ravages of time. We all know that these priceless historical statements have been very carefully preserved for more than a hundred and fifty years, and since 1921 have been on display in the shrine on the mezzanine floor of the Library of Congress. During the 15 years that I have been a Member of Congress I have frequently taken young people who were visiting me in Washington from the far West to see these great state papers in their original form in the shrine. But it was apparent to me that something should be done for their better preservation if the latest scientific knowledge could suggest a technique. It is my understanding that the ceremony we witnessed today of the sealing of the documents is that more modern and effective technique by which we hope to

preserve these basic instruments for an indefinitely long future.

At the appropriate ceremony many notable speakers gave addresses that should be studied by all American citizens. Among these speakers were the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and the President of the United States. Both of these high officials, as might be expected, had the appropriate thing to say linking the past with the living present. In this effort to safeguard and preserve the physical documents it seemed unusually fitting that the speakers should also mention the necessity of safeguarding the principles embodied in the statements. In these days when the world is divided between two great conflicting ideologies it seemed especially important for the speakers to contrast mere words with living ideas. Words alone will not suffice as we see demonstrated by certain other nations that have constitutions which are not adhered to and, accordingly, are not instruments of good government and human freedom.

A significant point was made that these great American charters are the parents of many similar charters around the world. And now we are reminded that the latest offspring is at this time being born in the island of Puerto Rico, where it is the hope of our Government that this island, dependent under the American flag, may have the greatest degree of self-government which may properly and wisely be furnished it. This is mentioned as the latest of the progeny but by no means is it likely to be the last. This statement is not intended to be more than a suggestion that from the writing of the fathers of our Republic many peoples and nations have gotten inspiration and hope as they attempted to realize their ideals. An historical library would be required to enumerate the progeny of these great documents. May their number increase. They will be meaningful to the rest of the world and through all future time to the degree that they are honored, revered, and observed by our America.

Illinois Newspaper Denounces Proposed Central Arizona Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the Illinois State Journal, published in the mid-western State capital of Springfield, recently published an editorial which indicates the growing awareness of many States of the fantastic nature of the proposed multibillion dollar central Arizona project.

Throughout the Nation, newspapers and magazines in steadily increasing numbers are denouncing this project as an unjustified burden on all taxpayers to aid a few landowners and speculators in Arizona. Obviously not all these edi-

torials can be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, although I wish my colleagues could see them, the better to know the facts of this case.

However, the Illinois State Journal's editorial is a commendable example.

It follows here:

Arizona, a very fine State for respiratory refugees from the humid Corn Belt, and a sight every American should see in his lifetime, is about to put across a costly irrigation project about which Illinois taxpayers should know.

Known as the central Arizona project, this costly scheme would total \$2,075,729,000 in taxes to irrigate 226,000 acres of war-boom land in the Phoenix area. That sum includes the original cost plus debt service for 75 years. Illinois taxpayers would assume \$157,534,000 of this obligation if the House should pass H. R. 1500.

Senate approval already has been given to build dams, pumps, and canals to the extent of \$1,838 an acre for the land to be reclaimed. This land would not be open the new settlers, but is already in private ownership. These private owners are in the front rank of the boondoggle's promotion.

Journal readers who are wondering what they can do to help relieve the ever-growing Federal tax load can contact their Congressmen and advise them to vote "no" on H. R. 1500. This will help prevent signing one more mortgage on the future earnings of ourselves, our children, and our grandchildren.

It is hardly good sense to curb badly needed flood-control measures in the populous Midwest and then pour money like water into the desert sands of the arid Southwest.

The Relief Chiselers Are Stealing Us Blind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 15, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on August 8, 1951, I introduced H. R. 5076. The purpose of the bill was to permit the several States to enact legislation if they so desired permitting access to the public records of persons receiving payments under the social security public-assistance programs without thereby making the States ineligible for their share of Federal funds under the public-assistance programs.

H. R. 5076 is identical with an amendment which the other body made to a revenue bill passed by the House. A full discussion of the provisions of my bill were had by the other body and after a full debate it was passed in order to help correct the misuse of the public-assistance funds paid for by the taxpayers of the country. Inasmuch as this legislation does not meet with the approval of Mr. Oscar Ewing, the Federal Security Administrator, although it is endorsed widely throughout the country by responsible organizations and citizens' groups, my bill has been successfully bottled up in the Ways and Means Committee.

Because this legislation is so important to several of our States, and indeed to all the taxpayers of our country who

are generally alarmed at the misuse of these funds, I am inserting for the record a recent article, appearing in the Saturday Evening Post of September 8, 1951, showing why it is important that the Ways and Means Committee favorably report H. R. 5076 and give every Member of the House an opportunity to vote on this legislation.

Under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting an article which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of September 8, 1951:

THE RELIEF CHISELERS ARE STEALING US BLIND

(By Paul Molloy)

(Money deducted from your pay check goes to cheats, encourages them to avoid work—and you're not even allowed to know who they are. Here are shocking facts uncovered in Oklahoma about the corruption of aid for dependent children.)

You could feel the filth in the two-room shack without looking at it. It hit you in the nostrils. The sullen woman in her forties padded about the drafty room in a pair of man's slippers several sizes too large. In one arm she clutched a bawling infant. Two other children huddled on a rickety bed in the corner. Two more stared vacantly out a dirt-creased window. The serious, puzzled expression on their faces made them look like little old men.

The woman mumbled in a dull monotone, "My husband disappeared after the second child came."

A man's cap hung on the chair. "Is there a man living with you now?" I asked.

A moment's hesitation, then: "Yes. My boy friend's living with me. This"—she swung the baby upward—"is his baby."

Talking was difficult, like the forced conversation at a funeral. "What about the other two children?"

"They're his too."

Silence. More prodding. Silence. More questions.

And then: "My boy friend's divorced. He's got five other kids from his wife."

"In other words, this man you're living with is supporting 10 children—these 5 and 5 from his wife?"

"Well, not exactly. You see, he ain't working. He ain't feeling none too well."

This woman and her paramour are getting \$126 a month in aid for dependent children (ADC) from the State of Oklahoma. They represent just one of the hundreds of individual cases I traced down during an investigation for the Tulsa Tribune. The inquiry revealed that in an alarming number of instances State welfare, financed directly by the taxpayer, is making Oklahoma a paradise for parasites. The case histories disclose countless examples of indolence and sloth, show clearly how the taxpayer supports men and women who not only do not work but who are breeding a society of illegitimates besides.

These, of course, are aside from the legitimate cases the ADC law was meant to serve—cases where the parents were dead or seriously ill, where deserving children would have been left to suffer without aid. But in case after case the investigation showed that the father is a chiseler and the mother a drone. Caught in between is the citizen, paying the bills for lazy, apathetic ne'er-do-wells satisfied to eat the bread of idleness.

A similar situation exists in several other States, although Oklahoma presently has the unsavory distinction of having more children on relief rolls than any other State. More than 55,000 children are receiving aid each month; this represents about 8 percent of all children in the State, and is more than twice the national average. The per-capita public-welfare bill in Oklahoma is the

second highest in the Nation; only Colorado spends more per inhabitant than does this oil-rich section of the Southwest. During the last fiscal year it cost each Oklahoman \$33.12 to maintain public-assistance expenditures, and out of every welfare dollar spent, 18 cents went toward ADC.

ADC obligations during this period totaled \$14,326,599 for 22,000 families; of this amount, \$4,968,459 was State money and the remainder was Federal. The Federal Government makes contributions to the States for public assistance; the Federal and State Governments combine to give the ADC parent \$27 a month and an additional \$27 for the first child. From then on, it is \$18 for each child, up to a monthly maximum of \$150. For the first child, the Federal grant is \$16.50 against the State's \$10.50, and \$12 against the State's \$6 for each additional child. The State and Federal obligations for ADC in Oklahoma are now running at more than \$1,500,000 a month. And a bill is pending, as of this writing, to increase the Federal share of welfare aid to the States by \$140,000,000 a year.

Getting this \$27-plus-\$27-plus-\$18-plus-\$18-plus-\$18, and so on, is no problem for the recipient. She just has to ask for it and show that she is in need. Whether the children are legitimate or illegitimate makes no difference. Whether she is married or divorced or separated or unmarried makes no difference. If there is no husband or father on hand to support the children or if the husband or father cannot support them, through illness, for example, she is entitled to ADC. If the supporting parent is dead, incapacitated or absent, ADC will be granted. The number of children has no bearing on the grant, nor do the circumstances of their birth. A girl coming in with her brood from a neighboring State, however, must wait 1 year before getting her first ADC check. Husband and wife do not have to be living together, but if the man responsible for a woman's pregnancy is in town, the case worker will report this to her case investigator. Naturally, the type of lover or husband this story is concerned with rarely stays in town.

Some of this money was received, and spent, legitimately; too much of it was not. Let's look in on some of the homes where this money went—homes picked at random which I had no reason to suspect of chiseling.

What little furniture there was in the house had seen better days, but that was understandable, for here was a family receiving ADC, distributed by the State out of the 17 percent of the State sales tax earmarked for that purpose. But atop a table and occupying a place of honor in the living room was a \$250 television set. The owner also had a large cabinet radio of recent vintage. He also has five children, for whom he receives \$112 a month. This is not quite the maximum of \$126, because this man reports a few dollars income from his casual efforts at working.

I came right to the point. "Nice set you've got. What did you pay for it?"

"Thirty-five dollars. Got it from a friend." The answer came so fast it sounded rehearsed.

"Who's the friend?"

"A grocer; he took it from a customer—you know—to pay the bill."

"That was lucky. And who's the grocer?"

"Well"—hesitation was setting in now—"he's out of business. I don't know where he is."

This man doesn't work, he told me, "because I don't feel too good." But a sign in the front yard proclaims him a radio repairman and on good days he admits he makes \$4 or \$5.

THE SORRY STORY OF AN UNHAPPY MOTHER

Sometimes you can tell a lot about a house from its entrance. The door on the next

cabin home I visited rattled out a sorry story. It was little more than a huge, gaping hole surrounded by a little screen, and it was shy one hinge. Inside was pandemonium, a 38-year-old woman with four children and plenty of dirt. One spot on the wall was clean; it held a placard reading: "God bless our happy home." But the woman wasn't happy. Her ADC check had been going up and down, and her temper had shifted accordingly. She didn't know the reason for the fluctuation, although it was obvious.

Her first husband, A, died after the arrival of the first child. Then she married B, who is now in the hospital. The second child came, but while B was in the hospital, she took up with C, to whom she bore another child, her third. Not long ago, her fourth child was born, from a fourth man, D. Although county records showed nothing on C or D, I found out that D is in Tulsa, jobless, and nobody knows where C is.

This woman at least had gone through a marriage ceremony with two of the four fathers, but some ADC recipients—some of whom have been getting a free ride for 12 years—don't bother with that formality. One woman receiving \$108 a month introduced me to her four illegitimate youngsters, fathered by four different men. Not one had stayed around long enough to provide for the offspring, and this woman has been receiving State aid for 8 years.

In another neighborhood, one woman's adventures left me a little stunned. After her third child she and her husband separated and a fourth child came after an idyl with another man. Still another affair, with another man, produced a fifth child. At this stage the original couple decided to pick up where they left off. The two remained together long enough to produce four more children—by now she had borne nine children—but for the second time the husband packed and left. He's in Kansas now, and you are helping to support his children.

At another home a young mother of two, both born out of wedlock, told me she had received no word from either father. As we talked, there was a cough in the kitchen. "Who's the man?" I asked.

"My boy friend."

"Is he living here?"

"Yes, he is."

It developed that this third lover has a job and the woman herself earns \$5.40 a day when she works. To top it off, this pair is getting \$72 a month of the taxpayers' ADC money.

Another girl with five illegitimate children insisted she was not "living with" her man. "He only comes here to see me now and again," she insisted. And she's been getting State aid for 3 years.

This isn't what Oklahomans had in mind when they voted to participate in the ADC programs. Says Jenkin Lloyd Jones, blunt-spoken editor of the Tribune, who ordered my investigation: "The reason why the ADC program went sour is the secrecy that surrounds the payments. Taxpayers are not permitted to know who gets their money. The Federal Government will refuse to pay its share of the grant if the names of recipients are made public, and this is an engraved invitation to grafters. This ruling, in effect, encourages leeches to live off the wage earner because their identity is protected. Thus we have made the matter of getting relief so easy that we are creating a large class of professional paupers. As long as the records remain hidden and the citizen tapped for taxes cannot learn whether his neighbor has a hand in his pocket, laziness and promiscuity will continue profitable and attractive."

Difficult as it is to support the progeny of men who love and run away, it is doubly onerous when the irresponsible fathers are criminals to boot. One girl I interviewed

was particularly unlucky. The man responsible for her first pregnancy has been in the penitentiary since 1949. The girl wasn't able to spell his name. Her second lover, after fathering her second child, got a 5-year sentence for raping a 12-year-old girl. She shares her apartment with a girl friend, also receiving ADC, whose husband deserted her 3 years ago, leaving four children behind.

Not too long ago an Oklahoma county attorney, fed up with the abuses, subpoenaed welfare records and had 18 errant fathers arrested. Immediately the Federal authorities, pointing meaningfully to Federal grants from the National Treasury which keep the ADC going in the States, informed the welfare department that it was to resist any further attempt to subpoena the records. It is an offense, punishable by prison or fine, or both, to reveal the names of relief recipients. I could not get the lists I used from welfare officials; as a newspaperman, I was able to get them from another source.

During this month-long survey I talked with a man who hadn't worked in 3 years. He owns a 1941 truck and hopes to become a trash hauler, but he gets a \$122 monthly grant and has been on ADC for 5 years. I noticed an addition to his house and asked how much it had cost. He said \$200.

Since this man isn't working, where did he get the \$200?

The monthly ADC average payments tell an interesting story. For October 1950 the average per family was \$44.66. It rose to \$50.19 the following month, and in December it stood at \$50.23. An across-the-board increase was begun early this year, and the average now has hit the \$72.57 mark. Of all the cases I investigated, not one had requested a raise; it came as a happy surprise to them all.

One house I called at was a study in contrasts. It was decrepit and crying for a coat of paint. The young woman who unlocked the door wore jeans and a man's suit coat. The coat was unbuttoned, and she was naked beneath it.

She flashed a coy smile, motioned me to a chair, and jolted me with "Ain't you got a key of your own?"

The woman was a prostitute and obviously had mistaken me for a regular customer. When it was evident that I had no key of my own she showed no embarrassment. She explained that her three children were illegitimate, from two men. "I don't know where the first man is," she said casually. "The second fellow's here in town, but I couldn't get him to take no blood (paternity) test."

"Do you get any help from either of them?"

The woman—she was in her thirties—pulled out her gum and rolled it between her fingers. "Naw—they don't help none at all." Oklahoma does, however. She gets \$90 a month in ADC, and only she knows how much she gets from her profession.

Margaret Lamm, assistant Tulsa County attorney, sees the situation like this: "Paying women to add to the population of miserable, illegitimate children is bad charity, for it doesn't eliminate want, it compounds it. It raises new generations of twisted, subnormal people bred in the foulest environments, who are candidates for our swelling ranks of unemployables, criminals, and insane."

Mrs. Lamm has been handling such cases for years. One that escaped her was the 39-year-old chap who was still in bed when I called at 1:30 p. m., although he doesn't work nights. He doesn't work days, either.

Yes, he was in good health, he said. No, he wasn't working. Yes, he'd looked for a job a while back, but hadn't had much luck.

I asked: "Do you plan on going to work soon?"

And this was his reply, complete with giggles, "Guess I'll get around to it, but you know—my trouble is just that I'm lazy."

Perhaps I hadn't heard clearly. I repeated the question, but the answer was the same, only this time it was funnier.

"It's like I say," again the silly laugh, "I guess I'm just plain lazy."

This man gets \$52 worth of hilarity every month from ADC. He doesn't even have to leave his bed to get it. It gets to him in the mail, regularly.

The cases of rapacity and fraud are endless. In one case, the mother claimed her husband was too sick to work. She said he was 61, had three kidneys instead of two, and suffered from arthritis and pneumonia. Despite his ailments—she said he was "actually dying"—the wife was expecting her seventh child. I asked to speak to the father, but he wasn't in bed. He wasn't even at home.

Said his wife cheerfully, "He's up the road apiece, with the boys."

A father of five children in Tulsa is living with his own parents in the country. It took a half hour before his wife would admit that her husband was a drunkard. She had insisted he was "resting up" from ulcers while she claimed a \$128 ADC check every month. Even for Tulsa, a city of phenomenal wealth, those are pretty expensive ulcers.

The public-welfare department concedes there are difficulties in getting the vanishing papas to face the music. Its last official report says: "The uniform support-of-dependents law has to date had little effect in obtaining support from absent parents, since those other States which adopted similar legislation are not the States to which most of the clients from Oklahoma have gone."

But this doesn't fit in with some of the cases I checked. I talked to one woman whose son-in-law, a widower, consistently refuses to support his two children. I finally found out that the father holds a good job in Oklahoma City and the grandparent has his address—he recently invited them down for a visit. She had complained to the authorities, but nothing came of the complaint. Another mother told me tearfully that on three separate occasions she had urged a former Tulsa County attorney to bring about the prosecution of her faithless husband. She was turned away with the reply that the authorities would never get anything done if all defaulting spouses had to be hunted.

This woman tended to agree with Oklahoma City District Judge A. P. VanMeter, who has seen the problem in his court many times, and who says, "Fathers who desert their children commit a worse crime than auto stealing. Federal law-enforcement agencies are used every day to apprehend and prosecute car thieves, but they are prevented from returning deserting fathers who flee across State lines and leave their families penniless."

One of the ADC's aims is to keep families united, where possible, but I found a case where mother and daughter were so close that one was helping the other with cash, although both are on ADC. The older woman was a widow with three children, the last illegitimate. Her \$50-a-month apartment was a new one and the furniture—including a gleaming kitchen range and a giant refrigerator—had been recently purchased. Besides the three young ones, she had three grown daughters, all of whom contribute \$10 a month toward her support, and one of these daughters is on ADC herself. This is in addition to the \$90 the older woman gets from the State each month. The furniture? A present from one of the daughters.

Steve Stahl, executive vice president of the Oklahoma Public Expenditures Council, which for years has fought to have the State publicize the names of ADC mothers, says bluntly, "Oklahoma has created a welfare Frankenstein." Stahl, who is also chairman of the National Conference of State Taxpayer Associations, emphasizes that Okla-

homa spends more for public charity than for public education, and adds:

"The ADC program encourages illegitimacy and subsidizes the breaking up of homes. Relief today, without any further expansion, is being dispensed in a manner and at a cost that neither our present nor any yet devised economy can support for a protracted period of time."

Stahl was particularly incensed with the odd instance of the Tulsa schoolboy who found work in the school cafeteria during the noon hour, 3 days a week. This investigation showed he was paid 50 cents an hour. After a month, his mother abruptly ordered him to quit; she draws an ADC check and it was to be cut \$2 because her son brought home \$1.80 at the end of the month. From his earnings he had paid for his lunches, and the \$1.80 represented what he had accumulated above his lunch cost. But it represented much more than that. That \$1.80 was the seed of industry and thrift which every American boy and girl can develop, with proper training. It was something he was proud of, because he had earned and saved it. But in his home there is no incentive, because his mother forbids him to work. So he, too, may grow up to be a parasite; his mother's check might well be his passport to a life of indolence.

What is the answer? How can these people be wiped off the rolls in Oklahoma, in your State, in your county?

Representative TOM STEED, one of two Oklahoma Representatives who discussed this investigation in Congress, feels the solution is squarely up to Congress and State officials. STEED has introduced a measure that has teeth to bite into the problem. He wants a Federal law to permit Government crime-detection agencies to pick up these wandering hoboes and take them back to jurisdictions where they can be made to work for their children or stay in prison indefinitely. "The abuses have increased so rapidly in recent years," says STEED, "that they are becoming a national curse and are threatening the entire ADC program."

Mrs. Lamm feels that fathers who breed for a macabre profit, then refuse to support their children, should simply be thrown into jail for bastardy. The idea of these fathers loafing and looking at television or taking refuge out of the State while the postman pads to the door with a public baby bonus, she says, is "senseless and intolerable."

District Judge Eben L. Taylor, of Tulsa, a mild-tempered man with little respect for deserters, also is disappointed with the abuses: "There are thousands of cases where ADC works well, but these have not been brought about by the State. They result from the fact that there are many mothers who are strapped financially, but are able and willing, with ADC help, to make good homes for their children. And this is what made ADC look plausible when it began, but the scheme has broken down. There is no plan to create a pleasant home for the unhappy children; only to send money each month to a person who, in too many cases, could never qualify as a responsible guardian for anyone's welfare."

Jones suggests that women who have illegitimate children should not be permitted to draw checks on them. His argument is that the unwed baby breeder is a racketeer, and her children should be placed in an orphanage. "That's expensive," Jones admitted, "but not nearly so expensive as the present situation, in which she can actually qualify for a free living if she bears enough children. It's time sentimentality was set aside and these women charged with State vagrancy."

Armed with the suggestions for remedy listed above and after the investigation was completed, I went to see Virgil L. Stokes, director of the Oklahoma welfare department. Stokes said he doubted if the publicizing of names of welfare clients would accomplish

a great deal. Regarding the penalizing of miscreant fathers, he insisted this was the responsibility of county and local authorities, stressing that he couldn't approve of anything that would put us in the "pistol-packing business." Asked if the mothers were ever warned by case workers that their promiscuous pregnancies could lead them to some form of punishment—such as deprivation of the child or a charge of State vagrancy—Stokes replied:

"Our interest is in the child; therefore we make no effort to reform the mother. We don't rehabilitate these women because we don't consider that part of our duties." The mother doesn't have to file charges against the man; Stokes said she can get ADC whether or not she takes action against the boy friend.

"This interview," Editor Jones retorted, "illustrates how far afield we have gone in public welfare. What ADC would need, under this formula, is a crew of business-machine operators, not social-service workers. One has so many babies, one gets so much base pay. The State comes around once a year to check up on production. It's just an inventory."

On July 31, 1951, Federal Security Administrator Oscar Ewing cut the State of Indiana off from Federal welfare funds, because of Indiana's insistence on opening her welfare rolls to public inspection. Oklahoma is still eligible for her share of Federal money, but unless something is done about the situation, Oklahoma's expenditures for all kinds of assistance, within 2 years, will have amounted to more than \$150,000,000 and will probably still be climbing.

There Is Nothing New About "Yes Men"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the Truman administration has repeatedly shown that it tolerates only "yes men" in its councils. It has been ruthless in its reprisals against those who dissent. It has refused to seek the counsel of some of the ablest, most experienced Americans because it knew they would offer advice it did not want to hear. It has frequently denied Congress access to information or advice contrary to administration views and policies.

The most dramatic case, of course, was the dismissal of General MacArthur. But that is only one example. Consider such matters as the firing of Admiral Denfeld; suppression of the Wedemeyer report and virtual banishment of General Wedemeyer; dismissal of former Ambassador Grew from the State Department in favor of Dean Acheson; the firing of Defense Secretary Johnson, who refused to pad the military budget; failure to heed warnings of the late Senator Vandenberg regarding far-eastern policy; refusal to consult such far-eastern experts as General Chen-nault, Admiral Yarnell, General Hurley and General MacArthur himself during the crucial formative stages of the disastrous Pacific policy; the bypassing of Congress as a whole in the decision to fight in Korea; the President's

curt rejection of Senator Tarr's offer to confer on foreign policy; last week's smear attack on Democratic Senator Douglas which brought his almost hysterical outcry, and many other instances of failure to use the national resources of experience and wisdom.

Note by contrast the high favor in which the administration holds former Defense Secretary Marshall, who said during the MacArthur hearings that he would not tell a congressional committee the truth if it involved expressing views "in opposition to my Commander in Chief." Note, also, the statement of General Bradley, "I wouldn't profess that my judgment was better than the President or the administration."

There is nothing new about "yes men" in Government, or about those in authority who make it tough for any who refuse to be sycophants. And it is nothing new for such a policy to lead to disaster. Here is a narrative of events in the year 897 B. C. It is found in the Bible, in the twenty-second chapter of I Kings:

And it came to pass in the third year, that Jehoshaphat the King of Judah came down

to the King of Israel (Ahab). And the King of Israel said unto Jehoshaphat, "Wilt thou go with me to battle to Ramoth-gilead?" And Jehoshaphat said to the King of Israel, "I am as thou art, my people as thy people, my horses as thy horses."

And Jehoshaphat said unto the King of Israel, "Enquire, I pray thee, at the word of the Lord today." Then the King of Israel gathered the prophets together, about 400 (they were prophets of the groves, hirelings of Jezebel) and said unto them, "Shall I go against Ramoth-gilead to battle, or shall I forbear?" And they said, "Go up, for the Lord shall deliver it into the hand of the king. And Jehoshaphat said, "Is there not a prophet of the Lord besides, that we might enquire of him?" And the King of Israel said unto Jehoshaphat, "There is yet one man, Micalah, the son of Imlah, by whom we may enquire of the Lord; but I hate him, for he doth not prophesy good concerning me, but evil."

And Jehoshaphat said, "Let not the king say so." Then the King of Israel called an officer, and said, "Hasten thither Micalah, the son of Imlah * * *."

And the messenger that was gone to call Micalah spake unto him, saying, "Behold now, the words of the prophets declare good unto the king with one mouth, let thy word, I pray thee, be like the word of one of them, and speak that which is good." And Micalah said, "as the Lord liveth, what the Lord saith

unto me, that will I speak." So he came to the king.

And the king said unto him, "Micalah, shall we go against Ramoth-gilead to battle, or shall we forbear?" And he answered him, "Go and prosper; for the Lord shall deliver it unto the hand of the king." And the king said unto him, "How many times shall I abjure thee that thou tell me nothing but that which is true in the name of the Lord?"

And he (Micalah) said, "I saw all Israel scattered upon the hills, as sheep that have not a shepherd; and the Lord said, 'These have no master; let them return every man to his house in peace'."

And the King of Israel said unto Jehoshaphat, "Did I not tell thee that he would prophesy no good concerning me, but evil?" And the King of Israel said, "Take Micalah and carry him back unto Amon, the governor of the city, and to Joash, the king's son; and say: 'Thus saith the king, put this fellow in prison, and feed him with bread of affliction, and with water of affliction, until I come in peace'."

And Micalah said, "If thou return at all in peace, the Lord hath not spoken by me."

Mr Speaker, the sequel to all of which was that Ahab went up to battle, his forces were disastrously defeated and routed, and Ahab himself was fatally wounded. It was a heavy price to pay for listening to "yes men."

PROPERTY OF UNIVERSITY
OF WASHINGTON LIBRARIES
GRADUATE READING ROOM
NON-CIRCULATING

W

3376